Appendix

The President's Balance-of-Payments Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made on July 18, 1963, in regard to the President's balance-of-payments message.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, IN REGARD TO THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS MESSAGE.

The continuing deficit in our accounts with foreign countries which causes the continuing loss of our gold is the most serious problem currently confronting the United States.

Administration proposals contained in the President's baalnce-of-payments message today do not provide for either a balance or a surplus in these accounts. The message predicts a deficit of at least $1 billion as late as 1965.

We spent abroad $2.4 billion more than we collected from foreign countries in calendar year 1961. The deficit was $2.2 billion last year; and it is running at a rate of $3 billion or more in the current year ending in December.

The President in his message expects some reduction in calendar year 1964, and estimates there will be a $1 billion deficit in 1965. Even this estimate is based on too many contingencies to make it certain.

This reduction in the deficit is contingent upon reduction in U.S. military expenditures abroad, reduction in sale of foreign securities in the United States, reduction in U.S. investments abroad, and continuing excess of exports over imports. The administration continues to avoid substantial reduction in foreign aid.

There is no assurance that foreigners will not retaliate against today's administration proposals which would raise the short-term interest rates, and tax sales of foreign securities in the United States; and it is likely that raising the discount rate will result in higher interest rates generally.

The fact remains that so long as these deficits in our foreign accounts continue, our gold supply is vulnerable to withdrawals by foreign governments and banks. They have already taken 66 percent of our free gold. More than $8 billion in gold has gone out of the country in 13 years; $4 billion since 1959. Less than $4 billion not needed to back the dollar remains, and withdrawals are still being made.

A situation in which dollar-gold convertibility could not be offered would rock the free world. It is tragic that effective steps to correct this balance-of-payments deficit have not been taken before. Previous efforts affecting military dependents abroad and duty-free tourist purchases abroad have not been effective. I believe stronger steps than those now proposed will have to be taken.

The emphasis in the President's message today was on curbs in the capital area. But American dollars are still going out of the country in tremendous foreign aid, military, and tourist expenditures abroad. These are in addition to private investment overseas, foreign loans in the United States, and U.S. loans abroad.

Stern and positive measures must be immediately taken to balance our foreign payments and avoid continuing deficits. Constructive action has been too long deferred.

The Editor's Desk—With "Red" Welsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, the following radio editorial appealed to me as a sincere tribute to a man who was interested in the public from all over the country. The lakes that he was instrumental in saving have been used by thousands from all of our 50 States.

It is too bad that his recognition in this field has to be posthumous:

A week ago, death came suddenly to a former city editor of the Billings Gazette. His name was Harold Letcher.

To "Letch," a newspaper's primary responsibility was to the public it served. He believed that honesty and objectivity in the news columns were reflected in the financial statement.

He was a man among men. He had a lot of friends. All who could make it were present when final rites were observed at the flag-covered casket in the Soldiers' Plot at Mountview Cemetery. They stood silently at attention as the dignity of "taps" said farewell.

This is a story many people don't know. That's why it is being told today.

Several years ago the Federal Government was offered an exchange of land located in Sweetgrass and Park Counties. In the overall national scale, a trade involving approximately 11 sections for about 5 sections in the mountains of the Far West didn't appear important. Land transfers between the Government and private individuals is not uncommon. Generally, such transactions are mutually beneficial. This particular trade was not in the interests of the public.

Practically all of the land the people were to receive was almost inaccessibly located near the ridges of the Crazy Mountains and was of little, if any, value. While the land the people would lose contained beautiful lakes, parks, and canyons that created one of the most attractive recreational areas in America.

The transaction was almost complete before people knew of its existence. Public opinion was the only thing that could stop it. With the skill and determination of a dedicated newsman, City Editor Hal Letcher put the tremendous power of the press to work.

He petitioned friends in radio and television for cooperation. It was gladly given. Between illustrated featured stories in the newspaper and on television, together with radio editorials, the people soon learned what they were getting—and what they were losing. He created so much public interest that the Federal Government sent representatives from the Department of the Interior to Montana for a public administrative hearing.

This was held in Livingston on a bitter cold winter day. Hal Letcher had done his job so well that people from all over Montana packed the American Legion Hall to capacity, despite the fact that the temperature reading outside the building was 30° below zero.

The rest of the story is anticlimactic. When the officials from Washington understood all of the details connected with the proposed trade, they canceled it as not in the interests of the public.

No one will ever erect a monument to the former city editor of the Billings Gazette. In time, only his family and close friends will remember him. But this generation and others to follow will forevermore enjoy the tremendous majestic beauty of Half Moon Park, Thunder Lake, Blue Lake, Pear Lake, Lower Twin Lake, and the entire Big Timber Canyon area only because a man who lived by principle thought that people are important—a newsman named Hal Letcher.

Remember Albany, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the proposed mass demonstration by Negroes in Washington on August 28 has elicited considerable editorial comments around the country. Shortly after the President announced that he would send the civil rights bill to Congress and urged that such a march not be held, and before he changed his mind and expressed approval of the demonstration, the able editor of the Albany Herald of Albany, Ga., on July 2, printed a front page editorial which was quite apropos the situation. This editorial needs no explanation for it speaks quite well for itself. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMEMBER ALBANY, MR. PRESIDENT?

Precisely 1 year ago, Albany enjoyed the dubious distinction of being the focal point for the activities of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.'s racial circus, ostensibly aimed at socially integrating this biracial community but, as a byproduct, enriching the coffers of his organization. To this end, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., led his followers into the streets and alleys of Al-

bany where they chanted, sang and, sometimes—but always publicly—prayed.

It was his way, said the reverend, of arousing the conscience of the power structure of the city to the sad status of the Negro citizens. Above all, these demonstrations, the reverend maintained, were not organized but spontaneous and solemnly dedicated, by this Christian minister, to the Hinduist principle of nonviolence as exemplified by the reverend's personal hero, the late Mohandas K. Gandhi.

And this was so, the reverend asserted piously, even though some of the faithful spat upon police, threw rocks and bottles at them, and threatened them in some of the foulest language ever introduced into evidence in the U.S. Court's Middle District of Georgia, Albany Division.

We do not recall these tense days with fondness, but simply to make a point. While all this caterwauling was filling our streets (and the microphones and cameras of national television networks were speedily summoned to the scene), the President of the United States was asked at a Washington news conference what he thought of the situation. Well, said the President, he thought the Albany City Commission should at least be talking to the protesting Negro citizens about their grievances. He noted that a municipal governing body which steadfastly refused to negotiate with dissident groups even under duress was not acting in a true democratic spirit.

Well, that was a year ago. Since that time, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.'s racial circus has pitched its tents at many other sites—and much more profitably than in its local performances. Birmingham, Ala., was one such community. Many others have heard the blare and blarney of its trumpetings. Now, it seems, no less a city than Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, is to be treated to a really king-sized hurrah. Predictions have been made freely that perhaps as many as 1 million Negro Americans will demonstrate on the steps of the National Capitol. Some have promised to lie in the streets to block vehicular traffic. Others will recline on the runways of airports. Everything in the Capital must come to a standstill, according to their spokesmen, until the 88th Congress passes the omnibus civil rights bill proposed by the President.

And what does the President say of these plans?

"Stay home," he counsels, almost fearfully. "Unruly tactics or pressure will not help, and may hinder effective consideration of these matters" by the Congress.

Above all, the President advises the Negro militants, do not march whatever you do. Do not demonstrate. Let the Congress act in an atmosphere free from all manifestations of persuasion, political or physical.

"Take your arguments to the courts, not to the streets," says Mr. Kennedy.

Oh, come now, Mr. President.

Is Washington somehow "better" than Albany, Ga.?

If the Congress of the United States cannot act "under duress," why should you have criticized the city commission of Albany, Ga., for seeking a situation that you now recommend?

Is the shoe of socialistic experimentation pinching now, simply because the racial circus has changed its playing site to step on your toes?

Is what happens in your own backyard different in any manner from what occurred in Albany, Ga.?

Or is it, Mr. President, that you prefer not to practice what you preach because you personally, as well as officially, happen to be directly involved in the threatened Washington mess?

We are not certain, Mr. President, how a typical King performance can advance the morality and legal purposes of this Nation. But we do know this: There is nothing like a stomp-down, sit-in, kneel-in, lie-in, shout-and-sing-in to make your rocking chair move faster.

JAMES H. GRAY,
Editor.

School Enrollment Surge To Slow Down, According to Roger A. Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading experts on public education, Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, made an interesting statement regarding projected school enrollment. It is highly significant in the light of our current debates on Federal aid to education and I commend it to the attention of the Members of the body:

STANFORD.—America's school enrollment surge of the fifties will slow down substantially during the rest of the sixties, a Stanford expert predicts.

As a result, "the outlook for adequate financing of education is bright, unless the national economy takes a nosedive or turns sluggish," says Roger A. Freeman, senior staff member at the Hoover Institution.

Between 1954 and 1962, total enrollment in the Nation's schools and colleges rose 35 percent, he notes. Between now and 1970, the increase will average only half as much—17 percent—according to projections developed by the U.S. Census Bureau and Office of Education.

Colleges and professional schools will remain the fastest growing component of the educational system:

[In percent]

	Actual growth 1954 to 1962	Projected growth 1962 to 1970
Kindergarten through 8th grade	27	11
High school	49	24
College	74	51
All levels	35	17

Commenting on enrollment at the elementary and secondary school level, Freeman says: "This fall may see the last of the big attendance jumps in the common schools. As the postwar babies graduate, annual increases will shrink to half the size they maintained in the past 12 years.

"For some time, the States have had to concentrate their funds on the rapidly expanding elementary and secondary schools. In the future, they will be able to channel a larger share of their resources into higher education."

On a nationwide basis, he notes: "During the 1950's enrollment grew at a faster rate than the economy, as measured by gross national product and national income.

"Between 1962 and 1970, the total production of goods and services is expected to advance between 27 and 37 percent, assuming an annual growth rate for 3 to 4 percent.

"This is almost twice the expected rate of increase in educational enrollment. Thus, the problem of financing education should gradually become easier to solve, its weight less burdening to bear."

Since World War II, education enrollment at all levels has grown 76 percent, rising from 28 to 50 million. Total public and private educational expenditures rose from $4 to $29 billion during the same period, a gain of 334 percent when adjusted for changes in dollar values.

As a result, Freeman notes, the share of national income devoted to education has tripled, rising from 2.3 to 6.8 percent of the national income.

His comments were prepared at the request of the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee.

The Threatened Rail Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal there appears an excellent editorial calling our attention to the President's lack of leadership in dealing with the threatened rail strike.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Political Flummery," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL FLUMMERY

Doubtless the Government could have found worse ways to deal with the threatened railroad strike; outright compulsory arbitration or seizure of the companies are two. But the President's proposal is bad enough on several counts.

The President proposes to bar either a strike or a lockout (as though anyone were talking about that) for 2 years. The companies and the unions would attempt to reach agreement on work-rule changes, but where agreement was lacking the Interstate Commerce Commission would be empowered by Congress to approve, disapprove or modify the proposed changes. In effect, then, the dispute would be thrown into the lap of the ICC.

One thing wrong with all this is that it confuses the plain issues in the conflict. The dispute has been going on for 4 years, during which time the unions have never engaged in real negotiation on changes in the archaic work rules which result in featherbedding costing the roads some $600 million a year.

It might be added that the managements are not threatening a lockout; under the antitrust laws they wouldn't have a chance even if they wanted. The threat of a calamitous national tieup comes from one source only: Union intransigence.

The commonsense and legality of the company position has been substantiated over and over. Presidential reports have recommended work-rule changes. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the roads are legally free to institute the changes. So the President seems to be saying the ICC should supersede the Nation's highest tribunal. And by trying to give the ICC this power he implies that the blame rests on the companies as well as the unions.

Moreover, the hoary, elephantine ICC is about the least competent agency to decide anything; its maze of regulations is one of the main reasons for the financial difficulties of many railroads. To put into its hands decisions which are plainly mana-

gerial prerogatives would be a drastic extension of its power. To delay the work-rule changes by this means would naturally aggravate the railroads' weakened condition.

It also is evident that this peculiar procedure is, after all, a somewhat disguised form of compulsory arbitration. If the ICC disapproves a change, that is compulsion on management; if it approves, compulsion on the union. For the unions, however, it has the great advantage of delaying, in all probability, any significant changes for at least 2 years.

Not the least unappetizing aspect of the proposal is that it is a political evasion. If Congress buys it, the administration gets safely through the next election without a paralyzing and hence politically dangerous strike.

More than that; it is an evasion, for lack of political courage, of the Government's clear responsibility in the matter. The Government long ago, and rightly, made it illegal for companies to conspire together to restrain trade; closing down an entire industry would be a rather extreme restraint. The Government, wrongly, specifically exempted unions from these laws, and that is the reason for the union threat to close down an entire industry, with the most harmful consequences for the whole Nation.

By even a minimal exercise of logic, the Government which created the conditions for such gross abuse of union monopoly power has the duty to correct the conditions. But you won't find a hint of the real trouble, or the right remedy, in the President's lengthy message to Congress.

It's not the first time in history that a correct course has been sacrificed to supposed expediency, but that is not an excuse either. It is always regrettable to see a President turn away from leadership to indulge in political flummery.

The Supreme Court Decision on the Issue of Prayer in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision on the issue of prayers in schools, has caused many interested citizens to write to their Congressmen in protest. Under unanimous consent, I would like to insert the following comments from two of my constituents, Laura Roberts of Sebastopol and Pastor Linden W. Heath of the Christian Missionary Church of Santa Rosa. The first was sent to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and referred to my office, and Pastor Heath sent me a copy of a recent radio broadcast that he initiated. I feel that this letter and broadcast is typical of the scores of letters that I have received on this issue and reflects the understanding and concern many of my constituents have on this subject. I would also like to include my personal opinions on the religious issue, which include principles that reflect my views.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
June 25, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN: It is not with the desire to impose upon a friend, but, that I'm not certain to whom I should express my views, knowing you for one, takes his responsibilities of office and responsibilities of citizenship most seriously, I have taken the liberty of writing regarding a subject of great concern.

I feel there is a latent strength and health in this country—our country. One which comes forth to allow us to be just a little proud of ourselves. During time of emergency or war there are so many instances of sacrifice, loyalty, and service beyond the call of duty, that most are lost to history. During peace, we do become citizens who enjoy the benefits of the situation, but allow us to hear of a real need, and the response is often more than was requested.

If there is benefit to personal loss or tragedy, it is to know the kindness, sympathy, and support of friends and neighbors, for Americans are generous, and kind, and good, and the very substance of this goodness is a belief in God.

As our shores have embraced the humble and the proud, the rich and the poor, the ignorant and the wise, from whatever part of the earth they have come and granted them the blessings of democracy, so has our country embraced the right of every man to believe in his own God, worship in his own fashion, but I conceive no written law which would deny nor defy Him. Surely, not against the common good?

This is only one small voice of one citizen, but there are so many of us shocked, hurt, and a little disillusioned, that the law we respect should speak against the greatest loyalty one should have.

That our Constitution could be interpreted to remove the worship of God is too revolutionary a thought, but where do we go from here?

Our allegiance, as we pledge it, is to "one nation under God." Our coin of exchange states "In God do we trust." As does our national anthem, and a popular song which speaks the thoughts of so many, and carried us through dark days and victory, "God Bless America."

We, as a Nation, feel the blessings of our God, and we pray for His blessing upon every new President, Congress, and invoke His blessing before personal and national undertakings of importance. How dare we write Him out now? The education of every child is an important dedication of future thought in our world.

Having sincere faith in your ability and concern to do that which is right, I implore you to use your voice to say that which should be said, and your strength of position to do that which should be done, to correct this situation which does not represent a God-fearing nation.

Most sincerely,

LAURA ROBERTS.

Our Nation suffered another tragic blow this past week, a blow far worse than the Communists inflicted when they took over Cuba, for this blow was at the foundation of our strength. It struck at the very spiritual forces upon which our Nation was built. Those forces instilled in the hearts and minds of our youth have been the guiding and energizing truths that have made our country one of the greatest in all of the history of mankind.

Who struck this blow? The Supreme Court of the United States, when they ruled this past week that it was unconstitutional for any public school to read a portion of the Bible, or to utter a prayer. What a mockery against a holy God in heaven. What total blindness to the true meaning of freedom; for to deny the majority the exercise of their rights because of the very, very small minority, is to distort the total meaning of liberty and freedom. Every Christian should stand for minority rights, but only a fool and a despot would stand for minority rule.

Here in California this Supreme Court ruling may not affect our educational institutions so much, for long ago God's word and any recognition of God in prayer has been ruled out of public schools in our State. Here and there sincere, dedicated Christian teachers have dared to share such portions of Holy Scripture as the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and even to offer a prayer in class. I know of one kindergarten teacher who, at lunchtime, would lead her little ones in a simple prayer of thanks to God. Then one day a mother came in and read the riot act to the teacher and to the principal, and from that time on there has been no simple expression of thanks in that kindergarten class just before the children eat. So, California has led the way in moral cowardice, before a very small minority, to rule out any mention of God and His word to our children in school.

However, this has not been the case in nearly 40 of the other 50 States in the Union. For they have, since the days of our forefathers, shared the wonderful influence in the minds of growing children, of the utterance of a prayer, and the simple reading of a brief portion of Holy Scripture. No, such an act doesn't make saints out of children, but it did help to instill these great virtues of reverence, respect, love, faith, and a consciousness of the human being's responsibility to a holy God in heaven.

But now, in one brief moment, our Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional these privileges that our forefathers fought and bled and died for. I agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Billy Graham, who stated that he was "shocked" at the ruling, and added, "Prayers and Bible reading have been a part of American public school life since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock. Now a Supreme Court in 1963 says our fathers were all wrong all those years. In my opinion, it is the Supreme Court that is all wrong."

I agree with Billy Graham 100 percent.

The tragedy is that so many professing Christians have succumbed to the propaganda brainwashing that has been going on for years, that our law of separation of church and state means separation of God from our society, except for the confines of the home and the church building. This, of course, is the Communist's policy, freedom for religion as long as it does not penetrate society outside the walls of the home and the church.

So the Christians of America will allow this Supreme Court decision to go by with very little objection, aside from perhaps a fleeting thought that "it does seem a shame." But we will go on our merry way, while the foundations of a God-fearing nation are destroyed by our leaders; until one day we will awake to discover that we can no longer call upon God to deliver us. Instead of enjoying His mercy, we must face His judgment.

I believe in religious liberty, and hold that this God-given right is exercised at its best when there is separation between church and state.

I believe in civil government as divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights, and to rule in civil things; and that in this realm it is entitled to the respectful and willing obedience of all.

I believe in the individual's natural and inalienable right to freedom of conscience: to worship or not to worship; to profess, to practice, and to promulgate his religious beliefs, or to change them according to his conscience or opinions, holding that these are the essence of religious liberty; but that in the exercise of this right, he should respect the equivalent right of others.

I believe that all legislation and other governmental acts which unite church and state are subversive of human rights, potentially persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of church and state;

and therefore, that it is not within the province of human government to enact such legislation or perform such acts.

I believe it is our duty to use every lawful add honorable means to prevent the enactment of legislation which tends to unite church and state, and to oppose every movement toward such union, that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty.

I believe that these liberties are embraced in the golden rule, which teaches that a man should do to others as he would have others do to him.

DON H. CLAUSEN,
Member of Congress.

Broadcast Editorializing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is holding hearings on the subject of broadcast editorializing. There has been some expression of opposition to this practice.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, I feel that broadcast editorializing, subject to reasonable rules and regulations, should continue. The people of this country have a right to know and the more information and opinions they can get the better.

Because of the fact that airways are owned by the public it is, of course, their duty to give ample and fair opportunity to opposition viewpoints. According to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's studies to date, most stations appear to be following such a policy and are complying with the rules of fairness established by the FCC.

A fine example of radio eidtorializing has recently come to my attention. W. Richard Carlson of Newport, N.H., owner and operator of station WCNL of that town, recently prepared and delivered an excellent editorial on the "gold flow" problem with constructive criticisms of the recent proposals to impose a tax on foreign investment. Because of current interest in both these matters, I thought my colleagues would be particularly interested in Mr. Carlson's timely and forthright expression of his views which follow:

BROADCAST EDITORIALIZING

(WCNL editorial, July 19, 1963, prepared by W. R. Carlson)

Yesterday, the President of the United States of America proposed that, to slow down the flow of dollars overseas, U.S. citizens who hold foreign securities—those who have invested in business overseas—should pay a special tax on these investments. The immediate reaction was the slump of foreign stocks on the New York and American stock exchanges today. But the real impact of the Presidential request has not yet been felt, and when its meaning becomes apparent to every thinking American, we trust the President and Representatives in Congress will be deluged with protests.

The United States has suffered a severe drain on its gold reserves through dollar spending abroad. This has been going on constantly since World War II, and at the rate we are proceeding, the Communists theory that they need only sit back and let the United States "spend itself into bankruptcy" may yet come to pass.

The largest single drain on our dollar reserves, however, has not been through the investment of these dollars overseas by U.S. businessmen; on the contrary, the largest drainhole through which the gold reserves have been pouring is the U.S. foreign aid program. This is the plan where U.S. citizens, who work very hard to earn their money, and who believe implicity in the rights of private property, and the theory that the investor shall reap the fruits of his investment, are taxed more and more stringently by their Government so that the "know-it-alls" in Washington can send these funds to provide aid for one Socialist government after another around the globe. The fact that these funds are going to governments which do not respect the right of private property, and the sanctity of individual investments has no influence whatsoever upon the golden boys who seem to come largely from that segment of the population who have never been in business, and who would be lost if they had to organize and operate a business themselves.

Now, after some 18 years of encouraging private investment abroad—and these investments have been made by individuals based upon a number of very sound factors, including the stability of governments where the business is operated, and their recognition of private property rights—now the U.S. Government intends to reverse this policy of encouraging such investment overseas and penalize those who have made such sound investments by taxing—or at least proposing to tax—their investments abroad.

This seems to your reporter to be the most asinine move ever made by a government founded upon the free enterprise system. These investments overseas are not "handouts." They are providing jobs for thousands of our allies, in a climate of private enterprise which is the system that should be fostered by our Nation. Withdrawing U.S. investments—and they'll be withdrawn by businessmen who cannot afford another form of double taxation—is going to hurt these business operations, many of which are the mainstay of the economy in allied countries that also practice free enterprise.

At the same time, the Government is making no move to cut off the "handouts"—the foreign aid to countries which do not recognize the rights of private investment, and which are in many cases not only Socialist—as Indonesia, India, and many of the countries in Africa, but which in some cases are out-and-out Communist; such as Yugoslavia, Poland, and others. So, with one hand, our Government is going to suppress private investment—sound investment abroad, while with the other hand they continue to dole out the "handouts" to the countries who, I'm sure, laugh at us behind our backs while they squander our substance.

The private investor who places his capital abroad because he feels it is a sound investment, which will not only return a reasonable dividend, but will also assist in building a sound economy where the dollars are used for capital investment will now be thwarted, while his Socialist counterpart in Government will still be free to continue the drain on U.S. gold reserves with the foreign aid program.

It is my considered opinion that if the President of the United States—whose family has millions, made from private investments—were to have cut off the foreign aid dollars instead of attacking the private investment segment of our economy, he would have made a much wiser move.

Then let those countries which want U.S. dollars provide a hospitable investment climate for them by recognizing the sanctity of private investment and making it possible for those dollars to bring a return on their investment to the investor. Cut off the handouts of foreign aid, and those countries which have been pouring them down the drain to further state socialism will be faced with the hard facts of life—that Uncle Sugar is no longer going to foot their bills, and that if they want investment capital it will have to be won by the reorganization of their Government to attract private capital.

I've heard all the old arguments about why we should help Yugoslavia and Poland and all these other nations—but we are heping them to build a Socialist society which eventually will compete, at slave wages, with our free economy, while we find ourselves with less and less opportunity for employment here at home through the constantly spiraling cycle of the wage-cost-price squeeze. I sincerely believe that if we don't stop building Socialist governments, and start making oversea countries vie for private investment capital through provision of an attractive climate for such investments, that we will eventually find that we have crossed the line into a Socialist state, with everything owned by the Government and controlled by the Government, and when that comes to pass, we will have no further need for any private investment capital, and there will be none, because the experts in Washington will have found a way to tax it out of existence.

Then it will come to pass that we will find ourselves living under the slogan of Karl Marx—to each according to his needs, from each according to his ability, and the politicians, as does the political hierarchy in the U.S.S.R. will reign supreme.

Is this what you want, Mr. President?

I don't, and I doubt that there are many Americans outside of the Communist Party who want it either.

Defense, Not Social Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C., has printed in the July 18, 1963, issue an excellent editorial column by Mr. Frank K. Myers on the subject of the Gesell report. The Gesell report was published in June 1963 and contains recommendations to the President by the "President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Myers' analysis of this report entitled "Defense, Not Social Reform" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it might be available to all Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE, NOT SOCIAL REFORM

(By Frank K. Myers)

Through the kindness of U.S. Representative JOE D. WAGGONNER, of Louisiana's Fourth Congressional District, we have received a summary of the 93-page "Gesell Report" which has been forwarded to Secretary of Defense McNamara at the Pentagon and

which is apparently already regarded by the branches of the Armed Forces as "the Bible" even though it was supposedly submitted only as a report, not a directive.

It is, in our opinion, one of the most sweeping and dastardly attacks on separation of the races since the Black Monday decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. It is not available for public distribution, but Representative WAGGONNER obtained a copy and has forwarded to us a few of its attitudes and recommendations.

It is the work of a seven-man civilian committee appointed by the President in June 1962 and is known after its Chairman, Gerhard Gesell, a Washington attorney. Actual name of the Committee is the President's Committtee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. The title of that part of the report which Representative WAGGONNER forwarded is "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States." As the Representative suggests, it is obvious from the first page to the last that the subject is not "equality," but "preferential treatment"—another case of bureaucracy twisting of dictionary definitions.

These are a few of the attitudes and recommendations made in the report:

More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes to correct the "insufficient flow" of Negroes into the services and to increase the "pitifully small" number of Negro officers.

Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preferences in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

Promotion boards should have more Negro officers on them because white officers are "consciously or unconsciously" discriminating against Negroes on promotions.

Special officers should be appointed (with biracial staffs) on every base to handle all complaints of the Negroes.

Such complaints are to be "encouraged."

More Negro girls are to be brought on bases for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation.

Negro hostesses should be considered rather than white.

Military police patrols used in neighboring communities should be integrated.

Segregated buses should be boycotted.

Base commanders should appoint biracial committees in the communities to break down segregation practices.

Civic clubs should not be joined if they are segregated.

The past policy of complying with local segregation policies should be terminated.

The practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another should not be permitted, even though this might be of their own choosing.

Methods are suggested for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

ROTC units should be cancelled in segregated schools.

The efforts of officers to bring about integration should be constantly reviewed and rated. Promotions should be based on their "initiative" and "accomplishments" in this field.

The traditional function of the base commander and senior officer to run a military establishment and maintain good community relations by staying out of local controversies is misguided and should be stopped. They should be encouraged to lead the way to full integregation.

Military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those local establishments which are integrated and have the "express approval" of the base commander. All others should be placed off-limits. Approved stores should display placards or decals on their windows and doors to show they have been approved by the military. This gives the base commander life-or-death control of the economic life of the community and the right to subject to military discipline all servicemen, their wives and children who shop at other stores of their own choosing.

Should all these efforts fail to bring about integration, the services must consider curtailing or terminating activities at these installations.

Representative WAGGONNER believes that the report brazenly calls down the threat of blackmail upon the populace, noting that the sorriest aspect is the damage it will do to the serviceman and his family.

Communities have always gone out of their way to receive servicemen and their families and make them welcome for the duration of their residence away from their homes. The report, when implemented, will make the servicemen and their families, through no fault of their own, walking symbols of civil disobedience. It will make the proud uniform they wear a shabby coat of political vote-getting. It will debease their honorable careers and turn friendly relations now enjoyed by base personnel and the community into one of hostility and resentment.

To sum up, the military forces were created for the defense of our Nation, not as instruments to enforce so-called social reforms. To use an old saying, "It's a hell of a way to run a railroad."

We'd Rather Give It Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful editorial from the Ledger-Star of Norfolk, Va.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'D RATHER GIVE IT AWAY

The reason for Mr. Kennedy's suggestion that Congress place a tax on certain U.S. dollars invested abroad is not difficult to understand. The reasoning behind it is almost bewildering.

The reason, of course, is to dissuade Americans from purchasing foreign stocks and bonds and thus sending dollars overseas. The action was taken in an effort to bolster our balance-of-payments position, which becomes sorrier by the year.

The reasoning is something entirely different. For, as everyone knows, the American position for a number of administrations has been to induce Americans to invest abroad. The purpose was to aid foreign countries to create home industries, to pull them onto their own economic feet and to foster trade. If Europe can make widgets to sell us, we can make gadgets to sell Europe.

So this latest move makes little sense at all. It has the look about it of improvisation, of catch-as-catch-can economic thinking. For, ask yourself, if Europe needs finances why deny it American private financing? And financing, basically, is what purchases of foreign bonds and stocks represent.

And what, one may ask, are the Common Market countries to make of all this? The Common Market is a plan to wipe away trade barriers which we practically sold to the Europeans and to which we have important ties. In fact, under the Treaty of Rome, which created the European Common Market, member nations are committed to remove restrictions on movements of capital between each other's countries. This tax is exactly the kind of restriction on capital we have told the Europeans they must do away with.

And it is more than that. For basic to the reasoning that suggested such a tax on investments abroad is the conviction that the Government knows better than individual Americans how to invest American dollars.

You can bet your last penny that most American private investments abroad are a sounder economic investment than the aid the Government goes in for, whether you want to look at it from the viewpoint of the country the money comes from or the country it goes to.

Now, if it's dollars Mr. Kennedy wants to keep from going overseas, what's the matter with trimming back more on our foreign aid—which runs annually to around $4 billion and since the end of World War II has amounted to around $100 billion?

Obviously, to the administration it makes more sense to send foreign aid to places like Afghanistan and Rwanda and Upper Volta than to have Americans invest in West Germany and Italy and Great Britain. But it doesn't to us. If we've got to keep dollars at home, then the Government ought to stop sending so many of them overseas. It shouldn't discourage sound foreign investments. And we hope somebody in Congress will tell Mr. Kennedy so.

For his sort of reasoning is blind to the chief causes of our balance-of-payments deficit. The deficit comes about because foreigners are turning in our dollars for our gold. They prefer our gold to our dollars because there is belief that the United States will have to raise the price of gold as the dollar continues to decrease in purchasing power owing to inflation. All of this results from our Government policy of deficit financing.

The cure for our balance-of-payments deficit is, we believe, twofold: We should stop crowding foreigners with U.S. giveaway dollars they can turn into gold and we should halt the dollar's erosion that results from Washington spending more than it takes in. Taxing private foreign investments won't do the job at all.

Eugene T. Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, July 18, the U.S. House of Representatives paid tribute to the record of great accomplishment and loyalty of Eugene T. Kinnaly. At that time, I was in executive session of the House Ways and Means Committee; however, I would like to take this occasion to join with my colleagues in praising this outstanding public servant.

Gene Kinnaly first came to the U.S. Congress and served for 10 years under the late beloved Congressman James Gallivan. Today, 45 years later, he is completing 35 years of service under our distinguished Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK. Gene has been an outstanding example to all administrative assist-

ants and secretaries on Capitol Hill. I am particularly grateful for the many times he has given advice and counsel to my office staff. He is a walking encyclopedia on Government agencies and an extraordinary authority on how to get things done.

Gene Kinnaly is loved and admired by all those who know him. He is the epitome of efficiency and competence and his record of service here in the U.S. House of Representatives is one which is honored by all and equaled by none.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to pay tribute to Eugene T. Kinnaly and I sincerely hope that he will enjoy many long years of beneficial service and continued good health.

Evers Must Not Have Died in Vain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a nation beset with civil disorder was shocked by the firing of a rifle that directed its deadly load toward the heart of one man; a man who had rallied to the cause of obtaining legal and moral rights for the betterment of his race.

The man of whom I speak, and who was the target of the assassin's bullet was Mr. Medgar W. Evers—a fighter true to the democratic principles of our great Nation.

On June 22, 1963, the Bloomington, Ind., Daily Herald Telephone, in an editorial, paid an inspiring tribute to Mr. Evers and to the cause of civil rights.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial entitled, "Evers Must Not Have Died in Vain," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERS MUST NOT HAVE DIED IN VAIN

Out of the dungeon of intolerance and ignorance customarily come some molecules of hope because sincere, compassionate people are in residence everywhere in our land.

So be it, in this country's mushrooming racial strife.

Although this is not advocacy, the assassination of Negro leader Medgar W. Evers, the field secretary for the NAACP, will hopefully produce more opponents of bitterness, strife, and mob rule. Like a courageous newspaperman named Mellett—slain for his integrity and guts—Mr. Evers will not have died in vain. His was an approach of calmness and firm devotion to the cause of his Negro race in its strivings for equality. Often he had reminded those in his crusade that law is to be abided by, not taken into one's own hands.

He lies dead today at the hands of those not as ennobled by principle. This brings us to the always plaguing question of why those so much in the right must be smitten by those so much in the wrong.

We know there is no real comfort today in this thought for this man's loved ones, or those he led. A shocked Nation cries out: "Why?"

It seems axiomatic that there will be more violence, not less, before calmer heads prevail in our racial strife. Yet, victory, in part, can even be seen in the deportment of a Governor Wallace in the Alabama enrollment incident. What ever motivated the Governor, he pursued his goals while appealing for nonviolence, and yielded in the face of the law. For this, at least, he can be commended.

Whether we be only at the threshold of tolerance and understanding, America's cause will best be served by moderates building on foundation stones of love for fellow man.

Because laws do not eradicate prejudice, education still stands as the guidepost in the hunt for understanding. All around us are those who would interpret the inner mind of the Negro in his quest for liberation from those things which make him feel oppressed, downtrodden and abused. Yet, intolerance will not succeed on either side of the pursuit of a mutually acceptable status quo.

Must we tabulate the box score of progress daily? If this we were to do, hope would be a forlorn thing. The days are much too short.

Troops, rocks, rifles and spit always are poor substitutes for the ingredients of good will and moral armament which eventually must be trotted into the conflict if peace ever is to prevail.

Nor is it sufficient to decide simply that stumbling America is yet the world's only real bulwark in a world of intolerance, inhumanity and greed.

The problem of racial strife inside our borders is real and acute, because we have made it so. The Everses of our land must not have died in vain because in them are found the elements of compassion, understanding and good will that can give us, ultimately, a victory we all can accept.

Federal Profligacy Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, entitled "Federal Profligacy Must Stop," is certainly worthy of note. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it in the RECORD and encourage my colleagues to read this timely message:

FEDERAL PROFLIGACY MUST STOP

If American taxpayers aren't indignant over the way the Federal Government is throwing their money around, they certainly ought to be.

Fresh evidence of the extent of this wastefulness came to light recently. To cite an example, the Defense Department had been paying $2,278 for an Army man-pack radio set. Now that competitive bidding has been extended, it's paying the same manufacturer only $843 for the same radio.

This is part of the cost reduction program by which Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says he saved the Government $1 billion during the past fiscal year.

Further cost-cutting, he believes, can save up to $4 billion a year by 1967.

Even this doesn't begin to plumb the depths of Federal wastefulness. A House Government Operations Subcommittee studying agencies of the Department of Commerce has found:

The armed services are wasting as much as $750,000 a year by duplicating maps and charts already available from another agency.

A serious duplication of weather forecasting activities could be eliminated by curtailing certain Navy work. One consolidation already in the works will save taxpayers more than $35,000 a year.

The National Park Service is probably wasting $2.5 million a year by building roads that either duplicate others or should be built by the Bureau of Public Roads.

These examples of fiscal wastefulness are confined to only two departments—Interior and Defense. Obviously there's much more of it elsewhere that we don't even know about.

Such profligacy is part of the price we pay for big government. One hand doesn't know what the other hand is doing—or how much it is spending.

The taxpayers, whose money it is that's being wasted, should insist that studies like the one being conducted by the House Government Operations Subcommittee be extended to other agencies in the vast Federal establishment.

At the same time, they also should insist that other agencies institute the commonsense practices that enabled Secretary McNamara to realize such substantial savings—namely, increased use of excess inventories, buying only what is needed, shifting to competitive buying, and closing down unnecessary operations.

These savings can be realized without sacrificing essential Government services. Secretary McNamara reports that in the 2 years his cost-cutting program has been in effect, nuclear warheads for strategic air forces have increased 100 percent, the number of combat-ready Army divisions has increased 45 percent, and special guerrilla forces have increased 200 percent.

In a nutshell, Uncle Sam needs to be spending less and enjoying it more.

The Road to Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of Southern States Industrial Council, writes a weekly news column which is published in a number of papers throughout the Southeast. A number of persons have called my attention to his news column this week entitled "The Road to Chaos" and asked that I present it to the Members of the Senate. I take pleasure in doing this and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sensing's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO CHAOS

(By Thurman Sensing)

Reading their newspapers this summer, and following the grim details of lawlessness in city after city, responsible American citizens must be shocked at the spread of chaos throughout the land.

"What is happening to our country?" many people are asking. The answer to that question is that it is being undermined from

within. For decades, the liberal intelligentsia has scoffed at the idea that there is an internal menace. Even those who admit a Communist menace usually refuse to recognize that there are persons who may be accurately characterized as para-Communists. A para-Communist is one who is not a member of the Communist Party and who is not a conscious fellow-traveler but who, nevertheless, pursues aims parallel to the Communist line.

The para-Communist have our great country in a state of turmoil this summer. They are trying to turn a Savannah, Ga., and a Newark, N.J., for example, into the equivalent of St. Petersburg, Russia, in 1917. They are organizing street disorders that are nothing short of revolutionary. In the Congress and executive branch, their allies are attempting to destroy the right of private property and its free use.

What is being done by the para-Communist is the fanning of hatred and the spawning of violence. What started out in early summer as a movement of so-called nonviolence has become a movement of marauders. Demonstrators have used guns as well as placards. They have not only held up insulting signs and blocked passage to stores, theaters, and restaurants but have used bodily force to break their way into places where they are unwelcome.

What difference, one may ask, is there between the Communist riots in Italy in 1948 and 1949 and the riots staged in Savannah and Cambridge, Md.? The goal of both Communist and para-Communist rioters is intimidation of legally constituted authority and terrorization of private citizens and peaceful communities. There is no sigfinicant difference between the Hitler youth who threw bricks at the windows of Jewish-owned shops in the 1930's and the CORE youth who rampage through the business sections of communities North and South.

The leaders of the movement of violence and intimidation only refer to their power drive as a "Negro revolution." Undoubtedly, they do not speak for great numbers of responsible, law-abiding Negro citizens who are shocked at what a power clique in their group is doing and who are themselves intimidated into silence.

But the country as a whole cannot be silent or inactive in the face of the para-Communist drive to turn this Nation into a land of chaos where street mobs call the tune. This must remain a land of law and order. That is the first and chief national imperative. The Constitution, after all, was written and approved in order to promote domestic tranquility. The American people have a right to domestic tranquility, if it requires the incarceration of every lawbreaker, street hoodlum, and conflict manager in the land. The choice in America is anarchy or law. The voice of the American people must be raised to support the sternest necessary measures to halt the hoodlum revolution in these United States.

Patriots—in any part of this country—cannot sit apathetically by and watch our Constitution destroyed by mob action. Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, stated the situation quite well in his testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the administration's civil right bill:

"We are acting under duress. We have been threatened and we are acquiescing and bowing to that threat. Lawlessness is being rewarded. A new technique in the United States is emerging for the passage and consideration of legislation. * * * When legislation is considered by the Congress as a result of highly organized, well-financed, and violent demonstrations, then we are on the road to anarchy. Law and order can collapse. The citizen will no longer be protected in his property rights. The law of the jungle will prevail."

Millions for Military Defense but No Thought of Moral Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the recent school prayer decisions of the Supreme Court have caused many of us great concern, not only because of the Court's reading of the establishment clause, but also because of the possible effect of these decisions upon our Nation's spiritual fiber.

In connection with this issue, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article written by Sister Mary Richard, the newly appointed principal of the Sacred Heart Academy in Hoboken, N.J. Sister Richard recently served an internship in my office under a grant from the New Jersey Society-Eagleton Institute of Politics, in conjunction with Rutgers University. This article, I feel, offers an excellent critique of the situation with which we are presently confronted.

The article by Sister Mary Richard follows:

MILLIONS FOR MILITARY DEFENSE BUT NO THOUGHT OF MORAL DEFENSE

Mrs. Murray, the lady who challenged the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, is now forming an atheistic corporation entitled Other Americans, Inc. She filed corporation papers on July 1, 1963, and according to the articles of incorporation, "The objectives and purposes of this corporation shall be to promote and advance the philosophy of materialism by whatever means the board of directors may determine." The main purpose of this organization is to bring about the complete secularization of American society by divorcing God from education.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in its decision of June 17 in the cases of *Abington School* v. *Schempp* and *Murray* v. *Curtlett*, has given a green light to organizations that will in time contest in court every fundamental religious practice which is an inherent part of our American heritage.

This Nation was founded "under God" to give refuge and freedom to those who sought freedom from religious persecution. Justice Clark in his decision takes cognizance of this fact when he cites, in part II, the many evidences of national awareness of a Supreme Being.

The history of the adoption of the first amendment is a long and complicated one. The annals of Congress state that the amendment was originally presented in six different versions. The third version proposed that "Congress shall make no laws touching religion or infringing the rights of conscience." This, however, was not the version accepted. Instead, Congress was enjoined from making any law respecting an establishment of religion, meaning that no one religion was ever to attain a privilege position to the detriment of all others. Justice Stewart in his dissenting opinion accepts this interpretation of the establishment clause when he states, "the establishment clause was primarily an attempt to insure that Congress not only would be powerless to establish a national church but would also be unable to interfere with existing State establishments." The free exercise clause is intended to protect us from governmental interference with the free exercise of religion. Justice Stewart further points out that to bar recitation of a prayer in schools interferes with this free exercise. It might be well for us as a nation to heed the advice of Thomas Jefferson when he told us to "carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text or invented against it conform to the probable one in which it was passed."

The issues involved in this question are complex and beyond the limitations of the average citizen who is not a constitutional lawyer. Since this Nation, however, has pride itself as being a nation that upholds the moral law and the teachings of morality which are to be found in the Bible, why deprive our youth of the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the foundations of goodness?

Arnold Toynbee, in his monumental history of civilization, points out that of the 23 ancient civilizations of which he made an exhaustive study, 13 deteriorated not because they were attacked by an enemy from without, but rather becaused they were corroded by moral decadence from within.

Our present Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, in a speech given in Milan in 1957, said: "People who are insensitive to religion are not creatures who have been liberated from some ancient inferiority complex; they themselves are atrophied beings."

Shall we, as a nation, legislate millions for military defense while we allow our moral defenses to go unprotected and permit ourselves to wither from within?

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join with my distinguished colleagues in the House, Congressmen DANIEL FLOOD and EDWARD DERWINSKI, and so many other Members, in participating in the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week.

It is most fitting that Members of the Congress and Americans throughout our country be reminded of the plight of the peoples of some 25 nations who presently live under a totalitarian form of government imposed on them by the leaders of the Soviet Union and of Communist China. Most of these nations have been under the heel of Sino-Soviet communism since the end of World War II; the diabolical subterfuge used by the Soviet Union to bring many of these nations under its dictatorial rule is one of the great tragedies of world history.

There is no doubt that the peoples of Cuba, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others have the right to determine their own destiny and to live in peace and freedom under the form of government of their own choosing. The United States, Mr. Speaker, must continue to do

everything in its power to help these nations realize their goal of liberty, and to make the peoples of these countries aware that we in America share their aspirations.

Therefore, I am proud to join with the President of the United States and millions of my fellow countrymen across our Nation in observing Captive Nations Week and in saluting the peoples of these countries for their courage and fortitude to bear up under Communist rule. It is my hope that soon the people of these captive nations will enjoy freedom and peace in harmony with the people of our country and all those of the free world.

Danny Kaye's July 4 Mission to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had occasion in the past to speak of the use of the talents in our national interest, of Danny Kaye, especially for the great contribution he has made to world understanding. Indeed, I believe his contributions as a U.S. entertainer to the Nation and to the world make him worthy of a Congressional Gold Medal; and I have introduced a resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 97—to pay him that honor.

Danny Kaye's ability to communicate friendship and good will to people all over the world was most eloquently demonstrated on his recent trip to Moscow. With permission I am making public an interesting, intimate account of Danny Kaye's visit to Moscow, in a letter written to Edward R. Murrow of the USIA by Henry C. Rogers, who accompanied Danny Kaye to Moscow. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., *July 10, 1963.*

Mr. EDWARD R. MURROW,
U.S. Information Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURROW: Let me introduce myself. I accompanied Danny Kaye to a meeting in your office a few weeks ago, and have just returned from Moscow. I know that you will be anxious to have a report on what happened.

As you probably know, Maurice Pate of UNICEF wrote a letter to Prof. George A. Miterev, president of the Alliance of the Soviet Red Cross and the Red Crescent Societies, and we met with him a few days after our arrival.

Professor Miterev had had lunch with Danny and Maurice Pate at the United Nations in New York a few years ago, so it was a most friendly meeting. Professor Miterev praised Danny for the work he had done for UNICEF, and was delighted at the interest he had shown in similar type work that was being done in the Soviet Union.

You will be pleased to learn that when the professor was asked as to whether he would mind that the American press attended his meeting with Danny Kaye, he replied by saying that he would be delighted. When representatives of Associated Press, United Press International and the New York Herald Tribune entered his office, he remarked that he was most pleased that the American press showed such great interest.

The professor told Danny about the manner in which children were being cared for in the Soviet Union from the prenatal stage up through the early teens. He then invited Danny to visit a children's consultation center and a pioneer camp.

When I mentioned this to Mr. Catherman in the Embassy, he was most impressed because he indicated that Westerners were never invited to installations of this type.

When we visited the children's consultation center, which we would call a pediatrics clinic, we were accompanied by both the American and Soviet press. The pictures of Danny, which are in the current Time and Newsweek, came as a result of that visit, and I understand also appeared prominently in the Soviet press.

Danny was warmly received by the doctors and nurses in the clinic. They too were impressed with the fact that an American entertainer was interested in them.

The following day we made our visit to the pioneer camp, although the camp was outside the 40-kilometer limit which is the maximum distance that visitors and Western press are allowed outside of Moscow without special permission; obviously an approval came from somewhere. We were accompanied by both the American and Soviet press and television cameramen.

You will be interested to know that 500,000 children in the Moscow vicinity go to pioneer camps every summer. The particular camp we went to is called the "Grasshopper Camp," and is run by the workers at the sewing machine factory nearby. There are 600 children in this camp.

It is interesting to note here that everything that happened at the camp was even more important than you might think, because the children had never seen nor heard of Danny Kaye, and merely knew that an American entertainer was coming to see them.

As we entered the campgrounds, all 600 campers were on hand to greet Danny, singing a song of welcome, and carrying bunches of wildflowers in their hands to present to him. One 9- or 10-year-old child made a lovely speech in halting English.

They escorted Danny to the auditorium where a children's orchestra was waiting for him, and the children played and sang. Danny got on stage, conducted the orchestra and clowned around with them. They loved him.

He was taken to an open field where the children crowded around in a circle, and one after another, singly and in groups, they entered the middle of the circle and did folk dances in his honor. Then Danny got into the middle of the circle and danced with them and for them.

The children taught Danny a song in Russian, and they all joined together in a community sing.

Danny said later that it was the most thrilling and exciting experience he had ever had * * * not because he was able to wrap up 600 children in his hands in a few moments time—no, it was much more than that. After all, Danny has done this all over the world for many years, as you so well know. It is a much more important implication. The important thing is that Danny met 600 children who had never met an American. These 600 children who have probably been taught that everything about communism is good, and that everything about capitalism is bad, and suddenly a guy shows up on the scene, and he is not evil at all. I am certain that those 600 children will go home and tell 6,000 other children, and they will tell their parents, and their parents will tell 6,000 other parents that Americans are not such bad people after all.

This is exactly what you wanted to accomplish, and I assure you, it was accomplished.

You will also be interested to know that last Saturday night a full pictorial account of Danny's visit to the pioneer camp was carried on the Moscow television station, and I have been told it was also beamed throughout the Soviet Union.

We saw ourselves how much was accomplished when, at the end of his visit with the children, the directors of the camp surprised him with a banquet laid on in his honor.

The vodka toasting came quick and fast. The director of the camp toasted Danny for making the children happy and for fostering good will between the people of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Then one of the women directors at the camp toasted Danny on behalf of the women of the U.S.S.R. Then, a man from the Soviet Red Cross toasted Danny because of his interest in the Soviet Red Cross work. It went on and on and on. Danny is not a sentimentalist, but at one point I believe I saw tears in his eyes.

However, from a purely personal point of view, Danny was really touched by a toast made by Stan Wayman, chad of the Life bureau in Moscow. Danny said it was the first time a newspaper head ever made a toast in his honor. As far as I can remember, the toast went something like this:

"We in the United States have known Danny Kaye for many years and have been aware of the wonderful things he has done for children. I have never seen, however, anything like what has happened here this afternoon. On behalf of myself, the publication I represent, all my press colleagues here today, and everyone in the United States, I propose a toast to Danny Kaye."

I am sure you will agree that this is a rare tribute coming from a press correspondent.

One other incident deserves your attention. On Monday night, just before we left Moscow, Danny appeared on the stage of a theater with other members of the American delegation in connection with the screening of "West Side Story." As he talked to the audience, after being introduced, he suddenly got an idea. He told the audience that he had learned a children's song in a pioneer camp a few days before, and would like to take back to America with him the memory of singing with a Russian audience. Then, without accompaniment, he started singing the song in Russian, and everyone of the 5,000 people in the theater joined in the singing. He finally came off the stage to thunderous applause. Again, it was a thrilling experience. All in all, Danny accomplished his mission in rendering a service to his country.

Danny stopped off for a few days in London and Paris on the way home but should be back over the weekend. I am sure he would be pleased to hear from you.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. ROGERS,
Rogers & Cowan, Inc.

Statement of Principles of the Tennessee Federation of Young Republican Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Federation of Young Republican Clubs at its May convention adopted a

statement of principles which clearly portrays the positive thinking of constitutionally minded citizens.

I believe that the time has come to return the Federal Government to its proper role in a free and prosperous America, a role which will create opportunity, not stifle initiative, a role which will extend freedom, not accept slavery.

In my opinion this statement of principles reflects the true philosophy behind republicanism and under unanimous consent, request that these proposals be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF THE TENNESSEE FEDERATION OF YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS, MAY 25, 1963

Increasingly in this century, politicians and political parties have curried favor with special interest groups and in some cases compromised the health and safety of the State and Nation to gain power and to perpetuate themselves in office. The Federation believes—and history itself will demonstrate—that the citizens of Tennessee and this country can no longer afford the dubious luxury of selfish candidates who mislead the electorate. Engaged as our Nation is in a life and death struggle with the forces of totalitarian socialism, we feel that it is our duty to speak to the issues, and to point out the errors of the present national administration as perpetuated by those at all levels who, for whatever reason, call themselves Democrats. We, as Republicans, propose a positive program by which the United States can stop losing the cold war; put an end to the centralization of power in Washington; reduce Federal expenditures; lighten the tax burden on our citizens; halt the dissipation of our gold reserves and other national resources; and regain the respect of our friends abroad. We further propose a program to stop the dangerous accretion of State power in the hands of one or a few in subversion of the mandates of the Tennessee constitution.

What the Republican Party offers is not a shortsighted and divisive appeal to class, race, or religion, but the chance to help return both our State and National Governments to constitutional rule. It offers no man a bribe, but every man an opportunity to make certain the great blessings from which all other blessings flow—a strong and prosperous Tennessee and an invincible America. Here, in brief, are some of our proposals.

NATIONAL DISARMAMENT

The position of our National Government, as perforce endorsed by all who vote Democratic, is that it is bad national policy for this country to be militarily stronger than Russia and her allies. Supposedly, our superior strength gives the Russian leaders a sense of insecurity which might lead to war. Therefore, the thesis goes, we should disarm until we are no stronger than Russia, and our Democratic administration seems to be doing everything within its power to see that we disarm, with or without the consent of Congress.

We, as young Republicans, hold this view to be fallacious. We believe that our concern should be not to allay Russian feelings of insecurity, but to see that the Communist leaders continue to feel insecure and the more insecure the better. History shows that dictators start wars only when they think they can win, and not when their hearts are filled with misgivings. The well intentioned, but tragic weakness of Chamberlain at Munich was ransomed by the blood of free men. We are determined that, to the extent within our power, this mistake shall not be repeated.

CUBA

The presence in Cuba of Russian troops and Russian weapons—of whatever type—is a distinct military threat to the United States and should not be tolerated. But of more importance to our national security is the fact that Cuba is being used as a training camp and base of operations for Communist agents and saboteurs whose mission is the subversion of all South and Central America to communism. For reasons which they have not made clear, the Kennedy administration is unwilling to meet this threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere. Indeed, since the naval blockade of last October was terminated, we have curtailed our surveillance of Cuban territory and forbidden anti-Castro freedom fighters to operate in defense of their homeland. As is the case in the disarmament policy, the administration masters of newspeak would have us believe that weakness is strength; retreat is advance; defeat is victory. Faced with plain evidence that the no-win policy is succeeding all too well, they can suggest nothing more than further concessions to the Russian imperialists.

The federation believes that the Nation should reassert its leadership in the Organization of American States and through the framework of that body reimpose the naval blockade on Cuba. We support the bill now pending in Congress which would declare that Cuba is not a friendly nation, and therefore, one not protected by the Neutrality Act. Once this bill is passed, we should actively support anti-Castro groups both in this country and in Cuba. We must act, and act now, for Castro will not attend our convenience. His aim is to create a Communist Latin America, and he will work toward that goal until he is removed from power.

FOREIGN AID

We believe that the time has come for the United States to distinguish between its enemies and its friends. It is one thing to offer help to freedom-loving peoples who will stand firm with us in the struggle against totalitarian socialism. It is something else again to squander the resources of this country to strengthen our enemies. Aid to those who are not clearly allied with us should be given, if at all, carefully and with strings attached. We must not continue our policy of trying to buy the friendship of other nations. We must insist that recipient nations earn our help and, in so doing, earn their own self respect.

TAXES AND A BALANCED BUDGET

The federation believes that taxes should be reduced for the relief of the individual taxpayer and the strengthening of the national economy. To this point, we agree with the present Democratic administration. But we do not agree that the tax laws should be rewritten to discourage contributions to religious and charitable organizations, for we recognize that the principal result of such a revision would be a further reduction in individual responsibility and personal morality. Nor do we think that a tax cut should be coupled with an unbalanced budget. The ever-increasing national debt cannot be explained away by saying, "We simply owe it to ourselves." The fact of the matter is that our Government is spending more than it takes in and our gold reserves are dwindling.

Administration spokesmen tell us that the desire for a balanced budget is a "hangover from Puritan ethics." We accept the indictment, for what we propose is an ethical approach to Government fiscal policy. It is possible to cut Federal expenditures without harming the defense budget, and no amount of figure juggling can prove otherwise. But the only way to cut the budget is to cut it. We cannot cut our expenses by adding thousands of people to the Government payroll every week or by acceding to every departmental request that is submitted to a congressional committee. We believe that Tennesseans should vote for only those persons who will demand from every bureau and department of our Government efficient performance of duty within reasonable budgetary limits.

CAPITAL, LABOR, AND THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

We believe in the maintenance of an economy as nearly free as the complexities of the modern world will permit. Some regulatory agencies are necessary to the orderly operation of our economic system, but we believe that controls should be kept to an absolute minimum. We hold, also, that monopolies in labor and business are equally dangerous to our national well-being and should be treated alike. We believe that every worker has a right to join a union or not to join as his conscience dictates; we believe that every businessman has a right legally to conduct his business without government interference or to close his business without penalty if he so desires.

CONCLUSION

We urge all Tennesseans who share these views to join with us. We sincerely believe that these aims can be achieved only through the election of Republicans at all political levels. Tennesseans must realize that the election of so-called "Southern" or "conservative" Democrats to the Congress of the United States can only frustrate the realization of these goals. Such men, however well motivated, must follow the dictates of the Democratic administration and Party leadership if they are to protect their political futures. Even if they chose not to do so, their voice of dissent would bear little weight inasmuch as the Democratic Party has clearly and irrevocably alined itself with the ultraliberal element of our country, and will continue to do so. Conversely, the leadership of the Republican Party still rests with those who honor the Constitution of the United States and who value the individual dignity of each of its citizens.

Similarly, at the State level, the inherent evil and corruptness of centralized power in the hands of one—or a few—grows more ominous. The recent example of our State legislature—the overwhelming majority of whom were Democrats—docilely abdicating their constitutional functions in order to do the bidding of our Democratic Governor, is repulsive to all sound-thinking Tennesseans.

In short, we believe the Republican Party can best stop the accretion of power to centralized government at both State and national levels. It would leave to the States those jobs the States are capable of doing for themselves, and to the citizens of each State those tasks which they can perform to their own benefit. We would tell the truth; keep the cold war cold by keeping America strong; win the cold war by standing firm against our enemies and by being loyal to our friends; balance the budget; cut taxes; and free both our national and State economies from unnecessary Government controls, that the United States and the State of Tennessee might realize the magnificent potential for economic development in the years ahead—a potential to be realized through the joint efforts of our individual citizens operating under freedom through free enterprise.

Why Nikita Laughs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the importance to mankind of avoiding a global

nuclear war long has been obvious, so it is natural that the prospect of an accord on nuclear testing would raise hopes among many citizens that a slackening of the nuclear arms race might be achieved and a shaky peace made more stable.

There are dangers, however, in an optimistic view of any apparently conciliatory attitude of the Kremlin. These are the dangers of disillusionment, entrapment and even national disaster.

In this connection, I include a perceptive editorial which appeared in the News of Lynchburg, Va., yesterday, as follows:

WHY NIKITA LAUGHS

In Moscow, Nikita Khrushchev talks of nuclear test bans with a jovial smile. But he isn't smiling at the prospect of peace or of lessening world tensions. He is smiling because he sees a chance of gaining a little more time to perfect his inner space program aimed at gaining military supremacy on this planet.

Each passing day it becomes clearer that the test ban talks in which the Kennedy administration places such high hopes may well be the final act in one of the most successful hoaxes in history.

If Khrushchev can once again mesmerize the United States with his flute song of peace he will have gained the last measure of time he needs to settle once and for all the military supremacy of the world.

"We will bury you," he has exulted. He meant it literally and he had good reason to be exultant.

Consider: What is Khrushchev offering in the test ban talks? He no longer needs to experiment with his big bombs. He already has demonstrated he has developed them to the point where they are large enough for his purpose—which is to dominate or destroy the United States. So he offers nothing when he offers to halt nuclear testing.

In 1961 the Russians exploded a 50- to 60-megaton bomb. "You do not have 50- to 100-megaton bombs," he crowed then. "We have them stronger than 100 megatons." Equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT, a 100-megaton bomb is 5,000 times the strength of the Hiroshima bomb.

But he does need a year or two more to develop and build his Vostok fleet to carry these monsters in world orbit. And since strong and urgent voices warning of this danger are beginning to be heard in this country, Khrushchev needs to lull the United States into a slowdown and keep this Nation's eyes fixed in the wrong direction: the moon.

For this is the hoax which has proved so successful. The Reds have enticed the United States into the wrong race. They have stressed an outer space program with moon shots while concentrating on their inner space goal.

They have demonstrated that they can lift far heavier capsules into orbit than we can. Their plan is a threat to orbit a fleet of these space vehicles loaded with 100-megaton bombs which can be detonated without warning by turning a key in Moscow.

Far-fetched? Listen to the Air Force-Space Digest, voice of the U.S. Air Force: "It is possible to place very large-yield devices in orbit, which have virtually instantaneous delivery time. Detonated at orbital altitude, such a weapon could set fire to a large part of the United States."

Exploding 100-megaton bombs at orbital altitude (from 150 to 300 miles) would generate heat as fiery as that of the sun. Bursting at 150 miles instead of 93 million miles, hundreds of thousands of square miles of this country could be incinerated in a flash.

No longer does Khrushchev depend on missiles which can be detected, knocked down or rendered inactive. There will be no warning of an orbital flash and no prediction of delivery is needed.

If the United States has not perfected the same weapon and the same method of delivery by the time Nikita has, then we had better, all of us, be on the moon.

The Nation's top military leaders, entrusted with the survival of the country, and many of the more powerful Members of Congress have warned that we are in trouble of losing the military race while concentrating on putting a man on the moon. But their warnings apparently have fallen on deaf ears in the administration.

Over the last weekend, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in a speech at the Air Force Historical Foundation at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Ala., warned that the United States is risking loss of the military battle by concentrating on a peace-oriented moon program.

"We are moon-struck," declared the Senator, who is a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. "While our eyes are fixed on it (the moon) we could lose the earth or be buried in it."

"It is the defense of our part of this planet, not the moon, that should concern us," he said. "Space weapons are the real new frontier of defense—not the moon."

Says Air Force Chief Gen. Curtis E. LeMay: "We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program."

And what is our program? It comes as a shock to find that there is no top-priority inner space program in this Nation which has as its goal the prevention, warning, or deterring of the Vostoks.

Despite the clear and present danger, despite the warnings of the Nation's top military brains, the Kennedy administration continues to give top priority to the prestige of the moon program for peaceful purposes.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions.

That is what Nikita is counting on and that is why Nikita laughs. For the picture he sees is not one of peace. It is a picture of the globe of this earth with the United States facing threat of white-hot nuclear fire bursting from orbital flight."

He needs just a little more time.

American Voice Peddling Hate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I received in the mail recently a most interesting letter. I wonder if we at home here who are not on the receiving end realize just what sort of image the Voice of America is giving the United States around the world. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD:

My husband and I are old-time American residents of Mexico. Since the Bay of Pigs incident there have been times when we have held our heads less high, but only last week did we lower them in shame.

We were seated in a small cafe on the remote Mexican-Caribbean island of Cozumel when one of the patrons turned on the Voice of America morning broadcast in Spanish. The Alabama racial crisis was blazing and, as the commentator laundered our country's soiled linen in foreign waters, we felt that a subversive and sinister hate-America peddler was at work. The misleading picture left by the commentator was not only a disservice to the majority of Americans, but it was a disservice to our Government and its image abroad.

That the United States has a racial problem, we do not deny. But it is lamentable that Voice of America's broadcasts are not confined to advertising the greatness of our Nation.

Mrs. ROY B. DEAN.

MEXICO 5, D.F.

Part VI—"American Individualism," by Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today I present chapter 6, the final chapter of "American Individualism," written by Herbert Hoover before he became President. This chapter is entitled "The Future." In it, this great American clearly expresses his deep and abiding faith in the country—and in the institutions which undergird our form of government. With proper nurturing of our great principles of government—with true love and devotion to our Constitution, and to our fellowman, we gain the conviction that this "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people—shall not perish from the earth."

In this closing series of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertions, I am reminded as well of an expression by D. B. Lewis in "My Creed." It goes like this:

I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed.

I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself; enjoy the benefits of my creations and to face the world boldly and say, this I have done. All this is what it means to be an American.

The article follows:

AMERICAN INDIVIDUALISM: THE FUTURE

Individualism has been the primary force of American civilization for three centuries. It is our sort of individualism that has supplied the motivation of America's political, economic, and spiritual institutions in all these years. It has proved its ability to develop its institutions with the changing scene. Our very form of government is the product of the individualism of our people, the demand for an equal opportunity, for a fair chance.

The American pioneer is the epic expression of that individualism, and the pioneer spirit is the response to the challenge of opportunity, to the challenge of nature, to the

challenge of life, to the call of the frontier. That spirit need never die for lack of something for it to achieve. There will always be a frontier to conquer or to hold as long as men think, plan, and dare. Our American individualism has received much of its character from our contacts with the forces of nature on a new continent. It evolved government without official emissaries to show the way; it plowed and sowed two score of great States; it built roads, bridges, railways, cities; it carried forward every attribute of high civilization over a continent. The days of the pioneer are not over. There are continents of human welfare of which we have penetrated only the coastal plain. The great continent of science is as yet explored only on its borders, and it is only the pioneer who will penetrate the frontier in the quest for new worlds to conquer. The very genius of our institutions has been given to them by the pioneer spirit. Our individualism is rooted in our very nature. It is based on conviction born of experience. Equal opportunity, the demand for a fair chance, became the formula of American individualism because it is the method of American achievement.

After the absorption of the Great Plains of the West came the era of industrial development with the new complex of forces that it has brought us. Now haltingly, but with more surety and precision than ever before and with a more conscious understanding of our mission, we are finding solution of these problems arising from new conditions, for the forces of our social system can compass and comprise these.

Our individualism is no middle ground between autocracy—whether of birth, economic, or class origin—and socialism. Socialism of different varieties may have something to recommend it as an intellectual stop-look-and-listen sign, more especially for Old World societies. But it contains only destruction to the forces that make progress in our social system. Nor does salvation come by any device for concentration of power, whether political or economic, for both are equally reversions to Old World autocracy in new garments.

Salvation will not come to us out of the wreckage of individualism. What we need today is steady devotion to a better, brighter, broader individualism—an individualism that carries increasing responsibility and service to our fellows. Our need is not for a way out but for a way forward. We found our way out three centuries ago when our forefathers left Europe for these shores, to set up here a commonwealth conceived in liberty and dedicated to the development of individuality.

There are malign social forces other than our failures that would destroy our progress. There are the equal dangers both of reaction and radicalism. The perpetual howl of radicalism is that it is the sole voice of liberalism—that devotion to social progress is its field alone. These men would assume that all reform and human advance must come through government. They have forgotten that progress must come from the steady lift of the individual and that the measure of national idealism and progress is the quality of idealism in the individual. The most trying support of radicalism comes from the timid or dishonest minds that shrink from facing the result of radicalism itself but are devoted to defense of radicalism as proof of a liberal mind. Most theorists who denounce our individualism as a social basis seem to have a passion for ignorance of its constructive ideals.

An even greater danger is the destructive criticism of minds too weak or too partisan to harbor constructive ideas. For such, criticism is based upon the distortion of perspective or cunning misrepresentation. There is never danger from the radical himself until the structure and confidence of society has been undermined by the enthronement of destructive criticism. Destructive criticism can certainly lead to revolution unless there are those willing to withstand the malice that flows in return from refutation. It has been well said that revolution is no summer thunderstorm clearing the atmosphere. In modern society it is a tornado leaving in its path the destroyed homes of millions with their dead women and children.

There are also those who insist that the future must be a repetition of the past, that ideas are dangerous, that ideals are freaks.

To find that fine balance which links the future with the past, whose vision is of men and not of tools, that possesses the courage to construct rather than to criticize—this is our need. There is no oratory so easy, no writing so trenchant and vivid as the phrasemaking of criticism and malice—there is none so difficult as inspiration to construction.

We cannot ever afford to rest at ease in the comfortable assumpton that right ideas always prevail by some virtue of their own. In the long run they do. But there can be and there have been periods of centuries when the world slumped back toward darkness merely because great masses of men became impregnated with wrong ideas and wrong social philosophies. The declines of civilization have been born of wrong ideas. Most of the wars of the world, including the recent one, have been fought by the advocates of contrasting ideas of social philosophy.

The primary safeguard of American individualism is an understanding of it; of faith that it is the most precious possession of American civilization, and a willingness courageously to test every process of national life upon the touchstone of this basic social premise. Development of the human institutions and of science and of industry have been long chains of trial and error. Our public relations to them and to other phases of our national life can be advanced in no other way than by a willingness to experiment in the remedy of our social faults. The failures and unsolved problems of economic and social life can be corrected; they can be solved within our social theme and under no other system. The solution is a matter of will to find solution; of a sense of duty as well as of a sense of right and citizenship. No one who buys "bootleg" whiskey can complain of gunmen and hoodlumism.

Humanity has a long road to perfection, but we of America can make sure progress if we will preserve our individualism, if we will preserve and stimulate the initiative of our people, if we will build up our insistence and safeguards to equality of opportunity, if we will glorify service as a part of our national character. Progress will march if we hold an abiding faith in the intelligence, the initiative, the character, the courage, and the divine touch in the individual. We can safeguard these ends if we give to each individual that opportunity for which the spirit of America stands. We can make a social system as perfect as our generation merits and one that will be received in gratitude by our children.

The Late Honorable John H. Folger

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Dorn and I learned with sadness of the passing of my distinguished and able colleague of the old 80th Congress. John H. Folger was a warm and devoted personal friend. John Folger was a quiet, unassuming, and dedicated public servant. He spent a long life in public service having been mayor of Mount Airy and having served in both houses of the North Carolina General Assembly. He was a loyal Democrat and was often a delegate to the State and National conventions. John Folger spent 58 years in the practice of law, and those whom he assisted, often without remuneration, are legion.

John Folger was progressive. He believed in the uplifting of the standards of living and the opportunities of those engaged in the industrial, mechanical, and agricultural arts. He was loyal to the principles and ideals of the Southland. John Folger will always be remembered as an able, patriotic Congressman and a great American.

He and Mrs. Dorn graduated from the great University of North Carolina. She joins me in my deepest sympathy to his family and friends.

Report on Failure of Foreign Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the failure of foreign aid to India seems to be one of the best kept secrets of the entire foreign aid program.

It is shocking that the World Bank study of the Indian situation should be kept secret; particularly at this time when the Congress of the United States, which finances the bulk of all foreign aid programs, is preparing to authorize the expenditure of still more billions of dollars for this purpose.

Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, in its July 15, 1963, issue, carries an excellent article on the top-secret World Bank report. This highly respected publication refers to it as detailing "a dreary mixture of inflationary finance, price distortions, diversion of resources to nonproductive uses, and reckless Government controls" in India.

Why should the Congress and the American people be denied the information buried in the report? Mr. Speaker, Congress ought to demand access to the document before we authorize the granting of another dime to India. And, as Barron's properly points out, "the U.S. taxpayer surely has a right to be told just how his money has been used, and misused."

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the Barron's article, which follows:

REPORT ON FAILURE OF FOREIGN AID TO INDIA

Momentous events on the international scene in recent weeks have tumbled on each other's heels. Peoples around the globe watched as Pope John XXIII, breathed his last, and his successor was duly chosen, amid pageantry a thousand years old. President Kennedy enjoyed a triumphal tour of West-

ern Europe, highlighted by visits to the land of his ancestors and to that bitter monument to the cold war, the Berlin wall. No sooner had he returned home than Nikita Khrushchev and Charles de Gaulle went ajourneying, seeking in their turn to win friends and influence allies. In Britain, meanwhile, the Macmillan government was rallying its forces to fight off opposition attacks triggered by the squalid Profumo affair. Finally, first in print and later in person, top Russian and Chinese dialecticians angrily debated what course communism must follow in order eventually to win the world. Amid this rapid-fire series of developments, it is little wonder that a relatively obscure meeting of Western nations at Paris last month received scant attention from the press, and even less from the public.

Yet the action taken there may echo across the continents. For 10 nations which in recent years have joined under World Bank auspices to finance a huge program of grants and loans to India came to a drastic decision. They slashed their annual contribution to the Asian subcontinent by no less than 25 percent from some $1.2 billion to $900 million. Prompting the cutback was a secret World Bank study of New Delhi's faltering third 5-year plan, which apparently shocked the donors with its frank documentation of waste and mismanagement. The report, excerpts of which were leaked to the London Economist 10 days ago, details a dreary mixture of inflationary finance, price distortions, diversion of resources to nonproductive uses and reckless government controls. To date, despite the Economist's scoop, the bulky survey still bears a top-secret stamp, and the World Bank is forbidden to publish it without India's consent. The facts, however, by this time are known to U.S. diplomats and agencies, and to at least nine foreign governments. As the biggest single contributor of funds to India, the U.S. taxpayer surely has a right to be told just how his money has been used, and misused. Nor could there be a more appropriate time for such a disclosure than now, as Congress once again comes to grips with the perennial pros and cons of foreign aid.

India, of course, is already the recipient of more U.S. aid than any other nation on earth. On its own, and as a member of the consortium, Washington since the war has poured a flood of funds into that unhappy land, to finance everything from food and fiber to steel mills and nuclear power stations. Outside help, indeed, has accounted for an evergrowing share of the cost of New Delhi's grandiose 5-year plans. The first (1951–56) called for an annual expenditure of some $800 million, of which slightly less than 10 percent came from abroad. The next stepped up outlays to about $1.9 billion a year, of which foreign countries footed more than 20 percent. Still more ambitious is the current grand design. In fiscal 1963 (ended March 31), the Nehru government asked oversea sources to contribute more than 30 percent of a total of some $3 billion. Nor did even Peiping's Himalayan threat cause any trimming of India's economic aspirations. Quite the contrary. For 1963–64, the dreamy-eyed planners envisaged spending some $3.4 billion; of this unprecedented sum, the consortium was expected to raise nearly 40 percent.

Unhappily, the billions already lavished on the land of the sacred cow have brought the free world but scant return. In agriculture, for example, the past 12 years have yielded only bitter fruit. On winning its independence, India promptly launched a trade war against hated Pakistan, diverting acreage formerly sown to various foods to growing jute and cotton. Both crops, however, have been consistently disappointing. As a result, the nation's cotton mills are operating well below capacity. Meanwhile, though the food needs of the subcontinent's teeming millions increase every day, farming has been hobbled by the blindness and ineptitude of the planners, who have failed to provide enough roads, enough trucks, or enough fertilizer. At the same time, they have neglected shamefully the vast irrigation potential of India's prestiguous new dams. As retiring U.S. Ambassador John K. Galbraith put it at his farewell press conference last week: "There is great room for growth in the productivity of Indian agriculture."

In industry, the record is equally bleak. For one thing, Government-imposed price controls have diverted scarce funds from the areas where they are most needed. Under these selective and arbitrary ceilings, investment in coal mining, cement manufacturing, and fertilizer production lags badly, since any entrepreneur can fare better in freer but less essential industries. Indeed, coal producers are earning so little that they have been unable to utilize fully a World Bank loan made 2 years ago. So starved for funds are the private steel mills that they cannot expand their facilities, and hence reluctantly have agreed that the Government build a fourth plant, with their taxes and, of course, with U.S. aid. Output of many another essential commodity has been equally disappointing, because New Delhi's penchant for interference has frightened away the oversea partners needed to supply the know-how. To that hard-headed lender, the World Bank, the remedy for such dislocations is clear. In the industries where it has a direct stake, its report urges prompt and generous price increases: 20 percent for the best grades of coal, and no less than 30 percent for steel. So far, however, the Nehru regime has turned a deaf ear.

More disturbing even than the sorry details of what has gone wrong with India's master plan is the false philosophy on which it is founded. Basically, Premier Nehru, clinging as always to the pose of neutralism, has chosen to ape Moscow's ways. While he talks of encouraging productive investment, his deeds have fanned the fires of inflation and choked off opportunities for individual enterprise. All the time, his government has been moving to amass broader economic powers. The results have been all too predictable. In the World Bank's view, too much control already is invested in ill-informed and unqualified officials. As spokesmen for New Delhi admit, its policies more and more are designed not to grapple with the country's most pressing needs, but to scatter handouts among the several provinces, in hopes of reaping political rewards. India, in short, far from using productively the generous contributions of the free world, is busy building fatter pork barrels.

The lesson is a vital one. In the past 20-odd years, this country has bestowed some $100 billion in foreign aid funds on 95 nations around the globe. Increasingly of late, the taxpayer has received only the sparsest accounting of the results, good or bad. By taking a sharply critical look at India's sorry record, the World Bank has performed a notable and unique service. Indeed, the facts buried in that still secret document deserve the widest possible audience. For only if U.S. taxpayers and legislators alike come to realize the full extent of the program's failures will the Nation finally bid farewell to the follies of foreign aid.

Challenge to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, no one would claim that all programs that are designed to help meet the challenge to Americans have been or could have been expected to be 100 percent successful, but at a time when our daily lives are so much affected by both whether and how we meet the challenge to Americans, it is worthwhile to review the purpose and accomplishments of some of the programs directed toward that objective. An article in the Sioux City Journal of June 23, 1963, reviews some of the objectives in this regard, and so that others may have an opportunity to read it, I am having it set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is as follows:

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal, June 23, 1963]

CHALLENGE TO AMERICANS: THE WORLD'S CHALLENGES—PART 1

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is part 1 of the last of a series of articles on "Challenge to Americans," the struggle we face today as a people and how we may help win it.)

We face a challenge in the needs and aspirations of the awakening peoples of the globe, whose lives have been stirred by the tides of change. They have suddenly been aroused to possibilities of a better life, not only in the newly independent nations but also in ancient undeveloped lands and even in highly advanced countries. They cry out for progress, opportunity, and a voice in world affairs.

Many of these lands are held back by outdated institutions and traditions. Many lack knowledge of the new paths they desire to explore. Some of the emerging leaders are tempted to embrace communism or other extremist doctrines as promised shortcuts to modernization, regardless of the cost in personal freedom and national independence.

Many of the newly emerging countries suffer such significant handicaps as: Dearth of experienced leaders in modern fields of endeavor, a lack of familiarity with democratic self-government under law, a social structure which excludes a majority of the people from educational, and economic opportunities, land and home ownership, economic weaknesses stemming from lack of investment capital and runaway inflation, and overdependence on one or two export items, and insufficient food supply and inadequate housing, educational, and health programs.

Many of the awakening peoples see our Nation above all as a successful, trail-blazing ex-colony. Its struggles for self-determination and national unity serve as model and inspiration for others.

Although we do not seek to recreate other countries in our image, our permanent revolution, dedicated to broadening the material and spiritual benefits of the democratic heritage, is to many of these peoples the pattern of growth they wish most to emulate.

They look to us for sympathetic understanding and support of their aspirations, and for effective assistance in achieving their objectives and goals.

The United States, through AID (Agency for International Development) programs, the Alliance for Progress, cultural exchanges, the Peace Corps, Food for Peace, expansion of trade, stimulation of private investment, and a variety of other constructive activities, is helping the awakening peoples to help themselves.

The precedent is the Marshall plan, so successful in helping Western Europe recover from the effects of the Second World War.

Western Europe, too, though anything but underdeveloped, is moving with our encouragement toward new horizons of growth in a progressively united concert of nations, linked to our own through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and other ties.

A principal aim of this new community of North Atlantic nations, with which Japan is also associated, is coordinating broader and more effective programs of economic and technical assistance to the less-developed countries.

Communism, thwarted in its ambition to control Western Europe (which might have come to pass had it not been for the Marshall plan and NATO), has mobilized its arsenal of political, economic, psychological, para-military and other subversive weapons to penetrate the awakening nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The Communists seek to win them over where possible, to alienate them from the United States and its allies, and to soften them up for eventual conquest by direct or indirect aggression.

The United States is meeting this threat by rapidly strengthening its own defenses, particularly its conventional military capabilities and antiguerrilla forces. It is also helping countries which are particular targets for intensified Communist indirect aggression, such as South Vietnam, to strengthen their internal defenses.

These emerging nations encompass more than one-third of the earth's people. They are the areas most affected by the "population explosion," which is itself a challenge of huge proportions.

In the region with the most rapid population growth—Latin America, in our own hemisphere—the growth in the production of goods and services can barely keep ahead of the increases in population. This means that in Latin America improvements in the standard of living are coming too slowly to meet the insistent demand for a better life.

This would be serious enough under any circumstances. With the Communist beachhead in Cuba and subversive Communist activities throughout the hemisphere, the success of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America is imperative.

In that program we have embarked on a joint effort with our Latin American neighbors to boost the curve of economic growth above that of the population increase, and to assure a more equitable distribution of the benefits of economic progress.

Since the Second World War there has been a rebirth of hope in the effort to advance the cause of peace, law, and progress among nations. The greatest advances have come through world cooperation in international organizations founded on the principles of free societies.

Paramount among the world bodies is the United Nations, strongly supported by the United States from its inception. The U.N. charter is founded on principles that parallel those of our own constitution. The aims of the organization and its specialized agencies are akin to our own.

In its 16 years of busy life, the U.N. has become a world influence for order and justice. It has won the special support of the new and weaker nations which need its protection and aid the most. Not the least proof of the U.N.'s effectiveness is that it has become a main target of Soviet vituperation.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, its establishment in 1949 spurred by the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin blockade, has become the shield and sword deterring Communist aggression against Western Europe. Other collective security alliances, SEATO in Southeast Asia and CENTO in the Middle East, are also designed to help independent nations to preserve their freedom.

Particularly important to Americans is the Organization of American States (OAS), whose history goes back 72 years, comprising all the republics in this hemisphere. The OAS and its agencies—with Communist Cuba now excluded from their activities—are playing an important role in carrying out the Alliance for Progress.

An Accurate Analysis of the Crime Situation in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much in the press recently about the crime situation in Washington. I regret to say that a good deal of the stories and articles have been biased in their reporting of the facts about crime in Washington. Since this is the case I think the Washington Post is to be commended for its objective analysis of the latest crime statistics and the relationship of Washington to the other cities in the country.

The Post's analysis appeared in the edition of July 19, 1963, and follows:

FBI BELIES ENORMITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME—FINDS RATE HIGHER IN U.S. CITIES OF EQUAL POPULATION

(By James E. Clayton)

Crime throughout the United States is increasing at a disturbing rate but Washington falls far short of being the most crime-ridden city in the country, the annual FBI crime report showed yesterday.

The report, based on crimes reported to local police and then by them to the FBI, showed that crime in general was up 6 percent in 1962 over 1961. Every category of major crime, with the exception of murder, showed a substantial increase. In the past 5 years, the report said, crime has increased four times faster than population.

The greatest increase in arrests, the FBI said, came among those under 18 years of age. Arrests in that age group were up 9 percent. In fact, more than half the arrests made in the communities of over 2,500 for burglaries, thefts, and auto thefts were of persons under 18.

Because of the widespread national publicity given recently to the crime situation in the District, the Washington Post made a careful analysis of the figures in an effort to discover just how this area compares with other parts of the country.

Accompanying this story is a table listing the 12 largest cities in the Nation and the number of crimes reported in each major category. Washington is ninth in population and in only two categories—robbery and assault—does it rate above ninth in the total number of crimes committed.

Perhaps more meaningful, however, is a calculation that reduces these total figures to the number of crimes committed per 100,000 residents. In that calculation, Washington comes out seventh with St. Louis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles heading the list. Almost twice as many crimes per person were committed in St. Louis as in Washington, the figures show.

The following table shows the number of crimes committed during 1962 in the 12 largest U.S. cities:

Statistics on crime in big cities

	1960 population	Murder	Negligent murder	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Theft	Auto theft
New York	7,781,984	507	43	882	6,534	12,418	41,478	94,832	22,737
Chicago	3,550,404	386	167	1,621	18,579	13,499	35,755	63,512	30,515
Los Angeles	2,479,015	160	194	976	6,111	8,177	37,665	57,053	16,092
Philadelphia	2,002,512	124	92	523	2,448	3,852	11,737	17,807	4,606
Detroit	1,670,144	131	31	333	4,206	5,134	16,636	38,993	7,289
Baltimore	939,024	105	56	107	990	2,012	4,451	12,126	2,977
Houston	938,219	106	35	121	817	2,011	9,785	13,604	2,867
Cleveland	876,050	59	16	52	1,242	597	3,306	12,776	2,612
Washington	763,956	91	26	82	1,572	3,005	5,022	9,855	2,581
St. Louis	750,026	69	23	266	1,925	1,955	10,621	23,601	4,327
Milwaukee	741,324	17	17	33	166	388	1,958	10,464	2,268
San Francisco	740,316	53	71	135	1,390	1,413	7,488	26,211	5,090

On that kind of calculation, Washington does lead the Nation's cities with the greatest rate of murders—11.9 per 100,000 residents—and assaults with 393.3 per 100,000. Houston, Baltimore, and Chicago are the other cities with a murder rate of more than 10 per 100,000. Chicago is the only city close to Washington in assaults.

In rapes, Washington rates 10th with Chicago, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Houston leading. In robberies, Washington rates fifth, behind Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit and Los Angeles. In burglaries, Washington is seventh with Los Angeles, St. Louis, Houston and San Francisco leading. In thefts, Washington is 10th with San Francisco, St. Louis, Detroit and Los Angeles leading. In auto thefts, Washington is sixth behind Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, St. Louis, and Detroit.

Such figures are open, of course, to argument. Their reliability depends upon the accurate collection of statistics by local authorities. Comparison is also somewhat distorted by the categories used by the FBI.

As an example, what is reported by one police department as an aggravated assault may be reported by another department, depending on the local definition of the crime, as a simple assault and therefore not appear in the FBI totals.

When all cities over 25,000 are brought into comparison with Washington, other interesting facts develop.

Twelve smaller cities, for example, reported more rapes in 1962 than did Washington. These were Atlanta, Boston, Cincinnati, Dallas, Denver, Kansas City (Kans.), Newark, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, Phoenix, and San Francisco.

Six smaller cities reported more burglaries. They were Denver, Kansas City, Newark, Phoenix, San Francisco, and San Antonio.

Fourteen smaller cities reported more negligent manslaughters, but these are mostly automobile accidents. Ten reported more thefts and nine reported more auto thefts.

In murders, robberies and aggravated assaults, only cities larger than Washington reported more such crimes.

When one looks at the standard metropolitan areas, the picture of Washington as a crime-ridden area becomes more blurred. Sixty-one other metropolitan areas in the country had a higher crime rate than did the Washington area.

These included such places as Akron, Atlanta, Corpus Christi, Memphis, Phoenix, Sacramento, and Seattle. In fact, the highest crime rate in a metropolitan area was scored by Reno with 3,061 crimes per 100,000 residents. It was followed, in order, by Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Miami and Phoenix.

In the national totals, the report showed that the greatest increase last year came in crimes against property. Burglaries, larcenies and auto thefts were all up more than 10 percent over the average of the last 3 years. Assaults were up 8 percent, robberies 9 percent and rapes 3 percent. Murders were down 2 percent.

As might be expected, the crime rate was consistently higher in urban areas than in rural ones. Twice as many crimes per resident were committed in large cities as in small ones and three times as many in large cities as in rural areas. The only crimes not to increase with population were murder and rape. The murder rate in rural areas is higher than elsewhere and the rate of rapes is higher in rural areas than in small towns.

Is the United States Adopting "Peace at Any Price" by its Acceptance of the Khrushchev-Soviet-Communist Strategic Slogan of "Peaceful Coexistence"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the present administration appears to have accepted the Khrushchev slogan of "peaceful coexistence." Under cover of this deceitful misnamed policy, the Soviet-Communist forces continue their nonmilitary political conquests designed to destroy Western nations, institutions and civilization.

President Kennedy, the State Department, and our naive foreign policymakers are now committing this country to the suicidal course of "peace at any price."

Victor Riesel, the renowned columnist, and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover have acquired a superior and basic understanding of communism.

The following article by Victor Riesel is a most worthwhile summarization of the contrasting philosophies that underlie Communist totalitarianism and American freedom:

FBI CHIEF URGES REDEDICATION TO PRESERVE LIBERTY

(By Victor Riesel)

Strategic: Few men in our land sit in as strategic spot as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. Across his desk daily come the intelligence reports of scientifically trained special agents whose task it is to alert their director—and therefore the Nation—to all conspiracies, be these criminal or subversive. Thus I asked J. Edgar Hoover for his comments on Independence Day—a holiday all too obscured by the weather, the gaiety which real security makes possible, and oftimes a cynicism which could undo both gaiety and security. Here is Mr. Hoover's reply: By John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Washington: On July 4, as bells ring out in celebration across the United States, some of us will be reminded that the bell which pealed the first jubilant notes announcing the adoption of the Declaration of Independence in 1776 reached all of the way back into Old Testament days for its message: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." (Leviticus, XXV, 10.)

That statement, engraved on the bell ordered for the State House at Philadelphia in 1751, is a living reminder that our origins as a nation are spiritual and idealistic.

Challenge: The Founding Fathers believed that man, with God's help, is capable of self-rule, and the blueprint of government which they gave us remains a continuing challenge. For though the men who projected that magnificent experiment in government gained for us the liberty we currently enjoy, they cannot preserve it for us.

They gave us the guidelines for continuance of our freedom in a brief document which has safeguarded that freedom for 174 years. But we can continue to reap the benefits of the Founding Fathers' knowledge and vision only if we in turn are willing to expend similar effort and to act with intelligence and foresight.

For today, the premise that governments are instituted to secure certain natural rights and that such governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed" is under vicious attack. Totalitarian Communism is increasing its challenging thrust in many areas. With mounting intensity, domestic Communists seek to spread their influence among our youth and to exploit racial unrest in the United States. They are unceasing in their efforts to infiltrate and secure a foothold in American labor unions.

Document: Late in 1962, the Communist Party distributed within party circles a document entitled "To Reestablish the Priority of Working Class Emphasis in the Work of the Communist Party."

This document is important. It is a statement on labor policy, and from a careful reading of it we may anticipate forthcoming Communist action in the labor field.

Some of the points listed in the program undoubtedly have considerable appeal to American labor. Any apparent merit in these points, however, is not the reason for Communist promotional activity.

On the contrary, Communist activity which appears to be directed toward correcting any existing inequities in the labor field is prompted solely by the desire to widen and enlarge the sphere of Communist influence in order that complete Communist control eventually may be achieved.

Faith: No area of American life is safe from Communist attempts to infiltrate and exploit, and communism thrives best in a world in which faith is in retreat. Therefore, in this week of celebrating the anniversary of a declaration which holds "these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights * * *" the words of the man whose active leadership made that declaration live are pertinent:

The first President of these United States said:

"It is impossible to govern the world without God. He must be worse than an infidel that lacks faith, and more than wicked that has not gratitude enough to acknowledge his obligation."

Strength: We endanger ourselves if we measure strength solely in terms of bullets, bombs, or manpower.

Former President Herbert Hoover pointed out the real strength of our people in a speech which he made at West Branch, Iowa, on August 10, 1962. He said:

"The mightiest assurances of our future are the intangible spiritual and intellectual forces in our people, which we express, not by the words the United States, but by the word America."

Meaning: "That word 'America' carries meanings which lie deep in the soul of our people. It reaches far beyond the size of cities and factories.

"It springs from our religious faith, our ideals of individual freedom and equal opportunity, which have come in the centuries since we landed on these shores.

"It rises from our pride in great accomplishments of our Nation and from the sacrifices and devotion of those who have passed on."

Spiritual: "The true wealth of this Republic can be assessed only in spiritual terms. Indeed, the very wellsprings of our being as a nation are spiritual and idealistic. It is against these sources of our freedom that the regimented forces of materialism currently are directing their most concentrated attacks. And they are meeting with some success."

March: "The forward march of materialism is apparent in changing attitudes and standards. It is clearly visible in contemporary reading material and in contemporary drama. It is to be seen in the incidence of crime, in the bartering of moral integrity for the cynicism of getting by, and in the refusal of growing numbers of citizens to accept personal responsibility.

"This year, as freedom bells ring out in celebration of the birth of this greatest of all Republics, may the living reminder of our spiritual beginnings renew in us the dynamic faith which motivated the Founding Fathers. May we rededicate ourselves to the task of preserving the immortal dream which we inherited."

A Good Place To Get Arrested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Good Place To Get Arrested," published in Parade magazine of July 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD PLACE TO GET ARRESTED—IF A COP STOPS YOU IN ROGERS, ARK., DON'T PANIC—YOU'RE ABOUT TO HAVE THE TIME OF YOUR LIFE

(By Sid Rose)

ROGERS, ARK.—One morning a few weeks ago, M. Sgt. Ted Wing and his family fell into one of the most unusual tourist traps in the Nation.

The Wings were on an automobile trip which took them through this pleasant small town (population 7,600) in the northwest corner of Arkansas. As Ted, his wife, Betty, and their two children were driving along, a police car suddenly wheeled onto the highway, roared in pursuit of the Wings and waved them to the side of the road.

Wing obediently stopped his car, and as he waited nervously for the trooper and his companion to approach, he wondered what was up. As far as he knew, he hadn't broken any laws.

His bewilderment grew when the trooper grinned, held out his hand and said: "Howdy, folks. I'm Leon Clinton and this is Mayor Puckett. We'd like you to be our guests today here in Rogers."

This strange "arrest" was the start of a 24-hour holiday on the town for the entire Wing family. By the time they departed

Rogers next morning, they had received the red-carpet treatment in full.

They were royally wined, dined, and shown the sights of the town by the mayor himself. They were interviewed on the local radio station and made honorary citizens of Rogers. To the delight of the children, they were given a ride on a firetruck and a complete tour of the Daisy Manufacturing Co., makers of air rifles.

Finally, they spent the night in the town's best hotel and drove off in the morning with their car freshly washed and serviced. And it was all free.

Operation Tourist Trap is part of a unique piece of tourist propaganda dreamed up 3 years ago by State Trooper Leon Clinton and seconded by Mayor Steward Puckett.

A CAR WITH KIDS

Clinton explains: "Once a week during the summer we stop an out-of-State car with kids in it and invite the family to visit our town, all expenses paid. It's our way of showing folks that Rogers is a friendly place." He added that not every family he "arrests" is willing to go along with the idea, but that most of them are intrigued and give it a try.

Operation Tourist Trap has been so successful that other towns are thinking of imitating it. As for Clinton, the man who thought it up in the first place, he has this to say: "It's a lot more fun than handing out tickets."

Post Office Department Service to Stamp Collectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Jesse G. Johnson, retired, secretary of the American Philatelic Society, in an address to the Rochester Philatelic Association called attention to the advantages of philately as a hobby. In his remarks he commends the Post Office Department for services rendered the collector by issuing new stamps of varying designs.

I know that those of you who are philatelists will find his remarks, which follow, of interest:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT SERVICE TO COLLECTORS

(By Rear Adm. Jesse G. Johnson, U.S. Navy, retired)

Philately, it seems to me, is highly unique among avocations. It brings pleasure and relaxation and intellectual stimulation to all ages and to all economic segments of our society. The rich and the not so rich alike can enjoy and benefit from the hobby. But philately is not unique merely in its widespread appeal. It is unique because it is never-ending, never-satisfied, never-static. Not even a modern Midas can say proudly, "I have acquired every stamp I want. Now I can rest. Now I can stop searching."

A golf player, perhaps, will not buy a new ball until he has lost one in the rough and needs a replacement. The amateur chef who relaxes by broiling steaks in his patio will not replace his sack of charcoal until it has been exhausted. Stamp collectors are a different breed of cat. They must keep moving ahead.

So in any discussion of the services that the Post Office Department provides in encouragement of philately, it must be said at the onset that one of these services, often overlooked because it is so obvious, is simply to provide new stamps for the collector to acquire. There is a phrase in Ecclesiastes, "Of making many books there is no end." We can paraphrase this into "Of making many stamps there is no end."

Have you ever considered what would happen in philately if the Post Office Department issued only regular stamps? In no time at all, the collector would have acquired all modern issues in all varieties, and his hobby would be at a dead end, unless he turned backward to acquire the classics, something not too many of us can afford to do.

Issuance of commemorative and special postage stamps, then, supplies the impetus which give life and meaning to the avocation of philately.

I do not wish to imply that issuance of commemorative stamps is solely for the benefit of the philatelist. It is not. Commemorative stamps are also for users of stamps, people who put these stamps on their mail and who often are reminded by the commemoratives of some significant event in our history or an accomplishment of some remarkable American of the past. This, obviously, strengthens national pride and links us with our heritage.

But in the selection of commemorative postage stamps, the Postmaster General today applies certain criteria which, I think, meets with the approval of the philatelists and which I think is applied with philatelists in mind.

First of these standards is production of a limited number of new issues each year. Most of you can remember the furor that resulted in philately a few years ago when the market was literally flooded with inconsequential and poorly designed commemoratives. Literally before you returned home from the post office with the latest commemorative, you were invtied to return and buy a newer one. They rolled off the presses at the rate of more than 30 different commemoratives a year. In order to keep his collection complete and current, the philatelist was required to buy, at no little cost, stamps of relatively unimportant historic significance.

Today commemoratives are limited to only 15 a year. Some philatelists may say this is too many, others may say it is too few. But in the opinion of the majority, this is perhaps the ideal number of new stamps to bring out annually. Now with the cut in the Post Office Department's appropriation for next year this may be changed, too.

In limiting new stamps to 15, another factor of appeal to philatelists is possible—improvement in the esthetic qualities of the stamp. Better design and more extensive use of multicolor printing is a result. And I think you have noticed—and I hope you like—the new art styles that are bringing variety and aristic vigor to our current commemoratives. In past years, as you know, design of postage stamps was limited to a relatively few artists. It is no reflection on artistic abilities to say that if one artist designs one stamp after another a certain amount of sterility results. His stamps all begin to look alike. Today the Post Office Department has broadened the field for stamp design, so that an increasing number of artists—in the fields of traditional, contemporary, and even abstract art—are under commission to design new stamps. I have a physician friend who asked me point blank, what would the stamp collectors do if there was an impressionist designed stamp.

This has caused both approval and disapprobation among philatelists, but I think that even those of you who do not like all of our new stamps will agree that today's stamps are more lively. Stamps do not look alike anymore. Because of this wide variety in design, stamps of course today come in for more criticism than previously—but even those that suffered widespread disapproval have their defenders, too. Few people had kind words of the "Apprenticeship Stamp." Even so, a well-known professional artist—in analyzing the designs of last year's issues, ranked it the most interesting design of the year.

Stamps today, then, are more vigorously designed and are more attractively printed than previously and this adds distinction and variety to the stamp album. Two additional areas in which the Post Office Department provides special services to philatelists are in availability and quality of commemoratives. Every major post office has a special philatelic window where current issues may be purchased.

The Philatelic Sales Agency, in Washington, as you know, provides both mail order and over-the-counter sales of stamps. This mail order service is of inestimable value to philatelists throughout the country who can buy stamps at face value, plus a small handling charge. Last year more than 300,000 stamp orders were filled by the Philatelic Sales Agency for a total amount of nearly $2½ million.

Many philatelists take the Philatelic Sales Agency for granted. Have you ever considered the problems you might have had in acquiring new stamps prior to 1922? Prior to 1922 when the Sales Agency was created, new stamps often were issued and placed on sale without advance notice to philatelists. If you happened by chance to be in your post office at the right time and happened to notice, behind the window, an unfamiliar pane of stamps then you were in a position to add to your collection. Collecting in those days was on a catch-as-catch-can basis. Even dealers had difficulties in acquiring stocks in those days.

Creation of the sales agency is by far the outstanding contribution that the Post Office Department has made in satisfying the demands of philatelists. And, as perhaps you know, the stamps for sale by the agency are select stamps—stamps for which the Post Office Department pays a higher cost per thousand to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. This is very important because most collectors do not know this.

The Post Office Department has also been responsive to a relatively new category in philately—the collector of first day covers. Each time a new stamp is issued, the Post Office Department sends technicians to the city of first day of issue to process these hundreds of thousands of cover requests. Special crews are hired so that the covers are cancelled promptly and the cancellations are clean and well placed.

As another service to philatelists, the Post Office Department has assembled in its exhibition room in Washington what ranks as one of the most unique and valuable collections of American stamps, a collection valued in excess of $5 million. Each year tens of thousands of philatelists visit the exhibition room. The room also contains displays that depict the "birth" of each new stamp—rejected models, various die proofs, approved die proof, sheets of stamps and so forth. These panel displays frequently are placed on loan to stamp clubs and are almost always present at major stamp shows. Many of you will remember my article in the A.P. which shows how this was done on the International Naval Review Stamp.

Finally, the Post Office Department provides philatelists with information—both technical and historical—on stamps. This is done by supplying stamp publications and the stamp writers on daily newspapers with background information on new stamp issues. This information enables collectors to acquaint themselves with the reasons behind the stamp and certainly extends enjoyment of the hobby beyond mere acquiring of bits

of adhesive paper. Such information also frequently is transmitted in direct contact with the philatelist—by mail or over the telephone.

For stamp collectors have an insatiable thirst for details about stamps that sometimes the press releases do not satisfy. For example, the recent "Carolina Charter" commemorative stamps had hardly been issued before the telephone calls and the letters began to arrive to the Post Office Department. They all asked, "What are the words in fine print on the reproduction of the charter that came after 'Charles II'?" To save you a phone call, the answer is—"by the grace of God."

When the next stamp comes out the phones will ring again and the mail will flow in.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, the great and popular American hero of many occasions, speaks out eloquently today for freedom in many public appearances around this country. Captain Rickenbacker is a dedicated American patriot who is giving so much of his time to promote the principles of Americanism, patriotism, and freedom at a time when conformity appears to be the order of the day. I think this further points up the courage and dedication of this outstanding American. On July 21, 1963, Captain Rickenbacker was a guest of Dean Clarence E. Manion on the Manion Forum radio network. I have been impressed with the remarks which Captain Rickenbacker made on this occasion and I think they will be of interest to the Members of this body.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CAPT. EDDIE RICKENBACKER: 1964—DEADLINE FOR FREEDOM'S SURVIVAL

DEAN MANION. Have you heard the bad news? Khrushchev has captured the Monroe Doctrine. For 135 years we told the world to keep its hands off of the American Continent—now we hear Khrushchev telling the American Continent to keep its hands off of Communist Cuba. This is our Monroe Doctrine in reverse.

Of course, this is a scandalous situation and fortunately Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, whose name is a legend of American courage and patriotic action, is leading a popular demand to correct it. Captain Rickenbacker is with me here to give us a progress report of his rapidly growing Committee for the Preservation of the Monroe Doctrine.

It is my privilege now to turn this microphone over to one of the truly great men of our time. Captain Rickenbacker, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Captain RICKENBACKER. Thank you, Dean Manion. I wish every active conservative could have the opportunity of addressing the American people over the Manion Forum nationwide radio and television network, which is one of the most effective anti-Socialist, anti-Communist media in America and the world.

I am proud to be the chairman of the Committee for the Preservation of the Monroe Doctrine, and what a wonderful committee of patriots it is, too. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have signed our petitions demanding the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine against its violators in Cuba, which is now a Red Kremlin colony, where Khrushchev's spies, missiles, aircraft, and armies now menace this entire Western Hemisphere.

Our national administration now sends American soldiers 10,000 miles to fight communism in Vietnam, but any Cuban exile who dares to disturb Castro, the Kremlin stooge dictator of Cuba, will be arrested by our Coast Guard. Thus we permitted the Monroe Doctrine to be bypassed in Cuba.

That was bad enough; but now our fearful Communist appeasers are using American military forces to help destroy it. This is a crime against humanity. The country that we fought to make free in 1898, we are now using our forces to keep in Communist slavery. If we are afraid to do anything about communism in Cuba, what chance do we have to do anything about communism in Berlin, Vietnam, Eastern Europe, or in South America?

Millions of Americans are disgusted with and afraid of the stupid shenanigans of Ivy League Internationalist Liberals in Washington, who are nullifying our national traditions, snuffing out the spark of individual initiative in the American heart, and steering us into One World chaos which, under Moscow's leadership, would reduce humanity to a condition of slavery.

For 32 years, this Communist-inspired Liberal Establishment has been gunning to destroy the nationalism of this once great Republic. Many of these men and women consider themselves loyal Americans. They simply do not understand that communism is an insidious pseudoreligious virus that has sneaked into the minds of millions of people.

If you, now listening to my comments, have been snared by the siren song of Communists into one-world liberalism, just take an hour and visit the law library in your local courthouse or college. There you will find records of millions of cases fought out in court.

All of these litigants—these accused defendants—were Americans, most of them growing up under the same national heritage, speaking the same language, conditioned by the same customs and economics. Yet there was no peace.

How then can we expect peace under a one-world setup into which are thrown nations with different heritages, different languages, different customs, set apart since the very beginning of human life on earth?

The teriffic liberal attempt to dissolve the nationalism of this Republic into the United Nations and then into a one-world government is the very heart and core of the Communist plan to enslave the human race.

The argument is simple—the military power and economic resources of the United States are the last roadblock holding up the steady march of the Soviet Union and Communist China to world conquest. Without the United States, Europe would fall to communism in 2 weeks. However, there is another roadblock to the success of their plan. It is the 50 sovereign States of the Union.

On the Communist blueprint, these States, from Maine to Hawaii, from Alaska to Florida, must be emasculated. They must be reduced to provinces of an all-powerful central government in Washington.

They must be stripped of sovereignty and autonomy so that, when the time comes for the Communist takeover, it can be done right in Washington.

If Russia, back in 1917, had consisted of 50 sovereign states, the Bolshevik revolution would not have taken place. The same is true of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and all the other satellite countries. They were made up of provinces under direct control of centralized governments in their respective capitals. It was in those capitals that the Communists did their subverting, infiltrating and murdering. They took over with ease.

LIBERAL PHILOSOPHY DOMINATES OUR DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

Thus the States, which created this Union, are now being devoured by the liberal, bureaucratic Federal frankenstein in Washington—and there is rejoicing in the Kremlin at every bite the monster takes out of the bodies of its creators.

In its rise to power over the last 32 years, the liberal establishment has spread its batwings of influence over all three branches of our Government. Its leaders have swayed the minds of our Presidents since 1933. In that year, it led Roosevelt to recognize the Moscow bandits as a decent, respectable government. It sat at the ears of President Truman, when he snatched victory from the hands of General MacArthur in Korea.

It sat across the desk from President Eisenhower, when the arch-murderer of Moscow, and butcher of the Ukraine was invited to contaminate our land with his presence, and then he snubbed Eisenhower in Paris.

It inspired President Kennedy's indifference to the destruction of the Monroe Doctrine in Cuba, through his failure at the Bay of Pigs to drive communism from Cuba, and who now, apparently, considers the Red fortress 90 miles from us an accomplished fact.

Through the influence of the liberal establishment on the Supreme Court, the first amendment to the Constitution, intended to prevent establishment of a state religion, as in England, was twisted to mean that a a simple prayer to Almighty God may not be uttered by pupils in our public schools. How the Moscow atheists must have thrown their fur caps up in joy over that one.

The philosphy of the pseudo-communistic liberals has brought us to the critical financial and economic conditions existing in America today. We have a national debt of $309 billion, which can never be paid. This means an annual interest charge of $10 billion, which must be paid annually. There is a so-called foreign aid carnival that has cost our taxpayers more than $100 billion, and has done us little good, but has helped to reduce the value of our dollar to less than 45 cents.

Keep this in mind that we now have a national debt of $309 billion—which is $60 billion plus more than the combined total debt of the remaining 132 countries on the face of the globe. The figure of $309 billion is incomprehensible—it defies human imagination, and at the rate Washington is spending our future, you will have a $325 billion debt by the end of 1964.

This debt, in my opinion, will never be paid only through devaluation and inflation, which will destroy the assets of everything that we own, particularly, those of our women who own 65 percent of the wealth of this country through trust funds, annuities, pension funds, savings accounts and insurance policies created by our free enterprise system.

Inflation and devaluation have cost the thrifty Americans $283 billion in the last 24 years. For example, a $5,000 savings bond purchased with a so-called 100-cent dollar in 1939 is worth only about 2,200 of today's cheapened dollars in purchasing power.

From liberal groups in the State and Defense Departments comes the muzzling of patriotic American military officers, who consider it their duty to educate our fighting men and women in the aims, schemes, and techniques of the enemy. In those nests, the smart boys huddle with their blue pencils, carefully watching to see that no adverse criticism be publicly made against communism, and no nasty epithets applied to its gangster leaders.

If conservatives are shouting mad today, there is good reason for it. Socialism has been in the saddle here for 32 years. Meanwhile, the United States has sunk to the lowest level of world esteem and internal moral strength in its history.

Do the critics of so-called extremism expect the American people to be sweet and docile as they see their beloved country disintegrating under pressure of a foreign, atheistic, satanical ideology? Those international socialists do not know the American people—but I predict they will know them after the election of 1964.

We read authentic reports of observers who say nationalism is springing to new life in all the captive nations of eastern Europe. Moscow is deeply worried. The desire of these people for their own country, their own laws, their own customs, and their own ancient religious freedoms is flaming anew in the hearts of those millions of human beings.

But these people look to us, the free Americans, for encouragement, moral and material support in their hope for a revival of their freedom and national independence.

WE CANNOT PURCHASE PEACE WITH THE BLOOD OF OTHER PEOPLES

The European Communist captives behind the Iron Curtain are particularly discouraged and demoralized to see our indifference to the plight of the Cuban people on our very doorstep. What hope can they have for our help and encouragement in East Berlin, Warsaw, Budapest and many other places, while we are arresting Cuban exiles for disturbing Castro's Communistic dictatorship of Cuba?

We have invited them into this hemisphere now by our official disregard for the Monroe Doctrine. If we think that we can go on purchasing what we call peace with the liberties, lands and blood of other peoples, we are badly mistaken. The Communists plan to take us over, too, as they have now encircled us on three sides.

Never forget this fact—communism will fail in its aim of world conquest unless it is helped by the United States. But, it cannot achieve its global control without the aid and cooperation of this Nation.

I compliment you, Dean Manion, for launching over the nationwide facilities of the Manion Forum what you call the anti-Socialist "political revolution" of 1964. I am grateful to you for what you have done over this microphone for our Committee for the Preservation of the Monroe Doctrine.

If we can restore the sovereignty and dignity of the 50 States in our Union, as assured by the Constitution, this Nation will never collapse into a dictatorship—socialistic—communistic—or fascist.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, for this forthright analysis of our cowardly retreat before the advancing forces of world communism.

My friends, along with a copy of this broadcast the Manion Forum will send you the petition now being circulated by Captain Rickenbacker's National Committee for the recapture and preservation of our American Monroe Doctrine. Congress and the President must learn that we are determined to preserve American independence. Millions of signatures are needed now. Send for your petition and go into action.

Attack on the Catholic Press by the President of the American Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on July 9, I called the attention of the Senate to the highly irresponsible attack on the Catholic press of this country, which had been made by the president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Edward R. Annis. The doctor's wild charges were provoked by the widespread support in Catholic newspapers, of the President's health insurance proposal for the elderly. The doctor dragged out a very shopworn bugaboo, accusing the diocesan newspapers of being "firmly fixed in their socialist philosophies."

The "socialist philosophies" were, according to Dr. Annis, the result of the misguiding influence of Msgr. George G. Higgins, director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Monsignor Higgins, in turn, was, of course, under the "diabolical" influence of the AFL–CIO. All of this is tiresome arrant nonsense. Monsignor Higgins is a distinguished churchman who personifies and practices the finest ideals of the church.

The support of "medicare" by the Catholic press and Monsignor Higgins is consistent with traditional Catholic social thought. A column written by Monsignor Higgins, which has just been distributed to some 25 Catholic newspapers, states that Dr. Annis "has accused an important segment of the Catholic press of ignorance and distortion in its handling of the continuing controversy over medicare." Monsignor Higgins, however, in a reasoned presentation, supports "medicare" as a legitimate approach to a major social problem, wholly in keeping with Catholic teachings. Monsignor Higgins says that—

> Catholic social teaching does not say that the social security approach to medical care is the only approach or necessarily the best approach under all circumstances. It does say, however, that the social security approach to this and related problems is legitimate from the point of view of sound social ethics and may be the best approach under a given set of circumstances.

I suggest, Mr. President, that thoughtful statements such as these do not make Monsignor Higgins a "political quack or charlatan"—terms used by Dr. Annis to characterize supporters of the "medicare" proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Monsignor Higgins, entitled "The Yardstick—Catholic Tests of a Social Order," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATHOLIC TEACHING AND MEDICARE

(By Msgr. George G. Higgins, director, social action department, N.C.W.C.)

Dr. Edward R. Annis, president of the American Medical Association, has accused an important segment of the Catholic press of ignorance and distortion in its handling of the continuing controversy over medicare.

Some Catholic editors, he stated in a recent interview with the Star Herald, official newspaper of the diocese of Camden, N.J., are so "firmly fixed in their socialist philosophies" that they "will not listen to our point of view."

Dr. Annis is particularly unhappy about my own infrequent writings on the subject of medicare. My writings on this subject, he told the Star Herald, reflect the thinking of labor leaders and what he described as the efforts of these leaders to dominate American medicine.

LEGITIMATE APPROACH

Dr. Annis knows better than that.

My purpose in writing about this problem has been to defend the principle of financing medical care for the aged (or for the general population) through social security and to do so from the point of view of traditional Catholic social teaching.

Catholic social teaching does not say that the social security approach to medical care is the only approach or necessarily the best approach under all circumstances. It does say, however, that the social security approach to this and related problems is legitimate from the point of view of sound social ethics and may be the best approach under a given set of circumstances.

Pope Leo XIII has left us the classical summary of traditional Catholic teaching on the ethics of governmental intervention in economic and social life. "If," he says in Rerum Novarum, "any injury has been done to or threatens either the common good or the interests of individual groups, which injury cannot in any other way be repaired or prevented, it is necessary for public authority to intervene."

This simple statement of principle obviously does not prove that the social security approach to medical care for the aged is a necessity at present, nor does it imply that any specific bill incorporating the social security principle is satisfactory. But it clearly implies that the state has not only the right but the duty to intervene in the field of health and welfare if circumstances call for such intervention.

Pope Pius XI, building on Leo's basic principle, refers explicitly to public health insurance and gives it his approval as a legitimate (and, under certain circumstances, a necessary) type of governmental action. His words are to be found in the encyclical on atheistic communism: "But social justice cannot be said to have been satisfied as long as workingmen * * * cannot make suitable provision through public or private insurance for old age, for periods of illness and unemployment."

Equally pertinent references can be found in Pius XI's encyclical on christian marriage, in the 1919 pastoral letter of the American hierarchy, and again in Cardinal Mooney's preface to the 20th anniversary edition of the latter document. Finally it should be noted that Pope John XXIII made several favorable references to social security and social insurance in his encyclical "Mater et Magistra."

"It is * * * quite clear," he said, for example, "that today the number of persons is increasing who, because of recent advances in insurance programs and various systems of social security, are able to look to the future with tranquility. This sort of tranquility once was rooted in the ownership of property."

The Pope took note of the far-reaching contribution made by social security programs in providing economic protection to individuals and families during periods of unemployment, old age, sickness, accident, or death.

CRYSTAL CLEAR

Shortly after the publication of "Mater et Magistra," Amleto Cardinal Cicognani, Vatican secretary of state, sent a letter, in the name of the Pope, to the Canadian Social Week. This latter made it crystal clear that public health insurance falls within the scope of the terms "social security and social insurance" as these terms are used in "Mater et Magistra."

The foregoing quotations from authoritative documents offer no solace or support for those who argue that the social security approach to the problem is to be condemned as "socialized medicine." Individuals are free to argue, of course, that the social security approach is unnecessary at the present time and/or that a particular bill incorporating this approach is poorly drafted or is inadequate. But the legitimacy of the social security approach is not invalidated by the weakness or imperfections of any particular proposal. The subject should be discussed on its merits, and those who oppose it ought to make it very clear that they are not denying the state the right to enact a program of medical care based on the principle of social security.

A Salute to Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on July 20, 1963, the city of Minneapolis was very privileged to have as an honored guest and visitor from Canada Hon. R. Teillet, the head of the veterans services in the Canadian Government. Mr. Teillet addressed the Editors' Day luncheon, sponsored by the Minneapolis Star and Tribune and attended by most of the editors of the weekly and daily press of the State of Minnesota. I believe Mr. Teillet's address is of such significance, in view of our relationships with Canada and our historic friendship with Canada, that I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO CANADA

(Notes from address by the Honorable R. Teillet to the Editors' Day luncheon, July 20, 1963, Aquatennial Festival in Minneapolis)

It is a great pleasure for me as representative of the Government of Canada and as grand marshal of the 1963 Aquatennial to be with you today. I take this opportunity to express my own pleasure in being here; to welcome you to the festival; and to invite your participation in all its activities.

As you know, the theme this year is "A Salute to Canada." As a Canadian, I am naturally very pleased with the choice of this theme and with the opportunity it provides to make Canada better known to the people of the United States, our good neighbors to the south.

I can think of no better group for this purpose than yourselves as editors of American newspapers and publishing companies. Your product—news and opinion—comes into the homes of all citizens across the land as no other product does. In a free society, the press is the great molder of public opinion. It has indeed far-reaching influence over the attitude, aspirations, hopes and fears of the people who, in the last analysis, determine by their votes the policies of government.

There is a saying among Canadians that the United States becomes concerned with Canada only when there is trouble. While this statement is an exaggeration, there is, I believe, some truth in it. A Canadian reading the American press and American magazines cannot help but notice that the United States is vitally interested in such areas as Cuba, or South Vietnam, or Berlin, or Latin America. Of the thousands of articles and millions of words that must be read by Americans every year, comparatively few are devoted to Canada.

The United States is, of course, a powerful Nation with worldwide interests and commitments. As a major world power, you are, of necessity, concerned with a great many political, economic, and military problems affecting the peace, security, and well-being of the free world. It is, therefore, understandable that your attention would be primarily focused on those areas of the world where these problems are most serious and urgent.

We should rejoice, of course, that Canada has not been and is not what may be termed a "problem area." And I certainly hope that it will never become one. There is, however, one point which I think ought to be emphasized. I would like to suggest to you that Canada in the 1960's will develop into a country which will be quite different from what it was in the 1940's or even in the late 1950's. I would like to suggest further that it will be to our mutual benefit if more people in the United States become aware of the changes that are taking place in Canada and of their possible influence on future relations between our two countries.

There has recently been a significant increase in the number of American citizens visiting Canada. As Canadians, we welcome this development as a major step in increasing mutual understanding between two good neighbors.

As a representative of the Government of Canada, I wish to extend to you all an invitation to visit us soon. I am sure you will find in Canada the same warm and friendly hospitality that is extended to us Canadians when visiting your country.

The majority of Americans, however, especially those farther away from Canada, may never visit our country or, at best, can see a very small portion of it and normally for a limited period of time only. This is not enough to gain a real understanding of the Canadian scene, especially in a country as vast and diversified as ours.

This is where I believe—if I may make a suggestion—that you as representatives of the American public have a very important role to play. By the very nature of your profession, you have unexcelled opportunities to visit all parts of Canada, observe our problems, understand our hopes and aspirations, explain them to millions of American readers and, most important, perhaps, help maintain and strengthen our ties of friendship, partnership and trust in the years to come, despite inevitable differences of view on certain problems.

The world is changing with bewildering speed. Political, social and technological changes have revolutionized our world in the last 20 years. The last two decades have witnessed more changes in the structure of world society than the previous hundred years. And there still seems to be no limit in sight as to the possibility of further changes. If anything, the tempo is likely to increase even more.

Canada must adapt itself to these changes or disintegrate. Canadians recognize this necessity and the Government of Canada is urgently concerned with the measures that will be required to develop a stronger and more viable political, economic, and social structure in our country. I would like, therefore, to spend a few minutes examining what are likely to be the most important characteristics of Canada in the years to come.

One of the most important challenges facing Canada today, and in the future, is the development of a national consciousness and sense of purpose. This may sound strange to some of you who have come to accept, almost naturally, the idea of national unity. U.S. citizens are justly proud of their Nation's history, its rich heritage and its ability to create, in a few generations, a unified continental state. Canada has followed a different line of historical evolution and, as a result, is still in the process of establishing its national identity.

To begin with, the United States became an independent nation following a revolutionary war which lasted a number of years, from 1775 until the Treaty of Versailles in 1783. Canada, on the other hand, moved gradually from being a colony to achieving with Britain's consent, responsible self-government by the 1850's. The confederation of all parts of what is now Canada did not take place until 1867; and it was only in the Statute of Westminster in 1931 that Canada's full powers of nationhood, including her independent conduct of foreign relations, were fully and finally recognized. As a nation, we are much younger than you.

Secondly, the United States was from its very beginnings a preponderantly English-speaking country. This characteristic was maintained by absorbing through the meltingpot process the various racial and cultural groups which came to the United States from various parts of the world. Canada, on the other hand, is a predominantly bicultural and bilingual nation. The Canadian Confederation of 1867 was created by the union of French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians and so it has remained to this day. In addition, Canada has welcomed people from many lands and cultures who have added to the cultural heritage of our two founding races by taking an important part in the development of our country, without surrendering their own cultures.

Thirdly, the facts of geography and climate have made it relatively easy for the United States to expand rapidly and attract large numbers of imigrants. Canada, on the other hand, has had to face difficult problems of national unity because of its geography. In a country that is as large, if not larger, than the United States there are approximately 19 million Canadians, spread thinly across thousands of miles of continent. Inevitably, regional differences develop and the world and its problems look very different, for example, on the prairies from the way they look in the Atlantic provinces. From the standpoint of the Province of Quebec, much is different from the shape of things as it appears anywhere else in the country.

Despite these difficulties, there is, however, a growing feeling of national consciousness among Canadians. It is true that the situation at the moment appears confused and gives the impression that Canada is more likely to be split by regional differences than to be united by strengthened bonds of national feeling. With the exception of certain extremist groups, however, the overwhelming majority of Canadians agree on the necessity of strengthening national unity on the basis of a full partnership between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians. I am sure therefore that our ten-

sions are a temporary phase and that we will successfully meet the challenge of reconciling the needs and interests of Canada as a whole with the problems and needs of our various regions and sections.

We should accordingly expect to see Canadian nationalism play a more important role in influencing the attitude and aspirations of the Canadian people as it approaches the hundredth anniversary of its existence as a Nation. Let me add at this point, that the Canadian nationalism I speak of does not worship nationalism for its own sake nor does it believe that the interdependent world of today can flourish, if organized into exclusive, inwardlooking national units. Canada has been slowly built by moderation and compromise based on a sense of justice for the individual and a spirit of responsibility towards the community. Now more than ever before, there is an urgent need for the application of these principles to international relations and it would be morally unacceptable for us Canadians to reject these principles now in favor of the narrow-minded and exclusive type of nationalism which has caused so many conflicts in years gone by.

The second major problem facing Canada in the years to come involves its economic future. Our country, like the United States, has been endowed with unusually rich natural resources. The exploitation of these resources—wheat, wood, electrical energy, oil, mineral ores, natural gas—has spearheaded the economic development of Canada and resource products still account for most of our exports. The key position of resource industries in the Canadian economy has not prevented the development of secondary industries. With few exceptions, however, such industries are restricted to our small domestic market and have not sufficiently developed to compete effectively in the international market. Canada must still import a major proportion of manufactured products from abroad and as a result has had a deficit in its balance of payments averaging $1 billion a year for at least the last 10 years.

One out of every five Canadians depends on international trade to make his living. In fact, our high standard of living depends to a large extent on our ability to trade successfully with the world. It is therefore only commonsense to recognize that in order to do so our industry must be competitive and that Canada must be in a position to produce more of the things we can export.

One of the factors influencing the implementation of this objective is the increasing degree of foreign ownership and control of Canadian industries. Foreign investments, and especially investments by Americans, have obviously been of considerable assistance to Canada in developing its industries and achieving a high standard of living much more quickly than would otherwise have been possible. Canadians recognize that they need substantial inflows of foreign capital for quite a few years to come. We therefore have every intention of continuing to welcome and treat fairly foreign investors interested in the development of Canada. The concern of Canadians, however, is that there should not be such an excessive and ever-increasing degree of foreign control that it would be inconsistent with the full economic development of their country and with its position as an independent nation.

A nation which lost control of economic policy would in fact also lose control of its political destiny. The United States was heavily dependent for many years on investments from Great Britain and Western Europe. The great majority of these investments consisted of bonds. As the life of these bonds ended, they were retired and that indebtedness was extinguished. The control of American industry remained in the hands of citizens of the United States. The character of foreign investment in Canada has taken instead the form of equity ownership. This means that the control and management of Canadian industries is in foreign hands and that basic decisions affecting the rate and the pattern of economic development in Canada are made by non-Canadians. I think you can therefore appreciate that ever-increasing foreign ownership and control of Canadian resources and industries is a matter of considerable concern for the people of Canada.

The third and final point I would like to examine concerns our relations with the United States and with the rest of the world. For the last century and a half, our two countries have enjoyed close, active and mutually profitable cooperation in a number of different areas. It is an unparalleled example of good neighborhood which could be followed with great advantage by many countries in our troubled world. We have had our differences and even our rows but we have succeeded in maintaining our friendship without a break and that is a real achievement, of which there are few examples in world history. It is true that few countries have so much in common. Geography, history, economics, defense combine to unite us and to make our relationship essential to each other. It was not always so, however, and the fact that we have succeeded in solving our mutual problems in a spirit of good will and understanding is an accomplishment of which we should be proud. Let's keep it that way.

Canadians in general are very much aware that Canada depends on the world for its continued existence. We do not believe that we can live in isolation. Even the oceans are no longer barriers. In this new kind of world we must all learn to live with our neighbors, to cooperate with them, to trade with one another not only in goods but also in ideas. Canada's foreign policy will give no comfort to those who seek to destroy free democratic institutions and replace them by totalitarian despotisms, or to those who want to turn the clock back to the days of competing and exclusive national units. Since World War II, Canada has endeavored, in cooperation with the United Nations and its allies throughout the world, to work for the cause of world peace and stability. It is a record of which we are proud and which we intend to maintain in the years to come.

The big challenge to Canada in its future relations with other countries will be to guide its developing sense of national consciousness and its rightful aspirations for a greater voice in shaping its economic future into channels which will be consistent with its policy of cooperation with all friendly nations of the world, particularly the United States. We want Canadian Governments that can be strongly Canadian without disregarding the legitimate interests of non-Canadians.

I am confident that Canada will be equal to the challenge. I am equally confident that our two countries will continue to enjoy friendly and mutually profitable relations as Canada goes in the 1960's through a new phase of its progress toward further political and economic maturity. We are both partners in a common endeavor to make the North American continent a mighty force for freedom, progress, and peace in the world. We cannot afford to fail in this partnership, and we will not as long as the United States and Canada strive to find ways and means of maintaining true friendship and cooperation based on mutuual respect and good understanding.

Dual Distribution in the Rubber Tire Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tireless workers on behalf of the small and independent businessman is George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, an organization composed of over 190,000 independent business and professional men.

On May 28, 1963, Mr. Burger testified on dual distribution in the rubber tire industry before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Small Business Committee. His sharp and to-the-point statement is an excellent argument for the passage of my bill, H.R. 560, which would prohibit tire manufacturers from selling their tires from their own retail outlets.

Mr. Burger's statement follows:

DUAL DISTRIBUTION IN THE RUBBER TIRE INDUSTRY

(Statement by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation Independent Business, before Subcommittee No. 4, House Small Business Committee, May 28, 1963)

I am George J. Burger, at this point acting in a dual capacity; one, vice president, Legislative Activities, National Federation of Independent Business, with which organization members of the committee are well aware, and the membership of the federation comprised exclusively of independent business and professional men in all lines of industry, all individual members in the 50 States, and I am more than pleased to advise you that since my recent appearance the membership of the federation for another month shows a consistent increase, at the moment numbering 190,361, which of course includes a substantial number of independents in the tire sales and servicing field nationwide. I am also speaking for the Burger Tire Consultant Service, which publishes the National Independent. This service is exclusively devoted to the best interests of efficient independent tire sales and servicing institutions nationwide.

I founded that service in January of 1941 and severed my management of that service in February, 1950. Since that time I have been retained by that service on the Washington scene.

I entered in business in the rubber tire industry in 1909; 2 years later established my own business in tire sales and servicing and continued on in that business successfully up until the summer of 1935.

During that career in the tire industry I was president of the National Tire Dealers Association for the years 1923, 1924 and 1925. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, in those days the president of the association, although the title was honorary, it was practically a whole day job at a sacrifice to one's private business and family.

It's also interesting to note that I was one of the original incorporators of that association, incorporated under the laws of the State of New York.

Then again in 1929 dealers nationwide were greatly concerned about the leadership and management in the then present National Tire Dealers Association believing that it lacked militancy in its leadership and was bypassing basic problems facing the independent tire trade.

I was then elected president of the Automobile Tire Dealers League of America, owned and operated by independent tire dealers of the Nation. The purpose of that institution was to secure its own tire so it would place the members in a position to meet the inroads of private brand tires, company-owned store operations of the manufacturers and direct deals by the manufacturers with national and commercial accounts.

In or around November 1929 at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago, on invitation from the National Tire Dealers Association to merge the operations, the outcome was that a new organization was established composed exclusively of independents of both groups, which was to be the buying group styled United Tire Stores Corp. of America.

In December of 1929 a 5-year contract was entered into by the United Tire Stores Corp. of America to secure their own trademarked tire, and such contract was entered into with Miller Rubber Co. of Akron, Ohio, then headed by former officials of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. The trademarked name of the tire was known as Mercury. The contract was made a few months after similar contracts made by Miller with Atlas Supply (Standard Oil of New Jersey), and in fact the contract in substance was equal to a similar contract that had already been entered into by Goodyear with Sears Roebuck.

When the announcement was made in the press of this merger leading financial authorities in the press stated they were very optimistic as to the importance this dealers' contract—that if it continued it could outdistance any similar private brand contract.

It is to be noted, Mr. Chairman, as I stated, the contract was entered into in December 1929 and a few months later B. F. Goodrich Co. took over the Miller Rubber Co. They hemmed and hawed about taking over the contract but as the term of the contract was 5 years there was no alternative but that they must carry out the contract—at least we in the United Tire Stores believed that they would. Some months later our hopes were dashed, ending up in a civil suit a few years later in Cleveland, Ohio.

In 1935, after the collapse of N.R.A. the then National Tire Dealers Association was left floundering. For practical purposes it was bankrupt. Its office was located in Chicago, Ill. Again, for the third time I was drafted into that association in the position of executive secretary to reorganize the defunct organization. It was no easy task to bring life into a dead organization that practically had no standing with tire dealers nationwide.

I continued my employment in that organization from the summer of 1935 to 1941, and during that time (December 1935 or January 1936) again I was one of the original incorporators of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers. It was through my acquaintanceship with some in the office of the secretary of state at Albany, N.Y. that the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers was given the privilege to use the name. It will be noted I believe that the corporate name of that organization has been changed in recent years to National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, with the word "Independent" omitted.

During my tenure with that organization, in 1936 or 1937, I made the first transcontinental trip for a 3-month period, holding dealer meetings from coast to coast, border to border, in the interests of the new organization.

It is interesting to note in that first trip, Mr. Chairman, the total expenditure was approximtely $800, which included rail transportation, hotels and meals, etc.

I merely cite this background, Mr. Chairman, to show I have been cognizant of this problem facing the independent tire trade for a period of 44 years. It has been constant these 44 year—7 days a week.

The problem in which the committee is vitally interested—dual distribution in the rubber tire industry—I first became acquainted with the problem during my third term as president of the National Tire Dealers Association. I received a letter or a telephone call from a tire dealer in Columbus, Ohio who advised me of his alarm that Goodyear had opened up a company-owned store. He remarked: "It's a serious problem." I immediately got busy, through our membership, and found a similar arrangement by Goodyear in Springfield, Ill., then in Pittsburgh, Pa., Newark, N.J., and to my amazement shortly thereafter in my own area, Metropolitan New York, where I was then operating a very successful business, tires and tubes, etc.

I then requested the Sales Manager of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. to meet with me at my place of business, 265 West 54th Street, New York City. He acceded to my request and I advised him of my alarm, as President of the National Tire Dealers Association. I advised him that I was able, through friends, to get either Dun or Bradstreet reports on those replies disclosed head office employees of the Goodyear Co. at Akron all being listed as being incorporated in these various stores. He advised me at that time that they were making a close study of manufacturers in the retail field. He mentioned some leading stock brokerage house in New York City who had some special reports of the success of Sherwin-Williams Paint Co. in their operation of retail stores in competition with their own independent paint dealers.

I advised Mr. Rockhill that if this situation wasn't curbed immediately it was the handwriting on the wall sooner or later that would destroy independent tire dealers—that their policy would be duplicated by other major companies sooner or later, and that I would announce my views to the membership of the National Tire Dealers Association. He pleaded with me not to make any such announcement, to see whether something couldn't be done.

In November of 1925 the dealers met in annual convention at the Chase Hotel in St. Louis, Mo. I presented to the convention and its board of directors the facts in the case as reported by dealers, and from financial reports secured through either Dun or Bradstreet (presently known as Dun and Bradstreet).

It is significant and important to note at that meeting that legal authorities both from Chicago, Ill., and New Rochelle, N.Y., as personal favors to me (no compensation involved) warned the dealers through their association that if they did not take an affirmative stand to fight the situation they were digging their own graves or putting a nail in their own coffin.

Top officials of the B.F. Goodrich Co. were present at that convention and waiting patiently to see what action the dealers would take in open condemnation of this new form of competition. Goodrich at that time had no company-owned stores, and when the dealers in convention, through improper direction of their board of directors, took no affirmative action, Goodrich stated to me: "If that's the way the dealers would ignore this serious situation then Goodrich in due time would take the next step.

Mr. Chairman, bear in mind that Goodyear at that time was most adequately represented nationwide by independent dealers in a greater capacity than any of the other three rubber companies put together, and from that point on then it is interesting to note the happenings.

It would be well for the Committee and its staff to review the docket of the Federal Trade Commission dated March 5, 1936, Docket No. 2116 in the matter of Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. This relates to the contract relationship existing between Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. between 1925 and 1936, which resulted in a cease and desist order by the Commission against Goodyear in its contract relationship with the Sears Roebuck Co.

It is my opinion that that contract in itself helped to revitalize Sears Roebuck business nationwide, taking them exclusively out of the mailorder business and putting them in mailorder and the retail stores nationwide.

This docket is invaluable to review as the contract had created cancers that in the first instance went a long ways to destroy the business life of many smaller producers and more serious, to destroy the business life of efficient independent tire dealers who were in existence at that time. The findings of the Commission will more or less confirm this statement.

This docket will show Firestone established its own retail store outlets as fast as the independent dealers became crippled or impotent, followed by others sooner or later.

There were some few stores operated by U.S. Rubber Co., as nearly as my memory serves me, in or around 1926 in the southern area of the country (as nearly as I recall) in or around Memphis, Tenn.

In or around March 2 of 1936 I was invited to attend a conference of some 8 or 10 representatives of independent business organizations, including druggists, wholesale grocers, and so forth, and to be part of a joint meeting that was being held of the group in Constitution Hall, I believe, on March 4, 1936. The late Charles Marsh was then Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. On March 5 he announced the Commission's findings against Goodyear—a cease-and-desist order in its contract relationship with Sears.

This meeting in Constitution Hall was attended by about 1,500 or more from all over the Nation. The principal address was made by the late Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, and the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, coauthors of the Robinson-Patman Act. I was also privileged to address that gathering. The following day we were honored by a visit with the President of the United States at the White House, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, in which we urged the President that if and when the Robinson-Patman Act came to his desk that he affix his signature. I recall the President's comment of his sympathetic understanding with small business when he cited to us the constant appeals being made on him as to the wretched price cutting tactics of certain large merchandisers in certain areas. He said this came to his attention during his tenure as Governor of the State of New York.

Shortly thereafter when the Robinson-Patman Act became law Goodyear announced publicly the cancellation of its contract with Sears, stating that they couldn't justify the price under the law.

At that time Goodrich, who I mentioned heretofore, had breached the dealers' contract for Mercury tires (United Tire Stores Corp. of America) had taken over the Atlas contract at the time they absorbed Miller. After the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, Goodrich canceled their share of the Atlas contract stating that they could not justify the price under the law.

There was some subsequent action after that cancellation that, in my opinion, helped to bring about total disregard of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Mr. Chairman, what I am leading up to is when the Robinson-Patman Act became law we in independent dealer ranks, and

the spokesmen, believed that our "Magna Charta" had arrived, that the heretofore policies of some of these companies, including Goodyear and others—company-owned stores, direct deals to national accounts, would be scuttled in keeping with the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. If there is any question in the minds of the committee it would be well to know shortly thereafter the appeals that were made to me by company-owned store managers of many companies "Burger, find us a job. They can't keep these company-owned stores or private deals going on if the law means anything."

In other words, those store managers knew of the subsidies, etc. going into those stores from the home office that were denied to the independent dealers of the respective companies owning and operating retail stores.

As we were approaching closer and closer to our involvement in World War II, and also coming out of a depression the plight of the dealers was still increasing due to price wars instituted by certain of the major companies, demoralizing the business of independents, with no letup on their company-owned store operations, and such information eventually reached the Senate Small Business Committee then headed by the Honorable James Murray, such information reaching them during my tenure as Secretary-Manager of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, and on instructions by the dealers in annual convention in Chicago, November, 1940, to cooperate to the fullest degree giving them the facts it resulted in, through the able leadership of the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, and it is to be noted concurred in by the members of the Committee, Senators MALONEY, ELLENDER, MEAD, STEWART, CAPPER and TAFT—the Committee made a survey nationwide of the problems facing the independent tire trade. The result of that survey is disclosed in Senate Print No. 3, 1941, that was published in the early summer of 1941 (I was no longer in the employ of the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers). This report is all documented in code, coming from dealers throughout the Nation.

Now bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, I was requested by the committee, after reviewing the reply (again, all in code) to summarize and make a report to the committee, and bear in mind this report had to be agreed upon by all the members of the committee stated above. So in no way could I inflict my own views as the facts would have to be the facts.

The committee's report disclosed: (1), the preferential treatment accorded company-owned stores by manufacturers owning and operating these stores; (2) the preferential treatment accorded large retail corporations by certain manufacturers. There are other major items in the report that all tend to reduce the position of the independent. (Reference: Senate Committee Print No. 3, 77th Cong., 1st sess., "Small Business Problems of the Tire and Rubber Manufacturers and Retailers," 1941.)

It is interesting to note the serious situation facing the independent tire trade and their suppliers early in 1941, as it referred to the operation of the big four—Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, and U.S. Rubber—in the overall as appeared in Senate Committee Print No. 6, 77th Congress, 1st session, "Small Business Problems—Small Business and Defense, 1941"—important statements coming from the late William F. O'Neil, General Tire & Rubber Co., J. P. Seiberling, president, Seiberling Rubber Co. (no longer its head) and the late Jack Whitehead, Norwalk Tire & Rubber Co., Norwalk, Conn. (now out of business).

To the everlasting credit of both the House and the Senate Small Business Committees in 1942 realizing the serious situation facing the independent tire trade they took appropriate action by way of resolutions to protect the business life of efficient independents for the duration of the war. These are all confirmed by actions of the committees embodied in committee reports or prints March 1942, April and May of 1943, and also at the same time action taken by the Senate Banking Committee during 1942 and 1943. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I could add a tremendous amount of references, but I will try to keep to the high points and the important part of the proposition.

It is to be noted in a public hearing before the Senate Small Business Committee, April 5, 1943, during the appearance of Mr. Howard Hawkes, an official of the U.S. Rubber Co., the following colloquy took place between Senator ELLENDER and Mr. Hawkes:

"Senator ELLENDER. Does your company have so-called company-owned stores to distribute your merchandise?

"Mr. HAWKES. We do not, Senator.

"Senator ELLENDER. Do you contemplate maintaining that same position in the future?

"Mr. HAWKES. To the best of my knowledge, yes; and I am making such recommendations to my company.

"Senator ELLENDER. I imagine that since your company has been handling its manufactured product in that way it does not believe in having the so-called company-owned stores.

"Mr. HAWKES. We had some, and we discontinued them. It was our judgment that we would be better off distributing through the independent dealers, and that represented the best method of distribution for us."

It is interesting to note in a letter I received from the staff director of the Senate Small Business Committee under date of May 13, 1963, he advises me that the committee's latest information is that U.S. Rubber Co. now has 166 company-owned stores, and we believe this is expanding. There is quite a story behind the whole situation.

During these hearings before the Senate Small Business Committee between April 5 and May 13, 1943, some interesting information was brought out in the interrogation of Mr. Osmun, of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.:

"Senator MEAD. Mr. Osmun, I wondered if anything is in the record to represent the percentage of business of manufacturers, which you represent, that was done in the past with commercial and national accounts, disregarding your own stores and the retail stores. Have you given us an idea of the direct volume of business that you as a manufacturer have done with commercial and national accounts?

"Mr. OSMUN. No; I have not here. I have given no figure to you on that.

"Senator TAFT. What is this 10 percent? I thought that included the Government.

"Mr. OSMUN. That would be included in the 10 percent. The 10 percent is very largely Government business, however. Our direct business to national accounts today is out. The dealers are selling national accounts today through their own buying price.

"Senator MEAD. It is not necessary that we have it today, but I was wondering if we could have for a normal year the volume of business that you as a manufacturer have done, with national commercial accounts."

It is interesting to note in the hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on "Distribution of Motor-Vehicle Tires" November 9, 10 and 17, 1943, on page 146 I quote:

"It was recently published in a responsible newspaper (the Cincinnati Enquirer) that the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. alone had charged off a $10 million loss in 1 year's operations of its company-owned stores."

That statement emanated from a statement of Senator Murray who was then chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and believe it or not that is the universal opinion of competent well informed dealers nationwide—that these losses sustained by these company-owned stores, as it relates to individual stores, comes out of the tire company gross profits. In other words, they are getting their manufacturing profit and that is all they are interested in. That is the run-of-the-mill of opinion of competent, efficient, independent dealers.

It is interesting to note that the Burger Tire Consultant Service, in the fall of 1954 (then headed by George J. Burger, Jr.) made an extensive survey of at least 2,000 or more independent tire dealers nationwide. The questionnaire form which went to them is being made a part of this record. The replies came from independents in 35 of the then 48 States. The reports disclosed that 37 percent said that tiremakers who have installed stores hadn't tried, or hadn't tried particularly to get any dealer representation to replace the closed independent outlets; 85 percent said that company-owned store competition had reduced their volume and profits; 85 percent said that company-owned store competition has hurt the volume and profits of other dealers in their markets; 66 percent said some independents in their markets closed down after company-owned stores were opened; 62 percent feel that company store operating manufacturers do not give their independent distributors the same buying prices and services as they allow their own outlets; 40 percent do not think that tire makers who operate stores try to earn and actually do earn a retail profit on store operations; 45 percent say they know of cases where stores have been operated "in the red"; 65 percent say that they can cite instances where store operating manufacturers have taken sales away from their own independents through store competition; 69 percent say stores took this business from dealers because of price advantages allowed by manufacturers; 69 percent say that tire manufacturers either directly or through their stores set the going prices in various markets; 79 percent say that company owned store competition has intensified since 1946; 66 percent say that company-owned store competition is hurting the rebuilding business (bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that report was compiled in 1954. Check the run-of-the-mill of tire dealers nationwide if the company-owned stores haven't more than ever increased their operation in tire rebuilding for all consumer acceptance.)

Now bear in mind when this report was released confidential copies of same were delivered to the respective chairmen of the Senate and House Small Business Committees, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and have been on file ever since.

It is interesting to note that in or around July 1957 a release was made from Arthur S. Bostwick, Public Relations Department, Fuller & Smith & Ross, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio, for the Pennsylvania Tire Co., which states: Dealers cite company-owned stores as greatest evil in tire business—Pennsylvania Tire Co. contest brings out list of 14 dealer grievances.

In 1941, then operating the Burger Tire Consultant Service, I brought to the attention of the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, the inequity of rank tax discrimination levied on the stocks of tires and tubes of the independent tire dealers, calling to his attention that due to a ruling of the Treasury Department the stocks of tires and tubes on hand in manufacturers' company-owned stores were exempt of the exise tax until their stocks were sold to the ultimate users—a tremendous advantage to the tire manufacturers owning and operating retail stores. To the credit of the committee,

unanimously joined by the ranking minority member, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, they recommended that this discrimination be corrected by the Treasury Department. I will have more to add to this later on as to further action.

At the hearings on the tire dealers problems spokesmen for the tire manufacturers or their representatives always presented the committees with statistical charts as to the distribution of tires and tubes in various channels—such reports emanating at that time from Dr. Warren Leigh of the University of Akron, and strange as it may seem early in the House Small Business Committee's action in 1947, the staff of the committee in examining Dr. Leigh's recent report on the overall distribution of tires through various channels discovered that from Leigh's own figures it showed an increased trend of tire manufacturers retail stores in the sale of truck and bus tires. Even at this late date that is where the store competition is coming from, affecting the life blood of independents.

During my tenure as secretary-general manager of the National Tire Dealers Association the tire manufacturers as a whole were not very active in the tire rebuilding field—such operations originated to a major degree by independent tire dealers throughout the Nation, and particularly from the West Coast.

Strange as it may seem a proposal was made to me, emanating from a tire trade publication, advocating my publicizing the fact that "A smooth tire was an unsafe tire." Form your own conclusions as to the origin of the proposal and the purpose. I wonder would tire manufacturers active in the tire rebuilding field still hold to that same premise today due to their increased activity in the tire rebuilding field?

Mr. Chairman, as you know and members of your committee also know—in fact all Members of Congress must be aware of it—that any official position taken by the national federation on either legislative or economic problems such position is the outcome of a poll of our entire nationwide membership. That alone determines the official stand of the federation.

Along this line, due to the constant communications received from federation members over the many years as to the unfair competition facing independents in dual distribution by the many industries, and particularly rubber tires, the industry now under consideration by your committee, legislation was introduced by the Honorable Alvin Bentley, H.R. 2729, 1st session, 86th Congress, and bear in mind it was the Congressman himself inquiring of the federation's Washington office as to the overall problem facing small business in unfair competition that caused him to have legislation drafted and introduced in the Congress, commonly known as the "Equal Pricing" bill.

It is significant and important to note that similar legislation was introduced at the same time in the same Congress by the Honorable WARREN MAGNUSON.

This bill in substance provided that where a manufacturer or producer was selling independents and at the same time operating his own retail stores the proposed law would provide that he must extend the same price consideration to both, and more important, the producer or manufacturer would be prohibited from bypassing both store and independent in direct sales to the ultimate buyer.

The nationwide poll of our membership on that legislation disclosed; 86 percent for, 11 percent against, 3 percent no vote.

Bear in mind this poll came from all types of independent businesses, both in the production and distribution field.

Hearings were held by the subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. No findings were ever made by the committee.

It may be found in the record of the hearings that major rubber companies opposed the legislation, and to our amazement, some of our antitrust agencies.

This situation is still plaguing efficient independent business, and in this it is interesting to note that in a recent current survey of the National Federation of Independent Business through "How's Business With You" from the period January 6, 1962 to January 26, 1963, replies received from our nationwide membership were 56,486, nearly one-third of our entire membership, and you will admit that this is an exceptionally high average on any poll of this kind made on any kind of a problem.

It is significant and important to note as to the overall response; 21,286 or 37.5 percent complained of unfair pricing by suppliers, and of this number 7,464 or 13.2 percent complained of factory owned store competition, and this included a substantial number of independents in the rubber tire sales and servicing field.

To confirm this we are listing 73 important specific instances nationwide, and the original signed reports are on file in our Washington office.

Now bear in mind these come from active independents in the tire sales and servicing field and cover the high spots of their findings relating to dual distribution in the rubber tire industry.

ALABAMA

Birmingham: "Company owned store-tire stores selling at my cost and below."

Montgomery: "Wholesalers should not be allowed to sell to the general public—retailers only. Factory owned stores should be required to sell to the public at regular retail price. Factory owned stores should actually have to sell to retailers only."

Selma: "Goodyear, Firestone, and Goodrich Stores; all of these are retail outlets that buy cheaper than I do."

ARIZONA

Phoenix: "Goodyear Tire factory stores will sell tires to customer below my wholesale price."

ARKANSAS

Dewitt: "We have many cases (unfair pricing by manufacturer) but the most clear example is Prestone Antifreeze. It seems no two of our jobbers have the same price to us, and we can buy locally at retail cheaper than we can from any of our jobbers. This is merely an example. Tires and tubes would be another good example, and we could name other items."

CALIFORNIA

LaJolla: "Selling of tires to the public at almost the same price and sometimes less than the dealer pays for them." (re company-owned stores)

Oakland: "Many large tire manufacturers sell private brands far below our costs on the same quality of merchandise."

San Rafael: "Factory-owned stores can operate stores in the red in one area, write it off, or offset loss by profit from other areas. Factory stores omit the independent dealer by manufacturing and selling consumer direct."

Santa Rosa: "Factory-owned tire stores sell at prices below those charged to retail stores."

Tracy: "I am a Firestone dealer. Most major tire companies have their own company operated stores in competition with dealers."

COLORADO

Cortez: "Factory-owned stores receive special discounts on tires sometimes weeks before independent stores."

Durango: "I have a Firestone Dealer Store, company-owned store out of Denver sell all the 'off the highway tires' to contractors in my territory."

Grand Junction: "Firestone factory store * * * can sell cheaper than the independent because of volume."

Gurly: "Co-ops, discount houses, factory-owned stores. Firestone (I am a Firestone dealer)."

Kiowa: "Factory-owned tire stores selling cheaper than I can buy from them."

CONNECTICUT

Danbury: "Tire factory-owned stores sell at our cost to retail customers."

Meriden: "Petroleum products being sold in discount house at far below our cost. Antifreeze the same—other automotive chemicals, etc. Also, Firestone selling tires below our cost in company stores."

FLORIDA

Cocoa: "Major rubber manufacturers (such as Goodyear & Firestone) sell direct to large accounts such as Ryder Truck Rental, Hertz, Bell Telephone, and if independent does business with these accounts, he is forced to give service free and accept 7½ to 10 percent commissions as profit."

Dade City: "Goodyear, Firestone, and all oil companies will sell to a consumer at lower prices than those I am allowed.

Hialeah: "Factory-owned store sells for less to same accounts than to us as dealer for same product.

Miami: "Tires are sold at prices many times that are at or near our cost. Company-owned stores can do so because the parent company is still making a profit through manufacturing.

Orlando: "All major tire companies in many instances sell our customers at the same price as our wholesale. Wholesale automotive parts houses retail at wholesale prices. International Harvester operates local store. They make little or no attempt to adhere to their retail prices."

GEORGIA

Milledgeville: "Impossible for us to compete with factory-owned tire stores."

IDAHO

Boise: "Also in tire business the major brands are sold direct to ultimate consumer at below local dealer costs."

Burlet: "Factory subsidized stores, Hood tires sold at retail at our costs."

Idaho Falls: "Firestone wants more for a tire supposedly sold to me wholesale than they charge a customer for it."

Idaho Falls: "Firestone stores sell a tire at $10.88 and the same tire costs me $11."

INDIANA

Union Mills: "Firestone store in LaPorte claim that they have to meet Goodyear and this is the way they work it."

IOWA

Cedar Rapids: "We are forced to buy tires from Goodrich and Goodyear who operate their own retail stores and undersell us at retail level on the same products."

Oskaloosa: "Worst evil—factory retail stores, method used to gain business, misleading advertising and pricing. Why can factories and producers have retail stores? Packing industry cannot."

Waterloo: "Please give examples of unfairness—major tire companies through their own company-owned stores."

KANSAS

Wichita: "I feel all business should be jobber but not both such as (answering question 4). This would be in the tire business. When they have tire sales, their sale price is very little above an independent dealers cost. This pertains to Goodyear, Firestone stores."

LOUISIANA

Alexandria: "Rubber company stores—they are interested in the 20–25 percent manufacturing profit—the stores can operate at no profit or even lose a small amount consistently."

MASSACHUSETTS

Fitchburg: "Firestone tires—selling of tires at retail close to the wholesale price which we pay. Unfair competitive advantage in buying brake linings, mufflers, etc., etc."

MICHIGAN

Grand Rapids: "Prices given at tire stores to public, same prices are our wholesale."

MINNESOTA

Conger: "We are wholesalers of Firestone tires, yet their stores can apparently undersell us on all items, State, county, local government bids by major oil companies are ridiculous—their bids for county, city, State business are usually at about, or under our buying price."

Faribault: "Factory stores do not have to show a profit on the local level, so merchandise is dumped to them. Firestone and Goodrich seem to be worst offenders."

MISSISSIPPI

Greenwood: "Goodyear and Goodrich both have factory-owned stores in our town and they sell tires direct to consumers at or near the same price they sell us as their dealers. All of the major oil companies have a policy of selling direct to consumers in transport lots at a price below our price as jobbers."

Hattiesburg: "Company-owned stores sell at low margins of profit or make their profit at manufacturing level."

Vicksburg: "Goodrich, Firestone, and Goodyear company stores selling tires at approximately our cost."

MISSOURI

St. Joseph: "Tire companies sell from factory-owned stores to anyone with money to buy, at wholesale prices."

MONTANA

Billings: "Factory outlets on items such as tires, batteries, and automotive accessories."

Glendive: "Goodyear sends an out-of-town dealer or their own factory representative into this area selling truck tires to fleets at net State price, way below my cost and that of their local Goodyear dealer. I sell General tires."

NEBRASKA

Omaha: "The large tire companies have used the same advertising mats throughout the country. Price competition and wages cannot be the same, but their advertised price is the same whether it be in Lincoln, Nebr., or New York City. Also, they are in competition with all that sell their tires."

NEVADA

Reno: "I quit selling truck tires because the manufacturers were selling direct to large truckers."

NEW MEXICO

Farmington: "General Tire and Rubber Co. quoting and selling below our cost through local owned store."

NEW YORK

Rochester: "Firestone Rubber Co. has own store, sells me tires, and competes against me with lower prices for the same market."

NORTH CAROLINA

Wadesboro: "Truck tire sales to fleets at below dealer prices."

OHIO

Edgerton: "Company tire stores have extra discount to work on. Also some off brand tires sold as husky, rugged, long wearing, will measure 1 to 3 inches smaller than name brands but still have the same size markings."

Kent: "Tire company stores are in direct competition with dealers. Holiday tire sales are advertised for less than $1 more than what a small dealer must pay."

OKLAHOMA

Duncan: "The tire companies run a special most of the time on these tires taking all our profit except about enough to pay the labor for mounting. For example, we sell Goodyear tires and on a special $10.77 tire we only make approximately $1.33 which is all absorbed in labor and equipment."

OREGON

Ashland: "Perhaps unfair is slightly incorrect—but in this area, tire companies have taken over the tire shops (two or three instances) and can sell at any price. They stress volume * * * competition is tough. Competition from factory-owned shops in this area (Jackson County) is very stiff. We quote a price—later find the big store quotes a much lesser price—usually less than our cost. Most often this is a "beginning of the season" price—for a short time only. Note advertised—quoted at source of supply. To truckers this is so important—in lowering operating costs. We just cannot and do not attempt to meet these prices."

PENNSYLVANIA

Greensburg: "When Firestone advertises tires at a price just above our cost, with little or no extra discount to us, we lose money when we have to meet these prices."

Kittanning: "Firestone Rubber Co., sells truck tires at prices below our cost. Montgomery Ward sells many items with their own brand name on but the item is the same and made by the same manufacturer our item is made. We believe it is extremely unfair competition for a company-owned outlet such as Firestone, Goodyear, Goodrich and other rubber companies to be in a retail business in competition with others who are strictly on a retail basis. When we suffer a loss it is real; when these people have a loss at one of their outlets is is absorbed into the manufacturing cost. When business is bad they sell at prices below our costs consistently. However, they always deny this when accused of it. With our present bookkeeping methods the truth is quite difficult to prove. However invoices are available to show from customers that have purchased at these prices. It is wrong for any manufacturing company to be in the retail business competing with those who must purchase their goods and try to sell at the same level the manufacturer does through these outlets."

Pittsburgh: "Our supplier, Goodyear Tire, has five company operated stores and through their combined advertising set the price on tires. Their profit is low and often these stores operate in the red. * * * There has been a continuing trend in the last 5 years to produce a cheaper tire—to do this quality has suffered and today there are many tires being sold that are not safe on the high-speed highways. The constant advertising of low tire prices makes our task of selling quality and safety a hard one, and lowers our margins."

SOUTH DAKOTA

Webster: "Factory-owned stores sell their products at very near our cost, they care about volume, not profit."

TEXAS

Big Spring: "Through competition of tire stores who are now selling comparative services—Goodyear, Firestone, etc. not only deal in tires but are in muffler, tailpipe, front end, wheel balancing business. While not strictly unfair, it does reduce our rightful business. Furthering implementing remarks on question No. 4, we find that most of the major service stations are now vying for the customer's dollar, and with less facilities and personnel than we. We have been in this locale for over 27 years, and through the years have attempted to set up a service department, full inventory of good equipment, trained, competent mechanics, and find that the general public in trying to get "something for nothing" avail themselves to these places where they cannot get proper service. We feel that the function of a service station is to dispense oil, grease, but also feel that any major and most minor repairs should be left to the iranchised dealer to further augment his profit potentialities. There is nothing we can do about the independent garage—but we do feel that someway we should be able to combat the so-called service departments installed in one- or two-man service stations."

Dallas: "Service stations buy tires on a key dealer discount and factory owned stores buy and sell at fleet discounts, therefore they can sell tires at below key dealer prices and still make money where we can't."

El Paso: "Moog Industries of St. Louis has begun selling major tire companies on direct basis at our cost prices, who in turn supply the local retail outlets which takes this business from local jobbers like ourselves."

Ft. Worth: "Retail tire sales made at our cost by both Firestone and Goodyear."

Pasadena: "I am a Firestone tire dealer. It's impossible to meet them. They manufacture, distribute, wholesale, and retail; how can you beat them or meet some?"

VIRGINIA

Staunton: "Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone stores—company owned—new tire sales made to consumers below my costs. Cut recap prices to dealers and consumers that leaves a poor profit if you are competitive. You lose the business if you are not competitive. * * * Dealer recap discounts have been raised from 40 to 50 percent. Some cases 50 plus 10 percent by Goodrich. All size winter recaps are advertised $12.12 plus tax. Regular treads at $8.88 plus tax. * * * Firestone and Goodrich have just published a new recap list 10 or 15 percent under the old list prices. There is no reduction in cost of rubber or materials to justify a cut. They are still quoting a 50-percent discount to dealers on this lower list. I used to have 50 or 60 percent of dealer business in this town. I now have about 10 percent if not less. * * * After 30 years (since March 1933) I am seriously considering getting out of the rat race and let the rats fight it out."

Unionville: "The biggest plug for tire dealers would be stop manufacturing in the retail business and also have tires marked according to standards so the public would know what you're selling."

Warsaw: "Our supplier is worst competition, Goodyear Tire."

WASHINGTON

Monroe: "Tire companies sell below our wholesale."

Seattle: "I have been associated with the tire industry in various capacities over the past 14 years and feel qualified to analyze some of its ills. I have a firm conviction that our large corporation officials have a warped attitude about progress. Certainly they are pressed by competition but they can't justify their own conduct by this stand. We have found it almost impossible to sell to large users of tires because of direct contracts of the rubber companies or their stores. In fact, we have a problem selling the public good merchandise when the major producers of our products advertise "turnpike proved tires" for $7.95. This is an outrageous lie. This thing is as ill as selling guns to children to play with. I wonder how many of our people are killed by our ethical manufacturers?"

Sedro Woolley: "Factor-owned tire stores have been a sore spot in local competition. Our suppliers have been our competitors."

Snohomish: "Factory-owned stores, pricing and promotion sales at or near our cost of the same tires."

Vancouver: "Factory-owned tire stores sell some tires so cheap that to compete I must sell a $15 tire for a 50-cent gross profit. Some battery companies are selling batteries through large grocery stores which are selling them for $12.95. At this price the batteries are too low a capacity for the automobile and cause undue electrical troubles."

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield: "Company store, Goodyear, very low prices, new tires and recapping.

WISCONSIN

Deerbrook: "Affected by unfair prices or policies originating with manufacturer * * * Tires, company-owned implement tsores."

Oshkosh: "By wholesale houses selling tires to my customers at my cost or lower. Goodyear and Firestone."

Porterfield: "Our Goodyear-owned store here sells wholesale and retail out of the same store and their retail price at many times is only 5 percent above dealer cost. We should have laws to stop the wholesale and retail sales in the same store. Just in case you people in Washington don't know what conditions are for small business, and I don't think you do—I would like to say I have been in the garage business since 1923 in a small town and what was once a good farming community. Now two-thirds of our farms are in the soil bank. I employ three mechanics and have plenty of work but each year it is getting less and less."

Again, the National Federation through its nationwide membership became aware of the rank discrimination on excise taxes as it applied to tax levy on stocks of tires and tubes in the inventories of independent tire sales and servicing institutions versus company-owned stores where the independent was obligated for the tax immediately on receipt of invoice from his supplier while the stocks of tires and tubes on hand in the company-owned stores were exempt from the tax until sold to the ultimate consumer.

You will recall that I brought to the attention of the committee, in the early part of my testimony, reference to this rank discrimination and again repeated polls were made of our nationwide membership on the proposition, presenting neutral arguments for and against the proposition, and in each and every instance these repeated polls disclosed a tremendous majority favoring correction of this discrimination.

Extensive public hearings were held time and again before the Ways and Means Committee and strange as it may seem spokesmen for the tire manufacturers, large and small, opposed any correction under one alibi or another. To the everlasting credit of the Ways and Means Committee, by unanimous action in the first instance they reported the bill to the floor for unanimous consent in the closing days of the 86th Congress, and the action was blocked by one Member opposing unanimous consent.

Then again to the everlasting credit of the Ways and Means Committee in the 87th Congress, 1st session they again took unanimouse action in reporting the measure to the floor of the House, and further, to the everlasting credit of the House itself unanimous approval to the legislation was given on September 19, 1961.

It is interesting to note that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 2, 1962, the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, in reporting the overall action of his committee, which included H.R. 222 by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, passed House September 19, 1961, said:

"The bill was reported unanimously by the committee. Under present law the tax is imposed at the time the tires or inner tubes are sold by the manufacturer, producer or importer. In the case of manufacturers maintaining their own retail stores or retail outlets, this means that no tax is imposed until the manufacturer makes a sale at retail, that is, to the consumer.

"The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that independent tire dealers may have as much as 15 percent of their inventory investment tied up in these taxes, while their competitors, the manufacturers with their own retail outlets, need make no such investment."

The bill, after passage by the House automatically was referred to Senate Finance and it is regretted to state died in committee at the end of the 2d session, 87th Congress, although it must be understood that the Committee on Finance had also held public hearings time and time again and had full knowledge of this tax discrimination.

It is interesting to note that some authorities both in the economic and educational field have stated to me personally that they were amazed that such a condition could exist in tax discrimination.

This is one of the many privileges and concessions enjoyed by major producers in the rubber tire industry through its operation in dual distribution, so you can draw your own conclusion what other major concessions the producer makes to his own stores and denies to the independent.

It is interesting to note, and to your credit, Mr. Chairman, you have voluntarily recognized this situation and introduced in this Congress legislation similar to that voted by the House unanimously in September, 1961. Similar action was taken in the Senate by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS after a close study.

Mr. Chairman, to keep the record straight as to the overall operation of the National Federation of Independent Business its nationwide membership, which comprises independent business of all descriptions, by majority vote of its members has recognized the rank discrimination in the excise tax levy, and in the most recent poll of its members (mandate No. 280), the results of the poll appearing in mandate No. 281 disclosed; 81 percent for, 15 percent against, 4 percent no vote.

Due to the ever-increasing problems as reported by independent members of the rubber tire industry, and following out the keystone of the federation's operations for fullest enforcement of the antitrust laws it was our exclusive action early in 1947, through the cooperation of the House Small Business Committee then headed by the Honorable Walter Ploeser, that for the first time in the history of the Robinson-Patman Act action was instituted by the Federal Trade Commission to bring into effect the quantity discount proviso for the rubber tire industry.

When the rule was announced by the Federal Trade Commission, and their action all in keeping with the intent of the law (public hearings), it will be found that the federation and a militant group, few in number, of independent tire sales and services, intervened in the Federal court action for the court to sustain the rule of the Federal Trade Commission.

Recently we received a communication from a prominent, well informed member in independent tire dealer ranks, in which he stated that to enjoy the maximum discount from his supplier he made a quantity purchase of inner tubes and he found that the company-owned store, his competition, was able to sell to his customers a single tube at the price the independent had to pay for buying in quantity. In fact, he added, he would have been much better off to confine his purchases for the tube to the company-owned store—that would reduce his investment in quantity purchases.

He followed through a little later on with an invoice given to one of his customers from a company-owned store in his area, where on the invoice itself was a specific mileage guarantee written out. As he stated in his communication: "How could he or any other efficient independent attempt to compete under such conditions."

This is not a single case. Incidents like the above are quite common. I state this due to my 54 years experience in that industry in my dual capacity appearing before this committee today.

Concluding, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is a more serious aspect in the overall situation as it applies to that important commodity—tires, tubes, and services, which plays no minor part in our overall transportation field, today more than ever—and the ever-increasing need for competent experienced independents to remain in the tire sales and servicing field.

To confirm this opinion—one of the leading railroad executives in the Nation, the Honorable William M. Jeffers, then president of the Union Pacific Railroad, on loan to the Government during the war period and in charge of the overall rubber program, made this statement at a public hearing before the Senate Small Business Committee and also the Senate Banking and Currency Committee:

"Now, you ask me as to my view on the bill. My view is this: I hold no brief for the big rubber companies. I think it is important and imperative that the independent be permitted to operate. * * *

"At the same time it is equally important that we keep this country on rubber. That must be done because failure to keep this country on rubber, to my mind, would be equal to a military disaster, and maybe more than that."

This is an important major observation and the warning should not be ignored. The failure to keep healthy, efficient, competent, independents in the rubber tire sales and servicing field to render the due service for all types of users of the products could act as a boomerang to the Nation's welfare, God forbidding, we should ever face another World War.

It is our recommendation, if there are to be any remaining independents in the rubber tire industry, that two actions be taken by the Congress:

1. Enactment of S. 1107, 1108 introduced by Senator LONG, of Louisiana, and companion bills H.R. 3562, 3559 introduced by the chairman of your subcommittee, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT.

The poll just completed of our nationwide membership on the bills in question, disclosed: 69 percent for, 28 percent against, 3 percent no vote.

2. Affirmative action by the Congress on the rubber tires bill, S. 542, introduced by Senator METCALF, and H.R. 560 introduced by Congressman MULTER.

This bill would provide for complete divorcement of the tire manufacturer in the retail field.

To the everlasting credit of the nationwide membership of the federation they have repeatedly voted in the affirmative in favor of this legislation.

Activities of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are all aware of the wonderful work that the Peace Corps has done abroad. I wonder if we are as aware of what the Peace Corps has done to attitudes here at home. I think this country has undergone a change in mental attitude since the emergence of the Peace Corps idea here in 1960. People are increasingly aware of the problems faced by other peoples of the world, I see this exemplified in desire of our fellow citizens to join the Corps, or, unable to do that, participate in some other similar activity.

I find it particularly gratifying to learn of the determination of some of my fellow citizens of New Jersey to grapple with some of the problems facing other nations of the world. They have joined or initiated different projects that will enable them to gain a better understanding of these problems. I feel that these projects are particularly worthwhile in that the participants are taking part at their own initiative. I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate three cases in which the citizens of New Jersey are embarking on such projects.

Rutgers—the State university—was recently the host of 300 participants in the "Crossroads Africa" program. These students, financing half the cost of the trip themselves, participated in a training program prior to their departure for Africa. Upon arrival in Africa, they will help in the construction of much needed schools, clinics, community centers, and the like. New Jersey is honored to have 15 of her students participating in the program.

On another front, I had brought to my attention the story of Mr. Jerry Leopaldi, President of Local 447, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, who is in the process of developing a "Labor Peace Corps." The purpose of this organization is to supply a source of skilled labor for construction projects in Latin American countries. The people participating would volunteer their services during their vacations or by taking leaves of absence from their present jobs. The project will be financed by labor unions, business organizations, and private individuals.

Still another project of a similar nature is that undertaken by George Keenen, of Stoneleigh Park, N.J., and 13 other youths and a priest from Notre Dame University. These students, having raised the money for the trip themselves, are now in Tacambaro, Mexico, a small mountain village 200 miles south of Mexico City. They will concentrate on the installment of the first plumbing system the village has ever seen, the establishment of a small library, and working with the Mexican families.

All of these men have donated their time at great sacrifice to themselves. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that articles from a recent issue of the Newark, N.J., Evening News, the July 4 issue of the Advocate, the Diocesan Paper of Newark and Paterson, N.J., and the June 11 issue of the Elizabeth, N.J., Daily Journal concerning these projects respectively be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News]

ANSWER TO PREJUDICE—THREE HUNDRED ON WAY TO AFRICA TO BUILD SCHOOLS, CLINICS

(By Jerome Aumente)

NEW BRUNSWICK.—With the American image tarnished by current racial outbreaks, a task force of young Americans—including 15 from New Jersey today begin leaving for Africa to counterbalance the negative impressions.

They include approximately 300 college students, leaders, and teachers from around the country who are part of "Operations Crossroads Africa." They will work this summer in 20 African countries on construction of schools and clinics and in teacher training programs.

Last week, they gathered at Douglass College for an orientation program which included lectures, discussions, social gatherings with United Nations delegates from African countries, and a talk by Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP.

Len Jefferies, 26, of 1 West Alpine Street, Newark, will lead college students in Guinea who will complete a youth center in the mountain town of Mamou. He recently returned from Africa after setting up projects in French-speaking African countries.

"It's a chance to contribute something material as well as spiritual. It's a way of convincing people that we mean what we say about friendship," Judy Rogers, 20, of 195 Park Street, East Orange, explained.

Judy is going to Sierra Leone and will build a youth center outside the town of Bo. Students at Dickinson College, Pennsylvania, where she is a junior majoring in sociology, held a dance to raise funds for her $900 share of the $2,200 cost of sending each participant. Teachers from her elementary school in East Orange also contributed.

An English major at Kenyon College, Ohio, Richard Passoth, 20, of 6 Newman Road, Upper Montclair, is going to Sierra Leone to work on a building project.

What will he say to Africans if they ask about the current racial tensions here?

"We've been told to be honest and not say 'well, you have problems, too.' if things don't go smoothly." He will tell the Africans. "That is to be expected with any change of social conditions."

"We have as much to gain from them as they from us," Robert Spellman, 21, of 46 South 7th Street, Newark, said. "Life is just a series of contributions. What you learn, you should contribute."

Spellman, who will help complete a training center in Oldonyo Sambu, Tanganyika, received some of the funds for his trip from the students and faculty of Virginia State College from which he graduated. Civic clubs in Newark also contributed. Spellman will teach art in the Jersey City school system when he returns.

Geoffrey Malone, 20, of 35 Girard Place, Newark, a Rutgers senior majoring in biology, will go to Ethiopia to help build a three room extension to a school house with funds raised by African agricultural students in Alemaya.

Beryl Goldberg, 21, of 105 Mapes Avenue, Newark, a Douglass College political science major, is going to Sierra Leone. Asked if she had any trepidations about doing mason work, she said: "I've worked as a waitress in hotels and that's hard labor of a sort also."

"I was fortunate in selling almost the whole town of Belleville on this." Gil Sherman, 20, of 224 Mill Street, Belleville, said. He won the support of Belleville civic clubs to raise money for his share of the trip to Guinea.

[From the Advocate, July 4, 1963]

WHO IS MY NEIGHBOR—VERONA MAN PLANS LABOR PEACE CORPS

(By Ed Woodward)

NUTLEY.—"Who is my neighbor?" asked Jerry Leopaldi of Verona, a man who deems that a vital question which demands action as well as a well-considered answer.

In terms of loving and helping, "most people think their neighbor is the woman down the street whose children they took care of while she was having a baby, or the fellow whose lawn they cut while he was sick," he replied to himself.

"But, there is more depth to the concept of who is your neighbor," added a man whose thoughts these days are reaching out to his Latin American neighbors in their hour of need.

Leopaldi is president of Local 447, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, of ITT Federal Labs here and guiding hand behind a proposed Labor Peace Corps.

The program, as Leopaldi sees it, would provide money and men for projects which will help various countries in Latin America and simultaneously combat communism. He is working toward the establishment of some type of labor committee or private foundation which can administer the program.

He expects this organization to be backed by labor, industry, and private individuals. It would select sites for projects—hospitals, clinics, schools or the like—and supply construction funds along with labor experts to supervise the work and provide a "people-to-people" contact which Leopaldi calls "indispensible."

The men would go to Latin America either on their vacations or on an extended leave of absence. "There's no worry about having the men," Leopaldi said with assurance, "I've got a list of volunteers who have been bothering me to tell them when they can go."

As for the other important ingredient, money, Leopaldi has a number of pledges of funds from various unions and he anticipates no difficulty in swelling the total once definite plans are determined.

Such plans may become more concrete this month when a meeting of interested parties—including national labor leaders such as IUE President James Carey—is held. "We'll structure a committee," Leopaldi explained, "and appoint a group to select a pilot project, which we can get off the ground in a very short time."

Finding the projects will be unnecessary since Leopaldi has done a great deal of research on this point. He recently met Bishop Gennaro M. Prata, S.D.B., Auxiliary Bishop of La Paz, Bolivia, and received an extensive outline of needs in that country.

Two motives should strengthen the backing of this Labor Peace Corps, according to Leopaldi. "We will be doing it out of Christian charity to help eliminate poverty," he said, "and we'll be fighting to check the spread of communism."

He has been working on the idea for more than a year, ever since he heard Rev. Frederick Haggerty, M.M., a Maryknoll missionary, discuss poverty in Latin America at a meeting of the Holy Name Society in Our Lady of the Lake Parish.

"I started adding up all the things I had read and heard about: Castro's rise in Cuba, a government survey which showed strong anti-American feeling in Latin America, the stoning of Vice President Nixon, the wonderful reaction to a group of boys from this area who went to Mexico last year.

"Those boys had nothing to gain, they had no selfish motives. And they didn't have the skills that the millions of people in labor have. So, I started working on this idea," he said.

Originally, he proposed an auxiliary to the Peace Corps. It would be a pool of craftsmen available on their vacations to go anywhere that they might be needed by the Peace Corps for specific tasks for short periods.

Peace Corps officials indicated that they like the plan, but it would be impossible under present legislation which makes 2 years service mandatory. Leopaldi said there is some talk of submitting legislation which would make an auxiliary possible.

However, he's not waiting for that and he's proceeding with a "Labor Peace Corps" which may see American labor contributing its knowledge, money, interest, time and love to its Latin American neighbors before this year is ended.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, June 11, 1963]

WESTFIELD YOUTH PARTICIPATES IN AID MISSION TO MEXICO

WESTFIELD.—Several cars and a truck carrying 13 youths and a priest, construction

equipment, and books left the University of Notre Dame campus today on a 2,500-mile journey through central and southern United States, across Texas, and into Mexico.

Their destination is not charming Mexico City or attractive Acapulco. Their trip will end and their summer will begin when they reach the mountain village of Tacambaro, 200 miles south of Mexico City.

Among the 13 students is George Keenen III, 20 years old, a sophomore, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Keenan, Jr., of 15 Stoneleigh Park. And he will bring Westfield to the village through Westfield residents who have contributed funds, medical supplies, plumbing equipment, and interest.

PLANS FOR HOUSING

Unlike tourists, the students' summer will be spent building three houses with the first plumbing Tacambaro has ever seen, teaching English in the evenings, setting up a small library of easy English and Spanish books, and living and working with Mexican families.

The youths are not part of the Peace Corps and are not sponsored by the university. They are volunteers, who have raised their own expenses and who have given up good summer jobs.

Moreover, their last 6 months has been crammed with preparations. They have been studying Spanish. "If you can't speak Spanish," said George, "half the trip is wasted."

At weekly meetings, they also have learned the "dos and don'ts" in Mexico.

NEW SKILLS LEARNED

And, of course, there were construction skills to be mastered. "Most of us," said George, "are like the ordinary man around the house, with a sore left thumb."

In the past few months, the leader of their group, a philosophy major, has been trying to teach plumbing techniques, said George. Another has been put in charge of showing them pick and shovel methods, and another brickwork.

Most of the young men gave up all other outside activities to prepare for the trip. George, a graduate of St. Peter's Preparatory School, Jersey City, gave up track.

Although the students will need physical stamina in their daily work, they must also be ready for the intellectual challenge. As George pointed out, Latin America is going through social ferment. Most of the countries are up for grabs and many ideologies are in the race for these countries.

Therefore, besides the construction of three houses, it is the day-to-day contact with Mexicans that is important to the American students.

TOUCH OF AMERICANA PLANNED

They plan to give Mexicans unusual details of American life. They have also learned Mexican songs and the national anthem. Several of the students play the guitar and they hope to put on skits, a popular pastime in Mexico.

Undoubtedly, the Fighting Irish of Notre Dame will run off a few scrimmages with the Mexicans.

George, who has been accepted for the Holy Cross Fathers Seminar, Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., and who hopes to become a missionary priest, appealed to the people of Westfield for funds and material as part of a two-way exchange program. About $8,000 was needed for the trip for a group of students going to Peru. The students raised the funds from all over the country.

"Perhaps I am an idealist," said George, "but, of course, the response from Westfield didn't approach expectations. The money came to about $50, plus some supplies."

ONE RESPONSE PLEASING

He said, however, that one letter from a Westfield resident made the appeal a success. The letter said: "Please cash this check and keep it in your wallet to make life easier for a Mexican family."

To those who have contributed, he will write letters and send a weekly newsletter from Mexico.

He noted that Westfield is a typical town in America—beautiful, happy, blessed. "Tacambaro," he said, "is also beautiful and happy." In their own way, these volunteers are trying to make Tacambaro blessed, also.

George concluded: "I feel that it is a distinctive mark of our generation that we have undertaken work such as this and the Peace Corps and other volunteer contributions on a large scale. It should be of some assurance to those who ridicule those our age."

Hon. John Hamlin Folger

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the passing on July 19, of the Honorable John Hamlin Folger, formerly a Representative in the U.S. Congress from the Fifth District of North Carolina, a seat now being so ably and effectively filled by our distinguished colleague and my longtime warm personal friend, the Honorable RALPH J. SCOTT.

Former Congressman Folger who was a native of Surry County, N.C., was living at Mount Airy in Surry County at the time of his passing. Mr. Folger was elected to the House of Representatives to succeed his brother, the Honorable Alonzo Dillard (Lon) Folger, whose death occurred on April 30, 1941, as a result of an automobile accident in Mount Airy. His service in the Congress extended from June 14, 1941 to January 3, 1949. He was not a candidate for renomination in 1948 and thus voluntarily retired from these halls.

I was closely associated on many occasions with the late Honorable Fred Folger, a son and law partner of the Congressman, and thus I had the privilege and the opportunity of becoming acquainted also with the former Congressman. The Folger law firm enjoyed the highest professional reputation for integrity and ability. Their reputation in this respect could not be surpassed. These gentlemen were among the leading lawyers in that section of North Carolina and it was in this capacity that I became associated with the Folgers and came to admire them for their uprightness, their honor and their high standards of personal and professional conduct.

The Fifth District of North Carolina and the Fifth District of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, are contiguous for a distance of approximately 150 miles up and down the North Carolina-Virginia line. In this way, I have felt quite close to all who have served in Congress from that district in recent years and have had the opportunity of observing at first hand the high caliber of these Representatives and the fine and effective work which they did.

The people of North Carolina with whom I have talked believed in John Folger and always referred to him as a dedicated public servant, who was interested not only in his political party, but who was interested in the welfare of the country. His reputation extended far beyond the confines of the Fifth Congressional District of North Carolina. He was well and favorably known in many of the counties of the district which I have the honor to represent. He believed in the true principles of the Democratic Party. He was schooled in the highest traditions of our Government and of our country, and stood willing at all times to do whatever was necessary to promote good government in his State and in his Nation. We have to few such men left.

John H. Folger will be greatly missed by a host of friends and admirers. I know that his work will be appreciated for many years to come, and his memory will be cherished not only by his widow and children and grandchildren, but by many hundreds and thousands of others who knew and understood and appreciated his true manly worth and great nobility of character.

Go Back to Taw on Making Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahassee, Fla., has printed in the July 14, 1963, issue an interesting and important editorial column by Mr. Malcolm B. Johnson entitled "Go Back to Taw on Making Law." Also included in this issue of the Tallahassee Democrat is another excellent column by Mr. Lawrence Fertig entitled "Property-Holding Is Human Right." In view of the fact, Mr. President, that both of these columns are concerned with the civil rights legislation pending in the Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that both of these columns be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GO BACK TO TAW ON MAKING LAW

(By Malcolm B. Johnson)

WASHINGTON.—Seldom defined, but always underlying the debate here over the extent of Federal supervision of the private rights of men, is the most divisive political question of our generation: Who makes the laws of the land?

True labels are hard to find and harder to attach, but it pits the theory of constitutional elasticity versus rigidity, the so-called activist in jurisprudence against the conservative.

There are those of us who maintain the Constitution means what it says, that "this Constitution, and the laws * * * made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the Supreme law of the land"—until they are

changed in accordance with the rules for change outlined as part of the Constitution.

Opposed to us, are those who say the Supreme Court has authority to interpret the Constitution, so the Supreme Court finally and actually makes the law of the land—shifting it from one position to another with changes in times, customs, prevailing political philosophy and the varying judgment of a transitory Court personnel.

The difference of opinion has been clear cut here for so long that it seems to be taken for granted as a basic conflict that won't be settled (yet it must be settled).

The contending sides seem to start each struggle with tacit acceptance of the cleavage, and move promptly to the more immediately decisive arguments on a political problem—often leading us, and sometimes themselves, down sidepaths into traps and brambles.

The Senate Committee on Commerce came close to basics during hearings last week on the Kennedy bill to prohibit discrimination against races by private business operators. But the arguments mostly involved whether the bill should be based on the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, or on the 14th amendment guarantee of equal protection of the law to all citizens, regardless of race.

QUESTIONS REVEAL PHILOSOPHY

Now, this is a dandy discussion for the lawyers (and pertinent, too, because the Commerce Committee only has jurisdiction if the bill affects interstate commerce). It's tempting to step into the debate at any one of a dozen points attractive to editorial comment.

But, to stick to the theme, it is necessary to report merely that the Kennedys chose to base their public accommodations bill on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution because the Supreme Court ruled, back in 1883, that Congress had no authority to pass a similar law under the 14th amendment.

The clear division was shown by questioning of Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall by Senators THURMOND, of South Carolina, ENGLE, of California, and PASTORE, of Rhode Island.

Marshall had explained the strategy of basing the bill on the commerce clause to avoid the risk of having the Supreme Court throw it out on the basis of the 80-year-old ruling that it was not permissable under the 14th amendment. Personally, he said, he didn't think it made much difference because he feels the 1963 Supreme Court would approve the bill regardless of its basis.

Senator THURMOND asked why the 1963 Court shouldn't follow the 1883 Court's interpretation of the Constitution. "The Constitution hasn't changed, has it?"

"No, Senator," the Assistant Attorney General replied, "but the country has changed, the Court has changed, the law has developed"—and he said flatly that's how he felt it should be, which put him squarely in the front row of the "activist" school.

HISTORIC ROAD TO TYRANNY

Senator ENGLE, who supports the bill based on the commerce clause, expressed misgivings about having to vote for one that would appear to be unconstitutional under the latest Supreme Court decision—the 14th amendment.

Not Senator PASTORE. He said Congress should march boldly into the legislation under any and all possible constitutional authority.

"Why can't we hope the Supreme Court will reverse itself, as it did in the school cases?" he asked. (And nobody bothered to answer, because the politico-judicial facts of life are well known here.)

Right there is the biggest question of our generation: If the Constitution is the law of the land, can the Supreme Court make it permit something today that wasn't permitted under the same working 80 years, or 80 days ago?

Nearly everyone agrees the Supreme Court, of necessity, has the authority to interpret the Constitution in deciding whether an act or an action is within bounds. From that agreement, it is easy to slide into a feeling that the powers to interpret carries the authority to change interpretations—particularly if the change is in line with your thinking.

But why have a Constitution laying down the rules for representative government if we allow five or nine men, appointed for life, to read it as they see fit, reversing themselves and their predecessors at will?

That, historically, has been the road to tyranny, even when it began with benign and enlightened judicial decrees. Our English forebears had to abolish the Court of the Star Chamber (despite its early dedication to true justice) when it became too much a prerogative court, enforcing proclamations of the King which created offenses "not known to law" and regulating trade, publications and conduct of municipal elections. Some of our most sacred rights were obtained and strengthened by the act abolishing this court.

ONE SENSIBLE ANSWER

But, since we permit and approve interpretation, how can we avoid changes of interpretation by new minds in new times? Only one answer makes sense.

The Supreme Court should be allowed only one interpretation of a single point of constitutional law; and if that interpretation—either immediately or eventually—runs counter to the popular will, the constitutional procedures for change should be followed to alter the Constitution to conform to popular will.

This is not a new theory. It is wrapped up in what the lawyers call stare decisis. It was well understood for 150 years of our constitutional history. The 11th amendment was adopted solely to set aside a Supreme Court decision on a point of court jurisdiction. (Incidentally, that's the only constitutional change we've ever adopted affecting judicial authority, and it reduced it—yet court power grows by assumption.)

The Dred Scott decision declaring that a slave was property and could not become a citizen, though it helped bring on the Civil War, was recognized all through the war until it was set aside by the 13th amendment outlawing slavery.

The activist doctrine that the Supreme Court can make the law of the land say one thing today and another tomorrow took over at the beginning of the Roosevelt era.

It's time to go back to taw. The only way to do it is to get Congress to stop taking the the conflict for granted as a normal way of politics, and bring up for full debate and submission to the States a constitutional amendment clarifying the role of the Supreme Court—perhaps writing into the Constitution the principle of stare decisis, a rule that only one interpretation of a point is allowed to the Court.

Otherwise, we'll keep taking treacherous shortcuts, following false and shifting landmarks into a judicial wilderness or worse.

PROPERTY-HOLDING IS HUMAN RIGHT

(By Lawrence Fertig)

Once again the false issue of "human rights versus property rights" has been dragged into the public arena—this time in relation to civil rights for Negroes.

The Negro problem is explosive enough, Lord knows, because it is interwoven with social attitudes, economic practices, and prejudices which have grown up for centuries. It is a disservice to bedevil the issue by using the very phrase which has been the stock in trade of demagogs for more than a century—"human rights and property rights."

Unwittingly perhaps, this is what the President did when he used this phrase in an attempt to justify the "public accommodation" recommendation in his civil rights message.

He proposed that owners of a certain form of property—restaurants, lodging houses, soda fountains, etc.—be compelled to serve customers without restriction.

This proposal is made despite a Supreme Court decision of 1883 declaring unconstitutional an act of Congress which denied property owners the right to select their own customers.

The administration justifies the proposed law by the clause in our Constitution which gives the Federal Government power to regulate "interstate commerce." The regulation of interstate commerce is a pretty flimsy excuse for a law which would restrict the use of all property of a certain type.

LIMITATIONS

Of course there are limitations on the use of some private property. As the President said, there are now laws about zoning, smoke control, etc. But this is hardly justification for loading down private property with important further restrictions. And it is certainly no reason for raising the false issue of property rights as distinguished from human rights.

The fact is that there are not two kinds of rights, there is only one. Property itself is inanimate and has no rights. It is the people who own property who have the right to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

When a person saves for a lifetime and buys a motel or a restaurant, his human right must be considered along with the rights of others. In the context of the civil rights problem it is the human right of the vast number of property owners which must be considered as well as the rights of those who wish to buy their goods and services.

It is a significant fact that without property rights there can be no human rights. Take a look at the Soviet Union or China, for example. No one there has a right to own productive property. Even the right to own a small home is limited. The state owns all the means of production, and since nothing must interfere with the state's right to use that property as it sees fit, no human being has any rights, as opposed to the state.

So the state decides on what people shall buy and where they shall live, where they shall work and what they shall think and say. No one can write a book or paint a picture that is objectionable to the state. There can be no opposition to the ruling hierarchy.

Since there is no private property no one can own a printing press or a radio station or a book distributing organization. How then can there be any effective public protest? Plainly when you do away with property rights you do away with human rights.

The Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution recognizes no distinction between property rights and other human rights. Dr. Paul Poirot (of the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington, N.Y.) points this out in a sparkling booklet, "Property Rights and Human Rights."

BILL OF RIGHTS

In the Bill of Rights the ban against unreasonable search and seizure covers "persons, houses, papers, and effects" without any discrimination.

Furthermore, the Constitution says that no person may, without due process of law, be deprived of "life, liberty, or property." Note that the authors of our Constitution were as concerned about unjustifiably depriving a person of property as they were of depriving him of life or liberty. This con-

cern for property goes back to the Magna Carta.

The "regulation of interstate commerce" used as an excuse in the present case could easily become the basis for an administration dictating practically everything in industry. It could regulate who gets jobs, the classification of workers, their wages, etc. The use of this excuse now in an attempt to solve a difficult social problem is a move in this direction. And to raise the false issue of property rights versus human rights during the ensuing discussion smacks of demagogery.

Heavy, Heavy Hangs Over the Head of Free America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, remember the game we used to play as children, Heavy, heavy, hangs over your head? Somehow, I have that same feeling now only it is not a child's game we are playing, but we are dealing with the life and death of the United States of America.

Newspapermen and others with whom I have talked recently have this same fearful foreboding, a feeling of crisis, a feeling of frustration never before experienced in Washington and, to a man, they all trace it to the failures, the inaction, the bewilderment of President Kennedy and his incompetent administration.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, the security of this Nation must be protected by a bold and fearless Congress. The administration has proved itself wholly incapable of leadership. Congress must begin to set America's House in order, to bring back fiscal responsibility, to reassert leadership in the world, to erase the danger spots which threaten our destruction through either war or subversion.

Part of what has led to this feeling of crisis is outlined in the U.S. News & World Report of July 29 on its Newsgram page.

An excerpt from that page follows:

There's getting to be a crisis "feel" in the Washington air.

Dollar weakness suddenly is out in the open. A major blowup could occur at any time in the Vietnamese war. Race issues remain inflammable.

Cuba acts as a festering sore that's infecting Latin America.

White House technique of seeking to sidestep troubles seems to solve nothing. It simply delays the day of reckoning—a day drawing nearer.

The dollar's troubles are basic. Dollars simply are asked to do too much—more than any currency can be expected to do and remain "free."

Billions in aid are given to the world by goodhearted Uncle Sam. More billions then go to carry the military burden of rich and powerful nations. Dollars have been open to all foreign comers to borrow at low interest rates.

It's simply getting to be too much, despite all the pats on the back given to the United States by those governments that have their own burdens eased.

A few figures help to show you what's been happening.

In 1950, the outside world held $19.4 billion in gold and dollars. The United States, at that time, held $28.8 billion in gold, with the dollar very strong.

In 1963, the outside world holds $46.5 billion in gold and dollars. The United States holds $15.8 billion in gold. U.S. gold: down $7 billion. Foreigners' claims on United States: up $27.1 billion. And: Foreign claims are rising fast.

The dollar today is vulnerable where it had been strong.

The United States, in effect, has the status of a debtor where it had enjoyed that of a creditor. Debtors tend to be at the mercy of creditors. Creditors in this case can call on the United States at any time to pay up on its debts.

It's not a comfortable position, not causing a secure feeling.

So what to do? White House plans are several. Borrowing, for one thing, will be made a little less easy, a little more expensive. A credit will be set up in the International Monetary Fund against which United States can draw, going deeper into debt. A tax, if Congress agrees, will be levied on income from dollars put into foreign stocks and bonds. Foreign aid will be cut somewhat. Military spending of dollars abroad also will be reduced moderately.

Tax on foreign use of dollars is the first faint move toward exchange control, toward control by Government over the movement of capital abroad.

Travel abroad by Americans is not soon to be limited. Businessmen will not be restricted in their investments abroad. A world superbank from which the United States can borrow is to be studied but not accepted at this time.

Devaluation of the dollar, a rise in the price of gold, would be the last thing tried. That is completely out of present calculations.

Effects of the dollar's growing troubles will be uncertain for a time.

Business at home may become less buoyant if borrowing should be made less easy and more costly. Mortgage money, however, will become more abundant if insurance companies and others are restrained from investing abroad.

Exports would be hurt if foreign borrowers are restricted.

Canada, the biggest user of U.S. dollars, will be hurt badly if the White House plan for a tax on dollars going abroad actually takes effect. The Canadians, however, have wanted to put penalties on U.S. investors in their country so the White House plan will certainly help them toward that goal.

White House and Congress, though, remain completely out of tune.

Tax on income from foreign investments isn't more than a 50–50 prospect.

Tax on income cut will be voted, effective January 1, 1964, but it's to be far different from the kind of tax cut and tax "reform" the White House asked.

Civil rights bills, if voted, will be much watered down.

Congress, although heavily Democratic, seems not to be in a mood to act favorably on any major portion of the program the President has asked.

Employers will not face a law telling them whom they must hire. Small businessmen are not likely to be made subject to suits in Federal court by an individual or by the Government in Washington on the ground that they tended to discriminate on a basis of race or religion.

President Kennedy is very unlikely to be given power to use $70 to $80 billions in Federal contracts, loans, grants, guarantees or insurance to force either individual businessmen or communities to meet conditions he lays down.

Civil Rights Commission will be extended. Community Relations Service probably will be created. Voting rights of Negroes may be protected more.

Dollar troubles abroad are matched, in a way, by dollar troubles at home. Balanced budgets seem to be as remote for the Government as ever.

Budget deficit for year ended June 30, at $6.2 billions was smaller than predicted. However, it was one more deficit with another bigger one ahead.

The point is that the spending trend of Government is strongly upward.

Eisenhower's last budget involved spending of $81.5 billions.

Kennedy's budget for year just ended involved $92.6 billions in spending. That's a rise of $11.1 billions in 2 years, with the trend up.

Kennedy budget for the new year is $98.8 billions. It probably will be trimmed somewhat, but still will be several billions over year just ended.

At some point, United States may face the hard task of getting its books in order both at home and on a world basis. The alternative: eventual inflation.

Congressional Record Is Read Every Day By William S. Steffey of Williamsport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, few people regard the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the type of journal to be read daily with the morning coffee, but William S. Steffey of Williamsport, Md., finds the RECORD interesting to read, with or without coffee. Each day for the past 33 years, Mr. Steffey has been reading the RECORD as a means to keep himself informed of the issues before Congress. It is encouraging to know that Mr. Steffey has taken the initiative to read the RECORD. He is living testimony to the American ideal of a well-informed citizen. For once at least, Mr. Steffey will be able to thumb through the Appendix and read something about himself.

The following article from the Hagerstown Daily Mail describes Mr. Steffey's pastime:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD IS READ EVERY DAY BY WILLIAM S. STEFFEY OF WILLIAMSPORT

(By Phil Ebersole)

Each day the Government Printing Office prints the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a 45,000-word compendium of the day's activities in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Each day William S. Steffey, 77, of Williamsport, reads it—for pleasure.

He doesn't read it all from front to back. He picks out the interesting parts.

He always starts with the prayers of the chaplains of the House and Senate in the front. Then he skims rapidly through the proceedings, or debate, pausing to read thoroughly any section that looks interesting.

The juiciest material, he finds, is usually in the Appendix, in which Congressmen have reprinted statistical tables, articles, and speeches on everything from "American Independence Day in Denmark" to "Tennessee Mud."

Many persons with special legislative interests make use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

But Mr. Steffey is one of the "few that get it for the purpose for which it was, in a sense, intended"—that of informing the citizen.

He has followed with special interest sections dealing with unemployment, foreign affairs, and the integration crisis. Reading remarks and articles by Senators and Congressmen from all parts of the country has given him an appreciation of the complexity of these issues, he said.

Steffey has made a clipping file of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles dealing with the late Pope John. "I will live and die a Methodist and after I die, I will go on being a Methodist in another sphere," he said, but he is an admirer of the late Pope.

He keeps the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for a year, then gives the old copies to Goodwill Industries. He has every issue dealing with the 88th Congress.

Steffey retired from his job as telegrapher for Western Maryland Railroad in 1959, after working off and on there since 1902. He has been getting the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the 1930's, "when Davey Lewis was Congressman," but now he has plenty of time to read it.

He also reads many books and tracts on religion, as well as the National Geographic magazine. He has also been an active Odd Fellow for 55 years.

Steffey nearly had an opportunity to work in Congress himself once. He was hopeful of getting a job in the office of the late Congressman William D. Byron of Williamsport, but another Williamsport man got the job.

The Customs Service on Its 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Customs, one of the first Federal Government agencies to be created, will celebrate its 175th anniversary on August 1, 1964. President George Washington established the Customs Service when he signed the Fifth Act of the First Congress on July 31, 1789. This was an act "to regulate the collection of the duties imposed by law on the tonnage of ships or vessels, and on goods, wares, and merchandises imported into the United States." The 1789 act created 59 Customs Districts in 11 States. Two States, North Carolina and Rhode Island, had not as yet ratified the Constitution, but subsequently seven districts were created in these States in 1790.

Prior to the creation of the Customs Service and the enactment of the first Tariff Act, almost every State had its own tariff laws and collector of customs. Some States even imposed duties against neighboring States. Chicken peddlers from New Jersey had to take their fowl to the New York customhouse to have them valued and to pay duty before selling them in New York City.

Government finances, furthermore, were in a perilous condition. The States were often slow in honoring, or ignored altogether, requisitions for funds from the Continental Government which did not have the power to levy taxes directly.

The Tariff Act had been proposed by James Madison as a temporary expedient intended to provide operating revenues. As finally passed, it included a levy on such items as candles, rum, iron and steel, such items, as candles, rum, iron, and steel, carriages, sugar, cocoa, and coffee. The act caused rejoicing throughout the young Republic and the newspapers referred to it as the second Declaration of Independence.

After the passage of the Tariff Act, quick implementation was needed as it was to go into effect almost immediately. Thus the Customs Service antedated even the Treasury Department by a month. The Treasury Department was created September 2, 1789. One of the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury was to superintend the collection of the revenue and the Customs Service automatically became a part of the Treasury Department.

In its first year, the Customs Service collected approximately $2 million. This sum loomed large in the total Government income of about $2½ million. In fact, up to 1910 customs receipts provide the principal means whereby the government maintained the army, the navy, the civil service, paid the interest on the national debt, and performed all other services. Today, of course, the income tax and other internal revenue taxes provide the greater part of the receipts of the Federal Government, but even today customs collections contribute a substantial sum. During calendar year 1962, $1,729,706,696, was collected and turned over to the Treasury.

Through the years, by determined effort, Customs has kept down its operating costs. During the first 10 years of its existence, the cost of collecting the revenue amounted to 4½ cents on each dollar; today it is 4⅕ cents for each dollar collected. Its budget for fiscal 1962, for example, was approximately $63 million and it collected over $1,624 million in duties and taxes in the same period.

In addition to collecting revenue, customs has been given other duties relating to seaports. The Navigation Act of 1789 was the first of the navigation laws governing the registry and clearing of vessels and regulation of coastal trade. Customs was given the responsibility for local administration of the law. Today customs still is concerned with the entrance and clearance of vessels, documentation of vessels, and the measurement of tonnage—which is used in assessing port fees and tolls.

For many years customs officers were the only local Federal officials and they had many extra functions assigned to them. Collectors of Customs often acted as lighthouse superintendents and they also were designated as pension agents directed to pay military pensions. The creation of the Marine Hospital Service in 1798 required collectors to gather hospital dues of 20 cents a month for every employed seaman from vessels arriving from foreign ports. Collectors were actually in charge of the hospitals for over 70 years.

The prevention of smuggling has always been a major concern of the Bureau of Customs. It is the responsibility of customs to apprehend the vicious narcotics smuggler as well as the casual traveler who is trying to evade the payment of duty. Both professional and casual smugglers are noted for their ingenuity. Diamonds, watch parts, and narcotics are hidden in clothing, suitcases, and hidden compartments in automobiles. In an earlier, more ornate, time, lace was another item often smuggled. An article about the New York Customs House published in 1884 tells of a gentleman who was caught with a quantity of point lace concealed in the crown of his hat.

The continuing war which customs has fought with professional smugglers throughout its long history has not been without hazard. Customs lives were lost in the early 19th century fighting Laffite, the pirate. Laffite was brazenly auctioning off slaves and goods obtained as booty. In this century, 42 customs officers have been killed in the line of duty by violators of customs laws or by accident while on duty.

Today the Bureau of Customs must cope with an increasing amount of foreign trade and travel. In fiscal year 1962 there was an estimated $16 billion worth of merchandise importations, and 160 million people and 46 million vehicles crossed our borders. This flow of goods and persons must be checked not only for violations of the tariff laws but for violations of health, agriculture, and immigration laws. Customs, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, must guard against the noxious plant, the insect pest, the disease carrier, the unlawful immigrant.

A big job has been assigned to our customs service in guarding our far-flung borders. Judging from its past history, however, its future duties will be carried out with efficiency and dedication.

It is interesting to note that concurrently with the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the customs service, the National Customs Service Association will mark its 40th anniversary in 1964.

The National Customs Service Association is an independent organization comprised of employees of the customs service at all levels. It is the only organization that has been accorded nationwide formal recognition by both the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Customs as representative of employees of the customs service.

One of the high points of next year's 175th anniversary celebrations will be the 21st Biennial Convention of the National Customs Service Association, which will be held in Montreal, Canada, August 2 through 8, 1964. Many persons of prominence in civic and governmental life of both Canada and the United States are expected to attend. The convention should provide a fitting climax to the many anniversary celebrations.

The U.S. customs service is an agency of Government that is noted for its efficiency and dedication to duty. The

slogan, "175 years of service to the American people,' is most appropriate, as is the motto of the National Customs Service Association, "Integrity, Loyalty, Efficiency."

Editorial Support for Tax Commission Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, my bill calling for the creation of an independent tax commission to serve as interpreter of the intent of Congress in the tax sphere has prompted editorial comment in two Dallas, Tex., newspapers. The Dallas Times-Herald commented:

EASING TAX MAZE

Congressman JOE POOL's bill to establish a tax law commission has as much merit as any piece of legislation offered this term—on the quieter side of Capitol Hill.

Any penalizing law is distasteful at one time or another, but nothing is so infuriating as capricious interpretation of a law—and that is what has irked a good many income taxpayers over the years.

At present, income tax deductions and points of enforcement are allowed or disallowed on a regional basis. Many times, what is deductible in California will be knocked out in Texas, and vice versa. And from year to year the picture shifts and blurs. Even tax specialists find it hard to predict with certainty that any given interpretation will hold up from one year to the next. The civil courts have very little access to the tax rulings, the way the present codes are written. This means that quite often an innocent enough deduction will get the filer hauled before an examiner or, at best, will cause embarrassing inconvenience and penalties several months after the taxpayer has paid what he thought was an orderly tax.

Congressman Pool's bill would create a commission to interpret income tax law so that a ruling would stick from one year to the next—and from one State to another.

The Dallas Morning News editorial was headed:

TAX CHAOS

Congressman at Large JOE POOL, of Texas has introduced a bill setting up a new commission to interpret Federal tax laws. The routine now is this: Congress passes a tax bill. It is so complicated the payer must hire a lawyer to help him grope in the dark. The Internal Revenue Service must interpret what Congress wrote, as well as collect what Congress says the Treasury Department needs to pay the Government's bills. Mr. POOL thinks Internal Revenue should stick to collecting and let somebody else do the interpreting.

The basic trouble is that of big government itself. The 2,500 bureaus and commissions in Washington have life-and-death power over the individual and business. The executive establishment is so big Congress can't begin to check on it. The rulings, orders and interpretations of these bureaus amount, at times, to a planned economy in what is supposed to be a free-enterprise economy.

Whether a new commission on top of another is the answer we cannot say. Mr. POOL can be credited for trying to develop a semblance of order out of chaos; but the basic trouble not only in revenue collections but in agriculture, finance, and commerce is a government which is trying to do too much to too many, and for too many.

Follies of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the July 19, 1963, issue of the Oelwein (Iowa) Daily Register includes an excellent editorial entitled "The Follies of Foreign Aid." This fine Iowa newspaper is absolutely right in stating: "When the taxpayer foots the bill, he deserves an accounting"; an accounting he is not getting as far as our global giveaway program is concerned.

The Oelwein Register editorial reads as follows:

THE FOLLIES OF FOREIGN AID

Millions of dollars are spent each year by the U.S. Government in foreign aid handouts. Yet, though the funds are taken directly from the taxpayers' pockets, the public knows little or nothing about how these funds are used.

It is a misuse of trust and public office when such facts are withheld from the public. When the taxpayer foots the bill, he deserves an accounting.

Reports continue to filter in, spasmodically, of U.S. aid dollars being diverted directly into the pockets of Government officials, their friends and relatives instead of being used to give aid and sustenance to the peoples of the recipient country.

Fortunes are being made through U.S. foreign aid. Sticky-fingered officials, both in the United States and in the receiving country, dip their fingers deep into the pockets of U.S. taxpayers. They grow rich, while the people of the country, for which the aid is intended, sit haplessly by, gaining little except doubt and a loss of faith in the United States.

Far worse than this, however, is the granting of aid to Communist countries. Why should the United States, as the representative of the free world, give aid to nations alined with the Communist bloc, which seeks to gain control, ultimately, of the free world and force its management on these free nations?

Ridiculous, incomprehensible, unjust, unbelievable. Yet it happens.

The good will and support of the peoples of a nation cannot be bought through foreign aid which makes them only dependent on more of the same. It must be administered in an intelligent manner which ultimately will allow them to become independent of aid.

But, when the aid fails to reach the common resident, when it ends up in the clammy, grasping hands of officials, highly ranked and petty assistants, then how can this aid be expected to benefit either the country to which it is extended or the United States?

In the last 20 years, India has received billions of dollars of aid, yet has progressed very little toward a productive nation. Its agricultural and industrial programs have failed to achieve set goals. Nehru, though professing neutrality, apes Moscow policies.

Where has the aid program taken us in India? From what information is available, just exactly nowhere.

In the past 20 years, the United States bestowed some $100 billion in foreign aid funds on 95 nations around the world. Increasingly of late the taxpayer has received only a sparse accounting of the results, good or bad.

Only if U.S. taxpayers and legislators alike come to realize the full extent of the program's failures will the Nation finally derive any benefit from foreign aid expenditures.

Sermons on Supreme Court Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD two fine sermons which were recently delivered in Ashland, Ohio, by two Lutheran ministers. They contain great wisdom and I commend them to the Members of the House:

A SERMON ON THE SUPREME COURT DECISION OUTLAWING THE READING OF THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOLS

(By Rev. A. R. Baldwin, Peace Lutheran Church, Ashland, Ohio)

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." Proverbs 1, 7.

"The fear of the Lord" * * * to stand in awe of Him who is the Creator of all things * * * to reverence God as the beginning and end of everything, the ultimate to whom we must some day answer * * * to know and to believe that without God, His love, His goodness, His grace, and His mercy, all else is futile and without meaning or purpose, that is what it means when we say, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." Without that, says the writer, you don't even get to the beginning of knowledge or wisdom. Do we believe that?

God must be reckoned with. God has been from the beginning, always has been and is here to stay. And unless we reckon with that fact our knowledge and wisdom doesn't even have a beginning.

Even the heathen believe that. All religions teach it. It is absolutely basic. It is basic to Catholicism and to Protestantism. It is basic to the Unitarians, to the Jehovah's Witnesses, to the Seventh Day Adventists, to Buddhism, to Brahmanism, and to all the religions of the world.

We say: "In God we trust." We pledge, "One Nation under God." God is basic to our whole American way of life.

The fact of God as the Supreme Being is basic to our whole system of law. Without the laws of God as we have them in the Ten Commandments, there is no need for courts or lawyers, for then there is no such thing as justice, equity, or righteousne . There is no validity to such commandments as: "Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not covet." Therefore, if the Government expects people to refrain from killing and stealing, is it not reasonable to expect that we should teach these principles of conduct in our schools? Does any judge have the right to condemn a murderer if the schools have no right to tell the children that murder is against God's law? What makes law valid if there is no God to whom we must give an account? Where, then, shall the children of America, who do not attend church, learn about the laws which govern

human conduct if they do not learn them in school?

If we place on our coins the words, "In God we trust," do we have the right to keep people in ignorance of God? Why is it that we have so much juvenile and adult delinquency today? Why are our prisons crowded and our judges plagued with problems? Because we have failed as a nation to teach the basic laws of God, man's responsibility to God, to the Government, and to parents. If a nation is to survive and if a nation is to prosper, it must learn this basic fact that "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

Dare the State or the Nation ignore this? Dare it ever be committed to the cause of atheism if it is to survive? Then why, in the face of these facts, dare we throw all religion out of our public schools? And since when should the Supreme Court in Washington tell the people of Ashland what we are or are not to teach our children in our schools if we, as taxpayers, decide that we want to teach them about God? Is the Federal Government to control education, business, medicine, and the school program in each community? If we decide to teach the moral principles of the law so that our courts can hold us responsible for our conduct, shall the Supreme Court deny us this right? "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," not the fear of Washington, not the fear of the Supreme Court, not the fear that some atheistic mind may rebel at the laws of God or be offended at God's demands.

If it is wrong to teach the commandments of God in our public schools, what basis is there for moral conduct? Then on what grounds do we allow our Government to pay the salaries of chaplains in the Armed Forces? Or why should not the courts rule against the teaching of religion to men in the service? Are they not afraid that these men are being forced to listen to some Christian propaganda which may give comfort and aid to the enemy? Is that why the Communists can so easily brainwash our soldiers?

Schools are allowed to teach anti-Christian views. Pupils are often taught that God really doesn't matter very much, that He didn't create the world, that somehow it came into being by itself. Yet we wonder why the Communists are having such success among the students in our colleges. We are throwing God out and letting communism in. Is that what Justice Clark means by being "committed to a position of neutrality"? With God there can be no neutrality. "He who is not for me is against me," says the Lord.

Of course, I don't think that is what the Supreme Court had in mind when it gave its decision against the use of the Bible in public schools. I think the Court is confused on the issue. I think what they intended to convey was that they are opposed to denominationalism, or the setting up of a particular religion as the religion of the state. I think they are confusing the terms religion and Christianity. Does the Government invade the province of the church when it allows religion to be taught in school? No. The Government invades the province of the church when it tells the church what it shall teach. This is true in England. The Church of England cannot revise its Book of Prayer without the consent of Parliament.

The Constitution of the United States also states that Congress shall not prohibit the free exercise of religion. If this isn't prohibition by Congress, it certainly is by the Supreme Court.

I think that the Supreme Court did this Nation a disservice in handing down a decision which makes it look that it favors atheism. Is the 1-percent minority to govern our religious education? These atheists want God out of the way. They want all religion out of the way. Is that the beginning of wisdom or the end of wisdom? I'm not saying that we should be allowed to teach Christianity in the classroom but I do say that religion most certainly belongs there.

Religion is essentially the fear of the Lord. And we need to have some fear of the Lord in the classroom, in our courts, in our halls of learning, and in our colleges and universities. Atheists could use a little too. We need more fear of the Lord among the general population, for without this religion the whole fabric of society breaks down. And if the classroom is not to promote this fear of the Lord there will be millions of people who will soon scoff at all laws which the courts seek to uphold and we will be ripe for revolution.

I'm sure that the Judges of our Supreme Court did not wish to convey the impression that it favors atheism, or that it has no use for religion. I'm sure that what they tried to convey is that they intend to uphold the principle of the separation of state and church. Unfortunately, their words do not seem to state this very clearly. But if that is their only intent, then Christian citizens can agree with their decision, for we know that the church has never been helped when the state has given aid and protection to the church.

Back in the early apostolic days the church was persecuted by the state. People joined the church only when they were fully persuaded of the truth of Christianity. Then often they were required to die because they became Christians. Yet the church grew in spite of persecution. Emperors threw Christians to the lions, used them as torches to light up the Roman games. Yet the church grew.

About the year 311, the Roman Emperor, Constantine the Great, became a Christian and from that time on, almost until recent times, the state has been trying to tell the church what to do in many countries, while in other countries the church has been trying to tell the state what to do. To those of you who read history, the results are evident. They are disastrous to the church and to the cause of Christianity. For when Christianity becomes popular with politicians and the masses, it is used as an instrument of advantage. Christianity in America is fairly popular. The majority of the population claims membership in the Christian church.

But what does most of our Christianity amount to? It becomes a religion of form and it lacks the vitality and the true spirit of Jesus Christ. Germany has for hundreds of years compelled all public schools to teach Luther's Catechism. Did it result in a Christian Germany? The same people who were forced to learn the catechism were the ones who supported Hitler, Himmler, Eichmann, and the thousands of other Nazi leaders who brought war and destruction to the world. But our schools have never had that church-state setup.

Or take a look at the countries of today where the state and the church are one or where they have agreements to work together. (Roman Catholic Concordant with Spain), (Lutheranism in Sweden), Franco's Spain where the people are kept in poverty and fear by a dictator who repeats the Lord's Prayer.

There are many South American countries where the state religion is furthered and religion has become an instrument to impoverish and enslave the population because only one religion is recognized by the state. In many of these countries the Protestant witness is suppressed by both state and church. They have agreed to suppress the truth in order to gain political advantage. That is not what we have or want in America. So I agree with the statement: "We have come to recognize through bitter experience that it is not within the power of government to invade that citadel," meaning the church. But it never has because Congress has never set up a state religion.

Another reason I believe this decision is not harmful to the church is because so many people have religion forced upon them and therefore being to hate religion. In many of our colleges it is required that students attend chapel. It is true here at Ashland College, it is true of our church college in Columbus. What is the result? The students begin to hate religion because they are forced to listen to dry lectures on a subject that should be the most vital to their lives. These same students don't often voluntarily attend Sunday services. There are, of course, many exceptions. Frequently, people are inoculated with a dry religion to keep them from getting the real thing, just as we inoculate people with cowpox to keep them from getting smallpox.

The true Christian faith has always been able to stand on its own feet. It doesn't need the help of the state. Americans do not want a state religion. Where the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preached according to the Scriptures, there you will find a vital faith and people with a vital religion, and churches that are able to support themselves without the aid of government or state.

What is so unfortunate is that the Government itself has not learned that truth with respect to business. When the Government is asked to subsidize everything from education to business it means that there is something wrong with education and business. Any business or enterprise that cannot stand on its own feet deserves to fail, and will fail eventually. The Roman Empire found that out, only too late. The Protestant Church has found that out. Our Government can't seem to learn from history, and many other governments haven't learned that simple economic lesson.

I have never wanted any part of any organization that can't stand on its own feet. That's why I'm against subsidizing the projects within the church, that's why I'm against moneymaking schemes by which you try to get the other fellow to pay your expenses. There may be some exceptions to this rule but there are less than most of us think. The church does not want nor ask any special favors from the state, but that does not mean that the state must divorce itself from the teachings of Scripture. That is not establishing a religion, that is separating the state from religion.

Now, I want to say another word about the Supreme Court decision regarding the reading of Scripture and the use of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. I do not believe that this decision has anything to do with the Constitution and I do not believe that reading the Bible in schools is unconstitutional. Some of you may recall that I made this statement some few weeks ago in my weekly column, viz, that the constitutional provision regarding religion was never intended to abolish religion in schools but was made to keep the Government from establishing a state church such as the colonists had experienced in the lands from which they had come, such as England and Germany. The Church of England is a state church; the church in Germany is a state church; the church in Sweden is a state church; the church in Italy is a state church; the church in Spain is a state church. The colonists were fed up with the state telling them how they were to worship, so they provided in the Constitution a safeguard against the state church, not against the teaching of religion in schools.

This week in a news editorial I read that Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School agrees with what I have been contending down through the years, viz that the Founding Fathers meant to bar the establishment

of a state-supported religion, not to eliminate religion from schools or public programs. And I'm sure that anyone who will study both the Constitution and the history of our country will be unable to reach any other conclusion. As a matter of fact, if you look at the Constitution you will find that the Supreme Court is not interpreting the Constitution at all. It is setting itself up as a lawmaking body.

The Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion." Has Congress made any laws in this area of religion so that these laws can be declared unconstitutional? No. Neither have the States, although this article does not forbid the State from doing so. Neither shall Congress prohibit the free exercise of religion. If Congress shall not prohibit this, what right has the Supreme Court to do so? Our early history shows that religion played a large part in the first schools of America, because our schools were a product of the church. Nearly all our great universities—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, were begun by the church.

It was the Reformation Church that gave us our system of public education. Our whole public school system stems from the fact that the church was concerned about the souls of people. The reformers wanted each person to be able to read the Bible for himself. In contrast, wherever the Roman Catholic Church had control of government, they kept the people in darkness. To this day they do not promote the reading of Scripture.

Public schools were established to promote the reading of Scripture. Now these very principles which gave greatness to America, which freed Europe from the Dark Ages, which promoted the scientific and cultural advances which we enjoy today are being rejected. Yet the Supreme Court has said nothing about our country having an Ambassador to the Vatican and appeasing the very powers which plunged the world into darkness. We can find hundreds of reasons for subsidizing Communist and Catholic countries, we can hand both our money and our freedoms to the state religion of communism and altheism and bring our own country into bankruptcy and shame on the pretext of reading into the Constitution something that was never there. Our Congress and our Supreme Court has consistently sold us out and what they have sown we are surely going to reap within the near future.

The principles for which millions have sacrificed and died and endured ages of hardships are being undermined by a generation which has forsaken the beginning of knowledge and wisdom which is "the fear of the Lord."

This Nation will not long survive in a healthy state if we continue to pursue the path of appeasing our enemies, supporting Communist countries, denying the validity of God's rule over us, and rejecting the principles which made our country great. I do not intend to convey the idea that we need Bible reading or the repeating of the Lord's Prayer in our schools in order to stave off ultimate destruction and disaster. This is but a small part of America's rejecting of the leadership of the Almighty. But the consistent rejection of God's word, the support of godness countries and the promotion of atheistic philosophy will surely catch up with us. "The Nation that will not serve God shall perish." But there are some things which we Christians can do. We can fight this trend by a more wholehearted support of religion and Christianity in our homes and Sunday schools and churches.

The church began as a small group which had a dynamic faith and a God-given purpose. If we Christians have such a faith, if we believe and teach what is taught in Scripture, then there is hope that there will be a revival of morality in our land. In the final analysis, it is not what our courts decree which will change America but what our people believe and how we act that counts.

I do not mean to minimize the far-reaching results of this Supreme Court decision. One can easily see what a minority did to Cuba and how devastating one man or one decision can be to a country. But while we still have time, and God still gives us the courage and the strength, we should use every good means within our power in our community and in our Nation to uphold the Word of God, to teach the Word of God, to make God real to all people that others and all Christians may have the "fear of God" in their hearts and minds, for this is the beginning of wisdom both for the individual and the Nation. I pray that God will give us the grace to see it before it is too late. Amen.

HAS THE SUPREME COURT ELIMINATED GOD FROM OUR SCHOOLS?

(By Pastor R. S. Kinsey, Trinity Lutheran Church, Asland, Ohio, JULY 21, 1963)

A month ago, June 17 to be precise, at 11:30 a.m., Justice Tom C. Clark began to talk for 25 minutes. He was talking about cases 119 and 142. When Justice Tom C. Clark finished, the world knew that it was unconstitutional for State laws to require Bible reading or prayer in our public schools.

The majority opinion written by Justice Tom Clark declared that government must be "absolutely neutral" in regard to religious beliefs of citizens, "neither aiding nor opposing religion."

The opinion admitted that "the place of religion in our society is an exalted one" and that "religion has been closely identified with our history and Government."

The Justice warned, despite the 174-year record, however, "the breach of neutrality that is today a trickling stream may all too soon become a raging torrent."

The vote on this opinion was 8 to 1. The one Justice who disagreed was Potter Stewart. Stewart was against the decision because parents don't have the freedom to expose their children to religious influences. "Religion is placed at an artificial and State-created disadvantage. Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if schools are to be truly neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises is thus seen * * * as the establishment of a religion of secularism."

A State law, then, cannot require Bible reading and prayer in our schools. Does this decision rule out schoolroom devotions altogether or only those which are required by law?

A cartoon depicts a girl raising her hand, "Teacher, is it all right if I offer a prayer to God before I take this exam?"

The nine men in black robes were called upon to make a difficult decision. Should the state tell you and me what kind of religion we should have? You and I don't want to be told what we ought to believe.

For example, should a Jew by law be compelled to recite the Lord's Prayer at school? From the point of view of both the Government and church, the answer would be "No."

Down through the years, we have agreed that the state and the church should be kept separate. The state has no right to tell the church what to do. The state has no right to tell you and me what to believe.

In looking at the decision of the Supreme Court, let us remember several facts:

First, from the days of our Founding Fathers, we have looked to God for guidance and for His blessings. We have felt that God in His power and majesty has brought our Nation into being, a nation where men were free to worship God as each wished.

Second, the Founding Fathers did not want to see the Government establish a state church. They were trying to get away from the state church. From England, from Germany, from Sweden, they were fleeing state religion. When it came time to write the Constitution, they included the part that the Government has no right to establish a state church.

Third, on every hand we still acknowledge God. Our coins have "In God we trust." When we pledge allegiance, we pledge "One nation under God." Every day our governing bodies open with a prayer. The Senate and House of Representatives open with prayer.

In the Armed Forces we have chaplains. Chaplain Eisemann is paid by the Government although he is a Lutheran minister. On every hand we still acknowledge God. The President is sworn in by placing his hand on a Bible: "So help me God."

Proverbs 1:7 declares, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." From cover to cover, the Bible describes nations and their downfall, nations which have belittled God, which have ignored God.

The Supreme Court did not set out to sabotage religion. In the minds of many people, however, the Supreme Court is proposing that God isn't important.

In many ways we as a Nation affirm that we believe in God. Why, then, should we cater to atheists? An atheist says there is no God. Why does an atheist have the right to be heard. We believe in God. An atheist says, "I don't believe in God and I want my rights protected." What rights?

Listen to the type of crackpot who brought the issue to the Supreme Court, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, of Baltimore: "If I can't come through this case the same offensive, unloveable, bullheaded, defiant, aggressive slob that I was when I started it, then I'll give up now. My own identity is more important to me. They can keep their gawd-damn prayers in the public schools, in public outhouses, in public H-bomb shelters, and in public whorehouses."

Such a person is given all the rights and privileges of responsible citizenship. Such a person is determining the future of our great Nation. Someone has described the case as the "tyranny of a crackpot minority." What would we have done with such a person on D-Day when our President called for us to get down on our knees and pray for victory? What would we have done to such a person? That was war, you might say. We are now in a war, a war between atheistic forces and God-fearing people.

What can we do about the decision? As Christians we can do a lot. Perhaps God is trying to awaken us, to make us appreciate what a wonderful heritage is ours.

First, we can pray. We should thank God for leading us and blessing us as a nation. We should thank God that we can discuss such issues without fear of prison. We should pray for guidance.

Second, we can write our Congressman and our President; not a long letter but a personal testimony. Something like this: We don't want our laws dictated by a crackpot minority. We firmly believe in God Who has guided and still guides our Nation. We don't want the Government interfering with the church but we want an all-out affirmation that the Government is on God's side and not on the side of atheism. Don't just write; telephone or visit your Congressmen.

Third, we can encourage our local schools to continue their programs which give God first place. Prayer and Scripture at the beginning of the day; religious programs presented by the choirs; baccalaureate services; ministers invited in to talk to the students. There is a fine relationship in our community between the school and the church. Our leaders are looking for encouragement. Talk to members of the school board and our leaders.

Fourth, we still have our churches. See that our children have every opportunity to come to Sunday Church School and Church. You can still pray at home. You can teach your children. It has never been the job of the school to teach religion. The home and the church are responsible for this phase of education.

Morality? What Do You Know of Morality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Allendale County Citizen of Allendale, S.C., is noted for its strong and eloquent editorial comments as written each week by its outstanding editor, Mr. Tom O'Connor. I have been particularly impressed, Mr. President, with a front page editorial from this paper dated July 19, 1963, and entitled "Morality? What Do You Know of Morality?" I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORALITY? WHAT DO YOU KNOW OF MORALITY?

Any government, however constituted, is in a position of trust. When it breaks an implied contract with its citizens, it is no longer worthy of trust.

Government, instituted by groups of people entering into a contract to provide for domestic tranquillity and orderly pursuit of happiness, cannot abrogate that contract with the people, nor with impunity violate the contract's provisions.

Yet, the U.S. Government, so contracting with its citizens, has taken the position that its commitment to some of its citizens supersedes its contract with all the people. This is neither moral nor defensible.

On the part of the citizen the contract calls for ready observance of, and quick obedience to, rules and regulations laid down for the benefit of all. When a citizen declines to recognize the contract, and, in effect, takes the law into his own hands, he breaks his contract and creates a situation in which he has no real defense or any morality on his side.

The Government of the United States has existed on certain rules and regulations, cited in the Constitution, which is surely a contract between it and its citizens, until the present day, when it has broken the contract by laying some of its citizens open to abuse, to intimidation, to realization that they have no protection from whatever riotous mob can be formed and made to take to the streets.

Even if this involves no more than the livelihood of one citizen, he has a right to expect that the contract he has made, and to which he has shown good faith by obeying the laws and paying the taxes, will be honored and he will be protected, his livelihood uninterrupted except by acts of God, and his security kept inviolate by the Government to which he has surrendered his right to arm and protect himself.

The present Government and its courts have not kept faith with the people and immorally has in effect abrogated a sacred contract. In the racial dispute, the complainants have recourse to the courts and so far have found the courts almost wholly on their side. But this has not been enough. They have overriden the courts and have brought their dispute into the streets, where, presumably, they propose to settle the matter.

This puts at the mercy of the mob millions of people who have no concern one way or the other with integration or segregation. The majority of the people of the United States want only to be permitted to live their lives in that domestic tranquillity and order for which they contracted.

There is no morality on the side of a government which encourages mobs to take to the streets, which, through one means or another, urges or coerces its courts to ignore State laws, city ordinances, or even simple traffic regulations designed not to subjugate anyone, but only to insure the orderly flow of travel, commerce, and the commonweal.

One can only feel a vast disgust with those intellectually impotent, immature men who dominate the administration and, for immoral political gain, make of a compact solemnly entered into, a mockery and a scrap of paper.

No court in the United States which does not recognize the moral obligation and responsibility, which is the Government's, to keep that compact, is worthy to be called a court.

Justices who prefer to use psychology and sociology, inexact sciences at best, rather than the body of law mankind has so laboriously compiled, are able neither to justice nor to understanding of their role in a modern society.

By its actions in the present crisis, the administration discloses its immorality, its lack of responsible decision, and its refusal to honor the compact which gave it power and which must remain its strength if the Republic is to endure.

TOM O'CONNOR.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thought and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MIAMI, FLA.,
June 2, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I have just mailed a letter to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH in which I requested him to submit to vote on his committee your resolution, House Resolution 14, asking for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I realize that such a committee would present to the world the plight of those nations under Russian domination as well as aid our Government in matter dealing with foreign policies.

A copy of the letter sent to Congressman SMITH is enclosed.

Respectfully yours,

C. R. MILTON.

MIAMI, FLA.,
June 2, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The United States has always been the hope of enslaved nations in their struggle for liberty denied to them by the tyranny of communism.

As a citizen of the United States I beg of you to submit the Flood resolution—House Resolution 14—calling for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations to vote by your committee.

While Russia has been championing the cause of national liberation in Asia and Africa, we do not seem to be doing much to liberate the captive nations under Russian domination. It is our opinion that those nations which have lost their independence and have fallen under the yoke of Russian imperialism should be given all the support that this country of our possesses.

The existence of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would serve as a real reservoir of knowledge and information on the plight of these captive nations yearning for freedom and national independence. Such a committee is urgently needed to study the problem and advise the Government of our country in formulating its policy on the Soviet Union and the captive nations.

Your support to the Flood resolution will be most gratefully appreciated. I wish to thank you in advance for anything you can do in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

C. R. MILTON.

JUNE 2, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As an American of Armenian ancestry I am very much interested in your bill, House Resolution 14–

15, for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Please continue your good work in behalf of this bill. I am sure it will please you to know that there are many other Armenian Americans who admire your determination regarding this bill.

Sincerely,

SERANOOSH RAYISIAN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your stand for the forming of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations bill, House Resolution 14, has impressed me greatly and I wish you much luck in its becoming a reality.

Sincerely,

TSOS VANTANIAN.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Just a note to commend you on your stand for the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations bill, House Resolution 14, and to also congratulate you on receiving the Freedom Award.

Sincerely,

A. GRACE DEVEJIAN.

SEAFORD, N.Y., *June 3, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD: This is a copy of my letter to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, Committee on Rules.

We would urge you to take action on House Resolution 14. That these captive nations might someday be free, and become needed allies of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

MR. AND MRS. ANDREW ROUSCH.

Speech of Hon. M. G. (Gene) Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, Hon. M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, delivered a principal address at the Kentucky American Legion Convention held in Louisville, Ky. I was struck by the logic of the fine message to these patriotic Americans and I would like to bring it to the attention of the House so that they might receive the benefit of its fine message.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN M. G. (GENE) SNYDER TO STATE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN LEGION AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

Hello, my friends, it is good to get home today and I'm pleased to be asked to speak to you for about 20 minutes this noon. I'm particularly pleased because it all occurs as a result of what happened here last November. I stand as a living example of what surprises came out of Kentucky ballot boxes. Why in Washington they say we have more surprises in our ballot boxes than you find in a lady's purse. That's a lot of surprises—a bandit snatched a woman's purse on Pennsylvania Avenue the other day. He got $2.50 and a hernia.

But I must say this: Can you imagine a community like this sending to Congress a "square"—a fellow who would go to Washington asking nothing for nothing. Oh, it's not easy in that "puzzle palace on the Potomac" to stand up for basic fundamental constitutional principles. Why a certain fellow running for the U.S. Senate was quoted in the local press as saying that a fellow with that philosophy would be laughed right out of Congress. But, you know, I don't mind being a square—that's another of the good old words that has gone the way of love and patriotism. Some political theorists do laugh out loud at those words. It used to be that you could pay a man no higher compliment than to call him a square shooter—and a square deal was the best. But today's "square" is apparently a fellow who gets his kicks from trying to do a good job. A "square" is a goon who gets so wrapped up in his job he has to be reminded to go home. A "square" is a guy who doesn't stop at the bar every night to get "juiced up." He prefers to go home—to his own dinner table, to his own bed. He's a guy who isn't "hep" to cutting corners and "goofing off." He believes in God—and says so, in public—the Supreme Court notwithstanding. Today's "square" still gets a funny feeling when the flag goes by. He believes that he should live within his income—and that the Government should too. He doesn't believe in vacationing today and paying later. A square believes in saving a few dollars for a rainy day rather than counting on using yours. A square is a fellow who still believes in the Bible—and in prayer. He still has that old-fashioned notion that taxes are for the purpose of raising revenue rather than for the purpose of redistributing the wealth. A "square" believes it is more important to play the game fairly than it is to win. Thank Heaven there are a lot of "squares" left today—and a lot of them are in this audience. But to some we are "mossbacks," "reactionaries," "extremists," and "obstructionists" along the New Frontier.

Why we even believe that experience is a good teacher and we believe that we can manage our own affairs and spend our own money better than the Government can do it for us.

It is because of this thinking that I am so concerned about the future of this—the greatest country on earth. The framers of our Constitution thought we could handle our own affairs—but we have been constantly granting to big government more and more authority. The Government is a lousy businessman. The Government is an incompetent manager. Americans are good businessmen and excellent managers. Where we get the idea that Government can do it better baffles me. All evidence is to the contrary.

Today's political theorists say that something called "the public sector" is destitute and another something they call "the private sector" is filthy rich. "Public sector" means government—"private sector" means individual persons. A high Government official says, "The choice our Government must make is a choice between the public interest and private comfort." Another Government planner says, "We have not provided the 'public sector' enough money to keep up with the 'private sector.' People are spending their money on pleasures and gadgets and automobiles that they do not need." In other words, the Government must take from the people the money they are unwisely spending—or saving—and spend it for them—wisely.

Let me say here that this theory is not necessarily a political party position. Both parties have their share of those who adhere to such philosophy. Now, the Federal Government wants to spend your money for you because your sense of values is warped.

Here are a few examples of how the Federal Government spends your money wisely for you:

(a) 1,000 23-inch TV sets costing over $400,000 for an oversea area without electricity.

(b) $80,700 to study dolphin talk—to try to communicate between these fish and humans.

(c) $1¼ million to study the affectional relationship of an infant monkey for its mother.

(d) Foreign aid funds are spent to build superhighways where there are few, if any, automobiles.

(e) $3,100,000 spent to build a millionaire Emperor a luxury yacht—with air-conditioning and gold wallpaper.

(f) $1,996 for a study of alcohol used in a changing Navaho community.

(g) $26,565 for studies of silent thinking.

(h) $8,205 for a study of the social role of aging wild ungulate.

(i) $9,775 for a study of stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain.

(j) $11,500 to study blood groups genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos.

(k) $14,030 for a study of oral health of Icelandic peoples.

(l) $20,092 for studies of disease in a giant snail.

(m) $15,998 to study the role of behavior of frontal monkeys.

(n) $13,816 for a study of the establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony.

(o) $100,215 for a suicidal referral demonstration.

(p) $18,000 for a study of appointment breaking in a pediatric clinic.

(q) $61,985 for initiation and support of a colony of baboons.

There are hundreds and even thousands, of expenditures like these that have been going on for the past 15 or 20 years that make "squares" like me stand in amazement.

Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, says the combined debt of all Federal Government agencies and instrumentalities is $1,242 billion—$6,642 for each man, woman, and child—or $27,500 for every family of four. Is the public sector that has incurred that much debt underprivileged? The consumer debt in the private sector is only $56 billion or $2,995 per capita—or $11,908 per family of four. The Federal Government's income has increased by about 20 times since I was born—the private sector's income only about 4 times. Whatever is or isn't wrong with public services, it canont be said they have been deprived of money.

The big difference is that businesses operating in the private sector have two important incentives—(1) they must compete and (2) they must make a profit. Take away these necessities and you have a listless organism.

The Government need not make a profit and it need not compete.

Let's revive the system which made us the unquestioned powerhouse of this planet in less than 200 years. Government doing for the people that which must be done and which they can't possibly do for themselves—and leaving them otherwise alone. Government is a good servant—but a bad master. You know you can kill your children with kindness. I would love to give my 2½-year-old son all the candy he wants, but I don't—for surely he would get diabetes. He would be momentarily happy but permanently dependent.

Dr. Walter Judd once said that he could do his daughter's homework for her better than she could do it herself—but he does not—not because he does not love her—but rather because he does love her.

We can kill our own country with kindness. Today we hear so much about the Negro's plight. Chicago has less than 10 percent Negro population yet 60 percent of the relief rolls are Negroes. One Representative has said that increased relief is worsening the Negroes' condition—not improving it. Relief has done more to keep the Negro in an inferior position than all other factors combined. It has caused the birth of children—compounding the problem. The philosophy behind public relief is that it helps people who need help and permits them to live in a dignified manner, thereby facilitat-

ing a return to independence. But the philosophy is false because it fails to take human nature into account. Without the necessity to work and without the incentive to work—many people won't work—it's that simple.

Kentucky distributed over $69½ million in public aid in 1962. The aid for dependent children program now runs over $2 million per month in Kentucky and it is estimated generally about one-third of the recipients are illegitimate.

Are we destroying the people we are trying to help? Available evidence indicates we are. Killing them with kindness. The shadow of big Government is lengthening over all aspects of American life. Is not the same result likely in other areas? I mean when the farmer is paid for not farming, are we not encouraging idleness, indigence, apathy, decay? When any American who gets sick can count on the Government to pay, what inducement is there for him to work and save for the rainy day? And why should shipbuilders and airline operators try for efficiency and improvement if they can always fall back on a Federal subsidy? Washington's deepening intrusion in our daily lives is nobody's fault but our own. We keep asking Government to take over and do for us things which traditionally we've been doing for ourselves. We make a lot of fancy Fourth of July speeches but we still vote for Santa Claus. We seem to forget that Government to perform increasing services has to get bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger—and we, spoon fed, overtaxed, overweight, get weaker and weaker.

On the wall of the Ox Bow Inn near Brandenburg, Ky., we find these words, "New England was a depressed area too—but the people took all they had—an ax, a plow, two hands, courage, and self-respect—moved out of their depressed area and founded the great West. When it is let alone—when the Government keeps its wasteful hands off—the profit motive leads men to outdo themselves, create their own frontier, grow, and prosper, but when Government decides it is its function to 'take care of' the people, it kills ambition, progress, self-respect, and that kills the Nation."

Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death." Many Americans today just say "Give me, give me, give me."

This great country is going into the direction of having so many of its people become dependent upon it. Listen, the average age of the world's great civilizations is 200 years. These nations progressed through this sequence:

From bondage to spiritual faith.
From spiritual faith to great courage.
From courage to liberty.
From liberty to abundance.
From abundance to selfishness.
From selfishness to complacency.
From complacency to apathy.
From apathy to dependency.
From dependency back again into bondage.

In 13 years our United States will be 200 years old. This cycle is not inevitable—But it depends upon you.

James Russell Lowell as Minister to England was asked how long our Republic would endure. His answer was—it will endure as long as the people keep the ideas of the men who founded it. What were these ideas? The Founding Fathers—that little band of men, the like of which this country has never known since—they created a government based on the theory that you and I have the God-given right and ability to determine our own destiny. It was the first revolution in all history that did not exchange one set of ideas for another.

This brave little group of men—they shaped a government, they bound it with a constitution, and they intended that this government was to be a watchdog over man's freedom, not a cow to be milked. There were no fringe benefits at Valley Forge. The West was won without an area redevelopment program—and if I might quote just a little bit more of Patrick Henry's famous statement—he said: "Is life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased with the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." If we are unwilling to dedicate our lives, our efforts, our sacred honor—to preserving this great country of ours, this system which has been so good to us—then we must one day, perhaps have the unpleasant task of sitting down and telling our children—and our children's children, what it once was like in America when men were free.

You men—you fought for your country. You fought for the system. Surely people like you will not see it taken away or see it extracted from us without some effort, some real effort, to preserve this way of life.

You say, "I've done my part." And surely you have. Now you say, "It's time to let somebody else make this effort" you are talking about—fight here domestically for these principles and ideas that we "squares" believe in. Let George do it. Well, my friends, if you take the attitude that you should let George do it—then it won't be done, for you are George. You say, I'm busy. You say, I have got my American Legion work to attend to—I've got my church work to take care of. I belong to the Optimist or the Rotary. I handle the Boy Scouts—and believe you me, every one of these things is really good. Nothing could be much better than any of these enterprises that you are working so hard to try to perfect and make better. But it is also true that none of these—not the American Legion—not the Boy Scouts—or your church—or these civic clubs—will amount to a hill of beans if you lose the society you live in.

Lincoln Club Endorses Lincoln Memorial Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on May 8, 1963, I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Lincoln Trail Memorial Parkway in the States of Indiana, Kentucky, and Illinois, and for other purposes. It was an honor to have Mr. BAYH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. DOUGLAS join with me in presenting this bill. We believe the Nation should memorialize the storied route of the Great Emancipator with a national parkway. A parkway over which many Americans can travel the same route as did our 16th President. Many interested groups from these three States have expressed approval of this proposed parkway, one of which is the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana which attests to its stated interest and approval.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN TRAIL MEMORIAL

Resolved, That the Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana reiterates its endorsement of an improved Lincoln Trail from Lincoln's birthplace in Kentucky through Indiana to Springfield, Ill., and earnestly requests: (1) that the trail follow as nearly as possible the authentic route traveled by the Lincolns in 1816 and 1830: (2) that the 1935 statute of Indiana authorizing the Lincoln Trail through Indiana be reviewed in the light of new evidence: and (3) that side roads in southern Indiana over which Abraham Lincoln so often traveled be included in the Lincoln Memorial Trail.

Mrs. RUTH JONES AYER,
President, Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana.

Mrs. BLANCHE SCHUNCK,
Secretary, Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana.

(Resolution submitted by Thalia S. Woods, community improvement chairman, Lincoln Club of Southern Indiana.)

Religious Freedom and the Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there have been many pronouncements both pro and con concerning the recent Supreme Court decision that Bible reading in public classrooms is unconstitutional.

The other day I happened to read a letter to the editor of the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald which I believe will interest the Members of Congress. The letter was written by Alma Madden, of Bellingham, and published in the Herald on July 9, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter in the RECORD:

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

EDITOR, THE HERALD:

In all this controversy, pro and con, concerning recent Court decisions about Bible reading and prayer, I have pondered the freedoms couched in our Bill of Rights. It is ironical that the right of an atheist to stand up in court and demand the removal of the Bible from the public schools rests entirely on the struggle for religious freedom.

The whole Bill of Rights grew out of this struggle. It began in England when the independent sects protested against the established Church of England and demanded the right to worship in meetinghouses of their own. This was termed by the Quakers, who led in the struggle, the right of free assembly. When their meetinghouses were burned, they met on the ashes. When the magistrates forbade this, because their preaching and singing constituted a public nuisance, they met in silence. This was the origin of silent meeting among Friends (Quakers).

It is said although George Fox and Lady Margaret Fell were married several years, they actually lived together less than a year because one or the other was in prison most of the time.

The Quakers carried their fight for free assembly to the New World and with the aid of such crusaders as Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson and the maryrdom of a few including Mary Dyer, who was hanged on Boston Common, won for all religious sects,

including the Catholics in Maryland, the right of free assembly. Since this was really a fight for religious freedom, both together became the cornerstone of our rights. These led soon to the right of free speech, a free press and the right of petition which I am exercising in writing this letter. Thus it came about that when the Federal Constitution was presented, some of the States refused to sign unless the Congress promised to include as amendments their precious Bill of Rights. This was done at the first session of Congress.

Freedoms, like other precious gifts, must be guarded. It is altogether possible so to manipulate one freedom as to abridge or destroy another. It is also possible to use one freedom in so subtle a manner as to a bridge or destroy all freedom in the end.

The real objective in the protest against Bible reading in the schools may be another thing altogether. A group has just asked that certain words be stricken from the Pledge of Alliance. May they not ask next that the pledge itself be eliminated and after that the salute to the flag and the singing of the anthem?

A national faith like a religious faith is warmed and strengthened by its symbols. A church spire, the cross against the sky, is a visible and cherished symbol to all Christians. Similarly, the flag waving in the breeze, the pledge recited in unison stirs our hearts and unites us as a Nation. All who love freedom should be on guard lest these symbols be neglected. Guardians of freedom should be alert to see that no adroit pleader assuming a plausible guise uses the liberty won for him to destroy all liberty.

ALMA MADDEN.

Job Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, Sunday, July 21, 1963:

JOB EQUALITY

"There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants," said President Kennedy in his civil rights message, "if he has no cash in his pocket and no job." Here is a piece of simple, homespun commonsense; and we hope the whole of the administration will keep it clearly in mind as it presses the fight on Capitol Hill for a public accommodations law. They are equally important; and they are intimately interrelated.

It is disquieting, therefore, to hear reports that there is no great steam behind the measure just approved by the House Labor Committee to create a five-member Equal Employment Opportunities Board empowered to eliminate racially discriminatory practices in hiring and firing among all business enterprises affecting interstate commerce. This is a thoroughly practicable proposal. And it is indispensable to the attainment of real racial equality.

Fair employment practices commissions of various sorts are working successfully in a number of States. A national FEPC operated with great effectiveness—and with very little friction—during the war. It is just as possible and just as reasonable to forbid racial discrimination in job opportunities as to forbid it in businesses offering services to the general public. Enforcement must, of course, be preceded and accompanied by tactful and skilled efforts in persuasion. But it also must be backed by the ultimate sanction of legal compulsion. Nothing is more fundamental to the idea that all men are created equal than an equal chance for all men to make the most of their abilities.

Suggestion to Negroes: Do Some Soul-Searching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times before and as many others have echoed the statement, the civil rights proposals which have been sent to us by the administration are not, as some would have us believe, concerned with the socalled rights of the minorities, but are concerned solely with giving the one minority, the Negro, special, and preferential treatment.

That this is true has not escaped the attention of another minority group in this country, the Japanese-Americans.

The Japanese-American newspaper Hobukei Manichi of San Francisco had some telling words for the Negroes recently in an editorial when they advised the Negro to "do a little soul-searching."

Because they, too, are a minority group, their words are worth a thousand of many others who have spoken on this subject. I commend the article to the attention of all my colleagues. It appeared as follows:

SUGGESTION TO NEGROES: DO SOME SOUL-SEARCHING—JAPANESE NEWSPAPER IN UNITED STATES OFFERS ADVICE

SAN FRANCISCO.—A Japanese-American newspaper has advised Negroes to "do a little soul-searching."

The newspaper, Hobukei Manichi, declared:

"We have no intention at all of telling the Negro community leaders, brazenly, to soften their fight for integration and for equal opportunity—for that is our (Japanese-Americans') fight too.

"But we believe there is a crying need on the part of the Negro community as a whole to make a concentrated effort sincerely to better themselves. And this effort should be made hand in hand with their effort to break down the social and economic barriers."

REVIEW PLIGHT

The advice was given in an English-language editorial addressed to San Francisco Negroes.

"Do not say, impatiently, there is not time," the editorial said. "Life is long, and America will be here for centuries and centuries after we are gone. This is the time for soul-searching for all Americans—from President Kennedy down. And America is doing it today. Negroes should be a part of it, too."

Written by the editor of the paper's English-language section, Howard M. Imazeki, the editorial began with a review of the plight of Japanese-Americans or Nisei, during World War II. It said, in part:

"Twenty-one years ago, many of us were behind the barbed-wire fences concentrated in 11 internment camps. Our only crime then was our color. 'Why can't we be like other Americans?' our children asked and made their parents weep with silent tears.

KNOW THEM BETTER

"We then thought the Nisei were terribly mistreated, losing property and citizenship. It is also true Nisei were refused service at some hotels and eateries, but even with this unpleasant background and discriminatory experience, the Nisei are not equipped to fathom the mental suffering and emotional agony of their colored brethren of today.

"It is only in the past 10 years we have had any sort of communication with them living together in the same neighborhoods. We have come to know them better, their aspirations, their habits, their problems."

"We have met outstanding Negro leaders," the editorial went on. "We confess we have had more occasions to come in contact with lesser Negroes who make a great number of our people afraid to come out to a Japanese district at night.

BLAME SOCIETY

"They will tell you the reason there is a large number of crimes being committed by Negroes is because they are not equally treated. They say there are more Negro dropouts from high school because the colored children are not given opportunity to follow the kind of work they want.

"They blame society for illegitimate children and living on welfare checks. They blame society for petty thefts and attacks being perpetrated by their menfolk.

"We have yet to hear any Negro voice blaming themselves for their social maladjustment.

"What we are trying to say most sincerely here is that the Negro leaders should do a little soul searching of their own.

"We have no intention at all of expecting the Negro children to be long suffering for education like the oriental children—who are impressed with the virtues of long suffering—for this may be considered feudalistic and anachronistic in this age of pragmatic living."

Racial Quotas Are Un-American: New Yorkers Awake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues another outstanding editorial column by the distinguished editor of U.S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence. The column, as printed in the Columbia Record of Columbia, S.C., on July 22, 1963, is entitled "Racial Quotas Are Un-American: New Yorkers Awake."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I might add also, Mr. President, that on Monday I discussed with Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, his opinion on the subject of racial quotas in job hiring. I commended Mr. Wilkins on his statement that generally he does not favor the establishment of job quotas based on race for job hiring.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACIAL QUOTAS ARE UN-AMERICAN: NEW YORKERS AWAKE

(By David Lawrence)

For a long time now, many people in the South have been saying that the newspapers of the North don't understand the segregation problem. But something has happened recently which indicates that prominent newspapers in the North—the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune—are beginning to understand that integration isn't as simple as it has appeared to be.

Equal rights, for instance, are being found to be impractical if they are literally applied in education. Even the viewpoint of the Supreme Court of the United States—that a Negro child can't get as good an education in a segregated as in a desegregated school—is turning out to be more theoretical than practical.

Perhaps the most realistic editorial that has been written on the impracticality of racial equality in the public schools appeared on Thursday in the New York Times. The full text is as follows:

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL

"New York City is doing some hard and needed thinking these days about how to give the Negro his equal opportunity in every way—education, jobs, housing, everything. That is good. But the Negro, equally with the white man, should be wary of easy solutions, quick remedies that seem to promise instant success. One of these is inherently unjust and inhumane. It is the quota system.

"It has the temptation of surface plausibility. If the population of the city is 15 percent Negro, why shouldn't the Negro have 15 percent of the jobs? If the population of Manhattan is 25 percent Negro, then he should have 25 percent of the jobs in Manhattan. Easy, isn't it? But go on from there.

"If this reasoning were valid, the quota should be immediately applied in every business, in every industry, and on every level—whether there were qualified applicants or not. It would apply to religious, nationalities—and how many other kinds of divisions? Every floor in every office building would have to have its quotaed shade of color, race, or whatnot. To state the proposition is to show its absurdity and also its inherent evil.

"Now let us look at the public schools. With the best will in the world how, in Manhattan, can 'quota' be achieved even if it were desirable to do so? Negro and Puerto Rican children in that borough total 76.5 percent of elementary school enrollment and 71.6 percent junior high school enrollment. Citywide there are 117 elementary schools whose pupils are Negro or Puerto Rican by 90 percent or more. These schools cannot be made 'white.' A satisfactory percntage of integration can be achieved neither by bussing, nor by zoning, nor by government fiat, nor by magician's wand.

"What is possible in this impossible situation? The board of education can do its best with the fullest use of the tried previous methods, which include the open enrollment policy of moving some Negro children to under-utilized schools in white or mixed districts. New schools can and must be built in fringe areas. But the best thing it can do for the Negro now is to bring him the best school that can be bought, with money and talent.

"Joseph P. Lyford, staff member of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and author of a study being made for the Fund of the Republic, for nearly a year has been working in a 40-block area of the Upper West Side of Manhattan. The other day he said:

" 'In my interviews over the past 10 months with low income Negro and Puerto Rican parents in the area, never once has the question of racial percentages been raised as a concern. The parents' interests have been in the type of teachers the children have * * * and the various facilities the school has to offer. All this leads me to feel that there is a cosniderable gap between the concerns of the low income Negro families in my area and the avowed aims of various organizational leaders who presume to speak for them.'

"The novel idea was thus presented that parents are more interested in good teachers and good teaching for their children than in color quotas. It is to their credit that they are. The best thing the city can do for the Negro is to make the schools better."

THE HERALD TRIBUNE COMMENTS

The New York Herald Tribune just a week earlier—on July 11—said in an editorial:

"True equality doesn't lie in mathematical formulas, in the careful maintenance of a 'nice balance,' or in a reverse racism that seeks to boost the Negro through preferential hiring or arbitrary advancement. Racial quotas are as un-American as discrimination itself. They separate, they categorize, they label, they inherently contradict the ideal of equal opportunity, because they establish separate ladders of opportunity."

But what becomes of the view that Negro leaders have been expounding—namely, that equality should mean equality, that for all jobs held by white men there must be a certain percentage of Negroes working alongside them, and that the same rule applies in the schools? Also, what happens to the views of those "moderates" in the South who have felt "token integration" to be adequate?

Anybody who has insisted heretofore that the practicality of the problem rather than theoretical equality must be taken into account has found himself classed as "racist" or a "Negro hater." In the end, it will be discovered that the best friends of the Negro are those who want to see such changes made as will truly benefit and not injure him or his opportunity to enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

So-Called Civil Rights Will Bring Serfdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Suncoast News of St. Petersburg, Fla., has printed in its July 11, 1963, issue an editorial which I feel merits the attention of the Members of the Congress. It is entitled "So-Called Civil Rights Will Bring Serfdom." I therefore ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Suncoast News, July 11, 1963]

SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS WILL BRING SERFDOM

Where are we headed? Do you know? Do you care? Are you willing to attend to your private duties and let the leftwing press and leftwing politicians determine the future of America?

Do you want a Socialist welfare state controlled by the power grabbing politicians in Washington? If not, what are you doing about it?

Do you know that within the past 30 years the complexion of Government has completely changed? Are you aware of the fact that the Constitution of the United States, under whose benign provisions, we grew to be the greatest Nation in the history of the world, has been eroded, changed, and amended by opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in so many ways as to frighten all thinking men who know anything about constitutional government and who desire to be free?

Have you ever been advised that our Constitution was brought into being for the express purpose of protecting and defending the liberties and freedoms of all American citizens, rather than for the purpose of granting excessive powers to officials in Government?

Has anyone told you that the people of England grew tired of the oppressive hand of government and in 1215 demanded that King John sign the Magna Carta which granted certain rights to the freemen of his kingdom?

Do you realize that the English people demanded greater rights as time went on? Are you aware of that fact that in a series of great liberty documents: The Summons to Parliament (1295); the Confirmatio Chartarum (1295); the Petition of Rights (1628); the Habeas Corpus Act (1679); the Bill of Rights (1688); and the Act of Settlement (1700), the people of England has reduced to writing a series of great declarations of liberty that made them a free people?

Are you conscious of the trials and tribulations, the heartaches, and bloodshed, the supreme efforts and demands put forth by the great Anglo-Saxon race to free themselves from the clutches of tyrannical and despotic government?

Has anyone every told you that those great Americans, who formed the Constitution of the United States, had gone through a great and bloody war to guarantee to themselves and their posterity the great liberties that the Anglo-Saxon race had wrung from oppressive rulers?

Are you aware of the fact that our great Constitution was formulated to curb the powers of the Federal Government so that all future Americans would be forever free from the iron hand of centralized government?

Do you know that as long as the Federal courts construed our great Constitution in the manner it was intended to be construed that Americans had more rights, privileges, freedoms and liberties than any other race of people in all the sweep of human history?

In your studies did you discover that under the Constitution, the several States were fully and supremely sovereign in all local matters, and that the Federal Government had no power whatever in those fields?

Did you find out the Federal Government was a government of delegated powers; and had jurisdiction only in those fields specifically enumerated in the Constitution?

Do you know that our Founding Fathers were deathly afraid of powerful central governments because of their dealings and subsequent warfare with the powerful English kings; and that they formed a Constitution that guaranteed that the supervision of their daily lives and their contacts with their fellow citizens would be under the sole control of State governments and that Washington would have no power whatsoever in such fields?

Are you not aware as a student of history that any race of people are governed best who are governed least?

Has it not come to your attention that every power you confer upon, or every power seized by a strong central government means a loss of liberty to you?

Have you discovered that Fabian socialism, the German Nazi doctrine, the Fascist dogma in Italy, and Communist philosophy of Russia are blood brothers; that all believe in complete power at the top and very few, if any, rights to the mass of people?

Do you know the Fabian socialism has been taught in a number of our leading universities for decades; and that since the early 30's many hundreds of men whose minds have been filled with that idea of government have held and are now holding positions of great power in Washington?

Do you realize that due to the baneful and pernicious influence of such leaders that America has been changed from a republic to a Socialist welfare state with great powers in hundreds of fields being stolen by the Federal Government from the States and from the people?

Have your reflections proved to you that the trend of events have demonstrated that the American people have ceased to push for greater freedoms and liberties and have been content to let our socialistic leaders push us practically back to the days before Magna Carta to an ultimate life of serfdom?

Do you realize that if Congress passes the proposed civil rights bills, such action will be an unlawful and unconstitutional seizure of power in the light of prior constructions of our Constitution.

Can't you see that this brutal action will create in Washington a despotism and a dictatorship greater than that of King John before the days of Magna Carta; and that America will be overrun from border to border with multiplied thousands of secret police whose actions will cause your privileges and rights to deal with those of your own selection to vanish overnight.

If you do not know these things, you had better learn the truth and learn it quickly, so that you can join with all true Americans to crush forever the fantastic desire of high Federal officials to destroy State governments forever and seize absolute power over the lives of every American by the passage of the so-called civil rights bills.

Dilemma in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the course of our foreign policy continues to disturb many thinking Americans, especially in the tragic inability of our State Department to actually comprehend the strength of resistance behind the Iron Curtain to Soviet oppression.

The New York Times, in an editorial commentary of July 16, which, under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD, pointed out in precise, effective fashion the problems that are compounding for the Soviet-imposed government in Poland:

DILEMMA IN POLAND

The decision of Poland's Communists to postpone their party congress until next year is another sign of the rising tensions in that country. Before that announcement, Wladyslaw Gomulka had lashed out at Poland's Catholic bishops; a campaign to tighten controls over Polish intellectuals had begun; and a key member of the Polish Communist leadership, Roman Zambrowski, had resigned from the party Politburo.

The nervousness among Polish Communists that these events suggest arises from a number of causes. One is the worsening of economic conditions as the result of a disastrous winter. The higher prices ordered for gas, coal, and electricity contributed to substantial public discontent. Poland's Communists are disturbed by the continued high prestige and great influence of the Catholic Church in that country and by the evident disdain for Communist ideology among significant sections of the Polish intelligentsia and youth. A decade and a half after all open political opposition to the Communist dictatorship was wiped out, communism still is far from dominating the loyalties of the Polish people.

Mr. Gomulka thus finds himself caught in a crossfire between the reactionaries who would have him tighten party controls and the liberals who are pushing for a restitution of the relative freedom gained in 1956. Complicating all this is the confusion caused by the Soviet-Chinese split and by Rumania's successful defiance of Moscow's economic wishes. For the moment at least Mr. Gomulka seems to be paying most heed to the hardliners in his entourage, but he must be aware of the risks to Polish political stability implicit in any neo-Stalinist course.

What Does Freedom Mean to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Capt. Eugene H. Breitenberg, troop information officer, MDW, which he made at the Congressional Staff Prayer Breakfast on July 10, 1963. I feel that this is an excellent presentation of a subject which should be called to our attention at the present time.

The address follows:

WHAT DOES FREEDOM MEAN TO YOU?

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to speak to you today. The title of my talk is a question that is easily asked, perhaps not so easily answered. What does freedom mean to you? The dictionary puts it this way:

"The state of being free; independence; ease in performance; particular privilege."

Americans of today accept freedom as a guarantee extended to each of us by the Constitution. I believe that if ever there was a time when the citizens of our country needed to know the true meaning of freedom and the legacy of the people who lived and sacrificed their lives for freedom as reflected in American history, it is today. Not only should we know more about history, we should know more about the Communist conspiracy that would distort the history and significance of this great land of ours.

I don't need to tell you about the story behind the Declaration of Independence as I am sure this fact has been discussed considerably during the past few days, but I do want to emphasize one phase of it. The Declaration of Independence does not guarantee happiness, but only the right to the "pursuit of happiness". Not only should we be concerned wtih the fruits of freedom but as good citizens we must be ready to contribute to progress and maintenance of that freedom which we are so ready to claim as a natural and national right. There is not a man or woman present here today who would not echo the words of the men who signed the Declaration. For when it becomes necessary to reaffirm their great vision, purchased at the cost of blood and sacrifice, each of us is ready to prove this worthy inheritance. But the democratic approach in the cold war struggle calls for more brave living by more citizens. Democracy, to survive, must be rekindled in the hearts of each generation of youth. You and I know the price paid for freedom. But many of our people don't know, or have not taken time to learn of our precious heritage. The hour is late and we must meet the challenge.

In President Kennedy's state of the Union message of January 29, 1961, he stated: "I speak today in an hour of national peril and national opportunity. Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us together—this administration, this Congress, this Nation—must forge those answers."

We should never forget that the strength of liberty and freedom has been forged and tested time and time again. Long before this Nation was ever formed, men of character and courage took their stand for freedom, independence, and the dignity of man. Basing their action on the Bible, the original source of law that recognizes human rights, they declared by words and deeds that all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty.

From the time of Pericles, some 450 years before the birth of Christ, when the principles of democracy were enunciated, men have aspired to the free life. With the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and the victory of the Colonies in the Revolutionary War in 1781, a new Nation came into being that made possible the hopes and aspirations of centuries. There is no guaranteed freedom—it can be lost. A great American patriot wrote during the early darkening days of World War II: "Many people all over the world are losing—almost overnight—rights and ideals that have taken hundreds of years to win. We in America can't protect our freedom by remembering it just on a few holidays and taking it for granted the other 360 days a year."

As we hear and read of those who boast that they will bury our way of life, and as we are confronted with voices of fear and compromise, we need to hear anew, the compelling voice of Patrick Henry, asking: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it Almighty God, I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death."

We need also to study the lives of other great men, for instance, Benjamin Franklin, who, at the drafting of the Articles of Confederation had this to say: "I have lived a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth; that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?"

We have every reason to be optimistic about the future of our great Nation if we maintain constant vigilance. The trend of history is on the side of liberty and justice for all. Is any American so naive as to think that a 40-year experiment of intimidation, slavery, and lies of communism can bury a way of life that has been evolving for more than 2,000 years?

We must remember that freedom is the most worthy objective attainable to man,

and in this time of maximum danger to America, freedom must be made the topic of our conversation, our policy, our plan, and the very core of our living. With courage and knowledge on our part, the very presence of the danger becomes an asset, spurring us on to greater heights in the most vitally important struggle in which Americans have ever been engaged.

Our Nation has faced many struggles since its birth. But none so close to our hearts as the dark days of the American Civil War. By looking back to those days of trial, the days of testing whether this Nation could survive, we can take stock and gird ourselves for the strife and battle of today. You may ask, What battle? The answer—the battle for survival as free men in a free nation. The response of our ancestors more than a hundred years ago was under conditions of armed conflict, yet the greatness of the Civil War was neither material nor military. It was rather moral and spiritual. Traditionally, the American way of life has been to preserve freedom of religion.

Here we see the importance of the Civil War. This conflict, and the men who led it on both sides, made it certain that regardless of the outcome, we would remain a religious nation. For in this reluctant war, during lulls in the actual fighting, it was not uncommon to see men of both sides exchange greetings, material goods, and even jointly engage in an occasional song or prayer. Though at war, all were Americans and lovers of freedom, who would remain men of faith when the war was over. We have evolved a nation of prosperity, growth and international leadership, a nation which inserted Lincoln's words, "under God" into our pledge of allegiance to the flag and readopted in an impressively official and unanimous manner the national motto, "In God we trust." How dramatic and profound is the fact that this is the heritage and reality of America and that we hold these truths in deep reverence.

It is imperative, especially during these critical days, that we keep faith at a time when two of the world's largest and most populous nations, Russia and Red China, have adopted atheism as their creed and have undertaken to reorder and reconstruct their societies, and ultimately, they hope, the society of all mankind on the lines prescribed by the absence and the nonexistence of God. This is the insidious heresy, the core of communism. This is why the world is in such dire peril. The United States has a role of leadership among free nations never before assigned to any single nation by a divine providence.

In commemorating battles in which our forefathers fought and died, let us reexamine the lives of men to understand why they reacted as they did. No other statesman in the long history of mankind has so perfectly blended and united pure religion with civil policy, as did President Abraham Lincoln in his Second Inaugural Address. One may say that Lincoln caught superbly and immortally the spirit of a religion controlled by a belief in a just and merciful God before whom every man must remain humble. The war President and great emancipator was sustained throughout the incredible ordeal of 4 dreadful years, by the conviction that the United States was chosen of God, destined for chastisement and suffering as well as for victory and everlasting example. President Lincoln knew why men fought. He realized that they based their actions on the great fundamental principles of the American Revolution. But he knew too, that a greater right was the preservation of our Nation, under God.

We must not forget the man Lee. Robert E. Lee, who set an example for all who would criticize the outcome of the Civil War and who would say that the centennial observance is just opening old wounds, for therein they show a lack of knowledge of the man, the great leader of the Confederacy and the cause for which a segment of American fought. General Lee, the one who turned down overall command of the Union forces because of his firm convictions in the right and just cause of his native State—Virginia, proved his mettle as a leader. For even today, in our schools, in Communist schools, and in schools all over the world, students study about Lee's superb leadership and use of the principles of war. This man Lee, upon defeat, did not blame others. He took the blame upon himself and in his 5 remaining years after the war, as an educator, this great man set the tempo of the times. While president of Washington College, he advised a southern lady as to the rearing of her sons. "Madam," he said, "Don't bring up your sons to detest the U.S. Government. Recollect that we form one country now. Abandon your local animosities and rear your sons to be Americans."

Let us not lose sight of the objective of the centennial of that great war that played a decisive role in uniting the American people. It may well be that Divine Providence has willed it so, that the observance of that war should come at this time when we are confronted by the greatest threat to our existence as free people.

In the final analysis, the very life of America and the freedom of all mankind, depends upon what we, individually do, or fail to do, day-by-day. We must realize the true heritage which we share together. We must know that living in a democracy is one thing; living democracy is another. The experiences, sacrifices, and endeavors of our people, through the years, have tempered the sinews of this Nation of today.

The challenge has been made. The choice rests with you, with me, with our sons and daughters. Let us take up the torch of liberty and with whatever talent we have, use it, to keep the flame of freedom burning, that it may not perish from this earth.

Senator Russell Speaks for the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, in his superb statement on June 12 was not speaking for the South alone. Senator RUSSELL was speaking for the American way of life, our free enterprise system, our Constitution, and the foundation stones upon which our civilization and this Republic are built.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the crossroads in our destiny as a Nation. We have been making fantastic progress and now we either move straight ahead with a continuation of this progress with dignity and equality for all of our people or we plunge down a side road of violence, retrogression, and socialism. We either move forward under the Constitution and the written law or we turn the clock backward to anarchy, chaos, and stark naked centralized power.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the entire Nation Senator RUSSELL's statement as carried in the U.S. News & World Report of June 24.

THE SOUTH STATES ITS CASE

(Statement by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, June 12, 1963)

(NOTE.—A key spokesman for the South—Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia—now states the South's case against civil-rights proposals. In a major policy statement issued after a conference of 18 Southern Senators, Senator RUSSELL said rights proposed for Negroes by President Kennedy would conflict with rights of other Americans and take the United States toward socialism. He promised to oppose administration plans with every means and resource.)

The President's speech on June 11 appealed eloquently to the emotions but completely disregarded reason, human experience and true equality under the Constitution.

The fact that every citizen has the same right to own and operate a swimming pool or dining hall constitutes equality. The use of Federal power to force the owner of a dining hall or swimming pool to unwillingly accept those of a different race as guests creates a new and special right for Negroes in derogation of the property rights of all of our people to own and control the fruits of their labor and ingenuity.

The outstanding distinction between a government of free men and a socialistic or communistic state is the fact that free men can own and control property, whereas statism denies property rights.

"From each according to his ability and to each according to his need" may have greater emotional appeal than "work hard to acquire property and the law will protect has not worked and can never work because it does not take human nature into account. To rebut the emotional appeal, we have the hard, undeniable fact that in our free-enterprise system we have plenty, whereas the Marxists—though they have never been able to apply literally their avowed creed—all suffer from scarcity and privation.

Our American system has always rejected the idea that one group of citizens may deprive another of legal rights in property by process of agitation, demonstration, intimidation, law defiance and civil disobedience.

I do not believe that the American people will be easily frightened into discarding our system for adventures into socialism that have been discredited wherever tried.

The highest office of the land should symbolize respect for law, whether it be legally enacted ordinances of the meanest hamlet in the land or the written word of our national charter—the Constitution.

I was, therefore, shocked to hear the President justify, if not encourage, the present wave of mass demonstrations, accompanied by the practices of sitting or lying in public streets and blocking traffic; forming human walls before the doors of legal businesses and assaulting with deadly weapons officers of the law whose only offense was undertaking to maintain order and protect private property.

The South has its shortcomings as well as other areas. But a calculated campaign waged by the metropolitan press, television, and radio has magnified the unfortunate occurrences in the South while crimes of violence in other areas have been minimized. This has generated bitterness and hatred against the white people of the Southern States almost amounting to a national disease. It is also encouraging a condition bordering on anarchy in many communities. These terrible conditions are sure to further deteriorate with increasing disorder unless the President of the United States desists from using threats of mass violence to rush his social-equality legislation through the Congress.

No American citizen has the right to select the laws he will obey and those he will disobey.

The President of the United States has a higher call to leadership than to use threats

of mass violence and disregard of reasonable local laws as a means of securing action in the courts and Congress, however desirable he may regard it to be.

The Congress of the United States, by an enactment of March 1, 1875, declared that all persons were entitled "to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement. * * *" The Supreme Court of the United States on October 15, 1883, declared this Federal restriction upon the use and control of private property to be unconstitutional. In accordance with the contentions of those who would use Federal power to mix the races socially, this has been the "law of the land" from that date and still applies today.

The President and the Attorney General now say that they will predicate this new thrust for race mixing on the already tortured commerce clause of the Constitution. If the commerce clause will sustain an act to compel the white owner of a dining hall to accept a Negro against his wishes, it can be used to sustain the validity of legislation that will compel his admittance into the living room or bedroom of any citizen.

I believe in equality before the law for every American. In equal measure, I reject the idea that Federal power may be invoked to compel the mingling of the races in social activities to achieve the nebulous aim of social equality.

Every Negro citizen possesses every legal right that is possessed by any white citizen, but there is nothing in either the Constitution or Judaeo-Christian principles or common sense and reason which would compel one citizen to share his rights with one of another race at the same place and at the same time. Such compulsion would amount to a complete denial of the inalienable rights of the individual to choose or select his associates.

I hope that the American people will not be swept further down the road to socialism by the present unprecedented wave of propaganda. To me, the President's legislative proposals are clearly destructive of the American system and the constitutional rights of American citizens. I shall oppose them with every means and resource at my command. I do not believe a majority of the Congress will be frightened by thinly veiled threats of violence.

Railroad Jobs Are Threatened by the Loss of Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, last week representatives of the railroad unions called at my office to present organized labor's version of the strike situation.

One reminded me that a few days earlier 260 railroad cars of fresh produce were shipped from my district in 1 day. This is not unusual. As many as 400 railroad cars have been shipped from Salinas in 1 day. This equals five long trains of fresh vegetables.

This is more produce than most Members of Congress have seen. These trains go at least to Chicago—many to Philadelphia, New York, Washington. Many thousands of railroad workers from Salinas to New York derive their whole livelihood from the row crop vegetable industry of the Salinas Valley of California.

This union representative was grateful for the bracero. Without the bracero many railroad workers and suppliers will lose their jobs.

A few years ago when the fresh produce was refrigerated by crushed ice on its long trip to eastern markets, more ice was manufactured in Salinas, population about 22,000 than in New York City. This will give an idea of the size and variety of industries which are allied to, or dependent upon, agriculture, which is dependent upon the bracero for supplemental labor. Now much of the produce is refrigerated by vacuum or dry cooling. This is another large industry employing many highly skilled and paid workers whose jobs are dependent upon the harvest of the crops.

The supplemental fieldworker—presently the bracero—makes it possible for many highly paid workers in other industries, from Salinas to New York, to enjoy good livelihoods. Ask these people if they would cancel the bracero program.

Study Indicates Little Relation Between Budget Deficits and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, although the administration contends that a program of planned budget deficits would stimulate economic growth and reduce unemployment, there is a large and growing body of opinion which believes otherwise. For example, an article in the July 15 Wall Street Journal describes a new study by Michael E. Levy of the National Industrial Conference Board that casts considerable doubt on the effectiveness of deficit spending as a stimulus to growth.

Mr. Levy draws several interesting conclusions from his study. After analyzing the budgets of United States and European countries on a national income basis, Mr. Levy concludes that there is no systematic connection between budget deficits and growth. As a matter of fact, he shows that several of the countries with the most rapid economic growth also have had sizeable surpluses.

In addition, Mr. Levy feels that the administration's analysis of the unemployment problem is inadequate. In his view the essential shortage may be in the skills needed for employment in today's technologically advanced economy.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with this conclusion. We are not going to solve the unemployment problem until we train our unskilled workers to fill the more demanding positions that are being created by the introduction of more advanced and complex machinery.

Because of the important contribution which this study makes to the Nation's continuing economic debate, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Wall Street Journal be included in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 15, 1963]

DEFICIT FINANCING

A new study of governmental deficits and their relation to economic growth raises serious doubts about the claims of administration economists for the policies they have persuaded President Kennedy to recommend.

The study is by Michael E. Levy of the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit economic factfinding group, and is called "Fiscal Policy, Cycles and Growth." It approaches the question from two viewpoints, that of European experience compared with ours and that of trends within the United States. The trends in this country, furthermore, are analyzed in a new way.

In all cases the budget figures used are those of the so-called national-income accounts, rather than those of the old-fashioned formal budgets or of the cash budgets. Cash budgets are the simplest: They measure governmental cash outflow and inflow. The old-fashioned U.S. formal budget differs in various ways, including the fact that, for instance, it doesn't include the operations of the social security fund.

The national-income budgets seek to measure economic effects: For example, an order for military hardware may immediately activate new employment and purchases of materials by the business that has received the order, but might not show up in the other two budgets as governmental outlays until the next year.

Also, in all cases Mr. Levy has measured budget surpluses or deficits as percentages of gross national output of nations. Otherwise there would be no way of telling whether individual nations' surpluses or deficits were relatively big or small. A Government deficit in the United States would have to be roughly 10 times as big in dollars as Canada's to have the same economic effect, because our economic system and population are about 10 times as large.

In his comparison with Europe, he finds no indication of "any systematic relationship between budget deficits and growth." He notes that "rapid economic growth well in excess of that of the United States was associated with significant cumulative surpluses in the case of Austria, the Netherlands, and Portugal, and with substantial cumulative deficits in the case of France. Similarly, much lower rates of economic growth coincided with cumulative budget surpluses for Norway and with cumulative budget deficits for the United Kingdom and the United States."

Mr. Levy also charts cumulative budget surpluses and deficits against the rate of inflation in the same nations during 1950 to 1960. He finds "no significant relationship between the two."

Of course, as in all economic studies, neither of these findings can be accepted without further thought. For one thing, the effects of surpluses or deficits can be very different, depending on whether the Government debt is sold to savers or to the banks. If to savers, the effects are likely to be far smaller than if through bank credit, because an increase in bank credit adds to the money supply and thus tends to be inflationary or stimulative or both.

He also reminds the reader that economic changes and governmental finances interact upon each other. For instance, a rapid rate of growth is likely to raise governmental revenues and thus prevent deficits or reduce them greatly.

The study of trends in this country analyzes the method used by the President's

Council of Economic Advisers and offers a different approach. The council's method has been to estimate what gross national production would have been in the various years reviewed if there had been full employment (defined as 4-percent unemployment), and what the effect would have been on the Federal budget.

It conclusion has been, broadly speaking, that reaching a state of full employment would be extremely difficult under present tax rates, because such prosperity would increase governmental revenue so much that the resulting Federal surplus would prevent business activity from rising that high, or would make it fall back again very quickly. The council also has advanced the theory that this situation explains why U.S. economic growth has slowed down since the middle 1950's. That's why the administration proposes lower taxes even at the cost of bigger deficits, in the hope they would make possible faster growth on a lasting basis.

Mr. Levy's approach is to use actual realized budget surpluses and deficits as percentages of national output, related to the actual unemployment rate. He relates these, in turn, to total saving and investment by private individuals and businesses. His findings, in effect, are that the council's thesis is not supported by the figures except those during the 1960–61 recession.

Furthermore, he also questions the alternative theory of some economists who disagree with the council and say the whole trouble can be ascribed to unwise Federal policies in 1959–60, which brought about the 1960–61 recession. If they were right, he says, the recovery since 1961 would have been a riproaring one because of big Federal deficits. Instead, unemployment has continued high in 1962 and 1963.

On the basis of all the foregoing, he suggests the trouble may be deeper seated. That is, it may be caused by a condition where more and more people lack the skills needed to be employed profitably at today's wage levels.

Finally, Mr. Levy makes clearly the distinction too rarely made between the effects of Federal budget policies over the short term and over the long term. No one questions that if the Government spends fast enough it can lift economic activity whenever there is not full employment. The question is whether the effect will last beyond the time when the budget is again in balance.

GEORGE SHEA.

Maryland Students Chosen General Electric Research Fellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that three high school students from the Sixth Congressional District of nearby Maryland have been chosen as 1963 General Electric Student Research Fellows. These young men, Douglas I. Will, of Gaithersburg High School, Gaithersburg, Md.; Arthur E. Ogus, of Montgomery Blair High School, Silver Spring, Md., and James A. Maiorana, of Boonsboro High School, Boonsboro, Md., were selected from among 700 outstanding high school science and mathematics students who competed for the opportunity to participate in the General Electric program. For 6 weeks, these young scientists will conduct original research in physics and chemistry under the guidance of the faculty of Union College in Schenectady, N.Y. I extend my congratulations to Douglas, James, and Arthur. In the years to come, the ability of America to increase the well-being of its citizens while maintaining its place of world leadership will depend upon the advances of science and technology. To encourage gifted students of science and mathematics through programs such as the one sponsored by General Electric is to insure our country of the scientific leaders which will be needed.

Statement of J. L. Robertson Before the House Banking and Currency Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Federal Reserve Board in increasing the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent was taken presumably to help solve the balance-of-payments problem. It is estimated that this will prevent $300 million from leaving the United States, an amount which is less than 12 percent of the current annual deficit.

In my judgment Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve and the Treasury Department have yet to demonstrate that a raise in the discount rate will, in fact, result in this $300 million saving. However, even if we accept this figure, the saving does not seem significant when weighted against the risk of the restrictive effect the discount rate action will have on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to solve this problem, it is important to consider the primary reason for the deficit. The largest single deficit item year after year is U.S. defense spending in Western Europe. The time has come in my opinion to reevaluate U.S. dollar commitments for the defense of nations in Western Europe—nations which have a surplus in their balance of payments and have amassed large amounts of U.S. dollars. Careful study may well prove that a realinement of our present commitments can go far toward elimination of our balance-of-payments deficit.

J. L. Robertson of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee with respect to the change in the discount rate on July 22, 1963. His excellent report emphasizes the problems inherent in raising the discount rate at this time.

STATEMENT OF J. L. ROBERTSON, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I voted against a discount rate increase last week because I did not think it was worth the cost. Stated more fully, my view was that the probable benefit to the U.S. balance of payments resulting from a discount rate increase would be so small as to be considerably outweighed by its potential adverse effects on our domestic economic activity.

I am concerned that an increased discount rate and its consequences will create some dampening influences in what still needs to be a stimulative monetary environment here at home, given our high level of unemployment. At the same time, it is my judgment that the rate increase will have only trivial effects on international capital flows.

In the short-term capital area, it is quite conceivable that the increase in U.S. rates may be largely offset by compensating adjustments in foreign money market rates and forward exchange quotations. (This has been the general historical experience as between United States short rates and those in the United Kingdom and Canada, the two chief foreign money markets to which large amounts of money market funds can flow.) Furthermore, a major element in the short-term flows in the past has been bank loans abroad, and I would not expect these to be curtailed much by a discount rate increase alone so long as the basic availability of reserves is kept ample. In the area of long-term capital, we have a larger and more persistent drain on our hands. But the discount rate increase will not deal with this. An evident aim of current policy is to minimize any rise in long-term interest rates, and the differentials existing between foreign and U.S. rates of return on long-term credit and equity capital are so great as to far exceed the range of any moderate rate adjustment.

In pointing out the very limited influence on international capital flows to be expected from moderate adjustments in U.S. market interest rates, I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not discounting the existence of a balance-of-payments problem, but only the efficacy of a moderately higher discount rate as a weapon for dealing with it.

There is not any doubt but that we are living through a troublesome balance-of-payments situation, for a time, at least. It is not a problem of crisis proportions, but it is still one that needs to be dealt with through the application of appropriate remedies rather than devices designed to mask its effects or to serve as temporary palliatives. What is needed is a thoughtful but determined adjustment of governmental and private policies, at levels and in areas which will permit effective dealing with the persisting causes of the deficits. The President's message on this score last Thursday contained much that gave me heart. But the most directly applicable steps he advocated must be resolutely implemented, here in Congress and throughout the administration. At all levels of government, we must carry through an "agonizing reappraisal" of our foreign aid and military objectives, and the extent to which they have to involve what are essentially unrequited dollar transfers abroad. We must strive even harder to knock down the barriers to our exports that exist in so many countries, denying us the full fruits of the real competitive strength that we have already achieved. Export promotion efforts at home can help, too, in this respect. But even more importantly, we must try to increase domestic business incentive, enriching profit opportunities, employing idle resources, both human and material, accelerating our rate of growth—all of which, taken together, will enhance the basic attractiveness of the United States as a place to invest. These call, above all, for an early tax cut and generally stimulative monetary conditions.

In other words, we must foster domestic economic expansion so that the attraction of U.S. funds for external placement will

be significantly reduced. Economic developments in the United States have recently been encouraging. If expansive tendencies in the economy gain in strength, impelled in part by a tax reduction, gradual moderation in U.S. credit availability would be entirely appropriate. I say this because we know from past experience that at some stage of business expansion it becomes necessary for monetary policy to resist possible future speculative and inflationary tendencies with the view of maintaining a sustainable pace of economic growth as well as to keeping U.S. industry competitive internationally. This means we have the prospect that interest rates in this country would naturally move up, with an accompanying pressure of domestic demands upon supplies of funds that would help to reduce, curtail, or reverse flows of funds abroad. It is not fanciful to expect that, in only a few short months, a discount rate increase might have been entirely in order from both a domestic and international point of view.

But in the present state of economic conditions in this country, with high rates of unutilized manpower and machinery, monetary policy should be primarily oriented to a stimulative objective. Monetary policy is one of the most potent of all economic forces in this country, in good part because it is one of the most pervasive. It can be effective not only in dampening down booms, but also in warding off recessions. On the basis of past experience, I do not agree with those who maintain that we cannot "push on a string." If monetary policy had been used to its full power over the past 2 years in stimulating the economy, by providing such an availability of funds as to cause banks and other lenders to reduce their rates of interest in order to put idle funds to work, the stimulative impact would have been felt. This sort of stimulation, however, cannot be achieved if monetary policy is designed to hold up short-term interest rates on the one hand, while on the other it seeks to hold down long-term rates. The result is that both rates are higher than they should be for stimulative purposes, and the full potential of monetary policy as a stimulant to the economy is curtailed.

To state my views most categorically, I believe unnatural efforts at twisting short rates up can create domestic drags that can delay fundamental market adjustments, divert the focus of attention from the basic problems, and create a later backwash of reactions that can conceivably worsen our balance of payments statistics in future months.

There is no question but that the real basis of the world's confidence in the soundness of the dollar is not the gold in Fort Knox or the balance-of-payments statistics, but rather the underlying strength of the American economy. Hence, there is a compelling need for invigorating our economy, putting our people, our materials, and our money to work in an expanding, competitive, noninflationary environment, with a corresponding strengthening of the capacity of the United States to exercise its role of leadership of the free world.

In the light of these views, my judgment with respect to the desirability of increasing the discount rate at this time was different from that of my associates, and I was obliged to dissent from that action.

The discount rate increase having been adopted, however, the necessity of making an appropriate change in the maximum interest rates payable by commercial banks on time deposits was clear. Any significant advance in short-term market rates as a result of the discount rate increase would have rendered bank time deposits at the prevailing ceiling rates less attractive investments. The growth of the more interest-sensitive forms of time deposits might well have been halted or even reversed. During the past 2 years, rapid expansion of time deposits has led banks to substantially expand their investments in mortgages, consumer loans, and State and local securities, thus stimulating business activity and economic growth. If such credit flows from banks were abruptly cut back, the volume of funds available in long-term markets would be reduced and long-term interest rates would be pushed upward, with corresponding depressive effects on an economy that has still not attained an adequate level of performance. As a consequence, the wise course with respect to regulation Q was to raise permissible rate ceilings to allow banks to remain competitive in this market for investible funds. This is the action that the Board took and in which I concurred.

Philip S. Marden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lowell and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, have suffered a tremendous loss in the death of Philip S. Marden on Saturday, July 20. Mr. Marden, who was in his 90th year, made notable contributions to every aspect of civil and cultural life. A distinguished author, patron of the arts, industrialist, and editor, Mr. Marden had a lively interest in every phase of community life. He will be sorely missed by everyone who benefited from his support and encouragement and by all of us who read his weekly column in the Lowell Sun, "The Saturday Chat."

Under unanimous consent I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial tribute paid to Mr. Marden in the Lowell Sun on July 22, 1963:

PHILIP S. MARDEN

We at the Sun make sorrowful note of the death of Philip S. Marden, the distinguished author of "The Saturday Chat."

To be sure, he had enjoyed a long, rich, and rewarding life, yet those who profited by and enjoyed his wit, his wisdom, and his sage advice will long feel a sense of loss.

Mr. Marden was a man of many attainments—an authority on literature and the arts, world traveler, patron of the opera, writer of books and essays of note, a talented newspaperman, an industrial executive, and a man who maintained an abiding interest in the welfare of his native city, Lowell.

In his later years his primary interests rested in Dartmouth College, his alma mater; the Whistler House, which he personally guided and supported so that it would remain a cultural shrine in Lowell, and, we believe, "The Saturday Chat," which he started almost a half century ago and which he found to be such a satisfying form of recreation.

And, now that the time has come to say goodby for his countless friends of many years standing and for his thousands of admirers who have known him through "The Saturday Chat," we think that Phil would consider it appropriate if we quoted the following famous lines by Tennyson:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.

American Banker Magazine Favorably Reacts to Equalization Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues an editorial from the American Banker, which casts a favorable eye on the recent balance-of-payments proposal by the President. As the editorial points out "the fact of action itself is a source of encouragement."

The article follows:

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS ACTION

The balance of payments has been elevated dramatically to the highest order of national priority, as so many leaders of the financial community have been urging, with the President's special message.

The painful decisions have been made, and the campaign now launched to make "further administrative and legislative inroads into the hard core of our continuing payments deficits."

The fact of action in itself is a source of encouragement.

The nature of the action is open to several interpretations, however. Except for the imposition of a tax on foreign borrowings here, and the arrangement of expanded borrowing capacity with the International Monetary Fund, the President's message simply reviews existing programs, encourages more vigor in their implementation, and generally takes a reasonably optimistic view of the problem.

The action proposed to raise the price on foreign borrowing in this country is controversial on two counts. One is on its effectiveness. Since this is the only country which operates a truly large and efficient capital market, the borrower in genuine need of giant amounts of money is not likely to be deterred from doing his borrowing here. So price may not be a significant deterrent. Perhaps it will be; there is little evidence at hand upon which to make a judgment.

The other controversial aspect of the tax on foreign borrowing is that is represents government involvement in a field where government has not often entered. For this Nation to tinker with the free flow of capital is contrary to tradition and to principle—a point which the President acknowledged when he claimed that "in solving its international payments problems, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements." In fact, the President's recommendations do tinker with the free flow of capital, but he makes it clear that this will be a temporary expedient. And more important, since this Nation is under severe pressure to solve the balance-of-payments problem, some encroachment on tradition—not unlike that made when the Eisenhower administration decided to "tie" foreign-aid loans to U.S. purchases—may be justified.

Once the determination to take stern action was made, the selection of the precise target followed logically. The U.S. capital market, the biggest most efficient, and least subject to government control in the world, has been made use of to great advantage by foreigners seeking large amounts of capital. The President's recommendation would simply raise a fence of price around that market, to make it somewhat less attractive to foreigners, so as to diminish the outflow of U.S. funds from it. And at the same time, the action proposed would exert almost no influence at all upon the domestic economy,

whose growth would be hampered by imposition of higher long-term interest rates across the board.

In the precision of its focus, and in its neat segregation of foreign capital flows from the other areas of this country's international financial involvements—such as genuine capital investment by Americans abroad, or the commerical loans of banks—the administration has presented a plan which offers the best chance of practical success, at the risk of the least possible disruption.

And in the context of implications for national policy, it is reassuring that the administration plan stops well short of exchange controls.

In the context of implications for the domestic economy, the administration plan, if adopted, would achieve the effect on long-term capital flows abroad of an increase of long-term rates in this country by 1 percent—a condition which would all but choke our economic growth, even though it would help significantly toward solution of the balance-of-payments problem.

By this policy of diagnosis and precise surgery, the administration hopes to avoid the necessity of so drastic a cure.

Rather it tinkers with the price mechanism—admittedly not a desirable thing to do under normal circumstances, but deemed necessary at this time. It imposes, in effect, a kind of tariff on the export of our efficient, available capital to foreign countries. But price is all that it tinkers with. All other elements in the market mechanism, of allocation of resources in the normal process of buying and selling, it leaves untouched. "Reliance will be placed on price alone," the President said.

There is an important parallel to the action taken earlier this week by the Federal Reserve System in raising the discount rate. That effort, the administration hopes, will, without constricting credit generally increase short-term interest rates in the United States compared to those abroad and thereby reduce the outflow of short-term funds.

To match, that effort, the President has now come forward with a request for legislation similarly to reduce the flow of long-term funds.

And on balance, considering the compelling need for reducing the whole balance-of-payments deficit—and also for showing the rest of the world that is what we intend to do; considering the special vulnerability of our long-term capital market, particularly in view of the barriers to free capital flow set up by the very countries which have been making so much use of our accessible market, the net effect of the President's request appears to offer hope for important progress in this crucial area.

Grassroots Tool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress continually demonstrate their appreciation of grassroots public viewpoint, especially as it is disclosed by the mail which we receive.

The July 11 issue of the Suburban Life, a biweekly publication serving western suburban Cook County, Ill., carried a practical editorial calling attention to the effectiveness of grassroots expression through mail to Members of Congress. I place the editorial into the RECORD as being an excellent commentary on this subject:

GRASSROOTS TOOL

Perhaps it's the size of the Federal Government, with all its bureaus, departments, commissions, offices, etc., which results in the average person's feeling of inferiority or timidness in expressing himself to his Representatives in Congress on Government operations.

While it is true that the individual can do little by himself he nevertheless holds within his grasp a powerful tool, a letter.

Personal mail to a Representative in Congress is a most effective contact between the legislator and his constituent.

In order to effectively represent the people of his district a Congressman must know their personal wishes and feelings which many times elude him. The Congressman, of course, must be fully informed on all developments within his district but he cannot be expected to know the intimate feelings of all.

And that's where the personal letter scores big.

There is a false feeling among many that their letters will receive little or no attention; that the Congressman is too occupied with other things or that he is indifferent to their wishes.

But if the Congressman doesn't know how the people feel he is missing something vital to his workings.

All subjects within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government are the people's business and everyone has a right to be heard. And there's many a piece of legislation the fate of which was determined in a large measure by the interest and comments drawn from the grassroots.

Congressmen, as a rule, are grateful for constructive letters from home because they give the legislators an insight into the subject which may have been subjugated by the national importance of the matter.

From a practical standpoint, a letter from a constituent is asking the legislator for a return on the investment the voter made when he put the man into office.

Furthermore, it can give the writer a feeling of being a part of government and having an active voice in it.

Tribute to Danny Kaye in Recognition of His Contributions to International Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, Danny Kaye, one of America's foremost all-round entertainers, accomplished a most extraordinary personal, good will mission to the Soviet Union. I wish to bring to the notice of my colleagues the meritorious service performed by Mr. Kaye, which reflected great good will in the Soviet Union for the peoples of the United States. I invite my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute to Mr. Kaye, who has achieved international stature not only as a show business star, but as a humanitarian, whose heart, mind, and formidable talents are dedicated to the children of the world.

Mr. Kaye went to Moscow under the combined aegis of the U.S. Information Agency and the entertainment industry, as a guest of honor at the Third International Film Festival in Moscow.

Although he participated in the film festival, Mr. Kaye's primary concern was to meet the Soviet people, and particularly to visit with the Russian children—children in schools, children in hospitals and children in various rural establishments and training centers.

In the 10 days Danny Kaye spent in the Soviet Union, he charmed his way into the hearts of untold millions of Russians, but particularly into the hearts of the Russian children.

In the cultural exchange pattern in recent years between the United States and the Soviet Union, there are many who believe the Soviet Union has come off to greater advantage. This because the Soviets have been able to send to the United States such outstanding cultural attractions as the Bolshoi Ballet, the Leningrad Kirov Ballet, the Moiseyev Dancers, and many great musical artists, including David Oistrach, among others.

The United States has sent over to Russia many outstanding American cultural groups and individual artists, but it is apparent that we have a long way to go to make up for the impact that Soviet culture has made with the American public in relationship to the impact that American culture has made upon the Soviet peoples.

The State Department has found that personal impact can be most influential.

Official Soviet Government organizations, as well as the Soviet Red Cross Alliance and Red Crescent Societies knew of the commendable work Danny Kaye has done over the years for UNICEF, relative to the welfare and happiness of children throughout the world.

Danny Kaye was warmly greeted upon his arrival in Moscow by Prof. George Miterev, president of the Soviet Red Cross Alliance and Red Crescent Societies. The welcoming event was covered by the international press, as well as the full Russian press—and it was considered a major breakthrough for American-Soviet relationships.

Danny Kaye was officially invited to visit various Soviet Government-operated clinics, hospitals, and camps for children—the first individual from any Western country to ever receive such an invitation. Danny Kaye's visits to these various children's centers were covered by both the Soviet press and American press. Under ordinary circumstances the American press would never have been allowed to cover such developments.

Wherever Danny Kaye went he found children ready to play for him, sing for him, and dance for him. And everywhere Danny Kaye went, he immediately went on stage, and he, in turn, played, danced and joked and clowned with the children.

From the press coverage of this extraordinary good will mission one major fact evolved—the Russian children showed great love for Danny Kaye.

Veteran newsmen on the Russian scene personally report that the Danny Kaye

mission was one of the most exciting and thrilling experiences they had ever encountered. This was not because Danny Kaye was able to capture the interest and love of the Soviet children—it was more than that. Danny Kaye has done this all over the world for many years and in 24 different foreign countries. There was a much more important implication.

I wish to point out to my colleagues, that the important thing in this Danny Kaye one-man mission was the fact that he was reaching out to thousands of Russian children who had never met an American before. Children who had been taught that everything that stems from communism is good and everything that stems from capitalism, including capitalistic countries, is bad.

Suddenly, this lanky, funloving, talented man shows up in their midst—and he is not evil at all. In fact, he is a "nice guy." He plays with them, he sings with them, and he dances with them. These children are going to tell other children and they are going to tell their parents, and their parents are going to tell other parents that a fine American visited them and brought them great happiness.

In addition, Danny Kaye was the star attraction of the "Saturday Night News Show," on Moscow TV, which, in addition, telecast film clips of his visit to the various Soviet children's establishments. It is estimated that over 100 million people saw this telecast.

It has been evaluated that Danny Kaye in that 1 hour did much to promote good will between the American people and the Soviet people. It is apparent that if peace is to come to the world, it will be on a "people to people" basis.

An interesting, but characteristic, aspect of this entire mission, is the fact that Danny Kaye personally paid all the expenses connected with his trip to Russia.

The lives of Americans throughout our land, as well as the lives of people throughout the corners of the world have been enriched by the artistry and genius of Danny Kaye. Particularly, this is true of the children of the world. As an American, he has brought great credit to his country—the United States of America.

It is, therefore, fitting and proper for us as fellow Americans to pay tribute to Danny Kaye and commend him for his great humanitarian and patriotic endeavors. His accomplishments have been great—the position he holds in the hearts and minds of his fellow man everywhere is just as great.

Eugene (Gene) Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed and delighted with the testimonials to Eugene (Gene) Kinnaly on the floor of the House on July 18. No man has shown more devotion to this body, to his chief, Speaker McCORMACK, or to his country.

As a Member from Massachusetts I have had personal experience with Gene's ability and fine judgment. He is a credit to his State. I cannot match the eloquence of my colleagues who paid tribute to Gene last week, but I cannot let the occasion of his 45 years of continuous service to our Speaker pass without giving him my sincere good wishes and congratulations. I hope that we will all have the benefit of his counsel for many years to come.

GNP Understates Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the common assertion that our economy's rate of growth is lagging is based upon gross national product computations. However, as I have pointed out many times, GNP is not an indicator of real economic growth, but rather a measure of economic activity. GNP fails to measure adequately many elements of real and significant economic growth, including increased leisure time, new and better goods and services on the market, better medical care, increasing longevity, and education.

A recent column by Sylvia Porter points out another area—the do-it-yourself movement—where GNP seriously understates our level of economic growth. She also might have mentioned the time of mothers and housewives which is not calculated in our GNP. Miss Porter says that the exclusion of the do-it-yourself burgeoning source of labor from our GNP figures is "no longer tolerable."

Professor Karl Brandt of Stanford University and formerly a member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that we may be understating our GNP by as much as 20 percent a year because of our failure to include this labor in our overall total.

Although the exclusion of do-it-yourself labor may have been justifiable in 1947 when the Commerce Department began to calculate the GNP and the do-it-yourself movement was still in its infancy, Miss Porter says, modern techniques and computers remove all excuses for not including this labor in our current GNP totals.

Furthermore, with the increase in leisure time that will result from shorter workweeks and longer vacations in the future the do-it-yourself avocation promises to expand and become a still more significant factor in our economy during future years.

Because of the significance of this omission in our present GNP figures, under unanimous consent I include Miss Porter's column from the July 19 Washington Star in the RECORD:

STATISTICS IGNORE LEISURE LABOR

(By Sylvia Porter)

We now have a road opening up some of the woods behind our country home for the first time since the original settlers cleared the land. It cost "nothing." My do-it-yourself husband simply got on his 1962-bought bulldozer, his 1960-bought tractor and those other mechanical monsters he keeps in sheds he built around here and moved earth, rocks, brush and trees until a road emerged.

Had he hired men to clear the road, the cost would have run into hundreds of dollars and what he spent would have duly added to our Nation's total output of goods and services (gross national product). But since Sumner Collins did it entirely on his own with machines bought in the past and paid no one, nothing counts. Neither the new road nor the value it adds to our property will show up in any statistical measurement of 1963 production.

A friend a few miles away invited us last weekend to the "inaugural" of his new bar—a sturdy, handsomely designed, beautifully finished thing. It cost next to nothing, for he's another weekend do-it-yourself fanatic with sheds loaded with tools. He built the bar with tender loving care, permitting no one to help.

Had he bought that bar, he would have spent a minimum of $500 and this would have duly added to GNP in 1963. As it is, the only dollars that will be counted are the few he spent on wood, nails, varnish, and the like.

PEAK OF SEASON

This is the peak do-it-yourself season, when tens of millions of men and women from coast to coast are finding a substitute for a psychiatrist's couch in the use of their leisure hours to create things ranging from an ashtray to an extra wing on the house.

How grossly are we understating our GNP because of the omission of this labor? A recent estimate by Stanford Prof. Karl Brandt, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers during President Eisenhower's administration, is that we may be understating it by as much as 20 percent a year.

A couple of decades ago this omission was understandable. The Department of Commerce was just starting to calculate the gross national product (it wasn't until 1947 that the Government began publishing the estimates every quarter), and it was trying to eliminate as much guesswork as possible. The do-it-yourself movement was in its infancy.

The United States was so busy filling shortages pent up during World War II that overtime, not leisure time, dominated our society.

INVESTMENTS MOUNT

But do-it-yourself now is a way of life. The leisure time workshop is commonplace in millions of homes. The investments of the American public in do-it-yourself machines and tools run into enormous sums, and great industries have come into being because the do-it-yourselfer is a compulsive buyer of equipment.

Moreover, do-it-yourselfers will add even more to the Nation's output in the years ahead. As the workweek shortens and vacations lengthen, this increasingly will be their escape and their hobby.

Perhaps excluding from GNP totals the services that tens of millions of housewives perform within their homes must be tolerated, because a dollar figure cannot be placed on their production. But with computers and new techniques to help us gather statistical data, excluding the value of the do-it-yourselfers' labor is no longer tolerable. The billions of dollars they contribute to the GNP are real and can be seen.

Not even trying to make a guess on the do-it-yourselfer's contribution is like pretending the foundation of a house is the whole house.

Southern Idaho's New Slogan: "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multi-million-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

The mounting number of editorials, articles, and letters I am receiving on this subject graphically illustrates the fact that southern Idaho is emphatically opposed to the unwarranted extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. There is no doubt that southern Idaho's new slogan is "Bonneville, please include us out."

It is almost unbelievable that the Kennedy administration would take the unwarranted action it did in the face of the widespread local opposition. Yet one should not be surprised, as the Kennedy administration's record on Federal power expansion is one of full speed ahead, damn the opposition or the economic justification. It is another example of the fallacious notion that "the Great White Father in Washington knows best."

With the rise in unemployment throughout the Nation being such a major problem, one would logically expect the Kennedy administration to refrain from actions which would result in greater unemployment. It is apparent, however, that logic goes out the window where the Kennedy administration plans for the expansion of the Federal electric power empire is concerned.

The following editorial from the North Idaho Press of Wallace, Idaho on June 13, 1963, presents a few facts of life which the promoters of the Bonneville power marketing area have ignored:

[From the North Idaho Press, Wallace, Idaho, June 13, 1963]

STREAM OF THOUGHT

Extension of the Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho is a controversial thing—as all public versus private power situations are. Added to this particular problem is the one of irrigation and water rights—whether BPA will, or can, subsidize irrigation as the Reclamation Bureau has in its handling of power revenue, and whether or not Idaho will lose its historic water rights to the needs of downstream hydroelectric projects.

Now another element is injected into the picture—the issue of Bonneville Power granting an unfair competitive edge to one industry in Idaho as against another industry. Because this is often the case when government gets involved in business, it deserves attention from Idahoans.

W. Grant Kilbourne, vice president and general manager of the minerals and chemical division of J. R. Simplot Co. of Pocatello, in a letter to Senator FRANK CHURCH says Bonneville Power in southern Idaho "seems to pose a disastrous threat to the $20 million investment (Simplot) now has in the phosphate fertilizer business and the $66 million expansion program we are now engaged in."

He explains there are two methods of making phosphate fertilizer—the wet process using phosphate rock and sulfuric acid as its primary raw materials which Simplot uses, and the electric furnace process which uses phosphate rock and electric energy as its primary raw materials. Central Farmers, FMC, and Monsanto use the latter process.

"The cost of electric energy to the electric furnace producer is the same to his basic production costs as the cost of sulfuric acid is to the wet method producer," Kilbourne writes, "and if the Bonneville Power Administration comes into the area to sell electric energy at a third of the present cost, it would have the same disastrous effect to our business as it would to the electric furnace producer if some Government agency should sell us sulfuric acid at one-third of our present cost. In either case, the injured party would be driven out of the fertilizer business by his subsidized competition and many millions of dollars that are now invested in good faith in plants and facilities would go down the drain. Furthermore, a substantial net loss of jobs would result as the surviving industry could expand existing operations to fill the market vacuum created by his driving his competitor out of business by adding a comparatively small percentage of employees."

Kilbourne adds that he understands the electric furnace phosphate business, which he says is suffering badly from overcapacity, is the only industry in Idaho that could qualify as a wholesale user of electric power from Bonneville Power. "There is no other potential combination," says Kilbourne, "which would help our economics in the area of extended Bonneville service that would attract any other type of wholesale user, such as the aluminum industry, in order to offset the loss of our own fertilizer industry which Bonneville power would surely bring about."

In a subsequent letter to Senator CHURCH, Kilbourne asks "how can it be true that the phosphate industry in Idaho will best be served and the economy strengthened by unfairly subsidizing the costs of one competitor against another to the extent that the one employing the larger number of people will be driven out of business?"

In a free enterprise economy, of course, the most efficient producer is the one who remains in business.

But Bonneville Power is not free enterprise. It is a public power setup that despite the fact it is subsidized by the taxpayers because it pays no taxes, still loses millions of dollars each year.

And, ironically enough, Idaho's Democratic Congressmen and the administration are bringing BPA into southern Idaho with the argument that it will mean more jobs in southern Idaho. If Kilbourne states the situation correctly, it will actually mean a loss of jobs in the phosphate industry.

The situation outlined by Kilbourne is analogous to some situations that have arisen under ARA efforts to bring industry into depressed areas. It does, and sometimes at the expense of industries in other areas. No new jobs are created; they are merely shifted.

Idahoans to date have shown little liking for public power projects.

If BPA results in a cessation of operations by Simplot and a loss of jobs; if Idaho's water rights suffer as a result of extension of BPA into southern Idaho; and if Idaho irrigation projects are adversely affected, Idaho's Democrats will rue the day they succeeded in bringing BPA into the State.

Congress Should Strip the Supreme Court of Its Appellate Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Dean Clarence E. Manion, who was for many years dean of the Law School of Notre Dame University and also served on President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recently broadcast to the Nation an outstanding and eloquent radio address on the vital need for curbing the appellate jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court. The broadcast entitled "Congress Should Strip the Supreme Court of Its Appellate Jurisdiction" is dated July 14, 1963. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this radio address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD STRIP THE SUPREME COURT OF ITS APPELLATE JURISDICTION

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

Thoughtful students of American freedom are deeply concerned about the rapid disappearance of enforcible States rights. In the current climate of conflict over communism, legislative reapportionment and civil rights, the Supreme Court, Congress, and the Federal executives are running the country in complete and utter disregard for the 10th article of the Bill of Rights which spells out the reserved rights of the States of the Union.

For the protection of freedom, our constitutional system contemplates sustained, effective competition for public authority between the governments of the several States and the Federal Government. This balance of power between on concentric sovereign jurisdictions—State and Federal—is indispensable to the citizen who hopes to protect his personal liberty by the enforcement of constitutional limitations against the Government of his State on the one hand and against the Federal Government on the other.

We must remember that the constitutional contest of States rights against Federal authority is never conducted in a depersonalized vacuum. On the contrary, every such contest represents the clash of forces that are called into action to attack or to support the asserted right of citizens to be free from the arbitrary exercise of governmental power. This ability to limit and restrain government is the practical definition of freedom.

In spite of the fact that the Constitution may speak plainly on the subject, it is often impossible for a simple citizen to enforce pertinent constitutional provisions against an offending governmental body, unless he can link his action with the claim of another branch or division of government which is competing with the offending body for jurisdiction over the area of authority where the alleged offense occurred.

Once this effective check of delicately balanced governmental power is completely destroyed, the American citizen will be free in name only, because a Federal Government whose actions can never be effectively challenged by the jurisdictional claims of State government will quickly consolidate its

monopolized powers into an irresistible despotism.

Americans are faced with this threat right now and our only encouragement comes from the fact that more and more people are becoming aware of it. Careful students of American history have discovered that the resolute maintenance of constitutional States' rights is an essential prerequisite to the preservation of personal liberty.

More than 50 years ago, Woodrow Wilson warned us that "a concentration of governmental power is what always precedes the death of human freedom." He said, in other words, that liberty can live only where the powers of government are effectively limited and widely diffused.

Wilson wasn't thinking of communism when he said this in 1912, but whoever repeats the statement today must think of the Communist menace because intervening history has shown that communism cannot be established in any place unless and until the governmental authority over that place is completely centralized and made absolute.

The rapid Communist conquest has shown that when all the levers of power have been conveniently brought together and consolidated, the big Red hand soon closes over the consolidation and human freedom immediately disappears. Thus, States' rights, as they were constitutionally conceived in the unmistakable language of the 10th amendment, constitute a definite, practical, and legal barrier against the successful inside conquest of the United States by the covert agents of the Kremlin.

In this turbulent time of worldwide war by communism against freedom, it appears to me that States' rights could ask for no better recommendation than this. Nevertheless, it is painful to observe that the advance of the Communist conquest throughout the world has almost exactly paralleled the official progressive dismemberment of States' rights within this country.

But there is good reason to hope now that the American people may soon reverse the evil political current that has carried us so perilously close to complete centralization and despotism.

A great and growing popular concern about the dangerous erosion of States rights is evidenced by the fact that one or both houses of 24 State legislatures have recently endorsed one, two or three of certain proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States, each of which would correct some of the damage that has been done to local autonomy and restore to the several States the constitutional right of self-preservation.

One of these proposed amendments would take away from Federal courts all jurisdiction in the field of State legislative reapportionment. Another proposal would establish a super Supreme Court composed of the 50 Chief Justices of the various States with power to overrule the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving Federal-State relationships.

A third proposal would change constitutional amendment procedures so as to permit the legislatures of two-thirds of the States to propose amendments which would become a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

This last proposal would restore the custody of constitutional law to the initiative of the several States where it originated in 1787, and thus enable them to bypass completely the tight Federal bottleneck in Washington which has demonstrated its determination to destroy rather than to preserve the constitutional integrity of the States of the Union.

STATE JURISTS ARE ALARMED AT CONSTITUTIONAL MISCONSTRUCTIONS

Some of the support that these proposed amendments are receiving from patriotic Americans is undoubtedly encouraged by the character of the opposition to their adoption. Consider the opposition of Chief Justice Earl Warren, for instance. The Chief Justice announces that he is surprised and alarmed by these amending proposals. He insists that their adoption would upset "the stability of the Constitution" and he urges lawyers everywhere to alert the public to the impending danger. (Durham, N.C.-UPI Dispatch, in Charleston, S.C. News and Courier, April 28, 1963.)

To most of these lawyers, Justice Warren's sudden and belated interest in "the stabilization of the Constitution" is very welcome news. It is common knowledge now that the stability of the Constitution has been in a sustained state of nervous shock ever since California Governor Warren took over the management of the Supreme Court in 1953.

Many lawyers are at a loss to understand Justice Warren's sudden surprise at the wide and warm reception that these proposed amendments have been given throughout the country. Each of these proposals is designed to correct what many lawyers believe are flagrant misconstructions of the Constitution in decisions rendered by a majority of Justice Warren's court during the past 10 years.

The Chief Justice cannot plead ignorance of the origin and development of this critical sentiment because public notice of it has been sent to him from many directions. In 1958, 36 State chief justices, joined in an unprecedented and thoroughly documented remonstrance against the Warren Court for its failure "to promote certainty and stability in constitutional construction" and for "raising considerable doubt" that we still have "a government of laws and not of men."

The State justices complained that "overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases causes us grave concern as to whether individual views of the members of the court * * * as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration as to what is or is not constitutional."

And, on the question of States rights, the State judges said: "It is strange indeed to reflect that under a Constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of powers between national and State governments, one branch of our Government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense and in many respects the dominant power which it now wields * * * we do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would, or should have the almost unlimited policymaking powers which it now exercises." (U.S. News and World Report, Oct. 3, 1958, p. 92, et seq.)

All this was said before the Warren Court decided the case of *Baker* v. *Carr* (7 L. ed. 663–1962, Ind.) which in dissenting Justice Frankfurter's words, reversed "a uniform course of decision established in a dozen cases" and, effectively turned over to subordinate Federal judges the legislative and policymaking job of reapportioning representation in the several State legislatures.

Likewise in 1958, the Warren Court came under the fire of the American Bar Association Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives. This distinguished committee of lawyers bitterly criticized the Warren Court for 20 pro-Communist decisions rendered in one short 2-year period.

In 17 of the cited cases the Warren Court reversed from one to three successive holdings by lower courts, nullified the antisedition laws of 42 States and wiped out or weakened the effect of practically all existing anti-Communist legislation.

On February 24, 1959, the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association accused the Warren Court of going easy on Communists in a score of decisions and called upon Congress to step in immediately with remedial legislation. The Supreme Court responded by granting a rehearing to the convicted Communist spy Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, after which his conviction was narrowly affirmed by a Justice count of 5 to 4 with Justices Warrens, Black, Douglas and Brennan voting to reverse the conviction. (362 U.S. 217–1960.)

In 1961, after years of delay, the Court finally validated the Subversives Activities Control Act but over the vigorous dissent of Justices Warren, Douglas, Black, and Brennan. (367 U.S. 1.)

THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION CONTAINS PROVISION FOR JUDICIAL RESTRAINT

During the past few weeks, at least 40 Members of Congress have either introduced or publicly advocated constitutional amendments to reverse the Warren Court's recent decisions invalidating State laws and/or regulations which permit nonsectarian prayers in State-operated public schools.

All of these continuous and noisy adverse reactions to the decisions of his Court on constitutional questions should have softened Chief Justice Warren's surprise at the attempt by 24 State legislatures to repair the damage which the Warren Court has done and is doing to the Constitution and particularly to the 10th article of the Bill of Rights in a persisting myopic interpretation of the 14th amendment.

Unfortunately, the Warren Court's continuing concern for due process and equal protection of the laws has not extended to beleaguered farmers, ordinary taxpayers and/or businessmen. For instance, just 1 week before the Court granted a rehearing to the Communist spy Abel, it directed—without notice or hearing—the conviction of farmer Evetts Haley who had been freed after a trial on an unlawful wheat planting charge in the Federal district court in Texas. (3 L. ed., 2d, 567, Feb. 24, 1954.)

The record reveals that the chief, if not the only, beneficiaries of the Warren Court's constitutional constructions have been convicted criminals, Communists, atheists, and clients of the NAACP. The gains that these litigants have made in the Warren Court have all come at the expense of constitutional States rights which are now at best in a state of uncertain suspended animation.

These unfortunate Court ventures into policymaking and legislation in disregard for what the State justices called proper judicial restraint cannot be corrected by the slow process of constitutional amendment, however much the effort to do that may be justified. The present Supreme Court has demonstrated that it is incompetent to hold the throttle of national policy in this time of crisis.

In the national interest, therefore, Congress should now exercise the authority given to it under article 3 of the Constitution and strip the Supreme Court of its appellate jurisdiction which it now exercises so prodigally to reverse the sound judgments of all of the inferior courts in the country—State and Federal.

If the country is to be saved and constitutional government restored, the Warren Court's right to supervise national policy must be sidetracked until appropriate constitutional amendments have had time to catch up with its adjudicated excentricities.

Meanwhile, judicial review of constitutional due process of law may be safely left in the custody of the experienced Federal circuit courts of appeal, and the supreme courts of the several States.

If the 40 Congressmen who are clamoring for an amendment to keep the name of Almighty God on the currency and in our salute to the flag will now join in a bill to strip the Warren Court of its appellate

jurisdiction, the fate of liberty and essential States rights will be better and more quickly served straight across the board.

Let's face it—the times demand candor, courage, action, and patriotism. Let them now step forward.

Hon. John S. Monagan Addresses Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, on July 17 the Assembly of Captive European Nations honored our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, at the annual banquet commemorating the observance of Captive Nations Week. Mr. MONAGAN was presented a plaque and a combination of the flags of the captive European nations, together with a citation in sincere gratitude for his steadfast furtherance of the freedom aspirations of the captive nations.

We are well aware of Congressman MONAGAN's effective efforts and accomplishments in chairing the hearings on the captive European nations held by the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I was privileged to hear his comments at the awards dinner and I wish at this time to call them to the attention of my colleagues. I include at this point the statement of Congressman MONAGAN which he eloquently presented at the dinner in his honor.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN, PRESENTED WEDNESDAY EVENING, JULY 17, AT CAPTIVE NATIONS DINNER OF THE ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to receive this award from the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and I assure you that this plaque and combination of the flags of the captive European nations will be a treasured possession and symbol.

I am particularly honored to be linked in these exercises with the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator KEATING, and the distinguished Senator from my own State, my dear friend, Senator DODD. I am also honored that my colleague and friend from Indiana, Representative Brademas, shares in today's program, as well as the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, and the equally distinguished commentator, Edgar A. Mowrer.

It is a particular honor to be invited to join, also, the long list of outstanding Americans who over the years have lent their support to the movement to give aid and encouragement to the people of the captured countries of Eastern Europe.

It is vitally important that the activity of your committee and of the various friends of the captive nations be continued because the need for this support is as great today as it ever has been. This task is complicated by the fact that we are passing through a period of thaw in which conditions in some of the captive nations have been materially improved. In addition, the Western World is striving manfully to find some basis upon which there might be agreement between the East and the West to outlaw thermonuclear war and to eliminate some of the sources of friction that have hitherto existed. The uninformed and those with short memories might be inclined to be unduly optimistic about the future and, therefore, to be disposed to gloss over the still remaining difficulties of the present.

It is here, precisely, that the Committee on the Captive Nations performs its function. It can and does call attention to the fact that in spite of the thaw, conditions in all of the captive nations are as far from those in the free world as day from night. There are still political prisoners. Religion is harassed. Cardinal Mindzenty and Archbishop Beran are still virtual prisoners. Intellectual and cultural activities are kept under control. The elections are not free. Trade discrimination is practiced on a broad scale to the detriment of the captive countries. Armed Communist troops, in the tens of thousands, are still stationed in Hungary. The threat of armed Russian intervention is always present.

As human beings, we must continue to sympathize with the fate of these hapless people who are strongly oriented to the West, and whose love of freedom is no less than our own.

All of us, I am sure, were heartened by the strong and stirring statements about the people behind the Iron Curtain which President Kennedy made recently in Berlin and in Dublin. He spoke of the impossibility of doing business with the Communists as demonstrated in Berlin, and he encouraged the continuation of resistance by the captive nations along the lines of the conduct of the Irish during their long struggle against English rule.

Let us hope that the acts of our Government representatives, contrary to the unfortunate decision on the Hungarian question at the United Nations, will, in the future, reflect these challenging words of the President, rather than a gradual lessening of our strict emphasis on the rights of self-determination and individual freedom.

I have been privileged to act as chairman in the House of Representatives of a committee which spent many hours of study of the problems of the people of the captive nations and which filed in the House a report which received widespread publicity and which was fortunate enough to receive the praise of this organization.

It was our conclusion that support of the captive nations should not flag nor lessen. We felt that a lessening of freedom anywhere meant a lessening of freedom everywhere. We concluded that tyranny and oppression and the deprival of private liberties should be proclaimed to the world and we felt that the United States should champion the cause of the oppressed people and on every occasion should work for their liberation.

In accepting this honor tonight, which represents a recognition of the efforts of others, as well as my own, I pledge my continuing support of the people of the captive nations in the hope that one day our efforts may contribute to bringing about the time when these people, in their own homelands, will enjoy the same privileges which are ours today.

What Causes Unemployment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following advertising copy prepared by Warner & Swasey Co. for the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. In very precise terms this short editorial points out that high costs caused by high wages and low productivity, high taxes, and other high costs of doing business, is the cause of unemployment. The lesson should be clear to everyone:

A HAIR OF THE DOG THAT BIT YOU NEVER CURED A HANGOVER

Unemployment is caused by high prices—too few people can afford to buy, so jobs dry up.

High prices are caused by high labor costs and high taxes (not by high profits which are not even high enough to keep plants modern and jobs safe).

How do many so-called experts in the Nation propose to cure unemployment? By making swollen wages and labor costs even higher, and so still further raising prices; and by enormous peacetime Government spending which cannot help but increase taxes again.

All that the morning-after hair of the dog drink did was bring on the binge again, and only postpone but make all the more horrible the inevitable, crushing headache.

Precisely.

Homer Thornberry Well Qualified for U.S. District Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Houston Chronicle of July 14, 1963.

In short, this article states that a committee composed of one lawyer from each of the 11 Federal judicial circuits examined into the qualifications of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], and that a strong majority of the committee voted THORNBERRY well qualified for U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas. The same committee found unanimously that Mr. THORNBERRY was qualified for the appointment. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the findings of this committee merely confirmed what his friends and colleagues already knew, that HOMER THORNBERRY is highly qualified for the post of U.S. district judge. Since the article appeared, his appointment has been confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

In addition to his specific legal qualifications, Judge THORNBERRY will carry into the Federal judiciary a mind that is learned in the lore of government at all levels; a mind that has been tempered by devoted and efficient government service at the local, State, and National level. Of equal import, he carries a heart that is compassionate toward the problems of all mankind. None of us doubt he will do justice. All of us know that he will temper justice with mercy.

Mercy—

It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,
It is an attribute to God himself;

And earthly power doth then show likest God's
When mercy seasons justice.

The article from the Houston Chronicle follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, July 14, 1963]

BAR ASSOCIATION FOUND THORNBERRY WELL QUALIFIED FOR JUDICIARY

Before Representative THORNBERRY was nominated for Federal judge by President Kennedy, he was endorsed by an American Bar Association committee.

The committee, composed of 1 lawyer from each of the 11 Federal judicial districts, examined the record of each man under consideration, an ABA source revealed.

A "strong majority" of the committee rated THORNBERRY as "well qualified" for the post. By unanimous vote he was endorsed as "qualified."

This endorsement was given after studying his record as State district attorney at Austin, as a member of one of Austin's leading law firms and as former partner of now District Judge Herman Jones.

THORNBERRY also was found to have shown a strong interest while in Congress in laws relating to administration of justice.

Industry's Most Underdeveloped Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is no more urgent business before Congress than the prompt enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation. Perhaps the most difficult fight we face in the civil rights revolution is the battle to insure all Americasn equal economic opportunity. As the President pointed out in his recent message on civil rights "There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants if he has no cash in his pocket and no job."

In an excellent well-documented report entitled "Industry's Most Underdeveloped Resource," the National Urban League has shown that this lack of equal economic opportunity not only involves great hardships for our Negro citizens, but also a serious economic loss to our national economy. I believe the following excerpts from the Urban League report will be of great interest to my colleagues.

INDUSTRY'S MOST UNDERDEVELOPED RESOURCE

A RESOURCE BASIC TO A RESURGENT ECONOMY

Of all the problems confronting the United States today, few are more serious than the need for increasing the Nation's rate of economic growth. For upon such an increase depends not only our continued economic well-being, but, indeed, our very position as the leader of an embattled free world. It is not surprising, therefore, that industry and business, economists of every philosophy, and the State and Federal Governments are all searching intently for the means and resources to assure a healthy and growing economy.

Yet, in the midst of this intensive search, there exists in America today a vast resource which has been tapped hardly at all—a resource which contains such a tremendous potential for increasing national productivity that it is difficult to imagine the full extent of its value. What is this tremendous resource? It is manpower—the manpower which lies buried deep beneath an ugly mountain of racial prejudice. More specifically, it is the 19 million Negro Americans who, though they possess the potential, have been denied the opportunity to match the economic productivity of their fellow citizens.

Admittedly, the crippling effects of racial injustice extend far beyond economics alone. But even if this weren't so—if the problem were purely a matter of dollars and cents its cost would still be more than America can afford. For with the Nation depending less and less upon the historic natural resources of land, water and minerals, it has now become imperative that the country use its manpower resources to the best possible advantage.

That great strides have been made already in stripping away the mountain of prejudice and getting at this important manpower resource, there can be no question. But there is yet much more to be done.

THE LOSS IN PERSONAL INCOME $11,850 MILLION

Although no one can measure the cost of race discrimination in human terms, it is possible to measure at least some of its burdensome economic cost. So let's begin by looking at one part of the cost—the substandard Negro market. The following figures taken from the latest studies made by the U.S. Department of Labor, illustrate clearly the annual loss to the Nation in terms of personal income.

Fact one: Today there are a total of 65 million American men and women employed within the country's major occupation groups. Of this number, the nonwhite working force[1] represents approximately 11 percent of this total—or 7 million people.

Fact two: Latest available figures also show that for Negro male workers the median annual income was $3,075 as compared to $5,137 for the white male worker. For Negro women workers the figure stood at $1,276 as compared to $2,537 for the white female worker.

Thus, by using these statistics as a base it is possible to determine that if the Nation's 7 million nonwhite working force were earning the same median income as the white working force, the yearly personal income for Negroes would be increased by $12 billion—or nearly double its present level.

And keep this point in mind: The personal income figures shown here represent a minimum spending increase only. They are based on the most conservative estimates available and exclude all current Negro spending. Were this amount to be added into these increase figures, the total Negro market would represent a market of at least $25 billion.

THE LOSS IN NATIONAL INCOME AND THE GNP

As high as the loss in personal income may seem to be, the dollar waste caused by unequal job opportunity climbs even higher when considered in terms of national income and the gross national product. The additional waste in these two categories lifts the total annual dollar loss to at least $14,275 million.

Thus, according to the most cautious estimates that can be made, the overall earning loss during 1962 alone looked like this:

	In millions
Loss to individuals	$11,850
This figure represents personal income loss—the amount which would have been available in wages to individuals.	
Added loss to industry	350
This figure includes losses based on corporate profits, dividends, inventories, net interest, wage accruals, etc.	
Total, national income loss	12,200
Product losses	2,075
This figure includes losses based on indirect business taxes, business transfer payments, subsidies, capital consumption allowances, etc.	
Gross national product loss	14,275

(Sources: U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce, Office of Business Economics, 1963 World Almanac and National Urban League economic surveys.)

THE INDIRECT DOLLAR COSTS

Thus far this report has dealt only with the direct dollar cost of racial prejudice—the amount of "new" income which might have been available if equal opportunity existed for every American. But this is still only a small part of total cost, for beyond the direct costs are the indirect costs which come from a failure to utilize Negro abilities fully.

What are these indirect costs? They are the amounts which the Nation pays out to help support the dependent Negro who, were he not denied equal opportunity, would be self-supporting. They are the amounts which the Nation pays out for a higher-than-necessary crime rate, for the support and rehabilitation of blighted housing areas, for needless property damage created by racial violence, and for a host of equally expensive situations which would not exist except for race discrimination.

While it is impossible to arrive at a precise figure for these indirect costs, most American authorities estimate that for every dollar lost in "new" income because of the race problem, the Nation must also spend an existing dollar to compensate for the present ill effects of that problem.

Hence, when the indirect costs of racial prejudice are added to its direct dollar cost, the Nation loses at least $28 billion every year.

THE NEEDLESS EXPENSE OF RACE PREJUDICE—A FEW EXAMPLES

Although Negroes now number 19 million, or approximately 10 percent of the total U.S. population, they account for a disproportionate percentage of the Nation's welfare and rehabilitation rolls. However, had educational and economic opportunity been equal for all Americans over the years, there would be no necessity today to provide Negroes with more assistance than is provided to others. The following examples present at least a glimpse of some of the extra welfare and rehabilitation expenses which the present inequity creates:

Estimated extra annual expense caused by discrimination

	In millions
State-Federal aid for dependent children	$300
Public assistance to the aged	250
Aid to the unemployed	500
State-Federal correctional programs	500

(Sources: Projections based on information supplied by U.S. Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, 1961 FBI crime reports, Urban League research studies, and the U.S. Census Bureau.)

[1] Where information is not available for Negroes alone, the Federal Government uses data for the total nonwhite population. However, since Negroes comprise fully 95 percent of the nonwhite population, data on the nonwhite population and data on Negroes are virtually interchangeable.

INDUSTRY AND THE URBAN LEAGUE PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

As industry has become increasingly aware of the enormous price of prejudice—a price which is borne primarily by the industrial community itself—it has turned more and more to the National Urban League for help. For the league represents the only agency in the race relations field to which industry can come for:

Aid in recruiting qualified Negro workers;

Help in integrating work forces smoothly; and,

Advice and information on any problem concerning Negro employment.

The National Urban League and its 65 local agencies are dedicated to winning equal opportunities for Negroes on a wide variety of fronts, of course, but the largest part of its program still concerns the matter of overcoming the economic waste caused by unequal job opportunities.

While a great deal has been accomplished in the 53 years since the league and American industry have been working together, there is still much to accomplish. Whereas a total of 40 percent of the white working force is employed at the skilled, managerial, and professional levels, the corresponding percentage for Negroes is still less than 16 percent. And the percentage of Negro unemployment still remains more than twice as high as that for the white population.

Neither the industrial community nor the National Urban League can afford to let down their efforts until both of these critical problems have been eliminated from the American scene.

The Congressional Reservist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been some publicity in recent weeks about the question of whether or not a Member of Congress should continue to serve as a member of the Reserve Forces of the United States, following election to this body.

On this point, I read with keen interest the remarks of our distinguished and beloved colleague, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, in the House of Representatives on July 10, 1963.

Congressman VINSON, who is chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and certainly as well informed as any Member of Congress about the needs of our Armed Forces, has significantly endorsed the resolution of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States commending members of the Congress who serve in the Reserve Forces.

As a member of the Naval Reserve, active in the service in World War II and prior to election to this body in 1952, I appreciate very much the view of Congressman VINSON that "significant service is being rendered today by Members of Congress who also maintained their posts and also their efficiency in the Reserve Forces."

My personal views on the subject are very much along the same lines stated by another distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas, as expressed in a newsletter to his constituents on June 6, 1963. The text of Congressman THOMPSON's very fine letter follows:

COMMENTS FROM WASHINGTON BY CONGRESSMAN CLARK W. THOMPSON

DEAR NEIGHBORS: For a great many years, I have believed that the Nation should maintain a strong and thoroughly prepared Armed Forces Reserve. This would constitute the trained militia recommended by Presidents from Washington on down. They have foreseen the fact that without such a Ready Reserve the only safe alternative was the maintenance of a tremendous standing Army.

After World War I, the soundness of this doctrine seemed very clear to me. I practiced it as I preached it; and it may be remembered by my hometown neighbors that it was the 15th Battalion, Marine Corps Reserve, which I had the honor to command, which was the first civilian component called to the colors in 1940.

Going back a little in history, in 1933, as a Reserve officer, I was attending a contact camp at Fort Crockett one weekend. A group of fellow Reserve officers got their heads together and decided that I should be a candidate for Congress in the next election which was then close to 2 years off. I had never dreamed of such a thing but since they seemed to be deadly serious, I did give the subject some little private thought. Exactly 1 week later, the incumbent Congressman, the late Clay Stone Briggs, suddenly died. Had the Reserve officers not made the suggestion to me, I would have never dreamed of becoming a candidate. At that time, the country was being bombarded by the pacifists who wanted to practically disband our Armed Forces.

I came to Congress as a proponent of a strong national defense, and I associated myself with an effort to increase the size of our Army from the pitiful figure of about 117,000 up to the minimum recommended by the then Chief of Staff, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I introduced appropriate legislation; and in 1934, saw the move gain sufficient momentum so that in 1935 it became a law.

My knowledge of the needs of national defense came largely through my membership in the Reserve. It is well known, and has frequently been remembered during my political life since World War II, that I served as a Reserve through that war and that I retired as colonel when it ended after close to 30 years service.

I have always had an idea that my service as a member of the Armed Forces had something to do with my election to Congress in 1947. There is no question that it did in 1933.

In the present Congress there as approximately 175 members of the Armed Forces Reserves. A few weeks ago, someone raised the question that a conflict of interest confronts a Member of Congress who was also a Reserve. In other words, it was implied that we might have a selfish interest in the legislation upon which we were voting. This seems to me to be a very farfetched theory. Certainly, I have cast some votes which were more intelligent because of my intimate knowledge of the workings of the Armed Forces. That, I believe, is one reason why you hired me.

So far as any Reserve officer in my knowledge personnally profiting by the legislation on which he voted, I can only say that I have never known it to happen.

If by some stretch of the immagination it was held that a Reserve officer could not properly be a Member of Congress, it would logically follow that a veteran is also taboo. Where it goes from there, Heaven only knows. Maybe next someone will suggest that a taxpayer shouldn't be a Member of Congress because of his interest in legislation pertaining to taxes. Anyhow, I am proud of my service on active duty and in the Reserve of the Armed Forces of my country. I commend to every young man careful consideration of a similar service.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK W. THOMPSON.

It is reassuring to know that the view of Congressman VINSON and Congressman THOMPSON, as well as that expressed by the Reserve Officers Association, has strong support at home by newspapers with a consistent record of supporting a strong national defense for the United States.

A very fine recent example along that line is the eduitorial which appeared in the Tulsa Daily World on Thursday, July 4, 1963.

The text of the Tulsa World editorial follows:

RESERVISTS IN CONGRESS?

One of the minor league questions being discussed nowadays is whether Reserve officers of the military services ought to be allowed to serve in Congress. Or, putting it in reverse, whether Congressmen should be allowed to keep their Reserve commissions.

We say it is minor league because it is not shaking the Nation like civil rights or any of the other really first-rate issues. But it's a fair question, nevertheless.

We believe all Members of Congress ought to be Congressmen first and whatever else they are, second. In other words, they must look at every proposition primarily as Members of the House or Senate, rather than as farmers, businessmen, Oklahomans, New Yorkers, Baptists, Presbyterians or Reservists.

But almost every segment of our population has members in Congress. Why not the Military Reserve? Certainly these men should have the advantage of authentic information and sound judgment in defense, security, and other military affairs.

They ought to be big enough to lay aside their interservice rivalries in the national interest. And they should always remember that in Congress they are civilian officials, not military. But we see no reason to deprive either Congress or the services of their talents and experience.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Nuclear Test Ban Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, July 28, on Channel 5, WNEW-TV, at 11:30 p.m. I will make the following remarks concerning the nuclear test ban talks which are currently proceeding in Moscow. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TALKS

After 15 tension-filled years in which we more than once went to the brink of war, we now find ourselves talking seriously of an accommodation with Russia. Khrushchev, who only yesterday was pounding a U.N. desk with a shoe and threatening to bury us, now is playing a new role—that of the benign world leader whose sole interest is peace—and telling us that with a little give and take on both sides we can ease the tensions of the cold war and perhaps even be good friends. Some sort of a nuclear test ban agreement seems certain and this, of course, is heartening.

Is there really any basis for solid optimism? There is, I think, but it must be guarded optimism. It is inconceivable to me that Khrushchev has undergone any basic change in his thinking toward the United States. We are the prime capitalist power and still the obstacle in the path of the Kremlin drive toward world domination. What, then, is behind this striking about-face on Khrushchev's part? The answer, I think, is obvious: He is faced with a rising new rival—Communist China—and one that is potentially a greater and more immediate threat to Russia than the United States. On the surface, the split between Mao Tse-tung and Khrushchev is a matter of Marxist doctrine, with Mao advocating the hard line toward what he calls Western imperialism.

But I feel the split is far deeper than that—that, basically, it is a power struggle. What is happening is that Khrushchev is facing a two-front cold war—one with an aggressive, grasping China, and one with ourselves. Now, for the first time, he is willing to make certain concessions—hence the progress of the nuclear ban agreement—in order to ease the pressure. But in our relief at Khrushchev's new attitude we must not forget to bargain from our position of strength.

Thus far, Khrushchev has spoken only of "easing cold war tensions." He has not yet offered to remove any of the causes of these tensions. We must not forget that the Berlin wall—a monument to tyranny—still stands; that Khrushchev's Caribbean puppet, Fidel Castro, dominates a Soviet satellite only 90 miles from our shores; that skilled Russian agents are teaching revolution-for-export in Cuba and infiltrating more and more Latin American governments every month; that the enslaved nations on Russia's perimeter are still as enslaved as they ever were, and that the Kremlin's espionage apparatus is as active in and against this country as it ever was.

Now, it seems to me that we might profit from this rift between Red China and Russia. Not by attempting to exploit it actively—that might draw the two back together again—but by putting it up to Khrushchev to demonstrate his good faith at the bargaining table.

If, as he claims, Khrushchev is sincere in desiring a truce with the West, then let him prove it. Is he willing to demolish the Berlin wall and permit the unhindered passage of Germans from East to West? Is he willing to permit self-rule in Moscow-dominated eastern and central Europe? Is he willing to halt his underground interference in the internal affairs of the countries in the free world? Is he willing to cut the Kremlin strings that support Castro and let the Cuban dictator fall—as he must without Russian support?

These are the causes of the cold war; unless Khrushchev is willing to remove them, no amount of dialogue at whatever level, ambassadorial or at the summit, will succeed in easing the tensions. In itself, a nuclear test ban agreement is in reality a detail; it doesn't remove the reason for the bombs. Nor will treaties without concessions amount to more than airy promises. When our people sit down to bargain with Khrushchev, I sincerely hope they will recall a report of the American Bar Association, and I quote:

"During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words. All this talk led to 52 major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them."

This time, let's be as hard-headed as Khrushchev.

New Hampshire State Convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Department of New Hampshire, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, recently held its State convention in Claremont, N.H. A traditional event of the annual New Hampshire VFW convention is the evening banquet. This year over 500 attended the banquet, at which the principal speaker was Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, VFW national security and foreign affairs.

General Hittle's speech was particularly pertinent, as it dealt with the strategic seriousness of the continuing Cuban crisis. I think it is especially noteworthy that General Hittle quoted extensively from the recent report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, whose chairman is the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi, Hon. JOHN STENNIS. I consider General Hittle's remarks to be one of the most timely and accurate summations of the basic dangers inherent in the Russian occupation of Cuba, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I would also like to point out that the presiding official at the recent VFW convention was Mr. Salvatore J. Saraceno, well known to many Members of this Senate, who completed his tenure as commander of the Department of New Hampshire, VFW.

He was succeeded as commander by another distinguished veteran leader and citizen of Concord, Robert E. Brochu. George P. Frost, of Portsmouth, was elected senior vice commander. Orman Flynn, of Lancaster, was named junior vice commander; Daley Whipple, of Fitzwilliam, was designated quartermaster; Daniel J. Corliss, of Manchester, was selected as department judge advocate; Dan Derry was chosen as chaplain; and Harry D. Manning, of West Swanzey, was named surgeon. George E. Jalbert of Hudson was appointed department adjutant by Commander Brochu.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN. J. D. HITTLE, U.S. MARINE CORPS, RETIRED

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States can indeed be proud of our organization's record in opposing the relentless and ruthless aggression of worldwide communism. The VFW, too, can derive genuine satisfaction from the services which it has performed, not only in alerting our fellow Americans to the objectives and methods of world communism, but also in helping stiffen our Nation's attitude toward Red expansion.

It would seem appropriate at this time to examine a critical area of Communist expansion in terms of the VFW's position and record regarding it.

I refer to Cuba. The VFW is no Johnny-come-lately to this issue. When Castro was just beginning his banditry in the mountains of Oriente Province, the VFW recognized him for what he was—and is—a full-fledged Communist, a ruthless killer, and a willing puppet of the Kremlin.

We recognized, also, that if this bearded instrument of communism were permitted to control Cuba, the entire structure of hemispheric defense would be seriously threatened, and perhaps irrevocably shattered.

But, the said and lamentable fact is that Castro was permitted to take Cuba. This meant, in fact, that Russia took Cuba. It meant many more things—none of them good for Cuba, for freedom, or for the United States.

There is no blacker page in the history of the Americas than the Castro-Kremlin reign of terror in Cuba. "To the wall" is the slogan of these ruthless Reds. Freedom-loving Cubans who have not gone before the assembly line executioners are consigned to a slow death of medieval torture in filthy dungeons.

Indeed, the Kremlin takeover of Cuba is a combined moral and strategic sin that should not have been permitted in the first

place. It is one that should not be permitted to continue.

As serious as are the moral aspects of what is going on in Cuba, we must not be unmindful of the strategic implications of this catastrophe. From the standpoint of plain realism, we must admit that communism, in focusing on Cuba, picked its target well. Indeed, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the Kremlin to have selected a more strategically critical base than Cuba for its movement into the heart of the Americas.

Let's look at it this way: If we could get a sufficiently large balloon to lift us at this moment sufficiently high to see the Caribbean, then a startling geographic fact comes into focus. If you draw a north-south line through the westward tip of Cuba and extend it northward, you will find that the westward tip of Cuba is west of Miami Beach, west of Washington, D.C., west of Pittsburgh, west of Cleveland, west of Detroit, and on a line running almost precisely through Fort Wayne, Ind. It is west, also, of every country in South America. I mention this to illustrate how thoroughly the Russian takeover of Cuba has fragmented the strategic integrity of the Western Hemisphere.

Cuba stands astride the north-south sea lanes, upon which the wartime survival and the economic well-being of the Americas depend. It commands the Caribbean and the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal. Much of the strategic history of the Americas has been the history of the struggle for control of Cuba.

The Russian takeover of Cuba constitutes the most significant strategic achievement of world communism since the fall of mainland China in the Red orbit. What it means is that Russian communism has leap-frogged NATO, jumped the Atlantic, which historically has been our protecting moat, and established a bastion in the strategic heart of the Western Hemisphere.

The Russian expeditionary force now in Cuba brings us to the realization that Cuba is far more than a political satellite of the Kremlin. Militarily, it is a suburb of Moscow.

I use the term "Russian expeditionary force" in its most meaningful sense. Let there be no mistake about it, Cuba today is an advanced base of communism in the Western Hemisphere. Nor is this a homegrown variety of communism. It is part and parcel, an integral and major feature, of the Kremlin's continuing assault on the citadels of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

The Russian expeditionary force is no quickly assembled, provisional, miscellaneous assortment of technicians, training personnel, and maintenance troops. It includes four mobile armored groups of firstline combat troops of the Army of the U.S.S.R.

How many Soviet troops are there in Cuba? I don't know how many, and if you don't know how many, don't be embarrassed. There is no U.S. official today who can give us the accurate figure, and this is no haphazard statement. I quote from the recent report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. That report says in part: "* * * no one in official U.S. circles can tell, with any real degree of confidence, how many Russians are now in Cuba and we are of the opinion that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure."

And, furthermore, in spite of all the wishful thinking that Khrushchev and Castro would be good to us by reducing the number of Russian troops in Cuba, such dreams have not been realized.

Also, as the Senate report of the Stennis Preparedness Subcommittee states: "There is no evidence that any of the combat ground troops associated with the four mobile armored groups have been withdrawn."

The deadly seriousness of what the Russians are doing in Cuba is reflected by what I consider to be one of the most important statements on this entire Cuban crisis. It is found on page 14 of this same report by the Stennis subcommittee. The report states, "According to our intelligence, the Soviet Air Force in Cuba has approximately 42 MIG-21's, one of their most modern, high-performance supersonic jet fighters."

It is impossible to overemphasize the seriousness of Russia's Soviet Air Force based on, and operating its aircraft from, Cuban fields. These are no training planes. As the report very clearly states, the MIG-21's are "one of their most modern, high-performance supersonic jet fighters." What does this mean? A lot of things. One thing it means is that the Russian Air Force jets are based in Cuba, flying from Cuban airfields, a few minutes flight from the United States. Little wonder, then, that Khrushchev brags about communism's seizure of Cuba.

Another key question: Are all the strategic missiles and so-called offensive weapons out of Cuba? I would like to believe that they are. But, realism and the record of Communist deception and lies prevent me from having such happy thoughts.

The Stennis subcommittee report makes this very significant statement, "To a man, the intelligence chiefs stated that it is their opinion that all strategic missiles and bombers have been removed from Cuba. However, they readily admit that, in terms of absolutes, it is quite possible that offensive weapons remain on the island concealed in caves or otherwise."

Now, keeping this in mind, let us note carefully the following statement: "* * * assuming maximum readiness at preselected sites, with all equipment prelocated, the Soviet mobile medium range (1,100 miles) missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours."

This should certainly dispel any hopes that the danger of Kremlin-controlled Cuba is lessening. Rather, the danger is becoming greater every day. It would not be exaggeration to say that the Cuban crisis is going to get worse before it gets better.

And here again, we find that the long-standing and vigorous position of the VFW, its convention mandates, and the farsighted and vigorous public statements by Commander in Chief Byron Gentry, are thoroughly justified by the official findings as reported in the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee's report. I quote from page 4 of that report: "The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas."

One more quotation from this same Stennis subcommittee report: "The Communist domination and occupation of Cuba, and the resulting menace to our security, requires and demands that the United States be ever alert and vigilant to all of its sinister implications. We must exercise the greatest surveillance and watchfulness possible, and use all available resources, for the purpose of ascertaining the true military situation in that unhappy island and to insure that we will not again be deceived and surprised. The entire Cuban problem, both military and political, should be accorded the highest possible priority by our governmental officials to the end that the evil threat which the Soviet occupation of Cuba represents will be eliminated at an early date."

All this underlines the correctness of the VFW demand for the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine. This VFW position was established by the unanimous vote of the delegates to our 1962 convention. It was reemphasized by being established by Commander in Chief Gentry, as a key objective, for the VFW for 1962-63.

The Monroe Doctrine is not some old-fashioned document or concept. It is just as applicable—and perhaps more so—than it was when it was promulgated in 1823. Its purpose was to keep alien oppression and aggression out of the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine has been a keystone in our national security structure for well over a century. It certainly has not become passé, outdated, or inappropriate. Its enforcement requires all steps, economic, political, diplomatic, and, if necessary, military, to expel communism from Cuba and to return freedom to that tortured island.

If freedom is to be preserved in the Americas, if Communist aggression is to be expelled from its American base, and if the United States is to survive, nothing less than the full enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine will do it.

Your VFW, in taking the lead among organizations throughout our Nation in calling for the full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine, is performing an indispensable service to our Nation.

In conclusion, I believe that our survival is dependent upon our awareness of our danger and the manner in which, as a nation, we face up to the challenge.

One of the most clear-cut lessons of history is that the fates that preside over the destiny of nations have no compassion for those nations that do not vigorously protect themselves. Survival, history so indisputably demonstrates, is the prize of those nations which earn it by vigilance, courage, and perseverance.

Every nation is challenged. Those which recognize the challenge and resolutely destroy it, survive. Those nations which have sought to evade the challenge, deny its existence, or depend upon temporizing, soon fade from the pages of history. History may not repeat, but it does teach some lessons.

The Red seizure of Cuba poses probably the most serious direct threat to our Nation since its founding. Realizing that each nation in its own time must solve its own problems, we can nevertheless turn to history for a great object lesson. There is much, indeed, to be learned from the action of a former great nation which in its own time was confronted with a problem strikingly similar in strategic context to our present Cuban crisis.

In 275 B.C., Rome was a great and still-rising power of the Mediterranean world. The Roman legions had established dominance over all of Italy. With this certainly came the responsibility for protecting the position she had achieved, as well as the lands of the Italian peninsula she had conquered. Rome had, additionally, established her primacy in the Mediterranean world. As such, she was a maritime power.

There was a powerful nation—Carthage—emerging in what was then a distant land on the far shore of the Mediterranean. Aggressively Carthage pushed her influence outward, pressing ever closer toward Rome.

When Carthage moved on Sicily, Rome readily realized the seriousness of the challenge confronting her.

The stern old Romans, who gave the world a lasting lesson in devotion to country and obedience to law, knew that the challenge had to be met. Their approach was basically simple. There was no Roman rationale that the enemy intent on taking this offshore island was engaged in defensive rather than offensive action. In the unsophisticated opinion of old Rome, Carthage could not be permitted to obtain a lodgement on Sicily off the shores of the Italian boot. Were Carthage to hold Sicily she would have a springboard for attack against the Italian mainland and she would be in a position to harass, threaten, and in time of war, sever the sea lanes so vital to Rome and her allies.

Rome faced up to the challenge. And so began the Punic Wars which were to con-

tinue almost 125 years. Before this great conflict was ended, Italy was ravaged by an invading army and Rome lost the flower of her legions to Hannibal's generalship at Cannae. But the spirit to survive as a great and free nation was stronger than the desire to exist. Finally, by a kind of determination all too rare in the annals of men and nations, Rome persevered through to victory.

It is not difficult to surmise what would have been Rome's fate had she permitted a vigorous and aggressive Carthage to gain a toehold in Sicily and build it into a stronghold.

Change a few terms: Caribbean for Mediterranean, Monroe Doctrine for Pax Romana. The parallel and the lesson should be clear.

Gus Toepel, Wisconsin's Great Legislative Librarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we in Wisconsin are extremely proud of our excellent legislative reference library. As a former member of the State legislature and in connection with my duties here in the Senate I have received prompt and competent assistance from the library whenever I have called on the staff there.

The excellence of their service was due in large measure to the chief, Mr. M. G. "Gus" Toepel. Gus Toepel was not only extremely able and competent, but a good friend to all members of the Wisconsin Legislature, on both sides of the aisle.

His sudden death while on duty in the library during an extremely difficult session of the Wisconsin State Legislature a few weeks ago is a great loss, not only to the State, but to all of us who knew him and worked with him.

I ask unanimous consent that a joint resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature eulogizing Mr. Toepel be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 76, S., STATE OF WISCONSIN

The ephemerality of life has seldom been evinced more sadly than by the sudden passing of Marinus Gustave (Gus) Toepel on July 12, 1963, Mr. Toepel, chief of the legislative reference library since 1950, had never placed any limit on the hours he devoted to his duties and had been particularly active during the present fiscal impasse, when overwork took its toll. Typically, he was on the job when stricken.

Mr. Toepel was born in Sheboygan 57 years ago and attended the University of Wisconsin, graduating with a bachelor's degree in history in 1927. He later received his master's degree in political science from the same institution.

The man's diversity is illustrated by the variety of responsible positions held by him. After graduation, he taught in high schools at Neenah and in Tennessee and was an instructor at the University of Wisconsin. He worked with the Bureau of Municipal Research at the University of Texas. He was a rating board examiner and field investigator for the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Toepel entered the U.S. Army in 1941 and was discharged in 1945. Entering as a private, he became a first lieutenant before his discharge. He served in Army intelligence as Assistant to the Chief of the Counterintelligence Division of the Washington, D.C., Military District and was a special intelligence agent in Europe. For his work in Europe, he became one of the few Americans to receive the signal honor of honorary membership (no U.S. citizen can become a full member) in the Order of the British Empire, from George VI.

After World War II, he worked with the Wisconsin Taxpayer's Alliance and also was executive secretary of the Governor's commission established in 1947 to study educational needs. He served with the extension division of the University of Wisconsin as director of the bureau of government and as first director of the Green Bay Extension Center, before assuming his duties with the legislative reference library.

Mr. Toepel was widely acclaimed as a master of the legislative process and he was nationally renowned for his work as a member of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

In a large sense, his life illustrates the enduring nature of the human spirit, for he will be long remembered by everyone with whom he was associated. Hundreds of legislators, State officials and private citizens knew him as a friend and sought his wise counsel and advice on legislative matters.

Mr. Toepel typified all that was finest in government service. The people of this State have never had a more devoted, more conscientious, more able public servant. He gave unstintingly of his time and, finally, his life.

Mr. Toepel's wife, Margaret, survives him as does his father, Gustave, of Neenah.

In view of M. G. Toepel's many outstanding contributions to this State, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), The the legislature expresses its great sorrow and deep sense of personal loss felt by each member at the passing of M. G. Toepel and extends its heartfelt condolences to his wife and father; that the senate and assembly flags be flown at half-mast on Wednesday, July 17, in memory of M. G. Toepel; and be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to his survivors.

Spendthrift Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish all Members of this Congress had more concerned, alert, responsible thinking constituents such as one of mine in west Texas, who wrote to me as follows:

Hon. ED FOREMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOREMAN: I have a dependent relative who has very little financial responsibility. He means well, but he keeps buying presents for my wife and me, charging them to my account. When he sees something that he thinks we might need, he buys it, and I have to pay. These things are rarely what we would have bought ourselves. Because he doesn't work for a living, money doesn't mean much to him.

He is generous to the poor and needy, with my money—and gives to the unworthy, too. I just received a bill for his latest spending spree, and it gives me a sick, hopeless feeling. How much better things would be if I could spend my own money for the things I want.

He won't listen to me, but he will listen to you. Please, please use your influence to cut the spending habits of my Uncle Sam.

Sincerely yours,

A. CONSTITUENT.

Appraisal of Future Oil and Gas Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, within recent years, and within certain circles, the oil and gas industry of this country has come under increasing attacks from people who ought to know better. It is strange indeed that an industry that has provided millions of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes for both the National and State Governments should be so castigated by people who ought to be its friends. There seems to be an opinion in certain circles that our supply of oil and gas is inexhaustible, and that all persons connected with the oil and gas industry, in any capacity, live in the lap of luxury without a care.

It matters little what some think of those who produce the oil. But it matters a great deal what leaders in Government think about the industry and its potentialities, for our national well-being and national security are directly involved. For that reason I would like to enter into the RECORD an article written by Mr. H. K. Hudson, a geologist and attorney with long experience in determining the adequacy of present and future oil and gas reserves. He points out that there is still a great deal of crude oil and natural gas to be found in the United States, but there is much evidence that we do not have the vast potential supplies that some people would have us believe.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oil and Gas Journal, June 17, 1963]

IS THE SONG OF PLENTY A SIREN SONG?

During the 6-year period since 1956, the number of exploratory wells drilled in the search for oil and gas has declined to only about two-thirds of the 1956 high; the number of drilling contractors that have gone out of business and the number of rigs that have been cannibalized to make repairs on other rigs have been tremendous; and the number of students studying to be petroleum engineers and geologists has declined at an alarming rate. During this same period gas reserves added annually have been far below the highs of 1955 and 1956; and last year, for the second time, oil reserves added (includ-

ing secondary recovery) in the United States were less than production.

It is well known that the United States, in making its tremendous industrial strides, has already exploited many of its mineral resources (iron, copper, lead, zinc, etc.) to a point where we are now mining low-grade ores in the United States and importing high-grade ores from other countries. In the face of that history with respect to our solid minerals, and in the face of the trends above referred to with respect to the exploration for and findings of crude oil and natural gas, some supposed experts still try to assure the Government and the people of the United States that there are far greater volumes of crude oil and natural gas still to be found in the United States than we have found to date; that, indeed, we have barely scratched the surface.

This song of plenty unavoidably creates an impression in many circles that oil and gas should be relatively easy to find. The fact that it has made an impression is shown by a recent statement by the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission of his conclusion that we need have no concern over our gas supply for 15 or 20 years or perhaps before the year 2000.

Contrary to this easy assurance of great supply, Dr. M. King Hubbert, of the National Academy of Sciences, and Ralph E. Davis, one of the most highly respected gas geologists in the United States, in separate studies, calculate that volumes remaining to be found are of about the same magnitude as those which have been found and that our finding rate has passed its peak. Hubbert's estimates cover both oil and gas; Davis's cover gas. Some of the high estimates of the crude oil and natural gas still to be found in the United States are as much as four or five times as great as the estimates of Hubbert and Davis.

EXTRAPOLATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS NOT VALID

How are these high estimates made? Using estimates of proved reserves of crude oil already found, the forecasters make extrapolations for crude oil to be found in the future based upon the assumption that the sedimentary deposits as yet unexplored will have crude-oil-bearing characteristics similar in some manner to those which have been explored. They then use an assumed (but unsupportable) historical ratio of the rate of finding of crude oil to the rate of finding of natural gas and calculate the volumes of natural gas still to be found. Demonstrably, these assumptions and these extrapolations have absolutely no validity.

Some of the facts uncovered by the oil and gas industry in recent years demonstrate the invalidity of those assumptions and extrapolations as well as the invalidity of broad, unsupported statements about the enormous volumes of crude oil and natural gas still to be found in the United States. Why won't these forecasters face those facts?

DISAPPEARING CRUDE OIL WITH DEPTH

In the last 25 or 30 years, the oil and gas industry has been finding that, beginning at depths of about 8,000 feet as we drill deeper and deeper, more and more of the hydrocarbon reservoirs are gas reservoirs and fewer are crude-oil reservoirs. In some manner, heat and pressure at great depth, together with the passage of geologic time, have done something to the crude oil. It simply isn't there in the same degree as at shallower depths.

Consider the facts that have been disclosed concerning the Permian basin area of west Texas and southeastern New Mexico and the gulf coast area of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. These two areas account for nearly half of the total crude-oil production of the United States. As Dr. Frank J. Gardner, exploration editor of the Oil and Gas Journal, shows in an article in the March 18, 1963, issue of the Journal, entitled "Deep Oil: Is It Only a Mirage?" these two areas also contain a large part of all the sedimentary beds in the United States below 20,000 feet.

In a current FPC area rate hearing, evidence has been introduced that in the Delaware-Val Verde Basin, which is the deepest part of the Permian Basin area, there is virtually no oil at depth—only gas. Although geophysics shows that the sedimentary beds in that area extend to a depth of 35,000 feet or more, enough exploration at depth has already been done to show that there is very little likelihood of commercial crude-oil reservoirs anywhere in the Permian Basin area below 15,000 feet.

Now look at the gulf coast area. In the same FPC hearing, it was pointed out that, although at shallower depths a very large part of the producing reservoirs are crude-oil reservoirs as compared to gas and gas-condensate reservoirs, below 8,000 feet they constitute only 46 percent; below 10,000 feet it becomes 37 percent; and below 12,000 feet it is only 30 percent. Anyone can see that that trend comes to zero percent at about 19,000 or 20,000 feet. In his article, Gardner points out that, out of a total of 15 record-setting wells drilled below 17,000 feet in the United States, only three have been productive and only one of those (a well in South Louisiana) produced crude oil in small quantities below 20,000 feet. That well was abandoned after producing for a relatively short time, obviously before it paid for itself.

NONE BELOW 16,000 FEET?

As a matter of fact, after a considerable amount of exploratory drilling and some crude-oil production below 15,000 feet, no really significant crude-oil discovery has been made below 16,000 feet anywhere in the United States. The depth below which crude oil in commercial quantities will not be found may well be about 16,000 feet instead of 19,000 or 20,000.

With such facts facing us indicating that there may be little or no commercial crude below 20,000 feet, or perhaps even below 16,000 feet, how can anyone make a valid assumption based upon the oil-bearing characteristics of known producing sedimentary beds at shallow depths to calculate any substantial volumes of crude oil in unexplored sedimentary beds at great depths? Instead of such pointless extrapolations, why don't the forecasters face this evidence that crude oil will not be present at great depth as it has been at shallower depths?

THE PHONY FINDING RATIO

Since, as indicated above, the calculations by extrapolations of the volumes of crude oil to be found at great depth have no validity, then certainly any calculations of the volumes of natural gas remaining to be found at depth, based on the crude-oil calculations, are equally suspect.

Furthermore, the so-called "finding ratio" between the finding of natural gas and crude oil is completely phony. Since much of our crude oil and natural gas occurs in separate "nonassociated" reservoirs, and since in some areas we find mostly gas and in others mostly oil, the so-called finding ratio makes no more sense than a finding ratio between crude oil and lead. As a matter of fact, if the forecasters had included Canada in their studies and had counted the 300 billion barrels of Alberta tar sand as crude oil (which it is), their finding ratio for gas would have been so low that their calculated volumes of natural gas still to be found in the United States would have had to be far less than those of Hubbert or Davis—even when based on the invalid high calculations of crude oil still to be found.

SMALLER RESERVOIRS WITH DEPTH

Now consider some facts that we have available to us with respect to the probable volumes of natural gas, as well as crude oil, at great depths. As Gardner shows by the map accompanying his article, the sedimentary beds lying below 20,000 feet have a relatively small areal extent, compared to the hundreds of thousands of square miles of sedimentary beds in the United States above that depth which have been fairly well explored. So, the available sedimentary beds at great depth will necessarily be far less extensive than the beds above that depth.

However, there is another fact of even greater importance than the limited areal extent of the deep sedimentary beds. This is the very considerable evidence that, as we drill deeper and deeper, the individual reservoirs encountered are smaller and smaller. This seems to be true for both oil and gas.

The largest known single accumulation of hydrocarbons in the world is the shale oil of Colorado and Utah. The volume of this oil has been estimated to be three or four times as great as all of the proved reserves of "conventional crude oil" (i.e., producible from wells) in the entire free world. This vast accumulation of hydrocarbons lies at and slightly below the surface.

The next largest known accumulation of hydrocarbons in the world is the Athabasca tar sands of Canada, the volumes of which have been estimated to be about equal to the total proved reserves of conventional crude oil in the free world. The tar-sand oil also occurs at and slightly below the surface.

By far the largest known single accumulation of natural gas in the free world is the Panhandle-Hugoton reservoir with original reserves of 70 trillion cubic feet at a depth of approximately 3,000 feet.

By far the largest known accumulation of conventional crude oil in the Western Hemisphere is east Texas field with an original reserve of some 5 or 6 billion barrels at slightly below 2,000 feet.

The next largest known single accumulation of conventional crude oil in the United States is the old, shallow Panhandle field oil reservoir with an original reserve of more than 1 billion barrels at about 3,000 feet.

Next in size to the Panhandle-Hugoton gas reservoir is the San Juan-Mesa Verde reservoir in northwestern New Mexico and southwestern Colorado with an original reserve of about 8 trillion cubic feet and at depths of 5,000 to 6,000 feet.

Nowhere in the United States below 5,000 feet have we found any single crude-oil reservoir remotely comparable in size to the shale-oil deposit, the Athabasca tar sands, or even east Texas field; and nowhere below that depth have we found any natural-gas reservoir remotely comparable in size to the Panhandle-Hugoton reservoir. And nowhere below 10,000 feet have we found any single crude-oil reservoir equal in size to the shallow Panhandle field oil reservoir or any single gas reservoir equal in size to the San Juan-Mesa Verde or even to the old, shallow Monroe reservoir of north Louisiana, which had a gas reserve of about 6 trillion cubic feet.

There has to be a reason for this greater accumulation of hydrocarbons at shallower depths. In developing the science of geochemistry and geobacteriology, it has been found that the soil above a hydrocarbon reservoir contains more hydrocarbons than the soil elsewhere. They obviously got there by vertical migration through relatively imperivous beds. Isn't it quite possible that, during the millions of years of geologic time, this vertical migration from the deep high-pressure zones to shallower low-pressure zones has been the cause of larger accumulations in the shallower zones and that the recoverable gas, as well as the recoverable oil, at great depth may be far less than at shallow depths?

Regardless of the reason for this phenomenon, the important fact is the evidence of smaller reservoirs of hydrocarbons at greater

depths. In the face of our knowledge with respect to that lesser occurrence at great depths, how can anyone, by the extrapolation methods above referred to, possibly make any valid estimate of enormous volumes of crude oil and/or natural gas at great depth? Why don't the so-called experts face those facts honestly?

DISAPPOINTING EXPLORATION IN SHALLOWER SEDIMENTARY BEDS

Now, how about the facts available to us which give us some indication of the probable occurrence or nonoccurrence of crude oil and natural gas in the shallower sedimentary beds which have not yet produced in large volumes?

THE SHELVES

Consider first the Continental Shelf around the United States, now being looked upon as a happy hunting ground. Every geologist knows that, so far, wherever in the world we have found oil or gas on an offshore Continental Shelf, it has been in depositional basins which produced onshore and which extend out onto the shelf. The examples of this in the United States are the Los Angeles Basin and the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas. In both cases, discovery of oil and gas on the Continental Shelf has been an extension of discovery in the same basins on shore. This certainly gives us some basis for suspecting that, where the depositional beds are barren onshore, they may also be barren on the adjacent Continental Shelf.

THE COASTAL PLAIN

Now look at the Atlantic coast. Although the Appalachian area has produced tremendous volumes of carbonaceous material (coal) and tremendous volumes of crude oil and natural gas, all of this production has been from deposits found west of the easternmost ridge of the Appalachian Mountains. The Atlantic Coastal Plains seem to be barren of fossil fuels (coal, crude oil, or natural gas). With this evidence that the sedimentary beds are barren onshore, the odds are very high that they will be barren offshore.

Now extend this inquiry around Florida and into the gulf coast and consider the unsuccessful exploration that has already taken place on the Atlantic coast and Florida gulf coast. In the current FPC area rate proceeding above mentioned, evidence with regard to this exploration was presented which was surprising to many. It was shown that, along the entire gulf coast of Florida and along the U.S. Atlantic coast, there had been a total of at least 475 exploratory dry holes drilled to depths greater than 3,000 feet (and a lot more to shallower depths), including about a dozen deep, dry holes on the Continental Shelf, and that the only production in that entire area is one 11-well oilfield on artificial lift and one abandoned gas well, both in southern Florida. Three more exploratory dry holes were drilled in 1962: one almost 13,000 feet deep in the gulf in the Key West area; one almost 12,000 feet deep in the Florida Panhandle; and one shallower well near Tallahassee.

On the basis of that evidence, neither the onshore nor offshore areas of the gulf coast of Florida and the Atlantic coast give any present indications of possible oil and gas production.

The official records of Washington and Oregon show that 375 exploratory dry holes (110 deeper than 3,000 feet) have been drilled in Washington and 167 exploratory dry holes (42 deeper than 3,000 feet) have been drilled in Oregon. The only production resulting from that exploration was from one small oil well in Washington, now abandoned.

There is current exploratory leasing activity on the Continental Shelf off Oregon and Washington. It remains to be seen what will be found but, if anything is found, it should be kept in mind that the Continental Shelf of the entire Pacific coast is quite narrow, compared to the wide shelf off Louisiana.

Oil may be found in those States, but there is certainly no present evidence of enormous accumulations there either onshore or offshore.

Now extend the same inquiry to the Continental Shelf off Texas. It is well known by geologists that the sedimentary beds under the Continental Shelf off Texas are considerably different from the sedimentary beds of the Continental Shelf off southern Louisiana. A substantial amount of exploration on the shelf off Texas has proved quite disappointing. They are still disappointing.

With respect to the Atlantic coast, the Florida gulf coast, Oregon, and Washington, and the Texas gulf coast, isn't it probable that the people who drilled the unsuccessful exploratory wells in those areas made use of all the geological and scientific knowledge that they had available, and that they considered those areas to be promising for exploration? Isn't it probable that a majority of those exploratory dry holes were drilled on promising geological structures? In view of the poor results of exploratory drilling in those areas, isn't there a likelihood that the results in other unexplored areas in the United States will be equally disappointing? Why won't the experts honestly face the implications of all this disappointing exploration?

PROSPECTS IN THE OLDER PRODUCING AREAS

There is much talk about the reserves that will be added in the future in the older areas due to improved technology. Of course, there is still a lot of crude oil and natural gas to be found in the older areas that have been fairly well exploited. Some of this oil and gas will be found in "traps" still to be discovered and some will be found in the less-permeable or "tighter" formations that we formerly could not develop commercially. However, it must be remembered that, since Colonel Drake's well, almost 2 million wells have been drilled for oil and gas in the United States and, in many areas, those wells have pretty well perforated a lot of the sedimentary beds like a pin cushion down to basement rocks or to considerable depths.

With respect to the "traps" still to be found, geologists generally recognize that we have probably discovered the greater part of the important "structural" traps which can be located by surface geology and geophysics; and that from now on, the search in the older areas must be for "stratigraphic" traps, which are the most difficult and most costly to find. With respect to the tighter formations which we have heretofore passed up but which technology will let us develop in the future, won't that be at best in the nature of gleaning?

FUTURE PROSPECTS COMPARED TO PAST EXPERIENCE

In the last 100 years, we have found in the United States approximately 100 billion barrels of crude oil and approximately 500 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Hubbert estimates about 75 billion barrels of crude oil still to be found, and Hubbert and Davis both estimate about as much gas to be found, as we have heretofore found.

Now consider the evidence of (1) the probability of no commercial crude oil below 20,000 feet (perhaps 16,000) and of smaller gas reservoirs at depth, (2) the exploratory evidence of poor prospects, onshore and offshore, of the Atlantic coast, the Florida gulf coast, Oregon and Washington, and of the Continental Shelf off Texas, and (3) the comparative narrowness of the Pacific Continental Shelf.

With that evidence in mind and remembering the hundreds of thousands of square miles that have been explored and exploited in the last 100 years by nearly 2 million wells, as well as the tremendous reservoirs that have been found and substantially produced during that period, the writer cannot imagine where the sedimentary beds could be that could contain a total volume of crude oil and a total volume of natural gas about equal to what we have heretofore found, as estimated by Hubbert and Davis, let alone the astronomical estimates of some of the other forecasters.

It is even more impossible to imagine the geological and economic climate under which such volumes of crude oil and natural gas could be found in commercial quantities. Considering this evidence, it may very well be that even the estimates of Hubbert and Davis are on the high side rather than the low side. To say, as some do, that in a hundred years of extensive exploration and development we have found only a small part of the total volumes of crude oil and natural gas to be found in the United States, seems absurd and extremely dangerous.

PRODUCERS ARE UNBELIEVING

It is interesting to note that the activities of a large part of the producing industry show that the producers do not place much reliance on the song of plenty. During the last 6 years when exploration for new crude oil and natural-gas supplies has been at a very low rate in the United States, many producers and many companies which need crude oil have, at relatively high prices, been buying proved reserves of crude oil and acquiring companies that have such reserves. Also, during this time, most of the larger producers and many of the smaller ones have been feverishly engaged in extensive and costly laboratory, pilot-plant, and development operations in the secondary recovery of crude oil in the older fields. This type of operation is limited to certain types of crude-oil reservoirs. Also, while secondary recovery increases the recoverable oil in an oil reservoir, it greatly reduces the recoverable gas in the same reservoir. And, while exploration in the United States is at a very low point, it is common knowledge that many U.S. producers are conducting extensive exploratory activities in foreign countries. The inference to be drawn from all these activities with respect to the opinion of all these producers as to volumes of conventional crude oil still to be found in the United States far greater than we have found to date seems fairly obvious. They don't believe it.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

The discussion herein with respect to crude oil has been limited to supplies of "conventional crude oil" within the 48 contiguous United States. Even if the volumes of conventional crude oil still to be found within those States should be less than estimated by Hubbert (a distinct possibility), we can take some comfort for the future in the availability of shale oil in Colorado and Utah and the oil still to be discovered and developed in Alaska, as well as the supplies of conventional crude oil and tar-sand oil which may be aavilable from Canada. However, some of these potential oil sources are many years away from production in volumes significant to our national requirements. So, prudence in our national economy and in our national defense would seem to lie for the present in offering the producing industry all reasonable incentives to find and develop as much conventional crude-oil reserves as possible in the United States.

With respect to possible alternative supplies, the picture for natural gas is different from that of crude oil only in degree. The transition to alternative supplies is, and must be, much further away but, for the distant future, the supplies are there. Physically, coal or any hydrocarbon (as from the shale oil or tar-sand oil) can be converted into gas at a price and natural gas from foreign and Alaskan sources can be liquefied and transported by tankers at a price. The gas from these sources need be no different from the natural gas that is now being transported by pipeline. So, with these future but more distant alternative supplies for

natural gas, there is no need to press the panic button and to restrict unduly the use of natural gas, as by "end-use" controls and the rejection of worthwhile pipeline projects.

However, these alternative supplies do not appear to be competitive with natural gas in any large volumes for some years to come. The enormous distance included in bringing Alaskan gas to the other States through Canada by pipeline would seem to rule out that alternative. So long as the price of oil per British thermal unit in the field is about three times the price of natural gas in the field, it would seem obvious that any efforts to develop the oil shales and the tar sands will for some years to come, be directed primarily toward the production of oil rather than gas; and no one has yet demonstrated that gas from coal or liquefied natural gas transported by tanker from available sources can compete at the city gates or elsewhere with natural gas transported by pipeline at anywhere near current price levels, except possibly for peaking purposes. At best, LNG transported by ship will be available only to coastal areas and will be subject to all of the problems of imported crude oil.

But even suppose that gas from such sources might become competitive with pipeline gas at the city gates within the next few years. None of the gas from those sources would be available to the gas pipelines in the source areas of the pipeline systems. Those pipelines that we now have represent a gross investment of about $10 billion, of which only about one-fourth has been retired by depreciation, and they have many years to go (about 24 years at current depreciation rates) to amortize that investment; and, undoubtedly, gas-pipeline expansions in the next few years will add tremendously to that gross investment and to the number of years required to amortize it. Against that required depreciation life of about 24 years for the present pipeline investment, the present proved gas reserves provide a full line deliverability of only about 12 years for average annual volumes and a shorter period for peak-load volumes.

Regardless of possible future alternatives for gas, the pipelines must, short of bankruptcy, continue to operate until they payout their investment. Not only that, they must operate at optimum capacity to keep down the unit costs and the resulting consumer rates to repay that investment. In other words, we must keep the present and future gas pipelines full for a good many years to come. Otherwise we face the inevitable alternatives of higher pipeline costs of handling gas and resulting higher consumer prices to cover those costs or a catacylsmic period of pipeline bankruptcies with an accompanying tremendously adverse impact on the Nation's economy.

So, with natural gas as with conventional crude oil, prudence in our national economy and in our national defense would seem to lie for the present in offering the producing industry all reasonable incentives to find and develop new supplies.

There is still a lot of crude oil and natural gas to be found in the United States but there is much evidence that we do not have the vast potential supplies that some people would have us believe—perhaps not even the volumes estimated by Hubbert and Davis. Finding and producing adequate supplies will be a hard and costly job. The vitally important point for the United States and its citizens is that we do not delude ourselves about our future supplies of conventional crude oil and natural gas or the ease of finding those supplies. The next time a so-called expert sings the song of plenty about far greater volumes of conventional crude oil and natural gas still to be found in the United States than we have found to date, consider the evidence and ask yourself, "Where is all that oil and gas?"

Join the Do-It-Yourself Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the tendency is to turn to Government for every type of assistance, it is refershing to learn there are communities with the do-it-yourself spirit.

We continually hear of the need for more scientists in our nuclear age. Here is a community which has transformed lip service into positive action. I commend it for duplication in countless communities over our land.

CASAC PROGRAMS SPUR YOUTHS TO PREPARE FOR CAREERS IN SCIENCE

The purpose of the Carlisle Area Science Advisory Committee (CASAC) is to promote interest among pupils of the Carlisle Area Joint School System and the South Middleton Township Schools in science.

This country is sorely in need of scientists in all categories—in Government, military, industry, schools, college, universities, and many others.

The CASAC was organized in 1955 and has embarked on many programs for the students of teenage and elementary pupils to stimulate their interest in science and so that they may eventually pursue courses on the college level to fit them for the needs of the country.

AMBITIOUS PROGRAMS

Each year the programs for the school youngsters have become more ambitious and those of the school year of 1962–63 have eclipsed everything CASAC has sponsored since its inception.

The CASAC membership comprises school teachers' college instructors, and heads of departments, personnel of industrial firms, and commercial businesses. Its members include electronic engineers, chemical engineers, biologists, geologists, psychologists, mathematicians, anthropologists, physicists, astronomers, quality control engineers and others. All have joined in the CASAC programs to aid the young students to choose their careers.

Among scientific projects undertaken during the 1962–63 CASAC year were seminars in which the subjects covered were oceanography, anthropology communications science, psychology, mathematics, geology, philosophy of science and others. Instructors from Dickinson College and an engineer of the United Telephone Co. cooperated with CASAC in giving lectures to high school science students on these subjects.

The CASAC committee arranging the series of six seminars at the Carlisle Senior High School included David Kendall, Carlisle Junior High School science teacher; John McDermott, Carlisle Senior High School science teacher; Robert Ogren, of the Dickinson College faculty, and Robert Whitcomb of the South Middleton Township Schools.

DICKINSON COOPERATING

The college cooperated in CASAC's astronomy program, which was conducted by Dr. Henry L. Yeagley, head of the college physics department and astronomer. While the lectures in the Roscoe Bonisteel Planetarium at the college were primarily for the school pupils, adults were welcomed to join in the series. These lectures were started in November and are continuing through the early part of 1963. During the first 4 months the lectures were held every Wednesday. Starting in March they were held on the first and third Wednesday at 7:30 p.m.

ASTRONOMY SEMINARS

When Dickinson opens its new observatory atop the Althouse Science Building the college will cooperate with CASAC in presenting programs for both students and residents of Carlisle and vicinity. The programs will be held, of course, when the skies are clear for observation. Dr. Yeagley will be assisted in these programs by a group of teachers of the public school systems who will have been trained by CASAC.

The CASAC Committee arranging the astronomy programs with Dr. Yeagley includes Donald Neidig, Piezo Crystal Co., engineer; Samuel Ryesky, president of the Hunt Corp.; Chester Lickel, of the Carlisle Senior High School faculty; and Karl Getz, Carlisle Junior High faculty.

The Carlisle Area Science Fair held on February 23 and 24 at the Mooreland elementary school was one of the best in years. There were 180 exhibitors from the elementary and secondary schools. John Rehr, Jr., senior at Carlisle High, won the grand championship.

The science fair committee included Walter Larsen, United Telephone Co.; John McDermott, Harold S. Faust, administrative assistant of the Carlisle area schools; William Virvin, Dickinson College; and Richard Gobin, Carlisle Junior High student, who also assisted with publicity.

SCIENCE IN ACTION

Another project which is being developed is "Science in Action." This program is for school students who will work in groups of 10 or less with cooperating scientists in the field. Subjects to be covered will be geology, parasitology or botany, analytic chemistry, psychology, and astronomy. Other subjects will be covered, if requested by students. This program is being developed by the science seminar committee.

A program, "Science Beyond High School," is being arranged by the project development committee. It will be for 100 students selected from 9 high schools in Cumberland County, 1 in York County and the Harrisburg Academy. Dickinson College will cooperate by furnishing instructors, its laboratory facilities and student cooperators. The college students will work with the school students on experiments previously planned in astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics.

In order to provide these programs through the year, CASAC virtually tripled its budget. CASAC is supported by donations from industry, commercial houses, and individuals.

There are more programs coming up with CASAC members helping the school students and providing interesting programs for the public similar to the astronomy lecture series. At every monthly meeting members usually come up with ideas for new programs or for improving those already in progress.

Price Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Wednesday, July 24, edition of the Washington Evening Star contains an editorial entitled, "Price Stabilization."

This editorial is a concise and accurate analysis of the real object of a bill

which is called by its supporters, "quality stabilization." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Evening Star, July 24, 1963]

PRICE STABILIZATION

The "fair trade" lobbies are still at it on Capitol Hill. Once again they are attempting to mask their drive for a Federal price-fixing law under the euphemistic phrase of "equality stabilization."

No one should be fooled. As in the past, the declared intentions of the latest "quality stabilization" bill, which already has worked its way through the House Commerce Committee, are to protect the integrity of brand-name products by permitting manufacturers to set retail price ranges, to protect small businesses against the scavenger tactics of price-cutting discount houses, and to protect the public at large from "come-ons" and other practices designed to lure them into the store.

Actually, of course, the principal results of this legislation would be to protect the consumer against the bargains which he may be able to ferret out through selective buying, and, among merchandisers themselves, to stifle the normal, healthy mechanics of competition. We have seen no more succinct analysis of the subject than that offered by former Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, who, in testifying against a similar measure last year, stated that it would make independent retailers merely "distributive appendages of the manufacturers * * * depriving them of their right to exercise independent judgment in establishing prices."

Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee, in a recent comment on the present bill, attacked claims that the absence of price fixing, by any name is a contributory factor in the failure of retail businesses. On the contrary, he said, official data indicate that the failure rate in States with "fair trade" statutes generally has been higher than that in States where no such laws apply. Significantly, moreover, the once widely prevalent "fair trade" practices authorized by the individual States have suffered steady attrition during the last decade or so as the result of judicial or legislative action, to the point that less than half the States now have such laws in force.

It seems incredible that these gains might be offset by a Federal law sanctioning price fixing. Nevertheless there is mounting concern on Capitol Hill—so great are the pressures—that this may happen. We trust that the responsible congressional leaders, who in the past have resisted these pressures, will have the fortitude and good sense this year to resist them again.

Negro Cleric Hits Parades and Sit-Ins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in the great sea of printed words with which we have all been flooded regarding the proposed civil rights legislation, my attention was caught the other day by a statement in the Washington Evening Star. It was the remarks on the subject by the Reverend C. C. Addison, of New York, a Negro minister.

What he has to say regarding his race and their tactics is worthy of consideration by all and under unanimous consent I include this news story in the RECORD for any Member who might not have seen the rather small item.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 16, 1963]

NEGRO CLERIC HITS PARADES AND SIT-INS

BATON ROUGE, LA.—The Reverend C. C. Addison, of New York, archbishop of the African Universal Church, yesterday bitterly denounced Negro sit-ins and mass Negro parades, charging "these incidents have caused my people to lose all of their self-respect and self-control."

He denounced the all-out civil rights drive by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, saying it was harming the Negroes of this country.

The Negro minister, president-general of the Commercial League Corp., visited offices of the Louisiana Sovereignty Commission, watchdog on segregation in this State.

Negroes, Mr. Addison said, are "being robbed of their dignity and the very rights for which so many profess to be fighting by advocating violence and hate."

The South is being made the scapegoat in the integration drive, he said in an interview.

"They point to the South as the land of slavery," he said, "but the truth is that it is in the North that the Negro is a second-class citizen."

Unless the onrushing pace of rabid integrationists is halted, he said, the Negro will find himself losing the progress that has been made in recent years.

"In the South," Mr. Addison said, "you find Negroes owning and operating businesses, owning land, driving new cars, and living at whatever stand he cares to push himself up to. But in most of the Northern areas of heavy Negro population, you find few Negro businessmen, few large land owners, and certainly much lower standards of living in general."

Air Passenger Traffic in Southern New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a most outstanding record of air passenger traffic development by a local service carrier was recently brought to my attention by David L. Miller, senior vice president of Allegheny Airlines.

The remarkable success of Allegheny Airlines in developing air passenger traffic in southern New England was achieved by satisfying the demands of the passenger market and promoting its service.

This is the type of initiative and aggressiveness required of all airlines in this country to fulfill their obligations to the public and meet their commitments to the Federal, State, and local governments who have invested in the national airport improvement program.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Allegheny Airlines be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ALLEGHENY AIRLINES

The belief that local service airlines can provide a more effective service to medium-sized cities and smaller communities, than the larger trunk carriers, is supported by several examples on Allegheny Airlines' 12-State system, where it has replaced a trunk.

Two examples of such a replacement, along with subseqent traffic development, are found in the certification of Allegheny in 1960 to New London and Bridgeport, Conn.

Prior to 1960, New London was certificated for many years to a regional carrier. In 1959 that regional carrier provided New London with a single, daily DC-3 round-trip flight between New Bedford, Mass., and New York City. The total number of passengers carried on that 1959 operation was 1,820.

In 7 months of operating in 1960 at New London, where the airport serves a large section of southeastern Connecticut and several military bases, Allegheny carried 6,940 passengers on flights between Boston, Philadelphia, and Washington.

In 1962, only 3 years after New London was headed for a complete suspension of air service because of its apparent inability to produce enough passengers, Allegheny carried 19,320 people to and from Trumbull Airport.

Bridgeport, located in the center of Connecticut's southwestern industrial community, was certificated for both a regional and large trunk carrier in 1959.

The regional airline never inaugurated service, despite its standing authority of many years. The trunk provided a token service of one trip a day between New York and New Haven.

That type of trunk service at Bridgeport in 1959 generated 1,950 passengers, and the airline publicly announced its desire to be relieved of its obligation to serve such an unproductive market.

As in the New London example, Allegheny wanted to replace the existing service at Bridgeport in 1960, and to provide effective scheduling betwen Boston, Philadelphia and Washington.

Also, Allgeheny said it would aggressively promote its new service and join in a cooperative program with the community to develop air transportation. A dramatic record of 18,220 passengers was registered in the first 9 months of Allegheny's operation.

In 1962, Allegheny carried 28,800 passengers to and from Bridgeport * * * again to a city destined 3 years earlier, along with its fine airport, for a complete suspension of air service.

Today, when many New England medium-sized cities and communities are extremely concerned about their existing and future air service, it might be well to review Allegheny Airlines' dramatic results as the replacement of regional and trunk carriers in southern New England.

Allegheny does not promise that a similar dramatic record could be achieved at all points in New England. Allegheny is, however, firmly convinced that many communities would be productive air traffic markets if provided with effective service—particularly if tied into the eastern terminals on Allegheny's system Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington.

Medicine and Modern Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable JOHN E. FOG-

ARTY, the distinguished Member of this House from the State of Rhode Island, has devoted a great measure of his time and effort in the advancement of medicine and allied sciences in our advanced schools of learning.

It was through his individual efforts, although he is not prone to admit it, that appropriations have been made available for financial aid to students aspiring to these professions. His efforts have been recognized by Members of Congress and the medical faculties and by the public press, which on many occasions commended his untiring work to promote the health and welfare of the people of this great Nation.

Congressman FOGARTY's recent address on June 11 at the commencement exercises of Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania, a renowned institution of medical learning, summarizes his expanded knowledge on the subject of the urgent needs and the requirements to meet such needs in this dedicated professional field. It is well that his discourse on the subject of urgent medical needs in these United States be forcibly brought to the attention of our people through every media possible.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I insert in the RECORD a copy of the text of Congressman FOGARTY's address to the faculty, students, and others who attended the commencement exercises at Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania, and who were fortunate to hear directly from a recognized authority on this subject which will have such a vital impact on this and future generations in this country:

MEDICINE AND MODERN DEMOCRACY

(Commencement address by Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY)

President Fay, honored guests, members of the faculty, members of the 111th class to graduate from the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, and their families and friends, it is an inspiring experience to be present as this group of outstanding young women is about to take its place in the noble company of those who have entered the profession of medicine from this great college in an unbroken procession of graduates since the year 1851.

And it is with a feeling of genuine humility and appreciation that I receive the honor you have bestowed upon me today. It has been my privilege to serve for the past 16 years either as chairman or ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee which deals with the health sciences. I have come to know and to appreciate the work of physicians in a way which is not granted to many men. And I have considered it my food fortune that I have been able to do my part in assuring proper levels of Federal support in cooperation with State, local, and private institutions for the advancement of medical education and research. Consequently, I am well aware of the greatness and excellence of the Woman's Medical College, from which 2,664 women doctors have been graduated to help make the place and role of women in medicine what it is today.

In the year 1963 it can be said that the struggle to gain for women their righful place of recognition in medicine has indeed been won. It has been written that "The measure of man's cooperation with man in the conquest of nature is the true measure of progress." In modern medicine progress is being measured by the constant cooperation of men and women physicians in both research and practice. And I have no doubt whatever but that the members of this graduating class will play their part to the fullest extent in pushing the frontiers of medical progress even further forward.

As their role will be important to their noble profession, so it will be equally important to their country in the great struggle of our times to preserve world peace and advance the cause of liberty and democracy in the face of the threats and dangers which confront us.

The work of doctors and medical researchers everywhere in the world is a mighty force for peace and freedom. As one who has long been identified with the U.S. participation in the work of the World Health Organization, I have been very much impressed with this fact. Wars and dictatorships are bred in poverty and disease. Those who help to eradicate malaria, those who labor to develop community water supply programs, those who promote international cooperation in fighting the great plagues of mankind—are all helping to create world conditions that will be favorable to the growth of free societies and a more secure peace.

When, in 1960, Congress passed the International Health Research Act, that measure was primarily intended to help support medical research by foreign scientists whenever and wherever it is evident that their work will advance the health status of the United States, as well as that of the country in which the research is conducted. It was my privilege to introduce that legislation in the House, and I have been gratified not only by its scientific aspects but also by the way in which it has brought about projects of international cooperation that have survived a number of periods of grave international tension.

In the World Health Organization today, American doctors and medical research scientists are actively engaged in helping to disseminate research information. They are seeking for more effective ways to surmount language barriers so that the explosion in medical literature, which is quite a problem even here at home, can be handled more efficiently for the mutual benefit of physicians and other workers in the health sciences. I am confident that as their work progresses, it will serve not only to improve the world's health, but also to prevent the spread of the disease of war.

Here at home, we must also realize the essential part which medicine and all the branches of medical research play in keeping America strong and free. In adding up our country's resources for national strength, the health sciences must be given a leading place. Medicine ministers directly to human beings and human beings continue to be the most valuable, the most remarkable, and the most significant creatures on this planet. In an age of machines and advanced technology man is not becoming obsolete. The recent wonderful performance of Gordon Cooper in bringing his space vehicle back to earth under manual controls is dramatic evidence that the human factor still counts for a good deal, even in such a highly technical field as that of space flight.

As man moves out into space a whole new branch of medical study will move with him. And we can be sure that the work of free doctors in a free society will have an ever-increasing importance for the winning of those victories for democracy which will be gained by our astronauts of the future—among whom there will in time be numbered a good many physicians. It is in fact quite likely that one or more of today's graduates may have the distinction of being a woman pioneer in this field as Dr. Ann Preston once pioneered in the field of winning recognition for women in medicine itself.

But if American medicine is to play its full and proper part in the life of our modern democracy, we must solve two problems which will not yield to pure laboratory research. First we must greatly increase the number of qualified physicians and other professionals in the health sciences. Then we must also work out more equitable ways of bringing the wonders of modern medicine to all of our people—regardless of their race, age, creed, or economic situation. And we must do both of these things without in any way interfering with the traditionally free and private character of the practice of the science and art of the physician.

Earlier this year, a nationally distributed Sunday magazine carried an article by Dr. Fay in which she convincingly discussed the gravity of the increasing shortage of physicians. The plain fact is that just to maintain the present ratio of physicians to population will require, over the next 10 years, a 50-percent increase in the number of graduates from our medical schools. And that is a minimal figure for the protection of the health of the people.

Where are we going to find the money to build and operate the equivalent of 20 new medical schools which will be needed? I see no practical answer to that question which does not include extensive Federal aid. As Dr. Howard Rusk has put it, "After 10 years of frustration, delay, and defeat, it now appears likely that Congress will at last enact a program of Federal aid to medical education."

Dr. Rusk was, of course, referring to the bill known as H.R. 12—the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963—which the House passed on April 12 and sent to the Senate. This legislation is a step forward because it does provide for a 3-year, $175 million program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel, and for a 3-year, $30 million program of loans for students of medicine and allied sciences.

I am, of course, disappointed about the omission of a scholarship program in this bill. I believe that a significant proportion of those who have the potential to become physicians are not doing so because they simply cannot afford the expense of medical school education. These people are handicapped—not by lack of brains, but by lack of funds. The present student loan program offers up to $2,000 a year to the student at a reasonable rate of interest and is, in a measure, going to offset the economic handicap, but I still believe a scholarship program—not requiring repayment—would have been better.

I am also disappointed at the sacrifice of a provision which would have forgiven a portion of the student repayment in those instances where young doctors set up practice and remained in areas of severe physician shortages—but this sacrifice was not too high a price to pay for the passage of a measure so long delayed and so desperately needed. The measure now goes to the Senate, where it is hoped and believed that a friendly reception awaits it. This is particularly gratifying to me and to some of my colleagues, who have tried so often and failed in the face of a situation which has continued to deteriorate while our colleagues continued to deliberate. I believe that we have a breakthrough, at last.

With medicine, as with other sciences, we have not yet developed all the social and political techniques which will enable the whole country to benefit from the rapid advance of research. Through grants administered by the National Institutes of Health we have expanded the freedom of medical research to undertake projects that could not have been possible 10 or 15 years ago. Now we must also develop forms of national health insurance which will widen the freedom of the American people to make use of the benefits of medical knowledge.

You who graduate today will have the high privilege and the grave responsibility of one of our most honored professions. As you exercise that privilege and undertake that responsibility with a full awareness of your equally important role as women and citizens, you will make your lasting contribution to the interdependent causes of the health, the peace, and the freedom of mankind.

SBA Administrator Horne Plugs for Tax Reduction for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out previously, the President's proposal for a tax reduction and reform would provide considerable benefit to the small businessmen throughout the country.

The Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration in a recent address before the Smaller Business Association of New England pointed out the importance of a tax cut to the economy as a whole, the great benefits that would accrue to small business, and the importance of a tax cut this year.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this address in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address follows:

ADDRESS PREPARED BY JOHN E. HORNE, ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND

I am delighted to be here today and I am grateful for the opportunity to return to this beautiful and historic region of our country; to renew old friendships; and, hopefully, to form some new ones.

I also am pleased to join with you in paying tribute to Harrington and Richardson for its achievement in producing and shipping nearly a half million M-14 rifles to the U.S. Government.

Harrington and Richardson has been a leader in the invention and manufacture of small arms for nearly a century. During that time the company has displayed both the ingenuity to meet changing conditions and the foresight and courage to diversify its operations to meet market demands. These are qualities which marked the successful Yankee trader of days past—and I use the term Yankee without the prefix which frequently accompanies it in jest, I emphasize, in my part of the country. Harrington and Richardson is a worthy successor to that ancient and honorable heritage.

In time of war the company has made a significant contribution to the defense effort. Today, it continues to serve the needs of our preparedness effort—an effort which, in these times of perilous peace, may well be of equal importance to our national survival.

The contribution Harrington and Richardson has made in meeting these military requirements is obvious. The contribution it makes by subcontracting to small firms in depressed areas, while less obvious, is also of considerable significance to the economy—and is particularly deserving of recognition by the small business community.

Any may I emphasize that subcontracting is an effective means of strengthening small firms and boosting the economy at both the local, and ultimately, the national level. We are pleased with the cooperation of both large and small prime contractors in subcontracting to small firms. The subcontracting program is an excellent example of how Government, working together with industry, is making a concentrated effort to increase small firms' share in Government procurement.

Yes, Harrington and Richardson has performed a real service to the Government. I know you are proud to have them as members of your association.

Service, though, has always been a hallmark of the Smaller Business Association of New England and its members. In this, your 25th year dedicated to fostering the strength, growth, and prosperity of small business, service continues to be your goal.

I need hardly add that it is a goal which you have consistently achieved. I know that you must have been gratified at the highly favorable evaluation of your work made recently in "The Politics of Small Business." This evaluation, I ought to add, is shared by those who have the responsibility for making our laws, as well as by those who administer them. To those of you of SBANE who have not gone to Washington to present your program let me give assurance that you have made a most favorable impression.

During my last visit with you a little over a year ago, we discussed some of the problems small business encounters in maintaining its strength and in achieving a high level of sustained growth and prosperity.

Any one of these problems could make an interesting subject for discussion today. Some of the problems are old and some are new. But all are problems of which we are aware. All are problems which we are attempting to solve.

In my opinion, however, no problem we might discuss today is more demanding of our attention, more deserving of our consideration, and more urgent in its need for solution than the problem of providing meaningful tax relief for small business.

I should like to explain why I attribute so much significance to this issue.

I believe the present tax system has an inhibiting effect on the welfare and growth of small firms. It weakens the small business community.

And weakness in the small business community dissipates the strength of the national economy.

The 4½ million small firms in the United States—firms which the Under Secretary of the Treasury recently termed, "the seedbed of economic advance in our free enterprise system"—represent 95 percent of all American business firms. They employ 30 million people and are responsible for 40 percent of the country's total business volume.

A healthy, vigorous, and expanding small business community is important, indeed essential, to the economic strength of the Nation.

In order for this country to be able to meet its commitments both at home and abroad the economy must operate at more nearly its full potential than is presently the case.

We know, of course, that small business shares in the fruits of a thriving economy. Conversely, it also bears the deadening weight of an economy operating below full potential.

Fortunately, the pace of business activity is increasing. In 1962, gross national product was at an annual rate of $552 billion. In the first quarter of this year, it was $571 billion and it appears that the second-quarter figure may have climbed to $580 billion.

Manufacturers' new orders are moving. Industrial production is good. Construction starts are expected to increase during the summer and early fall. Consumer expenditures are holding firm and the sale of durable goods other than automobiles is satisfactory. The business outlook seemingly is bright.

There are, however, several economic indicators that temper this outlook.

We have not, for instance, gained the momentum needed to achieve anything approaching full employment. In May, for example, more than 4 million people actively seeking work could not find it. Unemployment is perilously close to 6 percent.

Add to this the potentially explosive combination of idle youth, automated industry, and a growing population. Unemployment among teenagers climbed in May. During the midsixties, nearly 3 million young people will enter the labor force each year. This is an increase of 50 percent over the midfifties and presents us with a formidable problem. And that problem is going to be compounded as automation and modernization displace greater numbers of workers and curtail the need for semiskilled and unskilled labor.

Business failures, while not as high as they were a year ago, continue at the rate of about 300 a week. These, of course, are typically small firms.

Business failures not only sap the strength of the small business community, they strike at the very vitality of the Nation's economy.

Our productivity continues to rise. But while we can add a plus sign to our balance sheet on this account, we must also contemplate the very real possibility of a minus sign, due to the fact that productivity increases can also mean increase in unemployment.

This is a matter to challenge our imagination—how to generate greater productivity and at the same time provide enough new jobs to replace obsolete ones and absorb new workers. If we are to accomplish both of these objectives, we simply must find a way to spur our economy to expand at a rate greater than it has for the last several years.

The program of tax reduction and revision proposed by President Kennedy is aimed at just such a dual goal. And it offers, in my opinion, an effective means of meeting the special tax problems of small firms.

In fact, I would like to stress my own belief that, more than any tax program proposed by the executive branch in my memory, the President's proposals are directed toward helping small business.

This is not to say that only small concerns would benefit under the President's program. For small business operates within the framework of our economy—not independently of it. Small concerns, like firms of all sizes, can only prosper and grow in a climate conducive to economic opportunity. A national tax policy that helps provide such a climate will serve the needs of small as well as large enterprises.

But the President's proposal does, as he noted, "give particular encouragement to small business."

While I am certain that you are aware of the general provisions of the proposed program, I think we might examine a little more closely those portions specifically designed to provide this encouragement.

Perhaps the most obvious benefit to small business is the proposal to lower the rate of taxation. Under the proposal, small businesses—whether they are corporations, partnerships or sole proprietorships—would enjoy substantial rate reduction.

Corporations with net income of $25,000 or less would have their taxes reduced this year from 30 to 22 percent. This is a reduction of about 27 percent—the largest percentage cut proposed by the President for 1963.

For corporations which, while somewhat larger, are nevertheless small in comparison to the industrial giants, the benefits this year would also be impressive. Corporations with taxable incomes of $50,000 would get an approximate 10 percent reduction and those with $100,000 about a 4 percent reduction, with proportionate reductions for cor-

porations with incomes between these levels. These corporations would also benefit further from reductions in the surtax rate which will reduce the overall corporate and surtax rate to 50 percent in 1964 and 47 percent in 1965.

This proposal is one which I need not spell out for members of the SBANE. To quote from your own publications, "Our association has as a major tax objective the reduction of Federal corporate income taxes imposed on small business * * * reversal of corporation normal tax rate (30 percent) and surtax rate (22 percent) (is an important measure) to assure fairer tax treatment of small business and to accomplish our objective of tax reduction." Indeed, you have long been in the forefront of those urging enactment of this salutary legislation.

In order not to nullify the benefits of reversal of normal corporate and surtax rates for truly independently owned and operated small firms, the President has recommended a tightening of the law regarding the use of multiple surtax exemptions by related corporations having 80 percent common ownership and control. The President's proposal, gradually staged over a 5-year period, would treat the problem by limiting the number of exemptions to one. The Ways and Means Committee has tentatively adopted a different approach, employing a penalty system instead. Whichever technique is used, I consider it essential that such a safeguard be erected.

Unless such a limitation is provided for, large firms operating through separately incorporated companies will benefit from the rate reversal intended as an incentive for small business.

This practice has resulted in a substantial revenue loss to the Government and has contributed to a weakening of the competitive position of small firms. To that extent, putting an end to this practice will assist the many small businessmen who are now struggling to keep pace with larger competitors operating through several corporations at least partially for the purpose of taking advantage of existing law.

I think you will be interested to know that very few truly small firms would be adversely affected by a tightening of the law in this area. It is a beneficial revision, therefore, not merely because it would act as a deterrent to a form of multicorporate organization which is detrimental to free competition, but also because it facilities a deeper tax reduction than would otherwise be possible.

Corporate rate reductions combined with last year's investment credit and depreciation reform would give us, I feel, a strong and continuing stimulus toward accelerated economic growth.

A recent survey by the Commerce Department and the SEC not only bears out this feeling but offers skeptics of corporate rate cuts something to think about. The survey showed that expenditures for plant and equipment in 1963 should rise to more than $39 billion—they were $37 billion last year—and another survey by McGraw-Hill found that businessmen credited last year's tax reforms for more than 40 percent of their increased capital expenditures.

Reducing business taxes will increase productivity but will not do the whole job. Companies will not produce more goods, or new goods, unless markets to sell these goods exist.

A dramatic expansion in overall markets is needed and the best way to achieve that is to increase consumer purchasing power. It was with this in mind that the President recommended reducing personal income tax rates from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a much lower range of 14 to 65 percent. About 4 million small unincorporated businesses would benefit from this provision, with appropriate reductions covering sole proprietors and partners in every bracket.

The corporate and individual tax cuts would result in higher after-tax profits and retained earnings. Consequently, the tax program would help remove one of the most persistent deterrents to the growth of small business—a lack of adequate capital.

This is, of course, a major disadvantage of small firms—having to rely on costly short-term credit to supplement limited internally generated funds.

Tax reduction would increase the volume of earnings which can be plowed back into small businesses to sustain their healthy growth. Tax cuts would also attract new investment to small businesses, since the profitability of such enterprises would increase. At the same time, increased profit prospects would improve their borrowing power and make the small firms more attractive as potential investments.

By expanding the growth potential of small business, tax cuts could help arrest the trend toward purchases of small firms by bigger competitors and could help block the constant flow of management personnel from the smaller to the larger enterprise.

These are the major aspects of the President's tax program—although by no means an exhaustive analysis—that I wanted to discuss with you today. It is clear, I think, that small business does indeed have a very special stake in the proposed tax program. For small business, the tax problem is an urgent one. Small firms need tax relief and they need it now.

I am sure that you share this concern, and I am confident that you want to do everything in your power to promote the welfare of small business. The most important step which can be made in that direction today is, in my opinion, a program of tax reduction and revision along the general lines of that proposed by the President.

It is reassuring to know that men like yourselves are actively concerned with resolving the problems which threaten to block the progress we must achieve if the Nation, and particularly small business, is to prosper and grow.

Thank you.

The Calcasieu Junior Deputy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing problems of today is, as you know, juvenile delinquency, and it imposes itself not only upon the parents of children, but upon all public officials in a position to inspire our youth to maintain an orderly and exemplary attitude toward their future responsibilities.

Sheriff Henry A. Reid, of Lake Charles, La., has detected this problem and has spent much of his time in developing a program designed to help the young people in his area meet their responsibilities. The success of his program has been such that he has commanded the attention of the entire Nation. The award he recently received was given as a tribute to his efforts and inspiration, and it should inspire similar activities throughout the country. I commend to my colleagues the news article announcing Sheriff Reid's accomplishment.

CALCASIEU PARISH JUNIOR DEPUTY PROGRAM NAMED TOPS IN NATION

(By Cliff Seiber)

LAKE CHARLES, July 17.—"We are very happy to have won the award that was presented by the National Association of Sheriffs. We are proud of the youth of our parish and of those that have worked so hard in making our program the best in the Nation."

That was the reaction of Calcasieu Sheriff Henry A. Reid when he was informed that the Calcasieu junior deputy program was named the outstanding sheriff's youth program in the Nation by the National Sheriffs Association, Wednesday.

FIVE HUNDRED FIFTY REGISTER

A total of 550 sheriffs registered for the convention being held in Portland, Oreg., the Associated Press reported.

This is the first year the awards have been given. A total of 400 junior league programs have been organized in 40 States, William M. Lennox, association president, sheriff of Philadelphia County, Pa., said.

ORGANIZED IN 1958

The Calcasieu program was organized in 1958 by Sheriff Reid and put under the administration of W. Cliff Johnson, sheriff's department youth director.

According to Sheriff Reid, the program is designed to keep juvenile delinquency at a minimum in Calcasieu Parish and to give the youth a wholesome and attractive program of activities and a chance for boys to find recognition, worthiness and a sense of security.

FOUR HUNDRED BOYS

The junior deputy program, which has an annual enrollment of approximately 400 boys, is divided into two 15-week semesters, September–December and February–May.

House Small Business Committee Expresses Opinion Legislation Not Needed for Cooperative Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, following the completion of recent hearings by the House Small Business Committee on cooperative advertising, Mr. Larston D. Farrar, correspondent for several newspapers and trade publications, conducted an interview regarding this type of advertising as revealed by these hearings. This interview has recently been printed in the IGA Grocergram.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this interview in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE EXPRESSES OPINION LEGISLATION NOT NEEDED FOR COOPERATIVE ADVERTISING

(NOTE.—An exclusive interview between Larston D. Farrar, Washington representative of IGA Grocergram, and U.S. Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat of Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, conducted on the day after Congressman EVINS concluded his investigation into the Federal Trade Commission's con-

troversial advisory opinion on cooperative advertising.)

LARSTON D. FARRAR. First, Congressman EVINS, I wish to thank you on behalf of the readers of the IGA Grocergram for taking your time to discuss the subject of cooperative advertising by independent retailers and the facts and factors uncovered by your committee's investigation.

Representative JOE L. EVINS. I am delighted to respond, Larston, for I realize that the publication of information about governmental development is a vital part of our work as legislators. As you know, Members of Congress strive to stay aware of the many problems facing small businessmen in many fields. We tackled this problem at once, through the House Small Business Committee, because we felt that the situation demanded attention and because of its importance to so many thousands of independent retailers in many fields.

Mr. FARRAR. Will you relate the events, in sequence, which have precipitated the current wave of fear on the part of retailers concerning their cooperative advertising?

Congressman EVINS. Well, to start at the beginning, it seems that the National Association of Retail Duggists asked the Federal Trade Commission for an Advisory Opinion regarding the legality of a certain proposed cooperative advertising plan designed to be used by groups of retail druggists in various cities and towns throughout the country.

Under the plan, independent retail druggists located in a given community or town would place a joint ad in the local newspaper featuring certain items at sale prices which would be offered by the participating druggists whose names would be listed in the ad. The group of druggists would pay for the advertising by pooling their advertising allowances received from manufacturers of the items advertised.

The Commission advised that since the druggists agreed with each other to sell the items at the advertised prices, the plan was a price-fixing device that would contravene laws enforced by the Commission.

The drug association made public the Commission's advisory opinion and since great numbers of retail grocers, hardware stores, appliance stores, independent merchants, and others were placing joint ads under a plan that was identical, or similar, these small businessmen became alarmed and interpreted the Commission's ruling as a threat to their own cooperative advertising programs.

Mr. FARRAR. It is of great interest to those in this field as to the opinion of the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division with respect to the FTC advisory opinion. Didn't Lee Loevinger, head of the Antitrust Division, testify before your committee?

Congressman EVINS. Yes, he did, and in his remarks Judge Loevinger made it clear that the Department of Justice had known about the small business joint ads all along but had found no occasion to intervene or to interfere with the practice. His view differed from that of the Commission. He explained that the Antitrust Division has brought no cases against the practice.

Judge Loevinger testified that he did not want to make a general statement that cooperative advertising was legal or that it was illegal. He explained that it depends upon the facts and circumstances in each case. He did testify that small retail businesses may, if they do it properly, engage in cooperative advertising and mention prices without being in violation of the law.

Mr. FARRAR. Isn't it a fact that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY Democrat, of Minnesota, the Senate majority whip, has introduced legislation to make it clear that the FTC position must not be maintained in enforcement procedures?

Congressman EVINS. Yes, that is true. His bill, as I read it, would place the joint advertising programs of small business retailers under the supervision of the Federal Trade Commission. The bill authorizes the FTC to issue rules that would permit the small retailers to place such ads without being in violation of the antitrust laws.

In addition to Senator Humphrey's bill, I might mention that Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, has introduced a concurrent resolution in the Senate which, if adopted, would prevent the Federal Trade Commission or the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice from proceeding for a period of 1 year against small retailers placing joint ads. At the time Senator MCGEE introduced this resolution, I believe he explained that the moratorium was needed because the small merchants were asking for immediate action or assurances so that they could continue their advertising programs without fear of criminal prosecution.

I think our committee's hearing has clarified the matter, and has supplied the small business community with these assurances. We feel that we have been of real service to small business.

Mr. FARRAR. In view of all the facts which you uncovered in your hearings, and the reaction of congressional small business spokesmen generally, what is the best thing for Congress to do to assure small businessmen of their right to advertise cooperatively? What chance do you give to the proposed new legislation of Senator HUMPHREY, or similar legislation which you may sponsor, during this session of Congress?

Congressman EVINS. At this time, I doubt that I will sponsor any legislation dealing with this problem.

It is true that the testimony developed at the hearings held by my committee—the House Small Business Committee—made it very clear that the release of the Federal Trade Commission advisory opinion had a real impact upon small business retailers. Members of Congress became concerned because they, as well as others, recognize that small business must continue to have the privilege of placing these joint ads when it is necessary to do so to compete effectively.

Most important of all though, is the fact that the testimony and information developed by our committee's hearings clarified the situation. Chairman Paul Rand Dixon of the Federal Trade Commission told us that the Commission was merely answering a request for advice—not dealing with a question of enforcement. He added that the Commission has not proceeded against any of these small business groups in these situations and that it has enough to do to try to keep its backlog of cases from getting any larger. He said that no one has complained to the Commission about the joint ads and I have a feeling that the Commission has no present plans or intentions of proceeding in these types of matters.

Also, as I mentioned earlier, Judge Loevinger told our committee that the Department of Justice all along has been aware of the joint advertising programs conducted by small retailers and they have seen nothing to attack in it; that the Department has not found a situation in which they thought it appropriate to institute any type of proceedings against small retailers for cooperative advertising.

The Sherman Act was passed in 1890 and some of the other antitrust statutes and the Federal Trade Commission Act were enacted as long ago as 1914. It should be remembered that during all these years these two agencies have not instituted a single case against groups of small retailers for placing joint ads—and certainly they have had knowledge of the practice.

It seems, therefore, that the Federal Trade Communism and the Department of Justice have made it clear—at least to me and to our committee—that they are not going to proceed against these small retailers in their cooperative advertising programs.

Without doubt, the release of the advisory opinion proved to be a disturbing thing to many groups of small business retailers. Some became confused because one of the commissioners dissented and a short time later the Department of Justice announced its disagreement with the Commission's ruling.

It was under these circumstances, of course, that the Senators introduced their bills and resolutions, and our committee has held hearings on the problem. As I have said, these hearings, I believe, have "cleared the air," so to speak, so that now there may not be a pressing need for legislation.

Mr. FARRAR. Again, Congressman EVINS, I want to thank you on behalf of our readers for your candid and earnest respnses to my questions. We are grateful to you and to your committee for this, and for all the fine efforts you and your colleagues are making for the small businessman in every line of endeavor.

A Crisis of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, a very special premium seems to have been placed on the quality we call confidence. I am sometimes puzzled when it appears that the virtue of confidence has never been important until now, for I have always believed it to be a desirable attribute for all ages. Agreeing, then, that confidence is an important consideration in the world we find ourselves in today, just as it was 5 or 100 years ago, I would call to the attention of my colleagues the very thoughtful and provocative discussion of this subject offered by Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, in an address before the Portland, Oreg., Knife and Fork Club. I offer it, not in the promotion of a certain viewpoint, but as a sampling of the thinking of one of the most widely respected newspaper publishers in the West and in the Nation.

The address follows:

A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

The longer I live the more I have come to respect the incisive thinking of the late Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who once said: "It is more than passing strange that so many brilliant minds overlook the obvious."

If Mr. Justice Holmes were alive today he would find it hard to believe the beating that the obvious is now taking in the Nation's Capital.

Partly because of a disregard for the obvious, there are now four major crises facing the administration.

Crisis No. 1, Cuba: By which I mean not only the frustrating situation involving this unhappy neighbor of ours in the troubled Caribbean, but, by extension, the impasse that the administration has met in many other important phases of foreign policy.

Crisis No. 2, taxes: By this I mean the crisis in taxes which started with the ill-designed expense account law, its interpretations in proposed regulations by IRS and the ultimate confusions and frustrations which now exist despite late attempts toward clarification.

Also I mean the controversy over tax rates which started with the President's tax message to Congress proposing a cut in rates to aid the economy, reduce unemployment and boost the gross national product totals.

As a matter of fact, despite the concern over deficits, present and to be created, the initial tax message was fairly well received.

And then came the proposed administration tax bill itself, a melange of contradictions. The bill proposed a tax cut all right, but to take effect over a period of years in connection with reform phases.

Here the Keynesian eggheads really burst out of their shells to produce a hopeless jumble of altered exemptions that immediately stirred the wrath of affected groups.

This frightening monstrosity, the reform bill, an evidence of bureaucracy at its deadly worst, helped create the tax crisis and give it a most unpleasant shape.

Crisis No. 3, managed news: This crisis while very real and potentially dangerous, shouldn't have come to actuality. In other words, it shouldn't have been born. In fact, efforts of Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, to justify his attempts to manage the news became an adventure in esoteric stupidity.

Why was it stupid?

It was stupid because, Presidents and administrations have been discreetly managing news ever since George Washington took over. But, they made no announcements of results or intent.

It was stupid because the present efforts to rationalize the practice of shaping the news gave the freedom of the press professionals of the newspaper business a golden opportunity to howl about freedom of information, freedom of the press, and to further obfuscate the issue.

The efforts to manage the news are stupid because they stir doubt in the minds of all Americans, including Members of the Congress, as to who is managing what news, when, how, and why.

Crisis No. 4, and this is the big one, a crisis of confidence.

To this crisis I want to speak for a moment not as a Republican or as a newspaperman but as a citizen; as a loyal American who believes that confidence in the administration in this time of grave international hazard is important.

But confidence in the administration is not half so important as confidence in the President himself.

And that confidence is diminishing. It is unfortunate and unnecessary, too, because our President is young, contemporary, tough, and smart—actually a man for the times.

It is too bad that he has not followed more closely his own instincts and ideas rather than the advice of some of his superbrains—the too-smart intellectuals whose sense of the practical is virtually nonexistent.

For example, President Kennedy's own idea of a tax cut to spur the economy would have been accepted pretty generally by Congress, by the people—by labor and by business.

But no one is going to buy the tax bill as it was put into the congressional hopper. The President had best go back to a straight tax cut, with reforms to come later, or else forget the whole thing. I doubt seriously if the present bill can ever get to the floor and if it does, that it can ever pass. As a matter of fact, demands for passage of the tax cut and reform bill from the White House could be a very dangerous thing accompanied as they have been by predictions that unless this two-headed monster is given life, there will be a recession.

Through this procedure, the President is putting himself in the position of promoting a recession whether he realizes it or not. As a matter of simple fact, the economy is moving despite grim predictions of the White House economic pallbearers.

In February, according to U.S. News & World Report, as an example, personal income was running $18.9 billion ahead, with retail sales up and many other favorable indexes apparent.

Let's go back and look at the crises I have mentioned in more detail.

Crisis No. 1, Cuba. First, let's be realistic—Kennedy did not create Cuba. Far greater responsibility would have to be given Eisenhower and Dulles for Cuba than Kennedy and Rusk.

The crisis really landed in Kennedy's lap when it became known that the Russians had placed offensive missiles in Cuba capable of destroying the principal cities of the United States.

Once this fact was definitely established Kennedy acted swiftly and courageously. His prompt procedures restored America's position as the leader of the free world. They won unanimous support from Central and South America; a unanimity not anticipated by the most optimistic.

But Russian personnel remained in Cuba despite the departure of the missiles and the running battle between the Congress and the administration was joined—was Cuba still a menace to our safety and were there still offensive weapons in Cuba?

The basic situation in regard to Cuba thus remained and remains untenable in the minds of most Americans. Even though war seems to have been averted and the offensive missiles removed, there is no cause for satisfaction in the transformation of this island into a base for Communist subversion.

Several months ago I invited a group of Colorado business leaders to lunch with some top Washington officials to discuss the apparent failure of understanding between them.

At that meeting, one source of discontent that kept coming up—even more than some business problems—was the fear that this administration was unable to cope with the problem of Castro and communism in Cuba.

Cuba is, inded, an immensely difficult and painful issue for America. And I don't profess to know what the ultimate answer will be.

But I do know that when the President got tough with the Russians in October, the country was solidly for him.

The people may have been edgy during the peak of the crisis that followed, but they felt a sense of direction when Mr. Kennedy appeared to have won the decision.

Since that time, the administration seems to have slipped back into a somewhat hazy program on Cuba.

A part of the foreign picture, also, is the undoubted fact that our Western alliance is in disarray.

Let's look at the situation in Europe.

The key idea of much of our international policy in the years since World War II has been that somehow, someway, a united Europe would grow. Slowly a remarkable number of political and economic links have been painfully forged.

However, it also was a part of this faith that Britain would become integrated into the structure of the new Europe. We have built our NATO defense structure on the basis of this anticipation of a Britain "within the lodge."

Now the rejection of Britain by the Common Market attacks that fundamental belief of ours and makes the administration's diplomacy much more difficult.

Then there is crisis No. 2—the economic muddle over taxes, expense accounts, sluggish economic growth, and so on.

The big hope of the young President on Inauguration Day was to get this country moving again, especially in economic terms.

I think, as I have said, we can say it is moving, but not in the dramatic leap-forward sense that the term "New Frontier" suggested on Inauguration Day.

Congress seems in a dead-center mood, with no major legislation moving out of committee. The proposals of the administration have not always seemed to be backed by the aggressive leadership that turns theories into achievements.

The situation is mirrored in the highly controversial proposal for tax cuts and tax reforms.

The general motivation on the part of the President was, in my judgment, sound. Many of us on both sides of the political fense have for years been increasingly concerned about the morass of tax regulations, and about levels of taxation that quite unnecessarily restrict the kinds of investment which could "get the country moving again."

But the Kennedy tax program, as it came out in specific form, has developed into a brilliant bungle.

I detected an uneasiness in Congress some weeks ago when I was in Washington to participate in a program of the Advertising Federation of America. At that time I talked to a good many Members of both Senate and House. I have never—in my experience in and out of Washington over the years—have never seen legislators so spooked.

One Member of the House said: "We're not sure whether to turn one way or the other, so we're standing still. * * * We're not sure the President knows which way to go. We'll have to wait and see."

A very knowledgeable Democratic Senator told me privately, "If Kennedy doesn't watch out, this tax reform program will make him a one-term President."

This tax business slowly started to come to a boil with the crackdown on expense accounts. It is now pretty much of an academic question whether the new rules on deductions were good or bad. They have been substantially revised. In any event, they shook up a lot of people and left the idea with millions of taxpayers that they were going to have to become bookkeepers.

The zealous pursuit of the expense account crackdown overlooked the fact that—for better or worse—a substantial part of the Nation's economy is geared to the expense account. What really is surprising is that this fact should be overlooked in Washington, of all cities, where so much business involves persons coming in on missions of all sorts from outside the city and where prices obviously reflect that fact. But if the administration couldn't see it, restaurant operators, hotel and nightclub operators, and other businessmen could. They warned that the new rules—some of them reasonable but others onerous and petty—would cut sharply into their business, and that this would not only affect the business owners but thousands and thousands of others who worked for them—such as waiters and bartenders—and many others who did business with them. In this complex and interlocked economy of ours one small misstep can sometimes have large repercussions. What affects great commercial centers like the New York City area, for example, cannot help but be felt, ultimately, on the cattle ranches and in the lumber camps of the West and in a good many other corners of the Nation.

The passage of the bill authorizing expense account rules change is a good example of one of the glaring and dangerous weaknesses of our democratic system.

And that is the practice and habit of the Congress of voting for bills that Members do not understand and often have not read.

I will cite an example:

In the spring of 1948, I received a call from Barney Paul, regional director for the Rocky Mountain Empire for the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Paul said: "I need help. There are two paragraphs in the new 1040A form which I do not understand nor do any of our people."

I said, "Don't ask me, brother. I don't understand any of the paragraphs."

"No," said Barney, "I mean top help—like in Washington."

"Fine," I said, "come on over and I'll try."

While Mr. Paul was on his way to my office I got Mr. E. Ray Campbell, president of the Denver Post, a top tax lawyer himself, and I also asked the best tax man in the State government to come to my office.

Mr. Paul arrived; read the two paragraphs. No one present understood what the words meant. So, I called the late, great Senator Eugene Millikin, the Senate's great authority on corporate and tax matters and a coauthor of the bill.

The Senator, believe it or not, could not interpret the offending paragraphs.

When I took the great man to task, he said: "Well, of course, you know the staff men write these bills."

I said: "Yes, and you big domes never read the bills they write. Now, if you, the author of the bill do not understand it, what do you expect us country boys to do?"

The Senator didn't have the answer to that one but the bill was later clarified and amended.

It is all but unbelievable that Government, both legislative and administrative, could not have foreseen what the expense account law would do. Well, it has done it. It has not only increased unemployment, but it has put restaurants and night clubs out of business. But most important of all, it has emphasized a healthy dislike, disregard and disrespect for all taxes.

In other words, the expense account fiasco has laid the base for a very real tax revolution. No, it won't be an armed one like Shay's Whisky Rebellion, but an even more dangerous revolt, creating a climate of frustration and disrespect for law comparable to the prohibition era.

The full effect of the current expense account crackdown had yet to be felt when the Internal Revenue Service, by changing its proposals, gave some indication of a new awareness of the irritation of hundreds of thousands of businessmen, salesmen, or commercial people.

Much more could be said on this subject alone, but for now my concern is for the role of these developments in the picture of confidence in the Kennedy administration. The timing could hardly have been worse. For a sense of its adverse potential was just beginning to take hold when along came the administration's new tax package.

Prior to the time the President submitted his proposals, support had been building up slowly but substantially for the idea of a tax cut that would provide a long-term incentive to investment and business growth and consumer purchasing.

I asked many businessmen at that point, would they increase economic activity of their firms if tax rate reductions were made. Almost to a man they said yes, they would.

But the President's actual proposals automatically put everything in a new light.

Instead of proposing a clear-cut reduction in rates, as we had been led to expect, the President tied a 3-year proposal for reductions with a mixed bag of complicated "reforms"—some of which by their very nature were deterrents to business activity.

To take one of the most obvious, the tax reductions to corporate business were put off for at least 2 years through a plan of speeded-up collections that actually would increase business taxes. The reforms also would penalize homeowners paying mortgage interest and those receiving interest income—as well as many others. It was such a mixed bag of tricks, that taxpayers' first concern was how they would be hurt.

Moreover, the President said—at least at first—that the reforms were essential to the tax cuts and that he expected them to be enacted together. It was a bad move politically, because each change in the structure of deductions affected some segment of the public and each segment would have to have its say before anything could be done by Congress.

When the tax and reform package stalled, as it was bound to, the President began talking about the danger of recessions if it didn't pass. He also talked of the need for a planned deficit to avoid the recession he predicted. All this added to the public confusion and to an air of unreality that began to surround the issue. Once again, I began to question businessmen friends. Would they still accelerate their business activity under the new plan as they understood it? Almost to a man they had by now changed their minds.

Our Washington informants told my staff that the President's decision to couple tax reduction and tax reform was primarily to satisfy Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee and Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon. The President himself, we were told, would have preferred a simple tax cut now and deferment of the reform issue for another year. If this was true, the President was—in my opinion—his own best counselor. It tended to confirm my earlier impression of him.

These reports seemed to be confirmed when, in a question period after a speech to the American Bankers' Association, the President said he would be willing to drop the reform proposals if necessary to get the tax cut through Congress. But before the ink was dry on news reports of that statement, denials and disclaimers came out of Washington. One said an administration source reported the President had made a slip and that he was "just sick about what he did."

In any event, this tax impasse has had in my judgment, a profound effect in slowing the whole drive of the administration.

Another impediment came in the third crisis—that of managed news.

This third issue, while not so fundamental as the other two, pervades all recent thinking and discussion of Cuba and other immediate problems. It does so to such an extent that the people and thus the Congress, appear to doubt truth of many Pentagon and even White House statements.

News management, two words, a simple phrase, has ballooned to notoriety, taking rank with the deep freezes of the Truman administration and the vicuna coats that were worn to plague Eisenhower.

The term in general is taken to mean attempts by those who make news—the leaders of the Government and their assistants—to get out to the public, via the press, only that information that makes these officials of the administration look good and to suppress what they don't want the public to know.

There is nothing new about the desire of government to manage the news. Administrations have always tried it, and with varying success.

But no American administration before has announced that it tries to mislead the public as a matter of high policy.

However this decision originated—if it really was ever made consciously—it was articulated by an official with a kind of genius for making the worst of a situation. That man is a former newspaperman and presently an Assistant Secretary of Defense, Arthur Sylvester, who explained—or may have even originated the notion in his own mind—that this administration regarded news as a "weapon" to be manipulated or managed in such ways as it saw fit. And that the Government has what he called a "right to lie."

Thus when the public found administration officials telling them something other than the truth, and then heard that this was a matter of policy, is it any wonder that their faith in the leadership was shaken?

Perhaps the President disagrees with the managed news thesis. I don't know. But he would do well, for the sake of restoring public confidence, to renounce any intention to managed news—forever, amen.

There ought to be a simple, clear-cut rule about Government handling of news. I would put it this way:

(1) News of aid and comfort to the enemy will not be given while it is in that category.

(2) The public is entitled to have all other news and it will be given out quickly and to all news media impartially.

The propagation and fulfillment of such a rule by the President could go a long way toward clearing the air. And if Mr. Sylvester or some other Government public relations agent should not wish to go along, that official should be removed.

How foolish some of the incidents in this managed news crisis have been are illustrated by the following examples:

Example: How can anyone justify refusal of Secret Service men to allow an Associated Press photographer to take Bobby Kennedy's picture on his recent 50-mile hike when the Secret Service had a Life photographer as a passenger in its jeep?

Example: How can anyone justify withholding the news of the death of the four American fliers in the Bay of Pigs invasion for 2 years?

Example: How can anyone justify one of our top military men in the Pacific telling a reporter who asked incisive questions about the Vietnamese war to "get on the team."

Example: How can anyone justify attempts at military bases in Florida to keep from reporters information that is freely available to tourists?

Whatever the merits of the argument on "managed news," it came upon the New Frontier at an unhappy moment.

Given the Cuban crisis, and the tax muddle, the indication that the Government was not being entirely candid was most unfortunate, because again it attacked the credibility of the administration.

And that leads us to the fourth great crisis—in a sense the sum of all the others—the very real crisis of confidence in the administration.

There is no doubt that Mr. Kennedy is a tremendously popular President.

But this attractive man in the White House faces his greatest crisis, a greater crisis than those promoted by Nikita Khrushchev or Fidel Castro. It is "a crisis of confidence."

As I pointed out, the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, is a marvelous barometer. The most astute Representatives develop a sense of knowing which way the wind is blowing long before most people even begin to see the clouds. And their lack of response is now being supported by other indicators.

There is a trend in the Gallup poll of a significant drop in the Kennedy popularity of 10 percent—just since January.

The figures still leave Mr. Kennedy at a very high 66 percent popularity. But it is the trend, not the latest figure, that is most important. A good navigator, mind you, is just as much interested in where he is going as in where he happens to be at the moment.

I might interject that the Gallup figures also show corresponding falloffs in confidence in the administration's foreign and domestic programs, and growing concern about the threat to peace of the Cuban situation.

I don't pretend to be alone in this appraisal of the situation. Recently James Reston, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, wrote that "a strange kind of malaise now pervades Washington."

"Not only at the top of the administration," said Reston, "but down through Congress as well, there is a feeling that something is seriously wrong, that men are

trapped in institutions, that the habits of the past are dominating the present and future, that power is balancing power to the point of paralysis and that events are controlling men rather than the other way around."

I do not know whether it is too late for the problems I've talked about to be cleared up or the trend I mentioned to be reversed. But the effort would be well worth it.

And not, let me stress again, because of the concern on my part for the political future of any public figure.

I have laid this problem before you—and at the same time I have been laying it before the President—because the survival of the United States could well be affected by confidence or lack of confidence in the Presidency.

But the important thing will be whether the Nation recaptures a sense of motion, a dynamic that seems to have slipped away. The crisis of confidence, compounded of Cuba, of taxes, of "managed news," and of a general dead-center psychology simply must be overcome, as a matter not of politics but of sheer survival.

Law To Prevent Racial Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H.R. 7329) that I regard as an effective instrument with which to put an end to the racial troubles now shaking the entire Nation. This proposed legislation would bar any person, irrespective of his race, creed, or color, from crossing a State line for the purpose of demonstrating in violation of law or otherwise fomenting lawlessness or inciting to riot.

I have been greatly encouraged by the fact that the response which has come to me with respect to this bill is highly favorable. Letters of endorsement have been received from all parts of the Nation. Of the many messages sent me, only one has expressed disapproval.

My bill has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, and I have respectfully requested the chairman of that committee to refer it to a subcommitee for study. So far no such action has been taken.

The country vitally needs this legislation and the public generally approves of it. I hope that my bill may be favorably considered in the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and that it may be acted upon favorably at this session of Congress.

Although the President of the United States and his Attorney General brother may now be concerned over the current outbursts of law defiance and disorder in many places throughout the North and South, it seems to me that they display a strange blindness as to the essential causes of these riots and acts of law violation.

When I consider the disgraceful concerted defiance of law which has occurred in communities such as Danville, Va., in my own congressional district, it is perfectly obvious that the participants are responding to incitation from outsiders, people who are not Virginians, who do not know Virginia or her people, and who do not have the welfare of Virginians, black or white, at heart.

For various motives, these persons and organizations from afar have been stirring up the people to fever pitch and are working incalculable mischief. This situation is being reenacted in many places. In virtually every case the disobedience to law has been shown to have been methodically inculcated into what were ordinarily peaceful and peace-loving people. If we are to avoid a major tragedy on a national scale, these uprisings and organized floutings of law must stop.

The way to stop them is to prohibit outsiders from invading States where they have no business except to stir up disorder, or from conspiring to do so. The law I have in mind would have equal application to everyone. It would apply to the Ku Klux Klan and any kindred organizations; it would apply to the NAACP, or to CORE, or to the Communist Party. In short, it would apply to all persons who travel in interstate commerce for this sinister purpose. My bill is clearly within the purview and intent of the Constitution, and is something that is needed for the protection of the great bulk of our population, the law-abiding public that bears the responsibility of our industry, our government, and our religion.

There is nothing strange or novel about my bill when viewed against the background of existing law. Since 1910, when Congress adopted the Mann Act—18 United States Code 2421—this legislative body has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence and to aid the States in law enforcement.

The Mann Act was aimed at the suppression of the white slave traffic. It prohibited the transportation of female persons across State lines for immoral purposes. Later, in 1919, Congress made it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce—18 United States Code 2312—and this was later expanded to cover other kinds of stolen goods—18 United States Code 2314.

In 1934, Congress enacted the Fugitive Felon Act, prohibiting interstate travel to avoid prosecution for crime, and this enactment was expanded in 1960 and 1961—18 United States Code 1073, 1074. Clearly, if it is sensible to penalize interstate flight to avoid prosecution, it makes even better sense to prohibit interstate travel which is undertaken with the intent of violating the law. Such an enactment has the effect of deterring wrongdoing at its very inception.

Congress has seen the wisdom of this approach. In 1961 it enacted a law prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with the intent to carry on, or commit, any crime of violence to further any of a number of specified activities—18 United States Code 1952.

My bill merely carries this approach to its logical conclusion by penalizing travel across State lines with the intent to riot or violate State law.

The legislation I propose would have prevented some of the riots and community outbursts which have bothered the Nation at times for generations. Even the famous Hatfield-McCoy feud of the last century, with all its sadness and family suffering, might never have happened if such a law had been in existence.

Without exception, I feel that States are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influence which snub our laws and ignore our comunity mores, resulting in the chaos prevalent among us today.

It is a sad day in America if our local and State officials are deprived of exercising their police power. This power historically rests with the localities and with the States.

I believe the law I propose is one that the right-thinking people of this Nation deserve. It will protect the sound, taxpaying, law-abiding element from the lawlessness and threat of riot and violence brought in by outside agitators.

The language of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Congress finds that the recent and increasing practice of certain persons and organizations, with diverse ulterior motives, to enter States, territories, Commonwealths, or possessions of the United States, of which they are not residents, for the purpose of fomenting disobedience to their laws has led and leads to violent disorders gravely disrupting the peace and threatening the welfare of the entire Nation.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to promote the general welfare and assure peace and order by prohibiting in interstate commerce, or from conspiring to do so, where the purpose of such travel is to incite to riot or to engage in the violation of any law.

SEC. 2 (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 53 the following new chapter:

"Chapter 54.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Travel in for Unlawful Purposes.

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent (1) to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or (2) to violate any law of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed in anywise to limit the exercise of jurisdiction by any such State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession over any crime or offense committed therein or cognizable under the laws thereof."

Without Braceros, Tomato Growers Will Slash Acreage in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on July 6 the California Farmer, California's leading farm publication published an article by Don Razee entitled, "Without Braceros, Tomato Growers Will Slash Acreage in 1964."

I respectfully request each of my colleagues to read this article because it presents a graphic picture of the adverse chain reaction on California's economy which has been set in motion by the recent decision not to extend Public Law 78.

The article follows:

WITHOUT BRACEROS, TOMATO GROWERS WILL SLASH ACREAGE IN 1964

(By Don Razee)

What will happen in individual crops now that the bracero is gone? To get some answers we met with the leaders of the tomato industry in California. Robert Holt, secretary-manager of the California Tomato Growers Association, called together some of the top tomato growers in the State, and we've checked with representatives of the packers and with truckers. Here's how the leaders see the tomato picture in the immediate future.

The industry is in general agreement that the State will see a tremendous drop in tomato acreage in 1964 as farmers discontinue planting at least for a year to see what happens. Best guess is 30,000 or perhaps 35,000 acres down from 177,200 last year and an anticipated 110,000 acres this year. Holt, the growers, and the canners all figure acreage will gradually climb back to about the prewar level of 50,000 to 70,000 acres over the next 3 to 5 years. All agree the State will never again reach the 100,000 to 175,000 acres planted when there was a guaranteed supplemental labor force in the form of the bracero. These opinions, of course, are based on the assumption that no new supplemental labor force will be made available through the further extension of Public Law 78 or some other law.

What will a cut of two-thirds in tomato acreage mean to the economy of California? Last year's raw products value was $88 million—cut this by two-thirds and growers will get a tomato paycheck in 1964 of only $30 million. But this is just a start and is actually only a small part of the loss California will suffer.

We asked Alan Jensen, formerly with Tomato Growers Association and now with California Canners and Growers, what this loss in acreage would do to the canning industry.

Jensen preferred to talk most about his own operation where we could use actual figures, but this gives a graphic picture of the situation. In 1961 Cal-Can processed 240,000 tons of tomatoes in their five processing plants. Truckers received an average of $4.33 per ton for hauling the raw product to the processing plants. This amounts to $1,039,200 in trucking fees alone paid by only one of our State's processors. The teamsters will lose all but a third of this income. This does not take into consideration the loss in trucking income for hauling one-third as many cases from the cannery to the supermarket.

Cal-Can operates five plants. They figure the loss of two-thirds of the tomato crop will force a shutdown of at least two of the plants and perhaps three during the normal tomato processing run. It is almost impossible to get at a loss-of-income figure due to these shutdowns, but it is sizable, depriving over 400 people of the opportunity to pick up some seasonal earnings. We have no idea how many canners will close plants or operate at reduced capacity due to a two-thirds loss in acreage.

Holt comes up with these estimates of costs based on the 1962 tomato pack. In 1962, California growers produced 3,218,000 tons which returned $88,817,000 to the growers. This represents about 60 percent of the national total. In figure 1 no attempt has been made to include figures for tomato soup, pork and beans, and several other items which use tomatoes. Also the value of other ingredients such as salt, sugar and spices is not calculated.

Item:	*Value 1962 tomato pack (estimated)*
Cost of tin cans	$70,359,076
Cost of glass bottles and containers	11,090,560
Cost of caps for bottles and containers	1,867,556
Cost of cartons	12,616,204
Cost of labels	6,274,532
Trucking raw product to plants at $4 per ton average	12,872,000
Shipping finished goods, 51,918,160 cases average 45 pounds per case	32,744,142
Daily cannery payroll, 3 7-hour shifts, 50,000 workers in tomatoes average 45 days per year per day	1,001,601

It is difficult to calculate the vast sums of money this crop generates at the retail trade level, which will add to the staggering losses already mentioned.

As a rule of thumb if you multiply the amount received by the growers of any given commodity by 4 the result will establish the economic value of the crop within the agri-business complex. If the raw product value is multiplied by 7 the result will be the economic impact on the entire State or community.

Using these figures $88,817,000 times 4 equals $355,268,000 which is the impact on the agri-business complex; $88,817,000 times 7 equals $621,719,000 which represents the impact of canning tomatoes on the economy of California. This is a sizable portion of the total economy of the State, and the action of the Congress of the United States in blocking the bracero program will cut these figures by two-thirds next year.

To get these figures in a little more understandable light, lets reduce the above figures to terms relative to Monterey County. The actual return to the cannery tomato grower in the county last year was $4,382,162. Average tomato acreage in the county was 50 acres so this represented a gross return per grower of $12,500. Over 90 percent of the growers in the county grow less than 50 acres.

What will the death of Public Law 78 mean to Monterey County? It will first force the small grower out of business as his unit income per acre will not be sufficient to maintain him on the farm. In addition it will deprive Monterey County of approximately $30 million in wholesale and retail trade. Much has been said about the death of cannery row in Monterey. Is the same situation about to spread beyond the fishing industry? This county produces 5.8 percent of the total harvested tonnage of canning tomatoes in California.

In checking with growers to get on-the-spot reactions, they fall into three general groups. Some growers are fighting mad, and figure they've been had. Another group says fine, now the consuming public will find out our true needs, and we will get our supplemental labor force back after doing without for a year and there will be no more union yelling that the bracero is taking jobs away from domestics. And the third group says someone will take care of us.

How many braceros do we use in tomatoes? In excess of 42,000 during the peak week last year but counting those coming and going, another 4,000 to 5,000 would have to be added.

George B. Lagorio has planted 300 to 500 acres of tomatoes in San Joaquin County through the years. Next year he will cut back to 80 or 100 acres, assuming he can find someone who will custom harvest his tomatoes mechanically. His customary tomato acreage will be planted to alfalfa, barley, milo, and perhaps a few beans.

"What happens to the price of alfalfa if the bulk of the withdrawn tomato acreage goes into hay?" Lagorio asks.

Keith Reeve of Tracy, San Joaquin County, has averaged 150 acres of tomatoes over the past 10 years. He does not plan to plant any next year. Here we have the past president of the California Canning Tomato Association getting out of the tomato business. We wanted to know why.

Very simple, Reeve points out. Bankers will force most growers out of business. "The Extension Service says the average grower has $225 per acre invested in tomatoes by the time they are ready for harvest. What will a banker say to a grower asking for money to finance a crop when there is no guarantee it will be harvested?"

To check this statement further we called the Bank of America and asked what their attitude would be toward a tomato grower wanting financing. We were told a well diversified grower might get financing for a limited acreage, but the contract grower who picks up 75 to 100 acres just to grow tomatoes will get a cool reception from most bankers unless he can guarantee harvest.

There are some interesting items in a report from Stamford Research Institute. They come up with 157.1 man-hours of labor per acre of tomatoes. Using their figures as the amount of time required to do each job on a per acre basis, some interesting items can be developed. Picking out only the items where braceros are used, the labor requirement per acre looks about like this:

Thinning, 12.5 hours per acre; hoeing (twice), 5.8 hours; preparing the ground for harvest, 1.1 hours; miscellaneous labor, 3 hours; picking, 90 hours; loading, 13.3 hours, and inspection, 14.9 hours. This amounts to 140.6 hours per acre out of a total of 157.1 where the bracero has carried the bulk of the load.

This study agrees closely with the study by the University of California on the seasonal labor requirements in California agriculture. This report figures it takes 167 man-hours per acre—14 hours of regular labor and 153 hours of temporary help.

In checking this thing out the strangest things keep cropping up. A milk dealer in Stockton through the years has supplied 600 gallons of milk each day to the school lunch program. During the summer he sold 600 gallons of milk per day to the labor camps. The law provides that each bracero had to have a daily supply of milk. Anyone for 600 gallons of milk per day to keep the milk dealer in business through the summer?

A leading Woodland department store says that for 4 months of every year 70 percent of their volume was sold to the bracero. It is estimated that the average bracero spends about half of his earnings in this country and takes the remainder home.

Last year California paid $41,275,707 to 137,000 braceros, half of which was spent in local stores.

The industry sees no hope of filling the gap in tomatoes from domestic ranks even if competition for workers drives wages up to the average factory wage. Work in the tomato fields is among the toughest jobs

anywhere and the average domestic does not want to do it at any price.

But more important is the fact that hoeing and thinning of tomatoes comes at the same time cherries and apricots are being picked. With farmers competing for the few available domestics, the tomato grower will lose out because the domestics would rather work the trees.

In the fall, tomatoes will lose workers to grapes, peaches and nut crops. With so many more jobs available than there will be workers to fill the positions, growers expect domestics will be traveling from one job to another looking for the best deal.

It has been suggested this labor shortage can and should be solved by bringing into California family units from other sections of the country where there is heavy unemployment. This will require more schools, more law enforcement and more housing. And even assuming that agriculture could keep these families busy for the 4 months from thinning to harvest where do they go for the other 8 months out of the year?

Bringing in domestics has been less than a roaring success where it has been tried anyway. The Sacramento Referral Service was successful in recruiting 1,798 domestic workers between April 23 and July 21, 1962. Of these, 138 failed to report to work. Only 1 worker was still on the job after 1 month's time, 933 having left before completing 3 days' work; another 561 left prior to 7 days; 134 additional men left before completing 14 days and another 31 left before the month was up. Had these workers been recruited from other sections of the country they would be competing for jobs in the general labor market as soon as they left the farm.

How do you figure what the tomato acreage will be next year? To be sure, the best you can get is an educated guess. But no one we could find would predict more than 35,000 acres. They figure the tomato industry can attract and hold no more than 5,000 domestics as an average through the thining to picking season. These domestics can handle 10,000 acres. Assuming we can get 100 mechanical harvesters in the field by August 1964, these machines could handle another 10,000 acres. The other 10,000 to 15,000 acres will be planted on speculation, with the hope of harvesting some way.

The industry expects a shift away from tomato growing areas such as Woodland to areas closer to metropolitan areas such as Sacramento, Stockton, and San Jose. In these areas close to a metropolitan labor supply, look for an increase in small acreages. Here a man may gamble on 10 to 20 acres, he, his wife, their children, and perhaps a few friends can get harvested to take advantage of what is sure to be an increased tomato price next year.

Any questions as to why the bracero was important to the State of California?

Representative W. E. Brock

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG].

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal satisfaction that I am about to congratulate my colleague, BILL BROCK, on the honor that has come to him as a recipient of the Young Republican Man of the Year award bestowed upon him by the gathering of the Young Republicans at their national convention in San Francisco.

I want to add my best wishes to those of my colleagues that BILL will have a long and successful service and I know it will be also a fruitful service as a Member of this House. He has already made it clear to us that he is indeed a young man who commands the respect of all of us, and that means all of us on both sides of the aisle.

Which Party Is Unpatriotic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond, Va., News Leader:

WHICH PARTY IS UNPATRIOTIC?

If Americanism is a political party, then the Hatch Act must be repealed. For the Hatch Act forbids political activity by Government employees; and the Civil Service Commission has apparently decided to brandish the Hatch Act against anti-Communists. The firing of Festus J. Brown, a customs inspector at the Port of New Orleans, is a case on the record.

Mr. Brown served his country for 19½ years in the Navy and in the Customs Service. He so loved his country that he became infected with what seems to be an evil virus, nowadays—patriotism. He believed that communism is in total opposition to the things he loved in America. He worked hard on the Louisiana State Americanism Committee of the American Legion, making hundreds of pro-American speeches and showing anti-Communist movies which he bought out of his own pocket. The trouble first came when he organized protest pickets to greet the arrival of 19 Yugoslavian Communists flying into the port. The U.S. Department of Commerce made an official protest to his superiors in Washington; but he was able to avoid a reprimand by proving that he had violated no civil service rule.

Brown continued his patriotic activities. He noticed that city officials were flying the U.N. flag above the American flag and persuaded them to stop. He discovered that jeeps and weapons were being shipped to Castro labelled as agricultural equipment. He disclosed that Communist agents had been invited under the guise of railroad experts, and the uproar forced the cancellation of the invitation. Then, at a conference of American Legion officials, he distributed a confidential memo detailing the past record of a national political figure, who at that time, was not even running for office.

Later on, Brown's confidential memo was picked up and reproduced by a partisan political organization, omitting his name. Although Brown was not involved in the political campaign, he was instantly dismissed. Last October, a U.S. Civil Service hearing examiner ruled that hearsay evidence would be accepted against Brown. The final summary approving his dismissal, concluded that "the principal factor * * * is the active politically partisan role of other persons closely associated with him."

The Hatch Act was intended to protect civil service employees from party intimidation and party favors. But those close to the case say that Brown's only activities have been in the Americanist cause. In fact, he has been reelected post commander of the American Legion, and the American Legion State Convention voted him a special award for service in the fight against un-American activities.

Last winter, when Federal employees in Washington were pressured into buying Democratic fundraising dinner tickets, no one seemed interested in asking if this violated the Hatch Act. Similarly, when New York defense contractors were promised special attention if they came across with partisan advertising, no cry was raised of law violation. But when Festus Brown attacks communism, he is guilty of Hatch Act violations, because his action reflects on political figures.

The Hatch Act never was meant to be used against patriotism. If patriotism is political activity, then one embarrassing question remains. Which party is unpatriotic?

Expression of Gratitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid editorial regarding flood control which appeared in the Anthon Herald, Anthon, Iowa, in its issue of June 5, 1963. The editorial was written by Mrs. Violet Lundquist, editor and publisher. Mrs. Lundquist is a dynamic leader in civic affairs in her home community of Anthon. In her editorial she expresses the thanks and gratitude of the people of Anthon for flood control measures and projects which have been of immeasurable benefit to that area. I personally am proud and gratified that I had some part in bringing about the flood protection which Mrs. Lundquist mentions in her editorial:

EDITORIAL COMMENT

(By Violet Lundquist)

Flood control and preventive medicine have much in common. When either one is completely effective, nothing happens. Unfortunately, there is nothing dramatic about a community enjoying an entire summer without one case of polio for example. Even here in Anthon we tend to forget that a decade ago every family lived in terror throughout the summer due to this dread disease. The fortunate ones were those who were only afraid. Some families felt the full cruel force of the disease itself.

This past Saturday evening the rainfall in Anthon totaled 6¾ inches. Although water may have washed into a few basements, no flooding occurred in town.

What a similar downpour would have done to the town 10 years ago, prior to the watershed work, isn't hard to imagine. Muddy waters from the inadequate drainage ditch would have spilled over into the streets, into basements and possibly into buildings and houses. The ditch itself would have become so clogged with silt that another "cleanout" would have been imperative. Although the town was limited by law on the amount of money it could spend for this purpose.

For the benefit of more recent arrivals in Anthon I can report that it took much effort, time and money to convince all groups concerned that Federal funds should be expended on the Anthon watershed to hold the fast-running water back in the hills. It was a cause which some of us brought to officials on the district level, to the State, to the regional office in Milwauke, and even to our Nation's Capital.

We cited examples of the ruinous floods of 1951, we showed pictures of it, we described the adverse effect of such flash floods on the future of Anthon, we told of the wholehearted cooperation of the farmers within the Anthon watershed to do their part.

We were jubilant when we saw the effect of the first hard rain after the water-retaining structures had been constructed. The ditch did not run even half full. Nor was there any slit deposited in the bed of the ditch.

We were so pleased, so happy, so grateful that the Little Sioux river flood control program's efforts in Anthon had been so successful. We though we would always remember how terrible it had ben before the watershed was constructed.

Alas, we forget. We tend to take hard-won blessings for granted. More recent settlers here are not even aware of the constant flood threat which used to hang over Anthon.

Wouldn't it be worthwhile for each of us to take a brief look again at the structures west of Anthon which retard the runoff water from the hills so they can proceed into the drainage ditch in unhurried fashion?

Those water-retaining devices, plus the terraces on the upland acres, stand as sentinels keping watch over us, our homes and businesses down here in the valley.

Lawyers Could Contribute Real Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Daily American Republic of Poplar Bluff, Mo., recently published an editorial calling on the lawyers of the United States to bring to the attention of the American people the meaning of the U.S. Constitution. It called on the lawyers as constitutional experts to provide the people with information as to this greatest of all documents of government. I would agree with the editor that there is a void that needs to be filled. Responsible discussion and complete information would be most helpful to our Nation as we strive to strengthen our free society. Certainly the legal profession can make a unique contribution. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily American Republic, July 2, 1963]

LAWYERS COULD CONTRIBUTE REAL PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Bruce Biossat)

American lawyers still may not be facing their great responsibilities in this period of racial strife and constitutional test.

It is commendable, of course, that leaders of the bar have agreed to establish a committee to work for eased tensions.

But this could mean no more than that lawyers would offer their services as negotiators and pacifiers in difficult situations, just as my civic minded citizens might do.

What is needed from lawyers is something they can contribute uniquely: A brighter, clearer light on the broad range of constitutional controversies which have been stirred as the racial struggle has sharpened.

The lawyers could start at an elemental level, with profit to all of us.

For example, what are "civil rights"? To what extent are they Federal in character, whether or not spelled out in the U.S. Constitution?

Article IX of the Constitution's Bill of Rights says "the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

What does that mean? Lawyers ought to be able to tell us what the courts and the country's best legal minds think.

Then, what are States rights?

The other day, Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi, said, "a State that loses the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over its own affairs loses its political soul and its citizens have lost their most valuable freedom."

The key there, obviously, is knowing what is meant by a State's own affairs. If a Federal right conflicts with a State power, which takes precedence?

U.S. lawyers have been painfully reticent on this vital subject, though it is tightly bound up in the present racial turmoil.

Southerners dispute the validity of the powerful 14th amendment, whose "equal protection under the laws" clause is the foundation of so many recent Supreme Court decisions.

What do the courts, the lawyers, and the legal scholars say about the soundness of this amendment's status as law?

Who is sovereign, the Federal Government or the States? It may surprise many to know that the word is nowhere mentioned in the Constitution or any of its 23 amendments.

A line in the Constitution's main body says, "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Those words are seldom spoken these days. What do they mean?

The Constitution, invested with more immediacy in our lives than ever before, cannot be the plaything of the amateurs. Let's hear from the strangely silent experts.

Hon. Hjalmar C. Nygaard

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, my association with our distinguished departed colleague, the late gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD], was relatively brief, but the sense of loss is nonetheless great.

It was my privilege to serve with Mr. NYGAARD on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I held him in the highest esteem. He gave careful attention to each matter coming before the committee. He took his work seriously. He was earnest in advancing his views, but respected the views of his colleagues.

This courteous and friendly man represented his district conscientiously and well. His passing is a great loss to North Dakota, and to his many friends in this House.

My deep sympathy goes out to Mrs. Nygaard, their daughter and grandchildren.

Bible Reading and Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is the sincere opinion of great numbers of deeply religious people throughout our country that the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court prohibiting State-sponsored religious observances in public schools are a strong safeguard protecting religious freedom for all citizens. The following is an editorial from the May 1963 issue of Crusader, a monthly publication of the American Baptist Convention, Valley Forge, Pa. Mr. Paul C. Allen is the editor:

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Any day now the Supreme Court of the United States is due to announce its decision in the Bible reading and Lord's Prayer cases originating in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

In the Pennsylvania litigation, attorneys for the Abington Township School Board are endeavoring to reverse a Federal district court decision that the law requiring the reading of at least 10 verses from the Bible each day in public school classrooms is unconstitutional.

In the Maryland suit, attorneys for William J. Murray III and his mother, Mrs. Madalyn E. Murray, are attempting to prove that the State's Court of Appeals erred in a 4–3 decision upholding reading from the Bible and the use of the Lord's prayer in public school classrooms.

Pro and con oral arguments were heard on February 26 and 27. A decision is expected in May. We anticipate that the Court will rule against religious devotions in the cases presented. There are no advance "leaks" and we have no "inside" information. But we simply do not see how the justices can decide otherwise unless they are prepared to reverse such long-standing precedent in church-state matters.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Subsequent interpretation has decreed that this prohibition upon Congress applies to State legislatures as well.

The nub of the question, therefore, is this: Does the use of the Bible and the Lord's Prayer in public school classrooms constitute "an establishment of religion" and/or violate "free exercise thereof?"

Non-Christians see this preferment for the indicia of the Christian religion an establishment real or potential of one religion over another.

Speaking for a three-man court in the previous Pennsylvania decision, Circuit Judge Biggs declared that the Bible's "essential character" is "religious" and that the reading

of this book "can hardly do less than inculcate * * * religious doctrines in childish minds." He concluded that such reading "aids and prefers the Christian religion," and, in conjunction with school attendance factors, violates the free exercise clause.

Attorneys who have claimed that these practices are intended only to teach "morality" have been hard pressed to explain why, if this is so, children can be excused on request of parents.

In any case, if the Supreme Court rules against these practices, expect chaos primeval to leap from press and pulpit. Leading the assault will be—

1. Those who don't understand the decision. Without bothering to read the text of the pronouncement or to understand its precise meaning, many will assume that the Court has outlawed religion in all areas of public life. They will claim that the justices have legislated "secularism" and have deprived the Nation of its longstanding spiritual traditions. They will revile the Unitarians and atheists who instituted the legal actions, and attempt to find ways to curb the Supreme Court. There will be a rash of proposed constitutional amendments introduced in Congress, each attempting in one way or another to legalize classroom religious devotions.

How unfortunate.

How unfortunate, especially, if the proposed amendments to the Constitution make substantial headway. Any Baptist inclined to side with such movements would do well to consider the Pandora's box that would be opened up thereby. If such amendments were approved, then schools that inculcate religion (Bible reading, the Lord's Prayer) would continue to get public funds. On what grounds, then, could anyone deny public money to parochial schools which simply go a little further and make religion a little more evident?

2. Those who understand the decision only too well. This group would include the Roman Catholic hierarchy which would surely see its pitch for public funds for private schools almost certainly aborted. This is a decision for which it would likely never forgive the Supreme Court. It might well mark the beginning of a determined drive to downgrade the Court in our system of jurisprudence. It would surely put these prelates on the side of constitutional change.

If the Court decides as we think it will, are the traditional moral values of the American way of life in danger? Not really, for these belong principally to church and home. Few can honestly assert that the perfunctory reading of the Bible or the recitation of prayers—often led by those who have no respect for such things—accomplishes very much for the national character.

If the decision comes through as we think it will, examine it closely. It will likely be much more limited than newspaper headlines will make it appear. In any case, such matters as the use of chaplains in the Armed Forces or in Federal institutions will be unaffected. To refuse such ministries to men who have been sent overseas or segregated from society would in fact be "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion.

None appears to argue that the Bible should be excluded from the classroom when it is being used to study history or literature. It is the use of the Bible or prayer for religious devotion to which objection is made.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs wrote recently: "When one thinks of prayer as sincere outreach of a human soul to the Creator, 'required prayer' becomes an absurdity." To which we would add: When we contemplate the evils certain to follow the confusing of the separate functions of both government and religion, we are prepared to let our children devote themselves at home to the Bible and prayer and in school to history and math, with the hope that spiritually alert parents and wise teachers will join hands to provide total preparation for total life.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial also discusses the separation between church and state as provided in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. It is from the June 1963 issue of Missions, a monthly publication of the American Baptist Convention, Valley Forge, Pa. The editor is John C. Slemp:

BIBLE READING AND PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Before it adjourns, this month, the Supreme Court of the United States is expected to rule on the constitutionality of the use of Bible readings and the Lord's Prayer in the public schools in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

In Maryland, William J. Murray III, a student attending a public school in Baltimore, and his mother, are challenging the constitutionality of a ruling that requires a reading from the Bible and/or the use of the Lord's Prayer in the opening exercises of the schoolday, even though the ruling, as later amended, stipulates than any child shall be excused from attending the exercises upon written request of his parent or guardian. The Murrays contend that the regulation violates their freedom of religion and the principle of the separation of church and state.

In Pennsylvania, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Lewis Schempp, parents of three children attending the public schools in Abington Township, declare that the Federal Constitution is violated by a Pennsylvania law which requires that at least 10 verses of Scripture shall be read, without comment, at the opening of each day in the public schools.

In all probability, the Supreme Court will declare both these State laws unconstitutional—and rightly so, just as it did in the case of the regents' prayer in New York State (June 1962). All that the Court did in the New York case, and all that it most likely will do in the Maryland and Pennsylvania cases, is to say what the first amendment to the Constitution said long ago—that Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." As the 14th amendment made this provision applicable to the States, the Court ruled, in the New York case, that the board of regents had no constitutional right to prescribe an official prayer for the public-school children to read or recite at the beginning of the schoolday.

Now, that ruling, far from opposing religion, actually supports religion; it is not against religious liberty, but for it. Its intention is to prevent the state from interfering in religious affairs—to keep religion free from political regulation or control. It should go without saying that if a State has the right to prescribe a prayer acknowledging dependence on God, it has the same, identical right to prescribe a statement denying the existence of God. In short, the Court said that religion must be kept free—free from governmental control, free for people of all faiths or of no faith at all. It said, as the 1st and the 14th amendments has said, that in matters of religion, both the Federal and the State Governments must be neutral, must keep hands off.

There is, of course, a vast difference between required readings from the Bible as a religious service at the opening of the school day and using the Bible as a source or reference work in courses in history, literature, and social studies, which are a part of the regular school curriculum. Inasmuch as the scriptures of other faiths, such as Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism could be used in the same way, there would be no discrimination against any religious group, or against avowed nonbelievers.

The importance of a Supreme Court ruling on this intricate problem may be seen in the present confusion over it. Whereas 26 States require or permit Bible reading, and often the Lord's Prayer, 10 States forbid such activities. An Illinois law passed in 1910 is the exact opposite of one in Georgia passed in 1921. In the interest of upholding the Constitution, as well as keeping intact the wall of separation between church and state, we are in desperate need of uniformity on this national issue.

Until that happy state of affairs arrives, we Americans must not forget that we came by our religious freedom the hard way. Though the desire for freedom from England's established church brought many colonists to America, they soon found themselves in similar difficulties here. As late as 1776, at least 8 of the 13 colonies had government-established churches. Despite the crusade led by Roger Williams, William Penn, and others, it was not until after the Revolution that religious freedom for all, including minority groups and nonbelievers, made significant headway.

In time, however, the principle of the separation of church and state, with religious liberty as its corollary, captured the imagination of the Founding Fathers and was written into the basic documents of our national life. In "A Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man" (1778), James Madison wrote: "We maintain * * * that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society; and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance." And in the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty, drafted by Thomas Jefferson and enacted in 1786, were these words on the separation of church and state: "No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatever, nor shall * * * suffer on account of his religious opinions or beliefs, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities."

At last, in 1791, came the first amendment to the Constitution, written by Madison and adopted as a part of the Bill of Rights. "Congress," the amendment stated, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

So was erected what Jefferson, in a letter to the Danbury Baptists, called "a wall of separation between church and state," which has stood the test of time. Whether it will survive current efforts to breach it, remains to be seen. The choice is between religion dictated by conscience and religion regulated by law. So long as the wall stands, there will be religious freedom for all citizens. If the wall falls, or is breached, that freedom will vanish. The outcome is in the hands of the American people.

Hon. Hjalmar Nygaard

SPEECH

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, sorrowfully I join with my colleagues in noting the death of our distinguished colleague and friend, HJALMAR NYGAARD, of North Dakota.

HJALMAR was a quiet man, within the depths of that quiet calmness that

marked him outwardly, lay an abundance of understanding of the nature of this life and of his fellow men who so tenuously hold onto it. In those depths also lay a remarkable dedication to the only real things that, for all of us, make life worth living—love of God and country, and service to both; respect for one's neighbor and his right to differ from you; the true joy in useful work, particularly of the kind that would advance the principles in which a man like HJALMAR so deeply believed; the worth of a friendship, freely given and returned, and, of course, the priceless gift of love of home and family.

There are all too few men of this caliber willing to dedicate themselves to the service of their country; but, when they determine to do so, all of us are so much the better therefor, and so very much the lesser when we lose them.

It is in this fashion that I shall remember my friend, HJALMAR NYGAARD, and cherish that memory for the balance of my own appointed days, as I now extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family in this hour of their loss.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HAVERHILL, MASS.

Re passage of House Resolution 14, your bill on the Captive Nations Committee.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: May I congratulate and thank you for being the sponsor of the above bill advocating the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations Problems Behind the Iron Curtain.

I do hope that this bill will get out of the Rules Committee and on to the House floor for debate.

As an American of Armenian ancestry, I deem it important that your fine work is supported for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Very sincerely,

MELKON SKAININON.

HAVERHILL, MASS.

Re passage of House Resolution 14, Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.S.

Honorable FLOOD: As an Armenian-American, I wish to thank you for sponsoring the above bill which advocates a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

This bill must get out of the Rules Committee where it has been lanquishing since 1960, and onto the House floor for debate. It would be scandalous if the administration continued to ignore these nations of which Armenia is part. Therefore, please do your best to get this bill passed.

I shall write to the other Congressmen urging them to help in this matter. Again, thank you for your efforts.

Very truly yours,

BAGDASAS ANTARAMIAN.

HAVERHILL, MASS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has been brought to my attention of your stand for the formation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations bill—House Resolution 14—and to wish you great speed and success in this great endeavor.

Sincerely,

SRPOAHI OHANESIAN.

BRADFORD, MASS.

Re passage of House Resolution 14, Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for having been chosen recipient of the 1963 American Committee for the Independence of Armenia Freedom Awards, for being the sponsor of the above bill.

This bill has been bottled by Rules Committee and I wish you would see what can be done to get it out of there and get it onto the House floor for debate.

I am writing to Congressmen BATES and SMITH to see what they can do. Please do your best to get this bill pass and again I want to thank you for your efforts.

Very truly yours,

YEGUZAR ANTARAMIN.

PLAISTOW, N.H.

Re passage of House Resolution 14, your bill on the Captive Nations Committee.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations and best wishes to you for being the sponsor of the above-mentioned bill advocating the establishment of a specialist committee on Captive Nations problems behind the Iron Curtain.

As an American of Armenian ancestors I do hope that your fine work is supported by getting the bill out of the Rules Committee and onto the floor for debate—the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Very sincerely,

Miss SATINIG TAVITIAN.

Haymaker Air Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, recently I read that the Overseas Press Club in New York is planning to take its interested members on a charter flight to Europe and naturally, that flight is to be made on a foreign-flag carrier. I say "naturally" because we read almost everyday, it seems, of this group and that group leaving from the United States by foreign charter. And, as if this isn't enough, we also read where this beauty queen or that paperboy is receiving as first prize a free trip abroad, compliments of a generous foreign airline.

Not that I blame the clubs which avail themselves of the low foreign charter rates or the contest promoters for accepting such generous offers, but let us examine this phenomenon a little closer. Are these foreign-flag carriers faring so well and are they so prosperous that they can afford to consistently underbid our American carriers on charter flights and give away airline tickets as prizes at random? The facts indicate not. The British airline which obtained the Press Club charter reported a $40 million loss for its fiscal year ending March 31, 1962, and expects the same deficit this year. It and other foreign carriers who crowd out our American carriers with unreasonably low bids are government owned and subsidized carriers who operate continuously in the red.

What happens to our American carriers in this charter squeeze? If we want to compete as profitmaking, free enterprise operators we must offer realistic charter fares, and not ones so ridiculously low as to catch the eye of the consumer but also break the back of the company. Operating in the black apparently is not a prime concern of our foreign competitors.

Furthermore, this practice of rockbottom charter rates does not square with the attitude of some of these same foreign carriers toward regular tourist and first-class fares across the Atlantic. It raises questions which the American people are going to want answered before the transatlantic fares are established for next year's season.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Washington Daily News on July 2, entitled "Haymaker Air Competition" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAYMAKER AIR COMPETITION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The Overseas Press Club in New York is a capsule of what's happening in Europe's haymaker competition with our Nation's airlines.

My good fellow members worked up a London-Paris round-trip charter flight. Our two great, indispensable transatlantic carriers bid $36,000—actually close to cost. The French bid $31,500. The British took the business at $28,500.

Our carriers exemplify our free-enterprise system, even though operating as a public utility under Civil Aeronautics Board supervision. They fight hard against any idea they be subsidized like the foreign carriers. It's high time we gave them some credit for this. While it's been sink or swim for them, and they've been able to swim in both the national interest and their own, foreign carriers have piled up staggering losses.

The British airline that very naturally got the club's business reported a $40 million loss for its fiscal year ending March 31, 1962, and expects the same deficit this year, in spite of a 5-percent increase in passenger load—$80 million in 2 years.

About the only exception to equivalent blockbuster losses and foreign government red-ink support is Swissair, which is not only unsubsidized by the Swiss Government but runs its (splendid) large network operation at a profit.

So, what's happening to the American flag on the Atlantic Ocean? One single jet alone can transfer more passengers than the Queen Elizabeth. This is because it makes so many crossings while the giant liner is at sea or turning around. With our excellent planes we are carrying more people than ever as the total Lindberghs increase. But we're losing out drastically in our percentage of the business.

Foreign airlines now carry nearly 65 percent of the transatlantic air traffic. We carry about one-third. In short, the income from (and taxes for) about two out of three seats from this greatest airline market in the world goes abroad.

This is a complete reversal since 1950. Foreign companies then carried around 35 percent to our 65 percent. Their slice has doubled while ours has been cut in half, just about.

Now it's easy and very wrong to oversimplify a complex situation, and reciprocal questions involved. However, all this very importantly aggravates our Nation's unfavorable balance-of-payments problem and gold-outflow crisis.

Why and how much? Because about 60 percent of the passengers foreign lines carry are American citizens who pay for their tickets in dollars. In fact, one of the known reasons for the British $28,500 Overseas Press Club bid was that it was payable in American dollars.

Now, the point isn't to cut this all out or even to reduce it too much. But, in all fairness to the United Sates, isn't enough enough?

Yet our own Government representatives propose to further limit our flag carriers in competing with these European friends. CAB staff members now propose dividing principal European markets into zones, split between our two flag lines. Obviously, this would reduce the competition with each other. But inadvertently or not, it would also divert even more traffic to the foreign combines.

With this kind of bureaucratic thinking, our American transocean flag can one day end up flying around in the Great Lakes, and lucky to be able to stay there.

Attack on Outdoor Boomerangs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, subtle but unfair attacks on one or more media of advertising emanate sometimes from unexpected sources. It is good and proper, that as a part of the self policing of advertising, the right of fair and just criticism never be discouraged.

It is unfortunate, however, that an agency, engaged in the advertising business, should participate in a scheme whereby under the guise of advertising a product, perpetrates an unwarranted, unethical and unfair attack on an important medium of advertising.

Rover Motor Co. and its advertising agency, Freeman and Gossage, merit only the condemnation of the advertising profession for the advertisement of Rover Motor Co. in the New Yorker magazine of June 1, 1963, and subsequently in the San Francisco Chronicle, Harpers and the west coast edition of the Wall Street Journal.

I ask leave to reprint in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the July 1963 issue of the Outdoor Advertising News which treats of this subject in a well stated comprehensive manner.

The article follows:

[From Outdoor Advertising News, July 1963]

ATTACK ON OUTDOOR BOOMERANGS

The June 1 issue of New Yorker magazine carried an ad supposedly designed to help the advertiser, the Rover Motor Co. of North America, Ltd., decide whether or not they should use outdoor advertising in their overall advertising campaign. The same ad subsequently appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, Harper's and the west coast edition of the Wall Street Journal. Numerous statements in the ad made it obvious this was really an attack on the medium. The ad requested readers to indicate whether Rover should or should not use outdoor in their advertising or to indicate lack of interest in the subject. Investigation disclosed the ad was prepared by the Freeman & Gossage advertising agency of San Francisco. Our readers, of course, know Howard Gossage and his feelings about outdoor advertising which have been expressed publicly more than once. Official and private reaction to the ad was quick in coming. Reprinted here are a few of the editorial comments published and some of the letters sent to J. Bruce McWilliams, president of the Rover Motor Co. of North America, Ltd.

ADVERTISING FEDERATION OF AMERICA RESOLUTION

(The following resolution was adopted by the Advertising Federation of America at its 59th annual convention held at the Atlanta Biltmore Hotel, Atlanta, Ga., June 15–19.)

Whereas certain advertising of the Rover Motor Co. of North America, Limited, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, west coast edition (May 27), the San Francisco Chronicle (May 27), and the New Yorker magazine (June 1), was brought to the official notice of the Advertising Federation of America, assembled in its national convention in Atlanta, Ga., on June 19, 1963, and

Whereas such advertising bearing the headline "How Do You Feel About Billboards" is derogatory to this advertising medium: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

(1) That it is the sense of this convention that this advertising constitutes an unfair and unconscionable attack on a respected field of advertising media, and as such, is inimical to the best interests of the advertising profession.

(2) That the Advertising Federation of America deplores the manner in which the Rover advertisement seeks to sell its products through the disparagement of a recognized form of advertising communication, and an obvious attempt to prejudice the American public against this medium of advertising.

(3) That copies of this resolution be sent to all member organizations of AFA, to the Rover Motor Co. of North America, Ltd., and to its advertising agency.

(4) That member organizations of AFA be urged to write individually to the Rover Motor Car Co., voicing their censure of this method of advertising.

(The resolution was presented by Frank Baker, member AFA resolutions committee, partner, Grant, Schwenck & Baker Advertising Agency, Chicago.)

THE GALLAGHER REPORT (JUNE 17)

Outdoor advertisers riled about Rover Motor Car Co. ad in New Yorker, San Francisco Chronicle, Harper's, west coast Wall Street Journal; attacks outdoor medium. Copy states: "We don't mind saying that we personally loathe billboards." San Francisco's Freeman & Gossage wrote ad. Serious mistake. (1) Doesn't sell Rover cars. (2) Negative promotion always bad. (3) Allowed Howard Gossage to use client to push personal campaign against "billboards." Advertiser should back out of this one fast.

ADVERTISING AGE EDITORIAL (JUNE 17)

We bow to no one—well, practically no one—in our regard for Howard Gossage's creative ability and the general excellence of the New Yorker and its concern for taste as well as probity in its advertising columns. But we think Mr. Gossage deserves no merit points for his Rover Motor Co. ad attacking outdoor advertising, nor do the New Yorker and other publications on the list deserve any red ribbons for publishing it. And while we're at it, we might as well include the Rover people, for having approved it.

Mr. Gossage, a thoughtful, creative man of undoubted talents, has a "thing" about outdoor advertising, and it is apparently contagious. We do not know whether he picked up this "thing" from his former partner, Mr. Weiner, or vice versa. But both have a full-fledged aversion to this particular type of advertising.

This, or any other aversion, is of course all theirs to enjoy and indulge on their own time, and in the privacy of their respective boudoirs, or even in the white light of publicity as they mount their soapboxes. We think they are wrong, but they have a right, as citizens, to express their opinions.

It is a little doubtful, however, whether they have a right to put an innocent advertiser (and we must assume Rover, being a relative newcomer to American advertising, is innocent) into the middle of a fight or even a discussion of a problem which has nothing whatever to do with the purchase of a Rover, which is, after all, an automobile and not a commentary on the American way of life.

It is also doubtful if Mr. Gossage should be allowed to foist his hatred of outdoor advertising on the public under someone else's name and at someone else's expense, and under such conditions that he may just possibly wind up by waving the results of a strictly phony survey under the noses of some highbrow editors or congressional investigators—to prove that the public hates

billboards by an overwhelming margin, just as he does.

Mr. Gossage once invented pink air for a gasoline retailer. He cannot claim to have invented hot air, but in recent years he has used liberal quantities of this product on his favorite whipping poster.

CHARLES B. BURKHART, PRESIDENT, OUTDOOR ADVERTISING ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: When I first read your advertisement in the current issue of the New Yorker, I made up my mind that I would not dignify the proposition you offer with an answer from our association.

We represent over 700 companies throughout the United States. These companies are engaged in the business of furnishing outdoor advertising services in over 15,000 markets to some of America's outstanding and successful companies. Among the customers of our medium are the sales leaders in the automotive field, both domestic and imported.

We are continually engaged in working with our members to improve the medium of outdoor advertising and, based on the studies that we have made of the public's reaction, we have made considerable progress over the years.

Though I resolved not to write you, in retrospect, however, it occurred to me that you may have been caught in the crossfire between a representative of your advertising agency, who has long been an avowed enemy of our medium, and a desire to do something offbeat and different. If that is the case, then perhaps I might be able to contribute something constructive to your thinking about outdoor advertising. It isn't offbeat but it may be considerably different than you have been led to believe.

In the first place, your ad indicated very little interest in selling Rover motorcars; rather, it was a tired, old, and familiar attack on our industry which told me immediately that Howard Gossage must have had something to do with its preparation. I did not even need to investigate to find out who the advertising agency was, but I did it just the same, and sure enough, there he was. For some time Mr. Gossage has been carrying on a personal campaign against outdoor advertising. It is giving him a certain amount of personal publicity and a substantial amount of ill will in the advertising profession.

Not knowing how the Rover Motor Co. actually feels about outdoor advertising, I would not be in a position to state whether this ad is a true reflection of your feelings. However, it would be quite surprising if this position did reflect the thinking of an internationally minded company seeking the good will that is so essential if it is to obtain foreign markets. An outright attack such as this by a foreign company on such a thoroughly American institution as outdoor advertising could well cost the Rover Motor Co. a tremendous amount of good will in America.

For example, I know of one Rover owner who uses billboards extensively to advertise the products that he manufactures. The sale of those products provided him with a profit which he used to buy his Land Rover. I am sure he would take a dim view of your using paid advertising space in a national magazine to attack the principal medium of advertising he uses to sell his products. It would be my guess that among successful business people who would be prospects for your cars, this case could be duplicated many times over.

If you are really interested in knowing how people feel about billboards, perhaps the following facts may be helpful to you.

Fact No. 1: The automotive business is the biggest in America. Automotive and allied lines are the biggest users of outdoor advertising in the country. There is a close correlation between the amount of outdoor advertising used and the sales successes of the leading makes of automobiles, both foreign and domestic.

Fact No. 2: An opinion study was made in the summer of 1961 by a highly respected research group. During this survey 18 cities were visited and prominent educators, government officials, editors, leaders of special interest groups such as radio and television personnel, newspaper columnists, union leaders, and clergy were asked their attitude toward advertising in general. All media received a certain amount of criticism, but outdoor advertising received the least.

Fact No. 3: That criticism is confined to small special interest groups was brought out by a referendum put before the voters of Oregon in the fall election of 1960. This referendum asked whether there should be control of outdoor advertising in that State—the people rejected it by an almost 2 to 1 margin, and they were voting only on control and not prohibition.

Fact No. 4: A further study was made by Daniel Starch and staff, a well-known research organization, as to the public opinion on standardized outdoor advertising. The study was based on a probability sample of all U.S. urban markets of 2,500 population and over. Two questions were asked:

(1) In your opinion is outdoor advertising in good taste?

(2) In your opinion is outdoor advertising attractive and pleasant to see?

To the first question 84 percent responded with a "yes" answer. To the latter question, 79 percent gave a "yes" reply.

If you are really interested in how people feel about billboards, I would suggest to you that if you hire a reliable research firm to conduct your study in an objective manner, you would meet with a great deal more success than you will with your current highly subjective approach to the matter.

As I said in the beginning, we represent over 700 members of the outdoor advertising profession. It is part of our business to gather and disseminate facts about this industry. We would be more than happy to put ourselves and this association at your disposal to help you get the true facts.

CHARLES B. BURKHART.

Skagit Fever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the side of the aisle Members of this body sit, I am relatively sure the majority of us are amused and informed by "Potomac Fever," the product of Fletcher Knebel.

Not all newspapers carry this column. Therefore it is fortunate that Charles Dwelly—he would rather be called Chuck—is available to amuse and inform many persons in my section of Washington State. In fact, he has a wide reputation for his short, one and two sentence editorials he publishes in his Concrete (Wash.) Herald. This reputation spreads throughout the State and much of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, Concrete is situated on the north bank of the Skagit River, so to borrow a title for Chuck's editorials I refer to them collectively as Skagit Fever and leave those who read them to judge their merit. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include them in the RECORD:

Khrushchev was in a happy mood to open the latest test ban talks. Big joke, he's got us guessing again.

There's always a bit of solace in the fact that if all our gold is drained out of the country, we can use Fort Knox for our only other currency backing—rich taxpayers.

'Member way back when the only Negro riot we knew was a comedian named Rochester.

Vocational training may be the solution to unemployment, but the way it looks to us enough people know how to work and need to be taught when to.

The really contented man is the one who has his yesterdays all filed away, his today in order and his tomorrow subject to instant revision.

Anyone can be an expert. It just takes the nerve to charge enough that nobody will ask you to prove it.

Like the lad says, parents could never make it on their own—did you ever hear of any who didn't have children?

New dances will continue to trend toward gyration of some sort. Grace is old-hat and after the twist what is left for an encore?

Russian Pledges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that our Government is now negotiating a test ban treaty with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it seems to me appropriate that we review the letter written by that Government to the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the time our Government extended recognition to the Government of the U.S.S.R. because I doubt if any promise made in that letter has been kept.

I only wish we had some proof of the integrity of that Government.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, *November 16, 1933.*

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two Governments it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

(1) To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its territories or possessions.

(2) To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the terri-

torial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

(3) Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which makes claim to be the Government of, or makes attempt upon the territorial integrity of, the United States, its territories or possessions; not to form, subsidize, support or permit on its territory military organizations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against the United States, its territories or possessions, and to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organizations and groups.

(4) Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group, or of representatives or officials of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions.

I am, my dear Mr. President,

Very sincerely yours,

MAXIM LITVINOFF,

People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Despondent, Disillusioned Domestics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the migrant life is a cruel life for families and children. It can be cruel and disappointing for the worker and breadwinner also.

Some people, in an effort to defeat the bracero bill, are dreaming of many ways to develop a domestic migrant farm labor program. No idea yet has been advanced which is as efficient, practicable, or humanitarian as the Public Law 78 program.

Even though row crop agriculture can utilize labor of low or simple skills, not everyone can do the work.

A massive governmental recruiting program throughout the United States, in pockets of great unemployment and in big city slums, may produce some, but not enough, satisfactory fieldworkers. It will produce many times more disappointed, displaced, disgruntled people—who are entitled to more consideration.

Qualifications for row crop employees cannot be determined by interview alone. Actual tryout on ranches is required. To select inexperienced applicants from industrial areas and transport them to California and expect them to qualify for row crop vegetable work seems utterly fantastic to anyone in the farm labor recruitment service. Proponents of this idea either have no appreciation of the problem or no genuine concern for the individual worker.

It may sound good to the unemployed industrial worker for some politician to claim "I will get you a job out in California," but I would like to be present in California with that same politician when the worker does not qualify, does not want to work longer, wants to be home with his family, and is despondent and disguested, without a job, home, or security.

It is a serious matter to dislocate sincere, desperate workers who may be misled by political, governmental, recruiting propaganda into thinking they can perform work in which they have no experience.

Practically no consideration has been given to "tryouts of applicants" for row crop vegetable work. The cost of this would be enormous in and around big cities and in the heavy unemployment pockets. Then there would be the great costs of transportation from the East or South. All for 2, 3, or 5 months of low-skilled work. Then the trip back.

Growers in California have recruited as diligently as any govermental agency, State or Federal, will ever do short of conscription. The assiduous recruitment has produced first, a few qualified workers; second, many derelicts who had no intention of working after a free trip to California—who should have been prosecuted for defrauding the growers who paid their transportation, but who were so irresponsible they flouted most all laws and responsibility—and, third, many conscientious jobseekers who could not do the work and who became disillusioned, despondent, and destitute and a public charge in one or many ways. Some struggle back to their homes where they want to be and belong; many roam like nomads from one place to another seeking employment or relief wherever they can find either or both.

Do we really want the Federal Government to get into a program like this? The great cost may not deter us. But we will disillusion a lot of sincere work seekers and embarrass a lot of politicians. It may help the farm labor problem, at best, only slightly.

Can we not continue the bracero program, which is working effectively and satisfactorily, until some better, workable, recruitment plan for domestics has been devised?

GOP Governors Score on Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the Governors of our States have joined the crusade to restore the right of prayer in public schools.

I was delighted to learn that the Governors' conference in Miami Beach memorialized the Congress, as it did a year ago, to initiate a constitutional amendment to "permit free and voluntary participation in prayers in our public schools."

The adoption was by voice vote and no dissent was heard. The adoption came under a suspension of the rules and even the suspension motion was opposed by only one vote.

I am happy to inform the Governors that the vehicle by which Congress can accomplish this important function already is rolling. The discharge petition which is on the desk of the Clerk of the House will, if it is signed by a majority of the Members, bring to the floor my House Joint Resolution 9, which proposes such an amendment.

Let us heed, Mr. Speaker, the voice of our people all over the country as expressed in the vote of the Governors at their Miami Beach conference.

I insert as a part of my remarks an article from the New York Times of Thursday, July 25, 1963, which reports the action of the Governors' conference in detail.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1963]

GOP GOVERNORS SCORE ON RIGHTS—REPORT CRITICAL OF KENNEDY PUT IN CONFERENCE RECORD

MIAMI BEACH, July 24.—Republicans scored another propaganda victory on civil rights today in the Governors Conference.

Although outnumbered more than 2 to 1, Republicans forced into the record a minority committee report emphasizing the lack of antidiscrimination provisions in some legislation proposed by the Kennedy administration.

Partisan rivalry and maneuvering on civil rights continued almost to the final gavel of the conference, although it had appeared yesterday that the issue had been settled by a decision instructing the executive committee to give top priority to civil rights in the coming year.

The conference elected John Anderson Jr., Republican Governor of Kansas, chairman for the coming year. The chairmanship alternates annually between the two parties. The executive committee will have five Democrats to four Republicans. Control of that committee also alternates annually. (Cleveland was chosen for the meeting in 1964, starting June 7.)

PRAYER RULING OPPOSED

The conference again memorialized Congress, as it did a year ago, to initiate a constitutional amendment to "permit free and voluntary participation in prayers in our public schools."

To do this, the conference suspended the rules by a vote of 26 to 1. The dissenter was Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag, Democrat, of Minnesota.

The adoption of the prayer motion was by voice vote and no dissent was heard. Mr. Rolvaag said that he did not vote on adoption. However, he said that he had voted against suspending the rules because it was "an implied criticism of the (Supreme) Court decision" on prayer in public schools.

"I am satisfied with the Court decision and the Constitution as it is," he remarked.

Conquest Through Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a long period of time, I have noticed the

pattern of communistic revolutionary expansion—conquest through negotiations. This process has been strikingly illustrated as regards the piecemeal liquidation of U.S. sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal.

All students of modern geopolitics will find the following article by Constantine Brown in the May 25, 1963 issue of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of unusual interest, especially the paragraph on how negotiations are used as a means for resolving issues:

WHY DO WE OPERATE IN THE OPEN?—FRUSTRATION OF SYSTEM SUGGESTS TO CRITIC THE LACK OF ANY POSITIVE MASTER PLAN

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—"Why do you Americans tell everything you are doing and everything you are going to do?" my barber asked in a typical excited Italian voice while making appropriate forceful gestures. "You let everybody know all about Astronaut Cooper and if he had failed it would be like saying: 'Look, we made a terrible mistake.' "

He reads political news in the paper, too. "Look," he went on, "why do you argue whether you are going to plan a 30-day war or a 90-day one? You tell the Russians all about your war plans—even that you can't make up your minds which way to fight a war."

This Italian has a point. It comes to mind that the main trouble with the United States has been that over the past 15 years or so we do not seem to have had any other master plan except elusive peace.

At the end of World War II our goal was a peaceful world through the United Nations. Then the cold war set in and our goal was to defeat communism by peaceful means, such as foreign aid to strengthen our allies who had suffered badly from the war. At the same time we were willing to use force to prevent Communist aggression; we applied it in Korea and threatened to use it in Greece, Iran, Berlin and Turkey. In all these instances, we were successful without firing a shot except in Korea.

When our allies not only got on their feet but became stronger than ever economically and had the potential for being militarily strong, we decided that the best way to defeat communism was to free all the colonies as rapidly as possible and spend untold billions in aid of these underdeveloped countries.

When the Kennedy administration came to power in 1961 the whole concept of our world policy changed. We abandoned "containment of communism" and the threat of "massive retaliation" and adopted a policy of "accommodation." The State Department policy planning chairman, Walt Rostov, said our goal was not "victory over communism."

The Communists, on the other hand, have had only one goal over a hundred years and have never deviated from it since Karl Marx published his "Das Kapital." In other words, they know what they are aiming at—the "transition of capitalism to socialism" and world domination. And while they boldly tell the free world what their aim is, they are very cagey when it comes to hiding the means for arriving at it.

In some areas the United States and Russia are aiming at the same goals. We both are aiming at disarmament, for instance, but we want it for one reason and the Reds for another. We believe a disarmed world will mean peace—a live and let live policy between the free world and the Communist world.

The Communist magazine, World Marxist Review, explains what the Soviet aim is: "Disarmament primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly-developed countries. Disarmed, the imperialists would be powerless to prevent the people from attaining freedom. General disarmament does not mean disarming the peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence."

"Communists," the World Marxist Review said, "reject the idea of raising the edifice of socialism from the ashes of nuclear war * * * it goes without saying that negotiations should be the sole means of resolving issues."

And although Gen. A. Nevsky, in the World Marxist Review of March, picks apart both Washington's and the NATO military strategy (because it has been discussed widely in public, he does not give away any military plans of the Soviet bloc. Because the "ultra-reactionary circles" in the United States insist on making war plans, he said, the U.S.S.R. must "do everything to maintain the Soviet defenses at a level with the latest accomplishments in science and technology and to heighten the combat readiness of the Soviet armed forces * * *. The blind alley in which militarism finds itself is one more indication that it has outlived its time. * * * The Communists hold that the two systems can coexist, and that the question of which is the better system be decided not on the battlefield but through economic competition."

The Communists know better than anyone else that economics based on free labor will find it difficult to compete with economics based on slave labor.

Protecting Religion, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is most important that all Americans fully understand the major decisions handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court. This is particularly true when the decision concerns the Bill of Rights. A raging torrent of criticism is often directed at the Court because of misunderstanding. Much of the controversy over the Supreme Court's decision concerning Bible reading and prayer in public schools clearly shows misunderstanding of what the Court held.

The Daily Dunklin Democrat, of Kennett, Mo., recently published an editorial concerning this decision. The editorial adds immeasurably to an understanding of the decision. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kennett (Mo.) Daily Dunklin Democrat, July 12, 1963]

PROTECTING RELIGION, TOO

On the same day that the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed prayers and ceremonial reading of the Bible in public school programs, the Court handed down another decision on religion which should not be overlooked or neglected.

In the prayer decision, the Court broadened and strengthened that part of the first amendment of the Constitution forbidding a government establishment of religion. In the other decision—the one given much less public attention and virtually ignored throughout this State—the Court broadened and strengthened that part of the amendment which forbids government interference with the free exercise of religion.

The free exercise case involved a woman in South Carolina who was denied unemployment benefits by the State on the ground that she refused to accept suitable work when it was offered to her.

The rejected jobs required work on Saturday, a day regarded as the Sabbath by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, among others, and a day on which members of the church are prohibited from working. The woman in the case was a member of the Seventh-day church.

The Supreme Court found that the policy of the State forced the woman "to choose between following the precepts of her religion and forfeiting benefits, on the one hand, and abandoning one of the precepts of her religion to accept work, on the other hand."

"Government imposition of such a choice," the Court said, "puts the same kind of burden upon the free exercise of religion as would a fine imposed against appellant for her Saturday worship."

The burden on the free exercise of religion, the Court said, is not justified in this case by any "compelling State interest."

The Court shows no less zeal in this case in preventing government from burdening the exercise of religion than it does in the prayer case in preventing government from espousing religion through officially written prayers and Bible reading in the public schools.

Under the first amendment, the Court says, the government is obliged to protect religious rights without fostering a state religion; the free exercise of religion must be respected, even as the establishment of religion is to be avoided.

Considered together, as it was obviously intended that they should be, these decisions gave an impression of a Court much more understanding of, and even favorably disposed toward, America's religious tradition than some of its critics would credit it with being.

Road to Oblivion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the July 11 edition of the Palos Regional, serving the southwest suburban area of Cook County, Ill. The editorial is brief, and certainly to the point, and should provoke all of us into reflection on its thesis.

ROAD TO OBLIVION

General Eisenhower, like thoughtful Americans in all walks of life, fears that there has been a " * * * widespread deterioration in our moral strength" and that we "seem to be losing our capacity to bear our own responsibilities unflinchingly."

A "gimme" attitude appears to be infecting the moral climate. For instance, in the endless debate over taxation, the former President said: "We are critical of high taxes; but we don't like to see taxes revised in such a fashion as to relieve others 1 cent more than it does us of part of the tax

burden. The vast majority believes that governmental expenditures are too high; but we insist upon excluding from any program of reduction all those that seem to profit us individually."

This "let George do it" or "George pay for it" attitude can destroy a nation. The "what's in it for me?" point of view is becoming a suicidal blight. Chin deep in material benefits, we're still after all we can get for ourselves, and let the devil take the hindmost. This course, long enough followed, is a sure road to national dishonor—and oblivion.

The 88th Congress at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, who says Congress is not working? Why last week we passed a peanut bill, this week we worried about printing additional copies of "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag," and next week we will probably worry about the laws about the flying of kites. In any event, all of this has been neatly summed up by Art Buchwald in his Tuesday column, which I am putting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is probably the most important insertion in the RECORD since January:

THE 88TH CONGRESS AT WORK

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—There are some people in the United States, a minority we're happy to report, who claim that the 88th Congress of the United States is not getting much work done. Well, just to show you these people don't know what they're talking about, the House of Representatives not only debated but passed a bill last week in regard to a subject that involves every man, woman, and child in the United States—the boiled peanut.

Boiled peanuts are peanuts harvested before they are ripe, boiled in hot water and salted. Some people say they taste like cabbage, but other people say they taste like salted cabbage. In any case they are eaten mostly in the South, and the bill that was debated had to do with whether the boiled peanut could be excluded from the rigid marketing quotas, acreage allotments and price supports that the mature peanut is subjected to.

You would think that Congressman would be unanimous in favor of such a bill, but this was not the case. There were many strong objections to giving the boiled peanut favored treatment.

First a Congressman demanded whether the sponsor of the bill, Congressman MATTHEWS, of Florida, had brought any samples with him, Congressman MATTHEWS said he had and they were available in the cloakroom.

This led one Congressman to say he would vote for the bill only on the condition he wouldn't have to taste any of the peanuts. Congressman HAGEN, of California, added that the boiled peanut was not everybody's cup of tea, and that even the pigeons in front of the Capitol wouldn't eat them.

Congressman MATTHEWS rose to the defense of the boiled peanut and said its taste was unique and could be compared to that of a dehumidified artichoke, or a swamp cabbage.

Congressman FINDLEY, of Illinois, and Congressman DOLE, of Kansas, objected to the bill on the grounds that it discriminated against other types of peanuts. They maintained a peanut was a peanut, boiled, roasted, or fed to hogs, and either you controlled all peanuts or you controlled no peanuts.

Congressman DOLE pointed out that at the very moment this important piece of legislation, which would affect as many as 1,861 farmers in the United States, was being debated the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, was flitting around the Soviet Union.

He went on to say that it wasn't just a question of boiled peanuts they were discussing, but the entire agricultural program in the United States. If you exempted the boiled peanut from controls why not exempt other items that are also boiled before eating? Why not boiled potatoes or boiled apricots or boiled wheat?

Congressman FINDLEY said that the peanut program in the United States was costing the Government $14 for every $100 worth of peanuts produced. He said the Government had over $17 million tied up in peanuts and every peanut the farmer grew just increased the burden of the taxpayer.

But despite their valiant efforts the boiled peanut exemption bill was extended for another 2 years.

The importance of this legislation was not what the bill contained, but that it was passed at all.

It shows that Congress is working hard, no matter what the critics say.

With this bill out of the way Congress is now free to discuss other vital subjects of interest to the Nation such as whether seat belts should be required in automobiles, and whether the flying of kites should be allowed in Washington, D.C.

Let those who say the 88th Congress is not doing its job read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They'll be in for a surprise. Peanuts today, seat belts tomorrow, kites next week. Who says this country isn't moving?

Dr. Teller Warns Us of Russian Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker Dr. Edward Teller, the world's foremost nuclear physicist has written me, as he has to many other Members of Congress, warning us as to the actual meaning of the test ban treaty we are now entering with the Communists. His views should be heeded.

The letter follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF., *July 19, 1963.*

The Honorable STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEROUNIAN: Negotiations in Moscow may lead to a situation which would exclude future U.S. tests in the atmosphere. At the same time we could not control Russian atmospheric tests if these tests stay well below one kiloton. Use of clean explosives may permit even bigger Russian atmospheric experimentation. Such small tests could be decisive in developing missile defense, a field of utmost importance in which the Russians may already have a considerable lead.

There is little doubt that the Russians are ahead of us in big nuclear explosives. A ban on atmospheric tests would perpetuate this situation.

At the beginning of the 1958 moratorium it had been stated that little progress is to be expected by further development of nuclear explosives. The field of high-yield weapons and of missile defense have been designated as particularly barren. Only after the Russian tests and boasts of 1961 did we become fully aware of the fact that in these fields we are at a disadvantage and that this disadvantage could become fatal. We may now be involved in another move which will make this disadvantage permanent and which in the field of missile defense may give added opportunity to the Russians.

I greatly appreciated the opportunity a few weeks ago to point out to you some of these facts. The developments that have occurred in the last days emphasize the urgency of the situation.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD TELLER.

Whose Interest Is Served by the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, "Hypocrisy," from the Dallas Morning News of July 22, makes us wonder, just whose interest is served by the United Nations? And when will the people demand that elected officials either change U.N. policies or get the United States out of this subversive organization.

HYPOCRISY

That big, brave United Nations—frequently labeled "man's last, best hope for peace"—is now threatening to employ what it has often condemned as an "act of war" to appease the sensitive feelings of the Afro-Asian bloc.

A U.N. committee has requested the Security Council to press for a worldwide boycott of little South Africa, whose racial policies are offensive to most of the U.N.'s member states.

Nor is that all. The same committee described the boycott as merely a first step toward a general break in diplomatic and trade relations with South Africa. And to insure that all of this will be effective and bring South Africa to her knees, the U.N. committee said that a military blockade should even be considered.

One of the United Nations much-publicized goals is maintenance of independence and self-determination of all peoples. How can this be reconciled with a U.N. threat to dictate its terms to South Africa, an independent nation whose domestic policies—racial or otherwise—are her own business?

The hypocrisy of this U.N. request for boycott and/or blockade of South Africa is glaring. Only a few months ago the U.N. loudly protested the use of these two weapons against Cuba, which has posed a far worse danger to peace and done more to enslave its people than South Africa ever contemplated.

Why, then, is the U.N. willing to use these weapons against South Africa? Is it the only nation which practices segregation?

According to U.S. News & World Report, which published a survey of race problems the world over 2 weeks ago, segregation exists "in almost every place where color differences exist."

In most of the so-called "emerging nations" of Africa, that magazine concluded, blacks have the whites on the run, and slavery is not unknown.

In Kenya, for example, a 165,000-member Indian minority lives completely apart from both whites and blacks and there is little mixing among the 50 or more black tribes. In Africa's biggest country, the Sudan, both racial and religious segregation is practiced.

In Russia and its satellites, Moslems, Jews, and other racial and religious minorities are persecuted. Christians and Jews in Egypt and Arabs in Israel are "second-class citizens." In British Guiana, East Indians and Negroes are fighting a civil war.

Throughout Asia, the Chinese people are confronted with discrimination in almost every land. A few years ago, for example, Indonesia imposed a ban on all alien traders outside of the main cities. The result was the closing of 300,000 village shops and the emigration of 40,000 Chinese merchants.

The most glaring example of segregation exists in India, where 60 million "untouchables" are held almost in bondage and poverty by the caste system. Yet India is the world's foremost moralizer on the race problem, constantly condemning other nations and leading the current drive in the U.N. to crack down on South Africa.

Will the U.N. boycott or blockade Kenya, the Sudan, Russia, Egypt, Israel, British Guiana, Indonesia, or India? Certainly not.

But when the job is done in South Africa, and then perhaps in Portuguese Angola, are we certain that the U.N.'s guns won't be trained next on segregated areas of the United States?

If that day ever comes, we hope the U.N.'s commissars will have the good sense to attack our worst problem area first by setting up the initial blockade around Harlem—just a stone's throw from its own glass house on the East River.

K.'s Good Humor Ominous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, numerous predictions are being made and views expressed on the import of the partial nuclear test ban which Mr. Harriman has just completed negotiating in Moscow.

The entire matter of the practicality of negotiating with the Communist rulers is open to question. The Knoxville Journal, in its issue of July 16, carried a timely commentary on this question. Under leave granted to insert it at this point into the RECORD:

K.'s GOOD HUMOR OMINOUS

Press reports from Moscow are of a nature to justify the greatest concern on the part of U.S. citizens as to the future security of this country. If the American people had been told, or had had any way of finding out, about the disastrous agreements being made during and subsequent to World War II by the late F.D.R., they would have gone into mourning even as they celebrated what they thought was a victory in World War II. Actually, those agreements entered into by a sick President provided the basis and laid the groundwork for Russian power which has plagued us ever since.

Thus news that representatives of our Government and of Britain met the Russian negotitaors, including Khrushchev, in a spirit of optimism and high good humor on all sides is a frightening thing of itself.

Certainly no student of Communism's history will be misled by an outer show of good will on the part of Khrushchev and his men. Sensible people will keep in mind the number of times in which the Communist attitude has turned from lovingkindness to savagery within a flick of an eyelash.

When the Reds are apparently in a good humor—that is the time to suspect a new boobytrap.

Labor's Hypocritical Stand on Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is just a little disgusting to behold the crocodile tears some labor leaders are shedding over the civil rights issue. We listen to the words of George Meany and Walter Reuther and others spouting about every man's right to work and no man should be denied the right to a job, and then look at the record.

These same people demand that no man be allowed to work without paying dues to a union. How hypocritical can they be?

It may be well for the Negroes to check the real motives of some of those who are shouting loudest today as the champions of civil rights. Alas, I fear the Negro cause is being used by Mr. Meany and company to cover up their own misdeeds in the denial of human rights, and by the President and his political machine only in the interest of votes. Before they reap the full reward of betrayal Negroes should reconsider the wisdom of violent demonstrations, appeals to prejudice, and reliance on false promises in favor of a government of law which is the only sure protection for all people.

The hypocrisy of labor is shown in the following editorial, "Labor's Equality," from the Dallas Morning News of July 23:

LABOR'S EQUALITY

"Surely every American," says AFL–CIO president, George Meany, "is entitled to be judged on his own, on the basis of his ability" in seeking a job. Mr. Meany, of course, is right. But there is a vast gulf between what is right and what can be done to achieve it.

The solution proposed by Mr. Meany—a Federal "fair employment practices" law which he advocated the other day in testimony before the House judiciary subcommittee—is not the answer. It is doubtful that such a law would end discrimination in employment opportunities. It is probable that it would endanger essential freedoms of management and labor alike.

Mr. Meany candidly admitted that he would like such a law enacted "to help us do what we want to do—mop up those areas of discrimination which persist in our own ranks."

In other words, Mr. Meany can't clean his own house. He wants the Government to do the job for him and to saddle management with a large share of the blame for whatever discrimination persists.

If a fair-employment-practices law were enacted by Congress, probably any employer would be subject to fine, imprisonment, long and costly litigation or, at the least, considerable harassment whenever a job applicant is rejected for employment and decides that he has been discriminated against for race, sex, religion or color—depending on the statute's provisions.

Discrimination is easy to charge but difficult to prove. Unforunately, a large share of the burden of proof would be borne by the defendant.

Even if an employer were acquitted of the charge of discrimination, he would suffer considerable loss of time and money in court. What is worse, he could be haled into court time after time on similar charges by those who might like—for whatever reason—to destroy or cripple his business.

It is especially ironic that Mr. Meany has made this appeal for a Federal law prohibiting discrimination in hiring. His union and most others long have insisted upon thousands of discriminatory clauses in their contract arrangements with management.

Mr. Meany is a stanch opponent of right-to-work laws, an advocate of the closed, union or agency shop. His AFL–CIO representatives here in Texas have just called for repeal of the right-to-work law in this state.

Could anything be more hypocritical? Is it any worse to discriminate against a job applicant because of his race, sex, religion or color than to discriminate against him because he doesn't carry a union card in his pocket? That is exactly what the AFL–CIO and other unions do in 30 States which have no right-to-work laws.

Mr. Meany's high-sounding statement—that in seeking employment "every American is entitled to be judged on his own, on the basis of his ability"—has a hollow ring, when you understand that under his breath the AFL–CIO leader must have whispered the qualifier, "provided, of course, that the job applicant pays tribute to the union and possesses its card."

In the vernacular of Mr. Meany and his friends, "All men are created equal, but some are more equal than others."

The American Flag in Hong Kong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in a fine patriotic speech before the Rotary Club of Hong Kong on July 2, 1963, Mr. John A. Lacey of the American Consulate vividly describes the history of our flag in that great port city. The sentiments expressed in this talk add to our appreciation of the flag and to our knowledge of American history in Hong Kong. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this excellent speech in the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN FLAG IN HONG KONG

(By John A. Lacey, Deputy Principal Officer, American Consulate General)

Those of us who live and work in a foreign land are apt to become more conscious of our national flag than is our fellow citizen who remains in his native place. At least

that has been my experience, and since coming to Hong Kong I have become more conscious of the American flag as well as the part it has played in the history of the colony. That is why I welcome the opportunity to speak today on behalf of the American members of our Rotary Club on the subject of the American flag in Hong Kong.

Several of us have wanted to contribute a new Stars and Stripes to replace this American flag behind me which is sadly worn and somewhat out of date, lacking as it does two stars. The new banner which we present is a rather special flag, which only a fortnight ago flew over the Capitol dome of the Congress of the United States of America. It is appropriate that this gesture be scheduled on the eve of the Fourth of July when Americans celebrate their Day of National Independence.

Americans sometimes speak of "flag wavers" to refer to overenthusiastic patriots who like to make flowery, Fourth of July speeches. I do not propose to wave the flag today. But neither do I share the sentiment of a certain U.S. Congressman who in 1794 scoffed at a congressional debate over the design of the new national emblem, which he ridiculed as "a consummate piece of frivolity." Another Representative argued that the flag could not be changed every time a new State was added to the Union, in part because it was too expensive to keep making new ones. "Let the flag be permanent," he declared. Actually it was not until 1912 that the size and design of the American flag were standardized.

Among many explanations about the symbolism of the Stars and Stripes, I recall reading the words attributed to the first President of the United States, George Washington, who reportedly said:

"We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

What I didn't know until recently was that the design of the red and white stripes was inspired by the flag of the British East India Co., which in those days was trading with the American Colonies along the Atlantic coast, as well as with India, Canton, and Macau.

The general description of the flag which Congress authorized in 1777—with 13 stars and 13 stripes to symbolize the unity of the 13 States—left much to the imagination of the flagmaker. During the American Revolution, a number of different banners were used, including some which retained the Union Jack as part of their design. One famous emblem—the one, incidentally, carried by the Minute Men—showed a coiled rattlesnake and bore the worning, "Don't Tread on Me." Another from the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope."

For some time, Americans added a new star and a new stripe to the flag every time a new State entered the Union. By 1794 the total had reached 15 stars and 15 stripes. This was the flag which, in 1814, was "so gallantly streaming" over Fort McHenry when Francis Scott Key wrote the American national anthem, the "Star-Spangled Banner."

When five more States entered the Union in 1818, it clearly became impossible to add more stripes. One Member of Congress wrote: "If the Union keeps on increasing at its present rate, you will soon find that the tallest pine in the forests of Maine will not be high enough to serve as a flagstaff." Congress then decided to reduce the number of stripes back to the original 13 but to continue to add a star for each State. The most recent change, adding a 50th star for the entrance of the State of Hawaii, occurred on July 4, 1960.

It is, I suggest, a remarkable fact that 50 free and independent States—each with a distinct history and its own separate powers—all freely pledge allegiance to the flag" * * * and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

True to our revolutionary tradition, we are striving as we never have before to advance civil rights for all citizens, regardless of race, creed or color; and the very fact that our national energies are focused on this issue is in itself a sign of our determination that decisive progress shall be made.

The American flag, like the Republic itself, therefore has been a changing, dynamic symbol interwoven with the history of our mother country. Americans in Hong Kong have been a part of that history, and nothing illustrates the case better than the pictures of American flags which are visible in many old prints and paintings of Canton, Macau, and early Hong Kong. One that I am particularly fond of was called to my attention by Mr. J. R. Jones of the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank. This picture, dated 1846, shows the building of the American consulate which then stood at the corner of Aberdeen Street and Hollywood Road not far from the Central Market. The scene has a calm serenity with none of the hustle and bustle of present day Hong Kong. Except for the Stars and Stripes flying over this lovely old building, there is nothing in the picture to suggest that is was the residence of our merchant consul in Hong Kong, Mr. F. T. Bush, who followed our first representative here, Mr. Thomas W. Waldron.

The first American vessel in these waters was the *Empress of China*, which arrived in Canton in 1784. Aboard this vessel was a supercargo named Samuel Shaw, who became the first American consul in Canton in 1786. A brisk trade quickly developed and by 1789, the first year of the Presidency of George Washington, there were 15 American vessels in the Canton anchorage at Whampoa, loading teas, silks, and chinaware.

Hong Kong, of course, had not yet become a Colony, but Hong Kong waters were well known to American sea captains, one of whom, Captain Kendrick of the *Lady Washington*, was probably the first foreigner to describe the harbor of Aberdeen, which he called "Port Independence." According to Mr. Jack Braga, to whom I am indebted to this information, the American skipper describes the harbor in some detail and goes on to mention that "We found the inhabitants very civil, and were daily on shore at the villages, and following in the interior parts of the islands." This Yankee skipper, writing in February 1793, was probably the first westerner to use the name "Hong Kong."

By the time that Hong Kong formally became Hong Kong, American merchants, missionaries, and sailors had become a responsible, though small, part of the life of the colony. An American was a founder of the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank, whose founding committee of 1864 included American, British, Danish, German, Indian (Parsee), and Jewish members. Mr. J. R. Jones has also pointed out to me that Americans served on the board for many years and, at various times until the 1890's, held the office of chairman of the bank. Presumably these Yankees were clever businessmen, but I wonder what prompted them to sell out their interests in that estimable institution.

A still earlier venture by Americans in Hong Kong—in this case a religious one—was the building of Hong Kong's first Protestant Chapel which was dedicated on Queen's Road in 1842 by the American Baptist Board of Missions. In that same year the already famous Morrison School was transferred from Macau to Hong Kong, under the directorship of an American, S. R. Brown, who with other Americans taught Chinese students who later pursued their studies in America including Yung Wing and Wong Shing, the latter returning to Hong Kong in later years to be nominated to the legislative council.

This kind of cultural interchange, among Chinese, British and other nationalities became a vital and lasting part of the cosmopolitan life of the colony and not a few Americans contributed to it. One of whom I am particularly proud was Dr. Mary Fulton, a medical missionary from my home town of Ashland, Ohio, who traveled to Hong Kong in 1894 and helped found the first modern schools for nursing and for the blind in south China. She also taught at the Canton school of medicine and one of her students was Dr. Sun Yat-sen.

Already well known as a commercial center of south China, Hong Kong for Americans was also becoming a cultural crossroads where science and technology were exchanged freely for wisdom and knowledge.

Americans have also added to the lighter side of Hong Kong life, not the least important pleasure being the ice which Yankee merchantmen carried from North America to Ice House Street where it was sold in the 1840's at about 6 cents a pound delivered. Although ice was very much prized by my lord and lady, business was not always good as was indicated by the following editorial which commiserated with the ice merchant as follows:

"He tells his readers that they cannot expect men to go on losing money bringing in ice, then artfully coaxes them. If the said spirited men should stop bringing in ice, then * * * it will necessitate a deprivation of cool beer * * * and to their lady friends of ices, Blanc Mange, and all the other delicacies ladies delight in."

The history books are studded with references to the American fleet which began calling here regularly more than a century ago to the apparent satisfaction of the sailors and to many who greeted them, including the British tars in the harbor at the time. Thus a notice of July 4, 1851 tells us that the British fleet fired a salute on American Independence Day bespeaking the tolerant cosmopolitan nature of the colony. In 1870 the U.S.S. *Colorado* invited the entire foreign community abroad to commemorate the birthday of George Washington and to enjoy what the press described as the "sumptuous hospitality of the U.S. Navy."

It has been said that the American and British are two great peoples separated only by a common language. Since each side understands the other all too easily, little that we do or say is overlooked, and there has been more than one occasion in the annals of Hong Kong's history when familiarity failed to produce understanding. One such instance occurred in 1869, when the small American community found the grandstand at the races too uncomfortable for their liking and marched out in a body to sit in a private pavilion owned by Russell & Co., one of the largest American firms. Our British cousins took exception to this snobbery, and a history book informs us solemnly that "this gesture was much frowned upon."

I would like to end this talk on a happier note, and it is fair to do so because the relations between America and Hong Kong more often than not have been congenial and cooperative. Today, when Americans share with all other nationalities a desire to assist Hong Kong in meeting its social problems, it is heartwarming to recall that in 1872, when news of the great Chicago fire reached the Colony, many social events were held to raise relief funds for the victims, the most notable being a concert by the German Club.

The American flag at that time had 36 stars, and still more stars were to be added in quick succession because America was expanding rapidly and richly. But America was grateful to accept this expression of sympathetic assistance.

What Americans have learned in Hong Kong, as much as any place in the Commonwealth, is that there has been "* * * a long basis of understanding between our two countries," as President Kennedy stated upon leaving London only last Sunday. In Hong Kong also we have become better acquainted with the Chinese people, whose fortitude in the face of adversity, enterprise, good humor, and tolerance of human frailty are all qualities that Americans very much admire.

International understanding and tolerance, as much as trade and commerce, have in fact been hallmarks of Hong Kong's humid, sometimes harried, and occasionally humorous history; and Americans have played a small but continuing and usually constructive role in this history. Even before the Colony was created, the American flag was flying freely in Hong Kong waters alongside the flags of other nations, and we trust this will be ever so.

Which brings me to my last observation, and that is that the people of Hong Kong and America, despite vicissitudes, usually have stood together as closely as do the several national flags which we see here today, united with the flag of Rotary International. We American members of Hong Kong Rotary take pride in being a part of the international community endeavor for which the club stands.

And you will forgive us, I am sure, for our silent pride in our national flag, whose history—whose very design—has drawn much from the unfolding drama of Hong Kong. It is with this thought that Guy Harden and Johnny Shoemaker, on behalf of all American Rotarians, now present to the Club today a new Stars and Stripes.

Lions Club Urges Bellringing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the sentiment and purpose of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives last month, urging observance of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence by the ringing of bells throughout the country at 2 p.m. July 4, added a new and most fitting feature to this year's celebration of this greatest of all American holidays.

The Lions Club of Sedalia, Mo., is said to have been the first civic organization in the United States to come forward with an endorsement of this manner of observance, which they did by resolution shortly after the legislation was introduced in the Senate. This project of the Sedalia club, spearheaded by Lion D. Kelly Scruton, was later endorsed by the State Convention of Lions International Clubs of the State of Missouri. Kelly Scruton, a man of inexhaustable energy and outstanding talent in working for civic and patriotic objectives, personally carried the Missouri "Make Freedom Really Ring" resolution to the June Lions International Convention in Miami, Fla.

Having mounted a chrome-plated bell atop his appropriately decorated automobile, he was successful in securing permission to drive it in the big convention parade down Collins Avenue—which focused international attention on this patriotic project, dedicated to freedom. On the return trip to Sedalia, Mr. and Mrs. Scruton visited on Capitol Hill, where my colleague Senator STUART SYMINGTON and I had the great pleasure of introducing them to a number of Senators and others.

Mr. President, I am proud of the leading role played by the Lions International Clubs of the State of Missouri, and particularly the Lions Club of Sedalia, Mo., in drawing national and international attention to this manner of observance. They have done much to "make freedom really ring."

I now ask unanimous consent that the May 8, 1963, resolution of the Sedalia Lions Club as further approved by the Missouri State convention, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a related editorial from the Sedalia (Mo.) Democrat.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas July 4, 1777 the Liberty Bell first rang in observance of American independence and freedom; and

Whereas all Americans should be continuously aware of our heritage of independence and freedom; and

Whereas bellringing is symbolic in our country of the joy of freedom and independence: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the Lions Club of Sedalia, Mo., That we join in inaugurating a great new national observance of American Independence and we do urge that on July 4, 1963, all bells on churches, schools, government buildings, and all other buildings, peal across the land in enthusiastic celebration of American Independence Day.

J. L. VAN WAGNER, JR.,
President.

Attest:

JOHN FIEDLER,
Secretary.

Be it further

Resolved by the Lions International Club of the State of Missouri Multiple District 26, at its State Convention assembled in Kansas City, Mo. on the 11th day of May 1963, That the resolution here presented by the Sedalia Lions Club of Sedalia, Mo., unanimously adopted at its meeting in Sedalia, Mo., on Wednesday, May 8, 1963 be adopted by the Lions International Club of Missouri; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lions International Clubs of Missouri do recommend to Lions International that the same resolution be adopted and spread on its minutes at the International Convention.

RICHARD HEPPER,
Chairman, State Council of Missouri Governors.

Attest:

G. H. WHITE,
Secretary.

[From the Sedalia (Mo.) Democrat, May 17, 1963]

LIONS URGE BELLRINGING

A movement is sweeping the country to inaugurate a new national observance of American independence. It is a proposal for communitywide ringing of bells at a given time on July 4.

Quick to respond to this is the Sedalia Lions Club which initiated a resolution to join in and encourage this nationwide plan as symbolic of freedom and independence. Subsequently this group sponsored adoption of a similar resolution at the Missouri district convention in Kansas City and also proposes to present it for adoption at the international convention in Miami, Fla., in June.

This gesture is typical of the Lions Club's primary cooperation in so many fields of community activities.

The bellringing project should tend to renew citizen awareness of our heritage of freedom on Independence Day. Any proposal that can accomplish this objective is laudable but, may we say, not easy. To make it succeed much promotion is required. We know the Lions Club will not be remiss in this respect. They understand the meaning of promotion which has made so many of their projects successful.

Although the bellringing idea is something new, we wish the Lions or any other group would help revive public interest also in display of the American flag not only on July 4, but on all other patriotic occasions such as Memorial Day, Flag Day, Labor Day, Veterans' Day, and other recognized holidays.

Display of the flag in peacetime has well nigh become a forgotten obligation. Only a bloody war seems to bring desire to unfurl Old Glory.

Undoubtedly the bellringing project which the Lions Club endorses will bring resurgence of patriotic emotions which have been too impassive too long.

Let's swell this sentiment on bellringing day, July 4, and on other occasions, by displaying the American flag in front of our homes and business places.

The Late John Hamlin Folger

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish at this time to join with my colleague, Representative RALPH SCOTT, of the Fifth District of North Carolina, in paying tribute to a former colleague, the late John Hamlin Folger.

During John Folger's tenure in Congress it was my pleasure to serve with him on the House Banking and Currency Committee. It was also my pleasure to have served with his late brother, Alonzo Dillard Folger.

John Folger was elected to the 77th Congress in a special election to fill the vacancy caused by the untimely death of his brother. He was reelected to the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses, serving from June 14, 1941, to January 3, 1949.

He was a man of sincerity, a distinguished public servant, and one who commanded the respect of all who came in contact with him. He was endowed with those characteristics which qualify one for leadership. He had an understanding of all men, whether they worked on the land, in their overalls, in the factories, or in their blue serges in the countinghouses. And at all times he was ready to listen to their problems with a sympathetic heart.

He has gone to his reward. But he leaves behind to his loved ones and to his friends an inspiration that will be

part of our lives for as long as we shall live.

I extend to the family my heartfelt sympathy.

People Pay for Sending Their Money on a Round Trip to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the downright foolishness of Federal aid is exposed in the following column written for the Dallas Morning News by Ken Thompson, editorial staff writer. It is interesting to note that $8.7 billion could be saved by the American taxpayers if we stopped the crazy practice of sending our money to Washington and back, of course, this is the means employed to control State government, State and local activities, the lives of the people by the Federal Government:

FEDERAL AID IS NOT MAGIC

(By Ken Thompson)

Federal aid, money from Washington, "something for nothing"—it all seems like magic. But it isn't. When politicians tell you, as Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH did recently, that the Federal Government's spending is vital to the economy of individual States—YARBOROUGH maintained that Federal funds spent in Texas were more important to the State's economy than the combined produce from crops and livestock or the total benefit of oil and gas—they are not telling the real facts.

Federal funds are not manufactured in Washington. They are collected from States in the form of taxes. And as far as Texas is concerned, we're paying more than we're getting.

Tax Foundation, a reliable research organization, has just published significant material on this subject. According to its estimates, the people of Texas pay $1.03 for every $1.00 in Federal grants returned to Texas.

In fiscal 1962, Texas contributed an estimated $396 million in taxes as its share of Federal grants-in-aid programs, and $383,600,000 was returned to Texas under various grant programs.

These estimates do not include the costs to Texas of administering the programs or the amount of matching funds which the State had to raise to qualify for the grants, or the considerable cost of collecting and disbursing the money on its way to Washington and back.

If these costs were included, Texans would be losing a good deal more than 3 cents on the dollar for Federal-aid programs.

But even at that, we're a lot luckier than some States. Delaware, for example, pays $2.12 for every dollar it gets back. New Jersey pays $1.80, Connecticut $1.64, New York $1.52, Iowa $1.44, and Illinois $1.34.

Of course, some States receive more money from Washington than they have contributed. Alaska, for example, receives a dollar for every 19 cents it spends. Vermont pays only 35 cents to get back a dollar. South Dakota pays 39 cents, Louisiana 44 cents, Wyoming 45 cents, Mississippi 46 cents, Arkansas 48 cents, and Alabama and North Dakota each pay 50 cents.

Texas is 1 of 17 States which pay more than they receive. These 17 share a tax burden of $5,324 million to support Federal-aid programs, but receive $4,162,600,000 in return. That's a $1.28 cost for every $1 received.

What is interesting is that these 17 States—including Texas—have 64 percent of the Nation's population and 280 seats in the House of Representatives, almost a two-thirds majority.

It is easy to understand why Congressmen from Alaska, Vermont, South Dakota, Louisiana, Wyoming, Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, North Dakota and other States which are getting a "bargain" on Federal aid continue to vote for these programs.

But the 64 percent of the Members of Congress—who represent States which are not getting a bargain—ought to screen carefully and eliminate the nonessentials.

Another interesting fact brought out by Tax Foundation is that $5 out of every $6 collected for Federal-aid programs are returned to the same States from which they were collected.

Although we don't agree with the theory of redistributing the wealth, we could understand Washington's role in grant programs if most of the money were being taken from some States to be used in others. If that were the case, obviously the Federal Government would have to handle the money.

But that is not the case. More than 83 percent of Federal-aid money is merely making a round trip to Washington—and that round trip doesn't come cheap. Next year, Federal-aid programs are expected to cost $10.4 billion.

If that portion of these programs which does not change hands—except for the trip to Washington and back—were deleted from the 1964 budget, $8.7 billion could be saved in Federal spending. And that would go a long way toward eliminating the projected 1964 deficit of nearly $12 billion.

France Leaps Into Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in the June 17 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology, Mr. Robert Hotz has written an editorial entitled "France Leaps Into Space." This article is provocative and deserves the attention of the Members of this body:

FRANCE LEAPS INTO SPACE

(By Robert Hotz)

Last week at Le Bourget we saw France leap into space with a program aimed at establishing itself as the third major force in the development of space technology, surpassed only by the United States and the Soviet Union. The French space program has been developing swiftly during the past 18 months. But the full scope and pace of this effort became evident to foreign observers only after a startling exhibit of French space technology at the 25th International Air and Space Show and a special presentation of the program's full details by top officials. Gaston Palewski, cabinet minister for nuclear and space research, and Prof. Jean Coulomb, director of the new French space research agency (CNES), headed this group.

Although the collection of modern aircraft at Le Bourget was, as always, superb, it was the evidence of the major French drive into space that dominated this show—even to the changing of its name to include space along with aeronautics. The French decision to lead Western Europe into space stems directly from President Charles de Gaulle's intuitive understanding that any nation hoping to survive in the modern world must develop its own capability across the entire spectrum of key technologies (AW June 10, p. 21). Evidence of just how important President de Gaulle regards aerospace technology as a foundation of modern France came at Le Bourget when he stretched a scheduled hour-long visit to the show into 2½ hours, including a 35-minute detailed inspection of the excellent NASA space exhibit. His visit was spiced with numerous specific questions on details of U.S. space projects depicted at the show. This personal interest is reinforced by his decision to fund space research across major key areas in the space technology spectrum, plus an operational program for 6 French satellites, at same time adding key funds to French aeronautical programs to keep their export momentum rolling. These French moves in the aerospace field have been almost exactly the opposite of those taken recently by the government of Great Britain, where a once-superb technology in aeronautics has been allowed to deteriorate and far too little effort has been devoted to pushing into these technologies: nuclear, electronics and space technology. We predict that these government decisions on the new technologies will have a major effect on the relative roles of these countries in the leadership of Western Europe in the not-too-distant future.

In its currently emerging character, the French national space program is organized basically after the U.S. pattern in regard to relations with the military, industry and scientific community and universities. Indeed, it has been greatly assisted by the United States through training of French engineers in satellite technology at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center, and by providing the initial Aerobee and Scout boosters plus launch facilities at Wallops Island and the Pacific Missile Range during the interim before the French facilities become fully operational. France also is extending the international scope of its space program under bilateral agreements with India and Argentina involving boosters and scientific instrumentation. It appears inevitable that as the French space capability develops, its industry will become the source of hardware for many nations interested in their space sciences programs who prefer not to depend on the United States and cannot get help from the Soviet Union. Just as it did so well in developing its postwar aircraft industry from the ashes of World War II, France is carefully planning its space program to avoid duplicating major efforts by the United States and Russia, such as manned space flight, and is concentrating on filling gaps left by those programs' scientific explorations.

The prime reason for the success achieved with postwar French aircraft in export markets was the unique character of their products, which filled gaps left by U.S. and British aircraft and engines. The French space program, as now planned, appears to be aimed initially at developing basic knowledge and operational capability in satellite technology. Not until this capability is achieved do the French plan to branch out in new directions with contributions to space sciences based on Prof. J. E. Blamont's work with upper-atmosphere atomic hydrogen.

Meanwhile, the French industry, as it did a decade ago with supersonic aircraft technology, is working hard on developing a broad capability in the most modern techniques related to all areas of space technology. Many foreign observers at the French space pavilion were surprised to see more than a dozen traditional aviation firms exhibiting space work ranging from glass-wound rocket casings with integral liners, inertial guidance

systems, plasma-jet engines and small nuclear power sources to satellite structures, advanced space instrumentation, communications techniques and lasers.

Although France is developing its own space program and the required industrial support under a basic national policy, Professor Coulomb made it clear that France will continue to participate in and cooperate with the joint European space efforts now being organized through ELDO and ESRO. However, he was equally emphatic that France does not intend to be slowed to the pace of these organizations in development of its own capabilities. Wherever possible, French contributions to these joint efforts would be in handling a complete program on their own within the framework of the ESRO objectives rather than just contributing segments to the overall program as is currently being done in the ELDO booster program. None of the top French space leaders appear to be underestimating the magnitude of the technical, financial and political problems involved in putting the tricolor into orbit. The French industry is having to pay heavily for much of the technical knowledge it needs for its push into space, just as it faced the painful but necessary cost of tooling for production of supersonic aircraft at a time when more affluent nations quailed at this cost.

Paying this price a decade ago gave France the European leadership in the supersonic era of aviation. The French again appear prepared to meet whatever cost may be necessary to lead Europe in the space age. Another indication of how the French are viewing their space effort as a long-term investment is the program organized under the direction of Gen. Robert Aubiniere, technical director of CNES, to educate French technical students in construction and firing of small research rockets, while also providing facilities and supervision for these firings with maximum safety. France obviously is relying on its next generation to carry the real load in its space exploration.

At Le Bourget the large white dome of the U.S. space exhibit stands next to the long, slim silhouette of France's first space booster—the three-stage Diamant—creating an effect, as Professor Coulomb noted, of an oriental mosque. The U.S. exhibit was truly impressive for the technical maturity and breadth of effort it expressed as proof of progress achieved since its initial space exhibit here 2 years ago. The French exhibit reflects the youthful surge of enthusiasm and determination that characterized the U.S. exhibit 2 years ago. In comparing the two it is easy to see how much can be accomplished when pioneering spirit and political support run strong. Hopefully, the French-American space mosque at Le Bourget will endure as a symbol of the extraordinary achievements that are possible in expanding man's horizon when strong national capabilities are blended in realistic international technical cooperation.

Immigration Changes Advisable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, a revision of our immigration laws is desperately needed. It is ironic that a great and prosperous democracy such as ours is unable to accommodate the thousands who wish to emigrate here.

In the Wednesday, July 24, 1963, issue of the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., there is a perceptive editorial, entitled "Immigration Changes Advisable," dealing with President Kennedy's proposed revisions of the quota system, which Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, has incorporated into H.R. 7700—the administration's proposal.

Under unanimous consent, I included the editorial in the Appendix:

IMMIGRATION CHANGES ADVISABLE

Only hodge-podge attention to the general law and policy on immigration in the last 10 years has prompted President Kennedy to recommend with justification that Congress discard the current quota system as "without basis in either logic or reason."

People in afflicted countries always look longingly toward the more prosperous environment of the United States; people in lands subject to heavy-handed government or external aggression yearn for a haven. Through the last century Americans have accepted hundreds of thousands, mainly from Europe because of a sterner attitude toward orientals, and practically everyone has been assimilated into our national fabric.

The people of the northern countries of Europe no longer exhaust their quotas, but thousands in the Mediterranean lands and in the Asian subcontinent and the Orient want to emigrate to the United States. They are lured by the opportunities for improvement in their economic status, the broader political freedom, and the urge to join relatives or friends who preceded them and now prosper.

In the program sent to Capitol Hill, more thought, selective thought, is given to the talents of those to be admitted. Preference would be allotted to needed skills, of which an endless range permeates the present age in industry and commerce. Then those with relatives already established here would be considered. After them the field would be open to any who could qualify as potential citizens.

This program would be a considerable change, something more flexible, than the present arbitrary quota system, which frequently wreaks hardship on fragmented families.

The President concedes that his recommendations will not eliminate all the faults and difficulties in the immigration system, but a better process for evaluating applicants is possible—certainly something conforming more to the requirements of the time.

We're Running the Wrong Race With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in an address before the Air Force War College at Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, in Montgomery, Ala., on February 6, 1962, Dr. Walter R. Dornherser made some pertinent observations concerning our national space posture. This former German rocket scientist and now vice president and chief scientist of the Bell Aerosystems Co., stated that when the Russians are ready they will bring war into space and from space back to earth.

He warned further:

We must be aware that they have a head start. They have reliable high-thrust boosters, accurate navigation and guidance systems. Today they place payloads in space five times heavier than ours. In a few years they will be able to increase this payload to 100 tons, and be able to rendezvous in space—a crucial point in military operation. Having resolved this decisive problem, there should be no major difficulty anymore in establishing a man-operated military system. They won't rest until they have obtained complete control of the space effort. They may achieve superiority in a couple of years while we are still arguing about the usefulness of military space systems.

Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the Members, and in anticipation of the 1964 NASA authorization bill which will be before the House within a few days, I request permission to insert at this point in the RECORD the following article from the August Reader's Digest by Francis Vivian Drake, military editor:

[From Reader's Digest, Aug. 1963]

WE'RE RUNNING THE WRONG RACE WITH RUSSIA

Some weeks ago in Washington, D.C., a number of prominent politicans were asked this question: "What, in your view, is the most urgent project facing the United States today?" Without hesitation each named the moon shot, costliest—perhaps $40 billion can pay for it—most dramatic and most complicated program ever to be waved along with so much support from Congress and the White House. Added one Congressman: "The prestige of pioneering that maiden voyage across outer space will be incalculable. Whatever the cost, we've got to beat the Russians to the moon."

The sincerity of these replies is not in question. What is sending shivers up the spines of topflight military advisers is the assumption (shared, due to the flamboyant publicity, by millions of U.S. citizens) that the Nation which achieves the first moonlanding will automatically become top dog.

This is wildly dangerous thinking. It is dangerous because it ignores the warning that our military have tried to drive home to civilian planners from the very first conception of a moon shoot: that is, in lavishing our money and scientific brainpower on the effort to beat the Russians to the moon, we run the grave risk of losing the free world's battle for survival.

To understand why, we must understand the difference between inner space and outer space. These two zones relate quite differently to our security.

Outer space engulfs the limitless reaches of the universe, an infinite void in which billions of planets and celestial bodies spin rhythmically. Project Apollo is beamed at reaching the nearest of these bodies, the moon, 238,800 miles away—much more by the curved path spacecraft must take. A landing on its bleak and inhospitable surface will indeed bring fame to the nation which first accomplishes this feat, glory greater even than scaling Mount Everest. It will be a triumph for man's indomitable spirit of adventure; but, from the very remoteness of the moon, it can have little or no military consequence.

Inner space is the term used to represent that belt 100 to 500 miles above us recently invaded by the astronauts and manmade satellites. Since the appearance 6 years ago of Sputnik I, at least 134 satellites have occupied inner space, and 57 of them are still in orbit, some Russian, more American. Whoever is first to dominate this critical area

will from then on occupy the driver's seat in world affairs.

The reason is this: before long, before any moon-landing can be achieved by either Russia or the United States, it will be possible to introduce into inner space armed satellites capable of extinguishing any country below in a matter of seconds. Marshal Sergei S. Biryuzov, commanding Russia's strategic rocket forces, promises categorically that Soviet rockets could be launched from satellites "at any desirable time and at any point in the satellite trajectory."

The danger to the free world lies in the profound difference in national objectives. The stated policy of the U.S. space program, as put forth by the President, is that it is "for peaceful purposes." To that end we have developed weather and communications satellites, and have kept our sights steadfastly on a moon adventure. The Russian effort, on the other hand, is first, last and unblushingly military. The Soviet Union is therefore racing to win inner space, the only element in which it is still unopposed; where, unlike land, air, on and beneath the sea, it is not confronted by formidable deterrence.

For 6 years Russian satellites have been designed with this goal in view. Four or five times larger than ours (astronauts can move around inside them), Vostoks are built specifically for weight carrying. Already they can lift off, and orbit, with loads much heavier than any we can carry. Already they have contrived a rendezvous between two Vostoks, have shot an astronaut through 81 consecutive orbits and placed one directly above both our national capital and our heartland.

If this is not sufficient to ring alarm bells, we have Khrushchev's warning that Vostoks can "carry other freight than man. We will hold a sword of Damocles above the earth." If we remain high-mindedly wedded to our policy of peaceful purposes, our vast reservoir of native horsesense drugged with moonshine, he may well live to see his prophecy fulfilled.

What makes a reappraisal of our inner-space objectives of imperative concern is the fact that right now an atomic development of immense military significance is taking place. It is this:

The Russians have recently achieved an increase in the effectiveness of nuclear explosions so devastating that it dwarfs all previous records. Confirming this, our own atomic experts have warned that such tremendous forces, let loose above us from a satellite, could, in a few seconds, literally cremate a large part of the United States. There would be nothing left below, no man, beast, vegetation, buildings, nothing at all but the glare of white-hot cinders.

In face of such a dire threat, it must come as a stunning shock to all thoughtful Americans to learn that the United States has no top-priority programs beamed at preventing, anticipating or deterring such a terrifying prospect. Our top priorities are all tied up with steamrolling through the moon shot. Many billions of public money, together with the rich cream of scientific talent, are lavished on an effort that could well be aborted in midstride by Soviet enterprise and realism.

There is a crying need for a reappraisal of our space aims, for more specific public information, especially since statements from those highly placed in Washington are so contradictory that they blur rather than clarify our understanding. Less than a year ago, for instance, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara declared that "attack from enemy satellites is not a very likely threat for the immediate future. At the present time we see no advantage to space-based systems."

On the other hand, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, tough-minded chief of the U.S. Air Force, expressed a different view before the House Armed Services Committee: "The Russian space program is entirely military. I am sure that space systems will come."

Evidently small heed was paid to Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert's expressed dissatisfaction with "the tone and pace of our military space program," since 8 months later we find C. D. Perkins, former Deputy Air Force Secretary for Research and Development, complaining that "our military space programs are floundering badly."

Unlike Americans, the people of Russia have no such reasons for confusion. One of their leading strategists, Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky, has summed up the situation for them simply and concisely: "An important problem now is warfare with artificial earth satellites, which can be launched for diverse reasons, even as carriers of nuclear weapons."

How serious is this Russian threat?

First, their achievement of a vast increase in nuclear power, which could be directed against us via inner space, is technically feasible. Scientists tell us that given enough raw material there is no reason why bombs of unlimited power cannot be made. We have only to look at the record. The Hiroshima uranium bomb, which destroyed a city and caused 200,000 casualties, had a force of 20 kilotons—each kiloton equals 1,000 tons of TNT. Next came the hydrogen bomb, increasing the explosive factor of the Hiroshima weapon by 1,000 times—its power is reckoned in megatons, each equal to 1 million tons of TNT.

Now something even more sinister has occurred. In 1961 the Russians, violating the test moratorium, exploded a 55- to 60-megaton bomb. "You do not have 50- or 100-megaton bombs," exulted Khrushchev. "We have stronger than 100 megatons." (That is more than 5,000 times the strength of the Hiroshima bomb.)

Why, speculated the West, was this fantastically powerful bomb detonated? The answer came in a terrifying revelation by famed mathematician Dr. Donald G. Brennan, head of the Hudson Institute in Harmon-on-Hudson, N.Y., and associate of key atomic-physicist Dr. Herman Kahn.

Brennan said in part: The possibility of orbital weapons covers a great range. They could be aimed chiefly at the cities, in which case they would have relatively modest yields in the region of 1 megaton. "Another possibility that appears much more disturbing would involve placing in orbit a limited number of devices of very large yield, a few of 100 megatons or more, which could be detonated at orbital altitude rather than being brought down to earth. The thermal effect from such a high-yield device could set fire to a large fraction of the continent."

Air Force-Space Digest magazine, the highly informed voice of the Air Force, rammed home the same point: "It is possible to place very large yield devices in orbit, which have virtually instantaneous delivery time. Detonated at orbital altitude, such a weapon could set fire to a large part of the United States."

Atomic speedup has thus reached this frightening climax: an aggressor nation can orbit satellites carrying unimaginable power, which can be triggered simply by a remote radio key. Set off above our heartland, the explosion would generate heat as incandescent as the sun's—but with this difference: the heat would strike not from a source 93 million miles distant, but from merely 150 miles away, incinerating hundreds of thousands of square miles in a single flash without any possibility of warning. Precision of target aim is no longer a factor.

What are we going to do about it? Efforts to bring about an end to nuclear testing have been sabotaged consistently by the Soviet Union; so have Western efforts, initiated in 1960, to achieve the prohibition of all orbital weapons for mass destruction. Have we any alternative but to take the most immediate and realistic steps to protect the safety of the free world?

Here are the measures urged by military planners:

Perfect a method of detecting foreign satellites wherever they may appear. At present our ballistic missile early warning system (BMEWS) is tied to weapons that might show up in northern latitudes. We need a globe-gridling system, scanning all directions and sufficiently accurate to pinpoint a satellite so that we could send up a defensive vehicle to intercept it.

Pioneer inspector satellites, poised on launching pads and ready to lift off within minutes. Our moonshot experimental firings have been dependent on one big launching pad, Canaveral, and curtain-raising preliminaries there have required as many as 68 days. We must acquire the same hair-trigger, round-the-clock alertness that we have achieved with our nuclear bombers, missiles and submarines.

Place human observers in inner space. Despite radar systems, computers and other electronic miracles, science has still not come up with anything equal to the intelligence and judgment of a man. The Russians have already pointed the way to interception by bringing their vostoks so close together that the two astronauts could actually see each other. The next stage must include lock-on, perhaps by magnetic means, and physical inspection of the enemy satellite.

Achieve means of destroying, disarming or diverting a satellite if it is armed. In World War II, British pilots pioneered a means of diverting London-heading V-1's, nudging the buzz bombs with their wingtips to angle them away from the target into open country. To destroy a satellite would be infinitely more subtle and complicated, but scientists believe that they could be destroyed by electronics or radiation or even be directed back to their point of origin.

Coupled to all these precautions we must establish deterrence inside inner space, fortifying it with armed satellites of our own capable of confronting an aggressor with matching destructive force. Deterrent strength is the overwhelming reason our bombers and missiles have been able to preserve the peace despite incessant Soviet threat and belligerence.

Form a top-level space commission to redefine priorities and activate these measures so that defense comes before exploration.

It is futile to assume that the imagination-capturing moon program will aid us herein. Knowledge of tremendous value is being gained, but national defense against a hostile, racing Soviet Union has more urgent and exacting requirements than the peaceful exploration of space.

The urgent importance of an effective inner space military program has aroused a storm of controvrsy in Washington. Representative ROBERT WILSON, chairman of the Republican advisory committee for space and aeronautics has declared, "The administration's negligence in military space development is a disastrous course for the future of America," and his alarm is echoed by such noted Senators as BARRY GOLDWATER and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, both members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Nor can their criticisms be dismissed as partisan politics; as much alarm or more is being voiced by Democratic leaders such as Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL (chairman of the same committee), Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, and Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, head of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

The warning of top military planners could hardly be more emphatic. Here is what two of the front-rankers have to say: Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Air Force Research and Development, which has the prime responsibility for keeping ahead of Russia: "The most lethal threat posed against the United States today is missiles through space. Space is no longer remote.

We wish to operate both manned and unmanned systems in the near earth environment. Our objectives include detection, tracking, inspecting, and means of disabling hostile satellites." Gen. Curtis E. LeMay: "We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program."

Luckily, we do not have to start from scratch. A military space program does exist. We also have a magnificent instrument in NASA, and we have the hard-won experience of our astronauts.

The greatest practical difficulty is cost. The price of accelerating the military occupation of inner space would be about a billion dollars this year, with more to follow. This is far less than NASA is spending on outer space experimentation. A reallocation of funds in view of present dangers will undoubtedly be necessary.

The safety of our country and of the free world commands top priority, and no other project, however sensational, should be allowed to compromise security.

It is the duty of all Americans to ponder the words of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of MIT and adviser to the White House, when he surveyed the advance of missile systems: "This is one race we dare not lose."

Southern Idaho's New Slogan: "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth of a series of articles on why: "Bonneville's multimillion-dollars annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

An outstanding American virtue of the past has been the average American's desire to stand on his own two feet, to work for what he got and to move forward by his own courage and ambition. I will admit in these days of bigger and better Federal handouts this virtue is becoming slightly soiled. It is refreshing to find areas where the people still prefer to pay their own way, and hang their head in shame when a Federal handout is forced upon them. The following editorial from the Eastern Idaho Farmer of Idaho Falls, Idaho, indicates what that area thinks about Interior Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, May 23, 1963]

THIS IS IT

We bow our head in shame today for Idaho. All the while, we'd hoped that somehow Idaho would not be engulfed by Federal autocracy; that somehow Idaho would be privileged to stand on her own feet; to move forward by her own courage and momentum.

And now, this week, by the single stroke of a pen all of southern Idaho is enmeshed in the gears of that public power octupus, the Boneville Power Administration.

For some of us, that means cheaper power. For the city of Idaho Falls, for instance, it means a power saving, based on BPA rates delivered from Palisades generators, of more than $100,000 anually, we are advised. There are other beneficiaries, too—REA's, the industrial plants which can qualify by use of a great deal of energy, other municipal users like Burley, possibly a few others.

We liked things the way they were—or still will be until September 1. The Bureau of Reclamation was building our projects; we were paying for them. We've always paid for them; always expected to pay for them. At least that's what we thought.

It will be different under BPA. We'll get cheaper power rates for current from the same generators that have been grinding out Bureau of Reclamation electricity for years. And by that fact, we'll join the increasing brigade of those Americans who are getting something for nothing—or think they are. For Bonneville Power is a deficit operation. We haven't seen the 1962 operating report but in 1961, BPA lost $18 million. It's true that BPA has a credit payment backlog which has built up years ago when dams and power plants were cheaper to build and when BPA's rates returned a profit. But $18 million per year loss will whittle that down in nothing in short order—and then the deficits will be shouldered by taxpayers from coast to coast. Either that, or higher Bonneville power rates—which is what we've been told must never, never happen.

Idaho, too, is well started on the tincup career, seeking and getting handouts from the U.S. Treasury. We'd hoped it would never happen here. But this is it.

Mr. Speaker, not to be outdone by southern Idaho, eastern Oregon has expressed a kindred opposition to tax-free Bonneville power. I am sure the following letter from a man in Homestead, Oreg., is indicative of the thinking of most Americans that the Federal power empire should pay taxes just like all the other taxpaying businesses of the Nation:

HOMESTEAD, OREG.,
July 11, 1963.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR:
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SAYLOR: It is indeed a pleasure to read of your action to define the territorial limits of Bonneville Power Administration.

I live in Oregon School District 61, which this current year has a budget of $651,000. Of that sum, 83 percent will be paid in tax moneys by Idaho Power Co. This, of course, is somewhat of an exceptional situation; since the power company's Brownlee and Oxbow power plants are situated in this school district.

In the city of Baker, Oreg., the school district will receive approximately $75,000 in tax moneys from Idaho Power Co. These figures are necessarily approximate since the county school board allocates moneys on per pupil basis among different districts.

Over at La Grande, Oreg., Bonneville Power Administration has substations and transmission line facilities equivalent to those of Idaho Power Co. in the Baker area. There is not one thin dime of tax money paid by Bonneville Power to the schools of La Grande. This is a crime of Bonneville Power. Somebody else not only earns money to support their deficits and build their facilities through taxation; but also pays taxes to support the schools and county and city government in the area in which Federal power is sold.

I, as a taxpayer, and the very utilities in competition with Bonneville Power, have to earn money to pay taxes to support the schools, and local government; and the Bonneville Power Administration gets a free ride.

I feel that it is entirely too bad that Bonneville Power Administration is not by public law required to pay the same kind of taxes that private utilities in its area are required to pay.

Very truly yours,

WESLEY A. KLUCKHOHN.

Study Finds Gold Flow Cause Hazy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the current expansion of the economy is nearing the middle of its third year and areas of chronic economic stagnation still persist. In my judgment we will not be able to solve this problem if the Federal Reserve Board plans to pursue a tight-money policy.

Every day Congress is reminded in some way of the need for programs to reverse the downward trends in the less prosperous areas of the country. It now appears highly likely that the House will again be given the opportunity to vote on increasing the lending authority of the Area Redevelopment Administration. ARA was set up in large part to initiate a flow of capital into critically depressed areas, and I have supported that effort.

However, Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the Federal Reserve in raising the discount rate works in exactly the opposite direction on the domestic economy, and will negate much of the effectiveness of ARA. When the money supply is tightened it is the remote, undeveloped areas which are hit the hardest—interest rates get higher the farther you get from the big money centers. The rise in the discount rate could, if not aggressively counteracted by other measures, take more money in the long run from depressed areas than the ARA programs will put in.

The following article from the Washington Post of Thursday, July 11, 1963, details a recent study by the Federal Reserve on the absence of a "systematic" relationship between interest rates and the balance of payments. I would like to call this article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, July 11, 1963]

STUDY FINDS GOLD FLOW CAUSE HAZY

NEW YORK, July 10.—There is no "systematic" relationship between interest rates or the availability of credit in the United States and the flow of money overseas, a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York concluded today.

"Evidence regarding the question of whether international capital and gold flows tend to be interest-induced is becoming more abundant, and more confusing," the survey found.

A résumé of the study said it is difficult to estimate the effect of interest rates on capital flow because all that is available is historical data which tell only about the past.

"We cannot estimate precisely the responsiveness of capital movements to interest-

rate changes," the bank study said. "Historical data permit us to make generalizations about qualitative relationships. But on the basis of evidence currently available we cannot yet estimate by how much interest rates must change to generate a given size capital flow.

"At best, we can simply suggest the volume of capital flows that might be associated with 'substantial' rate changes."

Federal officials have for some time exerted influences to boost short-term interest rates in order to reduce the oversea flow of capital seeking higher returns. Currently a rise in the Federal Reserve discount rate is being considered as a step to aid the Nation's balance-of-payments position. The study by the bank said that a substantial rise in U.S. short-term interest rates relative to those abroad "might be associated with a reduction in our balance-of-payments deficit of as much as $750 million in a year." The figure was called a crude estimate and no definition of substantial was given.

Outdoor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in another item in the Appendix of the RECORD today I asked that certain material, bringing to light a crudely veiled attack on an important medium of advertising, be brought to the attention of my colleagues. Additional correspondence has been received that further brings this matter into proper perspective and I ask that it also be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

OUTDOOR ADVERTISING

ROBERT P. MOUNTAIN,
President, Outdoor Advertising, Inc.

DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: After reading one of your current advertisements, entitled "How Do You Feel About Billboards?", my first reaction was one of irritation, but further reflection has led me to set down some thoughts which I hope you might consider constructive.

In more than 30 years of advertising experience, most of it with two of the country's largest advertising agencies, I have never seen a more disheartening surrender of a good advertising opportunity than is exemplified by the Rover copy. What pains me is not so much the unconscionable misrepresentation of the standardized outdoor medium, with its touched-up photograph and expressions of personal prejudice, but rather the abandonment of an opportunity to present the advantages of a truly fine product in order to gratify a well-known personal prejudice against outdoor advertising.

You may be interested in the reaction of the advertising and business community to a similar attack on the outdoor medium in a Harper's magazine article of February, 1960, in which, also, the coupon gimmick was used. I am attaching a copy of an Advertising Age editorial and a Western Advertising article, which bear on this incident.

I would be hard pressed to believe that even personal prejudice against a single form of advertising communication could be so estranged from advertising know-how as to invest a client's money in what will surely be a useless prospect list. The extremists will fill in the blanks; those who disagree or are indifferent will ignore them. The harvest will be not a list of Rover prospects, but a list of antibillboard zealots. The advertiser will then have to send out his costly literature to people whose interest in buying a new Rover automobile is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. The effect would be the same if the outdoor industry were to organize its tens of thousands of employees to send in Rover coupons. One could also get a similarly dubious list by providing blanks for people who don't like to watch television commercials.

And I must confess I am at a loss to discover any sound business or advertising reason behind this advertisment. Certainly the purpose could not have been to discredit the judgment of those successful automobile manufacturers, including the leading foreign importer, who make up this medium's largest volume of business.

Neither could sanction of a campaign of this caliber have been based on a sound knowledge of standardized outdoor advertising (24–30 sheet posters and painted bulletins). It could not have been based on Starch national public opinion findings that 80 percent of the American people like and approve of the standardized outdoor advertising medium, or that fewer than 10 percent of this medium's structures are outside urban or built-up areas.

Finally, it would seem to me especially ill advised to associate the introduction of a foreign product with any kind of advertising prejudice. Only recently Advertising Age featured a report on the 30th Annual British Advertising Conference during which Mr. H. G. Lazell, chairman of the Beecham Group, warned that "we must be allowed to advertise in Britain in the same scale and in the same way that it is necessary in the United States." Mr. Lazell complained that "advertising is not properly understood by politicians, economists, and complacent publicists. If the misunderstanding continues," he warned, "I think we can anticipate further measures which will make it even more difficult to use advertising efficiently in this country." Needless to say, American advertisers face similar problems, and my feeling is that we in advertising must work together to promote a better public understanding of advertising.

The widespread, increasing, and diversified use of outdoor advertising in this country is, I believe, contributing to the efficient marketing of American products, as well as to the promotion of many public service causes.

Since outdoor advertising is so widely used by your colleagues in the automobile business, both here and abroad, it occurs to me you might be interested in hearing about some of the techniques they are using.

We also have an excellent new film which we feel objectively positions the medium's public relations status, and which you may find helpful in filling our your views on outdoor advertising. I should be glad to bring the film to your office for projection, or if you prefer, would be happy to have you visit our offices for a showing.

ROBERT P. MOUNTAIN.

CHARLES W. COLLIER,
Executive Vice President,
Advertising Association of the West.

DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: Your advertisement in the May 27 issue of the San Francisco Chronicle, entitled "How Do You Feel About Billboards?" has been called to our attention by a number of people who wonder why a company such as yours selling motor cars would care to project itself into a campaign of this sort.

It seems to us that the purpose of this advertising is obviously not one to determine whether or not the public would like to see you use billboards, but to influence public opinion on bilboards at a time when that industry is fighting for its very existence because of threatening legislation.

The Advertising Association of the West is composed of 6,500 members representing all phases of advertising. At a recent meeting at which other media, including newspapers, television and radio, were present, it was unanimously decided that sweeping restrictive bills against the medium of outdoor advertising are unwise, unfair and uneconomic.

The leaders in outdoor advertising are themselves the first to admit that the public interest must be considered; scenic areas must be kept scenic, but that the highways generally, which were built by traffic, not just made up of extremists on the billboard question, have been made possible mainly by tremendous commercial traffic.

It is our feeling that your point on how do you feel about billboards, is much like the question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" It is our belief that outdoor advertising is a very important part of advertising in the American economy, and it helps people to make incomes, which in turn are converted into purchases of such things as the motor cars you sell. We would like to suggest that you review the matter of this type of advertising and, if you agree with us, stay with the business of selling motor cars, which we understand is your business.

CHARLES W. COLLIER.

LEONARD DREYFUSS,
President, United Advertising Corp.

DEAR MR. MCWILLIAMS: May I set down some thoughts regarding your ad on page 77 of the current issue of the New Yorker.

I have been in the outdoor advertising business 48 years. We employ some 600 people. I know that outdoor advertising is an important channel of communication between the public and American business, which must market its products.

I won't believe it was your intention to attempt to injure an industry in order to sell a few cars. Rover is too good a motor to be a party to anything of that sort.

Mr. Freeman and Mr. Gossage, we won't discuss. Personally, I find Mr. Gossage's "beard" amusing, but it is his privilege to wear it if he thinks it is acceptable to most of his audience. He is entitled to his opinion of outdoor advertising. I really think he does it with tongue in cheek, feeling it is an excellent way to secure publicity for his firm which would not be possible if they were just ordinary ethical advertising people.

Why Rover should be a party to it, I do not know. I have traveled to England almost every year for the past decade and have a vast admiration for the British businessman and the way he builds his products. Rover is no exception; it is a well-built car and properly priced.

May I suggest that if you advertised it on its merits it would sell more automobiles than you can by attacking a reputable hard-working industry. I think the readers of the New Yorker would have liked to have had you tell them why you think they should buy a Rover rather than ask them to return coupons on outdoor advertising. Don't you really think there is merit to my premise?

Outdoor advertising is the oldest of all media. It has made great strides in the improvement of its service in the past two decades. I am not implying we are all "angels" in the outdoor advertising business. Every endeavor has its nonconformists. There are shyster lawyers, you will admit, and quack doctors. In the same token there are some snide manufacturers of automobiles. There is no reason why their product should reflect on Rover.

May I be honest enough to express my astonishment that you have allowed Freeman & Gossage to use you in furthering their attack on a very important means of com-

munication with the people of the United States.

LEONARD DREYFUSS.

LETTER FROM THE NEW YORKER MAGAZINE, DATED JUNE 17, 1963

Mr. JAMES S. GRIFFIN, Jr.,
Drewry Mills,
Raleigh, N.C.

DEAR MR. GRIFFIN: Thank you for sending us a carbon of your letter to the Rover Motor Co.

We read the copy very carefully and decided that it did not break any of our acceptance policy rules. Such sentences as "Many people who profess to dislike billboards may not, by the same token, dislike the advertising on them. They may even like the advertising, or some of it, very much indeed. * * * It would be churlish of us not to admit that the most engaging and clever automobile advertising campaign in the country looks wonderful on billboards," in our opinion, at least, did remove the anti-billboard connotation.

However, you will be interested to know that we have warned their advertising agency that we will not accept similar copy in the future.

All best wishes.

ROBERT S. OGDEN,
Advertising Manager.

LETTER FROM THE TAMPA ADVERTISING CLUB, TAMPA, FLA., JUNE 26, 1963

ADVERTISING MANAGER,
Rover Co., Ltd.,
Sollihull, England.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the Tampa Advertising Club on Monday, June 24 the following resolution was adopted by the officers, directors, and general membership:

"Whereas the advertisement of the Rover Motor Co. in the June 1 issue of the New Yorker magazine made unwarranted and unjustified attacks upon an effective, legitimate, and recognized medium of the advertising industry; and,

"Whereas such attacks serve only to question the honesty and integrity of the entire advertising industry; and,

"Whereas the advertisement is in no way the objective and interested search for information that it purports to be: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Tampa Advertising Club deplores and condemns such unwarranted attacks upon the advertising business and urges that the Rover Motor Co. refrain from any further ads of a similar nature."

Cordially yours,

VIRGIL S. PRICE,
President.

Federal Food Stamps for Alcholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a rather lengthly article which appeared in the July 18, 1963, issue of the Lexington (Ky.) Leader, entitled "Governor's Home County Also Home to Mammoth Bootlegging Operation."

This article gets into quite a discourse and controversy over the political situation in Floyd County, which is a dry county in eastern Kentucky. The point that I think is so important for this body to be cognizant of appears in the following paragraph:

Where do the people of Floyd County get the money for whiskey that sells for $2.50 a half-pint and $8 a fifth? According to several sources, the Floyd bootleggers will accept food stamps from those on relief.

It is quite evident that the use of Federal food stamps to purchase alcoholic beverages is not in keeping with the purposes of the program.

I have today written to the Department of Agriculture asking that they immediately investigate this story. Such an abuse of the taxpayers' funds is unconscionable and, I think, points up one of the fallacies of the food stamp program.

Perspective on Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in the June 24 issue of Aviation Week and Space Technology, Mr. Robert Hotz has written an editorial entitled "Perspective on Paris," dealing with the recent Paris Air Show at Le Bourget. Mr. Hotz has pointed up the kind of competition that the United States is now facing in the international aviation market. I think that this editorial is provocative and deserves the attention of the Members of this body:

PERSPECTIVE ON PARIS

(By Robert Hotz)

The 25th Paris Air Show dissolved in a red, green, and white mist left drifting in the blue twilight over Le Bourget after the superb double bomb burst finale of the nine-plane Italian aerobatic team. The Italians' magnificent performance in their F-86 Sabres, included, as always, several new additions to the world's aeronautic repetoire. It was a fitting climax not only to the best day of international formation aerobatics in a long, long time but also to the 10-day-long show that once again surpassed previous years in technical interest.

The final day at Le Bourget saw seven aerobatic teams representing six nations display their skill with an assortment of aircraft ranging from the venerable Sabre to the Mach 2 Swedish double-delta Drakens and the British P.1 Lightnings.

The two new additions to the Le Bourget aerobatic stable—the Greek air force team flying Sabres and the Swedish air force flying the delta-winged Draken—added distinctive flavor to the already familiar ingredients offered by the United States Air Force, French, British and Italian teams.

The Greeks added grace and elegance to the precision with which they swept their seven-plane formation of Sabres around the sky. They surprised many observers who had never seen them before with the obvious degree of proficiency that this smaller air force has achieved in modern equipment. The Swedes were somewhat handicapped by one of those momentary intervals of deteriorating weather that are so common in Europe but they managed to impart some of the potential of their amazingly maneuverable mach 2 fighters.

No matter how interesting or profitable the technical discussions in the exhibits or chalets may be, it is the flying that really makes an air show, and this final weekend at Le Bourget offered more really fine flying than has been seen anywhere in many a year. Among the individual virtuosos who were outstanding, special kudos should go to: Bernard Neefs, a Belgian flying a European-built F-104; Ralph Donnell in the Grumman Mohawk; Rene Bigand faultlessly flying the VTOL Balzac; Flight Lt. L. G. Lunn of RAF 617 Squadron putting the Avro Vulcan through an amazing low-level exhibition.

Technical trends evident in the show indicated the French are still running strong and becoming an increasingly tough competitor in international markets. The Mystere 20 is certainly a strong entry in the still-wide-open market for the jet executive transport and will give its British and American competitors a stiff fight. The development of the full potentialities of the unique STOL design of the Breguet 941 impressed many observers with its future both as a military aircraft and as a truly rugged commercial freighter for underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and South America. Export sales of the Mirage 3 mach 2 delta-wing fighter already have been good with prospects bright that it eventually will be flying under additional flags. It seems likely that the Mirage 4 nuclear bomber also will enter the export market and fly with insignia other than the Tricolor.

Still a shadow on the competitive horizon, but one of increasing substance, is the West German aircraft industry. It is evident from the wide variety of modern conceptual studies and early development projects on display by German firms that they are close to entering the competitive military and commercial markets with their own designs. The French press made much of "the VTOL battle of Le Bourget" between two opposing technical approaches to the VTOL problem—the vectored-thrust Hawker P-1127 and the lift-engine Dassault Balzac. Both are really experimental flying testbeds for later operational versions, the British supersonic P-1154 and the French Mirage 3V, which will compete keenly in the NATO markets.

The mishap to the P-1127 hardly had the technical significance attributed to it by the French daily press nor did the Balzac represent the great Gallic triumph they imagined. In fact, the technology of both machines is dependent on the technical brains of both countries. The British inherited the initial concept of vectored thrust from the Frenchman Michel Wibault, on whose patents the Bristol Siddeley developments are based. In turn, the Balzac is powered by a battery of Rolls-Royce lift engines, expressing this British firm's ingenuity in solving the high thrust/weight ratio problems that this approach demands. The lift-engine versus vectored thrust competition for the next-generation NATO fighter is far from over and certainly was not decided by a Sunday afternoon exhibition at Le Bourget.

The Paris Air Show has grown substantially in stature during its last three outings as a meeting place for the top technical management people of the international aerospace business. This year saw a noticeable growth in this regard, with more solid business talked than ever before and more buyers and sellers using the Le Bourget exhibits and chalets as places to see most of the people in a few days who normally would require months of travel to contact.

As this aspect of the show grows more important, we suggest that its directors give serious thought to facilitating this activity by designating several special days when the general public is barred and the show is open only to the true professionals in

the field. The British aircraft show at Farnborough has followed this practice for years with highly beneficial results, and we predict that its adoption at Le Bourget would add utility for the people who foot the largest portion of its bills.

No American observer at Le Bourget could have been completely happy with what transpired in these 10 days for, with some notable exceptions, the U.S. image at the show was weak. These exceptions included the USAF Thunderbirds aerobatic team, the NASA space exhibit and some business flying displays. But the lack of any really new or technically exciting U.S. aircraft, and the rather lackluster flying by most of the individual military planes displayed certainly created an impression of diminishing American strength in the international aviation market—an impression that it would be wise to correct not only by better representation at Le Bourget, but also in some basic government and industry policy implementation at home.

U.S. participants in the 25th Paris Air Show certainly have many strong impressions of what can and should be done to improve the American position in the international aerospace market. We suggest that those who stayed at home listen carefully to what they have to say and give it full consideration in charting future courses.

Test Ban: A Soviet Confidence Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, as a portion of my remarks, the following article from the San Diego Union of July 14, 1963:

TEST BAN: A SOVIET CONFIDENCE GAME

(By Ruthven E. Libby, Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy, retired)

If anyone has any sure-fire ritual or incantation that insures good luck—such as keeping the fingers crossed, throwing salt over the left shoulder, or picking up a pin—now is the time to perform it.

Tomorrow Averill Harriman, Under Secretary of State for political affairs, and Lord Hailsham, his British colleague, begin (to quote President Kennedy) "high-level discussions in Moscow looking toward early agreement on a comprehensive test ban treaty."

Three salient factors of this development are profoundly disquieting to all who question the wisdom of pressing for a test ban treaty at this time:

1. The spectacle of U.S. and British negotiators proceeding hat in hand into the enemy's camp to plead for a test ban.

2. The complete lack of knowledge on the part of the American public concerning the price Harriman is instructed to pay for Soviet agreement.

3. Finally but importantly, the selection of Harriman as the President's envoy to conduct the negotiations for the United States.

No man in public life today should be better qualified for this assignment than the Under Secretary, who has dealt with the Russians over a span of 22 years.

In August, 1941, he was U.S. chairman of the Beaverbrook-Harriman mission to Moscow which laid the groundwork for the massive lend-lease military aid program to the Soviets.

As a close adviser to President Roosevelt throughout World War II (and as U.S. Ambassador to Moscow from 1943 until 1946) he attended practically every major conference in which the United States and Russia were involved.

As ambassador-at-large in 1961 he was our delegate to the Geneva Conference on Laos; and as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs in 1962, he practically commuted between Washington, Bangkok, and Vientiane in furtherance of the Kennedy policy of a neutral rather than a pro-Western Laos.

The term "should be qualified" is used advisedly, however. For, in addition to the Laotian debacle, the record shows that Harriman has batted somewhat less than a thousand in his appraisals of Soviet intentions.

Apparently convinced by his experiences on the Beaverbrook-Harriman mission that Stalin could be trusted and that postwar cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union was to be expected, he rejected the advice and prognosis of Adm. William Standley (whom he relieved as Ambassador to Moscow) relative to the state of affairs.

He was one of the leading advocates of a multibillion-dollar loan to Russia to rehabilitate that country after the war. The degree to which his advice influenced President Roosevelt at the disastrous Yalta Conference is moot. Nevertheless, he played an important part in the Roosevelt-Stalin conversations at that ill-starred meeting, the consequences of which will be with us for a long time to come.

One must conclude that his selection to conduct the current negotiations does not indicate an intent on the part of the administration to take a firm and tough stand, but rather to seek an agreement for the sake of agreement.

In fairness to Harriman, it should be emphasized that Yalta was but the culmination of years of "personal diplomacy" conducted by Roosevelt vis-a-vis Stalin—during which Roosevelt's Secretaries of State (Cordell Hull and Edward Stettinius), his Ambassadors (Standley much more so than Harriman), and even that stalwart ally Winston Churchill; frequently were bypassed. So he is inured to having business conducted in this fashion.

He will be lucky if he does not find the rug pulled out from under him while he is in Moscow. For, despite the proved unwisdom of this method of dealing with our Communist adversaries—of whom President Kennedy in a rare moment of candor recently said, "They do not wish us well"—the President seems prone to follow Roosevelt's example. At any rate he keeps up a running personal correspondence with the Soviet premier; and we citizens remain largely in the dark as to how we are being committed.

It may not bother Harriman, but this proclivity on the President's part is a matter of concern. During the war years there was ample evidence available to Roosevelt that the ultimate Soviet aim was world dominaton—evidence which he chose to ignore, preferring to regard Stalin as a dependable ally and convinced that he "could handle old Joe."

Postwar evidence of Communist intent is overwhelming yet, even today, too many advisers too close to the President seem anxious to play down this hard truth.

Perhaps I am too given to the pragmatic approach. But if Washington has issued a credible, rational, convincing, understandable and categorical explanation of the obviously compelling urge felt by the administration—to reach agreement right now with Russia on this test-ban business—it has escaped me.

All that has emerged so far from the plethora of pronouncements is the rather amorphous idea that it is a "necessary first step" toward arms control—not because it has any intrinsic value but because, in some manner, neither spelled out nor easily perceived, it will engender mutual confidence between the signatory powers.

The explanation offered by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations last march is typical, and illustrates the difficulties encountered by the lay observer in trying to make head or tail out of what we are up to. This is what he said:

"What we need are arrangements on which confidence can be built as a matter wholly separate from the question of whether the Russians will trust us or we can trust the Russians, because the very arrangements themselves provide a basis for growing confidence."

Inasmuch as the President and Rusk have publicly acknowledged that the Soviets will abide by any treaty or agreement they make only so long as their interests continue to be served by doing so, the only "growing confidence" likely to emerge from a test-ban treaty signed for this sole purpose would appear to be a growing Soviet confidence in the gullibility of the American public.

Strictly within the context of long-term military superiority for the free world, the arguments against a test ban—particularly one without ironclad safeguards against cheating, are legion.

Sufficient be it to say that the reported opposition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to any form of unilateral test suspension is well founded.

In common with many other critizens then, I must confess ignorance as to why the President is so hellbent on obtaining a test-ban agreement. But it is clear that he is, for reasons which he obviously regards as compelling.

I wonder, however, if he is familiar with the remark made by a staff assistant to his boss when the latter pressed him for a crash answer to an intricate problem: "If you want it bad, you get it bad."

Why Nikita Laughs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we all realize these are perilous days, both internationally and domestically. In my opinion, every time we have entered into an agreement with Communist Russia, or any of her cohorts, the United States has come out second best. It seems that many people in high places of Government have been taken in by Communist propaganda and frequently cannot see the trees for the forest.

On Tuesday, July 23, 1963, there appeared a most thought provoking and well-prepared editorial in the Lynchburg News, with the title "Why Nikita Laughs." In view of the seriousness of the international situation and the importance of our space program, I feel it would be most helpful if the Members of Congress and other interested citizens could have the benefit of this editorial. It strikes a warning to all of us, and I commend it to the membership of the House, the other body, the executive

branch of the Government, and citizens who are interested in protecting America from the insidious Communist threat.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, July 23, 1963]

WHY NIKITA LAUGHS

In Moscow, Nikita Khrushchev talks of nuclear test bans with a jovial smile. But he isn't smiling at the prospect of peace or of lessening world tensions. He is smiling because he sees a chance of gaining a little more time to perfect his inner space program aimed at gaining military supremacy on this planet.

Each passing day it becomes clearer that the test ban talks in which the Kennedy administration places such high hopes may well be the final act in one of the most successful hoaxes in history.

If Khrushchev can once again mesmerize the United States with his flute song of peace he will have gained the last measure of time he needs to settle once and for all the military supremacy of the world.

"We will bury you" he has exulted. He meant it literally and he had good reason to be exultant.

Consider: What is Khrushchev offering in the test ban talks? He no longer needs to experiment with his big bombs. He already has demonstrated he has developed them to the point where they are large enough for his purpose—which is to dominate or destroy the United States. So he offers nothing when he offers to halt nuclear testing.

In 1961 the Russians exploded a 55- to 60-megaton bomb. "You do not have 50- to 100-megaton bombs," he crowed then. "We have them stronger than 100 megatons." Equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT, a 100-megaton bomb is 5,000 times the strength of the Hiroshima bomb.

But he does need a year or two more to develop and build his Vostok fleet to carry these monsters in world orbit. And since strong and urgent voices warning of this danger are beginning to be heard in this country, Khrushchev needs to lull the United States into a slowdown and keep this Nation's eyes fixed in the wrong direction: the moon.

For this is the hoax which has proved so successful. The Reds have enticed the United States into the wrong race. They have stressed an outer space program with moon shots while concentrating on their inner space goal.

They have demonstrated that they can lift far heavier capsules into orbit than we can. Their plan is a threat to orbit a fleet of these space vehicles loaded with 100-megaton bombs which can be detonated without warning by turning a key in Moscow.

Farfetched? Listen to the Air Force-Space Digest, voice of the U.S. Air Force: "It is possible to place very-large-yield devices in orbit, which have virtually instantaneous delivery time. Detonated at orbital altitude, such a weapon could set fire to a large part of the United States."

Exploding 100-megaton bombs at orbital altitude (from 150 to 300 miles) would generate heat as fiery as that of the sun. Bursting at 150 miles instead of 93 million miles, hundreds of thousands of square miles of this country could be incinerated in a flash.

No longer does Khrushchev depend on missiles which can be detected, knocked down, or rendered inactive. There will be no warning of an orbital flash and no prediction of delivery is needed.

If the United States has not perfected the same weapon and the same method of delivery by the time Nikita has, then we had better, all of us, be on the moon.

The Nation's top military leaders, entrusted with the survival of the country, and many of the more powerful Members of Congress have warned that we are in trouble of losing the military race while concentrating on putting a man on the moon. But their warnings apparently have fallen on deaf ears in the administration.

Over the last weekend, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in a speech at the Air Force Historical Foundation at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery, Ala., warned that the United States is risking loss of the military battle by concentrating on a peace-oriented moon program.

"We are moonstruck," declared the Senator, who is a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. "While our eyes are fixed on it (the moon) we could lose the earth or be buried in it."

"It is the defense of our part of this planet, not the moon, that should concern us," he said. "Space weapons are the real new frontier of defense—not the moon."

Says Air Force Chief Gen. Curtis E. LeMay: "We must not risk the danger of waiting for the enemy to demonstrate capability before we undertake development of our own. The visible threat requires a vigorous military program."

And what is our program? It comes as a shock to find that there is no top-priority inner space program in this Nation which has as its goal the prevention, warning, or deterring of the Vostoks.

Despite the clear and present danger, despite the warnings of the Nation's top military brains, the Kennedy administration continues to give top priority to the prestige of the moon program for peaceful purposes.

The road to hell is paved with good intentions.

That is what Nikita is counting on and that is why Nikita laughs. For the picture he sees is not one of peace. It is a picture of the globe of this earth with the United States facing threat of white-hot nuclear fire bursting from orbital flight.

He needs just a little more time.

Hjalmar C. Nygaard

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of our able and distinguished colleague, HJALMAR NYGAARD, and in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

We were not privileged to have HJALMAR NYGAARD in this body for long, but in the comparatively few years he was among us, his depth of character, his sincerity, and his deep devotion to liberty made an indelible impression on all who came to know him.

He was a devoted public servant, always keeping the best interests of the land he loved uppermost, and this House can ill afford the loss of men like him at a time when grave problems press upon us from all sides. It was an honor and a privilege to work with him and to count him a friend, and I feel a deep sense of personal loss at his sudden passing.

Mrs. Byrnes joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Nygaard and all of HJALMAR's devoted family in their hour of trial and sorrow.

Educational Success for the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this month the first group of Peace Corps volunteers began returning to the United States following their 2-year tours of duty in foreign countries.

Among the volunteers helping fulfill the goals which Congress set for the Peace Corps in 1961 are many teachers. In the broadest sense, of course, all the volunteers are teachers. They are educating the peoples of other nations in American methods and techniques.

Roughly one-fourth of the volunteers now involved in classroom teaching abroad were working in this same professional capacity here in the United States. The others were not teachers when they entered the Peace Corps. It is hoped that most of these Peace Corps volunteers will enter this profession when they return home and aid in the solution of our domestic teacher shortage.

The author of the accompanying article estimates that the Peace Corps will put into American education many more teachers than it takes out. This is just one more example of how the Peace Corps is serving the interests of our country.

In the July 20, 1963, issue of the Saturday Review, appears an excellent article on "Teachers in the Peace Corps," written by Mr. Mike Edwards, a Peace Corps press officer. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues as an interesting and informative description of an important phase of Peace Corps work around the world:

(By Mike Edwards)

The day after 26 Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Costa Rica last January, they were summoned to the office of that country's Foreign Minister, Licenciado Daniel Oduber Quiros.

He seated them in an elegantly appointed conference room and welcomed them with this challenging declaration: "You have an opportunity to participate in the greatest social revolution of all time."

His sobering greeting was not merely a reference to Costa Rica's own considerable achievements. Licenciado Odouber had in mind the worldwide quest of all peoples who have been denied the fruits of the 20th century.

The volunteers the Peace Corps sent to Costa Rica are teachers. They will spend 21 months in secondary school classrooms there. If, at the completion of their service, they have fulfilled the goals Congress established for the Peace Corps in 1961, they will have furnished manpower needed by the country to further its development, given Costa Ricans a better knowledge of Americans, and learned something themselves about another people.

Today Peace Corps files bulge with testimonials to the value of volunteers in oversea classrooms. But there may not be a better estimate of their significance than Licenciado Odouber's.

The Peace Corps is more than half teacher, and in a sense it is all teacher. About 60

percent of its 5,000 volunteers spend most of their time in a classroom situation. But because the Peace Corps is an educational undertaking in its broadest sense, all of its volunteers—the engineers, the nurses, the social workers, the agricultural extensionists, the machinery mechanics, the community developers, the nutritionists—are both doers in that they furnish manpower, and teachers in that they show how.

In classrooms throughout the developing free world, volunteers are teaching virtually every subject taught in the school system of a good-sized American city. This summer, for example, the Peace Corps is training volunteers to teach grammar and literature in Senegal, French in Sierra Leone, science in Turkey, chemistry in Nigeria, sociology in Liberia, geography in Malaya, business administration in Gabon, commercial education in Ethiopia, economics in Pakistan, vocational subjects in St. Lucia, English in Chile, mathematics in Bolivia. The volunteers will also work in teacher education in Thailand and in adult education in Brazil.

The need for these volunteers in the developing world is obvious. Some nations' school systems are years away from modern standards. Other nations, newly freed from colonial rule, have no trained manpower to summon into the educational field. Some nations hope to make progress in a special area, such as vocational education; other new nations feel that establishing a sound educational system is the first natural order of business. Consequently, there is a global need for talent able to communicate knowledge and stimulate thought in classrooms. Compared to the situation in many nations, the American teacher shortage is a feast rather than a famine.

This lack of teaching talent, and the attendant thirst for what it can provide, create for the Peace Corps volunteer one of the most exciting jobs in education today. A volunteer teaching in Ghana caught some of that excitement in a letter to Peace Corps headquarters. "If any of you in a speech mention that the chief problem (of volunteers) is boredom, you are all out of your minds," he said. "It is, instead, deciding which 20 things you want to do most."

A volunteer teacher in the Philippines felt the same excitement—but in another way—after the arrival of a footlocker of books that the Peace Corps provides for its members. "I am certain this is one of the happiest households in the Philippines tonight," she wrote. The books had come that afternoon, just before the customary afterschool arrival of Filipino students who use her small library.

The new books were spread out on the living room floor, the volunteer wrote, "and some of the students heard me oohing and aahing. Their curiosity was aroused, and they peeped around the corner of the library door. When they saw the books, their faces lit up like firecrackers on the Fourth. * * * They flocked into the living room, sprawled themselves out on the abaca rug, and read. * * * I got the biggest kick out of one girl. She actually sat down and picked up each book and smelled it."

Africa—where only 16 percent of the eligible youth are enrolled in primary and secondary schools—has used the most Peace Corps teachers thus far. The Peace Corps has put more than 1,200 in 14 nations of that continent. It is not by sheer weight of numbers that the Peace Corps hopes to relieve educational needs abroad, but the near nonexistence of qualified teachers in many nations makes this the case. In Sierra Leone, the arrival of 90 Peace Corps teachers increased by a fourth the number of secondary teachers present for duty. The volunteers increased by half the number of secondary teachers equipped with so much as one college degree. There are 40 secondary schools in Sierra Leone. Volunteers teach in 35. In Ethiopia, the opportunities for secondary school enrollment doubled with the arrival of 275 volunteer teachers. Volunteers have tripled the number of degree-holding teachers in Liberia. More than a third of the teachers in Nyasaland are volunteers.

These heavy injections of teaching talent were administered in response to requests from the countries themselves—the surest indication of the importance these nations attach to the improvement of educational opportunity. The Peace Corps provides teachers or any other volunteers, for that matter, only when a foreign government asks for them. But as Richard Ware, a Peace Corps African programs officer, observed: "Everybody wants teachers. They just do not have enough."

While Africa offers the more dramatic examples of Peace Corps impact on education, volunteer teachers are doing important work elsewhere. Physical educators teach in Malaya, university teachers in Colombia and Venezuela, secondary teachers in Ceylon, Nepal, Pakistan and Turkey, to name a few.

As the Peace Corps expands—the number of personnel will rise toward 9,000 by the end of 1963—emphasis on education will continue. Africa will continue to use the greatest number of teachers, but more will be sent to Latin America, in line with the Peace Corps' announced intention to concentrate on that area.

Who are these Americans who go abroad to teach? The sterotype is of a young ivy-leaguer in a buttondown shirt, diploma in one hand and guitar in the other. But it is only a sterotype. There is no average Peace Corps volunteer.

They come from all 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone. California has furnished more than any other State. Fourteen percent of all volunteers abroad at the end of March were Californians, prompting one Peace Corps official to speculate that there is something in the water out there that makes Californians receptive to the idea of voluntary service. [The South has furnished comparatively few, but the number is increasing.]

State university campuses have been fertile hunting grounds for Peace Corps recruiters. A team of Washington officials went to the University of Wisconsin this spring to try out a new recruiting technique for explaining the opportunities to would-be applicants. They returned to Washington with 425 completed aptitude tests. (The test, a questionnaire, reference checks, and a civil service background investigation are the tools with which the Peace Corps chooses from among those who offer themselves—50,000 thus far. Actual selection continues in the training period, during which about 15 percent are eliminated.)

For the most part, volunteer teachers are in their midtwenties. But teaching is an ideal area for utilization of senior citizens, and a number of retired teachers are working abroad now. Two from California, aged 66 and 67, are teaching in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia, whose most famous citizen is Haile Selassie.

The Peace Corps has been accused of "raiding" the American teacher pool, but only a fourth of the volunteers now teaching abroad were doing so at home. The rest began work armed with a bachelor's degree, an intensive Peace Corps training course, horsesense and a desire to do this work.

Among the 34 volunteer teachers sent to British Honduras last year were a former professional baseball player from California, a 4-H scholarship winner from Maryland who majored in home economics, a chemical engineer from St. Louis, and an employee of a California better business bureau. A strange assortment of teachers, to be sure. But in foreign classrooms, an inexperienced teacher is a lot better than none, so long as he knows his subject. And this, rather than professional background, is the criterion the Peace Corps has used in placing inexperienced volunteers in classrooms.

In British Honduras, the former baseball player who earned a B.S. at California is teaching commercial subjects. The 4-H scholarship winner, who had done some substitute high school teaching, is teaching home economics.

Just as there is no average volunteer, there is no average working condition abroad.

Books are in such short supply in Africa that Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver has asked publishers and others to donate a million texts—500 to back up each of the 2,000 volunteers who will be teaching there by the end of the year. Visual aids are as scarce. "A picture is worth a thousand words," a volunteer in Ghana wrote home, "as the student has little background in most fields. You can't just talk about a tunnel to those who have never seen one. You must show it to them."

Such shortages naturally slow learning. Volunteers have been known to spend several days explaining something, only to have students ask the same questions the next week.

Teaching in a foreign language is a challenge to many, but teaching in English can be, too. American English is different, say Filipino students who are accustomed to hearing localized versions of it.

From one African nation, a Peace Corps official recently wrote this description of the conditions under which a dozen adult educators, then in training, would teach: "Volunteers typically will teach in a one-room school with about 50 women seated and standing. If seated, they will be two to a table, facing the teacher's table and blackboard. Babies and children will wander about the room, along with occasional goats, chickens, etc. * * *" But this is not average. Other volunteers work in modern university buildings, with adequate facilities and texts.

The volunteer's living allowance ($40 to $160 a month, depending on the country) is intended to support him at the level at which a local teacher lives. But while his life may be more basic than it was at home, it usually is quite comfortable, especially in the cities. Not long ago a volunteer in Accra startled an interviewer who pictured all volunteers as living in jungles, by declaring: "I've been in Ghana 14 months, and I've never even seen the inside of a mud hut." But many volunteers have. Others have had a daily diet of rice and beans in Latin America and have traveled by bicycle and dugout canoe in parts of Asia where roads are paths and rivers.

These basic conditions, instead of repelling the volunteer, seem to charm him. As a general rule, those who work in the "bush" are happier than those in the cities, and are rather envied by their urban-based teammates. "Somebody had better point out," one volunteer warned Washington, "that riding a bus in Borneo is just about as exciting as riding a bus in Middleburg, U.S.A."

If these volunteers have anything in common, it is a feeling of occupational frustration, most frequently induced by the inability to see results of their work.

The Peace Corps' division of research, which is concerned with such things, finds this feeling usually is overcome after the first 6 months on the job. By then the volunteers usually are able to measure their accomplishments by the attitudes and motivations they instill.

A teacher in the Philippines dissolved her feelings of occupational frustration with this simple reasoning: "The important thing that we are doing is not that which can be measured with a camera. People in other projects can photograph a bridge they've designed, a road they've helped build or a

toilet they constructed. But who can photograph the mind of a child?"

A factor that sometimes contributes to a volunteer's frustration is the simple task of starting to work in an unstructed situation. Arriving full of zeal, he may discover that, in the words of Dr. Samuel Proctor, "even though he was needed to accomplish a national purpose, finding the handle and the fulcrum is likely to be his first job." (Dr. Proctor is one of many educators who have assisted the Peace Corps. He took leave from the presidency of North Carolina A. & T. College to be administrator of the Peace Corps' largest African project, in Nigeria. William G. Saltonstall, principal of Phillips Exeter Academy, took Dr. Proctor's position in Nigeria in June.)

A local official may not be certain what to do with a newly arrived American volunteer; his superior may not even have told him the American was coming. The result may be that he does nothing with him. Corps Director Shriver, visiting in Central America recently, was surprised to find two Ph. D.'s at an agricultural college who weren't permitted to teach. The school director maintained their Spanish wasn't good enough—a statement the volunteers disputed. This waste was ended by the assignment of one volunteer to full-time research and the transfer of the other to another Central American country. He is now teaching at an agricultural college that appreciates his training and is satisfied with his Spanish. If there were no problems like these, there would be no Peace Corps. The absence of difficulties would mean the country had no need of outside help in its development.

Offsetting the frustrations are the dozens of expressions of thanks from the people with whom the volunteers work. In Nigeria, where the now famous postcard incident of 1961 got the Peace Corps off to a shaky start, praise has replaced demands that the volunteers be sent home. The student newspaper at the University of Nigeria declared as the first volunteers neared the end of their tour of service: "The students * * * were * * * suspicious of the Peace Corps men and women when they arrived here on November 28, 1961. But as time went on, most of our students learned that the Peace Corps volunteers on our campus were men and women who had come with a mind to help and not to subvert. Their devotion to duty, their simplicity, their grace and ease, their complete lack of those qualities that are the exclusive preserve of master spies * * * all of those combined effectively to erase ill feelings the students nursed against the Peace Corps volunteers on our campus. Now that these men and women have almost completed their tour and are preparing to leave, we feel that no amount of praise showered on them for their work is too much."

Two other factors indicate Peace Corps success. One is that every country to which volunteers have been sent—45 in all—has asked for more. The other is that Communist railings against the Peace Corps have been intensified. Volunteers have been called CIA agents by Radio Moscow. Director Shriver (whose first name is in truth sometimes assumed abroad to be a military rank) has been described as in league with the Pentagon. The Bolivian Communist Party newspaper was more original, charging that volunteers in that nation were armed with "small, light arrows activated by rockets" and cast iron bombs camouflaged as cigarette lighters. Such charges have yet to cause a single nation to expel a volunteer.

Just as one cannot photograph the mind of a child, one cannot photograph the changes volunteers have caused in the attitudes of foreigners toward Americans—or the changes in the attitudes of Americans toward foreigners. But there are abundant indications that the changes are considerable. There is a feeling broad that the volunteer is a new kind of American, not your free-spending, loud-talking, luxury-loving tourist type. "Now that they are here and are working in remote areas among the rural people, Malayans are beginning to admire them for their self-sacrifice," the Malaya Times reported. "They are setting an example to young Malayans." A Philippine newspaper scolded Filipino teachers for not being as willing as volunteers to work in remote barrios.

Africans have been surprised to see volunteers pitch in to help with community chores—such as repairing and whitewashing an Ethiopian building so classes could be held in it, and helping build a new water tank in a Nigerian town. (Presently, the volunteers engaged in the latter activity received a formal invitation beginning, "The Mgbaike-Inyi community present their compliments and cordially invite [you] to the opening ceremony of their water tank. * * *")

In a town in Honduras, a town where American employees of a private company live in a compound separated from the community by a chain link fence, a volunteer has shattered the American stereotype for all time by starting vocational instruction among the inmates of the local prison. A volunteer in Cyrus who shows farmers how to raise pigs by day has set some sort of mark in educational counterpoint by becoming an English teacher at night.

For the Americans, too, old stereotypes are being broken. A volunteer teacher in Ghana found the students "an inspiration which certainly makes teaching refreshing. When they are called upon to recite, they stand and the others remain quiet. They pay perfect attention; you could hear a pin drop. The students fight with each other over who is to be the lucky one to carry masters' books and papers. * * *" A teacher in the Philippines found her children shy but "wonderful" and "eager to learn and to please." Establishing real relationships with them, said the volunteer, "is one or our most clearly defined challenges and the most fun."

But the surest index of change in the volunteer himself is the reshaping of his career plans. The Peace Corps believes it will disprove the charges that it is "raiding" the American teacher supply when the first 720 volunteers, sent out in 1961, complete their service this year. A poll of those volunteers indicates the Peace Corps will put into American education many more teachers than it took out. More than 25 percent of the volunteer teachers indicated they found the job so much to their liking that they want to teach here upon their return. Only 13 of these volunteers had previous teaching experience in the United States. Large numbers want to work in international programs, including the Peace Corps, which is hiring as many returning volunteers as it can get. Many will return to university campuses, taking advantage of 150 scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships offered by 35 colleges and universities, and another 50 provided by a $400,000 Ford Foundation grant. The Peace Corps is also having its effect on American higher education, without whose help in training volunteers the whole operation would not be possible.

The pivotal role of language in all Peace Corps work has produced innovation in the use of laboratories, language informants, and drills. Professors in training programs have faced the exciting challenge of classes composed of both high school graduates and Ph. D.'s. Area specialists have sensed immediacy and urgency in lecturing to volunteers who would put everything they said to the test of reality in a matter of weeks.

The Peace Corps' two Puerto Rican training camps and a training center operated by the University of New Mexico are developing appreciation for the British outward bound philosophy of building confidence and maturity by throwing the trainee into frustrating physical situations.

But the greatest effect of the Peace Corps on U.S. higher education has been the kindling of new international awareness. Among the 60 colleges and universities that have trained volunteers (on a contract basis) was Montana State College, located at Bozeman in the heart of the cattle country. To help train 50 volunteers bound for Ecuador, the college initiated a teacher exchange program with a university in Bogotá. The Colombian institution sent language instructors to Montana State, and Montana State sent several faculty members to Bogotá. New programs in American studies were introduced at Bozeman. Library facilities in the Latin American study area were expanded.

A permanent program in Latin American affairs has now been established. The college is in communication with the volunteers in Ecuador and the faculty hopes many will return to Bozeman for further study or teaching.

Altogether, the Peace Corps' impact, occuring in so many different ways and so many different places, has surprised not only the critics of the program, but many of its supporters. But everyone should have expected it, for the Peace Corps has had access to the best minds of the American people, the best facilities for training them, and the American predisposition to give what they have—in sum, the best of America.

Presidential Inability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, the House is scheduled to consider and act upon H.R. 4638—a bill to promote the orderly transfer of the powers and responsibilities of the Presidency at the time of a change in administrations.

In my judgment, the bill serves a useful and necessary purpose, and I congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for his efforts in bringing the bill before us, and I am pleased to lend him my support.

However, there is another problem also involving the orderly transfer of Presidential powers and responsibilities under different circumstances which—without intending to take anything away from the merits of the pending bill—I think is of far greater importance, and even more worthy of congressional consideration.

I refer, of course, to the still unresolved question of what to do when a President, because of mental or physical incapacity, becomes unable to personally carry forward the burden of his office.

As I am sure most of us know, the Constitution is wholly silent on this point. Fortunately, however, this void in our governmental scheme has been of concern on only rare instances in our history. Just the same, on those rare instances—and most of us can remember several of them—those who were charged

in point of fact if not of law with the responsibility for carrying on the business of the Chief Executive, were placed in an unnecessarily uncomfortable and uncertain position, and, without wishing either the present or future occupants of the White House anything but the best of health, none of us has any assurance that such an unsatisfactory experience might not again be repeated.

There is, to be sure, some difference of opinion as to how this procedural void should be filled. In my judgment, the safest and surest route to follow would be to adopt an amendment to the Constitution—as my bill, House Joint Resolution 210 proposes to do—specifically declaring that in case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall automatically devolve on the Vice President until such inability shall terminate, and further giving to Congress the authority to prescribe a method both for determining and terminating Presidential inability in this context.

I should think that all of us who remember those uncomfortable days when the lack of such a plan for the "orderly transfer" of Presidential powers and responsibilities was of real concern to the country—and that we would remember those days with a certain twinge of conscience over our failure to subsequently have done anything about them. I know that the Committee on the Judiciary, where my bill presently languishes, is now extremely busy on other matters, but I would most sincerely hope that, when it has time, it will have been reminded by the passage of H.R. 4638 of the wisdom of giving its early attention to this collateral, but far more serious, problem.

W. T. Burlant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to report the death Sunday of William T. Burlant, former sheriff of Fairfield County. Although he and I approached the service of the people of Fairfield County from different sides of the political fence, I considered him a friend whose death is a very great loss.

As a tribute to his memory, I am happy to offer the following article from the Bridgeport Telegram, which gives the highlights of a truly remarkable and useful career:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram]

W. T. BURLANT DIES—EX-COUNTY SHERIFF

William T. Burlant, 58, of Trumbull, former sheriff of Fairfield County and first Democrat to hold the office in a generation, died last night.

REMAINED ON JAIL STAFF

Mr. Burlant, who had been defeated for reelection last year after serving one term, was appointed director of vocational rehabilitation and recreation at the Fairfield State jail after he retired from office June 1, had continued to reside at the jail where he died. He had been in failing health for more than a year and had been hospitalized several times for surgery.

ELECTED IN 1958

Mr. Burlant was the first Democrat to be elected Fairfield County sheriff in 29 years when he won the office from Edward A. Platt, Republican, in the Ribicoff landslide of 1958.

He lost a bid for reelection last year when John P. Previdi, former Republican mayor of Danbury, won the office as Fairfield County reverted to its traditional GOP voting pattern in the State election.

Mr. Burlant came to prominence in Democratic county affairs after leading the party in Trumbull to an outstanding victory while serving as town chairman there in 1957.

After residing in Bridgeport many years, Mr. Burlant moved to Trumbull in 1937 and became active in the Democratic Party there. In 1953 he was a Democratic candidate for the Board of Selectmen there. In 1955 he was elected town chairman and headed the party in the town when Democrats scored their first sweeping victory on town offices in Trumbull 2 years later. This, in turn, centered attention on him as a candidate for county sheriff in 1958 when he was nominated and elected to that office.

Prior to running for sheriff, Mr. Burlant had developed an active interest in penal affairs. This led him to make improvements in the jail when he took over administration there, particularly in the field of vocational, recreational, and rehabilitation work with the inmates.

Mr. Burlant, who painted as a hobby, also was in the painting and decorating business many years. He was particularly active in the field of painting and redecorating Catholic churches in the Bridgeport diocese and his interest in the penal field developed as a consequence of this work.

HELPED INMATES

Mr. Burlant developed numerous programs for inmates at the jail, including painting of murals, ceramics, and woodworking that attracted considerable notice in the press. He also directed the beautification of the jail grounds with flowers and encouraged inmate patriciptaion in sports to a greater degree than had been the practice previously.

He sponsored the formation of a teenage band, known as the Junior Deputies, and the group performed in various civic functions in and outside Fairfield County. He was active in promoting many civic and charitable operations, particularly the cerebral palsy drive, for which he was recently honored at a dinner by United Cerebral Palsy, Inc., of Fairfield County, and the March of Dimes campaigns. He also took an active interest in the work of the Bridgeport Boys Club.

In the 1958 election campaign, Mr. Burlant defeated former Sheriff Platt, who had held the office 24 years, by 14,011 votes as Mr. RIBICOFF, now a U.S. Senator, carried Fairfield County for Governor by 50,000 votes.

In the 1962 election, with John Alsop, the Republican nominee, carrying the county for Governor by 4,600, Mr. Burlant lost to Sheriff Previdi by 6,283 votes. The two men were longtime friends. After the election, Mr. Burlant said, "I couldn't have lost to a nicer guy." While Mr. Burlant still was sheriff in the 7-month interim between election and the start of a new term, Sheriff Previdi frequently visited him at the jail where Mr. Burlant was ill.

CAMPAIGNED IN HELICOPTER

Mr. Burlant was a vigorous campaigner and was the first candidate for county sheriff in the State who ever campaigned by helicopter. His preelection motor caravans also were a familiar sight in the county. Ill health limited him to a less active role in the 1962 campaign than in the 1958.

In the jail, he had a friendly wave of greeting for the inmates and made many efforts outside the scope of his official duties to help rehabilitate the men and find work for them on their release.

He regarded the inmates, by and large, as persons with possibilities for good despite past mistakes, and said he never found an inmate who abused his confidence.

"Running a jail," he told an interviewer, "is like running any business. The only difference is the human factor—because here the business is turning out good people."

In May 1959, a week before he took office, nearly 750 persons turned out for a testimonial dinner for Mr. Burlant at the old Ritz ballroom.

BORN IN WALTON, N.Y.

Mr. Burlant was born in Walton, N.Y., February 28, 1905, in a family of 10 children. His parents, who had come to this country from Naples in the 1880's, settled in Bridgeport where his father worked as a carpenter.

Mr. Burlant was reared in the south end and attended schools there. He lived in that section of the city 33 years and was widely known there.

From his early interest in art he moved into the signpainting field, working here and in New York City, until he established his own painting and decorating firm here in 1930.

Mr. Burlant is survived by his wife, the former Gladys Morrissey of Meriden, whom he married 33 years ago; a daughter, Mrs. John Topolski; two brothers, Charles Burlant, of Bridgeport, and Louis Burlant, of Stratford; five sisters, Mrs. Elizabeth Tucci, Mrs. Thomas McHugh, Mrs. Theresa Richards, Mrs. Josephine Marzulli, and Mrs. James Robinson, all of Bridgeport, and four grandchildren.

Mr. Burlant was a former president of the men's league of St. Teresa's church, Trumbull, and was active in the Knights of Columbus. He was a charter member of the Trumbull Exchange Club and, while sheriff, served on the board of governors of the Connecticut Sheriffs Association. He was a former member of the board of tax review in Trumbull.

International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, none of us need be reminded that the problem of human rights and human dignity is one of worldwide proportions. Recently the United States has been fortunate in having an opportunity to show and prove its leadership in support of such rights in a major world forum. I refer to the recent dramatic month-long sessions of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland, which took place during June 1963.

As you know, sir, the ILO is the oldest major international organization. It was organized in 1919 as an agency of the League of Nations. The United States has been a member since the 1930's. It survived, almost alone, the collapse of the League and became a human bridge to the United Nations of which it is now an affiliate. Its unique tripartite organization provides direct representation and participation by and for government, workers, and employers.

At the Geneva conference, the United States had a strong 45-man tripartite delegation with an exceptionally able chairman in George L. P. Weaver, our Assistant Secretary of Labor as leader of the U.S. Government section. He also had the full support of our congressional delegation and of the representatives of organized labor and business, including AFL–CIO president, George Meany and former U.S. Chamber of Commerce president, Richard Wagner.

During the course of the sessions, the issue of racial discrimination focused on the segregationist racial policy of South Africa. As a result, the African delegates, the workers delegates from almost all of the 108 nations represented at the conference, including President Meany, delegates from Latin America, the Arab bloc, Israel, and Asia, all left the conference session as a protest, while the employer's delegate from South Africa was speaking.

In this crisis and ensuing discussions, the issues of human rights and the right of all parties in a dispute to be heard seemed to be in a conflict. It was through the determined and skillful efforts of another American, David Morse, Director General of the ILO that the conference was prevented from breaking up. In essence, our U.S. delegation supported both the right of the South Africans as duly accredited delegates to be heard and the right of the others to protest the South African policy of "apartheid." Out of this situation the United States emerged with the respect of the world for our determined support of both the principles of equal rights and the right of democratic due process.

I feel, as many others do, that this most important ILO conference has not received adequate coverage either in our American press or over the air. I wish, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, a very able series of six articles on the conference by John Herling, the able and highly respected Washington correspondent, who covered the ILO Geneva Conference for the Washington Daily News and the national newspaper syndicate which carries Mr. Herling's syndicated column on labor affairs to other leading American newspapers. I commend Mr. Herling's articles as background for the current discussions on the place of South Africa in the international community and the U.S. policy in connection with it. At the end of Mr. Herling's series, I have included a pertinent question and answer exchange between Mr. Herling and President Kennedy which I feel is most timely and significant:

ILO—ONE OF A KIND

(By John Herling)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—The folks back home are probably not aware that some of our leading spokesmen for labor, management, and government are participating here in the 44th annual conference of the International Labor Organization. As the oldest international agency, organized in 1919 as an agency of the League of Nations, the ILO represents the spine of continuity between the old League and the United Nations.

It is one of a kind. It is the only tripartite international organization. This means that the delegation from each country includes representatives of government, employers, and unions. They make up the structural framework of the organization.

For the United States, the ILO has special significance. One of its founders was AFL–CIO President Samuel Gompers. It is headed by an American, David A. Morse. Mr. Morse has been reelected to the post of director general for a series of terms since 1948, when he resigned as President Truman's Under Secretary of Labor. But just as important is the fact that representatives of organized labor and organized business participate as separate but equal delegates in developing the policies and progress of the ILO.

Ever since the United States belatedly joined the ILO in the mid-1930's American labor has moved in ILO activities with considerable energy, while American business went along with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Today, however, the business skepticism of this perennial international exercise has been replaced by keen interest and enthusiasm.

This does not mean that American labor and American business see eye to eye with each other on many specific issues which range widely over the whole field of labor relations, social and economic development. ILO's deliberations crystallize into "conventions" and "recommendations." When such international instruments are adopted by the annual conference of the ILO—a process which moves with all deliberate speed—then they are dispatched to the various nations for approval or for guidance.

As is true of any organization of such scope, it has undergone a series of shifts and changes arising from the profound transformations in the world. For one thing, when the ILO was first organized the power forces were located largely in Western Europe, the United States and Japan. Since World War II, the new and developing nations have multiplied to such an extent that the 108 nations affiliated with the ILO—UN membership makes a nation eligible for membership although special application must be made—now bring to the ILO a cross section of their bread and butter as well as related political problems to the ILO.

At this annual conference, for the first time, the ILO has just elected an African as its conference chairman. He is the Nigerian Labor Minister, Joseph Modupe Johnson.

The U.S. delegation is made up of four official delegates: two governmental—Assistant Secretary of Labor George Weaver and Philip Delaney, special assistant to the Secretary of State—one for labor, Rudy Faupl, who also servies as American labor's representative on the ILO governing body, which is the executive body between conferences; and Richard Wagner, chairman of the executive committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who has been an informed and energetic employers' representative since 1960.

BIAS ISSUE WITHIN ILO

(By John Herling)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—The issue of racial discrimination, whether in Africa or in the United States, becomes an all-pervading issue of the International Labor Conference. More than 1,500 delegates from 108 nations are attending the ILO conference here.

Chairman of the U.S. Government delegation is George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Mr. Weaver is a Negro. For the first part of the conference, his congressional adviser was Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House Labor Committee, one of the most active and controversial spokesmen for the Negro race.

In addition, Harold Snell, U.S. labor attaché at Beirut, Lebanon, and William M. Steen, African specialist at the Labor Department, have joined the delegation as specialists. Both Mr. Steen and Mr. Snell are Negroes.

Thus, out of the 15-man delegation representing the United States (apart from the employer and worker delegations), 4 of the personnel are Negroes. This was not a planned exercise, but a recognition of competence, regardless of color. It is a fact which impresses observers from other nations.

At past conferences, the position of the American Negro was a favorite theme, spun out in all directions by anti-U.S. delegations. More often than not, the American delegation found itself on the defensive. Not so now.

No sooner had this conference opened when the spokesman for Tanganyika, Secretary of Labor M. M. Kamaliza, attacked the the Governments of South Africa and Portugal for their "outrageous and discriminatory policies."

He then went on to say that his government "is firmly opposed to those governments which practice or permit repressive racial measures. We are against racial discrimination and oppression wherever it may occur, from Sharpeville in the Transvaal to Birmingham, Ala."

Well, there was considerable interest among the ILO delegates in the manner in which U.S. spokesmen would counter this. They soon found out.

In an impressive statement, his first of the conference, Mr. Weaver said: "We support, and indeed have anticipated, the suggested extension of the ILO's concern for individual expression, the right of the individual to petition his government, and, in particular, the right of collective protest.

"Because my country is an open society, and hides nothing, it is no secret that a struggle for basic human rights is now being waged by American Negroes in the last section of the United States where there has been large-scale denial of these rights. In this they are being supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

"We are proud," said Mr. Weaver, "of this legitimate effort of the American Negro to accelerate the attainment of the basic rights guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States. Our country was established on the principles of freedom, justice, and equality of opportunity for all. The inconsistency between the Nation's principles and its practices has diminished over the years."

How was this done?

"Constitutional amendments, court decisions, acts of Congress, executive orders, administrative rulings, State and local legislation, the work of private agencies, trade unions, efforts by Negroes and other minority groups—all of these have helped remove many of the barriers to full citizenship for all," Mr. Weaver said.

AMERICA'S FACE IS REFLECTED

(By John Herling)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—Here at the International Labor Organization, when you move from one committee room to another, or look down from the press gallery at the sessions of the 108-nation meeting, you watch the world's problems under a magnifying glass. And you see America's face in a reflecting mirror of intensive precision.

You realize how much American domestic developments have become the world's business, whether we like it or not. What happens in the United States one afternoon finds its expression the next morning on the agenda of even so well organized a conference as this. It seeps its way in.

Frequently, the spokesmen for the new nations will discuss technical matters with considerable legal sophistication. Suddenly they bitterly turn their comments to the state of their retarded economic development as the heritage of their colonial past.

In this way, many of the advanced industrial nations are promptly placed on the defensive.

In such an exercise, the representatives of the Communist countries aid and abet the attack, although it has become increasingly clear that few of the African nations are deceived by the Communist motives. Nevertheless, they take help no matter what the source.

But the tragic news from the United States—the shooting of the NAACP leader in Mississippi, the riots and clashes in one Southern State after another—provide the frame of reference of the discussion for practically every topic on the agenda. For example, several years ago, the ILO passed a "convention"—an international agreement requiring the governmental compliance of member nations—on the subject of discrimination in employment. A discussion on "discrimination in employment" immediately impels all eyes to turn to the American delegates. An answer is required.

It is given in two ways: the energetic action taken by President Kennedy and the Justice Department are given top billing in the European newspapers which the delegates eagerly examine. The dramatic confrontation between Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach and Gov. Wallace of Alabama—and the Governor's backing away—brought great satisfaction and relief to many delegates who were as distressed with the shape of events as the Americans themselves.

Secondly, the answer is given directly by the spokesmen for the American delegation. On successive days, Assistant Labor Secretary George Weaver poured it on in an eloquent factual recital of the great advances made against discrimination in and through daily living as well as through legislation. But above all, the obvious hour by hour concern expressed in the American press as well as affirmative deeds of the Federal Government carry their persuasive impact.

In such international forums, we see the recording of world public opinion. In the ILO, this is especially true because structurally it is made up not only of governmental representatives but of labor and employers. Here the focus of opinion becomes sharper, more articulate and more intimate. The dialog goes on in the professional vocabulary of the special groupings. The arguments become more specific and are directed toward specific remedies and relevant standards.

Yet, for many of the new countries, the discipline required to stick to the matter at hand sometimes snaps. Despite the growth in maturity and in competence, there comes a time when some delegates of the new nations would rather demonstrate than cogitate, rather yell than think. This happened in a dramatic incident affecting the representatives of South Africa. I'll report on this in my next column.

INCREDIBLE UPROAR

(By John Herling)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—The International Labor Organization is being wracked by a crisis of massive proportions. It is probably the most serious since its beginning when it was a matter of touch and go. It comes at a time when the 44th International Labor Conference was preparing to usbject itself to intensive analysis of its program and stood ready to consider the restructuring of its operations and administration. This much was anticipated in the report of the director-general, David Morse, which is the ILO "state of the union" message.

But what was not anticipated was the development of a sustained drive by the African states to take the center of the ILO stage in a way which they have not done in any other international body—in a highly disturbing show of contempt for the processes of the ILO that brings the organization to the brink of possible disaster or of fragmentation.

But it was not the prominence of the African states which caused this crisis. It was their insistence that they would not live in the same organization with the Republic of South Africa. The representatives of black Africa roared their anger at white segregationist South Africa, and then followed it up with the preparation of an ultimatum that either South Africa be expelled, or they, the African states, will walk out of the conference.

In what seemed like a carefully staged demonstration, delegates from the African states unleashed a deafening barrage of rhythmic chants, door poundings, and shouts of "assassins," "criminals," as they sought to prevent the South African employers' delegate, W. F. Hamilton, from speaking. He had been finally granted the floor, after parliamentary moves to prevent this had failed.

By prearrangement, the African delegates, the workers' delegates from practically all 108 nations, and some of the government delegates from Latin America, the Arab bloc, as well as Israel, various Asian delegates, and the Communist bloc—all moved down the aisles to the doors at the end, in open protest against the South African.

AFL-CIO President George Meany joined other leaders of the non-Communist labor organizations in the walkout. It was to have been a strong, silent manifestation of rejection of the "apartheid" segregationist government of South Africa.

But in a few moments it became clear that the African delegates were not going to leave silently. They clogged the doorways of the hall, and then all hell seemed to break loose. The sustained pandemonium which lasted for about 15 minutes, or as long as the South African spoke, almost wrecked the proceedings of the ILO, which proudly describes itself as the "Grand Assize of international social policy."

The reason for such a demonstration had its origins in places great distances from the conference hall of the Palais des Nations. It was triggered by African bitterness, and powered by an atomic slagheap of frustrations, personal and national, built up over many years. It was fused by a highly emotional and new-found sense of African solidarity.

The incredible uproar was all the more unfortunate because, the day before, the conference delegates, through ILO's tripartite system of electoral colleges, had given wide representation to the new African nations on the 48-man governing body, the key legislative and policy organ of the ILO. But perhaps both the combination of new-found power and the almost primitive need to pour forth this vocal vehemence in the face of the enemy spilled over the bounds of reasonable argument and parliamentary restraint.

MORSE'S FINEST HOUR

(By John Herling)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—The International Labor Organization has been having the fight of its life, a fight for both survival and the maintenance of its integrity. This three-part organization—government, employer, and labor—has in the past 2 weeks of its annual conference been under the blasting guns of the new African nations, which now number about a third of the total organization, and the old sapping operations of the Communist bloc. For a long time, the Communists have looked on the ILO, despite its frequently slow-paced operations, as a potential challenge. What they can't control, they would rather destroy. This year it became clear that they would be prepared to bury the ILO.

The man, more than any other, who has prevented this, and indeed has led the ILO into new areas of expansion and development, is the director general, David A. Morse, the ILO's director general for the past 15 years.

Dave Morse has occupied a difficult position. As an American, a former Under Secretary of Labor, he has been the target of those who regard him as an instrument of American policy. They could not conceive that he would administer his post with strict adherence to the requirements of international obligations.

As the only American heading up an international agency, Mr. Morse successfully won the confidence of skeptics, which abound even outside the Communist orbit. At the same time, he was subjected to some criticism by Americans, who, pleased with an American as head of this world agency, frequently thought Mr. Morse bent over backwards in his efforts to prove his impartiality.

In this conference, the moment of truth for Mr. Morse and the conference arrived on the issue of racial discrimination and, in particular, on the issue of South Africa. Over the recent past, the ILO and Mr. Morse have spent an increasing part of administrative time and budget on the African programs. He sought and arranged for fuller participation by Africa in the ILO, and, indeed it can be said that in the ILO the African nations found a greater sense of ease and confidence.

This whole conference, as one French delegate said, has been a "hymn to Africa." But the increased power and recognition—an African was elected conference president for the first time—finally led them to an effort to prevent a South African delegate, whose rights to sit had not as yet been challenged, from speaking.

Out of this came a struggle which wracked the conference. Clearly the issue was not the attitude of ILO toward the extreme "apartheid" racial policies of South Africa. That had already been made clear. But the Africans insisted that they didn't care about the ILO free speech argument; they wanted South Africa evicted from the premises forthwith. This the ILO would not do. Speaker after speaker passionately inveighed against "apartheid" but insisted that unless due process of law was observed, the foundations of ILO were endangered.

Finally after unprecedented demonstrations by Africans on and off the floor, and intensive efforts by Mr. Morse to build a bridge of communication to the African delegations, the ILO was confronted with the reality of a full-scale secession on the part of African states, aided and abetted by the Communist and Arab bloc.

Before packed galleries of the Assembly Hall in the Palais des Nations, David Morse rose and gave the speech of his life. Indeed, observers believe it was one of the most memorable in the history of international organizations. Great statements are sometimes made by leaders of national delegations, but seldom by an international official. Only the famous reply of Dag Hammarskjold to Khrushchev's attack can stand comparison. Mr. Morse's immediate efforts to persuade the Africans to reconsider their intention to quit the conference failed. They had apparently gone too far down the path of public—and political—commitment to retreat from their decision.

"We must fight discrimination," said Mr. Morse, "but we must fight it with truth and we must fight it with the dignity that comes from truth." Then with a voice deepened by intense emotion, Mr. Morse, a Jew, told the awed, hushed audience, "You don't have to tell me about racial discrimination: I need no lessons in racial discrimination.

"Racial discrimination is the enemy of the civilized world community, a challenge to world peace, to world order. We must—I pray you—engage this enemy effectively. This can not be done by quitting the conference, this particular field of battle."

RASCALS AT WORK

(By John Herling)

GENEVA.—The policies of the Soviet Union may now be geared to more peaceful methods. The establishment of a "hot line" between Moscow and Washington may give us all a chance to continue the dialog of clarification. But there is no doubt that, hot line or not, the intentions of the Soviet Union are to give the free world a hot foot whenever possible. In short, the rascality of the Communist tactics continues by other means.

Evidence of this was clearly established at the dramatic conference of the International Labor Organization just concluded. You will recall that the main issue centered around the whole question of "apartheid" in South Africa. This was surely an extension of the intense preoccupation of the entire world, including the United States, with the problems of racial tensions and racial discrimination.

When the ILO conference was nearly wrecked by the dramatic walkout of the 32 African nations, the issue, for a moment, seemed blurred. Some said that the ILO's passion for "due process" was narrow and procedural and that it should not have been too particular about finding even questionable means for throwing the duly accredited delegates of South Africa out of the Palais des Nations.

Now, the decision to hear the South African delegate was unanimously made by the officers' committee of the conference. This group included Sergei Slipchenko, the Soviet Ukrainian, one of the three vice presidents of the conference. It was at the behest of the officers that Rudy Faupl, the highly respected U.S. delegate, another vice president, took the chair. He carried out the ruling to hear the South African.

In the ensuing uproar which accompanied the departure of the 32 protesting African delegations from the ILO conference, the Communists began to get their licks in. In one way or another, they began to sharpen their knives, procedural and ideological, to cut the ILO to ribbons.

Despite Mr. Slipchenko's participation in the ruling, they presumed to act as the "voice" of the departed Africans—much to the dismay of some African leaders who had remained in Geneva to follow the proceedings, and then to participate in the ILO governing body sessions which follow the conference.

In addition, the Soviet bloc, whose delegates have long been using parliamentary sharpshooting to block the work of international organizations they can not control, tried to boobytrap the ILO through sheer unadulterated rascality.

For example, they fought against the approval of the ILO budget on the grounds that the departure of the Africans had not been "official" and therefore the Conference was not competent to establish the necessary quorum. When the ILO rejected this poisonous point of order, the Communist bloc tried again.

Since the ILO Conference was determined to follow through on its 1961 resolution against South Africa's apartheid it was now ready to act on an "urgency" resolution introduced by the Latin American countries. This calls upon the U.N., the parent body, to take action on South Africa. But none other than Sergi Slipchenko, the smiling Soviet spokesman, gave this the knife.

Under the rules of the Conference, any "urgency" resolution required the unanimous approval of the Conference officers. Mr. Slipchenko in executive session vetoed the anti-apartheid resolution. His motives were clear: by preventing the ILO from taking this action again South Africa, the Communists could place the ILO on the defensive on this issue. Which is exactly where the Soviet Union and its allies want it to be.

The obvious duplicity of this action brought full-scale exposure of Soviet skulduggery on the whole South African problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that President Kennedy has kept closely in touch with the developments in this area which is of deep concern to all of us.

At the last Presidential news conference on July 17, Mr. Herling asked the President the following question:

Mr. President, may I ask you, sir, about the recent demonstrations by the African States at the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva with respect to South Africa? What is our American position with regard to South African participation in the United Nations and many of its agencies?

To this question, the President replied:

Well, we have condemned the racial policy of South Africa which is inimical, I think, to the future of South Africa as well as repugnant to us. We also do not believe that it is useful to begin to expel nations of the United Nations. I think you have enough pressures on the United Nations. I think these countries ought to stay in the United Nations. The United Nations has every right to express hostility to policies which are pursued, and which are a threat to peace, but it would seem to me unwise to expel nations from the United Nations—because the hand will move, others will come, and the United Nations will be fragmented. I think it [the U.N.] ought to be as broad as possible a coverage but I think we ought to be very clear in our hostility to the concept of racial segregation.

Commissioning of U.S. Air Force Ship "Hoyt S. Vandenberg"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1963, I was present at the dedication of the U.S. Air Force ship *Hoyt S. Vandenberg*. With the commissioning of this research missile tracking vessel, the capability of the United States to defend itself from all enemies is significantly increased. It is particularly fitting that this missile-age vessel be named after a fine, farsighted Air Force Chief of Staff, Hoyt S. Vandenberg, for it was General Vandenberg's belief that scientific research held the key to the Nation's defenses. Among those present at the dedication ceremony were the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore, Md., and the Honorable Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, whose remarks at the ceremony follow:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE THEODORE R. MCKELDIN

Thank you Secretary McMillan.

Mrs. Vandenberg, Governor Tawes, Members of the Congress, Secretary Sylvester, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen; this gathering today for the dedication of the Air Force missile tracking ship, the *General Hoyt S. Vandenberg*, holds a special personal meaning for me. It brings to mind several happy occasions of the past when I had the pleasure of meeting General Vandenberg during his service in Europe.

I was Governor of the State of Maryland at the time and one of my more pleasant duties was to award diplomas to graduates of the oversea branch of the University of Maryland in Germany. Many of those graduates, incidentally, were officers and men of the Air Force who worked in their off-duty hours to earn their degrees.

On several of these trips overseas, I had the opportunity to meet and visit with General Vandenberg. His character and qualifications were highly impressive and his brilliant military career over a 30-year period placed this Nation greatly in his debt.

It is therefore a special pleasure for me to welcome all of you to Baltimore for the dedication of this Air Force vessel named for one of America's greatest airmen.

It is particularly fitting that such a dedication should take place here at Dundalk Marine Terminal, which was for many years the site of Harbor Field, the municipal airport of the city of Baltimore. Perhaps many of you here today who wear the wings of Air Force pilots had occasion to fly into Harbor Field in the years before its conversion into a marine terminal in 1961.

As Harbor Field, it served the air age needs of the city for many years before the construction of Friendship International Airport. As Dundalk Marine Terminal, it is serving the general cargo needs of the world seaport of Baltimore.

I might note too that much of the cargo that now moves through Dundalk Marine Terminal is Air Force equipment destined for all of the areas of the world where our soldiers and airmen are on duty.

So this facility, with a history of service to both sea and air, is now the site of the dedication of an Air Force ship which will sail far down the Atlantic Missile Range to track the progress of this Nation's space vehicles.

We here in Baltimore are used to technological advances on the part of the Air Force, and we are proud that you have chosen to bring this ship here for its dedication today. For many years this city was the home of the Air Research and Development Command, and Baltimoreans have always watched with great interest the progress made by the Air Force in the field of space research.

So it is with real warmth that I welcome you here today on behalf of the people of the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland.

And to the men who will sail the *General Vandenberg* let me assure you that you have our very best wishes for fair winds and smooth sailing on this and on all of your future voyages.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY HON. ARTHUR SYLVESTER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The oceangoing Air Force vessel that we dedicate here today epitomizes the changes that modern technology has wrought not only in today's weaponry but also in the capabilities of the armed services themselves.

For while the U.S. Air Force's *General Hoyt S. Vandenberg* conforms to none of the othordox marine occupations, it contributes vitally to our military strength. It emphasizes anew that the Air Force is not confined to the air, nor the Army to the earth, nor the Navy to the sea.

The ingenuity of the scientist and the skill of the technician have been combined with the experience and training of the military to produce in this vessel a missile tracking station equal to those on the islands ranging southward and eastward from Cape Canaveral.

Moreover, this ship and its sister ship, the U.S. Air Force's *General H. H. Arnold*, are unique in another way. They are mobile

tracking stations that can range the oceans of the world.

In this ship we see the most peculiar silhouette that any vessel ever displayed. In part that is due to the 40-foot-high dish antennas. They can literally collect millions of items of information about a missile in its final 2 or 3 minutes of flight between its reentry into our atmosphere and its impact.

We have balloons to study the atmosphere 250,000 feet up, and radios to transmit 10-,000 miles back to Cape Caanveral. Inside this ship we have equipment and computers to gather, assemble, and transmit this information in split seconds for human consumption and action.

All this, in varying degrees, can also be found in our island tracking stations. But here the problem was far more complex. For here our people had to concentrate all the equipment within the confined space of a ship. They had to make that equipment work despite the vibrations common to all ships under power. They had to insure reliability of precision instruments even while the ship pitches and rolls in rough water. Compensation has been built into this ship even for the errors caused by the bending and twisting of the steel hull.

With this ship we have, for the first time a fully instrumented tracking station capable not only of monitoring but also of recovering nose cones out to the full range of our ICBM missiles. This is truly a remarkable achievement of American ingenuity.

With ships of this class we can accumulate more information than ever before, and this reduces the number of missile tests required. They illustrate the progress of Air Force technology, producing increased efficiency and economy. They advance the Air Force in its primary job of supporting national policy generally, and more specifically, in keeping space free for peaceful exploration by all and protecting the free world's interests in space.

They also illustrate clearly our intense concentration upon our "need to know" the deeper and precise knowledge that lies behind so much of life's surface in all realms. It is the motivation for all our research and development, our scientific and technological progress, our intensified and expanding educational processes. This ship is evidence of our commitment to expanding knowledge.

General Vandenberg, for whom we name this vessel, dedicated his life to our need to know—in fact, he spent his life, and then gave it, to our need to know more fully and appreciatively the importance of airpower to this Nation. He worked to bring the Air Force into being, then defended it from those who did not understand airpower. Finally, having firmly established it, his mission was accomplished.

When he became Air Force Chief of Staff in 1948 he devoted himself to the revolutionary combination of jet, atom bomb, and electronics through which airpower was to rise to new capabilities. He understood what need to know means, in the sense of scientific research, but his biggest job was to convince his fellow Americans that the U.S. Air Force had a place in the first line of American defense. He was convinced this was the public's basic need to know at that time.

In a much broader and far deeper sense today, our need to know covers many other areas. For example, we need to see ourselves as others see us. We were very much surprised to find that some of our best friends and closest allies in Europe did not share our shock when Chairman Khrushchev moved his missiles into Cuba. We need to understand that a threat that is 90 miles away seems far distant to a person who lives in West Berlin within sight of Checkpoint Charlie. We can pass from Kansas City, Kans., to Kansas City, Mo., without hindrance or danger. But in Europe across a black line of demarcation between East and West Berlin the world is split into two camps.

We need to know history much better—not only our own history but also that of the world and the relationship between the two. We take for granted that the United States will exist forever. The dedication of this vessel testifies to our determination to insure that national survival.

But history suggests that perpetual existence is not the inevitable lot of every human society. The military might of Rome, the cultural preeminence that was Greece, the glory of Babylon—these and other civilizations rose to spectacular heights of dominance in their day, only to decline into the mist of history. The philosopher and poet, George Santayana, once warned that "he who will not learn from history will have to suffer making the same mistakes over again." So, we need to know history.

The State Department takes the problem of our need to know our own country and its history so seriously that it conducts special courses on these subjects at the Foreign Service Institute. Here it prepares our Foreign Service officers—and their wives—to explain the United States and to face criticisms of us in foreign quarters. If such specialists in international affairs need this training, I would think that most of the rest of us need it even more.

Satisfaction of the American people's need to know constitutes an important part of my responsibilities in public affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. But meeting this requirement sometimes confronts me with a dilemma. President Kennedy has expressed it in these words: "Two requirements seem almost contradictory but they must be reconciled and fulfilled—the need for far greater public information—the need for far greater official secrecy."

We are committed to the principle of the American public's need to have a truthful, factual flow of information about their Government's policies and actions. But we are also sensitive to the fact there are areas of defense security information the release of which is justified only by an affirmative answer to this question: "Is this information of enough value to the public and of little enough value to the enemy to warrant its release?"

That is not always easy to answer. But then we know, indeed we must not forget, that this problem is not new. George Washington complained of the colonial printers' continued lack of discretion in publishing certain items of military or strategic importance. However, neither Mr. Washington nor his great colleagues was deterred in the constitutional establishment of our basic freedoms simply because the exercise of those freedoms would create problems.

The free society they established can exist today only if we, its beneficiaries, are prepared to defend it against a wide spectrum of threats. Our presence here today evidences again our national will to do so.

May we then dedicate this fine ship, one of the many instruments of such a defense, in the name of General Vandenberg whose life was devoted to our free society. Thank you.

Celebrate the Fourth of July and Other National Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to some outstanding poems and articles in the Lynn Sunday Post of June 30, 1963, entitled "Independence Day."

These writings by the talented Mr. Anthony Cama, teacher, author, poet, and director of the Italian School in Lynn, Mass., are brilliantly done and do much to point up the need for promoting waning patriotic fervor for appropriate celebrations of the Fourth of July, and other great national holidays, which have undergone a serious decline in interest and participation in recent years.

When the time comes that Americans will not take the interest or time to celebrate the birthday of our great Nation, and stand by unprotesting and inarticulate, while others deemphasize patriotic occasions, the people of this country must definitely become alerted and concerned and move promptly to reinvigorate the patriotic sentiments toward and in our great national holidays that have sustained the faith of the American people in the past and made possible in large measure the achievements of our country.

Apathy is one thing, but deliberate downgrading of patriotic holidays and occasions is quite another. It would seem that both exist in this country today. It is up to loyal Americans, regardless of their race, class, creed, or station in life to join together wholeheartedly to reinvigorate and revive the outward expression of patriotic sentiments and patriotic celebrations of our great national holidays.

If we allow the Fourth of July and other great holidays to lose or be divested of their patriotic significance and turned into mere saturnalias of personal enjoyments and carnage on the highways, we will, by our action or inaction, be contributing to the decline of patriotic ideals and sentiments in this Nation that could have most serious consequences for the American system of person liberty and free government. Let us celebrate the Fourth with special vigor, and all our holidays with the reverence they deserve, notwithstanding the iconoclasts, the skeptics, and the materialists who oppose the free way.

The poems and articles follow:

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post, June 30, 1963]

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, 1776–1963

Lift high the flaming torch of freedom's light
A brilliant glory burning sea and sky.
Let every man know justice; wrong and right
Let every spirit thunder forth this cry!
This land shall be the home of liberty
To shelter and to nestle mortal's seed!
This Nation shall be ever one and free
Regardless of its color, race, or creed!
This land shall vanquish bigotry and hate;
No more the bloody stain; the thorn of shame.
For all of men no more the frightful gate;
For all of men one brotherhood aflame!
Lift high the vision, strong and ever brave,
This land is ours with equality.
No man was born to be a branded slave.
With faith in God we shall be ever free!

—*Anthony Cama.*

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post, June 30, 1963]

UNTO MY BROTHER

Make love a bridge from heart to heart
To span the awesome deep of hate and strife,

That man may heal the aching, broken part
Of every dream which brother built of life.
Let every sorrow be unknown to pain,
To burn a sunrise on the face of shame
And melt the tearful into fragrant rain
To bloom a joy within each brother's name.
Be like a surging seed to nest the Earth
And reach for Heaven like a woman-tree,
For mother knows no race or creed when birth,
Is blessed with anguish for the life to be.
Make every heartache sing within each vein
A throbbing voice of man with visioned face,
To wash away all bigotry and stain
And give each man his rightful honored place.

—ANTHONY CAMA.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post, June 30, 1963]

THE OLD FOURTH

The Fourth of July—Independence Day. What a world of color, of drama, of history those few little words bring to mind and especially to folks who can remember what the Fourth used to mean.

It was a day of fun, of course. There were games, complete with prizes for young and old alike, running the gamut from three-legged races to shooting matches. There were the family picnics, and sturdy old tables groaned under them. There were the fireworks, now banned almost everywhere, except in formal displays, for safety reasons. There were the orators. They ran the full gambit from good to indifferent to bad, but all had one factor in common—dedication, passion, and pride in Nation, its heritage, and its future.

There were the great brass bands, the members standing tall in their pressed, polished uniforms. There were the rollcalls of the towering names that had provided leadership in molding and making a Nation fit to stand with any nation—Washington, Madison, Monroe, Jefferson, the Adamses, Franklin. And the flags, proud against the sky, flew everywhere.

We still celebrate the Fourth. It is still a national holiday. But something vital has gone out of it. Whatever the reason, the Nation is poorer, weaker, and smaller because of that.

Times have changed. We have grown, prospered, learned sophistication, enjoyed vast material progress. But is the old pride, the old sense of faith in Nation and in its destiny, the old courage still with us?

Each person must answer that question for himself. Let every American man and woman ponder deeply and honestly before answering as another Fourth comes near.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post, June 30, 1963]

THE GLORIOUS FOURTH OF JULY

(By Anthony Cama)

It is proper and fitting that this writer bring forth awareness of the magnificent and precious importance of Independence Day to readers of the Sunday Post and to all Americans both young and old. In these crucial, anguished times, when our land is enveloped in the shameful strife of segregation, massed battles in the streets of America, where savage dogs are set upon human beings, it is the solemn duty of every teacher, newspaper, radio, and TV program to present the spirit of the Declaration of Independence to our citizens.

It has been unequivocally stated over and over again by President Kennedy, Vice President JOHNSON, and distinguished jurists and legislators all over our land that any person born in these United States is as truly and irrevocably an American as any other being, regardless of race, color, or creed.

The sacred Declaration of Independence is commemorated by the glorious Fourth of July in this country. This document, which was drawn up a year after the beginning of the Revolutionary War, during which the 13 Colonies threw off the British rule of tyranny and made themselves free and independent, gave voice to the doctrines of democracy, justice, and equality of opportunity. Yet sad and tragic facts fling their stark nakedness into our very ideal American image of human dignity and individual rights to this very day—right up to this very Fourth of July. How can a nation such as ours condone the un-American actions of Governors, Senators, and men of law and education who commit acts of inhumanity and treason against the very constitutional rights which allow them to challenge the President and the Supreme Court?

No American born should have to fight and suffer humiliation, intimidation, and even death for what is most irrefutably his or hers by the sacred law of birthright. Great shame has been brought upon our very cradle of liberty. Great loss of prestige and honor has been the penalty of such un-American acts of arrogance and racial discrimination.

What does the picture of Negroes being beaten, lynched, and refused equal rights convey to millions of nonwhites all over the globe? How do our ambassadors, diplomats, and Peace Corps volunteers explain the pictures of an American flag lying torn, dirty, and trampled in the streets, where police with guns, clubs, and snarling dogs disperse a group of American Negroes? How does a teacher-writer like myself teach democracy in the classroom when the newspapers and TV programs are crying out the acts of cruelty and injustice being perpetrated in some of our Southern States?

How does one explain to Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Cubans, or Indians the unlawful, sadistic acts of legislators and officers of the law who personify all that is American democracy? What do we say to the thousands of Negro veterans of World War I and II and Korea who shed their blood and gave their lives and health in the service of their country?

Let the indomitable spirit of American pioneers, the settlers of our vast wilderness, the conquerors of rivers and mountains, the vibrant voices of millions of immigrants who came to this beckoning soil to illuminate our skies with brotherhood and justice and equality surge forward on this Independence Day and every other one to come and be an engulfing tide cleansing the putrefaction which this day litters and ferments a stench upon these shores of hope and human rights.

Let the valiant and the courageous, the gentle and the humble-weave their faith in America's untainted future in every star and stripe of our glorious Star-Spangled Banner. Let every pulsing, throbbing American vein become a torrential storm in the magnificent Statue of Liberty to ignite and forever keep the torch of liberty a flaming beacon which will proclaim to all the peoples of the earth:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Let every church bell, every classroom, every American cry out this day that "government of the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Senator Kefauver on Resolution of Rail Merger Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] delivered a thoughtful and incisive address, "A Positive Resolution of the Rail Merger Problem," before the Great Lakes Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

In this speech Senator KEFAUVER, chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, pointed out that the magnitude and extent of proposed railroad mergers before the ICC indicates the wisdom of declaring a suspension of final decision on every pending application until clearly defined regional and national merger policies have been established by the Commission.

The proposed mergers of many of our great railroad systems would have the profoundest impact on the economy of this Nation. I urge my colleagues to read this address by Senator KEFAUVER which deals directly and frankly with this vital problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of "A Positive Resolution of the Rail Merger Problem" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSITIVE RESOLUTION OF THE RAIL MERGER PROBLEM

(By Senator ESTES KEFAUVER)

We have now come far enough along with these rail merger proposals to know that most of the railroad industry is involved in a massive movement toward consolidation and concentration of economic power in transportation. With the Interstate Commerce Commission openly encouraging rail mergers (but without real guidelines), and with the administration not aggressively opposed to a merger movement, we know we are on the threshold of a restructuring of our railroad network. The key question is: Are we as a Government strong enough, and knowledgeable enough today, to effectuate the best rail alinements and discourage, and if need be reject, those merger proposals which will do violence to a healthy, competitive private transportation system. This question has given me great concern.

The cards are now on the table, for the Congress, for the Commission, and for the administration. There will be no turning back after this game is played. The decisions made during the next few years by those responsible for our transportation policy will be irrevocable, and more, they will be cruicial to the growth of our country, the preservation of our security, and the perpetuation of our concept of private enterprise under regulation. These are indeed high stakes, demanding the highest ability of the players, and the keenest interpretation and enforcement of the rules. There is no room for cowardice or mistake in meeting this rail merger problem and in solving it in the public interest—and by the public interest I mean the direct interest of the consumer and the shipper, as well as the carrier. Railroad consolidation and reorganization is everybody's problem, and the Federal Government, not the industry, has the final responsibility as to how that problem is solved.

Recognizing the importance of rail mergers as a part of its general concern over the concentration of economic power throughout American industry, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, conducted an investigation and held extensive hearings. What we found was enough to sicken the heart of anyone holding faith in the concept of economic regulations in transportation. The plain fact of the matter is that the Commission was not prepared for the size and extent of the merger proposals which descended upon it, and it is still in search of a merger policy when most of the industry is before it demanding approval of its plans.

In the first place, we found that the Interstate Commerce Commission, although entrusted with plenary authority to approve rail mergers, is unequipped to make these vital social and economic decisions. The law under which it operates is so vague as to provide no definitive criteria which could have been followed by the railroads in choosing their merger courses. Instead of making any general investigation of the mass merger movement, and coming out with policy directives designed to establish definable public interest standards and safeguards, and thereby discourage bad mergers, the Commission did nothing. Now, today, its own staff has told the Commission that further economic research is necessary to develop patterns and methods of testing applicants' cases, and that the Commission is in no present position to appraise fully the effect of mergers on competition between railroads and between railroads and other modes of transport. It stated that the local and regional impact of mergers is not now adequately assessed. This should be of particular interest to State commissioners and other State representatives concerned with local and regional growth.

I directed a letter to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Secretary of Commerce asking these agencies concerned with transportation whether they had made any investigations, studies, or reports with respect to some 16 factors highly relevant to the testing of rail mergers. The general answer was that they had done nothing.

The point was made that the Commission relies on the participants in merger cases to develop the facts, that the Commission makes its determination solely on the record made, and does not engage an independent analysis. When we looked into this, we found many one-sided cases, with those best able to challenge applicant cases and provide crucial testimony withdrawing from the litigation or not appearing at all. In many instances those carriers and shippers remaining in the cases gave only token participation. Recognizing this danger of collapsing records and the need for an independent testing of mergers, the Commission called in its staff members to "bolster the record" in only two cases. Careful perusal of the records in these cases has left me with the impression that Commission experts, as well as other public interest participants, have not presented a sufficient independent testing of applicants cases. I must say that the recent testimony of Commission experts in the Pennsylvania-Central case gives promise of improvement in this area. The Department of Justice has been attempting to put into perspective many issues on brief, but it has not had the manpower or the expertise to develop the record sufficiently. These cases are indeed too vital for us to rely solely on the challenge of other carriers and shippers whose interests may not be sufficiently hostile to provide adequate examination of public interest criteria.

I am reminded of the testimony of Commissioner Paul A. Rasmussen of the Minnesota Railway & Warehouse Commission, a friend to many of you, and I should like to quote from his testimony with respect to the Northern Lines proceeding:

"When the railroads find it necessary to take 6 years in preparing a merger application, it is both unrealistic and unfair to even anticipate that the U.S. Department of Justice, the State governments, industries, and labor organizations that are opposed to the merger should be allowed only a few months to react to a petition that has been compiled by the best legal minds in the United States, outstanding statisticians, accountants, and research experts. Many State utility commissions found themselves abruptly confronted with the responsibility of protesting railroad mergers in the interest of the economy of their respective State and yet in a position where not $1 had been appropriated for this type of an expense.

* * * * *

"The point, gentlemen, I am trying to make is that the protestants should have an opportunity to be as thoroughly and well prepared as the petitioning railroads. In a matter of such importance, something more than token opposition should be expected of States and the parties of record who protest a merger proceeding."

What else did we find in our investigation into this rail merger problem? The railroad industry, taking advantage of the Commission's mergers, the broad merger criteria, and the adversary case-by-case approach without objective challenge, proceeded to submit some of the most extraordinary combinations of railroad power ever proposed. These mergers are based upon the concept of creating regional monopolies, shrinking rail capacity and eliminating service. I don't have to go into the details of these applications, except to point out a few examples. One proposal would combine the first and second largest railroads in the United States with over 50 percent of the traffic within the regions in which they now compete, and with even greater combined power at the crucial gateways and interchange points.

Another proposal involves the creation of three strong and wealthy competitive trunkline systems with some 26,000 miles of trackage extending over 17 States and some four times larger than its nearest competitor. Still another would give these large systems a near monopoly of rail transport in Southeastern United States. All proposals seem to be posited on the philosophy of eliminating as much rail competition as possible and ripping up as much trackage and facilities as possible, not to mention the possible job

losses of over 200,000 men in the process. It is on these two crucial points—competition and rail plant contraction—that the Commission has yet to firm up a definitive policy, and as its staff are still researching these issues, it may be some time before the Commission will have the information and data upon which it can make an adequate determination.

It is no surprising that receiving no general instructions from the Commission with respect to the maintenance of competition, economic balance, the preservation of service and the protection of community growth, that the big financial interests would seek to merge the strong with the strong, ignore the weaker roads, scrap service and capacity and eliminate competition, thereby creating giants of monopoly rail power as a spearhead to acquiring monopoly control over all transportation.

The sad fact is that the Commission by sitting on its hands and taking no positive policy action, has encouraged these giant mergers to be persented at great expense to all parties, and because they are the only combinations attainable at the moment, the Commission my be pressured into approving them even though they are not really in the public interest. Certainly, gentlemen, this is one time when the interests of good government should rise above the demands of financial expediency, and the fact that other types of mergers have not been proposed should by no means deter the Commission from making its objective decisions and flatly rejecting those alliances that are bad, regardless of the time and money put in by the applicants.

I was particularly shocked to find from the subcommittee inquiry that while all these merger cases are going forward and no policy seems to have been developed, neither the Department of Commerce nor the Commission has made any investigation or studies into what interest groups own, control, or influence these carriers. Again reliance is only on the record if opponents wish to place the facts before the Commission, but I must emphasize that our Government does not know today where the real lines of financial power are extended. At a time, gentlemen, when we are talking about putting giants together, we have no satisfactory information as to what supergiants we may well be creating. What is the role of the insurance companies, of the banks, of the brokerage houses, of other financial institutions in these mergers. I'd like to know, and I feel that the Commission should obtain this information for Congress and for the people. Are these new combinations of railroad power to be completely independent and separate in their politics? What control do these giant railroads have over other modes of transport? Are certain of the larger shippers interlocked with railroads such that they can obtain preferences to the detriment of their competitors? How does the development of such financial power such as a combined Pennsy-Central or a Great Northern-Northern Pacific affect business activity in the area served? We found no answers to these questions from those responsible for restructuring our transportation network.

But enough of this criticism and the hashing over of past mistakes. It is not too late for the Commission to extricate itself from the mess it is in, and take the initiative in the public interest to preserve a healthy competitive national rail network. The Commission has before it in one way or another most of the major carriers servicing the lion's share of the country. Indeed with its special powers it should be able to obtain what additional information and policy it needs for an overall view of these proposed mergers on a national level. What I am now suggesting is that the Commission not rubberstamp these mergers because they are the only ones approved by the financial interests, but rather consolidate cases for decision on a regional basis, determine the most appropriate lineups, rejecting those applications which do not conform to what is best for the public. At the same time it should indicate to the railroad community what types of alinements will be acceptable to the Commission, and work with the railroads to bring such alinements into effect. What I am saying, and I want to be clear here, is that the Commission should forthwith suspend final decision on every pending merger application. It should then assess each application to determine whether sufficient facts have been, or are being, adduced upon which it can make a determination as to the best competitive lineup of carriers within each region. Where such decision needs the consolidation of two or more cases, such consolidation should be ordered. If the merger proposals fit in reasonably with the overall policy for the region, the Commission should approve; if they don't, the Commission should reject the application, subject to being reopened if the parties rearrange their combinations to meet the appropriate regional policy.

The power of the Commission to consolidate cases for overall decisional purposes, to approve or reject cases according to an established policy of definitive criteria, and to render advisory opinions is manifest in the Interstate Commerce Act. The magnitude and extent of the mergers now being proposed, which combinations cut across broad areas of the country demand this overview approach, demand the establishment of regional and national merger policy by the Commission before it renders any further merger decisions. And the railroad industry is entitled to know how best it can cooperate with the Commission to create the best merged network. In the East, such policy initiative on the part of the Commission is not only crucial, it is mandatory. There, the three party package plan submitted by the industry on a take it or leave it basis is most unfortunate. The plan provides no substantial protection for many smaller railroads, it seeks the elimination of vast amount of rail competition. It creates a dangerous economic imbalance between proposed systems, it will result in unreasonable contraction of the rail plant in the Northeast, and will place a monopolistic ring around New England. Because of this the Commission could well flatly reject the Pennsy-Central merger, but in doing this by combining eastern cases for final decision, it might further find that a different network of competitive systems spearheaded by an independent New York Central system and by an independent Pennsylvania system would be practical and acceptable, providing that the smaller roads are absolutely protected. Although I would prefer to see the smaller roads merged into existing trunkline systems, and the Pennsylvania whittled down in size in the interest of greater efficiency and competition, such restructing may not now be feasible. Thus, as an alternative to the monopolistic Pennsy-Central merger plan, I would reluctantly accept a network built around these two carriers operating separately and competitively as the best of an otherwise complicated solution to the eastern rail merger problem.

It is the responsibility of the Commission to bring these better systems into being and encourage the cooperation of all financial interests for the good of this country. Similar initiative on the part of the Commission to prohibit the development of the vast Great Northern-Northern Pacific-Burlington monopoly, and suggest competitive rearrangement of lines is also mandatory. The Milwaukee, a good progressive road, must not be allowed to die at the hands of a carrier over four times its size. A stronger, augmented Milwaukee, tied to one or more of the Western carriers, is absolutely essential to the growth of this Northwest region.

I could go on around the circuit with these examples. In the Southwest, recent developments involving the Union Pacific, the Rock Island and the Southern Pacific, and the Santa Fe's negotiation with the MoPac certainly call for an overall view by the Commission as to our future southwestern network, and indeed a stay of pending cases in that area, and an ultimate consolidation af cases when the negotiations are completed.

In the Southeast, the Commission might well consider consolidating the Illinois Central's application for control of the Louisville & Nashville, because that carrier is an important competitive factor in the potential imbalance between a combined Atlantic Coastline-Seaboard system and the Southern system.

All over this country, railroads are seeking to combine. They are so vocal in their reasons supporting this getting together. Certainly they should be willing now to cooperate with what the Commission may consider to be the better policy of good order and competitive protection.

Now, I am well aware that I will be met with the argument that the 1940 Transportation Act outlawed the idea of a Commission merger plan, and provided for merger initiative to come from the carriers to be presented for approval or rejection by the Commission.

My answer to this is that the 1940 act did not take away entirely the planning and policy function of the Commission in promoting an adequate transportation network.

It intended the Commission and other branches of Government to study, educate, and assist in the development of railroad consolidations. And the Interstate Commerce Act, aside from setting forth a positive mandate for the Commission in its National Transportation policy, also has given to that body full authority and power at any time to investigate on its own motion any matter within its jurisdiction (49 U.S.C. 13(2)). In addition the act permits the Commission to determine its own procedure under any provision of the law "in such manner as will best conduce to the people dispatch of business and to the ends of justice" (49 U.S.C. 17(3)). Furthermore, section 5 of the act by setting up positive criteria for the protection of carriers not a part of the merger application imposes on the Commission a responsibility to analyze carefully the regional and interregional relationships between all carriers affected by a proposed merger and make certain that such carriers are protected from any imbalances caused by the merger. With so many mergers pending, this responsibility demands a total view which can only be accomplished by special investigation and consolidation of appropriate cases for final decision.

But let us not get bogged down in legal niceties as to the Interstate Commerce Commission policy function. The stark fact is that the exigencies of the situation now demand positive leadership by the ICC. The magnitude of the cases before it, a magnitude I'm sure never contemplated by the Committee of Six or Committee of Three, demands a coordinated merger policy by the Commission and a broad analysis of appropriate system relationships on a regional, and if need be a national basis, with special emphasis on retaining balanced rail competition, and direct instructions to the railroad community as to what combinations will be formed or what definitive issues must be met where pending merger proposals are rejected by the Commission.

The President of the United States set up the Interagency Committee to formulate more specific guidelines and more specific procedures for applying them in merger cases. The President was particularly concerned about maintaining competition between the same modes of transport. The Committee

studied the problem, and came out with 10 general, but nevertheless helpful, criteria in a recent report. But the ICC is under no obligation to accept the President's suggestions at this time. This Interagency Committee, through the Department of Justice, should forthwith petition the ICC for an investigation of these criteria leading to the possible adoption by the Commission of rules or a policy implementing its present general criteria on merger cases. At the same time the Interagency Committee should seek in the Commission a stay on all merger decisions until its views can be considered by the Commission, and some definitive policy developed. Otherwise, what good is this President's Committee? The Commission certainly should as a matter of courtesy, if for nothing else, give the President a chance to be heard on these crucial merger issues. Also, the Interagency Committee should continue its work, and let the Commission know how its views and policies are applicable to the situation involved in the cases. By its action, so will we judge the sincerity and worth of this important committee. The time for it to act is now.

Finally, Congress has before it important rail merger legislation. My bill or Senator MAGNUSON'S bill, if passed, will provide breathing time for the Commission to conduct its policy investigation. Senator HARTKE'S bill seeking a select committee to investigate railroad finances and interlocking financial relationships goes to the jugular vein of the rail merger problem. With the passage of this legislation, which I understand looks good at the moment, a merger moratorium is a must. But regardless of what Congress does, the responsibility is squarely on the shoulders of the Interstate Commerce Commission to process these mergers in the best possible way. If it accepts the industry packages as they are now proposed, without more than a liberal consideration of cases on a piecemeal basis, cases untested by objective experts, it will be giving to this Nation a tragic transportation system at a time when we need the best competitive, growing network of carriers we have ever had. It will be going against our national transportation policy, and letting down the public interest. The future of transportation in this country will be fixed by what we do with these rail mergers. Commission policy is the first step toward that future.

Richard S. Davis: A Great Reporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a great American newspaper reporter has died. He was Richard S. Davis, reporter and critic for the Milwaukee Journal for more than 40 years.

We in Congress know that newspapermen do more than record the events of the day. They also help to shape them. Good reporters can affect events in a way that benefits their community and their fellow men.

Mr. Davis was just such a reporter.

He used the appearance of the great singer Marian Anderson in Milwaukee in 1944 as the beginning of a campaign to better housing conditions in Milwaukee.

With the backing of the Milwaukee Journal, Mr. Davis wrote many articles and editorials about the squalid conditions in which most of the city's Negro population lived. In 2 years there was a vast housing development where before there had been shacks.

The Milwaukee Journal received the 1945 Courage in Journalism Award of Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalism fraternity, for these articles by Mr. Davis. Moreover, the editorial on Marian Anderson has been reprinted numerous times in journalism textbooks and elsewhere as a classic example of the editorial art.

Mr. Davis had a great writing skill and a love of the reporter's craft. His style was distinctly his own. It combined a keen sense for significant detail with a felicity of expression that made many a news story memorable.

With his death, Milwaukee has lost a critic, a friend, and one of its most distinguished and great-souled citizens. We are much the poorer for his passing.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Davis' obituary from the Milwaukee Journal of July 23 and an editorial of eulogy which also appeared on that day.

The article and editorial follow:

DAVIS, NOTED BYLINER FOR JOURNAL, IS DEAD—DRAMA CRITIC, WRITER RECEIVED NATIONAL ACCLAIM IN LENGTHY CAREER ON PAPER

Richard S. Davis, 73, whose byline was familiar to Wisconsin newspaper readers for more than 40 years, died Tuesday.

Death came at 1:25 a.m. in Door County Memorial Hospital, Sturgeon Bay, of complications that followed a series of strokes which began in 1960. He was taken to the hospital from his summer home in Ephraim Saturday.

Mr. Davis was the Milwaukee Journal's drama and music critic until his retirement in 1961. He was nationally known in these fields. He was noted equally as a reporter, versatile enough to handle any kind of story from a political convention to a sports event.

DISDAINED THE PHONY

His colleagues knew him as a man of sharp wit and mighty indignations. He had a vast disdain for the phony and the pretentious. His sympathy for the defeated or unfortunate was equally quick.

This wit, indignation and sympathy, in various combinations appropriate to the occasions, were reflected in his writings, giving them a human warmth that helps explain why generations of Journal readers found the Davis articles a delight.

Some outstanding examples of the thousands of stories Mr. Davis wrote for the Journal were collected in book form after his retirement in "The Best of Davis."

FAVORITE ARTICLES

Every Davis fan has his own favorites—his humor pieces, perhaps, with the sly turn of phrase that punctured an inflated pretention; his moving account of the funeral of Franklin D. Roosevelt; his accounts of such sports events as the Kentucky Derby.

Mr. Davis' own favorite was an editorial which he wrote after a Marian Anderson concert at the auditorium in 1944.

He told of how beautifully Miss Anderson sang and how enthusiastically the audience applauded.

"And that was right," he wrote.

"Last night * * * the people poured into the crisp night and every face was lighted. The great majority hurried every which way to their cheerful homes, but those who belonged to the race of the incomparable singer had to carry their soaring pride into the ramshackle, tumbledown district where neither pride nor hope can long survive.

"And what was right about that?"

SPURRED COMMUNITY

The editorial helped arouse the community to a problem which had been largely ignored. It was followed by a series of articles by Mr. Davis on Negro housing in Milwaukee—not a compilation of pious political statements or statistics, but an account of the sights and smells and sounds of a part of Milwaukee that much of the community had preferred to pretend did not exist.

The Journal received the 1945 Courage in Journalism Award of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalistic society, for these articles.

Mr. Davis would have snorted and walked away if anyone had suggested that reforms prompted in part by his crusade had done much to solve the problem.

SOME LIVE BETTER

Still, it is likely that at least a few Milwaukeeans are living better because on a night nearly 20 years ago Mr. Davis listened to a singer and was struck by the contrast between her artistry and the conditions under which her fellow Negroes had to live.

Mr. Davis himself had once planned to become a singer. He studied in New York and Paris and made his Milwaukee debut at the Pabst Theater in 1918.

But he decided that year that he was not likely to reach the top rank as a singer. He was not a man to settle for the second rate. He switched his allegiance to newspaper work, taking a job on the old Wisconsin News, and moving later in the year to the Journal, where he remained until his retirement.

He was assigned to cover city hall news. He was on hand to lead the singing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" in the well of city hall when the false armistice report caused a slightly premature celebration of the end of World War I.

OPINION RESPECTED

Mr. Davis next tried copy editing and served briefly as assistant city editor. Then, in 1921, his writing talent was recognized and he was freed of deskwork.

What his friends called the Davis touch made it possible to recognize his writings even when they ran without his byline. He was able to attack sham with a needle rather than a bludgeon. Even in an otherwise serious account, his wit had a tendency to break through to keep his readers on their toes.

As he ranged throughout the State and on occasional trips to cover a national story, his reputation grew beyond the Wisconsin boundaries. His opinion was one of the few west of the Hudson River that was greeted with respect on the part of the New York theater world.

His feature stories also gained him wide respect. In 1959, in an editorial about the late Meyer Berger of the New York Times, the Washington Post said that Berger's qualities placed him "among that small group of men who have become legend in their craft, writers like Robert J. Casey of the old Chicago Daily News, Richard S. Davis of the Milwaukee Journal, and Ray Sprigle of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette."

Mr. Davis' articles were reprinted in textbooks studied by aspiring journalists. His influence on younger members of the staff was so great that a reader once complained that they were all trying to write like Davis, and failing to come up to the master.

SPURNED AWARDS

He won a number of awards, but was impatient with such things. When one of his articles won a Milwaukee Press Club award some years ago, for example, it was only because an admiring colleague submitted it without Mr. Davis' knowledge.

It is the custom when a reporter retires to have a collection for a farewell gift. Mr. Davis would have none of such nonsense. So his fellow employees instead established an annual Richard S. Davis Award for a Journal writer whose work best exemplified the Davis tradition.

They also established a fund in his name which will be used for some worthwhile journalistic purpose.

Mr. Davis was born in Milwaukee April 15, 1890. He was the son of a Methodist minister, the Reverend John Scott Davis. His mother, Edith Smith Davis, once was world secretary of the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

Even as a youth, however, Mr. Davis had his own notions of how to deal with authority. His career at Lawrence College, Appleton, lasted less than a semester. Rumor had it that the son of the WCTU leader was apprehended visiting a tavern.

Later, his old school relented and gave him the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters. Mr. Davis enjoyed the irony of this tribute to the fullest and went happily off to Appleton in 1953 to get the degree that had been denied him so long before.

The night before the ceremony, tragedy struck. His wife, the former Henriette Luscher, a movie critic on the Milwaukee Sentinel before their marriage in 1922, was fatally injured in a fall down a stairway at a friend's home in Appleton. The degree had to be awarded to Mr. Davis in absentia.

SEVERAL AFFLICTIONS

The sudden death of his wife was one of a number of affliction that tested Mr. Davis' courage. The year before, a writing trip to Europe had to be interrupted for an operation in which one of his lungs was removed.

He had diabetes. His eyes had failed to the point where he could read only with difficulty and he had to dictate his stories. Despite this difficulty, his talent remained bright. Few who read the articles of recent years realized how many obstacles had been overcome by their author to get them in print.

Then, in 1960, came the first of a series of strokes. With his side paralyzed, it became apparent after several months that he could not return to the work he loved. Even after his retirement in 1961, however, he dictated several reminiscent stories for the Journal.

Since his illness, he had lived with his sister, Mary, a retired West Division high school teacher, at their apartment at 1725 East Kane Place. Mr. Davis also had a summer home at Ephraim.

Despite his illness, he wanted to see the Door County place for what he felt would be the last time. His family took him there July 12.

Mr. Davis was a tall man. His hair and mustache were white. He had an air about him. Even in a crowd, a stranger was likely to ask: "Who is that distinguished looking man?"

He was, despite his appearance of bristling dignity, eminently approachable. If the interloper were young and a little unsure, so much the better.

Mr. Davis might look like a man of importance—which, for that matter, he was—but his sympathies were firmly with the brotherhood of the underdog.

He recognized courage against odds, even when the courageous one was in the ranks of the famous. His review of a 1939 concert by Ignace Jan Paderewski still is remembered:

"Nothing will be written here about the manner of his playing. Surely a man who for 70 years had been lighting the world with his music has won the right to play in the deep twilight with no one taking notes.

"Surely a man who has looked out from mountaintops has the right to stumble as he descends into the valleys."

In the last few years, as his friends noticed, Mr. Davis descended into some rugged valleys of his own. That he faced them with courage and dignity, without stumbling, came as no surprise.

Besides his sister, Mr. Davis is survived by a son, Richard S., Jr., Milwaukee; a daughter, Mrs. John Fraser Hart, Bloomington, Ind., and another sister, Mrs. David H. Stevens, Ephraim.

Cremation and private burial will be held at Ephraim cemetery Thursday. There will be no funeral services. The Stephenson funeral home, Sturgeon Bay, was in charge of arrangements.

GOVERNOR OFFERS PRAISE FOR DAVIS

"The State of Wisconsin may never again see the like of Richard S. Davis," Governor Reynolds said Tuesday.

"To many of us, for many years, Dick Davis was the Milwaukee Journal," the Governor said. "His style was unforgettable, both as a writer and as a man. Those who knew him were fortunate, for he was graced with an uncommon wit, a rare appreciation for living, and a love for the truth.

"He had in his time laid many great men to rest in a prose style that moved his readers as few newspapermen had ever done. As he leaves us now, we acknowledge that he was their equal."

RICHARD S. DAVIS

We have to write very personally about Richard S. Davis, who died Tuesday, because he was our intimate associate and beloved friend. Journal readers knew him through what he wrote during more than 40 years; we knew him for what he was, and that was even finer than his writings.

There is no higher aspiration in newspapering, nor a more coveted accolade, than to be the best of reporters. Davis reached that height. He was a great reporter because he had not only intelligence and rare zest, but intense concern—whether the subject was the good or the bad, weighty or trivial, sordid or tender, politics or baseball, music or a gangster funeral, theater or Negro housing.

Davis demanded excellence of himself and others, and his standards brooked no slipshoddiness, no speciousness, above all no hypocrisy. His capacity for indignation at wrong and stupidity was as the wrath of Jehovah—and he had the language to go with it.

Davis was a great reporter, for not the least reason, because he could write. Man, how he could write! He could write because he knew and practiced the rule that good writing is hard work. He wracked his soul and tore his hair at it, literally. So it came out with never a tired phrase or ill-chosen word, scrubbed, sparkling, pungent, moving.

One has to say also, on behalf of those who were fortunate and happy enough to call him friend, that he was an ever joyous companion, even in his moods of distress at the way the world was going. He loved fun, a joke, a loud laugh, a barb. He was the magnet and heart of any social gathering.

Davis knew personal suffering more than most men. He met it with magnificent, courageous spirit, even hopeless invalidism and death. That is why we mourn not only a fine reporter and delightful friend but also a rarely splendid soul.

Negro Leaders Seeking Special Privileges, Not Just Equal Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Frank van der Linden, the distinguished Washington correspondent for the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., and several other daily newspapers across the country, has written an outstanding column on a recent television program featuring five Negro leaders in the integrationist movement. The column is entitled "Negro Leaders Seeking Special Privileges, Not Just Equal Rights: Agree Cause Would Be Defeated in Referendum," and was printed in the July 25, 1963, issue of the Greenville News.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO LEADERS SEEKING SPECIAL PRIVILEGES, NOT JUST EQUAL RIGHTS: AGREE CAUSE WOULD BE DEFEATED IN REFERENDUM

(By Frank van der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—Five of the Nation's top Negro leaders in the civil rights movement agree on one thing: the American public would vote down their cause by a 2-to-1 marign if a general referendum were held today.

"I would not be prepared at the moment to put our cause to a general referendum in this country," said James Farmer, head of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) in a special telecast for 72 educational TV stations. "I don't think we'd win it," he added.

Dr. Kenneth Clark, psychology professor at City College of New York and moderator of the program, went a step further, saying, "I think I could almost predict what the figure would be: 2 to 1 against you." That brought quick assent from Farmer.

The hour-long telecast also brought the admission from the Negro leaders that they won't be satisfied with equal rights, but instead want special privileges. Also on the program were Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP; Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, the Reverend Martin Luther King, of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and James Forman, of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Young admitted he is pushing for "indemnification, reparation" in the civil rights field. "Well, you can call it what you want," he said.

Young added that the Negro must "call not just for equal schools, but better schools and better teachers, and provisions for housing, and conscious recruiting at the level of employment. This has to be done in order to get rid of what I see too much of, and that is the feeling of despair and hopelessness."

But Wilkins backed away from Young's extreme view. "I'm going to disassociate myself from the word 'indemnification'," he said. But the NAACP spokesman added that

"you must do something extra special for the Negro, having stood on his neck for 250 or 300 years."

SPECIAL TREATMENT

Farmer chimed in with his thoughts on the matter, saying the Negro is asking for "special treatment of a positive sort to wipe out" the gap, he claims, has developed for the colored person.

Summing up the feeling of the group, Wilkins said: "In fairness, Negroes should receive not just equal opportunities but special training, special consideration on jobs in order to make up for past injustices."

The civil rights leaders also came out for a new concept of national citizenship, wiping out any vestige of States rights in any area. "Northern indifference is largely to blame for the conditions in the South," Young stressed. "We would have avoided this present situation if we had adopted the concept of a citizen in Mississippi being a citizen of the United States."

They also think the President's civil rights package, now before Congress, doesn't go far enough. "Look at it this way," said Forman: "The bill would give the vote to everyone with a sixth-grade education, but is the Federal Government going to see that families in Mississippi get more than $2.25 a day, and the older children won't have to quit school and go to work to support the younger ones?"

Dr. King deplored the drawing of black-versus-white lines. He said it would be "tragic if the struggle of the Negro to attain full civil rights should degenerate" into such a conflict.

The public accommodations section of the administration's bill was agreed on as the one point the Negro doesn't want to compromise. However, Capitol Hill observers think this section will be dropped in order to avoid a Southern filibuster in the Senate. Republican minority leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, and Democratic majority leader MIKE MANSFIELD have introduced such a bill, conveniently without the accommodations portion.

The five Negroes stood firm on the need for the impending march of 100,000 civil rights supporters on Washington, August 28, despite earlier pleas from administration officials to call it off. The President last week personally endorsed the march in his televised press conference.

WILKINS HAS WORD

Wilkins said the march was organized to offset the bogy-man stunts of Southern conservatives. He said "they began announcing their opposition * * * they were going to filibuster * * * they were going to hold up appropriation measures * * * they were talking of scaring the country that they weren't going to get a tax cut on account of civil rights." He added that the Negroes "don't see anything wrong with using Washington as our base to indicate support for this bill. I see nothing wrong with it at all, and I brush aside all people who talk about objections to it."

The five leaders agreed that they hoped for an orderly march, not one with violence.

They professed agreement in the civil rights field, without split leadership or bickering—despite published examples of their feuding. But Wilkins fired off a blast at Negro Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of Harlem, and Malcolm X, spokesman for the militant Black Muslims. He called both "ill-informed on this matter."

Farmer also called for withholding "funds from segregated schools, as well as granting technical and financial aid to those who are desegregating." His remarks came in the discussion of whether the administration's bill goes far enough, and he also complained that part III of the 1957 civil rights bill isn't included. Part III would give the Attorney General the right to file suits on all violations of civil rights, not only voting rights and schools.

Independence of Upper Volta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 5 the Republic of Upper Volta will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President and Prime Minister of Upper Volta, Maurice Yameogo; and His Excellency, the Upper Voltan Ambassador to the United States, Frederic Gweer.

In early August 1960, a number of formerly dependent countries of French West Africa became sovereign nations. Among them was the republic of Upper Volta. On July 11, 1960, she had signed an agreement with France providing for its unconditional sovereignty and independence. On August 5, which was also an ancient traditional festival day in Upper Volta, joyous independence celebrations marked the official emergence of this West African country approximately the size of our State of Colorado as a sovereign member of the community of nations.

The political history of Upper Volta is a fascinating tale of the rise and decline of empire, the penetration of the French and the establishment of a protectorate, and the transition from colony to autonomous republic and then to sovereign nation. The empire-building Mossi, thought by historians to have come from east Africa sometime in the 11th century A.D., established a feudal kingdom in Upper Volta which lasted well into the 19th century. By the time the French reached the area in 1896, however, the ancient customs and rigid feudal structure which had flourished for several centuries had begun to dissolve. The French established a protectorate over the kingdom of Ouagadougou, and in 1919 converted the original protectorate into the territory of Upper Volta.

As a French territory Upper Volta was transformed from an ancient feudal empire to a modern democratic state, slowly at first but more rapidly after World War II. The constitution of the French Union approved in 1946 gave French West Africa representation for the first time in the French National Assembly and thus some lever of influence in the French Government. An enabling law of 1956 gave Upper Volta direct universal suffrage. In May 1957 its first cabinet of ministers was formed. The transition from colony to independent state continued to August 1960, its impetus becoming ever swifter.

As independence approached, Upper Volta planned wisely and with foresight for the future under the able leadership of its President, Mr. Maurice Yameogo. Reversing the unfortunate trend to Balkanization which is one of the less happy African heritages, the heads of government of Upper Volta, Niger, Ivory Coast, and Dahomey decided in 1959, prior to independence, to form a close-working union, the Counseil de l'Entente. They agreed to adopt identical constitutions and parliamentary and electoral systems, to harmonize the organization of their armed forces, to initiate common economic policies including a customs union and common level of taxes, to set up a joint amortization fund for the guarantee of loans, to concert diplomacy and share ambassadors, and to coordinate foreign policy.

Association in the Conseil de l'Entente has been of considerable advantage to Upper Volta. Although the country itself is landlocked, it has assured Upper Volta of outlets to the sea. Cooperation has enabled the Entente countries to rationalize scarce resources. Upper Volta has also continued close relations with France, and as a result has received substantial French development grant aid.

On the third anniversary of independence we congratulate President Yameogo and the people of Upper Volta for their rational approach to the problems facing them as a newly independent nation and wish them continued success in solving them in the years to come.

Courage and Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, July 25, Dr. Shane MacCarthy who is well known to all Members of Congress for his work in governmental and community affairs received an award from the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, for his part in chairing the committee which investigated the causes behind the Thanksgiving Day riot at D.C. Stadium. The investigation by the committee was a thorough investigation and issued a report which had a decided impact on community relations in the District of Columbia.

The acceptance remarks of Dr. MacCarthy last Thursday on the presentation of the award are remarks which all persons in public life today should observe. I was deeply impressed by these remarks and request that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Members of Congress can share with Dr. MacCarthy the need for leadership with courage and confidence at this time.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF DR. SHANE MACCARTHY ON RECEIVING THE AMERICAN LEGION AWARD

This recognition is gratefully accepted in the name of the entire committee all of whom worked so diligently and conscientiously on both the investigation and the report.

The American Legion decision in this instance has unique significance since it demonstrates the courage of an organization to recognize truth over expediency. Be

assured that the inquiry was not conducted and the report was not written to win a popularity contest but rather to disclose the facts and record the ugly reality of conditions in our public schools.

The action of the American Legion, therefore, recognizes that in the current turmoil of social and civic conditions in our Nation, we should be careful lest the fabric of American society be torn to shreds by shallow decisions and impetuous actions at key posts.

While the problems in the public schools of the U.S. Capital are only a part of the major difficulties besetting our American culture throughout the land, every policy and every action undertaken in Washington, D.C., is in the bold profile of national and international publicity. To cope with current problem demands a brand of unsullied leadership more resolute and resourceful than that required in any epoch of our history.

Hence, with the poet, Holland, we say:

"God give us men.
A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned men;
Men above the fog in public duty and in private thinking;
So, God send us such men."

Leadership of this brand will engender both courage and confidence:

Courage, to speak the truth; to face the difficult rather than sidestep issues; to maintain balance of quality thinking when a surrender to quantity pressure would be so much easier; to hold the line of patience in the face of barbed criticisms; in a word, courage to act on principle rather than opportunism, and

Confidence, in the policies, objectives, and methods of our American system and in our combined ability to achieve lasting results.

For, if we lose faith in ourselves and in the firm fundamentals of our American concepts, the two interdependent and meaningful terms—"Rights" and "Duties"—are robbed of their power and become but barren words as we rest on the crutch of Federal sustenance. However, with effective reassertion of bold, upright and firm leadership at every level, we will achieve success in the major tests that face our country and experience solid social, economic, and moral progress in the days ahead.

Italian Government Gives the Marble for the Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as interest in the National Cultural Center mounts in the United States it also mounts in other nations.

Our thanks go to the Italian Government and its people for the donation of all the marble needed in its construction.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article carried in the July 1963 issue of the National Cultural Center footlight:

ITALIAN GOVERNMENT GIVES THE MARBLE FOR THE CULTURAL CENTER

During President Kennedy's recent visit to Italy the Italian Government announced that it would donate to the Center all the marble needed in its construction. In acknowledging this generosity, the President said, "The gift will stand forever as a symbol of the old and intimate ties of friendship between Italy and the United States and the indispensable contribution the land of Virgil and Dante has made to our culture."

In a letter to Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea, chairman of the Center's board of trustees, Roger L. Stevens, said, "The Center is being built to serve this generation and the generations to come. Its purpose and programs must meet the years of the future, anticipate their demands, and measure up to their opportunities. To be worthy of this goal, the building itself must be the finest that those charged with its design and construction can make it. I can think of no greater contribution to this end than that the walls, floors, and paving of this National Center for the performing arts should bear permanent testimony, both to your country's gracious generosity and to the excellence of one of your national products."

It is likely that more than 200,000 square feet of marble will be used in construction of some of the Center's interior walls and floors and the exterior paving, at a cost of over $1 million. The Italian gift, therefore, represents a major contribution to the Center's building fund, and will provide a significant boost to the national fundraising drive now underway.

Sale of Nonbrand Drugs to Latins Starts Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many questions are being asked about attempts of forward-looking American drugmakers to sell drugs to the people of Latin America at prices which they can afford. The standard of living in these countries has always been so low that few Latin Americans have been able to make use of drugs to any great extent. It would greatly benefit our Alliance for Progress if these plans to sell low-priced drugs to the countries in Latin America would be successful. The entire matter is of the greatest importance and the facts should be known to the American people.

A fine article explaining the issues involved was printed in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 28, written by an able reporter, Bernard D. Nossiter.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Sale of Non-Brand Drugs to Latins Starts Chemical Warfare," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALE OF NONBRAND DRUGS TO LATINS STARTS CHEMICAL WARFARE

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The drug industry is embroiled in a bitter but little-known war over low-priced drugs in Latin America.

The struggle touches on the Alliance for Progress, has side effects on the Nation's balance of payments and could determine the prospect for less costly drugs in the United States.

The battle has already afforded a tantalizing backstage glimpse of an effort by some drugmakers to enlist the State Department in their defense of the existing price structure.

But whether more of this picture is revealed depends upon a struggle going on inside the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

The undeclared war broke out last year when McKesson & Robbins, the biggest American drug wholesaler, began selling cutrate drugs in Colombia. Instead of selling drugs under their trade names, McKesson has been offering them under their generic or abbreviated chemical names.

This enables McKesson to escape the heavy promotion and advertising costs that swell the prices of the branded products.

McKesson, for example, sells Colombians the drug chloramphenicol for 3 cents a tablet and says it makes a tidy profit. The equivalent trade name product, chloromycetin, goes for 30 cents a tablet.

McKesson's line includes everything from so-called wonder drugs to tranquilizers. The company's prices are estimated at a third to a tenth of the same brand name drugs.

Drug prices have become a heated political issue in Latin America. The Agency for International Development has said that lower drug costs are "a matter of vital concern to the Alliance for Progress."

So in Colombia, McKesson has been reinforced by a new Government program.

Under this plan, any company that agrees to sell drugs under generic names and below the brand name price is guaranteed that every Colombian drugstore will carry its line.

McKesson likes what it is doing so much that it has recently opened up a similar venture in Venezuela.

The company also sells about 100 drugs under the shorthand chemical name in the United States. Although no major drugs have been sold this way, McKesson is considering the sale of more generic drugs here. That could mean less costly medicine for North Americans.

The move into generic drugs has touched a sensitive nerve in some makers of the higher priced trade-name products.

Officials from Colombia and from McKesson have charged that American manufacturers have tried to block the generic drug plans. However, the industry's trade group, the Pharamaceutical Manufacturers Association, retorts that the makers have simply exercised a legitimate right to petition for the redress of what they regard as grievances. PMA officials further contend that lower priced generic drugs still won't reach enough people to make a substantial difference. They also argue that selling drugs by their chemical names damages the property rights that the makers have built into their patents.

The chairman of McKesson is Herman S. Nolen, a former professor of marketing at Ohio State University. In a recent interview, he said that his company had been punished for its cut-rate sales by American firms. He declined to name the companies and PMA officials say they know nothing of what Nolen alleges.

More specifically, Nolen charges that "about a dozen" American manufacturers who formerly supplied McKesson with raw materials have refused to sell any for the firm's

cut-rate program. He says that some of these firms have told McKesson that they have cut the company off because it is selling under generic names.

McKesson has turned to drug producers in Europe in place of the American suppliers. Nolen says that this is costing the company about 10 to 15 percent more. It is also increasing the deficit in the Nation's balance of payments by several million dollars.

At the same time, Nolen acknowledges that no American firm has tried to cut off supplies for McKesson's sales in the United States. And this is the lion's share of its business.

The Colombian Government has obtained and published the minutes of a private meeting at PMA headquarters here last January at which plans were mapped to enlist the support of the U.S. Government.

At this meeting were officials of Merck & Co., Inc.; Smith Kline & French Laboratories; the Upjohn Co.; Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc.; E. R. Squibb & Sons Division of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp.; AFRIDO, the Colombian drugmaker's trade group, and Lloyd Cutler, of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, a law firm that represents PMA. The PMA officials present included the president, Dr. Austin Smith, and Walter Wien, director of PMA's office of International relations.

The minutes show that the meeting discussed McKesson's willingness to produce products under the Colombian program. After more discussion of the Colombian plan, the minutes continue:

"Mr. Cutler then suggested that a constructive counterproposal might possibly be developed under which a comprehensive solution could be found. In very broad terms, this solution might visualize the production of unpatented drugs as generics and the sale of trademarked products to Colombian governmental agencies, hospitals, and similar organizations. After some discussion, the consensus was that this positive approach could be effective if it were to be combined with support from the Government of the United States stimulated by PMA on the one hand plus further intercession by AFRIDO with the Colombian Government on the other hand. Dr. Smith said that he would confer with several members of the PMA board of directors with a view to mobilizing official support."

What exactly the drug companies wanted from the U.S. Government is not known. Several drug officials met with Allan J. Robbins, special assistant for international business to Under Secretary of State George Ball.

Robbins says that the drug officials simply told him of their fears that the Colombian program would lead to infringement of patents and discourage private investment in Latin America.

In any event, the State Department has not found that the generic program so far has breached any patents and has made no complaint to Colombia. The mobilization effort apparently failed.

In one interview, Wien of the PMA said that the trade association had held no meetings with drugmakers to combat either the Colombian or McKesson projects.

"We only discussed the public relations aspect of this thing. I shun this thing as the devil. I never discuss relationships among competitors," he said.

Later, when Wien was asked about the minutes of the January meeting, he said that he had meant that he personally had limited his own remarks to public relations matters.

Wien also offered an explanation of the industry's opposition to lower-priced generic drugs. Lower-cost drugs, he said are "a palliative at best" for poverty-ridden consumers. "A better way," he says, "is for the Colombians or any country to raise their income so they can afford more drugs, foods, clothing and other basic staples."

Wien also contends that cutrate drugs can't be manufactured with the same care as the higher-pricer trade name products. In addition, firms that sell at the reduced prices, he says, can't ordinarily afford the research to develop new drugs.

The battle has now moved to Capitol Hill. There Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the Anti-trust Subcommittee, has begun an inquiry into the domestic drug markers' activities.

KEFAUVER has said he wants to know whether "organized and collective efforts" have been made by "a number of large American drug manufacturing companies to prevent other American companies, who wish to do so, from participating under the (Colombian) program."

KEFAUVER also has said: "Evidence has come to my attention which suggests that such organized and collective efforts may have been made not only with respect to the program in Columbia but to prevent the adoption of similar programs by other South American countries."

How the antitrust laws apply to the operation of American firms abroad is a treacherous legal bog.

But KEFAUVER has said he wants to inquire into two areas: whether the American firms have violated the law and whether the law needs strengthening. So he has subpenaed from PMA and several drug companies documents dealing with their activities in eight Latin countries.

However, his investigation may die stillborn.

Last spring, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, the minority leader and a member of KEFAUVER's subcommittee, successfully moved that the antitrust unit first consult the State Department, the AID agency and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Ten days ago, the Foreign Relations Committee, in a letter signed by Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrcat, of Arkansas, said it thought that any inquiry should be conducted by the State and Justice Departments. This opinion strengthens the hand of those on KEFAUVER's subcommittee who want to keep him away from drugs.

The State Department and AID said that they have no machinery to conduct such an inquiry; Justice said it would look into the matter.

The AID agency said: "If anticompetitive concerted efforts by U.S. firms were to frustrate efforts (to reduce drug costs), this would disappoint the hopes for economic and social development which the Alliance program has already inspired."

For its part, the PMA has now asked KEFAUVER to withdraw his subpenas. PMA President Smith contends the subcommittee has no authority to issue them and that an inquiry would hurt the drug industry as well as all private investment in Latin America.

KEFAUVER has rejected Smith's request. He said: "Such information as we now have indicates that the main issue is simply the desire of some major American drug companies to continue to sell drugs in Latin America at these exorbitant markups, a willingness on the part of some other American companies to sell at more modest though still satisfactory markups, and certain alleged concerted efforts on the part of the former to prevent the latter from doing so. It is difficult for me to conceive of anything which is more within the jurisdiction of, and more appropriate to examination by, the subcommittee."

And there the issue hangs.

Address of Mrs. Fred Radke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on July 3, 1963, Mrs. Fred Radke, president of the National School Boards Association, addressed the National Education Association convention in Detroit. Mrs. Radke has long been identified with educational activities in the State of Washington. She is a resident of Port Angeles, Wash.

Because some of the newspaper stories may have misinterpreted her remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete text of her speech.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MRS. FRED RADKE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mrs. Blanchard, honored guests, and members of the National Education Association, first I want to tell you what a personal thrill it is for me to be here in Detroit at your great annual convention, bringing you the official greetings and best wishes of the National School Boards Association. Probably it is because of the extremely close ties between our two organizations that I view this chance to speak to you, and to attend your convention, as one of the most pleasant assignments I have had since becoming president of the National School Boards Association.

As I repeat the theme of your 1963 meeting, "A Great Profession—Ours by Choice," I want to express to you NSBA's firm agreement that we believe it is the greatest profession, measured not only in terms of the opportunities it affords its members to serve children and youth, but through them to serve our Nation and to help build a better tomorrow.

I need not remind this audience that a sound education is the base upon which rests all our endeavors—both as individuals and as a nation. And in order to achieve this level of education—not only in some classrooms, but in every classroom in every school of this Nation—we need teachers who are thoroughly trained, competent, and proud of their profession.

There can be no denying that the teacher is the heart of any educational endeavor, and this holds true despite all the marvelous mechanical innovations of recent years. Technology may lend the teacher valuable assistance, and such aids as programed learning, television, and language laboratories may speed and strengthen the learning process, but the teacher's skill remains the key factor.

However, there are problems today facing all of us who are involved in public education—problems which can best be dealt with in a straightforward manner.

One such problem, which has claimed increasing attention in recent months, is the interrelationship among school boards, teachers, and administrative personnel.

NSBA's interest in this subject is not new and over the years has been evident in many ways. For example, the NSBA-NEA joint committee, organized in 1956, focused its attention on the importance of written school board policies—in particular on the need

for developing clear, consistent, and effective school personnel policies.

Also, I believe it will interest you to know that the NSBA–NEA joint committee has repeatedly stressed its belief that written school board policies should be the result of cooperative action, considering not only the interest of board members and the superintendent of schools, but also of teachers, other school employees, and the public. In fact, this was one of our major recommendations in the "Reference Manual on Written School Board Policies," a publication of the joint committee.

NSBA's beliefs and policies also support this position and urge boards, while formulating policies, to consult individuals and groups affected.

NSBA has been cognizant too—just as your association has—of the need for recruiting greater numbers of qualified teacher candidates, improving teacher training procedure, establishing good working conditions, and encouraging and aiding in a variety of ways the professional growth of teachers. Again referring to our beliefs and policies we urge school boards to work to maintain and improve the professional status of the teaching profession, and to employ personnel with competence and personal qualifications which command community respect. The policy continues: "Appropriate to the importance of the role in their communities, all personnel shall be adequately compensated to insure their economic security, and their working conditions shall permit them to effectively exercise their skills and duties."

Our association is keenly aware also that teachers want to express their views as to what constitutes "adequate compensation and proper working conditions." We believe that teachers should have a voice in these important matters. In 1961 NSBA adopted its current policy on the subject which recommends that "school boards establish and use free channels of communication with all of their personnel so that decisions affecting their interests and welfare may be made only after careful board consideration has been given to their views, recommendations, needs, and grievances."

However, the policy firmly points out that while teacher concerns must be considered, the ultimate decision in any of these matters has to be left to the board of education. This position is expressed in the following section of the policies, and I quote again: "School boards, subject to the requirements of applicable law, shall refrain from compromise agreements based on negotiation or collective bargaining, and shall not resort to mediation or arbitration, nor yield to threats of reprisal on all matters affecting local public schools, including the welfare of all personnel. They shall also resist by all lawful means the enactment of laws which would compel them to surrender any part of their responsibility."

This position was further reaffirmed at our convention in April of this year by a new resolution which places the NSBA in opposition to "sanctions, boycotts, strikes, or mandated mediation against school districts." Delegates indicated they didn't consider such actions to be proper or wise remedies for use in problem situations. The resolution concludes: "The authority of the board of education is established by law and this authority may not be delegated to others." But of great importance, is the fact that the resolution also urges each local school board to review its policies, procedures, and activities relating to teacher relations and to establish carefully defined written policies. These policies would include procedures for actively involving "school boards, administrative staff, and teachers in discussing total budget needs, with particular emphasis on the determination of salaries and the handling of grievances."

I have taken some time this morning to present our position on the important subject of the interrelationships among school boards, administrative personnel, and teachers.

I have done so believing that it is of vital importance for these three groups to arrive at a clear understanding of each others roles and responsibilities in order to solve some of the troubles plaguing the educational scene, and to avert further misunderstandings. I believe our areas of agreement and our common goals far outweigh our differences.

I have done so believing that school board members, administrators, and teachers must pool their strength—not divide it—to meet the needs of our young people at a time in history when education has never more important.

Thank you for your attention.

Best wishes for a successful convention.

Presidential Transition Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4638) to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the genius of this country and the greatness of this political system are based upon the fact that we have an orderly transition of government. I was here as a freshman Congressman on that cold but brilliant day in 1960 when the present President was sworn into office. I could not help but contrast in my own mind the situation here with what happens in most parts of the world when there is a change of power in government. There was no blood in the streets. There were no hoodlums. There was a holiday spirit. It was, indeed, a festival of freedom. The outgoing President, Mr. Eisenhower, was there. The defeated candidate, Mr. Nixon, was there. The people had spoken and we were demonstrating to the world that we do have a government by consent of the governed.

But there is one flaw in this almost perfect system to which we are addressing ourselves today: It is what to do in the brief period between election and inauguration day. Because once a man is President-elect, he is not the Democratic President-elect; he is not the Republican President-elect; he is the President-elect of the people of the United States of America. In that interim time he is called upon probably to make more fateful decisions than he will have to make after he is, indeed, sworn into office. For that reason it is up to us to see that he has the tools and the implements. The gentleman from Iowa wants to know whom this bill benefits. I believe it benefits the people of America. It makes a good system perfect. For that reason I would certainly urge the support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Test Ban: Risks Weighed

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, July 21, 1963:

TEST BAN: RISKS WEIGHED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—The Nation's Capital watched the nuclear test-ban negotiations in Moscow this week with mixed emotions.

Hope, fear, and skepticism—particularly skepticism—were the dominant feelings in Washington as once again the United States and the Soviet Union tried to reach an agreement that might influence the arms race.

Judgments were mixed, first, about the advisibility of agreeing to any kind of nuclear test-cesation compact, and, second, about the form such an agreement should take if one proved to be possible. There was an even larger schism between those who applaud the political olive branch offered to the Kremlin in the President's American University speech of June 10, and those who have grave apprehensions about what former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has called the "flirtation with Moscow."

At the weekend, the discussions in Moscow were still in the preliminary stage and had not advanced far enough to warrant firm predictions about either the ultimate possibility of an agreement or the form such an agreement might take.

EARLIEST FOUNDATION

But there was a belief that, primarily because of the Chinese-Soviet frictions, some type of limited agreement might be possible. The form was expected to follow the offer made long ago by President Eisenhower and finally picked up by Premier Khrushchev some weeks ago of an unpoliced ban for all atmospheric, space and underwater tests, with no attempt to restrict underground tests.

The advantages of such an agreement, as seen by disarmament advocates, are that it would by-pass the thorny problem of on-site inspections and yet would result in stopping tests that add to the radioactivity in the atmosphere. It is generally agreed that atmospheric tests and tests in space and under water can be detected by monitoring devices outside the borders of the country conducting the tests.

On the other hand most experts believe that underground tests of small-yield nuclear weapons in certain types of soil can be concealed or "de-coupled" and that detecting instruments outside national boundaries would not be able, with complete confidence, to discriminate between such small-yield nuclear detonations and earthquakes.

It would appear, then, that if a test ban is agreed upon, it will halt for probably an undefined period United States, British and Soviet nuclear detonations in the atmosphere, in space and under water, but not underground.

From the point of view of weapons testing this would mean, in the opinion of most military and intelligence experts, that the United States would be able to test the type of weapons—small size tactical weapons—in which it has a clear-cut lead, but would be unable to test the weapons in which it is apparently lagging.

WHAT IT MEANS

But this appreciation of what a test ban might mean is dependent, first, upon exactly what can be accomplished by underground testing, and, second upon a appreciation of the present relative standing of the United States and the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon have discovered in extensive underground testing in the past 2 years that these tests could be extremely useful in certain areas and were not as expensive or as time-consuming as we had once believed. However, the limitations and disadvantages are definite. Tunneling and mining deep into the earth is required in order to trap radioactivity, and the larger the explosion the deeper and more extensive the mining must be.

Practically, most underground tests are limited to small yields, usually a few kilotons, because of the extensive excavation required. Instrumentation permits collection of data about the explosion itself and its efficiency, and some limited data about the effect the heat, blast and radioactivity may have upon structures or weapons. Scientists can then extrapolate or calculate on the basis of the data gained what a larger explosion might do.

But there is now way in an underground explosion to simulate accurately what would occur from fission in the thin atmosphere high above the earth, or of determining what would happen to communications, including radar, if a megaton bomb exploded in the skies.

There is disagreement as to exactly what can be accomplished by underground testing, but there is pretty general agreement that it cannot completely replace, technically and scientifically, tests in the atmosphere and in space.

Similarly, there is disagreement as to our exact standing vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in the nuclear arms race. There is rather general agreement that quantitatively we have far more nuclear weapons than Russia has.

SOVIET ADVANCES

There is also rather general agreement that we have a greater variety of nuclear weapons, particularly in the tactical or small yield category than the Russians have. But there is a widespread belief which is not, however, shared by all in Washington, that the last extensive series of Soviet tests, plus developments since then, have demonstrated a Soviet lead in three major fields of weapons technology.

One is the anti-ballistic missile. The Russians conducted many high-altitude test of multi-megaton weapons and recorded the widespread effects. In one test they intercepted and destroyed two incoming missiles with one giant explosion. Since the tests ended, installations believed to be the first operational anti-ballistic missile launching facility in the world have been detected near Leningrad.

The U.S. technology in radar, rocket engineering and so on is believed to be equal to the Soviet Union's in this field, but we have not conducted anywhere near as many or as large tests in the upper atmosphere or inner space.

The Russians are also believed to be ahead of us in practical tests of some so-called penetration aids, or devices to assist ballistic missiles to elude destruction, and to neutralize enemy defenses.

THE BIGGER BOMBS

The third area in which the Russians clearly have a lead is in the development of the superbombs themselves. The biggest bang in the world's history was the 58-megaton explosion the Russians conducted in their last test series in the Arctic.

The Soviet Union made major improvements in yield-to-weight ratio of its nuclear weapons—that is, the size of the weapon as compared to its explosive power—in its last series of tests. Our largest weapons are in the 30-megaton category and they can be carried, so far, only by planes.

The fear of many, but not all informed observers here is, therefore, that a freeze on space and atmospheric testing now would tend to consolidate these Russian advantages. The nightmare of a few experts is that a number of Russian superweapons exploded in the skies above the United States might blur our radar, knock out or confuse command and control systems, perhaps fuse or destroy our electrical circuits and thus prevent the launching of deterrent missiles. Similarly, some of those missiles that were launched might be knocked out of the skies or their fissionable warheads neutralized by intercepting Soviet antiballistic missiles with powerful warheads.

THREE INTANGIBLES

Thus any assessment of whether or not a nuclear test cessation would hurt us more than the Russians is dependent upon three intangibles: first, the kind of treaty that is agreed upon; second, an accurate estimate of our exact standing in the nuclear race vis-a-vis the Soviet Union; and, third, a balancing of the possible technical and scientific risks against the possible political and psychological gains.

Probably no one in Washington is able today to weigh all these intangibles accurately and to say with assurance that a nuclear test ban is or is not in the national interest.

Many, who side with a powerful group of presidential advisers, hold that it is less risky to put even a small check to the arms race than it is to continue it. A limited test ban, they hope, might lead to less strain and tension, a least between Moscow and Washington, and the beginnings of political accommodations. Such a ban might also put new life into the long-stalemated disarmament discussion. The effect might be more psychological than substantive, but it would be an undeniable factor in a world that has been ruled by tension.

But those who hold that such a limited ban has little political pragmatic meaning point, not only to its restricted nature, but to the fact that neither France nor Communist China would be bound by its terms. If France continues testing and the Chinese Communists begin to test, as many observers think likely within the next 3 years, an agreement between the great nuclear powers, the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain, could be strained and perhaps nullified.

Thus the Moscow talks, at their best, are only a very faint beginning on the long, long road to peace.

What's Become of "Law and Order"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 5, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report, which is on today's newsstands contains an excellent editorial which I feel merits the attention of the Members of the Congress. It is entitled "What's Become of 'Law and Order'?" and was written by the distinguished editor of this magazine, Mr. David Lawrence.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S BECOME OF "LAW AND ORDER"?

(By David Lawrence)

We pride ourselves on being a Nation governed by law. We boast of a society based on order—preserved by the volition of the citizenry or, if necessary, by force of law.

Yet we see minority groups today pretending that they cannot express their will effectively except through marches in the streets or lie-down and sit-in demonstrations which interfere forcibly with motor traffic or the carrying on of private business.

What has become of our famed system of communication for the expression of ideas on controversial questions—through the press, through television, through radio, in meeting halls and auditoriums, and even in the pulpits? Have all these facilities been unavailable to minority groups?

Why have so many clergymen, Negro and white, forsaken the pulpit and the spiritual way of inculcating ideas of justice and morality? One minister, a white man of prominence, who was himself arrested as a participant in a demonstration, told a congressional committee the other day that everything was peaceful until the counterdemonstrators arrived on the scene. But isn't it natural that counterdemonstrators should want to express themselves, too?

Church organizations have passed resolutions and individual ministers have preached sermons on civil rights. The Negro has not been without champions in every walk of life. Why, therefore, have so many Negro ministers become the active leaders and managers of street demonstrations that have resulted in disturbance of the peace, arrests, bloodshed and death?

Do the Negro ministers—those who on Sundays encourage the members of their congregations to participate in the marches—really feel that people of other races cannot be impressed with the merits of their cause except through so-called nonviolent demonstrations which so often lead to violence?

The dangers of the course which certain Negro leaders have adopted must in due time become apparent. If the only way to get attention for any cause is to organize provocative demonstrations, what lesson does this teach to a nation which believes in a government of law and order? Will not other groups of citizens, intent on attaining their objectives, be encouraged to adopt similar tactics?

The coming demonstration on the streets of Washington itself, it is estimated, will consist of at least 100,000 Negroes. Whether the Capitol Grounds themselves are invaded is irrelevant. If the President continues to acquiesce in such stunt tactics, the time will come when the mob spirit will replace orderly assembly and discourage reliance on our system of free communication—the media of printed and spoken words.

Why can't the demonstrators gather in big stadiums and listen to an exposition of views by their leaders? Are we approaching the day when in democratic America the slogan "law and order" is to be shunted aside with a dishonest rationalization that to disturb the peace is the only way to secure redress of grievances?

We hear the cry: "But we've waited a hundred years, we can't wait any longer."

Yet what happened in those hundred years? Was there no Congress or Supreme Court in session to proclam "the law of the land" in the usual manner? Was anyone prevented from challenging the laws or the court decisions in a formal way through the judicial or legislative processes established by our Constitution? Was there in those decades no discussion in the press and no public debate on the principles involved in the racial controversy? Would the ruling in the 1954 desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court have been achieved earlier if Negro demonstrations had been organized and many participants had been arrested for disturbing the peace?

Government is, in fact, a system developed by evolution. We believe in rule by the majority. The minds and hearts of a majority, however, cannot be won by disregarding the fundamental precepts of government itself—that "law and order" must be preserved while the facilities of debate and lawful communication are made available to all citizens, no matter how unpopular their causes may be.

But constitutional guarantees become worthless if the process of "law and order" is forsaken and we substitute the pressures of the mob in the precincts of government itself.

President Kennedy, the elected spokesman of the people, has failed to deplore or discourage the coming demonstration in Washington. He must, therefore, bear responsibility for any disturbance that may ensue. And the people who want "law and order" may find they have no other recourse but to express at the polls in 1964 a protest against the coercion of our legislative or executive process by street mobs.

Freedom and Individual Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit the following article which appeared in the July 25 edition of the Dixon Evening Telegraph. This editorial which appeared under the title "Declaration of Interdependence" is included at this time to call attention of my colleagues to the other half of the coin of freedom. In my opinion, it announces very clearly the threats to our freedom posed by growing Central Government and goes on to elucidate the basic responsibilities of every citizen to maintain our cherished liberties.

DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

We hear from many quarters these days the cry that American individuals should be "left alone." The cry really implies a question:

"Left alone to do what?"

No American who truly prizes the ideal and the practical substance of freedom can consciously wish to see himself and his fellow citizens plagued by unreasonable taxation, unwarranted Government interference in private affairs, unfair restriction on the exercise of individual rights.

But in a society governed by law there is no such thing as total freedom. The law is the basic means men have devised for accommodating with each other. Without it, they would be forever trampling on each other, and their "rights" and their "feedom" would be lost in mutually destructive chaos.

The freedoms they enjoy tend to shift somewhat in extent and character, depending on the needs and problems of their changing society.

They are wise to be ever-vigilant to keep freedom functioning through as wide an expanse of their lives as is compatible with the common good. Yet in fighting this battle it is not enough to say: "Leave us alone."

For freedom is not an endlessly celebrated birthday party, a perpetual binge, a lifetime of loafing on the sand or staring at television or riding around in a car.

It is a responsibility. You have to use it not just for yourself, not for the enjoyments of life, but for your companions in freedom.

If you do not undertake some tasks beyond the limits of your family, your circle of friends, and your immediate job, then society itself—acting through your government—will take on the broader assignments.

More than a few hardheaded conservatives have declared over the years that government in this country would have undertaken far less than it has if the American people, acting responsibly as individuals and in smaller local and regional groupings, had in larger numbers reached beyond their narrow personal concerns.

Too often the loud individual champions of freedom have defaulted their privileges. They have wanted to be left alone to do nothing but gratify themselves.

The call upon individual human effort in a free society is well expressed in a new report by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. It says:

"The Declaration of Independence is more than a declaration of individual supremacy. It is also an expression of faith in the concern of freemen for the public welfare.

"For a free society must rely heavily, if its values are to be defended and realized, on the voluntary actions of its citizens."

When men who are left alone take on their part of the public burden—as they should do—they will not likely find government encroaching further on the soil of their personal freedom.

As We See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, from the TV Guide of July 27, 1963, which tells the story of the advantages gained by this country through the use of film and tape abroad. Last year more than 500 USIA programs were seen in 61 countries, this editorial relates. I believe my colleagues would be most interested in reading this editorial at a time when the Congress is considering a proposed expansion of the program by the U.S. Information Agency.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT

Television is growing faster abroad these days than it is here at home. We have about 620 stations and 60 million sets in the United States. The rest of the world has about 2,500 stations (many of them low-power relays, repeaters, and satellite installations) and 65 million sets.

Despite mushrooming station and set figures, shortages of money and talent make programing a major problem in many countries. That is why film and tape provided without charge by the U.S. Information Agency are so popular. Last year more than 500 USIA programs were seen in 61 countries.

Apparently we're a jump ahead of the Soviets in this important area of propaganda, and in an effort to stay ahead and expand our efforts, USIA has asked that its budget for next year be boosted from $3.9 to $6.9 million. The money would be used for more programs and to provide adequate studio facilities and staff for foreign producers who want to send shows they make in America back to their own countries—especially countries in Africa and Asia.

Congress is understandably reluctant to increase expenditures. In this case, however, we can't afford not to take advantage of the position we have already established in television abroad.

If nothing else, we owe it to our country to turn out USIA television programs which will counteract the image of America reflected in some of the old, cheap, violent American commercial programs that are being distributed overseas.

We can't stop these programs from being sold abroad, but we can see to it that foreign audiences are also exposed to the truth about our people and our way of life.

Dramatizing the Dollar's Distress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 22 edition of the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Dramatizing the Dollar's Distress." I think that this editorial is provocative and deserves the attention of the Members of this body.

DRAMATIZING THE DOLLAR'S DISTRESS

"I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements."

That's what President Kennedy said last week. Then he proceeded to propose a 15-percent tax on investments in foreign securities. Whatever else may be said about it, this is a restriction on free capital movements.

And whatever the President may have intended, this and other proposals surely spotlight the depths of the dollar's troubles. They also leave the impression that the administration really does not understand why America, in 12 of the past 13 years, has been able to balance its international income and outgo only by dipping into the gold that backs up our dollar.

A major factor—if not the major factor—in this chronic payments deficit is the Government's own huge spending abroad. A lot

of this spending goes for foreign aid, and there's growing agreement that much of this aid is misdirected and unavailing. Yet the President proposes no real cutback in aid outlays; he merely would force foreigners to spend somewhat more of their aid dollars in the United States. Whatever modest help this may be to our balance of payments, it hardly squares with our "historic advocacy of freer trade."

Most of the rest of the Government's oversea outlay is military spending, and Mr. Kennedy does say that this spending will be trimmed a bit over the next couple of years. But it seems certain the reduction could materialize sooner and go a good deal deeper if our allies would assume their fair share of the burden of the West's defenses. And it should be obvious by now that they will do so only when Uncle Sam stops picking up their part of the tab.

Still another reason for the payments deficit has been the persistent policy of keeping money plentiful and cheap, both in recession and recovery. The idea is that when business is bad easy money will turn things around, and when business is good easy money will make it get even better. It didn't work out that way in the depression thirties, and in the past couple of years it hasn't produced the rate of growth the administration is seeking.

What it has done has been to encourage both Americans and foreigners to invest relatively more abroad, where higher interest rates are available. The Government seems well aware of this, and yet it still shrinks from strong countermoves, still clings to easy money as an economic stimulant.

It's true that the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate last week, indicating that short-term interest rates may head slightly higher. The proposed investment tax also would force foreigners to offer higher long-term rates if they want to borrow in the American market. But the President, in arguing for the tax, emphasized that there's to be no such interest rate rise for domestic borrowers. In other words, we're going to try the treacherous trick of tightening money for foreigners while we have even more easy money at home.

However much misunderstanding there may be about all of this in Washington, foreigners understand these things all too well.

They can see, for instance, that the investment tax may well be self-defeating. For U.S. investments in foreign securities produce a return flow of income, a flow that has been rising sharply. Last year it came to $800 million, not far from the $1.1 billion that Americans invested in new foreign securities. In the long run the income almost surely would surpass new investment.

Foreigners, furthemore, recognize flags of distress when they see them; they've flown them for their own currencies often enough. Like a bank that's in trouble, the United States proposes to limit withdrawals. In such circumstances, what will a German, an Englishman or anyone else think about the safety of investments he has made here? Or about the wisdom of investing any more funds in the United States? And will his confidence be inflated by the knowledge that America, for the very first time, plans to borrow from the International Monetary Fund?

Even so, these moves might accomplish something if the Government would accompany them with steps toward fiscal and monetary responsibility. Specifically, by making more meaningful cuts in its own spending and by abandoning its easy notions about easy money. But time will run out if the Government instead relies mainly on gimmicks that dramatize the dollar's distress.

Address of John W. Barriger, President of Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the interests of enhancing our understanding of today's transportation problems, I call attention to an address recently given by Mr. John W. Barriger, president of the Pittsburgh & Lake Erie Railroad Co.

I feel that Mr. Barriger has expressed in cogent terms the importance of railroad rejuvenation to meet the basic needs of our growing population and the potentials of our expanding economy. Mr. Barriger points to the example set by the Japanese in constructing a "super-railroad from Tokyo to Osaka." I have made explicit reference to this dynamic line in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 18, my proposal for a new approach to railroad modernization in our northeast States. I am glad to find that Mr. Barriger, together with other eminent railroad officials, believes that we in the United States are capable of immense improvement in our railroad services.

Furthermore, Mr. Barriger emphasizes that such improvement will attract greatly expanded passenger volume and will permit a similar expansion in railroad labor. At this time of stress in the railroad industry, his hopeful view of the future seems particularly refreshing.

I ask consent to have significant portions of Mr. Barriger's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RAILROAD FUTURAMA

(By John W. Barriger)

My subject for this address to the Pacific Railway Club's 48th annual dinner is "A Railroad Futurama."

Current discussions of basic economic problems have finally made the public aware that prosperity is primarily dependent upon the continuous expansion and improvement of the means of production and distribution of the private sector of business. These growth processes are dependent upon the availability of capital. Capital is derived from profits. Profits of any business in turn, represent a complex interaction between prices, volume, and efficiency.

The determination of competitively successful prices is the most important prerogative of management. Efficiency, which has a direct bearing on prices and volume, can always, or almost always, be improved by increasing the scale of output, and this can be accelerated by consolidation. Efficiency is also improved by moderization which, in turn, is dependent upon the availability of capital.

The cost of progress is high; consequently, great aggregates of capital are continuously needed to keep every business, and the Nation growing and developing. In a private enterprise economy corporate profits and individual savings are the principal sources of capital. Unfortunately, politicians and the general public too frequently relate profits only to the disbursement of dividends and refuse to understand that profits and capital are Siamese twins—one cannot live without the other.

When any industry—the railroads, for example—falls behind the national rate of technological progress and economic growth, the lag is due to one or more of the four following causes.

1. Insufficient capital.
2. Absence of technological, engineering, or commercial potentials; i.e. obsolesence.
3. Price controls which restrict the right of a business, i.e. the railroads, to utilize their inherent economic capabilities and characteristics in pricing their service in order to maximize volume and profits.
4. Efficiency controls which prevent attainment of full opportunities for improved operations; e.g., anticonsolidation policies, "excess crew" laws, working rules with employees that arbitrarily restrict production, etc.

The railroads are endowed with vast unrealized opportunities to utilize the full force of modern technological, engineering and commercial progress, but excessive controls that regulate their prices and restrict their efficiency have reduced them to a protracted state of chronic fiscal amenia, dating back, in its inception at least, for more than 50 years.

In my opinion, the technological progress actually registered in the property and equipment of the American railways, subsequent to any year since 1904–06, represents only one-third of the potential advance otherwise possible. That period as a base of reference coincides with the condemnation of the projected consolidation of the Hill lines—Great Northern, Northern Pacific, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the enactment of the Hepburn Act of 1906. These are not cited as causes, but as symptoms of attitudes that later hardened into patterns and policies.

A constructive railroad regulatory policy after 1906 which would have permitted the generation of more adequate net income would have saved the railroads. Proper consolidation and ratemaking policies and the consequent protection of rail traffic against competitive erosion after 1935 would together have brought spectacular improvements in efficiency and standards of service compared with present performance. The public would have been repaid subsequently by much better service at lower prices.

By analogy I might point out that a similar form of price controls applied during the development of the automobile or the electrical industries would have initially saved the purchasers of their products large sums of money. These temporary gains would, however, have been bought at the expense of the great public benefits that followed the development of those industries. Earning power is necessary if the high cost of technological progress is to be financed.

The progress of an industry as well as its component corporations, requires that its output be produced with modern equipment and facilities. Obsolete plants will keep on turning out goods and services as long as they are kept in repair, but technological progress is so rapid that companies using them can seldom attract or hold competitive business at a profit in a buyers' market.

No industry has a vested right to continued existence. Many once-important industries have retrogressed or vanished under the impact of progress. The economic utility of each must be continuously proved by its own competitive performance. The spectacle of declining markets for one industry with its

losses feeding the growth of another, is familiar to all. The downward spiraling of earning power symptomizes the process.

The public is accustomed to associating growth and financial success with commercial importance, so that when both are receding, the decline is taken as evidence of technological obsolescence and displacement. When rival industries meet under equal competitive conditions, comparative results do speak for themselves. It is rightly concluded that those companies which progress and prosper have achieved that status through their own superior merit and efficiency. Those that do not do so are presumed to suffer the consequences of their own obsolescence, inefficiency, or inadequacy. However, if the rules of the game are not the same for all, and the one falling back in relative position performs an essential service under artificially imposed handicaps that do not apply to its competitors, then the public interest requires that the artificially created burdens and handicaps be removed.

The national losses are tremendous from not having in these United States the improved economical rail services that would have followed, and may yet follow, constructive rather than punitive policies toward railroads. This is the hidden but nonetheless real cost, or penalty, paid by an unsuspecting public for the imaginary advantages of rigid and comprehensive regulation of railroads. Yet, whenever blame is assessed for the railroads' present shortcomings, this industry itself and not regulations is usually adjudged the guilty party. Obsolete and punitive laws, and their frequently narrow administration, are actually extolled as having rescued the railroads from a peril worse than the one they are in. The public, and I regret to say many railroad employees, having observed the contraction of rail services and the liquidation of rail properties, erroneously mistake the effect for the cause. The cause lies at the door of the Congress in the form of the Interstate Commerce Act and its creature, the Interstate Commerce Commission; the effects are the consequent liquidation of property, service, and employment.

The causes are price and other controls that restricted both earning power and traffic and consequently seriously retarded technological improvement. These handicaps have placed a fiscal blockade around the railroad industry, denying it access to all but a small part of the capital required for its full technological development. This is not a new condition, but a continuing and cumulative condition, dating back more than half a century.

The railway price controls established by acts passed in 1906, 1910, and 1920 were not necessary to curb the abuses in railway rate practices which brought on national railway regulation in 1887. The derelictions of that era were due to discriminatory, prejudicial, and unreasonable rates and practices. The original act, together with the prohibitions and heavy penalties of the Elkins amendment of 1903 ending rebates, and, take good note, this 1903 law was actively supported by the principal railroad spokesman of the day, provided adequate public protection against these legitimate complaints. These fundamental provisions of the original act should remain but the later structure of price controls should be removed.

These price controls were not necessary to correct railway abuses, but were designed to control earnings and permit, at a later date, allocation of traffic between competing modes of transportation. Regulatory intrusion into these vital matters could only have and did have, harmful consequences upon the railroad industry. Its present plight clearly attests to this being so.

There have never been valid economic grounds for giving the ICC protracted suspension powers and complete price controls over the level of railroad rates. The political expediency of such policies was, however, easily clothed in specious economic arguments. Absence of adequate protection for the railroads' earning power in these price control and rate suspension statutes, produced two effects, both bad. First, the exercise of control over maximum rates kept half of the railroad industry in poverty or bankruptcy when it had a monopoly and, second, the exercise of minimum rate powers and the suspensions of proposed rate reductions deprive the railroads in this competitive era of access to traffic that would contribute greatly to their earning power.

Punitive regulation is built around the price control powers given the ICC between 1906–20 and the anti-large-scale consolidation policy followed by the Commission, Congress, the Supreme Court and also by several presidential administrations from 1901 up until the ICC's decision of December 31, 1962, authorizing C. & O. control of B. & O. But regardless of the initial responsibility for punitive regulation of railroads, abandonment, or at least moderation of price controls and virtual prohibitions against large-scale consolidation are the areas where reform of national transportation policy is urgently needed to give the railroads opportunity of competitive equality and permit them to make up their arrested technological development.

In order to round out my presentation of the requirements for railroad progress, the necessity of modernizing work rules must be included. Most of these rules were imposed in the past by the unions and while technically accepted by management, its agreement to them was seldom voluntary.

Happily, the time is close at hand when some of these rules will be coordinated with the technological and economic realities of the present. The wage payment practices of this industry cannot longer be tied to the era when the only competition railroads had was horse-drawn vehicles on dirt roads, or steamboats on shallow rivers and a hundred-mile freight train run was, in fact, a day's work.

Even the most favorably situated railroads are seriously underdeveloped in relation to the full potentials they could realize with modern engineering and technology. But even in their present underdeveloped state the inherent characteristics of the railroads give them a commanding technological and economic superiority over their rivals, including inland waterways, in the mass production of transportation. Their pricing handicaps, however, deny them the right to demonstrate these capabilities in their quest for business.

Proof of the economic and technological superiority of railroads is found in the open, public confessions of waterways and highway spokesmen that their death knell would be sounded by lessening any of their present advantages in competitive pricing or, especially in the cast of the waterways, taking away of free public provision of their immensely expensive route facilities.

These rival modes of transport seem determined to hold on to all of their present artificially provided advantages and even press them further. They mistakenly believe that the political factors which have caused a massive transfusion of traffic to highways, waterways, and airways will continue to operate in their favor. However, privately owned and operated railways can no longer be expected to starve to death or accept nationalization in a spirit of sweet reasonableness. Neither calamity will happen particularly now that the public is becoming aroused and the Nation is confronted with a population explosion that will soon make the benefits of railroad mass transportation of passengers as well as freight even more important than ever before.

The quality of service and the cost of producing it, and therefore its price, are largely determined by the comparative standards of excellence of the design, construction and maintenance of all of the vast and intricate components, fixed and movable, that comprise a railroad. At a fraction of the per-mile cost of a superhighway or an artificial waterway, a superrailroad can be built between any combination of centers of population, commerce, and industry in the United States. A superrailroad would provide 100 m.p.h. terminal-to-terminal passenger schedules for trains comfortably accommodating 1,000 people and freight movements averaging between 50–70 m.p.h. for maximum length and weight trains. Such service would be performed with equipment and at service standards and prices that would seem fantastically better than those we presently have.

Where would the highways be without their multimillion-dollar per mile super routes? The present railroads, even the best of them, bear only the same relationship to the potentials of superrailroads that ordinary roads do to superhighways or the St. Lawrence or Ohio River Waterways to the original channels. The vast improvement of the route facilities for rubber-tired vehicles and barges is the basis of the immense expansion of highway and inland waterway transport, especially since the railroads have up to the present time been denied the equality of competitive opportunity necessary to provide superior route facilities for themselves. There is nothing that modern earthmoving machinery and materials of construction, together with bridges and tunnels, communications and signals, can do for competitive modes of transport that they could not do for rail transport much better and more economically and efficiently on a cost and service benefit ratio.

Japan is completing a 320-mile superrailroad from Toyko to Osaka. It will, of course, be electrified. Passenger trains will travel over it continuously at speeds up to 130 m.p.h. and freight trains at 70–90 m.p.h. Its bridges, tunnels and earthwork are being built on an impressive scale to obviate all speed restricting conditions. The United States would, I am confident, now have 25,000 miles of such superrailroads, and another 50,000 miles of lines would be approaching that status in their development, had the United States followed a progressive and constructive rather than a regressive and punitive railway policy beginning in the 1901–04 period.

Stop to consider the type of railroad system and consequently the standards of railroad service which the United States would now be enjoying if national transportation policy toward railroads had provided regulation that was continuously moderate, constructive, progressive, and cooperative.

Instead of the Nation's 215,000 miles of railroad being operated as a heterogeneous complex of more than 100 class I companies and several hundred organizations of lesser size, there should be no more than 20 line-haul railroads in the Nation, more probably less than 10, and possibly, and better still, only 2 or 3. These railroads, whether 2 or 20, or some intermediate number, would be great corporations, comparable to the most successful industrial and public utility companies in respect to their public prestige, recognize standards of service and technological progress and earning power and consequent financial strength.

Under truly large scale consolidated corporate organization, efficiency and service standards would far surpass even the best now obtainable. Increasing traffic volume and intensive technological developments will together bring costs down to levels which, in combination with concurrently improving service, would recover for the railroads a high proportion of all except very short haul freight movement and generate much traffic not now moving at all. The type of railroad that can be developed within a few years for the freight service under re-

formed conditions will also permit the operation of very fast high capacity passenger trains. These, in turn, will restore passenger traffic to a profitable growth business.

It is easy for all of us to visualize an ideal railroad, one that might be termed a "superrailroad." The maximum potentials of modern engineering would minimize the obstacles of grades and curves and relative distances and other forms of resistances and friction which nature places in the path of transportation. Permanent way and structures, tracks, signals, communication facilities, would all become representative of the highest contemporary standards. Trains would be composed of cars and locomotives that could utilize the full load and speed potentials of such a plant with electrified main lines using locomotives possessing up to 15,000 horsepower capacity in a single unit. Yards and terminals would be redesigned and equipped to minimize the time and expense requirements of the essential function they perform and be adapted to the intensified time requirements they will have to meet. Shops and other properties will be similarly improved.

Fixed plants and equipment of such standards would enable the railroads to provide greatly expedited and completely dependable service at reduced unit costs, both in terms of operating expenses and investment charges. This trend will be reinforced by the intensive utilization of railway services that will follow nationwide extension of the new era in rail transportation.

Railroads are confronted by the rivalry of fully modernized plant facilities in all other fields of transport. Witness the expanding system of superhighways, the St. Lawrence and Ohio River waterways, the gigantic airports required for jet planes and high capacity pipelines. Superrailroads alone can meet such competition successfully throughout the Nation and generate the additional volume of traffic essential to establish the earning power of present railway capital investment while providing a satisfactory return on the $30 billion of additional capital funds that will be required for this transformation. This total is an immense sum but the resultant gains in traffic and earning power will justify and support its expenditure.

All applicable scientific and engineering progress will be found in use to some extent in today's railway plans and equipment, but far too small a part of it is equal to the best. The crux of the railroad problem and consequently one of the principal purposes in stressing the essentiality of obtaining equality of competitive opportunity, under moderate and constructive regulation, is to overcome the long cycle of retarded progress and begin one of accelerated modernization.

After judicious pruning of duplicating mileages, which perform no appreciable volume of useful service, approximately 100,000 miles of branch lines, operated as part of consolidated railroad systems, will provide improved rail service to those areas and communities not directly served by the main line. Branch line service under these improved conditions will be prompt and dependable. Mileage of this character will be then a credit and an asset, and not a skeleton in the closet, or a liability to the companies which provide it. While the immediate purpose of present consolidation endeavors is to produce the additional earning power essential for the corporate survival of certain eastern railroads, and to improve service of these and other railroads in the west, the important public benefits of consolidation will flow out of the enlarged size and scale of railway operations and establish a contagious pattern of success as the diesel locomotive did and thereby insured its early complete acceptance.

The very artificiality of the political barriers which still stand in the path of railroad progress, together with the urgency of the need for reform of national transportation policy toward railroads, provide grounds for the hope and belief that if we continue our efforts unabated, or redouble them if we can, the long sought equality of competitive opportunity will be attained.

President Kennedy's ambitions for accelerating the economic development of the United States, which represent the best hopes of all of us, will be greatly facilitated if the Congress, working with the President, will accord the railroads in 1963 the modest measure of competitive equality now being proposed. The railroads will not be instantly transformed into a dynamic component of the American economy, but with one step taken, and its wisdom proved, the next will be easier.

In my opinion, competitive equality in pricing, along with consolidation and modernization of work rules and the resultant conversion of our present obsolete railroads into superrailroads will, within the next decade, more than double their present production of freight transportation and raise passenger transportation output to more than 100 billion passenger miles annually, while converting this present deficit operation into a profitable one. Superrailroads will have no difficulty in earning a 6-percent return at rate levels below present ones on the aggregate of nearly $50 billion net investment in the railroads which will be required to complete this transformation, even after giving effect to the write-off of present property and equipment replaced.

Markets of this size for rail service will require the railroads to employ more than a million men, even though they have attained the productivity inherent in superrailroads. For every job eliminated through the consolidations that must be effected to produce superrailroads, several new positions will be created by the resultant increase in traffic and modernization of plants and equipment.

The oustanding exhibit at the New York World's Fair of 1939–40 was the General Motors Futurama which educated the public to an understanding of the technological potentials of highway transportation. The railroads cannot afford such a striking visual exhibition, but through earnest and graphic words let us spread before the public the magnificent "Railroad Futurama" which awaits only reform of national transportation policy toward the railroad industry in order to make its vast economic and social benefits available to this dynamic Nation.

A Reply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Karen L. Mansfield, of Chicago, Ill., I include her letter addressed to me and dated July 18, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD, as I believe this letter merits the attention of the Members of this body.

A copy of her letter follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 18, 1963.*

Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 5, there appears a letter inserted by Representative ODIN LANGEN from one of his constituents, presenting a reactionary and somewhat lopsided view of the state of our Nation. I hope that you will consider the following sufficient reply to the writer of that letter, Miss Rhoda L. Matson, and will see fit to have it, too, printed in the RECORD.

In her introductory statement, Miss Matson accuses President Kennedy of "weakening our country, and destroying our principles, and yielding to Khrushchev." The fact is that our country is stronger today, both internally and in the eyes of the rest of the world, than ever before, as a result of President Kennedy's many forward-looking programs: the Peace Corps and the Alliance for Progress, to mention only two. And just whose principles does she think have been destroyed? Certainly not mine, nor those of my acquaintances; for now, more than ever, we feel the need to hold to our principles in the face of threats from countries with totalitarian philosophies; and we realize that we have an obligation to promote democratic ideals throughout the world.

Yielding to Khrushchev? Did not our President force the Soviets to dismantle their military bases in Cuba? Has not Mr. Kennedy stood firmly against any concessions in settling the issue of a divided Germany or surrendering Formosa to Red China?

Miss Matson is opposed to signing a nuclear test ban treaty, contending that we must continue the perilous arms race, making bigger and better bombs. Surely, she must realize the inherent dangers of continued weapons testing—not only is there the threat of accidentally setting off a war of total annihilation, but the increasing amount of radioactive fallout in the atmosphere would become a serious hazard to the survival of future generations.

For the United States to disarm in favor of United Nations weapons control is termed "madness" by the lady from Minnesota, since "there are Communists in the United Nations." Any student of current events can tell you that the free world bloc in the United Nations is substantially stronger than the Communist combine and thus would have the upper hand. Furthermore, under a United Nations weapons control plan, Communist countries would have to obey the same regulations and would be subject to the same sanctions as the United States. It is interesting to note here that in paragraph No. 8 of her letter, Miss Matson tells us to stop being afraid of the Communists—yet her entire letter is permeated with obvious evidence of, and was probably motivated by, her own fear of communism.

The letter charges that President Kennedy "borrowed" money from the United Nations. Could the writer have meant that he "lent" it money? Actually he did neither: money recently given the United Nations by the United States was simply an advance payment of our regular membership dues; and our payments will be accordingly lowered in future years. These funds have not been used to aid Communist countries, and where Miss Matson gets the idea that United Nations moneys have been used to aid the Communists in Cuba is a mystery; for Cuba is so far behind in paying her United Nations membership dues that she is in danger of being dropped from the rolls at the very next session.

As for paragraph No. 3, in which the writer urges we "* * * cut down on all * * * spending until we are out of debt," it is about time someone informed her that the national debt is a mythical beast. It will never be paid off, and no one, not even our top economists, expects it to be. Old debts are paid as new one are incurred; consequently, there is a constant turnover of creditors. One cannot increase the prosperity of a growing country by worrying and fretting over "debts" that will never be paid off anyway.

Miss Matson suggests that we spend money on strengthening our military forces and forgo space exploration. While we're at it, why not go all the way and return to the stone age?

Of course, there would then be no public schools in which students would be required to read the Bible every day, as Miss Matson advocates (and, for that matter, no Bibles). How ironic Representative LANGEN's eloquent constituent should advocate an amendment to the Federal Constitution to regulate procedures in public schools while at the same time, in paragraph No. 7, she protests that, by his Federal aid to education program, President Kennedy would be imposing this very same Federal regulation.

Religion is a personal matter. It belongs in the church and in the home. If there are homes without religion and people who don't go to church, that is the prerogative of the individuals involved; a prerogative guaranteed them by the Constitution; and if children must be taught religion in the public schools, it only indicates failure on the part of their churches and homes.

By allowing Cuban exiles to attack Castro, as Miss Matson suggests, we would certainly bring down upon the United States more trouble than we bargained for. Does she honestly think those who would stage the attack would have any chance of victory? "We should let the Cubans set up their Cuban Government on our base at Guantanamo * * *" she says. I have yet to hear a more preposterous idea.

The writer wants the Government to stop running corporations and allow private business to take them over. As it is run now, the TVA, for instance, is able to supply electrical power to many consumers at a very low price. If taken over by private industry, rates would skyrocket. The same is true of all Government-run projects; but these, in time, help private industry; for when power is cheap, consumers are apt to purchase more electrical appliances. These things Miss Matson simply does not understand.

Her suggestion that military men make decisions now under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense is a real dilly: doesn't she know that the post of Secretary of Defense was created especially as a civilian office, to prevent excessive control by the military in our Government? Countries like the Soviet Union are run by the military.

Miss Matson's questions as to where the President gets the authority to give aid to foreign nations is easily answered; and the answer may shock her. All such appropriations must be approved by Congress—by her own elected representatives.

There is one feature of her letter, however, with which I must agree; and that is the statement that all segregation should end immediately. It is time we realized that Negroes are Americans; they are human beings; and they are entitled to be treated as such.

I do hope I have demonstrated to you and your colleagues that not all of your constituents think alike.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. MANSFIELD.

Independence of Niger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, the Republic of Niger will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President and Prime Minister of Niger, Hamani Diori; and His Excellency, the Niger Ambassador to the United States.

In 1960 Niger, the largest of the eight territories that formerly comprised French West Africa and a country about the size of our States of Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico combined, became an independent nation. In his message to President Diori on the occasion of Niger's independence President Eisenhower observed that the United States had followed Niger's progress toward independence with great interest and welcomed with deep satisfaction the event, which was achieved in friendly cooperation with France.

On August 3, 1963, the third anniversary of Niger's independence, we once again salute Niger's independence. We assure the people of Niger that our interest in their country has not waned and that Niger's cooperative spirit has remained a deep source of satisfaction to us and to the rest of the community of nations. Niger has continued to maintain close financial, trade, and commercial ties with France in the 3 years since independence, to the advantage of both countries. In addition, Niger has enjoyed friendly relations with all the neighboring African countries and has cooperated with them in common enterprises. As a member of the Conseil de l'Entente, together with Dahomey, Ivory Coast, and Upper Volta, Niger has worked closely with three of its neighbor states in a customs union and political pact of mutual benefit.

Furthermore, Niger's constitution establishes it as a democratic republic. The preamble to the constitution reaffirms Niger's adherence to the principles of democracy, human rights, and civil liberties. The constitution itself states Niger's determination to establish relations of cooperation and solidarity with all the states in the French Community. In practice, Niger's relations with the whole world community have been cooperative and friendly.

Economically Niger is chiefly an agricultural country whose main cash crops are peanutes, cotton, livestock, and livestock products. Approximately 97 percent of the population is engaged in farming and stockraising, and industry is limited essentially to companies processing agricultural products. We commend the Niger Government for recognizing that the economic development which is one of the primary goals of every new independent nation must be achieved within this framework.

The 1961–63 development plan was one of modest and realistic goals, not of pipe dreams which were impossible of realization. Recognizing the necessity of establishing the essential preconditions of a long range development plan before launching into such a program, the Niger Government has concenterated on four basic objectives: First, increasing school attendance; second, improving the rate of national income growth to 4 percent annually, with chief emphasis on agricultural development and land reclamation, the development of the livestock industry, and the more rapid flow of rural products into the money economy; third, to develop internal and external trade in order to convert Niger from a subsistence to a money economy; and fourth, to increase and diversify exports, while gradually replacing imports with local manufactures in order to increase the supply of foreign exchange available for needed equipment.

In summary, we congratulate President Diori and the people of Niger for their accomplishments in the first 3 years of independence. Niger has shown itself a responsible member of the world community and a country of admirable and realistic domestic policies.

The Sound of Quiet Voices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the two following editorials from the July 5 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

THE SOUND OF QUIET VOICES

Sometimes reading the headlines or listening to the radio you might suppose there are only loud and angry voices debating the problem of the Negro and his place in American society.

There is the angry chorus of southern extremists, the equally angry cries of the Black Muslims and others preaching bitterness. Some sow violence to defy simple justice, others promise violence as an instant remedy. Together they raise alarm that blood will flow in the streets.

But these are not the whole of America speaking. Here and there a few quiet voices, more courageous than those who boast of courage, are trying to speak with reason and commonsense.

One such was Commissioner Murphy, of the New York Police Department, a city where violence has happened and more is promised. Mr. Murphy said it is not the function of the police authorities to settle or to take sides in the deep questions of the day; their function is to preserve order in society. Those who take their case to the streets, said Mr. Murphy, must reckon with his police department, which will do its duty against all comers, white or Negro. His statement was not everywhere well received, but it was the voice of reason.

So have been the voices, mostly nameless, who have acted quietly against the absolutists of the South. Their voices, from Little Rock to Birmingham, spared us worse disasters, and have brought immeasurable progress from North Carolina to Texas, though they have not always been well received either.

Elsewhere too reason has not been lost by all those in the forefront of the drive for Negro rights. No one can accuse Agnes E. Meyer, long active in furthering the Negro cause, of being unsympathetic to the Negro's feeling of frustration, and we think she spoke for many of like sympathy when she criticized the absolutists of the Negro movement and pleaded that "reason will gradually triumph over passion in this Negro revolution."

But perhaps the most significant thing is the emergence of some quiet voices among the Negro people themselves.

Recently a number of Negro residents of New Rochelle, N.Y., signed a petition asking that the predominantly Negro Lincoln School be kept open and that their children not be hauled away to be forcibly integrated into a distant white school. For this they were belabored as almost traitors to the Negro cause. Yet their desires were both understandable and reasonable.

So too are the observations of James Hood, excerpts from which are published elsewhere on this page. Mr. Hood, one of the two Negroes admitted last month to the University of Alabama in the midst of controversy, not only objects to demonstrations and violence as a way of achieving the true interests of the Negro; he also comes to grips with the very heart of the matter.

"In order for one to be accepted in a society," he remarks, "he must not only seek to get into that society but also he must have something to offer it. He must upgrade the status of that society in becoming a part of it." The way to achieve this is by education. But even here, "education itself will not and cannot occur overnight. It demands the tough of the toughest, and the concern of the concerned. It is not a one-way affair but a two-way street."

It is possible, as Mr. Hood fears, that this view of the matter may be frowned upon by the majority of his race; it certainly will be by its militant leaders. Yet we have a feeling that Mr. Hood says what many others know in their hearts, and we are sure that in what he says there is much wisdom.

In any event, it is comforting in times when passions are inflamed, and reason itself seems consumed, to hear a few quiet voices struggling to be heard. Our country has need of them.

NOTABLE AND QUOTABLE

(By James A. Hood, one of two Negroes admitted to the University of Alabama, in a copyrighted guest editorial in the university newspaper, the Crimson-White.)

As a result of recent experiences in my life, I have taken a careful look at racial relations and have concluded that the protest movements have resulted in, literally, a big, unnecessary mess.

With our Nation on the brink of racial violence, there is a firm need for a solution which will not only meet the demands of the Negro, but will also make him meet the demands of society. In order for one to be accepted in a society he must meet certain standards in accordance with that society in which he is seeking a position. He must not only seek to get into that society but also he must have something to offer it. He must upgrade the status of that society in becoming a part of it.

My point is this: Basically, I think the whole idea of protests has gotten off course. I think it has become a matter of excitement rather than conviction for most Negroes.

Why doesn't the Negro wake up and go about this thing in a more intelligent way? The answer to that comes with these questions: Who benefits from the conflict, the Negro masses or the Negro leaders? Who would lose prestige and money if another way were chosen?

There must be some more positive way of achieving first-class citizenship, a way without violence or protests. I think there is. It is the same method employed to increase the standards of a community; the same system which assures one of implantation of ideas. By now you have guessed the answer: Education.

The protest movement should be centered on educational objectives rather than immediate social and economic objectives such as sit-ins and swim-ins, and so forth. It is my belief that through education the sit-ins and swim-ins will be unnecessary. There must be more time spent in the classrooms and less time wasted on picket lines.

My solution to the problem is a long-range one, but I am confident it will resolve the individual differences of both races, and stabilize relations between opposing forces. Inasmuch as I propose a solution, frowned on by a majority of my race, I feel that many people will consider my ideas weird. My position will make me unpopular with the masses of my people, but that has no relevance with what I believe and how I feel.

But education itself will not and cannot occur overnight. It demands the tough of the toughest, and the concern of the concerned. It is not a one-way affair but a two-way street on which both parties must travel at the same rate of speed in pursuit of the same destination, if there is to be harmony at the traffic light.

Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I feel that all Congressmen will enjoy and benefit by the very thought-provoking report from this good and great American, my good friend, Otto Wettstein III:

EXCERPT OF REPORT OF HON. OTTO WETTSTEIN III, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICANISM COMMITTEE OF THE FLORIDA STATE ELKS ASSOCIATION, INC., GIVEN TO THE DELEGATES ASSEMBLED IN CONVENTION AT TAMPA, FLA., ON MAY 23, 24, AND 25, 1963

My brothers, my concluding remarks will not take much more of your time. During the past 3 years the Americanism Committee has devoted most of its energy in trying to awaken you as Americans and as Elks to the dangers of communism which threaten us from within and from without. We have sponsored many anticommunism activities and in so doing we could very well have earned the stigma of being anti this and anti that, without being pro anything. In defense of this prograh we were following the premise that unless Americans understood what communism was all about, understood its worldly aims, and the methods being used to obtain these aims, we could not effectively combat it. I will not attempt to review what has been done by your committee to further this program; the secretary has my complete report, too long to give to you here. Some progress has been made, but there is still an appalling lack of interest, a great indifference, which is most difficult to understand. There is entirely too much of a feeling, "It can't happen to us," and "We have always whipped everyone who has jumped on us, and we will again if we have to fight." My brothers, this is a different kind of warfare, and unless we understand how communism works and how it intends to take over this country, and to effectively resist, we will wind up one of these days Communist dominated without having fired a shot in resistance, and then, goodby to the freedoms I know you cherish.

Take Cuba, for instance. The administration has decided to coexist with Fidel Castro. This is an inescapable conclusion to be drawn from recent Government statements and actions. To critics, Government apologists offer a now monotonous answer: "What should be done? You tell us." This is an admission of defeat. From the day of President Kennedy's inauguration there were three obvious ways to oust Castro and his regime: invasion, economic blockade, internal revolt. Failure of nerve undermined the Bay of Pigs invasion when air cover was called off; failure of nerve spoiled the economic blockade last October; and now failure of nerve is canceling the final alternative, that of supplying arms and ammunition to insurrectionary groups inside and outside the island. These are tragic mistakes, mistakes foisted on the Government by the doom criers who preach a doctrine of paralysis based on fear of atomic war. They cry, "We cannot afford to step on Khrushchev's toes." And, Mr. Khrushchev marches merrily on, thumbs his nose, pounds his desk at us with his shoe, and communism continues to expand all over the world. We have lost the respect of the free world, and have completely lost face in Latin America because we didn't have the "guts" to back up the Monroe Doctrine.

Most Floridians are greatly concerned over the Communist threat within 90 miles of our State, but are they doing anything about it? Only a few of our citizens have had enough interest, enough concern to even write a letter to their Senators and Congressmen, expressing their indignation and opposition to this "coexist," "no nothing" policy of the administration. "Why? Why?" Congress is our only hope.

There are those of us who believe that changes have taken place in our way of life, and in our way of thinking, in our way of behaving during the past 30 years, which have brought about this complacent attitude, and which have made many of us soft, lazy, ethically and morally weak.

With this in mind, I am of the opinion that it is time for our Americanism committee to start a program to resell America to our people and to our brothers. In addition to our anticommunism program we should sponsor a far more active pro-Americanism program. A program much more effective than our Flag Day, flag presentations, and flag-display programs, which we have had for years. You will recall Brother Wall's splendid program, "A Declaration of American Principles," and Brother Donaldson's "Freedom Week." These and others like them are the kind of programs we need to drive home, not with lipservice but with a concerted all-out effort. Many Americans, also, must be resold on the absolute necessity of greatly strengthening our ethical and moral values if we are to survive and eliminate from our thinking, from our way of life, that we can survive on the generosity of a benevolent government, and get by with as little effort as possible.

The other day I came across this short piece written by Josiah Gilbert Holland. It is entitled "God Give Us Men," and I quote:

"God give us men. The time demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who have honor; men who will not lie,
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.

"For while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds
Mingle in selfish strife; lo, freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting justice sleeps."

Finally, my brothers, thank you for having given me the opportunity of serving on your Americanism committee. I have learned a great deal. I have had my eyes opened. I have made many new friends. I have seen

some accomplishments. I have been impressed by the all-out effort of some of our lodges and have seen quite a number of good American Elks in action, all of which has made a vivid and lasting impression on my own actions as an American and as an Elk. Nothing will ever be able to take the place of these 3 years of my life. Although this is my swan song, and I am closing the book on my activities as chairman of the Americanism committee, having learned something of the responsibilities of having the privilege of being a citizen of the great United States of America, I will be a better American and a better Elk in the years ahead.

A Scene To Remember: Boy Lying in the Street; Injured Child and a Distraught Driver Shatter Neighborhood's Afternoon Calm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleagues would want to share with me a story which appeared in the July 18, 1963, issue of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y. The writer is anonymous and perhaps will not be a candidate for a journalistic award. However, I believe he has ably given the details of an accident that could easily happen to any one of us. The article follows:

A SCENE TO REMEMBER—BOY LYING IN THE STREET: INJURED CHILD AND A DISTRAUGHT DRIVER SHATTER NEIGHBORHOOD'S AFTERNOON CALM

It's been a long day. You've a comfortable feeling of hunger and anticipation of a good dinner.

Your mind is not really concentrating on driving. You leave that to the subconscious.

You see a small figure dart out into Bailey Avenue up ahead. Then, in quick succession, the screech of brakes. Screams.

That comfortable feeling is gone and your stomach becomes a knot.

A car pulls over to the curb. The driver looks frantically for help. A boy lays bleeding on the hot sidewalk.

You turn down a side street and walk back to the scene of the accident.

A crowd gathers quickly. Someone has placed a blanket over the crying, frightened boy.

In the distance there's the faint scream of an ambulance siren. You wait. The crowd waits—tensely. You hope, no, you pray that they are on time.

Relief sweeps over you with its arrival.

Police take the boy's name—William Rumpl, 11, of 7 Schreck Avenue. The driver, John Pierce, 19, of 174 Seneca Street, tells them William ran from between parked cars.

The police officer wonders how many times he's heard that explanation for accidents involving children.

Today officials at Emergency Hospital list William's condition as fair. They report he suffered severe bruises and abrasions.

As the ambulance speeds away, you're not hungry any more. The good day has soured. You can't get the accident out of your mind. The driver could have been you. Or the child yours.

Liberian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am submitting for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD these remarks calling attention to the celebration in that country of Liberian Independence Day, this date, July 26, 1963.

On this date, in 1847, the free and independent Republic of Liberia was established on the agriculturally and historically rich shore of West Africa. It was because of herculean efforts by pioneering former American slaves, substantially aided by American philanthropic societies, that this still vital and growing constitutional democracy joined the family of nations. Thus, under a constitution modeled after our very own, these ex-slaves and descendants of slaves gave further proof that men must and will be free of oppression and suppression even if they are compelled by circumstances to build their own nation toward that end.

Since that time, the Republic of Liberia has come to contain 1,300,000 people—1960 U.N. estimation—approximately equal to the population of the State of Arizona. Liberia occupies 43,000 square miles, being slightly larger than the State of Tennessee and somewhat smaller than my own State of Pennsylvania.

The Liberian Republic enjoys a relatively healthy economic condition and is experiencing considerable growth and development along economic lines—a further tribute to the industry and aspirations of her capable and resourceful people. In 1958, 94.8 million pounds of rubber were produced along with 46.8 million pounds of other forrestry products which were exported. In 1959, 2 million pounds of coffee were exported as part of the yield of an increasingly prosperous agricultural endeavor. Estimated iron ore deposits have been set at 80 million tons of 67.8 percent pure iron, out of which 2.6 million long tons were exported in 1959.

Total imports increased from $26.7 million valuation in 1956 to $69.2 million in 1960. Exports, too, increased significantly during the same period, climbing from $44.5 million valuation to $78.8 million. Nearly 1,000 main-line ships called at Liberia's ports, principally the free port of Monrovia, during 1959. The nation has under registry 10.93 million tons of ships. The main importer of Liberian goods is the United States, which received $41.6 million worth of her exports in 1960; and that little nation reciprocated by importing $37 million in U.S. goods in that same year. She belongs to that area of Africa which led in American private investments with $290 million in 1960. The Liberian dollar has been at par with the American dollar since 1944; and the nation was placed in the American account area in 1952.

With no Sino-Soviet bloc ties or commitments whatever, the free and independent Republic of Liberia stands now and has always stood firmly with the free nations of the world against totalitarianism and exploitation. Moreover, her multimillion-dollar Robertsfield airport is a strategic U.S. base, while her well-developed port of Monrovia is a potentially vital submarine facility.

In view of her rich history, her noble and substantial accomplishments, her sturdy and resourceful people, and her fine record in international relations—as well as with regard for her kinship to the United States—I take great pleasure in according recognition to the Republic of Liberia on the occasion of her 141st anniversary. The words and title of her national anthem are well taken, "All hail, Liberia, hail."

Togetherness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, a letter from a patriotic citizen of this country has been directed to me in which this individual points out some of the things which have been disturbing to me and I believe all of us here in the Congress. I feel her comments are worthy of consideration and, therefore, under unanimous consent, I include her letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 24, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for bringing to the attention of the House the extent of Communist military subversion in Latin American countries.

I, too, feel that the civil rights and other internal problems have been magnified to divert attention from the increased Communist activity in Cuba and South America.

The State Department assures me that 'Soviet ships in this area have been under extremely close scrutiny" and that in no instance have they, in fact, engaged in transporting arms and Commuist guerrillas.

The Chief of Naval Operations, George W. Anderson, also assures me that a "surveillance system designed to detect and intercept clandestine movements of persons, propaganda materials, and arms for subversive purposes" was recommended at a meeting of Ministers of Governments, Interior, and Security of the Central American Countries, Panama and the United States which was held April 3–4, 1963, in Managua, Nicaragua. Mr. Anderson also wrote, "When fully operative, this system should be a valuable asset to hemispheric security, and the U.S. Navy will give important assistance to it."

Meanwhile, military subversion goes on while ministers make recommendations. It

may be recalled that numerous recommendations made in the United Nations in the past have served as a useful deterrent to military action while our enemies made many strategic gains, militarily and politically. Over the years, United States has gone down the ladder and is almost incapable of defending our national security.

What we need is a new kind of togetherness called patriotism and leaders with stick-togetherness on vital issues of concern to our country. We can use fewer leaders who have spread patriotism so thin that national erosion and disintegration have appeared in every segment of our national and political life.

The "assurance" that the State Department and Mr. Anderson give me is of no satisfaction since disturbing reports continue to leak through to a few Americans.

Sincerely,

MRS. MILDRED ROBERTS.

The Late Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nello S. Carozzoni, chairman, Americanism committee of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion, and a resident of the city of Wilkes-Barre in my congressional district, has forwarded to me a resolution that was adopted in memory of our late and distinguished chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Honorable Francis E. Walter, at the State Convention of the American Legion held at Pittsburgh, July 17–20, 1963. As part of my remarks today, I would like to include the letter of transmittal from Mr. Carozzoni as well as a copy of the resolution itself.

The letter and resolution follow:

WILKES-BARRE, PA.,
July 23, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: The following resolution was submitted to the annual State Convention of the American Legion on July 17–20, 1963, and was unanimously accepted by the delegates present.

Respectfully yours,

NELLO S. CAROZZONI, Jr.,
Chairman, Americanism Committee of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion.

RESOLUTION 39

(Submitted by Nello S. Carozzoni, Jr.)

Whereas the Honorable Francis E. Walter, Democrat, of Easton, Pa., born May 26, 1894, at Easton, Pa., a veteran of World Wars I and II; elected to the 73d and subsequent Congresses of the United States from March 1933 to June 1963, a total of 30 years, 3 months of service; and

Whereas he was appointed to the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1949 by the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, and eventually assumed the chairmanship of this committee in 1955; and

Whereas during his long service in the House of Representatives he was honored by many high and responsible positions which was a tribute to the quality of his service and dedication; and

Whereas in addition to his chairing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities he was chairman of the Democratic Caucus, chairman of the Patronage Committee and the chairman of two subcommittees of the House Judiciary Committee; and

Whereas Representative Walter, one of Pennsylvania's outstanding sons, was dedicated to his own District and region, his party and above all, God and Country in which the concern with the welfare of his country was manifested in his chairmanship of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whereby he sought out subversive elements and would grant no quarters to those who attempted to undermine his beloved country; and

Whereas his colleagues in Congress last supported the efforts of his committee by a confidence vote of 412 to 6, silencing those who, while opposing his work, never doubted his sincerity, and

Whereas his outstanding record of accomplishments and achievements have now come to an end and is a matter of record. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the 45th annual State convention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, regularly convened in Pittsburgh, Pa., July 17–20, 1963, do hereby go on record citing and commending the accomplishments and achievements of the late Honorable Francis E. Walter, a true and dedicated American, one who by his record, has laid down an example for other great Americans to follow, and be it further

Resolved, That the memory of the Honorable Francis E. Walter, whose body was laid to rest in the Arlington National Cemetery on Tuesday, June 4, 1963, will not fade in the minds of Americans who cherish freedom and deeply represent attempts to subvert the greatest Nation in the world.

Georgia Was First in Wheat Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia, in the recent referendum for the 1964 wheat marketing quota, voted overwhelmingly in support of the program. Quoted below is the letter I received from William L. Lanier, State executive director, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Athens, Ga., which gives a report on the opinion expressed by Georgia farmers:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE, GEORGIA STATE OFFICE,
Athens, Ga., June 24, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEPHENS: The complete and final results for the Nation of the 1964 wheat marketing quota referendum are now known. We feel, however, that you may be particularly interested in the results for Georgia.

As you know, in order for small wheat farmers to vote in the referendum, it was required that they sign an intention-to-participate form by May 13. In Georgia, 96.2 percent of the small wheat farmers signed a form MQ–24, saying they would participate; therefore, they were eligible to vote. This was the highest percentage of signup by small farmers in the Nation.

There were 18,387 eligible voters in the State and of this number 15,128 cast a ballot in the referendum. This 82.3-percent participation was the highest percentage of any major wheat State.

Of the 15,128 votes cast by Georgia voters, 13,143 voted "yes." This 87-percent affirmative vote led the Nation in support of the proposed program.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM L. LANIER,
State Executive Director.

The Untold Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Wall Street Journal of July 29, 1963:

THE UNTOLD STORY

Although the unemployment percentage figure is widely regarded as a major measure of the Nation's economic health, it is actually an unreliable thermometer; what's more, it tells only one side of the employment story.

This is especially unfortunate because the unemployment figures put out by the Government are used as a basis for far-reaching Federal programs. If the percentage rate starts to climb, there are prompt demands for action. That is how the Nation gets saddled wtih such costly and misdirected programs as the one for so-called area redevelopment.

What is left out by this exclusive concentration on the unemployment figure is the other side of the coin: The number of existing job vacancies. On that, as former presidential adviser Arthur F. Burns notes in a "Morgan Guaranty Survey" discussion, there is a "complete absence of national statistics."

It's a rather surprising gap, when you think about it, for the inclusion of such statistics would make quite a difference in the picture of the economy's performance. Suppose it is estimated that 4 million people are out of work; that sounds gloomy. But suppose at the same time there are 4 million job openings, which is entirely possible on the basis of scattered and unofficial indications. That sounds like a pretty vigorous economy; at least it puts some balance into the assessment.

To be sure, the vacancies aren't much help to those who are genuinely unemployed and who can't get to them or who aren't qualified to fill them. But the numbers of such people are almost certainly exaggerated by the present methods of computing unemployment and by the current worship of these statistics.

For example, a jump in the unemployment rate from 4 percent to 5 percent may seem serious enough. Dr. Burns observes, however, that it has little economic significance if it is caused by a seasonal entrance of teenagers into the labor force.

In any case, it is not proof of a weak economy if people are incapable of taking the jobs that are avaialble. And it makes little sense to base huge spending programs on such woefully inadequate data. A suspicious person might even be tempted to wonder if that is why the Government chooses to ignore the job-vacancy part of the story.

Independence of the Ivory Coast Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, the Republic of the Ivory Coast will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President and Prime Minister of the Ivory Coast, Felix Houphouet-Boigny, and His Excellency, the Ivory Coast Ambassador to the United States, Konan Bedie.

Unique is a word which may readily be applied to the Ivory Coast. This Republic achieved its independence quietly and without revolution. Furthermore, since independence was declared, there have been no political struggles for power, assassinations, or internal dissension. Now entering their fourth year of sovereignty, the people of the Ivory Coast owe their continued peaceful progress to their able President, Houphouet-Boigny.

Our Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, when attending the ceremonies in the Ivory Coast which commemorated the Republic's first year of independence, compared President Houphouet-Boigny to George Washington and said that he is an international statesman, respected throughout the world. Through the efforts of this astute personage, the Ivory Coast gained political freedom from France on August 7, 1960, under the best of circumstances. Close ties with its former protector have remained, especially in the economic fields. There resides in the capital city a large French community, still retaining important Government positions and guiding the economic affairs and destiny of the country.

Although France has a monopoly on trade with the Ivory Coast, recent missions have sought development capital elsewhere. M. Houphouet-Boigny came to the United States in May 1962 and received assurances from President Kennedy that the United States would be responsive to the need for development in his country. As such, aid for projects in education, agriculture, fisheries, and development of the southwest region were discussed and projected.

Much progress has been accomplished in the 3 years of its sovereignty. The capital, Abijan, once a small fishing village, has expanded rapidly since a ship canal was dredged to the sea, enabling the city to become a modern seaport. It now has the honor of being the fastest growing city in all Africa. Education, so important to the development of a new country, is taking first priority in government projects. By the end of its third educational development plan, over 45 percent of all children are now attending schools.

Agriculture remains the basic livelihood of 90 percent of the Ivory Coast population, with coffee and cocoa its two leading crops. But with development capital from abroad, industrialization is forging ahead. Manganese is now being mined and processed. There is now a plant to process instant coffee, sold as a commodity mainly to the United States. And even a television network will be installed in Abidjan this year.

President Houphonet-Boigny is not only looking out for the interests of his own country in international affairs. He is also a leading figure among all African states, especially those which were former French colonies. His address at the Addis Ababa Conference brought his country to the fore as an exponent of African unity. His numerous trips to other African states have solidified and stabilized the political force of Africa. By being the first African state to ratify the Charter of the Organization of African Unity established by the Addis Ababa Conference, the Ivory Coast proclaimed its good and since intentions and permanently established its leadership in pan-African affairs.

The Ivory Coast is fortunate to have such an able and energetic leader as President. It has been successful in retaining close and friendly relations with its former colonial ruler. It is a stable country, welcoming foreign investments and guaranteeing protection for these investments. It is a leader among the French community of nations, the African states, and the world community. Thus the Ivory Coast is unique.

On this their third anniversary of independence, we in the United States extend to the people of the Ivory Coast our congratulations for their progressiveness and unifying activities in Africa.

Why Bonanza Air Lines Is Buying U.S. Made Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, at a time when the outflow of gold is seriously threatening U.S. financial stability, a few of our domestic airlines have placed orders with the British Aircraft Corp. for short haul turbojet transports. These purchases, together with spare parts and equipment, will squander about $125 million of U.S. gold. The only excuse for making such foreign purchases is that the airlines involved will get a temporary competitive advantage by utilizing faster equipment first. American Airlines is buying 15 aircraft and has optioned another 15, Braniff Airways is buying 12, and Mohawk Airlines 4.

By way of refreshing contract, Bonanza Airlines is buying U.S. equipment and doing its part to keep U.S. gold at home. In the following letter, Edmund Converse, president of Bonanza, forthrightly sets forth his sound reasons for deciding to buy the American built Douglas DC-9:

BONANZA AIR LINES,
Las Vegas, Nev., July 18, 1963.

Right Honorable FREDRICK ERROLL,
President, British Board of Trade,
London, England.

MY DEAR MR. ERROLL: According to the press, there has been considerable speculation in Great Britain as to the reason for the U.S. Civil Aeronautics Board's 3-2 rejection in February 1963 of Bonanza Air Lines' bid for approval of its order for three BAC-111 twinjet aircraft. This speculation was further stirred, we understand, by recent announcement of our decision to purchase the Douglas DC-9 twinjet. Misunderstandings in this area can, of course, make it more difficult for the Civil Aeronautics Board to act with the full freedom which a matter of such import requires.

We believe, therefore, that it would be to the advantage of all concerned to clear the atmosphere with a few statements of fact.

There is not, nor was there ever, any indication from the Civil Aeronautics Board that their disapproval of our BAC-111 program had anything to do with the fact that the aircraft was of British manufacture. Nor do we believe it even quietly entered into their consideration of our application. We believe the Board's primary concern was with projected traffic levels and the possible subsidy impact of the purchase.

As to the reasons for our recent selection of the DC-9 in preference to the BAC-111, now that both are available for purchase, I will give you the facts, as we see them, and on which we based our determination.

Although we still believe that the BAC-111 would be well suited to our needs, nevertheless, in our judgment and related to our operation, the DC-9 offers several distinct advantages to Bonanza. They are briefly as follows:

1. The inventory and support problem is vastly improved with an aircraft built in the Los Angeles area rather than abroad. The cost and operating advantages of this alone are of incalculable value.

2. The DC-9 has a somewhat greater payload capacity. It, therefore, has a greater growth capability, which simply means that it can be operated over a longer period of years before it ceases to be capable of improved efficiency in our operation.

3. The DC-9 has derated engines which will be operated at 12,000 pounds thrust. They are actually 14,000 pounds thrust engines. The aircraft, therefore, has reserve power that is of particular value and significance in our high altitude, high temperature areas of the country. While on the surface the reserve power aspect would appear somewhat costly, there are in fact distinct cost advantages in terms of engine life, time authorized between overhauls and actual overhaul cost. An engine operated so substantially below top capability inevitably provides these advantages. Moreover, payload restrictions are nonexistent for our operation with these engines.

4. Pratt & Whitney expects in excess of 2,000 hours between overhauls on the DC-9 fan jet engines as a starting point.

5. The name of Douglas aircraft has instilled public confidence in commercial aviation through several generations of aircraft development. It is, in and of itself, a highly significant factor in air travel promotion and development in this country.

6. The designation "DC-9" will signify the ultimate in U.S. technical achievement in modern air transport, and will contribute greatly to actual traffic generation.

7. The ready availability (less than 1 hour by air) of the full sweep of engineering and technical assistance from the extensive facilities of Douglas should greatly minimize integration problems and provide much greater initial and subsequent service reliability.

8. For reasons 1 through 7 we feel that we can better demonstrate that the purchase of these twinjets will actually reduce our dependence on Federal subsidy.

In the light of the foregoing we feel that we now have a more persuasive case to present to our Government. It is also our belief that our Government will determine each situation on its own merits rather than on a broad policy basis that attempts to determine whether twinjets are good or bad for our industry regardless of the particular facts.

Moreover, and equally important, we feel that our increasing traffic and financial strength are factors that will better enable us to convince our Government of our vital need for this aircraft and our ability to absorb it beneficially into our system.

For these reasons we plan soon to return to the Government to seek approval of our DC-9 purchase. These are the reasons that lead us to believe that we can, in this instance, be more convincing.

Our purchase of the DC-9 does not aggravate our Nation's general gold-flow problem—a problem with which all of us here have a national concern. Happily, in our case, there is no need to face that problem, as the other factors were determinative of the issue.

Very truly yours,

EDMUND CONVERSE.

New Assignment for Jack Yohe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow John A. (Jack) Yohe, who had served as an aide to our late friend, Congressman Francis E. Walter, takes over as chief of the information office at the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD comments made by Mr. Horace Heller, an officer of the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record, appearing in the Daily Record, July 25, as well as an editorial that appeared July 26 in the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call and the news account of Yohe's appointment that appeared in the same paper.

The comments follows:

Horace Heller, general manager of the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record and a longtime acquaintance of Congressman Walter, had high praise for Yohe's services to the people of this area.

When informed of the appointment, he said, "In Yohe's association with Representative Walter, his service to the people of the communities range all the way from the Delaware River Basin to the Departments of State, Immigration, Justice, Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, and others. His services have been invaluable to the people of Monroe County. When Pike County was included in the 15th District, Yohe's service to that county was equally prompt and efficient."

The Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, where Yohe had been employed prior to coming to the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, in its editorial columns of July 26 edition, praised Yohe's move to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I wish to extend my very best wishes to Jack, whom I came to know and admire as a valuable member of "Tad" Walter's staff, and I know he will continue to perform outstandingly in his new position.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the news account and the editorial, as follows:

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, July 25, 1963]

EX-CALL STAFFER, WALTER AID—JACK YOHE GETS CAB POST

WASHINGTON.—Jack Yohe, congressional aid to the late Representative Francis E. Walter, will be the Civil Aeronautic Board's public information director.

CAB Chairman Alan S. Boyd announced the Allentown native's appointment Wednesday afternoon.

The 38-year-old Yohe, a former Morning Call reporter and Washington, D.C., Evening Star copy editor, will assume his new position Monday.

Yohe, who had been with Walter for almost 3 years, worked closely with the late Representative on a number of major projects the Easton Democrat initiated and carried through to completion by legislation.

They included the Delaware River basin compact legislation and related public works bills affecting the basin area and an independent investigation of the supplemental airline industry.

PROBE BROUGHT REVISIONS

The airline industry probe was prompted by the crash of a chartered Imperial Constellation plane at Richmond, on November 8, 1961. Twenty-nine Army recruits from the Lehigh Valley area were among those killed in the crash. The investigation of the industry led to Walter securing widespread revisions in the legislation affecting nonscheduled airlines.

As an aid to Walter, Yohe had been in contact with practically every agency in the Federal Government as well as the various committees of Congress.

Yohe, while working for the Washington Star, also covered Capitol Hill for several newspapers, including the Morning Call, as a member of the Morning Call staff, Yohe had received several citations from the Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers Association.

Yohe is a member of the 1942 class at Allen High School and 1947 class at Muhlenberg College. He is married to the former Ann Gabler, R.N., who had been a member of the supervisory staff at Sacred Heart Hospital, Allentown. They have four children, Jack Jr., 9; Marianne, 7; Alice Marie, 6, and Joseph, 5. They reside at 5700 N. 36th Street, Arlington, Va.

Yohe is a son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur V. Yohe of 122 S. 17th Street, Allentown.

[From the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, July 26, 1963]

YOHE AND THE CAB

The kind of job Jack Yohe did in Washington during his 3 years as an aid to the late Representative Francis E. Walter has been recognized by his appointment as public relations director for the Civil Aeronautics Board.

His assignment will not be easy. The board frequently is the target of justified criticism both for what it does and doesn't do. Most recently it has been under fire for refusing to give a reason for rejecting the merger request of American and Eastern Air Lines.

Yohe has reason to know the kind of job he faces and the CAB knows his capabilities through the legwork he did when Representative Walter investigated this agency. Chances are that if he expected it to be a sinecure, he would have taken one of the many other jobs offered him in recent months. From his earliest days as a newspaperman in Allentown he has, however, always sought tough assignments and given a good account of himself in them.

In selecting a newspaperman with Yohe's demonstrated integrity and uncompromising principles to represent it to the public, the Board gives evidence of being eager to improve its image. He will do this only as the Board and its agencies make it possible.

Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson Before the Governors' Conference, Miami Beach, July 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, addressed the Governors' Conference at Miami Beach, Fla., on July 23, 1963. I am sure that all who heard him felt as I did after reading his speech—that he had not only articulated the great questions of our day but that he had added a new dimension of understanding to contribute toward their solution.

The Vice President described us as "moving now with a favoring wind in the world and at home." He admonished the conference to use this advantage now toward the realization of our important national goals. This is sound advice from a seasoned skipper.

The speech is as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JULY 23, 1963

One hundred seventy-six years ago, our Constitution anticipated our many differences of section, State, and philosophy. That Constitution was ordained and established in the faith that those many differences would be overcome in a single will to unite—to unite as Americans, knowing no North, no South, no East, no West; favoring no creed, despising no color, and holding against no individual any condition of his birth or ancestry.

In that same faith, I come to speak tonight—not of those differences among us which will eventually pass, but of that higher unity which will inevitably prevail.

I know it is not the fashion at present in some quarters to speak hopefully or confidently of the future. Despair, despondency and defeatism have their disciples among us. But I cannot accept the proposition that hope is wishful or innocent. It is defeatism that is naive. For this generation of Americans, at this moment in our national history, optimism is the only true realism.

In the world and at home, we are beset with old, difficult, and continuing problems. Old perils remain. Old challenges still confront us. The fact of this year of 1963 is that—both abroad and at home—new breezes have begun to blow and we are sailing now with a favoring wind.

In the world, this year of 1963 is developing as a year of unusual portent and significance. For the first time since the beginning of the cold war, there are omens of change in the climate between East and West.

New forces are at work behind the Iron Curtain.

Profound changes are developing in relations among members of the Communist bloc.

New attitudes toward dealings with the West are being manifested by the principal nation of the Communist bloc.

On the basis of present evidence, no man can responsibly imply that the millennium is at hand in relations between East and West or in the success of freedom's cause. But no responsible man will insist that we keep the door closed against the opportunities which seem to be opening. It is a tragic perversion of American leadership—and a betrayal of American character—to ask the people to greet with suspicion any talk of peace and to greet with applause all talk of war.

We sit honorably at the negotiating tables today instead of standing anxiously at the nuclear brink not because we have accommodated the adversaries of our system, but because we have refused to accommodate them—in Greece and Turkey, in Iran and Italy, in Western Europe and West Berlin, South Korean and South Vietnam. Communism's designs have been repulsed in the Middle East, rejected in Africa, repelled in southeast Asia, and forced into retreat from Latin America. Of the six guerrilla wars launched by communism, five have ended in defeat of Communist forces and, in the sixth, American support is turning the tide in Vietnam.

Communism's one desperate effort last October to escape the ring of containment by establishing missile bases in this hemisphere ended in an historic retreat—a retreat which history may mark as the vital turning point of the entire cold war.

Furthermore, let it not be forgotten that, since the start of the cold war, more than 50 new nations have come into being—and not one has chosen communism. But many have adopted as their own the concepts and forms, and even the language, of our own constitutional system.

In the world of today, we must recognize that the winds and the waves are with us. This is the time for us to steer straight and true toward the horizons we have for so long hoped to reach.

But we should also recognize that favoring winds are rising at home. Our record in space is a prime example. We started late. We moved too slowly at first.

But the record shows now that where the Soviet Union has successfully launched 43 payloads into orbit, the United States has launched 144.

Our ratio of successes to failures in launchings prior to 1961 was only 1 to 1—but it has now reached the ratio of 5 to 1.

The Soviet continues its lead in the ability to launch heavier weights into space. But we are pulling far ahead in developing practical uses of space with weather, communication, and navigation satellites.

We are not racing for prestige in space. We are engaged in a deadly serious race for peace—and for control of our own destiny. This is a race free men must win.

As we act to grow stronger in space, we are also acting to grow stronger on earth.

Since January 1961 we have increased—

Our nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces by 100 percent.

Our ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet by 100 percent.

Our special forces trained to deal with threats of guerrilla warfare by 200 percent.

Our airlift capability by 60 percent.

Our number of combat-ready Army divisions by 45 percent.

Our number of tactical air squadrons by 30 percent.

We have increased the muscle of our defenses while trimming away the fat. During the fiscal year of 1963, savings of more than $1 billion were realized in the Defense Department through improvements in operating efficiency. As these improvements continue to take effect, we can look forward to savings by 1967 of nearly $4 billion a year.

Achievements such as these are coming on impressively. But in our domestic economy, too, the favoring winds are blowing briskly.

Since January 1961 our gross national product has risen from $500 billion to $589 billion, up 16 percent. Personal income has risen from $400 billion to a record annual rate last month of $462 billion, up 15 percent.

Corporation profits are up from $39 billion to $53 billion, a gain of 36 percent.

Employment has for the first time in the history of the Nation passed 70 million jobs.

Average weekly wages for factory workers have for the first time in the history of the Nation passed $100.

Farm income last year was up more than $1 billion over 1960, a gain of 11 percent.

This economic expansion has come with consumer prices holding comparatively stable while wholesale prices and industrial prices have actually declined. Moreover, as a consequence of this expansion, the flow of revenue to the Treasury has increased so that the cash deficit for the last fiscal year is only half as large as estimated 6 months ago.

What does this mean for us?

I believe the answer is self-evident.

Now, while the favoring winds are with us, we should be doing those difficult things which responsibility demands that we do to perfect our system.

That list is long. Many of the items upon it are old: education, unemployment, medicare for the aged, retraining of displaced workers, redevelopment of depressed regions, renewal of blighted cities, revitalizing the family farms, conserving our forest and soil, developing our water resources, curing the problems of mass transit, overcoming the congestion of our city streets.

America is not a nation with its work all done.

America is a nation in which much of the most vital work has not yet begun.

The demands of the future press down upon us.

Every day, our population over 65 increases by 1,000.

Every day, our population of 16 year olds increases by 3,000.

Every day, our school-age population grows by nearly 5,000.

Every day, our need for new jobs increases by more than 7,000.

If we are to meet the human needs and the humane obligations of our future, we must move today—while the winds are favoring us—to stimulate our economy, reduce our excessive tax rate, that in some cases is practically confiscatory, overcome the drain on our balance of payments, and restore our national fiscal house to order.

But we remember at all times that governments are not instituted among freemen merely to make budgets and balance them or levy taxes and collect them.

If we are to meet the tests of our future, our foremost challenge is to face and dispose of the problem of human rights which has burdened and compromised our society for 100 years—the problem of the inequality of our Negro citizens.

In saying this, I could not be more aware than I am of the many views of the question represented by this audience—or, in turn, by the people each of you represents.

To some, the issue is human rights.

To others, it is property rights.

Some say Negro rights. Others say white rights.

Some say States rights. Others say moral rights.

The descriptions vary. Slogans are many.

But let us strip away the slogans, the descriptions, the cliches and labels. What is it that we must do? We must attack the wrongs in our society—not the rights.

Whatever the legalisms or traditions, it is wrong that taxpaying, arms-bearing, vote-casting Americans should be unable to find a bed for the night or meals for their children along the highways of our free and decent society. Whatever the reasons, it is wrong that Americans who fight alongside other Americans in war should not be able to work alongside the same Americans, wash up alongside them, eat alongside them, win promotions alongside them, or send their children to sit in schools alongside children of other Americans.

I know of no valid right in our system which is jeopardized or compromised or weakened by correcting the wrongs which we know exist among us. On the other hand, I would suggest that the human rights and property rights of all of us will be strengthened and protected by ending the corrosion of these wrongs.

When I first entered the Senate, Arizona's Senator CARL HAYDEN told me there were two kinds of public officials: show horses and workhorses, talkers and doers.

This question will be answered by the workhorses and by the doers, by those who remove the beam from their own eye before concerning themselves with the mote—or the beam—in the eye of others.

This is not a regional problem, but a national problem.

Men who were denied the right to work last week on a Harlem hospital being built with public funds can understand the plight of their brother in a Birmingham cafe. Discrimination is not confined to the smaller community of Danville, but infects metropolitan Philadelphia as well. The problem is in Brooklyn and Baltimore, in Charleston and Chicago, in San Antonio and Santa Fe.

In the room in the White House where Jane Adams hung out her wash, the President has talked with labor leaders and businessmen; with Governors and mayors; with editors and women leaders; with educators and Negro leaders. No President in my 30 years of life in Washington has met with so many Governors as has President Kennedy in his search for a solution to the civil rights problem.

Among the people, there is a will to resolve this issue—not prolong it. It is especially noteworthy that throughout the Nation—especially in some of the most difficult States and cities—newspapermen from editors to deskmen are showing the highest order of responsibility and constructiveness.

Americans such as these are doing the workhorse jobs. They are getting results—quietly but effectively. Two hundred of the five hundred largest cities in the Southern and border States—nearly half of them—have taken affirmative action on local public accommodations problems. Right here in Miami, outstanding progress has been made in a short time by the efforts of ministers and medical society members and department store owners and county commissioners and union leaders.

The trust of public leaders will not be kept by exploiting the issue for partisan ends or discouraging its resolution for personal advantage.

American politics must not be less responsible than the electorate it serves. There can be no Democratic answer or Republican answer, no White House answer or State House answer, no 1964 answer or 1968 answer—but only a responsible American answer achieved by all of us, at all levels, working together all of the time for and with the people.

Let us all recognize this one thing: While the Negro has long been the object of studied neglect, many of the conditions he protests today are blind to color. If the Negro is now the first victim, he will not be the last if we fail to cure the ills within our society—or underemployment, undereduca-

tion, underdevelopment of our potential, underuse of our productive capacity.

We are moving now with a favoring wind behind us—in the world and at home. If we are to resolve these problems within our society, we must act now before those winds fall—or change to blow against us.

In response to the challenge before our Nation now, some say "Now"—others say "Never." But the clear response of the American majority is "Together"—together, for there is no other way.

Independence of the Central African Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 13, the Central African Republic will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, David Daco; and His Excellency, the Central African Republic Ambassador to the United States, Jean-Pierre Kombet.

The Central African Republic is celebrating its third birthday on August 13. The country is appropriately named, for the geographical center of the African continent lies just a few miles to the west of Bangui, the capital of the Central African Republic. Americans, however, may be more familiar with the country's more romantic but less modern-sounding former name, Ubangi-Shari, a composite of the names of two of the republic's chief rivers.

The ancient history of Ubangi-Shari is suitably shrouded in mystery. All that is known prior to French occupation of the area is that there were successive waves of migration from the northeast resulting in complex ethnic and linguistic patterns. The French first reached the area in 1887 and the first French outpost was established at Bangui in 1889. The area was constituted as a territory in 1894. In 1906 it was united with Chad, another former French West African dependency, to form the Ubangi-Shari-Chad colony. In 1910 Ubangi-Shari became one of the four territories of the Federation of French Equatorial Africa; the administrative structure it then received was retained through World War II. It is interesting to note that during World War II thousands of Ubangi men joined the ranks of the Free French Forces under De Gaulle, and that several of them were awarded the Cross of the Liberation, the highest decoration instituted by General de Gaulle.

The first representative assembly was created in Ubangi-Shari in 1945, and from then on events moved swiftly. In 1958 Ubangi-Shari chose its new name, the Central African Republic, and became a self-governing state within the French Community. It was then but two years to complete independence.

As a sovereign nation the Central African Republic has lived in peaceful and cooperative relations with its neighbors and has shown its concern for furthering international efforts toward maintaining and strengthening the peace as a responsible member of the United Nations. On the domestic scene concentrated efforts have been made to improve the country's economy by the democratic government under the presidency of David Daco.

The constitution of the Central African Republic is dedicated to the principles of democracy and self-determination. Governmental powers reside in a 50-member legislative assembly elected by universal suffrage, a president invested by the Assembly, and an independent judiciary. Both the President and the Assembly may initiate legislation.

In the sphere of economic development, the government has wisely focused its efforts on improving agriculture, which is the chief economic activity of the Central African Republic. In an autumn 1962 address to the National Assembly President Daco stressed the need for increased agricultural production and the diversification of crops. He also pointed out that industrialization should be commensurate with locally available raw materials and needs. Other major areas of development effort in the Central African Republica are the expansion of education and speedier Africanization of the administration.

President Daco and the people of the Central African Republic, we commend you on the third aniversary of your independence for your unceasing efforts at cooperation with the other members of the world community and for your realistic and determined approach to your own development problems.

Gene Kinnaly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the words of tribute which are being paid by my colleagues in the House to Gene Kinnaly your longtime right hand and capable administrative assistant. Gene is completing 45 years of outstanding and devoted service to the House of Representatives. Gene has served as our esteemed Speaker's right-hand man for 35 years and has been associated with Speaker McCormack from the first day he arrived in Washington as Congressman representing the 12th Massachusetts District.

Forty-five years of public service in the House of Representatives is an impressive record. Gene's record is far from being just one of quantity, but rather is an outstanding record of quality. The great fund of knowledge that Gene has acquired in nearly a half century of service in the U.S. Congress has made him an invaluable aid both to the Speaker and many Members of the House. I know that I speak for hundreds of my colleagues when I say that Gene's helpfulness and courtesy is deeply appreciated. I know that from the first day I took the oath of office in this great body, Gene Kinnaly has been a great source of wisdom and advice to me. He is now a credit to the office of the Speaker, but even before that, to the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I am delighted to join with my colleagues in congratulating Gene on his 45th year of loyal and tireless service and hope that Gene will continue to serve the Speaker and the House of Representatives for many years to come.

Our Girls in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following two articles which appeared in the July 25 edition of the Peoria Journal Star as editorials under the titles "Our Girls in Moscow" and "Get or Nullify." As the authors of the articles succinctly point out, the appalling tendency in these times of crises to pull our own way instead of together appears all too frequently. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the only way we can insure ultimate victory in the future is to reeducate ourselves in the ways of elementary teammanship.

The editorials follow:

OUR GIRLS IN MOSCOW

Do you realize that we could have rounded up a girls' track team from the Peoria Park District's playgrounds and we would have scored more points in Moscow than the best U.S. girl athletes actually got?

Any team that just obeyed the rules would have scored better than we did.

We didn't get the automatic minimum number of points just for being in the competition because we forfeited some of those!

This was a disgraceful exhibition in Moscow by people representing the United States of America, and the damage done may well include our ability to field good teams in the future.

The points we gave away on simple technical mistakes, as well as the points we lost on just plain poor performance, are not hard to understand when we read reports of the refusal of the athletes to practice, and of swelled-head temperament.

Too many treated this meet with the Russians as a kind of world tour for their own personal pleasure as a reward for winning competitions in the United States.

Some were quoted in their pride and arrogance as saying "I am the champion," and "I am the queen," in the days before the meet when they were ignoring training and training habits. Those who said these things found they were neither champions nor queens when they went up against the disciplined Soviet women, who wanted to win.

Moscow is the last city in the world for Americans to make fools of themselves and bums of themselves, and this is where some chose to do both—as sporting representatives of the best of our Nation.

But it goes beyond that. These are amateur competitions in sports, and they cost money. It is a major task of the AAU to raise funds to pay for these trips. They are now engaged in the tough job of doing this for the coming Olympics.

There is a relationship between the ability to raise money and to field the best team under the best conditions.

The foolishness of these girls in Moscow hardly helps the fund-raising job. People would contribute to see their country well represented in international competition, and to help us look good.

But who wants to contribute to somebody's pleasure tour? Who wants to contribute to sending representatives that make us look bad—both on the field and off the field?

The irresponsible conduct of our young girls in Moscow, and the apparent inability of the authorities to handle them effectively is not only a blow to us today and to our society before the world. It is a direct threat to the future of American prestige in this form of international competition.

This is grossly unfair to those girls who made a real effort. It is grossly unfair to those men who stuck to their job and came through like real champions. It is grossly unfair of the younger girls who were natural victims of example and environment of that sort.

There was a shocking failure here to make these people understand their position and their responsibilities, and a shocking failure in not applying effective discipline early.

And now we must pay the bill.

GET OR NULLIFY

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

It was a great line.

But who's practicing it, outside of a handful of young people in the Peace Corps and some dedicated professionals in the Armed Forces?

Our girls' track team (see editorial above) showed what can happen to us against determined and disciplined Soviet competition in sports when we get self-centered and irresponsible.

But haven't we for 30 years been cultivating the same kind of thing in our national society? Haven't we been dividing ourselves into organized blocs each dedicated to fighting for its own special interests? Who represents and considers the total, best interests and the true general welfare any more?

The accepted method we have developed to get what you want is through political organizations to put on the pressure, economic organizations to put on the pressure, social organizations to put on the pressure, and who knows what next since we established this pattern?

Our politicians do a lot of talking about the public interest, but when it comes to the hard realities as revealed by the makeup of their political families or the strategy of their political campaigns the true nature of the interests they represent comes out.

The trick of political success is no longer to serve the public interests. It is to patch together a collection of special interests.

Get or nullify the labor bloc. Get or nullify the big city professional political machines. Get or nullify the farm bloc. Get or nullify the Negro vote. Get or nullify the financial interests. Get or nullify the aged. Get or nullify the solid South.

The only reason we have been able to succeed in this kind of an atmosphere is because what is left of the free enterprise system still contains more dynamism than anything we have to compete against.

But there is no guarantee that we can continue this way, indefinitely, on an ascending scale without suddenly finding ourselves as much out of the race as our girl athletes in Moscow.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

UKRANIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
CAMDEN BRANCH,
Camden, N.J., June 19, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Americans of Ukranian descent in Camden, N.J., organized in the Camden branch of the Ukranian Congress Committee of America, are giving wholehearted support to your House Resolution 14. We also appreciate very much all your actions on behalf of the captive nations under Communist rule.

On this occasion we are pleased to inform you about our activities on behalf of House Resolution 14:

1. Letter was written to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH.

2. Letter was written to our Congressman of our congressional district, WILLIAM T. CAHILL, asking him to support House Resolution 14 and suggesting to introduce similar resolution of his own.

Copies of the above mentioned are enclosed for your records.

We wish you the best in your life and remain,

Respectfully yours,

MYKOLA ROMACH,
Chairman.
TARAS HALUSHKA,
Secretary.

UKRANIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
CAMDEN BRANCH,
Camden, N.J., June 19, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM T. CAHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CAHILL: On behalf of Americans of Ukranian descent in Camden, organized in the Camden branch of the Ukranian Congress Committee of America, we are pleased to inform you that we are giving wholehearted support to the Congressman FLOOD resolution, House Resolution 14, calling for the creation of a special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives in Washington. On this occasion we ask you, Congressman CAHILL, to support House Resolution 14 and use your influence in the House Rules Committee and especially with the chairman of the House Rules Committee HOWARD W. SMITH, to initiate action on the proposed legislation by opening public hearings.

We also ask you to introduce a similar resolution of your own. We firmly believe that the lasting peace can be established only on true freedom of all nations. The above suggested actions, in our opinion, could move us one step closer to this goal.

Wishing you the best in your life, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

MYKOLA ROMACH,
Chairman.
TARAS HALUSHKA,
Secretary.

SYRACUSE, *June 18, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thank you cordially for your kind letter of June 1. As a student of the Bolshevism since its bloody revolution of 1917 I appreciate very much your enlightened approach to the question of our relations with the Soviet Union.

There can be, indeed, no bigger mistake than to apply so-called silken gloves policy in the relations with the Communist system yielding up to the force only. By the events in the 30-year history of our relations with the Soviet Union we should be definitely convinced that even our peace efforts are considered by Kremlin as sign of our weakness and encourage new Moscow's demands unacceptable for us.

It is tragic therefore, if we do not pay attention to such lessons of history and dream about a favorable for the free world evolution of the Bolshevism despite of unceasing Communist strive for world domination. This dream, in my opinion, is not only unfounded—it endangers the future of our beloved country.

Because, if we let the red empire grow steadily by crushing one by one the free nations and if we do not stop extermination of the friends of democracy in the occupied by Soviet Russia countries,—the day will come when our own country will face the same threat of being engulfed by the red

tide. The omnious Soviet satellite in Cuba, only 90 miles from the coast of Florida, should be a sufficient warning against a such eventuality. We must act until we have effective means of resistance and assured victory of our ideals.

Consequently, it is gratifying to hear that the silken gloves policy practiced often by the executive branch of the Government meets in Congress with its proper rectification.

With my thanks again for your kind letter I am,

Very respectfully yours,

FRANK DAILIDE.

SYRACUSE, N.Y., *June 18, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committe on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the best ways to keep initiative in the relations of this country with the Soviet Union could be, in our opinion, the exposure of red colonialism everywhere and by every possible means. And as one of the very suitable means for this purpose we consider the establishment of a special committee on captive nations in the House of Representatives.

Being therefore convinced that such a committee would be in the best interest of our Nation we are asking you, Mr. Chairman, for quick action on House Resolution 14.

With our thanks for your kind attention to this request we are,

Respectfully yours,

FRANK DAILIDE.
ALEKSANDRAS ANDRIUSAITIS.
OLGA ANDRIUSAITIS.
VINCENT KASAITIS.
LYDIA KASAITIS.

LAKEWOOD, N.J., *June 20, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I wish to thank you for your most benevolent statements expressed in commemoration of the mass deportations from the Baltic States which took place on June 14, 15, and 16, 1941.

Your determined efforts in behalf of the Captive Baltic States are deeply appreciated.

With best personal wishes.

Yours,

JUHAN SIMONSON.

COHOES, N.Y., *June 19, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member, U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of the letter which was sent to Congressman Smith concerning the formation of a committee on captive nations.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch owf Cohoes is very happy and thanks you for your unending work in this enslaved nations' campaign. May you know that you have our greatest support in this endeavor.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL PAWLIW,
President.
JULIAN BACHYNSKY,
Secretary, Ukranian Congress Committee, Branch in Cohoes.

COHOES, N.Y., *June 19, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch of Cohoes sincerely asks you to uphold the Flood Resolution 14, concerning the formation of a Committee on Captive Nations. As we all know, such a committee may greatly aid and inform many distinguished citizens about the conditions prevalent among enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Since the United States is considered to be a "mother" country helping the handicapped peoples of the world, it is our duty to know more about the captive non-Russian nations through such a special committee, as mentioned above.

Therefore, we sincerely urge you, Congressman SMITH, to consider this Flood Resolution and support it in the Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL PAWLIW,
President.
JULIAN BACHYNSKY,
Secretary, Ukranian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, CAMDEN BRANCH,
Camden, N.J., June 19, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chiarman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Americans of Ukrainian decent in Camden, N.J., organized in the Camden Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., urge you to submit the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, for voting by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. We consider a committee on Captive Nations to be of vital importance not only for our Government, but also for American people at large. It would become a storage of true knowledge about the captive nations which knowledge will be helpful for our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We were the witness of how Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation Asia and Africa and at the same time our Nation was doing very little to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations. It is our Nation and not Communist Russia who has the great moral heritage to be allowed to speak and to act for national liberation everywhere in this world.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to act upon the Flood Resolution in your Rules Committee and give it your full support.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MYKOLA ROMACH,
Chairman.
TARAS HALUSHKA,
Secretary.

Hon. Hjalmar C. Nygaard

SPEECH

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, no one could meet HJALMAR NYGAARD and come away unimpressed. I was privileged to know and work with this noble man.

He had a quiet, modest, courteous manner that brought dignity and reason to every proceeding in which he participated. While we occasionally disagreed, I never knew a man who could do so with more consideration and kindness.

His family, his beloved State of North Dakota, and his country, all have great reason to be proud of and thankful for the good life of this fine man.

U.S. Airlines Should Understand There Are 2,167,926,800 Reasons for Not Buying Foreign Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the action of several U.S. airlines in ordering foreign-built air transports in preference to American-built planes establishes a precedent which poses a serious threat to our third largest industry, the aircraft and parts manufacturing industry. This also is the third largest U.S. exporting industry.

These foreign acquisitions are announced at a time when the domestic aircraft and aerospace industry is already in an unhealthy state. Employment in this industry during the last 5 years has dropped from 850,000 people to 650,000.

The adverse economic effects of these purchases from abroad are clearly established in an editorial published in the July 25 issue of the Long Beach Independent, of Long Beach, Calif. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD at this point.

THERE ARE 2,167,926,800 REASONS FOR BUYING DOUGLAS JET

There are at least 2,167,926,800 good reasons why we wholeheartedly endorse the Long Beach community campaign to get U.S. airlines to purchase the Douglas DC-9 short-range jet rather than foreign competitive models.

The above figure represents the total prime and subcontract dollar investment in 28 American States if Douglas Aircraft Co. produces and sells 400 aircraft in this class.

But that figure represents a lot more than just dollars. It means jobs. It means an increase in balance-of-trade gold payments into this country. It means providing money for workers who are potential customers of the airlines concerned. It means a better national defense posture for the United States by helping keep the aerospace industry alive. It means tax revenues for State, local, and national government. It means income to small businesses. It means a healthy economic condition for an important segment of the Nation's third largest industry. In a selfish vein, it means prosperity rather than depression for Long Beach—Douglas is our largest industry.

If other U.S. airlines follow the example of American Airlines, Braniff Airways, and Mohawk Airlines in buying the British (one eleven) jet, the consequences to this country can be grave.

It has been estimated that there will be a worldwide market for some 1,200 short-range jets (100 to 1,100 miles) within the next 10 years. Conservatively Douglas hopes to sell some 400 of these aircraft—267 within the United States and 133 abroad.

Best estimates developed by the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, which with the city has been spearheading the local campaign, are that the sales of 133 aircraft abroad will increase our gold reserve by $700 million.

Conversely, if Douglas had to drop the DC-9 program, U.S. airlines would have to buy at least 267 aircraft abroad for a direct gold outflow of $959 million. Thus the suc-

cess of the Douglas program will enhance our gold position by $1,659 million.

The successful DC-9 program will provide directly and indirectly 73,000 jobs yearly for at least 8 years. In terms of Federal income tax this means revenue of $304 million. To the State of California it means a tax revenue of $84 million.

Almost $400 million in new business will be generated throughout the country for small businesses. The aircraft and parts industry is third largest in the United States, following only the auto and steel rolling and finishing industries. It is the third largest U.S. exporting industry, following industrial machinery and grains.

At the present time the aircraft and aerospace industry employs more than 650,000 persons, but during the last 5 years more than 200,000 jobs have disappeared in the industry.

California has a large and direct stake in the DC-9 program. It will mean the average employment of 19,000 workers in the aircraft and parts industry here, including 6,000 in Long Beach. Total new employment in the State will reach 41,700, equivalent to 10 percent of the State's unemployed. San Diego County would get 5,450 new jobs and Los Angeles and Orange Counties 34,825 new jobs.

Estimates under a successful DC-9 program call for expenditures of from $900 million to $1.2 billion in California.

It is difficult for us to be too critical of Braniff and Mohawk since they purchased the British plane before there was any assurance that a comparable U.S. plane would be built. This is not true, however, of American Airlines.

We certainly feel that private companies have the right of free choice of purchase. And it is true that all U.S. airlines are private companies. But it also should be pointed out that they are Government-franchised carriers, that the various companies receive monopolies or near monopolies on highly profitable routes and that almost all airlines in this country—including American—were subsidized for many years by tax dollars.

American at present receives almost all of its income from U.S. citizens and from mail pay received from the U.S. Post Office Department. American's most profitable route, for example, is from Los Angeles to New York. Many of its customers on this route are employed in the huge aircraft industry in this area. The company just recently added two special nonstop late night jet flights to carry mail on this route.

We feel that the stand taken by city council and chamber of commerce and local labor unions is a proper one. Their pleas for intervention by President Kennedy, Governor Brown, and other State and Federal officials deserve thorough and complete study by these men, and direct and forceful action.

The points developed on this subject also deserve carefuly study by officials of all U.S. airlines. It is difficult to understand how these officials could study the above facts and then "bite the hand that feeds them" by turning away from the DC-9.

The Late Honorable Hjalmar Nygaard

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we are all sorrowful at the sad and sudden passing of a colleague whom we liked and respected, HJALMAR NYGAARD. None of us who knew and worked with him have anything but admiration for the kind of life he led and the kind of service which he gave to his country and to his district. HJALMAR WAS a man of kindness, integrity, and ability, and the Congress will suffer from his loss. I am grateful for the opportunity to have known him—I regret only that this privilege was for such a short period of time.

My deepest sympathy goes to HJALMAR's family; I share, as we all do, in the sadness and loss which has come to them.

Forum for Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal on July 26. This editorial points up the dangers to the United States because of our membership in the United Nations. This country can well become subject to the whims and desires of a majority of members who are not interested in promoting peace, but rather war, as well as internal control of our affairs.

The editorial follows:

FORUM FOR HYPOCRISY

Many of the things wrong with the United Nations are capsuled in the demands of independent African countries for strong action against Portugal and South Africa.

The Security Council is currently entertaining these arguments; the Africans would really like to get the two nations expelled from the U.N. but may settle for something like economic sanctions. It is not necessary to defend Portugal's cruelties in its African colonies or South Africa's policy of apartheid in order to see the revealing light this whole business sheds on the world organization.

One part of it is that the U.N. has become a forum for hypocrisy. There is always a certain amount of hypocrisy in diplomacy, we suppose, but the U.N. has elevated it to the level of sanctity.

Item: The attack on Portugal and South Africa rests on the charge that their policies are threatening international peace. Of all the things they are doing, that certainly is not one of them, and everyone knows it. Yet the Security Council, including the United States, gravely agrees to listen to this nonsense.

Item: Nkrumah of Ghana sends the Council a message saying he will be satisfied with nothing less than immediate independence for Portugal's African colonies. Such talk comes with poor grace from the Communist-lining dictator of a police-state; Ghana-style independence would hardly rate as an improvement for any colony.

Naturally all this provides the Soviets with wonderful opportunities for propaganda, and the U.N. has certainly become a forum for that, too. The Soviet representative could handly wait to applaud Nkrumah's sentiments, denounce Portugal and its allies (the United States) and propose a worldwide boycott of Portugal.

More serious are the implications of any U.N. action—indeed, even the present discussion of it—against these countries. For what is proposed is simply meddling in nations' internal affairs, something the U.N. is not supposed to do and most emphatically should not be doing. In the case of South Africa it's not even a question of colonies but strictly of policies within a sovereign nation.

On that precedent, what is to prevent the U.N. from acting against the United States? It could easily seize the pretext that this country is not moving fast enough on desegregation and hence, by U.N. logic, threatening the peace. The answer is that there is nothing in the world to prevent it. But such a possibility does not seem to disturb the U.N.'s American fans, including the U.S. Government.

These various anomalies stem from a central difficulty, which is also a form of hypocrisy or else of stunning naivete: The assumption that a large collection of nations would in fact work together in harmony to guarantee world peace. The inclusion of the Soviet Union is alone enough to explode that notion, but there are a good many other nations as well which have no desire to get along with each other or with us.

Because of this fundamental philosophical error, it is not surprising to see the peace organization waging war to suppress an independence effort, as in Katanga, or aiding our enemies, as in Cuba, or now talking of interfering in internal affairs. No amount of praise of the U.N. can alter the fact that it is founded on a delusion.

Those who are more realistic about the U.N. say that, for all its faults, it still has some diplomatic and other uses. Probably it does. But it is certainly not encouraging that impression by lending itself to this witless exercise in the Security Council. And we think the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. ought to call that performance by its right name.

The Late Honorable John H. Folger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last my distinguished colleague and the able Representative of the Fifth District of North Carolina in this body, RALPH SCOTT, called attention in appropriate language to the passing into the Great Beyond of our former colleague from that district, the Honorable John Hamlin Folger. Unfortunately, I was engaged in other duties at that moment and was thereby denied the opportunity to join with my friend, RALPH SCOTT, in paying tribute to the memory of this great son of North Carolina. I have particularly regretted this because it was my pleasure to have served in the House during the 1940's when the late John Folger represented the district now so ably and well represented by Congressman SCOTT.

John Folger made his mark and impression upon the Nation's House of Representatives in his comparatively brief service here. I recall that he was rated among the great advocates of causes he espoused. Possessed of splendid oratorical talent, he was most im-

pressive in the well of this House on the occasions that he felt it his duty to "speak his piece."

Quiet and deliberative generally, he never hesitated to speak out in behalf of the causes that he thought were in the best interest of his State and Nation.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the remarks of tribute paid to our former colleague by my colleague, RALPH SCOTT, and others who extolled his memory. And, I join with them in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and other survivors.

Improvements in the Publication of Federal Statutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I had occasion to call to the attention of the House, the valuable innovation made, with the cooperation of the Joint Committee on Printing, by the General Services Administration, National Archives and Records Service, Office of the Federal Register, in providing a legislative history as part of the first publication of each law enacted by the Congress. This is only one of a number of improvements made in recent years in the publication of the slip-laws and the statutes at large.

The publication of the laws is, of course, a matter of the most intimate concern of every Member, and improvements in the presentation of the product of congressional action is of great interest to us.

There is a most informative article in the July 1963 issue of the American Bar Association Journal on this subject, written by Dr. Charles J. Zinn, the law revision counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, which should be read by everyone who has to use the laws as published in slip-law form or in the Statutes at Large.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the American Bar Association Journal in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PUBLICATION OF FEDERAL STATUTES

(By Charles J. Zinn, Law Revision Counsel, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives)

(NOTE.—Federal statutory law is of ever-increasing importance to the general practitioner as well as the specialist. In the following pages, Dr. Zinn, a frequent contributor to this department, describes certain improvements in the publication of Federal statutes which will assist lawyers in identifying the laws passed by the Congress and in determining their legislative history.)

A law, according to the philosophers, is a rule of conduct (1) dictated by reason, (2) enacted by competent authority, (3) prescribing or forbidding some action in the light of the common good and (4) made known to those who are to be bound thereby. It is with the last element of that definition, the promulgation or publication of the law as it relates to the statutes enacted by the Congress of the United States, that we are here concerned. Obviously, a secret statute can have no application to an unaware and unsuspecting public. Such application, according to Thomas Aquinas, is made by its being made known to them by promulgation. Publication is the sina qua non of the aphorism that every man is presumed to know the law of the land. The ancient Romans, from whom we seem to have borrowed more than a few of our principles of legislation, clearly recognized the necessity for publication by their requirement that the law be posted in a public square where it could be easily read from the ground.

In the case of the laws enacted by the Congress there is no formal promulgation in an official gazette comparable to that in many other countries throughout the world. Laws are effective generally upon the date of approval even though they are not officially published for several days thereafter. The requirement of publication is satisfied in the first instance by the publication of the law in pamphlet form—popularly called a slip law—which becomes available within 2 or 3 days after the approval of the law. This publication is prepared by the General Services Administration, National Archives and Records Service, Office of Federal Register. That office, which seems to be ever on the alert to enhance the value of its publication, is to be warmly commended for a number of notable improvements made in recent years, with the cooperation of the Joint Committee on Printing, in the publication of the slip laws.

NUMBERING OF LAWS

Obviously, there must be some systematic method to identify the various laws enacted during a Congress. Reference to the date of enactment or to a short title or unofficial popular name is not enough. Traditionally this has been accomplished by a numbering system. Twenty-five years ago there was a dual numbering system, depending upon whether the statute originated in the form of a bill or as a joint resolution. Accordingly, there were two divisions, namely, "public laws" numbered consecutively through the entire Congress (2 years), and "public resolutions" with an independent consecutive numbering through the Congress. In addition, all statutes were given consecutive "chapter" numbers, regardless of whether they were public laws or public resolutions, starting with number "1" at the beginning of each session of the Congress.[1] In 1941, the Statutes Branch of the Department of State abolished the distinction in numbering between public laws and public resolutions since both are acts of Congress and have the effect of law and designated both as "public laws" but retained the chapter designation.

To identify and cite a law precisely, it was necessary to state not only the public law number but to add a reference to the Congress that enacted it. For example, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was numbered Public Law 601, but since there was also a Public Law 601 in each of many Congresses before that time, a proper identification required adding "of the 79th Congress" to the citation. Unfortunately, since the reference to the Congress was more often than not omitted through inadvertence or ignorance, confusion inevitably resulted. In 1957, the National Archives and Records Service, to which the function of publishing the laws had in the meantime been transferred, eliminated the superfluous chapter numbering and insured preciseness by inserting in the law number a designator identifying the Congress by which the law was enacted. For example, the first law was numbered "85-1," the second "85-2," and so forth, the prefix indicating the 85th Congress, thus curing the uncertainty that formerly existed. This system has been carried forward in each Congress since then. Incidentally, it may be hoped that such a numbering system will be extended to House and Senate reports and documents, if not to bills and resolutions as well, for quick and accurate reference.

MARGINAL NOTES

Much useful information is supplied in the form of marginal notes, both in the slip-laws and in the permanent bound volumes which are published with an index and other ancillaries after the close of the session. Since the slip-laws and the Statutes at Large are printed by photoelectric offset process from the original enrolled bill, it is possible to determine in advance on what page of the bound volume of the Statutes at Large a law will be found. Accordingly, each slip-law contains a marginal reference to that volume and page, so that a law may be referred to by a citation to the Statutes at Large even before the bound volume becomes available.

Furthermore, particularly in the case of amendments to existing laws that have been classified to the United States Code, there are marginal notes referring to the title and section of the code affected. In the case of internal references in the text to other laws, not only the United States Code reference but also the Statutes at Large reference is supplied as a marginal vote.

Since 1956, each individual volume of the Statutes at Large contains a valuable table, designated as the "Table of Laws Affected," showing what prior laws are affected by the laws set out in that volume. There is a 5-year cumulative table covering the years 1956–60 and it is planned to publish cumulations of the tables each 5 years in the future. This information is a most useful aid to the legal researcher in determining whether a statute has been affected by a later act of Congress.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In recent years, when a provision of a law is found to be ambiguous, the Supreme Court and other courts have increasingly had recourse to one or another element of the legislative history,[2] with the view of ascertaining the "legislative intent" of the Congress in enacting it. Lawyers and law librarians have struggled with inadequate guides to locate the pertinent committee report or the debate in the House or Senate Chamber. Of course, the daily calendar of the House of Representatives contains a legislative history of all bills and joint resolutions that have been reported in either body, but extremely few libraries and practically no private practitioners have access to the calendar. The bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain valuable indexes and histories, but these, again, are available only to the fortunate few. Law librarians, moreover, are acutely aware of the deficiencies of the average lawyer in the intelligent use of these sources, or even in knowing that they can be used for this purpose.

At the beginning of the current session of the 88th Congress, the National Archives and Records Service has introduced an improvement in the slip laws that will be a boon to everyone who wishes to consult elements of the legislative history of a law. Following the text of the law there is a guide to the legislative history, identifying the

---

[1] The chapter numbering also included private laws, which have an independent numbering system beginning with Private Law No. 1, each Congress.

[2] See the interesting and informative article by Elizabeth Finley, "Crystal Gazing: The Problem of Legislative History," 45 A.B.A.J. 1281; December 1959.

committee in each House that reported the bill, the report numbers and the volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reporting the floor action in each House, together with the dates on which the bill was considered and passed by each House. For example, Public Law 88-1 contains the following addendum:

"Legislative history:

"House Report No. 35 (Appropriations Committee).

"Senate Report No. 9 (Appropriations Committee).

"CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109: February 27, 1963, considered and passed House; March 4, 1963, considered and passed Senate."

The reason that page references to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not supplied is that the pagination of the bound volumes of the RECORD differs from that of the daily issues, and confusion might result. In any event, the reference to the date is adequate to locate the material in either the daily issue or the bound volume.

With the information thus provided, an individual who wishes to pursue his research into the legislative intent is saved many hours of frustrating efforts to determine which committee had considered the proposal in each House and in locating the committee reports, as well as in finding the debates in each chamber. He now has a valuable guide to the essential elements of the legislative history. The one important element that is not mentioned is the printed transcript of committee hearings. Occasionally the printed transcripts of hearings are not available until after the law has been enacted. Furthermore, a cumbersome description, incompatible with the conciseness of the guide set out in the slip-law, is often required to identify the particular hearing. Hearings are referred to in most instances by a lengthy descriptive title, or the title of a bill—or group of bills—or some other method that could not easily fit in the guide. It is to be hoped that through the auspices of the Joint Committee on Printing all committees may be induced to adopt a uniform style of identifying hearings. The House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, along with several other committees, assigns serial numbers to the printed transcripts for quick and accurate reference. If such a system were adopted by all committees, the guide to the legislative history could easily be amplified to include those concise references. This would greatly assist the individual in locating all the materials he would require in his research. If, as seems indicated, the guide to the legislative history will be set out in tabular form in the bound volumes of the Statutes at Large, a serial number method of referring to the printed transcript of the hearings can easily be accommodated, whereas a lengthy descriptive title does not lend itself to such treatment.

With the ever-increasing importance of the Federal statutes all these improvements in their publication make the task of the lawyer and law librarian less onerous. The guide to legislative history itself will open entirely new vistas to the many lawyers who heretofore were at a complete loss in this area.

Chicago's Midway Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial broadcast over station WIND, by Ralph L. Atlass, vice president of WIND.

The broadcast follows:

LET'S REVIVE MIDWAY

There are several moves underway to revive Chicago's Midway Airport. There is, also, a concerted move to forbid the use of Midway to the new, smaller jet aircraft.

This airport used to be the busiest in the world. The great populatoin increase in the surrounding area took place while the airport was in use. Industry and retail trade was established in the area because of the employment at Midway and the traffic to and from it.

O'Hare traffic has begun to approach the point where safety and time considerations require the use of a second airport. Propeller craft and the new smaller jets could use Midway. It would be virtually impossible to find another piece of land of this size so conveniently located. It would be wasteful to duplicate the existing Midway facilities at great cost. Economics require the use of Midway for both the propeller craft and the new smaller jets. The commercial operators would be justified in refusing to return to Midway if they cannot use all of their equipment that the South Side airport is qualified to handle.

Our sympathies are with the people who live near Midway and object to jet noise. We maintain that the greatest good for the greatest number should overrule these objections. Our entire area would be benefited. Reactivation of Midway would mean reactivation of that neighborhood. The use of Midway would make for more safety in air transportation.

Independence of Dahomey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, the Republic of Dahomey will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Dahomey, Hubert Maga; and His Excellency, the Dahomey Ambassador to the United States, Louis Ignacio Pinto.

Dahomey is one of the smallest and most densely populated countries in West Africa. Its area covers no more than 44,290 square miles, but it has an estimated population of over 1.7 million. Nonetheless, although small and overpopulated, it has achieved considerable advancement toward the goals of a modern democratic state. Even prior to independence Dahomey had the highest per capita school attendance of all the countries in French West Africa, and because of the continuing emphasis on education Dahomey today has one of the most advanced and best educated populations in Africa. Approximately 25 percent of the country's entire budget is being devoted to education.

Dahomey is also coping realistically and successfully with its other development problems. The most crucial immediate problem is to expand the agricultural economy sufficiently to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population; to this end Dahomey has instituted and is extending crop yield and quality improvement projects. Efforts are also underway to expand trade, in particular to increase exports in order that Dahomey's longstanding unfavorable trade balance might be redressed. Dahomey has a relatively good transportation system, and its port facilities have been improved since independence. A modern deepwater port at Cotonou, the capital, costing more than $21 million, is scheduled to open sometime this year. It will hold four times the amount of traffic of the previously inadequate facilities.

In the political sphere Dahomey has a responsible government willing to cooperate with other countries on the African continent and in the world community. Executive power is held by a president elected for a 5-year term by universal suffrage. Legislative power belongs to a National Assembly, also elected by universal suffrage every 5 years. Dahomey is one of the four countries which make up the Conseil de l'Entente, a West African cooperative association comprising a customs union and financial assistance fund; the four Entente countries also coordinate development plans and attempt to work out common policies in the fields of taxation, public administration, labor legislation, public works, and transportation and communication.

On the inter-African scene Dahomey has been a steadfast supporter of efforts toward inter-African unity. First it joined the other French-speaking African States in adopting the charter of African and Malagasy Union which provided for the coordination of members' foreign policy and the harmonization of economic and defense policy. Recently, at the Addis Ababa conference of independent African States it was one of the signers of a charter which for the first time provides for cooperation among all the African States, those in North Africa as well as those south of the Sahara. On a global scale, Dahomey became a member of the United Nations shortly after its accession to independence. Its votes in the United Nations have borne out its dedication to the goals of maintaining the peace and furthering economic and social development throughout the world.

Thus, we salute you, President Maga, and your people for 3 years of praiseworthy accomplishments as an independent nation, both on the domestic scene and in the world community.

Machines Will Replace Domestics as Well as Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if Congress eliminates the bracero as a source

of supplemental labor for harvesting crops at the crucial peak times, other harvesting methods must be devised or the crops will spoil. There never has been sufficient domestic labor to harvest row crop vegetables or strawberries. Supplemental labor was imported 80 years before the bracero.

Machines are one answer. Machines have always been a dread worry to farmworkers. They take the jobs of the bracero and domestic alike.

Libby, McNeill & Libby estimates that 75 percent of their frozen peas were harvested by machines in 1962, compared with less than 10 percent 5 years ago.

A snap bean harvester can replace 100 hand pickers. Sixty percent of the snap beans were harvested by machine last year compared with none in 1955.

Even asparagus and tomatoes may be harvested by machines if an adequate supply of hand harvesters is not available.

Farmworkers displaced by machines cannot obtain jobs in factories or other industries as can displaced miners, factory, or railroad workers. They seldom have other skills.

The machines which are developed to replace the bracero will displace the domestic also. With no more work on the farms, their last migration will be to the cities. I hope the cities have a job and a place for them.

Union-forced mechanization of the vegetable fields will have the same effect upon the employee that union-forced mechanization of the railroads and the coalfields had upon those workers. It will eliminate jobs in the newly mechanized or automated industry and force the displaced employees into competition with other low-skilled city workers who need the competition least of all workers.

The skilled mechanic or machine worker may find new and greater employment related to the new farm machinery developments. Union representatives of the skilled worker should have more consideration of the low-skilled worker. More effort should be made to improve the status of the farmworker than to eliminate him.

The bracero program protects the domestic farmworker.

Indians Recognize Edmondson's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, another group of Indians in Oklahoma last week recognized the congressional service of our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable ED EDMONDSON.

At Chewey, in the heart of Cherokee country, in Adair County, Congressman EDMONDSON was made an honorary member of the Seven Clans Society of the Cherokee Nation.

The ceremonies, conducted before the sacred fires of the society by Alex Smith and other organization leaders with the assistance of Cherokee General Counsel Earl Boyd Pierce, honored the nearly 11 years of Congressman EDMONDSON's service as representative of Oklahoma's Second District.

Other distinguished Oklahomans honored in the same ceremonies included Area Director Virgil Harrington of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, a former constituent of mine who has an outstanding record in the Department of Interior, and District Judge E. G. Carroll of Oklahoma, one of our State's most distinguished trial judges.

The recognition of Congressman EDMONDSON's service to the Indians is a logical result of his able service on the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As ranking Democratic member of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, ED EDMONDSON has won the commendation of many tribes and leaders of the National Congress of American Indians for his consistent support of measures to improve Indian health, educational and employment opportunities.

In 1956, the Otoe-Missouria Tribe conferred honorary membership upon our colleague and named him Chief Cha-Doe-Ye-Na, or Little Buffalo.

In 1960, the Quapaws made him honorary chief with the name of Gah-Ne-Tunga, or Big Thunder.

Outside Oklahoma, as well as at home, Indian leaders have acknowledged the role of ED EDMONDSON as an able champion of Indian progress.

The tribal chairman of the Menominees expressed that tribe's appreciation in 1960 and wrote, "We know now why the Indians of Oklahoma evaluate your service so highly."

A top executive of the National Congress of American Indians appropriately referred to Congressman EDMONDSON as "one of the best friends the Indians have in Congress."

In this body, where almost every week produces some new legislation or matter where Indian rights are involved, it is good to have in our midst an able and conscientious student of Indian history and problems, with the ability and dedication of ED EDMONDSON.

It is also good to note that the Indian people are aware of his service and appreciate it, and we congratulate our colleague upon the honor just conferred upon him.

Needed: A New Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, revision of our arbitrary and discriminatory immigration law is long overdue. The President's proposals look toward the construction of a humane and sound immigration policy. I have cosponsored this legislation by introducing H.R. 7740. The New York Times, in a splendid editorial on July 25, 1963, pointed out the inequity of our present laws and urged adoption of the President's recommendations. I hope my colleagues will read the following editorial:

A NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

Five years ago a Senator named Kennedy wrote a pamphlet the theme of which was summed up in its title, "A Nation of Immigrants."

As so many others have done before and since, he pointed out that the post-World War I immigration law was discriminatory because of its national origins quota system, whose only test was whether or not an immigrant was born in the right place. And then he concluded: "The most serious defect in the present law is not that it is restrictive but that many of the restrictions are based on false and unjust premises."

President Kennedy strongly supported his own long-held views on immigration this week. His message to Congress calling for abolition of the quota system within 5 years would not let down the bars completely, but it would break the pattern of inconsistency that has limited immigration from southern Europe and Asia. Eventually 165,000 persons from all countries would be able to come here annually—not a very formidable total in a nation nearing the 200 million mark.

These new arrivals would be selected on the basis of a new set of immigration rules deriving primarily from this country's needs for skill and talent and also from a desire to serve compassionate ends by facilitating the reunion of separated families. In practice, as the President points out, the present system results in much needless hardship because some of the nations most generously favored with quotas have few would-be immigrants, while other nations with vast numbers of potential immigrants have smaller quotas. About 60,000 quota numbers are thus wasted each year, while tens of thousands from less favored lands must wait and wait.

The President's proposed changes in an immigration law that is still based on the 1920 census would go far to remove the worst of its inequities. Under the present system of priorities, people who come from the lands where Galileo, Copernicus, and Confucius were born are not considered equal to those from the lands which produced Shakespeare and Heinrich Heine. This is senseless reasoning, but so is the quota system.

The diversity of America's population is one of its strengths. Immigrants from everywhere conquered this vast country, created its riches, contributed to its Armed Forces in war and peace. Today we know that each immigrant's worth is best judged by personal qualities and skills, not by group stereotypes. Adoption of the President's wise recommendations would be an act of justice and wisdom, as well as evidence that we fully understand the true nature of the changed world—now grown so small—in which all humanity lives.

Americans Want Wilderness Preserved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, several newspapers and many individual letterwriters in my district have urged the passage of a wilderness bill to preserve some

minute fraction of our country as a wilderness museum for study by future generations.

Considering the small area of land involved—less than 8 percent of our total national forest area—Congress should back this idea in a bipartisan effort before even this 8 percent vanishes forever.

The following editorial is from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, June 28, 1963:

WILDERNESS BILL

A U.S. Senate bill with a tiny number, S. 4, has been adopted by the Senate, but now faces a much tougher route through the House. It is popularly called the wilderness bill, and it would preserve for future generations millions of acres of Government lands in their natural wilderness State.

Conservationists throughout the Nation have been working for the bill's passage since its introduction. But it has been opposed strongly by interests which obviously have an eye on possible profit that can be made from timbering, mining, and other exploitation. Such opposition bogged the measure down in the house after it passed the Senate in 1961.

That there seems to be a bit more hope for the bill this year is based in part on facts that have become better known through hearings that have been held, and a resultant report to the Senate by its Interior Department committee. The report hopefully notes "increased understanding and agreement."

Charges that the bill would "sterilize," "quarantine" or "lock up" a vast area as claimed by opponents have been pretty clearly refuted, it seems from a study of sections of the Senate Interior Committee report.

The principal effect on mining, according to the report, is that 14.3 million acres of national forest areas would be removed from rights now available under the mining law. But, it is pointed out, if minerals are found and the President finds mining would be for greater public good than preservation of wilderness, he is empowered to authorize mining. And Congress can at any time remove areas from the wilderness system.

Similarly, the committee report states the less than 15 million acres of national forests involved represent only 8 percent of total national forest area. And currently, it is claimed, more timber is being offered for harvest in national forests than lumber men are using. Applying modern reforestation methods to more than 52 million acres needing it would produce a better timber supply, it is reported.

Whether the wilderness bill, S. 4, will make it this time depends upon how much attention can be gained for the proposal, in the welter of other problems facing the House. But the Nation's conservationists are making a determined effort. Most Americans, we believe, hope they will win.

Is Nixon Building Up for 1964 or Maybe 1968?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial, written by one of America's most able editors, John S. Knight, will be of interest to the Members of Congress:

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, July 28, 1963]

IS NIXON BUILDING UP FOR 1964 OR MAYBE 1968?

For a man who said last year that he was through with politics, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon is creating the impression that he may have changed his mind.

In the past month Nixon has been traveling in Europe and getting a good press. His recent foray into East Berlin and subsequent observations hit many a front page already crowded with news of civil rights, the railroad dispute, and the trials and tribulations of one Christine Keeler.

Now the Nixon family—Dick, Pat, and daughters Patricia and Julie—may have only been enjoying a European vacation. Nevertheless, the 1960 Republican presidential candidate was not exactly avoiding reporters on his holiday.

My understanding was that Nixon, following last year's California defeat, intended to settle down in New York and practice law.

At least, that is what the man said. Of course, there remained the small problem of passing the bar exams but a little boning up under the midnight oil ought to take care of that detail.

The Nixons bought an apartment near the Rockefellers in preparation for a private career. But when have they been in it? And what services is Nixon performing for his new employers?

Of course, none of this is any of my business. But, like everyone else, I'm curious.

ADVICE IN 1961 WENT UNHEEDED

In what the late Frank Kent used to call "the great game of politics," some strange cards are dealt to the players.

My memory book shows that in 1961, a confidante of Nixon's telephoned me to inquire what I thought of Dick's running for Governor of California against "Pat" Brown.

I told the gentleman that it would be a mistake on two counts—one, that there was no certainty that Nixon could beat Brown, and secondly, that if he did, a Democratic legislature would block any program advanced by a GOP Governor.

My suggestion was that Dick Nixon practice law, do some writing and make a few speeches on carefully selected occasions. I said further that such a course would give Nixon sufficient exposure to keep his name before the public while awaiting future political developments.

But Nixon, under strong urging by his major 1960 campaign contributors, decided to make the California race in which he got clobbered by Brown and took his defeat in poor grace.

Now let us assume for the moment that Nixon had followed my advice which is always freely given and seldom followed.

Here are Rockefeller and GOLDWATER at two extremes of the Republican political spectrum. "Rocky" is backed by the powerful eastern wing of the party, but is unpopular in the South and Midwest. BARRY is well liked by the conservatives and is strong in the areas where Rockefeller is weak.

The result is a divided party, and the breach will widen as the months roll by. At this stage, the probability is that neither of the leading candidates will get the nomination which may go to some dark horse such as Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky.

But had Nixon been content to bide his time and not risk the ill-fated California adventure, he would today be the one candidate upon whom a majority of the Republican delegates could agree.

For Nixon is neither too far to the right nor to the left to command support from all elements of the Republican Party.

So one fateful decision, probably taken against his own judgment, eliminated Dick Nixon as the favored 1964 Presidential nominee.

Of course, Nixon must still be counted as a possibility. A strife-torn party with a deadlocked convention may find him the best compromise candidate. But what he could have had for the asking is no longer within his grasp.

There are those who say that Dick Nixon is really looking ahead to 1968. This could well be the case.

The only thing of which I am quite certain is that Nixon is not out of politics and that he will again run for public office. He is an able man who enjoys political life.

When the time is right or duty calls, Nixon will be available.

All Americans Will Be the Victims if Law and Order Break Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy must be charged with full responsibility for any violence which results from the ill-advised march on Washington which he so enthusiastically reports. As the Chief Executive he has put the whole power and prestige of his Office behind the encouragement of the demonstration instead of appealing to reason and urging that the tried and tested methods of public persuasion in keeping with American traditions be followed.

The Negro leaders who have forsaken American traditions to foment riots and mob violence in the streets will suffer, along with all the rest of us, if the disregard for law and order becomes the rule in America as well it may.

The following editorial by David Lawrence, "What's Become of 'Law and Order'?," in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, should make good reading for the President, those who are agitating the mobs, and for all Americans who still believe in the rule of law, in American justice, in the basic traditions of our land:

WHAT'S BECOME OF "LAW AND ORDER"?

(By David Lawrence)

We pride ourselves on being a Nation governed by law. We boast of a society based on order—preserved by the volition of the citizenry or, if necessary, by force of law.

Yet we see minority groups today pretending that they cannot express their will effectively except through marches in the streets or "lie-down" and "sit-in" demonstrations which interfere with motor traffic or the carrying on of private business.

What has become of our famed system of communication for the expression of ideas on controversial questions—through the press, through television, through radio, in meeting halls and auditoriums, and even in the pulpits? Have all these facilities been unavailable to minority groups?

Why have so many clergymen, Negro and white, forsaken the pulpit and the spiritual way of inculcating ideas of justice and morality? One minister, a white man of prominence, who was himself arrested as a participant in a demonstration, told a congressional committee the other day that everything was peaceful until the counter

demonstrators arrived on the scene. But isn't it natural that counter demonstrators should want to express themselves, too?

Church organizations have passed resolutions and individual ministers have preached sermons on civil rights. The Negro has not been without champions in every walk of life. Why, therefore, have so many Negro ministers become the active leaders and managers of street demonstrations that have resulted in disturbance of the peace, arrests, bloodshed, and death?

Do the Negro ministers—those who on Sundays encourage the members of their congregations to participate in the marches—really feel that people of other races cannot be impressed with the merits of their cause except through so-called "non-violent demonstrations" which so often lead to violence?

The dangers of the course which certain Negro leaders have adopted must in due time become apparent. If the only way to get attention for any cause is to organize provocative demonstrations, what lesson does this teach to a nation which believes in a government of "law and order"? Will not other groups of citizens, intent on attaining their objectives, be encouraged to adopt similar tactics?

The coming demonstration on the streets of Washington itself, it is estimated, will consist of at least 100,000 Negroes. Whether the Capitol grounds themselves are invaded is irrelevant. If the President continues to acquiesce in such stunt tactics, the time will come when the mob spirit will replace orderly assembly and discourage reliance on our system of free communication—the media of printed and spoken words.

Why can't the demonstrators gather in big stadiums and listen to an exposition of views by their leaders? Are we approaching the day when in democratic America the slogan "law and order" is to be shunted aside with a dishonest rationalization that to disturb the peace is the only way to secure redress of grievances?

We hear the cry: "But we've waited a hundred years, we can't wait any longer!"

Yet what happened in those hundred years? Was there no Congress or Supreme Court in session to proclaim "the law of the land" in the usual manner? Was anyone prevented from challenging the laws or the court decisions in a formal way through the judicial or legislative processes established by our Constitution? Was there in those decades no discussion in the press and no public debate on the principles involved in the racial controversy? Would the ruling in the 1954 desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court have been achieved earlier if Negro demonstrations had been organized and many participants had been arrested for disturbing the peace?

Government is, in fact, a system developed by evolution. We believe in rule by the majority. The minds and hearts of a majority, however, cannot be won by disregarding the fundamental precepts of government itself—that "law and order" must be preserved while the facilities of debate and lawful communication are made available to all citizens, no matter how unpopular their causes may be.

But constitutional guarantees become worthless if the process of "law and order" is forsaken and we substitute the pressures of the mob in the precints of government itself.

President Kennedy, the elected spokesman of the people, has failed to deplore or discourage the coming demonstration in Washington. He must, therefore, bear responsibility for any disturbance that may ensue. And the people who want "law and order" may find they have no other recourse but to express at the polls in 1964 a protest against the coercion of our legislative or executive process by street mobs.

Senator Keating Honored by Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week was observed the week of July 14-20 to focus worldwide attention upon the imperialistic policies of the Soviet Union in subjugating and oppressing the peoples of more than two dozen nations throughout the world. During their observance we gave reassurance to these captive peoples that the free world has not forgotten them and pledges its efforts to restore liberty and justice to their nations.

One of the highlights of the week was the program conducted by the Assembly of Captive European Nations at the National Press Club on July 17. On that occasion the assembly honored U.S. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, and other outstanding leaders for their stanch support of the cause of the captive nations.

Senator KEATING delivered an incisive address concerning our policy toward the captive nations and their Communist oppressors, and I request unanimous consent to have Senator Keating's remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues and the Nation.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEATING AT CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, JULY 17, 1963

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a privilege for me to be here to join with you in commemorating the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

I am especially pleased to see my good friend, Senator DODD, here today. Some of you may have heard that TOM and I recently received a very high honor from Moscow. When the Kremlin issued a directive a few weeks ago ordering a worldwide purge of outspoken anti-Communists, the two of us were singled out for special attention. One might say that we made the top of the Communist hate parade.

Fortunately, this is one of those occasions when it's nice to be unpopular. It's quite heartening, as a matter of fact, for a Senator to know that his words and actions are not to the liking of the Soviet hierarchy.

This unexpected testimonial from Moscow was prompted in no small measure, I am sure, by our strong support of, and participation in, the annual observance of Captive Nations Week. Mr. Khrushchev and his chief lieutenants are terribly touchy about this subject—and I don't blame them.

It's understandable that they would prefer to have the world forget their suppression of national independence throughout the Red empire in defiance of solemn treaties and agreements.

I am sure they want the world to forget the anguished cries for freedom that were heard in East Germany in 1952 and again in Poland in 1956. I am certain they don't want the world to remember the roar of Russians tanks patrolling the blood-drenched streets of Budapest.

These cold, hard facts, brought to the surface during Captive Nations Week, give lie to the twisted distortions of the Red propaganda machine. And so, as we recommit ourselves today to supporting the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations, let us hope that our message travels far and wide alerting the whole world that we are here giving national recognition to Communist perfidy, duplicity, and tyranny.

Unfortunately, as we commemorate this fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week, there is a disquieting note in the air—one which has me greatly disturbed.

It occurs to me that this year's observance has been greeted with something less than enthusiasm by our national policymakers. The weak wording of the proclamation, and the lack of attendant publicity and promotion in connection with the observance leaves me both puzzled and dismayed.

To my mind, a token observance of Captive Nations Week—one lacking enthusiasm and inspiration—would be worse than having no official observance at all.

Downgrading of the event, year after year, by this country's leading spokesmen will doubtless force a diminution of its importance to Americans. For the observance to be truly meaningful and truly national in scope, our Government must be more purposeful in its display of enthusiasm in the future.

I am disturbed also by some of the new language that is cropping up in our foreign policy statements. In recent weeks, the word "accommodation" has been given a new measure of respectability—and I don't mean the reference to public accommodations in the civil rights bill.

We have heard reference to our helping to make the world "safe for diversity." We have heard the contention advanced that the Soviet Union has a "deep interest in a just and genuine peace."

I shudder to think of how such policy statements are received by the victims of Communist oppression behind the Iron Curtain. Do these prisoners think their jailers have a deep interest in a just and genuine peace? Do they want the world safe for the kind of diversity that has them in bondage? Do they appreciate the newfound fashionableness of the word "accommodation"? I hardly think so.

And what about the response of the oppressors themselves? Are they moved by this new language into mending their ways? On the contrary, they are encouraged at least to continue—and perhaps intensify—their old ways of conquest.

Khruschchev's reaction was typical. He viewed the new approach as an indication that we are losing confidence in our own strength.

It is significant that he made an immediate reference to Western strength because this is one commodity he understands and respects.

Whether translated in terms of military might or national determination, our strength has always been the roadblock barring his path to world domination. For this reason, perhaps his comment was more of a wish than a thought.

However, regardless of his motivation, we must never allow the notion that we are losing confidence in our own strength. We need not constantly flex our military muscle to convince the world of our power. We need only to conduct ourselves in a manner befitting the strongest nation on the face of the earth.

In our zeal for constructive negotiation, we must never allow ourselves to be bullied into a posture of accommodation.

And in our desire to protect those who enjoy freedom in the world, we must never turn our backs on those from whom freedom has been wrenched by the forces of communism.

While capitalizing on our own strength, we should be mindful of the Red empire's growing weaknesses.

We have already seen the signs of discontent in the Sino-Soviet world. An ideological split is threatening to turn warlord against warlord. Russia's technological advances have extracted a high price from the Russian people in terms of material necessities. Collectivized agriculture has failed, resulting in widespread hunger throughout the Red domain.

Finally, the innate desire of God's creatures to forge their own futures and control their own destinies must be reckoned with. Surely a paramount weakness is the still-burning desire of the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain to throw off the yoke of tyranny they now bear. In any crisis, these suppressed peoples will not be loyal supporters of Communist aggression. Instead they will seize upon the opportunity of international turmoil to rebel against their captors and aline themselves with the forces of freedom.

In light of these festering weaknesses, I view this year's observance of Captive Nations Week as a golden opportunity for this country's leaders to strengthen the spirit of our enslaved brethren behind the Iron Curtain and to bolster their faith in our resoluteness.

We must demonstrate this week—and throughout the ensuing weeks—that we are not only strong and determined but that we recognize our unqualified commitment to work for their eventual liberation.

This week, representatives of the United States, Britain, and Soviet Russia are meeting to discuss the possibility of a nuclear test-ban treaty.

This is a thoroughly worthwhile effort, which I believe has the support of the great majority of the American people. A ban on atmospheric nuclear testing is important to the whole world.

At the same time, there is reason to believe that Russia may seek a package agreement, couping a valuable test-ban treaty with a nonaggression pledge between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact nations.

This would be an obvious attempt by Khrushchev to force the West into a disastrous acceptance of the status quo in Central and Eastern Europe.

Whether or not any formal agreement is entered into, the mere participation by the West in serious discussions of such a pledge would be inexcusable.

Anything short of an outright refusal to discuss the proposal might well be considered by the captive peoples as a sellout.

We have absolutely nothing to gain by consideration of such a nonaggression pledge. We know from the lessons of history that agreements in the hands of Communists are valueless. And if the mere signing of a document constitute a guarantee, then the charter of the United Nations should be guarantee enough.

On the other hand, we have much to lose in this connection. Such discussions would build a wave of disrespect in the free world and discouragement in the slave world.

The only answer to a NATO-Warsaw nonaggression proposal is to stand firmly on the historic position that any and all pledges of this nature must come after, and not before, the granting of the right of self-determination to the peoples of the captive nations. Until this happens, we shall not dignify these totalitarian satellite regimes by the slightest hint that we might enter into a deal with them.

Standing fast on these principles, we must continue to identify ourselves not with the torturers but with the tortured; not with the ruthless, self-imposed rulers but with the unwilling subjects and their desire to recover the right of free choice in their own internal affairs.

I stand before you as one who staunchly believes this right of free choice will be recovered. It will not happen overnight, but it will happen.

And while the people of the United States continue to pray for—and work toward—this goal, let us not lower our standards, let us not settle for a world free for diversity, but rather for a world free for all men.

The ICC Plan Is Not the Answer to the Railroad Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last week I pointed out that the President's plan to give the railroad featherbed dispute to the Interstate Commerce Commission ignored the basic problem which was the economic plight of our Nation's rail systems. The approach suggested by the President could leave the basic problem of putting into effect reasonable economics in labor costs up in the air for a long as 6 years. Even if the ICC acts with unusual speed, there is no guarantee that after 2 years an additional period will not be needed.

These same facts have been elaborated upon by a number of editorials and articles, three of which I include after my remarks. The first is an editorial in the Hackensack, N.J. daily paper, the Record of July 26, 1963. As a spokesman for the heavily commuter populated county of Bergen, the Record's words should be given due consideration. In essence, the editorial finds the ICC to be an inappropriate vehicle for solving the crisis. Pointing out the dangers of any type of compulsory arbitration to both sides of the controversy, by whatever name you may call it, the Record nevertheless suggests that some sort of administrative court of arbitration may be necessary. This is a suggestion that deserves closer study.

The second editorial appeared in the New York Times of July 26, 1963, and also questions whether the slow-moving ICC is the appropriate agent to settle the dispute. Again, the fact of a possible 4-year freeze on wages is noted, and the disregard for the Presidential study commission's views is also discussed. Of great importance is the point that I have been trying to bring home to this body; namely that Congress now has the breathing space to consider an adequate solution, not just the Presidential suggestion.

Finally, one of New Jersey's commuter railroads, the Jersey Central, in its August edition of the Commuter's Almanac stresses again the need for an examination of the problem in the light of the financial plight of the railroads.

The articles follow:

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, July 26, 1963]

NO JOB FOR THE BUREAUCRAT

The more the administration's witnesses tell the hurrying congressional committees about Mr. Kennedy's legislation imposing on railroad labor and management compulsory arbitration without calling it by that unpleasant name, the more one hopes that when once this crisis is resolved Congress will come back to the job and do it right. Under the terms of the legislation the Interstate Commerce Commission would be empowered to rule on railroad working-rule disputes for a period of 2 years and would resort to the courts for injunctive enforcement of its edicts. Evidently anticipating a resolve on the part of the recalcitrant brotherhoods merely to defer their strike action until the ICC mandate would run out, the Administration has made it clear that it would renew the Commission's power to arbitrate for as long as it would be needed. Considering the economic stakes and the size of the modernization ordeal ahead, that could mean throughout any future now foreseeable.

This being the case, it is suggested that the power to decree industrial-relations settlements is too vast and important a power to be lodged in the ICC or any other administrative agency. If we must have compulsory arbitration (and we may as well face it now as later), we'd better understand that it is a gigantic power, a dangerous power, one which dictatorships have used to crush labor and bring honest enterprise to its knees. The ICC is not here indicted or even suspect, but we have learned the hard way that when we legislate we must have in mind not the uses good men can make of law but the perversions of evil men.

Again the "if": if arbitrate we must, then let's not lodge the power in such a bureaucracy as so long played the stupid tyrant to France. Perhaps the function should be lodged in the existent court structure. Perhaps a new kind of court is indicated. It would be best if the arbitrating body were out in the open where it could be summarily dismissed by the voters at the first sign of corruption or one-sidedness. But a board of arbitrators elected nationwide seems unlikely or unconstitutional, and perhaps the best we can have is a new agency having a single responsibility and working at it in the light. Economic life or death is no job to be done in dark corners.

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1963]

RAIL STRIKE DELAY

The railroads' agreement to delay the application of modernized work rules for a month spares the country the rigors of a serious strike. It also gives Congress adequate time to consider the deficiencies of the special law President Kennedy has proposed for resolving the long controversy over eliminating unneeded rail jobs. The President's plan for referring the dispute to the Interstate Commerce Commission opens up dangers that may prove almost as injurious in their end effect as the strike they are designed to avert.

The first question is whether the ICC, one of the most slow moving of all bureaucracies, can be depended on to order manpower economies within the 120-day time limit the administration believes feasible. The expectation that it can is a central point in the case Secretary of Labor Wirtz made for the bill in his letter to the Times yesterday.

Yet the language of the proposed joint resolution contains an escape hatch, under which the elasticity of "as soon thereafter as is practicable" is added to the 120 days. Given the 4-year record of stalling that has already marked efforts to resolve the conflict, plus the Commission's special talent for delay, Congress cannot ignore the possibility that the surplus firemen will die of old age before lawyers exhaust their ingenuity in stretching out the proceedings before the ICC.

Furthermore, the resolution would compel a waterdown of the sound recommendations for laying off excess workers that had been made last year by a special Presidential Commission headed by former Federal Judge Simon H. Rifkind. Its report proposed that all firemen with less than 10 years' seniority be given separation benefits and dropped with 3 months to 1 year's notice.

The Kennedy plan, by extending the employee protections now enforced in railroad mergers, would keep the bulk of this group on the railroads' payroll for 4 years and would lengthen the notice period for virtually all the rest. Thus, even before the ICC begins its review of a case that has already been studied to death, it would be under mandate to appease the unions whose own obstructionism has brought about the crisis the law is designed to relieve.

The new monthlong truce does give the brotherhoods yet another chance to reconsider their refusal to agree to voluntary arbitration or to any of the peace plans put forward by the administration and its two special boards. But giving the ICC an entering wedge to become the permanent controller of the labor-management decisions on the railroads, as the President's proposal would do, would create a Draconian precedent for all labor and for the country.

If the unions' stubbornness keeps the threat of a strike alive, Congress will again be under pressure to enact a coercive law. No such law will be a good one, but the one the President has suggested has many more defects than even the most painful of emergency statutes need have.

[From the Jersey Central Commuter's Almanac, August 1963]

ONLY A POSTPONEMENT

Once again, the Nation's railroads have acceded to governmental request to delay changes in work rules and operating conditions that the Supreme Court has ruled they have a legal right to make. We have done so to give Congress a chance to take some action which will avert the paralyzing strike that was scheduled for midnight Monday night.

From the beginning—through the long chain of negotiations that began when the Presidential Commission recommended the changes in out-of-date work rules and pay structures as a measure designed to help halt further decline of the railroad industry—we have done everything possible to avoid the inconvenience to our customers and the threat to our economy that a strike would represent. We know that everyone loses in this kind of a strike—and, for the Jersey Central, the loss of business involved (added to that already suffered from traffic curtailment in anticipation of a strike) would only add a further degree of seriousness to an overall financial situation which is already desparate.

You, as commuters, are naturally relieved at the postponement. But it is only a postponement. The issues are too critical to be escaped forever, unless the railroads are to be allowed to dry up and disappear. As the discussion in Congress proceeds, it is important that you know what this controversy is all about and how it came to the point of strike and emergency action by Congress.

Under the Railway Labor Act, disputes of this character between railroad employees and management go through a sequence of negotiations on individual railroads, then national negotiations, then mediation under the auspices of the National Mediation Board' then a proffer of arbitration, and finally a Presidentially appointed Emergency Board. This dispute, starting in early 1959, has not only gone through all of these procedures but extra ones as well, including a special Presidential Commission which studied the problem for 13 months. Even the Supreme Court has affirmed our right to discontinue unneeded jobs.

The dispute is basically a question of unneeded jobs—such as firemen—and modernizing work rules to improve service and better control costs.

The railroads accepted the recommendations of the original Presidential Railroad Commission, under the chairmanship of one of the authors of the National Labor Relations Act; the unions rejected them.

The railroads accepted the recommendations of this year's Presidential Emergency Board, the additional proposals made by Secretary of Labor Wirtz, as well as President Kennedy's suggestion for arbitration by Associate Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg; the union leaders rejected all these.

We have done everything we could to make collective bargaining work, and have accepted the findings of every third-party study made, including those parts that were extremely costly to us.

The dispute is not a simple matter of our wanting to dismiss some employees and the union's fighting to keep their jobs. Judge Rifkind, who wrote the original report, said the issue represented a choice "between a moribund industry destined to decline in importance, to decline in capacity, and to decline as an employer of labor" and an industry "which was modern, which was fit and in trim for competition * * * (and) capable of a vastly increased volume of employment." It will take the latter kind of industry to continue to supply the services needed to get you to and from work.

The Commission recommended a great many changes in railroad work rules and methods of compensation, designed basically to bring them into tune with modern operating conditions. There is no space here to go into the details, but it might be noted that the wages of 75 percent of the employees would actually be raised, and the remaining 25 percent, now working exceedingly short hours, would be able to make up most of their rate cuts by working a little longer.

The most publicized issue before the Commission was the question of retaining firemen on freight diesels (where a third man is in the cab) and yard diesels. (Firemen are to be retained on passenger diesels.)

The Commission recommended that the 27,000 firemen now in road freight or yard service with 10 or more years' seniority be kept on with full job rights until retirement, death, or other attrition ends the job. The 13,000 firemen with less than 10 years' seniority would be phased out with 3 to 12 months' notice, receiving dismissal pay ranging up to $13,380, while keeping all outside income. Displaced firemen also would get rehiring preference and 2 years' retraining, with the railroads paying 75 percent of the tuition. Many of these firemen are in their twenties and thus are best suited for retraining and have the best chance of finding new jobs.

In addition, employees losing jobs as a result of any technological changes would be protected with severance pay from the railroads ranging up to $24,000. Employees relocated would be compensated for moving expenses and loss of home value. Employees furloughed as a result of crew-size changes would receive extended unemployment compensation paid for by the railroads.

In other words, every reasonable protection has been provided as a part of the price of progress.

On the Jersey Central about 220 employees will be affected by the elimination of firemen on yard and freight diesels. Many more, of course, will be affected by other changes in work rules—but few adversely. And all but the displaced firemen stand to benefit from being employed in an industry "trim for competition" instead of "in decline."

We estimate that the changes would, in the long run, save us $1,500,000 in unnecessary annual costs. Any such substantial improvement in our financial position would inevitably make easier the solution of the problem of continuing to supply adequate commuter service.

Again, although we are glad that we are not being forced to inconvenience our customers, we remind them that there has been no solution to the basic problems involved. All parties who have studied the situation agree that the railroads cannot remain competitive if they continue to be hobbled by out-of-date work rules—and, if they can't compete, they can't continue to serve you.

Southern Idaho's New Slogan, "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

The flood of letters, editorials, and articles condemning Secretary Udall's high-handed action in extending the Bonneville Power marketing area into southern Idaho continues. "With a government like we've got, who needs enemies?" This is the conclusion in the editorial of the North Side News, of Jerome, Idaho, entitled "Who Needs Enemies?"

It is becoming more and more apparent that the American people are getting fed up with the tremendous growth in the Federal bureaucracy. The fact that this unwarranted expansion is being paid for in blood and sweat and loss of personal freedoms is gradually being realized by the rank and file of our citizens.

With the mounting opposition in southern Idaho to the extension of Bonneville's power marketing area to that region, the Representatives in Congress from Idaho who have backed or requested the unwarranted and untenable action of Secretary Udall would be wise to do an about fact on this matter.

The editorial, "Who Needs Enemies?" follows:

WHO NEEDS ENEMIES?

There is one bright spot on this Bonneville Power Administration mess.

Congress will have to appropriate an estimated $60 million for the transmission lines into southern Idaho.

Perhaps our elected representatives can be influenced enough so that they can vote the thing down for us.

Of course, as has been proven many times in recent years, that fact that we elected them to represent our wishes doesn't necessarily keep our boys from voting the way they want to.

We can only hope that Potomac fever can be cured with the tried and true home remedy of public opinion.

Some of our own representatives, both in the House and Senate, have the idea that

they know what is good for us in Idaho better than we do, ourselves.

This benighted attitude on their part tends to discourage optimism on our part.

But, the fact remains that more and more people, all over this Nation, are getting sick of the term "Federal moneys."

They know tax funds when they see them.

They know that every penny of that $60 million is coming out of their own pockets and that there is no such thing as "low-cost Federal power" in comparison with the adequate power furnished by private utilities.

What is more, there is a gaining awareness of the amount of damage and actual harm that can be done to private business and the communities and States in which they function and pay taxes.

People know that Government agencies such as Bonneville Power Administration are not taxpayers, far from it; they are tax-spenders.

In these days of big government, it may sound a little naive to talk about cutting expenditures and leaving the States alone.

Doubtlessly, the administration will use as one of its selling points the fact that the $60 million spent in Idaho will bolster our economy.

If that is an advantage, then why don't they just reactivate the WPA and the CCC and spend the money entirely on employing people who are out of work?

Or, better yet, why don't they just cut Federal taxes that much and let us all have a little more money to spend on things we need, raise our own and our employes' wages, buy needed domestic and business equipment, and, in other words, help ourselves.

After all, the biggest single problem we as individuals and as businessmen have had to cope with in the last 20 years has been the financial one of having to support a more and more costly Federal Government.

Bonneville Power Administration? Medicare? Foreign Aid? Urban Renewal? To paraphrase a popular saying of a few years ago, "With a government like we've got, who needs enemies?"

The Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the July 18 issue of the Gilroy Evening Dispatch in my home city of Gilroy, Calif., the following news article appeared:

The apricot season starting this week brings a need for women and young people to pick and cut the fruit, there is also a need for berry pickers, and for families to pick cucumbers, according to Arnold Hamilton, local State department of employment manager.

During the past week 200 continued and 45 initial claims were filed at the local office. In the same period 316 agricultural and 10 other placements were made.

Mr. Speaker, this article is of great significance when one considers the question of whether the bracero program should or should not be continued. The Gilroy Dispatch in the above article is performing a public service in advising prospective workers that harvest labor is needed to handle apricots, berries, and cucumbers. It is interesting to note that the second paragraph of the same news story reports that even with this labor shortage, 200 persons drew their unemployment insurance for the week and 45 persons made initial claims.

Mr. Speaker, what more dramatic evidence could be found to show that today's unemployed are either not able or willing to do the type of work which is required to harvest agricultural commodities?

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that California agriculture requires the importation of bracero laborers.

A Thankless Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, persons traveling between southern California and Mexico often have reason to be impressed by the courtesy and outstanding competence of customs officers stationed at the port of San Ysidro. This is a gateway for millions of persons entering the United States, or crossing over into Mexico. It has been established that the customs inspectors and agents at San Ysidro inspect an average of 11 vehicles every minute around the clock. They processed 21,521,567 persons during the calendar year 1962.

The only travelers who meet these public servants for more than a few seconds are persons suspected of evading taxes or otherwise violating the law. Such contacts seem unlikely to improve the customs agent's public relations image. His is one of the uncounted thankless tasks in Government.

However, the City Council of San Diego, Calif., recently adopted a resolution in recognition of a consistently outstanding performance by the Customs staff in that area. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I enter that resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 176223

Whereas during the calendar year of 1962, 5,712,657 vehicles were inspected by Customs agents at the port of San Ysidro, San Diego, Calif., and admitted into the United States of America, constituting an average of 11 vehicles inspected and cleared every minute of every hour of every day; and

Whereas during that same period, a total of 21,521,567 persons were examined by said customs officials and passed across the international border, being an average of 40 persons a minute processed by these officials; and

Whereas these figures represent a sizable increase in the number of vehicles and persons examined at the port of San Ysidro, San Diego, Calif., over previous years, and indicate a 33 percent increase in the total number of inspections, thus considerably increasing the workload of the customs officials; and

Whereas this additional workload has been accomplished by augmenting the staff with two inspectors, thus expanding the staff by only 10 percent; and

Whereas the efficient and expeditious handling of border inspection, notwithstanding the greatly increased workload, has practically eliminated the waiting time in vehicles and passengers returning to the United States, thereby encouraging tourists to visit the area to the economic benefit of the city of San Diego; and

Whereas these Federal officials, charged with the responsibility of Border inspection, have effectively discharged their duties at all times and willingly cooperated with the San Diego Police Department and other governmental agencies of both the United States and Mexico in making this necessary and vital operation both efficient and economical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Council of the City of San Diego, as follows: That this council, on behalf of themselves and the citizens of this city, do hereby officially recognize and publicly acknowledge the excellent service rendered by the departments of the Federal Government responsible for this outstanding record, for their invaluable service in securing the interests of American citizens, and effectively curtailing the illegal smuggling activities, the importation of narcotics, and other articles detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public, and the illegal immigration of aliens performed in a courteous and efficient manner; be it further

Resolved, That the Council of the City of San Diego, on behalf of themselves and local and national law enforcement agencies, expresses its appreciation and gratitude for the continuing cooperation which the Federal Customs officials have consistently demonstrated in handling the affairs of this very active International Border checkpoint; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, Justice Department, Washington, D.C., to the Honorable Lionel Van Deerlin, Congressman, 37th Congressional District, Washington, D.C.; and to the Honorable Raymond Farrell, Commissioner of Immigraion and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C., complimenting them and the personnel of their agencies which they direct and represent, for this outstanding service provided to the citizens of the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States.

ALAN H. FIRESTONE,
City Attorney.

Balance of Payments Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Federal Reserve Bank in raising the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent is designed to remove the Nation's deficit in short-term capital movements in the balance of payments. Although it is important to resolve these short-term difficulties, it is more important, in my opinion, to attempt to correct the imbalances in the recurring items—the basic accounts.

If the difficulties in the basic accounts had been resolved, the Federal Reserve would not have been forced to tamper with the discount rate just when the domestic economy seems to need a fiscal stimulant such as a tax cut.

One recurring deficit item in these basic accounts is U.S. defense spending

overseas. In 1962 there was a net adverse balance in these defense expenditures of more than $2 billion—with almost half of this deficit accumulated in support of nations which have a balance of payments surplus and which have large holdings of U.S. dollars. Only West Germany in 1962 offset U.S. defense spending with purchases in the United States.

In 1963, Mr. Speaker, Italy has joined West Germany in this program of offsetting U.S. defense spending by pledging to purchase in the United States. However, while this is a step in the right direction, in my judgment we must activate other developed nations to follow the examples of West Germany and Italy. The following table indicates the deficit spending—in millions of dollars—of the United States in 1962 of three of these dollar-surplus nations:

[In millions]

Nation	U.S. defense expenditures	Offset purchases	U.S. deficit
France	$266.6	$22.0	$244.6
Japan	371.0	23.5	347.5
United Kingdom	207.0	23.2	183.8
Total			775.9

Thus, we can save more than three-fourths of a billion dollars annually in our balance-of-payments deficit if we can encourage these three nations and others to enter into agreements to offset our spending to defend them with purchases in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this area of the basic accounts must be reexamined, as well as the others. A substantial savings in the basic accounts will leave the Federal Reserve free to allow the domestic economy to function unemcumbered by a raise in the discount rate.

For a general analysis of the balance-of-payments problem, I think the Members will be interested in the following article which appeared Sunday, July 28, 1963, in the New York Times:

KENNEDY AND ECONOMY—ADMINISTRATION MOVES INTO THE THIRD PHASE IN ITS POLICY FOR SOLVING NATION'S ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The economic philosophy of the Kennedy administration is, and always has been, a practical one. This administration has never shown any dedication to a particular set of beliefs. The objective of its economic strategy is to solve problems.

Within the confines of this eclectic and pragmatic approach, however, there have been three reasonably distinct phases in the development of the administration's economic policies. The shift into the third phase was completed within recent days.

The first stage was an activist one, and lasted roughly for the first year of the administration. That year saw enactment of an impressive array of programs to solve the major domestic economic problem—bringing the country out of recession and back onto the path toward a full employment. The budget moved into a fairly sizable deficit.

The administration then drew back somewhat from its action program, at least on the domestic policy side. After a violent argument within the administration, President Kennedy decided, in January 1962, that he had to balance the budget for the coming year.

Toward the end of the year, however, this cautious phase began to come to an end, as the administration took a new look at the progress it had made in reducing unemployment—and failed to find anything it could like in what it saw.

ARGUMENT

The argument within the administration was again intense, but the results were the opposite of the previous years. The advocates of bold action, the Council of Economic Advisers, rather than the cautious Treasury, won out. President Kennedy presented to Congress the largest deliberately planned peacetime budget deficit in history—nearly $12 billion.

The move toward new boldness on the domestic front was followed shortly by a similar move on the international economic front—and for essentially the same reason. The old, limited policies were just not working. By the time 1963 was a few months old, it was clear that the balance-of-payments deficit was becoming sharply worse.

By April, the balance-of-payments problem had become so obviously urgent that President Kennedy ordered new policies developed to cope with the deterioration. Those policies were announced 10 days ago.

One item in the package literally stunned financial circles at home and abroad and has had to be rescinded in part. That was the President's proposal to impose a tax, ranging as high as 15 percent, on long-term foreign securities, including both bonds and stocks, purchased by Americans.

The move was a shock because the U.S. Government had long proclaimed its opposition to any barriers to the free flow of investment funds.

Another major move against the balance-of-payments deficit was the increase in short-term interest rates put into effect by the Federal Reserve System, with the blessing of the Kennedy administration.

The administration—here a Treasury victory— felt urgently that short-term rates in this country had to be kept competitive with those available abroad and gambled that a further increase would not touch off the chain of events its critics said it would.

That chain would link these developments: First, the increase in short-term rates would cause an increase in long-term rates; that, in turn, would cause a drop in the purchase of things that are financed by long-term lending—specifically, houses, business equipment and highways, schools, and other items that are financed through State and local government bond issues. The final link in the chain is recession.

THIRD MOVE

The third of the Kennedy administration's moves against the balance-of-payments deficit was a highly tentative one. It had its genesis in two questions that weigh heavily in the midst of the administration's economic policymakers.

The first is a question concerning the constraints the balance-of-payments deficit has imposed on policies to deal with the sluggish economy, and its offspring, persistent high unemployment. Had there been no payments deficit, the administration might have felt free to advocate an even larger tax cut—or at least a more rapidly effective one—to bring the economy out of its doldrums more promptly.

Without a balance-of-payments deficit, there certainly would have been no policy of maintaining high short-term interest rates—the domestic economic consequences of which no one can claim to know with certainty. It is possible that they have helped to stifle economic growth these last 2 years, even though long-term rates have not risen.

The second question is longer range. It revolves around the problems the world will face when the United States no longer has a balance-of-payments deficit. For the deficit, though it has been a fierce problem, has served one very useful purpose.

Virtually everyone will accept dollars. The chances are good that any foreign owner of dollars will find a use for them. To buy something in the United States or to pay for a purchase in another country, where dollars are equally happily accepted.

ADDED CASH

Thus the dollars that have been flowing out of the United States in recent years—the dollars that represent the balance-of-payments deficit—have added to the world's supply of usable cash to conduct its international transactions.

But once the United States stops incurring a balance-of-payments deficit, any further expansion in the business that nations and their citizens do with each other would be limited to that which can be financed by the newly mined gold that enters the world's money system each year. It isn't enough.

Many people have worried about the potential problem for a decade and more and have proposed creation of additional international financial structures that would provide the needed increase in the world's supply of usable money. As recently as last September, however, the U.S. Government was pooh-poohing the need for any such steps. The cautious men at the Treasury feared the ready availability of new international financial resources might tempt many nations—including their own—to follow profligate economic policies and let international balance-of-payments deficits run on and on.

The administration is pooh-poohing no longer. It is now inviting financial authorities the world over to study seriously the various proposed means for adding to the world's money resources.

IN ITS FAVOR

In moving boldly into a new world of international financial arrangements, the administration has one important thing going for it that has no counterpart on the domestic economic policy side.

Domestic economic problems are old and familiar—and so are the various plans and programs for their solutions. Such programs immediately become involved in controversy. But international financing problems are new—to the United States, at least.

There are no neatly drawn lines of opinion—no clear-cut partisan positions—few problems of myth versus reality. If this makes wrong decisions more likely, as it may, it also makes bold experimentation more possible.

Mental Health Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety which I have the honor of serving as chairman recently completed hearings on mental health and mental retardation and favorably reported the legislation to the full committee.

I believe this legislation to be most important to the health and welfare of our citizens and am most hopeful that we will be able to bring this bill to the floor of the House in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert Q. Maisel wrote an article entitled, "How We Can Eliminate Our Overcrowded State Mental Hospitals," which appeared in the August issue of the Reader's Digest.

This article demonstrates the necessity for action to be taken in the field of mental health and mental retardation and, therefore, I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

HOW WE CAN ELIMINATE OUR OVERCROWDED STATE MENTAL HOSPITALS

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

(NOTE.—Farsighted communities throughout the Nation are discovering that "hometown treatment" is the key in providing more economical—and far more effective—help for the mentally ill.)

More than half a million Americans are still confined in State mental hospitals—mammoth, isolated institutions built in the days when the best we could do for the mentally ill was to lock them behind barred windows.

Though these monster hospitals are no longer the snakepits they once were, most psychiatrists and hospital administrators regard them as relics that hamper rather than hasten the cure of the mentally ill. And they freely predict their early abandonment. Within 25 years, declares Dr. Robert H. Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, "mental hospitals as we know them today will have ceased to exist."

Behind these predictions lie the tranquilizing drugs and their newer companions, the psychic energizers for the deeply depressed. These drugs have made it possible to treat most of the mentally ill effectively right in their own hometowns.

How much hometown treatment can accomplish is demonstrated by the case of a young mother in Chattanooga. She had given birth to a beautiful, normal baby girl. But one night her husband awoke to hear her sobbing, over and over, "I'm no good, and I've given you a no-good baby." For the next few days she alternated between periods of violent reproach of herself, her husband and her infant and even more alarming periods in which she sat motionless and staring. Her family physician diagnosed her as a classic case of post partum melancholia—a kind of crackup that hits some women right after the stress of childbirth.

If this had happened a few years ago there would have been no place to treat her in Chattanooga. She would have been taken to Tennessee's Eastern State Hospital near Knoxville, 120 miles away. In that old, 2,600-bed custodial institution she would have faced the prospect of up to a year's confinement and the possibility of lingering indefinitely in hopeless separation from her husband and child.

But fortunately this was 1963. Her doctor made just one local phone call. Then he took her for a 5-minute ride to the new Moccasin Bend Psychiatric Hospital, a wide-windowed, rambling structure surrounded by gardens.

At its entrance the young mother was welcomed by the attractive nursing director, Beulah Allen, who led her to a sunlit cafeteria where men and women patients were eating and talking as if at a resort hotel. There, over coffee, Nurse Allen explained how "we'll get you well again."

Together the two women toured the hospital. Patients, busy at ping-pong tables and shuffleboard courts, paused to greet her. Nurse Allen gave her a choice of a room to herself or one with two other women. Soon after, the hospital's director, Dr. Nat Winston, Jr., came to talk with her. An hour later she swallowed her first antidepression pill. That night she slept soundly. It was her first full night's sleep in more than a week.

After barely a week of drug treatment and psychotherapy, the young mother asked to use a sewing machine "to make something for my baby." A few days later she asked, "May my husband visit me?" That evening, she greeted her husband as if she had never been ill. And a few days later Dr. Winston asked him to bring her baby. Cuddling the infant, she exclaimed, "But she's so beautiful. She's a perfect baby." Proudly, she showed her child to all her new friends.

She had been there 6 weeks when her husband and the baby made the last of their visits to Moccasin Bend. This time all three of them went home.

Such rapid recoveries are common at Moccasin Bend because the hospital differs in every detail from our traditional mental institutions. Though it has only 150 beds, it is staffed by 6 doctors and 15 registered nurses—a greater complement than that of many custodial institutions with 10 times its patient roll.

Instead of crowding its patients into 50- or 100-cot wards, it preserves their dignity by offering private and semiprivate accommodations. And it permits patients all sorts of personal possessions; radios, TV sets, bedside lamps, cosmetics, clothes. There are no locked doors, no fences. Yet unauthorized departures are a rarity.

These facilities and services are costly. Tennessee spends an average of $14 a day on patients at Moccasin Bend, compared with barely $3 on those in its old custodial hospitals. But this is only a seeming extravagance. For, under intensive treatment, Moccasin Bend patients recover and are discharged, on the average, in less than 8 weeks. Spending much more per day often results in spending substantially less per patient.

Across the country from Tennessee, the State of Oregon has constructed, just outside Portland, a similar small intensive-treatment hospital (the Dammasch) with 300 beds and a doctor for every 30 patients. This hospital treated and released 1,400 patients last year. Its per diem cost is $14. But with an average length of stay of only 62 days, its per-patient cost is barely $800, in contrast with $2,000 to $3,000 spent per patient at Oregon's two old-style mental institutions.

But such community-based mental hospitals are by no means the only new method of providing hometown treatment for the mentally ill. With the new tranquilizers, general hospitals no longer have to fear disturbances from psychiatric patients. As a result, more than 600 community general hospitals—1 in every 10—now have set up psychiatric units.

In Georgia, for example, all mental patients formerly were sent to a single, colossal, custodial institution, the 12,000-bed State Mental Hospital at Milledgeville. Today Georgia's county health departments refer nearly 600 cases a year to phychiatric units in 5 general hospitals nearer the patients' homes. The daily cost to the State is high—$30 to $35 a day per patient. But under intensive treatment the average patient is hospitalized only 28 days.

In another innovation, some 100 community hospitals now operate day-treatment programs for housewives who return home in time to prepare suppers for their families. Sixty hospitals have instituted night-treatment programs for patients, thus enabling them to preserve their daytime jobs. And a small but growing number of hospitals have added weekend treatment for businessmen and students.

Physicians have long known that mental illnesses can most successfully be treated if tackled in their earliest stages. Yet when mental health clinics were set up for this purpose, the therapy provided was so time consuming that only a fraction of those needing help could be treated. Long waiting lists were almost universal. Now, however, the efficacy of the new drug therapy has enabled many clinics to set up emergency services—mental first aid stations—to tide the troubled over a crisis. Some clinics are open 24 hours a day, and their staffs are trained in special techniques for giving brief psychotherapy.

At New York's City Hospital at Elmhurst, for example, such a clinic has handled more than 3,000 emergency cases in the last 5 years. Similar "drop in" clinics are now operating in Berkeley, Calif., Suffolk County and Brooklyn, N.Y., Providence, R.I., and Philadelphia.

Up to now, most of the new facilities for hometown treatment have been operated as separate independent projects. But a few communities have seized upon another opportunity: the integrated operation of an emergency service, a general hospital inpatient unit, day and night part-time facilities, an outpatient clinic and an aftercare service.[1] How effective such comprehensive mental-health centers can be has been convincingly demonstrated in San Mateo County, Calif., where the psychiatric section of the County Hospital provides a complete range of services. In the five other counties of the San Francisco Bay area, admissions to State mental hospitals rose by 24 percent in the 3 years from 1959 to 1962. In San Mateo, however, State hospital admissions dropped by nearly one-third.

Comparable results have been achieved by centers in Boston, Providence, and Kansas City. On the basis of these experiences, two States are now moving rapidly to set up comprehensive community facilities for all their people. Connecticut is constructing community-based hospitals of 75 to 100 beds which will provide part-time and outpatient services. Illinois has recently approved a bond issue to build six $8 million mental-health centers so located that the majority of its citizens will be no more than an hour's drive from a full range of mental-health services.

To stimulate the construction of such centers, President Kennedy recently proposed a Federal grant-in-aid plan, under which the Federal Government would put up from 45 to 75 percent of the cost of building community mental-health centers. A bill aimed at implementing the plan was passed by the Senate late in May.

Such centers will cost little more to operate than the old-style mental hospitals. And the taxpayer will carry less of the burden. As long as mental illness spelled years of confinement, none but the rich could afford the cost of private treatment. Thus, 97 percent of all the mentally ill had to be cared for by a form of socialized medicine in our State hospitals. Now that short-term care is possible for most of the mentally ill, mental health insurance has become practicable.

Already, 58 of the 83 Blue Cross hospital service plans provide for at least 21 days of care for nervous or mental disorders; 70 percent of all Blue Shield plans provide partial coverage for physicians' services. Thus a large part of the community mental health centers' costs will be met in the same way as those of general hospitals—partly by payments from patients. Tax-raised funds will pay only for services to the truly indigent.

Far more important than such economic considerations, however, are the tremendous human benefits that nationwide, hometown treatment will make possible. Today, every community can accomplish what Chattanooga and San Mateo County—and scores of other communities—have already proved practical.

---

[1] See "Phone Amsterdam 91-51-11," the Reader's Digest, November 1962.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on Human Rights, a bipartisan State agency, has recently issued a statement and resolution on the current civil rights crisis facing the Nation. Because they are lucid and pertinent to the issue now facing us, I commend both to the attention of all Members. I should like to emphasize the point made in the Governor's commission's resolution:

That civil rights legislation goes beyond partisan politics and should therefore receive the vigorous support of both Republicans and Democrats as they move forward toward the objective of obtaining liberty and justice for all.

Also, I should like to call attention to the points made in paragraph 2 of the resolution calling for provisions to strengthen President Kennedy's bill. All four of these suggestions, I believe, are of the utmost importance if we are to achieve real progress and sound practice in the civil rights field, and I have incorporated all of them in my own bill, H.R. 7702.

The resolution and statement follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT REGIONAL MEETING OF THE WISCONSIN GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, IN SHEBOYGAN, ON JULY 8, 1963

Resolved:

1. That the Governor's Commission on Human Rights declare its strong support of a comprehensive Civil Rights Act encompassing the areas of voting, public accommodations, education and employment, as proposed by President Kennedy to the Congress of the United States;

2. That the Governor's Commission on Human Rights urge the strengthening of this proposed legislation by the inclusion of provisions: (a) which would make it unlawful to engage in voter intimidation; (b) which would extend the Attorney General's authority to initiate court suits in any area of civil rights; (c) which would establish a Federal fair employment practices commission; (d) which would make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Federal agency;

3. That the Governor's Commission on Human Rights declare its conviction that civil rights legislation goes beyond partisan politics and should therefore receive the vigorous suport of both Republicans and Democrats as they move forward toward the objective of obtaining liberty and justice for all; and

4. That the Governor's Commission on Human Rights call the people of Wisconsin to full awareness of the problems which this proposed legislation seeks to meet, and urge them to express their concern to their elected Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, JUNE 4, 1963

In the light of the present situation, the Executive Committee of the Governor's Commission on Human Rights makes the following statement to the people of Wisconsin:

"The massiveness and persistence of the racial demonstrations taking place in both the North and the South are evidence that Negro Americans are no longer willing to accept the long-established patterns of exclusion and segregation in our national life. They have been told to wait, but they suspect that wait means never. The policy of gradualism has been discredited in their eyes. They realize that justice too long delayed is justice denied.

"We find it commendable, therefore, that Negro Americans are demonstrating a heightened sense of human dignity in their refusal to accept second-class citizenship in a country that promises liberty and justice to all. We rejoice that in this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation they are pressing for their rights—rights promised, but not yet fulfilled, in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. In so doing, they are asserting their Constitutional right to peaceful and lawful assemblage.

"Negro Americans, however, should not carry the whole battle. All men of good will ought to be involved for it is simply a fact that the right to vote, and the right of free access to places of public accommodation, the right to compete for a better job on the basis of individual talent, the right to buy or rent a home one can afford in the neighborhood of his choice, are rights so basic that they should not be questioned. Thus the commission does not accept the recent defeat of a fair housing bill in the Wisconsin Legislature as a final answer to this problem. With or without such a law, open occupancy should prevail in our society. The American commitment to freedom should be honored on our common life.

"To this end, the Governor's Commmission on Human Rights calls on the people of Wisconsin to a greater understanding, appreciation and practice of human rights. It calls on them to support the legitimate aspirations of those who would be freed from the evils of prejudice and discrimination. It calls on them to make Wisconsin a State in which all men, whatever their race, creed, color, or national origin, may feel at home and live in dignity and mutual respect."

Puerto Rican Commonwealth Day, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago today, a form of government without precedent in all the world was established on the island of Puerto Rico under the ensign of the United States. Since then, this experiment in elevating a people from semicolonial status to virtual autonomy within the Federal Union has proved to be one of the happiest political concepts devised. The despair that once stalked the streets and fields of an impoverished land has given way to a confidence and serenity inevitable with a government fostering self-rule, a progressively higher standard of living, and the development of the whole man. Gov. Muñoz-Martin and his people are justifiably proud of the island's vastly improved economic posture; they are pleased almost as much with the ever-widening periphery of cultural attainments.

On the mainland of the United States, the thousands of Puerto Ricans who have traveled northward to live have experienced a corresponding economic and social uplift, ever since the first group of immigrants settled in the Metropolitan New York area. It is always difficult to be the most recent immigrant arrival, and there will always be some bitterness and prejudice at the lower end of the economic ladder. But the initiative and industry of the Puerto Rican people, combined with the encouragement of the Federal, State, and local governments in urging equal employment opportunity, fair housing, and better education have provided a progressively better living situation. My own district contains an excellent example of a Spanish-speaking community making great strides toward social betterment.

The Puerto Rican people, whether in the Commonwealth or in the States, have experienced enormous progress in every area of man's quest. The economic, social, and cultural advancement on the island itself serves also to inform and correct the naive and the gullible. Certainly, Puerto Rican progress is an indispensable weapon in our fight to stem the advance of the antihumanists who seek to establish communism in this hemisphere. But it is primarily, in the last analysis, a tribute to the hard work and dedication of the Puerto Rican people.

Tweedledee and Tweedledum Is Theme of Kennedy Approach to Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by William S. White, "Kennedy Takes Different Views," is a clear illustration of the confusion, the double standards, the bewildering policies of the Kennedy administration in meeting the critical problems facing the Nation:

ON CRISES KENNEDY TAKES DIFFERENT VIEWS

(By William S. White)

Crisis is piling up crisis for the Kennedy administration in Congress. The state of the Union is deeply troubled—and deeply dangerous.

Crisis No. 1 is the President's demand for sweeping, and in some respects highly dubious, civil rights legislation to appease spreading and frequently lawless Negro demonstrations. These are pointing to an ugly crescendo in a "march on Washington" in August plainly designed to frighten Congress into doing the will of the militant Negro leaders, wise or unwise, constitutional or unconstitutional though that will may be.

Undeniably, all this can readily create an intolerable national social chaos—and possibly even something worse. And no detached analysis can avoid the conclusion that the President's persistent refusal to speak out firmly against this attempt at government by intimidation has done nothing at all to ease the problem and may, indeed, have done much to inflame it by encouraging Negro extremism.

Crisis No. 2 is the President's urgent appeal for emergency legislation to block a nationwide railroad strike, threatened for July 30, which undeniably could create national economic chaos—and possibly strangulation. In this instance no detached analysis can avoid the conclusion that the President is in no way to blame and that he is at least coming to grips with the great problem of the "national interest" strike.

The unions, having lost in the very Supreme Court itself their effort to force the railroads to continue an old and indefensible featherbedding practice of hiring thousands of men more than they need or can use, had themselves decided to try the tactic of mass intimidation—in their case by striking.

THE SOLUTIONS

What the President has proposed is a strike-free period of 2 years, to be accomplished by empowering the Interstate Commerce Commission to impose binding work rules on both sides for the period. It is, of course, far from the perfect solution. But it has the great value of being the only solution that seems at all possible in order to protect this Nation from a paralysis of transportation which this Nation simply cannot permit. And if it is not compulsory arbitration, as the White House says it isn't and as critics say it is, then it is not more than a whereas away from that ultimate method of settlement.

On this issue the President frankly and courageously challenges the enormous power of big labor, which is already marshaling to fight his bill on the characteristic assumption that any settlement not granting big labor all its demands, and all at once, is no settlement at all.

On the racial issue, however, the President bows to minority-group pressure on the theory that any settlement not granting the Negro leaders all they demand, and all at once, is no settlement at all.

LOOKING AT THE CONTRAST

No doubt many interesting morals could be drawn from this curious tableau of a President standing resolutely for reasonableness in the one case and in the other case associating the great power of his office with irrational extremism. The effect upon his moral authority in the railroad crisis of his unwillingness to stand for reasonable solution in the racial crisis will be something which only later events can weigh.

At least one moral, however, is as clear as the July sunshine. He, a Democratic President, surely friendly to big labor, has found that 90 or 92 or 99 percent of his devotion is not enough for big labor. He has found that only 100 percent submission, every day and every year, will suffice.

When will he accept the patent truth that precisely the same is true of the professional civil rightists? Already the all-or-nothing spirit of these is being shown toward a White House which is asking for them from Congress far more than many fair men can grant. But already these professional civil rightists are striking at both the President and his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, with the cry that all they are demanding in behalf of the Negroes is not enough.

The Common Denominator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President has submitted a program to reduce the deficit in payments as well as a program of taxation, it seems to me that the attached address by Robert C. Tyson, chairman, finance committee, United States Steel Corp., delivered before the Eastern Area Conference of the Financial Executives Institute, at Spring Lake, N.J., June 14, 1963, is most timely and touches directly on the problems with which we are dealing.

The address follows:

THE COMMON DENOMINATOR

(By Robert C. Tyson)

It is an especial pleasure to meet with you and talk over some of the problems, the opportunities and obligations, of our profession. I experience in being with you something of the same sort of satisfaction that one who has been away gets when he returns to his own home and people. There is also involved in meetings such as these, convened by people who carry similar responsibilities in their own organizations, a gratifying sense of progress and accomplishment as through friendly—if occasionally controversial—discussion they seek to perfect the techniques, improve the standards and develop the new procedures and safeguards of the important functions they perform. The purpose is, indeed, the worthy one of self-improvement on which not only personal achievement but capacity to render good guidance and service to the community at large both rest.

I note from the program that your special interest on the occasion of these meetings is "cash"; and what a very nice, alluring subject that is. The mere fact that it is selected for your concentrated examination proclaims that all that there is to be known about it is not yet known, even by those whose duties require frequent, if not continuous, preoccupation with it. This also is true; and so your program is a worthy one that will, I am sure, prove constructive.

In a more general sense I think that matters pertaining to money and the various designations it receives, such as profits, taxes, wages, prices, depreciation and so on, are among the most obscure, the least understood features of our economy. At the same time they are absolutely vital to the functioning of the economy; and to bring it right home to our own doorstep, it seems pretty clear that financial officers of business firms have a rather special opportunity to perceive and portray the functioning of money in our economy—and hence an implicit obligation to do so.

THE ONE COMMON DENOMINATOR

Note, for example, that money is the one common denominator of every business transaction—now that primitive barter has become largely history. One-half of each business transaction is money or credit. Business firms assemble factories, materials, labor, and services in order to provide something for market. But they all have to be expressed in money equivalents if they are to be compared, measured, and combined to furnish intelligible guidance to enterprise. And whose job is it to see that the right amount of money at the right time is available to pay for them? The financial officer, of course. So he has to have one foot over in the labor market trends, another one in materials market trends, another in a thing called depreciation.

To do his job he has to have records, and these are compiled by the accountants. So the financial officer has to have another foot in the accounting profession. Perhaps he had better have two feet there so that he can really walk, rather than just hop around in accounting procedures and statements, thus avoiding the misinterpretations of accounting data often unhappily made by economists, legislators labor leaders and other nonaccountants.

The financial officer is responsible for lodging the firm's money in appropriate places—primarily banks. So he has to have another foot over in banking theory and practice—you see he is getting to be some sort of a centipede. He also becomes a central figure in any new financing undertaken by his firm—so there goes another foot out into the investment banking and capital markets areas.

When it comes to timing the selling of bonds or of investing corporate or pension trust funds, it is well for him, if he is to do so advantageously, to have a foot in the economic forecasting profession. When a firm is setting up a pension system the financial officer had very much better be "on the job," for that is an area full of quicksands for the financially unwary, and a foot or two in the actuarial profession's concepts and procedures is mighty important. When it comes to extending credit and establishing collection policies, the financial officer needs to have a couple more feet for those areas.

When it comes to taxes, to fiscal and monetary policies which may rescue or wreck a country and its business firms, I sometimes, almost despairingly, feel that my financial officer centipede might just as well give up growing additional feet and start growing hands to throw up. However that mood fades as relization rises that if those whose job is to administer the common denominator of all business transactions fail to provide leadership in preserving the integrity and productive usefulness of our money, then leadership from those less well equipped by their occupations to do so is not a rational prospect.

Perhaps I have said enough to indicate the breadth of understanding I think it well for the financial officer to cultivate and the corresponding breadth of opportunity and obligation that goes with it. Perhaps another way of saying much the same thing is to point out that he whose business it is to deal in the common denominator of all business is sure to find that the numerators with which he becomes involved are both numerout and important. It the remainder of my time I am going to try to outline some of the situations where confusion needs to be dissipated by clarification, where the data compiled by accountants and used by financial officers are too often misused or abused by others. They are of proper and especial concern to financial officers but, beyond that, they are of vital importance to all citizens.

PROFIT FACTS AND FANCIES

We might just as well start with the confusing array of ideas about profits. The confusion, the misapprehensions, the misrepresentations, the emotions, the controversies that enshroud the subject of profits are almost without end. It is indeed hard to know where to begin. Even such a seemingly simple thing as what is to be regarded as a profit or a loss is not a matter of unanimous agreement. The accounting profession has one definition of profits, the economic profession a different one. The taxing authority has still another definition for its purposes. The financial officer's interest spans all three of them. Each concept may be appropriate for its own special purposes. Most people, however, do not know there are several concepts and different measurements of profits and so can be led astray when a measurement inappropriate to the particular issue is inadvertently or deliberately employed.

Consider, for example, that there may be some nonbusiness groups who feel that their self-interests might better be served if corporate profits could be made to look very large. They would not use the economist's concept of profit, for that concept does not begin to count incoming dollars as profits until not only all the accountant's costs have been covered, but an amount equal to interest on the investment has also first been

secured. They might not even accept the accountant's calculation of income or profit. Instead they might hold up to display an item called "profits before taxes" which is an approximately double size figure vis-a-vis accounting profits. Certainly no one bearing responsibility for the results of a business enterprise could consider it a legitimate measurement of profits. In fact the term tends to confuse the manner in which a certain cost—the income tax—is computed with the fact that, regardless of how it is computed, once it is determined, it becomes a cost like any other one that must be met before any profit under any accepted definition can be shown. I imagine, nevertheless, that we might all be surprised to learn how many people have gained a quite exaggerated notion of the true extent of stockholders' profits in America due, at least in part, to the careless or sometimes intentional publicizing by those groups of data which, if not technically false, are at least loaded with semantic deception. As a quizzical test on the extent to which anyone may have been taken in, he might jot down sometime what part of gross national product he thinks is represented by corporate dividends; then he can look up the actual figure and see how close he came to the facts. Most people will be surprised to learn that the figure is less than 3 percent. This can emphasize a need for publicly establishing factual accuracy about recorded profits.

CASH FLOW

But no one needs to stop at that point for a new wrinkle seems to be becoming the vogue to minimize the perilous profit squeeze situation in which American enterprise has been gripped. I refer to so-called "cash flow," which is beginning to appear in Government publications and in testimony of Government officials before congressional committees. A suspicious person—and I sometimes wonder if I am not unduly that from time to time—might opine that those who for whatever queer reasons wish to perpetuate profit-squeezing, despite a rising public alarm about its adverse consequences, may think they could soothe that alarm by pointing to a dandy, bigger-than-ever cash flow that corporate America now "enjoys." This would be another instance where a technical measurement of a money amount designed for one purpose is misappropriated for a different and unwarranted purpose.

I am indeed surprised that cash flow should be considered by anyone as an illuminating measure of corporate health or well-being. It is a measurement originally devised, I believe, by security analysts. It has no hard and fast definition. Mostly it is regarded as being the sum of profits and of depreciation cost—about which latter I will have a word to say in a moment. For the security analyst the sum of profits plus depreciation may provide a measure of management discretion to choose between paying dividends, paying off debt or spending money to replace depreciated facilities. But as a measure of corporate success it is just as fallacious to add these two items as it is to add back taxes to profits.

The misuse of this type of measurement may be partly attributable to the vocabulary quirks in which the financial fraternity indulges when speaking of depreciation as a source of funds. If those supposed to know of what they speak say that depreciation is a source of funds, then those less well-informed can say, "The bigger the source, the better." So perhaps we had "better mind our language," as mothers used to admonish. The fact is, of course, that the only continuing source of cash that any firm has out of which to cover all its costs is its sales receipts from customers. Among those costs are the prepaid expenditures for facilities. It takes a long time to get them covered. Depreciation is the record of their cost slowly being covered. To hold that big depreciation cost in the guise of big cash flow is good for a company is the same as saying that the bigger its costs the better off it is. And that is plain nonsense. Here, then, is another area in which clarification of public understanding is necessary for establishment of prudent public policy.

UNDISTRIBUTED PROFIT

Still dealing with differences between professional and popular concepts of profits, one should note and the once quite prevalent and still too widespread belief that so-called undistributed profit or retained earnings is a stagnant pool of purchasing power—a pile of cash siphoned off from the economy—that ought to be put back to work through taxation or its transfer to others in the form of higher wages, dividends or purchases. The fact is, of course, that undistributed profit is a tag that accountants put on part of the money that has come into and, by reinvestment or debt repayment, passed through and out of the firm for the most part. More than that, reinvested income, as this item in increasingly called, is the only valid measure of a firm's savings margin. It represents the most essential "seed corn" for progress that exists in industrial America. This is because only as a firm has prospects of profit adequate to pay dividends with something left over for reinvestment has it any reason for or can it, out of its own resources, engage in new job-creating productive investment or attract funds from others to enable it to do so. Profit squeezing and progress stopping are thus one and the same thing in our economy. For it to be undertaken intentionally—perhaps as a steppingstone toward more and more government control—could be sufficiently tragic; but for it to be unintentionally effected through ignorance of profit facts and functions would indeed be truly pitiable. Financial officers, I would judge, may well have especial responsibilities in promoting clear understanding of the concepts and consequences of profits.

INFLATION

In doing so they, like everybody else, will have to face the disconcerting facts of inflation and taxation and how they affect profit measurements and prospects. Nobody doubts any more that this Nation has experienced a great inflation, by any definition, since the midthirties. Nor, with an irredeemable paper currency, looming Federal deficits and continuing fiat wage cost inflation, is there certainty that the inflation has run its full course. The dollar buys far less of labor, of materials, of plant and equipment, of government and of living than it used to do.

Similarly, no one doubts any more that the dollar total of annual depreciation charges on a plant bought many years ago will not provide enough buying power to equal that originally expanded for it. More dollars than that must be found if the company is just to stay even—if it is to be able to replace the plant when it is worn out. Those "more dollars" have to be earned as profit dollars—there is nowhere else to get them. The new burden on profits is thus to make good the inflation-wrought deficiency in depreciation amounts. There is thus less profit available to perform the normal functions of profits than there seems to be; and this is something to be remembered by every one in appraising the profit facts of our economy.

THE GREAT TAX DILEMMA

That brings me to taxes. The plain fact is that we are in a terrific dilemma with respect to taxation in our land. There is no readily apparent escape from its horns within what many regard as the present limits of American fortitude in halting welfare spending. Let me spell it out briefly: It is now generally recognized that over the years we have established a type and degree of taxation that seriously interferes with the effective operation of our economy. It is a type of taxation which was described by Karl Marx as making despotic inroads on property rights and so intended to overthrow our form of society. The tax features are steep progressive income taxation, punishing profits taxation and capital eroding estate and capital gains taxation. These simultaneously impair both the incentive and the ability to create new private wealth, while steadily eroding existing private wealth. Our recognition of this truth is often, perhaps usually, in the observation that our tax structure impedes our economic growth. The case for reform in the type of and reduction in the rates of taxation is thus clear—and by reform I do not mean so-called loophole closing to reduce further the incentives to the more productive. I mean rather the substituting of equitable for present taxation. This, then, is one horn of the dilemma.

The other horn arises out of the fact that, without expenditure reduction, tax reduction means augmenting existing dangerous deficits that can, by the evidence of history, ultimately result in currency debauchery. That would also be bad for there is no surer way to overturn the existing order of society than to debauch the currency. Both horns of the dilemma are sharp and strong. One is destructive taxation; the other is destructive deficits.

There are, of course, ways for a resolute people to escape the tax-deficit dilemma. One of them is, for example, to avoid or minimize the deficits, not so much by reducing taxes, but by gradually substituting more nearly proportional taxation for the present steep progressive taxation. This would greatly release incentives compared to the present system. Thus progressive taxation, with rates on individual incomes running up to 90 percent or more, confronts anyone capable of more than average productivity with the prospect that additional income resulting from added effort or investment on his part will be taxed away at much more than average rates. So his incentive to do so is undermined. Can you, for example, imagine any possibility of negotiating a union wage contract which called for less than straight-time pay for overtime work? Yet this is exactly the situation created by progressive taxation.

There is no such thing as incentive taxation—no one is inspired to earn income for the sake of paying it out in taxes. There is, however, a great difference in the degree to which different kinds of taxes act as disincentives. We have the worst kind in that respect. If we substituted for it a less bad type then the same total tax load now carried might be levied in alternate ways that could have far less growth-deterring consequences than now prevail. Increases in production, employment and tax bases might accordingly be expected; deficits might thus be narrowed and the expenditure reduction needed to avoid them entirely thus minimized.

Another way to escape from the dilemma is for the Nation to somehow find the courage to insist that there must be expenditure reductions. This is obvious arithmetic. It may not be practical politics. It is, however, about the only position that those with insight into these matters can take. For otherwise the deficits will certainly occur; they will be dangerous; and the extenuating rationalization that they are not really harmful but may even serve a more than compensating "prime the pump" purpose is a quite unsupportable proposition.

Thus elementary monetary arithmetic tells us—particularly those aware of the accounting profession's double-entry, credit-debit principles—that government cannot give out dollars to increase public purchasing with-

out taking them from the governed in some fashion. The taking and the giving offset each other. The arithmetic is not changed if the taking through taxes is reduced and that through borrowing equivalently increased. The net effect remains zero.

There remains, then, only the possibility that the dollars to cover deficits are not to be secured directly from the public but are, instead, to be printed or newly created by the debt monetization process that is the modern equivalent of the money printing press. This is the inflationary financing of deficits. Very few economists openly advocate this, but it may be that some of those who plump for deficits believe that continuing inflation is not evil.

There can be and, I suppose, there is a good deal of argument about whether there is such a thing as just the right amount of inflationary deficiteering from the economic point of view. To me the basic arithmetic involved is not changed—it is only obscured and perhaps a bit delayed. But beyond that, the controlling consideration to me is not any controversial economic consequence; it is the basic immorality of the process. I note that throughout history when governments resort to inflationary printing press techniques of financing, either overtly or indirectly, it generally ends up as the sinful and systematic fleecing of all creditors—and many of them are the "little folk" in our land: the savings depositors, the life insurance and savings bondholders, the pension and other fixed income receivers. This reinforces my belief that there is no proper place in American fiscal policy for deliberate resort to inflationary means of financing peacetime deficits.

Undoubtedly there may be other ways of escaping from the dilemma. However the most practical one and one which is also feasible would be a combination of tax reduction and expenditure reduction. A tax reduction that would release individual incentives would require heavier reduction in the higher income bracket rates. And reduction in government expenditures could be in many areas, and especially in those subsidized operations conducted in competition with private enterprise.

In concluding these brief remarks I would like to emphasize again that money—the medium of exchange—is the common denominator of our economy. Through its income flows, as wages and profits, the basic incentives are expressed. Through its transfers, specialized production and diversified consumption are bridged. It is in terms of it that all business costs and other calculations must be expressed. The preservation of its integrity is essential. Without it the economy as we know it would perish, as also would individual liberty and our form of government. These matters should therefore command the concern and require the insight of all. I cannot better express it than by quoting the words in a recent speech of Senator HARRY BYRD, whom I regard as a great statesman and patriot. He said, "It is up to all of us who believe in our system of government to fight for the kind of progress we know to be sound; the kind of progress that is built on the faith in the future that only a nation blessed with our fundamental freedoms can have."

Cotton's Survival Is at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. On Sunday, July 14, the Augusta Chronicle—Augusta, Ga.—carried an editorial emphasizing the need for the elimination of the two-price system on cotton. This supports the position I have taken here in the House. The editorial is reprinted below so as to become a part of the RECORD:

COTTON'S SURVIVAL IS AT STAKE

One of the most illuminating statements to be made on the complex plight of America's cotton industry came Friday from an Augustan, Graniteville Co. cotton buyer, J. Ben Kyser. His message reached a receptive, sympathetic audience at the American Cotton Congress in Dallas, Tex. But it needs also to be understood by all Americans—including many Augusta area residents—who have on interest in the future of cotton production and manufacture.

Most important, perhaps, it needs to be grasped by those in our legislative and executive branches of Federal Government who establish and administer agricultural policy.

Kyser did not dwell at length on provisions of the existing two-price cotton system or on the relative merits of alternative plans now being considered by Congress. What he did was simply to demonstrate, in graphic economic terms, that the two-price system must be eliminated if the cotton industry is to survive at anything approaching current production levels.

Speaking for "a company and an industry with a genuine fondness and attachment for cotton," Kyser told the Dallas gathering there is only one reason textile plants have turned increasingly to manmade fibers in recent years. That reason, he said, is price. Through the two-price system, which forces American manufacturers to pay $42.50 more for a bale of U.S. cotton than their foreign competitors, cotton is losing its ability to compete with synthetics on the domestic market. Kyser reviewed a detailed chart, step by step, to illustrate that cotton today costs a mill 15 cents a pound more than rayon, including the differences in initial cost and cost of processing. The purchase price alone is 12 cents a pound higher for cotton.

As a result, said the Augustan, firms such as the Graniteville Co. which for years processed no fiber but cotton are now beginning to use synthetics. Cotton's share of all U.S. fiber consumption decreased from 65.3 percent in 1961 to 59.5 percent in 1962, the lowest in history. Consumption of cotton by U.S. mills last year was close to 9 million bales. This year it is being used at the rate of about 8 million bales.

The two-price system was instituted in 1956 to encourage exports of cotton. But exports, said the Graniteville buyer, are declining.

Congress cannot afford to wait another year to strike the two-price system from the lawbooks. Ben Kyser's address adds timely emphasis to that point.

Law Books, U.S.A.

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a pioneer sponsor of the classics of democracy program that in its 10 years of operation has carried into the nooks and corners of the world, in paperback editions translated into many languages, the classics that inspired our own forefathers, I commend the Federal Bar Association and the World Peace Through Law Committee of the American Bar Association for their sponsorship of a contributing program, supported by private contributions from the members of the bar associations, and aimed at placing in the hands of lawyers in many foreign lands a selected number of paperback books dealing with the philosophy and spirit of the American law concept.

This program, inaugurated by the Federal Bar Association during the presidency of our distinguished colleague from Maryland, Mr. Lankford, is well outlined in purpose and scope in an article in the July 1963 edition of the Federal Bar News by Richard N. Flint and Scott Hodes. Mr. Hodes is the able son of the Honorable Barnet Hodes, former corporation counsel of the city of Chicago and presently heading with Col. Jacob Arvey one of the largest law firms in Chicago. It was Barnet Hodes who arranged and masterminded the largest political rally every staged in an American presidential campaign. This was in the final week of the campaign of 1948 and from the gigantic demonstration in Chicago, Harry Truman rode the crest of the wave to victory. The Chicago rally was definitely the turning point in the 1948 campaign.

From the experience of 10 years with the classics of democracy program, I can speak with knowledge and some authority of the need and the field of usefulness of the Law Books, U.S.A. program. Before the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], and I appeared before the advisory board of USIA, composed of some of the country's outstanding editors and publishers, and obtained the Board's endorsement of paperbacks, printed in many languages and dialects and distributed at grassroots, the classics of our democracy were available in foreign lands only in expensive English editions on the shelves of libraries that few ever visited. Meanwhile Soviet paperbacks were everywhere. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson has credited the classics of democracy program, inexpensive translations reaching people at grassroots, with turning the tide in the battle for the hearts and minds of people.

I might explain for the benefit of the newer Members of the House that the classics of democracy program had its birth at a now historic luncheon of a distinguished group of Chicagoans that I was privileged to attend. Participating in the luncheon discussion were: Dr. Jerome Kerwin, chairman of the Charles P. Walgren Foundation, University of Chicago; Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor, Christian Century; A. T. Burch, then associate editor, and Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus, University of Chicago; Thomas B. Stauffer, a member of the faculty of Wilson Junior College with State Department background, the host at the luncheon; John McGinnis, president, Pennsylvania Lodge 225, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks; and Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, State Department visitor to the universities of India and other countries, a recognized authority in his field, as were the others in their respective fields.

This distinguished group formed itself into a permanent committee that for a

decade has been a driving force in what has proved probably the most effective program for reaching the hearts and minds of men in the history of our country. It is based upon something so simple that the wonder is why it was overlooked so long. That was the realization that the classics of democracy that inspired our forefathers in their search for more perfect structures of popular government would prove equally inspiring, if made available in native languages and at grass-roots, to the men and women in the newly independent nations of the world who are searching, as did our forefathers, for the most perfect governmental expression of the popular will.

When the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Feighan, and I first proposed the classics of democracy program to the Congress there was only one translation of the Federalist. That was in Spanish and it was out of print. Today it is available in many languages in inexpensive editions and is one of the most widely read books in the world. I am reliably informed that at all-African conferences practically every delegate has had a translated copy of the Federalist in his valise library. The Italian, German, and Arabic translations ran into several editions, and were widely heralded by the press.

So it has been with the other classics of democracy, once they were taken from their entombment on the seldom-visited shelves of large but widely separated libraries, translated into native languages, printed in paperbacks, put within the reach of people everywhere.

There is room and need for Law Books, U.S.A., which is in a specialized field. It can prove a formidable factor in the fight for the hearts and minds of people. That is the fight that is important. It is the fight that will be decisive. And especially in these new nations, now in their founding years, their power and influence in the ascendancy, it is important that the lawyers should know and have the very feel of the American concept of law. To this end, Law Books, U.S.A. should contribute. It is not a Federal project. It is not subject to the charge of propaganda. It can be the vehicle for the lawyers of the United States to speak to the lawyers of other lands, lawyers to lawyers, all joined in the common interest of making this world of ours a world of justice, equity and peace under law.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the article in the July Federal Bar News by Richard N. Flint and Scott Hodes, as follows:

THE YOUNG LAWYER SPEAKS

(By Richard N. Flint, and Scott Hodes)

FBA ANNOUNCES LAW BOOKS, U.S.A.

An itinerant book salesman in native dress walked into the Lagos, Nigeria, office of a large American book distributor and purchased a variety of paperback volumes dealing with the nature of the American legal system. The transaction consummated, he carefully packed the volumes in a canvas satchel, flung it over his bare shoulders, and embarked on a barefooted sales expedition which would carry him in succeding days to the outlying districts of his country. In these remote areas, local civil administrators and attorneys would examine each paperback in the satchel longingly and carefully before making his selection. His choice finally made, he would pay the equivalent of a week's wages for one or two of the volumes.

This incident, which actually happened less than 2 months previous to this writing, typifies the thirst for knowledge regarding American jurisprudence and the interest in the American legal system which is currently being exhibited by the emerging nations throughout the world. Reports from the United States Information Agency, the Department of State, and from Peace Corps volunteers reveal a great demand for American books of all kinds.

But the United States is not the only country which has noted this great thirst for books: the Communists presently export books in dozens of different languages to some 68 non-Communist countries. Last year this Communist effort accounted for the distribution of an estimated 40 million volumes, and not surprisingly, Communist literature is being supplied abroad at a price far below the combined costs of publishing, shipping, and distributing. Clearly, if the growing international demand for American books is not satisfied at a price within the range of foreign readers, the Communists will fill the void by providing books which best serve their own purposes.

Books, U.S.A.

In an effort to meet this demand for American books, the U.S. Information Agency, in its various programs, will distribute or assist in the distribution abroad of some 6 million volumes this year. One such program which is entitled "Books, U.S.A." permits the American public, the publishing industry, and USIA to join in a nonprofit campaign to ship overseas large numbers of English language paperbacks. The costs involved are being met by donations from great numbers of individual Americans, particularly those who understand the importance of books in the international arena of political, social, and economic competition. Interestingly enough, when USIA first released the "Books, U.S.A." blueprint to its oversea posts, an immediate response was received from the USIA mission in Djakarta, together with a personal check from each American staff member. In the words of the Djakarta staff, "(it) is difficult for us to imagine a number adequate to reach the saturation point of effective and useful distribution of the packets."

Lawbooks, USA

More important to us as lawyers, Americans abroad also report a profound interest in American jurisprudence, particularly among the emerging nations. Many of these nations are former British colonies, and the local leaders have been educated in English schools and are familiar with a common law system. Also, in these new nations, lawyers and law students constitute probably the greatest single source of political and intellectual leadership. A great proportion of the educated population has studied law, and these lawyers serve as the statesmen, politicans, civil servants, and administrators in the developing countries.

Thus, to meet this great need for books concerning the American legal system, the Federal Bar Association has joined with the World Peace Through Law Committee of the American Bar Association and the USIA in sponsoring a program of "Lawbooks, U.S.A." Under this program, interested Americans, particularly lawyers, will be encouraged to contribute the sum of $8.

For each $8 contributed, a packet of basic paperback books concerning the nature of our legal system will be sent to selected lawyers, jurists, teachers, and law students abroad. The donor's name will be enclosed with the packet of lawbooks, and the recipient will be encouraged to correspond directly with the American donor. Oceana Publications, Inc., has undertaken to coordinate the program on a nonprofit basis and will publicize it throughout the legal profession in the United States, although the books making up the packet have been selected from the lists of several publishers.

The seven paperback books in the packet have been selected by lawyers, law students, and law teachers in this country. Technical legal treatises have been bypassed since the intent is to select books dealing with the philosophy and spirit of our legal system. Although substitute titles may be necessary if the supply of a particular book is temporarily exhausted, a typical packet will contain the following: "Spirit of Liberty" by Learned Hand; "The Nature of the Judicial Process" by Benjamin Cardozo; "Talks on American Law" by Harold Berman; "Brandies Reader" by Erwin Pollack; "Equal Justice Under Law" by Carroll Moreland; "American Constitution Reader" by Robert McKay; and "American Jurisprudence Reader" by Thomas Cowan.

Final selection of recipients will be made by USIA, but lists of prospective recipients will be furnished by the FBA, ABA, American attorneys serving with the Peace Corps and by Judge Advocate Detachments in the emerging nations. The individual American donor may leave the choice entirely with USIA, or he may indicate a particular country within which he wishes his packet distributed.

The program has received the enthusiastic support of the executive committee of the FBA and deserves the support of the entire association. Lawyers taking part may rest assured that they have contributed to, in the words of Edward R. Murrow, "keeping the human spirit unshackled and the desire for freedom, alive."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my newsletter of July 20, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, 5TH DISTRICT, TEXAS, JULY 20, 1963

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The Presidential message on balance, that is, imbalance, of payments once again shows the President's misunderstanding of problem and solution to the problem. Because of Government programs and controls our Nation yearly must pay others more than they pay us. Further, others can collect by demanding our gold for their dollars while we hold foreign I O U's. While our foreign assets (according to the President) exceed our debts by $27 billion we are, because of our Government's policies, in danger of losing all our gold and devaluing the dollar. So the stage is set for our economic collapse. Because of our Government's fiscal policies, the world can demand $24 billion in gold and we have less than $4 billion with which to pay off, before dipping into the approximately $12 billion of gold which backs up and gives our dollar its value. All our gold now equals only $15.6 billion. So what does the President do? He imposes more financial straitjacketing. He seeks to cure the results of Federal controls and dictates by more Federal regulation and control, a 15-percent tax called interest equalization tax on the purchase by Americans of new or

outstanding foreign securities—a tax on the free flow of money, a wall to prevent the financial activities we have always encouraged in the past.

The President, despite the lengthy analysis, skirted the basic problems at the heart of the situation. Capitalism, the private enterprise system, thrives on freedom, not Federal intervention. The tax he proposes on the flow of money is no solution. Why doesn't the President and his advisers turn instead to fiscal responsibility? The President and his deficit financing advisers have forgotten the reasons for and the need for a federally balanced budget, reduction of debt, and straightforward reduction of taxes including tax rate reduction, instead of the fuzzy tortuous Presidential tax reform recommendations. If the President really wants to reduce the imbalance of payments why doesn't he not stop giving our money away. While we have the greatest debt in the world we continue to continue to give foreign aid all over the world. Even our increased exports are recognized to be the result largely of our own subsidy. We give foreign nations money and they buy from us. This is artificial growth. Further, that money remaining in foreign hands can be converted into our gold at their discretion. Is it any wonder that foreign nations have built up such dollar reserves, callable in gold? Indeed, in many instances foreign nations have refused to lower their tariffs after agreeing to do so to match our reduction because they have pleaded dollar shortage. Our foreign giveaway and disproportionate support of the U.N. are instances of our inability to live within our means and exercise financial self-discipline. It is high time the New Frontiersmen and other new Socialists including our President, Schlesinger, Heller, Galbraith, and others realize the imbalance of payments result from the big spending policies, deficit financing, Government in business and the increasing regulation and control of our society by Federal Government, under the liberal-radical Democrats.

Besides foreign aid gifts of our money, as an example of the liberal Democrats failing to see the answer, look at their political charges in the past of the need for low interest rates and criticism of increasing interest rates. Democrats demand low interest rates; as a result U.S. capital flows abroad to get higher rates. If the interest rates were higher at home the money would stay here. So instead of recognizing the need for raising the interest rates, the President seeks to prevent the outflow by taxing the money sent overseas.

DANGER IN TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Most important development this week was the beginning of talks on a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union. The danger is that the people of the United States could lose World War III without ever knowing that it had begun. Besides the cruel facts of history showing that the Soviet Union never honors its agreements, and that they ruthlessly broke the last test ban moratorium when it suited their purpose, my concern over the present negotiations is even greater because of a talk with by Dr. Edward Teller. Recognized as one of the world's greatest scientists, Dr. Teller's warnings should make us consider the implications of entering into agreements with the Russians on test bans. Here are some thoughts he gives us to ponder. "It is my conviction that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear weapons. I cannot prove this statement, but I will say to you categorically that no one can prove its opposite." With even the slightest indication that Russia is leading the United States in the development of nuclear explosives, how can anyone in this country be optimistic about a test ban agreement which will bind us because we honor our agreements, but will have no effect upon the activities of the Soviet Union because history proves they do not.

Dr. Teller also points out that the believes the Russians may be close to developing an antimissile missile. If they succeed, or if they can make us believe they are about to succeed and we have not developed such a weapon, then we have no defenses. Dr. Teller says: "In order to develop missile defenses one needs to test in the atmosphere, but one does not need big tests. No one, in or out of the Disarmament Agency has claimed that nuclear explosives under 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere can be detected. With experiments using small explosives, missile advances can be conducted. These small explosions made by the Russians, may seal our doom."

There are two conclusions here that should be apparent to even the most naive and certainly should be clear to the President, (1) We cannot detect their testing and, (2) We must continue our testing.

IN THE HOUSE THIS WEEK

Comic relief came in the guise of "boiled peanuts" and any laughter relieves tension on the floor. Yet if laughter seemed hollow it was because of the realization that this plea to remove boiled peanut acreage from Government control leaves other peanut and additional crop growers still under Federal Government dictation.

Grief came in the sudden death of Hjalmar Nygaard (a relative newcomer and younger Member in his second term) of a heart attack during debate on the ADP bill, and reminds us of our tensions. I was privileged to visit Hjalmar in his district and to know him. Once again the flags at half mast were an unwelcome sight at morning going to work.

Automatic Data Processing equipment (ADP) comprises the electronic brain computing machines now widely used by many agencies of the Government. In an effort to streamline Government, increase efficiency, and eliminate cost at an estimated savings of $100 million yearly, a bill (H.R. 5171) was presented to place the coordination of their joint use under the GSA (General Services Administration). Eight Government agencies disapproved, yet the Comptroller General recommended this program. Even though generally not well understood, the bill passed (ALGER for). Charges embodying economy and false economy were exchanged. I believe this effort to be sound and can succeed without transgression on each agency's jurisdiction and peculiar needs.

Value of U.S. Foreign-Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Celler Act of 1934 permitted the establishment of foreign-trade zones in U.S. ports of entry to exepdite and encourage our international commerce. Now, almost 30 years later, this farsighted and useful law continues to serve the business community.

In addition the first foreign-trade zone, in operation in New York City since 1937, zones are also located at New Orleans, San Francisco, Seattle, Toledo, and Mayaguez, Puerto Rico. Within the past 14 months we have seen the development of new subzones as manufacturing sites at Penuelas, Puerto Rico, and San Francisco, Calif. Use of a foreign-trade zone as a manufacturing site, particularly for the production of goods for export, presents distinct opportunities for business firms and for much-needed use of our labor force.

A timely article on the subject by Mr. Richard H. Lake, executive secretary of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, appeared in the July 1963 issue of the American Import & Export Bulletin, published in New York. It is entitled, "A Time-Tested Device for International Business." Under leave to insert these remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include this article, as follows:

MODERN UTILIZATION—A TIME-TESTED DEVICE FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

(By Richard H. Lake)

The Foreign-Trade Zones Act, and the zones established under this unique law, offer business firms the opportunity to operate at a U.S. site and, at the same time, enjoy many of the advantages of a firm located abroad. The zone concept is receiving increasing attention from business, industry, and public officials concerned with business expansion and industrial development. Whether or not you have had previous interest in the subject, it now merits detailed consideration as a tool of international commerce.

This is hardly a new idea. Throughout history we find many examples of free ports and free trade zones serving the needs of commerce in surmounting many and varied obstacles to the handling and movement of goods between nations. The U.S. version of these classic trade devices is the foreign-trade zone.

In 1934 Congress enacted the Celler Foreign-Trade Zones Act which created a regulatory body, the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, consisting of the Secretaries of Commerce, Treasury, and War (now Army), with authority to permit the establishment of U.S. Foreign-Trade Zones. The original legislation permitted a wide range of business functions to be conducted in a zone, but expressly prohibited manufacturing and exhibiting. Legislative amendment in 1950 removed these restrictions.

THE U.S. FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE

A controlled area designated by the U.S. Government, in or adjacent to a U.S. port of entry and operated as a public utility by a public or private corporation where free, dutiable and quota-controlled foreign and domestic merchandise may be received without being subject to U.S. customs laws governing entry of goods or payment of duties thereon. Merchandise may be kept in a zone for an indefinite period and is subject to payment of customs duties only when entered into U.S. customs territory.

In the foreign-trade zone the following illustrate some of the business functions that may be performed:

Manufacturing, packaging, wholesale sales, display, marking, grading, destruction, assembly, mixing, consumption, processing, packing, manipulating, storage, labeling, cleaning, knockdown, repacking.

BUSINESS ADVANTAGES

Firms using a foreign-trade zone are afforded many opportunities for savings, cost control, and convenience. The zone concept also represents considerable potential for industrial development and business growth. These are but some of the many advantages zone use can provide:

1. Eliminate outlay of capital for customs duties on foreign materials used in manufacturing for export.

2. Reduce costs for materials handling, transportation, and insurance.

3. Defer outlay of capital for payment of customs duties on foreign merchandise until actually filling orders in the United States.

4. If duty rate on finished goods is higher than on foreign raw materials used to produce them * * * manufacture in a zone and pay the lower rate with further savings derived from deductions made for waste.

5. Employ U.S. labor skills.

6. Access to quota-restricted materials under certain conditions.

7. Retain desired controls and security over technological know-how.

8. Capital investment opportunities for international business firms.

9. Many benefits of an oversea-based business right in the United States of America.

10. Improve competitive pricing of goods produced for world markets.

11. U.S. goods placed in a zone solely for export are considered as already exported for purposes of:

(a) Customs drawback, warehousing and bonding, or any other provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, and regulations thereunder.

(b) Statutes and bonds exacted for payment of drawback, refund, or exemption from liability for internal revenue taxes, and for internal revenue laws generally, and regulations thereunder.

VARIETY OF FIRMS

Foreign-trade zones are designed to serve business firms engaged in manufacturing, export, reexport, import and transshipment. The size of the firm is of no consequence. Business operations now physically located in these zones range from a one-man marketing firm to a major petrochemical plant employing several hundred persons. Foreign as well as U.S. firms may use the services of a U.S. foreign-trade zone.

MANY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

A foreign-trade zone is furnished with facilities for loading, unloading, handling, and storing goods. Facilities and services vary to some extent with each zone. Buildings and structures may be erected and installed to meet business needs. Some facilities and services now available at particular zones include: factory space; materials-handling equipment; fire protection; vessel berths; covered and open storage areas; refrigeration; water, heat, light, and power; heavy-duty cranes; office space; wood-drying kiln; personnel recruiting and training; skilled and general labor; heated warehouse; vacuum fumigation; full warehousing services; railroad sidings; exhibition areas; lighterage; spice-cleaning machines; industrial security services; marketing information; transportation and services.

ZONES IN OPERATION

Foreign-trade zones are now in operation in New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, Seattle, Toledo, and Mayaguez, Puerto Rico. In addition to these all purpose zones, a special purpose subzone was established in Puerto Rico in May 1962. This subzone contains a petrochemical plant operated by Union Carbide and has the distinction of being the first zone facility established solely for industrial purposes. Steps are now underway for the establishment of a second industrial subzone in San Francisco, Calif. These developments account for much of the current wave of interest in U.S. foreign-trade zones.

With respect to location, the services and facilities of existing zones are used by business firms throughout the United States and abroad. Under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, additional zones and subzones may be established.

Businessmen seeking to improve and expand international and domestic business should acquaint themselves with the foreign-trade zone concept. It has many of the hard-to-find ingredients to serve these objectives.

Further information on U.S. foreign-trade zones may be obtained from any of the zone managers listed below or by contacting the Bureau of International Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.; or the U.S. Department of Commerce Field Office nearest you.

Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y.; Whitehall 3-4600.

Foreign-Trade Zone No. 2, Napoleon Avenue and River, New Orleans, La.; Jackson 2-2551.

Foreign-Trade Zone No. 3, Ferry Building, San Francisco, Calif.; Garfield 1-8800.

Foreign-Trade Zone No. 5, Post Office Box 1209, Seattle, Wash.; Main 2-8124.

Foreign-Trade Zone No. 7, Post Office Box 2672, San Juan, P.R.; 723-0040.

Foreign-Trade Zone No. 8, 241 Superior Street, Toledo, Ohio; Cherry 3-8251.

Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the opportunity of reading an advance copy of a Reader's Digest report for the month of August 1963 entitled "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies." In my opinion this is one of the finest articles published on this subject. Because the Foreign Aid Authorization Act will be coming before Congress in a short time, I wish to insert this excellent article so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read it before they consider the important subject of foreign aid.

The article follows:

LET'S STOP SENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO AID OUR ENEMIES

(By Charles Stevenson)

Once more the annual battle over foreign-aid appropriations is stirring passions in Congress. Amid the strongest criticisms yet from taxpayers, amid repeated allegations of waste and misuse of funds, our legislators are being prodded to cut deeply into the $4.5 billion which President Kennedy insists they must vote to see the Agency for International Development (AID) through another year.

But it's time to face up to an important fact: Simply reducing appropriations won't cure what's wrong with an aid organization which is in more trouble than ever after going through 10 different administrators, 5 major reorganizations and more than 100 billion tax dollars.

"The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid," says Dr. Hans Morgenthau, who heads Chicago University's renowned Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy. "None of our objectives has been achieved," says Eugene Black, recently retired president of the World Bank. "Soviet influence remains at high tide. Our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction."

Chairman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of the House Appropriations Committee, who is closest to the woe, sums it all up after a 1,000 hours of official hearings. "The trouble," says PASSMAN, "is that too much of our foreign aid has deteriorated into a subsidy of Communist takeover. And the spenders are so power hungry, they so withhold the truth from the public, they are so beyond the normal controls of Congress, that there seems no way to confine assistance to helping people help themselves unless we kill the entire operation and begin over."

The record carries its own proof. Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, looked at the Government's books to discover that even in the face of yearly budget trimming by Congress, the authorities haven't been able to spend as much aid money as they've been given in any year since 1958. Yet, crying poverty, they quietly accumulate funds from several different appropriations, of which the current request represents just a part. Then they earmark this money as "obligations" for future spending. Senator BYRD has discovered that the unexpended balances from previous appropriations have soared from $11,787 million in 1958 to $21,273 million in June 1963—enough to keep the aid administrators going for many more years even if they never get another cent from Congress.

In dishing out aid money, the spenders give slight heed to Congress or even to their own handpicked advisers. An example is Gen. Lucius D. Clay's pro-aid group which President Kennedy named to advise about reforms. The committee reported to the President: "The United States should not aid a foreign government in establishing government-owned industries which compete with existing private endeavors. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

The committee opposed any such ideas as having the United States advance $512 million to start building a $1,883,766,000 Government-owned steel plant for India. We already are handing over up to $775 million a year—some $3 billion since 1960—to keep India's socialistic experimentations afloat, while that country's healthy private enterprises mark time waiting for a bureaucracy to grant permits for their every expansion scheme. As for this steel plant, 150 technicians, appointed by AID to investigate in India, reported back that they had been unable to prove that the venture is feasible.

Nevertheless, President Kennedy announced his support for the government plant; retired Ambassador to India Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith had said that "by this procedure we will not arouse suspicions that we seek to mold Indian economic policy to our own image."

Even more disturbing is our aiders' persistence in siphoning subsidies into Poland and Yugoslavia.

"When we help a Communist form of government we are undermining the security of our own country," Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio protested last year on the Senate floor. Others agreed. Over administration objections, Congress last August forbade sending more than food to any country that is part of the Communist conspiracy.

Yet, 3 months later, we extended Marshal Tito $136,700,000 in aid—just about as much as he received in the previous year. "Oh, but most of this was Food for Peace," I was told at AID headquarters in Washington. "And it wasn't assistance. Tito paid for that food."

The trouble is, such purchases lack reality. For example, over the past 9 years, we have given Tito cotton, oils and wheat, which cost us $901 million. Most of this is not U.S.-owned surplus: a broker buys the grain the Yugoslavs want on the Chicago exchange when they want it and we pay for it. We then pay the freight to seaboard. There we pay for storage. Then in most cases we pay shipping costs to Yugoslavia, where Tito

markets the wheat for his own government's profit.

Tito pays the United States only in part, and then by crediting to us some Yugoslav paper dinars. We can't take these dinars out of Yugoslavia. By agreement we pass 90 percent of the money back to the Yugoslav Government, either as gifts or as loans repayable only in more blocked dinars, for Tito to spend on developing his country's airports, highways, mines, papermills, railroads and canals. We may use the remaining 10 percent to maintain our Belgrade Embassy. About all we get out of the arrangement is the privilege of keeping a U.S. Information Agency reading room in Belgrade.

Tito tells his people—and we don't contradict him—that he receives nothing free from the United States; he pays for what he gets. As our bounty has flowed in to bolster his sagging economy, he has assailed the United States for seeking international controls of atomic blasting when Russia is in a testing mood. He has supported Russia's policy on Berlin. He votes with the Communist bloc at the U.N. He spearheads anti-Western movements among African and Asian nations.

It's much the same with Poland. We sent Ambassador Jacob Beam to woo Poland away from Moscow with gifts. And although Beam reported back to the State Department that the Poles had "perhaps fallen into the habit of considering our economic cooperation as a matter of right" and returned here almost two years ago to admit failure, our government has refused to stop funneling aid to Polish communism. It has answered Congress' growing anger at this policy by supplementing $61 million in cash aid in the last seven years with $672 million worth of agricultural-surplus commodities, $81 million of it in the last 12 months.

Our diplomats in Warsaw say that except for our food there would be Polish breadlines. Indeed, not only has Food for Peace prevented a possible explosion in Poland; a House committee has now found that receipt of our agricultural commodities by Poland allows it to export food to other bloc members, thus helping the Soviet conspiracy to solve its most awesome internal problem. What we do has so eased the pressures on Russia to feed its dependent states that it is able now to use its own wheat to spearhead its infiltration of Latin America.

Meanwhile, our help to the Poles has enabled them to send $13 million worth of aid to Castro's Cuba and $15 million worth to North Vietnam, reportedly including arms useful in guerrilla operations against our own soldiers in South Vietnam. It enables the Poles to aid East Germany, whose economy is in a shambles because its largest industries have been meshed with Soviet and Czech endeavors in turning out rockets and nuclear arms. In last year's Berlin crisis Poland showed her gratitude to us by mobilizing her armed forces to support Soviet threats.

In country after country, the record shows, our officials have encouraged aid which helps communism more than it helps us. A report by the House Committee on Government Operations tells how "the United States team in Cambodia made a deliberate determination to finance and construct two radio stations which, when completed, became an adjunct to a Chinese Communist gift to the Cambodian Government of a radio broadcasting complex." When a subordinate passed along his discovery that U.S.-financed materials were being used in the construction of a Russian-built hospital in Cambodia, the report states, an AID superior caused the man to be transferred, given an unsatisfactory efficiency rating, and ultimately fired.

In June 1959 the Government of Burma wanted help from the United States to build a road linking Rangoon with Mandalay. Engineering firms sent to investigate reported back that the kind of road the Burmese wanted was economically infeasible. No agreement was reached.

Then, in March 1962, Gen. Ne Win took over Burma, established a military dictatorship, and jailed his predecessor.

He kicked out the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation because they represented private enterprise, in spite of the fact that they were spending $12 million of private funds on the most effective agricultural and educational development programs in the country. He is nationalizing the economy. He denounced capitalism as "the pernicious economic system in which man exploits man." He canceled extensive English-teaching programs which had been sponsored for years by Americans and British in a land where English was the language of educated people. He prohibited Burmese from coming to America as Fulbright scholars. He has also invited in Chinese Communist technicians, management, and assistance projects.

Now, with Ne Win's transition complete, we are giving him military equipment at a rate of $10 million a year, although this doesn't show on any aid books. And last spring, on top of another $21 million of assorted assistance for 1963, AID announced it was going ahead with the first 42-mile leg of the Rangoon-Mandalay Highway, although no agreement has yet been reached on the feasibility of the rest of the road.

Congressional alarm is also mounting over assistance given to countries which expropriate private property. Last summer our legislators stipulated by law that assistance must be cut off from any country which seized U.S. investments. But by late fall so little was being done that Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, charged that "specific instructions had gone out from the State Department to our representatives abroad to soft-pedal this amendment." Not until 6 months after enactment of the amendment (and a week beyond the congressional deadline for required enforcement) did the State Department finally get around to suspending AID projects that cost us $25 million in Ceylon, which had seized American oil properties without compensation so they could be used to market Soviet petroleum products. Food for peace shipments to Ceylon still continue—with most payments returned to the Ceylon Government to be used for further economic development.

The United States solved the problem of Brazil's seizure of an American-owned telephone company by dangling the prospect of more millions if she paid for the property. Then with the new aid flowing in—$398 million over the next 21 months—Brazil has been able not only to pay for the seized properties but to nationalize still more, and enter into a trade pact with Russia.

Congress is on record as opposing aid to countries which "live on our aid while they channel their own resources into arms from Russia." Yet this is exactly what is happening in the case of the United Arab Republic. Ever since 1956, Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser has been mortgaging the better part of his exportable cotton crop to the Soviet bloc as payment for more than $100 million a year in arms and other assistance. The purpose: an incessant war of subversion and violence aimed at taking over the 90 million inhabitants of the Arab world and alienating them from the United States and the imperialist Western nations. He has confiscated Egypt's industries and taken over virtually everything in the country which represented foreign private investment.

What have we done about this? Why, we have continued to pay Nasser every year. In the last 5 years our aid has doubled, tripled, quadrupled. The effect has been to subsidize Nasser, to keep his economy going so he could hand over some of the chief resources of his country to the Soviets for their arms and help in agitating against us and independent Arabs.

Our 1962 direct economic assistance to Nasser—$224,100,000—out-distanced anything we did for anyone in the world except India, Pakistan and, because of earthquake reconstruction, Chile. We treated him better than Turkey, our desperately poor fighting partner. We gave him far more than we gave all the friendly Arab nations put together. In addition, in just the first 6 months of fiscal year 1963, we agreed to have him "buy" another $546-million worth of Food for Peace commodities with Egyptian currency. This is more than anybody else in the world received, and it brings Nasser's Food for Peace assistance alone to more than $1 billion.

These commodities are sold on the Egyptian market for currency, which when "paid" to us is mostly turned back to Nasser to meet his budget deficits and build more state-owned factories. Our aid enabled him in a single gesture to distribute a $43-million "dividend" to 1,500,000 factory and government workers as "profit shares and bonuses" so as to convince the people that his state ownership did indeed provide them with more prospertity than "imperialistic" private investments from abroad.

The Egyptian people know nothing about our assistance. "Assistance? What assistance?" Nasser says. "I pay you for what I get, don't I?"

Last year, when news of our latest aid filtered around the Mediterranean, other Arab leaders reacted with such apoplectic amazement that our Ambassador to the United Arab Republic, John S. Badeau, had to race around by plane in an attempt to placate them.

"But we are your allies," they said. "You are underwriting the Egyptian-Soviet conquest of the Middle East. Now Nasser will have more resources than ever with which to undermine us."

Our officials said such fears were groundless. Yet within weeks the first of 40 new MIG fighting planes arrived in Egypt from Russia. Our aid enabled Nasser to go into a Yemen war with 18,000 troops, then 20,000, then 28,000 by daily air-lifts in Russian-supplied planes. Our aid means funds which enable his Voice of Cairo radio to goad the officers, soldier's and students of Saudi Arabia and Jordan to overthrow Saud and Hussein, the chiefs of those two countires. "How long are you going to tolerate them?" the Voice shouts. "Overthrow these lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the arch enemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, the Jews."

"These are the words that we are subsidizing," Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska recently told the Senate. "What kind of policy is that for the people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?"

But still the aid flows in.

Small wonder then that Algeria's Premier Ahmed Ben Bella, whom Nasser eggs on, can fly directly to Cuba after talking aid terms in Washington, and there demand that we abandon our Guantanamo naval base. Small wonder that on arriving home Ben Bella can say: "Algeria will have a socialism a la Castro. No power in the world can prevent our country's advance on this road." Small wonder, indeed. Our aid to him—$91,800,000 in the past year—makes it possible.

The same sort of appeasement adds to our woe in Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous nation. We were responsible for the formation of Indonesia; after World War II we threatened to deny Marshall Plan aid to the Dutch unless they gave up their control of these East Indies. But Indonesia's President Sukarno also coveted grandeur and Dutch West New Guinea, a primitive land of Negroid Papuans, 1800 miles from his own capital but adjacent to Australian

territory. So while he has neglected his economy and poured the wealth from his tin mines and rubber plantations into Russia to pay for MIG fighters, long-range bombers, guided missiles and submarines, we have pumped $787,300,000 in gifts into the country. We've trained doctors and dentists for a population which suffers for lack of medical care, only to see Sukarno draft them so he could have a standing army of 250,000. When his emerging industries slowed to 20 percent of normal production for want of exchange with which to import repair and maintenance parts, we advanced emergency millions so he could buy these parts from abroad.

"Sukarno's no Communist," I was told both in Washington and Djakarta. "He only wants to bring West New Guinea into Indonesia, and he must. Otherwise his revolution is incomplete."

Have our efforts strengthened our position in Asia? Already dispatches indicate worries that Sukarno is setting up in West New Guinea the same sort of outpost against adjacent Australian-held territories as Castro has established against us in Cuba. He has threatened to use his military force, the most potent in Southeast Asia, if independent Malaya, Singapore and the British dependencies on British Borneo carry out their announced plan to join in an anti-communist federation come August 31. In the presence of the titular head of the Chinese-Communist state, he has signed a manifesto calling for enforcement of Red China's major policies in Asia; the Chinese in return have vowed to support Sukarno's cause against Malaysia.

Because of this strange compulsion of our officials to pour fuel on burning problems, instead of trying to put out the fires, we have exported more dollars than our private enterprise can bring back from overseas investments and trade. Faith in our currency has declined due to our increasing deficits at home and abroad. Our gold supply has dwindled dangerously.

This is admitted by our Commerce Department. Our Government is so worried that it has sent ambassadors literally begging past and present foreign beneficiaries of our charity to help us out—to at least let us sell to American tourists there a small part of the currency we have acquired in exchange for Food for Peace. But what was the answer? No. And this from Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Seeking some way to stop the run on gold, the Commerce Department is now discouraging European investments by American private enterprise. "We have put up a caution light on investment in the developed countries," says Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, "because of our balance-of-payment difficulties."

Yet the administration in the face of all this wants a bigger aid appropriation this year; and Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that anyone who tries to cut the requested amounts will be cooperating with Communist global strategy.

Is it not time to ask ourselves why?

Is it not time to consider the advice of Chairman George Champion of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank? He would have us and the other friendly capital-supplying nations coordinate our aid through an independent banking-type organization staffed by professionals from the world of banking and private enterprise. Such a multinational approach has also been proposed by experts like retired World Bank President Black and Herbert V. Prochnow, former Deputey Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The means for getting such an operation underway already exists within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which most Western nations and Japan participate. All that's needed is for Congress not to be content with cutting aid appropriaions, but to order a phase-out of our current aid operations and establish a special joint congressional committee which can at last start working toward a new order.

What Is the Real Purpose of the Palace Royal Guard in the White House?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column, "Americans Active in British Affairs," written by Henry J. Taylor, raises some very real questions as to the purposes behind the activities of some of President Kennedy's closest advisers.

We are all too familiar with the radical economic policies being advocated by the palace guard in the White House, policies which are moving this Nation closer and closer to "democratic socialism" as expounded by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. It is becoming more and more clear with each passing day that most of the Kennedy proposals are broad steps on the road to dictatorship. Now, Mr. Taylor raises the fearful possibility that these same advisers are doing their best to increase leftwing prestige of other governments.

Mr. Speaker, is it not time we demand a clear-cut explanation from the President as to where he plans to lead the United States and failing to get such an explanation, that we take whatever steps are necessary for a complete investigation of the background and purposes of those who are directing domestic and foreign policy for this country?

The column follows:

AMERICANS ACTIVE IN BRITISH AFFAIRS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

LONDON.—White House advisers Theodore Sorensen, McGeorge Bundy, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., et al, have pried open the British doghouse door and are in it right up to their bifocals.

Not liking Prime Minister Macmillan and his Conservative party, they've poked their arrogance and innuendo smack into London's highest political circles and are accused by many here of outright sabotage.

First, Labor Party Leader Harold Wilson's invitation to visit the White House inner circle originated with that group, not with Wilson himself. The obvious relish with which the White House received Macmillan's opponent—very touchy business in diplomacy with a friendly power—further strained our relations with Great Britain.

But President Kennedy is faced here by the accusation of a two-fisted rabbit punch—the subsequent sabotage of Macmillan by New Frontiersmen in the Prime Minister's Profumo-Keeler crisis. This, in part, accounts for Mr. Kennedy's return from England—frostbitten—one day early.

High British Government officials express deep concern regarding rumors traced directly to the White House cabal. Noting that the post-Profumo talk of new British security breaches—some true, some false—originated in Washington, they state these began in an all-but-systematized way on June 27—2 days before Mr. Kennedy's visit with Macmillan at Birch Grove.

A QUESTION OF TIMING

For example, the Associated Press here was promptly told by such a source: "If anyone were interested in embarrassing London and Washington they could hardly have chosen a better time." Expanding this very correctly, the report even pointed out that some London officials suggest "there may be a sinister force at work with the deliberate aim of undermining U.S. confidence in England." This possibility is receiving high-level attention here. That I can assure you. And it should.

The most charitable thing that can be said of the New Frontiersmen is that they simply do not understand Europe. First, they apply a mistaken air of intellectual superiority to the statesmen over here that goes over like a lead balloon.

Presidential Adviser McGeorge Bundy is perfectly capable of telling French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville that he regards President de Gaulle as stupid and reportedly did so. Yet able M. de Murville has forgotten more about Europe, firsthand, than Bundy will ever have time to learn.

Moreover, if Bundy were Solomon, which he is not, his tumescent and snap-snap directives to his foreign peers who are not in the White House chain of command at all make it evident here that Bundy should stay at home.

Sorensen's Bonn and Rome invasion, accompanying Mr. Kennedy, yielded similar dismay. This is inevitable, as was the lush expedition to India by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

REGULAR ALIBI FACTORY

European statesmen know that this is the White House night shift that cooks up the alibis that the day shift tosses out to our friends abroad. Seasoned European statesmen are appalled by their whistling, carefree confidence, smacking of crewcuts, imagemaking, and "Oh, yeah" to elders.

Just now the more White House advisers who stay home the better. The President might give this a thought, and even include himself. His last visit, for example, was well intended, certainly, but inopportune.

Europe's leaders regard publicly cheered visits as mere joyrides by political figures with itchy feet (they have them, too) or as a cheer-drenched distraction from the visitor's home troubles. Also, over here, the meaninglessness is historic.

Making this solid contention, Sir Winston Churchill has often cited how, on a bright October morning in 1907, the German Kaiser landed at Portsmouth in his uniform of a British admiral, to be greeted by King Edward VII in the uniform of a colonel of the Prussian dragoons. And so what? That was that, and so has this kind of folderol been ever since.

Jet travel can increase the urge for this type of success. But a success for what? Nine times out of ten for nothing more substantial than the folderol and the free ride. Over here, at this critical time, it is obvious we must beware even the slightest official suspicion that folderol is a preoccupation of our President.

Today's Freedom Lesson: Again We Observe Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with continuation of nationwide interest in

Captive Nations Week, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD an editorial of Saturday, July 20, which appeared in the Houston Chronicle dealing with this timely and vital subject:

TODAY'S FREEDOM LESSON: AGAIN WE OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

For the 5th year the Nation has observed Captive Nations Week in the third week of July. The first time it was proclaimed, in 1959, Premier Khrushchev betrayed the fact that a sensitive nerve was hit by all but taking off a shoe and pounding it as he protested violently to Vice President Nixon who was on his visit to Russia at the time. This time President Kennedy proclaimed the week not far in advance of Under Secretary of State Harriman's trip to Moscow to negotiate a nuclear test-ban treaty. The Soviet leaders can't be any happier about it now than then.

For the vast areas of formerly independent but now subjugated peoples which are controlled by Moscow are perhaps its greatest weakness. The congressional resolution designating Captive Nations Week goes beyond the European satellite states—East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. Named also were the Baltic states Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, forcibly occupied and incorporated into Russia but whose independence is still officially recognized by the United States. In Asia there are North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, and continental China itself. While there is a question as to whether China is to an appreciable degree a satellite of Russia any longer, its people are enslaved as tightly as any of the others. Finally, the resolution names the Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia, Armenia, and other areas in the Soviet Union which once or more than once were independent nations.

Captive Nations Week expresses the sentiment of the American people that these peoples should have the opportunity to decide their own political destiny. Holding it is a sound practice which should be continued in the future until they have had that opportunity.

A Voice Is Raised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Faricita Wyatt is an outstanding citizen of California with a record of distinguished service in the State department of employment and recently to the Seventh Congressional District as my executive secretary. Presently she is employing her substantial talents as a high school teacher in the Oakland public school system. Faricita Hall Wyatt has been a loyal associate and close personal friend.

Not content solely with the pressures of her demanding professional activities, Mrs. Wyatt finds time to write and to paint. Three of her recent poems—one reflecting her sensitive concept of teaching and the other two on the imperative issue of civil rights—are works which are both tender and violent, both timely and significant. I commend these poems to the attention of all my colleagues.

CONGRESSIONAL CONSCIENCE

Where is your conscience
That you make jest of the black man's future,
Circumscribe his beginnings,
And keep him in a hovel of despair?
Where is your conscience?
Where is your conscience
That you ignore the longing
Heaving within his breast
For dignity of self,
And heed not his cry
To loosen the chains that bind his ambition?
Where is your conscience?
Why do you proclaim to the world
That here in this land
One may choose his path with undaunted spirit,
When you know the color of a man's skin
Distorts this vision?
Why do you spend long hours in whining defense
Of your position of human denial
Then decry the right of a black man
To protest your injustices?
What God do you serve
That you invoke His blessings
Upon your unrighteous self-interest?
You know no man so well
That his being is yours to command,
For you are not omnisciently endowed.
Forever, crouching in the wings of time
Are the despised,
Whose presence on stage
Set hate and fear in motion.
And now the scene is set again.
You cannot seal the curtain,
Nor your conscience.

—FARICITA WYATT.

BLACK WILL

Within my being there is enough will to inflame the world;
Indignation, to crush the mightiest mountains;
Tears, to swell the oceans and the seas,
The rivers, and the streams
Into a deluge of a world of worlds;
So much have I suffered in this land of black abhorrence.

I writhe in silence no longer.
You shall hear my voice.
You shall feel my will.
Naked I stand before your seething conscience,
Not alone for today,
But an eternity of tomorrows—
Shielded by the tide of providence.

—FARICITA WYATT.

CHILD

I see only a child.
Image of whom I care not—
A child I see.
Clothed in a future—I know not;
Destined to grow as you and I—
In a world we may not know.
Fate must not obscure his path.

—FARICITA WYATT.

Israel and Our Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, this past week President Nasser celebrated the 11th anniversary of his rise to power in Egypt by an impressive display of military might, including rockets, Mig-19 and 21 fighter planes, Ilyushan bombers, and a new "Arab" submarine.

A military display of this kind by the Egyptian dictator underscores the seriousness of the threat to the small State of Israel. In his anniversary speech, President Nasser once again made his intention clear when said:

The liberation of Palestine does not depend on words for local consumption but on one plan with armies, with missiles, and everything.

Since Israel was established, with the approval of the United Nations and through the assistance of our own Nation, the surrounding Arab States have attempted to destroy her, either by outright military power or by economic boycott and blockade.

In 1948 and in 1956, Israel relied on the superior quality and morale of its fightingmen to overcome the numerical superiority of her hostile neighbors. But the rapid advance of modern military technology has offset this advantage. It does not require a great deal of skill to push the buttons which shoot missiles capable of destroying cities. And with the aid of German scientists and the Soviet Union, Nasser now has rockets of such capability.

The time when the Arab States feel confident that they can destroy Israel is rapidly approaching. And they have made it clear that when that time comes they will attack.

We cannot allow that moment to arrive. As Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to President Kennedy, said in a recent speech:

The peace of Israel is a test of man's conscience. A world which allows Israel to falter or fail could not itself survive anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution for a collective defense agrement with Israel, joining some of my colleagues in the House and in the Senate, who have proposed such a resolution in order to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of Middle East States which wish to join in a collective agreement.

The resolution reads:

Whereas on May 25, 1950, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France issued a three-party declaration pledging themselves to hold inviolate the borders between Israel and the Arab States and to assure and guarantee those borders; and

Whereas the Congress, on March 9, 1957, adopted a joint resolution authorizing the President to "cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence", and to undertake in such area military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations desiring such assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism; and

Whereas the outbreak of armed conflict in the Middle East would be likely to spread to other areas; and

Whereas recent events in the Middle East, including an arms buildup by the Arab States with the encouragement and support of the Soviet Union, constitute a serious threat to international peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is urged to invite the United Kingdom, France, and any other interested nations to join with the United States in a collective defense agreement with Israel, and any other Middle East state which is willing to join and carry out its obligations under such an agreement, and to provide such military and other assistance and cooperation as may be necessary to protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any nation in the Middle East which is a party to the agreement against armed attack by any other nation.

In Europe and in Asia we have joined with other free nations to mutually guarantee the defense of our common interests. These agreements have served to prevent aggression. And when aggression did occur in one or two instances, the United States has immediately come to the aid of her ally. Such an agreement with Israel would serve notice that we will not countenance any attack upon her and that, in addition, we are mindful of our responsibilities for the maintenance of world peace.

But Nasser's ambition does not end with the liquidation of Israel. He has ambitions which encompass all the Middle East. At the moment, Syria, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, are being subjected to subversion, threats and invective. In Yemen, Egyptian troops are engaged in wholesale massacre. Eyewitness reports charge that Egyptian bombers have been using poison gas against helpless villagers. Despite the fact that Nasser agreed some months ago to withdraw all his troops from Yemen, Egyptians are still actively engaged there.

Nasser obtains the armaments for his campaign in Yemen and for his buildup against Israel from the Soviet Union. But it is our foreign aid which allows him to purchase quantities of sophisticated Soviet weapons. Our aid may be for economic development—it may consist in great part of surplus foods—but the fact is that our aid does ease the economic burden at home so that Egypt can afford to buy the armaments for aggressive adventure abroad.

The immediate need in the Near East is stability and an agreement which will guarantee the peace.

But the real key to peace in the Near East does not lie with security agreements or with limiting the acquisition of arms. To achieve a lasting peace and to spread development and a higher standard of living throughout the whole region, Israel, and Arab leaders must sit down and negotiate their differences.

I have introduced a resolution calling upon our delegation to the United Nations to introduce and support a resolution favoring direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States "as an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation." The text of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas warlike threats in the Middle East, accompanied by increased arms shipments to the area from the Soviet Union are taking place; and

Whereas continuing Arab-Israel conflict is a threat to the peace, menacing the security of all the peoples of the Middle East and disrupting their progress and development because of the wasteful diversion of their resources for armaments; and

Whereas article II, section 3 of the United Nations Charter provides that "all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means"; and

Whereas the United Nations should be strengthened in its efforts to uphold that provision of the United Nations Charter: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States delegation to the United Nations introduce and support a resolution favoring direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States as an indispensable condition toward the attainment of peace and cooperation and the settlement of all outstanding disputes between them.

Two weeks ago, at his first press conference, the new Prime Minister of Israel, Levi Eshkol, reiterated Israel's willingness to meet with President Nasser "or any other Arab leader at any time, anywhere * * * without making any prior conditions." It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that our Government should do everything in its power to bring about such a meeting. I urge that in the next session of the U.N. General Assembly our delegation call for efforts to lead the Arab leaders to the peace table.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish to insert some pertinent excerpts from recent statements of the American Jewish Committee:

The United States, as leader of the free world, must assume a primary and continuing responsibility, both directly and through the United Nations, for the maintenance of peace and security in this turbulent region. * * * The United States should vigorously pursue all avenues of negotiation, particularly with the Soviet Union, to remove the Middle East from the cold war arena. * * * A peace settlement between Israel and the Arab States is essential to the creation of a stable and secure Middle East. We urge our Government steadfastly to continue its efforts toward this prime objective.

The American Jewish Committee believes that implementation of U.S. policy requires our Government to (1) clearly define what it would consider aggression; (2) intensify efforts to end the arms race in the area, meanwhile assuring that the balance of arms is not upset; (3) provide a formal guarantee, upon request, of the independence and integrity of any state in the region; (4) vigorously discourage the violent hate campaign against Israel conducted by the Arab States; and (5) reevaluate the present U.S. policy of impartiality toward peaceful nations and those nations pursuing belligerent policies inimical to the peace and stability of the Middle East.

Blue Island, Ill., Issues Captive Nations Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during Captive Nations Week, 1963, Governors of most of our States and mayors of major cities issued proclamations directing the interest of their citizens to commemorations of Captive Nations observances.

The National Captive Nations Week Committee is especially pleased to note the participation of municipalities throughout the country. Typical of the proclamations is one issued by Hon. John M. Hart, mayor of the city of Blue Island, Ill., on the occasion of Captive Nations Week, which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America have by resolution requested and authorized the President of the United States to designate the week of July 14 through July 20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week; and

Whereas we Americans are proud that many refugees from the oppressed countries have found asylum in the United States; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to many of the captive nations peoples; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to these people of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the citizens of the city of Blue Island are fully aware of and grieve for the plight of those made captive under the heavy yoke of Russian communism: Now, therefore,

I, John M. Hart, mayor of the city of Blue Island, do hereby designate the week of July 14–20, 1963, as Captive Nations Week in the city of Blue Island, and urge the widest possible cooperation in the observance of this week.

JOHN M. HART,
Mayor.

Subversive Character of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 23, 1956, I spoke under special order on the subject of the "Subversive Character of NAACP." Records from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, of quite a number of the officers, members of the board of directors, legal, health, and other committees, as well as certain members of the executive staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, were incorporated at that time. Since only a few copies of this particular RECORD are available today, I have been requested to ask permission to again incorporate a good portion of this material into the RECORD, so that the same may be made available to anyone who may desire it.

A copy of "NAACP in Action—Report for 1961," the most current copy of this booklet which is available at this time, has been used as a guideline in checking over the current members of the staff of officials, board of directors, and various committees of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Out of the 77 persons listed as officials of the NAACP in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1956, 59 are still

active and serving in an official capacity as of 1961. All of those who are not at this time associated with the NAACP as revealed by this publication have been deleted from the material which is being incorporated herewith.

Remarks made by me with respect to the original founder of the NAACP, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, together with a statement with reference to or regarding the history and development of the American Negro movement in the United States, are also included herewith. The colloquy on the floor of the House between various Members is not being made a part of the current extension of remarks.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include certain material contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 23, 1956, which came from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives, regarding various officials of the NAACP, as of 1961, together with a brief statement made by me with respect to the history of the American Negro movement in the United States:

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of July 15, 1949 (p. 5), in an article datelined Los Angeles, July 14, reported that 'Roy Wilkins, acting secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, told a press conference * * * he voted for Benjamin J. Davis, Negro Communist, at the last election. Davis is now on trial for his Communist beliefs, along with 11 other national Communist Party leaders in New York City. Wilkins, however, refused any comment on the trial itself.' The same information appeared in the Daily People's World of July 13, 1949 (p. 1).

"Mr. Wilkins was a member of the national committee, International Judicial Association, as was shown on the leaflet entitled 'What is the IJA?' and a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1942; he was identified as being from New York State. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Judicial Association as 'a Communist front and an offshot of the International Labor Defense' (report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as having 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line' (report dated September 17, 1950, p. 12.)

"A letterhead of the Conference on Pan American Democracy dated November 16, 1938, contains the name of Roy Wilkins in a list of sponsors of that group, cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference as a Communist-front organization which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in report dated June 25, 1942).

"According to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1937 (p. 6), Roy Wilkins was one of the sponsors of a joint meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism and the American Friends of Chinese People.

"The American League Against War and Fascism was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954); it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as a 'Communist-front organization' (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and as 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union.' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Septembr 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League * * * as 'completely under the control of Communists' (reports of March 29, 1944; January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942). American Friends of the Chinese People was also cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization (report of March 29, 1944).

"The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 8), reported that Roy Wilkins spoke for the International Labor Defense in Brooklyn. The International Labor Defense was cited by the Attorney General as the legal arm of the Communist Party and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686; and press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the ILD as the legal arm of the Communist Party (reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944); the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the group in a report released September 2, 1947.

"Roy Wilkins spoke at a New York State convention of the Workers Alliance, as reported in the Daily Worker of February 11, 1939 (p. 1), and February 7, 1939 (p. 5). The Workers Alliance was cited as a Communist-penetrated organization and later as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684; and press releases on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the Workers Alliance as among the successes in the Communist-front movements (report dated January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

"In an article by Blaine Owen which appeared in the Daily Worker of June 17, 1936 (p. 1), entitled '1936 Communist Party Convention Significant to Negroes,' he stated: 'The greatest significance undoubtedly attends the 1936 convention of the Communist Party,' Roy Wilkins, assistant national secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and editor of the Crisis, said today. 'It must be patent to anyone who has kept track of the news that the political leftwing—and especially the Communist program—has been an important factor in bringing the plight of the Negro people, along with other underprivileged groups, more sharply to the attention of those parties which have been in power. * * * Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the program and demands of the Communists have had a very wholesome effect of the Negro people themselves. They have been emboldened by the basic and basically right demands put forth.' This, it was pointed out to Wilkins, is what the Communist Party means when it bases its entire campaign on the proposal for and toward the realization of the broad People's Front. He nodded.

To understand the civil rights movement as propagated by the NAACP, I feel that a person must know something of the history and development of the American Negro movement here in the United States subsequent to the reconstruction period.

In 1895, Booker T. Washington, president of Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, was selected to speak for the southern Negro at the Atlanta Exposition. Dr. Washington stated his position clearly and with great effect. I would like to quote several paragraphs from Booker T. Washington's address which I feel sum up the entire philosophy enunciated by him and his group:

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house."

Also:

"Cast it down in agricultural, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions. And in this connection it is well to bear in mind that whatever other sins the South may be called to bear, when it comes to business, pure and simple, it is in the South that the Negro is given a man's chance in the commercial world, and in nothing is this exposition more eloquent than in emphasizing this chance. Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labor and put brains and skills into the common occupations of life; shall prosper in proportion as we learn to draw the line between the superficial and the substantial, the ornamental gewgaws of life and the useful. No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities."

There was an entirely different school of thought, however, which was headed by Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, of Atlantic University. Dr. DuBois was a very bitter critic of the Washingtonian movement, which he referred to as "the Tuskegee machine." Dr. DuBois was the leader of the leftwing element of American Negro Society which, in 1905, met at Niagara Falls, N.Y., and devised plans whereby complete social equality could be attained. This group was subsequently called the Niagara movement.

The Niagara movement was not very effective, because it was hampered by lack of funds. However, in 1908, a race riot occurred in Springfield, Ill., the home of Abraham Lincoln, which aroused the interest of the dormant abolitionist movement in the North. As a result of the feeling which was aroused by the Springfield race riots, William English Walling made a strong appeal for the emancipation of the American Negro in the fields of political and social equality. This appeal later became the clarion for the formation of a new organization, called National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which joined the white liberals of the northern abolitionist traditions with the Negro liberals of the Niagara movement.

Dr. DuBois was one of the founding fathers of the present-day NAACP, which was founded in 1909. This Dr. DuBois, who broke away from the Booker T. Washing-

ton group, was the leader of the Niagara movement. His record of citations from the House Committee on Un-American Activities takes up on nine pages single spaced:

"FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, founder NAACP, leader Niagara movement.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Worker (Sunday edition of the Communist publication, the Daily Worker) on April 27, 1947, reported that "almost 100 Negro leaders, headed by W. E. B. DuBois, Paul Robeson, and Roscoe Dunjee, last week called upon President Truman 'to repudiate decisively' steps to 'illegalize the Communist Party.' * * * As Negro Americans * * * we cannot be unmindful that this proposal to outlaw the Communist Party comes precisely when our Federal Government professes grave concern over the democratic rights of peoples in far distant parts of the world" (p. 8 of the Worker). .

"Dr. DuBois sponsored a statement attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders (Daily Worker, Aug. 23, 1948, p. 3); he sponsored a 'Statement by Negro Americans' on behalf of the Communist leaders (the Worker of Aug. 29, 1948, p. 11); he filed a brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of the 12 Communist leaders (Daily Worker, Jan. 9, 1949, p. 3); he signed statements on behalf of Communist leaders, as shown in the following sources: Daily Worker, January 17, 1949 (p. 3); February 28, 1949 (p. 9); Daily People's World, May 12, 1950 (p. 12); Daily Worker, September 19, 1950 (p. 2); and in 1952, he signed an appeal to President Truman, requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, Dec. 10, 1952, p. 4); also an appeal on their behalf addressed to President Eisenhower (Daily People's World, Nov. 17, 1954, p. 2). Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the National Non-Partisan Committee To Defend the Rights of the 12 Communist Leaders, as shown on the back of their letterhead dated September 9, 1949.

"A statement on behalf of Eugene Dennis, a Communist, contained the signature of Dr. DuBois, identified as an educator (Daily Worker of May 5, 1950, p. 2); he signed a telegram of the National Committee To Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims, greeting Eugene Dennis on his 48th birthday (Daily Worker, August 11, 1952, p. 3); Eugene Dennis was formerly secretary general of the Communist Party.

The Daily Worker of August 2, 1949 (p. 2), disclosed that Dr. DuBois endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., well-known Communist leader; he was honorary chairman of the Committee To Defend V. J. Jerome, chairman, cultural commission of the Communist Party, United States of America (letterhead dated June 24, 1952). A leaflet of the Civil Rights Congress (dated March 20, 1947) named Dr. DuBois as having defended Gerhart Eisler, Communist. He was one of the sponsors of the Committee To Defend Alexander Tractenberg, former member of the national committee of the Communist Party (Daily People's World of April 17, 1952, p. 7; and the Daily Worker of April 18, 1952, p. 6).

"The Daily Worker of February 16, 1948 (p. 16), reported that some '80 leading New York civic leaders, trade unionists, and professionals yesterday joined Dr. William Jay Schieffelin, president emeritus of the citizens union, to demand the prompt seating of Simon W. Gerson to the city council seat made vacant by the death of Councilman Peter V. Cacchione, Brooklyn Communist. * * * The civic leaders' statement is directed to Mayor O'Dwyer and city council majority leader Joseph T. Sharkey. It is a reprint of a letter to the New York Times by Dr. Schieffelin in which he charges that the real reason for the refusal to seal German (sic. Gerson) is "the current anti-Communist hysteria."' Dr. DuBois was named as having signed the statement. (See also advertisement in New York Times of February 19, 1948, p. 13.)

"Dr. DuBois was a member of a committee formed to protest the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Communist Chilean senator and world famous poet; he signed a statement of the organization in support of Neruda. (Daily Worker of April 7, 1948, p. 13, and April 10, 1950, p. 2, respectively.) He was sponsor of a reception and testimonial for Harry Sacher, defense attorney for the Communist leaders. (Daily Worker of December 5, 1949, p. 2.)

"When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his furadulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); the Attorney General of the United States had cited the Citizens' Committee as Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687, and press release of Apr. 27, 1949). Dr. DuBois was a member of the Citizens' Committee * * * in 1942, as shown on their letterhead dated February 11, 1942; he sponsored a dinner of the group, according to the Daily Worker of February 5, 1942, and signed the call to the National Free Browder Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 25, 1942, pages 1 and 4.

"A 1950 letterhead of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born carries the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors of that organization; the same information appears on an undated letterhead of the group, distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of December 2–3, 1950; a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born dated April 30, 1951, names him as a national sponsor of the organization. He signed the group's statement opposing the Hobbs bill (Daily Worker, July 25, 1950, p. 4); he signed their statement opposing denaturalization (Daily Worker of August 10, 1950, p. 5); and signed a telegram prepared and dispatched by the organization to the Attorney General of the United States, protesting holding nine noncitizens without bail under the McCarran Act. (Daily Worker of November 24, 1952, p. 3.) He was also listed in the Daily Worker of October 21, 1954 (p. 2) as one of 95 sponsors of the National Conference to Defend the Rights of Foreign Born Americans, to be held December 11, through 12 in New York City by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

"The special committee cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States' (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942); the Attorney General cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, see consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"'For years, the Communists have put forth the greatest efforts to capture the entire American Labor Party throughout New York State. They succeeded in capturing the Manhattan and Brooklyn sections of the American Labor Party but outside of New York City, they have been unable to win control' (Special Committee's Report 1311 of March 29, 1944). Dr. DuBois spoke at a State conference of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of December 12, 1950, p. 5); he spoke at a dinner, April 18, opening the presidential campaign in New York City (Daily Worker of April 14, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and the Daily Worker of April 21, 1952, p. 1); he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, May 13, held under the auspices of the American Labor Party (Daily Worker of May 8, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and May 14, 1952, p. 1); and he spoke at an election rally in Madison Square Garden, October 27 (Daily Worker of October 22, 1952, p. 8, an advertisement; and October 29, 1952, p. 2).

"The Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), named Dr. DuBois as a member of the executive board and of the Policy Committee, Council on African Affairs; he signed the council's petition to the United Nations as shown in the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4); drafted their statement against the policy of the United States in Korea (Daily Worker of July 25, 1950, p. 3) and spoke at the council's conference on April 24 at Friendship Baptist Church in New York City (Daily Worker, April 23, 1954, p. 8 and April 26, 1954, p. 6). The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"The Attorney General cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an 'adjunct of the Communist Party' (press release of Dec. 4, 1947); also redesignated—consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954); the Special Committee reported that 'at the beginning of the present year, the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science.' (Report 1311 of Mar. 29, 1944.) Dr. DuBois was honored at the Jefferson School, as shown in the Daily Worker on Feb. 1, 1951 (p. 2); it was announced in the Daily Worker on Jan. 2, 1952 (p. 7), that Dr. DuBois was scheduled to conduct a seminar on 'Background of Africa Liberation Struggles' at the Jefferson School; the Jan. 26, 1952, issue of the same publication (p. 7), named him as a faculty member of that school, as did the Worker, October 4, 1953 (p. 10) and the Daily Worker, Oct. 14, 1953 (p. 8)—advertisement. He signed statements on behalf of the Jefferson School as shown in the Daily Worker, Nov. 25, 1953 (p. 2) and the Daily People's World, July 6, 1954 (p. 7).

"In a report of the special committee, dated Mar. 29, 1944, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as having been, in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian (report dated Mar. 29, 1944); the organization has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954). Dr. Dubois signed a statement of the national council in 1947 (Daily Worker, Oct. 17, 1947, p. 4); he signed the organization's statement protesting the Iron Curtain, as reported in the Daily People's World on May 20, 1948 (p. 5); he signed a statement of the council, praising Henry Wallace's Open Letter to Stalin in May 1948 (from a pamphlet entitled 'How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace,' p. 9); he signed their statement calling for a conference with the Soviet Union (Daily Worker, June 21, 1948, p. 3); he signed their Roll Call for Peace (Daily Worker of Aug. 31, 1948, p. 5); he sent greetings through the national council on the 31st anniversary of the Russian Revolution (Daily Worker, Nov. 10, 1948, p. 11); he signed the council's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled 'End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace,' dated December 1948); he spoke at the Congress on American-Soviet Relations, Dec. 3–5, 1949, arranged by the national council and signed

the council's letter to the American people, urging that a unified democratic Germany be established (Daily People's World, Aug. 13, 1952, pp. 4 and 6).

"A letterhead of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated Aug. 21, 1949, lists the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois as having signed an open letter of the organization, addressed to Senators and Congressmen, urging defeat of President Truman's arms program; he answered a questionnaire of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in favor of recognition of Chinese Communist Government, as shown in Far East Spotlight for December 1949-January 1950 (p. 23).

"The Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D.C., and as having been instigated by 'Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign' (Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 378 on the Communist Peace Offensive dated Apr. 1, 1951). The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been cited as Communist by the Attorney General (press release of Apr. 27, 1949); also redesignated-consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954.

"A page of signatures from the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, 'sponsored by American friends of the Soviet Union, and signed by hundreds of thousands of Americans' was published in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (p. 79); the Golden Book was to be presented to President Kalinin at the 20th anniversary celebration. The page carried the title, 'I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic,' and a facsimile of the name, W. E. B. DuBois, appeared on that page.

"The Golden Book of American Friendship was cited as a 'Communist enterprise' signed by 'hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travels' (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

"A letterhead of the New York Committee To Win the Peace, dated June 1, 1946, contains the name of W. E. B. DuBois in a list of New York committee members. The National Committee To Win the Peace, with which the New York committee is affiliated, was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General. (Press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated consolidated list of April 1, 1954.)

"Dr. DuBois sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as disclosed by the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the same organization, condemning the Greek Government, as reported in the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948 (p. 7). The American Council for a Democratic Greece has been cited as subversive and Communist, an organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council (Attorney General of the United States in press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"Dr. DuBois was a sponsor of a conference of the National Council of Arts, Sciences and Professions, October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a leaflet entitled 'To Safeguard These Rights,' published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the National Council; a letterhead of the National Council (received for files January 1949) named him as a member-at-large of that organization; he was named as vice chairman of the group on the leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950; a letterhead of the same organization's southern California chapter, dated April 24, 1950, lists him as a member-at-large of the national council; he was elected vice chairman of the group in 1950 (Daily Worker, May 1, 1950, p. 12); a letterhead of the group dated July 28, 1950, names him as vice chairman of the group; he endorsed a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts, sciences, and professions sponsored by the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, November 9, 1951, p. 7); the call to the conference contained the same information. A letterhead of the national council, dated December 7, 1952, named him as vice chairman.

"The call to a Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, issued by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions for New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as well as the conference program (p. 12), and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 9), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of that conference; he was a member of the program committee of the conference, honorary chairman of the panel at cultural and scientific conference (program, p. 7), and spoke on the Nature of Intellectual Freedom at that conference (p. 78 of the edited report of the conference entitled 'Speaking for Peace').

"The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, released April 19, 1949; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as a Communist front which 'was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.'

"The Daily People's World of October 28, 1947 (p. 4), named Dr. DuBois as one of the sponsors of a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947; he sponsored their Freedom Crusade (Daily Worker, Dec. 15, 1948, p. 2); the call to a Bill of Rights Conference, called by the Civil Rights Congress, for July 16–17, 1949, in New York City, named him as one of the sponsors of that conference; the program of the National Civil Rights Legislative Conference, January 18–19, 1949, called by the Civil Rights Congress, lists him as one of the conference sponsors; he was chairman of a conference of the Congress, as reported in the Worker of January 2, 1949 (p. 5); Dr. DuBois was defended by the Civil Rights Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 13, 1951, p. 3); he signed the organization's open letter to J. Howard McGrath, U.S. Attorney General, on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York (advertisement paid for by contributions of signers which appeared in the Evening Star on Oct. 30, 1951, p. A-7); he participated in the organization's sixth anniversary dinner in New York City, March 26, 1952 (Daily Worker, Mar. 28, 1952, p. 4).

"The Civil Rights Congress was formed in 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it is 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (Rept. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated Sept. 2, 1947); the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947 and Sept. 21, 1948); also redesignated—consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"Dr. DuBois spoke in Washington, D.C., on May 9, 1947, under the auspices of the Washington Book Shop, as shown by a leaflet of the Book Shop, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General; it had previously been cited by the Attorney General as follows: 'Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organization' (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also redesignated—consolidated list of Apr. 1, 1954; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688, respectively). The special committee cited the Washington Book Shop as a Communist-front organization (report of Mar. 29, 1944).

"The Workers Book Shop catalog for 1948 (p. 5), advertised Dr. DuBois' 'The World and Africa' for sale; the 1949–50 catalog (p. 11) advertised his 'Black Folk Then and Now; the Worker for March 1, 1953 (p. 16), carried an advertisement of Dr. DuBois' books, 'The Battle for Peace' and 'Black Reconstruction' on sale at the Workers Book shop, New York City. The Workers Book Shops are a chain of Communist bookshops which are official outlets for Communist literature.

"As shown on the following sources, Dr. DuBois was a member of the advisory council of Soviet Russia Today: Letterhead of the publication dated September 8, 1947; a letterhead of September 30, 1947; and an undated letterhead received April 1948. The Daily People's World of November 6, 1952 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois had written an article for the November issue of New World Review; and his article entitled 'Normal United States-China Relations' appeared in the issue of August 1954 (pp. 13–15). He was also shown by the Daily Worker of October 20, 1954 (p. 7), as one of those who attended the annual banquet held by New World Review on October 14 at which special tribute was paid to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Robeson. Soviet Russia Today has been cited as a Communist-front publication by the special committee in reports of March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942; the Committee on Un-American Activities also cited it as a Communist-front publication in a report dated October 23, 1949. Soviet Russia Today changed its name to New World Review, effective with the March 1951 issue.

"The Daily Worker of July 6, 1951 (p. 7), reported that Dr. DuBois was author of the pamphlet, 'I Take My Stand for Peace,' published by the New Country Publishers, official Communist Party publishing house which has published the works of William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party chairman and executive secretary, respectively. (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of May 11, 1948.)

"In 1947 and 1948, Dr. DuBois was contributing editor on the staff of New Masses magazine and later, of Masses and Mainstream. (New Masses, July 22, 1947, p. 2; Masses and Mainstream, Mar. 1948, vol. 1, No. 1; and issue of August 1950, p. 1; June 1954, inside front cover.) He contributed articles to the following issues of New Masses and Masses and Mainstream-New Masses for September 10, 1946 (p. 3) and June 10, 1947 (p. 20); Masses and Mainstream for April 1951 (pp. 10–16); and February 1952 (pp. 8–14).

"In 1940, Dr. DuBois signed New Masses' letter to President Roosevelt as shown in New Masses for April 2, 1940 (p. 21); he was honored at a dinner in New York City, January 14, 1946, arranged by New Masses and at which awards were mad for greater interracial understanding (Daily Worker of Jan. 7, 1946, p. 11, cols. 1 and 2); he endorsed New Masses, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 7, 1947 (p. 11): he sponsored a plea for financial support of New Masses, as disclosed in the issue of that publication for Apr. 8, 1947 (p. 9); he received the New Masses award for his contribution in pro-

moting democracy and interracial unity at the publication's second annual awards dinner (New Masses of Nov. 18, 1947, p. 7); the February 1953 issue of Masses and Mainstream carried a chapter from Dr. DuBois' book, 'The Soul of Black Folk,' written 50 years ago (Daily Worker, Feb. 23, 1953, p. 7); he was author of 'In Battle for Peace,' described as the story of his 83d birthday, and which was published by Masses and Mainstream (the Daily Worker of June 18, 1952, p. 7; Daily People's World of Sept. 17, 1952, p. 7; the Daily Worker of Sept. 23, 1952, p. 7; and the Worker of Dec. 21, 1952, p. 7).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited New Masses as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942, p. 7688); the special committee cited it as a nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939 and June 25, 1942.) Beginning with the March 1948 issue, New Masses and Mainstream (Marxist quarterly) consolidated into what is now know as Masses and Mainstream, with the announcement that 'here, proudly, in purpose even if not in identical form, is a magazine that combines and carriers forward the 37-year-old tradition of New Masses and the more recent literary achievement of Mainstream. We have regrouped our energies, not to retire from the battle but to wage it with fresh resolution and confidence' (Masses and Mainstream for March 1948, p. 3).

"A letterhead of the Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg case, dated March 15, 1952, carried the name of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois in a list of sponsors; he joined in a request of that committee for a new trial for Ethel and Julius Rosenberg (Daily Worker of June 2, 1952, p. 6); he participated in a rally October 23 in New York City, to demand clemency for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker, Oct. 27, 1952, p. 8); he signed an amicus curiae brief presented to Supreme Court in Washington, D.C., urging a new trial for the Rosenbergs (Daily Worker of November 10, 1952, p. 3; and the Daily People's World of November 13, 1952, p. 8). He wrote an article entitled 'A Negro Leader's Plea To Save Rosenbergs' (The Worker of November 16, 1952, p. 3M); and the Daily Worker of January 21, 1953 (p. 7), reported that he had urged clemency for the Rosenbergs.

"The Daily Worker of April 11, 1949 (p. 5), reported that Dr. DuBois was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the World Peace Congress in Paris; he was cochairman of the American Sponsoring Committee of the Congress, as disclosed on a leaflet entitled 'World Congress for Peace, Paris,' April 20–23, 1949, he was proposed as a candidate for the World Peace Prize, awarded by the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of December 7, 1951, p. 4); he was a member of the Executive Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of September 14, 1950, p. 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Second World Peace Congress in Sheffield, England (Daily Worker of October 19, 1950, p. 3); he was elected to the Presiding Committee of the World Peace Congress (Daily Worker of November 17, 1950, p. 1); he was a member of the World Peace Council of that Congress (Daily Worker of November 24, 1950, p. 9); a mimographed letter dated December 1, 1950, contains his name in a list of sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress.

"Dr. DuBois was a member of U.S. Sponsoring Committee of the American Intercontinental Peace Conference (Daily Worker of December 28, 1951, p. 2, and February 6, 1952, p. 2); the Peace Conference was called by the World Peace Council, formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw; he was awarded the International Peace Prize for "six world figures" by the World Peace Council (Daily People's World of January 29, 1953, p. 7; the Worker of February 8, 1953, p. 5; and Daily People's World, November 25, 1953, p. 4). He awarded the Stalin Peace Prize for 1953 to Howard Fast in ceremonies held in the Hotel McAlpin in April 1954. (See Daily Worker, April 26, 1954, pp. 3 and 6 and the Worker, May 9, 1954, p. 9.)

The Daily Worker of June 20, 1950 (p. 2), reported that Dr. DuBois signed the World Peace Appeal; the same information appears on an undated leaflet of the enterprise, received by this committee September 11, 1950. A mimeographed list of individuals who signed the Stockholm World Appeal To Outlaw Atomic Weapons, received for filing October 23, 1950, contains the name of Dr. DuBois. He was Chairman of the Peace Information Center where the Stockholm peace petition was made available. (Daily Worker of May 25, 1950, p. 2; and August 16, 1950, p. 5.)

"The World Peace Congress which was held in Paris, France, April 20–23, 1949, was cited as a Communist front among the 'peace' conferences which 'have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense pact' (Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of April 19, 1949; July 13, 1950; and April 1, 1951). The World Peace Council was formed at the conclusion of the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw and was 'heralded by the Moscow radio as the expression of the determination of the peoples to take into their own hands the struggle for peace.' (Committee on Un-American Activities in a report dated April 1, 1951.)

"The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; it 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy' and was 'lauded in the Communist press, putting every individual Communist on notice that he "has the duty to rise to this appeal."' (Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 1, 1951.)

"The American Peace Crusade, organized in January 1951, was cited as an organization which 'the Communists established as a new instrument for their "peace" offensive in the United States' (Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of Feb. 19, 1951, and Apr. 1, 1951); Dr. DuBois was one of the sponsors of the crusade (Daily Worker of Feb. 1, 1951, p. 2); minutes of the sponsors meeting which was held in Washington, D.C., March 15, 1951 (p. 4), named him as one of the initiators of the crusade and also as having been proposed as cochairman of that meeting; he was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, which was held in Chicago, June 29–July 1, 1951, called by the American Peace Crusade to advance the theme of world peace (Daily Worker, Apr. 22, 1951, p. 2; May 1, 1951, p. 11; the American Peace Crusade, May 1951, pp. 1 and 4; the Daily Worker of May 9, 1951, p. 4; Daily Worker of June 11, 1951, p. 2; a leaflet of the congress; Daily Worker of July 1, 1951, p. 3; a leaflet entitled "An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress"; the call to the American People's Congress; the Daily Worker of July 3, 1951, p. 2). He signed a petition of the crusade, calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power pact (Daily Worker, Feb. 1, 1952, p. 1); he attended a meeting of Delegates Assembly for Peace, called by the crusade and held in Washington, D.C., April 1 (Daily Worker, Apr. 3, 1952, p. 3); he was one of the sponsors of a peace referendum jointly with the American Peace Crusade to make the end of the Korean war a major issue in the 1952 election campaign (Daily People's World of Aug. 25, 1952, p. 8).

"Dr. DuBois issued a statement on the death of Stalin which read in part as follows: 'Let all Negroes, Jews, and foreign born who have suffered in America from prejudice and intolerance remember Joseph Stalin' (Daily Worker of Mar. 9, 1953, p. 3); the Daily Worker of January 18, 1952 (p. 8), reported that he had renewed his fight for a passport in order to attend the American Intercontinental Peace Conference in Rio de Janeiro; it was reported in the Washington Evening Star on May 10, 1952 (p. B–21), that Dr. DuBois was refused admission to Canada to attend the Canadian Peace Congress because he refused to undergo an examination by the Canadian Immigration Service. On September 14, 1952, the Worker (p. M6) reported that Dr. DuBois had experienced passport difficulties when leaving the United States; and on May 4, 1953 (p. 2), the Daily Worker reported that U.S. Delegate Betty Sanders told the opening session of the Continental Cultural Congress in Santiago, Chile, that DuBois would have attended in person 'as well as in spirit,' if he had not been denied a passport."

According to Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, "subversion" means "act of subverting, or a state of being subverted; overthrow; utter ruin; destruction. That which subverts."

The time element would prevent my reading all of these citations on the various individuals who compose the high echelon of this organization. I will, however, read excerpts from some of them and would like to ask later for permission to incorporate each of them in full in the RECORD.

"OCTOBER 13, 1955.

"Subject: Arthur B. Spingarn, national president, member of board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Arthur B. Spingarn is listed as an individual participating in the Conference on Africa, held by the Council on African Affairs in New York City, April 14, 1944, according to the Council's pamphlet, for a New Africa (p. 37).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"An undated leaflet, 'The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy' and the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), listed Arthur Spingarn, president NAACP, New York, N.Y., as one who signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions * * * to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. An advertisement in the New York Times, April 1, 1946 (p. 16), listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a signer of a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes.

"The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar

system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"An undated letterhead of the Public Use of Arts Committee listed Arthur B. Spingarn as a sponsor of the organization. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112), cited the Public Use of Arts Committee as a Communist front which was organized by the Communist-controlled Artists Union."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Grace B. Fenderson, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The pamphlet, 'For a New Africa' (p. 37), proceedings of the Conference on Africa held under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, April 14, 1944, named Mrs. Grace B. Fenderson as a conference participant.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow travel unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

"The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 'on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists"' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

"Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"'A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed.'

"George K. Hunton, testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"'In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * *.'

"Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"'Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?

"'Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"'The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow-travelers. It was a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"'The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"'As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"'We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

* * * * *

"'The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D.C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"'James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"'The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist front organization.

"'Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"'When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *.' (Pp. 510–512.)

"A Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the neutrality act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D.C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet, '7½ Million * * *' (p. 32). Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939, listed A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist, in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as 'organized at the First U.S. Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before.'

"The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the Ameri-

can League for Peace and Democracy as 'the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States.'

"A letter head of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15, 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17th annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by New Masses, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

"The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

"A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

" 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for, in support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations.' Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

"New Masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

"The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *.'

"A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"The Daily Worker, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3) and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

"A. Philip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy.'

"A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as 'one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war).' (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102.)

"The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

"A Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938). The booklet, These Americans Say, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, Feb. 12, 1940).

"The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

"The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. He signed the call to a United May Day conference, according to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

"The United May Day conference was cited as 'engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations' and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

"The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks 'to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.' (Letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

"The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. 'The People Versus H.C.L.' listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on April 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League.

"The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

"Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: L. Pearl Mitchell, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of April 18, 1936 (p. 3), named L. Pearl Mitchell, identified as national director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, as chairman of a committee for a benefit dance which was held by the Joint Scottsboro Defense Committee, Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of raising money to be sent to New York.

"The Scottsboro Defense Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82); and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

"Miss L. Pearl Mitchell, of Cleveland, Ohio, was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the call for National Negro Congress, Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

"The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that 'the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited, reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; March 29, 1944, p. 180; and included in the Attorney General's consolidated list of April 1, 1954)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Bishop W. J. Walls, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"As shown in Soviet Russia Today for December 1942 (p. 42), W. J. Walls was a sponsor of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. He was named as a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship on a letterhead of the group dated March 13, 1946, and a memorandum issued by the organization March 18, 1946.

"The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Council * * * (in a report dated March 29, 1944) as having been 'in recent months, the principal front' of the Communist Party.

"Bishop W. J. Walls, Chicago, Ill. supported the National Negro Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of February 3, 1936 (p. 2). The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954); the Attorney General had previously cited the National Negro Congress as 'sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687–7688). The special committee cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes' (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; January 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944).

"A petition to the United Nations, drafted and circulated by the Council on African Affairs, contained the signature of Bishop W. J. Walls, according to the Daily Worker of June 5, 1950 (p. 4). The Attorney General cited the council as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"Bishop Walls also signed a statement of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt (anti-Communist) Bill, according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4). The national committee * * * was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation' (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, released December 7, 1950).

"Identified as secretary of the board of bishops, A.M.E. Zion Church, Bishop W. J. Walls was named as having endorsed the World Peace Appeal (undated leaflet received by the committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of August 14, 1950 (p. 2). The World Peace Appeal was cited as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy'; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting 'every individual Communist on notice that he "has the duty to raise to this appeal" '; and as having 'received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. * * *' (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951).

"Bishop Walls was one of the sponsors of the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress, as shown on a mimeographed letter of December 1, 1950; he was a delegate to the World Peace Congress, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 7, 1950 (p. 2); he signed a protest made by the American Sponsoring Committee for Representation at the World Peace Congress (Daily People's World of Nov. 20, 1950, p. 2). The protest was made against exclusion by the British Government of more than 50 Americans, five-sixths of the U.S. delegation to the World Peace Congress. In the latter two sources, he was identified as secretary of the board of bishops of A.M.E. Zion Church.

"The World Peace Congress was cited as a Communist front among the 'peace conferences' which 'have been organized under Communist initiative in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against the North Atlantic Defense Pact' (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 1, 1951).

"According to the Daily Worker of October 28, 1949 (p. 2), Bishop W. J. Walls, of Chicago, endorsed Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Communist, and urged his reelection to the New York City Council. Benjamin J. Davis was 1 of the 11 leaders of the Communist Party on trial."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: John Haynes Holmes, national vice president, NAACP, 1954–61.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Rev. John Haynes Holmes was shown to be a member of the advisory board of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born on a letterhead of the organization dated April 27, 1938, on a letterhead dated January 1940, and in the call to the third annual conference. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (report, March 29, 1944, p. 155; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 13).

"In a bulletin, Spot News (p. 1), John Haynes Holmes was listed as a sponsor of the American Committee to Save Refugees, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pps. 49, 112, 129, 133, 138, 167, 180).

"A letterhead dated November 18, 1936, showed John Haynes Holmes to be a member of the general committee of the medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy. 'New Masses' (January 5, 1937, p. 31) also listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the general committee of that organization. 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy' (special committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 82).

"The Daily Worker (January 11, 1937, p. 2) reported that John Haynes Holmes was a sponsor of the New York City Conference Against War and Fascism. The Daily Worker (February 23, 1938, p. 2) reported that he signed a letter which was sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy. A contribution from him appeared in Fight (September 1935, p. 2), a magazine published by the American League Against War and Fascism; he was identified as minister, Community Church, New York. The following is quoted from an editorial comment on the article:

" 'In a recent sermon Dr. Holmes made an eloquent appeal for unity of Christians and Communists in opposition to the forces of reaction driving toward war and fascism, and in struggle for the achievement of a better world based on brotherhood and cooperation among men.

" 'If churchmen will unite with Communists, Socialists, trade unionists, and everyone else opposed to war and fascism, our forces will be tremendously strengthened, and war and fascism will not be inevitable. Already the American League Against War and Fascism has brought together in its ranks people of diverse political and religious beliefs, liberals, radicals, and revolutionists, of all races and creeds * * *.

" 'The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. There was, however, no fundamental change in the character of the organization. It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before' (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 53; also cited in reports, Jan. 3, 1939, pp. 69 and 121; Jan. 3, 1940, p. 10; June 25, 1942, p. 14). The Attorney General of the United States cited the league as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954). The Attorney General cited it as a 'Communist-front Organization, in re Harry Bridges,

May 28, 1942 (p. 10) and said it was 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7683).

"The Daily Worker (Sept. 24, 1940, p. 5) reported that an open letter sponsored by the Communist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union, demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties, was signed by John Haynes Holmes.

"The Daily Worker of February 13, 1937 (p. 2), reported that 'aroused by the Fascist tactics displayed by the Brazilian Government in its treatment of hundreds of political prisoners held without trial since November 1935, outstanding among them Luiz Carlos Prestes, leader of the liberation movement of the Brazilian people, and Arthur Ewert, ex-deputy in the German Reichstag, outstanding Americans have signed their names to a cable of protect forwarded to President Vargas of Brazil.' Among those named as signers was Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church. A letterhead dated November 16, 1938, of the conference on Pan American Democracy, listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor. The Attorney General cited this organization as subversive and Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 161 and 164; also cited in report, June 25, 1942, p. 18).

"The Daily Worker of February 13, 1939 (p. 2), reported that Dr. John Haynes Holmes was a member of the Descendants of the American Revolution. The Daily Worker (Jan. 21, 1938, p. 2), also referred to him as a sponsor and as a member of the advisory board of that organization. A pamphlet, Descendants of the American Revolution (back page), listed him as a member of the advisory board of the organization. The special committee (report, June 25, 1942, pp. 18 and 19) cited the Descendants of the American Revolution as 'a Communist-front organization set up as a radical imitation of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The descendants have uniformly adhered to the line of the Communist Party. * * * The educational director * * * is one Howard Solzam, an instructor at the Communist Party's Workers School in New York.'

"A program of the conference (February 12, 1940), named John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights. This conference was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report, March 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). It was also cited by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 3).

"An open letter to the U. S. Senate, initiated and distributed by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, in protest of the Dempsey deportation bill and the McCormack rider attached to the Walter espionage bill, was signed by the Reverend John Haynes Holmes (photostat of open letter). 'It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi Pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties' (Committee on Un-American Activities, report No. 1115, September 2, 1947, p. 12). The special committee cited the National Emergency Conference * * * as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 102).

"The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 7), reported that John Haynes Holmes was contributor to a booklet published by the League of American Writers. The league was cited as a Communist-front organization in three reports of the special committee (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 19; March 29, 1944, p. 48). It was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyality Review Board, released June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). Previously, the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686) stated that the overt activities of the league 'leave little doubt of its Communist control.'

"An undated letterhead listed John Haynes Holmes as a sponsor of the New York Tom Mooney Committee, which was cited as a Communist front by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 154).

"An undated leaflet published by the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York City, among those who appealed to President Roosevelt for justice in the Browder case. The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the U.S. Attroney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687; letter to Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). 'When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * *' (special committee report, March 29, 1944).

"Soviet Russia Today for December 1933 (p. 17) listed John Haynes Holmes among the endorsers of the National Committee, Friends of the Soviet Union. A pamphlet issued by the Friends of the Soviet Union entitled 'Welcome. "Land of Soviets" Moscow-New York 1929' listed John Haynes Holmes as a member of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers. The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited it as 'one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States' whose purpose 'is to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government' (report, January 3, 1939, p. 78).

"Rev. John Haynes Holmes, New York, N.Y., was shown to be a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace on the call to that conference. The conference was cited by this committee at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been 'aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda' (report 378, April 25, 1961, p. 58).

"A letterhead dated March 16, 1937, listed John Haynes Holes as a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst, cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a subsidiary organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which was described on page 2 of this report (report, June 25, 1942, p. 16).

"A letterhead dated March 20, 1926, listed Rev. John Haynes Holmes as a member of the advisory board of Russian Reconstruction Farms, Inc., cited by the special committee as a Communist enterprise which was directed by Harold Ware, son of the well-known Communist Ella Reeve Bloor (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

"New Masses for March 31, 1936 (p. 2) named John Haynes Holmes as a member of the League for Mutual Aid, cited as a Communist enterprise by the special committee (report, March 29, 1944, p. 76).

"According to the Daily Worker of February 16, 1958 (p. 16) Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a statement to the mayor and city council in behalf of Simon Gerson, a Communist. An advertisement in the New York Times (February 19, 1948, p. 13), listed him as a supporter of the Citizens Committee to Defend Representative Government, supporting the seating of Gerson.

"The following was reported in the Daily Worker on September 22, 1948 (p. 5): 'Prof. Ralph Sarton Perry of Harvard University released yesterday the names of 93 prominent educators, churchmen, and individuals in other cultural fields, who have formed a committee of welcome for the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, D.D., dean of Canterbury Cathedral. Dean Johnson had been invited to visit the United States by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship for a countrywide tour under its auspices. A visa was refused him on the ground that the sponsoring organization was on the Attorney General's list. The Committee of Welcome had extended to Dean Johnson an invitation to come to the United States under its independent auspice in November and December of this year and to speak at public gatherings.' The article named Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister, the Community Church, New York, among the members of the committee.

"The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the National Council * * * as 'the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian' (report, March 29, 1944, p. 156).

"The Daily Worker of February 19, 1951 (p. 2), reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes was a signer of a statement addressed to the Attorney General, urging withdrawal of contempt of Congress proceedings against a number of persons who had been indicted for refusing to answer questions before congressional committees.

"The Daily People's World of August 1, 1951 (p. 2), reported that the Rev. John Haynes Holmes endorsed a statement attacking the Smith Act, which was anti-Communist legislation. It was reported in the Daily Worker of January 15, 1953 (p. 8), that Rev. John Haynes Holmes, minister-emeritus, the Community Church of New York, signed a letter to President Truman asking for amnesty for 11 leaders of the Communist Party arrested under the Smith Act.

"In testimony before this committee on July 7, 1953, Benjamin Gitlow, former member of the Communist Party, said: 'Before the creation of the front organizations, the ministers who carried out the instructions of the Communist Party or collaborated with it were limited in numbers. The outstanding ones among them were * * * Rev. John Haynes Holmes * * *' (Communist Activities in the New York Area, p. 2077).

"The Daily Worker of January 1, 1953 (p. 1), reported that Rev. John Haynes Holmes signed a petition for clemency for the Rosenbergs. The same newspaper on January 13, 1953 (p. 2), published a list of 'the clergymen of various faiths and other religious leaders who have urged President Truman to use his power of clemency to save the lives of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg.' The name of Dr. John Haynes Holmes, New York, appeared on the list. The Rosenbergs had been convicted of conspiracy to commit espionage and sentenced to death."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: William Lloyd Imes, national vice president, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"William Lloyd Imes was one of those who signed a statement on December 14, 1939 (the day before the 148th anniversary of the Bills of Rights), 'warning against denying to the Communists, or to any other minority group, the full freedom guaranteed by the Bills of Rights' (letter signed by Dashiell Hammett dated January 1940, attached to the statement).

"A pamphlet entitled 'The People vs. H.C.L.' which was dated December 11–12, 1937, named William Lloyd Imes as one of the sponsors of the Consumers National Federation, publishers of the pamphlet.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the Consumers National Federation as a Communist-front organization.

"He supported the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 3, 1936, p. 2); spoke at the Second National Negro Congress in October 1937 (program of the congress); and supported a conference of the congress to push passage of the antilynch bill (Daily Worker, Mar. 17, 1938, p. 4).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *'

"William Lloyd Imes sponsored a dinner-forum called by the Protestant Digest Associates on the subject, Protestantism answers hate, which was held in New York City, February 25, 1941.

"Protestant Digest was cited as 'a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 48).

"He signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940; and sponsored a citizens rally of the same organization, on April 13, 1940, in New York City (according to a leaflet announcing the rally).

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1944 (p. 13), cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers.

"William Lloyd Imes sponsored the Fourth Annual Conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, as shown on a letterhead of the conference which was held in Washington, D.C., March 2 to 3, 1940.

"The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversives and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"Dr. Imes contributed to Fight magazine, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism (Fight for August 1935, p. 4); he was chairman of a rally of the American League which was held in Harlem (Fight for September 1935, p. 14); he spoke at the National People's Committee Against Hearst of the American League (Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1936, p. 4); he supported a statement of the League, addressed to the United States Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 27, 1937, p. 2); he was a member of the National People's Committee Against Hearst (letterhead of Mar. 16, 1937); he spoke in New York City at a joint meeting of the American League and American Friends of the Chinese People (Daily Worker, Sept. 23, 1937, p. 2); and was one of the sponsors of the China Aid Council of the American League, as shown on a letterhead of the council dated May 18, 1938. As shown by the Daily Worker of April 6, 1937 (p. 5), Rev. William Lloyd Imes, pastor, St. James Presbyterian Church, was guest of honor at a dinner of the American League Against War and Fascism, April 6, 1937, New York City.

"The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a 'Communist-front organization' in (re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); and 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7683). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as 'completely under the control of Communists.'

"A letterhead dated November 3, 1937, lists William Lloyd Imes as a member of the national executive committee, People's Congress for Democracy and Peace; he sponsored the Boycott Japanese Goods Conference of the American League for Peace and Democracy, February 5, 1938 (Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1938, p. 2); he signed a letter of the American League, as was shown in the Daily Worker of February 23, 1938 (p. 2); he signed a statement of the league concerning the international situation (New Masses, Mar. 15, 1938, p. 19); a letterhead of the New York City Division of the American League named him as a member of the advisory board as of that date (Sept. 22, 1938); a letterhead of the City Executive Committee, New York City Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated September 26, 1938, contained the name of the Reverend William Lloyd Imes in the list of members of the advisory board; he endorsed the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, January 6–8, 1939, in New York City, as shown on a letterhead dated December 7, 1938. A letterhead of the New York City Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated March 21, 1939, listed him as a member of the advisory board of the league. A letterhead of the Baltimore Division, American League for Peace and Democracy, dated May 18, 1939, contained the name of Dr. Imes in the list of members of the national committee; a letterhead of the league, dated July 12, 1939, furnished the same information, and also a pamphlet entitled '7½ Million * * *,' which was published by the league.

"The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'the largest of the Communist front movements in the United States.'

"The Daily Worker of August 13, 1940 (p. 5), named Dr. Imes as one who endorsed the Emergency Peace Mobilization; he was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Committee of the Emergency Peace Mobilization, as shown on an undated letterhead.

"The Attorney General cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as follows: 'The American Peace Mobilization was formally founded at a meeting in Chicago at the end of August 1940, known as the Emergency Peace Mobilization' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the Emergency Peace Mobilization as a Communist front which came forth, after Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, to oppose the national defense program, lend-lease, conscription, and other American warmongering efforts. It immediately preceded the American Peace Mobilization in 1940.

"Dr. Imes sponsored the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, as shown on the call to the conference, June 7, 1940; he signed a letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, addressed to Attorney General Jackson, in defense of ballot rights of minority parties (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1940, p. 1); he signed a statement of the federation, opposing use of injunctions in labor disputes, according to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Times of April 1, 1946, in which source he was identified as president of Knoxville College.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as 'an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations' (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102). The Attorney General cited the conference as one as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687).

"The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesigned April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.'

"Dr. Imes signed an open letter of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights (Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1 and 5); he was one of the sponsors of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, as shown on a letterhead of that group dated November 16, 1938.

"The National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights was cited as a Communist front organization by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and

102). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights as follows: 'It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.'

"The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"Dr. Imes was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, as shown on the program of the conference, February 12, 1940. He spoke before the American Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Jan. 29, 1938, p. 3); and endorsed the American Youth Act, as shown on a press release of the American Youth Congress.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its March 29, 1944, report (pp. 96 and 120), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The organization was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3), as among a 'maize of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'originated in 1934 and * * * has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7685). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the American Youth Congress as 'one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party' and 'prominently identified with the White House picket line * * *.'

"According to the proceedings and report, and to 'Equal Justice' for July 1939, he sent greetings to the National Conference of the International Labor Defense. He signed a letter to President Roosevelt, defending the publication, New Masses (issue of April 2, 1940, p. 21).

"The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7686). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 75–78), cited the International Labor Defense as 'the legal defense arm of the Communist Party of the United States.'

"New Masses was cited as a 'Communist periodical' by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 48 and 75), cited New Masses as a 'nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * *.'"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. W. Montague Cobb, chairman of the national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to the Bookshopper for July 1948 (p. 2), Montague Cobb, professor, Howard University, lectured at a membership meeting in January 1948 of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop, 916 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"The Attorney General of the United States found that 'evidence of Communist penetration or control [of the Washington Cooperative Bookshop] is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations * * * certain of the officers and employees of the bookshop, including its manager and executive secretary, have been in close contact with local officials of the Communist Party of the District of Columbia' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688); subsequently, it was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as a Communist front (report 1311 of March 29, 1944).

"Dr. W. Montague Cobb, identified as professor of anatomy, Howard University, spoke at the 1947 convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students, according to their official organ, the Interne (January 1948, p. 61); the same publication (February 1950, p. 27) reported that he had spoken at a convention of the organization; the printed program of the 16th Convention of the Association of Internes and Medical Students which was held in December 1950, revealed that he had spoken at the convention.

"The Association of Interns and Medical Students was cited as an organization which 'has long been a faithful follower of the Communist Party line,' and which supported the International Union of Students' Second World Student Congress in Prague in August 1950 (report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Communist Peace Offensive, dated April 1, 1951).

"An advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post of May 18, 1948 (p. 15), disclosed the name of Dr. W. Montague Cobb as having signed a statement against the Mundt (anti-Communist) bill."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Westley W. Law, Savannah, Ga., national board of directors, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"An undated press release, General Youth Statement (p. 3), listed W. W. Law, Savannah, Ga., as an endorser of the Youth Statement of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace (May 29–30, 1950).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 58), cited the Mid-Century Conference for Peace at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been 'aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda.'

"The Daily Worker of June 23, 1949 (p. 2), reported that W. W. Law, past national chairman, National Association for Advancement of Colored People, youth division, Savannah, Ga., signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. J. M. Tinsley, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"As shown by the official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 41), Dr. J. M. Tinsley, Virginia, was a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of the organization. J. M. Tinsley, Richmond, was treasurer of the National Negro Congress (Daily Worker, Apr. 7, 1936, p. 3).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations designated previously pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *.'

"J. M. Tinsley endorsed the Southern Negro Youth Congress (Daily Worker, Feb. 25, 1938, p. 3).

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Attorney General as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter released Dec. 4, 1947; redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated list). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as 'a surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League."

"FEBRUARY 14, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, Pa., national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be

noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"On the call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America at Washington, D.C., June 7–9, 1940, the name of Dr. Harry J. Greene of Philadelphia, Pa., appears in a list of the sponsors; he was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown on their letterheads dated September 10 and November 6, 1940, in which sources he is shown as being from Philadelphia.

"The printed program of a National Action Conference for Civil Rights which was scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C., April 19–20, 1941, named Dr. Harry J. Greene, Philadelphia, as one of the sponsors of that conference, called by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (formed as a result of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, June 7–9, 1940), as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations * * * by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their programs'; and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948, respectively; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party' (report of Mar. 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943). The Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in a report released September 2, 1947.

"Dr. Harry J. Greene was chairman of a discussion group on 'Denial of Citizenship Rights' at the Second National Negro Congress, October 15–17, 1937, in Philadelphia, as shown on the printed program of that congress (p. 19) in which source he is identified as being from Philadelphia, Pa., and president of the Philadelphia branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. A booklet of the National Negro Congress entitled 'We Are Rising' (April 1939, p. 2) named one Harry Green as vice president, Philadelphia council of the congress.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes' (report of Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and Mar. 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited the Congress as 'an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688); later, the Attorney General cited the congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954).

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Roscoe Dunjee, national vice-president, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker for April 16, 1947 (p. 2), reported that Roscoe Dunjee, attorney, Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement defending the Communist Party. He was one of the signers of a statement condemning 'punitive measures directed against the Communist Party' as shown by the April 20, 1947 issue of the Worker (p. 8). The Daily Worker for April 27, 1947 (p. 24), shows Roscoe Dunje as one of the signers of a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. Roscoe C. Dunjee, publisher of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, was a sponsor of a statement attacking the arrest of the Communist Party leaders, according to the Daily Worker, August 23, 1948 (p. 3). He sponsored the 'Statement by Negro Americans' in behalf of the arrested Communist leaders as shown by the August 29, 1948, issue of the Worker (p. 11). The Daily Worker for March 7, 1950 (p. 4), reported that Roscoe Dunjee attacked Judge Medina in the case of the Communist leaders.

"Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the initiating committee, of the Congress on Civil Rights held in Detroit, Mich., April 27 and 28, 1946, as shown by the summons to the congress. The Daily Worker of April 16, 1947 (p. 2), reported that Roscoe Dunjee, of Oklahoma City, Okla., was one of the signers of a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress defending the Communist Party. The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, 1947 and 1948; included in consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as being 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (report No. 115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19).

"The pamphlet Seeing Is Believing, 1947, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 135), show Roscoe Dunjee as a member of the Council on African Affairs, Inc. The Council on African Affairs was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. He redesignated the organization on April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.)

"Roscoe Dunjee was a sponsor of the Win the Peace Conference of the National Committee To Win the Peace, as shown by the Daily Worker March 5, 1946, a letterhead of the organization dated February 28, 1946, and the call to a win-the-peace conference, National Press Building, Washington, D.C., April 5–7, 1946. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released in 1947 and 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

"The Daily Worker for October 19, 1948 (p. 7), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of those who signed a statement released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The council was cited as a Communist front by this committee in its review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace (April 26, 1950—original release date April 19, 1949, p. 2).

"Roscoe Dunjee was a signer of the call to the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14–16, 1940. A letterhead of the conference, dated June 4, 1947, shows Roscoe Dunjee as vice president and a member of the national committee of that organization. He was also shown as vice president of the organization in an undated leaflet, The South Is Closer Than You Think, and the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947, page 139. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare was cited as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, p. 147.) In its report of June 12, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities described the conference as a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South,' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"The New York Times of October 9, 1944 (p. 12), reported that Roscoe Dunjee was one of the signers of an open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey for the pardon of Morris U. Schappes, which was sponsored by the Schappes Defense Committee. The Schappes Defense Committee was cited as a Communist organization by the United States Attorney General (letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953). The special Committee on Un-American Activities described the Schappes Defense Committee as 'a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York.' Morris U. Schappes 'was on the teaching staff of the College of the City of New York for a period of 13 years. In 1956 his superior on the college faculty refused to recommend him for reappointment. This action led to prolonged agitation by the Communist Party' (report, March 29, 1944, p. 71).

"Roscoe Dunjee was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress according to a letterhead of that organization dated June 12, 1947, the testimony of Walter S. Steele, public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 97), a letterhead dated August 11, 1947, and a page from a leaflet published by the organization. The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., 'which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means' (U.S. Attorney General, letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947; redesignated April 27, 1953; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The Committee on Un-American Activities said it was 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League (report No. 271, April 17, 1947, p. 14). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the organization as a Communist front (report, January 3, 1940, p. 9).

"According to the Daily Worker for April 1, 1945 (p. 6m), Roscoe Dunjee was asked what he thought of New York's new anti-discrimination law, and was quoted as replying: 'It shows a trend in the direction which the United States as a nation must take if we rise to the level of Russian morality * * *.'

"Photographs of Roscoe Dunjee are found in the Daily Worker, issues of December 9, 1941 (p. 7), and April 1, 1945 (p. 6m).

"Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Black Dispatch, Oklahoma City, Okla., was quoted in the March 28, 1944, issue of New Masses (p. 15), as follows:

" 'I attended a Lincoln and Douglas meeting held under the auspices of the Communist Party, February 12 * * * Most assuredly Americans should stop and listen to what Communists have to say. The Russian experiment as expressed today in Soviet life is too effective for anyone to attempt to overlook this. As president of the State conference of branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I have every year for the past 10 invited the Communist to address our meeting. Alan Shaw, secretary of the Communist Party in Oklahoma, addressed our State conference at

Tulsa last November * * * personally I endorse the idea of an international State * * * as espoused by the Communist Party.'

"The following is quoted from the Daily Worker of April 8, 1952 (p. 2):

" 'Roscoe Dunjee, editor of the Oklahoma Black-Dispatch, leading Negro newspaper in the Southwest, has hailed in a long editorial the victory won by William L. Patterson, head of the Civil Rights Congress, in securing acquittal on a contempt of Congress charge.'

"(Note citation of Civil Rights Congress on p. 1 of this rport.)

"Roscoe C. Dunjee, Oklahoma City, was listed as one of four sponsors of a statement which appeared in the Sunday Worker, August 29, 1948 (p. 11), from which the following is quoted:

" 'THE FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

" '(Statement by Negro Americans to the President and Attorney General of the United States)

" 'We, the undersigned Negro Americans, strongly condemn your hysteria-breeding arrests of national leaders of the Communist Party, and call upon you to take positive action to protect civil rights instead of persecuting political minorities.

" 'We raise here no defenes of the principles of the Communist Party. Our concern is to defend the right of political and other minorities, especially the Negro people, to fight for the kind of society which they consider necessary to give full expression to the principles of American democracy * * *

" 'The obvious purpose of these Gestapo-like arrests of Communist leaders is to frighten people away from the Wallace movement and progressive people's organizations generally, practically all of which have been slandered as Communist or subversive * * *

" 'We call upon our Government to halt its Fascist-like attacks upon opposition minorities, and to act for the protection of minority rights * * *' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The program of the fifth national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Atlantic City, N.J., March 29–30, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a sponsor.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"S. Ralph Harlow was an endorser of the Committee for Citizenship Rights as shown by a letterhead dated January 10, 1942. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 95), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as an organization which defended the 'interests of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Committee for Citizenship Rights as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"Prof. S. Ralph Harlow signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, December 14, 1949 (p. 9). He was identified in this instance as associated with Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist Peace Offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 54), cited the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of Communists in the United States doing their part in the Moscow campaign.

"As shown by Soviet Russia Today of November 1937 (p. 79), S. Ralph Harlow was a signer of the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union, cited as a 'Communist enterprise' signed hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers:

" 'January 23–25, 1948, New York City' conference call of the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East, listed Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Smith College, as a sponsor of the conference. The Attorney General cited the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East as Communist, and a conference called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy in a letter released July 25, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"A news release of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties dated December 26, 1941, listed S. Ralph Harlow as a signer. He signed the organization's 1943 message to the House of Representatives (leaflet, attached to undated letterhead); and the group's statement supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party (undated leaflet, 'the only sound policy for a democracy * * *' and Daily Worker, March 19, 1945, p. 4).

"The Attorney General cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

"As shown by the Daily Worker of September 17, 1940 (pp. 1, 5), S. Ralph Harlow signed a telegram of the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson in behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union defendants. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights as a Communist-front group.

"S. Ralph Harlow sponsored the call for the Protestantism Answers Hate dinner-forum held under auspices of the Protestant Digest, New York, February 25, 1941, as shown by a leaflet. He was identified in this instance as professor of sociology, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the Protestant Digest as 'a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal.'

"According to the New York Times, October 9, 1944 (p. 12), S. Ralph Harlow, chairman, department of religion, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., signed an open letter of the Schappes defense committee to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey asking a pardon for Morris Schappes."

"The Schappes defense committee was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as 'a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York.' (Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 71).

"Prof. S. Ralph Harlow endorsed the World Peace Appeal as shown by an undated leaflet, Prominent Americans Call for * * * (received Sept. 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker, August 14, 1950 (p. 2).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy'; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting 'every individual Communist on notice that he "has duty to rise to this appeal" '; and as having 'received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist parties throughout the world.' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Robert C. Weaver, identified from Washington, D.C., as an economic adviser to the Secretary of Interior, was discussion leader of a panel on 'The Federal Housing Program and the Negro' at the Second National Negro Congress as shown by the program of that congress which was held in Philadelphia, October 15–17, 1937.

"The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.' The Attorney General had cited the group previously as follows: 'From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little

doubt that it has served what James M. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

"The Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2), listed Robert C. Weaver, identified as Assistant Housing Administrator of the Department of Interior, as one of the signers of the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy letter to lift the Spanish embargo. The special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

"Robert C. Weaver, Washington, D.C., contributed financially to Social Work Today as shown by the January 1941 issue of that publication (pp. 16–18). Social Work Today was cited as a Communist magazine by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 129).

"R. C. Weaver, 1206 Kenyon Street, Washington, D.C., was listed as a member of the Washington Book Shop on a 1941 membership list of the organization subpenaed by this committee. The Washington Book Shop Association was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General cited the organization previousy as showing 'evidence of Communist penetration or control' according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942 (p. 7688). The special committee in report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the organization as a Communist-front organization.

"Robert C. Weaver was the author of The Negro Ghetto which was reviewed by Herbert Aptheker in the August 1948 issue of Masses and Mainstream (p. 85). The congressional committee, in its report on the Congress of American Women, April 26, 1950 (p. 75), cited Masses and Mainstream as successor to New Masses, a Communist magazine."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Lewis Gannett, national board of directors, NAACP, national vice president, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"On December 18, 1934, the Daily Worker (p. 5) reported the following: 'A reception to mark the 10 anniversary of International Publishers took place * * * December 14, in * * * the new school for social research * * * Scores of prominent writers, artists, and editors were present to pay tribute to International Publishers' decade of achievement * * * Among those present were * * * Lewis Gannett, book-review columnist of New York Herald Tribune * * *'

"The Attorney General of the United States cited International Publishers as 'The (Communist) Party's publishing house,' headed by Alexander Trachtenberg (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7686); and as the 'publishing agency of the Communist Party' (brief for the United States in the case of William Schneiderman, p. 145). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited International Publishers as an 'official publishing house of the Communist Party in the United States' (Reports of January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942); the Committee on Un-American Activties cited the organization as the 'Official American Communist Party publishing house' (Report No. 1920 dated May 11, 1948).

"Lewis Gannett, Harvard, was a member of the sponsoring committee of dinner sponsored by the American Student Union for 'alumni of the student movement and present members' as shown in Student Advocate for February 1937 (p. 2). The American Student Union was cited as a Communist front which 'the result of a united front gathering of young Socialists and Communists' in 1935. The Young Communist League took credit for creation of the organization (Report of the special Committee on Un-American Activties dated Jan. 3, 1939; also cited in reports of Jan. 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1949).

"A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939 contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' Committee of that organization; the same information is shown in public hearings before this committee July 21, 1953 (p. 3639). The American League was cited by the Attorney General as 'designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International'(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684); and subsequently, as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954). The special committee cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as 'a bold advocation of treason' (reports of January 3, 1939; Jan. 3, 1940; Jan. 3, 1941; June 25, 1942; and Jan. 2, 1943).

"The special committee cited the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers (report of June 25, 1942; also cited in report of March 29, 1944); a letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated May 26, 1940, contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the organization's national executive committee.

"A letterhead of the American Russian Institute for Cultural Relations With the Soviet Union, Inc., contains the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of its board of directors; the letterhead was dated July 14, 1938. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949; also included on consolidated list dated April 1, 1954).

"Lewis S. Gannett was a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service, as shown on a photostat of their letterhead dated September 8, 1930. The 'American Fund for Public Service was established by Charles Garland, son of the wealthy James A. Garland. Young Garland, conditioned against wealth through radical acquaintances at Harvard, declined to accept his inheritance for his own personal use. Instead, he established, in 1922, the American Fund for Public Service with the sum of $900,000 which consisted largely of conservative securities. During the lush twenties, the fund grew to some $2 million.

"'A self-perpetuating board of directors was set up for the purpose of handing out this easy money. Sidney Hillman was among them. Associated with Hillman as directors were Roger N. Baldwin, William Z. Foster, Lewis Gannett, * * *.' (From report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944.)

"An undated booklet of Friends of the Soviet Union contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of the Reception Committee for the Soviet Flyers, under auspices of that organization; he contributed a review of Maxim Gorki's 'A Book of Short Stories to Soviet Russia Today' (September 1939, p. 26). The Attorney General cited Friends of the Soviet Union as Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special committee cited the organization as 'one of the most open Communist fronts in the United States' (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). Soviet Russia Today was published by Friends of the Soviet Union.

"Soviet Russia Today for November 1937 (p. 79) published a list of individuals who signed the Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union under this statement: 'I hereby inscribe my name in greeting to the people of the Soviet Union on the 20th anniversary of the establishment of the Soviet Republic.' The Golden Book of American Friendship With the Soviet Union was cited as a 'Communist enterprise' signed by hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

"The Daily Worker of January 18, 1939 (p. 7) reported that Lewis Gannett was a committee sponsor of the League of American Writers, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special committee (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944). The Attorney General cited it as being under 'Communist control' and as subversive and Communist (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686; and press releases of June 1, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"New Masses for March 16, 1937 (p. 26) named Lewis Gannett as one of the sponsors of a sendoff dinner for the ambulance corps under the auspices of the American Artists and Writers Committee, Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy; an undated letterhead of the Writers' and Artists' Committee for Medical Aid to Spain also contains his name in a list of sponsors; the letterhead also carries the notation 'Affiliated with the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy'; he signed a petition of American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4).

"During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, 'recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy' (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

"Another such organization which was cited by the special committee (see last paragraph above) was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy; their letterhead of July 6, 1938, contained the name of Lewis Gannett in a list of members of the Writers' and Artists' Committee.

"The Liberator for September 1921 (p. 11) contained Lewis Gannett's interview with 'Bill Haywood in Moscow'; he also contributed an article to the July 1922 issue of the same publication (p. 30). The special committee cited the Liberator as a 'Communist magazine' (report of June 25, 1942).

"Lewis Gannett contributed articles to New Masses for February 16, 1937 (p. 21) and August 10, 1943 (p. 20); he signed New Masses' Letter to the President of the United States, as shown in New Masses of April 2, 1940 (p. 21), which source identified him as literary editor, New York Herald Tribune. New Masses has been cited by the Attorney General as a 'Communist periodical' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688); the special committee cited it as the 'nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party * * * whose ownership was vested in the American Fund for Public Service' (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1989 and June 25, 1942).

"A letterhead of the All-American Anti-Imperialist League, dated April 11, 1928, contains the name of Lewis S. Gannett in a list of members of that organization's national committee. The Attorney General cited the

All-American Anti-Imperialist League as a 'Communist-front organization' (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); the special committee cited the group as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to the Communist publication, the Daily Worker of April 13, 1936 (p. 3), Buell G. Gallagher, identified as president of Talladega College, endorsed a peace strike of 500,000 students who planned a demonstration for April 22, 1936. The strike was sponsored by the American Student Union which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

"The Daily People's World, the Communist journal on the west coast, listed Dr. Buell Gallagher as a member of the Draft Cross Committee, in connection with a move to draft Mayor Laurence L. Cross, of Berkeley, Calif., as candidate for Congress from the Seventh District of California. (See Daily People's World of January 28, 1948, p. 3.) In the February 17, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), we find that 'the committee originally formed to draft Mayor Laurence Cross for Congress has resolved to stay together in support of the candidacy of Dr. Buell G. Gallagher in the Seventh District.' According to Judge Louis J. Hardie, committee chairman, 'In Dr. Gallagher, we feel that we have found a congressional candidate who possesses those qualities of intelligence, integrity, and idealism which we admire in Dr. Cross. His deep acquaintance with social and economic problems and his broad experience in community activities insure the voters of the Seventh District a candidate who will honestly and ably serve them in the 81st Congress' (ibid).

"In the March 10, 1948, issue of the Daily People's World, we note that the 'Alameda County CIO Council voted endorsement last night for Dr. Buell Gallagher, pro-Wallace candidate for Congress in the Seventh District. Dr. Gallagher, endorsed previously by the AFL Central Labor Council and Building Trades Council, will run in the Democratic primary in June against Dyke Brown, the Truman candidate. Congressman from the Seventh District now is Republican John J. Allen, who voted for the Taft-Hartley law' (p. 3).

"Under date of February 10, 1951, Dr. Gallagher addressed a letter to the chairman of this committee detailing an analysis of the information reflected in the public files of the committee, and stating, 'at no time have I ever been a member of, or sympathizer with, the Communist Party; nor a member of, or sympathizer with, any organization which I knew or believed to be a front for communism.' The chairman, in a letter to Dr. Gallagher dated March 3, 1951, advised him that his analysis would be made a part of the committee records and quoted in any future releases."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Judge Hubert T. Delany (also spelled Delaney), national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in the following sources: Pamphlets entitled 'Africa in the War,' 'Seeing Is Believing' (1947), 'For a New Africa,' (p. 36), '8 Million Demand Freedom' (inside back cover); leaflets headed 'The Job To Be Done' and 'What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World' (June 26, 1944). New Africa for December 1943 (p. 4) and a letterhead of the council dated May 17, 1945, contained the same information. Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities July 21, 1947 (p. 135), that Judge Delany was a member of the Council on African Affairs. According to the Daily Worker of March 29, 1948 (p. 7), Judge Hubert T. Delaney was a member of the executive board of the council. The Daily Worker of April 26, 1947 (p. 12), named him as having signed a statement issued by the council.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954).

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, which was made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities, contains the name of one Hobert T. Delany, 30 Broad Street, New York City. The name of Hubert T. Delany appeared on a letterhead of the guild dated May 28, 1940, as director ex officio. The New York Guild Lawyer for September 1950 listed him as vice president of the New York chapter of the guild. A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild (as of December 1949) contains the name of the Honorable Hubert T. Delaney in a list of members of the organization's executive board; he is so named in a list dated May 1950. Both of these lists were printed in a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published by the Committee on Un-American Activities September 17, 1950.

"Convention News of May 1941 (pp. 2 and 4), issued by the fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild which was held May 29–June 1, 1941, in Detroit, Mich., named Hubert T. Delany as a member of the convention resolutions committee; he was also named in the same source as a member of the national executive board, National Lawyers Guild. Judge Delaney presided at an annual convention of the guild in Chicago, Ill., in 1951 (Daily People's World, October 18, 1951, p. 2); he also spoke before the guild in 1951, as reported in the Daily Worker of April 10, 1951, page 5. In the latter three sources, he was identified with the domestic relations court of New York City.

"The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that Judge Delany was to lead a workshop at the national conference on civil rights legislation and discrimination to be held in New York City, October 10–12, under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the New York City chapter of the guild dated October 17, 1952, listed Hubert T. Delany as vice president. The Daily Work of February 20, 1953 (p. 6), announced that he would speak at a panel session on civil rights and liberties, February 22, at the annual convention of the guild, February 20–23, in New York City. According to the Daily Worker of May 27, 1953 (p. 8), Hubert T. Delany was reelected vice president of the New York City chapter of the National Lawyers Guild at the annual membership meeting May 26. He was elected one of the vice presidents of the National Lawyers Guild, New York City chapter, for the years 1954–55, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 26, 1954 (p. 8).

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report No. 1311 dated March 29, 1944. In a report on the guild, prepared and released September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, it was shown that the National Lawyers Guild 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"Hubert T. Delany was a member of the Lawyers' Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy, as shown on their letterhead dated April 6, 1939. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of April 1, 1954); he had previously cited the organization as 'established in the United States * * * in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American league as 'the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States' (report of January 3, 1940).

"The catalog of the George Washington Carver School (winter term, 1947) contains the name of Judge Hubert T. Delany as a member of the board of directors of that school, cited by the Attorney General as 'an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party' (press release of December 4, 1947; included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954).

"Hubert T. Delany was named as a representative individual who advocated lifting the arms embargo against Spain in a booklet entitled 'These Americans Say,' which was prepared and published by the coordinating committee to lift the embargo, cited as one of the number of groups set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (From a report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

"A letterhead of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain dated March 5, 1938, and a prospectus and review of the organization both name him as a member of that group.

"In a report dated March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities had the following to say concerning the Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain: 'When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain, the lawyers' committee * * * supported this movement.'

"A letterhead of the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy dated July 6, 1938, contains the name of Judge Delany in a list of members of that group.

"During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party wholeheartedly campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and setting up so-called relief organizations such as the medical bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (From report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities dated March 29, 1944.)

"Hubert T. Delany was one of the sponsors of a testimonial dinner in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith, Communist Party member and national secretary of the National Maritime Union; identified as tax commissioner, New York City, Judge Delany was listed by Labor Defender (issue of October 1935) as one of the individuals who signed a petition for the freedom of Angelo Herndon, a Communist."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Norman Cousins, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be constructed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise inciated.

"In an article which appeared in the Daily Worker of January 13, 1948, it was reported that 'Thirty-five well-known authors, editors, clergymen, and other public figures today called on the new Federal Employees Loyalty Review Board to prevent injustices to individuals in the Government loyalty check.' Norman Cousins was one of those who signed the letter, addressed to Seth W. Richardson, board chairman. This article also appeared in the New York Times on the preceding day, January 12, 1948 (p. 10).

"In a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities entitled 'Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace,' dated April 19, 1949, we find the following statement concerning a speech of Norman Cousins before that conference:

" 'In answer to this totalitarian philosophy of dragooning culture, Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, declared amid a great deal of hissing and booing, that "Democracy must mean intellectual freedom, that it must protect the individual against the right of the state to draw political and cultural blueprints for its painters and writers and composers or to castigate them, or to enter into those matters of mind in which the individual is sovereign." ' (See p. 13 of the Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference.)"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Dr. Algernon D. Black was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, March 25–27, 1949 (conference program, p. 12, and conference call). The Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 2), announced that he was a member of the program committee of that conference. Speaking of peace, edited report of the conference, March 25, 26, 27, 1949, listed Algernon Black as a speaker on A Warning Against Sectarian Prejudice, and gave biographical data concerning him (pp. 121, 139).

"In 1948 and 1949, Dr. Black signed statements of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 2; letterhead received in January 1949; New York Star of January 4, 1949, p. 9, an advertisement). He spoke before the group in February 1949 (Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949, p. 2).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949, April 26, 1950, cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the scientific and cultural conference as actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

"The call to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East, held in January 1948, included the name of Dr. Algernon Black in the list of sponsors (Call, January 23–25, 1948, New York City); the conference was called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. In the December 1949–January 1950 issue of Far East Spotlight, which is the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Dr. Black answered a questionnaire issued by that committee, favoring recognition of the Chinese Communist government.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy as a Communist organization in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board and release to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"The Daily Worker of June 21, 1948, reported that Algernon D. Black had signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, calling for a conference with the Soviet Union; he signed an appeal of the same organization to the U.S. Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled 'End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace' which was dated December 1948); he signed a statement in praise of Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin (May 1948), as shown in the pamphlet How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace (p. 9), prepared and released by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

"The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as 'in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian.'

"Dr. Black contributed an article to the pamphlet We Hold These Truths (p. 22), which was issued by the League of American Writers. He was named as a member of the executive committee of Film Audiences for Democracy in the June 1939 issue of Film Survey, official organ of Film Audiences, cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

"The Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U.S. Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'founded under Communist auspices in 1935 * * * in 1939 * * * began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reports of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), June 25, 1942 (p. 19), and March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the League of American Writers as a Communist-front organization.

"A letterhead of the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, dated October 3, 1936, listed the name of Algernon D. Black as a member of that committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

"Algernon Black was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, as shown in a pamphlet entitled 'Presenting the American Student Union.' The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1939 (p. 80), cited the American Student Union as a Communist-front organization.

"A letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York, dated May 11, 1946, listed the name of Algernon Black as one of the public sponsors of that organization. The Attorney General cited the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York as subversive in a letter released December 4, 1947; included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"Mr. Black signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the booklet '600 Prominent Americans' (p. 16). The Attorney General cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program.' The Special Commitee on Un-American Activities, in its reported dated March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"The printed program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, February 12, 1940, reveals the name of Algernon D. Black as vice chairman of the group. A letterhead of the American Russian Institute, received July 26, 1949, contains the name of Dr. Black as a member of the interchurch committee of that institute. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front organization. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as a Communist organization in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"Dr. Black was a member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterheads dated March 13, 1931, and February 21, 1938); and described as a representative individual in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say" which was published by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as a Communist front organization. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

"In a pamphlet entitled 'News You Don't Get' (dated Nov. 15, 1938), Algernon

Black was named as one of those who signed the call to a conference on pan-American democracy; a letterhead of the organization dated November 16, 1938, named him as one of the sponsors of the conference. The Attorney General cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist front organization.

"Algernon Black signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Dimitrov, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943 (p. 40). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 112 and 156), cited the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a Communist front organization.

"Dr. Black signed an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges. (See Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4.) Letterheads of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, listed Algernon Black as a committee member or sponsor of that group. The open letter in defense of Harry Bridges was cited as a Communist front organiation by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 87, 112, 129, 166). The Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 90 and 94), cited the Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges as a Communist front organization.

"The Daily Worker of March 29, 1951 (p. 9), reported that Dr. Algernon D. Black signed a letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born attacking the McCarran Act. Algernon D. Black was shown as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951 (p. 8), a leaflet: 'Call—Mass Meeting and Conference,' October 27, 1951, Dearborn, Mich., and a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th anniversary national conference * * *, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Ill. (Dec. 8–9, 1951). The Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 5), reported that Dr. Algernon Black signed a statement of the American Committee Against Denaturalization.

"The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"On June 13, 1949, the Daily Worker reported that Dr. Black was one of the sponsors of an organization formed to oppose the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill; a press release of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, dated June 15, 1949, revealed the same information. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt bill dated January 2, 1951, cited that organization as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation.'

"A letterhead of the Voice of Freedom Committee dated June 16, 1947, listed Algernon D. Black as a sponsor of that organization. An invitation to a dinner held under the auspices of the group, January 21, 1948, listed him as a member of the dinner committee. He signed a petition of the organization as shown by a leaflet published by the Voice of Freedom Committee. The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on his April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"Algernon D. Black, New York Ethical Culture Society, signed an open letter of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program, as shown by a letterhead dated August 21, 1949.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 56), cited the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D.C., and as having been instigated by Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign.

"The Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), listed Dr. Algernon D. Black as a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act."

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this commmittee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Dr. Ralph Bunche was a member of the executive board of the Washington committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown on their letterhead of June 4, 1947. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization in its report of March 29, 1944. In 1947 the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the conference, in which it was cited as a Communist-front organization which sought to 'attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South,' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare' was 'simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States' (Report No. 592 of June 12, 1947).

"Ralph Bunche was a sponsor of the Conference on Civil Rights of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, April 20–21, 1940, as shown by the conference call, page 4. A letterhead of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action dated April 26, 1940, named Dr. Bunche as one of the sponsors of that group.

"The Washington Committee for Democratic Action was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General, April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included in the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General had previously cited the group as an affiliate or local chapter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7688 and 7689). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the organization as successor in Washington to the American League for Peace and Democracy and an affiliate of the national federation (reports of June 25, 1942, and Mar. 29, 1944).

"Official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936, pages 5 and 40, named Dr. Ralph Bunche, Washington, D.C., as a member of the presiding committee and a member of the national executive council of that organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes, and reported that 'the officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists' (report of January 3, 1939). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688; press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; consolidated list of cited organizations, dated April 1, 1954).

"The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1954, p. 6, reported that 'A Federal loyalty board announced today that it has unanimously cleared Dr. Ralph J. Bunche of any and all charges,' the article quoted the official announcement as follows:

" 'The full board had its second meeting with Dr. Bunche yesterday following which it unanimously reached the conclusion that there is no doubt as to the loyalty of Dr. Bunche to the Government of the United States.

" 'This conclusion has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmittal to the Secretary General of the U.N. At the same time it has been informally transmitted to Dr. Bunche.'

"Reference to the loyalty board's clearance of Dr. Bunche is found also in the Washington Evening Star, May 28, 1954, p. A–1."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. H. Claude Hudson, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily People's World of May 2, 1947 (p. 8), listed Dr. H. Claude Hudson as a sponsor of the Los Angeles chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Alfred Baker Lewis, national board of directors, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following in-

formation concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"On July 11, 1942, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties addressed an open letter to the President of the United States urging him to reconsider Attorney General Francis Biddle's order to deport Harry Bridges; the letter also stated that: 'It is equally essential that the Attorney General's ill-advised, arbitrary, and unwarranted findings relative to the Communist Party be rescinded.' Alfred Baker Lewis, executive board, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and executive board member, Union for Democratic Action, New York, N.Y., signed the open letter, as shown in the pamphlet entitled '600 Prominent Americans Ask President To Rescind Biddle Decision,' published September 11, 1942, by the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties and incorporating the open letter in full. The open letter, together with a list of individuals who signed it, appeared in the Daily Worker on July 19, 1942 (p. 4).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'Part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program,' and as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, respectively; also included in consolidated list released April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party (report of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of June 25, 1942, and January 2, 1943). It was also cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law (Report No. 1115 of September 2, 1947).

"An undated letterhead of the League for Mutual Aid, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City, contained the name of Alfred Baker Lewis in a list of members of the organization's advisory committee. The league was cited as a Communist enterprise by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944.

" 'Greetings and best wishes for success to the second national Negro congress' were contained in the printed annual program of that congress, sent by A. Philip Randolph, chairman, and Alfred Baker Lewis, secretary, Negro Work Committee of the Socialist Party. (Printed annual program, second national Negro congress, Philadelphia, Pa., October 15, 16, and 17, 1937, p. 61). The National Negro Congress was cited as an important sector of the democratic front, sponsored and supported by the Communist Party; and later, as subversive and Communist. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688; and press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; also included on consolidated list of April 1, 1954.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Congress as the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes (report of January 3, 1939; also cited in reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Dr. James J. McClendon, national board of directors, national health committee, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, The Only Sound Policy for a Democracy, named Dr. James J. McClendon as one of the signers of a statement, sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which supported the War Department's order on granting commissions to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party. Dr. McClendon was identified as president of the Detroit National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Dr. J. J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown by the program, Action Conference for Civil Rights, held in Washington, D.C., April 19–20, 1941; and on letterheads dated September 11, 1940, and November 6, 1940.

"The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in press releases dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also included in his consolidated list of April 1, 1954. The Attorney General described the organization as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities stated that 'There can be no reasonable doubt about the fact that the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties regardless of its high-sounding name—is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party' (special committee report, March 29, 1944, p. 50); also cited in reports, June 25, 1942 (p. 20), and January 2, 1943 (pp. 9 and 12).

"Dr. James J. McClendon was named in the Daily Worker of March 16, 1942 (pp. 1 and 4), and on a letterhead dated April 2, 1942, as one of the sponsors of the National Free Browder Congress.

"The National Free Browder Congress was cited as a Communist front which arranged to meet March 28–29, 1942. Earl Browder was general secretary of the Communist Party, United States of America, who had been convicted and sentenced to Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for passport fraud. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944 (pp. 69, 87, and 132.)

"Dr. James McClendon was one of the sponsors of the sesquicentennial bill of rights celebration, held under the auspices of the Michigan Civil Rights Federation, Detroit, Mich., December 1–2, 1939, as shown by the call of conference. Dr. James J. McClendon was one of the sponsors of a statewide conference, held under the auspices of the Michigan federation in Detroit, Mich., September 12, 1943, as shown by call of the conference. He was identified as president of the Detroit chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"The Michigan Civil Rights Federation was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as 'an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p 7687; and press releases of December 4, 1947, June 1 and September 21, 1948; also including in his consolidated list of organizations, dated April 1, 1954). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated September 2, 1947, p. 3.)"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: James Hinton, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"James M. Hinton, identified as president of the State conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for South Carolina, was one of the sponsors of a Congress on Civil Rights, as shown on the call to the congress which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946. (See pp. 21 and 22 of Rept. No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Civil Rights Congress, September 2, 1947.)

"The Civil Rights Congress was founded at a conference in Detroit April 27 and 28, 1946, effectuating the merger of the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Civil Rights Congress was 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it' (pp. 2 and 19 of Rept. No. 1115).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Theodore M. Berry, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild which was made available to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 1939, contains the name of Theodore M. Berry, 308 West Fifth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, as a member.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 9), Earl Dickerson, attorney, Illinois, was one of the signers of a statement defending the 12 Communist leaders. He signed a statement in behalf of the attorneys in the Communist cases as shown by the July 31, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 9). This same information was shown in the February 1, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3). As shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1950 (p. 12), Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a statement to the United Nations in behalf of the Communist cases.

"Earl B. Dickerson protested approval of the Smith Act by the Supreme Court as 'having a disastrous impact upon * * * struggle of Negro people' (Daily Worker, October 1, 1951, p. 1). He filed a petition with the clerk of the United States Supreme Court supporting the pending application for a hearing on the constitutionality of the Smith Act as shown by the Daily Worker, October 4, 1951 (p. 15). Mr. Dickerson was identified in this source as a Negro attorney in Illinois. He spoke against the Smith Act according to the February 12, 1952 issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), and was coauthor of a memorandum to the Supreme Court 'on the menace of the Smith Act to the Negro people' (Daily People's World, July 15, 1952, p. 1). Earl B. Dickerson, president, National Lawyers Guild, Chicago, was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4). As shown by the Daily Worker, December 29, 1953 (p. 8) and the Worker, January 3, 1954 (p. 6), Earl B. Dickerson was one of 39 prominent Midwest citizens signing a plea for Christmas amnesty for Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, which was wired to President Eisenhower. He was one of the initiators of an appeal for reduced bail for Claude Lightfoot, Illinois Communist leader, indicated under a section of the Smith Act as shown by the September 12, 1954, issue of the Worker (p. 16).

"According to the December 25, 1952 issue of the Daily Worker (p. 8), Earl D. Dickerson was a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs. The Daily People's World of March 13, 1953 (p. 3), reported that Earl B. Dickerson contributed a statement to the pamphlet, The Negro People Speak Out on the Rosenbergs, distributed by volunteers for the East Bay Committee To Save the Rosenbergs, Oakland, California.

"Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of an appeal to the Greek Government protesting the court marital of Greek maritime unionists as shown by the Daily Worker, August 19, 1952 (p. 1).

"Earl B. Dickerson was listed in the spring 1943 (p. 22) and fall session 1943 (p. 27) catalogs of the Abraham Lincoln School as a member of the board of directors. He was named in the same source as a guest lecturer at the school (p. 19).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Abraham Lincoln School as an adjunct of the Communist Party in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947. The Attorney General redesignated the school April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the Abraham Lincoln School as successor of the Workers School as a Communist educational medium in Chicago.

"A pamphlet entitled 'For a New Africa' (containing the proceedings of the conference on Africa, New York, April 14, 1944) names Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Negro Congress.

"The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.'

"He was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in a pamphlet entitled 'Eight Million Demand Freedom,' and the pamphlet For a New Africa (p. 36). Earl B. Dickerson is listed as a member of the Council on African Affairs in a leaflet, issued by the organization, The Job To Be Done, a leaflet entitled 'What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?' a pamphlet entitled 'Seeing Is Believing' (1947), and a letterhead of the group, dated May 17, 1945, and a pamphlet, Africa in the War.

"The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"The name of Earl Dickerson, of 35 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., appears on a 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild on file with this committee. In 1949 he was president of the Chicago chapter of the guild and chairman at a meeting on anti-Communist legislation, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 15, 1949 (p. 6); in the same year he attacked the Marshall plan as shown in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1949 (p. 5), in which source he was identified as president of the Chicago chapter of the guild; he participated in a discussion entitled 'Status of Civil Liberties' fifth annual convention, National Lawyers' Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2), published by the guild. This same Convention News (pp. 3 and 4) listed him as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth national convention of the National Lawyers' Guild. He submitted a report of the guild, denouncing lynching and discrimination, as shown in the Daily Worker, November 30, 1942 (p. 1). As shown by the October 15, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 1), Earl B. Dickerson was president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild; he spoke at the national convention of the organization in Chicago. The October 18, 1951, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson was elected president of the National Lawyers' Guild. He was shown as president of the National Lawyers' Guild in the Daily Worker, January 25, 1952 (p. 1), and February 20, 1953 (p. 6), and the Daily People's World, January 25, 1952 (p. 8). The January 18, 1952, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3) reported that Earl B. Dickerson was to speak on the Smith Act, the Constitution, and You, at a gathering of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild on February 1, 1952. The Daily Worker of February 24, 1953 (p. 6), reported that Earl Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, addressed the annual convention of the group held February 20–23, at the Park-Sheraton Hotel, New York City, and stated that 'a new foreign policy is needed if the drive against liberties is to be halted.' The Daily People's World of July 6, 1953 (p. 3), announced that he was to be honored by the Los Angeles-Hollywood chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild at a luncheon. The Daily Worker of August 28, 1953 (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, issued a statement opposing the American Bar Association's call for disbarment of Communist lawyers. As shown by the September 6, 1953, issue of the Worker (p. 6), Earl Dickerson protested the placing of the National Lawyers' Guild on the list of subversive organizations by the Attorney General.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Nations Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"One Earl Dickerson (with no middle initial shown) spoke at the morning session of the Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown in the program, Congress on Civil Rights (p. 1); Earl B. Dickerson signed a statement of the Civil Rights Congress which was in defense of Gerhart Eisler, according to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1947 (p. 2); he was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Civil Rights which was held in New York City on July 19, 1948, according to the Daily Worker of July 12, 1948 (p. 4); a photostat of a letterhead of the Civil Right Congress, Illinois, dated December 18, 1948, listed Earl Dickerson as a sponsor. As shown by the Daily Worker of November 1, 1950 (p. 4), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. A handbill, 'Dodge Local 3 Supports FEPC Rally,' listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of those who would speak at a rally to be held under partial auspices of the Civil Rights Congress of Michigan on April 16, 1950.

"The Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.'

"According to the printed program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (p. 14), Earl B. Dickerson was one of the sponsors of this conference which was held in New York City, March 27–27, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; he signed a statement of the council which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14, 1949 (p. 9620). Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a Resolution Against Atomic Weapons as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and

Professions dated July 28, 1950. Mr. Dickerson signed a statement to the American people, 'We uphold the right of all citizens to speak for peace' released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown by the handbill, 'Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American', He spoke at a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts held by the New York Council of the National Council of the Arts, New York City, November 10, 1951, according to the November 7, 1951 (p. 3) and November 14, 1951 (p. 7), issues of the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1952 (p. 3), listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the endorsers of the national council resolution calling for a hearing on Tunisia's demands in the United Nations. He spoke at a conference for equal rights for Negroes in the Arts, Sciences, and Professions held by the Southern California Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, on June 14, 1952, in Los Angeles (Daily Worker, June 20, 1952, p. 7).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the committee cited the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace as a Communist front which 'was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.'

"Earl B. Dickerson was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown by letterheads of the group dated February 26, 1946, February 3, 1948, May 18, 1951, and January 5, 1953. He signed an open letter of the organization to President Truman on Franco Spain as shown by a letterhead and mimeographed letter of April 28, 1949. He signed a petition of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to President Truman 'to bar military aid to or alliance with fascist Spain' as shown by a mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1951.

"The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

"Mr. Dickerson was chairman of the Illinois Legislative and Defense Committee of the International Labor Defense, as shown in Equal Justice, September, 1939 (p. 3). He spoke before the International Labor Defense, together with Earl Browder, according to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1942 (p. 5); October 6, 1942 (p. 5); and October 11, 1942 (p. 3). The pamphlet Victory in Oklahoma, October 1943, back cover, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Committee of the International Labor Defense.

"The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party,' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as 'part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers.'

"Earl B. Dickerson was a speaker at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties, the founding conference of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the printed program, Call to a Conference, page 2, June 7, 1940.

"The Attorney General cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as a conference as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 102), cited the conference as 'an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations.'

"The program and call to a national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the sponsors of the conference; he was one of the sponsors of the sixth national conference, which was held in Cleveland, May 9 and 10, 1942, as shown in a leaflet of the conference, page 4. In the latter source, Mr. Dickerson was identified as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Earl Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as shown by a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead (received for files, July 11, 1950), an undated letterhead (distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born of December 2–3, 1950), and a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (April 30, 1951). Mr. Dickerson, identified as president of the Chicago Urban League, was a sponsor of a dinner given by the Midwest Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born for Pearl Hart (Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1950, p. 4). A letterhead of the sixth annual conference of the Midwest Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born dated May 16, 1954, Chicago, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor.

"The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"In 1942 Earl B. Dickerson was a patron of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on a letterhead of the congress, dated October 27, 1942; he was named in Soviet Russia Today (December 1942 issue, p. 42) as one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship; the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943, listed Earl B. Dickerson among the sponsors. He signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, praising Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, page 9. He was identified in the last-named source as an attorney at law, Chicago. A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship dated September 17, 1951, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor of that group. A photostat of a letter of the national council dated March 19, 1952, listed Mr. Dickerson as a sponsor.

"The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council as 'in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian.'

"The Daily Worker of October 21, 1942 (p. 1), named Earl B. Dickerson among the list of members of the National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching. He signed an appeal to lift the Spanish embargo, which appeal was made by the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, according to the Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2). He contributed to the June 22, 1943, issue of New Masses (p. 9). He signed a petition of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, as shown in an official leaflet of the organization.

"The National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Negro Communist-front organization, whose secretary was Ferdinand C. Smith, high in the circles of the Communist Party (report, March 29, 1944, p. 180).

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

"New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688), and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1955, pp. 48 and 75).

"The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter dated April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 6 and 55), cited the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder as follows: When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder.

"An open letter demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties contained the name of Earl B. Dickerson in the list of persons who signed according to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1940, page 5. He was attorney for Eugene Dennis, general secretary, Communist Party, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 19, 1947, page 7, being identified in this source as a former member of the city council, Chicago. Reference to Earl Dickerson as attorney for Eugene Dennis appears in the Worker, November 30, 1947, page 4; the Daily Worker of January 15, 1948, page 5; and the Daily Worker of October 27, 1948, page 10, in which source he is identified as a Negro leader, of Chicago.

"Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade, Illinois assembly, as shown by a letterhead dated April 12, 1951, the Illinois Peace Crusade, May 1951 (p. 4), and a photostat of a letterhead dated June 21, 1952. He was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, held by the American Peace Crusade in Chicago, Ill., June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951, as shown by a leaflet, An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress, the Call to the American People's Congress, and the leaflet, American People's Congress * * * Invites You To Participate in a National Peace Competition, June 20, 1951, Chicago, Ill. He was a sponsor of a contest

held by the American Peace Crusade for songs, essays, and paintings advancing the theme of world peace as reported in the Daily Worker, May 1, 1951 (p. 11).

"The Attorney General included the American Peace Crusade on his January 22, 1954, list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist Peace Offensive April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which the Communists estabilshed as a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States and which was heralded by the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.

"Masses and Mainstream for February 1952 (pp. 52–56) listed Earl B. Dickerson as coauthor of an amici curiae brief to the Supreme Court supporting an appeal for a rehearing of its decision upholding the Smith Act, dated September 27, 1951.

"According to the April 30, 1950, issue of the Worker (p. 15), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Midcentury Conference for Peace, cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been 'aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda' (report on Communist peace offensive, Apr. 1, 1951, p. 58).

"Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill as shown by the pamphlet, Hey, Brother, There's a Law Against You (p. 2); a release of June 15, 1949 (p. 2), and a photostat of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950. He signed a statement of the organization according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation.'

"Earl B. Dickerson signed a letter defending the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead, dated January 7, 1949; he later signed a statement asking for the release of the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6). He signed a brief on behalf of the attorneys who represented the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 2, 1949 (p. 2); he signed a statement on behalf of the attorneys, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 7, 1949 (p. 5); he represented the attorneys who represented the 11 Communist leaders, according to the Daily Worker of January 24, 1950 (p. 3)."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Benjamin E. Mays, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker, March 4, 1948 (p. 2), named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of a letter in behalf of Communist deportation cases, which was sponsored by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. A letterhead of the group contained his name as one of the sponsors (letterhead December 11 and 12, 1948).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U.S. Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated by the Attorney General April 29, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the committee as 'one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States.'

"Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, was a member of the initiating committee for a Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, April 27 and 28, 1946. (See, Urgent Summons to a Congress on Civil Rights.) He was an honorary national chairman of the Civil Rights Congress, New York, as shown by an undated letterhead concerning a conference held October 11, 1947. He signed a call for a national conference of the Civil Rights Congress to be held in Chicago (Daily Worker, Oct. 21, 1947, p. 5).

"The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it.'

"Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., signed a statement by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in praise of Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948 (pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, p. 9). A leaflet, 'End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace' (December 1948), named Benjamin E. Mays as one of the signers of the National Council's appeal to the U.S. Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union. He was a member of the Sponsoring Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Committee on Education, as shown by a bulletin of the group, dated June 1945 (p. 22).

"The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as 'in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian. * * *'

"Dr. Mays signed an open letter sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing U.S. Attorney General Biddle's charges against Harry Bridges (Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4); booklet, 'Six Hundred Prominent Americans,' p. 25). He also signed a statement sponsored by this organization hailing the War Department's order on commissions for the Communists, as shown by the Daily Worker, March 18, 1945 (p. 2).

"The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The group was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special committee, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the federation as one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the federation as among a maze of organizations which were spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.

"Letterheads, dated June 12, 1947, and August 11, 1947, of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, list Dr. Mays as a member of the advisory board. A leaflet of the organization (exhibit 46, public hearings, July 22, 1947, Steele) also contained the name of Dr. Benjamin Mays.

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U. S. A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means by the Attorney General in a letter released December 4, 1947. The group was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The special committee in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the organization as a Communist front. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as surreptitiously controlled by the Young Communist League.

"The Daily Worker, April 27, 1947 (p. 24), reported that Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Georgia, signed a statement against the ban on the Communist Party. He signed a statement against the North Atlantic Pact, according to the Daily Worker of June 28, 1949 (p. 2). He spoke at a conference on 'Jim Crow in the Nation's Capital' (Daily Worker, December 21, 1950, p. 8)."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: A. T. Walden, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of October 7, 1952 (p. 3), reported that A. T. Walden, Georgia, was to lead the National Lawyers Guild workshop discussions at a national conference on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination, New York City, October 10, 11, and 12.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in 'ts report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party; its front organizations and controlled unions and which since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.

"A mimeographed letter addressed to the House of Representatives, May 12, 1948, included a list of signers opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill. Austin T. Walden, Georgia, was one of those signers."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Arthur D. Shores, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"According to letterheads of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, dated June 12 and August 11, 1947, Arthur D. Shores was a member of the advisory board of this organization. A page from an undated leaflet of the organization also listed Mr. Shores as a member of the advisory board. Arthur Shores, Negro attorney, was associated with Nesbitt Elmore in the defense of Senator Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho, who was fined $50 and ordered a 180-day suspended jail sentence for defying Birmingham's segregation laws at a meeting of the Southern Negro Youth Congress in Alabama (Daily Worker, May 6, 1948, p. 4).

"The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League (report 271, Apr. 17, 1947, p. 14). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1940, page 9, cited the Congress as a Communist front. The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, United States of America, which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, Dec. 4, 1947); the Attorney General redesignated the congress pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450 of April 27, 1953, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"Arthur D. Shores, prominent Negro attorney, told the Daily Worker that 'outlawing the Communist Party would "pave the way for a one-party dictatorship in this country"' (Daily Worker, March 19, 1947, p. 5).

"The Worker for December 14, 1947 (p. 8, southern edition), reported that Arthur Shores, identified as a leading Negro civil-rights lawyer, was assisting in the case of Mrs. Ruby Jackson Gainor, 'outstanding Negro teacher fired by the Jefferson County Board of Education. * * * Mrs. Jackson is the leading petitioner in contempt-of-court proceedings against the board for its refusal to equalize salaries of Negro teachers in accord with a Federal court decree * * *.' The article, which identified Mrs. Gainor as president of the Birmingham teachers' local of the United Public Workers, also reported: 'The outcome of Mrs. Gainor's case has become the keystone of the fight of all the Negro teachers in Jefferson County for equal pay. The United Public Workers nationally is supporting the fight * * *."

It is noted that the United Public Workers of America was formed in 1946 by a merger of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America and the United Federal Workers of America. Both of these unions were cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 18 and 19), as among the CIO unions in which the committee found Communist leadership strongly entrenched. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, by vote of the executive board, February 15, 1950, expelled the United Public Workers of America, effective March 1, 1950, on charges of Communist domination (press release, 12th CIO convention, November 20–24, 1950)."

OCTOBER 13, 1955.

"Subject: Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Lloyd K. Garrison was a member of the National Committee of the International Judicial Association according to a letterhead of the organization dated May 18, 1942, and the leaflet, "What is the I. J. A.?" Lloyd K. Garrison, dean, University of Wisconsin Law School, commended the International Juridical Association bulletin in that pamphlet.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as a 'Communist front and offshoot of the International Labor Defense.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'

"The Daily Worker for March 18, 1945 (p. 2), and an undated leaflet, 'The only sound policy for a Democracy,' listed Lloyd K. Garrison, National War Labor Board, as one of the signers of a statement sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties hailing the War Department order on commissions for the Communists. A photograph of Mr. Garrison is found in the Daily Worker reference.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program * * *' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"Lloyd K. Garrison, Madison, Wis., former Chairman of NLRB, was listed as a member of the Committee on Legal Research and Legal Education of the National Lawyers Guild and his book was reviewed in the newsletter of the National Lawyers Guide, July 1937 (pp. 2–3). Convention News, May 1941 (pp. 3 and 4) published by the National Lawyers Guild for the fifth annual convention, listed Lloyd K. Garrison as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth annual convention, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.

"The pamphlet of the Second National Negro Congress, October 1937, listed Lloyd Garrison as one of those who sent greetings to the congress.

" 'The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. * * * The officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists' (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, p. 81; also cited in reports, January 3, 1940, p. 9; June 25, 1942, p. 20; and March 29, 1944, p. 180). The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as a Communist-front organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24, 1942 (pp. 7687 and 7688).

"The Daily Worker for February 23, 1939 (p. 3) reported that Lloyd Garrison spoke at a conference of the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation, Madison, Wis., February 18, 1939. The Attorney General cited the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Sidney A. Jones, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Sidney A. Jones, attorney, was an endorser of the National Negro Congress as shown on the call for National Negro Congress, in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687–7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes. * * *'

"It was reported in the Daily People's World of December 2, 1947 (p. 4), that Sidney A. Jones, Jr., was vice president of the Chicago Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, and was further identified as being associated with the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, Urban League, Chicago. Mr. Jones was shown as an executive board member of the National Lawyers Guild from Chicago as of December 1949 and May 1950 in the Committee on Un-American

Activities report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (pp. 18–19).

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4), listed Sidney A. Jones, attorney, Chicago, Ill., as one who signed a statement of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill. A photostat of a letterhead of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill (Chicago chapter), dated May 5, 1950, listed Sidney A. Jones as a Chicago sponsor of the organization.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as 'a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation.'

"Sidney Jones, vice president of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, sent greetings to Paul Robeson according to the Daily Worker of April 29, 1947 (p. 12). He signed Labor Day greetings to the Daily People's World, which appeared in the August 29, 1947 (p. 4), issue of that paper; signed statement by Negro Americans, in behalf of arrested Communist leaders (the Worker of August 29, 1948, p. 11); and he signed a statement on release of Communist leaders, and was identified as a Negro attorney in Chicago as noted in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6).

"The Daily Worker of December 25, 1952 (p. 8), listed Sidney Jones, attorney, Chicago, as a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: W. Robert Ming, Jr., national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"An election campaign letter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., as the candidate for delegate to the national convention, Washington, D.C., chapter. Robert Ming, Jr., Washington, D.C., was a member of the convention nominations committee, fifth annual convention of the National Lawyers Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29 to June 1, 1941.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop listed Robert W. Ming, Jr., Howard University, Washington, D.C., as a member.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously cited. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Arthur J. Mandell, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The News Letter of the National Lawyers Guild, July 1937 (p. 2), named Arthur Mandell, Houston, Tex., as a member of the Guild's committee on American citizenship, immigration, and naturalization; and a copy of the 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, made available to the special Committee on Un-American Activities by the organization, contained the name of Arthur Mandel, Shell Building, Houston, Tex.

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149); and it was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities (H. Rept. No. 3123, Sept. 21, 1950), wherein it was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., was shown in the Call to the First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples of the United States, March 24–26, 1939, Albuquerque, N. Mex., as one of the signers of that Call. The Congress of the Mexican and Spanish American Peoples * * * was cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 120).

"A leaflet, attached to an undated letterhead of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, named Arthur J. Mandell, attorney, Houston, Tex., as a signer of the organization's January 1943 message to the House of Representatives. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited as being subversive and Communist (Attorney General letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954); as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687); as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 50; also cited in reports, June 25, 1942, and Jan. 2, 1943); and as being among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law' (Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Sept. 2, 1947, p. 3).

"Arthur Mandell was a member of the resolutions committee at the Congress on Civil Rights in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown by a mimeographed release issued by the congress; and Arthur J. Madell, Houston, was listed as a sponsor of the National Conference of the Civil Rights Congress in Chicago, November 21–23, 1947, in the printed program, Let Freedom Ring. The Civil Rights Congress has been cited as a subversive and Communist organization by the Attorney General (letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; also redesignated, see consolidated list, April 1, 1954; and, as an organization formed in April 1946 by merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties), 'dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party,' and 'controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it" (Committee on Un-American Activities, House Report No. 1115, Sept. 2, 1947, pp. 2 and 19)."

"OCTOBER 26, 1955.

"Subject: Robert W. Kenny, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Reference to Robert W. Kenny is found in the appendix to this committee's public hearings regarding communism in the United States Government, part 2, September 1950 (pp. 2991–2992), as follows:

" 'Robert W. Kenny: Kenny, attorney general of State of California during the years 1943–47 and president of the National Lawyers Guild during the years 1940–48, has been associated with the defense of a number of Communist cases. He was also one of the attorneys for the Hollywood 10. He sent greetings to the Biennial National Conference of the International Labor Defense held April 4–6, 1941; this organization was cited by the former Attorney General Francis Biddle as the 'legal arm of the Communist Party.'

" 'The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has specialized in the legal defense of foreign-born Communists such as Gerhard Eisler. Kenny was a sponsor of its national conference held in Ohio on October 25–26, 1947, and again in 1950. He spoke in behalf of Communists held for deportation, according to the Daily People's World, Communist publication, dated March 8, 1948.

" 'On repeated occasions, Mr. Kenny has attacked the trial of the 11 Communist leaders convicted for teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, particularly as reported by the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948, and the Worker of October 30, 1949.

" 'He signed a statement in behalf of arrested leaders of the Communist Party of Los Angeles, according to the Daily Worker of October 19, 1949, and the Daily People's World of November 7, 1949. Statements opposing the outlawing or restricting of the

Communist Party have been signed by Robert W. Kenny and have appeared frequently in the Communist press. Mr. Kenny has opposed Government loyalty procedures on various occasions.

" 'On the eve of the 1947 May Day celebration, Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, hailed Robert W. Kenny as a "friend of the Soviet Union in the United States." Another Communist government, namely that of China, selected Mr. Kenny to defend its legal interests, according to the Daily People's World of April 26, 1950 (p. 4).

" 'Robert W. Kenny has a number of affiliations and associations with Communist-front organizations. These include the American Youth for Democracy (formerly known as the Young Communist League), the National Committee To Win the Peace, of which he was vice chairman, Civil Rights Congress, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, Hollywood League for Democratic Action, California Labor School, Lawyers Committee on American Relations With Spain, Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, and the American Slav Congress.'

"Subsequent to this committee's release which contained the above reference to Robert W. Kenny, he had served as counsel for 66 witnesses before this committee."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Milton R. Konvitz, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

A membership list of the National Lawyers Guild contains the name of Milton Konvitz, 744 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (List in committee files.) The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149). The organization was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents' (Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, Sept. 21, 1950)."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Loren Miller, national vice president and national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"One Loren Miller, 837 East 24th Street, Los Angeles, Calif., was a signer of Communist Party election petition No. 120 in California in 1932.

"An article entitled 'Why I Will Vote "Red"' written by Loren Miller appeared in the Daily Worker of July 11, 1932 (p. 4). In a note which accompanies this article, the following information is given concerning the author: 'Loren Miller, until recently city editor of the California Eagle, Los Angeles, Calif., largest and oldest of western Negro newspapers, is now en route to the Soviet Union.' Excerpts from this article follow:

"I regret very much that I will not be present to take an active part in the struggle that Negroes must wage to pile up a huge vote for William Z. Foster and James W. Ford, Communist candidates for President and Vice President.

* * * * *

"It must be evident to anybody who thinks through the things about which I have been talking that the Communist Party is our party. It is fighting our fights, warring against our enemies, struggling for our welfare. Commonsense dictates that we should support our party with every means at hand."

Loren Miller wrote an article for the Daily Worker while he was traveling in the Soviet Union with a group of Negro writers, workers, etc., observing conditions. This article concerned the equality of races in the Soviet Union and appeared in the Daily Worker of September 24, 1932 (p. 4). Mr. Miller compared racial equality in the Soviet Union and the United States, stated that the Communist Party in the United States was the only political party which promised equality, and concluded as follows:

" 'Only the Communists with their straightforward platform on relief for the por (sic) farmers and workers, their demand for self-determination for Negroes in the Black Belt, and with a Negro, James W. Ford, as nominee for the Vice Presidency deserve the vote of the Negroes of the United States. It is for these reasons that I wish to renew my plea to Negroes everywhere in the United States to vote Communist.'

"The Daily Worker of January 26, 1948 (p. 10), reported that Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, defended Claudia Jones, Communist. He signed a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill as shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1948 (p. 3). According to the Daily People's World of July 22, 1948 (p. 3), Loren Miller, attorney, Los Angeles, attacked the arrest of the Communist Party leaders.

"In the Daily Worker of December 24, 1931 (p. 3), Loren Miller was named as a reporter for the Worker. Reference to Loren Miller as a reporter for the Worker appeared in the Daily Worker of December 21, 1935 (p. 3). Loren Miller has been a contributor to the Daily Worker as shown in the issue of May 4, 1938 (p. 7), as well as the two issues already cited.

"The Worker is the Sunday edition of the Daily Worker, which was cited as 'official Communist Party, U.S.A., organ' by the Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1920, dated May 11, 1948. The publication was cited as 'chief journalistic mouthpiece of the Communist Party' by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944; it had previously been cited as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, January 3, 1941, and June 25, 1942.

"Loren Miller was named as editor of New Masses in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 5), and as associate editor in the issue of January 14, 1936 (p. 5). He was shown as contributing editor in the following issues of New Masses: June 2, 1936 (p. 5), January 5, 1937 (p. 22), May 11, 1937 (p. 9), September 7, 1937 (p. 9), January 11, 1938 (p. 9), and September 20, 1938 (p. 14). He was a contributor to New Masses, as shown in the issue of August 20, 1935 (p. 26), and was named as a contributor to New Masses in the Daily Worker of April 3, 1963 (p. 3).

"New Masses was cited as a 'Communist periodical' by the Attorney General of the United States (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). It was cited as a 'national circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party' by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944. New Masses had been cited previously as a Communist publication in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, and June 25, 1942.

"As shown by an undated letterhead of Book Union, Inc., Loren Miller was a member of its advisory council. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in report 1311 of March 29, 1944, cited Book Union as 'distributors of Communist literature.'

"According to a letterhead of August 24, 1939, Loren Miller was a member of the Harry Bridges defense committee, southern division.

"In report 1311 of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944, the Harry Bridges defense committee was cited as one of the Communist fronts formed to oppose deportation of Harry Bridges, Communist Party member and leader of the San Francisco general strike of 1934 which was planned by the Communist Party.

"As shown in the Call for the National Negro Congress held in Chicago, Ill., February 14, 1936, Loren Miller, Los Angeles, Calif., was one of the endorsers of the National Negro Congress.

" 'From the record of its activities and the composition of its (National Negro Congress) governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, Communist vice presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted: "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the Communist Party' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687–7688). The National Negro Congress was cited as a Communist front in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the group as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"Loren Miller, author, was a signer of the open letter to American liberals, as shown in Soviet Russia Today, issue of March 1937 (pp. 14–15).

" 'In March 1937 a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open leter bearing the title given above. The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials' (report of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, June 25, 1942).

"As shown in the proceedings of the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism, held in Chicago, Ill., September 28, 29, 30, 1934, under auspices of the American League Against War and Fascism, the report of the publications committee was presented by Loren Miller. (See public hearings, appendix, vol. 10, p. 22.)

" 'The American League Against War and Fascism was formally organized at the First United States Congress Against War and Fascism held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. * * * The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union. * * * Subsequent congresses in 1934 and 1936 reflected the same program' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7683).

"The American League Against War and Fascism was 'established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7683). The Attorney General cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board,

released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in reports of the special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1939, January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

"In connection with the testimony of Harper L. Knowles and Ray E. Nimmo before the special Committee on Un-American Activities on October 25, 1938, a brief releating to activities of the Communist Party among professional groups was presented and incorporated in the record. In this brief Loren Miller is described as 'contributing editor to New Masses and a member of the Communist Party' (public hearings, p. 1997). According to this same source, he was a participant in the Western Writers Congress, cited as a Communist front by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

"A pamphlet, 'Equality, Land and Freedom' published by the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, December 1934 (p. 44), listed Loren Miller as a member of the national council of that organization.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the League of Struggle for Negro Rights as follows: 'The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. Practically the same group of leaders directing this directed the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, which was, until 2 years ago, the name of the Communist front for Negroes. The name was later changed * * * in 1936 to the National Negro Congress.'

"It was reported in the Daily People's World of September 28, 1950 (p. 5) that Loren Miller was one of a group of Los Angeles lawyers who signed a brief against a Communist registration ordinance. The brief was presented in connection with the case of Henry Steinberg, county legislative director of the Communist Party, who was charged with failing to register with the sheriff's office in accordance with provisions of the ordinance. Reference to Loren Miller as one of the attorneys who signed a brief charging Los Angeles County's Communist registration ordinance with being 'basically unconstitutional' also appeared in the Daily People's World of October 9, 1950 (p. 3). The brief was filed in connection with a hearing on a demurrer against the ordinance filed by attorneys for Gus Brown, Furniture Workers Local 576 business agent.

"The Daily People's World of May 17, 1950 (p. 3), listed Loren Miller as one who signed a statement against the loyalty oath."

"OCTOBER 26, 1955.

"Subject: Morris L. Ernst, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"In testimony of Walter S. Steele before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 15, 1938, Morris Ernst was named as a member of the board of the American Fund for Public Service (public hearings, p. 388). The following issues of New Masses named Morris L. Ernst as treasurer of the American Fund for Public Service, November 1930 (p. 19), November 1931 (p. 31), and January 2, 1934 (p. 2). He was named as treasurer and a member of the board of directors of the American Fund for Public Service on a letterhead (photostat dated September 8, 1930).

"The American Fund for Public Service (Garland Fund) was 'established in 1922 * * * it was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprise' such as the Daily Worker and New Masses, official Communist publications, Federated Press, Russian Reconstruction Farms, and International Labor Defense. William Z. Foster, present chairman, Communist Party, and Scott Nearing, a leading writer for the party, served on the board of directors of the fund (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report of March 29, 1944, pp. 75 and 76).

"A letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy (a photostat dated April 6, 1939) carried the name of Morris L. Ernst as a member of the lawyer's committee of the league. The American League for Peace and Democracy was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. It was established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union.' (Attorney General of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the league as 'the largest of the Communist front movements in the United States' (report of January 3, 1939).

"The Daily Worker of February 19, 1937 (p. 4), reported that Morris Ernst spoke at a meeting of the American Youth Congress in Washington, D.C. The American Youth Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the United States Attorney General (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list). The Attorney General cited the organization as 'originated in 1934 and has been controlled by Communists and manipulated by them to influence the thought of American youth' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7685). The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American Youth Congress as 'one of the principal fronts of the Communist Party' (report of June 25, 1942, p. 16).

"Mr. Ernst spoke at a meeting of the League of American Writers in New York City, as was revealed by the Daily Workers of December 5, 1936 (p. 5). He spoke for the League for Mutual Aid on 'Dethroning the Supreme Court,' February 1, 1937, as shown in New Masses of January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

"The League of American Writers was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948) and was redesignated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, April 27, 1953; and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The League of American Writers previously had been cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General and by the special committee. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686; and reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942 and March 29, 1944, respectively.) The special committee cited the League for Mutual Aid as a Communist enterprise (report of March 29, 1944, p. 76).

"Morris L. Ernst was named on a letterhead of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, dated July 6, 1938, as a member of the lawyers' committee of that organization. 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations' such as the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

"Morris L. Ernst, identified as treaturer, American Fund for Public Service, was shown as a stockholder of New Masses on a photostatic copy of the statement of ownership of that publication, dated October 1, 1930. New Masses was cited as a 'Communist periodical' by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688) and as the 'nationally circulated weekly journal of the Communist Party' by the special committee (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 48 and 75).

"The Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in the report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122). Mr. Ernst was chairman of the Nonpartisan Committee for the Reelection of Vito Marcantonio, as was shown on a letterhead of the organization dated October 3, 1936.

"A newsletter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated July 1937 (p. 2), listed Mr. Ernst, of New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on the relation of government to business. The Daily Worker of February 10, 1939 (p. 2), reported that he spoke at a meeting of the National Lawyers Guild; a letterhead of the guild, dated May 28, 1940, named Mr. Ernst as director ex-officio of that group; a membership list (1939) of the guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Morris L. Ernst, 285 Madison Avenue, New York City.

"On September 17, 1950, the Committee on Un-American Activities released a report on the National Lawyers Guild in which it was cited as a Communist front and the 'foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions.' An earlier report of the special committee (report of Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149) cited the guild as a Communist front.

"An editorial in the Daily Worker of December 10, 1947 (p. 9), criticized Morris Ernst for his proposed legislation to register front organizations. Morris L. Ernest, of New York City, testified voluntarily before the Committee on Un-American Activities, February 11, 1948, regarding legislation before the committee which would seek to curb or outlaw the Communist Party. He stated, in part, as follows:

" 'Mr. KERSTEN. Would you say we would have to have the freedom of expression on the parts of teachers in our schools, professors in our universities, the freedom of expression to the extent that the president of this particular institution could, if he wants to, permit his teachers to teach to the students, for example, the tenets of communism?

" 'Mr. ERNST. Well, may I state my position on that? I have got to cut down underneath it a bit.

* * * * *

" 'I think the Communists or the Klan have a right to elect the Government of the United States. Not having elected the Government of the United States, I take it to be the mandate of the people to the officials elected to make sure that neither Klan nor Communist policy is infiltrated or injected into the Government.

" 'Under those circumstances, it seems to me I would say that no klansman should be in the Bureau of Education of the United States Government even though on an open debate an and election with nightshirts off, they may elect the Government, that's what we are gambling on.

" 'Now, I have got faith that they are not going to elect the Government, if they take their shirts off.

"'Mr. KERSTEN. The question is, however, do you think a university president has the right or teachers have the right in that university, if they wish to exercise it, to teach the student the tenets of communism?

* * * * *

"'Mr. ERNST. I should say that if it is an avowed Communist or a teacher said this is what communism is, I would like to see that taught in the schools without nightshirts, yes. I would like to see it taught.

"'Now that doesn't mean that I am at all in favor of a school being sneaked upon, as our schools were in New York by Communists sneaking their perfidious stuff underground. I am not afraid of the thesis of communism aboveboard, not at all. Americans will beat down at every point. We are not afraid of them at all, haven't got the least fear of that crowd, and they are not all crackpots. They are fanatics, maybe, but not crackpots, but I have great fear of any secret group for this reason.

"'Up to now the problem of America has been the protection of minorities against majorities, oppression by majority or minority. From now on in, I suggest our problem is reversed, because a tightly regimented controlled minority in a labor union, in any place in life with the complexities of modern life can oppress a majority, and that is what the Communists are doing to the decent part of the American labor movement today.' (Public hearings, pp. 291, 292.)

"Reference to Mr. Ernst was made by Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, a witness during public hearings before this committee, August 22, 1951, as follows:

"'Without going into details which are in this file, the International Red Aid, Soviet-Comintern sponsored, becomes the International Labor Defense, and the American Labor Defense becomes the Civil Rights Congress. And, incidentally, again Weiss, as an organizer, develops other agencies, such as the American Committee for the Defense of the Foreign Born, and several other organizations, all of which have been analyzed and commented on adversely by Mr. Morris Ernst, a reputable New York lawyer, who resented, apparently, ever having been mixed up with this group.' (American Aspects of Richard Sorge Spy Case, p. 1188.)"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Z. Alexander Looby, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild, on file with this committee, contains the name of Alexander Looby, 419 Fourth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 23, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions,' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The Daily People's World of April 25, 1948 (p. 11), reported that Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the Southern Negro Youth Congress. The Worker of May 16, 1948 (p. 2), disclosed that Z. Alexander Looby, attorney, Nashville, Tenn., had spoken before the same organization.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means (letter to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947). The Attorney General redesignated the group April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the organization as 'surreptitiously controlled' by the Young Communist League."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Karl N. Llewellyn, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Prof. K. N. Llewellyn, Columbia Law School, spoke at a conference of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as shown by the program, February 12, 1940.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.'

"A letterhead of the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Vito Marcantonio dated October 3, 1936 listed Karl N. Llewellyn as vice chairman of the organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the Non-Partisan Committee for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

"An undated letterhead of the International Juridical Association listed Prof. Karl Llewellyn, New York, as a member of the national committee.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the International Juridical Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 12), cited the International Juridical Association, as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'"

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Shad Polier (Isador Polier), national legal committee, NAACP, 1961

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Who's Who in America (vol. 25, 1948–49, p. 1971) shows that Justine Wise Polier married Shad Polier in 1937. Who's Who in American Jewry (vol. 3, 1938–39, p. 818) shows that Justine Wise Polier is the daughter of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and that she married Isadore Polier, March 26, 1937, New York City. It is noted further that Max Lownethal, a witness during public hearings before this committee, September 15, 1950, when asked if he were acquainted with Shad Polier, stated: 'Yes, he was Rabbi Wise's son-in-law.' (Communism in the U.S. Government, pt. 2, p. 2984.) Therefore, this report includes references from the public records, files and publications of this committee which appear under the name, Shad Polier, and references which appear under the name, Isadore Polier.

"Shad Polier was named in the election campaign letter of the Washington, D.C. chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, dated May 18, 1940, as a candidate for delegate to the national convention of the Guild. Convention News for May 1941 (p. 3) listed Shad Polier, New York City, as a member of the nominations committee of the National Lawyers Guild Fifth Annual Convention at the Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941. Shad Polier is shown as the writer of an article in the Lawyers Guild Review, vol. VI, pp. 490–491.

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. 1311, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149), and was the subject of a separate report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 17, 1950, in which it was cited as a Communist front that 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"A letterhead of the International Juridical Association, dated May 18, 1942, carries the name of Shad Polier, New York, as a member of the organization's national committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense' (report of Mar. 29, 1944, p. 149); the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line' (Rept. 3123, Sept. 21, 1950, p. 12).

"A 1941 membership list of the Washington Book Shop, on file with this committee, contains the name of Shad Polier, 3610 Idaho Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 'The Washington Cooperative Book Shop, under the name "The Book Shop Association," was incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1938. * * * It maintains a bookshop and art gallery at 916 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D.C., where literature is sold and meetings and lectures held. Evidence of Communist penetration or control is reflected in the following: Among its stock the establishment has offered prominently for sale books and literature identified with the Communist Party and certain of its affiliates and front organizations.' (United States Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7688). The Attorney General also included the Book Shop on lists of subversive and Communist organizations furnished the Loyalty Review Board (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948) and redesignated it pur-

suant to Executive Order 10450 (memorandum of April 29, 1953, released by the Department of Justice); and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities also cited the Washington Bookshop as a Communist front (report of March 29, 1944, p. 150).

"The newsletter of the National Lawyers Guild for July 1937 (p. 2) named Isadore Polier, New York City, as chairman of the guild's committee on constitutional and judicial review. A leaflet, What Is the IJA?, contains the name of Isadore Polier as a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association. An undated letterhead of the group listed him as executive director, and this committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950 (p. 13), reported that Isadore Polier was executive director of the International Juridical Association at 'the time of its inception.' See citation on page 1.

The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), reported that Isadore Polier signed a petition, sponsored by the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, to lift the arms embargo. 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy' (report of the special committee dated March 29, 1944, p. 82).

"The booklet, These Americans Say (p. 8), compiled and published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named Isadore Polier among the representative individuals who advocated lifting the Spanish embargo. The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 137 and 138)."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Jawn Sandifer, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of April 10, 1951 (p. 5), reported that Jawn A. Sandifer was a speaker for the National Lawyers Guild. The October 7, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3), reported that Jawn L. Sandifer, New York, was to lead workshop discussions at the national conference of the National Lawyers Guild on civil rights, legislation, and discrimination to be held at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City on October 10, 11, and 12, 1952.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front, which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Sidney R. Redmond, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"S. R. Redmond signed the open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties denouncing the Attorney General's attack on the Communist Party and decision in the Harry Bridges case as shown by the Daily Worker of July 19, 1942 (p. 4), and the booklet, '600 Prominent Americans' (p. 27). Sidney R. Redmond, editor, National Bar Journal, St. Louis, Mo., signed a statement of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting the War Department's order on granting commissions 'to members of the Armed Forces who have been members of or sympathetic to the views of the Communist Party' according to an undated leaflet; 'the only sound policy for a democracy' and the Daily Worker, March 19, 1945 (p. 4).

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as 'part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as 'one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party.' The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation * * * among a 'maze of organizations' which were 'spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law.' "

"Subject: George M. Johnson, national legal committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"George M. Johnson, Washington, D.C., was a member of the executive board of the National Lawyers Guild as of 1949. (See the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18.)

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist-front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Edward P. Lovett, National legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers Guild listed Edward P. Lovett, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D.C., as a member of that organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Louis L. Redding, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild listed Louis Redding, 1002 Franch St., Wilmington, Del., as a member of the organization. Louis L. Redding, a member of the Delaware bar, was among the speakers at a panel session on Civil Rights and Liberties as part of the National Lawyers' Guild annual convention, February 20–23, 1953, New York City, according to the Daily Workers, February 20, 1953 (p. 6).

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the organization as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress, 1936 (pp. 5, 6, 41), listed Louis L. Redding, Delaware, as a member of the National Executive Council and a member of the presiding committee and general resolutions committee.

"The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953 and included on the April 1, 1954 consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist front (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Joseph B. Robinson, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or

findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"One Joseph B. Robinson signed the call for the National Emergency Conference, Washington, D.C., May 13 and 14, 1939.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 49), cited the National Emergency Conference as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 12), cited the National Emergency Conference as follows: 'It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Dr. Edward L. Young, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Dr. Edward L. Young was an initial sponsor of the American Peace Crusade as shown by letterheads dated February 1951 and February 1953. He signed a petition of the American Peace Crusade calling on President Truman and Congress to seek a big-power act as reported by the Daily Worker of February 1, 1952 (p. 1), in which source he was identified with the Harvard University Medical School. The Daily Worker of February 1, 1951 (p. 2), listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee on Physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an orangization which 'the Communists established' as 'a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States' and which was heralded by the Daily Worker 'with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.' The Attorney General of the United States designated the American Peace Crusade January 22, 1954 pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

"Dr. Young was a United States sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace as shown by an official leaflet published by the Congress.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 21), cited the American Continental Congress for Peace as 'another phase' in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere."

"According to a statement attached to a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, dated December 14, 1949 (p. 10), Dr. Edward L. Young, Committee of physicians for Improvement of Medical Care, Brookline, Mass., signed a statement calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons.

"The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as an organization which was formed as a result of the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and which was located, according to a letterhead of September 16, 1950, at 30 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; and to further the cause of 'Communists in the United States' doing 'their part in the Moscow campaign.'

"A mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee dated May 18, 1951, listed Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., as one who signed a petition to President Truman 'to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain.'

"The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

"Dr. Edward L. Young was shown as a member of the board of directors of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on a leaflet, Policy and Program Adopted by the National Convention, 1950, a letterhead dated July 28, 1950, and a letterhead dated December 7, 1952 (photostat). He was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949, as shown by the conference program (p. 13), the conference call, and the Daily Worker, February 21, 1949 (p. 9). As shown by the conference program (p. 10), he spoke at the conference, and according to Speaking of Peace, edited report of the conference (p. 49), Dr. Young introduced the discussion on psychiatric aspects of today's international crisis. He signed a statement supporting a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the Supreme Court and protesting the Smith Act as shown by We Join Black's Dissent, a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 20, 1951, by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 2) reported that Dr. Young was a speaker for the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. He signed a statement of the organization as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 14, 1949 (p. 9620). He signed a resolution against atomic weapons released by the National Council as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of July 28, 1950. He signed a peace appeal in a drive of the National and New York Councils of the Arts, * * *, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 16, 1952 (p. 2).

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this report, Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, the committee cited the conference as a Communist front which 'was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.'

"As shown by an undated leaflet, 'Prominent Americans Call for * * *' (received by this committee September 11, 1950), and the Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 1), Dr. Edward L. Young signed the World Peace Appeal.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1954 (p. 34), cited the World Peace Appeal as a petition campaign launched by the permanent committee of the World Peace Congress at its meeting in Stockholm, March 16–19, 1950; as having 'received the enthusiastic approval of every section of the international Communist hierarchy'; as having been lauded in the Communist press, putting 'every individual Communist on notice that he "has the duty to rise to this appeal"; and as having received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., which has been echoed by the governing bodies of every Communist satellite country, and by all Communist Parties throughout the world.'

"The following is quoted from a 'Statemen of Principles for the Defense of Democracy Against McCarthyism,' as reported by the Daily Worker of March 31, 1954 (p. 8):

" 'Minority opinion is being suppressed by such devices as blacklisting, dismissal from employment, and even jailing.

" 'Teachers, lawyers, doctors, writers, artists, actors, and other professionals should be free to practice their professions without discrimination because of their political beliefs or associations, whether they be Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or Communist.'

"The Daily Worker article reported that 'the signers of the statement urge support for an eight-point program, including abolition of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, reinstatement of teachers dismissed in recent inquiries, and amnesty for those in jail on charges of "conspiracy to teach and advocate" their political views.' Dr. Edward L. Young, Brookline, Mass., was named as a signer.

"The call to a bill of rights conference New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Dr. Edward L. Young, Massachusetts General Hospital, as a sponsor. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, in writing about the conference for her column in the Daily Worker (July 25, 1949, p. 8), stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases. She reported that seven of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that 'the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the Presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to the investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Viola Bernard, national health committee, NAACP, 1954.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4), listed Viola Bernard as one who signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embago.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: 'In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy.' "

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Dr. Russell L. Cecil, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow-traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A pamphlet, 'Relighting the Lamps of China,' listed Russell L. Cecil as a medical sponsor of the China Aid Council.

"The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 16), cited the China Aid Council as a 'subsidiary' of the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union * * *' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as ' the largest of the Communist 'front' movements in the United States * * *.'"

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, national health committee, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A membership list of the American League for Peace and Democracy which was compiled by the special Committee on Un-American Activities from original records of the organiation, subpenaed in 1939 by the committee, contains the name of one C. Herbert Marshall, of 2712 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released June 1 and September 21, 1948. The Attorney General redesignated the organization April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism 'in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7683 and 7684). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democrary as 'the largest of the Communist front movements in the United States. * * *'

"C. Herbert Marshall was shown as a sponsor of the Washington Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder in an advertisement of the organization which appeared in the Washington Post of May 1942 (p. 9). 'When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder * * * Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country, headed it' (special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, pp. 6 and 55). The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated Apirl 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"The call to a conference on civil rights, April 20–21, 1940 (p. 4), lists C. Herbert Marshall, M.D., as a sponsor of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, under whose auspices the conference was held. A letterhead of the organization, dated April 26, 1940, also shows C. Herbert Marshall as a sponsor. In 1941, Dr. C. Herbert Marshall was a member of the executive committee of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, according to a letterhead dated May 23, 1941.

"The Attorney General cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as an 'affiliate' or 'local chapter' of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. 'The program of the Washington committee followed that of the national federation. National Communist leaders have addressed its meetings, and conferences sponsored by it have been attended by representatives of prominent Communist front organizations' (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7688 and 7689). The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 25, 1942 (p. 22), cited the Washington Committee for Democratic Action as follows: 'When the American League for Peace and Democracy was dissolved in February 1940 its successor in Washington was called the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.'

"As shown by an advertisement in the Washington Post, May 18, 1948 (p. 15), Dr. C. Herbert Marshall signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Gloster Current, director of branch department, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Gloster Current and his orchestra were scheduled to play at the Independence Day picnic to be held July 3–4, 1938, under the auspices of the Communist Party of Michigan, according to a leaflet entitled 'Where's Everybody Going?' which announced the picnic.

"The Civil Rights Federation (affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties) issued a call to a statewide conference, September 12, 1943, in Detroit, Mich.; the name of Gloster Current appeared on the call in a list of sponsors and he was identified as secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Detroit chapter.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as an affiliate of the Communist front, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; and as a subversive and Communist organization which has been succeeded by and now operates as the Michigan chapter of the Civil Rights Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687; and press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948; also included on his consolidated list of organizations.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities and the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Michigan Civil Rights Federation as a Communist-front organization. (From Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated Mar. 29, 1944; and Report No. 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated Sept. 2, 1947.)

"In July 1947 Mr. Walter S. Steele testified in public hearings before this committee, at which time he named Gloster Current of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a council member from the United States to the World Federation of Democratic Youth (from Steele testimony, p. 81).

"The World Federation of Democratic Youth was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. From the outset, the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth. (From Report No. 271 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated Apr. 17, 1947.)"

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Ruby Hurley, southeast regional secretary, Birmingham, Ala., NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Ruby Hurley was a sponsor of the World Youth Festival, Prague, July–August 1947, as shown by the World Youth Festival, page 7, and the booklet, "The Bright Face of Peace," published by the U.S. Committee for the World Youth Festival. As shown by the call to World Youth Festival (p. 3), the festival, held in Prague from July 20 to August 17, 1947, was sponsored by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (pp. 12 and 13), cited the World Federation of Democratic Youth as follows: 'The AYD (American Youth for Democracy) is affiliated with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which was founded in London in November 1945 by delegates from over 50 nations. * * * From the outset the World Federation of Democratic Youth demonstrated that it was far more interested in serving as a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy than it was in the specific problems of international youth.'

"The International Union of Students was cited as follows by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 13): 'The World Federation of Democratic Youth brought into being the International Union of Students, which held

a meeting in Prague on August 17–31, 1946. The administration and direction of this project was entrusted to a 17-man executive committee of whom 12 were known Communists.' "

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Thurgood Marshall, director counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund and Educational Fund, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Thurgood Marshall was a member of the national committee of the International Juridical Association, as shown in the pamphlet, What Is the I.J.A.? The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the International Juridical Association as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense' (Rept. No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944). In a report on the National Lawyers Guild, prepared and published September 17, 1950, by the Committee on Un-American Activities, the International Juridical Association was cited as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'

"A list of officers of the National Lawyers Guild, as of December 1949 (printed in the committee's report on the National Lawyers Guild, p. 18) contains the name of Thurgood Marshall, New York City, among the members of the executive board. He was shown to be an associate editor of the Lawyers Guild Review in the issue of May–June 1948 (p. 422). It was reported in the Daily Worker of November 30, 1942 (p. 1), that Mr. Marshall, special counsel of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was one of those who submitted a report denouncing lynching and discrimination which was adopted by the national executive board of the National Lawyers Guild. It was also reported in the Washington Evening Star (February 8, 1948, p. A–22 and February 12, 1948, p. A–82), that Mr. Marshall, identified as special counsel, NAACP, criticized the loyalty program in a public forum held under the auspices of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D.C.

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in Report No. 1311 of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). In the committee's report on the organization, released in 1950, the guild was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.'

"The Daily Worker of November 24, 1947 (p. 4) reported that Thurgood Marshall was among a group of attorneys who sent a telegram to New York Congressmen asking them to oppose the contempt citations in the case of the so-called Hollywood 10."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Clarence M. Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individaul. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or finding of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Clarence Mitchell, a representative of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities, May 3, 1950, in opposition to H.R. 7595, at which time he stated that he was not then and had never been a member of the Communist Party. He stated that the question as to whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party 'is an unfair question, because it immediately precludes from appearing before this committee many of the people who would be on trial under a bill of this kind (H.R. 7595). Presumably there are people who may, for sincere and personal reasons, wish to be members of the Communist Party, but they may want to come here and object to this bill, but I suppose if they had to answer that question they very likely would not come.' (Public hearings, pp. 2296–2302.)

"It is noted by the Daily People's World of February 12, 1952 (p. 2) that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People, 'blasts civil rights record of presidential hopeful.' The Daily Worker of February 15, 1952 (p. 1) reported that Clarence Mitchell, director of Washington bureau, NAACP, appeared before the Senate Armed Forces Committee in protest of universal military training."

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"'Subject: Henry Lee Moon, director, public relations department, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"A membership list of the Washington Book Shop which was subpened by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in 1941 contains the name of Henry Lee Moon with address shown as 1206 Kenyon Street NW., Washington, D.C.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the Washington Book Shop Association as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list or organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 150), cited the Washington Book Shop Association as a Communist-front organization.

"Henry Lee Moon, New York, was a member of the national executive council of the National Negro Congress, as shown on the official proceedings of the congress for 1936 (p. 40).

"The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 'on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organization members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists." Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the Congress, * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph. John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support.' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687, 7688.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.'

"A review by Abner W. Berry of Henry Lee Moon's book, Balance of Power: The Negro Vote, was published in the Daily Worker of May 28, 1948 (p. 12). The review reads, in part:

"'As a newspaperman who spent the war years in Washington and later was associated with the CIO Political Action Committee, Henry Lee Moon has written, in balance of power a helpful survey of Negro suffrage in America. He defends the Negro voter against the charge of venality and corruptibility with the materials of history, and traces the long fight for the franchise.

* * * * *

"'It is the only volume brought to our attention which gives a detailed national picture of the Negro vote. It is too bad the author felt impelled to defend the two-party system and the Negro. And it is worse that he chose this otherwise useful contribution as the bearer of his offering of fuel for the cold war.'

"A photograph of Henry Lee Moon was published in the June 16, 1932, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 2).

"The Daily Worker of June 17, 1946 (p. 2), reported that one Henry Moon (no other identification shown) was one of the signers of a statement of the Action Committee To Free Spain Now which protested the delay in breaking diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

"The Attorney General cited the Action Committee To Free Spain Now as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

"The Daily Worker of February 16, 1949 (p. 13), reported that Henry Moon was nominated as commentator of the Voice of Freedom Committee.

"The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450."

"OCTOBER 25, 1955.

"Subject: Clarence A. Laws, regional director, New Orleans, La., NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"An undated letterhead (1947) of the Committee for Louisiana, affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, listed Clarence A. Laws as a member of the executive committee of the organization.

"The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of

funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference * * * as a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.'

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Robert L. Carter, assistant special counsel, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"Robert L. Carter wrote an article which was published in the Lawyers Guild Review (vol. VI, pp. 553–54, and 599–601). The Lawyers Guild Review was cited as 'an official organ of the National Lawyers Guild' by the Committee on Un-American Activities, report on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950 (p. 13).

"The National Lawyers Guild was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front organization in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149). It was cited as a Communist front which 'is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions' and which 'since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents.' (Committee's review on the National Lawyers Guild, September 21, 1950.)

"It was reported in the Times Herald of April 28, 1948 (pp. 1 and 4) that Robert L. Carter, of the American Veterans' Committee, was a sponsor of a conference against anti-Communist legislation.

"FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

"Subject: Torea Hall Pittman, assistant field secretary, NAACP, 1961.

"The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

"The official proceedings of the National Negro Congress for 1936 (p. 6) listed Mrs. Torea Pittman, of California, as a member of the general resolutions committee of the National Negro Congress.

"The Attorney General of the United States cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 'on the ground that it was "deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists." Commencing with its formation in 1936, Communist Party functionaries and fellow travelers have figured prominently in the leadership and affairs of the congress * * * according to A. Phillip Randolph, John P. Davis, secretary of the congress, has admitted that the Communist Party contributed $100 a month to its support.' (Attorney General, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688.) The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as 'the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes.' "

The American Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, because of rising costs, declining sponsorship and other grave problems, the visual and performing arts in the United States are tending to concentrate more and more in the largest cities, leaving the rest of the country with limited opportunity to enjoy and participate in them on the professional level. The shrinkage of the legitimate theater in particular is threatening to curtail sharply the expression and influence of the dramatic arts. Support from private sources alone has proved inadequate, and I deeply believe that some form of government cooperation is essential. Many countries are already providing some governmental help with considerable success in encouraging cultural development, and I believe that it is becoming increasingly evident that some government help is essential in the United States. Legislation for a U.S. Arts Foundation, which I have sponsored for years now, would encourage live performances of theater and exhibits of art in cities and towns which could not otherwise receive and support them.

One of the great impresarios of our times, S. Hurok, recalls what he considers the heyday of the American theater and contrasts it with its present decline in a recent feature article. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by S. Hurok entitled, "The Glory That Was New York," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, July 14.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GLORY THAT WAS NEW YORK

(By S. Hurok)

Do you remember when 42d Street was lined with legitimate theaters, when the Manhattan, Lexington, and Century opera houses, the Hippodrome, and nearly 90 theaters catered to a public that ranged through every strata of society? You may not, but I do.

Granted, the subject matter on these many stages differed somewhat from today's. Surely, some goodhearted—and a few not so goodhearted—prostitutes were to be seen from time to time; there were occasional hints of incest and what were politely termed "social diseases." Every second serious play, however, wasn't about homosexuality, and I don't seem to recall any cannibalism or some of the odder perversions we have been subjected to lately. People's private lives may have been just as unpleasant as today's theater and literature tell us they are, but on the stage things were a good deal more pleasant.

FUN AND GIRLS

There was lots of gaiety and boisterous fun and pretty girls, not just in one show, but all over the place. There were the adventures with the new playwrights, Eugene O'Neill, Maxwell Anderson, Robert Sherwood, Elmer Rice. There were the great producers, Charles Frohman, Florenz Ziegfeld, Charles Dillingham, David Belasco, George White, Arthur Hopkins. New York was a place where Max Reinhardt could stage "The Miracle" and "A Midsummer Night's Dream."

Let us say that all this was prior to the thirties prior, perhaps, to the depression, prior, certainly, to television. Anyway, it was only some 30 years ago, and New York was a theater town beyond compare.

Is 30 years a long time for you? Well, then. The other day I was walking past the new apartment building at Seventh Avenue and 59th Street, and paused to remember with nostalgia how only a few short seasons ago I used to spend fascinated hours backstage at the now vanished Century Theater watching the skilled wardrobe people of the Kabuki endlessly folding and unfolding with infinite care their elaborate and fanciful costumes.

Where are all the theaters? They are movie houses, parking lots, television studios, office and apartment buildings. And where is the New York theater? It has dwindled into something resembling a trickle and not a very distinguished trickle at that.

Why, in these few short years, has this happened? Television, wildly rising costs, the move of the middle class to the suburbs—I've heard and thought about all the answers that one can find for this question. We all know the many contributing factors.

I also know, as I've said for 50 years, that when the public is offered the best, it is a pretty fair bet to say that it will come. Witness the Royal Ballet, opening at the Met in the late spring and taking in $700,000 in less than 5 weeks.

It seems to me that recently I have spent a goodly number of my waking hours addressing groups from university students to Rotarians, talking to newspapermen and local managers and always finding myself alternately extolling the extraordinary talent to be found everywhere in this country, the eager audiences for the best, and then, the other side of the coin, decrying the disappearance of theaters all across the country.

It isn't only New York. The Boston Opera House is now a parking lot. There is no place to present ballet or other spectacular productions in our Nation's Capital. This spring we couldn't take the Royal Ballet to one of the country's most cultivated cities, San Francisco, because the only possible place to present it, the War Memorial Opera House, was completely involved with musical comedy.

In Washington there were only 8 or 10 theaters, now there is only 1. In Boston there were some 10, now 2. In San Francisco there were some 12, now 2.

I say, give us more theaters, many, many more. Certainly I praise the splendid new buildings in Chicago, Toronto, Montreal, the rising Opera House in Los Angeles; Lincoln Center is fine, too; but these are not enough.

Can a man with a family of five take them out to the theater in New York unless he

can afford a whopping sum? He used to be able to do so. Will Lincoln Center solve that problem? Of course not.

What the theater needs, and the ballet and the opera, is subsidy from city, State, and Federal sources. And the performing arts need many theaters, everywhere.

I am weary of hearing our Representatives in the Congress and the State legislature talking about "culture" as if it were a seven-letter dirty word.

I'm also weary of hearing how subsidy would hamper the arts. One need only point to Britain, where the Arts Council began to function at the end of World War II, to find an answer.

SOME RESULTS

In London, then provincial as far as ballet and opera were concerned, there are now two ballet companies and a major opera company and partially subsidized theaters flourishing with the classics and with experimental plays. A Benjamin Britten, a William Walton has been encouraged to write for the lyric theater, for the ballet. Major painters have contributed sets. Major poets and playwrights have turned librettists.

I've often said that if I had a 4,000-seat theater I could keep it running 52 weeks a year to capacity business and be able to sell seats at prices the average man could afford. I shouldn't fill it with foreign attractions alone, although these would certainly figure, but with the best that American writers, composers, choreographers, and directors could achieve. I might even show a profit. I always like a profit. Maybe it's not too late to try.

Swiss National Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Swiss people are known throughout the world for their individualistic love of freedom and their readiness to defend their nation; for their careful attention to the obligations of citizenship, and for their success in maintaining a harmonious and stable country. We all know neutral Switzerland as a country where Latin and Teuton, Catholic and Protestant, worker and banker can live together in peace and harmony. Not so many of us realize that this remarkable combination of diversity and harmony has a history which dates back almost seven centuries. Today we have an opportunity to salute the gallant people of Switzerland, because August 1, 1963, is the 672d anniversary of the Swiss Confederation.

On August 1, 1291, the citizens of three cantons within what is now Switzerland—Uri, Schwyz, and Lower Unterwalden—banded together into a defensive league. During the next several centuries more cantons were added to this league, and in 1798, after considerably more territory had been acquired, a unified Helvetic Republic was formed. In 1803 Napoleon Boneparte gave the Swiss a new constitution and the number of cantons—the confederate parts of Switzerland—increased to 19. Switzerland acquired two further constitutions during the 19th century, of which the second survives to the present day. Despite domestic crises and foreign interventions, the Swiss Confederation has remained intact through almost seven centuries. Today, as we note the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation, we greet all friends of Switzerland everywhere.

Americans have long enjoyed a special bond of friendship with the Swiss people. One reason may be that our countries respect many of the same principles of government. The Swiss people, who have been called the most democratic in the world, exercise a direct voice in their government, and have been able to reconcile the interests and ideas of diverse groups.

Some have suggested that the remarkable success with which the Swiss have preserved their national independence through the centuries is a reflection of the physical characteristics of the country. Formerly the traditional isolation of the Swiss mountain folk was only partly tempered by the mountains and rivers that link Switzerland with the outside world. But in the 20th century, when rapid means of transportation and communication have reduced the importance of natural barriers between peoples, the Swiss continue to defend their national independence and neutrality, despite the cataclysms of war that have taken place around them. One suspects that mountains have been less important in preserving Swiss independence than the steadfast determination of the Swiss people. I am happy to salute Switzerland and her friends around the world on the anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Confederation.

Commonwealth Day—11 Years of Fulfillment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, a concept unique in all the America's—indeed in all of man's history—became a reality. On that day the Governor of Puerto Rico, with the blessing of the U.S. Government, proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Slightly less than a State in stature, but more autonomous than all other Territories, Puerto Rico was accorded all but the last full measure of political maturity while retaining the economic concessions so vital to an experiment that promised to dismay the collectivists and inspire the free.

Politically, a precise definition of the island's status has yet to be coined. Neither an independent entity, a State, nor an incorporated Territory, Puerto Rico reflects the dignity of a free people; its citizens, who are citizens of the United States, enjoy practically all the privileges of statehood, save that of national suffrage, while being free of Federal taxation; and, in local affairs self-rule is complete. In Puerto Rico the Governor is popularly elected; this privilege was never enjoyed by the people of either Alaska or Hawaii until these incorporated Territories became States. What, then, is the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico? Actually, it is an inspired design for living adapted to the needs of a people not yet fully prepared to meet the economic demands of statehood, but who merit the right to rule themselves. They cannot vote for President, and they have a nonvoting Resident Commissioner to represent them in the Congress; but for all local offices, as well as problems, they are the final arbiters. It might well be that the Puerto Rican definition of status captures the essence of this political and social phenomenon: Associated Free State.

Mr. Speaker, the men of Puerto Rico have the same military obligations as their fellow citizens on the mainland. They have followed the Stars and Stripes in battle since World War I, long before the attainment of Commonwealth status. More than 91 percent of the Puerto Ricans engaged in the Korean conflict were volunteers. In terms both of patriotism and valor their record has been a distinguished one.

The standard of living on the island has risen spectacularly; the millenium, however, will be some time in arriving. Although per capita income is four times larger than it was 20 years ago. Net Commonwealth income continues to rise at a phenomenal rate; in fiscal 1962 it attained a level 11 percent higher than that recorded the previous year.

Measured in terms of mainland figures, Puerto Rican progress is less than overwhelming; when contrasted with pre-World War II conditions the advance is staggering. In 1940 family income totaled only $660; in 1961 it climbed to $3,003. Net income from manufacturing rose from $26 million in 1940 to $384 million in 1962.

Progress in other areas has been even more remarkable. Life expectancy at birth in 1940 was only 46 years; in 1960 it was 70 years—precisely the same as it was in the continental United States. The death rate in Puerto Rico from tuberculosis in 1940 per 100,000 persons was 260.2; in 1961 it was approximately 26.0. The death rate from all causes in the island in 1961 was 6.8 per 1,000 population; in the States it was 9.3.

Mr. Speaker, these magnificent achievements are attributable in very large measure to the vision, talents, and industry of one of America's greatest statesmen, Luis Muñoz-Marín. In the middle 1940's he and a coterie of dedicated associates instituted "Operation Bootstrap," a daring program of economic reform by which the island was to be

transformed from the "poorhouse of the Caribbean," dependent almost entirely upon the cruel vagaries of sugar quotations, into a proud "showcase of democracy at work."

Painfully cognizant that only through industrialization could its people realize the American dream of the good life, the island government, through an imaginative program of tax write-offs and other concessions, induced stateside industries to establish parent or branch plants in Puerto Rico. Incidentally, only those firms whose departure from mainland localities would not leave an economic void in those areas were invited; Operation Bootstrap has never been a piratical venture. As a result, the stateside economy has escaped damage while the venturesome businesses have realized, in the main, substantial profits; and the once "stricken land" has already become a model not only for its Latin American neighbors, but also for underdeveloped areas throughout the world, free and otherwise.

Commonwealth Day is a day for rejoicing by all Americans.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Prayer by the Senate Chaplain Before National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the first week of June 1963, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held its 50th National Convention in Washington, D.C. At the annual luncheon meeting of this golden anniversary conclave on June 7, our own beloved Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, delivered the invocation. This very beautiful and moving prayer has in it gems of thought and spiritual solace for all of us, Mr. President; so I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, D.D., CHAPLAIN, U.S. SENATE

Let us lift our hearts in prayer.

God of our fathers, Who in every hour of destiny dost use human talents to accomplish Thy tasks and human lips to blow the trumpets of Thy freedom, to us has been passed the torch of liberty. Help us to hold our stewardship as a solemn trust in these times of tension and crisis, as we gird the might of the Nation and of our allies who love freedom, to defend threatened liberties. May we take care to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our democracy, knowing that without these verities we but build on sinking sand.

Forbid that, fronting such a day, freighted with sobering and solemn significance for the long years that stretch ahead and for all Thy children everywhere, we should meet titanic issues with tiny conceptions, petty patterns and selfish designs. Broaden, we pray Thee the areas of our sympathy exposed to the world's want and woe.

Now, God be praised to have matched us with this hour of world destiny when we are privileged, with our all, to defend the treasure committed to us by the Founding Fathers and to guard their dream and ours against sterner odds and darker perils than those who rang the Liberty Bell were called to measure or to face.

Give to us peace, a just peace, in our time, Oh God, the peace that comes of purity and strength to simple justice do. So runs our loyal dream of Thee. God of our fathers, make it come true. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

The Significance of President Kennedy's Recent Visit to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the annual Irish Day outing in my section of Pennsylvania was held recently at Sans Souci Park, near Wilkes-Barre, and the featured speaker on that occasion was Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, of the city of Pittston, in my congressional district. Mr. McCarthy spoke on the significance of President Kennedy's recent visit to Ireland. In the Scranton Times of Saturday, July 20, 1963, Mr. Neil L. Whitney, associate editor of the Times, in his popular column, "Personal and Pertinent," commented upon Irish Day and Mr. McCarthy's address. As part of my remarks today, I would like to include Mr. Whitney's column.

The article follows:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S RECENT VISIT TO IRELAND

(By Neil L. Whitney)

People from Scranton who journeyed to Sans Souci Park, near Wilkes-Barre, to attend the annual Irish Day outing held under the sponsorship of the combined Irish societies of Luzerne County, said they were amply rewarded by the excellent speech made by Charles A. McCarthy, the well-known Pittston historian. Mr. McCarthy is a former president of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Greater Pittston. The title of his talk at the Luzerne County outing was: "The Significance of President Kennedy's Recent Visit to Ireland." He referred at some length to President Kennedy's suggestion that Ireland become a member of the European Economic Community and said that "not since Ireland gained its independence has there been so strong and unanimous feeling on any matter of national importance as there is today in reference to this matter." He pointed out that Ireland's economists have estimated that if Ireland joins the EEC and starts exporting its agricultural products to member countries, the value of these products would be increased $84 million. "President Kennedy's helpful suggesting to Ireland to join the EEC was of great significance to that country," Mr. McCarthy told the Irish Day audience. "It is known that Ireland, on the average, exports about one-third of its agricultural production, which adds up to more than 60 percent of its annual exports. More than 80 percent of these go to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, where they compete with imports from countries with high subsidies. Consequently, Irish exports of butter, cheese, and bacon are strongly subsidized in order to maintain their share of the United Kingdom market."

Historian McCarthy had some encouraging news for his listeners, most of them descended from early settlers who came to the Wyoming Valley from the Emerald Isle. He explained that the exodus of people which had been draining Ireland of its population for such a long period of time has now come to a halt. The latest figures show a slight increase in Ireland's population. This has been brought about mainly by the effort to industrialize the country. "The migration of people from Ireland, which lasted for many, many years, has somewhat of a parallel in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania," declared Mr. McCarthy. "Farming was bad in Ireland and its citizens left its shores in droves to find a livelihood elsewhere. With the curtailment of mining operations and subsequent loss of jobs, many of our ablest residents and their talented offspring found it necessary to leave the Wyoming Valley to obtain employment. Ireland has shown the world that the principles of liberty, justice, and freedom are not abstract thoughts in a vacuum but are something which must be implemented by action. To Ireland's credit, not only did the Irish fight the good fight for freedom when their own welfare was at stake, but they fought in all wars for freedom and liberty. They were in all the battles of the American Revolution. A battalion of Irish patriots fought resolutely for Israel's freedom. Members of the Irish Republic Army were detailed to the Congo by the United Nations when trouble flared in Africa. The peace-loving Irish maintained order there at a perilous time in that area's history. How appropriate it was for President Kennedy to visit the land of his forebearers and again share with them their material concern for liberty and justice for all. Traditionally the Irish are home-loving, family-loving, but most significantly—are God-loving people."

A-War and the Test-Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Evening Star of July 26, 1963, contained an excellent column by Mr. David Lawrence on the subject of the proposed test-ban treaty. It is entitled "A-War and the Test-Ban Treaty: Pact Viewed as Not Abolishing Conflict and as No Guarantee Against Cheating." I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A-WAR AND THE TEST-BAN TREATY: PACT VIEWED AS NOT ABOLISHING CONFLICT AND AS NO GUARANTEE AGAINST CHEATING

(By David Lawrence)

The biggest delusion of modern times is contained in the "nuclear test ban" treaty just "initialed" at Moscow by representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

Formal signing is to come later, and ratification by the U.S. Senate is necessary before the document can be regarded as in effect for this country.

The agreement, however, does not do what most people probably think it does—reduce the danger of a nuclear war. Indeed, the impression is mistakenly given that it means the abolition of nuclear war. This is due to the emphasis that has been placed on the meeting at Moscow and because of the protracted crusade for the test ban which has been carried on in recent years, largely by pacifist groups in various countries.

But the new treaty would not bar the use of any nuclear weapons in war.

It would not bring about a reduction in the existing number of nuclear weapons possessed by any government or limit in any way future production.

It would not bar nations other than the signers from carrying on whatever tests they pleased.

It would not prevent nuclear tests underground.

It would not guarantee against attempts to cheat by conducting tests above the ground. Russia cheated last time and deliberately violated her agreement.

The military advantage to the Soviet Union lies in the fact that the United States is ahead in the kind of weapons that require underground testing, and now the Soviets have gained a free hand to improve their position and catch up with the United States in this field. Also, the Soviet Union is believed to have gone ahead in certain categories, such as antimissile missiles and "terror" weapons, which require atmospheric testing, and the United States cannot now conduct such tests to catch up with the Russians. It is argued here in rebuttal, however, that bombs requiring aboveground or underwater testing have been accumulated in sufficient quantity to make such testing less important.

Then why all the hullabaloo about a nuclear test-ban treaty or partial ban, as it is more often termed? The answer is to be found in the political domain. The same proposals were made in previous years by the United States but were rejected by the Russians. Today, however, for undisclosed reasons, Premier Khrushchev is trying another tack. He suddenly indicated a few weeks ago he was ready for a high-level conference at Moscow on the subject of nuclear testing. Nobody knows why he shifted tactics, but it is assumed that he needed to make some showing of peaceful intent so as to quiet his internal opposition and deflate Red China's war scare.

It is conceivable, too, that the military experts of the Soviet Union figured that, if the United States were to discontinue aboveground and underwater testing, this would in some manner halt the nuclear development of the United States in certain categories of weapons and prevent any real superiority from being achieved.

As for underground testing, it will continue to be carried on by both sides. Also, it is contended that if the moratorium on aboveground and underwater testing is some day broken by the Soviet Union, the United States can automatically resume testing anywhere. The experts among the scientists say, however, that it isn't as simple as it sounds and that continuous testing is important in developing many varieties of defense weapons. America, they explain, will have to be satisfied with its present strength and take a chance that the Russians will not increase their offensive or defensive power in the nuclear field.

American military men are uncertain. They haven't had much of a voice in the negotiations. They are skeptical but probably will be required for reasons of policy to go along on the new treaty without making much protest.

But Congress—in which there is an abundance of skepticism—will make a thorough inquiry and carry on a considerable debate. In the end, the chances are that the agreement will be accepted by the Senate on the vague theory that it is "a step in the right direction." But there's a lot yet to be done before any tangible benefit can be derived from the pact. China, for instance, can go ahead on its own with tests, and so can France. If either country does so, this could automatically terminate the new treaty 3 months thereafter.

Nuclear war, therefore, can happen despite the new agreement. Further development of only certain kinds of nuclear weapons will have been deferred for the time being. Meanwhile, the delusion that nuclear war has been somehow banned by the agreement initialed at Moscow this week will gain headway. Actually, however, the true barrier to the prevention of a nuclear conflict—the power of autocratic government—isn't likely to be removed by the signing of an agreement with the kind of regime which rules today in the Soviet Union and which is constantly extending its influence by infiltration and subversion in all continents of the world.

Is It Not Against the Law To Break Unjust Laws?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Frank Mathews of the St. Paul's Episcopal Church, in Selma, Ala., recently wrote an article in his weekly bulletin and which was reprinted in the editorial column of the Selma Times Journal and the Anniston Star.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks of Reverend Mathews are very pertinent in regard to the issues facing us concerning civil rights and under permission previously granted, I wish to, at this time, revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Anniston Star, July 22, 1963]

IT IS AGAINST THE LAW

The following was written by the Reverend Frank Mathews for the weekly bulletin put out by St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Selma. It was reprinted in the editorial columns of the Selma Times-Journal, and our hope is that it already has been brought to the attention of the individual whom it names and to the attention of others of like mentality.

The Reverend Mr. Mathews wrote:

"I was appalled the other evening to hear a news commentator quote these words from the mouth of Dr. Martin Luther King: 'It is not against the law to break unjust laws.'

"This is a statement made by a man who has been supported, encouraged, praised, and strengthened by our National Government in general and the President of the United States in particular.

"This philosophy that gives the right to an individual to decide which laws are just and which unjust, that gives the right to an individual to assert his own devices and desires against the whole legislative system of our Nation, that gives the right to an individual to openly defy democratically imposed restrictions to satisfy personal whims—this philosophy is calculated to destroy the civilization of our Nation.

"This philosophy is the way of the jungle, where the hyena eats the monkey and the lion eats the hyena and the hunter kills the lion.

"It is the primitive law of 'survival of the fittest,' where the strong prey on the weak, where there are no limitations imposed to protect society from the greed of sinful man. This philosophy does, in effect, abolish law, because laws which can be freely broken are not laws at all, and without laws we have no civilized society.

"It is not a question of whether the laws are just or unjust. There are undoubtedly many unjust laws on our statute books.

"But there is a constitutional method of repealing those laws, and until and unless they are repealed by democratically appointed means, they remain the law and each individual is subject to their limitations and restrictions.

"Therefore, contrary to the stated philosophy of Dr. Martin Luther King, it is against the law to break unjust laws, and those who openly defy the law should be punished, rather than protected by the armed might of the Federal Government."

The Troublesome Jagans of Guiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in addition to Cuba, the free world faces two ugly and unpleasant situations in the Western Hemisphere which should induce some repressive actions by the Organization of American States if these festering sores are not to spread their poisons to other areas. One is of course Haiti with its unscrupulous and vicious dictator who now rules that country in open defiance of its constitutional safeguards; the other is British Guiana which now finds itself in the early stages of a new police state run by a man and wife Communist team, the utterly irresponsible Jagans.

An interesting and informative report on the Jagans appeared in the July 23 issue of the newsletter published by Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., of Washington. It presents some descriptive facts and background material which Members of Congress should well keep in mind in order to make sure that none of the multibillion dollar foreign aid bill now being considered finds its way into the grasping hands of the Jagans.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TROUBLESOME JAGANS

President Kennedy has shown a little of his hard core in the case of Cheddi Jagan, the Communist boss of British Guiana. Were his fingers not burned on Castro, we probably would be supporting that former British sugar fief with loans, grants and Peace Corps aid until the Hindu and his Chicago University wife are firmly in the saddle and begin to infiltrate their neighbors.

But up to now the record of the Tory government and our own listless efforts smell to high heavens. If this is any criterion of our fine Anglo-Saxon self-respect on both sides of the Atlantic, then it is no wonder that we are treated with contempt in Mexico, Brazil and the rest of Latin America. The Latins respect courage and that is a commodity that recent U.S. administrations have not.

The solution of the Jagan problem is to get rid of the Jagans. It is so absurdly simple that the mind reels at the idiocy of treating them with the same consideration as legitimate rulers. Ever since Truman sent the troops into Korea, we have not dared to tackle a Communist power.

The Jagans have been members of the Communist conspiracy for many years. The Jagan woman was indoctrinated in a Chicago group and is probably the most arrogant and vicious female on the world scene. She is also considered by her friends to be personally the dirtiest female alive, living in squalor and bathless for months at a time. Castro's chroniclers say that he remains away from water for 45 days at a time, beating the record of the average dromedary and smelling like one. Jagan is personally clean, taking showers in the homes of his friends and brushing his teeth regularly. In London he is regarded as the rudest guest ever at the hotels, but fairly clean.

The Jagan woman is full of blood and guts and it was she that ordered the shooting of the strikers. She uses a sort of M-squad to knock off political rivals. She would probably be running a full-scale satellite were it not for the fact that Jagan is yellow clear through. The U.S. press is still mealy mouthed over Jagan. It emphasizes his titles "Doctor" and "Prime Minister." Just as Castro was brought to power by the New York Times by continued references to the "young leader, Dr. Castro." The columns, for what reason no one knows, refer to Red Jagan as "left-oriented" or "leftwing" or "extreme Socialist." Why a Red can't be called a Red in this country is beyond our best legal minds. Surely the Jagans won't sue.

In recent days we have seen a switch in the line about British Guiana. Instead of characterizing the brawl down there as an anti-Communist revolt of Forbes Burnham and his black workers, it has now become a race war. Why? The Communists in the United States are generally at the bottom of the switches in labels. They invented "agricultural Socialists" so that the U.S. public would not be alarmed at the Red takeover in China and landed plunk on the editorial pages of the New York Times, day after day. The hard core passes it on to the pinks and there the damage is done. The same with "young Dr. Castro"—the murderous Red. Now it's a race war in Guiana. Why? Well, racist news is high in the U.S. press and television. We get page after page of news of race demonstrations. It is tops on the editorial must list.

So if it is a race war in Guiana, then it is a diversion from anticommunism.

We do not know, or at least have heard nothing of a wave of sympathy for Forbes Burnham and his black legions. He must need arms and money. There was no trouble getting them to Castro when he was tearing down a friendly government in Cuba.

Who would like to contribute to this worthy cause?

RTCA Report on Air Traffic Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics issued its awaited report on the air traffic system in the United States. It defines air traffic control problems currently being experienced and recommends improvement programs.

The 83-page report by RTCA Special Committee 104—SC-104—activated only last January, represents the first step in a group effort by various airspace users and other aviation experts from government and industry to set forth their coordinated views on today's air traffic system.

The report first analyzes broad operational and economic problems or aspects of today's air traffic system taken as a whole, and places emphasis on areas requiring further coordination and planning. Some of the major areas considered are the operational complexity of today's system, the work load on the pilot and on the controller, as well as economic considerations, both ground and airborne, and the international aspects involved.

The body of the report defines air traffic control problems currently being experienced and contains recommendations for immediate improvement. Principally, these recommendations, which cover 69 specific problem areas, call for changes in procedures or for the employment or fuller utilization of developed equipments or known techniques. Included are recommendations for more effective utilization of airspace in terminal and en route areas and if aircraft performance capabilities; more effective dissemination of information essential to the pilot; training and qualifications of controllers; as well as the handling of flight test and military flight operations in common system airspace. Other recommendations are directed toward the development of better capability for all-weather operations; improved weather operating capability at low traffic density airports; an operational trial of a different method of pilot-to-weather forecaster communications; reduction of required position reporting; improved air traffic control data handling and displays; and airport runway and taxiway lighting, marking and configuration requirements, including takeoff areas for light aircraft.

The report recognizes that some activities aimed at resolving current problems are already underway. In those instances where the actions coincide with those recommended in the report, RTCA's recommendations are intended as an endorsement and stimulus to such actions. In a number of instances, the report indicates where additional effort is required. In those areas where no action is in progress, or where the current effort is at variance with the recommended solutions, responsible agencies are urged to give prompt consideration to the solutions offered.

For all in the Congress, who themselves frequently use our Nation's airlines, I recommend the reading of the entire report.

Over the past several years I have become acutely aware of the problems which have been multiplying in the area of Air Traffic Control. I personally feel the Congress has fulfilled its responsibility by providing sufficient funds for the Federal Aviation Agency to have done a far better job in improving the State of air traffic control.

It is my hope that the FAA will quickly incorporate the recommendations and suggestions made by the RTCA into their planning, thereby, giving greater assurance to the air traveling public that their safety is assured.

Race War For Export

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt writes a very interesting and informative column which is published each week in a number of newspapers across the country. I have been very impressed with her latest column entitled "Race War for Export" and is dated July 28, 1963. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACE WAR FOR EXPORT

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Fidel Castro is exporting racial revolution. From Harlem to Haiti he pokes his red finger at sore spots between whites and Negroes. His purpose: To advance Communist power by the old ploy of divide and conquer.

Already, a powerful radio station in Cuba tells Negroes as far north as New York City to riot and strike down their white exploiters. This station, which calls itself Radio Dixie, is operated by Mrs. Barbara Collins, the daughter of a New Jersey minister and Robert Franklin Williams of Monroe County, N.C.

Mrs. Collins, known as "Beardless Barbara" to her pro-Castro pals, sought political asylym in Cuba after she was subpenaed to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Williams, a Negro, is wanted by the FBI on charges of interstate flight and kidnaping.

Sandwiched between the finest of jazz music, Radio Dixie broadcasts speeches by

Cuban leaders and American Communists. They tell American Negroes they are "the slaves of American capitalists." A few days ago, the station broadcast a speech by Cuban President Oswaldo Dorticos. "Someday the American people will rise up and destroy the capitalists," he said, "When they do your Cuban brothers will give you plenty of help"

In view of this country's troubled racial picture, such broadcasts are a danger to our security and to the peaceful solution of our racial problems. The 60,000-watt station broadcasts in English round-the-clock from studios at the University of Havana. A youth I know here says he frequently picks up these broadcasts on his ham radio set. The call letters are CMCA.

Radio Dixie also beams shortwave broadcasts to Central and South America aimed at Indian and colored peoples. It seeks to convince the less developed "have nots" that the way to progress is to seize property and jobs from the white middle and upper classes.

Special appeals are made to Negro visitors to Cuba. Negro students from the United States are greeted by "Negro fighters" like Williams and fed the Communist line on race questions. This reaps propaganda dividends for Castro. For example, reports the San Francisco Enquirer of July 2, an art student returning from Cuba expressed his "wonderment that one government could help people as much as this one."

U.S. citizens are, of course, forbidden to make such trips to Cuba. But our State Department refuses to enforce this travel ban.

Less publicized are the trips to Cuba made by American Negro leftists on Mexican passports. This writer was informed that Russian-made planes are landing on an airstrip in Yucatan to transport American Negroes and U.S.-made weaponry to Cuba. During the past few weeks more than 150 of these American Negro citizens have received special training at Cuban schools such as the Minas del Prio School in Ariente Province, Cuba. Already, hundreds of Negro Haitians have been trained at the Oriente school run by General Bayo, the Communist general in the Spanish civil war. They were returned to Haiti to foment murder and mayhem.

There is also the problem of infiltration by Castro agents into this country. Although the vast majority of white and Negro Cuban refugees are stanch anti-Communists, a small, well-trained group of Negro Castroites are reportedly setting up chapters of Black Muslims.

Cuban underground sources in Florida told this writer that Castro agents had set up Black Muslim chapters on the outskirts of Miami.

Significantly, the Communist Party announced in Political Affairs as of July 1962 that it would form a "United front" with the Black Muslims, a Negro nationalist group, hoping that fanatics would train their fire on the "reactionary" ruling class.

For these Negro extremists, Cuba can be the madel of a state where "Black rules White." But it is closer to the truth to state that the criminal element rules both races. Primitive and untrained elements among the Negroes have been deliberately elevated in an attempt to fomet class war and produce the chaos on which a dictatorship thrives. This is also a way of serving notice on white officers, managers, professionals, and intellectuals to work for communism or face extermination.

The type of black supremacy which Cuba is implementing is described by John Martino in his book "I Was Castro's Prisoner" (published by Devin Adair, 23 E. 26th St., New York). Martino, who was in Cuban prisons between 1959 and 1962, relates that the committees of defense and all the Communist and repressive organizations upholding the dictatorship are almost entirely staffed by Negroes. They are deliberately given the unpopular jobs.

A Negro heads the armed forces. He is Juan Almeida Bosque, who was sentenced in 1948 to 4 years in the Isle of Pines after attacking and robbing a Fort Lauderdale, Fla., woman.

This is the type of "racial justice" which Castro agents are working to export to other countries. It is another reason why we must have a free Cuba in which all races try to live in harmony.

Double Jubilee of Saints Cyril and Methodius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, 1963 is the year that Americans of Slovak heritage are commemorating the 11th centennial of Saints Cyril and Methodius to that part of the world which is now known as Slovakia.

On May 13 of this year the late, beloved pontiff, Pope John XXIII issued in honor of these two great saints of Christendom an apostolic letter known as "Magnifici Eventus." On the same day His Holiness blessed the cornerstone of the new institute built in their memory by the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

Under the sponsorship of the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America a pilgrimage assembled on June 30 at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, here in Washington, D.C., where Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Washington, celebrated a solemn pontifical mass. The following day, at the request of my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, the Honorable Edward J. Patten, Reverend Michael J. Churak, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, opened the session of the House of Representatives with a most inspiring invocation.

In the Eighth District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent in this body, I am pleased to say that there is a Roman Catholic parish which bears the name of these saintly apostles of Slovakia.

But Saints Cyril and Methodius, of Clifton, N.J., in addition to the participation of its members in the Washington pilgrimage and in the observance of the feast day of Saints Cyril and Methodius on July 7, has still another cause for joy. On October 22, 1963, this parish, under the benevolent stewardship of Rev. Gilbert Maga, OFM, aided by his devoted assistant pastor, Rev. Anthony Maskulka, OFM, will celebrate its golden jubilee. I know the best wishes of the entire House of Representatives are extended to Father Gilbert and all his parishioners on this memorable occasion.

How Canada Solved Featherbedding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "How Canada Solved Featherbedding" by Truman R. Temple, which appeared in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star on July 28, 1963.

In my judgment, Mr. Temple has performed a distinct service in directing attention to the striking similarity between a problem which Canada met and overcame, and one with which we in the Congress are struggling at the moment. It is interesting, indeed, to note that while the railroad work rules question came into focus at the same time in both the United States and Canada, our neighboring country was able to resolve the problem in an effective and expeditious manner and, as Mr. Temple reports, "Canada's rail transport is highballing ahead."

I am confident that my hope for a speedy solution to this controversy is shared by the American public and I think this article deserves careful reading both in the Congress and throughout the country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CANADA SOLVED FEATHERBEDDING

(By Truman R. Temple)

While Washington wrestles with the railroad work rules problem, a nightmare it has failed to solve in nearly 4 years of talk and reports, Canada's rail transport is highballing ahead.

"This issue is settled," a Canadian official commented in an interview last week. "We are gradually getting rid of firemen on diesel trains. The unions were not entirely happy, but phasing out the workers gradually cushioned the shock."

Canada reached the crisis that Washington is now going through back in January 1957. The events that followed might well have offered a model for the United States—but somewhere down the line Washington was shunted into a siding where the political bushes grow thick.

RAISED THE SAFETY ISSUE

As both countries have abandoned the steam puffers in favor of the more economical diesels, the need for a man in the cab to shovel coal vanished. Foreseeing this, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen began stressing his importance to safety. Management disagreed.

By 1956 the railroads in this country and Canada told the brotherhood that the old diesel rule would be changed to exclude firemen in some services. Most lines later backed away, however, watching with intense interest as the Canadian Pacific Railroad decided it would make a test case: It would run freight diesels without firemen.

The union called a strike January 2, 1957, and the result stunned the Canadian Government. Although the walkout lasted only 9 days, its effect on Canada's economy was serious. The $2 billion railroad (it has some 17,000 miles of track in Canada, against

13,000 for the longest in the United States, the Santa Fe) proved to be indispensable.

Deciding that the issue overshadowed politics, the Dominion appointed a royal commission to look into the matter.

ROYAL COMMISSION HAD POWER

Such bodies are not unusual in Canada. On the average, perhaps one a year is created to study some problem. But the hooker in this one was that it possessed the power of arbitration. What it recommended, with a few minor changes, was carried out.

The royal commission did a thorough job. It heard 119 witnesses from both sides in five cities, rode in diesel cabs, and made a first-hand inspection of what European railroads were doing about firemen.

The commission's conclusion: Firemen are not needed in diesels, either in freight or yard service.

Under a resulting plan, the firemen were to be eased out gradually. The scheme had compassion in it; Canadian Pacific figured the program would cost more than $38 million, extend over 10 years, and involve transferring some employees to other jobs.

But the CPR reckoned the price was worth it all; annual savings on discontinuing firemen in diesels was estimated at $5.7 million initially, $11.6 million a year ultimately. (U.S. railroads think their savings would be around $200 million a year.)

The firemen's union did not go down without a struggle. Realizing its very life was at stake, it called another strike in May, 1958, as the CPR layoffs began.

But public opinion was solidly behind the CPR, and other unions, unconvinced of the firemen's cause, crossed picket lines. The strike collapsed after 3 days. The Canadian National Railways, CPR's Government-owned rival, also adopted the new work rules, and today peace reigns in Canada on this issue.

In some ways, affairs in Washington at first paralleled the Canadian case. President Eisenhower appointed a special commission, and for 14 months it went over much of the same ground.

Both commissions studied many work rules, but the aspect that drew much attention remained the firemen. The Eisenhower Commission also concluded that firemen on freight diesels were unneeded.

It recommended, among other things, laying off all firemen within a year who had less than 10 years' service a measure that would affect 13,000 men. Those with longer seniority, about 27,000 in all, would be kept on and simply not replaced, their numbers to decline by attrition of death, retirement, and so on.

THE MISSING ELEMENT

But there was a missing element. Unlike the Canadian panel, the Eisenhower commission did not have power to force its recommendations on the industry. Neither did a series of subsequent panels, who threatened to study the whole matter to death without getting anywhere. Arbitration remained a union bugaboo, viewed as the first demolition of free institutions and the end of collective bargaining.

The latest move by the White House, to shunt the issue to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the next couple of years, has the advantage of getting Mr. Kennedy past the 1964 elections. But it still does not meet the issue head-on. The "cooling off period" has become a Washington mystique in the problem, a way to ignore the problem in the hope it will go away.

There are three elements in the United States that conspired to prevent a settlement, in the opinion of one shrewd Canadian observer:

"It was a mistake for the presidential commission to say that X number of firemen should be liquidated within a year," he declared. "The unions were backed into a corner by this."

A POLITICAL ISSUE HERE

Second, according to the Dominion official, the railroad unions have closed ranks, believing they are against a wall. Railroad employment has dropped from 1.4 million to less than 700,000 since World War II in the United States. Where will it end, asks labor.

"Third, compulsory arbitration in your country has been injected into this as ammunition, to be used by any politician," the Canadian observed. "So what you have now is essentially a political rather than an economic problem."

How did Canada avoid these woes? First, because she depended so heavily on railroads, all parties feared the nation simply could not afford a strike. Second, the royal commission did not set a precedent for compulsory arbitration despite union fears; Canadian railroads have negotiated other issues since 1959 without it.

And above all, public opinion in Canada was aroused against a strike. Here, it is still uncertain and not making itself felt strongly—at least not yet.

The Farmer as a Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the man who tills the soil and provides our food and fiber has too often been caricatured as a plodding unimaginative sort of person who is probably incapable of ever attaining business or economic maturity.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I come from an agricultural area where the men who operate some of the best farms in the Nation have cut their eyeteeth, not on the proverbial gold brick, but on the hard reality of give and take in the marketplace.

The agricultural people I represent discovered decades ago that they can carry on their farming operations a bit better when they make their own decisions, without let or hindrance from some Federal or State bureaucrat.

Over the years they have come increasingly to listen to leaders of the Pennsylvania branch of the Farm Bureau Federation and it was in conformity with that philosophy of self-sufficiency that they rejected the administration's wheat program by a vote of better than 10 to 1.

But let Carl Empie, chairman of the Pennsylvania Farmer's Association Legislative Committee, enlarge on the attitude of most of our farmers as he did earlier this year before the Pennsylvania congressional delegation:

THE FARMER AS A BUSINESSMAN

(By Carl Empie)

At the 1958 winter meeting of the Chester County Farmers' Association a panel discussion was held on "The Problems Facing Agriculture Today." Following the discussion, a vote indicated that over 70 percent of the farmers felt that Government control of agriculture was our most severe problem. Only two people indicated a belief that public relations should be of any concern.

Now farmers may not all be philosophers, but they have plenty of time to think while doing chores which require but little mental application. Most of them are not articulate, but they can evaluate their problems pretty accurately. They were vaguely aware of the tremendous changes going on in agriculture and of occasional public resentment over farm programs, but they were not fully alert to all the implications that were involved.

One of the major objectives of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation is education and information for their members including training in the fulfilling of their citizenship responsibilities. A political energy program was initiated in August of 1958 and about 80 farmers from all over Pennsylvania participated in a 2-day concentrated training session under Joe Ely and Cliff White, public affairs councilors from New York City. There were regional followup sessions and shortly after that local groups were functioning in the selection as well as election of public officeholders.

As a result of this training and experience, a significant resolution originated last year in many parts of the State and was approved by the voting delegates at the annual meeting.

As quoted from the PFA policy booklet:

"In view of the widespread misunderstanding on the part of other industries and the general public concerning the business of farming, steps need to be taken by our local county, State, and National organizations to promote a public relations program. We recommend:

"1. That a public relations program be set up to: (a) acquaint consumers with the heavy investment required of a farmer; (b) acquaint consumers with the narrow margin of net profit with which the farmer must operate; (c) show the number of working hours required of the average farm family; (d) show the quantity in tons and dollar value of gasoline, oil, steel, rubber, and other products used in farming.

"2. That activity be increased in public relations and information in the county, State, and National organizations."

Farmers had finally recognized the vital importance of public relations as a dominant factor in the shaping of legislation affecting agriculture. Tonight we start to carry out this mandate with the most important group—our Congressmen.

The growth rate of agriculture since the postwar period (1947 to 1961) has been one of the greatest success stories of all time. An appreciable infusion of new blood in the complexion of agriculture, young farmers who have been trained in Vo-Ag schools and in 4-H groups through extension service, has accelerated the acceptance and application of important technological advances that have come from our land-grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture research stations.

The agricultural output has increased by 31 percent with a decrease in labor imput of 37 percent. The production rate per man-hour has increased over twice as much as that of nonagricultural labor. What do these figures signify?

The egghead pessimists groan that we are increasing unemployment. Let us review the facts. It is true that farm labor has dropped to 7.5 million, but over 10 million people are now employed in transporting, processing, promoting, and distribution of farm products to the consumer. In addition, about 6 million people are employed in supplying those things that the farmer must buy to run his business—about $27 million worth last year. That means that 40 percent of our total labor force is directly related to the agricultural industry. As a customer, the farmer last year bought $1.5 billion worth of petroleum products, $1.7 billion of building construction for farm use, over $3 billion

of new machinery, and also spent $4 billion for repair and maintenance of buildings and machinery.

The increased output has created, not destroyed, jobs. What else can the growlers complain about? "The cost of food is too high. The farmers must be getting rich." If you frequent the supermarkets, you must have heard this misstatement often. What are the facts? In 1947, the cost of food took 27 percent of the consumer's income. Since the farmer then received 51 percent of the cost of food, this means that the consumer was paying the farmer 14 percent of his income for his market basket. In 1961, the consumer paid only 23 percent of his income for food, but the farmer's share had dropped to 38 percent, so that the consumer was then paying the farmer only 9 percent of his income for food. This is a decrease of 35 percent for the farmer while the consumer is getting better food, more food, and much more conveniently prepared food. In fact, it has decreased much of the drudgery of food preparation for today's housewife. How has this been accomplished? The following chart will show that farming has become a highly specialized business, requiring top proficiency in all branches of management [not printed in RECORD.]

The high level of investment requires careful management of income and the use of accounting practices which were hardly dreamed of in agriculture only 12 years ago. The higher rate of family owned farms has resulted in better land conservation practices and less exploiting of our land resources which has happened so often on rented land. The diversified skills required today include such fields as: purchasing agent, skilled machine operator, an understanding of economics, accountant, soil chemistry, animal husbandry, credit management, repair and maintenance techniques (especially welding), electrician, marketing specialist, and cooperative endeavor. All of this requires an annual labor input of 3,000 hours, as contrasted to the 2,000-hour annual labor input in the nonagricultural field.

The contribution of the farmer to the steady growth of our economy is little understood or appreciated. All of our energy or wealth comes from the sun or from underground storage. Chart No. 2 shows that it is the farmer who makes a major part of our wealth available by transforming part of the sun's energy into usable form. (See chart II.)

This basic wealth from our farms, mines, waters, and forests, provides all the jobs for our economy as it goes through multiple stages to become our consumer products and services. Obviously then all the cost of consumer products, above the cost at its source, represents the wages of people; and it throws into perspective the fact that all taxes, in the final analysis, are paid by the consumer. It also demonstrates that practically all the increase in cost of living is the result of higher wage levels and increased Government spending. This is in sharp contrast to the increased contribution of the farmer. In simple terms, the farmer is subsidizing to some degree, our entire economy.

In recent years much importance has been attached to our growth rate with special emphasis on our gross national product. May we submit that the only growth rate which is really significant is that portrayed by our righthand column in chart No. 2—"Consumer Products and Services" [not printed in RECORD].

Many proposals have been and are being made to stimulate this growth by increasing consumer purchasing power. A careful analysis of this chart leads to the inevitable conclusion that any action which increases the cost of consumer goods is the limiting factor in purchasing power and far outweighs any artificial attempts to elevate income.

So far we've been talking about our economic contribution in which the farmer has more than met his responsibility to society. As a good citizen he is also deeply concerned with other responsibilities in which he has always supplied leadership, and these are the spiritual, moral, and ethical aspects of our society. We are proud of the heritage passed on to us by preceding generations. We appreciate and are deeply thankful for those basic qualities of self discipline, integrity, and opportunity which were obtained at great sacrifice and which have enabled our Nation to become great. We feel a sacred obligation to do all in our power to pass on to the next generation a country economically sound and strong for which they likewise can be grateful. How well are we meeting that obligation? We look at history and see recorded that 19 previous civilizations have attained the stature of greatness. Their ascendency covered roughly a 400-year period, with a peak at about 200 years and then a decline into oblivion. "The rise and decline of the Roman Empire" illustrated the typical pattern followed by most of them. Are we going to become number 20?

We see the philosophy of "getting something for nothing" being encouraged in all directions. We see young people encouraged to seek education without effort or sacrifice. The self-discipline which is vitally necessary to make that education effective and worthwhile, is too often ignored. When we see labor encouraged to seek higher wages without a corresponding increase in productive effort, we realize that our society is beginning to stagger. When we see a paternalistic government taking over our individual responsibilities of administering to the sick, the aged, and the needy; then we see our depth of character becoming rapidly dissipated. We see a welfare state taxing away rewards for responsible behavior so that it can remove the age-old penalties for irresponsible behavior and sadly we realize that our strong and secure foundation is turning to jelly. We continue to see brazen government programs that spend borrowed money, based on the theory that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. Farmers know better. They realize that either succeeding generations must pay for our extravagance or that inflation will lead to financial collapse and then we are on the road to oblivion.

Recognizing that farmers have become a decided minority in our society, we still feel that we must cry out against this rising tide of gross materialism.

The farmer and his wife can walk hand in hand down the road with head held high and shoulders back, secure in the knowledge that they have more than met their economic obligations and are continuing to bear willingly the burden of preserving and passing on to succeeding generations our precious heritage.

You, our Congressmen, bear a very heavy responsibility likewise in the fulfillment of that objective. May we challenge you to effectively use the power and prestige of your office to stimulate other groups of our society to match the contribution of the farmer? We pray that God will give to you and to them the wisdom and strength to meet that challenge even as He has sustained us down through the years.

Our Strategy for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the recent Human Events Conference was keynoted by one of America's outstanding citizens both in war and in peace, Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, U.S. Navy, retired, now the chairman of Americans for Constitutional Action.

Admiral Moreell, in sounding a clarion call against the American trend into "democratic despotism" with a sterile conformity and "gradual erosion of individual responsibility," set forth a simple, but great, strategy for 1964 in the form of a prayer:

The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time. May He, in His infinite wisdom, endow us with faith, understanding and humility, so that we may regain the courage of our Founding Fathers, and preserve for ourselves and our posterity our sacred heritage of freedom.

If God grants such courage to this Nation, I am certain most of our great problems will soon be taken care of.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the full text of Admiral Moreell's address:

OUR STRATEGY FOR 1964

(By Adm. Ben Moreell, CEC, U.S. Navy, retired)

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman." So wrote Tom Paine in the darkest days of our Revolution.

Many believe that the United States now face an even greater crisis, which involves their survival as a constitutional federated Republic, and ourselves as a free people. So, we should plan our strategy for the trials which lie ahead.

More than a century and a quarter ago the great French scholar, de Tocqueville, toured our country and wrote a book called "Democracy in America," which is even more cogent now than when it appeared.

America, he wrote, although a nation of vigorous free people, was vulnerable to a novel kind of political tyranny which he called "democratic despotism." This would not be an alien dictatorship, imposed from without; it would manifest itself as a spreading paralysis of will, a failure of nerve, a gradual erosion of individual responsibility.

"Under such a despotism," he said, "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided; such a power does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes and stupefies a people, till the nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

Are we witnessing the fulfillment of that prophecy? Is the steady encroachment of powerful centralized government on the rights of the sovereign States and the freedoms of individuals forcing us into democratic despotism? The current enthusiasm for automation is not restricted to machines. The master planners in Washington hold that by relieving persons of the responsibilities of living they, too, can be "automated" and subjected to push-button controls, like zombies. They plan to accomplish this by depriving the individual of his freedom of choice. An ever-larger share of our production is now being taken by all levels of government. It already approaches 36 percent of the national earned income. After providing for the bare essentials of living, there is left to the average citizen only 7.4 percent of his income, to be used as he chooses for support of the church, charities, cultural activities, schools, tobacco, alcohol, insurance, and savings, the life blood of our industries.

This margin, over which the individual has freedom of choice, grows steadily smaller as mounting taxes and inflation take their

toll. Soon there will remain little economic surplus for pursuit of those higher ends of life essential to a civilized society, scholarship, art, music, charity and worship.

Is this loss of control over the fruits of our labors transforming us into a "flock of timid and industrious animals of which the Government is the shepherd?" If so, can we arrest our advance along this road to serfdom?

The answer may lie in de Tocqueville's warning of a "spreading paralysis of will * * * a failure of nerve * * * a gradual erosion of individual responsibility."

During the past 30 years we have succumbed in large measure to democratic despotism. In particular, there has been a tragic erosion of the significance of the individual. We have plunged ever deeper into the abyss of group action, "togetherness," regimentation and a sterile "conformity" in all sectors of our social structure, in government, industry, education, charity and even the church. There is progressive deterioration of the individual as a responsible creature of God, sovereign in his natural rights, having worth and dignity, deserving of respect because he is self-respecting and respectable.

Herding our people into flocks of timid animals is possible only when we, as individuals, surrender to that paralysis of will against which we were warned. Because we have lost courage, moral and physical, we are being transmuted from a vigorous, self-reliant, confident, and venturous people, free and independent, into a nation of dependents, insecure, apprehensive, and fearful of incurring the wrath of reprisals of our own Government. The mechanism devised by our Founding Fathers as a servant to protect our God-given rights has become the fearful master from whom we cravenly beg crumbs from bread made in the sweat of our own brows.

But this is not all. The fear which paralyzes our wills in domestic affairs is a contagion which affects the national courage when we deal with other nations. On the international scene, compromise, appeasement, accommodation, and surrender to blackmail have become standard practice. Moral principle is sacrificed on the altar of expediency to achieve a false security. So we suffer the fate of those who sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. We are not loved, not even respected, by those who profess to be our friends, by the so-called neutralist nations, or by our openly avowed enemies. In spite of profligate gifts which threaten to bankrupt us, "Yankee go home" has become an international slogan.

Our greatest error, one of such enormity as to constitute a crime against humanity, was our recognition in 1933 of the Soviet Union as an honorable member of the family of nations. By this act we clothed a monstrous tyranny with respectability. This opened the portals of all nations, including our own, to espionage, subversion, and sabotage, and resulted in the enslavement of one-third of the world's people. But this is not enough; the Communist bosses states that only complete world mastery will satisfy them.

There is no logical reason to grant the Soviets recognition, which had been refused by all prior administrations. Some of our officials evidently believed that if we crawled into bed with the Russian Bear we could reform him. There is no record in all history of such an act bearing fruit.

Our second greatest error was to connive with the so-called agrarian reformers to surrender China to communism, thus enslaving 600 million of our friends and allies. This was preceded by our dishonorable gift of the Kuriles and Sakhalin to the Soviets, and was followed by our yielding in Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and New Guinea.

Our betrayal of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and others was not heroic. Nehru, that self-anointed champion of peace and freedom, who calls us Western imperialists, seized Goa and other Portuguese colonies with only a token protest from our Government. Our support of Ben Bella and his brigands in Algiers, and our financing of the rape of Katanga and Angola should not cause us to burst with pride.

By sponsoring Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal we have compromised our position in Panama, where control is vital to our national security. Our support of native agitators and adventurers, who forment spurious revolutions in the name of "anticolonialism," has led to demands that we surrender our naval base at Guantanamo Bay.

In the Western Hemisphere our policies have been no less myopic. In Cuba we connived to depose a dictator who, nevertheless, was a friend of the West, honored his agreements and protected American lives and property. In his place we helped install an arrogant Communist who murders and oppresses his people, seizes billions in American investments and spread the infection of communism throughout Latin America.

The self-declared nobility of our objectives, which forbade victory in Korea and demands avoidance of any risk which might possibly result in armed conflict, has blinded us to the duplicity of those whose favors we court. The Soviets brazenly violate their agreements, blockade access to Berlin, insult our President, encourage Communist marauders throughout the world, and in other ways show their contempt for honorable conduct and for us.

Our reaction is to intensify our ardent courtship of these insufferable boors.

Our enchantment with the idealism of nuclear disarmament blinds us to the fact that, with 950 million servile subjects under their control, the Communists could inflict inhuman tortures and brutal slayings on our people, even if all arms more deadly than baseball bats were outlawed. Only the threat of retaliation with the bomb has kept Communist hordes from overrunning the earth.

If we are to maintain our self-respect, security, and sovereignty, as well as the leadership of the free world, we must have a new direction and a new purpose in our national administration. Above all, we must have a rebirth of courage, moral and physical, individual and collective. Without these there is grave danger that we will lose our national identity and become a satellite of a "one-world" state, dependent for protection on the good will and military power of the United Nations which will soon be dominated by its Afro-Asian members, many of whom have just emerged from a primitive tribal state and are easily subverted by Soviet influence.

In 1949, there appeared in the Omaha World-Herald, an editorial entitled "God Hates A Coward." It is even more pertinent now than then. Since its appeal is to conservatives, I will quote some excerpts:

"Here, too, in our own America, the State is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting freemen into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer, and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a Great White Father, a father corrupted and corrupting, since great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely * * *.

"Surely * * * it shall not be recorded by amazed historians of a later day, that when the black flag of absolutism was raised back in the 20th century, when the fate of all mankind was involved, there was nowhere, in any land, not even our own, an organized body of men and women who had the courage, the devotion, the wisdom, the loyalty to God who made men free, to challenge that foul intruder and to dedicate their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to driving him back into the Dark Ages, whence he emerged.

"Never has there been sounded such a call to service as rings today * * * never, for men and women of courage, of character, of conviction, has there been afforded such an occasion for rising to the heights of human devotion to imperishable ideals."

Fellow conservatives: "The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time." May He, in His infinite wisdom, endow us with faith, understanding and humility, so that we may regain the courage of our Founding Fathers, and preserve for ourselves and our posterity our sacred heritage of freedom. This is our strategy for 1964.

Youthful Example of Manly Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, believing that it will serve as an inspiration to my colleagues, as it did for me, I insert hereunder an article from the Birmingham Post-Herald about a brave little hero who is a star baseball player.

As my friend who called this story to my attention indicated, this is a marvelous example of courage and physical fitness.

The article follows:

BRACES NO HANDICAP FOR LITTLE ANDY—TOP HITTER AND HURLER

(By Wayne Martin)

The opening game of the West End Little League knothole season this year was a memorable one for Andy Watkins.

For this 6-year-old ballplayer, who tips the scales at 35 pounds and stands 3 feet, 10 inches tall, it was the start of a dream come true. After months of thinking and talking about nothing but baseball, Andy was given the starting assignment for the Green Hornets.

Andy did all right as a pitcher, holding the other team scoreless. The only trouble was the Green Hornets couldn't score either. Finally Andy came to bat with two on and promptly hit a double, driving in two runs and winning his own game, 2–0.

What's so great about this?

For one thing, Andy is one of only two 6-year-olds on the Green Hornets' team, and on top of that, he has to play with braces on both legs. When he was a year old he was given only a slight chance to live.

At the age of 18 months, Andy had major surgery and after a series of radium treatments which affected his legs, was forced to put on the braces.

Andy is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Ed Watkins, of 1512 18th Street S. "The day we came home with the braces," said Mrs. Watkins, "Andy played a game of football with the neighborhood children."

Andy's main objective last winter was to earn a spot on a Little League team. "When he first started talking about it we were concerned," said Mrs. Watkins. "But we asked the doctor and he said it would be the best thing for him." The arrangement turned out to be good both ways. Baseball is good for Andy, and Andy is good for the Green Hornets.

So far this year has has compiled a .354 batting average, but he hasn't been doing much pitching. "I can't use him as a pitcher very much," said his manager, Clyde McCaleb. "I need him in left field. He can stop the ball and he knows where to throw it.

"For a 6-year-old boy his ability to think and act is that of an 8-year-old. Fielding a ball is a natural thing to Andy," he said.

Andy's interest in sports comes naturally. He has an older brother, 9-year-old Gregg, who plays for the Braves in the West End Triple A League. He also has two uncles who are pretty well known in sports circles—Hayden Riley, the head basketball coach at the University of Alabama, and Edward Riley, of the University of Idaho. Andy also has a 3-year-old sister, Genny.

But little Andy, who is a candidate for "king of the knotholes" from the Green Hornets team, will be out of action for a little while. During the next 2 weeks he will go back into the hospital for an operation which doctors hope will make it possible for him to discard his braces.

But one thing is sure. Next year, braces or not, Andy will be back as just another player in the West End Little League.

Test Ban and Weapons—Effect of Treaty on Military Strength May Hinge on Redirection of Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of July 21, 1963, by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin. A more recent article on the test ban agreement by Mr. Baldwin appeared in the New York Times of July 26, 1963, and is entitled "Test Ban and Weapons—Effect of Treaty on Military Strength May Hinge on Redirection of Research."

Since this second article is also deserving of the considered attention of my colleagues, under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TEST BAN AND WEAPONS—EFFECT OF TREATY ON MILITARY STRENGTH MAY HINGE ON REDIRECTION OF RESEARCH

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union to outlaw nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in space and underwater may influence materially the balance of nuclear power. Whether the United States military and scientific position will be adversely affected, and how much, depends upon a number of factors both tangible and unknown. The first question is the present relative position; the second is the fine print in the treaty and exactly how it is carried out; the third is the duration of the ban. Assumptions about Moscow's nuclear strength in comparison with Washington's differ widely, and no exact comparison, even by President Kennedy or Premier Khrushchev, is possible.

ANALYSIS NEWS

Most Washington observers believe the United States has a great numerical advantage—that is, it has many more nuclear weapons of more kinds than the Soviet Union. In fact, it has so many nuclear weapons that long before the treaty, the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission were thinking about curtailing production.

The argument was twofold: that the United States had enough weapons to devastate the Soviet Union many times over, even allowing for interception by Soviet missiles and for failures; and that weapons technology was changing so fast that many weapons now stockpiled might soon be obsolete.

STORAGE PLAN OFFERED

Senators HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, Democrat, and CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico Democrat, have suggested that instead of reducing the production of fissionable material—the raw material for a bomb—the country stop producing weapons. The Senators suggested a "bank"—deep in caves—of the finished explosive. Thus the material would be rapidly available for processing into more advanced warheads or bombs if needed.

In addition to its tremendous stockpile of finished nuclear warheads, bombs, shells, and depth charges, the United States is believed to have a substantial lead in the carriers, or weapons systems, that would deliver the explosives to targets. This lead is chiefly quantitative.

Land-based American intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched missiles probably outnumber similar Soviet missiles three to four times. The production of such missiles would not be halted by a test ban, though some features of their design might in time be frozen. The United States also has a much larger bomber fleet than the Soviet Union, and a greater variety of offensive systems—such as the aircraft carrier, tactical aircraft carriers, tactical aircraft based overseas, and winged missiles.

Washington believes it has a considerable advantage in quantity, quality, and variety of small-scale, or tactical, nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, many observers in Washington suspect that during the unpoliced 34-month moratorium on nuclear testing, which ended in September 1961—and during the extensive Soviet tests that followed it—the Soviet Union gained qualitatively in three related areas.

Moscow tested "superbombs" of far larger size than any the United States possesses. It made considerable advances in "weight-to-yield" ratio, or size and weight of the weapon as compared with explosive power. There was one 58-megaton explosion in the Arctic test series, and it is generally believed that Moscow now has ready at least 50 weapons in the megaton range—each, that is, equivalent to thousands of tons of TNT.

Moscow's latest four-stage rockets, recently tested in the Pacific, may even be capable of carrying 100-megaton warheads. These tremendous weapons—exploded high in the thin air, or inner space—have great potential importance in the defense against ballistic missiles.

During the latest Soviet tests, one high-altitude explosion destroyed two incoming missiles. In one American high-altitude test in the Pacific, a fairly small nuclear detonation high above the earth caused fission—an atomic chain reaction—in a nose cone 150 miles above the earth and 800 miles from the explosion.

This phenomenon, called neutron flux, travels great distances in a virtual vacuum. Thus, it may be able to neutralize fissionable material in incoming warheads. This is a technique about which the Russians are believed to know more than American scientists.

Experts also believe Moscow has accumulated more data than the United States on the effect of the bursts of many megaton-range warheads upon American missile-launching facilities, their electrical connections and their defensive radar and communications.

The so-called "EMP," or electromagnetic pulse, induced by a major explosion has widespread effects. Indeed, the United States has already revised the electrical wiring of its Minuteman missiles as a result of the development of the huge Russian bombs.

The effect of a treaty upon the balance of nuclear power will also depend on how it is carried out.

Continued underground testing—not covered by the pact—would permit technological advances in weapons design. But the deep mining needed to prevent "venting," or escape, of radioactivity is costly. So the tests would have to be small; the conclusions, as applied to large weapons, would have to be drawn with reserve. No meaningful conclusions about nuclear explosions in space or at high altitudes would be possible.

PROGRESS MAY GO ON

Thus underground testing would seem to permit continued, though slowed, technological progress by the United States and the Soviet Union in small tactical nuclear weapons (perhaps freezing the United States advantage in this category). It would, at the same time, prohibit much advance in "superbomb" technology, thus freezing the Soviet advantage.

The manner in which the treaty is carried out, and whether it is violated, will also influence the balance of power.

Contrary to popular opinion, it is not certain that all atmospheric or space shots can be detected. Some high-altitude tests in the South Atlantic by the United States have gone undetected.

The duration of the treaty may well influence the balance of power. A long cessation would tend to affect the United States more than the Soviet Union.

In the closed Soviet society, secret preparations could be made—as they were before the tests in 1961—for sudden resumption of testing that might not be possible in the United States.

Nuclear technology is far from static, and some experts fear that a secret breakthrough by the Soviet Union might jeopardize the American position.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, while not opposing all bans on nuclear testing, have been unanimous in stressing the military risks of certain unpoliced treaties.

Whether the political and psychological gains outweigh the military and technological risks, however, only history will tell.

U.S. Korean Casualties Are Test Ban Pact Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. casualties in the Korean Armistice border during the past 2 days are directly attributable to the test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow. The escalation of activities by Communist forces there follows calculation by the Red Chinese and Red Korean regimes that border warfare and perhaps even-full-scale resumption of conventional warfare in Korea now can be carried on safely, without fear of U.S. resorting to the discriminate use of nuclear arms to stabilize the situation.

"If the Americans regard nuclear weapons as too terrible to test," they reason, "the Americans surely will regard

them too terrible to use except in a final life or death show-down with the Soviet Union."

This reasoning will result in intensified armed conflict wherever Far Eastern Communists forces plan aggressive expansion. As time goes on, we can fully expect the Soviet Union to adopt this successful formula for aggression.

Here, already, is proof that Communist leaders regard the test ban as a green light to intensify aggression by all conventional means free from the fear that nuclear weapons will be used by us to overcome their military advantages from mass manpower and favorable geography.

Rather than bringing peace to the world, evidence already exists that the pact will intensify conflict and war on many fronts, creating universally situations of instability and danger and causing untold American casualties.

This Is Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an interesting and outstanding editorial column by Mr. George Todt in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of July 24, 1963. It is entitled, "This Is Tyranny." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS TYRANNY

(By George Todt)

"I have sworn, upon the Altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."—Thomas Jefferson.

It is all very well for hard-core integrationists to label the projected mass march of 100,000 American Negroes on Congress in Washington, D.C., next month as just another "peaceful demonstration"—but is it? Would "intimidation" be a better word here?

Certainly, each one of us has the inherent right to petition our lawmakers for a redress of grievances. This is constitutional and entirely legal.

But not since the days of the unfortunate bonus march of the veterans in the depression 1930's has anybody deemed it necessary to instigate threatening mob action against our Congress.

NOT MOB ACTION

Every citizen has a right to go to Washington and consult, even lobby, his representatives on Capitol Hill. But good taste requires that this be done in small groups—without the onus of intolerant pressure.

The chilling aspect of the so-called "peaceable demonstration" is that it is being encouraged, if not fomented, by the President of the United States.

The suspicion exists in many minds that Mr. Kennedy fears that Congress will not pass some of the more extreme aspects of his controversial civil rights bill now under consideration.

Like the Caesars of ancient Rome, he is not above intimidating the Senate of the United States with mob action. This is tyranny.

Government must always be kept beyond outright intimidation of pressure groups—including minorities—or we will all lose our freedoms.

Ancient Rome was held in the foul grip of mob rule by weak emperors in the days of her decline. Hitler degraded the German Reichstag with planned mob actions which destroyed the fabric of legal representative government.

WHY ROME FELL

Is that what we want in the Republic of the United States?

If not, then it is time to cry out against wrongful and misguided action. All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.

Let the American Negroes and their friends journey peacefully to Washington to lobby in their own behalf on any issue of their own choosing—but not as an insulting, ill-disguised mob action against the Congress of the United States.

Whether this be sanctioned personally by Mr. Kennedy, Walter Reuther, or Nelson Rockefeller to gain their immediate political objectives is not the decisive factor here. The fact remains that it is not considered correct by an overwhelming majority of the public today.

Those who have the real interest of the American Negro at heart can tell him that he stands to gain much more in the end by a constructive campaign of politeness, reason and intelligence than by attempted intimidation or mob action.

PUBLIC FED UP

This may come as a shock to some demagogues, but I can also suggest something else: Joe Doakes is fast getting fed up with so much bureaucratic, governmental "kow-towing" to minorities in general. It is self-serving and un-American.

One of the main reasons Los Angeles Republican Congressman DEL CLAWSON won 3 to 1 in a 2 to 1 Democratic district recently was because he said he would kow-tow to no minority, play it fair and square. Politicians, take note.

Why I Want To Visit Our Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this year in the Eighth District of New Jersey I inaugurated an essay contest which was open to students attending 21 public and parochial high schools. Grand prize was a 3-day, all expenses paid, trip to Washington, D.C., for the winner and a chaperon. The trip was sponsored by the New Jersey Bank & Trust Co. The winner was Miss Diane McFadden who was accompanied to the Nation's Capital by her mother, Mrs. William McFadden, of Paterson. A committee composed of the late August J. Hovorka, an attorney, Dr. Leonard Pine, an optometrist, and James La Bagnara, a business executive, selected the winning essay which follows:

WHY I WANT TO VISIT OUR NATION'S CAPITAL

(By Diane McFadden, St. John Cathedral High School, Paterson, N.J.)

America to me is a land of endless opportunities, a refuge for the oppressed, and the bulwark of democracy in a world of uncertainty. I cherish the values upon which it is conceived and the heritage of charity and justice which I have inherited. This land is my land. It is a land where the individual counts and where the State exists for the welfare of each individual and his personal freedoms. Our governmental system is designed to have the individual express his wishes, elect his representatives and have adequate knowledge of democratic processes.

To understand these concepts is an important thing, but to appreciate fully the intricate safeguards which have been placed over man's inalienable rights and the working democracy which daily wards off the threats of communism, materialism and innumerable other dangers to the American way of life, one should witness the elementary functions of Government at Washington, D.C.

A trip to the Nation's Capital, for me, would enrich and further the knowledge I have gained from textbooks. Where can my heritage find better expression than in the beautiful monuments to the great personalities who dedicated their lives to the American idea? From Lincoln Memorial to Arlington Cemetery, my history, our Nation's history, continues to live and leads us to a future of even greater heights. Here in this city of wide diversifications can America be seen problems existing along with solutions. Citizens go about their daily lives while those they have duly elected protect and enrich their possessions and freedoms.

In a world where knowledge plays such an important part, it is essential that each American have a growing understanding of everything which makes his country a synonym for justice, charity, and peace. To do this I feel that education should constitute a well-rounded picture of democracy—the theories of books combined with the actuality of government in action. Therefore I wish to visit Washington to become a citizen capable of combining the ideals of the past with the ideas of the present and of accepting the responsibilities of a young citizen who places much faith in the American concept.

Kerr-Mills Law Being Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to receive a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare today, showing that 32 States out of 50 have now placed the Kerr-Mills program for medical care for the aged into effect.

North Dakota, of course, has had the Kerr-Mills program in use since July 1, 1961, and it seems to have been effective in caring for our aged citizen's medical needs. It has been said that our State provides the broadest and most comprehensive medical care of almost all the States using the Kerr-Mills two-way program.

Of the 28 remaining States, the HEW report shows that South Dakota has submitted a plan which will be effective as

soon as it is approved by the Department.

Of the 27 remaining States, Iowa has a plan drafted, and the appropriation will be available after July 4, 1963.

This leaves 26 unaccounted for, and we find 5 States had enacted legislation, but their plans have yet to be submitted to the Department for approval. These States are Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, and Virginia.

Of the 21 remaining States, we find Missouri has passed legislation through both its houses of the legislative assembly, and Wisconsin now has pending legislation.

Of the 19 States remaining, Georgia has already enacted legislation to use the MAA portion of Kerr-Mills, and is merely awaiting funds in order to implement the legislation. New Mexico has its legal authority for MAA, but since its 1963 legislture denied a request for funds, it must go through this action again. Nevada enacted its law in 1963, but also has to vote the necessary tax funds to implement the law.

This leaves 16 States unaccounted for. Among these, we find Alaska, Delaware, and Mississippi need legislation; Arizona, Colorado, Montana, Ohio, and Rhode Island have considered legislation during 1963, Indiana has already passed a law but the Governor vetoed it, and Texas has passed a resolution for a constitutional amendment—necessary under its State constitution. If this is ratified by popular vote, it may be followed by necessary enabling legislation.

Six States remain to be heard from one way or another. Considering the fact that the Kerr-Mills law was enacted and placed on the books in late 1960, I feel this is a fine showing and a vindication of my contention that we should wait to see if the States would—if given enough time—put the law into use for their aged citizens medical care. We must remember this act is voluntary, would be State-administered, and yet would provide a comprehensive program of medical benefits to those who really need the care. This is in the true American tradition—and surely the local and State authorities are in a far better position to know the true facts concerning needs in their area than a Federal Government bureau, far removed from the scene. I expect to see these HEW reports on the use of Kerr-Mills improve as the months go by.

Tabulation of Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year I sent out a newsletter to the people of the 41st Congressional District, reporting on the activities of the 88th Congress to date, and on the impact of several Federal programs in western New York.

A portion of this newsletter included a 10-part questionnaire. The tabulated results are, I think, varied and fascinating. Especially notable is the fact that 71.6 percent of all my responding constituents supported at least three-fourths of the programs advanced by President Kennedy. Worthy of the attention of the House are the following complete statistics:

Question	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor taking whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?	63.0	31.3	5.7
2. Do you favor a medicare plan which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security?	78.2	19.8	2.0
3. Do you favor an income tax cut at this time?	86.1	11.1	2.8
Percent			
If so, would you prefer an increase in the personal tax exemption 65.6			
Or would you prefer an across-the-board cut in income taxes? 20.5			
4. If Federal aid is granted to public schools, would you favor including aid to parochial and private schools?	62.1	35.6	2.3
5. Should the United States remain in the United Nations?	77.6	17.8	4.6
6. Should we compete with Russia in providing foreign aid to uncommitted countries such as Brazil, India, Ghana, Indonesia?	43.9	49.8	6.3
7. Do you favor the expenditure of billions of dollars for the purpose of putting a man on the moon?	32.6	63.4	4.0
8. Do you favor establishment of a domestic National Service Corps modeled after the Peace Corps?	55.7	35.6	8.7
9. Are we in favor of a $100 monthly pension for World War I veterans, regardless of need or disability?	41.6	42.4	16.0
10. Do you approve of the programs advanced by President Kennedy?			
Percent			
Replies indicating 100 percent support 29.0			
Replies indicating 75 percent support 42.6			
Replies indicating 50 percent or less support 25.0			
No opinion 3.4			

Objections to the Handling of the Railroad Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a constituent of mine clearly states the objections of many business people to the present handling of the railroad problem.

It is unfortunate that whenever a problem is somewhat of a "hot potato" either in domestic or foreign affairs the present-day policy is to sweep it under the rug and forget about it.

Mr. Speaker, some things cannot be put off; some things cannot be swept under the rug; some things have to be faced and faced with courage, not put aside until after the next election.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

GILLINDER BROS., INC.,
Port Jervis, N.Y., July 23, 1963.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ST. GEORGE: Without a doubt, within the next 24 hours, the Congress will be handled another one of the administration's fumbles—the railroad situation. While I deplore a probable strike that will cripple the Nation, I feel there is something that is far more basically wrong than the issues that constitute the differences between the railroad management and their employees.

The administration, without a doubt, is handling this particular issue to Congress—getting rid of a "hot potato" so that the onus will be on Congress whatever the outcome, in the probably correct belief that the least harm, votewise, will result for the administration.

Whatever the Congress may do that is specific to this single situation only, will not go to the basic cause of this national threat. In my opinion, and of many of those with whom I talk, a situation of this kind is the direct result of the uncontrolled monopolistic power, free from all Government regulation, that is permitted to organized labor.

Let the steel companies raise their price and a clutched fist is raised and reprisal threatened by the administration. This Hitler-like action, we have seen in the not too distant past.

Let the larger electric manufacturing companies merely talk together and they are in violation of the trust laws.

Let any group of like business seek to merge and they will be investigated as it may not be in the interest of the public to allow such a merger.

The list is endless, of the restrictive laws with respect to business and industry—but there is a modicum of such restrictive laws on organized labor. Furthermore, the Supreme Court, with its rulings on existing laws in recent years, is making the situation even worse.

Basic legislation to correct this situation, is needed, rather than congressional action on the issue under question between the railroads and their employees.

Yours very truly,

J. FLETCHER GILLINDER.

American Youth Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the contents of a very thought-provoking letter I received from a group of considerate youths in Los Angeles, Calif., who wish to take a positive step in informing the public at large that today's youth is just as serious and interested in the many prob-

lems of tomorrow's world as are the adults of today. This sincere group of young adults feels the brush of condemnation has swept across them indiscriminately and is far too broad and has covered much too much of the ranks of today's youth.

In my trips to the various youth correctional facilities, when I was a member of the California State Legislature and also as a member of the Los Angeles City Council, in talking to the boys I became more convinced than ever that the overwhelming reason many of these youths were in these institutions was because of delinquent parents rather than delinquent youth. I have always been a firm believer in the youth of our great Nation and as we search the records of accomplishments of the past decade we can document the many advances that we enjoy today to the discoveries and inventions of yesterday's youth.

I know my colleagues will welcome this affirmation of today's youth on their readiness and willingness to come forward and help solve some of the problems and dilemmas the adult population finds itself in today.

May I take this opportunity of thanking their spokesman, Robert W. MacDonald, for bringing this most worthwhile and enterprising project to my attention. His letter reads as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 22, 1963.

Hon. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURKHALTER: It seems to me as a sophomore in college and a member of the younger generation that the youth of America have had an injustice done to them by the adult population. Youth is characterized as a general group of delinquents who are not interested in anything but TV, rock and roll, and laziness. The usual picture of a teenager is an irresponsible, long haired, strange talking, problem child. I feel this is an incorrect picture. To my way of thinking something should be done to change this picture and I am working with a group of students attempting to start something that we hope will be of some help.

Together with a few friends I am attempting to form a company that will offer young student speakers to the community. These students will speak on many subjects. The speakers will offer the ideas of youth on such subjects as politics, economics, business, and world affairs. Several of the students will speak on youth physical fitness and how to gain interest. We call our company American Youth Enterprises.

We have three chief goals. First, to try and show the other side of the youth picture. To show that the majority of students and young people are interested in becoming sound mature citizens. Second, we feel the experience gained in this venture while we are students will be of great value to us as adults and citizens. Third, some of the students need financial help in school and the earnings from speaking will be applied to our education.

We all realize this is a very ambitious adventure for a group of students so we decided to write you and ask for your opinion and wish that if you have any suggestions you would forward them to us.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT W. MACDONALD.

Leading or Following

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the most interesting columns printed in a weekly newspaper is found in the Hanahan News of North Charleston, S.C. The column is entitled Fact and Opinion by the Minuteman. This week's column is entitled "Leading or Following." I ask unanimous consent that this column which appeared in the July 24, 1963, issue of the Hanahan News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADING OR FOLLOWING

This is the chosen battlefield; for the carefully organized protest campaign; to preserve the Constitution; a rally attracts thousands; a prominent clergyman unleashes bitter attacks; the rally is designed to recruit more volunteers for action; this objective is accomplished; officials are unable to maintain order; specially trained police are called to attempt to restore order; authorities pledge to be patient, but firm and decisive; picketers continue to demonstrate; agitators and student leaders direct the activity; chants and songs get louder, and defiance to police attempts to maintain order becomes more universal.

Students enthusiastically join in on the refrains "we shall not be moved"; police warnings are met with jeers and boos and renewed chanting and renewed singing; the crowds begin to jostle the police; when authorities warn that fire hoses will have to be used if the crowd does not disperse, the demonstrators become more and more unruly.

One student provides the spark; the mob surges forward; the fire hoses are turned on; leaders give orders to resist police enforcement; the crowd now in open defiance of law and order, begins singing once again, "we shall not be moved"; riot squad police reinforcements arrive and are met by boos and jeers from the rioters; agitators give new orders.

Sit down, backs to fire hoses; hands in pockets after interlocking arms; "nonviolent resistance"; police make arrests; riot leaders charge police brutality; four demonstrators suffer minor injuries; eight policemen require hospitalization.

At the police station rebellious students appear to have lost a little of their blatant enthusiasm and defiance; the psychological stimulus of mass chanting and singing is gone; demonstrators are conscious and ashamed; gone is the air of defiance; organized resistance has been changed into individual confusion; these people have been duped into openly resisting and defying law enforcement.

If in reading the foregoing you think we have put together a capsule picture of racial disturbances, demonstrations and uprisings which have occurred at Ole Miss, in Birmingham, Cambridge, Chicago, Charleston, New York and around other points of the compass, then look again.

What you have read is a summary of the official report of the Committee on Un-American Activities concerning the Communist-led riots against the HCUA in San Francisco, Calif., May 12–14, 1960.

President Kennedy has said that he thinks a "redress of grievances" is the answer to the problem. He has added, "We have no evidence that any of the leaders of the civil rights movement in the United States are Communists. We have no evidence that the demonstrations are Communist-inspired. There may be occasions when a Communist takes part in a demonstration. We can't prevent that."

The Communist Party is not interested in "redress of grievances." According to J. Edgar Hoover, "The Communists demonstrated in San Francisco just how powerful a weapon Communist infiltration is. They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots. Their success there must serve as a warning that their infiltration efforts * * * can create chaos and shatter our internal security."

Wake up, civil rights leaders; are you leading your demonstrations or following the Communist Party?

Toward More Federal Responsibility?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in this day of wide interest in Federal-State conflict and rights responsibilities, the following speech by Oklahoma's junior Senator, Hon. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, delivered nearly 2 years ago, has an even greater significance now.

It follows:

TOWARD MORE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY?

(By Gov. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, before the American Bar Association Convention, St. Louis, Mo., Aug. 9, 1961)

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people," so reads the 10th amendment or final article of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution of the United States. From this provision, and from these principles so eloquently spoken by the framers of our Constitution has grown the great debate of the 20th century.

For a person to proclaim the so-called theory of State's rights, he is declared a conservative. For another to seek Federal action in the fields formerly considered exclusive to the States, he earns the title of a liberal.

How often do we hear the conservative resist Federal legislation on the grounds that it invades the realm of State's rights? How often does the editor seek letters to Congressmen that would resist legislation described as socialism.

To this the liberal shouts: Congress must take action to promote the welfare of all and not the few. He argues that a Nation as rich as ours can ill afford to turn its back on the ill-housed; the indigent; the children whose educations are poorly suited for the nuclear age. And so the debate continues. The people seek understanding and decision, only to become more confused by the so-called logic of the adversaries.

All of us have seen either by personal observation or from the pages of history, that we have gone a long way from the original concept of the 10th amendment. Few objective historians would claim that Jefferson ever specifically intended that the Federal Government provide for the mother of four illegitimate children.

The fact of the matter is that we have been and are living in an age of the vanishing sovereignty of the several States. Can you think of a single State governmental activity that today is within the exclusive province of the several States?

Some of these invasions by the Federal Government we accept as a matter of course, mainly because we have had them longer than others. No one today questions either the legality or the wisdom of the Federal Government's spending 50 percent of the money that goes to the State's highway program, or 90 percent of the cost of our Interstate System. We seek such help.

Long ago, we accepted the right of Uncle Sam to provide assistance in the field of public welfare.

They say economics dictated Federal intervention in business and industry.

Chambers of Commerce anxiously solicit Army Corps of Engineer projects in their areas to harness their rivers and provide flood control, hydroelectric power and navigation.

The plight of the isolated farmer brought on rural electrification, and today, we wonder if Madison and Adams really ever expected urban renewal.

The question is not whether the Federal Government can invade these areas. The question is not whether the same is constitutional. The question today is, and should be, how did we get here and what are we going to do about it?

Extremists would contend that power hungry politicians dedicated to a centralized socialistic government sought such legislation and the programs thereunder. But can we honestly say that this was brought about by the conscious design of Congress? Can we honestly say it was the ambition of the President? Did the people, through the Democratic process, intentionally elect Representatives, Senators, and Presidents who were dedicated to such a plan or scheme?

I think that the answer is a most emphatic "No." As a matter of fact, I respectfully submit that action in these fields in the Nation's Capitol has been the direct result of inaction in the States' capitols. Where the States have failed to act, eventually Congress has. In practically every instance the biggest argument is not whether or not the laws are good, but rather whether or not they should be passed on the State level, rather than the Federal. And again I submit, as long as the States fail to act, the trend to centralize will continue.

Look at just a few examples: Can there be doubt in anybody's mind but that the States have had opportunity extending over decades to provide adequate highways even with Federal funds available on a 50–50 basis? Must we not admit that there was a need for the Federal Interstate System? And so as a result of inaction in the State capitols, relief was sought in the Nation's Capitol and relief we got in the form of 90–10 Federal interstate program now underway.

Look in the area of education. The debate on Federal aid to education goes on today in Washington, but the question is not whether we should or should not have any form of Federal aid to education, because we already have it. And the reason that there are those who seek more Federal aid today is because of the failure of first, the local school district, and second, the State, to provide the needed high standards of education necessary in the nuclear age.

How many of you here today have participated in various efforts to locate defense installations in your community. I daresay that practically every one of you have done something to hold a military installation, an aircraft plant or some other facility associated with national defense in your city or area. Most of us have made trips to Washington lobbying for the same. This is plain old commonsense when it comes to good business, because after all, that installation provides jobs, payrolls, and money to be spent in your home. But whereas we sought Government activity through such an installation in our community, did we at the same time provide the necessary educational facilities for the children that came with the employees? On the contrary, it was our failure to act here that necessitated so many of us going back to Washington again and asking Federal aid to our overcrowded schools that were brought about as a result of this extraordinary number of children. The result: Federal aid to education in defense impacted areas.

My remarks are not intended as an attempt to prove that what the Federal Government has done was constitutional or unconstitutional. Neither am I here to argue that it was right for the Federal Government to take such steps. My point is simply that these are the facts. This is what has happened and we will not solve this problem merely by asking Congress not to pass these laws and not to infringe upon States rights. Our solution lies in the State level of our responsibility to see to it that conditions do not get so poor that Congress finds it necessary to further intervene upon our sovereignty.

Unfortunately, it has been my observation that in all too many instances the attitude on the part of the States, and by this I mean Governors, legislatures, and the people of the States, has been to create consciously, or unconsciously, situations that tend toward more Federal intervention.

I cannot help but recall this past session of the Oklahoma Legislature. We were confronted with the problem, as is true in all States, of needing additional funds for education. Time and time again I heard senators and representatives say, "let's wait and see what Congress does." Time and time again I read editorials that said, "Well, if Congress is going to provide Federal aid, why raise taxes in Oklahoma for education." Time and time again in the same session, it was argued on the floor of the legislature that we should not appropriate money for highways until we waited to see what Congress appropriated for highways. As a matter of fact, the best argument today in a State legislature for an increased appropriation is: Well, if I get $50,000 more, the Federal Government will match it with $50,000 or $100,000. Practically every department of the State government seeks its appropriation on the basis of matching Federal funds available for that program.

I was in office only a matter of weeks in January 1959, when a regional official of the Federal Government came to my office seeking more States funds for Civil Defense. When I told him that we were short on funds and trying to avoid a tax increase, he was quick to inform me that we had better increase our State funds or he would decrease the amount of Federal funds available for Oklahoma in direct proportion, and he had the audacity to prove his point by citing what he had done in two of our surrounding States.

I could not help but be amused at the last Governors' conference when I heard several Governors orate eloquently on the subject of States' rights, in support of their opposition to Federal aid to education. A few hours later, we began discussions on highways and the same Governors were equally eloquent in their demands that the Federal Government provide more funds to step up the Federal interstate highway construction program.

When in the last session of the Oklahoma Legislature, it was obvious that additional funds were necessary for education, many editors opposed any tax increase to provide thoes funds. In all too many instances, it was the same editors who opposed Federal aid, stating the States can handle their own problems in education.

The truth is: The States have proved their ability to solve some problems (without Federal help), even where several States are involved. Consider the subject of conservation of oil and gas. Through aggressive imaginative action the States created the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. Through such cooperative action, much has been accomplished—without Federal intervention or control.

Thus we see what can be done on the State level, even on interstate problems.

Now consider the problem of the ever increasing fatalities on our highways.

Are we witnessing today action by States within their borders and between each other. I say there is too little. Some States work at it but the usual picture is one of inaction and complacency.

As a result—at present, a somewhat faint, but ever increasing demand for Federal action. I predict we will see the day when Congress does act through the establishment of a Federal Highway Patrol, unless we do a better job on the State level.

By the same token, I predict that we will see Federal intervention in the field of care of the mentally ill, unless the States move aehad, and yet, I regret to say that in my own State in this past session, we did well to provide a mere nominal increase for our mental health program. In all too many States the same is true. We are only fooling ourselves. We cannot have our cake and eat it. When the Constitution says that the powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States, I submit, that with powers goes responsibility to act when action is needed and to do so with imagination and dispatch. We should see less criticism of Federal action and more criticism of States' inaction.

Indeed, I seek your demand for States' action. As lawyers we have unique opportunities to lead the way. If we increase our own local activity to be more commensurate with the needs of the people, we will see the demand for Federal action proportionally decrease. If we accept and fulfill our responsibilities, reserved to us by the Constitution, then we will see the pendulum swing back to the respective Capitols of the States.

And so, the challenge is to us. We have the opportunity, let us not fail to fulfill it.

Two Thought-Provoking Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert in conjunction therewith two editorials from newspapers in my district.

Mr. Charles Mooshian, the editor of the Carroll County Times, in the issue of July 25, has praised the building of a Hall of Free Enterprise at the coming World's Fair in New York. I am delighted to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his commendation of this proposal:

HALL OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Recently ground was broken for the erection of the Hall of Free Enterprise at the New York World's Fair.

This is a unique and stimulating undertaking. It is strictly a new idea—using a building at a major exposition for the purpose of going over to the offensive in the debate with creeping socialism.

The estimated $2 million which it will cost, is being solicited frankly and openly from individuals and corporations who are sold on the advantages of a free market economy.

In the face of manifold failures of the left, it is time the forces of free enterprise stood up and crowed a little.

The theme of the exhibit will be the Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom. These are the principles that make for growth, production, high living standards, and all the other desired ends—and do it in a climate of freedom, without Government domination.

Some 70 million people, 3.5 million of them foreigners, are expected to attend the fair. May many of them visit the hall—and leave it with a new and abiding realization of the wonders that free enterprise can accomplish, and the need for standing resolutely in its defense.

Equally thought provoking is the editorial on the stalemated peace in Korea which appeared in the July 25, 1963, issue of the Democratic Ledger, of Havre de Grace, Md. All Americans can take these comments of Editor Charles M. Moore to heart:

TEN YEARS AGO FIGHTING STOPPED

On June 25, 1950, when Communist hordes, Soviet-trained and equipped, swept south in an attempt to subjugate a newly liberated people, Korea was almost unknown to the average American. Today it is part of American history.

While the active phase of the war ended with the signing of an armistice in July 1953, no true peace was ever established. A peace treaty has not been signed. Disarmament has never been effected.

Saturday, July 27, 1963, marks the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Korean Armistice, the longest in the history of mankind.

The term armistice, "a temporary suspension of hostilities" cannot be applied to Korea. Although large-scale hostilities have ended, infractions of the terms of the agreement are still occurring. There are still casualties along the demilitarized zone!

After nearly a decade, we may ask, why are we still in Korea? Why should Americans be on the border in a country where the war ended 10 years ago? The answer is brief and to the point; because the war is not over. A truce has been signed but not a peace treaty.

The actions in southeast Asia, garner the headline, but Korea is still a "hot-spot." As long as the country remains divided, we will be there. This is not a commitment to war but a commitment to peace. As long as we show the world that—this is where we stand—it is here where we draw the line—we can prevent other Koreas from happening.

A Union general once said, "War is hell." At times a truce can be the same.

Abuse of Civil Service Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the flagrant disregard of civil service laws in promoting and hiring unqualified Negroes in preference to qualified white persons by many executive agencies should be a matter of grave concern to the Congress. The American Legion, Department of Mississippi, at its recent annual convention, adopted unanimously a resolution condemning these injustices.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the department of Mississippi's resolution on this subject. It follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MISSISSIPPI, JACKSON, MISS., JULY 14, 1963

Whereas the present administration of our Federal Government has ordered Federal agencies to, in so many words, ignore the civil service law in hiring additional personnel; and

Whereas this action on the part of the present administration appears to be in direct violation of the civil service law; and

Whereas this action is believed to be one of political expediency designed to influence more votes in the next presidential election for the present administration; and

Whereas this violation of the civil service law has and is resulting in disabled veterans, as well as other veterans, employed under civil service being bypassed on the civil service register in order to employ less qualified personnel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion, Department of Mississippi, in convention assembled in Jackson, Miss., July 12–14, 1963, That we deplore such tactics as are being used by the present administration in order to gain votes and violate the law; and be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen and Senators be called upon to demand an immediate investigation of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal agencies that are violating the civil service law.

FRANK N. CHAMBERS,
Department Adjutant.

What Harms Agriculture, Harms Allied Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some city businessmen are becoming acutely aware of how important agriculture is to them—not only for the food they eat, but for their jobs, their economic survival.

The following is one of many letters I receive daily from outside my district. The bracero is important to others than farmers. There is someone in every congressional district who is dependent upon the reliable supply of supplemental farm labor in my district. The bracero is the only known feasible solution.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.,
July 3, 1963.

Congressman BURT L. TALCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALCOTT: As important suppliers of shipping containers to California growers-shippers, we are deeply concerned over the failure of Congress to extend Public Law 78.

You may not understand why we, as a part of California industry are so concerned over a matter of direct concern to agriculture. Actually, our own survival and well being is directly related to the economic health and vigor of our State's agriculture. Most of our production goes to shippers of fresh or processed fruits and vegetables. We recently erected a new plant in Sacramento, creating what we hope will be permanent jobs for many people in that area.

Being in daily contact with our agricultural friends, I am convinced that a sudden termination of their supply of braceros can only result in financial losses and a curtailment of production. This loss in production will directly affect our own business, as it surely will effect the business of all suppliers to our State's agriculture.

With five manufacturing plants in this State, we at Western Corrugated are deeply concerned. We can only urge with all sincerity that you do everything in your power to provide a means of gradual, rather than sudden elimination of Mexican workers. This may permit growers and shippers to adjust to the change over a period of 2 or 3 years with a minimum loss in production.

What harms our agriculture, harms our industry, and our State as well.

Very sincerely yours,
WESTERN CORRUGATED, INC.,
J. P. BLOUNT,
Manager, Agricultural Division.

The Jacob's Pillow Dance Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I acknowledge the 30th anniversary of the internationally famous Jacob's Pillow Dance Festival. This prominent festival is situated in the beautiful Berkshire Hills near Lee, Mass. It is certainly one of the great cultural events of this country and I am proud that it appears in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

The man responsible for this remarkable festival is the famous Ted Shawn. Mr. Shawn had performed a great service for American dancing through his introduction of famous foreign troupes to America and through his University of the Dance at Jacob's Pillow. He founded Jacob's Pillow Dance Festival 30 years ago and has directed it ever since. I would like to extend my congratulations to Mr. Shawn and wish him many more successful years at Jacob's Pillow.

It is therefore a great privilege for me to reproduce in the RECORD a very fine article by Kathleen Cannell, which appeared in the July 22 Christian Science Monitor. This article, in a very concise manner, gives many of the reasons why Jacob's Pillow has achieved such notable successes over the last 30 years.

THIRTY YEARS AT JACOB'S PILLOW

(By Kathleen Cannell)

The Jacob's Pillow Dance Festival—whose founder, director, and animator is Ted Shawn—is celebrating this summer its 30th anniversary. What has become during July and August the hub and Mecca of dancing in North America began in 1933 as tea-and-lecture demonstrations with 4 or 5 finished dances as a finale to an audience of 45.

As there were no lighting facilities, matinees were presented on an outdoor platform

built by the performers themselves. When weather was bad they retreated into a barn.

Nowadays every performance in the modern Ted Shawn Theater, designed exclusively for the dance by Joseph Franz, architect of the music shed at Tanglewood, is packed with aficionados who come from far and wide to view the dance stars of five continents.

Ted Shawn was the first American man dancer to make a world reputation. An inspiration for the idea which grew into what the New York Times has hailed as "one of our most important native cultural institutions" was Mr. Shawn's "crusade for the legitimacy of the dance as an honorable career for men."

SUCCESSFUL TOURS

Jacob's Pillow, named by biblically minded New Englanders for a huge, smooth stone on which the full moon's rays directly shone, was ideal for the experiment, partly because of its proximity to Tanglewood and the Berkshire Music Festival. Beautifully situated in the Berkshire hills near Lee, Mass., it comprised 150 acres of woodland with a big pre-Revolutionary house and spacious barns renovated for living quarters and studios.

The original men's group was composed for the most part of college star athlete, among whom was Barton Mumaw, who reappeared this summer in a nostalgic solo, "The Banner Bearer," from an early Shawn composition, "Olympiade." Ted Shawn and his men dancers successfully toured the United States, Canada, England, and Cuba for seven seasons—until the Selective Service Act siphoned off his performers.

The first mixed company at Jacob's Pillow derived from Denishawn, founded in Los Angeles in 1915 by Ted Shawn and his illustrious wife and partner, Ruth St. Denis, whose graduates, Martha Graham and Doris Humphrey, became the most famous dancers of their generation."

As audiences increased, the scope of performance became global. In the past three decades more than 1,000 different dancers and dance companies have appeared at Jacob's Pillow. More than 200 world premiers of choreographic works have been presented; and countless established or potential stars have made their American debuts there.

AUDIENCES ENCHANTED

Between festivals Ted Shawn and John Christian, now associate director of the Pillow, globe-trotted while scouting for new talent, inviting, and sometimes persuading fixed stars to take the great leap to give a new country the benefit of their scintillations.

Long before Kabuki came, the late Tei Ko, acclaimed as the greatest Japanese classical dancer of her time, enchanted Pillow audiences. Carmelita Marracci, the inimitable, rarely seen Spanish dancer-choreographer, made brief exquisite appearances there. And the fantastically powerful Ernestis, American Indian from British Columbia, created a sensation.

In 1953 Mr. Shawn introduced the National Ballet of Canada, which never had toured beyond the Dominion; later the Ballets Canadiens de Montreal. In 1955 he imported 10 young Danes from the Royal Danish Ballet, then no more than a name in the United States, though now so firmly cemented in our affections through the guest appearances of their great premier danseur, Erik Bruhn.

The biggest enterprise he ever undertook, says Mr. Shawn, was to bring the Ballet Rambert, England's oldest company still in existence, to the United States in 1959. Pioneer Dame Marie Rambert, once with Diaghilev, discovered Antony Tudor, Sir Frederick Ashton, Hugh Lang, and a host of others.

Other firsts at the Pillow were the Swedish ballerina Birgit Akesson, the National Dancers of Ceylon, Toekila Alasa from Samoa, Herman Baldrich from Santiago, Chile, and Balasaraswati, India's most reverent interpreter of the religious dance, Abhinaya.

The University of the Dance at Jacob's Pillow parallels the festival in time and achievement.

"The dance includes every way that people of all races in every period have moved rhythmically to express themselves," Mr. Shawn affirms. "Therefore a dancer who has studied only one form—classical ballet, for example—cannot be called a truly educated dance artist."

COLLEGE CREDITS OFFERED

At Jacob's Pillow under one institutional roof are three basic major dance courses: classic ballet, contemporary American (modern), and ethnic (racial, national, and folk). All pertinent auxiliary studies, including weekly lectures on dance appreciation, are taught by their leading exponents. College credits toward a bachelor of arts or master's degree may be obtained.

The performances at the dance festival constitute an education in themselves. Students are required to watch the dress rehearsal of each new program, in which the problems of music, costume, lighting, and stage management are worked out before their eyes.

The "crown jewel" of this 30th anniversary festival, declares Mr. Shawn, will be the 6-year-old Western Ballet of England (July 16 through 27). Their premiere will be "Le Carnaval," reproduced for them by Tamara Karsavina as it was when she and Nijinsky danced the lead roles for Diaghilev in the European premiere in 1910.

Another highlight will be "Les Etoiles du Ballet de l'Opéra de Paris," an all-star ensemble (Aug. 13 through 17).

From Paris, too, comes Bella Reine, an extraordinary mime réaliste, in characters after Toulouse-Lautrec.

Also in August come popular Pillow repeaters: Alvin Ailey's jazz drama company starring Carmen de Lavallade; and the prestigious ballet partners, Edward Villella and Violette Verdy.

The Ximenz-Vargas Ballet Español (first introduced to American audiences at Jacob's Pillow in 1958) brought the original dance crusade full circle. They opened the season with the world premiere of "Pinceladas: Homage to Ted Shawn," featuring a coruscating male cast of Spanish dancers.

Cuba and the Cold War

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me time, and I wish to join my colleague in extending thanks to the men on both sides of the aisle who have obviously worked long hours in preparing for this presentation this afternoon.

I think we all recognize and probably anticipate that any time you get close to touching paydirt the "babysitters of past error" are going to rise in wrath. Any time you get close to putting your finger on what has been wrong and to making firm recommendations about what should be done the cry will be raised by those whom I choose to call the "babysitters of error" that you are urging the paths that will lead to war. I think you all anticipated this in advance and expected it.

The fact remains that those who have studied the pattern of Communist operation worldwide were most disturbed in a prior administration by some of the action or lack of action or misdirected action that laid the groundwork for Castro to take power in Cuba.

The time has come when we must have some of the type of operation we have had this afternoon, where men on both sides of the aisle are willing to clearly and forcefully come up with proposals as you gentlemen have done, and in addition to that are going to have to be willing to analyze without animosity between us the errors in the past. Certainly if we are going to propose programs that have any chance of being put into action it is essential that we understand why the failures took place before.

I think it is important as well to recognize that while I know the center of attraction this afternoon is based on Cuba, communism in Cuba is only an extension of a worldwide operation that has been going on for a long time, and I know there is not a person present this afternoon who is not aware of that.

The mere elimination of Castro from Cuba under any guise of an operation of agreement would be hardly satisfactory; and there have been rumblings here and there that there might be a possibility of Castro, perhaps, either removing himself or being removed. We can settle for nothing less than the elimination of a Communist dictatorship under any other name as well as Castro in Cuba.

One of the points which I thought was well made this afternoon was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] who pointed out that to this day the United States has still to establish clearly the intent of winning the cold war. This, I think, is the key; and while we might have a temporary victory in an isolated spot, unless there is a coordinated program that brings together the divergent areas of policy aimed at establishing victory in the cold war, the entire survival of the free world is, indeed, in jeopardy.

I will say I view with apprehension certain aspects of policy when one of the most prominent spokesmen in the other body not once but twice will rise before the public and say, What would we do with victory once we achieved it? The essential ingredient that is necessary is a policy aimed at victory over a force that is composed of three basic elements. The Communist operation is not just military. It is first of all a faith. It is, secondly, flesh, and it is, third, force. Any policy that does not take into cognizance all these phases of communism is doomed to fail. Castro did not come to power in Cuba by force alone. He came to power primarily because he was a Communist and he utilized the faith of the Communists together with the flesh. The missionaries of communism throughout the world,

including those in the United States, sold a false line to non-Communists on the virtues of Castro. Castro used the faith and the flesh to reach a position where he could impose the force. Because we failed to combat the faith; because we failed to recognize the manipulation and the operation of the flesh, the force was allowed to gain a position where it could be imposed.

Again let me commend the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER], and all of the rest of my colleagues who have spoken. May I commend them for their fine work this afternoon. Keep it up.

House of Representatives Approval of Extension of National Cultural Center Will Be an Important Landmark in Private Effort for the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Friday, July 26, editorial columns of the Washington Evening Star contained a welcome editorial on important legislation now pending before the House Committee on Public Works. I refer to legislation on the National Cultural Center, H.R. 6659. This bill has two basic purposes:

(a) Extension for 3 years of the time period within which funds can be raised for the completion of the center, and (b) increase in membership of the board of trustees, so as to assure the broadest representation of all parts of our Nation.

The editorial notes that this legislation has already been approved by the Senate without dissent. The legislation soundly provides the American people opportunity "through personal business, institutional and foundation donations," to fulfill the vital goal of the building of the center.

As a member of the board of trustees of the cultural center, it is my privilege to join with many warm supporters in urging favorable action on this legislation.

It is clear that the public-spirited Americans who have been working, night and day, on behalf of the realization of the center, deserve a green light from the Congress. To quote the language of space science, "All systems should be go."

Fortunately, all systems are "go." Last week, Mr. Roger Stevens who has devoted so much time and effort to the Center, on a visit to President Kennedy, stated that the fund raising is proceeding so well that it is hoped that construction can be started in the spring of 1964.

We, in the Congress, should, therefore, give a mandate for the completion of this great project. We should give a well-deserved vote of confidence to those who are making it possible for the people in all 50 States of the Union to enjoy this great center of the arts.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Evening Star's editorial be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CUTRATE CULTURE

Recognizing a rare bargain when it saw one, the Senate lost no time approving a 3-year extension for the National Cultural Center fund-raising drive. It may be the only bill the Senators see this session fully guaranteed to cost the Government absolutely nothing.

This is because the people are footing the cost directly, through personal, business, institutional, and foundation donations. With about one-third of the $30 million goal accounted for, the legislators merely had to add their blessing. It didn't even require the formality of a debate.

Now it is the House's turn to keep the ball rolling. A House Public Works Subcommittee has the same bill the Senate passed with such alacrity. It extends the fund-raising, time beyond the 5-year period originally allotted. It also doubles the number of Cultural Center trustees to 30, broadening the geographic representation of members.

There is no reason why the amended bill should not sail through the House, where the Cultural Center has many friends. The point is, the sooner the better. Roger Stevens, chairman of the Center's Board of Trustees, was never more confident of victory—provided the momentum is not allowed to die. With the right kind of support, he estimates, the fund will swell to $20 million by the end of this year. The next move is up to the House.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BOSTON, MASS.,
July 1, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The 70th Annual Convention of Armenian Revolutionary Federation greets you and assures you of unlimited support of national organization of your campaign to establish special House Committee on Captive Nations. We extend the appreciation of Armenian Americans for your interest in problem of the captive states of the Soviet Union.

HAGOP MOURADIAN,
EGHISHE MELIKIAN, *Cochairmen.*

KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA,
Worcester, Mass., July 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.:

The time of year when Captive Nations Week is observed is nearly at hand again. The subject of captive nations is an opportune time for me to ask your continued support for the passage of the resolutions in favor of freedom for the Baltic States and the other oppressed captive nations.

Sincerely,

JOHN ANDRUSKI,
Chairman of Lithuanian Affairs.

UKRAINIAN CULTURE CENTER,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 28, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Americans of Ukrainian descent in Greater Los Angeles, organized in Ukrainian Culture Center of Los Angeles, are endorsing your House Resolution 14. We also express our deepest gratitude and appreciation for your continuous endeavors on behalf of the captive nations under the Communist domination.

We are pleased to inform you that we are also urging other Americans in this area to endorse House Resolution 14 by writing to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH urging him to submit the resolution for a vote in the House Rules Committee.

Wishing you the best of health, we remain.

Respectfully yours,

ALEX WESELY,
Chairman.

OREST L. DOLYNIUK,
Secretary.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
June 29, 1963.

Re H. Res. 14.

Hon. D. J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please note the enclosed copies speak for themselves.

Your effort in this direction is highly appreciated.

Thanking very much for kindness.

Yours truly,

JOHN VARNES.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
June 27, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: With this letter I endorse your House Resolution 14, for the creation of a special Committee on Cap-

tive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I also take this opportunity to thank you for all the endeavors on behalf of the captive nations of the world and hope that you will continue to do so.

Wishing you the best of health.

Respectfully yours,

B. HIRKA.

Centennial Observance of Henry Ford's Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, July 30, 1963, is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Henry Ford, who through his genius and industry, made tremendous contributions to our country, to our way of life, and to the progress of the world.

Henry Ford was born on a farm in what is now the city of Dearborn, Mich., on July 30, 1863, where today the residents and officials of the community, together with thousands of visitors, are gathered to pay honor to this man who gave so much to the community in which he lived, to our Nation and to the world.

In addition to putting the world on wheels, Mr. Ford pioneered in many fields. His development of the production line, not only put an automobile within the reach of the average worker, but it also set the stage by which America was able to mass produce so many goods to give our citizens the highest standard of living in the world. In spite of opposition, he initiated the $5 daily wage and the 40-hour week, a revolutionary concept at the time, which enabled the working man to buy his automobiles and gave him time to relax and enjoy leisure with his family.

He gave incentive to the aircraft industry by building the trimotor plane, which was the first all-metal, first multiengine plane and the first with radio control and passenger service.

His interest in farming brought about the industrialization of agriculture, and the development of fabricated materials from farm products.

He was interested in preserving bits of American heritage, so he established Greenfield Village where original and reproductions of items from the American past are on display.

He set up the Ford Trade School which trained capable young men for the many skills needed in his plants.

An article on the fabulous career and contradictory character of Henry Ford appeared in the Detroit Free Press of July 28, 1963, written by David J. Wilkie, who was Ford's confidante and close observer of his doings over a long span of years. Mr. Wilkie retired 4 years ago after 56 years with the Associated Press in Detroit.

His article about Mr. Ford follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 28, 1963]

ON THE CENTENNIAL OF HENRY FORD'S BIRTH, THE WRITER WHO KNEW HIM BEST TELLS OF "THE FORD I KNEW"

(By David J. Wilkie)

Henry Ford had an "idea whose day had come."

And because he put the idea into motion, he changed the world, and became one of its richest and most famous men.

Henry Ford, the centennial of whose birth will be observed Tuesday, put the world on wheels with his fabled model T.

But he was something of an industrial iconoclast, a man of deep convictions, "stubborn" if you prefer. He was in almost constant controversy with his business associates from the time he started his great industrial colossus almost up until his death 16 years ago.

In an era when most persons believed only the well-to-do would be able to afford automobiles, he insisted upon "building a car for the masses."

When Ford introduced the model T in 1908, some of his closest associates told him he was "crazy." Had they been right, the model T would have gone down in history as "Ford's folly." But it did exactly what Ford predicted, and some 15 million of them were rattling and quivering everywhere.

That his efforts brought him one of the greatest fortunes in American industrial history, counted in the hundreds of millions of dollars, truly was coincidental to Henry Ford. Fired with the ambition to make machines do the work that long had burdened the backs of men and beasts, he would have pursued this objective to his last day had the effort yielded him no more than a living wage.

If you measure the extent of Henry Ford's success by the huge fortune he amassed, you have to admit he did not and could not have achieved that success alone. He was not a good businessman. He needed the help of many individuals of much sounder business acumen.

But if you measure his success by his mechanical achievements, you have to give him full credit—and credit, too, for making many others extremely wealthy. It needed both Ford's unschooled genius and the business skill of others to create the great Ford industrial empire.

"Gold," Ford once remarked, "is the most useless thing in the world. I am not interested in money but in the things of which money is merely a symbol. I am in business not to make money as money, but to make things which I believe are of public benefit."

It was this writer's good fortune to have been acquainted with Henry Ford and to have enjoyed his confidence from the early days of the model T until is death in 1947.

On a few occasions he made a statement than, on second thought, sounded a bit impolitic.

"Maybe you'd better not quote me on that," he would remark. "It will only make people mad at me, and I don't want them to be mad at me."

That was in his later years, when he seemed no longer to want to indulge in controversy.

What was Henry Ford like? Here are some impressions of the man and his methods.

Like most individuals of outstanding achievement, he had his successes and his failures. He was right perhaps more often than he was wrong. He was criticized frequently for summarily dismissing or breaking off with associates of many years standing, particularly men who had figured prominently in the development of his company.

In some such instances Ford was quoted as saying the individual concerned was "getting too big for his britches." Others drew from this statement the inference that Ford was jealous of accomplishment in the company, that he wanted credit alone for major advances.

But Ford was not always wrong in the disputes that led to the ousting of some of his close associates. Certainly he was not wrong when he brought about the severance of Alex Y. Malcomson's association with the company.

Malcomson was a major figure in bringing Ford Motor Co. into existence, but while an officer and large shareholder in the company he invested heavily in another auto company that conceivably planned to compete with Ford. This was in 1906, when the company was but 3 years old.

Perhaps the break with James Couzens, another stalwart in the development of the company, resulted from a two-sided argument between the two. This came in 1915. Couzens explained his resignation at the time with the statement: "Mr. Ford and I have disagreed on almost everything of late. I could work with him but not for him."

Unlike Malcomson, however, Couzens resigned only as an official of Ford Motor Co. He retained his minority stockholdings until they were purchased by Ford in 1919.

In the light of what was involved, Ford's demand that all the minority stock be sold to him in 1919 was not unreasonable. It would not have happened had not John F. and Horece E. Dodge, original Ford stockholders who already had started their own Dodge Brothers, Inc., a competing auto company, sued Ford for a greater dividend distribution.

Success eluded Ford until after he had passed his 40th birthday. When it did come, it almost overwhelmed him.

In his own estimation, Ford's greatest achievement was his successful fight against the so-called Selden patent. Awarded to an upstate New York lawyer with mechanical leanings named George Baldwin Selden, the patent, granted in the early 1890s was turned over to a group of New York financiers who organized the Association of Licensed Automobile Manufacturers.

The association promptly began collecting royalties from every manufacturer of gasoline-propelled vehicles. Almost as soon as Ford Motor Co. was formed in 1903, suit was filed against it by the association charging infringement of its patent.

Ford fought the suit for nearly 8 years, finally winning a verdict stating that while the Selden patent was valid it covered a two-cycle gasoline engine and not the four-cycle then being used in most gasoline-propelled vehicles.

Years afterward Ford said: "Without that decision we could have no automobile industry as we now know it."

When in 1914 Ford announced a minimum wage scale of $5 a day, his competitors and other industrialists screamed that it was "industrial suicide."

"Higher wages and lower prices," said Ford, "mean greater buying power—more customers. If you cut wages you just cut the number of your customers. That's why it is good business always to raise wages and never lower them."

Certainly this action on Ford's part helped greatly in increasing the standard of living. Wages at the time in the autoplants averaged about $2.52 a day.

One of Ford's futile undertakings was his famous Peace Ship Expedition in 1915. Pacifists cheered the undertaking, designed to bring a halt to a war in Europe that was destined to become World War I.

Others jeered as the Scandinavian-American Line steamship Oskar II, with Henry Ford standing in the bow, moved from a Hoboken (N.J.) wharf on December 4, 1915. The expedition was to last 100 days and accomplish nothing.

But Ford denied it was a failure. "It cost about $400,000, but I wouldn't take a million

dollars for the experience I obtained from it," he said. He learned, he said, that "war is inspired by greed on the part of a few individuals who can make money profits from the manufacture and sale of munitions."

Unfortunate and ill-advised was Ford's anti-Semitic campaign, carried on in the columns of his newspaper, the Dearborn Independent. It brought Ford a million-dollar damage suit, which he settled out of court.

His own million-dollar libel suit against the Chicago Tribune, which had called him an anarchist, won a six-cent verdict in his favor; but it was a bitter victory, for Ford was subjected to grueling questioning by defense lawyers, who searched into his schooling, his understanding of history and even his ability to read.

Nearly 2 decades after the 1919 verdict in Ford's favor, Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Tribune, wrote Ford to express his regret that the editorial had been published. Although Colonel McCormick suggested Ford use the letter in any way he chose, Ford made no use of it, but filed it away with other records now in the Ford Archives.

Ford frequently was at loggerheads with other industrialists, merchants, and businessmen, largely because of his ideas on economy, mass production and merchandising.

A Ford market, initiated primarily for the benefit of Ford workers, was credited with doing close to $6 million worth of business a year in ready-to-wear clothing, shoes, and foodstuffs.

When the market was thrown open to the general public, Ford brought down upon himself the wrath of smaller independent dealers, and a boycott against Ford was organized. The merchants refused even to receive goods from wholesalers using Ford trucks. The argument was settled by agreement of the Ford interests to confine the market privileges to Ford employees.

Despite Ford's somewhat detached attitude toward money, his huge wealth enabled him to do many things that otherwise would have been impossible.

At the peak of his domination of Ford Motors Co. he was also one of the largest individual railroad owners and operators in the world.

One of the largest shipowners and operators on the Great Lakes and on the ocean.

Was a pioneer in commercial aviation, developing airplanes, landing fields and commercial aviation without Government backing.

Was one of the largest farmers in his State.

Was a distiller of coal and a coal mine owner in Kentucky and West Virginia, an iron mine owner in Northern Michigan and a leader in blast furnace work.

Was one of the Nation's largest glassmakers, producing plate glass in continuous sheets.

Grew flax and manufactured linen cloth, manufactured cotton cloth, grew wool and fabricated it.

Although he termed history "bunk," he was an educator in the broadest sense, operating trade and engineering schools, and putting millions into the preservation of relics of historical interest.

These varied interests sometimes were termed facets of the Ford genius. But it required money rather than genius to promote them.

Henry Ford was an enthusiastic prohibitionist; he was an opponent of capital punishment; a firm believer in reforestation; he was vitally interested in things agricultural; he devoted much time and money to sociological work, particularly in aiding victims of drug habits and the regeneration of ex-convicts; he was not an active churchworker but had pronounced religious views and read his Bible carefully.

Ford was baptized in the Episcopal Church. Of his religion he once said: "I believe in God and in Jesus Christ." But, he maintained, creeds were manmade. And, during his lifetime, he built half a dozen churches, all conducted on a nonsectarian basis.

Although he was not a heavy reader, Ford possessed an extensive library, including some volumes that could be classed as "deep" material. He liked the works of Tennyson and Emerson. He found hims if occasionally in disagreement with Emerson's choice of words.

"Emerson," he said, "is a pup. Just as I get myself comfortable and begin to enjoy reading his stuff, he uses some words I don't understand and I have to get up and go to the dictionary."

An ardent prohibitionist, Ford once threatened to close his factories if the prohibition amendment were repealed. But when repeal came, he accepted it in good grace.

"If prohibition did nothing else," he said, "it made a lot of people clean up their basements."

Ford was one of the bitter opponents of the National Industrial Recovery Act, commonly known as the NRA. With the Agriculture Adjustment Act, it gave the President control of industry and agriculture. Despite repeated threats by General Hugh Johnson, NRA administrator, to "crack down" on Ford, the motor magnate made it clear he was an unwilling participant.

He considered the NRA program unconstitutional, un-American and dangerous to the Nation's welfare. The U.S. Supreme Court eventually ruled the NRA unconstitutional.

The automotive pioneer's foray into politics cannot be termed exactly a failure. Asserting he was not a party man, he permitted his name to be entered in the 1918 Michigan primaries as a candidate for U.S. Senator on both Democratic and Republican tickets.

He won the Democratic nomination, but was defeated in the election by Truman H. Newberry, a Republican, by 4,000 votes. Newberry later was denied his seat by the Senate because he had spent too much money in his campaign.

Had Ford made any semblance of a campaign he probably would have won the election.

Real charity, Ford believed, was to give a man a job and an opportunity to rehabilitate himself. Yet Ford and his family gave liberally to charitable undertakings.

And many charitable impulses came to Ford in out-of-the-way places. Typical of many was an incident in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, where Ford turned back after passing a man carrying a pack and accompanied by a women in tears.

From the women he learned that fire had destroyed a home the couple had just completed with a lifetime of savings. They were moving on with no definite destination. Ford rebuilt the home at his own expense.

Besides his great devotion to his wife, Henry Ford revered the memory of his mother. He said that as a boy he never was punished by his mother.

"I have tried to live as my mother would have wished," he once said. "I believe I have done as far as I could just what she hoped for me. She taught me that service is the highest duty in the world. I believed her then; I believe her now. I have tried to follow her teachings."

Another phase of the Ford thinking that was difficult to understand was his attitude toward his son, Edsel, who was president of Ford Motor Co. from 1919, when the family came into sole ownership, until his death in 1943. Throughout that period the father remained the dominant personality in the company, and Edsel was subjected to considerable harassment by his father.

This probably stemmed in no small degree from the fact that Henry Ford sought unsuccessfully to raise Edsel in his own image.

The elder Ford seemed to place greater reliance upon Harry Bennett, a former World War I Navy veteran of approximately the same age as Edsel, who became his chief lieutenant and subsequently took over charge of all Ford personnel. It was Bennett who carried out many of the senior Ford's orders that so often embarrassed Edsel.

When the elder Ford again took over the presidency of the company following Edsel's death in 1943, he leaned even more heavily upon Bennett. Ford at the time was 80. The country still was at war. It needed the cooperative effort of all the Nation's industrial might. The high command in Washington did not look with enthusiasm upon the 80-year-old Ford's determination to direct his company's destiny in this period.

Terrific pressure was exerted by the Government upon Ford and members of his family to let a younger man direct the company's war effort. One result was the discharge from the Navy of Henry Ford II in 1943. He became executive vice president of Ford Motor Co.

Two years later the elder Ford resigned as company president to be succeeded by Henry Ford II. Although he resisted this move with characteristic stubbornness, he finally yielded to family pressure.

This pressure included the urging of his wife, Clara. She had helped in his initial efforts to build the empire. In urging him to step down in 1945 she helped save it from probable ruin.

How much influence the threat of other members of the family to sell their holdings in the company may have had in Ford's decision is conjectural. But the threat was made—the same threat Ford himself had successfully used on two earlier occasions against other shareholders in the company.

At this critical moment in the saga of one of the world's greatest industrial enterprises, two wonderful women—Mrs. Clara Bryant Ford and Mrs. Eleanor Clay Ford, widow of Edsel Ford—joined forces to effect the needed change in the company's leadership.

One thing the situation demonstrated was that the elder Mrs. Ford still held the faith and confidence of her husband.

The younger woman had control over a substantial block of voting stock in Ford Motor Co. It is no exaggeration to say that for a period in 1945 these two women held the destiny of Ford Motor Co. in their hands. The elder Henry Ford at the time held a controlling share of the voting stock.

At the time of the 1945 change the huge empire that for years had dominated the automobile market was losing money at the rate of $9 million a month. No business could long survive that kind of drain.

What the younger Henry Ford accomplished with the company that was tottering dangerously on the brink of oblivion in 1945 was little short of miraculous. He had it back on the high road within 5 years. And last year the company that lost $55 million in the second half of 1945 reported profits of $481 million on total sales of more than $8 billion.

When a cerebral hemorrhage brought death to the elder Henry Ford on April 7, 1947, when he was nearly 84, it ended one of the most fabulous careers in America's industrial history.

Flickering candles and kerosene lamps, replacing a flood-crippled electric system in the Ford home, cast strange shadows on the bedchamber walls as death entered that night. But Henry Ford apparently was at peace with himself and with the world.

On Detroit's western outskirts there is a small, fenced-in plot of ground—a quiet spot in a fast growing business and residential area. It is the Ford family burial ground. Within sight are Henry Ford's birthplace and the huge factories that long were the center of the far-flung industrial colossus.

Here, among his ancestors, rests the one-time farm youth who pyramided an "idea whose day had come" into one of the greatest fortunes of his time, and gave his name to the ages with a crude, low-cost vehicle, often irreverently called the "Flivver" or the "Tin Lizzie," that "put the world on wheels."

Mr. Speaker, although Mr. Ford's contributions to the world are well known, little is known of his charities in the town where he was born, lived, and died. The following editorial from the Dearborn Press of July 25, 1963, outlines a few of these:

OUR DEBT TO MR. FORD

Dearborn will be host to thousands of visitors next week as the city celebrates the 100th birthday anniversary of Henry Ford the man who put the world on wheels.

More visitors will be coming to Dearborn July 27-30 than at any other time in recent history.

The many special events of the Henry Ford centennial observance will give an important boost to Dearborn's fast growing reputation as the "Gateway to Michigan's Water Wonderland" and its longstanding position as one of the Nation's top 10 tourist meccas.

Dearborn's centennial commission has made plans to insure that visitors will be entertained, informed, and treated with genuine hospitality.

It is up to the individual citizen, businessman, and official to cooperate by demonstrating that Dearborn is a friendly, progressive community. He or she can do this best by attending as many of the special centennial events as possible.

We owe this cooperation to Mr. Ford who did so much to make Dearborn one of the richest communities in the world and one of the best places to live, work, and enjoy life.

Mr. Ford's contributions to mankind the world over are well known. But what he did for Dearborn, the community loved and lived in most of his life, are known only to a few. For Mr. Ford disliked making a show of his wealth and his charity.

He built the Rouge plant and other Ford Motor Co. facilities in Dearborn which have contributed so much to the city's rich industrial tax base and provided many Dearbornites with jobs.

He donated land for schools, parks, and libraries.

Mr. Ford built the magnificent Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village which have attracted tourists from all over the world and provided residents with countless hours of entertainment and cultural enrichment.

He built homes here for his workers and constructed the Ford Foundation, a model community.

Mr. Ford established the Henry Ford Trade School in Dearborn and many residents were educated there.

He was instrumental in the consolidation of the cities of Dearborn and Fordson and served on the old Henry Ford School District's board of education.

Hundreds of Dearborn residents can recall countless acts of personal kindness and charity. For these, perhaps, he is best remembered.

Dearborn owes a great deal to Mr. Ford, and it is fitting that we pay tribute to his memory next week.

Mr. Speaker, the city of his birth, Dearborn, has staged an elaborate 4-day celebration of his hundredth anniversary from July 27 to 30. Starting the 4-day celebration was "The Creative World of Henry Ford," a colorful 2-hour pageant beginning at 3:30 p.m., July 27 and 28, at Greenfield Village.

On July 27 the Dearborn Chamber of Commerce opened its "Internal Funarama" with a Henry Ford Centennial theme in the Youth Center. It ran daily through Tuesday.

Featuring a cotton-candy world of amusement rides fashion shows and a beauty contest, Funarama also presented special art and science exhibits, sky diving exhibitions and athletic contests for children.

Sunday evening, July 28, at 5 p.m. the famed Interlochen Youth Orchestra and Ballet Group presented a concert, reminiscent of the old Ford Sunday Evening Hour radio program, on the wooded grounds of the Ford Fair Lane Estate.

Tours of the famous mansion were available from noon to 5 p.m., July 27 and 28 and 1 to 5 p.m. July 29 and 30.

Today, July 30, at 2 p.m., there will be the unveiling of a State historical marker, paid for by the nickels and dimes of Dearborn school children, at the site of Mr. Ford's birth.

Speakers for the occasion will include Mrs. George Romney, Mayor Orville L. Hubbard, Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co. and grandson of its founder.

At 5 p.m., some 500 State, county, and community leaders, friends of the Ford family and early Ford employees will gather for a social hour and dinner at the Ford Central Staff Office Building.

Speakers will include the Rev. D. I. C. Johnson, former canon of St. John's Episcopal Cathedral and a long-time friend of the late Mr. Ford, and the Honorable Arthur M. Smith, Judge of the U.S. Patent Court of Appeals, a former Dearborn resident and Ford friend.

At 8:30 p.m. at Ford Field, Brady and Cherry Hill, a 1,000 cast pageant will be presented. Titled "The Man From Dearborn," the show will relate in song, dialog and action the life of Henry Ford. Music for the affair will be provided by the Pensacola Naval Choir and the U.S. Air Force Band. Fireworks will blaze a final posthumous birthday salute to Mr. Ford.

Henry Ford's pioneering work in aviation was recalled on July 26 when a Ford Tri-Motor owned by American Airlines was landed at Ford's Dearborn test track on Oakwood.

The track once was the Ford Airport from which the "Tin Goose" took off when built by Ford in 1929. The "return to home" at 10:30 a.m. was marked by inspections by airline executives, Ford employees who worked on the Tri-motor 35 years ago and members of the Ford Aerosports Club.

The Dearborn Junior Chamber of Commerce arranged for special Douglas DC-3 flights over Dearborn from Willow Run Airport every 45 minutes starting at noon on July 27.

Hudson's new budget store at Michigan and Greenfield sponsored a fireworks display at 9 p.m. July 29 at the Dearborn Civic Center.

Throughout the observance, bus tours to historic locations identified with Mr. Ford during his lifetime were scheduled from tourist booths at several locations in Dearborn.

Chairman of the committee which planned Dearborn's Henry Ford centennial observance is Miss Iris Becker, a Salina schoolteacher who coordinated the 75th birthday celebration for Mr. Ford.

Honorary chairman is Mayor Hubbard of Dearborn.

President Kennedy's Inconsistencies on the Test Ban Require Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on occasions prior to his radio-TV speech to the Nation last Friday, President Kennedy has taken precisely opposite positions on several aspects of the test ban treaty. He has a duty to resolve these inconsistencies. The following quotations from prior statements which require explanation are placed on the RECORD for the information of Members of the Congress and the public:

EXTRACTS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S RADIO-TV ADDRESS TO THE NATION, MARCH 2, 1962, ANNOUNCING RESUMPTION OF ATMOSPHERIC TESTING FOLLOWING BREACH OF MORATORIUM THEREON BY THE SOVIET UNION

I find it deeply regrettable that any radioactive material must be added to the atmosphere—that even one additional individual's health may be risked in the foreseeable future. And, however, remote and infinitesimal those hazards are judged to be, I still exceedingly regret the necessity of balancing these hazards against the hazards to hundreds of millions of lives which would be created by any relative decline in our nuclear strength.

In the absence of a large shift in Soviet policies no American President—responsible for the freedom and safety of so many people—could in good faith make any other decision.

Until mankind has banished both war and its instruments of destruction, the United States must maintain an effective quantity and quality of nuclear weapons. Only through such strength can we be certain of deterring a nuclear strike, or an overwhelming ground attack, upon our forces and allies. Only through such strength can we in the free world—should the deterrent fail—face the tragedy of another war with any hope of survival.

That deterrent strength, if it is to be effective and credible when compared with any other nation, must embody the most reliable and the most versatile nuclear weapons our research and development can produce. The testing of new weapons and their effects is necessarily a part of that research and development process.

Our nuclear posture affects the security of all Americans and all free men.

If we are to be alert to new breakthroughs, to experiment with new designs—if we are to maintain our scientific momentum and leadership—then our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves.

Should we fail to follow the dictates of our own security, they (the Soviets) will chalk it up, not to goodwill, but to a failure of will—not to our confidence in Western superiority, but to our fear of world opinion, the very world opinion for which they showed such contempt. They could well be encouraged by such signs of weakness to seek another period of no testing without controls—another opportunity for stifling our

progress while secretly preparing, on the basis of last fall's experiments, for the new test series which might alter the balance of power.

The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.

We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparation and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an un-inspected moratorium. Some may urge us to try it again, keeping our preparations to test in a constant state of readiness. But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution.

EXTRACTS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 7, 1962

Question. Mr. President, would the United States be willing, without further nuclear tests in the atmosphere, to sign a formal treaty with the Soviet Union banning such tests?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I have stated that our concern would be—I stated before, since, and as I said afterwards, that we would sign an agreement which provided for adequate inspections system, that is correct. But adequate inspection in regard to preparations as well as testing, because otherwise—

Question. My question was hinged on further tests in the United States.

The PRESIDENT. I understand. We will support the passage of an effective treaty which provides for effective inspection, but we cannot take less in view of the fact of our experience of the past months where it takes us many months to prepare for tests in the atmosphere.

The Soviet Union prepares in secret. Unless we have adequate protection against a repetition of that incident, any such test agreement obviously would be extremely vulnerable.

Question. Mr. President, on the test issue, if I understand what you have been saying correctly you introduced a new element into these negotiations. That is, inspection which would cover any possible secret preparations for tests. Is this in fact a new element that the United States is introducing and, if so, how might you meet that problem in an inspection system?

The PRESIDENT. I think this is a matter which should be discussed at the disarmament conference, but I think that any agreement—not to have an agreement whereby some time would go by and then when the Soviets have exhausted the information they have acquired from this series of tests suddenly overnight begin another series of tests, meanwhile 2 years have gone by and many scientists and others who might have been working on this may have gone into other occupations.

It is a deadly business, this competition, and I don't say that much security comes out of it. But less security would certainly come out of it if we permitted them to make a decisive breakthrough in an area like an ICBM so we would certainly have to have some assurances against a repetition against this before we would feel that the treaty is a satisfactory one. But it is a matter which I think will be discussed in March.

Is the U.N. Really Concerned With Imperialism or Is It Aiding Communism in Africa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been subjected to an all-out propaganda barrage from the United Nations on the issue of imperialism. Of course all attacks have been directed against the West. The U.N. has never condemned, nor even criticized the brutal imperialist aggression of Soviet Russia.

The United States, under the leadership of President Kennedy, to the dismay of the whole world, joined with the Communists in condemning Portugal and became a part of the wolfpack determined to engage East Africa in the same blood bath now so prevalent in the Congo.

Now, at long last we are beginning to learn the facts on the other side. The East Africans do not consider themselves colonial subjects of Portugal. They are not in revolt against themselves. The whole plot is now developing and we find it is the Communist-oriented Africans outside East Africa who are creating the trouble and the issue. This proves once again the use to which the United Nations is being put by the Communists and is another strong argument to clean it up or withdraw U.S. membership in it.

To help keep the record straight, I include, as a part of these remarks, the following column, "An Ideal Example of Integration," by Robert C. Ruark, certainly one of the best informed writers on Africa. The article appeared in the New York World Telegram:

AN IDEAL EXAMPLE OF INTEGRATION

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NAMPULA, MOZAMBIQUE, PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA.—The brightly bandanaed native women formed a long line to the left of the paramount chiefs, the chiefs and the subchiefs. The ladies wore great sunbursts of dresses; the chiefs wore floppy military hats, khaki suits, and the brass belt buckles of office.

A short white man, dressed in formal city clothes, stepped off the Friendship jet and was warmly embraced by a coal-black man, lean and handsome in his formal city clothes. The short white man embraced the lean black man warmly.

Flashbulbs popped, and then a small group of dignitaries walked with the two men down a strip of red carpeting through the airport.

As the short white man walked into the sunlight, a sudden surge of color enveloped him—a mob of black faces in bright clothing smothered him with savage cries. He was lost, buried in the sea of black humanity, each person eager to touch him. It could have been a murder. It was not.

It was the people of Nampula greeting their beloved governor general. And their elected mayor—the lean black man—was lost in the rush as the natives rumpled their beloved chieftain who had flown from Laurenco Marques to dedicate a new indoor athletic stadium.

Nampula is a brilliant town of planned housing, vividly colored modern architecture, in the Portuguese fashion which makes a Lisbon a palette against the sea and sky.

It has modern schools, modern soccer fields, modern churches, modern swimming pools, modern theaters, wonderfully kept streets, beautiful flowers. That would be excepted if it were in the Congo, under the old Belgian rule.

But what makes Nampula miraculous in this day and age is that it is unsegregated, integrated; amicably, tolerantly black-and-white, in housing, schooling, recreation, eating, drinking, athletics. There is not and has not been for a very long time any destruction between races in Portuguese East—or West.

There is no internal scream for independence. The yells—and the action—come unabashedly from outsiders, using outside troops. I have covered Angola once and Mozambique three times in the last three years—Mozambique three times since last May—and it is a province of Portugal, not an oversea colony.

Its progressiveness and its future plans for savages exceed anything I have seen in any portion of Africa, including the recent free nations which clamor in the United Nations for Portuguese expulsion. And I have not been on guided tours or a guest of the Government.

I have covered the four corners of Mozambique on my own time and money, seeing all the cities and a great deal of the back bush, and I would say that Portugal is streets ahead of America in its handling of its black citizens—particularly far ahead in education and in assimilation.

When you ask the population of a city, you do not get the Kenya answer of so many white, so many black. You get the lump figure of so many Portuguese—there is no breakdown by color.

There is no subservience of the black man in the city, and there is no resentment of the white man in the almost totally black suburbs.

I made a round of predominantly black bars, full of drinking natives, at late hours of the night. We were not greeted as intruders, as dignitaries, as patronizers. The boys at the bar just moved over a notch to make room. We bought a drink and they bought one back.

I have recently spent several weeks in Portuguese East. Some of the things I have seen this year, as well last, are staggering in light of the Afro-Asian bloc's effort to oust Portugal from the U.N.; staggering in the cynical array of troops intent on freeing a people who are already free; monstrous in light of the dreadful mess the recent emerging nations have made and are making of their own countries.

Mr. Lanin Did Not Urge Substitution of Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I commented in the RECORD to the effect that some 160 radio stations are now using Lester Lanin's recording of "Hail to the Chief" as signoff music in place of the "Star-Spangled Banner," and both the radio editorial which I included with my remarks and my own re-

Here, among his ancestors, rests the one-time farm youth who pyramided an "idea whose day had come" into one of the greatest fortunes of his time, and gave his name to the ages with a crude, low-cost vehicle, often irreverently called the "Flivver" or the "Tin Lizzie," that "put the world on wheels."

Mr. Speaker, although Mr. Ford's contributions to the world are well known, little is known of his charities in the town where he was born, lived, and died. The following editorial from the Dearborn Press of July 25, 1963, outlines a few of these:

OUR DEBT TO MR. FORD

Dearborn will be host to thousands of visitors next week as the city celebrates the 100th birthday anniversary of Henry Ford the man who put the world on wheels.

More visitors will be coming to Dearborn July 27–30 than at any other time in recent history.

The many special events of the Henry Ford centennial observance will give an important boost to Dearborn's fast growing reputation as the "Gateway to Michigan's Water Wonderland" and its longstanding position as one of the Nation's top 10 tourist meccas.

Dearborn's centennial commission has made plans to insure that visitors will be entertained, informed, and treated with genuine hospitality.

It is up to the individual citizen, businessman, and official to cooperate by demonstrating that Dearborn is a friendly, progressive community. He or she can do this best by attending as many of the special centennial events as possible.

We owe this cooperation to Mr. Ford who did so much to make Dearborn one of the richest communities in the world and one of the best places to live, work, and enjoy life.

Mr. Ford's contributions to mankind the world over are well known. But what he did for Dearborn, the community loved and lived in most of his life, are known only to a few. For Mr. Ford disliked making a show of his wealth and his charity.

He built the Rouge plant and other Ford Motor Co. facilities in Dearborn which have contributed so much to the city's rich industrial tax base and provided many Dearbornites with jobs.

He donated land for schools, parks, and libraries.

Mr. Ford built the magnificent Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village which have attracted tourists from all over the world and provided residents with countless hours of entertainment and cultural enrichment.

He built homes here for his workers and constructed the Ford Foundation, a model community.

Mr. Ford established the Henry Ford Trade School in Dearborn and many residents were educated there.

He was instrumental in the consolidation of the cities of Dearborn and Fordson and served on the old Henry Ford School District's board of education.

Hundreds of Dearborn residents can recall countless acts of personal kindness and charity. For these, perhaps, he is best remembered.

Dearborn owes a great deal to Mr. Ford, and it is fitting that we pay tribute to his memory next week.

Mr. Speaker, the city of his birth, Dearborn, has staged an elaborate 4-day celebration of his hundredth anniversary from July 27 to 30. Starting the 4-day celebration was "The Creative World of Henry Ford," a colorful 2-hour pageant beginning at 3:30 p.m., July 27 and 28, at Greenfield Village.

On July 27 the Dearborn Chamber of Commerce opened its "Internal Funarama" with a Henry Ford Centennial theme in the Youth Center. It ran daily through Tuesday.

Featuring a cotton-candy world of amusement rides fashion shows and a beauty contest, Funarama also presented special art and science exhibits, sky diving exhibitions and athletic contests for children.

Sunday evening, July 28, at 5 p.m. the famed Interlochen Youth Orchestra and Ballet Group presented a concert, reminiscent of the old Ford Sunday Evening Hour radio program, on the wooded grounds of the Ford Fair Lane Estate.

Tours of the famous mansion were available from noon to 5 p.m., July 27 and 28 and 1 to 5 p.m. July 29 and 30.

Today, July 30, at 2 p.m., there will be the unveiling of a State historical marker, paid for by the nickels and dimes of Dearborn school children, at the site of Mr. Ford's birth.

Speakers for the occasion will include Mrs. George Romney, Mayor Orville L. Hubbard, Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co. and grandson of its founder.

At 5 p.m., some 500 State, county, and community leaders, friends of the Ford family and early Ford employees will gather for a social hour and dinner at the Ford Central Staff Office Building.

Speakers will include the Rev. D. I. C. Johnson, former canon of St. John's Episcopal Cathedral and a long-time friend of the late Mr. Ford, and the Honorable Arthur M. Smith, Judge of the U.S. Patent Court of Appeals, a former Dearborn resident and Ford friend.

At 8:30 p.m. at Ford Field, Brady and Cherry Hill, a 1,000 cast pageant will be presented. Titled "The Man From Dearborn," the show will relate in song, dialog and action the life of Henry Ford. Music for the affair will be provided by the Pensacola Naval Choir and the U.S. Air Force Band. Fireworks will blaze a final posthumous birthday salute to Mr. Ford.

Henry Ford's pioneering work in aviation was recalled on July 26 when a Ford Tri-Motor owned by American Airlines was landed at Ford's Dearborn test track on Oakwood.

The track once was the Ford Airport from which the "Tin Goose" took off when built by Ford in 1929. The "return to home" at 10:30 a.m. was marked by inspections by airline executives, Ford employees who worked on the Tri-motor 35 years ago and members of the Ford Aerosports Club.

The Dearborn Junior Chamber of Commerce arranged for special Douglas DC-3 flights over Dearborn from Willow Run Airport every 45 minutes starting at noon on July 27.

Hudson's new budget store at Michigan and Greenfield sponsored a fireworks display at 9 p.m. July 29 at the Dearborn Civic Center.

Throughout the observance, bus tours to historic locations identified with Mr. Ford during his lifetime were scheduled from tourist booths at several locations in Dearborn.

Chairman of the committee which planned Dearborn's Henry Ford centennial observance is Miss Iris Becker, a Salina schoolteacher who coordinated the 75th birthday celebration for Mr. Ford.

Honorary chairman is Mayor Hubbard of Dearborn.

President Kennedy's Inconsistencies on the Test Ban Require Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on occasions prior to his radio-TV speech to the Nation last Friday, President Kennedy has taken precisely opposite positions on several aspects of the test ban treaty. He has a duty to resolve these inconsistencies. The following quotations from prior statements which require explanation are placed on the RECORD for the information of Members of the Congress and the public:

EXTRACTS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S RADIO-TV ADDRESS TO THE NATION, MARCH 2, 1962, ANNOUNCING RESUMPTION OF ATMOSPHERIC TESTING FOLLOWING BREACH OF MORATORIUM THEREON BY THE SOVIET UNION

I find it deeply regrettable that any radioactive material must be added to the atmosphere—that even one additional individual's health may be risked in the foreseeable future. And, however, remote and infinitesimal those hazards are judged to be, I still exceedingly regret the necessity of balancing these hazards against the hazards to hundreds of millions of lives which would be created by any relative decline in our nuclear strength.

In the absence of a large shift in Soviet policies no American President—responsible for the freedom and safety of so many people—could in good faith make any other decision.

Until mankind has banished both war and its instruments of destruction, the United States must maintain an effective quantity and quality of nuclear weapons. Only through such strength can we be certain of deterring a nuclear strike, or an overwhelming ground attack, upon our forces and allies. Only through such strength can we in the free world—should the deterrent fail—face the tragedy of another war with any hope of survival.

That deterrent strength, if it is to be effective and credible when compared with any other nation, must embody the most reliable and the most versatile nuclear weapons our research and development can produce. The testing of new weapons and their effects is necessarily a part of that research and development process.

Our nuclear posture affects the security of all Americans and all free men.

If we are to be alert to new breakthroughs, to experiment with new designs—if we are to maintain our scientific momentum and leadership—then our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves.

Should we fail to follow the dictates of our own security, they (the Soviets) will chalk it up, not to goodwill, but to a failure of will—not to our confidence in Western superiority, but to our fear of world opinion, the very world opinion for which they showed such contempt. They could well be encouraged by such signs of weakness to seek another period of no testing without controls—another opportunity for stifling our

progress while secretly preparing, on the basis of last fall's experiments, for the new test series which might alter the balance of power.

The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.

We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparation and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an un-inspected moratorium. Some may urge us to try it again, keeping our preparations to test in a constant state of readiness. But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution.

EXTRACTS FROM PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PRESS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 7, 1962

Question. Mr. President, would the United States be willing, without further nuclear tests in the atmosphere, to sign a formal treaty with the Soviet Union banning such tests?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I have stated that our concern would be—I stated before, since, and as I said afterwards, that we would sign an agreement which provided for adequate inspections system, that is correct. But adequate inspection in regard to preparations as well as testing, because otherwise—

Question. My question was hinged on further tests in the United States.

The PRESIDENT. I understand. We will support the passage of an effective treaty which provides for effective inspection, but we cannot take less in view of the fact of our experience of the past months where it takes us many months to prepare for tests in the atmosphere.

The Soviet Union prepares in secret. Unless we have adequate protection against a repetition of that incident, any such test agreement obviously would be extremely vulnerable.

Question. Mr. President, on the test issue, if I understand what you have been saying correctly you introduced a new element into these negotiations. That is, inspection which would cover any possible secret preparations for tests. Is this in fact a new element that the United States is introducing and, if so, how might you meet that problem in an inspection system?

The PRESIDENT. I think this is a matter which should be discussed at the disarmament conference, but I think that any agreement—not to have an agreement whereby some time would go by and then when the Soviets have exhausted the information they have acquired from this series of tests suddenly overnight begin another series of tests, meanwhile 2 years have gone by and many scientists and others who might have been working on this may have gone into other occupations.

It is a deadly business, this competition, and I don't say that much security comes out of it. But less security would certainly come out of it if we permitted them to make a decisive breakthrough in an area like an ICBM so we would certainly have to have some assurances against a repetition against this before we would feel that the treaty is a satisfactory one. But it is a matter which I think will be discussed in March.

Is the U.N. Really Concerned With Imperialism or Is It Aiding Communism in Africa?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been subjected to an all-out propaganda barrage from the United Nations on the issue of imperialism. Of course all attacks have been directed against the West. The U.N. has never condemned, nor even criticized the brutal imperialist aggression of Soviet Russia.

The United States, under the leadership of President Kennedy, to the dismay of the whole world, joined with the Communists in condemning Portugal and became a part of the wolfpack determined to engage East Africa in the same blood bath now so prevalent in the Congo.

Now, at long last we are beginning to learn the facts on the other side. The East Africans do not consider themselves colonial subjects of Portugal. They are not in revolt against themselves. The whole plot is now developing and we find it is the Communist-oriented Africans outside East Africa who are creating the trouble and the issue. This proves once again the use to which the United Nations is being put by the Communists and is another strong argument to clean it up or withdraw U.S. membership in it.

To help keep the record straight, I include, as a part of these remarks, the following column, "An Ideal Example of Integration," by Robert C. Ruark, certainly one of the best informed writers on Africa. The article appeared in the New York World Telegram:

AN IDEAL EXAMPLE OF INTEGRATION

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NAMPULA, MOZAMBIQUE, PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA.—The brightly bandanaed native women formed a long line to the left of the paramount chiefs, the chiefs and the subchiefs. The ladies wore great sunbursts of dresses; the chiefs wore floppy military hats, khaki suits, and the brass belt buckles of office.

A short white man, dressed in formal city clothes, stepped off the Friendship jet and was warmly embraced by a coal-black man, lean and handsome in his formal city clothes. The short white man embraced the lean black man warmly.

Flashbulbs popped, and then a small group of dignitaries walked with the two men down a strip of red carpeting through the airport.

As the short white man walked into the sunlight, a sudden surge of color enveloped him—a mob of black faces in bright clothing smothered him with savage cries. He was lost, buried in the sea of black humanity, each person eager to touch him. It could have been a murder. It was not.

It was the people of Nampula greeting their beloved governor general. And their elected mayor—the lean black man—was lost in the rush as the natives rumpled their beloved chieftain who had flown from Laurenco Marques to dedicate a new indoor athletic stadium.

Nampula is a brilliant town of planned housing, vividly colored modern architecture, in the Portuguese fashion which makes a Lisbon a palette against the sea and sky.

It has modern schools, modern soccer fields, modern churches, modern swimming pools, modern theaters, wonderfully kept streets, beautiful flowers. That would be excepted if it were in the Congo, under the old Belgian rule.

But what makes Nampula miraculous in this day and age is that it is unsegregated, integrated; amicably, tolerantly black-and-white, in housing, schooling, recreation, eating, drinking, athletics. There is not and has not been for a very long time any destruction between races in Portuguese East—or West.

There is no internal scream for independence. The yells—and the action—come unabashedly from outsiders, using outside troops. I have covered Angola once and Mozambique three times in the last three years—Mozambique three times since last May—and it is a province of Portugal, not an oversea colony.

Its progressiveness and its future plans for savages exceed anything I have seen in any portion of Africa, including the recent free nations which clamor in the United Nations for Portuguese expulsion. And I have not been on guided tours or a guest of the Government.

I have covered the four corners of Mozambique on my own time and money, seeing all the cities and a great deal of the back bush, and I would say that Portugal is streets ahead of America in its handling of its black citizens—particularly far ahead in education and in assimilation.

When you ask the population of a city, you do not get the Kenya answer of so many white, so many black. You get the lump figure of so many Portuguese—there is no breakdown by color.

There is no subservience of the black man in the city, and there is no resentment of the white man in the almost totally black suburbs.

I made a round of predominantly black bars, full of drinking natives, at late hours of the night. We were not greeted as intruders, as dignitaries, as patronizers. The boys at the bar just moved over a notch to make room. We bought a drink and they bought one back.

I have recently spent several weeks in Portuguese East. Some of the things I have seen this year, as well last, are staggering in light of the Afro-Asian bloc's effort to oust Portugal from the U.N.; staggering in the cynical array of troops intent on freeing a people who are already free; monstrous in light of the dreadful mess the recent emerging nations have made and are making of their own countries.

Mr. Lanin Did Not Urge Substitution of Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I commented in the RECORD to the effect that some 160 radio stations are now using Lester Lanin's recording of "Hail to the Chief" as signoff music in place of the "Star-Spangled Banner," and both the radio editorial which I included with my remarks and my own re-

marks attributed this information to Mr. Lanin.

I have since had a call from Mr. Lanin who is very upset lest anyone think that he has urged the substitution of his recording of "Hail to the Chief" for the "Star-Spangled Banner," and who reports that he did not know that it was being used in this way until he was so informed by Mr. Joe Franklin, a broadcaster on station WOR.

I am pleased to know that Mr. Lanin agrees with me that there is a proper time and place for playing "Hail to the Chief," and a proper time and place for playing the national anthem, and that the two should not be confused or misused.

Mr. Lanin says that his business is playing music, not playing politics, and I think this is an excellent expression on the part of a man who has been successful in his own profession for some 20 years, having played for President Eisenhower as well as President Kennedy.

To Defeat the Public Law 78 Powerplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 29 the House took the thoroughly justified, but long overdue step, of terminating the infamous bracero program—a program which has provided a subsidy for less than 1 percent of our country's growers while it has worked to the direct disadvantage of thousands of small farmers and America's farmworkers.

The cry has been raised by proponents of this unjust measure that braceros are needed if crops are to be harvested; that domestics will not perform stoop labor.

An answer, in part, to the absurdity of this charge is the success California has experienced in utilizing teenagers. As Albert Tieburg, director of California's State Department of Employment reported on July 17, "more than 1,860 of these youngsters were dispelling grower doubts by succeeding in 'stoop labor' crops like strawberries, lettuce, cotton, carrots, garlic, asparagus, tomatoes, onions, cucumbers and sugarbeets."

Director Tieburg also cited the favorable reaction of growers including one with 1,500 acres in grapes and plums who said—

> They are very good workers, take instruction readily, adapt quickly and work faster than their adult counterparts. I'm very satisfied. I haven't had to fire one.

Mr. Speaker, I think our colleagues will find this report of interest and importance. I also commend to their attention the timely editorial from this morning's Washington Post, and its admonishment:

> Any backdoor attempt to slip the bill through the Senate and to force the House to reconsider by bargaining on other legislation should get the scorching condemnation it deserves.

The report and editorial follow:

REPORT OF STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT JULY 17, 1963

Nearly 10,000 youths were placed by the department of employment's farm youth recruitment drive by mid-July a 33-percent increase over 1962, the department reported today.

More than 9,900 teenagers, 2,400 more than were placed all of last harvest season, have been placed so far in the department's drive to fill the bracero gap exepected next year. California's harvest peak was still 6 weeks away.

In addition, the department estimated conservatively that 3,500 youths independently found crop work.

Director Albert B. Tieburg reported more than 1,860 of these youngsters were dispelling grower doubts by succeeding in stoop labor crops like strawberries, lettuce, cotton, carrots, garlic, asparagus, tomatoes, onions, cucumbers, and sugarbeets.

Some 3,300 were picking and cutting apricots in the San Francisco Bay region. Another 1,760 picked and processed bushberries along the coast. Still ripening were multimillion-dollar crops of prunes, pears, and peaches, expected to draw heavily on young pickers across north central California. The remainder of the youth total was scattered among varied field, livestock, dairy, and nursery jobs.

The department recruited nearly 500 of the youngsters into all-youth crews, primarily in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys and east bay crops, Tieburg said.

The youth, farm front shock troops to ease the expected demise of the Mexican farmworker program December 31, are part of Gov. Edmund G. Brown's program to help harvest the State's billion-dollar crop next year.

Tieburg's farm placement aids reported that where growers and contractors enabled youths to learn, "they are performing as well as adults." This included pilot projects in arduous stooping to weed, thin and harvest row crops 8 hours daily.

Most agricultural employers welcome the chance to give youngsters experience, Tieburg was told, but some are resisting where they must pay 16 to 18 year-olds minimum wages, preferring experienced adults.

Growers in diversified endeavors praised the youths.

Birge Kirkorian, who has 1,500 Kern County acres in grapes and plums, said, "They are very good workers, take instruction readily, adapt quickly and work faster than their adult counterparts. I'm very satisfied. I haven't had to fire one."

Clem Liano, manager of the Delta Farm Group, Isleton, who hired a green crew of 16 to 18 year-olds for beet and row crop weeding for 11 days, reported there was no horseplay and though enough of them to furnish a swin and ice cream party on their last day.

Teenagers are employed in such wide-ranging jobs as flower pollenating (Santa Barbara County), horse sitting (for San Diego County vacationers), and removing olive trees for transplant (San Bernardino County).

SLIPPERY WETBACKS

The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor will hold hearings today intended to block a cynical power play involving imported Mexican farm labor. On May 29, the House overruled its own Agriculture Committee and refused to extend again an "emergency" measure to allow braceros to enter the United States for harvest work. Originally, Public Law 78 was enacted on the grounds that the Korean war caused a shortage of farm workers—but that pretext has long since vanished.

The effects of the bracero program have been bad for underpaid and underemployed American migrant labor, and bad for Mexican labor—Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ of Texas, who is of Mexican descent, called the bill "a shameless piece of legislation." Yet the Senate now has before it the very bill the House has already killed and a vote is expected on Wednesday.

No Senate hearings have been held, and it is the intention of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Migratory Subcommittee, to put on record the facts about the bracero legislation. He deserves strong support. Any backdoor attempt to slip the bill through the Senate and to force the House to reconsider by bargaining on other legislation should get the scorching condemnation it deserves.

Trackless Void

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD today an article entitled, "Trackless Void," from the May 13, 1963, issue of Barron's, the nationally known business and financial weekly.

On Thursday, the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 7500, the $5.2 billion National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill for fiscal year 1964. I am calling this article to the attention of the Members of the House in anticipation of their consideration of this important bill:

TRACKLESS VOID

Like the exploration of space itself, any criticism of the national effort in this sphere is filled with extra hazard. A writer approaches the task uneasily aware, that on some launching pad, either in the United States or the U.S.S.R., the countdown may have started on the next towering feat of scientific prowess and personal bravery, one that will overshadow such mundane considerations as priorities or costs. In coming months, so President Kennedy confidently forecast last week, "spectacular" achievements by Soviet astronauts will silence all partisan objections to the soaring U.S. space budget. Even between moon shots the critic's lot is not an easy one. For willy-nilly he must challenge the most persuasive appeal to emotion since the Pharaohs of Egypt—perhaps to overawe the surly Assyrians, or to create jobs along the lower Nile—decided to build the pyramids. Like Columbus, we have been told time and again, the United States today lives in an age of discovery. Like Columbus, the United States must not fail to seize its moment of greatness.

While popular and plausible, the comparison strikes Barron's as unfortunate. To begin with, in contrast to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Columbus raised the funds for his epoch-making voyage at least partly from private sources. Far from setting out to discover America, moreover, the admiral and his financial backers merely sought to find a shorter—hence more profitable—route to the Indies; their primary aim was to make money, not history. Finally, though Washington has chosen to ignore the inconvenient fact, the conquest of the New World yielded Spain, after a short-lived fling at glory, four centuries of economic and political decay.

The parallel to Columbus can be pushed too far, not only by friends of the space program but also by its foes. Nonetheless, the lessons of the past, coupled with some contemporary wisdom on the subject, underscore the need for a sweeping reappraisal of the current U.S. space program. For example, lawmakers now suspect that NASA's skyrocketing budget (from which, according to the administration, not 1 cent can be cut without courting disaster) is designed to serve political as well as scientific ends. In turn, scientists, who know how to weigh alternatives, have grown increasingly skeptical of the overwhelming emphasis which Washington has placed upon landing a man on the moon. Thereby, they claim, the United States has ignored far less costly and more fruitful avenues of lunar exploration, while neglecting other promising ventures in space. The time has come, we submit, to ask "Is this trip necessary?"

Washington to date has replied with a ringing affirmative and the greatest burst of Federal appropriations in U.S. peacetime history. From modest beginnings in 1958–59, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has ballooned to the point where today only the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury, and Defense deploy more of the taxpayers' money. In the fiscal year which ends on June 30, NASA expects to spend $2.4 billion, nearly twice as much as in fiscal 1962. For fiscal 1964, its projected outlays will nearly double again, to $4.2 billion, and, to judge by the even steeper climb in new obligational authority, the end is nowhere in sight. The figures are vastly more impressive than the arguments which have been advanced to justify them. In a speech in Houston last September, President Kennedy offered this explanation: "The exploration of space will go ahead whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space."

Scarcely illuminating at the time, official policy has grown no clearer since. What has changed abruptly is the Nation's supine acceptance of its burdens. Part of the change—especially on Capital Hill—undoubtedly springs from a sudden awareness, especially among Republicans, of the massive political leverage which spending of such magnitude commands. The party in power, of course, knew it all the time. As the President told his whooping audience in Houston, "During the next 5 years NASA expects to double the number of scientists and engineers in this area; to increase its outlays for salaries and expenses to $60 million a year; to invest some $200 million in plants and laboratory facilities and to direct or contract for new space efforts over $1 billion from this center in this city." Openhanded NASA also has blueprinted a $50 million Electronics Research Center "in the Greater Boston Area," which critics aver is unnecessary, as well as $77 million worth of construction which the Air Force, in a formal memorandum, claims will duplicate existing facilities. "What we are witnessing," a noted physical chemist and the editor of Science magazine has concluded, "is the expansion of a new sophisticated form of the prewar Public Works Administration. Science is being used increasingly as a 'front' for technological leaf raking."

From the same source has also come a trenchant critique of Project Apollo, the first lunar expedition in which, he charges, science is running a poor second to propaganda. Noting the total absence of scientists among the scheduled crew, he argues that "the alternative of exploration by electronic gear becomes exceedingly attractive. The cost of unmanned lunar vehicles is on the order of 1 percent of the cost of the manned variety * * * most of the interesting questions concerning the moon can be studied by electronic devices." His views have been echoed by a growing number of colleagues, including Dr. Vannevar Bush of MIT, scores of Nobel Prize winners, and by a caustic observer in the New Scientist, who recently remarked: "The widespread and growing belief that the first visit to the moon will bring back some kind of scientific Holy Grail is probably the biggest popular delusion of all time, the South Sea Bubble notwithstanding."

The benefits of Apollo thus threaten to be largely illusory; the costs, however, are painfully real. As noted, the project already has sent NASA's budget into orbit. What is more unfortunate, by commandeering so much of the available time, money and talent, it has led to an unwise—and possibly dangerous—neglect of other areas of space development. Thus, in its haste to get off the ground, NASA has depended largely on obsolescent liquid-fueled vehicles which were ready to go; only last month the Air Force, with NASA's cooperation, placed the first orders for huge new solid-fuel rockets which, technologically, represent a great leap forward. Again, little has been done with the weather satellite, Tiros, which, back in 1960, was performing such scientific wonders as photographing cloud formations half a world away. With the help of Congress, finally, NASA has succeeded in dimming the once-brilliant future of satellite telecommunications. In the knowledgeable hands of the Bell System, Telstar made history nearly a year ago. Since then nothing of consequence has been done by the new publicly owned corporation which is supposed to take over from Mother Bell. And despite the great success of Telstar, NASA is tinkering with a different system known as Syncom, the first unit of which promptly got lost in the trackless void.

Whatever its other defects, Syncom thereby qualifies as the perfect symbol of the Nation's spaceprogram. For unless NASA's chaotic growth is slowed and controlled, the Federal budget—and U.S. solvency—someday may go the same way. Reaching for the moon, as President Kennedy has buoyantly said, may be the "greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked." Before it's too late, however, Washington would do well to come down to earth.

Long Labor Peace at Hand for Steel, Industry Believes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of June 26, 1963:

LONG LABOR PEACE AT HAND FOR STEEL, INDUSTRY BELIEVES

(By Robert Dietsch)

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 26.—The steel industry feels it is on the threshold of extended labor peace with the United Steel Workers (USW).

The industry is buoyed by the labor agreement (which in itself guarantees about two years of peace), the success of the human relations committee, a conviction that the union appreciates steel's financial and competitive problems and even the diminishing number of wildcat strikes—61 last year against 90 in 1960 and a record 388 in 1955.

Even the cost of the new contract leaves some steel executives comparatively unruffled. As Donald C. Duvall, executive vice president of Pittsburgh Steel, told the American Iron and Ore Association.

"The employment cost increase—when spread over the full term of the contract (about 15 cents an hour)—will come closer to matching the employee's annual productivity increase than any other contract negotiated since World War II."

Talks with corporate executives here and with mill officials in northern Ohio also brought out the optimistic sentiment.

Company negotiators are meeting individually with USW representatives in Pittsburgh to iron out individual contract differences. Major talking point remains the extended vacation plan and how it will work in each firm.

The novel vacation plan begins in 1964.

In his talk, Mr. Duvall maintained the industry had made considerable progress in the area of industrial and labor negotiations. After noting there had been six steel strikes since World War II, he said:

"This is the first time since World War II that we have been able to conclude two successive agreements without a strike * * * this is genuine progress (which) I think implies that our employees better understand the kinds of commercial and financial challenges the industry faces.

"We have proved that the two-party approach to mutual problem solving can function and we have obviated the slighted necessity for Government intervention into free collective bargaining.

"It is entirely possible that neither party—steel labor nor steel management—ever again will have to exercise its rights to conduct or experience a strike."

Our Exploding Cities—A National Problem—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard E. Pearce, editor of the editorial page of the San Francisco Examiner, has recently concluded an illuminating series of articles entitled "Our Exploding Cities."

I know many of our colleagues will wish to take advantage of the knowledge gleaned by this distinguished San Francisco writer on his monthlong study of seven eastern and midwestern cities. His insight and observations regarding the problems and challenges facing our urban centers will mean much to students of metropolitan America.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind, many current writers who deal with urban problems deal with what the "experts" think ought to be the case rather than with what really is the case. The latter is Mr. Pearce's starting point. In this series of articles he outlines clearly factual problems and crises facing cities throughout our country. In doing so he has made a notable contribution to the literature on urban affairs.

Under unanimous consent, I include part I in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUR EXPLODING CITIES—PART I

(By Richard E. Pearce)

(At its present rate of growth the San Francisco Bay area's population will double in just 20 years. This explosive growth will create immense public problems—and opportunities. The Examiner is confident our citizenry can master the problems and grasp the opportunities if kept well informed. To that end Richard E. Pearce, editor of the Examiner's editorial page, has carried out a month's study of seven major eastern and midwestern cities. Here is the first of his series of reports on "Our Exploding Cities."—THE EDITOR.)

To most easterners struggling in an endless quagmire of big city troubles, San Francisco and its environs are a sort of urban Eden.

As they see us in their moments of despair, we are a carefree people reclining on our lovely hilltops in the cool salt breeze, eating pomegranates and disposing of our urban problems, when on rare occasion a problem such a rapid transit intrudes, by blithely tossing another billion dollars into the pot.

They see themselves on the other hand as doomed like the cursed Cain to rebuild their cities in the sterile land of Nod on the east of Eden.

Surprise greeted me everywhere when I said I had come East to observe and learn. Whether it was the mayors of New York and Boston and Detroit, or political leaders and planners in Washington and Chicago, or industrialists and urban experts in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, the refrain went like this:

"What in heaven's name do you expect to learn here? You people have got it made out there in wonderful San Francisco. All your urban problems are pebbles compared to the millstones we're carrying."

They meant it in good part. Truly, the San Francisco Bay area's urban pangs are but pinpricks compared to some of theirs—although some of our pangs do threaten to grow into acute pains.

But in lesser part these easterners were simply being self-deprecatory. Underneath they are proud and with good reason, of the many things they have managed to do under great difficulties. They knew, and I was to discover, that a rich harvest was to be had from a close examination of their troubles and triumphs.

In some of these cities the harsh spur of a live-or-die choice has driven them to a creative urban renaissance. They are accomplishing magnificent changes from which the San Francisco Bay area has much to learn.

In most of these cities the eye and human spirit are offended by dreadful planning mistakes of the past and present—mistakes many of which are visible here in embryo, yet can still be largely avoided if we act with wisdom.

A shining example of the creative is the handsome new Penn Center, a complex of commercial towers in the heart of downtown Philadelphia. Beneath five full blocks of Penn Center extends an underground concourse, with sunken garden open to the sky, that ties commuter train traffic to the city's subway system and ties both intimately into the commercial life of the city.

This modern underground complex, with its warmly imaginative design and its natural sunlight slanting in from the sunken gardens, is as different from the dark and dismal undergrounds of New York and Boston as gay Paris is different from gloomy Moscow.

OTHER MISTAKES

This is something that San Franciscans should compel every member of their Board of Supervisors and every rapid transit director to see before our Market Street is disemboweled for its three-level rapid transit subway.

An example of the mistakes of other cities is the horrible public housing that New York and Chicago continue to build with the compulsiveness of a red ant colony. Invariably this housing shames the skyline in ugly, depressing clumps of institutionalized buildings that rise 15 to 20 stories.

Chicago has just completed in its south side Black Belt a new city-within-city of this stuff so vast that, it is grimly joked, a Negro child could be born there, live his life there and never find his way out except in a coffin.

NOT MUCH BETTER

These wretched places are indeed better than the slums they replace—but not much better. They are formalized, subsidized ghettos breeding as many social sicknesses as they cure. Surely there is a better way, and San Francisco must help find it.

In every city visited it was a delight to find that the downtown area is showing a tremendous vitality, as demonstrated by a boom in high rise commercial construction. Downtown land values continue to increase, providing a substantial portion of the tax base so essential to big city survival.

Once and for all we can dismiss the old notion that big city downtowns weer doomed to a slow death because their business houses would hemorrhage away to the suburbs.

CHANGING ROLE

Downtown's role is changing, however. Everywhere it is becoming more of a management center, less of a retail center. In most of the cities the downtown retail volume is either stationary or declining.

The reasons usually given for the retail decline are urban sprawl, the competition of regional shopping centers, and poor mass transit or too few freeways into the central city.

This oversimplifies. Central cities are being choked by what former Mayor Richardson Dilworth of Philadelphia called their "white noose" of indifferent suburbs.

An angry and eloquent Pittsburgher named Leland Hazard put it this way: "Here is a delusion—the delusion that the 129 municipalities which snuggle up to Pittsburgh for economic warmth, like little pigs to an old sow, suckling her milk, can prosper after the sow dies."

Additionally the central cities are suffering from the high cost and social strife involved in digesting and lifting up their Negro minorities.

In Washington, now an estimated 56 percent Negro and destined to reach 70 percent, whites wryly call it "the majority problem."

It is a fact of tremendous importance that the massive, 20-year migration to northern cities of rural southern Negroes with scant education—the Negroes hardest to absorb into the urban fabric—has dropped to a trickle.

Detroit, 30 percent Negro, actually has vacancies in its public housing. Demographers say the great migration is ending because few rural Negroes are left in the South.

PHYSICAL DECAY

Big cities are suffering, too, from the effects of long-ignored physical decay, poor political and civic leadership in past years, and the indifference to their needs of rural dominated State legislatures.

But most of all, it seems to me, they are suffering from failures to make their downtowns the fascinating, irresistibly compelling places these should be.

This can't be done with just the conventional urban attractions like a symphony, opera, and museums. Detroit and Pittsburgh have these, yet their downtowns turn into wastelands when the sun descends—factory towns that grew into big cities but not into true cities.

URBAN MAGNETISM

Urban magnetism requires these formal cultural institutions but also much, much more—an urbane citizenry that cares passionately underneath, hundreds of good little restaurants as well as the few famous ones that denude the purse, artists fighting city hall, offbeat night spots, fine architecture, turbulent nonconformists, the enrichment of European and oriental folkways, lovely homes down unexpected side streets, lovely people who devote joyous lives to the most unexpected things.

Of all the cities examined in this report only New York and San Francisco and to a lesser extent Chicago (yes, Chicago, still the most masculine and in ways the most venturesome of our cities) are maintaining and actually strengthening their roles as true cities.

PLANNING MISTAKES

All of the cities are engaged in a massive effort to restore their physical youth by purging themselves of slums and commercial blight with the tool of urban renewal.

Mistakes are inevitable in so huge an effort. But I found myself wishing, as I examined great and costly new residential projects like our Golden Gateway in city after city, that our urban experts did not have to make so many mistakes of underplanning and overplanning.

After the third or fourth such project in as many different cities I became unhappily aware that they were all basically identical with differences only in the trimmings—body by Fisher with external trim that make it any one of four GM cars.

LIKE ICE TRAYS

All of these renewal projects are a mix of high rise apartment building in the familiar modern design (grumped a Washington matron. "They look like vertical ice cube trays,"—hurrah for her), so-called maisonettes or townhouses that squat in identical rows, "garden courts" in which the hardest thing to find is the garden, and such an excess of that new fetish called open space that the human warmth of close contact is lost.

Why is this happening? Because city planners and architects, just like doctors and cost accountants and editors, read the same professional journals and pool the same ideas at annual conferences—and copy each other slavishly. This is fine for doctors and cost accountants. Planners and architects and editors shouldn't do it.

BUT NOT HOMES

It is bad enough that this monotony of basic design threatens to rob our cities of their diversity in cityscape. It is worse that these big projects all too often emerge as costly, cold, and impersonal places designed for people as so many ciphers—not human beings.

These are not homes. These are neatly labeled people boxes, every bit as bad in their way as the identical tract houses we all love to deride.

They are a mistake that San Francisco must at all costs avoid. The answer, here and everywhere, is not fewer planners but more, and more educated and imaginative planners.

A NEW ELITE

One of the most surprising discoveries I made is the fact that these people—the planners and the city and Federal urban renewal experts—are emerging as a new urban power elite equal in importance to the political power and the economic power structure in the reshaping of our cities.

They are not as visibly powerful as the mayor or the millionaire civic leader. But they guide decision because the politician and the millionaire must turn to them for technical know-how.

If they are so important—and they are—then let us make certain they are in good supply, well trained, and imaginative.

Toward a Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks there has been considerable discussion in the press, in the chambers of this building, everywhere around the country about the possibility for a limited test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

There are many who, in all good faith, believe that such a treaty is unworkable in this present age. Yet even they must admit that without such a treaty there might not be another age.

Certainly no one is proposing that we abandon or curtail our efforts to maintain our military forces as the most powerful and most effective in the world. But we must give heed to the warnings given to us by men of science of all beliefs that unchecked nuclear testing threatens our very civilization.

Typical, I think, of the thought given to the subject is an excellent editorial appearing in the Newark Evening News last Wednesday, July 24. As we concern ourselves with the results of our distinguished representative at the Moscow talks, Gov. W. Averell Harriman, let us consider this sober, careful analysis of the problem:

Of all the reservations that might be raised against a limited nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union, none seems to outweigh the preponderant desire of mankind to be relieved of the dangers of radioactive poisoning.

Fears are expressed that a treaty might limit our quest for an impenetrable antimissile defense, that we might be trapped into yielding our acknowledged leadership in atomic weaponry, or that the present nuclear powers could not keep other nations from testing and that, therefore, the ban would be futile.

These are legitimate considerations of course. All have been weighed carefully by technical experts in the military, scientific and political fields. The consensus, as gathered by President Kennedy, with whom final responsibility for the Nation's security rests, is that national self-interest resides on the side of a limited test ban.

If members of the military community possess convincing arguments to refute this, they have been remiss in not being more outspoken. In the absence of such evidence, advantage appears to weigh clearly in favor of a treaty that would halt tests in the air, in space, and under water.

Such a treaty would stop the major sources of radioactive contamination while world pressures could be exerted against newcomers to the nuclear club. Those concerned about the strontium content of milk or alarmed over the deformation of future generations may rejoice in that.

There also is the possibility of using this agreement to place relations between the Soviet Union and the West on a firmer, less volatile basis.

Whatever economic or political advantages free governments possess, they operate most effectively within the framework of a stable peace. For that reason we should not surrender to the purveyors of fear who believe we can only lose in any arrangement with the Soviet Union. To reduce tension is not to yield to communism.

Shall America Negotiate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during this period as we witness efforts of this Nation to negotiate with godless communism, I think we should carefully consider the steps we take, as there may be no turning back. The Reverend Robert C. Duhs, pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Vicksburg, Miss., recently delivered a sermon on the timely subject of negotiating with an atheistic power.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of Reverend Duhs' sermon and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SHALL AMERICA NEGOTIATE?

(By Rev. Robert H. Duhs)

(Judges 2: 1-5)

INTRODUCTION

The time has come for something to be said, from the Bible standpoint, on this business of negotiating between the professedly godly nation and one avowedely, boastful, atheistic, especially when such negotiations impinge upon moral values, involve the spiritual good of humanity and prevent, or delay, the "doing of God's will on earth."

Our day is cursed with a brand of summitry which, after bargaining and compromise, seals off huge pieces of the world from the blessings and benefits of Christianity. The question here is this: What nation has the moral prerogative to sell the spiritual birthright of another for a temporizing mess of pottage?

I. The national directive

First of all, one cardinal point must be thoroughly understood. It is this. The function of the Christian nation may be quite different from that of the Christian church.

The church's job includes the evangelizing of the world with the "Truth that makes men free," on a purely nonpolitical, nonmilitary level. "My kingdom is not of this world * * * else my servants would fight," said Jesus. The mission of the church is missions.

But there is also a national directive. It has often been a punitive one, including the waging of holy wars. Proof of this can be found in the record of God's own judgment falling upon a chosen people who were cursed only for, "keeping back the sword from blood." This failure is viewed, in Holy Writ, as a national crime and described as "neglecting the work of the Lord" (Jeremiah 48: 10).

The records show God as having sometimes used a nation "called by His name," to rise up and destroy a godless one when great issues were at stake.

On the other hand, there is the total absence of divine sanction on the matter of negotiation. Negotiate or demand; which? Moses, the leader of Israel, did not appear before the mighty Pharaoh, King of Egypt, to negotiate, but to demand "Let my people go" (Exodus 5: 1).

Pharoah called for negotiations. He expressed willingness, four times over, to give a little and take a little, each time giving a little more. He suggested first that the Israelites "go sacrifice in my land." This was unacceptable. Then, "go but don't go very far." This was flatly turned down. Next, "go ye that are men, leave your wives and children behind" (Exodus 8).

Moses was adamant. He had not come to parley. He refused to bargain away, or concede, one single trifle. His obdurate reply to the final suggestion, "Leave your flocks and herds," was classic. "Not a hoof shall be left behind."

II. God's men refused to dicker

Also there is the example of Nehemiah. The Samaritan leaders, realizing they could not overcome by open arms, resolved to employ deceit and stratagem. With amicable manner, they invited him to dicker at the conference table. Nehemiah turned down one invitation after the other. He refused on the grounds, "I am too busy. Why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?" (Nehemiah 6: 3).

First came ridicule. Then came threats. Then came compromise, the invitation to negotiate. But all offers were categorically rejected, and in the will of God, too.

God-fearing statesmen have always been at their best when refusing to bend. Patrick Henry's shining hour came when he shouted, "Give me liberty or give me death."

For a people called by God's name to negotiate with the godless, is to do so on a Samson-Delilah basis. It has never yet been known to "work together for good." There never has been, and never will be, a basis for negotiating good, or evil; right, or wrong; God or Satan.

But what of the consequences? Perhaps failure to try to negotiate would mean war. Refusing to bow down to tyranny, or to be diplomatic with dictators might result in annihilation. The Bible provides the answer.

The atheist, Rabshakeh, speaking in the name of King Sennacherib, appealed to the people of Israel, "Don't listen to your own King * * * make an agreement with me by a present * * * and come out to me." In return, they were promised "every man his own vine and fig tree." How like the Utopian promises made by his counterpart today. The alternative was threatened annihilation (2 Kings 18, 19).

But what was the reaction? Stone silence. The people held their peace, and answered him not a word; for the King's commandment was, "answer him not." Do not negotiate. Were they annihilated? Read 2 Kings and see the intervention of God Almighty and the miraculous victory of His people.

King Ahab, too, almost got entangled into committing his people by negotiation. Thirty-two kings joined in confederacy under Ben-hadad, King of Syria. They layed seige against Ahab and Israel. Their price of peace was the turning over of the nation's wealth and a large portion of its people; namely, the wives and children.

Ahab agreed momentarily to what would have been ruinous to the nation. He then listened to the wise counsel of the elders and, just in time, reneged on the bargain. Marshaling his own men, he caught Benhadad in the midst of a drunken orgy, and disposed of him and the problem forthwith, under God (I Kings 20). Even so he did not finish the task as verse 42 tells us, and his life was exchanged for the enemy.

III. A nation's moral duty

It becomes the duty of the statemen of every "nation whose God is the Lord," to recognize the futility of trying to do business with the Devil by negotiating with atheistic regimes whose sworn plans and purposes include the segmenting of the world, piece by piece, and sealing each one off from its spiritual heritage and from God.

The question is asked: What nation in this day can qualify as Godly? Let us remember that not all Israel were wholly sanctified, yet God called them "My people."

Likewise no one will contend that all individual Americans are Godly, but it can be said that godliness should be sanctioned in high places. Ungodliness is unconstitutional, and un-American—and unpatriotic. The Lord is really an integral part of America. He is woven right into the warp and woof of the Constitution of the United States. So we may affirm, even if our citizenry is not wholly Christian, our Nation may still properly and constitutionality be designated as a Godly nation. (That is, it could up to now. The recent rulings of the Supreme Court make one wonder, however.)

This then, completely disqualifies us from conniving with a nation whose god is anti-God. It becomes the duty of every nation built along Godly lines, resting on foundations of faith and recognizing the Lord as supreme, to assert her position as a "Nation Under God," and fulfill her moral obligations in the earth.

Accounts could be multiplied from both sacred and profane history of God's destructive dealings with godless realms and kingdoms. He frequently appointed the nation called by His Name to utterly destroy another in order to perpetuate His honor and glory in the earth. And, when there was failure to do so, God's judgment would fall upon His own.

An ancient example of this should serve as a warning to nations professing Him today, and still mingling with the heathen. One reference with suffice (Psalms 106:40–43: "They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the Lord commanded them therefore was the wrath of the Lord kindled against His people, and He gave them into the hand of the heathen."

This could happen again—to us. The national warnings of the phophets need to ring throughout the land today. Woe to them that go down to Egypt (Moscow) for help, looking not to the Lord.

The Egyptians (Communists) are but men, not God. Both supporter and supported shall collapse and crumble. Isaiah 31 can be put in this way: "Because you trust in the wise and the wile and guile, and lean on your own policy—bent on no plan of mine, weaving a treaty I never sanctioned. The strength of Pharaoh shall be your shame. Your strength lies in ceasing to make leagues; your strength lies in quiet faith."

Having rediscovered these truths, that evil cannot be negotiated, that a nation owned by God is forbidden to enter an immoral give-and-take agreement with an atheistic power, and that dire consequences can only come to those which do; let those nations claiming God as Lord stand up and strike whatever blows are necessary, not so much to make the world safe for democracy as to smash the barriers that wicked systems have erected to prevent the doing of God's will on earth. Let them stand up to their moral obligations—military too—and never fear the consequences of refusing to placate the godless.

Said the Psalmist, "Through God we shall do valiantly." Isaiah added, "You must be calm. Never quail, never be afraid." And Moses declared, "If thou shalt harken diligently—the Lord shall set thee on high above all nations. He shall make thee the head and not the tail. But if thou shalt not harken, cursed shalt thou be in country and town."

These words and warnings, of one-time leaders of Israel are the guide lines for Godly nations today. We must make God the Lord.

Hall of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a dramatic presentation of the blessings and benefits of the free enterprise system is being developed at the New York World's Fair. This dramatization of the principles of economic freedom will be housed in the Hall of Free Enterprise which will stand on International Plaza.

The idea of this presentation was inspired and guided by the American Economic Foundation with the support and cooperation of the National Small Business Association. The challenging educational task accepted by the Hall of Free Enterprise has won support from thought leaders all over the world. It is an international effort in the spirit of the World's Fair to promote peace through understanding.

The program has been endorsed by our three former Presidents, Herbert Hoover, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, who are acting as honorary chairmen of its International Advisory Council.

The Hall of Free Enterprise should become a great American showplace, displaying to the world how man realizes his spiritual fulfillment and reaps his material rewards in a free economy. The exhibits will be based on the Foundation's 20 years of research into the semantics and the teaching of simple economics. This $2 million project is being financed by voluntary contributions from individuals and corporations throughout America.

Cooperating with the American Economic Foundation in the presentation of the Hall of Free Enterprise, in addition to the National Small Business Association, are: Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Junior Achievement, Inc., National 4–H Clubs, Foundation for Economic Education, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, Christian Freedom Foundation, Wilkie Brothers Foundation, Canadian Economic Foundation, American Federation of Stockholders, and, Invest-in-America National Council, Inc.

The Hall of Free Enterprise will stand on the Avenue of Europe opposite Picturesque Belgium and Vatican City. It will be the largest single building on International Plaza. Its main entrance will lead directly to the "Pathway to Plenty" where the visitor will pass by a series of animated narrated dioramas. He will see dramatized the dual nature of economic man as a self-centered producer and an equally self-centered customer. Having traveled the Pathway, he will view the story of production and exchange in the Tree of Economic Life, the function of money, the Rights of Man. Before leaving, he will be able to have 120 of his economic questions answered simply by pushing buttons.

Since 1938 the American Economic Foundation has worked to develop a mass communication language of economics, internationally acceptable. Out of this research has come a statement of principle entitled the "10 Pillars of Economic Wisdom." These are the principles upon which the free enterprise system rests.

The "10 Pillars of Economic Wisdom" have been approved by the thought leaders from 50 States and from 35 foreign nations who make up the Hall of Free Enterprise International Advisory Council. It is fitting that the Hall of Free Enterprise, fronted by 10 stone pillars, should stand on International Plaza.

Since a common ground of economic understanding between freedom-loving people has been lacking far too long in our troubled world, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the "10 Pillars of Economic Wisdom" with the hope that they might serve to stimulate greater peace through economic understanding:

TEN PILLARS OF ECONOMIC WISDOM

1. Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere or go nowhere, nor can it be free: everything in our economic life has a source, a destination, and a cost that must be paid.

2. Government is never a source of goods. Everything produced is produced by the people, and everything that government gives to the people, it must first take from the people.

3. The only valuable money that government has to spend it that money taxed or borrowed out of the people's earnings. When government decides to spend more than it has thus received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air, through the banks, and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all money, savings, and insurance.

4. In our modern exchange economy, all payroll and employment come from customers, and the only worthwhile job security is customer security; if there are no customers, there can be no payroll and no jobs.

5. Customer security can be achieved by the worker only when the "boss" is allowed, by the worker, to do the things that win and hold customers. Job security, therefore, is a partnership problem that can be solved only in a spirit of understanding and cooperation.

6. Because wages are the principal cost of everything, widespread wage increases, without corresponding increases in production, simply increase the cost of everybody's living.

7. The greatest good for the greatest number means, in its material sense, the greatest goods for the greatest number which, in turn, means the greatest productivity per worker.

8. All productivity is based on three factors: (1) natural resources, whose form, place, and condition are changed by the expenditure of (2) human energy (both muscular and mental), with the aid of (3) tools.

9. Tools are the only one of these three factors that man can increase, and tools come into being in a free society only when there is a reward for the temporary self-denial that people must practice in order to channel part of their earnings away from purchases that produce immediate comfort and pleasure, and into new tools of production. Proper payment for the use of tools is essential to their creation.

10. The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—is the highest in a competitive society in which the economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than in a state-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere, and intelligent those people may be.

Our Exploding Cities—Part II and III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I include parts II and III of a series of articles by Richard E. Pearce, of the San Francisco Examiner, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In these two articles, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pearce offers his observations concerning the expanding use of mammoth office buildings and discusses the ill-abused words "metropolitan government."

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 1, 1963]

OUR EXPLODING CITIES—NEW YORK QUESTIONS

(By Richard E. Pearce)

The new Pan Am Building in New York City is truly enormous. It stands astride midtown Manhattan like some towering barrel-chested giant among a lesser race of giants. It is just plain breathtaking. It is also a question mark of major importance to all other large cities. That particularly includes San Francisco.

This great, octagonal building, the world's largest commercial structure, has risen at precisely the most congested pinpoint in the most congested sector of the Nation's most congested city.

That pinpoint is Grand Central Station in midtown Manhattan, the major center of Manhattan's underground transportation network, the heart of an area where street traffic is so impossible that for many years walking has been quicker.

There, utilizing air rights above the tracks where Grand Central's trains come to rest, this $100 million structure has been planted on stilts to thrust for 69 stories into the sky, and to overpower with its bulk the scores of other great commercial towers and spires and slabs hard by it.

It is so vast that it houses 25,000 workers. It is so big that the telephone company had to give it an exchange all its own, then lease two floors just to hold the telephone equipment. It is so immense that its battery of escalators emptying into Grand Central Station had to be made reversible for the rush hours.

INCREDIBLE

The giants of Greek mythology picked up Mount Pelion and piled it on top of Mount Ossa to reach lofty Olympus. That feat was hardly more incredible than this piling of supercongestion upon supercongestion. And the process goes on and on. Today six more big buildings are under construction within three blocks of the Pan Am Building, one of them 50 stories high and another 41.

Why? What forces are at work to bring about this superconcentration of the crush of downtown humanity? And, most pertinently, is this a preview for other large American cities of the shape of their downtowns when the national population has doubled and trebled?

OPINIONS

These were the questions I put to professional planners and public leaders in New York and the half dozen other cities I studied. Their opinions were far from unanimous. Some called the Pan Am Building an isolated phenomenon and a mistake from a planning standpoint.

Most planners expressed the view that New York was not typical of American cities; there can only be one New York, as there can only be one Washington, and that our other big city downtowns will not develop in this superconcentrated fashion.

A handful of planners and others regard the Pan Am Building as the most striking current evidence that a profound centripetal force continues to work on our metropolitan downtowns, causing them to swirl inward and upward in an ever increasing, ever more compact concentration of skyscrapers.

LIMITATION

This is the view I share, for I saw evidences of the force at work in every other large city I examined except Washington. That city has a 13-story height limitation and so its downtown is growing horizontally, much to the dismay of some of its leaders.

The centripetal force is clearly visible in San Francisco. Surely downtown Montgomery Street is our most congested area. And it is there, at the Montgomery-Market-Post gore, that the Dillingham interests are preparing to put up the city's tallest structure, the 42-story Wells Fargo Bank Building. Note, moreover, that most of San Francisco's postwar construction of high rise commercial buildings has been concentrated within a short walk of this point—the Equitable Life, the Crown-Zellerbach, the John Hancock, the International, the Bethlehem Steel, the Hartford and the projected Standard Oil and many others of lesser size.

Again, what is the nature of this force that swirls inward and upward in defiance of congestion? Most answers given me were prosaic but plausible. Usually this point of business concentration is also the focal point of mass transportation. Too, the world of business likes to operate cheek-by-jowl, where it's only an elevator ride or a short walk to the other fellow's office and where plenty of good restaurants are close by for luncheon conferences.

(If one wants to get psychological about it, and briefly I do, our species obeys an instinct to huddle together and draws strength from the huddling. We are like logs in a fireplace. You can't make a decent fire with two. Three will do it but four or five are better. A whole armful of logs crowded upright together make a fine blaze of business activity.)

This whole subject posed by the Pan Am building is important not only because our planners and politicians need to know the shape and nature of our future downtowns, but also because this determines too the kind of citizens the city will require.

NEED FOR SKILL

If as the evidence suggests downtown is destined to become ever more a headquarters place for management, finance, etc., it will require more and more skilled and educated people in all kinds of pursuits. It will have less and less need for the uneducated and unskilled in the bottom economic strata.

Yet paradoxically at this very time the cities find themselves with an immense supply of the uneducated and the unskilled because of the rural Negro migration from the South.

Mass migrations of the unskilled into our big cities is an old story. These people were badly needed by the cities in those earlier times when the assembly line was still a vague notion and automation was not yet dreamed of. The immigrant Irish, the Italians, the Poles, and others were the brawn—the cheap labor, to put it plainly—that built our cities while fighting their way up into a higher economic class. What is there for the hands of the unskilled Negro to do in this era of Pan Am buildings?

While the big city downtowns swirl inward and upward, an opposite or centrifugal force continues at work spinning people and some kinds of businesses farther and farther outward in vast, mushy chunks of urban sprawl.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 2, 1963]

OUR EXPLODING CITIES—PART III

(By Richard E. Pearce)

The term "metro," used as an abbreviation for metropolitan government, has become a dirty word almost everywhere.

This is as it should be, and not because a few of the more absurd right-wing radicals smell in metro a Communist plot, either.

Metropolitan government, meaning a unified government that rules the entire metropolitan region, simply cannot be made to work.

All those citizens who have been sincerely advocating metropolitan government as one of the necessary cures for the ills of our expanding metropolises (and this includes me) should forget it.

Instead they should work for a limited number of regional instruments to govern and guide those matters truly regional in nature, and leave all else to the State and local government.

SEVEN CITY VISITS

This is a conviction I bring back after studying the subject in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Washington and Pittsburgh.

Metro won't work for several reasons. The most obvious is that the physical boundaries of a metropolitan government could never be extended rapidly enough to keep pace with the outward sprawl of the metropolitan area.

Dr. William Wheaton, director of the Institute for Urban Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, predicted to me that the Nation's metropolitan areas, while doubling in population in the next generation, will quadruple in physical size. If he is correct—and numerous other studies support his view—a boundary drawn today for a metropolitan government would be outdated 5 years from now. But once that boundary were fixed, just try to change it.

True metropolitan government has long been out of the question for most eastern urban areas because their metropolitan regions spill over into adjoining States.

OK IN 1898

New York City created a true metropolitan government in 1898 when, with a metropolitan population of less than 3 million souls, its five counties joined to become boroughs of a central city government. Today the New York Metropolitan Region embraces 22 counties in the three States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. The region has a population of 16.1 million. Less than half (7.7 million) live in the central city that constituted the metropolitan region of 1898.

For 40 years the region has had a two-State (New York-New Jersey) regional instrument, the Port of New York Authority, to operate its harbor, airports, bridges, tunnels, and truck and bus terminals. Today, because of the Port Authority's reluctance to take on the problem of the commuter railroads, a new tri-State agency is being formed to deal with rails.

But even this tri-State instrument isn't large enough. The metropolitan regions along the Atlantic Seaboard are gradually coalescing into a supermetropolis, called megalopolis, stretching from Boston to Washington. Last month President Kennedy created a special commission to deal with the megalopolis' transportation problem.

HARVARD STUDY

Metropolitan government is also made impossible by the frightening pattern of metropolitical growth. Last year a Harvard group studied this pattern for the Regional Plan Association of New York. The Harvard study staff concluded that, if existing patterns of zoning persist, every bit of land within 50 miles of Times Square will be built up by 1985.

But outside of the urban centers this growth will be a spongy mess aptly dubbed "spread city" by the Harvard report: "It is not a true city because it lacks centers, nor a suburb because it is not a satellite of any city, nor is it truly rural because it is loosely covered with houses and urban facilities."

In other words, a thing with neither head nor heart. A costly thing that the central city and the genuine suburbs should want nothing to do with—except to prevent it if possible.

No doubt the impossibility of coping with spread city is one of the reasons Mayor Wagner of New York is content to pursue a course of voluntary cooperation with the other cities and counties of the metropolitan region.

New York has only one vote on this body, the Metropolitan Regional Council, but Wagner told me the vote disparity is a small price to pay for cooperation. The voluntary way, he asserts, is working.

From the air, evidences of this spread city are evident in the metropolitan regions not only of New York but Boston, Philadelphia and Washington. It is a phenomenon beyond the capacity of the central and suburban cities to control. Only State legislatures and Governors can deal with it.

Evidences of spread city are apparent in the San Francisco Bay region too, though of course not to the extent it has developed in southern California. One of its courses is the fact that its low population density makes support of mass transit impossible.

Though the eastern cities I studied have abandoned any thought of metropolitan government, it cannot be said they have yet developed successfully the alternatives of limited regional instruments.

The Boston area, for example, has no less than five regional authorities and commissions. But too often they overlap, backbite, struggle in the morass of Massachusetts politics, and have too much or too little power.

BOSTON WAKES UP

This, however, hasn't kept Boston, which slumbered through the last half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, from leaping with amazing vigor into the space age. This is attributed to the big new complex of space industries that have clustered around Boston because of the great universities there.

Not unimportant in this renaissance have been a tough, honest mayor, John Collins, and his equally tough-minded development administrator, Edward Logue.

It was Logue who told me a metropolitan region should have only two regional instruments of government. One would control all forms of transportation—commute trains, subways, rapid transit systems, freeways, toll facilities, harbors, and airports—and would have a planning arm. The other would-be an open spaces agency, charged with preserving open spaces and with operating regional parks and recreational facilities.

An ideal, perhaps, but a sensible one.

Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding article which has been printed in the August issue of Reader's Digest. It is entitled "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies" and was written by Mr. Charles Stevenson. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP SENDING U.S. DOLLARS TO AID OUR ENEMIES

(By Charles Stevenson)

Once more the annual battle over foreign-aid appropriations is stirring passions in Congress. Amid the strongest criticisms yet from taxpayers, amid repeated allegations of waste and misuse of funds, our legislators are being prodded to cut deeply into the $4.5 billion which President Kennedy insists they must vote to see the Agency for International Development (AID) through another year.

But it's time to face up to an important fact: Simply reducing appropriations won't cure what's wrong with an aid organization which is in more trouble than ever after going through 10 different administrators, 5 major reorganizations and more than 100 billion tax dollars.

"The United States has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid," says Dr. Hans Morgenthau, who heads Chicago University's renowned Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy. "None of our objectives has been achieved," says Eugene Black, recently retired president of the World Bank. "Soviet influence remains at high tide. Our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction."

Chairman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of the House Appropriations Committee, who is closest to the woe, sums it all up after a thousand hours of official hearings. "The trouble," says PASSMAN, "is that too much of our foreign aid has deteriorated into a subsidy of Communist takeover. And the spenders are so power-hungry, they so withhold the truth from the public, they are so beyond the normal controls of Congress, that there seems no way to confine assistance to helping people help themselves unless we kill the entire operation and begin over."

The record carries its own proof. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, looked at the Government's books to discover that even in the face of yearly budget trimming by Congress, the authorities haven't been able to spend as much aid money as they've been given in any year since 1958. Yet, crying poverty, they quietly accumulate funds from several different appropriations, of which the current request represents just a part. Then they earmark this money as "obligations" for future spending. Senator BYRD has discovered that the unexpended balances from previous appropriations have soared from $11,787 million in 1958 to $21,173 million in June 1963—enough to keep the aid administrators going for many more years even if they never get another cent from Congress.

In dishing out aid money, the spenders give slight heed to Congress or even to their own handpicked advisers An example is Gen. Lucius D. Clay's pro-aid group which President Kennedy named to advise about reforms. The Committee reported to the President: "The United States should not aid a foreign government in establishing government-owned industries which compete with existing private endeavors. We should not extend aid which is inconsistent with our beliefs, democratic tradition, and knowledge of economic organization and consequences."

The Committee opposed any such ideas as having the United States advance $512 million to start building a $1,883,766,000 Government-owned steel plant for India. We already are handing over up to $775 million a year—some $3 billion since 1960—to keep India's socialistic experimentations afloat, while that country's healthy private enterprises mark time waiting for a bureaucracy to grant permits for their every expansion scheme. As for this steel plant, 150 technicians, appointed by AID to investigate in India, reported back that they had been unable to prove that the venture is feasible.

Nevertheless, President Kennedy announced his support for the Government plant; retired Ambassador to India Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith had said that "by this procedure we will not arouse suspicions that we seek to mold Indian economic policy to our own image."

Even more disturbing is our aiders' persistence in siphoning subsidies into Poland and Yugoslavia.

"When we help a Communist form of government we are undermining the security of our own country," Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, of Ohio, protested last year on the Senate floor. Others agreed. Over administration objections, Congress last August forbade sending more than food to any country that is part of the Communist conspiracy.

Yet, 3 months later, we extended Marshal Tito $136,700,000 in aid—just about as much as he received in the previous year. "Oh, but most of this was food for peace," I was told at AID headquarters in Washington. "And it wasn't assistance. Tito paid for that food."

The trouble is, such "purchases" lack reality. For example, over the past 9 years, we've given Tito cotton, oils, and wheat, which cost us $901 million. Most of this is not U.S.-owned surplus: a broker buys the grain the Yugoslavs want on the Chicago exchange when they want it and we pay for it. We then pay the freight to seaboard. There we pay for storage. Then in most cases we pay shipping costs to Yugoslavia, where Tito markets the wheat for his own government's profit.

Tito "pays" the United States only in part, and then by crediting to us some Yugoslav paper dinars. We can't take these dinars out of Yugoslavia. By agreement we pass 90 percent of the money back to the Yugoslav Government, either as gifts or as "loans" repayable only in more blocked dinars, for Tito to spend on developing his country's airports, highways, mines, paper mills, railroads, and canals. We may use the remaining 10 percent to maintain our Belgrade embassy. About all we get out of the arrangement is the privilege of keeping a U.S. Information Agency reading room in Belgrade.

Tito tells his people—and we don't contradict him—that he receives nothing free

from the United States; he pays for what he gets. As our bounty has flowed in to bolster his sagging economy, he has assailed the United States for seeking international controls of atomic blasting when Russia is in a testing mood. He has supported Russia's policy on Berlin. He votes with the communist bloc at the U.N. He spearheads anti-Western movements among African and Asian nations.

It's much the same with Poland. We sent Ambassador Jacob Beam to woo Poland away from Moscow with gifts. And although Beam reported back to the State Department that the Poles had perhaps fallen into the habit of considering our economic cooperation as a matter of right and returned here almost 2 years ago to admit failure, our Government has refused to stop funneling aid to Polish communism. It has answered Congress' growing anger at this policy by supplementing $61 million in cash aid in the last 7 years with $672 million worth of agricultural surplus commodities, $81 million of it in the last 12 months.

Our diplomats in Warsaw say that except for our food there would be Polish breadlines. Indeed, not only has food for peace prevented a possible explosion in Poland; a House committee has now found that receipt of our agricultural commodities by Poland allows it to export food to other bloc members, thus helping the Soviet conspiracy to solve its most awesome internal problem. What we do has so eased the pressures on Russia to feed its dependent states that it is able now to use its own wheat to spearhead its infiltration of Latin America.

Meanwhile, our help to the Poles has enabled them to send $13 million worth of aid to Castro's Cuba and $15 million worth to North Vietnam, reportedly including arms useful in guerrilla operations against our own soldiers in South Vietnam. It enables the Poles to aid East Germany, whose economy is in a shambles because its largest industries have been meshed with Soviet and Czech endeavors in turning out rockets and nuclear arms. In last year's Berlin crisis Poland showed her gratitude to us by mobilizing her armed forces to support Soviet threats.

In country after country, the record shows, our officials have encouraged aid which helps communism more than it helps us. A report by the House Committee on Government Operations tells how "the U.S. team in Cambodia made a deliberate determination to finance and construct two radio stations which when completed became an adjunct to a Chinese Communist gift to the Cambodian Government of a radio broadcasting complex." When a subordinate passed along his discovery that U.S.-financed materials were being used in the construction of a Russian-built hospital in Cambodia, the report states, an AID superior caused the man to be transferred, given an unsatisfactory efficiency rating, and utimately fired.

In June 1959 the Government of Burma wanted help from the United States to build a road linking Rangoon with Mandalay. Engineering firms sent to investigate reported back that the kind of road the Burmese wanted was economically unfeasible. No agreement was reached.

Then, in March 1962, Gen. Ne Win took over Burma, established a military dictatorship and jailed his predecessor.

He kicked out the Ford Foundation and the Asia Foundation because they represented private enterprise, in spite of the fact that they were spending $12 million of private funds on the most effective agricultural and educational development programs in the country. He is nationalizing the economy. He denounced capitalism as "the pernicious economic system in which man exploits man." He canceled extensive English-teaching programs which had been sponsored for years by Americans and British in a land where English was the language of educated people. He prohibited Burmese from coming to America as Fulbright scholars. He has also invited in Chinese Communist technicians, management, and assistance projects.

Now, with Ne Win's transition complete, we are giving him military equipment at a rate of $10 million a year, although this doesn't show on any AID books. And last spring, on top of another $21 million of assorted assistance for 1963, AID announced it was going ahead with the first 42-mile leg of the Rangoon-Mandalay highway, although no agreement has yet been reached on the feasibility of the rest of the road.

Congressional alarm is also mounting over assistance given to countries which expropriate private property. Last summer our legislators stipulated by law that assistance must be cut off from any country which seized U.S. investments. But by late fall so little was being done that Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER of Iowa charged that "specific instructions had gone out from the State Department to our representatives abroad to soft-pedal this amendment." Not until 6 months after enactment of the amendment (and a week beyond the congressional deadline for required enforcement) did the State Department finally get around to suspending AID projects that cost us $25 million in Ceylon, which had seized American oil properties without compensation so they could be used to market Soviet petroleum products. Food for Peace shipments to Ceylon still continue—with most "payments" returned to the Ceylon Government to be used for further economic development.

The United States solved the problem of Brazil's seizure of an American-owned telephone company by dangling the prospect of more millions if she paid for the property. Then with the new aid flowing in—$398 million over the next 21 months—Brazil has been able not only to pay for the seized properties but to nationalize still more, and enter into a trade pact with Russia.

Congress is on record as opposing aid to countries which "live on our aid while they channel their own resources into arms from Russia." Yet this is exactly what is happening in the case of the United Arab Republic. Ever since 1956, Col. Gamel Abdel Nasser has been mortgaging the better part of his exportable cotton crop to the Soviet bloc as payment for more than $100 million a year in arms and other assistance. The purpose: an incessant war of subversion and violence aimed at taking over the 90 million inhabitants of the Arab world and alienating them from the United States and the "imperialist" Western nations. He has confiscated Egypt's industries and taken over virtually everything in the country which represented foreign private investment.

What have we done about this? Why, we have continued to pay Nasser every year. In the last 5 years our aid has doubled, tripled, quadrupled. The effect has been to subsidize Nasser, to keep his economy going so he could hand over some of the chief resources of his country to the Soviets for their arms and help in agitating against us and independent Arabs.

Our 1962 direct economic assistance to Nasser—$224,100,000—outdistanced anything we did for anyone in the world except India, Pakistan and, because of earthquake reconstruction, Chile. We treated him better than Turkey, our desperately poor fighting partner. We gave him far more than we gave all the friendly Arab nations put together. In addition, in just the first 6 months of fiscal 1963, we agreed to have him "buy" another $546 million worth of Food for Peace commodities with Egyptian currency. This is more than anybody else in the world received, and it brings Nasser's Food for Peace assistance alone to more than $1 billion.

These commodities are sold on the Egyptian market for currency, which when paid to us is mostly turned back to Nasser to meet his budget deficits and build more state-owned factories. Our aid enabled him in a single gesture to distribute a $43-million dividend to 1,500,000 factory and government workers as "profit shares and bonuses" so as to convince the people that his state ownership did indeed provide them with more prosperity than imperialistic private investments from abroad.

The Egyptian people know nothing about our assistance. "Assistance? What assistance?" Nasser says. "I pay you for what I get, don't I?"

Last year, when news of our latest aid filtered around the Mediterranean, other Arab leaders reacted with such apoplectic amazement that our ambassador to the UAR, John S. Badeau, had to race around by plane in an attempt to placate them.

"But we are your allies," they said. "You are underwriting the Egyptian-Soviet conquest of the Middle East. Now Nasser will have more resources than ever with which to undermine us."

Our officials said such fears were groundless. Yet within weeks the first of 40 new MIG fighting planes arrived in Egypt from Russia. Our aid enabled Nasser to go into a Yemen war with 18,000 troops, then 20,000, then 28,000 by daily air-lifts in Russian-supplied planes. Our aid means funds which enabled his Voice of Cairo radio to goad the officers, soldiers, and students of Saudi Arabia and Jordan to overthrow Saud and Hussein, the chiefs of those two countries. "How long are you going to tolerate them?" the Voice shouts. "Overthrow these lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the arch enemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, the Jews."

"These are the words that we are subsidizing," Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska recently told the Senate. "What kind of policy is that for the people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?"

But still the aid flows in.

Small wonder then that Algeria's Premier Ahmed Ben Bella, whom Nasser eggs on, can fly directly to Cuba, after talking aid terms in Washington, and there demand that we abandon our Guantanamo Naval Base. Small wonder that on arriving home Ben Bella can say: "Algeria will have a socialism a la Castro. No power in the world can prevent our country's advance on this road." Small wonder, indeed. Our aid to him—$91,800,000 in the past year—makes it possible.

The same sort of appeasement adds to our woe in Indonesia, the world's fifth most populous nation. We were responsible for the formation of Indonesia; after World War II we threatened to deny Marshall plan aid to the Dutch unless they gave up their control of these East Indies. But Indonesia's President Sukarno also coveted grandeur and Dutch West New Guinea, a primitive land of Negroid Papuans, 1,800 miles from his own capital but adjacent to Australian territory. So while he has neglected his economy and poured the wealth from his tin mines and rubber plantations into Russia to pay for Mig fighters, long-range bombers, guided missiles and submarines, we have pumped $787,300,000 in gifts into the country. We've trained doctors and dentists for a population which suffers for lack of medical care, only to see Sukarno draft them so he could have a standing army of 250,000. When his emerging industries slowed to 20 percent of normal production for want of exchange with which to import repair and maintenance parts, we advanced emergency millions so he could buy these parts from abroad.

"Sukarno's no Communist," I was told both in Washington and Djakarta. "He only wants to bring West New Guinea into Indonesia, and he must. Otherwise his revolution is incomplete."

Have our efforts strengthened our position in Asia? Already dispatches indicate worries that Sukarno is setting up in West New Guinea the same sort of outpost against adjacent Australian-held territories as Castro has established against us in Cuba. He has threatened to use his military force, the most potent in southeast Asia, if independent Malaya, Singapore, and the British dependencies on British Borneo carry out their announced plan to join in an anti-Communist federation come August 31. In the presence of the titular head of the Chinese Communist state, he has signed a manifesto calling for enforcement of Red China's major policies in Asia; the Chinese in return have vowed to support Sukarno's cause against Malaysia.

Because of this strange compulsion of our officials to pour fuel on burning problems, instead of trying to put out the fires, we have exported more dollars than our private enterprise can bring back from oversea investments and trade. Faith in our currency has declined due to our increasing deficits at home and abroad. Our gold supply has dwindled dangerously.

This is admitted by our Commerce Department. Our Government is so worried that it has sent ambassadors literally begging past and present foreign beneficiaries of our charity to help us out—to at least let us sell to American tourists there a small part of the currency we have acquired in exchange for food for peace. But what was the answer? No. And this from Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

Seking some way to stop the run on gold, the Commerce Department is now discouraging European investments by American private enterprise. "We have put up a caution light on investment in the developed countries," says Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, "because of our balance-of-payment difficulties."

Yet the administration in the face of all this wants a bigger aid appropriation this year; and Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that anyone who tries to cut the requested amounts will be cooperating with Communist global strategy.

Is it not time to ask ourselves why?

Is it not time to consider the advice of Chairman George Champion of New York's Chase Manhattan Bank? He would have us and the other friendly capital-supplying nations coordinate our aid through an independent banking-type organization staffed by professionals from the world of banking and private enterprise. Such a multinational approach has also been proposed by experts like retired World Bank President Black and Herbert V. Prochnow, former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

The means for getting such an operation underway already exists within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which most Western nations and Japan participate. All that's needed is for Congress not to be content with cutting aid appropriations, but to order a phaseout of our current aid operations and establish a special joint congressional committee which can at last start working toward a new order.

International Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD two newspaper articles dealing with the necessary interpretation of foreign policy strategy of the international Communist conspiracy. First, one from the July 23 edition of the Tulsa Post, which dramatizes the tragic story of our recent betrayal of the cause of Hungary in the U.N. Second, from the July 23 edition of the Denver Post which points up the continuing world revolt financed by the Soviet Union. I believe these editorials deserve close scrutiny:

[From the Tulsa Post, July 23, 1963]

PRICE OF A DEAL—IF WEST-MOSCOW PACT IS APPROVED, WHAT OF HUNGARIANS?

(By John Chamberlain)

He is a short man, a native of Hungary, and he talks slowly and carefully in a precise, though oddly accented English. His eyebrows are strong and heavy, giving an impression of hidden physical reserve. On his left arm is a tattooed identification mark, the ineradicable reminder of his compulsory registration in a Nazi concentration camp.

Dr. Bela Fabian, head of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, knows what it is like to be stuck away behind barbed wire or in a remote place from which attempted escape is usually a form of suicide.

As a survivor of the Nazi hell of Auschwitz, Dr. Fabian considers that a duty has been laid upon him to spend the rest of his life working to save political prisoners who are still being held incommunicado. There are plenty of them today, in Soviet Russia and in China—and they include among them some 63,000 Hungarian compatriots of Dr. Fabian who were carted away to Kazakstan in Soviet Asia after Khrushchev's armored divisions had finished the business of smashing the 1958 Hungarian revolution.

Now the talk is that some nonaggression agreement might be worked out between the NATO nations and the Soviet satellite nations of Eastern Europe. Khrushchev, in suggesting a pact, has been showing his pleasant side. As the poet, Robert Frost, said, Khrushchev has the ability to seem a "genial ruffian." Such ruffians are in marked contrast to Stalin, who was generally dour and implacable and whose humor was heavily sarcastic.

A genial Khrushchev intent on playing the role of Dr. Jekyll may be better for the Western World than the shouting, shoe-banging Bolshevik version of Mr. Hyde. But Dr. Bela Fabian sees it somewhat differently. He is afraid that, in a period of amity between the West and Moscow, the 63,000 Hungarian prisoners will be forgotten.

The U.N. has not been able to do anything for the Hungarian prisoners in Kazakstan. There has been no amnesty, no Bay of Pigs type of ransom.

What should be done if the prisoners are not to be sacrificed to amity between West and East? Dr. Fabian has one last wild hope; let an exchange of Hungarians from Kazakstan be put high on the agenda as one price of any deal with Khrushchev on Eastern Europe. There should be other prices, too, but that is another subject.

[From the Denver Post, July 23, 1963]

SOVIETS STILL PROMOTE REVOLUTIONS

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Recently it was reported that a top-level paper is being circulated by some administration planners in Washington calling for a new policy toward the Soviet Union "to arrange for a period of relative tranquility between Russia and the United States," and also "to work out over the longer run tacit understandings with the Soviet as to the ground rules governing our competition throughout the world."

While this Washington policy paper was being circulated, the Soviet Union set forth its ideas concerning these ground rules. They are in the July 1963 open letter from the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee to all party organizations and Russian Communists.

Here are the seven basic Soviet ground rules to which we would have to consent for such a tacit understanding as some administration policymakers in Washington are seeking:

1. "Expressing the line of our party, Comrade Nikita Khrushchev said: 'There will be wars of liberation as long as imperialism (advanced capitalism) exists, as long as colonialism exists. These are revolutionary wars; such wars are not only permissible but even unavoidable. * * * Therefore it is only through struggle, including armed struggle, that the peoples can win their freedom and independence.' The Soviet Union is rendering broadest support to the national liberation movement."

2. "To insure peace means to contribute most effectively to the consolidation of the Socialist system and * * * to the growth of its influence * * * on the world revolutionary process."

3. "Revolutionary Cuba is living in peace and building socialism under the guidance of its United Party of the Socialist Revolution and the leader of the Cuban people, Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz."

4. "The principle of peaceful coexistence, naturally, can in no way be applied to the relations between the antagonistic classes inside the capitalist states; it is impermissible to apply it to the struggle of the working class for its class interests against the bourgeoisie (middle classes)."

5. "Every knowledgeable Marxist-Leninist knows that to advance a slogan for an armed uprising, when there is no revolutionary situation in the country, means to doom the working class to defeat. * * * Who determines the intensity of internal contradictions, the existence of a revolutionary situation, chooses the moment for the uprising? This can be done only by the working class of each given country, its vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist party."

6. "Naturally, no matter what forms are used for the transition from capitalism to socialism, such a transition is possible only by means of a Socialist revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat in various forms."

7. "The Socialist revolution takes place as a result of the internal development of class struggle in every county, and its forms and ways are determined by the concrete conditions of each given nation. The general regularity lies in the revolutionary overthrow of capital and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. * * * It is the task of the working class and the Communist parties to make maximum use of the now available opportunities for the peaceful road of a Socialist revolution, not connected with a civil war, and to be ready for the nonpeaceful method, for the armed suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie."

The foregoing seven Soviet Communist ground rules are those on which some appeasers in Washington are ready to come to tacit agreement. For us to go along with such Red ground rules would mean for us to consent to eventual establishment of a world Communist proletarian dictatorship.

Our Exploding Cities—Parts IV and V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the fourth and fifth parts of an informative

series by Mr. Richard E. Pearce, of the San Francisco Examiner, are appended hereto.

These two articles contain valuable insight into two major problems that face all our Nation's cities—the expansion of our freeway and rapid transit systems and urban renewal.

OUR EXPLODING CITIES—PART IV

(By Richard E. Pearce)

Everywhere I went in the East, public leaders pumped me with eager questions about the bay area's billion-dollar rapid transit program.

Many saw in it the shape of the future—destined, if done right and if truly rapid, to be the greatest achievement of any metropolitan area in decades.

All admired the wisdom and courage of the electorate here in voting to dig deep into its wallet for rapid transit.

But all were genuinely puzzled. They viewed public attitudes here in terms of the attitudes of their own electorates. And so they wondered: Upon what new meat doth this California people feed, that it should be willing to take such a forward and costly step?

RAZZLE DAZZLE

Replying, I sometimes gave them a bit of the old razzle dazzle about the youthful and venturesome California spirit. This was seldom appreciated. The loss of so many of their ablest and most venturesome young people to other States, and particularly to California, is an increasingly painful subject in many Eastern States.

The Pittsburgh area, for example, was alarmed to discover from the 1960 census that during the previous decade its loss of population in the 20-to-29 age bracket was four times the national average. Where did they go? Look around you.

LESS OPPOSITION

More seriously, I ventured the reply that the affirmative rapid transit vote resulted in good part from a conviction that this was the only way to keep future freeways to a minimum.

This explanation was somewhat more acceptable. But not entirely so. With a few exceptions freeways have not encountered in the East the rising public opposition so familiar here. But efforts to modernize their mass transit systems have too often been met with the effective opposition of lethargy, fiscal poverty, and internal rivalries.

Result: Great new radials and girdles of freeways are slashing through and around most of the big eastern cities, altering them even more than urban renewal.

(The term "freeway" is used here to include all the terms one encounters in the East: expressway, parkway, turnpike, throughway.)

NEED OTHERS

Clearly the big cities had to have the freeways now built or building, and need the others they plan to build.

Chicagoans agree they are benefiting immensely from their fine freeways radiating from downtown like spokes from a hub. The same is clearly true of the new freeways in Detroit, Boston, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh.

Aside from their traffic function, the freeways also serve as a major renewal tool because they wipe out slum and blight. Too, they "ventilate" the city, to use a favorite term of Edward J. Logue, the tough-fibered development administrator of Boston.

HANDSOME FREEWAYS

But while Chicago spends hundreds of millions on new freeways, it can't find the money to tear down the Loop, that ancient, elevated transit noose around the throat of downtown. While Boston drives a second major freeway into the heart of its downtown, local jealousies and rivalries keep it from pushing its mass transit system farther into the suburbs.

Pittsburgh is building strikingly handsome freeways that will enhance urban values, but hasn't yet been able to unify the 30 separate transit systems of its Allegheny County (success may come soon). Washington is locked in a civic struggle on the issue of freeways vs. rapid transit.

Even the New York City metropolitan area is spending $2 billion on an expanded freeway network while the commuter railroads plead for relief because of declining traffic and the subway system cries out for faster modernization.

Folly? Not wholly. The new freeways are not folly. The folly lies in failure to put equal sums into better mass transit and future rapid transit.

FREEWAY DOLLARS

The underlying reason: The freeway dollar is easy to come by, the mass transit dollar is hard to come by, and the mass rapid transit dollar is very hard to come by.

Little wonder public leaders in the East want the secret of the meat that gave our voters such daring and foresight.

I have gone into the transit difficulties of these other cities at some length because it seems to me they contain a warning: The people of the San Francisco Bay area cannot smugly conclude that, having authorized a three-county rapid transit system, their task is done.

While the populations of these eastern metropolitan areas will on the average double in 35 years, ours will double in a scant 20 years if present growth rates persist—and they probably will.

TIME NEEDED

No metropolitan area is rich in the precious commodity of time needed to make major public decisions accommodating this growth. We are especially poor in time. And time works against us in another way. Each passing year deepens the grooves of habit, and multiplies the vested interests both public and private, that have made so difficult the transit problems of eastern cities.

Even as the Bay area begins to build its bob-tailed three-county system, it must contine to strive for a genuine regional system. This system must not only reach deeper into the existing three counties, it must send branches down the peninsula and north through Marin.

Somehow we must find and feed upon a still stronger meat.

EXPLODING CITIES—PART V

(By Richard E. Pearce)

URBAN RENEWAL—ITS ACHIEVEMENTS, PROBLEMS

Some Negro leaders assail urban renewal here and elsewhere, declaring bitterly it should be called Negro removal. Their bitterness is understandable. They are wrong, however, to believe that racial prejudice is the guiding impulse behind renewal.

One cannot observe the magnificent rebirth taking place in decayed older cities like Boston, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh without believing completely in both the wisdom of and necessity for renewal.

Compared with the renewal effort in these and others of the older eastern cities (half the population of Boston lives within renewal areas) the programs of San Francisco, Oakland and other bay area cities are modest. The need is modest, too.

Cities like Boston and Philadelphia must have renewal to save themselves from utter physical stagnation.

IT'S A MUST

Cities like San Francisco and Oakland must have renewal—among other tools—to make certain they never sink into the physical state of a Boston or a Philadelphia.

As they grow older, all cities develop an inner ring of commercial blight and residential slums just outside the central business district. In earlier times the slums were occupied by successive waves of European immigrants. Today, almost everywhere, they house the lowest economic strata of Negroes, most of them migrants from the rural South. Too, this blighted inner ring usually contains a skid row of white derelicts and cheap hotels occupied by elderly single men.

This close-in decay was the obvious, natural, and proper first target of renewal. Very often the decay was so advanced that complete clearance of the land was considered the only possible course. So much blight has been leveled in and around downtown Detroit that that city has a shockingly blitzed look.

Once this close-inland was cleared, its high value as a public asset became apparent. Too, for economic reasons private developers could not put low income housing there. And so, in San Francisco and everywhere else, it is being devoted to public projects and to new housing for the middle and upper income purse. Few of the evicted Negroes can afford to return. Hence their angry name "Negro removal."

But the economic health of cities required this radical surgery. Unless cities maintain that health they can never afford the large public expenditures necessary to lift up their new Negro citizens and integrate them into the community.

CONTAGIOUS

Too, urban renewal has proved contagious. It has stirred a resurgence of urban pride, and spurred private investments.

Because of it, and often with its indispensable help, great new civic centers are rising in New York, Boston, Detroit, and Pittsburgh.

It has led to the rescue of national shrines like Independence Hall in Philadelphia and Faneuil Hall in Boston, both smothered unforgivably for decades by surrounding blocks of commercial blight.

It made possible the $45 million coliseum complex in New York, which generates $500 million a year in convention and trade show business.

It also made possible New York's tremendous Lincoln Center for the performing arts. (A "cultural supermarket," its few detractors call it; Philharmonic Hall, first completed structure in Lincoln Center, does look like an airport terminal from the outside but is superb within.)

It prompted private enterprise to produce the splendid Penn Center commercial complex and the huge food distribution center in Philadelphia, and the $137 million Prudential Center commercial complex now rising on air rights above a freeway and commuter rail line in Boston.

Too, it no doubt stimulated a labor union to sponsor in Chicago the most revolutionary residential-commercial complex yet attempted—downtown Marina City with its twin, circular, 60-story towers.

RESIDENCE AREAS

It has caused spontaneous regeneration of famous residential areas like Society Hill in Philadelphia and Foggy Bottom in Washington. Result: Districts of historic brick homes have been restored, are again fashionable, and have skyrocketed in price.

Similarly in San Francisco, urban renewal will join hands with rapid transit and private enterprise to bring magnificence (if it is done right) to Market Street.

This is not to say that all is well with urban renewal.

Most of the mayors and renewal directors in the East with whom I talked admitted that the growth of new slums is still proceeding faster than eradication of the old. The causes are numerous: too late a start,

poor code enforcement, the slowness of slum clearance.

This has led generally to a shift in emphasis from major redevelopment projects to smaller neighborhood projects in which only the worst buildings are torn down, and emphasis is on rehabilitation and conservation.

In these projects the cities are finding that they make no headway until there exists a thorough neighborhood understanding of the need, and a strong neighborhood organization in a supporting role. Even New York, where it is claimed (not always accurately) that one seldom knows or cares who his neighbors are, is hard at work fostering neighborhood organizations.

SCHOOL NEED

Too, renewal projects don't succeed in holding desirable citizens in the central city unless the schools are good. On Chicago's South Side is a large integrated project of 10 tall apartment buildings for middle income families. I was told that its young couples with children, Negro couples as well as white, tend to move away when their children reach school age.

The reason: The nearby school is poor. And it is poor because it contains too many children from a nearby slum filled with migrant Negroes of the bottom educational, cultural, and income level.

Finally, too many of the big renewal residential projects suffer from a lack of human warmth. They seem cold, sterile and vaguely inhuman because they are too big, too sleek, too formalized—and, oddly, because they preserve too much land as open space.

Some open space is, of course, essential—small gardens, little parks, and plazas, an occasional wide street. But when it is overdone the human proportion is lost.

(Which is more interesting and enjoyable, wide Van Ness Avenue or narrow Grant Avenue in Chinatown? Van Ness or Maiden Lane? Van Ness or Jackson Square? As a tourist in Paris you admire the Grands Boulevards created by history and Baron Haussmann—what a ruthless urban renewal director he was—but you go for cozy warmth to a cafe on some narrow, crooked, and crowded street. One of the great joys of hilly San Francisco is that we can enjoy this crowded coziness, yet lift our eyes to a distant vista of bay or mountain.)

It is comforting to know that open spaces, so important in the right places, haven't been overdone in the Western Addition and Diamond Heights projects. Hopefully, they won't seem overdone in the Golden Gateway either.

Plight of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial, "Plight of the Dollar," which appeared in the Arizona Republic of July 20, 1963, and which, I believe, my colleagues will find as interesting and pertinent as I did:

PLIGHT OF THE DOLLAR

President Kennedy's proposed balance-of-payments tax stems either from desperation or from a determination to clip the wings of private economy. Maybe from both.

Regardless of what caused him to ask Congress for a new tax on American purchases of foreign securities, the action shows how low the dollar has sunk. Once the strongest of all currencies, it is now being propped up by prepayment of foreign loans and by tender treatment on the part of foreign banks. The United States has even had to support the dollar with loans from the international monetary funds it set up to help other nations.

The President has proposed a law, expiring in 1965, which would make Americans buying foreign stocks pay 15 percent of the value in tax. The rate for bonds would be 2.75 percent. Many exemptions, such as commercial bank loans, would be provided. But on the whole, Americans seeking to invest their money abroad would find the tax so high that they would probably keep their money at home. This, obviously, would slow down the flow of dollars (now going abroad at an annual rate of $3.3 billion compared with $2.2 billion last year).

But the wall around U.S. dollar export also would support another major aim of New Frontier philosophy, namely the boosting of the public sector over the private sector of the economy. It would, that is, prevent private business from investing in foreign countries, while doing nothing to prevent the continued pouring of American Government dollars into foreign economies. Unfortunately, the dollar gap grows just as fast when the U.S. Government sends dollars overseas as when private investors send the dollars.

Administration spokesmen say that taxing American investments would stop the sending of $900 million to foreign countries in the next year. At the same time the adminstration is asking Congress to approve $4.5 billion in foreign aid, exactly five times as much as it proposes to save by the tax on investments. Why doesn't Mr. Kennedy simply cut his own foreign spending plans in half? That would eliminate the dollar gap almost completely. But it also would run counter to the big spending ideas of the New Frontier, which has always felt there is an inherent evil in private spending but not in public spending.

There is a good possibility that restricting private investments abroad will not protect the dollar. And if the flow continues, it undoubtedly will create even more distrust of the basic soundness of the dollar. Sooner or later it will cause foreign governments to cash in their dollar holdings for gold, and the unhappy fact is that the United States doesn't have enough gold to trade for the dollars held in foreign banks.

The way to reverse the direction of the dollar flow is to create a confidence in the stability of American finances. There is no better way to do that than to cut foreign giveaways and balance the Federal budget. Any blows aimed solely at private business, while continuing the massive outflow of Government dollars, probably will not do the job.

World Center of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

WORLD CENTER OF LAW

The lawyers from 105 countries who met in Athens last week demonstrated the well-known propensity of the profession for controversy, but in the end they gave a significant boost to the idea of law supplanting force as a instrument of world peace. The disputes were ironed out with a free exchange of views. Though many differences necessarily persist, this first world conference of lawyers succeeded in creating a World Peace Through Law Center and in launching various attempts to mobilize legal thinking upon critical world problems. One of the most difficult projects undertaken by the new organization was a bid for disarmament. A committee of experts will attempt to draft disarmament principles that will be submitted to governments and national bar groups. This venture will be especially handicapped by the absence of lawyers from the leading Communist countries at the conference, but the result may be to build up more sentiment for disarmament on an international scale.

The other undertakings which the conference approved are more directly within the legal sphere. The new World Peace Through Law Center will coordinate research in international law, issue publications, encourage the teaching of international law and the exchange of students, scholars and judges. Its special function will be to study specific problems, such as the development of space law, and to aid governments in reaching agreements and in improving agencies for the adjudication of international differences. Behind these specific projects is the larger aim of better understanding among lawyers from many lands so that they may work together to make law a more potent influence in world affairs.

Much of the credit for the outcome goes to a Washingtonian, Charles S. Rhyne, who for several years has represented the American Bar Association in holding regional and continental conferences in preparation for the culminating event in Athens. Apparently there was some concern at Athens about the predominance of American influence in the movement, but that was inevitable from its origin. It is greatly to the credit of Mr. Rhyne and his associates that they succeeded in interesting so many eminent lawyers from nearly all parts of the world and in winning approval, after free and extended debate, for the general organization they had in mind.

If wisely managed, the new center can become a powerful influence for the advancement of law among nations. A good foundation has been laid.

Henry C. Lynch: Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1962, it was my great privilege to attend and participate in the very impressive and moving memorial exercises at the Rindge Technical School, Cambridge, Mass., in honor of an old and valued friend of mine, the late Henry C. Lynch.

At the exercises, a beautiful memorial photograph of Mr. Lynch, for many years head of the foreign language department and faculty manager of athletics at Rindge, was presented to the school at a largely attended student assembly.

The photograph, a gift of Rindge alumni and other friends of Mr. Lynch, now hangs in the school trophy room, in which he took such great pride.

Present for the ceremony were Dr. Albert Lynch, a son, Richard Partridge, of the Lynch family, Headmaster Robert R. Sweeney, Headmaster Emeritus John W. Wood, Hon. Raymond Fitzgerald, outstanding educator and lawyer, N. V. "Swede" Nelson, the well-known sports figure and afterdinner speaker, the beloved Charles Linehan, former teacher and famous coach, and a host of other very prominent friends and distinguished figures of public service, business, professional and educational life.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of my speech at the Henry C. Lynch memorial ceremony:

My dear friends, I am very grateful to my good and great friend, our beloved Charlie Linehan, your distinguished Headmaster and others who have given me the great privilege and honor to be with you on this very moving occasion.

To visit your renowned secondary school, one of the finest of its kind in the land, would ordinarily stir some very happy memories for me. But today, I come on a mission of commemoration and love that is mingled with sadness and yet with great pride. For I know that when we are honoring a man like our beloved and lamented Henry Lynch, we are honoring one who for so many years served this beautiful community as a gifted teacher, counsellor, adviser and able, dedicated lawyer with every ounce of his being and every pulse of his great heart.

Henry Lynch was a few years ahead of me at college when I came down here to Cambridge from Clinton High School, friendless and alone, as a neophyte to what was for me the strange and rather bewildering collegiate world of the time. But with typical kindness he immediately took me to his heart and his home and the hospitality of his wonderful family and was my dear friend until he passed to his eternal reward.

Henry had many warm, admiring friends throughout his long, useful life, because he was deeply interested in people and their concerns, and could not do too much to emphasize his high concept of what loyal friendship really means.

He had a superb background and was sprung from a fine family, a family of doers and achievers, civil, business, and professional leaders, all of whom were deeply public-spirited, interested in making something out of themselves and contributing something of real worth to their community and country.

Henry Lynch was endowed with great natural gifts, a keen alert mind that made him an outstanding student at Harvard, and later enabled him to achieve magnificent success as a teacher, a leader, and a lawyer, molding and guiding the minds of young people in creative, aspiring channels, wisely counselling his fellow citizens, and serving his proud city and his country with the Army overseas in World War I, and throughout his long, constructive civilian career.

Henry Lynch had deep, rugged convictions and high principles and always clung tenaciously to them. He wore no man's collar, and rigidly followed his own way of life which was the way of high character, rectitude, lofty aims, perseverance, and a fine sense of justice and desire to help others.

Greatly devoted to his family, he was extremely proud of the great progress he saw them make and the marked success he lived to see them achieve. It is most appropriate that his brilliant, young son, who is achieving such great success in the medical profession, should be with us today.

It is hardly necessary for me here today, in the presence of his dear friends, too numerous to mention, his loving family and colleagues, and the fine student body of this great school, to dwell more upon the fine life and inspiring, wonderful achievements and the many good works of Henry Lynch because you of Cambridge know them so well and appreciate them so much. This community owes him a great debt.

We will ever continue to be inspired by the fine example Henry Lynch set for us, his complete devotion to so many young people, whom he helped in innumerable ways to find their place in life, his special, outstanding service to sports and athletics, his unselfish dedication to his work, his generosity of impulse, and his surpassing loyalty to his friends, his school, and so many good causes.

I commend our esteemed, beloved friend, Mr. Charles Linehan, great friend and leader that he is, your able distinguished headmaster, Robert R. Sweeney and his able staff, the Key Club and all those who helped to arrange for the presentation of this beautiful, characteristic likeness of Henry.

For many years to come, this lovely portrait will remain in these cherished halls to remind all who pass here of the memorable virtues and unstinted contributions of Henry Lynch.

May the remembrance of his noble qualities, friendship, and peerless service long continue to bring us light, inspiration, and firm resolve to emulate the things he so stanchly stood for, and the many things he did to make Cambridge and our great country a better place in which to live.

So long as this famous school, and our great Nation can produce able, distinguished, and dedicated leaders and teachers and patriotic, God-fearing, liberty-loving, red-blooded Americans like Henry Lynch, we need have no fear of the future. For ambitious, well-trained young people like you, always looking upward with spirit and hope, and pressing forward with vigor, courage and determination, faithfully following the lessons and the lofty example he gave, will continue to keep our great Nation strong, peaceful, and free.

May our dear friend, Henry Lynch, find rest and peace in his heavenly home.

I insert as part of my remarks a copy of the able and most appropriate speech made on the occasion of the Henry C. Lynch memorial exercises by Mr. William H. Mahoney, distinguished teacher and leader of Rindge Technical School:

HENRY LYNCH—IN RETROSPECT. "THE TRUMPET'S SILVER VOICE IS STILLED," THE WARDER SILENT ON THE HILL."

Henry Carty Lynch, great humorist, master teacher, kind and wise moralist, has gone to his reward, and nevermore shall we at Rindge bask in his ready smile and be regaled by his inimitable anecdotes which already have become a part of the Rindge legend.

Henry always loved the limelight of life's stage and no man loved more the sunshine of full recognition.

If you were merely an acquaintance you could not help noticing that he was a lover of life, but if you were an intimate friend, as I was privileged to be, you always felt in your heart a warmth, a joy from being in his company. Of subtle intelligence and open nature, of deep erudition and vast conversational powers, he brought rich gifts indeed to his teaching.

Certain it is that thousands of Rindge students will always recall with affection and gratitude the clarity and orderliness of his teaching which, brightened by bland humor and tingling wit, made his classes rich and memorable experiences.

The whole expanse of education was his familiar park of pleasance. Yet he was not a scholarly recluse. With all his intellectual gifts he was as much a companion of all the leading figures in the athletic world as of Chardinal and Blackstone. And on an evening in the square, that he loved, he liked to discuss the contemporary scene with such firm and fast friends as "Jack" Lyons, "Bill" Cleary, "Bill" Cunningham, and if I may boast, myself. These were golden moments for Henry.

Henry's social sympathies were no less strong than his fondness for learning and he was the most fascinating of comrades.

His extraordinary knowledge, whether of literature, law, or athletics and his gleaming wit and glittering repartee, in which his knowledge was fused, glowed throughout his conversation, completely captivating all of us.

Education was his pursuit but athletics were his passion. He had an unfailing interest in all sports but track was his delight and the two "Toms" who revered him, "Tom" Duffy and "Tom" Hynes, shared his enthusiasm.

Henry was an intensely loyal Harvard man. The Harvard legend, the Harvard language, the character and the achievement of Harvard men were all his delight and constant topic of conversation. Woe betide the luckless wight who spoke disparagingly of Harvard "brains" or memorial hall which always evoked for him nostalgic memories.

Henry was a preeminently fair and objective person, but on the subject of his alma mater, it was always "Harvard right or wrong, but Harvard, my love."

Even at the most serious and critical moments when he was so ill, if there was a gleam of humor anywhere he saw it and used it to help himself over rough places. He could still joke in the dark hours and, what is more uncommon, greatly enjoyed being the target of a good jest.

To the end, Henry remained unfailingly attractive because he was always perfectly natural and his own wonderful self.

His like we have not met before nor shall we see again.

Requiescat in pace.

E Pluribus Unum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the testimony of Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, before the House Judiciary Committee on July 26, 1963. A dedicated union official, Mr. Tyler brings to the civil rights hearings many years of experience in labor and civil rights. By drawing upon the experience of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, he presented cogent arguments for strong Federal legislation to insure full equality for all our citizens. The ILGWU has performed an important public service by urging Congress to meet the challenge and enact a comprehensive civil rights program.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF GUS TYLER, ASSISTANT PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, JULY 26, 1963

My name is Gus Tyler. I am assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and am appearing on its behalf.

We are an organization of some 450,000 men and women in 40 States and several hundred localities. Thanks to our 63 years of activity, not only in our industry but also in our greater political community, many members of your committee and of Congress know us almost as well as we know ourselves.

There are two special qualities and interests of our union, however, that have impelled us to accept this opportunity to appear before you briefly today.

We have a congenital involvement with minorities and a hereditary concern for human freedom.

We are a union of minorities. All continents and all creeds. We have had 63 years in which to learn first hand the meaning of "E pluribus unum." We have made it the work of many generations to make "one out of many." We have never had difficulty with the "e pluribus" part, the coming of the many, for they have come from everywhere. But we know first hand the difficulties of making "one out of the many," to build a union, to give some real meaning to our formal union greeting of "brother" or "sister."

We feel that a distillation of our experience may serve some purpose here because, in a way, it is a distillation of the American experience. "E pluribus unum" was written across our early history as a nation to signify the union of 13 States into one Nation. Since then, the symbolic phrase has gained added meaning: one people out of many people. That, too, is the quintessence of our union.

Our members have not only come from everywhere but have all too often come in flight—flight from oppression. They have come to us with fear and with a dream, with a sensitivity to injustice and a sense of justice.

We, therefore, look upon ourselves as part of the long tradition of minorities—racial, religious, economic, or political—reaching out for their human rights, whether it be against czars, Communists, Fascists, economic royalists or racists.

As part of this movement, we like to think of ourselves as having developed a degree of sophistication about those moments in history that are called revolutionary. We know that revolutions can be betrayed, often by their own leaders. We know that revolutions gone astray can often provoke monstrous counterrevolutions. But we also have come to know the meaning of America as the land of the "permanent revolution," to use the language of a favorite Republican, Russell Davenport: America as a nation where the ideal of "one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all" has been constantly renewed by recognizing the rising expectations of newly aspiring peoples, whether economic or ethnic.

We are at one such decisive moment right now: a moment of fulfillment through renewal.

Before coming here today, I tried to acquaint myself with the testimony before your committee and also before your senatorial counterparts, to avoid repetition and to spare your valuable time.

I found a heartening consensus. It seems to be agreed that the American Negro is entitled to equal opportunity to a job, to housing, to education, to voting rights, to the use of public accommodations.

The great debate seems to revolve around the question of whether this desirable goal shall be attained through voluntary action or through Federal law. I wish to address myself to this sole point and to rely heavily on our own experience.

In 1934, our union met in Chicago in a hotel where we found that some of the facilities were segregated. When our protests were unavailing, we moved the convention out of the hotel into another hall. Ours was a voluntary act. In the intervening 30 years, many unions and other organizations have done the same.

Yet just this last week, one of our regional directors informed me that he could not find a suitable meeting place for a staff conference because integrated facilities were not available.

After 30 years, despite a measure of progress, the old problem continues.

I am certain that if our regional director persists and is ready to put up with some inconveniences, he will find a place. But his very success in doing so will demonstrate our failure as a society, will serve only to dramatize the fact that he has found a straw of human rights in a storm of social wrongs.

In the area of public accommodations, we have found that voluntary action is not only inadequate, but, measured against the rising tide of social expectation, is almost useless.

Permit me another example. In 1934, our union's delegation introduced a resolution at the AFL convention in San Francisco "instructing the executive council to confer with the executive boards of affiliated national and international unions with the object of securing the eradication of all practices, whether sanctioned by law or custom, tending to bar colored workers from unions, or to discriminate against colored members, or to abridge their rights." The convention minutes report that the resolution was adopted unanimously.

Now, 30 years later, despite progress in eliminating discrimination in unions, President George Meany appeared before you to plead for legislation, for a Fair Employment Practices Act, to strengthen the hand of the AFL–CIO in dealing with discrimination in its own ranks and in dealing with the greater problem of discrimination in employment in our total economy.

In the area of equal job opportunities, then, experience has established the limited and inadequate power of purely voluntary action.

One final example. In the early thirties, many Puerto Ricans enrolled into our union in New York. Because of their recent entrance into the union, they were constitutionally ineligible to run for certain posts requiring a year of membership in the local and 2 years in the international. In 1934, the president of our union, David Dubinsky, wrote a letter to a local in which he proposed that the newcomers be exempt from the constitutional proviso. "In this way," he wrote, "these Spanish workers will be afforded an opportunity to take part in the administration of the affairs of the local."

These Spanish-speaking workers became first-class and first-rate citizens of the union. Yet, today, some 30 years later, Puerto Ricans in New York may not vote, although they are born citizens and are literate, solely because they are not allowed to take their literacy test in Spanish.

I list these three cases, in part, because we are proud of what we have been able to accomplish on our own, but primarily to emphasize the limits of progress through voluntary action.

Progress in human affairs is a relative thing: to be measured against human expectation and human frustration. By this measure, the progress made by voluntary action is unsatisfactory.

To meet the rising aspirations of awakened people is one of the functions of legislation. We have come to associate the words "law" and "order" so often that they often sound like one word. But law that does not change with the changing needs of our people is no maker of order. Law based on social justice brings order. Law based on social injustice provokes disorder.

In a democratic society, human needs seek expression through legal channels. When citizens are denied voting rights, their basic right to act through the avenues of law and order, frustration accumulates.

When such people are denied an equal chance at jobs, homes, schools, access to public accommodations, whether by law or by custom tolerated through lack of law, frustration is piled on frustration.

Creative legislation is the means whereby the angry torrent of frustration can be channeled into creative energies for the whole Nation.

May I once more ask your indulgence to dip into the experiences of American labor. One hundred years ago, the worker found himself in a situation not altogether unlike that of the Negro today. Certain human rights, implicit in the American idea, were denied to working people in practice and were not spelled out in law. The worker found himself the victim of de facto oppression without de jure relief.

The history of labor-management conflict, for almost 75 years was a protracted series of violent episodes from Homestead to South Chicago. Employers, accustomed to absolute rule, used all the instruments of terror, while workers, frustrated beyond all patience, payed back in kind .

Then came recognition. Recognition that workers had rights. Recognition of unions. Recognition spelled out in Federal legislation and in court decisions.

Union recognition did not end all differences between labor and management. But it did create legal and legitimate channels for expression and adjudication. And with the mounting recognition of rights came a sense of respect and responsibility—on both sides.

Legislation then is, first of all, a peaceful avenue for the righting of social wrongs.

Legislation has a second function. It protects the individual who would like to do the right thing against a competitor who is doing the wrong thing.

We are inclined to believe many of those merchants who say that they would desegregate if they were not afraid of competition. These merchants want to do the right thing. But they are restrained because business may go to a competitor.

This is one of the real shortcomings of the purely voluntary approach. It can punish the man who would do the right thing and reward the man who is doing the wrong thing.

Because legislation often legalizes decency, it not only restrains the wrong-doer but liberates the right-doer to follow his conscience.

We can cite decades of experience to support this point. Our union is a kind of legislature that tries through collective bargaining to legislate wages and working conditions in an industry. We have more than half a century of experience with decent employers and with cutthroat employers, the saints and sinners of our industry. We know that many employers would have liked, in the past, to pay a better wage but that they could not do so because they feared cutthroat competition. When the union established a basic wage condition in the industry as a whole, the more generous employer could pay the wage he always wanted to pay and the skinflint employer had to follow the lead of his more fairminded competitor.

Where there are no legal restraints, the bad guy sets the tone. Where a legal norm is established, your more fair-minded employer, merchant or citizen sets the tone. The pressure is reversed from down to up.

For this reason, too, I would like to suggest that the difference between progress through voluntary action and progress through legislation may not be as great as it is often portrayed to be in the public debate. Legislation, especially when it is in line with our avowed ideals, creates a social atmosphere within which most people will voluntarily do the accepted thing. Compulsion becomes unnecessary.

I can cite many recent experiences. Within the last 2 months, I attended two regional conferences of our union: one with delegates

from the Southeastern States and the other with delegates from the Southwestern States. Both these conferences were integrated. They took place, in these months of passion and crisis, without a single disturbing incident.

I do not believe that our members, whether white or Negro, are vastly different from the other people of their towns. But, in the union, they have an understanding. Here it is the norm, it is the right thing, it is the traditional thing, it is the union thing for Negroes and whites to work together for a common cause.

Very recently, in a southern organization drive, a white member invited other workers to her home, because the union could not find an appropriate integrated meeting place. The hostess was frank about her feelings. "I would never invite Negroes to my home socially," she said, "because I just don't believe I want to. But I will let them come with others to my home for a union meeting because that's the way it is in the union."

I heard a companion view stated by a delegate from Kansas to another from Arkansas at a union conference. "The way I see is," said our Kansan, "is this: You don't have to love them although as a good Christian you should, but you have to let them use the public library because they have the right as American citizens."

Now I don't know whether legislation can make a good Christian out of everyone. Nor do I know whether legislation can make one member invite another member to his or her home socially. I doubt it. Legislation can not wipe out prejudice; but it can cut down discrimination. We can't legislate love; but we can legislate rights.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this committee, I do not wish to appear before you in the posture of superior self-righteousness, as spokesman for almost half a million people who have no tinge of prejudice in their hearts. We know firsthand the tensions that exist between Jew and Gentile, between Negro and white, between Italian and Latin American, between midwesterner and easterner. We know all these tensions and dozens of others. We see them daily in our shops, in our union meetings. Our members don't all love one another. But they do know that in the union and in the union shop they must respect the rights of one another. Sometimes, they just have to put up with one another. But this they do: First, because this is the way it is in the union and, secondly, because they know only too well the value of standing together.

There is one last aspect of this question I should like to touch on briefly: Namely, the need for Federal legislation in areas where such action appears to conflict with property rights and with States' rights.

We believe in the rights of property and of States. We should not like to see the day when all property or all political decisions are in the hands of Washington, D.C. We feel that the base of freedom is more secure when property and power are widely distributed. Indeed, that is why our union favors an ever wider distribution of income and an ever wider use of the franchise.

We are all safer when power is scattered—and since both property and State government represent such a scattering of power, we favor the perpetuation of both.

But power can be misused—both by individuals and by States. Trusts have misused their power to crush competitors. Companies have misused their power to starve and mistreat workers. Banks and railroads and shippers and, if you please, even unions misused power. And, as a result, we pass laws—Federal laws—to protect the individual and the public interest against the abuse of power.

Similarly, the power of individual States can be misused to deny to individuals their rights as citizens of the United States. The denial of voting rights is a most egregious example. In such cases, the Federal Government clearly has the duty of using its power—whether it be legislative, executive or judicial—to protect the rights of its citizens against the abuse of any State.

The writers of the Constitution foresaw the possibility that within a State a group might arise to seize power, deny democratic rights, and establish a nonrepublican form of Government. And for that reason, article IV section 4 gives to the Federal Government the responsibility "to guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of Government."

And because the Federal Government is the guardian of the Republic in our 50 States, this committee and the Congress presently carry one of the gravest responsibilities in our national history. This moment is a challenge to greatness. And we look to our Congress to rise with the occasion, to enact a broad, comprehensive, human rights program that will once more renew the spirit of freedom in America.

Terror-Stricken President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about how our American "image" abroad has been damaged by the so-called plight of the Negro in certain sections of our country. This was never in issue until appeasement of minority groups came to the fore as vividly as it has in the past few years.

In a nation that recognizes the time-honored principle of majority rule, it is shocking to see the President of our great country defy its traditions by pursuing a weak-kneed policy of catering to the whims of a minority group at the expense of the majority, and meanwhile using military force where it is "politic" to do so. Surely, no policy could do more to damage our American image to the world. In the guest editorial section of the Somerset (Pa.) Daily American newspaper, I read an extremely interesting and timely editorial taken from the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader. The following should prove of interest to the Congress:

TERROR-STRICKEN PRESIDENT

The Kennedy administration stands terror-stricken in front of a few bad Negroes who are responsible for the rioting in the South, in the North and in the West. This cowardly and craven performance by the administration in domestic affairs has been likened to the same cowardly retreat this administration is conducting throughout the entire world.

The mobs at home and the Communist threats and other international wrongdoers abroad quickly sense, of course, the funk our administration very evidently is in. So they become bolder day by day.

The behavior of the Kennedy administration is literally encouraging international anarchy, on the one hand, and domestic riot and revolution, on the other. In the estimation of this newspaper, the Kennedys have completely lost control of the situation. They are apparently able to threaten Governor Barnett, of Mississippi, or Governor Wallace, of Alabama, or James Hoffa, of the Teamsters' Union, but when it comes to standing up against Negroes whom they think control a large bloc of votes, or against the Communists abroad, they retreat in terror. It is the most disgusting sight that any American has ever seen during the history of our great Nation since 1776.

It is no wonder that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the Negro Congressman, dares stand up in Englewood, N.J., and scream that "the white man is frightened. We have the white man on the run and we're going to keep him there."

This is fantastic nonsense. The Negroes in the United States, in the 1960 census, amount to only 10½ percent of our total population. On top of that, the actual rioters and troublemakers among the Negroes are a tiny fraction of the entire 10 percent.

Why in heaven's name would the administration stand in apparent terror of these few black thugs, hold panicky conferences and make public apologies on the radio, as the Attorney General did the other morning, saying that we hadn't done enough for them? It's a perfectly incredible sight. However, it is merely the domestic version of what has been going on in our foreign affairs for some time.

We crawl on our bellies to Yugoslavia and ask Tito, pretty please, to take some more aid from us. We fawn over the Communist thugs in Poland. We entertain the friend of the Communists, Sukarno, who shouldn't be allowed in the back door of any respectable home. Finally, and most important, we lie down and let the Communists take over Cuba, 90 miles from our homeland.

Our Exploding Cities—Parts VI and VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most baffling and complex issues facing most large American cities is the question of public housing.

Mr. Pearce reexamines our public housing problems in this series on urban problems. He candidly takes up an issue close to the hearts of all Americans—improvement of the economic and social position of the millions of nonwhites who have crowded into northern and western cities in the last 20 years:

EXPLODING CITIES—PART VI

(By Richard E. Pearce)

Public housing is in serious trouble, here and everywhree.

San Francisco city officials privately agree that, if an election were held today, the voters would refuse to authorize any more such publicly owned, publicly subsidized low-rent housing.

If this attitude persists, construction of new public housing will soon come to a halt because the housing authority has used up most of its existing authorizations.

In New York, where Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Wagner are quarreling over the issue, the Governor's chief housing adviser has publicly warned of growing voter resistance.

In Chicago white aldermen will not permit new public housing projects in their wards. So the new projects that continue to rise are all in predominantly Negro wards with Negro aldermen.

THE "WHITE NOOSE"

Detroit is limiting future projects to housing for the elderly and for university students.

The city of Washington, 56 percent Negro, has 40,000 persons in public housing and a waiting list. But officials privately say the answer is not more public housing; the answer is to break the "white noose" that prevents Negroes from spreading into the suburbs.

And in Congress, which since New Deal days has almost routinely approved funds for low rent public housing programs, opposition to a new bill is so strong the administration may delay it until next year.

Negroes predominate in most public housing of the big eastern cities and, nationwide, comprise 46.7 percent of all public housing occupants. These are to a considerable extent migrants of the last two decades from the rural South—uneducated, uncultured, of the lowest economic strata. They have not adjusted to or been absorbed into the urban environment. Like any undigested mass of low education and income, they create serious police, welfare, school, and other social problems.

SEGREGATION

White prejudice against them is unquestionably a major factor in the mounting opposition to more public housing. Many whites believe the construction of more such housing would serve to perpetuate them as public charges and increase their number.

This is not, however, the only reason for opposition.

Many longtime champions of public housing have begun to question whether such projects, in their present form, serve as a sufficiently useful social tool. The opposition of such people is not to public housing as such, but to the kind of huge, impersonal projects that institutionalize their inhabitants, isolating them both from their neighborhoods and the community.

In New York these tall apartment projects continue to rise as big, dismal clumps of buildings, all cast from the same depressing mold. On Chicago's South Side they are still being built as huge rows stretching, in one instance, for nearly 30 blocks.

MONUMENTS TO POVERTY

Sometimes the projects are so immense that the public schools are built within them, and serve only the children of the project tenants. This is school segregation with a vengeance. However well intentioned such projects may be, they result in a form of legalized apartheid that delays if it doesn't prevent the Negro's absorption into the urban fabric.

One gets the feeling that officialdom continues in a compulsive way to build these grim monuments to poverty simply because it doesn't know what else to do. It defends them with the argument that, bad though they may be, they at least get people out of slums, increase health and sanitation, and circumvent the avarice of slum landlords.

One urban expert in an eastern city defended them to me in these interesting terms:

"Sure, this housing is bad. But if you were born in a Mississippi cotton patch in an unpainted shack with an outhouse, and you moved to the slum of a northern city, that slum would seem better to you even if it were crowded and rickety and had no hot water and the plumbing worked only half the time. Then if you moved into a clean, modern public housing project, it will seem wonderful to you. Sure it's bad. But you don't know it's bad."

THE TOP FLOORS

(A sidelight: Detroit has vacancies in the top floors of some of its high rise public housing because southern Negroes, reared close to the soil, don't like to live high up. But in new apartment buildings for the middle and upper income level, created by urban renewal in a former Negro slum area, whites are willing to pay a premium for the top floor to get the view.)

If opposition to public housing grows into open revolt, what will happen?

One immediate result would be to cripple urban renewal. It relies on public housing to take care of persons displaced by slum clearance.

Another would be to kill the new programs of public housing for the aged.

NEW IDEAS SOUGHT

Governor Rockefeller has urged a search for new ideas and methods, and advocated that the private sector of the economy be encouraged to enter into the low income housing field.

Chicago has started an experimental "rent certificate" plan for elderly housing, in which private landlords are invited to accept the elderly on supervised terms. The tenant pays what he can afford, the public agency pays the balance.

This is similar to a new program in Toronto. Under it the housing agency leases vacant privately-owned housing units at the going rate, then sublets them at a lower rental to low-income families.

In Boston housing officials have proposed the purchase and rehabilitation for public housing of decayed buildings in otherwise sound blocks of private, working class housing. Somewhat similar plans have been put forward in San Francisco and elsewhere.

EMERGING ERA

In the era of the new deal, society padlocked the poorhouse, substituting public welfare and public housing. Now, in an emerging new era, the weaknesses of public welfare and public housing have brought them into question. New approaches and new forms of assistance are evolving. These are inextricably bound up with biggest of all problems facing our cities: Can they digest and integrate their large Negro minorities?

OUR EXPLODING CITIES—PART VII

(By Richard E. Pearce)

Given a decent chance, can the migrant Negro mass now in the big cities develop into a substantial middle class?

One who believes so is Edward Marciniak, executive director of the Chicago Commission on Human Relations. He has gathered extensive evidence to show that such a middle class is rising in Chicago even under today's handicaps. Similar data has been assembled in Philadelphia.

Marciniak is a genial, articulate product of the wave of Polish immigration to the Chicago area around the turn of the century. His father had only a second grade education. "He kept telling me, 'Eddie, I want you to get a college education so the Irish won't push you around the way they pushed me.' "

LATEST WAVE

That remark is Marciniak's way of illustrating his conviction that the rural southern Negro's migration should be viewed in long perspective as simply the latest in a succession of migratory waves that big cities have managed to absorb and lift up.

The Irish, the Poles, the Italians came to Chicago in migrant masses from Europe, filled Chicago's slums and did Chicago's dirty work, and in two or three generations fought their way up into the great American middle class. Now it's the Negro's turn.

"His way is harder," said Marciniak, "because of his high visibility.

BIG DROP

"But today the migration from the South has dropped to a trickle. That means cities no longer have to expend all their energies and resources on the emergency task of receiving the migrant. They can turn to the task of absorbing him. I think he'll make it and the cities will make it."

(Marciniak didn't coin that term "high visibility." It's another of those bits of pretentious argot that sociologists think up. What they mean is that the Negro's color makes him obvious and works against him.)

TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT NEGRO

Chicago's South Side has the largest concentration of Negroes in the country outside of Harlem. The city has always had a substantial Negro population. This suddenly surged upward in numbers with the great Negro movement northward and westward in the two decades 1940–60. The greatest gain was in the decade 1950–60, when the census showed a nonwhite jump (in Chicago 97 percent of all nonwhites are Negroes) from 509,000 to 837,000.

In 1960 Negroes comprised 23.6 percent of the Chicago population. Today the figure is estimated to be at least 25 percent, not because of additional migration but because of natural increase and the continued movement of whites to the suburbs.

EARNING MORE

Using 1960 U.S. Census Bureau data, Marciniak measured Negro rise toward a middle class by four yardsticks: income, home ownership, education and occupational status. This is what he found:

The number of nonwhites earning $6,000 or more annually increased from 5,100 in 1950 to 63,100 in 1960.

The number of nonwhite homeowners increased from 15,900 in 1950 to 36,700 in 1960.

The number of nonwhites with 4 years of high school education increased from 46,000 in 1950 to 76,300 in 1960. Nonwhites with one or more years of college increased from 26,100 to 46,600. College graduates increased from 8,900 to 15,200.

RAPID GAINS

Nonwhites holding jobs classified as middle class increased from 49,871 to 81,213 during the decade.

In all of these categories the gain was more rapid than the gain in Negro population. Since whites started at higher levels, and many high income whites moved to suburbs during the decade, the Negro gains were also more rapid than white gains.

From all this Marciniak concluded that Chicago has a continuously growing, numerically important, middle income Negro population. He added:

"There is a direct relationship between the growing Negro middle class and the future of the low income sector of the Negro population in Chicago. The Negro middle class sets the pace, shows what can be accomplished, and helps raise the vocational and educational horizons of the latest arrivals to the city from the South."

TWO VIEWS

That is the bright side. Is this middle class growing in size at a faster rate than the undigested mass is growing? Putting it another way, have the positive forces grown stronger than the negative forces of slums, segregation, discrimination, high birth rates among indigent Negroes, the "welfare" way of life, etc.? Although Marciniak thinks so, other informed Chicagoans are not so sure.

Public doubts and concerns have led to major controversies over the size of welfare rolls and over the supplying of birth control information to those on relief. It has also led to a special program for the "contagious" reliefer—the uneducated, unskilled, chronic welfare recipient of any color who breeds rapidly and passes on his way of life to his children.

HOUSING PROBLEM

Too, the real estate "blockbusters" continue to promote segregation by panicking white home owners into selling when Negroes appear, and the degree of segregation continues to increase. An estimated 95 percent

of Chicago's Negroes live in predominantly Negro sections, compared to 87 percent in 1950.

These concentrations may not be confined to the central city. Prof. Donald J. Bogue of the University of Chicago has written:

"With rapid urban renewal inside Chicago and a gradual aging of suburban housing, the metropolitan area's supply of cheap, overage or invadable housing is concentrating more and more in the older suburbs. * * * Once the population pressure and the economic potential reach the breakthrough point the suburban shift will very likely be remarkably rapid."

STABLE AREAS

It must be said that Negroes with substantial incomes do find an increasing opportunity to break out of the racial ghettos within the city. Apparently stable areas of racial integration have developed as the result of much conscious effort by whites and blacks in the Hyde Park-Kenwood area near the University of Chicago, the big Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores renewal developments on the central South Side, the revolutionary, 60-story Marina City towers of circular design downtown, and in a few other areas.

Rent levels in these places are so high that only a Negro of at least the middle income class can afford them. Once he settles down amid whites, what sort of a neighbor does he prove to be? That subject will be explored tomorrow.

Growing Success of the U.S. Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the growing success of the U.S. Peace Corps is being acclaimed and proved in country after country.

The Associated Press reported, and the New York Times published this report, that the U.S. Peace Corps program in Indonesia, despite some initial misgivings, is working out so well that 33 more volunteers are being sought to augment the 17 who arrived in May.

Under unanimous consent, I am including this report as it appeared in the New York Times of July 28, 1963:

INDONESIANS ASK MORE CORPSMEN

JAKARTA, INDONESIA, July 27.—The U.S. Peace Corps program in Indonesia, despite some initial misgivings, is working out so well that 33 more volunteers are being sought to augment the 17 who arrived in May.

The Peace Corps representative here, David Burgess, said the Indonesian Government would like a total of 50 to cover 23 areas, including the recently gained territory of West Irian (formerly Dutch-held West New Guinea). It is up to Peace Corps headquarters in Washington.

Needed are more athletic instructors and coaches to train Indonesian athletes and broaden the country's sports base.

The 17 corpsmen who arrived in May are posted in 9 cities and towns stretching from Medan in Sumatra to Menado in the North Celebes.

The group—dubbed "volunteers for development" by President Sukarno—got a hostile welcome from local Communists on its arrival in Jakarta. The Indonesian Communist Party boasts 2 million members, making it the largest outside the Iron Curtain.

However, since a "Yankee-go-home" demonstration at Jakarta Airport—which one corpsman described as "nowhere near as big or lively as a high school football rally back home" there has been no trouble with the Communists.

Volunteers at Semarang and Surabaya on Java Island, both rated as hotbeds of Communist activity, say they have not been bothered by the Reds.

Many of the volunteers have moved in with local families. Victor Godfrey of Aberdeen, S. Dak., says of his Surabaya surroundings, "It's practically like living at home."

John Second of Chico, Calif., says, "You cough a few times, and everyone gets worried." When he did come down with a touch of dysentery, the territorial commander of the Makassar area sent his personal physician.

All the volunteers have become fairly fluent in the Malay tongue. George Larson of Portland, Oreg., knows its well enough to lecture at the University of Jogjakarta, in Central Java.

Foreign Trade and Buffalo, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report prepared by the League of Women Voters of Buffalo, N.Y., entitled "Progress for the Port of Buffalo—Prospects in World Economic Patterns" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This report describes in plain language what foreign trade means to one American city. It shows how one trading area became a major port of American trade with the world. Buffalo analyzed its problems; established its potential assets for future development; and then proceeded to do something about them.

This report is an excellent summary of what foreign trade means to the man on the street. The operation of the port requires many people to load and unload freight, to collect tariffs, to operate warehouses, to transport freight to and from the port, and to administer the port's operation. Not only has Buffalo's port made the city a center of world trade, but it has provided many individuals with employment.

Mr. President, I never cease to be impressed at the clarity with which the women of the League of Women Voters are able to grasp current world problems and their ability to analyze a situation and explain it in clear concise language that the man on the street can understand. I am indeed proud of the League of Women Voters, especially those in Buffalo, who have so diligently labored to produce this excellent report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS FOR THE PORT OF BUFFALO—PROSPECTS IN WORLD ECONOMIC PATTERNS

PART I: PROGRESS FOR THE PORT OF BUFFALO

The genesis and growth of the Common Market in Europe startled the trade patterns of the world. The gap that followed De Gaulle's use of the veto power in March 1963, gave an awareness of the forces at stake. It also brought keener realization that even local communities of the United States would feel the impact of the concepts and practices in the new European Economic Community. With the usual purpose of study for understanding, the League of Women Voters of Buffalo began closer acquaintance with the export-import statute of the Niagara frontier.

The port of Buffalo is the fifth most active of the 48 customs districts of the United States, with a probable tariff collection in 1962–63 of $25 million. Through this district No. 9 in 1962 there passed 4,646,582 autos, 3,152 aircraft, 428,421 freight cars, 12,206,703 passengers and pedestrians. There were 239,814 merchandise entries, 755,280 shipments exported. Of the 347 vessels arriving, 117 were in trade with countries other than Canada. Collections totaled in 1962 $22,095,815.65, compared with $16,386,312.66 in 1961. In addition, of course, many of the other 47 districts, such as the port of New York, handle exports and imports bound from and to this area.

The International Trade Analysis Division of the Bureau of International Commerce gives these values as passing through the Customs District No. 9:

[In millions]

Year	Exports		Imports	
	Total, United States	Buffalo	Total, United States	Buffalo
1961	$19,104.9	$740.7	$14,713.0	$440.6
1962:				
Estimate	19,336.8	775.7	16,396.5	490.3
Actual	21,555.3	778.6	16,405.1	499.7

Export figures exclude "special category shipments," i.e., defense material. These statistics are compiled monthly from the vast number of declarations required by the U.S. Department of Commerce from each shipper of exports and of imports.

The port of Buffalo has many assets for future development. Its management is vested in the Niagara Frontier Port Authority created by the New York State Legislature in May 1955. It is governed by a nine-member board appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the State senate. There is an executive director and a professional staff of six appointed by the board.

The authority includes three cities (Buffalo, Lackawanna, Tonawanda) and four towns (Amherst, Cheektowaga, Hamburg, West Seneca). Niagara County has expressed an interest in being admitted to the authority.

The extensive harbor-front properties of the port stretch some 3½ miles along Fuhrmann Boulevard in a wide area from the south channel entrance north through the seaway piers. They include the large Buffalo port terminal (formerly the Ford plan), Templeton terminal (the old canal terminal) and the seaway or municipal piers. Along with these are Buffalo's first heliport, with its 40,000 square feet of landing area, and a small boat harbor. All these may be directly affected if an All-American Waterway connects Lake Erie with Lake Ontario. In addition to the waterfront properties, the authority also controls the Greater Buffalo International Airport.

To operate these valuable holdings and to develop them for expanding waterborne

foreign trade requires both expert staffing and sizable investments. The present revenues are derived from the airport, the port terminals and piers, the small boat harbor and an allocation of $200,000 annually from the income of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority, which manages the Peace Bridge. Any deficiency in this last item could be made up from certain of the parking meter tolls of the city of Buffalo.

The State of New York in 1959 granted an interest-free loan of $5 million to build or buy major port improvements within a 2-year period. A 2-year extension was granted by the State to sell authority bonds to repay the loan. With the $3.5 million received to date, the port terminal was acquired. This was then leased to International Terminal, Inc., but this lease has now been given to Pittston Stevedoring Co. of New York with the stipulation that the charge of $7 a ton, which is comparable to charge in most lake ports, be set as a limit for loading flour at the terminal. In the supplemental State budget of April 1963, a sum of $2,335,509 was reappropriated for the authority.

The authority has used necessary funds to deepen the mooring site at the terminal to 25 feet. Additional waterfront improvements are scheduled for this coming year when the Federal Government finishes deepening the outer harbor to 27 feet, or the depth of the seaway. The present depth is sufficient for those oversea vessels now using the facilities.

Activities of the port are shown by these figures:

Year	Overseas vessels	Exports	Imports
		Tons	*Tons*
1961	127	203,752	37,[illegible]
1962	103	104,258	88,889

The first Japanese ship stopped here in 1962 to load scrap iron. Cargo has moved from this port to England, France, West Germany, Italy, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Pakistan, Siam, and Formosa. Much of the present shipping is done under foreign flags because of the lower wages involved. The largest ship arriving was 487 feet long. The first ship in, in 1963, was the West German freighter *Yildun*, led in by the Coast Guard icebreaker on April 27 with 800 tons of mixed cargo, including steel, and unloaded by 2 a.m. of the 29th. Four ships can be loaded orunloaded at one time at this terminal.

Two types of cargo are handled: bulk which is loose and general which is packaged in some form. Either type can be transferred with present equipment in a minimum time of moorage, especially since the newer ships carry their own cranes and hoists. For the best shipping, both weight tons (2240 lbs. each) and measurement tons (40 cubic feet each) are preferred.

Pig iron and scrap have constituted the major bulk cargo for export. For instance, in 1961, scrap was taken on by "out-of-operation" lake freighters which were towed overseas and melted down there—ships and all. Demand for scrap dropped in 1962 but export of general cargo was up 54 percent. A large part of this was surplus flour for relief in Formosa and Yugoslavia. Also wines, apples, ash-stem for ax handles, maple blocks for shoe lasts, chemicals, tools, and machines were shipped out. A set of old newspaper presses were taken abroad, piece by piece. At the end of the season in 1962 a novel consignment of onions from Elba, N.Y., was shipped to England, clearing the seaway just before its closing but arriving without spoilage. This arrangement was made through the foresight of the local office of an international forwarding company and the international trade department of a local bank.

Import commodities have included wet hides from Canada, great cylinders of newsprint, steel wire, pebbles from the beaches of Denmark, resin from South America, liquors, baler twine, grass seed, tractors, cheese, and sardines.

Buffalo lost business in grain storage and transfer shipment as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. But progress for the port of Buffalo has great potential if developed with skill by the Port Authority backed up with citizen support. The terminal has excellent waterside warehouse space for use during and after the 7 or 8 months of the shipping season. It has its own railroad spurs. The port serves a very productive industrial and agricultural "hinterland" as well as progressive local business enterprises. Labor can help and, in turn, be helped by these trade developments since skilled stevedoring is essential to efficient loading or unloading of deep-sea vessels. Many services such as banking, foreign shipping, insurance, trucking, railroad transportation, and storage will be substantially benefited by expansion in operation of the port. The Authority already has access to a maze of super highways, six international bridges, an airport with its possible accommodation for air freight and an active heliport.

More cargo? More ships? Which comes first? Actually both are needed simultaneously. At present, 85 percent of potential export-import tonnage is controlled in New York City. It is vital to development that some of the agents for firms having commodities for shipment and managers of steamship lines be made increasingly aware of the potentials of this particular port. Valiant effort to do so is underway now. Creative enterprises, such as the onion shipment, can stimulate use. Civic awareness of the value of present holding and civic promotion of their use will be paramount in achieving vitality in foreign commerce for the Niagara Frontier. In the current flux of world trade patterns, now is the strategic time to get export-imports for and from a future world market streaming through the port of Buffalo.

Aids and resources available locally for expansion of trade

The Field Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce is the only official source of export and import statistics for each Customs District. Office Director, Robert Magee, Post Office Building.

Congressman of the 41st District, THADDEUS J. DULSKI has given invaluable assistance in securing information, statistics, and publications from Government centers in Washington. Home Office, U.S. Court House, Buffalo.

Buffalo collection district of the customs service covers Erie, Niagara, Cattaraugus, and Chautauqua Counties. This has a staff of 170 members available. Inspectors are sent to the poitns of entry as needed. The range of tariff varies from "free" to 33½ percent and is determined as "specific" (by weight or quantity) or as "ad valorem" (by value) or by a combination of these two. An appraiser determines value, an expert determines classification. Collector of Customs, Frank Sedita, Post Office Building.

Regional office of the New York State Department of Commerce has contact with the newly appointed representative from the New York State Department of Commerce who is to have headquarters in Brussels, Belgium, to secure prospects for exports and industry and to encourage tourism. This office has available periodic issues of "Foreign Trade Opportunities" which list a wide range of firms interested in purchases: e.g., "electrical parts and refrigerators" in Sierra Leone, "sewing machines" in Cameroon, "cloth-cutting machines" in El Salvador, "dental spare parts" in Saudi Arabia, "catering equipment and artistic painting materials" in Iran, "paperback editions and all types of comics" in Fiji. It also offers booklets, "The Whys and Hows of Exporting" and "New York State Vacation Lands." It is very active in a program to secure new industries for location in the State. Manager, Tom Pyle. Office, 908 Ellicott Square.

The Niagara Frontier Port Authority has been a prime reference for this report. It is directly concerned with expansion of port facilities. Chairman of Board, Arthur Victor, Jr.; director of trade development, W. G. Gilbert; Office, 432 City Hall.

The foreign trade department of the Buffalo area chamber of commerce was recently cited by the U.S. Department of Commerce for "development of oversea sales of regional products through seminars, workshops, and counseling services." It provides trade lists for potential markets and has listed the names of 500 manufacturers of exportable products and of 200 importers in the area. It is in touch with the nine resident consuls from foreign countries. It has organized a number of trade missions around the world in 1963. Manager of trade department, Linwood Law, Chamber of Commerce Building.

Department stores, specialty shops and food markets import a great variety of articles and commodities offering good quality but novel features or a lower price range. One department store listed 43 articles of merchandise offered from 16 different foreign countries. Another featured Christmas cards from seven diverse lands. Foods come in from worldwide sources. These are some of the imports that help to keep trade flowing toward the United States. For the requisite balance of payments, imports must thrive as well as exports to keep up with the new patterns in world trade.

PART II: PROSPECTS IN WORLD TRADE PATTERNS

Iowa raises corn and hogs, Virginia grows tobacco, and Massachusetts makes shoes. Iowans get their tobacco and shoes from Virginia and Massachusetts, paying in part with money earned by selling corn and hogs outside the State. The people of Virginia and Massachusetts likewise import many products, paying in part with products they do make. Why does such trade take place? Why, instead, don't the people of each State make at home all the things they possibly could? Clearly, because that would be wasteful. Everybody understands the benefits of specialization and trade among regions of a single country. The benefits of specialization and trade among countries are no different.

What is the European Common Market?

The Common Market is the most ambitious step yet taken toward economic integration in Europe. The Treaty of Rome binds France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg together into the European Economic Community (EEC). It calls for the creation of a customs union—an area of unrestricted trade surrounded by a common tariff wall. More than that: it calls for free movement not only of goods, but of capital, services, and labor throughout the territory of the Six.

The original treaty of 1957 allowed 12 to 15 years for progressive elimination of tariffs and quotas among the Six and adjustment of external tariffs to a common level. This transition period was broken into three stages, of 4 to 5 years each. Although the rate of further tariff cutting may be speeded up or slowed down (depending on business conditions), the target date for complete elimination of internal tariffs is presently 1966.

Tariffs and quotas are not the only artificial barriers to trade among countries. Monetary exchange restrictions, subsidies, differences in taxation, restrictive agreements between firms, and even the national

fiscal and monetary policies can distort the pattern of trade. The Common Market aims to harmonize economic policies and business law, turning the Six as effectively as possible into an economic unit. Specific fields include capital and labor mobility, competition, transportation and agriculture.

The new Europe is the Western World's fastest growing economy. After 5 years of operation, its gross national product stands at $210 billion, and industrial production has soared 40 percent. The Common Market poured almost 80 million tons of steel last year (compared with the United States' 98 million tons) and is the world's second largest automobile maker. As the world's biggest trader the Common Market is first in imports, second only to the United States in exports. Since 1958 imports into the Common Market from the rest of the world have risen 39 percent, those from the United States a giant 59 percent, thus aiding Washington's balance-of-payment problems.

The institutions of the Common Market

The Rome Treaty sets forth a fairly detailed outline of policy for the Common Market but it is only an outline. To fill in the outline with specific policies and to administer their execution, the treaty established a number of community institutions. The most important of these institutions are:

1. A Commission, which proposes community policy and has day-to-day administrative authority.
2. A council of ministers, which decides community policy and has prime executive responsibility.
3. An assembly, which serves as a limited parliament.
4. A court of justice, which passes judgment on legal issues arising under the treaty.

Although the Rome Treaty does not confer supranational powers on these institutions, their importance is more than administrative. They represent a nucleus from which a European government could some day evolve, if the six member countries should want this evolution to occur.

De Gaulle's rejection of Great Britain's entry into the Common Market

1. Background: In 1950 England turned down the opportunity to enter the European coal and steel community. In 1957 England rejected an invitation to be an original member of the European Common Market.

2. Suggested reasons for De Gaulle's 1963 veto: Opposition to England's special ties with United States and Commonwealth Nations. Claim that Great Britain is an offshore island, not European enough. After United States scrapping of the Skybolt program, felt that Macmillan should have turned to France for a joint nuclear program. Realization that Great Britain's entry into the Common Market would not solve France's surplus farm products problem as De Gaulle originally anticipated.

3. Western Europe's reaction: Alfred Müller-Armack, West Germany's chief negotiator at Brussels, quit his job in disgust. Jean Monnet, father of the Common Market said, "There now looms disunion with its inherent dangers." Belgium's Spaak called the rupture "a monstrous thing."

4. Britain's alternatives to the Common Market: More efficiency in industry and harder work at home. Bargaining with individual Common Market members. Closer trading ties with the United States, the Commonwealth, the nations of the European Free Trade Association, and Latin America.

5. Effect on American trade: The Trade Expansion Act, passed last year with League of Women Voters support, was geared to British entry into the Market. One of its notable features, now rendered nearly meaningless, was the authority granted the President to reduce to zero tariffs on products for which the United States and the Common Market together commanded 80 percent of the world market. With Britain out of the Market, only two items (jet planes and oleomargarine) instead of the expected 26 will fall within this category. Although the President retains authority to reduce other tariffs by 50 percent, the administration may want Congress to broaden the Presidential powers impaired by British exclusion from the EEC.

The trade plight of Latin America

The conditions that favor economic integration in Western Europe do not, by and large, exist today in Latin America. There is little basis for intraregional trade in the present economic structure of the Latin American countries. They are largely self-sufficient in foodstuffs and export chiefly agricultural products and minerals. The trade of these countries has therefore been directed to the industrial nations that need Latin America's primary products and can supply Latin America with the manufactured goods it requires. While manufacturing has expanded rapidly in some Latin American countries in the postwar period, it is generally on a scale sufficient only to meet domestic requirements and is characterized by high production costs. Moreover, freight costs within the region are often prohibitively high.

A crucial year in the history of foreign economic aid—1963

League of Women Voters criteria for successful economic aid:

1. Stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries.
2. Efforts to reduce and ultimately eliminate our aid by enabling nations to stand on their own feet as rapidly as possible.
3. Securing increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of aid to developing countries.
4. Development programs should be long term because development problems cannot be solved overnight.
5. The programs should be adequately financed so that they have a real chance for success.
6. The programs should be effectively administered so that our tax money will pay full value.

Kennedy Inflation Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget, the insidious enemy, inflation, is slowly increasing pressure on the pocketbooks of America's wage earners. While President Kennedy, smiles and frolics in the surf at Hyannis Port, Palm Beach, and other vacation resorts, and his propagandists pour out reams of misinformation on how well off the people are under his benevolent care, the small print in the daily news shows that the cost of living has steadily increased since he took office.

Our happy-go-lucky Chief Executive and his completely befuddled economic advisers will not have to pay the piper when the dance is through, but the people will and the burden will fall hardest on those least able to pay, the low salary group, the aged, those on fixed salaries and pensions.

It is too bad President Kennedy would rather experiment with foreign philosophies than give our own tried and tested private enterprise system full opportunity to work. This is the oath he took when he became President, but it is becoming clear that he had no more intention of keeping his oath of preserving the Constitution than he did of keeping his campaign promises.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news item on another increase in the cost of living from U.S. News & World Report of August 5, 1963:

LIVING COSTS RISE—SO DOES TAKE-HOME PAY

WASHINGTON.—The cost of living in the United States set a record in June. The Labor Department's index climbed four-tenths of 1 percent to 106.6, compared with the base of 100 set on 1957–59 costs.

Sugar prices rose 32 percent during June. Other increases: in taxes, medical care, housing costs, pork and cigarettes. The June figure was 1.2 percent above June 1962.

Factory workers' take-home pay also hit a record high in June, the Department reported. The average, after taxes, for a worker with three dependents, was $88.38 per week, up 90 cents.

Statement by Hon. Nelson W. Peach, Professor of Economics, University of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Reserve Board moves to raise interest rates through discount rate action it affects the pocketbooks of Americans in every walk of life. This fact is brought out in the following statement by a very eminent economist, Prof. Nelson W. Peach, professor of economics at the University of Oklahoma, which I am sure my colleagues will find informative:

Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, is to be complimented for his fancy footwork in his statement before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, July 22d, 1963. In this statement, he was supposedly explaining why the Board raised the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. If Floyd Patterson had shown the same dexterity in his footwork earlier in the week, he might have been the first person to regain the heavyweight crown twice. According to the Board's statement, the purpose of raising the discount rate was that such action was essential to aid in the United States effort to meet its international payments problem. On the basis of the evidence presented by Mr. Martin, he might almost as well have argued that the purpose of raising the discount rate was to solve the smog problem in Los Angeles, or the traffic congestion problem in our large cities, or the water shortage problem of the Nation, or the racial issue, or that the purpose was to produce the first Beethoven in the United States.

Like Floyd Patterson, Mr. Martin landed one solid punch in his testimony. He stated that the discount rates had been raised from 3 to 3½ percent. The rest of his testimony is about as clear and convincing as Mr. Patterson after his third knockdown.

Mr. Martin stated that he was dealing in an area of judgment and that other judgments may differ from his. It is, however, a fairly safe generalization that there is considerable unanimity of opinion among lender groups that high interest rates are desirable. On the other hand, there is considerable unanimity of opinion among borrower groups that low interest rates are desirable.

The higher interest rates resulting from the Board's action amount to more than another raid on the U.S. Treasury. With public and private indebtedness of a trillion dollars, an increase on one-half of 1 percent per year amounts to a transfer of $5 billion a year from borrower groups to lender groups. If the higher interest rate policy of Mr. Martin continues, it would mean a transfer of $5 billion each year from borrower to lender. Mr. Martin stated that the higher interest rate policy was adopted only after long, "careful and conscientious consideration by the Board and, indeed, by the entire System, in which every aspect of the question and every point of view was developed and weighed." If the transfer of $5 billion a year from borrower to lender groups was indeed weighed by Mr. Martin and his associates, he must have deemed it sufficiently unimportant for comment.

Mr. Martin says that we do not know as much about the flow of funds between countries as we would like to know and it is certainly clear that we do not know much. But, the Federal Reserve System has an annual income of a billion dollars and one wonders why the Federal Reserve doesn't spend a modest amount of this income in compiling basic information on such an important subject.

Mr. Martin states that U.S. funds flow into other countries mainly because of the higher yield available outside the United States; but we do not know how large this flow is. If Mr. Martin wished to know, however, it would not be a difficult statistical problem. A survey of the largest 500 corporations in this country will account for most of it. One might expect that these large corporations would be quite willing to report voluntarily to Mr. Martin's organization. But, if it seemed desirable, Mr. Martin might ask the Congress for legal authority to require such reporting.

In an article in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal, it was stated that the increase in discount rates might improve the balance-of-payments position by as much as half a billion dollars. Although it is carefully to be noted that neither Mr. Martin nor Mr. Dillon gave any assurance on this point (Wall Street Journal, July 17, 1963, p. 3). Even if we accept this undocumented figure, one might wonder if $5 billion a year in higher interest rates for the domestic economy is not a high price to pay for a possible half a billion dollars.

It is not as though recipients of interest income have fared badly during the past decade. In 1952, personal interest income in this country amounted to $12.1 billion and in 1961 had risen to $27.3 billion. During that same period, farm proprietor income dropped from $15.3 billion to $13.1 billion (U.S. Department of Commerce, "Survey of Current Business," July, 1962, table 4, p. 8).

President Kennedy has asked for a $10 billion tax cut. As soon as the lenders pass on the higher cost of money to borrowers, the equivalent of half of this tax cut will be transferred from lender to borrower groups. It might be suggested that Congress make the transfer direct.

Mr. Richard E. Pearce: Our Exploding Cities—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, appended below is the final article in a series on our exploding cities by Richard E. Pearce of the San Francisco Examiner.

In this final article Mr. Pearce sums up his findings and applies them to the problems confronting San Francisco.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend Mr. Pearce for his outstanding research and penetrating analysis of problems and challenges facing metropolitan America. I am certain many of our colleagues will learn much from this series and benefit from his experience and his insight into urban problems.

The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 8, 1963]

SURPRISE IN EXPLODING CITIES—PART VIII

(By Richard E. Pearce)

What kind of person and neighbor is the Negro when he works his way up to a middle class income and home ownership?

The city of Philadelphia, which is 26.7 percent Negro, decided recently to find out. The findings of its study will surprise some.

Historically the massing within a big city slum of poorly educated ethnic or national groups has led to one or more of the familiar problems of high crime and death rates, family instability, racial and religious tensions. The existence of these social problems in turn fanned the fires of prejudice and discrimination.

(San Francisco, proud of its reputation for tolerance, doesn't like to recall an earlier era here when employment signs not uncommonly added, "No Irish Need Apply.")

In time the successive waves of European immigrants worked their way out of the slum, the ghetto or racial pocketing, and melted into the great American middle class. Each time that happened the social problems, which had been blamed on their race or national origin, vanished.

DIFFERENT?

But, say some, the Negro is different. Unlike the white European immigrants and the small Oriental immigrant groups, the Negro has behind him no racial culture or civilization of his own, no binding religion. Doubtless the existence of this viewpoint was among the reasons that prompted the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, an arm of city government, to carry out its study.

It chose for the study two racially mixed districts of Philadelphia which, for the purpose of clarity, will be called the middle income area and the low income area.

The middle income area was found to contain 74,466 whites and 35,452 nonwhites. (Since Philadelphia has few nonwhites other than Negroes, the term nonwhite for all practical purposes means Negro.)

The low income area contained 26,730 whites and 153,961 nonwhites.

In the middle income area the median family income for whites was $6,472, for nonwhites $5,641.

In the low income area the figures were $4,203 for whites and $3,954 for nonwhites.

Note that the nonwhites in the middle income area had a higher income than the whites in the low income area.

VARIED FACTORS

Using 1960 U.S. Census data and Health Department statistics, the commission examined the factors of education, occupation, employment, home ownership, conditions of home, degree of overcrowding in the home, health, death rates and family stability.

Among the findings:

The nonwhites in the middle income area had a higher percentage of high school graduates (40 percent) than the whites in the low income area (24). The same held true for education beyond high school.

Fewer nonwhites in the middle income area were unemployed (6 percent) than whites in the low income area (10).

Whites in both areas showed a lower percentage of divorce and separation than nonwhites. However, nonwhites in the middle income area had a much lower percentage (12) than nonwhites in the low income area (22).

The proportion of children under 18 living with both parents was higher among nonwhites in the middle income area (76 percent) than among whites in the low income area (71). Whites in the middle income area had the highest proportion (88) and nonwhites in the low income area had the lowest (59).

(Commented the report: "Socioeconomic factors thus appear to be stronger than racial in determining family stability.")

HOMEOWNING

Of all four groups, the nonwhites in the middle income area had the highest ratio of homeownership (72 percent). Fewer of their homes were overcrowded (9 percent) than white homes in the low income area (11 percent).

Though data on condition of housing could not be separated out for these two areas, census figures for the entire city showed that 85 percent of all homes owned by nonwhites were in sound condition, compared to 61 percent of those rented by nonwhites.

Infant death rates showed a steady progression in the two areas, from 17.9 per 1,000 live births among whites in the middle income area to 29.1 for nonwhites in that area, to 36 for whites in the low income area and 45.5 for nonwhites in that area.

Commented the report on these findings:

"This demonstrates that the socioeconomic differences between whites and nonwhites in Philadelphia are a function of opportunity for social mobility and are not related to race per se."

Or, in simple English, when the Negro moves into the middle class he lives and acts like any other middle class citizen.

(Areas of attractive Negro middle class homes existed in all seven of the cities I visited. Usually the areas were undergoing a process that made them increasingly all-black.

(In Washington, Maurice Shean, San Francisco's Federal lobbyist, and I asked a white taxi driver to show us three kinds of Negro housing: Upper income, middle income and slums. The driver knew exactly where the first two kinds existed. They were tree-shaded areas of good homes, well cared for, with neat lawns and gardens.

(If the taxi driver is to be believed, they are not integrated areas. He said the only whites remaining were elderly homeowners who had spent most of their lives there and refused to join the white exodus.)

The Philadelphia study did not include crime statistics. In Chicago, where urban renewal wiped out an area of Negro slums and created a racially mixed, middle class neighborhood, the police captain for the area said crime had not vanished. He said it had changed from a pattern of typical slum

crimes to middle class crimes—"the kind you find in any middle class neighborhood."

How does a city hasten the rise of this Negro middle class? The answer has many parts. It was best stated in broad terms by Jerome P. Cavanagh, Detroit's young (35), aggressive and handsome new mayor.

Cavanagh successfully advocated in his election campaign a city income tax hitting those suburbanites who make their living in the city but don't help solve its problems. He is also trying to break the suburban "white noose" by quietly encouraging Negro real estate men to find Negro buyers for the estimated 7,000 homes in white Detroit suburbs that have been foreclosed by the FHA and VA, which forbid discrimination.

Cities, said Cavanagh, must parallel their urban renewal efforts with a "human renewal" program, in which the community concentrates all available tools on the rehabilitation and upgrading of its submerged citizens.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 9, 1963]

EXPLODING CITIES—PART IX: PROBLEMS OF SAN FRANCISCO

(By Richard E. Pearce)

"And here we are in the best of all possible worlds—more beabutiful than Washington, more cosmopolitan than New Orleans, a better marketplace than Atlanta, industrially sounder than Houston or Dallas, wealthier and more civilized than Los Angeles or San Diego, San Francisco offers to the next generation much of what New York offered to the last generation. Given a continuation of the exuberance that is the legacy of this coastline, San Francisco could become the city of the future."

The words above are not another of those syrupy blurbs designed to snare the tourist or feed San Francisco's fat ego.

They came from a brilliant student of cities, a young New York real estate operator named Robert A. Futterman. He backed his judgment of city growth potentials with hard cash, and amassed a fortune in urban real estate before he was 33.

Not content simply to make more money, Futterman studied in depth the forces that shape American cities, and examined 19 of the largest in detail. He put the results in a book, "The Future of Our Cities." The words above are taken from the final chapter, devoted to the city he found best situated in the economic, geographic, and human senses to grapple with the future.

Though I examined fewer cities than he and studied them much more cursorily (and my heart and home were in San Francisco to becloud my judgment) I must say I returned sharing his opinion.

San Francisco does have problems, some of them serious. But nothing shrinks those problems to their true proportion faster than an examination of the same problems in older cities of the East and Midwest where they are so much more severe.

San Francisco is far richer in opportunities than in problems—opportunities to learn from the good and the bad in other cities, yes; above all, rich in opportunities to build a future city and citizenry not only with zest and imagination but also with enduring quality.

What should San Francisco do to master its future? My list is not long. Nothing on it is optional.

DOWNTOWN

The happy conjunction of three major enterprises—the coming of the three-level transit subway to Market Street, the Market Street rejuvenation program and the south-of-Market urban renewal—provides San Francisco with a truly magnificent opportunity. It is one that probably won't come again in this century.

These three enterprises should be meshed into one grand plan for downtown in which the city seizes the chance to correct mistakes of the past while boldly redesigning the whole Market area to meet the needs of the future.

The key to all this will be the subway's first level. It should not be confined to the width of Market Street as a utilitarian place of turnstiles and cigar stands. It should be a vast concourse system that thrusts into the business community on each side of Market, transforming downtown into a weatherproof shopping center. It should be handsomely designed and brilliantly lighted. It should have sunken gardens open to the sky. In all respects it should invite, not repel like older undergrounds in the East.

Let me repeat for emphasis something I wrote at the beginning of this series: San Franciscans should compel all of the rapid transit directors and every member of the board of supervisors (that goes too for Oaklanders and Berkeleyans and their city councilmen) to go take a long look at Philadelphia. There are to be seen in subway concourses the worst and the best, the wrong way and the right way, all within 5 minutes' walk.

Philadelphia's East Market Street, the main retail street, has a subway and also a commuter train station emptying directly onto the street. But these haven't saved East Market's retail business from declining or saved the street from sinking into the blight so evident on parts of San Francisco's Market. The subway concourse is the familiar old kind—narrow, linear, and gloomy. The nearby South Broad concourse is even worse—a long, forbidding tunnel avoided by Philadelphians except during rainstorms.

Stroll then a few blocks and enter a whole, delightful new world—Penn Center with its vast and cheerful new concourse system, carefully designed and lighted, open to the sky at several points and above all serving as a means to unify its entire area.

"Please," said Philadelphia Planning Director Edmund Bacon to me as I left him. "Please plead with the people of San Francisco not to make on their Market Street the same tragic mistake that we're spending hundreds of millions to correct."

It will cost money, lots of money, to do Market Street right. Not to do it right would be a civic crime of the first magnitude.

SCHOOLS

The most pressing problem in all big cities is that of absorbing into the urban fabric their large new populations of uneducated, uncultured Negroes from the rural South.

The community program that upgrades the Negro must stand on three legs—education, job opportunity, decent housing. All are indispensable. Education comes first. Only education can break the generations-old chain of ignorance in these families, creating of the Negro child a useful urban citizen in a way his parents can never be.

San Francisco's candidates for mayor say we need more police because of the rising crime rate. Perhaps so. But I would hope this need is transitory. I would much rather spend the money to strike at the root source—to hire more specially trained teachers and counselors to work with these Negro children in the earliest grades. Only there can the wretched chain be broken.

Nor is that all. In city after city I was told by public leaders that the declining quality of the public schools, not housing, was the biggest factor in their failure to hold desirable young families within the city, or attract them back from the suburbs. San Francisco has an excellent school system. Nothing is more important than maintaining that quality.

CODES

The biggest single cause of blight and slums in cities was their failures to adopt and enforce good codes—the codes that control building, zoning, health, fire, etc.

Where codes are poor, and most particularly where a slack or dishonest city government fails to enforce them, there grow the slums that invite problem people to come and live in the city.

San Francisco's codes are good. Its housing is generally good. ("I wish I had some of that housing you people tore down as slums," the renewal director of one eastern city said to me.)

But San Francisco's code enforcement is not good enough.

PLANNING

For too long politicians looked with contempt upon city planners. That era is dead. In city after city of the East, where politics and civic sloth ruled for decades, it is planners to whom people have turned for guidance and rescue.

Strong, well financed, and continuous planning are imperative both for San Francisco and the bay region, if the immense population growth of tomorrow is to be absorbed without chaos.

OUR HERITAGE

San Francisco is a treasure trove of distinctive urban values. It should cherish and protect them fiercely—its delightful little neighborhoods, its fine architecture, its small parks, its views, its vistas, its diversities, to mellow disorderliness.

A memorable city is a warm and human and crowded place where one has a sense of the legacy from past generations and of the infinite variety of man's creative talents and instincts.

On the tongue of land in Pittsburgh where the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers join the Ohio stands the ballyhooed new Gateway Center. It is a cluster of carefully spaced, precisely planned, tall commercial buildings. The whole is costly, sleekly handsome—and dull and impersonal. One feels that Gateway Center is all the work of one hand, and that it is not really a part of Pittsburgh. It seems to stand apart from the old downtown, sniffily lifting its skirts to keep them unsoiled. That is not the way a city should grow.

I wouldn't trade San Francisco's Chinatown for the whole complex. No, not even Jackson Square.

REGION

True metropolitan government is an impossible dream. Limited instruments of regional government, to guide those matters that are regional in nature, are a necessity. So is voluntary regional cooperation.

The cities of the bay area are not savagely at one another's throats like the communities of the Boston and Pittsburgh metropolitan regions. But neither have they learned to work together, through both regional laws and voluntary association, as well as the New York and Chicago regions.

The bay area needs a regional planning arm. It needs a regional agency to unify its airports, seaports and toll bridges. And the Association of Bay Area Governments, its best tool for voluntary cooperation, needs the support San Francisco is now petulantly withholding.

LEADERSHIP

Too often citizens think they need a strong mayor to get things done, or a strong business leadership to force a weak mayor to act. It isn't so. A city needs a strong political power and a strong economic power. Neither can get things done without the other.

They need not be of the same political persuasion, as reawakened Boston and Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have shown. They do need to be united in love of their city. Given this unifying force they learn to work together, and to respect one another.

Appendix

An Address by Mayor James H. J. Tate, of Philadelphia, on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, recently spoke on behalf of our great city when he expressed himself on the civil rights issue in an address before the city council on July 25, 1963. Many Members represent cities which would like to learn what is being done about this most pressing issue, and how to constructively approach the problems involved in its successful resolution.

I therefore take pride in including in my remarks at this point the full text of Mayor Tate's avowed determination to fully implement the civil rights program which has been in continuing and expanding operation in Philadelphia—the "Cradle of Liberty"—under the outstanding administrations of Mayors Clark, Dilworth, and Tate:

MESSAGE BY MAYOR JAMES H. J. TATE TO CITY COUNCIL, JULY 25, 1963

To the president and members of the Council of the City of Philadelphia, it is indeed a pleasant assignment for me to return to these legislative chambers from time to time, since leaving this honorable body to assume the high office of mayor.

Being so intimately acquainted with both the legislative and executive branches of our city government has enabled me to appreciate more fully than might otherwise be possible this special role which each branch of government plays in our unique democratic system.

I last addressed your honorable body some 3 months ago, on April 18, in my annual message on the state of the city. At that time, if you will recall, I spoke at some length about some of our more pressing problems—about our serious unemployment, about the need for more education and continued economic growth.

To a very large degree, these problems are intimately connected with another problem which in the past few months has been brought before the entire Nation with decisive impact.

I am referring, of course, to a matter which goes to the very foundations of our national conscience—the imperative need to extend full civil rights to all Americans, without delay, in accordance with the guarantees of the Constitution and the law of the land.

We in Philadelphia take pride in the fact that our city is the cradle of liberty—the birthplace of our Nation, of the Declaration of Independence and of our Constitution. We are quick to take pride as well in the fact that our city in the past dozen years has been in the forefront of the battle to combat discrimination and to promote fuller opportunities for racial and religious minorities.

Just three weeks ago today, down at Independence Hall, we heard Vice President of the United States Lyndon B. Johnson make a ringing affirmation of the civil rights, moral rights, and human dignity of all Americans. If our Nation is to fulfill its destiny, he said, we should not waste our strength worrying about who is to ride in the back of the bus, or who can purchase a hamburger in a public place.

We in Philadelphia also have a destiny to fulfill. It is a great and perhaps an ambitious destiny for we are actively engaged in the program to restore our city to the place it once held as the most important city in this Nation, and the center of a thriving and industrious region and I think you will agree with me that we are well on our way.

While we in Philadelphia have overcome the problem of who is to ride in the back of the bus, or who can order food in a public place, we still have discrimination and segregation affecting many other areas of our citizens' daily lives.

Let me say firmly and categorically, here and new, that my entire administration stands for full civil rights and for full equality of opportunity for every citizen of Philadelphia, regardless of race, creed, color, religion, or national origin. Not only do we stand for it, we insist upon it—to the full extent of the city's authority.

The administration's philosophy in this vital field was spelled out last month, when it was my privilege to notify President John F. Kennedy of our wholehearted support for his civil rights program. I was pleased to be able to inform the President that Philadelphia has substantially enacted his five recommendations to the mayors of the Nation at the U.S. Conference of Mayors in Hawaii.

First, we have had an active bi-racial Commission on Human Relations since 1952. Second, you have adopted, and I have signed, a fair practices ordinance. Third, we have established a biracial citizens advisory committee on civil rights. Fourth, we have in operation in our own municipal employment a highly successful nondiscriminatory merit system. And finally, we have a functioning manpower utilization commission to seek new approaches and solutions to unemployment.

Our Philadelphia Home Rule Charter established the Commission on Human Relations and gave it power to administer and enforce all statutes and ordinances prohibiting discrimination.

The Home Rule Charter also charged the Commission to promote equal rights and opportunities for all.

Utilizing a variety of techniques, the Commission works to reduce and eventually to eliminate segregation and discrimination in employment, housing, education, and other vital areas. The Commission has fulfilled these tasks with distinction for more than a dozen years, and has become a model for many other cities throughout the Nation.

In an effort to make the Commission even more effective in carrying out the mandate of the charter, I have instituted several moves which I believe can help substantially to strengthen its role.

One of these was the appointment of a biracial citizens advisory committee on civil rights, which is now actively at work. This group includes approximately 40 distinguished representatives of a wide cross-section of the informed leadership of our community—clergymen, labor, and industrial representatives, social agencies, professional men, educational and civic groups.

The purpose of this citizen advisory committee is to serve as a pipeline between the Commission and the community, providing new and meaningful communication between our citizens and the administration.

The advisory committee assists the Commission to identify pressing problems, to establish a system of priorities, to outline approaches, and to serve as a forum for sounding out opinion and testing procedures. Thus, it will save valuable time in enabling the Commission and the administration to respond to community needs and desires promptly and effectively.

The two cochairmen of the Citizens Advisory Committee are former State Supreme Court Justice Thomas D. McBride, Chairman of the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, and the Rev. Henry H. Nichols, President of the Philadelphia Council of Churches. They are among the most capable people of our community, and I believe we are extremely fortunate in being able to make use of their high qualifications.

I have met personally with the members of the advisory committee on civil rights on two occasions and I plan to meet with them personally again and again, and as frequently as circumstances permit. I have been tremendously impressed with the way these citizens have approached this very important task, and I am confident that they will make an important contribution to the solution of this complex and urgent community problem.

Already the committee has taken thoughtful action and made meaningful recommendations to the Commission on Human Relations in the areas of public and private employment, education, and law administration.

Recent events have made it clear that the Commission on Human Relations must step up its activities very substantially if it is to respond to the current needs of our community. I therefore directed a management survey of the Commission's functions and staff organization. The purpose of this survey was to determine what areas of the Commission needed reinforcement in order to do the most effective job possible.

The results of that survey indicate that the Commission requires an increased budget to carry out the functions mandated by the Charter and spelled out in our nondiscrimination ordinances.

The Commission now has a budgeted staff of 34 persons, at a current annual cost of $204,847. The Commission's expanded work load, resulting from adoption of the fair practices ordinance recently and increases in other activities, will require the services of 13 additional employees, to be recruited at once. Unless this additional money is on hand, and we hire the additional people, the Commission will be slowed in its activity and will be tremendously handicapped in carrying out its mandated activities for action—now.

The additional cost for personnel for the balance of 1963 will be $20,865.

In addition, the sum of $3,625 will be needed for the balance of 1963 to cover such expenditures as furniture, office supplies, and incidental costs.

The total proposed increase for the balance of 1963, therefore, comes to $24,490, and I am accordingly requesting a supplemental appropriation to the Commission on Human Relations in that amount. Further increases costing approximately $88,000 for expanded activities in 1964 will be included in the Commission's regular budget estimates which will be submitted to your honorable body as usual later this year.

It is my further recommendation that your honorable body consider this matter promptly, because time is of the essence. You are well aware that, due to your summer recess and the repairs scheduled for the council chamber, there will be a period of 5 weeks following next Thursday's session. By the time you return, I anticipate that the additional employees will be recruited, and I ask a commitment for the use of this sum now.

The element of time is important for two other reasons. The first of these has to do with our inescapable moral duty to distinguish between justice and injustice. For the innocent victim of injustice, every hour's delay is an hour too long.

The second reason is economic. Both from the point of view of the nonwhite citizen who must earn a decent living in order to live a decent life, and from the point of view of the community at large, which loses a tremendous economic potential when many of its citizens cannot work at jobs for which they are fully qualified, it makes sound economic sense to break down the remaining barriers of discrimination as rapidly as possible.

Our city, as you know, has had its share of demonstrations by citizens taking advantage of their fundamental right to peaceably assemble for the redress of grievances. It is worthy of note that we have now moved from the streets to the conference table. I believe this is evidence that responsible leaders throughout the community now realize that the city's approach to this vexing problem of equal rights is a just one. I believe they realize that the citizens advisory committee, working closely with the Commission on Human Relations, provides a top-level forum to deal with these challenging issues promptly and effectively.

I also believe strongly that our citizens—both white and nonwhite—are sensible, law-abiding people. They recognize injustice when they see it—for they are citizens of the city of brotherly love. They have the moral courage to do something about injustice—and my administration is in full accord with that view. Something is being done, and right now.

As you know, President Kennedy has sent to the Congress a comprehensive civil rights program designed to extend first-class citizenship to all Americans. We support his program. We have already shown that we in Philadelphia are actually in agreement with his philosophy, and that we are sincere in seeking a just and permanent solution, for we do have his civil rights program locally, and we are actively doing something about it.

As we all know only too well, however, laws are only a partial answer. The full solution to this problem is long overdue. That solution must lie in the hearts and resolutions of the American people, and in the hearts and resolutions of all the citizens of Philadelphia.

In submitting his civil rights program to Congress, President Kennedy said:

"In this year of the Emancipation Centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquillity—but, above all, because it is right."

I believe with President Kennedy that this legislation is right, and I call on all Philadelphians to carry out the letter and the spirit of his civil rights program here in our own city.

I am confident that with the united and continued support of all of the people of Philadelphia, who with their courage and their faith and their prayers have shown that they have been equal to any challenge, we can give new substance to the message of the Liberty Bell that we should "proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof"—and mean it.

Civil Rights Legislation Will Create a Federal Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the July 25, 1963, issue of the Suncoast News of St. Petersburg, Fla., contains an outstanding editorial on the pending civil rights legislation. I take pleasure in commending this editorial entitled "Civil Rights Legislation Will Create a Federal Police State" to my colleagues and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION WILL CREATE A FEDERAL POLICE STATE

We, in America, are headed pelimell and headlong into a dictatorship. Our great Constitution, which was the wonder and admiration of other great nations, and the safeguard of our freedoms and our liberties, is being either ignored or misconstrued by the Federal courts with the advice and consent of our Attorney General.

Our Constitution no longer means what it says, according to the views of the Attorney General. He declares that it should no longer be used as a crutch, but we must read between the lines for the basic moral principles of the broad civil rights legislation being urged by the Kennedy administration.

This argument will not bear examination. According to all of the basic rules of consitutional construction, constitutions must be construed in the light of conditions that existed at the time of their adoption and in a manner consistent with the views of those who brought the constitution into existence. A great change in conditions and events will not justify a change in constitutional construction. If the Constitution no longer reflects the opinion of the people, let it be amended in regular form by submitting the needed amendments to the States for adoption as the Constitution requires.

Once a provision of the Constitution is carefully considered by a court of last resort, in this case the Supreme Court of the United States, the construction given that provision becomes a part of the Constitution itself; and any subsequent change amounts to an amendment of the Constitution. Anyone at all familiar with constitutional law knows full well that no court has any power whatever to amend the Constitution by judicial decree.

And now we see the amazing statement of the Attorney General that we must read between the lines of the Constitution to come up with a new construction to meet modern conditions. That is utterly dumbfounding.

The present civil rights law proposed by the Kennedy administration differs but little from the civil rights laws considered by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1882–83. That act provided that: "All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement."

The law was passed 7 years after the 14th amendment was declared adopted. The 14th amendment and the circumstances surrounding its adoption were well known to everyone at that time and more particularly to the Justices of the Supreme Court, which did not contain a single southerner.

The Court, at that time, gave full and complete consideration to the powers of the Federal Government and what Congress could and could not do in the way of passing civil rights legislation. The Court declared the 14th amendment did "not invest Congress with the power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation; but to provide modes of relief against State legislation or State action of the kind referred to. It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights."

Despite the decisions in the civil rights cases in 1883, we now see the Attorney General of the United States, our chief law officer, issuing statements to the effect that we should ignore the decisions in the civil rights cases, and read between the lines of the Constitution in order to come up with a construction permitting Congress to enact civil rights legislation which our Supreme Court held, 80 years ago, was entirely beyond the power of Congress.

We admit there are changes in circumstances, but these changes should not and cannot justify an amendment to the Constitution by an opinion of the Attorney General. If the amendment is needed, let it be done by two-thirds of each House of Congress submitting such amendments for adoption by three-fourths of the States.

We are dumbfounded that our chief law officer should suggest any other course.

Have we reached the sad state of affairs where our Congress will pass laws out of sheer power to do so, hoping the Warren Court will now uphold them, without regard to any constitutional rights to do so and in defiance of prior decisions of the Court?

If so, our Republic no longer exists. We have reached the full status of a police state. A Federal policeman can walk into our house, if we take in a roomer or do sewing, or give music lessons or make a meager living from any other form of activity dealing with the public; and we can be taken forcibly to the nearest Federal police station to be sentenced to such fine or imprisonment as the Federal judge may determine.

Our States will cease to exist. Our State police power will vanish. Our federalized form of government will come to an end.

We will be ruled by the Attorney General and multiplied thousands of his henchmen. And America, as we know it, will be gone forever. May God forbid such a state of affairs in our great country.

Imports Not Chief Woe, Commerce Department Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in Footwear News on Thursday, July 25, 1963:

IMPORTS NOT CHIEF WOE, COMMERCE DEPARTMENT ASSERTS

(By Robert Barr)

WASHINGTON.—Imports are not the major cause of the domestic leather footwear industry's problems, the Commerce Department bluntly has advised Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York.

This appraisal of the industry's troubles cited chronic overcapacity, ease of entry into the business, chronic business failures in the trade, and the domestic industry's inability to stimulate consumer consumption.

The blunt analysis was made by J. F. Collins, Director of the Commerce Department Office of Trade Adjustment, in a June 25 letter to Senator KEATING who had written Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges about the domestic industry's plight. Senator KEATING revealed Mr. Collins' answer last week.

This letter represents the Department's view, not the personal opinion of Mr. Collins, according to a check by Footwear News.

It is in sharp contrast to the noncommittal letter written some time ago by Christian Herter, special representative for trade negotiation, to Representative HOWARD ROBISON, Republican, of New York.

The Collins letter to Senator KEATING conceded that imports are capturing an increasing share of the leather footwear domestic market.

CITES OTHER POINTS

But to stop any discussion at this point, the Commerce Department official wrote, would be to "overlook other salient points that put the import question in proper perspective."

Currently, the United States enjoys a favorable general balance of trade with Italy and Japan, which account for 78 percent of the leather shoe shipments to the United States, Mr. Collins noted.

"To raise tariffs (which the industry does not seek) or to install quotas (which the industry does seek) would be to jeopardize the exports to these and other areas, thereby transferring the damage of one industry to another industry presently gaining through free trade," Mr. Collins wrote.

He cited the present operations of the domestic shoe industry as being only 60 to 70 percent of the capacity of 1 billion pairs.

"While imports compound the problem, nevertheless it is not even the major cause of the 30 to 40 percent of unused capacity. Here, the industry places the blame on imports for a situation where (a) chronic overcapacity, (b) ease of entry into the industry (445 factories entered the industry between 1951 and 1962 out of 1,300 factories operating in 1962 or 34 percent), (c) chronic business failures (603 factories ceased operation between 1952 and 1962 out of 1,450 factories or 41 percent) are more basic problems and ones which must be tackled before any lasting solution is found for this industry," Mr. Collins wrote.

Further, he advised Senator KEATING, the domestic production plus imports, when compared with population statistics, show little growth in consumption of footwear during a period of economic growth for the Nation.

Mr. Collins wrote: "It appears that, in spite of economic prosperity, leisure time growth, new trends in discount merchandising, etc., the leather footwear industry has been unable to interest the consumer in greater leather shoe consumption. And yet the leather shoe industry says that the average price of a leather shoe at factory value was only $3.80 a pair or $6 (approximately) at retail."

COORDINATION LACK

It is obvious that, with the large number of firms in the industry, it is difficult to get coordinated market stimulation by the firms, Senator KEATING was told.

If consumer consumption was increased only by 1½ pairs per person the domestic industry's present overcapacity would become undercapacity, Mr. Collins wrote.

Labor Department statistics do not show substantial job displacement in the shoe industry, and the decline of shoe production workers between 1956 and 1961 (7,800 workers from the 1956 total of 221,500) can be attributed to laborsaving devices rather than imports, Mr. Collins continued.

He noted that total shoe production was 591 million pairs in 1956 and 599 million pairs in 1961, despite this decline of 7,800 jobs in the industry.

COMPARES FIGURES

Regarding the argument that imports have cut the leather industry's profits after taxes, Mr. Collins told Senator KEATING that when imports were at a lower point in 1956 (1.8 percent of domestic production compared with 8.2 percent in 1962) the leather shoe industry profit picture was lower than the average (5.3 percent) for all domestic manufacturers.

"Clearly, we are dealing with a low-margin industry whose chronic problems are fully as significant or more so than its tariff problems.

"The Commerce Department and the Interagency Shoe Committee has been endeavoring to stimulate industry talks on these other areas of industry need, rather than letting the tariff question bear the brunt of the pressure," Mr. Collins wrote.

Senator KEATING revealed this letter last week and also revealed he and certain other Senators had written President Kennedy to ask for an international agreement to curb shoe imports.

A similar plea was made some weeks ago by 235 Members of the House, plus their plea for a White House conference with a committee presenting them. Representative JAMES BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, heads that informal committe and so far has not received any answer from the White House.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 27, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your remarks on your House Resolution 14. I support your opinions and wish that more Congressmen would do so.

Sincerely,

EDWARD POCIUS.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
June 28, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I thank you for your continuous effort on behalf of all the enslaved nations of the world that are under Communist domination.

I also wish to inform you that I wholeheartedly endorse your House Resolution 14.

The best of health to you.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH ZUK.

GROVELAND, MASS., *June 20, 1963.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: May I take this opportunity to commend you for your stand for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

As an American of Armenian ancestry, I am especially interested in the successful formation of this committee. I feel that it will develop the true facts relative to Armenia and other captive states now forcibly incorporated into the Soviet structure.

I want to assure you of my every support in your measure and all the success in the passage of House Resolution 14 and House Resolution 15 once released from the Rules Committee.

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES N. CHOOLPAN,
Selectman, Town of Groveland.

JUNE 23, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: A resolution of the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD (H. Res.

14) is before your committee. As citizens, we feel that a Committee on Captive Nations, as proposed by this resolution, is vitally necessary in order to provide such knowledge and information as is essential for the formulation and propagation of America's foreign policy. The existence of such a committee will show the rest of the world, both free, and as the knowledge inexorably disseminates, slave, that America is the insurmountable citadel in which the flame of worldwide freedom is continuously nurtured.

We sincerely urge you to give this resolution your consideration. After careful study, we hope you will give this resolution your unequivocal support and actively aid in its passage through your committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. W. Ricket, Mr. and Mrs. P. Rusynko, Mr. and Mrs. P. Kudyk, Mr. and Mrs. A. Kulczycky, Mr. and Mrs. E. Taharchuk, Mr. and Mrs. A. Stepanchuk, Mrs. R. Sansone, Mr. and Mrs. F. Serio, Mr. and Mrs. J. Onufrey, Mr. and Mrs. Sawicki, Mr. and Mrs. A. Bendiak, Mr. and Mrs. W. Burdock, Mr. P. Wowczak, Mr. and Mrs. M. Predun, Mr. A. Kurlo, Mr. and Mrs. M. Kopchan, Mr. and Mrs. O. Jameson, Mr. and Mrs. P. Kostowich, Mr. and Mrs. Palonsky, Miss M. Oleksniki, Mr. and Mrs. A. Fuchs, Mr. and Mrs. L. Flower, Mr. and Mrs. J. Denney, Mr. and Mrs. J. Spota, Mr. and Mrs. N. Burdiak, Mr. M. Barchin, Mr. and Mrs. W. Beck, Mr. and Mrs. P. Schimetzki, Mrs. M. Drozdek, Mr. and Mrs. P. Kozecky, Mr. and Mrs. J. Yenco, Mary C. Grau, Ruth M. Campbell.

Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we all say that "it can't happen here," that the United States is great and strong and will always be so. But it can happen here unless the American people exercise eternal vigilance over the freedoms and system of government which have made our Nation the greatest in all history and given our people a way of life never before enjoyed by any others.

Mr. Opie L. Shelton, executive vice president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, has written a thoughtful column in the chamber's official publication, Atlanta magazine, which I believe Members of the Senate will find interesting.

I also would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and those who compose the editorial and art staff of Atlanta magazine for this splendid publication. It is a credit to all Atlanta, and I believe the best of its kind in all the country.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shelton's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Atlanta Magazine, July 1963]

NIGHTMARE

(By Opie L. Shelton)

Nightmares are a rarity for me. Usually I sleep the sleep of the righteous, whether the righteous like it or not. But the other night I had a lulu of a nightmare. The thought of it still sends cold chills up and down my spine.

I dreamed that all of a sudden America ceased to be a great nation, but found itself relegated to a second rate status. All the dreams which had been wrapped up in the founding of the Nation were no more. The people, once free and self-reliant, had become only statistics under an all-powerful Government.

People, once dynamic and inventive, now moved in sullen fear, trusting no one. Posted all over the streets, in store windows, and wherever people might go were official governmental proclamations, each spelling out to the passersby those things which they could and could not do. Few openly protested, because also very much in evidence were Federal police.

It seemed it all had happened when the elected governmental leaders of the Nation had suddenly decided that the American people weren't capable of thinking for themselves, that freedom was too much of a burden to be placed on the shoulders of the average citizen. These leaders had decided that they, and they alone, were wise enough to make decisions affecting the Nation.

The first thing they had done was to declare that everyone must be equal, regardless of ability, education, and proved productivity. No one, the governmental leaders had decreed, would be allowed to rise above anyone else. Extra effort, extra ability would no longer be allowed, since it would be un-American.

Private property had disappeared, because under the new regime everyone shared equally, and again it would be un-American for anyone to work and save in order to do a little better for his family and for himself. Only the Government could own and administer property.

The churches were all closed because worship of any being other than the Government would tend to offend those sharing different views. Religion, or what was left of it, had gone underground.

In short, things were about as bad as things can get in a nightmare.

I was thankful to waken from my dream, but the cold sweat was on my brow. This could happen, I told myself. This really could happen. Here in the America so many have helped to make great there is no guarantee that our freedoms and our liberties will continue automatically. They had to be fought for in the first place, and only eternal vigilance can assure their continuance.

I hate nightmares. From now on I plan to sleep with one eye open. It won't be easy, but I am going to try.

The March on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many persons across the country are concerned about the Negro demonstrations which have been turning into race riots in so many cities in the North, South, East, and West.

In an effort to give some indication of the concern which is felt on this matter, even in the North, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the Enquirer of Cincinnati, Ohio, of July 24, 1963, entitled "The March on Washington." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON

President Kennedy's role in the civil rights struggle has too often been one of opportunism. During his campaign for the Presidency, for instance, a phone call to the wife of the jailed Dr. Martin Luther King was decided upon as a political artifice—an action that achieved nothing but yielded a harvest of votes.

Mr. Kennedy's press conference comment on the proposed mass march on Washington next month seemed in similar vein. He said—somewhat disjointedly—in response to a question whether he thought the proposed march on Washington would be a handicap to him:

"No, I think that the way the Washington march is now developed, which is a peaceful assembly calling for a redress of grievances * * * is in the great tradition. I look forward to being here. I am sure Members of Congress will be here. We want citizens to come to Washington if they feel they are not having their rights expressed. But, of course, arrangements have been made to make this responsible and peaceful. This is not a march on the Capital. Now, there are other places, of course * * * where there are grievances, where the demonstrators got caught up in a cycle. And we have it in Cambridge, Md., where there is no peace. They have almost lost sight of what the demonstration is about. You have an increasingly dangerous situation. You could have violence any night. I am concerned about those demonstrations. I think they go beyond information, they go beyond protest. And I think the cause of advancing equal opportunities only loses. I have warned against demonstrations which could lead to riots, demonstrations which could lead to bloodshed, and I warn now against it."

The President, it seems to us, is walking a very tight rope on this issue. There is little to suggest that the proposed march on Washington can be easily contained to a peaceful assembly. If it takes place, and avoids the violence so likely to ensue, well and good. But on one hand, Mr. Kennedy is recognizing the inflammatory potentialities, and, on the other, he is stimulating the movement as being "in the great tradition."

What tradition? Certainly not of representative democracy. It tends more to the principle of mobocracy. There would be no great march on Washington unless there was an intent to intimidate Congress by personal presence or sheer weight of numbers. The moderates in the civil rights movement opposed the idea at the outset, although moderation in recent weeks has tended to become almost a dirty word. That fact alone suggests that the march on the Capital may become something more than a peaceful assembly. If Negroes in Chicago boo and shout down James Meredith for advocating moderation, what is apt to happen in the Nation's Capital, which lives in the shadow of casual violence constantly?

As far as the history of marches on Washington is concerned, those in the past have been exceptionally well disciplined, but unfruitful. When Coxey's Army marched on Washington in the 1890's, it received short shrift, although its demands—Federal loans to States, counties, and municipalities—later became an accepted doctrine. The Bonus Army of 1932 presented an uninspiring spectacle, and its efforts to pressure Members of Congress were rebuffed. Although, again, the bonus later was paid as a pump-priming measure.

The civil rights march on Washington is of problematical effect. We doubt very much that Congress will be intimidated, even if it later coincides with the demands of the marchers. And a riot of sizable proportions could exacerbate race relations dreadfully. Those who are insisting upon the march are risking much. And, we think, needlessly.

Double Deficit Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a pertinent editorial which appeared in the Tampa Tribune of Tuesday, July 2, Double Deficit Nation.

I am deeply concerned over the lack of fiscal responsibility in our Government. I recommend this editorial to the attention of all my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tampa Tribune, July 2, 1963]

DOUBLE DEFICIT NATION

While President Kennedy travels abroad, things proceed quite normally here at home—including the matter of the Nation's double deficit.

When the fiscal year ended Sunday, the Federal Government's income for 1962–63 was about $7 billion short of meeting its expenses (the Treasury Department won't know the exact figure for a few days). This was the third straight deficit.

The other deficit is the gap between the dollars the United States sends abroad and the dollars it receives from foreign countries. Current estimates are that in the last 6 months the balance went against us at the rate of about $3 billion a year, which is worse than in 1962. This deficit has been continuous for the last 12 years, with the result that national gold reserves are at the lowest level in nearly 25 years.

Our domestic deficit is cause for serious concern, because of the basic unsoundness of a prosperous country continuing to spend more than it collects in taxes. No matter how New Frontier economists may rationalize it in terms of gross national product and per capita debt, this practice adds up to ultimate bankruptcy.

But the international deficit is more immediately alarming. It means that, increasingly, the stability of the dollar is at the mercy of foreign governments and banks which hold dollar credits; if they insisted on converting most of these claims into gold, the U.S. gold reserve would be wiped out. Washington would be forced to devalue the dollar by raising the price of gold, which since the Roosevelt devaluation of 1934 has been pegged at $35 an ounce.

The unfavorable balance of payments, as Columnist Sylvia Porter points out, comes not from a deficit in export-import trade but from the dollars sent to foreign lands for economic and military aid, commercial investment, tourist expenditures, and individual gifts.

What's to be done? As an exponent of free trade and travel, the United States could ill afford to stop Americans from visiting Europe or businessmen from investing in foreign factories. Congress already has cut to $100 the amount of duty free goods an American tourist may bring home.

The logical place to stanch the dollar flow is in foreign aid, both economic and military. It makes less and less sense for the United States to continue giving economic help to virtually every foreign country which puts its hand out. Much of the money is wasted and precious little of it buys gratitude.

Nor should all our military expenditures abroad be regarded as untouchable. Ten years after the end of the Korean war is it still necessary to maintain two American divisions in South Korea, in addition to the swollen Korean army supported by American taxes? And would not four divisions in West Germany demonstrate America's commitment to the allied defense as well as five? The fact is, of course, that the real defense of South Korea and Western Europe against Communist aggression rests not with the American troops on foreign soil but with America's atomic arsenal, plus the conventional weapons it can bring to bear on any part of the world on short notice.

The entire aid program, which for economic and military purposes last year required $7 billion, needs to be reexamined and cut to more reasonable size.

When he was campaigning in 1960, Mr. Kennedy pledged himself to "defend the present value and soundness of the dollar." If he intends to keep his pledge, he'd better give more than vocal attention to the growing problem of the double deficit. No matter how great its military might, a nation unable to meet either its budget or its foreign gold claims is poorly armed to lead the world toward political and economic freedom.

Tribute to Comdr. Bernard "Barney" Jensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a splendid tribute was paid recently by the Saginaw (Mich.) News to a departing commanding officer of the Naval Reserve Center in that community. The editors of that newspaper were impressed by the contributions made by this officer, not only as a military man, but as a good citizen.

The man who received the tribute is Comdr. Bernard Jensen. He is known not only to his friends in Michigan, but also to a Senate colleage, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey. Senator WILLIAMS and Commander Jensen served together as naval aviators in World War II. I am sure that Senator WILLIAMS and others in New Jersey will be interested in the fine record Commander Jensen is maintaining.

Mr. President, many military representatives are serving with distinction and responsiveness to local need in many parts of the Nation. It is heartwarming indeed to have this one example of the excellent community feeling they help to create.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Mar. 14, 1963]

SAGINAW SALUTES HIM

The U.S. Navy is essentially ships, guns, aircraft, missiles, strategy, and sailors. But in the more immediate reality, the Navy is the man who represents it. On a personal basis this may be a son, a father, or other kin. On a community basis it is most likely to be the man who heads the local establishment.

Such a man, Comdr. Bernard Jensen, soon leaves Saginaw for a Washington assignment after 3 years as commanding officer at the Saginaw Naval Reserve Center. As an officer and a gentleman he would be the first to disclaim that his years in Saginaw have been any more than a loyal performance of duty. Official consideration by his superiors in the Navy Department indicates that he has indeed fulfilled these duties.

However, there is another and less official facet of Commander Jensen's Saginaw residency. This is suggested by the idea of residence. Barney Jensen has not been a transient, a visitor, a temporary representative of the military. He has been an actual part of Saginaw, in uniform and in mufti.

How many people who come to live here, knowing in advance that this is just a phase, a stepping stone, a waystop in their careers, take hold of local problems and interests? How rare and valuable is the man who will serve on committees, affiliate with civic groups, attend public functions, mingle in society and, metaphorically, join the family instead of remaining as an in-law. The Elks Club, Kiwanis Club, Pit & Balcony, Saginaw Museum, Saginaw Club, the Boy Scouts—these are but a few of the Saginaw activities that have had Barney Jensen as an active, working, concerned participant.

This then, is in tribute to the man who made the Navy his duty and Saginaw his interest. He has set a pace of action and attitude which cannot but benefit the Navy here for years to come and benefit our community in ways beyond assessment.

Broadcasting and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1963, Chairman OREN HARRIS, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, addressed the first National Broadcast Editorial Conference. This conference which lasted 3 days was sponsored jointly by the Georgia Association of Broadcasters and the School of Journalism at the University of Georgia, and was held on the campus of the University at Athens, Ga.

The subject of broadcasting and politics is of particular interest not only to Members of Congress but also to public officials and candidates for public office in State and local governments.

The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting hearings on broadcast editorializing in general and on my bill, H.R. 7072, in particular. The purpose of my bill is to amend section 315 of the Communications Act to give candidates for public office who are attacked in a broadcast editorial an opportunity to reply in person over such station. Similarly, if a broadcasting station editorializes in favor of a candidate, other candidates for the same office would have, under my bill, a right to reply in person. Chairman HARRIS' address went in considerable length into some of the problems presented by broadcast editorializing, and raised many questions to which answers must be sought in the public interest. Therefore, I am enclosing the text of the address at this point in the RECORD:

BROADCASTING AND POLITICS

(Speech of Hon. OREN HARRIS)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, participants and honored guests of the National Broadcast Editorial Conference, there is an old saying that a statesman is a dead politician. I am glad to be alive; I am proud to be a politician; and I am gratified that you have invited me to participate in this conference on broadcast editorializing to talk to you on the subject "Broadcasting and Politics."

The assignment is not an easy one. But then a man does not choose to be a politician because he prefers an easy life. A successful politician considers problems not so much as difficulties to be avoided but as challenges to be met.

The subject "Broadcasting and Politics" is certainly a challenging one. In discussing it with you, I do not expect to provide you with easy answers to many difficult questions. My hope is to suggest some pertinent questions for your critical consideration.

In recent years there have been several Supreme Court decisions with which I have disagreed emphatically. However, I must say I concur fully with a statement by Justice Frankfurter in a decision involving the first amendment that "Broadcasting * * * has produced its brood of complicated problems hardly to be solved by any easy formula about the preferred position of free speech."

About 3 months ago I had occasion to speak to another group of southern broadcasters. (Incidentally, I am gratified that this conference proves once again that southern broadcasters are not in the rearguard of the profession but in the very forefront.) Today when this region of our country is being challenged by our Federal Government and often criticized unfairly by persons living in other regions of this great Nation, it is vitally important that we should be able to demonstrate to ourselves and to the Nation that as in the past the South is still capable of producing leaders in all walks of life who are an asset to the entire Nation and of whom we in the South can be proud.

In speaking to the Mississippi broadcasters, I entitled my talk, "Broadcasting and Tightrope Walking." I expressed the thought that those persons who are engaged in the field of broadcasting whether as broadcasters or as Government regulators of broadcasting must make skillful tightrope walking a regular habit if they aspire to become successful broadcasters or regulators.

In no area of broadcasting is this more true than in that area of programing and program control which seeks to deal with broadcast editorializing. Perhaps it might be said that in that area broadcasters and regulators have to acquire the skill of dancing tiptoe on the tightrope. The tightrope which I have in mind stretches between public needs and private interests and more particularly between the first amendment and section 326 of the Communications Act at the one end and the licensing standard of the public interest at the other end.

As you well know, our Subcommittee on Communications and Power has been conducting hearings during the past week on broadcast editorializing. You may not be familiar with the occasion for these hearings.

In the course of the hearings on the House resolution proposing to suspend section 315 for presidential and vice presidential candidates during the 1964 campaign frequent reference was made to broadcast editorializing. During the committee consideration of the bill in executive session several members of our committee urged adoption of amendments to the resolution aimed at dealing with the rights of candidates in case of broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates.

I urged my colleagues not to attempt to tack on any highly controversial amendment dealing with broadcast editorializing to the somewhat less controversial temporary suspension of section 315 limited to presidential and vice-presidential candidates for 1964. I promised that our Subcommittee on Communications and Power would hold hearings on the entire subject of broadcast editorializing in the course of which all aspects of this problem would be gone into carefully. Subsequently, in the course of the debate on the floor of the House on the suspension resolution, I advised the membership of the House of our plans to conduct these hearings.

Now, there has been some open criticism of our decision to hold congressional committee hearings on this highly sensitive subject, and I understand there has been a good deal of not-so-open grumbling and a great deal of apprehension among broadcasters.

It has been suggested that these hearings were being conducted for the purpose of intimidating radio and television broadcasters so that they would think twice before editorializing over their facilities, and particularly with regard to political candidates.

Let me state to you emphatically that in my opinion the appropriate committees of the Congress have not only the right but the duty to go into this admittedly highly sensitive subject. We will not avoid our responsibility because it happens to be a delicate problem.

The Communications Act of 1934 does not have any specific provision which sets forth a congressional policy toward broadcast editorializing. The act does not specifically permit or specifically prohibit broadcast editorializing nor does it lay down any ground rules for such editorializing.

The Commission tried to deal with the problems of editorializing first in 1941 in the Mayflower decision by applying the general provisions of the act that a broadcast license may be granted only if it serves the public interest, convenience, or necessity. The Commission construed that provision as precluding broadcast editorializing by licensesees because the Commission felt that licensee editorializing could not be reconciled with the interest of the public in having broadcast operations conducted fairly and impartially.

Later, in 1949, after extensive hearings on the subject, the Commission, with one Commissioner dissenting, reached the opposite conclusion and determined that licensee editorializing was compatible with the public interest, provided licensees affirmatively aid and encourage the airing of opposing views.

Thus, the statutory language of an act of Congress has been construed to reach diametrically opposite results. As the practice of broadcast editorializing becomes more frequent, the Congress would be derelict if it did not exercise its oversight function to examine into the practices and policies relating to broadcast editorializing and the possible need for further clarifying legislation.

The purpose of such an examination is to establish what the facts are and to identify such problems as may exist which are of public concern. I submit—and I trust you will agree—that there are few things, if any, in the area of broadcast editorializing which are exclusively matters of private concern.

After all, broadcast editorials are concerned with public issues, are addressed to the public, and the public airways are used to disseminate them to the public.

By no stretch of the imagination can they be considered the private outpourings of individuals destined to reach only a preselected group. The participants in broadcast editorializing cannot, in my opinion, claim any right of privacy seeking to screen the circumstances from public scrutiny. However, there may be limits which should be imposed upon such scrutiny, and I trust your conference may want to explore what these limits should be.

Personally, I have been for some time a strong advocate of broadcast editorializing. In a speech in May 1958 before the Connecticut Broadcast Association, I had this to say on the subject of editorializing—and I quote:

"In reading the reports on the recent NAB convention at Los Angeles, which many of you may have attended, I was glad to see that the key speakers appealed to you, the broadcasters, to make use of your right to editorialize. I agree with the speakers on it and I hope you will do so and will do so freely, and in so doing you will of course observe the rules of fairness which the Communications Act imposes on broadcasters as a part of the requirement that broadcasters must operate in the public interest. * * * In editorializing you will not be able to look at 'ratings' in order to decide whether your efforts at editorializing are successful. * * * In editorializing you will find that to a large extent you must shoulder responsibility for your editorials yourself and you cannot pass that responsibility on to the listeners or the viewers. Having shouldered this responsibility yourself in the case of editorializing, you may rely to a lesser extent on 'ratings' and to a greater extent on your own proper sense of values."

If the Commission at different times reached different conclusions with some Commissioners dissenting with respect to editorializing, it should not surprise anybody that individual broadcasters and individual politicians differ when it comes to the "broad of complicated problems" inherent in broadcast editorializing.

In order to discuss complex problems halfway intelligently we first must be reasonably certain that we give approximately the same meaning to the terms which we use in our discussions. When we talk about "editorializing" we must realize that there is the narrower concept of editorializing referred to by the Commission as "overt editorializing" which consists of advocacy by broadcast licensees identified as such.

In fact, there is the type of broadcast editorializing by means of licensee selection of news editors and commentators sharing the licensee's general opinions.

There is also broadcast editorializing by making available the licensee's facilities to persons and organizations reflecting the licensee's viewpoint either generally or with respect to specific issues.

In order to have a fruitful discussion it will be necessary at all times to bear in mind these different types of broadcast editorial-

izing and we shall have to specify which type we have reference to when we talk about broadcast editorializing.

Chairman Henry, in his prepared statement before our subcommittee, suggested that the Commission and the Congress are most concerned about the "overt" type of editorializing. I cannot agree at all that this type of editorializing is the main concern of the Congress in this area, and I believe that the Congress and the Commission would be remiss in their duties if they concerned themselves only with this particular aspect of editorializing.

I venture to guess that many political officeholders—and I am not speaking only of Members of Congress—are likely to be apprehensive with regard to broadcast editorializing for or against political candidates. Their apprehensions are not based so much on lack of trust in the fairness of broadcasters but on the certain knowledge that radio and television broadcasting are today among the most powerful mass media of influencing public opinion in general and the voters at election time in particular.

Therefore, the first choice of many politicians might be to avoid this new threat and to prevent boradcast editorializing for or against political candidates. On more mature consideration, however, most politicians may come to the conclusion that their first choice might not be a wise one, quite apart from the fact that a prohibition of this particular kind of broadcast editorializing might be attacked in the courts on the grounds that it violates the constitutional prohibition of the first amendment.

Thus, their second and probably wiser choice might be to attempt to bring about the enactment of an amendment to the Communications Act to assure fairness to politicians in the use of radio and television facilities when used for purposes of editorializing for or against particular politicians.

Incidentally, your Conference may want to explore the question whether fairness to politicians and fairness to the public are necessarily one and the same. I may be prejudiced and, therefore, not a good judge. As George Bernard Shaw has remarked: "The love of fairplay is a spectator's virtue, not a principal's." I can assure you, however, that politicians, as a rule may object to having their "rights" of answering broadcast editorials depend on the discretion of broadcasters.

Congressman Moss' bill constitutes an attempt in setting up some ground rules in the limited area of editorializing with regard to political candidates. It would make applicable the equal opportunity provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 to editorializing by broadcast licensees for or against political candidates.

As was testified in the course of hearings before our subcommittee there are some difficulties inherent in the approach proposed by the bill. These difficulties, however, can be corrected and our committee will have occasion to consider the bill after the hearings have been completed. Whether or not the bill becomes law, however, Congressman Moss ought to be congratulated on his efforts to place before the public a concrete proposal designed to deal with one important aspect of broadcast editorializing.

While it may be difficult to lay down hard and fast rules with regard to broadcast editorializing we must nevertheless strive to do so. The very fact that the Georgia Broadcasters have called this conference seems proof to me that you agree with that proposition. Discussion of the problems in this area is wholesome and constitutes a valuable and important aspect of our democratic processes.

Let me attempt to make some observations which I hope will focus atention on some aspects of editorializing which I happen to believe are of transcending importance.

Broadcast editorializing is but one aspect of broadcast programing. Regulation of broadcast programing is a most difficult and elusive subject. This is true or regulation by government as well as self-regulation by industry through voluntary codes, etc.

Since all broadcasters require a government license before they are permitted to engage in broadcasting, there is a natural tendency to base regulations—governmental as well as private—on the fallacious assumption that broadcasters are pretty uniform when it comes to aspirations, interests, capacity, outlook, and other human traits. This assumption is factually incorrect and as supposition it is not in the public interest.

If there has been a regrettable tendency towards uniformity among broadcasters, this tendency ought to be counteracted to the utmost, and especially by organizations which purport to represent broadcasters.

I wonder whether many persons would suggest that newspapers are pretty uniform or that magazines are, and that standards with regard to their contents could be established by establishing minimum standards for their personnel or facilities.

Similarly, would it not be inappropriate to attempt the esablishment of standards for broadcast programs, including broadcast editorials, by establishing minimum standards with regard to personnel or facilities?

The NAB committee on editorializing seeks to encourage editorializing as broadcasters become—and I quote—"properly equipped to perform the editorial function with the highest degree of professional skill and integrity." Chairman Henry stated before our subcommittee—and I quote: "We have cautioned that the licensee should not do so [namely, editorializing] if he is not prepared to act fairly and to employ an adequate staff as the foundation for meaningful and intelligent editorialization."

Are the NAB and FCC getting ready to establish minimum standards with respect to staffing? I hope not. I doubt that meaningful minimum standards in this respect can be established for all broadcasters.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to say that there are not and should not be standards of procedure to be followed by all broadcasters with regard to broadcast editorializing in order to assure performance in the public interest. But is exclusive or primary focusing on the question of staffing going to be helpful?

For example, I submit that a radio broadcaster who operates an electronic juke box and who does not give any time for the discussion of public issues either by political candidates or by spokesmen for different points of view on such issues, has not equipped himself in any sense of the word to editorialize on such issues or candidates even if he should hire a qualified person to write the editorials for him.

I submit that the right to editorialize must be earned and this right should be properly exercised only within the context of other exposures of the issues or the candidates over the facilities of the station.

Furthermore, your conference may well desire to discuss the application of the principles underlying section 317 of the Communications Act to broadcast editorializing—the overt type of licensee editorializing as well as other types of editorializing.

Section 317 provides substantially that all matter broadcast by any radio station for which any money or other valuable consideration is directly or indirectly paid or promised to the station by any person shall at the time the matter is so broadcast be announced as paid for or furnished by such person.

The broad principle on which this statutory provision is based is that the listeners or viewers have the right to expect that matters broadcast are broadcast because of the independent editorial judgment of the broadcast licensee rather than because of some consideration paid or promised to the licensee for broadcasting this matter. Listener and viewer reliance on the broadcaster's editorial integrity is an important public interest factor which is entitled to protection.

Of course, section 317 would be applicable if a broadcaster were to broadcast an editorial for which he receives compensation from any other person. However, should not the listeners and viewers also be apprised of the fact, if such fact happens to be the case, that a particular editorial was prepared by a source not controlled by the licensee himself such as, for example, an editorial service to which the broadcaster happens to subscribe? Or that the editorial was furnished free of charge by some organization or another?

The existence of editorial services is a well known fact and many newspapers avail themselves of these services. True enough, no newspaper is required to disclose to its readers the fact that some or most of its editorials are derived from such a source. Many newspapers, however, do so anyway.

I would like to leave with you, however, the question whether the public interest does not require such disclosure in the case of radio and television broadcast editorials.

Our committee's payola and ratings investigation have demonstrated the tremendous power which organizations not licensed by our Government, such as phonograph records manufacturers and distributors, and rating services have exercised over the programs broadcast by many licensees. If, unbeknown to viewers and listeners, persons not controlled by individual licensees, such as editorial services were to achieve similar control over broadcast editorializing, the potential harm to the public could be infinitely greater than it has been in these other situations.

Therefore, as the practice of editorializing grows, in order to forestall any harm to the public should we not require certain disclosures with regard to the sources of editorials and, perhaps, other circumstances which surround the origin of editorials?

Questions of how the public interest can best be protected in the area of broadcast editorializing are just beginning to be asked. In no area of broadcast programing is the public interest more difficult to protect. In no area will protection be needed more as the practice of editorializing assumes greater prevalence.

I am glad that you are aware of the urgent need to discuss these problems, and I hope that I have left with you a little food for thought for the impending dialog in this important area.

The Bob and Jack Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of July 30, 1963. The American people are beginning to wonder what part of the Kennedy administration is real and sincere and what part of it is the glamour and profile field in anticipation of the 1964 elections.

The following editorial speaks for itself:

THE BOB AND JACK SHOW

Those who resent the endless parade of reruns on summer television should cheer up. There's a first-time spectacular coming up soon. But although we sympathize with discontent over repeats, in this case we devoutly hope the first time will be the last time.

The show deals with the admission last month of two Negro students to the University of Alabama. There was a lot of TV coverage at the time, but this is different. It was filmed with the cooperation of the Attorney General and features inside scenes of conferences in his office and in the White House, with the President of the United States as a top supporting character to his brother.

According to the producer, Robert Drew, the Attorney General permitted Mr. Drew's cameras and tape recorders to be present during 27 hours of conferences. Other cameramen were used elsewhere. For example, in telephone conversations between Robert Kennedy and his deputy, Nicholas Katzenbach, the show will cut back and forth between the Justice Department in Washington and Mr. Katzenbach in Tuscaloosa. Featured scenes will show the President and his brother planning the former's moral crisis appearance on television, thus getting into the classic show business gambit of the musical comedy about putting on a musical comedy.

It seems to us that there is a moral question about the whole affair. At this late date it hardly comes as a surprise that the Attorney General sometimes lacks a sense of the fitness of things. But the personal lack is here spilling over on the Government of the United States. That Government, at its highest levels, is revealed as meeting the moral crisis with one eye on the camera, the tape machine and the synchronized watch. It is not an inspiring spectacle.

Hypocrisy in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting editorial from the Winchester Evening Star of Winchester, Va., entitled "Hypocrisy in New York." The editorial is dated July 24, 1963, and makes the simple old point that in all too many cases the question of whether one favors rapid and total integration depends primarily on "whose ox is being gored." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRISY IN NEW YORK

The foremost advocates of enforced integration, along with the Washington Post, have been the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune. They have thundered at the South, telling their many readers how backward the southern people are, how unfair southerners are to the Negro, and how lacking in kindness and understanding.

But in recent weeks the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune are beginning to understand that integration isn't as simple as it has appeared to be.

Why this change of attitude?

It seems that Negroes in New York have read what the Times and the Herald Tribune have said about the South and have begun to seek a better situation for themselves in New York City.

This week, for example, 500 Negroes were arrested and hauled away to police stations for a demonstration in Brooklyn. Several thousand chanting racial pickets cast themselves in relays before heavy construction trucks in protest over hiring discrimination in the building industry. Police grew tense and arm weary in arresting and hauling 500 of them away bodily. Mayor Wagner's office has been filled with sit-in demonstrators. Governor Rockefeller's New York City office has been unusable because it has been filled with Negroes protesting that they do not have equal rights and equal job opportunities in New York.

Negroes have protested bitterly, too, that there has been no real effort to integrate the schools of New York City. They claim that most New York schools are either 90 percent Negro or 90 percent white.

So now the great liberal newspapers, the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune, are becoming a bit more conservative and realistic in their appraisal of the Negro problem.

Read this sentence for a moment: "The Negro, equally with the white man, should be wary of easy solutions, quick remedies that seem to promise instant success." One might expect such a statement from Governor Barnett, of Mississippi, or Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina. But that viewpoint has been scarce in the editorial columns of the New York Times. The New York newspaper has said time and again that the problems of the South can be solved easily and quickly if the southern people put their mind to it. But for New York City, quick remedies do not appear to the Times to be so desirable.

The Times is particularly alarmed because Negro leaders are contending that since New York has a large percentage of Negroes that they should have the same percentage of city jobs. The Times says that if this reasoning were valid, "the quota should be immediately applied in every business, in every industry, and on every level—whether they were qualified applicants or not." This, the New York Times says, "would be inherently just and inhumane." Isn't this the viewpoint of Governor Wallace of Alabama or Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia?

The New York Herald Tribune, an equally belligerent opponent of the Southerner, had this to say in a July 11 editorial: "True equality doesn't lie in mathematical formulas, in the careful maintenance of a nice balance, or in a reverse racism that seeks to boost the Negro through preferential hiring or arbitrary advancement." Spoken like a true southern conservative, which heretofore the Herald-Tribune has ridiculed.

What concerns the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune is that the Negro in New York City has become dissatisfied with his way of life. So, suddenly, the editorial columns of the Times and the Herald Tribune are beginning to warn against Negroes pushing too hard and too fast. It is satisfactory to the Times and to the Herald Tribune if the Negroes want to push hard and fast in the South. But it is inappropriate, so the New York newspapers feel, for Negroes to take similar action in New York City.

Any southerner who heretofore has insisted that the practicality of the racial problem must be taken into account has found himself classed as one who favors unjust discrimination. But since the Times and the Herald Tribune are beginning to feel the heat of the practicalities, those great apostles of liberalism are beginning to talk like Southern segregationists.

We can't truthfully say that our heart bleeds for our New York editorial colleagues. In fact, they have provided us with our chuckle for the day.

The 100th Birthday Anniversary of Henry Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 100th birthday anniversary of Henry Ford—a name known by all in these United States. Last night it was my pleasure to attend a dinner in honor of this event in my district. Mr. Ford's birthday anniversary only missed by a few days the 50th anniversary of the Ford Motor Co.'s establishment of the Louisville assembly plant.

The address given last evening by Mr. Charles H. Patterson, executive vice president of Ford helps to again point out the accomplishments that can come in this country so long as we maintain a free economy and are willing to put forth a maximum effort for ourselves rather than rely on the Government for our existence. While we all know that Mr. Ford and the Ford family profited much from his achievements let us all remember that the American people and the American economy reaped a profit many thousands times greater than that reaped by the Ford family.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Ford Motor Co. in the Third District of Kentucky. My people are proud of this company and its 50 year record in Louisville. To the average American I am happy to say there is a Ford in your future—and to my bureaucratic friends who look forward to a limousine in their future, I would like to suggest that Ford can supply these too.

Mr. Speaker, in tribute to this great American company on this great accomplishment in their history, I would like to give the Members of this body the benefit of Mr. Patterson's remarks of last evening:

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HENRY FORD

(Following is the text of remarks by Charles H. Patterson, executive vice president, Ford Motor Co., at the 50th anniversary dinner of Ford Motor Co. in Kentucky, Sheraton Hotel, Louisville, Ky., on Tuesday, July 30, 1963.)

On behalf of Ford Motor Co., I want to thank you for joining us tonight to celebrate our 50th year of assembling automobiles in Louisville. It is good to know that we have made so many lasting freinds, and I assure you that Ford Motor Co. is proud indeed to be a part of Louisville and Kentucky.

Our relationship with Kentucky has been so mutually rewarding that we felt it would

be especially appropriate to observe this golden anniversary on the centennial birthdate of the man who brought us together—Mr. Henry Ford, who was born 100 years ago this day on a farm near Detroit.

When Ford Motor Co. was formed in 1903, there was little to indicate that Ford and Louisville would ever mean much to each other. In the first place, there was considerable doubt as to whether the company would ever mean much to Detroit—at one point in that first year there was only $223 of company funds left in the bank, and many an astute business mind was unconvinced that there was much of a future for even a successful automobile company.

In the second place, the bluegrass country, with its tradition and appreciation of fine horses, was not the most promising market for the horseless carriage. That Mr. Ford's Model T could win acceptance in Kentucky shows what a remarkable machine it really was.

To illustrate the sort of sales resistance it had to overcome, there was a gentleman over in Paducah who proposed an unusual and exacting test of the Model T's power and maneuverability. He told a persistent salesman that he would become an automobile owner on the day that one of those contraptions could be driven through the county courthouse. Not to the courthouse, mind you—but through the courthouse.

What arrangements our dauntless salesman made with the county authorities we don't know, but with more or less nonchalance he cranked up his model T and drove up two flights of stone stairs, through the courthouse front door, down the halls, out the rear door, and down the back stairs.

A man of his word like all Kentuckians, our Paducah skeptic bought the car, and paid cash at that—all $780 worth.

With that kind of total performance, the Ford car soon won its way into Kentucky in sufficient quantity to justify the establishment of a sales and service plant on South Third Street where the Summers-Hermann Ford dealership now stands.

I am afraid this modest operation did not attract widespread notice in 1913. After all, that was the year that Donerail, with Roscoe Goose up, paid $184.90 in winning the derby.

But up in Highland Park, Mich., another event was taking place which would mean a great deal to Louisville—to the whole industrial economy, for that matter. Henry Ford was developing the moving assembly line.

The little sales and service plant on Third Street, where knocked-down model T's were put back together by a few mechanics, was a far cry from what was going on in Highland Park. But Henry Ford was now locating full-scale assembly plants around the country in what appeared to be the key areas, and one of these locations was Louisville. It was a happy choice, for our Louisville operations have never ceased expanding.

In late 1914, construction was begun at Third and Eastern Parkway on the four-story brick building which now belongs to the University of Louisville. On January 2, 1916, the first model T's rolled off the new assembly line and by the end of that first month production totaled 700 automobiles, assembly by an average of 53 employees.

Small this plant may have been by later standards but, with the addition of an annex, by 1924 it was turning out more than 50,000 model T's a year and 6,000 of those powerful model T trucks besides.

But the time had come to think in bigger terms, and in February 1925, assembly operations were moved to South Western Parkway, where Ford had built the largest plant under one roof then in the South. From here poured out cars and trucks for nearly a generation. But after 30 years—in 1955—it was succeeded by the present facility on Grade Lane which, with recent expansions, now totals nearly 2 million square feet, one of the largest of Ford's 16 assembly plants.

All told, in these 50 years more than 2½ million Ford cars and trucks have been assembled here in Louisville. We presently employ about 3,000 persons with an annual payroll of $23 million, and purchase more than $2 million worth of materials and supplies from Kentucky businessmen each year. Additionally, Ford-owned properties in Pike County mine and ship a million tons of coking coal a year to our Rouge plant in Dearborn, and upwards of another million tons of coal is mined annually from holdings in Clay and Leslie Counties.

Such figures, and the record of continuing expansion which they embody, tell more eloquently than any words of mine why Ford Motor Co. is happy that Henry Ford decided to make Louisville a key part of our operations. Those figures show that we have found this a mightily fine place to do business and that we have a great confidence in the future of this area.

In this yearlong series of centennial events being held in commemoration of Mr. Ford's birth, we have been deeply impressed by the widespread interest that has been demonstrated. The 16 years since his passing seem to have sharpened the public's memory of this unusual man.

He has been called a man of many paradoxes, and perhaps the greatest paradox of all was that this farm boy who became one of the richest men in the world was the hero of the so-called common man.

Why? Because for all his wealth, his revolutionary concepts and his particular kind of genius, he still remained a common man himself. He was never a rich industrialist so much as a very rich farm boy.

He made it plain that his success was founded on serving the ordinary people who made his cars and bought them. He looked upon his busines as a social experiment and never got over his amazement at the way the money came rolling in.

I mentioned his particular kind of genius, but few people have been able to agree just what sort of genius he was. He did not invent the automobile and did not really display any real inventive genius. He was a master mechanic but not what we would call a mechanical genius. He wasn't interested enough in money to be a financial genius. Perhaps he had a measure of production genius, but that is a hard term to define.

The historian, Allan Nevins, perhaps described Henry Ford's genius best when he wrote: "A special kind of genius lies in seeing what everybody else admits to be obvious—after the exceptional mind thinks of it; and Ford had that genius."

This was the genius who conceived an automobile that the farmer and working man, as well as the wealthy, could afford. This was the genius who saw how to put together the production techniques that resulted in a fully integrated assembly line so the car could be sold at a cheaper price to a broader market. This was the genius who stunned the world—and alarmed a part of it—by announcing the $5-day as a result of the increased production efficiency.

This was the genius, in short, who forged the link between profits and service to both customers and employees, and dramatized better than anyone before or since how farsighted free enterprise can change the world.

Tonight, as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of his birth and the 50th anniversary in Louisville of the company he founded, I want to assure you that Ford Motor Co. is still dedicated to making that free enterprise system work to the best advantage of us all. We are determined to do all we can to contribute to the growth of Kentucky, and we now enter our second 50 years here looking forward eagerly to a continuation of your warm friendship and cooperation.

Local Governments Are Also Adversely Affected by Sudden Termination of the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, for the first time the Salinas, Calif., City Council, in my district, has petitioned the Federal Government. The situation motivating this unprecedented council action is the threatened sudden termination of the bracero program for supplying supplemental labor to harvest highly perishable crops.

So that my colleagues may share with these councilmen a better, more intimate view of the havoc and disaster which would occur in California if the bracero program were suddenly terminated, I quote pertinent portions of their resolution:

Whereas the city of Salinas has for many years been the hub of a vast farming district and the prosperity and well-being of its citizens has been directly dependent upon agricultural and allied activities, the City Council of Salinas has been viewing with increasing concern the impending impact upon this community of the recent action of Congress in bringing to an abrupt termination the suplemental labor program made possible by Public Law 78. Faced with prospect of loss of workers needed to harvest essential crops, those responsible for planning next year's crop programs have of necessity been obliged to approach their tasks with a strictly limited outlook before risking the great investment of men, machines, and capital required to carry out crop programs as in past years. The uncertainty of the labor outlook has already touched every segment of our agricultural community in terms of crop planning, acquisition of farmlands and requisitioning of accessorial services and supplies. Farmowners, growers, shippers, fertilizer companies, seed suppliers, carton, shook and box makers, ice and refrigeration companies, railroad and truck carriers, banks and lending institutions, and the general business community are all affected. Not only management but workers as well are greatly concerned for it is obvious that restricted agricultural production will be accompanied by a limitation in the number of required jobs. Nor would the impact of such restricted production be confined to our community. The Nation as a whole would suffer because it is upon this producing area that the Nation is dependent for a large part of the great variety of vegetable crops which are sought after daily by housewives in every part of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Salinas, Calif., in meeting assembled, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to take prompt and timely action to avert such harmful consequences to the citizens of our community as well as to the Nation as a whole by making suitable provision for a continuation of the supplemental labor program until such time as an orderly adjustment to any new changes can be accomplished; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be communicated to the President of the United States of America, the Governor of the State of California, the Representative in Congress from this district, the California

congressional delegation, the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Secretary of Labor, and others in administrative positions of responsibility in this matter.

Is Stalemate Our Goal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 21, 1963:

IS STALEMATE OUR GOAL?

The free world could breathe considerably more easily if it could believe that economy or something similarly prosaic was the real factor behind the closing of 28 of the 68 distant early warning stations that span across the northern reaches of North America.

The DEW line installations were originally built, at enormous cost, to provide the United States and Canada with the earliest possible warning of an enemy air attack. Despite the closing of 40 percent of the DEW line's radar installations, North America, we are told, will still have acceptable warning facilities.

We hope so.

We hope also that the curtailment of this aspect of our total defense posture is unrelated to many other recent developments in the field of national defense.

We refer, for example, to the decision not to push forward with the development of an antimissile missile, which could protect American cities from a Soviet missile assault.

We refer also to the decision to scrap the Skybolt missile system and to the decision not to develop the RS–70.

We refer, in brief, to all of the steps that, taken together, convince more than a few competent observers that the Kennedy administration is embarked upon a systematic program of disarmament through nondevelopment and nonimprovement.

WE CAN ALSO DISARM BY DOING NOTHING

The word "disarmament" portrays to most of us one standard image. We think in terms of warships being scuttled, of warplanes being dismantled, of ammunition being poured into the sea, of servicemen being demobilized and sent home.

This is the traditional concept of disarmament.

We forget, though, that in today's rapidly changing world substantially the same results can be achieved by failing to press forward with the development of new weapons systems and failing to improve existing weapons systems.

If such a program actually exists, its root could very well be the conviction that we and the Russians have either arrived at a "balance of terror" or that we should seek to arrive at one. When we establish equality as the goal of our defense policy, we abandon any hope of military superiority. We think, in fact, of superiority as some kind of illusion that can never be. And we strive instead to arrive at a point of rough military equality with our enemies. In so doing, we imagine, we eliminate the possibility of war: No nation will risk war when its adversary possesses equal military strength.

This is what Walter Lippmann referred to when he wrote on this page several weeks ago: "The notion that either of the two rival nuclear powers can bury the other has become nonsensical * * *. In the age of nuclear parity, there is no alternative to coexistence."

AMERICA'S WEAPONS ARE NONPROVOCATIVE

Mr. Lippmann uttered these words in praise of President Kennedy's June 10 speech at American University—a speech that very possibly marked a turning point in America's approach to the cold war.

For in the course in his remarks, the President spoke of America's weapons as "nonprovocative, carefully controlled, designed to deter, and capable of selective use."

He spoke as a man seeking desperately to allay fears—not the fears of the American people, but the fears of the men in the Kremlin. These are men, the President also said on June 10, who "have a mutually deep interest in a just and genuine peace."

The tone of the American University address suggested that Mr. Kennedy has swallowed the notion that the cold war is, after all, the handiwork of the free world as much as it is the handiwork of the Communist world. ("We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other, and new weapons beget counterweapons.")

Hence, the President seems to believe, the primary purpose of the West must be to convince the Russians of our peaceful designs. All of which sounds strikingly like President Roosevelt's conviction that he had somehow to win Stalin's trust and confidence at Yalta. In so doing, of course, Mr. Roosevelt bartered away the freedom of millions of human souls and afforded the Communist world a series of triumphs whose consequences will continue to cast long and ominous shadows upon the world for many years to come.

The only logical conclusion is that Mr. Kennedy is now convinced that neither we nor the Russians can do anything constructive to advance the cause of peace: We are caught up in a web spun by fate. We are engaged in a struggle we cannot hope to win. The only conceivable victory in such a struggle is a victory we must share with the Russians, for it will be a victory of men over circumstance.

As Walt W. Rostow, the chairman of Mr. Kennedy's State Department Policy Planning Council, puts it, "It is sometimes asked if our policy is a no-win policy. Our answer is this—we do not expect this planet to be forever split between a Communist bloc and a free world. We expect this planet to organize itself in time on the principles of voluntary cooperation among independent Nation-States dedicated to human freedom. * * * It will not be a victory of the United States over Russia. It will be a victory of men and Nations over forces that wish to entrap and to exploit their revolutionary aspirations."

This, it seems, is where American policy stands today. Victory in the nuclear age is simply impossible, so the administration seems to believe. Americans must hope, as Mr. Rostow sees it, that the Russians will awaken someday to the conviction that "the only logical course is to make a common cause with the United States to establish a minimum framework of order."

This, we fear, could well be what the inaction on the defense front is all about. This could explain why the United States has scarcely embarked upon any new weapons program since the Kennedy administration took office and since Mr. Rostow took up his duties as the State Department's principal policy adviser.

It is a course that neither Congress nor the American people have chosen; but it is a course they can do little or nothing to alter.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the Members of the House and Senate who spoke in the respective Chambers, or elsewhere, in commemorating the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I regret most exceedingly that the extreme demands on my time because of pressing legislative work on July 25, prevented me from appearing in this Chamber to invite you personally to join in observing the Commonwealth's birthday.

As you may know, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT spoke to the people of Puerto Rico, in San Juan, as the personal representative of the President of the United States and as an old friend returning to Puerto Rico to join in anniversary festivities. The people of Puerto Rico felt deeply honored by the visit of the distinguished Senator on this very important occasion.

I am sure that my distinguished colleagues will find in Senator FULBRIGHT's speech, which I include here, genuine appreciation of Puerto Rico's progress on many fronts and of Puerto Rico's inspiration to the inter-American community:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED JULY 25 BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT IN SAN JUAN, P.R., MARKING THE 11TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH

Governor Muñoz-Marín and distinguished guests, it is a great honor to represent the President of the United States on this memorable occasion and to bring to your Governor and the Puerto Rican people his cordial greetings and best wishes. It also gives me great personal satisfaction to return as an old friend who deeply admires the outstanding record which Puerto Rico has made as a progressive, forward-looking community of fellow citizens engaged in the vital task of making democracy work in this part of the world.

Eleven years ago the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed. The constitution was conceived by Puerto Rican minds and drafted by Puerto Rican hands. It expressed noble intentions and great ideals. It devised one of the most enlightened systems of representative democracy in this hemisphere, looking forward to a period of social and economic achievement within an institutional framework deeply responsive to the people's will. It proudly inserted in its preamble its "loyalty to the value of the human being regardless of social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and the hope for a better world based on these principles."

In the past 11 years Puerto Rico has matched the inspired words of its Constitution with inspired deeds. It has shown that democratic ideals can be translated into great achievements by resolute and imaginative effort, by hard work and a dedication to self-help. The record is here for all to see.

It is a sober, dramatic, unassailable record which should give renewed hope and confidence to the people of this Island as they prepare for the tasks ahead.

In many fields Puerto Rico has become the model and pioneer for the Western Hemisphere. When the American Republics met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in the summer of 1961, the task they undertook was nothing less than the charting of a new course for the people of the new hemisphere. In the words of the "Declaration to the Peoples of America," which was there adopted, the Alliance for Progress was to be founded "on the basic principle that free men working through the institution of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations, including those for work, home and land, health, and schools." The Declaration added, "no system can guarantee true progress unless it affirms the dignity of the individual which is the foundation of our civilization."

This Declaration, as well as the Charter of Punta del Este, summarized the aspirations of the peoples of Latin America for a better life and a better world. The documents framed at Punta del Este envisaged a peaceful, democratic revolution based on self-help measures and free external assistance. To these objectives the United States has pledged its wholehearted support.

It is altogether fitting and proper on the occasion of this community celebration to point out how Puerto Rico, by its own self-help measures, by its wise and imaginative use of all available resources—including its trade relationship with the mainland United States—has actually pioneered in many of the areas of social and economic development to which the Alliance for Progress is dedicated.

The Charter of Punta del Este looks forward to a rate of economic growth in Latin America of not less than 2.5 percent per capita per year. Puerto Rico has achieved a current growth rate of nearly 5 percent per capita per year—one of the highest in the Western World. This increase in productivity has been accompanied by a substantial effort to make available the benefits of economic progress to all the citizens of the Commonwealth. This, of course, is one of the basic objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este. The growth of purchasing power and economic well-being among all sectors of the population of the Island has been achieved through farsighted legislative and executive action and through the growth of enlightened labor-management relations. Puerto Rico ranks only after Great Britain, Canada, and the mainland United States in the percentage of national income that goes to wage earners in the form of salaries and services. The progress of the Commonwealth is truly a striking example of democratic achievement.

The reform that Puerto Rico undertook of its tax laws, its efforts to avoid tax evasion and to provide the basis for an efficient public administration, committed to honest government and the general welfare, are other signal landmarks in the Commonwealth's success. These achievements, far more than noble words and intentions, are a living inspiration for other countries now struggling to modernize their political and economic institutions.

At Punta del Este the Latin American republics committed themselves to national development programs based on self-help and the choice of basic priorities for the promotion of human and material progress. This is one of the fields in which Puerto Rico has been a pioneer for the Americas. Economic planning in Puerto Rico has involved both Government action and effective private participation. It has been democratic planning at its best, conducted largely on the municipal and local level. It has generated a sense of common purpose in the community effort, a sense of confidence and hope for the future. It has created a generation of planners, many of whom are now lending their experience and techniques to other governments as well as to international institutions.

A land of meager natural resources with neither coal nor oil, with no important mineral deposits and with limited forest preserves, Puerto Rico has demonstrated that human resources and dignity can overcome the obstacles of nature. Largely through judicious fiscal and trade relationships with the continental United States, the Commonwealth has created a favorable industrial climate and achieved an amazing expansion in its manufacturing activities. The basic source of these accomplishments is the initiative and vision of the people of Puerto Rico. The creative, enterprising spirit of the present generation of Puerto Ricans has produced in a single decade of effort one of the world's most successful development programs. The Puerto Rican story is uniquely one of the triumphs of human resources over natural obstacles.

As in other fields, Puerto Rico has become a model for all Latin America in dealing with the difficult problems of land reform. Puerto Rico has left far behind its heritage of a one-crop economy and has moved ahead with its own agrarian reform. Agriculture has been greatly diversified, as exemplified by the striking growth of the poultry and livestock industries during the last decade and the considerable expansion of the production of fruits and vegetables for the domestic market. The resettlement of 73,000 families on their own plots, with essential community service available, is a striking illustration of the Commonwealth's concern for the welfare of the campesino and his family. And this has been achieved in the best democratic manner with neither social upheaval nor loss of productivity.

At Punta del Este, the inter-American community wisely stressed the improvement of human resources and the widening of educational and cultural opportunities as a key priority target of the Alliance for Progress. Investment in education was rightly considered to be a preeminent factor in national development.

Of all the achievements of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, none is more impressive, or more encouraging, than its progress in the field of education. The Puerto Rican people have clearly understood that the acquisition of knowledge and skills is the indispensable prerequisite to economic improvement and spiritual fulfillment. The wiping out of illiteracy and the availability of primary education for all children of school age—two basic targets of the Charter of Punta del Este—are close to being accomplished realities on this island. Progress in higher education has made Puerto Rico a center of learning for the entire Caribbean area.

Nor has education been limited to the schoolroom: vocational training has been extended to the community and put to work as a basic factor in community development. In its emphasis on vocational training—which is probably the most neglected field of education in the United States—Puerto Rico is setting a valuable example, not only for Latin America, but for the continental United States as well. This pioneering spirit in so many fields has turned Puerto Rico into a laboratory of social experiment and creativity. Both in symbol and in substance, this island is an eminently suitable training ground for the young men and women of the Peace Corps. On this island the Peace Corps trainee is able to see the benefits and the promise of self help as living, growing realities.

As Governor Muñoz-Marín pointed out a few years ago, "There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about."[1] The success of the Puerto Rican people in their hard, uphill effort has commanded the respect of their fellow citizens in the United States and of the entire free world. On this occasion of its 11th anniversary, the Commonwealth is entitled to take great pride in its achievements and in its prospects. When one contemplates the poverty, the illiteracy, the social injustice and the political instability which afflict so much of the world today, it is natural to wonder why, in contrast to the world about her, Puerto Rico has been so successful.

After 20 years of political experience, it is my conviction that one of the indispensable and most significant ingredients of your success is the discriminating judgment which you have repeatedly shown in the selection of your chief executive, the Governor. As free citizens of this Commonwealth, you have exercised the power of the franchise responsibly and intelligently, for which you are to be commended most highly.

It is my privilege today to convey to the Puerto Rican people the admiration and regard of all Americans for their progress toward the goal defined by Gov. Muñoz-Marín as a society based on the "maximum respect for that minimum minority which is the individual."[2]

---

[1] Luis Muñoz-Marín. "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State," New York Times magazine, Aug. 16, 1959.

[2] Godkin Lecture, Harvard University, Apr. 28, 1959.

What Price Integration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., carried in its July 14, 1963, issue an article which was written by a nonsoutherner on the subject of integration of the races. This article has been called to my attention by a number of persons who feel it should be made available to the Members of the Congress, especially in view of consideration which is presently being given to the President's proposed civil rights legislation. The article is entitled "What Price Integration? A Northerner Speaks Frankly About the Upheaval in American Custom," and is written by Mr. David Warren Ryder.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE INTEGRATION?—A NORTHERNER SPEAKS FRANKLY ABOUT THE UPHEAVAL IN AMERICAN CUSTOM

(About the author: David Warren Ryder, author of the accompanying article, is a native of California who, for the past 10 years, has specialized in the field of business history, writing histories of several old California business institutions. Prior to this work, he was active in the newspaper business, advertising and public relations. His

writings have appeared in the North American Review, Collier's, American Mercury, the Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, and many other leading periodicals. His latest book, recently published, is a biography of William H. Crocker, one of the West's outstanding business, financial, and civic leaders. Mr. Ryder, who wrote the accompanying article exclusively for the News & Courier, has made several trips throughout the South, most recently last fall, when he visited every southern State except Arkansas.)

(By David Warren Ryder)

For the sake of any who may read what follows, I wish to say in advance that it makes no claim to originality. The views here put forward are a composite of the views of the many informed, thoughtful men and women—northerners, all of them—with whom I have discussed the matter in question at length—lawyers, doctors, clergymen, professors, teachers, writers, painters, businessmen, labor leaders, office workers—in fact, men and women from almost every calling and walk of life.

That more of them have not put these views in writing, or otherwise committed them to the public, reflects the degree to which a powerful, well-organized and completely unrestrained minority has succeeded, during the last few years, in coercing the unorganized majority—as well as a segment of the press into silence.

I am constrained also to say in advance that I am a northerner who, throughout the last 50 years, has had many contacts with individual American Negroes, all of which have been agreeable in every respect. To this it may be well to add that all four of my grandparents were ardent abolitionists; that two were soldiers in the Union Army, and that one was active in aiding the operations of the "underground railroad."

Thus both inheritance and experience have operated to engender in me the friendliest of feeling for the American Negro. I say these things in advance, so that no statement made herein may be properly suspected of accruing of any hostility to the Negro, or even dislike of him.

Goethe, in one of his "Conversations with Eckermann," declared that while it might be permissible to equivocate or dissemble concerning trivialities, important matters demanded complete honesty and frankness in their discussion.

Honoring that injunction, let us begin this discussion of integration, which certainly qualifies as an important matter in America today, by honestly and frankly stating that:

1. Despite Supreme Court ukases, and all that has been done thereunder, we do not have genuine integration of Negroes and whites in large areas of this country today—in the public schools or elsewhere; and

2. We are paying—and will continue to pay—a devastatingly high price for the pseudointegration that has been set up as a sop in its name.

Can any honest person, looking around the Nation today, dispute the accuracy of the first statement? Confronting the full meaning of the word, will anyone of sound mind seriously contend that the putting of a handful of Negroes into white schools by force, constitute integration in any honest sense? Can even the Supreme Court seriously maintain that a school in which there is a policeman or his equivalent standing guard to prevent white children assaulting blacks, or vice versa; and in which the psychological climate is constantly charged with hostility, is really integrated? Or is a suitable place for any child—Negro or white—to acquire education?

No, this is not integration; and no amount of saying so—even when that "saying so" is by august governmental agencies or personages—can make it so. However, the incessant "saying so"—and otherwise pretending so—by those in positions of political power and leadership can do this:

It can deceive a large segment of the citizenry into accepting the false for the true; the disastrous consequences of which need no elaboration. We vehemently denounced Hitler when, as a part of Nazi "weaponry," he murdered truth and iterated and reiterated the Big Lie. Are we now to embrace and applaud the very same evil we so lately decried?

Why do those at the head of the Federal Government, as well as the integration leaders, pretend that we have integration when the facts so belie this?

For Government officials it is difficult to find any answer compatible with statesmanship and right reason; but apparently they hope by so doing to (1) garner the Negro vote for their political party; and (2) save face for the Supreme Court, which, having eagerly and gleefully grabbed a bear by the tail, now may desire something to help it "let go."

It seems almost incredible, but apparently it was possible for the Supreme Court to have been so far removed from reality as to believe that it had only to speak, and customs, conventions, attitudes, and accommodations which had been generations in building would vanish as snowflakes before the summer's sun. When they did not, it apparently was quite surprising and disconcerting to the Court.

Why do we not have integration today in large sections of the Nation? Why, despite the Supreme Court's decision, and all of the hullaballoo there has been for it, has integration made such little headway in the 9 years since the Court attempted to legislate it.

The answer is simple—because most of the people the whole country over do not believe it is desirable and hence do not want it. We found with Prohibition how difficult to the point of impossibility it was to force something down unwilling people's throats. Now we are trying to do the self-same thing again; and with equal ineffectiveness.

Neither as a statute of sovereign States nor as a part of the Federal Constitution could Prohibition be enforced. Why? Essentially because, in attempting to do summarily by force majeure what could be done, if at all, only through education, it went solidly against the grain of human nature and was anathema to the vast majority of the American people. They would not countenance it, either as a moral principle or as a practical instrumentality for the regulation of human conduct; hence would not obey it. The whole miserable failure of Prohibition was as simple—and as profound—as that.

We should thus have learned the lesson that although an enactment of Congress or a State legislature, upheld by the Supreme Court may be called a law—"the law of the land," if you please—from a practical standpoint it is not one unless and until it has the sanction of the overwhelming majority of those to whom it applies. Unless it has that sanction it will not be respected; unless it is respected, it cannot be enforced, and unless it can be enforced, it is not from a practical standpoint, a law but only congeries of empty words.

By the same token, integration cannot be established throughout this country—no matter what the Supreme Court, the President, and the pontifical New York Times say to the contrary—by judicial fiat.

To be sure, at the cost of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money and of ugly wounds which will never heal, the U.S. Army—and little less than an army of U.S. marshals—invaded Oxford, Miss., and, through brute force and intimidation, deposited the physical body of one James H. Meredith within the halls and lecture rooms of the University of Mississippi, to the end that James Meredith became in his own words, "the most segregated man in America." But can any intelligent and reasonable person view this as anything but a horrible caricature of real integration?

Indeed, any sane, intelligent person who contemplates this malodorous affair cannot escape realizing that the employment of thousands of armed soldiers to put one Negro at bayonet's point into a white university was not the result of sincere desire to achieve real integration; but, rather, proceeded entirely out of the belief that this was good politics at the time; that it would assure the Negro vote being cast at the impending election for the party in power.

Once asked by newspaper reporters if we ever would have fascism in this country, the late Huey Long is said to have instantly replied: "Of course; but we'll call it democracy." The Kingfish knew with what little compunction high-placed Americans engage in hypocritical euphemism when it suits their purpose. He also knew how easy it is to gain public acceptance of evil when, well-purified by hypocrisy, it comes wearing the mantle of good.

Besides not bringing about integration, the forced mixing of Negroes and whites in public schools—or anywhere else—augments and intensifies whatever natural antipathy those of one race felt toward the other; and this applies to children and their elders alike. Human nature being what it is, this follows as the night the day; and every time force is employed in alleged aid of integration, more barriers between the two races are erected.

The advocates of race mixing repeatedly and vigorously assert that there is no proof that this would be injurious to the white race; in short, no proof that the black race is biologically inferior to the white.

They are wrong. There is such proof, as anyone will find who honestly seeks it. To be sure, it was all but buried under a mass of pseudoscientific flotsam and jetsam emanating from writers, who, in their zeal for egalitarianism, suppressed and tortured facts to make them serve their egalitarian ideology. But the proof still exists; unaffected by the avalanche of scientific foal that was dumped on it, in the effort to conceal it from view.

From a purely practical standpoint, whether or not there is scientific proof of the inferiority of the black race does not alter the existing situation. For so long as untold millions of white Americans believe their race is superior to the Negro, it is a fact that must be reckoned with. Regardless of the basis of this belief, there it is.

In being unwilling to have my daughter marry a Negro (or a Filipino, Hindu, or Indonesian, for that matter), my position might be considered to be scientifically unsound and logically untenable. It might be held to transgress Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, and to violate all the dogmas of sweet democratic togetherness. No matter; it still would be my position, which I would resolutely maintain and defend regardless.

The comparatively few people who really favor Negro-white race mixing speak pejoratively of prejudice, scoffingly asserting that it is prejudice which actuates the vast number of people who are actually opposed to integration. That may well be, for prejudice is the manifestation of deep-rooted feeling which, in turn, is the product of long racial experience. And to say nothing of the fact that life without prejudice is equally impossible and undesirable, that is why real integration cannot summarily be.

The fact that millions of nonsouthern Americans do not cry out against integration means not that they favor it; it means only that for one reason or another they are afraid to announce their dissent. Their silence is for self-protection.

Although it is abundantly plain that the violent methods thus far pursued in the

abortive attempts to effect integration have deepened and intensified the opposition to it, violence still seems to be the order of the day with its proponents. The professional integrationists and their governmental allies appear to believe that if some violence will not do the trick, more and more violence will.

There seems to be not the first glimmer of realization on their part that this violence is not only seriously impeding the advance of any real integration, but militating against the deserving Negro severely. And violence apart, all of the noisy huckstering the professional integrationists engage in—all of their hullabalooing and breast beating in behalf of the Supreme Courts legislation—is slowly but surely arousing the ire and therefore the opposition of millions of Americans who have been more or less neutral up to date.

It is doing this because much of it is so repugnant to truth, so offensive to good taste, so farfetched and absurd, so obviously unfair to the great mass of white citizenry, and so unrepresentative of millions of Negro men and women. Let me cite two examples.

In San Francisco, last spring, students of one of the high schools wrote and produced a little musical based on Mark Twain's inimitable "Huckleberry Finn." While it was in rehearsal word got out that a Negro boy was taking the part of "Jim." Immediately a great outcry arose. Officials of NAACP and CORE—and various others who make their livings out of being professional race-mixing agitators—made violent protest.

What was the basis of their complaint? Simply that a Negro youth was cast to play the role of the Negro "Jim."

To the enduring credit of the school superintendent he, like the principal, refused to be intimidated, and the play went on—to the delight of the students, including the Negro lad who played "Jim" and, according to all accounts, played him well.

There were many reliable indications that most of the San Francisco and bay area Negroes—including "Jim's" parents and friends—were displeased by what their so-called leaders did and said in their name; and they, therefore, were blameless for it. Nevertheless, the damage was done—to them and to the entire Negro population.

Not daunted by silly fiasco, a few months later the Negro leaders were at it again. This time they breathed wrath and defiance because an elementary San Francisco school was scheduled to open in the fall with about 60-percent Negro and 40-percent white pupils. Since this reflected the racial complexion of the district the school was to serve, what was there wrong about it?

Well, according to the peculiar mental calibrations of CORE and NAACP officials, and other professional integrationists, if there are more Negroes than white in a school it is still not integrated. By some sore of outreasoning they came up with the contention that a school to be integrated, must have at least 51 percent whites.

One thing noticeably common to virtually all integrationist leaders, and other professional race-mixers, is their assumption that they are always 100 percent right about everything, and that what they choose to demand must be 100 percent granted, regardless of how much the rights of others may suffer thereby. There must be integration—as they define integration—at once and at all costs; nothing else matters.

In far too many cases this arrogant attitude, and the threats and demands to parents, have paid off; those upon whom the demands were made have capitulated—to avoid trouble. In this instance this did not happen. The school board simply announced, at the height of the furor, that if this was the way the professional integrationists were going to play the game, alright; the school simply would not open at all.

Genuine evolutionary integration has suffered immeasurably from remedies which are worse than the disease; remedies which, for the most part, are the handiwork of the political liberals. These men not only have a positive mania for what they call equality, but commit endless mischief through their unwitting efforts to give it to all and sundry, everywhere. Intoxicated with their Utopian idealism, they do not realize that (1) no one, not even a liberal, can give anybody equality; and (2) what they mean by equality is not the equality of Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence, but the egalitarianism of Saint-Just and the other chief inquisitors of the French Revolution.

The equality of the Declaration of Independence difers as much from the egalitarianism of the liberals as the Mona Lisa differs from a pin-up girlie, or a Shakespearean sonnet from a college yell. Under the equality of the Declaration of Independence, men are created with equal claim to those boons we have specified. Under the egalitarianism of the French Revolutionists and today's ritualistic liberals, man's natural inequality is to be set aside by law. Unequal men are to be made equal—that is, equalized—by governmental action which may take the form of brute force if necessary. Under this, everybody, regardless of individual merit or innate capacity, is going to be equalized with everybody else—in income, opportunity, education, sex appeal, housing, food, clothing, personality and all else any liberal can conceive of. What God or nature cannot do, government will do—quickly. "All power hereafter resides in the laws," said Saint-Just, "which take the place of God."

To those who are not lost in the miasmatic fog of liberalism, it will be unnecessary to point out that equalizing the Negro by law cannot help—and must seriously hinder—him in the long run. Saying that a purse made out of sow's ears is silk—even though the saying of this is in the devious and involuted prose of a Supreme Court decision—can not give it the real attributes of silk; cannot make it silk. But saying so can do this: it can, through deceiving purse-buyers by false claims, ultimately ruin the purse market.

By the same token, insisting that through being equalized by, for instance, having one of his race put at bayonet's point into an all-white university, the Negro has attained real equality, cannot really aid or advance him; on the contrary must harm and retard him. For the chief long-range effect of such equalizing is to coerce the Negro into striving to be what he is not. When he fails in this, and fail in most instances he must, he is left "dangling" between two worlds—the old, familiar one which he has been induced to leave prematurely and which therefore will be difficult for him to re-enter; and the strange new world in which, legally equalized though he may be, he does not naturally fit, and is consequently ill at ease and unhappy.

In persuading the Negro to believe that, through being equalized by law, he is entitled to something without having earned it, Government officials and integrationist leaders are betraying the Negro. In soliciting the Negro vote through attempts to effectuate integration by force, those so doing are betraying the Republic.

For the present we can expect to witness continued privileges to him; this because the liberal establishment now in power thus bids for his vote; meanwhile arguing to the public that these are his due—to compensate for the equality he was previously denied.

That argument, however plausible sounding to the unthinking, is too specious, too tenuous, too devoid of solid foundation, to gain more than ephemeral acceptance. Even now a great many thoughtful people are asking: "Do two wrongs make a right? If it was wrong to discriminate against the Negro, is it less wrong to discriminate in his favor, and thus against the vast remainder of the population?"

It is abundantly evident that the current disposition of the average politician to fawn upon the Negro is not born of love but of fear; the fear that unless he joins in the noisy huckstering for "civil rights," he will lose the "Negro vote."

Those of us with long memories will recall that Prohibition, during most of its evil life, enjoyed the public support of most of the politicians. Here, again, it was fear that motivated them. With a few exceptions, they did not vote for Prohibition initially—or later vote for appropriations for its attempted enforcement—because they believed in it. On the contrary, they disbelieved in it, to the point of flagrantly violating it when occasion (and the state of their ulcers) permitted. They voted dry simply and solely because they were scared half to death that if they didn't, that old dragon, the Anti-Saloon League would get them. Believing the League to be as politically powerful and ferocious as it pretended to be, they voted its mandate out of fear that otherwise it would devour them. Only after Franklin Roosevelt, in his 1932 campaign, came out boldly for repeal and, instead of being instantly consumed by fire and brimstone, was elected President, did more than a scant few of the politicians wake up to the fact that (1) the League never had been anything like as powerful as it claimed to be; and (2) for several years past it had ben no more than an empty shell. Only then did they trip over one another's feet in their mad rush to board the repeal bandwagon.

The same thing is bound to happen with the politicians vis-a-viz the Negro vote, which they now so much fear. It will take a little time yet, but most of us now living will see the day when the politicos will discover that their fear of this ogre was as ill-founded and foolish as their precedessors' fear of the Anti-Saloon League. Moreover, one of these not-too-distant days, most of the politicians—Democrats and Republicans alike—will awaken to the fact that it will be to their own distinct advantage—to say nothing of the Nation's—to treat the Negro vote the same as any other. To be sure, they probably will not do this out of consideration for the Nation's good. Rather, they will do it because they will by then have realized the advantage to themselves of not having to engage in outpromising contests with their rivals. And they will be helped to this realization by the Negro himself, who is smart enough to discover the emptiness of promises made under such conditions.

The French Revolution may well be history's most hideous example of the inhuman attempt to do what is humanly impossible. In the name of liberty, equality, fraternity, and in the fanatical attempt to achieve their absolutes, the most unspeakable crimes were committed. Men crazed by the delusion that absolute equality was humanly attainable and desirable, defied violence; and, as the guillotine operated with the regularity of a metronome, the streets of Paris literally ran with the blood of innocent men and women.

God forbid that this, or its like, should be repeated here in America, in our time. God forbid that, today, in the name of integration, men should—by the methods and means they employ in attempting to further it—create such a tidal wave of hostility as will submerge and destroy all that has been gained in more than a century of dedicated, intelligent, patient endeavor to increase understanding and improve human relations between black man and white.

Layman's Point of View—Where Are We Headed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baptist Message magazine, July 18, 1963, by A. Loyd Collins, of Louisiana College, Pineville, La.:

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

(By A. Loyd Collins, Louisiana College)

We should be much concerned on the apparent trend in our country, stimulated by recent Supreme Court decisions, to outlaw God from various phases of our national life.

As I see it, we are not moving in the direction of greater separation of the church and state, but rather in the opposite direction of the separation of God and the state.

There is a vast difference in these two important concepts. The former deals with denominational matters, as relating to a particular church or religious group. The latter concerns fundamental principles of Divine protection and guidance, which has always been recognized as one of the significant cornerstones upon which this Nation has rested since its creation.

Our illustrious forefathers wisely provided for religious freedom in this country. The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that the "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

They provided for the freedom of religion, not freedom from religion. They had no thought of providing a way for the free extermination of religion.

Many people today are asking the question: Are we on the road to becoming a godless nation like Russia and other communistic states?

The question arises: What will the next step be? Will it be:

1. To take the words, "In God We Trust" off our money, for fear that it might possibly offend someone who did not believe in God?
2. Abolish prayer in Congress and other legislative bodies?
3. Withdraw chaplains from our Armed Forces?
4. Leave the name of God out of the oath of office for public officials?
5. Take the reference to God out of the pledge of allegiance to the American flag?
6. Abolish any reference to God in our legal documents?
7. Eliminate the teaching of documents in history which mention God in any way?

We need to wake up in this country before it is too late. The long pathway of the history of the world is strewn with the wreckage of nations who have deliberately chosen to ignore and turn their backs on God.

Shall we heed the lessons of history? It is a matter of historical record that nations have always fallen when they have turned away from God. There are many examples of this.

In ancient times, Rome is a classic example of what happens when a nation forgets God.

In modern times, there is the example of Germany under the leadership of Hitler.

Communism, which has said, "There is no God—it is all a fable and myth" is another example of what happens when a nation does not recognize God and basic Christian principles. Look at the persecutions, the loss of liberty, and slavery behind the Iron Curtain countries.

Will America be added to this list of nations? It will, if we do not stem this mad tide to abolish God in our national way of life. The challenge is up to us. We must stem the tide of Godless secularism.

We cannot survive materially, if we die spiritually.

A deep religious spirit permeated our early settlers. They clung to their faith, looked above and courageously forged ahead, undaunted and unafraid. The Holy Bible was a light unto their path and the guidebook for their lives.

We have depended upon the Lord and He has helped us as a Nation. Our great leaders have had faith and have trusted Almighty God to lead and to direct them. As the old Ship of State has frequently sailed through troubled and foaming waters of storm and strife, our leaders have looked above and have sought the Hand of the Almighty to steady the wheel.

The story is told of a foreigner who once came to our shores because he wanted, he said, to try and discover the secret of the greatness of America. After visiting with many of our leaders and traveling through many sections of the country, he said that he had discovered the real secret of the greatness of America. He said that it was our faith in God.

As long as we stay close to God, our Nation will live and prosper. If we continue to look into the face of God for our inspiration and leadership, He will bless us, and He will make us great and a blessing to all mankind.

Shall we throw our God-given heritage away? The challenge has been thrown to us to preserve this heritage and faith in God. We must not fail.

"Stuffy" U.S. Postage Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a great many people throughout the country are interested in philately, and on many occasions I have heard a great deal said about the dullness of our postage stamps. Only in the last few years have the design and color changed.

I would like to include in the RECORD a very interesting editorial by Mr. George W. Linn which appeared in the July 15, 1963, issue of Linn's Weekly Stamp News.

SOMEBODY TELL MRS. KENNEDY

The Kennedy administration has shown an unusual interest in the arts. Mrs. Kennedy's historic redecoration of the White House has won more than the admiration of antiquarians. It has created a warm new feeling for "the President's house" as a showcase of the very best in American taste.

All this being true, it is high time the Kennedys came to the rescue of the American postage stamp. No nation, large or small, has built such a tradition of dull, conventional, pompous stamps as our great Republic. Nor has much improvement been apparent of late. A knowledgeable Chicago collector, Fairfax M. Cone, describes three recent issues as "an undistinguished Lincoln, a grim Washington, and a fat airplane."

Yet these tiny oblongs of design travel all over the world as silent representatives of the United States. I don't know how the word would be expressed in various tongues and dialects, but I am sure that our stamps must be described in all corners of the world as "stuffy."

Defense Letdown Seen as U.S. Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of July 17, 1963:

DEFENSE LETDOWN SEEN AS U.S. DANGER

The United States must guard against apathy in national defense, Frank Gard Jameson, a past president of the U.S. Navy League, said here yesterday.

Jameson, who is Douglas Aircraft vice president for planning, cautioned that in spite of current nuclear test ban talks, the Russians plan to take over just as soon as they can. He spoke before a Kiwanis Club luncheon in El Cortez Hotel.

Noting that there are 36,000 people working in the Pentagon, Jameson said he deplored the extent of authority wielded by civilians in military matters.

CHIEF OF NOTHING

"We are looking at a time when the Chief of Naval Operations could become chief of nothing," he said.

He criticized the low levels of pay and benefits received by military personnel compared with civilian Government employees. In the last 100 years, he said, a Navy captain's salary has only doubled, to $12,000 a year. In the same period, a Congressman's annual salary has grown to $22,500 from $1,500, he said.

Jameson urged stronger incentives to attract top men into military service.

MANAGEMENT LACK

"War is an art as well as a science," he said, and, therefore, "you don't push a button to meet a national crisis. Military proficiency only comes from long years of experience," he added.

Speaking of the United States growing public debt, he said the Nation's problem is a lack of management, not a lack of capital.

The administration's current annual budget amounts to about $127 billion, he said, with $10 billion needed just to pay interest on the debt.

He likened domestic government aid programs to a "blood transfusion from one arm to the other, using a leaky tube."

He urged citizens to make their views known to elected legislative officials.

"Unless you ask for something, you are not going to get it," he asserted.

In an interview Jameson said the Government's cancellation of the Skybolt missile project meant a loss to Douglas Aircraft of $30 million a month in sales. In 1962, Douglas' sales totaled $749,921,000, with net income equal to $10,205,000.

He said the company's twin-jet, medium-range DC-9 is expected to take up some of the slack. About 50 percent of all air trips are for less than 400 miles, he said, and the DC-9—scheduled for first deliveries in 1966—will be aimed at this market.

Also, the DC-9 will save the United States some $3 billion in gold outflow, he estimated. The only similar aircraft being developed is the British Aircraft Corp. 111, he explained.

Commercial airplanes are the Nation's third ranking export item, after wheat and steel, he said, and Douglas expects to sell about 300 DC-9's to foreign customers in the next 5 years.

Douglas thinks "very, very highly" of Rohr Corp., Chula Vista, which will make the power packages for the DC-9 under a $28.3 million contract, he said. Rohr got the award because "they are the experts in the engine pod field."

For Whom Does Allen Speak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the mayor of Atlanta, Mr. Ivan Allen, testified last Friday before the Senate Commerce Committee in favor of the President's proposal that the Federal Government be given authority to dictate to private businessmen to whom they must sell and serve on their private property. Since that time, Gov. Carl Sanders, of Georgia, has testified before the committee and has in effect repudiated the testimony of Mayor Allen, placing in the record of those hearings resolutions from the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and also the Atlanta Junior Chamber of Commerce opposing pending legislation. He also placed in the record of the hearings editorial comments from both the Atlanta Constitution and the Atlanta Journal, the two most liberal and pro civil rights newspapers in the entire South, expressing the opposition of these newspapers to the President's proposals.

In addition to this, Mr. President, I have received a large number of communications in my office from people in Atlanta objecting to Mayor Allen's position before the Commerce Committee. I have also had called to my attention an excellent editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of Augusta, Ga., dated July 29, 1963. This editorial is entitled "For Whom Does Allen Speak?" I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR WHOM DOES ALLEN SPEAK?

Atlanta Mayor Ivan Allen spoke neither for the business community to which he owes his livelihood nor the electorate to which he owes his political office when he testified Friday in favor of the public accommodations section of President Kennedy's civil rights legislation.

Allen, a highly successful businessman and former president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, spoke out for a bill that would shackle private enterprise with one of the most restrictive burdens ever conceived in our free society. He advocated a course of action leading to a form of dictatorial control from Washington over the practices and policies of virtually every private business in the country.

Moreover, Allen registered a lack of faith in the kind of racial progress his own city has made. He told the Senate Commerce Committee, in effect, that Atlanta cannot continue to go forward voluntarily in solving its racial problems. Atlanta and other cities, he said, must have a new Federal law as a guide and support if voluntary desegregation of private establishments is to be permanent.

We have never heard of a mayor with so little confidence in his own townspeople.

One would think that Allen, of all the witnesses who have testified on the civil rights proposals, would have been one of the most outspoken against the public accommodations provisions. As a man who has prospered and gained fame in the world of private business, he certainly should cherish the right to own and manage private property. And surely he recognizes that American business did not become great by asking the government to set its standards of behavior; rather it built its foundations on private initiative and voluntary change in the interest of the general good.

More obviously, Allen should be as aware as any American of the advantages of voluntary action over coercion in this sensitive area of race relations. While many other American cities have experienced violence and national notoriety in the wake of controversy over the legalities involved in lowering racial barriers, Atlanta has moved voluntarily to desegregate most of its public facilities and many private establishments. In many respects, Atlantans have gone beyond the mere letter of the law and treated the racial problem as the moral problem it is. Like Augustans and many other Georgians, they have relied on responsibility and mature judgment as well as law to guide their approach to racial matters.

Now Allen asks that the clock be turned back, that Congress establish standards to govern race relations as they affect private business operation. We believe most Atlantans and most businessmen would disown his request and deny his contention that voluntary racial action has provoked more tension than would Federal coercion.

A far more reasonable view of the pending legislation, in our opinion, was presented to the committee by Gov. Donald S. Russell of South Carolina on the same day Allen testified. "The civil rights bill," said Russell, "not only is unconstitutional but it offers no sound remedy for the delicate and complex problem of racial relations."

"Actually," Russell added, "legislative coercion can aggravate and make more difficult the whole problem. New York State has as stringent a code of so-called antidiscrimination legislation as can be envisaged. * * * [Yet] laws have not given New York racial peace."

Congressman James G. O'Hara Has Busy Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker. It has come to my attention that the Warren Star Reporter of Warren, Mich., recently carried an article and pictures describing a typical day in the life of my good friend and colleague who so ably represents the Seventh Congressional District of Michigan, JIM O'HARA. I have worked with JIM O'HARA and know how well the people of the Seventh District—Michigan's "Thumb Area"—are represented in the House of Representatives.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Warren Star Reporter, headlined "Congressman O'HARA Has Busy Days," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN O'HARA HAS BUSY DAYS

If "variety is the spice of life" as we are told, then a Congressman's life should indeed be rewarding. For a Congressman is expected to perform a variety of tasks every day, but still no day is exactly the same as the day before. This is true in the case of Congressman JAMES G. O'HARA of Michigan's Seventh District—just as it is in the case of his 434 colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives and 100 in the Senate.

Every day of the year—whether Congress is in session or not—a Congressman and his staff perform a number of chores. These include answering the mail (in the case of Congressman O'HARA, this sometimes means more than 100 letters in a single day); representing his constituents in solving problems concerning the various Federal agencies—this can run as high as 20 a day for the Seventh District—and meeting with representatives of trade associations, business and labor groups and other organizations.

When Congress is in session (an average of 8 to 10 months a year in recent years), the Congressman attends committee meetings, which convene at 10 a.m. and continue until noon. He participates in sessions of the House, which start at noon most weekdays and continue usually until 5 or 6 p.m. but sometimes at late as 10 p.m.

On top of this crowded schedule, a Congressman must take time to return occasionally to his district, inspect Federal projects, meet with State, county, and municipal officials at home and in Washington, make speeches and perform other duties when he is asked.

All of these duties are in addition to the Congressman's primary task—the important job of legislating, helping shape the laws which make our democracy work.

Why, one might ask, would anyone want to be a Congressman with a schedule like this? Congressman O'HARA, a 37-year-old veteran of World War II, explains it this way:

"This is the most satisfying experience of my life. The opportunity to participate in the national legislative process and at the same time serve the people of my district, more than compensates for the occasional loss of sleep and rather hectic schedules."

Congressman O'HARA's typical working day starts about 9 a.m. when he arrives at his office (Room 1109, Longworth House Office Building). Members of his staff, consisting of an administrative assistant, Donald M. Baker, and three secretaries, join him and here the day's work begins. From then until his 10 o'clock committee meeting the Congressman goes over the mail and confers with staff and others on the day's schedule.

A graduate of the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan Law School, he is a member of the important House Education and Labor Committee, which handles legislation pertaining to education at all levels as well as labor matters.

The Seventh District Congressman is now in his third term in the House, meaning that he has moved up in seniority to a position of considerable responsibility on the committee.

Committee meetings usually adjourn about noon—just in time for Congressman O'HARA to head for the floor of the House for the opening of the daily session. During the afternoon he tries to find time to eat lunch and get back to his office to answer more mail.

In addition to his membership on the Education and Labor Committee, O'HARA is an assistant majority leader or whip for the three States of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. In this capacity, he works closely with Democratic Majority Leader CARL ALBERT to muster support for President Kennedy's legislative program.

When his work is completed at the end of the day, Congressman O'HARA signs his mail and leaves his office about 6:30 or 7 p.m., arriving at home half an hour later.

Then Congressman O'HARA begins his nightly homework—reading background material on legislation before the Congress, scanning newspapers and magazines, perhaps reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the day before to be sure he hasn't missed anything of importance and mulling over the many problems he has faced during the day.

Then about midnight, the Seventh District Congressman retires for the night. Tomorrow will be another day. But every day holds some surprises—new problems, challenging the best efforts of O'HARA and his staff. With the solutions to the problems come the rewards—the satisfaction of knowing that someone has been assisted, that the Congressman has had a hand in shaping national policies on important issues facing our Nation and the world in which we live.

Why Land on the Moon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, very soon the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences will complete its scrutiny of the $5.7 billion budget request by the National Aeronautical and Space Administration. The members of the committee and the staff have devoted several weeks to the examination of the NASA budget. In recent months there has been increasing attention focused on the space program because of the substantial budget increase from a percentage standpoint, as well as in terms of dollars, over last fiscal year. This public awareness of the problems involved in rapid expansion of our space program has been reflected by the diligence of the committee.

The question continues to arise, "Why land on the moon?" Not too long ago I tried to respond to that question and now two scientists, Dr. Robert Jastrow and Dr. Homer E. Newell, have presented an answer in an article in the August issue of the Atlantic. While both these men are employed by NASA I believe their point of view is shared by many in the scientific community. Indeed, support for the objectives of the space program was voiced by a number of distinguished scientists who testified last month before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Dr. Jastrow and Dr. Newell pointed out that the consequences of the space program are far reaching—"the fruits of research into fundamental problems of science; economic benefits from the application of satellites to communication and weather forecasting; long-range technological benefits accruing to industry; a general stimulus to science education; and most important, the security which comes from U.S. leadership in space."

While they detail the scientific justification for the moon landing they sum up by adding:

But however we may try to break the program down into its elements and to attempt a detailed balancing of debits and credits, the fact remains that the space effort is greater than the enterprise, not only for the United States but for all humanity. We have the power and resources to play a leading role in this effort, and it is inconceivable that we should stand aside.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY LAND ON THE MOON?

(By Robert Jastrow and Homer E. Newell)

(NOTE.—A theoretical physicist who taught at Columbia and Yale, Dr. Robert Jastrow joined NASA in 1958 as Chief of the Theoretical Division of the Goddard Space Flight Center. He is now Director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York and adjunct professor of geophysics at Columbia University. Dr. Homer E. Newell is Director of the Office of Space Sciences in NASA Headquarters. He is a mathematician who entered atmospheric physics after World War II and joined NASA at the time of its formation in 1958. Previously he taught mathematics at the University of Maryland, and served as Chief of the Division of Astronomy and Atmospheric Physics at the Naval Research Laboratory.)

Congress has been asked to provide $5.7 billion for the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the current fiscal year, roughly 6 cents out of every Federal tax dollar. This level of expenditure has produced demands for a reevaluation of the space program. Critics ask whether the exploration of the solar system is a valid enterprise for the United States to undertake at this time; or, granting the ultimate importance of the step, whether, it must be carried out at the present pace.

The focal point of the criticism is the Apollo project for manned lunar landing, which absorbs $3.7 billion out of the $5.7 billion in the projected NASA budget. The Apollo budget which has produced the current outcry stems from a decision taken in 1961. At that time the man-in-space program was expanded beyond the limited Mercury effort to a full-scale attack on the problems of manned flight to the moon and planets. The impetus for the decision came from a series of Soviet achievements in February and March of 1961, when the U.S.S.R. launched in rapid succession four spacecraft, each weighing 10,000 pounds or more. These were followed on April 12, 1961, by the successful orbiting of Major Gagarin in a 14,000-pound spacecraft and his safe recovery after a circuit of the Earth in 1 hour and 47 minutes. Thus the world saw the Soviet Union achieve man's first flight in space.

On May 26, 1961, President Kennedy laid the Soviet challenge before the American people. He urged the Nation to commit itself to the goal of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to Earth before the decade was out. The President's message suggested the reasons underlying this recommendation: we faced the gloomy prospect of standing second to the U.S.S.R. in manned flight for years to come; the manned lunar landing would be the first major space achievement in which the U.S. effort could reach its full strength; a vigorous effort could achieve a manned lunar landing by the end of this decade; and if the United States set 1970 as its target date for the lunar landing, it would have a good chance to reach this goal before the U.S.S.R.

President Kennedy asked for a careful examination of the proposed commitment: "I think every citizen of this country as well as the Members of Congress should consider the matter carefully in making their judgment * * * there is no sense in agreeing or desiring that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burdens."

In July 1961, the Congress voted overwhelmingly for the funds requested to move the space program into high gear. In 1962 Congress reaffirmed its support by doubling the budget of the previous year.

Now, in 1963, we see the substantial fruits of our increased labors in space. The manned-flight program is rapidly advancing through its intermediate objectives toward the milestone of the lunar landing. The space-flight program as a whole has produced a great volume of scientific research, as well as economically important applications to weather forecasting and communications.

At the same time, the Russians continue to show great vigor in their man-in-space program. The single-orbit flight of Gagarin was followed rapidly by Titov's 17-orbit mission, and more recently by the formidable accomplishment of a near rendezvous between cosmonauts Popovich and Nikolayev. The Soviet science program in space has also been stepped up to a high level after a lull of some years, with 18 Kosmos scientific satellites, a lunar probe, and a Mars probe launched during the last year. There appears to be no letup in the Soviet space challenge to the United States.

What, then, is the basis for the questioning of the commitment to the expanded U.S. space program?

Thoughtful critics, concerned over the allocation of limited national resources, ask whether this is a good way in which to spend funds that might otherwise be used for the betterment of man's lot on the surface of the earth. Could some of the money going into space research be diverted into other programs of public interest—medical research, education, housing, technical aid to emerging nations—a variety of projects contributing to the welfare of our society?

This query implies that public funds are transferable. However, the reduction of support for one national program does not carry a guarantee of increased support for other projects. President Kennedy remarked recently, "Some people say we should take the money we are putting into space and put in into housing or education. My judgment is that what would happen would be that they would cut the space program and you would not get additional funds for education."

But if space money cannot readily be rerouted into other channels, that negative consideration in itself is not a reason for large expenditures of public funds. What are the positive values which we derive from this investment?

The Nation can expect the following consequences of the space program: the fruits of research into fundamental problems of science; economic returns from the application of satellites to communications and weather forecasting; long-range technological benefits accruing to industry; a general stimulus to science and to science education; and, most important, the security which comes from leadership in space.

Scientific administrators ask: granted these benefits, can we afford the cost of the space program in technical manpower? Their concern is heightened by the fact that

Federal programs in defense, space, and atomic energy together consume nearly half of the science and engineering talent available in the United States. But is the space agency the major consumer of trained manpower within this Federal complex of technical agencies? In actuality, NASA will be using 6 percent of the national manpower pool in science and engineering through its contracts with private industry, plus an additional 1 percent in Government laboratories. If the space program has substantial value, this is not an overwhelming drain.

But scientists who see the potential benefits of space exploration are still opposed to the timetable of the man-in-space program, and particularly the schedule set for landing men on the moon. They ask whether the objectives of space research cannot be realized by robot instruments, with the manned-flight program carried out at a slower pace.

This question requires a further exploration of the motives underlying the U.S. space effort. Is it primarily a scientific program, or is it motivated by a broader concern with the national interest? Looking back to the overwhelming support given the new space program by the Congress in 1961, it seems clear that this support was not tendered for scientific reasons primarily, but came from a deep-seated conviction that the expanded program will make an important contribution to our future strength and security. We believe that this is the reason why the people have supported the enlarged space program. That brings us to the point on which we take issue with some of our scientific colleagues, who complain, "The scientific exploration of the moon has been accorded a secondary priority in the lunar program." This remark is based on the premise that science should have top priority in the space program. However, while science plays an important role in lunar exploration, it was never intended to be the primary objective of that project. The impetus of the lunar project is derived from its place in the long-range U.S. program for the exploration of the solar system. The heart of that program is man in space, the extension of man's control over his physical environment. The science and technology of space flight are ancillary developments which support the main thrust of manned exploration, while at the same time they bring valuable returns to our economy and our culture. The science which we do in space provides the equivalent of the gold and spices recovered from earlier voyages of exploration. It is the return to the taxpayer for his investment in his nation's future. But the driving force of the program is not in scientific research alone, valuable though that may be in the long run. Thus, the pace of the program must be set, not by the measured patterns of scientific research, but by the need for a vigorous response to the national challenge.

In these remarks we express our views as citizens confident in the destiny of this Nation. Now, as scientists, we wish to turn to the scientific objectives of lunar exploration. What are the important questions which may be illuminated by this project? One of the classical problems in science concerns the origin of the solar system—how we came to be here in the physical sense. It is a question which has occupied the mind of man for centuries, and a matter of the deepest scientific interest and philosophical importance. It is also an inquiry to which the space program can make a unique contribution, for surprisingly, the exploration of the moon has a direct bearing on this basic problem.

In order to understand the relevance of lunar exploration, we must back off to supply the general context of the new ideas on the way in which a star, such as our sun, is formed, and how the planets may have been formed around it. The story will carry us through 10 billion years of stellar history in a few paragraphs.

According to the current picture in astrophysics, a star is born when some chance fluctuation of dust draws together the particles of interstellar matter. The gravitational attraction among the particles then acts to draw them still closer together, building a very strong condensation at the center, with very high temperatures and pressures. When the temperature reaches about 10 million degrees, the situation is ripe for the ignition of a thermonuclear reaction in which the hydrogen nuclei combine or fuse to form helium nuclei, releasing at the same time enormous amounts of energy. This release of energy prevents the star from collapsing further under the force of gravity. But eventually the hydrogen fuel is used up, and the star again contracts until a temperature of 100 million degrees is reached. At this point, the helium nuclei fuse to form the heavier nucleus of carbon. From carbon, oxygen is formed, and then still other elements.

In this way, successively heavier elements are built up from the original hydrogen. The whole table of elements is developed step by step in this cooking process within the center of the star—a synthesis of all the elements of the universe out of the basic building block of hydrogen. We have duplicated the process for brief moments in the explosion of the hydrogen bomb, but we have not yet succeeded in producing it under laboratory conditions.

Toward the end of the life of the star all available nuclear fuel has been consumed and no further energy release can occur to support the star against the massive pressure of the overlying layers. A collapse results, followed by an explosion and destruction of the star. The exploding star is called a supernova.

In a supernova explosion, most of the matter of the star, including the elements that were synthesized in it during its lifetime, is sprayed out into space. These elements join with the hydrogen of interstellar space to form an enriched mixture including the carbon, oxygen, iron, and other elements that were manufactured previously. The enriched mixture may then be drawn together in a subsequent condensation to form the body of another star later in the history of the galaxy.

Presumably our sun was formed in such a process. The planets are believed to have been formed as minor nuclei of condensation in the cloud of gas and dust around the primitive sun. If our own planet Earth was formed in this way, then everything in the Earth, including the constituents of our bodies, was once manufactured within other stars, dispersed to space, and condensed again to dust and solid matter.

We believe that all this happened 4.5 billion years ago, but we do not know precisely how it happened, nor exactly what the tangled complex of events was which surrounded the genesis of the sun and the planets. The problem is a fascinating one, and the object of much scientific effort during recent years.

In the study of these questions the exploration of the Moon plays a very special role, because it is a body whose surface has preserved the record of its history for an exceptionally long time. On the Earth the atmosphere and the oceans wear away the surface in 10 to 50 million years. There is little left on the Earth and surface features that existed several hundred million or a billion years ago. But on the Moon there are no oceans and atmosphere to destroy the surface, and there is little, if any, of the mountain-building which rapidly changes the face of the Earth.

For these reasons the Moon has retained a record which probably extends back billions of years to the infancy of the solar system. The Moon is the Rosetta stone of the solar system, and to the student of the early history of the Earth and planets this lifeless body is even more important than Mars and Venus.

The internal structure of the Moon can also provide clues to the origin of the solar system, quite apart from the study of its surface features. One of two principal theories for the formation of the planets holds that they were created during a near collision between our Sun and another star, in which the gravitational forces between these two massive bodies tore out huge streams of flaming gas. As the second star receded, the masses of gas which happened to be near the Sun were captured by it into orbits in which they eventually cooled and solidified to form the planets.

If such a collision was the way in which the solar system was formed, the Moon and the planets must have been very hot at an earlier stage in their histories. In that case iron, which is present in abundance, in the Sun and presumably in all the planets, would melt and run to the center to form a dense core. All planetary bodies would, therefore, have iron cores, according to this theory.

The other leading theory holds that the planets were formed out of condensations of relatively cold gas and dust around the Sun, as the stars themselves are probably formed.

If the moon and planets were indeed condensed out of cold gas and dust, the iron in their interiors would not necessarily melt and flow to the center. Planets as large as the earth might be expected to melt completely, as a result of the heating due to release of nuclear energy by the decay of radioactive uranium and other elements in the interior; therefore these plants develop molten iron cores in any case, even if cold at the time of formation. But the moon is smaller, and if it were formed cold, enough heat could be lost from the lunar surface to prevent subsequent melting. As a result, the moon would not form an iron core but would retain a structure in which bits of iron are distributed through the main body of rock, like raisins in a fruitcake.

So, during the lunar exploration program we will study this and other questions related to the internal structure of the moon, by landing on its surface instruments of the kind used to study the interior of the earth. These will include a seismometer for the direct study of the interior, and radioactivity detectors, which have an indirect bearing on the problem by indicating the amount of heat released within the moon by decay of radioactive uranium and other elements. This radioactive heat supplements the heat of the moon at its formation and must be known before the early history can be deduced from the internal structure. The radioactivity detector and seismometer are included among the experiments being developed for the Surveyor spacecraft, an unmanned craft scheduled for landing on the moon in the 1964–65 period. Through this variety of experiments on the moon, first using unmanned instruments and later with trained human observers, we expect to deduce information bearing on the origin of planetary bodies.

The answers to these questions are interesting not only to people trained in the problems of science. They also have great philosophical and general importance, because they relate to the origin of life and the probability of other living organisms in the universe.

For, if the moon and planets were formed in the near collision of two stars, then life must be very unusual, and possibly unique, because space is nearly empty and collisions between stars are extremely rare. The following analogy demonstrates the void of space: if the sun is the size of an orange, in New York, then the next nearest star is another orange 3,000 miles away in Los Angeles. This is the emptiness of space—a dis-

tribution of oranges 3,000 miles apart. Under such circumstances we can estimate that only 10 stellar collisions such as would have produced planets can have occurred during the 15-billion-year lifetime of the galaxy.

On the other hand, if the planets were formed as a natural accompaniment to the condensation processes in which our sun was born, then the creation of planets must have accompanied the formation of nearly every star in the universe. If most of these stars have planets around them, there must be many cases in which the size of one of the planets and its distance from the star are suitable for the development of life in a form somewhat as we know it.

These are the fundamental questions involving the physical origin of our solar system and its living organisms, on which a powerful attack can now be made with the aid of lunar and planetary exploration. They provide the scientific motivation for both the unmanned and the manned projects in the lunar program. But some scientists feel that most facts of scientific interest on the moon and planets can be learned by remote-controlled instruments alone, at less cost than manned operations. An editorial in Science, the journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, estimates that robot instrument landings on the moon will see us through all the important phases of the lunar exploration program at 1 percent of the cost of the man-in-space budget. Actually, an inspection of the NASA budget indicates that the Surveyor project for unmanned lunar landings is more nearly 10 percent of the cost of the Apollo project, including the development costs in each program. On a per-flight basis in the long-range continuing programs, the cost ratio rises to 16 percent; and when allowance is made for the increased chance of success in the mission which results from plugging man into the control systems, the comparison of costs is still more favorable to manned operations.

But a comparison of costs is not the only issue. The question is, will a robot instrument do everything that man can do?

The answer is that in early stages the simplest observations can be made by remote control. In later stages, when more difficult experiments are attempted for answers to the important questions, the trained human observer brings to the supervision of these experiments the ability to deal with unforeseen difficulties and to respond to unanticipated opportunities. The automatic instrument in this advanced stage of the program must be designed with great complexity, at a heavy price in reliability and cost of development, to achieve even a crude imitation of human sophistication and flexibility. The balance of cost and reliability then tips in favor of the human participant, expensive though it is to bring him to the scene.

Space exploration also has general consequences for the physical sciences as a whole, and for science education. Scientists working on problems related to the exploration of space often refer to their field as space science. What is this new field? Is it physics or astronomy or geology? The answer is that it is the collection of all the problems of the physical sciences to which spaceflight experiments can make a unique contribution not obtainable on the ground. These are questions which encompass large segments of physics, astronomy, and the earth sciences. Those fields, which together constitute what was once known as natural philosophy, split apart several hundred years ago in the first flowering of the scientific revolution. Now, for the first time in centuries we feel again a unity in our efforts as we draw together people of widely different backgrounds all united by a general interest in the external physical world, in natural events on a large scale and their causes. Out of this interest and activity a separate discipline is forming with its distinct entity and integrity. We call it space science, and that name will probably persist. But the development also represents a renaissance of the older tradition of natural philosophy, as well as a significant move away from the specialization that has increasingly characterized science in these past years, toward a broader spirit of inquiry into the physical surrounding of man. This revival of the spirit of catholicity in science is an important accompaniment to space research.

Even more valuable for the future welfare of the Nation, the space program has a pronounced effect on young people. It appeals to the imagination of the student, and provides him with an additional stimulus to remain in school, to discipline his energies to the attainment of constructive ends, and to acquire the training necessary for advanced scientific and technical work. This can be one of the great contributions of space research—that through its general interest it may assist in the transformation of values which is so badly needed for the realization of the full potential of talent and energy in the United States.

These are the specific values of space exploration: the benefits of basic research, economically valuable applications of satellites, contributions to industrial technology, a general stimulus to education and to the younger generation, and the strengthening of our international position by our acceptance of leadership in a historic human enterprise. The current discussion of these values of the space program has served the United States well in directing its attention to questions of national purpose. But, however we may try to break the program down into its elements and to attempt a detailed balancing of debits and credits, the fact remains that the space effort is greater than the sum of its parts. It is a great adventure and a great enterprise, not only for the United States but for all humanity. We have the power and resources to play a leading role in this effort, and it is inconceivable that we should stand aside.

Stop Pampering Gangsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the greatest law enforcement agency in the world. I was shocked, therefore, when I learned of the actions of a Federal judge in Chicago who seeks to curtail the efficiency of this organization in apprehending criminals in that city—a city whose crime rate is known worldwide. May I call my colleagues' attention to the following editorial from the July 18 edition of the Jamestown Post-Journal, Jamestown, N.Y. I could not agree more with its conclusions.

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, July 18, 1963]

STOP PAMPERING GANGSTERS—TELLING FBI TO QUIT HARASSING CROOKS IS SHAME

The pampering of the gangster and hoodlum element in this country has been the shame of the United States for many years. At times we have been hopeful that there has been some strengthening of the courage of our courts and law enforcement heads to stand up against these known criminals only to have our hopes dashed to the ground. And now a Federal judge in Chicago, once the gangster capital of the universe, has told the Federal Bureau of Investigation to pull in its horns and quit harassing Chicago's reputed crime syndicate czar.

U.S. District Judge Richard B. Austin has not only told the FBI that it must stop using more than one car to shadow the known gangster leader, who is said to be the successor to Anthony Accardo as the head of the Al Capone hoodlum empire, but the judge held the Chicago head of the FBI in contempt of court for refusing to divulge FBI secrets in its investigation to the gangsters in court.

It seems to us that Judge Austin should be more concerned with the protection of the ordinary citizens, the law-abiding people of Chicago, from the extortions by gangsters, the threats to their lives and property when they refuse to pay tribute to the hoodlums, the interference with the legitimate conduct of business by crooks and hoodlums which still continues in such cities as Chicago. If Judge Austin is concerned for the rights of individuals, we urge upon him the consideration of those gangster activities which have been carried down from the Al Capone days.

Knowing the record of the FBI for its full recognition of the rights of the public and its respect for the law and law-abiding people, we are confident that there is some fully justified reason why the agents in Chicago have been shadowing Sam (Mooney) Giancana and why under instructions from Washington the head agent there has refused to answer certain questions in Judge Austin's court.

We are a firm believer in the full protection of the rights of the individual and the protection of all of us from harassment by overly zealous law officers. There have been many times when it has seemed completely unnecessary for certain Federal officials to pry into the private affairs of decent citizens with no records of law breaking. But the courts seem to think that such harassment of respected citizens is permissible but when it comes to the interrogation of known crooks and hoodlums some judges seem to believe the activities of law enforcement agents must be curtailed.

The hoodlums and gangsters gained tragic power in this Nation in the prohibition days because many law enforcement agents and the courts were afraid to stand up against them. That power has continued—perhaps in somewhat lesser degree—wherever our courts have given special privilege to these gangsters and hoodlums who would continue the racket operations.

One of the greatest forces in combating these remaining gangsters and hoodlums has been the FBI. That a Federal judge in Chicago should take it upon himself to chastise the FBI and its agents and to seek to spread a cloak of protection around a known crime syndicate czar adds greatly to the shame of gangsterism and aids in its hold on the decent people of this Nation.

The United States must stop pampering its crime leaders.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there is a great deal of concern over so-called quality stabilization legislation

now pending in the Congress, and on how it may affect our free enterprise system.

Miss Allie Mann, president of the Georgia Retired Teachers Association and a member of the legislative committee of the National Retired Teachers Association, requested that I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials from the Washington Post and the Atlanta Constitution dealing with this matter. In accordance with this request, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 8, 1963]

QUALITY STABILIZATION

One must marvel at the energy and ingenuity of those who are determined to eliminate competition in retail distribution and saddle consumers with price increases that could cost them more than $1 billion annually. First they persuaded many States to enact "fair trade" or resale-price maintenance legislation. But 27 States and the District of Columbia have either invalidated or refused to enact such legislation, and now a well-heeled lobby, spearheaded by retail druggists, is attempting to accomplish that end through Federal legislation. Since the term "fair trade" has been thoroughly discredited, they are now backing a "quality stabilization" bill (H.R. 3669) in an effort to gull the public with a euphemism that is as transparent as a picture window.

H.R. 3669, which has just been pushed through the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Chairman OREN HARRIS, would grant manufacturers absolute power to fix the prices on branded or trademarked articles at every stage of the distribution process without fear of Government intervention. Why this legislation should be supported by small businessmen, who would be bereft of any vestige of bargaining power, is something of a mystery. But there is nothing mysterious about other aspects of this bill which is opposed by virtually every agency of the Federal Government—the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission—and by interests so divergent as those represented by the AFL–CIO, the American Bar Association, and the Wall Street Journal.

Alfred R. Oxenfeldt, a professor of marketing at Columbia University, succinctly summarized the objections to the so-called Quality Stabilization Act when he testified that "* * * the bill's ultimate effect would be to require highly efficient distributors to charge substantially more than their costs would require. Consequently, it would weaken, and possibly eliminate, the chief attraction that new types of retailers have offered throughout American history to win a place for themselves in the marketplace. In short, the Quality Stabilization Act would help us to transform U.S. retailing into the unprogressive type that prevails in much of Europe."

A Senate version of this act is embodied in a resolution (S. 774) sponsored by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The Senator was once a druggist, and it is perhaps significant that his version of the bill makes no provision for exempting prescription drugs.

Seasoned observers believe that this thoroughly reprehensible piece of legislation, the essence of which has already been rejected in 27 States, stands a good chance of passing the Congress. In that event we would urge President Kennedy to respond with a stinging veto.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, July 5, 1963]

QUALITY STABILIZATION OR FAIR TRADE, IT'S SAME OLD PRICE-FIXING PACKAGE

Many of those who uphold the virtues of free enterprise can be found behind the scenes busily trying to destroy it. Stymied in the courts and in State legislatures, for instances, proponents of so-called "fair trade" laws are making great headway in Congress. In fact, it is reported that chances are about even that such legislation will be passed within the next 12 months.

They've even given it a new name, "Quality Stabilization Act." Under whatever name, it is the same old package that would restrict free competition. Under any deceptive label, it is still price fixing by law and if that's free enterprise then socialism is not as it's defined.

The bill now under consideration is designed to curb pricecutting at both the wholesale and retail level. It would empower a manufacturer to set minimum prices throughout the country at which any of his products bearing a name, brand or trademark, could be wholesaled or retailed. Any product, from automobiles to toothpaste, canned soups or refrigerators, would be covered.

Independent retail druggists are said to be spearheading the drive yet they have plenty of assistance. They want protection from chains and other mass distribution outlets. Experience shows, however, that so-called "fair trade" laws have quite the opposite effect. The inducement to shop around removed, consumers gravitate to the larger stores where greater variety of merchandise can be found.

If Congress should pass such a bill, precedent indicates it would not stand the test of the courts. In the meantime, however, it could cost consumers millions. In the final analysis, laws restrictive of trade and free competition are inimical to the American system and Congress, where bombastic oratory is heard every day extolling free enterprise, certainly knows it.

West Virginia Centennial Story Is Well Presented in Baltimore Sun Articles by John C. Schmidt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on June 16, the Baltimore Sun published an article entitled "West Virginia 1863–1963," written by John C. Schmidt. This enlightening literature describes West Virginia as a State divided geographically and yet united in an effort to improve itself; a State considered depressed and yet rich in human and natural resources. This is another helpful effort to tell the people of our country of the contradictions and challenges of a citizenry which looks forward to better tomorrows, even as we celebrate our centennial. This is the first of two articles by Mr. Schmidt which were called to my attention by a letter to the editor of the Sun written by Mr. Jonah Dunn.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA 1863–1963

(By John C. Schmidt)

Fed up with a Government dominated by slave-holding planters in the eastern tablelands, settlers of 48 Virginia mountain counties 100 years ago this spring voted to secede from the Old Dominion. This defiance in 1863 gave birth to West Virginia—the only State to be created by division of another, and one which was called upon in its infancy to play a weighty role in Union survival during the Civil War.

Today, another determined generation is taking the chance-of-a-century to draw citizens closer together and help restore some of their lost pride in being West Virginians, centennial activities are likewise planned as a tourist showcase to help rebuild the State's public image, which some newspaper stories and television programs in recent years have badly tattered.

The bundle of bad press clippings left a lot of West Virginia's story untold. Younger than Oregon or California because of its unusual creation, West Virginia for its size is as rich in natural resources as either of those Western States. The average income of factory workers in Charleston, the capital, is fourth highest of any city in the country, facts which should put the general impression of statewide poverty in truer perspective.

From the smoggy steeltown of Wheeling on the Ohio River, the gleaming $35 million medical center at Morgantown, from the hardwoods that cover the hills and soft coal that lies beneath them, from smoking chimney of mountaineers' cabins and slack faces of jobless miners—from all these facts of its life West Virginia today molds a complex, if not schizophrenic, personality.

On the one hand, in rich river valleys, industry is king. Around Charleston, once represented in the Virginia Assembly by Daniel Boone, the country's largest concentration of basic chemical plants now feeds on rich salt seams. From laboratories here along the Kanawha River came nylon, vinylite, and other base materials. Three miles from the handsome blue and gold-domed capitol building is the Nation's largest sheet glass plant.

Forty miles downriver at Huntington is the country's largest nickel rolling mill, and the prosperous Chesapeake & Ohio Railway maintains operational headquarters and some of the Nation's biggest rail facilities. On riverside flats to the north along the Ohio are clusters of aluminum and other metal plants, attracted by cheap barge transportation and plentiful electric power from coal-burning generating stations.

In the fingerlike extension that points north along the edge of Pennsylvania is Wheeling, home of America's 11th largest steel producer. Within a 50-mile radius is concentrated the State's crystal tableware industry, fired by West Virginia's natural gas and fed by its high-grade glass sand. A firm in Morgantown makes the White House crystal.

AN OASIS OF LUXURY

In the State's southeastern corner where the air is cleaner and the hills gentler is Greenbrier, oasis of luxury and healing waters. Nearby, at Green Bank, eight radio telescopes of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory probe the universe, aided by the region's freedom from manmade electrical interference.

At West Virginia's southwestern tip is Bluefield, a city that claims the best climate in the country and which is summer home of the Baltimore Oriole's class D farm team. In the northeastern panhandle, just across the Maryland line, is Charles Town. Thoroughbreds now pound the turf a mile from where

a horse-drawn wagon hauled John Brown to his hanging, following his raid on Harpers Ferry which primed the fuse of Civil War.

Separating these populous industrial and resort areas is the other West Virginia. In coalfields where John L. Lewis forged the industrial union movement during the depression now exists depression of a new origin. But its symptoms are the same: widespread unemployment, poverty, and despair. Illiteracy and indifference are common, and there are places where people believe water dipped from a stream before sunrise on Ash Wednesday will cure rheumatism.

The State became the leading producer of soft coal in 1936, but since the early 1950's new mining machinery has been chewing into manpower needs as hungrily as it bites into bituminous deposits. In 1949, nearly 123 million tons of coal were mined by 112,000 men. In 1960, almost as much was mined by less than 49,000.

UNEMPLOYMENT SOARS

The high wage pattern set by coal and metal industries discouraged other types of industry from locating in the State, and for most furloughed miners, there was nowhere to turn for work. Unemployment soared to a peak of 105,000, 16.6 percent of the work force. When the Area Redevelopment Act was passed in 1961, all but 5 of West Virginia's 55 counties qualified immediately for Federal aid.

Agricultural employment also declined in the decade of the 1950's at a higher rate than the national average. This is attributed largely to the State's mountainous character, which is conducive only to small, marginal farms. Jokes about perpendicular cultivation have more than a kernel of truth. One farmer said West Virginia was a good place to work because if you got tired, you could always lean on it.

Besides unemployment, and largely because of it, West Virginia also faces the problem of a shrinking population. It was one of only two States to lose significant numbers between the 1950 and 1960 censuses, and is now the only State still losing. As of last November, the population was 1,733,000, with only 38 percent classified as urban. Some of the 20,000 high school graduates each year must leave the State to find jobs, which accounts for part of the loss.

NATIONAL FOCUS

West Virginia's problems came into the national spotlight during the 1960 presidential contest. In what has been called the primary that made a President, Senator Kennedy cleared his first major hurdle by carrying a State that was 95-percent Protestant.

At the same time reporters who followed campaigners through the rugged hill country saw depressed areas at firsthand and pounced on the headline potential of hungry miners, leaning shanties, and shoeless children. With few exceptions, news media showed only the dark side, and made West Virginia look like the ashcan of America.

Nobody denies that the State has serious problems, but so do adjoining areas in Maryland, Ohio, eastern Kentucky, and western Virginia. Economic distress lines geographic pockets throughout the Appalachian highlands, but it was the Mountain State's misfortune to be singled out. West Virginians don't like it, and through a number of programs, including their centennial, they are trying to do something about it.

Both major candidates for the 1960 Democratic gubernatorial nomination advocated some reorganization of the State government. The winner, 51-year-old William W. Barron, an Elkins native and then attorney general, was subsequently elected Governor. He failed to get the job of budget preparation away from the board of public works on which he has but 1 vote, to change a law preventing a Governor from succeeding himself, and to streamline the 85 State departments into about 20 by consolidation.

But he did get through the State's first personal income tax and add a penny to the 2 percent sales tax, permitting a sizable expansion of many programs. And he did establish the first department of commerce, with the specific mission of elevating the economy through business, industrial, and travel development, both on an immediate and long-range basis.

As chief of the new department, Governor Barron named his opponent in the primary, Hulett C. Smith, an insurance executive and banker from Beckley.

FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS

One of the first steps was establishment of a liaison office in Washington, staffed by a man who was not tied down by congressional routine as were the State's legislators. Among other things, he assists in placing Federal contracts with State industries by military and other Government agencies. Since 1960, West Virginia has jumped from dead last to 30th in acquisition of such public work, worth a total of $134 million.

The Commerce Department has also helped assure that the State derives the fullest possible benefit from other forms of Federal assistance, Commissioner Smith says. Department people helped 42 counties submit required plans for overall economic development in just the first year of the area redevelopment administration's operation. This agency makes low-cost loans to develop new industry and operates a job retraining program for people like furloughed miners who can no longer find work in the coal industry.

An ARA official in Washington says West Virginia is doing well in the program, considering that it had to start from further behind than almost any other area, with the possible exception of eastern Kentucky. Porjects so far have created about 2,800 jobs, and pending projects will add as many as 6,000.

Partly because of such Federal programs and partly because of State and private efforts, the first 2 years of the decade saw 159 new manufacturing plants and expansions, representing an investment of $418 million and 13,300 new jobs. Unemployment dropped from 80,000 at the end of 1961 to a low of about 61,000 at the end of 1962.

On the State level, one program which supported this growth was an industrial development authority, set up with a $2 million appropriation for loans to aid in establishing new industries. Attention was focused on finding new uses for coal and wood, the two principal resources, and in the case of wood, on getting more dollar value out of timber by introducing processing operations. About three-fourths of the wood sold out of the State still leaves in its raw form.

Similarly, the State has joined coal operators in supporting a research program at the University of West Virginia. The last legislature adopted a favorable position on the coal-by-wire system of pulverizing coal, mixing it with water and pipelining it to steam-electric generating plants. This action cleared the way for a $58 million plant that will supply 30 million tons of coal by this method over the next 20 years.

Just as in the realm of commerce, there have been important advances in public welfare administration—the State's third costliest program. One new concept was introduced by Governor Barron when the State joined the Federal Government in a program of aid to dependent children of the unemployed (ADCU).

"Benefits under legislation approved by Congress were made to be available as outright grants," the Governor said, "but I insisted that West Virginians participating in the assistance project be required to work for the money. This was a departure from the previous philosophy of the dole, but Washington quickly agreed on its merits, and West Virginia became the first in the United States to apply this novel concept."

The State benefited visibly from the idea, for able-bodied welfare recipients were put to work in a large-scale cleanup campaign. State parks, roadsides, towns, colleges, and other public institutions were beautified, rendering the countryside more attractive to centennial visitors and other tourists.

The need for a new philosophy in welfare is also stressed by State Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith. What is greatly needed, the welfare chief says, is a system which will awaken a positive attitude in welfare recipients, rekindle initiative and restore their pride and self-respect. The importance of this is underlined by the fact that as of last July, 1 out of every 12 of the State's citizens was receiving some form of public assistance.

Not nearly all were being helped because of unemployment, however. Of the total of 46,000, about 18,000 were over 65 or blind and with little or no income. More than 7,000 others were permanently disabled. Less than half the total number of cases—19,631—were receiving aid under the ADCU program.

Another of the State's programs last year established a national record for rehabilitating 3,710 handicapped citizens to useful employment. It was the third straight year in which West Virginia led the Nation in this area. The division of vocational education likewise has an active program, and during the past 2 years, more than 4,300 unemployed people have completed courses, a high percentage of whom found work in the area in which they were trained.

Yet another field of critical need is public education. The average adult West Virginian has 8.8 years of schooling. Little better than an elementary education. The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last year spent $3,500,000 on programs through which nearly 32,000 high school students were enrolled in vocational classes, and loans were made to more than 2,200 students to enable them to continue higher education.

West Virginia is participating in the Federal interstate highway system, with 520 miles allocated. Progress has been relatively slow, while the State Roads Commission underwent reorganization to gear itself to the new demands. Finances are one problem, Commissioner Burl A. Sawyers said, with more than $86,600,000 in excess of foreseeable revenue needed over the next decade to complete the interstate system and other road work.

Roadbuilding is greatly complicated by terrain, which ranges from a low elevation of 240 feet at Harper's Ferry to 4,860 feet at Spruce Knob.

Good roads are of vital concern to West Virginia, because recreation and tourism are already the third largest industry and could possibly take over the lead spot as early as 1970. Nursing the development of travel is another job of the Commerce Department, which is striving to promote the enormous scenic, hunting, fishing, camping, and water sport potential.

ALL FOR TOURISTS

Travel development director, Robert R. Bowers, says in the past 18 months, 36 new motels have been built and 59 existing motels have been enlarged. At the start of the centennial year there were 13,090 hotel and motel rooms, Mr. Bowers said, in addition to 160 rooms in three vacation park lodges and 220 vacation cabins.

Facilities at the Cacapon Lodge, 15 miles south of Hancock, Md., for example, include 50 guest rooms and 30 vacation cabins open

the year round. Cacapon offers fishing, boating, swimming, horseback riding, game courts, hiking trails and splendid scenic visits. Commerce Commissioner Smith says the aim is to develop a chain of such attractions along the entire Allegheny ridge.

West Virginia has one of the most extensive park systems in the East, with 20 State parks and nine State forests that last year drew nearly 3 million visitors. In addition are the mammoth Monongahela National Forest, which spreads over 1,641,000 acres, and four good skiing areas.

The travel development division hoped for a 10 percent increase in tourism in 1962. It got 15 percent, and indications are for an equally substantial gain this year. Other tourist incentives being fostered include ative arts and crafts industries, such as hand-made glassware, pottery, wood sculpturing, spinning, and jewelry made from coal.

An example of how native ingenuity is capitalizing on the tourist trade can be seen at Stotesbury, a few years ago one of the most severely depressed mining areas. Now 200 of the original miners and their families have developed the country's first coal town museum, which is becoming a major attraction.

By the end of the year, 15 permanent tourist information centers will have been set up at points where major highways enter the State. And looking ahead, West Virginia will have a large pavilion at the forthcoming New York World's Fair. One of the highlights will be a planetarium-like display of the sky as seen by a radio telescope, stressing the State's unique space-age role.

AN AWAKENING STATE

In Rip Van Winkle fashion, West Virginia is awakening as never before to the potential of both its natural and human resources. Activities marking the centennial year, which has mustered 30,000 volunteer participants for events scheduled on 206 out of the 365 days, should hasten this awakening.

Also, officials hope, the centennial will cut into a problem that goes back to the character of the people who created the State 100 years ago—rugged "West-by-God-Virginians" who did not like what was going on around them and shut themselves off from it.

Such sectionalism has always ben a handicap, and one of the centennial's major goals is to create a climate of increased understanding between urban and rural areas and the varied viewpoints of their respective citizens. "All Together West Virginians" is a centennial slogan to remind residents of cities like Clarksburg, Wheeling, and Charleston that they share a burden of difficult problems with citizens of Nitro, Quick, and Clover Lick.

It is also to remind them that by working together, they can best enjoy the freedom implicit in the State's motto: Montani Semper Liberi—"Mountaineers are always free."

Applying the Monroe Doctrine Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is always most encouraging to read of the concern of young Americans about basic American principles and doctrines. Recently, Mr. Vernon Larry Walters of Daniel High School in Clemson, S.C., was awarded first place in the South Carolina American Legion Auxiliary Americanism essay contest. Mr. Walters' article entitled "Applying the Monroe Doctrine Today" was selected from 1,500 entries in South Carolina. His essay was submitted through the Milledge Gordon Unit No. 42 of Clemson, S.C. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this outstanding essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLYING THE MONROE DOCTRINE TODAY

(Submitted by Vernon Larry Walters, Post Office Box 1296, Clemson, S.C., Daniel High School, Clemson, S.C.; submitted through Milledge Gordon Unit No. 42, American Legion Auxiliary, Clemson, S.C.)

Is the United States applying the Monroe Doctrine? In order to answer this question, we have to know what the Monroe Doctrine states. The Monroe Doctrine embodies two main principles. The first was noncolonization and was the brainchild of John Quincy Adams, Monroe's Secretary of State. He disliked the commercial exclusiveness with which colonizing powers still surrounded their dependencies; he distrusted monarchical neighbors and he desired to keep North America as a preserve for the United States to expand over at leisure. The second fundamental principle was noninterference. It guarantees all the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere against European interference "for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny." The Monroe Doctrine is not a law; rather it is a self-defense policy that opposes any non-American encroachment on the independence of the Western Hemisphere.

At first Latin Americans paid little attention to the doctrine. They knew it was the British fleet and not the Monroe Doctrine that protected them. Later, as the United States became more powerful, they felt the United States was more concerned with protecting themselves than Latin American independence.

Now we can answer the question: Is the United States applying the Monroe Doctrine today?

I would have to say "No" to the question for a number of reasons. The U.S. foreign policy has changed from one that would only interfere in European wars that relate to the protection of the United States to a policy of participation in international affairs in all ways of life.

Look at Communist Cuba controlled by Russia with Fidel Castro as a figurehead for the Cuban people. The United States did not do a single thing about Castro taking over Cuba and most of the people in the United States called him a hero and liberator. After the United States found out that Castro was a Communist, they did not do anything.

So far as the Monroe Doctrine is concerned, it has not only lost its effectiveness, but its basic characteristics of earlier days. It has become "Pan-Americanized" during the present century. In 1933, at the Montevideo Conference of American States, the United States agreed to refrain from the use of U.S. forces to intervene in the affairs of the Latin American countries. In 1938, the Charter of the Organization of American States was signed at Bogotá and "continentalized" the Monroe Doctrine. All of the states would share the task of defending the hemisphere.

What has the Organization of American States done to combat communism by implying the Monroe Doctrine? Until recently the organization has not done anything. In February of 1962, the Organization of American States excluded Cuba from its organization. It has yet to be proved effective.

The United States is the only power that can readily enforce the Monroe Doctrine. If the United States neglects its duty, the Monroe Doctrine will die.

Provide Full Annuity Benefits to Employees After 30 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in connection with my bill, H.R. 327. I am hopeful that the Congress will pass this greatly needed legislation during this session.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JACOB H. GILBERT OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, your committee has under consideration my bill, H.R. 327, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity, as well as numerous other bills on this subject of retirement.

This legislation has wide support. You have heard testimony by representatives of the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Postal Union, the United Federation of Postal Clerks, and others, who have shown the need for, and the fairness of, this proposed legislation.

By the time a person has worked for the Federal Government for 30 years, he has given the best years of his life to his job, and 30 years is a long time. It seems only fair that when he has completed 30 years of service, he should be permitted to retire regardless of age, without any reduction in annuity because of earlier retirement. Our conscientious and faithful postal workers and classified Federal employees are entitled to this consideration and assistance. They deserve a few years of leisure in which to travel, to pursue hobbies, to enjoy life, while their health is still good and they have the energy to carry out their retirement plans.

Many persons have written me, stating that they are in poor health and suffering, but they cannot afford to retire at the reduced annuity they would have to accept because they have not reached the age of 60. Most persons between the ages of 55 and 60, suffer some deterioration in their general health; many have severe ailments. Yet, they have to struggle to work day after day, looking forward to reaching the age of 60, when they can afford retirement.

We must admit that the Federal Government has never been overly generous regarding salaries. The vast majority of Federal employees receive pay in the lower brackets of income. Considering the high living costs and high taxes they have to meet, they find it impossible to save very much money, and when they have dependents, they can barely make ends meet. These people need every cent of their retirement benefits.

There is at present a high rate of unemployment in our country. In New York City alone, there are many thousands of un-

employed persons who have passed U.S. civil service examinations and are on the registers, waiting to be called for appointment. If civil service employees were given the opportunity to retire, as provided in my bill, the vacancies created would be filled by the young people who desperately need work and who should be given the opportunity to start their Federal careers.

I am hopeful that your committee will take favorable action on the legislation before you. Our Federal employees highly merit this assistance.

Latin America: Target for Communist Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt but that a widespread Communist conspiracy exists throughout Latin America.

It is obvious Cuba is the first well-defined base for the Red assault on Latin America, but other recent happenings are carefully and craftily planned.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, director of the center for strategic studies, Georgetown University, served for 6 years as Chief of Naval Operations and naval member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—longer than any other officer.

His retirement in August 1961 capped a distinguished 42-year naval career.

Admiral Burke is eminently qualified to understand the threat confronting the United States and her Latin neighbors. In a recent article, he tells of the efforts of the Soviets to subvert and control the people of the Western Hemisphere and calls for a four-point program to combat their moves.

His analysis should be of great interest to Members of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his article for the information of this body:

LATIN AMERICA: TARGET FOR COMMUNIST CONQUEST

(By Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired)

Since the early 1920's Latin America has been a target for Communist conquest. The movement grew rapidly in the 1930's and 1940's, and by the end of World War II, taking advantage of our common effort against the Nazis, the Communists were operating openly in most countries of this hemisphere. They were represented in nine national congresses, one national cabinet, and had penetrated local government in several other countries. Their infiltration into labor movements and student groups was also widespread.

With the election of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala in 1951, the Communists captured their first American country. Their failure to gain control of the Guatemalan military establishment was a tactical mistake which led to the overthrow of their regime in 1954. That the Communists profited by their mistake was evidenced by the dispersal of the July 26 movement in Cuba soon after Castro achieved power.

The coming of Castro has brought a new phase in the Communist attack on Latin America. Now for the first time, they have a full-scale, well-defined operating base within the hemisphere. Castro has consolidated his power, and with Soviet and Chinese support is making a coordinated, stepped-up effort to subvert and control the people of this hemisphere.

In spite of our Government's efforts, subversion emanating from Cuba is increasing. In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs last February 19, John M. McCone, Central Intelligence Agency Director, stated, "Even before the October missile crisis—and with increasing rancor since then—Cuban leaders have been exhorting revolutionary movements to violence and terrorism, and supporting their activities."

MINIMUM STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

Beginning with the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, the United States has held a minimum strategic objective for the security of the Americas: we would not tolerate any alien system in the hemisphere. In times of crisis, statesmen such as Adams, Monroe, Polk, Cleveland, Wilson—men who particularly used the Doctrine—recognized that this objective was absolutely imperative, and that if we failed to achieve it when threatened by an alien system, our security would be in peril.

It is not within the scope of this article to review in detail how, why, and when this strategy collapsed. But the collapse did not come suddenly in 1959, or in 1961 as some have maintained. We began in the 1930's to move away from the concept of strong U.S. unilateral action in this hemisphere, partly as a result of an overreaction to the periods of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson when the strategy of the Monroe Doctrine was applied at times for intervention in the internal affairs of Latin American nations. We developed a worship of "world opinion" as if it were our strategy. This was a period when many Americans developed guilt feelings about our relationship with Latin America, and a period when many Latin Americans resented us.

As a result, we forgot that the lessons of history show a just peace to be the product of the wise and principled use of power. Hence, when confronted with communism—a system far more alien than those which worried Monroe and Adams—we were morally unprepared to act.

STRENGTH AT SEA

Throughout the history of the Western Hemisphere, while the techniques and equipment of war changed, the principal strategic weapon upon which the Monroe Doctrine rested was seapower. Spanish galleons and high-masted frigates gave way to ironclads and steam-driven ships, and finally, to mighty men of war. But the advent of modern weapons, with their tremendous destructive capability, caused us to forget the importance of the seas, and particularly of the Caribbean. We assumed that the future of mankind would depend on the ability to deliver nuclear weapons.

Now that Cuba is Communist, the importance of the seas and of the Caribbean has been brought forcibly to our attention. Last fall, when the United States demanded withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba, Premier Khrushchev complied quickly because he knew he did not have—and could not get—control of either the high seas or the Caribbean. Still, Soviet submarines were there, perhaps quite a few. The U.S. Navy's antisubmarine forces flushed several to the surface. And the water around the Leeward Islands is good submarine water—deep, warm, and difficult for antisubmarine forces because changing thermal currents make it hard to trace submarines.

If these Soviet submarines had been nuclear powered, or had they contained missiles capable of being launched from underwater, they would have represented a threat more serious than the Cuban land-based missiles. It is not reassuring to realize that such missile-carrying submarines could be based in unfriendly islands in the Caribbean and would not have to risk hazardous trips back and forth across the Atlantic to and from their home ports.

From our problems in Cuba we have two basic lessons to learn:

First, in a geographical as well as a strategic sense, it is of primary importance that the United States keep the waters of the Caribbean open to free world commerce and free from Soviet bases.

Second, and more important, the elimination of communism from Latin America is the minimum strategic objective to be achieved if this Nation and the whole hemisphere are to endure as we know them.

STEPPED-UP SUBVERSION EFFORTS

Today, Cuba has become a base where Communist leaders have dedicated themselves to the destruction of freedom, of the social order of the Americas, and of our free economic system. They have vowed to establish a Communist system throughout the Western Hemisphere. And they are doing their best right now to gain control of other Latin American countries.

STRATEGY RELATES TO PEOPLE

Since the confrontation over Cuba last October, the Communists do not risk fighting us openly. But they are maximizing their strategy and tactics of political warfare—a weapon which we have not yet learned to recognize as a weapon of war. Hence, we hesitate to use our power in sufficient quantity to defeat enemies employing it.

We can only develop a counterstrategy if we remember that the aims of strategy relate to people, and to those in control of the people. We must keep in mind that just wars are fought to prevent the enemy from controlling our people.

Today, even national security must be described not just in military, but in political, scientific, and economic dimensions. Our ultimate objective in Latin America involves conditions conducive to a political order, which, with evolution rather than revolution, will move toward representative government in which power is balanced, initiative is widespread, and the marketplace is free.

A LARGER STRATEGIC APPROACH

With this in mind, we must strive to develop a broader strategy. Even if the Monroe Doctrine had been applied in past years to eliminate an alien system from the hemisphere, this would have been only a beginning.

First, we must have an improved approach toward Latin American institutions. The church, universities, and social classes all have decisive roles to play, but I would like to discuss in particular the institution of the military.

THE MILITARY

We have already noted that the military in Guatemala was the bulwark against communism, and this is generally true throughout Latin America. The military is probably the most internally democratic institution in Latin America. With the exception of the church, it is about the only institution where an individual can enter from the lower classes and emerge to high rank and responsibility. It has, by and large, social mobility.

At the same time, some members of the armed services in Latin America lean toward authoritarian and state-controlled programs, both in economics and politics. Since the military is probably the most decisive single influence in Latin America, we have a great and beckoning opportunity to influence the military in the direction of

representative government, free enterprise, and power balance within the state.

MUTUAL MILITARY COOPERATION

What our Navy has already accomplished might well be applied to other institutions to develop confidence. A few years ago we began assigning destroyer-type ships to engage in maneuvers with navies of those Latin American countries who desired to participate. The effects of such cooperation were forcefully demonstrated during the Cuban crisis last fall when several Latin American countries offered ships to assist our blockade.

Another example is the U.S. Army's Civic Action Program—a Peace Corps operation begun long before the Corps was conceived. Army units supervise and work with natives on a people-to-people level in small rural communities on water purification, housing, road construction, small port facilities, schools, and other projects.

ECONOMIC STRATEGY

The second element in our broad strategy must be directed toward encouraging free and stable market economies. Military strategy is devoted to the cure of an infection which has developed to the need of surgery. But economic strategy has the larger role of developing and maintaining a healthful climate in which the dignity and creativity of man may flourish.

However, prosperity cannot be imposed by an outside agency. Any significant change must be accomplished by the people within a country—by the plans and efforts of those who live there.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Since 1958 U.S. private investment in Latin America has fallen off to practically nothing. Besides the decline in foreign investment, native Latin Americans have withdrawn an estimated $10 billion capital and shipped it off to Europe and the United States. Next to the presence of communism in Cuba, the hemisphere's worst problem is this flight of capital.

Not only Latin Americans, but often some in the United States appear to lack appreciation of the value of private enterprise in the foreign market. In the face of a barrage of propaganda against free enterprise, it is difficult for private businessmen in Latin America to operate and make the important contribution of which they are capable. And, if public spokesmen for the United States do not defend and endorse the free enterprise system which has contributed so much to our own growth and strength, then Latin American policies which weaken free enterprise are likely to predominate. As a result, the ultimate good of the Alliance for Progress will be put off further into the future.

PRODUCTIVITY AND DIVERSIFICATION

The third element of our overall strategy must be a better approach to the problems of productivity and diversification. To obtain the capital goods necessary for industrialization, Latin American nations must expand their dollar volume of exports. Nearly all these countries, however, derive 50 percent or more of their exchange earnings from only one or two commodities. A few are almost entirely dependent on one commodity and they suffer severely when the international price levels fluctuate. So until Latin America can diversify its export commodities and other goods, it is likely to continue to suffer from the world market price fluctuations which have been so common over the last decade.

Both exports and the general standard of living in Latin America can be improved greatly if modern management, labor, capital, and technical methods are applied to agriculture. Land reform programs, in particular, must be centered around increased productivity and not around fractionalizing and splintering production limits.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The fourth element in our broader strategy must be to encourage sound local government. Our government-to-government aid programs in Latin America have been carried out primarily at the level of the national governments, and hence have given an overemphasis to centralized government—to the neglect of local government.

Traditionally, local, and State governments in Latin America have been assigned a minor role—a factor which has dampened the economic and social development of these countries. The development of sound local government should be encouraged, particularly since an untapped source of revenue is readily available to them in the form of a property tax.

MOBILIZE OUR BEST MINDS

Prof. William Stokes, at our Center's Conference on National Security, noted that we ought to be concerned not only with what we are against, with prohibiting further encroachments of Marxism-Leninism, and eliminating what is already there. We must also concern ourselves with "the alternative attitudes and values, with the alternative economic concepts and ideas, and with the alternative political methods, forms of organization, and procedures."

He is right. We have not done nearly enough to mobilize our best minds and skills within this country—experts in land productivity, taxation, industrial pioneering, local management, education—to establish rapport with key individuals and groups in Latin America.

To summarize: our minimum strategic objective is to thwart and eliminate communism from the hemisphere as an alien and intolerable system. Our larger objectives are manifold, but a first step toward them is to establish a national priority to marshal the best people we have in search of ways to share with our Latin American neighbors the lessons of our own successful experiences. Then the Alliance becomes one for true knowledge out of which can spring the climate for progress—not of totalitarianism such as the Soviets seek, but of creativity, initiative, and self-reliance.

Attorney General Doesn't See Touch of Pink in Red-Infiltrated Movement for Negro Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States has reported to the Congress that there is no Communist influence linked to the leaders of the present civil rights agitation. Yet, Martin Luther King admits that Jack H. O'Dell, who has been called a dedicated zealot for communism by a counsel for the House Un-American Activities Committee, has been in the employment of the King-founded Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

We have heard much about a "color blind" Constitution lately, and I wonder if Attorney General Kennedy has become so color blind that he can not see even a touch of pink in this obviously Red-infiltrated movement for Negro equality. I commend to the attention of the Congress these two UPI press releases found on the same page of the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger under date of July 26, 1963:

RFK SAYS MIXERS NOT COMMUNISTS

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy notified Congress Friday that an FBI check has shown no evidence that any of the leaders of the major civil rights movements are Communists or Communist controlled.

Kennedy also wrote Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma, that Communist efforts to infiltrate integration groups have been "remarkably unsuccessful."

MONRONEY is a member of the Senate Commerce Committee which recently heard Govs. Ross Barnett of Mississippi and George C. Wallace of Alabama charge that Communist influences were back of much of the Negro civil rights protest activity.

The Senator wrote FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for his views and the latter turned the letter over to Kennedy.

The Attorney General replied: "Based on all available information from the FBI and other sources, we have no evidence that any of the top leaders of the major civil rights groups are Communists or Communist controlled. This is true as to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., about whom particular accusations were made, as well as other leaders."

MARTIN LUTHER ADMITS LINK BETWEEN SCLC, FORMER RED

ATLANTA.—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said Thursday that a 39-year-old technician, who was linked by congressional committees to the Communist organization worked twice for his Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

King said the Negro, Jack H. O'Dell of New York, left the SCLC the second time June 26 by "mutual agreement" because of concern that his affiliation with the integration movement would be used against it by "segregationists and race baiters."

The Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee have linked O'Dell with Communist work.

At an Atlanta hearing of the Un-American Activities Committee, a committee counsel called O'Dell a "dedicated zealot" for communism.

At a New Orleans hearing of the Senate group, Richard Arens, chief counsel, said O'Dell was the "top man" for Communist activity in Louisiana.

ACKNOWLEDGED

King acknowledged at a news conference that O'Dell "may have had some connections in the past" with communism but, "we were convinced that he had renounced them and had become committed to the Christian philosophy of nonviolence in dealing with America's social injustices."

He denied repeatedly a recently published report (in the Atlanta Constitution) that O'Dell was currently employed by the SCLC in any capacity.

The newspaper said he was director of the SCLC New York office. A staff employee who answered the telephone Thursday morning told United Press International O'Dell was still with the office as administrator of the New York operation. Later in the day the same office said he was not connected with the agency and had no knowledge of his whereabouts.

King told reporters he could not understand why anyone in his office would say O'Dell worked there when he doesn't.

King said O'Dell worked for the group on two occasions—the second time after the

SCLC satisfied itself he was not a Communist as charged—but that his connections were severed for good, June 26.

King said O'Dell first came to the SCLC after work on the Bronx committee of citizens for Kennedy in 1960 and that a letter of commendation for O'Dell was received from Robert M. Morgenthau. He is a U.S. attorney in New York who ran against Nelson Rockefeller for the New York governorship.

ASKED TO QUIT

King said O'Dell was asked to resign temporarily after published reports that he had had some relationship with the Communist Party. After an investigation, he said, "We concluded he had no present connection" and he was returned to the SCLC staff.

He said "it was mutually agreed" that O'Dell should leave the SCLC again when it became evident in Birmingham that the crusade for civil rights had reached the conscience of America and that Mr. O'Dell's employment could be used against the organization by segregationists.

King said the O'Dell issue was being used in another attempt to forestall and hamper the true essence of today's civil rights struggle.

"It is another McCarthy-like tactic to destroy the movement," King said.

He acknowledged that communism can use the integration movement against the United States but he felt that efforts to prevent Negroes from full rights would be used even more.

The Road to Yale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable apprehension throughout the Nation concerning the Federal Reserve Banks' decision to raise the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. This increase has been undertaken specifically to alleviate the deficit which has occurred in short term capital movements and we have been assured by both the Federal Reserve Bank and the Treasury Department that they will not allow this action to restrict the domestic money supply.

Of course, it is necessary to improve our short term position but it would seem that a more concentrated effort is also necessary in the areas of recurring imbalance—The Basic Accounts. One area of the basic accounts which thus far has not received sufficient attention in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is U.S. tourist spending overseas. In 1962 the Treasury Department estimates that U.S. spending overseas for travel and transportation was a deficit item in the balance of payments of $1.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, if this item in the basic accounts were brought into balance it would go far to resolve the balance-of-payments problem. U.S. tourist spending overseas is a luxury—a luxury which in no way contributes to a healthy domestic economy. It does not seem reasonable to risk disrupting the domestic economy by raising the discount rate unless we are also prepared to take action in these luxury areas as well.

The following editorial which appeared Monday, July 29, 1963 in the Washington Post indicates that in the judgment of the new Brookings Institution report the basic accounts will show a surplus in 1968. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we should make concerted effort to achieve this goal this year—not 5 years hence. I would like to call my colleagues attention to the conclusions of this Brookings study as reflected in the Washington Post editorial, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1963]

THE ROAD TO YALE

When Robert Triffin, a Yale University economist first broached his plan for a more effective international monetary mechanism, he found himself cast in the role of a latter-day Jeremiah sounding warnings toward which the central bankers and statesmen of the free world turned deaf ears. But 5 years of anxiety over the dollar glut have changed all that, and an important measure of Triffin's vindication is a Brookings Institution report on "The United States Balance of Payments in 1968," written by Walter S. Salant and his associates.

As the title suggests, the efforts of the Salant team were largely directed toward forecasting the components of the U.S. balance of payments for 1968, an effort which they frankly characterize as "more speculative than most economic projections." They conclude that the "basic balance" in 1968—the net balance of transactions on account of trade and long-term capital movements—will show a surplus. This projection is based upon a number of explicit assumptions about economic growth here and abroad, the trends of export prices and the height of tariff barriers, assumptions that will doubtless cause some arching of eyebrows within the economics profession. But for the general public the significance of the book lies in the excellent last chapter where the authors make a most persuasive case for the creation of a new international monetary mechanism.

There has been a good deal of uninspired writing about "placing our house in order," but the Brookings authors demonstrate that the difficulties which beset the free world will not be resolved by a U.S. payments surplus. The dilemma, as they see it, is this:

"On the one hand, U.S. balance-of-payments deficits make the rest of the world increasingly reluctant to go on accumulating liquid dollar claims, and they hamper the pursuit by the United States of vital domestic and international objectives. On the other hand, large and sustained surpluses may not be attainable; even if attained, they would not be desirable since they may not free the United States from undesirable constraints and they would impose constraints on other free world countries."

The Brookings authors wisely refrain from any attempt to make a detailed blueprint. But the nature of the fixed exchange monetary mechanism which they urge the United States to press for immediately is clearly outlined. It must provide for the growth of international liquidity—the means of settling balances of indebtedness among countries. It must prevent sudden and unsettling shifts of reserves from weak to strong-currency countries. And it must provide automatic credit facilities which would permit countries sufficient time to eliminate their balance of payments deficits without recourse to self-defeating deflationary policies.

With the imprimatur of the respected Brookings Institution, it can be expected that the cause of international monetary reform will acquire more new converts in high places. Treasury Secretary Dillon is beginning to see a glimmer of light. And it is clear from his weekend remarks that Under Secretary Roosa will in the future desist from the unsportsmanlike practice of shooting birds on the ground as he did with the Maudling plan at the last meeting of the International Monetary Fund. All the signposts point toward Yale, and the question now is the speed at which the repentent sinners can be moved.

Kennedy Inconsistencies Put Strain on Gold Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistencies of President Kennedy, which are basically the cause of most of our present-day problems, are clearly shown in the following article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the August 5 issue of the Washington World. The article, "Administration Wants Vast Aid Funds While Trying to Stem Outflow of Gold," follows:

ADMINISTRATION WANTS VAST AID FUNDS WHILE TRYING TO STEM OUTFLOW OF GOLD

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

Whatever it is—good, bad, or futile—President Kennedy's emergency anti-gold drain tax on U.S. investments abroad is directly contrary to another major measure he is vigorously seeking from Congress.

This inconsistency is the latest in a trend that is increasingly characteristic of his administration.

The President recently proposed what amounts to a "sales tax" on purchases of foreign securities to curb the continued disquieting loss of gold reserves. Since 1952, they have sunk from $23.25 billion to around $15.7 billion.

AID CAUSES DEFICIT

Yet at the same time the President is demanding speedy enactment of any emergency restriction on U.S. investments abroad, he is strongly pressing Congress to approve his $4.5 billion foreign aid bill which has three provisions expressly aimed at increasing such spending in foreign countries—through Government guarantees.

These three little-known contradictory provisions are under title III, Investment Guarantees of S. 1276, the Senate version of the administration's foreign assistance bill. They would expand and accelerate U.S. investments abroad as follows:

1. Increase from $1.3 billion to $2.5 billion the total of Government guarantees for losses due to expropriation, incontrovertibility and war;

2. Raise from $180 million to $300 million guarantees to cover so-called small business loans—not to exceed $10 million; and

3. Boost from $60 million to $150 million guarantees on housing projects in Latin America.

Thus the President, while pressuring Congress to impose a 15 percent sales tax on certain investments abroad, at the same time is insisting it vote a total of $2.95 billion in Government guarantees to stimulate other foreign investments.

Vermont Senator GEORGE AIKEN, second-ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee, tried to get an explanation of this striking inconsistency from Budget Director David Bell—without success.

DISPUTE IN COMMITTEE

At a closed-door meeting on the hotly controversial multi-billion dollar foreign aid bill, the conscientious, quiet-voiced New Englander called attention to the three provisions guaranteeing investments abroad, and asked if they weren't directly counter to the President's "sales tax" proposal.

"Oh, no," replied Bell blandly. "There is no inconsistency. Each is designed to do a different thing, and they balance off."

Address by Hon. Sam M. Gibbons, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, our friend and colleague, the Honorable SAM M. GIBBONS, of the 10th District of Florida, dedicated the memorial to the honored men of Florida on that historical ground. He took that occasion to draw attention to the dangers of hate and bitterness which have been recently expressed by violence in our country. He called on all responsible Americans to work for the betterment of human relations within the framework of our Republic—the ballot box, the legislature, and the courts of the land—not in the streets.

Because of the warning voiced to Congress by J. Edgar Hoover, "Because communism thrives on turmoil, the party is continuously attempting to exploit all grievances—real or imagined—for its own tactical purposes," and other concerned Americans, I include the address by the Honorable SAM M. GIBBONS, Member of Congress from Florida, in the RECORD:

SPEECH HON. SAM M. GIBSON, 10TH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Exactly 100 years ago at this hour and place, history recorded the turning point of the bloodiest war ever fought in the Western Hemisphere. In this bitter struggle, our Nation found part of the meaning of freedom. We must not lose it now in hate, violence, and dishonor. The burden of the fight for freedom now rests on us.

As responsible Americans working for better human relations, we abhor the use on our citizens of the snarling police dogs, the fire hose, and electrically charged cattle prodding stick. On the other hand, we find no place in our America for the agitating opportunist, who for his own monetary or political gain, pits one race against another, sometimes urging mob violence.

As responsible Americans working for freedom for others throughout this troubled world, it is our duty to practice freedom and equality here. In our country freedom and equality will be brought about by understanding, honestly practiced; education, earnestly pursued; opportunity, freely given without discrimination.

Our disagreements must no longer be settled by armed conflict, as here a century ago. Our racial conflicts must be removed from the streets and our differences resolved the American way in our courts, our legislative bodies, and the ballot box.

If we should fail—and we will if leadership passes to the extremists—then man's best chance for freedom and equality under law will have been eclipsed. Those who died here, and on other American battlefields, will have died in vain.

The effects of the battle we mark at this ceremony were largely confined to this country. But such is not the case today, for now, America's racial conflict has immediate worldwide significance. We cannot hope to win men's minds in our battle with communism if America becomes a land in which freedom, equality, and opportunity are only for the white man.

Much progress has been made in human relations in this last 100 years. Let us resolve to preserve our progress and to strengthen it—not wreck it.

This monument which we now dedicate to the hundreds of Floridians who met in conflict here bears this inscription:

"They fought with courage and devotion for the ideals in which they believed. By their noble example of bravery and endurance, they enable us to meet with confidence any sacrifice which confronts us as Americans."

This afternoon when the Confederate and Union soldiers met on this battlefield, they met with hands held out in welcome and friendship, and not with fire and bayonet. May this gesture be accepted in our streets and in our hearts.

May this become the true lesson of Gettysburg.

New Chairman Discusses Role of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, the new chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two outstanding addresses in New Orleans, La., in which he discussed the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The first of these addresses was delivered before the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and dealt particularly with the role of the Committee in relation to national security.

Both because of the important subject matter of this address and because it reflects the broad viewpoint and philosophy which Mr. WILLIS brings to his new and heavy responsibilities as chairman of the committee, I am happy to include the address in the RECORD. I hope it will receive the thoughtful attention of all our colleagues:

THE COMMITTEE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana)

I would first like to say how pleased I am to be here in New Orleans to address you, the delegates to the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, your friends, and distinguished guests. I love Washington, but I love Louisiana—the grassroots of America and its people—more. It is always a pleasure for me to return to my home State, to meet and talk with its people, to get down to earth again—if I may use that phrase—after some time in the rarified atmosphere of Washington.

It was most fortunate that I was able to be here for the presentation of your Freedom Awards. I say with all sincerity that it has been inspiring to be a witness to this program, to see the awards being given, to know that many Americans are devoting themselves, their time and effort to their country. It is heartening to know that organizations such as the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation are alert and perceptive enough to encourage and award those who work for freedom's cause.

My congratulations to each of the award winners—and to you, the members of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, for initiating this program. I hope you will continue it for many years to come.

Freedom is everybody's job. It is the job of farmers, the job of educators, the job of clergy, the job of Members of Congress—and of every man and woman in our country. This morning, I have seen something of what the people of Louisiana are doing for freedom. I think, therefore, that it would be appropriate for me to tell you something of what the Congress and, more particularly, the Committee on Un-American Activities, is doing for this same cause.

Early this year the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly not only to continue the Committee on Un-American Activities, but to give it the largest appropriation it has ever had. As the newly elected chairman of the committee, by the unanimous vote of the House, I assure you that I will do all in my power to see that the funds appropriated to the committee will be well spent, that any unneeded funds will be returned to the House, and that I will do all I can to see that the committee is strengthened in every way possible and its life continued for as long as it is needed.

Why do we need the committee? Why has the House, for 25 years, voted funds for its continuing operations?

It is because the House knows—just as you and I do—that freedom in every part of the globe is today challenged by the most deadly enemy it has known since the dawn of civilization. That enemy, the world Communist movement, has fifth columns in over 80 nations of the world, including these United States. The aim of this movement is to seize control of the entire earth. It uses every conceivable weapon to achieve that aim—military forces, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, treachery, deceit, and infiltration into governmental and other groups. This is the finding of the Congress of the United States. It is a finding that has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

We know that we must build and maintain powerful military forces to protect this country from the tremendous military might created by the forces of world communism. By the same token, we know, too, that because Soviet leaders openly proclaim that the United States is their No. 1 enemy—and because they have a fifth column within our border—that we must have adequate internal safeguards. That, basically, is why the House continues its Committee on Un-American Activities.

What is the Committee on Un-American Activities? And what is its function?

Is it a spy-catching agency? No, that is the job of the FBI which has the responsibility of collecting evidence against those who break our Federal security laws, though the hearings of the committee have actually assisted them in this respect. The committee is not a counter-espionage agency, though it has uncovered some spies.

Is the committee supposed to convict people of being Communists or violating security laws? Again, the answer is "No." The

committee is not a prosecuting agency like the Department of Justice. Nor is it a court of law, set up to pass judgment on legal guilt or innocence. Again, however, the committee's investigations and hearings, through the facts which they develop, are helpful in this connection.

What then is the committee and what is its function, if it is not supposed to catch spies or convict Communists?

Stated simply, it is the eyes and ears—and the principal legislative advisor of the House of Representatives—on matters concerning subversion and internal security.

It is a nine-member, standing committee of the House, commissioned to investigate subversive activities and propaganda within this country—whether of foreign or domestic origin—and to report its findings to the House.

There are 20 standing committees in the House. All have the power to investigate in specified areas, as may be granted to them by the House from one session to another. But with the exception of the Government Operations Committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities is the only one which has permanent, continuing investigative power.

It can hold hearings in any part of the United States, whether or not the House is in session. Other committees need special authorization from the House to conduct investigations.

Like all other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities has a basically legislative function. It is its duty to hold hearings on, and weigh the merits of, bills relating to subversive activities and internal security which are referred to it for consideration. In the same area, the committee has the duty of recommending new legislation where it sees a need for it. It also has the duty of proposing amendments to existing legislation when its hearings, investigations, and study reveal weaknesses in our laws which need correction.

Again, like all other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities has an oversight or watchdog function. That is, it should keep an eye—"exercise continuous watchfulness," the rules of the House say—on the administration of security legislation by the executive branch.

What is the jurisdiction of the committee? Are there any limitations on the areas in which it can investigate?

The Supreme Court held in the Barenblatt decision of 1959 that in the field of national security the House has given the Un-American Activities Committee pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country.

In other words, no matter where the committee finds Communists operating, no matter where it finds subversive efforts being made against the security of the United States, it has the right to investigate.

Lloyd Barenblatt, whose contempt conviction was upheld in the Supreme Court decision I have just mentioned, claimed in his appeal that the field of education should be excluded from the committee's authority. The Supreme Court rejected his claim. It held that the committee's right to interrogate him—even though he was a college professor—was unassailable.

I want to point out here, while touching on the Barenblatt case, that the committee does not investigate educational institutions as such. It does not investigate churches. It does not investigate union, business firms, or any other bona fide organizations or institutions.

Communist fronts, however, are a different matter. When the committee has compelling evidence that an organization is Communist-controlled or a front, as defined in the Internal Security Act, then it may properly investigate the organization.

When dealing with individuals, the committee's policy is that it will not be deterred from investigating their subversive activities simply because they happen to be labor, church, or business leaders, college professors or whatever.

The committee's interrogation of Professor Barenblatt is an illustration of its policy in this respect. When it questioned him, it was not investigating the college with which he was affiliated. It did not concern itself in any way with the overall activities or policies of the college or what it was teaching. It concerned itself only with Barenblatt's individual activities as a Communist.

This is what the committee has always done in the past. It is what it will do in the future. The courts have unequivocally upheld the committee's right to follow this policy.

No citizen of this country, because of his trade, profession or calling, can claim that he is somehow different from, or superior to, other citizens, and that he is therefore exempt from and beyond the power of the Congress when he engages in activities which are violative of our laws or designed to help a foreign power destroy our Government.

Now, let me illustrate the role the committee plays in protecting our national security by citing facts about some of its current and recent investigations and hearings.

Over the past 3 months, in 6 separate days of hearings, the committee has taken testimony from over a score of witnesses on the subject of illegal travel to Cuba. Generally, American citizens have been barred from visiting Cuba since the severance of diplomatic relations on January 1, 1961. Special passport validations are given, however, to those who have a legitimate, compelling reason for such travel. Despite this, committee investigation has uncovered the fact that many Americans have been going to Cuba without validation.

These people are violating this country's laws. The committee has learned that many of these people have Communist backgrounds. It has also learned that a considerable number of them, after returning to the United States, have gone about lecturing on the glories of Castro's Cuba without registering as agents of his government.

What is the purpose of these hearings? Of what use are they?

First, they have had a definite legislative function. They're developing facts which will assist the committee in judging the merits of a travel and passport control bill which has been referred to it for consideration. They will also help the Judiciary Committee weigh the merits of several bills which have been referred to it and which also deal with the problem of controlling travel in times of national emergency.

Second, it is the committee's hope—and belief—that the facts developed about the propaganda activities in behalf of the Castro regime carried on in this country by these lawbreakers, will enable it to propose amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act. These amendments will be designed to compel the registration—and thus force the disclosure—of many Communist propagandists who are today succeeding in thwarting the intent of Congress when it passed that Act 25 years ago.

Third, a necessary, unavoidable and useful offshoot of these hearings, of course, is the fact that they reveal to the American people the current activities of the Communist Party and its agents. This is a part of the informing function of Congress. By doing this, the hearings are making it more difficult for the party to mislead the American people and achieve its goal of destroying your freedom and mine.

Fourth, in these hearings the committee is also carrying out its watchdog or oversight function. Specifically, it is overseeing the administration of our country's travel control regulations and the Foreign Agents Registration Act by the executive branch of the Government.

Finally—though this is by no means the least result—because of the facts developed in these hearings, I have referred the cases of 14 witnesses to the Department of Justice for prosecution on the grounds that they are in violation of travel regulations.

Another example: two employees of our supersecret National Security Agency disappeared in the summer of 1960. The committee immediately began an investigation of the background of these men, Bernon F. Mitchell and William H. Martin. Later, on September 5, 1960, they surfaced in Moscow at a highly publicized press conference—to publicly defame and vilify their country. Undoubtedly, they also told all they knew about NSA's activities to Soviet intelligence officials. By this time, the committee's investigation had convinced it that they never would have been hired by the NSA—or retained in its service for any length of time—if the Agency had been following adequate security procedures. A full-scale NSA investigation was then instituted.

Because of the highly sensitive nature of NSA operations, the committee made no inquiry into its activities. It did, however, hold 16 executive hearings in which it thoroughly explored NSA's personnel and security procedures. The committee's investigators spent 2,000 man-hours—and covered 15 States—developing the facts for these hearings.

What were the results? Twenty-two reforms in security and personnel practices were instituted by the NSA.

The Director of Personnel was dismissed.

The Director of Security resigned upon request—as did two other officials in his office.

Twenty-six other NSA employees were dropped for reasons of sex deviation.

In addition, the committee drafted a bill which will establish sound security practices in the agency for all time. That bill was passed by the House just a few weeks ago.

Can there be any question about the fact that, by inquiring as it did in this case, into the administration of security practices by an agency of the executive branch, the committee made a very real contribution to our Nation's security and welfare? It found a shockingly lax situation in NSA when it began its inquiry. Today, I believe the NSA's security procedures are as tight and effective as they can be made.

The Communists and other enemies of the committee are forever charging that the committee has done little or nothing in the legislative field and that it concentrates on exposure and defamation of witnesses, who often aren't even Communists but merely people who oppose the committee.

The truth is that the committee has been responsible, over the years, for over 40 security laws or amendments to existing laws enacted by the Congress. This is a legislative record of which any committee can be proud.

The Communists have demonstrated by their own actions that one of the laws they fear most today is the Internal Security Act, a law drafted by the committee. In June 1961, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the key element in this law, its registration provisions. Just last week a special three-judge court in Washington upheld another of its provisions—the one denying passports to members of the Communist Party.

After the Supreme Court's decision, Gus Hall, leader of the Communist Party, said the party would refuse to comply with the law because it "asks the Communist Party to commit suicide."

This statement was quite a tribute to the committee. It was an admission by the top Communist in the United States that the committee knows how to hit the conspiracy where it will hurt most.

How did the committee do this in the Internal Security Act? It did it by drawing up a law that compels the party to be honest—to reveal the identities of its members and the organizations it controls. It drew up a law that strips the party of its major weapons—deceit and concealment.

To what extent has the party used these weapons successfully in the past?

You will know that nearly all party members have always concealed their membership. They have known they could get nowhere with most people if they openly proclaimed they were Communists. It is as secret, hidden Communists that they have been able to carry out their undermining activities.

Have they successfully used false labels, deceit and concealment in the organizational sense?

Here is a copy of the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," published by the Committee on Un-American Activities. This 250-page document lists nearly every organization and publication in this country which, as of December 1961, had been cited as Communist or subversive by Federal legislative and executive agencies and by various State and territorial investigating committees. The names of 663 organizations or projects and 122 publications are contained in this volume.

This is an indication of the extent to which the Communist Party relies on, and has successfully used, the false label to peddle its wares.

The Communists themselves have referred to these front organizations as "innocents' clubs" and "transmission belts." They are outfits through which the party has spread its line and won acceptance for it from many thousands of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

What distresses me—and this is a sad commentary on our times after years of exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work. It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote communism and undermine freedom. What is wrong with some of our citizens? Can't anything shake them out of their carelessness and irresponsibility?

But now, let's get back to the committee. Before closing, I would like to say a few more words about what it does and what it does not do.

The committee does not subpena witnesses for its hearings unless it has evidence that they possess information about the matter under investigation. It does not accuse any witness of being a Communist Party member—or even ask them if they ever were or are one—unless it has documentary evidence or reliable confidential information they are or have been members of the party.

It does not call witnesses to expose or harass them, but rather, as I indicated before, because it knows that they are in a position to give Congress information which will help it in developing remedial or needed legislation.

Naturally, because the committee deals primarily with Communist activities, it must call Communists as witnesses. Because the Communist movement is secret and conspiratorial, they are the only ones who have first-hand knowledge of its operations. That this results in the exposure of certain Communists, I grant. This, however, is something that cannot be helped. It is a basic part of the legislative process, and the committee can no more carry out its function without calling Communists as witnesses than the House Education and Labor Committee can carry out its function without calling educators and labor leaders as witnesses.

Serving on the committee and being its chairman is not a pleasant task. You are subject to a continuous barrage of vilification and false accusations. You are compelled by the very nature of your task to deal repeatedly and continually with the activities which border on the treasonous.

However, it is not always the knowingly and deliberately disloyal we are dealing with. In some cases, I feel that our troubles stem primarily from ignorance and lack of knowledge about communism, rather than from treason. This is particularly true in regard to foreign policy positions where some tragic mistakes have been made, both in and out of government.

That is why it is so important to study communism, to know our enemy well, in addition to having effective security laws and agencies—such as the committee—to cope with the internal subverters.

This is why I have been discussing with you the subject of the committee and national security and why, in a few moments, I will be talking to another audience in another room of this hotel on the subject of "Education for Victory," meaning, of course, education about communism.

Frankly, as regards both the field of law and of education, and all other fields, I think I can say with complete truth that every member of the committee wishes that there was not need for it; that all of them will be glad if the day ever comes when the committee is abolished because there is no longer a Communist fifth column in this country and thus no need for a Committee on Un-American Activities.

That day however—I am afraid—is a long way off. And until that day comes I can assure you that each member of the committee will do his utmost to see that the committee is not deterred for any reason from carrying out the function assigned to it by the House of Representatives.

Each year, of course, an effort is made by the Communists, their stooges, and some misguided but well-intentioned liberals to abolish the committee. Naturally, this creates a problem. Despite this, I am convinced that there is no need to fear that this move will ever be successful. I have too much faith in the Congress to believe that, as long as we have a real internal security problem, its Members would fail to carry out their duty of protecting this Nation from those who would destroy it.

The committee's life is in the hands of the Congress and of the people of this country. It is in good hands. I am certain that they will preserve the committee—and that the committee will continue its vital role in the preservation of our Nation.

Italian American War Veterans, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, there was introduced before the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to support and enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian War Veterans, Inc. This resolution was adopted by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives on May 5, and by the State senate on July 8. Such action indicates the unanimity of accord which emerges with regard to expressing the appreciation of, and recognition by, the people of my State for the fine and continued achievements of our Italian community. I commend this resolution, appended hereto, to my colleagues for their consideration and subsequent favorable action on behalf of this most worthy organization:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 20

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memoralize the Congress of the United States to support and enact appropriate legislation to incorporate or charter the organization known as the Italian American War Veterans of the United States Inc.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that my mother is an active member of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is always thrilling to go with her to the local chapter meetings. To see their devotion to the principles and ideals of the Founding Fathers strengthens my own faith in the future destiny of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as part of their outstanding program the Daughters of the American Revolution maintain, support, and fully own two schools; Tamassee, a boarding school in South Carolina, and Kate Duncan Smith, a day school in Alabama. I am proud that Tamassee is located in my own congressional district.

Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan, president general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, is one of the most distinguished and beloved presidents general in the history of this magnificent patriotic organization. Mrs. Duncan very kindly furnished me, at my request, some little-known facts about this unique society chartered by an act of Congress in 1896. I commend to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the United States the following facts about this great and dedicated society:

THE DAR: ITS ORGANIZATION AND HOW IT FUNCTIONS

SOME LITTLE-KNOWN FACTS

Perhaps "unique" better than any other word describes the character and operation of the National Soceity, Daughters of the

American Revolution. With equal propriety, "unique" describes the organization's founding in 1890 and is applicable to its present-day activities as well as covering the achievements spanning the intervening three-quarters of a century.

Actually, the DAR means different things to different people—including its own membership of approximately 185,000. A look past and present provides a possible key to this. To be specific, the record of the national society's historic-educational-patriotic program reveals its diverse and manifold nature. Numerous little-known facts readily fall into a quiz-type pattern of "Do You Know"—

By actual congressional charter provisions the NSDAR is one of two national organizations required to report annually to the Congress through the Smithsonian Institution.

From its founding there existed a definitely defined and close relationship between the DAR and the Smithsonian Institution, space in the museum for deposit of valuable DAR collections, manuscripts, etc., being specified and the privilege was exercised for a number of years.

In recognition of Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross, for the service she rendered the country, the NSDAR created the office of surgeon general on its governing board. The position was later abolished.

During the Spanish-American War in 1898, the DAR established a DAR hospital corps to recruit nurses for service. This became the nucleus of the Army Nurse Corps. Following the war, the DAR at its own expense paid pensions to all such nurses who entered the service prior to September 6, 1898, and who were not receiving or were not eligible for Government pensions.

It was in 1913 that the DAR founded the Americanization School in Washington, D.C.—the only school of its kind in the United States. Later, this school was incorporated in the school system of the District of Columbia.

Under Americanism, the DAR has ever extended a welcoming hand to immigrants seeking naturalization. In cooperation with the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the DAR publishes and distributes free of charge hundreds of thousands of Manuals for Citizenship (9-million mark passed in January 1963) and participates in naturalization court ceremonies throughout the Nation.

For a great many years—until the facilities were closed by the Government—the DAR pursued a very active occupational therapy and patient aid program at Ellis Island in New York, and Angel Island in California.

Since its inception, an important service rendered annually by the society to the U.S. Government, and for which the DAR has received commendation from time to time, is the locating and indexing of unmarked graves of Revolutionary soldiers—all done completely at DAR time and expense.

In addition to the continuing project of locating graves, the DAR has pursued a steadfast program of marking these graves, securing the Government headstones from the Department of the Army (formerly the Quartermaster Department, now Chief of the Support Services). Cost of placement and arrangement of appropriate ceremony assumed by DAR.

Not only does the DAR through its individual membership subscription have an outstanding record of war bond purchases, and recorded Red Cross service in time of national crisis (indeed, during World War II, it made available its own national headquarters buildings in Washington for war work and held its annual convention—Continental Congress—elsewhere); it materially assisted war orphans and restored the waterworks of the destroyed French village, Tilloloy.

Under historic activities, the DAR has an enviable record in the number of restorations, preservations and maintenance of historic spots and buildings. Many have been done in its own name; others, it has substantially supported.

Placement of markers is too numerous to attempt to enumerate, but two special endeavors merit mention; namely, erection of the "Madonna of the Trail" statutes across the Nation marking the pioneer trek westward and the building, at a cost of over $500,000 of the Memorial Bell Tower at Valley Forge, which structure, upon completion and dedication, was formally given to the Valley Forge Foundation.

In the field of education, many schools—especially those in so-called "pilot" or remote mountain areas—have materially benefited by direct yearly gifts of money and supplies. This, given in addition to maintaining and supporting two fully-owned DAR schools; Tamassee, a boarding school in South Carolina, and Kate Duncan Smith, a day school in Alabama. Approximate contributions annually run $200,000; total to date exceeds $4,500,000, this exclusive of student loans and scholarships.

The unique quality typifying all DAR youth activity programs is that all are entirely volunteer. Although these encourage and emphasize leadership, service, dependability and patriotism, participation is volunteer and none of the winners are hand-picked by the DAR who awards the bond, medal, certificate, or other prize. Value of such a program is to inspire American ideals and principles in youth and aid them in recognizing the four specified attribues among fellow students. DAR youth work falls under committees on: Children of the American Revolution, Good Citizens, Junior American Citizens, and Student Loan and Scholarship. These programs have been conducted for years with no restrictions of race, color, or creed.

At national headquarters—the largest group of buildings in the world owned and maintained by a women's group—the DAR has two exceptional and noteworthy facilities open daily to the public: A genealogical and historic research library having some records not available elsewhere and a significant Americana Museum together with 28 period rooms, furnishings predating 1830.

The crux of the patriotic effort of the DAR is preservation and maintenance of the Constitutional Republic as set forth in the Constitution of the United States and as exercised through democratic processes. The NSDAR takes stands (resolutions) on fundamental principles. Action by members is on an individual basis as good citizens. The obligation to encourage an enlightened, alert membership may well stem from Benjamin Franklin's admonition in 1787, upon being asked when he came out of the Constitutional Convention, "What kind of a government have you given us?" replied: "A Republic, madam, if you can keep it."

Also under patriotic activity comes the well-known DAR sponsorship and promotion of Correst Use of the Flag of the United States of America, observance of Constitution Week (initiated by DAR) and celebration of February as American History Month.

PURSUIT OF OBJECTIVES

The foregoing highlights, all part of the comprehensive scope of DAR, are furthered nationwide through 24 established national committees. Authority is the congressional act of incorporation of 1896 chartering the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution. The Honorable W. L. Wilson, Representative from West Virginia (later president of Washington and Lee University and a regent of the Smithsonian Institution), first introduced such a bill in 1892. However, it was Senator Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan, who in 1895, introduced Senate bill 1386 which successfully passed, having first been referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. In the House of Representatives, Representative D. B. Henderson offered the companion House bill 3553, which, after referral to the Committee on Library also passed. The act of incorporation was signed February 20, 1896, by Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, Hon. Thomas B. Reed, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Hon. A. E. Stevenson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.

This act of incorporation sets forth the following requirements, "That said society shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, concerning its proceedings, and said Secretary shall communicate to Congress such portions thereof as he may deem of national interest and importance."

Objectives as stated in the bylaws are (condensed):

I. Historical: "To perpetuate the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved American independence";

II. Educational: "To promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge"; and

III. Patriotic: "To cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country."

DAR RELATIONSHIP TO THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

This unique relationship was explained in an address by Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to the DAR, October 12, 1955. In it he traced the history from its inception, then cited:

"The first report (to Congress) so transmitted was that for the years 1890–97, which Smithsonian Secretary Samuel P. Langley sent to the Senate on February 23, 1899. It was printed as Senate Document 164 and several thousand copies were distributed."

ANNUAL REPORTING: FACTS AND FIGURES

In compliance with the act of Congress incorporating the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, a brief summary has been submitted over the years. During this period several high compliments have been paid the DAR on accomplishments reflected therein by officials in places of great responsibility; a valued one being a letter to Mrs. Matthew T. Scott, then president general, from Hon. Lindley M. Garrison, Secretary of War, dated April 4, 1913. Most outstanding and appreciated by the membership of the DAR is the decision to reprint at public expense—always a voluntary act of the Congresses since the national society came into being. This is construed as recognition of the public service the DAR performs.

A current check indicates that recent reports to the Smithsonian Institution have run between 142 and 345 pages, contents breakdown is in four sections:

Part I. Reports: Executive Officers, including a financial summary, State Regents of the 50 States and 6 Oversea Units and Chairmen of National Committees.

Part II. Resolutions: 12 passed April 1963.

Part III. Report of the National Society, Children of the American Revolution.

Part IV. List of located, unmarked Revolutionary soldiers' graves, identified and indexed by States.

It should be thoroughly understood that the copies of this report, printed by the Government Printing Office as a Senate document do not come to the DAR. A usual printing for such documents runs approximately 1,500; these are delivered to the Senate and House Document Room and are disbursed as follows: To the Senate, the House of Representatives, Congressional, Supreme Court, Archives, and depository libraries all over the country in addition to being sent to approximately 150 agencies and bureaus on the regular list for all printed documents. Any

copies, (usually 200-300) used by DAR, are ordered and paid for by DAR.

Also true is the fact that the DAR annually pays $300 to have the manuscript edited, proofread, and indexed prior to presentation for printing. This, in addition, to employing at its (the society's) expense, on a per diem basis, a special researchist, for the required 2 to 3 months necessary to prepare the list of Revolutionary soldiers' graves and fulfill its obligation to report these.

A point of prime importance to avoid misunderstanding is the fact that the condensed summary report to the Smithsonian Institution should not be confused with the full annual proceedings of the DAR. The two are separate and distinct. The national society publishes and pays for, individually, its own full annual report, the yearly proceedings, which is issued for the use of the national society, its officers, its own chapter groups and any interested Daughters.

Bituminous Coal Industry Demonstrates Flexibility and Ingenuity in Meeting the Challenges of Change—United Mine Workers of America Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the mineral-rich mountains of West Virginia have long been noted as one of the world's leading coal producing areas. The recent challenges of competitive fuels have taxed the ingenuity and capability of the industry's leadership, and through radical change coal is maintaining its position as a valued source of energy for the United States.

Mechanization of the mining processes has done much to lower the cost of bituminous coal production, and still other new procedures have been instituted in order to reduce prohibitive transportation costs. Coal is now moved in huge coal trains; it is pouring through pipelines in the form of slurry; and it is utilized by power companies located near the mines themselves, who then forward the resultant electrical energy by means of high-voltage transmission lines.

In the July 28 issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail appeared a copyrighted New York Times Co. article written by J. H. Carmical, which discusses the coal industry's struggle to retain identity. Mr. Carmical touches on the technological and procedural changes which have been necessary in order to compete with other fuels, and to beat high transport expense. Of particular interest is his complementary reference to the progressive and realistic attitude of the United Mine Workers of America when confronted by automation and its unsettling effect on employment levels.

I request that the article, "Soft Coal Battered, but Unbowed," in the July 28 issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail, written by J. H. Carmical, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOFT COAL BATTERED, BUT UNBOWED

(By J. H. Carmical)

NEW YORK.—The bituminous coal industry appears to be well into the competitive fight with other fuels. Although badly battered, and with several markets definitely lost, the soft-coal industry continues to hold a prominent position in the Nation's energy picture, but only through its meeting of great challenges.

Through the mechanization of its mines and other adjustments, the coal industry in the postwar period has pretty well licked the problem of high production costs. Now its efforts are being concentrated largely in solving the problem of high transportation costs to bring coal prices in line with other fuels.

Since the end of World War II, the coal industry has undergone radical changes in its consumer markets. The switch of the railroads from coal-burning to diesel locomotives, the steadily increasing use of fuel oil both by homeowners and industry, and the expansion of natural gas pipelines have resulted in the loss of several traditional coal markets.

With the gradual disappearance of these markets, the electric utility industry continued to expand in a spectacular manner because of the many new homes built and the greater use of electrical gadgets. Realizing that these utility companies offered coal a steadily increasing market, attention was directed at first toward lowering mining costs and later to reducing transportation charges to the utility plants.

Although these efforts met with success with respect to the utility companies, the use of coal in all other domestic markets has declined steadily since 1951. In the export field, where there was a sharyp increase in 1956 and 1957, largely because of the Suez crisis, present shipments are much below the level of 1951.

During this period of declining markets, the productivity in the coal-mining industry has gradually been improved. From an average output of 7.47 tons a day for each miner in 1952, the rate had been raised to 15.41 tons in 1962, by far the highest in the world.

With this increase in productivity, the operators have been able to make slight reductions in prices at the mines and at the same time increase the wage rate, which averaged $129.96 a week in April.

Currently, the mine price is around $4.50 a ton, down almost 10 percent from the 1951 level, when it was $4.80 to $5 a ton.

The main contribution to increased productivity and lower costs in the industry has been the attitude of the United Mine Workers of America, which has not insisted on make-work and other featherbedding practices.

The bottleneck in the coal-mining industry continued to be in the heavy transportation charges. Although it is being offered at a lower price at the minehead, the value of coal is judged in the competitive market on its delivered price and heat content.

About 75 percent of the coal loaded at the mines moves by rail. Excluding 3 percent used at mines and moved out through high voltage transimssion lines in the form of electricity, the rest is moved equally by barge and motor vehicles.

About a year ago the railroads started a movement to adjust tariffs on the basis of trainload lots rather than single car rates. By merchandising their services on a competitive basis rather than the old artificial single car rates, it is estimated that coal freight charges will be reduced up to 50 percent.

Transporting coal by pipeline has been found commercially feasible, although the Nation's only such carrier has been placed on inactive duty. It has been delivering coal from a mine near Cadiz, Ohio, to a Cleveland utility for 6 years without interruption. By forcing the railroads to cut their rates from the mines to Cleveland from $3.54 to $1.88 a ton, a reduction of 47 percent, it has served its purpose.

The feasibility of constructing a coal pipeline from Utah to Southern California is being studied. But like a proposed West Virginia-New York line, a right-of-way problem is involved. Coal pipelines do not have the right of eminent domain—that is the right to condemn property for a right-of-way—and it will require congressional action to make this possible. Such a bill has been pending in Congress for more than a year.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., an organization sponsored by the United Mine Workers, the coal industry and their railroads, said there was evidence that coal delivered to the customer will be even cheaper in the future.

Moody said, however, that, if the Government continued to pay subsidies amounting to millions of dollars a year in an effort to make electricity produced from atomic plants as cheap as that produced from coal steam plants, coal would be driven from more and more utility markets, no matter how much costs are lowered.

At present, coal is used as the fuel to generate more than one-half the power produced by the electric utility industry and the coal interests hope to increase this rate over the years by meeting head-on the competition with other fuels.

Private Enterprise Creates Jobs and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans know that only private enterprise, not government, can create jobs and maintain a healthy economy. I say most Americans, because this basic economic fact is quite evidently not understood by President Kennedy and his economic advisers. They continue to urge big government, more Federal spending, and democratic socialism as the way to riches for a nation and its people even though all their theories have been tried and found wanting in other countries.

As a part of a study of economics, in the hope some commonsense may rub off on the President, I am including two articles from the Washington World of August 5, 1963. The first, "Unimpeded Private Initiative Can Create the Jobs Vitally Needed for Prosperity," by W. P. Gullander, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, and the second, "Drop In Corporation Profits Retards Economic Growth."

UNIMPEDED PRIVATE INITIATIVE CAN CREATE THE JOBS VITALLY NEEDED FOR PROSPERITY

By W. P. Gullander, president, National Association of Manufacturers)

A lack of adequate job opportunities is the one failing a free economic system cannot tolerate. Therefore, the unemployment rate is the most significant economic statistic compiled by the Government and has the most influence on the development of national policies.

This is as it should be, but in developing policies to cope with unemployment we need to take a good square look at the factors which help or hurt job creation. Only then do we have a yardstick by which to gage the effectiveness of proposed programs.

Jobs in the private sector of our economy, where most employment must originate, are created when the savings of individuals are invested to start new business ventures in the hope of earning a profit, or additional capital is invested in the expansion of existing businesses in the hope of increasing the profit. Thus most jobs depend on the initiative of individuals in business or who desire to enter business.

With this fact in mind, let's measure some of the existing or proposed measures to reduce unemployment against the yardstick of whether they encourage or discourage this initiative.

Let's take the shorter workweek, with no reduction in take-home pay. This would sharply increase the unit cost of producing goods and services and reduce or eliminate the possibility of profit unless prices were raised to absorb the added costs. With higher prices, fewer goods and services would be sold and therefore fewer people could be employed in producing them.

Let's take the idea of raising the minimum wage so those on the lower end of the income scale can buy more goods and services and thus create more jobs by adding to demand. This has been applied repeatedly, but the very people it is supposed to help are those in the growing unemployment categories.

Instead of increasing their purchasing power, it has robbed many of them of opportunities to earn purchasing power because their ability to produce is too low to employ them at the legal minimum wage.

It is now proposed that we turn to make-work projects, aimed particularly at decreasing unemployment among people between the ages of 16 and 22. The Youth Employment Act of 1963 now before Congress would set up a Youth Conservation Corps, with starting pay of $60 a month plus keep, and a State community youth employment program which would put young people to work on local public service projects at the prevailing rates of pay in the locality.

If it were not for the Government-imposed restrictions on employment, many of these young people would be able to find jobs in which private employers would be able to use their services profitably, and at more than the equivalent of $60 a month and keep.

For a long time, NAM has advocated a three-point program to create more jobs. The three points are simple and in keeping with the factors which make for economic growth.

These are: Revision of the tax structure to remove obstacles to the accumulation and investment of job-creating capital; restraint in wage demands so that greater productive efficiency can be translated into wider markets for our goods at home and abroad; and avoidance of actions by Government which inhibit business initiative and expansion.

If governmental policies, labor union policies, and business policies are developed with these three objectives in mind, we can quickly overcome the unemployment problem and go on to more and better jobs and higher living standards for all of the American people.

DROP IN CORPORATION PROFITS RETARDS ECONOMIC GROWTH

The year 1962 was one in which the nation's total production, employment, and money income were greater than in any previous year.

The record was marred, however, by the failure of expenditures for new plant and equipment to be significantly greater than those of 5 years ago, by the persistence of pronounced unemployment, development of a large Federal fiscal deficit where balance earlier had been promised, by one of the sharpest stock price declines in security market history, and a continued adverse balance-of-payments situation resulting in further decreases in already shrunken gold reserves.

There has been economic improvement but its extent has proved far from satisfactory.

PROFITS TOO LOW

Underlying the disappointing features of the situation and in substantial measure responsible for them is the continued failure of profits and profit prospects to provide the incentives on which peacetime expansion of employment and production entirely depend.

Corporate profits as a percentage of sales were only about three-fifths what they were in earlier postwar years; the percentage was scarcely better than in the depression year of 1954.

The profit squeeze, and its origins thus are of significant interest; it is of especial importance to the owners and employees of steel companies and similar large corporations, because such industries are experiencing the profit squeeze and its consequences in more acute form than are many other industries.

For example, the steel profit margin on sales has been reduced since 1958 by approximately one-third despite the fact that it shipped approximately one-sixth more steel. The 1962 profit margin was smaller than that of any nonwar year since the depression year of 1938.

Its product prices have not increased since 1958; its hourly employment costs have increased by approximately 20 percent; and it has been squeezed out of some markets so that it and its employees have lost to foreign producers 6 to 10 percent of the market they formerly supplied.

IMPORTANCE OF PROFITS

The critical importance to progress of profits and profits prospects merits public attention. Such attention is especially relevant in view of proposals being advanced to cure unemployment and other adverse features. Involved may be important national policies with respect to taxation, Government expenditures, international trade, monetary matters, labor, subsidies, and prices.

These policies constitute a significant segment of the institutional framework within which the American economy functions, and they may be of overriding importance at the present time.

That the profit squeeze lies at the root of other unsatisfactory features of the situation is clearly evident in terms of ordinary observation, accepted economic principle, and the statistical record.

In the matter of employment, for example, it seems clear that there is no dependable reason why any person ever hires another except that he values the service thereby received more highly than its cost to him.

In the case of corporations, which pay about three-quarters of all nongovernmental wages and salaries, this means that, within their financial capabilities, they will invest in tools of production and will, with alacrity, hire people when a profit from doing so is foreseen, a profit which is significantly greater, of course, then can be obtained by relatively riskless investment of money in, say, tax-exempt bonds.

PROFIT LOSS CUTS JOBS

It is the prospect of profit and profit alone which inspires the productive employment of people in the private economy; it is the dimming of that prospect that breeds unemployment and stops economic growth.

This principle has long been recognized by economists and it is confirmed by the record.

Shrinking profit margins go hand in hand with rising unemployment percentages. From 1929 to 1932 corporate profits as a percentage of sales declined from about 5 percent to less than nothing; and the percentage of those unemployed increased from about 3 to 24. By 1936–37 the profit percentage of sales had risen to about 3½ percent, while unemployment dropped to about 15 percent. In the nonwar years since then, the tendency for unemployment to increase as profits decrease is also clearly observable on the record. It is not mere happenstance that the postwar downtrend in profit margins has been accompanied by an uptrend in unemployment that threatens to become chronic.

It follows, too, then, if profits are squeezed and unemployment thereby increased, the fiscal problems are aggravated. The income tax bases are relatively diminished at the time the welfare burden is enlarged. If large fiscal deficits occur, then the unsettling question of inflationary financing is raised, and should that question arise, then, in turn, the risk of undermining international confidence in the dollar's stability is heightened.

LESS CAPITAL ATTRACTED

If profits are squeezed, then not only is this source of job-creating expenditure for plant and equipment curtailed, but the ability and incentive to attract "outside" capital is simultaneously impaired and this, in turn, reacts to maintain or worsen the unemployment situation. If industries do not make modernization expenditures they must lag behind in international competitiveness, and this reacts to worsen our adverse balance-of-payments situation.

As the late Lord Keynes said of his own England many years ago, the impairment of the necessary profit incentive to production is the root of our problems. If this situation is adequately corrected, it thus appears that little else is imperatively required; if it is not, then other measures must prove comparatively futile.

Tax Writeoff Rules Boost Plant Outlays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the new guidelines on depreciation instituted by the Treasury Department in 1962 resulted in increases of $2.4 billion in the depreciation allowances of corporations. However, 45 percent of U.S. corporations did not take advantage of the new depreciation rules.

In the following article of the July 26, 1963, Journal of Commerce various reasons are indicated for the hesitancy of U.S. corporations to avail themselves of the new depreciation schedules. I am sure my colleagues will find this article most informative.

TAX WRITEOFF RULES BOOST PLANT OUTLAYS

(By Sidney Fish)

Investments in plants and equipment, which were stimulated substantially during the last year by the new Treasury guidelines on depreciation, as well as by the investment tax credit enacted by Congress, could be substantially increased by making the new depreciation rules permanent.

This is the view of corporation executives and accountants who have studied the results achieved in 1962 by the new tax writeoffs. They point out that only 54:5 percent of property was on the new guidelines basis last year. Fear that the whole guideline

structure may be changed or rescinded at the option of the Treasury is one factor that is preventing a larger proportion of corporations from using the more liberal writeoffs, which were made available in July 1961, under the so-called revenue procedure 1621. Another factor limiting use of the guidelines in the uncertainty over what will happen 2 years from now, when the Treasury begins to apply its "reserve ratio" test to depreciation deductions.

Financial officers of corporations are fearful that after July 1, 1965, when the present "period of grace" ends, there will be a recurrence of long drawn out disputes with the Internal Revenue Service over whether the corporation is actually retiring machines at the rate for which he is claiming depreciation deductions. Until July 1, 1965, the Treasury agents are required by procedure 1621 to accept the depreciation rates claimed by the taxpayers.

WOULD ENCOURAGE USE

If depreciation guidelines were made permanent, through passage of an act by Congress, this would encourage many more corporations to use the guidelines, according to Maurice E. Peloubet, a partner in Price, Waterhouse & Co.

The Treasury feels that the guidelines are accomplishing their purpose, because corporations increased their depreciation allowances in 1962 by $4.1 billion, of which $2.4 billion was attributable to the use of the new guidelines. The latter figure was almost exactly what the Treasury had predicted the guidelines would accomplish.

But corporation executives feel that the Treasury should not take too much satisfaction from the fact that its advance estimate of the use of the guidelines proved accurate.

TWO POINTS

Business says that the Treasury, instead of patting itself on the back, should study two important statistics. The Treasury should ask itself why only 54.5 percent of all property was placed under the guideline, and why many small and large manufacturers declined to avail themselves of the faster writeoffs.

Also, industrialists say that the Treasury should be concerned over the steady rise in the average age of machine tools in American plants. It is estimated that 64 percent of all machine tools in metalworking are at least 10 years old. This is a postwar high, and compares with only 38 percent over 10 years of age in 1945.

The steady increase in the use of obsolescent machine tools is placing U.S. manufacturers at a disadvantage with overseas producers, industrialists say. As compared with a ratio of 64 percent for this country, no European country had more than 59 percent of its tools over 10 years old. In Russia, only 50 percent of all tools are 10 years old or more.

TAXES REDUCED

As a result of the extra depreciation allowances permitted by the guidelines, income taxes were reduced by $1¼ billion. Corporations also claimed investment tax credits of $1 billion on their 1962 tax returns.

By offsetting these reductions in Federal revenue were the modernization of many industries, on a scale which could not have been accomplished, if the tax incentives had not been provided. In the steel industry, for example, a vast modernization and improvement program is under way, while the auto industry is investing more heavily in new facilities than in some years. The effect of the guidelines and the tax credits has been to set in motion a big capital investment program, which could easily become a boom—if the depreciation rules were further eased, and made permanent. Capital investments this year are scheduled to set an all-time record, in dollar volume.

But considering the higher costs of new machinery, much still remains to be accomplished in modernizing American plants. Larger cash flow achieved through revised depreciation regulations, could give capital investments the additional stimulus that is needed to increase employment opportunities and step up the national rate of growth.

Fitting Tribute to George P. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the very able chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, performed a significant and important service last month with his tribute to the Japanese-American Veterans of World War II—a tribute in which many of us were privileged to join him.

The gentleman from California has been a stanch and consistent advocate of human justice and equality, and it is altogether consistent that he would take a role of leadership in this cause.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman MILLER's service has been appropriately recognized by one of the leading newspapers of his congressional district—the San Leandro Times Star and Morning News. I know that our colleagues will join me in expressing congratulations in this very fitting and appropriate tribute:

MILLER TELLS HOW DEMOCRACY CORRECTS EVEN ITS ABUSES

On June 11, Alameda's Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, having previously reserved for himself 2 hours of time in which to address the House, made a speech which is of great significance to the entire country in this summer of 1963.

The speech was of such significance because it bore most pointedly on the question of civil rights in this democracy of ours and because it so clearly showed how our democracy has demonstrated its ability, as MILLER said, to "correct its mistakes and even its abuses." Furthermore, it did this without once mentioning the difficulties which Americans of Negro ancestry are now experiencing.

The way in which MILLER accomplished this was through his exposition of how the country had wrongfully treated Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II, how these same Americans of Japanese ancestry had offered their services by the thousands at that very same time to the country's armed services, how the offer was accepted, how valiantly the Americans of Japanese ancestry fought for the United States throughout the war and how, after the conflict, they assumed the place in the life of the country that is rightfully theirs and which no one today could possibly deny them.

Occasion for the speech was to commemorate services sponsored by the Japanese American Citizens League at Arlington National Cemetery on June 2, marking the 20th anniversary of Japanese American military service in World War II.

In the course of his talk MILLER made a point of reminding the House that World War II was by no means the first conflict in which Americans of Japanese ancestry had given their lives for the country. He called the attention of his colleagues to the fact that among the 144 officers and men of the Battleship *Maine* who lost their lives in Havana Harbor in 1898 were seven Japanese Americans. "These seven Japanese," MILLER said, "are the first known of their ancestry to have died in the defense of our country's freedom and ideals. And their death more than half a century ago serves to remind us of how long those of the Japanese race have served our Nation well in time of peril and crisis."

After paying tribute to the most decorated military unit in American history, the 442d Regimental Combat Team, composed of Nisei, MILLER said, "The significance of these services, not only to the Nisei, or Japanese-Americans, but also to all Americans everywhere and to people of good will throughout the world * * * so impressed a number of my colleagues and me from both the House and the Senate that it was decided that we should relate them to the Congress and the citizens of our country, as well as to all the peoples of the earth, in order that they may better understand, through living example, what democracy in action truly means."

Whoever reads MILLER's address, and the speeches of the other Members of the House who rose to comment during the 2 hours, cannot fail to see that the essential truth of MILLER's thinking is, to quote his words again, that our democracy does "correct its mistakes and even its abuses."

That is the fact which forms the heart difference between our society and that of the monolithic, crushing dictatorships, be they of the proletariat or of individuals.

And because of that fact we should all know and clearly see that our country will win through its present difficulties involved in the civil rights controversy and emerge the stronger for it.

President Should Ban the Test-Ban Bandwagon Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last when President Kennedy addressed the Nation on the partial test ban treaty he called for full discussion and debate, not only in the Senate, but amongst the American people. However, Kennedy strategists appear to be attempting to choke off such debate and full scrutiny of the pact. The Senate majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has made optimistic statements both about support for the treaty and the shortness of time in which it will be considered. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman have claimed very widespread support for it amongst the public and in the other body. Administration-inclined columnists and commentators also have taken it upon themselves to assert to the effect that "almost everybody is for the pact." The administration has given out stories that it is popular in capitals all over the world.

Obviously, these statements are not based on any widespread and accurate information on just what is the state of opinion either amongst the public or in the other body. Senator after Senator has stated he is reserving judgment on the matter until more facts are in.

Despite the President's words last Friday, consciously or unconsciously, administration stalwarts have adopted the strategy of rushing consideration of the treaty as fast as possible, before thoughtful consideration can be given to it. This is a strategy of choking off debate and discussion, both by limiting it in time and by stampeding public opinion. Before the average person even gets to consider the matter, he is being told everybody is for it. This is the old bandwagon technique so effective in political campaigns. It is calculated at getting support by implying anybody on the opposite side is out of step.

I call upon the President to match his words last Friday with action. To do so he must order his subordinates and associates to cease and desist their shabby tactics and give the Nation the opportunity he has promised for full and fair evaluation of the claimed advantages and claimed disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty.

Omar B. Ketchum

SPEECH

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of us were shocked to learn of the passing of our good friend, Omar B. Ketchum, on Thursday last. He was not only my friend, but the friend of a great many Members of this House and even this entire Congress. Most of all he was a friend of the millions of veterans who have served our country in time of war.

Omar B. Ketchum was director of the Washington office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. As director of that office he was continuously alert to his responsibility for the passage of legislation beneficial to the veteran and to the furtherance of plans and programs with the Veterans' Administration that would be good for those men who have a veteran status whether they were members of the organization he belonged to or a member of some other veteran organization.

It was my privilege to meet Omar B. Ketchum many years ago when I was commander of Post 1000. Veterans of Foreign Wars in Independence, Mo. Although he came to Washington several years ago he never forgot to return to his adopted State of Kansas and to visit his friends in western Missouri. Perhaps the happiest years of his life were spent in Topeka, Kans., which is not very far west of Kansas City, Mo.

It was there that he served the city of Topeka as mayor for two terms and offered himself as a candidate for the Governor of the State of Kansas and also a candidate for the U.S. Senate from the State of Kansas.

Our next association with Mr. Ketchum came to be in our first term in the 86th Congress as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Quite frequently, Mr. Ketchum would appear as a witness but he was always regarded by members of the committee as a well informed witness with a reasonable, moderate viewpoint and one that was always willing to demonstrate the merit of a particular bill that he was seeking to have reported out by the committee. He was a witness that was impressive but was always one that was straightforward and never in a single instance was there anything said that might mislead the committee. He will probably best be remembered because of his annual appearance before the committee each year in February or March at the time of the annual appearance of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He would sit at the right hand of the commander because in truth and in fact he was the right arm of the commander in chief when he was in the city of Washington.

Omar Ketchum was a courageous man and one who had the courage to speak out in favor of his convictions. Among his strong convictions was the belief that the loyal citizens of the United States must be constantly vigilant against the threat of the subversive forces of communism and that every citizen must also be constantly alert to the need for a strong national defense of our country.

Our departed friend was the sort of person who would not allow a breach of arrangements or an upset in plans to derail his purpose or objective. He was a person that persevered in everything he did, but with it all, he was an optimist and a man who believed in the Biblical passage which states, "all things work together for men of good will."

Members of the VFW will miss the leadership which has been provided for so many years by Omar B. Ketchum. His life was dedicated to the VFW but this was so because he was a true patriot, and yet, it was also true because he forever maintained a desire to serve his fellow men. We have all lost a leader and a friend.

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary negotiations have been in the view of Mr. Harriman and his English counterpart successfully concluded. They do not mark as the President has so rightfully expressed anything like "peace in our times" a phrase with some unfortunate history. The test ban now accomplished is to the British observer like the girl who has awaited overlong a proposal and is therefore not the catch she once was. One southerner I know said the treaty negotiation results reminded him of the story of the rebel holdout in the War Between the States who held off a Yankee patrol for about a week from a hillside cave. Finally out of food, out of water, out of ammunition, and out of spunk, the rebel's stronghold was finally and successfully rushed and when the Union sergeant towered over the emaciated holdout and shouted "We got ya reb." He replied, "Yeah, and a helluva gettin' ya got."

Well, regardless of the appraisal of what kind of "a gettin' we got" in this proposed test ban and giving due credence to the validity of calls for caution in affirmatively counting on any presentments by Khrushchev this much is to be said: the continuing, jointly expressed compassion for a world divided against itself is not a very satisfactory substitute for some affirmative action, however limited. Unless and until the two major camps in this division can weld one or two points of agreement the bridge across the schisms of doctrines and interest that now are so wide and deep will not start abuilding. The peace that is war will remain with the ever-present threat that it could start on the escalator to the nuclear weapon.

The debate in the Senate will run a heavy tide of reasons why we dare not sign this treaty. Any person even slightly informed or aware of our past disappointments would have to admit to some risks involved in the signing. But it is our belief that the greatest risk we take in this small step is one of complete disappointment by Khrushchev's failure to honor the pact. We know of this risk going in. Can we not therefore in the face of possible improvment hope that we can change from a peace that is war to a peace that is conflict, realizing that even this degree of change could be for the better and provide a possible beginning for a bridge that ultimately must be built.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently an attack was made upon the proposal for quality stabilization legislation in an editorial in the Washington Post.

As usual the Post misses the point altogether. It is as far from a so-called fair trade price fixing bill as the fears of the Post editorialist is from the real purpose of the bill.

Without giving my own reasons for supporting the bill other than to say

"You get what you pay for" under a quality control bill. A quality product honestly made and fairly priced is the only one that survives. If you don't believe this just visit any discount junkyard.

I would like to put correspondence covering this subject into the RECORD at this point.

To compare logic with editorial guessing I submit the Post item along with some of many logical answers.

QUALITY STABILIZATION

One must marvel at the energy and ingenuity of those who are determined to eliminate competition in retail distribution and saddle consumers with price increases that could cost them more than $1 billion annually. First they persuaded many States to enact fair trade or resale-price maintenance legislation. But 27 States and the District of Columbia have either invalidated or refused to enact such legislation, and now a well-heeled lobby, spearheaded by retail druggists, is attempting to accomplish that end through Federal legislation. Since the term "fair trade" has been thoroughly discredited, they are now backing a quality stabilization bill (H.R. 3669) in an effort to gull the public with a euphemism that is as transparent as a picture window.

H.R. 3669, which has just been pushed through the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Chairman OREN HARRIS, would grant manufacturers absolute power to fix the prices on branded or trademarked articles at every stage of the distribution process without fear of Government intervention. Why this legislation should be supported by small businessmen, who would be bereft of any vestige of bargaining power, is something of a mystery. But there is nothing mysterious about other aspects of this bill which is opposed by virtually every agency of the Federal Government—the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—and by interests so divergent as those represented by the AFL-CIO, the American Bar Association and the Wall Street Journal.

Alfred R. Oxenfeldt, a professor of marketing at Columbia University, succinctly summarized the objections to the so-called Quality Stabilization Act when he testified that—

"The bill's ultimate effect would be to require highly efficient distributors to charge substantially more than their costs would require. Consequently, it would weaken, and possibly eliminate, the chief attraction that new types of retailers have offered throughout American history to win a place for themselves in the marketplace. In short, the Quality Stabilization Act would help us to transform U.S. retailing into the unprogressive type that prevails in much of Europe."

A Senate version of this act is embodied in a resolution (S. 774) sponsored by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The Senator was once a druggist, and it is perhaps significant that his version of the bill makes no provision for exempting prescription drugs.

Seasoned observers believe that this thoroughly reprehensible piece of legislation, the essence of which has already been rejected in 27 States, stands a good chance of passing the Congress. In that event we would urge President Kennedy to respond with a stinging veto.

QUALITY BRANDS ASSOCIATES OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1963.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: Lowell Mason, a man who served 11 years on the Federal Trade Commission, is most qualified to speak about economic legislation.

And as usual, Mr. Mason is concise.

He says: "The quality stabilization bill needs and deserves the support of all who are opposed to socializing distribution."

We believe you will be interested not only in his views but also the letter from Thomas A. Rothwell to which he refers. Both are enclosed.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. MAURER.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 11, 1963.*

THOMAS A. ROTHWELL,
Attorney at Law,
Marysville, Ohio.

DEAR TOM: Your letter of April 10, 1963, to John Anderson concerning the quality stabilization bill is a fine analysis of what the shooting is about and who is doing it. As a former dean of the Federal Trade Commission now associated with a law firm engaged in trade regulation practice I am quite conscious of the present day governmental aversion to private ownership in brand names.

I see little difference between socialism which puts the means of production in the public domain and the current efforts to put the reputation of trade-marked products in the public domain. Today the cult of mediocrity is so strong that a man hardly dares assert ownership to private property rights in his own superior brand name. To do so may subject him to criminal prosecution.

The Supreme Court in its 1919 Colgate decision upheld the right of a brand name manufacturer to keep his products out of the hands of brand vandals. I tell you the recent Parke-Davis decision has taken this right away. The quality stabilization bill will restore one's right to protect the goodwill he is able to create in the marketplace for his own products.

As Lord Acton concluded, "A people averse to the institution of private property is a people without the first element of freedom." The quality stabilization bill needs and deserves the support of all who are opposed to socializing distribution.

Sincerely,

LOWELL B. MASON.

MARYSVILLE, OHIO,
April 10, 1963.

Mr. JOHN W. ANDERSON,
President, Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., Gary, Ind.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: In rereading the quality stabilization bill introduced last month in the Congress, I could not help but think of the words used by District Judge Clarke in his March 14 decision in *U.S.* v. *General Motors Corp.* U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California, Central Division):

"The free-enterprise system is a basic part of the American way of life. Justice Holmes' suggestion 'to let people manage their own business in their own way, unless the ground for interference is very clear' is good advice. If the advice is heeded both by the courts and by government, I am confident that the United States will continue to be free, strong, and prosperous."

Judge Clarke has taken his stand. So have the 11 Senators and the 25 Members of the House that have cosponsored or introduced the quality stabilization bill.

The quality stabilization bill symbolizes our free competitive enterprise system at its best. This bill enables the brand name manufacturer vountarily to take the risks of marketing his own brand name product in certain prescribed and limited ways that insure free and open competition at all levels of distribution while protecting the consumer against deceptive and fraudulent practices. And it does this without supervision by any Government bureau and without adding one penny to the cost of Government.

Whether the brand name manufacturer elects to use the orderly marketing procedures that will be made possible by the Quality Stabilization Act is unimportant. That properly, under our free competitive enterprise system, is the individual decision of the brand name manufacturer. But the availability of his right to so market his own brand name goods is vital. That is why quick enactment of the quality stabilization bill is vital.

The ominous situation is that the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission have assumed authority in determining what the national economic policy should be. Whether this assumption of authority is constitutional or unconstitutional is beside the point, unless Congress now acts firmly with respect to the quality stabilization bill. Otherwise it will be surely too late to lock the barn door for the damage will be irreparable.

The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have harassed, undercut, hampered and destroyed the legal posture of the orderly marketing of brand name products. In indictment after indictment, in complaint after complaint, and order after order, these agencies, oblivious as they are to the realities of the marketplace, have unilaterally determined that competition between one manufacturer's brand against all other manufacturers' brands is not enough. They insist that any effort by a manufacturer to obtain orderly marketing by limiting destructive self-competition as to a single brand is a violation of the antitrust laws.

General Motors was indicted in California for conspiracy to keep Chevrolets out of discount channels. The position of the Department of Justice is that retailers are free to divert to discounters, and the producer, in effect, commits a crime if he tries to prevent this illicit traffic. Consider as well the plight of the franchised Chevrolet dealer in California. He can shut down his service facilities and go discount, or else he can become bankrupt by operating a free showroom for "brokers" and "referral services."

Orderly marketing in any sense is impossible if discounters have the right—enforceable by law—to purchase any trademarked product they choose to handle. Conversely, the Government seems to be saying that a manufacturer risks fine and imprisonment if he seeks to keep his products out of discount channels. If the Government's views are to prevail, no restriction on either the buyer or the seller will be countenanced.

This extreme position of the Department of Justice was not "lost" on Judge Clarke in the criminal case against General Motors. Judge Clarke said:

"The Government has argued that this criminal prosecution in no way represents an attack on the franchised dealer method of selling automobiles. I cannot agree.

"In applying the antitrust laws, it seems to me that a balance must be struck. The interest of the consumer in a freely competitive market must be protected. But, at the same time, industry has rights which also must be respected. In part, business has, or should have, the right to merchandise a product in a manner that the particular manufacturer determines to be the most feasible and the most competitive. Indeed, I believe that the best way to further the interest of the consumer is to allow business, large and small, to avail itself of the free enterprise system with as little Government interference as possible. This court feels, therefore, that its decision protects both the interests of the public and the interests of business * * *.

"In the instant case, General Motors, the manufacturer, has chosen the franchised dealership as the outlet best suited to the merchandising of Chevrolet automobiles. General Motors has made the further decision that discount houses and referral services are not the kinds of outlets for Chevrolet automobiles that will keep Chevrolet a leader in sales. At present, the discount

operation does not fit the bill because (1) the discount store does not offer service facilities; (2) the discount store is not run by men whom General Motors has handpicked as its representatives on the retail sales level; and (3) the discount store's automobile department is not run, as is a dealership, by a man having a large investment in his business who has a long-range view and will endeavor to maintain the public's confidence in, and goodwill toward, Chevrolet. In its broader aspects, the case presents this question: Despite the decision of General Motors, should the Government, through the antitrust laws, compel General Motors to adopt the discount houses and, with them, a method of merchandising not of General Motors' choosing? The court thinks not."

Judge Clarke thus has ruled that General Motors in a criminal way has not violated the antitrust laws. Now there begins the civil side of the case.

The Government in the General Motors case attempted to pin the label of "boycott" onto the activity of the car manufacturer. Its reason: a boycott is a "per se" violation of the antitrust laws for which there can be no justification.

The Government's equally determined position in recent cases involving Sandura, White Motor Co., Brown Shoe, etc., point up the urgency for action by Congress to resolve the central question presented in the Quality stabilization bill: May a trademark owner protect his property rights against a third party who seeks to exploit—to the point of destruction—that which he did not create?

The quality stabilization bill is property confirming legislation. It protects the property in the brand name by preventing its unauthorized use. It is submitted that the ownership of private property and the regulation of private property—in the sense that it can be controlled by its owner—constitutes the very basis of the free enterprise system. To own private property means in effect that one has certain rights to exclude others from the use and enjoyment thereof. Otherwise there is no such thing as private property.

The quality stabilization bill recognizes the property right that exists in a maker's reputation—his good name—his trademark. The quality stabilization bill provides in substance that the owner of the brand name can forbid the commercial use of his reputation to those who would abuse and destroy it.

Our best analogy comes from the law of real property. If you own a parcel of land, that ownership carries with it the right to exclude others as you will from the use of that property—simply because it "belongs" to you. Now it may be in your interest to permit others to use your property, but if ownership means anything, it means that you can deny the use of your property to those who would abuse it. This, in essence, is the quality stabilization bill.

A proper appraisal of the quality stabilization bill can be made in the light of *Bourjois* v. *Katzel*, 260 U.S. 629, 43 Supreme Court 244 (1923); section 526 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 46 Stat. 590, 19 U.S.C.A. 1337, and *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram Distillers Corp.* 299 U.S. 183 (1936). These cases and the cited statutory section stand for the proposition that the ownership of a brand name is a property right whose use by others can be limited.

Three circumstances are set out in the bill as circumstances which justify the withdrawal of the privilege to use the brand: (1) bait merchandising; (2) selling at other than the established price; and (3) misrepresentation.

The quality stabilization bill says, that if any of these acts are committed by a retailer, his right to make any further use of the brand may be denied to him by the owner, and such denial may be enforced in the courts. However, in order to meet the due process test, there is a provision against forfeiture of a financial interest by the retailer in reference to the merchandise he has on hand. Also, there are provisions in the bill which require fair and equitable conduct by the owner in exercising his rights thereunder.

It is noted that this approach regulates the use of the brand only. It does not interfere with any other use of the physical property or commodity. The unique merit of the quality stabilization approach is that it does no more than implement as established property right in the brand and no trade practice or policy is set forth that State courts have overruled.

Congress, as it has done by the Lanham Trademark Act, merely permits the trademark owner under the quality stabilization bill to regulate the use of his brand name which flows in commerce. It does not permit the brand owner to enforce a rigid price structure on the use of the product itself.

Under the quality stabilization bill there is no explicit or implied extension of regulatory power of the Federal Government over intrastate commerce. There is no invasion of States' rights. Nor is there the establishment by law of any trade practice or public policy that the courts of the States have protested.

The rights recognized by the quality stabilization bill are in essence an implementation of the rights as set out in the Colgate case (250 U.S. 300). This leading case, decided in 1919 by a unanimous Supreme Court, held that a producer could lawfully decide to whom he would sell his products, and to whom he would not sell. However, when branded goods fall into the hands of an unwanted customer, a reseller whose practices are highly undesirable, the Colgate-based right of the owner of the brand is made sterile. Under present law the owner of the brand must sit helplessly by while the trespasser, an uninvited and unwanted reseller, wreaks havoc with the brand and destroys its market. The quality stabilization bill will permit such brand name owner to vindicate his rightful interests promptly and effectively.

In the Colgate case, a unanimous U.S. Supreme Court said:

"The purpose of the Sherman Act is to prohibit monopolies, contracts, and combinations which probably would unduly interfere with the free exercise of their rights by those engaged, or who wish to engage, in trade and commerce, in a word, to preserve the right of freedom to trade. In the absence of any purpose to create or maintain a monopoly, the act does not restrict the long-recognized right of trader or manufacturer engaged in an entirely private business, freely to exercise his own independent discretion as to parties with whom he will deal. And, of course, he may announce in advance the circumstances under which he will refuse to sell. * * * In *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *John D. Park & Sons Co.*, supra, the unlawful combination was effected through contracts which undertook to prevent dealers from freely exercising the right to sell."

The quality stabilization bill logically extends the principle of the Colgate decision to resellers who are not sold directly by the trademark owner. The trademark owner electing to use the Quality Stabilization Act will announce in advance the circumstances (in consonance with its paragraph 8) under which the reseller will be denied further use of the trademark. Contracts or agreements are not involved.

The Colgate doctrine has never been considered "price fixing" in an antitrust sense. Legally speaking, price fixing has always been limited to arrangements based on agreement either expressed or implied. Colgate is not "price fixing." Neither is the quality stabilization bill.

Further consistency between the approach of the quality stabilization bill and these sound legal principles is reflected also in the language used by the unanimous U.S. Supreme Court in its Old Dearborn decision:

"The essence of the statutory violation then consists not in the bare disposition of the commodity, but in a forbidden use of the trademark, brank, or name in accomplishing such disposition. The primary aim of the law is to protect the property—namely, the good will—of the producer, which he still owns. The price restriction is adopted as an appropriate means to that perfectly legitimate end, and not as an end in itself.

"Appellants (resellers) here acquired the commodity in question with full knowledge of the then-existing restriction in respect of price which the producer and wholesale dealer had imposed, and, of course, with presumptive, if not actual knowledge of the law which authorized the restriction. Appellants were not obliged to buy; and their voluntary acquisition of the property with such knowledge carried with it, upon every principle of fair dealing, assent to the protective restriction, with consequent liability under section 2 of the law by which such acquisition was conditioned * * *.

"We find nothing in this situation to justify the contention that there is an unlawful delegation of power to private persons to control the disposition of the property of others, such as was condemned in *Eubank* v. *Richmond*, 226 U.S. 137, 143; *Seattle Trust Co.* v. *Roberge*, 278 U.S. 116, 121–122; and *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, 311. In those cases the property affected had been acquired without any pre-existing restriction in respect of its use or disposition. The imposition of the restriction in invitum was authorized after complete and unrestricted ownership had vested in the persons affected. Here, the restriction, already imposed with the knowledge of appellants, ran with the acquisition and conditioned it.

"Nor is section 2 so arbitrary, unfair, or wanting in reason as to result in a denial of due process. We are here dealing not with a commodity alone, but with a commodity plus the brand or trademark which it bears as evidence of its origin and of the quality of the commodity for which the brand or trademark stands. Appellants own the commodities; they do not own the mark or the goodwill that the mark symbolizes. And goodwill is property in a very real sense, injury to which, like injury to any other species of property, is a proper subject for legislation. Goodwill is a valuable contributing aid to business—sometimes the most valuable contributing asset of the producer or distributor of commodities. And distinctive trademarks, labels, and brands, are legitimate aids to the creation or enlargement of such goodwill. It is well settled that the proprietor of the goodwill 'is entitled to protection as against one who attempts to deprive him of the benefits resulting from the same, by using his labels and trademark, without his consent and authority.' *McLean* v. *Fleming*, 96 U.S. 245, 252. 'Courts afford redress or relief upon the ground that a party has a valuable interest in the goodwill of his trade or business, and in the trademarks adopted to maintain and extend it.' *Hanover Milling Co.* v. *Metcalf*, 240 U.S. 403, 412. The ownership of the goodwill, we repeat, remains unchanged, notwithstanding the commodity has been parted with. Section 2 of the act does not prevent a purchaser of the commodity bearing the mark from selling the commodity alone at any price he pleases. It interferes only when he sells with the aid of the goodwill of the vendor; and it interferes then only to protect that goodwill against injury * * *. There is nothing in the act to preclude the purchaser from removing the mark or brand from the commodity—thus separating the physical property, which he owns, from the goodwill, which is the prop-

erty of another—and then selling the commodity at his own price, provided he can do so without utilizing the goodwill of the latter as an aid to that end."

Thus the fresh approach of the quality stabilization bill, when enacted, will bring unusual advantages: (1) A logical court-tested basis for the protection of property rights in the marketing nationally of branded products; (2) one body of substantive law interpreting the statute; and (3) a remedy, directly related to the property right, that is effective and complete.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. ROTHWELL.

The Technological Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will take up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bill, providing $5.2 billion for civilian space programs for fiscal year 1964. The development of these programs and the question of our objectives should be given careful thought and consideration. I respectfully call to the attention of each Member of the House the following excerpts from the article, "The Technological Conflict," which appeared in the most recent issue of the Air University Quarterly Review, written by Col. Raymond S. Sleeper, Deputy Chief of Staff, Foreign Technology, Headquarters AFSC. Colonel Sleeper has previously served as Chief of War Plans, Cincpac, from 1957 to 1960 and as Assistant to the Deputy Chief of Staff, Foreign Technology.

Mr. Speaker, the instruments of strategy have historically been political, economic, psychological, or military, and in many cases, combinations of two or more of these. Today, another strategic tool has been added—technology. Although the United States has long held a superior position in this field, since the mid-fifties we have seen the Soviet Union challenge that position.

The excerpts follow:

During the cold war, it has been accepted that the military tends to be the enabling instrument of power. This means that so long as the United States retained preponderant military power this power deterred Soviet commitment of direct military aggression in spite of the fact that the Communist hierarchy was fully dedicated to world domination by all possible means. It also means that while the U.S. military preponderance deterred Soviet military aggression this power enabled the United States to employ economic, political, and psychological instruments of strategy to achieve the expressed U.S. objective of containing Communist expansion. We shall see that, in spite of our enjoying deterrent military power over the past 10 years, the Communists have made significant progress in undermining the power of the free world by means of political and psychological internal offensives against freemen and their governments in free nations.

Tibet and Cuba were the most recent victims of Communist aggression, in 1958 and in 1960. During the forties it was believed by many that the Soviets possessed the potential military power following World War II to invade Western Europe, but our atomic forces apparently did succeed in deterring this Soviet aggression that many feared. * * * Our strong military deterrent posture has enabled our economic, political, and psychological instruments of power to keep West Europe free and to reestablish her power.

On the other side of the world we have also succeeded in building strength in Japan, in the Philippines, and to some degree in certain other free nations that are allied to the United States * * *. Without for one moment degrading the great value of positive U.S. economic and military aid throughout free nations, it is nevertheless very sobering to view the progress the Soviets are making in undermining free nations.

In the 1955 period some military analysts believed the United States, together with its allies, not only had the military power to deter Soviet aggression but clearly had the capability to persuade the Communists to behave in a manner acceptable to the family of free nations. This was essentially the root conviction that led to John Foster Dulles' policies of "brinkmanship," when he was saying that we would respond in a manner and with weapons of our choice in order to discourage Communist aggression into Indochina.

In the Lebanon crisis and again in the Taiwan Strait crisis of 1958 the deployment of significant U.S. military power persuaded the Communists not to embark upon aggression in those areas. In 1960 and 1961, however, the Communist internal offensives in the Congo and in Cuba were not dissuaded by the presence of U.S. and United Nations military power. Similarly, the presence of the 7th Fleet off the coast of Vietnam has not dissuaded the Communist internal offensive against the free governments of Laos and South Vietnam. Cuba, Laos, and South Vietnam are the obvious examples of Communist internal offensives which are now being waged against free nations. It is important to recognize that these separate conflicts in Asia and in the Americas are the fruition of careful Communist plans for internal aggression which are taking place in all free countries and which simply happen to be most evident in these countries at present. Moreover, these internal Communist offensives are not being deterred by U.S. military power.

The Communist strategy for internal offensive action is not infallible. It can be defeated in the present and future as it has been defeated in the past. What is essential, however, is a full recognition of the strategy and the necessity for positive, continuing preventive action * * *. The counter-methods are similar in each case. They are known. It is only important here to recognize that the Communist internal offensive against free nations can be defeated. But it is necessary for the United States to enjoy freedom of action in these areas if we intend to prevent Communist takeovers. We will enjoy less and less freedom of action in these areas if Communist forces grow stronger than ours and deny us freedom of action.

Now if the Soviets should make a major breakthrough in developing new weapons, they could conceivably gain military superiority, at least in some military sphere. If we have now succeeded in closing the missile gap, the most serious threat in the near future would appear to be the early development by the Soviets of the military capability to dominate near space. This capability could consist of antisatellite missiles, maneuverable satellites with offensive capabilities, satellite interceptors, or other similar developments. If the Soviets should achieve control of near space, the results could be most grave. They would be able to preempt our atomic striking capability to a large degree. They could exercise control over much that transpires on the surface of the earith and in the atmosphere. They would probably attempt to keep us within the atmosphere. In short, they would attempt to realize all the benefits that the surrounder has over those who are surrounded. The Soviets have given us repeated warnings that they intend to dominate space for important military and political reasons. It is wishful thinking to hope that they will not use their significant lead in space to facilitate their political and military goal of dominating the world. It is obvious that this situation must be prevented. It can be prevented by technology.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL INSTRUMENT OF STRATEGY

Military power has traditionally been the enabling instrument of national power. * * * As one studies the relative military power of the United States and the Soviet Union over the last 10 years, it is clear that the Soviets, by rapidly developing atomic power, jet bombers, jet fighters, intercontinental missiles, and earth satellites, have reduced the advantages originally held by the United States. * * * The greatest opportunities for significant changes in military power derive from the technological instrument of power. It appears that the technological instrument of power will be the instrument which may enable one of these nations to gain a major power advantage over the other.

We should note * * * the major jumps in aerospace capabilities that take place in moving from the atmosphere to space. In the 1955 period, when the philosophy of air control, having been quite fully developed at Air University, was being considered by the Air Staff as a contribution to national strategy designed to deter enemy aggression, the most difficult aspects to accept were the requirements for large numbers of aircraft in order for the United States to patrol and gain control of the air over potential enemy areas and thereby significantly control the behavior of such an enemy. The major jumps in altitude, speed, and range produced by leaving the atmosphere give spacecraft the capabilities required to effectively control space (at least in given areas) in such a manner that present nuclear strike forces may be preempted. This might be done in a number of ways.

1. Conceivably the U.S.S.R. might develop such an effective aerospace defensive capability as to deny the United States the ability of confidently launching an effective nuclear attack. Such a development is not very probable, but it must be considered. The relative missile strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union are, of course, important in this context * * * while there appear to be new missile developments in the offing, these developments do not seem to promise major breakthroughs in the overall growth of strategic capabilities.

2. Another and probably more likely method of controlling space would be to combine elements of both defensive and offensive systems into the most effective military space force possible. This might then permit the Soviet Union to restrict our use of space in such a manner as to make a nuclear strike launched by missiles and aircraft impractical and possibly very difficult. The implications of such a development are quite interesting. Assume, for example, that one nation over a period of time builds in great secrecy and then suddenly launches an overwhelming force of spacecraft that have significant offensive bombing and interception capability. Assume that elements of this space-alert force are overlying the second nation at all times—in fact, they are patrolling its skies.

Under these postulated conditions the second country's strategic retaliatory power is to a significant degree preempted. The initiation of nuclear war in response to such

a patrol force would seem unlikely. Yet the political-psychological impact of such a spaceborne force on the leadership and populace of the second nation would probably cause fundamental accommodation of its national objectives to those of the first nation.

Is this what Gromyko had in mind by his remark on 23 December 1960? "The time has come when it is possible to cut short the attempts by the aggressors to start world war. More, conditions are being created in which war can be eliminated for good from the life of human society." Whatever the answer to this question may be, no elaboration of the gravity of the potential threat of the Soviets developing a capability to restrict our freedom in space is needed. It is clear that the Soviets must not be permitted to win a military technological superiority in space. The conflict must be won by the United States, not for cold-war advantages, not for national prestige purposes, but for vital national survival. In winning this race our goal is not to dominate any nation or to dominate space. Our goal should probably be to attain the capability to prevent any hostile force from dominating space. To put it in positive terms, our goal should be to insure the peaceful use of space.

A TECHNOLOGICAL STRATEGY NEEDED

If the United States and the U.S.S.R. are waging technological conflict—and the evidence is clear that they are—then the United States needs a national technological strategy to win this conflict. * * * Such a strategy does not seem to exist in any coherent form. Moreover, the technological strategy needed must fit into or pattern, as the case may be, our military, economic, political, and psychological strategy.

The establishment of such a national objective in space and explanation of the importance of this objective constitute a most urgent undertaking.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL BATTLE AREAS

As in any broad conflict, it is helpful and instructive to analyze the specific areas of conflict. In the technological war we can distinguish several specific areas.

(a) Fundamental to all areas of the conflict is the national base of education and spirit of the people.

(b) The next important area of technological conflict lies in basic and applied research. * * * There is a lot of evidence that basic and applied research need far more national and popular support in the United States than they are now receiving.

(c) One of the most cricital battle areas in the technological war is aeronautical systems technology. * * * The present U.S. inventory of aerodynamic vehicles is superior to that of the Soviets. * * * But where are the Soviets going in aerodynamic systems in the future? Are they developing new aerodynamic systems that would be significantly superior to those that we now have in our inventory or on the drawing boards?

(d) The Soviets stole an early lead on the United States in the development of missiles by vigorously exploiting German technology. * * * On March 17, 1962, Khrushchev boasted that the Soviets then had huge new invulnerable missiles that could travel over 20,000 miles to the target. Such missiles could probably carry new, large warheads.

(e) We have made significant progress in our own space programs, but we must be frank and recognize that the Soviets have clearly demonstrated a superior booster capability, they have acquired a superior knowledge of bioastronautics, and they enjoy a superior spacecraft payload capability. It is pure wishful thinking to believe for a moment that the Soviets will not militantly exploit this lead in space technology to achieve their objectives in dominating the world.

(f) We believe that the United States is probably ahead in command and control systems. * * * Nevertheless, close study of the Soviet communication system, such as that done by Dr. Alex Inkeles at the Harvard Russian Research Center, leads us to suspect that the Soviets have achieved command and control systems fully adequate for their purposes.

(g) Soviet progress in the development of nuclear weapons has been phenomenal. * * * It is clear today that the Soviets were vigorously preparing for new tests during the period when we obligingly stood down our nuclear technological development forces. * * * It is clear that the Soviets made great strides forward in this critical technological battle area, and that we must continue to press ahead if we intend to maintain nuclear weapons deterrent capability against the Soviet Union.

The battle areas in the technological war are all critical to our national security. Significant defeat in any one area will provide the Soviets with a breakthrough which they will exploit in their quest for world power. Since the end result of a successful technological strategy is to achieve significant military superiority, it may be helpful to at least suggest what appears to be the Soviet strategy.

Clearly the Soviets are embarked upon world domination. They recognize that in order to succeed in this goal they must achieve significant military superiority over the United States. They have invested large national resources in education and in basic and applied research facilities. In the aeronautical systems area, it appears that the Soviets feel confident they can defend themselves. In the missile area, the Soviets boast that they are well ahead of us. And they now boast that they have the capability to destroy our missiles on reentry. The Soviets as a nation have stressed the development of space capability. Here it appears that in the areas mentioned previously they enjoy a 2- to 4-year lead over the United States. It appears that the Soviet leaders are embarked upon a technological strategy of outflanking us in aerospace. It appears that they are embarking upon a major campaign to develop a military space capability which would in fact constitute a strategic aerospace envelopment. Thus, in old infantry language, the Soviets are conducting a vigorous holding attack in the aerodynamic and missile technological battle areas while executing a strategic aerospace envelopment in the space systems technological battle area.

The United States has operated for years on the assumption that we enjoy military technological superiority. New Soviet developments in basic and applied research, in aerodynamic systems and ballistic systems, in space systems, in nuclear weapons, and in the so-called exotic weapon areas (maser/laser, plasma research, and the like) give us serious cause to ask if this assumption is valid today.

The challenge is that we must mobilize our technological resources and plan our technological strategy for countering and controlling the new technological developments that we see appearing in the Soviet Union. And we must do this with great urgency and personal dedication.

Military Order of World Wars Urges Caution on Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, by resolution, the Military Order of the World Wars urged caution regarding the test ban treaty proposal as follows:

THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

RESOLUTION

Whereas the U.S. Senate is to be called upon by the executive branch of our Government to ratify a partial nuclear test ban treaty recently negotiated in Moscow; and

Whereas this proposed treaty will paralyze any effort on the part of the United States in the testing of high yield weapons, a field in which the U.S.S.R. is admittedly superior; and

Whereas this proposed treaty will permit unlimited testing in tactical nuclear weapons in which the U.S.S.R. is admittedly inferior; and

Whereas this proposed treaty will curtail, or seriously hamper, our efforts to develop an antimissile weapon at a time when, according to Khrushchev, the Soviets have "solved the problem of antimissile defense"; and

Whereas this treaty appears to be based on secret negotiations of undisclosed scope: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Military Order of the World Wars, at an official meeting in Washington, D.C., on July 27, 1963, That we urge the U.S. Senate to withhold ratification of this treaty until extended and thorough hearings determine its effect upon our national defense posture; and

That the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be consulted individually and freely regarding their professional opinion on the advantages and disadvantages of this proposed treaty; and

That Dr. Teller, other scientists, and military experts be also called upon to testify; and

That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of the U.S. Senate; and

That all chapters of the Military Order of the World Wars and individual companions be urged to contact their Senators requesting a careful and thorough evaluation of the proposed treaty.

To Authorize the Mailing of Lottery Tickets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 7856, which would authorize the transmission through the mails of lottery tickets and other material relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof.

I have introduced this bill because I believe that the Federal law prohibiting the transmission through the mails of lottery information should be amended so as to exclude State and local governments.

I am very much in favor of the recent action of the New Hampshire State Legislature in establishing a State lottery for the purposes of raising revenue to provide that State with more and better schools and hospitals and public debt amortization.

Governor King and the people of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for adopting a sensible solution to some of

the fiscal problems facing all of our State and local governments.

As an example of the kind of proposal which would be possible if my bill were adopted, I would cite the resolution put before the New York City Council by Councilman Morris Stein which would provide for the sale of non-interest-bearing bonds by the city of New York with a substantial prize if the purchaser's bond number is picked in a lottery. If the New York State law is amended to permit this, the lifting of the Federal prohibition would aid greatly in the sale of such bonds.

Handling Equipment Sales Spurt Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 7-percent investment tax credit and the liberalized depreciation allowances have not only stimulated investment in plant and equipment but have also resulted in substantial increases in related industries. Sales of materials handling equipment, for example, have risen 10 percent this year above 1962 levels.

I think the Members will be interested in the following article in the July 24, 1963, Journal of Commerce. It details the significant progress in the materials handling equipment industry this year.

The article follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, July 24, 1963]

HANDLING EQUIPMENT SALES SPURT AHEAD

(By Sidney Fish)

Sales of materials handling equipment this year have risen over 10 percent above the levels of 1962, and are running above any year since the Korean war. This is the second consecutive year in which sales of lift trucks, conveyors, overhead cranes and other handling equipment have shown a substantial increase.

Manufacturers of such equipment believe the boom in spending has been caused by the liberalized depreciation allowance authorized by the Treasury Department for income tax purposes. The 7 percent investment tax credit has also stimulated buying of materials handling equipment, by providing funds for purchases.

Higher labor costs are an additional factor contributing to spending for more efficient handling equipment, since the latter helps to reduce labor costs.

NEW ORDERS UP

In the first 5 months of this year new orders for materials handling equipment were 11 percent above the level of 1962, according to the Materials Handling Institute.

The May index of new orders was 150, which compared with 146 for April, and 131 for May 1962. In this index, the 1957–59 average is equal to 100.

The sharp rise in new orders reflects replacement of equipment that has been in use 10 years or more. It also represents some investments in new plants. New uses are also developing for materials handling equipment. Thus, Clark Equipment reports a demand for equipment for use on farms, in handling fruit crates and in heavy terrain applications. Clark says a wide variety of industries are ordering lift trucks in larger volume than a year ago.

The year started rather slowly, but new orders have steadily gained momentum since then. R. L. Fairbanks, executive vice president of Towmotor Corp., says his company, a maker of lift trucks, has been running 25 percent over a year ago. It has boosted its production schedules for the current quarter, because new orders are running ahead of forecasts.

The materials handling division of Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., estimated that 35 percent of the nearly 500,000 lift trucks in use are over 10 years old. Thus, an annual replacement market exists for about 30,000 new trucks a year.

Lift trucks and conveyors built today are substantially more efficient than those built 10 years ago. Hence, replacement of the old equipment results in cost savings that usually make the investment worth while. The big problem until this year has been to find the funds with which to replace obsolete equipment.

The easing of the U.S. Treasury's rules on depreciation allowances, and the new investment tax credit, have both made contributions toward supplying the funds needed for plant spending. Improvement in railroad purchases of lift trucks is ascribed to the new rules on depreciation and on tax credits.

ONE AND A HALF BILLION DOLLAR INDUSTRY

The materials handling industry grosses nearly $1.5 billion a year. Last year, after a period of price cutting, quotations stabilized, and the lift truck industry managed to put through a small price rise which stuck.

All of the lift truck producers are working hard on new models. The trend has been to develop models for special uses. Thus, R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., of Longview, Tex., has developed giant fork trucks which are capable of lifting 50 tons. Steel companies are inquiring for such trucks, and plan to use them for lifting steel sheet coils. Le Tourneau's backlog has been rising steadily.

Clark equipment is developing a 50-ton model, for heavy-duty work. A trend toward automatic handling of heavy materials is also reported.

Thus, Telemotive Division, of Dynascan Corp., has received large orders for radio-controlled systems for overhead cranes. The Gary works of United States Steel at Gary, Ind., has installed four such systems this year.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the death of anyone been felt as a personal loss by an entire country. When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt died last fall, a nation and, indeed, the whole world mourned.

Such affection and respect are not extended to every man and woman. Such sentiments are reserved for those who do not seek them, who in their daily living have exhibited the purest virtues, who know no prejudice, whose greatest love is mankind.

What Mrs. Roosevelt saw in 1948 as the ideal for a Declaration of Human Rights is what should guide men of all nations, races, and creeds. "Personal rights, such as freedom of speech, information, religion, and rights of property; procedural rights, such as safeguards for persons accused of crime; social rights, such as the right to employment and social security, and the right to enjoy minimum standards of economic, social, and cultural well-being; political rights, such as the right to citizenship and the right of citizens to participate in their Government."

Millions who knew such misery and dejection during the depression will long remember the humanitarian spirit which Mrs. Roosevelt brought to the White House. Those millions of us who have been so eager for the United Nations to succeed are well aware of and thankful for the hopeful enthusiasm which she has infused in that organization tirelessly and magnificently.

Eleanor Roosevelt will be remembered not because she sought fame, or reward, but because she had a deep sense of what she knew to be right and she spent her life seeking that goal.

A Fair, Impartial, and Controlled Test for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 598, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on now for many years; I believe it is now time to end the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary tests immediately and without further delay so that we may determine whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering caused by cancer and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the Congress so that those now using Krebiozen may continue to use it until the completion of the National Cancer Institute's tests. If there is the slightest chance that Krebiozen is helping those now using it, we must not allow the Food and Drug Administration to keep the drug from them.

The Patrick Cudahy Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last it was my privilege to join with community leaders of Cudahy, Wis., in paying tribute to the Patrick Cudahy Co. and the Cudahy family.

It was a particular honor to join in testimonials to Mr. Michael Cudahy and his son, Mr. Richard Cudahy, for carrying on the traditions of public service for which the Cudahy family has long been known.

It was Mr. Michael Cudahy's father, Patrick, who organized the now famous meatpacking firm and founded the community which bears his name and in which the Cudahy plant is located.

The history and activities of the Cudahy family should be an example and an inspiration to the businessmen of today. Those who are eager only for quick success and easy progress can well take a lesson from the story of the Cudahy family.

The Cudahy success was accomplished because from the very beginning of their business enterprises and throughout their history they had a firm goal. Moreover, they had the determination to reach that goal despite difficult economic trials, and tribulation, including wars and depressions. By their perseverance, they achieved their goals.

Today Patrick Cudahy Co. stands as a living tribute to their efforts. Under the present leadership of Richard Cudahy, the future bodes well for Patrick Cudahy Co., its employees, and the community.

The firm has one of the finest records of labor-management relations.

These facts were given eloquent expression at the testimonial banquet kicking off the Sweet Applewood Festival of the city of Cudahy, July 29–August 3. Mr. Harold Nicolaus, president of the Cudahy Marine Bank, principal speaker, thoroughly reviewed the history of the Cudahy family and its contributions to the community, the State of Wisconsin, and our Nation.

I commend Mr. Nicolaus' remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PATRICK CUDAHY STORY

Today we hear a great deal about a certain Irish family who immigrated to Boston some years ago from Ireland and whose three sons now live in Washington and occupy important posts in our Government. There is another family who immigrated to our country from Ireland but continued on past the eastern seaboard to Milwaukee.

The Patrick Cudahy story begins on St. Patrick's Day in 1849 in a little village in Ireland when Patrick Cudahy was born. This story unfolds like a typical Horatio Alger story with the hero a poor Irish lad who overcame obstacle after obstacle in his struggle to establish in this land of opportunity a packing business to be known first as Cudahy Bros. and later as Patrick Cudahy, Inc.

The Cudahy Marine Bank is currently using the slogan "Our job is getting things done." Although the slogan may be new, the philosophy behind it is not our exclusive property, and when we look back at the glorious history of Patrick Cudahy, Inc., we can see that even though the firm might not ever have formerly printed the slogan it has actually been the underlying philosophy that has guided the fate of this great company to which we are paying tribute tonight on the occasion of its diamond jubilee.

Patrick Cudahy was still an infant when he was brought to this country by his parents with his sister Catherine and his brothers Michael and John. Two other brothers William and Edward were born in this country.

Upon their arrival in Milwaukee the Cudahy family lived in a small home near what is now Eighth and Clybourn Streets and then they moved to a log cabin in the country south of Washington Park. The heavy timberland with trees measuring 3 to 4 feet in diameter in front of the cabin was called Cudahy's Woods and its fallen trees were cleared as firewood for the family. So thinly settled was the countryside at that time that Indians trading baskets and beads for food found a way to the Cudahy house.

Patrick Cudahy's early and lasting love for growing things was acquired as he watched his father perform what to this young lad must have seemed like wonders, at Beecher's Nursery. This love of nature led him to a job at Gifford's Nursery during the summer and eventually it counted for a hobby that led him to many years of service on Milwaukee County park boards. In fact it was his love of roses that brought about the formation of the Cudahy Floral Co. with George Scott. Later this company became Scott's Rose Gardens and is now on Grange Avenue.

Though a mere youth of 13, Patrick Cudahy already had entered the business world. Perhaps not in the most glamorous way, but the business world nevertheless; as a delivery boy for Heinecke's Grocery earning 25 cents a day. He had no fringe benefits, no social security, and no pension fund. His pay was indeed modest and when he left the store it was to a position that would double his salary to the magnificent sum of $3 a week. Most important the new job that Patrick Cudahy entered was to shape his future. For it was as a meat carrier for the Roddis Packing Co.

When Roddis ceased operations young Patrick Cudahy found another firm, Barthelet Theboo & Co., and continued his packing house experience. Part of his duties included packing 250 barrels of pork each day which was truly a man's job although he was only 17 years of age. He was then earning $75 a month. All these funds were turned over to his mother, as were the funds earned by other members of the Cudahy family until they were 21 years of age. In the summer months when work was slow at the packing company, Patrick Cudahy learned the stonecutter's trade. He not only cut stone in Milwaukee but also in surrounding cities.

His hard work and determination attracted the attention of Phillip Armour who at that time was a junior partner of Plankinton & Armour. It was on Armour's recommendation that young Patrick Cudahy, now a seasoned 22 years old, was named superintendent of a new packing firm known as Lyman & Wooley.

Three years later, again on the recommendation of Armour, Patrick Cudahy was named to be superintendent of the large Plankinton & Armour plant. At that time Armour took Michael Cudahy, Patrick's older brother, to Chicago to run his plant there. Michael was later to have great influence upon that firm's growth.

Another Cudahy entered the picture in 1877 when Edward, the youngest of the Cudahy brothers, became part of the Armour Cudahy Packing Co. in Omaha. In 1890 Michael sold his interest in Armour & Co., purchased Armour's interest in the Armour Cudahy Packing Co., and formed the Cudahy Packing Co. of Omaha.

During the period when Michael Cudahy and Armour were spreading out and expanding Patrick Cudahy's energy, alertness, and initiative gained him the attention and admiration of old John Plankinton. The young man assumed more and more of the management burdens of the meatpacking plant.

In 1888 when Patrick Cudahy was 31 his loyalty and hard work were rewarded with a sixteenth interest in the business. This new success prompted him to work even harder for now what was known as John Plankinton & Co.

It is interesting to note that John Plankinton started in business in 1844 with a butcher shop on the site that is now Gimbels store, and it was through the help of the Marine Co., which was a forerunner of the Marine National Exchange Bank, that John Plankinton got a start in the packing business.

Seventy-five years ago, in 1888, the elder Plankinton retired and Patrick Cudahy with his brother John formed a new company that bore the family home Cudahy Bros.

In 1890 packinghouses were looked upon by the city of Milwaukee as undesirable additions to a community, so in 1892 Patrick Cudahy decided to build a new plant south of Milwaukee's city limits and set up a model village. Seven hundred acres were purchased and work was begun, financed partly by Patrick and John. The stock market crash of 1893 completely wiped out John's fortune which he had made on the Chicago Board of Trade.

Undaunted and convinced that his plans were sound Patrick borrowed all the money he could raise and managed to complete his plant and started operations in 1893 despite the fact that most of the country was in a financial panic. Here again Patrick Cudahy proved that his job was getting things done despite the perilous times.

Patrick Cudahy became a one man chamber of commerce. Through his efforts as time went on a number of industrial plants located in our city. Among these were:

1. A chemical works on the lake shore. Afterwards it was converted to Milwaukee Vinegar Co. Several years ago the land was purchased by the Milwaukee County Park Commission. The firm now has its headquarters in Milwaukee as Universal Foods.

2. The Power Mining & Machinery Co. which was organized by a number of former officers of the E. T. Allis Co. Later Power Mining was purchased by the Worthington Pump & Machinery Corp. and moved East. Geo. J. Meyer & Manufacturing Co. now occupies the building.

3. The Milwaukee Rubber Co. which later became the Federal Rubber Co. later bought out by Fisk Rubber Co., and unfortunately in 1930 some of the buildings were demolished. However, some still remain and are occupied by various smaller industries.

4. The Helmholz Mitten Co. is no longer in existence. These buildings are occupied by Worldsbest Industries, Inc.

5. The Obenberger Drop Forge Co. later became Ladish Drop Forge Co. and is now known as Ladish Co.

These concerns were all offered inducements to locate in Cudahy and Mr. Cudahy invested in most of them to show his faith in their future.

The area of productive farmland along Lake Michigan's shore also had another advantage. It was accessible to the Chicago & North Western Railroad, whose trains occasionally stopped at a wayside station known as Buckhorn. Near the station popped up a general store, an inn and several homes. Streets were laid out checkerboard fashion and named after other well-known meatpackers.

Mr. John Cudahy, a brother of Patrick Cudahy, although never active in the affairs of the company always retained his interest and was of great assistance by his counsel and encouragement.

In 1895 the population around the Cudahy plant was sufficient to permit the organization of a village. For the name of the new community its citizens fittingly enough selected Cudahy, a name which incidently the railroad company had already adopted for its former Buckhorn Station.

By the time, in 1906, that Cudahy actually became a city the Cudahy Brothers plant formed in the midst of a financial panic, had become one of the most successful packing operations in the Nation. Trade connections had been made in every important city in the United States and Canada, as well as markets in England, Ireland, Germany, and Sweden. A far cry indeed from the company's humble beginning.

In 1877 Patrick Cudahy had married Anna Madden, a devoted wife and mother to their two sons Michael and John, and six daughters. Some of the childhood of the Cudahys were spent in their home on 13th Street and Grand Avenue, not too far from what is now The Wisconsin Club. Later they built a larger home on Prospect Avenue where they lived for years in a large home now owned by the College Womens Club.

John, the younger son of Patrick Cudahy, had a most varied career. He practiced law for 4 years, successfully operated a large ranch in Mexico, went into the real estate business, and later was appointed Ambassador to Poland and Minister to Ireland. He had been appointed Ambassador to Belgium and arrived there in time to inform President Roosevelt of the invation of Belgium only hours before it happened in World War II. He was later to become Chairman of the Office of Civilian Defense for the State of Wisconsin. Shortly after he was killed in an accident while riding a horse.

Tradition has it that the oldest son in the family carries on the family business. Therefore, it was natural that Patrick Cudahy's older son, Michael, was destined to manage the family packing business, and according to Patrick Cudahy's autobiography his son Michael was well equipped for the task He writes as follows, "Our oldest boy, Michael, is with me in business. He is our treasurer and vice president as well as one of our directors. He is a coolheaded fellow. Thinks before he speaks. He does a lot of deep thinking. In fact he has all the qualifications that are required in our business. He has been with me only about a year now and has already gotten things well in hand. He is one of the commonsense kind and I believe he will be able to carry the load all right when it is dumped on him, and that may be pretty soon." Mr. Cudahy entered the company in 1906 and was elected treasured and a member of the board of directors in December, 1908. In 1909 he was made vice president and 1913 assumed executive management of the business.

In 1909 the Cudahy State Bank was founded by my father, Charles Nicolaus, and David Rosenheimer, with a capitalization of $25,000. The bank opened for business in October, and in January of the following year Michael Cudahy was elected president, a position he held for 3 years. During this time the small bank struggled for deposits for growth. Today we are proud to report that our assets are $16 million and we are honored to have on our board, as a director, a member of the distinguished family that has meant so much to us all, Richard D. Cudahy, president of Patrick Cudahy, Inc.

World War I interrupted the business career of Michael Cudahy as he served his country abroad as an officer in the American Expeditionary Forces.

In 1919 Patrick Cudahy died and Michael Cudahy became president of Cudahy Brothers at the age of 33. He was dedicated to its progress and followed the sound principles laid down by his father Patrick.

Mr. Michael Cudahy is an extremely modest and reserved man. He has interests in fishing, sports, and music. His charities, like his father's, are unostentatious. One particular subject which he is very enthusiastic about is the Marquette Medical School, of which he was a trustee, which he feels has made a splendid contribution to the community.

Mr. Claude Robarge, vice president of Patrick Cudahy, Inc., has informed me that there are four outstanding contributions which Michael Cudahy has brought to the meat packing industry

1. Canned ham prepared with real champagne.
2. Sliced dried beef in tins instead of glass. This I am told is still an exclusive product of Patrick Cudahy.
3. Sweet Applewood smoked meats.
4. Honey cured hams. Usually ham is cured with sugar.

Michael Cudahy has many things to be proud of, but his greatest pride is in his only son Richard D. Cudahy, who at 35 years of age assumed the presidency of Patrick Cudahy, Inc. He was a graduate with high honors from Country Day School, West Point, and Yale Law School. Dick Cudahy was a successful attorney in Chicago, but the family business made its demands on him and he moved to Milwaukee and assumed the presidency of the family corporation. Dick has carried on the family tradition of doing whatever they can for the city of Cudahy. Two years ago Dick and several aldermen, the mayor, and I drove to Madison, called on the governor, our State senator and assemblyman and tried to do what we could to have Pennsylvania Avenue widened through the various cities south of us to form a trucking route from Chicago to Milwaukee. Dick is on the board of Trinity Memorial Hospital and at a fund raising style show just a few months ago, his wife took a very prominent part. Few people know that Dick is a lecturer at the Marquette University Law School. In addition, he has written several fine articles which have been printed in the Marquette Law Review. Just a few weeks ago Dick was a guest at a State Department dinner in Washington given for the President of the Republic of Tanganyika.

Dick has made many changes in the family company to keep it up to date in line with new methods of distribution, promotion and product development. I am told that a few days ago the company got an order for 49,000 pounds of sliced bacon from an outlet in California which had never before sold Patrick Cudahy products. It may be of interest to you gentlemen to know that the men who recently conquered Mount Everest carried dried beef processed at Patrick Cudahy. The officials at Patrick Cudahy were very much concerned when they saw the menu and could not find Patrick Cudahy dried beef on it. On making inquiry they found that only venison was on the menu because in India, where Mount Everest is located, beef cannot be eaten. However, packages which were marked venison actually contained Patrick Cudahy dried beef.

This, gentlemen, is the Cudahy story, told without any fictitious elaboration. Unfortunately because of time much had to be omitted.

All of us who make our homes in this fine community and have brought up our children and our grandchildren on the shores of Lake Michigan owe a great debt to the family who made all this possible. Cudahy has a fine reputation as a community for schools, churches and progressive industries, of beautiful parks, recreation areas, of clean government and civic achievement. All this is directly traceable to the Irish immigrant whose vision and foresight was to create not just a place for his packing plant, but a community of which all its residents are to be proud.

Our job is getting things done. This philosophy certainly has been epitomized by the Cudahy family and I have been proud to have been able to pay just a small tribute to this very wonderful family and company.

Canal Zone Cleanout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Richmond News Leader of July 23, 1963, should be required reading for all of us who have the welfare of our country at heart. The Panama Canal is a waterway vital not only to our defense, but to our commerce—almost three-quarters of the goods carried through it are either outbound from or inbound to the United States. For reasons that are not at all clear, the State Department, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Army, has embarked on a scheme to surrender more and more of the property needed for canal operation to the Republic of Panama. Only recently the House passed H.R. 3999, to insure that the Congress receives advance information regarding canal giveaways, and it is now before the Senate. It is my belief that this bill constitutes the minimum we need to protect ourselves against the ever-increasing demands of Panama.

The editorial follows:

CANAL ZONE CLEANOUT

What was remarkable about the national plan which Panama presented to the Organization of American States last week? Well, it was a thick 935-page document. But could Panama afford enough specialists to do that much planning? No, the United States paid for it through the Alliance for Progress. Well, what's remarkable about that? Plenty, Panama's plan, paid for by the United States is a step-by-step outline for doing away with U.S. jurisdiction in the Canal Zone.

Accordingly, the OAS accepted the plan immediately. This brilliant plan needed no revision, according to the wise elders of the OAS. It would commit the Alliance for Progress to spend $438 million over the next 8 years to enable Panama to assume the control functions of the canal. The remaining $862 million called for in the plan would come from Panamanian resources—presumably much enlarged by the canal takeover.

All of this was front-page news in Panama City, but it went unnoticed when the OAS officials met to accept the plan in Washington. No doubt no one in Washington actually has read the voluminous document except those in the State Department who want to get the Yankees out of the Canal Zone. However, last April 16 the plan was fully explained to Panamanian businessmen by Panama planning director David Samudio. Among those in the audience applauding Samudio was Panama's President Roberto Chiari. He loved every word of it.

Samudio modestly asserted that all he wanted was to do away with the Canal Zone concept. His Alliance for Progress experts had pointed out that the only way to solve Panama's economic problems was to take advanatge of its geographical position

as a transit route. With the aid of these experts sent out by the U.S. State Department, Samudio decided that the waterway could remain in operation as before but the benefits should be placed fully in Panamanian hands.

It has been no secret that the State Department is trying to pull the United States out of the Canal Zone. Remarking that he was out to slaughter some "sacred cows," the zone's Governor, Robert J. Fleming, Jr., has ordered the flying of the Panamanian flag on U.S. territory and the use of Panamanian postage. When suit was brought against him by U.S. citizens, the U.S. Justice Department replied that Fleming was engaged in the conduct of international affairs and under the express command of the President.

On the practical side, the Panama Canal is too vital to the United States to be run by amateurs—and Panama's Government can't even keep the garbage collected in Panama City, according to residents. On the international scale, U.S. prestige and sovereignty sink lower among those who hold us in contempt. We have a lot of rotten garbage of our own to clean out.

The Lincoln Trail in Western Illinois: Shrine for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, through the picturesque country of western Illinois from the land of Huckleberry Finn on the Mississippi to the historic city of Springfield, a traveler is able to see a rich heritage of Americana. All U.S. citizens should make pilgrimage to western Illinois, shrine of Midwest America.

The 20th Congressional District of Illinois is famous in Abraham Lincoln's life not only for Springfield, his home town and place of burial, but for many other communities such a Beardstown, Quincy, Mount Sterling, and Carthage.

"The Lincoln Trail and Attractions in Western Illinois," an article in the Quincy Herald-Whig, describes the Lincoln Heritage Trail and the booklets recently printed by the State of Illinois to publicize the historic Land of Lincoln:

THE LINCOLN TRAIL AND ATTRACTIONS IN WESTERN ILLINOIS

Illinois was so closely connected with the life of Abraham Lincoln that there is hardly a county that has no contact with the Civil War President. Yet until lately the history-inclined visitor from out-State visited only the Lincoln Tomb and home in Springfield and perhaps the reconstructed New Salem village where Lincoln lived as a young bachelor.

The Lincoln Heritage Trail was organized to remedy that situation. It will not, of course, include all the Lincoln spots.

The Heritage Trail promotion was launched in Chicago early this month, with the first showing of a 52-page booklet of pictures and text listing major points of interest along the Lincoln Trail.

Ralph Newman of Chicago is president of the trail council which has the official cooperation of State agencies. Newman, Lincoln authority, spoke in Quincy last winter at the annual dinner of the Civil War Round Table.

Major attraction: Abraham has been for a century Illinois No. 1 travel attraction. Millions of persons have visited the tomb and home in Springfield. The old Sangamon courthouse, recently acquired by the State, will be restored to its former appearance as the State capital and is expected to be the center of Lincoln travel interest.

But there is much more in all parts of Illinois, as well as Indiana and Kentucky. Lincoln lived in all three States, but from age 20 until his death he claimed Illinois as his home.

The Lincoln Heritage Trail is being marked with 3,000 black and goal roadside signs, so that the tourist may follow it from its origin in Kentucky across the southwestern part of Indiana, into Illinois at Vincennes, to the first Lincoln home near Decatur, to Springfield and New Salem and to Vandalia where Lincoln served as a State legislator.

This is the central tour. There are two other loops, the southern and the western.

Quincy is the western point of its loop. The trail leads from New Salem park to Beardstown, Mount Sterling, and Quincy. From here it continues to Warsaw and Nauvoo, Monmouth, Galesburg, Peoria, and Bloomington, rejoining the central trail at Lincoln, only Illinois city named for the president.

A week's tour: To do justice to the subject, one should spend a week on the Lincoln trail. There is scenery as well as history, especially along the Mississippi River, and things other than Lincoln to interest the traveler.

The trail booklets provide a quick summary of the attractions. The Quincy page carried a picture of the Lincoln-Douglas plaque in Washington Park. This was one of the seven debate cities. It tells of Quincy's origin, carved out of the War of 1812 bounty lands, of the old village of the Sacs and Foxes here, of the use of John Quincy Adams' name in Adams County and Quincy.

It tells of the statue by Cornelius Volk of Gov. John Wood, the city's founder, of his handsome home, now the home of the Historical Society, of the Erroke Museum, the Soldiers' Home and Quincy College.

Of Mount Sterling, it relates the major campaign speech made there by Lincoln in 1858, of the old courthouse where Stephen A. Douglas presided and of General Singleton who once lived in Brown.

Beardstown holds especial interest for the Lincoln scholar. The city is not far from Lincoln's New Salem home. The old courthouse where Lincoln successfully defended the Armstrong boys, accused of murder, still is in use, as a city hall. In Beardstown, Lincoln was commissioned captain of militia at the outset of the Black Hawk war.

Nauvoo and Warsaw are not especially Lincoln country, but no one should miss seeing them. Warsaw is the site of old Fort Edwards where Zachary Taylor commanded. Nauvoo, the old Mormon city, once largest settlement in Illinois, is the State's most unusual and interesting old town, with many of the original Mormon buildings still standing. It is now in process of being restored. Carthage has both Lincoln and Mormon memories.

Quincy's rich past: Lincoln visited Quincy twice, but he carried on a lifelong correspondence with Quincy persons. The Brownings were among his closest friends. Browning's last home now is a part of St. Joseph Hospital. Scores of others were Lincoln's friends—Abraham Jonas, John Tillson, Henry Sullivan, Almeron Wheat, Archibald Williams, to whom Lincoln offered a place on the Supreme Court, Henry Asbury and John Wood. Lincoln contemporaries included Col. William Richardson, I. N. Morris, Barney Arntzen.

Perhaps the most famous Quincy resident of the period was Stephen A. Douglas, Lincoln's friend and political opponent, who died urging the Nation to support the President. Douglas claimed Quincy as his home for 11 years, served as judge of the circuit court here, was three times elected to Congress from this district.

There are many things locally to remind the visitor of our romantic past. A central Illinois man who visited Quincy on the Illinois Historical Society spring tour last year said recently that this city has more beautiful old houses with historical background than any other city in the State. Many of the homes of Civil War days still are in use and are in good condition. Others have been permitted to deteriorate, but looking down on the great river from the north or south bluffs one may envision conditions a century ago when the river teemed with steamboats.

A beginning: Illinois has neglected too long its appeal to vacation travel. This is only a beginning. The 100,000 copies of the trail booklet must be followed by many other pamphlets telling the world of the things the Midwest has to offer.

An Alternative Labor Force—Its Costs, Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following information with respect to Public Law 78 has been provided by the Council of California Growers:

AN ALTERNATIVE LABOR FORCE—ITS COSTS, PROBLEMS

Any alternative to the bracero program for California agriculture must be weighed in both human and economic terms.

One alternative being proposed in legislative halls is the recruitment, plus transportation and housing, for family workers from labor surplus areas, primarily the Deep South.

Conservative estimates show that between 40,000 to 50,000 families would be needed to fill the gap left by the loss of braceros in California. At peak harvest in 1962, California farmers employed approximately 70,000 braceros.

With California farmers already paying the highest wages in the Nation, and paying higher freight costs than their competitors in distant markets, many of them would be forced out of business under the added costs of such an alternate program.

California taxpayers also would suffer increased burdens * * * for additional school classrooms, for more teachers, for added police, fire, recreation, street and sanitary services. And, not the least, for welfare

Braceros come to the United States singly, without their families, and remain in this State only during peak harvest periods.

Imported families, however, would not return to their former homes when the harvests are ended. More likely, they would remain in California. Many would need some relief assistance. Forty thousand families would mean approximately 200,000 new people in the State.

The uprooting of such families for temporary employment, with extended periods of unemployment, could only add to their social ills.

They Are Not Government Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in Baptist Message magazine, July 11, 1963:

THEY ARE NOT GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

The Supreme Court's ruling banning Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer in public schools was not met with the emotional response which followed the Court's ruling on the New York Regents Prayer case. One reason is that many have had time to reflect and now concur with that decision, as well as the latest ruling.

There are still those who disagree and feel that their reasons are valid. They link religion and patriotism and are of the opinion that the two should not be divorced, that the desires of the majority should overrule those of the minority, and that there should be a state expression of religion to duel with "secularism."

One of the primary questions in consideration of the Court's decision is: "How separate should government and God be?" Organizationally, they must be entirely separate. In terms of values, morality, and the goals of life they must not be separate.

The Supreme Court ruled wisely in 1962. It is not the business of government to write the prayers which the citizens are to pray—nor to require that the Citizens must pray at all—nor to demand that they must read the Bible.

Religion is a private matter and the state has no responsibility to support it in any way. If the government supports one religion, it forces those who subscribe to other religions to shoulder the expense involved. If the government supports all religions, it forces those who subscribe to no religion to support that in which they do not believe.

A church historian in 1857 wrote, "The glory of America is a free Christianity; independent of the secular government, and supported by the voluntary contributions of a free people. This is one of the greatest facts in modern history."

Historically and presently we cannot in the name of religion force the irreligious among us to a commitment they do not freely make. The method of the Pharisees was one of coercion.

Freedom of religion includes freedom from religion, freedom of irreligion, at least with respect to one's own personal participation or involvement.

"Secularism, or various nonreligious views, did not come into our world as the result of some state policy or some state neglect but arose from much deeper sources in the nature of our age. Similarly, such views will not be defeated, nor even significantly impeded, by any state enforced public recognition of God or act of worship. Indeed, it has been the faith of the voluntary tradition that such state religion, far from helping to preserve the religious substance in a people, works rather to decay it. There are three reasons why, as it seems to me, we should not actively defend state religious services, like the New York regents prayer, the Lord's prayer and Bible reading in the schools: compulsion; empty ritual; civic religiosity" (William Lee Miller, "A Journal of Church and State").

There is little good to be said of religion which is nothing but a lazy habit or is perfunctory in nature.

In his concurring opinion Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., a Catholic, quoted C. Emanuel Carlson, director of Baptist public affairs, as saying, "When one thinks of prayer as sincere outreach of the human soul to the Creator, 'required prayer' become an absurdity."

One minister has said, "The more we attempt as Christians or Americans to insist on common denominator religious exercise or instruction in the public schools, the greater risk we run of diluting our faith and conrtibuting to a vague religiosity which identifies religion with patriotism and becomes a national folk religion."

The Supreme Court could not have ruled otherwise for the first amendment to the Constitution forbids "establishment" of religion. The Court's decision is not hostile to religion, but is a safeguard to and for religious liberty. Prayer and Bible reading are not government property. Neither are the youth of the land.

The responsibility for religious instruction falls squarely on the home and the church. As parents we need to realize that we cannot shift or transfer the responsibility of moral and religious training of our youth to the public schools.

How can some parents violently disagree with the Court's decision when they do not pray with or read the Bible to their children? Such is a distorted view of parental responsibility.

The only two institutions ordained of God which are responsible for the spiritual nurture and admonition of our children are the home and church—beginning with the home. If the decision does nothing else it should compel Christian families and churches to seriously review their central task and look for effective ways of instructing our youth in spiritual matters.

It is a ringing challenge to ministers and laymen alike to redouble their efforts in strengthening the home spiritually.

In the words of H. B. Sissel, a Presbyterian minister writing for the June 18 issue of Look magazine, "Churches and synagogues, clergymen and churchgoers, all must regain the unique sense of purpose and mission that God has given them to perform by a worship within and witness without. All need to face, and to deal with, the urgent problems bound up in the issue of chuch and state. And all need to recognize that when men of faith begin to look to the state as a pillar of religion the edifice of faith they seek to save has already begun to collapse."

Loss of the Bracero Program: Some Possible Effects in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following information with respect to Public Law 78 has been provided by the Council of California Growers:

LOSS OF THE BRACERO PROGRAM: SOME POSSIBLE EFFECTS IN CALIFORNIA

Refusal of Congress to extend the bracero program beyond the December 31, 1963, expiration of Public Law 78 poses serious economic results not only to California's $3.35 billion agricultural industry, but also to the hundreds of industries which either sell to or buy from the growers of crops that depend heavily upon braceros.

Unless an adequate substitute labor force can be quickly and economically assembled, the outlook may be summarized as follows:

(1) Substantial cutbacks in the acreages of such labor-intensive crops as tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, lemons, lettuce, melons and celery.

(2) The movement of many California growers to Mexico.

(3) Increased imports of such crops into the United States from Mexico.

(4) Consequent loss of jobs in the many California plants which process, store and package these crops.

(5) Consequent loss of jobs in the numerous industries which supply the growers of these important crops.

(6) Increased mechanization, with a further squeezing out of those farmers who cannot afford the high costs.

(7) Decreased tax revenue from agriculture and the multitude of industries related to it.

The Wilderness Is for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of July 29 entitled "The Wilderness Is for Everyone," chronicling why the Congress should give urgent and favorable consideration to the wilderness bill:

THE WILDERNESS IS FOR EVERYONE

The wilderness bill has passed the Senate by the handsome majority of 73 to 12. It is now in the Interior Committee of the House.

Nearly every nationwide conservation organization and most newspapers and magazines, urge that it be brought out to the floor, where no doubt it would be approved decisively as it was in the Senate.

Why? Because its passage would assure that 2 percent of the lands of the United States would always remain as all of it was before the white man came—a place of green forests, clear streams, blue lakes, and pure air. A wilderness—

Where plants and animals could reproduce themselves through the ages and no species would ever be lost, as was the passenger pigeon.

Unmarred by automobile roads, and the civilization and litter that automobile traffic inevitably brings, but open to all to explore by foottrail and horseback.

For hunters of big and small game, for those who would fish in white water or calm lake, for bird-watchers, for the myriads of amateurs with still and movie cameras.

As the indispensable laboratory for scientists, who must always have primitive nature to study if they are to understand how to bring health to overcivilized men of our teeming cities.

But "Ah" do you say, "I am not adventurous. What would it mean to me?"

It would mean that if you are a camper, you could camp in lands provided in the wilderness foreground; if a motorist, travel roads and stay in hotels and motels, having this wide, unbroken landscape as the inspiring backdrop of your vacation.

But another may say: "I am a stay-at-home; I cannot afford to travel," or "I am too ill to take a journey," or "I do not care to."

To you, it may mean most of all.

After you have come home through the traffic rush, the fumes, and the neon glare of the city, to open your newspaper and

magazine and see pictures and stories of this wilderness; to go out to a movie and see it in magnificent color in nature and sports films and as the scenes in which human drama is enacted; or to turn on your television set at home and see these things there.

Even without these pleasures, would it not mean much to everyone just to know that primitive nature is still there—that man the despoiler, the destroyer, the greedy exploiter, the waster, had spared a little of original creation, which God saw after He had made it, and "Behold, it was very good." (Genesis 1: 31)?

If you think as we do, then write to your Representative in Congress, to Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the Interior Committee, to any member of that committee—indeed, to any other Congressman, and tell him that you want the wilderness bill passed.

Do not underestimate the power of an American citizen who will write to his Congressman.

Education for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as I have noted in another extension in the Appendix of the RECORD, our able colleague, Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, successor to the lamented Francis E. Walter as Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two addresses in New Orleans, La., last week.

His second address, "Education for Victory," was delivered at a luncheon meeting of the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area.

In this excellent speech, Chairman WILLIS discusses the importance of public information and education regarding the threat of international communism and calls attention to the contributions which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has made and is continuing to make in acquainting the American people with the threat posed by this alien and hostile system.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. WILLIS' address:

EDUCATION FOR VICTORY

(Address by Representative EDWIN E. WILLIS before the Americanism Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area, July 23, 1963)

I feel truly privileged in being invited to address this luncheon meeting of the Americanism Committee of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area. Mr. Rhodes, your chairman, was kind enough to send me some information about the accomplishments of the committee in the brief 2 years of its existence. You have carved out an impressive record with your lectures, film showings, and distribution of literature on communism.

You are to be congratulated for what you have done. You are also to be congraulated for the basic approach you have taken to the problem. Through it, you have demonstrated your appreciation of the fact that the first step toward victory over communism is the study of communism, along with effective internal security laws. Just an hour ago, I addressed another group on the subject of "The Committee and National Security." Now, I want to discuss with you the problem of education and victory.

Knowledge is the beginning, the essential first step, in licking any problem. This is true whether we are searching for a cure for disease, economic disruption, crime—or for the means of protecting our freedoms from destruction by the Communist fifth column.

As an example, look at the progress we have made in recent years in fighting cancer. The disease was once incurable. Today many thousands of people are saved by treatment or surgery. Soon we will have a cure for it, and then a preventative.

Why? Because we have fought this evil calmly and intelligently. The American people have contributed millions of dollars for research. Our best doctors, scientists and hospitals are learning everything they can about the disease. This is the way the cure will be found and this enemy of mankind eliminated.

Now, we must do the same thing about what is today mankind's deadliest enemy—communism. This is a political, social and ethical cancer. It not only destroys men's bodies; but degrades, warps, and corrupts their minds—and kills their souls.

This cancer, too, must be destroyed—and it will be. In the past, we have tended to fight communism on the basis of instinct and emotion rather than knowledge. Now the picture looks brighter. We are beginning to act more like competent military commanders in the field. We are abiding by the first rule of warfare—know your enemy.

We realize that we are faced with a formidable adversary who threatens our country, our civilization and the very concept of freedom. We perceive that we will not have any real security until the bulk of our citizens and public officials know this enemy well. Until this condition prevails, we cannot be assured of victory.

What do we have to know about him? We must know his basic philosophy and doctrines, his objectives and the means he has used—and will continue to use—to achieve those objectives.

And—let's not kid ourselves—this is a big order. It's going to take a lot of serious study. Communism is not a simple thing. It is attempting to undermine us on many fronts; military, economic, diplomatic, propaganda, cultural, and scientific, as well as political. Its strategy is carefully planned; its tactics clever and varied. It has thousands of tricks, ruses, and deceptions. It makes abundant use of lies and half-truths. It is not something we can learn all about quickly and easily.

But, as I said before, things are looking up. Here in Louisiana and in many other States, we are teaching about communism in our schools. In many parts of the country, seminars and study conferences are being held. In hundreds of communities, Americanism committees such as yours are working at the grass roots level and doing a very effective job.

And here is something that should be of interest to you on this point. A bill has been introduced in Congress to establish a national Freedom Academy, where key leaders from every walk of life in our country can be sent to get a solid, thorough grounding in the essential facts about communism. The Senate has completed hearings on the bill. The House version of the bill has been referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is too early for me to predict—or even hazard a guess—about what will be the outcome of Congress consideration of this measure. Whether or not the academy is established, however, it is significant that such a bill should be introduced in the Congress with strong bipartisan support, and support that is not only bipartisan, but both conservative and liberal.

This is an indication of how much serious consideration is now being given to a matter that is so vital to our national survival—the study of communism.

Here in the New Orleans area, you are doing what you can to promote knowledge and study of communism. I hope you will continue this important work.

And now I would like to outline for you some of the things the Committee on Un-American Activities has done in this field. Some of the facts I will cite will surprise you, but they will give you an idea of the help the committee's work can be to you in your educational efforts. They will also give you a better idea of the overall contribution it has made to our country.

The committee has been in existence for a quarter of a century. We celebrated our 25th birthday on May 26 of this year.

During these years the committee has heard the testimony of over 3,500 witnesses; has published over 500 separate volumes of hearings, consultations, and reports; has distributed over 7½ million copies of these documents to the American people; has been the initiator of over 40 security laws and amendments thereto enacted by the Congress; and has had over a dozen of its policy recommendations accepted by the executive branch of our Government.

Despite this record, there are some people—in addition to the Communists—who want the committee abolished. In an effort to support their demand, they make all kinds of false charges against the committee—charges which, I hope, are based on ignorance and misinformation rather than evil intent.

I challenge these people to name any institution in the United States, governmental or private—and other than that grand organization, the FBI, which cannot publish its information—that can match this record of accomplishment. I know of no agency that has given the American people so much solid, substantial information on every phase of communism. To the extent that the American people, over the last 20 years, have been informed about communism and the threat it presents, I say that the Committee on Un-American Activities can claim major credit for it.

What about the committee? How does it operate?

There are those who claim that the committee does not operate in a very laudable manner. When pressed, they will grudgingly admit the committee's accomplishments which I have just mentioned, but then they will claim that it has amassed all this information by procedures and methods that are unfair and which violate constitutional rights. They claim the committee harasses, persecutes, and abuses the witnesses who appear before it.

The truth is that in the area of fair procedures, the committee has been a pacesetter for the Congress. It was the first committee to have written and printed rules of procedure. A copy of these rules is presented to each witness when he is subpenaed. The committee is bound by these rules.

The committee went further than that. It created its own subcommittee on rules to study and refine its procedures. This subcommittee took another step. It wrote to every Member of the House of Representatives, asking them if they had any constructive suggestions to offer. This was first done years ago, and it has been continued over the years. The scarcity of replies and constructive suggestions received from Members of Congress is an indication of how carefully and fairly the committee has devised its methods of operation and rules of procedure.

Another point on this issue: Some years ago, each member of a Special Committee of the American Bar Association reviewed a varied selection of the committee's hearings. The purpose of this study was to analyze and make a finding about the committee's methods and hearing procedures.

I am not going to read the full report of the Bar Association Committee on this subject, but these last two sentences from the report are sufficient to refute the charges made about the committee's alleged unfair methods:

"Your committee is impressed with the fairness with which hearings before that committee have been conducted. * * * We are satisfied that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are being treated fairly and properly in all respects and we also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded full protection so far as his constitutional or other legal rights are involved."

Now, as I said before, the committee's primary duty is investigation for legislative purposes. Despite this, the committee is also really a kind of educational institution. This is because the purpose of a congressional hearing is to develop facts. Now, facts are facts, and facts are educational, for whatever purpose they are developed. The committee's hearings, reports, and consultations therefore serve an educational need and are useful tools in the study of communism.

Attempts have also been made to create the impression that the information published by the committee is not really very informative. It is claimed to be shallow, on the extremist or flamboyant side, and therefore of little value to anyone who wants to study communism seriously.

Again, the truth is the very opposite of this. The committee's publications are used as sources of speech material by Members of Congress, clergymen, civic and business leaders, educators, and many others. The committee's documents are also used as texts and supplemental reading material in schools and colleges. As a matter of fact, they are also used in our Government training program—and the committee has had the honor of having foreign governments order them so they, too, can use them as aids in equipping foreign service and security employees for their jobs.

I don't want to take the time to do it now but, if I were so minded, I could read at this point a list of a few dozen recognized authorities who, in writing scholarly works on communism, have used the committee's publications as source material.

The work you are doing—education on the subject of communism and Americanism—is controversial. I am neither surprised nor dismayed at this. Many inovations and new concepts meet with resistance. They are opposed by the uninformed and by persons who have an ax to grind. This should not worry you too much. This resistance will be overcome, and before long I feel certain that there will be overwhelming acceptance of the educational work you are doing.

I would like to comment here about one point that has been made on the subject of teaching about communism. Some people are placing great stress on the fact that this teaching must be thoroughly objective, that there must be no indoctrination in it.

Generally speaking, I agree with this. Instruction on communism must be factual and objective. If it is not, we are misinforming ourselves and our students about our enemy, and therefore aiding him and his evil designs instead of helping ourselves.

No rational person can object to the idea that education on communism must be thorough, objective, and sober—and that it should not be mere indoctrination or ranting against communism. At the same time, I cannot help viewing with caution the excessive warnings against indoctrination made by some persons.

After all, in any study—even in mathematics—there must be some indoctrination in basic principles if the student is to learn anything at all and be able to find the answers to problems. Without this indoctrination, he would be helpless.

Similarly, there must be some indoctrination, some value judgments offered and advanced, when teaching about communism.

Let me illustrate what I mean: communism proposes a way of life vastly different from our own. The students are presented with the way of life offered by the Communists. Questions naturally arise in their minds.

"Is their way of life as good as, better, or inferior to, our own?"

"Is our judicial system better, equal to, or inferior to that of the Soviet Union?"

"Is our system of private property and private enterprise superior, or inferior, to the Soviet system of collective ownership?"

These and manifold other questions must be answered by the student. He has to make a judgment. Given all the facts on many of these issues, our students will be able to come up with the right answers.

But not all the questions are as simple as those I have just mentioned. Some are much more complicated. The Communists have devised clever propaganda arguments for their side, and young students cannot always readily see through them.

What happens?

He turns to his teachers, his parents, and other adults for help and guidance.

Are you going to turn him down? Or will you go so far as to talk about principles and ethics—not mere facts—in talking with him? When this point is reached, I say that we have an obligation to help—even if it means what some people call "indoctrination."

The claim of the anti-indoctrinators that many matters concerning communism are gray, rather than black and white, is actually an argument for indoctrination. The more gray area there is, the less black and white there is, the more difficult the problem and the more the student needs help in making a value judgment.

A final point: Hand in hand with the study of communism, we must have study of Americanism. How can you expect students, our youth, to be patriotic, to have a deep love for our country and its institutions if they are ignorant about it? How can we expect them to stand up for and defend our country, if they don't know what it stands for?

No one can appreciate what he does not know. Our youth must know and thoroughly understand the principles on which this Nation is founded, its history, its great traditions and—though this may seem trite—its heroes. Only if they know these things, will they be able to appreciate the value and worth of our institutions. Only then will they be able to understand what a terrible loss it would be for them if these institutions were ever to be destroyed by communism or any other ism.

I am no advocate of jingoism or extreme and excessive nationalism. But I know one thing; that knocking and debunking our heroes and institutions is no way to develop loyalty. That kind of so-called education can only weaken loyalty and undermine patriotism.

Our country is not perfect. No country is. Our country has its weaknesses, some blotches in its history. But, at the same time, when compared with any other country on earth, I say that there is nothing for us to be ashamed of and much for us to be proud of. In its principles, history, its accomplishments, there is no other country like it.

I am not appealing for suppression, even with students, of anything in our past that is not admirable. I only appeal for objective teaching of both the good and the bad, with special emphasis on neither.

Why do I make this appeal? It is because I know that the good and the great and the glorious in our history so far outweigh the bad that objective teaching cannot help but instill pride and love of country.

Unfortunately, in the past, we have often neglected instruction in American history and government. In addition, when this instruction has been given, it has sometimes not been objective. There has been undue emphasis on debunking. There has been failure to give adequate consideration to all that is great in our past.

As a result of this faulty teaching, we have seen the development of the apathetic, indifferent, uncommitted citizen—the political neutralist who exists in a vacuum as far as patriotism is concerned.

We must face the reality that a man who stands for nothing, can fall for anything.

We must face the fact that nature abhors a vacuum.

We must face the fact that Communists—and other totalitarians, too—are always eager to fill politically empty minds with their insidious philosophy.

We must realize that they can fill these empty minds much more easily than minds which have something in them that has to be destroyed before there is room for communism.

Our youth want and need belief. If we don't give it to them, someone else will. We cannot let them down.

We face a great challenge today. But we are a great Nation, and I don't fear the future. We do have great public officials, great educators, great citizens. We will meet that challenge in a great way—as we have met all such challenges in the past. I am absolutely convinced that through education—and educated action—in the areas of Americanism and communism, we will achieve victory in the cold war.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Diamond Jubilee Celebration of St. Vincent de Paul Parish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Sunday to have participated at the diamond jubilee celebration of my parish church in Milwaukee, St. Vincent de Paul Parish.

St. Vincent de Paul's has established a reputation during its 75 years for outstanding achievement in spiritual, civic and cultural activities. Twenty-seven sons of the parish and 57 of its daughters have answered the call to the religious life. The parish has sponsored cultural activities in the fields of art, music, and drama.

The day of celebration began with a solemn high mass of Thanksgiving at which the Most Reverend William E. Cousins, archbishop of Milwaukee, presided in cappa magna. Celebrant was St. Vincent de Paul's distinguished pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor S. J. Studer. Deacon and subdeacon were the able parish assistants, the Reverend Albin Sowinski and the Reverend Edward Wawrzyniakowski.

The diamond jubilee also was observed with an evening banquet. Upon that occasion, I gave the following address, for which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT DIAMOND JUBILEE CELEBRATION, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PARISH, JULY 28, 1963

It is a singular honor for me to be a part of this celebration today, as we commemorate the diamond jubilee of our parish, St. Vincent de Paul's.

This is, indeed, a happy and memorable occasion. The words of the gradual of the mass for Easter are particularly appropriate today: "This is the day which the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad." As is customary on birthdays and anniversaries: Congratulations are in order.

First, I want to extend sincere congratulations to our beloved pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor Studer. Monsignor Studer truly has followed in the footsteps of our Lord as the good shepherd of our flock.

All of us who have had the privilege of knowing him, and working with him, share the same esteem for his character. We are all indebted to him for his spiritual counsel and advice. We cherish him in our affections as a venerable man of God.

In recent years, Monsignor Studer, you have had many trials and tribulations, particularly with respect to your health. All of us have been concerned for your physical well being. We thank God for granting us your continued services. May our Good Lord further grant us our prayers that you may be with us for many more years to come.

Next, on behalf of all the parishoners past and present, and in my own behalf, I want to express sincere appreciation to those who have dedicated themselves in a special way to St. Vincent's Parish: To the assistant pastors, present and past; to the venerable and beloved sisters who teach in our school; to the lay people who work at the church; to the numerous organizations and societies, particularly the ushers, choir, altar society, church committee, and altar boys; to all of these, go our sincere gratitude and earnest prayers.

Third, it is appropriate to pay tribute to you, the members of the parish.

Our beautiful church, our school, and participation in 75 years of honor to Almighty God and service to fellow men stand as concrete evidence of the strong faith of this congregation. You have been willing to sacrifice in order to devote your best efforts to the glory of God.

As a Member of Congress, I have—through the years—spoken to hundreds of groups. None of them, however, has held for me the personal and heartfelt association which this occasion presents. As a member of this parish, and its former humble servant, I am particularly honored that you have asked me to say a few words at this diamond jubilee celebration.

I would like to address my remarks this evening to the challenges which face the world today—and the opportunities which thereby are presented to every citizen, but especially to every Catholic man, woman, and child.

Let us therefore, briefly review the past and its lessons, the present and its problems, the future and its portents.

First, the past. Since this parish was founded 75 years ago, there have been truly amazing advances in science and technology.

Diseases like cholera, smallpox, typhoid, and diphtheria which once ravaged whole continents, snuffing out the lives of millions, have been conquered. The invention of the internal combustion engine has made possible the vast array of automobiles, trucks, and buses that ply the highways of the world. It has created millions of new jobs and revolutionized our society.

Man has learned to fly. And with that knowledge has tried to fly faster and higher, until today he aims at the very stars themselves.

Laborsaving devices in our homes, in our businesses, and in our factories have made life easier and more healthy for millions of us.

The atom—that building block of all matter—has yielded up its secrets. Harnessing the energy of the atom has made possible many new advancements. They brought about achievements that promise a prosperity that would have been dismissed as a wild dream 75 years ago.

But the atom has also loosed other forces in our world—forces which likewise would have been beyond the belief of our forefathers. The cracking of the atom has made possible—for the first time in history—universal destruction and annihilation.

The possibility of a nuclear holocaust is not a remote one. It is a very real threat to the lives of each of us, to Western civilization, to the very existence of life on this planet.

Man has evolved a Frankenstein's monster which could some day destroy man.

Why has this terror entered our lives at a time when so many positive achievements have been gained? Because men have forgotten God.

As men learned more about the physical universe, they neglected the spiritual universe. Along with discoveries in science and technology came new philosophies which rejected God as an outworn myth. Man and the material universe became the sole concern.

What a Pandora's box of evils these errors loosed on the world. In Germany, a man named Karl Marx used these ideas to formulate the philosophy of atheistic communism—the philosophy which threatens to bury us today.

The scourge of communism can, in my opinion, be directly traced to the rejection of God.

In our own country, we experienced a rise of materialism. It took a different form here. It infected people with the insane desire for money and possessions. It gnawed at the very moral fiber of our citizens. This materialism led to a self-centered individualism which rejected moral values in a search for cheap thrills, and worthless pleasures.

Through it all the Catholic Church stood as a beacon of faith in a sea of strife and error. The church, buffeted by wave after wave of denunciation, denial and outright persecution, continued to teach those moral truths laid down for it by its founder, Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

With error all about, the church, of necessity, was put on the defensive. Its principal efforts were directed to protecting the faith of Christians against the evils of atheism, secularism and materialism. It was felt that the less contact Catholics maintained with the world around them, the better off they would be.

Today the situation is changing. Men are coming to reject the sterile existence of life without spiritual meaning. The world has been frightened by the cruelty and terror loosed on the world by fascism and nazism.

Freedom-loving people are alarmed by the steady march of communism, with its barbaric, police-state methods.

Mankind fears instant death under a hail of hydrogen bombs. And they have no place to turn.

All see the poverty, ignorance, disease, hunger and unrest in the world about us, and yearn for an answer.

We, as Christians, have the answer. But too often we have been content—even smug—in our faith. Although we realize that we embrace the truth, we have been slow to communicate it to others. We have, in some instances, failed to recognize that the problems of the world are our problems and that we have the responsibility to aid in their solution.

It should be of concern to us as Christians that in many countries the per capita annual income is less than $50 a year.

It should be of concern to us that thousands of babies die of starvation each day in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

It should be of concern to us that the people of Thailand are ravaged by disease for lack of proper sanitary facilities.

It should be of concern to us as Christians that there are millions of people who have never had the opportunity to learn to read or write, who will never hear the name of God.

If we truly believe in the teaching of the church or the brotherhood of man and

the mystical body of Christ, then we must be concerned for the welfare of people all over the globe. It makes no difference whether their skins are black, or their eyes are slanted or their customs are alien to ours. We have an obligation in Christian charity to care for—to help—those less fortunate than we are.

Our example in this endeavor should be the late Pope John the 23d. His charity and goodness gained him worldwide love and reverence. At his death he was sincerely mourned not only by Catholics, but by Protestants, Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, and even those of no religious belief.

Why? Because the inner peace and wisdom which Pope John radiated touched a responsive chord in the hearts of men everywhere. His impact on the world is proof that—as never before in recent history—men are ready for Christ's message.

Pope John realized this. He convened the Ecumenical Council and thereby showed the world that the Catholic Church is capable of a healthy self-examination and—where needed—progressive reform.

Pope John's encyclicals, "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris," once again put the Catholic Church in the forefront of advanced social thought. These brilliant documents demonstrated that the truths of catholicism are as relevant today as they were in the middle ages or in early Christian times.

"Pacem in Terris," the most recent encyclical, asserts the right of every human being to security in cases of sickness, inability to work, widowhood, old age, unemployment, or any other case in which an individual is deprived of his livelihood through no fault of his own.

The encyclical proclaims that all men are equal by reason of their natural dignity and that racial discrimination cannot be justified.

"Pacem in Terris" declares that every trace of racism must be eliminated.

This great encyclical condemns the terrifying contest between nations to amass bigger and more destructive weapons.

"Justice, right, reason, and humanity," it asserts (and here I am quoting) "urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control."

These are words to remember as the Nation debates the ratification of the test ban agreement recently negotiated with Russia.

"Pacem in Terris" expresses support for the purposes and goals of the United Nations and other international organizations, such as United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which seek to bring peace and prosperity among peoples.

The splendid work begun by Pope John XXIII is being carried on by Pope Paul VI. Under his direction, the Ecumenical Council will resume its work this coming September. The results of the council will profoundly affect the future of the church—and perhaps of the world.

For us as Catholics and children of St. Vincent de Paul Parish, the challenge is clear. We must cast away old defensive attitudes about our religion. Unafraid and unashamed, we must take our Christianity into the world to share it with our fellow men.

What, you ask, can we as individuals do to prepare ourselves for this encounter?

First, quite obviously, we mst know the dogmas and teachings of holy mother the church. The texts and interpretations are available in Catholic books, newspapers, and periodicals. Our church organizations are a good source for this information. Knowing the teachings of the church, we must live by them. Unless we practice what we preach, our efforts will be fruitless.

Uppermost in our minds must be the key virtue of charity. Let us have charity for all men, regardless of race, color, nationality, or religion.

Second, we should have a thorough knowledge of the recent pronouncements of the Popes in their encyclicals. These, too, are available from Catholic sources. Further, we should be able to discuss the encyclicals with others in order that they, too, may learn the exciting and significant ideas these papal documents contain.

Third, we must continue to support our parish as we have in the past.

It would be extremely foolish, I am sure you will agree, to set out to change the world and neglect our starting point and home base: our parish church. For here is to be found the fountainhead of God's graces. If our efforts to implant the seeds of Christ's truth in the hearts of men are to be successful, we will need those graces.

Our efforts will be futile unless we continue to serve God through our parish and our parish priests, following the leadership of our beloved monsignor.

Many of us are the descendants of the founders of this parish. Those men and women faced grave problems, but they forged ahead with faith to establish a parish, to build a church and then a school. Their sacrifices have worked to our great benefit.

Let us, therefore, remembering their religious fervor, rededicate ourselves today to the future progress and well-being of this parish so that our children and our children's children will have the same rich heritage that we are privileged to possess.

Then truly can we rejoice and be glad on this day which our Lord has made.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the benefit of the Members of Congress an editorial from the Catholic Standard of Washington, D.C., concerning the captive nations of the Communist empire. As the editorial so well points out:

The state in the captive countries assumes the rights of God and man, presuming to parcel them out according to their desires. Even the reports that governments in these states have now relaxed their controls, granting some scant exercise of rights, confirms the inadmissible premise that the state, not the individual, possesses the rights.

The editorial also calls for free elections and abolition of the chains of satellite nations, the secret police, the barbed wire and mines, and the restriction of freedoms of people, religion and ideas:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

A thoughtful observance of Captive Nations Week is good insurance against captivity. Although we welcome every whiff and vestige of evidence that Russian communism is turning toward the West, we must very soberly gage both the validity of these indications and our course. The plight of the captive nations is the best example for our guidance.

People must live on facts, not promises. People must enjoy the daily benefits of freedom—not party explanations of group freedom—before they can say they are free. Therefore the gage of what the Reds mean about human rights, including freedom, is what they are actually doing in the captive countries.

By any standard of civilized law and usage, the captive countries well deserve their name. The very foundation of human rights is not acknowledged, that men as creatures of God possess rights granted by the Creator. The state in the captive countries assumes the rights of God and man, presuming to parcel them out according to their desires. Even the reports that governments in these states have now relaxed their controls, granting some scant exercise of rights, confirms the inadmissible premise that the state, not the individual, possesses the rights.

The Reds can easily disprove that the satellite nations are not really captives—by free elections, by abolishing the secret police, by tearing down the barbed wire and mines at the frontiers, by granting freedom to the press and fredom of religion, by permitting freedom of education.

And until the enslaved nations are free, we shall continue to pray for them and to use all possible pressure to assure their freedom.

Questions Before We Sign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahassee, Fla., printed on Friday, July 26, 1963, an editorial which I believe has a great deal of wisdom and merit on the proposed test ban treaty. Editor Malcolm Johnson of the Democrat is one of Florida's most learned journalists, and I felt that this message is of interest to every Member of Congress and to the American people. It follows:

QUESTIONS BEFORE WE SIGN

The text of the proposed nuclear testing limitation treaty presents three immediate questions for which the U.S. Senate must find satisfactory answers before it ratifies the agreement with Russia and Britain:

1. Does stopping our testing at this point leave our defense at a disadvantage because the Russians have learned uses and technical procedures which we have not learned? This is a matter on which our military leaders and our most profound and patriotic scientists must be encouraged to give their most candid advice—if not publicly, then certainly to the U.S. Senate in confidential session. A proper decision is beyond our politicians and our diplomats.

2. Is it entirely clear to what extent this treaty would leave us—and the other parties—free to undertake such experiments for the peaceful use of nuclear power as Dr. Edward Teller has proposed and the Russians claim to have carried out for excavation of canals, construction of dams and other big dirt-moving jobs? This work should not be foreclosed; and there should be no loophole that would let the Russians conduct military experiments in the name of peaceful use while we refrain out of respect to the letter

of the agreement. Here, again, the best scientific advice must be sought.

3. Most important of all, are there possibilities of being boobytrapped in the clause which permits any party to withdraw, upon 3 months' notice, "if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country?" It has been suggested informally that this is designed to let the parties pull out if Red China or some other nation should start testing. Such an escape hatch is vital; but we must be aware of the possibilities of the Soviet Union making test preparations for a year, while conspiring with Red China in its testing program, then giving us just 3 months' notice to match their 12 months of preparations. They've done substantially that to us within the last 2 years.

Whatever answers come to these questions, the United States must not be so blind as to enter this agreement in any way dependent upon the good faith of Soviet Russia. It has earned no right to good faith in international dealings. If we sign this treaty, we must do it with a full determination to keep our own powder dry and our testing equipment and knowledge up to the minute in case we need to use them.

Progress in Muscatine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Frank J. Killian, executive secretary of the Muscatine, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce, was guest editorialist in the Saturday, July 27 edition of the Davenport, Iowa, Times-Democrat. In his editorial, Mr. Killian cited the progress which has been made in Muscatine in successfully meeting the challenges of these changing times. The significant fact which stands out is that this progress is the result of local people working together, applying their talents and knowledge in facing up to their problems and solving them through local initiative.

It is incumbent upon me as the Congressman for the residents of Muscatine to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. There is a message here for us to ponder as we consider the programs and proposals which seek to make the Federal Government the all-knowing and all-encompassing force in American life. I am sure that other cities can be just as resourceful and just as successful as Muscatine has been in keeping their communities up to date and progressive without massive Government assistance. All they need is the encouragement and help which we can give them in working out their problems themselves.

Frank Killian's guest editorial, "Progress in Muscatine," follows:

PROGRESS IN MUSCATINE

On a recent day in Muscatine an automobile dealer, a plant manager, a high school economics teacher, an attorney, the president of a bank, a furniture store owner and the city assessor met together to discuss what could be done to make the downtown district more attractive to area shoppers and at the same time save a very necessary tax base for the city.

At another meeting later the same week a button jobber, a production supervisor, a printer, a baker, a telephone company manager, a consulting engineering firm employee, a tool and die company employee and a pest control service operator, meeting as the city council, spent innumerable hours discussing plans for a $2 million sewerage treatment plant for the city.

Over lunch on still another day a group, that included a consulting engineer, a bank president, a men's clothing retailer, an auto dealer, a union official and a minister, discussed plans for further expansion of services in a fine industrial park area just outside the city limits.

These three meetings, and many more like them, have much in common. They personify a metamorphosis that has taken place in Davenport's smaller neighbor to the west, Muscatine.

The postwar change from a community that was known as "the pearl button capital of the world," the home of some of the finest watermelons in the Midwest and the onetime home of Mark Twain, to a city that proudly boasts of its industrial output in no uncertain terms, has come about through an awakening of its citizens to the need to assume a place in the dynamic economy in which we now find ourselves.

There was no magic formula responsible for this change of attitude. Many persons and factors have been credited with playing important parts but the most important has been the assumption of civic responsibility by people in all walks of life. These persons are willing to give time, money and effort to work for betterment of their community. Most are willing to even go a step further and give a little extra in order to see a program to a successful completion.

Has this type of community effort by all paid off? Can the value of this thinking be proven in dollars and cents? A short résumé of some of the recent achievements might set the record straight:

1. A new $200,000 community college building with $80,000 of the necessary funds coming in small gifts from the general public. Muscatine Community College is now the only public junior college in the State with a building specifically erected for use by such an institution.

2. A multimillion dollar chemical compound on a site where soybeans were harvested only a short time ago.

3. A new pleasure boat harbor that handles boats from many communities along the Mississippi.

4. An excellent park system that includes the only free zoo in Iowa with some 60 species of animals including elephant, bear, lion, llama, puma, bison, and others.

5. An off-street parking program that added 101 spaces to the already existing 445 available spaces.

6. Continued employment growth, plant, modernization and rebuilding and new product development on the part of existing industries.

7. A gradual, but noticeable, facelifting program in the downtown shopping area.

8. Three successive over-subscribed United Fund drives with one recent drive exceeding the goal of $99,150 at the same time that the public was pledging $80,000 for the community college building fund.

9. Increased bank deposits, increased retail sales and other glowing statistics of a business index.

Before I sound like a confirmed optimist who is always looking at things through rosy glasses, let me say that growth has also brought along further problems that the voluntary leaders and the elected officials will have to face in the very near future. Some of the more obvious ones are:

1. The need for better bridge facilities across the Mississippi.

2. The need for an enlarged program to provide better surfaced streets to handle the additional traffic load.

3. The need for additional equipment and personnel in the police and fire departments.

4. The need for more classrooms to meet the requirements of the so-called population explosion.

At the present time civic groups are devoting time to studying these and other problems and trying to arrive at solutions. If the enlightened thinking and leadership of the past two decades continues there is no doubt that these problems, which today seem almost insurmountable, will be solved and recorded as another feather in the community's cap.

What Muscatine has been able to accomplish in the years since World War II can be accomplished by any community if all citizens will take a normal interest in their city's future.

No one person or organization is wholly responsible for the successful program in Muscatine—it took the combined efforts of the chamber, the jaycees, the development corporation, the city administration, the schools, the churches, the unions, the service, veteran and fraternal organizations, the ladies groups and, most of all, the people themselves to change the face and pace of the community.

Fourth of July, Revolutionary Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the concept of the Alliance for Progress is a revolutionary one—it hopes to create a social and economic revolution in Latin America.

I think that this editorial from La Tribuna of Lima, Peru, will show that the winds of revolution are blowing in Latin America—there is renewed hope for freedom and prosperity:

[From La Tribuna, Lima, Peru, July 4, 1963]

FOURTH OF JULY, REVOLUTIONARY DATE

The United States of America celebrates today one more birthday of its Declaration of Independence. The prosperity of the Union and overwhelming existence for a long time of a bourgeois, satisfied and prudent mentality, in spheres of power and influence have not been able to erase the irrevocably revolutionary character of such a glorious date.

The North American Revolution precedes the French Revolution in all its concepts, inspired by liberty, equality, and fraternity.

The Declaration of Independence, drafted by Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, among others, came before the "declaration of the rights of men and citizens." Besides being a markedly liberal movement, the American Revolution is the first anticolonial war and, as a paradox for those of us who think in concepts of the 20th century, it was the first triumphant anti-imperialistic struggle. That is because in the 18th century, England meant imperialism producing an oppression more economic than political, from which George Washington freed the American people. This is the real sense of the date we celebrate today.

A new generation of intellectuals and politicians, whose prototype is President Ken-

nedy, is trying to recapture this revolutionary sense of the origin of the most important nation of the world. They, therefore, contradict those who think of America as just a fortress of plutocracy. This attitude of the new governing team is being projected in all senses, in an action which is not only just national, but is singularly international. As far as Latin America is concerned, the behavior of Kennedy is diametrically opposed to that of his predecessors, including the progressive Franklin D. Roosevelt. Until a short time ago, the reactionary capitalists of the United States had as their dogma the idea that the safety of their investments, amount of their profit, and deeper roots of their empire would be in direct proportion with a greater backwardness and political and economic primitivism of Indo-America. The Alliance for Progress destroys this concept and bases itself on the fact that political and social underdevelopment in Latin America and its lack of industrialization are a danger, not only for its inhabitants but for the United States of America. This is the return to a progressive and revolutionary spirit in the White House.

The Tribuna, spokesman for a revolutionary, antifeudal, anti-imperialistic, and Indo-Americanistic party, salutes the great principles which surrounded the birth of the fatherland of Lincoln, wishes it great prosperity and loyalty to these principles invoked in 1776.

U.S. Ban on Financial Deals With Cuba Seen Ineffective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article concerning Cuba written by an Indianapolis businessman, Preston G. Woolf. Mr. Woolf has traveled extensively in Latin America, and many of his articles have appeared in the Indianapolis Star.

He deals here with the erroneous assumptions that a U.S. ban on financial dealings, on shipping, and on travel has severely cramped the Red base's economy. As he points out, Cuba benefited from the $80 million in ransom goods from the United States; it enjoys worldwide shipping through Soviet satellite ships; and it has the travel situation in hand via a regular airline connecting the island with Mexico City and the rest of the world.

Mr. Woolf's article should serve as a warning to those who believe that communism can be snuffed out in Cuba through these halfway measures. The article follows:

BAN ON CUBAN MONEY DEALS SEEN FUTILE

(By Preston G. Woolf)

Banning of U.S. financial transactions with Cuba, as announced in Washington, is expected to have little if any effect in curtailing the continued Communist domination of that island. It might be compared with ceasing to serve free coffee to firemen fighting a fire—the fire will continue but the workers will have minor inconveniences.

The amount of dollars that have been frozen are estimated to be less than $25 million, which is inconsequential in international finance. It also is small in comparison with the $80 million in ransom goods that we have just finished sending to Cuba to bail out the released prisoners from the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

The Government has adequate financial connections in Canada, Western Europe, and certain friendly Latin American nations and will be able to attend to any necessary international money transactions, in addition to their basic alliance with the Soviet monetary experts.

Washington seems to take much cheer from the fact that the volume of free world shipping in and out of Cuba has deteriorated to only a small fraction of that in former years. However, to properly appraise the situation, it must be well recognized that the growing volume of Communist shipping has now been estimated to be more than one ship a day into Cuba.

Any lack of prosperity in Cuba today is not caused by U.S. efforts to stop trading in dollars, or to reduce shipping. The real reason is that no Communist captive nation enjoys a good economy and each lacks a decent standard of living. It should also be remembered in a realistic appraisal of Cuba, that no Communist politically controlled captive nation has ever fallen from the side of the Soviets. The Russians will go to any length to maintain political and military control of Cuba. The hardships, privations and sufferings of the Cuban people are of little concern to the Soviet overlords.

Washington also wishfully estimates that Cuba is being isolated from travel. While it is true that no luxury liners put in and out of Cuban ports, yet there is today no shortage of ways and means for visitors, students and agitators to freely enter and leave Cuba. In addition to regular and frequent airline and steamship service to and from Iron Curtain nations, there are countless ways to make the shorter trips in and out of Latin America.

A regular airline service flies to Mexico City, from where one may travel anywhere in the world. Passengers may fly a few miles south of Cuba to Grand Cayman Island, from where there are several airline services to Latin America. And the best service of all for both passengers and Communist materials to Latin America is the large fleet of Soviet fishing boats based in Cuba. They are well equipped seagoing vessels which can land and discharge people and supplies off the long stretches of the isolated sea coasts of most Latin American nations. The airport at Curacao, in the Netherlands Antilles, has also been the frequent transfer point of airborn passengers and freight to Cuba.

It would be fatal for U.S. appraisal of the Cuban situation to dream that this Communist beachhead in the Americas has really been isolated from an easy traffic in moneys, people, or goods. The forthcoming visit of Khrushchev to his new Western Hemishpere base may be expected to bring to light still further revelations of the chummy coexistence which permits the continued Soviet build-up just off our shores.

(Preston G. Woolf, an Indianapolis importer, is an expert on Latin American affairs.)

Perdido to Key West, We're One State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times-Union on Thursday, July 25, carried a very fine editorial entitled "Perdido to Key West, We're One State." This great newspaper has consistently told the story of all Florida, and those of us who live in northwest Florida appreciate this fact.

PERDIDO TO KEY WEST, WE'RE ONE STATE

The Florida State Chamber of Commerce will launch a series of regional meetings today at a gathering in Panama City under the sponsorship of the trade body in that city. The session will be conducted under the slogan "Speak Up," and is aimed at accomplishing an ingathering of chamber people from the 21-county area of Congressional Districts 1 and 9. Included in this territory, which extends from Tallahassee to Pensacola, are 27 chambers.

The delegation from the State chamber will be visiting in a region that bulks large in the history of Florida. Since the time of Andrew Jackson, arguments have been heard to the effect that the so-called Panhandle should not be a part of the Sunshine State. Interests in that section, it has been stated, lie more wih Georgia and Alabama than with Florida. This is all part of another contention which has held that the capital of the State belongs elsewhere than in Tallahassee.

Meanwhile, there has come into being during the post-World War II era an entirely different kind of northwest Florida from that which was known before. Panama City, situated on beautiful St. Andrew's Bay, typifies that changed complexion. With a bustling little industrial economy of its own, this city is generally regarded as one terminus of the now famous "Miracle Strip" which extends westward along the gulf to Pensacola.

A ride along the scenic waterfront through Fort Walton, with its nearby Eglin Field, to the metropolis at the extreme western end of Florida, is a must for anyone who wants to know this State. Part of the journey is over a route that follows along the historic Santa Rosa Sound which lies between the mainland and the lengthy strip of island territory by the same name offshore.

Famed as a recreational area, the Miracle Strip is a rival for anything of similar nature Florida has to offer. With a booming postwar industrial growth that is the talk of the Southeast, the Empire of Northwest Florida can, with no reservation, be considered one of the coming sections of our State. Indeed, it has already arrived.

The State chamber can serve no better function with its series of meetings than to banish the regionalism concept which in the past has militated against the solidarity of our State, no small assignment considering the farflung coastline that runs from Perdido Bay on the west to Key West on the south.

White Criticism Scored by Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of August 1, 1963:

WHITE CRITICISM SCORED BY NEGRO

(By Jack Langguth)

LOS ANGELES, July 31.—White spokesmen who say they are alienated from the Negro cause because of current demonstrations may never have been genuinely sympathetic,

the executive director of the National Urban League said today.

The director, Whitney M. Young Jr., said in an interview at the Urban League's 53d annual convention here, that a "reverse reaction" was developing in the country and urged that white citizens resist it.

"If we're told to give up certain tactics because we might lose our white friends," Mr. Young said, "we can't be so sure that we had those friends to begin with."

He also suggested that white commentators let Negro leaders do the speaking about Negro responsibility and Negro self-improvement.

He said these themes were being voiced by "many self-appointed advisers who for all these years have never spoken out against the obvious racial injustices."

Mr. Young said Negro leaders would like to point to deficiencies that Negroes themselves might correct within their communities. But he said Negro spokesmen cannot afford to lead this kind of self-criticism so long as the current critics are white who are suspected of being hostile or indifferent to the Negro movement.

Mr. Young did, however, caution Negroes against coming to regard demonstrations as an end in themselves. "If our children must march to the 5- and 10-cent stores," he said, "let them march on to the libraries. After praying on the courthouse steps, let their parents continue on to PTA meetings."

Tutoring Negro students who had not received sufficient education, Mr. Young said, is a contribution as lasting as going to jail or lying in the streets.

PREFERRED TREATMENT EXPLAINED

The 42-year-old league director, who was formerly dean of the Atlanta School of Social Work, expanded today on the subject of giving Negroes preferred treatment, which has often been advanced by members since the league's opening statements last Saturday.

"The white leadership must be honest enough to grant that throughout our history there has existed a special privileged class of citizens who received preferred treatment. That class was white.

"Now we're saying this: If two men, one Negro and one white, are equally qualified for a job, hire the Negro."

In a speech prepared for delivery to the annual convention banquet tonight, Mr. Young also dealt with considerations of social status, and how they bear on the racial question.

He asked the press and advertising media to assist in leading public opinion toward the viewpoint that inclusiveness indicates creativity, that exclusiveness means stagnation.

While granting that some rivalries remain between the major civil rights groups, Mr. Young said the Negro movement was now more united than ever.

He said that it was significant that the six leading civil rights organizations had chosen him as co-chairman of an emergency fundraising program, which has raised $800,000.

"My selection indicates that they all feel the need for the kind of planned approach that the Urban League represents," he said.

Omar B. Ketchum

SPEECH

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that we learned of the passing of a distinguished American, Omar B. Ketchum, here in Washington last week. Mr. Ketchum came to Washington from Kansas, where he had served the city of Topeka as mayor and had sought the governorship and the U.S. Senate of my State. He was a dedicated American who fought for the millions of veterans who have served our country in time of war. His leadership and devotion to the Veterans of Foreign Wars gained for him a lasting place in the hearts of his comrades everywhere.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Stars and Stripes which echoes the sentiments of this Nation's veterans:

OMAR B. KETCHUM

Omar B. Ketchum of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has answered the last rollcall. His death, after a long illness, will sadden thousands of members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for whose cause he fought most zealously in the Nation's Capital.

Coming to Washington in 1941 as the national legislative director of the VFW, Ketchum soon carved a niche for himself in the history of veteran benefits. Possessing a pleasing personality, a fluent manner of expression and a thorough knowledge of the intricacies of veterans laws and regulations, Ketchum soon won the esteem and confidence of Members of Congress in his able presentations before congressional committees on matters pertaining to veterans.

He was active in presenting the VFW viewpoint in the fight for the passage of the GI bill of rights. His duties as national legislative director encompassed a large field of legislative activity and he was thoroughly conversant with all of the many facets of the entire VFW program.

In recent years Ketchum was the executive director of the VFW Washington office with supervision over many of the phases of the organization's functions.

The VFW and the veterans of America will miss the knowledge and experience which the Kansan brought to his office. He was a sincere, devoted and accomplished representative and his handiwork in the Nation's Capital will long be remembered by all who came in contact with him.

All of us have lost a stalwart champion and an able and energetic defender of veterans benefits. We share with thousands and thousands of others the loss of this outstanding veterans' spokesman. May he rest in peace.

Congress Urged To Establish a Captive Nations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1963, the New England Captive Nations Committee sponsored a freedom rally in Boston, Mass. In the spirit which made this country the leader in the cause of freedom, those assembled resolved that the United States wage an open fight in behalf of the people in satellite nations held back by the iron chains of communism. This group finds it imperative that the Congress establish a Captive Nations Committee as suggested by our esteemed colleagues, Congressmen FLOOD and DERWINSKI. The resolution of this assembly expresses the true dedication of the American people to freedom and I commend it to the attention and consideration of all Members of the House:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE FREEDOM RALLY HELD ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON, MASS., SUNDAY, JULY 20, 1963

Whereas President Kennedy and Governor Peabody proclaimed the week of July 14 to 20 as Captive Nations Week in accordance with the Captive Nations Week resolutions passed by Congress in 1959; and

Whereas the Soviet Government continues to annihilate the national, cultural, and political identities of the captive non-Russian nations through russification and deportations; and

Whereas Russian communism made its way to Cuba, making Cuba an armed outpost in the Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas the United States has failed to develop effective policies toward the captive nations to regain freedom and independence: Now, therefore, we assembled at the fifth observance of the Captive Nations Week in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1963, do hereby

Resolve——

1. Urge the U.S. Government to declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the United Nations on October 14, 1960, its support on the right of self-determination of all peoples held in Communist captivity, and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern in all negotiations with the Soviet Government; and

2. Urge the House Rules Committee to speed action on the pending Flood resolution (H. Res. 14), Derwinski resolution (H. Res. 15) and other similar resolutions calling for the establishment of a Permanent Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations which will devise a progressive program to aid captive nations to restore their historic freedom and independence; and

3. Compliment all Congressmen for their resolutions and support; commend all Americans who voiced their support; and urge those who have not thus far given their support for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee to do so now; and

4. Deplore the State Department policy in not supporting the establishment of the said committee, and urge our State Department to endorse and support the Flood resolution in its entirety.

(Sponsored by the American Institute, Inc., and the New England Captive Nations Committee, Milton, Mass.)

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, public interest in the nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union is being fostered by public information media through which our Government can pour its conclusions. If that interest is still far short of outright enthusiasm, the reasons are clear enough. We have had a sad and sobering succession of experiences about how

the Soviet Union regards its international obligations. This seemingly modest agreement, we are told is another of those instances when our own national interests and those of the Russians converge in the same place at the same time. The question, to be resolved, however, requires both an evaluation of what our national interests are at this time as related to what the interests of the Soviet Union are. This must be done with both eyes on the mortality of the Soviet pledges in the past.

I want to commend to the Congress the following thoughtful editorial from the Stanly News and Press of Albemarle, N.C., which ably discusses the cloud of doubt that hangs over this agreement in the minds of so many Americans:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Don't put much faith in the nuclear test ban treaty which has been initiated by officials of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States.

While the atmosphere in which its terms have been agreed upon seems different from most of the meetings aimed at lessening tensions in the cold war, we must wait and see if the Russians are really interested in a change for the better in international relations.

There are certain facts which cause us to doubt the usefulness of a test ban treaty, even though we are in good faith seeking to lessen danger to the people of the world.

First, it should be remembered that of more than 50 agreements signed by the Soviet Union since World War II, she has broken all or almost all of them—often in flagrant disregard of international opinion.

Second, we are reliably informed that a test ban which does not also ban underground testing will not be effective in preventing development of new and more terrible weapons. The proposed ban does not apply to underground tests. Even if it did, we are told by scientists that it would be virtually impossible to detect cheating on the ban.

Third, it will be remembered that Russia broke a test moratorium in 1961 with a tremendous series of tests, thereby breaking faith with us and the rest of the world.

Fourth, the proposed treaty would become ineffective if other nations, such as France or Red China, continue to test. France is not expected to agree to halt its testing and Red China is expected to be ready to test within 2 years.

Fifth, our military leaders have been reported as opposed to limitations which might be opposed on us and our security by the singing of a test ban treaty. If other nations, especially Russia, continue to be as perfidious as in the past, we might be signing away our deterrence to international communism.

Sixth, based upon past performance, it is very dangerous to trust Khrushchev. He is a wily old politician without a moral scruple in his mind. Whenever he agrees to anything you may be sure he expects to reap rewards from it.

Finally, there has been no indication at any time that communism has changed its ultimate objective, which is domination of the entire world, including the United States. It is exceedingly hard to do business with the power which has already openly vowed to conquer you.

We fully expect the test ban treaty to be ratified by the U.S. Senate, but it would be well for us to enter this agreement with our eyes open and not to expect great benefits from it. Only time will reveal just what it may mean to the course of history.

An Outstanding Political and Civic Leader Passes to His Final Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, this week sadly marked the passing of one of Illinois' outstanding political and civic leaders. On July 30, 1963, Jerry Dolezal, member of the Cook County Board of Commissioners and popular Republican leader in my congressional district, died in the Presbyterian-St. Luke's Hospital in Chicago.

Few men in the long and impressive history of State politics will leave as indelible a mark of achievement as did Commissioner Dolezal. His contribution to all of the people in his community, to his country and to the Republican Party will always be remembered.

Unlike many men who enter politics, Commissioner Dolezal was not a man with selfish, personal ambitions; for if he had been so, he could not have been denied a much higher public office because of his ability and the great respect which was accorded him by both Republicans and Democrats alike. Instead he chose the course of helping others in the common cause of strengthening his own political party while insisting on better government in the process.

The name of Dolezal is symbolic of the great civic progress which has been made in the town of Cicero, now a community of more than 70,000. As a resident and leader in this community, which once carried the stigma of the old days of gangsterism, Dolezal enlisted the aid of good citizens, church, business and industrial leaders in establishing a program to improve the town and its standards at every level. With the cooperation of public officials and other civic-minded leaders, he accomplished projects which today have made Cicero a fine residential area in which to live—in which the residents take great pride in their homes as well as their educational and civic achievements.

At the same time, Dolezal contributed to the progress of adjacent suburbs, served as Superintendent of the Illinois Industrial Home for the Blind, and more recently did an outstanding job as one of the Commissioners of Cook County, as a member of the board which serves its more than 4,800,000 citizens. Jerry Dolezal's untiring efforts and accomplishments will not stand alone in the memory of those who have been privileged to know and associate with him, as have I. For, indeed, there was a warm personal side to this man, which none of us will forget. To have known him was to love and respect him.

He was a man of deep conviction, yet never ill-tempered or intolerant. The gentlemanly qualities he possessed were recognized by friend and political foe alike.

He lived by the precept he so often quietly voiced to his political proteges, of which I am proud to be one, "Promises are made to be fulfilled for a man is judged by the way he keeps his word."

Just as Commissioner Dolezal was an inspiration to so many while he lived, so may his memory provide an inspiration to those who will follow in pursuing the hopes and ideals of an outstanding leader and an esteemed gentleman.

Second District Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best means available for me to determine the views of my constituents is the annual questionnaire I mail to each household in my district. I am pleased the people of the second district have the interest they do in national and world affairs.

Of the 92,500 questionnaires I mailed, 12.7 percent were returned, many with interesting and constructive comments. Actually the percentage of returned questionnaires was higher when you consider that some could not be delivered because of address changes. If you allow for this nonforwardable mail, 14.4 percent of the questionnaires were answered.

Several persons who answered my poll asked me why I had not sent an extra copy for their wife or husband. I sent only one to each household because it is impossible to determine how many adults reside at a given address. These addresses were obtained from the various telephone directories in the district. However, if there are those who would like to have additional copies of the questionnaire, I shall be happy to send them.

When the answers to my questionnaire reached my office, Mr. Speaker, they were group into six categories by occupation. These categories included business, farmer, labor, professional, white collar, and miscellaneous. This last group included unsigned questionnaires, housewives, retired persons, students, and others who could not be readily classified in one of the other categories.

As I said before, many questionnaires were returned with interesting and constructive comments. I am grateful to those who took the time and the trouble to comment in detail on the issues and problems we face. The ratio of answers with comments was about 3 in 7. These remarks are a great help to me in determining how best to represent the people who sent me here to represent them. Of course, I wish there had been enough time for me to give a more detailed reply to each person who answered the questionnaire, for I should like to have done so.

Mr. Speaker, the views of the majority who answered generally parallel my own.

I know the Members of Congress will be interested in the outcome of my questionnaire, so under leave to extend my remarks, I include the detailed results in the RECORD. The figures I use here represent percentages, not the number of persons who answered a particular question:

1. In order of importance to you, number the six most important issues today:

	Business	Farmer	Labor	Professional	White collar	Miscellaneous	All
National defense	20	14	23	14	20	20	19
Foreign policy	12	15	8	22	16	15	15
Cuba	17	10	13	10	13	10	12
Federal encroachment	15	21	7	8	10	12	11
Budget	11	4	8	13	9	10	9
Taxes	10	7	10	7	10	8	9
Employment	6	1	14	3	8	6	7
Education	3	1	4	13	4	5	6
Nuclear test ban	4	1	5	4	4	3	4
Medical care	(1)	3	2	(1)	2	6	3
Farm problems	(1)	16	2	(1)	(1)	1	2
Berlin	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
De Gaulle	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Vietnam	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Other	3	5	3	4	3	4	3

[1] Less than 1 percent.

2. The President has proposed cuts in income taxes, but at the same time has submitted a $12 billion deficit budget. Should Congress (A) cut taxes regardless of the deficit; (B) cut taxes only if spending is reduced; (C) balance budget and reduce national debt?

	A	B	C
Business	12	52	36
Farm	12	45	43
Labor	17	42	41
Professional	11	55	35
White collar	13	51	36
Miscellaneous	18	39	43
All	14	47	39

3. Should Mount Baker and Snoqualmie National Forests areas continue to be operated under the multiple-use concept or should they be restricted to recreational use only?

	Multiple use	Single use
Business	83	17
Farm	79	21
Labor	81	19
Professional	77	23
White collar	72	28
Miscellaneous	75	25
All	78	22

4. De Gaulle has refused the President's offer to give the Polaris submarine to France. Should we: (A) Pressure France to accept our Polaris; (B) sell some subs to NATO; (C) assign them to NATO with multination control?

	A	B	C
Business	10	30	60
Farm	7	42	51
Labor	8	36	56
Professional	4	31	65
White collar	4	36	60
Miscellaneous	9	25	66
All	7	32	61

5. Should the U.S. contribute to United Nations funds from which it draws cash to pay for programs extended to Cuba such as the agriculture project?

	Yes	No
Business	13	87
Farm	12	88
Labor	14	86
Professional	34	66
White collar	27	73
Miscellaneous	19	81
All	20	80

6. Do you favor a voluntary medical care program for our senior citizens over a compulsory program?

	Yes	No
Business	85	15
Farm	83	17
Labor	85	15
Professional	82	18
White collar	73	27
Miscellaneous	76	24
All	79	21

7. Should we revise our military and economic assistance program to cut off so-called neutral countries which receive Russian aid?

	Yes	No
Business	76	24
Farm	86	14
Labor	81	19
Professional	62	38
White collar	73	27
Miscellaneous	76	24
All	75	25

8. Do you favor establishment of a Domestic Peace Corps?

	Yes	No
Business	44	56
Farm	48	52
Labor	51	49
Professional	52	48
White collar	45	55
Miscellaneous	45	55
All	47	53

9. Should the U.S. take a firmer stand toward Cuba, even at the risk of war?

	Yes	No
Business	88	12
Farm	86	14
Labor	84	16
Professional	82	18
White collar	88	12
Miscellaneous	78	22
All	83	17

10. Should Congress pass my bill to place import quotas on Canadian lumber?

	Yes	No
Business	79	21
Farm	85	15
Labor	84	16
Professional	67	33
White collar	74	26
Miscellaneous	76	24
All	77	23

11. Do you favor an increase in earning limits of social security recipients?

	Yes	No
Business	78	22
Farm	72	28
Labor	80	20
Professional	79	21
White collar	81	19
Miscellaneous	66	34
All	76	24

Mr. Speaker, the results again show that many people of my district are concerned with national defense. Closely tied to this issue is foreign affairs which ranked second. However, the thinking of the people back home is shifting. Thirty-six percent rated national defense the top issue in 1961. Last year 42 percent chose defense as the key issue. This year the results show that 19 percent selected national defense for the No. 1 spot.

On the other hand, foreign affairs received only 8 percent of the vote in 1961 and only 6 percent in 1962. This year, foreign policy polled 15 percent and Cuba 12 percent. This indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is growing concern in my district over the way the foreign affairs of our Nation are being run.

Also, there is growing concern over Federal encroachment, which ranked third this year, having moved up from fourth place in 1962. I received a large number of comments related to this issue as well as comments on national defense, spending and foreign affairs.

The fact that taxes and the budget ranked as fifth most important issue, that 47 percent believe taxes should be cut only if spending is reduced, and that 39 percent believe the budget should be balanced is a real strong indication the people of my district see the relationship between fiscal responsibility and a sound dollar.

Employment ranked sixth this year having replaced education and medical care of previous years as most important issues. All of us recognize the problems created by unemployment. I hope efforts can be made in my own district to level the peaks and valleys caused by seasonal fluctuations.

Mr. Speaker, the majority in each category in effect expressed the same view toward all major issues. As I have pointed out in the past, this means the people of the Second District are in agreement when it comes to what is good for our country.

Bad Medicine To Treat the Wrong Ailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's idea to tax foreign investments as a cure for the U.S. balance-of-payments problem is the wrong prescription.

Rather than cutting Government spending, the administration seeks a disrupting international curb on American foreign investments.

Such a proposition is worse than a snake oil cure; it would deter both the economic growth of the United States and the entire free world. Undoubtedly it would be followed later by a demand for more U.S. foreign aid spending to correct the harmful effects of the investment tax.

Instead of putting our fiscal house in order, President Kennedy prefers to obscure the real reason for the weakness of the dollar: deficit financing. Such dodging of the issue is politically convenient; a medicine man seldom tries to sell a bitter product to the public.

Henry Hazlitt's "No Help to the Dollar" in the August 5 Newsweek sets the record straight on this latest brand of administration phony medicine:

NO HELP TO THE DOLLAR

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration's proposal to tax foreign securities is unfortunate from every angle. It is a further abridgment of the economic liberties of American citizens. It is another roadblock to free markets. It is a clearly protectionist measure. It is a beggar-my-neighbor policy. It seeks to cure our balance-of-payment problems at the cost not only of increasing such problems for other nations but of disrupting their economies.

There were so many leaks in the proposal, even before the President announced the Canadian exemptions, as to make it futile in accomplishing its intended purpose of helping the balance of payments. The attempts to plug these leaks would lead inevitably to exchange controls. The proposal to give the President discretionary powers to discriminate as among securities and countries would substitute uncertainty and administrative favoritism for a rule of law.

The tax would, of course, do nothing to cure the balance of payments. On the contrary, its mere proposal has undermined confidence in the dollar. And the irony is that all punitive measures of this kind would be entirely unnecessary if the administration had the courage and understanding to take the proper measures.

HURTING OUR CUSTOMERS

The proposal to impose a so-called interest equalization tax of 2.75 to 15 percent on foreign securities offered in the American market had all the earmarks of a panicky idea that no one had thought through. Immediately after the President's message, stocks collapsed on the Canadian and Japanese markets. Within 3 days the President announced that "new" Canadian security issues would be exempt from the tax. The Canadians had meanwhile pointed out that while $457 million in new Canadian issues were purchased by U.S. citizens last year, Canada still had a $565 million deficit in her trade with the United States.

In other words, Canada was buying from us more than she was selling to us—and our loans and investments made part of this excess buying possible. But this also applies to Japan, which also buys from us more than she sells to us, and also partly because of our loans to her. And this applies to still other countries.

When one contemplates all its loopholes and exemptions—all direct investment, all securities or loans of less than 3 years, loans of commercial banks, securities of "less developed" countries—it is hard to understand what compensation even the administration expects from its disruptive proposal.

INFLATION CONTINUES

And all such measures are quite unnecessary. The deficit in the balance of payments could be stopped overnight if the Government would halt the inflation. It took a timid step in this direction when the Federal Reserve increased the discount rate from 3 percent to 3½ percent. But this move was too little, too late, and too isolated. In such a situation the raise should have been at least 1 full percentage point. It should not have been accompanied by assurances that long-term interest rates were going to be kept down. It should not have been preceded and contradicted by the Federal Reserve's inflationary policy of buying Federal securities and so increasing the paper money supply. (The Federal Reserve held $31.7 billion of Government securities on July 17, an increase of $2.7 billion in 12 months. In the same period the money supply has increased about $4 billion.)

In the same week that the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate, moreover, the world learned that our Federal budget deficit in the fiscal year ended June 30 was $6.2 billion, with the prospect of a deficit twice as big in the new fiscal year. Yet on top of all this the adminstration is recommending increased expenditures and has renewed its suggestion for a substantial tax cut.

It is continuing this policy of inflation, which is the basic cause of the dwindling confidence in the dollar, as the result of the quite false Keynesian idea that inflation is the cure for unemployment. Because it will not accept the only real cure, it is plunging deeper and deeper into dangerous and disruptive expedients.

Eleventh Anniversary of Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert into the RECORD a telegram sent by the mayor of the great city of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, to the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

I consider it a great privilege to do this inasmuch as a substantial portion of my constituency consists of those who were former residents of Puerto Rico. As Mayor Wagner says in his message, "The social, economic, and political achievements of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans are sources of pride for us all."

Text of telegram:

Hon. LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN,
Governor of Puerto Rico,
Portaleza, San Juan, P.R.:

On the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth, I extend to you and to Puerto Rico the best wishes of the 8 million people of New York City. So closely linked together are we in a hundred ways that today every New Yorker feels closely related to Puerto Rico, and your inhabitants in turn consider New York their second home.

New Yorkers have observed with prideful wonder the dynamic political status achieved by Puerto Rico 11 years ago. There has been an expanding recognition of this unique status not only in Washington but throughout the world. Similarly dynamic has been the increasing economic interdependence between Puerto Rico and the mainland.

The social, economic, and political achievements of Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans are sources of pride for us all and of congraulations to all of you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor, City of New York.

Others Tried First Steps to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, Drew Pearson's column of July 31 reviews the efforts made during the past half century, by both Democratic and Republican administrations, to achieve a more peaceful world through international organization.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Pearson's article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1963]

OTHERS TRIED FIRST STEPS TO PEACE

(By Drew Pearson)

A lot of memories came crowding back as I listened to John F. Kennedy tell the Nation that even if our goal of peace is a thousand miles away, we have to take the first step.

I remembered many other first steps.

There was that of Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State under President Coolidge, fretting, persevering, indefatigably working to negotiate a pact to outlaw war. I went with him when he went to Paris to sign that Kellogg-Briand Pact. He hoped that the world hoped it would be a long step toward peace.

Perhaps it was too long. But, anyway, I remember another Republican Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, when he tried to implement Kellogg's work. He went to London in 1930 to try to persuade the big powers to reduce their navies. I went with him, watched his patient, plodding, idealistic steps toward peace.

Later, as the dictators of Italy and Germany worked against him, Stimson went to Geneva, even though the United States was not a member of the League of Nations. Republican isolationists didn't like it, but Stimson, a Republican, went anyway.

And at night, facing the discouragements of Old-World diplomacy, Stimson couldn't sleep. He would look out at the poplar trees and see in the night the line of men from the fields, the factories, the sea, going forward; and the line of women, wounded men, exhausted troops falling back. A panorama of World War I in which he had fought lay before him. Most of his years had been given to trying to rebuild better understanding. And he had failed.

"How heavy," he wrote a friend, "a simple dove, bearing the olive branch, can weigh upon a man's wrist."

YEARS OF AGONY

World War II broke after that—years of agony, years of suffering, years of death. John F. Kennedy, a young naval officer, knew something of that agony during a long tropic night in the South Seas. Nikita S. Khrushchev knew far more of that death and suffering during a freezing winter at Stalingrad when his country stood with its back

to the wall, when his son was killed and when he occupied a dugout which his own troops had timebombed against the day when the Nazis would take it.

Came the end of the war, and new steps in the thousand-mile journey, back toward peace.

I remember Jimmy Byrnes as Secretary of State at the Paris peace conference in 1946. He argued patiently with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov. Jimmy had a temper, but kept it under control—for the sake of that first step toward peace.

But Molotov did not want peace, and later Khrushchev told me some of the reasons why.

I remember another conference in Geneva—the Summit meeting of 1955, after Stalin died and a new Red regime ruled in Moscow. Khrushchev came to Geneva.

END OF IRON CURTAIN

That conference accomplished one thing—people-to-people friendship. The Iron Curtain was on its way down. People of the East and West could now talk to each other. It didn't seem like much, but to me it meant a lot. I had been writing about it, harping on it for a long time, talked to Ike about it even when he was president of Columbia University. And eventually people-to-people friendship came to mean a lot to the world, for it began to show individual Russians and Americans that they could trust each other.

Came 1959 and the Camp David talks. Ike and Khrushchev seemed to like each other. Later Khrushchev told me he thought Ike was a man who sincerely wanted peace but couldn't control his own administration.

At the Summit conference in Paris in May 1960, it looked as if he hadn't been able to control the U-2 spy plane and some of the people around him.

Basically Khrushchev was right about Ike. In his clumsy, sometimes faltering way, Ike did want peace. And his greatest disappointment was that failure.

John F. Kennedy, who picked up the pieces after him, thinking diplomacy was easy, also failed at first. His meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna was a miserable failure. He came home a shaken, discouraged man.

But he had won one victory which he didn't realize—Khrushchev's respect, "President Kennedy is a man you can disagree with but still respect," Khrushchev told me later.

He also told me, as we parted after 2 days' conversation: "Please see President Kennedy when you return and tell him everything I've said. Also tell him that if the United States and Russia stand together, no country can ever start war."

Some people criticized me for believing Khrushchev meant what he said. But I still believe it. And the difference between the discouraging first steps toward peace taken by Kellogg and Stimson, and Jimmy Byrnes, and the first step taken by President Kennedy and Khrushchev is first, the fact that if two of the strongest nations in the world do stand together, no one can successfully start war; and second, that both Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy understand the horror of nuclear war.

Participation by the United States in the International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent of the House to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of the Honorable Kenneth C. Kellar, of Lead, S. Dak., which was made before the House Committee on Education and Labor and also before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The testimony of Mr. Kellar with regard to the International Labor Organization should be of special interest to every Member of Congress. It is a studied statement and very well documented. The statement is as follows:

My name is Kenneth C. Kellar. I am a mining attorney in Lead, S. Dak.; and I am the senior partner of a law firm which represents several substantial mining companies. I have specialized to a large extent in the field of labor relations.

It is my understanding that this informal review was initiated to examine the activities of the International Labor Organization with a view to determining whether a full-scale investigation by the Congress of the ILO is warranted to determine whether the United States is justified in remaining in ILO, particularly in view of recent disturbing developments at the seat of the ILO, in Geneva. I am not in a position to, nor do I propose to, report factually on the current dispute within ILO which reached such disgraceful proportions last month. However, I am neither surprised nor shocked, in the light of my own personal observations of ILO, at the performance on the ILO stage. In November and December 1957, I attended a tripartite meeting of the ILO on mining (other than coal) as one of two employer-delegates representing the mining industry of the United States. Therefore, I should like to comment on ILO, by way of historical background, for the benefit of this committee and possibly shed some light on the current trend of ILO events.

ILO, as you know, operates on a tripartite basis. Each member nation is represented at the regular sessions by two government, one worker, and one employer delegate. Presently, 108 nations are represented at ILO, which reflects a considerable increase in numbers since 1957, mostly as a result of added participation by the emerging African countries. At the outset, permit me to point out that our own great Nation has only equal voting strength with each one of the Communist bloc countries or other member nations, including such sophisticated and allegedly competent nations in the field of labor-management relations as the Congo, Cuba, Dahomey, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, the Ivory Coast, Kuwait, Liberia, Malagasy Republic, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia Republic, Tanganyika, Rwanda, Upper Volta, and Togo, to name but a few.

The United States foots 25 percent of the ILO bill, the next highest contributors being Russia and Great Britain with about 10 percent each and thereafter other nations in rapidly descending scale. In 1956, the ILO budget was $7,395,000, and remained fairly static until 1959, when it jumped to $8,529,000 and thereafter has been going up at a rapidly ascending pace, until the 1963 budget reached $14 million, or approximately $3 million over the 1962 budget. The assessment against the United States for the 1963 budget was $3½ million. I note that the 1964 budget recently adopted in Geneva is $16,977,156, another $3 million increase. I shall return to this subject later.

ILO carries on its activities through several devices, such as conventions, resolutions, conclusions, and memorandums in descending order of importance. A convention, in reality is a basic law which, when ratified by member nations, is effectively a treaty among the countries which have ratified it. Before presentation to the ILO plenary session, items on the agenda are first farmed out to working subcommittees of workers-, government-, and employer-delegates which meet in separate sessions. Thereafter, there is a combined committee meeting of all three of these groups. The millfeed from this particular crushing plant then goes to the plenary session for final beneficiation. I use the term "crushing" advisedly since employer-delegates in a relatively few nations of the free world are absolutely helpless when confronted by the combined vote of government, worker, and so-called employer-delegates of the Communist bloc countries and the combined vote of worker, and government delegates, sometimes joined in by employer delegates in Socialist-dominated countries. This situation has been even more accentuated by the addition of a number of the new African nations to the fold.

At the ILO sessions, both my codelegate and myself voted against any resolution per se because we felt such a document had more impact and weight under ILO procedures and practices than a conclusion or memorandum and, therefore, was much more likely to eventually wind up as an international convention adopted by the ILO. Neither of us believed that the ILO should function as a super deluxe world parliament and therefore were opposed to the principle that ILO should adopt any international instruments.

Another interesting facet of the mechanics of the administrative procedure within the framework of ILO was noted by my codelegate and myself. The activities of the working subcommittees are under the rigid direction of the ILO permanent staff. In such meetings, discussion is held to a minimum and the major objective seemed to be the production of embryonic international legislation. At the desk of each subcommittee member suddenly appeared a complete draft of a resolution which, in great detail, sets forth principles, rules, and regulations which should govern all phases of the subject allegedly "under discussion." Henceforth, discussion consisted in voting on these specific proposals obviously prepared well in advance of the meeting by the ILO permanent staff, acting apparently to further the aims of the leftwing international trade unions.

I was impressed by three aspects of the ILO during my attendance at the sessions in Geneva. First, and foremost, is the fact that dedicated trade union radicals from many nations, in Latin America, in Asia, in Africa and even in the European countries, regarded ILO as a convenient forum to denounce and vilify the capitalistic free-enterprise system in speech after speech before the plenary sessions by the use of the most intemperate, untrue and inflammatory language. Delegate after delegate ran the gamut of laudatory comments about the accomplishments within his own particular country ranging from a 1 day holiday for every 16 days' work to commendation of a maximum 30-hours work week, to participation by workers in a public body controlling the investment policies of companies, to advocacy of nationalization of mines.

Secondly, the very considerable influence of the Soviet bloc countries was very much in evidence as witnessed by the outcome of a very heated contest on an administrative point within the framework of ILO. The question arose as to whether employer-delegates from the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia should be seated and permitted to vote in employer-working committees. Employer delegates from the free nations contended that such a seating should not be permitted since obviously, in essence, these Soviet employer delegates were in reality merely a second set of government delegates as they did not represent free employers. The dispute was carried to the floor of the plenary session where the Soviet view prevailed in a very close vote. Significantly,

the U.S. Government delegates abstained from voting on this issue.

Finally, it seemed to me quite obvious that the main objective of ILO is to establish worldwide international standards in the labor-management field which will have the full force of international law once approved by member nations by way of the convention device. Certainly a one-world concept of international labor standards, which ILO will attempt to foist on the United States should be repugnant not only to industry but to labor in the United States. Note should be taken by both that our voting strength in ILO is in the minority when faced by the votes of the Soviet, the Asian, the African and a number of Latin American countries.

Apropos of the last statement, I call attention to an event which occurred in 1962. The employer delegate of Cuba was challenged by the Credentials Committee on which the employer and worker members of the Credentials Committee recommended invalidation of the credentials in question. Objections to the credentials of the Cuban employer delegate were lodged by a group of employer delegates and by an association of Cuban employers in exile. The point was raised that the credentials should be invalidated because the Cuban employers nomination could not have been made in the atmosphere of freedom essential to the nomination of representative nongovernment delegates and that he could not have been chosen in agreement with the most representative industrial organizations as required by the constitution of the ILO. Despite these objections the proposal to invalidate was brought before the plenary session of ILO, which, after a prolonged discussion, rejected the proposal to invalidate by a very substantial majority.

Even American labor leaders in recent times have shown faint enthusiasm for ILO. The Christian Science Monitor, for July 5, 1962, carried an article quoting George Meany in which the following observations were made, "Meany warned that unless free trade unions and free world government begin to combat Communist infiltration the time will soon arrive when you can kiss the ILO goodbye." Meany said, "The ILO has become a political background and a propaganda front for the Iron Curtain countries." This violation of the ILO constitution, said Mr. Meany, allows Fascist and Communist countries a legal cover and can only lead to the destruction of the ILO. I am shocked at what prevails today at ILO particularly the possibility that Communist countries may force through a constitutional amendment which would give them the right to ILO staff jobs without any examination. The only test being geographical allotment."

Lawrence Fertig, about a year ago, stated in his column, "Goldberg is considering whether the United States should participate in ILO. The reason being that AFL-CIO flared up on the rendition of two reports by ILO, one being on labor unions in the United States and the other on labor unions in the Soviet Union. The United States had no representative on the investigating group for the American report and had nothing to say about its final version. The report from the U.S.S.R., however, was guided by two Communist nations on the committee as well as an official interpreter. When it came out American labor leaders were shocked."

By remaining in the ILO, the United States apparently embraces the doctrine of tripartitism in the labor-management field. When the Communist nations were permitted to enter ILO, tripartitism became ridiculous since so-called employer delegates from such countries could scarcely be regarded as representatives of free employers. Hence, proponents of ILO were hard pressed and evolved the credo of universality. Now, in view of the current ruckus which occurred in Geneva involving the Communist, Asian, and African countries, I understand universality is being mentioned with muted breath and tripartitism has again come to the fore. In any event, I submit that tripartitism reveals a basic weakness in the entire ILO structure since it recognizes the dominant role of government in the labor-management field with two government delegates to one for labor and one for management. While governmental intervention by the all-powerful central States may be a precept acceptable to other nations, certainly there has been indication that businessmen and some union spokesmen in this country view with skepticism and concern full-scale dominent government intervention which will inevitably lead to the destruction of the collective bargaining process.

Business leaders in this country have shown increasing disquietude over ILO activities. In 1961, the National Association of Manufacturers withdrew from participation in ILO and speaking as one director of NAM, I applaud the wisdom of this policy. The other participating business organization, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, at least to date has elected to remain within the ambit of ILO, although even their leadership is beginning to raise serious questions about ILO as will be noted by a statement appearing in the June 27, 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11176, reporting a speech by Mr. Richard Wagner, chairman of the board, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the employer-delegate at the recent ILO session in Geneva, as follows: "The deplorable fact, however, has been that, in the face of its new-found challenges and opportunities for effective service, the ILO has been diverted by the Eastern European nations from its original purposes and has essentially degenerated into a cold war forum and an instrumentality for political propaganda." And, Mr. Wagner in a press release of July 7, 1963, among other things made the following observation: "It is time for the Congress to take a good look at what is occurring in this particular area." Mr. Wagner said, "And to take such steps as seem expedient after they have had this review." In this expression I fully concur. I understand also that Mr. Wagner is of the opinion that as long as the United States participates in ILO, U.S. business should be represented in the hopes that ways and means may be found to minimize the use of the forum by Communists for ideological warfare. I have only the highest regard for those American businessmen who are motivated by very laudable idealistic concepts and who would hope that ILO might become an instrumentality for educating the millions of underfed and underprivileged peoples of the emerging nations in the advantages and desirability of the private enterprise system. However, I take a more realistic and practical political view of the situation. I do not believe any tangible benefits to the United States can be accomplished when the American delegation and its few supporters from other countries can be outvoted at the behest of the Communist world. In my humble opinion, employer delegates of the United States extolling the virtues of our system at ILO sessions in Geneva are talking down a wind tunnel and their message will never reach the populace they have in mind.

Gentlemen, I submit the ILO is not the proper forum for informing the peoples of the world on the virtue of our American free enterprise system since our words may well be drowned out by the unruly chanting of African delegates who regard an international conclave as a proper situs for mob rule. It would certainly be most appropriate for the Congress to conduct an inquiry as to the source of the recent disturbance in Geneva to ascertain which nation instigated the discord and whether this ties into any pattern relating to some of our more serious domestic problems.

Further, in such an inquiry it would seem desirable for the Congress to get down to specifics and ascertain, if possible, what benefits if any have accrued to either industry or, for that matter, to labor, in this country by reason of participation in ILO. The citizens of this country who are footing 25 percent of a $16,900,000 assessment are certainly entitled to find out whether their dollars so spent are in any manner whatsoever strengthening the United States or whether these funds are being expended to perpetuate a forum for the dissemination of one-world international, radical, trade unionism, inspired by the guiding hand of the Communist bloc.

In conclusion, one final observation. The director general of the ILO has called for the ostracism of South Africa over the apartheid issue and calls for the formulation of a policy to guarantee freedom from forced labor to the native population. But, strangely, his voice has not been raised to call for ostracism of the Soviet for its subjugation of the people of Hungary and other Iron Curtain countries.

I urge this committee to consider the desirability of recommending withdrawal from ILO by the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

KENNETH C. KELLAR.

The Day They Shook the Plum Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the House to a current bestseller. It is "The Day They Shook the Plum Tree," the story of Hetty Green, the "witch of Wall Street," written by Arthur H. Lewis, who resides in my district in Philadelphia.

Mr. Lewis, a former newspaperman, deserves commendation for his diligence and research in the life and times of Hetty Green, who amassed a fortune, estimated at $300 million, with a complete disregard for her fellow citizens.

She lived in squalor, deprived her son and daughter of a proper home life, and left not 1 cent to charity. Her fortune ultimately was squandered by her son in aimless and riotous living, and finally disposed of in a senseless fashion by the daughter.

It is of interest to note that only a few hours after Mrs. Green's death in 1916, William Jennings Bryan, then a Congressman, noting that she had lived in a cheap boardinghouse and contributed only a few hundred dollars a year to the national economy, stated:

> This woman, under our indirect method of taxation, did not pay as much toward the support of the Federal Government as a laboring man whose income of $500 is spent on his family.

The reason for bringing this book to the attention of the House is to put in proper focus the danger of accumulation of mammoth fortunes without regard for public welfare. Hetty Green's "public be damned" attitude is still with

us. It exists in the case of multimillionaires who misuse their vast fortunes in a selfish grab for power. Some set up so-called foundations which provide the funds for hate peddlers. Great sums are spent by them to fight progressive legislation and to weaken the fabric of our democracy.

On the other hand, there are a number of wealthy individuals who have dedicated their fortunes to noble ends. Those, like the Rockefeller and Ford foundations, annually spend millions to help eradicate disease, support the pursuit of knowledge, feed the hungry, and build a better life for victims of misfortune.

America must ever be alert that the public welfare be guarded from the greed of the Hetty Greens. We must revise our tax laws so that venal money lords do not find loopholes to evade their rightful tax responsibilities. We must encourage legitimate foundations set up for the public good, but we must not allow foundations to be used as devices to spread hate propaganda in an effort to divide our people in the guise of education.

The story of Hetty Green should be a warning to America that money can be a curse when misused, and a blessing when it is spent for the good of mankind.

A Note to Jack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, answers to my annual questionnaire are being tabulated and soon will be ready for publication. Preliminary results indicate that 14 percent of the approximate 84,300 persons who receive the questionnaire answered it. I am pleased that the people of my district have expressed such an interest in their Federal Government.

Interest also was expressed by many newspapers in the district, including the Burlington Farm Journal. In an editorial, "Note to Jack," the Journal pointed out the difficulty involved in selecting the six major issues of the day. This interesting editorial discusses the issues and concludes that the Congress, elected by the people, must make the decisions. Significantly, the Journal states that our Nation is regarded by much of the world as a leader, and suggests that it begin to act like one.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

NOTE TO JACK

Congressman JACK WESTLAND has mailed out his annual questionnaire to voters, soliciting the opinions of 2d District constituents on important matters of the day. JACK says, "It's hard to answer some questions flatly 'Yes' or 'No,' but I face this problem each time I vote. I'll welcome your comments."

We will concern ourselves here with only the first question which is broad in scope and wherein, we feel, is the key to the answers for the other 10 the Congressman has posed. Question No. 1 follows:

"In order of importance to you, number the six most important issues today: Foreign policy, farm problems, De Gaulle, national defense, Cuba, nuclear test ban, budget, medical care, Vietnam, Federal encroachment, taxes, Berlin, education, employment, other (specify)."

Well, JACK, as Americans, we feel our own problems come first. If we are strong economically, politically, and morally, our national defense will also be strong and we will be in a far better position to deal with international strife that may involve us. Let's begin by properly educating our children; not by book learning alone but by instilling in them a proper set of values. Let's provide them with the practical as well as academic knowledge necessary to make a living when they get out of school. Let's somehow get across to them the world does not owe them a living, but rather, that they owe the world and themselves something.

Armed with a proper education, they will not wind up facing what we feel constitutes the second most important issue, unemployment, or if you will, employment. Incidentally, JACK, it would be comforting to be able to believe all of us will not wind up working for the Government some day. This may come as a complete surprise to some of the boys back there, but there actually are a few of us left who feel we could do better under a free enterprise system. Possibly the manpower retraining program could be applied to some of your coleagues' thinking. This would certainly help in the cause of people standing on their own feet again.

A properly educated and gainfully employed person will solve the problem of the third issue, taxes. That is, he will be able to pay his share. None of us object to this. But when taxes are squandered in behalf of such people as Duvalier of Haiti, who we have supplied with millions of dollars and U.S. guns, gums that could conceivably be turned on us, well, our patience, as well as our pocketbooks, has been taxed to capacity, and you and the rest of the boys back in Washington had just as well know it.

If our citizens are properly educated, gainfully employed, and able to pay their fair share of the tax load it takes to run this country, we do not feel they are going to put up with the fourth problem for very long, Federal encroachment. A healthy business community, free of regimentation and control, will seek and find its own level of prosperity, provide jobs for people, and thereby promote individual responsibility. Competition is good for the soul and what's good for the soul is good for our country. The average American does not need to be told by bureaucrats how to run his life.

And if the Federal Government doesn't get its nose out of every business in the land, and soon, the fifth issue, farm problems, is going to move up on the priority ladder. The belief that the Government can run the Nation's farms from a desk in Washington, D.C., is nothing more than what is usually piled behind the barn. One of our greatest surpluses is too much government; permanent storage on this commodity is long overdue. The Nation's farmers long to lift their heads again.

Furthermore, JACK, if the Government doesn't get off our collective backs and provide us with some incentive to get out of bed in the morning, we will all be ripe prospects for the sixth problem, medical care. We're not talking about the aged only, but every living, breathing American that cherishes the right to think for himself. Believe us, when we say there is a sickness running riot in this country we fear much more than that which accompanies old age. It is the sickness of conformity, of lack of initiative, of eventual despair, and ultimately, of passive subjection. People must have a will to work, to strive for something, to realize the fruits of individual achievement. We have a hunch that most people so girded for the battle of life will live to be happy and old, and well able to take care of their own problems.

Foreign policy? De Gaulle? Cuba? Nuclear test ban? Budget? Vietnam? Berlin? Jack, you and the rest of the boys back there will have to figure out the answers to these. That's what we sent you back there for. We trust you'll make the right decisions on those questions if you can make the proper judgment on our problems at home. The whole mess is tied together in a conflict of principles. We are regarded by much of the world as a leader. Let's begin acting like one. And Jack, on most questions the answer has to be yes or no. We have foraged on the broad and open field of compromise for many a moon. Where has it led us and what is the price we have paid?

Hammond (Ind.) Times on Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Carl M. Davidson, editor of the Hammond (Ind.) Times, sets out a few facts which constitute the major questions to be decided in the test ban treaty ratification.

The Hammond Times is one of the leading papers in Indiana, and in the past has supported the Republican Party on most national issues;

THE TEST BAN TREATY

The tentative agreement between the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia on a treaty which would ban nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere, under water or in space is of course not a treaty binding the United States until it has been confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

There is no doubt that the Senate will take a very thorough look at its provisions before consenting to making it binding on this Nation. Republicans, as the party of opposition, will be taking a particularly close look, and may suggest some provisos they believe will strengthen U.S. protection under the treaty.

That treaty would not result in disarmament of nuclear weapons by either side. All it would do is require the three biggest nuclear powers to cease further experimental blasts that would further contaminate the atmosphere or the waters on the earth. Detection of any cheating by either side would, of course, be cause for immediate abrogation of the treaty.

The treaty that has been arrived at is a limited version of what the United States and Britain have been attempting to gain agreement upon from Soviet Russia since talks were initiated under the Eisenhower administration in 1956.

The big point of disagreement continued to be in the field of underground testing and how many inspections and how many monitor sites would be necessary. Finally, the whole underground test issue was thrown out. Both sides are free to continue further underground testing.

Underground testing, fortunately, does not raise radioactive clouds into the atmosphere to circulate around the world and to scatter unassimilated radioactive poisons which decay only slowly to the detriment of all mankind. At least, as President Kennedy said, it may be possible to halt poisoning of children's milk, under the present negotiated treaty.

It would be a sad thing if the treaty got mixed up in partisan politics in the Senate. At the same time, the debate before the ratification of the treaty should serve to educate the American people further into just what such a treaty can be expected to accomplish, as well as its limitations. One limitation is already apparent with the failure of France's Prime Minister de Gaulle to go along.

Furthermore, the signing of the treaty—assuming the Senate ratifies it, of which the chances are good—should not put the West off its guard. We should not be lulled into assuming any basic change in Russian aims to promote a "Communist world victory."

The Soviet will continue to promote these aims by various methods. The main thing the test ban treaty will do is stop injecting radioactive poisons, which respect no world boundary lines, into the world's atmosphere while the struggle goes on.

Watch on the Rhine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than 3 years have passed since I first warned of dangers that would arise from continued unfavorable balance of payments. During these years, little was said about this problem in the press. Recently, however, the subject has become front-page news and has occupied column after column of type.

The concern among many people is indicated by the number of editorials that are being written about this matter. An example is the editorial that appeared in the Seattle Times on July 17.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

COSTLY WATCH ON THE RHINE

The American Bankers' Association has urged the administration to consider troop reductions overseas as a means of easing the mounting international balance-of-payments crisis. The recommendation makes good sense. It represents perhaps the simplest and least politically painful way to begin curbing the flow of dollars overseas.

The time has come for Americans to ask themselves why they should continue to maintain more than a quarter million American troops in Europe at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars when prosperous Western Europe is—with the backing of the U.S. Strategic Air Command—fully capable of maintaining its own defense.

Retaining a representative American military force in Europe probably will be necessary for the foreseeable future as a guarantee to skeptical West Europeans of America's intention to honor its NATO commitments.

But why should Uncle Sam maintain six or more divisions there while most of his allies continue to shirk their own NATO commitments in terms of military-force levels?

This is not to suggest that the United States should begin to disarm itself. The uneasy and flammable state of the world does not suggest that Uncle Sam could safely relax his military posture.

What the international situation does suggest, however, is that some of the divisions now in Europe could be transferred to the Strategic Reserve in the United States, with a subsequent considerable reduction in American dollar spending abroad.

Such a redeployment might, in fact, actually increase the Armed Forces' capabilities for dealing with types of military emergency most likely to arise under present international conditions—"brush fire" flareups in Asia, the Middle East or Latin America—assuming air transport capacity is maintained at a suitable level.

In 1962 the United States devoted 9.8 percent of its total national output to the defense budget. The comparable figure for the European NATO Allies, on the average, was 5.4 percent. None of those countries approached the United States in percentage of national output devoted to defense.

The two West European countries with the highest percentages of spending for defense purposes were Portugal with 7.1 percent and France with 6.5. Much of Portugal's military expenditure, of course, goes to maintain its African colonies, and much of France's is spent on development of an unnecessary strategic nuclear bombing force.

Meanwhile, the golden flow of spending by the huge American Military Establishment in Europe continues to flow into the economies of other countries, further weakening the position of the dollar and helping to keep Uncle Sam in the position of an international debtor.

California Dategrower Hit by End of Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, for those who contend, without supporting factual information or knowledge, that the bracero program does not help the small farmer or even the widow with 10 acres, I share the following letter:

LAS DUNAS RANCH,
Coachella, Calif., July 27, 1963.

Hon. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The effect of the prospective end of the bracero program has begun to hit me, personally. I have 10 acres of dates, and it is time to cut the dead branches and prepare to put on bags. The American Date Gardens, who handle our dates for market, have been able to reassign to me bracero date men. This week they are so far behind for want of date workers that they have none to spare. The Coachella Farmers Association has no date men. This operation is a minor one; what will I do when the big operations, date picking and pollinating, come along? I am speaking for one small grower.

Since the death of my husband, Tom Sakai and Louie Dan have been leasing my farmland for tomatoes, beans, and other truck crops. This was supposed to have been a long-term operation. I have been shocked to be confronted with the news that, owing to the anticipated end of the bracero program, they will not be able to renew the leases.

My son-in-law was on the verge of selling a piece of farmland in the Fallbrook area when the news of the end of the bracero program came. Overnight the real estate business died, as far as farmland was concerned.

The first of June people were saying to us farmers, "What will you do?"

We were replying, "We'll wait and see."

Now we, too, are saying, "What will we do?" We are asking you. Will you let the program die?

Sincerely yours,

ALGA KERSTEINER
Mrs. W. H. Kersteiner.

For those who can combine empathy and economics, I suggest we answer this lady, and thousands of others, affirmatively by extending the only program yet devised for assuring an adequate supply of farm labor for peak harvest periods when no other labor is available.

Trade With Soviet Bloc Linked to Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article which appeared in the July 29, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times entitled "Trade With Soviet Bloc Linked to Ban Treaty."

As will be noted, it is reported in the article that in connection with the nuclear test ban discussions the United States and the U.S.S.R. have reached an understanding that the United States would liberalize its policies on trade with Communist nations.

If these reports are accurate, it is a matter of utmost concern to everyone genuinely interested in the security of the United States and opposed to policies of accommodating the Communist attempts to achieve their devious goal of world domination.

Obtaining from the West strategic and precision machinery, technologies, whole factories, and so forth, is one of the major goals of the Communist bloc. This they are trying to do by every means at their command, aboveboard where this is possible and illicitly where it is not. This has been common knowledge for a long time and certainly American officials participating in the talks with the Soviets know this and are completely aware of the significance the Communists attach to increasing their trade effort with the West.

It would be highly ironic and inadvisable to accompany any test ban with agreements by the United States to lift bans on trade with the Communist bloc which would increase greatly Communist strength through increasing their economic and military potential.

Aside from the serious questions arising with regard to the proposed nuclear test ban agreement itself, I believe the possibility of tacit side agreements—for example, an agreement on weakening U.S. trade controls—must be thoroughly explored because of the great significance of any such agreements to our welfare and security.

Many concerned citizens will be watching events in this area closely and with much interest to see whether and to what extent side agreements may have been made which are contrary to our security and welfare.

The article follows:

TRADE WITH SOVIET BLOC LINKED TO BAN TREATY: SOURCES SAY KHRUSHCHEV APPROVED PACT WITH AGREEMENT ON MORE U.S. COMMERCE

HYANNIS PORT.—Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's willingness to okay the historic test ban treaty was accompanied by an understanding that the United States would liberalize trade with Iron Curtain countries, informed sources said Sunday.

The United States is now prepared to open direct trade talks with the Communist pact nations, the sources said, and negotiations will get underway shortly.

KENNEDY HAILS TREATY

Undersecretary of State Averell Harriman refused to comment on this report Saturday after his meeting here with President Kennedy. Harriman headed the U.S. delegation to the three-nation talks which concluded the test ban treaty.

Mr. Kennedy hailed the signing as a "victory for mankind." But it must now be ratified by the Senate, which predictably would balk at any deal to increase trade with the Soviet bloc countries.

The White House flatly refused to comment on the reports that a trade understanding had been reached with the Soviets. But the sources, close to the administration, maintain that the deal was discussed at the test ban negotiations. They feel that Khrushchev managed to kill two birds with one stone—better coexistence terms and a liberal trade pact.

AGREEMENT DELAYED

In a further development, informed sources said that the official signing of a nuclear agreement with Canada, supposed to be initialed last week, has been delayed indefinitely by mutual consent of both governments until the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia has been ratified.

The agreement was arranged by President Kennedy and Canadian Premier Lester Pearson at their little summit meeting here last May. It should have been signed last Tuesday, but the ceremony was postponed, the sources said, because "neither side wanted to upset the diplomatic applecart when the negotiations in Moscow were going so well."

Under the agreement, the United States would provide Canada with nuclear warheads for missiles to be used for intercontinental defense.

A Tribute to the VFW's Omar B. Ketchum

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one of its outstanding citizens in the tragic death of Omar B. Ketchum, the distinguished director of the Washington office of the Veteran of Foreign Wars.

Arkansas-born and Kansas-reared, Omar Ketchum was known as "Mister VFW" to many Members of the Congress. For more than 20 years he spoke eloquently and worked effectively to advance the many fine causes supported by this great veterans' organization.

As much as any other man, Omar Ketchum was responsible for many improvements in our veterans' benefits programs. He was also a strong and consistent champion of measures to strengthen our armed forces and internal security.

In addition to this, he was a warm friend, a worthy comrade, and an unselfish servant of noble causes.

The VFW has lost a pillar of strength in the Nation's Capitol, and the veterans have lost a stalwart champion.

Statement of Mr. Leslie Logan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Leslie Logan, president, Arlingtonians for Preservation of the Palisades:

STATEMENT OF MR. LESLIE LOGAN TO MEMBERS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—OPPOSITION TO THREE SISTERS BRIDGE

Highway officials apparently have paid little or no attention to the intent of Congress, which set up the National Capital Transportation Agency after rejecting the District's Mass Transportation Survey Plan of 1959. In establishing the NCTA, Congress stated:

"It is becoming increasingly evident that any attempt to meet the area's transportation needs by highways and private automobiles alone will wreck the city; it will demolish residential neighborhoods, violate parks and playgrounds, desecrate the monumental portions of the Nation's Capital, and remove much valuable property from the tax rolls."

Yet the District Highway Department has redoubled its efforts in pressing for its accelerated 1959 plan, to which has been added a Three Sisters Bridge project as a key segment. As reported by the Whitener subcommittee:

"The reasons given by the District government for the acceleration of these projects are unimpressive in the light of the heretofore expressed intent of the Congress in enacting the NCTA legislation. Basically, they boil down to the fact that when additional Federal funds were unexpectedly made available, the District Commissioners decided to accelerate their highway program, upon the basis of questionable traffic projections, without the least consultation or coordination with, much less approval by, the National Capital Transportation Agency, or consideration of its plans, and in the belief—at least of the Highway Department—in an all-highway solution to the transportation problems of the Nation's Capital, despite the fact that such a solution has been heretofore expressly rejected by the Congress."

Even before the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, we had long believed the Three Sisters project to be unnecessary. The report of that agency, as well as the report of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City (the oldest planning agency in the Nation's Capital), and the Special Subcommittee on Traffic, Streets, and Highways (87th Cong., 2d Sess.), chairmanned by Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, which outline a coordinated and balanced highway-mass rapid transit system, all go to prove that our opposition has merit and that the bridge is unnecessary. If the old 14th Street Bridge were restored as provided for in bills (H.R. 6744) introduced by Congressman JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia, and (S. 1748) introduced by Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, an additional river crossing for all types of motor vehicles would be provided for the Interstate System at minimum cost to the taxpayers. There is already the nearly completed Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, and there are other alternatives for a truck crossing over the Potomac River, among them being the remodelling of Key Bridge.

WHAT PRICE TO ARLINGTON?

District Highway Officials have shown no concern whatsoever for the disastrous effects of a Three Sisters Bridge on the Arlington Community. These officials have not considered:

1. The desecration of many acres of parklands; the ruination of the most beautiful portion of the Potomac gorge; the scarring of fine residential areas. We quote the opinion expressed by the Whitener subcommittee:

"Unfortunately, and sadly, it must be admitted, little or no heed has been paid to the adverse aesthetic effect of this whole highway program, gouging as it does into the beauty of our lovely Capital, nor to the attendant loss of parks and recreational areas in the Nation's first city."

2. The removal of valuable land and homes from the tax rolls of Arlington County.

3. The downgrading of fine residential sections on either side of Lorcom Lane from Spout Run to Old Dominion Drive. It is inevitable that the residential cross streets of this area will become traffic feeders to Lorcom Lane, which cannot help but become a high-speed thoroughfare.

4. The cost to the State for land acquisition.

5. The cost of construction of a mammoth interchange at Spout Run and Lorcom Lane.

6. The cost of Interstate Route 266. In public testimony at the official hearing for the proposed Spur Route 266, the State Highway Engineer estimated the cost of the route at $3,670,000. As this spur parallels, and therefore duplicates, the main Route 66, it can be readily understood that the cost of $3,670,000 becomes doubled. Presumably this cost does not recognize the cost of taking up, and therefore destroying, the value of the present Spout Run Corridor which is now being used by motorists.

When the additional costs of items 4, 5, and 6 above are added by the District Highway Department to its estimated cost of the Three Sisters Bridge, we are bold enough to state that the total cost could come close to equaling the District's estimate of $5,500,000 for the bridge alone, or a total of near $10 million for the completed project.

We cannot attempt to place a dollar sign on items 1, 2, and 3, as these items are not susceptible to such a cold evaluation—the losses there being of the heart and mind in the taking of homes and the destroying of communities.

The Arlington County Board has unanimously endorsed the President's position that further commitments for Three Sisters Bridge should be deferred pending "a careful reexamination of the highway program."

We believe any appropriation for a Three Sisters Bridge before Congress has had an opportunity to evaluate the NCTA program, and the study recommended by the President has been completed and evaluated, would be premature; and, also as taxpayers, we oppose the unnecessary cost of this project. Therefore we urge the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives to continue to hold in abeyance any project or use of funds respecting to the proposed Three Sisters Bridge.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: As an American of Armenian ancestry I am very much interested in your bill, House Resolution 14–15, for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Please continue your good work in behalf of this bill. I am sure it will please you to know that there are many other Armenian Americans who admire your determination regarding this bill.

Sincerely,

MASSOAB MOORADIAN.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
June 29, 1963.

Re House Resolution 14.
Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Forest Hills, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Please note, pending resolution on captive nations, in the House, needs your utmost attention. So please do all you can to make it a success. I assure you your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you very much.

Yours truly,

JOHN VARNES.

JULY 5, 1963.

Representative HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I wish to go on record as endorsing H.R. 14 which I understand would set up a House Committee on Captive Nations, the function of which would be to collect data on captive nations and make said data available to responsible people. This is a wonderful idea.

Please consider my views.

Sincerely,

J. C. PEELE, M.D.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 22.*

Representative DANIEL FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the current issue of the St. Paul Wanderer where you have introduced a bill to set up a permanent Captive Nations Week Committee and I heartily endorse your bill.

I have recently written to the President and Secretary of State on the matter of this yearly proclamation, in hopes that it will bring to their attention the demand for it on the part of the grass roots. But once again it appears that they will try to scuttle it entirely, or wait until the last moment as they did last year.

I sincerely hope this bill goes through and that it might give a jolt to our State Department, who care more about the feelings of the Communist leaders than the people they have enslaved throughout the world.

Yours very truly,

KATHLEEN RARDON
Mrs. Jack A. Rardon.

JUNE 3, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: House Resolutions 14 and 15 has been called to our attention.

We are concerned that the bill which you introduced in 1960 has been tied up in the Rules Committee for so long.

As Armenian Americans, we are interested in a committee for captive countries. We hope for a quick passage for this bill.

Our deepest thanks for your support of our cause.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HANOIAN.

A Brave Man Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the following editorial from the Catholic Standard of Washington, D.C., needs any comment. The message is moving indeed:

A BRAVE MAN DIES

A brave man was buried recently—the Hungarian freedom fighter. He was officially removed from the face of the earth when the United Nations Assembly accepted the credentials of the Hungarian delegation to the General Assembly on the same basis as those of the other members. Previously, at the urging of the United States, the Assembly has refused to rule on the Hungarian credentials one way or the other. While this was so the freedom fighter's hopes lingered on that something might be done about the Soviet Union's suppression of the Hungarian revolt in 1956. Now hope has turned to dust, and, as if to supervise the funeral, Secretary General U Thant has announced that he will soon visit Hungary.

Why this change in policy? Certainly the United Nations resolutions regarding Hungary have not been met. These resolutions, formulated in 1956, called for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, free elections, the admission of United Nations observers and an amnesty for Hungarians who opposed Soviet control. To date, only the amnesty has been granted and this may only be a token since a number of patriots still remain in prison.

One reason for the change seems to be that Mr. Thant (along with a great many of the members of the United Nations) feels that the Hungarian question is a cold war issue. Consequently, Mr. Thant would want to drop the issue since it would only irritate the Russians without bringing any great practical result. The other reason for the change lies in the new attitude of the United States. The United States has decided to go along with the majority and accept the Hungarian Government since the necessray two-thirds vote to adopt a resolution to investigate the Hungarian revolt is now a virtual impossibility.

The United Nations decision to say no more about the Soviet suppression is tragic, nevertheless. Upon the conscience of the United Nations falls the lot of the freedom fighters—the dead in their graves, the living dead in Communist prisons.

Income Sources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that a number of my colleagues led by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] earlier in this session inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements of their sources of income. They did so because they believed that the public was entitled to such information from its elected representatives who daily must make decisions affecting a wide variety of interests. I wish to commend my colleagues for having taken such action. I believe as they do that such disclosures are in the public interest.

My principal income is derived from my congressional salary and allowances. My only other sources of income consist of rent received on my Washington residence during the months of each year that my family and I spend at our home

in Michigan, dividends of less than $50 a year from a small investment in American Telephone & Telegraph stock, and speaking fees of less than $1,000 per year received by me from various organizations outside of my own district to which I have spoken.

Harlan Trott: "Transit Showcase Abuilding"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, since we will soon consider the urban mass transportation bill, I believe that many Members will be interested in an article which delineates how the San Francisco Bay area is using the mass transit concept to help solve its transportation problems. The article, "Transit Showcase Abuilding," is by Harlan Trott, a longtime staff member of the Christian Science Monitor and now head of the Monitor's San Francisco Office. Mr. Trott, a distinguished journalist, has succinctly described a projected rail transit system which has been blueprinted for the San Francisco Bay region.

His article describes how the bay area voters approved a bond measure to finance this system. Their approval of this $792 million bond issue shows that these voters have been convinced of the worth of mass transit.

Mr. Adrian J. Falk, chairman of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, estimated in a statement before the House Banking and Currency Committee hearings last February that Federal aid could cut the time needed for construction of their system from 8½ to 5 years. And he felt that the possibility that Federal aid would be forthcoming went a long way toward obtaining a favorable vote for the bonds.

Furthermore, as Mr. Trott's objective article points out, this one rapid transit project can hardly be a complete cure for bay area transportation problems. Further studies are to be made. A similar approach is incorporated in the Urban Mass Transportation bill. It would foster such studies. It would encourage a variety of solutions to the urban traffic tieups which are increasing throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the time is quickly passing when we hope to solve our urban transportation problems with a semblance of economy and rational planning. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Trott's article in the RECORD, and urge rapid favorable action on this bill:

TRANSIT SHOWCASE ABUILDING

(By Harlan Trott)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Every large city is up against this problem: The building of a new transit system or else new freeways and big parking facilities. But how to finance such an immense job?

More optimistic than most people, the citizens of San Francisco and of two neighboring counties have voted a bond issue of $750 million, the biggest local bond issue ever floated. With it they are going to build a 75-mile new rail system, the first entirely new rail rapid-transit system in nearly half a century.

The work will be carried out by the three-county Bay Area Rapid Transit District (called BART), a regional public agency established by the California Legislature to design, build, and run the regional transit system.

The initial 75-mile rail network, comprising subway, aerial, and exclusive surface lines, will connect nearly 30 cities and communities in the San Francisco Bay region.

At the hub of the system will be a 4-mile-long underwater transit tube linking the cities of San Francisco and Oakland.

SEVENTY-MILE-PER-HOUR ELECTRIC TRAINS

Specially designed, lightweight electric trains, equipped with automatic controls, will operate over the network at speeds of more than 70 miles an hour, and at intervals of only 90 seconds during peak commuter hours.

The entire rail transit system has been designed under a space age concept that will enable it to complete in attractiveness with the private automobile from the standpoint of speed, comfort, economy, and convenience.

Passage of the transit-bond measure by a 61-percent majority followed 11 years of study and planning by the district.

The BART system will take 8½ years to build. But the first trains are scheduled to begin running in 1966.

BART officials term the project a real breakthrough in the effort to halt the costly waste of automobile congestion. "Not only will it bring many economic benefits to the bay area," says Adrien J. Falk, BART president, "but it will mean the creation of a truly balanced system of regional transportation—with freeways as well as rapid transit."

The project calls for an average annual work force of 3,000 over the 8½-year construction period, with the peak employment figure to rise as high as 8,000 during some periods.

TOLLS TO BUILD TUBE

Besides the $792 million general-obligation bonds, an additional $133 million in surplus bay bridge tolls will be used to build the transbay tube, and another $71 million in revenue bonds will be issued to buy rolling stocks for the rapid-transit system.

The initial system will be built in the counties of San Francisco, Alameda, and Contra Costa. Of the 75 miles of double tracks, 20 miles will be underground; 31 miles will run overhead, and 24 miles along exclusive surface routes.

The transbay tube will carry trains under the inner harbor from the Ferry Building at the foot of Market Street here to the Southern Pacific Mole in Oakland.

In San Francisco, the system will be a subway beneath Market Street, then traverse the city through the Mission District to Daly City. A subway also will be built on either side of the Twin Peaks Tunnel here, which will make possible express operation of existing Municipal Railway streetcars.

From Oakland, routings fan out from subways beneath Broadway and Eighth Street north to Richmond, east to Concord, and south to Fremont. All the routings have been planned to serve major residential and employment areas, and to be extended into other communities in later years.

UNIFORM PROPERTY TAX

A uniform tax on property in the member counties will support the general-obligation bonds amounting to $790 million. The tax will pay interest on the bonds during construction of the system, and commence payment on principal when the system is in full operation. The maximum probable rapid-transit tax would be 67 cents per $100 of assessed valuation in the mid-1970's.

A typical bay area homeowner with real property assessed at $4,000 would pay $5.60 during the initial year of construction, $24.70 when the system is virtually complete, and a maximum of $26.90 after the system is completed in 1971. The last general-obligation bond would mature in 1999, so that the financial obligation would be spread over future generations of rapid-transit users.

System revenues, estimated to reach $10 million net during a normal year of operation, will maintain the system.

Plans call for a computer-tabulating device to automatically record each passenger's entrance and exit through the station turnstiles, using individually coded credit cards. The bay area traveler will be billed automatically for his total mileage at the end of each month.

Money machines that make change also will be installed at each station to facilitate collection of cash fares.

LEGAL HURDLES LOOM

Even though the voters have approved the bond issue and engineers are turning out builders' blueprints, there are some legal hurdles looming directly ahead. While 60 percent of the voters endorsed the project, minority resistance is still active.

On April 2, a Contra Costa superior court judge will hear a suit filed by four taxpayers touching on the validity of—

1. Spending public funds incident to the transit-bond election;

2. The district's $47 million engineering contract;

3. Possible unlawful payment of public funds to Kenneth Hoover, BART engineer, who is not a licensed engineer in California;

4. Repayment of funds used by Citizens for Rapid Transit which campaigned for the bond election.

BART officials say they are not unduly concerned about the merits of this attack. But they deplore it as a delaying action at a time when work on the final blueprints of routes and structures should be moving ahead if the project is to meet its calendar deadlines. Any serious delay, it is said, would tend to compound the billion-dollar price tag due to the gradual inflationary trend throughout the economy as a whole.

OPPOSITION REFLECTED

Assemblyman Byron Rumford, Democrat, of Berkeley, also has filed a bill providing that the BART system may not run through any city without approval of the city. The Rumford bill reflects opposition from citizens who object to having Shattuck Avenue and other main thoroughfares torn up for years while subways are being built.

There is still another vocal minority of skeptics. Some of these are professional engineers with a highly specialized grasp of regional transportation problems. Some of them say the voters were not adequately informed about the various aspects of the undertaking.

Their case may be summed up this way:

According to the district's own estimates, the rapid-transit system will carry 258,600 daily person trips in 1975 when it is in full operation. But in the three-county area served by BART there will be about 5,500,000 daily trips in 1975.

Rapid transit expects to divert 157,400 daily person trips from autos in 1975. At one point, the consultant says that "the increased patronage on the interurban transit facilities due to the installation of rapid transit would reduce the number of automobiles used for daily commuting by an estimated 39,000."

This is cited to show that apparently rapid transit is not expected to have any appre-

ciable impact on the total number of vehicles in the bay area.

The district has not said that its program will make freeways unnecessary. It assumes that those planned will be built. Its consultant says that "currently, 48 lanes of highways serve the region's transportation needs through the six gateways. * * * By 1975, it is expected that 32 more lanes of freeways will be built."

The district expects to absorb 5,843,000 vehicles a year from the bay bridge at the peak in 1970, leaving 39,746,000 motor vehicles on the bridge. Daily figures would approximate 20,000 vehicles absorbed by transit; 135,000 remaining on the bay bridge. The district estimates that the bay bridge will reach capacity without transit by 1971; with transit by 1978.

There seems to be general consensus in the bay area that additional crossings (Transbay and Marin) will be needed for vehicular traffic in the near future with possibly some but not great delay because of transit. If the need for more bridges is not conceded, the same reasoning would suggest the need for freeways at the other gateways as well and throughout the area.

The recent Bay Area Transportation Coordination Committee, participated in by BART officials, unanimously endorsed recommendations for a comprehensive study and plan of transportation in the bay area, embracing all transport modes and integrated with land-use planning. This action was taken after the successful transit vote.

Few people regard the Bay Area Rapid Transit project as the complete cure for bay area transportation problems.

Meanwhile, of course, the district is moving ahead briskly to carry out its mandate from the voters. Many San Franciscans say BART will be a powerful engine for the creation of wealth, a national showcase of how a self-supporting city should operate.

Statement in Support of S. 108, Making Columbus Day a Legal Public Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the story of Christopher Columbus is an inspiration to all men. His intellectual, physical, and moral courage; his persistence in planning and carrying out his ambitious enterprise against apparently overwhelming odds; the vast scope and far-reaching consequences of his discovery—all are surely worthy of commemoration in the most thorough and wholehearted fashion. A great majority of the States, amounting to almost four-fifths of the States of the Union, and representing a preponderance of the population of the United States, already observe the anniversary of Columbus' landing by the closing of banks and public offices, and by appropriate community ceremonies. It is surely proper that the will of the people of the United States, thus visibly and unmistakably expressed, should be carried out by a corresponding observance on the part of the Federal Government.

Such public, national recognition paid to Christopher Columbus would be of value as a gesture of solidarity with our Latin-American neighbor republics, most of which observe Columbus Day as a national public holiday. It would, further, be a significant recognition of the important part played by Spanish and other Latin explorers, colonists, missionaries and settlers, in the formation of the United States, and, as such, would be warmly welcomed not only by the Latin elements in our population but by all of us. I strongly recommend, therefore, that S. 108, making Columbus Day a legal public holiday, be given an early hearing by the Committee on the Judiciary, and urge that both the committee and the Senate take prompt and favorable action upon the bill.

More Trained Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I taught vocational school for 7 years and I was happy to read the July 25, 1963, editorial of the Plainfield, N.J., Courier-News, in which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urged "more and better trained manpower."

A lack of adequate skilled manpower is a serious national problem, which hampers our economic growth. It is important for American workers—including thousands of our unemployed—to develop and acquire skills that would enable them to fill available jobs that are crying for qualified workers.

The vocational training feature of the education bill is vital and I hope it is approved by Congress.

The Courier-News article follows:

MORE TRAINED MANPOWER

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is spurring its campaign for more and better trained manpower as one remedy for lagging economic growth.

Presidents of State and local chambers of commerce, as well as trade associations, are being sent letters urging them to maintain "strong and vital" education committees. They also are asked to encourage businessmen to serve on school boards and school committees.

Edwin P. Neilan, chairman of the board and president of the Bank of Delaware in Wilmington, heads the national chamber. "Lack of trained manpower," he declares, "is holding back our economic growth."

In his letter to organization heads Neilan says in part:

"This space age has brought with it an increasing demand for skilled workers and well-educated people. The demand is not being met.

"Too many young people in America today are failing to get an adequate education. As a result, they are unable to obtain work. The unemployment rate for those under 25 is three times as high as it is for those in the other age groups."

Neilan is saying about education what most citizens realize. It is the reason for the present strenuous efforts to interest our teenagers in at least completing high school instead of dropping out, only to realize their mistake when it is too late.

Education is a must today. Everyone should obtain as much of it as possible. It is a good investment that will pay dividends in the future.

An American Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a magnificent speech, in the true American manner, by our colleague from New Hampshire, LOUIS C. WYMAN. Congressman WYMAN's "An American Manifesto," sets forth in clear terms what is needed in the United States to replace the tolerance of the Communist philosophy so alien and dangerous to our freedom.

AN AMERICAN MANIFESTO

(Address of Hon. LOUIS C. WYMAN)

Reverend clergy, fellow Legionnaires, and distinguished guests, I appreciate the honor of your invitation to address you briefly this evening. I assure you my remarks will not be longer than 20 minutes.

The country seethes with growing pains. The world has a similar affliction. Men of conviction and sincerity differ markedly in their opinion as to the course we should pursue. It is to the problem of the general direction of our national fortunes that I address myself tonight.

The American Legion is a great organization. Its recommendations concerning national policy are heard in Washington. Many of them are enacted into law by the Congress. Many more have been adopted by the executive branch of the Government. The contributions of the Legion to American thought and action, particularly with respect to its firm stand against subversion from within and aggression from without, have been invaluable. I congratulate you all for a constructive and dynamic record of pro-Americanism. We could use more American Legion policy in the conduct of national affairs.

We have witnessed profound changes in the United States in recent years. There has been a great migration from the fields and the farms to the cities: a tremendous expansion of population: vast and rapid advances in the field of scientific technology, in space, in television, in communications, in weapons of war. We have devised all manner of horrible means of destruction, from hundred-megaton atomic bombs to nerve gases and bacteria. Plans to land a man on the moon are tempered by a realization that in the process of getting there we must maintain military supremacy in outer space between the earth and the moon or we may never be allowed to get to the moon at all.

All these things are greatly complicated by the fact that they cost added billions and billions of dollars when the Nation is already burdened by a huge national debt of over $305 billion, which the Congress is regularly asked to increase. Many of us believe that in good times we should operate the Federal Government on a pay-as-you-go basis and make some reduction in this huge national debt. Yet, there is little evidence that either the executive branch or the liberal majority

of the Congress is prepared to risk popular disfavor by rejecting expensive program after expensive program that will increase this debt perhaps to a point of no return.

Huge western farmers continue to demand to be paid for farm products they do not grow. Particular groups, many of them justifiably so, urge that they should receive Federal payments and benefits on a grand scale without regard to the effect upon the Treasury. The great cities plead for hundreds of millions of Federal dollars for mass transit facilities. There is rising demand for Federal aid to eduaction of billions more. In our efforts to impress peoples in faraway lands of the sincerity of our desire to achieve understanding and world peace, we have established a national Peace Corps of volunteer citizens that in the present budget involves a cost of more than $100 million. It is suggested that, to meet the challenges of juvenile delinquency, we should now have a Domestic Peace Corps costing more millions. Foreign aid rolls on to the tune of billions more.

In the meantime, interest of the national debt alone exceeds $10 billion a year, each year, and our defense appropriations are at a level in excess of $50 billion a year.

With but $15 billion worth of gold left at Fort Knox, foreign creditors hold $24 billion worth of claims on this gold. Our balance of payments—the ratio between what we pay for goods imported and what we receive for goods exported—is steadily declining.

This is a serious, even urgent, fiscal crisis. It is worse in detail—which time does not permit. But I would observe that if we continue much longer to spend more than we take in, to operate the Federal Government at a huge deficit, to refuse to face up to the requirement that government, to avoid bankruptcy, must be operated as must any business or home, we invite runaway inflation and advance the day of probable devaluation of the dollar. The disastrous effect of either of these eventualities is written large on the pages of history in what has happened in other nations that have taken such a road. The caution light is clearly lit and the red light is not far away.

In the meantime, on Monday of this week, in a series of opinions in a single case running to more than 130 pages, the U.S. Supreme Court solemnly announced that, in its view, the American Constitution does not permit required recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools, even under circumstances wherein any student who so wishes may refrain from participation in the prayer. This opinion follows the outlawing by the Court of another voluntary prayer prescribed by the board of regents in the New York school system. To me, the pattern of such decisions is a portent of disaster for America.

In the Congress we were asked to comment upon this decision and I observed that "In a morass of legal verbosity the High Court has lost perspective and now even humility before God. Americans are deeply concerned."

While the Constitution clearly prohibits a state religion, it is urgently important that we not become an irreligious state.

In the quiet hours before going over the top—to use the words of Arthur Guy Empey—or in the moment of crisis as the engines of a bomber warmed up for a mission over Germany in the last war, or in the silent moments before D-day in Normandy, or even in Cooper's space capsule, each of these true American heroes turned to prayer for comfort and for confidence. Our Pledge of Allegiance affirms that we are one nation under God. The daily sessions of the House and Senate are opened with prayer. Perhaps the greatest strength of this Nation, composed as it is of many differing theologies, is that it is humble in recognition of a Divine Being.

Refinements in the field of jurisprudence derived from a constitutional prohibition that Congress or the States shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, ought never to indulge themselves in the impertinence of the provocative suggestion that young people in the public school system should not also be encouraged, if they want, to recognize God.

Despite protestations of indifference based on technicality that we may not have a state religion, we are a Christian nation under God, dedicated to religious freedom and to belief in God. The Court's unnecessary restraint upon voluntary recitation of prayers in the public schools is, to me, an invitation to disintegration, because implicit in such decision is a measure of material self-confidence that approaches a condition of cockiness before the great dispenser of infinite justice. It is sort of like asking for it.

As I said on the floor of the House earlier this week:

"The real question in determining the eventual success or failure of democracy in the world is not whether God is on our side but whether we are on God's side. The pattern of these decisions of the Supreme Court do not help us to be on God's side."

Seven years ago, I had the privilege of addressing you at Newport, N.H., on June 23, 1956. In that talk, I referred to several problems that were then of grave concern to the country and particularly to the American Legion. These included (1) Communist military supplies to Nasser; (2) Soviet buildup around the world toward a shift in the balance of power to the Soviet Union; (3) the ineffectiveness of the United Nations; (4) the stalemate in Korea and violations of the armistice thereafter by the Communists; (5) Communist military buildup including at that time from Janes Fighting Ships more than 400 submarines, 20,000 bombers, and so on, while the cocktail party diplomatic corps urged further appeasement upon this country; (6) that neutrality in the face of communism was an invitation to disaster; (7) that our example in refusing to help in Hungary and elsewhere was scarcely encouraging to those nations undecided between the East and the West; (8) that a Soviet steamship in the Caribbean, loaded with arms and ammunition and destined for a country in Central America, should have been turned around or sunk; (9) that in the face of communism's phoney peace offensive lay the greatest danger as more and more Americans might be persuaded to believe it. These concerns then apparent are of even greater magnitude today—7 years later.

I quoted from the great English scholar, Macaulay, who a hundred years ago said of America:

"Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reigns of government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th; with this difference, that the huns and vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and that your huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

Friends, the urgence of decisively meeting the Communist thrust is imperative. Those who believe that by turning the other check we can assure peaceful coexistence in perpetuity are living on borrowed time in a fool's paradise.

Let's face some dismal facts. We have been losing every year ever since the end of World War II, with a few small exceptions. What we have claimed as victories have, at best, only amounted to holding an uneasy status quo. We surrendered China through a policy of coalition governments. The stalemate in Korea was, in fact, a defeat for Korea is indefensible today. In calling off the British and the French in their defense of Suez, we created the Soviet protege, Nasser. In Hungary, we talked big and then let thousands of courageous Hungarians die like sheep in the face of Russian tanks. With the U-2, we had no plan for the contingency of a crash or a shoot-down.

So inadequate was our policy here that we even lied when first faced with the pictures. Now, we have Communist guns, bombs, planes, and military personnel in Cuba. When the President courageously imposed a quarantine last fall the country cheered—only to see this position quickly abandoned without curing the cancer—a cancer that is rapidly spreading in this Hemisphere.

The tragedy of most of these things is that they never needed to have happened had we been willing to do then what we must do eventually, to risk war in standing firm for peace and freedom. Had we done this earlier the probabilities of war were minimal. Even today, I am convinced that if we show the Soviet Union we are willing to fight for freedom and justice, for our allies, there will be no war. This is the best way to avoid war. But human beings what they are and morale being what it is, there comes a time when if one side or one team loses long enough the will to win evaporates. I wonder if we have lost the will to win. I wonder if, instead, there has developed a new national policy of coexistence with the devil. We all know—or should know—what such a policy will mean in the long run. Certainly it is not victory.

The Communists today, whether their leader's name is Khrushchev or Stalin, use every event, every happening, every unfortunate incident in the world to encourage dissension, distrust, and conflict within the Western World and its allies. They charter allied ships, they trade in strategic materiel around the world, they subsidize Canadian purchases of chickens for transshipment to Cuba, they profit from the Cuban sugar market in world trade, they erect pipelines to ship oil to European markets at less even than their slave labor cost to undersell and obviously to ruin American companies. All this and more is their economic warfare which, accompanied by their propaganda of the big lie and the massive indoctrination of propaganda that American imperialism aims at the destruction of the Soviet Union through germ warfare if need be, intentionally aggravates an explosive world situation.

They even indoctrinate the young people of other nations with the same anti-American hatred venom. Young Cubans are sent in Soviet ships to Russia for their indoctrination in hatred toward us.

Here in America, what has been our policy? We have had Yugoslav Army officers attend our Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.—officers whose military discipline and philosophical training constitutes them captives of the Communist bloc, whether or not they are members of the Communist Party. We trade with Communist satellite nations and accept their products for sale in our stores in competition with our own; we abandon the Monroe Doctrine and permit Communist military aggression in this hemisphere.

On June 10 the President of the United States, in announcing new talks with Britain and Russia on atomic test-ban agreement, said: "History teaches us that enmities between nations as between individuals do not last forever * * *. Let us reexamine our attitude toward the Soviet Union."

With all due respect to the Office of the Presidency—of whatever political persuasion—I say to you tonight that this is perilous talk. It is so contrary to historical fact in its dreaminess that it is frightening. It reflects advices and advisors that endanger the national security.

We are in a struggle to the death with communism, everywhere in the world. No amount of being nice to Communists will alter their fanatical goal of American destruction. It cannot, for such is the essence of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. It is not our attitude toward the Soviet Union that is at fault. It is the Soviet Union's Communist program for subversion and conquest of the free world. If an American President does not know this, something is radically wrong and at pretty high levels.

We do not know what potential destructive capacity there is in Cuba. Make no mistake about this. We cannot know unless we take a look. Unless we inspect. There has been no inspection, and apparently it is not the official policy of the United States to demand it. These facts are an awful indictment of a government, no matter its party name, that professes to accept the responsibility for leadership of the American people.

On several occasions, I have met privately with a group of Congressmen of both political parties for discussions with leaders of this country, past and present, to discuss the possibility of devising a workable program to meet the Cuban problem. The other day, a high official of my political party suggested that it was poor politics for me to work with members of the opposition party to achieve such a program, on the basis that if the problem remained unsolved in 1964 it would be a great issue for Republicans. I told this man, and I say to you here tonight, that I represent all of the people of my district and that when it comes to the security of America and the survival of this Nation I am not going to think or act in terms of political advantage. If we can devise a satisfactory, workable, reasonable, practical solution, I will not hesitate to join other members on both sides of the aisle in urging it upon the President at the earliest possible moment. We cannot afford to wait until 1964. Nor will I hesitate to support the President if he acts to implement it, regardless of political considerations. To me this is of the essence of responsibility in government.

I know you are asking what kind of a program are they thinking of. What is a possible solution? I will tell you that, on the drawing boards, on the working sheets at the moment we have outlined a tentative start. It is as follows:

(a) Firm determination and announcement to our people and to the world of the determination that we are in this worldwide struggle called the cold war—to win.

(b) Demand of Castro full and free inspection of the Island of Cuba on a continuing basis at a very early date, with the announcement that if our inspection teams are refused we will inspect by force.

(c) Announcement and adherence to a policy that the United States of America will not tolerate Communist governments in this hemisphere and will use force if necessary to prevent them.

You have been patient and I appreciate your courtesy. I share with you an abiding conviction that we live in the most wonderful land in all the world, that we are fortunate indeed to be American citizens, and that if we are to insure for those to follow us anything like the blessings which the good Lord has seen fit to allow us, we must prepare now to stand firm and decisively for freedom. The American people owe much to the American Legion for its dedication to this cause.

New York State College Young Democrats' Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last June the New York State College Young Democrats held their annual convention in New York City. The convention was attended by over 150 college young Democrats, representing institutions of higher education from all parts of the State. The students adopted a bold and forthright platform in which they took positions on many controversial issues.

The students are to be commended for their interest in public affairs and for developing an issues program which reflects the liberal tradition of the Democratic Party. I am pleased to inform the House that the Columbia-Barnard Democratic Club, which is in the district I am privileged to represent, is playing an active leadership role in the activities of the New York State College Young Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include part of the platform which was adopted:

PLATFORM OF THE NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE YOUNG DEMOCRATS

(As adopted in annual convention assembled, New York City, June 14–15, 1963, and by the executive committee)

We believe that the most important function which the Young Democrats can perform as an integral part of the Democratic Party is to encourage young men and women to become active participants in Democratic party politics.

We can best fulfill this role by being both vocal and active in public and party affairs. It is our responsibility to debate vigorously all matters of public concern and party policy, with the intention that such discussion will end in independent action. Respect for those within our party who hold public and party office is both desirous and healthy when it contributes to the consideration and toleration of the point of view of those who govern, and aids in the administration and enforcement of the law of the land. But such respect, when it breeds blind loyalty and acceptance for both the good and the bad and stymies free thought and action, must be replaced by challenge and dissent. Criticism is the essence of a democratic political system.

It is we who are not only educated, but are concerned about the problems which face us as a people. Within this platform we speak forthrightly about the problem of denial of civil liberties, because we believe that the rights of minorities and individuals must be protected from the unconstitutional exercise of Government power. We express our conviction that all Americans must be permitted to exercise their civil rights, because we hold that all men are morally committed to affording their fellow men an equal opportunity to develop their abilities to the fullest extent.

Today we are faced with a national crisis which disturbs our national conscience. Sadly, we remember that 100 years ago this Nation was plunged into a civil war which saw brother murder brother, because this country's political leaders, in the towns, in the cities, in the States, and in the Nation, refused to come to grips and confront face to face the grave and divisive issue of slavery for more than half a century. Today this Nation is being tested anew, its people and its leaders are challenged by a moral contradiction within our society which betrays our society and reveals its weaknesses. But we as a people have decided to meet this challenge and demonstrate that by peaceful change, the United States will be a democracy both in name and in fact.

We must recognize, however, that to be successful we require superior political leaders in our local communities as well as in Albany and in Washington. We cannot acquiese in a situation in which too many of our political leaders consider the gaining of patronage for their supporters foremost, and the securing of equal rights for all citizens as a secondary problem, which at best causes only trouble for them, because they may have to offend those who have given them support in the past. The true danger to our democratic way of life is the creation of a situation in which the major political parties and their members find it unnecessary or refuse to debate and face the decisive issues of the day and speak as the conscience of the people.

If we are to achieve the integration of "lily-white" neighborhoods, if we are to obtain an end to the neighborhood school concept when it results in schools which are completely or predominantly white or colored, if we are to have competent teachers and safe and sound school buildings for Negroes and Puerto Ricans, if we are to convince labor unions to integrate, not token integration, but substantial integration in their memberships and in their apprenticeship programs, and if we are to change the present situation in which Negroes and whites live along side each other, to a situation in which we live together, each individual contributing his share to the development of our democratic way of life, we will need political leaders in our communities who are patient and persevering, who instead of hiding in the group and succumbing to a group instinct, which denies the existence of the difficult and the different, will lead us forward and be willing to dissent. For there will be times in the days to come when in different communities a lone voice may be the only one speaking for justice and right.

We have a responsibility to the public, to our party, and most important to ourselves as individuals, to act as a gadfly which stirs the Democratic Party to afford an opportunity for all those who are vocal and strong in conviction and principle to run for public office, and hold party office. That the party has failed in this respect is testified to by the fact that since Governor Lehman, the voters of New York State have elected only one Democratic Governor, and since Senator Lehman, no Democratic Senators.

Since the election of General Grant as President in 1868, the Republican Party has, by choice, deliberately disassociated itself from the great struggles for political, economic, and social reform. It has been the Democratic Party which has fought for labor's right to collectively bargain, for labor's right to strike, for social security, for a minimum wage, and for unemployment insurance. In supporting all these programs the Democratic Party has recognized that all men possess human dignity which must be preserved, and self-respect which must be felt by each man in his own heart.

The Democratic Party must rekindle the spark of concern for the individual which guided it earlier in this century, for from within the Democratic Party men and women must come who are liberal by conviction, and capable of supplying the superior political

leadership which is desperately needed if we are to avoid violence and succeed in peaceably integrating our society.

If we as an organization do not speak out, and act, this organization will be valueless, but more important, we as individuals will have failed, and we will have to answer to our own consciences.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Civil rights

Racial prejudice is contrary to the ideals upon which this country was founded, segregation being despicable evidence of racial prejudice negating the human dignity of 20 million Americans.

The Congress of the United States has failed to initiate necessary legislation to combat the cancer of racial prejudice which is sapping the strength and prestige of this country, endangering our relations with the emerging and uncommitted nations of the world. We do not believe that the United States can continue to deny equal rights to all its citizens and remain the leader of the free world. The test of a country's principles is its practices. If we are indeed a democracy we must act like a democracy.

In order to help insure that every citizen of the United States is able to exercise his constitutional rights, we suggest the following proposals:

1. The President should issue a comprehensive Executive order banning discrimination in housing financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

2. We ask the President to support, and the Congress to enact, legislation which would—

(a) Prohibit discrimination against customers of stores, hotels, theaters, restaurants, and other businesses which engage in or sell products which travel in interstate commerce, and/or are authorized by the State.

(b) Give the Attorney General power to institute legal proceedings against State or local officials who deprive any citizen of his right to "equal protection of the laws" because of race.

(c) Implement the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. The Supreme Court in this decision held that "separate but equal educational facilities are inherently unequal," accordingly ordering desegregation of segregated facilities with "all deliberate speed." Implementation to date has resulted in a mere 8 percent desegregation since 1954. Congressional legislation is obviously required.

(d) Deny Federal funds for "impacted" areas in which the schools are segregated. (An impacted area is one which contains an abnormally high percentage of Federal employees.)

(e) Prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from certifying as the bargaining agent for any group of employees any union which practices racial discrimination.

(f) Make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Federal agency.

(g) Enact the administration's literacy test bill (a bill designed to help guarantee to all citizens the right to vote regardless of race).

(h) Utilize all means to insure that all citizens are guaranteed their constitutional rights, and that all citizens seeking these rights are not denied redress under the law.

We are particularly disturbed by the complacent attitude and covert hostility of many Northerners to the granting of equal rights to all persons in the North. It is easy to criticize the southerners who defy the law in order to maintain segregation as a way of life in the South, but it is much more difficult to battle against the prejudice which many white northerners harbor for the Negro and Puerto Rican. Whether it is by circumstance or by deliberate policy we are opposed to—

1. The neighborhood school concept when it results in schools which are completely or predominantly white or colored. We believe that the experience of playing and studying together by children of different races is as important a part of a person's education as it is to learn how to read or write.

2. The maintenance by pressure, both covert and overt, of "lily white" neighborhoods. We urge the political leaders of such areas to exercise superior leadership in fostering the integration of their neighborhoods.

We are disappointed that the labor union movement which in the first part of this century was the spearhead of the most important attempts to gain progressive social and economic measures, today is all too often the propagator of segregation and economic deprivation. We urge all labor unions to open their membership to people of all races, and in particular to integrate their apprenticeship programs.

We believe that it is the responsibility of all citizens living in the North to participate in changing the present situation in which for the most part Negroes and whites live along side each other, to a situation in which we live together, each individual contributing his share to the development of our democratic way of life.

Students, as present and future leaders of this country, should fully support, endorse, encourage, and assist all nonviolent efforts on the part of Negroes throughout this country to obtain their full civil rights and civil liberties.

The New York State College young democrats should utilize the full resources at its disposal to implement in the North the goals herein expressed, and encourage their implementation in the South.

Civil liberties

Loyalty Oaths and Disclaimer Affidavits

We believe that loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits are violative of first amendment freedoms as contained in the Constitution of the United States. They threaten academic freedom on college campuses throughout the Nation. Furthermore, loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits are no indication of a citizen's patriotism and devotion to the ideals upon which this country was founded, but rather are contrary to these very ideals and tenets.

We therefore advocate that the use of loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits be discontinued, and that all legislative requirements pursuant to the use of such loyalty oaths and disclaimer affidavits be repealed.

We oppose the provision of the National Defense Education Act which permits the U.S. Commissioner of Education to deny any scholarship award he deems not in the national interest.

We oppose the provision of the National Defense Education Act which forces an individual to list fines over $25 which he has sustained.

Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950

The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, commonly known as the McCarran Act, is designed to, and has the effect of, imposing political persecution by discriminating against a distinct element of the citizenry whose ideas differ from those of the majority, and therefore threatens the free exchange of ideas. Democracy provides for guarantees of minority rights and the Congress has shown bad-faith intentions in violating the basic tents of democracy by requiring a distinct political minority to register.

We urge the Congress of the United States to repeal the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

House Committee on Un-American Activities

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has consistently violated the fundamental rights of American citizens as guaranteed them in the Bill of Rights. The U.S. Supreme Court, in *U.S.* v. *Watkins*, made it clear that the committee has habitually misused its mandate in unconstitutional ways, that it has become an agency of repression, that it has usurped the functions of the executive and judicial branches of our Government, and that it has sought to punish via publicity those holding unpopular views.

The fear of such improper committee investigation endangers the process of intellectual inquiry, and further violates the precept of due process of law by denying the accused the right to face his accuser. The committee has not lived up to the original purpose for which it was intended, that of investigation essential for legislative purposes.

The free expression and advocation of ideas without fear of reprisals or later incriminations is basic to free and open discussion, especially in the classroom, where opinions cover the entire range of intellectual activity. Attempts by individual pressure groups or governmental agencies to restrict the curriculum or the expression of individual ideas is in direct violation of the principles of academic freedom, and further violative of the basic premises upon which our country was founded.

The New York State College Young Democrats condemns all expulsions, incriminations, and reprimands which are in direct violation of the principles of free expression of ideas, such actions being precipitated by public and private pressures.

The New York State College Young Democrats urges that the legitimate functions of the House Committee on Un-American Actities be assumed by the House Judiciary Committee, or by other House committees to which those functions rightfully belong and that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be permanently abolished.

The New York State College Young Democrats commends the courageous actions of those Representatives who, in the 2d session of the 80th Congress, opposed the appropriations for the committee.

The New York State College Young Democrats urges all to unite in countering public and private pressures, and to strive for the removal of restrictions and obstacles which hinder the fruition of the realization of our first amendment freedoms.

Medical Care for the Aged

We urge the Congress to pass the President's medical care for the aged legislation. The rising cost of medical care coupled with the inability of the sources of income of the aged to keep pace with their expenses, makes it mandatory that medical care under social security be enacted. The attempts of the private insurance companies to demonstrate their ability to fill the gap in this area are dismal failures. The Kerr-Mills bill is not adequate. It is in the national interest that the United States give its senior citizens an opportunity to receive competent medical care and to maintain their dignity. We urge that the Congress enact H.R. 3920.

Resolution by the Board of the National Limestone Institute, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the resolution passed by the board of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., of Washington, D.C., passed at its recent meeting in Chicago in connection with planning for the national highway program after 1973:

RESOLUTION ON THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY PLAN PASSED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC.

Whereas the Federal-aid highway program, created by a foresighted 84th Congress in 1956, is progressing toward its 1972 completion through the coordinated effort of Bureau of Public Roads and State highway personnel with all phases of the highway construction team; and

Whereas such modern, well designed, quality constructed highways serve the national defense and economy; and

Whereas continuation of similar expanded highway programs on a soundly conceived and economical plan subsequent to 1972 is in the best interest of a growing nation; and

Whereas such new, badly needed highway programs require considerable planning to insure quality and economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the board of directors of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., in a meeting assembled in Chicago, Ill., this 11th day of June 1963, urge the Congress of the United States to promptly begin consideration of the national highway plan to take effect in 1973, immediately upon completion of our current highway program.

Art Show, Greenwich Village

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a time during which, in increasing degree, our people turn to an appreciation of artistic and creative endeavor. This search is reflected in new building and new music, new directions in the performing arts, and new efforts to achieve excellence in these areas.

A medium in which the United States is gradually seizing initiative from the old academies, is painting. At the center of activity is the small part of New York's 17th District known as Greenwich Village.

I am happy to place in the RECORD an article on the Greenwich Village Art Show, in which more than 8,000 paintings by over 1,000 artists were shown along the streets of the Village.

This is encouraging. Admittedly much of this art cannot fully qualify as having seized the initiative, but much of it is excellent, and all of it is worthwhile.

The sponsors of the Greenwich Village Art Show are to be congratulated on a very successful community endeavor.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 4, 1963]

GREENWICH VILLAGE BLOSSOMS WITH ART

(By Joseph Deitch)

NEW YORK.—The flowers in the old red pot at the window are white, pale blue, and orange. They are fresh and clean and seem fragrant. An evening breeze pushes away a gauzy white curtain, revealing the sad and rather beautiful face of a young woman seated at the window, her head resting against the side, her dark hair long and flowing. A Tennyson maiden, with this difference—the window is part of a tenement, its bricks black and crumbling. And the scene is not a poem but a painting, titled "Waiting: East 10th Street."

It is the work of 1 of 800 artists exhibiting in the Washington Square spring outdoor art show in Greenwich Village. These are the painters, who, twice a year, use as galleries the walls of houses and other buildings, fences, sidewalks, big boilers waiting to be installed, and anything else in the streets they can hang their work on throughout a 5-square-mile area.

About 8,000 paintings, produced, presumably, during the late fall, winter and spring, are on display.

ABILITY VARIES

The exhibitors may be classified as professional artists of inspired ability, some of whose work is worthy of museums and most of which would enrich anyone's living room or any chairman's board room; those with genuine talent; those just emerging or still groping; and those on display through the kindness of the approving authorities.

The show abounds in competent work that may be divided into styles and subjects showing individuality and creativeness, like the brownstones, tenements, and other old houses painted by Raymond Sandler, art director of the Cities Service Oil Co., and exhibited by him on West Fourth Street; and into the usual bullfighters, clowns, sunsets, Spanish girls with fans, ballet dancers, Moorish heads, guitarists, gondoliers, and birds of paradise.

A good part of this section of New York—through street after winding street—becomes an endless gallery at this time of the year. The spring show runs to June 9.

CHOICE LOCATIONS

Choice locations for top painters and prize winners, are on Fifth Avenue and in the adjoining streets, but much that is interesting and worthwhile is to be found in nooks and crannies deep in the village. Artists from all over the United States and other countries have paid a $5 fee for a chance to show, and perhaps sell, their work.

"This is the way art should be displayed—in the marketplace, and in the open air, and out among the people, not penned up in big, dead buildings," a girl remarked at her exhibit, mounted in front of what may have once been someone's townhouse.

Her work, quite well done and showing training and great care, consisted of perhaps a dozen still-lifes in the style of Cezanne and Matisse. They were priced at $35 to $100. She was seated on a canvas chair at the curb. The green-covered book in her lap was titled "Seven Winters and Afterthoughts," by Elizabeth Bowen.

"Besides," she added, "at what other exhibition do you find artists accompanying their paintings, ready to answer questions or talk about art?"

The vast display in the streets begins after lunch—weather permitting—as the artists unload their canvases from cars, station wagons, shopping carts, and homemade trunks on wheels. Space is reserved months in advance, and many artists occupy the same spots each year. Some would not exhibit on Fifth Avenue, prefering, by temperament, the more intimate and more authentic streets in the village, like MacDougal Street, Weshington Square South, West Third Street, and University Place.

The artists keep their work on view till sunset. Many exhibit after coming home from their jobs. A "fantastic" number of paintings were sold on the second Saturday of the show and on Memorial Day, according to a director of the exhibition. Oddly enough, a few artists will tell you their work is not for sale. Many have regular customers and are sure of selling most of their stock.

Anyone expecting to find beatniks and other odd types will be largely disappointed, at least in the current show. Most of the artists lounge near their work, alone or with husbands or wives, or with a friend or two, and are patient, modest, and courteous. Indeed, the meandering spectators are often more arty-looking than the artists. Nevertheless, one is aware of, and respects, an inner distinction about the creators.

DEEPER GOAL

An ink and pastel drawing of a girl combing her hair won first prize in graphics for Gerald Fairclough, a graduate of the University of Utah, the Art Students League, and the National Academy School of Fine Arts in New York. He started with the girl's knee—"that went well, in a very direct, demanding, and mercurial medium, and I built on it and in 45 minutes had the sketch finished. I sold it for $100."

Gerald Morfeld, whose painting of a young woman in a white shawl won first price for oils, spoke for most of his fellow artists when asked what sort of things he liked to paint.

"Anything beautiful or interesting," he said. A professional artist, he "puts in a good 8-hour day" and has completed 40 paintings in the past 8 months. He makes color slides of all his paintings as a way to look back to "see how things are moving."

The French impressionists have influenced him, but he owes most to William H. Mosby, a teacher at the American Academy of Art in Chicago.

United States Will Counter Common Market on a Tariff Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Bank has raised the discount rate to help eliminate the deficit in our balance of payments. It has been indicated this action was taken in part to convince our Common Market allies that we are willing to initiate drastic steps if necessary to alleviate our balance-of-payments problem and stabilize the international money system.

And yet the very nations that have requested this step, Mr. Speaker, have now embarked on a tariff program which can only lead to greater deficits in our balance of payments. The protectionist duties that the Common Market has refused to rescind on U.S. agricultural exports—such as poultry—means that we will be able to export less to Western Europe. This of course lessens the ability of the United States to build a surplus in its balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, the recent raise in the discount rate could have a serious effect on the domestic economy. We should not be asked to run this risk if our Common Market allies are unwilling to undertake their part of the bargain.

The following article in the New York Times of July 31, 1963, details the failure of the most recent negotiations to eliminate tariff barriers on the export of U.S. poultry into the Common Market. I

think the Members will find it most informative:

UNITED STATES WILL COUNTER COMMON MARKET ON A TARIFF RISE—READY TO START LEGAL STEPS TOWARD RETALIATORY ACTION ON POULTRY IMPORTS

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—The United States is nearly ready to initiate retaliatory action against the European Economic Community for the tariff increases that have blocked almost all exports of American poultry to West Germany.

Government officials indicated that preliminary legal steps would be taken in the next few days.

The decision to act was made today, officials said, after it became clear that the European Economic Community, or Common Market, would not reverse its earlier policy on the tariff on chickens, which is regarded here as a test case for all U.S. agricultural exports to the Common Market.

The Council of Ministers of the Common Market rejected the U.S. request for a reversal of the policy at a meeting in Brussels today.

LOSS PUT AT $46 MILLION

Retaliation would come after a series of legal steps required under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). It would take the form of a tariff or other measures that would exclude from the United States imports from the Common Market area equal in value to the exports of American chickens that have been excluded from the Common Market. The United States says that the loss runs to $46 million a year.

The members of the Common Market are France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

Because some of these countries never did import much American chicken, the recent tariff changes had important consequences only in the case of West Germany. There the effect has been to make American chickens more expensive than those raised anywhere inside the Common Market.

MEASURES UNDECIDED

The precise form U.S. retaliation would take has apparently not yet been decided. Officials stressed, however, that they would take care to follow to the letter the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in any moves they make.

There is only an outside chance that the United States might not go ahead with retaliatory action, officials said. That would occur if the Council of Ministers were to make a firm promise that it would resolve the problem in a short period of time.

The Council instructed the Common Market's Executive Commission to produce a solution by September, but the United States regards this move as inadequate because the Commission has said that it could not conduct meaningful negotiations with the United States without specific new instructions from the Council, the top governing body of the Common Market.

FEARS RAISED IN UNITED STATES

The poultry issue has raised widespread fears in this country that a number of other U.S. farm products might, in the future, be excluded from the Common Market. The question figured importantly in hearings today before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Committee members closely questioned W. Michael Blumenthal on the problem before voting to approve his nomination as deputy to Christian A. Herter, President Kennedy's special representative for trade negotiations.

Three Democratic Senators who generally support the administration's policy expressed the hope that the United States would insist that the Common Market be left open to American farm products. The three were J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, the chairman; JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Senator SPARKMAN expressed the view that the United States must let the Common Market know "in no uncertain terms that we prepared to retaliate—that we will retaliate." He asked Mr. Blumenthal whether he agreed with that position and Mr. Blumenthal said that he did.

President Kennedy named today a second deputy to Mr. Herter, William Matson Roth, whose job it will be to assemble information from American industry on the tariff concessions it would like to get from the Common Market in the "Kennedy round" and those it is wiling to see the United States give to the Common Market.

Mr. Roth, a San Franciscan, is a member of the board of the Matson Navigation Co., chairman of the board of the Pacific National Life Assurance Co., and a director of a number of other concerns.

Two Fateful Days in Our Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, to many people in our country and the world over the basic philosophy of Zionism is not known. Last month I had the privilege of being a guest at the Zionist Organization of America Convention in Tel Aviv, and there I heard the distinguished president of the ZOA, Rabbi Max Nussbaum, give a most interesting and rewarding address. Dr. Nussbaum happens to be a well-known constituent, and even if he were not, I have no doubt that many Americans will benefit, enjoy, and be enriched by reading his eloquent address which I am happy, therefore, to insert in the RECORD:

[From the Jerusalem Post, July 12, 1963]

TWO FATEFUL DAYS IN OUR GENERATION

(By Dr. Max Nussbaum, ZOA president)

This is a historic convention in terms of both time and space. For the first time in its 66-year-old history, the Zionist Organization of America is holding its annual convention on the sacred soil of Israel.

The fateful days, one of death and one of rebirth, 15 years apart in the destiny of our people and of mankind, linger on the horizon of history as we convene here tonight. We meet 30 years after the seizure of power by a bestial tyrant who was responsible for the greatest blood-bath in history; and 15 years after the reestablishment of the third Jewish commonwealth, the fulfilment of Herzl's dream—the State of Israel.

The 30th of January 1933—1 day in the life of our generation—has cost mankind 17 million killed in military personnel, 18 million in civilian casualties and countless additional millions in wounded and permanently maimed. Of the 18 million massacred by Hitler's hordes, 6 million were Jews.

In ratio to the world population, estimated at over 2 billion, the Jewish people—numbering then only 17 million souls and constituting one of the smallest of groups on the earth has borne the brunt of one-third of the total world catastrophe. In more understandable terms, whereas 1 out of 186 non-Jews lost his life as a result of Hitler's ascent to power, more than 1 out of every 3 Jews died as an aftermath of the 30th of January, 1933—one day in the history of our generation.

However, as the ZOA thus opens its annual convention in the holy city of Jerusalem on the most tragic anniversary in the annals of our people's martyrdom, we are also meeting 15 years after the 14th of May, 1948—another single day in the history of our generation, one that has, radically changed our lives in the greatest and most dramatic revolution wrought in the life of the Jewish people in the past 2,000 years.

May 14, the day of the rebirth of Zion, for which our people have prayed and yearned throughout the centuries, was the day when the gates of the Jewish homeland were thrown wide open to the vast masses of our homeless, to the refugees of massacres and persecution wandering on the highways and byways of the earth. It was the day when Zion reborn launched the ingathering of the exiles from east, west, north and south—a day which placed and sanctified the name of Israel on the map of the community of nations.

It is within the context of this historic perspective and within the very span of time in which this miracle occurred, that we are gathered here to open the 66th Annual Convention of the ZOA, the parent body of all Zionist organizations in the United States.

The proceedings of this great national assembly, with the 2 decisive days in history—one of death and one of life—as backdrops, will thus focus our attention on the tragedy and the triumph, on the abyss and the exaltation, on the lowest ebb of degradation and the highest tide of recognition within the colorful history of our eternal people.

These will be a challenge to all of us and stir our hearts and minds toward a reappraisal of our thinking and toward the shaping of the future of our movement.

PROPHETS OF OUR MOVEMENT

On this occasion, it is significant to note that three decades after the 30th of January and 15 years after the 14th of May—the events of history have vindicated the position of Zionism from A to Z. The forerunners and founders of our movement—Pinsker and Hess, Herzl and Nordau—from the very beginning were unanimous in the theory that a people scattered all over the world—a minority everywhere and a majority nowhere—cannot survive, even if it is a people like ourselves skilled in survival and tested in the crucible of life. They, the prophets of our movement, took a dim view of the future, particularly that of European Jewry, in the belief that anti-Semitism, overt and covert, will sooner or later undermine the position of the Jews of the world.

On the basis of this historic analysis, Zionists gave the classic answer to this problem; namely, that only the establishment of a Jewish state with its door wide open to immigration to those forced to flee and to those wishing to come voluntarily, will solve the millennial problem of our people's homelessness.

The events of the last three decades substantiated beyond any shadow of doubt the logic of these arguments. Had there been a Jewish state during the Hitler period, another million Jews would have been alive today. There were periods—and I remember them well from personal experience—when exit from Hitler's hell was still possible, but there was no country which would admit us. In no other sphere were the impotence and indifference of the Western World more clearly demonstrated than at the congress in Evian in July 1938, which the late President Roosevelt convened to find ways and means of saving European Jewry. Representatives from one country after another used every pretext to justify their refusal to open their doors to Jewish immigration. All the forebodings and fears concerning the future of our people which were harbored by the

founders of our movement materialized before our very eyes in the most shocking, cruel, and barbaric manner.

Looking back upon that black period, during which my generation was subjected to the uttermost of degradation, homelessness, and helplessness, because of the nonexistence of a Jewish state, one can only adequately describe this situation in Biblical terms: I quote from the Tochacha (Deuteronomy 28: 64–67) "And the Lord shall scatter thee among the nations, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth. * * * And among these nations shall thou have no repose, and there shall be no rest for the sole of thy foot; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and languishing of soul. And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear night and day and shalt have no assurance of thy life. In the morning thou shalt say: 'Would it were evening' and in the evening thou shalt say: 'Would it were morning'—for the fear of thy heart which thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see."

In no other source, ancient or modern, has the meaning of "galut" been better defined than in these ancient words, and no book ever published on the Nazi period has ever in such stark terms described the reality of our existence in those days.

VALIDITY OF ZIONIST POSITION

Our Zionist position proved to be correct also on the positive side. The verity of our conviction that the welfare of the Jewish communities abroad and the security of the Jewish State are interdependent, can no longer be challenged. Our contention that the Jewish State will not only solve the problem of Jewish homelessness through immigration and absorption, but will bestow its blessings upon Jewish communities abroad in political, psychological and spiritual terms, has been proved valid with the passage of time. Israel has become not only a home for our people's body but a sanctuary for its spirit.

In the two-way channel of mutual aid and mutual benefit between Israel and American Jewry, the State of Israel in the short span since its establishment has has made one of it greatest contributions to American Jewry in ratifying the loyalty of the Jewish citizen to the United States. Israel has given the American Jew a tool which he never before possessed. For the first time since the year 70 of our current age, a Jew residing in the United States or any other country in the free world has been given a choice: He does not have to live in the United States nor in any other Western country, be it England, France, Canada, Belgium or Holland, unless he so desires. He has a choice. Under the Israel law of the ingathering, he is free to leave the Western World and settle in Israel with his family. This is a choice which a Jew did not possess for the most part of our people's history. It is gratifying that the recent years have witnessed an increase of U.S. Jews immigrating into Israel, and I hope than many more particularly among the young generation, will seize this unique opportunity to participate through personal aliya in the exciting venture of rebuilding our people's future in its ancient homeland.

But the fact remains that for generations to come American Jews will remain where they are, because they consider themselves part and parcel of America, to the upbuilding of which they have contributed so much, and this again out of such free choice born out of loyalty to America.

WHAT ZIONIST ENVISIONED

Zionism never envisaged the absorption in a Jewish State of the Jewish people in its entirety. At the same time Zionism envisioned that the existence of a Jewish State would considerably affect those Jews who chose, or were forced, to remain in the Diaspora, making an impact on their lives, their culture and the education of their children. Thus we see that the State of Israel has made a vital contribution to American Jewish life by bestowing upon the Jews of America the gift of the freedom of choice which has been denied to our people throughout the history of the Galut and has so given them equal status with all other groups that make up the pluralistic pattern of the citizenry of the United States.

Thus Israel has contributed greatly to the normalization of American Jewry within the totality of the American community. The image of the Jew in the eyes of the non-Jew has undergone a drastic change. The Jew who fled from Eastern Europe heretofore was ironically enough identified with Russian, Rumanian or Polish society and culture. With the emergence of the State of Israel, the Jew is better understood by the average non-Jew than was the Jewish immigrant of yesteryear. The Jew in America, through his spiritual, cultural and historical affinity with the State of Israel, has become integrated into the American Jewish scene and has now a legitimate cause to fight the tides of assimilation for his survival as a Jew. Psychologically, the Jew's birthplace is no longer considered synonymous with his background or origin.

RADICAL TRANSFORMATION

The miraculous metamorphosis of the homeless Jew since his absorption in the State of Israel, has caused the non-Jew for the first time to look upon his Jewish neighbors as sons and daughters of an ancient and noble people which originally hailed from the Holy Land, and which in turn is now restored into the Third Jewish Commonwealth. It is as if whole centuries of the Diaspora are gradually receding in the memory of man and the historic origin of our people is coming to the fore, bringing about a psychological normalization in the position of the only group within the American Nation which, in the eyes of the observing outsider, may have had many illegitimate motherlands but no historically legitimate fatherland.

I will not dwell here on the numerous other revolutionary changes which have been wrought in Jewish life in terms of cultural enrichment, Christian-Jewish understanding, and a sense of pride in Israel's role in international affairs as a bastion of democracy which binds it so closely with the United States.

For the first time American Jews can proudly point out to their non-Jewish neighbors the Jewish State as a shining, living attestation to the true character, nobility and valiance of the Jewish people.

Speaking from this rostrum, in the capital of the State of Israel, let us remember that the miracle of Israel's rebirth, its impact upon the Jewish communities and the fulfillment of Zionist vision, was accomplished by the selfless dedication and the inordinately hard struggle waged by the leadership and rank and file of the Zionist movement. And this is particularly true of the American Zionist movement and the leaders of our own organization who have all courageously and unfalteringly carried aloft the Zionist torch, mobilized the Jewish community, galvanized public opinion, fought battles on all levels at the United Nations, and emerged triumphant in the face of the heaviest odds. They truly are the coarchitects of the Jewish State.

It is a matter of regret that the story of the arduous and persistent battles waged by American Zionists throughout the years for the establishment of a Jewish State is too little known, and that some quarters have chosen entirely to forget or ignore it. Fortunately for us and for the historic memory of our generation the two principal figures in this exciting drama, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Dr. Emanuel Neumann, are with us, each representing in his person the golden pages in the history of that period.

During my two visits to Israel this year, it was gratifying for me to observe the beginning of a change in the climate of opinion among some segments of the people of Israel towards Zionism and Zionists. Zionism may be on its way to becoming less and less an object of derision and denigration, even among the youth of Israel. If this be true, an atmosphere of better understanding of the work of Zionists for the creation of the State and for the State of Israel since its establishment, may commence to permeate the people of Israel. I am confident that this convention will usher in an era of even greater understanding of our movement and its program, not only for Israel, but for the enrichment of Jewish life in the Gola.

It is not my intention to harp upon what I consider the serious mistake made in certain Israel circles in attacking the Zionist movement. This is all, I prayerfully hope, water under the dam. However, what needs to be reiterated and reemphasized is the fact that every great cause in history needs a dedicated army to translate aspirations into reality. Israel is such a cause and the Zionist movement is such an army. It is true that with the exception of an infinitesimal group, the entire American Jewish community is sympathetic and friendly toward Israel. But there is a vast difference between sympathy and commitment. The Zionist movement is the only entity in American Jewry whose support for Israel is that of commitment.

The Zionist movement in America is wholly, devotedly and zealously committed to the concept of Jewish peoplehood and to the centrality of the Jewish state within the spectrum of that peoplehood. This concept is quite different from the philosophy of those organizations originally founded for entirely unrelated purposes, and which have now added the promotion of a project in Israel to the many projects they have undertaken heretofore.

This psychological and fundamental difference between the Zionist organization and other groups has emerged clearly time and again, especially during the critical period of the Sinai campaign, when many so-called friends manifested a negative attitude, or at best went into hiding, whereas Zionists, and Zionists alone, stood firmly by Israel and proved Israel's only reliable ally even in the Jewish world.

The State of Israel will be in need of a strong and influential Zionist movement for many years to come. Israel, as a great historic cause, needs not only friends but allies; not only sympathy and financial support, but commitment. The Zionist organization is the only body in the free world that can meet these requirements; and I know that the leadership of Israel is gradually becoming aware that the Zionist movement is not a gulf but the bridge between the Jewish state and the Jewish people.

There is one other aspect of the Zionist ideal which must be continuously stressed in view of the repeated misinterpretations that have been made regarding the very nature of the Zionist movement and in view of the unrealistic approach to the complexities of Jewish life.

Zionism is a creed of Jewish life which proclaims the indivisible oneness of the Jewish people—a concept that has been propounded with renewed stress by Herzl, the immortal founder of modern Zionism. This means that Jews, while living in the lands of the Diaspora, and justifiably considered among the most loyal citizens of their respective lands, are inseparably held together by historic, religious, and cultural ties, which make them members of one and the same people.

The State of Israel is the guarantor for the survival and the unity of the Jewish people. Israel today functions in this capacity. Zionism is much more than work in, or on behalf of, Israel. This in itself would be not more than Israelism. Zionism, however, is Israelism plus revitalization of Jewish peoplehood in the Diaspora. To us Zionists every new project in Israel, as well as every new undertaking by a Jewish community in the farflung corners of the earth, are both manifestations of the same Jewish will to live as Jews and the selfsame expression of the creativity of our people's spirit. Zionism is the foundation that gives Jewish life its basic structure, the walls that hold it together and the ceiling that gives it splendor, dignity, and status. This is what Theodor Herzl meant when he stated that "Zionism will never die" because he believed that "We are a people—one people."

ISRAEL'S MORAL SUPPORT

Israel's moral support of Zionism is indispensable for the continued existence of the Zionist movement. Bluntly speaking, the disappearance of the Zionist movement from the Jewish scene would be a catastrophe for both Israel and the Jewish people. The vacuum would be quickly filled by the assimilationist and isolationist philosophies which are now biding their time to conquer the Jewish communities—a Kibbush Hakehilot by non-Zionists and anti-Zionists.

To counteract these corrosive forces which are continually gnawing at the foundations of creative Jewish life, we are now concentrating all our efforts upon the Hebraization of Jewish communities, the Jewish education of our youth, the building of economic and cultural projects in Israel, the encouragement of aliya in the United States and the bringing of the young American generation into direct contact with their counterparts in Israel, which is now being accomplished through our teenage programs at Kfar Silver, study programs by our Zionist Youth Commission and the Young Zionists—undertakings which are destined to bind together the different parts of our people, both in Israel and the Diaspora, into the eternal unity of Jewish peoplehood.

The partnership between the Zionist movement and Israel also places a similar obligation for the future of Jewish life upon the State of Israel. The welfare of the Jewish State is interwoven with a creative Jewish community in the Diaspora.

GOALS HIGH

These goals are high, the tasks great and the vision staggering. But this is the new image toward which our movement is aspiring, so that it may contribute in the future, as it has so efficiently done in the past, to the upbuilding of Israel and the unification of our people.

All this was spoken many centuries ago, about 800 years prior to the common era and apparently for the same reason—the eternal partnership between the Jewish people and the Jewish land. It is to be found in the Book of the Second Isaiah, among the chapters rightly called "The Rhapsody of Zion Redeemed." It was wisely selected by our rabbis as the last of the Haftarot of Consolation and is to this very day the prophetic reading that accompanies the portion of the week "Nitzavim" in the Book of Deuteronomy. Says the prophet: "For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until her triumph go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a torch that burneth." (Isaiah 62: 1). It is God who is speaking here about His own commitment to Zion and Jerusalem, saying that He will not hold His peace till the unification between the land and the people is accomplished. God, then, continues to state His anxiety in this fashion: "I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem. They shall never hold their peace day or night" (62: 6). This means that He sent prophets and leaders to remind the people that the unification of the land of Israel with the people of Israel is the majestic task of history. The prophet then apparently turns directly to his audience and says: "Ye that are the Lord's remembrancers, take ye no rest, and give Him no rest till He establish, and till He make Jerusalem a praise in the earth (the glory of the earth)." (62: 6–7.)

Peace Corps Lawyers: Building Emerging African Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the May 1963 issue of the American Bar Association Journal an article by R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, describing the need for volunteer lawyers in the Peace Corps in the developing nations of Africa.

The Peace Corps has received over 1,000 inquiries from lawyers regarding this program. From the 400 to 500 volunteer questionnaires completed, 26 lawyers have been selected for service. They have entered training programs at universities across the country to study the history, culture, and traditions and, where necessary, the language of the host country. The trainees will be given extra reading courses in law along with courses in preventative medicine and health education.

At the conclusion of the training programs, the volunteer lawyers will assemble at the Yale University School of Law this month with graduation scheduled for September 5. While at Yale the lawyers will participate in a 3-week seminar on African legal institutions, their development and problems.

I would like at this point to include Mr. Shriver's article in the RECORD:

PEACE CORPS LAWYERS—BUILDING EMERGING AFRICAN SOCIETIES

(By Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr.)

"Law and justice I established in the land and promoted the welfare of the people," Hammurabi's Code, 2000 B.C.

Over a century and a half ago, a newly emerging nation on the North American Continent stood on the threshold of constitutional government. This nation had just experienced a long and destructive war. Its people had suffered a severe economic depression. Its normal peacetime commerce was disorganized. Armed insurrection was rising. Political agitation was rampant. There were elements of hostility to a federal government and a marked aversion to taxation, with or without representation.

Each state was its own free agent. Public credit was demoralized and private credit lacked confidence. The peace treaty was ignored by both sides and seemed incapable enforcement. The national currency was practically worthless. The prestige of the government was almost nonexistent at home and abroad; the public will seemed to be paralyzed.

Its system of law demanded drastic revision. The only answer at that time was to call for a Constitutional Convention to draw up a new charter of government that would provide for stable and binding executive, legislative, and judicial procedures.

So the delegates went to work. And from their skills of statecraft, their political experience and practical knowledge, their intimate connection with government came the Constitution of the United States.

Despite their youth, the men who wrote the Constitution were learned in history and political theory, in war and diplomacy, in the law and in business. The roster of its authors were the men who had made the Revolution and who were destined to build the foundation of a new nation.

From that historic day when the Constitution was proclaimed the "supreme law of the land", it has withstood the severe test of time. This document has become the beacon for all nations who seek to protect individual liberties under law. Its architects have become synonymous with the concepts of human freedom. Their influence is written into history, preserved by our stanch faith, still registering a vital impact upon the actions of Government from day to day.

Newly emerging nations in today's world, particularly in Africa, stand upon the frontiers of constitutional government. Free of colonial administration, they are preparing to solidify their independence through the establishment of modern legal systems. But they have far to go, as our forefathers did.

They know that independence does not guarantee freedom under law. There is no magic that can provide a nation with the understanding and experience with which to design a free society. The democratic system does not emerge fully developed from a pressure cooker. It evolves slowly and patiently with the help of trained and dedicated men and women whom it represents.

In an article for the Journal of Education, James Paul, of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, has written:

"Political freedom, order, and concepts of justice embodied in the term 'rule of law' are no easier to develop than natural resources. Nor is it wise to assume that material and technological advance must come first, at the expense of development in the intangible, but for the long haul, more basic area of ideology."

Chief Justice Earl Warren enlarged on this issue in a speech at Atlanta, Ga., commemorating Georgia Tech's 75th anniversary. The Chief Justice pointed out that if technology is to serve the peaceful purposes of mankind it must be given a peaceful setting in both domestic and world law, a factor that he said is, so far, lacking.

Rather than science's running away and endangering civilization, he suggested that the real danger lies in the lack of a lawful world.

"A world governed by law will not permit scientific discoveries to be used for purposes of destruction," Chief Justice Warren declared. But a world without law is destined for destruction with or without scientific discoveries.

For the community of nations now stretching forth toward the realities of independence, rule by law is the first order of things; it is top priority.

THE AFRICAN EXPERIENCE

Many African nations share the English common law heritage, common juridical ideology, and common legal institutions. These nations now seek to mesh their British legacy with local customs, to fuse together all the diversified factors into unified judicial procedure.

They have passed through an explosive period and now face new stresses and difficulties. Colonial civil servants have departed, leaving a partial vacuum which must be filled. The urgency to make the law work well, to enhance respect for the courts and

for their authority, is deeply felt. In daily governmental activity, in commerce, and in private affairs, lawyer skills are in demand. Men of caliber are needed to staff the court systems, to fill responsible positions in government at home and abroad, to become teachers of law, to represent African interests in a growing, changing economy in a changing world.

One of the requisites is to develop a new generation of well educated, law-trained men. Another is to develop the best possible system for administering justice—men and laws.

Many young men will seek opportunities in politics. The study of law, the legal disciplines, the law degree, will continue to attract the finest and most ambitious of them. But additional talent, energy, skilled manpower are required to implement the principles of self-government, of rule by law.

In parts of English-speaking Africa there is now a scarcity of lawyers of African descent. Many leaders of the bar believe that professional standards must be raised and the scope of professional training broadened and adapted to national needs. They feel strongly that the job must be done at home, by new universities and new law schools.

Africa is determined to build new societies. Legal institutions as well as social and political institutions must be related to the shape and design of these new societies. They cannot exist apart or as a superstructure. Neither can they exist as parallel systems.

Perhaps at this point a word of explanation is needed on the African legal system.

A recent survey conducted in Africa described the duality of British and African law this way:

"The common law and Parliament's statutes of general application up to a fixed date were received in most English-settled regions of Africa by a process similar to the reception of law in our country. Since most of Africa is a region of many dissimilar tribal languages, English perforce became the professional lingua franca, just as it became a national language for other purposes.

"As European institutions spread, so the received law became more and more important in African life. Courts patterned after England's were established. European settlers, and Africans who had the opportunity, went off to study law in England. Upon qualifying there as barristers, they returned to practice at home.

"The common law system and its traditions took root just as they did in other lands where English-speaking people settled. But indigenous tribal customs—the customary laws—were left intact to govern most Africans, particularly those outside the urban areas. These customs related primarily to matters of land, inheritance, marriage, and family relationships.

"Native court ordinances recognized or established systems of African-staffed local courts which administered the native law as well as important criminal court jurisdiction roughly similar to that of our lower tier of municipal or magistrates' courts. This was subject to supervision and review of colonial officials, and, in some areas, the courts established by the colonial government. Thus, indigenous customs and tribunals were carefully cultivated, in part as a conscious aspect of colonial policy. These dual systems of law were and are administered side by side in the new countries."

We can see then that, logically, emphasis must be placed upon the integration of British common law with native customary law.

THE PEACE CORPS PROGRAM

In their effort to distill the precepts of British law and customary law, many African states have turned to the Peace Corps for assistance.

Requests originally came from four nations which wished to explore the possibilities of a volunteer lawyer project. In the fall of 1962, Mr. Paul followed up these requests. He toured English-speaking Africa, visiting Nigeria, West Cameroon and Sierra Leone as well as Liberia. In each of these countries he noted significant gaps in the availability of trained legal manpower. Mr. Paul felt that Peace Corps volunteers could bridge some of these gaps.

Mr. Paul met with host national cabinet ministers, government officials, faculty members of existing law schools, American diplomats, and Peace Corps oversea staff members.

He turned to report enthusiastically that a project of this type would "contribute in a significant way to the host country and offer challenging hard work and stimulation to the volunteers."

His conclusions:

"These several projects (Nigeria, West Cameroon, Liberia, and Sierra Leone) would form the basis for the Peace Corps lawyers' project for Africa. The program would supply competent law-trained personnel to serve in universities, government ministries, government corporations and judicial systems, including the administration of customary courts.

"Volunteers would perform such services as assistance in the administration of the customary courts; legal drafting and research; teaching and research necessary to develop improved legal education in African universities; assistance and editing of legal materials—case reports, journals and other professional publications—in countries where they are lacking."

Now that possible jobs were on paper, we could move ahead. Discussions continued. American private agencies and universities were already deeply involved in Africa. Young American lawyers, under the aegis of these associations and institutions, were providing a share of legal assistance. It was the Peace Corps interest then to cooperate and extend this assistance where it was needed.

WHAT THE VOLUNTEERS WILL BE DOING

Nigeria: Mr. Paul's survey had carried him to Nigeria's three regions. He has recommended that lawyers be assigned to work with the Native Court Administration in the Northern Region; in the Ministry of Justice in the Eastern Region; at NSUKKA University Law School and in the Ministry of Justice in the Western Region.

Cameroon: In the West Cameroon area, Mr. Paul found a lack of trained lawyers. There are only 3 African barristers and about 10 African law students studying in England. Twenty men are studying law via a correspondence course offered by London University.

"There are very few law books in the West," Mr. Paul noted. "If the common law is to survive, help must be forthcoming, quickly, to give the law and the profession a foothold."

For the western state (Cameroon is a federated country and East Cameroon is French-oriented), volunteer duties would include legal assistance to the Attorney General in connection with counseling the ministries of the West, as well as research and drafting. One lawyer may work in corporation law as well.

Sierra Leone: This would be a combined teaching and reporting program. Here volunteer lawyers are critically needed to organize, edit, and publish a considerable volume of cases spanning a number of years. Others will teach and provide research assistance at the University at Fourah Bay.

(Mr. Paul's interest sent him back to Africa in January for a further review. At this time he found that Ethiopia and Nyasaland had expressed a desire to obtain the services of volunteer lawyers.)

Nyasaland: A law school is just in the formative process. One Peace Corps volunteer lawyer is already at the school helping to establish initial courses. Additional volunteers will expand the faculty and broaden the curriculum.

Nyasaland is in the midst of a crash program to educate its lay judges and prospective lawyers. At present, 20 judges are being retrained in modern judicial methods; 8 prospective lawyers are studying for the English Bar, which they expect to take later this year.

Ethiopia: Working with Peace Corps Representative Wofford in Ethiopia, Mr. Paul came up with these recommendations:

"Lawyers are needed on two fronts. (1) For purposes of legal research, drafting and related tasks in government; (2) To assist in the development of a law school to which the university is now fully committed. Volunteers would work under the supervision of the Institute of Public Administration which supplies a variety of professional services to the Ethiopian Government."

Three of the nearly 300 volunteers already in Ethiopia have been transferred to the Institute. As law school graduates, they will be of great use in the Institute.

Liberia: We have left this country for last because here the project takes on a different cast.

Volunteer lawyers in Liberia will be a part of an overall public administration project. Liberia, the oldest republic in Africa, was founded on the American pattern. Its constitution is similar to ours and its system of government is very like ours.

However, Liberia faces many difficult problems because it has few civil servants to carry on the daily tasks of government. Recently, President Tubman established the Special Commission on Government Operation to study administrative procedures and suggest methods for streamlining and reorganizing the government.

The commission has proposed many changes. Peace Corps volunteers will assist in their implementation. Volunteer lawyers will handle legal research and the drafting of legislation and will serve as assistant administartors to county and provincial courts.

NEXT STEPS

Volunteer lawyers, using their professional skills, represent a new dimension in Peace Corps programing. Lawyers are in the Peace Corps today; some are actually performing legal duties like the volunteer in Nyasaland; but the majority are either teaching, working in community development, credit union or co-op organization.

This African lawyer project is a pilot program. It will be an evolving project, and its success and growth will depend largely upon the measure of the men who volunteer for it.

The Peace Corps is conducting a talent hunt through major U.S. law schools. Using the facilities of the American Bar Association and the American Bar Foundation, Peace Corps officials are combing student bodies around the Nation, looking for resourceful, mature, imaginative young men who would like to teach others and learn from others, under hardship conditions at no financial gain.

They are not ignoring the lawyer already in practice or the man who has retired from his professional work. Experience is an asset. Volunteers from the 1963 graduating class and volunteers with years of professional training behind them will together place the project on a sound professional footing.

Volunteers must have an LL. B. degree. Membership in the bar is desirable, but not required. Summer experience in a law firm, a State or Federal office or congressional office would be useful for the young lawyer. Volunteers must be American citizens, without dependents under 18, and preferably single.

These are the basic requirements. Beyond them lie the requirements that are intangible. "Can he work well with others?"

"What are his skills; where can we use them?" "Can he work under tension?" "Is he patient?" These are the other qualities that mold a volunteer.

SELECTION AND TRAINING

Before a volunteer goes overseas he has to be selected for a project. The first step is to submit a volunteer questionnaire. Once that is processed and the volunteer has taken the Peace Corps placement examination, he can be matched to a job slot in a project. He is then invited to participate in a Peace Corps program.

Like all other volunteers slated to go overseas next fall, the volunteer lawyers will receive intensive training in this country. They will train for about 3 months at a colleg or university, studying the history, culture, traditions and language of their host country. Peace Corps volunteer lawyers will study along with other volunteers going to the same country. They will also take an intensive reading course in African legal studies.

Language-study features the most modern techniques of instruction. Although the host countries requesting lawyers are English-speaking, it may be necessary for the volunteers to learn native dialects for their rural assignments, particularly in native court administration.

Volunteers for legal projects will receive additional training in a 2-week seminar to be conducted at a special training site. Here they will take courses and be briefed on African law and legal procedures. This seminar will help relate their formal training to the unique situations that they will face in their particular project area.

After a 2-week home leave, volunteers report to their host countries for a brief in-country orientation. Transportation is arranged and paid for by the Peace Corps.

ALLOWANCES

Peace Corps volunteer lawyers will serve for 2 years, includnig the training period. During this time they will receive a living allowance to cover food, clothing, housing and miscellaneous expenses—plus a readjustment allowance of $75 for each month of service, nearly $1,800 for the entire tour.

The living allowance varies from country to country and is designed to let the volunteers live at a level equal to that of the people with whom they work.

Housing conditions will vary greatly, from a modern apartment to a small rural cottage. In all areas, living quarters for volunteers compare with facilities shared by host country coworkers performing similar jobs. All volunteers also receive 30 days of leave a year, during which they are encouraged to travel in the host country or visit neighboring countries.

LEADERSHIP FROM THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

The questions can rightfully be raised—"What about afterwards?" "What happens when the volunteers get home?"

The American Bar Association has demonstrated forthright leadership in asking firms employing lawyers to grant leaves of absence for Peace Corps service. Volunteers could go back to their firms with 2 years of overseas experience, as experts in African law.

They will have given of themselves in the highest traditions of service. Volunteer lawyers, steeped in a heritage of rule by law, knowledgeable in the spirit and practice of a democratic society, will have helped to establish societies of free men based upon these tenets.

They will return home with the experience and expertise that only a few have. They will be better prepared for leadership in their profession and in their communities. Volunteer lawyers, answering the challenge of public service, will share in an experience that will enrich their entire lives. They will have learned that liberty under the law, be it the civil or the common law, and the equal rights of individuals to live a life of freedom, limited only by respect for the similar rights of others, are the needs of all peoples.

Approve the Ban—And Stay Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the July 28, 1963, issue of the South Bend Tribune, endorsing approval by the U.S. Senate of the limited nuclear test ban treaty which was initialed a few days ago in Moscow.

The editorial, entitled "Approve the Ban—And Stay Alert," follows:

APPROVE THE BAN—AND STAY ALERT

Two temptations flutter around the limited nuclear test ban treaty draft initialed last week in Moscow like moths around a porch light on a July night. One is to overestimate the importance of this cold war agreement; the other is to underestimate it.

The significance of the event is precisely this: Soviet Russia, apparently influenced by its open and serious break with Red China, has finally accepted a minimal agreement on nuclear testing that the West has plugged for more than 4 years.

First offered under the Eisenhower administration and then reoffered after Kennedy took office, the agreement avoids the thorny issue of inspection because it involves only atmospheric and underwater tests, which can be detected from afar by currently available instruments. (It also covers tests in space, which are of no special concern because any test that would be of value to the tester would have to be held close enough to the planet to be easily detectable.)

That's all the agreement covers. It is not in any sense a major step toward disarmament. There is no reason to believe it heralds any global power realinement or any significant move westward on Russia's part.

There is, in fact, no real reason to believe Russia will even abide by its terms any longer than it suits her purposes to do so.

On the other hand, the agreement is not meaningless. It does put the brakes on the nuclear race. Equally important, it ends for the moment the radioactive pollution of the atmosphere, a matter that ought to concern all men living on the planet, even though scientists argue over how much damage this pollution threatens to the race.

And finally, the very fact that Russia said "da" to anything the West proposed must be considered at least a tiny improvement in cold war relations.

The treaty is yet to be approved by the three signatory nations. Russia having come this far, probably will approve without further fuss. Britain's assent seems certain. There is a real question only in the United States, where the Senate has been asked to give its blessing to the pact.

We believe the Senate should consent. The treaty carries some risk, but not a great deal. The United States, so far as laymen can judge, holds the edge in all phases of nuclear development except extra-big 50- and 100-megaton bombs, which are of dubious strategic value. The only weapon breakthrough in sight in either the United States or the Soviet Union is an antimissile missile, and that's some distance down the road for both, according to best military and scientific estimates.

If the test ban treaty is approved, however, the administration must do two things: It must encourage the continued laboratory development of nuclear weapons right up to the testing point, and it must remain ready to resume tests in short order if the Russians break the treaty. In addition, of course, it must be constantly alert for Red cheating.

Russia, after all, did not become trustworthy because it agreed to a treaty. The Soviets have seldom kept their word—never when it was not in their interest. The administration, having been burned before, must surely remain shy of the fire.

If Russia should resume testing, we must be ready to follow suit as national security dictates—and without delay.

Senate approval of the test ban would place enormous responsibility on the administration. Let the executive branch not forget it.

Goethe Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 28 we observe the anniversary of the birth of Germany's greatest poet, Johann Wolfgang van Goethe. Goethe's name symbolizes the highest achievements of culture and humanism. He was as aware as any writer in his century of the dark abyss of the human heart and the follies and tragedies of history. Yet unlike many of his contemporaries, this knowledge did not make him despair. Although he lived in an age when the word "culture" suggested the sheltered life, the ivory tower, and frequently contempt for the problems of the real world, Goethe participated in active and creative pursuits. A man who has become immortal because of his magnificent prose and poetry, he also devoted himself to science, to the history of art, and to the administration of the state in which he lived—all without compromising his independence as an artist. "Never, in my vocation as an author," he once said, "have I asked what would the people like and how I could (through my poetry) serve the whole. I have always striven to improve myself, to raise the standard of my personality, and to express only that which I recognized as good and true."

The noble cultural tradition of Goethe has been perpetuated by many German artists. As evidence of the continued influence of Goethe's devotion to culture I need only mention two artists who have lived in my own State of California, Arnold Schoenberg and Otto Klemperer. Both the composer, Schoenberg, and the conductor, Klemperer, came to California as exiles from Nazi Germany. Schoenberg was known throughout the musical world for his revolutionary use of "atonal" scales in his music; Klemperer, because he was one of the great conductors of the century. These two great

artists have demonstrated, in the spirit of Goethe, that the German people remain leading contributors to the world's music. Like the great 18th century poet, also, their lives and works indicate that art and music knows no national boundaries.

GNP Seen as an Inadequate Measure of Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing group of economists who question the adequacy of the existing gross national product measurement as a valid indicator of economic growth. The emergence of this group is of great importance since the administration's demand for more spending and tax cuts to stimulate growth is premised on current GNP figures, which are said to portray a stagnant economy.

An article in the July 14 St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times by Henrietta and Nelson Poynter adds further support to those who challenge the validity of GNP as a growth measure. Pointing to a speech by our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], the article contends that the GNP ignores many elements of real growth, such as the improved quality of goods and services, greater longevity, increased leisure time, do-it-yourself labor, and better education. If GNP were to include more of these factors it is likely that the administration's pessimistic assumptions about the state of our economy would be vitiated and that a picture portraying substantial current growth would emerge.

Mr. Speaker, the question about the adequacy of our present GNP measurement is extremely important because our debate about national policies for economic growth is based upon GNP figures. Before carrying on policy discussions, we must first be sure that our statistics are complete and portray our actual economic situation.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article from the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUR GROWTH YARDSTICK: OUTDATED?

(By Henrietta and Nelson Poynter)

Tonight the French are dancing in the streets. Thousands are crowding the boulevards with song and celebration because this is their Fourth of July marking the fall in 1789 of the Bastille, the hated prison where so many were held who advocated "liberty, and fraternity."

With the American and French Revolutions, new values emerged in the economic, political, social and spiritual thinking of the Western world. This change is continuing, and among other long-established bastions the gross national product (GNP) is under reexamination.

The Department of Commerce last week released an attractive booklet which explains the materialistic production of our country. It's a far cry from the Soviet policy of appeasing the Russian family in a crowded room with glorious reports on pig iron production.

But after almost 200 years of growing freedom the question still is how we can measure and promote the intangible values—and set new goals—for the dividends of a free society.

When "The Affluent Society" was published in 1958, Kenneth Galbraith, who taught John F. Kennedy economics at Harvard, maintained that when the cold war ends "the basic demand on America will be on its resources of ability, intelligence, and education. The test will be less the effectiveness of our material investment than the effectiveness of our investment in man."

Now, to challenge the President's demand for an increased growth rate based on GNP with facts and figures which back up much of the Galbraith theory, comes one of the most perspicacious Republican Congressmen, THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri.

In an analysis of a new study by Princeton Professor Fritz Machlup, which maintains that knowledge production grows faster than GNP and that this is the sign of real economic growth, Mr. CURTIS told Congress:

"The gross national product measures only imperfectly, if at all, many of the components of real growth, such as increased leisure time, new and improved goods and services on the market, more and better education, improved health, longevity and so forth. If we could measure accurately some of these real growth factors, I am confident that a picture would emerge of a dynamic and rapidly growing economy."

Beginning with the thesis that short-term studies of the economy may indicate only temporary ups and downs, but not a long-term trend, Dr. Machlup uses a 10-year period for his studies. The differences in the rates of increase, he observes, appear even more impressive if knowledge production, which comprises 28.7 percent of GNP, is compared with everything else included in the gross national product. The knowledge production increase for the years 1947–58, he claims, is 10.6 percent, with a total money value of over $100 billion.

Prof. Machlup presents a table of 48 items of knowledge production to back up his conclusions. Education, for example, is broken down not only for private and public, lower and higher, but includes studies at home, on the job and in the Armed Forces. The other items extend from research and development to the living arts, information media, and professional services.

Changes in 10 economic items in 10 years

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Item	1951	1961	Increase	
			Amount	Percentage
Gross national product	$329	$519	$190	58
National income	279	428	149	53
Personal income	257	416	159	62
Disposable personal income	227	364	137	60
Personal consumption expenditures	210	338	128	61
Personal taxes	29	53	24	83
Personal savings	18	26	8	44
Compensation of employees	180	302	122	68
Corporate profits	41	46	5	12
Dividends	9	15	6	67

Department of Commerce table.

The statistics would seem to back up the less scientific conclusions of Elmo Roper poll of economists and business executives, during the furor caused by "The Affluent Society." Although many of them disagreed with some of Professor Galbraith's iconoclastic pronouncements, one of his major points, vital to the latest Princeton study, received majority approval:

"America's basic deficiency in facing the future is the inadequate cultivation and education of its human resources. We must, therefore, place less emphasis on material production and more on developing the applied intelligence and creativeness of our people."

To this 68 percent of the economists and 53 percent of the top businessmen agreed.

But Galbraith's central thesis on the importance of public services elicited no such approval. The Roper poll found a bare majority of the economists—52 percent—agreed, but 78 percent of the businessmen actively disagreed with this statement in the poll:

"Our preoccupation with high production also promotes a continuing social imbalance in American life whereby the private production of goods (automobiles, cosmetics, appliances, etc.) is kept at too high a level at the expense of public production of services (adequate schools, parks, sanitation, public safety, etc.)."

With the biting satire for which he is famous, Professor Galbraith described this attitude:

"At best, public services are a necessary evil; at worst, they are a malign tendency against which an alert community must exercise eternal vigilance. Such attitudes lead to some interesting contradictions.

"Automobiles have a greater importance than the roads on which they are driven. We welcome the expansion of telephone services as improving the general well-being, but accept the curtailment of postal services as signifying necessary economy.

"Vacuum cleaners to insure clean houses are praiseworthy and essential in our standard of living. Street cleaners, to insure clean streets, are an unfortunate expense. Partly as a result, our houses are generally clean, and our streets generally filthy. In the more sophisticated of the conventional wisdom, this distinction between public and private services is much less sharp, and, as I have observed, it does not figure in the calculation of gross national product."

The Princeton study goes even further and into more detail, in challenging the validity of what is included and what is left out in the figuring of gross national product. The Government has already begun to modernize and update the Consumer's Index. Perhaps this idea of calculating knowledge production and other intangibles of a viable economy may lead to new methods of computing not only gross national product, but the budget and other traditional national studies which have not kept pace with the changes in the country and the world.

Shakespeare Summer Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable evenings of theater that Washington has ever offered is the Shakespeare Summer Festival presentation of "Much Ado About Nothing" at the Sylvan Theater. The performances are uniformly excellent, the costumes are enchanting, the setting is superb, the lighting and musical effects are magnificent—in short, the entire production is a sheer delight.

Shakespeare's crisp and witty play is a perfect vehicle for the versatile cast and their virtually ideal setting. I should add that another of this production's virtues is the fact that there is no admission charge, thanks to the sponsoring organizations, the Department of the Interior, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department. The polished, professional touch, however, was made possible by the liberal financial support from many private organizations and individuals.

The Sylvan Theater, at the foot of the Washington Monument, is the perfect spot for such a performance, and Ellie Chamberlain, the producer, and Director Don Driver have utilized every natural and technical advantage at their disposal. I would also like to commend the exceptional cast, headed by Marian Mercer, and Robert Mandan.

Since the opening night, July 13, thousands of District residents and tourists have flocked to the theater. The weather has been ideal, the reviews were excellent, and I understand that the attendance has averaged 1,500 per performance.

Unhappily, "Much Ado About Nothing" will run through August 11 only. It is seldom that the public is treated to such a thoroughly delightful theatrical experience, and I urge my colleagues, and all others who have the opportunity, to make every effort to attend one of the final performances. It is a rare opportunity and one which should not be missed.

I hope that next year Mrs. Chamberlain and her deft, magic touch will again turn the Sylvan Theater into Washington's most popular attraction. She is to be commended for her vision and imagination. Washington is indeed fortunate to have the benefit of her talents.

Omar B. Ketchum

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many throughout the Nation were saddened by the death on July 25 of Omar B. Ketchum. He served his country with distinction in time of war and peace. A combat veteran of World War I, he returned to his home in Topeka, Kans., following the war where his unusual talents soon found expression in a distinguished career of public service.

As mayor of Topeka from 1931 to 1935, he made a record for which he is still held in the highest esteem by those who knew him in the old home town. His outstanding qualities led to his selection as the nominee of the Democratic Party for Governor of Kansas in 1934. Though he was defeated by Alfred M. Landon's bid for reelection to a second term, he was again the nominee of his party in 1936 to oppose Arthur Capper, the senior U.S. Senator from Kansas. He was defeated in a very close race by the popular Kansas Senator but soon returned to a career of service when he became a national officer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Omar Ketchum served in the Washington office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from 1941 to the time of his death. As legislative director of the VFW and later as executive director of the Washington office, he was well known as an aggressive and articulate spokesman for veterans and their dependents.

Omar Ketchum knew war as a soldier. He also knew war as did the parents of boys killed in the service—his oldest son, Jack, was killed while serving as a bomber pilot in the European theater during World War II. So, I say Omar Ketchum gave much to his country—he will be long remembered for his many talents and long period of service.

Test Ban Treaty Hazard: Soviets Have Super-ICBM for Delivery of Super-H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the fact that Soviet Russia has tested H-bombs with far greater "bang" than any of ours is beyond dispute. And under provisions of the test ban treaty now under consideration in the other body, the United States is prohibited from testing devices of greater force than we now have in an effort to catch up with the U.S.S.R. It must be taken for granted that Khrushchev will build a very large arsenal of these superbombs, which he already has successfully tested, while we are forced to depend on our smaller bombs for retaliation against any surprise attack.

Until recently, there was doubt that the Soviets had a "carrier" capable of delivering their superbombs to U.S. targets. This doubt has now been removed on the word of no less an authority than Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Chief of Staff.

General LeMay's startling disclosure, made to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee, should give supporters of the test ban treaty some second thoughts. It is recounted in a Washington dateline article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott which appeared in the July 17 issue of the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article at this point:

LEMAY WARNS BAN WILL BENEFIT RUSSIANS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—A new Soviet nightmare in cataclysmic weapons hangs like a fearsome cloud over the East-West nuclear test ban talks getting underway in Moscow.

The Russians have successfully tested the SS-8, a third generation intercontinental ballistic missile that is far more powerful and accurate than the giant ICBM's they already have.

This foreboding development means that Soviet rocket scientists have perfected an ICBM "carrier" for their steadily increasing stockpile of 50- to 100-megaton super-H-bombs. One megaton is the equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT.

Gen. Curtis LeMay disclosed this startling information to the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee in expressing his frank opposition to the United States entering into an unpoliced nuclear test ban agreement with Russia.

The outspoken Air Chief of Staff warned the Senators that the Soviet is now substantially ahead of the United States in the development and testing of giant nuclear weapons and their carriers, and that a treaty banning tests of them in the atmosphere would definitely continue the Reds in their sinister lead.

General LeMay asserted that Air Force Intelligence is now firmly convinced the Russians are giving the development of giant ICBM carriers top priority. This belief is strongly supported by data based on recent Soviet missile tests in the Pacific, which Air Force experts feel quite certain completed the development of the deadly SS-8.

At a closed-door session with the same Senate committee, Central Intelligence Director John McCone agreed with LeMay's grim report on the Soviet's superiority in supernuclear weapons.

However, while conceding that the Russians have the "capability" of delivering superbombs, McCone expressed the opinion that Soviet priority is now centered on the production of a new ICBM that is considerably lighter and more mobile than the huge SS-8.

As described by the CIA chiefs this latest Soviet missile is similar to our Minuteman, that has a range of 5,000 miles and is just becoming operational.

The Russian version of the missile is launched from pads that are cheaper to construct and perhaps capable of being better camouflaged than other Soviet ICBM's. The missile is deemed to have full inertial guidance, instead of the combination of radio and built-in guidance of earlier models.

In the judgment of CIA, this new Red missile is an exceptionally satisfactory weapon for a nation whose military theorians insist above all on the crucial importance of "preemption"—the necessity to strike first in the employment of nuclear arms.

These and other still-classified details of the Soviet's stupendous nuclear missile capabilities will be made public by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman, when and if a nuclear test ban treaty is submitted to the Senate for ratification.

All Is Not Gloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, in the June 25 issue of the New Britain, Conn., Herald, there is an editorial entitled, "All Is Not Gloom," which refers to our Alliance for Progress program and its recent success in Latin America. This editorial is provocative and deserves the attention of the Members of this body:

ALL IS NOT GLOOM

We must confess that virtually everything we have read to date has dismissed the Al-

liance for Progress as being a waste, a loss, doomed to defeat unless there is a marked pick-up by the apathetic Latins.

Thus, it came as both something of an eye-opener and a pleasure to come across a piece in Vision magazine. In piercing, analytical style, the magazine undertook a point-by-point survey of Latin America, collectively and nation by nation.

Its conclusion: Far from being "down the drain," Latin America's story has a side that is positive and promising, and should be told.

Specifically of the Alliance, the magazine writes: "The Alliance has had a slow start but considering the unprecedented scope of the program, a fast start would have been impossible. * * * The real burden of making the Alliance work lies with the Latin Americans, and an encouraging number of them are shouldering the load. Tax reform and land reform legislation is being passed, and through implementation may be long in coming, even the consideration of these reforms is a great step forward in many republics."

The article reviews numerous areas of progress and reform throughout the continent. It points out that declining economic indicators have been reversed, and that political stability is far more widespread than is generally realized in this country: "Revolutions—not street fights and police actions—are not as frequent as they once were. But the motivations (for revolutions) are changing * * * from a simple lust for power to * * * worry over Communist inroads; worry over political power vacuums; and, occasionally, worry over the preservation of constitutional government."

There is no pretense that all is well and rosy in South America. But there is a definite series of illustrations to show that all is not as bad as some would have it.

Argentina's Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to learn of the recent establishment of an Argentine Peace Corps. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the July 1963 issue of the International Volunteer entitled, "Argentine Teachers for America":

ARGENTINE TEACHERS FOR AMERICA

Argentina has announced the establishment of a national volunteer service called "Maestros para America" (Teachers for America). This program will send an initial group of 50 volunteers to teach in primary schools and fundamental education campaigns (literacy teaching and basic mathematics) in the rural areas of other Latin American countries as part of the Alianza para el Progreso.

The announcement came at the end of discussions in Buenos Aires between the International Peace Corps Secretariat, an Organization of American States Commission, and Argentine officials in regard to the program. The IPCS has worked with the Argentine Government in the development of this program and has agreed to provide technical assistance in setting up the program.

Argentina hopes to send its first volunteer teachers abroad by October 1963 when a number of primary school terms begin in Latin America. The volunteers will be selected from the more than 700 who have already applied to serve in the program. They will be trained and supported in the field by the Argentine Government. However, Argentina has asked the OAS to sponsor the program and to place the volunteers through OAS machinery.

The Argentine Government has formally expressed its hope that other countries will adopt similar programs so that a multilateral campaign against illiteracy can be mounted in Latin America under the auspices of the OAS.

Foreign Editor Condemns Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Michael Padev, the foreign editor of the Arizona Republic, appeared on July 28. It sets forth so clearly the reasons why so many fear the adoption of a nuclear test ban treaty that I felt it should be brought to the attention of my colleagues:

FOREIGN EDITOR CONDEMNS TREATY

(By Michael Padev, Republic foreign editor)

WASHINGTON.—The United States-Soviet-British nuclear test ban treaty, concluded by the Harriman mission in Moscow last week, has received substantial public opinion backing in the free world.

So far only Premier Charles de Gaulle's France has come out with a resolute "no" of disapproval, and West Germany has expressed some anxiety and doubt.

In Britain the treaty has been received with the enthusiastic approval of all political groups, from the rightwing Conservatives to the leftwing Socialists and Communists.

In the United States the treaty is also meeting with general approval. A majority of newspaper comment favors it, and it seems that the Senate will ratify it with the necessary two-thirds majority (67 out of 100 votes).

As our readers know, the Arizona Republic opposes the test ban treaty and strongly disapproves of the policy of the Kennedy administration, a policy of friendly collaboration with Soviet Russia, which has made the treaty possible.

Why do we take such a lone wolf attitude?

Why don't we join the optimistic appraisals of the majority of newspaper columnists, commentators, and editorial writers?

Why don't we share President Kennedy's views that the treaty is a "victory for mankind" and a "first step" toward peace?

In the first place let us note that our editorial position on this issue has nothing to do with the personality of the man in the White House or with his political affiliation.

We would have opposed the test ban treaty just as strongly if a Republican team headed the present administration.

As a matter of fact, our readers might recollect that the Arizona Republic raised repeatedly its voice of disapproval and warning against the so-called moratorium ban on atom tests announced by President Eisenhower in 1958.

We said at the time that the moratorium would harm U.S. interests, that the Russians would prepare secretly for testing and that they would break their promise not to test.

We were proved to be right. The Russians did secretly prepare for testing for more than 2 years. They resumed large scale testing in 1961, breaking the moratorium, while the United States honestly and in good faith observed the moratorium and did not test.

In so doing the United States retarded and weakened considerably its own nuclear arms development.

We oppose the 1963 Kennedy nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviets on the same grounds we opposed the 1958 Eisenhower test ban moratorium; namely, that you cannot, ever, trust the Moscow Communists to keep their word or to observe any moratorium, treaty, or agreement, which they might make with the West.

We are convinced now, as we were convinced in 1958 and proved right, that the Soviet Government will continue to develop secretly its nuclear arms.

We are convinced that the Soviets will secretly prepare for atom tests, including tests in the atmosphere.

We are convinced that the Soviets will continue, secretly, to expand, strengthen, and perfect their nuclear arms.

We expect that the Soviet will openly resume large-scale testing in 2 or possibly 3 years. This is a period of time necessary for the scientific and military preparation for a new series of advance nuclear tests.

Because of this we think that for the United States it will be the height of folly not to go on testing.

We fear that this policy will weaken American defenses and will strengthen the Soviet war potential.

In our view any treaty or agreement or policy which weakens the United States and strengthens Communist Russia is not and cannot be a step toward peace or a victory for mankind.

Quite on the contrary, such a treaty, or agreement or policy, is a step which endangers world peace.

It is also a victory for the enemies of mankind, the Communists.

Time To Analyze Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the annual round of arguments seeking to justify the foreign aid program is well along in this season when Congress is studying the authorization legislation. One of the standard arrows shot into the air by supporters of the program is the one about the aid program supporting American jobs and our own economy. The argument is no more valid on the ten thousandth repetition than it was the first time it was trotted out by an overzealous propagandist for the program.

It is time we begin to analyze some of these canards and I am pleased to see that this is being done. I strongly recommend to Congress the following editorial by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., of Charlotte, N.C., on July 24:

EDITORIAL BY JEFFERSON STANDARD BROADCASTING CO.

When David E. Bell, director of foreign aid, told a group of broadcasters and editors that

money advanced to other countries is mostly spent in the United States and is therefore bread cast upon the waters, he was indulging in a fallacy that realistic economists abandoned years ago.

Every businessman knows that, when he gives credit, he is out both the money and the goods until the bill is paid. If the customer cannot pay, the businessman sometimes endorses the debtor's note at the bank and gets his money, but at the same time he has lent his credit, and the goods are not actually paid for until the note is canceled. That is what we do with foreign aid when it is in the form of loans. But, when it is in grants, we don't get anything back. We simply give money to the aided country to buy our goods. In those cases we are paying for our own exports.

To put it more brutally, the American taxpayer is paying the exporters for the goods bought by the foreign country. As usual it is the taxpayer who loses.

It is hard to follow Mr. Bell when he says such a process makes jobs for Americans. It simply takes money away from the taxpayer and gives it to a foreign country to buy goods from American suppliers. These suppliers will employ more people, yet, but the business which pays the taxes is deprived of its investment money. Far from creating new jobs, that economic sleight-of-hand is more likely to cause unemployment in the long run.

Since the war Europe and Japan have been given $57 billion in economic aid out of the American taxpayer's pocket. With this money they have rebuilt their bombed-out factories and equipped them with machinery more modern than our own manufacturers could afford. With this new machinery, operated by workers whose wages are far below those paid in the United States, they are building a worldwide competition that the American companies cannot meet. Some are shipping their goods to the United States and competing with us on our home grounds.

The textile industry is an excellent example of this.

But that is not all. We pay out in foreign aid much more than we get back, and the difference must be made up in gold. Foreign creditors, be it remembered, can collect in gold; the American citizen cannot. Since foreign aid began, our gold reserve has dropped from $24.5 billion to $16 billion. Foreigners now hold short-term credits of $24 billion redeemable in gold, or $8 billion more gold than we have at Fort Knox.

There are some legitimate arguments for foreign aid, but the ancient hoax that robbing Peter to pay Paul is good for the general welfare is not one of them. Paul, the exporter, gets his money, but Peter, the taxpayer, is out of pocket.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

A stream of editorials, letters, and articles emanating from southern Idaho continue to express emphatic opposition to Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho. I am surprised that the representatives in the Congress who have promoted tihs indefensible action of the Secretary are not asking for its repeal.

It is evident from the tenor of the editorials and letters that the people of southern Idaho are fully aware of the shortcomings of socialistic Federal power. The realization of the potential loss in State and local taxes, the desire to stand on their own two feet without subsidy from the taxpayers of the rest of the Nation, and the knowledge that the growth of Federal bureaucracy is the forerunner of the loss of personal freedoms are all clearly indicated.

Idaho was carved out of the rugged West by a courageous band of hardy pioneers who believed in the free enterprise system that has made America the envy of the world. It is refreshing to realize that the early pioneer spirit in Idaho is not dead and that most Idahoans want to continue to provide for themselves. There is an apparent realization that the "Great White Father in Washington" takes much more out of their pockets on the one hand than he puts back with the other hand. This realization is fully evident in the editorial from the Idaho Free Press of Nampa, Idaho, wherein they say:

Sometime, somehow, we must become mature enough to realize there is no Santa Claus. Someone pays for everything we get. The gifts someone brings to the front door usually are paid for at the back door—and we lose a lot of freedom, self-reliance, and money in the process.

The complete editorial follows:

[From the Nampa (Idaho) Idaho Free Press, June 15, 1963]

CHEAP POWER?

The Department of the Interior last month extended the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area to all the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific Northwest. This includes southern Idaho.

You've been reading plenty on the subject since then.

Idaho Power Co. understandably is attacking the move as another example of pitting tax-supported Government power against taxpaying private power. Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, and others of his political philosophy are hailing the move as a spur to the further development of southern Idaho.

Each citizen's view of the situation probably is determined by his ideas of Government's role. Some want it big, all-serving and expensive. Others want it restricted, noncompetitive and less costly. Some haven't any idea—except when they realize how much of their income is going to Washington.

We're not going to repeat all the arguments advanced in recent months and years on the subject of public power versus private power. But we would like to make a few observations and raise a question or two.

First, we dislike the arbitrary manner in which the Department of the Interior acted in extending the marketing area. We recall Gracie Pfost's assertion last October that "if the people of Idaho indicate they want Bonneville service, the Secretary [of the Interior] will issue the necessary marketing order." Did anyone ask you?

Second, we wonder how one Government agency can undersell another Government agency on power generated by the same facilities. BPA says it will sell power at 40 percent less than the Bureau of Reclamation—the power being produced at Bureau of Reclamation plants.

Third, we are curious about BPA deficits. While reportedly selling at lower rates than private companies and other Government agencies, BPA has suffered five straight deficit years—and according to Mrs. Pfost, is facing more annual deficits. Who picks up the tab? Could it be the taxpayer?

Fourth, we have been thinking about Idaho's efforts to attract more industries that pay taxes and salaries. What do you think Idaho Power is? Last year, the company paid $13,799,421 in Federal, State, and local taxes—$204,749 of this to our own Canyon County. Of that amount paid to our county, more than $128,735 will be used to support local schools. Idaho Power Co. employees in the county number about 60 and their salaries total $342,000 most of the money going into the local economy. Are we trying to discourage such contributions?

Fifth, we wonder whether many folks honestly think big Government is very efficient. There has been so much evidence over the years of extravagance, waste, inefficiency, and other evils in big Government—and someone always must pay the bill. Guess who.

Sometime, somehow, we must become mature enough to realize there is no Santa Claus. Someone pays for everything we get. The gifts someone brings to the front door usually are paid for at the back door—and we lose a lot of freedom, self-reliance and money in the process.

We'd like to see taxpaying, manpower-hiring industry encouraged for Idaho—not discouraged by tax-raising Federal competition.

Hon. John F. Henning: "Expanded Apprenticeship for all Americans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Labor took a most significant step toward ending discrimination in apprenticeship programs. The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training issued regulations which would end Federal support of those programs which practice discrimination in the selection and training of apprentices. The regulations apply to some 9,000 joint labor-management programs in all parts of the United States; programs having some 150,000 registered apprentices currently employed.

This action follows closely upon the recent action by the president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mr. George Meany, in appointing a special five-man committee to work with the administration to prevent all forms of discrimination, but especially to work to prevent racial discrimination in employment.

There recently appeared in the American Federationist an article on the problem of the Negro worker. It points out that his problem is only in part a problem of the color of his skin, of racial discrimination. The roots of his problem lie not only in social factors, but

also in the economic situation faced by all labor in America. The Negro suffers also because he is predominantly unskilled, in a society where the demand for unskilled labor is contracting, even as the demand for highly skilled labor is expanding. He suffers because he is a worker in a society where full employment has not been attained, where the rate of unemployment has remained above 5 percent for over 5 years. An end to racial discrimination is an essential first step to aid the Negro, but, as the article points out, it is only a first step.

This article was written by John F. Henning, our able and distinguished Under Secretary of Labor. Mr. Henning as Manpower Administrator of the U.S. Department of Labor has responsibility for the overall direction of its manpower programs and training programs. He is Chairman of the 15-member Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. Before coming to Washington, he served as director of the California Department of Industrial Relations and as chief adviser to Governor Brown in the field of labor-management relations.

Because of the current interest in equal employment opportunities, I include Mr. Henning's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, I believe a number of our colleagues will find this article more than interesting.

The article follows:

EXPANDING APPRENTICESHIP FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By John F. Henning)

(NOTE.—John F. Henning is Under Secretary of Labor. As Manpower Administrator of the U.S. Department of Labor, he also serves as Chairman of the 15-member Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. Formerly he served as director of the California Department of Industrial Relations and chief labor adviser to Governor Brown. Previously he was with the California AFL–CIO.)

American Negro demands for fair employment have turned sharply to a precise area of dispute: apprenticeship training.

The new emphasis is hardly surprising. Skilled journeymen are the income elite of manual labor. They look to a brightening future. All responsible projections of U.S. labor force needs cite the continuing call for skilled labor and the declining proportions of unskilled work.

Back in 1957 the U.S. Department of Labor issued its now historic projections of the labor force requirements of the 1960's. The study estimated that in 1970 America will need 42 percent more professional and technical workers than in 1960, 24 percent more sales and service personnel, 22 percent more skilled workers and 18 percent more semi-skilled. The percentage of the unskilled will be down.

The prophecy presumes a full employment economy in 1970. Without economic growth, both skilled and unskilled will suffer. But not alike. For example, during the past 5 years, the national unemployment rate has approximated a disturbingly high 5.5 percent, but in this period the jobless rate among the unskilled has been at least twice that of the skilled. Whatever the course of the economy, the days of the unskilled appear numbered.

Long ago Benjamin Franklin observed that he who hath a trade hath an estate. The difficulty is that he who hath a trade usually hath a white skin.

As in Franklin's time, the one certain road to journeyman training is the apprenticeship system. To some the road seems a narrow, twisted trail, bordered by bigotry and privilege. Whatever its hazards, more than 150,000 young Americans today are found in registered apprenticeship programs.

The average apprenticeship embraces 4 years of on-the-job training and normally entails 144 hours of related classroom instruction a year.

The tripartite forces of labor, management and Government shape the character of apprenticeship training. But the shape of things does not satisfy any American sensitive to the demands of democracy.

Federal responsibility came to apprenticeship with the adoption of the Fitzgerald Act in 1937.

The Fitzgerald Act called for Federal and State Government promotion of labor-management apprenticeship programs. The Government role has been noncontrolling in that actual on-the-job training has been directed by the employer, usually under union-negotiated conditions.

The Government role has been significant in that the U.S. Department of Labor and the several State apprenticeship agencies fix minimum standards for program registration. Registration entitles apprentices in approved programs to employment on Federal public works projects and assures approved programs of the services of the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training or the services of the pertinent State agency. Historically, Federal registration of programs has applied alike to State-sponsored as well as federally directed programs.

Thirty States manage their own apprenticeship agencies. In the remaining 20, the Federal Government alone sponsors and guides apprenticeship.

Civil rights spokesmen long have held the idea that Federal registration should be denied any program stained by ethnic discrimination. AFL–CIO President George Meany agrees. Meany backed a 1961 attempt to write such a denial into Federal law. Meany noted, however, that discrimination in apprenticeship is only part of total job discrimination. He urged enactment of a national Fair Employment Practices Act with full powers of enforcement.

But the immediate question is—what can be realized in the absence of a national FEP law?

In July 1961, then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg announced the Department of Labor would thereafter require the inclusion of a specific nondiscrimination statement in all apprenticeship standards of firms handling Government contracts. He further declared a similar provision would be required in the registration of any new apprenticeship program regardless of its relationship to Federal works.

Labor Department action did not die with the Goldberg pronouncement. The following achievements merit attention:

1. Within the past year, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training assigned four minority consultants to the task of opening opportunities to Negroes and other minority peoples. Now located in Washington, New York, Chicago and San Francisco, they counsel with employers, joint apprenticeship committees and unions on a regional basis to encourage acceptance of qualified minority applicants. Additionally, they advise minority groups on apprenticeship fundamentals and admission processes.

2. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz on February 27, 1963, announced the appointment of a National Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. The committee consists of 15 members: 4 from management, 4 from labor, 5 from minority organizations, and 2 from the public.

The Advisory Committee held its first meeting in Washington on May 14 under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Labor. The committee developed a five-point action program:

(a) The establishment of aprenticeship information centers in certain critical cities throughout the Nation.

(b) The fostering of apprenticeship information centers through State apprenticeship councils wherever feasible.

(c) The creation of research programs to measure the present depth of minority participation in apprenticeship programs.

(d) The implementation of present anti-discrimination provisions in apprenticeship programs registered with the U.S. Department of Labor.

(e) The consideration of preapprenticeship programs for the training of young workers not qualified for admission to apprenticeship programs.

3. The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, the District of Columbia Commissioners and school authorities, the U.S. Employment Service, labor and management, opened its first Apprenticeship Information Center on June 17 in the Nation's Capital.

The Information Center, which the Department proposes to extend throughout the Nation, offers young apprenticeship applicants personal and group counseling, aptitude testing, information on educational requirements, and related data pertaining to District apprenticeship programs. It also offers an orderly system of referral to joint apprenticeship committees and serves as a point of contact for unions, employers, and minority groups.

The values of the Information Center are intended for all young Americans, whatever their race, color, creed, or national origin. But the Center should be of particular value to Negroes and other minorities from whom the knowledge of admission procedures and requirements often has been withheld.

4. Secretary of Labor Wirtz issued a directive to all joint apprenticeship committees of the District of Columbia, June 5, 1963, on the discrimination crisis in the District jurisdiction. The Secretary listed the following requirements for programs hoping to enjoy Federal registration rights:

1. If apprentices are not selected by a merit system alone, selections must be made in a manner that demonstrates equality of opportunity.

2. Waiting lists which reflect previous discriminatory practices must be subjected to whatever action is necessary to offset such discrimination.

5. President Kennedy on June 4, 1963, directed the Secretary of Labor to require that "admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis."

6. Following Secretary Wirtz' order of June 11, 1963, the Bureau of Apprenticeship began a 50-city check of Negro apprenticeship participation in Federal construction projects.

The varied activities here cited indicate the commitment of the Kennedy administration to equality of opportunity in apprenticeship.

The President held a national conference with 300 labor officials at the White House June 13 in which he called for the end of job discrimination at every level of union jurisdiction. This was one of a number of conferences on civil rights held with businessmen, educators, clergymen, and lawyers.

However, the President noted that genuine equality of opportunity could be meaningful only in a full employment economy.

National morality and the times will permit nothing less than full job equality, but

without full employment this means sharing job scarcity regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. Job equality must mean sharing the bounty, not the scarcity of national life. But apprenticeship at its fullest would hardly have the capacity to solve youth unemployment. The problem is beyond that.

During the calendar year 1962, teenage unemployment averaged 13 percent against an overall national figure of 5.6 percent. During 1962 the average teenage unemployment total was 816,000 workers.

Between 1957 and 1962 the total number of registered apprentices in training averaged 150,000.

Apprentices in training today average only 3 percent of the 5,077,000 teenage workers in the U.S. labor force. Of the teenage total, 3,017,000 are male.

The apprenticeship solution assumes even less promise when pictured against a 50-percent mortality rate. The consistent national experience suggests that only one-half of those now in training will know journeyman status.

The proportionate place of apprenticeship must also be seen in the perspective of the awesome burdens the American economy will confront in the 1960's.

The U.S. Department of Labor tells that the economy must provide 34.5 million new jobs in the 1960's to match the demands of population growth and technological change.

The labor force will realize a net increase of 12.5 million through population expansion. This involves an increase of 26 million young workers. Death and the retirement of older workers will determine the 12.5 million net figure.

The technological impact will be greater. The Labor Department estimates the annual rate of productivity increase will be about 3 percent throughout the 1960's. This means the output per man-hour will jump about 3 percent each year. The job displacement statistics become frightening when the 3-percent productivity rate is applied to an annual average employment figure of 74 million workers. For the 1960's this means the economy must provide 2.2 million new jobs each year to care for technological progress. The decade's demand will be 22 million jobs.

The statistics are germane because apprenticeship, unlike vocational education, always has been a job-related training system. Unless employers determine to hire apprentices there is no apprenticeship system. Further, unions relate the number of admitted apprentices to the number of employed journeymen.

Given full employment, apprenticeship could come to its greatness.

But at this hour, the immediate crisis of apprenticeship discrimination plagues the national conscience and cries for action.

The Kennedy administration reforms must succeed. There is hope and precedent in the experience of California.

Four years ago Gov. Edmund G. Brown named apprenticeship bigotry a special evil and called for remedies. Adoption of an FEP law in 1959 helped greatly but was not quite enough. The subtleties of apprenticeship bias often escape FEP enforcement.

California's plan has won national praise. It features (1) statewide and local committees on apprenticeship opportunities for members of minority groups; (2) local apprentice information centers for making vital data available to high school students and graduates.

The statewide opportunities committee was founded in 1960. It is comprised, like the National Advisory Committee, or labor, management, and minority group representatives and includes Government spokesmen.

The California committee last year developed two precedent-smashing surveys of the depth of discrimination.

The initial study approached the ethnic identity of the more than 20,000 apprentices receiving training in California. The second involved an ethnic sampling of journeymen who completed their apprentice training in 1955.

The first survey, based on a one-third return of questionnaires, revealed the startling evidence that there were 283 American Indians participating in California apprenticeship programs as against 150 Negroes. Mexican-Americans numbered 521, Japanese-Americans 31, and Chinese-Americans 18.

The findings suggest that Negroes number just a bit more than 2 percent of California's apprentices. In the Federal census of 1960, Negroes formed 5.8 percent of the total State population and 4.7 percent of the State's male labor force.

The State committee data on minority representation among journeymen certified in 1955 also are revealing.

A one-fourth return of inquiries pegged Negro participation at 1.5 percent.

The journeymen survey indicates the rewarding nature of skilled employment. Seventy-two percent of the graduate apprentices were earning $7,000 or more a year, while 52.4 percent were earning over $8,000 per annum. Only 11.2 percent were earning less than $6,000 per year.

Ninety percent were enjoying full employment on a yearly basis.

Both surveys confirm the skilled labor problem of the Negro. But the totals do not necessarily prove discrimination. For example, in certain survey areas Negroes had rarely, if ever, applied for apprenticeship admission. The failure could represent either resignation to bias or the absence of training qualifications.

Traditionally, Negroes have been the particular victims of hasty and frequently indifferent counseling in the high school systems. In California's soaring school population, a senior student is fortunate if he receives one hour of personal counseling in his final year. This obtains for any student whatever his race or skin. The national practice is scarcely different.

Each year thousands of young Americans emerge from the secondary schools without any sense of occupational direction. Adequate high school counseling would be of particular benefit to the children of Negro families recently removed from the agrarian South. These young people suffer the same lack of skilled labor tradition as did most of the 19th century European immigrants who poured into America searching for freedom and opportunity.

But where immigrant Europeans could seek manual labor in coal and steel and maritime employment, today's young Negro faces a labor market in which there is little future for the unskilled.

Not only becausse of discrimination but also because of lack of skills, Negro unemployment is consistently twice the overall national average. In the calendar year 1962 the rate of unemployment among Negroes was 11 percent against a national average of 5.6 percent. Negroes represent 11 percent of all American workers but represent 22 percent of all unemployed.

As indicated earlier, economic growth is the first requisite of full employment in the 1960's, the full employment that will give job opportunity to all Americans.

Economic growth, however, will not find employment for the unskilled.

America needs an active labor market policy to accompany the fiscal and monetary policies of growth. An active labor market policy would directly answer the training needs of the U.S. labor force. The rate of unemployment among unskilled workers in the calendar year 1962 was 12 percent against the national average of 5.6 percent.

An active labor market policy also would end racial and ethnic discrimination in employment.

But it would do more than that. It would also achieve these ambitions:

1. An updated labor market information service for workers and employers.
2. An employment service warning system for impending technological changes and other changes causing serious job displacement.
3. An effective informational service for career guidance and counseling.
4. An educational system, vocational as well as academic, which would answer current and upcoming manpower needs.
5. An expanded apprenticeship training program.
6. An improved system of job placement services.
7. A program for aiding the mobility of workers.

In summary, it is obvious that Negro discrimination in apprenticeship has its unique and general features. The Negro suffers because of his skin. But he suffers also because he often is an unskilled worker in an economy which has limited place for the unskilled. Finally, he suffers because he is a worker in a society which has not yet found the way to full employment.

The issue of employment discrimination is not peculiar to apprenticeship. It will be found everywhere, including the banking, insurance, and newspaper worlds. It will be found in the professions and the religions of America. Indeed, discrimination is often strongest in sectors of nonunion employment.

American labor must persist in its efforts to realize full employment and the abolition of the last measure of job discrimination. The efforts must reach to the State councils, local councils, and local unions.

The matter is moral. For more than 100 years labor has served as the social conscience of the Nation. Unpurchased and unafraid, it has led the everlasting struggle to attain a society in which bread, security, and freedom shall be the right of all Americans whatever their racial, religious, or ethnic identity.

Labor holds priceless credentials of sacrifice and struggle. It must use these credentials now as mortal conflict shakes the Nation. The honor and duty of leadership rest with the trade union movement.

WHERE LABOR STANDS

AFL–CIO President George Meany, testifying before a House Education and Labor subcommittee on a bill to promote equal opportunity in apprenticeship programs, August 21, 1961:

"There is general agreement that the demand for skilled workers will grow very rapidly in the next decade, while the opportunities for unskilled workers will continue to shrink.

"Therefore our interest—and the national interest—must look to an across-the-board increase in apprenticeship training.

"In order to insure—as we must and we should—full opportunity for Negroes and other minorities to enter these skilled trades, we must have full opportunity for all candidates.

"Let me put it this way: We are opposed to the exclusion of any candidate for apprenticeship on grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin. We are also opposed to the selection of any candidate on those grounds. We want a place for every qualified candidate, on an open and equal basis. We believe this bill, with the improvements I have suggested, will help toward that end; and I repeat, we endorse it.

"The problem demands much more than a piecemeal approach. It demands vigorous action to stimulate employment; it demands a strong, enforcible fair employment practices law.

"The legislative branch of our Government has lagged far behind the executive and judicial branches in recognizing the imperative

need for wiping out segregation and discrimination. It is our hope that the present bill represents only a first step in redressing the balance."

Misuse of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the misuse of prayer in the racial demonstrations which are sweeping this country prompts me to call the attention of the Congress to a very fine statement on this matter which recently appeared in an Alabama weekly newspaper.

The article, which follows, was written by Mr. J. B. Stevenson, editor and publisher of the Roanoke Leader, Roanoke, Ala. Mr. Stevenson is one of Alabama's outstanding newspapermen and I believe his article merits the attention of my colleagues and of all Americans.

Following is Editor Stevenson's statement which appeared in the Roanoke Leader, July 25, 1963:

MISUSE OF PRAYER

In the racial struggles of 1963, prayer is being employed as a weapon when it should be used as a key.

Those "reverends" who are now making a career of promoting Negro protest demonstrations intersperse their marches with prayer meetings in public places—apparently more for propaganda purposes than for the beneficial answers praying people usually expect to receive as a result of their prayers. In effect, the prayer of the demonstrators seems to be, "Lord, help us to smash all barriers down." This amounts to a public underscoring of grievances rather than an earnest seeking after God's guidance in the solution of the problems.

Leaders of all-out resistance to Negro demands have not adopted the strategy of praying in the streets. But, judging from their public efforts, any private prayers they might have on the subject would likely be, "Lord, help us to hold the fort without a breach." This would be prayer for the "immovable object" with which to withstand the "irresistible force" the Negroes are seeking to generate.

A set of "prayers" asking for something at the expense of somebody else—opposing goals that too often disregard the rights and feelings of those on the other side.

The American people as a whole profess to believe in God, in prayer, in religious freedom, in morality, and in fairplay for all. They become alarmed at Supreme Court decisions that seem to undermine this Nation's moral and religious traditions.

But just how much do we believe in these religious values we say we cherish? In them can be found right answers to our serious problems involving human relationships. But first we shall have to change our tactics. We shall have to lay aside the weapon of prayer and substitute for it the key of prayer.

There is something noble about a person who will stand up and fight for his convictions (especially if his convictions are the same as mine), but continued all-out battle between persons of strong, differing convictions on racial matters will solve nothing. Into every struggle, sooner or later, must step the "peacemakers," those blessed individuals who "shall be called the children of God."

Who would be the best peacemakers for resolving racial tensions in every community? Obviously those leaders of both races who maintain quiet prayer-contact with the great Author of Peace. If they would agree on a mutual program of prayer for patience, understanding, enlightenment, and guidance, there would be created an atmosphere in which workable solutions could be found.

Man's answers (as seen in extreme legislative proposals from both sides) have a devilish way of compounding the racial problem and of stirring up more ill will than already exists. God's answer (there must be a right answer for every problem) would bring gains for all while building up good will.

Where do we find God's answer? In the Halls of Congress or State legislatures? In picket lines? In mob-filled city streets? In staged prayer meetings? Hardly.

Turn to Matthew 6: 5–6 for some timely advice from the Sermon on the Mount:

"And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."

Enough of one-sided prayer for divine endorsement of man-made goals. In its place try cooperative, humble prayer for God's direction. Be done with the noise and try some purposeful silence.

Special Commemorative Stamp in Honor of the Overseas Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been proposed that in recognition of the activities of the Overseas Press Club a special commemorative stamp dedicated to that organization be issued by the Postmaster General of the United States. Under the permission heretofore granted me I am enclosing the following letter under date July 25, 1963, addressed to the Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N.Y., July 25, 1963.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. POSTMASTER: The Overseas Press Club is the largest organization of foreign correspondents in the world and is one one of the outstanding institutions in our city. In March 1964 the club is celebrating its 25th anniversary.

The club in 25 years of its existence has accomplished much. It has become a forum for leading figures from all over the world to present their ideas freely and submit them to the scrutiny of the American public through the medium of the press, radio, and television.

The Overseas Press Club has become a leading champion of freedom of the press, speaking out fearlessly when the fundamental rights of the press are denied, or when newspapermen are hampered in their efforts to inform the free world.

Therefore, as mayor of New York City, in recognition of the work of the Overseas Press Club, I urge you to issue a special commemorative stamp under the slogan "The people's right to know," which would be dedicated to our continuous efforts to secure the freedom of press, expression, and information, throughout the world.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor.

Editorial by the Reverend Frank B. Seghers Jr., Assistant Pastor of the First Methodist Church in Somerset, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial written by the Reverend Frank B. Seghers, Jr., who is the son of a longtime personal friend of mine and of my family. I think the subject matter of this editorial is particularly appropriate at this time and coming from a minister of the gospel, it should be all the more meaningful. There is a better cure for a hangnail than cutting off your finger:

Not long ago Governor Wallace of Alabama made the statement that the Federal Government has usurped (and is continuing to do so) powers from the States. It seems, therefore, that we are moving toward a total dictatorship. We agree with the stand and the statement of Governor Wallace. The Constitution states (amendments, art. X.): "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It is our opinion that the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States regarding the use of prayer and the Bible in the public schools (which are operated by the States, not the Federal Government) is a trend in the wrong direction. Not only does this decision usurp the powers reserved by the States—that is, not specifically enumerated as granted to the Federal Government—but this decision also shows contempt of a higher power and a higher court—that of Almighty God.

We also take our stand in opposition to the proposals presented to the Congress by the President of the United States. Mr. Kennedy thinks that the Federal Government has the authority to control private enterprise. So does Mr. Khrushchev. Regardless of whether one is an integrationist, a segregationist, or a moderate, a good American, who truly believes in our constitutional government, will oppose such a measure. Under our system of government not only do the States reserve powers but also do the people, and we contend that a businessman has the right to perform his services without interference from the Federal Government. It is our sincere hope and prayer that Congress will have enough intestinal fortitude (guts) to vote down this unconstitutional measure.

God save the United States of America.

Aid to Education Without Federal Interference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, many people in my district have written to me expressing criticism of the U.S. Supreme Court ban on religious practices in public schools. The same position has been reiterated by many clergymen who are concerned over the outlawing of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in our public school system. Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish spokesmen have been vehement in denouncing the strange dictum of the highest court of our land.

One of the most thought-provoking editorials prompted by the Court decision appeared in the Washington Evening Star on June 17. I quote herewith its concluding paragraph:

> In the process God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. What remains? Will the baccalaureate service and Christmas carols be the next to go? Don't bet against it.

It is not a pleasant notion, Mr. Speaker, but it is a question that must be faced realistically in view of the assortment of Supreme Court decisions that seem to give emphatic preference to atheism and agnosticism over the philosophy that there is a Divine Being and Americans should be encouraged to worship Him. In view of this opprobrious inclination on the part of the Court, supporters of any program to extend the power of the Federal Government—and in particular those who advocate Federal aid to education—should make a cautious and extensive reappraisal of their position.

In opposing Federal aid to education, I have over the years warned that bureaucratic control would inevitably follow bestowal of U.S. funds to State and local school systems. This consideration is in itself sufficiently repugnant to reject any legislation that would permit Washington bureaucrats to get a foot in the door of our public and parochial school systems. Such a plan is all the more odious in view of the truism that all funds which came from Washington represent but a portion of revenue collected. In every instance an important percentage of the total must be deducted to pay the salaries of the hordes of Government workers and for the maintenance of their plush offices. From the time that the so-called school construction bill was introduced in 1957, I insisted that the more reasonable and more economic way to provide necessary school buildings and better teachers' salaries would be a tax reduction to enable our citizenry to meet these problems at the local level.

The economic consideration holds as true today as it did in 1957, or in 1907, or as far back as you may care to go. For this reason I have introduced H.R. 5680, which is now before the Committee on Ways and Means. It would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending a school. The deduction for the parent of a child in grade school or high school would amount to $800 and the parent of a college or university student would be allowed a deduction of $1,000. This increase from the usual $600 exemption would apply to parents of all students, regardless of what schools they attend—public, parochial or private.

Mr. Speaker, the job of providing for the education of America's youth was not assigned to the Federal Government by our Founding Fathers. It is true that financing our schools has become more burdensome with the passing of years, and parents who choose to send their children to denominational institutions encounter exceptional obstacles because they are in effect contributing to the support of two school systems. Behind these fiscal difficulties is the very bureaucracy which so many other aid-to-education measures propose to enlarge. The average parent has experienced less buying power with each dollar because of inflation created by a profligate and irresponsible Federal Government. Inflation, in addition, serves as a cruel encumbrance on retired teachers and other pensioned men and women as well as on everyone who depends upon savings or insurance to finance his children's education or to see him through his twilight years. High taxes are a further detriment to his ability to provide the necessaries of life, including an education for his children.

H.R. 5680, in allowing the parent to retain a greater share of the wages he earns, opens the way for him to support the schools of his community and gives him a little more of the wherewithal to send children to college.

Mr. Speaker, I have been confounded by the various bills introduced this year to allow increased exemptions from income tax in the cases of parents whose children are in institutions of higher learning but which completely disregard those boys and girls who are in grade school or high school. Unless the American parent can afford to support local primary and secondary schools and to pay teachers the high wages that they merit, there will be no need for colleges and universities. Our first responsibility is the grade and high school. They must be kept in good repair, we must continue to build them, laboratories and needed supplies must always be available, and the salaries of faculty members must never be permitted to lag. Too often there has been a poverty of principle in the aid-to-education issue. Any legislation providing Federal grants would be particularly unfair to Pennsylvania, which must pay $1.23 to the U.S. Treasury for every dollar it receives in return, whereas Texas—whose economy is booming through Uncle Sam's multibillion-dollar defense and space programs—makes a 20-percent profit on every exchange with Washington.

H.R. 5680 invites a solution of our school problems. In the process, it will have a tendency to check the extravagance of an already too big bureaucracy, for it will make available for education a portion of the revenue that is now squandered without regard to the needs of the men and women back home who pay for the upkeep of the Federal Government.

I offer this legislation in substitute for the variety of bills to provide Federal money for school systems. One of the measures that has received particular attention this year is H.R. 320, whose supporter is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY]. Its provisions would include an annual appropriation of $20 to each school pupil for the purpose of defraying part of the cost of his education.

While I respect the intent of my friend from New York, I would challenge his approach as impractical if not inadequate, although I must commend him for his attempt to provide assistance for educational purposes without involving the Federal bureaucracy to the degree involved in many of the other proposed school programs. The Delaney bill nevertheless provides a measure of intrusion by the Commissioner of Education, thus opening the door to Federal prescriptions that could ultimately bring control by the Federal Government.

God and religion have all but been driven from the public schools. If parochial institutions become beneficiaries of Federal grants—that is, public funds—how could they expect to escape from a similar fate?

Outlaw religion in religious schools? Incredible, one might say on first impulse. Yet those who oppose recognition of God in public school systems would institute action to take Him out of parochial schools the minute that public grants were accepted. In the light of its current behavior, the Supreme Court would be inconsistent if it did not extend the prohibition of religious practices to every school and every school system receiving public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 5680 is the logical answer to these economic problems facing both the public, private, and parochial schools today. Through it, perhaps we can keep God in at least some of America's educational institutions.

"Shorty" Powers Did a Great Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, so rapid is the course of events and so tremendous the progress the United States has made in conquering space, that it is easy to overlook one of the most important figures of Project Mercury. I refer to the outstanding role filled with such competence by Lt. Col. John A. "Shorty" Powers, known to the world as "the Voice of Project Mercury."

None who watched and listened in tense and prayerful mood as the American astronauts went into orbit and were returned safely will ever forget the in-

spiration and calming effect of the words, "This is Mercury control" as "Shorty" Powers proceeded to quietly and clearly explain and describe the status of the preflight or flight conditions.

Now that Project Mercury is ended, "Shorty" Powers will be transferred to other duties, but I think it is most fitting that we say to Colonel Powers, "Thanks, 'Shorty,' for a job well done."

I concur heartily in the recent editorial in the Miami (Fla.) Herald of July 24, which follows:

"SHORTY" AND THE TEAM

Through the series of space shots that put the first Americans in orbit, the words "This is Mercury control" were the signal for drama and excitement. This phrase by Lt. Col. John A. "Shorty" Powers always preceded official news of the astronauts in flight for a worldwide television audience. As the voice of Project Mercury, "Shorty" Powers became better known than many of the pilots themselves.

Now that Project Mercury is ended, "Shorty" Powers will be relieved of his public relations duties and reassigned.

He never earned a ticker-tape parade or a White House reception but he literally made space history. His role was unique.

Like all in Project Mercury he considered himself only a member of a team with a tremendous goal. He expressed this in his reaction to reports of his pending retirement: "Let's put this thing to bed, and get on to the moon."

Importance of Braceros to Major Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following information with respect to Public Law 78 has been provided by the Council of California Growers:

IMPORTANCE OF BRACEROS TO MAJOR CROPS

Growers of the following crops in California are the major users of imported Mexican national fieldhands, called braceros: Tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, lemons, lettuce, melons, sugarbeets, and celery.

During 1962 the aggregate value of these crops in California was $435 million. Applying the economic multiplier index of 4, this results in a total of $1.74 billion to the total economy of the State.

Below are listed the crops, their value in 1962, the number of employees hired at peak harvest or cultural activity, and the percent of braceros:

Crop	1962 value	Peak employment	Percent braceros
	Million		
Tomatoes	$130	43,700	80
Strawberries	36	17,000	61
Asparagus	27	9,250	50
Lemons	33	6,250	67
Lettuce	87	7,600	80–85
Melons	37	9,100	44
Sugarbeets	54	7,000	50
Celery	31	2,350	28

Source: "Seasonal Labor in California Agriculture," prepared by Division of Agricultural Sciences, University of California.

Christ's Plan for World Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I am submitting for the Appendix of the RECORD an unusual sermon by the Reverend Dr. James K. Leitch, minister of the Potomac Presbyterian Church, Potomac, Md., which is of particular interest:

CHRIST'S PLAN FOR WORLD SECURITY

(By James K. Leitch, D.D.)

Scripture: St. Matthews 6: 9–13

Men the world over have been seeking desperately for a plan that will save the world from the chaos that threatens to engulf it. Even now the leaders of the East and West are gathering for their latest effort to find some basis of agreement for a nuclear test ban. Perhaps you have never thought of "The Lord's Prayer" as being a plan for world security. One of the weaknesses of prayer is that we feel that in its utterance we have fulfilled our total responsibility. Somehow we have successfully transferred our concern to God. We forget that we are "workers together with Him" and, when we ask for knowledge we must set ourselves to study; when we ask for sturdy characters we must be ready to submit to such disciplines as produce character; and when we ask to be forgiven we must embrace the spirit of forgiveness ourselves. It doesn't suffice to say that Jesus lived 2,000 years ago; that in His day the problems of the world were simple and easy; that by no stretch of the imagination can we think that when He spoke to His little group of disciples that He was envisioning the world that confronts us today. All that may be true but, nevertheless, we must remember that basic principles don't change and that Jesus was dealing with basic principles.

He began by laying the foundation for world brotherhood: He used plural pronouns and He set the relationship between Creator and creatures. It is important that we note the significance of these facts. This prayer teaches us to say "Our Father," not "my Father"; "Give us this day our daily bread," not "Give me my bread." Jesus used a term for God that suggests the closest relationship we know in life. Acknowledgement of that relationship is basic to any accord in human relations. Moreover its personal intimacy creates an atmosphere which contributes to a sense of human dignity and an ease of communication which is essential. It isn't hard to talk to one's father. We can tell him our troubles. We can confess our struggles. We need not be afraid for "If our hearts condemn us (as they will), He is greater than our hearts." When the New Testament apostle pondered this relationship, he broke into an exclamation of wonder: "Behold what manner of love that we should be called the children of God." He was exclaiming over the sheer strength and equisite beauty of such a relationship. While it is indeed a "thing to behold," we might ask ourselves how often it has been attained by those who pray this prayer and why it hasn't been attained more often. Is it possible that men have prayed the prayer that Jesus gave for centuries and that God hasn't seen fit to answer it? Before we come to any quick conclusion let us ask if it isn't more likely that we don't really pray it at all * * * that we merely recite, or repeat, it? If the church could ever really rise to the level where she really believed this to be "Our Father's world" and we were really "His children" in the truest and most intimate sense and if the church could lift the world to such a concept, then surely it would be a safe place in which to live.

Now suppose we look at Christ's plan for world security. There are seven planks in it. He had a genius for "putting first things first" and His first plank, which is basic to all the others, is that "God's name shall be hallowed on earth as it is hallowed in heaven." Somewhere in usage we have grouped these first petitions and made them into a threefold ascription of praise. It may help to think of them separately. This one doesn't say that God shall be holy (for He is) but that "His name shall be hallowed" as it was, you remember, in the vision given Isaiah when he visited the temple (Isaiah 6: 1–5). He saw the Lord "high and lifted up." His train filled the temple and each seraphim sang "Holy, Holy, Holy." The deepest need of men is to know God—not just any god—but the holy God. The worship of gods that are not holy is a degrading thing because man becomes like that which he worships—or—respects. "In Him and in Him alone" can we have the perfect standard for human life.

The second plank recognizes man's need for a sovereign state: "Thy kingdom come on earth." We've been endeavoring to put into operation all sorts of associations of nations; i.e. League of Nations, World Court, United Nations. How frequently man has tried to build a society without a pattern. How costly and bungling the results have been. The danger is always that we shall be satisfied with less than the best. We shall say: "Things are better than they were" or "Things will become better" but there is never a clear-cut concept of what they "ought to be." Jesus gave us such a concept. He called it the kingdom of heaven. It wasn't a detailed "working drawing" to be sure. It didn't have all the "i's" dotted and "t's" crossed but in broad outline, with sweeping strokes, He sketched the basic principles. Shall it die? or Shall it be our goal? One of the most tragic little books I have ever read was one that came out a few years ago, written by Margaret Slattery, and bearing the title: "Thy Kingdom Come, But Not Now." It was a series of everyday incidents where individuals had come up to some crisis or moment of great decision and had committed themselves to some definite thing. When it came time to put their commitment into practice and its implications became at least partially clear, they backed away "until a more opportune time." We had to help us in our home when the children were little a deeply religious woman. Her husband was addicted to alcohol and this disturbed her. One day she told us that the night before, when she had gone home, she found that the "paddy" wagon had come and "toted" her man to jail. It was necessary for her to go to the corner store and, as she walked the street with head bowed so neighbors wouldn't recognize her, she was silently praying "O Lord, I'm so ashamed. I wish I could die." At that moment a motorcycle almost ran her down and, stepping back, she ended her prayer: "But not now." The time has come to quit playing with the tenets of our religion and begin practicing them.

The third plank in Christ's plan for world security emphasizes obedience: "Thy will be done." There can't be a kingdom in

which there isn't wholesome and complete respect for authority. Most people shudder at the thought of God's will. They associate it with the misfortunes of life. They see a little child "crippled from birth" or hear of a "mother killed in a traffic accident" and piously they say "It is God's will." I'm not going to get involved in the nonsense embedded in an attitude like that but let me remind you that when God's will is understood it contains the most beautiful things we know in life. But don't miss the verb: "Thy will be done." Jesus said: "If you know these things you are blessed if you do them." The common attitude is one of tacit and academic approval instead of implicit obedience. And yet, time and again, Jesus said: "If you love me, you will keep my commandments. You are my friends, if you do the things I command you."

The fourth plank is the only one that deals with material things. This is in marked contrast to manmade plans and perhaps points up much of our difficulty—we are too much concerned about prestige, possessions, status etc. A fair exegesis of this plank would have it include all those things needed to keep life going—food, shelter, medicine. Economic security is very much in our thinking. It is close to the core of our problem. A few things need to be remembered: (a) That a solution must be on a world scale—Jesus said: "Give us all our daily bread"; (b) that the resources are sufficient—God saw to that; and (c) sharing is the problem—man is far too ready to say "this is mine" and to demand some return for it—which isn't sharing at all. The answer will come only when man is willing to think, as Jesus did, in terms of the plural pronouns without regard to the distinctions which have emerged or been erected.

The fifth plank touches a tender spot. It calls for a spirit of foregiveness. It puts our sincerity to its severest test because there isn't much disposition to forgive in the deepest sense of the word. It never seems to make too much sense. It is easy to find ourselves in the position of the Pharisee who "prayed thus with himself saying, 'Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men.'" And it will take a great deal more humility than we have heretofore shown to say simply and honestly: "Father, I have sinned and am no more worthy to be called Thy son."

The sixth plank concerns temptation. I used to have trouble trying to fit this phrase into my total concept of God and then I read a suggestion by an Assyrian scholar, who has worked on translations of the New Testament, that it might read: "Let us not be lead into temptation." In the light of the way Jesus warned against "placing a stumbling block in a brother's way," any society that licenses liquor or gambling or that condones vice in any form will be well advised to do some close thinking at this point.

The final plank envisions "deliverance from evil." You may call it visionary—impractical—but it seems to me that even more than we need foregiveness from the wrongs we have done, or are doing, we need to be freed from the forces that seem to overpower us. Men sometimes speak of "entrenched evil" or they say it is useless to struggle against this or that because it is here to stay. But Jesus spoke of building His kingdom and said "that the forces of evil would not prevail against it." Which do we believe? Where do we stand? If we really believe in the ultimate victory of good over evil, then we can take our stand and we have reason to join Jesus as He reaches His climax in a crashing crescendo: "For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever."

President's Plan To Tax Foreign Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the ill-advised proposal of President Kennedy to tax foreign securities raises additional criticism as more and more economists and financial writers have an opportunity to study it. Showing that the plan will be no help to the stability of the dollar is the following excellent article by Henry Hazlitt in the August 5 issue of Newsweek:

BUSINESS TIDES: NO HELP TO THE DOLLAR

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration's proposal to tax foreign securities is unfortunate from every angle. It is a further abridgment of the economic liberties of American citizens. It is another roadblock to free markets. It is a clearly protectionist measure. It is a beggar-my-neighbor policy. It seeks to cure our balance-of-payment problems at the cost not only of increasing such problems for other nations but of disrupting their economies.

There were so many leaks in the proposal, even before the President announced the Canadian exemptions, as to make it futile in accomplishing its intended purpose of "helping the balance of payments." The attempts to plug these leaks would lead inevitably to exchange controls. The proposal to give the President discretionary powers to discriminate as among securities and countries would substitute uncertainty and administrative favoritism for a rule of law.

The tax would, of course, do nothing to cure the balance of payments. On the contrary, its mere proposal has undermined confidence in the dollar. And the irony is that all punitive measures of this kind would be entirely unnecessary of the administration had the courage and understanding to take the proper measures.

HURTING OUR CUSTOMERS

The proposal to impose a so-called interest equalization tax of 2.75 to 15 percent on foreign securities offered in the American market had all the earmarks of a panicky idea that no one had thought through. Immediately after the President's message, stocks collapsed on the Canadian and Japanese markets. Within 3 days the President announced that new Canadian security issues would be exempt from the tax. The Canadians had meanwhile pointed out that while $457 million in new Canadian issues were purchased by U.S. citizens last year, Canada still had a $565 million deficit in her trade with the United States.

In other words, Canada was buying from us more than she was selling to us—and our loans and investments made part of this excess buying possible. But this also applies to Japan, which also buys from us more than she sells to us, and also partly because of our loans to her. And this applies to still other countries.

When one contemplates all its loopholes and exemptions—all direct investment, all securities or loans of less than 3 years, loans of commercial banks, securities of less developed countries—it is hard to understand what compensation even the administration expects from its disruptive proposal.

INFLATION CONTINUES

And all such measures are quite unnecessary. The deficit in the balance of payments could be stopped overnight if the Government would halt the inflation. It took a timid step in this direction when the Federal Reserve increased the discount rate from 3 percent to 3½ percent. But this move was too little, too late, and too isolated. In such a situation the raise should have been at least 1 full percentage point. It should not have been accompanied by assurances that long-term interest rates were going to be kept down. It should not have been preceded and contradicted by the Federal Reserve's inflationary policy of buying Federal securities and so increasing the paper money supply. (The Federal Reserve held $31.7 billion of Government securities on July 17, an increase of $2.7 billion in 12 months. In the same period the money supply has increased about $4 billion.)

In the same week that the Federal Reserve raised the discount rate, moreover, the world learned that our Federal budget deficit in the fiscal year ended June 30 was $6.2 billion, with the prospect of a deficit twice as big in the new fiscal year. Yet on top of all this the administration is recommending increased expenditures and has renewed its suggestion for a substantial tax cut.

It is continuing this policy of inflation, which is the basic cause of the dwindling confidence in the dollar, as the result of the quite false Keynesian idea that inflation is the cure for unemployment. Because it will not accept the only real cure, it is plunging deeper and deeper into dangerous and disruptive expedients.

Test Ban Takes Terrible Chance With Nation's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the other body will do well to heed the words of Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, former judge advocate general of the Navy, warning against the United States being tricked by Khrushchev into accepting the nuclear test ban treaty.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by William A. Mullen which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., on July 19. The article includes excerpts from a speech made by Admiral Ward recently citing the dangers of surprise attack on the United States by the U.S.S.R. which are inherent in the test ban treaty:

ADMIRAL SAYS TEST BAN TAKES TERRIBLE CHANCE WITH NATION'S SECURITY

The international propaganda mills have begun to spin furiously again, grinding out a new batch of grist for a crisis-weary world that would like nothing better than a return to the type of peace that is a stranger to two generations.

Coming from the mills are the glowingly optimistic reports of a new breakthrough in the cold war in the form of progress toward a limited ban on nuclear testing, as an-

nounced in a joint communique by the United States, British, and Soviet participants.

Added to this optimism are the broad hints of a nonaggression pact between the United States and the Soviet Union, which may be presented as a new alinement between East and West against the rising threat of Communist China and its approaching status as a nuclear nation.

All of this is extremely appealing. Surely all of us would welcome suspension of the cold war and a lasting accord among honorable men so that the plain people could go about their business and rear their families without fear that one day everybody will be blown to kingdom come in a nuclear holocaust.

We might find some surcease in these Moscow reports if it weren't for the fact that our negotiator is W. Averell Harriman, who recommended the troika government for Laos, now almost completely a Communist plum.

There also might be some encouragement if there were no grim reminder of what really may be concealed beneath the Moscow test ban talks, as pointed to by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired.

We have the text of a speech by Admiral Ward, former judge advocate general of the Navy, before the Hawaii Foundation for American Freedoms a few weeks ago. What he had to say in the State that was the target of the sneak attack that ignited World War II makes the newest Moscow pronouncements downright terrifying, not reassuring.

The admiral began by divulging that the United States would have been burned to a cinder last October had it not been for a slippage in the Soviet program for developing an electronic control for the antiaircraft guns in Cuba and had it not been for public opinion at a politically opportune time that forced an aerial inspection of Cuba, which led to discovery of the nuclear missiles there.

He also commented on managed news and its purpose, and these excerpts from his remarks tell the story best, in all its stark ominousness:

"It's a terrible, terrible gamble that we are taking. We are going to rely on trusting Russian promises instead of United States strength to insure our security. There are only two ways we can attempt to insure peace. One is trusting the Russians not to disturb it. The other is to rely on our own military strength.

"It has become the fad in certain pacifist circles, pseudointellectual circles, to say that the 'only alternative to peace is annihilation.' Actually, the only alternative to annihilation is strength. Yet we are very rapidly decimating the massive nuclear strength of the United States. We are doing it deliberately, and we are doing it clandestinely.

"Strategists refer to this in private as 'clandestine unilateral de facto disarmament of the United States.' This is a very real thing. Under the guise of so-called 'modernization' we are cutting out about 90 percent of our nuclear firepower. We are substantially scrapping all of our first strike power."

Admiral Ward went on to say that Pearl Harbor was possible because we had underestimated the purpose of the enemy and he said that again our greatest danger is from surprise attack, which Premier Khrushchev could not launch until he won the nuclear arms race. He continues:

"There was only one way in which that race could be won. Khrushchev knew he had to trick the United States into stopping, while the Soviets secretly raced ahead. It took a brilliant mind to conceive a method of doing that. The method adopted was that of the nuclear test ban agreement. * * *

"When he (Khrushchev) broke the moratorium it was no piddling kiloton type of breach; he went directly into tests in the atmosphere that ran up to 58 million tons (TNT) equivalent. It is the same way with his Cuban adventure. We underestimated him then. We are underestimating him again now.

"We say the present threat is subversion. Out of the nuclear test ban and his two great series of test ban-breaking experiments he has completely reversed our position. This is one of the things that has been suppressed by this administration. The administration has suckered the newspapers of the country, liberal and conservative, on this issue.

"If we can get our leadership to face the twin facts that Khrushchev does intend to control the world and that the only way he can do it is through a surprise attack, then we can take the necessary steps to insure there will be no surprise attack. Also, it will be necessary for our strategists in the White House armchairs to recognize the elements of a successful surprise attack. The prime example is John Kennedy saying that the Soviets 'were not intending to use' the missiles they had in Cuba, because they 'had their own missiles in Russia.' "

The difference, the admiral noted, is that Cuban missiles would rob us of a 15-minute advantage in launching a counterattack against Russia, and he gave this advice.

"They (Russians) do have the objective of burying us, and they are rapidly developing the capability of carrying out this objective. Under these circumstances, the least we can demand of our leadership is that they stop disarming the United States."

There's nothing to add to that.

—WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

League of Women Voters Backs Foreign Assistance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, all of us welcome and appreciate receiving a thoughtful letter on an issue before Congress. The other day I received such a letter from the Minneapolis League of Women Voters. The letter sets forth the case for our foreign aid program. Because the views set out in the letter are so well stated, I would like to share it with my colleagues.

The League of Women Voters is one of the truly selfless, dedicated groups in America which studies issues before Congress and comes to clear and direct conclusions. Minneapolis has been a fortunate beneficiary of an active league for many years, and this letter reflects the care and thoroughness of its work. The letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
July 23, 1963.

Representative DONALD FRASER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRASER: On behalf of the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis I should like to inform you of our support of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 and urge your active participation to see it enacted.

We know that in the past you have been an active proponent of foreign economic aid. We want you to know that we sincerely appreciate your efforts and are sure that you will do everything possible to see that this year's act is passed without substantial cutting. Although in some ways the Clay Report was sharply critical of our aid efforts, we agree with its conclusion that development help must continue not only because we are altruistically concerned with the plight of less fortunate peoples but also because through it we can assure expanding markets for our production and reliable sources of supply of needed raw materials. Aid must continue, "because we believe those nations which are seriously striving to promote their own development should be helped by us and by our partners to create and maintain the conditions conducive to steady economic progress and improved social well-being within the framework of political freedom."

League study and action on world economic development over the years has crystallized into standards for evaluating foreign assistance—a sound and effective aid program should be long-range, effectively coordinated, well-staffed and efficiently administered. In addition, the developing countries should be expected to commit their own resources to the fullest degree practicable; they should make their own financial contributions, organize to the best of their ability a comprehensive development plan, make necessary fiscal reforms, and emphasize social progress and education. We feel that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 does conform to these high standards.

Recent years have brought more and more emphasis on the long-range development programs—more than two-thirds of all U.S. economic assistance now is long-range and the proportion of long-term development loans has grown steadily. This we find encouraging and would like to see the trend continue.

Several of the League of Women Voters' standards for good aid programs are concerned with administration, staffing, and coordination. Much improvement in this area has become evident in the past few years. The consolidation of aid agencies, improvement in personnel, reduction of marginal activities, better analysis of development requirements, new and simplified procedures and AID's concentration on selected countries are indicative of continuing efforts to better administer the program.

We are encouraged also to note the increases in aid given by other developed countries. In this area of greater participation by the developing countries, there seem to be indications that many countries understand their own problems more clearly than they did a few years ago, and that more sustained effort can be expected.

We are particularly concerned with any attempt to reduce the United States contribution to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. When you consider that money contributed to these programs is more than matched by the recipient countries it would seem that to reduce the sums available would only result in a reduction of matching effort by the developing—hardly an incentive to self help. The outstanding accomplishments of these programs as well as the incentive we often provide by matching other contributions up to 40 percent of the total leads to the conclusion that we should not think of decreasing our contribution.

We also urge you to consider favorably the President's request to reinstate the most favored nation treatment toward Yugoslavia and Poland. In our judgment, both U.S. economic and political interests argue the case for this reinstatement.

As in the past, we are again counting on your support and feel sure that you will do

everything possible to see the Foreign Assistance Act adopted.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JEROME S. GRAY,
President.

Edward Crafts Speaks on Outdoor Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr Speaker, during June 4–7, 1963, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held its 50th national convention. The theme of the convention was "How can we insure that the water resources of the United States are adequate at all times to meet the demands of our economy and ever-increasing population?"

For more than half a century, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has assisted State and local governments in developing their water resources. The organization was founded in 1901 because of the vision of public-minded citizens interested in conservation, development and control of this Nation's water supply.

Now that rapid strides are being made in this direction, the Congress has developed a keen interest in the related field of recreation, a subject which is also receiving attention at present by the U.S. Congress. In this connection, one of the speakers before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress Convention was Mr. Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior. While not in agreement with Mr. Crafts on all points in his speech, including the proposal for user fees on all Federal recreation projects, I would like to make available to Members of Congress the text of his informative address.

OUR NEW OUTDOOR RECREATION PROGRAM

(Remarks of Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, at the 50th National Convention, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963)

Congressman SIKES and ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you something about Chairman SIKES here this afternoon that you may not know. You know, I'm sure, Representative SIKES, of Florida, is one of the most distinguished leaders in the Congress in military affairs. I don't know whether you know that he is also one of the longtime leaders in Congress in conservation affairs and particularly in forestry affairs.

The first connection that we had, I think, was a long time ago. About 14 years ago in 1949, if I remember correctly, there was a bill going through Congress which Bob SIKES had authored. The bill had to do with making an inventory of the timber resources of the forest lands of our country. I was in the Forest Service at that time and was much interested in the bill. I was quite concerned, when it got through the committee and reached to the point of floor consideration, as to whether it was going to pass.

The chairman probably doesn't remember this, but he said to me, "Young fellow, don't you worry about this bill," and I said, "Why not?" He said, "This bill is bound to pass. There are too many trees in too many districts; it's just in." He was absolutely right. This is the way he's been for years and years in his leadership of forestry and conservation affairs in the South. So it's a real pleasure to be here today and speak to you.

I represent one of the newest and smallest agencies of Government, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Outdoor recreation in the last few years has achieved new stature as part of the American way of life. No longer are people who engage in outdoor recreation looked on askance as slackers in the shade.

Americans spend $20 billion each year on outdoor recreation; 90 percent of all of us take part in it. The participation reflected in these figures is the real origin of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The more direct origins lie in the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Under the chairmanship of Laurance S. Rockefeller, this Commission filed its outstanding report with the President and Congress about a year and a half ago. The ORRRC was set up by an act of Congress, as many of you doubtless know. It submitted numerous recommendations, one of which called for creation of a small policymaking, planning and coordinating bureau in the Federal Government to serve a number of functions. One task it proposed for the recommended bureau was promotion of coordination of outdoor recreation activities among the 20-odd Federal agencies engaged in outdoor recreation activities. Another was that it should serve as the focal point of relationship between the Federal Government and the States in this field. I should add that there are about 500 State agencies so engaged, an average of about 10 per State.

Another function recommended for the proposed new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was the conduct and promotion of research in outdoor recreation. There probably has been less research carried out in outdoor recreation than in any other field that has a comparable impact on the American economy. When Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, acting at the suggestion of the President, issued his order setting up the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation he gave it highly significant responsibilities involving promotion of interdepartmental coordination in outdoor recreation. Although the Bureau is housed in the Department of the Interior, it is recognized by that Department and by the President's Recreation Advisory Council, a Cabinet-level group, that the Bureau's function in the promotion of coordination in this field between the Federal agencies is interdepartmental in character.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation started from scratch about a year ago. We've been organized, we've staffed and we have been thrown from one fire alarm job to another. To give examples of this work, I need but mention such names to you are Fire Island off the coast of Long Island in New York, Assateague Island off the coast of Maryland which is discussed almost daily in the newspapers, the Allagash River in Maine, the Oregon Dunes on the west coast, Wild Rivers, Whiskeytown, Flaming Gorge, and the North Cascades Mountains. This is almost a litany of place names, but it also is a list of areas whose future is in doubt. There is doubt as to the best use for each of these areas. The questions involve deciding what is the best use as between recreation and other types of use. What is the best use as between different kinds of recreation, mass type of recreation or the wilderness type of recreation? There are questions as to the best administration between various Federal agencies or between Federal, State, and local agencies. We have been precipitated into all these problems for the purpose of making policy recommendations to the Congress and to the executive office of the President.

We are a small agency, about 135 people. We have a pretty good first team assembled from the States, from private life and from other Federal agencies. We don't yet have much depth. Among our more significant achievements in the past year has been the development of interdepartmental agreements between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. These have settled some longstanding differences between the two Departments, and have been hailed by the President as "milestones in conservation."

We have found that those activities which have the most "sex appeal" to the Congress and to the general public also are those which promote coordination. Coordination is a function we are just beginning to get into. The mechanics—the tools we use—involve program, budget and legislative methods, as well as the particular area studies which I have mentioned.

The Congress recently passed and on May 28, 1963, the President signed Public Law 88–29 a basic organic statute for this Bureau. Over the years I think this will be recognized as an outstanding benchmark in conservation. A number of provisions in this bill outline the functions of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. One particularly worthy of special note lies in the area of interdepartmental cooperation. This refers to coordination and directs the heads of the Federal departments and establishments having responsibilities in outdoor recreation to consult from time to time with the Secretary of the Interior and vice versa. Furthermore, the statute directs that the heads of the Federal departments and agencies carry out their responsibilities in outdoor recreation in general conformance with the nationwide plan for outdoor recreation which the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is directed to prepare and submit to the Congress periodically.

Another aspect of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's program which is just beginning to be developed is currently in the hands of the Congress. This is the Land and Water Conservation Fund proposal. Hearings have been held in both House and Senate. This is a complex bill. The bill's basic premise is that the States should occupy the key role in outdoor recreation, that the public needs to acquire certain lands, and that such lands should be acquired in the reasonably near future before they become prohibitively expensive or irrevocably committed to other uses. A further premise of the proposed Land and Water Conservation Fund legislation is that there should be a responsible method of financing needed State and Federal outdoor recreation programs. The proposed Land and Water Conservation Fund would derive partly from user fees paid by those who enjoy and make use of Federal recreation lands and partly from other sources. It proposes to make certain of these funds available to offset the cost of recreation development at Federal reservoir projects, to make certain funds available for acquisition of needed Federal recreation areas, and to make about two-thirds of the funds available to the States on a grants-in-aid basis. This money could be used for State planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation areas.

The bill has enjoyed good hearings before Congress. It has had the endorsement and support of the majority of the States and of nearly all the conservation and recreation organizations. When enacted, this vital legislation, coupled with the organic statute already passed and signed into law, will mean that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the Nation's new venture in outdoor recreation are off the ground.

To sum up, let me point out that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is a small agency. We will continue to be that. We have a good program in a burgeoning field. As recom-

mended in the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the Bureau's role is that of a catalyst in getting the States and the private sector to carry the major part of the responsibility in outdoor recreation.

It is particularly significant that in the last few months a fair number of Governors, congressional leaders, and college presidents are coming to us to discuss the recreation problems in their particular States and in their particular areas of interest. These men are not technicians nor professionals in this field, yet they recognize the coming of outdoor recreation as a major use of our land resources. We regard this as far more significant than if we were being approached by the technicians and the professionals.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is staffed with a number of gifted and talented men from various walks of life who have gambled their future to get this new venture underway. With passage of the land and water conservation fund legislation, the Bureau will be in full gear. I think the events of the past year and the events of the years to come will prove once again the truth of Robert Frost's statement that "The reward of daring is the privilege to dare again."

Statement on 30-Year Optional Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to my three bills to benefit postal and other Government employees, which are before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I hope these bills will receive committee approval and will be enacted this year. My bills are H.R. 7287, to authorize retirement of Federal employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity, H.R. 7659, to adjust Government and postal employee salaries to achieve comparability with industry pay; and H.R. 7288, to prevent the use of stopwatches and other measuring devices—work measurement systems—in the postal service.

With permission, I wish to insert in the RECORD my recent statement before the Subcommittee on Civil Service, urging approval of a 30-year optional retirement law. I have not yet given testimony to the committee on my two other above-mentioned bills, but will do so at the proper time. My statement on H.R. 7287 follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. HEALEY, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE, OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 24, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to testify on a subject very close to my heart—optional retirement from the Federal service after 30 years of employment.

As you know, I have given evidence of my interest in this matter by introducing one of the retirement bills under discussion, H.R. 7287.

Mr. Chairman, I favor a 30-year optional retirement law for many reasons, some humanitarian, some practical.

From a humanitarian point of view, let me say that after a man or woman has devoted 30 years of life to the arduous and demanding tasks involved in most postal and Federal jobs, he or she should have the privilege of retiring in reasonable comfort and security.

The Federal retirement system was rather late in coming into being. Employee organizations—notably the National Association of Letter Carriers—fought for more than 30 years to get a retirement act on the books. The Civil Service Retirement Act was finally signed into law as late as May 22, 1920. Ever since that time the retirement policies of the Federal Government have lagged significantly behind accepted standards in private industry. In my opinion, enactment of an optional 30-year retirement law would be an important step toward bringing Federal practices into line with those generally followed in the private sector.

There are other reasons why I think this important improvement in our retirement laws should be made. We are all concerned over the stubborn unemployment figures in this country which seem to resist all attempts to reduce them. Certainly, a 30-year retirement law would help this situation by creating vacancies in the Federal employment structure.

We are also disturbed by the lack of career inducements in the postal service. Recruitment of first-class young talent is becoming more difficult each year. I believe enactment of this legislation would alleviate this situation. Next to pay and promotional opportunities, the young person of today is most interested in the retirement provisions in the career he is about to choose. If we make the retirement program in the Federal establishment more modern and more generous, we shall be making the service more attractive to desirable young people.

There is a further practical reason, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, which should be carefully considered at this time. Our present rigid retirement program in the Federal Establishment is actually costing us more money than we should be spending.

It is demonstrable that men become more accident-prone as they grow older. This is particularly true in the postal service, where the jobs are physically demanding.

Last year, 50,524 Federal employees retired.

It may surprise some members of this committee to learn that one-third of those retirements—16,728—were for disability. The average age of those employees retiring for disability was 55.4 years.

Actually, almost half of the 526,000 persons on the Federal retirement rolls—a total of 210,000—are receiving benefits under disability retirement.

If we permit postal and Federal employees to retire with full annuities before they reach the age when they are most accident-prone, we shall be eliminating a great deal of unnecessary misery and we shall be saving a considerable amount of money as well.

I have just one point to add. The opponents of this legislation have painted a rather lurid picture of flocks of valued employees leaving the Federal service en masse as soon as the retirement provisions are liberalized.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a gross exaggeration. I think this for the simple reason that the annuities that we pay to our retired employees are too low to induce mass retirements.

No, the people who would take advantage of this law would be those who need it most. The study of geriatrics has shown us that some people age faster than others. It is these people—the tired, the early-aged, the least robust—who will benefit most by this legislation. Those who are still vigorous—by and large—will prefer to stick at their jobs rather than try to subsist on the pittance which the Federal Government bestows upon its superannuated employees.

Mr. Chairman, this is necessary legislation. It is forward-looking legislation. And it is legislation that the Federal and postal employees need and deserve.

Thank you very much.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Miami Beach is one of the communities in Florida's Fourth District, which I am privileged to represent. I need not go into its justly famed beauties and attractions which draw visitors from every State in the Union and practically every country in the world. None of these visitors will be more hospitably welcomed as bestowers of distinction and honor to the community than the members of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, who will hold their national convention at Miami Beach next October 21 to 25. Seven thousand delegates and vistiors are expected to attend this triennial meeting.

Mr. Speaker, as you and my colleagues know, the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is chartered by the Congress and all members receive an annual report. After examining the material which recently came to me, I am prompted to pay a sincere tribute to this fine organization and the contribution it has made to our Nation and to the youth of the world.

A gentlewoman of the Deep South, Juliette Gordon Low of Savannah, Ga., organized the first troop of 12 girls on March 12, 1912. Since that time there have been a total of 18½ million members of the Girl Scouts—more than 14 million girls and 4 million adults. The guiding purpose is to help girls develop as happy, resourceful individuals, willing to share their abilities as citizens in their homes, their communities, their country and the world. Membership is open to all girls between the ages of 7 through 17 years who accept the Girl Scout Promise and Laws. Membership dues are $1 per year. Adults, both men and women, are eligible for membership if they subscribe to the Promise and Laws and pay the same dues as girls. They work as leaders, council members, troop committee members, program consultants, finance advisers or in other positions of voluntary leadership.

The type of citizenship engendered by Girl Scout training is clearly shown forth by the Girl Scout Promise:

On my honor, I will try: To do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, and to obey the Girl Scout Laws.

The Girl Scout laws, designed to inspire the highest ideals of character and conduct, outline a code of behavior for young people which will stand them

in good stead as citizens and mature adults. They are laws of which all of us can afford to be reminded:

A Girl Scout's honor is to be trusted.
A Girl Scout is loyal.
A Girl Scout's duty is to be useful and to help others.
A Girl Scout is a friend to all and a sister to every other Girl Scout.
A Girl Scout is courteous.
A Girl Scout is a friend to animals.
A Girl Scout obeys orders.
A Girl Scout is cheerful.
A Girl Scout is thrifty.
A Girl Scout is clean in thought, word, and deed.

Through Girl Scout activities, girls put these laws into action and learn to develop a wide range of personal interests. The program activities are based on 11 fields of interest: Agriculture, arts and crafts, community life, health and safety, homemaking, international friendship, literature and dramatics, music and dancing, nature, out-of-doors, sports and games.

All Girl Scout activities are designed to carry out the motto: "Be Prepared" and to help the girls develop ability to cope with a variety of situations, to meet emergencies, and to lead stimulating and constructive lives.

The very essence of the democratic ideal is set forth in the Girl Scout slogan, "Do a good turn daily." Service to an individual, a group or the community is the inherent principle of scouting.

The troop is the basic unit of government in scouting. The girls meet weekly with adult leaders to plan their activities. There are a total of 163,000 Girl Scout troops in the United States and at U.S. military and civilian locations in 48 countries around the world. Scouts belonging to U.S. troops overseas are called TOFS—Troops on Foreign Soil.

As may well be expected, the strenght and growth of the Girl Scouts of the United States is the result of judicious guidance and foresight. Its program throughout its 50-year history—the 50th anniversary is being celebrated this year—has been shaped by the changing needs of girls in a changing society. Although the fundamental values of Girl Scouting have remained unaltered there has been a series of adaptations in the program to keep it current. The Girl Scout leadership is deeply aware, in this era of unrest and mounting social problems, of its responsibility to provide for all girls the most stimulating and constructive program possible, geared towards the development of fine character and good citizenship.

This coming September 9, there will simultaneously be released four new Girl Scout handbooks, launching a new contemporary design in the program. This will provide a total and continuous program of informal education and recreation for girls from 7 through 17. It is based on the most recent findings in the fields of child psychology and curriculum development. This program provides for four age levels—instead of the former three—to correspond with the development of today's girls:

Brownies, age 7 and 8.
Juniors, age 9, 10, 11.
Cadettes, age 12, 13, 14.
Seniors, age 15, 16, 17.

Each age level has its own handbook and the progression from the Brownie to the Senior handbook reflects the increasing ability of girls, as they grow from 7 through 17, to understand more difficult concepts and accomplish more difficult tasks.

Each of the 4 age levels will build on what has gone before, so that a girl who joins at age 7 can continue to grow in Girl Scouting through the age of 17—always with a sense of widening horizons and new goals for endeavor. At the same time, the structure within each age level will be such that a girl can begin in Girl Scouting at any age from 7 through 17, joining in the activities of her troopmates without going back to fulfill requirements the others have finished.

At each level, learning what lies ahead in Girl Scouting will be an integral part of the program, and older girls will be expected to assume definite responsibility for showing and explaining activities to troops of the next younger group. In these ways Girl Scouts of all ages will learn to recognize that the meaning of Girl Scouting in their lives can grow deeper with every year of membership.

In addition and as a corollary of the new four-step program, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. are also implementing a new council coverage plan designed to provide the strong councils, by merger and consolidation, which are essential to realization of the infinite possibilities of the 1963 redesigned program. These local councils will touch border to border, thus achieving total coverage of the United States. At the present time, approximately 90 percent of the girl membership is in councils where coverage has been completed or in councils which have voted their willingness to become part of a changed or enlarged jurisdiction.

Among the benefits credited to the plan are greater camping opportunities, improved leadership training, increased volunteer participation and more efficient use of funds through elimination of duplication. It is estimated that when this plan is completed there will be no city, village, or hamlet in this country that is not included in the jurisdiction of a Girl Scout council that has the potential of personnel, finances, and access to community resources to carry out its own total responsibilities and provide a Scouting program of opportunities diversified and challenging enough for the present and the future.

With the streamlined approach and "new look" of the coverage plan, Girl Scout membership has increased since 1946 from 958,000 to 2,688,000, and adult membership from 256,000 to 747,000. Lone troops in the United States now represent only 1 percent of the total girls membership as compared with 14.8 percent 17 years ago.

Under council coverage, Girl Scouting continues to have firm and enduring roots in the neighborhood, whatever the size of the council jurisdiction. Girls still experience the personal satisfaction of troop activities in their own communities, plus the exhilarating and rewarding camaraderie provided through joint activities with troops from quite different areas which, however, are within the same council jurisdiction. Completion of council coverage has been set for December 1963, to coincide with the initiation of the new four-step Girl Scout program.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing and encouraging in these troublous times to be reminded of an organization of young people and adults who are daily working to express more fully the ideals of our great democracy and to contribute their share toward freedom and peace for all nations on earth. Such, I believe, is the contribution made by the leaders and members of the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.

The Making of a Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, often we forget the striking power that a bit of well-placed levity can have on the body politic. The pen of the satirist has always been an effective weapon against destructive agitating and thinly camouflaged extremism.

In a phenomenon such as the one we are witnessing today, where, in a single vociferous denunciation, thousands of so-called conservatives are waggling accusing fingers at the Supreme Court, the fluoridation of drinking water, and the Negro quest for human dignity, the satirist's weapons can be wielded to great advantage.

I, too, have frequently been at odds with dangerous rightwing radicals in our country, and I am always pleased to see the sharp wits of such columnists as Art Buchwald of the Washington Post and Art Hoppe of the San Francisco Chronicle employed in the exposure of extremist absurdities.

In the July 18 edition of the Post, Mr. Buchwald admirably satirizes the lunatics of the far right, strips them of their pseudorational covering, and leaves them shivering in an embarrassing state of undress.

According to Dr. Johnson, the sage of 18th century English letters, the dual purpose of art is to please and to instruct. For the pleasure and instruction of its readers, and with the consent of my colleagues, I therefore offer "The Making of a Conservative" by Art Buchwald:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 18, 1963]

THE MAKING OF A CONSERVATIVE

(By Art Buchwald)

According to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER there is a grassroots movement toward conservatism that is sweeping the country. Since we always like to get on the bandwagon early, we dashed over to the Statler-Hilton the other day to attend a convention of archconservatives and right-wing fellow-travelers, sponsored by Human Events, a weekly newspaper devoted to fighting communism, socialism, New Frontierism, liberal Republicanism, Governor Rockefellerism, and the U.S. Supreme Court.

We went up to the registration desk on the mezzanine floor and told the man, "Sir, I've been swept up by the grassroots movement and I'd like to become a conservative. How do I go about it?"

A FEW QUESTIONS

He pinned a BARRY GOLDWATER for President button on our necktie and replied, "I'll have to ask you some questions first, to see if you're one of us."

"Yes, sir. Ask anything you want. You won't catch me taking the fifth amendment."

"Good. How do you feel about the Federal income tax?"

"Lousy. I think it's a scheme by left-wingers in the Government to make us pay for socialistic projects such as urban renewal, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, Federal education, and welfare payments for illegitimate children. If I had my way I would take the money I paid in income taxes and invest it in the stock market where it belongs."

"Now let me ask you this. Where do you stand on nuclear disarmament?"

"I'm against it. I think we should not only continue testing, but we should drop a few bombs on other countries to show the Russians we mean business."

"Very good. What about desegregation?"

"I think desegregation is a Communist conspiracy to mongrelize the races, and a violation of the 10th amendment of the U.S. Constitution."

"Would you want your sister to marry a Negro?"

"Yes. But that's because she voted for Kennedy, and the whole family is mad at her."

A PLOT AGAINST DENTISTS

"How do you feel about fluoridation of water?"

"Fluoridation is a socialistic scheme to contaminate our drinking water so we'll have less cavities, thus depriving dentists of making money under our American free enterprise system."

"What do you think of Bobby Kennedy?"

"Boooooooo."

"How do you feel about the Supreme Court?"

"They should all be impeached," we said. "I say take the prayers out of the churches and put them back in the schools where they belong."

"Where do you stand on the United Nations?"

"The United Nations is a Communist organization with the specific purpose of keeping us out of war. I think U Thant should be impeached and the United Nations building should be turned over to Conrad Hilton for a new hotel."

"You seem to be doing very well," the man said.

"Yes, sir. I'm not trying to become a conservative for laughs."

THE ACID TEST

"Let me ask this question. What is your personal opinion of Dwight Eisenhower?"

"He was a good general, but when he became President he became a Communist and sold us out to the Russians."

"Why do you say he was a good general?" the man said suspiciously.

"I must have lost my head," we cried.

But it was too late. The man took back the BARRY GOLDWATER for President button and showed us to the elevator.

"For a moment there," he said, "I thought you were one of us. But you gave yourself away."

"Give me another chance," we begged.

He shook his head.

"We're a grassroots movement and we can't afford to take chances with Eisenhower-lovers like you."

Impact Upon Related Industries—Fresh Vegetables and Melons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following information with respect to Public Law 78 has been provided by the Council of California Growers:

IMPACT UPON RELATED INDUSTRIES—FRESH VEGETABLES AND MELONS

It would be difficult to measure precisely the full economic impact upon all segments of the related agricultural industries that the loss of the bracero program is expected to produce in California.

On succeeding pages, however, are listed some of the key industries which either sell to or buy from the growers of California crops heavly dependent upon bracero labor.

According to figures furnished by Western Growers Association (3091 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles), California's fresh vegetable and melon industry annually accounts for 117,000 railway carlot shipments; 137,000 carload equivalents of truck transportation; 820,000 tons of ice at points of shipment alone; $10 million worth of petroleum products; $6.5 million worth of seeds; 156 million containers, boxes, bottles, etc.; 93 million pounds of fertilizers.

Investments of the fresh vegetable and melon industry include: $34 million in packing houses and equipment; $6 million in special harvest machinery; 17,500 trucks and 16,800 tractors.

Western Growers Association estimates that more than 60 percent of the harvest workers in these crops are braceros.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, educational television is a little more than 10 years old, but it is already being used to teach more than 8 million students in 800 school systems and 400 institutions of higher education.

This relatively new instrument of mass education, however, is not growing as fast as we would like it to. The Federal Communications Commission has set aside over 330 channels for educational purposes but as of June 1 there were only 80 educational TV stations in operation throughout the country. There should be many more, and Congress did provide $32 million last year for a 5-year Federal program of matching grants to stimulate and encourage the growth of noncommercial educational television. States, communities, and universities, as well as public and private agencies, can broaden educational and cultural opportunities in this way for the benefit of all.

Commercial broadcasters have also been alerted to their responsibilities in this connection. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks by Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, before the ninth general conference of CBS television network affiliates, New York, May 9.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. FRANK STRATTON

Once more I am very happy to welcome all of you. It is now 15 years since we first met together to discuss our common opportunities and our common problems. The mutual approach we have taken—the friendly atmosphere of openness and informality—has, I think, been extremely useful in maintaining the CBS Television Network's No. 1 position.

In 1955, when we began to refer to this annual session as a "general conference," I emphasized that our calling this gathering a conference was no accident. "Our purpose," I said at that time, "is not to invite you here for lectures; rather, the purpose is to provide means for the exchange of ideas with the central focus on perplexing problems that affect us all deeply and equally."

We have had, in the intervening years, many such discussions, and out of them have come reasoned, consistent, supportable views that have frequently been the basis for much of the progress not only we but the whole field of television have made.

It is in this spirit of friendly and frank mutual counsel that I come again to you this year, to discuss a subject that is, I believe, of deep concern to the future of all television and, perhaps, of our whole society—educational television.

At the outset, let me put unmistakably the propositions that I see as the points of departure—the minimum essentials—for our discussion:

First, educational television must not fail.

Second, we in commercial television have a very real stake in its survival and success.

Third, it must succeed in its broadest, not its narrowest, concept.

Fourth, it must be independent—independent alike of subsidy by Government or subsidy by commercial television.

Although the concept of educational television is as old as television itself, as an operating branch of broadcasting it is still in its early youth, going through agonizing growing pains more frequently than not, uncertain of itself in most ways, and attempting to solve problems of a very special nature that have no counterparts either in broadcasting or in education.

OUR STATE IN ITS SUCCESS

In 1948, when we held our first affiliates' clinic, the precedessor of these annual conferences, there were no educational television stations on the air. And it was to be 5 years—1953—before the first started operations. Today there are 79 educational stations in operation, and over 300 channels, both VHF and UHF, are reserved for educational purposes. But even this number, according to a report of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, is inadequate to meet the need if television is to be fully utilized to help solve the immense educational task facing this country for the predictable future. No less than 600 additional channels, the report stated, will be necessary.

We in commercial television know something of the problems these educational stations have, because some problems are implicit in the medium—however it is used or financed. To name a few—all too familiar to you: the enormous need for material, the great costs of production, the competent manpower required, the necessity to serve a community as a whole and not just one area of interest or just one level of education. In addition, educational television must find a means—better than improvisations—to pay its way in a society than can afford no foolproof method borrowed from a similar situation.

And the fundamental challenge to educational television is the same as the fundamental challenge to us in commercial television: to interest an audience and to hold it. We broadcasters ought not to take any satisfaction in educational television as a weak adjunct of commercial television, however true that may be today. We ought not to be content merely to support it with conscience money. We have a very real stake in its success—its success on a broad, varied scale. For what diminishes it diminishes us, in that it diminishes all television. And what strengthens it strengthens us, because it strengthens all television.

THE MEASURE OF A MEDIUM

If this seems to you idle theory, think for a minute of what our society would be if we had the printing press but no textbooks, no learned quarterlies, no magazines appealing to the few, no specialized cultural publications—if the role of the printing press were limited only to the production of mass circulation magazines, however excellent. Would not all of us sense that something was wrong and feel an obligation to see that something was done about it? And would we not feel that those already using print with spectacular success had a particular concern that something be done? That it not be bucked over to the Government?

I am not just preaching benevolence here. To prove itself in our age—to advance its freedom as a mature medium—television is going to have to do, with distinction and effectiveness, all the jobs of which it is capable—not just those that we in commercial television have taken on. And the measure of the medium's total achievement will be the measure of our own freedom to do our part of the job.

If educational television is to realize its fullest potentialities, it is important that we encourage it to take the broadest and not the narrowest view of its mission, to make the most and not the least of its opportunities.

THE NEED FOR COMPETITION

This means that, if we honestly believe in free competition, we should welcome educational television into the free competition for the viewer's attention. I discussed with you last year our conviction that the surest path to television's growth was, not more Government supervision, not more industry policing, not more private pressure groups, but more competition. I suggested to you, and I testified before the FCC, that the most sensible approach to more competition was a fuller utilization of the spectrum—UHF as well as VHF—using both bands for more stations and better, more varied service.

I remind you of this now, because it is to me overwhelmingly clear that educational television is one additional competitive factor that can give us the kind of prodding anyone needs in order to improve constantly. As you know, CBS has not arrived at this judgment lately. Over 2 years ago, on January 13, 1961, I disagreed with the president of the National Educational Television and Radio Center, in a panel discussion at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that educational television should be only supplementary to rather than competitive with commercial television. On that occasion, I said, "I think that in the long run educational television will be a competitive service, and I think that this is desirable." In that same year, 1961, the CBS annual report included the following statement in the letter of the Chairman and the president:

"CBS has always had a special interest in educational television, has supported its growth, and has directly contributed to the widening of its range of activities. CBS welcomes educational television not only as supplementary to, but as competitive with, commercial television service. We believe this competition will benefit both types of service."

We did not come to that conclusion only for the good of educational television. We did not come to it only for the good of the public that television, in order to survive, must serve. We came to it primarily for the good of all television—commercial and educational.

A NEW TESTING GROUND

I am sure that you know as well as I do that the price of growth—the price, in fact, of survival—in any mass medium is change—

constant, never-ceasing change. I do not know that it is always change for the better or even that it is always progressive. But change itself is the thing—never resting on your oars, never sure you have the right mix, never completely satisfied, being as willing to change when you are not entirely sure you are right as when you think it is perfectly safe. The only deadly thing for us—for any mass medium—is to stand still while the inexorable law of change is going to work all about us.

Yet we must have some sense of what we are doing, some sense of pace, some sense of direction. We are like the mass circulation magazine whose economics, audience and fundamental editorial and advertising roles do not permit it the same freedom as the book publisher, who can survive with a much smaller audience, who has no advertising function and who needs to meet no huge economic commitments. Yet does anyone doubt that the mass printed media are much the better off because there are book publishers and publishers of little magazines, from whom flow a continuous stream of new ideas, new knowledge, new theories appealing to every size of audience, reflecting every kind of interest, representing every kind of creative approach? A great testing ground is provided by all this activity—where the unfamiliar and the unproved can be tried out in an arena in which the stakes are low enough to make such trial possible on a broad scale.

FREEDOM TO DARE

Ultimately not just the vitality of our total cultural life is quickened by this but the mass media find themselves with a twofold gain—an audience somehow aware of new things going on and an indication of what those things are and how they can be handled.

This medium of ours is not immune, and cannot be, from all the laws of survival and growth and the pressures that affect the older media. Nor are we immune from the economic facts that rule out for us today many of the things that we are going to be doing tomorrow—the experimenting that must precede the innovations that will command popular attention at some future time. We must look to educational television stations to pave the way for us in some of these fields.

It is, therefore, of direct concern to all of us that these stations thrive, that they find a satisfactory solution to their financial problems.

I hope that there is no disagreement that it is fundamentally bad for any medium—or any important sector of a medium—to be dependent for its survival on Government handouts. The critical role an educational television station can play in the national and local community, its daring in attempting to treat new ideas in new ways, its independent, freewheeling approach to broadcasting, all can be compromised by the need to withstand political scrutiny to get next year's funds.

BEHOLDEN ONLY TO THE PUBLIC

Nor does subsidy by commercial television offer an any more desirable permanent solution. As you know, we at CBS are keenly aware that, during the initial stages of their development, educational stations need our help. CBS has, in fact, contributed well over $1 million to educational television stations, in funds, material, equipment and technical assistance. But over the long haul it would be a bad business for educational stations to develop habits of finance that made them dependent upon us or any other networks or stations. The educational television station ought not to be trying to please us any more than the Government. It ought to be trying to please the public it serves—and ideally should be beholden only to that public.

For this reason it seems to me wholly desirable—and I also believe it to be wholly feasible—that educational television derive its support from multiple sources and that the great bulk of that support come directly from the public.

Television is commonly recognized as the most powerful and persuasive medium the world has ever known. Its effectiveness in moving people to action has been clearly and impressively demonstrated over and over again. Its ability to enlist and hold the attention of audiences is unmatched. Surely by putting this enormous capacity to work intelligently, imaginatively, educational television can tap the resources of its great and growing audiences to build up its capital and operating funds. Individual educational institutions in this country, during the past decade, have attracted hundreds of millions of dollars to bolster their position. A single college has raised as much as $100 million in 3 years.

I have had enough experience in nonprofit organizations—and so have all of you—to know that it isn't easy. But the important thing is that it is possible and that, given the drive and the imagination, success is probable. Stronger, more meaningful, and more appealing membership plans can be conceived and launched. New, more realistic and relevant matching gift arrangements can be explored. Campaigns and public appeals can be more persuasive, more provocative, more moving.

ENLARGING THE BASE OF SUPPORT

In all this, we in commercial television should, I think, take a more active and concerned role. Making a donation is the simplest and easiest thing to do. We ought to do more. We ought to use our experience and ingenuity to help the educational stations plan and launch a mighty annual campaign. It ought to be communitywide, and it ought to be saturating. It is important, and it ought to involve not just the educational and television worlds, but the churches, the civic organizations, the business community—the people.

The service provided by educational television—whether it is called educational, cultural, non-commercial or any other name—ought to be a commonplace in this country and in this age. Its support ought to cut right across the board. It ought to stimulate not only the interest but the pride of our people. But none of this will happen automatically. And again I remind you that the easiest way in the short run will be the hardest in the long run. We ought to tackle it the hard way now—enlarging the base of support until it is as natural for people to support their educational channels as it is to support their colleges and universities, their hospitals and all their other community services.

TOWARD PERMANENT SOLUTIONS

There is, as far as I know, no specific program of action that you as a group can undertake, and I doubt very much that you could find a universal formula equally applicable to all communities. But each of you has an expert knowledge of his own community. Many of you have been leading forces in the support of educational stations in your areas, and have given generously, both materially and of your time and abilities. I hope very much that, individually and on your own initiative, you can share with one another your exepriences and the knowledge you have acquired, that you can think more about permanent solutions and broadening support and discuss your thoughts with other community leaders, and, finally, that you can help make the true dimensions and nature of the problem far more apparent to far more people.

Educational television has a giant mission—one of the greatest opportunities for constructive good in this century. We have got to see it off to a sound start and to a lasting future.

Montana's Fight To Save a Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the New York Times of Sunday, July 28, carried an interesting story about one of Montana's historic buildings, the Hotel Marcus Daly in Anaconda.

The hotel, with its Gothic "pepper-pot" towers, was built in the late 1880's by the copper magnate for whom it is now named. Sumptuous in its day, the hotel was used as a pawn in Daly's bold drive to make Anaconda the capital of Montana.

Daly failed in his bid—Helena is to this day the capital of my State—but his hotel remains as a memorable historic monument and tourist attraction. The New York Times story, by Jeanne Beaty, catches the flavor of this fine old building and tells of local efforts underway to preserve it for future generations.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA'S FIGHT TO SAVE A LANDMARK

(By Jeanne Beaty)

ANACONDA, MONT.—In the late 1880's, Marcus Daly, a redoubtable copper magnate of the day, built a sumptuous hotel here, the Montana, costing $300,000, as a weapon in a million-dollar fight to make this city the State capital. Today, local citizens are trying to raise $200,000 to save this establishment, now the Hotel Marcus Daly, both as a monument to Montana's turbulent beginnings and as a tourist attraction.

In those days, Helena was, as she still is, the capital of Montana, and her successful defender against Daly's impetuous drive to bring the State house, with all its business and influence, to Anaconda was another millionaire, William Andrews Clark. Clark was to becouse a U.S. Senator from Montana and later a celebrated New York art collector.

The hotel, with its Gothic "pepper-pot" towers, was a pawn in the continuing battle of the magnates. Daly hoped to house the State legislators in it, as well as to make it a showplace for the town. Indeed, in those days it was one of the finest hotels in the West.

The date 1888 is carved in the ornate stonework over its entrance, but the grand ball which actually opened it did not take place until July 1, 1889. That was the year Montana became a State.

The bar was the pride of the new hostelry. The room was floored with alternating strips of maple and redwood, with a mosaic of the head of Daly's favorite racehorse, Tammany, inlaid in the center. Tiffany's designed the inlay for $3,000. One of the many legends is that he would allow no one to step on Tammany's head.

FURTHER BATTLES

Daly was an Irish-born immigrant who had worked his way north from California, Nevada, and Utah. In 1892, and again in 1894, he challenged Helena and his rival, Clark, in elections. Helena, however, was accustomed to capital fights, having won the title of territorial capital from Virginia City in 1874 after two unsuccessful tries.

Most of the campaigning took place in Butte. For weeks before the final vote, there were torchlight parades, night resounded to the sounds of marching bands and dynamite blasts, and money and whisky circulated freely.

The Daly forces lost. Althought the Anaconda Standard, the newspaper Daly founded in 1889 to help in the fight, referred to Helena as the "temporary capital" for years thereafter, it was the last such battle in the State.

Anaconda lies about halfway between Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks. Southwest of the barren ridges surrounding the town is the Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness Area. The backbone of this highland is the Anaconda Range, a glaciated stretch of mountains whose snow-capped peaks loom above Georgetown Lake. The lake is the center of a summer recreation area west of Anaconda.

PICTURESQUE SURROUNDINGS

U.S. 10A traverses the recreation area, passes the lake and descends through the short, but spectacular, Flint Creek Canyon to Philippsburg, center of a rich and active mining district. In the hills east of Philippsburg is a genuine ghost, the old town of Granite.

The main attraction at Anaconda is its copper smelter, with the world's largest smokestack sitting high on a hill above a stairway of buildings, mills and settling ponds. Tours of the smelter are available in the summer.

In Butte, 24 miles east, mine tours are offered free of charge daily, and the Berkeley Pit, a large, surface operation, has an overlook. Architecturally, both Butte and Anaconda are relics of the past and of considerable interest to historians.

In 1878, Marcus Daly bought a silver mine in Butte. The discovery of a 50-foot-wide seam of copper in this worn-out silver mine opened up operations on what was soon labeled the "richest hill on earth." The mine had been called the Anaconda, and thus an empire was founded and named.

The Montana Hotel, as Daly called it in his empire-building days, has survived several recent crises. For many years, it was operated by the Anaconda Co. at annual losses of more than $50,000. In 1958, it was sold to a Montana concern for $1. After a year, the new owners decided the hotel would have to be razed and the land sold.

A "save the hotel" civic meeting was called, and a group of Anaconda residents who felt that the building had a sentimental and commercial value formed the Montana Hotel Corp. and bought the place. The name was changed to the Hotel Marcus Daly, and a modest remodeling job was begun. A few rooms were modernized, the dining room was rehabilitated and a new coffee shop was installed in the northeast corner.

This corner of the hotel had previously been occupied by the Anaconda Club. Old menus show that club members had feasted on bear, buffalo, deer, antelope, elk and other wild game.

The barroom and adjoining parlor are still the showrooms of the hotel. They were restored a few years ago by the same people who have done much of the restoration work in Virginia City, Mont. The triple-arched mirror behind the bar, the gleaming chandeliers, the picture of cavorting nudes—all add to the Victorian atmosphere of the place.

The parlor, with its large, gold-framed mirrors, its fringed chairs and sofas, its heavy red draperies and its red and cream wallpaper, is equally elegant.

Since it is the only hotel in town, the building serves as a social center for many functions. Luncheon clubs meet in the banquet rooms off the lobby, and on Sundays a smorgasbord meal is served from 2:30 to 10 p.m.

LOSSES CONTINUE

However, despite the fact that the seven-man board of directors has operated the hotel without pay since 1959 and the employees are presently working for nominal wages, the establishment has continued to lose money. The loss has been cut, but not enough.

Two different companies were asked to appraise the situation, and both brought back similar proposals. They felt the building needed a complete overhauling, and that a 20th-century motel should be built in conjunction with it.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, the Small Business Administration and the local bank all have agreed to invest in this plan, providing that the citizens of Anaconda can raise their share of the necessary funds. This summer is the crucial period.

The Freedom Foundation Serves Freedom Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, some time ago I noted a statement in the House portion of the RECORD that some badly misguided individual was attacking the Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge and even supporting a blacklisting of its outstanding president, Dr. Kenneth Wells, which was proposed by a leftwing "rating group" in Washington.

One wonders what motivates these fanatical leftwingers who consider every conservative suggestion as dangerous or as symbolic of some self-imagined danger from a disorganized and thoroughly impotent radical right which in the main is supported by people of so many contradictory and confusing viewpoints that even among those whose viewpoints are so exotic and extreme as to merit the designation of extremism there is no coordination or agreement as to which extreme proposal it is desirable to support. I doubt that any one of the many rightwing groups advocating unworkable and unwanted proposals numbers a membership of more than 10,000 or 20,000, and there is apparently no centralized direction, and no coordination of their efforts. There very certainly is no foreign power and no great internationalism directing the thinking and the actions of the rightwing organization of America.

All Americans could sleep easier at night if the same could be said of the radical leftists in this country who get so much encouragement, direction, and support from international communism.

It is both strange, significant, and disturbing that none of the would-be Paul Reveres who fancy they see a great and growing danger from an undefined and undisclosed radical right have spoken up with equal energy and with similar fanfare against the known, disclosed and definable groups in this country who echo the Communist line and who support policies paralleling those engineered from Moscow. These would-be sentinels of our American way of life would do well to remember that the original Paul Revere warned of a danger dressed in red. Certainly today's red creedsmen are fully as dangerous as the red-coated Britishers of two centuries ago.

Among the groups in this country supporting the type of American freedoms of which we can all be proud is the Freedom Foundation, headed by Kenneth Wells. It is neither rightist nor leftist except insofar as it is right to support our constitutional freedoms.

In a recent column, highly regarded and widely read, George Todt of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner discusses the Freedom Foundation and its constructive service. I ask unanimous consent that the Todt column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT OF RIGHTS

(By George Todt)

("Nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpartisan and nonpolitical, the Freedom Foundation's sole purpose is to encourage all Americans to understand and defend the rights, freedoms and responsibilities they enjoy as Americans under our constitutional democratic form of government."—Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, June 13, 1963.)

What is the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.?

How does it work? What are its mechanics of operation?

Not long ago I read a splendid dissertation about this hard-working foundation by Senator STROM THURMOND, a fine American patriot.

Let me pass on to my readers the gist of his research and remarks.

Here is the description of the American way of life as given by Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge: Political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual, these being—right to worship God in one's own way; right to free speech and press; right to assemble; right to petition for grievances.

RIGHT OF INNOCENCE

Also, right to privacy in our homes; right of habeas corpus—no excessive bail; right to trial by jury—innocent until proven guilty; right to move about freely at home and abroad; right to own private property.

Also, right to free elections and personal secret ballot; right to work in callings and localities of our choice; right to bargain with our employers and employees; right to go into business, compete, make a profit.

Also, right to bargain for goods and services in a free market; right to contract about our affairs; right to the service of Government as a protector and referee; and right to freedom from arbitrary Government regulation and control.

All of which is based on constitutional government designed to serve the people and a fundamental belief in God.

Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge was founded in 1949, at which time it embarked on an extensive awards program—and over 1 million entries have since been received from students, teachers, businessmen, ministers, writers, broadcasters, members of the armed services, actors, civic leaders, communities, schools, colleges, and companies.

TO SERVE PEOPLE

During this time, more than 12,000 Americans in all walks of life have been given awards of $50 to $5,000, George Washington honor medals, plaques, teachers medals, free-

dom libraries, and student-teacher pilgrimages to Valley Forge.

Under the inspiring leadership of Dr. Kenneth Wells, president, Freedom Foundation has proven itself to be one of the most effective means of rededicating our youth to pride and understanding of the American heritage.

And it has proven remarkably successful in stimulating adults to reaffirm and perpetuate their beliefs in the American way of life.

FACILITIES EXPANDED

More and more educators, editorial writers, clergymen, movie and TV producers, cartoonists, lecturers, and other opinion formers are asking Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge for material, research work, and assistance to help them retell the freedom story.

To help meet these requests, Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge has increased its facilities by erecting new buildings and adding libraries, research and study centers.

It is offering new printed material and plans to expand its national award program, recognizing and encouraging oustanding accomplishments by the proponents of freedom. Philanthropists would do well to help out.

The local office of Freedom Foundation of Valley Forge is located in the Union Oil Center, 461 South Boylston, Los Angeles 17; telephone 482-9967. Comdr. Paul Terry, U.S. Navy, retired, is director.

Military Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the recent order of the Defense Department which would authorize military base commanders to extend their authority beyond the bounds of military establishments is the most unwarranted order that I have ever heard of.

We live in a nation of law, and not of man, and certainly not under a military dictatorship.

We should certainly see that this order is rescinded if we want to keep our armed services out of politics, and to protect the integrity of communities surrounding military establishments.

The Augusta Chronicle and Augusta Herald, in recent editorials, strongly deplored this order, and I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Augusta Herald, July 30, 1963]

BIGGEST RADICAL BLACKJACK YET

Disdaining the calm and constructive approach of Southern officials and businessmen who would extend Negro rights within the framework of law, accompanied by orderly behavior and civic responsibility, the radical faction in control of the national administration has now produced the biggest blackjack yet.

This weapon is nothing less than a perversion of the Armed Forces of our country, changing its job in part from national defense to the strong-arm accomplishment of controversial so-called civil rights. Secretary of Defense McNamara has approved the use of off-limits restrictions, to blackmail communities where private operators of businesses prefer to select their own customers.

It is not a matter of merely placing certain businesses off limits, since the other authorizing the politically motivated steps would permit placing "areas" off limits. That could be a whole street, or business section, or city, or county.

By this extralegal, unconstitutional, Hitler-like order, the administration has put into effect—without sanction of the Congress—its public accommodations bill, so far as military personnel is concerned. The bill has not been passed and—if rights of private owners of businesses are still rights in this era of socialistic trends—it will not pass. The radicals in whose ranks the Kennedy clan are numbered, however, grind their heels on the Congress, and with respect to military people put the obnoxious bill into effect "by decree of Caesar."

This brazen move alters the mission of the Armed Forces, to the extent that it diverts time and effort from the defense of the Nation to the implementation of a political objective. It cracks the whip of authoritarianism in setting up an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights and in requiring a report from the Services by August 15 as to how well they are activating the party line.

The vicious report of the President's committee which created this Frankenstein's monster goes further, suggesting that the lash be cracked over the backs of base commanders and other high-ranking military officers, by denying promotions to those who won't go along with this neoreconstruction.

This whole program obviously puts base commanders on the spot. It makes them political agents of the radicals, whether or not they wish to be used in this manner. It is a barefaced exhibition of Stalinism, because it brings into our Armed Forces at last the Soviet function of the political commissar.

The present order would be no more political if it required military commanders to use their power to secure socialized medicine, expanded public electric power, or more foreign aid.

One further aspect of the operation of this order deserves attention. Before the base commander can place an area off limits, prior approval must be given by the civilian Secretary of the service concerned. This puts final responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the national administration's own appointees. It obviously opens the way for a great deal of political latitude.

An official of the Teamsters Union, testifying before the House Judiciary Committee, already has declared that the administration has filed civil rights voting suits in a pattern which is designed to penalize Congressmen opposing the administration, and to avoid embarrassment to those who go along with the radicals.

If and when off limits are declared, it will be revealing to see if the move is used to try to whip into line those Congressmen who favor sane conservatism.

The whole ugly business is a manifestation of the radical movement's determination to ignore the Constitution, the statutes, and human nature. It is in keeping with its feverish pattern of force, intimidation, and sponsored lawlessness.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, July 30, 1963]

A CASE OF PLANNED BLACKMAIL

A Defense Department order authorizing base commanders to declare off-limits to troops businesses which do not serve or cater to Negro servicemen and their families is an insult to the character and the integrity of every owner of a private concern in the Nation who refuses to knuckle under to governmental blackmail.

There can be no other connotation placed on the infamous effort of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to dictate this offensive policy, for the sanctions which he plans to impose may be likened, he said, to those invoked in "vice-ridden areas."

This equating of a privately operated business in the public domain to a house of ill repute not only flies in the face of all that is sacred in the commercial life of this Nation, but, as we have previously said, threatens a rupture in the morale of America's Armed Forces and a devastating blow to the national economy.

McNamara's sadistic order is based upon his compliance with recommendations made by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. That it was one weighted against the white was early indicated in its report.

While admitting that Negroes within the Armed Services are on equal plane with their white counterparts, the Committee—as though it were intent upon creating dissension—declared that "the great progress made is not enough."

It is unwilling to let this "great progress" set the pace for further and harmonious advances for the Negro. It prefers, evidently, to move on a course that will antagonize almost every white businessman in the Nation, none of whom hereafter may feel any security in the free operation of his business.

Worse still, if that be possible, is the almost complete lack of concern the Committee evidences for the irreparable harm that can befall the Nation as a result of its socialistic and unholy presentments. By giving greater ceredence to color of skin than to merit—an example of which is its demand that "energetic efforts must be made" to increase the number of Negroes in the Service Academies so as to boost the number of Negro officers—the Gesell Committee is playing a major role in determining the makeup and, as a consequence, the effectiveness of America's Armed Forces.

Its recommendation that base commanders be wary of groups and clubs and functions that practice their constitutionally guaranteed right of freedom of choice and assembly denies to these commanders the intimate civilian-military relationship so valuable to the well-being of the community and the installation. It places on them, too, a morale-breaking burden which could destroy their effectiveness as commanders of all their troops, colored as well as white.

Failure of a community to fall in line with the Defense Department's dictatorial tactics not only, then, might lead to off-limit sanctions and to the destruction of its economy, as we have noted, it could tear down the morale of white troops at whom it would be aimed just as much as at Negroes, and it could mean—if the Committee recommendations are followed—loss of promotion to highly qualified military commanders whose failure to advance because of non-military actions over which they would have absolutely no control might work against the survival of the United States in some future war.

It was on such a report that the Secretary of Defense now moves to blackmail businessmen in the area of military installations into accepting Government dictation of their business practices.

Loss of their liberties, just as surely as night follows day, will react to the loss of individual freedoms for all Americans in the years to come. The loss will be as great to the Negro as it will be to the white.

West Virginia Centennial Is Lauded for Variety and Historical Significance in Baltimore Sun Article by John C. Schmidt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun has recently published two articles by Mr. John C. Schmidt, the first of which was printed in the RECORD of July 31. Mr. Schmidt writes of the various West Virginia Centennial celebrations which are happening throughout the State. This article will be of interest to those who are following the Mountain State's birthday year festivities.

I ask unanimous consent that the following article, "Mountain State Centennial," which appeared in the Sun of June 23, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOUNTAIN STATE CENTENNIAL

(By John C. Schmidt)

With the ringing of every church bell in the State at the stroke of midnight as 1962 passed into 1963, West Virignia marked not only the new year but the start of the celebration of the 100th anniversary of its admission to the Union. This State-wide bell ringing was the first in a yearlong series of centennial activities involving thousands of people and virtually every community.

The scope of these activities is indicated by the number and variety of special centennial designations, including a centennial queen, flower, fish, opera, poem, candy, train, showboat, stamp, medallion, homemaker, baby—even centennial centenarians.

Mass participation was one of the early goals set by the West Virginia Centennial Commission, for State leaders saw a unique opportunity to draw together divergent urban and rural elements in the population and also to present West Virginia in a favorable and interesting light to the rest of the country.

"The scope of our centennial is shown by the fact that some 30,000 people in every area of the State have become personally involved in the more than 100 State-wide programs," says Governor, William Wallace Barron. "Those programs cover 206 days of the year and are spread through 69 cities in each of the 55 counties."

RICH NATURAL RESOURCES

People of the Mountain State have much to be proud of in the first 100 years of statehood, Governor Barron notes. Immediately after West Virginia's dramatic creation by secession from Confederate Virginia in 1863, its young strength was tapped to aid the Union in its battle with the South.

While the new State supplied 8,000 soldiers for the Confederacy, including Gen. Stonewall Jackson, it supplied 29,000 to the Union Army, including Gen. Jesse Reno, hero of South Mountain. There were a number of small engagements on the State's soil, but it suffered little damage compared to some.

In the years following the war, the State began to tape its rich natural resources of coal, timber, oil, natural gas, salt, limestone, clay, and shale. Railroad and barge transportation developed extensively. Famous resorts grew around White Sulphur Springs and Berkeley Springs, and the State university was established at Morgantown, W. Va. is still the Nation's leading producer of soft coal and one of the leaders in chemicals.

Among its well-known sons and daughters, the State can boast James Rumsey, who had a steamboat operating on the Potomac 20 years before Robert Fulton's, Col. Charles E. Yeager, a native of Hamlin, was the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound, Andrew S. Rowan, the man who carried the famous message to Garcia, was a West Virginian. So is Dagmar, who conveyed a message of another sort in the early days of network television.

SEEKS TO IMPROVE IMAGE

Again this background, the centennial commission has been working since 1955 to plan a program of observances that would be meaningful and meet specific goals.

"We want to increase pride in West Virginia among West Virginians," explains Governor Barron. "We want to establish a more respected image of West Virginia throughout the rest of the United States and the world. We want to attract new industry; to increase the State's tourist and recreation facilities; to wipe out the sectionalism that has plagued our State for too many years; to examine the State's problems frankly and with a view to attracting public and private agencies in their solution, and, lastly, to develop a centennial program that interests everybody, both inside and outside the State."

The search for an appropriate symbol to pull together all the varied facets of the centennial was a difficult one. With an eye to the future as well as the past, the commission chose a radio telescope, for with the National Radio Astronomy Observatory at Green Bank, W. Va. has become a leading center of this new science. The telescope is superimposed on an outline of the State and points to a start with the number 35, indicating West Virginia's place as 35th State admitted to the Union.

The observatory will figure prominently in one of the major centennial events, a National Youth Science camp. One hundred science-minded high school seniors, two from each State, will be centennial guests for 3 weeks in July. They will stay at nearby Camp Pocahontas and will combine camp life with science studies under supervision of the observatory staff.

AN OLDTIME SHOWBOAT

A program of special interest to people in the river areas is an oldtime showboat which will spend the summer giving shows in the cities along the Ohio, Monongahela, and Kanawha Rivers. The boat will revive a fast-vanishing era of riverboat romance and dramatize the importance of river transportation in West Virginia. The cast for productions of such old tearjerkers as "East Lynne" is being recruited from music and drama departments of the State's colleges and universities.

All parts of the State will have a chance to see a special exhibits train, which started May 31 from Washington. Over the following 3 months, the 9-car special will carry the story of West Virginia's growth and progress to 56 cities and towns all over the State. Each car carries displays and exhibits depicting one phase of West Virginia life.

The highlights of official participation were planned for two important anniversary dates. On April 20, a special session of the legislature was held in Wheeling in the building still standing where West Virginia was born 100 years ago. It was on that date in 1863 that President Lincoln signed a proclamation creating the State, to become effective 2 months later. A reenactment of events of that memorable day was a feature of the Wheeling celebration. For Statehood Day, June 20, elaborate ceremonies were held on the steps of the Capitol Building at Charleston.

Carrying out one of the centennial aims, a Forum of the Future was held in Charleston in April. Experts in economics, industrial technology, government and education delivered papers and participated in a general discussion. The emphasis was on what problems West Virginia can anticipate in its second century, and the discussions produced some solid guidelines for future planning.

STAMP AND MEDALLION

In recognition of the anniversary, the Post Office Department issued a commemorative centennial stamp at Wheeling on Thursday. At the same time, the Treasury Department issued a commemorative medallion, with the Great Seal of West Virginia on one side and the centennial emblem on the other. These are made in platinum, silver, and bronze.

On the more festive side, five young women, all college students, were chosen from 55 county centennial queens to add glamour to various events and represent the State in outside appearances this year. They made an auspicious beginning, appearing together for the first time on the first-prize-winning West Virginia float in the Rosebowl Parade on New Year's Day. Nancy Trace Conwell, of Clarksburg, one of the five girls, was chosen State centennial queen and crowned at a glittering ball in Charleston in April.

For sportsmen, the centennial offers a new strain of trout, sun-gold in color and officially proclaimed the Centennial Golden Trout by Governor Barron. It was developed at the Petersburg State Trout Hatchery from a single female rainbow trout which was found with a mottled coloring. From her offspring, which ranged from 15 to 30 percent solid gold in color, was developed a brood stock for the new game fish. About 40,000 of them have been stocked in the State's lakes and streams. Ranging from 9 to 15 inches long at maturity, Centennial Goldens are said to be both fierce fighters and dinner-table delicacies.

On the cultural side, the commission last year sponsored contests for painting and sculpture on West Virginia themes. Four prizes of $1,963 each were awarded, two to native artists and two to out-of-State artists. Other contests for poetry and folk drama were held, and art contests on centennial themes were conducted in the State's schools.

ORATORY AND PAGEANTRY

West Virginia is taking advantage of its unusually large number of annual festivals, each of which this year will be tied in with the centennial. These include the Alpine Skiing Festival at Blackwater Falls State Park, the Rhododendron Festival at Charleston, the Strawberry Festival at Buckhannon, Folk Festivals at Glenville and Beckley, the Buckwheat Festival at Kingwood, Forest Festival at Elkins, Black Walnut Festival at Spencer, Wood Festival at Grantsville and Trout Festival at Petersburg.

Another special effort is being made by retail merchants throughout the State, with sales featuring "Made in West Virginia" items. Parades, concerts, a centennial iris garden, poetry, oratory and pageantry are all part of this wide-ranging effort to advance the State on the occasion of its one-hundredth birthday. In addition, each county and many municipalities have commemorative programs of their own.

Governor Barron sees the centennial as a challenging opportunity for the State. "Our centennial, in itself, is not a magic carpet to a better lie for West Virginia. Nor will it automatically bring more industry and more tourists to our State. But it does give us a rallying point. Through our centennial we can show a united front to the rest of the country by demonstrating our pride and confidence in West Virginia. It is a wonderful time for every West Virginian to do something for the State."

CENTENNIEL EVENTS

Here are some centennial events within a day's driving time (each way) from Baltimore.

July 15-August 15: Contemporary crafts and centennial poetry exhibition, Oglebay Park, Wheeling.

August 1-3: Mason County Centennial Peach Festival, Mason.

August 3, 4: Muzzle-loading musket shoot, Harpers Ferry.

August 10-16: Mineral County Fair, Keyser.

August 10-17: Glass exhibit, Martinsburg.

August 14-17: Civil War exhibit, Clarksburg.

August 15: Centennial showboat, Fairmont.

August 20,21: Centennial pageant, Keyser.

August 24: Parade with centennial queen and her court, Keyser.

August, 31-September 2: Civil War exhibit, Martinsburg.

September 1-7: Centennial Fall Festival, Harpers Ferry.

September 2: Centennial pageant, Berkeley Springs.

September 5-9: Civil War exhibit, Morgantown.

September 26-28: Preston County Buckwheat Festival, Kingwood.

October 1: Opening of Museum of Industry and Natural Resources, Morgantown.

October 1-5: Civil war exhibit, Elkins.

October 1-5: Mountain State Forest Festival, Elkins.

October 1-6: Civil War exhibit, Harpers Ferry.

October 10-12: Black Walnut Festival, Spencer.

October 19: West Virginia University Centennial Year Homecoming, Morgantown.

October 24: Centennial photography exhibit, Elkins.

December 6, 7: Centennial Classic Basketball Tournament, Morgantown.

Further information on any of these events may be obtained from the West Virginia Centennial Commission, 1608 Kanawha Boulevard East, Charleston, W. Va.

Sermon by Dean C. Julian Bartlett, D.D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues a sermon preached recently by the Very Reverend C. Julian Bartlett, D.C., dean of Grace Cathedral in San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Bartlett ably outlines the tragic national moral crisis we face. He eloquently disclaims an ostrich policy in racial matters. He disclaims the approach of those individuals who are willing enough to speak out on this issue, yet inwardly hope that this issue will somehow go away, or who say that time, or general proclamations of good will, will solve "this ponderous social evil" of racial discrimination.

Dean Bartlett makes clear such a detached position is completely untenable—untenable to an American and to a Christian. He makes clear that our past experience confirms the wisdom of the judgment of President Kennedy that firm and forthright action must be taken in every quarter. It must be taken in every area. For our part, Mr. Speaker, it can and must be taken in enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that many of our colleagues will take the few minutes it will take to read the sermon of Dean Bartlett. The contents thereof will result in many hours of reflection:

SERMON PREACHED IN GRACE CATHEDRAL JULY 14, 1963, BY THE VERY REVEREND C. JULIAN BARTLETT

We are indebted to Dean Samuel H. Miller of Harvard Divinity School for recalling one of the extremely wise observations which have been made by men in times past. When Gouvernour Moris was U.S. Ambassador to the Court of Louis XVI of France, he wrote to President Washington: (paraphrased), "Louis XVI is a good man. In another generation he would have made a good king. The trouble is that he has inherited a revolution."

Here was a man who in ordinary circumstances would have made a good king. But he ascended the throne of France at a time when the pent-up pressure of the past had come to the explosion point. We can assume safely that neither he nor any other man could have succeeded in either releasing that pressure gradually or in maintaining the status quo. One cannot help but recall the famous words of Louis XIV, the forebear of hapless Louis XVI, "After me, the deluge"; or indeed, the familiar painting of the royal family of France being hauled to the guillotine in an oxcart: Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, and the dauphins.

"After me, the deluge." In another generation Louis XVI would have made a good king. The trouble was that he inherited a revolution.

Due to a series of circumstances, this is the first time in 5 weeks that I have occupied this pulpit. In the course of those weeks our country has seen a decided and obvious change take place in the raging racial controversy. Hitherto, over the past 9 years, the struggle of Negroes to acquire social justice has been confined to "test situations" here and there. But Birmingham ushered in a marked change. Alabama, the last State bastion of segregated State colleges, has fallen. Medgar Evers has been murdered. Martial law prevails at this moment in Cambridge, Md. Demonstrations, and in some cases civil strife, have erupted all across our country—from New York and Chicago to Los Angeles and Savannah. James Meredith, a hero less than a year ago on the campus of the University of Mississippi, was booed and derided at the national convention of the NAACP because he accused Negro youth of irresponsibility and called for mature response to opportunity.

And there will be more. I prophesy that social unrest will continue all across this land until Negroes see action to protect their legal rights and until opportunities are extended to them to rise up from second-class citizenship. One has only to read the signs of the times. The fact is, my brethren, we are in the midst of a revolution. We are in the midst of profound social change. Never again will anyone see the former racial situation prevail in American society. I emphasize this because I believe many Caucasian Americans do not realize what is going on; the depth and reality of the forces involved. We are in the midst of a revolution.

Now it is imperative that Caucasian Christians think about this—and that they think about it in Christian terms. The fact is that Caucasian Christians have not been in the forefront of efforts and action to alleviate the plight of Negroes in our society in anything like the numbers they should have been. Moreover, the Christian Churches usually have been content either to do nothing, or to issue pious statements good enough in themselves, but which have not resulted in wide-scale action by their membership, or to be content with a greater or less measure of actual integration in parish church membership. But in any case, Caucasian Christians have tolerated at best, or assisted at worst, the social evils which have denied Negroes their place in society as human beings of equal worth in the sight of God.

We should ask why this is so. Well, the answer no doubt involves a number of factors; psychological, economic, political, and historical. But we should realize that the institutional form which Christianity has taken in America has allowed Caucasian Christians to insulate themselves from the whole problem and therefore has resulted in an apparent separation of the racial problem from the concerns of the churches which have claimed their energies and attention. Thus we have seen rather "monochrome" congregations emerge: the "carriage trade" kind, the middle-class kind, the lower middle class—and, on the whole, the "mainline churches" have paid little attention to the lower socioeconomic strata.

The vast majority of Negroes fall into the last category because of poor education and prejudice which have in turn caused the lower economic status. Now these conditions constitute a ponderous social evil—and, as I have stated, for whatever and all the reasons involved, Caucasian Christians—and their institutional churches—have failed to demand rectification or to act in effective ways.

Now, I want to state that I am no church-iconoclast. I am not a church-baiter or destroyer. I believe the Caucasian churches in their insulation from this part of their world, at least, have striven mightily to carry on their work. They have conceived the main part of that work to be the pastoral care of the faithful and the indoctrination of the large numbers of people who have come voluntarily (for the most part) into their midst. In another kind of world, or society, their accomplishments would have been rather satisfactory.

But I remind us of unfortunate Louis XVI. We Caucasian Christians in mid-20th century America have inherited a revolution—and what might be a rather satisfactory church for another age and another society is not satisfactory for this revolution. And now hear me, for I make bold to prophesy: If Caucasian Christians do not make their witness to redress this immense social evil, their religion and their churches will be passed by in the march of history and be relegated to an irrelevant and cultish place in society. But I hasten to add that I do not believe that will be the ultimate fate of our religion, though we may pass through the heat of the refining fire of reform. I believe that Jesus is still and is in fact the Lord of history and of His Church—and that the gates of hell will not prevail against it. But should such days fall upon His Church, it will emerge purified, reformed, and courageous—even though but a remnant remains.

What Caucasian Christians need to do—what you and I must do—is to think about this crisis in Christian terms. (President Kennedy, in his historic address to the Nation, appealed to every American to deal with this problem at the level of the individual conscience. He correctly called this a national moral issue, and for that reason his address was historic. Seldom in our history has a President felt called upon to tell the people they were involved in a national moral crisis. President Kennedy also correctly reminded us that actually the problem will not be solved only by the passage of laws, or in the courts of justice, but rather in the consciences of men.) Yet "the ink was hardly dry" on his message to the Congress before members of both the major po-

litical parties began to temporize because of legalities. Moreover, and worse, they began political infighting to protect their respective parties in forthcoming elections.

But politicians are not the only ones who are temporizing. Anxiety about protecting the rights of Caucasians is overriding concern for the deprived rights of Negroes and colors the thinking of many, many people. I remind you, however, we are in the midst of revolution and the issue is the elimination of a ponderous social evil. Christians must think in Christian terms.

Now this is not easy to do because few of us think any longer in real Christian terms. I am reading a startling book now, titled, "The Christian Mind" by Harry Blamires (Seabury Press, 1963). The author's main thesis is shocking: he holds there is no longer a Christian mind in society, that the mind of modern man has been secularized. "The mental secularization of Christians," says Blamires, "means that nowadays we meet only as worshiping beings and as moral beings. We agree that it is right to be present on the Lord's own day in the Lord's own house. We agree that it is sinful to commit adultery or to slander our neighbors. But we cannot meet, as thinking Christians, over the controversial political, social, and cultural issue. * * *" And he goes on to say: "We 20th-century Christians have chosen the way of compromise. We withdraw our Christian consciousness from the fields of public, commercial, and social life. [This] has left the pragmatists and utilitarians in power. It has led to the decay of the Christian mind."

If this be so, and Blamires presents a strong argument, there is raised, in turn, the whole question of the nature of the church and the role and function of the laos, the laity, the people of God.

Thinking Christians must recognize and remember that there is no discontinuity between the church and what we call the world. Alden D. Kelly, in his fine book, "The People of God" (Seabury, 1962) says: "We try to escape the full impact of the church's involvement in the world by talking about being in the world but not of it * * * but surely the one thing (this) cannot mean is to be against or separate from the world * * * Christians are not committed to some notion of a glorified * * * church which abandons the world to the powers of evil. In fact, union with Christ, the head of the church, requires identification with this fallen world in all its impermanence, sin, and death, because it is precisely for just that sort of world that Christ suffered."

And he goes on to say: "The Christ whom we worship in His glory is precisely the Son of Man who has identified himself with all humanity in its sufferings and sorrows, in the ordinary events of day-to-day life. For the Christ there is no outside or against. His identification with the whole of suffering humanity, as Alan Richardson reminds us, is not in any abstract stoic sense of humanity in general. It is, rather, with the individual man, woman, or child whom we meet. In this single and unique person we encounter our judge, the Son of Man."

Certainly one of the primary responsibilities of the people of God is to recognize, to be aware of, the common ground of all of humanity as regards their basic needs, aspirations, fears, insecurity, and hope. And my plea this morning, my friends, is that Caucasian Christians, if they are to identify with Jesus their Christ, must also in this time, in this place, and now, must identify themselves with the needs, sufferings, aspirations, fears, insecurity, and hope, of the Negro American. Let us not for a moment depreciate the several virtues which individual Caucasian Christians may have; but in general it is safe to say that the average one has an outlook upon the world and his life which has been imposed upon him by his social class, his environment, etc. Again, I say this may or may not be good for another age and generation—but in America, now, we have inherited a revolution. And Caucasian Christians may not claim to be identified with Christ if they do not share His identification with the plight of the American Negro.

And so I come back to our texts taken from the Gospel and Epistle of the day. St. Luke tells us Jesus said to Peter, James, and John as He called them to their vocation as His disciples: "Do not be afraid; from now on you will be catching men. (And) as soon as they had brought the boats to land, they left everything and followed him." And the writer of first Peter tells us: "Who is going to do you wrong if you are devoted to good? And yet if you should suffer for your virtues, you may count yourselves happy. Have no fear of them: do not be perturbed, but hold the Lord Christ in reverence in your hearts."

As the people of God, Jesus calls you this day to leave everything and follow Him. For you today this does not mean to quit your jobs or to stop caring for your families—for remember, the Christian is in the world, not locked up in a church building. It means to be of a Christian mind, to think christianly, to put away all lesser claims to your loyalty, to devote yourself to identification with Jesus in all that you do, say or think. It means to be ready to share sufferings, to share hopes and aspirations of all people which are consistent with their inherent dignity as human beings and as children of God for whom also Jesus suffered and died. And if this sharing, this identification, means suffering at the hands of wicked men, then we must suffer even as Jesus did. The primary thing is to hold the Lord Christ in reverence in your hearts.

To identify with Christ as He identifies with the Negro means to greet each one you meet with a smile and warmth in your eyes. I remind you of the story of the Dutch official and the Javanese. When the Dutch were leaving Java under pressure, the official said: "Why do you not want us. We have brought many benefits to your land and we have been friends." And the Javanese answered: "Yes; but friendship was never in your eyes."

To identify with Christ as He identifies with the Negro means to stand and be counted whenever you hear the Negro derided or ridiculed because of his race. It means to demand of your elected legislators courage to pass just laws. It means never to discriminate against the Negro because of the color of his skin.

For now, my Christian friends, historic crisis is at hand. We have inherited a revolution and Jesus still calls us to leave everything and follow Him; in short, to be the "people of God."

U.N. Take Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a very timely editorial entitled "Russia Jeers at U.N." in a recent edition of the celebrated New Bedford Standard Times, New Bedford, Mass.

The American people have been disturbed for some time past about certain operations of U.N. and the disproportionate share of the cost of maintaining this World Organization which is being assumed and paid by the United States.

It is one thing for this Nation to help finance an organization honestly devoted to world peace and zealously pursuing that most desirable aim. But it is quite another matter when other member nations, particularly a major power like the Soviet Union, is not paying its proportionate share of U.N. costs, and when some of the funds of this organization are used for projects which are definitely alien to the best interests of this Nation.

The U.N. should confine its work and efforts to the promotion of world peace and prevention of war. It is entirely foreign to the purpose of its charter when it diverts any of its funds to questionable purposes which naturally result in Communist propaganda anad militate against the interests of the United States and other nations of the free world.

The editorial follows:

RUSSIA JEERS AT U.N.

In a self-respecting organization, the issue presented by the Soviet Union's latest refusal to pay its share of United Nations dues could be simply resolved: Loss of voting rights or expulsion.

But the U.N. has no moral standards to enforce. It has struggled along with less integrity every year, avoiding permanent settlement of internal crises, permitting outright phony states like Byelorussia and the Ukraine to retain membership and cadging most of its operating costs from a single member, the United States.

Even to a U.N. near bankruptcy, the new list of operations which the Soviet declines to sustain—in addition to its earlier reneging on Congo operation costs—does not pose a considerable financial threat. The entire U.N. outlay proposed for these items is $7,760,000; the 10-nation Soviet bloc's share, 21 percent, would be $1,652,000.

This newest default isn't a fatal blow, then, for an agency that has been trying to find $46 million in operating deficiencies. But there is definitely a matter of principle involved.

The United States should not contribute a dime of what the Soviet declines to pay.

The U.S. Government pays 32 percent of the main U.N. budget, and up to 66 percent of all other U.N. expenditures. Sixty-one new nations have joined since the U.S. share was allocated; the Soviet Russia economy has zoomed upward, to hear its leaders boast. But the U.S. share has virtually remained unchanged.

Some of the funds are used for projects wholly alien to our best interests, such as aid to Cuba, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Nations that do not give declare how funds shall be spent. For years, the Soviet Union and Byelorussia voted on the executive committee of the U.N. Children's Fund although neither ever contributed a cent, while the United States gives 65 cents of every $1.

Ambassador to the U.N. Adlai Stevenson calls the latest Soviet move an attempt to gain financial veto over the organization, and a threat as grave as those over Korea and the troika issues.

This isn't the situation at all. The power of financial veto is available far more securely to the United States. It is the only real influence this country has over the U.N. It has not been used, but it should have been exerted long ago to bring about reforms that might have saved the U.N. from becoming the failure it is today.

The threat in the Soviet's refusal to pay is a threat to the reputation of the United States. This Nation cannot continue to condone hypocrisy such as underlies the U.N. operating rules. We ought to see that the rules are changed or get out of the U.N.

Radical Takeover of Defense Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the two great daily newspapers of the city of New Orleans, the Times-Picayune and the States-Item, recently have focused the spotlight of publicity on a shadowy report to the President, heretofore virtually ignored by the national news media.

Placed before the reading public by the New Orleans press was the report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, popularly referred to as the Gesell report.

That this report is now getting public and congressional attention is due in no small way to the efforts of the Times-Picayune and the States-Item.

The Times-Picayune recently published a series of page 1 articles on the Gesell report, culminating with publication of the text of the report itself.

The distinguished editor of the Times-Picayune, Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., following the objective news exposure of the Gesell report, has subjectively commented on the report in a lead editorial, published July 30, 1963.

A newspaperman of national stature, Mr. Healy has pinpointed the alarming dangers of the report. I commend the editorial, and I will have more to say on the Gesell report at a later date.

Members of Congress who are only now hearing of the existence of the Gesell report will, I believe, find much food for thought in Mr. Healy's editorial, which I am including into the RECORD herewith:

THE GESELL REPORT—RADICAL TAKEOVER OF DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Elsewhere in this issue appears the first installment of the full text of the so-called Gesell Report, which calls for virtual transformation of the armed services of the United States into an instrument of domestic sociopolitical pressure.

Reprinting of this text follows a series of articles in which we believe the gist of these radical recommendations was fairly summarized; and of pertinent news stories which disclose that their major implementation already is underway.

This attempt to degenerate the military services and their installations, and through them the very bedrock of national security, is a matter that addresses itself primarily to the people, and sections, of this Nation, whose interests in their integrity and single-minded purpose are greatest, numerically and proportionately, at stake.

This fact—or charge—can perhaps be appreciated by them only by a careful study of the means proposed, or in the making, for reorientation of the warp and woof of the Military Establishment, to make it revolve about a single issue or problem—integration, segregation—in national controversy.

The techniques outlined for achieving this represent, in a certain wry sense, a masterpiece of blueprint (we understand the authorship should be credited to a member of the planning committee, rather than to Chairman Gerhart Gesell, of Washington, who otherwise may take and get all the credit he deserves).

Though independent thought even in a free country can, unfortunately, devise the same methods for prostitution of a vital national institution, the preparation here can be compared, with reference not to objectives but to thoroughgoing, painstaking detail, with outlines for corruption, intimidation and takeover of the military institution by Nazi, Fascist, and Communist elements, elsewhere on the globe.

To add to the single national issue at present involved in this abomination of cleverness, a group of issues more or less entwined, forming a pattern of upheaval and reform, calls only for hack artists, to fill in and embellish the brushwork of the talented (mayhap unwitting) pioneer.

With education, interstate commerce, much intrastate commerce, and other institutions and rights, already subservient, by one form of fiat or another, to this same single present issue, the further addition of armed force should not be, to the interested, appraising eye, a surprising development or ambition. From slow growth of a pattern in stages which can be watched, to kaleidoscopic riot, dizziness, confusion—and finality—is a process recorded both in modern and ancient history.

The Gesell Report's preparation began a little more than a year ago. We will have something to add later concerning the general circumstances under which President Kennedy initiated it. To say at this point also that the supposed subject of study, "Presidential Commission on Equal Opportunities in the Armed Forces," turned out to be a misnomer, is the least of the criticisms applicable to the matter.

Rumors or reports relative to proposed abandonment or transfer of military bases, without regard to national security concerns, or to supposed logic and pertinence in military planning, emerged during about the past month.

There seems to have been a considerable degree of hush-hush about the report's delivery to the White House; the presidential review, complimentary comment, and transmittal to Secretary McNamara; the details of intramilitary and extramilitary coercion, etc. It seems Louisiana and other southern Congressmen who had wind of the matter pleaded in vain against directives that have followed (or are held in abeyance only because they are not yet "feasible," or because coercion conceivably could make them unnecessary). For our part, we were unable to obtain a copy of the 93-page blueprint in time to present more than one of a series of analyses, before the Defense Secretary's orders came through.

Congressman WAGGONNER is to be congratulated for his services to the U.S. public in baring the report and its more or less obvious implications. Congressman HÉBERT is among those who think Mr. McNamara (despite his expression of acquiescence and agreement) had his orders from the White House. In any case, the content and significance of this extraordinary encroachment would be no less had the plans, intentions and handling been open and aboveboard throughout.

Death of Raymond Edward Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last Sunday our country suffered a great loss when Raymond Edward Murphy passed away. A career State Department employee, his work will serve as a continuing memorial to his memory.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by Loy Henderson, professor of international relations, American University; formerly Under Secretary of State, State Department; and career Ambassador, retired, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAYMOND EDWARD MURPHY

(By Loy Henderson)

On Sunday, July 28, 1963, Raymond Edward Murphy, a retired State Department official, died of cancer at the Georgetown University Hospital. This brief statement announces the passing of a quiet, retiring man who devoted almost 40 years of his life to the service of his Government and to whom the American people are deeply indebted.

Mr. Murphy was born in Lewiston, Maine, on August 31, 1898. He interrupted his education in Bates College in order to enter the U.S. Army during the First World War. He subsequently obtained his degree from Bates College; graduated from the George Washington Law School; and also became a member of the bars of Maine and the District of Columbia.

He entered the Department of State on July 1, 1924. After serving in the Department for several years as an economic analyst, he was assigned to the Division of Eastern European Affairs. His major duty in that Division was to ascertain the extent to which international communism, with headquarters in Moscow, was endeavoring through its various tenacles to maintain control over the Communist Party in the United States; to penetrate and influence other U.S. organizations in this country, which, although not completely Communist, were serving the purposes of Moscow; and with the aid of Communist sympathizers to build up espionage networks. At a time when the FBI did not possess the authority which it now has to keep a check on Communist activities in the United States, Mr. Murphy was a pioneer in that field.

Up to the time of his retirement some 4 years ago, Mr. Murphy continued to observe and evaluate those types of international Communist activities that might affect our foreign policies or national security. In so doing he kept in touch with various other governmental agencies and with leaders of organizations, such as labor unions, that the Communists were tirelessly endeavoring to penetrate.

During the years he developed an understanding of Communist techniques that enabled him to foil many of their subversive designs, some within the very framework of the U.S. Government. Although he worked unobtrusively and never sought public acclaim or personal credit, Communist circles in the United States and their friends were painfully conscious of his presence in the

Department of State and of the fact that he was a person to be feared and, if possible, eliminated. They, therefore, made use of such resources as were available to them in almost constant endeavors to put an end to his activities. Failing in that, they carried on systematic campaigns for the purpose of isolating him and of reducing his influence.

During the latter part of the 1930's and the first half of the 1940's, when national attention was riveted primarily on the Nazi-Fascist threat, Mr. Murphy's findings were not always well-received in some U.S. governmental circles. There was a tendency not only in certain of these circles but throughout the country to consider that findings of Communist infiltration into the U.S. governmental apparatus and into private U.S. organizations were irrelevant to the main task at hand and, if ascribed importance, might distract attention from the iniquities of nazism and fascism. This tendency was particularly strong among those groups who refused to recognize the fact that it is a basic strategy of international communism to undermine its Allies while cooperating with them in the defeat of a common enemy. During the period when these tendencies prevailed, there was some resentment even in the Department of State at some of Mr. Murphy's findings. Several of his associates expressed their resentment by subjecting him to treatment that at times almost amounted to boycott. He never flinched, however, from carrying out his duties with courage and tenacity.

Mr. Murphy's work was not limited entirely to the observance of international communism; his office also went deeply into the international activities of the Nazis. In 1943, the State Department put out a volume prepared by Mr. Murphy and has associates, entitled, "National Socialism, Basic Principles, Their Applications by the Nazi Party's Foreign Organization and the Use of German Abroad for Nazi Aims." This book, which was a classic in its field, is still one of the most valued sources for scholars who are interested in the fifth column activities of Hitler Germany.

Following the conclusion of the Second World War as U.S. governmental circles and the public at large began to be aware of the objectives and strategy of international communism, the value of Mr. Murphy's work throughout the years began to be really appreciated. Shortly before his retirement at the Sixth Annual Awards Ceremony of the Department of State in 1958, he was selected as the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award, the highest honor that the Department can bestow on any of its members.

The friends of Mr. Murphy are glad that he lived long enough to see the whole country conscious of the dangers of which he had been pointing out for so many years.

Sympathy is extended to members of his family, including his wife, the former Agnes Mullen of 3438 Mount Pleasant Street NW., Washington, D.C.; his step-daughter, Rosanne Burch of the same address; and a sister and brother, Marguerite and John Murphy, of Lewiston, Maine.

Address by Robert Moses at Equitable Life Assurance Society Pavilion, New York World's Fair 1964–65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964–65, at the Equitable Life Assurance Society Pavilion, at the New York World's Fair on July 30, 1963.

There being no objection, the address wos ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65 AT THE ANNOUNCEMENT AT THE EQUITABLE BUILDING OF THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY PAVILION AT THE WORLD'S FAIR, JULY 30, 1963

I am not much at hyperbole, ballyhoo, and superlatives. I said recently that a fair must, like Caesar's wife, be all things to all men. This was so old a chestnut that I could hardly believe it when the New Yorker thought that out of sheer ignorance I misquoted and mixed up Shakespeare, Plutarch, and the Apostle Paul. After this, no more feeble jokes.

Without hope of reward or fear of punishment, and under no compulsion to sing for hors d'oeuvres, vodka martinis, and free lunch, I am here to testify today to the remarkable usefulness of the Equitable exhibit at the World's Fair. It will feature and explain what is far and away the most vital subject before the people of the world. Not even the threat of nuclear war is so important, and in fact there is a relationship, however grim and foreboding, between the incidence of increase in population and the holocausts which have traditionally regulated the strength and numbers of the tribes that inherit the earth.

Yours is to be a factual exhibit. You present the figures graphically as they change kaleidoscopically from day to day. You call the shots as they are fired. You are neither pollsters, prophets nor Swamis. I can think of no greater service to mankind than to present what we at the Fair call the shrinking globe in the expanding universe.

I am a conservative and a sceptic in this field, but I want all the facts I can get, without bias or phophecy. When an ordinary fellow tells me he knows what New York will look like in the year 2063, I know he is either a colossal egotist, a demon paper planner or a licensed busybody. Where there is no vision the people perish. Where there is too much vision they perish twice as fast.

We can see just so far into the future. In the game of population guesses—for it is a game, not a science—we deal with imponderables. If we continue the upward curve of the last decade to the year 2000—not so far off and well within the life span of present teenagers—we reach a total world population far beyond the present resources of society to sustain in comfort. The line of the graph will, however, be deflected. It will be bent. It will wobble. It will go up suddenly like a rocket, swing off into a parabola or drop like the fever chart of a Stock Exchange panic. One thing alone is certain. You can't bank on it.

You can trust to population facts, but not to population predictions. No matter how thin you slice them, they are still prosciutto. Can we actually count on and budget the shelter, food, schools, utilities and whatnot for the huge numbers confidently prophesied for the year 2000? Where is the money coming from? And what of the insistent rising demands of underprivileged and newly emancipated people, promised by the Communists immediate prosperity and equal division of everything? Or shall we think about the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, birth control, reclamation of waste places by atomic desalination, new sources of cheap food like plankton, all factors which enormously influence the graph of population?

Equitable will give all points of view. The meliorist, the optimist, the pejorist, the pessimist will enjoy an equal opportunity to get the lowdown. Those who welcome with cheers and those who view with alarm can then confirm or confound their convictions and prejudices, go right or left or stay in the middle. At any rate, a great insurance company will give them dramatically at the Fair the actuarial evidence which all honest minds must seek. In this spirit we who direct the Fair welcome the Equitable Life Assurance Society today and present our silver medallion to its head man, James F. Oates, Jr.

Dedication of New Quarters of Southbridge, Mass., Post No. 29, Franco-American War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an account from the Southbridge Evening News on the dedication of the new quarters of Southbridge, Mass., Post No. 29, Franco-American War Veterans, Inc.

This outstanding event was held on Sunday, May 26, 1963, and it was my great privilege and honor to attend the inspiring dedicatory exercises which also marked the 1st anniversary of the post. Under unanimous consent, I include my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Southbridge (Mass.) Evening News, May 27, 1963]

FRANCO VETS DEDICATE QUARTERS; PHILBIN HEADS LIST OF DIGNITARIES

Several hundred persons, including including town, State, and national leaders along with delegations of various veterans and patriotic organizations, were present yesterday at ceremonies marking the first anniversary of Southbridge Post 29, Franco-American War Veterans, Inc., and for the formal dedication of its new headquarters at 61 Chestnut Street.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, cut the ceremonial ribbon with Senator Paul H. Benoit, Selectman S. Anthony Capera; Post 29 Comdr. Paul R. LaRochelle; National FAWV Comdr. Alfred O. Pinault, of Providence, R.I., and other dignitaries assembled with him at the front entrance of the building.

Dedicatory rites highlighted a weekend of first-anniversary events that included an open house, a military ball, veterans' memorial services, and a chicken barbecue.

FULFILLMENT OF DREAMS

Delivering the principal address, PHILBIN hailed the occasion as "the fulfillment of the dreams of an outstanding group of veterans that has rendered truly distinguished service to the community, State, and Nation."

Praising Franco-Americans, he stated that "they have bravely fought in every war, and have faithfully and brilliantly sustained the cause of freedom, justice, and good government."

The organization which today numbers approximately 360 war veterans of French descent dedicated the program to two members who died last year, Dorila Cournoyer of 80 Worcester Street, and Adelard Dauphi-

nals, 199 Charlton Street. The American flag that Commander LaRochelle presented for Cournoyer's funeral was returned by Mrs. Cournoyer, his widow, to fly at half mast as Emile Gendron and then Robert Lamothe sounded Taps. The Colors were raised by Commander Pinault and Post 29 Junior Vice Comdr. Laurent E. McDonald.

150 COUPLES DANCE

The military ball was notable for an enthusiastic turnout of 150 couples, who danced to the music of the Don Tremblay Orchestra of Southbridge.

Yesterday at 8:45 a.m. the various veterans and patriotic organizations assembled in front of Town Hall and then proceeded together to Notre Dame Church for the Veterans Memorial Services, a High Mass. The celebrant was Rev. Armand Morrisette, O.M.I., of Lowell, FAWV national chaplain.

The Fife, Drum, and Bugle Corps of Nipmuck Tribe 131, Order of Red Men, played march music for the parade to and from the church.

Senator Benoit served as master of ceremonies at the dedication, and the welcome address was delivered by Caprera, who is chairman of the Board of Selectmen. Commander LaRochelle offered a brief talk in which his officers, members and others were thanked for their support over the past year.

Volunteering their time and skills to the project, Post 29 members have extensively remodeled the former Town Infirmary, installed furnishings and opened rooms for the use of several groups such as the Gold Star Mothers and the World War I Veterans.

"We owe much gratitude to those of you who supported us verbally at the Town Meeting enabling us to obtain this building." Commander LaRochelle said, "We will never forget your support. We hope to work in the best interest of all veterans and their families and to serve the community whenever and wherever we can."

In the main building of Post 29 headquarters there is a meeting room, 32 by 17 feet, completely remodeled with wood paneling; and the gold star room, 16 by 17 feet, home of Southbridge Chapter 27 of the Gold Star Mothers. The motif is patriotic with gold stars and eagles, natural oak paneling, and a marble fireplace.

A cocktail lounge, some 15 by 20 feet in size with Victorian Period furnishings, a crystal chandelier and marble top tables, is also on the first floor.

The front hall of the main building has an open staircase of hand-carved oak, now completely restored. The Victorian style is predominant here as in the cocktail lounge. The front hall leads to the main club room, which is modern in design, with two-tone wood paneling. Some 40 by 25 feet in size, the room permits a bar 19 feet long and recreation facilities that include a pool table. A kitchen 11 by 20 feet in size adjoins the main clubroom.

On the second floor there is a ladies powder room; another meeting hall, 32 by 17 feet, and other rooms, including the administrative offices and facilities for the firing squad and honor guard.

The military ball took place in the auditorium, or what was the "barn," outside of the main building. Some 42 by 62 feet in size, it has been restored to give the hall an attractive rustic appearance, and the veterans have installed a hardwood floor.

The auditorium is the setting for dances, installations, banquets and other functions.

AMONG DIGNITARIES

Among the dignitaries at the dedication were Army National Guard Capt. Alfred F. Guenette, Jr., of Chicopee Falls, attending as Governor Endicott's personal representative; Fire Chief Alva Gregoire; Police Chief Ovide A. Desrosiers; Louis N. Provencal of Lawrence, State commander of the Massachusetts FAWV; Roland J. LaBrie of Riverside R.I., Rhode Island State FAWV commander; LaBrie's wife Emma, who is president of the Rhode Island FAWV Auxiliary; and State Polish-American Veterans Cmdr. Albert Gryncewicz of Southbridge.

Attending were officers and members representing FAWV posts in Fall River, New Bedford, Lawrence, Haverhill, Lowell, Leominster, Worcester, Newton, and Lynn in Massachusetts and Woonsocket, Central Falls, and Providence in Rhode Island. (FAWV representatives from Connecticut were at the military ball.)

Organizations represented at dedicatory services included Southbridge Post 66, Italian-American War Veterans, Inc., with Comdr. Anthony DiPietro; Southbridge Barracks 1747, World War I Veterans with Comdr. Omer Genereux; Southbridge Post 31, American Legion with Comdr. Alfred Papineau; Leonide J. Lemire Post 6055, VFW, with Comdr. Gerard Archambeault and incoming commander Wilfred H. Forcier.

Also, Southbridge Chapter 101, Disabled American Veterans, Inc., with Comdr. John F. Jesky; Polish-American Veterans, Inc., of Southbridge with Comdr. Frank Smolen; Southbridge Chapter 27, American Gold Star Mothers, with President Mrs. Gertrude Gendron; Sturbridge Chapter 38, DAV, with Comdr. Roger Cloutier; and United War Mothers, Inc., with President Mrs. Parmelia Gaumond. Representatives of the Legion, VFW, Barracks 1747, PAV, and DAV auxiliaries were on hand. The Daughters of the Union Veterans and the Cercle Canadien sent members. Highway Superintendent Joseph Benoit was present.

The program yesterday included coffee and donuts following the dedication; then a chicken barbecue open to the public. Close to 300 persons attended. The Intertown Square Dance Club entertained.

OFFICERS

The complete list of Post 29 officers is Paul R. LaRochelle, commander; Albert J. Langevin, senior vice commander; Laurent E. McDonald, junior vice commander; Richard H. Genereux, quartermaster; H. Albani (Ben) Bousquet, adjutant; J. Archie Champagne, chaplain; Robert Girouard, historian; William Paquin, Ernest A. Peloquin, and Donald Sarrasin, trustees; and Emery Gendron, officer of the day.

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, DEDICATION NEW FRANCO-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS HEADQUARTERS, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., MAY 26, 1963

Franco-Americans may well be proud of their contributions to the country.

They have bravely fought in every war; they have faithfully and brilliantly sustained the cause of freedom, justice, and good government in times of peace.

They have been inspiring constructive leaders in Southbridge and throughout the Nation, always in the first rank of our fellow citizens devoted to the security, progress and advancement of our great democracy.

Ever mindful of their obligations as citizens, Franco-Americans have resolutely stood and worked for the spiritual ideals and the enlightened political principles that are so largely responsible for the greatness of our American Government and the richness of our national life. Their loyalty and devotion may well serve as an example and inspiration to all who believe in our country and what it stands for.

(Referring to the growing evidence that the tides of world opinion were now running strongly on the side of the free world.)

Not even the boisterous jingoism of embattled Soviet leaders can conceal the sense of frustration that is permeating the Communist conspiracy throughout the world.

The overwhelming military and economic strength of this Nation and the free world will continue to be the real effective deterrent to aggression and violence, said Philbin. The threat of nuclear destruction is receding before the tremendous moral and physical power of the free world and our determined efforts to implement a lasting peace, based on justice, truth, and the rights of man.

As we grow in faith, good works, and strength, as we are bound to do, let us continue to make clear to the whole world our wholehearted support of every worthy movement and every practical instrumentality to promote amity, good will, justice, and peace among the nations.

Let us prayerfully resolve here today, as we have done so many times before, that as we strive for peace, we will never give up our American heritage, we will never appease those who seek to dominate us, and if necessary we will continue to defend our country and our freedoms, whatever the cost, with our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Legal Effect of Partial Test Ban Pact Only That of Unilateral Moratorium Under Provisions of Soviet Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, article IV of the partial test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow provides the treaty shall be of unlimited duration but provides for withdrawal if "extraordinary events" are believed to "have jeopardized the supreme interests" of the withdrawing country. The treaty stipulates 3 months' advance notice of withdrawal.

The provisions of article IV of the treaty are in direct conflict with article 49–0 of the Soviet Constitution which entitles the Soviet Government to abrogate any treaty instantly, with or without cause.

There is no provision of Soviet law which provides for the Soviet Constitution to be overridden by the provisions of a treaty.

Based on article IV's inconsistency with constitutional provisions, the Soviets may at any future time declare the treaty invalid from its beginning and the effect of such declaration will be instantaneous.

As an alternative, the Soviet Government, acting in secret session of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. may, under authority of article 49–0, denounce the treaty. This act would operate instantaneously to release the Soviet Government of its obligation to deliver 3 months' advance notice or withdrawal, or any notice at all. Under these circumstances, the U.S.S.R. could keep secret from all other parties its renunciation of the obligations of the treaty until such time as appeared most advantageous to the U.S.S.R. suddenly to reveal it.

Under either alternative, all parties to the treaty other than the U.S.S.R. in actual practice are committing themselves fully to the pact in exchange for what, in actual practice, amounts to no more than a unilateral moratorium on the part of the Soviets.

Mirror of World Opinion—Religion Ally in Birth Control Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus, Memphis Press-Scimitar, has written an article that should be studied by those interested in the problem of birth control. An approach is suggested to which no one should object.

The article was reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor of July 13. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIRROR OF WORLD OPINION—RELIGION ALLY IN BIRTH CONTROL FIGHT

Students of population trends predict the earth's population will double to 6 billion persons by the year 2000. By 2035, they say, the population will double again to 12 billion.

What this means in economics is shown by Eugene Black, until recently President of the World Bank. Writing one of the essays in the Doubleday book, "Our Crowded Planet," he points out that in India, one of the countries where population is increasing too rapidly, in the 30 years between 1956 and 1986, a total investment for housing of roughly $25 billion will be needed. That figure, he says, is well over four times the total loaned by the World Bank in all countries.

No wonder that the National Academy of Sciences recently issued a report calling for "international cooperation in studies concerned with voluntary fertility regulation and family planning" and declared that "the U.S. Government should actively participate in fostering such programs."

When such announcements are made by scientists, it is usually commented that opposition from religious people is to be expected. This should not be. It should be expected that religious people would heartily endorse such a report, and be the first to do so.

For religion is the principal source of our humanitarian feelings, and considerations of humanity cry for emergency action to prevent a disastrous explosion of "the population bomb" no less than the atomic bomb.

Unless the trend to multiplying population can be reversed, there will be widespread want. Even if we could feed the vast populations, it would be mere existence. Mankind needs space, needs an environment of nature undestroyed by a crowding population, to live in beauty and dignity and fulfill our immortal destiny as children of God.

"Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, subdue it." That was a command to be obeyed literally in the early days of humanity on the earth, when the jungle needed to be pushed back, the wild beasts held in check, and more people were needed to subdue them.

But now it is the spirit of this command and not its letter which should be obeyed. Our need is just opposite what it was in the primitive times of the Old Testament. If the earth, fast being laid waste by exploding population, and pushing urbanization, is actually to be "replenished," the growth of population must be checked. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life," rich, thrilling joyous life to man, not a hardly worth living existence.

Nearly all scientists see this as our need. In the birth control programs they advocate, they should find religious people as their strongest allies. For the heart of all religion is love, and love commands that children should not be brought into the world unless there is a place for them. To bring an eternal soul into time should be more a sacred responsibility and less a matter of chance.—EDWARD J. MEEMAN in Memphis Press-Scimitar.

Has the Wolf Jumped Out of Mr. Khrushchev's Skin and a Lamb Jumped In?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the question which the title to these remarks poses, I submit the following from the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram newspaper written by Larry Collins, Sr.:

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent-Press-Telegram, July 28, 1963]

L.A.C. SAYS: LEST WE FORGET

Can we trust the Communists to live up to any nuclear test ban they sign? That is the basis for reluctance of many Members of Congress and other citizens to sign a test ban agreement which we would live up to—with little reason to expect the Communists to do likewise. Reason for this reluctance was given by television commentator George Putnam in his July 15 broadcast. Because we should keep these facts in mind we quote from the broadcast as follows:

"This is Captive Nations Week, in which we pause to remember the 18 nations whose people are now enslaved by communism. It is unfortunate that despite an act of Congress passed in 1958 setting aside this week for national remembrance of more than 1 billion people in Communist enslavement, Washington remains silent, as does Sacramento, concerning this event. Each of the nations that have fallen under communism can attest to the fact that it can happen here. The people of those captive nations were once as free as we are. Today, they are the slaves of communism.

"And yet, at this moment, our representative sits with Communist Premier Nikita Khrushchev as Khrushchev wisecracks and chitchats with the men he would destroy. And unfortunately, too many of our representatives react as giddy girls to Khrushchev's changing moods. Khrushchev smiled this morning. He laughed. Ah, but Khrushchev scowls, and so we react like a fluttery barometer to his changing whims. This is the same Khrushchev, hangman of the Ukraine, butcher of Budapest, the same beast who sent his own wife to a concentration camp and directed the murder of Joseph Stalin's wife. The same Khrushchev who imprisoned, executed, or deported over 3 million Soviet citizens.

"The same Khrushchev who bossed a genicide that took an estimated 6 to 7 million lives. He personally engineered the systematic starvation of millions of Ukrainians. He participated in the slaughter of 80 percent of the Ukraine's intellectuals and directed the secret police murder of 400,000 political foes. He organized manmade famines in 1938. He uprooted the Catholic Church, destroyed 4,400 churches, closed 127 monasteries. He is the enemy of the Christian and the Jew and anyone who believes in God.

"In 1956, on Khrushchev's orders, 50,000 Hungarians were killed during the Hungarian revolt. He deported 12,000 persons to the Soviet Union. He imprisoned hundreds of thousands in Hungary. He confined 15,000 to slave labor camps. What has this beast in mind for the United States? Khrushchev has said, 'We cannot coexist eternally. One of us must go to his grave. The Americans and the West do not want to go to their grave either. We must push them to their grave. We will bury them.' These are the words of Nikita Khrushchev, hangman of the Ukraine, butcher of Budapest, whose emissaries of peace are now only 90 miles from our coast in Communist Cuba and whose spies swarm through this hemisphere. Each President in turn has believed he could deal with Communist leaders and communism, but the fact remains, you can't deal with communism. This is a war to the finish. Communism is not only a disease of poverty and chaos—communism is a disease of the mind.

"The decision we must make is only being delayed. Now, during Captive Nations Week, we must certainly know that the choice is between God and godlessness, freedom or slavery, life or death."

Mr. Putnam's conclusions are severe. It may be we should enter into an agreement as the President says, but as Will Rogers used to say: "We have never lost a war, or won a conference." The Senate has reason to go slowly in ratifying an agreement of such importance with a government that has never lived up to any agreement we have had with it.—L.A.C.

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 7500, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues from Massachusetts in stressing the importance of the proposed electronics research center in the Greater Boston area.

It is certainly true that all New England would benefit from this center.

There is a critical need for a research-development effort in space-related electronics and control. For this reason, it is important that the center be placed in an area rich with academic achievement and close to a budding industrial region.

The NASA commitment requires coordination at all levels, and this research center will provide impetus in this area, and will contribute greatly to the space efforts of the United States.

The center will provide a focal point for scientists, engineers, technicians, and

other personnel participating in electronics and related physics research required for our future space explorations.

Specified in-house research and development, which is essential to the lofty U.S. space goals, will be performed at this center.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that New England and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is ideally equipped educationally and industrially for this center.

In Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, we have the greatest concentration of brain power in the world. As the Science and Astronautics Committee report suggested, it is essential that this center be in close proximity to this great abundance of talent, brains, and industrial know-how.

Economic Impact of Bonneville Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the stimulus to business, industry and agriculture which low-cost electric power has provided in the State of Oregon is widely acclaimed as we approach the 25th anniversary of the Bonneville Project Act. A new transmission line is extending into a southwestern Oregon area to serve new industrial plants. Power provided through Bonneville Power lines is making possible the better utilization of our State's natural resources.

The mighty economic impact of Bonneville Power was recently emphasized in an editorial in the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review, a newspaper which is conservative in tone and generally noted for its skepticism toward some activities of the Federal Government. The evaluation of the worth of Bonneville Power is all the more noteworthy because of the newspaper's editorial policy. I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled: "BPA Has Had Mighty Economic Impact."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BPA HAS HAD MIGHTY ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Bonneville Power Administration may be the center of pro-and anti-public power arguments for many years to come, but no one can deny the big Columbia River power project has had its impact on Oregon economy.

This year, the BPA is celebrating its 25th anniversary. It was on August 29, 1937 that President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Bonneville Project Act.

Since then, the project has grown to surpass any other single river basin in the world in hydroelectric development.

BPA's utility operation, serving an area of 220,000 square miles, reaches into Oregon, Washington, northern Idaho, western Montana and a corner of Nevada. From its power capacity, it has sold 363 billion kilowatt-hours of power, enough to meet the current power requirements of the entire United States for more than 6 months. It feeds power to publicly owned utilities (43.4 percent) privately owned utilities (10.3 percent) aluminum industries (30.1 percent) and Federal agencies and other industries (15.7 percent). Power sales to these sources for fiscal 1952 amounted to $69 million for 29.2 billion kilowatt-hours.

The industries served by BPA today represent a gross investment of nearly $400 million and pay annual State and local taxes ranging from $5 to $7 million.

Since its inception 25 years ago, BPA has returned more than $860 million to the U.S. Treasury, and was $20 million ahead of its scheduled payout.

This is on an investment of $2.4 billion in the total U.S. Columbia River system. Of this total, $1.8 billion is allocated to power.

Of course, everything isn't coming up roses. At the end of the annual operating year in 1962, operating deficits stood at $17,700,000. The BPA is working on this through payout schedule revisions, increased sales in the region served and through a California intertie. A rate increase might even be in line.

Administrator Charles Luce says on the subject: "We do not believe that as a matter of policy a Federal power system should operate in the red, and we are dedicated to taking such steps in 1963 as are necessary to correct this situation."

The Bonneville Dam and other dams in the system reach far down into southern Oregon to help boost industry. The latest project is a new transmission line to the Reedsport area to serve the big new industries coming in there. They also furnish electricity to much of the northern part of the county through Douglas Electric Cooperative and to the Hanna nickel mine and smelter.

The BPA estimates that 99 percent of the Pacific Northwest's farms are now electrified. It estimates typical residential and farm families in Oregon and Washington today use about 10,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year and have an average investment of about $2,000 in electrical appliances.

The Bonneville system may be controversial, but its effect on the life and economy of Douglas County and the rest of the Northwest in its first 25 years has been tremendous.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

No Time for Witch Doctors—The Ailing Dollar Calls for the Classic Remedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most down-to-earth, penetrating, and at the same time frightening analyses of the current problem with the flow of gold and deficit financing that I have had occasion to read appeared in the July 29 issue of Barron's.

It has been said that there is no great interest in the matter of dollar stability and gold flow, but I do believe that increasing millions of Americans are becoming seriously concerned over the situation. The halfway measures and temporary expedients used by this administration simply do not work, and the American people are beginning to realize that something concrete must be done. As Barron's comments in its article:

What the circumstances call for is clear. As the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis notes, the "orthodox prescription" for countries plagued by persistent balance-of-payments deficits is the imposition of monetary and fiscal restraints on the total demand for goods and services. In other words, tighter credit and a balanced budget. While unpalatable, especially to officials who equate them with outmoded shibboleths and myths, the stern doctrines of classical economics can boast at least one virtue: they generally work. The administration will reject them at its own—and the Nation's—risk.

I believe the entire article from Barron's is so well written and so much to the point it should be given even wider distribution, and I include it now as part of my remarks:

NO TIME FOR WITCH DOCTORS—THE AILING DOLLAR CALLS FOR THE CLASSIC REMEDIES

As Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board for more than a decade, William McChesney Martin, Jr., starred in many a command performance on Capitol Hill. Over the years, however, none has been so noteworthy as his appearance last week before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. In a formal statement on the U.S. balance of payments, the veteran official handled such technicalities as Euro-dollars, "errors and omissions" and "export leads and lags" with cool authority. Only during the subsequent give and take with members of the committee was his customary aplomb, perhaps for the first time on record, momentarily shattered. Pressed by the lawmakers to comment on the persistent outflow of gold from these shores and its possible consequences, Mr. Martin somberly replied: "I hope and pray the time won't come when we would have to devalue the dollar. It would not be the end of the world, but it would take years to recover."

From an old hand like Bill Martin, whose skill at fending off questioners is legendary, the response is strangely unguarded. From the head of the Nation's reserve system it is shocking. For it plainly suggests that the U.S. money managers, who are charged by law with maintaining the stability of the currency, are less than confident of their ultimate success. In view of their record to date, as well as their plans for the future, they have reason to run scared. After years of complacency and inaction, Washington this month finally grew alarmed at the pressing threat to the Nation's global solvency. Hence in rapid-fire sequence, the Federal Reserve Board raised the rediscount rate from 3 to 3½ percent; the President proposed a novel tax on the purchase of foreign stocks and bonds; and the Treasury, for the first time in U.S. history, drew on the International Monetary Fund. Altogether, we are now assured on every hand, these measures will go a long way toward righting the lopsided balance of payments.

Like Chairman Martin, however, Barron's harbours doubts. The half point rise in the discount rate strikes us as too little and too late. The so-called interest equalization tax, in turn, will probably do more harm than good. For even if it gets through Congress (which is by no means certain), the proposal is so shot through with loopholes, actual and potential, as to rob it of much of its theoretical efficacy. As a practical matter it has aroused widespread fears about the imminence of overt exchange controls, and touched off a minor flight of capital. Hope and prayer doubtless have a place in the scheme of things, but they are no substitute for sensible fiscal and credit policies.

By word and deed alike, since 1961, the powers that be have done their best to pretend otherwise. Time and again the Treasury issued rosy bulletins on the state of the payments deficit; last July the President of the United States told the world via Telstar that the dollar was as good as gold. Lulled into complacency, the fiscal and monetary authorities did little but wait for something to turn up. The tireless Robert Roosa, who boasts an extraordinary knack of finding novel ways of borrowing, was packed off on a grand tour of the Continent. A sharp cutback in duty-free import allowances, from $500 per head to $100, was imposed upon the ordinary traveler, and last summer Americans were barred from owning gold abroad. At no point, however, did anyone in Washington come to grips with the realities. Last week Mr. Martin disclosed some hard facts indeed. In the first 6 months of 1963, the U.S. payments deficit ran at an annual rate of $3.5 billion; in the June quarter alone, the gap widened to nearly $4 billion annually, as bad as in October 1960, when the famous gold panic broke out in London. While buying time, this country, as the Bank for International Settlements icily warned, has been marking time.

Despite a new sense of urgency, the administration hasn't budged from the same old stand. Nothing daunted by its dismal record, the Treasury is still making cheerful forecasts—its timetable now calls for the payments deficit to vanish by the end of 1965. What is worse, instead of seeking a lasting solution to the crisis, its experts persist in tinkering with expedients. Their latest is the so-called interest equalization tax, which, by imposing a sliding scale levy upon domestic purchases of foreign securities, seeks to curtail the mounting flow of American capital abroad. Their concern is genuine: in 1962 U.S. investors acquired over $1 billion of new foreign issues, twice as much as in the previous year. This year purchases are running even higher. By raising the effective cost of U.S. capital, the new tax, it is claimed, may cut the payments deficit by $500 million.

Whether it will achieve anything of the kind is, to say the least, doubtful. Even in its original draft, the improvised blueprint was riddled with loopholes. For example, in an open invitation to evasion, underdeveloped countries (including Panama, a favorite haven of corporate enterprise) were specifically freed from the levy. Again, while bonds and stocks would be taxed, bank loans would escape. Since the President's message, of course, several fresh exemptions (notably one for new Canadian issues, which largely nullifies the whole scheme) have been hastily conferred. How the proposal will fare, in and outside of Congress, remains to be seen. As of now, however, the interest equalization tax has plainly made history. It touched off severe, if short-lived, panics on the Toronto and Tokyo exchanges. Despite official disclaimers, it has conjured up the specter of exchange controls, to which it bears an uncomfortable likeness. Worst of all, while holding out scant hope of a cure, it has whipped up fresh fears, both at home and abroad, about the fate of the ailing dollar.

Like the gamy potion of an economic witch doctor, the interest equalization tax is no remedy for anything. For low interest rates are merely a symptom of what really ails the United States and its balance of payments, an ancient malady known as inflation. Despite the illusions of the President's advisers, who prate of idle machines and idle men, the United States today is operating close to effective capacity. In no other way can one explain the sudden appearance of freight car shortages, or the mounting scarcity of skilled labor (including, as Dr. Arthur F. Burns noted in a recent critique of official unemployment statistics, "extensive shortages of scientists, teachers, engineers, doctors, nurses, typists, stenographers, automobile and TV mechanics, tailors and domestic servants"). Nothing but the manifest presence of inflation can account for the recent across-the-board burst of price increases—in lead, zinc, fabricated aluminum, fertilizer, motion-picture film, tires, shipping containers, fractional horsepower motors, nuts and bolts, and men's suits. As Barron's has pointed out before, the Federal Reserve and Treasury have poured forth a flood of easy credit, and a sea of red ink. Excessive liquidity has now become a mounting threat to the dollar.

What the circumstances call for is clear. As the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis notes, the "orthodox prescription" for countries plagued by persistent balance-of-payments deficits is the imposition of monetary and fiscal restraints on the total demand for goods and services. In other words, tighter credit and a balanced budget. While unpalatable, especially to officials who equate them with outmoded shibboleths and myths, the stern doctrines of classical economics can boast at least one virtue: they generally work. The administration will reject them at its own—and the Nation's—risk.

U.N.: Blunder and Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mrs. Lillian Gardner entitled "U.N.: Blunder and Tragedy." Mrs. Gardner is an outstanding student of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. This article appeared in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register on June 26 of this year:

U.N.: BLUNDER AND TRAGEDY

(By Lillian Gardner)

Wednesday, June 26, 1963, marks the 18th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter-Treaty by 50 nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union. Since that day in 1945, the interwoven history of the United States and the United Nations reads like the story of an Alice in Wonderland blundering through the international twilight zone, pursued by the Red menace.

On June 5 Americans were given grim new evidence that the Red menace and its use of the U.N. as a tool of Communist espionage is no fairytale. J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Appropriations Committee that Soviet Russia "Continues to carry out an espionage and intelligence attack against this country on a scale unequalled in history." Hoover revealed that although it has been illegal since 1955 for Soviet citizens in the United States to purchase aerial maps, charts, or photos of a certain scale; one Soviet national, employed by the U.N., was able to purchase from one map company 200 or 300 of these forbidden maps. The UNer merely posed as a student in order to break the law of his host country.

Let us turn back the pages of history to the rainy afternoon of April 25, 1945, when the curtain raised on the 20th-century spectacle of a 50-nation conference to organize the world. The affair began with the entrance into San Francisco Bay of a Soviet ship bearing 50 delegates and a cargo of vodka and caviar. This Conference on International Organization was held at the San Francisco Opera House under the aegis of its Secretary General, Alger Hiss, and company: Leo Pavlosky and Dalton Trumbo. Hiss later was to be exposed to the American people as a Communist spy and American traitor, and convicted of perjury. At the time of the San Francisco Conference his treachery was already known to men in high positions in the Federal Government. Trumbo was an adviser to the U.S. delegation and ghostwriter for some of them, including its head, Secretary of State Stettinius. Trumbo was later to become famous or infamous as one of the Hollywood 10 who were sentenced to jail for contempt of Congress as a result of their behavior before a congressional committee investigating Communist penetration of the movie industry. The late Harry Dexter White, espionage agent for the Russians, represented the Treasury Department at the Conference. White's main responsibility was the creation of the U.N.'s World Bank.

At the final plenary session of the conference held June 25, the Charter of the United Nations was unanimously approved by the heads of each delegation. President Harry Truman addressed this final meeting, and as he made his way to the rostrum, he extended a congratulatory handshake to an official of the American delegation. This gracious acknowledgement was deserved. No one person had been more influential in the framing of this charter, or better deserved the title of major architect than the man that the President of the United States greeted—Alger Hiss. A few years later Truman was to say of that same man: "The ——— betrayed his country."

CHARTER FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

The next day the Charter of the U.N. was signed with pomp by the plenipotentiaries of the 50 sponsoring nations. China's delegation, in recognition of her long-standing fight against oppression, was accorded the honor of being the first to sign. Next came the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, then the United Kingdom, France, and in alphabetical order the remaining delegates affixed their signatures to the charter of world totalitarian government. The United States as the host nation was the last to sign. Those who signed for the U.S. Government were: Edward R. Stettinius Jr., chairman and Secretary of State; Senator Tom Connally, Congressman Sol Bloom; Cmdr. Harold E. Stassen; Congressman Charles Eaton; Senator Arthur Vandenberg; and Virginia Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College. Chairman Stettinius was described by a high-ranking administration official in the State Department as under the "Svengali-like influence" of Alger Hiss.

Old Tom Connally of the delegation did rejoice that June day. He had worked long and hard to condition the Senate and the American people for this day, and he knew that much of the responsibility for the imminent ratification by the Senate would rest upon his shoulders. This Texas-born internationalist, studiously dressed like the stage version of a southern Senator—black morning coat, black bow string tie, and long white curls topped by a broad-brimmed black hat—passed out cigars to newsmen to celebrate the birth of the charter. Asked if he had become the foster father of a new baby, Connally answered, "No, I was just one of many." Above howls of laughter he shouted. "This is off the record. The baby is a synthetic product."

COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

These delegates who signed the charter were aided and abetted in the birth of this misbegotten synthetic union of governments called the United Nations Organization by numerous consultants. Among them numbered approximately 40 members of the Council on Foreign Relations. This Council should not be confused with a Communist front, but it did have interlocking relationships with the Institute of Pacific Affairs, identified as one of the most effective Communist fronts of all times. Members of this council had served since 1939 on the secret planning committees of the State Department and the council for the drafting of an international organization. Some of these consultants were John Foster Dulles, John J. McCloy, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Adlai Stevenson, Ralph J. Bunche, Clark M. Eichelberger, long connected with the "world citizenship" movement had been the director of the Association of the League of Nations. Today Eichelberger is the director of the American Association for the United Nations (AAUN); a member of the National Advisory Board of the United World Federalists; and a member of the National Committee of SANE which has recently received an unfavorable report by the Senate Fact Finding Committee of California. James T. Shotwell, chairman of the consultants, had been chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations secret wartime committee called the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace. Shotwell is president emeritus of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Before Shotwell appeared at San Francisco he had appeared on the same platform with Dr. Harry F. Ward, the head of the largest Communist-front organization in the history of the Communist Party of the United States of America, the American League for Peace and Democracy.

CHARTER DELIVERED TO SENATE

The charter of the U.N. was given into the custody of Conference Secretary General and Master Spy Alger Hiss for speedy delivery to Washington, D.C. President Truman presented the charter-treaty to the Senate of the United States on July 2 and demanded its immediate ratification without amendment or reservation.

The President said: "I shall not attempt here to go into various provisions of the charter," but the choice before the Senate is now clear. The choice is not between this charter and something else. It is between this charter and no charter at all." The President's closing words:

"I urge ratification. I urge prompt ratification," received prolonged applause and a standing ovation.

Only 5 days of testimony regarding the U.N. charter were held by the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. A few raised their voices against this permanent entangling alliance. One woman, warning the Committee against ratification said: "Our perpetual involvement in all future wars is guaranteed under this charter." That great patriot and anti-Communist, John T. Flynn added his warning against the charter. Their voices were like a whisper in the wilderness. So universal was the acclaim of the United Nations Charter, sight unseen, that it was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 28, almost without debate, and few had bothered to read it. The vote was affirmative 89, negative 2. William Langer of North Dakota and Henrik Shipstead of Minnesota cast the only negative votes. Senator Hiram Johnson of California sent word that if he could be present he would vote, nay, but he was ill unto death. A few years after observing the United Nations in action, Senator Pat McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada, said that he would regret to his dying day his affirmative vote.

CHARTER THE SUPREME LAW

On August 8, President Truman affixed his signature to the treaty and the charter of the international organization became the supreme law of the land. The charter came into force on October 24, 1945 (U.N. Day), when the Big Five and a majority of the signatory nations had filed their instruments of ratification in the national archives, Washington, D.C. Bryton Barron, head of the Department of State treaty staff, described the part Alger Hiss had to play in bringing the charter into force. It was Barron's duty to draft and send forward for approval and signature by Secretary of State Byrnes the text of the protocol which was to bring into force the charter of the United Nations as soon as the three Soviet instruments of ratification had been received. Barron was told that the draft protocol must be cleared with Alger Hiss. Once this had been done and the changes incorporated which Hiss desired, no further questions were asked. Barron said: "As I stood by the elbow of Secretary Byrnes on that memorable occasion on October 24, 1945, it was the signature of the Secretary of State that was affixed to the protocol, but the document itself was one that had been phrased to suit Alger Hiss."

YEARS OF TRAGEDY

Thus the embryo of unlimited world government came to life. The passing years—18 years of fantasy marked by unprecedented defeat and retreat for the United States and for the American dream—have found most Americans supporting the United Nations, not out of knowledge, but out of faith and fear. Is the adulation of the U.N. warranted in the face of history? Surely, the tragedy

of blunders and aggressions for nearly 18 years including the recent misadventures in the Congo involving rape, pillage and murder by U.N. troops; including the Indian massacre in Goa; the U.N. censure of Portugal's defense of her people, black and white, in Angola; including the cruel deliverance of the 700,000 Papuan people into the hands of the ruthless Sukarno of Indonesia by the United Nations; including the recent disgraceful conclusion of the Hungarian affair; must raise some doubts in the minds of even the most ardent devotee of the United Nations organization.

The symbol of peace on that organization's banner is stained with blood of innocent men, women, and children who asked only for independence, for self-determination. Instead of peace the U.N. has fomented conflict by increasing injustice. Instead of collective security the U.N. has given us collective insecurity.

TOOL OF THE U.N.

In spite of the United Nations' bloody and tragic 18-year history of blunder and aggression, obedient support of that body remains the only foreign policy of the United States. The United Nations organization is the major tool of the State Department policy. In fact, it would be more accurate to contend that the State Department of the United States is the major tool of the United Nations organization.

As a signatory of the U.N. Charter-Treaty, the great American Republic is losing its independence, sacrificing its wealth, and exposing its citizens to the extensive one-world propaganda of the socialist, Communist and atheist. The result of 18 years involvement in internationalism is the decay of American moral, spiritual and cultural standards. The U.S. Government has drifted far from the traditional American system under which its citizens have enjoyed the greatest freedom, happiness and individual achievement ever experienced in the world's history. This was once a land that was the life dream of the downtrodden and oppressed masses of the world. The American ideal was once the aspiration and hope of all who desired freedom, independence and prosperity.

After these years of United Nations realities, what could be a better or more fitting way to commemorate that fateful day of June 26, 1945, than for the American people to demand of their Senate a resolution rescinding American membership in the totalitarian, tyrannical United Nations organization and all of its alphabetical agencies?

Harry C. Shaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend of mine died recently at the age of 82, in Washington, Mass. He was Harry Shaw, a distinguished gentleman who held public office for over 27 years. He will be missed in Washington, where his presence was as familiar as the crisp, clear countryside.

Few men have given so much to their communities, Mr. Speaker, and Harry Shaw's great contributions to Washington will never be forgotten.

For me, he was a friend and a trusted adviser. I cannot imagine Washington, Mass., without him. The distinction and legend of this warm and kind man will be, however, long remembered by the fine people of that community.

The unique contributions of this man, and his active life exempified the highest ideals of American citizenship.

Although a brief summary of his life does not mention these high principles and ideals, I am proud to include in the RECORD an article from the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, of July 23, which does describe many of his talents and contributions.

HARRY SHAW DEAD AT 82—LONGTIME SELECTMAN OF WASHINGTON WAS BOSTON NATIVE

WASHINGTON.—Harry C. Shaw, 82, selectman for 27 years until his retirement last year and holder at one time or another of almost every town office, died at his home here this morning after a short illness.

Mr. Shaw was born in Boston, the son of Walter Shaw and Maria Walsh Shaw. He was raised in Brookfield and graduated from high school there in 1888.

Before settling in Washington in 1932, Mr. Shaw had been a summer visitor there since 1916. Previous to 1932, he was a real estate man with a seat on the New York Real Estate Exchange and with class A membership on the New York Real Estate Board.

WAS WRITING NOVELS

In 1959 and 1960, Mr. Shaw was New England public relations director for the National School of Construction, founded by his son, Gilbert Shaw, in Charlotte, N.C. Mr. Shaw traveled 25,000 miles in 13 months on that job, visiting secondary schools throughout New England.

On March 11, 1961, Mr. Shaw was honored by 300 friends at a reception in the Washington School on the occasion of his retirement as selectman. At that time he was working on two novels and was learning to fly. He was a frequent contributor of letters to the Eagle.

Mr. Shaw was for some years president of the Sons and Daughters of Washington and president of the Berkshire County Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution. In the town of Washington, he had been fire and police chief, assessor, moderator, chairman of the board of welfare and a member of the board of health.

He was a deputy sheriff and member of the Berkshire County Deputy Sheriff's Association. On January 1 of this year, he was made a life member of the Berkshire County Selectmen's Association.

One of Mr. Shaw's sons, Walter R. Shaw, was killed in submarine action in the Pacific during World War II.

Besides Gilbert, he leaves two other sons, Arthur L. of Hialeah, Fla., and Harry, Jr., of Haverhill; a brother, Everett of Portland * * *.

President Kennedy Names Former Congressman Joseph W. Barr New Chairman of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased, as I am sure were most Members of the House of Representatives, at the recent appointment by President Kennedy of our former colleague in the House, Joseph W. Barr, to be Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Joe Barr has been serving with great distinction in the important position of Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, and this experience coupled with his service in the House and his outstanding educational background and experience in private business admirably equip him for this new position of responsibility.

As a New York Times dispatch of July 29, 1963, said of Joe Barr, "New U.S. Banking Aid Has Strong Credentials."

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEW U.S. BANKING AID HAS STRONG CREDENTIALS—JOSEPH WALKER BARR SERVED 2 YEARS WITH DILLON—CHAIRMAN OF FDIC STUDIED UNDER SUMNER SLICHTER

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, July 28.—It is not necessary to be a Washington insider to know all about the men, in every major Government Department, who hold the jobs of assistant to the Secretary for Congressional Relations. They are almost always former Members of Congress, defeated in their bids for reelection, who didn't want to return to their home districts.

A certain number of them, every 2 years, are rewarded for past efforts and for belonging to the party in control of the White House, by being given $18,000-a-year jobs (a $7,000 cut from their congressional salaries) as official departmental ambassadors to Capitol Hill. With rare exceptions, over the years, they have been an undistinguished lot.

An exception is Joseph Walker Barr, who has just been chosen by President Kennedy to be the new chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. As such, he will be one of the Government's principal watchdogs over the Nation's banking system.

Mr. Barr has served, since the outset of the Kennedy administration, as assistant to Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, and he follows the pattern for holders of congressional liaison jobs—up to a point.

He was a Member of the House of Representatives—a one-termer. His Indianapolis district departed from custom to elect him in 1958 but returned to its old Republican habits in 1960.

In appearance and manner, too, Joe Barr fits the mold. A high-spirited extrovert who retains a bounce in his step even at the end of the 14-hour days he has often put in at the Treasury, he has a fund of anecdotes, a ready smile and the hearty handshake of the born politician.

He also has an easy self-confidence that enables him, for example, to ignore the rigid, unwritten rule that any subordinate entering Secretary Dillon's office waits to speak until Mr. Dillon looks up from whatever he was doing. Joe Barr booms out "Hi" the instant he crosses the threshold and Mr. Dillon has never appeared to mind.

Mr. Barr was born in Indiana in 1918 and collected his diploma, along with a Phi Beta Kappa key, from DePauw University in 1939. He then went on to Harvard, where he earned a master's degree in economics, studying under the late Sumner Slichter, whose theories about the inevitability of inflation in a full employment economy he does not, however, share.

He had planned to be an economist but instead, in 1942, he went into the U.S. Navy, from which he emerged in 1945 with the rank of lieutenant commander. He rode the assault wave in four landings—Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, and South France. He remains proud

of the fact that he sank a German submarine—"an awfully little one"—off Anzio Beach from a subchaser—which he describes as "a poor man's P.T. boat." He won a Bronze Star for the exploit.

After the war, Mr. Barr returned to Indiana and the operation of a variety of businesses his family owns there, including grain elevators and the Barr Finance Co., which specializes in financing farmers' purchases of tractors and other equipment. In contrast to almost all other small-loan company men, he is an ardent advocate of legislation that would force any company that makes loans to consumers to state clearly the exact amount of interest being charged.

Mr. Barr's record during his 2 years in Congress was liberal, although it did not earn him a score of 100 percent right on the voting records kept by labor organizations and liberal groups. The figure would probably be about 75 to 85 percent.

In his 2½ years with the Treasury, Joe Barr has had the responsibility for attempting to maneuver through Congress some extremely unpopular bills—repeated requests for increases in the statutory debt limit, for example, and tax reform proposals which, by definition, always hit directly at somebody's pocketbook.

But even those against whom he fought the hardest—the American Bankers Association, for example, over last year's proposal to withhold taxes on interest payments—emerged from the struggle both liking and respecting him.

It is clear that Joe Barr is getting his new job, among other reasons, because the Kennedy administration desperately needs someone, in at least one of the three Federal agencies that regulate banks, who will carry the administration's point of view on broad economic policy issues to the banking industry. The Federal Reserve Board and its chairman, William McChesney Martin, certainly do not speak for the administration; nor can Controller of the Currency James J. Saxon be relied upon to do so.

But the FDIC, which has direct ties with every bank in the country whose deposits are insured by the Federal Government, and which has additional authority over State-chartered banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System, could carry the administration's message with some effect.

Mr. Barr approaches his new $20,000-a-year job with this comment:

"It was bred in me to be a protagonist. So if I have 7,500 small banks under me, I expect I'll be for them."

Mr. Barr is married to the former Beth Ann Williston, an Indianapolis native, and—in the terms in which he customarily thinks these days—they have five additional tax exemptions.

A Warning: To Disarm Is To Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, "A Warning: To Disarm Is To Die" is a brilliant article written by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker that appeared in the San Diego Union on July 28, 1963. It is a reading must for each of my colleagues, many of whom seem to have been lulled to sleep by the recent test ban treaty:

A WARNING: TO DISARM IS TO DIE

(By Ira C. Eaker, lieutenant general, USAF, retired)

Recently a friend of mine made a business trip to the Far East. In Bangkok at a formal dinner he was seated beside the ambassador from a European country. The diplomat, during the evening, gave some earnest but kindly advice to citizens of the United States, illustrated with lessons from history. His queries, concerns and counsel ran somewhat as follows:

"Yesterday I saw a news bulletin which stated that your Congress voted 410 to 1 to cut the defense budget requested by your President by nearly $2 billion. Can it be that you Americans take comfort from the reported rift between the Russians and the Chinese?

"The conference in Moscow between the leaders of the two principal Communist countries has been for the purpose of agreeing on the best way of doing you in. The Russians are saying that it is better to let the United States and other capitalist countries die of a lingering illness, whereas the Chinese favor a knockout blow. It escapes me how you could be cheered by this conference on the timing and method of your destruction.

"Do your leaders not remember and realize that in 1961 these same Russians and Chinese met in Moscow and divided up the world, setting forth agreed-upon hemispheres of prime interest and domination? Can it be that you are so naive as to think this plan has been abandoned?

"Am I to believe that you Americans are seriously considering disarmament? I could understand your establishment of a Department of Disarmament to study all facets of the many and varied disarmament propaganda exercises proposed by the Communists. It was wise to relieve them of the exclusive use of this very important gambit.

"I am now beginning to feel and fear that you are undertaking unilateral disarmament. I am told some of your leaders believe that tensions will diminish in the world when your armaments are reduced to the level of the Russians. I must tell you that weapons do not cause wars. Wars are caused by economic factors, by fear, by hunger, by population pressures and by ideological differences. We in Europe fought for a hundred years over religion. You fought the bloodiest war of all time over slavery. Nations fight for the same reasons that men fight. The only relation that armaments have to war, if I read history aright, is that strong nations are seldom attacked by weaker nations.

"Is it true, my friend, that your leaders believe that there has been a real thaw in the Cold War? Do you think Mr. Khrushchev has altered the Kremlin plan of world domination by communism? If so, let me remind you that I remember other times when you showed little international understanding and foresight. You elected a President in 1916 on the slogan, 'He has kept us out of war.' Six months later that same President asked your Congress to declare war against Germany.

"I remember in 1922 when you agreed to sink your battleships. I recall also some years later that you had everybody who could drive a rivet building ships to meet the demands of a Second World War, and when the U-boats were sinking them as fast as you could build them.

"I shared, I think, the admiration of most of the civilized world when your country, under your Marshall plan, freely gave billions to Germany, Japan, England, France, and other countries whose economies had been disrupted or destroyed by World War II.

"For the past few years, however, when the countries you aided have had less unemployment than you have, with their economies in higher gear than yours, with their currency as sound or sounder than your dollar, it is hard to understand why you continue to pay their defense bills.

"There was a time when I could observe with detached bemusement the aberrations, the anomalies practiced by your Government and your people. That time is past, and for this reason. If you make the fatal blunder, if you go under, we all go under with you.

"When you return home, please tell your people that they are the most fortunate people on earth, the most favored people of all time. They must husband their strength, guard their resources, and maintain steadfastly the power and the will to stop the world conquest by communism. We shall help. But without you we cannot win.

"I worry sometimes now about how things are going in your country; therefore, I do not sleep so well in Bangkok these nights."

Since my friend told me about the diplomat in Bangkok who is having troubled sleep, I have had some insomnia myself.

Annual Adjustment of Pay of Postal and Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill that carries out the recommendations of the President of the United States relative to the annual adjustment of pay of postal and Federal employees. Public Law 87-793, enacted by the last Congress, provided for a study of the pay of Federal employees as compared to that of comparable employees in outside industry. Such a study would be made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which would make recommendations to the President and, after analysis by the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies of Government, presented to the Congress.

Such a recommendation was sent to the Congress by the President in the latter part of April of this year. My bill will go a little further than the Presidential recommendation, in that it provides for up-to-date comparability.

The recommendations of the President are based upon the 1961-62 comparable figures. A study such as that made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is made at the end of a year; by the time the figures are completed, the data is 1 year old. By the time the study is completed in the various agencies of Government and the legislation is passed by Congress, the comparability that is then attained is 2 years old. Pay raises granted in outside industry during the last 2 years have averaged 3 percent a year.

Accordingly, in my bill that I introduced, I am providing an additional 6 percent in the lower levels over and above the recommendations of the President. I have also reduced the increases recommended in the top levels so that those increases will amount to approximately 10 percent. The present pay in level 20

of the postal field service schedule and grade 18 in the classified service schedule is $20,000. In my bill this is increased to $22,000 annually. I think it should be confined to that figure until such time as Congress concludes a study on executive pay.

I sincerely recommend that my colleagues make a very careful study of the bill that I introduced.

Kaiser Finds the East-West Center in Hawaii a Working Instrument to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that lasting global peace can be achieved if the peoples of the world acquire a respectful understanding of each other. One of the instruments being effectively employed for man to learn and appreciate his fellow man is the nearly 3-year-old East-West Center in Hawaii.

Despite its short period of existence, the center is proving to be the best investment in peace that this Nation of ours has made since the end of World War II. Here is provided the common ground, the meeting place, where men from the East and the West share learning, interchange technical knowledge and culture, and benefit from living side by side.

Hawaii is proud to be the home of this great idea and institution which by its daily activities slowly but surely is helping to sow the seeds of peace throughout the world.

The operations and progress of the center is briefly reported in the July issue of This Earth, a magazine published by Henry J. Kaiser's Permanente Cement Co. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD this noteworthy article entitled "Hawaii's Enterprising East-West Center":

HAWAII'S ENTERPRISING EAST-WEST CENTER

"A place where people rub minds together."

In these provocative words, Chancellor Alexander Spoehr sums up the work of Hawaii's East-West Center and its goal of greater friendship between Orient and Occident.

Presently engaging 420 students and scholars from the United States and 27 Eastern lands, the East-West mind rubbing is now in its third year at the center, lubricated by Honolulu's celebrated multiracial climate. By 1967, a total of 1,000 Americans and Asians will be enrolled in the mind-mingling experiment.

At stake is one of mankind's grandest dreams—understanding, respect, and cooperation among peoples whose cultures are separated by diverse tongues and beliefs, and whose lands are parted by oceans. Fulfillment is far in the distance, but the outlook is encouraging.

"There is, of course, a long way still to go, but the need for the center is compelling and the planning is sound," says Lucius D. Battle, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.

"The center is a new phenomenon in our newest State," Battle told This Earth in a Washington statement. "It has many of the problems and all of the dynamic promise of youth. When I visited the center for the first time recently, I was greatly encouraged by the progress it is making toward its primary objective, the increase of understanding among the peoples of the Pacific area. Not yet 3 years old, the center has been marked by healthy growth."

Located on the University of Hawaii campus at Honolulu, the East-West Center is known formally as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. It was established by Congress in 1960 as a cultural and educational clearinghouse between the United States and Pacific-Asian countries. Its avowed aim is not to erase differences that exist, but to take them into account in a mutual striving for a dynamic and fruitful but peaceful life for all.

Inevitably, the center is sometimes compared with Moscow's Friendship University and Peiping's Foreign Institute. It makes no claim, however, to being America's educational answer to Russia and Red China. Neither is the center billed as a means of combating communism in Asia, but this prospect is implied in its goal of East-West friendship and understanding.

The center's getting-to-know-you program takes place on three levels, ranging from the grassroots up to the ivory tower.

The student scholarship program, largest by far of the three study areas, is an intellectual-middleground operation bringing together mainly graduate students for 2 years of study and travel. Ordinarily each student spends about a year pursuing academic subjects at the Center. Most of the next year is spent in extended field studies: U.S. students go to Asian universities or research centers; Asian students come to the U.S. mainland. Scholarships for the carefully chosen students are valued at $9,500.

On a much smaller scale but a loftier academic plane is the Institute of Advanced Projects, a "think factory" operation dedicated to high-level research and writing on current world problems. Truly distinguished scholars, numbering about 20, engage in joint research, conduct special conferences and maintain scholarly translating and publishing bureaus, all aimed at enriching the fund of human knowledge.

The East-West Center's third program, operating at down-to-earth level is the Institute for Technical Interchange. It is based on a 10-year-old Hawaii institution called the International Cooperation Center which for years has provided training in Honolulu for several thousand Asians in a variety of technical skills. Adapted now to the East-West Center, the program expects to enroll 300 participants this year for in-service or on-the-job training, lasting from 1 week to 2 years. Stress is being placed on "interchange," the idea of both West and East learning from each other.

The programs are administered by Chancellor Spoehr and a staff of 65 persons. To date, nearly $22 million in Federal funds have been spent for the project.

The East-West Center and its ages-old ideal of world understanding are newly housed in a handsome building complex on the Hawaii campus.

On a site dedicated in 1961 by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, an early advocate of the center, five striking concrete structures have recently been completed. A showcase of Hawaii's concrete know-how, the buildings are likely to add their exemplary influence to the East-West interchange they house.

Included are a high-rise men's dormitory of 12 stories, a 3-story women's dorm, the Institute of Advanced Projects building, a 600-seat theater-auditorium and a spectacular administrative and food service building. The latter contains a large lobby, 50 offices finished in teakwood from Thailand and a commodious, modernly equipped cafeteria and kitchen.

Regarded as one of Hawaii's most beautiful buildings, the administrative and food service structure created a sensation during its construction. It required the hauling of 33 prestressed concrete beams, weighing 40 tons each and measuring 128 feet in length, across Honolulu. The haul called for special rigs and a police escort to convoy the beams, three at a time, through city traffic. A week was required to complete the delivery.

Concrete Engineering Co., a division of HC & D, Ltd., fabricated the beams, which were lifted into place by two 40-ton cranes. HC & D also supplied 20,000 yards of concrete for the center, utilizing Permanente Cement.

McKee-Nordic Construction Co. of El Paso and Los Angeles was the contractor for the five buildings, which cost $5,700,000 and required 19 months to construct. H. A. Bohne was the project superintendent.

Huge precast window units for the two dormitories were furnished by Prestressed Concrete, Inc., of Honolulu. A total of 642 of the 6- and 4-ton units were cast.

Design and plans for the East-West Center were drawn by Young and Henderson, Honolulu architects, and I. M. Pei & Associates, New York City. Alfred Yee, Donald Lo, and K. D. Park were structural engineers for the various structures.

As it completes its third year and moves into the new buildings, the East-West Center is a growing contributor to international understanding in a troubled world. Intellectually, architecturally, and geographically, it should go a long way toward bridging the thinking between East and West.

At ground-breaking ceremonies for the center, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON declared: "Of the works to which I have contributed, I have the greatest confidence that the East-West Center will outlive them all."

Alliance for Progress Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, today it gives me pleasure to point out an example of where the Alliance for Progress has scored a fine success. This is another example of the positive accomplishments we can achieve in our foreign-aid program:

ANN ARBORITE WITNESSES GROWTH IN BOLIVIA BY SELF-HELP PLAN

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of three articles by J. William Wenrich, a career Foreign Service officer on duty in Bolivia with the Agency for International Development. He is a graduate of Ann Arbor High and the son of university Prof. and Mrs. Ralph C. Wenrich, of 1217 Baldwin Avenue. The personal comments in the articles do not necessarily reflect official opinion of the U.S. Government, Wenrich points out.)

In agriculture, the Alliance for Progress has had some of its most dramatic successes in Bolivia. Certain crop and other farm pro-

ductions have practically doubled, notably sugar, rice, and wool.

New fertile lowlands are being colonized in the eastern regions by Aymara Indians who had never before left the bleak 13,000-foot high Altiplano. It is hoped that nearly one-eighth of the Bolivian population of 4 million will be resettled in the next 10 years.

In public administration there has been considerable evidence of progress. Cynics say smuggling is Bolivian's major industry. However, as a result of increased enforcement and improved customs administration, Bolivian customs tax revenue has increased 70 percent in the past 2 years.

One of the major impediments to economic development in Bolivia is the scarcity of good transportation and communications. Road construction is a major priority for U.S. assistance in Bolivia. A $6 million loan has been made for the Government to conduct feasibility and engineering studies for potential new roads, as well as for other public works projects.

The postal system and communications system are being reorganized and improved by U.N. and AID technicians and the nationalized part of the railroad is being rehabilitated by British technicians.

The banking systems in Bolivia in the past have been unable to provide the financial credit that Bolivia needs for its industrial and agricultural development. Currently both the Mining and Agricultural Banks are being studied. A new Private Industrial Development Bank has recently been created with U.S. support and a number of credit cooperatives have sprung up to aid the small farmer.

In recent years, through joint United States, United Nations, and Bolivian efforts, major public health menaces such as malaria, smallpox, and yaws have virtually been eliminated in the country. But a disturbingly high incidence rate of silicosis and tuberculosis remains. An extensive TB and silicosis eradication program has begun with particular emphasis placed on helping the mining population where the incidence rate is the highest.

Bolivia's 70-percent rate is among the highest in Latin America. This is due partly to the fact that over two-thirds of its population, the Aymara and Quechua Indians, don't speak Spanish. But a high premium is placed on education by the campesino in Bolivia. Through American assistance 200 new rural schools and 20 new urban schools will have been constructed by the end of this year.

Many of the rural schools are being built under the so-called civil action program. In this construction program the Bolivian Army provides the technical skill and much of the manpower, the community supplies local materials, and AID pays for any imported materials needed. In addition, any campesino who wants to work on the school is paid in food for his family under the U.S. food-for-peace program.

Besides schools, American aid is financing the printing of new, inexpensive primary readers and textbooks. Our technicians are also training new teachers on a continual basis.

The food-for-peace program is not limited merely to wage payments for construction assistance. Over 300,000 Bolivians, mostly children, receive food which comes from U.S. surplus crops. Food is distributed in school lunch programs, at hospitals and health centers, at homes for the blind, crippled, or aged, and in emergency situations resulting from natural disasters.

No one today argues that Bolivia has achieved the economic growth or stability of which it is capable. But through the combined United States-Bolivian efforts in the Alliance for Progress, the people have a hope and a possibility of fulfillment.

Wooly-Headed Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dangers of appeasement of world communism such as those inherent in the proposed test ban treaty are pointedly set forth in an editorial published on July 27 in the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point:

CUBAN POLICY EXPANDED?

Speaking to newsmen shortly before an announcement was made that a partial test ban had been initialed by negotiators of our Government, Britain, and the Soviets, Richard M. Nixon summarized the position of the Kennedy administration so succintly that his words deserve noting. This is what he said:

"The emphasis up to now has been on defending freedom but we must do more for spreading freedom. The Communists are prepared to take bigger risks to spread communism than we are to spread freedom."

These words followed upon Nixon's assertion that it was wooly-headed thinking to believe Premier Khrushchev is mellowing and moving toward the end of the cold war.

It is well to keep both of these thoughts in mind in connection with the major propaganda effort which was opened last night in the President's appearance on television to influence ratification by the U.S. Senate of the treaty agreed to by the negotiators in Moscow.

Even if Khrushchev has for once agreed to a treaty in good faith, such action would not indicate any sincere yearning on his part for a cessation of cold war hostilities around the globe. He may have approved the treaty out of fear of his former Communist Chinese ally. He may have had it signed with the purpose of cheating on it in the near future. He may have signed it on the theory that with a nuclear arms race stalemated, Communist aggression might well continue its successful course through infiltration, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare.

The point to be remembered at all times is that, even if the treaty before the Senate and the country becomes a fact, no new day is dawning soon in international relations. The purpose of world communism will still be the conquest of the globe no matter what treaty is signed, for one of the several reasons suggested above, to outlaw nuclear weapons tests.

Our national danger lies in the possibility that the Kennedy administration, reaching for a role of world peacemaker for the benefit of the 1964 election, will expand the appeasement of world communism in the fashion it has meekly followed in the Cuban situation.

The Sky Brightens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 of this year I introduced H.R. 3328 to transfer administrative responsibility for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles Airport from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. G. Frank Stricklin, editor of the Jeffersonian, Towson, Md., in the issue for Friday, August 2, 1963, has ably stated the economic justification for my bill. Airlines have transferred to Dulles, feeling that such a move was necessary because the landlord at Dulles was also the same agency which regulates airline operations. Mr. Stricklin's editorial points out that United, in order to increase traffic—and income—has transferred some of its flights back to Friendship from Dulles. I am delighted to include Mr. Stricklin's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SKY BRIGHTENS

The promotion campaign being waged by the Airport Board is apparently beginning to pay off—at least it looks that way. When the Federal Government constructed mammoth Dulles Airport near off-the-beaten-track Chantilly, Va., it naturally desired its multimillion-dollar facility to be a success. And to insure its success, it informed the airlines that it, instead of Friendship International Airport, would be the terminal for passengers in the Washington area.

The Federal Aviation Agency regulates airline operations. It also operates Dulles Airport. So when it decreed that the airlines should transfer their local bases from Friendship to Dulles the future looked black indeed for our field.

Like anyone aware of what side his bread is buttered on, the airlines, in varying degrees, acceded to the FAA's "request." Visitors to Dulles have described the vast aviation complex as like some long forgotten temple come upon suddenly in the wilderness, so scarce are passengers.

Now United, one of the airlines that switched its local operations to Dulles, admitting that "maybe traffic results might be better out of Friendship," has pulled two of its jet flights out of Dulles and added one more to the service it already offers at Friendship. The addition will be a nonstop morning flight to Los Angeles—the only flight scheduled at this time of day from our field.

We hope that other airlines will be emboldened by United's courageous action and, admitting that Friendship is more convenient for passengers in the Baltimore-Washington area, stage a mass return flight.

Western Newspaper Supports Revision of Mining Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that last year, during the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill, H.R. 12913, to modernize the mining laws of the United States. I made a statement in the House of Representatives explaining the purpose and background of the bill on August 16, 1962, and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day on page 15746.

While no action was taken in the 87th Congress the bill stimulated considerable discussion which I submit is a healthy situation. Not having received any convincing arguments indicating the necessity to change the concept of my proposal, on January 9, 1963, at the start of the 88th Congress, I reintroduced the bill as H.R. 935. Subsequently, on March 28, 1963, I made a further statement on this matter in the House and it appears on page 4667 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House support from a western newspaper, the Denver Post, for the principle of mining law revision. It is a thoughtful editorial that appeared in the July 23, 1963, issue and, under permission previously granted, I include the full text as part of my remarks and commend it to my colleagues:

NO ROOM FOR PHONY MINING CLAIMS

The Mining Act of 1872, growing out of Spanish and Mexican mining traditions, has served U.S. mining development fairly well. In recent years, however, trends in public land use show that changes are needed.

The obvious pressures of recreation and industrial use attending this Nation's population growth mean growing recognition of uses of land other than mining.

Also, some parts of the traditional mining law—notably the requirements concerning discovery and assessment work—don't even benefit miners.

The Engineering and Mining Journal, a national mining magazine, commeted recetly that assessment requirements of the mining law "have broken down,"

People have evaded the requirement of performing $100 of work per claim per year. As a result, some mining men feel that dropping assessment work might be possible, along with a provision that all unpatented mineral claims be canceled after 3 years if evidence of potential ore is not obtained and if no work is in progress.

Other proposals would require a locator of a claim to file for patent within 10 years after date of location. Such proposals would eliminate confusion over validity of claims.

But there is no question that the big need is to end abuses of the mining act. The story is well known of people who, with obvious intent, use mining claims as an excuse for squatting on cabin sites or commercial property.

The Comptroller General of the United States in 1962 suggested that a way to eliminate abuses without damaging the mining industry would be to reserve to the U.S. the nonmineral surface of mining claims. The Secretary of Agriculture then could protect national forest land for grazing and other uses by granting only as much surface land as is deemed necessary for subsurface development.

There are, before Congress, several items of legislation to do something about mining claims. Some provisions are friendly to mining interests—recognizing their interests as well as other interests. Some are aimed at clipping the industry's wings as an end in itself.

We think the prudent course is to accept the fact that changes are needed. When people, as happened recently in Arizona, actually salt land with real gold dust just to use the mining claim as a loophole, there is needed for change. Those concerned should get together on a program of reasonable amendment of the mining law, eliminating the abuses and protecting that portion of the mining industry which is productive and must go on using public lands.

Soviet Goal Remains the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial published in the Dallas Morning News on July 27, the dangers of imagining that Khrushchev's acceptance of the test ban treaty is a genuine move toward peace are effectively disclosed. As stated therein, the Soviet goal is still to spread communism wherever and however possible. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point.

NUCLEAR TREATY

Within hours of the announcement that United States, British, and Soviet negotiators had reached agreement on a nuclear test-ban treaty, a radio news commentator offered his own appraisal of the event: "The Kennedy administration," he said, "has finally been able to win Mr. Khrushchev's vote on this issue; now its major problem is to win the votes needed in the U.S. Senate to ratify the treaty."

The commentator's remark was an affront to commonsense. The implication seemed to have been that suddenly Mr. Khrushchev had become more trustworthy and loyal than our own elected officials. They are now the problem.

One would think that any evaluation of the merits of a treaty which the world's No. 1 Communist can approve, while a substantial number of U.S. Senators cannot, ought to include the possibility that the treaty is bad. Perhaps—just perhaps—the Kennedy administration has made a mistake.

Maybe Khrushchev was able to win our negotiators over to his side, instead of the other way around—which seems to be the current interpretation.

It is not as if a handful of crusty old Senators had decided—for the sake of meanness—to put a damper on what one of their colleagues, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, calls a victory for mankind. For they are not the only skeptics.

Just last week the Senate Special Preparedness Subcommittee revealed that this Nation's top military experts are flatly opposed to any test ban treaty. In secret hearings before that subcommittee, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had cautioned strongly against such a treaty. What is especially significant, their opposition was unanimous.

Moreover, additional opposition has just been registered by an expert whose opinions ought to carry a great deal of weight. Former NATO commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad, has warned that this treaty can be violated, unilaterally and perhaps without our knowledge.

There are many specific loopholes in this treaty. It is not binding on nonsignatory nations. The Chinese or the French can test to their hearts' delight. The Red Chinese could do Mr. Khrushchev's testing for him.

The treaty can be broken at any moment—or ignored. This happened to us once before. After 1958, while we honored a pledge to refrain from nuclear tests—or preparation of tests—the Soviets worked feverishly in the laboratories preparing for that series of massive explosions in the fall of 1961 which narrowed the weapons lead we once held over them.

It is hard to believe that Mr. Khrushchev's acceptance of a test ban treaty is a genuine move toward peace, and not a new twist in tactics. The Soviet goal is still to spread communism wherever and however possible. His acceptance could fit into that plan.

The great danger is that we will swallow the bait by being lured into believing that the Kremlin's apparent posture of cooperation is more than a tactic.

Belief that Soviet goals have changed or relaxed could result in a disastrous weakening of our own posture. It could lead to a neglect of our own defenses. It might spur our State Department on to believing that we can safely afford to make greater concessions to the Soviets. And it might very well lead to a relaxation of efforts to bring together and strengthen the already-fragmented Western alliance.

All of these dangers are hardly compensated by the few gains which may—or may not—be in prospect if and when the Senate ratifies the test ban agreement.

Long, Long Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the July 17 edition of Roll Call featured our distinguished young colleague, GILLIS LONG of Louisiana.

I am certain that others will be interested in this perceptive article, and offer it for insertion in the RECORD:

LONG, LONG TRAIL—THERE'S A LONG TRAIL OF LONG LEADERS IN LOUISIANA, AND YOUNG GILLIS LONG IS HEADING HOME

(By Oscar Johnson)

Time has not changed much in Louisiana politics.

More than 30 years ago, the late Huey P. Long—the fabulous "Kingfish"—won his first term as Governor.

A visitor returning to the Bayou State this year after an absence of 30 years—or 20 or 10 years, for that matter—could hardly tell that there is any difference. As usual, there is an "off year" primary campaign for Governor.

And as usual, another Long is right in there fighting.

This time he is GILLIS P. LONG, 40, a short and fast-moving freshman Congressman who decided to heed the call of the huge Army of Louisianians who believe that the Governor should just naturally possess that magic surname.

Such is the respect for the Long name that crewcut GILLIS is viewed as the man to beat. Says one observer: "If the past is prolog, GILLIS will win."

What dismays nearly two dozen other contenders in the race is one simple fact: Not since 1924, when the youthful Huey failed in his first impossible bid for the Governor's chair, has a Long ever lost a statewide election in Louisiana.

Including Governor and Senator, the Longs have won eight straight. Here is their record:

Year 1928: Huey sweeps into office for his first term as Governor.

Year 1930: While still Governor, Huey runs successfully for the U.S. Senate.

Year 1948: Huey's Brother Earl Long wins as Governor.

Year 1949: RUSSELL B. LONG, Huey's son, elected to the Senate at the age of 29, in a special election.

Year 1950: RUSSELL LONG wins another Senate term.

Year 1956: Earl wins second term as Governor; RUSSELL wins third Senate election.

Year 1962: RUSSELL wins another Senate election.

It is a safe bet that the Longs would have won more elections, except for Louisiana's law that a Governor cannot succeed himself. Even with this handicap, they have been able to win again after a 4-year absence.

Gillis Long, latest scion of the clan (he is second-cousin to RUSSELL), is the only member of Congress now waging an election campaign. His State's Democratic primary is on Saturday, December 7, 1963. If nobody gets a first-round majority, it will be followed by a runoff between the two top vote-getters on Saturday, January 11, 1964. The general election is March 3, 1964.

Word from Republicans is that they will make an all-out effort to find a candidate who can beat the Democratic nominee. It is probable, however, that the Democrat will win—especially if he is a Long.

Although few announcements of candidacy have been made this early in the maneuvering, GILLIS LONG will probably have two chief primary foes. They are DeLesseps Morrison, 50, smooth-talking former mayor of New Orleans, and former Gov. Robert F. Kennon, who is in his early sixties and has been quietly building strength for 4 years.

Morrison, now President Kennedy's Ambassador to the OAS, retains some strength in Catholic New Orleans and the southern Louisiana Creole country—although he has lost two previous tries for Governor. Kennon, who was beaten by RUSSELL LONG in RUSSELL's first Senate race, is well-financed and has a following among the hardshell Baptists in conservative northern Louisiana, just below the Arkansas border.

GILLIS, who ranks between "city boy" Morrison and the conservative Kennon, has his main strength in moderate central Louisiana—the traditional Long stronghold. However, GILLIS decries the use of labels in the campaign.

"What is important and what has meaning and substance to me is that we make use of all our resources both human and material in a manner consistent with our heritage, our ideals and our principles," GILLIS has said.

Several other candidates are expected to receive a modest vote, among them Public Service Commissioner John McKethen. He is supported by Mrs. Earl K. Long, but GILLIS backing by RUSSELL LONG is expected to help bring him upwards of 90 percent of the "Long vote."

GILLIS leaped into the gubernatorial race at a modern-style kickoff dinner in New Orleans on June 24. About 1,600 of the faithful attended at $50 a plate—including, reportedly, hordes of veteran Long supporters who hadn't been seen in 15 years but came from out of the hills and bayous to see their latest champion.

He opened his campaign on June 27, with a 30-minute statewide television broadcast. "I am a Long and I am proud of it," he told the huge audience.

"I am proud of the contributions that the Long's have made not only to the State of Louisiana but to our Nation's political life," GILLIS said. "There are people in this State who will be against me simply because of my name, because they know that I will stand for the rights of the individual against any special interest groups.

"They will oppose me because they know that while other candidates have only promised to do something for the people of this State the Longs have done it, and as you ride across the highways and over the bridges and past the grade schools, the high schools, colleges and universities that the Longs have helped to build, I would ask you to remember that the Longs have contributed to this State.

"I hope that no one in this election will vote for me simply because my name is LONG, but, I also hope that no one will vote against me simply because my name is LONG."

Although GILLIS is still tending to his Washington duties on a full-time basis, elements of old style "Longism" can be seen in his campaigning to date. Where Huey once promised "Every man a King," GILLIS has also been raising the prospect for advancement of the struggling little man by government action.

"I have spent many years studying, and seeking new ways in which government can best serve the interests of all the people," he said in his TV address. "We hear many people today speak of government as if it were some outside force over which we have no control. * * * Ladies and gentlemen, we are the government."

Through action by a strong Governor, GILLIS said, the people of Louisiana can make strides in education, welfare, income. He speaks of the State becoming part of a great "Space Crescent" stretching from Houston, Tex., to Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Observers see an updating of the Long style in GILLIS' approach. For one thing, Earl Long shunned TV, preferring to talk directly to the people in small gathering throughout the rural areas.

In his congressional campaign last year, GILLIS displayed an effective, folksy appeal on the stump, but he is basically a polished sophisticate. "He can put on the sidewinding style in the rural areas," said one Louisianian, "but he doesn't know the people in every ward and parish of the State as Earl did, or have the dynamic force of a Huey Long."

While there may be something to that assessment, it's of small comfort to the other candidates who're watching his bandwagon roll along. And making up for any lack of Longism, GILLIS has adopted new political techniques such as catch slogans and heady platforms of progress.

"Louisiana is in the midst of a crisis," he said in his announcement speech. "I want to see those men and women working again."

Calling for a partnership for progress, LONG declared: "There is a climate for change now." He said it was time for all levels of government—local, State, and National—to end their bickering and get together on programs to help the people.

LONG's platform calls for economic development, employment opportunity, education, and effective, economical, ethical government.

Whatever happens in the race, Louisiana seems happy to have another capable, colorful LONG adding interest to its statewide politics. He is a slightly modernized, more efficient, and less flamboyant version, but few would be surprised if, on election day, GILLIS LONG proves to have the same old vote-getting power of his illustrious kin.

The Trouble With the U.S. Dollar: Lack of Belt Tightening by Government and Sagging Citizen Confidence Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take leave to include an editorial in the Evening Star of August 2 by Constantine Brown. Mr. Brown has a long and distinguished career as one of the most accurate news reporters on world problems and conditions, gaining intimate knowledge by his close association with the ruling class of many foreign nations. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I, along with many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, have tried my level best to stop unnecessary wasteful spending of our taxpayers' dollars, knowing full well that the day would come which Mr. Brown points out has now arrived.

The editorial follows:

THE TROUBLE WITH THE U.S. DOLLARS

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—The interest equalization tax on foreign securities purchased by Americans which was proposed by President Kennedy to stem the dangerous ever-increasing flow of dollars abroad is regarded in high financial circles in Western Europe as a mere palliative which cannot bring any sizable results. It is said in banking circle that the real trouble is the tendency of the American people to lose confidence in their national currency.

The question of the vitality of the dollars in contrast with the strong European currencies backed by substantial quantities of gold—kept at their disposal in America—has been worrying Europe's bankers for a long time. They have wholeheartedly cooperated in the past with Washington in pegging the dollar at its present unrealistic value. But they have not failed to warn our Government that nothing short of a drastic fiscal policy can revitalize our dollar.

Privately they did not mince words. Drastic measures would consist of a substantial curtailment of America's expenditures at home and abroad with the view of eventually achieving either a balanced budget or at least one which shows a definite tendency toward balance. The national budget tends to mount stratospherically and so does the national debt.

It may be strange for the average American to hear that these nations which have achieved their present unbelievable prosperity and financial stability, thanks to the American bonanza, are now wondering why the U.S. Government still insists on spending billions on foreign aid. The explanation that it is needed to the tune of $4 billion a year in order to prevent the further advance of communism, especially in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa, is ridiculed in Western European financial circles.

Germany, France, and even Britain are equally interested in these nations which in the past were a part of their empires. But the assistance they offer is on a strictly business line and well within the means of each. The bulk of the NATO allies can well afford to—and do—pay for needed military hardware.

Americans' lack of confidence in the dollar has filled the coffers of the Swiss banks to bulging with dollars. U.S. investors who change their national for foreign currencies, placing them either on deposit or investing them in stocks or bonds, are not enjoying the same yield as they would at home. The stocks usually pay lower dividends. Moreover, in Switzerland, the foreigner pays 30 percent on the yield of foreign investments to the Swiss Federal Treasury.

The Swiss and German banks have imposed drastic restrictions on Americans. They pay only 1½ percent on long-term deposits. But the gimmick in such a case is that the depositor must give the banks 9 months' notice before he can withdraw any of the full amount.

By and large, the American investor would do much better either purchasing American stocks and bonds or enjoying a 3½- or 4-percent yield from U.S. building associations. Also, he can withdraw his deposits at a moment's notice.

Why then, it is asked here, do so many Americans prefer to submit themselves to banking regulations far more stringent than at home? Why do so many Americans prefer a lower income from their investments? The inevitable answer is lack of confidence in the fiscal probity of the Government; fear that some day, somehow, their investments at home might become jeopardized by some strange measures suggested by the financial whiz kids in Washington.

A leading Swiss banker, regarding the gold outflow, has pointed out that while some 5 years ago only Americans of substantial wealth brought part of their capital to Switzerland, there are now tens of thousands of accounts opened in Geneva and Basle from "little capitalists." That is, those who possess only small surplus sums between $10,000 and $50,000. They seem quite satisfied with the 1½-percent yield and neither do they object to the ban on withdrawals without 9 months' notice.

"The lack of confidence in your own money," he went on, "does not stem from Europe but from your own people themselves, who have become alarmed by the spending sprees of your Government."

Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, of which I am honored to be chairman, recently favorably reported to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill on mental health and retardation.

I was most pleased, Mr. Speaker, to receive a copy of a resolution adopted by the Association of Counties at their annual convention held in Denver, Colo., July 31, 1963, supporting the enactment of a mental health bill. I would like to insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point:

ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES CALLS FOR ENACTMENT OF KENNEDY MENTAL HEALTH BILL WITH 4 YEARS' CONSTRUCTION PERIOD—8 YEARS' STAFFING

Whereas in the last few years new and revolutionary methods have been developed for treatment of the mentally ill and retarded; and

Whereas these methods rely upon treatment of the ill in centers in, or near, the community in which they live; and

Whereas such methods embrace a philosophy of restoring responsibility to the local community, away from State and Federal control; and

Whereas the new community center treatment concepts promise radical cost-savings per patient to local and State government over present custodial methods; and

Whereas such community mental health centers are designed to serve populations of 100,000 and will thereby involve counties or clusters of counties; and

Whereas these new-type centers, containing about 75 beds, will provide our counties with comprehensive care of our mentally ill with diverse services such as diagnostic services, inpatient services, day or night care, 24-hour emergency walk-in clinics, sheltered workshop, consultative services, supervision of foster home facilities; and

Whereas for the counties themselves to initiate such a comprehensive mental health program the financial burden would be staggering to an extent where it would be assumed only over a period of many decades, if ever; and

Whereas President Kennedy in his historic message to Congress proposed a new program to combat mental illness and retardation, wherein the Federal Government will provide, for a limited number of years, "seed" money for initial construction and initial staffing of comprehensive community mental health centers on a matching basis with counties, cities, and States, with control at the local level; and

Whereas the counties, financially hard-pressed as they are to support a wide range of necessary services, recognize at the same time that the care of their mentally ill and retarded citizens is principally a State, local, and private obligation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Counties endorses, and urges early passage this year, of President Kennedy's program, which will help get underway, at local levels, facilities for effective treatment of the mentally ill and retarded, by providing 4 years of Federal-State matching fund assistance in construction of community mental health and retardation centers and 5 years of assistance in staffing the centers with the minimum necessary trained personnel.

(Adopted Denver, Colo., July 31, 1963.)

Budget Deficits Worsen Balance-of-Payments Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, little attention has been paid to the role played by Federal budget deficits in aggravating our balance-of-payments problem. The relationship between these deficits and our payments outflow has now been pinpointed, however, in an editorial in the August 1 edition of the Wall Street Journal.

The Journal points out that the budget deficits totaling $30 billion in 5 of the past 6 years are, to a large degree, responsible for the balance-of-payments troubles we are now experiencing.

Ironically, the money created to finance the Federal deficits has not had a severe inflationary effect in the United States because it has been spent or invested abroad. According to the Journal, deficit financing has thus worsened our balance of payments and, at the same time, stimulated business in foreign countries.

The Journal concludes that the solution lies in eliminating the budget deficits. By dampening inflationary pressures, such a policy would improve the competitive position of the United States, increase confidence in the dollar, and thus help stem the gold flow.

Under unanimous consent I include this editorial from the Wall Street Journal in the RECORD:

RIGHT FOR THE WRONG REASONS

Our balance-of-payments deficit is limiting U.S. employment, according to a study by the Brookings Institution. There's a lot to be said for that conclusion, though the reasons are not the ones that the private research organization advances.

The Brookings report, prepared at the request of the Government, finds the payments deficit highly annoying as a restraint on growth at home. Because we are so consistently shipping more money abroad than foreigners are spending and investing here, the report says, the Government cannot take the steps it should take to stimulate the domestic economy. That view is shared by Federal economists.

"The expansionary fiscal policy needed to restore high employment has been delayed and make more difficult to achieve," the Brookings study argues, "by fears that expansion would make the balance of payments worse." The same fears, the study continues, have inhibited the easing of money needed to "promote high domestic investment and growth."

One problem raised by these views involves a definition of terms. How expansionist do we have to be to satisfy some economists?

In 5 of the past 6 years we have had sizable budget deficits, totaling more than $30 billion, and the deficit for the current fiscal year is forecast at close to another $12 billion. Is this really a picture of a Nation exercising what the Brookings group calls budget restraint?

As for monetary policy, the Federal Reserve System for 3 years now, through recession and recovery, has been seeing to it that the commercial banks have more funds than they are able to lend. Even the recent rise in the Federal Reserve discount rate, traditionally a signal for somewhat tighter money, was accompanied by assurances that lendable funds would remain plentiful. Is this really a portrait of monetary restraint?

Obviously, however, the Brookings group believes that we have not been unrestrained enough since the economy's growth rate has not come up to the administration's objectives. So the researchers clearly favor bigger doses of the same medicine that has failed us in the past—not only in recent years but during the depression thirties.

If there is no historical support for the argument that even bigger budget deficits and even easier money will send the economy sailing into the stratosphere, there is a great deal of support for the belief that such policies would worsen the balance-of-payments deficit. For the relatively milder doses we've been taking largely explain the troubles we already have.

Much of the deficit of the past half dozen years has been financed by borrowing from the commercial banking system—in effect, by creating new money. One reason this new money has not led to sharp inflationary pressure is that much of it has gone into spending and investing overseas—by Government, by business, by individuals. Oversea investments have been especially attractive to private Americans because artificially easy money in the United States has kept interest rates lower here than abroad.

All this has not only worsened our balance of payments but has had a further ironic effect. Increasing U.S. spending and investment abroad has inevitably added to employment overseas. By making investment relatively less attractive at home, we have just as surely put a checkrein on the expansion of the domestic economy. Thus in our efforts to stimulate U.S. business we have done a good job of stimulating business in foreign countries.

So the Brookings Institution is quite right, though for wrong reasons, when it says that the payments deficit is having an adverse effect on U.S. employment. The answer is not to try to keep the effects of Federal budget deficits at home; the answer is to stop running the deficits. Only with sensible economic policies can there be much hope for solid growth at home or abroad.

First Negro Police Chief Will Attend FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of calling my colleagues' attention to the fact that a constituent of mine is the first of his race to attend the FBI National Academy as a police chief.

It is doubly an honor not only because Ted Wilburn is a constituent of mine but, in addition thereto, I have had the privilege of knowing and working with Ted for a number of years. He is an extremely intelligent and earnest young man. He has distinguished himself by his conscientious application to his work and he commands the highest respect among the citizens of Portsmouth because of his integrity and dedication to duty. He has indeed brought honor to the Negro race. I, too, join the citizens of Portsmouth in congratulating Ted on his invitation to attend the National Academy and wish to include in my remarks an article apearing in the Butler County American, Hamilton, Ohio, on July 13, 1963:

FIRST NEGRO POLICE CHIEF WILL ATTEND FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has invited Theodore Wilburn, Jr., chief of police, Portsmouth, Ohio, to attend the FBI National Academy commencing August 19, 1963.

Wilburn will be the first Negro chief of police to attend the "West Point of law enforcement" by which name the FBI National Academy is commonly known. There have been other Negroes but no Negro chiefs.

Approximately 29 percent of the graduates of the FBI National Academy are the heads of their respective law enforcement agencies. The FBI National Academy is designed to train police executives and police instructors. Attendance is avidly sought. There is a long waiting list.

Chief Wilburn has in a short time distinguished himself as a police executive. He is a career policeman and formerly lived in Cincinnati.

He was named police chief at Portsmouth, Ohio, December 4, 1962, based on a competitive civil service examination in which he was the top candidate. His meritorious achievement was stimulating to FBI, which is a merit organization.

The appointment of Chief Wilburn is interesting inasmuch as Portsmouth, an important Ohio city, has a population of approximately 34,000 people of which less than 5,000 are Negroes.

Chief Wilburn heads up a 57-man police department and capitalizes upon his 10 years of police experience to do an effective job. He is looking forward to his attendance at the FBI National Academy as a means of providing him with additional executive background. The FBI is looking forward to his attendance, having already had substantial, close, and harmonious experiences with Chief Wilburn in the law enforcement field. Chief Wilburn and the FBI have worked bank robberies and other cases together. He has attended local FBI training schools under the auspices of the Cincinnati FBI Division.

Ed Mason, Special Agent in Charge of the Cincinnati FBI Division, who has had the closest personal friendship with Chief Wilburn, regards him as a perfect example of a dedicated career police executive whose only objective is effecitve service to the people of his community.

Chief Wilburn, 36, resides with his wife June at 1033 15th Street, Portsmouth, Ohio.

In his off hours Chief Wilburn enjoys music. Prior to becoming chief he performed as a drummer in a dance band on a part-time basis and thus supplemented his income, but gave up these professional activities in order to concentrate exclusively on improving his police department.

Even so, he relaxes with the drums at home, occasionally, in between his Boy Scout work, his services as a member of Allen Chapel AME Church, and his evening study at the Portsmouth Branch of Ohio University where he is endeavoring to secure a degree.

He has previously been graduated from the Portsmouth Interstate Business College, Hughes High School of Cincinnati, and has had prior military service in the U.S. Navy.

Chief Wilburn's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Wilburn, Sr., reside at 3739 Dirr Street, Cincinnati. A brother and a sister are also Cincinnati residents.

Conservatism: Its Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we hear many definitions as to what constitutes a liberal or a conservative. I think the Members of the House will find interesting the observations on this subject of my friend, Cal Waldron, and attorney and poet of Minot, N. Dak.

Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Waldron's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONSERVATISM: ITS MEANING

I'm getting awfully sick of listening to the bunco-boys of the fuzzy brigade of nothing beats liberalism, who deplore, demean, malign, castigate, and flay the conservative.

The unreasoning aplomb with which they suavely and sometimes viciously, shoot off their popguns, poisoned verbal shafts, bilious blast and mouths is in itself a revelation as to what these carping harpies stand for. They have declared a war to the death against thrift. "Economy" raises their blood pressure. The nothing-beats-liberalism disciple is always talking about "the broad view." He assumes the status expert in the field of giveaway. He brushes off the declining gold standard and the 300-plus-billion national debt as mere bagatelles of unimportance as compared to his theories of internationalism. He never misses a chance at harpooning anything and everything designed to effect national stability.

So let us look at what is wrong with conservatism. Let's get down to some bedrock definitions so we can clear away the bushy-haired buncomb of the "lap it up" liberal and take a look-see at some down-to-earth plain unvarnished deductions.

A conservative is one who believes it is good to learn early in life the lesson of "paying as you go" and going under his own power.

A conservative believes there is virtue in conserving, in thrift, in economy; he does not want his own assets or that of his neighbor dissipated. He knows that if he cannot support himself and his family, he is an unwholesome drag on his fellow man. He never asks something for nothing and he believes in giving value received.

He believes in making his own way in the world, and, in so doing, he expects the same attitude from those who surround him.

He believes in the principal that produced the unparalleled system of American initiative and effort. He not only conserves himself, he takes pleasure in seeing others improve their fortunes.

Waste appalls him. Inefficiency disturbs him. Debts cause him acute discomfort. Paying his way preserves his pride and gives him the feeling of self-reliance, resourcefulness, and responsibility.

The conservative is the salt of the earth and when he dies, he leaves accomplishment and integrity that others may, with good conscience, emulate.

So tell me what is wrong with being a conservative. If you are a conservative, you will admire the conservative. If, on the other hand, you are a guy looking for a swift buck and no worries or a "let George do it" or "let the government figure it out" sort of duck, you won't see much good in the guy who actually makes it possible that your spendthrift ways do not bankrupt the country.

A liberal is invariably liberal with the money, the property, and the effects of others. This virtue does not extend to his own. He schemes to get at the money, property, and effects of others by having it appropriated through quasi-legal means and then by participating in spending it. The liberal wants the conservative to put up the dough so that the liberal can declare to himself out of the public trough an interest in the whole.

The conservative furnishes the doughnut; the liberal furnishes the hole.

So why castigate the conservative? Why lambaste him? If it were not for his conservatism the liberal would starve to death.

So we listen to the drivel of liberals who specialize in describing conservatism as right wingers or Birchers or Fascists or something else less complimentary.

What's wrong with being a conservative?

The liberal is always trying to raise hell with the country he won't work for; he doesn't believe too deeply in its system. He likes to toy with something different. He is always trying to raise hell with the conservative who made the country possible.

It may be good that the liberal can raise something. As conservatives we can hope that he will ultimately and deservedly abide in the one thing he raises so often and so well.

Bootleg Truckers Flourish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on H.R. 4700, it developed that one of the reasons why the

regulated carriers were losing so much traffic is because that same traffic is moved by unregulated and independent motor carriers.

Unless this traffic can be directed to the regulated carriers we cannot build up in this country a satisfactory transportation system.

The Committee Against Unlawful Transportation has prepared the following article entitled "Bootleg Truckers Flourish," which appeared in the July 8 issue of Railway Age:

BOOTLEG TRUCKERS FLOURISH

Sometime this summer, enforcement officials in 40 States will throw roadblocks across major U.S. highways. The purpose: to furnish regulatory commissions with up-to-date information on the activities of the Nation's No. 1 lawbreaker—the bootleg trucker.

This multistate roadblock will be the latest effort in a nationwide drive to curb modern highwaymen who are stealing billions of tons of freight every year from railroads and regulated truckers.

Actual figures on how much traffic is being taken from regulated carriers by so-called gypsy truckers engaged in illegal buy-and-sell or phony leasing arrangements are hard to come by. But, according to the Committee on Transportation Practices, which has gained considerable experience in the field—

Between 5,000 and 30,000 trucks move illegally along the Nation's highways each day.

One out of every four trucks moving in intercity transportation is in violation of either Federal or State regulations.

Bootleg truckers are violating Federal laws once every 17 seconds, or seven times every 2 minutes, night and day. This tops the Federal Bureau of Investigation's timeclock, which ticks off one robbery of $50 every 6 minutes. And the bootleg trucker is doing considerably better than the upper-story man, since the average take on a truckload of stolen traffic is between $400 and $450, while the average burglary nets only $187.

How much are the bootleggers costing the common carriers? No one knows for sure, but the available figures make one thing clear: For many carriers, elimination of the bootlegger would make the difference between a profitable and an unprofitable operation.

ICC estimated $800 million loss. The Interstate Commerce Commission's definitive 1960 study—"The Gray Area of Transportation Operations"—estimated that illegal truckers move some 11.5 billion ton-miles of traffic a year, amounting to a loss of over $800 million annually in freight revenues to the common carriers.

Last year, the National Conference of State Transportation Specialists, which will conduct the 40-State roadblock this summer, set up roadblocks in 20 States. In 11 of these States the roadblocks were manned on an around-the-clock basis for 7 days. The results of this sampling indicate that between 26 and 29 percent of all trucks in intercity haulage are operating illegally; that they are moving as much as 35 billion ton-miles of freight a year, costing the common carriers in the neighborhood of $2.5 billion.

Other estimates go higher. For example, W. Maurice Buttram, director of the Arkansas Commerce Commission and a veteran of over 30 years in State enforcement, thinks that the bootleggers are siphoning off as much as $5 billion a year in freight revenues from the regulated carriers.

RAILROAD LOSS IS $500 MILLION

Even taking the lowest estimates, it is fairly safe to assume that the railroads alone are losing close to $500 million a year to illegal truckers. The growth of this gray area transportation has undoubtedly been a major factor in the railroads' decline from 1930, when they handled 74 percent of total intercity freight, to 1962's figure, which was close to 40 percent.

Effect of the war: The bootleg trucker got his biggest boost during World War II when transportation of any type was difficult to obtain. Because transport was short there was considerable leniency toward anyone who had a truck available to move a load. Since then, with little tightening up of enforcement machinery, the bootlegger has continued to flourish.

Today, gray area operators are legion. They vary in size from the single have-truck-will-travel type to large operators leasing drivers and equipment in quantity.

They all have one thing in common. They seek out areas of transportation that are exempted from or excluded from regulation and stretch these provisions far beyond their original and legitimate meaning. More often than not, their activities are directly illegal.

For each load, a new name: In Illinois, for example, agents found one trucker, clearly engaged in the transportation of regulated commodities without a certificate, who used washable paint to put a new name on the door of his truck for each load he hauled. When caught, he was hauling a load of farm machinery with the name of the manufacturer proudly displayed on the truck.

A large share of illegal truck traffic moves via buy-and-sell operations. The trucker supposedly purchases the goods he transports and sells them at his destination, purporting to be a private carrier since he can claim ownership of the goods while in transit.

Obviously phony operations of this sort can easily be spotted by alert enforcement officials like the one who recently stopped a truck hauling a load of razors and razor blades worth some $5,500. The driver claimed he was hauling his own goods, but could produce cash resources of only 30 cents and was badly in need of a shave.

Temptation is strong: There is, of course, nothing illegitimate about bona fide private carriers or haulers of exempt commodities—that is, nothing illegal so long as they confine themselves to the activities permitted under the Interstate Commerce Act. But the temptation for an exempt trucker who may be hauling a load of Georgia peaches to the New York market to pick up a few bucks on the back haul is often too strong to resist.

When a Federal inspector in Georgia, for example, stopped a refrigerated truck, the driver promptly produced a paper showing his load consisted of fresh vegetables—an exempt commodity. But when the inspector looked inside the truck he found bathtubs.

In Kentucky, another trucker iced down a load of steel in an effort to get by inspectors. When caught, the authorities found that he had covered the steel with a layer of straw and then a coating of ice to make it appear that he was hauling vegetables.

Illegal leasing: According to the ICC study, illegal leasing arrangements account for the largest number of violations—about 45 percent. These are often complicated and difficult to detect, but usually involve the subterfuge leasing of drivers and vehicles to shippers to create the appearance of private carriage.

Buy and sell operations account for roughly 21 percent of illegal trucking activities, with exempt carriers transporting regulated commodities another 12 percent. Most of the remaining violations usually fall into such categories as intercity carriers operating beyond the territorial scope of their operating authority, local cartage firms who engage in a little stealthy intercity hauling, of brokers who furnish loads to carriers under an array of illegal practices.

The difficulties in curbing gray area truckers are inherently regulatory in nature.

"An examination of the regulatory policies applicable to motor carriers," says Commissioner Foster Ockerman, of the Kentucky Department of Motor Transportation, "provides an insight into our difficulties. Except for safety regulations, less than 15 percent of all intercity motor carriers are subject to direct regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These unregulated carriers are responsible for over two-thirds of the intercity ton-miles operated by motor carriers, and the percentage of purely intrastate commerce attributable to the unregulated carrier is even higher."

ICC steps up activities: Despite a pitifully small enforcement staff, the ICC's stepped-up program against illegal truckers is continuing at an accelerated pace with special emphasis on gray area operations. During the 12-month period ending last April 30, the ICC handled 895 court cases against illegal carriers. Over 50 percent—451, to be exact—involved gray area operations: unauthorized transportation, 258; the subterfuge of leasing vehicles to shippers to create the appearance of private carriage, 152; subterfuge buy and sell operations to create the apperance of private carriage, 9; subterfuge operations engaged in by shippers associations and alleged agricultural cooperatives, 10; concessions and rebate cases, 22.

The Commission's efforts are being actively supported by two organizations which are waging war against unlawful trucking activities—the Committee on Transportation Practices (COTP) and the Committee Against Unlawful Trucking (CAUT).

CAUT, which was set up by the Transportation Association of America, is a broad-based grouping of major interests in transportation, including various railroad associations. Basically, it functions as an information service to the public, shipper, and regulatory bodies on illegal transportation.

COTP, on the other hand, is a motor carrier action group set up by the Regular Common Carrier Conference, the National Motor Freight Traffic Association and the Common Carrier Conference—Irregular Route.

COTP, with a staff of 4 investigators and 4 attorneys has so far filed 33 cases with the ICC naming over 1,000 defendants as violators of the Interstate Commerce Act. The majority of the cases have involved shippers' associations or shippers' agents purporting to come under the exemptions of the act.

Big victory: COTP's most important victory to date came in a decision handed down by the ICC's Division 1 after hearing COTP's case against the Atlanta Shippers Association. The decision, which set forth basic principles for determining the exclusionary provisions of section 402(c)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, held, in essence, that a corporation, as the term is commonly understood, may not lawfully act as a bona fide shippers' association. This ruling had subsequently been applied in other cases involving unlawful operations by shippers' associations.

Considerable progress has been made in stepping up enforcement against illegal truckers at the State level in recent years. Oregon, for example, has set up a special committee which furnishes forms to drivers of legitimate carriers which are filled out and sent in to the Oregon Public Utility Commission when illegal operations are spotted. When sufficient evidence has been gathered the case is turned over to the ICC for prosecution.

In Kentucky one department—the department of motor transportation—now controls the issuance of operating authority in intrastate commerce, the granting of reciprocity rights, registration and licensing of all commercial vehicles, the administration of special truck taxes and safety and enforcement activities. In addition to licensing carriers based in Kentucky, the State now requires all motor vehicles engaged in for-hire carriage and all trucks with three

axles or more operated by private carriers to qualify with the department to obtain an identification cab card for each truck in the name of the operator.

Texas has organized a transportation league which is working for improved legislation dealing with the definition of private carriage and leasing activities. Idaho now has a law requiring registration of interstate authority by truck operators, and similar bills are pending in the Iowa and Minnesota legislatures. Both Arizona and Montana have stepped up enforcement activities against illegal truckers, and Illinois has adopted new leasing regulations and amended laws dealing with strengthening rules against so-called casual or one-shot transportation arrangements.

But the picture in other States is less encouraging. New Jersey has no motor carrier law at all. Main, Vermont, and Connecticut have legislation on the books against illegal carriage but no enforcement staffs. And there is little or no effort to curb illegal trucking in New York, California or Pennsylvania.

As a minimum, COTP believes every State should have—

A law requiring registration of all carriers operating over its highways.

Adequate laws and regulations covering the leasing of equipment.

An adequate inspection force with the power of arrest.

SIXTEEN KEY STATES

COTP says that 16 key States, if they had the necessary laws and a practical enforcement program, could virtually eliminate illegal trucking. COTP's 16 States, based on strategic location, population, manufacturing, truck registration, and the Interstate Highway System, are California, Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming.

With some modification in their laws, four of these States—Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi—could stop a large percentage of coast-to-coast operations. Two States—Kentucky and Virginia—are the key to breaking up the bulk of the North-South illegal operations.

As the crackdown on illegal trucking continues, more and more shippers are finding themselves involved. Of the 451 gray area cases prosecuted over the past year, shippers were included as defendants in 103.

Safety violations: A trucker involved in illegal operations to begin with, is not likely to pay any more attention to safety regulations than he pays to the ICC's economic regulations. In scattered road checks, State enforcement officials have found that about 80 percent of motor vehicle safety violations can be attributed to unregulated carriers. And shippers are becoming increasingly liable for the damages.

Some time ago in New Jersey, for example, a gypsy trucker who had allegedly been on the road for 36 hours without sleep, plowed into a bus. One of the passengers who was injured promptly brought a $1 million damage suit against the trucker, the shipper association which had leased his services and the shipper members of the association charging that the shippers' association was transporting manufactured goods over the highways without authority from the ICC or the Georgia Public Service Commission.

At issue in the case, which is now before the courts, is whether or not the shippers who are members of so-called nonprofit shippers' associations are liable for the torts of that association. A ruling against the defendants in this case could be a major milestone in the fight against illegal trucking.

Short-term benefits: Actually, traffic managers who use illegal carriers usually get only short-term benefits, ignore the fact that the unlawful diversion of traffic from regulated carriers will force rates upward and curtail the services of common carriers.

"I believe," says ICC Commissioner Rupert Murphy, "that a significant contribution toward curtailing illegal operations could be made by informed shippers taking simple precautions to avoid contributing to the schemes and devices held out to them as a means to legalize that which is unlawful.

"The shipper has full discretion to employ or not to employ one who offers carrier service or to accept or reject questionable leasing or buy-and-sell arrangements. A shipper who makes no inquiry about operating authority before tendering goods for transportation or who enters into a leasing or buy-and-sell arrangement may be aiding and abetting unlawful activities.

"A shipper who does not select the carrier," continues Mr. Murphy, "is in a somewhat different position. But he has warning of unlawful operation if:

"The vehicle which arrives to pick up the load has no permanent markings of the name of the buyer on it.

"The vehicle is registered in a name other than that of the customer.

"The driver cannot definitely identify himself as a regular employee of the customer."

A Plan To Free Cuba and To Save America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most informed persons on the situation in Cuba is my good friend and former member of the U.S. Senate, William F. Knowland. In light of the fact that this body debated the Cuban situation for 2 hours last Monday, I feel it timely that I insert into the RECORD one of Senator Knowland's recent speeches. I am sure that the other Members of the House will be as interested in the Senator's comments as I was.

The speech:

A PLAN TO FREE CUBA AND TO SAVE AMERICA

(By Hon. William F. Knowland)

Ninety miles from our shores there is a Soviet base in Cuba. We have had a vacillating policy relative to Castro. We have at one time or another encouraged him, tried to ignore him, entertained him, encouraged and failed to support an invasion against him, paid him ransom and tribute of millions of dollars in cash and supplies to release the Bay of Pigs prisoners, subverted our own judicial and legal processes by releasing Cuban criminals and gunmen in exchange for American citizens held in Cuban prisons.

In dealing with the Soviet base in Cuba, we marched up the hill last October and since then have marched most of the way down again.

The strong stand of the President last October, which had the support of a united Congress, widespread public approval, the wholehearted support of our Latin America States and the backing of our NATO allies, has been frittered away.

Khrushchev was not prepared for a showdown 90 miles from our bases and 5,000 miles from his. He may be in the future when his Cuban bases are augmented by others. Despite the Monroe Doctrine, that foreign bases in the Western Hemisphere would be contrary to our vital national interests, the Soviet Union challenged us in our own back yard.

During the October exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev, the latter had suggested that we get our missiles out of Turkey and Italy in exchange for his getting Soviet missiles out of Cuba. Our Government denied then and denies now any such deal, but without advance consultation and agreement with our allied Italian and Turkish Governments, we have taken our missiles out of those two countries.

Was it historic coincidence or was it a deal with Khrushchev? I don't know. Senators of both parties with whom I discussed it in Washington don't know.

Have we become so much a captive of the "peace at any price" and "better Red than dead" philosophy that we are prepared to surrender bit by bit and piece by piece under constant nibbling tactics of the Soviet Union?

Last October, along with millions of other Americans, I supported what I then thought was the firm leadership of President Kennedy. From that high point where President Kennedy appeared to be functioning in the Theodore Roosevelt tradition, we have been brushing Castro's beard with a feather duster.

Last October we demanded the removal of the missiles and on-the-ground inspection to see that this was carried out. Though history is replete with examples that the word of the Soviet Union is not worth the paper on which it is given, we backed down from our on-the-ground inspection requirement and, without boarding their ships to inspect, took the word of the Soviet Union that the canvas-covered objects on deck were, indeed, all of the missiles going back to the Soviet Union from Cuba.

How naive can we be? We did not insist on the immediate withdrawal from Cuba of all Soviet armed forces, though these, as well as the missiles, were there contrary to the Monroe Doctrine and the Rio Pact.

An Assistant Secretary of Defense, Arthur Sylvester, has enunciated the doctrine of "the right to lie" to the American people. He has not to this date been repudiated by either Secretary of Defense McNamara or by the President of the United States.

Now, this is not refusing to comment, nor declining to give out a press release on inquiry by the press, the "right to lie" is deliberately misleading the American people.

The administration has not escaped the penalty of such a policy. Millions of Americans today no longer know when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth. I sincerely regret this for if ever the people were ever in need of confidence in their Government, it is when we face the menace of international communism.

AMERICAN PEOPLE KEPT IN DARK ABOUT MISSILE BUILDUP

Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, had more accurate information on Cuban missile bases than the administration—weeks in advance of October 22. At least, the Defense Department was denying their existence until the President's speech to the country.

Why? The Cubans knew the missiles were there—they had imported them. The Soviet Union knew they were there because they had supplied them. Only the American people were deceived, and they were the ones at whom the missiles were pointed.

Monday afternoon, October 22, the President discussed for the first time the proof of Soviet missile bases in Cuba. But, weeks earlier, Members of the Senate and House of both political parties pointed out that Soviet missile bases were in Cuba.

On September 17, 1961, at the Los Angeles Rotary Club, as a private citizen, I

said, "The buildup of missile bases in Cuba, 90 miles from our shores, is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine."

In April, President Kennedy in his press conference said that about 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn from Cuba. This still left from 12,000 to 13,000 Soviet troops in Cuba, even if the 4,000 were a net withdrawal. But, Senator KEATING states that approximately 3,000 to 4,000 have been sent to Cuba while the others were being withdrawn. These facts have also been revealed by a report released by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

Now, this is not a partisan question. I have recently spent several days in Washington, and Democrat as well as Republican members of the House and Senate are deeply troubled over Cuban policy, or a lack of one.

The answer one gets from the "whiz kids," whose advice finds its way to the President is: "Would you have this country invade Cuba and risk the danger of all-out war?" They try to slam the door on congressional and public discussion, while at the same time spoon-feeding the public only what the want the public to know.

On this I do not believe they will be successful. A great debate is now under way in every crossroad, village and town in America. It will spread until we have an American policy that is sound and defensible and understandable.

Now, let me tell you what it should not be before I give you my views on what it should be:

1. It will not pay extortion nor permit the payment of ransom to any nation, Communist or otherwise.

2. It will not torpedo the Monroe Doctrine as a basic cornerstone of American policy.

3. It will not be founded upon lies, half-truths or news blackouts in order to make it swallowable by the American people

Recognizing that there are risks involved in any policy that we follow other than complete surrender or appeasement, which is a form of surrender on the installment plan, I would be prepared to take whatever risks would be involved for my country, for my family and for myself.

Our general worldwide guideline to our State Department and our Foreign Service should be: the U.S. Government and the American people are dedicated to human freedom. What advances it, we will support and what undermines or destroys it, we will oppose. In support of this general directive the Government of the United States will examine the facts and then take whatever steps our national interests require.

Now, to the specific Cuban cancer:

1. The President should proclaim that the Monroe Doctrine has been reestablished as a keystone of American policy in the Western Hemisphere.

2. The President should address a private letter to Mr. Khrushchev stating that the continuation of Soviet forces in Cuba is in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and that in the interest of our mutual desire to maintain the peace of the world, they should be withdrawn.

3. If a completely satisfactory reply is not received by the President, he should ask to speak to a joint session of the House and Senate. At this session he should ask the Congress for a joint resolution in support of the President to secure the removal of every Soviet soldier from Cuba. He should request legislation permitting the immediate recruitment, equipment, and training of a freedom volunteer corps.

I believe many more Americans would make their contributions to such a corps than contributed to the blackmail, ransom, tax-free donations of last year.

A PLAN OF ACTION TO OUST COMMUNISM FROM CUBA

If Khrushchev is not cooperative, the policy should be:

1. Joint action by all the Western Hemisphere countries, or as many as will cooperate, notifying the Soviet Union that if all such troops and their equipment are not out of Cuba by a stated date, that all Soviet embassies will be closed and all diplomatic relations will be suspended with the Soviet Union until such troops are withdrawn.

2. The placing of U.S. air, naval, and ground forces on an alert basis at least equal to that which existed in late October of 1962.

3. If the Soviet forces are not withdrawn by a specified date, pursuant to paragraph 1, a joint blockade, both sea and air, to cut off all shipments to Cuba, except for food and medical supplies.

4. If the Soviet forces are not fully withdrawn, the United States should encourage the creation of a freedom corps, air and ground.

This should be open to free Cubans, Hungarian freedom fighters, members of U.S. Reserve units who could volunteer without losing their retirement and other rights, veterans of Polish, Czechoslovak World War II forces, volunteers from trained units of free Chinese and free Korean forces, and any other experienced fighters who are prepared to strike a blow for freedom. The plane cover would be flown by experienced combat fliers like Chennault's Flying Tiger volunteers in China.

Since these would be volunteers, and since the use of Chinese Communist volunteers at the time of the Korean war were not looked upon by the United Nations as being a Casus Belli of the Chinese Communist regime, we have ample precedent and quotable quotes for any who might feel called upon to object at the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Such volunteers would be adequately equipped with air, ground, and naval forces to make decisive landings and/or feints simultaneously along the Cuban coast.

The international banner of such a group might well be a torch of freedom that is held aloft from the Statue of Liberty and has been an inspiration to men and women who love freedom everywhere.

5. Notice should be served, following the removal of Castro and the Soviet forces that a trusteeship will be established under the Organization of American States until free elections could be held by the Cuban people.

6. U.S. ground, naval, and air forces would not be used unless the Soviet Union attempts to reinforce its garrison or commit a hostile act against the United States or its allies.

This I would call a progressive squeeze policy to offset the Communist nibbling process.

Of course, risks are involved. But, if the signers of the Declaration of Independence had not taken risks, we would not be here now. Risks have been taken through all our history to gain, to preserve, and to protect our way of life. The risk of doing nothing is in my judgment far greater to our ultimate survival.

Somewhere, somehow, at some time, the right place must be found for the free world to say to communism: "You have gone far enough," and for Americans to say: "Indeed, you have gone too far when you have established your bases 90 miles from our shores."

Federal Statistical Directory Provides Ready Reference to Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the 19th edition of the Federal Statistical Directory was published by the Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget. According to its foreword:

The Federal Statistical Directory is designed to serve as a guide to facilitate communication with offices concerned with particular statistical functions. It lists, by organizational units within each agency, the names, office addresses, and telephone numbers of professional, technical, and administrative personnel associated with statistical and related activities of agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recommend this directory as a document of considerable value for congressional offices. It contains vital information and is most useful for all research projects.

In an exchange of letters with the Joint Committee on Printing, I requested that each Congressman's and Senator's office receive a copy, and it is my understanding that these have been distributed.

Remarks of Dr. Enrique Llaca at the National Draft Goldwater Rally on July 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the remarks of Dr. Enrique Llaca, which he made at the national draft Goldwater rally on July 4. Dr. Llaca is a Cuban freedom fighter and a veteran of the Bay of Pigs invasion:

As Mr. O'Donnell has told you, I am not an American citizen. I am a Cuban. You may ask, "Why are you here before an American rally for a man who is being asked to seek the Presidency of the United States?"

I believe with all my heart that the future freedom of my fellow Cubans, as well as the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, depends on the kind of leadership which will be provided by this country in 1964.

More than that, I believe the future freedom of the people of this country is in jeopardy. I want to testify from personal experience how easy it is to lose freedom and how difficult it is to regain. Truly, one blow to save freedom is better than a million to win it back.

I know these things from bitter experience. I saw Cuba ravished by communism, when I was sure it could not happen in my country. Communism reaches its evil goals by deceiving the people into thinking they are going to live in Utopia.

Americans, be on guard. When we lost our freedom in Cuba, I vowed to fight to regain it, and I joined the Cuban freedom fighters. With the promise of support from the U.S. Government, we landed at the Bay of Pigs. At the crucial hour the air cover we were promised was withdrawn, and we were betrayed.

As a result of that betrayal, many of my comrades in arms died, and the rest of us were thrown in a Communist prison. I was released because of ransom paid to Castro by the U.S. Government. But mark this well, there will be no one left to pay your ransom, no one left to come to your rescue. There will be no second chance for Americans.

America is the last hope for freemen. Should America fail, freedom fails everywhere.

The years of struggle which brought so much suffering will not be in vain if the United States learns it must provide leadership that will not vacillate, that will not equivocate, that will not accommodate our sworn enemy.

To the defense of the traditions and values Americans cherish, we Cubans are committed. One of the great tragedies of the free world is the fact that our struggle for a free Cuba is laboring under conditions that greatly benefit the Communists. While Khrushchev sends Castro tons of modern weapons and economic aid to keep his regime going, the Kennedy administration clamped down on the Cuban freedom fighters.

Instead of blocking the stream of Soviet arms which continue to flow into Cuba and the Western Hemisphere in defiance of the Inter-American Treaties and the Monroe Doctrine, your present administration established a new blockade to protect the enemy and persecute our freedom forces in international waters.

But let me make it clear, if the leaders of the West are preparing a new Munich without taking into consideration the Cuban peoples' right to freedom; if the present leaders of the free world are secretly negotiating a false, precarious peace, implemented by enemy propaganda, let them know—let them know—they will only swell to giant proportions the heroic resistance of my people and the freedom loving people throughout the Americas.

Fortunately, we are not alone in this struggle. There are still leaders like Senator GOLDWATER, who has from the beginning stood by Cubans in their struggle to liberate our country from Communist oppression. Before, during, and after the Bay of Pigs invasion, Senator GOLDWATER has stood resolutely on his belief that a man does not deserve freedom for himself unless he is willing to fight for the freedom of others. He knows that the struggle to liberate Cuba is at the same time a struggle for a free America, and he knows that to restrict any man's fight to regain his freedom is a blow against freedom everywhere.

Let all Americans remember on this Independence Day that the liberation of Cuba means a vital step toward fulfillment of the God-given destiny of this great Nation, to help all peoples of the world to obtain and preserve the ideal goals of independence, the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

West Paterson, N.J.: A 50th Anniversary Salute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, 14 communities make up the Eighth District of New Jersey which I have the honor to represent in this body. One of these, West Paterson, is now observing the golden jubilee of its establishment.

The assembly of a dozen dedicated citizens in November 1912 led to the incorporation of the Borough of West Paterson by the New Jersey Legislature on March 25, 1941. Ratification by the voters of West Paterson followed on May 26 of the same year.

Garret Mountain Reservation, an expanse of 450 acres, is located in this municipality of 8,000 inhabitants. The borough is nearly 3 square miles in area at a latitude of north 40 degrees 53 minutes and longitude of west 74 degrees 10 minutes.

The borough has adjusted to the increasing tempo of the 20th century, and has thriving modern industrial plants in addition to its many dwellings. The homes in West Paterson, although not luxurious, are proud symbols of the American economic system.

West Paterson is a typical American town which takes great satisfaction in its institutions. It is grateful for its churchs, its schools, and its volunteer fire department.

Mr. Speaker, our beloved Nation can only be as strong as the thousands of municipalities of which it is composed. West Paterson is one of these sources of national strength and growth. We salute it on its 50th birthday and wish it many more years of progress in a free and peaceful United States.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3211.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HARLINGEN, TEX.,
July 3, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Though I am not in your district, I want to wholeheartedly commend you and encourage you in your efforts to push through House Resolution 14, the resolution asking for a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I believe this to be very necessary.

Let us have this committee which will make known the oppression, the hopelessness and the true facts of life within the captive nations.

Why the administration is bending every effort to soft-pedal and cover up the evils of the Soviet is completely beyond my comprehension.

We are spending some $40 billion each year for defense against one self-declared enemy. This enemy has time and again stated to the world that they are going to overwhelm us.

If there is no danger from them—if they are not aggressive—if they do not intend to take us over—then we do not need to spend $40 billion a year in defense.

If the Soviet does constitute the greatest danger that we face today—if they are bent on world conquest—if they are using every possible means to overthrow the constitutional Government of the United States—then let us spend the $40 billion, and also let us name the enemy. Let us have the true picture of him. Let us see him as he stood in the Katyn Forest and let us take a good look at him as his tanks rolled by in Budapest.

The one comforting part of the picture is that there are a few men such as you in our Government who are not crawling around on their hands and knees and who are unashamedly pro-American.

Sincerely yours,

M. H. PERRY.

HAVERHILL, MASS.,
June 3, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Please accept our gratitude for your introducation of House Resolution 14–15.

As people much interested in captive countries, we commend you and we support your bill.

Very truly yours,

GRIGOR AVEDION.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
June 29, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please note pending resolution (H. Res. 14) on captive nations needs your utmost consideration. So please do all you can to make it a success. Your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you very much,

Yours truly,

JOHN VARNES.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., June 22, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am taking the liberty to write to you in behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America,

Inc., State branch of North Dakota, urging you to submit House Resolution 14 (Flood resolution) to a vote by your committee and at the same time we ask you to give it your favorable support and consideration.

As we wrote to you in regard to this resolution about a year ago, our people of North Dakota strongly believe that such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people as a whole. Especially now that Communist Russia has been supporting the cause of the so-called national liberation in Africa and Asia in order to spread communism in those areas. We, as a nation, are not doing enough to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations which constitute a tremendous weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We discussed this problem at our meetings and we strongly urge you to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) in your Rules Committee.

Thank you,

Respectfully yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President.

(Copy to Hon. DANIEL FLOOD, Member of Congress.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 25, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This letter is to urge quick action on House Resolution 14 concerning a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. America has too long neglected positive action in this area of exposing the Communist imperialists for what they are in regard to those whom they have enslaved.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA MURPHY.
CLAIRE M. NORTH.

Trial in the Rose Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly refreshing to find one of the Washington columnists who can diagnose the political plays which take place in the White House Rose Garden and at the same time have sufficient courage to write a column about them, such as the one by Mr. George Dixon which appeared in the Washington Post on August 5.

Mr. Dixon's column follows:

WASHINGTON SCENE: TRIAL IN THE ROSE GARDEN

(By George Dixon)

I try so hard not to grow cynical. I really try. But the more I try the more I'm tired. An anguishing trial, which I lost before the jury ever retired to deliberate, took place in the Rose Garden at the White House the other day.

I entered the famous garden as trusting and free from cynicism as Caroline, but departed with the soul-numbing realization that I'd been led down the garden path.

With all the outward trappings it should have been an occasion to stir my heart. The chivalry, if not the beauty, of the Pentagon was assembled on the greensward, resplendent with stars and gold braid. Also present was the Commander in Chief of America's Armed Forces resplendent in made-to-order civvies.

The Commander in Chief, a Mr. Kennedy, was flanked by a fine military figure of a man in a spotless white Navy uniform. This tall, handsome warrior could be mistaken for none other than Adm. George Anderson, retiring Chief of Naval Operations.

Staring at Admiral Anderson in what seemed to be rapt admiration was Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. My heart fluttered with emotion—which crescendoed into wild beating as Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth stepped forward and read the citation that went with the Distinguished Service Medal the President was about to bestow on Admiral Anderson.

As Secretary Korth described it, Admiral Anderson was a paragon of all the military virtues; a man without peer in the glorious history of our Navy. Korth made John Paul Jones, Admiral Perry and Admiral Farragut sound like untried draftees by comparison.

Lord Nelson never had such encomiums heaped upon him—certainly never in Jackie's rose garden.

"Admiral Anderson," proclaimed the Secretary of the Navy Korthily, "has displayed superb qualities of leadership * * * under his skillful and effective guidance * * * consummate knowledge and understanding * * * inspiring devotion * * * in the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

Korth hesitated just this side of describing Admiral Anderson as the greatest Chief of Naval Operations this country ever had.

President Kennedy said practically the same thing all over again as he pinned the medal on Anderson's illustrious chest. Throbbing with emotion, I stole a glance at Secretary McNamara. He seemed to be throbbing too.

I said to myself, my whole being uplifted:

"Isn't it indeed inspiring that Secretary McNamara now recognizes the superb qualities of leadership, consummate knowledge and understanding of Admiral Anderson? And it seems only yesterday the story, obviously a base canard, was going 'round the Pentagon that McNamara had insisted on Anderson being rooted because he disagreed with him on the TFX contract."

Then I nearly swooned with innocent childish fervor as President Kennedy told how great a Chief of Naval Operations Anderson had been "during the last 2 years, which have been very difficult, sometimes dangerous, always challenging."

You can never understand how my ardor was dashed when a misanthropic White House correspondent standing next to me muttered:

"Things were difficult, dangerous and challenging, all right. Anderson made things difficult for McNamara; McNamara became dangerous to Anderson; and Anderson got challenged."

It was as if I'd been basking in the beneficent sun, only to discover that it wasn't a healthy tan I was acquiring, but jaundice.

I stumbled blindly from the rose garden, heedless of the scratching thorns. Before merciful cynicism set in to numb my heavy heart, I blubbered:

"This paragon of naval paragons * * * this composite of all the great sea warriors of history * * * this superb and consummate leader. * * *

"This is the same poor guy they just fired."

Serra: 1713 and 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no chamber in this great Capitol is more replete with historical significance than Statuary Hall. There stand in honored glory the statues of those who have framed and molded the spiritual, military, social and political history of these United States. One among them I would like to cite for recognition by this body. The 250th anniversary of his birth is being commemorated this year. I refer, of course, to the immigrant Franciscan friar who left an inextinguishable mark on what is now the State of California, Father Junipero Serra.

Junipero Serra, the son of Margarita Ferrer and Antonio Serra, was born in Petra, Mallorca, on November 24, 1713. His baptismal name was Miguel José. He chose the name Junipero after completing his probationary period and upon making his religious profession shortly after entering the Franciscan Order at Palma on September 14, 1730. He was ordained a priest in St. Francis Friary in Palma.

Father Serra spent the early years of his priesthood studying and teaching. The recipient of the degree of doctor of theology from the Lullian University of Palma, he filled with distinction the post of instructor in philosophy and was also heralded as the area's finest preacher. But the friar's most brilliant service still lay ahead of him.

Sailing in 1749 with a group of Franciscans bound for the Apostolic College of San Fernando in Mexico City, he landed in Veracruz. He trudged on foot to Mexico City without provisions or guide and accompanied by only one companion, arriving on New Year's Day, 1750. Soon, Father Serra accepted a call to the wild and inhospitable region of the Sierra Gorda where he spent 9 years among the Indians. The next 8 years he spent in Mexico City as a preacher and confessor. In 1767, when the Franciscans replaced the Jesuits in lower California, Father Serra was sent as presidente to that region.

In 1769 he ventured forth again into a new field. The Franciscans agreed to cooperate with the government by founding missions in upper California. Five members of the order, with Serra as presidente, accompanied the military expedition of Gaspar de Portola as it moved northward. On July 16, 1769, they established the mission of San Diego, the first of 21 eventually set up on the California coast.

For the next 15 years the able, kindly friar toiled in California. Up and down the coast on foot he traveled, the guiding force that resulted in the successful occupation of what is now the State of California. During his presidency 9 missions were founded, more than 6,000 In-

dians were baptized and more than 5,000 were confirmed.

Equally remarkable was the material progress under the missions. Father Serra was the first to apply the science of irrigation in the area. He was the pioneer who revealed to the world the possibilities of California's fertile soil and favorable climate.

When just past 70, the earthly mission of Serra ended. He died in 1784 within the precincts of the Mission of San Carlos de Carmel near Monterey. His remains were interred in a quiet spot beneath the old arches.

But the spirit of Father Serra endures today, not simply confined to the tradition of California or to a dignified section of Statuary Hall but throughout a wide portion of the Western Hemisphere.

A movement known as Serra international began February 27, 1935, in Seattle, Wash. Over the years Serra clubs have been formed in the great majority of our States. All existing Serra clubs duly organized and chartered constitute Serra international. The Serra movement is international in scope, Catholic in emphasis and character, and democratic in practice. Catholic business and professional men compose the membership of the Serra clubs. The objectives of Serra international are to foster religious vocations and assist in the education of young men for the priesthood and to further Catholicism through enduring friendships among Catholic men.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House of Representatives that a chapter of Serra was organized in Paterson, N.J., in the late 1950's. Very Rev. Edward J. Scully, now pastor of Immaculate Heart of Mary R. C. Church, Wayne, is the chaplain. Joseph A. Abbott, a communications official and parishioner of St. Joseph's, Paterson, served as first president. He has been followed successively as president by Cyril W. Collins, trucking executive, St. Anthony's Hawthorne; James P. Evers attorney and college professor, St. Anthony's, Hawthorne; Edward J. Foster, businessman, St. Philip the Apostle, Clifton; and J. Joseph Simonelli, businessman, Holy Cross, Wayne.

I know that these leaders and their associates prefer silence to acclaim in the performance of their endeavors. However, in view of the significance of 1963 as the 250th anniversary of his birth, I merely want to pay a deserved tribute to Father Serra's missioners in my home city of Paterson, N.J.

Spotlight on Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union of July 30, 1963:

LET'S HEAR FROM MILITARY: SPOTLIGHT ON TEST BAN

We have heard the emotional and idealistic arguments in favor of the partial nuclear test ban treaty signed by the United States, England, and the Soviet Union. Now, let's hear the cold, realistic analysis that must be made.

Hearings will be conducted by the U.S. Senate, which must ratify the treaty by a two-thirds majority. In these hearings the Nation will have the benefit of the counsel of its military leaders who are entrusted with our security.

Not until then can the full military significance of this agreement be weighed. We may never know the full political significance—until the moment of truth comes. That moment may come when it will be more advantageous for the Communists to abandon than to honor the treaty.

The President, in his address to the Nation, acknowledged that the signed agreement actually meant very little, in a practical way, other than to eliminate any possible danger from radioactive fallout, and even that has greatly exaggerated for ideological and political effect.

France already has indicated it will not bind itself to this agreement. Red China sneers. The neutral nations don't have atomic weapons and their applause must be discounted in considering the future of the United States and the prevention of aggression.

The three who did sign can go right on producing atomic bombs and weapons, as if nothing had happened. They can go on testing, too, probably every weapon but the most massive bombs. But the Communists already have 50-megaton bombs.

The United States did not gain anything the Russians didn't want to grant for reasons of their own. The same points have been discussed and argued for year after year. They could have been settled at any time.

The President seemed greatly moved by the achievement of such a limited objective. From this small stance he saw a lifting of a curtain on a new era for the world, of the possibility of the ultimate triumph of the reason of mankind over the forces of darkness. He saw the spotlight of destiny already turning to light his place in history.

In every case the effect was not all that Mr. Kennedy perhaps expected. Some listeners were shaken. Was past experience so easily to be laid aside? Was the past treachery of the Communists to be forgotten?

It was only a few years ago that the Russian Communists agreed to suspend atomic testing in the air—and suddenly, when a new batch of weapons secretly had been made ready while we dozed, exploded them with terrifying power.

The Russians have signed 52 agreements and broken 50 of them.

Does the President not remember that the Russian representatives lied to his face about missiles in Cuba?

In view of this, the partial test-ban treaty must be examined not just for what it says but for what can happen in spite of it. Is the signature of a Communist to be given more weight than the record of his performance?

What this country should have heard from its President was a down-to-earth, hard appraisal. Instead the country is in danger of going on an emotional binge.

The President of France may have his shortcomings but he has been battle tested and politically matured. He checked the record, as it were, watched the signing, listened to the President, and said, thanks, but he'll hold on to his own gun.

Prudence Isn't Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week this House passed the NASA authorization bill by a substantial vote. This measure contained a provision which we hope will result in a great electronics research laboratory in Massachusetts.

Many of us who sat in this House last Thursday when this bill was approved will never forget the dramatic speech delivered in support of the bill by the former Speaker of this body, Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts.

In the closing minutes of the debate, JOE MARTIN rose and voiced his confidence in the House Science and Astronautics Committee, his awareness of the need for space research, and his appreciation of the many real benefits of locating the research center in Massachusetts.

Few more sincere, more dramatic or more effective speeches have ever been given in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. Speaker MARTIN's remarks impressed all who heard them, and they also made a fine impression on the people of Massachusetts. The Governor of that Commonwealth has voiced his thanks, and a number of fine editorial comments have appeared in Massachusetts newspapers.

Typical of these fine comments is an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on Saturday, August 3. I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

PRUDENCE ISN'T POLITICS

Among the many causes for satisfaction in Massachusetts over the twin advance by the U.S. Senate and House toward a Space Research Center in Greater Boston not the least was the part played by JOE MARTIN.

It was heartening to have a man so long and highly respected by the GOP leadership take the floor and give the lie to Republican charges that Kennedy family politics dictated the choice of Boston as site for the proposed $50 million National Aeronautics and Space Administration Laboratory.

Politics is a poor synomym for the prudence and commonsense behind locating a great national electronics laboratory in the one area of the Nation that possesses the heaviest and best concentration of electronic brainpower—industrial and academic.

If the Boston area were to be blackballed as a site for a new space center merely because it is the home of the President and our junior Senator, that would indeed be politics. And the entire Nation—not just this city—would suffer through loss of the unique service Boston scientists and specialists are in a position to render the space program.

JOE MARTIN's speech was a factor in winning House approval of $3.9 million in planning funds for the new NASA Laboratory. Another Republican, Maine's Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, was instrumental in reversing the Senate Space Committee vote so that it, too, now favors the project.

The vigorous support of these two GOP lawmakers was no more provincial than the

administration's preference for the Greater Boston area was political. The common motive all around was simply commonsense.

There is still a long way to go before new NASA research facilities in this area become a reality. It's to be hoped that the future course won't prove as tricky and slippery as the one that diverted NASA's moon shot center from its logical place in Boston to Houston.

Nothing could be more ridiculous than that situation. Texas is still struggling to build up its Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, established in 1960 to provide the academic support essential to great scientific endeavors in space. Through MIT, Harvard, and other institutions Massachusetts has long had flourishing educational resources that have attracted an unparalleled network of electronic and space industries to our midst.

Hector MacLean at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1963, an outstanding citizen of North Carolina made a noteworthy address at Gettysburg. The occasion was the rededication of the North Carolina monument on that historic battlefield. The speaker was Senator Hector MacLean.

It was 34 years ago that the monument was originally dedicated. The son of a former Governor of the great State of North Carolina, Hector MacLean, participated in the original unveiling of the monument. It seems to me most appropriate that he was asked to speak on this occasion of the 100th anniversary of the battle which saw 770 soldiers from North Carolina give their lives.

In his address, my kinsman, Hector MacLean outlines the aims of all true patriots and the dedication we should all embrace for the future. I commend this outstanding address to my colleagues:

SENATOR HECTOR MACLEAN—GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, JULY 1, 1963

Sixty years after her sons had made glorious history on the bloody field at Gettysburg, North Carolina dedicated this magnificent monument to those who gave their all for the cause of the Confederacy. Though long delayed as was said on that July day in 1929, "by a proud poverty now proudly overcome," this memorial is a fitting tribute to the patriotic devotion of North Carolina soldiers in the War Between the States; the war which a London paper called the most desperate war in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we should assemble here again a full 100 years after that great struggle and rededicate this memorial to the gallant soldiers of the old North State. We rejoice once again in the heritage that they have given us. And when we rededicate this edifice, we should rededicate ourselves. We can draw renewed supplies of courage and of ambition to live in a day of peace and freedom with the same devotion to our land as the Confederate soldier gave on this battlefield without thought of cost or consequence to himself. We can feel our hearts leap with pride that we came of such a breed.

Let us not be content then with this commemoration ceremony, this rededication of this bronze edifice with words, rather let us take a new sense of purpose to do not what will further our own devices, aims and desires, but what will further the cause of freedom and of Christian brotherhood across the face of the earth.

For, the great victory of the men who followed General Lee came after they had met what the world called defeat; when they followed his advice and example, as they had followed his orders in battle, when they set their hands to the given task of rebuilding their homes, of bringing back their lands to production, of gathering scattered resources and slowly regaining their wasted strength and fortunes.

And an even greater victory than this was the spirit which the grim soldier of the Southland passed on to his children, who in turn passed it on to their children, so that today in 1963, men and women of North Carolina are winning, as the men and women of no other State, the respect and admiration of the Nation for their energy and success, for their habit of good government, for their calm and intelligent approach to the problems of the times.

North Carolina is a proud State with good reason. She has won imperishable renown in all times of national emergency and peril. But none surpass the military glory and moral victory which abide in the records which her devoted battalions achieved in the herculean struggle of the war between sections. First at Bethel, fartherest at Gettysburg, last at Appomattox. This is no mere historical slogan but a statement of fact. In the words of our great war Governor Zeb Vance, "in the number of soldiers furnished, in the discipline, courage and loyalty and difficult service of these soldiers, in amount of material and supplies contributed, in the good faith and moral support of her people at large, and in all the qualities which mark self sacrifice, patriotism and devotion to duty, North Carolina is entitled to stand where her troops stood in battle, behind no State, but in the front rank of the confederation alined and abreast with the best, the foremost and the bravest."

Here on these fields a full century ago North Carolina gave 770 of her noble young men; this was one-fourth the Confederate losses in the battle of Gettysburg, the most costly of the war. North Carolina is still giving men and women, good citizens, in the cause of right and justice and human dignity. She is ever in the front rank of progress, both materially and spiritually, for she knows the real greatness of any commonwealth like that of the individual lies in two inherent forces, the one material and the other spiritual. North Carolina will not forget that the greater of these is spiritual.

As her men here 100 years ago led their State to new glory, she is still leading in the things that make men just a little lower than the angels.

In the words of the immortal Lee, "God bless old North Carolina, she is always the first and last in every charge." We should say it again and again. God bless old North Carolina may she ever be the first in the fight for human liberty and righteousness and the last to accept tyranny and oppression in any form.

How did all this come about on July 3, 1929? We owe a debt of gratitude today for the untiring efforts of the United Daughters of the Confederacy for their unceasing efforts in having North Carolina provide this memorial that we rededicate. Done by the noted sculptor Gutzon Borglum, it interprets in bronze the spirit and purpose of the North Carolinians who engaged in the decisive battle. We owe much to many who labored for the completion of this outstanding effigy. The North Carolina Gettysburg Memorial Commission plus an advisory commission, all composed of dedicated North Carolinians brought this project to glorious fruition. We pay tribute to them here again as we take even greater pride in our North Carolina Gettysburg memorial today.

You recall the story of Col. Isaac E. Avery commanding Hoke's brigade as he led a charge on East Cemetery Hill on July 2, 1863; how he was mortally wounded but mustered enough strength before he died to scribble a message. "Tell my father I fell with my face to the enemy." North Carolinians still face the enemy. Not so much enemies from without, not necessarily some foreign general who seeks to destroy us with military power, but those generals who are much more dangerous to our way of life, general apathy and general indifference. We must face these as our forefathers did and win the battle for the minds of men.

As we said here at the first dedication of this North Carolina monument by O. Max Gardner, "The first cornerstone of a monument is laid in the hearts of a people." And so as we come to the rededication of this memorial, let us truly rededicate ourselves and carry from this hallowed place new hearts of courage and honor and determination. Let us seek to create within our own hearts here today a living memorial so glorious and so abiding that Heaven itself can feel the warmth of its glow.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

With so many articles, letters and editorials to choose from, it is a bit difficult to choose which one to use next in this series of articles about the unwarranted and untenable action of Secretary Udall in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho.

In nearly every section of the country the farmer is a solid, clear-thinking type of American who wants to pay his own way and retain his freedoms. The recent farmers' vote relative to more bureaucratic farm controls by Washington is indicative of such thinking.

Here is an article from the July issue of the Idaho Farm Bureau News which claims that a great deal of stupidity must be involved for anyone to declare that southern Idaho needs public power to help their economy. The entire article follows:

BPA REVIEWED BY OWYHEE COUNTY FB

In the current controversy over entry of Bonneville Power Administration power into southern Idaho there are some documented facts that need to be brought to the attention of the public. One of the arguments most vociferously advanced by the public power exponents is that we need low cost public power to bolster our economy here in southern Idaho.

Let's take a look at the actual facts. There is a handy yardstick available to measure how areas fare under public nontaxpaying power and private free enterprise power.

The Federal Government has an act setting out areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to be eligible for Federal help. Thirty of the counties served by BPA power in the Northwest are declared areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. None of the counties in southern Idaho served by the Idaho Power Co. have earned this dubious distinction.

A good deal of stupidity must be involved for anyone to declare that we need public power to help our economy. The record shows a different picture. Approximately $100 million of public tax money will be needed to finance the building of the BPA transmission line. The ones who would benefit would be but a select few who would be subsidized by the money.

As an organization the Farm Bureau is beholden to no company or corporation but is committed to the defense of taxpaying free enterprise as the true base of our economy. If BPA wishes to enter southern Idaho it should pay taxes on the same basis as private power. Most studies seem to indicate that if public power paid the same taxes as private power it could not compete.

After considerable research, it seems to the Owyhee County Farm Bureau that from the standpoint of water rights, future reclamation, and service records, that we would have little to gain from public power now being suggested. The tax structure in many counties might be seriously impaired also.

For these and other reasons the Farm Bureau suggests that you get all the facts before you allow Congress to raise your taxes even higher to pay for something you don't need.

Color Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Helen Harrington, of Lamoni, Iowa, has composed a poem, "Color Book" which puts the civil rights issue in its proper perspective and suggests that the solution of the problem starts in the heart and mind of each of us. I wish to bring these provocative lines to the attention of my colleagues by asking that the poem appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COLOR BOOK

This is a man.
Call him Mister. He can
Live in this house on this street.
Would you like to visit him there?
Here is where he can eat
—Or there—or anywhere—
He is equal and free.
Do you like him to be?
Color him equal and free.
That's right.
Color him white.

This is a man, too.
Who knows his name? Do you?
He is free to pack and to clean
And do any job that is mean.
This is his street. Paint it grim.
You would not like to visit him.
Draw him pushed down, and back.
Color him black.

Do you know these men?
Look at them again.
You have seen them before
And you will see them some more
Before this color book ends.
Draw them starting to walk
And eat together and talk,
And live on the same block.
Do you think that they can be friends?
This is the country they save . . .
Color them brave.

—*Helen Harrington.*

Total Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial titled "Total Freedom a Dream," which appeared in the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record News on July 8, 1963.

The editorial outlines, in a very understandable manner, the responsibilities which go with the freedoms we possess. I feel this is a worthwhile message we should all note. The editorial follows:

TOTAL FREEDOM A DREAM

We hear from many quarters these days the cry that American individuals should be left alone. The cry really implies a question: "Left alone to do what?"

No American who truly prizes the ideal and the practical substance of freedom can consciously wish to see himself and his fellow citizens plagued by unreasonable taxation, unwarranted Government interference in private affairs, unfair restriction on the exercise of individual rights.

But in a society governed by law there is no such thing as total freedom. The law is the basic means men have devised for accommodating with each other. Without it, they would be forever trampling on each other, and their rights and their freedom would be lost in mutually destructive chaos.

The freedoms they enjoy tend to shift somewhat in extent and character, depending on the needs and problems of their changing society.

They are wise to be ever vigilant to keep freedom functioning through as wide an expanse of their lives as is compatible with the common good. Yet in fighting this battle it is not enough to say: "Leave us alone."

For freedom is not an endlessly celebrated birthday party, a perpetual binge, a lifetime of loafing on the sand or staring at television or riding around in a car.

It is a responsibility. You have to use it not just for yourself, not just for the enjoyments of life, but for your companions in freedom.

If you do not undertake some tasks beyond the limits of your family, your circle of friends, and your immediate job, then society itself—acting through your Government—will take on the broader assignments.

More than a few hardheaded conservatives have declared over the years that government in this country would have undertaken far less than it has if the American people, acting responsibly as individuals and in smaller local and regional groupings, had in larger numbers reached beyond their narrow personal concerns.

Too often the loud individual champions of freedom have defaulted on their responsibilities while demanding their privileges. They have wanted to be left alone to do nothing but gratify themselves.

The call upon individual human effort in a free society is well expressed in a new report by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. It says:

"The Declaration of Independence is more than a declaration of individual supremacy. It is also an expression of faith in the concern of free men for the public welfare.

"For a free society must rely heavily, if its values are to be defended and realized, on the voluntary actions of its citizens."

When men who are left alone take on their part of the public burden—as they should do—they will not likely find government encroaching further on the soil of their personal freedom.

Young Citizens for Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a group of northern Virginia young people have set out to show the horrors of automobile accidents by putting up some 40,000 "gruesomely realistic" posters.

The teenagers involved in this project are members of the newly formed northern Virginia branch of Young Citizens for Safety, an organization that started in Richmond last summer. Its northern Virginia representative, David Osterlund and his assistant, Stephen Williams have been leading the campaign to get 300 youths to carry out the objectives of the Young Citizens for Safety in Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax Counties.

It is the hope of this organization to instill the horrors of automobile accidents by use of these posters, and at the same time encourage safe driving, not only to teenagers, but adults as well.

As a member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I would like to commend these young people for their attitude and enthusiasm. The effort they are making to stamp out one of our Nation's No. 1 killers—automobiles accidents—is a creditable one. Perhaps the goals and objectives of the Young Citizens for Safety of Virginia may be brought to the attention of all the young people of the United States. It would certainly be a boon for the young people of America to set the example for themselves and their seniors in leading the way from mounting automobile accidents toward increased traffic safety.

I am enclosing a copy of the August 4, 1963, article that appeared in the Washington Post that describes the fine effort being made by David Osterlund, Stephen Williams, and the Young Citizens for Safety:

VIRGINIA YOUTH GROUP WORKS TO BOOST SAFETY ON HIGHWAYS

A group of northern Virginia teenagers is out to show the horrors of automobile accidents by putting up 40,000 posters that are rightly described as "gruesomely realistic."

The youngsters are members of the newly formed northern Virginia branch of Young Citizens for Safety, an organization that started in Richmond last summer.

Conceived and administered by young people, the organization has won the praise of Gov. Albertis S. Harrison and business and safety groups in the State.

Its northern Virginia representative, David Osterlund, 19, of Alexandria, has mustered about 75 youthful volunteers to the cause of safety so far. He wants at least 300 to carry the campaign throughout Alexandria and Arlington and Fairfax Counties.

A good part of the work this summer will be in distributing posters supplied by the organization's headquarters in Richmond. These carry 14 different photographs taken by Virginia State Police at the scenes of the worst accidents that have occurred in the State.

After seeing the poster that bears the picture of a sedan with its top ripped off and bearing the bodies of three men, the passerby may well have a deepened sense of responsibility behind the wheel.

"People criticize teenagers for their driving," Osterlund said, "and the facts show that teenagers on the whole are pretty bad drivers."

The organization's message is directed at motorists in general, but one goal is to teach young people better driving habits and increase their civic consciousness by putting them to work for safety.

Osterlund, who directs the branch from an office at 815 King Street, Alexandria, said Young Citizens for Safety also plans a bumper sticker campaign and spot announcements on radio and television. The safety program is supported through contributions.

Besides increasing public awareness of the responsibilities of driving, the organization wants compulsory driver education courses in schools throughout Virginia and is preparing a lobbying program for the next session of the general assembly.

The group plans to ask for legislation strengthening the "implied consent" law governing blood tests for intoxication and for new laws establishing stricter licensing procedures and increasing the pay and size of the State police force.

Impact Upon Unrelated Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following information with respect to Public Law 78 has been provided by the Council of California Growers:

IMPACT UPON RELATED INDUSTRIES—CANNING TOMATOES

The following figures were supplied by the California Tomato Growers Association, 145 South American Street, Stockton:

1. Approximately 50,000 people are employed in tomato canneries during the season.

2. Tomato growers annually spend $4 million for fuel and machinery repair service, $3.5 million for fertilizers, $3 million for insecticides and their application, $5.5 million for seeds and plants.

3. Tomato processors in 1962 spent $70 million for metal containers, $11 million for glass containers, $1.8 million for caps and lids, $12 million for cartons, $6 million for labels, $12.8 million for trucks hauling raw tomatoes to plants, $32 million for shipping finished products to market, $45 million for cannery employees.

(NOTE.—The figures above do not represent the full economic chain reaction effect. They do not indicate, for example, the labor involved in the making of the metal cans, the glass bottles, the cartons; the cost of paper and ink used in making the labels.)

If We Fail To Ratify

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today representatives of the United States, U.S.S.R., and Great Britain signed a historic document—the nuclear test ban treaty. Now the U.S. Senate faces a historic decision. In the column, "Today and Tomorrow," in today's New York Herald Tribune, Laurence Barrett has asked: "What would be the consequences if the Senate fails to ratify?" Mr. Barrett provides cogent answers and makes the point that a rejection of the treaty "will sentence the world to continued imprisonment in the dungeon that is the arms race for a long, long time." I recommend this column to all who harbor the hope of release from the dungeon:

IF WE FAIL TO RATIFY

(By Laurence Barrett)

WASHINGTON.—So far, the argument over the limited nuclear test ban treaty has skirted perhaps the most important issue: What the consequences would be if the Senate fails to ratify.

President Kennedy says this would be a "great mistake." Mr. Harriman says it would cost this country its position of world leadership. These are understatements. It is not too much to predict that rejection of this treaty will sentence the world to continued imprisonment in the dungeon that is the arms race for a long, long time.

Both in the administration and in Congress there is considerable optimism that the necessary two-thirds vote in the Senate will be achieved. Yet there is an undercurrent of opposition, rather muted for the moment, and lacking in focus. If a rallying point emerges, the treaty could be in trouble. Rejection is not the only avenue of defeat. An attempt could be made to append reservations or even formal amendments. These could have the same effect as a negative vote.

One wonders whether those who for various motives are searching so hard for minute flaws in the treaty have honestly considered the larger question of what failure to ratify would mean.

If the United States is unwilling to take this very little step towards arms control, then its stated position since the end of World War II in favor of controlling the atom is a fraud. And the more recent American posture in favor of arms reduction and ultimate disarmament is doubly fraudulent.

It must be remembered that the treaty under consideration is essentially an American treaty, which both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations put forward for the world to see and desire. Were we seeking to deceive the world? Were we, safe in the knowledge that the Russians would spurn any agreement, merely teasing humanity?

The treaty to ban tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water is the most modest advance possible that can still provide meaningful progress. If we fear this, then longer strides toward peace will frighten us senseless.

Would the Russians negotiate with us seriously again on anything else? It is difficult to see why they should. They could simply bask in their greatest propaganda victory of the cold war.

The arguments against the treaty vary from sober considerations of the military and technical implications to hysterical screams about what monsters the Russians are. The Senate must think about the former and try to be immune from the latter.

The Republican Congressional leadership now gropes for some rational basis on which to question the treaty. It posed this choice last week: "Which will do most to preserve peace in the world, ratification of a limited treaty placing selective restraints on the development of nuclear weapons or a maximum up-to-the-minute defense capability so destructive as to prohibit attack?" (This is the same Republican leadership that thinks the defense budget could be cut easily by a few billions.)

Actually, this seemingly logical question contains holes. The treaty does not prevent, or even seriously inhibit, continued weapons development. But there is a bigger hole. The question implies that an absolute deterrent exists, or is readily obtainable. This is a delusion. There exists only the means for mutual destruction.

No new weapon is immune to a still newer defense. No defense remains impermeable for long. The choice really is between an ever-quickening contest for more devastating weapons and a glimmer of hope that the race may slow to a more rational pace.

In evaluating the debate that is to come, it would be stupid to shut one's mind to all opposition. Perhaps there is real evidence, undisclosed until now, that the treaty's risks are greater than its benefits. If so, it is difficult to believe that President Kennedy is unaware of it, or has ignored it.

The skeptics urge caution and objectivity. One would do well to be cautious and objective in considering criticism by scientists who think that, because they have built great engines of war, these engines must be kept ever primed at mankind's head, and the criticism by professional anti-Communists. One would also do well to be skeptical of politicians who have their eyes on election day next year and who know that, if the treaty is ratified and proves successful, President Kennedy will reap great political benefits.

Finally, the 100 judges in the Senate must know that their votes on this issue will be remembered for a long, long time.

Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag, of Minnesota, Speaks Up for Equal Opportunity in Public Accommodations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last week the distinguished Governor of Minne-

sota, Karl F. Rolvaag, appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee. He testified in support of President Kennedy's proposal for a Federal law against segregation of public accommodations. Senator John O. Pastore called Governor Rolvaag's testimony, "a breath of fresh air."

Under unanimous consent, I include Governor Rolvaag's brilliant statement of American principles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my fellow Members of Congress and Americans everywhere may read it:

As Governor of Minnesota, I strongly urge passage of the public accommodations bill. I believe that President Kennedy has wisely emphasized that the States, local communities, and individual citizens have a large measure of the responsibility for providing equal rights for all citizens.

Nevertheless, the intensity of the present drive for racial equality makes it obvious that new Federal action is necessary.

The principles of civil liberty, equal opportunity, and equal protection under the law are part of our national heritage. Putting these principles into practice has been a continuous challenge to all levels of government and to society. This challenge continues to be unmet, and may well be the most critical social and moral issue of our time.

Two centuries after the Declaration of Independence, the American dream of equality of opportunity remains, for millions of my fellow citizens, an illusion.

It is bitterly ironic that at this stage of our Nation's history it is necessary for Congress to maintain a Commission on Civil Rights; for courts to be called upon to enforce a citizen's right to vote, or to go to school; or for legislation to be necessary to secure for our citizens their unalienable rights as Americans. Our duty to secure the rights of all men requires that we give up the problem of racial discrimination our earnest thought and most vigorous action.

Racial and religious discrimination sometimes results in the denial of constitutional rights and more often it manifests itself in a basic disregard for human decency and dignity.

MINNESOTA'S RECORD

If we Americans are to be perfectly honest with ourselves, we must admit that discrimination is not limited to our larger cities. It is not restricted to the South; it is not confined merely to narrow, or widely scattered pockets within our Nation.

I would be the first to admit to the difficulties that Negroes and other members of minority groups have in securing housing, suitable employment, and equal educational opportunities in Minnesota.

I know that these same difficulties exist throughout our Nation, North and South, and I know that it will not help these citizens obtain their rights if we merely engage in a dialogue among ourselves about what is right or proper or feasible.

There isn't a person in America who deep in his heart doesn't know right from wrong on the issue of equality. We all know that discrimination exists. We all know that it will end and that it must end.

The promotion of racial justice and religious freedom has been the policy in Minnesota throughout its 105 years of statehood. During this period, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, many steps have been taken to protect the rights and improve the opportunities of our citizens.

Generally speaking, Minnesota today has the best body of law and the best record of executive action against discrimination of any State in the Nation.

POLICY IS BIPARTISAN

In the 4 months since I became Governor, I have taken steps to keep Minnesota where the overwhelming majority of her citizens want her to be, in the forward ranks in the fight for equal opportunity. I have issued an executive order requiring cancellation of State contracts with employers who discriminate. I have directly urged several hundred representatives of local government in our State to apply this same procedure—under a never-before used law—to their own local public contracts.

In the last session of our State legislature, I did support and we now have, a special commission on Indian affairs. Currently, I am in the process of naming a labor-industry committee which will work to find better employment and increased opportunity for members of minority groups.

In short, gentlemen, it is the policy of our State to protect and expand opportunity for all of our people. I believe that we have done much, but I know as well that we have not done enough. We can, we must, and we will do more.

Public accommodations legislation is familiar to us. We have been living under a statute similar to the public accommodations proposal for 78 years. In more recent years our State has adopted laws requiring fair housing and employment practices, and prohibiting discrimination in public employment and job promotion.

Our fair housing law was drafted and sponsored by a Democratic State senator and received strong support from a Republican Governor.

Our public accommodations law prohibits exclusion on account of race, color, national origin, or religion of any person from the full and equal enjoyment of "public conveyances, theaters or other public places of amusement, or by hotels, barber shops, saloons, restaurants or other places of refreshments, entertainment or accommodations." Segregation by retail stores, which would also be forbidden by the public accommodations proposal has to my knowledge never been a problem in Minnesota.

Our law provides for both civil and criminal remedies. An aggrieved person may receive $500 damages in a civil suit. In addition, one who violates the statute is guilty of a gross misdemeanor. To insure that every visitor to our State is informed of his rights under this law, we print it on every copy of our official State road map.

FEDERAL LAW NEEDED

An example of the workings of this law in our State occurred in September 1962. A Negro father, his wife, and three children made reservations at a northern Minnesota resort. The reservations were confirmed in advance. Upon appearing at the resort, this family, tired and hungry from their long journey, was denied accommodations.

The resort owner and his wife were arrested and tried on a criminal charge in a district court.

Upon pleading guilty, they received a suspended jail sentence and paid a heavy fine. In addition, the defendants settled, for several hundred dollars, a civil action filed by the Negro family because they had been denied their basic human rights.

I admit that cases of this nature under our public accommodations statute are rare. However, I suspect that with Federal legislation they will become more frequent as local officials receive added pressure to perform their duty and enforce the law of the land.

I firmly believe there is an urgent need for a Federal public accommodations law to complement and uniformly strengthen State statutes. Such a law would serve to emphasize and dramatize on a national level the public policy which prohibits discrimination not only in public accommodations, but in every aspect of life.

The bill currently being studied by this committee will, if enacted, provide only the minimum assurances of justice and human dignity. The public accommodations proposal is no departure from traditional concepts of American justice and fair play.

It has been said that this bill will interfere with "property rights." This is a curious inversion of our legal tradition. For if racial discrimination is to be considered a "property right" it is certainly a novel departure from common law.

Traditionally, innkeepers as well as persons engaged in many other public callings, undertake a duty to serve all well-behaved members of the public who are able to pay for their services, so long as they have facilities available.

COMMON LAW CITED

As early as 1460—over 300 years before our Constitution was adopted—it was the tradition of the common law that an innkeeper who violated his obligation to serve the whole public could be sued for his injustice.

In 1701 Lord Chief Justice Holt of England could say, simply, that "if an innkeeper refuse to entertain a guest when his house is not full, an action will lie against him * * * He has made profession of a trade which is for the public good, and has thereby exposed and vested an interest in himself in all the King's subjects that will employ him in the way of his trade."

In 1906, Professor Beale of Harvard, in his treatise on Innkeepers and Hotels, could find scant legal authority for any "property right" to discriminate among members of the public.

Finally, in almost two-thirds of our States, including my own, such a supposed property right—if it ever existed at all—has long since been abolished by public accommodation statutes.

In any event, all property is held subject to the demands of the public welfare and the common good. This is a fundamental principle of republican government. I suggest that those who cry "interference with property rights" consider who are the "radicals" here. The ancient common law never recognized any property right of hotel keepers and similar persons following public callings to discriminate; a public accommodations law, therefore, is no radical innovation.

It merely restores vigor to a legal concept which antedates this Nation by as much as three centuries, but which has been allowed to lapse temporarily by some people more responsive to improper social pressures than to legal tradition.

There is no way to tell how long the present racial crisis will last, nor how it will eventually be resolved. But one thing is becoming more and more clear:

CHALLENGE IS REAL

Unless those of us at all levels of government provide constructive and intelligent leadership in sustaining the rights of all citizens this time of agony for our Nation will leave scars which will not heal for generations.

Is Federal legislation necessary? I think the question is answered as soon as it is asked. Who among us has not noticed the pitiful spectacles which have resulted from the willful obstruction of the drive for freedom by local and State officials in some areas of our Nation? Public officials who should have led the way to a peaceful and just accommodation of social conflict have instead placed themselves at the head—and thereby at the mercy—of the forces of bigotry and injustice.

It is a sad, but nevertheless true, commentary on our society that in many instances—in the North as well as the South—we cannot count on local and State officials to implement the national policy, notwithstanding their oaths of office.

Times change and we cannot move with them merely on the force of public statements. If we are to promote justice in our society and carry out our sworn duties as

public officials, we must provide leadership and action in the crusade for equality.

Our conscience will no longer permit us the luxury of simply reacting piecemeal to inflammations and pressures as they arise. As servants of the people, we know that the moral law, and our rich love of liberty, argue against procrastination.

Gentlemen, the challenge to act against racial injustice is genuine and immediate and cannot be met with speeches. We can help to meet this challenge through passage of the public accommodations bill and in so doing we will fulfill our public trust.

If we fail, we betray not only our duty as responsible representatives of law and order, of peace and freedom, but we will contribute to the decline of a great heritage begun by men with a burning desire for liberty and justice for all.

Dr. Goddard Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein a recent article from the celebrated Fitchburg Sentinel, Fitchburg, Mass., entitled "Dr. Goddard's Work Memorialized."

The article embraces, in part, two speeches that I made on Armed Forces Day, one at dedicatory exercises of the monument at Fort Devens honoring the late, great Dr. Robert H. Goddard, father of modern rocketry, and the other my remarks at the Armed Forces Day celebration at Fort Devens on the same day.

The very appropriate monument to Dr. Goddard was made possible in large measure by the interest and work of Mr. Samuel Hopley, distinguished editor of the Fitchburg Sentinel, and his charming, talented daughter, Jean, General Verbeck, the able and distinguished commanding officer at Fort Devens, and Mrs. Goddard, the devoted wife of the late word-famed scientist and some other people and groups, too numerous to mention here.

As the result of the devoted efforts of these and other fellow citizens, Dr. Goddard continues to receive almost day after day, additional recognition for the tremendous scientific achievements for which he was responsible. It is now clear to the world that this great man will go down in history as one of the world's greatest scientists and his fame and the luster of his work will grow even greater with passing years.

I express deep appreciation to all those who contributed in any way to the erection of the Fort Devens Goddard Memorial Monument.

The article follows:

DR. GODDARD'S WORK MEMORIALIZED

FORT DEVENS.—High tribute was paid the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, of Worcester, father of American rocketry, by Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, Gov. Endicott Peabody, and other dignitaries at the dedication of a 40-foot-high replica of Goddard's launching tower, a highlight of the Armed Forces Day program held here Saturday.

Despite the fact inclement weather forced cancellation of the unveiling plans at the site of the model rocket on a knoll overlooking Route 2 within the confines of this sprawling Army reservation, the program was carried out in the sports arena before a large crowd of spectators.

Congressman PHILBIN praised Dr. Goddard for his early experiments in rocketry and said in part, "If the counsel, advice, and discoveries of this great man had been heeded and acted upon when first proclaimed, our mastery of space would doubtless be vastly more extended than it is today, and some of the security problems we now face would probably be much less compelling than they are."

The actual Armed Forces Day program opened at 9 a.m. but a steady drizzle forced some cancellations. Exhibits of various military weapons were displayed in tents throughout the Rogers Field parade area. The program continued throughout the morning and afternoon and was climaxed by a parade of 2,000 men from the Army Security Agency Training Regiment which was reviewed by Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, commanding general of the fort, Gov. and Mrs. Endicott Peabody, Congressman PHILBIN and other State dignitaries.

The program, which annually attracts upward of 20,000, was cut because of the weather and there was no official estimate of the total attending.

The rocket dedication program at 2:30 p.m. attracted widespread attention. Army and post engineers constructed the tower and placed at the foot a mock rocket. Directly in front of it was a granite monument about 4 feet high and set with a bronze plaque commemorating Dr. Goddard for his achievements.

Funds collected by Fitchburg public and private school children and donations from Crocker Burbank & Co. Association were used to defray the cost of the monument. Fitchburg school children were among those in attendance at the ceremony going by special bus from Fitchburg to the fort to witness the dedication.

In his dedicatory address Congressman PHILBIN said: "It is a very great honor for me to be present today at this moving dedication of a beautiful monument for our great citizen, scientist and friend, Dr. Robert H. Goddard, of beloved memory.

"The Nation and the world will applaud the action of General Verbeck, his staff and the Army in making this historic dedication possible, and we are all grateful to Samuel Hopley and Miss Jean Hopley (Fitchburg) for their deep interest and many efforts in bringing this most appropriate monument and plaque to reality. We are grateful to all who assisted in this valued project.

"It is extremely appropriate that Mrs. Goddard, who helped her famous husband so effectively during his life, and who has taken part in many efforts to perpetuate his memory, should be with us today.

"The Nation and the world have come to realize the greatness and significance of Dr. Goddard's tremendous contributions. He has been honored in innumerable ways. The Congress of the United States has struck off a gold medal in high tribute to him. Our great Space Center, so meaningful to us, in the terms of the national security, space exploration and the advancement of science, bears his name. Many memorials to honor him have been established in this country and elsewhere to bring enduring luster to his achievements.

"And it is in our best traditions indeed that this memorial be established here at Fort Devens, where years ago this great dedicated, gifted man performed some of his earliest and most important experiments.

"No one could possibly describe, let alone evaluate, the reach, depth, and everlasting vital importance of Dr. Goddard's work. Born in struggle and sacrifice, conceived in genius, carried out with a courage and determination that would not be denied, Dr. Goddard's contributions now rank by common consensus with the most epochal ever achieved by man.

"The ideas he generated and developed have already carried us to the reaches of space. No one could predict today the extent they will permit us in the future to penetrate, indeed to conquer, problems and adventures that have challenged the human race since its inception.

"If the counsel, advice, and discoveries of this great man had been heeded and acted upon when first proclaimed, our mastery of space would doubtless be vastly more extended than it is today, and some of the security problems we now face would probably be much less compelling than they are.

"But, we must live for the future, for the enlargement of human knowledge, for progress, advancement, improvement in the status of man and his control over his environment for the broad ideals of freedom we stand for, for better conditions, better relations and peace in the Nation and the world."

In speaking prior to the annual review of the troops of the ASA Training Regiment, Congressman PHILBIN commended General Verbeck for his outstanding contributions as commanding general of the fort.

He proclaimed Fort Devens as "one of our great Army posts and we have every reason always to be proud of its marked contributions to the security of the Nation. Fortunately for us, our Nation and the world, on this Armed Forces Day, we are in a position to make a high and confident appraisal of the state of readiness, efficiency and power of our Armed Forces."

Governor Peabody praised Dr. Goddard and compared him with Christopher Columbus, Magellan, and Edison for contributions to the world. He also praised General Verbeck and troops stationed here.

Our Nation Being Suckered Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, legitimate questions regarding the recently signed nuclear test ban are being raised across the Nation.

Mr. Opie R. Tucker, publisher of the Los Altos News-Mountain View News in my congressional district, has raised one of these questions in an editorial of July 25.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit Mr. Tucker's editorial as worthy of consideration by the entire House:

OUR NATION BEING SUCKERED AGAIN?

News reports indicate that nuclear test ban talks in Moscow are proceeding satisfactorily. But that which this country and the free world perhaps have cause for worry is unstated; namely, in which direction.

Fear is expressed in some circles that the Russians have already perfected a neutron bomb, a tactical weapon that will kill or incapacitate enemy forces without serious harm to the physical landscape. It is known that they have been working on the "death ray" bomb for at least 10 years.

The Atomic Energy Commission announced recently that it had detected at least three suspicious events, without radioactive fallout, which resembles such a blast.

Since our own perfection of the bomb has been delayed, due primarily to our "arms fanatics" in Washington, could it be that the Russians are ready and willing to negotiate a test ban treaty to protect their lead in the arms race?

Russia has never been known to negotiate a treaty unless in so doing all the benefits accrue to its cause. Therefore, if they suddenly become receptive to the idea, that is all the more reason why we should be concerned.

Let us hope that we are not tricked into an agreement that will result in our own demise simply because we have an earnest desire for an honorable peace.

A Republic's Endurance: An American Poet Supplied the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from Life Lines in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A REPUBLIC'S ENDURANCE: AN AMERICAN POET SUPPLIED THE ANSWER

Many years ago, James Russell Lowell, the American poet, was in Paris talking to Guizot, the French statesman and noted historian.

In their discussion of the rise and fall of great empires, kingdoms, and dynasties, Guizot turned to Lowell and asked, "How long do you expect that Republic of yours to last?"

After a moment's thought, Lowell replied, "Our Republic will last as long as the ideals of the founders are observed."

The ideals envisioned for our Republic by the Founding Fathers were lofty and challenging ones indeed, but they were practical and attainable. The Founding Fathers were influenced in their choice of ideals by events of the past. Everyone has marvelled at their wisdom in setting the United States upon a course which is still practical, valid, and expedient today.

Many contemporary observers believe that we are losing hold on some of the ideals which have enabled this country to become the world's leading power. They point out that unless we rededicate ourselves to these ideals, this Nation is doomed to obscurity along with the other great powers of the past which lost sight of national purpose.

The forefathers dreamed of building a society in America which would be strong, prosperous, free, and devoid of discrimination against the individual. They cherished the heritage of freedom which has been handed down by others. They wanted to preserve the rights and liberties set forth in the Magna Carta, the Petition of Rights, and the English Bill of Rights.

They were fully acquainted with the divine right of kings which had been the rule in Europe. According to this theory, kings contended that their power to rule came directly from God and that they were answerable only to God.

This theory was not compatible with the dream which our forefathers had for America, so they rejected it. They argued that the true function of government was to protect and preserve God-given rights. Their ideal first required obedience to God and then obedience to rulers.

The Declaration states:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In the Preamble to the Constitution, our forefathers spelled out the ideal purposes of the Government which they were establishing:

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Every freedom-loving American is thrilled by words such as liberty, justice, rights, and general welfare. These words proclaim the ideals of government which the founders of our Nation promoted.

To go along with these lofty words, the founders employed others suggesting action. They planned to do something to make the American dream a reality. Note that the Preamble contains such words as establish, secure, insure, and promote. If our Republic is to continue along the lines envisioned by its founders, there must be maintenance of the ideals and purposes which they so clearly set forth, plus a dedicated program of action on the part of every American.

Here are some suggestions as to how individual Americans can assist in the preservation of the ideals which have enabled us to make steady progress over the years:

1. We can inform ourselves about the traditional ideals of our Nation by thoughtful reading of our basic documents.

2. We can remember the debt we owe our ancestors. The lives of great men remind us that "we can make our lives sublime, and, departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time."

3. We can assume responsibility. If our ideals are to be realized, we must be willing to share in the thought and work required in any worthy endeavor.

4. We can speak up against those who thwart our efforts to realize our ideals. If our Constitution is being undermined, we are the ones who must prevent it. If the balance of power in government is being destroyed, we must arouse public opinion to insist upon a return to balance. As Thomas Paine said: "He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression."

Religion and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Feltham S. James, past national chaplain of the American Legion and presently Department Chaplain of South Carolina, made the following report to the 45th Annual Convention, the American Legion, Department of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, this is a magnificent report and typifies the principles and ideals of the American Legion:

RELIGION AND EDUCATION

(By Dr. Feltham S. James, D.D.)

Some years ago Dr. Herbert E. Hawkes, then Dean of Columbia University, said: "It is the duty of schools to develop the whole man—social, intellectual, aesthetic, and religious. An education that does not accomplish this fails insofar as it falls short of the ideal."

I think that all of us will agree that the ultimate forces of life are the spiritual forces. These must not be neglected at any time. When Dr. Arthur T. Hadley was president at Yale University, he said, "I do not believe you are going to make the right kind of citizens by a godless education, and then adding in religion afterward. The idea is wrong. Education and religion must go hand in hand."

In view of the apparent conspiration between the atheist, the Communist, and the U.S. Supreme Court to eliminate God from every phase of our national life, the "back to God" movement or spiritual emphasis of the American Legion is more imperative now than it was when it had its inception into the total program of the Legion at the Miami National Convention in 1951.

Belief in God and dependence upon God has been the guiding force of mankind through the centuries. However, it seems that if religion is to maintain its place of guidance in the days ahead, we, who believe in God, must go back and pick up the thread of days gone by and once again make the home a school of faith. The edicts of the courts will have to be fought as once our early fathers fought the edicts of the Emperors. The worship of government is being brought to bear upon your children, as long ago the worship of the Emporer was brought to bear upon the children of the early Christians.

It was the home then—and it will be the home now that will save this Nation from the fangs of the godless. The home and the church school will be the only places where your children will be given the necessary element that will make their education complete—the element of religion. It has been done in the past and it can be done in the future.

In addition to regular attendance at your place of worship and family prayers in the home, one of the elements in the Legion's "back to God" movement is the religious education of children. While we are concerned with what our children know, and with what they think, and with what they make a living; and while we must give them the knowledge that is rightfully theirs through the inheritance of the human race; and while we must teach them to use this knowledge in the thinking process of their own day; and while we must help them to master the skill and tools that will give them their daily bread, the greatest duty devolving upon us is the production in the individual of qualities that will give him character to take his place among men. Only in religion will you find these qualities. Religion is the only sure basis mankind has ever found for moral life of the community. It is the only sure basis that will ever be found for the control of conduct and the undergirding of character. Religion is the organizing principle in the complete educational process. If education is to result in the complete man, with powers developed and unified in the highest, it is evident that these powers must be developed under the guidance of some unifying principle that makes for such character. Religion, therefore, is not an adjunct to education nor one of the important subjects in education but it is the central and organizing principle of education. The school is not merely a contract between teacher and pupil, but between teacher and God and pupil, between pupil and God and teacher.

The destiny of America does not lie in our being the first to set foot upon the moon, to put into orbit a space station for the future conquest of outer space. Our destiny lies in keeping faith in and yielding to the authority and power of God. "In God We Trust" is the greatest motto any nation ever had. It is truly the foundation of America. When you remove the foundation the building crumbles and falls. A nation that walks with God need fear no man. It is the aim and objective of the "Back to God" movement of the American Legion to bring God to the foreground in American life, not merely the religious life, but the social, economic, and political life as well. God is an essential part of real Americanism. Without God, there is no Americanism.

Legionnaires must become not only crusaders for country, they must become crusaders for God. That is, if the words at the beginning of the preamble to our Constitution mean anything—"For God and country."

"For God and country" offers the only way to save this Nation from oblivion. I urge you to go back to your posts and make the "Back to God" program the essential activity that it is. Remember that America's safety lies in our relation to God. A former president of our country has said, "A nation's strength is in her religious convictions." Battleships and armies, nuclear weapons and space ships will never save us from the moral foes which threaten. St. Augustine explained it centuries ago when he said that without adherence to God, there can be no purity, stability or permanence in the life of the nation. God, give us faith, such faith as is the victory that overcometh the world.

THE "BACK TO GOD" MOVEMENT

The American Legion pledged to service "For God and Country" has continuously emphasized the spiritual foundations of our freedom.

To preserve this freedom, a spiritual reawakening of the American people is imperative. It behooves us as a nation to reaffirm our faith in almighty God, to rekindle that spirit of humble reliance in divine guidance which inspired the Founding Fathers to arm our people in time of peril with the ageless weapons of moral and spiritual might and to uphold and preserve, unimpaired, the spiritual heritage of America.

Our Founding Fathers derived our fundamental rights from God, and made "treating the other fellow as yourself" the means of continuing them. Our Nation's security was not placed in man alone, in classes of men or manmade plans. Our security was based on trust in God and in the individual responsibility of freemen to God and to fellow citizens.

Impact Upon Related Industries—Wooden Box Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the following information with respect to Public Law 78 has been provided by the Council of California Growers:

IMPACT UPON RELATED INDUSTRIES—WOODEN BOX INDUSTRY

Crops such as tomatoes, asparagus, melons, and celery are packed almost 100 percent in wooden containers, according to the Wooden Box Institute of 55 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco.

The institute provides these figures to show the importance of these crops to the box industry:

1. Overall employment: 10,000.
2. Annual production: 40 million containers (the equivalent of 60,000 carloads of packed produce).
3. Value of annual production: $15 million.

Because of an embargo upon American-made box material (shook), any large-scale movement of U.S. growers to Mexico would seriously affect the American boxmaking investment.

We are very likely to see more and more of these crops being produced in Mexico and shipped here to compete with the growers who do try to produce and market these commodities as they have in the past if our labor problem is not resolved before December 31. The trend has already begun. Compare Mexico's production and export of the following crops in 1955 with their status in 1960 as an indication of a trend which might well continue to expand more:

Crop:	*1955, pounds*	*1960, pounds*
Winter tomatoes	45,674,000	151,999,000
Spring tomatoes	15,847,000	64,765,000
Strawberries	10,030,000	31,388,000
Spring cantaloups	3,831,000	14,032,000

Will They Pay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress have expressed concern recently about the growth of the Bonneville Power Administration in serving the Pacific Northwest. It has been stated that any new dams, such as Burns Creek or Knowles, will simply create an unusable power surplus. It has also been said that the extension of the Bonneville marketing area into southern Idaho will adversely affect consumers there in addition to having a harmful effect on the private utilities in the area. In fact, we have benefited during the last several days from a protracted series of statements in the RECORD painting a black picture of the dangers created by expanding BPA. An editorial in the New York Times supports the contentions of the opponents of Bonneville and I wish to include it at this point in my remarks.

WILL THEY PAY?

Under the large powers granted to the President by the Recovery Act about $400 million will be spent for power development, flood control, irrigation systems, and the improvement of navigation. The public works in course of construction are magnificent—a credit to the engineering ability and energy of the Nation. But are they economically justified? Are they part of a larger plan in which existing privately owned structures have a place? A stage has been reached when the public, which must eventually pay the bills, has a right to ask such questions. The Engineering News-Record performs a notable service by analyzing these "undertakings without precedent" as business enterprises and thus supplying facts for the answers.

Although political pressure forced the administration to allot money for a few of these works, all are intended primarily to achieve the President's social ends. Four "power yardsticks" were wanted in as many regions to measure the reasonableness of the rates charged by privately owned utilities. How undertakings of doubtful economic value can serve this purpose is not evident. In the Northwest, for example, the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams and accessory structures, promoted by politicians and costing respectively $63 million and $39 million, must stand still or fall as powerplants. The final installations proposed will give the region a generating capacity of 15 billion kilwatt-hours, and this in the face of a consumption that has never been more than 25 percent of that amount. Another project of Fort Peck must be judged as an aid to navigation in the Missouri. But the engineers who finally reported on its future declined to commit themselves on the commerce that would be developed or the savings in freight charges that would be realized. In Wyoming the Casper-Alcova irrigation diversion dam and the Seminoe storage and power dam were planned for geographical rather than for business reasons. There is little hope that the land to be watered by them will ever repay their cost.

Low rates for energy and low prices for household appliances have created an electric boom in the Southwest, but it will take years of experimenting and something better than the kind of cost-accounting that shows a profit for the Postoffice to determine whether administration hopes will be realized in the Tennessee Valley. Boulder Dam, which was begun before the New Deal, but which must be included in its program because it will aid in supplying one of the power yardsticks, stands alone as a commendable piece of engineering and economic planning, although it seems destined to start badly because of a lack of water and because it will be completed so far ahead of time that communities will not be ready to use the power for which they contracted.

It may be that no great social experiment can be undertaken without ignoring the prospect of direct financial return, and it may be that national assets cannot be appraised in terms of markets and services alone. Moreover, utilities have a way of ferreting out unexpected sources of income and meeting unforeseen needs. Air conditioning, heating and cooking by electricity, the electrification of farms and railroads—these are but a few of the more obvious possibilities that await development. But even if we grant that the natural evolution of technology and the country may come to the financial rescue of these gigantic undertakings, the fact remains that they have little prospect of paying for themselves in what an economist would call a reasonable time, and that they are primarily workmakers in a national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, that editorial appeared in the New York Times on December 9, 1934, and was a moderate example of attacks at that time on public power in the Northwest. Men of little vision are still having difficulty understanding the potential benefits of the Columbia Basin, and still seem incapable of grasping the fact that an economy will always grow to meet available resources.

Mr. Speaker, the diatribes against Bonneville in the 1960's are just as invalid as the diatribes of the 1930's have proven to be. The original attacks on BPA should be very helpful in assessing

the real worth of attacks being made today, and I hope to call several old articles to the attention of my colleagues during the next few days.

Coast Guard Observes 173d Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, August 4 has been set aside annually, by Presidential proclamation, as Coast Guard Day, a day in which all Americans should recognize the splendid job being done by our Nation's oldest, continuous, seagoing military service.

The Coast Guard has always played a major role in our Nation's coastal defense, oceanographic studies, and water safety procedure—not to mention their ever-vigilant rescue service which has resulted in the saving of scores of lives.

We on Long Island, comprising one of the Nation's largest concentrations of both commercial and sport marine enthusiasts, are especially grateful for the magnificent job being performed by our Coast Guard in this, the start of their 174th consecutive year of service.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD an article written by the Treasury Department in recognition of the Coast Guard's 173d birthday:

COAST GUARD OBSERVES 173D ANNIVERSARY

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 4.—The U.S. Coast Guard today moved briskly into its 173d year by announcing the start of its first major fleet modernization program since World War II.

The program, which will take about a decade to complete, looks toward a completely streamlined service by the early 1970's, Adm. Edwin J. Roland, Coast Guard Commandant, said.

In commenting on the future plans of the Nation's oldest, continuous, seagoing military service, Admiral Roland pointed out that within the next decade the Coast Guard plans to replace existing fleet units with newly designed ships of all classes. They will range from heavy- and medium-endurance cutters to buoy tenders and other smaller craft. The new ships will embody the latest naval engineering concepts, including revolutionary combination diesel-gas turbine powerplants and air-conditioned living quarters for the crew.

Two of the new ships have already been built and will soon be in service, Admiral Roland said. They are the 210-foot medium-endurance cutters *Reliance* and *Diligence*, with others soon to follow. The new fleet will add new reach and effectiveness to the Coast Guard's capability for search and rescue and related duties. Coast Guard rescue efforts during the past year saved 2,352 lives and more than $1.3 billion in property.

Plans are also under way to extend the capabilities of the Coast Guard's air arm. Most noteworthy has been the recent acquisition of the HH-52A gas-turbine helicopter. Eventually, the Coast Guard will acquire about 98 of these amphibious aircraft which will become the workhorse of the service. In the field of long-range aircraft, the Coast Guard is acquiring the HC-130B Lockheed "Hercules" which can be employed for more extended search and rescue as well as for transport of men and equipment.

As part of the service modernization program, Coast Guard officials are currently studying a reorganization of shore facilities to meet the demands of 20th-century shipping and burgeoning small-boat traffic.

In view of the troubled situation in Cuba, the Coast Guard has maintained a regular air and sea patrol off the Florida coast. Objective of the patrol is to prevent violation of United States laws by Cuba-bound raiders. More than 4,000 Cuban refugees have already been rescued by Coast Guard ships and aircraft.

The Coast Guard is participating actively in our country's efforts to unlock the secrets of the oceans. It has been carrying out oceanographic research since 1867 when the Revenue cutter *Lincoln* conducted the first survey of Alaskan waters. Since then, its oceanic studies have been broadened to include the international ice patrol and its ocean station vessels in the Atlantic and Pacific.

Within the past several months, Coast Guard has moved its oceanographic unit from Woods Hole, Mass., to the National Oceanographic Data Center in Washington, D.C. The Center has been established to coordinate Federal oceanographic efforts.

The same progressive spirit sparks the Coast Guard's testing and development program. Its electronic engineers have long been active in developing new techniques and devices to promote the safety of life at sea. One of the most important of these has been loran-C, an advanced version of the famous long range aid to navigation system, loran-A, in effect since World War II. Other products of Coast Guard research include an atomic buoy and lighthouse which hold much promise for the future, and a pilot version of a radar and television aid to navigation known as RATAN. Ultimately it is expected that this new aid will contribute substantially to the safety of coastal navigation.

Along with these varied activities, the Coast Guard has been carrying out its traditional merchant marine safety program, including small boat safety, and operation of more than 40,000 aids to navigation. At the same time, it maintains itself in a constant state of military preparedness so that its officers and men may take their places promptly with the Navy in the event of national emergency.

It has been a crowded 173 years for this small service of approximately 31,500. But the Coast Guard has always been proud of its readiness to take on the new responsibilities of our swiftly changing times. Its dedication and skill can always be counted on to be at the service of our Nation.

Two Thousand Women Political Prisoners in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1963, representatives from the Commission for the Protection of Women Political Prisoners in Cuba, an organization dedicated to freeing some 2,000 women being held in Cuban prisons, were in Washington and stopped by to see me. These women are concerned over the inhumane treatment of these women behind the Cuban prison walls, and they urge that these women be freed.

I am greatly concerned over this situation, and feel that the Organization of American States and the International Red Cross should send in investigating teams to examine this situation. The inhumane treatment that these women are suffering is another instance that may be added to a long list of human suffering in Communist Cuba. The Cuban people have nothing better to look forward to, until communism and Castro have been removed from Cuba. I urge that the results of the Organization of American States and the International Red Cross investigations should be made public, and positive action taken to aid in the release of these women prisoners.

J. Edgar Hoover Cited Sinister Backing in Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, is the march on Washington, scheduled for August 28, a brainchild of the Communist apparatus in this country?

Even though the march has Presidential blessing and is being pushed by some church leaders, that does not necessarily mean that the whole idea for the mass demonstration was not Communist inspired. It is an old Communist trick to get decent and respected people to do their bidding.

We do know that Martin Luther King, the moneyraising Negro leader, has been quite friendly with Communist functionaries. And King is the kingpin of the Washington march. A widely publicized photograph shows King in attendance on a meeting sponsored by Communists, seated alongside Abner Berry, of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Also seated with King is Aubrey Williams, president of the Southern Conference Education Fund, Inc., described as the transmission belt in the South for the Communist Party; and Myles Horton, director of Highlander Folk School for Communist Training, of Monteagle, Tenn. Berry and Horton are Negroes.

Now, this alone does not prove anything other than King's friendliness with the subversives. He evidently knew who they were and what their business was when he met with them. They evidently knew King very well. They invited him to their meeting and invited him to speak to them.

What about Jack O'Dell, the Communist leader, who until right recently was Martin Luther King's righthand man, on the payroll of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in the New York headquarters? He was released by "mutual agreement," according to King, because it was feared his past might be

used by what King described as "segregationists and race baiters."

In other words, O'Dell was not fired. By King's own admission the Communist was taken off of the payroll for strategic reasons, and, according to the press, only temporarily.

No one is better qualified to discuss the role of Communists in racial strife than J. Edgar Hoover. His timely and highly significant comments on this subject are contained in a recent column written by the respected journalist, Holmes Alexander. The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—On January 16, 1958, when Director J. Edgar Hoover was asking the House Appropriations Subcommittee for funds to run the FBI during next fiscal year, he said:

"The Negro situation is also being exploited fully and continuously by Communists on a national scale. Current programs include intensified attempts to infiltrate Negro mass organizations. The party's objectives are not to aid the Negroes—but are designed to take advantage of all controversial issues on the race question so as to create unrest, dissension and confusion in the minds of the American people."

Mass demonstrations by Negroes in the North and South, to be culminated with a huge march on Washington next month, were not in the news, as they are now, when Director Hoover gave this dispassionate, succinct and informed statement of Communist intentions.

Last week southern Governors Barnett, of Mississippi, and Wallace, of Alabama, flapped the Red flag in words much like Hoover's. But the Barnett-Wallace testimony before the Commerce Committee's civil rights hearings was too self-interested to be effective.

Another red object—the red herring of McCarthyism—came scurrying into the caucus room where McCarthy once performed. The subject of Communist complicity soon got lost amid pious horror of "smearing" the Negro race and its leaders. Somebody suggested that J. Edgar Hoover be summoned as a star witness on the subject, but Chairman MAGNUSON was against it.

Fortunately, it is hardly necessary to call Hoover. A little page leafing through House appropriations hearings shows that the FBI Director has several times asked Congress for money for the very purpose of investigating Communist incitation of the Negroes.

On March 3, 1961, Hoover told the House money raisers:

"The sit in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its ends."

By now the director was giving names, places, and dates. He mentioned James E. Jackson and Joseph North, "national Communist Party functionaries," who came around for the demonstrations at Richmond, Va., in February 1960. He quoted the Negro Communist, Ben Davis, "the party's national secretary," as stating in March 1960, that Negro demonstrations are the next best thing to "proletarian revolution."

Again, on January 24, 1962, Hoover came to the House Appropriations Committee for funds, and one of his arguments was:

"Since its inception the Communist Party, U.S.A., has been alert to capitalize on every possible issue or event which could be used to exploit the American Negro in furtherance of party aims. In its efforts to influence the American Negro, the party attempts to infiltrate the legitimate Negro organizations for the purpose of stirring up racial prejudice and hatred. In this way, the party strikes a blow at our democratic form of government by attempting to influence public opinion throughout the world against the United States."

Well, nothing could be clearer than that. I have names for future columns showing proved Communists ferrying between Havana and the demonstration sites in American cities, and showing known Communists at the dirty work of teaching Negroes and whites to hate one another.

But the point which WARREN MAGNUSON's Commerce Committee ought to be honest enough to discover is already laid bare, and this is it:

The unhappy American Negro, generally immune to Communist blandishments and greatly preferring the American way, is now being solicited and tempted, organized and incited as never before, by the worst enemy our country ever had.

The Bracero's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in some quarters the bracero farm labor program has been denounced as slave labor and described as harmful to the Mexican workers and their families. The Copley News Service recently featured an article from Mexico City which answers the congressional debate which was loaded with antislavery purple prose when Public Law 78 extension was defeated.

Two hundred braceros gathered in front of the Novedades newspaper office in Mexico City. Their spokesmen talked to the editors. Here is the gist of their comments:

While people in Washington and Mexico City denounce bracerismo as slave labor, nobody has asked our opinion. We could tell them it is hard work, but we could cite a thousand cases of harder work at one-tenth the pay right here.

Some have denounced us as unpatriotic for going abroad to work. But the plain answer is we would gladly stay home and work for one-third of what we earn in the United States if we could just find work. What shall we work at? There is unemployment in the fields and even more in the cities. If our bracero contracts are not defended we will be forced to migrate illegally and seek work under much worse conditions.

Now, some Mexican officials might prefer to be handed millions of American dollars so that they could administer the distribution thereof to their petty officers and local agents and take the credit for such largesse. Some of our own bureaucratic governmental officials, too, would prefer that our largesse be funneled through their agencies. I suppose this is a frailty of human nature. But we need not succumb to it.

The U.S. agricultural industry can sponsor the most effective, most beneficial, and most appreciated aid program yet devised. It provides aid in valuable technical agriculture knowledge and in direct wages for services performed.

We should not tolerate illegal migration as suggested, but prevention will be difficult and embarrassing to both the United States and Mexico because the respective needs on both sides of the border are so great.

The bracero program is an effective, desired, decent solution to a difficult economic and diplomatic problem.

ARA Is Self-Defeating; Report Confirms Program Is Not Achieving Its Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the area redevelopment program, also sometimes referred to as the PWA program of the sixties, is now recognized by objective observers as a failure. That fact is confirmed by a report on a study conducted by Prof. Sydney C. Sufrin for Syracuse University.

In an editorial entitled "Policies To Promote Depression," the Wall Street Journal of July 31, discusses the findings, and adds some very timely and convincing observations. The editorial follows:

POLICIES TO PROMOTE DEPRESSION

The attempt to aid chronically depressed areas of the Nation with huge Federal subsidies is worse than no remedy; it may well aggravate the problem it seeks to solve.

That is a conclusion strongly argued by history, economics, and commonsense. It is now specifically formulated by Syracuse University Prof. Sydney C. Sufrin, writing in New York University's Challenge magazine.

First, the official planners of the area redevelopment program and related undertakings evidently fail to understand the elementary matter of why communities decline and why some—not many out of the whole Nation—remain depressed even in times of high national prosperity. For one economic reason or another, they get, in Mr. Sufrin's words, out of joint with the times.

For example, "changes in markets, production techniques and demand for goods and services have caused industries which were onces prosperous to find themselves at the edge of prosperity, then deep in difficulty." By a kind of cruel irony, the very changes which enhance the economy as a whole tend to cause the chronic unemployment in the depressed areas. "Aluminum, synthetics, and new technology in the construction industry, while causing booms in other areas, lead to unemployment in the steel industry."

Moreover, a spiraling process appears to be at work. Prosperity tends to be centered in large communities which have a history of economic success, and prosperity attracts prosperity. When new investments are forthcoming, they are likely to be made in the communities already highly prosperous, further weakening the depressed areas.

Some areas have managed to regain economic well-being through diversification and attracting new industry. Yet for others neither outside aid nor self-help nor the two combined seems to work.

There are 18,000 to 20,000 community development organizations which provide financial or other inducements to attract industry. A tremendous amount of money has been spent by the Federal Government, States and localities in the past generation, with but scant success for the most part.

By and large, Mr. Sufrin finds, these financing operations have been successful only where the communities in question enjoy advantages which make them attractive to business. Elsewhere, the mere provision of money and credit is just not enough to convert declining communities into expanding ones.

So the present attempt to put these places on an enormous Federal dole simply does not deal with the realities of the condition. Mr. Sufrin believes this attempt to resuscitate communities which have lost their economic base, which are not adaptable to the industrial technology of the mid-20th Century, may lead to an industrial policy as difficult and costly as the present farm policy.

Nor is that all. It will impede the potentialities for greater innovation. It will certainly discourage what is a major part of a real solution—namely, the movement of labor to more promising parts.

It may sound harsh to tell a man in a depressed town that his best bet is to uproot himself and his family and move elsewhere. But is it really? As Mr. Sufrin puts it, "19th-century Americans crossed a continent to find new opportunity. Twentieth-century Americans can at least bear the hardship of moving to a neighboring State." It can be added that if we had such Federal policies in the last century the country would not have been developed in the flourishing way it has.

And it might not be too great a hardship for our officials to engage in a little thinking—instead of busily designing policies of economic rigidity and permanent depression, policies which in the last analysis sacrifice charity to a misguided politico.

Statement by Hon. Farris Bryant, Governor of the State of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in submitting herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the Honorable Farris Bryant which he made when he appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee on July 29, 1963, concerning his views on Senate bill 1732. We in Florida are proud of our distinguished Governor. We feel that his statement to the Senate committee is one of the clearest and most effective which has been made on this important and controversial matter:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE FARRIS BRYANT, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE, JULY 29, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Senators, I do appreciate this opportunity to present to you my views concerning Senate bill 1732, in the hope at most that I can add some grain to that storehouse of wisdom which I know that this distinguished body, individually and collectively, already possesses.

I am fully conscious that if the things I have to say are worth saying, and hearing, it will be because of the experience I have gained as Governor of one of the States of this Union at a time in which it has rested in large part upon the executive branch of the State governments to chart a course for the people to follow in otherwise uncharted waters.

Florida is a State with an experience in population dynamics including the mingling of races, which should be of some value. It is the fastest growing State in the Nation, and the appeal it has for new residents is not limited to any particular group or class—or race—or religion—of people. It is a State with a growing Negro population which constitutes a percentage of its total population well above the national average. Unlike some other States its Negro population is not decreasing; indeed, the rate of increase of its Negro population, roughly 46 percent in the last decade, is almost twice the national average.

Florida's experience is also unique among the States of the Union in that it has been and is the host to a tide of refugees from foreign tryranny, numbering one-quarter of a million people. These people, with a different language, and a different culture, have been absorbed and assimilated into our cities, our schools, our hospitals, and our homes. The conduct of the people of Florida has been such as to bring credit to our Nation. We have been assisted by the Federal Government in making them welcome. We have not been coerced, and I speculate that if we had been, the results would not have been so good.

I submit to you that out of this record which the people of Florida have made there is some wisdom to be gained. Florida, with its roots in the South, but with its spirit fixed on Cape Canaveral, has been and is in the mainstream of all the currents flowing across this Nation. Yet with all this, the names of her cities have not been spread across the headlines of the world as a herald of violence and of the incapacity of a people to resolve their conflicts within civilized institutions. Indeed, if you should inquire of the Department of State, I am confident they would tell you that the Government and the people of Florida have been of active assistance to our National Government in providing hospitality to visitors from governments all over the world.

I am not here today to argue the case for segregation—nor against it.

I am not here to question the power of the Federal Government to do what it is proposed by this bill to do.

I am here to argue the case for freedom.

The real issue you must resolve is between conflicting demands for freedom.

On the one hand the traveler demands the freedom to buy what he wishes to buy, in a hotel, a theater, or anywhere that there are things for sale.

I believe that he should have that freedom, provided, of course, he does not violate the freedom of others.

There is the crux of the matter.

I do not believe that we are talking about the commerce clause. Candor, it seems to me, would force the acknowledgment that the commerce clause is just a convenient peg on which to hang this particular hat.

What is here attempted is to give primacy to the freedom of some to go where they wish and to buy what they wish over the freedom of others to own private property.

I have seen some suggestions that the real contest is between human rights and property rights. That is not so.

Property has no rights. Humans have the right to own property, just as they have the right to speak, and to worship, and to travel from State to State.

One man owns a piece of property. He has earned it. He may have acquired it by saving money he otherwise would have spent, perhaps for the pleasure of travel.

He may have acquired it by borrowing and thereby risked the security of his age and his family.

He may have acquired it by working long hours while others rested or played.

In any event, it is his, by the law and by every principle of justice.

What this bill proposes to do is to take part of that right away from him, and give it to someone else who has never earned it.

We are dealing with property rights. The only question is: Who shall have those property rights? Shall it be the man who has earned, or the man who covets that which he has not earned?

The only "human rights" involved are the rights of some humans against the claims of other humans.

The debate in which we are now engaged is over the assertion of a new right: the right of nonowners of property to appropriate it from the owners. The new right is asserted in the name of equality. Differently stated: this is a debate between those who seek to preserve freedom in the use of property by its owners and those who would appropriate a part of the bundle of rights which make up that ownership, without compensation, to the public, in the name of equality.

May I suggest that the proper goal for the Congress to seek is not a transfer of property rights, but freedom. We would all agree that the traveler is and should be free not to buy. He can pass a motel because he doesn't like the town, he doesn't like the color, or he doesn't like the name. He can stop and go in and when he sees the owner he can decide he doesn't like him because he doesn't like his mustache, or his accent, or his prices, or his race, or his other customers. He can turn around and walk out for any reason, or for not reason at all. Why not? He's a free man. So is the owner of the property. And if the traveler is free not to buy because he doesn't like the owner's mustache, accent, prices, race, other customers, or for any or no reason, the owner of the property ought to have the same freedom.

That's simple justice. The wonder is that it can questioned.

The argument is made that this invasion of property rights is nothing now—that our courts have for years upheld laws on zoning, minimum wages, collective bargaining, etc. I submit that the comparison is superficial, and the argument is misleading. The difference in degree is so great that it amounts to a difference in kind. The same argument would sustain the equal ownership of property—which can only be achieved through ownership of all property by the state, in the name of the people.

We have heard a great deal in this last decade about the 5th amendment, the 10th amendment, and the 14th amendment, and surely all of these deserve our respect and our attention. I call your attention now to another amendment to our Constitution which has never been modified, or superseded. It is the ninth amendment and reads thusly:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

My petition now is that you not deny or disparage the right of the people to own property—that you not further restrict their freedom.

In our eagerness to make all things right with the world, let us not forget that inherent in and inseparable from freedom is the capacity to make errors. If this Government were allwise, and all powerful, it could prohibit all error. In such event this might be a better Nation. But it would not be a free one. And the State would have taken the place of God.

I think I can understand the aspiration of minority groups to improve their status. Nothing is more American than to aspire. But surely we should remember that when the majority loses its freedom, the minority loses its hope for freedom.

It would be a tragic mistake if we tried to purchase equality for minorities, and as part of the price gave up freedom for all.

Texas Town Refuses ARA Aid—Resents Being Labeled "Depressed Area"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Congress is being pressured to expand the Area Redevelopment Administration—which is in reality a revival of depression's WPA—it is refreshing to know that a community in Texas wants no part of it, despite a determined effort by the Federal Government to force it on them.

Thus, Texas takes the lead again, showing the Nation how to solve economic problems by the use of old-fashioned self-reliance and a do-it-yourself approach.

That is the story of Longview, Tex. Beset with economic problems that are typical of hundreds of other communities over the country, the proud, and enterprising people of Longview refused to be wet-nursed by the "great white father" in Washington.

This example of self-reliance, in keeping with the finest traditions of American enterprise, should serve as an inspiration for others to emulate. Abe Lincoln once said: "You cannot permanently help a man by doing for him that which he can and should do for himself."

The Longview story, written by Steven Gerstel, is described in the following article which appeared in the July issue of the Dallas Morning News:

LONGVIEW, TEX.—Two times during the last century and a half, inhabitants of the beautiful tree-shaded hills that make up Longview have been entangled in rebellions.

The first was in 1826 when fellowers of Benjamin Edwards got fed up with high-handed government authority. Carrying a flag inscribed with "Independence, liberty and justice," they rode into Nacogdoches, some 50 miles south, captured the old stone fort there and proclaimed a new Republic of Fredonia.

Their effort was ill fated. They had counted on help from Indians, and in exchange planned to carve Texas up between the Indians and their new republic. But the Indian help failed to come, and they had to flee back across the Sabine River, bringing to a disappointing end the Fredonian rebellion.

The second rebellion lasted just short of 2 years and ended only last March 28.

This time the citizens of Longview and Gregg County were successful, and the victory for most of them was pleasing.

This latest rebellion was waged with words and paper, against the masters of word-and-paper operations, the Federal bureaus in Washington.

The fire that lit the modern rebellion was an edict that suddenly flared out of Washington on July 21, 1961. The Commerce Department, without warning, declared that Longview and Gregg County, along with 46 other Texas counties, could get Federal loans and grants under the Area Development Act because of their economic situation.

Congressmen already had been referring to such eligible sections of the Nation as "depressed areas." This was a label that infuriated the businessmen of Longview who had been working successfully for nearly two decades without outside help in attracting industrial plants to their city.

The label was pinned on at a time when Longview was in the midst of a national promotional and advertising campaign pointing up its progressiveness and prosperity.

It also came at a time when Longview ranked third in the whole nation in retail sales per household, stood first in a 66-county region in total retail sales, and had led all Texas cities in percentage gain of manufacturing employment.

Perhaps the feelings would not have been quite so intense had other situations not existed. But the city, which had once depended almost entirely on a booming oil industry, had been suffering setbacks and disappointments in oil and allied businesses.

The large Lone Star Steel plant 30 miles to the north, whose principal business had been the making of oilfield pipe, suffered because of the decline in oil well drilling.

And not long after the Federal order was issued, Longview was slapped in the face again when the slanted oil well scandals broke, and more than 300 wells in the area were shut in.

The businessmen knew that reduced payrolls at the steel plant and the idle wells would have to be offset by more industry. They sincerely believed that could, through their own efforts, make necessary gains and survive the burst of problems.

But the tag of "depressed area," they felt, was heavy enough to sink everything.

At first Longview citizens were puzzled. Nobody had asked for the Federal designation. The reason came to light eventually. Washington had a new program for spreading some money around. It was so new, in fact, that the Commerce Department, charged with the task of disposing of the money, had no criterion by which to do the job. So Commerce officials went to the Department of Agriculture and borrowed a set of economic studies which had determined that depressed agricultural conditions existed in the 47 Texas counties.

Everyone knew that agricultural employment was way down in Gregg County. Cotton and other row crops had long since become a part of the past, cattle had taken over the countryside, and most farmworkers had either moved to a city or had found jobs in Longview, the steel plant, or some other place.

Longview leaders felt that if other counties which had not made industrial progress wanted such a program, then let them have it. But they wanted no such burden to carry in their efforts to attract new plants to their growing city

After recovering from the initial shock, various groups went to work to try to get the label removed. But what had fallen so suddenly from Wahsington was not to be brushed away quickly or easily.

And so another rebellion of this east Texas region was doggedly pursued.

The Longview News and Journal editorially blasted the Washington program. Citizens loudly voiced their opposition at a public meeting with ARA officials in September of 1961.

But a year went by and no change was made. In July of last year, the Longview Chamber of Commerce called for a termination of the label. And in December, the Gregg County Commissioners court petitioned the Commerce Department to take it away.

In an extra salvo in the city's words and paper rebellion against Federal spending, the Longview City Commission last October voted unanimously not to seek a Federal grant for its program of water, sewer, and street improvements. They carried out the program, but financed it locally.

Finally, on last March 28, word came down to Longview from Washington that the city and Gregg County, by their own request, were being removed from the list of those eligible for ARA aid.

This rebellion had been successful. One Longview businessman became almost poetic in his comment. He said:

"Just take a deep breath of this free air. All of that bureaucratic smog that rises out of Washington and settles over the country has been distilled out of the air here in Longview."

Three months later, in June, another event caused citizens to rejoice in their victory. Penn Controls, a major company which makes automatic control and regulating devices, announced it would build a plant in one of Longview's industrial districts. At about the same time, two other companies announced expansion plans.

* * * * *

The Longview Chamber of Commerce has an industrial development committee, headed by oilman Robert Cargill, which also has been fruitful in such endeavors. Assisting the group is chamber manager, Walter Koch, who formerly headed industrial development work for the State of Kentucky.

As a result of the work of these citizens, an impressive group of industries now occupies three industrial parks, two of which are owned by Longview Industrial Districts, Inc., a nonprofit organization which Cargill also heads. The third is owned by publisher Estes.

Among the plants are Texas Eastman Co., employing 1,300 workers in the manufacture of various plastics and chemicals; U.S. Industries, which recently opened a new $7 million sucker rod plant; Stemco Manufacturing Co., which makes a popular boat; Resistol Hat Corp., Bell and Gossett Co., Trailmobile, Udell, Inc., Sunoco Products Co., and many others.

And the big Lone Star Steel plant north of town is in the process of diversifying its production and its business is on the upswing again.

Turning an eye to the future, the chamber of commerce has established a special space age committee which is working with officials of NASA on potential space industries.

In another recent development, Longview is bidding for more conventions. Two large luxury motels recently opened and plans are being discussed to build a convention center.

Longview also is the home of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, which serves half the State, including Dallas and Houston.

Industrial growth here has had its influence on the makeup of the city's population of over 43,000. Manufacturing plants have attracted young people, and their homes have been built among pines and oak trees, up one hill and down another.

This sizable population of young families has been largely responsible for an unusually good school system. Last year, city voters approved a $1,250,000 school expansion program and four suburban schools invested more than a million dollars in similar improvements.

LeTourneau Technical Institute, begun soon after the LeTourneau plant came to Longview, is to embark on a 10-year expansion program looking toward establishment of a fully accredited college in science, technology, liberal arts, and religion. A $300,000 dormitory will be built.

Lake O' the Pines, a 30-minute drive away, and Caddo Lake, slightly farther, attracts many Longview people. A group of citizens built and owns Lake Cherokee south of town and sells water to the city.

In the city are 4 golf courses, a library which is getting a $150,000, addition, 3 hospitals, over 70 churches, and a fair ground. Interstate 20 Highway, now under construction, will swing south of town, and a loop is being built around town.

Politicians everywhere know that Longview voters are independently conservative. Their State representative, John Allen, is

one of the conservative leaders in the legislature.

"Voters here are independent to the extent that they don't brand themselves to anybody's party," Representative Allen, a radio station executive, said. "They have a deadly fear of Federal power, and will reject just about all Federal projects."

As the name of their city suggests, they believe this is the best way to take the long view toward the future.

Big Government Is Bad Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina by invitation addressed a joint session of the General Assembly of the great State of Georgia on February 6, 1952. Mr. Speaker, here are excerpts from that superb address:

Big government is bad government. In this country there are no men with enough wisdom and enough virtue to direct from Washington all the business of this country and supervise the lives of 150 million people in 48 States. The trouble is in Washington there are men who think they possess that wisdom and that virtue.

The power to spend billions of dollars makes little men think they are big men. Power intoxicates all men and they will not voluntarily relinquish it.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Modernization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many people got a big laugh out of Congress last Sunday. A column by Mr. Art Buchwald, which appeared in many newspapers across the country, must have brought howls of laughter from many readers.

The sad part is that this amusement was all at the expense of Congress. For many years, I have worked for reforms to modernize the procedures of Congress, so that our efforts at legislation will no longer be a laughing matter to pundits such as Mr. Buchwald. The results have not been impressive.

Mr. President, I regret that we have been so inept at modernizing our own procedures that newspaper columnists can get a laugh at our expense. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Buchwald's article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTRUCTIONALISM ART CREATED IN ABSTRACT

(By Art Buchwald)

Many people are wondering how Congress can remain in session for as long as it has without passing any important legislation. Well, it isn't easy. It takes experience, know-how, and devoted patience.

The Members of the 88th Congress have the art of legislative featherbedding down to a science, and after spending time on Capitol Hill one can't help developing anything but admiration for our elected representatives. To paraphrase Sir Winston Churchill, "Never have so few done so little for so many."

How do they do it? In order to find out, we interviewed a Congressman who was willing to talk providing we didn't use his name.

"Sir, how are you able to stay in session for so long without doing anything?"

"The secret is cooperation, boy," he said. "Without cooperation from everybody in Congress, heaven knows how many laws we'd pass."

"What do you mean, sir?"

"Well, boy, Congress has built-in safeguards against anything getting on the floor for a vote. For one thing, a bill has to go to a committee for study. The bill is usually given to the committee that is most unfavorable to its being passed, so it's pigeonholed without much discussion. In most cases the key committees in Congress are controlled by chairmen who are pledged to keeping legislation away from the legislators."

"Why is that?"

"If you, as a legislator, vote, that means you're taking a stand on an issue, and if you're running for reelection the last thing you want to do is to let the voters know what side you're on.

"Then as a safeguard we also have the congressional hearing. You can have hearings for as long as 9 months on a piece of legislation. Sometimes, if the legislation is newsworthy enough, you can have two or three committees holding hearings on the same bill at the same time. In many cases the hearings become so complicated the committee forgets why they're holding them in the first place. But as long as the hearings get in the newspapers everyone is satisfied."

"Who decides whether a hearing has enough publicity value?"

"Usually the chairman of the committee. We depend on him to hold hearings only on legislation that will get our names in the papers."

"But there have been occasions where a bill has gotten to the floor of the house. How do you explain that?"

"Somebody goofed. He is usually censured in private for it, and we see that he doesn't get to handle any bills again. But fortunately, even if a bill gets to the floor, we have safeguards against passing it. For one thing, you need a quorum and it isn't easy to get one.

"Most Congressmen go home on Thursdays and come back on Tuesdays. Then they have mail to answer, speaking engagements to fulfill, and interviews to give to the press. Very few Congressmen have time to vote."

"But suppose you do have a quorum and you do vote and you do pass a bill. Then what?"

"It's happened in previous Congresses," he admitted. "But very rarely in ours. If this did happen, we would then depend on the Senate not to pass it. That's why we have two Houses. So each one has a chance to cancel out the other's bill. We're pledged to kill their bills and they're pledged to kill ours."

Jamming the Airlanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have an intolerable situation in my congressional district, and believe some of my colleagues have been faced with similar situations. The problem involves interference with television and radio reception by a 16-year-old amateur radio operator in Elizabeth, Pa., who monopolizes the air and deliberately steps up his power, "blasting TV reception off the air." This has been going on for about a year now, and I have been trying for most of that time to have something done to eliminate the trouble.

Elizabeth Borough is a community of approximately 2,600 people, of which 60 to 65 percent are retired. The only pleasure many of these people have is through television, and yet they are deprived of this pleasure most of the time. Communities surrounding Elizabeth are also bothered by the interference.

I have had considerable correspondence with the Federal Communications Commission, and they have had a number of inspections conducted by their Buffalo, N.Y., office. It has been determined that if the boy stays within the lower part of his band, there will be no interference, but when he goes into the higher ranges, he causes trouble. The operator always seems to know when the inspector is in the area, and he complies with regulations during the inspections.

The FCC has insisted that if the residents would install high pass filters on their sets, the interference would be eliminated. This has been done by a majority of the people, but when the operator deliberately goes into the higher range—which he continues to do—the filters will not eliminate the interference. The FCC has continued to state that the boy is complying with the "technical provisions of the Amateur Rules" and that "there is no legal basis for putting him on probation or for suspending his license." From all reports, he is a very arrogant young man, and the more exasperating the people become, the more he steps up his interference. The people have become very irate, for which they cannot be blamed. They cannot understand why one uncooperative, irresponsible teenager should be permitted to defy a whole community and get away with it. These residents are responsible citizens—they pay their taxes, pay for their sets, and feel they should be permitted to enjoy them without continued harrassment. The boy is on the air day and night now that school is out.

I am not against amateur operators and know of instances when they have done a great deal of good. I am certain they would not condone the unethical actions of this one individual.

The Borough Council has become incensed over the situation and has been trying—through my office, as well as direct communication with the FCC—to have something done about it. There have been several items in the local papers concerning the condition, and I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Elizabeth Herald on July 25, 1963:

JAMMING THE AIRLANES

There are many people in the Elizabeth area who contribute to Radio Free Europe, attempting in their own small way to give people behind the Iron Curtain information from the free world.

We are always incensed to hear, then, that the transmitters must be moved from place to place continually to keep the Communist radio transmitters from jamming the airwaves so that the captive peoples of the world cannot receive true news of the outside world.

The people of Elizabeth and the immediate area have been having a taste of the same thing during the past year. Living in a free community, where their rights and privileges are a God-given right fully protected by their

Government, they are becoming more and more highly incensed that the jamming of the airlanes in their own community seems to have as little chance of being eliminated as if they were living behind the Iron Curtain and had the Government behind the interference.

Making the situation even more incomprehensible to folks in an American community is the fact that it appears to them that the Government is leaning over backward to protect an amateur who has proven himself to have little consideration for others.

Elizabeth television owners making most of the complaints have lived a lifetime of proving their responsibility as taxpayers, property owners, businessmen, and civicly conscious not only of their obligations but also of voluntary service to the welfare of their community and those living within that community.

They have complied with the suggestions that they install high-pass filters on their television sets, and yet continue to be "blasted off the air," in the words of a broadcast declaration of the amateur operator.

It has come to such a pass that town council has now passed a resolution which will be distributed to the State Boroughs Association, the Association of Borough Mayors of Allegheny County, and the Allegheny County Association of Boroughs to urge passage of stringent laws that will give local communities the right to control amateur transmission as public nuisances. Elizabeth is now determined to take the enforcement of consideration of others into their own hands. They will also be the instrument in giving other local officials that same right.

The actions of one teenager will have affected millions of amateur operators all over the United States.

Already, the preliminary steps are being taken by presenting Elizabeth's plight before the House committee that plans legislation to control interstate and foreign commerce.

People can be pushed just so far by lack of consideration and laxity by Federal agencies supposedly capable of controlling such a situation. In an American community—and especially one with the pioneer background of Elizabeth—righteous wrath and indignation may be slow in building. But it brooks no return to the original state once the wheels start grinding.

In only one manner can folks in town be criticized. They should be more than willing to have their names on record as the necessary proof that town officials must have to back up the complaints that they are taking to higher authority.

If you are willing to vote for the men you wish to represent you locally, statewide, and nationally, you surely should be just as responsible in giving them the ammunition to enact necessary legislation to correct an unbearable interference with your rights as citizens in a self-governed community.

You can help correct the situation by writing to your borough secretary, the mayor, your Senator, and your congressional Representative. It need only be a few short words over your signature. Your sincerity and indignation will be enough to push this matter.

Your letters can be carbon copies—this will prove that you are making your complaint known to others and that you are putting your full force of citizenship behind your complaint.

These letters seem to be required to solve this problem.

Anyone having a tape recorder should keep it in readiness so that the broadcasts may be taped as final proof. Only one good recording would back up the statements of hundreds of furious television owners.

What the FCC sidesteps will have to be undertaken by vigilant citizens.

A year is too long to wait for correction of a local public nuisance.

Support of Hospital Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security yesterday issued a public statement reiterating its strong support for enactment of a plan of hospital insurance for the aged. The committee is made up of a number of distinguished physicians, including two Nobel laureates. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

WASHINGTON, August 5.—A committee of distinguished doctors today urged the enactment of legislation to provide hospital insurance for the aged under social security because "it will help physicians to fulfill their commitment to provide high quality medical care while preserving their independence of professional judgment."

"With hospital and related services covered by insurance, physicians will be in a better position to prescribe that treatment which is best for the patient," the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged under Social Security declared in a news leaflet. "It will improve the quality of health care."

The committee is composed of 31 leading American doctors, including a Nobel prize winner in medicine, a recipient of the American Medical Association's Distinguished Service Award, a former president of the American College of Physicians, a world-famous baby doctor, among others prominent in the profession. The chairman of the committee is Dr. Caldwell B. Esselstyn, founder and director of the Rip Van Winkle Clinic, Hudson, N.Y. Other members include Dr. Benjamin Spock of Cleveland, Ohio, famous baby doctor and author of the best-seller "Baby and Child Care"; Dr. Dickinson W. Richards of New York, N.Y., winner of the 1956 Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology; Dr. William A. Sawyer of Rochester, N.Y., past chairman, AMA Committee on Medical Care for Industrial Workers and former medical director, Eastman Kodak Co.

"Physicians have long been concerned because the elderly of our Nation live in fear of the catastrophic costs of hospitalization," the committee stated. "A single long illness can wipe out slender savings and force the aged to seek either public assistance or help from already overburdened children."

"Physicians know that because of this fear, many older people who need hospital care do not get it at all or get it too late," the committee declared.

The doctors, most of whom are members of the American Medical Association, said nonprofit hospitalization plans and commercial insurance plans "have not been able to meet the problem." The State programs under the Kerr-Mills bill, they said, is "a plan for the indigent aged" and provides "generally meager, spotty and often uncertain benefits."

The King-Anderson bill to provide hospital insurance for the aged under social security, on the other hand, provides the "most economical and practical answer," according to the committee.

"(It) is a hospitalization insurance program which involves virtually the entire population. It enables people to pay for their protection during the time they can best afford to contribute—while they are working. This approach avoids the necessity of a means test * * * and it helps to prevent poverty and destitution."

The committee rejected the argument that the bill is socialized medicine. Instead, the doctors stated, the measure "maintains the existing doctor-patient relationship." They called it "a self-help program."

They said that the King-Anderson bill provided three specific safeguards against overutilization of services.

The measure would also aid hospitals, the committee declared, because "these institutions, now often financially hard pressed, will know that they will be paid for services rendered to aged patients instead of having to absorb such costs as charity."

"No matter how you look at it," the physicians concluded, "legislation to provide hospital insurance for the aged is an effective, practical and commonsense way of meeting the high cost of hospitalization for the aged. It fills a great human need. It will improve the quality of health care. It protects the patient and the physician."

Got Yours Yet?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I believe a recent editorial in the Palos Regional newspaper, published in Palos Heights, Ill., sums up in a few words pertinent views on the agricultural program, mass transit, and a proposed Department of Urban Affairs. It is worthy of the attention of all Members:

GOT YOURS YET?

Having troubles? Don't worry—maybe Government will take care of them.

To make things all hunky-dory down on the farm, the Federal Government has put up tens of billions of dollars to keep prices up and is still kicking in to the tune of $5 billion a year of the taxpayers' money. The mess is worse than ever, but no one can say agriculture is neglected.

Due to changing needs, times, and habits, many of our city transit systems are finding the going hard. So, as a start, it is proposed that, over a 3-year period, the various units of government kick in with more than $500 million in grants and low-interest loans. Representative TAFT estimates the ultimate total at $20 billion. Representative DERWINSKI thinks that "Handing out Government grants will discourage initiative among transit operators, who might otherwise solve their own problems; drive financing out of the field, and subsidize inefficiency." They sure would—but never mind little things like that.

The House has balked at a proposal to establish a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs, which would enable the Federal Government to run the cities. But don't worry—the bill will be back.

There's lots of money down there in Washington, so long as we don't worry about more and more taxes, more and bigger deficits, a worsening world trade position, inflation, and other such petty matters. Got yours yet?

On Welfareton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ran across a rather thought provoking and amusing article in the Williba Knotholer, Lee County, Ky., that I would like to pass on for some of our colleagues to review and ponder.

I particularly appreciated the very kind remarks in support of my good friend and colleague, Representative GENE SNYDER, and my good friend in the other body, Senator THRUSTON MORTON, for their outspoken support of sound, conservative and responsible government. We need more men in Congress who think and vote as these gentlemen do:

ON WELFARETON

Me and Chester Deaton got to discussing the conditions of us pore people of eastern Kentucky what them Congressmens and welfarites are allus a talking about. Chester said with much authority and knowledgement, "You know I ain't hearn of nary a pore feller of eastern Kentucky a starving to death nor working hisself to death in a might long time."

We got to checking on Chester's statement and all the statistics and surveys put out by all the governmental surveys and probes of the welfare of eastern Kentucky does not show of a single pore person a starving to death in Lee County. Neither is there any references in these tons of surveys and investigations which would lead one to believe that anyone died from overexertion or excessive workings.

Them legislators met again down there in Frankfort and they pooled a lot of money together and they bought them big horsepittles yp here in eastern Kentucky and the way the papers read these horsepittles will be used mostly by us pore eastern Kentuckians who get indigent or pregnant. We've been discussing that indigent disease or malady and none of us pore ever remember a ketching no disease like that and some even think it is something similar to what happens to women what sounds sort of like that. If we ever do get indigent we'll rush to one of them new poreman's horsepittles and get ourselves took care of real quick so we can get back to our duties. All of us pore are about decided that indigent malady is a new disease carried in by all them governmental surveyors and investigators of eastern Kentucky's pore conditions.

Even one of former President Roosevelt's younguns were up in the pore sections of eastern Kentucky last month and taking a good look at us pore and needy. He was very much impressed by our conditions and he hurried back to tell the Presidents and Congressments that we were in real pore conditions and it was time to stop surveying and investigating and time to get a lot off good stuff sent right into us or we might even starve to death or ketch the indigents before the next election. We have been promised much because of the Roosevelt's youngun's visit among us pore and needy. Them Roosevelts all did have tender hearts for us unfortunates.

We even writ Senator MORTON about our conditions and we explained how none of us pore here in Williba got any boxes of food and clothing during the time that Lee County was declared to be in a governmental disaster area. Lee County has been a disaster area for many years but when the government recognizes the fact because of a heavy rain or an unforseeable election results; then us pore can expect boxes of food and clothing and money sometimes. We writ Mr. MORTON to see if we could find out if maybe them boxes of food and clothing had got short stopped down to the county seat. Sometimes we don't trust them fellers down to the county seat non too much and we nearly know they get a lot of the governmental stuff what is supposed to be for us pore county citizens.

Senator MORTON writ us back and he explained how the funds for a disaster area works and either he didn't know what he was talking about or we didn't one. Sounded like all the money and food and clothing goes thru the hands of the big shots down to Floral Clock, Ky. Then it is divided up and sent out to us what are suffering from disasters and the "indigents."

We guess all them big shots down to Floral Clock, Ky., pick out all the good stuff and just send little dabs of the tother stuff out to us pore sufferers. Sometimes it is such little dabs that it ain't noticable.

We did tell Senator MORTON 'bout how our neighbor's johnny fell over into the back water and floated off during the disaster flood and we told him we thought that to be 'bout the worst disaster thing to hit Lee County. The Senator was very nice and to writ us that he was most certain that someplace within the government there would be a agency or board what could take care of our neighbor's johnny. He even thought it might be possible to take the old WPA johnny project law and apply it to a brand new modern 1963 model of a johnny. We hope this can be done. Such a building would add much to our community.

We were pleased with the quick and kind response that we got from Senator MORTON. He has always been considerate of our pleas and we believe him to be one of the best Senators we got up in them Congfessments and we hope he will be in the presidential race in 1964—at least on the Vice President ticket. MORTON is a right good feller and you should ort to write him about any of your troubles.

They's another good man up there in one of them lower Houses of Congressment. His name is Representative G. SNYDER. He knows the direction in which the pore and the rich and the royal are headed and he will sacrifice his chances of reelection to do the right thing. We sort of like Mr. MORTON and Mr. SNYDER because they are men who resemble the old statesmen that made the United States once a great nation.

But looks like most of them fellers up there in them Congressments can talk about nothing but how pore and needy us eastern Kentuckians are and how dreadfully the Negroes are being treated. Seems like they don't give much thoughts to nobody else hardly and we don't reckon they's anymore pore people in the United States but eastern Kentuckians and maybe a few that border on eastern Kentucky by West Virgina.

Since Congressments dwell upon the pore conditions of eastern Kentucky so much some of us have come to the conclusions that maybe they ort to just make eastern Kentucky the 51st State of the Union and give it the beautiful name of Welfareton. Then a wall could be built around us and all methods of governmental reliefs could be experimented upon us. There's room in these hills whereby most of the Negroes could be transplanted among us here in Welfareton and then when something good come along to be handed out to us, it could all be loaded onto one freight car and shipped right into us. Then us pore and needy and the Negroes could fly right into the freight car load of good stuff and eat it up. Since the Governor has freed the Negroes in Kentucky, we could all eat together out of the same box. Yes, Welfareton, formerly eastern Kentucky, can become a great State of the Union and can become a haven for us pore and needy and the mistreated Negroes and the Congressments can get busy on some other urgent business like sending a billion dollars to Antarctica or some other country that needs it.

Write your Congressment and get them to establish Welfareton at their earliest convenience. It would be for the betterment of the Nation as a whole. What ever State of the Nation you live in, be sure your write your Congressment in our favor. Help us get Welfareton established as the 51st State of the Union.

Welfareton citizens will be allowed to vote at least once and in some instances they might be allowed to vote more than once. There will be no important offices such as Governors or constables in Welfarton. All business for Welfareton will be centralized in Washington.

Treaty Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be general agreement that we have an advantage over the U.S.S.R. in the size of our nuclear weapons arsenal. Conversely, there is little or no argument over the Soviets' superiority over us in the development of high yield bombs. In other words, we have nuclear bombs in quantity and they have them in quality. This seems to be quite satisfactory to the administration and other supporters of the test ban treaty.

The danger of accepting this situation, however, lies in the fact that use of the Soviet "big bang" bombs against us could immobilize our capability to retaliate with our larger arsenal of "smaller bang" bombs. This is one of the hazards inherent in Senate ratification of the treaty, as is well described by the widely circulated news columnist Holmes Alexander in the July 30 issue of the Houston Chronicle as follows:

TEST BAN TREATY COULD FREEZE UNITED STATES IN SECOND PLACE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Up till the time, in September 1961, when Russia held mammoth thermonuclear tests in the Arctic, there was well-informed confidence in Washington that the United States was ahead of the U.S.S.R. in the number of nuclear weapons and in nuclear knowledge.

President Eisenhower and Kennedy could be called justified, before those Arctic explosions, in offering a test ban treaty to abolish further explosions in the air and in the water.

There was much expert opinion which said that we did not need cooperative inspection of such explosions because both sides had instruments for detection. To make the treaty include space, as the Kennedy administration later proposed, seemed unwise to many knowledgeable persons. To make the treaty include underground testing, without adequate on-site inspection, would have been reckless, and was so branded.

But the whole matter of a test ban treaty now must be reconsidered on the basis of that turning point—September, 1961. It is still authoritatively assumed that the United States is ahead in the number of nuclear weapons and in our ability to produce them. But there is another area in which the United States is definitely behind—and that is the area of nuclear knowledge.

Well-informed men declare that Russia has learned more about nuclear weapons during 1961–63 than we have learned. Therefore, the advantage of a test ban has altered radically in the last 2 years. Before the autumn of 1961, a test ban treaty, if honestly observed, would have perpetuated American superiority within the limits of air and water. But after the autumn of 1961, the advantage went to Russia.

A good many Senators know this. They will say so if protected from seeing their words in print. They do not wish to be premature by opposing a treaty which is not yet before the Senate. But they do wish to find ways of offsetting this Russian advantage by writing certain provisos into the treaty that they finally ratify.

One very important proviso, is that we will consider the treaty to be automatically violated—whenever we detect unexplained explosions within Soviet territory.

Another is that the three parties to the treaty (the United States, U.S.S.R., and Britain) agree to limit production of nuclear weapons, as distinguished from the testing of them. This limitation is necessary for a reason so sensitive that I prefer to let another writer, who is more familiar than I with "sanitized" Pentagon language, put my information into words. Hanson Baldwin, New York Times military columnist, says it this way:

"The nightmare of a few experts is that a number of Russian superweapons exploded in the skies above the United States might blur our radar, knock out or confuse command-and-control systems, or destroy our electronic circuits and thus prevent the launching of deterrent weapons."

The "nightmare," to give it Baldwin's term, is that Russia, since 1961, has tested a superweapon which could cripple our military communications and render us incapable of striking back.

There are Senators ready to vow that no treaty shall be signed which leaves Russia free to produce this weapon which "a few experts" believe has already been tested.

Drive Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know our colleagues are familiar with the Drive essay contest, because winners from throughout the country have been coming to Washington as part of the reward for writing winning essays.

From Omaha, Mr. and Mrs. Blaine L. Rish, Teamsters Local 554, were selected as winners in the essay contest and recently visited Washington. I was pleased to speak with them and learn of their concern about certain legislative issues before the Congress.

I believe that it would be of interest to include the winning essay which was written by Mrs. Rish on the subject, "Drive Is Important to Me Because." Mrs. Rish's entry was the winner in the Joint Council Area which includes Omaha. Her essay follows:

Drive is important to me because my right to vote, intelligently, is important to me. To exercise that right and vote for the candidates who will lean toward benefiting the working man, I need to be fully informed of each candidate's stand toward labor. As an individual, it is impossible to keep abreast of all legislation, and those who propose it, that will harm the working man's only security, the union contract, and new position in the world. Drive does this for me, keeps me informed, and so being my information center, my eyes and ears of political affairs, it is a must for me.

Second Ship To Bear Proud New Hampshire Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on June 15, 1963 the U.S. Navy proudly commissioned the first in a new class of ocean escort vessels, named for a valorous Navy surgeon, Lt. Ben Richard Bronstein, of Manchester, N.H. This is the second ship to bear his name and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the commissioning ceremonies program be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Ben Richard Bronstein of Manchester, N.H., lost his life on February 28, 1942, when the U.S.S. *Jacob Jones* (D–130) was sunk by an enemy submarine off the Atlantic coast at Cape May, N.J.

Dr. Bronstein had been appointed assistant surgeon with the rank of lieutenant on October 4, 1941, and on November 6, 1941, reported for active duty at Portsmouth Navy-yard and was assigned to the *Jacob Jones*.

Ben Bronstein was born in Manchester in April 1913, and was graduated from the University of New Hampshire with a B.S. degree in 1936. He continued his education at Tufts College Medical School, Boston, and was graduated in 1940.

On December 13, 1943, the Navy commissioned the first U.S.S. *Bronstein* in memory of Lieutenant (jg) Bronstein which, after reporting to Norfolk was assigned to a hunter-killer group. From February to May the group was in continuous action against German U-Boats. The *Bronstein* also performed convoy escort work during this period. For her services and achievements the President of the United States awarded the U.S.S. *Bronstein* the Presidential Unit Citation. The citation reads in part, "On the night of February 29, the U.S.S. *Bronstein* engaged three German submarines during a 4½-hour period and struck heavily and effectively throughout the concentrated action to score decisive victories, consistently maintaining a superior degree of efficiency in the performance of her assigned missions, this gallant ship established an optimum level of antisubmarine effectiveness for escort vessels during World War II. By her readiness for combat, and the skill, courage and determination of her valiant officers and men, the U.S.S. *Bronstein* rendered invaluable service in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service." She was placed out of commission on November 5, 1945, and on May 3, 1952, was transferred to the Uruguayan Navy and renamed *Rou-Artigas*.

The second U.S.S. *Bronstein* named in honor of Lieutenant Bronstein was commissioned June 1, 1963, and is the first in a new class of ocean escort ships considerably larger than ocean escorts of the past. It has a high maneuverability as a destroyer escort and is equipped with the most modern communications and electronics installations to aid in screening transoceanic convoys and to operate offensively against submarines. Her entry into service marks another major stride forward in the program of providing the U.S. Navy with most advanced types of warships to enable it to meet its challenge today and tomorrow.

Episcopal Church of the Atonement, Westfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to call attention to the 100th anniversary of the Episcopal Church of the Atonement in Westfield, Mass.

This church, Mr. Speaker, has had a long and distinguished place in the Westfield community.

A recent article in the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News—July 26—summarized this history. I therefore would like to include portions of this story.

It is stirring tribute to the faith of these Westfield residents, and I am sure that my distinguished colleagues will find the history of this church particularly interesting:

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF THE ATONEMENT, WESTFIELD, MASS.

WESTFIELD.—The parish of the Episcopal Church of the Atonement is currently engaged in plans for the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the church in this community.

Although the Atonement Parish was organized on July 7, 1863, the beginnings of the organized Anglican or Episcopal congregations in this area dates back somewhat earlier. In the early days of the city's religious life there was no place in the Puritan village for the services of the Church of England but for those who came here shortly before the Revolution occasional services were held in Southwick which was a part of Westfield.

The Protestant Episcopal Society of Blandford and towns adjoining, was organized and incorporated by the legislature in 1799. The church, called St. Mark's, was located on North Street in Blandford. The district covered Granville and this city.

Services were sometimes held in the homes of persons in this community. Services were also held in local homes by Edward Jessup, rector of Grace Church in Chicopee and later on week days by Rev. H. H. Bates, former rector of St. Mark's in Blandford and who became the rector of Trinity Church in Tariffville, Conn. The early services were held in the meeting places of several other congre-

gations including the Baptists, Methodists, and Universalists.

Finally on July 7, 1863, the parish was organized as the Church of the Atonement with Rev. John F. Mines as rector. The new church was named for the Church of the Atonement in Philadelphia.

The first rector proved unsatisfactory and was deposed by the bishop early in 1864. He was succeeded by Andrew Mackie in March of that year. Records show that the bishop made his first visit here on October 2, 1864, and that 12 persons were confirmed. Mr. Mackie resigned in 1868 and records indicate that there were no Episcopal services held for the next 5 years.

UNION HALL SERVICE

Largely through the efforts of Miss Fanny Helen Greenwood, Rev. John Frank Winkley came to this community in 1873 and began services in Union Hall over the Post Office at the corner of Elm and Church Streets. The Rev. Benjamin F. Cooley succeeded him in 1878 when a planing mill on the site of the present H. B. Smith Co. plant on Main Street was then established as the place of worship.

Henry James Sheridan, a deacon, took charge in 1879 and was ordained a priest a year later. Land for the first church on King Street was given at that time by O. D. Jessup of Philadelphia.

The cornerstone of the King Street Church was laid on May 16, 1880, and the first service held on Good Friday, 1882. Rev. H. N. Cunningham replaced Mr. Sheridan in 1883 when the latter left to do missionary work in the west. From 1886 the rectors included Rev. Alan Prescott, Rev. Henry Tarrant, George G. Dugan, Normand S. Boardman, Rev. Frederick A. Wright, Rev. Herbert Grantham, and Rev. James F. Bullitt.

Rev. Robert Keating Smith took over the pulpit in 1906. He organized a boy choir and pioneered in the organization of Boy Scout Troop 101, one of the first troops to be organized in this country. Rev. Alfred D. Snively was the incumbent during 3 years abroad spent by Mr. Smith as a representative of the presiding bishop and archbishop of Canterbury in the organization of the national church in Czechoslovakia following World War I.

Purchase of the Court Street property took place in November 1923, and the first service in the remodeled building took place in September of the following year. Mr. Smith resigned in 1927 and was followed by Rev. Wolcott Coit Treat who was responsible for considerable physical growth prior to his death in 1931. Rev. Robert Lay Read became associate priest and priest-in-charge in 1935. The parish was taken over by Rev. Stanley C. S. Shirt on January 1, 1936, and until his death in 1946, led the efforts which resulted in paying off the church indebtedness. He also promoted many improvements to the church property.

Rev. Paul T. Schultz, Jr., was made rector on October 1, 1946, and active plans were started for a new church. The old building was deconsecrated in 1952 and services were held in temporary quarters in Fellowship Hall of the First Methodist Church until the new building was entered on June 7, 1953. The dedication was held 3 days later.

Rev. William M. Hale, the present pastor, came here in the spring of 1957. In the fall of 1958 the debt on the new church was retired and consecrated by Bishop Hatch. At this time the second floor addition to the west wing was completed. The first curate, Rev. Robert Golledge, came to the church in July of 1958 followed by Rev. Allen Wright in 1960, and Rev. Elliott Blackburn in 1962. The former Durkin property in the rear of the church was purchased in December of 1962 and only recently the church purchased the Atwater home at 38 Court Street.

Treaty Settles Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newton (Kans.) Kansan which discusses the test ban treaty. Prior to action by the Senate on this proposed treaty there should be full public debate on the pros and cons of such an agreement with the Soviet Union. I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the House as it represents the thinking of many citizens in regard to the value of an agreement with the Russians:

TREATY SETTLES LITTLE

The United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have come to an agreement barring the testing of nuclear bombs anyplace except underground. The agreement still must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate before it becomes effective.

Regardless of whether or not the Senate ratifies the treaty, it still has a couple of big weaknesses.

First, one atomic power, France, has been left out. The French may go on with their testing at will. Not only that, but China—Red China—is expected to develop an A-bomb within a relatively short time, and with the present split in the Commie world Red China will never become a party to such an agreement.

Second, a treaty with a Communist country has never been worth the paper it has been written on. It is effective only as long as the Communist nation wants it to be effective. Just as soon as it is in the best interests of the Commies to break the treaty, they will break it.

Premier Khrushchev probably was pushed into the treaty by his split with the Red Chinese. He needs desperately to bring them into line, but he can't do this with the West at his back. Nor can he risk stirring up trouble in the West with the Chinese on the other side of him, even though they speak almost the same ideological language.

So he suddenly starts to make peace with the West. This will free him in dealing with the Red Chinese. Once they are back in line he can feel free to break any treaty he has made.

The best that can be said for the treaty is that it might give the West some breathing time in which it can shore up its defenses against communism. The worst it can do is to betray the West into letting down its defenses.

A Tribute to Patrick J. Hurley

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, there are frequently times when one yearns for soft words and tender phrases that could convey cherished memories. Such a time is now, for my dear friend, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, has passed from our sight, bequeathing me a rich legacy of fond memories.

Patrick J. Hurley truly lived the American dream, he was born of immigrant parents in Coal County, Okla., and was reared in poverty, but amassed a fortune before turning to public life to serve his country.

I am proud to be among the many who today are paying tribute to a man whose mark in history is the rich legacy of wisdom, statesmanship, honor, and courage which he has imparted to the Government of the United States of America. Patrick J. Hurley was a man of many talents and he served his country in many capacities; he had a long and honorable military career; he was Secretary of War under President Hoover; was Ambassador to China under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am proud to live in a generation that has known the service, leadership and love of country that has been given so freely by my dear friend. I will always think of him as being indestructible, imperishable, and indomitable. To these characteristics must be added the qualities of integrity, wisdom, loyalty, friendliness, fairness and leadership, for he is a man who long will be remembered in our great country's annals of history.

Mrs. Belcher and I extend our most heartfelt sympathy to his wonderful wife, Mrs. Ruth Hurley and to his three children.

Prayer in Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, many outstanding organizations are lending their support to efforts to amend the Constitution so our children may pray and read the Bible in public schools.

This, as you Members know, is the purpose of discharge petition No. 3, which has been on the desk of the Clerk since July 9, 1963.

I am glad to report to the House that among those organizations adopting resolutions on this matter is the Kiwanis Club of Clermont, Fla.

I insert at this point, the text of the resolution adopted by the Clermont (Fla.) Kiwanis Club on July 23, 1963:

RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY AFTER DISCUSSION BY CLERMONT (FLA.) KIWANIS CLUB, JULY 23, 1963

Whereas it is our belief that the great majority of the citizens of the United States of America are God-fearing people; and

Whereas it is our belief that our Nation was founded by similarly God-fearing people, who prepared for us a constitution and a political system with many references to the Diety and our trust in Him; and

Whereas it is our belief that our Nation has thrived and risen from the status of a dependent colony to the greatest, most powerful, most beneficient Nation on earth in the incredibly short period of 175 years,

by the will of God, as the result of this great faith and trust in Him; and

Whereas it has been the great American tradition to express our devotion to Almighty God by opening our legislatures, our schools, our service clubs, and most other organizations with an invocation, prayer, or reading from the Bible; and

Whereas our Supreme Court has apparently bowed to the will of a minute minority of godless in our midst to declare unconstitutional the use of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading as devotional opening exercises in our public schools; and

Whereas we believe this to be contrary to the will of the great majority of American citizens who insist upon freedom of religion, not freedom from religion: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby petition all the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to consider legislation, amending the Constitution if need be, so that we may return to the great American tradition of setting the example to the children of the Nation, through our public schools, of our belief and trust in Almighty God.

ROY W. CALDWELL,
President.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 23, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Having read your remarks in the May 1, 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the reception of House Resolution 14, may I express my own appreciation for this committee. However, the one word which depresses me is that the committee be "permanent." I hope the understanding is "permanent only so long as the captive nations are denied their freedom."

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MILDRED JAGIELLA.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
June 22, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committe on Rules, the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: It is difficult to stand by and see one's former native land labor under the yoke of the Soviet Union. Lithuania is one of many countries, once free but now unwillingly under the grasp of the most destructive force of freedom the world has ever known, atheistic communism.

Therefore, I urge action on House Resolution 14 to establish a Committee on Captive Nations.

It is not only my request, but one of many thousands of freedom-loving people who ask that the United States of America deal with the "bloody hand of the Soviets."

Would you please advise me on the progress of this vital resolution.

Sincerely yours for a free world,

JOHN MACYS.

JUNE 19, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my gratitude to you for your efforts on behalf of the nations under Communist subjugation. I hope your work on the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives will be successful.

Even though the help I can give to you and your colleagues is small, I am more than happy to assist. I have written to my Congressman, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE, asking him to submit a resolution similar to House Resolution 14. Also, I enclose a copy of my letter to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Committee on Rules.

I would like to use this opportunity to request that you use all the influence at your disposal in order to have the President declare the third week in July as Captive Nations Week in accordance with the resolution passed in Congress in 1959.

Again I wish you and your colleagues success and thank you for your dedication to the Captive Nations cause. I hope you may continue your work until Soviet imperialism has been wiped from the face of this earth.

With deep respect,

A. VAITKUS.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL.

Re passage of House Resolution 14—Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As a naturalized American, who left Armenia many years ago, I want to commend you for your sponsorship of the above bill.

I know that despite many obstacles you are making every effort to obtain its passage.

Speaking for myself and others of the Armenian-American community in Haverhill, Mass., I want you to know that you have our support regarding the passage of this bill.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE NAJARION.

HAVERHILL, MASS.

Re passage of House Resolution 14—Captive Nations Committee establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The above bill submitted by you sometime in 1960 is of very great interest to me.

As a naturalized American, I favor its passage. The establishment of this committee is a positive step toward bringing to light the position of those captive nations, of which Armenia is one, which have been swallowed up by the Soviet Union.

I want to commend you for its introduction and also for your continued efforts to obtain its passage.

I am also writing Congressman SMITH urging him to take whatever steps are necessary to release this bill from the Rules Committee and on to the House floor for debate.

Very truly yours,

HEMAGEG VOSGARIAHIAN.

HAVERHILL, MASS., *June 17, 1963.*

Government Lotteries of Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, among the 77 foreign countries which utilize government lotteries as a revenue-raising device are Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland. In these five foreign nations, like in all the other countries, the gambling spirit of its people is legally recognized, accepted, and regulated for the countries' needs and the people's benefit.

Norway, in addition to the lottery, also benefits from semiofficial football pools. In 1962, the gross receipts of the national lottery came to over $17 million. After payment of prizes, the total annual net income to the government came to over $5 million.

Poland has a government lottery which was established long before the Communists took over that country—it dates back to 1808. In Poland there are two countrywide lotteries. In 1962, the total gross wagered in these lotteries was over $53 million. The net profit to the government was over $18 million of which part is used for investments in sports installations and support of sporting activities. The other part is used for housing, historical monuments, and local cultural activities.

Portugal gives us another example of how the urge to gamble may be utilized on behalf of charitable organizations. In 1962, the total gross receipts were $25½ million. The net income came to over $6½ million which went to public assistance.

Sweden has found the lottery to be of great help to its people. Not only is the

Swedish lottery the largest Scandinavian lottery but it is the most profitable. In 1962, the gross receipts came to $52 million. The net income to the government was almost $31 million. A good portion of this money is set aside for cultural activities and the rest is devoted to general budget purposes.

Switzerland has three lotteries which are operated on a multicantonal level. The 1962 figures show over $6¼ million in gross receipts. The net income came to close to $2 million which was used for private and public charities and for cultural organizations. Part of the moneys was used for conserving wildlife, for financing public buildings and maintaining public transportation systems.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson to be drawn from the example of these foreign nations is that a national lottery can be of great benefit to a country. This is not merely a case of the ends justifying the means, for if we were not so steeped in moral hypocrisy, we would realize that a national lottery is a time honored and tested financial device. With our own lottery we can produce over $10 billion a year in new revenue which can be used to reduce our high taxes and growing national debt. When will America wake up to the worth and value of national lottery?

Union Station Yawns as Traffic Fades but Taxes Go on Forever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Evening Star of July 31, concerning the famous Union Station just a few blocks north of the Capitol Building.

The article discusses the proposal by Downtown Progress, Inc., to turn the station into a visitors center. It is pointed out in the article that taxes on the station last year amounted to $2,750,455.74 or, as the Washington Terminal Co. manager, M. H. Lingenfelter is quoted as saying, "Just about how much the airport takes out of the Treasury. So we are paying for the airports that take our business away."

I think most of us have had occasion to pass through Union Station, and I include the article because of its current interest and because of the history which is reviewed in it:

UNION STATION YAWNS AS TRAFFIC FADES

(By Myra MacPherson)

Union Station is a depressing cavern where people no longer come.

Its look of lonely disuse is sad to view, especially so for those who remembered when 100,000 people a day swarmed the concourse; when it was a gateway to all parts of the world for millions of soldiers during World War II; when presidents and kings came to town that way because, after all, who could take the airlines seriously?

In 1928, 301 trains steamed in and out of the station daily. Today the roar has subsided to the relative quiet of 121 trains a day.

The entrance with its mammoth roman arches is marred by a shabby gray wooden canopy that brings no beauty with its function of protecting people from the rain.

Inside, it is dim and humid and, high above in arched windows, huge fans succeed only in whirling warm air from one place to another. The click of heels echoes on the marble floor and there is a gloomy feeling that although a shout would resound in the emptiness, no one would bother to turn a head.

ROOM FOR OTHERS

Two or three soldiers walk past leisurely, where, during the war, a soldier's leg was broken in a trampling rush of people getting to their trains. On a shiny wooden bench where people once shoved together elbow to elbow, a man sleeps full length, knowing there is plenty of room left for others.

A mother tells two small boys to keep their feet off the benches. In a far corner an old woman rummages through a sack. Another leans on her arms at her newsstand waiting.

"It's nothin' like it used to be. People's not traveling like they used to by train." Looking down the quiet room she said, "You couldn't used to get through there. They didn't have sitting room left. They used to sit on their bags. It's sad about the trains."

Management in this fading business of passenger trains, the Pennsylvania and Baltimore & Ohio Railroads, has been trying to dump Union Station for years.

Last year, they paid $2,750,455.74 in taxes. Or, as the Washington Terminal Co. manager, M. H. Lingenfelter, grimly cognizant of the facts, put it: "Just about how much the airport takes out of the Treasury. So we're paying for the airports that take our business away."

HAIL CENTER PLAN

The railroads greeted the latest proposal by Downtown Progress, Inc, to turn the station into a visitors center with all the enthusiasm of a parent meeting the prospective suitor of his spinster daughter.

"We would adjust ourselves in order to make the building useful. I'm certain we could put a small waiting area in some corner of the station," said Mr. Lingenfelter.

The project is very much in the "if" stage. It would first require congressional legislation and to date, a bill has not even been drawn up. If the station did become the visitors center some of the vast space would be chopped up for theaters, meeting rooms, display areas, information centers, cafeterias and snack facilities.

"I would think much of the personnel would stay. In fact, the people who run some of the stands could benefit by it," said Mr. Lingenfelter.

Today, parts of the station take on the aspect of an amusement park during the off season. Souvenirs wait untouched at many stands. A large sign invites people to "have fun" in the game room where, at noon the other day, all the pinball machines were idle. There is a bar and dining room where one is certain of immediate seating.

It is hard to imagine this ghost of a building when it was filled with life. The splendor of its Roman architecture drew tourists when it was completed in 1907. It was a fitting place to receive King Albert of Belgium in 1919, the King of Siam in 1931.

With fanfare, King George and Queen Elizabeth were escorted to the Presidential Lounge. In World War II, the State Department did the noble thing and turned the lounge into a USO center. The red carpets and the furniture were packed away, never to be used again. There were no demands for their services after the war.

A long secret hallway for anyone wishing to make an unobserved exit runs alongside the lounge. Today it is used as a free baggage room for the servicemen who still come through Washington, making this room with its rock 'n' roll music, one of the few populated in the station.

The station had its memorable moments. Thousands huddled outside in the plaza when President Franklin D. Roosevelt's body was brought back from Warm Springs.

RUNAWAY TRAIN

And on a January morning 10 years ago the Federal Express ran away, ripped through the station and planted its engine in the basement. It left a crater in the terminal concrete where minutes before people walked with suitcases, candy bars, magazines and train tickets—injuring 40 and miraculously killing no one.

It seems like a long time ago.

Oliver La Farge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the Nation's leading authorities on American Indian life, Oliver La Farge, died Friday in New Mexico. He was 61 years of age; and if his health had not failed, he would have had many more useful years ahead of him. He was an historian and an anthropologist whose main interest was in telling the story of American Indians, and thereby helping advance their progress through a better understanding by the rest of the country. He won the Pulitzer Prize for his novel "Laughing Boy," a story of Navajo life. A quarter million copies of "Laughing Boy" have been reproduced here and abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial about Oliver La Farge which appeared in the New York Times on August 4, 1963, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLIVER LA FARGE

A half century ago, when the American Indian was much in the news because of the gross injustices done to him, he had a considerable number of influential—or at least highly vocal—friends. But in time the national conscience found other and seemingly greater injustices pressing upon it, and many of the Indian's friends wandered away from a concern for his welfare. Not so Oliver La Farge. He became an eloquent spokesman for the Indian cause in the 1920's when he wrote the Pulitzer Prize winning novel, "Laughing Boy," a tale of Navajo life. His ardor never waned; indeed, at his death thousands of residents of Indian reservations considered him their only hope for ever achieving a measure of dignity.

Oliver La Farge approached the Indian without maudlin sentiment. He liked and respected him, and with gentle but firm good nature he repelled the caricature of the modern Indian as a drunk and a wastrel. La Farge told America that the Indian was brave, loyal, and intelligent. He fought the

Indian's battles before many a congressional committee and White House advisory group. Others were in the fight, too, but it was La Farge's voice that was heard most frequently and most movingly in behalf of the country's original settler.

Oliver La Farge threw his arm in kindness and affection around the shoulder of a forgotten man. No racial minority ever had a more resolute friend.

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, at American Library Trustee Association Recognition Dinner, Chicago, Ill., July 13, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, another deserved honor has come to our distinguished colleague from the Second District of Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY, who received the Citation of Merit for his outstanding contribution as a library trustee at the American Library Association's 82d Annual Conference in Chicago, Ill., on July 14.

Those of us who have difficulty keeping track of the multiplicity of JOHN FOGARTY's interests and attainments may not be aware that he is an active member of the board of trustees of the Harmony, R.I., Public Library.

Representative FOGARTY was cited:

For his militant championship of libraries in the halls of Congress * * * his immeasurable help in 1956 in obtaining appropriation of funds which implemented the Library Services Act * * * his powerful and effective fight in 1960 which culminated in extension of the Library Services Act * * * his continuing leadership in preparing the way for new Federal legislation favorable to libraries.

Prior to the announcement of the award, Mr. FOGARTY was the featured speaker at the annual Recognition Dinner held on July 13 by the American Library Trustees Association. His remarks reveal his keen understanding of the significance and the problems of today's public libraries. Because they are of exceptional value to Members of Congress at this time when we are considering legislation to amend the Library Services Act, I should like to insert Mr. FOGARTY's speech it its entirety:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT AMERICAN LIBRARY TRUSTEE ASSOCIATION RECOGNITION DINNER, CHICAGO, ILL., JULY 13, 1963

First, let me express my pleasure at being among you. As a fellow public library trustee and one of the thousands of unsung, unpaid partners in library development, I know that you share my abiding commitment to the importance of good public libraries. We can take pride in the fact that the devoted efforts of conscientious trustees, who give so freely of their time and effort, have done much to make the American public library a major resource for lifelong learning.

This ALTA recognition dinner provides a fitting occasion for some reflection and some speculation on the fortunes of the libraries in our charge. Without doubt, each of us can gain some satisfaction with library progress and improvements made over the last year. Equally certain is our knowledge of problems yet to be solved, demands yet to be adequately met, and, just over the horizon, a whole new world of library change and growth.

The continued ability of American citizens to make intelligent decisions and well-informed choices is a matter of crucial importance in today's world and in the years ahead. A good public library has a central responsibility in the achievement of this vital goal. To understand some of the reasons why library service of excellence is becoming more complex, more expensive, and more important, we need to consider the major social, economic, and cultural forces now impinging on our daily lives. On the one hand, we have more people who are more highly educated and more highly dependent upon resources for continuing education than ever before. On the other hand, we are just beginning to cope with a phenomenal increase in both the quality and quantity of recorded knowledge in the form of books, periodicals, films, tapes, and other communication media which can be appropriately considered as library materials.

This is a very broad statement of a serious situation which now faces, and will continue to face, all of our social and educational institutions. For public libraries, and for us as librarians and trustees, the problem has special significance. With this growth pattern in mind, let me try to identify a number of elements which seem to bear directly on the task of providing good library service.

We are all acutely aware of the numerical increase in population, and libraries have a special concern with certain parts of this growth. For example, the number of people who are 5 through 21 years of age, the heaviest users of both public and school libraries, will increase from 53.2 million in 1960 to 67.5 million in 1970. During the same period, those persons who are over 60 years of age and who frequently have need of specialized library facilities will increase in number from 23.7 million to 28.4 million.

If the implication in these figures was simply that we will need to do more of the same kind of thing that our libraries are already doing, this would still be a demanding task. But let's not forget the change which has occurred in the number of persons employed in professional and technical occupations. This group, with its built-in demand for reference and research material, increased from 4.5 million in 1950 to 7.5 million in 1960, a rise of 66 percent.

The significance of this change was identified by Lester Asheim when he was dean of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School. He noted that "growth is occurring in those parts of the total population which have traditionally been the greatest users of the book. The implications for the library add up to something considerably more than just a growth in library use; they point to a more serious, more intensive and more purposeful use of library materials." It follows logically from this that more extensive library collections will be needed, together with a more specialized and more highly trained staff of professional librarians.

The handmaiden to this growth in demand for materials is the increase in the number and variety of publications available. It has been estimated that 10 million words are added every month to the cumulative knowledge of mankind in the field of chemistry alone. The number of titles of scientific books published in the United States, excluding Government publications, increased from 705 in 1950 to 1,743 in 1962. The total number of new books and new editions rose from 11,022 in 1950 to 21,904 in 1962.

Still a third factor in this demand and supply situation is the sharp increase in the cost of library materials. The average subscription price of periodicals in the fields of chemistry and physics increased 102 percent between 1950 and 1962. In only the last 7 years, the annual subscription price of Chemical Abstracts rose from $60 to $500. And this journal, despite its value, can offer only partial coverage of the 50,000 scientific periodicals now being published.

One characteristic of our growing and changing society which seems to be occasionally neglected by library planners is the truly amazing mobility of the modern American family. Nearly 46 million citizens moved, at least from one house to another, in the 15-month period between January 1959 and April 1960. In our urban fringe areas, only 21 percent of the population in 1960 had lived in the same house for 10 years or more. This same ebb and flow of people exists even when the place of residence is not changed. The family members may live in one community, earn their living in another, and go to school in a third. They shop, go to church, and seek their recreation on this freewheeling basis, crossing city, town, county, and even State lines, often without being aware that they are doing so. These Americans have little patience for arbitrary political boundaries which, to them, merely complicate rather than simplify their lives. In many cases they have also shown little tolerance for public officials who try to maintain such boundaries for the benefit of a few, rather than reducing them for the benefit of all.

The implication for libraries of this mobility has been well expressed by ALA President Bryan who said, "Let us turn our attention to what in effect is the library system. This is the totality of all libraries in the United States and, while the differing units are not identified as necessarily related in any way, we are for many students and scholars serving just as certainly as a system of libraries as our public and private schools on all levels are serving as a system of formal education."

All of these facts show that we, as library trustees, have a big and important job. We must realize that library service as we have known it in the past will not meet the needs of our citizens in the days ahead. Bold and imaginative planning, followed by action on an unprecedented scale will be required of both librarians and trustees. For library trustees, the key word is "planning." As policymaking groups, constituted to represent the wide range of community interests and needs, library boards of trustees can be the focal point in library development. The present demands on our library facilities which I have already mentioned create considerable daily pressures on our librarians. We trustees should see to it that these serious distractions do not prevent an occasional halt to examine the fundamentals involved in designing adequate library services for our communities. It is the mutual understanding by the library board members, the librarian, and the library staff of their respective responsibilities that makes possible a spirit of productive teamwork. It is in this spirit that real progress toward our library's goals will be made.

In this working partnership for better libraries, we can be sure that each trustee can make a unique contribution to some aspect of each library activity. As an example, let's consider the national standards, as defined in the ALA publication, Public Library Service. These statements describe the various criteria which, when taken as a whole, mean that a library is giving service of minimum adequacy. As I view the role

of the trustee in applying these standards to his community, it would be first to identify any shortcomings in his library, then to begin planning the ways and means by which the gaps can be filled. I think we should also remember that these standards defined minimum adequacy in 1956 and today's needs are unquestionably greater.

It is interesting that these standards, which emphasize the joining together of libraries in order to provide a network of resources for the user, reflect exactly the patterns of use which Mr. Bryan has described. Trustees, familiar with the people and places reached by their libraries, can be alert to possible cooperative arrangements which would help make such a network a functioning reality. That these possibilities exist has already been demonstrated by several States. New York State, now almost entirely covered by 22 library systems, has led the way in the development of cooperative networks of public libraries. But New York State has also recognized a wider need, which is embodied in their "three-R" program. This idea, now in the form of proposed legislation, is based on a report by a special Governor's Committee, and is entitled "A Cooperative Program for the Development of Reference and Research Library Resources in New York State." It provides for five regional reference and research library systems which would permit access to all of the available library resources in each area on an equitable financial basis. This proposal reflects the fact that not only is any single library inadequate in terms of current demand, but that no one type of library has the money, space, staff, or equipment to cope with these needs. The job demands a joint enterprise which will promote the cooperative acquisition and use of materials and which will fully exploit modern electronic techniques of information storage and retrieval and of automatic data processing.

New York is not alone in mounting a concerted attack on the problem. In my own State, a study published in March 1963, takes into account the resources of all the libraries in Rhode Island—public, school, academic, and special. The recommendations are specifically aimed first at correcting shocking existing inadequacies, and second, of coordinating facilities to provide freer access to materials of all types.

In New Jersey, a massive do-it-yourself survey of libraries has just been completed. Conducted by the New Jersey Library Association, with the direct involvement of many library trustees, the survey teams covered all type of libraries and the various methods of financing library operations. California, Illinois, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, and Pennsylvania are examples of other States which have taken a long-range wide-angle look at library development. Every library trustee should be fully informed about current planning in his State. Every library trustee has a direct responsibility to become thoroughly familiar with the recommendations for improved services and should be willing to work toward their implementation.

In many cases, the key to effective implementation of programs to improve library services is money. Every comprehensive statewide plan for library development considers the problem connected with adequate financing of library services. We all know the inherent inefficiencies of the overburdened local property tax as the traditional source of most library support. Other revenue sources must be found and many States are now examining the respective responsibilities of local, State, and Federal Government toward the support of library service of high quality.

At the present time we have begun to accumulate some valuable experience with programs of grants-in-aid at both the State and Federal levels. I know you are all familiar with the Federal Library Services Act which allocates funds to the States for the extension and improvement of public library services in areas of less than 10,000 population. This program has been highly popular and a part of its success can be measured by the fact that more than 38 million citizens now have new or improved public library services as a direct result of the Library Services Act. Of special significance is the fact that State appropriations for rural public library services have increased 92 percent and funds from local government for the same purpose have risen 71 percent since the act went into effect. This demonstrates beyond question that one basic purpose of the law—to stimulate greater State and local effort—has been accomplished. To me, it is also convincing evidence that the Federal Government can, and should, share with State and local governments the responsibility of financing good library service. We have clearly seen that the problems facing our libraries are national in scope; it seems to follow logically that a part of the solution also lies at the national level.

A little more than a century ago, States began to adopt legislation permitting the establishment, organization, and support of local public libraries. I am proud to say that Rhode Island, in 1875, passed the first State-aid law under which the State board of education could pay local libraries up to $500, based on the size of the book collection.

The role of the State in public library development has been well stated by Carleton Joeckey, who said, "Since education is a State concern and the library is a part of the educational system, it is also a concern of the State. The public library must be raised to a level higher than that of purely local interest. The process will doubtlessly be gradual, but it must be definite if the library is to be successful either in extending its service to all people of the State or in raising the quality of service to anything like a uniform standard."

A forthright endorsement of this position was made in 1959 by the California Legislature which adopted the following statement as part of its education code:

"The legislature hereby declares that it is in the interests of the people and of the State that there be a general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence through the establishment and operation of public libraries. Such diffusion is a matter of general concern inasmuch as it is the duty of the State to provide encouragement to the voluntary lifelong learning of the people of the State. The legislature further declares that the public library is a supplement to the formal system of free public education, and a source of information and inspiration to persons of all ages, and as such deserves adequate financial support from government at all levels."

Today, 27 States have State-aid programs which include cash payments to local libraries. The grant programs in Colorado, Florida, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Oregon were all enacted since 1956, and the programs in three other States, Kentucky, New York, and Pennsylvania have been substantially increased in recent years.

In 1950, State grants to local libraries made up only 1.7 percent of total public library expenditures. In 1956, this proportion rose to 2.7 percent amounting to $4.3 million. By 1961 State grants totalled more than $17 million or about 6 percent of all public library expenditures. That same year the maximum authorized appropriation under the Library Services Act was $7.5 million or about 2.5 percent of the national total.

Although this trend is highly encouraging, the proportion of State and Federal support for public libraries does not yet begin to approach levels recognized by professional leaders as required for adequate service. As long ago as 1948 the suggested ratio of library support was: 60 percent from local units; 25 percent from the States, and 15 percent from the Federal Government. In 1961 a prominent State librarian recommended that a more realistic formula would be 40 percent local funds, 40 percent State, and 20 percent Federal. It is interesting to compare this with a recent paper on public school finance which suggests that, "A school revenue pattern of 50 percent from State sources 25 percent from Federal sources and 25 percent from local sources would be far more logical and equitable than our present pattern."

It may well be that there is no one correct formula for the optimum distribution of library support among the various levels of government. The overwhelming evidence from public libraries and from our other educational enterprises, however, does show that placing over 90 percent of the burden of support for public libraries on the already struggling local community is unfair and unwise.

As we consider the role of the Federal Government in helping to define, to understand, and to solve the problems now facing our libraries, it is of value to note that the very success of the present Library Services Act has helped to reveal the serious library needs yet to be met. The present Library Services Act was designed to cope with only a small segment of the total library situation. The act provides assistance only to public libraries, and then only to those public libraries which are located in rural communities. Providing improved services to these residents was, and still remains, a highly important goal, but the forces of change do not wait until present problems are neatly solved.

Legislation now pending before the Congress contains two new and much needed revisions of the present program. First, benefits become available to communities of every size, and second, funds can be used for the construction of library buildings and for site acquisition.

The inclusion of urban areas will allow librarians and trustees to build substantial programs of library extension and improvement on the more developed libraries of the larger cities. In this way, improved library facilities and services can be shared by all users regardless of their place of residence. However, the problems which we have considered—increased library use, rising costs of personnel and materials, lack of enough books—cannot be solved by providing assistance only for operating expenses. The ability of any library to respond to these demands is directly related to the adequacy of its physical plant. Advanced age, lack of usable space, nonfunctional design, and expensive maintenance are the typical characteristics of American public library buildings today.

Title VI, part C, of the comprehensive education bill would authorize the appropriation of $20 million for public library construction. This title is based on the same State plan principle which has proved so successful under the present Library Services Act. By enlarging this program to include all areas of the country, and by providing assistance for construction costs we are recognizing the essential unity of public library needs.

Other parts of the proposal are addressed to the larger unity of libraries of all kinds. One of the strongest features of John Humphrey's report on Rhode Island libraries is, in my judgment, his emphasis on the need for immediate and radical improvement within each type of library. The importance attached to interlibrary cooperation has not been exaggerated, but it is absolutely vital to such cooperation that the partners be at relatively comparable levels of adequacy. A vigorous public library

program, operating with a comprehensive book collection cannot "cooperate" with a weak or nonexistent school library program. It can only act as an unsatisfactory substitute. The same principle will hold true whenever academic, special or other libraries are grossly inadequate to the demands made upon them. The various proposals affecting libraries now pending before Congress, when taken together, represent a beginning effort to achieve some of this basic improvement in library facilities and services. There are gaps in the legislative proposals and there are strong and weak points in particular bills, but I am convinced that we are moving in the right direction.

By stimulating more systematic statewide planning; by fostering greater and more rapid investment in public and academic library facilities; by stimulating additional State and local effort; and by providing new opportunities for additional professional training, these proposals will give our libraries a running start into the difficult but fascinating years ahead.

Alert and intelligent leadership is urgently required from every librarian, library trustee, government official, and citizen concerned with good public library service. We know the magnitude of the job ahead and the importance of doing it well. We know the strengths and weaknesses of our own libraries. Every library board and each individual trustee should, therefore, come to grips with some basic questions now confronting us. What productive relationships can be established with our neighboring public libraries? What specific forms of cooperation among different types of libraries will help improve the services of each? What is the appropriate role of our large urban and academic libraries toward the extension of high quality service? How can we work toward optimum distribution of the responsibility for library support among the various levels of government?

It is only as we lift our eyes to the horizon that we are able to see the true perspective of our daily concerns. Any plan we make for our own libraries will be realistic and effective only if it is based on a clear view of the relationships between each library and all other related facilities and service throuhgout the State and region.

In considering our responsibilities as public library trustees, we must never lose sight of the constructive role which the library must assume in society. In today's society a major area of concern is the extension of basic American rights to every citizen of the Nation. Ours is a leadership task—to promote an orderly transition in a period of extraordinary tension. Freedom of access by every citizen to every public library should be the goal of every library trustee.

The Council of the American Library Association has taken a bold step forward in authorizing the conduct of a study of access to libraries throughout the Nation. We look forward with interest to the report of this study which is to be presented to the council of the association next week.

I might add that in addition to such nongovernmental action, the Congress also must face its obligations in this field of human relations, and legislation in the area is currently under consideration.

You all know of my deep commitment to the improvement of all our educational agencies. You know of my belief that the public library can provide needed educational opportunities to every citizen. If we work together as trustees, if we build effective patterns of cooperation, if we strive for higher standards, we will accomplish our library goals. If we can provide library services of consistently high quality, we will be making a significant contribution to educational excellence in the United States. The stakes in our efforts are, at the least, the continued freedom and enlightenment of individual Americans. The stakes may also be the continued vitality of Western civilization and the survival of mankind upon this earth. In either case, can any of us do less than our very best for the progress of our libraries?

Rural Area Development and Civic Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, in the eyes of most of our New Hampshire citizens, the best kind of cooperation offered by the Federal Government promotes, but does not preempt local initiative. I was particularly pleased to see the Department of Agriculture Rural Area Development newsletter reprint an editorial by our distinguished northern New Hampshire publisher, Judge Frederick Harrigan. The vision of local businessmen, farmers, and other civic leaders is an indispensable ingredient in a successful area redevelopment program and, indeed, one of the strongest hidden benefits of the ARA program in over 1,000 areas in this Nation. The work of the local Rural Area Development Committees often goes on without praise, so Judge Harrigan's words of commendation are especially welcome. Equally noteworthy is the fact that his assessment of rural areas development does not reflect a partisan position, but an altogether independent judgment. I ask unanimous consent that his editorial and news story from the Colebrook, N.H., News and Sentinel for April 29, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Attendance at the meeting of the Rural Areas Development Committee here last week was an enlightening experience—so much so, in fact, that this issue of the paper devotes more space to it than we have ever accorded any one story before. It is only after writing it up and proofreading the copy that some comprehension began to dawn of the apparently tremendous scope of this whole RAD idea. Coming to it completely uninformed—a little prejudiced, if anything, since our slightly "anti" feelings on promotion per se are no secret—personal observation and reflection have now convinced us that despite its plethora of New-Dealish-sounding initialed agencies and programs, it is a fine and much-needed thing, a sort of superclearinghouse for problems and projects on a county basis. Even to the bewildered neophyte, it is obvious that this group ranges all over the map in trying to apply mature, nonpolitical consideration to any and all matters which may concern the county and its people.

Some of the ideas seem almost inconceivably vast and expensive. One could wish that solutions did not so often involve Federal grants, obtained by something resembling subterfuge at times, or differentials in State aid ratios based on compliance with the urgings of State agencies. But what kind of group would be worth its salt if, without exception, everybody connected with it agreed with everything it said or did? It would die a quick death from sheer boredom, if nothing else.

This is not a promise that we can always find space or energy to write a book on a RAD meeting as we did this week. But it is without the slightest hesitation that this newspaper pledges is complete cooperation in every way possible to as worthwhile a movement as we have seen in many years.

RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT GROUP RUNS GAMUT OF COUNTY AFFAIRS

The April meeting of the Coos County Rural Area Development Committee was held at the Colebrook Town Hall Thursday night, with a number of speakers discussing subjects of interest in various parts of the county. Executive Secretary Dwight Stiles, of Lancaster, county agent, introduced various nonmembers of the committee, including Governor's Councilor Dr. John P. Bowler, of Hanover, who were present at the meeting. He then read a letter of resignation from Mark Hamlin, of Berlin, who has served as chairman of the committee for the past year. On the recommendation of a nominating committee composed of Charles W. Jackson, of Colebrook, Principal Richard Bradley, of Berlin High School, and Mr. Stiles, Lawrence Philbrook, of Shelburne, was unanimously elected chairman to succeed Mr. Hamlin. Dr. Douglas Horton, of Randolph, was elected as temporary chairman to preside over the Thursday night meeting. His first official act was to call for a moment of silence out of respect to the memory of Norman Craigie, of Groveton, veteran RAD member who died recently.

HARDWOOD USE AND CHRISTMAS TREES

County Forester Jack Sargent, the first speaker, spoke on a projected study for feasible use of low-grade hardwood. He said that between 62 and 63 percent of the area of Coos County is hardwood, the greater part of it low grade. Following a move initiated by the county foresters of the three northern counties, Governor John W. King has personally carried to Washington a request for a 1-year study, carrying $48,000 in Federal funds, which it is hoped may result in the suggestion of products capable of being manufactured by small independent north county firms from native low-grade hardwood. Mr. Sargent also reported that the University of New Hampshire is now in the process of engaging a forest marketing specialist, who will oversee this study and provide liaison with the university. Mr. Sargent went on to discuss an experimental Christmas tree project on a 2-acre tract in Colebrook given by the Rainville Bros. He said as a result of discussions with Harlie Weir, of Colebrook, and Louis Day, of Stewartstown, he had gone to the University of New Hampshire for help with this project, and that as a result the university is now advertising for a qualified man to head up a long-term study of the best methods of pruning, shearing, fertilizing, etc., to produce quality Christmas trees.

PONTOOK DAM AND DEAD RIVER

Editor A. W. "Brud" Warren of the Berlin Reporter discussed a study of the entire Androcoggin River which is now underway by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. One possible outcome of this study is a dam at Pontook creating a lake some 10 miles long. The project would cost $14 million, and would be unique in that it would ostensibly serve the three aims of flood control, hydroelectric power, and recreation. With such a dam expected to bring some 42,000 people a year into the Berlin area, Mr. Warren said the idea has "caught the imagination" of Berlin people to an amazing extent. The project, among other things, would require relocation of some 12 to 14 miles of highway along the river. Mr. Warren cautioned that, while the idea has obviously met with favor in the eyes of the Engineer Corps personnel who have studied it, it will be an estimated 8 years before any such dam is actually built. In response to questions

from Dr. Herbert Gifford, the Berlin editor said the dam would create a lake entirely within New Hampshire borders but power produced would be sold under Department of Interior control to buyers anywhere, with REA unity, which have some 182 miles of line in northern Coos, given preference. He stressed that the Pontook idea is an entirely different concept than the so-called High Errol Dam discussed some years back, and which Mr. Warren referred to as "gone by the board."

In the absence of Les Blaisdell, Mr. Warren also touched briefly on the problem of the Dead River in Berlin, which flows right through the city business district to empty into the Androscoggin. Twice, in 1936 and again in 1953, it has caused major damage to Berlin businesses, and a separate project is underway with RAD approval and U.S. Soil Conservation Service participation to control this river and create at the same time a lake large enough for municipal recreation purposes. Cost of this project was estimated at a quarter of a million dollars, with completion possible in about 3 years.

ARA STATUS DISCUSSED

George Martin of the Groveton Public Service Co., office offered brief comments on the possible use of power produced at Pontook, and it was announced that Mrs. Dick Bradley would be the new Coos member of the State RAD Committee, replacing Mr. Hamlin. Then the committee finally got to the point at which an outsider, bewildered by the Tugwelian parade of alphabetical designations which were being fired around with abandon, finally learned that the most important initials of all, "ARA," stand for "Area Redevelopment Administration." In this department ARA status is apparently something akin to being an Eagle Scout, or perhaps making the Porcelian. Anyway, Secretary Stiles reported that Governor King is "very optimistic" that we (meaning the county, one supposes) will receive this coveted honor shortly, presumably with all the benefits and emoluments accruing therefrom.

Edwin Frizzell, pinch-hitting for Les Blaisdell, went back to the matter of the Dead River, discussing it from the point of view of the Coos County Soil Conservation District. He pointed out that a "feasibility study" of cost and benefits of the project is under way, with assistance from the university, and that if the project is carried out the Federal Government will take on half the cost of such land easements as may be required solely for recreation purposes, with the city of Berlin footing the rest of the bill. Since money is actually in hand once authorized, Mr. Frizzell predicted quick action on this question, one way or the other, and agreed with Mr. Warren that it could probably be done in 3 years.

MANPOWER RETRAINING PROGRAM

Principal Dick Bradley and Dick Pinette, chairman of the vocational education department in Berlin, had news of recent developments with regard to manpower retraining. They stated that even though the Manpower Retraining Act was passed in May 1962, no real action has resulted in this area until about 4 or 5 weeks ago. Then frustrated members of the committee * * * National Committeeman Emmett Kelly of Berlin to make one phone call to Washington. It is now certain that a program of instruction in stitching will be underway at the Berlin Fire Station within 2 weeks, a second course in machine operation will go into high gear shortly afterward, and the industrial committee will immediately go to work on still a third program.

The stitching course, primarily for women, will use equipment supplied by Granite State Rubber Co. and Ware Knitters, and will train 16 people at a time with the course lasting 4 weeks. There are already 116 applicants. The machine shop course, a 600-hour program, is planned for Berlin High School. It was emphasized that eligibility for this retraining is not confined to Berlin. A person to be eligible has to be (1) unemployed (2) eligible to receive unemployment compensation payments, and (3) sign an agreement to the effect that if work in the particular field is not available in this area he or she will accept such work elsewhere in New Hampshire. The New Hampshire State Employment Service acts as the "screening agency" in this program, and persons who live outside the community where such training is given may receive mileage and expense money in addition to their regular unemployment compensation.

LANCASTER REPORTS ON SCHOOLS, RECREATION

A letter was read from Mrs. Grace Lee, of Lancaster, reporting the recent vote of five school districts in the Lancaster, Dalton, Whitefield area to form a cooperative school. Stating that smaller towns simply cannot support adequate schools in these times, Mrs. Lee's letter lauded the fact that over 90 percent of the voters in the five district affected had favored the move. The schools will operate for one more academic year as in the past, with a meeting scheduled for the Lancaster Armory at a date to be announced shortly (probably around May 14) to set up officers, school board, etc., for the new cooperative district. It was mentioned, among other things, that the backers of the successful cooperative movement worked so energetically that they received a $5,000 grant from the Spaulding-Potter Trust, which was a great help in their efforts. Dr. Horton called Mrs. Lee's letter a "report of achievement, not just progress."

Ray Hartshorn, of Lancaster, speaking for the Lancaster-Development Corp., really showed enthusiasm in describing the achievements of the group, which is capitalized for $200,000 and has actually sold $50,000 worth of stock in the Lancaster area. According to Mr. Hartshorn, this group owns or holds options on no less than 10,000 acres of land in Lancaster, Jefferson, Randolph, Kilkenney, and Berlin, forming a natural "bowl," and promisin gto develop into what could be a $50 million, year-round recreational enterprise which would be about the biggest thing of its kind in the East if not the entire Nation. Somebody said, "How about the 1958 Olympics?" and the speaker was away ahead of him.

Seems they already looked into that, and the only trouble is Olympic sites require 2,600 feet of vertical drop as against a maximum of 2,100 feet available in the area. Mr. Hartshorn made it clear the promoters had by no means given up on that one, and would "hang hooks from the clouds" if they had to in order to get the Olympics to Lancaster. Money was being discussed in almost frightening sums, with Mr. Hartshorn predicting revenue running into the hundreds of thousands from sale of land and mentioning one citizen who assured the group $5 million could be raised in New York on short notice if needed. Phase I of the project, on Starr King and Haystack Mountains, envisions no less than 1,000 acres of open ski slopes, with $4 million invested in an aerial tramway and double T-bar. The whole idea looks to private financing, but a bill has already passed the New Hampshire Senate and is in the House to authorize the State to construct access roads to such private recreation areas. Mr. Hartshorn also stressed that about 500 year-round jobs would be created by the project, which would occupy an area which is now entirely an uninhabited wilderness. In response to a question, he assured it would be no jukebox and sleeping bag operation, but would be strictly zoned, designed to attract the kind of people who would stay a week, or a month, or perhaps buy a home and reside permanently in the area.

Also discussed was the possibility that the Lancaster Water Precinct may appropriate $70,000 for a "gravel-packed well" source of water supply on land owned by the Development Corp., taking it out of the "Class A Watershed" classification. The speaker also mentioned a 20-acre lake, overhead cables for water-skiing, a golf course, a chalet development, a monorail, and plentiful nightly entertainment as possible summer attractions. He declined to estimate just how many people, in round numbers, might eventually be attracted to Lancaster by all this, but if there are a dozen redevelopers down there half as enthusiastic as Mr. Hartshorn it will be standing room only 12 months a year.

BUDGET APPROVED, MR. HAMLIN THANKED

Clarence Marshall of Northumberland reported that the county delegation had approved the OADP (over all development plan) item of $1,000, along with the rest of the budget including the forestry and soil conservation jobs. It was voted to have the secretary send an appropriate letter of appreciation to Mr. Hamlin for his many services to the organization. There was some discussion of meeting on Friday nights instead of Thursdays, but the majority seemed to favor continuing the Thursday meetings.

White Mountains Region Association Secretary John Wilson talked himself smack into a job when he brought up the suggestion that some of the famous $9 million bond issue might remain unspent, and could well be used for making the summit of Mount Washington into a State park. Mr. Wilson said the trouble with the summit situation now is that "no town claims it," and that "nobody is responsible, there's a lot of junk and unused military stuff around up there." Edna Whyte of Lancaster agreed, commenting that there is no one on hand to guide tourists around and that the only service available at the summit is provided by "surly adolescents." After some discussion, it was decided to have Mr. Wilson take charge of bringing back as "concrete" a report as possible to the next meeting, first examining the report of the Governor's committee (on the summit question, apparently), contacting local promotion groups, etc. Dr. Bowler, questioned as to what the State position might be on this question, said he "wouldn't dare venture" an opinion at this time.

Tribute to Patrick J. Hurley, Former Secretary of War

SPEECH

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of the only man from Oklahoma ever to serve in a President's Cabinet, Patrick J. Hurley, saddened all of us.

Pat Hurley was one of our State's most respected men, a lawyer of great ability, and a most able Secretary of War under President Hoover.

Pat Hurley played a major role in the development and growth of the U.S. Army Artillery and Missile Center at Fort Sill, Okla., in my district.

The decision to locate the artillery center at Fort Sill was made while Pat Hurley was Secretary of War. Pat Hurley was always interested in the develop-

ment of this fine military post. He had earlier predicted that Fort Sill would become a great university for the instruction of artillery.

Much of this can be attributed to Pat Hurley's deep interest in the Army and military affairs.

Pat Hurley served his country in the highest tradition. I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Figures Belie CAB's Northeast Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the recent tentative decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to deny the application of Northeast Airlines to retain its routes south of New York concerns all of New England. The vigorous dissent put the issues in perspective and indicated the tremendous hardship that this decision would work on the local traffic in New England. In addition it pointed out that confining the busy New York to Florida route to two airlines may not prove to be in the public interest.

There has been a great deal of discussion of the Board's action in the press and two particularly fine articles appeared in the Boston Record-American on July 30 and July 31 written by Bill Duncliffe. Under unanimous consent I include them in the RECORD along with an editorial which appeared on July 31:

FIGURES BELIE CAB'S NORTHEAST DECISION

(By Bill Duncliffe)

The Civil Aeronautics Board appeared Monday to have tripped over its own figures in the 3–2 decision by which it denied Northeast Airlines a permanent license to run planes between Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and Florida.

CAB figures showed that, since 1957, Northeast had increased its share of the Philadelphia traffic tenfold, and in the same period had increased its Boston-Washington business from 12,609 to 190,611. These same figures showed a sevenfold increase in its Miami traffic.

Northeast carried over a quarter of a million passengers on the New York-Boston run in 1962, a spokesman for the airline said. He pointed out the tremendous importance to Boston of the frequent air service provided by Northeast.

BACK TO THE WALL

Northeast, with its back to the wall, is fighting the CAB decision which could, at best, reduce it to a puddle-jumping airline whose costs would be borne in large part by the taxpayers.

At worst, it could put them out of business, with a resultant loss of 1,500 skilled jobs and an annual payroll of $12,300,000 in Greater Boston alone.

The CAB based its ruling on whether Northeast was fit, willing, and able to compete for business in the east coast market, which averages 2 million passengers a year and is one of the most heavily traveled air corridors in the world.

It said, in substance, that New England's only home-based air carrier could not fill the bill.

BACKED BY HUGHES

Embattled Northeast said otherwise. As to its fitness, it pointed to the backing of multimillionaire Howard Hughes, who last week wrote off $26 million in debts owed him by the airline.

Its willingness was obvious—and its ability to compete for the Florida traffic—and for the traffic to Washington and Philadelphia as well—was borne out by CAB figures.

They showed that, for the first 3 months of 1963, Northeast carried 35,544 round trips between Boston and Miami—60.2 percent of the traffic between Boston and Philadelphia, Northeast carried 27,583, or 61.9 percent of the total.

And, between Boston and Washington, 38,144, or 52.4 percent.

By contrast, the third carrier on the Boston-Philly run had 47 for the same period—1 percent of the total. Between Boston and Washington, the third carrier's share of the market was 103 round trips—1 percent of the total.

RALLY TO SUPPORT

New England businessmen, labor leaders, and Congressmen rallied to Northeast's support, but their effort to reverse the CAB decision was almost certain to be an uphill one.

Their concern was principally that, if Northeast loses the fight, New England will lose a service that has tied it in with the entire eastern seaboard and given it a fast, convenient long-haul and short-haul airline.

They pointed out that, when Northeast was given a temporary certificate to Florida in 1957—a certificate that also included the right to stop at Washington and Philadelphia—it voluntarily gave up a Federal subsidy.

At the same time, National Airlines was given a permanent certificate to Boston, and Eastern Airlines had certain operating restrictions removed.

Both these lines compete with Northeast for the Florida business.

Now, while dealing Northeast out of the long-haul picture, the same concessions granted National and Eastern 7 years ago still remain, they said.

SAW NO NEED

The CAB also, in its decision, ruled that it saw no need for a third carrier in the Florida market—contradicting what they said when they granted Northeast the 1957 certificate.

They also appeared to have contradicted their policy with 12 other major markets which have three competing carriers, and in two other markets which have four airlines competing for business.

Two CAB members who entered a minority opinion that supported Northeast cited the $15 million savings it has effected for the taxpayer and insisted it had proved its right to the permanent license.

The minority opinion cited all the factors in Northeast's favor, and added this paragraph on the effect the majority decision could have on the New England economy:

"Of major concern to us is the crippling effect which this decision will have on the large pool of skilled employees of Northeast and its effect upon many cities and communities in New England, an area of the country already suffering from a deteriorating railroad transportation system.

"We cannot overlook the fact that New England has been adversely affected by a number of recent economic developments and can ill afford this setback to its employment and industrial well-being."

NEW NORTHEAST LOAN OK'D BY CAB WHILE KILLING FLORIDA RUN

(By Bill Duncliffe)

On the very day the Civil Aeronautics Board gave the kiss of death to Howard Hughes' $30 million investment in Northeast Airlines, it told him it was all right for him to pour still another $1 million into a line it planned to reduce to a puddle-jumping service, it was disclosed Tuesday.

The apparent contradiction in the Board's actions was contained in two CAB documents, each dated July 26.

The first served notice that the board by a 3 to 2 decision, intended to cancel Northeast's authority to run planes between Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, and Florida.

This would, unless Northeast succeeds in reversing the decision, reduce it to a regional carrier, dependent on Federal subsidies to keep from going bankrupt.

CREDIT PACT OK'D

The second document was an order approving a credit agreement under which Hughes, through the Hughes Tool Co., would guarantee a loan of $1 million to Northeast from the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York.

Hughes' financial stake in New England's only home-based airline added up this way:

His company, Toolco, took control of Northeast from the Atlas Corp. in 1961. The line then was in the hole to Atlas for some $16,250,000. Toolco took that over.

In addition, Toolco poured another $9,500,000 into the line.

That added up to $25,750,000.

Last April, CAB Examiner Walter Bryan, in recommending that Northeast be denied a permanent license for the Florida run, gave as one of his reasons the fact that he was not satisfied that Toolco was interested enough in Northeast to put it on its financial feet.

DEBT WRITTEN OFF

On July 22, Northeast president James W. Austin announced that Hughes had written off the money owed him by the line. That reduced Northeast's debt by $25,750,000, and brought it to near solvency.

On July 26—4 days later—three members of the CAB voted to deal Northeast out of the Florida service—one of the most lucrative in the world.

Among other things, the CAB apparently was still not satisfied that Hughes had done enough.

In fact, he had done more.

In 1962, Toolco guaranteed a $4 million loan to Northeast by the Chase Manhattan—in effect, Toolco agreed to pay the debt if Northeast was unable to.

Since then, Toolco has given the line another cash-in-the-line $1 million, and on July 26, was given the okay by the CAB to guarantee still another $1 million.

Aside from that, Toolco leased two 880 jet planes to Northeast in December 1962. It cost Hughes $100,000 for modification of the planes.

The rent on the planes was $50,000 a month from December through last April—a total of 5 months or $500,000. In May, just one of the two planes was in use, and the rent was $50,000.

Toolco has never tried to collect that money.

Thus, in one form or another, Hughes has backed Northeast to the tune of $31,400,000—and has CAB approval to get in $1 million deeper.

Two minority members of the CAB thought this was quite enough, and declared:

"The recent extraordinary steps undertaken by Toolco to reorganize the debt structure of the carrier so as to place it on a sound financial basis demonstrates management's conviction in the ability of Northeast to survive with the Florida route, even in the absence of subsidy."

SAVE NORTHEAST

The decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to take away Northeast Airlines' license to continue operation of its busy Boston-to-Florida routes, including service to Philadelphia, Washington, and other markets,

is not simply an action affecting an airline; it is a matter of grave concern to all New England.

The CAB has ruled, with absurd illogic, that this Eastern Seaboard commercial air corridor which is constantly growing and now accommodates 2 million travelers yearly, can be serviced by just two airlines.

The CAB has moved to eliminate Northeast, which transports 60 percent of those 2 million passengers, and thus set up a monopoly for New England air traffic.

It has threatened a needless crippling blow to this region's economy—the loss of 1500 skilled jobs and an annual payroll of $12,300,000 in Greater Boston alone.

It has imperiled regional air service within New England, a service Northeast has provided without subsidy for the past 7 years.

It has jeopardized the continuation of Northeast's efficient and dependable and frequent Boston-New York service (250,000 passengers a year; one of the top 2 carriers).

Northeast's fight to retain its eastern seaboard routes is also New England's fight. That is obvious for this needed air service is vital to our economy.

Massachusetts two U.S. Senators already have petitioned the Justice Department, to determine if antitrust laws are being violated; if a monopoly is being set up for the two remaining airlines by eliminating Northeast from the commercial routes all three now serve.

This investigation is mandatory on the basis of CAB's own figures which show that in the first 3 months of this year Northeast carried 27,500 passengers between Boston and Philadelphia as against 47 passengers for one competing airline; and that Northeast carried 38,114 between Washington and Boston as against 103 for the third place airline. Yet it is Northeast which the CAB would oust from these runs.

A monopoly investigation is warranted by the facts and is a good start, but it is not enough. In addition, all members of the New England congressional delegation should unite in demanding that the CAB revoke this unfair action.

And all of this region's civic, labor, business, and industry leaders should besiege the CAB to change its decision. If this fails, they should carry their protests to the President who certainly is aware of the terrible impact this move by a governmental regulatory agency will have on the New England economy.

Here is an opportunity for the administration not simply to do more for Massachusetts, but to something which New England has an honest right to expect—protection from this indefensible and discriminatory action by the CAB.

The Late General Patrick J. Hurley

SPEECH

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, all Oklahomans join in sorrow at the passing last week of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, distinguished native son of our State.

General Hurley was born at Lehigh, in what was then the Choctaw Nation, now Coal County, Okla.

The son of a coal miner, he won renown as an attorney, a businessman, an Army officer, and a diplomat. As Secretary of War under President Hoover, he became the first and thus far the only Oklahoman to serve as a member of the Cabinet.

After World War II General Hurley made his home at Santa Fe, but he never forgot his native State and community. It was through his initiative and with the help of his generous donations that Coal County has obtained badly needed health facilities.

Years ago General Hurley began his benefactions in the county with the project of fencing the cemetery of Lehigh, where his parents, two brothers, and two sisters are buried. Later he contributed funds to help construct the Coalgate community building. This work was followed by the construction of Mary Hurley Memorial Hospital in 1952, named for the general's mother.

A retired residents' home, Ruth Wilson Hurley Manor, named for his wife, was built in 1959. And at Coalgate now a new Mary Hurley Hospital is under construction. When it is complete the present building will become a convalescent home.

A lifelong Republican, General Hurley served his country under administrations of both parties. In 1944 and 1945 he acted as President Roosevelt's personal representative to Chiang Kai-shek and later as Ambassador to China.

In his home State, as elsewhere, he has left behind many friends.

Six Months of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, all of us are familiar with the various criticisms which have been leveled against this 88th Congress because it is still in its first session. Too often the implications are that we are not only slow, but self-centered—or worse

Today, with a great deal of pleasure, I read a comment on the "first 6 months of the 88th Congress." It appeared in a small periodical, the Union Signal, the official organ of a band of gallant women, the WCTU, whose national office is in Illinois—Evanston, Ill., to be exact. The founder of this organization, Miss Frances E. Willard, is one of the two Illinois citizens to be memorialized in the Statuary Hall of this Capitol. Some of the WCTU membership are my constituents, whose legislative interests require me to read their periodical just as I do their letters and cards.

The comments which I now insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appear in the Union Signal for August 10, 1963. For this thoughtful analysis of your and my situation we are indebted to Mrs. Mildred B. Harman. I believe the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will share our appreciation:

SIX MONTHS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

A comprehensive assessment of the first 6 months of the 88th Congress was made available July 1. It is a statistical report of both Houses and gives the lay person a bird's-eye view of proceedings and results without going into detail on specific bills. It points up the validity of the claim that, although much time has been spent, little has been accomplished.

The Senate was in session 85 days and the House 80. In the Senate 2,136 measures were introduced and 8,493 in the House. The majority of these bills were assigned to a committee, but up to July 1 only 11 Senate bills had been enacted into law and 44 House bills. A total of 341 bills have passed the Senate and 402 the House but many of them have a long way to go yet.

These bills have nothing to do with the great amount of routine business such as disposing of 47,032 executive nominations, of which 46,471 were confirmed; nor does it take into account a great many hours of committee work on the part of the Congressmen, for each one is assigned to some committee or committees, and a great amount of research is usually necessary. Of course, a Congressman's staff helps with this, but a great amount of time is spent answering letters from constituents back home. Some can be answered routinely (as we well know), but a great many must be given the personal attention of the Congressman.

Quite a few of the legislators take courses in memory retention, for it is important that each remember what constituents write about when he is touring the State in a political campaign; and, of course, he must have many facts about many things at his fingertips, for he never knows when he is going to be queried about any subject.

A Congressman is supposed never to tire, to be well informed on past, present, and future activities, and to have a personality that is altogether pleasing and charming 365 days a year. Not an enviable situation to be in, but 535 people made a great effort to achieve it.

The Inefficiency of Our Federal Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, in a manner showing the great patience and good humor of my constituent, this letter very well points up an example of why our Federal bureaucracy is so slow, wasteful, and inefficient:

HORRELL & HORRELL,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Orlando, Fla., July 31, 1963.

Hon. ED GURNEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: On July 16, 1963, I wrote to the Government Printing Office in Washington, D.C., inquiring as to the availability of a map of the island of Eleuthera. I stated that I was informed that such a map had been prepared by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. I inquired what maps of the island were available and what would be the cost of each.

A rubber-stamped endorsement on the face of my letter indicates it to have been received on July 18, 1963. This morning, July 31, 1963, I received back my original letter together with an advertisement of pamphlets on "Home Canning and Food Preparation," a mail order blank informing me of the availability of, amongst other publications, "The Air Force Chaplains

Manual," a work on the Japanese beetle, a book telling me how to market my products in the Sudan, how to grow "Ornamental Bamboo," and something to satisfy my curiosity of "Geology of the Willow Springs and Rosamond Quadrangles, Calif." I also note for sale a small brochure on "Manned Space Flight Team." I wonder if Glen and Company know about this—they might find it useful. Last but not least I note the expensive ($6.25) "Organization and Administration in World War II." If I could afford it I probably should get this one just to check up on all the things I did wrong.

The real answer to my letter was a green slip attached to my letter stating that their mail bulk was so great they just couldn't write any letters. I can understand this and I actually prefer getting my letter back with a message on it to having to write the endless endorsements we used to write in the Army. Remember "make five copies and throw away four?" Well, the green slip explained why the answer to my letter was the following, handwritten, on the bottom of my letter:

"For information apply Army Map Service, 6500 Brooks Lane, Washington, D.C." 20333.

I suppose it is too early to say how the Zip Code is going to work out but if it does work out, maybe it would be a good idea to employ something similar in the Government Printing Office. That is, for the internal workings of that office because it makes me kind of wonder why it should take from July 18 until July 30 or July 31 to find out that I have to find out somewhere else. Of course, it is possible that the press of correspondence in the GPO is so great that my letter just didn't come up for answering until a day or so ago, but if this is a fact, there certainly must be a lot of people reading at Government expense and perhaps we should put our literacy campaign into reverse gear.

Yours for "1-2-3 and the Moon" 1963, 28 p. IL. Cat. No. NAS 1.19; 7 25 cents.

Sincerely,

HORRELL.

The New Government Playground at Williba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the consideration of the House an amusing—but unfortunately revealing—article from the Williba Knotholer published in "depressed" Lee County, Ky. I am a little confused as to whether this article refers to the ARA program or the recently conceived rural renewal program—but either one—the story is the same.

I hope the Members will think it through—it is not as funny as it sounds:

THE NEW GOVERNMENT PLAYGROUND AT WILLIBA

We have got wonderful and thoughtful men up there in our Government. They are allus a thinking up good things for to help us pore and needy people. Just here awhile back one of them important official fellers thought up the idea of making all our little pore farms into big playgrounds for them city slickers to come and play and cavort upon. The Government will pay 80 percent of the cost of converting our pore farms into huge playhouses for them city slickers to come and have them a good time upon. All we have to do is to go down to our local farm relief office and put in our application for materials and supplies.

We aim to build a big playground upon our old pore farm here in Williba. You tourists and city slickers and short clad golfers can have you a real good time cavorting around upon these old pore hillsides.

The first thing we aim to build is a big swimming pool. This pool will be built right where our sweet tater patch is now. We aim to save the Government some money by not building no dressing rooms. There's a big clump of Government pines right on top of the big hill behind where we aim to build the pool. This clump of pines will be used instead of an expensive dressing room. The swimmer will put on his bathing suit here in the pines. Then he will jump into a long metal slide that leads right off on the hill into the swimming pool. You talk about going over the hill and splashing into that pool, you will. Be like taking a space ride. We will keep this metal slide slicked up good with that commodity cooking oil. A feller will really be flying through space when he hits the slide and shoots into the swimming pool down where the sweet tater patch used to be.

There will be picnic tables under the big walnut trees upon this pore farm. There will be little convenience houses all along on the farm. We are contacting Corsey Gabbard and Anderson Rose about their ponies. We aim to buy these ponies and put in a riding area for them city younguns. This riding area will be up and down one of the hollers. Going up and down hills on a pony by a city youngun would be sure to produce an upset. We don't want to hurt none of the city dudes.

We've got a cow that got bang tested by the Government last summer and we ain't never been able to ketch her since them Government men hooked them pliers into her nose and stretched it at least 18 inches long and it turned plumb purple. This cow will not go into a barn no more and she has run wild upon this pore farm since the intrusion of the many governmental bang specialists into this area. This cow is Government inspected and free of bad maladies. She will be safe among the visitors to the Williba playground.

The government will furnish us with several cowboy outfits. We will rent these to the city slickers and ren them a horse and let them try to ketch this wild cow and her young calf. We will offer a reward to the one that might accidentally ketch this bang free cow. Only those who have seen a cow, other than on television, before coming to our playground will be allowed to rodeo for the brute. She has long horns and a wild look in her eyes. She might do damage to greenhorns who have never seen a cow other than on television.

We aim to build a long and exciting roller coaster. This roller coaster will be the safest one in the country and will be one of the fastest ones. We will begin the tracks for the roller coaster right there on top of the Harlis Kidd Knob. This equipment will be the safest because it will not be built on structures high in the air. The track will be laid upon the ground surface. It will leave the Harlis Kidd Knob and descend into the deep holler below and thence up the next big rolling hill and onward until it goes up and over seven very steep hills and then comes to a halt in the bottom at the tother end of the farm. The riders can hike back for another ride. They need the exercise.

There's a beautiful pond between two of the hills and it will be well stocked with fish and mud turtles. For a small fee, the city fisherman can set upon the bank and fish until the gnats and mosquitoes dehydrate him. He'll never know what is a eating upon him. He will be too interested in ketching a fish. Chances he want know that he is setting on a bank slightly covered with pizzen vine. He will be a pore sight to his family whenever he returns home from his vacation upon the Williba playground.

Of course it will be our duty to the government to keep the premises free of whizzer briars and pizzen vine and meadow thistles. We will keep them all cut down so as not to do any damage to the short cladded tourist and city dweller. The pizzen vine will be cut down but one can gat contact with the part what is left after the vine is cut down. Signs will be put up warning of this danger but it will go unheeded. We'll sympathize with them. It is necessary that these tourists and city slickers come in contact with pizzen vine, chiggers, and counrty gnats.

Our intentions are to set free a bird and three bears. The bird will be one of the bird hunter's kind and it will be used for these city dwellers to shoot at occasionally while wasting their time in the playground. The bears will be loosed over in the Sally Holler. They will be of the wild type and tourists and city slickers will do well to heed the sign which will tell them of the bears. Of course several idlers will not heed the sign and will cross into the Sally Holler among the wild bears and copperheads and black widder spiders. Every day or so, there will be a city slicker or a tourist missing. The bears will devour him. But that will be a big help in cutting down the expenses of the playground. We won't have to feed the bears. There are already grouse and squirrels in the Sally Holler for the more sturdy ones to hunt for. The Sally Holler of the playground will not be a place for younguns or tender ones. It will be for those who wish to enter the wilds of the hills. They may even get potshotted a few times from someone who has set him up a little moonshine still for to make a bit of likker to sell to the tourists and city dwellers who do not bring enough with them.

Extra long and slick and steep slides will be built down some of the steeper hills for the younguns to have fun upon. Also oldsters will delight in speeding over the hills on one of these steel slides. Blister pads will be furnished by the playground. There will be slides for all sizes of tourists' scooting ends.

In these hills of the Williba playground there can be found coal and possibly gold and diamonds and neutrons. Indian arrowheads are found all along and many have explored for the contents of supposed to be Indian graves. Wild grapes, huckleberries, and poison mushrooms abound during their seasons.

The city slicker and the tourist can have the time of his life upon the Williba playground and he might even spend the night or week in the shack acrost the hill among the bears. Everything possible will be done by us and the Government to make his stay at the playground pleasant and expensive.

Watch for details upon the opening date of the new governmental playground at Williba.

We Are Bankrupt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to, at

this time, include in the RECORD an editorial from one of the many excellent newspapers which serve the people of Illinois. In the face of the present prospects of once again being forced to boost the debt limit ceiling to unprecedented and astronomical heights in order to meet irresponsibly incurred obligations, I call the attention of my colleagues to the succinct views recently expressed in the August 1 edition of the Tazwell County News:

WE ARE BANKRUPT

The United States of America is bankrupt.

According to Webster, any person or entity is bankrupt when he or it cannot pay its debts. At present, the supply of gold held by our Government is only 87 percent of the amount foreign countries could demand if all of them decided to press for immediate payment of the money we owe them.

We owe them this money because we have been buying more from them than they have from us. Not only that, but we have been lending many of these same countries more of our money so they "can get back on their feet."

Our national debt is $305 billion. Add up the total debt of all 112 other nations of the world, and the United States owes $25 billion more than that—a total of $305 billion.

Yet 101 of those nations are still getting aid from us—and a lot of them are exporting more to us than we are to them, causing an additional drain on our supply of gold. We really don't have a supply any more, because we owe it and more to these nations.

The drain started under the Eisenhower administration. Kennedy gave the American people a "snow job" about putting an end to the unstable balance of payments. Not only has he failed to reverse the drain, the deficit has gotten worse.

This might indicate that one party is as lax as the next in running the country with any amount of economic horsesense, until one recalls that Democrats controlled Congress while Ike was in the White House.

Our own Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has somehow made for himself an image of one seeking economies in Government, yet he has voted for the great majority, if not all, of the foreign aid and internal giveaways sent before Congress.

Indiana Republican Congressman RICHARD ROUDEBUSH has said that "In Congress we're called old fashioned if we oppose this newfangled idea that debt is good and big debt is better and bankruptcy is best of all."

The Nation, either under Democratic administrations or Democratic majorities in Congress, has been on a public spending drunk since the end of World War II.

Maybe we need a few more old-fashioned Republicans in Washington after all. And maybe one Republican in the White House—one that doesn't have so many dollars that he has lost sight of what the value of one should be.

We came out of World War II as the country with the soundest economic status of any country in the world. After nearly 20 years of predominately Democratic influence in our Government, we are now bankrupt.

Give the Democrats all the credit you want for taking a leading role in internal social reforms, but you can't get away from the fact that they have also spent us into bankruptcy. A person who owes more than he has can keep up pretenses for a while, but sooner or later he is trapped by his own foolishness, and his house collapses.

Why shouldn't Russia preach coexistence and sign a nuclear test ban? If we continue our present path under Democratic leadership, this house will not have to be blown down with an H-bomb. It will very soon collapse of its own accord.

Three Great Conductors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly honored to attend a historic Boston Symphony concert at Tanglewood last weekend. Nothing could please me more, Mr. Speaker, than the knowledge that the Boston Symphony Orchestra appears during the summer months in my congressional district. In fact, this Berkshire area has been called the cultural center of the world. I heartily agree and want to pay tribute again to three great conductors; namely, Pierre Monteux, Charles Munch, and Erich Leinsdorf. It would be a memorable weekend of listening if one of these three outstanding maestros conducted, but on last weekend all three appeared. An excellent review of that weekend's performance appeared in the New York Times on August 5. I am happy to make this part of the RECORD:

LEINSDORF, MUNICH, AND MONTEUX LEAD BOSTON SYMPHONY AT TANGLEWOOD

(By Ross Parmenter)

LENOX, MASS., August 4.—The Boston Symphony's present conductor and its two living former conductors took turns leading the 82-year-old orchestra at Tanglewood this weekend.

Erich Leinsdorf, who succeeded Charles Munch last fall, conducted on Friday. Mr. Munch, who became the orchestra's musical director in 1949, was the leader on Saturday. And this afternon's program was conducted by Pierre Monteux, who was born 6 years before the orchestra and whose tenure as its head (1919–24) came before the Berkshire Festival was even dreamed of.

Each man's concert bore the stamp of his particular personality, and each brought his individual gifts to the performance he led. All won ovations from the audience.

Whatever the individual listener's preference, Mr. Munch's concert was by all odds the stormiest.

Mr. Leinsdorf's program (which was reviewed earlier) was crowned by an unhurried and confidently controlled unfoldment of Mahler's First Symphony.

But there was nothing leisurely about Mr. Munch's program. In fact, it could almost be said he whipped through it.

It consisted of the Franck Symphony and two impressionist works with which he has been closely associated, Debussy's "La Mer" and Ravel's "Daphnis et Chloë" Suite No. 2.

Often when Mr. Munch brings his particularly fiery temperament to the works he leads, the effects are electrifying. The audience is carried away, and Saturday night's audience seemed to be, to. But to this listener, Mr. Munch, who was conducting his fourth and final concert of this summer's festival, was not at his best.

The Franck tended to seem more frantic than soaring, and the Debussy had so little delicacy of tone coloring in its more subtle moments that it hardly evoked the sea at all, except when the waves were roaring.

The Ravel went better, and the general dance at the end was rousing, though the daybreak of the first section seemed more like the rising of a red sun over the desert than the serene dawning it generally is.

Serenity, on the other hand, was one of the keynotes of Mr. Monteux's program. This is not to say it was all blandness, for there was plenty of vigor. Where needed, there were moments of dramatic tension.

And there was a wealth of orchestral color. But the overall feeling was that of a benediction from a great conductor who has spent an uncommonly long life in music.

Probably it was no accident that he chose to end with "Nobilissima Visione," the concert suite Hindemith drew from his ballet about St. Francis. The work is a dignified and poignant evocation of the saint's feeling for life and all its creatures. And beyond the girders of the Shed, there were birds sounding and sunlight to match the blessings of the sun that Hindemith was praising in his music.

Nature played a prominent part in Mr. Monteux's other selections, too. His symphony was the Beethoven "Pastoral," and he also led Rosphigi's "Fountains of Rome." The opening work was Beethoven's "King Stephen" Overture, the program was the conductor's one concert of the festival. May he be back for many more.

The three concerts of the weekend drew 25,290 listeners. The total attendance for the week, the festival's fifth, was 43,935, the record so far this summer.

Abuse of Executive Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, last Wednesday the distinguished Senator from Mississippi delivered an eloquent speech on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the recent directive of the Defense Department which would extend control into areas that are purely civilian.

I am in complete accord with the Senator's views and I hope that commonsense will prevail and that this order will be rescinded.

A summation of congressional opposition to this military order was written by David Lawrence, editor of U.S. News & World Report. His column appeared in the August 2 edition of the Washington Evening Star and I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILITARY AND SOCIAL REFORM

(By David Lawrence)

It seems incredible that, with all the denunciation that Americans have heaped on the Soviet Union for indoctrinating their troops with the social and political ideas of communism, the people of the United States should be reading this week in their newspapers about speeches in the Halls of Congress alleging that the Kennedy administration is trying to use the armed services to propagate its doctrines of social reform.

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, Democrat, is a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and chairman of its Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. In a speech to the Senate on Wednesday, he cited the directive which has been issued by the Secretary of Defense ordering command-

ers at military bases to declare off limits any businesses or areas where any racial discrimination may occur. The Senator said in his speech:

"It is now proposed that the military profession itself be utilized as a driving force in the establishment of a new social and political order which involves race relations and individual associations in off-base areas surrounding our Military Establishments * * *.

"This new and previously unheard of mission is designed to shape our military force as an instrument for social reform and can only result in irreparable injury to the military profession. In addition, it is a grave and serious challenge to the long-established and traditional concept of complete separation of the military from all political matters and activities * * *.

"Paragraph C [of the directive] places clear and heavy responsibility upon the military commander in the field of social reform. It provides:

" 'Every military commander has the responsibility to oppose discriminatory practices affecting his men and their dependents and to foster equal opportunity for them, not only in areas under his immediate control, but also in nearby communities where they may live or gather in off-duty hours.' "

Not long ago, the Secretary of Defense had to revise an Air Force directive which was construed as encouraging soldiers when out of uniform to participate in racial "demonstrations." It is not yet clear how much of the Defense Department's influence still remains a factor in the activities of soldiers off duty who are in sympathy with the "demonstrations."

Senator STENNIS not only calls attention to the economic coercion involved in using military commanders to determine what places of business shall be patronized but he says the new directive brings into play the factor of influence in promotions. Senator STENNIS declared that the new directive "will affect the promotion and career advancement of officers affected" and that he could not conceive of any step "which would be more destructive of officer morale." He quoted from a Presidential Commission's report which proposed that officers "showing initiative and achievement" in this activity "will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement."

Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Republican, joined with other Senators on Wednesday in denouncing the directive. He recommended that the Senate Armed Services Committee conduct an investigation of the Pentagon committee which, he said, had gone to military bases around the country "with complete dossiers on every businessman" in the surrounding communities, including "every figure the committee can get out of income-tax returns" filed with the Internal Revenue Service. He declared:

"I think this goes much further than what we are talking about here today; namely, the threat of a military takeover should things change in this country and we find that the military commanders have become used to running politics and the social life of the community—I do not care where it is. It goes further than a discussion of the civil rights question."

"Militarism" is a term used to refer to military men who usurp power to control civilians, but there seems to be no word except possibly "politics" to define efforts by civilians to use the military to carry on social-reform programs. Senator STENNIS said:

"This may only be the beginning. If political activity is condoned and encouraged in this field, the President some day may not be able to extricate the military from other political activity that could follow."

Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, Democrat, on the same day denounced an order by which the Federal Government will withdraw contracts for the civil defense adult education program if a State doesn't sign on the dotted line an agreement against "discrimination," He declared that "what can't be done by the law and under the law is done by Executive order or by departmental directive."

Mr. HÉBERT is chairman of a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which has been holding extended hearings on a civil defense fallout shelter program. He declared that his statement concerning executive usurpation was based on principles underlying governmental operation and not on the merits of the discrimination problem itself. He added:

"I have a deep conviction that the very integrity of the Congress is involved here. And this integrity is being constantly compromised by what I consider capricious and unwarranted assumptions of legislative power by the executive branch."

Prayer, Clergy, and Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members are panicking to effect a constitutional change in the prayer subject area as a result of the recent Supreme Court rulings.

Many of the religious organizations are responding in a more realistic, mature manner than are some of us lay people.

I, too, agree with the decisions, though question some of the reasoning. It would seem that serious-minded legislators might bend their discharge petitions in the direction of other more substantive matters before the Rules Committee.

A study report of the Board of Social Ministry of the Lutheran Church sets forth a temperate viewpoint which I admire:

THE SUPREME COURT ON PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(NOTE.—This statement is a working paper prepared by the Commission on Church and State Relations in a Pluralistic Society under the auspices of the Board of Social Ministry of the Lutheran Church in America. It should therefore not be construed as an official document. Drafted by Paul G. Kauper in behalf of the commission, this paper is offered for study and discussion purposes in the hope that it may contribute to reasoned and constructive assessment of the substance and implications of the Supreme Court's recent decisions on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. Comments and criticisms of this paper are kindly solicited and should be addressed to Rev. Rufus Cornelsen, 231 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. Additional copies are available upon request.)

I

In June 1962 the U.S. Supreme Court held that the action of a local school board in the State of New York in prescribing the daily recitation by children of the nonsectarian prayer recommended by the State board of regents was unconstitutional. Although children were free not to participate in the recitation of this prayer, the Supreme Court held that the practice was nevertheless invalid since it amounted to an establishment of religion in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution.

Only recently the Supreme Court has decided two other cases dealing with religious practices in public schools. In these cases the Court held that the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and the reading of a chapter or certain number of verses of the Bible without comment at the beginning of the schoolday were also unconstitutional practices when required by State law. The Court viewed the practice of reading the Bible without comment as a religious practice which was therefore unconstitutional on the same basic theory followed in the prayer cases, namely, that this amounted to a State establishment of religion.

Roots of concern

These cases have naturally attracted much attention and excited much controversy. It is understandable that this should be so since practices of this kind in our public schools have had a long history and have been widely prevalent in various parts of the country. Moreover, a part of the unfavorable reaction to the decisions had its roots in the fear that the Supreme Court in its interpretation of the Constitution was carrying the establishment idea to an unwarranted extreme and in doing so is invoking the Constitution to confer a blessing on secularism as the Nation's official orthodoxy.

To some it appears that the Supreme Court is unduly magnifying the issue and that these practices should be permitted so long as children who object to taking part are not required to do so. Others feel that the majority of the community should have the right to have their children engage in prayer exercises or to hear the reading of the Bible in public schools, and that to resolve all these questions in favor of the opposition is to belittle and deny majority rights.

Prayer cases

In comment on these decisions, it is pertinent to note that from a religious point of view we do not believe that much has been lost by the Supreme Court's decisions in requiring the discontinuance of these prayer and Bible-reading practices in the public schools.

Looking first at the prayer cases, it may be doubted whether the daily recitation of either a nonsectarian prayer or of the Lord's Prayer under circumstances that subjected all students to indirect pressure to participate unless they were willing to identify themselves as nonconformists was of substantial value in promoting genuine religious piety and devotion.

Insofar as children felt constrained to take part because of the official nature of the prayer, even though they were not genuinely interested, this practice forced insincerity in regard to a religious matter. Even with respect to the children who wished to participate, the daily mechanical recitation at the beginning of the school day of the very short prayer, composed by the New York Board of Regents, broadly but briefly worded so as to avoid any sectarian difficulties, could not be said to convey much by way of religious thought. And it should be added that even parents who had no objection to their children reciting this prayer at home, or who might welcome such prayer exercises at home, might still object to having such a prayer composed by the State and made part of an official public school ceremony.

The use of the Lord's Prayer introduces new elements. This is distinctively the prayer of Christians and they regard it as the highest form of prayer. It does not suffer from the defect of a prayer which is officially composed and which is designed to appeal to all religious groups. But precisely because it is a Christian prayer it presents further legal difficulties so far as its use in public schools is concerned since it may be claimed by non-Christians that this is giving the Christian religion a preference in the public school system. Indeed, Christians themselves may object to reciting the Lord's

Prayer when it becomes an officially sanctioned prayer.

Bible reading

So far as Bible reading in the public schools is concerned, some different considerations are presented. Whether viewed in its literary, historical and moral aspects or as a collection of religious writings, the Bible has been the most influential book in the history of the Western World, and any system of education which fails to introduce students to the world of Biblical knowledge, ideas and values, is a very deficient kind of education. Reading and study of the Bible has a place in the public schools if for no other reason than that it is a repository of literary works and moral teachings basic to the culture of the Western World. But a special problem is presented in respect to the reading of the Bible without comment at the beginning of the school day.

The practice of reading without comment was of course introduced in order to avoid sectarian indoctrination in the use of the Bible and yet it is this very feature which impairs the educational value of Bible reading, since the reading without comment and explanation by the teacher may not be very valuable educational experience for the students. This is not to deny that the reading of certain parts of the Bible may in itself have a value for the students. And yet it must be conceded that reading without comment readily takes on the appearance of being a ritualistic exercise which is grounded on the religious authority of the Bible and which, therefore, assumes a certain religious position with respect to the Bible.

A further difficulty presented is that the Bible is regarded as a sectarian book because it is distinctively the sacred Scriptures of the Christian church. The Jewish community accepts the Old Testament but does not accept the New Testament as inspired Scripture, and so the tendency at least in the case of schools with mixed religious constituencies is to avoid controversy by reading the Old Testament. A further complication has arisen in the past in that the Catholic Church has objected to use for daily recitation purposes of any Protestant translations of the Bible since it regards these Protestant translation as sectarian in character.

The net result of all this is that at least in some communities where the Bible is read without comment, in order to avoid controversy teachers may concentrate on passages from certain Old Testament books which at least from the Christian point of view may not have as high a religious value as other portions. All this illustrates of course the difficulty of making any kind of devotional use of the Bible in public schools.

Symbolic worth

We believe, therefore, that from the religious point of view substantial arguments can be made against the value and usefulness of prayer exercises in public schools and of Bible reading without comment. But while saying this we also recognize that symbols play an important part in life and that the recitation of prayers and the reading of the Bible have a symbolic worth in pointing up the Nation's religious heritage and tradition and in providing a focus point for the expression of values deeply rooted in American life.

We realize as well that the value of these exercises may vary depending upon the particular school community that is involved. The recitation of the Lord's Prayer in a school community consisting entirely of Christian children may be a more meaningful exercise than its recitation in another community of mixed religious backgrounds where some children feel obliged to take part simply because it is an officially approved exercise. The same may be said with respect to Bible reading, which may become a much more meaningful school exercise in some communities where, because of the homogeneity of the student body, school authorities are free to draw upon all parts of the Bible for this purpose.

Vague religiosity vis-a-vis historic faiths

We must keep in mind also in appraising these decisions that it is not the business of the States or of the public schools to play the role of the church or of the home. Certainly religious instruction and the cultivation of religious piety are matters reserved for the home, the churches and the schools operated by the churches. As soon as the public schools become involved in distinctively religious exercises, there is always the possibility of course of using them to further sectarian purposes or to favor one or more religious groups at the expense of others, thereby contributing to religious divisiveness in the community.

We believe the schools do have a function to perform with respect to religion in terms of a positive educational program. In this connection it is important to observe that the Supreme Court in its latest opinion made clear that while a State may not require religious exercises in the public schools, it may, nevertheless, provide for study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a program of secular education. In short, the Constitution forbids religious practices and religious indoctrination in the public school. Study of the Bible and study about religion in order to achieve purposes consistent with the objectives of secular education is permitted.

Furthermore, we believe that public schools are under an obligation to cooperate with parents and with the churches to see to it that time is made available for religious instruction by the churches. But we question whether opening devotional exercises in the form of prayers and Bible reading properly belong to the public school program, least of all in areas of mixed religious constituencies where these programs must be so diluted as to become virtually devoid of any positive religious content. This latter point needs to be stressed. There is always the danger for Christians that in the attempt to arrive at some common-denominator religion that will be agreeable to all and that will avoid the sectarian label, we reduce our faith to some rather vague religiosity expressed in broad ideas of the Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man but which conveys none of the substance, the depth, and cutting edge of the historic Christian witness.

We realize, of course, that there is a historic basis in this country for the expression of a faith in God which reflects a basic and common religious consciousness shared by the various religious groups within the Judaeo-Christian tradition. This common religious heritage is reflected in the motto that appears on our coins, in the reference to God in the pledge of allegiance to the flag, in our national anthem, and in numerous official acts and documents. This kind of expression should not be confused or identified with the kind of syncretistic religion which for some people at present may be a substitute for the historic faiths. Nevertheless, we must concede that the more we attempt to promote common denominator religious exercises or instruction in public schools, the greater risk we run of diluting our faith and contributing to that vague religiosity which identifies religion with patriotism and becomes, as some have described it, a national folk religion.

In summary then, so far as the religious value of prayer and Bible reading in public schools is concerned, we repeat our doubt that these have served a valuable religious purpose, even though we recognize that these exercises are well intentioned and directed to the worthy end of cultivating a respect for the Nation's religious heritage, instilling respect for prayer and for the teachings of the Bible and contributing thereby to the value served by religion in the community.

II

Having said this, we nevertheless wish to express some reservations about the reasoning used by the Supreme Court in these opinions. While the detailed analysis of constitutional doctrine is a matter best left to lawyers, it is nevertheless appropriate for citizens to examine basic reasons given by the U.S. Supreme Court in handing down decisions on what are basically broad policy matters which are not expressly governed by specific provisions of the Constitution.

Interpretation of establishment

In the regent's prayer case the Court held that the prescription of these practices in the public schools was in effect an official sanctioning of the religious beliefs embodied in these practices and therefore amounted to an establishment of religion within the meaning of the first amendment, which in turn the Court said is made applicable to the States by means of the 14th amendment. The notion that the State's action in permitting opportunity for children to recite the nondenominational prayer in public schools, and indeed encouraging them to do so, but permitting freedom of nonparticipation, amounts to an establishment of religion within the meaning of the first amendment strikes us as being an extraordinarily broad application of the purpose served by the establishment language. We are fortified in this conclusion by the criticism that scholars have directed against this kind of interpretation.

Having in mind the historical circumstances leading to the adoption of the establishment limitation in the Constitution, it would appear that this was aimed at governmental practices which forced people to pay taxes in support of religious activties, or which compelled people to acknowledge certain religious beliefs or suffer disabilities if they failed to do so. We appreciate the contribution the Supreme Court has made by its interpretations to the protection of religious freedom and to the safeguarding of the separation principle which is essential to the freedom of both the churches and the Government.

With respect to prayer and Bible-reading practices in the public schools, we do not have much difficulty in seeing that the State by prescribing a particular religious exercise is thereby giving a preference to the religious beliefs embodied in these exercises. We appreciate that such a practice runs the danger of impairing freedom of religion or freedom of conscience since children naturally feel constrained to take part despite a privilege to be excused from participation. But we have some difficulty with the Court's statement that such a practice constitutes an establishment of religion.

Some inconsistency

Moreover, we have reservations about the implications of the Court's opinions in suggesting that anything the State may do in giving official recognition to religious beliefs commonly held by a majority of the citizens and long sanctioned by the Nation's religious history are also within the ban of the first amendment. Indeed, the Court itself in its opinion in the Regent's Prayer case stated that its decision did not prohibit a school from engaging in exercises whereby children recite passages from patriotic documents or sing the stanza of the national anthem which acknowledge dependence upon God.

The Court appears somewhat inconsistent in this respect, although we realize that there is a formal basis for distinguishing between religious activities as such and those which are comingled with patriotic exercises. This

formal distinction cannot obscure the fact that whether an acknowledgement of God is identifiable with a patriotic exercise or not the school is still encouraging a confession of religious belief by school children. The Court, therefore, apparently accepts the idea that the Constitution does not prohibit all exercises in schools whereby children are encouraged to express their dependence upon God. Apparently the matter reduces itself to a very precise rule and that is that the school authorities must see to it that the religious element is indentifiable with a patriotic element. Whether the great principle of separation of church and state should be applied to create such technical distinctions is not clear to us.

Problem of being neutral

In the more recent cases involving the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in public schools, the Court's opinion placed stress on a different but related idea in the interpretation of the first amendment. The Court said that the language of the first amendment which prohibits laws "respecting an establishing of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," establishes a rule of neutrality in respect to religious matters. Government cannot do anything designed to inhibit or advance religion. Religious matters as such are outside the Government's domain. Bible reading and prayer exercises are intended to advance religious purposes. Hence they are prohibited by the first amendment. On the other hand, it is immaterial if an incidental religious benefit flows from a governmental program or activity that is intended to serve a valid secular purpose.

In comment on this interpretation, several points may be noted. It should of course be clear that government should be neutral as between religions. Prayer practices and Bible reading are subject to attack on this ground alone, since these practices do tend to favor one or more religions over other religions or over other forms of belief or nonbelief. The neutrality concept is useful also in pointing up the consideration that government in its laws and programs should not discriminate on religious grounds, since this would interfere with the free exercise of religion. But the application of the neutrality idea as an overall principle presents difficulties.

The question may be raised whether the first amendment does require the Government to be completely neutral as between religion and nonreligion. Various practices in public life attest to the fact that Government has not been strictly neutral and that it has given expression to religious beliefs shared by many Americans. Moreover, the Supreme Court has said that Government can accommodate its program to the religious needs of the people since "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being." Mr. Justice Stewart, dissenting in the recent cases, thought that the prayer practices and Bible reading were a permissible form of accommodation, and that the state was better serving the principle of neutrality by giving children an option to engage in these exercises than by completely denying this opportunity.

The real vice, it seems to us, of these religious practies in the public schools is not that they offend some abstract conception of neutrality in respect to religious matters but that they tend to give a preferred position to one religion and operate with an indirect coercive effect to induce participation.

While agreeing that Government should not perfer one or more religions over others and that Government should not act to compel the acceptance of any kind of belief, we doubt whether a strict and abstract neutrality in respect to religious matters is really possible. If a state in the interests of so-called neutrality is to disregard the element of religion in American life and if our public schools are to make a studied effort to disregard religion, it is plain that the state is not being neutral but that it is favoring a philosophy of secularism or humanism. It should be clear that the state is no more lawfully permitted to establish secularism or humanism or even democracy as the official orthodoxy and as a religion of the state than it is to establish any theistic religion.

We recognize that the Supreme Court's decisions do not go so far as to require the public schools to exclude all references to the religious factor in their teaching programs. Indeed, in its latest opinions the Supreme Court has made clear that study of religion and of the Bible may appropriately be included in a program of secular education. Nor do we believe that these decisions are a mandate to government to pursue secularistic policies. Nevertheless, we do wish to point up the problem faced by the public schools of steering a middle course between required school practices that amount to the prescription or establishment of certain religious beliefs and a program of so ignoring religion as to make the public schools stand as mute witnesses to the irrelevancy of God and religion to our national life.

Perhaps the ultimate conclusion is that we cannot expect too much of the public schools in dealing with religious matters. They must be careful to abstain from practices and teaching programs that involve commitment to ultimate truth or values. We do not see how they can enter into this area without offending some groups. On the other hand, it should be possible for the public schools to teach respect for the spiritual and moral values that reflect the community consensus and which for most citizens have their roots in the Christian-Judaeo tradition. Our democratic society is premised on certain moral assumptions. But even here the public schools must be careful. In teaching respect for the ethics of a democratic society, they cannot commit themselves to either a theistic or humanistic philosophy respecting the sources and motivation for ethical conduct.

Rights of nonconformists

Attention was called earlier in this statement to the fact that children who did not wish to participate in the prayer and Bible-reading exercises were free to be excused. To some it may appear that this was a sufficient recognition of the rights of dissenters and nonconformists. It must be remembered that the Court in these decisions did not base the result on the ground that there was an interference here with freedom of religion in the sense that anyone was actually compelled to take part. On the contrary, the Court rested its decision on the interpretation of the establishment clause.

It seems to us that the decision could better have rested on the theory that under the circumstances the practices did have a coercive effect on all children, thereby inducing them to participate, and therefore did interfere with the constitutional freedom of objecting children whether we put this in terms of freedom of religion or freedom of conscience. We must remember that children are particularly impressionable and that to ask them to exercise the role of a nonconformist and to identify themselves as such is to place a heavy strain upon them.

The exercises in these cases were prescribed by the State, and were conducted as part of the official school program under the authority of the public school teacher who to the pupils is a symbol of official authority. So it could be said that the whole official machinery of the public school program was used to give sanction to these exercises and that this official character did impose a restraint on all children to participate. We believe that if the Court had rested the decisions on this ground, the decisions would command wider public support.

We recognize that even to rest the decision on this ground presents some problems, since nonformity is a common feature of our American society, and it is not clear to us at what point the rightful objections of nonconformists furnish the basis for requiring the discontinuance altogether of practices that meet the approval of the majority in the community.

To some it may appear that these decisions indicate the Court is attaching excessive weight to the rights of the minority as compared with the rights of the majority. This is probably too simple an analysis of the case. It can hardly be asserted that the majority of a community should have the power to use the public school system in such manner as it sees fit in order to promote religious faith. Nor can it be said that religious exercises in public schools are essential to religious freedom. Parents and children are still free to pray as they see fit except that the children may not engage in corporate prayer exercises that are officially sponsored by the State. Indeed, consistent with these decisions children may still engage in silent prayer in public schools.

Recognition of religious tradition

The more critical question is whether or not the majority of a community may rightfully claim that the public schools should in their program recognize the religious tradition in American life or whether this is prohibited out of deference to minority groups. The Supreme Court has made clear that public schools may engage in patriotic exercises which reflect the significance of religious faith in American life and history and also that the schools may engage in educational programs that deal with religion.

It may be that some members of the community would object to any kind of dealing with religion in the public schools, but at this point we feel that the rights of objectors are carried to an excessive extreme if they are permitted to raise objections to any kind of instruction that deals with religion. We call attention to a problem arising out of the practice, common to many public schools, of having children recite the pledge of allegiance to the flag. The Supreme Court has held that Jehovah's Witnesses who regard salute to the flag as an idolatrous practice cannot be required to take part in the exercises, but there has been no indication that the schools must eliminate this practice altogether out of deference to this minority, although it may be assumed that a Jehovah's Witness child identifying himself as an objector who refuses to salute the flag is subject to some embarrassment and humiliation.

So far as the rights of objectors are concerned, we fail to see a substantial distinction between the Government's sponsoring an exercise designed to promote a political faith which to some has a religious significance and its promoting a religious exercise by way of prayer or Bible reading. In neither case is the state in a position to prescribe an orthodoxy for all to accept, and yet in the one case it is enough that those objecting are not required to participate while in the other case the practice must be discontinued altogether.

Again, we adhere to the idea previously expressed that in the circumstances of the public school situation, and in view of the pressures to which children are subject, a persuasive case can be made for banning religious exercises. But we do believe that the question of minority rights with respect to public school programs requires careful probing and consideration by both courts and the churches.

There are many things taught in the public schools and many programs that are probably offensive to various groups, and it is clear that some degree of tolerance and accommodation must be expected if the public schools are to function at all and with any degree of success. The question may also be raised whether courts should entertain appeals from persons objecting to public school practices unless they claim an appreciable interference with their own personal rights or interests.

History and contemporary pluralism

The Court in invalidating these practices thereby sets aside school programs that have had a long history. It may seem peculiar, indeed, that practices sanctioned by history are now for the first time in the years 1962 and 1963 found to be a violation of the Constitution. Certainly history should have its place in the interpretation of the Constitution. As Justice Holmes once observed, "A page of history is worth a volume of logic." But we must also recognize that the Supreme Court in exercising the power of judicial review has assumed an extraordinary power in accommodating the Constitution, according to the Court's best lights, to the needs and conditions of our day and with reference to what it considers to be the values served by the constitutional order.

We must remember that Bible reading and prayer were introduced in public schools at a time when the schools could be said to be virtually Protestant schools and that they are identifiable with that period in history when Protestantism was the dominant religious force in this country. This day has passed. Protestants must adjust their thinking to the realities of contemporary religious pluralism. They share the religious scene with Catholics and Jews, to say nothing of groups fitting into other categories. All religions must be recognized as standing equal before the law. None can claim a preferred position. Protestants cannot ask for governmental favors with respect to the public schools that they enjoyed at one time when they represented the major religious force in American life. Moreover, the whole movement of our day toward greater fulfillment of the aspirations and values of a democratic society features increased sensitivity to freedom of thought and expression, freedom of conscience and the rights of dissenters and of minority groups.

All of these developments are a challenge both to the churches and to the state to reappraise the interrelationship of law and religion and the roles of church and state in achieving their respective purposes with due regard to the basic values undergirded by our democratic society and the constitutional order. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Supreme Court, in accommodating constitutional interpretation to new conditions in American life is also ready and willing to take a fresh look at these problems and to interpret the Constitution's broad and indeterminate language to yield results at variance with practices conditioned by the social mores and historical circumstances of an earlier day.

Local autonomy versus national regulation

A final observation we have in respect to these decisions has to do with the Court's application of the 1st amendment to the States by means of the 14th amendment which was adopted in 1868. Indeed, in some respects this is the greatest difficulty presented by the Supreme Court's decisions.

At one time in our history the question of practices in public schools was a matter governed only by State laws and constitutions, and accommodations were made locally in response to the particular situation in the community. In accordance with this practice Bible-reading and prayers were permitted in a number of schools throughout the country. Now the Supreme Court has undertaken to make the first amendment serve as a basis, in conjunction with the 14th amendment, of establishing national rules and regulations in regard to all these matters of primarily local concern and interest. This strikes us as a matter of dubious policy.

We recognize that many developments in our national life—social, economic, and political—have given a new dimension to problems that at one time were thought to be local in character. Our various churches have grow to be national bodies and their interests transcend local lines. What happens in local school communities is a matter now of interest in various parts of the country, and again it may be said that the Supreme Court by its interpretations is accommodating the Constitution to these new phases of our national life. But granted all this, it appears to us that in matters of distinctively local interest, as in the case of public schools and their practices, much is to be said for permitting a large degree of local autonomy subject only to basic national limitations directed to insuring equal protection and protection of the fundamental freedoms of the person.

As previously noted, there may be school communities throughout the country that have a distinctively homogeneous quality so far as religious background is concerned, and we see no compelling reason why the prescription of religious practices in these schools should be held to violate national constitutional limitations. This is not an area where uniformity is required and to insist on uniformity for uniformity's sake in the sphere of public education does not appear sensible.

On the other hand, where there are mixed religious communities, there is much to be said for a type of review which will assure the full respect for religious freedom or for freedom of conscience. In these cases it is appropriate to strike down school practices which are found to exercise a coercive force on children to participate despite a formal freedom of nonparticipation.

It may be that it is too late in our history, in view of what the Supreme Court has said and done, to raise this question, but it strikes us that to subject the local communities to restrictions of State constitutions and to broad standards of equality of religious freedom enforced by the Supreme Court would furnish sufficient protection so far as school practices are concerned and still permit a desirable freedom and flexibility of local control.

III

In conclusion, we recognize the limited if not dubious religious value of prayer and Bible-reading in the public schools and recognize also that practices of this kind may operate with coercive effect on objectors. The Supreme Court's decisions may be sustained on these grounds. We nevertheless, also assert that the general ground relied upon by the Supreme Court and some of the broad propositions stated by it are properly the cause of some concern.

We should also conclude with the observation that the Court's opinions evidence no hostility to religion and on the contrary reflect a high regard for religious freedom. The cases should not be construed as indicating a godlessness on the part of the Supreme Court or any intention on its part to force godlessness on the Nation. We believe that the Supreme Court was activated by the best motives in striking down practices which it thought were inconsistent with the basic values sought to be achieved by the principle of separation of church and State. Whether we agree or not with its conclusions or whether or not we agree with its theory of interpretation of the Constitution, we should at least avoid the intemperate and unjust criticism that reflects unfairly upon the Court and impugns its integrity.

Further Reduction in Dairy Farmers' Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, Northeast dairy farmers are incensed over a current Department of Agriculture proposal which would be far afield from our President's campaign promise to "raise farm income all across the country."

Operating under New York-New Jersey Federal milk marketing order No. 2, farmers were given to believe that sanitary requirements and automation would eventually require the installation of bulk tanks by all producers. This would eliminate the old 85-pound milk can by pumping fluid milk from the farmer's bulk tank directly into the handler's tank truck, thereby preventing multiple handling and the attendant danger of contamination en route. It sounded reasonable and the financial inducement was the handler's assumption of transportation charges from the farm.

Now, under the cumbersome procedure of a Federal order, it is proposed to saddle the farm producer with from 15 to 25 cents per hundredweight, representing the cost of hauling bulk milk from his farm to the processing plant. This, of course, means that the farm price, which is already but about one-third of what the consumer pays for fluid milk, would be reduced by that amount. Assuming the farm is operating profitably, and many are not, this would represent the farmer's entire net income on his product.

Needless to say, our dairy farmers are up in arms and upon his return from Europe, I fear that the Secretary will be confronted with many expressions similar to an editorial recently appearing in the Register-Star of Hudson, N.Y., leave for which I have requested to quote as follows:

FREEMAN'S TRIAL

Orville Freeman must have been aware when President Kennedy made him Secretary of Agriculture that he was being assigned to the hottest kitchen in Washington. But Minnesota's voters had chosen to dispense with Mr. Freeman's services and a displaced Governor cannot be too fussy about jobs.

Since then Mr. Freeman has faced a great many discouraging events in his Department. There was the disillusioning unmasking of Billie Sol Estes who played fast and fancy with cotton allotments and seemed to have lots of well placed friends in the Department. There was the administration's—and Mr. Freeman's—defeat on the wheat control proposal, the Secretary's biggest no-confidence vote since Minnesota.

Then, of course, there's the lost 24 million bushels of Government surplus wheat which at best landed in competition with normal U.S. wheat sales to Europe. And now there's a new one for Mr. Freeman.

It's the battle brewing over the administration proposal to subsidize expansion of beef cattle production. In short, the Government would pay farmers to switch cropland in grazing land for cattle. It's all based on a prediction by one of Mr. Freeman's experts

that the country will need to add twice as much grazing land by 1970 as is likely to be added under the normal pressure of the marketplace.

Without disputing the Agriculture Department's forecast that Americans will need 99.5 million head of beef cattle by 1970, 24.6 million more than now, the American National Cattlemen's Association is dead set against the administration's approach to it. The cattlemen point out the Government proposes in effect to use tax dollars to subsidize competition against cattle raisers.

This spring's slump in cattle prices suggests the beef shortage envisioned by Mr. Freeman's experts is not nigh, nor is there reason to believe that when it comes, the law of supply and demand will not take care of the beef gap.

It looks as though Mr. Freeman's kitchen is going to stay hot. The question is how long Mr. Freeman is going to stay.

A National Oceanography Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed yesterday H.R. 6997 providing for a comprehensive, long-range and coordinated national oceanography program which I was pleased to support. This legislation, which now goes to the Senate, will be as important in the field of ocean research as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program is to America's space development. It will coordinate the marine activities of a large number of Federal agencies, without destroying or impeding their autonomy, and permit maximum use of all the technical resources, knowledge, and skills of both Government and civilian effort in this area.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will make it the national policy of the United States to encourage and develop a coordinated and comprehensive oceanography program. It will direct the Office of Science and Technology to put the program into effect and authorize the President to establish in that Office the position of Assistant Director for Oceanography. At the same time, it will set up an Advisory Committee for Oceanography consisting of not less than seven members empowered to review and recommend programs within the scope of the legislation.

Although I am generally opposed to the extension of the Federal Government into activities which State or local communities can usually handle more efficiently and effectively, I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly supporting this legislation as a step which must be taken by the Federal Government. Because 75 percent of the earth's surface is covered by oceans, this program is obviously beyond the scope of local communities to handle and must be coordinated by the Federal Government.

In this connection, I would like to call the attention of this body to an activity by the Mission Bay Research Foundation in California which could well turn San Diego into the leading oceanographic research center in the United States. Developed with private capital as a nonprofit venture, the project is called Sea World and will, when finished, be the world's largest seaquariam. Because of the importance of this project to the San Diego area and the contribution it will make to oceanography, I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point a summary of what is planned by Milton C. Shedd, president of the Mission Bay Research Co. Foundation of San Diego:

The 3 years of study and investigation which led up to the planning and designing of Sea World convinced a number of people of the vital need for furthering marine research. This resulted in the formation of Mission Bay Research Foundation, a nonprofit corporation, independently organized but sponsored by Sea World.

San Diego's Sea World, one of the world's largest and most unique oceanariums, is a business corporation concerned with returns to its investors; therefore, the activities of the two entities could not be fused. However, Sea World commands facilities and personnel which can be of inestimable value in assisting research programs and its support and cooperation have been assured. Its staff of experienced and highly trained oceanographers, marine biologists, water chemists, animal trainers, and others will provide an invaluable nucleus of scientists and technicians. A waterfront site, which the city of San Diego has indicated will be available as a location for the laboratories of the foundation, is adjacent to Sea World and further insures the opportunity for cooperation in the use of tanks and other vital equipment.

Initially, the Mission Bay Research Foundation's activities will be of a supporting nature and will primarily be directed to projects instigated by other institutions. For example, at present the foundation is actively participating in the very important endeavors of the California Fish and Game Commission and the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the tagging of large numbers of tuna, so that more information may be obtained not only on the migratory patterns of the fish but also the conditions which influence its movements. This venture, together with a substantial participation in the California Fish and Game's program for tagging albacore could be entered into at this early date because these projects required no permanent facilities. The foundation's ability to perform in these activities was made possible by the valuable assistance of Mr. Elmer Hehr, who contributed time, money, and the use of his 58-foot vessel, the *Dorsal*, to the foundation. This equipment was augmented by another 58-foot craft, the *Cisco*, which was made available to the foundation by Mr. R. B. Sprague.

By spring of 1964, certain of Sea World's facilities will be available to limited use by the foundation and by then plans should be finalized and construction started on the initial research facilities of the foundation on its own site. It is anticipated that by the latter half of 1964, the foundation will be initiating its own research projects.

Oceanography is no longer an isolated science. It must now include the marine aspects of many sciences. Meteorology and oceanography are now interwoven. Biology is basic, as are physics, chemistry, and fluid mechanics. Geophysics, mechanics, and electronics must contribute design for necessary tools, gear, and equipment while the marine sciences must provide new concepts of surface ships and submarine vehicles for the penetration of depths, under great pressure.

As an outcome of the work of teams of scientists from these various fields, the theories that seemed fantastic only yesterday are to become the practical achievements of tomorrow.

During the last 30 years, a great deal of very valuable exploration and research was accomplished by Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Woods Hole and other institutions and foundations; but despite these efforts, advance in the science and the application of its findings, lagged and in no sense paralleled the progress of most other major sciences.

Defense requirements and the economic need for more effective exploitation of marine resources now compel our Nation to accelerate her quest for increased knowledge of marine phenomena. The military has concluded that probably the Nation's greatest peril from the enemy lies in the presently undetectable approach routes to our shores, encompassed in the ocean's depths. Further, many authorities are convinced that not far in the future the strongest nations in the world will be those most adept in exploiting the vast storehouse of minerals, energy and foodstuffs contained within the ocean.

The pressures from many sources for an accelerated pace is expressed in the Federal budget request for $155,900,000 in support of marine research in 1964. As late as 1958, this budget was only $8 million. Government agencies, both State and Federal, are joining with educational institutions and foundations in far-reaching programs to seek fresh data and to apply the existing knowledge to practical ends.

Mission Bay Research Foundation will be eminently qualified to make important contributions in many phases of this Nation's expanding research activities in the field of oceanography and related sciences. By so doing it will add another facility to San Diego's growing research complex dedicated to this field.

The foundation will be administered by its own officers, independent of the administration of Sea World. Its policies will be guided by an advisory board, including the following:

Harold B. Clemens—marine biologist, supervisor, Tuna Research, Marine Resources Operations of the California Fish and Game.

Col. Theo. R. Gillenwaters, retired, was formerly deputy commander, second in command of the U.S. Air Force Weather Service during World War II. Attorney for the foundation.

Charles Griffith, businessman, corporation executive experienced in all phases of management especially personnel management and corporation finance.

Carl Hubbs, Ph. D., ichthyologists of Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Member of National Academy of Science.

Kenneth S. Norris, Ph. D., former curator, Marineland of the Pacific. Ph. D., Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Presently doing work in Zoology Department, UCLA.

Irvine Reynolds, economists, Copley Press, San Diego. Business manager and investment adviser for important San Diego business interests.

Milton C. Shedd, chairman of board of directors of Sea World. Investment banker.

Robert Sprague, president of Sprague Engineering, Gardena, Calif. Former owner-operator of Drake Craft, boatbuilding company, Long Beach, Calif.

Additional members will be selected to meet the foundation's needs.

Financing will be accomplished through donations, grants, contractual fees, and profits arising from contract performance.

During its early stage of development, the foundation will play a supporting role in research programs initiated by other institutions. As soon as possible, its activities will

be expanded to make the fullest research use that is practical of Sea World's facilities. Ultimately, the foundation's activities will be primarily concerned in, but not restricted to, the utilization of its own facilities which in general will consist of the following:

1. A testing and animal research tank, a large volume facility especially designed to permit instrumentation below the surface and photography of gear and animals. The volume will be in the range of 250,000 to 300,000 gallons total capacity.
2. A pier and animal handling facility, including trucks, fish transport tanks, booms and electric winches capable of handling very large animals (5 to 8 tons capacity).
3. A laboratory complex including wet labs, aquarium room, dry instrument room, microtechnique rooms, darkroom, library.
4. A hydrodynamic testing tank, which would be elongate (350 feet to 400 feet long) with turning tanks at each end and a gear trolley which could run the length of the tank at full speed. The tank will be equipped with viewing ports for photography and flow visualization techniques.
5. Animal holding and training facilities.
6. Pier space for the docking of small research vessels.
7. A water purification and disposal system.

The major objective of the foundation will be not only to make the fullest research use possible of Sea World's facilities as well as to create and use effectively its own facilities but to locate, catalog, and make arrangements for the use of all types of facilities, located in southern California that can be effectively used for oceanographic research.

In addition it will be the foundation's aim to locate the most eminent scientists and technicians of this area involved in oceanography or its related sciences, index their special interests and capabilities and make arrangements for their participation in projects that develop which require their special attention.

To these ends, additional members of the advisory board are being carefully selected as will be the technical staff of the foundation and other permanent personnel.

MILTON C. SHEDD,
President.

Address of Congressman James H. Morrison, of Louisiana, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Before the Fifth NAIRE District Conference at New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an address recently made by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, JIMMY MORRISON, before the Fifth National Association of Internal Revenue Employees District Conference at New Orleans.

In his address to the conference delegates and officials, he explained his enthusiastic interest in making the life of a Federal employee "more realistic, and on a basis more equal and more comparable to private enterprise."

He particularly complimented the Department of Internal Revenue for its dedication and efficiency, and pointed out that it actually worked "in partnership with the taxpayers."

JIMMY MORRISON's comments on the IRS and other Federal employment branches are illuminating and concise.

Under unanimous consent, I am including his address which appeared in the NAIRE Bulletin of July 15, 1963:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES H. MORRISON, OF LOUISIANA

I have had the privilege of speaking to many conventions and meetings, various Government officials, and Government employee organizations, but I don't believe I ever had the privilege before of speaking at a banquet of Internal Revenue employees. You know, to me, the Internal Revenue is, as far as peacetime is concerned, one of the most, if not the most important Governmental agencies and departments. Of course, it is not the biggest by any stretch of the imagination. The Post Office is much bigger. But I don't know of any that are more important than IRS, and I don't know of any that are as important. Your Department's accomplishments have been amazing. It is doubtful that anyone would dare to say that it would ever be as efficient and successful and as amazing as it is today. It is hard to realize and it is hard to imagine and it is hard to even think that you people could be as dedicated and as able and work to the end that the United States would get every taxpayer in this great Nation of ours in a partnership where these taxpayers, as citizens of this great Nation of ours, would not only assess themselves of the tax, and the basis on which they assess it, write out all the papers, do all the paper work and at the same time, do the collection work and the giving of the money to the U.S. Treasurer as they do. In other words, actually, you're in partnership with the taxpayers. They do your work under your supervision. I'll tell you this, being as good as you are, and I think you are tops, I don't know of any people in any line of endeavor whether it be Government work or private enterprise anywhere in the world that are more dedicated, more efficient, or do a better job than your Department does. But at the same time, as dedicated as you are and with the degree of perfection that you have reached, you could never even hope, presuming no matter how many people were put in your agency to do the paper work and the actual collecting and paying out that the taxpayer does under your guidance and supervision, to get the taxpayer to pay that money which he doesn't want to pay, and do it quite naturally. It is just exactly as difficult, I think, as the supervision that teachers have to do when they teach your children, and before our children, they taught us. Something that we had to do, but at the same time, we didn't want to do it. We rebelled against it, and yet we ended up doing it. So I would say that the success of the entire basic tax assessment and tax collection is the very backbone and fundamental basis of our existence as a free nation, because by far the greatest source, single and otherwise, of our tax revenue comes from income taxes. There is an old saying that you never appreciate the water until the well goes dry. And maybe a lot of people never appreciate what you people do in the Internal Revenue Department until they visit some country that doesn't have anywhere near the efficiency, the dedication, and the perfection that you have shown over the years so masterfully.

For instance, when I was in France several years ago, I saw those people over there were victims of favoritism in tax collection. Nobody felt that it was their duty to pay taxes. They didn't pay the taxes because they thought that it was their duty to do so to keep not only the Government going, but guarantee its freedom. They did everything they could as an excuse. This fellow did not pay his taxes, or that fellow didn't, or favoritism was here and favoritism was there. The result of it was a horrible network of chaos. And I think that that is one of the main difficulties that France has experienced over the years, and one of the main difficulties that brought about their Government changing so much, putting this group in, that group out, and then another group in. They did not have any fair system in collection, that all-important basic fundamental of freedom and democratic government, which is the fair collection of taxes. Without taxes we wouldn't be able to defend ourselves, we wouldn't be bale to have a land of the free, and we wouldn't be able to do the things that this great Nation of ours has been able to accomplish in the way of becoming the greatest democracy in the whole world. The working out of the democracy that we have causes these other nations to look to our leadership, and we not only have to lead ourselves in the cause of freedom but we must lead the entire free world and provide the hope for these nations that are not now free but hope to be free some day.

Your work isn't glamorous, your work hasn't built up glowing headlines in the papers, saying you did this and you did that which was the spectacular. It's just the opposite. It's dreary, and many times it's drudgery, but I will tell you one thing, maybe a lot of people just don't realize your dedication and the very fact that you may not necessarily be doing the thing that you might want to be doing. But you have certainly mastered this, which I think perhaps is the best definition of conquering a job, namely that it is not necessarily doing that which you want to do but learning to like to do the thing that you must do. It isn't everybody that has the dedication and the determination to say, "I don't care what anybody says, I don't care what they think, or what they may not think, but I have a job to do and I'm going to do it to the best of my ability." If it were not for your dedication and determination you couldn't get the job done like you have succeeded in getting it done.

You know, being on the Civil Service and Post Office Committee in many ways is a very rewarding and a very wonderful, I think, position to have. Many Members come on and seem to get off at the first opportunity. Maybe they don't appreciate the challenge, maybe it's not to their liking, but I'll tell you one thing that I believe caused me to want to stay there, caused me to have the determination that I had to do a job I thought was more necessary to be done than perhaps almost any job that I knew of at that particular time in Congress where I had an opportunity to do it. That was to make work in the Federal Government something that the people of this country would look to and respect and admire, and that would at the same time make our young people want to seek Government work.

You know, there was a time not so many years ago that people would say by inference and otherwise, by jokes of various entertainers, "Oh, you work for the Government," trying to give the impression that it was just a so-so job, half deadhead. You only worked part of the time; you didn't get the job done; you just got paid; they always had about five people doing one person's job. I'd hear people say, "why are you working for the Government? Don't waste your time, go get a job in private enterprise. Nobody's got any ambition, ability, or anything else with the Government." That used to make my blood boil. Because not only was it not true, but there was a fundamental, underlying reason for that and that was mainly, I think, the fault of Congress.

As a Member of Congress, I take my full share of the responsibility and I further take my full share of the responsibility for

being on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. So I used to wonder and think who do they say that about our Government employees? Why, why should that happen? Oh, the answer was very simple. Congress had just taken the Government workers for granted. There was no progress as far as salary increases were concerned comparable to jobs in private industry, there were no fringe benefits such as hospitalization, group insurance, such as life insurance, such as benefits that you would get in a comparable job, so I decided that as best as I could, and I had a high position on the committee when I first went there, and I am vice chairman of it today, I would do something about it. And I did just that. I have been in the middle of every Government employee salary raise that we've had. I've been abused, I've been told that I wasn't for economy in Government. Of course I had a quick answer to that. I said no Member of Congress necessarily had a monopoly on patriotism or on economy in Government, that I was just as patriotic and just as economy-minded as any Congressman and I wouldn't bow to anyone on this. However, I've taken the position that I wasn't going to economize by taking off the skin of the backs of the Federal employees nor was I going to stick my head in the sand like an ostrich and say that they weren't entitled to the fringe benefits that they could get in comparable jobs in private enterprise.

You know, you have no basis for collective bargaining. You have to depend on fellows like myself in Congress when you get a salary raise. And that is one reason why your organization is so important and why I can't help but be so greatly impressed with your organization and the very fact that you've had this regional get-together here and are having them all over the United States. That is the very fundamental basis of having your wants and desires given to the Members of Congress. As an individual you may have your fragrance lost in the desert air and be gone forever, but as an organization your voice is powerful and clearly heard and understood.

You have some very distinguished and able people in the leadership of your organization and I think you should be congratulated on your choice. I've heard this gentleman on my right, Mr. Brady, the person that introduced me, testify before our committee and he did a magnificent job. And I'll tell you this, that that is the way you need to tell what your agency wants and needs, not as an individual, but as an organization. One individual in an agency may come up and say we want this, another one may say just the opposite. So one person offsets the other one and you've gotten nowhere. But when one of your officials comes up and says I speak for this organization and here is what we think we are entitled to, here is our problem, here is the way we feel, here is what we think we are entitled to, here is what we need and want, that is the difference between success and failure. I can remember the ASC, Agriculture Stabilization Administration, which has a very responsible job and gives out millions of dollars in soil bank programs throughout the United States. Its employees weren't organized. One or two of them would come before the committee and it was just like speaking out in the middle of the desert as far as any influence was concerned. But they got organized all over the United States, every one of them, and even though the Agriculture Department said, "Well, even though the Federal Government pays them, we don't necessarily say that they should be taken in for all the fringe benefits of the Federal employees." Well, they organized, they came before our committee, and they made a good case. Our committee thought that, the vast majority of both the House and the Senate passed their bill, and the President signed it. But that bill would never have been passed had they not been organized.

In past years, in some six or seven salary increases that you've received I've been in the middle of every one of those fights. Oh, they've said, "Well MORRISON's a professional bill introducer." They run out of things to criticize me about when I take up for the Federal employees. And then they'll get out and say, "well, this agency and that agency, they have just too many people in them and they're not efficient and all that." Just anything to throw a roadblock in to say, "Well, let's don't give them a pay increase."

And I remember one Congressman accusing me of going overboard for Federal employees and another Congressman who was dean of his State's delegation said, "well, I'll tell you one thing, you may call MORRISON a professional bill introducer but as far as the Government employees are concerned they ought to thank God that they've got JIMMY MORRISON that does introduce those bills because if they didn't have him they wouldn't have gotten as many pay raises as they did get, and they would be working for peanuts.

You know, I remember when we had the Cordiner report. Cordiner was chairman of the board of General Electric and had some of the smartest brains in the world on his committee. He got out a report that the average Government employee, and this was some 7 years ago, was 20 percent behind the employees in comparable private enterprise. Why should that be? Well, that's what used to burn me up. I say this, that if a person is working for the Federal Government, and that is the biggest business in the world, 2½ million people, why shouldn't they be paid a fair and just salary with all the fringe benefits comparable to private enterprise, if you want to get the best people that are necessary to get the job done. That has been my creed and will always be my creed as long as I am in Congress and on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and that is as it should be, I think. We can look back a few years and a person either had to be a pauper or a millionaire to go to the hospital. Federal employees then had no hospitalization insurance and I asked what's the difference between a group hospitalization insurance policy for governmental employees numbering 2½ million or a group policy for General Electric or General Motors? None, they are just another group, so to speak. One is just larger than the other, but we shouldn't put a penalty on Government employees because there are more Government employees than there are workers at General Electric. Yet, when we first brought that up, there was a cry and they came to me, these private insurance companies, and said, "If you put in this hospitalization plan, why, we will go out of business. You are against private enterprise."

I said, "No, we're not against private enterprise. As a matter of fact, we want private enterprise to handle this if they want to."

So the first time we failed. The next time we came back we worked and we struggled and finally we got a hospitalization bill through and it is a good one. Today, there are some 10 of them that are taking care of the 2½ million Federal employees. These private insurance companies are making more money and selling more insurance today, and, if anything, they benefited by your group hospitalization insurance policies because they have brought it home to many people that didn't have it.

That is a benefit that hasn't cost anybody as far as the taxpayer is concerned. It hasn't cost them any money. You pay for your own insurance, but somebody had to get criticized for doing it. Well, the "water is under the bridge." You got the hospitalization insurance and I am still in Congress.

The same thing happened with your life insurance. Many people are working for the Government who can't pass a physical examination. Many of them are in the age bracket where life insurance would be prohibitive, but they need it more than anybody else. Well, the same cry went out when we tried to get a group life insurance policy for all Government people. It didn't hurt the private insurance companies. They are selling more insurance today than they ever have before, but look what it has done in the way of giving security to the Federal employee.

I say that it isn't perfect, but we certainly have got a wonderful start I will tell you this, I certainly look forward to taking that group life insurance policy and correcting many inequities in it and many of the things that could be improved in it, and I think that is something that will develop in the future for the benefit of every Federal employee.

I might also state that either this next week or the following week, the permanent Subcommittee on Civil Service, of which I happen to be chairman is to take up a lot of retirement problems and we are going to go into that very closely. There is one feature of it that I am sure you are interested in and that is the 30-year optional retirement. In the military service, you get retirement at the end of 20 years. There are some who say that you should be able to retire at 55 with 30 years, some say just 30 years, and some say that particularly in the Internal Revenue many, after 30 years and regardless of age are so burned out—like this gentleman said, "burned out before then." Others say they are just getting good after 30 years of work and so they might want to stay with the Government a little longer. Frankly, I feel like you might say that we could work out something that won't be mandatory but that will be optional and will please, I am sure, the vast majority of the employees of this great Nation of ours.

Today, I think, the feeling toward Government employees is much improved over what it was 10 years ago or 20 years ago, when I first went to Congress. I see students today who are coming out of colleges and they write me letters about going into the Federal Government. They never did that before. I think people today are awakening to the fact of how important employees of the Federal Government are and I think the people in the Federal employment by the same token have a greater respect for themselves and their jobs. The main reason is that they now have many of the fringe benefits they would have in private enterprise.

So I think we are entering into a period where you can say that if you are an employee of the Federal Government you can be proud of it. You can have self-respect and you can have devotion and dedication to your work. The Members of the Congress of the United States that represent the people of America have the respect that they should have for you by having provided for you the fringe benefits and the salary increases and the retirement improvements that you are entitled to.

I think we have accomplished a lot. It hasn't come as quickly as I would have liked for it to come and some of the other Members of Congress would have liked for it to come, but we have come a long way. So I say to you, let me be one of those to tell you that whatever I have done, whatever part I have played in making your life as a Federal employee better, making it more realistic, making it on a basis more equal and more comparable to private enterprise, it has been a great privilege to work for you. What I have done, I am proud of. I am not only very happy about the past, but I look to the future with more hope and optimism.

From all indications, it may be that the good people of the Sixth District, which in-

cidentally is the best congressional district in the whole wide world, will see fit to reelect me to Congress. Maybe it will be my good fortune to be chairman of the committee in the foreseeable future. The chairman has already stated on several occasions that this might be his last term, that he is considering voluntary retirement. As to what happens after this term, your guess is as good or better than mine, but I believe that with the opportunity I might have as chairman of the House committee many of these things that will be for the further improvement of the Federal employees of this great Nation of ours, may yet come.

Anyhow, that is the way I look forward to what I think and hope will happen in the future. So I say to you, to your wonderful organization, to you distinguished officials, let me express my deep appreciation for the opportunity I have had of being able to be here with you, being able to be a part of your great convention. I want you to know that I stand ready to help you and your great organization at all times.

David Rockefeller Sees Progress in the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the criticism, frequently heard, of the Alliance for Progress it is significant that no less of an authority than David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, finds a number of encouraging trends following the initial year of that ambitious undertaking in Latin America.

Of particular interest is Mr. Rockefeller's observation that private industry is pressing ahead with substantial capital investments as a result of the stimulus provided by the Alliance for Progress.

In a speech before a group of businessmen in Mexico City on July 22 Mr. Rockefeller seconded the recommendations of the special Clay Committee report that assistance be concentrated heavily on those countries which undertake to meet the principles set forth in the Alliance Charter. A report of Mr. Rockefeller's speech appeared July 23 in the Journal of Commerce. The article follows:

DAVID ROCKEFELLER NOTES TREND: LATIN INVESTMENTS SHOW EXPANSION

MEXICO CITY, July 22.—The determination of the majority of U.S.-financed firms in Latin America to press ahead with expansion is impressive testimony to the faith of businessmen in the growth potential of Latin America, David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, told a group of businessmen here tonight.

The resiliency of investment in significant areas of Latin America, Mr. Rockefeller said, was one of a number of encouraging trends in the countries to our south.

During the initial year of the Alliance for Progress, Latin American nations invested over $8 billion of their own private and public funds, he stressed, and there appears to be a further pickup in local private investment in recent months.

Foreign sources committed almost $2 billion under the Alliance, he continued, and this, too, is reassuring.

COULD BE GREATER

While American associates and subsidiaries have continued to expand their operations, it is undeniably true, however, he added, that total investment, especially the flow of new capital from the United States, would have been much greater if conditions had been more favorable.

Turning to other favorable trends in Latin America, Mr. Rockefeller observed that exports appear headed for another record year.

If the United States and other industrial nations move ahead at a fairly rapid pace in the next 2 years, there could be a substantial upsurge in Latin America sales abroad, he noted.

There are also firm grounds for hope that the slide in commodity prices is at or near an end, he said. The new coffee agreement would help, while other sectors of the commodity picture are also fairly bright.

There are also several reasuring aspects to the manufacturing picture, the banker commented. Production of automobiles, television sets and electric motors has risen sharply while the chemical industry has expanded its output on an average of 10 percent a year. Steel, paper, and cement production has more than doubled over the past decade.

Mr. Rockefeller also cited the great promise of the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market. Mexico's trade, for example, with LAFTA members is expected to double this year as it did in 1962.

Further, Mr. Rockefeller said, the outlook for political stability in several areas is better today than at any time in some years.

But, in conclusion, Mr. Rockefeller stressed the need for a favorable investment climate to encourage more participation of private initiative in the development of Latin America.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES URGED

Since the specific policies needed to improve the investment climate vary from country to country, Mr. Rockefeller proposed the establishment of a series of business advisory committees to work with the various government organizations implementing the Alliance on means to encourage private investment.

He also suggested the formation of an overall hemisphere business committe to advise on matters of broad policy.

He seconded the recommendations of the special Clay Committee report that assistance be concentrated heavily on those countries which undertake to meet the principles set forth in the Alliance for Progress charter, including broad social and economic reforms and the encouragement of private investment.

Independence of Jamaica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, August 5, Jamaica celebrated the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Prime Minister of Jamaica, Sir Alexander Bustamente; and His Excellency the Jamaican Ambassador to the United States, Sir Neville Noel Ashenheim.

Hail to Jamaica, as it marks the first anniversary of its independence. One of the very oldest countries of the Western Hemisphere, in point of discovery, one of the youngest to join the ranks of independent nations of the Commonwealth, of the American nations, of the United Nations, of the world; Jamaica, we salute you.

Within your island you have happily combined the old and the new, the great and the small. It is pleasing to us in the United States to see our flag among those at your shrine of Columbus.

After Columbus discovered your island in 1494 and you remained a Spanish possession for the next half century, the British took over for some 300 years. Your institutions reflect the spirit of liberty, the respect for the individual, a belief in the rule of law, which are the hallmarks of the Western World. The great ideas of the past you have epitomized in the new constitution of your beautiful little island. As your self-government developed with the major constitutional changes of 1944, 1953, and 1959, you were well on your way to the independence of 1962.

We note the wisdom of the provisions of your new Constitution concerning the fundamental rights and freedoms of all persons within your shores. Not only are those fundamental freedoms of the individual safeguarded as in other free countries of the world, and not only so safeguarded irrespective of race, place of origin, color, creed, or sex, but also irrespective of political opinions, and in any case, "subject only to respect for the rights and freedoms of others and for the public interest." [1]

We note with gratification your readiness at cooperation internationally, and that you approached independence even prapared to assist in the common services to the small islands about you, as long as such assistance remained necessary, in the interests of the region as a whole. Among these common services are such deserving institutions as the University of the West Indies and the teaching hospital associated with it, which serve all the British Caribbean territories; the West India Regiment; the Federal Supreme Court; the West Indies Shipping Corporation, which operates an interisland shipping service with two ships given by the Canadian Government under its West Indies Aid Program; the West Indies Meteorological Service, and various other regional projects. We are glad that Jamaica wanted to join the United Nations and related agencies, which are working toward the betterment of mankind.

We welcome you as one of us. May your freedom be as pure, as pleasant, and are perpetuated as the fragrant white corona of lilies that is doubly self-perpetuating in your world-renowned gardens. May your future be as bright as the hibiscus flowers for which you are known the world over. Jamaica, it is with pride and hope for a happy future that we welcome you among the nations

[1] "Jamaica, the making of a Nation." British Information Services. London, Central Office of Information. April 1962. (No. RF.P. 5379) p. 10.

of the Americas, among the nations of the United Nations, among the nations of the world.

Excluding Lumber Cargo From Certain Requirements

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill that has the unanimous support of the committee. It has the support of the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Agriculture. It has the support of the ocean carriers and the support of the lumber shippers in the Pacific Northwest, as well as the support of the National Industrial Traffic League. The only opposition the bill had during hearings was from the Maritime Commission which reversed its previous position on the bill. Last year we had a similar bill before the committee and the Maritime Commission supported it, but this year it reversed itself and opposed it.

There also was opposition to the bill received by the committee after the bill had been voted out, in a letter from the Department of Justice. I might say with respect to the opposition to the bill that the Maritime Commissioner who spoke for the Commission said in response to a question that nobody could be hurt by this bill.

The committee took the view that if his opposition was to have any merit it should have been to protect the public interest, but by his own testimony he said that the public could in no way be hurt. The only people who are affected are the ocean carriers and the lumber shippers, and they support the bill.

The need for the bill arose because Northwest lumber producers are competing with the Canadian producers for the European lumber market. The Canadian lumber producer has had an advantage because there is no law in Canada requiring the filing of ocean freight rates, so that the lumber shipper in Canada could negotiate with the ocean carrier for lower rates. This the American producer could not do because under existing law the ocean carrier must file his rates with the Maritime Commission, and there was no opportunity to negotiate for lower rates.

While it would not take a great deal of time for the Maritime Commission to okay a reduced rate, the carriers were reluctant to reduce them because they knew if they wanted to again raise them they would have to file the increased rate, and it must remain on file 30 days before it would become effective. Consequently, the carrier did not wish to file reduced rates. That being the situation, the Canadian lumber producer had the advantage over the American in the foreign market.

This does not affect any other than the foreign market where the Canadians have been taking from us business which we formerly enjoyed.

It is a meritorious bill despite the opposition of the Maritime Commission and the Department of Justice. I might say the Department of Commerce supported it very actively. As the House knows, the Maritime Administration is within the Department of Commerce, so as far as the maritime agencies of our Government were concerned, they were split in their views.

I urge the House to support the bill.

California Jaycees Support the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the California Junior Chamber of Commerce is an exceptional group of young men who participate actively in the business, social and educational affairs of their community, State and Nation. They are uncommon men concerned with their future and the future of their young children. Few of them are farmers, but they appreciate the importance of the agricultural industry. They have observed that the Bracero program works well.

The following recent resolution of the California State Junior Chamber supporting an extension of Public Law 78 deserves the consideration of all Congressmen who are seeking the advice of knowledgeable people on this subject:

Whereas the economic strength of our State, like that of other States which are basically agricultural, is directly dependent upon the continued and uninterrupted production of its farmlands, a production which daily pours into the markets of our Nation vast quantities of vital foodstuffs giving strength and vigor to our national energies; and

Whereas in order to maintain our farms on a level of production required to meet our national demands, it has for years past been necessary for our farmers to have the assistance of able and willing foreign contract workers to supplement our domestic supply of such workers; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom, by enacting Public Law 78, has long since recognized that a program which will enable our neighboring Republic of Mexico to cooperate with us to accomplish this objective, is not only in the best interests of our Nation by making possible a continuation of our essential farm production, with employment of thousands upon thousands of domestic workers in related and accessorial products and services, but such program also serves as a link to bind two neighboring nations together in mutual respect and endeavor to achieve and perpetuate democratic ideals.

Now, therefore, the California Junior Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled, strongly recommends and urges the Congress of the United States to extend, without amendment, Public Law 78 and thereby avert any disastrous consequences which would flow from termination of such enabling legislation.

Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, an Example of America's Finest Business and Christian Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, widow of Alfred I. du Pont, has a residence in my hometown, Jacksonville. I am deeply honored that this is so.

Not many people in the world's history have had the opportunity to handle the large amounts of money which have been the responsibility and possession of this gentle lady. For this she deserves her generous share of credit; for she is an able businesswoman and has added greatly to the financial strength of the Du Pont fortune which she inherited from her husband.

Remembering the parable of the talents, her talents have been great and have been greatly used. More important than all of this is the fact that the purpose of her endeavors has been primarily, if not exclusively, the general betterment of mankind, not her personal comfort or indulgence. Her gifts of time, effort, and money to education, to health, and to the general welfare here in America, as well as abroad, have no parallel of which I know. I emphasize that she has given not only of her financial help but also of her time and effort in many charitable and civic leadership posts. It is a genuine personal pleasure for me to pay tribute to her on the occasion of an honor recently conferred on her by the Episcopal Church, more fully discussed in the following article from the Florida Times-Union:

REWARD FOR GOODNESS

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

"He who loves goodness harbors angels, and reveres reverence, and lives with God."

People who are familiar with the practice of Mrs. Alfred I. du Pont of "going around and doing good" for her fellow beings will rejoice with her over the high honor she has received for following that program.

She was made an associate commander with the designation of Sister in the Venerable Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in recent colorful and ancient investiture ceremonies in the (Episcopal) Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City.

She was honored for her hospital philanthropies and her gifts of food and clothing to Britons during World War II bombing attacks.

She also received the civilian form of the George Cross, one of the highest British military honors.

Mrs. du Pont's work on behalf of the British War Relief Society had earlier earned her a citation and special medal from the late King George VI of England.

Illness which has confined Mrs. du Pont to her home in Wilmington, Del., prevented her from receiving the new honors in person. Under present plans she will receive the jeweled insignia and vestments at her home.

Only two other American women—Mrs. John Jacob Astor and Mrs. William Randolph Hearst—have received similar recognition.

At the ceremonies one English woman and five American men also were honored.

Mrs. du Pont's election was approved by Queen Elizabeth II, sovereign head of the order in England; the Duke of Gloucester, its grand prior, and Lord Wakehurst, its lord prior and Governor of northern Ireland.

Lord Wakehurst and Sir David Ormsby Gore, British Ambassador to the United States, played prominent parts in the ceremony. Officiating chaplain was the Right Reverend Horace W. B. Donegan, sublime prefect of the order and Episcopal bishop of New York.

The service began and closed with a procession of members of the order, including representatives of the Canadian priory and the German affiliate.

It was only the fourth time the service had been held outside the British Commonwealth.

People who know Mrs. du Pont's background of family history will quickly realize that she fits into the picture like the man who "finds himself" like the man in Woodrow Wilson's delightful little book which has that title.

The "northern neck" section of Virginia would be a country all its own, if our governmental affairs on this continent were handled in ways comparable to other governments all over the world which the United States is supporting with the tax-money gifts of the United States.

Indicative of the minds of the "Northern Neckers" is the fact that they voted the Republican ticket in the first election after the Civil War and have been voting it ever since.

The people of that area are originals—original Americans, that is. They are a species that knows how to love and how to fight.

Mrs. du Pont learned both traits and brought them to Florida when Mr. du Pont overtook her in California in her early days, married her, and made her his partner in the work of building Florida into greatness.

She has done a magnificent job of work for Florida's betterment.

Her love has been spent on people. Wherever you go in Florida you will see the footprints of Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, where she has been "going about doing good," in accordance with Christ's command.

We don't know Mrs. du Pont personally. Our knowledge comes from what we have read in the Florida Times-Union and other newspapers since 1922 and what we have learned from devoted friends and almost constant companions. And about all that has come from that source is to the effect that she is extremely liberal with her goodness; that she seems to have an inner power which controls her desires, her attitudes and her actions.

Her greatest joy comes from helping people, all people, but particularly young people, who need help. The extension of this wonderful quality is generous and far-reaching.

There is no phase of struggling human endeavor that is ever passed up by her or any segment of the vast empire that she controls.

We feel sure that the inner life which holds the reins of her life is a softhearted genius under careful control.

Congress: Lag in Science Advice Gives Executive an Advantage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following two excellent editorials from Science, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, point out clearly the difficulties of legislating wisely in this era of scientific and technical specialization. It is a problem I have sought to meet through my bill, H.R. 6866, which would provide permanent scientific advisory staffs for each House of Congress. I offer these editorials for the thoughtful study by all Members and commend the editors of this authoritative scientific publication:

CONGRESS: LAG IN SCIENCE ADVICE GIVES EXECUTIVE AN ADVANTAGE

"One of the most bizarre features of any advanced industrial society in our time is that the cardinal choices have to be made by a handful of men: in secret: and, at least in legal form, by men who cannot have a first-hand knowledge of what those choices depend upon or what their results may be," C. P. Snow, in "Science and Government."

"Most scientists are working with tools and methods that give only a partial glimpse of the real nature of any complex human and social problem," Don K. Price, in "Government and Science."

Federal agencies expect to obligate $14.7 billion for research and development during the coming fiscal year, and Congress, to judge from past performance, can be expected to approve most of these funds for science more or less on faith.

It is not unusual to hear legislators state their predicament in voting on the science budget in just these terms. Last May, for example, Representative CLARENCE BROWN, the ranking minority member of the House Rules Committee, opened debate on the bill authorizing a $3.7-billion budegt for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with the rueful comment that "there seemingly are few Members of the House—and I suspect very few citizens of this country—who know for a certainty whether the amount contained in this bill is the proper one."

BROWN went on to express the hope that the Appropriations Committee would subject the bill to searching scrutiny, and he concluded his remarks by saying, "So I feel, very frankly, with a situation here in the House of Representatives where we must accept this legislation on faith, because programs of this type—some of them at least, if not all—must go forward. We must accept them on faith and hope that the expenditure of these huge funds authorized in this bill will be in the best interests of the American people and the world peace we all seek."

BROWN is a resolute defender of congressional power and prerogatives and a stern auditor of most kind of Federal spending, and his statement is a measure of congressional acquiescence on science appropriations.

Fears within Congress that the executive is usurping congressional powers are probably as old as the Republic, but in regard to Federal operations affecting science, there is little question that the legislative branch's traditional fiscal control and influence on policy have been eroded. As rising Federal expenditures on science have obliged Congress to consider new and highly complex questions, it has in many cases had to default to the executive, with its decisive advantage in information and expertise. Senators and Congressmen as individuals simply do not have the background, and Congress as an institution has so far not developed the apparatus of advice, to put itself on an equal footing with the executive in making most major decisions on science policy and programs.

The nonscientific bent of Congress at large is indicated by studies of the professional and occupational backgrounds of its membership. These studies show, for example, that in the last Congress, whereas well over half of the Members of the Senate and House were lawyers, scientists were a conspicuously underrepresented group.

By the least rigorous criteria of education and experience, there was not a single scientist in Congress, and the total number of engineers, physicians, and dentists barely exceeded a dozen. Some Members, such as Senator HUMPHREY, who worked as a registered pharmacist, and Representative HOSMER, who was an attorney for the Atomic Energy Commission, have had experience which may add to their understanding of issues involving science. But on the record, Federal politicians are not scientists.

The same statistics suggest, to put it another way, that scientists are not interested in electoral politics, or at least that they do not get elected. There are doubtless adequate economic and career reasons why scientists of ability and reputation avoid Federal politics, but anyone who has seen scientists and legislators confronting each other in the committee room or at the Washington party takes away the impression that scientists and politicians are unaccustomed to each other's company and belong to different tribes with distinctly different laws and customs.

It is fair to say that the legislator's attitude toward scientists is tinctured with awe. He feels that scientists are privy to the secrets of nature and also, since they built the bomb, that they are trustees of national security. This awe is not endangered by familiarity, since Senators and Congressmen, in the line of duty, actually see very little of scientists. They deal mainly with science administrators, who must develop the special knack of interpreting the needs of their agencies in terms that a legislator and his constituents can understand.

If a legislator wants to find out for himself what is going on in a science program in Washington or beyond, he will probably deal with agency liaison and information officers rather than with scientists, unless he is unusually inquisitive.

Government scientists, for the most part, work in laboratory enclaves and see legislators only when the latter are on inspection tours. Another larger group of scientists do the Government's work in industry, universities, and research institutes linked to the Government by the attenuated bonds of Federal contracts.

APPEAL TO AUTHORITY

Not only do legislators see little of scientists; they may also get the feeling that important decisions on Federal science policy are made outside Government by the advisory panels and committees of distinguished scientists which the Federal science administrators like to have to back them up. Whether the decision is on a fellowship grant or a major piece of science policy, there is almost certain to be a committee of experts from the scientific community in the background to answer an appeal to authority.

The organization of Federal science cuts off the scientists from the legislator in a way that the specialist in, for example, the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, or Commerce, is not cut off, and thus Congressmen and Senators are deprived of a helpful source of information and advice.

Scientists and legislators have not developed closer working relationships for other, more elusive but nonetheless significant reasons. Scientists and politicians, in an important sense, don't speak the same language. Not only is the scientist's idiom becoming increasingly private, but scientists and politicians use language for different purposes. Scientists strive for precision and admire the brevity and exactitude of the formula. The politician very often exploits the vagueness and allusiveness of language to achieve a protective imprecision. Communication between the two groups is often uncomfortable.

The writings of scientists, especially those directed in letter form to Senators and Congressmen, suggest that scientists harbor a distaste for politics and a cynicism about politicians. They seem to feel that science is pure and politics is dirty and that the method of the first is obviously preferable to that of the second. Scientists often favor the solution of political problems by strict application of logic or by tests of efficiency or economy—methods which in many cases would guarantee disaster.

Objectivity is a cardinal virtue of science, and many scientists seem to see a fundamental conflict between this objectivity and the compromise which is a necessary element of democratic politics. The lack of affinity between the scientist and the politician makes it difficult for them to work together, but its significance is speculative. Of much more definite influence on congressional competence in science in the quality of advice on science that Congress now gets.

There is a general feeling in Congress that on most scientific issues the internal machinery for providing advice at present is inadequate. Members of the personal staffs of Congressmen and Senators tend to be generalists like their employers, and, with virtually no exceptions, their training and instincts are nonscientific. The professionalization of congressional committee staffs has only begun, and the committees, with a few notable exceptions, are still patronage fiefs of the chairmen. The science and technology section of the Library of Congress is undermanned and underfinanced, and the Library's Legislative Reference Service, which was established to provide specialized help to Congress in the evaluation of legislative proposals, has a single senior specialist in science.

If Congress as a rule has been a poor match for the Executive in dealing with science, one committee has proved an exception—the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Over a period of years and particularly on some issues, the Joint Committee has been an unusually active and influential shaper of policy on the uses of atomic energy. Observers of Congress say that the Joint Committee not only has been given momentum by some vigorous and aggressive members, but also has two special advantages not enjoyed by other committees.

First, the committee by law must be kept "currently and fully informed" by the Atomic Energy Commission. Second, the committee has had the services of staff members with scientific and technical competence borrowed from the Federal agencies and military services.

By insisting on its right to information and relying on its own experts, the Joint Committee has achieved a position of authority which other committees envy.

PRESTIGE AND POWER

The eruption of science into government, however, has been an overwhelming experience for most committees. Even the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, which are remarkably well informed on their subject and formidable in the realm of policy, cannot ride close herd on the Defense Department's budget for research and development, which next year will hit $7.3 billion if requests are approved.

The House and Senate committees which handle the authorizations for the Nation's fastest growing enterprise—the space program—are still in the relatively early stages of building expertise and prestige. The Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the House Science and Astronautics Committe both were created in 1958 in the wake of Sputnik I, but both are fledgling committees by congressional standards. Under the leadership of its new chairman, Representative GEORGE MILLER, the House Science Committee last year showed a new vigor (Science, May 25, 1962) which earned it new prestige in the House and may presage a growth to greater influence.

While authority for the research budget remains decentralized in nearly a score of House and Senate committees, congressional performance is likely to remain uneven. And congressional committees being as they are, authority is likely to stay where it is.

Outside Congress, there have been some attempts to do something about the recognized limitations of legislators in science. Three years ago the AAAS joined with the Brookings Institution to sponsor a series of "roundtables" to expose Members of Congress to scientists in different disciplines. The National Academy of Sciences is contemplating proposals for similar efforts, and the Academy for some time has been offering to furnish House and Senate committees with names of scientists and engineers competent to give advice in specific fields.

Inside Congress, there have been signs that the legislators are bestirring themselves. The days when hearings on the space budget were essentially briefings seem to be passing. Watchdog committees have been growling over waste and duplication in the growth programs administered by the science agencies. The House Appropriations Committee even cut a rather sizable slice out of the space budget last year, and although the cut was restored, such discussions may be more frequent in the future. These straws in the wind do not mean that Congress is about to turn parsimonious on science, but they do suggest that Congress feels it is not doing its job as well as it should.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Within the last year Congress was given some home truths about research and development which may foster a closer interest in these Government activities. A Defense Department report published in June gave information on the geographic distribution of defense contracts and showed that the location of awards for research and development and testing was related to the placement of production orders.

In the words of the report, "Revolutionary changes in weaponry have been reflected, naturally enough, in manufacturing processes. Production line items were a large part of the fiscal year 1953 hard goods buy; but by 1961 these had dwindled comparatively. Instead, the more recent emphasis has been upon research and development, and upon fewer, far more costly, weapon units. Traditional metal fabricating processes are giving way to more intricate and sophisticated techniques. In consequence, blue collar workers are fewer, while scientists, engineers and technicians multiply in establishments serving defense procurement needs."

Translated, this meant that contracts, jobs, and votes were at stake. Some legislators, particularly in areas that had been adversely affected by the gravitation of research to the coasts, reacted to the report by demanding that their fine industries and great universities get a bigger share of the research and development contracts. But others realized that it is time to cultivate the research men in the firms and universities back home as well as those who award the contracts in the agencies.

Congress knows that it has forfeited much power over science to the executive and it does not like it. If the legislators are to get their own competent science advisers, serious organizational and temperamental difficulties will have to be overcome. It is true that Congress changes its ways slowly and reluctantly, but it is also worth noting that Congress is at its most adaptable when it feels threatened.

JOHN WALSH.

DEVIL'S ADVOCATES

Increasingly the future shape of science is being determined by legislative actions taken by men who can be expected to have only a superficial knowledge of the technical facts embodied in their decisions. The Government provides about two-thirds of the support for the Nation's efforts in science and technology, and the fraction has been growing.

On the surface it would seem that more money for science is a good thing. Indeed, I have heard some scientists say that it would be almost impossible to provide too much support. However, the realities today are that in many areas of science and technology the crucial bottleneck is brains, not money. For instance, top-quality physicists are in short supply, and this deficiency is likely to continue. When Congress votes to expand activity in a field requiring first-rate physicists, it simultaneously makes the negative decision to remove them from other important endeavors.

It has been pointed out that the educational background of Members of Congress is heavily weighted toward the legal profession, with little representation from science. The remedy usually proposed is that more scientists should get into politics. On the surface this suggestion is attractive. One obvious difficulty is the time it would take for any considerable group to be elected. A second problem is that, in becoming politicians, the erstwhile scientists would in general lose their professional acuity. Moreover, there is no certainty that a man trained in science would bring as much wisdom to Congress as one trained in the law. Some of the most narrow-minded, uncompromising, chauvinistic individuals in this world are scientists. Many research workers are deeply convinced that their narrow area of inquiry is the only one worth pursuing. I recently sat on a panel which cheerfully toyed with the desirability of channeling the total gross national product into a single area of scientific endeavor. A man representative of such a body of opinion would be a dangerous nuisance on the congressional scene.

The Government does not suffer from a quantitative lack of scientific information. Rather, the difficulty is that most of the advice comes from special pleaders. The executive branch has good counsel from the Bureau of the Budget and Jerome Wiesner's office, but the Congress has no independent impartial source of advice. Since the legislative branch cannot evaluate technical proposals, the temptation arises to employ phony arguments in advocating major projects. In scientific circles there is a tendency to be more concerned with the glamorous, salable aspects of a proposal than with intrinsic merit.

It seems well to consider other ways of improving the scientific judgments of Congress. To make good decisions it is not necessary to digest all the facts. It is necessary to be well advised. One of the more promising methods would be to make available to Congress a special group of scientific counselors. These would supplement existing staff and would not be permament Government employees. They could be nominated by such a body as the National Academy of Sciences on request of Congress. They might serve for short, intensive periods while retaining their professional connections. They would be expected to act as devil's advocates (the Washington Star recently made a similar suggestion), with a duty to insure that the public interest was well protected. If such a system could be properly implemented, a substantial improvement in the quality of science legislation might ensue.

P.H.A.

President Kennedy Fails Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, chalk up another failure for President Kennedy. This time his suggested solution to ease the balance-of-payments crisis. The President called for an equalization tax on foreign investments to shore up confidence in the dollar. As predicted by some of us, it has had just the opposite effect, causing grave concern abroad about the stability of the dollar and threatening new pressures on our dwindling gold supply. Just how long can we withstand the unworkable theories and experiments of the Kennedy administration?

The following item from Newsweek of August 12, points out the foreign reaction to the Kennedy proposal:

DOUBTS ABOUT THE DOLLAR

Kennedy's balance-of-payments program, intended to bolster the dollar, has had just the opposite effect in some parts of the world.

Some Europeans have concluded that innovations such as the "equalization tax" on foreign borrowings mean the dollar is in trouble.

The speculative London gold market, for example, moved up last week to the highest level since mid-April.

The situation will probably be aggravated by the U.S. payments-deficit figures for the second quarter. Probable rate: between $3.5 billion and $4 billion, up from $3.2 billion in the first quarter.

A more detailed analysis of the President's proposal and its weaknesses is given by Henry Hazlitt in the same issue of Newsweek and I include it as a part of these remarks:

INFLATION IS THE CAUSE

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The administration would be well advised if it dropped entirely its unfortunate proposal for a tax of up to 15 percent on foreign securities sold in this market. If it nonetheless persists, Congress should certainly not enact it in any form. It is already so riddled with exemptions that it has become "more holes than cloth," but though this means that it could have at best a negligible effect in "saving dollars," even if it worked the way the administration expects, it does not mean that it cannot do great harm.

It is a misfortune that it was ever proposed. For it has convinced both Americans and foreigners that a dollar emergency must exist to make such an emergency measure necessary. And it has raised fears both at home and abroad that still more drastic controls will be resorted to if this one does not work—which few expect it to do.

SOURCE OF STRENGTH

The President's message asking for this control was, in fact, full of inconsistencies and contradictions. At the very moment when he was asking for a barrier to trade and to capital movements he announced: "This Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements." And in the very message in which he asked for a tax intended to discourage or inhibit further long-term foreign investment in order to protect our balance of payments, he was explaining how lucky it was that we had made precisely such foreign investments in the past:

"Our payments deficits, measured in terms of our loss of gold and the increase in our short-term liquid liabilities to foreigners, have consistenetly been equaled or exceeded by the growth of our long-term high-yielding foreign assets—assets which have been and will continue to be an increasing source of strength to our balance of payments. Today, Americans hold more than $60 billion of private investments abroad, and dollar loans repayable to the U.S. Government total over $11 billion. At the end of 1962, all of these assets exceeded our liabilities to foreigners by an estimated $27 billion. And they have shown an increasing strength over the years: our total income from these sources in 1959 was $3 billion; in 1962 it had risen to $4.3 billion, and we expect further substantial increases in the coming years."

What the President is proposing is that a prohibitive tax now be put on voluntary private foreign investments, likely to bring in such future dollar income in interest and dividends, in order that the Government may continue to tax this money away and pour it into "underdeveloped" countries from which it is highly unlikely that we will ever get a dividend or interest return.

EXCHANGE CONTROLS?

The tax on foreign securities would not work; but the danger is that in trying to make it work the Government would move deeper and deeper into exchange controls. We have already gone far. Under Republican and Democratic administrations, the Government first made it a crime for Americans to buy or hold gold at home. Then to buy or hold it abroad. Then Americans traveling abroad were only allowed to bring in $100 of duty-free goods. Now we are to tax foreign security purchases. Will the next step be to limit the amount of money our tourists and businessmen may spend abroad? (This has already been suggested by Senator JAVITS.)

The whole compartmentalized item-by-item approach to the balance of payments is fallacious. In his message the President had to confess, at the same time he was estimating that the $100 limit on duty-free goods "achieved a saving" last year "of more than $100 million," that our "total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent * * * to nearly $2.5 billion." And overlooked by the sponsors of the tax on foreign investments is that these investments have made possible a large part of our export surplus.

We can solve the balance-of-payments problem only by dealing with its basic cause—our domestic inflation. If we were to halt this inflation—by stopping budget deficits and cheap money—we could cure the balance-of-payments deficit overnight. But this is the one course that the administration will not take.

Providing for the Reimbursement of Certain Vessel Construction Expenses

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the distinguished chairman's remarks wtih a great deal of interest. I notice he referred to the shipbuilding capacity on the east coast and on the west coast, but he did not mention the shipbuilding capacity on the Great Lakes. I presume this was merely an ommision and that the bill also provides, as does the basic act, for shipbuilding on the Great Lakes also.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is correct. This bill does not deal only with shipbuilding on the east coast and the west coast, but it includes shipbuilding on the gulf and the Great Lakes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I think the gentleman raised a point that he should have raised and it should be explained. The reason why I referred to the west coast is that the only allocations that have been made from the low bidder to a high bidder were made from the east coast to the west coast, and the Maritime Administration could very well have allocated it to the lakes or the gulf coast.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the comment of the chairman, because those of us representing the Great Lakes ports tried in certain instances to get the shipbuilding capacity there utilized, and we were unable to do so.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to know that the committee is interested in the lake areas and is interested in the shipping situation that exists there today.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the retroactive feature is still in this bill, that the payout will be retroactive if the bill is passed?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Only if those operators who benefited by the allocation pay to the Government what they save by the allocation. This is a two-way street. This is designed to reimburse the operators who are hurt by the allocation, but it also provides that if an operator benefits—and one has benefited—there shall be a reimbursement to the Gov-

ernment by the operators who were benefited by the allocation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further with respect to that, I tried to point that out in my overall statement. But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], raised an interesting point, that the operator will have to pay money back under this bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has outlined the objectives of this bill. They are designed to remove inequities that result under present law. There have been cases, a very few, where ships have been allocated, where ship construction has been allocated by the Maritime Administration to those other than the low bidder. That allocation, in one or two cases, has been disadvantageous to the operators. In other words, it cost him more money. On the other hand, there has been the situation where an operator gained by the allocation. This bill would require that the operator who is hurt will be reimbused by the Government because the allocation was made in the interest of national defense. But it also provides that if an operator gains an advantage dollarwise he must reimburse the Government.

The bill has the support of everybody interested in it. So far as I know there has been no opposition to it. It will result in equal treatment by the Government of all subsidized operators in those instances where ship construction contracts are allocated to other than the low bidder. For that reason I hope the House will approve the bill.'

Fallacy of the Antibracero Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, those who argue against the bracero program state that the bracero depresses farm wages and displaces American workers.

A recent press release of the Council of California Growers points up the fallacies in these arguments.

The release follows:

FALLACY OF THE ANTIBRACERO ARGUMENT

SAN FRANCISCO.—Two major arguments used by opponents to help defeat the bracero law cannot be supported by facts, the Council of California Growers charged today.

These arguments are (1) that the hiring of braceros has depressed farm wages generally and (2) that braceros are displacing American workers.

Figures compiled on a regular basis by the Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was cited by the council to show that farm wages have risen steadily ever since the inception of the bracero program.

The same source was quoted to show that California, the largest user of the imported Mexican fieldhands, pays the highest farm wages in the Nation, the average composite wage being $1.33 an hour in this State. Many fieldworkers in California earn up to $2.50 and $3 per hour.

Records of the California Department of Employment were used to disprove the argument that braceros are displacing Americans in agricultural employment.

These records show that during the past 6 years the employment of braceros in California has declined sharply while the employment of hired domestic workers has remained almost constant.

As a percentage of the total California work force, braceros dropped from 15 percent in 1957 to 10 percent in 1962. During the same years, temporary hired domestic workers increased from 28 to 32 percent as a portion of the total work force, and year-round hired domestic workers from 27 to 29 percent.

In spite of this decline in the use of braceros, the council points out that at peak harvesttime, when perishable crops must be harvested, domestic help in sufficient numbers is just not available, and the bracero fills a very definite need in California agriculture.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 11th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

I am sure that Secretary Udall did not realize how much of a hornet's nest he was going to stir up by his unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. The following letter from G. L. Elliott, of Caldwell, Idaho, is indicative of the clear thinking of southern Idahoans regarding the extension of Bonneville's socialistic Federal power empire into southern Idaho:

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: I wish to commend you for your comments that were entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 8, 1963 concerning the extension of the BPA into southern Idaho.

It is high time that someone started taking a critical look at the high-handed, outlandish, rough-shod methods the public power proponents are using to force socialized power down the taxpayers' throats.

Co-ops, REA's PUD's, and all the other types of public enterprise couldn't compete with a private enterprise if they didn't have prefetential treatment on taxes and interest rates.

Whether you are building skyscrapers or digging ditches, if you don't contribute your fair share someone has to make up the difference.

Very truly yours,

G. L. ELLIOTT.

CALDWELL, IDAHO.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Caldwell News-Tribune of Caldwell, Idaho, 2 days before Independence Day points up the need for each voter to take a close look at the expansion of the Federal Government pointing to the new Bonneville offices in southern Idaho as a case in point:

INDEPENDENCE DAY

We can understand the passing of the old Fourth of July celebration with some notable person speaking at the bandstand in the city park and the city band playing the national anthem and several patriotic numbers.

Often the speakers said just about the same thing that Fourth of July speakers had been saying for years. Frequently they weren't the most accomplished speakers. Many times the band gave the impression it could have practiced more. Generally the weather was not the most pleasant for standing out in the park.

We also understand the desire of people to get out of the city for the holiday or a long weekend such as some are getting this year.

However, we sincerely wish that in observance of Independence Day all Americans would read and think about the Declaration of Independence adopted 187 years ago Thursday by the Continental Congress. We particularly urge all to take note of the reasons the Congress gave for declaring the independence of the American Colonies. We wish that each voter would bring those reasons to the attention of his representatives in Congress—both Senators and Congressmen.

The representatives of the Colonies, assembled in Philadelphia, accused King George III of curtailing the power of the legislatures, of obstructing the administration of justice, of cutting off trade with all parts of the world, of imposing taxes "without our consent."

"He has erected a multitude of new officers, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance," the Continental Congress stated.

Twice recently, the second time less than 2 weeks ago, it has been noted on this page that administration spokesmen in Congress, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, had urged that Congress relinquish more of its powers to the executive branch.

More and more, laws prepared by the executive branch and submitted to Congress with the power of the President pushing for their adoption provide for administrative boards rather than the courts to settle disputes.

The executive branch does not appear to be hampering our trade with the world but labor laws and higher costs of production are making it harder for American products to compete in the world market. Included in those costs of production are wages and taxes, both of which are going higher with the blessing of the executive branch of our Government.

We can't accuse the Executive of imposing taxes without our consent, because only Congress can vote taxes, but we can say that the President uses all of his influence to keep the income for support of Government activities going up.

"He has erected a multitude of new offices."

Idaho has an example of that. Bonneville Power Administration has taken over a duty that has been performed for years by the Bureau of Reclamation and established new offices in the State to carry out that old function. Reports from Washington show the number of Federal Government employees going up constantly, necessitating a bigger bite into the taxpayers' pockets.

We do not advocate a new Declaration of Independence as a prelude to forceful overthrow of the Government in Washington.

We do, however, urge that all voters take a close look at the trend toward complete centralization of Government in Washington and supremacy of the executive branch over the legislative branch, they then should go to the polls on election day in 1964 to vote

not in a popularity contest but for the candidates who will give us the kind of government that made the United States the home of independence from despotic government.

Peace Corps Soon Will Graduate First Oversea 2-Year Hitch Volunteers—American Industry, Government, and Colleges Scramble for These Veterans as the Cream of the American Crop of Young Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, no one doubts the success of the Peace Corps anymore, for even its early and most vocal critics have become converts to this sincere humanitarian cause to uplift the burdens and assist the underprivileged in the less fortunate and underdeveloped areas of the world.

It has been 2 years since the Peace Corps, under the able leadership of Director Sargent Shriver, went through its birth pangs and began to send a trickle of volunteers overseas. They were anything but naive and arrogant and they were not met with indifference and amusement as the critics had proclaimed when President Kennedy announced creation of the Peace Corps in March 1962.

Soon those first oversea Peace Corps volunteers will be returning home to American shores, and there already is a competitive scramble among our industries, Government, and colleges to hire these Peace Corps graduates. I insert at this point a story from the Wall Street Journal of July 31, 1963, by M. S. Mendelsohn, telling of this competition for Peace Corps members:

INDUSTRY, GOVERNMENT, COLLEGES SCRAMBLE FOR PEACE CORPS VETERANS

(By M. S. Mendelsohn)

A group of young men and women who have been working for the past 2 years for as little as $12 a week are being courted by would-be employers who are offering them salaries ranging as high as $9,600 a year—or about 15 times their most recent pay. But strangely enough few of them seem interested.

These reluctant job prospects are the first Peace Corps volunteers, now returning from 2-year tours of duty in underdeveloped countries around the world. According to a Peace Corps poll, most of them would rather study, teach, or work for nonprofit organizations than enter private industry.

Because of their experience and background, many businessmen regard Peace Corps veterans as top candidates for employment. "They have demonstrated their ability to take on tough jobs under extremely difficult circumstances," says Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of International Business Machines Corp. IBM hopes to hire some engineers from the crop of returnees.

Stauffer Chemical Co., which is looking for physicists and analytical chemists, is willing to pay up to $800 a month to qualified Peace Corps veterans. An executive says the company is interested in ex-Peace Corps members because, in addition to the lessons they learned abroad, "only the pick of the crop got into the Peace Corps in the first place."

A LACK OF SUCCESS

But thus far, neither Stauffer nor IBM has succeeded in hiring a single Peace Corps veteran. Instead of flocking home to accept such offers, most of the first 100 to finish their tour of duty are still traveling abroad.

Even when they do get home, there is some doubt about their interest in working in private enterprise. The Peace Corps has polled these 100 veterans about their future plans and about half said they would continue their studies, about 10 wanted to teach, another 20 or so hoped to work for the Government or some other nonprofit organization. Only about 10 expressed a desire to work for private industry, and a handful were undecided.

The initial 100 will soon be followed by 600 other volunteers who are due to complete their tours of duty by the end of this year. And next year, the Corps will release 3,000 more of its workers.

Business concerns undoubtedly will be able to hire some from this larger number of ex-Peace Corpsmen. But the competition will be exceedingly stiff—particularly from the academic world. The Ford Foundation alone is offering 50 graduate fellowships for returning volunteers. In addition special fellowships and assistantships are being offered by the University of Minnesota, Northern Illinois University, Columbia University, Fordham University, New York University, and the University of Pennsylvania, among others.

TEACHING OPPORTUNITIES

Notices of openings in teaching jobs also have been pouring into Peace Corps headquarters in Washington.

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations is searching among Peace Corps volunteers for engineers, agricultural and forestry officers, economists, and statisticians to serve in posts around the world. The State Department, the Treasury, and the Labor Department are among the U.S. agencies spreading their nets for ex-corpsmen.

Joining the competitive scramble for Peace Corps recruits are a number of private, nonprofit groups. These include the Boy Scouts of America, the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, and Goodwill Industries of America, Inc. This last organization helps find work for handicapped persons and runs centers around the country where handicapped workers refurbish secondhand toys, clothing, and furniture and assemble new products. Goodwill has openings in public relations, rehabilitation, and personnel at salaries ranging from $6,500 to $15,000 a year.

The private employer must also outbid labor unions for the services of the ex-corpsmen. The AFL-CIO says it hopes to find Corps veterans to run union summer schools, conduct economic research, and write for union publications. And the United Auto Workers is advertising for economists in Volunteer, the Peace Corps magazine. A UAW official says: "We want people concerned with human status and the welfare of people."

Corporations may have much the same motives in hiring the Peace Corps veterans. The idealism attributed to their voluntary activity overseas is recognized by one business executive who makes this comment: "I have a daughter in the Peace Corps, and she seems to work with a nice bunch of people." This man would like to hire some of them.

Impact on California of Terminating the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a recent press release of the Council of California Growers shows the tremendous adverse impact on the State of California of terminating the bracero program.

The release follows:

IMPACT ON CALIFORNIA OF TERMINATING THE BRACERO PROGRAM

STOCKTON.—Industries with an estimated annual volume of $621 million face a thinner slice of California's huge canning tomato production next year if the bracero program isn't revived, or if an alternate labor force is not available.

These are the industries which either process, package, ship, store, and sell tomatoes, or those which supply the growers with fuels, fertilizers, machinery, and services.

California growers, who produce 60 percent of the Nation's canning tomatoes, last year employed 42,000 of the Mexican braceros at peak harvest.

When Congress recently voted not to extend the bracero law beyond its December 31, 1963, termination date, many people at first probably viewed it as a problem of the farmer, said the Council of California Growers.

Now, adds the council, the concern is spreading throughout the hundreds of industries which either buy from or sell to the growers of products in which bracero labor has been significant.

Tomatoes are only one crop in which large numbers of braceros have been employed, at peak seasons, to speed the harvest in California. Others include strawberries, asparagus, melons, lettuce, lemons, and celery.

To give the public an idea of what is at stake in the canning tomato industry alone, should a labor shortage occur in the harvest next year, the council talked to Robert Holt, manager of the California Tomato Growers Association, with offices in Stockton, which is in the heart of the canning tomato growing area of the State.

First, to be affected, of course, would be the California growers who last year produced 3,218,000 tons of canning tomatoes worth $88 million, says Holt. Unless they are assured of an adequate labor supply, he foresees sharp cutbacks in plantings next spring.

The extent to which this, in turn, would affect related industries cannot be measured precisely. However, some concept of the size and importance of the vast economic complex involved indirectly, but substantially, in the labor problem can be visualized by these statistics furnished by Holt:

During 1962 California's canning tomato growers bought an estimated $5.5 million worth of seeds and plants, $4 million worth of tractor fuel and machinery repair services, $3.5 million worth of fertilizers.

During 1962 California tomato canneries and processors spent an estimated $70 million for metal cans, $11 million for glass containers, $12 million for boxes and cartons, $6 million for printed labels, $1.8 million for caps and lids for containers, $12.8 million for truck hauling of tomatoes from the fields, $32 million for shipping processed tomatoes to markets, $45 million for the salaries of 50,000 cannery workers.

Holt arrives at the $621 million figure by applying the economic multiplier index of seven to the $88 million received by growers.

"The canning tomato industry provides just one example of the thousands of jobs and millions in economic wealth that will be materially affected if a severe harvest labor shortage should occur," says Holt. "Many, if not most, of these same industries will be affected if labor shortages arise in the harvest of other crops in which braceros are now employed in substantial numbers."

NASA's Master Stroke of Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 13, 1963, which clearly indicates how understaffed the Congress of the United States is. NASA has now earmarked $131,000 to study its public relations program.

NASA, the fourth-largest executive agency, has an annual budget of $5.7 billion. The House Science and Astronautics Committee, whose job it is to oversee this budget, has the smallest professional staff on Capitol Hill, 10 members, not one of whom is responsible to the minority. This is just one of countless instances where the lack of adequate congressional staff is causing needless waste.

The full text of the editorial follows below:

NASA'S MASTER STROKE OF STUPIDITY

The summer's prize for the biggest boondoggle—and it cannot be blamed on the heat—goes to those in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who dreamed up the idea of spending $131,000 to study NASA's public relations program. (The project, whose details are still vague, will be administered by the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism.)

Like the $97,000 Atlantic City got from the Federal Government to study the feasibility of air conditioning its convention hall, this NASA thing is another sample of our survey craziness. NASA's information systems have not operated smoothly in all instances, any more than the first space mechanisms have, but whatever is wrong certainly can be corrected through mature consultation between spacemen and newsmen. As a matter of fact, such consultation has already taken place, with the result that the last time around the hot lines between Canaveral, Cooper, and the public functioned better than in the initial flights.

The basic news mission of any Government agency is to give the public the facts as fast and as fully as possible. No academic researchers can come up with hidden secrets for doing this, no study group can find a formula for penetrating the public mind any more speedily with the technical terms of spacemanship. It cannot be done that way.

NASA's $131,000 rocketfull of nonsense should never get off the pad. A quick cancellation of the Columbia grant (provided Columbia does not pull out first) would be the wisest sort of public relations now. If there is really that much coin lying around gathering dust, we can think of better ways of spending it, like getting our own astroniece into the air before Khrushchev makes it two to nothing in his favor, or giving lie-detector tests to NASA people to find out who concocted this ingenious method of tapping the public treasury.

Alliance for Progress Makes Progress in Salvador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress is a bold program. It has to be bold because it must deal with enormously difficult problems. The Alliance proposes to change the social and economic structures of whole countries—to create democratic institutions where democracy has never existed or has been forgotten; to help ease the grinding poverty of millions of people.

El Salvador is one country in which the Alliance has made considerable progress, as is evidenced in this report:

[From the New York Tribune, July 14]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS MAKES PROGRESS IN SALVADOR

(By Bert Quint)

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR.—A big, bronze-faced man in an open-necked sportshirt stood talking to a group of Indians in the village of Sierra Colorado, close to the Honduran border.

It was at the inauguration of the first school that the 1,500 people of Sierra Colorado ever had—a school built by the Alliance for Progress. The big man was treated as an important visitor, although he himself was part Indian of humble birth.

The Communists say that the Americans are bad people, he told the Indians quietly. He paused now and then nervously to finger his thin, dark mustache. "Look at that school. The Americans helped us build it. Is that a bad thing?"

INDIANS APPROVE

The Indians listened intently as El Salvador's El Senor Presidente, 41-year-old Julio A. Rivera, took a new tack.

"The Communists tell you that this country is ruled by the rich people. Am I rich? No. I am one of you. Each of you has a vote, and there are more poor people than rich people. You can outvote the rich."

The villagers crowded closer to see and hear. They nodded approvingly. They could not read or write, and they knew nothing of politics, but they understood their President's words.

Standing near President Rivera was another visitor who was no stranger. He was a tall, gangling, fair-haired man with a big grin.

"It is he," one of the Indians whispered, "who got the money to build the school."

The man was U.S. Ambassador Murat Williams. He and President Rivera have been conducting an experiment in El Salvador that officially was 1 year old on July 1, when the President celebrated his first anniversary in office. But the test actually began 18 months earlier.

It was on January 25, 1961, that Lieutenant Colonel Rivera and a group of young army officers seized the government from another army faction—a junta which only 3 months before that had ousted President Jose Maria Lemus.

In its 90 days in power, the junta had permitted a degree of Communist political activity and infiltration in the government. That infiltration worried the younger elements of the army.

From the beginning, Mr. Rivera's provisional government proved that it was not like most of Latin America's military governments, while as a rule are stanchly conservative. Mr. Rivera's pledge was to abide by and carry out the laws of the Act of Bogotá—forerunner of the Alliance for Progress which was to be proclaimed by President Kennedy only 2 months later.

FEUDAL PATTERN

With the help of Ambassador Williams, who provided a sympathetic ear, advice and American moral and financial support, the Civic Military Directorate set about to change the pattern of life in this coffee-growing Central American country.

The smallest nation in Latin America—barely the size of New Jersey—El Salvador is also one of the most feudal. Most of its 2.7 million people are peasants, and over 60 percent of them live and work on the great fincas owned by masters not unlike the barons of medieval days.

They plant, tend and harvest their lords' coffee and cotton crops and in return they are given 50 cents a day or less and are permitted to live with their families in miserable huts on the grounds. If the harvest is bad, there is no work and no pay. Even in the best of years there are seasons when the peasants do not work at all.

While the masses live in poverty, just 75 individuals in some 25 interrelated families control 90 control 90 percent of the country's wealth. In the past they also controlled the Government through rightist military dictatorship. The directorate went to work to loosen the oligarch's grip. It issued sweeping decrees that: nationalized the Central Reserve Bank, long exploited by the wealthy as a means of unrestricted credit and of getting their money out of the country; instituted a social security code; established a minimum wage for urban workers; and guaranteed peasants a seventh day off with pay.

CUT RENTALS

Other directorate decrees made the landowners responsible for the hospitalization of their peasants and forced them to serve the workers staple diets or else pay them extra so that they could properly feed themselves. They cut the rental of slum dwellings—most of them owned by the same elite families—by one-third, and instituted a sweeping income tax law.

The reforms met with fierce opposition from the wealthy families who saw their privileged positions challenged, and from the Communists, who realized that a government that improved the lot of the masses would destroy their own chances for an eventual takeover.

The result was incongruous—a marriage of convenience of Communists and oligarchs trying to overthrow the directorate. It is the same kind of cynical alliance which was used to get at Guatemala's now-deposed President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, is still working against President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, and now seems to be at work against the new Government of the Dominican Republic headed by President Juan Bosch.

There were bombings, subversion in the army, a spate of student strikes, virulent anti-directorate campaigns in the press. But the directorate hung on, issuing its revolutionary decrees and working with the United States to put the Alliance for Progress into practice.

The country became an alliance laboratory: if reforms could succeed in feudal El Salvador, they probably could succeed throughout the hemisphere. And in little El Salvador, a limited amount of properly spread alliance money could go a long way.

In the first year of the program, El Salvador got $25 million for housing, schools, hospitals, supervised agricultural credits, and economic studies. On the one hand there was money for the reforms which the alliance demands, and on the other the financial boosts to the country's economy.

HONEST ELECTIONS

The first indication that the experiment was going to work was the election of a new legislature in December of 1961. That the directorate was successful—until then anyway—was evident in the overwhelming victory scored by the National Conciliation Party formed by the directorate in an apparently honest election. The second sign was Mr. Rivera's election as President in April of 1962. Because the December elections showed the other parties that they had little hope, Mr. Rivera ran unopposed.

At that time, this reporter asked a peasant of the village of Ahuachatan, far out in the dusty cotton country why he bothered to vote. His reply: "Our colonel is our only hope for a better life."

That same day, one of the wealthy landowners told me he was staying away from the polls in protest. "With Rivera's gang in power," he said, "I was not able to take my usual trip to Europe last summer."

ADEPT POLITICIAN

The record vote in Mr. Rivera's behalf showed that even if the land barons were not with him, the serfs were.

By the time Mr. Rivera was inaugurated, the barrel-chested career army officer, who was once nearly executed by a firing squad for taking part in an uprising against the dictator, had transformed himself. No longer the soldier whose outspokenness was a political liability, Mr. Rivera had turned into an adept politician, skilled at handshaking, baby kissing, and hatchet burying.

When he began his 5-year term a year ago, Mr. Rivera pledged to bring about a "national conciliation"—a peacemaking between the wealthy class and his government. Nobody was willing to wager that he would even be able to stay in office.

Today, he is still in the Presidential Palace and stronger than ever. His efforts at conciliation have consisted of bringing several members of the aristocracy into his government, seeking its advice on economic matters and trying to prove to the upper class that he is all for private enterprise.

"In order to give a bigger slice of pie to the poor," he says, "we must provide a bigger pie."

But, as one American official puts it, Mr. Rivera is convinced that "you cannot fatten the flies by feeding the horses better," that the poor do not automatically become better off just because their wealthy employers are making more money.

To help both the horse and the flies, the Rivera government is trying to increase overall production by following the advice of the U.S. Government and an American firm of consulting economists.

NO COOPERATION

But the hitch, says President Rivera's capable Vice President, Francisco Lima, a political liberal although he is a member of the aristocracy, is that the wealthy class still is not willing to cooperate fully.

"The rich are trying to strangle the government by holding back their investments," he says. "Bank deposits are high because they refuse to circulate the money. If they do not do so willingly, we will have to take bank measures to make them do it."

Some of the more zealous reformers in the Rivera government are starting to worry that their social revolution has been betrayed. They claim that the "national conciliation" is turning into national appeasement. But so far, at least, there is little reason to think that the Rivera government is giving up on its reforms.

DECREES NOW LAW

Already all the decrees of the provisional directorate have been enacted into law—except the one establishing an income tax law. Mr. Rivera says the delay is only that, and that it is for good reason. "The proposed tax is too high," he says. "It discouraged investment. We are revising it to make it more just and will resubmit to the legislature soon."

While he still has hopes of being able to avoid getting tough with the wealthy classes, Mr. Rivera does not tolerate the Communists. He has kept them relatively quiet with threats of jail and deportation, although there are murmurings that indicate it may be only a temporary peace.

The United States, meanwhile, continues to pump in $25 million a year, with the current emphasis on mobile health clinics for areas that never have seen a doctor.

In return, the United States is getting its money's worth of good will. This is evident in the faces of the Indians who come into the capital to speak personally with Ambassador Williams.

"We would like a school," they tell him.

"You supply the land and the labor," he replies, "and the United States will supply the building materials and the textbooks."

Now, as President Rivera enters his second year in office, Ambassador Williams is satisfied with the progress already made and is optimistic about the future.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

But he realizes, as does President Rivera, that there are serious problems still unresolved. The delicate task of forcing the land barons to collaborate in a social revolution that frightens them is not yet finished. And while the Communists are down, they certainly cannot be counted out.

Nevertheless, says Ambassador Williams, pointing to a significant barometer in the storm centers of Latin American politics, "there has been less talk of a military coup in the last 6 months than ever before."

Providing for Comprehensive Long-Range Coordinated National Program in Oceanography

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] has applauded the individuals and organizations that worked in support of this legislation. I think it is in order that the gentleman from North Carolina himself be commended for the tremendous part and work that he put into this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina stated this represents the work of some 4½ years. I know of no one who has worked as hard as the gentleman from North Carolina on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the House may recall, a similar bill was approved at the last session of Congress by both the House and the Senate. However, it was pocket vetoed by the President. The committee is satisfied that the President had no real objection to the objectives and purposes of the bill, but there was some disagreement over the actual wording of it—some technical language. In consideration of that the committee has reworded the bill and has satisfied the executive branch of the Government with respect thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the bill. It covers a subject of tremendous importance and I think the Congress should again approve the legislation. I am satisfied that if it does pass this bill today the bill will not be again vetoed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to approve this legislation.

Dallas a Free Enterprise Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the story of Dallas, Tex., is always an inspiring one. We are a proud community in the finest American tradition. One of the great metropolitan areas of the United States, Dallas was built through local initiative, local know-how, local money, on the dreams and with the sweat and hustle of the local people.

In spite of our tremendous record of achievement, the people of Dallas must be on the alert constantly against big Government encroachment. A case in point is Love Field, our fine airport, built without Federal funds by the people of Dallas. Now the people are engaged in a contest with the Federal Government to prevent a bureaucratic agency from killing Love Field in favor of a federally sponsored and directed air facility in another location. We, in Dallas, will resist the move as we have resisted Federal efforts to make us take urban renewal and other Federal projects with the result we have built more buildings, rehabilitated more blighted areas, and continue greater growth and progress than any comparable community in the United States.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of August 4, "No Mean City," tells the story of Dallas and warns what can happen to Dallas and any other free American city if it knuckles under to a dictatorial Federal bureaucracy:

NO MEAN CITY

Anyone who has listened to the airport hearings cannot help but reflect on Dallas—how it was born, why it grew and where it is headed.

As far as physical advantages go—climate, scenic features, natural resources—Dallas is not blessed. Had it depended on any of these, it would be lucky to have 5,000 people whittling away at their small existences.

But destiny ruled otherwise, and here we are approaching a million people because forevisioned leaders realized early that Dallas couldn't depend on natural advantages or trust to luck and would have to generate its own steam to get anywhere.

So that leadership went to work to build Dallas with Dallas brains, Dallas muscles, Dallas adventure and Dallas effort.

Acquisition of the Federal Reserve bank and Southern Methodist University within a short interval of time laid the foundation for future financial and educational growth.

Bankers risked capital which, with the help of the Robertson law, in turn attracted insurance men. Dallas drive landed the 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition which brought outsiders here to look us over; simultaneously, the East Texas oil field put more money into more Dallas institutions and helped us weather a depression.

The war made Dallas aircraft and aviation conscious.

In the postwar period, light and heavy industry has been added to a balanced economy, and in the 16 years since 1947:

Dallas has built more office space than any other city except New York. Population has jumped 65 percent, employment 73, retail sales 86, buying power 193.

Throughout Dallas' history of growth, wholesalers and retailers located here because truckers, railroads and airlines gave this city accessibility and distributive power.

Love Field epitomizes all of this. Whatever makes Dallas tick has made Love Field tick.

If a Government can come in and kill a local enterprise, built with local money, conceived with local vision and developed with local muscle, that Government can—and will—do anything.

What incentive remains, in the future, for local ingenuity? Who will know how to proceed in any kind of enterprise, when the heavy hand of a bureau 1,500 miles away can type out a simple directive that kills years of effort and painstaking care?

This city was told years ago, by the Government, to develop its own airport and proceed with its aviation future on its own. It did, in good faith.

Dallas' growth and dreams are thoroughly Texan and genuinely American. Its airport is part of that story. This city asks only that it be allowed to go ahead to a greater future along the lines of a glorious past.

Msgr. Nicholas P. Coleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Msgr. Nicholas P. Coleman, one of the outstanding spiritual leaders of Connecticut died at the age of 87 after a life of great achievement on behalf of his fellow man and his church. The Stamford (Conn.) Advocate has paid him a moving editorial tribute, which I am proud to offer for the RECORD:

MSGR. NICHOLAS P. COLEMAN

The Right Reverend Nicholas P. Coleman, P.A., V.F., who died Monday at the age of 87, was the dean of Stamford clergymen. He had been a priest 61 years, all but 8 of them in Stamford and Riverside. Since 1936, he had been pastor of St. John's, the "mother" Catholic church of Stamford.

Monsignor Coleman received many honors from his church for his spiritual leadership. This leadership was expressed in many practical, constructive ways. His executive ability was reflected through the entire community, far beyond his parish boundaries.

It is possible to say that without his direction and leadership, St. Joseph's Hospital would not be the haven for the sick that it is today. Monsignor Coleman gave more than his time, prayers, and labors to this institution of public service. He gave a considerable fortune in money.

All these works would have brought Monsignor Coleman fame and respect, but his great place in the heart of our community goes beyond that and is more firmly based. It is based on the shining integrity of the man. He had the ability to face any problem fearlessly and without equivocation. Through spirit and personality, he was able to convey this courage and forthrightness to the many who brought their problems to him.

He worked with the exercise of true love. He was no soft sentimentalist, knowing that the superficial was degrading to human dignity. The love he gave men made them better for it. The love he gave Stamford made it a better community. Stamford has lost a spiritual leader, a builder of community services, a giver of charity. This is a grievous loss but, most of all, we will miss Monsignor Coleman's guiding love. There is too little of it in this world.

Voice to the Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place into the RECORD an article entitled "Voice of the Satellites," which appeared in the August 1 edition of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin. It was authored by Vladimir Stedry, a former Czech editor now living in exile in Germany. It offers a suggestion that should be incorporated into free world broadcasts to Communist countries.

The article first appeared in the Sudetan Bulletin, a review published in Munich, and raises legitimate questions concerning the effectiveness of the Voice of America and other radio broadcasts beamed behind the Iron Curtain.

I am also communicating with our officials in the VOA, with Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty, directing their attention to this constructive article:

VOICE TO THE SATELLITES

(By Vladimir Stedry)

It is the purpose of every broadcasting station that beams a message to the countries behind the Iron Curtain, to make more difficult the consolidation of the regime which has been forced upon the peoples there.

Radio is the only truly effective weapon the West has in this struggle with communism and the Communists are certainly well aware of it, which explains why they do all they can to reduce its power, spending hundreds of millions annually to jam the programs.

Despite an all-out attempt at interference, it is proven that Eastern static constitutes no formidable obstacle and that newscasts from the West do reach listeners behind the Iron Curtain. Important is the method employed to attract an ever-widening conspiracy of listeners and to win their confidence, at the same time utilizing every opportunity available to Western broadcasting companies in the battle of truth versus the lie.

NEWS IS DIFFERENT

The broadcasting of news and commentaries to the satellite countries seems to be a simple and easy matter. Nonetheless, it is an undertaking which the Western transmitters do not always rightly grasp and properly carry out.

For example, there is a fundamental difference between a newscast within the Western countries whose internal situation is familiar to us, and one beamed to the East bloc, whose structure and development is not always correctly evaluated by the West.

Very often we forget that where communism prevails, terror is the order of the day. Not only do the Reds make use of heavy interference to prevent listening in any foreign newscasts, but they make full use of sneakers and informers. For this reason it is vitally important to consider just how the mind of the Eastern listeners works.

The broadcasters should also remember that they are not beaming news reports to persons contented with their lot. They are addressing listeners whose thinking has been radically affected by their resistance to communism; they are against any form of compromise for the simple reason that they hold any compromise with the Communist system to be impossible.

Nowadays every newscast that is transmitted should be commented on; of itself it should be enlightening.

SOME EXAMPLES

For example, it would be expedient if, in reporting to the East on a Western strike, one would mention the fact that the workers in the East have no weapon against their authoritarian state, although they have to work much harder than the Western workmen.

Or, when reporting on a Western airplane crash one should note that the Eastern authorities only report damage to their own planes in rare exceptions, since such reports contradict the perfectionist image they wish to foster in the minds of their public.

Should one tell about the Western Youth Congress, it should be added that the meeting is entirely voluntary and in no way party instigated or government sponsored.

One should keep in mind, that what may be crystal clear to the Western listener, is not so self-evident to the less informed ears behind the Iron Curtain. A short, penetrating or ironic commentary exempts the broadcaster from any suspicion the listener frequently might entertain, that the former was inclined to compromise with the Communist system.

FALSE CONCLUSIONS

News reports of the Western run-of-the-mill variety are no suitable antidote for communism. They often prompt the listener to false conclusions.

A broadcast designed for the satellites should not be based on the assumption that those tuning in are well informed on the West. The anti-Communist message does not reach millions; it gets through to isolated individuals who happen to have a chance to listen in and are willing to take the risk involved. In its present form the Western transmitting system that beams to the satellite states is no longer adapted to current conditions and the stratification of Eastern listeners.

The present-day listener behind the Iron Curtain is, by and large, a person who is dissatisfied with the Communist regime or who has been disappointed with the life it offers. To know this has its advantages.

The Western broadcaster will far more readily win the confidence of a limited but well-developed group of resisters to the regime if it desists from speaking to imaginary masses and seeks the individual approach. The small but loyal group of listeners will spread the news picked up from abroad, for in the land of the lie, truth has wings.

One View on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the real key in the move for freedom, the demand for increased rights in society, lies in the expansion of the spectrum of choice. What the Negro citizen should seek and want is more to choose from and a real power to choose. A range of job potentials as wide as the existing multiplicity of classifications generated by our 20th-century technological age and a real opportunity to compete on the basis of competency and qualification. More of the material things, such as new homes, television sets, washing machines, motorcars, and so forth, and a real opportunity to use the benefits of the credit system on the basis of his individual performance for responsibility and payment. Greater chance for the things of the mind and the things of the spirit without artificial barriers of generalities of deficiency and disqualification. Acceptance of his right to be different as long as it is a progressing, improving difference.

We submit that the way to get these desirable things does not lie in cutting down everyone else's choice to a lower, common level or a lower, equal size. That is precisely the way to narrow choice and diminish rights and freedoms. It deprives our society of its flexibility, diversity, and incentive upon which a policy of plenty and of a dynamic, growing culture so urgently depends.

What the Negro is entitled to is the right to be included in everything everyone else in America is included in, and on the same basis. To put a goal realistically within the reach of all is quite different from putting it within the grasp of some. It should be remembered that whereas the Negro has much to gain he also has something that could be lost. Mainly, himself and all of the heritage and culture that is worthwhile in his past. A society in which everyone is nobody and anybody can be anyone is not in character with America. The free scope for individuals to develop by their own efforts and their own gifts and for groups to exist within our American framework by their own vitality and integrity and by the needs they serve, this is the strength of our society. Add to that the free interplay and interflow between such individuals and groups, and this is the open society of a free land.

It is in view of this truth that we suggest some error and misguidance may operate in the programs sought for civil rights. It is our belief that aside from the strong assertion of a general policy of equality backed with court sanctions the most productive programs will be aimed to help the Negro where he is. Crash programs designed to improve the environment and improve the individual will, in the long run, be best. Only such an approach can maintain the integrity of the Negro as a person and Negroes as a race. Only such an approach can protect us from the erosion of the present quality of our society. For the long history of oppression and denial we owe the Negro citizen much, but we do not intelligently pay the debt by making our society a less attractive one in which to claim full citizenry.

Every minority has, at some time in its struggle for status, required its government to help its members measure up. At no time is it appropriate to ask its members to mark down their rights, privileges, or opportunities. All of the demonstrations, all the righteous recriminations about the past, whatever constructive part they have to play, are not going to change the hard facts of life in the Negro's situation. He still has the burden to measure up to the requirements of responsibility for enlarged political rights with the assumption of enlarged political responsibilities. He still has the burden of measuring up to increased education and skill as a condition of fuller economic recognition and progress. He still has to measure up to standards which for some time will include the prejudice of the past before achieving full participation as an individual in the more intimate interplay of society. All this is simply to say that after eliminating such artificial barriers as now exist the Negro must still find an honest, meaningful ground on which to base a personal pride on being a Negro before he will have a recognizable or meaningful basis for pride in being an American.

The burden of this accomplishment is primarily money and time. The tools for achievement are increased quality and quantity of education—job training—housing and a real competitive chance in the large arena of choice. Now is the time to urge all manner of assistance to those so long denied the opportunity to measure up. Let us be generous in our approaches on every front to provide real, effective avenues for self-improvement. But most importantly, let us do this meeting the Negro where he is. Not only where he is physically but where he is as a person, as a member of a race. What we are seeking is not the right to be the same, but the same right to be ourselves. Let us guard for all, including the Negro, this intrinsic value of our open society and moreover, I suspect, this intrinsic value in true human dignity.

Only by distinguishing between those actions that make smooth the way for the self-improvement of a particular group of persons and those actions which reduce the measures of rights, remove the value of difference and restrict the spectrum of choice for all can we make real progress. Only thusly can we assure the Negro that his contribution to his country will be the best he is capable of producing. Only thusly in his efforts can he achieve that plateau of the fullest panoply of choice.

Hard cases make bad law. The case of the Negro is a hard case. Can we hope that we will avoid the maximum possible of bad law?

Maryland Young Democrats Support Civil Rights Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following resolution at this point in the RECORD. This resolution passed by the executive committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland at its last meeting on July 26, 1963, takes a very forthright and commendable stand on the difficult and perplexing problem of civil rights. I think the organization deserves congratulations for taking the position that it has. It is an accurate reflection, I believe, of the thinking of Maryland's youth. The Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland is comprised of 31 local and college organizations with a total membership of approximately 4,000 persons scattered throughout the State:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND, JULY 26, 1963

No man can be partly free. No man can be partly equal to his fellow citizens. The dream and the hope of America—her pledge to history—is that all people within our Nation are free and equal. Now that a century has passed since the Emancipation Proclamation, it appears likely that we can achieve the next great advance toward our goals of freedom and equality.

We are inspired by, and proud of, President John F. Kennedy for his comprehensive legislative proposals in the field of civil rights. It is a program of necessarily interrelated policies each of which is necessary and each of which enhances every other.

We call upon the Congress to translate into laws the requests of the President. We want legislation designed to:

Give to the Attorney General the power to institute law suits for the purpose of guaranteeing freedom and equality of opportunity;

Prohibit discrimination in employment opportunities by enactment of an enforceable fair employment opportunities bill;

Prohibit denial of equal access to places available to the general public under both or either the 14th amendment and the constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce. Either basis for such legislation is virtually totally comprehensive and no reasonable, good-faith supporter of such legislation would vote against any such proposal because it included one rather than the other basis for such legislation;

Give the President power to cancel Federal participation in discriminatory programs;

Effectively protect the right to vote, including the appointment of Federal registrars where there is evidence of systematic denial of the right to vote on the basis of race, creed, or color.

This is a period in American history and in the history of mankind when the pledge of freedom and dignity must be redeemed. To do less is to defy history. It is essential that faith in the ability of the government—on every level—be furthered and maintained. There can be no doubt that lack of such faith has been a major con-

tributing element to the upheaval shaking Maryland and the United States.

Therefore, we the Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland, call upon all our fellow citizens, regardless of political persuasion, to do everything within their power to help make the promise of America a reality. We call upon those who represent us in the ranks of Government to lead the way.

He Should Have Stayed Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has had his European tour. He has given speeches, been cheered by the crowds, and spent thousands of our taxpayers' dollars. What has he accomplished?

In a letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune on July 10, 1963, former Gov. Alf M. Landon summarized the results of the President's tour. Governor Landon's years of service and experience make this letter an important and valuable judgment which I commend to all my colleagues.

The full text of the letter follows below:

HE SHOULD HAVE STAYED HOME

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

When the tumult and the shouting ceased—when the cheers died down—our President's swing around Europe was far from a success. You do not clear up misunderstandings between heads of governments by public recriminations.

President Eisenhower was cheered also on his trips abroad. In his campaign in 1960, Mr. Kennedy frowned upon what he called this circus type of diplomacy as producing few results except for political mileage at home. Yet Mr. Kennedy did the same thing for which he criticized his predecessor—and went further.

Former President Eisenhower did not state any public policies on his good will tours, President Kennedy did. Stating public policies by the Chief Executive of a mighty nation in the excited emotional atmosphere of enormous crowds contributes to misunderstanding.

Mr. Kennedy, in his statements at Berlin and Bonn, interjected some uncertainty—to say the least—in the meaning of his American University speech on June 10. Mr. Kennedy certainly aroused feelings that will handicap still further reestablishing with De Gaulle the relations vital to the forces for peace with freedom in this life. He was unable to arouse any interest in Great Britain in his multilateral NATO nuclear force.

I have always believed those Presidents are best advised who leave the implementation of their foreign policies to their Secretaries of State to work out through the customary diplomatic channels.

July 1963 may be as epic in the life of the world as July 1863. It is clear that accommodations with De Gaulle of France are essential to a possible satisfactory understanding with Khrushchev of Russia achieving a sane nuclear policy for this generation.

ALF M. LANDON.

TOPEKA, KANS.

The Smear Technique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, some of us have been complaining of the activity of the Justice Department in injecting itself, without justification, into purely local matters. An instance of this has been brought to my attention regarding the city police of Lynchburg, Va.

Restaurants in Lynchburg, Va., have been integrated for some time. Recently, Negro girls entered a restaurant in Lynchburg and became quite disorderly. They refused to leave the premises when requested to do so. There was no issue whatsoever of discrimination or racism. The girls refused to leave and when the city police were called in to compel the disturbers to leave, the girls still refused to leave. The police then had to take charge and carry the girls out.

No question was raised at that time or when the girls were released from police custody about police brutality. However, 2 days later an unsigned bulletin, put out by an organization headed by a Negro minister, charged the police with brutal treatment of the girls.

There are two points that need to be made here.

First, soon after the charges were made in the unsigned bulletin and without any complaint directed to them, the Justice Department called in the FBI to investigate "police brutality in Lynchburg." The FBI made a thorough, painstaking investigation and discovered that there was no brutality whatsoever and that the police acted in a proper manner.

It would be interesting to know just why the Justice Department would concern itself over an incident that it knew about only through newspaper reports and without receiving a complaint from anybody. In other words, someone in the Justice Department read an article in the newspaper and took it upon themselves to call out the FBI, to send them to Lynchburg to hound and dog the police officers without having received a complaint and without picking up a telephone and ascertaining if there was any truth in the complaint. All of this at a tremendous cost to the taxpayers. It looks like we are heading into a police state headed up by the Justice Department.

The second point that needs to be made is that clearly some of these organizations that are supposedly headed up by ministers apparently on occasion have no regard for the truth. Here we have an organization headed by a Negro preacher putting out information that has no semblance of truth in it. We just wonder if ministers are interested in Christ and in saving souls or are more interested in publicity, money, power, and influence, as were the Pharisees of old.

There appeared in the Lynchburg News of Friday, August 2, 1963, an editorial entitled "The Smear Technique." It points out cogently what happened in the incident referred to. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial, which follows:

THE SMEAR TECHNIQUE

The Lynchburg Police Department—and indirectly the city itself—has been cleared of charges of "police brutality," and that's all well and good.

The charges were without foundation in the first place. They were raised by the Lynchburg branch of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference headed by racial agitator Virgil A. Wood—which should have made them suspect.

But their purpose has been accomplished: the city and its police department have been smeared and we suspect that many areas of this country which were informed of the charges will never hear that they were false.

What was the incident which resulted in this trumped-up accusation? Five Negro girls were asked to leave a restaurant because they were noisy and disorderly. They refused and the manager called the police.

Integration was not the issue here. The restaurant had served Negroes before and has served them since. The issue was simply one of disorderly conduct, for which Negroes, whites and persons of all colors, have been indiscriminately arrested since the rights of private property were recognized.

The girls refused to leave, and they refused to walk when taken into custody. They were taken out of the restaurant bodily. There were no complaints of brutality at the time. They sang hymns and recited prayers on their way to police headquarters and they did not complain of brutality when they were released to their parents.

The "charges" were made 2 days later in a bulletin put out by Wood's organization. None of these bulletins have been signed.

Why then did the Justice Department concern itself with an incident when no Federal complaint was made?

A Department spokesman said they had read of the charges in the newspapers and called in the FBI. They were, he said, intrigued by the use of an iron claw. They had never heard of one before, he said.

The FBI could easily explain that the claw is a metal device which can be clamped on the arm and tightened by means of a ratchet. It enables an arresting officer to detain a person without manhandling him.

We had not realized the Justice Department pays so much attention to newspaper stories. It has never displayed concern over whether the civil rights of other persons have been denied because of the racial demonstrations.

Nor has it been concerned over the mounting evidence that Communists have infiltrated the racial movement.

We do not believe the Justice Department when it says it called for an investigation of Lynchburg because of the stories in these newspapers.

We do believe the Department is seeking excuses to show the Negroes it is on their side and we believe the reason for this is purely political. We believe the Department is being used to carry out the personal policies of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who would not hesitate to use the Federal Bureau of Investigation as his private police force, when possible.

"As far as this case is concerned," said the Department self-righteously, "the Lynchburg Police Department acted properly and with propriety."

We doubt that there were many who believed otherwise, including those who hurled the accusation in the first place.

But the smear will not be erased in many places where it was made known.

Urban Renewal: The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, urban redevelopment is not strictly a Government enterprise. It is being conducted by private firms as well. One inspiring example of the way in which local business and industry can be a force for community good exists in Lowell, Mass., where the Prince Macaroni Co., under the leadership of its president, Joseph Pellegrino, has pioneered with its own program of community development. In a recent guest editorial in the Lowell, Mass., Liberator, Mr. Pellegrino discusses his company's program and his philosophy of business responsibility to the community where its workers make their homes. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Pellegrino's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

URBAN RENEWAL—THE AMERICAN WAY

(By Joseph Pellegrino)

Life is a give-and-take situation. Every day we are confronted with situations which require us to show fairness to those around us while, at the same, as strive toward reaching our own set goals or desires.

This obligation extends between all people from the poorest man to leaders of nations. It encompasses all phases of life; social, economic, and political. This has long been my belief as an individual and, as president of the Prince Macaroni Manufacturing Co., I have sought to extend this belief through the company's relations with the community.

I feel very strongly that a manufacturer owes a great deal to his community. I feel it is not only because the community supplies the life blood of the industry, that is the labor force, but also because of the economic, political, and social facilities which the community affords the manufacturer.

I do not believe that it is enough for a manufacturer to guarantee a fair day's pay for a fair day's work to the labor force. The manufacturer should give of himself and his company to the individual in the labor force, in particular, and to the community, in general, which they share.

In my early days with Prince Macaroni in Lowell, one of the major problems we encountered was a very serious epidemic of vandalism throughout the neighborhood. It was a rare night which passed during which several windows in our offices and/or plant were not broken, or that a fire was not lighted or that some teenage gang would not engage in fist fights on the grounds.

The first reaction to these events would obviously be to call the police and insure by force, if necessary, that these episodes did not reoccur. Needless to say this was done in several instances.

However, if we might think about this situation in the light of the physical surroundings of the building a more feasible solution might become apparent. First of all, our plant was a converted wool mill which had been allowed to become considerably rundown. The surrounding area, our own as well as the city's, was not what one considered very pretty. Adjacent to our property was a nonpublic dump. Rodents of many sizes abounded in the canal which bordered our property. High weeds and grass surrounded the plant itself. In front of the building was a gaping hole which had been eroded further by trucks backing up into it.

In general, the area beckoned to all forms of desecration and misconduct. After all, in an area as depressed as this, what mattered if one more window were broken or one more rock or piece of debris were laid around the area?

I decided then that it was time to do my part for the community and actually to help ourselves, too.

Several years ago we began our own "urban redevelopment" on the grounds of the Prince Macaroni Co. The once tall fields of weeds were replaced by acres of carefully tended green laws. The gaping hole has been filled and is now topped with several Italian water fountains.

The canal where the rodents used to abound is now a neatly walled stream bordered on both sides by green grass and colonial wooden fences. Rambling roses entwine throughout all the fences surrounding the property and also border the canal.

No longer are we forced to have police protection. Instead, we have children of our neighborhood make use of our property as a park. Benches are spread throughout our grounds and water fountains are placed here and there for public use.

Now it feels empty if we do not have boys and girls in the neighborhood stopping at these water fountains for a drink, or elderly people walking through our property admiring the several hundred varieties of flowers which we constantly have on display. We have built what we feel is a fine restaurant on our grounds for those who wish to dine leisurely with a tasty meal.

We have only begun our "urban redevelopment" program. It has now extended to the improvement of not only our own property but also that of our neighbors. We have given flowers and window boxes to many of the neighbors and even helped them cultivate their lawns and these flowers.

We have supported an entire Little League in the park adjacent to our property and have offered to have our gardener assist in the upkeep of this city owned baseball park.

The results have been most gratifying. It is now an isolated event when any damage at all is done to the grounds. It is now very difficult for anyone to feel that depositing litter on the grounds would not be noticed immediately and would actually make it less pleasant for themselves.

Many times children in the neighborhood have actually come in and on their own to help us tidy up the property. Needless to say, seeing this happen was my biggest pleasure.

We have held several concerts on our grounds during the summer months and even had fairs for the benefit of charitable organizations.

I do not believe that one should say about Prince Macaroni Co., "Isn't this nice that they have accomplished so much." I find that at least this much is owed by us to our community and to the workers who have given a good portion of their lives not only to this same community but also to ourselves, the Prince Macaroni Co. of Lowell.

The First Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, our efforts to achieve a reduction in world tensions—a reduction in the threat of nuclear war and annihilation—have all too often been met by intransigency. This is why the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow yesterday—limited as that treaty certainly is—must be considered a hopeful sign, an important first step.

As the New York Times stated in its lead editorial today:

In our tormented, warring century, mankind has won so few victories in the struggle for world peace that even this partial one is reason for rejoicing.

Mr. Speaker, as the Times also points out:

The future holds threats as well as promises, and much uncertainty.

But this treaty should be approved, for as the President has stated so succinctly:

This limited test ban is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race.

I include the thoughtful editorial from the New York Times for our colleagues attention:

THE TREATY SIGNED

The nuclear test ban treaty is, as President Kennedy has said, a victory for mankind. In our tormented, warring century, mankind has won so few victories in the struggle for world peace that even this partial one is reason for rejoicing. Today is the eighteenth anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. It was a puny bomb, but 78,000 persons were killed outright.

The treaty signed in Moscow yesterday does not outlaw even a 100-megaton nuclear bomb. It does not stop underground testing. As Secretary Rusk said, "it is only a first step." West Germany does not want to sign for the present. France and Communist China are planning some atmospheric tests. The all-important ratifications are yet to come. Yet, taking everything negative, everything depreciatory that can be stated in argument, it is still a fact that the signing of the treaty was an event of historic importance.

The importance does not lie so much in what the treaty is as in what it means and the hope it arouses. It means more today than if it had been reached earlier because of the split in the Communist camp which, along with economic and popular pressures, gave the Soviet Union an interest in reaching an accord.

The hopes it arouses lie in the expression Secretary Rusk used, following President Kennedy, that it is "a first step." It offers an opening for what Lord Home, the British Foreign Secretary, called "a continuing dialog." Moscow's Foreign Minister Gromyko made the same point. "The conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests," he said, "may pave the way to the solution of other still more important international problems, including the disarmament problem."

Thus, every responsibile party is solemnly committed to try to move forward from this beginning. Mankind, having won this little but precious victory, is looking for more. Every new step must be a cautious one, and there are still a thousand miles to go, as President Kennedy said. The future holds threats as well as promises, and much uncertainty. Still, it can be said that something good and hopeful happened in Moscow yesterday.

Article by Mrs. Edith Guttmann, of Aberdeen, S. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in the Augsut issue of the Reader's Digest there appears an article by Mrs. Edith Guttmann, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., "My Most Unforgettable Character." It is a heartwarming and loving tribute to her father, the late Morris Strauss.

I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues, as well as an article from the July 28, 1963, edition of the Aberdeen American-News, concerning Mrs. Guttmann and her family. I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER

(By Edith Guttmann)

"He's coming." A child's shout pierced the lazy peace of a Sunday afternoon in Minneapolis. The street sprang to life with the scurrying figures of children shrilling, "The motorcycle man! The motorcycle man!" In the distance, the chug of a motorcycle grew louder. We ran, too, my little brother and I, as fast as our legs could carry us, not just because we knew what was in store, but because it seemed the thing to do.

The man with the twinkling brown eyes and the warm smile who came riding down the street was Papa. To the kids on James Avenue in 1920, my father was the Pied Piper, Frank Merriwell and Sir Galahad all rolled into one. No matter that his trusty steed was only a motorcycle. No matter that they were a variegated assortment of smeary-faced kids of different nationalities. He lifted the girls into the sidecar as gently as if they were royalty, hoisted the boys, one fore, another aft, and away they swooped for the ride around the block.

The motorcycle soon gave way to a big Jeffrey touring car with flapping side curtains. In some mysterious manner that car always seemed to stretch to accommodate one more, no matter how many of us piled into it. And whether it was a trip to the zoo or an ice-cream binge at Abe's Delicatessen, Papa entered into the occasion as heartily as if he were exactly our age.

Perhaps it was because he had grown up in a grim world where there had been no time for youth. It was in a little town in Austria that young Morris Strauss had helplessly watched his beloved mother die from malnutrition, the dread companion of poverty. At 15 he came to America, equipped with little but the clothes on his back and a grim determination to make a place for himself in the cold, impersonal world of New York.

In the factory where he worked, surrounded by Scandinavians, Italians, Poles and Slavs, he was aware of a terrifying loneliness. No one paid much attention to the serious young boy working so intently. But as his fingers flew, the bright, quick mind busied itself, too. A phrase here, a word there, and soon he was conversing with his fellow workers in their own vernacular. He filled his evenings with classes in night school, learning the new language that was so vital to him now. The foremen began to respect the slim, quiet boy as the voice for the workers who could not speak English.

At heart, however, Papa still longed for the friendlier contacts of a smaller town. A few years later, when the opportunity presented itself, he moved to Minneapolis, where he soon acquired a wife, a family and the motorcycle.

During the years we kids on James Avenue were growing up, Papa, by dint of hard work and sacrifice, became the proud possessor of his own business, which he called the Columbia Haberdashery. The store was as unusual as the name, for in a world of second-hand clothing stores it dared to sell new merchandise. A sign, prominently displayed, proclaimed "One Price for All." Morris, or Strauss as he was affectionately called, soon became known as the squarest man on Washington Avenue to the workingmen who provided the bulk of his business. It was not until later that I learned of Papa's reputation among another group—the dreary membership of Skid Row.

The depression had begun, and along with it the desperate fear of hunger and insecurity. I had gone to work in the store as part-time cashier over the protests of my mother, who thought the environment unsuitable for a young girl. Papa pooh-poohed her fears. And to me he said, "You want to be a writer? All right. Here you will get something schools cannot give you. Look and listen." Ensonced behind the huge old-fashioned cash register, I saw a great deal, including some things on which Papa had not reckoned.

Situated between the Valhalla Saloon with its air of good fellowship and the Persian Palms with the allure of its flamboyant females, Papa's store seemed to offer little in the way of competition. But an odd thing happened. Around noon, just as I left for lunch, a motley assortment of men would file silently past me through the door. One day, when I returned for a forgotten parcel, I saw why.

Floating toward me came the pleasant aroma of home-cooked food, the sound of voices and the clatter of plates. Curious, I peeked into the little back room. There stood Papa, beaming over a soup kettle on the gas burner and busily ladling out food and greetings in a variety of tongues.

Quickly I withdrew, but not before the pieces of the puzzle had clicked into place. Memories of Papa carefully placing dishes of leftovers in his car every morning. Mama laughing and saying with a twinkle in her eye, "Honestly, I don't know how you eat so much." And the response with a chuckle, "Is it my fault you're such a good cook?"

It had been a game of "pretend" that they enjoyed, both knowing that the inevitable destination of the food would be a hearty stew or a thick soup to nourish needy men. Much later, when he caught the unspoken question in my eyes, Papa realized that I knew, too. Like a little boy whose secret had been found out, he looked at my shyly, and said, "A little food for the stomach, yes. But maybe also a little food for the soul."

Papa always seemed to sense, too, when a man needed shoes, but lacked the wherewithal to pay. Casually, he would say, "When you have the money, you can pay." And noting that the men's toes, more often than not, protruded through their socks, he would throw in a few pairs, saying, "These are on the house. They go with the shoes."

Invariably the men would come back with the money whenever they had jobs. Proudly they would take care of their debts, extract enough for a small evening on the town and turn the rest over to him for safekeeping. In a world in which they had no illusions about their own weaknesses or the parasites who preyed upon them, they had an almost pathetic faith in Papa.

As the Depression waxed more intense, the Columbia Haberdashery became unofficial headquarters for the unemployed. Whenever Papa heard of employment opportunities through friends or the want ads, he would send the men he thought suited to the job. When they returned triumphant, he rejoiced with them; and when they came back disheartened, he would send them elsewhere to try again. Sometimes a potential employer tried to soften his refusal by a handout. Then Papa would be furious. "You're taking the easy way out!" he would say. "Help them to help themselves."

When no job was available, he would create one. Our home had the shiniest windows for blocks around during that era. And one day I heard him giving detailed instructions to a man on painting our garage for the third time in 6 months. Sensing my disapproval, he disarmed me with the casual words, "You know, I never did like that color."

There was only one thing he could not tolerate, and that was intolerance. Once a pompous businessman from down the street asked jeeringly, "What are you running here, Strauss—a one-man rescue operation for these bums? That's what the Salvation Army's for." I watched Papa struggle for a moment to control his anger. With lips set grimly, Papa struck back coldly and calculatingly.

"Well, Fred, let's put it in a way you can understand. No man can live by bread alone. He must fulfill himself, somehow; he must find an escape from the humdrum. Yours is playing poker. Let's just say this is my way."

When Fred had gone, Papa turned to me and, shaking his head sadly, said, "When will people understand that when they build a wall for others, they build one for themselves, too?"

Papa made short shrift of the insincere. But those who were in true need were always sure of a welcome and a friendly ear for their problems. They told him of their native countries, of the families they had left behind, and he listened quietly and sympathetically until some of the loneliness left their eyes in the remembering. He reminisced and joked with them until the laughter that had grown rusty with disuse came once more, and, as they left, each stood just a little taller than when he had entered.

Most of them were rough, uncouth men. When they forgot themselves and uttered an oath in my presence, Papa would snap, "Watch your language. There's a lady present." There was something comical about the way he would stand there bristling like an indignant mother hen until those hulking men ducked their heads in embarrassment and apologized. Thus he reminded them of a world and a code of conduct that they had all but forgotten in the life on skid row. In his own way he summarized it when he said, "Treat them like men, and they'll act like men."

Papa employed many college students who worked for their tuition. Some, discouraged by the prospect of years of study and hardship, were tempted to surrender long-range plans for an immediate job. These he would rebuke in his gentle, earnest way: "A good education is better than money in the bank. It never fails you."

Once I overheard him telling one of them, "Look about you, son. Every one of those men on skid row had a dream, too, just like you. But it takes guts and hard work to see a dream through. Somewhere along the way, they settled for less. Each day it became easier to settle for less until they were not really living anymore, just existing from day to day. Will you do the same?"

Every one of those boys finished his education and entered one of the professions. And because they were grateful for his encouragement during the lean years, they never turned away the men Papa sent to them for free legal or medical advice.

"How could we?" said one, a skilled surgeon. "I used to listen to him prescribe that hot-milk, butter-and-honey concoction for all sorts of things those men complained about. And I was amazed when it always seemed to work—until one day I realized that what he was really giving them was tender loving care, the vital ingredient in any doctor's formula."

"There is so much I owe him," said another, an attorney famed for his conciliation work. "When I first began to practice, I wasn't very successful. Then I remember how he talked to those men on skid row. He seemed to lose his own identity, to become one of them, hurting or laughing with them. Then I knew. If you want to understand a person, you must identify with that person. That was the turning point in my career."

As the depression began to recede, so did Papa's hairline. But the spirit in him remained young and undaunted. As he often said, "It isn't the years that matter, but what one has done with the years."

Early one morning when Papa was alone, straightening merchandise on the shelves, a man entered the store stealthily and stuck a finger simulating a gun in Papa's back. Papa wheeled and grappled with him, and when a patrolman, hearing the commotion, came running, he found the would-be bandit pinned down and helpless.

Papa's only comment was, "Strange the things men can do when they are desperate and alone." And he quietly wrote the ending to the story himself by supplying his assailant with clothes, money and a job upon the man's release from jail.

And so time went on, and we went on too, taking Papa for granted as we always had. Then, one day, the heart that embraced all humanity weakened. As quietly as he had lived, he was gone. It was only then we learned that for 6 years he had lived with the knowledge that death might claim him at any moment.

The service was to be brief, in accordance with his wishes, and limited to close friends and members of the family. And then a strange thing happened. Through the doors of the chapel they came, the successes and the failures—all the bright young men and the grizzled denizens of skid row—from their separate worlds. Shoulder to shoulder we stood, heads bowed, weeping openly and unashamedly. For one moment in eternity we were bound together in our grief by the memory of a man who had been a veritable rock to all whose lives he had touched. Driven by a need within him, Papa had taught us that every man has not only the right but the obligation to walk through life with courage and dignity.

The other day I went back to Minneapolis and walked down Washington Avenue. It's all gone now, skid row and Papa's store, torn down to make way for the huge triangles and squares, the shining steel and glass of progress. A wave of desolation overcame me, and I sensed a kinship with the men who had once frequented the area. Was this the way they, and my father, too, once a lost, frightened boy in New York, had felt?

I turned to leave, and suddenly there was our old policeman hurrying toward me with a broad smile and the light of warm memory in his eyes. In the railroad station, the freight master gave me an indifferent glance, then looked back, this time with bright recognition.

"You're Strauss' daughter," he announced triumphantly and shoved everything else aside while he reminisced about Papa. As he talked, a curious comfort began to ease its way into my heart and with it, a moment of awareness.

In an ever-changing world, where even the skylines of cities are transformed from one generation to the next, only one thing endures. And that is the remembrance of love.

It was something that Papa had known all along.

MOST UNFORGETTABLE IS MRS. GUTTMANN'S FATHER

(By Evelyn Van Wagner)

When Morris Strauss died on July 4, 1953, he left a warm and loving memory in the hearts of his family, his neighbors in Minneapolis and the many other people who had been touched by his bigheartedness and wisdom.

That might have been the end of it, but it wasn't. Now, millions of people speaking more than a dozen languages and thousands of others who are blind will remember him and be touched perhaps by his life. They are those who will read his daughter's beautifully written "My Most Unforgettable Character" essay in the August issue of the Reader's Digest. The "unforgettable character" is her father.

That daughter is Edith Guttmann, wife of Mike Guttmann and mother of Harvey and Paul Guttmann. The Guttmann home is at 502 11th Avenue, SE.

Morris Strauss' life pattern was one that appeared fairly often earlier in this century: He was a 15-year-old Austrian Jewish immigrant to the United States. After trying his luck in New York, and not liking it much, he moved to Minneapolis. By dint of hard work, he became the proprietor of a clothing store. Those are the bare facts of his life. But the things that made him memorable and beloved are the things Mrs. Guttmann has put into her true story.

"There was only one thing he could not tolerate," wrote his daughter, "and that was intolerance."

THEY BUILD A WALL

"When will people understand," said Strauss when he was jeered for helping people during the depression, "that when they build a wall for others they build one for themselves, too?

The Reader's Digest article is Mrs. Guttmann's first published work but it is the fulfillment of an ambition of long standing. Even when she was a young girl she dreamed of writing. Said her father, "You want to be a writer? All right. Here you will get something schools cannot give you. Look and listen."

Mrs. Guttmann's looking and listening has included doing publicity for some of the things she believes in most: her church, the PTA, Hadassah, the YWCA. She has written little things but for years she has wanted to do this more ambitious piece about her father.

Mrs. Guttmann is a graduate of the University of Minnesota. She was sidetracked from English and writing into majoring in medical social work with a minor in dental hygiene. She used her technical training during World War II when she was a dental hygienist at Fort Snelling, Minn.

WRITING TAKES TIME

Careful and polished writing like Mrs. Guttmann's isn't easy. It takes time, lots of it, and care. She finds that the morning hours are more productive than the afternoon. She doesn't want to be disturbed while writing and that is one reason why she insists on doing her own housework. She flips off her telephone and settles down at her desk.

Her "My Most Unforgettable Character" was written with submission to the Reader's Digest in mind and that magazine quickly recognized that it was good and told her so. Most articles accepted must be worked over by a staff writer so that they conform to the Digest style. Mrs. Guttmann's would have to have that treatment, too, she was told, and it would perhaps be several months before it could be done.

Few writers enjoy having their creations handled by alien hands. Mrs. Guttmann asked if she couldn't do the revising and remolding of her story. (One of the pleasures of having her work accepted, Mrs. Guttmann says, has been her association with the editors.) They said yes, if she wanted to try it, go ahead. So she did and it was almost exactly what they wanted. She was told that seldom do even established writers submit work that needs no further revision.

KEEPS A SECRET

Mrs. Guttmann has known since the first of May that her story was to be published. She was asked to keep it a secret as nearly as possible until publication and that was difficult since she already had received the beautiful check in payment for it and had a photostatic copy made of it.

Incidentally, Mrs. Guttmann learned that when something is sold to the Reader's Digest, the writer relinquishes all rights to it. And that includes the right of using any of it in another piece of writing and movie and television rights—everything.

Mrs. Guttmann's husband and sons are proud of her. Better than that, they have recognized through the years that she was a to-be writer and encouraged her. Paul, 15, will enter Central High School this fall. He shows signs of being a writer also. Harvey, 24, is a graduate student at Georgia State College, Atlanta, taking political science and working for a degree in law. His B.A. was earned at Minnesota University.

What's she going to do next? She didn't specify exactly but her husband, who jokingly says that he is her business manager now, revealed that she already is working on a book. It will probably be set in the same background as her "Most Unforgettable" was. And the Reader's Digest wants more from her.

Big Brother Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield, Ind., Reporter:

BIG BROTHER GOVERNMENT

An article in Time deals with the tremendous—and, in a sense, frightening—impact Government projects and spending have on industrial research, as a result of the defense program and all its related projects.

Ten years ago, says Time, U.S. business financed two-thirds of the Nation's research; now Government is responsible for two-thirds.

Unless infinite care is taken to prevent Government becoming the dominant Big Brother of American industry, we will have a nation which is appallingly different from what we have known. Individual rights and status will be steadily lost in a vast material and power complex before which we will be helpless.

Government defense spending—for research or anything else—is not going to decline It will probably rise. So the urgent task ahead is to control it, and to successfully achieve the difficult task of keeping it squarely within the framework of a free nation based upon individual liberty.

NASA's Search for Skills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Skyline magazine, the quarterly publication of North American Aviation, recently described the nationwide enlistment of effort to support Project Apollo. The National Aeronautics and Space Agency program for a manned lunar landing demands an immense national outpouring of manufacturing, research, and training skills. It was partly to enlist the efforts of New Hampshire industry in this vast enterprise that a Federal Government Procurement Opportunities Conference was held at the University of New Hampshire on March 29, 1963, with New Hampshire's entire congressional delegation represented. I am glad that the writer of this excellent article took note of the conference and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASA'S SEARCH FOR SKILLS

At Downey, Calif., behind the low beige buildings of North American's Space and Information Systems Division, a squat, conical, boilerplate module, simulating a return to earth, is slamming alternately into plowed ground and a pool of water.

At Edwards Air Force Base the roar of the world's largest rocket engine is shattering the desert stillness. In Mississippi, pile-drivers are ramming steel slivers into the black earth, first step in the erection of giant test stands. In Florida rusty pipes are sucking sand and silt from the Banana River to form the base that will link the earth and the stars.

The shock waves from those activities are reaching into every corner of the United States.

They reach to Warwick, R.I., not far from the spot where patriots once dumped British tax collectors into Narragansett Bay. At Warwick the 300 employees of Sealol, Inc., are welding metal foil only four-thousandths of an inch thick—about twice the thickness of sandwich wrap. That unique capability has brought Sealol into one of the greatest technical adventures of our time, the planned journey of the Apollo astronauts to the moon.

Across the Nation, in Albany, Oreg., the Wah Chang Metallurgical Co. is shaping a flange of expensive columbium metal destined to be welded to an engine that will fire when men high above the earth are plotting a course to the moon.

Down in El Paso, Tex., women employees of Northrop's Ventura Division, "the most efficient seamstresses in the world," are stitching thousands of yards of multicolored nylon, the giant parachutes that will lower the Apollo module back to earth.

In the flowing farmlands surrounding Elkton, Md., Thiokol engineers are snipping the steel skirts of small rocket engines and placing them, like Jonas in the whale, within even larger rocket engines.

Within helicopter view of Niagara Falls, N.Y., engineers of the Bell Aerosystems are fighting the disorderly wanderings of liquid propellants that are mesmerized by the nonforces of zero gravity.

Multiply these five companies 4,000 times over and one begins to grasp the scope of the activity that has encompassed America.

The Apollo project is so widespread that it cannot be met by any one company, any one State, any one geographical region.

A MAJOR NATIONAL COMMITMENT

President John Kennedy emphasized that fact when he presented to the Congress of the United States the accelerated program for placing men on the moon and returning them safely to earth. "It demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material and facilities."

The product of that national commitment will be Saturn V, the moon rocket and the Apollo spacecraft. Responsible for one of the greatest technical and management feats this world will have witnessed will be the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., will be guiding the efforts of five major Saturn prime contractors: Boeing of Seattle, Wash., for the first-stage booster; North American's Space and Information Systems Division, of Downey, Calif., for the second stage; and Douglas of Santa Monica, Calif., for the third stage. North American's Rocketdyne Division, Canoga Park, Calif., is developing the big first-stage booster F-1 and the upper-stage J-2 rocket engine powerplants.

THOUSANDS OF COMPANIES HELP

Under NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex., are the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, major prime for the guidance system; Grumman Aircraft of Long Island, N.Y., for the lunar excursion module (LEM); and North American's Space Division for the command and service modules.

These companies are at the very peak of the pyramid, supported by the entire range of American scientific and industrial resources.

Precise figures on industry participation in the lunar effort are difficult to pinpoint. An educated guess by Business Week magazine is that by 1964 almost 20,000 companies and at least 150,000 people will be involved. It is possible to count the prime contractors, and the subcontractors through the first, second, third, and fourth tier, but what blurs the picture is the almost impossible task of accounting for the vendors and suppliers who enter into each stratum of the subcontracting effort. Thousands of these companies are not even aware that their materials and products have been placed into the pipelines that lead inexorably to the Florida moon launching site.

One way to grasp the complex participation in the NASA lunar program is to examine just a segment of the subcontracting activities of North American's Space and Information Systems Division.

The division has two assignments in the lunar effort, the S-II and the modules, but attention here is focused on the design and development of the Apollo command and service modules.

A 5-TON WORLD

The division has been charged by NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center to create a new world, a 10,000-pound planet that will safeguard three astronauts during the voyages to and from the moon. Every force known and unknown to man will be conspiring to jeopardize the journey. The conical command module will be their fortress. It is designed not only to keep them alive, but to keep them functioning normally. The 42,000-pound service module contains propulsion systems for midcourse maneuvers.

To provide subsystems and assemblies for the two modules, Space Division has enlisted the aid of more than a score of major first-tier subcontractors in 12 States—California, Massachusetts, Iowa, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Kansas, Virginia, Ohio, Missouri, New York, and Illinois.

When a subcontract is announced the dollar figure is prominent; what is rarely called out are the tough technical problems, the very hard and long engineering spade work and test procedures that invariably accompany each award. One subcontractor said wryly, "If it was easy, someone else would have got the job."

Typical is the award given to Avco Corp.'s Research and Advanced Development Division for the design and fabrication of the heat shield that will protect the Apollo crew from reentry heating. The Massachusetts company was asked to translate into the Apollo the skill it had already acquired in devising the nose cones for the Titan, the Atlas, and the Minuteman ICBM's. The headache is in the far higher temperatures to be encountered by the Apollo, and the longer exposure to the higher temperature—several minutes as compared to the 30 seconds of a typical nose reentry. And the Apollo module, unlike the ICBM nose cones, is peppered with openings, each one of which adds to the Avco problem.

Westinghouse of Lima, Ohio, has been building high-performance electrical aircraft equipment for 15 years. When it was called on board the Apollo to furnish the inverter which changes d.c. to a.c. power, it deviated from previous practice, the use of a rotating unit, and developed a completely transistorized device with no moving parts. The Apollo inverter requires less cooling than rotating equipment, operates at a higher efficiency and eliminates another noise that could make life in the confined command module unbearable. It's a solution to a tough technical problem.

Beyond the major first-tier subcontractors, the Space Division negotiated directly for materials and products with 1,500 companies in 40 States.

This was just the beginning. Each of the major first-tier subcontractors, in turn, fanned out from its own area into other cities and States, sometimes spanning the width of the country, in order to obtain the necessary skill to fulfill its segment of the Apollo task.

FROM SOUTH POLE TO MOON

At Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the Collins Radio Co. is accustomed to the task of linking high-flying men and people left behind at sea level. Ham operator Art Collins, while still in high school, was Admiral Byrd's only constant contact with the outer world when Byrd was slogging around the South Pole in 1929.

Today Collins has one of the most demanding communications jobs ever asked of any company—providing a reliable link between the earth and the astronauts as they hurtle toward the moon; providing the equipment that will seize tracking radar pulses to be beamed from earth, strengthening them, and slamming them back to earth; providing the rescue communication that will bring help if the module should fall unseen into the sea.

TOUGH PROBLEMS

After 30 years of experience the new problems, centering around heat and vibration, are still tough. Subcontractors backing up the Collins effort are Motorola in Arizona; Modine Manufacturing in Wisconsin; J & D Electric in North Carolina; and Radiation Corp. in Florida.

At Boulder, Colo., where the Rocky Mountains rise in one of the most sparsely settled areas in the Nation, Beech Aircraft is carrying out research on the assured supply of air for the astronauts to breathe during the moon journey. Beech has been cramming cold liquids and gases into tight spaces for more than 8 years. In the Apollo effort they reached from Colorado over to Ohio, to the Cincinnati Testing and Research Laboratories for the necessary disk insulation units, a move that is just one of the thousands of lines of supply that trace the movement of materials and products in the Apollo command and service modules.

Another move was that of the Aeronca Corp., of Middletown, Ohio, developers of the stainless steel honeycomb planels being used in the Apollo module. Aeronca dipped down into Tennessee for aid from the Avco Corp., at Nashville, a company already linked with the Apollo effort by reason of subcontracts with Aerojet General in California and the parent Avco Corp., in Massachusetts.

The spreading effort is well illustrated at the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp., located in East Hartford, Conn. Pratt & Whitney Aircraft has been called on board the Apollo module effort because of an exciting new power development, the fuel cell.

The astronauts within the Apollo module, divorced from both the earth and the moon, will need assured electrical power to drive the environmental control system, and to start and stop and to gimbal the rocket engines that guide the module. A conventional engine for generating power in the Apollo module would be as unwelcome as an elephant.

The good points of the hip-high fuel cell read like a sparkling advertisement in a mail-order catalog. It can put out enough power to take care of the requirements of a small home. It's the acme of simplicity—a chemical combination of hydrogen and oxygen that produces electricity. It's compact, lightweight, smokeless, odorless, has practically no moving parts. It's highly efficient—80 percent as compared to an automobile engine's 15 percent—a roundabout way of saying it develops four times as much power for the same amount of fuel. Just for a bonus, the byproduct of the fuel cell is pure drinking water.

Pratt & Whitney has its own mountain of skill, a peak from which have flown the jet engines that power the big commercial airliners and the military F-100's and the F-105's. It's been involved in power cell research for 4 years. When the need of the Apollo fuel cell was spelled out, P. & W.A. not only utilized its own in-house capability, but reached out to Cleveland, Ohio, to the Clevite Corp. for the special pie plate-shaped noncannibalistic electrodes that were needed.

It spread out into 10 Connecticut cities for second-tier subcontracting support. When P. & W.A. needed a special kind of valve for the fuel cell it called on Scott Aviation in Lancaster, N.Y.

Rhode Island vendors in Bristol, Warwick, Tiverton, and Woonsocket were asked to supply special needs. Requests were sent to the Lawson Machine & Tool Co. in Malden, Mass.; to the Split Ball Bearing Co. in Lebanon, N.H.; and the Fellows Gear Shaper Co., in Springfield, Vt.

ESCAPE MOTOR BY LOCKHEED

A similar pattern is being displayed by other first-tier subcontractors. Lockheed Propulsion is developing and building under subcontract to Space Division the solid propellant escape motor which perches on a trellis of titanium above the Saturn V as it sits during the critical countdown on the launch pad. The Redlands, Calif., firm has second-tier subcontracting team members that reach from the dry desert of Henderson, Nev. (where the American Potash Co. is converting salt from Salt Lake City into an agent which activates solid rocket fuel); to the highly complex industrial compounds of Trenton, N.J.; to Silver Creek, N.Y.; to neighboring Los Angeles and Compton, Calif.; and again eastward to Paramus, N.J., and Louisville, Ky., where the Reynolds Metals Co. is providing a highly combustible aluminum powder so finely atomized that it passes through a screen water cannot penetrate.

Minneapolis-Honeywell is supplying the stabilization and control system for the Apollo module being built by Space Division. What they're providing is a guaranteed stable platform in space when the astronauts "shoot" the earth, a star, and a corner of the moon just prior to making vital midcourse corrections in flight. The system triggers the space engines at exactly the instant required, for the duration of time required and in the right sequence. To fulfill those demanding requirements Honeywell not only enlisted the subcontracting aid of 5 other companies in the home city of Minneapolis, but also reached out into 11 other States, spanning the country from Beaverton, Oreg., to Salem, N.C.

A PALM-SIZED ANTENNA

Melpar, Inc., of Falls Church, Va., makes the beacon antenna for the Apollo command module under contract to North American. The antenna is a small flat saucer, scarcely covering the palm of one's hand. Yet its smallness doesn't lessen its importance. The antenna, the answer to the call, "Car 54, Where Are You?" is used for receiving and sending radio signals to those waiting back on earth or to the astronauts who descend to the moon's surface.

"Price alone can't be the factor in making a decision to select a second-tier subcontractor," Charles Cragg, director of procurement for Melpar, said. "Quality and on-time delivery are stronger factors. To get help on a single item," he continued, "we might send out requests to 30 potential second-tier subcontractors."

One of those selected by Melpar was the J. Frank Motson Co., of Flourtown, Pa. Motson started in 1920 in the paper printing business. An order from the Horn and Hardart chain of automat cafeterias for little plastic tabs imprinted, "Ham Sandwich, 5 Cents" started the conversion of Motson from printing on paper to printing on glass, metals, and ceramics. It has led to an activity which may be unique in the entire Nation, the ability to do direct printing of conductive electronic circuits on geometric shapes. Motson prints circuits in a process almost identical with the printing of the small cards that announce, "Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Jones. At home, Wednesday, July 13."

So on and on and on. The movement is interminable, always upward through tiers of subcontractors and finally into the Space Division's Downey, Calif., plant, where the command and service modules are taking form.

The search for skills is the first motive in bringing thousands of subcontractors into the program. Ernest Brackett, the Director of NASA's Supply Division, said, "We're not seeking help in spreading the dollar; we're looking for businesses that can help our contractors fulfill their contracts while maintaining reliability."

But the search does coincide directly with the expressed wishes of the Congress—that a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small business firms. Every NASA contract has written into it a provision safeguarding the interest of small business.

One of NASA's latest moves has been to publish in the Department of Commerce Daily newspaper the names and addresses of firms such as North American who are being solicited by NASA for research and development procurements of $100,000 and more. The idea is for small businessmen to contact these firms directly in order to make their capabilities known.

Conferences have been the most widely used NASA technique to acquaint businessmen throughout the Nation with the possibility of contract participation. In 1962 NASA attended local procurement meetings in 40 cities in 18 States.

In March of this year a typical event was NASA's participation in a Federal Procurement Opportunities Conference sponsored jontly by the University of New Hampshire and U.S. Senator TOM MCINTYRE. It was attended by more than 200 small businessmen at the university in Durham. The object was to provide individual counseling, advice, and detailed information to small companies in selling their products to various Government agencies, prime contractors, and subcontractors.

SMALL FIRMS VITAL

Awareness of NASA and Apollo contractor activities is just the beginning for those desiring to enter the program. Don Goldsmith, manufacturing manager of Sealol's Foil Fusion Devices Department in Warwick, said, "Small business needs a special ability in order to participate."

Typical of that ability is the skill of the Kaufman Glass Co., of Wilmington, Del., second-tier contractor to Thiokol Chemical Corp. in Elkton, Md., developers of the Apollo escape tower jettison motor.

Kaufman has 24 employees, each one the product of at least 6 years of painstaking training. Kaufman's specialty is grinding extremely hard, heat resistant, and chemically stable borosilicate glass, much of it to a thickness only one-eighth that of window glass. Despite the small size of the company it stands side by side with giant firms in doing most of the precision glass fabrication in the United States.

High quality is an obsession with most lower-tier participants. One of them expressed it quite simply, "We exist on quality." Another picked up a small valve and cradled it in the palm of his hand as though it were pure gold. "To us," he said, "this valve looks just as big as the Apollo module does to North America."

Still another, speaking of the long business relationship he had had with a first-tier subcontractor said, "We give them the benefit of every bit of knowledge we have."

That knowledge is considerable. Linked with the river of technical skill that flows through America, it swells to gigantic proportions, carrying with it the success of the command and service modules being developed by North American's Space Division.

It is this united, nationwide effort on just one part of the lunar program that is fulfilling the words of President Kennedy, "In a very real sense, it will not be one man going to the moon. It will be an entire nation. For all of us must work to put him there."

Imports Rise 36 Percent in First 5 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the floods of cheap foreign imports continue to

inundate the competitive domestic shoe market. In spite of the fact that the industry has met in Washington with concerned representatives of districts in which it is a substantial employer and despite repeated petitions and requests to the President for quota relief under the Trade Expansion Act, none has been forthcoming. As the attached news item from Footwear News issue of July 18, 1963 shows, with every passing day the need for Presidential quota relief for the shoe industry becomes more pressing if we are to protect American working men and women in their right to reasonable job projection through entitlement to a larger share of our domestic market:

IMPORTS RISE 36 PERCENT IN FIRST 5 MONTHS

NEW YORK.—Footwear imports this year, through May, increased 36 percent over the first 5 months of last year, according to the National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Excluding waterproof rubber footwear, zories and slipper socks, imports of 45,568,101 represent about 15 percent of domestic production for the first 5 months of the year.

Japan pairage leads with 24.9 million pairs valued at $13.7 million. Italy is second with 9.8 million and all others total 10.8 million pairs.

Tim'rous Beastie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Friday, August 2:

TIM'ROUS BEASTIE

Back in 1946 the United States was lending encouragement to a Communist-inspired move in the United Nations to destroy the Franco government in Spain. We must have known that this would be harmful to our own interests. But we didn't want to offend the Communists.

Now it's Portugal's turn. And the great United States is again trying to carry water on both shoulders. The showdown came in a Security Council vote demanding that Portugal get out of Africa. We didn't want to offend Portugal. And we didn't want to antagonize the so-called newly emerged African States. So we abstained on the vote, and wound up infuriating both sides.

Meanwhile, one reads inspired dispatches that this country needn't worry about its airbases in the Azores, which happen to belong to Portugal. We can always move our bases to Spain, these dispatches say. But it happens that Spain is still governed by the same Franco whom we were willing to cast into the outer darkness just 17 years ago. In this, to say the least, one finds more than a touch of irony.

But back to the Security Council vote. Surely our people who make the decisions as to what is right and what is wrong in these situations must have an opinion one way or the other. But they prefer, apparently, to try—without success—to curry favor in both camps. How refreshing it would be if our delegation in the U.N. would stand up just one time, and cast a loud, emphatic vote for what it believes to be right, and never mind whether the Africans or the Portuguese or the Communist like it or not. There is no future for us in trying to emulate Robert Burns' wee, cowrin, tim'rous beastie.

TFX in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, 5 months ago a committee of the other body undertook to investigate the TFX contract award, with the avowed purpose of determining whether political favoritism was involved.

In the intervening months it became increasingly obvious that this investigating committee was unable to turn up evidence that favoritism figured in the award. Having failed in this objective, the committee then began to direct its inquiry into other avenues—including some unfortunate second guessing as to technical merits of the two competing designs.

Still unable to find evidence of shadowy skulduggery, the committee nevertheless has persisted in prolonging its inquiry ad infinitum. Now we have such respected publications as Air Force and Space Digest, the official journal of the Air Force Association, expressing belief that the committee is looking for "a way to gracefully dismount this tiger."

I commend to my colleagues the full report, written by Senior Editor Claude Witze, in the August issue of this magazine:

THE MARATHON CONTINUES

The transcript of Navy Secretary Fred Korth's testimony before the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations went past the 1,000-page mark today. It is clear that by the time he leaves the stand he will have provided close to 25 percent—possibly more—of the inquiry's total record to date. For sheer volume, there has been nothing like this since the Army-McCarthy hearings, and there is some evidence that the show may equal that one in other respects, including wasted wind, redundance, and the deliberate injection of unwarranted invective.

Today is Mr. Korth's sixth as a witness and it is hard to imagine a facet of the TFX contract award that has not been dissected in near-boring detail, too much of it repetitious. The thing that has been repeated more than any other is Mr. Korth's statement that when he selected the General Dynamics-Grumman team to develop the new Air Force-Navy aircraft, he had been told, so far as the Navy was concerned, that there was no significant preference between that company and Boeing. In exchanges with Chairman John L. McClellan and Senators Karl E. Mundt and Henry M. Jackson, Mr. Korth went back to this argument so often that his inquisitors wearied of it.

At one point Mr. Korth acknowledged that he knew Adm. George Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, favored Boeing and that Rear Adm. Frederick L. Ashworth, Navy representative on the Source Selection Board, regretted he had not made his identical opinion more emphatic to the Secretary. There also was a document signed by the Air Force Council, which in this case was augmented by three rear admirals, urging the selection of Boeing. Prodded by Chairman MCCLELLAN, the Secretary said he knew all these things and also that the Council "stated that there was no clear-cut choice in the naval configuration between contractors."

Observed Mr. MCCLELLAN: "Mr. Secretary, that is about the hundredth time you have repeated that, and that is all right. You may repeat it all you want, but you can't get away from the fact, and that is all I am asking you, if they didn't recommend a choice of Boeing?"

The answer is yes, but indications at this point are that the committe cannot properly finish its job without recalling some military witnesses, the ones who favored Boeing, for more queries on how they reached their decision. While Mr. Korth and his colleague on the stand—Dr. James H. Wakelin, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development—have fumbled from time to time, they also have succeeded in focusing the attention, against big odds, on what was and was not considered by their peers in uniform. As pointed out here last month, there is evidence that most of the military men who had a voice and voted for Boeing did not read the crucial evaluation report. On top of this, Mr. Korth has managed to challenge the weight given to a Boeing Co. progress report that was filed, as requested by the U.S. Air Force Project Office, on October 19, 1962. The clear implication is that Boeing was favored because of what this report proposed, not because of its proposal itself, which was 5 weeks older.

The committee members have done everything possible to shroud the role of this "progress report," and they have succeeded in making it so ethereal that the daily as well as the trade press has given up trying to report its significance. At this point Representative JIM WRIGHT, a Democrat from Mr. Korth's and General Dynamics' hometown of Fort Worth, Tex., stepped in with a definition of the issue that is worth quoting. Charging that the MCCLELLAN inquiry has shown more respect for witnesses from the underworld than it does for the Navy's boss, Mr. WRIGHT says it has "shockingly berated Secretary of the Navy Korth for not having given overriding weight" to the "progress report." The Congressman gave an accurate résumé of this part of the TFX history, going back to September 10, 1962, which was the announced cutoff date for submitting designs and technical data. Then, he said:

"The Pentagon at about that point asked both General Dynamics and Boeing to submit progress reports on their work to date. They were clearly told these reports were not for purposes of detailed evaluation. For 18 months such detailed tests and evaluations already had been conducted. The technical evaluation team had found in favor of the General Dynamics-Grumman proposal: 662.4 to 654.2 in the composite evaluation and 175.6 to 172.1 in the raw scoring."

Mr. WRIGHT then gave General Dynamics credit for properly replying to the request but accused Boeing of offering to redesign its airplane and, in effect, submitting a late bid.

"Had Secretary Korth given great weight to this unverified, unevaluated report at that late date," he said, "then he would have been guilty of decision by brochuremanship, for the Boeing paper was in effect an advertisement of claims, a brochure, a pamphlet. It represented not what Boeing had been able to offer for evaluation, but what it now tardily hoped to offer at some future time.

"Wisely, Secretaries Korth, Zuckert, and McNamara did not give this report the same weight given to properly evaluated and double-checked technical information sub-

mitted in accordance with their instructions and accepted procedure prior to the cutoff deadline."

The Congressman then cited the words of Secretary Korth, who testified, "For me to have taken the October 19 submission into consideration would have been no different than if I were, in a competitive price-bidding procurement, to allow a bidder after the final date for filing bids had closed, to change his bid."

This viewpoint, it must be added hastily, will not go unchallenged. The Boeing Co., in the first place, will not agree that its progress report involved major redesign and will insist that it was responsive to a written request of the Air Force. The fact that 5 weeks had elapsed since the proposal cutoff was not the fault of the company, because October 19 was the date the progress report was requested by the customer. The changes suggested in the progress report were offered as options, with the decision to be made by the customer. Probably the fuzziest aspect of the affair is one created by the Defense Department itself when, after three TFX evaluations, it provided funds for both Boeing and General Dynamics to continue work toward the fourth round and instructed that both of them were to be treated as prime contractors. This highly irregular procedure, by being so far out of step itself, would appear to alter the impact and, indeed, the significance of anything that followed.

Friends of the military services should be apprehensive, in view of recent history in the entire procurement area, of the suggestion here from Mr. Korth, accentuated by Mr. WRIGHT and certainly with its origins in the Pentagon civilian hierarchy, that uniformed men have themselves violated procurement procedures. It is difficult to read the Korth testimony without detecting that the established military procurement officialdom is going to be accused of doing the things the Secretary of the Navy found so repugnant. These would include giving weight to unevaluated data and allowing a bidder to change his bid after the deadline. Again, Mr. WRIGHT sounds more like the executive branch than the legislative:

"The Boeing paper," he conjectured, "helps to clear up some of the mystery surrounding why the top civilian and military leaders in the Pentagon found themselves in conflict on the relative merits of the Boeing proposal. Through an apparent mixup, certainly top military officials unfortunately appear to have been given the impression in official briefings that the claims and redesign proposals contained in the Boeing progress report had been verified and evaluated when in fact they had not been. They, therefore, may have mistakenly believed it definite and proven that all the deficiencies in the Boeing proposal had been corrected. This could account for the honest differences of opinion expressed by the military leaders on the one hand and the defense civilian leaders on the other.

"It seems more than passing strange that certain subcommittee members appear to be outraged at the very thought of the responsible service Secretaries exercising their responsibilities and in effect overruling preferences of certain military figures, yet apparently it has not occurred to them that the military figures who expressed a Boeing preference were in effect overruling the findings of the professionally and technically competition evaluation group which after 18 months of careful testing and analysis had found in favor of General Dynamics and Grumman."

There is no room here to review the elephantine transcript of Mr. Korth's appearance, yet no man should pass judgment on it without undertaking that task. This reporter has read every line and, for the first time since the TFX inquiry started months ago, is unable to ignore the fact that the McClellan committee's record for expertise in military procurement is not unsmirched. Barely a year ago Douglas Aircraft Co. and Western Electric were the fall guys. The arithmetical legerdemain in that case was designed to tell headline readers that Douglas was made 44.3-percent profit for its role in the Nike missile program, in a period when the company was not paying any dividends. By adding some more correct figures in the wrong places, the staff accused Western Electric of making 31.3 percent on the same program. In both examples they were distorting the truth.

This was brought to mind in the present sad performance by the increasing resort to innuendo. Senator MUNDT, to cite the most objectionable case, referred to Mr. Korth several times as "Mr. Dynamics" and again as "Mr. Fort Worth." What this added to the aura of dignity that is supposed to surround a Senate investigation escaped the limited audience, who also report that there is an increasing amount of exchange in raised voices as tempers grow shorter and the committee looks harder for a way to gracefully dismount this tiger.

There is no more reason, at this point, to question the integrity of Mr. Korth than there is to question that of Secretary McNamara. This means their integrity is not the issue in the TFX investigation. There are other, more germane, areas of interest.

Trimming on Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 21, 1963, "Trimming on Travel":

TRIMMING ON TRAVEL

In a thoughtless action, the House of Representatives has hacked off one of the welcoming hands the United States extends to tourists from abroad. This was done by drastically reducing the budget of the U.S. Travel Service from the current $3.3 million to a paltry $2.6 million (USTS had sought $4.2 million). What makes this economy so strange is that no activity by the Government has had a more direct effect on encouraging a flow of dollars into the United States.

Since its inception 2 years ago, USTS has had its occasional missteps—such as the promotion suggesting that Europeans could travel coast to coast in high style on a budget of $98 a week. But the solid accomplishments have outweighed the blunders. The service has helped to simplify visa application procedures, to publicize tours in this country, and to work with American transportation and hotel interests in setting up such special bargain rates as the "99 days for $99" ticket offered by buslines.

Last year, oversea travel (not including Canada and Mexico) rose 14.2 percent over 1961, a jump from 624,000 to 713,000 persons. Besides profiting the domestic economy, the money spent by tourists has helped to ease the pinch of the balance-of-payments problems. USTS could do an even better job with a better budget (our Government spends, proportionately, far less than most European countries in enticing tourism). But at the evident behest of Representative ROONEY, the House wielded the cleaver. The Senate has the opportunity to restore the full budget request, and by standing firm in conference, assure that USTS can extend both hands in welcome.

U.S. Power Plans Called Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent abuse heaped upon the Bonneville Power Association reminds us of similar attacks almost 30 years ago.

It was argued at that time that projects such as Bonneville would force an upturn in the rates for electricity. Mr. Speaker, those harangues were not valid in 1934 and they are just as invalid today. For example, Walcott Electric, of Rupert, Idaho, recently scheduled a rate cut of 10 percent effective in September announced that "The lower Bonneville Power Administration wholesale rate will directly benefit customers of the Walcott Electric Co. by making it possible to lower the company's resale rate."

The following article from the New York Times of Saturday, November 17, 1934 is typical of the tirades in the pre-Bonneville era. I think my colleagues will find that it makes interesting reading:

U.S. POWER PLANS CALLED "UNFAIR"—HEAD OF JERSEY UTILITY BODY LAYS $12 BILLION LOSS TO FEDERAL COMPETITION

ATLANTIC CITY, November 16.—"Unfair competition" from publicly owned power projects has demoralized the market for securities of utilities and the Federal Tennessee Valley Authority and the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River will force electric rates up rather than reduce them, John S. Riggins of Camden, president of the New Jersey Utilities Association, told the 50 delegates today at the opening of a 2-day session of the 19th annual convention of the association in the Hotel Traymore.

Mr. Riggins said that because of this competition "more than $12 billion of investment in the industry has been lost since Jan. 1, 1934."

"Securities of the utilities have dropped far down," he continued. "The cost of money will be so high, even if anyone is willing to take the risk of governmental destruction, that rates must go up. They must stay up until the Government desists from threats of destruction and for a long time until confidence is restored to the investor."

The two Government power projects now under way will produce only 5 percent of the total electric output in this country, said Mr. Riggins, who is counsel for several utilities.

"Yet," he complained, "the public, which consumes 95 percent of the production, must be taxed to enable the remaining 5 percent to enjoy lower rates. And these lower rates are made possible in unfair ways.

"The railroads, which the public is financing, haul the labor and freight for the Federal projects at reduced prices. The advertising, circulars and bills are mailed under Government frank, although the Post Office Department usually has a deficit. Govern-

ment credit is supplied at lower interest. There are no taxes.

"On the other hand, utilities of all kinds paid $726 million in taxes in 1932 and now pay $30 for every family in the United States. Electric company taxes have risen 25 percent in 2 years.

Dr. Theodore J. Grayson, professor of finance and director of evening schools at the University of Pennsylvania, discussed other Federal policies.

Why Labor Unions Should Support the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article, entitled "One Labor Official's Farm Labor Views." This thought-provoking article is from a recent issue of the Indio, Calif., Daily News.

There have been a lot of second thoughts about the farm labor situation since Congress balked at extending the Mexican bracero importation for even 1 year.

Growers are predicting the fruit and vegetable prices will be higher next year because of increased labor costs, and a number of Central Valley growers at a meeting in Salinas early this week told of investigating plans to move strawberry, lettuce and tomato operations into Mexico.

Everyone at the Salinas meeting agreed that the action by Congress was one of the worst things to hit agriculture in many years.

To date most of the unhappiness has been expressed by the growers. The Council of Churches, certain labor officials, and labor department people have supported the end of the bracero program as needed to give unemployed domestic workers jobs. None of them have pointed out that California farmers are required by law to hire domestics first before importing braceros, nor have they pointed out that braceros are single men, easily housed, whereas domestics are usually family men and cannot be carted around the country without including their families which pyramid the housing, schooling, health, and other problems.

A statement by a strawberry grower at the conference was reported by the San Francisco Examiner as sparking interesting observations by an official of the Teamsters Union.

The grower said said the expected drop in strawberry production could result in a drastic employment cut at the big growers frozen food plant in Salinas. The plant ships 25 million pounds of berries a year.

The Examiner's story continued:

"William G. Kenyon, secretary-treasurer of Salinas Teamsters Local 890, said the end of the bracero program 'will create a real problem for our members in California.'

" 'We've got 70,000 members in canneries, frozen foods, and dehydration plants, not counting thousands of warehousemen and truck drivers whose work opportunities would be reduced by a drop in food production here.'

"Kenyon thought the bracero program should be 'eased out over a 4- or 5-year period.'

"He estimated that it would take, at the very least, a wage of $1.75 an hour to attract field labor, 'but Salinas growers could not compete because Texas farmers can get domestic labor for 80 cents, 75 cents and less.' "

Kenyon went on to make another interesting observation. He said boys from 13 years and up might help in harvesting and proposed that year-round schools with staggered vacation periods "could give the kids a chance to work outside and build their bodies. I am opposed to child labor in factories, but this is something different. A middle-aged man might not be able to take stoop labor, but a youth can do it."

This labor union official's views are doubly interesting because they state clearly the problem ahead for California growers, workers, and housewives.

It is easy enough to talk of increasing the minimum wage, talk of hiring domestics, talk, talk, talk, but this official knows what is going to happen to workers.—O.J.N.

A Housewife's Views on Prayer Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the space of little more than a year, two momentous decisions have been handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States. Both decisions circumscribed the use of voluntary prayer or other observances intended to remind our children of the spiritual heritage that has played such a large part in our Nation's history. A good deal has appeared in the press as to the reactions of Members of this body, State and local school officials, and other opinion leaders. I want to call the attention of this body and of the country to the feelings of a housewife in Westwood, N.J., in my district, Mrs. Charles P. Donatone. Her comments on our spiritual heritage and the need for men of good will in these times of high emotion deserve thoughtful consideration.

I do not agree, Mr. Speaker, with the position taken by the Supreme Court on prayer and Bible reading. Yet I realize, and I hope those in authority around the Nation will realize, that the ruling of the highest court of the land should not be defied. There are specific ways to remedy the situation: One is the reversal by the Supreme Court of its ruling, and I am realistic enough to know that this will not come about soon. The other is by way of a constitutional amendment providing for the voluntary exercise of our spiritual heritage, and I have introduced such an amendment in the last two Congresses.

Included in Mrs. Donatone's remarks are her concern for the right and wrong ways of bringing grievances to the attention of those in authority, and I would like to include following my remarks and Mrs. Donatone's, an editorial from the New York Times of July 23, 1963, on this same subject. As a cosponsor of civil rights legislation in this Congress, I would urge careful consideration of this editorial as well.

The articles follow:

WESTWOOD, N.J.,
July 22, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. WIDNALL: I am very concerned about the sad events occurring in our country and, although I am only a housewife who perhaps should just listen and hope for the best, I have been driven by an inner urge to write down how I feel about some things. After writing these papers, I left them on my desk for a few weeks, but when I saw the policemen of New York on television tonight, being placed in such an unpleasant position, while performing their duty, I decided to send my thoughts to you, as a representative of our State. I am sure there are many who feel as I do.

I am primarily concerned about the Bible reading decision, but demonstrations, I think, when carried too far, too often, and too long, defeat their own purpose and undermine our character as a nation.

I am enclosing, on separate sheets, my thoughts, as they have occurred to me during the recent weeks.

I apologize for taking up your time but I feel compelled to express myself. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ROSE M. DONATONE.

The recent Supreme Court decision regarding Bible reading in the schools makes me think that Uncle Sam must feel like an unhappy parent, who after years of teaching his child right from wrong in their family tradition, grows up to go their own way and does just the opposite.

How far backward can we lean as a country to win the favor of the world? If we have to lean so far back that we destroy ourself in the act, then I think it is ridiculous. Let the world hate us, but let's hold on to our heritage. This country was started by a group of God-fearing people who believed in the Bible, not as a book to be studied for literature, but as a book that was a pattern to guide their lives and also the country they had the guts to fight for and the government they were forming. Freedom was the key word. They loved the ring of freedom as they loved the Bible they learned it from. They valued it so much, that they paved the way for others to come here in freedom to pursue happiness according to each person's belief. They could live here unmolested. True—they did not say all must believe this Bible. They simply said, "Come. Live. Pursue happiness." But, our founders believed in this Bible and thus grew this right to freedom. Therefore, I feel that the law should be made that every public function open with Bible reading, especially our schools—if only in memoriam—to our founders. Let it not be ordered that all believe in it, or give up their way because of it's reading; but, on the other hand, because this country had its origin—as Christian, let it be constantly aware of it. I know of no other country that gives up its origin for others who want to come to its shores. The old idion "When in Rome, etc." apparently applies every place but here.

We are too concerned with world opinion. Let us, as a country live up to our convictions and if the rest of the world scoffs us—so what? They say, "Go home American"—so what? Cringing on one hand and selling our soul, on the other, will not bring us the respect and love of other countries; but being strong in our convictions or sense of Democracy, might. After all, we are not the United States of the world, but the United States of America, born in 1776 and only 187 years old.

We are a democracy. Democracies allow growth and change by petition and vote of

its people. Let us not be dictated to by opinion from without.

My soul cries when I hear the news commentators these days. What is happening in my country, where I learned of democracy and learned tolerance and understanding and heard the Bible read and knew we were a great and true country because of our religious forefathers.

Oh, leaders of America, please heed "the writing on the wall." Maybe even now you are allowing the beginnings of our "being buried." Maybe these are the signs of the shifting of the dirt or events, which will start the possibly Communist-planned avalanche. Let us not allow anything that would assist the "burying of the world in communism," thus bringing back bondage; but rather help the unhappy world to a high plateau, over which a mantle of protection to freedom would hang, by spreading democracy. Of course, I don't mean to spread democracy by aggression, but certainly by living it strongly here and by remembering its origin, and by holding that origin dear. We don't expect all to accept the Bible as our forefathers believed it, but at least respect it as the means that brought forth this freedom. I believe strongly that the men who composed the first amendment never dreamed it would be otherwise. Haven't American officials often used the "spirit of the Constitution" as their guide instead of following a strict interpretation of the written word?

Allowing Bible reading at opening exercises in schools in no way effects: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." (I even interpret the phrase "establishment of religion" to mean any one particular religion, not religion in general.)

Banning Bible reading might possibly infringe on the phrase "prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Also—doesn't this very amendment, which has suddenly changed our American scene specify—how to present a grievance? We have the right to assemble, peacefully (have a convention, make statements of our desires, petition, seek legislation) but where does it say demonstrate? Why are demonstrations allowed to such a point that people who are just looking for excitement join just to have something to do? It seems that demonstrators are looked at as if they are right and everyone else is completely wrong. Where is an opening for the fact that each have a right to their opinion? It seems to me that demonstrations are a communistic way, not a democratic way.

However, in regard to the Bible reading in school, I must repeat that I am sure that the men who composed the first amendment never dreamed it would cause such a law to be passed. Let us not forget the "spirit of the Constitution" and that all our officials take oath on this very Book. It seems to me that they are destroying the very thing that gave them the power they have.

We respect all and their beliefs, but please let us also demand the same for ourselves.

We have freedom of thought, speech, and press, but please don't allow the world to forget where this freedom from bondage originated. God made man a free spirit. I, therefore, feel the Supreme Court decision to be a wrong one and that they ought to correct it quickly.

ROSE M. DONATONE.

RIGHT GOAL; WRONG METHOD

Demonstrators, of course, have the right to call attention to the obviously discriminatory apprenticeship and job requirements of certain unions, such as those in the building trades in New York.

But there are right and wrong ways to achieve the goal of equal employment opportunity. When demonstrators picket peacefully, they exercise the fundamental right of petition. But they are transgressing that right when they block access and physically interfere with the passage of others. This is particularly true when public buildings are involved, and where governmental business is transacted.

The pickets who lay down yesterday in front of the construction sites of the Downstate Medical Center in Brooklyn and the Rutgers housing project in Lower Manhattan went beyond acceptable bounds of nonviolent protest and incidentally blocked progress on two important public works. They were asking to be arrested; they should have been arrested; they were arrested.

The demonstrators are also following a truly vicious principle in playing the "numbers game." A demand that 25 percent (or any other percentage) of jobs be given to Negroes (or any other group) is wrong for one basic reason: It calls for a quota system, which is in itself discriminatory. A quota system disregards qualifications, at best leads only to token jobs and is obviously discrimination in reverse. This newspaper has long fought a religious quota in respect to judgeships; we equally oppose a racial quota in respect to jobs from the most elevated to the most menial.

American Security Council Points to Gains Soviets Expect To Make Over West Under the Partial Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the American Security Council's Washington Report for August discusses advantages which the Soviets expect to gain from the partial test ban treaty at the West's expense. The report is as follows:

THE ISSUES NOW JOINED

Twenty-four years ago, on August 23, 1939, the world was stunned to learn that Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany had signed a nonaggression pact. Russia had executed one of the greatest diplomatic about faces in history. Two nations which had been the bitterest of ideological enemies and had been on the brink of war during the Munich crisis of the previous fall, suddenly became friends. The atmosphere of the negotiations was businesslike and cordial. The negotiators were jovial. A British delegation, which had come to Moscow in the hope of inducing the Soviets to join Britain in a guarantee of Poland against German attack, left for home, its mission an utter failure. The international Communist movement was temporarily rent asunder by the shock of a Soviet pact with Fascist Germany. Disillusioned idealists quit the party in droves.

So much for the parallels between 1939 and 1963. There are also differences. The Nazi-Soviet pact was a green light for war and was so intended by both parties; 10 days later Hitler invaded Poland and World War II began. The agreement between Hitler and Stalin was an utterly cynical act of political and military expediency by two dictators, each of whom expected to double cross the other. Neither expected the arrangement to last. The Soviets expected to do what they later did to Japan (in violation of a nonaggression treaty), enter the war at the last moment for maximum advantage at minimum risk. Their miscalculation lay in the easy German victory over France, which freed Hitler for the attack on Russia.

The nuclear test ban treaty which the United States and Britain have just signed with the Soviet Union represents another dramatic tactical reversal in Soviet foreign policy. But this time it is being hailed as a great step toward peace and an end to the cold war. There is little reason today to believe that the Soviets act with any less cynical motives than they did in 1939. They know what they are doing. But do we?

President Kennedy, to be sure, has sought to avoid the "peace in our time" role of Neville Chamberlain on his return from Munich. In his report to the Nation on the test ban treaty, the President cautioned against overoptimism.

"This treaty is not the millennium," he said. "It will not resolve all conflicts, or cause the Communists to forgo their ambitions, or eliminate the dangers of war. * * * "But," he went on, "it is an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war."

When put before the American people and the Senate in this form, it becomes very difficult to oppose the nuclear test ban—almost as difficult as it must have been for Winston Churchill to buck the tide of popular British acclaim over Munich in order to warn of the consequences. The treaty appears safe enough, since it avoids the problem of underground cheating. What harm can there be when weighed against the great advantages of elimination of fallout and a step toward peace?

It will not be easy to oppose this kind of treaty because the charge of "warmonger" is hurled at the opponent almost automatically. For example, a Herblock cartoon (Washington Post, July 28, 1963) portrays the "anti-test-ban club" as made up of sadistic and embittered men who passionately wish to blow up the world. "Poisoners of children" could as well be added in the emotional atmosphere which prevails.

What, however, are the legitimate reasons for skepticism? Why might honest men oppose this treaty, not because they are for war, but on the grounds that the treaty is not really a step toward peace as Americans understand the word?

There is, first, the question of Soviet motivation. In agreeing to a partial test ban, the Soviets reversed their earlier position. It is probable that their decision was taken during June and thrashed out at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party which was held at that time. It is obviously part of the overall Soviet "peace offensive" now in progress. When the Soviets undertake a major shift of this sort, they do so with cold calculation. Why, then, have they reversed their more threatening attitude of the spring, which caused Secretary Rusk to warn of a possible new hardening of the Soviet position?

Many reasons are heard. First among them is usually the dispute with China. This may be a factor—Khrushchev's desire to emphasize the contrast of strategies and rally the faithful to his banner. But since the dispute has been going on for some years now, it is not likely that this is a major reason for the switch at this time. Here are some other, less frequently mentioned possible reasons:

1. The U.S. political situation. The widespread anger of the American people over the failure to eliminate Soviet forces from Cuba, combined with the racial issue, may have indicated to Moscow that the present accommodation-minded administration would be vulnerable to defeat in 1964. Since both of the leading Republican nomination contenders apparently favor a stronger U.S. foreign policy, it is in the Soviet interest

that there be no change in administrations. One way to cause the American people to forget about Cuba is to convince them that Russia herself is no longer dangerous.

2. The political situation in Britain. The conservative government is desperate. Its normal lack of realism toward Russia is compounded by the fact that only "peace in our time" offers it a chance of reelection. Under such circumstances it will probably press its allies for almost any concession to get an overall settlement with Russia.

3. The political situation in Europe. The astonishing increase of Communist strength in Italy, the resurgence of Communist influence in France, and the coming departure of Adenauer from the German scene, may suggest to the Kremlin that now is the time for honey rather than vinegar in seeking its European objectives, which are chiefly the recognition of the status quo in Eastern Europe, the neutralization of Germany, and the dissolution of NATO. Nuclear blackmail having so far failed, psycho-political warfare may look much more promising.

4. The economic consequences of the arms race. It is extremely expensive and virtually impossible for the Soviets to alter or even maintain the military balance in an all-out arms race. If a way can be found to achieve the same objective at less cost, it is to their advantage. The element of secrecy, by which they once fooled us into thinking there was a "missile gap," is now largely lost. The effort to put missiles into Cuba failed (we hope). The area of "disarmament" is a third way.

5. The specific instance of the President's strategy-of-peace speech at American University. This may have been the "clincher" that confirmed the other arguments and galvanized Soviet diplomacy and loyal Communist cadres into action. The eagerness of the American Government to find a way out of the cold war could scarcely be ignored. A "fluid" world situation in such an atmosphere offers the Soviets limits possibilities for maneuver.

Secondly, there is the treaty itself. From the standpoint of Soviet cheating, it is less dangerous to American security than is a total test ban without adequate inspection. This, however, is only one part of it. The Joint Chief of Staff may be pressured into giving approval on political grounds, but they are known to have military reservations. The Soviets are sacrificing very little. Since 1961 they have completed two massive atmospheric tests in which they made at least enough progress on the antimissile missile to be able to begin deployment of an operational system. No one knows just how effective their system is, but it seems certain that the ban freezes them in a position superior to the United States in this vital area. Moreover, if and when they decide to resume atmospheric testing, the "escape clause" in the treaty gives them a legal and propagandistically "honorable" way out. Any party can withdraw on 90 days' notice. France's determination to continue testing provides the Soviets with a suitable excuse to withdraw whenever they wish.

The third reason for opposition to the treaty is related to the first and is in the realm of the psychological. No matter what words of caution United States and British leaders may now utter, they have set in motion and are continuing to fuel a groundswell of popular optimism and hope that the cold war is ending.

Khrushchev, the same man who relaxed tension by withdrawing from Austria in 1955 only to follow it with Hungary, the Berlin ultimatums, and the Cuban missiles, adds his now benign voice to the call for "peace." The real danger, therefore, is that the Western democracies will be swept along the road to political concessions to communism by a popular momentum which will be impossible for a politically conscious leadership to resist. A new Summit Conference has become a virtual certainty.

Already the U.S. and British negotiators have morally committed their nations to enter into some kind of nonaggression pact or "arrangement" with the Communists, whatever the legal reservations. De Gaulle's implacable "non" to the idea preserves France from such folly, but may further strain the alliance. The preamble to the treaty reaffirms the aim of general and complete disarmament "under strict international control." The treaty itself, however, avoids the major problem of on-site inspection in the Soviet Union, which has always been the sticking point on actual disarmament. The Soviets agree to international control over "disarmament"—over what is actually destroyed—but not over the remaining armaments. So far we have avoided this kind of trap, but will we do so now? The public pressure for concessions to the Soviet position on actual disarmament could become enormous now that new hopes are aroused.

The Communist goal has not changed. As recently as July 14, 1963, it was reiterated, again and again, in the long Soviet open letter which answered the Chinese charges. For example, it said:

"We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

FRANK J. JOHNSON,
Editor.

The Answer to Juvenile Delinquency—Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always the sensational, the crime, the exciting which makes news. The everyday drama of millions of people doing their jobs, raising their families, and continually building a better America does not sell newspapers or give TV and radio commentators a chance for breathless exposition. But it is the steady citizen, the hardworking father, the selfless mother, the responsible teenager, who is the real hero in the life of the Nation.

We read about the wild teenagers who cause the trouble, the delinquent few, but there are no headlines for the millions of earnest, ambitious boys and girls who are taking the lessons of good citizenship responsibly and who will take over tomorrow's world well fitted for the job. It is to these youngsters we owe allegiance. It is to these responsible young citizens we must show the rewards of the capitalist system—unlimited opportunity for those who are willing and able to earn it.

The copy in the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in the August 12 issue of Newsweek, says it in very clear language and I include it at this point in my remarks:

JUVENILE DEPENDABILITY

For every young rowdy whose crimes get in the newspapers, we believe there are a hundred decent, ambitious, God-fearing American boys and girls. They run errands, work, and learn at Junior Achievement and similar fine organizations, cut lawns if they can, and live the normal American life you did at their age (but they know a lot more than any of us did at that age).

Opportunity to be something important, to win recognition, is the best cure for the delinquents, the best reward for the dependable. And opportunity for the million new jobs America must provide every year can only come from enough profits to invest in equipment to create those jobs. So—anything like wasteful taxes or slowdowns by workmen or fearful management that refuses to provide modern tools—anything which smothers opportunity hits at young people first and worst.

And these are the people, remember, who are going to vote the laws and the government and the future of our country. Hadn't we beter show them what opportunity plus hard work can accomplish?

Maryland Firms Benefit From Contract Awards From Foreign Countries Receiving Foeign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, many critics of the foreign aid program complain that American aid money is just being given away without any benefits accruing to the U.S. economy. It is obvious that this criticism is greatly overdrawn and inaccurate. An article in the July 23 edition of the Baltimore Sun points out how firms in Maryland have benefited from almost $3 million in contract awards from foreign countries recently awarded to five firms. The money for these contracts was provided by financing from the U.S. foreign aid program. The Agency for International Development reports that more than three-fourths of all foreign aid funds allocated for commodity purchases stay with the American economy. With contracts like those which are benefiting Maryland, the money allocated to foreign countries may not only be foreign aid, but domestic aid also.

The text of the article follows:

LOCAL FIRMS GET ORDERS THROUGH AID

(By Jesse Glasgow)

The State Department's Agency for International Development reported yesterday that buyers in four countries recently have ordered almost $2,800,000 worth of merchandise to be produced in the Baltimore area.

The products for export, the bulk from a single plant here, are to be purchased under financing provided by various U.S. foreign aid programs.

The Agency for International Development said Bethlehem Steel is producing $2,552,799 worth of iron, steel, and tinplate for buyers in India, Pakistan, South Vietnam, and Turkey.

TO INDIA, PAKISTAN

Bethlehem is working under contracts awarded to it and nine New York exporters by the four foreign countries.

Most of the total is financed under development loans to India and Pakistan.

Slightly more than $500,000 worth of goods was purchased with funds granted by AID to assist the economic development of the recipient nations.

Among other Baltimore suppliers which received foreign aid orders, American Smelting & Refining has contracted to produce $170,059 worth of copper ingots for a firm in Bombay.

The Koppers Co. is producing a $20,000 order under a larger contract for industrial equipment awarded to another U.S. firm by a Turkish customer.

CROWN CORK DEAL

Curtis Steel Products Co. is producing $16,608 worth of tinplate for delivery to a company in Karachi, Pakistan.

The other Baltimore area firm is Crown Cork & Seal, which is turning out food processing machinery costing $12,811 for shipment to South Vietnam.

The Federal Agency stated that more than three-fourths of all foreign aid funds allocated for commodity purchases stay within the American economy.

It said that all goods purchased through foreign aid programs are marked with a distinctive color emblem to inform people of the foreign nations that the goods have been provided by U.S. aid.

The Nuclear Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult things we have to do these days—in view of the multitude of articles, stories, statements, and so forth—is to keep clearly in mind the sequence of events on important issues of the day. This is necessary in order for all of us to understand what is involved, and to focus our minds clearly on what we must do to solve some of our most troublesome problems.

The nuclear issue—or test ban treaty—is a complex matter. The general public has been reading and hearing about possible treaties for many years now. Basically the whole problem started back before August 1945, when we exploded the atom bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in an effort to bring an end to our stalemate in the war with Japan. It started when the first inkling of building an atom bomb appeared in the mind of the first scientists. It ushered in the most extensive and sustained effort in the field of espionage and counter espionage known in the history of the world. The pros and cons, the virtues and the faults of individuals and governments have been discussed profoundly and endlessly in connection with the atomic and nuclear threat to the very existence of man.

I was pleased to see a chronology of events on the nuclear issue which appeared in the National Observer of July 29, 1963, along with a statement of what the proposed test pact treaty calls for. Along with this appeared an editorial called "A First Step"—a brief commentary which ends with a telling phrase "whether the step is forward or backward only time will tell."

I would like to add to the last date shown in the chronology of July 15, 1963—the date of Thursday, July 25, 1963. On this date representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union came to an agreement—after nearly 2 weeks of tense and delicate negotiations in Moscow's Spridinovska Palace—on a partial treaty concerning nuclear weapons.

The three principal negotiators, who initiated the proposed agreement, were W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Andrei Gromyko, Foreign Minister for Russia, and Viscount Hailsham, British Minister for Science.

After the ceremony was over, the signers issued a communique calling the treaty "an important initial step toward the lessening of international tension and the strengthening of peace." Soviet Premier Khruschev then repeated his demand for a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact Communist nations of Eastern Europe, stating that such a treaty "would show all peoples that the most powerful military states, in the first place the nuclear powers, have reached agreement among themselves with a view to averting thermonuclear war." This demand was one which almost provided the shoal upon which this first partial test ban treaty almost foundered when the U.S.S.R. wanted it added to the treaty itself.

Now final steps must be taken of submitting the treaty for ratification to the U.S. Senate, the Supreme Soviet, and the British Parliament. The British Parliament seems to be greeting news of the pact with unqualified joy; the Supreme Soviet will, of course, do what Mr. Khrushchev tells them to do, regardless of any private misgivings or doubts; but the U.S. Senate has clearly indicated it desires a full and complete disclosure of all facts involved before coming to a decision on ratification.

And this—in the final analysis—appears to be the step which may take us forward—over the precipice, or backwards. And who among us can truly foretell which this is to be?

I would be more optomistic regarding the reality of this step toward the removal of nuclear war had the Soviet Union demonstrated its good faith by removing troops and armament from Cuba, taking down the Berlin wall or extending freedom to the captive nations—the Soviet Union knows the United States is sincere—in view of past failure of the Russians to live up to agreements it would only seem reasonable that we expect a demonstration of good faith by Mr. Khrushchev.

I would like to include the articles, "The Nuclear Issue," "What Test Pact Says," and the editorial "A First Step," all appearing in the July 29, 1963, issue of the National Observer, with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Observer, July 29, 1963]

THE NUCLEAR ISSUE DISARMAMENT

August 1945: United States explodes atom bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki killing 105,000 persons, injuring 94,000.

June 1946: United States proposes the "Baruch Plan." It would set up an international authority to own and inspect all atomic materials and facilities. Soviets reject the plan.

August 1949: Soviets test their first atomic bomb.

January 1952: United Nations establishes disarmament commission.

October 1952: United States enters the thermonuclear age by firing off its first hydrogen device.

August 1953: Soviets explode their first hydrogen bomb.

December 1953: President Eisenhower outlines his "Atoms for Peace Plan," proposing a U.N.-directed atomic energy pool.

THE LONDON CONFERENCE

May 1954: A new U.N. disarmament subcommittee, composed of United States, Canada, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, opens a conference in London. West proposes step-by-step disarmament plan. An international control authority would supervise each phase of the agreement. Russians continue to demand weapons ban and one-third cut in manpower before controls.

May 1955: Russians submit disarmament plan similar to Western proposal of May 1954, but tie it to an early end to nuclear testing and dismantling of United States oversea bases.

July 1955: President Eisenhower unveils "open skies" proposal at summit meeting. The plan calls for reciprocal air surveillance rights to prevent surprise attack. Russians express little interest.

September 1956: Adlai Stevenson, Democratic candidate for president, calls for an end to nuclear weapons tests. Mr. Eisenhower replies that testing is "an indispensable part of our defense program."

March–September 1957: Soviets accept the principle of inspection in proposing a 2- or 3-year test suspension under international authority with control posts to be established in the United States, Britain, and Soviet Union. West proposes disarmament package including 12- to 24-month test suspension, which would become permanent if inspection machinery is functioning satisfactorily by the end of that time. Russia charges Western inspection demands are excessive.

SCIENTISTS GET TOGETHER

July–August 1958: In response to proposal by President Eisenhower, scientists from eight countries, including the United States and Soviet Union, meet in Geneva to study technical problems of inspecting a test ban. Agreement is reached on the feasibility of a world detection system with 180 control posts.

October 1958: One-year "undeclared moratorium" on nuclear tests goes into effect. United States, Soviet, and British negotiators meet in Geneva to work out details of a treaty providing for a permanent ban.

January 1959: United States and Britain agree for the first time to detach test ban issue from disarmament package. But they insist a test ban treaty must provide for adequate inspection.

April 1959: Mr. Eisenhower proposes a phased test ban treaty beginning with tests in atmosphere, which are easiest to detect, while negotiations continue on means of detecting tests underground and in outer space. Russian Premier Khrushchev rejects the plan, proposes instead setting an annual limit to the number of on-site inspections.

December 1959: President Eisenhower says United States considers itself free to resume testing because moratorium has expired but won't do so without advance notice. Premier Khrushchev pledges his country won't resume tests unless the West does so first.

JOINT RESEARCH PROGRAM

February–March 1960: United States submits "threshold" plan for banning all explosions that can be easily detected. Russia agrees, but says treaty also must ban the hard-to-detect underground explosions.

Both sides agree to joint research program to perfect methods of detecting underground tests.

May 1960: Premier Khrushchev breaks up Paris summit conference in the aftermath of American U-2 plane incident. Russians repudiate joint research program.

March 1961: New Kennedy Administration offers treaty with 12 on-site inspections instead of 20 demanded previously, and 19 control posts on Soviet territory instead of 21. Russia demands "troika" system of voting in proposed control authority. It would give her veto power.

September 1961: Russians resume atmospheric testing, ending 34-month moratorium on all tests. United States renews underground testing two weeks later.

April 1962: United States resumes atmospheric tests, 3 weeks after start of new test ban talks by U.N.-sponsored 17-nation disarmament conference in Geneva.

A CHOICE OF TREATIES

August 1962: United States and Britain offer Russia a choice of treaties. One would ban all tests and rely on 8 to 10 on-site inspections a year to detect possible underground violations. The other would exclude underground tests, and depend on existing means of detection available to each country for enforcing a ban on tests in atmosphere, space, and underwater. Russians reject both offers.

December 1962: Premier Khrushchev, in exchange of letters with President Kennedy, agrees to two or three on-site inspections a year and three unmanned seismic stations on Soviet territory. Kennedy reply says eight inspections are needed.

January 1963: Secret Soviet-American negotiations are held in New York and Washington but neither side will compromise its inspection demands.

June 1963: President Kennedy says United States will refrain from tests in atmosphere as long as other states refrain. He calls for new East-West efforts to break test-ban deadlock.

July 1963: Premier Khrushchev tells East Berlin audience Russians want a treaty banning tests in atmosphere, space, and underwater, along with simultaneous signing of a nonaggression pact between rival East-West military organizations.

July 15, 1963: Test ban talks open in Moscow.

[From the National Observer, July 29, 1963]

WHAT TEST PACT SAYS

Here are the four articles of the proposed United States-British-Russian Treaty that set forth the rules governing nuclear weapons:

"ARTICLE I

"1. Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

"A. In the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including outer space, or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

"B. In any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the state under whose jurisditcion or control such explosion is conducted. It is understood in this connection that the provisions of this subparagraph are without prejudice to the conclusion of a treaty resulting in the permanent banning of all nuclear test explosions, including all such explosions underground, the conclusions of which, as the parties have stated in the preamble of this Treaty, they seek to achieve.

"2. Each of the parties to this Treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to in paragraph 1 of this article.

"ARTICLE II

"1. Any party may propose amendments to this Treaty. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the depositary governments which shall circulate it to all parties to this Treaty. Thereafter, if requested to do so by one-third or more of the parties, the depositary governments shall convene a conference, to which they shall invite all the parties, to consider such amendment.

"2. Any amendment to this Treaty must be approved by a majority of the votes of all parties in this Treaty, including the votes of all of the original parties. The amendment shall enter into force for all parties upon the deposit of instruments of ratification by a majority of all the parties, insluding the instruments of ratification of all of the original parties.

"ARTICLE III

"1. This Treaty shall be open to all states for signature. Any state which does not sign this Treaty before its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

"2. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification by signatory states. Instruments of ratification and instruments of accession shall be deposited with the governments of the original parties—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which are hereby designated the depositary governments.

"3. This Treaty shall enter into force after its ratification by all the original parties and the deposit of their instruments of ratification.

"4. For states whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty it shall enter into force on the date of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.

"5. The depositary governments shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding states of the date of each signature, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification of and accession to this Treaty, the date of its entry into force, and the date of receipt of any requests for conferences or other notices.

"6. This Treaty shall be registered by the depositary governments pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

"ARTICLE IV

"This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration.

"Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other parties to the Treaty 3 months in advance."

[From the National Observer, July 29, 1963]

DISARMAMENT

In the dark world conjured up the other day by President Kennedy, a nuclear war lasting less than 60 minutes would wipe out 300 million people. The survivors, said Mr. Kennedy, "would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of all its horrors."

It's a frightful thought, so frightful that almost anything seems better by comparison. That, precisely, was President Kennedy's point as he sought to muster public support for the limited test ban agreement initialed last week in Moscow. It may not look like much, he seemed to be saying, but it is something.

Beyond the fragile hopes it raises, the pact doesn't offer much. The scope is limited to testing in the sea, in the atmosphere, in space. Testing underground can, and apparently will, go on so this can only bring a slowdown, not an end, to the nuclear race. The signing nations—Britain, Russia, and the United States—can pull out of the accord without pain or punishment if their interests dictate it. The President admits some testing could be done in secret. And the treaty does not, of course, cover either France or Red China, and there's little reason to believe they'll agree to limit their testing, at least until they've caught up with the other three powers.

Still, as Mr. Kennedy says, it is something, a "first step." Whether the step is forward or backward only time will tell.

The Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise and add my voice to the overwhelming majority of Americans throughout our Nation who are greeting the signing of the treaty banning most thermonuclear tests as the bottom rung on the ladder to world peace. True, this does not remove the threat of nuclear war. However, when one nation can approach another nation and when three such nations can meet and discuss a problem which affects each and everyone of them, as well as all the other nations of the earth, and do so in a friendly and serious mood and reach an agreement binding on all the cosignators, this action, although overdue, does give mankind a relaxed breathing spell. How much better off all of tomorrows unborn babies will be because of a treaty signed by three of the world's great powers to ban further atmospheric testing of thermonuclear reactions, including underwater and outer space testing.

The consequences of continued thermonuclear testing are so complicated and unfortunately so controversial that discussions will go on for many months ahead, however, everyone, regardless of whether their particular views are pro or con will welcome the new treaty, and will await most anxiously for the final acceptance when the U.S. Senate will vote its will. The citizens of the United States can rest assured that our Government knows full well the capability of our adversaries and knows full well the retaliatory might of our forces in protecting the Nation against any and all challenges to our national sovereignty. In human events there is always a first step and this treaty may be the first step to an era of cooperative expansion in fields of attack on disease, underfed peoples of the world, substandard conditions of human existence throughout all of the earth's nations, an era which will startle all peoples with its swift progress and

giant strides toward eradication of many of mankind's oldest chronic problems.

Just as it has taken vision, manpower, and natural resources to accomplish the many wonderful things that mankind has wrought in the ages, since the epoch of understandable knowledge was disseminated far and wide, to bring us to today's brink of space exploration; so may tomorrow's horizons be expanded here on earth to alleviate man's many sufferings and to use the earth's resources for a truly peaceful defeat of all these afflictions. If at some time in the future mankind can devote but a small part of its daily labor and resources toward self-protection and can turn the greatest part of its immense production capabilities into producing for human comfort, those in their youth today will be able to enjoy a lifetime of accomplishment and well-being never before thought possible.

Many, many hours of patient persuasion by many dedicated persons were spent at the conference tables in the past discussing the issues contained in trying to bring about the signing of a test ban treaty. I wish to pay homage to all of these people for their service in the past, for tending the ground that made it possible for the planting of the seed of understanding that has led to the first fruit—the new thermonuclear test ban treaty. We have started on a new highway of human existence, may we accept the challenge and make it straight and safe.

An Admiral Sees Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 2 issue of the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif.:

AN ADMIRAL SEES DANGER: TIME TO HEED ADVICE

Is the United States embracing a modified political version of the old saying that if you can't beat 'em, join 'em?

We are wrapping our arms around Communist negotiators and are about to sign an agreement limiting nuclear testing. We have pledged not to invade Cuba, and have abandoned the Monroe Doctrine in face of the presence of a Russian expeditionary force in the Caribbean.

Where is this all going to lead us?

Adm. Arthur H. Radford, U.S. Navy, retired, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believes "that under the national security policies of our present administration, the survival of our Nation is being threatened."

These are strong words. And, we had better listen.

The administration has refused to accept, or for that matter, even to seek the advice of the Nation's military leaders charged with the security of the nation, and is flirting with a dangerous argument that the cold war springs out of mutual distrust and fears than out of any evil designs.

A typical statement, cited by Admiral Radford, is that of McGeorge Bundy, Special Presidential Adviser on Foreign Affairs, that the importance of Cuba "is less than we think."

Admiral Radford believes otherwise and says that "Cuba is a cancer which is destroying the healthy image of the United States abroad."

If we merely measure the cold war on the basis of the present military threat to the United States, the immediate danger is not great. The Soviet Union will not begin a war against us without first maneuvering us into an inferior military position, and while Red China talks big, it carefully avoids a showdown over Formosa and stabs at its weaker neighbors along isolated borders.

But the vital question is, are we helping to create the conditions most favorable to the advance of atheistic communism and, eventually, will they lead to a forced acceptance of a Communist-dominated world?

The answer seems to be that we are embarking on a course which conceivably could lead to such a result.

Already the tide of anti-Americanism is swelling in Latin America, as the result of our reluctant position against the Communist takeover in Cuba. The angry little Fidel Castro has successfully defied the mighty United States. Every government in Latin America has been weakened before the pressure of Communist-inspired mobs.

After peeling away the shallow applause of the neutral nations, we will find another foreign reaction to our signing of the Moscow treaty, that fear of nuclear war has stayed our hand and dulled our purpose.

Thus, has a shadow been lifted from the Soviet Union; and is communism now free to push its program of subversion and corruption, even against the very countries that sign the agreement, without danger of war?

Who will defy the Reds?

If we are seeking to minimize the danger of war, at the same time we are reducing our capacity to confront and discourage an enemy. Admiral Radford said it best:

"There comes a time when risks must be taken to protect and preserve our vital national interest. The risks of doing nothing are infinitely greater than the risks of acting."

The Communists, as Admiral Radford points out, have always backed down in the face of challenge. Are we also to forgo challenge?

The ramifications of the nuclear test-ban document are so vast and could be so foreboding, not for what it says but for what it might imply in our relations with the Communist world that, at this point, we agree with Senator BARRY GOLDWATER that a decision for or against it had better be put off until all phases have been thoroughly examined.

Fred Pass of Dallas Morning News Wrote Story About Longview, Tex., Refusing ARA Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated August 5, 1963, page A4981, there appears an insertion entitled "Texas Town Refuses ARA Aid—Resents Being Labeled 'Disaster Area'." An article from the Dallas News was included, purportedly written by Steven Gerstel. That was an error. The name of the writer was Fred Pass.

Fred Pass, a widely recognized writer for the Dallas News, has done an excellent job in studying and analyzing the application of the aid program as it has been applied in east Texas.

"Don't Elect Spenders," Farsighted Parents Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will be interested to read the outstanding letter to the editor which was written by Henry Lippitt, of San Diego, Calif., and appeared in the San Diego Union on July 23, 1963.

"DON'T ELECT SPENDERS," FARSIGHTED PARENTS TOLD

EDITOR: Parents who love their children and for their sakes economize, sacrifice, and save in order to educate them properly and leave them an inheritance are the strength and bulwark of our Nation. The stability of such parents assures the soundness and permanence of our economy.

It is incongruous and inconsistent when such farsighted and exemplary citizens in their own private lives make a complete turnabout at the polls and vote for free-spending politicians. Excessive Government spending defeats and annuls the plans of the purposeful parents.

Liberal politicians practice exactly the opposite policy. They are impatient and want to reap the results of their lavish spending immediately passing on to our children and to our children's children that part of the tab which is inconvenient for them to pay.

Spending beyond our income automatically imposes a ponderous burden on future generations. Without any choice in the matter our descendants are compelled to assume huge debts, with their increased interest charges and higher taxes. It is a shortsighted policy which shows little concern for the future of our country.

The inevitable erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar resulting from consistent deficit spending affects us all. No one escapes. Our dollar buys less and less goods as time goes on. It is a discouraging blight which demoralizes the morale of our citizens.

On the other hand we can elect public officials who are solicitous for the welfare of our country's future and treat its finances as they treat their own, with an eye to the future. They control spending, balance budgets, whittle away at our indebtedness and keep our country's economy sound and strong.

These deserving officials are consistent. They practice publicly what they practice privately. They know that the axioms of public finance are identical with the axioms of private finance. There is no hocus-pocus about public finance which allows a government to overspend and not suffer the consequences. Two plus two still equals four.

We are fortunate that this is so. It would be utterly demoralizing if the carefree, uncurbed spendthrift became the financial success and the careful, controlled economist

became the failure. What a world that would be.

If we elect spenders, the dollars we have so carefully accumulated will be worth only a fraction of their original value and will be insufficient to give our children the start in life which we planned.

If we elect sound economists, they will preserve the value of our dollar, and our children will be efficiently educated and eager to take their place in the dependable and enjoyable life ahead.

Parents, the choice is yours. How you vote at the polls determines whether your efforts in your children's behalf will or will not turn out successfully.

HENRY LIPPITT.

Private Plans Cut Health Tax Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Nation's Business, August 1963:

PRIVATE PLANS CUT HEALTH TAX NEED: NEW DEVELOPMENTS DISPROVE SUPPORTERS' CLAIMS

Champions of a compulsory national program of health taxation are ignoring four important new developments:

The swift expansion of additional private health insurance plans.

Growing public resistance to the administration's approach.

Alternative legislative proposals for the diminishing number of the aged who may need Government help.

The steadily improving ability of the aged to meet their own needs.

The experience of one State deserves nationwide attention as the administration continues its campaign to provide a limited program for all under social security, regardless of need.

The New Jersey Legislature defeated a bill this spring that would have permitted private insurance companies to pool their financial resources and sales facilities, spread their risks, and achieve other economies through a large market to bring low-cost medical insurance to the elderly.

Democratic Gov. Richard J. Hughes took a stand against the proposal, declaring: "Legislation of this type will be used to minimize the need for the President's program."

The sponsor of the bill, veteran legislator Alfred N. Beadleston, counters that the result meant: "To hell with the old folks in New Jersey."

Despite the attitude in New Jersey, such cooperative plans are making rapid headway in Connecticut, New York, and Massachusetts.

Legislatures in many other States have passed or considered the laws needed to participate. One authority says that West Coast States may become the nucleus of a 13-State regional program, including Hawaii and Alaska, and that a small regional approach is being considered for North Carolina and Virginia.

He sees the pool-type program as supplementing the role of old-age assistance and the Kerr-Mills legislation, which permits Federal-State aid to those who do not qualify for other forms of assistance but need help with medical bills.

COMPANIES EXPAND COVERAGE

As the program takes hold, say supporters, costs should be far less than plans of individual companies, which themselves have dramatically expanded programs available to the elderly.

Sources in the industry and Congress say these developments, emerging since full-scale hearings on the administration's bill, further strengthen the evidence that private insurance can meet the needs of most of the population within a few years.

Add some of the proposals for tax credits or deductions for payment of insurance premiums, grants in case of need, Government use of private plans—which get scant attention in the new administration—and the private approach could be applied to more of the hard-core elderly who may need some Government help.

Yet Congress gets the argument that, since private industry doesn't claim it can provide for all the needy, Government must rush in with a plan to cover everyone.

Despite the propaganda, however, opinion polls run by several Congressmen this year showed constituents opposed to the administration's bill.

The thinking behind the bare-bones statistics is even more revealing, as reflected in this year's poll by Republican Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio, whose district includes parts of Cleveland.

Her polls in 1960, 1961, and 1962, which simply asked whether each registered voter was in favor of medical care for the aged under social security, found as many as 60 percent replying "Yes."

WHAT POLLS SHOW

But this year, for the first time, her questionnaire listed some alternative choices. The difference in replies was striking. Here they are, based on 16,000 replies:

Compulsory health care under social security, 37 percent for, 50 percent against; voluntary private health insurance with Federal tax credits of $150 a year toward premiums, 41 percent for, 32 percent against; no more government in the health field, 32 percent for, 30 percent against.

Much of the remaining support for the administration's plan appears based on the misunderstanding that a worker would pay only $1 a month for health insurance covering his retirement years.

Although actual costs would be more than twice this amount, the plan would cover only 25 to 40 percent of real requirements.

Improvement in the financial position of the elderly is revealed in a report by the President's Council on Aging. It notes that in 1950 there were 12.3 million Americans age 65 and older with income totaling $15 billion; in 1961, there were 17 million elderly an increase of 40 percent, with income of $35 billion, an increase of 130 percent.

Significantly, it adds: "In addition, the people who retire during the next 10 years will receive higher payments, on the average, than the benefits being paid today. * * * Private pensions will also play a bigger role in providing economic security for the people retiring during the next 10 years."

In addition, the report shows that the Federal Government contributes more than $17 billion in income maintenance and medical care payments, plus tax advantages, for the 17 million-plus citizens 65 and older, or an average of $1,000 apiece. Yet the pressure for Government to do more continues.

Train Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to read, in the New York Herald Tribune of July 13, 1963, an editorial which at last puts the railroad crisis into proper perspective.

It appears that a great deal of the maneuvering on this issue by the Kennedy administration has been politically oriented. One of the clearest evidences of this is the fact that President Kennedy will wait until July 22 to give his recommended solution to avert a July 29 strike to the Congress. This not only places tremendous pressure on Congress; it also, as the President knows, makes it practically impossible for the Republican members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, where the President's recommendations will be referred, to prepare sound, constructive alternatives to the Kennedy administration's proposals. There is only a single staff member on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee responsible to the minority.

I commend to your attention the text of the Herald Tribune editorial which follows:

TRAIN TIME

It's clear by now that the only hope of averting a disastrous nationwide rail strike lies in congressional action.

President Kennedy, doing his best to wash his politically sensitive hands of the whole affair, has put it up to Congress—but he proposes to give Congress only 1 week between submission of his own promised recommendations, along with the report of the new committee, and the July 29 strike deadline.

This isn't much time, especially considering the potential political explosiveness of any legislated solution, and considering also the glut of labor bills already in the congressional hopper or taking form in congressional minds. No one seems entirely clear on what Congress is likely to do—except that there's a likelihood of a Donnybrook.

For Congress to wait until July 22, when it's due to get the report and recommendations, before getting to work on a crash basis would be an abdication of its responsibility to the Nation. The dispute has to be settled, and things have gotten to the sorry state now where it apparently has to be settled by Congress.

There's no need to wait for a report of the facts. These have been exhaustively and repeatedly researched. All Congress needs, in order to get started, is the 576-page report that a special 15-man Presidential Commission submitted to Mr. Kennedy on February 28, 1962, after a 13-month study.

Judging by his performance so far, it seems likely that Mr. Kennedy's recommendations will aim first at protecting his political flank from angry recriminations by organized labor, to which his wing of the Democratic Party is so deeply indebted. But this is a case in which the unions involved have behaved with such gross irresponsibil-

ity as to bring the whole collective bargaining process into disrepute. By refusing for 4 long years to bargain, they have caused bargaining itself to fail. By balking mediation efforts and vetoing arbitration, they have caused the free alternatives to bargaining to fail. The only remaining choices are chaos and coercion.

There's no need for Congress to wait for Mr. Kennedy, who clearly would like nothing better than a chance to weasel out of decision.

There has to be someone with the guts to call a coal shovel a coal shovel.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Oil Lamp Inaugural

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, some 40 years ago, Vice President Calvin Coolidge was sworn in by his father as President of the United States in their family homestead at Plymouth Notch, Vt. It was, and will remain, a unique historical incident.

This swearing-in ceremony of the former Northampton, Mass., attorney, is vividly recounted in a recent article by Herbert A. Kenny in the Boston Sunday Globe of August 4, 1963. Very rarely, Mr. Speaker, do we find such an excellent reportorial summary of a major historical incident. Since Mr. Coolidge lived many of his formative years and later died in my congressional district, I am indeed happy to bring this column to the attention of my colleagues. This is also good history which the youth of the country can thrive on and I further hope that many Members will pass the article on to their families and friends.

The article follows:

OIL LAMP INAUGURAL

(By Herbert A. Kenny)

PLYMOUTH NOTCH, VT.—Forty years ago yesterday, at 2:47 a.m., Vice President Calvin Coolidge was sworn by his father as President of the United States in their family homestead here in a kerosene-lamp ceremony unique in American history for its homely drama.

The full measure of the sacred simplicity and significance of that farmhouse has never been taken in prose, poetry or painting.

The annual memorial exercises here yesterday afternoon had the same unsophisticated stamp as the ceremony itself.

But the deeper significances of it all are beginning to grow in the soul of an America where life has become as complicated as the innards of a guided missile.

Ten years later Calvin Coolidge was dead. His father, Col. John C. Coolidge, lived for 3 years after administering the oath. In those years John Coolidge, only surviving son of the President, never heard his father or his grandfather mention it.

"I can't recall that they ever did," he said reflectively at his summer home here on the eve of the anniversary, "certainly I never heard them. I was at Fort Devens, Camp Devens then, when it occurred. I was in the old CMTC. We were lining up for mess when an officer told me that Harding had died. I stayed at camp. I don't know why, it was hot, dirty, and dusty, a hellhole. Later, of course, I went to Washington, my brother was working in the tobacco fields down Northampton way, so neither of us was present."

But the historic scene itself was not a big thing to either of them. Over the years, John Coolidge acknowledges, he never reflected on it a great deal but does so more in recent years.

"I feel myself that the simplicity of it is all the more appealing as life becomes more complex around us.

"There's a nostalgia in us all for the American where that sort of thing could happen."

MINOR INCIDENT

Joe H. Fountain, now public relations counsel for the Canadian National Railways, is one of the two men alive who witnessed the ceremony. In 1923 he was editor of the Springfield (Vt.) Reporter. Years afterward he wrote a monograph called "Homestead Inaugural" and has recorded his recollections many times over the years.

But at the time he gave the news story only five paragraphs on the back page of his paper. He placed it over the news notes from Felchville which announced Mrs. Claude Wyman was recovering from the mumps, and beneath a clutch of classified advertisements. The lead story on the front page of the paper told of the death of the oldest man in Springfield.

Nor did the State of Vermont get wrought up about the site until Vrest Orton, author and country store owner, became head of the Vermont Historic Sites Commission.

In 1951, Gerald McLaughlin, successor to Joe Fountain as editor of the Springfield Reporter could write.

"Vermonters, who for 18 years have paid no attention to Plymouth Notch, birthplace and final resting place of Calvin Coolidge, 30th President, are taking lagging steps to rectify their neglect, etc."

Orton and others were critical of the overgrown condition of the grave of the President in the town cemetery.

TURNED OVER TO STATE

In 1957 shortly after the death of his mother, Mrs. Grace Goodhue Coolidge in Northhampton, herself a native of Vermont, John deeded the homstead to the State of Vermont to be maintained as a shrine.

He retained his present summer home, a quarter of a mile to the rear, also the birthplace of his grandfather close by, and the cheese factory founded by his grandfather which he revived since he retired from the printing business in Connecticut. His winter home is still Farmington, Vt.

The homestead stands across the street from the house where Cal was born and lived until his fifth year. This house contains a small general store run by Mr. and Mrs. Herman Pelkey who bought it from Florence V. Cilley who bought it from the President's father. They maintain it in taste and simplicity.

They refer to the house as the summer White House as well as the birthplace.

"Actually," John Coolidge says amiably, "the homestead was the summer White House, but then he did have an office over the store and his secretaries worked there with the mail. So it was the summer White House office. But he lived summers at the homestead."

Next to the homestead is another white frame dwelling that was the home of the President's uncle and aunt, John and Gratia Wilder, now a simple coffeehouse and tearoom run by the State of Vermont for pilgrims. The homestead stands between the Wilder house and the Plymouth Cheese Co.

On the opposite side of the street to the rear of the birthplace is the Union Christian Church, small, white, and distinctly New England, with an American flag posted in the pew where Coolidge sat.

LISTS NOT UNIFORM

Dispute still reigns over how many persons were present at that early morning inaugural. Some say six; some say seven. Coolidge himself made two lists, both of them incomplete. On one he left out Editor Fountain. But in another list he left out his own father.

Present, the best authorities ever, were Mr. and Mrs. Calvin Coolidge, Col. John C. Coolidge, Erwin Geiser, the President's secretary, Leonard L. Lane, a representative of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association; Editor Fountain, Congressman Porter Dale (in those days Vermont had two; and Joseph McInerney, Coolidge's chauffeur.

Some accounts put Lane outdoors, some put McInerney behind the screen door. Mark Drown, a taxi driver, who brought others up, and Herbert P. Thompson, commander of the Springfield Post of the American Legion, were definitely outside.

TOO SACRED

A number of newsmen had been present. When word of Harding's death came, Coolidge issued a brief statement and the newsmen fled to Ludlow to telephone their papers. The one telephone at Plymouth, in the store, was being held for Presidential business.

When the reporters were gone the famous ceremony took place.

The first reported to arrive on the scene after the ceremony was George Frederick Jones, of Rutland, now a probate judge, and in those days well known to Cal. He recalls winning the first interview and telephoning it to the Boston Globe.

When Jones spoke to Mrs. Coolidge of "the President," she replied, "Mr. Harding?" "No," said Jones, "President Coolidge." "I misunderstood," said Mrs. Coolidge, "you are the first one to refer to him that way."

Jones was sworn as a deputy marshal the next day to help Coolidge to the train at Rutland and off to New York where he changed to a train for Washington.

The reporters returned en masse to get the story of the inaugural. One untold incident reveals that Coolidge had a deep appreciation of the early morning ceremony.

A photographer from Boston, the late Morris Fineberg, asked him if he would reenact the scene with his father.

"No," said Cal laconically "too sacred."

But he couldn't remember who was present when he took the oath. Perhaps that was because of the sense of reverence that absorbed him.

In October of the same year, Arthur I. Kellett, an artist, was engaged to reproduce the scene in oils for a national magazine. He wrote to Fountain Jones and others who had some knowledge of the early morning scene.

"Mr. Coolidge," Kellett wrote Jones, referring to the President, "was more or less vague and uncertain in his memory on some important facts." Several hack reproductions were done, but nothing major. One pictured Colonel Coolidge wearing a collar and tie.

"My memory is distinct on that," says Judge Jones, "he wore no collar and no tie. He had on a shirt to which a collar could be attached but wasn't."

The Kellett picture appeared but never became famous.

"I had a copy of that picture for years," says John Coolidge, "but I don't know where it is now. The likenesses were no good, terrible as a matter of fact. I kept it over my desk for a while, but I can't remember what happened to it."

Perhaps 40 years is not enough to give history the same neat trimmed look the lawns now have around the Coolidge memorials at Plymouth Notch, an unspoiled and unexploited area, entered by an undulating drive past green forests and farms and two beautiful lakes.

Another 10 years and the farmhouse inaugural may assume heroic proportions in the public mind.

It would take a Grant Wood or an Andrew Wyeth to paint the picture the ceremony deserves, and a Henry Wadsworth Longfellow or a Robert Frost to celebrate it in verse. When it reaches the proportions it deserves in the hearts of Americans, that sort of immortal memorializing may commence.

By that time no Coolidges may be left in the ancestral halls after six generations.

The 14th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 12, 1963, issue of the U.S. News & World Report contains an outstanding editorial on the subject of the illegal 14th amendment. The editorial is entitled "Undoing a Fraud" and was written by the distinguished editor of the U.S. News & World Report, Mr. David Lawrence. In view of the fact that this editorial addresses itself to the need for congressional action with regard to the 14th amendment, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDOING A FRAUD

(By David Lawrence)

Few people realize that both Houses of Congress can at any time, by a majority vote, pass a resolution which would have the effect of declaring that the so-called 14th amendment is not a part of the Constitution. Such a joint resolution would not require the President's signature and would not even have to be submitted to the State legislatures.

This is the paradoxical status of the amendment which in 1868 was declared by resolution of Congress to have been legally ratified, when in fact it was not. Ohio and New Jersey were counted as having ratified the amendment, but actually each had withdrawn an earlier resolution of ratification and had adopted instead a formal resolution rejecting the amendment.

The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly refused to pass on this fraud. It ruled as recently as 1939, in the case of *Coleman* v. *Miller*, that disputes over ratification or rejection are "political questions" with which Congress alone can deal.

The facts in this strange sequence of events are perhaps best stated in a communication just prepared, after careful research, by an eminent lawyer, Everet C. McKeage of San Francisco. He was for 4 years a judge of the superior court there, and later general counsel and for two terms president of California's Public Utilities Commission, of which he is still a member. He is active in the American Bar Association. He writes to this editor as follows:

"In recent days, I have undertaken to review the acts of the Congress and also the proclamations of the Secretary of State and of the President of the United States with regard to this matter of the asserted ratification of the 14th amendment. The whole story is set out unequivocally in "15 United States Statutes at Large," at pages 700 to 711. The documents which appear in the "United States Statutes at Large" are documents of which all courts, Federal and State, must take judicial notice. Upon the face of these documents, it is clear and unequivocal that the 14th amendment was never lawfully adopted.

"This conclusion of mine assumes for this purpose that the asserted ratifications by the 'carpetbag' governments of the Southern States were valid ratifications. However, we know that these 'carpetbag' governments were not the lawful governments of the Southern States at that time and we also know that the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, required that the Southern States must ratify the 14th amendment as a condition precedent to 'readmission' into the Union. This requirement was unlawful and void, as any constitutional lawyer would conclude, and made such ratifications unlawful. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Texas* v. *White*, held that the Southern States were never out of the Union and, therefore, it could not be said that they were 'readmitted' to the Union. But, swallowing all of this fraud and corruption, the official records, to which I have referred, clearly reveal that the 14th amendment was not lawfully adopted.

"At the time that the 14th amendment was adopted, there were 37 States in the Union, including the 11 Southern States. Therefore, three-fourths of that number would be 27.75. Thus, it would require the ratification by 28 States to adopt the 14th amendment. On the 20th day of July 1868, the then Secretary of State, William H. Seward, pursuant to a request by the Congress, issued a proclamation with regard to the status of the pending ratification of the 14th amendment. The Secretary of State stated that 23 States had ratified the amendment and that six of the Southern States, by their newly established governments, had ratified the amendment, making a total of 29 ratifications.

"However, and this is most important, the Secretary stated that the States of Ohio and New Jersey, which had theretofore ratified the 14th amendment, had subsequently withdrawn their ratifications. He pointed out that if these withdrawals by Onio and New Jersey were valid, then the 14th amendment had not been adopted, but that if these withdrawals were unlawful and invalid, the amendment had been adopted.

"On the 21st day of July 1868, the Congress, by joint resolution, arbitrarily resolved that the 14th amendment had become a part of the Constitution of the United States and directed the Secretary of State to so proclaim. Obviously, the Congress proceeded upon nothing more than the information contained in the proclamation made by the Secretary of State which was furnished to the Congress on the previous day (July 20, 1868).

"The contention has been made that New Jersey and Ohio did not withdraw their ratifications of the 14th amendment until after a sufficient number of States had ratified the 14th amendment—three-fourths of the States—and had thus made it a part of the Constitution. This contention is refuted by the first proclamation of Secretary of State Seward. It was then that Congress arbitrarily resolved that the 14th amendment had been adopted, and instructed the Secretary of State to proclaim that fact.

"At pages 708 to 711 of '15 U.S. Statutes at Large' appears this first proclamation of July 20, 1868, which shows, at page 710, that the State of New Jersey ratified the 14th amendment September 11, 1866, and withdrew that ratification in April 1868.

"Also, at page 710, the same proclamation of the Secretary of State shows that the State of Ohio ratified the 14th amendment January 11, 1867, and withdrew that ratification in January 1868.

"Also, at the same page, the Secretary of State's proclamation shows that the State of Iowa ratified the amendment April 3, 1868; Arkansas, April 6, 1868; Florida, June 9, 1868; Louisiana, July 9, 1868, and Alabama, July 13, 1868.

"So, it will be seen that the required number of States had not ratified the 14th amendment—including both New Jersey and Ohio—at the time New Jersey and Ohio had withdrawn their ratifications.

"Including New Jersey and Ohio, the largest number of States claimed to have ratified the 14th amendment amounted to 29, 3 of which—Florida, Louisiana, and Alabama—ratified the amendment long after the withdrawal by New Jersey and Ohio of their ratifications. All this is shown in these documents to which I refer appearing at pages 700 and 711 of volume 15 of 'United States Statutes at Large.'

"These documents to which I refer are documents which the Supreme Court of the United States has held that courts will not go behind. All that the Supreme Court of the United States needs to do is to look at these documents which show on their face the fraudulent claim that the 14th amendment became a part of the Federal Constitution.

"There is a rule of law, not always adhered to by the Supreme Court of the United States, that courts will not go behind the official statements of the legislative branch of the Government but will accept the official statements as correct. However, this rule of law has the qualification that, if the invalidity of these official statements appears upon their face, the courts will so declare and so hold. All that any court has to do is to review these public documents, and the conclusion will be inevitable that the 14th amendment was not lawfully adopted.

"The Supreme Court of the United States has never said that this amendment was lawfully adopted. What it has said is that it will assume, without deciding, that the amendment was adopted. The Court has further held that the question as to whether or not the amendment was adopted is a 'political' one with which courts will not interfere."

Mr. McKeage points out that in 1962 the Supreme Court, which has always ruled that apportionment of Congress and State legislatures was a "political question," reversed itself and held that the courts have jurisdiction to interfere in such matters. He adds:

"Therefore, it is high time that the Supreme Court undertake to adjudicate this issue of the validity of the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution.

"There is a well-recognized rule of law that, where several persons are about to undertake a matter, until the required number of persons have signed the undertaking to make it binding, those who have signed may withdraw, but they may not withdraw after the required number have signed. In other words, New Jersey and Ohio, lawfully could withdraw their ratifications if the constitutional number of States had not ratified the 14th amendment at the time of such withdrawal.

"To illustrate: The whole number of States in the United States is 50. Three-

fourths would be 37.5, requiring 38 States to ratify a constitutional amendment today. Assume that 30 States had ratified and that, before the required 38 States had ratified, 15 of those 30 ratifying States withdrew their ratifications. Would any reasonable man contend that the proposed constitutional amendment would be adopted if 8 more States should ratify the amendment, notwithstanding the fact that 15 of the 30 States referred to had withdrawn their ratifications?

"This was the situation with the 14th amendment, although the margin was much narrower but the principle was the same.

"I believe that people generally are becoming aware of the fraud that was perpetrated upon the American people by the Reconstruction Congress."

If Congress, therefore, by a majority resolution, can declare ratified an amendment that really hasn't been approved by three-fourths of the States, then repeal of such a "ratification" can, by a subsequent resolution of Congress, similarly be voted.

But rather it would seem logical and fair for Congress, by a two-thirds vote, to resubmit the 14th amendment to all State legislatures. When this is done, a blemish and disgrace in American constitutional history will be removed. We will then be able to present to the world the image of a government that does not condone fraud but even after nearly 100 years is willing to atone for its sin.

Civil Rights: Public Accommodations Section

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there have been in the press suggestions that compromises will be necessary if any civil rights legislative package is to be passed this year.

An editorial in this morning's edition of the Washington Post, Mr. President, deals with these suggestions, saying that the entire civil rights package is designed to cure a disease, and if the medicine is weakened "the cancer will not have been excised."

I ask unanimous consent so that the editorial may printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVING THE PUBLIC

The purpose of the civil rights bill is to cure a disease, to remedy a wrong. If its medicine is too weak, its dosage inadequate, it will leave the patient still gravely ill, and the whole of the treatment will have been in vain. Judging from the substantial modification of the key public accommodations section of the administration measure now being discussed in Congress, there is serious danger that the medicine will be watered down to a mere nostrum.

It is important to recognize that the President's civil rights bill was, to begin with, a compromise. For all the fanfare with which it was introduced, it was an extremely moderate, and modest, measure. It embodied no real fair employment practice legislation. It provided for no inflexible denial of Federal funds to localities and enterprises engaging in racial discrimination. It was essentially placatory rather than punitive in approach. There was justification for this moderation—the justification of expediency that half a loaf is better than no bread, that a compromise civil rights law is better than no law at all. Vital concessions were made in the hope of forestalling a filibuster.

Now there is talk of seeking influential Republican support—the support of such Republican leaders as Senators DIRKSEN, HICKENLOOPER, and AIKEN—by exempting from the public accommodations section certain types of enterprise. The public accommodations section is now the heart of the administration bill. It represents an effort to outlaw the most cruelly humiliating and degrading aspect of racial discrimination—the denial of service to Negroes by business enterprises which offer service to the general public. It is this form of discrimination which, more than any other, has given rise to the demonstrations and disorders which at last goaded the conscience of the country to action.

A public accommodations section which exempts certain categories of business or exempts all enterprises beneath a specified size simply would not serve to eradicate this galling source of friction and bitterness from American life. For the plain fact is that racial discrimination is most prevalent and most flagrant in small establishments. It has its most painful and irritating impact in small towns where individuals choose to flaunt their spurious sense of racial superiority by denying service on the basis of color. Let these establishments continue to discriminate and the country will find itself still infested with racial hatred—and still plagued with racial strife and violence. The cancer will not have been excised.

For the Congress of the United States to say, moreover, that it will forbid racial discrimination in big businesses but will permit it in small businesses is to put a kind of Federal imprimatur of approval on the evil. It is to condone in part what ought to be extirpated root and branch.

There is real difference of opinion, to be sure, respecting the reach of congressional authority in this field. But this reach need not, and should not, be precisely defined in legislation. Congress can simply and unqualifiedly outlaw discrimination on grounds of race by all enterprises affecting interstate commerce and offering service to the general public, or otherwise within the constitutional reach of Congress, and it can, and should, leave determination of the law's scope to judicial reflection and decision. What is wanted from Congress in this situation is the plain assertion of a principle and the extension of that principle to its outermost constitutional bounds.

There is a chance at hand to cure an old and ugly and crippling national disease. That disease cannot be cured by poultices and potions. Only heroic measures will serve. In a land where all men are created equal, all men are entitled to be treated equally by their fellow men in all the public aspects of their lives.

Detroit Free Press and Russian Editors Trade Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee Hills, Detroit Free Press publisher and executive editor, is a double Pulitzer Prize winner and a past Pulitzer Prize judge. Last summer Mr. Hills headed a delegation from the American Society of Newspaper Editors on a trip to Russia. On his return he wrote a series of articles outlining his impressions. Boris Burkov, chairman of the board of Novosti Press Agency in Russia and secretary of the U.S.S.R. Journalists Union, commented on some of Mr. Hills' observations. Mr. Hills replied. Mr. Burkov took issue with several points in the reply, and Mr. Hills answered him. The Detroit Free Press of August 4, 1963, printed the following excerpts of this exchange:

MARCH 31, 1963.

DEAR MR. HILLS: I was glad to receive your letter and of the opportunity to continue our exchange of views, which you quite aptly called an attempt to bridge the ocean of mutual misunderstanding.

Of course, that is only a hyperbole. But perhaps we will manage at least to explore the route for a future bridge, which undoubtedly will be built sometime.

When you, my esteemed colleague, raise the question of freedom of the press, freedom of criticism in the Soviet Union, you ask a not quite appropriate question: "Did the Soviet press criticize the excesses of Stalin in the period of the personality cult?"

That is not according to the rules of fair-play, as the English say. You know full well that the period of the personality cult was characterized by an intolerant attitude toward criticism of any actions of Stalin. Had it been otherwise, there would obviously not have been the mistakes and tragic misuse of power.

I note that you, Mr. Hills, are inclined to put forward such questions, the only purpose of which is to place your partner in an uncomfortable position. I don't know if the classic example of this kind of question is known in America: "Have you stopped beating your wife—answer yes or no."

The notion "totalitarian system," which you peremptorily apply to my country, hardly contributes to our understanding. I would not want to cite for you, on this matter, the Soviet constitution and our other laws, which bear witness to the fact that the term "totalitarianism" can be applied to Soviet reality only by misinformed or unfriendly people. And I do not count you in either of these categories.

You continue to assert that the spirit of criticism is absent in the Soviet press. I can advise you to take any issue of any Soviet newspaper and become convinced that our press comes out daily against the most varied objective and subjective shortcomings in the economic, administrative, and cultural life of our society.

It goes without saying that this criticism is called upon to serve the common well-being, to help realize the policy of the government and the Communist Party.

Are you, Mr. Hills, an advocate of criticism for the sake of criticism? Of the kind of criticism which would not serve society? Obviously not.

You yourself mentioned that President Kennedy considers the press "an invaluable arm of the Presidency." In our country, Premier Khrushchev considers journalists as active assistants of the party, of the people. Isn't aid to the party and to the people a broader notion than aid to the President?

I would also like to make some corrections to your remarks concerning the sources of the arms race and the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States. You mentioned a concrete date, February 2, 1946, when Stalin allegedly declared a rebuilding of the Soviet armed forces aimed at the conquest of Europe.

Of course, even historians probably will not be able to determine the day or the specific

action which marked the beginning of the cold war. In any case, an infinite number of points of view on this subject are possible.

I personally, and many of my Soviet colleagues, believe that this unfortunate start was given by the speech of Churchill, new honored citizen of the United States of America, in Fulton, Mo. (Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech). That was, as you remember, an implacable, anti-Soviet policy speech.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Hills, to some other inaccuracies in your letter.

For example, you set forth, as if it were undisputed truth, a documentarily unconfirmed story that during the Korean war the conflict was started from the territory of the Korean Peoples Democratic Republic. If you could study the archives of American military intelligence, you would become convinced that the matter happened far differently.

I do not know, my dear Mr. Hills, what sources you used for such a "historical excursion." I carefully searched in Pravda and Red Star, the press organ of the armed forces, for information which would at least distantly confirm your thesis. I did not find anything of this sort in the Soviet newspapers.

On the contrary, I came across reports concerning the buildup of the U.S. 7th Fleet, and military construction which your country was carrying on in Greenland, in Alaska, in Saudi Arabia, in many parts of the present belt of American bases surrounding the Soviet Union.

You write, Mr. Hills, that in a speech published in Pravda on January 26, 1958, N. Khrushchev "spoke of the American bases then being built in Greece and Italy," and belittled their military significance, stating that they would not be ready for another 2 or 3 years, etc.

I reread that speech. Apparently your filing system is not completely in order. Khrushchev never pronounced the word Italy or the word Greece. He spoke of American bases abroad in general, emphasizing the danger which they posed for the cause of international peace.

Let us agree that if we are to quote important documents in the future, we will try to do it with the utmost accuracy.

Nevertheless, how can we bring about the building of relations between our countries on the basis of a firm conviction in the absurdity and impermissibility of atomic conflict?

You visited the Soviet Union and you know that our people hold the best of feelings toward the American people. I visited the United States, I saw that very few Americans actively hate the Soviet Union, while the whole of the American people welcome any sign of improvement in our relations.

So, there are trustworthy piers for a "bridge across the ocean" on both sides. As far as I am concerned personally, I am ready to work at that construction site as a common laborer, and I welcome any sound of the ax coming from your side.

In Moscow, winter was quite prolonged this year. There is still frost at the end of March. But still nature is beginning to claim her own. Doesn't it seem to you that the Soviet-American "winter" is too prolonged?

Sincerely yours,

BORIS BURKOV.

JULY 20, 1963.

DEAR MR. BURKOV: I was pleased to receive your delayed letter of March 31. I agree with you that our correspondence has tended to drift into a rather unfruitful argument over how to rearrange the bones of the dead past. Without conceding the essential rightness of our respective views, let us continue our exchange with an eye to the future instead of sterile recrimination.

As President Kennedy said in his speech on world peace at American University June 10: "We are not engaged in a debate, seeking to pile up debating points. We are not here distributing blame or pointing the finger of judgment. We must deal with the world as it is, and not as it might have been had the history of the last 18 years been different."

In your letter you described the friendly feelings which exist between the Soviet and American peoples. You called these feelings "piers for a bridge across the ocean."

Of course this is so, but it is not enough. You and I and almost all men, everywhere, share similar goals: Enough food to eat, a decent home, security for our loved ones, the right to think our own thoughts. But agreement on ends is only a small part of the task. It is necessary to work out practical methods to reach our common goals.

In this respect, I am glad that your government is willing to sit down and negotiate realistic solutions to our common problems. The discussions of a treaty to ban easily detectible nuclear tests in the atmosphere are certainly a helpful first step. Even though some would prefer a complete ban on tests safeguarded by a satisfactory system of inspection and control, let us do, now, what we can do.

As President Kennedy said in his June 10 address, your country and mine share one overwhelming interest—how to avoid the perils of mutual annihilation. Apparently the Chinese leaders do not share this interest, or at least do not seem to realize how important it is. We respect and applaud your efforts to open their eyes to the dangers that flow from their policies.

At the same time, I wish you could persuade your leaders of the hazard they are running by continuing to keep thousands of Soviet troops in Cuba.

According to some press reports, the number of Russian soldiers in Cuba has not been reduced and, in fact, may have been increased. Their presence is a constant irritant to the American people. It places my Government under heavy pressure to abandon its policy of patience.

I am sure you realize the power of public opinion in a country such as mine. Until your troops depart, and the Cuban people are allowed to work out their own destiny—under communism or democracy as they prefer—the danger of an explosion remains.

The Cuban question, Mr. Burkov, touches on the fundamental difference between us. We believe that we stand for freedom of choice. In the marketplace, in the university, and in systems of government, we want men to be free to choose what they want.

It is my impression, from my visit to your country and my reading, that your people, while not satisfied with everything about their life (neither are mine), are reasonably content with your socialistic system. So be it. It is not our intention to interfere with that, no matter how mistaken we may think you to be.

But what we do most earnestly object to is your effort to impose your system upon others without allowing them the freedom of choice.

It is true that Premier Castro was apparently welcomed with enthusiasm by the Cuban people when he marched into Havana. Indeed, many Americans welcomed him as a replacement for the dictator, Batista.

But now, the evidence seems overwhelming that millions of Cubans are unhappy with what Castro has done. The refugees who fill Miami are not malcontents, idle rich, or traitors to their people. They include the intellectual, professional, and technical elite of the island, as well as its humblest fishermen and farmers. More than 250,000 of them have already left Cuba, and another 350,000 have asked and received permission to enter the United States if they can find transportation.

(A population drain on the same scale would cost my country 7 million citizens, or take from the Soviet Union as many workers as were lost during the Second World War.)

The only way these Cubans can express their opposition to Castro is to flee—to vote with their feet—or to enter the desperate life of a guerrilla in the hills.

Let us agree to work for the day when the people of Cuba, of Vietnam, of Rumania, of Venezuela, of Poland, of Algeria—in short, of all countries, can choose freely the system under which they live.

And let us both strive, in our national life at home, to increase the freedoms of our own peoples.

In my country, I confess, we have much to do. A man without a job is not really free. A child without an opportunity for a good education cannot be free. A man with a black skin is, unfortunately, not always completely free. But we are trying to do better. I hope the Soviet press will report our efforts honestly, and not simply dwell on our failures, real though they may be.

In your country, in turn, there has been disurbing news in recent months of renewed restrictions on the free flow of ideas. As you remarked in your letter, the period of Stalin was characterized by an "intolerant attitude toward criticism." I earnestly hope that the outpouring of literature, art and music in the years after Stalin's death is not to be frozen once again in the ice of intolerance.

Your leaders preach "peaceful coexistence" and nonwarlike competition between our systems in the world at large. Yet how are we to believe you mean this if you refuse to permit "coexistence" and "competition" among ideas at home? Doesn't this sound like the man who demands privileges for himself when he is out of power, but denies them to others when he is in power?

I would like to call to your attention a most interesting statement by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the role of law.

"The purpose of law in a free society," he said, "is to enlarge freedom, by letting each know what kind of conduct to expect from the other. And it is through our laws that personal freedom is not only protected but constantly enlarged, so we can pursue our orbit with a minimum of collisions."

In other words, in our system, law is not a device to restrict freedom, to block new ideas or to sterilize the human spirit. Instead, in a marvelous paradox, it does precisely the opposite. If all men, in your country and mine, shared this conception of law, how much better life would be.

And why cannot the same spirit form the basis for our international relations? Freedom through law is surely preferable to the lawlessness of subversion, agitation and "wars of liberation" which inevitably cause "collisions" between our orbits.

For generations, we Americans have dreamed of "making the world safe for democracy." Your leaders dream of the eventual triumph of communism. On these matters we stand unalterably opposed.

But on this much we must agree: We must find ways, in the words of President Kennedy, at least to "make the world safe for diversity." Otherwise, there will be no safety, no democracy, no communism.

I send you my best regards, and hope to hear from you again.

Sincerely,

LEE HILLS.

A Tax Gimmick To Shun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., has printed in its July 22, 1963, issue an editorial elaborating on a point I made in one of my recent newsletters. This editorial is entitled "Senator THURMOND Points Out a Tax Gimmick To Shun." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR THURMOND POINTS OUT A TAX GIMMICK TO SHUN

Churches, charities, private institutions of higher learning, and such like, are the beneficiaries of generous giving. Through it they are able to maintain the vital services they render; and, justly enough, the Federal tax laws have been drawn—through the years—respectful of that generosity; yes, implementing it by provision for lawful deductions.

These laws until now also have exempted from Federal taxation the interest paid by taxpaying citizens, on their homes, or other transactions.

Under existing law, taxpayers may deduct from the amount of their income, subject to tax, all of the interest paid and the amount of contributions to churches and charities which does not exceed 30 percent of their adjusted gross income.

The Kennedy administration doesn't like that. It now proposes that only the amounts of contributions and interest which exceed 5 percent of adjusted gross income be deductible. That is its suggestion for a major change via its highly-touted tax "reform" bill.

Who would suffer under that arrangement? Well, the taxpayers, of course; and churches, charitable agencies, and other institutions deriving their support in large measure from generous contributors. It's a peculiar, yea eccentric, suggestion, on the part of an administration which proposes—on the other hand—an endlessly enlarged outlay for handouts all over the world. It is additionally peculiar, on the interest item, considering that Uncle Sam's own interest charge now runs to more than a tenth of the Kennedy-swollen budget.

Senator STROM THURMOND has put some facts in focus with the statistical explanation of what this proposal means: The nondeductibility of the "first 5 percent" includes the bulk of all contributions and interest. According to the Internal Revenue Service, based on 1963 returns, only on 19 percent of the returns filed were interest deductions in excess of this "first 5 percent" claimed. Also, only on 15 percent of returns filed were deductions for contributions in excess of this "first 5 percent" claimed.

A taxpayer who has an income of $8,000, can now deduct all the contributions he makes up to $2,400, and all the interest he pays. Under the Kennedy proposal, he could not deduct the first $400 in contributions, nor the first $400 in interest which he pays. In truth, "under this proposal, the taxpayer would not only have less incentive to make contributions to his church and charities, and to own his own home, but he would also have less money with which to do these things."

It is not enough to suggest that under these arrangements, normally, of individual responsibility the Government would just take over.

Political gimmicks are dangerous.

The House of Representatives has the constitutional authority to originate all tax legislation—responsible exclusively to the people it represents. When Congress exercises that authority * * * that assignment of trust, only then will the Nation be safe from the political idiosyncracies of the administration in power.

Kennedy Atmospheric Treaty Not the Eisenhower Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, former President Eisenhower on April 13, 1959, proposed a treaty banning atmospheric tests. Some people are arguing that this is equivalent to President Kennedy's proposal today. Nothing could be more irrational. In 1959 the Soviets clearly were behind in all phases of nuclear weapons development. Since that time they have conducted extensive series of tests, many more than the United States. It is now admitted they are ahead in high yield weapons and they claim to have solved the nuclear anti-missile-missile problems at a time when we are unable to make such a claim. Since the Eisenhower proposal, the Soviets have made a quantum jump ahead in areas which require testing in the atmosphere for the United States to catch up. Whereas the Eisenhower proposal would have frozen the United States in a leadership position, the ultimate effect of the Kennedy proposal is to freeze the U.S.S.R. in a leadership position. This is discussed in the following article by Columnists Evans and Novak in appearing in many newspapers on August 6:

INSIDE REPORT: ROSES AND THORNS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

All is not roses for President Kennedy's test ban treaty.

Certainly the odds right now are overwhelmingly in favor of Senate ratification, but there is a thorn or two—such as former President Eisenhower's refusal to endorse the treaty.

If General Eisenhower's inner doubts were known, they would come down to this: When he proposed a noninspection atmospheric test ban on April 13, 1959, the Russians had not yet exploded their 1961–62 series of giant bombs in the high-megaton range. Furthermore, the former President would pointedly note that his 1959 proposal—which, of course, Moscow rejected—did not ban testing in outer space.

Accordingly General Eisenhower would assert that conditions are vastly different than they were in 1959.

This leads to the second thorn—the refusal of Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, senior Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, to go to Moscow for the treaty signing. He was not specifically invited. No President or Secretary of State will risk an invitation of this kind unless its acceptance is certain. HICKENLOOPER made it clear, several weeks ago, that he would send regrets.

HICKENLOOPER's refusal tells a lot about the automatic political response of the conservative Republicans to the new treaty. At the weekly GOP policy committee luncheon last Tuesday he surprised some of his colleagues with 15 minutes of forensics in which he seemed to challenge all Republican senators (without success) to stay away from the treaty-signing ceremony. His argument: The Republican Party had an obligation to remain uncommitted until all the evidence was in.

The evidence HICKENLOOPER wants is precisely the evidence former President Eisenhower wants: How the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the scientists, and the lab men feel about the treaty. One crucial witness, for instance, will probably be Dr. John S. Foster, director of the famed Livermore Laboratories in California.

President Kennedy had a long conversation with Dr. Foster in the White House last week, exploring the black art of nuclear testing and all its ramifications. One question they discussed was what would happen if the Russians, with or without a pretext, broke the treaty and launched an immediate series of tests in the atmosphere. How much time would elapse before the United States could match the Russians and resume atmospheric testing? Six months? One year?

The Hickenlooper Republicans have no intention of committing themselves until they know whether the answers to such technical questions might give them a solid point of attack on the treaty.

Liberal Republicans condemn this as a dog-in-the-manger attitude. As one of them said: "You can't beat peace with a nothing policy." Another remarked that GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, the two Republicans who agreed to go to Moscow despite HICKENLOOPER's challenge, went not as supporters of the treaty but as witnesses to the signing.

In a purely political context, however, the correct position for the opposition party may be Hickenloopers: Skeptical, critical, and alert for boobytraps.

The thorns are not all in the opposition party. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, also declined a proffered invitation to go to Moscow. If RUSSELL should oppose the treaty, his great influence would find allies both inside and outside the South.

These then are the reasons for the administration's elaborate pains to build an irresistible case for the treaty. In fact, some Republicans complain that their mail has "the earmarks of a propaganda campaign."

In the end, the thorns may prove no more than minor irritations, unless the Republicans are able to locate that solid point of attack. If they do not, it will be difficult to vote against the "mother and children lobby." It is not inconceivable that even Senator BARRY GOLDWATER would find it hard to vote "no" without serious damage to a Goldwater presidential candidacy.

U.S. Deal With Cuba Revealed by Representative Cramer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, my able colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], re-

cently made the startling revelation that Castro selected half of the 4,100 Cuban refugees who entered this country on the five ships which hauled the ransom goods to Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER also revealed that of the 2,000 Cuban refugees handpicked by Castro, only 20 were denied admission to this country. Neither of these statements have been denied by the State Department. Instead, the State Department pointed to Mr. CRAMER's revelation as "academic" since, according to the State Department, "all persons leaving Cuba by legal means must have an exit permit issued by the Cuban regime."

Mr. Speaker, this is an amazing admission of concessions to and deals made with Castro. It means that Castro, not the United States, dictates who enters this country from Cuba.

I share my colleague's grave concern over this clandestine deal which evidences a slipshod security check on the refugees entering this country and which adds validity to the charges that many Castro agents have entered this country as refugees.

I too am alarmed at the secret negotiations and behind-the-scene machinations that have been going on between this country and Soviet-Cuba. I believe Mr. CRAMER should be lauded for bringing this deal to light.

In line with this, I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent editorial which appeared in the July 31, 1963, issue of the Tampa Tribune.

The editorial follows:

MORE RANSOM FOR CASTRO

The U.S. Government refuses to recognize Fidel Castro as the true ruler of Cuba, and rightly so. Diplomatic relations with Cuba were severed during the Eisenhower administration and U.S. troops were on the point of invading the island last fall when Castro permitted the establishment of Soviet nuclear missiles on his soil directed at the heart of America.

Washington has cut off virtually all trade with Cuba, frozen Cuban Government assets in this country, and has announced that it intends one day to see the island freed of communism.

Despite this, the Government seemingly continues to make under-the-table deals with Castro.

The Kennedy administration propounded the myth that it had nothing whatever to do with the blackmail scheme under which Castro was paid $53 million worth of food and medicines in exchange for the lives of 1,100 rebels captured in the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion. Yet it is well known that New York Attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the deal, was working closely with the Government and that the Kennedy administration pressured U.S. pharmaceutical and food processing firms into contributing the ransom goods.

Now Pinellas Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER has charged, without direct denial from the State Department, that the United States acceded to Castro's demand that he be permitted to select 50 percent of the 4,100 refugees who were brought to this country on the five ships which hauled the ransom goods to Cuba.

CRAMER said the agreement supposedly was made to obtain the release of 900 American citizens in Cuba.

A State Department spokesman says the question raised by CRAMER is "academic," because all refugees brought out of Cuba must have exit permits from Castro and security clearance by the United States. He did not specifically deny the 50-50 agreement.

"Academic?" We wonder.

The humanitarian instincts of Fidel Castro are not so acute that he was anxious to release a particular group of refugees from the rigors of his regime. While Castro may have used the agreement to export those whose property he wanted to confiscate, it can be suspected that his main motive was to slip an army of his agents into the United States, either to work against the best interest of this country or to disrupt the efforts of displaced Cubans to form an effective force for the eventual overthrow of his regime.

Congressman CRAMER says that of the thousands of refugees who came into the country under the ransom deal, only 20 were turned down or ordered to return to Cuba. The current activities of the other hundreds picked by Castro should be of more than passing interest to U.S. security forces.

Of greater concern to Congress, however, should be the question of who approved the alleged deal with Castro and why. Paying ransom in money and goods is bad enough, but paying it in license for Communist agents to enter this country by the hundreds is far worse. This is folly of such proportions as to warrant an immediate congressional inquiry.

Study the Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier properly comes to the defense of those Members of the other body who have refused to be stampeded into a premature judgment on the partial nuclear test ban treaty.

As the Courier asks: "Is Wanting To Study Treaty Wrong?" Of course it is not, and it is indeed shocking that irresponsible attacks would be made against those who merely want to scrutinize the treaty carefully before taking a stand.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared in the August 2 issue of the Courier:

IS WANTING TO STUDY TREATY WRONG?

The Courier believes that the test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow should be ratified. In our view, it involves no confidence in the good intent of the Russians but merely verbalizes existing areas of self-interest. The possibilities of a Soviet double-cross, while they exist, are less risky than continued contamination of the atmosphere.

But we are also shocked at the outrageous attacks being made in Iowa and elsewhere on Senator B. B. HICKENLOOPER, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN because they refused to join the group of American officials traveling to Moscow for the formal signing of the treaty. Because they don't want to be stampeded into a premature judgment on the treaty, they are being attacked as John Birchites and blind reactionaries.

This talk may be typical of political debate; but it is significant that those who protested most loudly during the McCarthy era at the labeling of "liberals" as Communists now are engaged in an equally reckless campaign to tag every conservative a John Birchite. This type of attack would be bad enough if HICKENLOOPER and DIRKSEN had announced they would oppose the treaty. But it is almost incredible when all they have done is say they want to study it carefully before taking a stand.

Headlong and unthinking American idealism—commendable as it may be from one standpoint—has in the past led to trouble. The Washington Naval Treaty of 1922, for example, allowed Japan naval supremacy in the Pacific and, although it expired at the end of 1936, slowed American preparation for the two-ocean war which it faced in 1941. The treaty reduced the armament burden for 15 years; but it created the dangerous conception in the United States that it was safe to allow Japan naval supremacy in the Pacific as long as our total two-ocean strength was greater. World War II proved the fallacy of that concept, although the Pearl Harbor debacle intensified the disaster.

Likewise, the real danger in the test-ban treaty is not in what it accomplishes—which is very little—but in the erroneous conception of American-Soviet relations which it may create in the minds of unthinking and poorly informed citizens. The treaty only represents a small area of common interest during a period when the Communists will continue to wage war against us by all feasible means. A full Senate debate on the treaty will serve to emphasize this point and will help to put the matter in its proper context.

We suspect that HICKENLOOPER will ultimately vote for the treaty; but he wants to prevent any headlong stampede toward the public belief that American security can be protected by worthless scraps of paper. The Russians will honor the terms of the treaty only so long as they think it is in their self-interest; and it should be ratified only on this assumption.

Vocational Education Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, today over 70 million Americans are gainfully employed and how pleased we are that this country is prospering. But unfortunately there are many who are not employed and of these there are those who are not employed because they are not trained to perform the jobs which are available. The committee's report indicates that 2.6 million young people are seeking employment; that the number of older workers continues to increase; that training and retraining opportunities are needed to obtain employment.

The fact is that we have had great changes in our employment picture. It is true that once brawn and will were sufficient to insure man a place in industry. Now special skills are needed for almost any job in the plant. These skills must be developed and training is necessary. Unfortunately, funds for

facilities, equipment, and teachers are severely limited in vocational education high schools and area school programs.

This bill is a step in the right direction and it has my wholehearted support. The bill has strong bipartisan support, including the support of the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK. It is a recognition of a pressing problem. It is an effort to solve that problem. I hope the bill will pass.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Re House Resolutions 14 and 15.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Our thanks go to you for putting Resolutions 14 and 15 for Special Committee on Captive Nations to the House Rules Committee. Since 1960 the committee hasn't put this resolution on the floor for debate.

We are writing to our Congressman and Congressman Smith to help you in passing this resolution through the Rules Committee.

Our support goes with you in this vital matter.

Very truly yours,

KRIKOL MOORADIAN.

BEDFORD, MASS.

Re passage of House Resolutions 14 and 15 Captive Nations' Committee establishment.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The above bill submitted by you sometime in 1960 is of very great interest to me.

As a naturalized American, I favor its passage. The establishment of this committee is a positive step toward bringing to light the position of those captive nations, of which Armenia is one, which have been swallowed up by the Soviet Union.

I want to commend you for its introduction and also for your continued efforts to obtain its passage.

I am also writing to Congressman SMITH urging him to take whatever steps are necessary to release this bill from the Rules Committee and on to the House floor for debate.

Very truly yours,

VAHUN TOPPION.

HAVERHILL, MASS.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Your House Resolutions 14 and 15 calling for a committee on captive nations deserves to be released to the floor for debate and eventual passage.

It is our hope that this be accomplished soon. We thank you for your interest.

Very truly yours,

ALEXANDER TERZION.

HAVERHILL, MASS., *June 3, 1963.*

MAY 31, 1963.

Re House Resolutions 14 and 15, bill to establish Captive Nations Committee.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Just a note of deserved praise and sincere thanks on your introduction of the above bill to Congress. Although the bill is presently at a standstill, we urge you to use your influence and good judgment in helping to get it out of the Rules Committee and on to the House floor for debate. We are certain that other elected officials realize the importance and immediate necessity of a Committee on Captive Nations.

Most sincerely,

SARA VOSGARICHIAN.

HAVERHILL, MASS.

JUNE 19, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you in order to request quick action on House Resolution 14 dealing with the setting up of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. As the chairman of the Committee on Rules I believe your influence can do much to speed this resolution into action.

From the latest information available on the matter, I am lead to believe that there are about 33 legislative proposals by various Members of the House requesting the establishment of such a committee. Since the House is always considered as the pulse of the people, there can be no doubt to the popular support of this resolution has obtained.

I also hope that you could ask the President, in accordance with a resolution passed by Congress in 1959, to declare the third week of July as Captive Nations Week.

I wish to thank you for the time and consideration you have given my request. Further action on this matter would be in the interests of our own Nation as well as the free world.

Sincerely yours,

A. VAITKUS.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL.

Opposition to Racial School Transfers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, my attention has been called to two articles from northern newspapers which give an indication of the thinking of the people outside the South on the great lengths to which integrationists are going in order to force total integration of the races. One article is entitled "The People Speak: North Increases Opposition to Racial School Transfers" and was printed in the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia, Pa., on August 1, 1963. The other article is from the Long Island Press of July 28, 1963, and is entitled "Many Deplore Sorting Pupils by Skin Color." This latter article which consists of a poll by Jack Boyle, director of "What America Thinks" shows 86 percent of the public is opposed to the "arbitrary movement of Negro children to white area schools and vice versa."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both of these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., Aug. 1, 1963]

THE PEOPLE SPEAK: NORTH INCREASES OPPOSITION TO RACIAL SCHOOL TRANSFERS

(By Samuel Lubell)

A quite strong protest is kicking up among white parents in northern cities against proposals to transport their children to predominantly Negro schools as a way of breaking down segregation.

This protest is all the more impressive since it comes even from mothers and fathers who on other questions declare, "Negroes have waited too long for their rights."

In the Canarsie section of Brooklyn, N.Y., the young wife of a salesman declared, "Segregationists are sick people."

Asked about the school transfer, she replied:

"I'm against shifting our children around like pawns. It's not a question of integration. I don't want my child sent to school in a slum with drunks all around. I don't care whether these drunks are pink or yellow, black or white."

A TOUCHY ASPECT

Again in Orange, N.J., a luncheonette owner said, "Negroes should get everything they ask for except this one thing."

The question of moving white and Negro children between schools to correct racial imbalance seems to be building up into the touchiest aspect of the whole civil rights agitation in the North.

Repeatedly the same protest was voiced.

"Our husbands slaved for years so we could get our children out of a bad environment. Now they want to send our kids back to the neighborhoods of filth and squalor that we worked so hard to leave."

SOME TORN BY CONFLICT

With few exceptions, the white families interviewed during recent weeks in 11 States think racial trouble will get worse in the future rather than die down.

Asked how they feel about the Negro demonstrations, roughly 4 out of 10 say, "Negroes deserve their rights." Another third protest, "They're pushing too far." The remaining fourth are torn in conflict.

Some of these who sympathize with the Negro cause say, "I never thought much about it before, but when I saw those dogs in Birmingham I knew something had to be done."

But others who have been pro-Negro in the past now say, "I'm afraid." A musician's wife in New York City confided, "If I were a Negro I'd feel the way they do. But those demonstrations scare me."

SOME HAVE DOUBTS

In northern cities, criticism of the demonstrations runs strongest among older people and in Catholic neighborhoods. In rural areas the controversy is remote. Often a farmer would say, "The South is short on Negro rights, but it's not for us to tell the southerners what to do."

Two of every three white families interviewed think that Congress should pass President Kennedy's civil rights proposals. However, even persons who display no racial hostility are troubled about "how far should the law go in limiting the rights of private property?"

Others maintain, "Laws aren't the answer. You can't legislate morality."

CANNOT MAKE FRIENDS

Three of the white neighborhoods I visited have schools into which Negro children have been transferred during the past year. A few persons told me, "It's good for white children to act as examples to Negroes."

But generally, the white parents argue, "That bus money should be spent on better teachers" or, "Those children have to go back right after school. They can't make any friends here."

An 18-year-old Brooklyn girl recalled, "They transferred one of these Negroes into my class. He always sat by himself, even in the auditorium. He was so lonely."

NATURAL APPROACH FAVORED

A lawyer's wife pointed out that in her daughter's school the children are divided into brighter and slower classes.

"The slower classes are mostly Negroes," he said, "so they are segregated all over again."

In other cases, the intensity of feeling seems to reflect how large a proportion of Negro children are brought into the schools.

A New Jersey high school teacher pointed out:

NEGROES ARE DIVIDED

"We have seven Negro families on our block. Their children go to our school. This is gradual integration. We should not bring more Negroes in by bus."

The Negroes interviewed divide on the wisdom of these pupil transfers.

In two Philadelphia neighborhoods, the split was almost even. Some felt Negro parents should be able to send their children to "any school they want to." Others were worried that "teachers in white neighborhoods may not like Negro children. Here the Negro children are liked by their teachers."

A Harlem taxicab driver shook his head vigorously as he said, "I don't like using kids to fight these battles."

[From the Long Island Press, July 28, 1963]

MANY DEPLORE SORTING PUPILS BY SKIN COLOR

(By Jack Boyle)

An overwhelmingly large majority (86 percent) of the public, including a substantial portion of those who are basically sympathetic to the aims of desegregation, are opposed to the arbitrary movement of Negro children to white area schools and vice versa. The conclusion is based upon a nationwide cross-section survey of Americans by "What America Thinks."

This remedy for overcoming segregation brought about by housing patterns has been prescribed for the Malverne School District. In some cases where courts ordered local school boards to attain greater racial balance in schools, the boards would have to either make wholesale transfers or build new schools in different locations and abandon old ones.

Included, of course, in the national poll were the unalterable segregationists. Among the moderates and the desegregationists, including a substantial portion of Negroes, many shades of opinion were offered. Some are advocates of gradualism, some feel it is a bad thing for the children of both races. Many believe the increased costs of either transportation or new schools might be better spent on improved education across the board.

The question asked a national cross section of Americans was—"In some northern cities it has been suggested that in order to attain a racial balance in some schools that Negro pupils be transferred to preponderately white schools and white pupils to preponderately Negro schools. Would you approve or disapprove of such an arrangement?

The responses reported in percentages were:

	Percent
Disapprove (against transfers)	86
Approve (for transfers)	10
No opinion	4

"It would be better to gradually integrate and not do anything rash to bring on new troubles and inconveniences for both races," replied a midwest attorney.

A Mountain States secretary: "I think the idea is stupid since if left alone time will work this out."

"It would be inconvenient for both races and would not accomplish anything. It is completely impractical," replied an architect and builder from New England. A California high school teacher, a woman: "There is no reason to support artificiality of an arrangement no matter what race, religion or creed is involved." An Illinois male student said "It could set off a lot of unnecessary trouble. I think the schools should somehow be desegregated but I don't think this is the way to do it."

A Washington, D.C., oil salesman remarked: "It would simply create more publicity and agitation and I think that this has done more to stop or hinder integration than anything the people have done, white or black." A west coast real estate broker: "It might be practical at the high school or junior college level but not grammar school. The political parties, according to the Supreme Court, are not supposed to gerrymander so why should it be considered for schools?"

"In most situations, either North or South, this would mean either extra costs for buses or new schools. If more money is to be spent it should be used for better education and schooling for both whites and Negroes," retorted a Wisconsin grocer. A southern magistrate: "Where this was done it could not help but make the children, both white and Negro, even more race conscious, which is the very thing we are trying to avoid."

Is the Test Ban Treaty a Step Toward Peace or Toward Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, the Oakland Tribune, a newspaper published by former Senator William F. Knowland, of California, ran the following thoughtful editorial under the title: "Toward Peace or Disaster"?:

TOWARD PEACE OR DISASTER?

Virtually everyone in the United States desires a genuine peace, if it can be secured with honor, and without jeopardizing the security of the citizens of this country and the West.

Thus, the proposed test ban treaty, which is awaiting ratification by the Senate, must be assessed in the light of two major considerations: Whether it would advance the cause of peace, and whether it would preserve the security of the free world.

An overriding consideration, moreover, is whether it provides a superior alternative to the nuclear standoff which now causes men to dread war more than at any other time in history. If the treaty should erode that dread, or cause an imbalance of power, it could be disastrous.

Let us examine, first of all, the question of security. We are being asked to accept a treaty which has no provision for on-site inspections of possible nuclear blast areas. We are being asked to accept the word of technicians that on-site inspections are not necessary, except in the case of underground explosions, because existing monitoring equipment, which measures sound waves, heat waves, radioactivity and concussions, is adequate.

It may be true that at this time nearly all tests except those underground can be detected. But will this technological condition prevail 5, 10 or 20 years hence? At present, scientists are learning a great deal about concealing explosions and making "clean" bombs. It is possible that technology could rapidly nullify much of the science upon which the current treaty is founded. Obviously, the only type of policing that would stand the test of time is unlimited on-site inspections.

The danger of a treaty with inadequate inspection provisions is precisely this: Historically, we abide by such treaties, while the Soviet Union doesn't. Thus, American nuclear technology could be retarded or frozen, while the Soviets' technology would forge ahead.

Apparently, neither power now has an antimissile missile. Such missiles use a nuclear blast to knock down opposing missiles in the upper atmosphere. If the ban were to halt our own antimissile development, while permitting the Soviets furtively to develop their own, the day would come when the Soviet Union would be virtually immune to our power, while we stood with bared breast before Soviet rockets. Such an imbalance—caused by inadequate inspections—would be conducive to war.

The very fact that the treaty does not ban underground testing is a danger in it-

self. Americans traditionally live by the spirit as well as the letter of the law. Future U.S. administrations would be loath to test underground, simply because the Nation would be circumventing the spirit of the treaty. But the Soviets are under no such moral compunctions, and would undoubtedly test if they thought they could get away with it.

Yet another danger is that the treaty does not include Red China and France. There is little probability that either of these potential nuclear powers will become a signatory to the treaty in the foreseeable future. That means, bluntly, that while U.S. nuclear technology stagnates, or at best advances without benefit of tests, other nations will be gaining ground. This is a particularly vital point because the United States could not hope to amass armies the size of those of the Communists, and must rely upon nuclear superiority just to stay even.

One real question is whether the treaty would actually be a step toward peace, or whether it would be the lightning rod which might draw down the bolt of nuclear war upon mankind. Where there's a lack of concrete facts, there's suspicion. Where there's no means of proving or disproving your suspicions that your opponent is cheating, you suspect the worst. It is easy to see how a treaty with inadequate inspections could become the very escalator to war that everyone dreads.

If one side suspects, but can't prove, the other side is cheating, it might furtively begin to cheat itself. Which would quickly arouse the suspicions of the other side and cause it to step up its own testing. Soon there would be charges and countercharges, open testing, and threats of retaliation. A foolproof inspection system could avoid such an eventuality.

Until the Soviet Union is willing to admit inspection teams, just as the United States has offered to do, the test ban pact must be regarded as more of a Soviet cold war stratagem than an effort to pacify the world. Its purpose is to weaken American resistance and calm the world's anxieties so that the Soviet Union can conduct relentless campaigns of sabotage and terrorism against the free nations of the world.

It will be argued that the treaty should be ratified in any case, because peace can be achieved only by taking small steps. But accepting on-site inspections is the very first step; the absolute minimal guarantee that the Soviets are willing to abide by the treaty. Anything less than on-site inspections is not a true step at all, but an attempt to delude the West. Any nation, after all, which sincerely desires to disarm should be willing to allow inspections in exchange for the right to inspect other nations.

Surely any genuine move toward peace would be most welcome. But the present effort isn't genuine. Beneath the golden promises is the base lead of deceit. It would be a mistake to ratify a treaty which might move the world closer to war, and dull the talons of the American eagle.

The REA and Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a highly significant editorial appeared in the August 1 issue of the Harvard, Ill., Herald, one of the leading newspapers in my district of which Lowell Ney is the editor. The editorial emphasizes what I have said heretofore on the floor of this House about continuation of the Rural Electrification Administration. This agency has fulfilled its purpose and steps should now be taken to terminate its functions, particularly its new and expanded activities in urban areas and with respect to commercial and industrial electrification services as well as with respect to generating and transmitting electric power.

I commend this editorial which follows, to the attention of my colleagues and to the citizens of the Nation:

THE REA AND US

Harvard area farmers who showed their independence from government by voting "no" on the recent wheat referendum now have the opportunity to show further independence. There's a new bill in Congress, sponsored by Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, to compel the REA (Rural Electrification Administration) to obtain its loan money on the open market, instead of being favored with a 2-percent rate while the Government pays 4 percent for all other money.

On the Senate floor, Senator LAUSCHE said: "98 percent of all farms already have electric service; four of every five new customers added to the REA system are non-farm power users; and more than half of the total power sales of the systems now are being made to non-farm users."

This whole area has never had the chance to benefit from these low REA rates. And we never will. The REA, like so many other Government welfare agencies, has outlived the usefulness it had when it was set up in 1936. Meanwhile, the taxpayers continue to subsidize favored areas that are still under the REA—getting Government loans at 2 percent.

So local farmers, who said "No" to the wheat deal, are within their rights to urge passage of this bill which will at least put the REA on a more competitive basis with private power. And from all that is being said about the REA, the country could benefit by its gradual dissolution. It served a fine and noble purpose in the past. But the past is past. Our Government needs to concern itself about the income tax which affects all the people and is a hard burden for every wage earner to bear.

The CAB Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star regarding the Civil Aeronautics Board decision which could have severe effects on the airline industry. In recounting the 3 to 2 decision, the editorial states that "one man may have set the stage to put Northeast Airlines out of business." I have asked the Department of Justice to look into this ruling, and I trust the Department will consider the serious consequences. I agree fully with the editorial and trust that my colleagues will benefit from its precise reasoning:

CRASH LANDING

With the stroke of a pen, so to speak, one man may have set the stage to put Northeast Airlines out of business. This, without undue exaggeration, could turn out to be the practical result of the recent 3 to 2 decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the New York to Miami case.

The announcement containing the bad news did say that "the Board is prepared to subsidize Northeast's operations north of New York City as soon as Northeast ceases operations south of New York." This, if one may say so, misconceives the fact. The CAB can't subsidize anything. If Northeast, shorn of the relatively lucrative Miami run business, continues to serve New England on a subsidized basis, the public, not the CAB, will foot the bill for the subsidy. Let's be very clear on this point. And as long as the public can stand the gaff, any kind of uneconomic operation, or any kind of bureaucratic mismanagement, can be kept afloat. Just keep those subsidies coming in.

From the record, it would appear that there simply hasn't been enough business on the Florida run to support operations by three airlines. Northeast and Eastern, on their entire operations, have been losing heavily. The news reports don't give details with respect to the third line, National, but presumably it isn't getting rich. The anticipated revenues simply haven't materialized, and so Northeast, being the last one in, becomes the first to be bounced out. Presumably Eastern and National, at least in this area, will do nicely with the field to themselves.

Northeast has its headquarters in Boston, and Massachusetts Senators KENNEDY and SALTONSTALL have asked the Department of Justice to look into the CAB ruling. The Department says it will do so.

One may doubt that much will come of this. For the CAB, which recently refused to permit a merger of Eastern and American, presumably has ample authority to squeeze Northeast out of the Florida business, even though it overruled its own hearing examiner in doing so. Still, this was a 3 to 2 ruling. And if a person really believes in the concept of competition and survival of the fittest, this is an awful lot of economic power to put in the hands of one man.

Earl W. Mann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Earl W. Mann, an outstanding citizen of the city and county of Denver, was a fellow officer of our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, during World War I. Mr. Mann's health was broken as a result of his service in the Army. It was necessary for him to come to Colorado for his health.

During the past 40 years, Earl Mann has taken an active part in the civic affairs of the city and county of Denver and the State of Colorado. He served for several terms as a member of the Colorado General Assembly. He was always forthright in dealing with the racial problems. He has made outstanding contributions to this cause. Recently the Rocky Mountain News placed the follow-

ing letter in their paper, and I direct this to your attention:

TIMELY

EDITOR: Your editorial, "Flimsy Argument," is not only timely but was extremely well written.

The irony of the present racial revolution in America lies in the failure of our political leadership to recognize, to realize, the importance of demonstrating to the world the value of Christian brotherhood. Twenty million citizens of America cannot be denied their constitutional rights without severe prejudice to America.

Nothing in my life has been more disheartening than the discovery of how high office-holding eats into the character and souls of human beings—with rare exceptions.

In the present revolution some sort of violence is unavoidable between violence and nonviolence. The NAACP and other organizations seeking a solution to the tremendous problem of getting rid of racial discrimination in politics and places of public accommodation it is but natural that various means and measures be resorted to to attain this objective.

In this respect it is the duty of decent newspapers and decent citizens alike to fight for clean politics, and respect for the laws governing our great commonwealth.

To those who may be reluctant to accept the transitions now taking place—who were fortunate in the enjoyment and security of the order of yesteryear—bear in mind that it was the order in which the great tyrant of Europe was bred, in which he found a ready audience for the evil doctrines separating races, which doctrine brought anarchy without precedent.

EARL W. MANN.

The Enrico Fermi Award to Dr. Robert Oppenheimer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a brief but eloquent editorial warning from the Camden Chronicle, of Camden, S.C., dated July 29, 1963. The editorial is entitled "Changing Climate." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING CLIMATE

Alger Hiss, the State Department whiz kid who played a part in the infamous Yalta deal with Stalin and was convicted of perjury in 1951 for denying his participation in a Communist spy ring, has told the British public via transatlantic telephone and BBC radio that the present mood in this country might permit new consideration of his case leading to a Presidential pardon.

It well could be, in view of the astonishing award this year of the $50,000 Enrico Fermi prize by the Atomic Energy Commission to Dr. Robert Oppenheimer who was stripped of his security clearance in 1954 for his intimate association with Communists and fellow travelers and for his "falsehoods, evasions and misrepresentations."

It is customary for the Enrico Fermi Award winner to receive his fifty thousand tax-free dollars out of the U.S. Treasury at the hands of the President in a White House ceremony. So far as is presently known, no date has been set thus far for such a performance. If the President does go through with it, however, rather than finding a less embarrassing means of conveying the prize, this could well be taken as an indication that Mr. Hiss is right in his evaluation of the times.

If we are ready now to regard playing around with Commies as a boyish prank, Hiss may not only be pardoned but restored to his State Department eminence.

A Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Members of Congress will have an opportunity to hear a State Department briefing by the Honorable John Kenneth Galbraith, retiring Ambassador to India, who will report first-hand on the developments in India.

In connection with the commendable record which Mr. Galbraith established during his tour of duty in India, I take great pleasure in putting into the RECORD an article from the Indian Express, which was published in the India News recently:

A GREAT AMBASSADOR

When on arrival at the White House in 1961, President Kennedy was gathering around him his team of Frontiersmen from Harvard and disposing of them, it is said Professor Galbraith preferred and pleaded that he be sent to India as Ambassdor. He thought there was a job of work to be done there and that he could be of most use for the Kennedy administration in New Delhi. A full month's delay intervened between the announcement of the appointment and Professor Galbraith's actual departure for India, as the President needed his services in Washington during those early formative days of the new administration.

The economics professor at Harvard was so excited about it and so much looked forward to his assignment in New Delhi that, it was said, he elaborately prepared for it during the interregnum. And it must be stated that New Delhi, to which he was no stranger, was equally excited and eagerly looked forward to receiving him.

During the hectic and crucial 2½ years that Professor Galbraith has been his country's ambassador in ours, those expectations on either side, we daresay, have been more than fulfilled. Professor Galbraith's obiter dicta, which he scattered up and down our country's plains like fruitful seeds, would be long treasured up by the Yojana Bhavan (which houses the planning commission) in New Delhi. Though he grumbled about the inhibitions imposed by his diplomatic post, he expressed his views about Indian problems fairly freely, and it is a tribute to his intellectual integrity that Indians took it in good part.

His frank criticism of the unenterprising manner in which our public sector enterprises are being run and his advice against post office socialism were accepted gratefully, though to what extent it was implemented is another matter. He bluntly told Indians: "The controversy of public versus private sector is meaningless in an underdeveloped country like India." He emphasized to another Indian audience: "Development is a democratic task. It will proceed only if the masses are enlisted, and they can be enlisted only if they are rewarded."

Equally relevant was Mr. Galbraith's observation: "I venture to think that you are reaching the stage where the problem of increasing the size of the capital plant will be no more important than to increase the efficiency of its use." He retorted to critics of planning: "Lack of planning in developing countries carried a greater risk of authoritarianism than proper planning." And then he cautioned: "It was not advisable for developing countries to rely too much for capital formation from people's voluntary savings." These remarks underlined the man's grasp of the fundamentals of India's problems.

But it was during the crisis of October last, following the Chinese invasion, and since then, that Mr. Galbraith's services proved most invaluable to India. It was fortuitous indeed that at that crucial moment we had in New Delhi as the American Ambassador one who had the ear of the U.S. President. For if U.S. military aid was so prompt and generous, not a little of our thanks must go to Mr. Galbraith.

We may now confidently look forward to a book or even books to emerge out of the rich Indian experience of this economist-cum-writer who, during his hectic diplomatic term in New Delhi, had constantly complained that he was missing his writing. And we predict it would be a bestseller not only because of the byline on the book but also because of the interesting reading matter in it.

And if we had to part with Mr. Galbraith, we could not have asked for a better replacement than Mr. Chester Bowles, who is an old and trusted friend of India and who knows this country inside out and is himself a top-ranking politician in his own country. Mr. Bowles has many friends in New Delhi and the rest of the country, having served a distinguished term in the Indian capital in the years 1951–53. His sympathetic understanding and intimate knowledge of the problems of economic development in this country will stand him and us in good stead when he now comes back to New Delhi after the lapse of a decade.

The John Birch Society Gross and Net

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of articles on the John Birch Society which had been published by the Detroit Free Press. In case any of my colleagues have missed the total income of this society, I am pleased to include the following editorial from the July 31 Detroit Free Press regarding the gross and net of the John Birch Society.

In a way of speaking, the John Birch Society has a very good thing going. Last year, gifts, dues, and other income enabled paid workers in its fold to draw $370,474.95 in wages, plus some expense account benefits.

Expenses, which include travel, came to $139,066.96.

Some of this, of course, must have gone for office space, stationery, stamps, and such. When you've got $370,474.95 worth of employees there has to be a place for them to sit, and things for them to fiddle around with.

And any way you look at it, there was a very neat net. Total income for 1962 came to $737,716.87, which leaves a margin over the costs here noted of $228,175.23

All of which goes to show that credulity affords a wide and ready market, and that to exploit it the only capital needed is plenty of brass.

Is the Big Feud Real?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress to a most interesting editorial which appeared in the August 5 edition of the Peoria Journal Star. Once again, this dedicated newspaper in the process of serving the people of Illinois, has touched on some very important issues of national concern. At this time I would like to include the editorial which appeared under the title "Is the Big Feud Real?" and I would urge careful consideration of the questions it raises:

IS THE BIG FEUD REAL?

Is the big feud between Russia and China real, or just another game?

After a generation under both Stalin and Khrushchev during which the world situation has blown hot and cold, with the Soviet dictator planning and setting the tune, one wonders if it isn't all part of the zigzag game of "wearing down the West."

It makes us a bit nervous in the midst of all this name calling between the Communist powers that Russia still supplies China such a large hunk of its oil—the stuff that makes her warplanes fly and her tanks run. It is also the stuff China must have to make industrial progress of any kind.

It makes us a bit nervous when amid all the name calling, the Chinese go one step beyond calling the test ban a fraud to call for nuclear disarmament.

That's exactly what De Gaulle did. He walked into the trap.

And both we and the Russians admit the test ban, itself, is mostly symbolic (a nicer word than fraud) but important as a first step. A first step to what?

The nuclear disarmament about which China and De Gaulle are speaking would catapult the Chinese mass armies into a powerful status, and would do the same for the Russian armies which are still heavy in tanks, planes, artillery, and all those "old fashioned" weapons.

Where would it leave the free world?

Ripe for the picking.

So, we have reason to be nervous and reason to be cautious. However, with all this, the Chinese-Russian squabble, we now believe, is very real and not a maneuver or game.

The Russians haven't cut off the oil, but they've cut off a tremendous amount of their technical and physical aid. The truculence of the Chinese, and their mass armies, make the Russians nervous on their own frontiers as evidenced by the major efforts to bolster populations near those Chinese borders, and fragmentary reports of other activities, like arming the tribesmen in the central Asian plains that roam both sides of the border and resist the Peiping government.

Above all, this struggle inside the Red camp started years ago and was visible in various ways, but both governments tried hard to keep it toned down. They talked in jargon, dancing around a direct clash. They tried to keep it down, not put on a show for us.

Now it has broken into the clear with direct, insulting, and inflammatory language and with that kind of language being blasted through their propaganda machines at their own people. So far as they are able, they also are blasting it at each other's population.

Nobody has a greater respect or sensitivity to public information than the Communists. They go to unbelievable extremes in order to control everything their people hear and read. They do this out of a real and very great concern about controlling the populations. They worry about this, plainly.

So propaganda is not a game thing, or something that can be turned on and off. It is deadly serious.

When they start using it on their own populations to fan hatred of the Chinese in Russia, and vice versa, this is might serious.

It is especially serious, and they know it, because the Russians have long and historically hated, feared, and fought the Chinese, and vice versa.

It is especially serious because the Russians, even in the days of brotherly love, reacted more violently about the Chinese and with more emotion than the Germans. We saw this on more than one occasion in the Soviet Union. We saw contempt, ridicule, and plain anger directed against the Chinese and their aspirations.

The Chinese in turn have a kind of folk superstition (not unlike some of our own more foolish ones) that Russians, by nature, have a particularly unusual and revolting body odor.

These are just suggestions of the kind of rampant racial prejudice that surged between these peoples when the official line was brotherly love, and which is now being publicly fanned by the authorities.

This is not something they would do unless it were a deadly serious problem between them.

The split is real. Therefore our opportunity to make the most profit from it is real. We should use it. But since both would like to bury us, we shan't do it by trusting either one.

Let's hope we have learned that lesson.

Our help to Russia in World War II was wise. It was the only sensible thing to do. But trusting Russia, just because she was a necessary ally, proved to be a foolish and disastrous course.

We dare not repeat that error.

Farmers Need Assurances of a Reliable Labor Supply Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram is succinct but profound. It asks a question being asked by hundreds of small farmers in California:

AUGUST 2, 1963.

Congressman BURT TALCOTT,
Washington, D.C.:

What crops should I plant this fall to survive without braceros. Please reply.

RED FRANSCONI.

GONZALES, CALIF.

If there is a Congressman who has a reasonable answer, I earnestly ask him to respond to Mr. Fransconi for me. I know of no answer.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 12th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho has raised a number of questions in the minds of southern Idahoans as to the serious effect this action will have on Idaho water developments and water rights. The following editorial from the Idaho Falls Post-Register of Idaho Falls, Idaho, on July 2, 1963, expresses some of the southern Idahoan feeling on the matter:

OLD IDAHO ARGUMENT IN NEW GARB

North Idaho once pooh poohed the thought when the much-battered Hells Canyon Dam issue was renting the Northwest air.

But look at the turnabout now.

Southern Idaho questioned the Hells Canyon Dam because it feared the buildup of a downstream industrial complex which would eventually challenge upstream water needs.

In the California Intertie prpposal, the Bonneville Power Administration and the rest of the BPA network is insisting on a reserve clause which allows the Northwest to yank the power back from California when the Northwest buildup demands it.

The BPA and its supporters in Oregon, Washington, and northern Idaho know full well that once California gets the extra power from the Northwest it will undoubtedly presume on it as its industries grow. The BPA wants assurance that the Northwest has first priority.

It's the old southern Idaho argument in new geography—and north Idaho is finding it quite handy now. It was pretty puerile stuff 10 years ago but it suddenly has validity in 1963.

No one has said yet whether the reserve clause principle proposed to be applied to California, can also be applied to southern Idaho in time of downstream power need. It matters little. Because if the lower Columbia development future ever demands it, the BPA will not only pull the rug on California, it could also orphan southern Idaho's power program.

And this could happen after BPA's reclamation-neutralizing program has allowed southern Idaho's multiple-use dam effort to atrophy. Southern Idaho, suddenly thrown back on its own water development resources,

would find dredging the old water development opportunities much more difficult.

An old formula is still the best. Develop all the feasible upstream, multiple-use sites first. This is where the mountain runoff can most effectively be stored for irrigation, flood control, power, and recreation. And do this, before the downstream network has claim on the entire basin.

The argument goes that the United States-Canada treaty, the Bruces Eddy development and other potential Columbia-feeding projects will provide more than enough water power for a long, long time.

But at the same so-called cheap (non-tax paying) rate?

Grand Coulee, the papa dam in the BPA complex which can produce power so wondrously cheap, will never be matched in cheap power by any succeeding dams. New dams will cost more, just like several dams in the BPA hinterland build after Grand Coulee have cost decisively more per power unit produced.

Right now, water leaders are rightly suspicious about the BPA claim of undercutting Bureau of Reclamation power by 30 to 40 percent. In the future, the argument will become even more pertinent. All the power-pooling which BPA can muster is only postponing a day of reckoning on upstream water development in Idaho.

New York Drowns Another Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we are living in an age of complete urbanization, and this may well be one of the facts of modern life.

However, none of us will eat too well if life on the farms near all our big cities is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing Delaware County in the Empire State of New York. The following article written by Noel Perrin, and appearing in the August Harper's, tells the story of what is happening today in that most beautiful county. Every word in Mr. Perrin's article is true and I can only say that this destruction of farm property for the benefit of New York City has been overdone, to say the least. It should be stopped now in Delaware County.

The article follows:

NEW YORK DROWNS ANOTHER VALLEY

(By Noel Perrin)

(NOTE.—Noel Perrin, who is assistant professor of English at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, once occupied a West Side apartment in Manhattan which had a permanent drip in the bathroom. His book of humorous essays—1961—was called "A Passport Secretly Green.")

There are normally only two times that a city man gives much thought to the water he drinks: when it begins to taste funny, or when his supply starts being rationed. The rest of the time he is about as interested in where it comes from as he is in the location of the oilfield that provides heating fuel for his apartment house, or in the home address of his postman.

This detachment is especially noticeable in New York City, where most people know vaguely that their water comes from "upstate," and a minority know a little less vaguely that the great bulk of it comes from some unusually high and pure reservoirs in the Catskill region. At about that point interest ceases.

Things are different upstate. For the past 129 years, various rural communities in New York State have been acutely aware of the logistics of the city's water supply, because those logistics have spelled their extinction. Counting 5 villages in Delaware County that are being bulldozed right now to make way for the city's new Cannonsville Reservoir, 35 or 40 villages and small towns have been drowned by New York over the years, along with a couple of thousand farms. But though New York undoubtedly triumphs in sheer number of villages taken—its water-supply system is the largest in the world—in no other way is the city's water policy exceptional, for similar drowned villages are to be found near almost any American city, except for a handful on the Great Lakes, or on major rivers.

Originally, New York supplied its own water from local wells, like the famous Tea Water Pump on Queen Street, which could turn out 30,000 gallons a day. Then, in 1834, because of the increasing pollution of the ground water in Manhattan, the State legislature gave New York the power to condemn land outside the city limits for the purpose of building reservoirs and aqueducts. The city has been exercising this power steadily ever since. During the 19th century it was first farmers and villagers in lower Westchester County, then in upper Westchester, and finally in Putnam County who gave apprehensive looks at the growing metropolis and from time to time fought in vain to preserve their fields and houses from the water commissioners. When the supplies conveniently available in Westchester and Putnam ran out around 1905, Dutchess County—the next one up—gave a great shiver, but in the end proved powerful enough to keep the city out. (Dutchess has its own city of Poughkeepsie to fight for it.) The city then made the leap to the Catskills, where at present it owns and stores 380 billion gallons of water, which sit on 35 square miles of former farmland in Delaware, Green, Schoharie, Sullivan, and Ulster Counties. Another 130 billion gallons are stored on 10 square miles of what used to be Westchester and Putnam. With the Cannonsville Reservoir, the city's total water holdings will amount to 150 square miles, which is about the combined size of Hudson and Union Counties, N.J., or a trifle larger than Rockwall County, Tex.

Over the years, the city has not had much sympathy for the successive thousands of upstaters it has turned out of this vast domain. The average New Yorker is completely unaware that any of these people had to go; and the city itself, though well aware that you can't build reservoirs without clearing the land of what the annual reports of the board of water supply have occasionally called "encumbrances"—trees, houses, churches, people—has felt with some justice that a city's need for pure water outweighs a village's need to exist. The newspapers have tended to focus entirely on the expense to New York that a new reservoir entails. (Back in 1838, the old Evening Post lamented that a "golden stream" of city money was flowing into the pockets of Westchester farmers whose land was being taken. In 1962, the World-Telegram and Sun, keeping up the tradition, reported that "huge sums are being ladled out" of the city treasury and into the hands of the people in and around Cannonsville. The ladle has thus far dipped up about $4 million for 20 square miles at Cannonsville, which comes to $309 an acre: houses, barns, and a couple of small dairy plants included.)

The question ever since May 2, 1834, when the city first got the power to take over other people's land and build reservoirs on it, is a horribly complicated one. With the exception of those early Westchester farmers—who alternately besieged the State legislature with appeals and stood off the city workers with shotguns—no one has disputed New York's right to supply itself with upstate water for its just needs. Neither has anyone been able to agree what its just needs are. The question became acute with the full rediscovery of the principles of waterworks engineering in the late 19th century, and now with Cannonsville it is poignant indeed.

It is poignant because for the first time in all these years not only the people who are losing their land, but most outside observers, doubt that a new reservoir needs to be built. Few of these critics have received much public attention, however, and I was—like most New Yorkers—completely unaware of any of them and, indeed, of the Cannonsville project itself until last summer, when I took part of my vacation in the Catskills.

OUR TIME HERE IS SHORT

I go to the Catskills to look at scenery. I like to get up above the summer resort region, and prowl along backroads through what is still unspoiled farm country—a little like Vermont, but more prosperous. One of the roads I had in mind to work out from last summer was State Highway 10, which ambles down through Delaware County, following the course of the west branch of the Delaware River. I had been in the valley of the west branch about 10 years ago and remembered it as almost idyllically rural: green fields curving along either side of the river, black-and-white cattle grazing in them, and great rows of sugar maples shading the road for miles at a stretch. My dominant memory was of quiet.

Last summer, though, when I had checked in at a motel in the little river town of Walton, and started to drive on down Route 10 toward Deposit, I felt as if I had been abruptly plunged back into the Second World War. The valley for 20 miles below Walton looked like territory occupied by an enemy power. The enemy was my native city. First I passed a huge sign by the road, announcing that, from here on, the valley was under the control of the Board of Water Supply, City of New York. "This Valley to Be Flooded," it read.

A minute later I passed a police cruiser belonging to the city, and then another. A procession of bulldozers appeared, clanking across one of the fields. Every 10th or 15th maple for the next 20 miles had a notice of dispossession nailed to it, signed with the endlessly repeated name, Leo A. Larkin, corporation counsel of the city of New York. Along one stretch, all but the roadside trees had been cut, and were being burned in great piles. In the villages I passed through—Beerston, Rock Rift, Granton, Cannonsville—the local life was still going on, but an alien force moved through it. City vehicles were parked everywhere. In each successive village, the biggest house had a sign out front, marking it as headquarters for a district engineer of the board of water supply. A couple of times I passed houses which were occupied by detachments of Board police. All these were well kept up. By contrast, most of the other village buildings looked pretty shabby. Judd's Hardware Store in Cannonsville had a sign in its dusty window: "Closed: no gas, no money, no nothing."

The village store in Rockroyal, N.Y., 6 miles away on Trout Creek, was still open, though a sign on the counter read, "Sorry, no credit. Our time here is short." The sense of urgency was increased by the booming of explosions from down the valley, and equally by the large number splashed in red paint on the front of every house, barn, church, and store in the valley. These, I

learned from a woman in the store at Rockroyal, were directions for what she called "the grubbing contractor" who would be coming to tear them down. This was all to make drinking water for New York—though, she added, you'd think with the big dam they'd just finished over at Downsville, they'd have enough for a while.

The whole encounter was so upsetting that I pulled in at the next district engineer's office to ask what was going on. The district engineer said politely that he wasn't allowed to answer questions, but that I could inquire at the division office at Roscoe—a town about 40 miles away. Instead, when I got back to Walton, I wandered into the office of the Walton Reporter. I once worked as a cub on the New York Daily News for a few months, and have ever since felt free to bother other newspapermen.

It amused Mr. George White of the Reporter considerably that I was a native of Manhattan and so surprised at the fate of the west branch. Yes, there was another dam at Downsville in the next valley, even bigger. They'd flooded four villages over there, about 7 or 8 years ago. Yes, the grubbing contractor was going to take five villages here and knock out about a hundred dairy farms, which were doing a million dollars' worth of business a year. Between the two dams, the county was about ruined. It used to be first in the State for milk production. After they built Pepacton Reservoir, it dropped to third. It was going lower now. And, of course, everybody knew the dam wouldn't have to be built if New York didn't waste the water it had.

Two or three months after I got back from the west branch, I happened to see a small news item on page 33 of the New York Times. It was the summary of a speech given at a meeting of water company executives by Prof. J. W. Milliman—as I've since learned, one of the three authors of a Rand Corp., study of how American cities obtain and manage their water. He was talking about wasteful water management, and his prime examples were New York City and southern California. New York, he said, could gain as much water as it will get from its new Cannonsville project, and at a fraction of the cost, simply by repairing some of the more obvious leaks in the mains and by extending the use of water meters. Cannonsville was, in fact, an unnecessary reservoir. There were competent studies which proved it.

Not exactly as a debt owed to the now-dead villages along the west branch, but probably more to restore my own sense of well-being as a sometime drinker of city water, I have spent the last few months tracking down those studies, and slowly learning how the city manages its water. It is quite a story.

WHY THE MANHATTAN CO. WENT INTO BANKING

In the beginning, New York had practically no water to manage. Up until 1842, when the first of the upstate reservoirs came into operation, a New Yorker got his water in one of two ways. If he were a poor man, he bought it by the bucket from traveling carts that sold it for the rather stiff price of a penny a gallon. A rich man bought piped water—it reached his house in wooden pipes—from the old Manhattan Co. No one knows how much water the poor used, but it wasn't much. The Evening Journal guessed in the 1830's that "a moderate quantity" for a poor family would be three pails a day, costing 2 cents each, which comes to 6 gallons for the whole family.

The few thousand rich families who took water from the Manhattan Co. used a very great deal more than that, but once again no one knows how much. The Manhattan Co. had no way to measure its water, and it didn't try. Instead it tallied something it did know how to tally, which was the number of fireplaces in its customers' houses. For one to four fireplaces in your house, you paid the company $5 a year for water. If you had a fifth fireplace, you paid another $1.25, and so on, up to a maximum of $20, which was the fixed price for houses with 16 or more fireplaces.

This system worked miserably. After a few good years, beginning at its founding in 1799, the Manhattan Co. made practically nothing on its water, because the customers wasted so much. The private customers left their taps running all the time, and, if they happened to be philanthropists, freely gave away bucketfuls to their poor neighbors. The commercial customers where worse. A good many Manhattan grocers used regularly to give away a free pail of company water with every order, and a couple of ship chandlers who subscribed were in the habit of filling up the tanks of visiting ships. In the end the Manhattan Co. gave up selling water altogether, and moved into the banking business, where it still is. Well before that, it quietly abandoned the search for new water supplies on Manhattan Island, and at frequent intervals its pipes ran dry.

When the city finally went into the water business for itself and set out to flood the Croton Valley between 1835 and 1842, practically its first decision was to make water as plentiful in New York as it had previously been scarce. The water commissioners calculated that a liberal per capita consumption for the city's 300,000 people would be 22 gallons a day. They then provided four times as much as that, thinking to be secure for 50 years to come. All the same, by 1850 there was a water shortage. The trouble, of course, was reckless waste. The sales method made it inevitable.

The city's solution for charging for water, which went into effect in July 1842, was to measure the width of all the buildings in New York and charge flat rates based on that. It is true that the very first water commissioner was violently opposed to this system, and insisted that he could invent a measuring device capable of registering the quantity of water used by every large consumer. But the city aldermen had never heard of measuring devices for water (not being students of Roman history, they didn't know about Frontinus, water commissioner of Rome from A.D. 97 to 100, who did use water meters, and with them saved a hundred million gallons of waste water a day, equal to nearly half of Rome's supply) and they very much doubted that any such thing could be made to work.

The city did try to cut waste. It dug up some of its 200 miles of new water mains and plugged up the numerous leaks in them, and it also shut down Croton Aqueduct once a year, long enough to patch the leaks in that. But then, since there was nothing it could do about the 40 or 50 gallons of water per person per day rushing unused out of taps on private premises, it went up to Boyd's Corners in Putnam County and built another reservoir. Then it came back down to Westchester County and began building reservoirs left and right. Some of these reservoirs would have been required even to supply the growing city's just needs, but most of them provided water to go directly from leaky faucets into waste pipes—or even from well-built faucets into waste pipes, since a good many New Yorkers left the water running all winter to make sure the pipes didn't freeze, and all summer to make sure it would be running cold when they wanted a drink. At New York City pressures, a 1-inch faucet left full on will waste a thousand gallons an hour. There was no possible penalty for even the wildest waste. The owner of a New York house five stories high and from 18 to 20 feet wide paid $10 a year for his water whether he used 1 pint or 900 gallons a day. Tenants, of course, paid nothing at all, and their landlords paid a dollar a year for them—per family, that is. Water use has naturally risen steadily ever since. At the moment it is 155 gallons per person per day, expected to reach 160, 3 years from now. In all, the city has dammed and flooded 17 valleys, and spent about a billion dollars on dam construction, in the excitement of keeping up.

THE MERCHANTS IGNORED

Some 15 valleys back, water meters had finally got reinvented and put into commercial production. In 1875, the first 250 meters were put into service, and by 1900, 30 percent of New York's water was delivered through meters. From the point of view of upstate New York, those 25 years were the best the city ever had. Every year a few more meters were installed, and as more big consumers began to pay for their water they began to look after their plumbing. The metered water was gloriously cheap—75 gallons for a cent—but even that low charge made it worth while for consumers to repair leaks and to turn off hoses and faucets when not in use.

However, in 1900, a sort of death knell for meters was struck. The city had just taken over the other four boroughs and was growing enormously, and it had to make the crucial decision—whether to continue the emphasis on cutting down waste, or whether to stop worrying about waste and flood as many valleys as possible. Most city politicians were for more floodings. Most private citizens weren't. The merchants' association took up the question and then engaged two distinguished water engineers, J. J. R. Croes and Foster Crowell, to study the city's water problems. Their findings were that New York should do a little dam building and a lot of meter installation.

The most striking figures in the report are those which show what happened to the 117 gallons of water a day that each New Yorker was supposed to consume in 1900. Five gallons of each person's 117 were being used by the city itself—to put out fires, wash streets, keep fountains supplied, and so forth. Twenty gallons went through meters to factories and all other commercial users. The remaining 92 comprised domestic use, plus waste. Crowell's experience with meters showed that 30 gallons were use, and 62 were waste. The 6 people in his own prosperous household used 23 gallons a day each, he said—and don't think Mr. Crowell's family were holding back to make the figures look good, Mr. Croes added. It would have been pointless. "The difference between a liberal use of water for legitimate purposes and a parsimonious use is really very slight."

The city greeted these findings, as well as the recommendations of a second Merchants' Association report in 1906 on the advantages of metering, with great yawns. Instead it went up into the Catskills and began building reservoirs. Since about 1895 interest by the city in meter development, waste control, and leak inspection has been practically abandoned, and the percentage of meters in the city has slowly declined from 30 percent in 1900 down to 24.2 percent at the present time. The one real spark of new interest appeared in 1948, when the Bureau of the Budget presented a report on meters to Mayor O'Dwyer, which concluded that at a conservative estimate they would eliminate 220 million gallons of waste a day, and that they would bring an extra $9 million a year into the city treasury. That report had been stimulated by the department of water supply, gas, and electricity, whose job is distributing water in the city, and whose Commissioners have generally favored meters. But before anything could be done, the great water shortage of 1949–50 came along, and the city concluded that instead of installing meters it would be better to hurry the work on Neversink Reservoir, get started on Pepacton Reservoir, and begin the agitation for Cannonsville Reservoir.

Neversink and Pepacton had been designed back in the thirties—the depression had kept

them from being built—and the people in such now-vanished Catskill villages as Arena, Union Grove, Pepacton, and Shavertown had long since made their stand, and lost. Cannonsville, however, was a new project. It made its public debut in a report to the board of estimate on December 28, 1949. Almost immediately, four separate reactions occurred.

The board of water supply was all for Cannonsville. Its argument was very simple. From 1842 to the present, it said, the city has used more water almost every year, and it will continue to. Upland water from the Catskills is what New Yorkers like to drink, because it's so pure. Coming from an altitude of 1,100 feet, it will flow to the city by gravity, and save the cost of pumping.

Incodel (the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, created by New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware in 1936) spoke next. Its job was, and its successor commission's job is, to whack up the water in the Delaware River so that all four States get enough for their just needs. Incodel now said that it had been thinking of building a dam at Cannonsville, maybe some other dams, too, and that the New York Board of Water Supply should keep out. After all, it already had that big dam started just a few miles away at Downsville.

The third voice was the disorganized one of Delaware County and its people. In March 1950 they addressed themselves to the New York State Water Power and Control Commission, which holds hearings whenever a city in New York State wants to build dams. Delaware County's towns, villages, and individual citizens had two arguments: one, that the dam would wreck them; and two, that the city didn't need it anyway.

One man, when it was pointed out to him that the city would pay him for his land, added:

"It is kind of hard for you people from the city to appreciate what a farm means to a person who is a farmer. In the city you move from one apartment to the next, and maybe they are about the same. * * * There is as much difference between one farm and the next as there is between black and white."

Another witness told the commission that, right after he had heard about the board of water supply's plans, he had had what amounted to a vision. He was standing by the river at dawn, he said, looking upstream. Through the mist he saw some kind of procession moving down the current. As it drew nearer:

"I saw it was a long string of birchbark canoes, and in those canoes were a lot of ghostly figures with blankets around them, and feathers on their heads, and so on. They came along by where I was standing and looked at me, and one of them stood up and said, 'What's the matter, brother?' I said, 'I have got to move,' and he said, 'You might as well get your satchel and come on with us.' Oh, how they did laugh. They laughed their heads off at me. I suppose they were thinking about a couple of hundred years ago."

The local lawyers, rightly suspecting that appeals like this wouldn't get far with the commission, had meanwhile been trying to bone up on water-supply technique. One of them announced that he had been in touch with the Water Commissioner of Cleveland (Cleveland, like Jersey City and Detroit, delivers from 99 to 100 percent of its water through meters) and had a letter stating that the real answer was meters in New York. That made no impression at all. According to a water expert named Roscoe Martin, no protest by local people makes much impression on planners of dams. At least on the Delaware, local resistance has never stopped a dam. (This should give pause to residents of southern Illinois, where the State water survey has a list of 113 "promising reservoir sites," and to people in the Colorado River Basin, where in addition to the 4 giant reservoirs now being built by the Federal Government, 9 more are authorized, and 25 more than that are in the drafting stage. It should scare the wits out of people along the Potomac and its tributaries, where the Army Engineers would like to build 16 major dams in a great arc out from Washington, and another 418 "small headwaters structures" out still further.) In November 1950 the State ruled that New York City could go ahead with the reservoir as soon as it got the consent of Incodel. It got that in 1954.

THE PROFESSORS PIPE UP

Meanwhile, the chorus of outside experts had begun to form. The first section, led by Dean Thorndike Saville of the College of Engineering at New York University, comprised a blue-ribbon engineering panel on water supply appointed by the city in 1950. It came out against building at Cannonsville, and for installing more meters. Even most of the 180,000 meters then in use, it said, weren't kept in good repair, and many were badly designed to begin with. Apart from water waste, the city was losing (it still is) about $3 million a year in uncollected meter revenue from its present meters—which let water through without recording it. The city would, however, the panel said, eventually need further upstate supplies. Easy and cheap. Tap the Hudson 80 miles upstream at Hyde Park, and filter the water. By ordinary standard filtration processes, Hudson River water can be made to equal, if not better, the quality of water (now) supplied to New York City.

When this report was released in December 1951 the board of water supply greeted it with howls of fury. Ignoring the long sections on metering and waste, it concentrated on the Hudson River proposal. The board claimed that New Yorkers would never drink Hudson water, even if it were made twice as pure as Catskill water (as it could be). The stuff is "psychologically unpalatable." The board did not comment on Poughkeepsie, which has been finding filtered Hudson water psychologically patalable for about 80 years now.

The argument over the Hudson largely diverted attention from the question of misuse at home. One or two other outsiders did bring up the question of meters during 1952. But as Neversink and Pepacton Reservoirs moved into operation, the whole matter of the city's water supply slipped back into oblivion—as it had after Middle Branch came in during 1878, Kensico in 1884, Ashokan in 1913, Schoharie in 1924, and so forth. New York placidly continues to sell the great bulk of its water by the house-width plan. In 1963, the owner of a building more than 18 and less than 20 feet wide, and five stories high, pays a base rate of $13 for all the water he can use. He has, to be sure, some extras to pay, such as $4.50 a year for each bathtub beyond the first, and $7.50 a year for an air-conditioning unit using between half a gallon and a gallon of water a minute. The owner of an apartment house 80 feet wide and 11 stories high pays a base rate of $45—with a good many tubs and such to pay extra for. Restaurants pay $12 a year. Dentists pay $1.50 a year for each of those little fountains they keep running all the time. The results are about what one would expect. Waste has hardly diminished since the days of the Manhattan Co.

In matters of public policy, issues won't stay dead, though. Once the corpse is buried, the scholars come along and dig it up. In 1960, Professor Milliman and his two colleagues published their monumental study, "Water Supply: Economics, Technology, and Policy." In 1962 Professor Milliman made the speech that I saw mentioned in the Times. That leads to his book, where one learns that just by repairing mains, with no other reforms, New York could save half as much water as it will get from Cannonsville, "at a cost, per million gallons, of far under one-hundredth of Cannonsville costs." The book in turn leads to the panel report of 1951, and there one learns that metering the whole city would have cost less than half what it has taken just to build the aqueduct for Cannonsville. One also learns that cities like New York and Chicago, which don't meter, "consume" an average of 73 gallons more water per person per day than cities like Boston and Louisville, which do.

One last question remains. If every engineer since the 1870's has been for water meters, and no one has been against them ("The best engineering talent in this country has pleaded for the use of water meters for at least half a century," the magazine American City wrote in 1950), why doesn't New York have them? Why is it flooding the valley of the West Branch instead, burning all the sugar maples, tearing down 900 buildings, moving a thousand people, digging up 10 cemeteries, and all the rest?

I think it's a blind working together of three forces that keeps the city such an enemy to its own countryside. One of the forces is landlords, especially those who own tenements. If tenements and apartment houses were metered, it would no longer be economical not to fix the plumbing. But there is more to it than that. Landlords have a horrible fear that they could fix every leak in a building, and still have high water bills, if they were to pay by use, as they do with fuel oil or electricity. The tenants, they are convinced, would pour it out the windows, if necessary. As the head of a landlord's association wrote the Times during the last shortage, the average tenant is a reckless fellow—"not the least bit concerned with saving water or with its economical use. He has always considered water as a God-given gift which comes to him from heaven for his free and unlimited use." Some landlords oppose metering altogether; others are very tepidly for it, provided that every apartment is metered, and not just the building. (This is perfectly possible, though of course it takes a lot more meters. But meters are far cheaper now than they were in 1870. When Philadelphia finally put them in a few years ago, the total cost per installed meter was about $35. In any event, the experience of dozens of cities is that one meter per building works fine.) If landlords looked at metered Boston or metered Jersey City, or remembered what Mr. Croes pointed out in 1900 about the small difference between liberal and parsimonious use, they would perhaps be less nervous.

I don't mean to imply that landlords are unique in their abuses. A plumber in Terre Haute, Ind., once told the story of one of his customers—a private householder—who left a defective toilet running steadily for 18 years rather than pay to have it fixed. The man always pointed out to the plumber that the water cost him nothing, whereas the plumber was going to charge. He had it fixed the day Terre Haute adopted metering.

A second force of inertia is the division of responsibility in the New York City administration. Nobody is concerned both with getting water and with using it well. If the city wastes what the board of water supply provides, that's no affair of the board. If Cannonsville is needless, that's nothing to the Department of Water Supply, Gas, and Electricity. If someone chooses to let his plumbing fall apart, that's no affair of either. That can be stopped only by the Department of Buildings—which, in turn, has no official connection with water supply at all.

SMALL BOYS WITH MUD

Most of all, though, there's the problem that Scientific American brought up in 1896 in a discussion of New York's water supply,

that it's much more exciting to build new reservoirs than it is to practice good management. This, at any rate, is what the Rand Corp., men think. "There is a certain temptation," they say in the preface to their book, "for water supply leaders to cast themselves in a heroic mold, as mighty battlers for the cause of pure and adequate water. To maintain the romance of this role, great projects are continually being conceived, planned, and executed, some of these projects being sound, others unsound, and some bordering on the manic." The mighty battlers would almost rather not see plumbing fixed or meters installed, they continue, since "the gains achievable merely by making better use of the supplies in hand may indicate postponement indefinitely of vast new engineering wonders."

But there's no need to accept this theory at the hands of Professor Milliman and his colleagues. The commissioners of the New York Board of Water Supply showed it in action in a report they made to Mayor Impellitteri on January 1, 1952. This was just after the blue-ribbon panel had recommended that Cannonsville Dam not be built, and that the city instead put meters in at home and plan to tap the Hudson for a supplement. The commissioners said they wanted to go ahead with their project anyway. "Cannonsville is the one official project of the board for the future," they explained.

The fear of upstaters—and it's perfectly justifiable, as far as I can see—is that the city will always want to have one or two official projects cooking, like a small boy who can't resist making mud dams, no matter how many he already has, no matter whose mud it is. The hearings after which Cannonsville was condemned were held in Delhi, New York, the county seat of Delaware County. A Walton lawyer named William Fancher represented most of the villages that have since gone to the grubbing contractor. New York City was represented principally by John Fitzgerald, then Chief Engineer of the Board of Water Supply (and an active member of its New Sources Division), and by a panel of city lawyers. A State water engineer from Albany named J. C. Thompson presided. Late in the hearings, when it was obvious the city would win, this exchange took place. It is interesting chiefly for the local reaction indicated in court reporter's brackets at the end.

"Mr. FANCHER. Where are you going when you get through with Cannonsville, Mr. Fitzgerald?

"Mr. THORNTON. (Assistant counsel for the board of water supply). I object to that.

"Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know where you are going after you get through with Cannonsville?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. No sir. [Laughter.]"

The laughter was that of the people of Delaware County, with maybe a few Mohawk Indian echoes, and they were laughing because they believed the Chief Engineer of the Board of Water Supply of the City of New York had just perjured himself.

Crime in U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Soviet use of propaganda drives at the U.N. against the Western nations that it designates as colonial powers, I feel the article by columnist Robert C. Ruark, which appeared in the Houston Press on Tuesday, July 30, deserves our attention.

I have long advocated the use of the U.N. to investigate the colonial structure of the Soviet Union and its oppression of the captive peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia, rather than following the Soviet lead and chastizing legitimate governmental structures of our allies.

This article is especially timely now that our stanch ally Portugal is the target of Soviet pressure:

CRIME IN U.N.

(By Robert C. Ruark)

BEIRA, MOZAMBIQUE, PORTUGUESE EAST AFRICA.—You really have to know this country, to meet its people, see its back-bush areas, understand its problems, observe its progress, applaud its aims in education and public health, its land and game conservation, its crop control and housing-agricultural schemes, to appreciate the crime that the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations is attempting to perpetrate in the misnomer of immediate "freedom" for Portugal's oversea possessions.

The trouble is that the people who read the papers, and most of the people who write them, never get out into another hemisphere. They are cliche ridden; they use words like "imperialism" and "colonialism" and "brutal policy" and "totalitarianism," while avoiding the mention of the fact that a state like Ghana is a pure dictatorship, ruthless and corrupt and subject to momentary remake of the law, according to Emperor Nkrumah's whim.

They seem to forget that the Congo on the Belgian side has been a highbinder state which needs an international police force to protect another international police force from the local police force, and that the whole damned pestilential area would starve to death without outside help and the cynical hijacking of the only state, Katanga, which carried its own weight.

They forget that the current about-to-be Government of Kenya was built on murder and horrible oathtakings, and that Joma Kenyatta, the prime minister-elect, would rank roughly with Jack the Ripper in the legion of decency. And that the No. 1 national hero, "Field Marshal Sir" Dedan Kemathi was a syphilitic sadist who strangled more than 2,000 of his own tribesmen for fun.

Nationalism is a great excuser. They speak now a few self-seeking architects of vile murder and torture, such as Holden Roberto of the infamous March 15 mass murders in Angola, as head of a government-in-exile. Roberto is no more a representative of government-in-exile than John Dillinger was an exiled member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

There is no government-in-exile from Angola, Portuguese Guinea, or Mozambique. The government is in Lisbon, in Portugal, and its African possessions are Portuguese states. At least they are accorded the status of state, which is better than we did with Hawaii and Alaska, which remained "territories" until statehood recognition was finally pressured into being.

They would not know here, generally, that in New York, Nikolai Federenko, Russia's United Nations delegate, is fulminating for blockades and boycotts and U.N. expulsion for Portugal on account of what the U.N. Afro-Asian bloc is pleased to call "colonial possessions."

Federenko, who seems as loose with truth as that consummately lying predecessor, Valerian Zorin, is demanding "freedom" for the Portuguese "colonies" by the end of 1963—as complete an interference in internal administration as if Adlai Stevenson were to be agitating the freedom of Kazakhstan from Russia. We do not have to mention Hungary or Bulgaria or the other Soviet-gobbled territories here.

The outside opinion of Portugal's extraterritorial possessions is that the administrators begin the day by beating a gross of babies to death with the palmitorio, a kind of perforated Ping-pong paddle, and that every man is a slave. It's about as far from the truth as the allegation that all southerners consider the day lost without a lynching, or that all white southerners are patterned after Erskine Caldwell's clay-eaters.

The people who haven't seen it wouldn't know about the limpopo scheme, in which white and black farmers work side by side, live side by side, and in which no Portuguese is allowed to hire native labor, and vice versa. They would not know about the bush maternity hospitals and medical centers. They would not know that one area with 90,000 savages is administered by one paramount chief, whose subordinate is one Portuguese administrator; one white policeman, and 13 native policemen. They would not know about Mozambique Island, which holds 12,000 people of assorted coloration, and which has only 15 police for the lot.

Nazis and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I recently raised a question about the wisdom of permitting the American Nazi Party to stage a counterdemonstration on August 28 against the mass Negro civil rights rally to take place in Washington, D.C. I was subsequently informed by the Metropolitan Police that a permit would be refused to the Nazis because of their obvious aim of fomenting rioting and bloodshed.

It has now come to my attention that Chief Murray has come under criticism for restricting the planned Nazi agitation on August 28. The criticism has come from misguided interpretations of "free speech" that would stretch the constitutional intent out of all context with both the sense and spirit of the law.

I wish to commend the police decision and, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three pertinent items on this situation. The first is a news dispatch of July 14 from the Jewish Telegraph Agency. The second is an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 5 and the third is a press release by the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. which is now assembled here in a national convention:

[From the Jewish Telegraphic Agency]

WASHINGTON POLICE CANCEL PERMIT FOR NAZI PARTY DEMONSTRATION

WASHINGTON, July 14.—Heeding a protest by Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, New York Republican, District of Columbia police today announced that the American Nazi Party and other bigots would not be allowed to parade and demonstrate here against Negroes and Jews at the time of a massive civil rights gathering on August 28.

Representative HALPERN had questioned a previous police ruling to permit the anti-Semitic mass rally. He said in a telegram to Police Chief Murray: "It is only asking for a bloody explosion to permit a violence-oriented agitation organization to take to the streets when civil rights supporters are here and emotions are brimming over." He stressed that "the criminal records of the Nazis and their fellow travelers indicate that they represent a known public nuisance."

A police statement today said that no parade permits will be issued to any groups other than the antidiscrimination organizations directing the August 28 march.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,

NAZIS AND FREEDOM

Chief Murray has come under attack for his refusal to permit the American Nazi Party to stage a counterdemonstration at the same time and in the same place as the August 28 civil rights demonstration here. His refusal, however, is not only defensible but obligatory upon him under his most basic responsiblity as a peace officer.

Critics point out that the test of our belief in freedom of speech comes in our willingness to grant it to those whose ideas we despise. This is true and the American Nazi Party is peculiarly well qualified to put us all to that test: In the political forum or the marketplace of ideas there are few ideas so loathsome to Americans as those associated with Adolf Hitler. When so many American lives and so much American treasure were spent so short a time ago to check that lunacy, it is appalling that contemporary American youth can dig up the old Nazi intellectual garbage and find ideals of political organization and personal behavior.

But the racists' proposed counterdemonstration has nothing to do with freedom of speech. Permits presumably would be issued on August 27 or August 29 or any other day. Deputy Chief Howard V. Covell has pointed out that even on the 28th the Nazis are free to protest as individuals. But a mass parade, with 100,000 or more civil rights demonstrators in town, would be asking for trouble, for violence, bloodshed, possibly deaths.

The classic American formula on free speech states that no one has the right to cry, "Fire!" in a crowded theater. The formula applies here. Chief Murray's decision is prudent and just.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS NATIONAL CONVENTION HEARS WARNING AGAINST NAZI, FASCIST ATTEMPTS TO FOMENT AND PROVOKE VIOLENCE AT AUGUST 28 NEGRO RALLY

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 6.—National Executive Director Joseph F. Barr, of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America stated today at the 68th annual Jewish War Veterans National Convention at the Shoreham Hotel that "while the Metropolitan Police acted wisely in denying the American Nazi Party the right to organize a counterdemonstration on August 28, vigilance is needed to prevent deliberate violence from this and similar sources."

Mr. Barr said that the Nazis and similar agitators were trying to "entice psychopathic personalities and violence-prone hotheads to come to Washington on August 28, to stir up an outbreak calculated to discredit the nonviolent character sought by the Negro groups."

District of Columbia police have denied a formal permit to Nazi-like organizations to parade on August 28, but said the Nazis could assemble on the Washington Monument grounds and walk about in small groups, carrying signs and picketing. Mr. Barr said that he could understand the free speech considerations involved under constitutional guarantees, but, nevertheless, thought that deliberate attempts to provoke a riot must be kept under careful scrutiny.

According to Mr. Barr, "the main purpose of fanatic groups is to milk the unwary of contributions for the personal gain of this or that fuhrer or self-appointed leader, preying on the fears and emotions of the public."

He said the objective of such bigots was to "gain notoriety through newspaper and TV publicity in an attempt to increase their income and personal lust for power."

"In these troubled hours of decision on an enormous national problem, the integration crisis, every effort must be made to prevent known subversives and criminals, many of whom have been convicted by various courts, from endangering human life and liberty in the National Capital on August 28," said Mr. Barr.

He made clear that he did not advocate denial of appropriate constitutional rights to fanatics, "even though they are spoiling for blood," but thought "they should be ignored at best or at least carefully observed by police with every precaution taken to compel obedience to the letter and spirit of the law."

"The eyes of the world will be fastened on Washington on August 28," said Mr. Barr. "Let them see a peaceful and inspiring triumph of the democratic process rather than a debacle brought on by a few vengeful and despicable hatemongers."

An estimated 5,000 Jewish veterans delegated by 500 posts throughout the country are expected to attend the weeklong convention which opened yesterday. The Jewish War Veterans is the oldest active war veterans organization in the United States.

Latin America: Target for Communist Conquest

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have become aware of the many sides to the problem of defending the free world and democracy. Increasingly, we realize that in many areas the key to a successful defense against communism is found in social and economic progress rather than in military power. This view has been implemented by the Alliance for Progress in our policy toward Latin America.

At the same time, however, we must maintain our direct efforts to prevent subversion and Communist infiltration. In a recent article appearing in the General Electric Forum, "Latin America: Target for Communist Conquest," Adm. Arleigh Burke discusses our defense program in this area. Now, director of the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University, the distinguished former Chief of Naval Operations presents an informative analysis of the continuing aspects in our policy toward Latin America along with several recent developments.

I am inserting the admiral's article in the RECORD, as I have the others in this unusually fine issue of the Forum, so that it can be brought to the attention of all who may read it. Although we may not agree on the same priorities and emphases in our foreign policy, I am sure that we can all benefit from the views of this outstanding citizen-servant, who capped his 42-year naval career with the longest tour in history as Chief of Naval Operations and member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Since the early 1920's Latin America has been a target for Communist conquest. The movement grew rapidly in the 1930's and 1940's, and by the end of World War II, taking advantage of our common effort against the Nazis, the Communists were operating openly in most countries of this hemisphere. They were represented in nine national congresses, one national cabinet, and had penetrated local government in several other countries. Their infiltration into labor movements and student groups was also widespread.

With the election of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala in 1951, the Communists captured their first American country. Their failure to gain control of the Guatemala military establishment was a tactical mistake which led to the overthrow of their regime in 1954. That the Communists profited by their mistake was evidenced by the dispersal of the July 26 movement in Cuba soon after Castro achieved power.

The coming of Castro has brought a new phase in the Communist attack on Latin America. Now for the first time, they have a full-scale, well-defined operating base within the hemisphere. Castro has consolidated his power, and with Soviet and Chinese support is making a coordinated, stepped-up effort to subvert and control the people of this hemisphere.

In spite of our Government's efforts, subversion emanating from Cuba is increasing. In testimony before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs last February 19, John M. McCone, Central Intelligence Agency Director, stated, "Even before the October missile crisis—and with increasing rancor since then—Cuban leaders have been exhorting revolutionary movements to violence and terrorism, and supporting their activities."

MINIMUM STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Beginning with the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, the United States has held a minimum strategic objective for the security of the Americas: We would not tolerate any alien system in the hemisphere. In times of crisis, statesmen such as Adams, Monroe, Polk, Cleveland, Wilson—men who particularly used the doctrine—recognized that this objective was absolutely imperative, and that if we failed to achieve it when threatened by an alien system, our security would be in peril.

It is not within the scope of this article to review in detail how, why, and when this strategy collapsed. But the collapse did not come suddenly in 1959, or in 1961 as some have maintained. We began in the 1930's to move away from the concept of strong U.S. unilateral action in this hemisphere, partly as a result of an overreaction to the periods of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson when the strategy of the Monroe Doctrine was applied at times for intervention in the internal affairs of Latin American nations. We developed a worship of world opinion as if it were our strategy. This was a period when many Americans developed guilt feelings about our relationship with Latin America, and a period when many Latin Americans resented us.

As a result, we forgot that the lessons of history show a just peace to be the product of the wise and principled use of power. Hence, when confronted with communism—a system far more alien than those which worried Monroe and Adams—we were morally unprepared to act.

STRENGTH AT SEA

Throughout the history of the Western Hemisphere, while the techniques and equip-

ment of war changed, the principal strategic weapon upon which the Monroe Doctrine rested was sea power. Spanish galleons and high-masted frigates gave way to ironclads and steam-driven ships, and finally, to mighty men-of-war. But the advent of modern weapons, with their tremendous destructive capability, caused us to forget the importance of the seas, and particularly of the Caribbean. We assumed that the future of mankind would depend on the ability to deliver nuclear weapons.

Now that Cuba is Communist, the importance of the seas and of the Caribbean has been brought forcibly to our attention. Last fall, when the United States demanded withdrawal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba, Premier Khrushchev complied quickly because he knew he did not have—and could not get—control of either the high seas or the Caribbean. Still, Soviet submarines were there, perhaps quite a few. The U.S. Navy's antisubmarine forces flushed several to the surface. And the water around the Leeward Islands is good submarine water—deep, warm, and difficult for antisubmarine forces because changing thermal currents make it hard to trace submarines.

If these Soviet submarines had been nuclear powered, or had they contained missiles capable of being launched from underwater, they would have represented a threat more serious than the Cuban land-based missiles. It is not reassuring to realize that such missile-carrying submarines could be based in unfriendly islands in the Caribbean and would not have to risk hazardous trips back and forth across the Atlantic to and from their home ports.

From our problems in Cuba we have two basic lessons to learn:

First, in a geographical as well as a strategic sense, it is of primary importance that the United States keep the waters of the Caribbean open to free world commerce and free from Soviet bases.

Second, and more important, the elimination of communism from Latin America is the minimum strategic objective to be achieved if this Nation and the whole hemisphere are to endure as we know them.

STEPPED-UP SUBVERSION EFFORTS

Today, Cuba has become a base where Communist leaders have dedicated themselves to the destruction of freedom, of the social order of the Americas, and of our free economic system. They have vowed to establish a Communist system throughout the Western Hemisphere. And they are doing their best right now to gain control of other Latin American countries.

STRATEGY RELATES TO PEOPLE

Since the confrontation over Cuba last October, the Communits do not risk fighting us openly. But they are maximizing their strategy and tactics of political warfare—a weapon which we have not yet learned to recognize as a weapon of war. Hence, we hesitate to use our power in sufficient quantity to defeat enemies employing it.

We can only develop a counter strategy if we remember that the aims of strategy relate to people, and to those in control of the people. We must keep in mind that just wars are fought to prevent the enemy from controlling our people.

Today, even national security must be described not just in military, but in political, scientific, and economic dimensions. Our ultimate objective in Latin America involves conditions conducive to a political order, which, with evolution rather than revolution, will move toward representative government in which power is balanced, initiative is widespread, and the marketplace is free.

A LARGER STRATEGIC APPROACH

With this in mind, we must strive to develop a broader strategy. Even if the Monroe Doctrine had been applied in past years to eliminate an alien system from the hemisphere, this would have been only a beginning.

First, we must have an improved approach toward Latin American institutions. The church, universities, and social classes all have decisive roles to play, but I would like to discuss in particular the institution of the military.

THE MILITARY

We have already noted that the military in Guatemala was the bulwark against communism, and this is generally true throughout Latin America. The military is probably the most internally democratic institution in Latin America. With the exception of the church, it is about the only institution where an individual can enter from the lower classes and emerge to high rank and responsibility. It has, by and large, social mobility.

At the same time, some members of the armed services in Latin America lean toward authoritarian and state-controlled programs, both in economics and politics. Since the military is probably the most decisive single influence in Latin America, we have a great and beckoning opportunity to influence the military in the direction of representative government, free enterprise, and power balance within the state.

MUTUAL MILITARY COOPERATION

What our Navy has already accomplished might well be applied to other institutions to develop confidence. A few years ago we began assigning destroyer-type ships to engage in maneuvers with navies of those Latin American countries who desired to participate. The effects of such cooperation were forcefully demonstrated during the Cuban crisis last fall when several Latin American countries offered ships to assist our blockade.

Another example is the U.S. Army's civic action program—a Peace Corps operation begun long before the Corps was conceived. Army units supervise and work with navies on a people-to-people level in small rural communities on water purification, housing, road construction, small port facilities, schools, and other projects.

ECONOMIC STRATEGY

The second element in our broad strategy must be directed toward encouraging free and stable market economies. Military strategy is devoted to the cure of an infection which has developed to the need of surgery. But economic strategy has the larger role of developing and maintaining a healthful climate in which the dignity and creativity of man may flourish.

However, prosperity cannot be imposed by an outside agency. Any significant change must be accomplished by the people within a country—by the plans and efforts of those who live there.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Since 1958 U.S. private investment in Latin America has fallen off to practically nothing. Besides the decline in foreign investment, native Latin Americans have withdrawn an estimated 10 billion dollars capital and shipped it off to Europe and the United States. Next to the presence of communism in Cuba, the hemisphere's worst problem is this flight of capital.

Not only Latin Americans, but often some in the United States, appear to lack appreciation of the value of private enterprise in the foreign market. In the face of a barrage of propaganda against free enterprise, it is difficult for private businessmen in Latin America to operate and make the important contribution of which they are capable. And if public spokesmen for the United States do not defend and endorse the free enterprise system which has contributed so much to our own growth and strength, then Latin American policies which weaken free enterprise are likely to predominate. As a result, the ultimate good of the Alliance for Progress will be put off further into the future.

PRODUCTIVITY AND DIVERSIFICATION

The third element of our overall strategy must be a better approach to the problems of productivity and diversification. To obtain the capital goods necessary for industrialization, Latin American nations must expand their dollar volume of exports. Nearly all these countries, however, derive 50 percent or more of their exchange earnings from only one or two commodities. A few are almost entirely dependent on one commodity and they suffer severely when the international price levels fluctuate. So until Latin America can diversify its export commodities and other goods, it is likely to continue to suffer from the world market price fluctuations which have been so common over the last decade.

Both exports and the general standard of living in Latin America can be improved greatly if modern management, labor, capital, and technical methods are applied to agriculture. Land reform programs, in particular, must be centered around increased productivity and not around fractionalizing and splintering production limits.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The fourth element in our broader strategy must be to encourage sound local government. Our government-to-government aid programs in Latin America have been carried out primarily at the level of the national governments, and hence have given an overemphasis to centralized government—to the neglect of local government.

Traditionally, local and State governments in Latin America have been assigned a minor role—a factor which has dampened the economic and social development of these countries. The development of sound local government should be encouraged, particularly since an untapped source of revenue is readily available to them in the form of a property tax.

MOBILIZE OUR BEST MINDS

Prof. William Stokes, at our Center's Conference on National Security, noted that we ought to be concerned not only with what we are against, with prohibiting further encroachments of Marxism-Leninism, and eliminating what is already there. We must also concern ourselves with "the alternative attitudes and values, with the alternative economic concepts and ideas, and with the alternative political methods, forms of organization, and procedures."

He is right. We have not done nearly enough to mobilize our best minds and skills within this country—experts in land productivity, taxation, industrial pioneering, local management, education—to establish rapport with key individuals and groups in Latin America.

To summarize: Our minimum strategic objective is to thwart and eliminate communism from the hemisphere as an alien and intolerable system. Our larger objectives are manifold, but a first step toward them is to establish a national priority to marshal the best people we have in search of ways to share with our Latin American neighbors the lessons of our own successful experiences. Then the Alliance becomes one for true knowledge out of which can spring the climate for progress—not of totalitarianism such as the Soviets seek, but of creativity, initiative, and self-reliance.

Observance of the 175th Anniversary of the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States, former Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of the city of Philadelphia, established a public committee whose responsibility it would be to arrange and coordinate a national commemorative program to call to the hearts and minds of all citizens the greatness and significance of our Constitution. It is indeed appropriate that such a program should originate in Philadelphia, the birthplace of freedom, the location of the adoption of the Constitution in 1787. We take pride in our heritage as the Cradle of Liberty, and are proud that this far-reaching, well-organized program was able to reach so vast a number of citizens. Each reminder of our Nation's tradition of freedom under the Constitution contributed to the enhancement of love for, and dedication to, this great land of ours.

It gives me great pleasure to include in my remarks the text of the report on the activities of the committee for the observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of the United States.

OBSERVANCE OF THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Late in 1961, Mayor Richardson Dilworth, of the city of Philadelphia, appointed a citizens' committee to be known as the 175th Anniversary of the Constitution Committee and charged it with the responsibility of preparing a suitable commemorative program which would focus attention of all citizens on the Constitution of the United States—the greatest document ever conceived by the minds, hearts and hands of men.

Mr. William W. Bodine, Jr., was appointed by Mayor Dilworth to serve as chairman of this committee and he headed a distinguished group of nearly 100 Philadelphians who late in 1961 prepared a program of significance designed to carry out the assigned mission.

After many discussions and deliberations, a program was agreed upon which had as its principal objective the honoring of the 50 States of the Union in the order in which they ratified the Constitution and assumed statehood, thus pointing up the importance of the Constitution in the growth of the Union. The committee scheduled a year-long series of ceremonies to be held at Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, where the Constitution was adopted in 1787. A subcommittee consisting of Chairman Bodine, Mr. Frank C. P. McGlinn, vice chairman, and Mr. Paul B. Hartenstein, executive director, prepared details of a weekly program which was successfully carried out for 50 weeks. This report endeavors to give in some detail the salient facts concerning this program and the manner in which the committee fulfilled its responsibilities.

At the outset, it was determined that the celebration should in effect be spread over 2 years; namely, 1962 and 1963, inasmuch as the Constitutional Convention, which convened in May of 1787, after a long hot summer of hard and dedicated work, adopted the final draft of the document on September 17, 1887. After being signed by the delegates to the Convention, it was submitted to the Thirteen Original States for ratification.

To be operative, the Constitution required ratification by two-thirds of the States of the Union and, there being 13 at that time, the approval of 9 States was required. New Hampshire, on June 21, 1788, was the ninth State to ratify, thus making the Constitution operative. It was agreed, therefore, that in addition to the weekly celebrations at Independence Hall honoring the States of the Union, which will be discussed in some detail in this report, the committee would plan a major event to be held on September 17, 1962, and another on June 21, 1963.

It was also decided that it would be wisest to suspend the weekly ceremonies during the weeks of July 1 and September 17, 1962. This course was determined upon so that there would be no event sponsored by the committee which might detract in the slightest degree from the visit of the President of the United States who came to Independence Hall on July 4 to speak to the Nation, and indeed the world, as a feature of the national Governors' conference, gathered here in Philadelphia for what proved to be a historic meeting with the President. The decision to hold no ceremony during the week of September 17, 1962, was arrived at so that complete attention could be devoted to the major celebration taking place on the exact anniversary date of the adoption of the Constitution—September 17, 1787.

The weekly programs developed by the committee began at Independence Hall on January 2, 1962, and with the exception of the weeks of July 4 and September 17, were carried out each Tuesday morning in the exact order in which the States of the Union were admitted. On January 2, 1962, we honored the State of Delaware, the first State to ratify the Constitution. The citizens of Philadelphia were honored by the presence of the Governor of Delaware, the Honorable Elbert N. Carvel, Mayor Richardson Dilworth and City Representative Frederic R. Mann, of Philadelphia, at Independence Hall. Mr. Bodine, the chairman of the committee, presided at the first ceremony and the program to honor all the States of the Union was auspiciously launched. The sounds of patriotic band music reverberated from the walls of historic Independence Hall and drifted over the broad expanse of the Mall and Independence Square as a military color guard followed the Philadelphia police and firemen's band. Fifty ceremonies, fifty talks on, "What the Constitution Means to the People of My State," 50 State flags flying on the flagpole of Independence Hall for a full week, 50 gatherings of Philadelphia citizens as well as visitors from all over the world, served effectively to point up the greatness of the Constitution of the United States. Almost 7,000 school children from all grades and all sections of Philadelphia as well as from the surrounding counties, attended these affairs and participated in the inspiring and impressive ceremonies. Each student was presented with a facsimile of the Constitution and a certificate duly signed by the mayor of Philadelphia and Chairman Bodine attesting to the fact that the recipient was present on one of these memorable occasions. Each Governor was invited by the mayor of Philadelphia and the mayor's committee, to come to Independence Hall, bringing or sending the flag of his State to be flown for the remainder of the week on the Independence Hall flagpole and to present a brief message on "What the Constitution Means to the People of My State." After the opening procession and introductions by the chairman, the mayor of the city of Philadelphia or his representative, introduced the Governor from the State being honored (in most cases it was a representative of the Governor) and a brief speech was delivered on the assigned subject. Following the Governor's (or his representative's) remarks, a proclamation was presented by the city of Philadelphia, either by the mayor or his designee, to the Governor of the State being honored, to be brought to the attention of the people of his State.

When the committee embarked on this program of weekly ceremonies, there were many in the city of Philadelphia who were concerned that while the program might start out well, we would not be able to carry on through 50 ceremonies as planned. The committee takes a great deal of satisfaction in reporting that its program was successful, and the ceremonies as planned—all 50 of them—did take place. True, it took a great many telegrams, letters, and telephone calls and in some cases, even a certain amount of coaxing; particularly as invitations were extended to the Governors of the far Western States. Participating in these 50 ceremonies were four Governors, one ex-Governor, several Senators, a number of Congressmen and many other high State officials. Only one State, Georgia, was not able to have a representative attend. This occurred because the Governor's representative simply could not get to Philadelphia because of bad flying weather. The Governor assigned the attorney general of Georgia to represent him, and he was at the airport in Atlanta when "weathered out" with no alternate means of transportation to Philadelphia.

When we found this to be the case, the matter was discussed with the Governor's office by phone and he suggested we appoint someone here in Philadelphia to represent him. Mr. M. O. Anderson, the Superintendent of Independence National Historical Park, was named as the representative of Governor Vandiver of Georgia. We already had an advance copy of Governor Vandiver's speech and in this way, Georgia was well represented.

The weather was favorable to this program inasmuch as only 5 of the ceremonies were forced indoors; on 45 occasions we were able to hold the ceremonies outside of Independence Hall at the flagpole.

While many of the ceremonies were outstanding for one reason or another, two call for special mention in this report. The first is the one that was conducted on May 1 when the committee joined with the Law Day committees of both the State bar association and the Philadelphia Bar Association and enlarged the ceremonies to include not only the program honoring the State of Indiana, but also extensive and impressive exercises relating to Law Day itself. On this occasion, the Governor of the State of Indiana, the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, spoke for his State in connection with the flag-raising exercises and was the principal speaker for the bar association. The other occasion was when we honored Kansas. The annual meeting of the American Municipal Association was being held in Philadelphia at the time and the Governor of Kansas requested the mayor of Kansas City, Kans., Paul F. Mitchell, to represent him on this occasion. There were 12 other Kansas mayors here for this convention, all of whom attended the ceremonies honoring Kansas, thus providing the largest representation from any one State at any of these 50 ceremonies. There were more than 40 Kansans at Independence Hall on this occasion.

It is important to note that during the summer months when the schools were closed, the school children were not available to be part of the audience. This presented no problem of any moment, however, because from the week that school closed until they reopened in the fall, the large number of tourists from all over the United States and from all other parts of the world who visited Independence Hall, particularly during the summer, made up our audience. There never was any difficulty in having a

good gathering of citizens to witness the brief but impressive ceremonies.

This report would not be complete without paying tribute to the officials and staff of the Independence National Historical Park. They are members of the National Park Service organization who cooperated in every particular with the committee and participated in the ceremonies on every occasion. Without their faithful and constant assistance, these affairs could not have been held, nor could they have been as effective as they were. The committee is grateful to the National Park Service and those assigned to the Independence National Historical Park. Specifically, Mr. M. O. Anderson, the Superintendent, deserves the special plaudits of the committee.

Particular credit must be given in this report to the military services that participated by providing a color guard on each occasion which added so much color and dignity to the events. Through the cooperation of the Commandant of the Fourth Naval District, Adm. Robert W. Cavenagh, U.S. Navy; Gen. Oliver C. Harvey, Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center; Brig. Gen. Joseph S. Reynaud, U.S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Supply Activity; Col. Edgar R. Owen, Commander, Headquarters, 111th Fighter Group (Air Defense) Pennsylvania Air National Guard; Capt. James W. Smith, Philadelphia Command Element, 52d Artillery Brigade (Air Defense) USA, Pedricktown, N.J., and the staff members, the various military services took tours of duty covering from 4 to 6 weeks but the Navy acted as color guard for 16 of the 50 weeks.

As an addendum to this report, we have listed the names of those who represented the Governor of each state which was honored, the name of the person who represented the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, and the presiding officer at these 50 ceremonies held every Tuesday in 1963.

It is also important to note that Mayor James H. J. Tate who succeeded Mayor Dilworth early in 1962 endorsed the commemorative program and actively participated throughout the year-long celebration.

Truth in Packaging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in the June issue of Internal Affairs, which is published by the Department of Internal Affairs of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a poem was featured by a Pennsylvania housewife on the subject of deceptive packaging of food and other commodities. I am sure that it will be of great interest to the Members, so I have included it in my remarks:

HOW NOW, MR. FOOD PACKER

(By Lillian Mermin Feinsilver)

Let me hereby start some rumors
About feminine consumers:
We are far from enlightened,
And we're mad—and even frightened.

We have started reading labels
On the foodstuffs for our tables,
And we're truly foaming lathered
Over facts that we have gathered.

We are hep to hidden treasure
In improper weights and measure,
And we spot their lowdown traces
In a plethora of places—
From the boxes that are bigger
Than the weight should really figger
Or the bottles that are styled
So the sight can be beguiled.

To the lettering so tiny
(Or on colored wrapper shiny)
That no eye can make it juggle
Into text without a struggle.

To the contents put in fractions—
All of which are such infractions
Of good taste and good intentions
That they lead to these contentions:

We need better regulations
To dispel our trepidations.
Not all packers heed the book,
And La Consumer's being took.

Yes, loss in weight and gain in price
Together catch a sucker twice;
And "Family Size" in cost per ounce
Can often mean an upward bounce.

Besides, note those expedients
For listing of ingredients—
The "alternate" or "and, where used"
That leave the shopper all confused.[1]

Or the vaguely stated "spices,"
One of several devices
That withhold much information
From us buyers of the Nation.

More practices disputable
Which surely should be mutable:
Flavors and colors "artificial"
Not "U.S. Certified" official.

Strange "softeners" and "conditioners"
Unnamed for home nutritioners,
Or all those articles "added"
That make products further padded.

Like "hydroxyanisol",
Fiercest-sounding of them all
(After being "butylated"
For our senses mutilated).

Don't you, now, agree with me,
No product ought to harbor three
Types of such extraneous item
Lest a Federal law would fight 'em?

I've just chewed a stick of gum
Whose label left me feeling glum:
Not one or two or three, but four
Synthetic extras was the score.[2]

Just in case that doesn't faze you,
Here's a fact that may amaze you:
From this chemical bag of tricks
Our daily margarine gets six.

And if THAT seems unexciting,
Let me say that at this writing,
I've seen one that's tempting fate—
A mashed-potato prep. with eight.

(Worse offenders, I don't doubt,
May be readily sought out—
Discovery I leave to you;
Their purchases I for one eschew.[3])

And too—why should the packers chafe
At finding out how much is safe
Of each new kind of chem. preserv.
Before it's judged OK to serve?

Sodium benzoate, I know,
Is limited to an old low [4]—
Should we not determine whether
Others also need a tether?

What is all too oft-forgotten
Is the underlying rotten
Residue of pesticides
That in much of food resides.[5]

Not to mention dirty fallout
(On which study's far from all-out)[6]
That gets into so much cooking
When we women are not looking.

If such by themselves are scary,
Adding to them's most unwary.
Let us not our innards use
For these modern witches' brews.

If all that is not enough
We deplore still other stuff.
Further facts from label reading
Worry us in family feeding.

Beef and poultry prods. like bouillon
Show the kind of rope that you're on.
Chicken cubes say "fed.-inspected";
Beef ones? They go unsuspected.

And dried soups are even queerer:
Rarely do you find that mirror
To the quality within;
You must act on faith therein.

With respect to ham and corned beef
We've another weary, worn beef:
Why do not their wrappers show
These meats are spiked with H_2O?

(And why, indeed, supply this shot
To evaporate within the pot?
We'd pay lots more without blinking
If convinced there'd be no shrinking.)

These few examples will, we hope,
Suggestively describe the scope
Of modern mamma's shopping ken—
Take warning, you food-packing men.

We'll give you time to reassess
What we can only term a mess;
And if you do not mend your ways,
We'll let the Congress hear our brays.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] If one has to watch his diet,
Let him read such lists and try it.

[2] That's on top of almost twenty—
Which is many more than plenty—
Other things that hide in "gum base"
(Undisclosed, they say, to save space.
Yet Consumers Bulletin shows
That in printing readable rows,
There is room for telling us all
Even though gum wrappers are small.)

[3] At the rate they're multiplying
Chemicals must leave us sighing
For the good old-fashioned flavor
We are nevermore to savor.
And—what is a greater pity—
Both in small town and in city,
Many a child, in mother's haste
May never know food's real taste.

[4] One-tenth of 1 percent, we're told
Is all that any food may hold.

[5] Consult Miss Carson's "Silent Spring"
For data on this pesky thing.

[6] For a portrayal of these warts,
See the mag. Consumer Reports.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Education and Labor, urging approval of the bill to provide for a National Service Corps. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, you have under consideration a most important subject. I introduced H.R. 5640, to provide for a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the United States, and my bill and others providing for

such a Corps are now before you. I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in favor of this legislation.

Impressive testimony, overwhelmingly in favor of the Corps has been given by many persons from public and private life. The Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Peace Corps, community leaders, directors of hospitals, social service workers, religious leaders, national service organizations, industrial leaders, and many others, have been vigorous in their efforts in behalf of the legislation and enthusiastic in its support. I have received voluminous mail from individuals and organizations urging passage of the bill.

We have had graphically described for us the poverty in certain of our Indian reservations, among migratory farm laborers, and in our city slums. Millions of human beings in our country exist in a vacuum of despair. These are our fellow citizens who live under heartbreaking conditions. We must face the fact that in this land of opportunity of ours, 1 in 6 lack opportunity; 11 million boys and girls have almost no chance of being useful citizens. The sick and the underprivileged are begging for our aid. But in this affluent society of ours, we have ignored the deplorable conditions and the sufferings of the poverty stricken; we have closed our eyes to the misery so close at hand.

We have been shown that there is need for a National Service Corps in every part of our country. Now that testimony and information received have spread the facts before us and have shown what must be done, if we have a national conscience, we should proceed with alacrity to do everything humanly possible to alleviate the woeful conditions which exist.

The national service program would help to show the American people the extent of the poverty and despair in our country, so that our resources can be used to the fullest extent possible to solve the human problems and so that there can be a new and concerted nationwide attack on the causes of such poverty and despair. It would enlist the aid of all citizens of our country to do their utmost about the causes. The problems are too overwhelming and too numerous to be solved by private and local efforts alone. The national service program would operate on a Federal level; it would provide a service and a hope; it would offer human minds, hands, and compassion, all inspired by a sense of patriotism and love for one's fellow man. We recognize the importance of stimulating community efforts in areas of critical human needs.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has pointed out that there is a critical shortage of personnel to carry out needed community services—shortages of physicians, dentists, nurses, social workers, teacher, and others. The corps would recruit skilled and dedicated persons who would be willing to give a year of full-time service as assistants in these shortage professions.

Mental retardation is a grave national problem and the Federal Government must help solve it. All States face the same burden—how to get dedicated people who can provide motivation instead of just custodial care. The National Service Corps would respond to requests by local communities for assistance in self-help projects. Study has shown many areas in which there is need for the National Service Program—among them, educational aid; communities would be happy to have the Service Corps aid in locally initiated projects aimed at keeping youth in school and otherwise helping people to learn. It is a shocking fact that there are over 8 million Americans who have less than 5 years of schooling; one-third of our youth become school dropouts; about 5.5 million suffer mental retardation. When we help these people, we help ourselves and our Nation. There is a monumental task to be done in our urban slums—child welfare work alone will require tremendous effort. We must help slum youth to break the cycle of poverty and deprivation. Corpsmen would help as instructors and recreational supervisors, in social work, in health programs. We find that our American Indians on reservations are suffering from malnutrition, inadequate sanitation and lack of educational opportunity. They need to be taught how to help themselves, and will welcome such assistance. Migrant workers and their children need social work and educational aid.

Our Peace Corps has proved eminently successful. I feel certain that a National Service Corps would prove just as successful and would contribute inestimable help to our Nation. A perpetual problem of most communities is to try to get enough personnel with necessary education and motivation at existing wage levels in those positions directly responsible for rehabilitation, education, and understanding. The need is only partially met by part-time volunteers who donate their efforts in neighboring institutions for the aged, the mentally disturbed, the chronically ill. There is a great need for those who are idealistically motivated and with the proper background to tackle the many tasks at hand.

Those to whom money is not a primary objetcive but who seek to help their fellow men wherever they can, can be priceless assets, not only in the work they perform—but in the example they set. It is here that a domestic Peace Corps can prove meaningful. At a minimal cost the idealism and knowledge of the volunteers can be directed for maximum effect.

If we are to be successful in furthering the cause of democracy abroad, then we must fulfill our obligations to our needy citizens at home. Domestic Peace Corps volunteers working with our unfortunate people will be performing a valuable service for the vast numbers who cannot help themselves. Our citizens will be alerted to the duties they can perform, and we know that there is nothing more gratifying than to hold out a helping hand to a neighbor who needs us.

This proposed measure which can provide so much good at so little cost, should have our hearty support. We desperately need a national service corps. I urge your favorable action and am hopeful that the bill will soon become law, so that this valuable and important work can go forward.

NASA Authorization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is, on balance, a good bill and deserves support.

I am, as a new Member of Congress, proud to be associated with the Science and Astronautics Committee. Its work has been impressive and its deliberations studious and exhaustive.

Although I was sharp in my questioning of the NASA witnesses who appeared before us, I can say they were an outstanding group of men in whom America can take great pride. The job they have done is first rate.

I believe it is the task of Congress to be crtiical and wherever possible constructive. I believe that our committee has done both soundly and well and that the program is a better one as a result.

The program has three levels—inner and outer space and here on earth. The need to control inner space is of military importance and this year our committee stressed the importance of "one team" spirit with our military to protect the security of our Nation. The distinction between military and civilian in the field is rather the expression of a hope for the future than of a real difference.

In outer space, with certain exceptions, our program is sound and has been successful. I doubt there is a single official at NASA who would trade it even for what the Russians have. We have made remarkable progress. No other nation on earth could have done it.

Although we heard the expected statements that the program could not be "cut," it was obviously watered for just such a purpose. All pruning was done most carefully and is justified. If need for additional funds should arise, the Congress would appropriate it in a supplemental request. In the early stages of a new program such requests should be expected.

Some money has been saved as a result of elimination of duplication with the military. This kind of economy can only result in a better coordinated program. It appears that a joint committee made up of members of the Science and Astronautics Committee and the Armed Services Committee should be set up to foster cooperation.

Most of my criticism of the current program is based on that phase taking place on earth.

I personally believe that NASA is tending to spread itself into too many fields for which it has not been given responsibility. I speak of moneys contracted for studies of public relations, sociology, water pollution, regional development, transportation, and school construction. These matters should not be allowed to detract from NASA's responsibility to keep America first in space. When the hardware is developed there will be time to consider these matters of lower priority.

I realize that much of the research done by NASA must be of the "basic" type. However, this should not become a habit. I believe that there should be an expanded program of practical research looking for a current solution to the development of proper noise suppressors for jet engines. The present program, though extensive, is directed toward the noise control of "sonic boom." I do not believe it is wise to solve problems yet to come before those that already exist.

America is now first in the space race. Our present team is well equipped to keep us there.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my supplemental statement to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, on the vitally important subject of civil rights. My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, in May of this year, when hearings were begun on civil rights bills before our committee, I made a comprehensive statement covering the numerous bills on civil rights which I had introduced, and I pointed out the great necessity for approving and passing strong, effective, civil rights legislation.

Thereafter, I introduced bills to reduce the congressional representation of States which deny the vote to Negroes. Congress has an obligation to enforce section 2 of the 14th amendment. If effective action is taken by the Congress in this regard, it would correct the injustice against Negroes who are now prevented from voting; absurd residence requirements and complicated literacy tests would disappear.

The social revolution now progressing at full speed throughout our country has intensified. Negroes and members of other minority groups are not to be denied their just rights; they will not be content with empty promises; they are demanding equality now. They are casting off the yoke of "second-class" citizenship. Because of recent events, I feel it necessary to make a supplemental statement.

The President, on June 19, 1963, sent his message on civil rights and job opportunities to the Congress. He was eloquent in his appeal to the conscience of the American people and called upon us to meet the growing moral crisis in American race relations. Thereafter, Mr. Chairman, you introduced H.R. 7152, which embodies the President's program. On June 24, 1963, I introduced H.R. 7223, which is identical with your bill, to show my strong support, as I wished to lose no opportunity to work for this important legislation. The bill is the most comprehensive civil rights bill ever to receive serious consideration from the Congress. There are titles relating to voting rights, public accommodations, school desegregation, community relations service, Civil Rights Commission, nondiscrimination in Federal programs, Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and other provisions.

Discrimination against human beings because of their color, race, religion, national origin or ancestry in any phase of our American life is morally wrong. The conscience of the American people has been aroused. Every right-thinking American wishes to help those who suffer the indignities of discrimination; the millions who, for generations, have been denied voting rights, educational and employment opportunities, decent housing, and who have been refused lodging and food because of the color of their skin.

We have heard testimony by leaders in all walks of life who advocate prompt enactment of this legislation; religious leaders, labor organizations, national service organizations, educators, civic organizations, State and city officials, and many others, have made persuasive pleas for the millions who look to us for the help this legislation would afford them.

It is an indisputable fact that the future of our Nation depends upon enactment of the administration's civil rights bill. We face terrible consequences if we fail in our duty now. I hope and pray that our committee and the Congress will not shirk the duty and responsibility which is ours.

I wish to make my position clear—we must pass strong, effective civil rights legislation. The proposed reforms are long overdue. I call upon our committee and the Congress to approve the administration's bill in its entirety and in the form in which it was introduced—including the important public accommodations section. Anything less will mean a continuation of racial strife and violence.

Let us now establish here in our Nation the true democracy of which we have boasted; let all citizens enjoy the equality and rights guaranteed them by our Constitution.

The State Board of the Greatest Agricultural State Speaks on the Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the California State Board of Agriculture appointed by Governor Brown should know the problems of the greatest agricultural State in the Union as well as any other group of persons. Their backgrounds and experience should be persuasive credentials to those seeking considered opinions and judgments concerning the bracero program.

The board has access to all of the facts and records pertaining to the reliable supply of domestic labor available to California agriculture.

The board says officially:

The termination of Public Law 78, which provides authorization for contract foreign labor, will have a very serious impact on California agriculture and related industries. Domestic labor supply is currently not available to meet the supplemental labor required in a number of California's important crops.

California agriculture and California State governmental agencies are concentrating on developing ways and means to fill their labor requirements from domestic sources. However, these means will fall short in 1964, and for sometime thereafter, and will result in a curtailment of the production of important crops if foreign contract labor is not available. In addition, the loss of the contract foreign labor and the recruitment of necessary labor from domestic sources will create economic and social problems, such as unemployment in related industries, problems of transportation and housing for workers and their families, the need for schools, hospitals and other services.

This board is as concerned with the individual farm laborer as it is with the farmer. No one has ever accused the board of being probusiness or antilabor.

The California State Board of Agriculture adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION REGARDING 3-YEAR PHASEOUT OF FOREIGN CONTRACT LABOR PROGRAM—PUBLIC LAW 78

Whereas, the U.S. House of Representatives has failed to pass H.R. 2009, which provided for a 2-year continuation of Public Law 78, and

Whereas the complete termination of the foreign contract labor program authorized under Public Law 78 at the end of 1963, will have a serious impact on several of California's important agricultural industries; and

Whereas other bills have been introduced in the Congress for a 3-year phaseout of Public Law 78; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the California State Board of Agriculture, at a meeting in Sacramento in July 15, 1963, respectfully urges and endorses the enactment of legislation providing for the progressive termination of the foreign contract labor program over a 3-year period, to give California farm industries a reasonable opportunity for action to provide them with an adequate supply of labor for the production of crops, where the need cannot now be filled with domestic labor; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California; Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Hon. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, and the members of the California congressional delegation.

For those seeking the advice and counsel of knowledgeable and objective experts in agriculture, these men have credentials.

Capt. Finn Ronne Addresses Norwegians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year in Norway there is a celebration of American Independence Day by the Norwegians. At a time when many nations seem at loggerhead, this annual event is heartening, for it emphasizes the common purpose and heritage as well as the sturdy virtues which are shared alike by Americans and Norwegians.

Speaker at this year's Fourth of July celebration in Sandefjord, Norway, was Polar Explorer Capt. Finn Ronne, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired. Captain Ronne, who immigrated to this country from Norway as a young man, has covered more terrain in the Antarctic by dogteam and airplane travels than any other Antarctic explorer and has claimed vast and valuable territories in the Antarctic for America. He was recently given the certificate of merit by the Explorers Club of New York in recognition of his geographic and scientific contributions to polar knowledge over 30 years of exploration.

Under unanimous consent I insert Captain Ronne's speech in today's RECORD. I believe my colleagues will find his words timely and inspiring, and a credit not only to the Americans of Norwegian ancestry who have contributed so greatly to our country, but to all Americans

whose colorful and different backgrounds have helped to mold this great Nation:

FOURTH OF JULY 1963 ADDRESS IN SANDEFJORD, NORWAY

(By Capt. Finn Ronne)

It is with profound pleasure and honor that I am here today upon the invitation of Nordmannsforbundet—to extend greetings to the Norwegian people on the occasion of the Fourth of July the Independence Day of the United States. I am bringing this greeting to you with the best wishes from those Americans of Norwegian birth—those who left Norway, searched and found their fortunes in the land across the sea.

Americans—all over the world are commemorating this day—their 187th year of independence when the fight for freedom had at last been won as they broke away from English colonialism. A Union of Thirteen States today consists of 50 States, including Hawaii and Alaska.

I am sure that we all remember the glorious saga of the coming of our forebears from the land of Thor to the forests and plains of America. Leif Erikson came early—almost 500 years before Columbus. We are proud of the Viking exploits and have long celebrated them in speech and song. October 9, Leif Erikson Day, is officially recognized in several States in the Midwest and Far West.

The modern story of the Norwegian migration began in 1825 when the first Norwegian emigrants sailed from Stavanger in the sloop *Restoration*. During the next 100 years, more than 1 million Norwegians came to the United States. They left their small mountain valleys and hamlets in the old country for the lush meadows and sun-drenched prairies of the Central and Western United States. Except for Ireland, Norway gave to America a larger proportion of her people than any other nation during the Atlantic migration of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Originally, Norwegians came to America to realize their destiny in a new life—in the great, open and undeveloped spaces of America. Encouraged by glowing letters from those already there, wave after wave of enthusiastic migrants crossed the hazardous Atlantic and joined the westward movement and settled in all the States and territories from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. The Norwegians settled thickly on river bottoms and spacious prairie lands under the large and potent sun, and they built towns that were called Norway, Oslo, Voss, Hetland, Bygland, and Flom to mention only a few.

In the Midwest the Americans from Norway became successful farmers for the most part. Many helped to build railroads across the plains and over the Rocky Mountains. Norwegian Mormons, seeking religious and political freedom, marked the routes to Utah and the Far West. The discovery of gold in California was a strong and attractive force as the discovery of the rich, black soil of Illinois, Minnesota, and Iowa had been before. In Montana they became miners, lumbermen, railroad workers, and businessmen. And so they came with courage and endurance over desert and mountains to the Pacific Ocean where they have played a leading role in the shipping industry and construction work as engineers and architects.

Let me say to you: No European contribution to the racial conglomerate of America was more American before it passed Ellis Island than the groups from Norway. Freedom from classlines, love of liberty, and the appreciation of personal worth are inbred characteristics of Norwegian history and life in the valleys and in the fjords. The pioneering of the Norwegian emigrant on the physical frontier of America paved the way for pioneering by their sons and daughters on the frontiers of scholarship, science, medicine, literature, engineering, and art.

One result of the Civil War of the United States was to identify the Norwegian emigrants closely with the ideals and fortunes of their adopted country. Deeply opposed as they were to slavery, several thousand Norsemen responded enthusiastically to President Lincoln's call for volunteers. They fought in many battles for the Union cause and gave their strength and their lives for the unity and safety of their adopted country no less bravely and no less cheerfully than did the native born Americans.

Thousands of sons, daughters, and grandchildren of Americans from Norway served in both World Wars, and distinguished themselves in all the military services in the foremost firing lines on land, on the sea as well as in the air. A Marine fighter-pilot JOE Foss won the Congressional Medal of Honor by shooting down dozens of Japanese fighter-planes in the Pacific. Another Marine officer Evans Carlson won fame at Guadalcanal by leading a battalion known as Carlson's Raiders. Gen. Lauris Norstad who helped plan the north African campaign, became chief of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe and later became head of NATO forces in Europe. Gen. Lief Sverdrup, brother of the late leading world-scientist Harald Sverdrup, played a leading role in the Pacific war under Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And so I could go on and on.

As the frontier era faded into the past and as more and more technically trained Norwegians migrated to America, they have made impressive contributions to the American professional life. Americans from Norway have built tunnels and bridges, skyscrapers and factories, and subway systems in many of the American cities. Olaf Hoff built tunnels under the Harlem and Detroit Rivers. Ole Singstad constructed the Holland, Lincoln, and Queens Midtown Tunnels in New York. Gunvald Aus and Kort Berle engineered the Woolworth Building in New York (for many years the tallest building in the world), the Supreme Court Building in Washington, and many others. The contribution of these and many other Norwegian-American engineers make an impressive chapter in the history of American industrial life. Men of Norwegian birth and ancestry have also made major contribtuions in the scientific fields, medical sciences, education, literature, movies, television, music, and exploration. The most outstanding man of letters among us was Ole Rølvaag whose masterpiece "Giants in the Earth" was first published in 1924.

In the realm of business and finance we have not been big operators. While a few of our countrymen have built modest fortunes, as a group we have preferred small-scale enterprise. The Norwegian's empire has been his home, farm, his workshop, his general store.

Last but not least, the Norwegians have made contributions to American Government and politics at all levels. Hundreds have been mayors of American cities, and more than two dozen men of Norwegian ancestry have sat in Governors' chairs. Many more have served in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. The well known and respected Senator Knute Nelson served in Congress for 33 years. Upon his 80th birthday he received congratulatory messages from the King of Norway, the President of the Norwegian Parliament and the President of the United States.

Thus, in little more than 125 years, the dream of our ancestors has come true in generous measure. The Norwegian-American saga has been a thrilling one. Never before in the history of mankind has a Nation of pioneers grown so fast, or become, for better or for worse, the greatest power on earth. In cooperation with other Europeans we have made our own America. Let us rejoice, as once again we celebrate together the Fourth of July, that both Norway and America are still lands of the free and homes of the brave. And let us resolve ever to keep them so.

Before concluding my remarks today, I have another pleasant task to perform—one which gives me a great deal of satisfaction. First, however, I have to relate a short story.

Last summer while visiting the famous hunter and trapper Hilmar Nøis in Sassendalen, up on Spitsbergen, he presented me with a dogsled—one that he himself had used over the years. Although it was in a bad condition with a couple of the crossbars missing, I recognized it as a historic prize of great sentimental value. Nøis obtained this sled in 1913 from Adoph Hoel and he knew at the time that it was the one of the original sledges that Amundsen's party used on their long trek when they first reached the South Pole on December 14, 1911. Since the sled thus is a historical treasure, I decided that it should not leave Norway as here it would have more appreciation than any other place in the world.

The sled has now been restored to its original condition and herewith I present it to Consul Lars Christensen with the hope that he will include it among the historical items in his Whaling Museum here in Sandefjord as a memento of the first conquest of the South Pole by Norwegians. Before we hear from Consul Christensen may I express the words used by Frithjof Nansen when the FRAM expedition returned to Norway, as follows:

"We glader oss over alt det som er naad. Vi vil folge de smale kjelkespor som de smaa svart prikkene av hunder og men har trukket over den endelose hvite flate der syvdpaa, som en forskningens skinnegang in i hjerte av det ukjendte. Vinden arbeider i sit evige jag hen over disse spor gjennem sneorkenen. Snart er alt slettet ut. Men videnskapens skinnegang er lagt, vor viden er blit rikere; og av dyden lyser det til alle tider."

In conclusion—let me thank you—each and everyone for this great privilege of addressing you—my fellow countrymen.

A Record of Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Post on August 4. The article by one of Washington's ablest reporters, Milton Viorst, provides much insight into the personality of one of our leading statement, Averell Harriman.

The article follows:

AVERELL HARRIMAN: HE CAME BACK WITH THE TREATY

(By Milton Viorst)

WASHINGTON.—Someone once said it's a pity youth has to be wasted on the young, but that was before W. Averell Harriman's time. Now in his eighth decade, the former New York Governor is a man who obviously still has the zest and vitality of youth to spice the experience and wisdom of later years.

In New Frontier Washington, where the top man in his forties and key policymakers still wear a college sheen, Harriman is considered a gray-haired boy. And the peace-

loving world looked on him with wonder last week when he returned from Moscow with a nuclear test ban treaty.

Harriman, at 71, isn't about to stop moving. Besides his regular duties as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, he is the President's chief lobbyist for mobilizing, the public and the Senate behind the treaty. His days are, and will be, filled with interrogations before congressional groups, interviews with the press and personal appearances before almost any audience that will hear him.

Despite his association with the smooth and articulate New Frontier, Harriman is still the uncertain public speaker that New Yorkers came to know when he campaigned for and occupied the Governor's Mansion in Albany. But what he says packs a punch. Harriman invariably knows what he is talking about and is never reluctant to come out with it, even if he bruises someone in the process.

At the Washington Press Club this week he replied thus to a question from a reporter: "This is a typical question of a semi-informed person." When his audience burst into laughter, he snapped: "If I have offended anybody, I am delighted."

Though normally not so caustic, at least not in public, Harriman is nonetheless a man who is persuaded that he has done a good job in his time and does not lightly take the criticism of those who have achieved less than he. Few have come close. He has also served, among many other things, as wartime Ambassador to Moscow, Secretary of Commerce and head of the Marshall plan.

It was in his elegant paneled office at the State Department that he reminisced in an interview on his tenure in Albany. Though he conceded he was under orders from the White House to refrain from talking politics these days—in order to get as much bipartisan support as possible for the treaty—he could not resist comparing his administration with that of Nelson Rockefeller, the man who defeated him for reelection in 1958.

"We had the best team of competent fellows running New York that the State has ever seen," he said. "The trouble was that we were so busy doing a good job we didn't have time to tell anyone about it. We started a lot of programs that Rockefeller threw out. We tackled poverty in aggressive fashion and we were making real headway. We undertook a vigorous program against discrimination. All these programs were dropped.

"The trouble with the current Albany administration," he said—and here the New Frontier reared its head—"is that it has no vigor."

Harriman's office associates still call him "Governor." He says it is just a respectful title, like "Colonel" in Kentucky, and reflects no nostalgia for a lost office. But he still gets heated, for instance, when talking about the Republican charges in 1958 that he was unduly influenced by Carmine De Sapio, the former New York Democratic leader. "They pinned the Tammany label on me," he said "but De Sapio had nothing to do with picking my men. I picked them myself."

As if further to counter the almost-forgotten charge, he declared: "Rockefeller doesn't run New York anyway. It's Walter Mahoney, that stalwart upstate Republican. And I know what an upstate Republican is. I was once one of them myself."

Harriman switched parties in 1928 to support Al Smith and has been a Democrat ever since. He is currently being mentioned as a possible challenger to Republican Senator KENNETH KEATING in 1964. Harriman admits he would not mind being a Senator. The Senate, he says, is a wonderful forum, where what a man says is quoted. "During the Eisenhower administration there were times I wished I were a Senator so that I could get my views across to the people," he said. But he will give no positive indication of whether or not he wants to make the race.

If he has a mission in life, Harriman said, it is not to become Senator but to contribute to the defeat of communism, and he feels he would be doing his part whether he were in politics or in diplomacy. The fight against communism is not internal, as Joe McCarthy once tried to beguile the people into believing, he said, but is on the world scene. The battle is no less serious today than it was in Stalin's time. Only the tactics have changed. Khrushchev, he declared, is as determined to sink the capitalist world as Stalin.

Ironically, it was Khrushchev's view of him as a capitalist that strengthened his hand as a negotiator in the Kremlin, Harriman feels.

"Khrushchev thinks that capitalists dominate this country," he said. "He doesn't like to deal with bureaucrats. He wants to get to the real power and he thinks, because of my background, that I'm one of the possessors of power."

Harriman's background is dominated by a railroad fortune. But even as a young man, he recognized the potential of the new regime in Russia and set out to learn about it.

Harriman is proud that in 1945 he said the differences between Washington and Moscow were irreconcilable. It left him open to bitter criticism in many circles, he said, but it was accurate. Over the years, his influence has grown because of the consistency with which he has held to that position, he maintains. But these irreconcilable differences do not nullify the wisdom of a test-ban treaty in his view. On the subject of nuclear war, he said, the Soviet Union and the United States are in total agreement.

The test-ban treaty, he said, will contribute to peace.

"Khrushchev knows I'm an adversary," he said. "He knows me since I sat next to Stalin and he sat all the way down at the foot of the table. He told me he remembered that scene almost 20 years ago.

"In those 20 years, the Soviet Union advanced from a have-not to a have nation. Have nations are conservative. They don't want to be destroyed. When I was in the Soviet Union at the end of the war, Stalin told me that in 15 years steel production would go up from 12 million to 60 million tons. I didn't believe him. Fifteen years later, however, they had their 60 million tons. To do it, they had to make a prodigious effort not only to build plants to make the steel but exploit the mines, extend the railroads, dig the harbors, create new tools and train the technicians. They don't want to see this go down the drain.

"The difference between Stalin and Khrushchev is that Stalin believed that communism would simply walk in as capitalism rotted away and collapsed, while Khrushchev believes in the necessity for peaceful competition. He still believes in the justice of wars but he doesn't want an atomic war."

Harriman is not a boaster but the self-confidence he exudes when talking of the many times he has guessed right on the complex problems of the postwar world has made a deep impression on his young boss, President Kennedy.

"I wasn't brilliant," he said, "but I was exposed to it." He talked of the recommendations he made when he returned from a tour of Europe to examine the devastation created by World War II. Partly as a consequence of his report, the Marshall plan was born. "Europe saved itself with our help," he said. "Now the battle is in the underdeveloped countries."

After the 1960 election, Harriman, looked on as one of the party's faithful old war horses, was given a roving ambassadorship of obscure purpose, somewhat as an honorific political plum. He first proved his worth to the New Frontier when he skillfully negotiated an agreement over Laos, which many had thought was impossible. He then agreed to take the difficult and unrewarding job of Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, which was by no means honorific and which many thought was too lowly for him. Though he had never been a Far Eastern expert, he handled the tricky problems associated with the crisis in southeast Asia so adroitly that he won widespread acclaim.

Harriman's momentum suggests that he is destined for an even higher position, perhaps that of Secretary of State itself. Certainly, his recent triumph in Moscow adds another dimension to his stature.

Some Washington insiders claim that he has definitely set his sights on Dean Rusk's job and that Rusk knows it. But Harriman's history suggests otherwise. He has always been a loyal team player, whether it was for Roosevelt, Truman, or Kennedy. A patrician in spirit, sure of himself in the big leagues or power politics of high finance, he does not convey the impression of being ambitious for power for its own sake. He was not too proud to take a minor job under a President 25 years younger than he. The Nation has heaped many honors on him and, like any man—save, perhaps, a President—he probably thirsts for more—but as much as any American in recent history he represents a model of the scion of great wealth who has found deep personal satisfaction in public service.

Harriman, however, is not of the cut of, say, a Henry Stimson, where view of public service was, in considerable measure, nonpartisan. He is more like the man who first introduced him to active politics, the common man's aristocrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Harriman is a devoted liberal Democrat and, with the slightest provocation, will launch into a deeply felt tirade on what he conceives to be the errors of the conservative opposition. For the moment, he has reined his feelings in deference to the requirements of passing the test-ban treaty. But in 1964, he plans to be out on the campaign trail again.

Harriman won't say if it will be in his own behelf or in Kennedy's. It is his misfortune that he is such a poor campaigner. Though he is still slim and handsome he lacks the fire an orator needs to convey a message. He is too cerebral, too cautions of the meanings of words. Such, however, are the very qualities that serve him so well as a policy planner or diplomatic negotiator. At 71, Averell Harriman's future is still uncertain. But it seems certain that he still has a long one ahead of him.

Bonneville Provides Needed Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the protracted series of articles attacking the Bonneville Power Administration reminds us of similar diatribes we were subjected to some 25 years ago before Bonneville was completed.

As indicated in the following article from the New York Times, Friday, June 4, 1937, critics at that time maintained that Federal power policy had "resulted in the production of far more power than is needed for public consumption in the areas adjacent to the dams."

Mr. Speaker, these critics have been proven wrong. Bonneville has provided needed power both for our homes and for our industry. In fact, in 1962 fam-

ilies in the Pacific Northwest used about 10 times as much electricity as they used in 1940. Furthermore, the availability of hydroelectric power has resulted in an industrial revolution in the Northwest. Today, for example, 28 percent of the Nation's primary aluminum is produced by Bonneville customers.

As yet, Mr. Speaker, the prophets of gloom are still at work. Once again Bonneville's critics are shouting "surplus" and once again they have failed to look to the future. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest will have to develop three times as much power in the next quarter century in order to support a population that will have expanded to 10 million. The critics of Bonneville have failed to recognize that this burgeoning population will need 3,600,000 jobs to maintain a healthy economy, and it is estimated that a capital investment of more than $1 million a day in new dam and generator projects will be required to put the necessary kilowatts on the line in the next 25 years.

I think the Members will find the comparison between the following article from 1937 and the current series to be both interesting and informative:

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1937]

UTILITIES CONDEMN FEDERAL PROGRAM; PRESIDENT OF EDISON INSTITUTE SAYS POLICY HAS PRODUCED MORE POWER THAN NEEDED

CHICAGO, June 3.—Utility executives attending the annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute voiced criticism of the Government's power program today.

The speakers included Charles W. Kellogg, president of the institute; W. C. Mullendore, executive vice president of the Southern California Edison Co., and Dr. Gus W. Dyer, professor of economics at Vanderbilt University.

Mr. Kellogg declared that Government propaganda had magnified the power issue out of all proportions to its relative importance.

"The Federal Government's power policy has resulted in the production of far more power than is needed for public consumption in the areas adjacent to its dams," Mr. Kellogg said. "It has been attempted to justify this by a cry of 'power shortage.' At the very time this 'power shortage' propaganda was promulgated, the industry had an excess over even normal reserve requirements of about 4 million kilowatts."

Mr. Kellogg estimated construction expenditures by the power and light industry in 1937 at $475 million, compared with $290 million in 1936. The major portion will be for distribution facilities, with generating facilities representing less than a quarter of the total.

During the last 35 years, Mr. Mullendore said, use of electricity has increased 25 times over. Its cost declined more than 66⅔ percent, while the industry's tax bill is 94 times that of 35 years ago.

"Patrioteers who are so concerned to transfer this great natural resource from private to political management find it convenient to forget those who build and maintain this service in fair weather and in foul, through floods, cyclones, and earthquakes," he said. "This industry was made important by those private citizens, who today, we are told, cannot be trusted with its management."

Mr. Dyer, who spoke at the annual dinner tonight, said that since private and municipal ownership of electric utilities began in 1882 there were 3,938 municipal plants established, of which 2,068, or more than half of the municipal government plants were later sold or abandoned. Of the 1,849 government plants that continued in business, 949, or more than half, buy all of their supply of electric power from privately owned plants.

"After half a century of experience," Mr. Dyer said, "private companies are producing 95 percent of the total power supply. These facts indicate that the people of this country have discovered that there certainly is no decided advantage in government ownership over private ownership."

The Charles A. Coffin Medal was awarded to the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., for a distinguished contribution to the development of electric light and power for the convenience of the public and the benefit of the industry." Gerard Swope, president of the General Electric Co., made the presentation. The judges were Mr. Kellogg, Dr. Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Louis H. Egan, president of the Union Electric Light & Power Co. of St. Louis.

A Jim Farley Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD "A Jim Farley Interview" by Godfrey Sperling, Jr. This most interesting article appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on July 9. We are all familiar with the distinguished record of the former Postmaster General in public life and private industry. His varied experience and sustained interest in this country's political life make him a much sought-after subject by newspaper columnists who realize the quality of his keen observations.

I believe the Members of the House will profit by reading General Farley's thoughts on the past and a crystal ball view of the future:

A JIM FARLEY INTERVIEW

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

The big man on the speaker's platform, at a banquet honoring a local Republican, looked a lot like James A. Farley. But he was not only out of place for a Democrat—he also looked like James Farley of, say, 20 or 25 years ago.

It was, indeed, the former Postmaster General, and a few weeks later this reporter was able to verify this almost unchanged appearance at across-the-desk range. He was now president and director of an international soft drink corporation. But, otherwise, he was the same Jim Farley, as strongly partisan in his views as in the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The phone rang and Mr. Farley was saying: "This is James A. Farley, former Postmaster General." He was talking to passport people in Washington, making arrangements for a trip to Europe. At the end of his conversation, he said, again, "I'm Jim Farley. I was in Washington before you were born." Hanging up, he smiled and said: "He was 24 years old; he didn't remember me."

Speaking of F.D.R. Mr. Farley always said, "Mr. Roosevelt." Reminded that he once broke with Roosevelt, he said: "Remember, I only differed with him on packing the Supreme Court and on the third term. I agreed with him on everything else."

Asked to compare President Kennedy with Roosevelt in terms of political persuasiveness, Mr. Farley said: "Kennedy has just as much appeal as Mr. Roosevelt. He has that ability to speak quite seriously and then interject a bit of humor here and there—giving people the feeling he is talking to each one of them."

What would be the issues in the 1964 race? "Unemployment," he said, "has been a big issue ever since the Roosevelt administration. If the economic climate is good in 1964, and if there is peace between labor and management, it will be helpful for the administration in power."

He said that civil rights would be a big issue in 1964, "and for many years to come." He said that the Republicans would be trying very hard to gain political ground from this issue. But he said he felt that any votes the Republicans might pick up in the South would be more than balanced by votes the administration would be gaining in the North. He sees the Democrats winning "California and several other western states that Kennedy lost last time."

Did he have any ideas on the possibile Republican candidates? He said he did not feel it was his place to comment specifically in this area, but he did say he thought the "pros" in the Republican Party would make the choice of the convention—and that it would be the choice of someone the party could "rely on," not a man who might take an independent position.

From this, it sounded as though Mr. Farley saw a choice of a Goldwater, or Romney, or Scranton—rather than the choice of Rockefeller. However, he would not go beyond the general statement.

About here Mr. Farley was on the phone again, talking about the trip abroad. He said his little grandson was going along: "We'll be going to several countries," he said, "including Ireland. The boy is Irish on both sides. I think it's time he kissed the Blarney Stone." Then he laughed.

Hanging up, he talked of another grandchild, a little 11-year-old granddaughter, who recently was asked by her teacher to name the most important American statesman: "Pop," she answered, "James A. Farley, my grandfather." And again laughter.

Had the President made any political mistakes? "Yes," he said, "he has made mistakes and he will continue to make mistakes. All presidents do. But I feel he has the kind of mind to profit from his experiences." From here Mr. Farley went on to say that he felt Mr. Kennedy would become a great President—although he added that much of the administration's record had yet to be written.

Of former President Truman: "He made 10 or 12 courageous decisions. He can't help being among the top five or six presidents."

He also spoke of Truman as the leader of his party. He said that Kennedy also led his party. He said that no president can be truly effective unless he plays this strong political role. In a variant from his partisanship, Mr. Farley had this to say about Herbert Hoover: "One of the most unselfishly patriotic Americans I have ever been privileged to meet. I have great admiration for him which grows with the passing years."

Mr. Farley feels that Mr. Kennedy was more prepared for the presidency that Roosevelt. He thinks that the Kennedy experience in the Senate and House outweighed the Roosevelt experience as Governor of New York. "No President has been better prepared for the presidency," says Farley. "Kennedy was born and raised in a political atmosphere."

What of the civil rights issue in Congress? Mr. Farley saw some legislation this time, "a little more each year." He said that the processes moved slowly in Congress but that he was quite understanding of it—"the lawmakers have their problems, their obligations to their localities, etc." He said he was fully satisfied with our system of lawmaking, as compared with the parliamentary system: "It has served us well," he said. "We should be forever grateful to our Founding Fathers."

Appendix

West Virginia Hosts National Youth Science Camp—Delegates Hear NASA Administrator James E. Webb, Meet Senators During Capital Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, from June 30 to July 20, 1963, 100 young men enjoyed a valuable educational and recreational experience in the wooded mountains of West Virginia's Monongahela National Forest, and other areas of our beautiful State. All were high school students with demonstrated leadership and scholastic ability, particularly in scientific study. They came from every section of our country, two from each State, to attend the National Youth Science Camp, sponsored by the West Virginia Centennial Commission in cooperation with the National Science Foundation.

During 3 stimulating and fun-packed weeks these young leaders not only engaged in the pleasant activities of many other summer camps, such as water sports, hiking, archery, and softball, but also took advantage of a unique educational opportunity. The National Science Foundation's facilities at the National Radio Astronomy Center, Green Bank, W. Va., were made available for inspection, and the capable staff of this installation cooperated with lectures, guided tours, and demonstrations. Additionally, qualified members of the scientific community visited the camp to deliver briefings and lectures. Many of the counsellors were men actively participating in scientific work.

A high point of the camp schedule was a visit by Astronaut M. Scott Carpenter, who spent considerable time with the delegates in answering questions and describing his flight into space. Astronaut Carpenter later commented that he found the young campers extremely knowledgeable in scientific matters, particularly those relating to the Mercury program.

Mr. President, on Thursday, July 18, it was my privilege, along with my West Virginia colleague, Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, to host a luncheon in the Nation's Capital in honor of the delegates to the National Youth Science Camp. Taking a day from their busy schedule, the young men and camp officials came to Washington, D.C., arriving in time to tour the Capitol Building before lunch. U.S. Representative KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, met the group on arrival and accompanied them on their tour, escorting them into the Chambers of the House and the Senate.

The luncheon, in the New Senate Office Building, provided an opportunity for the boys to meet some 27 Senators who either were present for the meal or came by to express greetings. Principal speaker was Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. An honored guest was Dr. Jerome Wiesner, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, gave the invocation and benediction. Prof. Charles N. Cochran, camp director; Carl R. Sullivan, West Virginia Centennial Director; Mrs. Jean Guthrie, camp coordinator for the centennial commission; and Prof. Joseph M. Hutchison, associate camp director, were introduced.

The luncheon was sponsored by the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, a philanthropic organization founded by the late West Virginia industrialist, Michael L. Benedum. It was my pleasant task to read a telegram from Foundation President Paul G. Benedum expressing his regret at not being present, and his high regard for the purposes and accomplishments of the National Youth Science Camp.

In his message to the young scientists and their guests Space Administrator Webb spoke of the history of scientific inquiry and the unbelievable impact of scientific discovery on our lives. He pointed out that this Nation has a strong tradition in research, and that current efforts in Government and in the private sector are aimed toward maintaining our position as a leader in technology. Mr. Webb emphasized that "the human intellect, operating with its powers of observation, can learn ever more about the universe in which we live, and can utilize these forces to modify the environment of earth to the betterment of mankind."

At the conclusion of Mr. Webb's remarks it was my pleasure to introduce West Virginia Centennial Director Carl R. Sullivan, who presented awards to the Administrator on behalf of the Science Camp Delegates, and the State of West Virginia.

Following the luncheon, the campers boarded their buses for the trip to the Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., where yet another unique experience awaited them. Guided by informed and helpful NASA personnel, the group inspected facilities at the center, including a massive computer complex which gathers and stores data relayed from U.S. space satellites.

Mr. President, after several weeks in which to evaluate and review the achievements of the National Youth Science Camp, it has become increasingly clear that from the standpoint of all concerned the event was a genuine success. Letters from the young participants indicate not only appreciation, but recognition of the fact that they had received an educational experience without equal. West Virginians and the Nation can be gratified at the response which the camp has evoked among responsible leaders, and we sincerely hope that it will be possible to continue this project as an annual observance. The National Youth Science Camp is a worthwhile investment in youth, and in the future of America—an investment which will bring rich dividends to the generations of tomorrow. Gov. W. W. Barron, of West Virginia is an ardent advocate of the camp's continuance, and there is widespread hope that this can be done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following items be printed in the Appendix: Remarks by NASA Administrator James E. Webb, at the luncheon honoring delegates to the National Youth Science Camp, July 18, 1963, Washington, D.C.; text of a telegram received from Col. Paul G. Benedum, president of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation; roster of counsellors serving at the National Youth Science Camp, Thornwood, Pocahontas County, W. Va.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, AT A LUNCHEON HONORING DELEGATES TO THE NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP

Senator RANDOLPH, other distinguished Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Mr. Corcoran, and members of the Youth Science Camp, it is certainly a pleasure to be here with this stimulating group today. If, as has been said, a picture is worth a thousand words, then I am sure the experience you young men and women had of rubbing minds with Scott Carpenter last night around your science campfire must have been worth a million words. Carpenter, and all the astronauts, represent men who have the courage and skill to fight in the air, to test the most advanced types of aircraft so that many others may have the best of equipment, to stake their lives on their own skills in the cockpit of a spacecraft when coupled with the skills of their fellow teammates in the control centers and recovery forces around the world, and, in addition, just as important, each of the astronauts has the engineering skills to translate the knowledge and experience they have gained over many years into systems for life support in the hostile environment of space, and for control systems and abort systems that make it possible for a human being to mount the nose of a rocket, take off into space, and return through the fireball of friction as their spacecraft plunges back into the earth's atmosphere.

Scott Carpenter, last night gave you many sides of the picture of space exploration, but I am sure his emphasis was on the role and the importance of the man in the cockpit as we move out into this new medium. This afternoon, at the Goddard Space Flight Cen-

ter, you will see another most important facet of our national space effort. You will see a center where scientists in universities and in industry converge both their instruments and their most advanced ideas to work with men and women in a government laboratory. All must work together to produce and launch the rockets and spacecraft to carry the scientists' ideas and instruments into space, to conduct the network around the world which brings the data back, and then run it through the computers and put it into a form which the scientists can use to analyze the new areas of investigation to better understand the laws of nature. At the Goddard Space Flight Center the international satellites Ariel and Alouette were prepared and tested, and the record-setting weather satellites of the Tiros series were prepared for launch, and the outstandingly successful series of communications satellites, Telstar I and II, Relay, and Syncom I and II, were developed and prepared for flight. And at this center you will see the computer system, the most complete and largest in the United States, which requires about 140 miles of magnetic tape every day to record and store the data from our worldwide network which collects the data from our working spacecraft.

Now Senator RANDOLPH, good friend that he is, gives the appearance of a genial and jovial gentleman. But today, from my point of view, he is a man with a whip. He has told me that I have just 15 minutes to cover the history of science and its relation to space and describe current efforts at the exploration of the universe, and he has hinted broadly that he would be happier if I could do it in 12 minutes. This is not an easy assignment, and I shall try to go rapidly along so that I do not feel his whip as well as see it.

For men and women of my generation and the generation of many of the Senators and Representatives here, it is hard to visualize the kind of dynamic universe in which we live, and to keep constantly in mind the fact that we are now on the spacecraft Earth, traveling at 67,000 miles per hour, and that within 6 months all of us will be 180 million miles from where we are today over on the other side of the sun. But that is the universe in which we live, and the characteristics of the space environment through which our spacecraft Earth is traveling and through which the energy of the sun reaches us is of the utmost importance to the future lives we can live here on earth. But to your generation, these things seem more understandable because you have learned or are learning that while mankind has had agriculture and writing for some 6,000 years, Christianity for 2,000, he has had modern science for only a little more than 300 and has learned to utilize modern science to radically revolutionize the power of technology only in the last 150 years. Three hundred and thirty years ago the cardinals who condemned Galileo stated that it was absurd and false for anyone to assert that the earth was not the center of the universe and that it moved. In rapid succession, man used his powers of observation to examine the material of the earth, the characteristics of the earth such as its gravity, its magnetic fields, its radiation, and also to examine and understand the forms of life as they exist on earth. He magnified his powers of observation through telescopes and microscopes, and now knows that we live and have our being in a vast, limitless dynamic universe where the principles he has discovered through his study of the earth and its material and characteristics and life also seem to apply universally, or at least through much of the universe. He has proven his ability to develop the use of the air through the application of technology to that part of it which is only up to the height of his highest mountains, and through the power thereby gained make possible travel to even the remotest parts of the earth in a few hours. He has seen this same power coupled with the revolutionary forces in the political arena result in a bipolarized world while the shrinking of it through aviation was taking place. He sees that while the application of energy in the form of a new engine by the Wright brothers to the older principles of aerodynamics has permitted man to fly first in the United States, we as a nation neglected aviation, only to see it developed first by foreigners, requiring the United States to mount a major effort to catch up, beginning in World War I and extending into the World War II period.

He has seen the even more radical rocket engine developed in the United States by Dr. Goddard as early as 1926 and which can deliver its power in a vacuum, neglected here also but exploited by the Germans and the Russians with the results that V-2 bombs rained on London during the World War II and the intercontinental ballistic missile became a main ingredient of Russian military power in the 1950's. Again he has seen the United States moving rapidly to catch up, first in many areas in many Government services during the 1950's, and then through a consolidated effort began in 1958 with the passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act and the organization of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Within 7 weeks after President Kennedy took office, four spacecraft, weighing over 10,000 pounds each, were orbited by the Russians, one of them carrying Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin. A fifth, weighing perhaps more, was set on a trajectory toward Venus. To protect our Nation's vital interests and building on the structure created in the period from 1958 to 1961, President Kennedy, with the strong advice and leadership of Vice President JOHNSON and the Space Council, established a space program designed to give the United States preeminence in space. This program is now vigorously underway, as you have heard from Scott Carpenter and will see at the Goddard Space Flight Center. From this U.S. space effort, man is now about to obtain the material of the Moon, and then the material of Mars to compare with the material of Earth. He is about to get even more information about the characteristics of the planets than we obtained from the Mariner flight out to Venus last December for comparative studies of the characteristics of these planets with those of the Earth. And, as we move out to search for extraterrestrial life, it may well be that life from other areas in space will be available for study and comparison with life as we know it here on Earth.

Here is the challenge of space, here is the necessity for preeminence by the United States, because these forces must not be captured and utilized by totalitarian nations with aggressive tendencies. Here is the future of the expanding process through which the human intellect, operating with its powers of observation, can learn ever more about the universe in which we live, and can utilize these forces to modify the environment of Earth to the betterment of mankind.

It is a great pleasure to be here, and permit me to thank you and our host, Senator RANDOLPH, for this splendid occasion.

TELEGRAM TO YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP GROUP

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is my great pleasure to send this greeting and welcome to you distinguished young men. I commend you for the high goals you have set for yourselves in your pursuit of excellence in science, and I congratulate you upon your superior performance in approaching your objectives. West Virginia is honored to have been your host at National Science Camp and the Benedum Foundation is justly proud and delighted to be your host at luncheon today. On behalf of our directors, I salute you and wish you continuing success.

PAUL G. BENEDUM,
President, Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.

COUNSELORS, NATIONAL YOUTH SCIENCE CAMP

David Tork, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.; John Harris, Pennsboro, W. Va.; Paul Errington, Scarbro, W. Va.; Rod Wilson, Morgantown, W. Va.; Roger Mersing, Kingwood, W. Va.; David Shepherd, Morgantown, W. Va.; Lowell Shaw, Fairview, W. Va.; Bob Leeson, Charleston, W. Va.; John Welden, Morgantown, W. Va.; John Stone, West Virginia State College; and Wayne Bailey, Marlinton, W. Va.

Government Lotteries of Ceylon, Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, Syria, and Upper Volta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to discuss a few more of the 77 foreign countries that operate Government-run lotteries as a means of raising revenue. Ceylon, Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, Syria, and Upper Volta are five nations which recognize the wisdom of a national lottery.

Ceylon conducts two national lotteries. One is run by the Hospital Lotteries Board and the other by an Industrial Exhibition Sweep which only started in 1962. However, the gross receipts in 1962 on the hospital lotteries came to almost $1½ million. The total amount given to the government was almost one-half million dollars which was set aside for improvement of the health services.

Republic of Congo does not have its own Government lottery but the French national lottery does sell tickets in this country. Plans are now underway to set up, by agreement with a large German lottery firm, a lottery. By arrangement, the Government would receive 20 percent of the weekly income from the sale of tickets.

Sierra Leone just started to operate a national lottery. The first drawings will probably be held this summer. The Government has announced that they plan to issue 1 million tickets per month which should bring in about $500,000 a month or $6 million a year. The net profits are expected to be invested in capital expenditures for schools and hospitals.

Syria has a nationwide lottery run by the Director of the Damascus International Fair, a semiautonomous organization attached to the Syrian Ministry of Economy. In 1962, the total gross annual receipts were over $1 million. The net income of almost $700,000 was earmarked for the promotion of the annual Damascus International Fair.

Upper Volta does not run its own lottery but once a year a private service organization, the Lions Club, conducts a sort of lottery for a 1-week period and the proceeds go directly into charity work.

Mr. Speaker, all of these countries realize that the urge to gamble is ineradicable and the Government should act to control it rather than ignore it. A national lottery in the United States would make the gambling urge work for the public good. It would easily pump into our treasury over $10 billion a year in new income which can be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

Good Ideas on Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "GORE Has Good Ideas on Test Ban Treaty," published in the Bristol Herald Courier on August 4. The very excellent editoral commends the attitude and the position of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bristol Herald Courier, Aug. 4, 1963]

OUR OPINION: GORE HAS GOOD IDEAS ON TEST BAN TREATY

Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, undersored one of the basic tenets of democracy in an Avoca School speech here Friday night when he reminded his audience that the Volunteer State is sometimes represented by divergent opinions in the U.S. Senate. He said that he and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER always talk things over, usually vote together, but sometimes are led by conviction to cast votes that for all practical purposes cancel each other.

Just as two such like-minded men as KEFAUVER and GORE sometimes disagree, we sometimes disagree with one, the other, or both. But the points made by GORE in his talk to Sullivan County Democrats are so vibrantly true that we deem them worthy of review. Speaking on the Big Three test ban treaty, the junior Tennessee solon drove home the following three concepts:

The test ban represents a first step in easing world tensions.

The test ban would decrease the fallout problem considerably.

The test ban would reduce chances that other countries might develop and test an atmosphere-polluting atomic weapon.

Each of these three points was developed fully and convincingly by GORE, whose unique position as a former Geneva Conference delegate, a former United Nations delegation member, and a current member of the Atomic Energy and Foreign Relations Committees in the upper House gives him an unusual insight into problems connected with testing.

GORE also noted that quite a few Senators who will be called upon to cast votes granting or refusing "advice and consent" to the treaty have yet to reach a conclusion on the test ban. He said they deserved time in which to do so, pointing out that this was a major issue well worthy of deliberation. He is right.

But as Senator GORE's unique position has given him the opportunity to quickly decide which course to take, we feel certain that a majority of the Senate will side with him when the debate is over. As the undecided Senators filter through a mountain of facts on the treaty, they will attain the same level of knowledge that GORE has reached on the subject and most of them, we feel, will come to the same conclusion as has GORE.

Let us not forget, however, that an aura of isolationism and obstructionism lingers yet in the Halls of Congress. There will be opposition to the treaty; we feel, however, that the opposition will be considerably more vocal than strong in terms of voting power. We would be disappointed if some Senators did not honestly oppose the treaty, for that situation could possibly be equally as dangerous as rejection of the treaty.

In short, we side with Senator GORE in urging complete Senate deliberation on the test ban treaty. We trust, as Senator GORE trusts, that the treaty will not be rejected.

Uneducated Killers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. H. Rakestraw, editor of the Pilot, Union Bridge, Md., in an able editorial, adds his voice to the call for more careful driving on our highways. As he points out, every year the accident toll on our highways is 12 times the number of casualties in the Korean war. As a measure of prevention, Mr. Rakestraw calls for education—driver education. I am pleased to include his whole editorial:

UNEDUCATED KILLERS

Every year Americans cut down 40,000 fellow citizens and injure another million and a half. American forces suffered 125,887 casualties in the course of the 3-year Korean conflict; 12 times that many are killed or wounded each year on our highways without a shot being fired.

Korea cost the United States $5 billion 1 year (1951–52); automobile accidents cost $6 billion every year. As highways become more crowded, if present standards are held, accidents and costs will rise as well.

No amount of insurance can replace a father or mother, son or daughter. It is little consolation for a widow to know that her husband had the right of way. License revocations and/or prison sentences have yet to resurrect one traffic victim.

Highway accidents can be looked on as a vicious and deadly disease. Its chief carriers and sufferers tend to be the young but no age group possesses natural immunity by any means. Noticeable symptoms of the disease before it actually strikes are showing off, drunkeness, recklessness, and general lack of commonsense.

The thing to do for a disease is to cure it. The best cure for any disease is prevention. The only way to prevent a disease is to have thorough knowledge of the disease.

By far the best available preventive medicine is driver education. Prospective and already experienced drivers learn the mechanics and responsibilities of driving from professional driving instructors. How many parents are qualified enough to give their children a better than even chance of being skilled drivers and not death machine pilots?

Reports show that a driver education course reduces accidents by 50 percent and insurance is 15 percent cheaper for graduates of driver education courses.

Taneyton, Westminister, and Francis Scott Key have adopted driver education as at least a partial summer course. There is no guarantee that a graduate of one of these courses will not be killed or have an accident, but they have a much better chance of living than their uneducated brothers on the road.

Manned Air and Aerospace Craft and U.S. National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following Washington Report of May 6, 1963, issued by the American Security Council, on the subject of Manned Air and Aerospace Craft and U.S. National Security, was written by Dr. James D. Atkinson, associate professor at Georgetown University and a research associate in its center for strategic studies. This report clearly points out the dangers in continuing to deemphasize the military importance of inner space while the Soviet Union continues to apply space science and technology to military strategy.

In this connection, I again call attention to my resolution—House Resolution 470—to create a Select Committee on National Space Policy to review and reappraise our national space posture and goals.

The report follows:

MANNED AIR AND AEROSPACE CRAFT AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Throughout military history, no search has been more persistent than the search for the ultimate weapon, the impregnable position, the invulnerable force. Now in America in this decade of the 1960's, the search seems finally to have centered on the ballistic missile as the invulnerable answer to the complex problems of defense which beset us.

Underlying this missile strategy is a quantity theory of warfare. It assumes that x numbers of missiles directed against y targets will equate with absolute deterrence. But now, and especially in the future, armaments competition is not solely quantitative The United States might, for example, be able to convince the Soviet Union that we can and will maintain superiority in the production of missiles. We are unlikely, however, to convince Soviets that they will be unable to achieve scientific and technical breakthroughs which might give them overall military parity and perhaps even superiority at some period in the future.

Within the next decade, both the United States and the Soviet Union can be expected to devote strenuous efforts to countering or neutralizing threats posed by the ICBM and the IRBM. Should Soviet efforts prove successful even to a limited degree, the present and projected numerically superior missile capability of the United States may be largely neutralized. Conversely, the

possession by either the United States or the Soviet Union of a manned, continuously powered, nonorbiting spacecraft would have a strategic impact quite without relation to quantity.

All of this is not to say that missiles are worthless. They may be most useful, but they are inherently inflexible and thus should be complemented and supplemented by the flexibility provided only by manned systems.

It is to say that we must avoid the Maginot-line-thinking which assumes that a future war (or its prevention) is based on a ballistic missile exchange. Despite the most careful mathematical measuring and weighing, warfare does not develop according to preconceived images.

The current debate over the RS-70 will alone have served a useful purpose if it causes us to rethink the entire question of manned air, aerospace, and spacecraft. During and beyond the next decade, there appear to be vast new possibilities for using manned systems in preventing general thermonuclear war and in controlling limited and unconventional warfare. VTOL's (verticle takeoff and landing) convertiplanes, air-cushion vehicles, very low level penetration aircraft, ultrahigh altitude aircraft, aerospace and spacecraft—all indicate the expansion of ideas, the development af tactics, and the utilization of technology in support of strategy that can be applied to present and to future modes of conflict facing us.

In the coming decade and, even more importantly, in the years beyond, manned systems will offer these significant advantages over missiles:

1. Operational capabilities: Among these are an unpredictable flight pattern; a superior ability to carry out electronic countermeasures and to operate foxing devices to foil enemy defenses; and enhanced versatility, notably standoff capability; propulsion systems based on nuclear fuel or, perhaps, on fuel cells; and an enhanced reliability factor as a result of the ability to improvise and to make repairs in flight.

2. Controlled launch: Manned air or aerospacecraft can be launched in response to a low-grade equivocal warning and can later be recalled. This permits a significant safety cushion with reference to unverified warnings for which missiles cannot at all be launched, but which should require a controlled reaction on our part.

3. Show of force: Manned systems provide the show of force so often important in deterring a potential enemy military move. This role is automatically denied to missiles. The importance of the show of force in maintaining the general peace has often been demonstrated. The display of strength through the deployment of obvious military power has a psychopolitical value which can scarcely be obtained from missiles buried deep in underground silos. The rapid response and controlled presence of a squadron of RS-70's, for example, would give significantly observable evidence of U.S. intentions to safeguard the peace in a threatened area.

4. Sustained information gathering: Missiles are incapable of reporting what has been accomplished by their strikes. Manned systems can do more than just report their own mission achievements; they also can supply continuous assessments of missile strikes, target damage, shifting of mobile targets, and the like. The side with such continuing information fights with clear vision, the other side fights blindfolded. Such sustained information gathering can best be performed—and in most instances only be performed—by manned air or aerospace craft.

5. The "mix" factor in deterrence: The variety of our possible choices of action adds immeasurably to an enemy's complications in preparing responses to our capabilities. The "mix" compounds the task of the enemy. This makes deterrence meaningful. There are many uncertainties and unknown factors in working out the problems of offense versus defense, since the acid test is—and only is—actual war. Hence those things which complicate the enemy's task set up cautionary signals for him. Those things—such as complete or even too great a reliance on missiles—which simplify this problem, reduce his uncertainties and unknown factors. Such simplification may tempt the enemy to deliver a surprise attack. Above all, the "mix" is significant in the load factor which it places on a potential enemy's defense structure. The Soviets are not all-powerful; there are many limitations on what they can do. Every time we force another defensive requirement on them, it limits their capability in the development of qualitative breakthroughs in offensive weapons.

While manned systems can be expected to take on increased importance in the next decade and beyond, there are three areas that seem worthy of special note. These are:

1. Low-altitude penetration aircraft: Increasingly, it would seem that very fast and ultra-low-level aircraft will have high survivability in face of enemy defense capabilities. Advances now on the horizon in terrain avoidance equipment suggest that low-altitude penetration aircraft will have very great utility in unconventional, limited, and general war situations.

2. Carrier aircraft: Deployed aircraft-carrier based forces appear to be less vulnerable to surprise attack, particularly to ballistic missiles. Carrier-based aircraft will in many cases be more efficient than land based aircraft because of the geographic considerations involved. In fact, carrier aircraft may be the door opener for land-based aircraft in an area in which it is desirable to assist forces friendly to the United States. Additionally, carrier-based aircraft can put up a maximum air effort immediately upon arrival in an area. This latter factor can be expected to have increased importance in the sublimited challenges with which we will be confronted in the coming years. The contribution of carrier task forces to the "mix" is likewise important since there is much evidence to suggest that no small portion of the Soviet military effort is directed toward countering them.

3. Manned "low space" and space craft. The X-15 rocket research aircraft has flown at 314,750 feet. Manned aerospace or "low space" craft will be operational at altitudes well in excess of this figure in the next 10 years. Such craft will possess obvious attack capabilities. Equally important will be the intelligence capabilities which will flow from the operation of manned low space craft.

In the 1960's and 1970's, the outer space environment offers intriguing new possibilities for the exercise of power by the United States in the interest of maintaining peace. Manned systems in space have the potential for controlling the communications utility and the military threat of attack from space. Thus, for example, the United States might well preclude a trouble-inciting nation from effective functioning on earth and from conducting operations in and from space.

The military exploitation of space will require large expenditures and much vision. Most of all it will require the abandonment of the naive belief that we can treat space as a peaceful arena while the Soviet Union actively pursues a course in which the scientific side of space is merely incidental to the military.

SUMMARY

Whether one envisions manned systems operating at very low levels, at high altitudes, in low space, or well out in space, present, and projected technological advances indicate that manned systems are not obsolescent. Rather they will assume new and higher roles in the makeup of a credible strategic deterrent, and in winning and rendering harmless limited or unconventional wars.

The creative, competitive thrust of the American free enterprise system offers us significant advantages in the research and development of the material for advanced manned systems. The American heritage of drive-to-win offers equally great advantages in the area of human resources. These factors do not guarantee success. They do offer the potential—if we have the will to develop and employ them—for victory.

Our present policies with reference to research for and development of manned weapons systems will—if continued—jeopardize the future security of the nation to an irretrievable degree. Equally dangerous for the future is the temptation held out to the Soviets to play the game of strategic blackmail, or, worse, the temptation to gamble on a first strike against America.

Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of Thursday, August 1, 1963, from the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, Wytheville, Va., entitled: "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LEGAL WRONGS

The title of a pamphlet just issued by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government is "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs." Before any reader grabs the idea the commission is a radical or fanatical group, we assure everyone such is absolutely not true. Some of the most distinguished Virginians of the day compose the commission. Gov. Albertis Harrison is an ex officio member. The chairman is David J. Mays, attorney and a Pulitzer Prizewinner for historical biography. Among the members are James Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader, Burr Harrison, former Congressman, two State senators, four members of the house of delegates, W. C. (Dan) Daniel, former national commander of American Legion are some of the members. From this area is Garnett E. Moore, of Pulaski, a native of Max Meadows, and now an attorney and member of Virginia House of Delegates.

The Enterprise believes the proposed civil rights bill is one of the most dangerous suggestions Americans and Congress has ever faced. Therefore, in support of our editorials of the past, condeming the bill, we are using some excerpts from the Virginia commission's "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs." We point out again for emphasis that these men are among the best sound thinking citizens, and definitely are true Americans.

Some of the pertinent highlights that every American Negro or white needs to know—to realize—are set forth in the paragraphs below.

We believe this bill is a very bad bill. In our view, the means here proposed are the wrong means. The weapons the President would contrive against race prejudice are the wrong weapons. In the name of achieving certain "rights" for one group of citizens,

this bill would impose some fateful compulsions on another group of citizens. The bill may be well intentioned—we question no man's motivation in supporting it—but good intentions are not enough. In this area, we need good law. And the President's bill, in our view, is plain bad law.

That is perhaps the least that could be said of it. It our judgment, this bill violates the Constitution in half a dozen different ways:

It would tend to destroy the States' control of their own voting requirements.

It would stretch the commerce clause beyond recognition.

It wrongly would invoke the 14th amendment.

It would undermine the most precious rights of property.

It would raise grave questions of a citizen's right to jury trial.

The bill would open new doors to the forces of Government regimentation.

And in the end, because of the violence that would be done to fundamental law, Americans of every race would suffer equal harm.

The President's bill continues with a provision aimed at certain of the Southern States, in which—in a scattering of counties—fewer than 15 percent of the adult Negroes have registered to vote. The Virginia commission would make its own position clear: We have no patience with conspiracies or chicanery or acts of intimidation intended to deny genuinely qualified Negroes the right to vote. We have no patience with acts of bland partisanship that may give the vote to certain white persons and prohibit the vote to Negroes of equal stature. Wherever such acts have occurred, they are to be emphatically condemned. We do say this: There is abundant law on the books—there was abundant law on the books even prior to enactment of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960—to prohibit and to punish such willful acts by local registrars. All that is required is that the existing laws be enforced. If the Congress somehow is persuaded that still further law is required to enforce the 15th amendment, the Virginia commission will raise no constitutional objection. In the area of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," the amendment plainly vests in Congress the power to adopt appropriate legislation.

At this point in our argument the Virginia commission would beg the closest attention: We do not propose to defend racial discrimination. We do defend, with all the power at our command, the citizen's right to discriminate. However shocking the proposition may sound at first impression, we submit that under one name or another, this is what the Constitution, in part at least, is all about. This right is vital to the American system. If this be destroyed, the whole basis of individual liberty is destroyed. The American system does not rest upon some "right to be right," as some legislative majority may define what is "right." It rests solidly upon the individual's right to be wrong—upon his right in his personal life to be capricious, arbitrary, prejudiced, biased, opinionated, unreasonable—upon his right to act as a freeman in a free society.

Whether this right be called the right of free choice, or the right of free association, or the right to be let alone, or the right of a free marketplace, this right is essential. Its spirit permeates the Constitution. Its exercise colors our entire life. When a man buys union-made products, for that reason alone, as opposed to nonunion products, he discriminates. When a Virginian buys cigarettes made in Virginia, for that reason alone, as opposed to cigarettes made in Kentucky or North Carolina, he discriminates. When a housewife buys a nationally advertised lipstick, for that reason alone, as opposed to an unknown brand, she discriminates. When her husband buys an American automobile, for that reason alone, as opposed to a European automobile, he discriminates. Every one of these acts of discrimination imposes some burden upon interstate commerce.

The examples could be endlessly multiplied. Every reader of this discussion will think up his own examples from the oranges of Florida to the potatoes of Idaho. And the right to discriminate obviously does not end with questions of commerce. The man who blindly votes a straight Democratic ticket, or a straight Republican ticket, is engaged in discrimination. He is not concerned with the color of an opponent's skin; he is concerned with the color of his party. Merit has nothing to do with it. Some nonunion goods may be better than some union goods; some Democrats may be better than some Republicans; some issues of Look may be better than some issues of Life. None of this matters. In a free society, these choices—these acts of prejudice, or discrimination, or arbitrary judgment universally have been regarded as a man's right to make on his own.

Title III of the President's bill goes far beyond all decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of school desegregation, for it implicity couples the formal desegregation of public schools in the South with the elimination of "racial imbalance" in schools throughout the land. The bill proposes to achieve these aims by vesting broad new powers in the Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General. Even private schools, if their pupils receive tuition grants from a governmental source, would be brought into line.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land, but when the court acts in a suit arising under the Constitution it acts judicially, not legislatively. If local school boards throughout the South are to be prohibited by law from maintaining separate school systems, a law must be passed "pursuant to the Constitution" to impose such a prohibition. Until then, any such grants and loans and training programs as these would appear premature. And we would take the position, in the light of the history of the 14th amendment, that such a law would not be "pursuant to the Constitution." It would violate the plain intention both of those who framed the amendment and also of the States that ratified it. Such legislation would not be appropriate legislation.

More serious, in our view, are the provisions of title III that would best elaborate new powers in the Attorney General. The effect of these provisions would be to throw the entire massive weight of the Department of Justice, with its unlimited resources, into the scales of almost any parent in search of a free lawsuit.

Our apprehension is that the awesome power here, proposed for a proliferation of suits in the name of the United States, would create more turmoil than it would settle. The orderly progress of desegregation in public education would not be enhanced, but impaired, as resentments were stirred up that otherwise might be peacefully resolved. And we cannot see the end to the bureaucracy that could be required to prosecute suits "in the name of the United States," once this precedent were set in the single area of school desegregation.

Again, it seems to us necessary merely to quote the provisions of the bill in order to make their autocratic nature evident to every thoughtful observer. The power here proposed to be conferred upon the President is virtually unlimited. No legislative limitations of any sort are suggested. The President may confer upon the Commission "such powers as he deems appropriate." And whether these include the power to impose criminal sanctions, or to seek civil injunctions, or to abrogate contracts awarded under sealed bid, no man can say. The Commission's power would be whatever the President regarded as appropriate; and the definition of "Government employment" is as wide as the Federal budget itself. The administration's bill proposes, in effect, that the Congress abdicate, and turn its legislative powers over to the White House. The powers here demanded are not the powers rightfully to be exercised by a President in a free country. These are the powers of a despot.

Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received from Dr. James D. Bales, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.:

HARDING COLLEGE,
Searcy, Ark., June 18, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: I realize that the life of a Congressman is a very busy life. Thus it has occurred to me that you might find it helpful to have your attention called to some of the directives which the Communists send throughout the world through the pages of the World Marxist Review each month. So I have prepared a list, with some very brief comments, of some of the ideas which are found in the June 1963 issue. It should be kept in mind, of course, that the Communists read their publications for directives as to the courses of conduct which they must pursue. Of course, they will adapt these directives to the situations under which they have to operate in various countries.

1. Nuclear war must be avoided (pp. 3–5). This means it is highly unlikely that short of an all-out attack on the Soviet Union that they would resort to nuclear weapons. That is, unless they achieved some major breakthrough which convinced them that they could destroy us with one blow. Since they believe that "there is no protection anywhere in the world against thermonuclear war," we should not operate from fear that resistance on our part to Communist aggression will bring a nuclear war.

2. They call for mass action for peace and disarmament (pp. 3, 6). This means that they will try to get as many people as possible in non-Communist countries to put peace before anything else.

3. They want to convince us that the only two possibilities are peaceful coexistence or a thermonuclear war (p. 3). What they mean by peaceful coexistence is the intensification of the struggle for communism by means short of a nuclear war. This includes revolutions where possible (pp. 5, 6), and peaceful means when possible. They must be ready to shift from one to another on short notice (p. 7).

4. Lenin and the Communists say that their enemies will be divided into the party of peace, which party sees the need for peaceful coexistence, and the party of war which calls for victory over communism. They must encourage those who are for peace, and who incline "toward pacifism, even of the worst kind." This means that Communists will label as warmongers those who say that we ought to try to win over communism (p. 4).

5. Regardless of whether they get power by peaceful means or by revolution, it is their aim to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat (p. 7).

6. They must try to build a united front with non-Communist groups in working for objectives which the Communists believe will benefit communism (pp. 8, 9).

7. More than once, Communists throughout the world are called on to abide by the decisions made in the Communist summit conferences in 1957 and 1960 (pp. 4, 11, 16). This means that leaders in the free world should study the documents which were issued by these conferences. The Communists are studying them and trying to implement them.

8. The party in Indonesia called the United States the main enemy (p. 13). It is well to remember that Sukarno views the Communists as one of the family (Marxism Today, September 1962, p. 267, 270. This is a publication of British Communists and contains a speech of Sukarno.)

9. "Major Victory for Italian Communists." Chart of parties, votes and number of seats for 1958 and 1963 (pp. 38–40).

10. Efforts to stimulate mass action to convince the people that capitalism is bondage and communism is freedom (pp. 57–70).

11. The story of a Communist, Marcos Ana of Spain, who suffered for communism and who is devoting his life to sacrificial service for communism (pp. 71–75). This raises a very serious question. Can the struggle against communism be won by a people who are not willing to take the time to learn about communism and to sacrifice in order to meet the challenge? Can half-hearted allegiance to the highest ideal in the world win over wholehearted allegiance to a false and degrading faith?

Sincerely yours,

JAMES D. BALES.

Democracy and Fairplay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Bridgeport Post recently printed an editorial on a significant address made by John Shostak, Fairfield County chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Mr. Shostak, State representative in Norwalk, and former mayor, stressed the need for men of good will to cooperate in resolving the civil rights problem in many of our communities. There is a lot of good commonsense in both the speech and the editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTITUDE UNDER PRESSURE

In the midst of claims and counterclaims dealing with nationwide issues which have been hoisted into prominence, it is well to heed the advice of the Fairfield County Chairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. John Shostak, of Norwalk, in a recent address asked his fellow citizens to "maintain their traditional dedication to democracy and fair play in the present period of increased tension."

The county chairman continued: "We in Fairfield County have a tradition of tolerance and understanding by which we can live, even when under pressure. By taking counsel together, men and women of good will will be able to arrive peacefully at a just solution of any problem with which the community is confronted."

As a State representative from Norwalk, and a former mayor, Mr. Shostak felt qualified to speak on this subject. To emphasize his views, he observed that the general assembly this year adopted a civil rights bill dealing with housing accommodations. He indicated that the measure puts Connecticut in the forefront of States in which the law has been put squarely on the side of equality.

With democracy and fair play uppermost in the minds of most Connecticut people, there is no doubt that some of the most perplexing questions coming before the public will be studied and dealt with in a practical manner.

Jim Keegan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend of mine died recently at the age of 72 in Sarasota, Fla. He was a man who devoted his entire life to youth and the principles of good sportsmanship. I greatly mourn the death of Jim Keegan.

While every community has one man—or a few men—whose lives exemplify the highest ideals of honesty and genuine interest in our youth, I think that Berkshire County in Massachusetts was particularly fortunate in having a man like Jim Keegan.

A native of Adams, Mass., he served the Pittsfield Boys Club for 42 years and never lost interest—even though he became a prominent official throughout New England. For me, he was a source of great inspiration and help, as he was to hundreds of my friends. I include an article from the Springfield, Mass., Union of August 6, 1963:

JAMES KEEGAN DEAD—FORMER GRID OFFICIAL—BERKSHIRE MAN WAS NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED IN FOOTBALL—DIRECTED PITTSFIELD BOYS CLUB

(By Ed Toole)

PITTSFIELD.—One of the best known sports figures from the Berkshires—James E. (Jim) Keegan—died late Sunday at 72 in Sarasota, Fla. Nationally recognized in the collegiate ranks as a top football official before his retirement, and the man credited with having given the Pittsfield Boys Club national prominence in his 42 years service which was topped by his outstanding reign as superintendent, Keegan was held in high esteem by young and old.

He retired from the Boys Club post in 1950. He would have celebrated his 72d birthday Monday in Memorial Hospital in Sarasota, where he had been confined for some months following a stroke:

JOINED CLUB IN 1909

A native of Adams, he joined the staff at the Boys' Club in 1909. After a fruitful career as athletic director, he was named superintendent in 1920. His reputation as a grid official was widely heralded from the high school to the prep school ranks of New England. Later he became one of the best regarded football referees in "little three" and later in the Ivy League.

Keegan developed the basketball program at the Boys Club and also was successful with the swimming program following construction of the Boys Club pool. His was a helping hand to every youngster in the county as well as in his adopted city of Pittsfield.

A sparkling afterdinner speaker, he traveled far durng his Boys Club career to donate his services either as toastmaster or main speaker where youth and athletics were the topics.

There is no denying that Keegan was a molder of young men. Prominent people have given testimony to the fact that he was instrumental in their advancement up life's ladder.

Highly regarded by the top executives of the Boys Club of America, following his retirement he was singularly honored with the Keystone Award for "42 years of unselfish and devoted work among youth."

Throughout the height of football officiating career, he was untiring in his work with clinics for young officials at the Boys Club.

EULOGY BY WATTERS

Typical of the esteem in which he was held is the tribute paid him Monday by Len Watters, retiring football coach at Williams College. Informed of Keegan's death, Len stated: "He was a mighty good friend of mine. * * * I never played under a finer official. * * * You know he worked the games when I was at Springfield College. * * * Never in my long athletic career have I ever met an official more gentlemanlike who knew what he was doing and how to handle young men. * * * And I mean every word of what I say. * * * Jim Keegan understood men and young boys and left the imprint of his own sterling character upon them."

Misuse of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of the House there was an extensive discussion with regard to Secretary McNamara's directive under which all members of the Armed Forces would be used to implement the Department of Defense directive in connection with the Gesell report.

As a Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, who has a consistent record in favor of civil rights, I think I can discuss the implications of the Department of Defense directive objectively and I wish to state unequivocally that while I will continue to press for progress in the field of human rights I am completely opposed to using the Department of Defense and members of the Armed Forces in the enforcement of moral and social civilian issues. The use of our military in this respect should be abhorrent to every American. Historically the armed services have been used for one function and one function only; namely, a military one. Segregation and discrimination is, and by right must be, barred within the military itself, however, the military role in Government and outside its own organizational structure is and forever must remain separate from civilian and political func-

tions. I say the Department of Defense's responsibility should be limited to the safeguarding of our country and for no other purpose.

How inconsistent can our Government be? When the Kennedy administration came to power the Department of Defense issued a directive banning anti-Communist education such as the House Un-American Activities Committee film, "Operation Abolition," which was produced to alert citizens to the dangers of communism. This film was banned in reserve officers' meetings and even barred for loaning to off-base civilian groups. The Department said that it was following this policy because it should not be used to influence the thinking of either military personnel or civilians.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense is clearly out of order when it issues a directive which in effect injects Armed Forces personnel into a major domestic problem such as the present civil rights issue.

Senator Mundt's Role in Korth-TFX Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert in the RECORD the article of Clark Mollenhoff which appeared in the August 4, 1963, issue of the Minneapolis Tribune, reporting on the part my colleague Senator KARL MUNDT took in one portion of the TFX hearings. I think the article should be made available for everyone to read.

The article follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, Aug. 4, 1963]

COUNTRY BOY FROM SOUTH DAKOTA PLAYING SHREWD ROLE IN KORTH-TFX INVESTIGATION

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The investigation spotlight is hot and bright on Navy Secretary Fred Korth, demonstrating once again that a self-styled "country boy from South Dakota" is not as naive as he sometimes pretends.

It is Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, who asked the questions that brought out the fact that Navy Secretary Korth's bank in Fort Worth made loans of at least $400,000 to General Dynamics Corp., which has a plant in Fort Worth.

And, then in his quiet and often whimsical way, the South Dakota Republican quipped that in the light of this relationship Korth would have had to be a Solomon to have retained objectivity when he took part in the decision to grant a $6.5 billion to $8 billion TFX warplane contract to General Dynamics.

Retaining the air of amazement, MUNDT asked Korth what procedures he had followed to protect himself from being influenced by the bank loan, or by his interest in a $6.5 billion contract for the home locality of Fort Worth, where Korth's Continental National Bank is located.

To those who have not watched KARL MUNDT in action, the series of questions leading into the loans from Korth's bank might have seemed rambling and innocuous.

However, to those who have watched MUNDT over the years, it was standard operating procedure.

Although MUNDT is not a lawyer, he is an experienced congressional investigator. He has been a member of major investigating committees ever since he first landed in Washington in January 1938 and was assigned to the Dies Committee that was in the process of delving into subverstive activities.

For 25 years MUNDT has been a moving part of more investigations than any other man in the history of Congress. Association with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, and a host of other lawyer-legislators has given him the experience to add to a skill acquired in debating at Carleton College and as a speech teacher, businessman, and investment banker in Madison, S.Dak.

He regards the present investigation of the TFX warplane contract as second in importance only to the investigation of Alger Hiss by the Un-American Activities Committee.

"The great confrontation of Hiss and Whittaker Chambers was the greatest moment," MUNDT said last week. "The investigation was probably a little more important because it involved the problem of subversion at a high level in our State Department."

However, MUNDT is quick to declare that "the TFX warplane investigation can't be minimized, because this involves the procedures for procurement in the Defense Department—a Department that spends more than $50 billion a year."

"This investigation deals with all the factors that went into the biggest contract this Government has ever awarded, and all the influences that were a part of it," MUNDT said.

"At this stage, I would not make any predictions on the final outcome, but I would bet that just what we've had so far will mean that Secretary Robert S. McNamara won't be using any more 'rough judgments' and figures just 'out of his head' when he decides to overrule unanimous recommendations of military and engineering experts," MUNDT said.

MUNDT declared that he hopes the investigation of the TFX warplane contract will end the plans in the Pentagon to abolish the high-level Source Selection Board, to do away with recommendations from subordinates so that the civilian Secretaries will have more freedom in making awards of contracts.

"The past system has been carefully thought out and is an effort to be fair," MUNDT said. "It is bad only when improper outside influences get into it, and it looks to me like the changes McNamara is contemplating would open the door wider to political influences and other influences."

Although MUNDT has been a major figure in bringing Korth's bank operations to public attention, he and Senator CARL CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, have been playing a most restrained role for members of the opposition political party. Under similar circumstances in the Truman administration, the Republican committee members were busy with fiery speeches day after day.

And when the Eisenhower administration had its problems with the Dixon-Yates contract, the relations between Boston Industrialist Bernard Goldfine and White House Aid Sherman Adams, the Democratic committee members drummed out a war cry from the outset.

MUNDT and CURTIS have been content to let the testimony pile up in the record, with only an occasional restrained comment to call attention to some point they feel indicates laxity or poor judgment in the TFX procurement matter.

They have full confidence in Chairman MCCLELLAN, and MUNDT characterized him as "having absolutely no political interest or other interest in this TFX contract."

"He is simply doing his job of bringing out the facts," MUNDT said. "He is a Democrat, but not a partisan Democrat. He has made it a policy to honor any reasonable requests by Republican committee members, and I have tried to be reasonable."

Last week, MUNDT requested that MCCLELLAN send investigators to Fort Worth to do a full investigation of Korth's role in bank loans to General Dynamics, as well as all other factors dealing with Korth's connections with the Continental National Bank since he has been Navy Secretary.

Herbert Clark Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of America's most outstanding men, an esteemed leader, and former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Clark Hoover, will celebrate his 89th birthday this coming Saturday, August 10.

A friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Robert J. Murrin, 6724 Bostwick Drive, Springfield, Va., has honored President Hoover on this occasion in verse, and I am both pleased and privileged to present his poem to this House and all Americans who will soon join in honoring a great man on his day.

The poem follows:

HERBERT CLARK HOOVER

Born 1874—August 10th was the date.
In a hamlet, at home, in a humble way;
An infant—a boy—with a future so great,
Was his destiny at birth that historical day.

His parents were Quakers of the "pioneer West,"
Patriotic, religious, yet of no special fame.
His father a blacksmith—the villages' best,
Forged for the world this wonderful name.

His generous mother possessed many gifts,
As a teacher, a preacher, and speaker quite fine.
She could also settle his childhood rifts,
But she answered God's call before he was nine.

When he was just six his father had died,
But death gave him courage and ne'er got him down.
He moved to his uncles with God by his side
And prepared for his future with seldom a frown.

A graduate of Stanford, 1895 the year;
He had worked his way all the way through,
Prepared and ready as an engineer,
To the field of mining went this man so true.

He left for the Orient along with his wife,
And by age 27 was a success in his field.
But this was just one phase of his life,
For his country was calling and he soon did yield.

A call for "relief" in Belgium and France;
A problem resolved with the help of this man;
A man who was destined to give others a chance,
From the day when his manhood first began.

As diplomat, statesman, and President great,
He served his country heroically fine.
As citizen, philanthropist, and man of fate
For the sake of mankind, he always has time.

With a firm devotion to his God above,
And a love for his neighbor above self.
He has filled many hearts with appreciative love
And therefore enmassed great spiritual wealth.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following "Reports From Washington:"

REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

(By Hon. ED FOREMAN, of Texas)

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

As the United States dashes headlong toward a test ban agreement with the Soviets, it might be well to recall the warning of the late John Foster Dulles, who was Secretary of State under President Eisenhower. Discussing the possibilities of a United States-Soviet pact several months before his death in 1959, Dulles commented to a close associate:

"Since a treaty is what the Russians want, it wouldn't be difficult to come up with one which would look good on the surface. We could include in it all the fuzzy language of diplomacy—and believe me, I know some of the phrases—and present it to the world as a great achievement for peace. All of this would result in a relaxation of world tensions, generate a feeling of international good will, and probably elect a Republican President in 1960.

"But we're not going to do it. If we signed such a pact with the Soviets, there would develop a tremendous pressure to cut back on our defenses, reduce the size of our Armed Forces, and curtail our armaments. And we'd have only the word of the Russians that they were doing the same. Our NATO, SEATO, and other alliances would be endangered, perhaps to the point of deterioration. As a result, within a few years we could be a sitting duck for the Communists to pick off whenever they felt the time was ripe."

So spoke a man who understood the Communist and the Communist menace.

COMMUNIST PROBLEMS

We must not be led astray by the current dispute between the Soviets and the Red Chinese. While their differences are deep, for us they represent only a falling out of thieves; both camps are intent upon our destruction. In our eagerness to exploit this division in the Communist world, we should not form an alliance with one of the thieves.

ONE PROPOSAL MIGHT BE

Jenkin Lloyd Jones in the Tulsa Tribune says, "One of the most pernicious illusions abroad in the world today is the fond hope that if nations give up testing atomic weapons that the threat of an atomic holocaust will vanish * * * We ought to quit dispatching futile emissaries to face the familiar and bitter choice of frustration or surrender. Instead, we should send Mr. K. a simple note in nondiplomatic language: 'Look, Buster, we think tests in the atmosphere aren't even for the birds. We'll quit them if you will, but one more trick like the last time and we won't make this offer again. As to underground tests, we'll have them as often as we like and you are welcome to yours. If you ever want a moratorium on them, send us a letter telling us how many monitors you'll allow and if we're interested, we'll write you back.' "

A Nuclear Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the President is to be commended for his excellent handling of the recent limited nuclear test ban negotiations and for the three-power treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater that was agreed on in Moscow.

This is indeed a milestone in the history of the nuclear space age, and it may well be the turning point in the 18-year-old cold war between East and West.

The preamble to the treaty states the interim goals toward which the treaty itself is a major, though limited, step:

The discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time * * * and an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances.

These are most worthy and admirable goals. But we all look forward to the day when the principal aim of the treaty, also outlined in the preamble, is achieved:

An agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons.

This test ban treaty is the first major Soviet-Western accord since 1955, when the Austrian Peace Treaty ended four-power occupation of that country and established Austria as an independent island of neutrality in central Europe.

It gives us all hope that fresh winds of change may indeed be blowing across the Iron Curtain. But as we move into what may become a new era of relaxed tensions, we must not forget communism's long record of broken promises and unkept pledges. We must guard our strength, keep up our defenses, and assure that any agreements entered into will completely safeguard our vital interests and leave nothing to chance.

With this warning in mind, and with full knowledge of America's overwhelming military defense capability to meet Communist aggression on land, at sea, in the air, and in space, we should have no fear of discussing and negotiating on any and all topics of mutual concern and on every subject of international friction likely to cause trouble.

The overwhelmingly favorable response with which this test ban treaty has been greeted by all the peace-loving nations of the world—at this writing some 60 members of the United Nations have already indicated their intention to sign—and the unmistakable signs of nearly unanimous approval of the U.S. Senate within the next few weeks, are certainly heartening indications of a deep-seated desire for peace among the people of the world, as well as a willingness to accept the first step on what may be a long and sometimes difficult road to our ultimate goal.

President Kennedy discussed this goal in his recent speech in St. Paul's Church, Frankfurt, Germany. After noting that the "strength and unity of—the Atlantic Community—is and will continue to be the anchor of all freedom for all nations," he declared:

Our mission is to create a new social order, founded on liberty and justice, in which men are the masters of their fate, in which states are the servants of their citizens, and in which all men and women can share a better life for themselves and their children.

Let us hope that this nuclear test ban treaty is a step in the direction of achieving that magnificent goal.

Grandpa Smith's Great Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago Grandpa Smith popped up a great idea. Back in 1913, Cloid H. Smith had just sold his telephone company, the Nation's first automatic telephone system. But Grandpa Smith was not the type to stay idle very long. He owned some farmland in the heart of the popcorn country and decided to package popcorn and market it through grocery stores—under a brand name.

This was a revolutionary idea for those cracker-barrel days since popcorn had previously been distributed to grocers in 150-pound bags. But Grandpa Smith shelled, cleaned, graded, and packaged his product in cardboard cartons for the housewife's convenience, and folks liked his idea. He called his popcorn Jolly Time, and now you see it on grocery shelves around the world.

The grandchildren of Grandpa Smith still operate the American Popcorn Co. at Sioux City, Iowa, in my congressional district which is one of the largest pop corn producing areas of the country. The American Popcorn Co. is the world's largest producer and packer of popcorn, and it looks like Jolly Time will continue to be a leader for another 50 years.

I mention Grandpa Smith and his great idea because his story is so typically American. His ingenuity and energy built an organization which now provides jobs for many in the free enterprise tradition. We need more like him.

Nursing-Home Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, early in the session the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], appointed a Special Subcommittee on Intermediate Care to specifically investigate the desirability and feasibility of increasing the number of beds allocated for intermediate or nursing care.

The chairman of the full committee did me the honor of naming me as chairman of this subcommittee and appointed our colleagues—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], to serve on this subcommittee.

Never have I seen a more harmonious group than this subcommittee, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to express my great appreciation to my colleagues on the subcommittee who have given me their complete cooperation in every step we have taken. There is a great interest in this subject and the subcommittee members have been diligent in their attendance at the subcommittee sessions and, in addition, have sacrificed a considerable amount of their own time to visit field installations to obtain a better understanding of the problems which arise in this area.

Pursuant to the direction of the chairman of the full committee, hearings were held beginning on May 14 and running through the end of June.

Every interested party was given an opportunity to testify. In addition to the Veterans' Administration, the following Government agencies appeared and expressed their points of view: The Bureau of the Budget; Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Helpful testimony was received from the American Hospital Association, the Association of State Homes, the American Nurses' Association, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, United Spanish War Veterans, and Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc. In addition, individual Members of Congress and certain interested associations filed statements.

The hearings have now been printed in a 1701-page volume which I am happy to say contains much useful and helpful information.

The activities of the subcommittee culminated today in an executive session of the subcommittee which unanimously agreed on a bill to be introduced and reported favorably to the full committee. In addition to the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, all members of the subcommittee are introducing this bill. The subcommittee has been assured by the chairman of the full committee that early attention will be given this matter by the entire membership of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The measure which we are recommending to the full committee, and which is being introduced today by six members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs provides:

First. The Veterans' Administration shall operate 4,000 additional nursing-care beds;

Second. Transferring for a maximum of 180 days to a private facility certain patients who are presently in Veterans' Administration hospitals and who have received maximum hospital benefits;

Third. Increasing the per diem rate from $2.50 to $3.50 for nursing care in State homes and authorizing a 5-year program, involving $5 million a year on a matching-fund basis, for the construction of nursing-care units in State homes;

Fourth. Permitting veterans who receive an aid and attendance pension to be in a hospital as long as 60 days without the loss of his pension;

Fifth. Authorizing the furnishing of therapeutic and rehabilitative devices for the aid and attendance pensioners who are eligible for an invalid lift; and

Sixth. Extending the completion bed occupancy program (CBOC) to permit the Veterans' Administration to provide, for a longer period of time, medication and medical assistance to aid and attendance pensioners who suffer from chronic diseases which particularly afflict older individuals.

Thousands of veterans are already hospitalized in Veterans' Administration hospitals today and are receiving this type of care. A long-term-care unit has recently been opened for treatment of diseases of this type at Kecoughtan, Va. A restoration center is now in operation at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Hines, Ill., and another is planned at the East Orange, N.J., Veterans' Administration hospital. While these two restoration projects are related to nursing-home care, in the opinion of the subcommittee members, they do not meet the immediate and pressing need.

Generally speaking, nursing-home care can be provided at a smaller cost than that required for acute and intensive medical care.

It is the judgment of the subcommittee that action is fully warranted and, in fact, essential in the immediate future if we are to meet our responsibilities.

Legislation of this general type was supported by all of the veterans' organizations testifying before the subcommittee.

Happy Birthday and Aloha to Wright Patman

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my wishes for a happy birthday and aloha to a most distinguished Member of Congress, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, dean of the Texas delegation and chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Congressman PATMAN has been an acknowledged leader in Congress for many years. In fact, he was already a famous man when I was still a student in high school. His name was an oft-repeated one in connection with American politics and Federal legislation even in the remote Pacific Paradise. To meet him and to serve with him in this great body, therefore, have meant to me an honor and privilege. Even in the short time that I have been in Congress, I have benefited from his wise counseling and personal interest. As Hawaii's Representative and as a friend, I join the others in wishing Congressman PATMAN good health and happiness in the years ahead and look forward to his continued leadership in the affairs of our great Nation.

Property Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article from a recent issue of the Colorado Springs Gazette-Telegraph, entitled "Property Right."

PROPERTY RIGHT

To the EDITOR:

There are those who constantly contrast human rights with property rights. They leave the impression that something material, which is property, is an oppressor of the rights of man, who is a person. They then affirm that they approve human rights over property rights. The impression is left that those who disagree with them are really materialists who put property rights above human rights.

It is striking that some who take the position, including Communists, are materialists and relativists. If materialism is true, how can they speak of human rights and property or material rights? If all is matter in motion, including man, there is no ground on which to maintain the idea that anything transcends the material. Furthermore, as relativists and materialists, they cannot derive any real standard of values from matter in motion. So how could they speak of any rights, whether human or property, and how could they say that one set of rights should take precedence over another set of rights? It is an implicit denial of materialism for the materialist to pose as a defender of human rights against property rights.

As a matter of fact, one of the basic human rights is the right of private property. Although all may not avail themselves to the same extent of this right, if all are deprived of this right, they are also deprived of freedom. How can men keep from becoming the slaves of the all-powerful state if they are deprived of the right of the ownership of property? Think how limited are their opportunities for protest if the state owns all the printing presses and other channels of communication. The very roof over their

heads can be taken away from them if the state owns all housing. The food can be kept from their state-owned table if the state controls the food supply. From what bank can they borrow if the state owns all the banks? If they are in disfavor with the state, for whom can they work if the state is the employer? Without a basis in private property man, except in his spirit (which the state will also endeavor to control or crush), has no basis on which he can legally oppose the state when it becomes or threatens to become an instrument of oppression.

Even Djilas of Yugoslavia, although he did not renounce Marxism itself, recognized that "control over material goods constitutes one of the basic means used by the Communist Party to control the population. After assuming power, the Communists almost completely destroyed private ownership under the pretext of establishing justice and equality" (from a review of "The New Class," in "Highlights," September-October 1957, p. 432, published by the Library of Congress).

This same truth was seen, in a part at least, by a Socialist, Pershottam Trikumdas, when he wrote in the Socialist Call for spring, 1960: "Whatever other means of ownership may be devised, I am certain in my mind that state ownership is the one which does not and will not fit into Socialist society. Experience has shown that it leads to bureaucracy, oppression, and often inefficiency and corruption and, last but not least, the complete subjection of citizens to an omnipotent state." And yet, by the time the Socialists get through wrecking free enterprise there will be nothing left, insofar as ownership is concerned, but the all-powerful state.

The right of private property, even though an individual does not own very much, is a fundamental human right. There are, of course, people who get property the wrong way and use it for the wrong purposes, but the solution is to be found in the enforcement of laws against illegal activities and through the building of better men. The solution is not to be found in a few men in government seizing, in one way or another, the property and their using it as they see fit.

This last statement suggests that it is impossible to get away from private property, private ownership. For regardless of what the Socialists in the total state say about the property, regardless of whether they call it public property, a basic property right is the right of disposal. And when the state has the right of disposal, the state is the owner regardless of what fair words may be used to cover up this foul fact.

PERRY MASON,
Harding Academy.

SEARCY, ARK.

A German Exchange Student Reluctantly Leaves the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Imlay City Times, a weekly newspaper in Imlay City, Mich., recently carried an article written by Jens Brueckner, a German exchange student who spent a year living with an American family and studying in an American high school. He summed up his year in Imlay City with these words:

This 1 year was a wonderful experience, an experience where I got the most favorable impression of the United States.

I believe Jens Brueckner's article represents further proof that one of the very best methods to improve international understanding is through exchange programs such as the one which brought this German student to the United States for a year.

This young man suggests an answer, to a question which has been bothering Americans for decades: "How can you give the European people a better impression of the United States?" He answers the question this way:

In my opinion, there is only one answer for the Europeans: Come over to America and see how the people live here.

Unfortunately this is not possible on a wide basis because it is simply too expensive to come to America for a period of time. But one possibility has been found, and that is a student exchange program.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will be impressed as I was by this article. I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Jens Brueckner Reluctantly Leaves the United States," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

JENS BRUECKNER RELUCTANTLY LEAVES THE UNITED STATES

(By Jens A. Brueckner, German exchange student who spent a year in Imlay City)

America—an immense variety of pictures, images, experiences, incidents, and impressions.

America—melting pot of different nationalities; a country with so many different people, but a country with very friendly people.

America—country of immense distances, beautiful scenery, desolate villages, and glittering cities.

America—country of "unlimited opportunities," with the highest standard of living in the world, where democracy is practiced more and better in every day life than in any other nation.

These are some points that come to my mind when I am thinking about America. I had the privilege of spending 1 year in this great country as an exchange student.

I did not spend this year as a tourist or like a tourist, but as a member of an American family, as an ordinary student in an American high school, and a "temporary citizen by choice" of an American community.

By knowing and understanding the people I learned to understand and interpret the country.

Before I came to the United States I had a very different impression of this country. The picture or image the Europeans have of the United States is mainly influenced by the following media:

(1) American tourists;
(2) American shows and movies;
(3) Books by American writers; and
(4) Communist propaganda in West Germany.

The American tourists truly do not create the best impression. As it is still very expensive to go to Europe, only people who are very well off can afford such a trip. These tourists then play the big spenders in Europe, and sometimes it seems that they think all the world is theirs. Materialism and no apparent appreciation of culture characterizes these tourists.

Two years ago I had an experience that was typical for an American tourist in Europe. I was in the Louvre, the world famous art museum in Paris, silently watching the picture "Mona Lisa," when two American tourists approached the picture, looked at it for a minute, and then exclaimed, "Gee, that's a pretty nice picture. How much is it?"

Incidents like this make Europeans who are very proud of their culture very mad and intolerant. This is one example, but by Europeans it is taken for typical of the United States. Of course, this is not true, but generalizations are very often drawn from small incidents like this. Besides that, it is only the tourist that behaves differently whom Europeans recognize. Unfortunately you remember the poor example much longer than the good ones.

And that is why we Europeans have a bad impression of the American tourists, and consequently draw conclusions about the United States.

The American shows and movies surely do not give a right picture of the United States. If you think about some of the big Hollywood movies you have seen, you will remember that the people live in beautiful mansions, have at least two cars, a wonderful swimming pool, and live in all luxury you can imagine.

You here in the United States know that this is not true and not typical of the United States, but we Europeans see these movies and take it for granted that they depict life in the United States, and therefore, what these shows present, is typical for the United States. A Nation of luxury and millionaires is one image the Europeans possess of the United States.

Another picture of the United States is made up by the writings of American poets and playwrights. Especially intellectuals enjoy reading books by Arthur Miller, Upton Sinclair, John Steinbeck, etc.

These writers criticize American society and depict the worst sides and shades of American life. Life in the slums of New York and Chicago is very often their topic. So this is another image the Europeans get from the United States. America—Nation of slums and hoods.

Especially the latter is dramatized by the Communist propaganda. The Communists point out that there is one ruling class, the exploiters (like Kennedy) and then the masses, extremely poor and living in slums. In their propaganda this is typical of the United States.

You can see that there are many different pictures of the United States. Pictures and images that are between a nation of luxury and a nation of slums. So this is what the European people get to know about the United States.

Perhaps I have made my points too strongly and dramatized them too much, but what holds true is, that the European people do not know how the United States really is, what is typical of, what is the character of the United States.

But what can be done about this? How can you give the European people a better impression of the United States? In my opinion, there is only one answer for the Europeans: Come over to America and see how the people live here.

Unfortunately this is not possible on a wide basis because it is simply too expensive to come to America for a period of time. But one possibility has been found, and that is a student exchange program.

I have been here in the United States for 1 full year, and I spent this year as a member of an American family, attended school in America, lived in a typical American community; in short, lived like the Americans live.

This 1 year has given me so many insights in life and the way of life of the United States, and I believe that after this 1 year I know what life in America looks like, what the famous American way of life really is. You can believe me, I enjoyed this 1 year in the United States, enjoyed every day, every hour of it.

I have seen how the Americans live, feel, act, behave, in short, how the Americans really are. I could not have gotten a better impression of the people of this country. Frankly, the American people are the nicest, the friendliest people I have ever met.

This friendliness is admirable and worth imitating. Everybody is interested in the other person, everybody tries to help another person, everybody tries to make another person feel at home in this country. The relationship between the different people is much closer and much more understandable here than in European countries. The teachers are not authoritarian rulers, but friends.

This different attitude is probably a result of the different historical development and the different background. Democracy as it is practiced here in the United States is truly great. Of course, European nations have constitutions very similar to the American Constitution. But in no European country is democracy as widely, as openly, and as vigorously practiced as here in the United States.

American citizens should be proud of their great democracy, and the United States is highly justified as a symbol of freedom and democracy by all free nations.

I like the American people. I like America. I would even dare to say that America is the greatest country on earth. I say this because I am convinced through my experiences in the past year that this is true, and I say this without disloyalty to Germany. I would like to stay in the United States, would like to live here, but by this—in my opinion—I would hurt one of the objectives of the exchange student program.

I have lived here and know what life is like, but my fellow countrymen still have this wrong or slanted viewpoint of the United States. To come to your home country to tell the people about the United States and how the United States really is, is part of the responsibility and privilege of an exchange student.

I gave some 50 talks here in the United States about Germany, and back in Germany I will have to give just as many, if not more talks about the United States. Only this can lead to a better understanding between these countries and provide for closer cooperation on the way to world peace.

It is evident that I enjoyed this year in America very much, more than any other year of my life. Why then, do some people ask, do I not plan on staying in the United States, or at least to come back to live here? As an exchange student you have many privileges and responsibilities. It would be easy for me to come back to the States and live here, but this would be too selfish. I was here to represent Germany to the American people, and I am going back to Germany to represent the impressions I got from the United States.

I have told you that the image of the United States is very wrong and slanted in Germany, and therefore there is a definite need to tell the people about America to give them a true and complete picture of this great Nation. This is my major responsibility after my return, and this is why I want and have to go back.

I go back, I will stay in my country, but I hope that I will never lose my connections and contacts with the United States. I am sure that this was not my only visit in this country. During this 1 year I have learned to like, admire, appreciate, and to love the United States. My great admiration, appreciation and love of the United States will never vanish.

If any one of you will ever have the chance to come over to Europe, be sure to look me up, or if you have any questions or comments on Europe or Germany I would be happy if you would write to me. My address is: Jens A. Bruckner, 29 Oldenburg-O, Ruthningstr 22, Germany.

For me is nothing to say but a sincere "thank you." This 1 year was a wonderful experience, an experience that I will never forget and an experience where I got the most favorable impression of the United States.

A deep and sincere "thank you" to all of you, but especially to the Rotary Club, Lions Club, the Imlay City Community High School, the Methodist Church, and above all my wonderful American family (Mr. and Mrs. Herman Haedicke and family). Thank you so much for the greatest experience of my life, and—as I hope—"Auf Wiedersehen" in 2 years.

Drought Nullified in Northern Colorado by Big Thompson Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have advised the Members of the House with respect to specific examples of the tremendous contribution which reclamation projects are making to the economic stability of the Western States. This year the Colorado-Big Thompson project has proved to be a lifesaver to the agricultural area of northern Colorado. This matter is discussed by Mr. Bert Hanna in an excellent article in the August 4, 1963, issue of the Denver Post.

I am including Mr. Hanna's article with these remarks for the information of all Members, as follows:

DROUGHT NULLIFIED IN NORTHERN COLORADO BY BIG THOMPSON WATER

(By Bert Hanna)

With thousands of acres of Colorado land scorched by drought, the Colorado-Big Thompson reclamation project is proving a lifesaver to a vast agricultural area of northern Colorado.

Without this complex of reservoirs, canals, and tunnel diversion from the western to the eastern slope, experts agree that losses from lack of water would be catastrophic in one of the richest and most diversified farm areas of the West.

The Big Tom is taxed to its limit this year to supplement streams that have dwindled to trickles and to supply water needed for a profitable harvest.

The region 7 office of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation points to this project as the prime example of agricultural stabilization in the West.

They also cite it as justification for the planned future water resources development of the South Platte River involving the downstream Narrows Dam and upstream Two Forks Reservoir—a project that would conserve thousands of acre-feet of water for Colorado use.

It is estimated that last year Big Thompson project water increased by more than $22 million the value of crops grown in the 720,000-acre area under the Northern Colorado Water Conservation District.

This year, that figure is expected to be significantly higher and to represent the difference between virtual crop failure for many farmers and normal production.

The actual 1963 deliveries of project water so far have amounted to nearly 150,000 acre-feet of water. The project spreads over a tier of counties, including Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, Summit, Washington, and Weld.

Normally, deliveries from the system would be about 200,000 acre-feet annually. But because of the drought, the maximum allotment was declared at the beginning of irrigation season—or 310,000 acre-feet.

It is estimated that at least 300,000 acre-feet will be delivered this season—a record.

Last year, the take from the Big Thompson was 283,000 acre-feet, but much of this water went into private storage of small irrigation companies.

This year, that storage is being consumed along with direct deliveries. The estimated 160,000 acre-feet of storage water used, plus the direct diversion, would be the equivalent of direct stream use. Thus the project is supplying about half the water needed to mature crops. Normally, the project water utilization is 28 percent of need.

The Reclamation Bureau points up an experiment conducted under bureau auspices on water use and value by a farmer near Eaton, Colo., to determine how much additional production is obtained from an acre-foot of project water.

It was found that in the past year, the benefits in this case ranged all the way from $17 per acre-foot on such crops as oats to around $79 for potatoes. For diversified production on this farm, it was estimated that the value in terms of additional crop production was about $60 per acre-foot.

However, this was a controlled experiment, it was pointed out, and the average throughout the district was scaled down to about 60 percent of this farmer's result.

H. P. (Pat) Dugan, Denver regional director for the Reclamation Bureau, and George R. Highley, Big Thompson project manager, say that each year since completion of the full facility in 1955, the increased gross value of crop production due to project water has amounted to more than the original repayment contract.

The total value of crops harvested in the irrigated area totaled $78,602,244 in 1962, or an average of $109.17 per irrigated acre.

Bureau officials also stress the importance of crop diversification which is brought about by supplemental irrigation. Delivery of project water was made to farms on which 35 different crops were grown.

Irrigated sugar beets continue to be the most valuable cash crop and corn ensilage the most valuable feed crop. Sugar beets harvested from 114,094 acres accounted for $26,856,107 of the total gross crop value in 1962. Other valuable crops include cucumbers, onions, and dry beans.

Livestock feeding on a large commercialized scale is a vital industry, consuming much of the agricultural feed products. The beef, poultry, and dairy products sold or processed add much to the area's economy.

Thus, reclamation officials assert that projects such as the Big Tom do not contribute materially to the Nation's crop surplus because they permit a diversified agricultural economy to meet national needs.

Negro Citizens of Anson, Tex., Oppose Forced Integration of Their Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it may be of interest to my colleagues to know that Negro citizens in my hometown of

Anson, Tex., are disturbed and opposed to being forced to integrate their public schools.

These citizens know that their community will be depreciated when they do not have their schools as a point of community interest. They express themselves in a public statement in the Western Observer, the weekly newspaper in my home community.

It is as follows:

TO THE HONORABLE SCHOOL BOARD OF ANSON

We, the colored people of Anson, and community do not want integration. A number met with the school board Monday night and asked to be left to ourselves, as in the past.

The white folks of Anson have always been friendly to the colored people. If we needed any help, they always came to our relief, and we have always tried to show our appreciation, and tried to be respectful of their friendship.

We do not believe in what has happened in Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama. We want no part in dividing the people of our country, as both races need our united friendship and cooperation.

Our students do not want to change schools. They are happy as we have been situated, as it will result to our hurt, make increasing dissatisfaction, and make added burdens.

Please do not force us against our wishes, and deprive us of our teachers that we love and respect for their loyalty and successful interest in our children. And please leave us our present teachers. We humbly ask and pray that we may be left to ourselves, and our happy living conditions. Therefore the patrons and citizens of the Fred Douglass School of Anson are asking the white people to leave the elementary school in our community for our social activity.

(Publication of this statement was authorized and paid for by Rev. J. L. Shellman, Otis James Moore, W. S. Mitchell, Mr. Bozie Dalbert, Sr., Mrs. Estella Dalbert, Mrs. Grace Wynn, Mrs. Robert Oliver, Jr., Mrs. J. H. Owen, and others.)

I am not aware of all the factors involved which bring about this situation, and make no effort to judge its merits. I offer it to simply show that not all citizens of the colored race are desirous of having integration forced upon them.

Civil Rights March on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached statement by Dr. John L. Suttenfield published in the Fairview Christian Church Newsletter of Lynchburg, Va.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SHALL NOT MARCH

A call has been sent out for thousands of white Christians to join in the civil rights march in Washington next month. Both Roman Catholic and Protestant leaders have joined in this call, therefore, when I refuse to answer this call, I realize that I am in the minority. Nevertheless, I stand by my own convictions, and I grant those who differ with me the same right. I am not discussing the merits or demerits of the civil rights bill that is before Congress, but I do not believe in pressure groups. To me, this is not the American and democratic way of enacting law.

During the years I served on city council, I was always glad for people to come before the council to speak for or against any proposed ordinance, but whenever a group or an individual sought to bring pressure on me to vote according to their views, I always reacted in the opposite. Ours is a representative government, and we have elected our Senators and Congressmen to represent us. I think these men and women will be in a better position to vote on the merits or demerits of any proposed legislation, if pressure is not brought against them by thousands of people marching through the streets of Washington. Any Congressman or Senator, who seeing the multitude and changed his vote, would not be worthy of his office.

I regret very much that the national leaders of my own church have requested me and my members to join in this march. I believe the church as an organized group should stay out of politics. Every Christian as a citizen should be in politics to the extent that he goes to the polls and votes, or to hold public office whenever his service is needed and he can make a contribution to society through the government, but I do not think the church should organize pressure groups to march on any legislative body demanding the passage of any proposed law. I do not believe this is the proper method that Christians should use to correct any evils that exist. Pressure groups are always too emotionally biased to discuss sanely the merits or demerits of any subject.

The proposed demonstration in Washington next month could become a mob. Mob psychology is dangerous and very difficult to control. If someone gets out of line, this whole demonstration could turn into an uncontrollable mob, and many innocent people get hurt. A football game between two high schools in Washington last fall, turned into mob and more than 500 people were injured before the police were able to clear the field. I pray earnestly that nothing of this kind shall happen during this proposed demonstration in Washington, D.C.

I believe there are better, more orderly, more Christian ways for the church to exert its influence in the world than by organizing pressure groups. No, I shall not march on Washington next month, nor at any other time.

The Antisubmarine Warfare Navy of the Seventies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am making a part of the RECORD the speech of Vice Adm. John W. Thach who, in March of 1960, assumed command of our Antisubmarine Warfare Force in the Pacific.

The speech is entitled "The Antisubmarine Warfare Navy of the Seventies." It deals with a very important phase of our national defense but one little known to the general public. While there is an awareness of emphasis Soviet Russia has long been placing on its submarine fleet, and some awareness of the threat it represents to our security, I do not believe that many, except those who have been giving close attention to our defense organization, are fully apprised as to the seriousness of this threat and what we are doing to meet it.

Vice Admiral Thach's speech should be carefully read by all of us. It deals not only with the present. It looks to the future. It deals with a phase of our national defense too extensively overlooked.

The speech follows:

THE ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE NAVY OF THE SEVENTIES

(By John W. Thach, vice admiral, U.S. Navy)

Looking ahead a decade to contemplate the kind of antisubmarine warfare force the U.S. Navy will have in 1973 seems, at first, a daring and difficult thing to do.

In this age of explosive technological progress, 10 years is a long, long time. Doubtless there will be significant developments in the antisubmarine warfare field about which none of us has a completely clear idea today.

Nevertheless, we are almost certain of one thing—the enormity of the threat from a rapidly developing Soviet submarine force which will be nuclear powered and equipped with hydrogen-warhead ballistic missiles of varying ranges. No crystal ball is needed to predict this.

I think, too, that no occult powers are needed to determine the forces and equipments that will be needed by the U.S. Navy to meet this menace to our control of the seas, to our land-based deterrent forces, to our cities and to the very life of our country.

A major antisubmarine warfare effort will be needed in the next decade to keep pace with Soviet submarine and missile developments. We cannot, of course, expect absolutely airtight security from an underseas counteroffensive system, any more than we can hope to build an anti-ICBM which will knock down each and every enemy long-range missile. But the impossibility of achieving 100 percent success cannot, of course, be an excuse for ignoring the challenge.

The gravity of the impending danger from true submersibles in the hands of a potential enemy has only recently begun to make a deep impression on the consciousness of the American people. We long have had tremendous programs for continental air defense. We are now completing a ballistic missile early warning system for use against ICBM's, and we are engaged in a large-scale effort to develop an antimissile missile.

These programs have had the support of the people because the people have understood the vital need for them. An understanding of the critical challenge facing us in the antisubmarine warfare area will, I feel, bring about the national effort that will be necessary in this area throughout the next 10 years.

But the sooner we accelerate our effort, the better. We have, as a nation, consistently underestimated the Soviet Union's competency in weapons technology. (Occasionally, of course, we have miscalculated their intentions, as when the bomber gap of the late fifties and the more recent missile gap were created erroneously. The Russians exploded an atomic bomb years before we thought they would; the same was true with the more powerful hydrogen weapon. I confess that we sometimes have underestimated what they were doing in submarine development and in shipbuilding. Russia's technology is of the first order and she is determined to build the best weapons within her power.

We must, therefore, face up fully to the challenge which already has been flung at us.

Let us embark on a not-so-imaginative cruise into the future and attempt to develop a blueprint for antisubmarine warfare progress in the fleets, progress which will enable the United States, together with her free world partners, to keep the Soviet submarine menace constantly in check.

THE THREAT

First a closer examination of the Communist submarine threat is in order.

Russian interest in submarine warfare is no creation of the Soviet state; it dates back a century or more. While it is true that the Russians have only recently begun to think in terms of the offense in this kind of naval warfare, the military planners in the Kremlin have learned well from experience, particularly from the experience of other countries.

Thus, the tremendous strategic effectiveness of the Nazi U-boat campaign in the early years of World War II made a deep impression on them. Ships heavily laden with war materials for the Red army were sent to the bottom in steadily rising numbers. The Russians are as aware as we are that the Nazis started their all-out attempt at world conquest with only 57 submarines.

Borrowing heavily from the design of the German-type XXI snorkel-equipped boats, the Russians began building their first postwar submarines—the medium-range W "whisky" class—in the late forties. It was the start of the most massive conventional submarine construction program in history. Before it finished, the U.S.S.R. built almost 250 "whiskys"—more than a third of them in the single year of 1956.

These oceangoing snorkellers were not designed for the traditional Russian coastal defense role, but rather to provide an offensive punch for the fleet.

Many Soviet conventional submarines have been transferred to Communist satellites or sold to the "nonalined" countries in the last several years. Red China, the largest Communist nation, has 20 or more, while Albania, the smallest satellite, has 2. Neutral Egypt has six, and Indonesia, a dozen.

This suggests that the Kremlin may well be setting the stage for the commitment of submarines to limited war missions.

This must be viewed as a distinct possibility. We should, therefore, not think of our antisubmarine warfare fleet as purely a counterweapon, for employment in an all-out war. Nor should we think of it as "defensive." It is "offensive" in that it must be operated in a "forward" strategy if we are to assure that our naval striking power will function with its full versatility and effectiveness.

The Soviets have followed our development of nuclear-powered submarines and of the most terrifying combination of delivery system and weapon yet devised—Polaris—with keen imitative interest.

They suddenly stopped the construction of the conventional "whiskys" and began to gear up for the construction of nuclear-propelled submarines armed with missiles—airbreathers like our Regulus, at first, and, more recently, ballistic types possibly somewhat similar to Polaris.

Today, the Soviet navy's construction program is firmly focused on nuclear power and rockets. How are they doing? From a good many indications, the only answer there can be is, "Better than expected." They have a growing number of nuclear-powered submarines in operation, both in the Pacific, and in the Atlantic. They have ballistic missiles on a number of conventionally powered boats. The number is growing. They assert that they have fired ballistic missiles from submerged submarines. I know of no reason to doubt them.

Incidentally, there has been an unfortunate tendency on the part of some Americans to overemphasize the fact that the Soviet ballistic missiles already aboard submarines are much shorter ranged and have smaller warheads than our Polaris. The published estimate is that these operational Russian rockets have a range of about 350 miles.

I take little comfort in this. Most of our large population centers and industrial complexes and many fixed military bases lie well within 300 miles of our Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts. Hydrogen warheads of far less explosive power than a Polaris carries could destroy these targets quite completely.

For these reasons, and because warning time would be measured in seconds, hardly giving us time to bring defensive weapons to bear, I have long said, "Don't sell the short-range missile short." However, the fact remains that we must expect longer range missile developments in Soviet submarines by 1973.

Missile-firing submarines are not our only concern, however. The capability of the Russians' long-range, fast-attack submarine to conduct offensive actions in the Atlantic, Pacific, Indian, and Arctic Oceans poses a serious menace to free world commerce and naval operations. The threat inherent in about 400 Communist conventional submarines is, in itself, formidable.

But the true nuclear submersible, which no longer needs to expose herself on the surface of the seas, represents a much tougher problem. Her ability to dive to unprecedented depths, coupled with fantastic improvements in maneuverability and speed, have compounded the difficulties of detection and tracking. Her nearly unlimited endurance has expanded the area of offensive action to the 70 percent of the earth's surface that is water. Soviet submarines now can remain in patrol stations off both our coasts indefinitely. They can also conduct operations in the Arctic. The difficulties of carrying out antisubmarine warfare among the icepacks needs no elaboration.

It is to this quantum-jump threat by the seventies that our antisubmarine warfare effort must be directed if we are to remain able to project and exploit our naval power. At the same time, our readiness to defeat any submarine problem arising in a limited war situation is a matter of paramount importance.

FORCES OF THE FLEET

We have outlined the challenge. Let us now consider the forces of our future fleet.

The spectacular advances in submarine design and performance require comparable improvements in ships, aircraft, and antisubmarine warfare weapons. How fast will they come? We cannot be certain, but the trend will be clear by 1973. Important factors will be technological progress and a proper level of expenditures. Scientific breakthroughs in key areas could (1) telescope the time involved and (2) reduce the cost of creating a force adequate for this formidable job.

Before considering the necessary improvements, I want to emphasize that virtually every ship and plane in the Navy has some degree of antisubmarine warfare potential. Accordingly, when we talk of improvements we should think of them as spreading gradually throughout the fleet. The magnitude of the antisubmarine warfare problem is such that the more units, both our own and those of our allies, which we can employ, the greater the likelihood of success.

THE ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVS)

We brought the antisubmarine warfare carrier into the antisubmarine effort to spearhead offensive action against underwater targets.

The requirement for these ships and their special aircraft has become more and more urgent as the submarine's skill in escaping detection has risen.

How will the expanded role of the carrier be facilitated? The answer seems clear: by the construction of new ships designed from the keel up for the antisubmarine warfare task.

We will have, I feel certain, the first of these new carriers before our decade runs out. They, I think, will be nuclear powered. If we are to hunt nuclear-powered submarines, we will need nuclear surface and subsurface ships to do the job.

By designing from the keel up for antisubmarine warfare, we should be able to build a significantly better antisubmarine warfare performance into these ships. They will handle more aircraft and all-weather helicopters. New helicopters will carry more weapons and possess increased staying power. Their deeper-dipping sonars will give them increased potential for under-the-layer search.

In addition to the improved long-range detection capability of the aircraft, each will be outfitted with higher-performance MAD (magnetic anomaly detection) equipment, and with other classifiers which will help us determine within seconds whether we are dealing with a submarine or sea life.

The sonars, both active and passive, hull-mounted and trailing variable depth type, may be installed to give tomorrow's antisubmarine warfare carriers greater self-protection and enable them to attain broader under the sea sound coverage.

New and better lightweight communications and identification equipment in the carrier—we are working feverishly to develop it—will give the task force commander the link he needs for tridimensional (air, surface, and subsurface) tactical deployment.

Improved data processing systems will, it is hoped, provide the hunter-killer group commander with a more precise tactical picture of action in the contact area. The rapid reaction required to sink a swift enemy submarine will be within his grasp.

Even greater improvements in communications, navigation, and data processing are promised by the development of special space satellites. The exploitation of outer space appears destined to help us conquer our most critical problems of inner space.

THE ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE DESTROYER (DD)

What about the running mates of these greatly improved carriers? They are likely to be an entirely new vintage of antisubmarine warfare destroyer, smaller and powered by the atom to give them the endurance and speed to catch a prey which cannot be chased to exhaustion.

For an optimum-sized nuclear destroyer to be feasible, a breakthrough will be needed. Not a scientific one, but an engineering one. We must have a smaller nuclear reactor. Should this goal elude us, our nuclear-powered antisubmarine warfare destroyers will be of a greater size—perhaps not unlike the new 8,000-ton frigate U.S.S. *Bainbridge* (DLGN-25).

These sleek ships of the seventies will be designed to battle the nuclear submarine on a no-quarter-given basis. But they will not fight singly, except against targets of opportunity. They will perform as one element of a tactical team.

These destroyers will specialize in seeking out, classifying, and destroying enemy submarines. They will provide the offensive dash and the protective screen for the antisubmarine warfare force. Though built for antisubmarine warfare, they will be versatile enough to engage in prompt and effective antiair and surface action.

Teamed with available air support, their role, as now envisaged, will include the protection of merchant ships, convoys, amphibious and service forces, as well as the fleet units they screen during day-to-day antisubmarine warfare operations.

The new antisubmarine warfare destroyers will be very different from their predecessors Their detection capability will be much longer ranged and sharper than it is today.

In my opinion, these ships will be 10 times as effective as the nonnuclear destroyers now in the fleet.

The new ships' sonars will be able to hold a contact tenaciously in both the deep blue and the shallow waters of the coasts. Computer classifiers will back up the detection sensor to determine quickly whether the target deserves further antisubmarine warfare attention. Their spectrum analysis of the first few pings will provide the green light that shouts "shoot" or the red one that says "stop."

These antisumarine warfare ships will be equipped with the deepest dipping variable depth sonars (VDS) available. As the submarine reaches greater depths, there the ears of the antisubmarine warfare destroyer must also go. Advanced, extremely long-ranged detection equipment—to close the distance between our sound and shoot systems—will supplement the hull-mounted and deep-dipping sonars.

Future naval missions will require increasing numbers of ships. Ship sizes will be as small as feasible in order to minimize the impact upon the fleet of individual losses—and especial concern in this age of nuclear weapons.

What about weapons for these new destroyers? Multipurpose missile systems with accurate fire control to provide for early attack at long ranges will be forthcoming in the next decade, and the eyes and muscles of these ships will be strengthened by helicopters, both manned and drone.

Our antisubmarine warfare greyhounds must be as silent as drifting swans and as swift as sharks; the objective will be to reduce the noise level so that we can track an underwater contact while operating at full speed.

THE KILLER SUBMARINE

While the potential of the submarine in antisubmarine warfare has long been recognized, this potential is today still largely unrealized. Nevertheless, I predict flatly that the killer sub will fulfill much of its promise as a vital element of the antisubmarine warfare force during the next decade.

Communications is one of the important keys to this progress. Improvements in existing communications can and must be made to open the way for full exploitation of the unique capabilities of the nuclear-powered killer submarine (SSN).

The importance of having a really effective underwater fleet unit with increased detection, chase, and tracking capabilities can hardly be overemphasized. The SSN will provide the force commander with a swift and silent sentinel, one which will be able to scan the depths to find the enemy no matter how deep he dives or where he might try to hide in the ridges and valleys of the undersea mountains. The long-range sonars of our nuclear-powered killers will cover ever larger areas. They will pierce any thermal layer.

The ability to pinpoint targets at long range with regularity will permit us to rush aircraft to the scene to complete promptly the job of identification and classification. As our surface forces converge, the antisubmarine warfare tridimensional force will be geared for a concerted attack to finish off the enemy submarine.

Killer submarines will be especially valuable for employment in waters near enemy submarine bases, where our surface ships and aircraft become unduly exposed to increased air and missile threats.

Equipped with the very latest electronic equipment and weaponry, these SSN's, with their highly trained crews, represent our first building block in the development of a truly "forward" antisubmarine warfare strategy.

THE SEAPLANE IN ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

The potentially high surveillance rate of patrol aircraft dictates, I believe, that we build a capable antisubmarine warfare seaplane for our Navy of the seventies to supplement the land-based patrol planes flown by the fleet. The need for such a vehicle, supported by mobile tenders, is easily understood when we realize how vital is ocean surveillance to antisubmarine warfare and how few are the bases we may count upon to carry out our air operations against submarines operating throughout the vast ocean areas.

The antisubmarine warfare seaplane would enjoy the luxury of self-sealing runways which would be unaffected by even the most devastating hydrogen bomb attacks. I have urged that we capitalize on the opportunities provided for exploiting the seaplane for antisubmarine warfare use. The Russians are building modern seaplanes. So are the Japanese.

The seaplane logically lends itself to nuclear developments in aircraft. I want to make the most of the seaplane for future antisubmarine warfare readiness. In doing so, we will be building some real potential for long-term national progress in the air.

MINE WARFARE

The mine is an attractive and useful instrument of antisubmarine warfare. It can detect, classify, and destroy a submarine. As a triple-threat member of the team, its tactical employment in selected areas can pay big dividends.

Operating under the principle that we must use every means at our disposal to limit the enemy in the use of his tremendous submarine force, the antisubmarine warfare navies of the free world will look more and more to the development and employment of special antisubmarine mines during the next decade.

Mines already are playing a role in antisubmarine warfare. This role will increase. The mine is one of the least expensive weapons capable of destroying submarines, and fortunately, they work just as well against nuclears as they do against conventionally powered ones. They help us to capitalize on the geographic advantages we enjoy over the Communist world, particularly in the Pacific.

HYDROFOILS

The vision of several squadrons of 100-knot subchasers, equipped with effective detection gear and armed with adequate weapons, would excite the mind of any antisubmarine warfare force commander. I am no exception.

The amazing hydrofoil boat, which combines design characteristics of aircraft with marine technology, is the source of this vision of a fantastic future on the surface of the oceans. Already these craft, their hulls rising out of the water on struts, have streaked along at better than 60 knots. The experts believe this record can be doubled, or nearly so, within a few years.

Although these strange-looking craft may not prove adaptable to the open ocean chase, we must closely examine their capabilities as a new and promising approach to the overall antisubmarine warfare problem.

In the amphibious objective areas, the availability of hydrofoils to supplement the antisubmarine warfare force would prove highly useful. This would be particularly true, if we could cradle these craft in our larger surface ships. Hydrofoils might also provide increased protection for convoys during the periods of their greatest vulnerability—when they are heading out from port or arriving at their destination.

The Navy is currently testing a 110-ton hydrofoil craft. If all goes well her successors should be ready for antisubmarine warfare duty by 1973. We will know by that time whether larger hydrofoils can be constructed or whether the relatively small craft will turn out to be the best application of the principle.

The major question mark concerning hydrofoils—and one which may limit their value in antisubmarine warfare—is this: Can we develop sensors that can capitalize on their speeds to help solve the search problem? The problem is under attack, and hopefully the solution will come soon.

We need the best aerial, subsurface and surface vehicles and weapons we can get. Making the hydrofoil vision a reality would be a tremendous step forward.

The development of the ground effects machine (GEM) and the marriage of the hydrofoil with the seaplane are underway. Both give promise of a new degree of swiftness at sea for meeting our future antisubmarine warfare needs.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE OPERATIONS IN THE SEVENTIES

We have discussed the increased capabilities built into individual fleet units to help counter high-speed nuclear submarines of virtually unlimited endurance. We have recognized that unless the antisubmarine warfare problem is solved we cannot really control the seas nor can the fleet accomplish its vital mission of projecting offensive power.

Let us assume that the size of the fleet has been expanded and then, from our vantage point at sea, let us consider the operations of this "new" antisubmarine warfare fleet, which springboards our naval striking power.

The major question which arises here is this: how can we best exploit the concept of integrated action through improved tactics and doctrine?

We have been convinced—and current trends reinforce this conviction—that there is far greater effectiveness in the combined antisubmarine warfare force than there is in the sum of the individual elements. We have clearly demonstrated this with our hunter-killer (HUK) groups. They bring a fully integrated antisubmarine warfare weapons system to the submarine contact area. They concentrated a variety of methods for detection, classification, localization, and destruction that substantially enhance our potential for killing submarines. Certainly no single weapons system is as potent.

The new weapons and vehicles now coming into the fleet, and those which we foresee in the future, require us to improve our tactics so that the HUK group will become increasingly effective.

We must, likewise, sharpen our instruments of seapower in an implementation of a truly forward strategy for antisubmarine warfare and limited war. Never has it been so important that we meet the enemy as far from our shores as possible. Never has the demand been so great for long-range detection, prompt classification, and rapid destruction of the target. The enemy must never know what killed him. Every attack we make must be a surprise attack.

There is a compelling reason for this, one of which I am certain the reader is well aware. It is the marriage of the ballistic missile and the submarine equipped with a nuclear powerplant.

The impact of our own remarkable Polaris submarines upon the balance of power and strategic initiative has been profound. The combat-ready presence of this virtually invulnerable strike system has unquestionably dampened the Kremlin's enthusiasm for any bid for world conquest by sneak attack and made it easier for us to reject out-of-hand its clumsy efforts at ballistic blackmail.

The balance of assured strategic striking power which we are almost certain would survive any enemy surprise attack, is firmly on our side thanks to these same Polaris weapons lurking under the seas within range of critical targets in the U.S.S.R., backing up our deployed carrier striking power.

But while we may take justifiable pride in the Polaris accomplishment, there is a grim

warning implicit in looking on the other side of the Polaris coin.

As stated, the Russians appear to be underway with a high-priority program for the construction of nuclear-powered submarines. Despite our long headstart, they now have a greater number than most people realize. How many more of these ships the U.S.S.R. will build, I do not know. It appears likely, however, that it will gradually replace its 400 or more conventional Communist submarines with nuclear-powered ones—if not boat for boat, then on a ratio of perhaps two of the new for three of the old.

Recognition of the global nature of the submarine threat makes clear the need for antisubmarine warfare action on a similar scale. The aim of our strategy will be to provide for a shield for the defense of the North American continent and the means with which to liquidate enemy submersibles and the threat they pose to shipping and oversea bases.

Adm. John H. Sides, the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, in a recent statement, pointed out this problem. "The threat from missile-carrying submarines will be a very real one in the not-too-distant future," he said. "If we act now with the proper level of effort we will be able to control this threat in the years to come."

To meet our responsibilities we will rely on maximum mobility of our forces and capitalize to the utmost extent on favorable geographic factors. Antisubmarine warfare strategy must seek to exploit the geographic restrictions which help us maintain effective control of the seas. The configuration of Soviet coasts and her lack of ice-free ports and avenues of egress, for example, are inhibiting factors confronting Soviet operational planners.

ALLIED ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE ACTION

When I say "we" will rely on mobility and favorable geography, I mean allied as well as U.S. antisubmarine forces. I want to emphasize as strongly as I can that without the help of our free world neighbors, the total antisubmarine warfare problem would be infinitely more difficult, if not impossible, to solve.

Most of the allied navies have considerable antisubmarine warfare potential. Some, in fact, exist primarily for the purpose of destroying enemy submarines. Thus, the West German Navy may be counted upon to intercept Soviet submarines in the Baltic. The Turks and Greeks can help cork the Black Sea bottle at the Dardanelles. The Italians and French are on the alert in the Mediterranean. The Norwegians and British will help in the Norwegian Sea and the Denmark Strait, the 130-mile-wide channel which separates Iceland from Greenland.

On the other side of the Atlantic and in the Pacific, the Canadians have well-trained and highly effective antisubmarine warfare ships and aircraft. Many of the South American navies have trained with our units and have improved substantially their ability to combat enemy submarines in some areas of the South Atlantic and South Pacific. The Australians and New Zealanders also are prepared to lend a hand in the overall effort. Most recently, the Japanese, once one of the foremost naval powers in the world, have shown unmistakable signs of rebuilding their maritime strength with antisubmarine warfare particularly in mind.

To repeat—the large numbers of antisubmarine warfare units our friends and Allies contribute to the operational free world naval power are of major importance. These friendly forces-in-being are strategically located, and so restrict the freedom of operations of enemy submarines and complicate their problem of remaining undetected. Free world antisubmarine warfare forces, deployed well forward geographically, counter potential Soviet use of foreign bases to extend the range of their submarines.

These are fine reasons for capitalizing on the potential of small navies of the world through antisubmarine warfare support. The United States receives maximum return on the "map dollar" invested in Allied antisubmarine warfare.

COMMANDS OF THE ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE FLEET

There is another major consideration which should be recognized in any discussion of the way in which the growing undersea warfare challenge may best be met. This is the matter of naval antisubmarine warfare command.

The devastation that modern ballistic missile submarines can inflict upon fixed installations ashore, with little or no warning, imposes a new order of strategic requirement on the fleet. Similarly, the broadened area of submarine activity has greatly expanded the underseas coverage task of fleet forces. These factors place increased emphasis upon speed in strategic and tactical reaction. For this reason, the matter of overall command, which has always been important, has become even more so.

In the exercise of command of antisubmarine warfare forces, communications linkage between the major ocean areas will be needed if we are to assess properly the thermonuclear threat developing against the American continent. Almost instantaneous correlation of Atlantic and Pacific surveillance is essential.

Command action must move on the basis of the best intelligence that can be provided. Facts must be solid, and firm evaluations rapidly available. Surveillance will play a major role in the rapidity with which antisubmarine warfare command can react. If we cannot make the oceans transparent, we still must cover the major ocean areas of enemy submarine with all of the antisubmarine warfare systems that can provide clues and confirm the presence of submarines.

It is clear that the fleet commanders must direct the antisubmarine war. Command relationships evolved must provide positive and precise control so that we may react with concentrated power wherever the threat is posed and whenever the decision is made to destroy. There must also be a will and a way to dovetail our antisubmarine warfare operations smoothly and quickly with those of our many allies.

RESEARCH

The disparity between the threat and the means with which to meet it provides all the incentive we need for across-the-board improvement of our antisubmarine warfare forces.

The greatly increased performance we expect of our 1973 fleet will result in substantial measure from the basic and applied research being carried out in the laboratories of the United States and in those of our allies and from the achievements of oceanographic survey ships and deep submerging bathyscaphes.

I believe that the American people and their government are alert to the problem and are willing to make the necessary effort, although a very great deal remains to be done.

A case in point is the Navy's TENOC program—10 years of oceanographic research and development.[1] Another is the Oceanographic Act of 1962, passed by the 87th Congress and approved by the President. Under this legislation, we recognized the need for a national effort to conquer liquid space.

Much of the progress that is needed will come from the devoted scientists and engineers of America. That is the reason I recently issued a challenge to science and industry for the backup support that antisubmarine warfare so urgently needs if it is to perform its vital role. I asked these questions:

What can each of you contribute to our success in antisubmarine warfare, to our ability to control the seas for freedom?

Can you give the positive, secure and rapid communications we need to control our forces, including the deeply submerged antisubmarine warfare submarines? We have an urgent need for such a capability.

We need computer systems to gather the multitude of antisubmarine warfare clues, analyze them, and convert them into a meaningful picture from which intelligent decisions can be made rapidly. Can you provide them?

Can you provide scientific means to make our forces invisible to periscope and electronic observations?

Can we conquer the physical limitations of short sound ranges in salt water?

Can your technological and scientific talent provide sonar effectiveness at high speed? Our antisubmarine warfare forces of the future must travel fast to close the swift moving submarines. Applications of the speedy hydrofoil system in antisubmarine warfare are in their infancy—sonars must keep pace. They must hold the target with precise, position-fixing sound beams so they can guide the kill.

In the battle of sound beneath the surface, we need means for keen and quick capability to decoy our target for killing by long-range weapons systems. Can you tell us how to make the enemy submarine skipper think we are far away when we are actually near? Can you compute the false echoes at long distances in the broad ocean areas so we can classify instantaneously the quiet submarine treading water on station, waiting for the word to fire his megaton-tipped missile?

Have you really inevstigated all of the scinetific phenomena which might possibly give us that additional little clue which could make the big difference in detection or classification of submarines?

I hope the challenge will be accepted and the needed technology will be created.

IN CONCLUSION

I want to stress the overriding importance of the human element in the creation of our antisubmarine warfare fleet of the seventies.

People in the research and development laboratories must provide the advanced concepts for the equipment and arms we need for doing our job better.

People in industry must translate the products of the national scientific effort into the tactical tools the fleet requires.

People in the Congress must appropriate the funds for our future success at sea.

People as private citizens must, through a broader understanding and deeper conviction, support the overall program for controlling one of the most dangerous and difficult threats ever posed against our Nation.

Our people must man and fight our modern fleet. And people in the Navy itself must provide the leadership and vision that takes them beyond a parochial interest in one branch of their service.

If people will do these things, and I am confident that they will, we will build the bulwark of antisubmarine warfare strength upon which our military power depends for effectiveness.

---

[1] See J. R. Morgan, "A Decade of Oceanography." U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, November 1962, p. 60.

American Educator Returns Convinced of Need for Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, the Agency for International Development—AID—is constantly scoring successes all over the globe which receive little notice in this country. Working quietly but effectively, AID is helping the world's less fortunate peoples help themselves.

As an example of one such success, I should like to insert the following article from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of June 23, 1963, on the work of a Jackson educator in rural Iran:

AMERICAN EDUCATOR RETURNS CONVINCED OF NEED FOR AID

A former Jacksonian, recently returned from the Middle East, has a recipe for promoting progressive ideas in a traditional society:

Make soup, and let the soup simmer.

The author of this recipe, Charles Dove, is not a home economics expert but a former school superintendent and now an education adviser for the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

Mr. Dove, son of Mrs. Clara Dove, 814 West North, is home from his second assignment in Iran, where he has worked closely with provincial and county officials in assisting in the development of education in remote areas.

He expects to leave about mid-August to undertake a similar assignment in Laos.

Iran, Mr. Dove noted in explaining his receipe, is a mountainous country whose peoples are fiercely independent and suspicious of strangers and new ideas.

At about the time Dove arrived there the government was moving to improve education, health, agriculture, and housing standards for the provinces, and asked for American technical assistance.

At first, Mr. Dove, a superintendent at Erie, Mich., 7 years prior to 1958, concentrated on trying to improve administrative practices, teacher training, curriculums, and teaching methods at the existing schools.

The Iranian Government had insufficient funds for school construction in the provinces, so there was little opportunity to improve the design of schoolbuildings and the layout of classrooms.

However, when Dove visited existing schools he would sometimes bring the discussions around to the subject of how the children's desks could be better placed, or point out wasted space, or how a different setting of the building could provide more shelter from winter winds or glaring sun.

"When real interest was shown," said Mr. Dove, "I would take education people out into schoolyards and have desks brought out of the schoolrooms so they could be arranged in different ways, measure the space required for a good classroom, and so forth.

"It was kind of a game," he said, "and at times an academic one, you might say, because there were no funds to build schools, and I didn't know whether there would be a chance for my ideas to be used, even if they were accepted and remembered. But I did hope this game would some day turn out to be useful."

It did.

The ministry of education sometime later budgeted enough funds from a nationwide rural development program to build more than 200 schools in Kurdestan, one of three provinces in which Mr. Dove worked.

The ministry sent designs and specifications for a two-room building. But Mr. Dove felt they could do better, make more efficient buildings and even save money so they could build more schools than had been planned.

Mr. Dove went to work and made three mock-up models of a two-room school out of cardboard. The first followed the design sent by the Government. The second included some modifications, and the third introduced the maximum possible improvements under the limitations set.

He, the Iranian provincial education chief, and the governor-general met to discuss the new schools.

Mr. Dove pointed out the standard model, then turned to the second and began to note the changes he had made. Before he could expound on the advantages of the new features in the second model, the two Iranians took up the "sales pitch" themselves and enthusiastically continued on through the improvements in the third model.

"Fine," grinned the governor-general, turning to Dove. "We have made soup of your ideas and our ideas. Now we will make soup of our ideas and Teheran's ideas."

"I hadn't thought of it quite that way," Dove says, "but as I left the office I realized what an apt phrase that was. At first I had been making my own soup by tossing in ideas about better school design whenever I had the opportunity.

"Then, as my soup simmered they began tossing in some ingredients themselves and it became their soup. Finally, their soup was mixed with the government's."

The improvements in the new school will include disposition of corridors. Traditional design for all Iran schools, large or small, is the corridor. It took up half the space in a two-room school, and is missing from the new schools.

With two tours of duty behind him, one for 27 months and the other for 24, Mr. Dove is convinced of the necessity and desirability of American technical assistance to lesser developed nations.

Their development is essential to the welfare of both our country and the countries receiving aid, he says.

But, he cautions, the results of assistance can't be expected to be seen within only a decade. Pointing to the auto industry as an example, he says it has taken car manufacturers 50 years to reach their present stage of technological efficiency but we "still get a Tucker Torpedo that won't sell. Building autos is much simplier than building a nation."

Trading With the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Walden Citizen Herald of August 1. This excellent weekly is very highly thought of in my congressional district.

The news item alluded to from the North Countryman is certainly worth looking into.

Mr. Speaker, who is kidding whom? Are we importing such surplus staples as cotton from behind the Iron Curtain, and if so, why? I fear that again the answer will be the now all-too-familiar cry, why? Nobody knows.

The editorial follows:

[From the Walden (N.Y.) Citizen Herald, Aug. 1, 1963]

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

Despite official protestations to the contrary, open trading is going on every day among the business firms of this Nation and those of Communist Russia.

Doing business with an enemy that wants to kill and bury us is treason in its own right, and those who carry on this traffic should be subject to the penalties that attach to treason.

An upstate weekly newspaper, the North Countryman of Rouses Point, reported this last week:

"Ten days ago four carloads of Russian cotton crossed the border from Montreal destined for a textile concern in New Jersey. Reason for shipping through Montreal is that maritime workers in the port of New York refused to unload the stuff. They have some naive notion that when Washington says this Nation is in a death struggle with communism, something other than talk should be done about it."

It should not be difficult for the Government to trace the above shipment to its destination and publicly identify the consignee who imports Russian processed materials with which to manufacture goods to sell to Americans. Prosecution should follow. But will it?

Let's watch the papers and see.

Latin American Operations of Certain Drug Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "KEEF Rides Drug Firms Again," written by Milton Britten and published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel of recent date, dealing with the Latin American operations of certain drug firms.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEF RIDES DRUG FIRMS AGAIN

(By Milton Britten)

WASHINGTON.—Deadline for a dramatic new head-butting between Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and U.S. drug manufacturers is August 29. Outcome of the clash could affect both the U.S. image in Latin America and drug prices at home.

At issue is an allegation that U.S. manufacturers are out to get McKesson & Robbins, the biggest drug wholesaler in the United States, which has been selling prescription drugs at rock-bottom prices in Colombia in cooperation with the Colombian Government.

KEFAUVER has set August 29 as the deadline for the big firms to produce company documents relating to their efforts to block such sales south of the border. The firms are fighting the subpena, claiming KEFAUVER's Anti-Trust Subcommittee has no jurisdiction and that disclosure of the documents would imperil their Latin American operations.

Background of the scrap is this—McKesson & Robbins in July of last year pioneered in Colombia a profitable program of selling drugs by their generic (nontrade) names at prices 50 to 90 percent cheaper than name brands sell for.

A HOT POLITICAL ISSUE

Drug prices are a hot political issue throughout Latin America, where infant mortality is high—and wages so low that even basic necessities are beyond the means of many. Against this backdrop Latin cries that "Yankee imperialists" are exploiting the people through high prices are not unfamiliar.

In Colombia the legislature has passed bills to make drug manufacture a Government enterprise. Rather than take this course, however, the Colombian Government, following the McKesson & Robbins lead, sought to meet the problem by executive decree last February.

Firms that sell by generic name some 60 percent below brand name prices are guaranteed that their products will be distributed by all drug stores and that they will receive other favored treatment. McKesson & Robbins has put some 100 drugs under this program.

The McKesson & Robbins all-out campaign in Colombia has caused concern and resentment among some U.S. drug manufacturers whose products McKesson & Robbins wholesalers in the United States too. They obviously fear that the practice of low-cost drug sales will not only catch on through all of Latin America, but might even be exported back to the United States.

Somewhow, Dr. Jose Felix Patino, Yale-educated Colombian Minister of Public Health, got hold of the minutes of a meeting held in Washington last January 14 by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the U.S. industry's trade group, and put them in the Colombian Congressional Record.

This meeting, according to the minutes, was attended by representatives of such big U.S. manufacturers as Squibb, Upjohn, Pfizer, Merck, Sharp & Dohme, and Smith, Kline & French, and representatives of an industry trade group from Colombia. They discussed ways to find a "solution" to the low-price drug situation in Columbia and proposed contacting both the United States and Colombian Governments, which they did.

All of this outraged KEFAUVER, who has long urged sale of drugs by their generic names as a means of reducing drug costs to oldsters and other low-income groups in the United States. He contends there are also indications that the big drugmakers are trying to bring McKesson & Robbins into line by cutting off bulk drug supplies to McKesson & Robbins, that this interferes with McKesson & Robbins' legitimate business pursuits and therefore is properly a concern of his Antitrust Subcommittee.

DIRKSEN WOULD BLOCK PROBE

Leading opponent of the proposed inquiry is Senator Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois, who is also the ranking Republican on KEFAUVER's subcommittee. DIRKSEN also sought to throw the blocks to KEFAUVER's drug bill efforts in the last Congress—until the ghastly thalidomide scandal broke and the bill passed in a landslide.

DIRKSEN's first step was to demand that the whole issue be explored in hush-hush meetings with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee wanted the inquiry made by the Agency for International Development and the Justice Department.

But AID says it isn't equipped to make such an investigation—and volunteered the opinion that it is obviously in the best interests of our Alliance for Progress that drugs be marketed at the lowest possible cost throughout Latin America. Justice has expressed interest, but says it doesn't have jurisdiction over the whole problem and a congressional investigation wouldn't hurt.

So the issue is back in the lap of KEFAUVER's subcommittee. He'll get the subpenaed documents and hold hearings—unless DIRKSEN can get up enough votes, Republican and Democrat, on the eight-man subcommittee to block him.

Dr. W. J. Johnson: Citizen of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was privileged to attend a ceremony in my hometown of Pulaski, Tenn., honoring one of Tennessee's most outstanding citizens. I refer to the occasion when my fellow Giles Countian, Dr. W. J. Johnson, was named as Citizen of the Year by the Pulaski Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Dr. Johnson's life has been an exemplary one, which we would all do well to emulate. His achievements, both as a practicing physician and as a private citizen, are far too numerous to elaborate upon, and I can only say that the honor which was bestowed upon him by the VFW was most appropriate.

In conclusion, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following two articles, one of which appeared in the Giles Free Press, and the other in the Pulaski Citizen, which describe much better than I the outstanding qualities and attributes of this distinguished Tennessean and American:

[From the Pulaski Citizen]

A WISE CHOICE

Congratulations are in order for the Pulaski Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which has taken as one of its projects the naming of the Citizen of the Year in Giles County. Congratulations are also in order for this group for having named Dr. W. J. Johnson as its first subject. The genial doctor whom we jokingly refer to as "Old Ironsides" because we like and respect him, has played a very important role in the everyday life of Giles Countians. He was born in 1890 on a Star route in the community of Cairo, Ala., later migrating to what is now Frankewing. It was at the latter location that he began the practice of medicine, and remained there until Uncle Sam called him to service in World War I. When this conflict ended victoriously for the Allies Dr. Johnson returned to his native State and established his residence at Cornersville in Marshall County where he remained for several years during which time he was engaged in the practice of his profession.

In 1926 Dr. Johnson established the Pulaski Hospital located on East Jefferson Street, thus giving the people of Pulaski a medical facility enjoyed and apprecited by only a few towns of similar size. It will be remembered that before Dr. Johnson opened his hospital in Pulaski all cases of severe illness and surgery requiring hospitalization were of necessity transferred to Nashville. These trips to Nashville were not only costly and inconvenient, but often times endangered the life of the patient. This was the end of the no hospital era in Giles County and for the next 24 years the Pulaski Hospital was headquarters for the sick. In 1951 Giles County through the help of Dr. Johnson opened its modern hospital facility on East Madison Street, and the Pulaski Hospital was converted into offices to be occupied by Drs. Johnson and Speer.

"Old Ironsides" has come a long way since he graduated from medical school. He has been honored many times by his profession, and he ranks completely out of the pauper class here in Giles County where he is considered one of the wealthiest citizens. He was instrumental in the establishment of the Richland Bank during the early thirties, and is today one of the First National Bank's largest stockholders, an institution that succeeded the old Richland Bank in name only. Dr. Johnson has served this bank as president and chairman of the board, the latter position he held until recently when he retired at this own suggestion.

The Citizen is indeed happy to salute "Old Ironsides" on this memorable occasion, and wishes the best for him as he continues to live and prosper in the city and county where he has given his all to relieve human suffering and misery.

J.H.S.

[From the Giles County Press, June 12, 1963]

AN HONOR WELL EARNED

This past Friday evening, business associates and friends of Dr. W. J. Johnson gathered to pay honor to this well-known physician on the occasion of his being named Citizen of the Year by Post 4577 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This honor came to Dr. Johnson during a year which marks a significant milestone in his life and career. It was 50 years ago that he first started the practice of medicine. In earlier years he practiced at McBurg, Frankewing and Cornersville. In more recent years his practice has been here in Pulaski.

The qualities of citizenship displayed through the years by Dr. Johnson are admirable. His life as physician, businessman, and private citizen certainly qualify him for the high honor his fellow citizens bestowed upon him.

After years of hard work earning his medical degree, Dr. Johnson chose to practice in an area where he could serve his own people, giving no thought to seeking out a career in some distant, and perhaps more glamorous part of the country.

Upon entering the medical profession, he was not content to be a practicing physician only; he saw the need for a clinic at Cornersville and built one. Later he came to Pulaski to establish a hospital at a time when such a facility was badly needed.

As a man of seemingly unlimited energy, and one with a keen insight into trends of changing times, Dr. Johnson has not confined his time and talents to the medical profession alone. While he has always been first and foremost a physician, he has turned his talents with considerable success to such other fields as banking and real estate development. His qualities of leadership have, on more than one occasion, been devoted to projects for the advancement of this community.

The association between Dr. W. J. Johnson and the people of Giles County has been one of mutual benefit. This community has seen many worthwhile endeavors take shape with Dr. Johnson's efforts playing a prominent role. At the same time, the people of Giles County have given Dr. Johnson their acceptance, friendship and support.

This, we feel, is what citizenship is all about: giving of one's self through talent and labor to a community in which one has found a happy environment of friendship and respect.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ASSOCIATION FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE, WESTCHESTER BRANCH,
Westchester, Ill., June 29, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our organization we the undersigned, take the liberty to ask you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and to give it your favorable consideration. Freedom is indivisible—the continuation of Russian oppression toward Ukraine and other enslaved nations is a sign that America will be deprived of her freedom too. While Communist Russia has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we, as a Nation, are not much concerned about the sufferings of enslaved and captive non-Russian nations—the most vulnerable problem of Moscow's eternal jail of nations. Bolshevism is Russian fascism.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a source of true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, helping in the same time our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We dare to ask you once more, dear Congressman SMITH, to give your full support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

M. Kulchytskyi, Mary Kulchytskyi, L. Kulchytskyi, A. Kowalenko, M. Borowych, I. Petroshchuk, P. Dzentsilowskyi, H. Dzentsilowskyi, Euhen Browar, Stephania Borowych, Marie Maleckyj, and Julian Maleckyj.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I support House Resolution 14 and hope you keep fighting for it. God help this country if our administration doesn't see the light soon.

JOAN R. MANAHAN.

BRIGHTWATERS, N.Y.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By Robert Morris)

As we approach Captive Nations Week, quite coincidentally, we are being told by the leaders of our Nation and indeed the world that we have a solemn moral obligation to extend full liberties, equality, and justice to all Americans of every race, color, and creed. It is well that we are so told because we do indeed have these deep and solemn obligations to our brothers.

It is a common denominator of the religious codes of all of us that all men are our brothers and that we are our brothers' keepers. Therefore we must see to it, to the best of our ability, that every man receives the full complement of rights that man's divinely inspired nature deserves.

A careful analysis of what is going on today, however, will bring out a serious inadequacy. For only conditions in the United States are the object of this crusade even though world leaders are doing much of the talking and even though great strides are being made here to level segregation barriers. This leaves the United States the sole object of obloquy on the world scene.

No one raises a whisper about the far more extensive segregation that exists in the Soviet Empire or in India, the leader of the neutrals, where the cruel caste system prevails. In the latter country, 80 million Indians are literal outcasts because of the color of their skin.

Ralph Bunche, the Undersecretary of the U.N. for Political Affairs is throwing himself fully into the crusade in the United States even though he is an international civil servant. I have not heard that he raises the same issue in the Soviet Union or in India. You may say that he is an American citizen. But then neither Suslow, the Soviet, or Narasimhan, the Indian, the other two members of the troika that rules the U.N. sit like sphinxes when it comes to the severe segregation in their home countries.

In short a double standard exists and no one seems to advert to it.

But this double standard becomes even more pronounced when the question of the captive nations turns up on the agenda.

Last week the Nation's press carried photos of U Thant beaming broadly on the cruel butchers of Budapest on their home territory. These ruthless leaders have literally murdered thousands of human beings whose only crime was that they aspired to freedom. After victims were tortured and killed, their corpses were literally put into meat choppers and ground into the Budapest River. Ten million Hungarians are in complete bondage, bereft of virtually all their civil rights. Khrushchev, Castro, Kadar, and Tito do not practice discrimination. They crush civil liberties in toto. They make discrimination in the United States pale by comparison. And yet U Thant favors Khrushchev and his "peaceful coexistence" to liberty, with its imperfections, in the United States.

We do have a moral obligation to our brothers. But this obligation extends to all men. It should not be selective but universal in scope. This obligation accrues to men on both sides of the Florida Straits, to the people in East as well as West Berlin, to North as well as South Korea. It accrues to Poles, to Azerbaijans, Bulgarians, Latvians, North Vietnamese, and all the billion human beings in bondage today.

When we see the general acceptance of the pronouncement of our highest policy papers here that we should not be critical of the captors of the enslaved peoples, or give any hope to the people in bondage, you wonder about the genuineness of the crusade some people profess to be waging. The concern they express involves only certain people and then only selected acts of discrimination.

Liberty and freedom should be for all men. That should be our goal, clearly expressed during Captive Nations Week.

MCALLEN, TEX., *July 10, 1963.*

Representative DAN FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s' column of July 8, 1963, in our paper I read of your resolution to create a House Committee on Captive Nations. I wish to commend you on your efforts to try to get the Soviets on the defensive. I think Dean Rusk's attitude smacks of appeasement. It looks like his advisers always make decisions that are to our degradation.

It is way past time for us to launch an offensive in this cold war. If Russia disturbs the Berlin situation we should not try to work around their blockades but strike back and make them back down again. They will do it, and we should keep them doing it until the people in the captive nations and those they are trying to subvert, rise up against them too. Keep up the good work

Yours truly,

W. G. WESTERFIELD.

HERB PHILBRICK'S STORE,
Rye Beach, N.H., July 24, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: In view of your initiative in sponsoring the Flood resolution, House Resolution 14, I believe you may be interested to know of the enclosed resolution passed at the Captive Nations Day rally in Boston, Mass., on Saturday, July 20, and of the speech made by myself at the Captive Day rally in New Hampshire on Sunday, July 21.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally commend you and thank you for the meritorious service you are rendering our Nation in Washington,

Sincerely,

HERBERT A. PHILBRICK.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE FREEDOM RALLY HELD ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON, MASS., JULY 20, 1963

Whereas President Kennedy and Governor Peabody proclaimed the week of July 14 to 20 as Captive Nations Week in accordance with the Captive Nations Week resolutions passed by Congress in 1959; and

Whereas the Soviet Government continues to annihilate the national, cultural, and political identies of the captive non-Russian nations through Russification and deportations; and

Whereas Russian communism made its way to Cuba, making Cuba an armed outpost in the Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas the United States has failed to develop effective policies toward the captive nations to regain freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, we assembled at the fifth observance of the Captive Nations Week in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1963, do hereby *Resolve*—

1. Urge the U.S. Government to declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, it's support on the right of self-determination of all peoples held in Communist captivity, and consequently, make this issue the permanent concern in all negotiations with the Soviet Government; and

2. Urge the House Rules Committee to speed action on the pending Flood resolution (H.R. 14), Derwinski resolution (H.R. 15) and other similar resolutions calling for the establishment of a permanent congressional committee on the captive nations which will devise a progressive program to aid captive nations to restore their historical freedom and independence; and

3. Compliment all Congressmen for their resolutions and support; commend all Americans who voiced their support; and urge those who have not thus far given their support for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee to do so now; and

4. Deplore the State Department policy in not supporting the establishment of the said committee, and urge our State Department to endorse and support the Flood resolution in its entirety.

Sponsored by: The American Institute, Inc., and the New England Captive Nations Committee (Milton, Mass.).

Perilous U.S. Policy in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Perilous U.S. Policy in Africa," from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Thursday, August 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERILOUS U.S. POLICY IN AFRICA

The United States continues to behave as though a conglomeration of Asian-African nations were more important to it than its ancient and established European allies. Latest happenings in this area is the report that we are seriously considering abandoning our invaluable bases in the Portuguest Azores so that we may disengage from any embarrassing military alliance with Portugal.

And why is the alliance with Portugal embarrassing? Because, forsooth, such statesmen as the heads of the newly hatched African governments—several of whom keep their opponents in jail without trial and behave generally like tinpot dictators—do not like Portugal (another dictatorship), and its record in Africa.

They also don't like the Government and politics of South Africa. In order to curry favor with the newly formed African-Asian countries and the Negro vote in the United States, our Government will cut off shipments of arms to South Africa.

One does not have to approve of all the policies of either Portugal or South Africa—and we disapprove of some of them strongly—to feel that the U.S. Government is going far overboard in trying to cater to dozens of little Asian and African nations whose level of civilization is still almost primitive.

Imagine our giving up our bases in the Azores in order to placate world opinion, as supposedly represented by these pint-sized countries. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson has termed our bases in the Azores the most important U.S. bases on the globe. They were vital to us at the time of the Lebanon crisis of 1958, the Congo crisis of 1960, and the Berlin crisis of 1961. In these days when it is necessary to move troops to almost any part of the world by air with the greatest possible speed, such bases as those in the Azores are almost indispensable.

The possibility that we will give them up seems not to have been discussed overseas to any great extent, but our ban on arms to South Africa has been loudly criticized in some of the leading British newspapers.

The London Daily Telegraph says, for example: "Since South Africa is well able to equip itself against any internal uprising, it is probable that the arms ban movement aims at weakening the Republic in its external defenses. South Africa and Portugal together command a defense structure on which the military stability of southern Africa depends. Britons may not like this sort of shield, but it may be more dependable than the good will of the Afro-Asian states."

The good will of the Afro-Asian states is an extremely slender reed on which to lean. We helped to force the Belgians out of the Congo, with catastrophic results. We seem now to be toying with the idea of trying to force the Portuguese out of Angola, Mozambique, and Portuguese Guinea and the whites out of the Union of South Africa.

Much of this pressure on Portugal and South Africa, if implemented with U.N. sanctions, as the Afro-Asian bloc urges, would constitute flagrant interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Furthermore, the blacks in the areas in question are no more ready to take over than were those in the Congo. Only disaster will result, if further areas of Africa are wrested from the hands of the whites who have governed them over the years, and put under the control of African governments which have only a handful of trained citizens.

We reiterate that some of the policies of the whites in Africa cannot be defended. Some of those colonial administrations are guilty, for example, of not giving the natives adequate opportunities to obtain education and training. But too hasty changes in the governmental arrangements of those areas could bring on a chaotic and bloody war, as in the Congo, with everybody losing.

Let our representatives in Washington and at the United Nations consider well before inviting any such situation.

Communists, Following Mao's Rules, Soft-pedal Marxism in Early Stages of Guerrilla Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech before the Commonwealth Club of California, Prof. Kit G. Machado, instructor in Asian politics at the University of California Extension Division, points up in vivid terms how the Communists in a relatively safe method expand their influence.

Mr. Machado refers specifically to the fact that societies in the early stages of modernization are peculiarly vulnerable and states, further, that the vacuum between national leadership and the mass provides a natural opening for Communist penetration.

I believe all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of his address which merits full attention. The text of his remarks follows:

COMMUNISTS, FOLLOWING MAO'S RULES, SOFT-PEDAL MARXISM IN EARLY STAGES OF GUERRILLA REVOLT

(By Kit G. Machado)

The Communist powers appear to have concluded that the national-liberation war—such as the one in South Vietnam—is a relatively safe method of forcefully expanding their influence. Risk of full-scale Western intervention is minimized, because they take the form of internal or civil wars.

The Soviet Union considers this type of war an effective mode of further expanding Communist influence fully compatible with peaceful coexistence.

Conditions which favor liberation movement exist in many societies today. For contemporary Southeast Asia, and much of the developing world, this is an era of drastic and rapid change.

Societies in the early stages of modernization are peculiarly vulnerable. Political activity at the national level often has no relationship to political activity at the village level and vice versa.

There is a significant gulf between the national ruling elite and a large portion of the population—few channels of communication or organizational links.

AUTHORITY WEAKENED; NOT REPLACED

In many cases, the Western impact weakened the authority of traditional village leaders. During rapid social change, old forms crumble before new ones replace them. The new governments have serious difficulties in establishing their authority at the local level.

There is not a nation in Southeast Asia, except North Vietnam, which has completely established its authority in all areas within its borders.

The vacuum between national leadership and the mass provides a natural opening for Communist penetration—particularly when combined with serious socioeconomic grievances. Genuine sources of discontent—such as land hunger, petty governmental oppression, or frustrated aspirations—are easily capitalized upon. People may have no effective channels for expression themselves at the national level.

REVOLUTIONISTS USE MAO'S DOCTRINES

The writings of Mao Tse-tung constitute a large body of doctrine on revolutionary war, adapted for use by numerous revolutionaries—Communist and non-Communist alike. One of his most successful disciples, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, is undoubtedly managing North Vietnam operations in South Vietnam today.

Armed struggle, excepting a general war, is conceived as the continuation of essentially political activities. The revolutionary war is viewed by the Communists as the climax of extensive political and socioeconomic activity.

Guerrilla fighters, the backbone of Communist effort in initial stages, operate successfully only where they have local roots. Only where they enjoy the loyalty or acquiescence of the population can guerrillas consistently utilize surprise and extreme mobility; count upon excellent intelligence;

operate without fixed supply bases. These things make guerrillas effective.

Maoist doctrine emphasizes political mobilization as a prerequisite to revolutionary warfare. Initial emphasis is upon political and socioeconomic activities. After proper preparation, the military phase of the conflict is stepped up slowly.

Initially, a hard core of Communist cadres entrenches itself in various local areas. Normally, they are indigenous to the society. In South Vietnam, the Vietminh simply left behind 3,000 to 5,000 cadres after the 1954 Geneva agreement. They also took southerners north with them for training and have subsequently sent them back.

REDS USE LOCAL GRIEVANCES

Such cadres attempt to recruit and train followers from among the indigenous population. In this period they pursue soft policies, capitalizing upon local grievances to attract adherents. In South Vietnam, this effort probably began in earnest early in 1956.

After sufficient adherents have been won in some local areas, small units of guerrillas begin to operate to bring larger segments under Communist control, and to develop safe areas. The effort is made to cut some local areas off from outside authority altogether. This activity can only be carried on successfully where local authority is weak.

In South Vietnam, this effort began early in 1958, when the Vietcong began establishing organizations in some villages, openly propagandizing the population; where considered necessary, using terror fully to isolate the population from weak local authorities.

The Diem government's weak land reform program was capitalized upon by the Vietcong, which undertook simple land redistribution or rent reduction measures in areas it controlled. National government and army officials in some provincial areas alienated the population. In such areas, the Vietcong attempted to assume the role of defender of the people against the government.

TERROR USED TO BREAK NATIONAL TIES

The Communists use terror selectively and systematically: principaly against provincial government officials and government representatives—such as health workers—to break down the flimsy ties between government and population.

It is also directed against those who cooperate with government officials in giving information about the Vietcong.

Systematic liquidation of such people, whom the Vietcong calls "traitors," tends to intimidate the people. Attempt is made to legitimize this terrorization by executing people after finding them guilty of "crimes" in front of a peasant audience.

MARXISM SOFT-PEDALED IN EARLY STAGE

Support gained during this period is rarely based on ultimate goals of Communist leaders. The propaganda appeal of the Vietcong is rarely based on Communist ideology.

Programs and propaganda are almost exclusively couched in terms of anti-Diem, anti-U.S. imperialism, and provarious types of social and economic reforms, peace, and national reunification.

During this phase, the gulf between the national government and the population is filled by a well integrated, sub rosa revolutionary political and military organization, which superimposes itself over parts of the countryside and which wields actual authority in some areas—a Communist shadow government. Viet Cong followers in the villages form a highly effective intelligence network.

When these political objectives have been satisfactorily achieved, small guerrilla bands are combined into larger units which operate in coordination. This phase began in South Vietnam around January of 1960.

An effort is made to extend control over a much broader segment of the population and to develop an effectively integrated military machine. In South Vietnam today, the Viet Cong controls about half of the population. The national army is able to control many of these areas when they are there, but when they leave, the Viet Cong takes over again.

GUERRILLAS CHANGED INTO CONVENTIONAL FORCE

Militarily, this is a period of guerrilla harassment of government forces, while avoiding conventional engagement. In this period, a war of attrition is carried on to demoralize and sap the strength and will of the enemy, in keeping with the Maoist notion of the protracted war.

In this way, revolutionary war becomes the ideal weapon of the militarily weak. Guerrilla forces normally hold down regular forces 10 times their numbers. In South Vietnam, roughly 25,000 to 30,000 hard core Viet Cong are holding down a national army of over 200,000.

Maoist doctrine recognizes that no country is likely to be taken over solely on the basis of this kind of operation. The extended period of guerrilla war is viewed as simply the means to create a conventional force—which in the final phase will seize power in a conventional military fashion.

Any sound policy designed to counter revolutionary war must combine political, socioeconomic, and military elements. There are three basic objectives: defeat or encouragement of surrender of the guerrillas; detaching guerrillas from popular support; and establishment of governmental authority at the local level and creation of an integrated and viable order. These objects must be pursued simultaneously.

Given the Communist approach and heavy emphasis on political and socioeconomic preparation, it is possible that by the time we are confronted with the terminal, military phase of their strategy, it is too late to do much about it.

Clearly then the best way to fight revolutionary war is to assist in its prevention. This requires efforts to combat the most basic problems which make a society vulnerable.

It is my opinion that the United States should avoid military overcommitment to those governments which are unwilling to make their best efforts and the United States should make a full-scale effort to assist those governments willing to make this effort.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (W. W. Geddies). Why were the four U.S. intelligence entities so late in realizing Communist revolutions under way?

Answer. These things involve touchy relations with other governments. We have tradition of noninvolvement in internal affairs of other societies. Today in northeast Thailand, with 9 million people, there is potential target. There have been Communist cadres there for 30 years. This is, classically, an area where the people are totally unintegrated into the national political process. I'm sure the United States is pressing the Thailand Government on this. If these efforts have not started early enough, there may be general guerrilla warfare in next year or so.

Question (Walter McGovern). How serious is Russo-China friction?

Answer. Very serious rift—probably will never be completely breached—for reasons of ideology, history, national interest, different perspective.

Question (A. D. Hughs). Much chance for revolutionary war in Malaya?

Answer. The 12-year internal Communist revolutionary war finally ended under conditions much more favorable than those in Vietnam today. (Guerrilla action was by ethnically distinct people; antiguerrilla action was by British; there was no common border with a Communist society.) Malaya is on way to stability but effort may be made in Sarawak and North Borneo to undo federation.

Question (George R. Concannon). Who would you replace Diem with? How?

Answer. There are people who I believe could develop broader support. They are not well known in the West. Supporters of Diem argue it's unwise to switch horses. Societies of southeast Asia which successfully combated the problem—the Philippines and Malaysia—did just that.

Question (R. A. Terry). Is Communist strategy in southeast Asia directed and supported only by Red China?

Answer. In South Vietnam it is directed and supported almost exclusively by North Vietnam rather than directly by China or the Soviet Union.

New Frontier Hiring Breaks All Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the real reason the people cannot get a tax cut is because President Kennedy refuses to make it possible by cutting expenses. On the contrary the Kennedy programs and policies are zooming Federal spending to new highs with the end result that people will be paying more taxes, not less.

In just one area, hiring new employees, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News, "A Look at the Record," shows that the Kennedy policies are doing to the taxpayers:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Aug. 6, 1963]

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

Like topsy, the Federal Government's payroll just seems to grow and grow. Month after month, the number of civilian government employees increases and the burden on taxpayers become heavier.

According to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Kennedy administration added 17,180 new cilivian employees to the Federal payroll during June 1963. This brought total Federal employment at the end of fiscal 1963 to a peacetime high of 2,509,028.

The Government itself estimates that the average annual salary of Federal civil service employees is $5,800, not including fringe benefits or the cost of adding working space, supplies, and other necessary items involved in any increase. Hence, in the single month of June, 1963, the basic cost of adding those 17,180 new employees came to $99,644,000.

That's only part of the picture. When President Kennedy took office in January, 1961, the total Federal payroll was 2,356,737. In 2½ years he has added 152,291 employees at a cost (salary only) of $883,287,800.

Nor is that the end. The President has requested Congress to permit the employment of an additional 36,500 new Federal employees during the current fiscal year. The basic cost of adding these employees will come to $211,700,000.

Add this request to the increases already made in the Federal payroll by the Kennedy regime and the totals show 188,791 new employees at a cost of $1,094,987,800.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of fringe benefits, additional working space, and other supplies which these new employees require, but it must run into many millions of dollars.

When he was campaigning for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy was particularly critical of the new employees which President Eisenhower had added to the Federal payroll. Actually, there were fewer Federal employees at the end of Eisenhower's term than when he moved into the White House. Mr. Kennedy, however, will have increased the Federal payroll by more than 8 percent in his first 3 years in office.

Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges received a good deal of publicity when he complained that he could run his Department with 10 percent fewer employees. Actions speak louder than words. Mr. Hodges, like the heads of most Government bureaus, has steadily increased the number of employees working under him. In June 1963, alone, his Department grew by 1,381 employees—a boost of nearly 5 percent in a single month.

This burgeoning army of Federal employees is going to continue to grow, as it has in the past, unless we who pay the bills stop judging politicians by their words and start judging them by their actions.

Poll Shows South Idaho Citizens Welcome BPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, for several days the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has been inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from southern Idaho newspapers opposing Bonneville Power.

In a speech recently on the floor I informed my colleagues of the tactics used by the power companies to obtain editorial support for their great multithousand-dollar, anti-Bonneville Power Administration campaign. And, when they were able to obtain the editorials that they wanted from certain Idaho newspapers they would immediately circulate them to other newspapers requesting that they carry them in "What Other Editors Say" columns.

Thereafter, if a newspaper editor was still reluctant to join the power company bandwagon, he could count on a visit from the manager of the local power company office to convince him further that he should propagandize in accordance with their policies.

These editorials have then been forwarded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who with regularity has been inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as supposedly expressing the views of the people of southern Idaho. At first he carried them under the misleading title of Southern Idaho's New Slogan, "Bonneville—Please Leave Us Out."

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that there has been no newspaper in Idaho more solidly in the power company's camp than the Idaho Daily Statesman. It has been the source of many an anti-BPA, anti-Senator CHURCH, anti-Congressman HARDING and anti-administration editorial. However, this newspaper sent its inquiring reporter into the streets of Boise, Idaho, to sample public opinion on the question "What is your opinion about expanding BPA marketing area into southern Idaho?"

The question was put to 12 people selected at random. The results show that 9 of the 12 favored the inclusion of southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area, 2 oposed it and 1 offered no firm opinion either way.

Mr. Speaker, if southern Idaho needed a slogan regarding BPA, as a result of this public opinion poll from the Idaho Daily Statesman, it could be briefly stated: "Idaho Citizens Welcome BPA Into Southern Idaho by a Vote of 9 to 2."

In order that my colleagues may be fully aware of the positions of Idaho citizens on this matter and of their support for the position of the Kennedy administration, Secretary Udall, and the Democratic Party in Idaho, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the interviews recorded in the Sunday morning Idaho Daily Statesman of August 4, 1963:

THE INQUIRING REPORTER

THE QUESTION

What is your opinion about expanding Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho?

THE ANSWERS

George Milich: "I think it would be all right. Private power in Idaho needs competition. Electric power rates in Idaho, in my estimation, are too high. I think the Government should run all utilities. The expansion of the Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho will benefit a lot of people."

Mrs. Wila Hinton: "I definitely feel the Government should stay completely out of all utilities. Every time the Government undertakes a project such as this, it costs the taxpayer a lot of money. Private providers can handle the job adequately."

Mrs. Velma Olds: "I suppose the expansion of BPA into southern Idaho would be expensive to begin with but if, as they say, lower rates will be possible, I'm sure new enterprises will be attracted to Idaho. I think electricity rates in Idaho are much too high. I lived formerly in Washington where rates are much cheaper."

Ralph Reed: "I think the expansion of BPA into southern Idaho will encourage private industries to come into Idaho because BPA will offer rates they can afford. I think Idaho Power Co. and Utah Power and Light should have their market areas but I think BPA will in this instance will serve Idaho in numerous ways."

George A. Hall: "I think the extension of the Bonneville Power Administration to serve southern Idaho would be all right. I don't think this would be treading on the toes of private power suppliers. I feel this is an instance where the Federal Government can provide a service to a lot of people without unduly competing with private power concerns."

Duane Johns: "I really haven't followed the issue as closely as I would have liked, but I think lower rates, if they can be provided by BPA, will stimulate growth in the southern part of the State. In special cases such as this, I feel the Government can provide useful services. I feel private power can be too monopolistic."

Bob Watson: "I think it's a good thing for BPA to come into Idaho. I think this will provide healthy competition and not really hurt private companies. This also will create development of the southern part of the State by attracting new industries with the lower rates."

Robert E. Bakes: "I'm in favor of bringing Bonneville Power Administration into Idaho. The Government is now providing service to 12 to 15 municipalities and rural electrical cooperatives. If lower rates will attract new industry, then we need it."

Edward F. Frasier: "I don't believe Idaho Power should have such a tight control over the power market. My rates have been increased substantially. If the Government can operate more cheaply, then I think Bonneville Power will help the farmer, the community and industry."

Miss Judy Silva: "I don't think Bonneville Power should come into Idaho because it would compete with private power companies. I think the Government would run in the red and just be a load on the taxpayers. Private concerns operate more efficiently because they are less bureaucratic."

Miss Joan E. Jones: "First of all it must be established that there is a need for power in this area. Then, if private power companies can't supply power cheaply enough, I feel the Government should provide the service. In instances such as Tennessee Valley Authority, the Government has done a lot of good to raise the economy by making cheap power available."

Mrs. June Pearce: "I'm for it. I feel Idaho needs new industry and we won't get it with the present high power rates. BPA might be a taxpayer's burden until it gets going but it will be a saving in the long run and will be beneficial to the State."

Atlanta School System Drive To Return Dropouts to School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal, pro and con, in recent days concerning broadcast editorials. Knowing the exceptionally good work that some of the radio and television stations in the Atlanta area have performed in the realm of public service, I heartily endorse the continuation of such editorials.

One evidence of the effectiveness of the full expression of independent viewpoints is the following editorial, broadcast by television station WAGA of Atlanta, concerning the vital and timely topic of school dropouts. Knowing that this message is of importance nationally, I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

During the next 3 weeks 30 visiting teachers of the Atlanta school system will be calling on 2,500 young men and women who may face a dismal future unless they make the right decision. These are the 2,500 students who recently made a decision to discontinue their education.

The crash program to get these boys and girls back in school this fall was formulated earlier this week when $5,000 was made available for this purpose.

The 3-week drive is of vital importance to the future well-being of Georgia and the Nation. Similar efforts will be underway elsewhere throughout the United States.

Channel 5 has discussed the school dropout problem with you many times in the past.

The dropout rate in Georgia is appalling. Did you know that more than half of the youngsters of the State who start school do not finish?

Statistics show the dropout becomes heaviest after school attendance is no longer required by law, at age 16 in most States.

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE says it may be well to consider a higher compulsory school age. Channel 5 agrees. The legislature would do well to consider raising the compulsory school age.

Today's demand for highly developed minds and bodies is greater than ever before. But as Senator TALMADGE points out, it is not enough to make school attendance mandatory.

He says "the importance of education must be fully understood and appreciated by everyone at the local level and this must be translated into school and community action."

It is gratifying to see the Atlanta school system moving in this direction. We hope other communities will follow the lead. The drive to return dropout students to school next month deserves your wholehearted support. And if you're the parent of one of these youngsters who has discontinued his education, do your part by encouraging him to get back in school in September.

Soviet Signature Worthless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if you cashed 53 checks for an individual and 50 of them were worthless, would you not question the honesty of the signer? Then why should the American people put any faith in the signature of Khrushchev, representing the Soviet Union, to a treaty of any kind? The Soviet Union does not honor its signature. The Communists have never kept their word and have never indulged in any action that would give credence to the belief that its leaders are honorable men. On the contrary the record proves they are dishonorable, untruthful, murderers, and that they would not hesitate to exterminate an entire people, commit mass murder, or any other evil or devious thing that would advance their professed goal, world domination.

In spite of this record, President Kennedy now asks the American people to stake the security of the United States and the very lives of our people on the word of Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. Surely the people must be aroused to demand that the Senate refuse to approve the test ban treaty. Only Senate action will stop the mad rush to national suicide in which President Kennedy is leading us.

The total lack of principle on the part of the Soviet Union and its dictator is clearly outlined in the following column by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star, "Lipservice to Noninterference":

LIPSERVICE TO NONINTERFERENCE

(By David Lawrence)

Every line in the treaty just signed in Moscow banning certain nuclear tests can be acclaimed and approved except one—and that line contains the signature of the Soviet Government, headed by Premier Khrushchev.

Hardly had the ink been dry on the treaty signed between the East and West, when the Soviet Premier in a speech publicly reiterated the hyprocrisy which runs through the policy and acts of the Moscow regime in various parts of the world. He said:

"We are deeply convinced of the advantages of socialism, communism, and do not conceal this conviction. No treaties and agreements between states can overcome the radical contraditions that exist between the two coexisting social systems.

"But we, the Soviet people, firmly hold the position that social and class questions, the questions of internal social and political systems, should be settled not through war between the states, but by the peoples of every country."

But why did the Soviet regime interfere in Cuba, why did it send missiles there, why does it still maintain approximately 15,000 troops there, and why have the Communist "technicians"—trained in everything from social philosophy to military operations—been virtually controlling the Cuban Government in the last several months? Why has the Soviet Government continued to maintain troops and exercise authority over puppet regimes in Poland, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and East Germany?

Why, also, have Communist-trained students and agitators been involved in stirring up demonstrations and bloodshed between factions in Venezuela, Ecuador and Argentina, as well as in several other countries of Central and South America?

It is an established rule of international law that there should be no interference from the outside in the internal affairs of any sovereign state. Lip service has been given again and again by Premier Khrushchev and his stooges to the doctrine of self-determination. It has been warmly supported in his speeches crusading against colonialism.

Only this week, however, the double standard practiced by Mr. Khrushchev was given moral support by the United Nations itself, which professes to safeguard the independence of its member nations. Yet the U.N. interferes in the internal affairs of the Republic of South Africa, which has adopted a racial-segregation policy disliked by the governments of other African countries whose population is predominantly Negro.

Even the U.S. Government, which has again and again proclaimed that internal affairs should not be intruded upon by the U.N., did not have the temerity last week to vote against the resolution of the African countries in the Security Council interfering in Portugal's internal affairs, but merely "abstained from voting."

The United Press International, in a dispatch from U.N. headquarters in New York on August 2, quoted Adlai Stevenson, the American representative, as saying that he feels the Republic of South Africa "is failing to carry out its obligations under the U.N. Charter" in continuing to deny Africans political rights. Mr. Stevenson added:

"By stopping the sale of arms to South Africa we will emphasize our hope that the republic will now reassess its attitude on 'apartheid' (segregation) in the light of numerous appeals from the U.N. and from member states such as the United States."

The dispatch concludes: "Mr. Stevenson said the United States is prepared to meet with other U.N. members and with the foreign ministers of African states to discuss what can be done about South Africa and racial segregation."

So who is interfering in "questions of internal social and political systems?" Has the United States been contradicting its professed policy of noninterference in the domestic affairs of other countries? And has Mr. Khrushchev not been insisting on the right to interfere secretly not only in Africa but in Cuba and South America? Of what avail is any treaty, no matter how meritorious its professions of worthy purposes, if the signer is himself guilty of deception and carries on clandestinely an active interference in the affairs of a country only 90 miles away from the southern coast of the United States.

If Ambassador Stevenson's declarations about interference in South Africa's internal affairs are upheld by President Kennedy and the State Department, the American people at least will have the chance in the next election to repudiate the administration. But no such opportunity is given the people of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Khrushchev's acts are law, and hence his government's signature on the nuclear test treaty becomes meaningless because it is the act really of a ruler who announcer that he will not interfere in internal affairs but does so just the same. All the world is asked to swallow as sincere not only the doctrines of noninterference but the pledges Premier Khrushchev has given to carry out the ban on certain kinds of nuclear testing.

Duty Free Measurement Instruments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, H.R. 2874 is presently on the Union Calendar awaiting action by the House. This bill would remove electronic microscopes from the present duty free status. We commend this bill to the House for its early consideration and passage.

The beneficiaries of the duty free status are France, England, and Germany. At least two of these are within that group of common market countries which have within the last few days taken action seriously impairing the export of the United States as competitive products in their lands. Although we would not like to see a trade battle in which duty barriers became increasingly high, and, therefore, all world trade seriously damaged, on the other hand, where there are competent manufacturers of products within the United States who are put at a competitive disadvantage by products from countries who at the same time refuse fair competition to our exports, we are forced to take a rather tough position in order to protect our domestic producers.

As to the particular bill, H.R. 2874, may we state for the RECORD that Beckman Instruments, Inc., which is in the 34th Congressional District which I am proud to represent, is one of a number of California companies producing instruments fully as competent and of competitive quality to those imported presently duty free. The Research programs and employee levels of the Beckman Co. and others in this business are seriously threatened by a situation in which we find that the import of foreign competitive instruments are not only free, but come from countries who levy import duties on U.S. instruments, and

in many cases flatly refuse import licenses on any basis.

Mr. Speaker our instrument industries are essential to our national defense and our future advancement in space research. Our laws, therefore, as a matter of national concern, should assure their development and well being should not be threatened by an unfair competition from countries who refuse to take a fair free trade position with the United States.

Part 45 Carrier Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent stranding of 100 California students in Europe by a part 45 air carrier, Intercontinental U.S., Inc., points up a need for Congress to give to the Civil Aeronautics Board the tools to regulate this particular segment of the industry.

It is estimated that some 1,200 California students in Europe, who were flown there by Intercontinental, will be stranded before the summer is over.

The CAB will be criticized, although it is in no way responsible, and the Board can expect to receive the brunt of future criticism because the public and the press are unable to distinguish between charter operations of part 45 carriers and those of supplemental air carriers legitimately serving the transatlantic charter market.

A part 45 carrier is certificated by the Federal Aviation Agency as a commercial operator, and cannot hold itself out to the public as a common carrier. It is true it must meet the same safety standards as supplemental air carriers, although it operates on a contract basis only. However, a part 45 carrier is under no economic regulation by the CAB.

I propose asking the Civil Aeronautics Board's Bureau of Enforcement to draw up legislation which would empower the CAB to regulate part 45 carriers by ordering them to report their operating activities in the same manner that surface carriers are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I am confident that the Civil Aeronautics Board is doing everything in its power to protect the air-traveling public. It is up to Congress to give the CAB the tools to work with in the part 45 carrier field, just as it did in the 87th Congress when new legislation was enacted tightening regulations affecting the supplemental airline industry.

Congress must give immediately to the CAB new guidelines to enable the Board to determine whether a part 45 carrier's operations have crossed the boundaries from private to common carriers.

If it doesn't the general public is entirely dependent upon the operators' whims, and lacks the benefit and protection of the CAB's regulations which govern other operators.

As an example there are no insurance requirements or performance standards in effect for part 45 carriers such as those applicable to supplemental and certificated cargo carriers, and the public's interest is entirely a matter of the operator's discretion.

Let us look at the International U.S., Inc., case. This part 45 carrier, headquartered in Luxembourg, is run by citizens of the United States.

The first newspaper interest in this company stemmed from its cancellation of a transatlantic charter flight which resulted in the stranding in New York of 100 passengers en route from California to Europe.

Then came a report that the same part 45 carrier would likely cancel its Paris-to-New York charter with 87 California students involved. California State officials are seeking help for passengers on this flight. However, the main problem seems to be one of finding substitute lift at the low rates for which the original passage was booked.

Inquiring at CAB, I learned that its Bureau of Enforcement is receiving many letters from parents and families of passengers now in Europe, expressing concern over the possibility that there may be strandings brought on by cancellation of other flights. Every few days a letter is received at CAB from some student in Europe who can't find out how he is going to get home because the travel agents handling the flights are in trouble with the New York or California authorities, and no one is answering their mail.

If some 1,200 California students now in Europe, who were flown there by Intercontinental and who are threatened with stranding actually do suffer, the public criticism will be leveled at the Civil Aeronautics Board, although it is in no way responsible for regulating this part 45 carrier's operations.

The CAB already has indicated that necessary waivers would be granted supplemental carriers to transport the passengers. This is of no avail, however, because of the higher charges of legitimate carriers for substitute transportation.

The only way to prevent a repeat of this type of stranding is for Congress to give to the CAB the legislation that will reguate all part 45 carrier operations.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of Friday, July 5, 1963, about the quality stabilization bill, which is really fair trade, or more simply put, just plain price fixing and consumer gouging.

The article follows:

QUALITY STABILIZATION OR FAIR TRADE, IT'S SAME OLD PRICE-FIXING PACKAGE

Many of those who uphold the virtues of free enterprise can be found behind the scenes busily trying to destroy it. Stymied in the courts and in State legislatures, for instance, proponents of so-call fair trade laws are making great headway in Congress. In fact, it is reported that chances are about even that such legislation will be passed within the next 12 months.

They've even given it a new name, "Quality Stabilization Act." Under whatever name, it is the same old package that would restrict free competition. Under any deceptive label, it is still price fixing by law and if that's free enterprise then socialism is not as it's defined.

The bill now under consideration is designed to curb price cutting at both the wholesale and retail level. It would empower a manufacturer to set minimum prices throughout the country at which any of his products bearing a name, brand, or trademark, could be wholesaled or retailed. Any product, from automobiles to toothpaste, canned soups or refrigerators, would be covered.

Independent retail druggists are said to be spearheading the drive yet they have plenty of assistance. They want protection from chains and other mass distribution outlets. Experience shows, however, that so-called fair trade laws have quite the opposite effect. The inducement to shop around removed, consumers gravitate to the larger stores where greater variety of merchandise can be found.

If Congress should pass such a bill, precedent indicates it would not stand the test of the courts. In the meantime, however, it could cost consumers millions. In the final analysis, laws restrictive of trade and free competition are inimical to the American system and Congress, where bombastic oratory is heard every day extolling free enterprise, certainly knows it.

Fort Myers Heralds Henry Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Fort Myers News-Press, an outstanding Florida newspaper, in paying tribute to one of America's outstanding citizens, Henry Ford, on the 100th anniversary of his birth. Mr. Ford's foresight and leadership has aided the automobile industry in becoming one of the top producers in our economy today. I know that Fort Myers was greatly honored to have had Henry Ford as a winter visitor on many occasions, and I think it quite fitting that they should pay tribute to him in their July 28, 1963, edition of the Fort Myers News-Press that follows:

FORD SHOULD NOT BE FORGOTTEN HERE

The 100th anniversary today of Henry Ford's birth, which is being marked with ceremonies in Michigan, suggests that Fort Myers might well pay more attention than it does to the memory of this unique American who had a winter home here for a quarter of a century and whose achievements in the field of industry were as monumental as

those in electricity of his crony and Fort Myers neighbor, Thomas A. Edison.

Ford was as truly a genius of machinery and mass production as Edison was with his inventions and it is not surprising that these two developed an intimate friendship which endured until Edison's death. Ford, like Edison, had little formal schooling, having quit school at 15 and left his farm home at 16 to go to work in a Detroit machine shop. Like the inventor, he was a practical man who liked to work with his hands but yet a visionary with the drive and talent to make his dream come true. Ford literally put American on wheels, he founded the great automotive industry and he conceived and developed the system of mass production which made the United States the wealthiest country in the world. He was indeed a giant equaling Edison's stature.

At the same time the automotive wizard, like the electrical wizard, was a homey man of plain tastes, a friendly man who relished a chat with ordinary folks, and an inquisitive man who was interested in the people and things he encountered. The town of Fort Myers and its surrounding countryside of 30 to 40 years ago held much of interest to him and he seldom failed to spend some time here each winter while Edison was alive. After the inventor's death in 1931 his visits were less frequent and he last came here in 1941.

There are many associations between Ford and Fort Myers. The unpretentious house he bought in 1916 on the riverfront next door to Edison's place still stands, occupied now by Mr. and Mrs. Thomas M. Biggar who bought it from him in 1943. He once owned the old Everett Hotel in LaBelle which he acquired from E. E. Goodno, the founder of LaBelle with whom he had business dealings. Edison's original Fort Myers laboratory now stands in Dearborn Village, the great museum of Americana which Ford established. The laboratory was moved there lock, stock and barrel and reerected, and Edison built a new one here across McGregor Boulevard from his estate. The rubber experiments which Edison was undertaking in the new laboratory at the time of his death were started at Ford's instigation and with his aid. Also at Ford's Dearborn Village is a river steamboat with machinery salvaged from the Menge Bros. steamer *Gray Eagle* which plied the Caloosahatchee for 22 years before the turn of the century until it went on the rocks and was abandoned. Ford employed Capt. Conrad Menge of Fort Myers to build and superintend this exhibit and others at Dearborn Village.

Yet strangely there is no memorial of Henry Ford in Fort Myers, as there is of Edison. Ford Street which runs through Dunbar Heights may or may not have been named for him, but there is nothing else. It would take nothing away from Edison's imperishable luster if some reminder of Ford were included in the annual Pageant of Light. And what better name could there be for the new span crossing the Caloosahatchee close by the Thomas A. Edison Bridge than the Henry Ford Bridge?

Farm Bureau and REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I received in my office today the August 1963 issue of the Record, the Illinois Farm Bureau magazine in addition to the August 1963 issue of Rural Electrification, the magazine put out by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I have two REA co-ops serving sections of my district and many of the co-op members are also members of the farm bureau. I am sure both of these publications are, therefore of considerable interest to many of my constituents.

Let's take a look at what Mr. Clyde Ellis, NRECA general manager, had to say in his column "From Where I Sit." He writes:

There has been considerable stir throughout the country about the editorial in the current issue of the American Farm Bureau Federation magazine signed by President Charles Shuman.

It is a strange editorial, in which Mr. Shuman alternately praises the rural electrification program, implies that it is going astray and claims that at present the members do not have a satisfactory evidence of ownership. * * *

Generalities, especially when expressed publicly, can be dangerous. * * *

Many electric cooperatives are now repaying capital credits and all of them plan to do so, but as yet they, in the aggregate, have only about 20 percent equity.

This system of elective cooperative business is working successfully, not only in bringing light aand power to rural America but in giving the members the control and ownership they were promised when they joined the co-op.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what Mr. Norman Clapp, REA Administrator, had to say in the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1964. I asked Mr. Clapp:

In section 5 of your standard loan contract it is so worded that whenever a cooperative borrows money from you they are required to mortgage not only the property being financed by the loan, but all property for the present and future. Is that correct?

Mr. Clapp replied, "Yes."

Further on I stated:

REA has the right to veto its co-op managers, its attorneys, and engineering firms if you so desire; is that right?

Mr. Clapp replied:

Yes; we retain that right.

Mr. Speaker, as local distribution borrowers repay their 35-year loans to the Federal Government, REA loses the control over their activities which is embodied in its mortgage and loan contract with its borrowers. As long as a local borrower is in debt to the Federal Government, the REA Administrator maintains such rights as the veto power over a borrower's choice of manager and attorney, and the right to maintain an exclusive banker's position by refusing to permit the borrower to obtain expansion funds elsewhere. Once the Federal debt has been retired, however, the borrower is free to conduct his business independently as a cooperative should.

Thus, when REA approves a G. & T. loan for a group of distribution borrowers, these cooperatives become indebted to the Federal Government and come under the Federal Government's control for another 35 years. Once a group of cooperatives construct their own G. & T. system and take on a utility responsibility for their own power supply, normal load growth (a co-op doubles its load every 7 years) requires periodic expansion of facilities, thereby increasing the borrower's debt to REA. Thus, Mr. Speaker, borrowers soons find themselves indebted to the Federal Government for an indefinite future. REA's strict contractual control over its borrowers makes this agency as much of a Federal power agency as TVA or the Interior Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious Mr. Shuman knew what he was talking about and was not speaking in generalities. On the contrary, Mr. Ellis made a fool of himself during the hearings by his testimony on Colorado-Ute, and here again we see that his aforementioned statement regarding co-op control remaining with the members is completely at odds with the testimony of the REA Administrator.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Illinois Farm Bureau Record at this point:

FARM BUREAU AND REA

Rural electrification and Farm Bureau in Illinois have grown up as friendly neighbors. Although Farm Bureau is the older of the two, Farm Bureau was in the forefront as lines were strung and electric power taken to the farms of Illinois.

In fact, O. M. Kile, in his book, "Farm Bureau Through Three Decades," states "Rural electrification was another activity which got its start on an organized basis at farm bureau headquarters in Chicago." Kile tells that work was done by the American Farm Bureau as early as 1923 to promote the extension of electric lines to rural users.

Through the persistent support of Farm Bureau, the Rural Electrification Administration was finally established in 1935 and farm bureau went to work immediately to guarantee its success.

In Illinois, most of the early pioneers in the rural electrification movement were also Farm Bureau leaders.

The goodwill which has always been shared by rural electric cooperatives and Farm Bureau was evidenced in the support Farm Bureau gave rural electric cooperatives in the territorial integrity legislative fight in the 73d general assembly which was just completed.

However, in the June 2, 1963, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Thomas W. Ottenad wrote a story in which he branded the American Farm Bureau Federation as one of several organizations taking part in an "assault on the federally-financed rural electrification program."

Ottenad, a Post-Dispatch Washington correspondent, proceded to write his story about Norman M. Clapp, who is REA Administrator. He failed completely to substantiate his charge that Farm Bureau was conducting an "assault" on rural electric cooperatives—a trick which is politely termed "name calling."

To add insult to injury, the Post-Dispatch headline writer singled out Farm Bureau by writing: "Intensive Attack Being Made Against Federal Rural Electrification Program by Businessmen and Farm Bureau as Well as Private Utilities—Administrator Clapp Replies to Opponents."

In order to bring the whole question into proper perspective, this is what Farm Bureau delegates wrote in their resolutions in 1962:

"We support rural electric and telephone cooperatives organized and operated in accordance with accepted cooperative principles and practices. Further development and growth of these cooperatives call for the active and loyal support of member patrons who understand their responsibilities for supporting and helping finance them. Local ownership by well informed members

is the best safeguard for true cooperative principles.

"It is time to make certain that the members of rural electric cooperatives can obtain full and complete member ownership and control. Ownership and control should be clearly secured in the hands of the patrons. We recommend that member equities be made transferable to eligible persons on the books of the cooperative at any time.

"We urge members of rural electric cooperatives to study the by-laws of their associations and to make certain that they contain provisions that make it mandatory to (1) allocate annually the equities of individual members and inform each member of the amount in his equity account and (2) require approval by a majority of patrons before the principal assets and business of the cooperative can be sold.

"Power shortages and inadequate grids or transmission lines continue to be a major problem in supplying adequate power to farmers in some areas. We support sound and economic developments to assure farm people adequate electric service.

"We urge power companies to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people at reasonable cost. We urge efforts on the part of the rural electric cooperatives and other private power companies to reach agreements that will be in the best long-time interest of all concerned.

"If satisfactory agreements cannot be reached for necessary amounts of energy for farm use at competitive rates, we support the use of Rural Electrification Administration funds to finance the generation and transmission facilities farmers need. We oppose any efforts to change the present law which makes this possible.

"Where further expansion or improvement of power production is contemplated, serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program on an investment basis from members of the cooperatives. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes.

"Rural electric cooperatives have performed a valuable service for rural America, but many factors affecting their operations have changed materially since Congress authorized their establishment. Any future loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration to established rural electric or telephone cooperatives and other borrowers should be made at not less than the cost of money to the Federal Government.

"We oppose any plan or effort to convert rural electric cooperatives into a public power system.

"Rural electric cooperatives should not participate in financing the Rural Areas Development Program. We recommend that they confine their activities to the purposes for which they were organized."

For most Illinois Farm Bureau members and rural electric patrons, this is a good statement. However, some rural electric cooperative spokesmen have been throwing boulder-sized rocks at farm bureau over four points contained in the resolution.

First of all, in the opening paragraph of the resolution, the delegates said that "local ownership by well-informed members is the best safeguard for true cooperative principles."

This statement has been augmented by recent statements of Farm Bureau leaders in which the suggestion has been offered that rural electrification patrons become true owners of their cooperatives and own stock in their cooperatives rather than simply capital credits."

Secondly, Farm Bureau has opposed expansion of generating and transmission facilities by rural electric cooperatives unless those facilities are fully justified and necessary.

Farm Bureau has said generally that cooperatives should avail themselves of the lowest power rates available. If these rates are provided by privately owned utilities, then the cooperatives should buy there. If lower power rates are guaranteed by construction of cooperative-owned generating plants, then this should be the route.

In the third place, Farm Bureau has opposed the current 2-percent loan rate which established rural electric cooperatives can pay to borrow new funds from the REA. Farm Bureau's point, stated in the eighth paragraph of the resolution, is supported by the fact that some rural electric cooperatives borrow funds for 2 percent, then plow their surplus funds into Government bonds which draw a higher interest rate instead of prepaying their 2-percent obligations. Farm Bureau simply states that established REA borrowers should pay the going rate for new money—enough to pay the Government's cost of borrowing the funds to lend REA.

Finally, Farm Bureau opposes, as the resolution states, "any plan or effort to convert rural electric cooperatives into a public power system." Ten years ago, Illinois Agricultural Association delegates wrote this into their resolutions by stating that "The IAA believes that the production, transmission, and distribution of electrical power should be primarily a function of private enterprise—either cooperative or noncooperative."

But similarly, Farm Bureau has opposed the capture of rural electric cooperatives by private utilities, feeling that whether the Government or private utilities take over, the farmer will be the loser.

In some circles, rural electric cooperative spokesmen state that no one in the rural electrification movement favors a public power system. But on the other hand, more than one Congressman who thought he had voted to favor all REA measures found himself roundly criticized as anti-REA because he voted against such public power projects as the Hell's Canyon Dam.

The attacks on Farm Bureau, claiming it is antirural electric cooperative have been made mostly by insinuation or the kind of namecalling to which Post-Dispatch Correspondent Ottenad resorted.

Farm Bureau has been termed "proprivate utility" by some and as "pro-REA" by others. The truth is, Farm Bureau is neither proutility nor pro-REA—it is profarmer. Since the beginning of the rural electrification movement, Farm Bureau has stood strongly for high-line electric service for all farmers at the lowest possible rate. In Illinois, for the most part, this service has best been furnished by rural electric cooperatives, with some notable exceptions, mostly in northern Illionis.

But the crux of the whole matter seems to lie in the fact that Farm Bureau helped build rural electric cooperatives. Farm Bureau is still dedicated to those principles on which these cooperatives were founded. If the cooperatives, or some of their spokesmen, want to change these principles, then a new examination would be in order.

Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will be interested, I know, in an editorial in the well-respected New York Times on recent criticism of Ghana that gained considerable publicity. I am extending my remarks to include this editorial from the New York Times of July 16, 1963, and also a letter from Dr. St. Clair Drake in the "Letters to the Times" in the New York Times of July 30, 1963.

Dr. St. Clair Drake spent several years in Ghana as a professor of sociology. He is personally well known to me, and I have valued his counsel on Ghana.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I visited with Dr. Drake, who is a distinguished member of the faculty of Roosevelt University in Chicago, during his residence at the college in Ghana. I do not know of any American who has been closer and more intimately in touch with the youth of that African nation.

The editorial and letter follow:

[From the New York Times, July 16, 1963]

BAITING THE GHANAIANS

The statement that Ghana is probably "the first Soviet satellite in Africa" is almost as harmful to the position of the United States in Africa as it is unjust to Ghana. The irresponsibility of the statement is obvious from the fact that even its author only claims to have talked to one man, who is a respected Ghanaian opposition leader in exile, Dr. Kofi Busia.

Conclusive evidence of President Kwame Nkrumah's communism, according to this way of thinking, seems to be that Mr. Nkrumah made a trip behind the Iron Curtain. Even Dr. Busia, for all his hostility, did not testify that Ghana in his opinion is a "Soviet satellite." He argued that it is "Communist oriented."

The evidence is mixed, even contradictory. The aid being given by the United States and British Governments and the World Bank was arranged after careful inquiries. A new Ghanaian investment law to encourage foreign private investments has just been adopted. The American Peace Corps has had a successful program.

Ghana's foreign policies do often coincide with the Soviet position; but that is a very long way from saying that Ghana—or any other African state—is a satellite. Guinea was stereotyped in the same way by many Americans until a year or two ago, when the essential African determination to be nobody's satellite became clear there—and Guinea was much nearer to being a Soviet satellite than Ghana has ever been.

None of this means that the Nkrumah government is pro-Western or democratic. Nothing could be less democratic than the autocratic, authoritarian, one-party system of Ghana, with Kwame Nkrumah as the tribal chieftain of his nation. Moreover, no one can question the fact that Mr. Nkrumah is a fanatical anticolonialist, "anti-imperialist" African leader with, doubtless, imperial ambitions of his own in West Africa. Besides which, he is a variation of a Marxist since he has introduced what he himself calls a policy of African Socialism.

The author seems to believe all this makes Ghana a "Soviet satellite." Such wild statements could, in fact, help drive an African leader toward Moscow. It is hard for foreigners to realize that people like ——— ——— fortunately, do not speak for the United States, or the U.S. Government or, in his case, even for the U.S. Senate.

[From the New York Times, July 30, 1963]

WHERE NKRUMAH STANDS—HIS "AFRICAN SOCIALISM" DEFENDED AGAINST CHARGE OF COMMUNISM

(The writer of the following letter was professor of sociology at the University College

of Ghana for some 2½ years, until February 1961. He is now director of the African studies program at Roosevelt University.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Senator, in his July 24 reply to your July 16 editorial attempts to bolster the contention of his subcommittee that sworn testimony and documentation available to them "Strongly suggests that Kwame Nkrumah's Ghana has become the first Soviet satellite in Africa." There is considerable evidence, however, to "strongly suggest" otherwise.

The charge of "irresponsibility" against the Senator must stand until he is willing to examine some evidence other than the testimony of the self-exiled leader of Ghana's United Party and the "108 documents which convey the view of and opinions of many other prominent Ghanaians." (These are not documents at all in the historian's sense.)

All of these persons, however charming, brilliant, and sincere they may be, are for quite understandable reasons bitter and biased. They may honestly believe that Ghana is a "satellite" and Nkrumah a Communist, but that doesn't make either charge necessarily true.

NO COMMUNIST PARTY

African socialism in Ghana is what Nkrumah says it is, not what Khrushchev or Tito or Mao or Castro says it is. There is no Communist Party in Ghana and the Convention Peoples Party is not one of the 81 parties which make up the international Communist movement.

All Soviet satellites have indisoluble economic bonds which tie them to the dominant country. Ghana has no such ties with either the U.S.S.R. or China Less than 10 percent of the exports and imports involve Communist countries, and the bulk of Ghana's valuable cocoa crop is sold in the West.

Since 1960 Ghana has tried to free itself from the risk of chronic price fluctuations in the West and the possibility of suffering from some future depression by cultivating trade ties with the East to balance off those with the West. Most of the capital invested in these major development projects is Western.

TECHNICAL ADVISERS

A few Russians, Czechs, and Poles are in Ghana to supervise the building of factories and the organization of state farms, this technical assistance being financed by low interest loans which Ghana has secured from the East. But the overwhelming majority of the technicians and advisers in the country are from Canada, the United States, Great Britain, Israel, and other Western countries.

Canadians—not Russians—are helping to train the armed forces; an American heads the law school at the university and a medical team is on the way from the United States to organize a teaching hospital. Nearly 200 Peace Corps volunteers are in the country. No "satellite" would be allowed to absorb this much Western technical and financial assistance.

At the U.N., Ghana has always voted against the Russian idea of a troika to replace the Secretary General, but it also votes for the admission of Red China. It has repeatedly rebuked both sides for dragging heels on the banning of nuclear tests.

During the Cuba crisis, the Ghana delegate expressed sympathetic understanding of U.S. fears, but oposed an invasion of Cuba. It did not go along with Cuba's attempt to have a renewed Security Council debate on the issue. There is absolutely no substance at all to Senator DODD's charge that Nkrumah has "consistently suported the Soviet Union and Cuba in the U.N."

Americans who object to a policy of "positive nonalinement." African socialism, the one-party state and militant Pan-Africanism have a tendency to label all of these orientations "Communist," as do Ghanaians who prefer other political styles. This simply confuses the issue.

The crucial question from the American foreign policy standpoint is not whether the Ghanaian Government is authoritarian—the United States supports the governments of Liberia and various other African authoritarian states—nor whether it is Socialist (the United States helped to finance Clement Attlee's Labor Government and Tito's communism). Pan-Africanism is not a communistic movement and is no menace to the United States.

The relevant questions are: "Does Ghana have an independent foreign policy not tied to that of the U.S.S.R. or China?" and "Is it likely to keep that orientation?" A careful study of Ghana and its leader might produce a positive answer to both questions.

The gentleman is proud of having predicted the ultimate destination of Castro and Jagan. He will risk ruining his reputation as a prophet, however, unless he opens his mind and takes the time to learn more about Nkrumah and Ghana than the peripatetic anti-Nkrumah politicians are able to teach him.

ST. CLAIR DRAKE.

CHICAGO, *July 26, 1963.*

H.R. 7688: A Bill To Amend the National Firearms Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 1963, I introduced H.R. 7688 to amend the National Firearms Act to eliminate the Federal occupational and transfer taxes on certain firearms which are chiefly collectors' items.

The purpose of H.R. 7688 is to amend the National Firearms Act to eliminate the "any other weapon" category from its provisions.

The National Firearms Act was enacted by the 73d Congress in 1934 to impose a tax and registration on the making or transfer of machineguns, sawed-off rifles and shotguns, and certain other weapons which had become a national crime problem in the prohibition era. This law is administered by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department.

The tax on the making or transfer of fully automatic weapons, short-barrel rifles and shotguns, and certain other firearms is $200. The tax on concealable firearms—excluding pistols and revolvers—defined as "any other weapon" under the act, is $5.

Section 5848(5) defines "any other weapon" as "any weapon or device capable of being concealed on the person from which a shot can be discharged through the energy of an explosive, but such term shall not include pistols or revolvers or weapons designed, made, or intended to be fired from the shoulder and not capable of being fired with fixed ammunition."

This definition presents an area of inequity and a difficult administrative problem. Collectors and firearms enthusiasts who are interested in possessing the kinds of firearms falling under the category of "any other weapon" are discouraged from doing so because of the tax and registration involved. Further, the law does not define what is a pistol or revolver; hence, it becomes a matter of administrative determination as to what is a "pistol" or "revolver," excepted under the act, and what is "any other weapon," prohibited under the act. If a weapon is concealable and not clearly recognizable as a pistol or revolver, then it must come within the vague category of "any other weapon," subject to tax and registration.

Reputable persons who unwittingly violate the provision with regard to "any other weapon" may, upon conviction, be fined a maximum of $2,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

Clearly, Congress intended that the National Firearms Act be directed toward these weapons favored by the criminal and not toward those firearms which have little or no utility and appeal for the lawless. In connection with this observation, it should be noted that ammunition for many of the firearms falling within the "any other weapon" category is not available. To subject law-abiding collectors and enthusiasts to the possibility of prosecution and severe penalties for the pursuit of a legitimate and wholesome activity would appear to be inconsistent with the principles of the law and the intent of the Congress.

Those firearms falling within the scope of the definition of "any other weapon," as determined by administrative ruling, comprise the unusual and strange, highly prized by collectors and enthusiasts as specimens of a bygone era. These firearms mark stages in the development of small arms through the process of experimentation, trial, and error and plain American inventiveness. Their sole value today lies in their historical associations and in their unique character.

The amendments I suggest will remove a vague, burdensome area from the National Firearms Act, thereby improving its administration and enforcement.

President of Alabama Bar Association Speaks on the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Hon. James J. Carter, president of the Alabama Bar Association, was one of those invited to the White House for the Conference on Civil Rights on June 21, 1963. At that meeting, Mr. Carter, in clear, direct language expressed the deep convictions of the great majority of Alabamians on the situation of recent weeks which has seen Negro demonstrations rage rampant, first in Birmingham and

subsequently in cities and towns throughout the country.

I want to respectfully commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House, and to Members of the other body, Mr. Carter's statement on the subject, particularly as it regards the State of Alabama.

The Montgomery Civitan Club, which sent me a copy of Mr. Carter's remarks, joins me in endorsing his views completely.

His statement follows hereunder:

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES J. CARTER, PRESIDENT OF THE ALABAMA BAR ASSOCIATION, AT THE WHITE HOUSE, JUNE 21

Law is for everyone. Without law, liberty would be nonexistent. Alabamians have traditionally been law-minded people. We are still a law-minded people. Our respect for law and order is deeply ingrained, and, even in the face of strong provocations and agitations, our people have responded with commendable dignity and restraint. Patience and restraint, however, grow thin at times when outside meddlers and fund raisers with sanctimonious professions of righteousness and piety, and under the spurious label of "nonviolence" seek to incite and influence peaceful communities.

We are sick and tired of having the white citizens of our State unjustly pictured as lawless hoodlums. When Negroes fill the streets and seek to precipitate clashes and incidents; when at the hands of a mob made up of Negroes a policeman is stabbed in the back; when a white taxicab driver has his vehicle overturned and his life almost taken by "nonviolent" demonstrators; when a thousand or more Negro children, at the behest of fund-seeking agitators, abandon school and discipline and run wild through the streets and stores; when buildings are set on fire and Negro mobs stone the firemen who come to extinguish the flames; the so-called nonviolence campaign is revealed as a provocative movement not only lacking respect for law and order but filled with vitriolic contempt therefor.

In the name of law and order the time is long past due when people in high places in this country should stop encouraging, and should speak out against, the exhibitionists and publicity seekers who seek to influence the emotions of men with what they call nonviolent freedom rides, freedom walks, kneel-ins, sit-ins, and street demonstrations. These are devices of duress and pressure and threats, and pressure begets pressure and chronic hostility and ultimately frustration and violence. Law and order is not just for white citizens. Negroes, too, are subject to law and order. The many blessings of liberty, which can be enjoyed only in an orderly society, carry with them many responsibilities. To destroy order in the name of liberty is to incite anarchy. Order can no more be rightly abandoned by Negroes than by white persons.

Law and order has not broken down in Alabama, and I am confident that it will not. In past weeks the agitators in Birmingham, with their so-called nonviolent mobs, taunted and defied the duly constituted authorities who with patience, courage, and fortitude performed the unpleasant duties that were theirs. Anarchy did not prevail. Father Albert S. Foley, chairman of the Alabama Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, was quoted as saying: "The white community of Birmingham has observed law and order. The Negro community has not observed law and order." Another press dispatch said: "Foley said a member of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) which King heads, told him the group's treasury was nearly depleted and the demonstrations were needed to spark lagging contributions." Is this responsible conduct, or just a front for a massive fund-raising campaign?

Law and order? Yes. But Negro agitators and their sympathizers and followers are not a privileged class above the law, and they should not be encouraged to so believe. The lives, liberty, and property of citizens should not be allowed to be placed in jeopardy by any lawless element, black or white.

The Gesell Report Would Overcorrect the Racial Strife and Damage the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a timely and well-written editorial by Mr. Leon Smith, editor of the Free Press, Thomaston, Ga. This editorial appeared in the issue of August 6, 1963.

Once again this dedicated newspaperman has performed a service to his community by pointing out the dangers which are contained in the Gesell report.

The inherent danger in the philosophy which generated this report does not concern itself alone with the controversy over rapid forced integration or other phases of the civil rights controversy. The greatest danger is that, if implemented, the recommendations contained in the report would subvert the Department of Defense and all its component parts from the primary role of defending this country into a massive force to implement a political doctrine for purely political purposes.

As Editor Smith points out, such a course "could prove disastrous for this Nation." His editorial, in full, follows:

THE GESELL REPORT WOULD OVERCORRECT THE RACIAL STRIFE AND DAMAGE THE ARMED FORCES

The Federal Government is going beyond all reason in their latest efforts to have the military of this country actively push the politically motivated civil rights battle.

Evidence of the extremity in the Kennedy administration's effort to overalleviate the grievances of the Negro race of this country was unearthed last week when it was discovered a virtually secret committee had been at work to push integration inside and through the Armed Forces and to make recommendations.

At this writing only the blackjack idea of placing segregated communities on off limits to the military has been made public.

But we have a copy of the initial report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces together with the cover letter from Secretary of Defense Robert T. McNamara.

If the Committee is taken the least bit serious and permitted to force its ideas on the military of this country it will demoralize our Armed Forces to a point that we could fall to the Russians without so much as firing a weapon.

The Committee would have the commanders of military bases throughout this country use political and economic pressure to force communities surrounding military bases to submit to change in local customs.

To give an illustration of the extremes to which this report goes we quote from one portion pertaining to base commanders: "He can also point to the successful program of equality of treatment and opportunity which exists on his base and to the economic dependence of the community upon the base." "Commanders should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval. Qualifying establishments might be issued a display placard or decal."

In the 93-page report are found these other attitudes and recommendations from the committee:

More recruiting should be directed toward Negroes to correct the insufficient flow of Negroes into the services and to increase the pitifully small number of Negro officers.

Negroes should be located in jobs throughout the services regardless of their individual preferences in order to have a few everywhere and in all positions.

Promotion boards should have more Negro officers on them, because white officers are consciously or unconsciously discriminating against Negroes on promotions.

Special officers (on each base) should be appointed with biracial staff to handle all complaints of the Negroes, and such complaints should be encouraged with full protection of the complainant from any punitive action. (This is above and outside the normal channels all servicemen have for registering complaints.)

Base commanders should see to it that more Negro girls are brought on every base for social functions and fewer girls who believe in segregation; that Negro hostesses should be considered for base clubs rather than white.

Base commanders should appoint biracial committees to break down segregation practices in neighboring communities; service personnel should not join off-base civic clubs if they are segregated.

The voluntary practice of Negroes gravitating to one base service club and whites to another should not be permitted.

Intimidation of base commanders with this directly quoted from the report: "It must be made clear to base commanders and others concerned with these problems that they will be measured in terms of their performance. It should be made clear that officers showing initiative and achievement in this area will enhance their performance ratings and obtain favorable consideration for promotion and career advancement."

These are but a few of the recommendations in the report which has come to be known as the Gesell report for its chairman, a Washington lawyer.

The Armed Forces is made up of 8.2 percent Negro personnel yet, should this report be taken seriously by the Department of Defense and pushed by the administration, the remaining 91.8 percent of the military personnel would have their way of life altered, promotions hampered and be forced into the field of politics.

Such action could prove disastrous for this Nation. The military has always remained aloof from local situations, politics of local, regional or national nature, and concerned itself with the defense of the country.

President Kennedy wrote, in his cover letter on the report to the Secretary of Defense: "The committee's recommendations regarding both off-base and on-base conditions merit your prompt attention and certainly are in the spirit that I believe should characterize our approach to this matter."

Mr. McNamara has written, in a return memorandum for the President, that directives, manuals, and regulations are being prepared on the subject and that a system for regularly monitoring and measuring progress in this field is being instituted. He writes that "Many of these have been or will

be put into effect, but some require more study and on a few we have reservations."

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL says he will have many questions about the Gesell report this week when the military comes before his Senate committee asking more than $50 billion.

This report, in our opinion, is the ultimate in the reckless abandon being condoned by the administration to overcorrect the racial situation.

Who's Kidding Who About Our Cuban Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, News Director Ralph Renick of station WTVJ in Miami recently aired an editorial about the U.S. policy toward Communist Cuba which should be brought to the attention of all interested in this serious problem.

Mr. Renick quoted from the May 22 statement by Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Edwin M. Martin, and then Mr. Renick added his own comments as follows:

Secretary MARTIN. We are engaged in a variety of measures, unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral, which are designed to increase the isolation of Castro.

Mr. RENICK. Here we point to reports that shipping to and from Cuba is picking up almost daily with full knowledge of the U.S. Government.

Secretary MARTIN. To increase his serious economic difficulties.

Mr. RENICK. Here we ask why this week's closing off of money transfer to Cuba wasn't done months ago.

Secretary MARTIN. To prevent by military means, if necessary, any export of aggression from Cuba.

Mr. RENICK. Here we point to the relaxation of that once tight quarantine of Cuba and the admission by the State Department this week that Red infiltrators are traveling by air from Cuba to the Cayman Islands and then to other points in the hemisphere. And this admission came only after a newsman broke the story.

Secretary MARTIN. To thwart Cuban based and supported subversion of Latin American governments.

Mr. RENICK. Here we need only mention the rapidly deteriorating situation in Venezuela, British Guiana, and possibly Haiti.

Secretary MARTIN. To increase the costs to the Soviets of their maintenance of Castro.

Mr. RENICK. Here we would ask where the Communists have ever given up; because of high costs.

Secretary MARTIN. To persuade the Soviets that they are backing a losing and expensive horse.

Mr. RENICK. We would call the horse far from losing—it certainly is still in the race.

Secretary MARTIN. To effect the withdrawal of Soviet military forces in Cuba.

Mr. RENICK. Here we only repeat what recently returned Cuban exiles constantly report—the increase of Russian presence in Cuba.

Secretary MARTIN. And to maintain surveillance of Cuba to insure that it does not again become a military threat to the United States or its allies in this hemisphere.

Mr. RENICK. We didn't realize that Cuba had ever stopped being a threat to the United States. That winds up Mr. Martin's official policy statement. Who is kidding who?

While that was the text of the quotes used by Mr. Renick to show the State Department position, and his own comments on each point, one more item of interest should be added.

Back in October of last year, at my personal request, the Select Committee on Export Control of the House of Representatives held hearings on the Castro-Soviet economic and military buildup in Cuba. Of particular interest to this committee was the assistance that had been rendered in the buildup by ships flying flags of free world countries.

At that hearing I pointed out that free-world nations were permitting their ships to carry goods to Cuba. Greek, British, West German, and Norwegian ships were the major offenders. I pointed out that—

The United States is presented with a clear and present threat from the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The weapons, armaments, and personnel now in Cuba add up to a new Soviet offensive in the Western Hemisphere. This offensive is being aided by the 28 free world tankers which ran petroleum products to Cuba in the June–August period.

And what was the official State Department position then? The record of the hearings show that Under Secretary of State George W. Ball told the committee of the Congress the following:

As an island, Cuba is entirely dependent upon shipping for the maintenance of its tottering economy. With the decline of the Cuban economy and with the Soviet buildup of arms and aid, ships and shipping have emerged as a special problem * * * as this situation has emerged, the U.S. Government has recognized that it should take steps to curtail or prevent the use of free-world shipping in the Soviet bloc-Cuban trade.

This was on October 3, 1962. Today, almost 1 year later, free world shipping constitutes a majority of all shipping to Cuba, outnumbering Soviet bloc shipping.

Allied shipping continues to keep Castro supplied. The State Department continues to assure the American people that there is no reason for concern.

Mr. Renick might very well ask, "Who's kidding who about our Cuban policy?"

The Honest Taxpayer Pays To Support the Chiseler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the increase of Government welfare programs is breaking down the moral fiber of our people and is leading to graft, chiseling, and robbery of the honest and hard-working taxpayer. Welfare has become a racket where the indolent and the lazy have found a new way of life, living at public expense without working even unto the second and third generation.

I hope soon the people who have to pay the bill will rise up in anger and put a stop to further Federal welfare programs and serve notice on those who are able to work, but refuse to, that "those who do not work will not eat."

The following item from the U.S. News & World Report of August 12 shows that more than $5 million of the taxpayers' money in 1 month went to support those who refuse to earn an honest living:

ONE REASON WELFARE COSTS ARE SO HIGH

WASHINGTON.—Among findings in a close look at the program of Federal-State aid to needy families with dependent children:

In 1 month—March of this year—almost $5 million went to families ineligible for aid.

Nationwide, about 5 in every 100 receiving the aid were not entitled to it.

The survey was made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at the direction of Congress.

Houston FHA Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Galveston, Tex., Mainland Times on July 31, 1963, describes the operations of the Houston district office of the Federal Housing Administration, and the district director, Mr. Neal Pickett.

The praise for the operations of this office by Mr. George Beach, secretary of the Galveston County Home Builders Association, is worthy of notice. I commend the article to my colleagues:

One of the noticeable islands of efficiency amid the storm-tossed seas of Federal bureaucracy is the Houston district office of the Federal Housing Administration, according to George Beach, secretary of Galveston County Home Builders Association.

This office handles Federal mortgage insurance on homes, apartment projects, office buildings, and commercial structures in Houston and a 37-county area of southeast Texas. Nineteen hundred and sixty-two was the third best year in the history of the Houston office in which it insured 5,200 loans for homeowners and businessmen, totaling more than $70 million.

This is a vital contribution to the economic lifeblood of Houston and southeast Texas particularly in the construction industry.

The main reason for this is that the district FHA Director, former Mayor Neal Pickett, has shown a commendable, and typically Houston, spirit of "Let's get the job done," since he was appointed 19 months ago. He will address the La Marque Rotary Club August 8.

Since he took over, the waiting time for processing loan applications has been cut from about 7 weeks to about 7 days. The volume of loans insured under his direction has placed Houston in its proper national rank, commensurate with the dynamic expansion of Houston and southeast Texas in this space age era.

Moreover, the FHA office in Houston has been able to sell 913 of the 920 properties on which it has had to foreclose during the year 1962. A resale average of 99.2 is one which many a bank would envy, and is a tribute to the soundness and energy of the businesslike operations of the FHA office in Houston.

"We applaud Mr. Pickett for his success in overcoming the vast inertia of Federal bureaucracy, for cutting redtape, and for his forthright can-do policy of cooperating with the business community and the home-buying, taxpaying public," Beach said.

"The efficiency of FHA under his supervision is substantially and constructively speeding up our dynamic economy. Other Federal officials might well apply some of his kind of energy to their own Government bailiwicks," Beach concluded.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I greatly fear that a new agency of the Federal Government on air pollution will grow into another topheavy Federal Government bureaucracy. This agency could well become a new instrumentality of harassment, regulation, and control of business and of our people.

The Honorable Dan McLeod, our dynamic attorney general of South Carolina, sent me the following resolution adopted at the National Association of Attorneys General opposing legislation providing for national regulation of air pollution.

I commend to the attention of every Member of this Congress this timely resolution:

RESOLUTION XIV—AIR POLLUTION

Whereas air pollution is becoming an increasingly serious problem, but one which is best dealt with at the local and State level by reason of the fact that the characteristics and incidence of air pollution vary from place to place; and

Whereas air pollution control is particularly within the area of State and local public health and welfare responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 57th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General in Seattle, Wash., July 3, 1963, That local and State governments be encouraged to expand and improve their programs of air pollution control as necessary from time to time and location to location; and be it further

Resolved, That this association opposes the enactment by Congress of legislation providing for national regulation until and unless State and local efforts prove unavailing; and be it further

Resolved, That the role of the Federal Government in research and training with respect to air pollution problems is specifically recognized and should be encouraged; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee on Federal-State relations is authorized to present the association's position on the subject whenever appropriate.

(States recorded as voting "nay": California, Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, and Missouri.)

Many Losing Benefits Due to Hazy Social Security Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who has advocated improved and increased social security benefits for our senior citizens, and introduced legislation to this effect, I was most surprised to read a newspaper article showing the results of a recent study in the city of Buffalo which disclosed the amount of social security benefit losses. Many persons of retirement age are not collecting the benefits to which they are entitled because they have failed to check with the local social security office to determine their eligibility.

I am sure the following article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on July 31, 1963, will be of interest to many of our constituents who are eligible for benefits but who have neglected to file an application:

WEEK'S LOSS, $47,325—MANY LOSING BENEFITS DUE TO HAZY SOCIAL SECURITY FACTS

Hazy ideas of the social security law result in western New Yorkers losing thousands of dollars in benefits every year. A recent study made in the Buffalo office disclosed that benefit losses uncovered in just 1 week totaled $47,325.

"We realize that the social security law is complex," said John J. Gorelick, district manager. "But even so, we are amazed at the hazy concepts held by some on the basics of the law."

In warning against accepting hearsay interpretation of the law, Gorelick pointed out that over the years there have been many changes in the legislation. There are four occasions when it is especially important to check personally with the social security office, Gorelick said. They are:

1. When an insured worker in the family dies.
2. When an insured person becomes disabled before reaching the age of 65.
3. When the insured person is nearing retirement age.
4. When the insured person reaches the age of 72.

FAILING TO FILE

"We will never know all of the reasons why people fail to file when they should," said Gorelick. "But our studies give us some of the answers."

One woman, referred to in the study as Miss A, lost $10,052 in benefits. Miss A, who is 80 years of age, had worked hard all her life and had aided in the support of parents and helping brothers and sisters obtaining educations.

She was under the impression that because she was still working full time and earning more than $1,200 a year, she was not eligible for benefits.

When she finally made a personal check with the social security office she learned that she would have been eligible for full benefits after reaching 72. Benefits are retroactive for only 12 months immediately preceding the month in which an application is filed.

The benefits are based on earnings and can range anywhere from $40 to $127 a month.

SAVINGS ACCOUNT

Mr. B, 82, and still working regarded his social security as a sort of savings account. When he showed up at the social security office, he said:

"Well, it's about time I drew out my social security. You owe me for 10 years."

His benefit loss totaled about $9,000.

Mrs. C was 60 years old when her husband died 5 years ago. At the age of 65 she filed for social security. When asked why she had not filed at the age of 62, she replied that she had waited so that she could get the full benefit.

Ever since 1956 it has been possible to pay female workers and widows monthly benefits after reaching the age of 62. Workers benefits are actuarily reduced if payment is selected between the ages of 62 and 65.

There is no reduction for widows. Mrs. B's loss was $1,890.

Mr. D, a crane operator, was paralyzed from the waist down following an industrial accident in 1953 and was receiving regular payments from an insurance company.

A social security field representative heard of the case and called at Mr. D's home. The injured man thought that he was not eligible for disability benefits because he was receiving insurance checks. His loss was $4,130 in benefits.

BIRTH RECORD NEED

Mrs. E was under the impression that she had to have a birth certificate to be eligible for benefits.

After she learned that her birth had not been recorded she waited for a considerable period before finally checking. She was informed that social security prefers birth certificates as proof of age, but that "secondary evidence" will be accepted.

These include passports, census records, insurance policies, children's birth records, marriage or voting records. Mrs. E lost $150.

"It is always a sad occasion when we have to inform people of benefit losses," said Gorelick. "An electronic brain in the social security accounting division in Baltimore, Md., supplies us with leads on persons who are eligible, but are not drawing benefits.

"We try to follow up on all these, but often addresses are old. Out of three such leads we tracked down recently, one had lost $4,300 in benefits, one $3,708, and one $400.

"Interviewers in our offices are always glad to answer questions concerning the law. We answer queries either by telephone or mail."

The Buffalo social security office is located at 120 West Mohawk Street and the Kenmore office is at 3660 Delaware Avenue.

Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch Urges Senate Ratification of Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1963, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune calling for Senate ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty.

I am pleased to insert another editorial urging that the Senate ratify this treaty, an editorial which appeared in the August 5, 1963 issue of another outstanding newspaper in my district, the Michigan City News-Dispatch.

This editorial, entitled "Let's Take This First Step," follows:

LET'S TAKE THIS FIRST STEP

Presently the Senate will decide the fate of a nuclear test ban treaty negotiated by the United States, Russia and Great Britain. Before the President may ratify the treaty, two-thirds of the Senators present and voting must give their advice and consent.

Early Senate reaction has been cautious and reserved. Both support and skepticism have crossed party lines and it appears that public opinion will weigh heavily in the final vote.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, minority leader, typified the Senate's cautious early mood when he said only that the treaty would "be on the floor quite a little while" and that he would "guess a good many reservations would be presented."

Admittedly, the test ban agreement is not perfect. Nothing negotiated with the Russians can be. Essentially it provides:

1. A prohibition of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space or seas.
2. Commitments not to participate in or encourage tests by other nations.
3. Regulation of underground tests to those which do not spread debris beyond territorial boundaries.
4. Procedures permitting withdrawal from the treaty by one nation if another signatory violates it or if nonsignatories conduct tests which endanger its national security.

But despite its imperfections and omissions, the treaty is a first faltering step in the direction a nuclear world must take to survive and prosper.

The alternative path leads to continued staggering waste of resources on military might—and ultimate catastrophe. Historically, arms races lead inevitably to war.

If a test ban treaty can be made to endure, gradual disarmament agreements should follow. Future generations may then find it possible to use constructively the enormous resources presently poured into military machinery.

Survival aside, that prospect alone should fire the imagination and spur an all-out quest for international understanding and world peace.

True, the way to that difficult goal is long and arduous. But, as a wise ancient once observed, the longest journey begins with a single step.

The test ban treaty may well be that first step. The Senate should let America take it.

This Is Newsday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the editor and publisher of Newsday passed away. Her husband, Harry F. Guggenheim, assumed her responsibilities and recently stated editorially his creed and purpose to continue her policies. This succinct statement could apply to newspapers that wish to succeed in serving their readers and the general public, and I, therefore, read it into the RECORD:

[From Newsday, Aug. 5, 1963]

THIS IS NEWSDAY

Since its first issue on September 3, 1940, Newsday has been an independent, alert and hard-hitting newspaper. It has grown in influence and in readers. Much of the credit for Newsday's success must go to the energy, ability and personality of my wife, Alicia Patterson. Working together we built a staff able to produce a good newspaper. I intend to continue to publish the same kind of paper.

Now that I am acting as editor as well as publisher, I should like to reaffirm the credo of this newspaper.

To be successful today, a newspaper must contain all the elements of the best journalism to fill the needs of modern newspaper readers but beyond that it must inspire complete confidence in its integrity.

The role of the publisher is difficult. He must be above the reach of individuals and political parties and his personal ambition must be directed solely to honest journalism. He must be open to the opinion and advice of experienced experts and not surfound himself with sycophants who merely parrot his own views.

He must not only get out a newspaper that presents the news fairly and interestingly but he must speak with authority on local, national and international affairs. He must at the same time avoid considering himself—and acting like—a pundit on all human affairs, spiritual and material.

His editorials should be objective, not neutral, as fiery and forceful as the occasion demands. They should be based on knowledge and wisdom from experience and not mere observation.

He must do his best to see to it that editorials and columns are inspired by and related to events—not merely mass-produced like rolls for breakfast.

He should never use the prestige and circulation of his newspaper to propagandize his readers, or seek to create reader interest solely by his ability to turn phrases and write excitingly. His analysis should be constructive, devoid of his personal likes or hates, his political predilections, and his pet sociological and economic opinions.

The publisher's responsbility is to keep his entire newspaper fair as well as forceful, gay, interesting, educational and helpful to its readers. He must expose wrong and endlessly fight the abuse of power in whatever high or low place it lurks. That will continue to be the aim of the publisher and editor of Newsday.

—HARRY F. GUGGENHEIM.

Why Our Top Military Leaders Oppose the Test Ban Treaty, Even Though They Are Muzzled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are scheduled to testify next week on the Senate side with respect to their views regarding the nuclear test ban treaty. Will they speak their true beliefs? Or will they be forced by the Kennedy administration to yield to its pressure for rubber-stamp approval of this treaty which is so hazardous to the security of our country and the entire free world?

The Joint Chiefs know the hazards which are inherent in this treaty. Will they be allowed to reveal them in their testimony? Such information is presented, for the consideration of the Members of the other body as they approach a vote on the treaty ratification, in a news column by the eminent and well-informed King Features writer, Mr. Ralph de Toledano, which is scheduled for publication by that syndicate's subscribers tomorrow. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the column at this point:

When Secretary of State Rusk, Under Secretary Harriman, and other high administration officials face the Senate Foreign Relations Committee next week, they should be asked:

"Why do the Joint Chiefs of Staff feel so strongly against the test ban treaty with the Soviet Union, and why are they being muzzled?"

It can be assumed that the doughty gentlemen in the striped pants will deny both parts of the question. They will say that the Joint Chiefs are cautious about the treaty, but not opposed. This line has already emerged from the Pentagon where Defense Secretary McNamara let military leaders know that he would not tolerate any obvious dragging of heels.

But secret testimony before several House and Senate committees, as well as private conversations between individual military men and Senators they trust, show that the military believes the United States is cutting its throat by agreeing to the Soviet proposals. The orchestra struck up "Love Walked In" during the festivities in Moscow after the treaty signing, but there are many in Washington who feel that a grimmer song should have been the theme.

The military estimate is not based on any doctrinaire ideas. Very solid intelligence information, which the country and most of our legislators have not been told, is behind the fears of the Joint Chiefs. That information breaks down into two parts: (1) The success of the Soviet Union's last round of atmosphere tests, and (2) the failure of America's last nuclear blasts in the atmosphere.

Very simply, the intelligence community is certain that in her last test series, the Soviet Union gained all the information necessary to proceed with anti-missile missile research without further atmospheric shots. On the other hand, U.S. scientists, on orders from the White House, launched their own atmospheric tests hastily and under protest. They had lost time and momentum during the period of the "moratorium"—while the Soviets were busily making preparations—and they just were not ready.

It can be reported that those tests failed.

It can also be reported that without atmospheric testing, it will be a very long, very hard road before the United States develops an antimissile missile.

Our scientists do not have the theoretical knowledge gained by the Soviets in their tests—and our intelligence has no Klaus Fuchs or Bruno Pontecorvo to steal it for us. There is no certainty that we shall succeed in the anti-missile-missile research, but in any case, the Soviets will have the capabilities well before us.

What they do with it is another matter. They have always waited for Western scientists to do the basic research, then leapfrogged to a finished product—astounding the world with their know-how. If they develop a working, production-line model of the antimissile missile first, it will mark a milestone for them.

This is what Pentagon leaders mean when they say vaguely that the Soviets are ahead in antimissile missile work. Given another series of tests by our own scientists, the United States could easily eliminate the present advantage held by the Soviets. The test ban treaty prohibits this. To make the anguish of the Joint Chiefs even greater, there is the fact that the administration has, by the stroke of several pens, wiped out

the U.S. Air Force and its mighty Strategic Air Command. How many Americans know that by 1969 the United States will not have a single operational bomber wing? This means that the B-47's, the B-52's, and the B-58's will be completely phased out.

The manned bomber has a 95-percent capability of delivering its bomb load on target, in spite of the new antiaircraft missiles. Our very best, most sophisticated ICBM's and Polarises have at most a 70 percent capability.

Missilery is still an infant art. But Secretary McNamara and the President, knowing better than the men who have given their lives to the study of weapons and military strategy, are shattering what has been called SAC's "shield of the Republic."

This is why the Joint Chiefs are so worried about the test ban treaty; and why the Senate of the United States must demand that their testimony be free from all Executive restraints and all fear of White House reprisal.

Immediate Krebiozen Decision Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure, House Joint Resolution 639, authorizing and directing the National Institutes of Health to undertake a fair, impartial, and controlled test of the drug Krebiozen; and directing the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such test; and authorizing to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the sum of $250,000.

During the last several months, Mr. Speaker, I have been deluged with telephone calls, wires, letters, and delegations in my office from families, friends, and from cancer patients themselves, protesting first, the delay in testing of the the drug, and as of now, its removal from the public, outside the State of Illinois.

I am not a physician and I lay no claim to specialized knowledge of the practice of medicine, nor the contents or use of drugs. However, as the Representative of the people in my district who, with or without scientific validation, feel that their lives are dependent on continued use of this drug, and as a compassionate human being, I feel I should bring this matter before my colleagues.

Gentlemen, I have had in my office several of these cancer patients in a state of great distress of mind and body. These cases are too numerous to cite, but from the many I should like to mention three:

First, the case of a terminal cancer patient, who was accompanied by her personal physician. She assured me that she had been greatly helped by the use of Krebiozen, prescribed by her physician; in fact, it was her belief that her life had been saved and maintained by use of this drug, and without it she was doomed to die. This statement was corroborated by the attending physician.

Second, the case of an ambulatory terminal cancer patient who felt so dependent upon continued use of Krebiozen that when its sale was confined to the State of Illinois, he was forced to the trouble and expense of removing to that State where he could continue to buy the drug prescribed by his physician and to which he attributed his life.

Third, another terminal cancer victim in such serious physical condition that he is not ambulatory who is suffering great mental anguish at the removal of the drug which he considers essential to continued existence.

It is my belief that it is highly desirable, in fact, urgent, that legislation should be passed immediately to enable cancer patients to obtain the drug Krebiozen when prescribed by their attending physicians and that steps be taken at once to find a satisfactory solution to this long-pending controversial issue. It would seem only reasonable to expect that after 14 years of delays, claims, and counterclaims, that the Members of Congress, physicians, cancer patients, and the general public should be given an official report based on the usual careful, scientific test under the auspices of the National Health Institutes. Issuance of such considered scientific evaluation should resolve this unsatisfactory situation and quiet the fears of my constituents and the general public.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no need for extensive hearings on a measure of this kind. The need for emergency action is obvious. I urge the chairman and members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to consider this matter within 24 hours and have it available for consideration by Members of the House.

Gentlemen, 24 hours is a very short time, legislatively speaking. To a person who is in anguish over termination of the treatment upon which he feels his very life depends and who is faced with the specter that the ensuing 24 hours may see his life ebb away, 24 hours is a long, long time.

In consideration of the human factors involved, I respectfully request the support of my colleagues in passing this legislative measure without delay.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 13th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multi-million-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

It is quite apparent that Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho, if fully consummated, would have very serious adverse effects on the economy of southern Idaho that were not visible through the rosy hued glasses worn by the socialistic promoters of the Secretary's actions.

Not only is there a potential major loss in employment at existing industrial plant in southern Idaho, but the multi-million-dollar potential expansion of existing plants with its attendant increase in employment could be stopped cold. In addition, it appears that an existing industrial plant in the original Bonneville power marketing area will be so adversely affected as to force the company out of business. This would undoubtedly increase the areas of substantial and persistent unemployment in BPA territory.

The following letters sent to me by Mr. W. Grant Kilbourne of the J. R. Simplot Co. explain in considerable detail why his company will be so adversely affected by Secretary Udall's indefensible action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho:

J. R. SIMPLOT CO.,
MINERALS AND CHEMICAL DIVISION,
Pocatello, Idaho, July 18, 1693.

Hon. JOHN S. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SAYLOR: I have read with a great deal of satisfaction of your efforts in your committee and your speech on the floor of the House in regard to our Bonneville power problem out here in Idaho. Needless to say this gave me a great deal of satisfaction and hopes that something can and will be done to safeguard us against the sad results that this encroachment will bring.

There is one other odd but interesting situation regarding the electric furnace phosphate plant at Butte, Mont., that I have not brought out in my various leters. This plant was originally built by Victor Chemical Co. and later acquired by Stauffer Chemical Co. through merger. It was conceived and built on the economics of low Bonneville power rates and high phosphate rock cost inasmuch as its only source of phosphate rock is an underground mine with high operational costs whereas the electric furnaces in Idaho are based on the economics of higher power costs but low-cost phosphate rock from open pit mining operations. Stauffer's Butte plant is having a hard time under present conditions meeting the competitive lower cost producers in Idaho and an extension of low-cost Bonneville power to the Idaho producer will surely shut the Butte operation down permanently. In other words, it would seem that BPA created an artificial atmosphere that induced the building of the Butte operation and is now proposing to pull the rug out from under them by extending the same condition to competitive industry that already has much lower production costs. The last time I was in New York, I visited with Mr. Hans Stauffer on this point and he is very much concerned. I suggested that he take this up with Senator MANSFIELD.

I'm enclosing copies of some of my letters on this subject in case they may be of help.

Sincerely,

W. GRANT KILBOURNE.

J. R. SIMPLOT CO.,
MINERALS AND CHEMICAL DIVISION,
Pocatello, Idaho, May 22, 1963.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of May 18th enclosing a copy of the Bonneville Power Feasibility Report and inviting comment on the matter. I have withheld com-

ment on this question in the past in the hopes it might quietly go away but instead it seems to have emerged recently into a full-blown issue. I do not doubt that Bonneville power has many advantages but I am afraid the disadvantages could far outweigh them. In fact, it seems to pose a disastrous threat to the $20 million investment this company now has in the phosphate fertilizer business and the $10 million expansion program we are now engaged in. I do not believe either the proponents or opponents of cheap Bonneville power are aware of this and in order to properly understand this statement, one must be aware of the following facts.

First of all, there are two methods of making phosphate fertilizer. One is called the "wet" process which this company uses and the other is known as the "electric furnace" process such as used by Central Farmers, FMC, and Monsanto. The wet process uses phosphate rock and sulphuric acid as its primary raw materials. The electric furnace process uses phosphate rock and electric energy as its primary raw materials. In the wet process, sulphuric acid is used to induce through a series of acidulation and filtering steps the extraction of phosphate from the rock in the form of phosphoric acid, whereas the electric furnace process uses electric energy to induce the extraction of the phosphate from the rock by melting it and driving the phosphate off as a gas which in a series of steps is converted to phosphoric acid.

The electric furnace producers of phosphates are already in such keen competition with this company and the other wet process producers in the argicultural fertilizer field that margins have seriously deteriorated over the past few years to the point that it is very difficult for any of us to maintain a profit position. In fact, many wet process producers are now operating at substantial losses.

Now the cost of electric energy to the electric furnace producer is the same to his basic production costs as the cost of sulfuric acid is to the wet method producer, and if the Bonneville Power Administration comes into the area to sell electric energy at a third of the present cost, it would have the same disastrous effect to our business as it would to the electric furnace producer if some Government agency should sell us sulfuric acid at one-third of our present cost. In either case, the injured party would be driven out of the fertilizer business by his subsidized competition and many millions of dollars that are now invested in good faith in plants and facilities would go down the drain. Furthermore, a substantial net loss of jobs would result inasmuch as the surviving industry could expand existing operations to fill the market vacuum created by driving his competitor out of business by adding a comparatively small percentage of employees.

I might add in closing that it is my understading that the electric furnace phosphate business, now suffering badly from overcapacity, is the only industry in Idaho that could qualify as a wholesale user of electric power from Bonneville. There is no other potential combination of raw materials and economics in the area of extended Bonneville service that would attract any other type of wholesale user, such as the aluminum industry, in order to offeset the loss of our own fertilizer industry which Bonneville power would surely bring about.

Sincerely yours,

W. GRANT KILBOURNE.

J. R. SIMPLOT CO.,
MINERALS & CHEMICALS DIVISION,
Pocatello, Idaho, June 4, 1963.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have received just today your latest newsletter which very forcefully brings out under paragraph 3 the threat to the wet process phosphate industry described in my letter to you of May 22, 1963.

As I mentioned in my letter, electric energy performs the same raw material chemical task for the electric furnace producer as sulfuric acid does for the wet process producer. The relative cost of the respective processes is about the same, approximately 25 percent of total production costs.

You are correct in saying that a 2-mill reduction in power costs to the electric furnace producer would reduce his costs by $4.50 per ton of fertilizer if you mean dry fertilizer. It would represent about $6.50 per ton of 54 percent phosphoric acid, which is the form in which most of it is sold. However, this represents more than the average net margin of profit to most wet process producers.

The wet process producers drawing from Idaho mines now account for far more jobs than the electric furnace producer. Most all expansion in the electric furnace business would come by way of adding additional furnaces to existing facilities which would add very few employees instead of the rather fantastic 9,000 claimed by BPA. Furthermore, most all expansion in this business would have to go into fertilizer in direct competition to us inasmuch as industrial phosphorous demand is pretty well leveled out now that the swingover from soaps to detergents is completed.

My question to you then is how can it be true that the phosphate industry in Idaho will best be served and the economy strengthened by unfairly subsidizing the costs of one competitor against another to the extent that the one employing the larger number of people will be driven out of business?

Sincerely yours,

W. GRANT KILBOURNE.

J. R. SIMPLOT CO.,
MINERALS AND CHEMICAL DIVISION,
Pocatello, Idaho, June 4, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This company has about $20 million in a "wet process" phosphate fertilizer manufacturing business and is in the middle of an expansion program involving an additional $10 million. We are one of several such producers. All of this investment is made in good faith based upon the natural economic balance of the fertilizer industry. One of our keenest forms of competition that has contributed strongly to the present narrow profit margins is the electric furnace phosphate manufacturer who uses electric energy as a raw material to perform the same chemical task as sulfuric acid does in our process. These two costs are relatively the same to each producer, approximately 25 percent of total production costs.

Now Secretary Udall proposes to bring Bonneville power into our area and subsidize the electric furnace producer by at least 2 mills which will represent more than the existing margin of profit to most wet process producers. This will drive us out of business as surely as we would drive the electric furnace producer out of the fertilizer business if some Government agency were to subsidize our sulfuric acid cost in the same manner instead.

We have here a unique set of circumstances completely unconnected with the usual public versus private power issue and should like to petition you to intercede in this matter so as to prevent the creation of a highly artificial, unfair, and disastrous competitive situation in a business now competitively in balance.

Copies of recent letters on this subject to Senator CHURCH are enclosed for further detail and are self-explanatory.

Respectfully,

W. GRANT KILBOURNE.

J. R. SIMPLOT CO.,
MINERALS AND CHEMICAL DIVISION,
Pocatello, Idaho, June 21, 1963.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of June 4 in response to my earlier letters to you and hasten to say that it is unimportant to us if the Bureau of Reclamation is replaced by BPA as marketing agent for power or if a lower rate is offered to present customers. It is only when a new power line or some other means of delivering Government subsidized cheap power to one segment of the phosphate industry is proposed that our economic life is threatened and we must fight for survival with everything at our command. We just cannot believe that the people of Idaho, when fully appraised of the situation, will support an effort to subsidize corporate giants like Monsanto and FMC to choke off comparatively small homegrown industry that retains and spends everything it makes in Idaho.

You will note that I still use the word "subsidize" notwithstanding the explanation in your letter, but with all due respect I can find no more appropriate word under circumstances where BPA borrows all its money from the Government at half the rate the Government pays to borrow the money it loans BPA. Also, I understand BPA is running very substantial deficits and pays no taxes of any kind. We ourselves could sell fertilizer much cheaper to the farmer if relieved of taxes and interest burdens. However, I must admit I would have to consider both us and the farmer subsidized under such circumstances.

Sincerely yours,

W. GRANT KILBOURNE.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Civil War Made Webster County, W. Va., Independent State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Webster County, W. Va., is one of the few political entities of our Nation which enjoyed the distinction of having functioned as an independent State. According to an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, for 4 years, during the Civil War, neither the government of the North nor the government of the South functioned in Webster County. No courts were held, nor were taxes collected. The county was administered by its own Governor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Gazette-Mail be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL WAR MADE WEBSTER COUNTY, W. VA., INDEPENDENT STATE

Created by the act of the Virginia Assembly, January 10, 1860, Webster was the last county created before the separation of the two States. It was composed of part of Randolph, Nicholas, and Braxton. The act provided that the county seat be located at Fork Lick, between Elk River and Back Fork, and should be known as Addison. Commissioners were appointed to select the site of the courthouse and other public buildings. An eminence above the salt sulfur spring was selected as the site of the courthouse. The townsite was surveyed and named for the donor. The county was made a part of the 15th judicial district.

Off the beaten path westward, Webster was among the last of the counties to be settled. Although tradition gives earlier dates, the first authentic account of a white man in the county limits were in the notes of a surveyor, dated August 10, 1785, wherein was mentioned the "fork lick." There is credible testimony of at least four families settling in the territory, and of two men penetrating the fastnesses to Fork Lick, one in 1772, the other in 1785.

At the first election held in the county, May 1860, county officials were elected. Only one session of circuit court was held, August 1860. Before the county organization was completed the Civil War erupted and activities ceased.

Through the Civil War period only one election was held, the polls opened in but one precinct. The polling took place at the mouth of Leatherwood, the present site of Bergoo. Only nine ballots were cast.

For 4 years neither the government of the North nor the government of the South functioned in Webster County; no courts were held, nor were taxes collected. From this period comes the legend "The Independent State of Webster." It is said the county had a governor and a full complement of State officials.

At the end of the war organization work was resumed, and in 1865, county and district officers were elected. Until 1866 the county had no courthouse, courts being held in dwellings. The first courthouse was a frame building, erected on the public square, at a cost of $1,600. June 17, 1888, this building was destroyed by fire, suspected of being purposely set to destroy records of a land suit pending in the circuit court. Courts were held in the Baptist church until a new stone courthouse was erected in 1896.

Though no major battles were fought here during the Civil War, the county did not escape its ravages. Much damage was done and several persons killed from ambush. Two bands of marauders operated in the county. The saltworks were destroyed by Union soldiers. In a clash between a passing body of Union soldiers and Confederates at Lanes' Bottom (now Camden-on-Gauley) it is said one Confederate and seven Unionists were killed.

The earliest occupations of the settlers in Webster were farming and lumbering. In the virgin forests the early settlers found trees of gigantic size. There is record of 1 tree yielding 7 logs and scaling 24,787 board feet. The first lumbering operations on a large scale were by a Charleston company. This company had choice of the virgin forests, cutting only the highest grade softwood, paying the owner 25 cents per tree. The logs were floated down Elk River to the mills at Charleston. Other companies have cut thousands of acres in the county.

The first schoolhouse in the county was built about 1835, on Elk River opposite the mouth of Wolf Pen Run. There were no free schools until 1867. In that year there were 4 schoolhouses with 61 pupils enrolled. By 1895 60 teachers were employed.

The first sermon preached in the county was in a barn on Elk River. The Baptists were first to organize a church about 1872, followed shortly by the M. E. South, and M. E. Protestant. The first Sunday school was organized at Webster Springs in 1868 or 1869, with four members, one a Baptist, one M. E. South, one Catholic. The denomination of the other member is not known.

The county's first newspaper, the Mountaineer, appeared in 1883. The equipment was hauled from Preston County on a sled. After several changes of name, the paper is known today as the Webster Echo. The Webster Republican followed a few years later.

Isolated from the outside world by poor roads, growth of the county was retarded for years. Merchandise and mail were hauled over long distances. Contact with the outside world was limited to lawyers and litigants attending court, and transient visitors. With the coming of hard roads, Webster is no longer a "lost world."

R. L. THOMPSON.

Detergent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, by a clerical error a statement I submitted in support of S. 1183, the detergent control bill, was omitted from the Public Works Committee hearing record on water pollution control measures. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with a letter I received from Mr. Philip Brownstein, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to you and the members of the subcommittee for the consideration being given to the detergent control bill introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, Senator NELSON, Senator LONG of Missouri, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator MAGNUSON, and myself. As attention has focused upon detergent contamination, it has rapidly come to seem a more serious problem than had hitherto been supposed.

EXISTING CONCENTRATIONS IMPAIR SEWAGE TREATMENT

I joined in introducing S. 1183 with the thought that Congress should have an opportunity to consider the regulation of detergent wastes. My own study of this matter has led me to believe that the national average concentration of detergents in our streams is at a sufficient level to interfere with the operation of sewage treatment plants, increasing the cost of sediment extraction. Congress should, in my opinion, be concerned about the widespread presence of any contaminant in the Nation's streams, especially if it is so persistent as the surface active agents of modern detergents which can last for years in water without being broken apart by bacterial action. It may be contended that this long-term low concentration contamination is not a serious economic problem. However we may feel about this question, I believe the low-level nationwide presence of detergents in streams deserves more attention and investigation than it has received.

THE MULTIPLICATION OF DETERGENT RESIDUES

What is alarming, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that persistent detergent residues can be brought together and the low-level concentration multiplied each time the water in our interstate streams is used and reused. In the Ohio River, which is used and reused some four times by the communities along its banks by the time it reaches the Mississippi, the average concentration of residues is now at a level of two-tenths of a part per million. It is because our Nation uses water so heavily that detergent residues become concentrated in streams and along the shore. I would call these acute concentrations. The list of their effects is a weird assortment of woes:

In California detergent suds below a dam blow across freeways, constituting a traffic hazard.

In Cleveland's sewage-treatment plant jets of water have been installed at a cost of $250,000 to beat back foam that impedes the plant's very operation.

Damage to shellfish along the Atlantic coast.

Refusal of water by livestock and damage to irrigated crops.

Appearance of suds in tapwater. In large apartment houses this residue combined with ordinary use of detergents can block drains

with suds, creating serious public health problems.

Impedes oxygen exchange with the atmosphere in streams, causing further growth of harmful algae and preventing stream renewal with oxygen to dispel the harmful oxygen-demanding effects of sewage.

THE SEPTIC TANK PROBLEM IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

I am particularly concerned, Mr. Chairman, with the form this problem has taken in New England. The growth of our residential areas is taking place on the periphery of the cities, often beyond the reach of established sewer systems. Our builders and developers have come to rely on septic tanks to provide essential sanitation. And here the increase in detergent contamination can be especially harmful. Mr. Matt Krenn, a surveyor in Epsom, N.H., wrote as follows:

"Having battled the detergent-in-water fight with my own home * * * (as a result, I had to put in a separate pair of septic tanks, one for sanitary wastes and one for kitchen wastes, and it's a bloody nuisance)—and being concerned about our Nation's water supply—(as you have probably pointed out, a given volume of water passing down a major river will probably form part of the water supply—and sewage system of all the cities on the route), I see the cumulative effect of detergents as nothing less than frightening, even though we know little about their toxicity in the human system."

IMPAIRED MORTGAGEABILITY OF PROPERTY

I requested Mr. Philip Brownstein, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, to find out the effect of detergent contamination in ground water on the mortgageability of FHA-insured properties. I should like to ask that his entire reply be made part of the hearing record. It does not represent an agency endorsement of the bill, but is limited to a description of the problem. Mr. Brownstein points out that detergent pollution in the water supplies of localities in New England, New York, and Minnesota "has made these properties ineligible for FHA mortgage insurance and we understand in most instances for Veterans' Administration guaranteed loans as well. The finding of detergent pollution of water supplies has generally retarded new construction programs and in some instances has brought the building program to a halt. This is turn has depreciated the price of land." The contribution of detergent contamination has been to lower the values of existing property and make new developments much more expensive. This result of ground water contamination deserves our most considered attention.

THE NEED FOR LEGISLATION

It is because each cycle of water reuse adds a new increment of detergent residue to our interstate streams that the problem of detergent contamination merits the attention of Congress. As was pointed out in an excellent article in the Chemical & Engineering News for March 18, 1963, this contamination is unnecessary. Detergents now in use contain a refractory kernel in the chemical composition of their molecules which resists decomposition in ground water, but new substances being developed incorporate straight-line molecules which will decompose readily. If Congress provides that these new substances must be used in detergents, the problem of increasing contamination will be at an end. That is why, Mr. Chairman, in preparing this legislation, we did not contemplate a national tolerance level for detergents, but aimed at the elimination of a specific class of ingredients and their replacement with materials that would decompose. The bill as written would not regulate detergents as such, but the surface-active agents which they contain, because it is these constituent products that determine whether a detergent which contains them would be able to meet decomposability standards.

It has been very gratifying to learn that some oil and chemical companies have developed cleaning agents for inclusion in detergents which would then decompose readily. I would hope that out of a sense of public responsibility, all detergent makers would include these new products in their detergents. If the industry could decide on this course of action without the spur of Federal law, the problem of detergent contamination would be at an end.

I would like to observe, Mr. Chairman, that the change to new ingredients is not going to increase market preference for the public-minded manufacturer. The housewife is unaware of the problems that can arise 2 or 3 years in the future from the detergent she pours out with the dishwater. I fear that not all detergent manufacturers would include the newly developed surface-active chemicals in their products. In that event, the passage of the detergent control bill would prevent the loss of a share of the detergent market by those companies which include the new ingredient for the sake of its public benefits. The decomposable chemicals would soon be in universal use by all manufacturers of detergents and detergent contamination would no longer be a threat to the Nation's streams and the public health.

AVOID CONFLICTING STATE LEGISLATION

Detergent contamination multiplying in navigable streams and flowing in underground waters does not respect State lines. Consequently the problem should be controlled at the Federal level. Otherwise manufacturers may be faced with a bewildering pattern of inconsistent State legislation. The success of the West German Government in controlling detergent contamination should point the way toward action within our own Federal system, to insure uniformity of standards and timing.

NATIONWIDE INTEREST IN DETERGENT CONTROL

I was interested to learn that the National Shellfish Association, concerned with preserving our valuable resources of oysters, clams, and other marine organisms, considered the detergent contamination problem at its recent meeting in Washington, D.C. The Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries and Department of Health are scrutinizing the problem. The National League of Women Voters Current Review of Continuing Responsibilities for May 1963, devotes several pages to persistent detergent residues and proposals for their control. I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the Missiles and Electronics Lodge, I.A. of M. Local 2230, Santa Cruz, Calif., be reprinted in the record at the conclusion of this statement. I am confident that Congress will respond to this need by regulating detergent residues to the extent compatible with economic reasonableness and technical feasibility. That is the intention of S. 1183, now pending before the Public Works Committee.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1963.

Hon. TOM MCINTYRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCINTYRE: This is in further reference to your April 12 letter requesting a summary of the Federal Housing Administration's experience with ground water supplies polluted by detergents and the effect this has had on land values. Some of our insuring offices located in New England, New York, and Minnesota, with firsthand knowledge of the local reaction to detergent pollution of water supplies and the effect this has had on marketing of residential properties, were contacted so we could give you the latest information.

The finding of evidence of detergent pollution in the individual water supplies of a specific locality has adversely affected the marketability of properties in various ways. First it has made these properties ineligible for FHA mortgage insurance and we understand in most instances for Veterans' Administration guaranteed loans as well. In addition where the pollution reports have been given wide publicity, the buyers have been hesitant to purchase even if mortgage funds from conventional sources are available. Furthermore, the stigma of polluted wells is attached to the neighborhood even if only part of the properties are involved.

Even though the detergents are not known to be a health hazard, their presence does indicate that sewage pollution is entering the water supply. When it becomes common knowledge that such pollution is occurring within a given area, the housing market is seriously impaired. If the finding of pollution has not been publicized and the water supply serving the particular property has not been examined, there is no apparent market resistance and the properties continue to be marketable.

The finding of detergent pollution of water supplies has generally retarded new construction programs and in some instances has brought the building program to a halt. This in turn has depreciated the price of land and existing residential property in the neighborhood. An exception is large developments which are supplied central water service and in some instances have sewers. The cost of these central facilities increases the cost of building, however, the added value of central utilities is reflected in the price of land. Frequently local governmental bodies have stepped up their programs of extending water and sewer service and in a few localities public systems have been installed. The knowledge that shallow ground water supplies were being polluted has undoubtedly been a factor in election authorization for a bond issue to provide the funds to make these programs possible.

Prior to the discovery of the detergent pollution of water supplies, land which could be served by central water and sewer utilities generally was not a major factor in determining the desirability of building sites and therefore had only a limited effect on land value. Building sites that have or can get central water are generally the only ones readily marketable in neighborhoods with detergent problems. Consequently the price of these sites has appreciated and this in turn has tended to promote the construction of more expensive improvements. These two factors have combined to raise the market price of new housing.

Neighborhoods that have developed with individual water supplies where pollution has been detected have usually undergone a decline in marketability, however as soon as central water service becomes available, the market rebounds with an increase in value which is reflected in the pricing of the properties.

Thus far our experience with detergent pollution of water supplies has been limited to those areas where relatively dense development with both individual water supply and sewerage systems has occurred.

I am glad to have had this opportunity to relate FHA's experiences with detergent pollution of water supplies and its effect on building programs, sale of existing properties, and residential land prices. Should you desire additional information, I will provide all the assistance possible.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN,
Commissioner.

Mineral County, W. Va., Surveyed Nearly 300 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail tells of several historically important surveys made in what is now Mineral County, W. Va.

The first known mention of this region was in the report of John Lederer, an Austrian surveyor sent out by the British Crown in 1669. A subsequent survey was made by George Washington in 1748. Nearly a half century later Claudius Crozet, a military engineer who served under Napoleon Bonaparte, surveyed this section for what was to become the old Northwestern Turnpike—now U.S. Highway 50 west.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article in the Gazette-Mail be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ROYALTY SURVEYED MINERAL COUNTY

The rich land which lies around and in the present Mineral County was always of interest to the British Crown and its queen colony, Virginia. The first known mention of the territory was in the report of John Lederer, an Austrian surveyor sent out in 1669 to ascertain just what lay in the western portion of the Dominion.

Mayo's Commission was sent out by the King in 1736 to survey Lord Fairfax's land, and the Fairfax Stone was erected at this time near the present town of Thomas.

George Washington surveyed here in 1748; stayed with Farmer Brown in his log cabin on New Creek, and later met with an Indian raiding party. With an exchange of "fire water" and a session of "peace-pipe smoking" the meeting was peaceful.

The first fort south of the Potomac River was built by the Ohio company in 1750 near what is now Ridgeley, W. Va., and from this territory General Cresap conscripted his Revolutionary soldiers to join Washington's army at Boston.

The old Northwestern Turnpike, or U.S. 50 west, was laid out through this section by Claudius Crozet, military engineer of Napoleon Bonaparte on the basis of surveying done by the Lewis party in 1746; such an excellent job that only one curve was subsequently changed on the 5-mile grade up Allegheny Front Mountain.

Mineral County lies in what was the original Orange County, Va., a county created by the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1734. Orange County contained the present States of West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. In 1738 the land east of the Alleghanies was divided into Lower Augusta and Upper Frederick Counties. Hampshire County was proclaimed in 1754 from land lying in each of these counties. Mineral County was finally formed from Hampshire County by act of the new West Virginia Legislature on February 1, 1866—the second county to be named by the new governing body.

The county seat of Keyser figured significantly during the Civil War because it was an important center for the B. & O. Railroad. The railroad had been completed to here in 1852. Up until this event the town was called Paddytown in honor of Patrick McCarthy who had settled here in 1760. When the railroad was completed the name was changed to New Creek—a name of somewhat more dignity for a growing railroad metropolis. The present name of Keyser was given the county seat in 1874 when the B. & O. Division was moved from Piedmont to "New Creek." This was the name of the vice president of the company at the time.

"New Creek" was the site of Fort Fuller, a Federal fort which occupied the entire hill where Potomac State College now stands. It was supported by Fort McWilliams on a hill directly behind it and by Fort Piano, constructed on a facing ridge. The Confederates were never able to capture and occupy these positions, but they did great damage to supplies, and so forth, through cavalry raids.

Mineral County has been the scene of wild, boisterous exploitation of natural resources—colorful railroading history and rugged mountain farming. The scenic beauty of the county is unsurpassed in the entire country. Her citizens are definitely working for progress but are hoping not to destroy her picturesque originality in the process.

West Virginia Group Lauds James B. Donovan for His Service to Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the free world has been truly heartened and helped through the efforts of an American attorney who gives his time and talents so that men and women everywhere can know the joys of freedom.

James B. Donovan has performed a genuine service for mankind by arranging the exchange of Cuban prisoners and other persons held captive by the Communist regime of Fidel Castro. With determination, with skill, and with patience, Attorney Donovan contacted the Castro government, and after numerous reversals and delays, worked out acceptable terms for the release of men, women, and children who otherwise would still be languishing in the hostile atmosphere of today's Cuba.

As a recognition of his contribution to the cause of freedom, the Jefferson County Voiture 1356 of the Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia, La Société des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, adopted on July 11, 1963, a resolution in his honor. The resolution observes in part that James B. Donovan has "saved countless lives and prevented the bloodshed of human beings and through his unceasing efforts has brought joy to the families of countless Cuban refugees and has through his individual initiative advanced and demonstrated the philosophy and ideals of the American principles of international brotherhood, particularly with the peoples of our Western Hemisphere."

Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in this merited praise of James B. Donovan. He is a credit to this Nation, and has served well the cause of freedom and democracy. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Jefferson County Voiture 1356 of the Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia, La Société des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas James B. Donovan has meritoriously given of his time and talents in successfully freeing from bondage Cuban Nationals and other prisoners; and

Whereas James B. Donovan has saved countless lives and prevented the bloodshed of human beings and through his unceasing efforts has brought joy and happiness to the families of countless Cuban refugees and has through his individual initiative advanced and demonstrated the philosophy and ideals of the American principles of international brotherhood, particularly with the peoples of our Western Hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jefferson County Voiture 1356 of the Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia, La Societe des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux does recognize the endeavors and accomplishments of James B. Donovan in the freeing of countless thousands of Cuban refugees from imprisonment in Cuba; and be it further

Resolved, That this Nation through the Congress of the United States or other appropriate governmental body take steps to achieve this purpose and; be it further

Resolved, That Jefferson County Voiture 1356 through its resolution committee take whatever steps necessary to publicize the action taken by this Voiture.

Dated this 11th day of July 1963.

Jefferson County Voiture 1356, Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia.

By: DEAN NICHOLS,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Research for Cause and Prevention of Human Cataracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, recently reported findings concerning eye cataract formation dramatize the role being played by privately endowed researchers working in concert with Federal research institutions.

The Eye Research Foundation of Bethesda, a nonprofit trust created in 1957 to conduct pioneering studies into the causes of blindness, presented its findings to the Association for Research in Ophthalmology during the recent meeting of the American Medical Association in Atlantic City.

The foundation's research team is the first to demonstrate chemical changes which occur in the eye before clouding of the lens occurs. The importance of this work may be seen in the fact that this is the first direct evidence of a failure in biological processes prior to the visual appearance of cataract.

Subject of a lengthy review by Science Writer Nate Hazeltine in the Sun-

day, July 21, 1963, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald—appended to these remarks—the researchers' findings were the result of a 32-month-long study financed in part by a grant from the National Institute of Neurology and Blindness of the National Institutes of Health.

Privately endowed organizations working for the enlargement of scientific knowledge are the unique and tangible expressions of a free society. Since they derive their main support from charitable gifts they satisfy the commendable urge within many to "be our brothers' keepers" while at the same time refuting the Marxian principle that all benefits must and do flow from the state.

Government-sponsored research does have its place in our society since vast sums are required to carry on intensive and time-consuming studies. Currently, for example, more than $1.5 billion is being expended in basic medical research with approximately two-thirds of this amount being provided by Federal and State agencies. But the importance of private research, through industrial and privately endowed institutions, may be seen in the fact that more than $500 million is provided by these nongovernment organizations.

It is a source of considerable pride that the world's greatest concentration of medical and scientific activity is located within Montgomery County, a part of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, which I am privileged to represent.

Federal agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, the Bethesda Naval Hospital, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Atomic Energy Commission have created an exciting and stimulating scientific community which has, in turn, attracted major nongovernment research institutions such as the Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University, large divisions of Vitro Corp. of America, and a host of other independent research and development organizations.

The National Institutes of Health alone currently conducts more than 1,400 research projects in its laboratories. But the importance of independence and freedom of action in scientific inquiry is recognized by the National Institutes which, since 1946, has provided grants to support the research studies of non-Federal organizations, including medical schools, colleges, hospitals, and scientific institutions. During fiscal 1962 this phase of the NIH program provided funds for 14,882 independent projects in non-Federal institutions.

It is this unique partnership of Federal and non-Federal institutions that has made it possible for such privately sponsored organizations as the Eye Research Foundation of Bethesda to develop its singularly effective program of research within the very shadows of the National Institutes.

Organized as a nonprofit trust for charitable, scientific and educational purposes on Christmas Day, 1957, the foundation is directed by Dr. William M. Hart, a recognized research and ophthamology specialist with the assistance of Dr. Robert H. Peckham, a specialist in biophysical research. Remarkable progress has been made in the 5 years since its founding with 15 major reports having been published in scientific journals.

The private financial support it has attracted has enabled construction of a major new research building which will be occupied later this month. The larger quarters and new, modern equipment will result in greatly expanded basic research and clinical programs in cataract, glaucoma, retinal function, and cancer of the eye. A major phase of the foundation's work will be channeled into rehabilitation programs implementing the results of research to assist those with serious vision defects.

The foundation's work has been encouraging and its recent findings in the field of cataract research augurs well for those who are working toward the day of eventual control and elimination of this and other blinding diseases.

The above-mentioned Post article follows:

RATS TESTED TO END CATARACTS

(By Nate Haseltine)

Bethesda scientists are looking into the eyes of test white rats, searching for the cause and possible prevention of human cataracts.

They have already reported finding the first direct evidence of a failure in a biological process in the development of diet-induced cataracts.

The animal studies are underway at the Eye Research Foundation of Bethesda, a nonprofit trust fund set up nearly 6 years ago for pioneering studies on such conditions as cataract, glaucoma, retinal function, and cancer of the eye.

Reporting their first clue in cataract development were Drs. William M. Hart and Robert H. Peckham, ophthalmologists, and Janet Appel, research associate. They reported the findings, now prepared for publication, to a recent meeting of the Association for Research in Ophthalmology, in Atlantic City, during the American Medical Association meetings.

The research, they reported, demonstrated for the first time in the intact eye a mechanism of cataract formation that occurs before actual clouding of the eyelens.

The normal lens of the human, and rat, eye is clear and transparent. In cataract formation, natural or induced, the lens clouds to a milky white, much like the clear albumen of an egg turns white in boiling water.

The Bethesda scientists sought to find out what happens in the animal eye before clouding occurs. They knew they could induce cataract formation by feeding rats a diet rich in galactose, sugar obtained from milk.

Somewhat of the same process is known to occur in the inborn cataract-forming process in infant victims of a congenital condition called galactosemia. Here the child's body chemistry lacks an enzyme which normally converts galactose to fructose, a sugar with optical properties. Infants with the chemical error may be saved from the otherwise inevitable cataracts if placed early enough on a milk-free diet.

To those who question the meaningfulness of studying a human affliction in a rat's eye, it can be pointed out that it was research on the premature eyes of mice that led to the eventual conquest of the human blinding disease, retrolental fibroplasia. The research showed that this disease was due to overexposure of oxygen to premature babies in incubators.

The Bethesda investigators also are studying rat eye lens in all forms of development, from the tiniest speck of the lens in the rat embryo to that of the fully mature eye.

Such research necessarily involves destruction of the lens in the progressive stages of development, so the findings must be related statistically through generations of rats, rather than through the growth and development of a single eye.

Using the convenient experimental way to produce cataracts by loading the rat's diet with galactose, the foundation scientists found that though the opacity of the forming cataract occurs some 4 days after the start of the special feeding there are earlier changes which occur during the first 24 hours after the diet's start.

The changes, they reported, involve an increased flow of fluid into the lens, with subsequent loss of eye proteins and potassium from the lens. This signifies, they said, an imbalance in what is called the active transport system, the delicately balanced body mechanism which chemically harmonizes the lens tissue with its surrounding environment.

For about 2 weeks, their experiments showed, the lens seem to maintain some measure of control, and then there is a rapid collapse of the transport system. The breakdown involves sudden loss of nitrogen and potassium from the lens, and a waterlogging of the now cataractic lens.

The Bethesda investigators now are trying to find out if similar changes occur with other cataract-producing agents, such as radiation. Finally, they will need to relate their results to human processes of cataract formation.

The research program is being conducted in temporary laboratory facilities at 4806 Rugby Avenue, Bethesda.

Splitting the Peninsula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation's attention is focused upon the limited atomic test ban, we must not forget that communism is pressing ruthlessly forward in Asia. What is transpiring on the western rim of the Pacific has a direct bearing on our national security and ultimately upon the survival of the free world and our Nation itself.

Because of these considerations, I invite the attention of the House to an article, "Splitting the Peninsula," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, appearing in the June issue of the VFW American Security Reporter, which is published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, under the direction of Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the VFW.

This article is timely in that it analyzes in basic understandable terms the combined diplomatic and military tactics which communism is employing in its continuing drive to conquer the vitally important southeast Asian peninsula. The article contains one of the first dis-

cussions of not only the existence, but also the broad implications of the so-called peace pact between Cambodia and Red China by which Cambodia reportedly pledged support of Red Chinese objectives.

Included also is a brief, but pertinent, explanation of the indispensable contribution being made by President Chiang Kai-shek's free Chinese military forces from the standpoint of Far Eastern strategy. The text of the article, "Splitting the Peninsula," from the VFW American Security Reporter, follows:

SPLITTING THE PENINSULA

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, National Security and Foreign Affairs, VFW)

It is not generally realized in the United States, but the forces of world communism are on a full scale offensive throughout all of southeast Asia.

About a year ago Free Chinese intelligence was reporting that Red China was building a major highway southward toward the Laotian border. In spite of the remarkable record of Chiang Kai-shek's intelligence service in forecasting major Red moves, wishful thinkers discounted Red roads leading to southeast Asia.

But now that the Reds have openly demonstrated their contempt for all promises made in connection with the coalition government in Laos—as if this should be any surprise after our experience in mainland China and elsewhere—the outbreak of fighting in Laos takes on increasingly significant proportions. And so do the roads leading to Red China's border with Laos.

It would appear that the Red action in Laos has multiple objectives. The immediate purpose, and one that has been largely accomplished by the Red military action in the Plaine de Jars, is to protect the flank of the Ho Chi-Minh trail. This is the route by which Communist reinforcements and supplies move from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. The Ho Chi-Minh trail runs along the eastern section of Laos, with a southern extension along the Cambodian border, and then slants off into the South Vietnam densely-wooded Dar-Lac province. This Ho Chi-Minh infiltration road is, in effect, a privileged and covered route of approach for Red aggression into South Vietnam. From the standpoint of the pro-U.S. Government, of South Vietnam that infiltration route from the north must be severed or blocked. Conversely, communism must keep the route open. The action in the Laotian Plaine de Jars area is the Red method of securing the flank of this Red road of conquest into southeast Asia.

The long-range objective of Red action in Laos is to weaken that already far-deteriorated government. The Reds have reduced that government to the point that it is little more than a legal fiction. That is why they like a coalition government because they can prevent it from being a working government.

As this column pointed out on previous occasions, the importance of Laos is far greater than its relatively sparse population, untapped resources, and landlocked location indicate. Laos is, from the broad strategic viewpoint, a corridor leading southward from Red China into the center of the southeast Asian peninsula. From the Red standpoint, it is a highway that not only leads southward, but also splits that peninsula.

It is this splitting of the southeast Asian peninsula which is moving at so fast a pace, and which is so little understood in the West, but is well appreciated in Asia.

In order to fragment this highly strategic area, the Reds are combining military action with diplomatic pressure. The military action is taking place in Laos. The diplomatic action is being focused—for the moment—in Cambodia. The Reds are making progress in both places.

Cambodia, as the map indicates, occupies a highly strategic position: It borders Laos to the north, Thailand on to the west, and South Vietnam to the east. Thus Cambodia separates the two anti-Communist nations of Thailand and South Vietnam. Also, Cambodia in Red control, or cooperating with the Reds, would give communism a continuous corridor from the Red power base in the north all the way southward to the Gulf of Siam.

The ultimate effect of Cambodian alliance with communism is clearly evident. The flanks of Thailand and Vietnam would be jeopardized, and communism would have a base of operation for infiltrating both countries. The strategic problems facing these two anti-Communist, pro-United States, nations would be increased. Communist aggression would be brought that much closer to control of Singapore and linking up with the powerful Communist influences in the vast Indonesian Archipelago. That such a strategic disaster for the West would result from Cambodian affinity to communism is not a matter of real speculation. It is, and unfortunately so, a situation based on reality.

Those who have been happily dreaming that U.S. aid, military and economic, to Cambodia would dissuade Cambodia from an alliance with communism have joined the all too large lodge of wishful thinkers. The dream has ended in a Red diplomatic victory.

On Sunday, May 5, 1963, 20,000 persons, including a large proportion of uniformed schoolchildren, according to the Associated Press, stood in lines before the royal palace while President Liu of Red China and Prince Sihanouk, the Cambodian Chief of State, signed a document formally binding them not only in friendship but pledging support for each other's policies.

By this agreement the foundation was laid for Red Chinese assistance to Cambodia in that nation's disputes with Thailand and South Vietnam. The implications of this are obvious and far from encouraging. Red troops operating against South Vietnam from along the Cambodian border will be explained as helping protect Cambodia. And the same situation will apply against the eastern flank of Thailand when the Reds consider it opportune to move overtly against that pro-U.S. country.

But, perhaps, of even more fundamental significance is Cambodia's pledge to support the Chinese Communists' claim to the island of Taiwan (Formosa). Cambodia, by the recent agreement also pledged support of Red China's admission to the United Nations. Indeed it would be difficult to find a more fundamental list of Communist aggressive objectives than that to which Cambodia pledged support.

Thus, in supporting Red China against Taiwan, Cambodia, the recipient of U.S. military and economic aid, now supports the destruction of the free Chinese Government, a loyal and stalwart friend of the United States. This would, of course, give Formosa and the surrounding islands, which are vitally necessary to U.S. security, to Red China. Formosa, it will be recalled, constitutes the virtual center of the U.S. outer defense line in the Western Pacific. That line extends from South Korea through Okinawa, Formosa, the northern Philippines, and thence to its southern anchor in South Vietnam. With good reason it can be said that if Chiang Kai-shek's government and military forces were not protecting Formosa and the offshore islands, the United States, in simple self-defense, would have to do so itself.

Thus, with its pact with Red China, Cambodia has pledged herself to objectives which, if achieved, would undermine the security of the United States and constitute a Communist victory of major historic proportions.

And so, communism with its traditionally versatile use of military and diplomatic action, has split the southeast Asian peninsula. This is a gain of vast magnitude for the forces of Red aggression. It would be less than realistic to contend that it is not a serious setback for U.S. policy.

This Red advance makes it all the more vital that the United States support South Vietnam where there has been a favorable turn of the tide, and where the war can be won if our Nation does not falter in the rough going that lies ahead. The Red achievement in Cambodia also imposes on the United States the imperative task of continuing full economic and military assistance to the pro-American, anti-Communist government of President Chiang Kai-shek. The Cambodia slide toward the Red orbit illustrates again the necessity of basing U.S. economic and military aid on the very simple policy of supporting only those who stand openly and wholeheartedly with us. Any other policy is loaded with diplomatic disappointment and strategic failure.

In this protracted conflict against Red aggression, which has been thrust upon us, there is no place for either.

McDowell County, W. Va., Once Called "Nation's Coal Bin"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, McDowell County, W. Va., is proud to have been known as "the Nation's coal bin" during the critical years of our two World Wars, when great quantities of coal were needed for the success of our war effort.

In the years following World War II, coal from McDowell County fueled up the weakened industries of Europe and contributed to the economic recovery of our allies and friends abroad, as well as to our own prosperity. A recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail pays tribute to McDowell County as the greatest coal-producing region of our time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MCDOWELL COUNTY EARNED MARK AS "NATION'S COAL BIN"

McDowell County was created out of Tazewell County, Va., on February 20, 1858, 5 years before West Virginia became a State; was named for James McDowell, the 25th Governor of Virginia. Perryville was named the county seat, but in 1892, after a colorful struggle of some 34 years, Welch became the permanent county seat.

McDowell County, being sparsely settled, played little part in the Civil War, even though there were men from the county serving with both sides.

McDowell County showed the greatest increase in population of all counties of West Virginia from 1900 to 1910—155.3 percent—due to the abundance of coal. The great awakening interest in coal came in the early 1870's. Many men of vision pioneered the great new era which brought McDowell

County into its own as "The Nation's coal bin." It became a vital part of the "billion dollar coal field" and earned a worldwide reputation for its production of fine fuel.

With new mines constantly opening and ready to ship coal as soon as the railroad reached them, a great transformation was taking place during the last 15 years of the 19th century. Mining operations mushroomed all over the county. It is freely acknowledged that much of the credit for the development of the Pocahontas coalfields is due to the Norfolk & Western Railway.

The boom, which reached its peak in 1929, was responsible for the building of new branches of railroad. Sawmills began to thrive and the timber industry enjoyed a great period of prosperity. Automobiles and roads put in an appearance.

McDowell County was well represented in World War I. She joined in the gaiety of the roaring twenties, was sobered by the market crash of 1929. Then came the depression of the thirties. Government regulations were passed in an effort to help the coal industry, and under union pressure, the wage and hour situation was improved.

In World War II, king coal came into his own by helping win the biggest war in history. Trains grew longer, wages soared, and business in general boomed. In 1948, McDowell County produced 26,573,940 tons of bituminous coal, or about 20 percent of the tonnage in the State. But by 1950, the coal industry hit a slump. Production costs reached an all time high, automation set in, the coal market dropped. Present times find many of the best seams almost worked out; mines closed down; unemployment high; people leaving the county to seek new homes and jobs in other counties and States.

McDowell County, in 1963, in spite of its present economic recession, is a good place to live. The people are confident they have a future here. There are great possibilities, under the leadership of those who have the same pioneering spirit as our forefathers. True, to date, we have relied solely on coal mining for our livelihood, but who can say that there is not some undreamed of industry in our future?

McDowell County boasts of being the first in a number of projects. The First World War memorial building established in the United States is located in Welch. A building dedicated to honor Negro veterans of World Wars was erected at Kimball in 1928, the first of its kind in the United States. The first tax-supported dental clinic in the United States. The first municipally owned and operated parking building in the United States. The largest coal-cleaning and mixing plant in the world is operated by the United States Steel Corp. at Gary. McDowell County had the first food stamp program initiated by President Kennedy in an effort to help the needy.

McDowell County has a first-class school system, many modern buildings, and probably the most hospitable people in the world. Chief among its assets are the residents. Long known for their provincial pride and independent spirit, outsiders are not surprised to hear the residents of the county speak fondly of "the Free State of McDowell."

Statistics: McDowell County, with exception of about one-fourth square mile, lies in the drainage basin of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River. The eastern edge lies in the Great Appalachian Mountain system. There are 8 municipalities, 6 magisterial districts, 108 voting precincts in this county. The assessed valuation of all classes of property in this county for 1962 is $108,783,600. Panther State Forest, 7,810.19 acres, is a beautiful forest, offering hunting and fishing, camping, cabins, swimming, picnicking, and beautiful winding mountain trails. Berwind Lake, located near War, offers the best in warm water fishing and is stocked every year with trout. There is a total of 65,582 feet of land drilled for gas, 13 gas wells complete, and 18 permits to drill or deepen.

Mrs. L. E. HAYNES.

"No Fragmented Education"—An Editorial, the Denver Register

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I now note the constitutional arguments against Federal aid to assist all schoolchildren are abandoned, as well they should be. No court interpretation could preclude assistance to any schoolchild who seeks the benefit of an education.

The more fashionable arguments against aid have been directed to policy levels. Many sincere people are disturbed by the possible fragmentation of education, resulting from parochial school aid, and a possible decrease in quality. This notion is honestly contended but I think an editorial from this Sunday's Denver Register should help to dispel it:

NO FRAGMENTED EDUCATION

A reader has asked us to give a point-blank answer to the difficulty so often raised against any aid to other than public education, the fear that any such aid will cause as many schools to develop as there are sects in the country, and that thus education would be dissipated in numerous tiny schools, none of them strong enough to impart a solid education.

The best way to exorcise the specter of educational fragmentation is to consider how many sects in America ever maintained schools of their own. The number comes to just eight, and outside the Catholics and Lutherans, what denominations now show any great determination to maintain schools of their own? The expenses and sacrifices demanded by such an undertaking, even with Government aid, are prohibitive to all except the most durable and doctrinally cohesive groups.

A Lutheran pastor recently stated the situation better than could we when he said: "Christian day schools are not built and maintained on lackadaisical, wishful thinking. They are built on the tears and sweat, sacrificing of time and money, and the long hours of wrestling in prayer with the angel of the Lord on the part of faith-filled Christian men and women."

Most Christian bodies in the United States simply do not have the integrated view of their religion with life that would induce them to maintain schools of their own. As in the past, most Protestants would settle for a school that taught a broad interdenominationalism, being content to let private home teaching fill in whatever determinate religious education was felt to be needed.

The nonviability of private schools that do not arise from intense religious conviction can be seen from what has happened to those schools in the South that were established, with State aid, for the sole purpose of circumventing integration.

The maintenance of a strong public school system can always be guaranteed by the setting aside of a certain amount of public money for its use alone. A monopolistic public school is not a strong school.

Pioneer's Cabin Nearly 200 Years Old Still Stands in Summers County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the people of West Virginia are proud of many historical monuments. One that deserves mention is the log cabin home of Col. James Graham, who first settled in what is now Summers County in 1770.

According to an article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, the Graham home is still standing, despite the fact that it withstood a savage Indian attack in 1772. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PIONEER'S CABIN NEARLY 200 YEARS OLD STILL STANDS IN SUMMERS COUNTY, W. VA.

Summers County with a land area of 358 square miles and a population of 15,640 has as the county seat the city of Hinton with a population of 5,197.

The county which was named after Hon. George W. Summers, Congressman and judge, was created by an act of the West Virginia Legislature, February 27, 1871, from territory ceded by the counties of Greenbrier, Monroe, Mercer, and Fayette.

The circumstances that led to the formation of the county are as unusual as those which led to the establishment of the State of West Virginia. In Monroe County a battle was on between Union and Centerville (now Greenville) as to which town would be the county seat. In Mercer County there was a battle royal between Princeton and Concord Church (now Athens) over the county seat and in Fayette County a battle was on between Ansted and Fayetteville. In Union, Princeton, and in Fayetteville the powers that be were willing to surrender some territory to deprive their opponents of voting power. It was to the leaders in these towns that Evan Hinton turned for support in the legislature for the creation of the new county. A courthouse fight in Raleigh County acted in reverse as a courthouse battle was on there between Beckley and Trap Hill and Beckley refused to go along with the proposition of surrendering Richmond district to the new county. Greenbrier County which has many square miles to spare agreed to give any additional territory that was needed. Summers County does not have the 400 square miles required by the Constitution and so specified in the act creating the county. It was ruled by a commission in 1893 that was appointed to settle a boundary controversy between Greenbrier and Monroe that Summers had failed to exercise jurisdiction over an area, hence had lost the territory to the other counties.

The first settlement in the county was at Lowell where Col. James Graham, Conrad

Keller, Samuel Gwinn, Jesse Beard, Jeptha Massie and other families settled about 1770. This settlement was soon followed by one on Little Bluestone in 1772 by Robert Lilly and his sons.

The Graham home, of log construction, still stands on West Virginia 3 at Lowell. It was at the Graham home that the Shawnees came to avenge the murder of their chief, Cornstalk, attacked in the summer of 1777 in which McDonald, a neighbor, was killed when the attacking Indians attempted to force the door. The Indians then entered a building in the yard and killed Sharp, the Graham servant; John, the 10-year-old son of Graham; and carried away into captivity the 7-year-old daughter, Elizabeth.

Until the completion of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway in 1873 the area comprising Summers County was engaged in agriculture. Their farms produced the food and clothing that was needed by the family. There was little to sell and very little was bought. At the time of the creation of the county there were three small stores: at Rollynsburg (now Talcott), Jumping Branch, and at Richmonds Falls. The stores also housed the three post offices.

With the start of construction in 1868 of the railroad many found work with the contractors and a ready market was found for the products of the farm. Operation and maintenance of the C. & O. has continued through the years as the main source of employment. Much of the surplus labor found employment in the development of the coal industry. With automation many have been without employment in the mines and by the C. & O.

In 1949 Bluestone Dam in New River, at Hinton, was completed. With the impoundment of the waters creating Lake Bluestone the region is rapidly developing as a recreational area. The waters of the lake provide excellent fishing and boating, and in the area which is under lease to the department of natural resources, deer, turkeys, and other game have been stocked and provide excellent hunting for 5,000 sportsmen annually. A facility is operated at Shanklins Ferry by the department of natural resources along with the Boy Scouts of America. Bluestone State Park is also in the reservoir area and has 25 cabins with other facilities. Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates operates Camp Thomas E. Lightfoot on the Greenbrier River for the benefit of the children of their employees. Camp Brookside at Brooks is operated by Carbide & Carbon Corp., Alloy, W. Va., for the children of the employees.

The synod of West Virginia, Presbyterian Church, United States, operates the Bluestone Center, which serves more than 2,500 people each season. The county court of Summers County operates Camp Summers on the Greenbrier River which is used by the Summers County 4-H Clubs and by other counties in Virginia and West Virginia. It is also used by church groups and athletic groups.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Inflatable Communications Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

INFLATABLE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota-made Echo I, the largest satellite that man has sent into orbit, is celebrating its third birthday. It was rocketed into space by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from Cape Canaveral, Fla., August 12, 1960. A completely peaceful device, dedicated to helping men all over the world to communicate better with each other, the huge satelloon has been seen by more of the earth's people than any other space vehicle.

The 100-foot-diameter plastic sphere with a mirror surface, designed and manufactured by the G. T. Schjeldahl Co. of Northfield, Minn., is still aloft and in orbit, a visible symbol of American creativity for all the world to see. Echo I has traveled some 425 million miles at an altitude averaging 1,000 miles. It has been used in countless meaningful experiments in which electromagnetic signals have been beamed to it and reflected to receivers in remote parts of the globe.

Echo I is an inflatable space vehicle. It was packed tightly into a 26½-inch canister and carried into space and into orbit in the nose cone of a Delta rocket. After it was ejected from the launcher, the canister opened, allowing the plastic sphere to spill free and become inflated by means of a subliming agent.

At the time Echo I was launched, no one foresaw that the satelloon would survive in space for more than 2 weeks. Its supply of gas to keep it inflated, of course, has long since leaked out through holes made by flying micrometeorites. But even if it has become relaxed and prune faced, Echo I demonstrated the practicability of employing large inflatable reflectors to rebound intelligent signals beamed to it.

Yet Echo I, for all its durability and longevity, is a primitive electromagnetic reflector.

Echo II, also designed and manufactured by the G. T. Schjeldahl Co., is a larger, more efficient reflector and will maintain a smooth spherical shape indefinitely. It is scheduled to be placed in orbit early in 1964. Unlike Echo I, which has a skin that "remembers" all the wrinkles it acquired in its folded condition within the canister, Echo II has a skin that is more rigid and which will "forget" its canister wrinkles. Once given a new shape after ejection from the canister and being inflated, Echo II will keep that shape, without benefit of internal inflation.

Echo II spheres are fabricated of laminated aluminum foil 0.18 mil thick, on each side of Mylar polyester 0.35 mil thick, making a total thickness of about seven ten-thousandths of an inch. The laminate, as well as the tapes that seal the gores or segments of the giant satelloon, is bonded by a specially developed Schjeldahl adhesive which will withstand the extreme temperature variations encountered in space.

The rigidized spheres weigh about 500 pounds each, compared to the lighter weight—135 pounds—Echo I. The material in the Echo II satelloons is about 50 times as rigid as the material used in Echo I.

Echo II spheres are larger—135 feet in diameter—and their skin surfaces are not so shiny as Echo I. This latter quality enables the new satelloon to have a larger circle of visible light reflectivity than does Echo I. Echo I reflects light from a disc only about 9 inches in diameter. All the rest of the light beamed to it is reflected into space. Echo II's light reflective disc will be equal to the vehicle's silhouette—135 feet in diameter. For electromagnetic reflectivity, Echo II is expected to be 100 percent more efficient than Echo I. This coupled with the fact that Echo II's permanently smooth skin will prevent scintillation and that the vehicle will be operating at a lower orbit than Echo I—700 miles against 1,000 miles—will result in a much more effective communications satellite.

Of necessity, passive communications satellites have been spherical up to this point in history. Only two, one natural passive satellite—the moon—and one artificial passive satellite—Echo I—have been used in actual experimentation. It is desirable that other shapes be given future passive communications satellites to improve the efficiency of bounced signals and it is equally important that new materials be developed that will not only help preserve the orbital life of the vehicle, but also will enhance bounced signal strength.

The Schjeldahl Co. is at present working with inflatable shapes other other than spheres and is considering devices which could be oriented by means of gravity gradients, so that they would always present a broad, effective reflective surface to the earth. One such device the Schjeldahl Co. is experimenting with is a model of an inflatable device which is in reality a segment of a sphere many times larger than the model. For communications purposes, such a small oriented device could equal in efficiency a sphere many times larger.

The Schjeldahl Co. is also at work in the development of new "advanced materials" for future space communications satelloons. One of these is a "chemically milled" plastic-to-metal lamination for Goddard Space Flight Center of NASA. The new material consists basically of a "sandwich" of ultrathin aluminum laminated by means of Schjelbond adhesive to a center piece of biaxially oriented polypropylene.

Objective of chemically milling the material is to reduce weight without sacrificing strength or impairing the material's effectiveness as an electromagnetic reflector. The new material weighs only about 60 percent of that in Echo II, yet compares favorably with it in strength and reflective properties.

The reason for milling out a pattern of holes in the material is that solar radiation acts on an opaque surface much as wind acts on a sail. On a large satelloon orbiting in space, this pressure has the undesirable effect of slowing the vehicle and altering its orbit. In order to minimize this effect, the Schjeldahl Co. is milling out a pattern of hexagonal "windows" from the aluminum in the sandwich, leaving the transparent polypropylane intact.

The inflatable concept is by no means confined to passive communications satellities. They have applications with the active repeated type satellites as well. Huge inflatable antennas, precisely designed and constructed, can be inflated in space to enable maximum propagation of the active satellite's signal. The inflatable concept may also be applied in building all kinds of space structures. Such a method shows promise in solving the problems of creating space stations in which men could survive in the space environment.

Gilmore T. Schjeldahl, president of the Northfield firm, points out that the work the Schjeldahl Co. is carrying on has many applications in space research:

> Whenever a large shape in space is required, we believe we can often provide it efficiently and economically by means of satelloon-type vehicles shot up by rockets in small compact packages.
>
> Once aloft and in orbit, these small packages will instantly inflate to become massive rigidized structures. Their economy and compactness argue for their continued application.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Roland H. del Mar, on July 27, 1963, spoke to the Círculo de Puerto Rico, a social organization composed principally of Puerto Rican people in the Washington, D.C., area, in commemoration of the 11th anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which anniversary was July 25.

The Círculo de Puerto Rico was, indeed, honored to have General del Mar as their speaker, since the general as a former commander of the Antilles, based in San Juan, P.R., well knows the Puerto Rican people. In his post as commander of the Antilles, General del Mar became one of us and he is respected and affectionately regarded by the Puerto Rican community.

For his outstanding performance as commander of the Antilles, General del Mar was, on July 30, 1963, awarded the Legion of Merit, which is added to the other decorations which he holds: the Bronze Star, the Army Commendation Ribbon, the Oak Leaf Cluster, and the U.N. Medal.

Because General del Mar is so penetrating in his remarks on the activities and developments in the island of Puerto Rico today and some of the needs of the future, I thought that my colleagues would be interested in reading the general's remarks to the Círculo de Puerto Rico.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS TO CIRCULO DE PUERTO RICO IN HONOR OF CONSTITUTION DAY OF THE COMMONWEALTH, JULY 27, 1963

I have been honored to be invited to speak to you tonight. I wish I could speak to you in a humorous vein, but the occasion is of a more serious nature and I believe I should have a more serious, if not nostalgic vein, in my remarks tonight.

All of us are here tonight because of our love of Puerto Rico. Actually, in one way, we are no different in our sentiments than the many people from all over the United States who live in Washington and who are engaged in Government activities. There are literally scores of groups in Washington who get together because their people come from a certain State, a certain university, or belong to various organizations and periodically want to renew acquaintances, or hear familiar voices, or live all over again happy experiences and scenes of by gone days with kindred spirits.

On the other hand, there is a nostalgia for Puerto Rico that permeates Puerto Ricans who were born there, have relatives there, or, as in our own case, have lived there long enough to appreciate the warmth of the people, the beauty of the scenic vistas, or have enjoyed the year-round climate, pleasant breezes, and ever-blooming countryside. It is said that there is a mysticism to an island; that its people never lose their innate desire to return—a magnetic current; an invisible call of life itself.

Many of you have not been back for many years. Many of you have not seen the island newspapers or magazines in years. Yet you know or sense that the island is changing for the better. I wish I could paint the complete picture of what is there now, but it would take too long. Maybe some day there can be shown to you the marvelous colored motion pictures—about six of them—now produced and distributed by the Commonwealth to show the unbelievable development of the island in the past 20 years.

The population on the island itself has almost doubled in the past 25 years. Automobiles have increased almost 15 times since 1940. The university now has over 20,000 students and 1,500 professors. And the enrollment has increased in the Catholic University and Inter-American University. I believe some 900 industries have come to Puerto Rico since 1946 and about 700 are still in operation. For the first time, last year, the value of dairy products, cattle, and poultry production exceeded sugarcane, so a one-crop economy is long a thing of the past. In addition, pineapple is coming to the fore and new coffee crop production methods are in the offing.

In addition to about 500,000 tourists last year, some 20,000 Latin Americans came to Puerto Rico to determine how so much progress had been made in 25 years. Also, thousands of Africans and Asians from the new countries as well as the old come to observe, learn, and take away ideas for their development. Besides the constant flight of planes to and from New York, Washington, and Miami, three aviation lines now fly between South America-Puerto Rico and direct to Europe with six flights each week each way. Puerto Rico is becoming a hub of the hemisphere due to its location and the jet air age as well as because of its unusual development.

Hotels, apartments, condominiums are going up everywhere. The skyline of the Candado is crisscrossed with derricks and construction equipment. New low-cost housing developments continue to rise and to be planned for. Beautiful residential sections have come into existence. Highway improvement is taking place. A huge, new stadium is now available for sports and spectacular shows. Parking buildings have come into existence as in Washington, but more are needed. The harbor is being dredged and deepened and new port construction is in the offing due to the tremendous worldwide shipping utilizing it.

But with all the progress, there are gaps. The upsurge in so many areas has not been compensated for in all areas. Both the Commonwealth and the public are well aware of the problems and everybody is trying to correct the deficiencies, all of which require money, time, and cooperative effort. More schools, more hospitals, more housing, more roads are required. More medical practitioners, more engineers, more technicians, more managerial help—administrators and organizers—are in constant demand. The colleges and vocational schools cannot meet the demand at present. Wages are at an all-time high, but many people have no skills to offer industry.

The public press is absolutely free and all the problems of the island are covered daily by letters to the editors, editorials, reportorial investigations, and legislative activities. There is no embarrassment or fear on the part of anybody to express their opinions on what is wrong and what ought to be done. The plebiscite, of course, has had ample coverage daily for months. Let us hope that in the heat of argument, hot tempers, and constant counteraccusations that bitter feelings will not permanently arise to halt the continued sociological, economical, and cultural development of the island. The island cannot afford a split into irreconcilable camps of hard feelings.

In the cultural fields, the island has not halted. For those who want art in any form, there is always something occurring as art exhibits come from many countries, musical groups from Latin America and Spain, and the natural and wonderful talents of the Puerto Ricans themselves rise to entertain their fellow citizens and then seek other shores. There is never a week when dramas, musicals, concerts, poetry readings, recitals, orchestras, lectures, etc., are not available at the university, the Ateneo Puertorriqueño, the Instituto de Cultura, the Casa de España, the Musical Conservatory, and now even at San Cristobal.

Did you know that one of the most important collections of antique books in Spanish is now housed at the Amigos de Calle del Cristo with 4 percent of the world's known books printed in Spain prior to 1500? Did you know that at Ponce is an art gallery considered by many to have one of the foremost collections of famous oil paintings in the Western Hemisphere? A new museum of the military history of Puerto Rico has opened at San Geronimo—unique and fascinating. Another museum will be opened shortly by the Instituto de Cultura.

Cornell University is installing one of the world's great celestial telescopes near Arecibo. The university is cooperating in atomic research. Medical research on tropical diseases has brought doctors and medical conventions to the island. And, as you know, the U.S. Government is utilizing the talents of more and more of our Puerto Ricans in hemispheric affairs; notably among these are Dr. Arturo Morales Carrion, Department Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, Department of State, and Mrs. Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, while others have been sent on special missions, conferences, etc., to Central and South America such as Sr. Enrique Campos del Toro, Sr. Horace Davila, Sr. Rafael Carrión, Sr. Sol Luis Descartes, and many others. Chancellor Jaime Benitez has been called upon to lecture in the States many times and Jesús Maria Sanroma has been honored in the States twice this past year for his musical abilities. Ballerinas and opera stars are now in England, Spain, Italy, and Germany from Puerto Rico.

Sports are coming to the fore not only because of the racetrack, basketball tournaments, baseball, golf championships, and auto racing, but now swimming, and tennis, are coming into their own with world champions in the offing. I understand the Carnival was the best this year it has ever been. Horseback riding and horse shows may yet take their place in public favor. And of course, the deep-sea fishing sport, is now hemispherically well known.

And last, but possibly most important, is the social consciousness of the Puerto Rican people themselves. In all my experience, I have never known a people who are giving so much of themselves to help the poor, underprivileged, and ill. Every civic club is doing something in its community to better the life of its people. Literally dozens upon dozens of citizens' organizations seem to be eternally on the drive for more funds to help crippled children and adults, the deaf and dumb, the blind, the underprivileged, the orphans; even the prison inmates and their families and children.

I could go on and on, but I must stop. I wish you could see with me the magnificent view as one crosses the mountains on the new highway from Mora to Moca to Mayaguez; the busy scene on the cool tropical campus at the CAMA; the bay at Fajardo with its many boats; the gorgeous valleys and mountains around Utuado; the views from near Juana Diaz and Villaba; the winding road from Guayama to Cayey; the sunny plazas of so many towns of happy people. An island unique, wonderful, and different—your island.

May the good Lord watch over the island and its people; give guidance to its leaders; and preserve a people who have come so far in so short a time; a wonderful, gracious, friendly, ever-striving people who gave us much happiness.

Patriotism Still Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the very excellent talk given by Mr. LeRoy M. Strickland, Jr., chairman of the Americanism Committee, Florida State Elks Association, in June 1963, at Community Flag Day ceremonies at Tallahassee, Fla., and Sarasota, Fla.

This was a very excellent address, one which I commend to all Members of the Congress to read:

PATRIOTISM STILL BURNS

"The Order of Elks is distinctively American. Linking the destiny of our order with the destiny of our country, we have made its flag the symbol of the crowning virtue." Many of you recognize these lines taken from the Elks' ritual. The order of Elks is distinctively American, an American organization, a national organization, not an international organization. In these days of international organization. In these days of internationalism, where forces are at work to reduce every country, every individual to the lowest comon denominator, I thank God for an American order that proudly proclaims its allegiance to its country and its flag.

We have linked the destiny of our order with the destiny of our country. As America goes, so goes the order of Elks. Because of this, we, as Elks, have a distinct responsibility in the future of our Nation. Where has America been? Where does she stand today? Where are we going tomorrow? As Americans and patriots, as Elks, we must ask these questions and we must seek truthful answers.

Ours is a glorious past. A nation carved from a wilderness by a handful of rugged individualists. A nation which fought and won its independence from one of the most powerful countries of the world. A nation founded on the greatest man-written document in the history of mankind, the Constitution of the United States. A nation which readily admitted it achieved its being from God. What American, what Elk, does not thrill to the words of Patrick Henry, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." Have we forgotten the sage words of Benjamin Franklin, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

We are a people who stood united in our efforts to overthrow the tyrant Hitler, the man whom no one believed when he proclaimed his intention to rule the world. Hitler was an amateur when compared with the danger we face today. A force, like Hitler, that has written and proclaimed many times its intention to conquer the world. While Hitler's conquests were limited to only a few nations, today's evil, international communism, has enslaved over a billion people.

Lenin said, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, and then we will surround America the last citadel of capitalism. We shall not have to attack. She will fall into our lap like an overripe fruit."

Were Lenin's words and his plan for the triumph of communism merely boasts? Lenin laid the plan and how perfectly have his followers carried it out. "First we will take Eastern Europe." In Russia, the Kerenski Republic fell to communism in 1917. In 1940 Communist Russia annexed Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, then, followed World War II, the remainder of Eastern Europe and the majority of the Baltic countries fell—Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia Eastern Germany.

"Then the masses of Asia." In 1949 communism won control of China and began spreading the remainder of Asia.

"Then we will surround America the last citadel of capitalism." Remember the Monroe Doctrine? The document that so clearly guaranteed all the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere against European interference "for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any manner their destiny." Would you have dreamed, even as late as 1960, that Cuba would today be a stronghold for Communist subversion to all the Americas? Think * * * think how cleverly, how subtly your mind has been conditioned to accept a Communist Cuba. A short time back you would have defiantly rejected any thought of Cuba becoming a Communist satellite. Today, we not only accept it, our Government is making every effort to suppress any attempts by anti-Castro exiles to free their country. Yes, Lenin predicted communism would surround America. Cuba has become the springboard from which this portion of Lenin's plan is being realized. And the ironic truth is that we could have stopped communism dead in its tracks without Castro ever gaining power but for the efforts of certain members of the U.S. State Department, members of the liberal press and other opinion-molding Americans. Members of the U.S. State Department knew as early as 1958 that Castro was a Communist and was surrounded by Communists, yet, they persisted in their efforts to further his rise to power. A large portion of the opinion-molding press glorified Castro as a modern day George Washington through clever editorials, articles in national magazines, television and on and on.

Americans were actually brainwashed into accepting Castro, thus paving the way for a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere.

Will America fall like an overripe fruit into the laps of the Communists? Will the final act of Lenin's plan become a reality? Only the American people hold the answer to this question.

All is not black today. Patriotism and love of country still burns in the hearts of most Americans. We have our new set of heros. Such names as Glenn, Grissom, Shepard, Carpenter, Schirra, and Cooper. These are men who are not ashamed of old-fashioned patriotism. John Glenn says he gets a tingling feeling down inside when he sees the flag go by.

Today, our country still has a a choice. I believe we, the grassroots people of our Nation, people like you, the members and friends of the Order of Elks, have already begun to make that choice. I believe that we are going back to our old beliefs in such things as ideals, pride, patriotism, loyalty, devotion, and even hard work.

Yes, I said hard work. The president of the Florida State Elks Association, Thomas E. Mallem, has charged your State Americanism committee to develop a program which will stress and encourage lodges to sponsor appropriate methods to combat subversive activities, to sponsor and support patriotic programs, to encourage the display of the American flag, to participate in community Flag Day ceremonies, and to participate in and sponsor programs which support the traditions of our country.

To develop a program which will accomplish this very large order will take a lot of hard work. Hard work and planning on the part of your State Americanism Committee. Hard work and cooperation on the part of all lodges. As chairman of your State Americanism Committee, I can promise that your State committee is planning one of the most comprehensive Americanism programs ever offered the Elks of Florida. We are in a position to do this because of the trailblazing and strong foundation laid during the past 3 years by the former chairman, Brother Otto Wettstein of Live Oak. When our program is presented to your lodge, we ask that you back us 100 percent.

Let us, as Elks, do our part in guiding the destiny of our country. Let us become the symbol of freedom in America. We are well over a million strong. Let us, as Elks become a flame that will ignite America with a courage and a will to win over communism. Let the fuse of freedom be ignited here, with the Elks in Florida; let it spread throughout the Elks in the Nation and let it explode with a great burst of patriotism.

Planning for Tomorrow: Assuring Employment, Retirement, and Contentment for Our Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of our older citizens is an issue with which all Americans must deal. When should retirement occur? How should it be financed? How can older people be encouraged to live out rich, full lives? Twenty-five million Americans over 60 want the answer.

One central problem related to the welfare of our older citizens is that of persistent unemployment. Naturally enough, younger workers tend to be hired first when job openings occur. Many people 60 and over are faced with idleness, inadequate income, and unhappiness just at the time when they could be enjoying their most pleasant years. The American people acting through their Government can, however, take action to change this picture within this Nation's existing social and economic framework.

First. Older workers should be given the chance to retire with full old-age survivors and disability insurance—OASDI—at age 60, women at 55. Current ages are 65 for both with full benefits. The full benefits themselves should be increased in accordance wtih current living costs. Average rates allow $69 monthly for a 55-year-old-male retiree; $121 monthly for a couple; and only $57 monthly for a worker's widow. These should be increased to $100 monthly per person, regardless of status, still not a living wage rate, but somewhat more reasonable.

Estimated cost of reduction to age 60 at current pension rates: 1½ percent of payroll.

Effect: Encourage more people to retire at an earlier age with fewer financial worries, finances being clearly the cardinal factor in the employment-retirement choice for the aging. Of course, earlier voluntary retirements at a reasonable pension rate would make available more jobs for younger workers, thus alleviating unemployment.

Second. The transition from full-time employment to complete retirement should be made more gradual and more attractive in and of itself. One possible device: a 3-day workweek for workers during their last 3 years on the job; that is, the 57 to 60 years, so that potential retirees begin to learn how to make good use of their free time. A full work force could still be maintained, of course, by having the other half reported Thursday through Saturday. Such a plan, of course, would have to be modified to meet special circumstances. Simply stated, this gradual retirement changes a person's view on later life to one of an opening rather than one of a closing door. As for compensation, the transitional worker would receive half of his salary from his employer, and half of his full retirement benefits from the Government, switching to full Federal benefits at age 60.

Third. John F. Kennedy, February 21, 1963:

> It is not enough for a great nation merely to have added new years to our lives—our objective must also be to add new life to those years.

Retirement can and should be a rewarding experience. With financial worries reduced and other interests awakened, the retirement years will be looked forward to rather than feared by many American workers nearing retirement.

By reducing financial insecurity, retirement can be made more attractive. The Government should lead in this effort, not by appropriating any funds directly to aid the 60-plus age group, but rather, by allowing certain tax relief to our older citizens somewhat along the lines proposed in the Kennedy tax program. The major important variation therefrom is the lowering of the common retirement age from 65 to 60. This relief, plus other incentives available to those who seek them, are as follows:

First. Removal of outside income limitations when receiving benefits within the OASDI social security system;

Second. A $300 flat tax credit for all taxpayers 60 or over, and no tax whatsoever on incomes below $4,800 annually;

Third. Devices designed to develop new interests (a) eliminate 5-percent airline tax to encourage travel, and 8 cents a gallon gasoline tax; (b) eliminate admission fees to national parks, shrines, et cetera; (c) charge no fees to people over 60 taking adult education courses at schools and colleges receiving any form of Federal aid—if they pass entrance examinations;

Fourth. Encourage older people to particiapte in the Kennedy Food Stamp Program where operative;

Fifth. Give older citizens the opportunity to participate in useful community and volunteer programs, where their experience would be valuable. The establishment of the National Service Corps modeled after the Peace Corps would be a perfect outlet for the energies and enthusiasm of our older citizens.

These ideas are by no means inclusive, but only suggestive of the many avenues open to our Nation in dealing with the challenge presented by an ever-increasing older population in a climate of sustained unemployment. We can only create jobs by creating a rewarding and happy retirement for millions of our older workers.

True, the scope and cost of effective action seems great, especially in its initial stages, but the cost of inaction will become a national burden for many decades. Helping people and encouraging them to help themselves has always been a part of our American tradition. The call has come, and it must be answered.

The 'Quoddy Comedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have brought to the attention of this House the zealous ambition of the administration to run roughshod over private interests and spread Government control over the distribution of electric power.

The editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of August 9 stated this newest attempt to revive Passamaquoddy has comic-opera aspects.

Well, I suppose if the matter was not so serious to the taxpayer it might be funny. I personally feel, however, that when we are contemplating the spending of at least $1 billion to start another questionable project it ceases to be funny and becomes a dead serious matter.

If it will cost $1 billion to complete this project how much will it cost to produce and distribute this power?

Rather than being named the "Quoddy" project perhaps we should rename it the "Shoddy" project. In any event I include in the RECORD the latest comment on this new proposed boondoggle.

THE 'QUODDY COMEDY

The attempt to revive Passamaquoddy certainly has its comic-opera aspects. Chief among them is the series of 1-night stands Interior Secretary Udall has been conducting up and down Maine, complete with magic lantern slides, to explain to skeptical natives that "this is not the old Quoddy project."

Maybe it isn't, but it bears a strange resemblance to the tidal power project on which the New Deal began work in 1935 with $7 million in relief funds. A year later Congress, scenting more pork than even it could stomach, ordered work stopped. Since then, most recently in 1961, at least two agencies have reviewed the possibility of pursuing the project again and have reported that it isn't any more economically feasible than it was almost three decades ago.

Then the Interior Department suddenly announced the other day that due to the availability of more efficient electrical equipment the 'Quoddy project was indeed feasible and could be successfully completed for little more than $1 billion. That figure sure isn't the same as the old 'Quoddy initial $7 million.

The ostensible theory behind this scheme is basically pretty simple. The ocean's tides around Passamaquoddy Bay, at the Maine-Canadian border, average about 20 feet. When the tide's in, the bay could be made into a sort of trap, with a series of huge dams on the ocean side keeping the water from flowing out. The trapped water then could, when desired, be dropped through a series of turbines to produce electricity.

But at what cost, apart from that measly $1 billion? A joint United States-Canadian commission estimates the delivered cost of 'Quoddy power at more than double that from new steam plants in the area. Moreover, some Republicans have been unkind enough to observe that 'Quoddy's revival would give the appearance of doing something for Maine while, coincidentally, the State's Democratic Senator is coming up for reelection.

Somehow you'd think today's sophisticated politicians would have better taste than to resurrect 'Quoddy, a deal so shoddy the very name has long been a synonym for boondoggle. Or if it's just that they're addicted to low comedy, they should be told it isn't particularly funny any more.

The Francis Case Memorial Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the late Senator Francis Case's love for this Nation's Capital was surpassed only by his love for South Dakota. He devoted his quarter century in Congress to building both of them, along with many notable contributions to the betterment of the Nation as a whole.

Senator Case was one of the few Members of Congress who truly earned the reputation of a friend of the District of Columbia. By virtue of his chairmanship of the Senate District Committee in 1953 and 1954, he served as "mayor of Washington" and secured enactment of the District public works program.

In 1959 when he was already burdened by numerous responsibilities having direct application to his own State, he volunteered to resume service on the District Committee.

It is largely through his efforts that the voteless residents of the Capital City will be privileged to vote for the first time in a presidential election next year.

Therefore, I am pleased to introduce today a joint resolution designating the bridge constructed over the Washington Channel of the Potomac River, in the District of Columbia, as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge." I am hopeful the House of Representatives, where Francis Case spent 14 fruitful years, will join the other body in approving it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of this resolution be printed as a part of my remarks:

JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE BRIDGE CONSTRUCTED OVER THE WASHINGTON CHANNEL OF THE POTOMAC RIVER, IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS THE "FRANCIS CASE MEMORIAL BRIDGE"

Whereas the Congress and the citizens of the District of Columbia are sorely saddened by the tragic and untimely passing of one of the District's most dedicated and resourceful friends, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Francis Case; and

Whereas during his long and distinguished career in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, Francis Case was know and respected for his courage and untiring devotion to duty, and was loved for his sincerity, modesty, and understanding; and

Whereas he attained enviable stature and esteem for his constant cooperation, his wise counsel, and his broad comprehension of planning and development in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas Francis Case was an architect of the twenty-third amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for electors for President and Vice President; and

Whereas during his years of service Francis Case sponsored almost numberless measures for improvements in the District of Columbia and served as chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in 1953 and 1954; and

Whereas, through diligent study of past, present, and future District of Columbia needs, Francis Case gained a thorough grasp of District activities and helped fashion firm policies that will guide the District for decades; and

Whereas, after having served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia through the years 1951 to 1954, Francis Case returned voluntarily to the committee in 1959 and 1960 to serve again the people of the District despite his increased responsibilities in the United States Senate; and

Whereas his able and dedicated service as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works contributed immeasurably to the development and improvement of the highway transportation system in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it was through his remarkable dedication to duty that Francis Case helped bring about major District of Columbia expansion of highway and bridge construction, through the enactment of the District of Columbia public works program in 1954, that is a lasting monument to his service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the bridge crossing the Washington Channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95, approximately 100 yards downstream from the outlet gate of the Tidal Basin, near the intersection of the extension of Thirteenth and G Streets Southwest, shall be known and designated as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge." Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge."

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall—

(1) place on the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge" plaques of suitable and appropriate design; and

(2) in connection with the opening of such bridge to the public, provide for suitable ceremonies honoring the late Francis Case, United States Senator from the State of South Dakota, for his many valuable services for and on behalf of the residents of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the wife of the late Senator Francis Case, Myrle Case; his daughter, Jane Case Commander; and his granddaughter, Catherine.

Oliver LaFarge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 2, Oliver LaFarge, historian, anthropologist and Pulitzer Prize-winning author died at the age of 61 in Albuquerque, N. Mex. He was a great American, a renowned humanitarian and author who used his pen to further the cause of mankind.

Through his work he brought new stature to the American Indian and greater dignity to the Spanish American. These two, he said, were the ethnic groups which established the roots of our American culture and civilization in the Southwest, portraying them as humble people with a rich heritage.

The people of New Mexico loved Oliver LaFarge because he represented our State's traditions. He embodied and exemplified them in his works and in his everyday life. Our State and its people will always remember him and his legacy will live in the libraries and in the minds of all Americans—these will be his monuments reminding us that this was truly a great American.

Besides using his pen to advance the commonweal, he served his country in war, attaining the rank of colonel during World War II.

His story of Navajo Indian life, depicted in his Pulitzer Prize winning novel "Laughing Boy," launched an outstanding career in letters. His other works included a short story, "The Haunted Ground," which won him the O'Henry Memorial Prize; "Behind the Mountains," a book about the family of his charming wife, Consuelo, the Baca's from Rociada, N. Mex.; "The Year Bearer's People," "Long Pennant," "The Enemy God," and "As Long as Grass Shall Grow," and many others.

The American Indian has lost a true and dedicated friend, but the Association on American Indian Affairs, of which he was president, will continue his inspiring work.

I am happy to say that during his lifetime, he was my personal friend and his counsel was most helpful to me throughout my public life.

Oliver LaFarge never asked for personal favors. His sincerity of purpose and his dedication made him tenacious and determined when he sought a better way of life for the American Indian. Through years of fruitful endeavor his use of logic and persuasion earned him the great respect of all those with whom he came in contact. His pen was a mighty sword that cut deep and activated the thinking of men for the great causes which he espoused. Although he is no longer with us, the American landscape will be enriched because his presence will continue to be notable in the indelible contributions which he made as a man of letters and a great humanitarian.

His lovely wife, Consuelo, and his children can justly say that this great American endowed them with a heritage which will live forever.

Good News for Tree Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, research continues to make great progress in developing new uses for the products of our forests.

Tree growing is a certain source of income for millions of American farmers. Tree growing creates no surpluses in Government warehouses and is no headache for the Congress nor the Department of Agriculture.

The following article, which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, August 1, 1963, will be of interest to the American farmer who is investing millions in tree planting and modern methods of tree culture:

PAPER TOGS FOR NURSES IN BRITAIN; NOT HERE YET

Hospitals are starting to get rid of almost everything but the patients.

At one English hospital, nurses are even going to try out throw-away paper uniforms, according to the Manchester Guardian.

Disposables are "the coming thing," affirms a Georgetown University Hospital official here, although he adds that "we haven't got around to uniforms yet."

A spot check of Washington hospitals, however, showed that throw-away items in use here range from laboratory trays to washcloths, nursery caps and water pitchers.

But it seems doubtful anyone can match Acton Hospital in Middlesex, England, where a 12-month experiment with as many as 170 disposable items is getting underway.

Nurses in one ward there will wear proper jackets, aprons and caps for a month as part of the project.

Acton officials are also trying out disposable paper blankets—although they start shredding a bit too soon for their liking—as well as many other coverings, utensils and containers aimed at reducing infection and saving money.

Among other disposable items on the market are laundry bags. Georgetown Hospital, for example, is considering these, according to Assistant Director Albert M. Biecich.

"You just stuff in the linen, toss everything in the washing machine and the bag dissolves when the water temperature gets to a certain level," he said. "We've been assured it won't damage the machinery."

"Of course, the salesmen say all the items are cheaper, but some of them are kind of expensive at the outset and the saving in labor doesn't always follow," said Victor F.

Ludewig, administrator at George Washington University Hospital.

Ludewig said his hospital uses various disposable items, including paper drapes to toss over patients on the operating tables. But he seemed skeptical about uniforms.

"I don't know what would happen if they got wet," he said.

Views on Skagit Channel Vary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers is making a study of the Skagit River in my congressional district to determine whether or not the channel should be dredged between Mount Vernon and Concrete.

The possibility of dredging has been the subject of editorials in several newspapers. For example, the Seattle (Wash.) Times on July 22 carried an editorial entitled "Threat to Skagit River Fish." The following day the Skagit Valley Herald of Mount Vernon, Wash., published an editorial, "Channel to Concrete." These editorials were followed by another in the Concrete (Wash.) Herald.

Mr. Speaker, those who read these editorials, which I include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, will find that the views on this subject vary.

The editorials follow:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, July 22, 1963]

THREAT TO SKAGIT RIVER FISH

Commercial and sports fishermen are alarmed over an active project of the Corps of Engineers to dredge a channel in the Skagit River through the 40-mile reach between Mount Vernon and Concrete. Studies to be completed next summer will determine the economic feasibility of the project to permit barge and log-boom navigation of the river, perhaps resulting in further industrial development of the valley.

The State game and fisheries departments have lodged protests on the grounds that valuable fish-spawning grounds would be disturbed. They point out that the Skagit is the second largest spawning stream in the State, the Columbia River being first in this respect. From 32 to 38 percent of the Skagit's Chinook salmon are spawned, the departments declare, in the stretch between Mount Vernon and Concrete which would be dredged to provide a channel 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide. The Skagit, of course, is one of the most productive steelhead fishing streams in the Nation.

On the other side of the dispute, Skagit County industrialists and logging operators contend that use of a dredged channel would result in transportation savings of $600,000 annually, and permit fuller utilization of limestone and other mineral deposits in the upper valley. They express the belief that other industries might be developed in the county, which is classed by the Government as an area of substantial unemployment.

Here, again, is the controversy of long standing between industrial promotors and conservators of fisheries resources. The latter groups have been losing the battle. Even now they are protesting that Tacoma's municipal-lighting utility has failed to provide adequate means to preserve the fish runs on the Cowlitz River where the utility built Mayfield Dam.

The Skagit dredging project is one where the conflicts of economic interests will not be resolved easily. The State needs to develop basic industries, especially in areas of chronic unemployment. The economics of commercial and sports fishing likewise are important. The Skagit River's value as a fisheries resource is by no means confined to the valley. The migratory fish spawned in the river provide some of the best sports and commercial fishing in northern Puget Sound and beyond.

We trust that the appropriate Government agencies which will make the decision on the channel-dredging project will not only weigh the respective economic interests at issue. They should likewise take into account that they are dealing with a recreational resource whose value cannot be computed in monetary terms.

[From the Skagit Valley Herald, Mount Vernon, N.Y., July 22, 1963]

CHANNEL TO CONCRETE

A new campaign in the continuing war between conservationists and proponents of industrial development is threatening to break out on the Skagit River.

The focus of developing controversy is the proposed dredging of a 100-foot wide channel, 6 feet deep, to Concrete. The channel would open the river to tug and barge traffic and connect valley towns to salt water.

With a stagnant economy, Skagit County sorely needs to strengthen existing payrolls and to develop new employment opportunities.

Initially the navigable channel would create new activity at Lone Star Cement Co.'s upriver limestone quarry. Lone Star is anxious to switch from Canadian to Skagit County limestone at its Seattle cement plant. While this is the reason for interest in creating a navigable channel on the Skagit, it is obvious that a navigable waterway through Skagit Valley is an asset that could attract future commerce to this area.

Alarmed that fish spawning grounds will be disturbed, the State game and fisheries department has made an official protest, pointing out that roughly a third of Skagit River's Chinook salmon are spawned in the area of the proposed dredged channel. Certainly, every effort must be made to develop, not destroy, our fisheries. The complaints of the fishery people must be examined. Effective protection of the Skagit should never be allowed to become a factory or industrial stream, whose waters are charged with manufacturing waste.

Intelligent realization of the importance of clean pure water flowing through an attractive landscape must not be lost from sight in our enthusiasm to develop commerce and industry.

Fortunately, the examples set by others elsewhere in America and Europe clearly demonstrate that river commerce can be entirely compatible with the conservation.

We don't pretend that a dredged channel will not have some small effect on fish spawning despite adequate safeguards. There has to be a reasonable amount of compromise on the part of fish conservationists in order for Skagit County to enjoy vitally necessary economic growth. The conflicts that may seem to exist can most certainly be resolved by calm and constructive approach to the problem by all concerned interests.

[From the Concrete (Wash.) Herald, July 24, 1963]

The Skagit River has been getting much editorial comment lately over the proposed dredging of the channel to allow its use for barging. The contention is that such work might upset the salmon and steelhead runs. Most of this uproar is premature in that all the facts and figures are not ready for a complete study of the proposed work and its effect. That will come well before any decision is made. Let's let the engineers get their job done first, then do our talking.

Minority Needs Adequate Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we welcome the fact that the Rockford Morning Star has seen fit to understake editorial support of our project to improve minority staffing in the House of Representatives. This is an extremely important issue which deserves and indeed demands widespread public support.

The Rockford Morning Star is fulfilling its role as a responsible newspaper in calling this important matter to the attention of its readers. We commend them for their interest and hope that as a result of their efforts we shall be able to recruit additional public support for the accomplishment of this goal.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

MINORITY NEEDS ADEQUATE STAFF

Congress needs to institute reforms in the present practice of staff appointments by committee chairmen. The abuses are intolerable in representative government. Bipartisan staffing on a more equitable basis is long overdue. Further delay in correcting this disparity can be harmful to the Nation.

The controversy over the majority and minority party staffing of congressional committees arose in 1962. Republicans noted that the great bulk of professional personnel hired to assist the legislative task forces were Democratic or served only the majority party. The GOP Congressmen further noted that only 10 percent or less of the committee staffs were responsible to the minority party, despite the fact that it controlled nearly 40 percent of the seats in Congress.

If the two-party system of Government is to function properly both the majority and minority arguments must be based upon facts. Lack of sufficient investigative, research or information gathering personnel can hamper presentation of opposition policies. Without such services unwise and oftentimes purely partisan legislation can be forthcoming from Congress.

For this reason we welcome the appointment of Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Rockford, to serve on the House Republican Conference Subcommittee on Minority Staffing. The subcommittee was created last January 24 by Representative GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan, conference chairman as part of the GOP's continuing campaign to win greater representation on House standing committees.

Committees serve as a filtering process through which Congress puts various pieces of legislation. The procedures eliminate laws dangerous to the public. Because of the volume of legislation introduced—more than 17,000 bills in a single session of Congress—it is impossible for any single Congressman to be even partially informed on more than a few bills. The five types of committees—standing, special or select, joint, subcommit-

tees and conference—with their qualified staffs make mass deliberation possible.

As the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has worked out, in nearly all cases the majority, and often the chairman alone, hires and fires staff personnel who provide the special studies or investigations. Republicans say that the minority has lacked sufficient personnel to provide constructive criticism of majority programs and to provide alternative programs.

On half of the 20 standing committees of the House of Representatives there is no Republican staff member to answer a GOP member's information requirements, while the ratio is 11 to 1 among personnel on 20 standing committees in the Senate. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has 22 employees, none of whom is assigned to assist the minority party, while the House Foreign Affairs Committee has 15 staff members and none assigned to the minority. Still the two committee chairmen deny that their staffs are partisan.

Republican Members of Congress cannot depend entirely on their personal staff and inadequate assistance from the legislative reference and counsel agencies to prepare minority programs. Congress needs to accept a view that more satisfactory relationship can be achieved by providing the minority with a fixed and permanent ratio of investigative personnel to whom they can have confidence. Such personnel should not be wholly "captive" by the majority, regardless of which party is in power.

No Discriminatory Ordinances in Honolulu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it with pride that I submit for the RECORD a copy of a letter from the city corporation counsel's office to the city council of the city and county of Honolulu. Even though there is less evidence of racial prejudice in Hawaii than anywhere else on the face of the globe, the City Council for the City and County of Honolulu had requested its legal counsel to review all ordinances to make certain that there was none which fostered discrimination on account of race or ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, we in Hawaii find that the spirit of aloha, the spirit of friendliness, makes life more pleasant. The action of the Honolulu City Council in requesting this study indicates that although we are further advanced in this field than our sister States, we do not consider ourselves perfect and are striving to do better. Racial prejudice has not been completely eliminated in our Aloha State, but there is a constant effort toward eliminating that which still remains. The letter reads as follows:

JULY 19, 1963.

Hon. Chairman and Members of the City Council, City and County of Honolulu, Honolulu, Hawaii.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to your request we have reviewed the ordinances of the city and county of Honolulu to ascertain whether or not there is in existence any ordinance provision discriminatory in nature based on race or ancestry.

Please be advised that our search has disclosed no ordinance provision of the type referred to above.

In addition, we have made a random check of departmental procedures and practices, as well as permits and licenses issued by the several departments, but have found no evidence of discriminatory practices.

Very truly yours,

HIROMU SUZAWA,
Deputy Corporation Counsel.

Approved.

STANLEY LING,
Corporation Counsel.

The Same Old Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News:

THE SAME OLD QUESTION

A dispatch from Washington the other day told us that the commanding general of the Army Electronics Command at Fort Monmouth, N.J., had credited Hoosier Congressman EARL WILSON with making disclosures that have started a full-scale investigation into procurement of various kinds of equipment by that command.

In a speech on the House floor, Representative WILSON said Maj. Gen. Stuart Hoff, top man in the Fort Monmouth operation, had written him to say that as a result of his (WILSON'S) inquiries into the purchase of flight attitude indicators for military aircraft, the Electronics Command has undertaken an intensive review to guard against future unnecessary procurement of items that aren't needed.

Representative WILSON said Hoff informed him that procurement of 69 of the indicators had been canceled, saving the taxpayers another $55,000. On a previous proposed purchase $338,000 was saved when the procurement was canceled and stockpiles of 12,000 of the almost obsolete equipment turned up, WILSON declared.

Congressman WILSON has been something more than a nettle in the side of the Nation's defense establishment for some time now through his continuing probe of waste and needless spending.

"This is just another example," WILSON said, "of how the Congress can police the sole source and negotiated procurements of the military and thereby save taxpayers' dollars. It is another case that clearly illustrates the need for the blue-ribbon congressional watchdog committee that will be set up to ride herd on such purchases if my bill, H.R. 4409, is enacted by the Congress." He again predicted that the savings of such a committee would run into the billions.

If a committee such as Representative WILSON seeks, can save the billions of dollars he predicts, or even millions, then by all means let's get it.

But the same old question arises: Why wasn't this done before? And, for that matter, why is the Nation's vast military establishment apparently unable to achieve a measure of efficiency and devotion which would make unnecessary a constant over-the-shoulder view at everything it does?

FBI's Role and Record in Civil Rights Dealings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the August 5, 1963, New York Herald Tribune. It is important that everyone know and understand the true facts in this situation:

FBI'S ROLE AND RECORD IN CIVIL RIGHTS DEALINGS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Unless the role and record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in dealing with civil rights violations are widely understood, it is going to be unfairly caught in the middle of a hurtful controversy.

Already extremists on both sides are inaccurately accusing the FBI either of willfully enroaching the sovereignty of State and local agencies or of willfully neglecting to do its duty under civil rights legislation.

This kind of ill-considered, uninformed criticism of the FBI will not do anybody any good. It can only do harm.

It has already brought a strong rebuke from Director J. Edgar Hoover who, in the course of an article in the August issue of the Yale political magazine, has written:

"There are highly vocal pressure groups who feel that the FBI should be obligated to step in wherever, in their opinion, a breakdown in law enforcement has occurred. When we have declined to exceed our jurisdiction in response to these demands, extremists among these elements have gone so far to accuse the FBI of racism.

"Persons such as these are no less bigoted in their thinking than those who parade around in white sheets demanding that the FBI 'stop prying into State and local affairs' and counseling witnesses to civil rights violations: 'Don't tell FBI agents anything.'"

These words deserve to be pondered—and heeded.

The first necessity is to understand the FBI's assigned responsibilities in the area of civil rights and the limits of the jurisdiction. Its responsibilities are defined in the acts of Congress including the civil rights law of 1957 and 1960. It has been given authority to investigate these eight categories of rights violations:

1. Involuntary servitude and slavery.
2. Any infringement on the right to vote for a candidate for Federal office.
3. Conspiracies to deprive any citizen of the free exercise of any right secured to him by the Constitution or Federal law.
4. The deprivation by persons acting under the color of law of any such rights.
5. Willful obstruction of any Federal court order—such as an order requiring a public school to desegregate.
6. Interstate flight to avoid prosecution for firing or bombing private, religious, or educational institutions, or to avoid testimony.
7. Interstate transportation of any explosive with knowledge that it will be used for the foregoing purpose.
8. Use of any instrument of communication or commerce to threaten to damage private or public buildings.

These assigned duties give the FBI a wide responsibility in the area of civil rights

which it has and will carry out without apology to anybody. But it needs to be understood that the FBI is not a national police force; it is a Federal police force concerned only with Federal law. It is not an enforcement agency; it is strictly an investigative agency. It cannot and should not exceed its jurisdiction. When no violation of Federal law has taken place, it can't step in merely because there has been a breakdown of State or local law enforcement.

Civil rights cases are handled by special agents of the FBI who have completed advanced training courses which specifically qualify them to conduct such investigations.

In recent years the FBI has taken the iniative to provide civil rights training to law enforcement agencies in all parts of the country; a total of 553 special civil rights schools were conducted for police officials.

From my observation, the FBI deserves the confidence of every responsible civil rights advocate.

Who's for Civil Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1963, the following Chicago Sun-Times editorial discussed the unfortunately unsuccessful attempt to attach a civil rights amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1963. In but a few paragraphs the Sun-Times has very accurately summarized the many hours of debate which took place.

The editorial follows:

It is usually difficult to agree with the peripatetic Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York; but it is hard to argue with his recent scornful statement. Speaking in reference to civil rights POWELL said: "There are phonies on both sides. We all know that."

This week most of the phonies were on the Democratic side of the aisle. Or so it would seem.

On Tuesday the House passed a vocational educational bill that more than triples Federal aid to vocational education.

A Republican-sponsored amendment was offered to the bill that would have denied Federal aid to State-run training schools practicing racial segregation.

The amendment was defeated by a vote of 217 to 181. Those who voted against the civil rights amendment numbered 211 Democrats and 6 Republicans. All the Republicans from Illinois voted for the amendment and they were joined by two Illinois Democrats—BARRATT O'HARA and MELVIN PRICE.

On Wednesday the Senate passed, by a voice vote, a $5½ billion appropriations bill for the Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A civil rights amendment was introduced by Senator JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York. It was defeated on a motion made by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, majority leader.

This gives rise to a question. Just who is for civil rights?

Certainly not the Democrats; the members of that party in the House quite plainly indicated that they wanted Federal funds for their respective districts far more than they wanted civil rights.

The Speaker of the House, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, yesterday assured the NAACP leaders of his State that the House would stay in session until there was action on the President's civil rights program.

What sort of action the Speaker hopes to get is debatable. Certainly the outright rejection of civil rights amendments to important bills by both the Senate and the House this week do not indicate any commitment by the Democrats to the principles of civil rights. The flaming liberals of the majority party in the House seem to pledge more allegiance to the pork barrel than to equality of all men.

It is one thing to pay lipservice to a principle. It is quite another to stand up and be counted at the rollcall. It was the Republicans who stood up and were counted for civil rights this week; not the Democrats.

Guide to GOP Committee on Nuclear Testing Information Contained in the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, because of numerous requests, I have asked that a list showing location of materials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sponsored by the House Republican conference's committee on nuclear testing or myself be printed herewith. The list also includes statements by the joint GOP leadership on the subject:

GUIDE TO NUCLEAR TEST BAN PAPERS APPEARING IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD UNDER SPONSORSHIP OF HOUSE GOP CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESTING OR ITS CHAIRMAN, REPRESENTATIVE CRAIG HOSMER, JANUARY 31, 1963, TO AUGUST 8, 1963, INCLUSIVE, AND GUIDE TO GOP JOINT LEADERSHIP STATEMENTS ON TEST BAN

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD DATE AND AUTHOR OR TITLE

January 31, page 1515, Dr. Edward Teller.

February 4, page 1551, Frank J. Johnson.

February 4, page 1551, William C. Foster.

February 5, page 1742, Lewis L. Strauss (interview).

February 7, page 1861, Dr. John A. Wheeler.

February 11, page 2085, Dr. Stefan T. Possony.

February 11, page 2085, Chester C. Ward.

February 11, page 2087, first report to Republican conference by its Committee on Nuclear Testing.

February 14, page 2148, Dr. James E. Dougherty.

February 22, page A878, Dr. Richard B. Roberts.

February 28, page A1078, second report to Republican conference by its Committee on Nuclear Testing.

March 4, page 3189, Hosmer disputes Fisher.

March 5, page A1217, test ban fact sheet No. 1.

March 11, page A1287, test ban fact sheet No. 2.

March 18, page 4177, third report to Republican conference by its committee on nuclear testing.

March 19, page A1564, undetectable nuclear tests (Washington Post letter).

March 21, page 4358, the test ban—American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation, by S. Possony.

March 21, page A1590, New York Times account of GOP Nuclear Test Ban Committee's third report.

March 21, page 4334, Disarmament Agency spokesman states inaccurate test ban facts.

March 21, page 4512, Disarmament, Senator ALLOTT.

March 21, page A1636, "bury" measurement.

March 25, page A1697, American Security Council report: The Test Ban Trap.

April 9, page A2164, official organ of Communist Party reports on test ban petitions.

April 11, page A2270, censorship by subordinates blocks Presidential access to nuclear test ban facts.

April 11, page A2259, scientists are not experts on everything.

April 15, page A2306, an appraisal of Mr. Foster's views.

April 25, page A2489, Subury Daily Item explains test ban choice.

May 15, page A3069, Is it time to abandon nuclear weapons, secrecy and security?

May 16, page A3086, two Senators versus one Representative on test ban trap.

May 16, page A3135, test ban letters to colleagues.

May 16, page A3101, St. Louis Globe Democrat says "End the Test Ban Illusion."

May 23, page A3271, Hollywood American Legion opposes ineffective test ban.

May 27, page A3331, Citizens' Views on Test Ban.

May 27, page A3347, Simplified Test Ban Treaty.

May 31, page A3506, Test Ban Roundup by B. Sumner, parts I and II.

May 31, page A3507, Test Ban Roundup by B. Sumner, parts III and IV.

June 5, page 9634, Fallout Limitation Proposal.

June 10, page 9938, President Reenters Test Ban Unilateral Moratorium Trap.

July 11, page 11792, Disarmament Agency Sick.

July 16, page 12059, Who Shall Finger the Nuclear Trigger?

July 22, page A4576, Khrushchev Tells Red China That His Success in Taking Over Cuba Without War Proves That the Best Way To Bury the United States Is So-called Peaceful Coexistence.

July 23, page 12440, Pitfalls of the Moscow Partial Test Ban Treaty.

July 29, page 12849, Dr. Possony Demolishes the Overkill Argument.

July 30, page A4836, President Kennedy's Inconsistencies on the Test Ban Require Explanation.

July 30, page A4826, United States-Korean Casualties Are Test Ban Pact Casualties.

July 31, page A4889, President Should Ban the Test Ban Bandwagon Strategy.

July 31, page A4894, Military Order of World Wars Urges Caution on Test Ban.

August 1, page A4929, Test Ban Treaty Hazard: Soviets Have Super-ICBM for Delivery of Super-H-Bomb.

August 1, page A4937. Test Ban Takes Terrible Chance With Nation's Security.

August 2, page A4952, Legal Effect of Partial Test Ban Pact Only That of Unilateral Moratorium Under Provisions of Soviet Constitution.

August 2, page A4953, Has the Wolf Jumped Out of Mr. Khrushchev's Skin and a Lamb Jumped in?

August 5, page 13305, Partial Test Ban Treaty Removes the Bone From Khrushchev's Throat.

August 5, page A4960, Woolly Headed Thinking.

August 5, page A4961, Soviet Goal Remains the Same.

August 6, page A4985, Treaty Nightmare.

August 6, page A5025, American Security Council Points to Gains Soviets Expect To Make Over West Under the Partial Test Ban Treaty.

August 7, page A5037, Kennedy Atmospheric Treaty Not the Eisenhower Proposal.
August 7, page A5040, Is the Test Ban Treaty a Step Toward Peace or Toward Disaster?
August 8, page 13823, Comments on Soviet Treaty Violations.
August 8, page A5086, Why Our Top Military Oppose the Test Ban Treaty Even Though They Are Muzzled.
August 8, pages 13763–13768, Dirksen-Halleck Joint GOP Leadership Test Ban Statements During the Period May 11, 1961–June 11, 1963 (15 documents).

Diminishing Gold Supply and the Balance-of-Payments Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great many protests from constituents in connection with one of the Kennedy proposals to help solve the balance of international payments deficit. I refer to the suggested taxing of American purchases of foreign securities. Criticism of this stop-gap measure—and I find it objectionable too—is that if the administration concerned itself more with creating a favorable investment climate; an atmosphere of long range confidence, the balance-of-payments deficit would substantially resolve itself.

Meanwhile, other Kennedy proposals including certain temporary expedients such as raising the discount rate should help attract short term investment capital and thus deter its flight abroad.

As for borrowing from the International Monetary Fund it will perhaps help in a superficial way, but let us recognize a nation cannot borrow itself into solvency.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, the balance-of-payments deficit last year was the difference between the $34.2 billion Americans spent overseas and the $32 billion which foreigners spent in the United States.

The public has been given the impression that this payments deficit was the result of the outflow of investment funds but actually American investments abroad earned $3.8 billion in income which was more than the $3 billion newly invested abroad last year by Americans. So it should be understood that earnings on American-owned foreign investments exceeded the annual outgo of capital funds.

I think the real root of the payments deficit is the $2 billion that went overseas in foreign aid payments plus the $2 billion of our foreign military costs.

These two items alone resulted in a net loss of more than $4 billion or twice the payments deficit of last year. My personal feeling is that the foreign aid program is where the major cut in the deficit should be made.

However, it seems to me, there can be no true solution unless America can earn greater international confidence in our dollar by obtaining increased respect for our domestic monetary policies.

So my view is that the President has only proposed a partial solution and one too that is partially wrong.

Foreign financial experts tell us we must tighten our belts. They say we must curb spending and bring it in line with incentive tax cuts. I agree.

Mr. Speaker, the way to solve our economic problems requires self-discipline. There is no alternative; we must stop legislating more and increased benefits.

Today our gold obligation and commitments to foreigners amount to $27 billion. This is over and above our own domestic gold requirements of $12 billion. What gold do we have with which to back up this $39 billion liability? Only $15 billion in gold to meet a $39 billion obligation or a gold stock shortage in America of $24 billion. That is the bleak truth of the matter.

If foreigners suddenly started asking for gold because of fear that the dollar will be devalued, we will have to default. France and Germany together have claims on us for more gold than we could deliver, and all that stems the tide of such demands is confidence in our monetary management and fiscal policies.

Mr. Speaker, stimulation of our economy if it can be accomplished by a tax cut without inflation will invite that confidence, but let me add I don't see how that confidence—so necessary to solve the balance of payments deficit—can be induced if we continue deficit financing on the scale that has continued during the past decade and is projected in the future.

The time has come for Congress to cease spending borrowed money for things we do not need. Instead we are asked by the President to follow a program of a planned Federal deficit. Will that invite world confidence in the buying power of our dollar? On the contrary, it will create distrust and that is why foreign nations are drawing on us for gold. It is due to lack of confidence.

A dark shadow extends over our improving business activity—the stubborn balance-of-payments deficit coupled with a diminishing gold supply.

The President has suggested a plan to stem the tide. This with a stepped-up economy should help. But sooner or later—but not much later I fear—we must come to grips with a more fundamental solution and if I may sum up, I think in Federal Government austerity lies much of the answer to this final solution.

The Late Thomas F. Gregg, Former Mayor of the City of Amsterdam, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week a distinguished citizen and former mayor of the city of Amsterdam, N.Y., died suddenly and unexpectedly, Hon. Thomas F. Gregg.

Mayor Gregg was in my judgment one of the really outstanding mayors the city of Amsterdam ever had. He was a public official of courage and resourcefulness. His passing will leave a real gap in this great community in my district.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of August 6 1963:

THOMAS F. GREGG

As a man, a merchant and public official, the entire career of former Mayor Thomas F. Gregg was centered in Amsterdam. And it was a good career, marked by the highest type of citizenship and service to his community.

Those who knew "T" Gregg and called him friend will always treasure his memory. He was a fine person, with a deep appreciation of the true values of life and a ready sympathy for those in need.

Blessed with a keen Irish sense of humor, he had a rare capacity for friendship and a warm, mellow personality that attracted people wherever he went. Yet he was a man of strong convictions, never temporizing with what he believed to be right, nor hesitating to speak out against what he held to be wrong.

Even after ill health forced his retirement and brought to an abrupt end his political aspirations, Tom refused to let it get him down. To the very end, he retained his enthusiasm for all that was good in life. No one ever got more enjoyment out of telling or listening to a funny story, especially when the joke was on himself. He loved to laugh and make others laugh.

The death of Thomas F. Gregg is a loss to the city of Amsterdam and to all who knew him. It will not be the same without him.

Opinion Poll Indicates Voters' Beliefs on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently conducted an opinion poll among my constituents in the Seventh District of Indiana. I believe the results of this sampling are of significance and of interest to my colleagues.

Seventh District voters favor taking a tough stand on foreign policy. Their response shows they want strong action against Communist domination of Cuba, substantial cuts in foreign aid and no further concessions to the Russians to achieve a nuclear test ban.

Four out of five persons said we should not give further concessions to Russia to achieve a test ban. This referred to a general test ban. The partial test ban, which was concluded after the questionnaire was circulated, does not in itself represent further concessions, for we had made a similar offer a few years ago.

Opposition to large foreign aid grants is growing, with 87 percent of the replies favoring extensive reductions. Many indicated they would favor limited programs of assistance if they were confident the aid was being administered

properly. They are concerned that too much of it does not really help the people of the recipient nations and that there is waste and expensive errors.

The question on Cuba asked simply, "Do you favor stronger U.S. actions toward Cuba, even at risk of war?" Eighty percent of the replies said "Yes"; thirteen percent said "No."

In supplementary comments it was obvious that a great many Americans believe the Communist regime in Cuba represents a continuing threat to the security of the United States.

They fear that it is being used as a training ground for Communist agents who will fan out to all of the Latin American countries and produce Castro-type revolutions throughout the hemisphere.

Various countermeasures were proposed, ranging from an economic blockade to direct invasion. Those who believe the situation will right itself were very much in the minority.

Seventh District voters disapprove of reducing Federal taxes without cutting spending. Sixty-six percent of those responding do not favor a tax cut without a comparable reduction in spending. Twenty-eight percent do approve, with 6 percent having no opinion.

A compulsory program of Federal medical care for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes was turned down by 73 percent of the respondents. It was approved by 22 percent. Five percent gave no answer.

A proposal for Federal subsidies to construct mass transportation facilities in the Nation's cities was rejected by 79 percent of the replies and approved by only 10 percent. Eleven percent did not respond.

A domestic peace corps to work on social welfare projects in depressed areas, slums, Indian reservations, and other places was favored by 52 percent of the persons replying. Forty-three percent said "No," with 5 percent having no opinion.

A youth conservation corps, similar to the CCC's of the thirties, which would employ young men at $60 a month to work in forests and parks, was supported by 54 percent of the replies and opposed by 40 percent. Six percent did not express an opinion.

Strong public sentiment favoring a constitutional amendment expressly permitting nondenominational prayer in public schools was expressed. Better than four out of five favor such an amendment.

Additional comments indicated the voters do not want anyone to be forced into such exercises but they do not believe optional participation invades the freedom of belief of those who do not wish to participate.

There is great interest in this matter, which is partly shown by the fact that only 3 percent failed to make a "yes" or "no" answer.

We all recognize our duty to know the thoughts and beliefs of our constituents and to be the spokesmen of these views in the House of Representatives. It is not an easy task to keep well acquainted with voter sentiments in districts that cover large areas and contain populations of 300,000 or more. In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls I receive, I greatly appreciate the many personal contacts I have with Seventh District people. I believe this poll is worthwhile in keeping closely in touch with the legislative wishes of the people, and consequently being better able to represent them. Each of those who replied helped to form this cross section of public opinion, and demonstrated the willing participation and interest in public affairs which has been the hallmark of American citizenship.

I commend this insight into the thinking of my constituents to all of my colleagues for I know these people to be truly representatives of the finest traits and characteristics of this Nation.

Final summary of opinion poll conducted by Congressman William G. Bray, 7th District, Indiana

Do you favor:	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Further U.S. concessions to obtain a nuclear test ban with Russia?	16	80	4
2. Extensive reductions in our foreign-aid expenditures?	87	10	3
3. Stronger U.S. actions toward Cuba, even at risk of war?	80	13	7
4. A tax cut even if there is not a comparable reduction in Federal spending?	28	66	6
5. Compulsory Federal medical care for the aged under social security as proposed in King-Anderson bill?	22	73	5
6. Federal subsidies for mass transportation in the Nation's cities?	10	79	11
7. A Domestic Peace Corps to work on social welfare projects in depressed areas, slums, Indian reservations, etc.?	52	43	5
8. A Youth Conservation Corps, similar to the CCC's of the 1930's, employing young men at $60 a month to work in forests and parks?	54	40	6
9. A constitutional amendment to permit prayer, optional and nonsectarian, in public schools?	81	16	3

Fascinating Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the past several months, there has been considerable discussion in the House of Representatives concerning the establishment of an aquarium in the National Capital. Voices have been raised in criticism of the public purpose of such an undertaking.

The following editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 8, 1963, indicates the reaction of the Cleveland community for a comparable facility:

FASCINATING FISH

Cleveland has a chance to have one of the finest aquariums in the land, and now that the decision on its location has been made, it is a community responsibility to see that the new museum will be a model.

Some folks who aren't familiar with the present fish house, off East 72d Street overlooking Lake Erie, don't know what they are missing. Even in the present cramped quarters, the displays are fascinating and attendance has been running 250,000 and more a year. This number undoubtedly will multiply with the new building's opening.

The new aquarium should be a real showplace, since the Leonard C. Hanna, Jr., fund has provided $300,000. In addition it will have the benefit of the experience and ingenuity of Director William E. Kelley, whose dedication to his work is tremendous and contagious.

Kelly has raised the aquarium's standards vigorously, both by the unusualness of many of the displays and through his research which has prolonged the life of rare marine specimens in the collection.

The new building, adjoining the present small one in Gordon Park, may seem out of the way to many, but actually it will be within quick driving time for the greater part of the county when the freeway network is further along, since it's near the shoreway.

To take care of more visitors, much more parking will have to be provided than is available now. The city must cooperate in guaranteeing the needed space.

To make the new aquarium even better than the Hanna Fund's gift contemplates, many Greater Clevelanders may want to consider making donations, either for the building or for displays. Such money will be well used, as will the $6,264 bequest of the Plain Dealer's late outdoors editor, Viv Gray.

Europeans Competing Boldly for Business in SST Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts of remarks of Mr. William M. Allen, president of the Boeing Co., before the airplane division of the National Editorial Association. Mr. Allen spoke largely on America's chances of continuing its world leadership in the air transport field. I believe the ideas and information conveyed by this leading aviation executive are worthy of consideration by Members of Congress, especially in view of forthcoming deliberations on the Federal Government's role in the development of a supersonic transport in cooperation with U.S. industry.

EUROPEANS COMPETING BOLDLY FOR BUSINESS IN SST FIELD

THE CHANGING COMPETITIVE SCENE

It should be noted that the proportion of foreign airlines in the total aircraft market has been increasing, until now in the case of jet transports foreign purchases amount to 48 percent of the total. With the supersonic, they are expected to account for more than 60 percent. More importantly, the competition has become ever more keen in the sense that the Europeans have been striving to narrow the gap of technological leadership which we have held. We still feel

that we have a marked technological advantage, but this must be weighed by the customer against a cost disadvantage which stems from the fact the national average of wages and salaries both in France and in Great Britain at present is less than 40 percent of the average paid in the United States. Even allowing for the relatively higher labor productivity in our country due to our tooling and large production quantities, the cost of labor in these European countries appears to be well below our own. The question is whether we can maintain a technological advantage great enough, in the hard press competition, to offset an adverse price differential.

WHEN GOVERNMENTS BECOME RISK-TAKERS

Still another factor, and perhaps an even more important one, is that foreign governments have placed themselves in the role of the risk-takers in behalf of our competitors through underwriting further technological improvements. It would be recognized that our competition is not from private companies as such, in the sense that American manufacturers are private, but either Government-owned or Government-subsidized manufacturers. Further, most of the foreign airlines which constitute our oversea market are either Government-owned or substantially so; consequently many must buy as directed.

Now we come to the new situation where two Governments, the British and the French, and incidentally, the owners of two of our principal oversea customer airlines, have teamed up to underwrite the development of the supersonic transport. Each has agreed in principle to share the $475 million estimated development cost of the Concorde, toward which they have already committed $70 million.

WHAT PRICE PROGRESS

To appreciate what has been happening, we must note what we have been doing to the product itself. The first large expansion of passenger air transportation in 1931 employed trimotored airplanes each of which provided on the average, in actual operation, about 3,500 seat-miles of transportation per day. These airplanes cost $75,000 each. In rapid jumps we have been able successively to increase the capability of the product until now, in the form of the 707 or the DC-8, it is delivering 400,000 seat-miles per day, which is 114 times the output of the 1931 trimotor. The jet airplane cost is $6 million, or 80 times the cost of the trimotor.

WHAT PROGRESS HAS COST BOEING

Each step of progress which has made this change possible has been larger than the one before, and the jump to supersonic is by far the largest of all. The development cost has mounted accordingly. The Boeing Co., using all the money it could scrape together at that time, financed in 1935 the prototype of the four-engine airplane which became the Flying Fortress, at a cost of $660,000. In 1952, it designed and built with company funds America's first jet transport at a cost approaching $20 million. Again this tool took most of the savings that the company had built up from the preceding lean years. That was 30 times the cost of the once "huge" Flying Fortress. A prototype supersonic transport of the type regarded now as most practical is estimated to cost a possible $150 million, which is 7½ times the cost of the jet transport just 10 years ago, and more than 200 times that of the first Flying Fortress. This does not include many further elements of the development cost in the realm of testing, prototype modification, etc.

BOEING'S COST TO DATE ON THE SST

Even with the Federal Government carrying the major share of the financial burden of a supersonic transport development program the risk to the manufacturer can be enormous—so great as to be incommensurate with anything previously undertaken. Already Boeing has expended in the neighborhood of $15 million on supersonic transport study, which happens to be the same as the amount originally appropriated by the company, but later increased for the design and actual contruction of the prototype for the 707 jet transport. But the big costs are still ahead in supersonic prototype development.

OUR GOVERNMENT AND THE SST

The required investment will be several times that which has been necessary for the subsonic jet transport, and it will therefore look correspondingly larger when compared with prospective returns from early sales. It becomes evident that there is valid reason for the initiative which our Government is taking in developing means to finance the program and that the continued cooperation of Government, the manufacturing industry and the airline industry is required in working out a program that can be practically accomplished with the economic capability of industry and will serve the national interest.

In carrying out this program and undertaking to meet the intensive competition which we will face from abroad we feel it is important, as Federal Aviation Agency Administrator N. E. Halaby has recognized that we retain the advantages of the private enterprise system of contractual responsibility which has proved so effective in our industry in the past.

IMPACT OF THE SST ON AMERICA

This market represents a very substantial source of employment for our country in the future, employment which is needed now that the production of subsonic jet transports for the present airline reequipment program is past its peak. Further, it represents an important potential source of future foreign exchange needed in meeting our Nation's balance-of-payments problem. If we find our airplanes obtaining their future equipment from Europe, our industry's favorable contribution to the solution of this gold flow problem could suddenly be reversed. That possibility is real. Already one U.S. airline, mindful of its requirement of providing competitive service in the future, has entered into a provisional contract for a number of the European Concordes, and other lines are considering such action.

Methodist Warns Against Secularists' Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading spiritual advisers of our Nation, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, minister emeritus of Christ Church in New York, has called upon the Nation to alert itself to the dangers inherent in a current legal effort to remove "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Dr. Sockman said in a speech before the Methodist National Institute of Higher Education at Nashville, Tenn.:

Let us work and pray that these words be kept in for truly this is a nation under God.

Dr. Sockman further dealt with the Supreme Court's decisions banning prayer and Bible reading in public schools and other aspects of our spiritual life. His comments should be a part of the RECORD, particularly in the light of the decision now facing this House in my discharge petition No. 3.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an account of Dr. Sockman's address as reported by the Religious News Service:

[From the Tablet, Aug. 8, 1963]

TO BAN "UNDER GOD" FROM PLEDGE: METHODIST WARNS AGAINST SECULARISTS' EFFORTS

NASHVILLE, TENN. (RNS).—Dr. Ralph W. Sockman of New York declared here that Christians must remain alert to any efforts by secular or other groups to remove the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance as a result of the United States Supreme Court prayer decision.

Addressing the Methodist National Institute of Higher Education, the minister emeritus of Christ Church in New York told some 250 Christian educators: "Let us work and pray that these words be kept in for truly this is a nation under God."

"We are under God's protection and also under his judgment," he said, adding that while church-state separation is a "valid principle," it does not mean the divorce of religion from civic life.

Referring to the Supreme Court's ban against devotional prayers and Bible reading in public schools, Dr. Sockman said the ruling created "a vacuum which the home, church, and school must fill and fill soon."

He also stressed that this country "cannot be explained without reference to the Judeo-Christian religion on which our laws and institutions are founded."

"What would oaths of loyalty or oaths in court be worth without belief in God?" he continued. "It was the church which pioneered in establishing schools and colleges. If we took religion out of American life, our streams of philanthropy would dry up and our business would be undermined by loss of integrity."

The Hazards of Euphoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress is debating the 1964 NASA authorization bill and the Nation is weighing the risk involved in the proposed limited test ban treaty, I wish to call attention to an article in the August issue of the Air Force/Space Digest. The article by Mr. Wm. Leavitt, associate editor of the Digest, states that:

The continued and increased development of U.S. military space capabilities—as a new dimension of the deterrence that has hitherto kept the peace—is essential.

Mr. Speaker, on August 1, I introduced House Resolution 470 which would create a select committee—to reevaluate our national space goals as a necessary first step in assuring that this Nation is not preempted in space from a military standpoint.

The article follows:

THE HAZARDS OF EUPHORIA

(By William Leavitt)

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 16.—Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, W. Averell

Harriman, and British Minister of Science, Lord Hailsham, are freshly arrived in Moscow for which are being hailed as the most hopeful East-West talks on a nuclear test ban pact.

This time the emphasis is on a partial test ban, an agreement to halt nuclear testing in the atmosphere, under water, and in space. A partial test ban, the administration believes, would represent major progress in the arms control and disarmament field, yet would avoid the thorny problem of onsite inspection. The Soviets oppose any kind of useful inspection despite their concession offer, in previous ban talks at Geneva, of three onsite inspections a year.

Premier Khrushchev himself, ostentatiously snubbing concurrent angry peace talks between the ideologically warring Russian and Chinese Communist Parties, is expected to head the Soviet delegation to the Harriman talks. Already many of the editorial oracles of the West are proclaiming the possibility of a great new and happy turning point in the history of the cold war.

The test ban talks are indeed crucial, but not for the reasons being presented so grandly by those who believe that their successful conclusion will set off a new era in Soviet-Western relations. Rather, they are crucial because if Mr. Harriman should pull off a partial test ban agreement with the Soviets, the administration will be faced with a new dimension of responsibility for American and Western security in year six of the space age. For, in the event of a successful partial test ban agreement, it will have to cope with its own inevitable optimism, and the danger that such optimism presents to Western safety.

Successful negotiations leading toward an East-West partial nuclear test ban are bound to strengthen the already strong view in the administration that the partial ban is but the beginning round in a series of mutual interest agreements between the Soviets and the West. Such hopes foresee—despite public denials—a rational stalemate in technology between the Soviets and us which is supposed to preclude the uncontrollable arms race that so many analysts in and out of the administration consider inevitable and the highest possible evil. These analysts believe fervently that viable agreements on nuclear testing must be reached and serve as prelude to additional agreements with the Soviets in other areas, among them space. They argue that the United States is currently ahead in the strategic balance, and that a freeze on technology kept to by both sides will serve U.S. security by maintaining a status quo. They suggest that despite divergent political purposes, both the United States and Russia, as the major nuclear and space powers, can, through mutual interest agreements, control the military-technological future. And currently, they are adding fuel to their argumentative fires with suggestions that Russia, want to or not, must move westward as a result of what appears to be the final collapse of unquestioned Moscow hegemony in world communism.

There are as many answers as questions on the matter of the real worth of nuclear test ban agreements, even the partial ban, which is supposed to be much easier to police. There is at least as much risk in agreeing to a ban with an opponent whose record for truthfulness is depressingly bad as there is in not agreeing. Yet, unless the Russians are subjecting us to some new aspect of Pavlovian psychology, they are making a good show of looking serious about wanting an agreement at this juncture. However, they have already muddied the water by seeming to tie the agreement to a NATO-Warsaw Pact nonaggression pact. This involves Western recognition of East Germany, which is unacceptable to the United States.

In a real sense, the trouble will begin the moment an agreement is signed and implemented. Instead of waiting a decent interval to see with some certainty whether the Soviets honor a partial test ban, the mutual-interest advocates, elated with success, may be expected to begin a campaign for additional gambles—all in the hope of reaching the utopia of detente with the Soviet Union.

Such a campaign could have serious deleterious effects on future Western security, with special reference to space technology. If a spurious new "spirit of Geneva" develops, as is likely in the wake of the expected partial test-ban agreement, there will be a chorus of loud arguments against further American efforts at harnessing space technology for defensive uses. To the cool statements that using space militarily is complex and expensive, therefore unlikely, will be added to suggestion that it is also provocative and damaging to the prospects of further agreements and accommodations with the Soviets. It is not hard to foresee a domestic campaign against the deployment of reconnaissance satellites, for example, on such grounds. The mutual-interest advocates may well argue for such an abandonment of reconnaissance satellites as further demonstration to the Soviet Union of our good faith. The Soviets have from the start objected to the reconnaissance satellites as spy vehicles and surely aren't going to change their tack. Should such a disastrous abandonment take place, we will, of course, have given up a major tool in our strategic inventory. But reconnaissance satellites to be or not to be are only part of the picture. The whole range of potential U.S. military capability in space could be endangered in a romantic postlude to successful partial test-ban talks, marked by enthusiasm for further slowing down of U.S. military space developments.

In a striking article in the August issue of the Atlantic Monthly, entitled "Our Gamble in Space—the Military Danger," Dr. Alton Frye (see also Dr. Frye's "Breaking the Cold War Stalemate: A Proposal," Space Digest, July 1962), now with the Rand Corp. in Santa Monica, Calif., projects some of these hazards.

Dr. Frye writes:

"By voluntarily and unilaterally foregoing precautionary development of space weapons, especially antisatellite systems and bombardment satellites, we remove the major incentive for the Soviets to come to terms on an arms control treaty for space. Since the United States is abstaining from serious research on space weapons anyway, the Russians do not face a threat from that quarter, except insofar as they consider themselves threatened by American reconnaissance and surveillance satellites. So long as there is no inspection agreement and the United States refrains from substantial research on the military uses of space, the Soviets are free to test and possibly to deploy various military space systems at minimum risk.

"In negotiations regarding space the United States has already given the Russians the very prize for which we propose to negotiate. The Soviets enjoy adequate security that the United States will not use space for deployment of weapons, while the United States has no comparable guarantees from the Soviets. From Moscow's point of view, there is no need to negotiate in earnest for arms control in space.

"This seems to be a recurring pattern in Soviet-American relations. In its eagerness to demonstrate its good faith, the United States has time and again squandered its diplomatic capital. In Korea a hint of Communist willingness to discuss armistice terms led the United States to suspend its increasingly successful military operations, the principal factor which had brought the Chinese and North Koreans to the armistice table. With the pressure off, the Communists were able to regroup their forces and drag out the negotiations interminably. In order to promote a nuclear test ban treaty, the United States entered into the test moratorium. Since the Western Powers were not testing anyway, the Soviets had no need for a formal agreement; instead, they were encouraged to prolong the discussions indefinitely while secret research and test preparations wiped out the Western lead in nuclear weapons technology. The United States has yet to comprehend that most painful paradox of the cold war: Concessions may sometimes be fatal to the success of negotiations, especially when those concessions involve the substance of the issue at stake.

"A vital question for American policymakers in the months ahead is whether we are committing the same mistake in negotiations concerning space. There is no assurance that American restraint in the development of space weapons will evoke similar behavior on the part of the Soviets. Indeed, current political and technical trends make it seem more likely that the Russians will regard space weapons as highly advantageous, both politically and militarily."

The development of American military capabilities in space has been hobbled from the start by penuriousness, naïvete, and fear of the "arms race." It is disturbingly possible now that to these disabilities may be added the dangers of post-partial-test-ban euphoria. Whether in its weakening role as supreme ruler of the Communist empire, or in its developing position as fallible majority stockholder, the Soviet Union has always acted in self-interest and in the hope of removing the underpinnings of the democratic West. It would be an act of folly to assume otherwise. The continued and increased development of U.S. military space capabilities—as a new dimension of the deterrence that has hitherto kept the peace—is essential. Absolutely nothing in a partial test-ban agreement precludes further Soviet military space developments. Hopefully, the administration, which is willing to take the grand gamble in Moscow, will control its own enthusiasm for negotiation.

The People and Business Pay Heavily for Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following article from the August 19 issue of U.S. News & World Report which shows just what big government and Federal redtape is costing the people of America. The heavy hand of Government is gradually squeezing out of our society the freedom and with it the individual importance and dignity of human beings.

REDTAPE: WHAT IT COSTS IN TAXES—IN HEADACHES

(NOTE.—Following are excerpts from an article in the August 1963 Monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank of New York.)

As everybody knows, government costs a lot of money.

Revenues of all our governments—Federal, State, and local—are running up past $150 billion a year, equivalent to $1,400 for every adult in the United States.

While devoting tens of billions to putting a man on the moon—described by former President Eisenhower as "a mad effort to win a stunt race"—government has taken on dependents all over this earth.

Checks go out to more than 40 million persons at home—12 million to employees and the others to welfare beneficiaries.

Abroad, no less than 95 countries and territories are receiving U.S. aid.

The true cost of government runs far beyond $150 billion a year.

Many people, after gathering figures and receipts all year long, worked on into the night last Easter on governmentally prescribed arithmetical exercises, filling the forms for Federal—and perhaps also State—income tax returns due the next day, April 15.

No one has tried to calculate the man-hours of dismal drudgery going into the preparation of tax returns. The rates of tax rise progressively. And so does the effort demanded. The more a man earns—and the more his time is worth—the greater the obligation imposed to amass detailed records and comprehend the complications of the law.

Form 1040, which 35 million persons find it necessary to use, can require upward of 500 entries—including supplemental schedules—and as many as 200 additions, subtractions, multiplications and divisions.

The Superintendent of Documents in Washington has on sale a 144-page volume which elucidates some of the major technicalities. Yet no one can settle back and say he understands the whole of the law. Not only is the law itself in process of repeated change, but the regulations are changed and court decisions alter the interpretation of law and regulations.

The Internal Revenue Service itself has a major problem of training qualified agents, numbering some 30,000.

Publishing technical books on taxes and advising people on taxes have become big business.

The core of tax experts outside Government is represented in the 71,000 "enrolled practitioners" recognized by the IRS.

The work imposed on individuals is nothing compared to that imposed on employers. Not only are there many more forms, but employers must serve as uncompensated tax collectors, taking money out of the pay envelopes of workers according to formula and, often, adding a tax bite assessed on customers.

The Internal Revenue Service has a total staff of 64,000 and a budget of $674 million. These are big figures. But there is little doubt that business firms collectively employ even more people and spend even more money gathering in tens of billions of revenues.

And burdens of calculating and assessing taxes are just part of the story.

Besides the IRS and State and local tax authorities, there are thousands of Government offices and agencies with overlapping jurisdictions over business. Thus, lying beneath the visible costs—set out in the budgets prepared at various levels of Government—is an iceberg of invisible costs.

Such costs take an infinite variety of forms, ranging from a simple post-card report for an official agency to interminable procedures required by regulatory authorities and tedious investigations launched by congressional committees or executive departments—all too often simply uncovering facts already known to anyone who has taken the trouble to find them.

The second Hoover Commission gave some idea of the dimensions of the problem at the Federal level. As of 1955 it was estimated that paperwork within the Federal Government cost $4 billion a year, consumed 25 billion sheets of paper, required office space equal to 36 Empire State Buildings and storage space equal to 7 Pentagons. Paper handling is a more popular exercise than 50-mile hikes. It fans out across the country.

Forms go out to business firms and individuals to be completed and returned for regulatory, statistical or tax purposes. Though the Hoover Commission made no overall estimate of the total costs involved, it pointed out that the private cost "is far greater than the Government's cost of toting up the figures."

FIFTY-THREE HUNDRED FORMS TO FILL OUT

Since 1955, both costs have grown. By latest count, the Fedeal Government has some 5,300 forms in use for regular reporting. And this does not include reports to the Internal Revenue Service, certain other agencies of the Treasury Department, and the several layers of banking authorities, which are exempted from the Federal Reports Act.

There are, besides, reports for State and local government units. The Hoover Commission found that State and city governments impose "more than 50 percent of the Nation's burden of paperwork."

As John E. Swearingen, president of the Standard Oil Co., of Indiana, describes the situation: "We have arrived at the unhappy point at which the Cyclopean eye of some almighty regulatory agency is upon us when we buy or sell, ship or receive, hire or fire, grow or manufacture, save or spend, drink or diet, profit or lose, talk or listen."

Amid all the hue and cry about accelerating economic growth—which means cutting out useless effort and getting more production per man-hour—we tend to ignore the multiplication of burdens placed upon people to comply with laws.

And while we lament the shortage of employment opportunities, we overlook the endless rules and regulations that discourage people from going into business, or invite them to get out.

The most familiar kind of invisible cost to the average American is the paperwork involved in his income tax return.

Partly because the tax rates are so high, the Government takes a proprietary interest in the money a man earns. And, all the time, people are being put to more and more trouble to defend their take-home pay.

Even so, there was considerable public support for changes in expense-account rules—including the requirement for the keeping of a day-to-day diary—put into the Revenue Act of 1962 as a means of checking abuses. This makes bookkeeping a large part of the job of everyone who has responsibilities to pay out money in connection with business travel.

In response to businessmen's advice, the Internal Revenue Service later loosened up a bit on the rules. But all this paperwork becomes a burden to the employer's tax department.

One corporate executive, quoted by Business Week, predicted that "well have to rent a separate warehouse for the literally millions of pieces of paper we'd have to keep." No one will ever have a chance to go through them all. Nevertheless, the law requires that they be there for years until the related tax returns are audited and approved or the statute of limitations mercifully permits disposal of the waste.

The scope for additional layers of State and local government taxation has been broadened by Supreme Court decisions giving them greater leeway for taxing out-of-State corporations. What this has meant in terms of paperwork burdens was effectively presented before the Special House Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce in June 1962, by Werner N. Davidson, secretary-treasurer of the Caloric Corp.:

"The cost of additional help to file only for State tax purposes, the space required for the storage of such otherwise useless records, the cost of one additional invoice copy for each charge to our customer, will add at least $20,000 annually to our cost of doing business. * * *

"By taking into account machine time, salaries paid to our people who perform the tax-reporting function, subscriptions for tax services, endless correspondence with taxing authorities to support our returns, payment of travel and per diem allowances to tax auditors of foreign States, we spend an additional $50,000 per year.

"Our corporation and its subsidiaries file a total of 999 tax returns of all kinds per year and the cost of each tax return amounts to $70."

Just in the year since his testimony, Mr. Davidson reports that the number of tax returns has risen further to 1,140.

Larger companies have even more. In 1959, the Union Carbide Corp. was filing 3,600 tax forms a year.

While it is difficult to generalize, reporting requirements arise at the birth of a fledgling enterprise and ever after distract from the work of keeping alive.

The requirements tend to be heaviest for the biggest companies, for firms in regulated industries, for corporations holding Government contracts and for firms dealing in agricultural products.

Regulated industries typically have much more Government-imposed reporting and recordkeeping expense than business generally.

After the Hoover Commission study in 1955, some progress was made toward simplifying and thinning out reporting workloads in certain industries.

The contrary drift is exemplified in the field of banking where financial institutions this year are being required to file information returns on each account with interest payments of $10 or more.

Also, along with other payers of interest or dividends, banks are devoting a good deal of time and money to obtain social security numbers from customers to be put on reports to the IRS.

REPORTS THAT BURDEN RAILROADS

The classic case, of course, is that of the railroad business, put under the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887. Over the decades, reports required to meet the needs of the day were enlarged until the industry found itself preoccupied with paperwork.

The last time the Association of American Railroads made a listing of the reports required by Federal agencies—in 1954—it took 10 pages to give the titles of 164 separate reports. This list did not include reports connected with the handling of mail.

Some reports are required annually, others semiannually, quarterly, monthly, weekly, daily, or as certain events occur. The longest annual report, form A of the ICC, runs to 117 pages of detailed schedules.

One monthly report for the Department of Agriculture is labeled: "Report to USDA, San Francisco, of number of carloads of corn westbound passing Needles, Calif."

Such detailed reports are only one aspect of a general problem of overregulation of the railroads; reporting to the ICC alone is figured as costing more than $5 million a year.

Similar problems are found in other public utility fields. The Hoover Commission reported in 1955 that it cost gas and electric companies more than $14 million a year to prepare requests for rate changes.

Even if a manufacturer or distributor is not in a regulated industry, it may still find itself immersed in a similarly expensive procedure. An ever-present danger is the possibility of running afoul of the vague but potent antitrust laws.

In 1959, for example, three salt companies—Morton, International, and Diamond Crystal—were charged with fixing prices of

rock salt. Two and a half years later, a Federal jury found them not guilty.

In the interim, the work of assembling data and materials to defend themselves—plus lawyers' fees—had cost the three firms $775,000, a sum far greater than the $150,000 maximum in fines they might have been liable to pay if found guilty.

But the invisible costs go beyond these figures. As reported by the Wall Street Journal, Morton Salt Co. president, Daniel Peterkin, described the lingering effects:

"We've been in business more than 100 years and we think we have a fine reputation. Any time you're accused of violating the law, particularly the antitrust laws, it's extremely damaging to you. After acquittal, the damage still exists. The mere fact that you're accused is enough to hurt you in many people's minds."

SEVENTEEN YEARS OF LITIGATION TO WIN A CASE

A similar, but much lengthier, case involved Standard Oil of Indiana, which was cited for alleged price discrimination by the Federal Trade Commission in 1940. After extensive litigation involving two trips to the Supreme Court, the company finally won its case in 1958.

President Swearingen, however, found the victory worth the cost:

"In our judgment, the net effect was to preserve a competitive system for American business, but it took 17 costly and trying years of litigation to do it. And, to preserve our right to compete, we had to fight off a Federal agency originally established to insure the continuance of effective competition. * * *

"I submit that this is the kind of thing that can give any responsible businessman nightmares at high noon. In our instance, the continuing threat to our ability to compete also threatened the interests of our thousands of stockholders and employees."

The growth of "invisible costs" has accompanied the expansion of Government activities—through the great depression, two major wars and the postwar burgeoning of the welfare state.

WHY PAPERWORK GROWS

As more and more money is disbursed by public agencies and as more private activities are regulated by Government, public officials want at hand more minute information about what's going on. Hence, more paperwork.

It is perhaps no accident that the agency with the largest number of regularly required reports—the Agriculture Department—is the one that encountered outright rebellion last May when wheatgrowers, in a national referendum, rejected high price supports and tighter controls.

There comes a time when self-respecting individuals resist encroachments upon their privacies and freedoms.

About the worst thing that can happen to a people is to become servants of the state.

It is well to recall the warning of Alexis de Tocqueville, more than a century ago, describing how despotism might conquer a democratic society:

Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild.

After having thus successfuly taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting.

Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd.

Communist Guiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Communist activity is rapidly increasing in British Guiana. The Washington Post ran an excellent article on this subject this morning:

COMMUNIST GUIANA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

While the Kennedy administration entwines itself with webs of diplomatic protocol, British Guiana moves ever closer to becoming South America's first Communist satellite.

In fact, Guiana now must be regarded as halfway within the Communist bloc, even though it remains under nominal British sovereignty.

The pro-Communist regime of Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan and his fanatically Marxist wife (the former Janet Rosenberg of Chicago) is heavily subsidized by Moscow. Georgetown, the Guianese capital, is becoming the South American focal point for Communist propaganda and gun-running expeditions. Meetings by anti-Communist opposition parties are harassed by bomb-throwing goons.

What's worse, if the British insist on bestowing full independence on Guiana, the Minnesota-sized nation is sure to become a full-fledged Red dictatorship.

Although Connecticut Senator THOMAS J. DODD's warnings about the Guianese crisis 2 years ago were scoffed at by some fellow Senators, there's little argument today about whether the Jagans are trying to lead Guiana into communism.

If any further proof were needed, it was brought to Washington last week by Anne Jardim, a lovely 26-year-old who is the Guiana Senate's only opposition member. In her briefcase was evidence of $120,000 in recent fund transfers from the Soviet Ministry of Education to Freedom House, headquarters of Jagan's People's Progress Party, and of a $1 million indirect loan to Jagan from Fidel Castro's National Bank of Habana.

But evidence isn't enough. British and American diplomats are playing an Alphonse and Gaston act that would be laughable were it not so tragic.

In trying to justify its apparent willingness to abandon Guiana to the tender mercies of the Jagans (and thereby comb a nasty mess out of their hair), the British resurrect the old "spheres of influence" concept. "This is not our hemisphere," a top official in the British Colonial Office commented during a recent private conversation.

On the other hand, the U.S. State Department feels inhibited about plunging into Guiana because the British maintain sovereignty there. (In fact, within the organization of our our State Department, Guiana remains under the jurisdiction of its Bureau of European Affairs.)

But the problem of intrawestern jurisdiction is not all thats' wrong with the way the State Department is handling the Guianese question. Here's a partial bill of particulars:

Item: In contrast of Moscow's unashamed subsidization of Jagan, punctilious American officials have refused to give a dime to the nearly bankrupt opposition parties.

Item: When asked recently by the pro-American United Force Party for use of a U.S. propaganda film, an official at the American Consulate at Georgetown flatly refused, contending that this would constitute meddling in Guianese politics. (After much effort, this refusal was finally reversed.)

Item: Consul-General Everett Melby, who is trusted and respected by the Guianese anti-Communists, is scheduled to leave Georgetown on a routine reassignment, even though the crisis is nearing its climax.

These items are piddling, however, compared with what seems to be one immense tactical error.

Although the White House officially proclaims Guiana to be London's problem, President Kennedy has been secretly trying to buy time by talking the British into withholding full independence as long as possible. Indeed, the United States wants the British to suspend Guianese self-government, automatically ousting Jagan.

But far from buying time, say the opposition parties, this would play into Jagan's hands. He would become a martyr and thereby widen his popular support.

What the opposition parties want is a new electoral system of proportional representation that almost surely would spell Jagan's doom. Moreover they believe proportional representation would be adopted in a national referendum, if only the British would call for a referendum.

So, Guiana's future may hinge on whether the United States tries to talk the British into conducting the referendum. But time is short, as witness the preparations of the country's middle class. They're packing their bags for a quick getaway from the Jagans.

Clarification of Position of the Shoe Industry on Foreign Shoe Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to etxend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to James F. Collins, Director of Trade Adjustment, Department of Commerce, from Mr. Roy St. Jean, chairman of the Foreign Trade Committee for the Shoe Manufacturing Industry, with regard to the impact of foreign shoe imports.

JULY 30, 1963.

Mr. JAMES F. COLLINS,
Director of Trade Adjustment, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COLLINS: The Foreign Trade Committee of the Shoe Manufacturing Industry takes this opportunity to go on record as expressing serious and fundamental disagreement with the assumptions and conclusions contained in your letter to Senator KEATING of June 25, 1963. We are pleased to note that you recognize we have a serious import problem. However, the focus on other problems with which we are fully

familiar and which we share with many other industries, in our opinion, diverts attention from the impact of imports on the shoe industry. Some of the facts set forth in your letter are erroneous and others evidence a misunderstanding of conditions in the industry. We cannot believe that your letter was written with the advice and assistance of the industry specialists in the Commerce Department. Since you have referred to some of these other problems, this will set the facts straight.

In 1962, foreign competitive footwear represented far more than the 8.2-percent figure covering leather footwear which is presented in your letter. Protracted conferences and analysis with officials of the Tariff Commission, the Customs Bureau, the Census Bureau, and industry representatives have made it apparent that certain nonleather types of footwear are interchangeable with leather and must be taken into account. As a result, in 1962 competitive imports amounted to over 12 percent of the total market. Moreover, even the 8.2-percent share exceeds the approximately 6-percent figure sufficient to justify relief for the cotton textile industry—an industry which also has other problems.

The shoe industry capacity figures cited by you grossly exaggerate the true capacity of our industry. The true capacity of our industry is about 750 million pairs or approximately 150 million more than the 600 million actually produced during each of the past few years. This is required to take care of seasonal peaks in production. For example, in August 1962 our industry produced 59.3 million pairs or 21 percent more than was produced in September, when only 48.9 million pairs were produced. This variation is due to August production for the fall season; if the August 1962 production were multiplied by 12, total production would be at least 712 million pairs or only 4 percent under actual capacity. Moreover, an increasingly tighter machine capacity condition underscores the swollen nature of your letter's estimate.

It should be apparent to anyone that many millions of pairs of imported footwear causes us to lose thousands of job opportunities. You contend that the decline in number of workers since 1956 is attributable to labor-saving devices. The fact is, however, that the major decline in employment has resulted from changes in product mix with simpler constructions. With easier to make types of construction, there are fewer stages of production, and this, in turn, calls for fewer machines and workers. At the same time, it should be pointed out we are the most productive footwear manufacturing industry in the world.

You aver that the footwear industry has been unable to interest the public in greater leather footwear consumption. You fail to add, however, that we have developed the highest per capita consumption of any nation in the world. From this level, it is evident that the domestic industry has lost its normal growth to imports.

You claim that the large number of firms in the industry makes it difficult to get coordinated market stimulation. We are puzzled by this comment since, in our opinion, public policy favors a highly competitive market structure.

We have made the point time and again that the shoe manufacturing industry is highly competitive; that it earns low profits and has a very high rate of exits and entries each year. It is against this type of industry that low-wage imports are particularly devastating, because they depress profits even further or erase them completely. As you point out, there is a correlation between the decline in industry profits and the increase in imports. With this we certainly agree. Your table shows a drop in the percent of profits on net sales after taxes of nearly 50 percent from 1956 to 1961. On profits as a percent of equity, the decline has been nearly 40 percent between the 2 years. At the same time, leather shoe imports increased 268 percent. A number of our companies are ground out each year by stiff competition. Low-wage shoes from abroad are aggravating this situation.

It is highly significant that 235 Congressmen and 33 Senators have signed a petition asking the President to stop the increase of footwear imports.

We look forward to working further with the Department of Commerce on this serious import problem.

Sincerely,

ROY ST. JEAN, *Chairman.*

Report of the Resolutions Committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Resolutions Committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress is one of America's most productive organizations in the field of the Nation's waterways, flood control, and reclamation. The convention, held in Washington, this year was attended by 483 registered delegates and their wives from 46 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia. Texas led with 62 delegates and 27 wives; Florida was second with 34 delegates and 5 wives; Louisiana was third with 28 delegates and 4 wives; while Ohio was fourth with 27 delegates and 4 wives.

It was also attended by several score unregistered delegates, guests, visitors, and representatives of the press, radio and television.

As chairman of the resolutions committee, it was my privilege to preside over one of the most productive meetings this committee has ever conducted. The resolutions committee is composed of representatives from every section of the country and their occupational specialities represent business, government, and interested organizations. The resolutions adopted give expression and strong evidence of the sentiment of the subject matter contained, and I ask that these resolutions be included in the RECORD at this point.

The resolutions follow:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE TO THE 50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, JUNE 7, 1963

FOREWORD

Our objectives, endorsed by every President of the United States for the past 61 years, have certainly had a splendid reception by the Congress and as a result we now have an effective program of land and water resource development throughout the land. Our aims are to make the program more effective and our 50th national convention is dedicated to a supreme effort to accomplish this aim. The protection of life and property is paramount of course but the impressive effect on our national economy gained from the comprehensive development of our land and water resources makes it imperative that our efforts in this respect not be relaxed.

WATER RESOURCES EDUCATIONAL BUILDING

Whereas the education of the public, especially the younger generation, in the importance of the wise and advantageous use and conservation of our water resources has always been a basic tenet in the policy of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress; and

Whereas the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, an independent nonprofit scientific and educational trust foundation, desires to give to the Federal Government as a public service, without cost to the latter or gain to the former, the construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of a water resources educational building to be Government-owned and controlled facility located in the national capital parks and operated under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior by the Bureau of Water Resources without present or future cost to the Government or profit to the Bureau; and

Whereas H.R. 4712 and H.R. 4743, 88th Congress (identical bills) now pending before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs provide for the acceptance of this gift by the Government under the above stated conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, its delegates from all States of the Union being assembled in their 50th annual convention at Washington, D.C. on this the seventh day of June 1963, endorses the above bills and urges their prompt enactment into law.

BANK STABILIZATION

The staggering loss of fertile farmland along the banks of our Nation's streams creates an economic loss which must be corrected. The requirement for a systematic program of bank stabilization to protect land, flood control structures and sundry public works is certainly evident. We urge Congress to provide the means for protection of these valuable assets in the interest of preserving and promoting the national economy.

COMPREHENSIVE BASIN PLANNING

Piecemeal planning for the development of our river basins is outmoded. All requirements and potentials should be considered in the river basins. This means that full participation by all interested Federal and State agencies is indicated. As a warning it must be said that studies over a period of years before specific items are recommended are not appropriate. Any feature of a basin found to be compatible with the overall basin plan should be submitted for approval by the Congress immediately if it meets the criteria established for such elements.

CONGRESSIONAL PREROGATIVES

Historically the Congress has had full responsibility for authorizing and funding water resource projects. Policies and interpretations of authorizations by the agencies concerned have, in some instances, contravened the intent of Congress. We urge the Congress to expand the authorization language for development projects to the end that agency interpretations and regulations promulgated by them will not be deterrents to orderly progress in needed development.

LAND ACQUISITION

Uniformity by Federal agencies in the acquisition of land and estates therein is a requirement that is lacking at present. This extends to the amount of land acquired for a project and the price paid for it. Furthermore, flexibility is indicated to permit the acquisition to be compatible with local conditions and thereby promote adequate

recreational, industrial and related economic development. This congress with full cognizance of the problem suggests that the Congress consider remedial measures to insure adequate acquisition and just and equitable compensation for the estate acquired without excessive cost.

FLOOD PLAINS

Encroachment on flood plains in our river valleys for residential, industrial, and agricultural purposes lacks economic justification in many instances. This has been recognized by the Federal Government and by many of the States and laws, regulations and information services are available. We urge the officials in the problem areas to take full advantage of these media to insure proper development of our flood plains and to prevent encroachment where such is appropriate.

PARTIAL PARALYSIS

The idea that the President should have the authority to veto individual items in authorization and appropriation bills is definitely opposed. If placed in effect it would transfer the responsibility for water resource development from the Congress to one individual—the President. After full consideration in the Committees of Congress and enactment thereby the proposals should be approved in their entirety or rejected. Partial enactment of a complete program is a definite deterrent to an appropriate program.

CONDUCT OF THE PROGRAMS

The existing Federal agencies are doing excellent work in the overall development of the land and water resources of our Nation and they have our earnest support. The creation of a single public works agency for the purpose of consolidating these agencies or lessening their effectiveness is not conducive to rapid development. The indicated overall expansion of our Nation in a short period of time requires that our existing facilities must be duplicated. No time is left for change or delay. By the same token we oppose the creation of any agency for the purpose of interfering with or adversely affecting the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers. This organization, composed of selected Army officers and dedicated civilian employees, pioneered engineering in our Nation and have continued the tradition of a job well done for more than a century. The disruption of this well-established activity would be detrimental to the immediate prosecution of a program so vital to our future welfare.

PRIMITIVE AREAS

The preservation of small areas of our Nation as examples of its original primitive state is a noble idea. We endorse such a program provided it contemplates such preservation in a balanced manner.

MERCHANT MARINE

Our national security in time of war requires, in peacetime, the maintenance of a modern, versatile, privately owned merchant marine. This fleet to provide for the movement of products of our mines, industry, and agriculture requires constant attention. Aid from our Government should be sufficient to insure its effectiveness.

BRIDGES

The bridges over our navigable waters have generally and adequately met the requirements of water and land transportation until now. The nuclear and space age, which we are now entering, requires in many areas the movement of large objects in larger vessels. Where such movements are a consideration, additional clearance in bridges should be required to meet these needs.

TOLL WATERWAYS

The large investments already made and contemplated for waterway improvement for naviagtion is still in danger of becoming a poor one. Also the investors in the equipment using these waterways stand to lose if their freedom is removed by the concerted attempt to tax their use.

Our efforts in the past have been and our future interests will be dedicated to the historic proposition that our waterways should be forever free.

WATER REQUIREMENTS

The requirement for 450 billion gallons of good water daily by the year 2000 indicates the need for immediate action now. The economic uses and requirements are varied and include first the domestic use by our expanding population, municipal and industrial demands and for other uses including the heavy demands on water for the production of hydroelectric and thermal power.

The insurance of the quantity of water required carries with it a necessity that pollution be avoided or controlled. Industrial waste has been guilty for many years as a contributor to the problem as has the normal waste from our cities and towns. There is no lack of recognition of the problem and there appears to be a definite move by those concerned to solve it. We will to our utmost to assist.

The People Speak on Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, whenever the people have a chance to express themselves they speak out loudly against Federal urban renewal. Most communities in the United States are ready, willing, and able to solve their own slum problems and they can do it better, cheaper, and with more benefit to their people than when Federal bureaucracy moves in.

To remind you that there are many people in the United States who still believe in local responsibility and are against Federal planning, I include an article from Human Events of August 17, "Protests Kill Urban Renewal Projects":

PROTESTS KILL URBAN RENEWAL

(By Ross Hermann)

FORT SMITH, ARK., August 6.—For the second time in less than 5 months, the people of Fort Smith have voted to keep Federal urban renewal and its traveling bureaucrats out of their community.

Last April, urban renewal was defeated by a slim 101-vote margin—but only after a recount was ordered of the originally tally which gave the edge to urban renewal proponents.

After the narrow defeat, the New Frontier went to work, sent representatives of Federal agencies to Fort Smith to push urban renewal. They succeeded in drumming up support from the chamber of commerce, the three big banks, the building and loan associations, organized labor, the radio stations, the TV station, and both newspapers.

Expecting a more favorable voter response because of this groundwork, urban renewal advocates placed the issue on the ballot on August 6, but to their amazement it was defeated again—this time by a 2–1 margin. Incomplete returns showed a vote of 6,991 to 3,964.

Urban renewal foes credit the special Human Events supplement, "The Case Against Urban Renewal," with playing an important part in this victory for property rights and local self-government.

This defeat for urban renewal concluded what local observers called "one of the most bitter and serious political fights ever staged in Fort Smith's history." They now call urban renewal a dead issue and doubt that it will be brought up again in the foreseeable future.

BUFFALO, N.Y., July 18.—The Buffalo Evening News has revealed that Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey is a stockholder in the First Hartford Realty Co., the redeveloper favored by Democratic members of the Buffalo City Council to handle urban renewal projects.

Bailey is also attorney for First Hartford in its operation in Connecticut and a general legal adviser to the company.

Bailey confirmed that Peter J. Crotty, Buffalo attorney, Democratic leader, and legal counsel to First Hartford in Buffalo, was an old acquaintance and political associate, but did not remember whether he recommended Crotty to First Hartford.

RICHMOND, VA., July 16.—The Richmond City Council has voted 8 to 1 to kill a proposed $63 million Federal urban renewal project after hearing it condemned as a socialistic scheme that would destroy property rights.

In rejecting the plan, Councilman J. Westwood Smithers said the cost of urban renewal was "too high in the violation of principles."

He objected to the use of Federal money, the acceptance of Federal controls, and the key provision of urban renewal—the use of eminant domain to condemn one man's property for sale to another.

The urban renewal project found support among some of Richmond's leading business interests. It was opposed by a newly formed citizens' group consisting of small business owners, homeowners, and a number of Negroes who felt that the plan was designed to deprive them of their property.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In an attempt to shore up urban renewal's sagging image, the Urban Renewal Administration has published a booklet which purports to show what it is doing to preserve America's historical shrines.

The administration cites, as one example, Monterey, the old Spanish capital of California, where it says urban renewal has provided for the preservation of historical landmarks.

What the booklet fails to mention is that all important landmarks within the Monterey urban renewal area are owned by the State of California and were restored by California taxpayers long before urban renewal came to Monterey.

WAYLAND, MASS., July 3.—After insistent opposition to urban renewal, the five members of the board of the Wayland Redevelopment Authority have bowed to local sentiment and unanimously voted themselves out of jobs.

In a public statement explaining their decision to dissolve the authority, board members said, "We have, regretfully, kept the people of the area on tenterhooks for far too long.

"Since the people of the area did not want us to proceede, it was our decision to abandon this project and submit the question of dissolution * * * to our next annual town meeting."

Residents of the urban renewal area fought the project from the beginning, contending that the town was able to make necessary improvements without involving itself in an urban renewal program that would be uncontrollable by local elected officials.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO.—A bill that would have allowed cities of 5,000 to 75,000 popula-

tion to initiate urban renewal projects by ordinance only—without voter approval—was permitted to die in the Missouri House of Representatives after opponents attached an amendment requiring a referendum on every proposed project.

Planners let the bill die because they realized that urban renewal projects have a slim chance of being approved if people are given a chance to vote. Just prior to action on the bill, Columbia, Mo., voters turned down an urban renewal program by a 2-1 margin.

SALISBURY, MD., July 23.—A controversial urban renewal plan that would have forced several hundred people out of their homes has been abandoned by the city council, after a meeting at which no one rose to defend the plan.

"Must we pay Federal taxes that will be turned against us through urban renewal for the purpose of losing our homes?" asked one protester.

"Where is the justice in moving people in order to build a big apartment house that no one living there now could afford to rent?" asked another resident whose home stood in the way of the project.

The city council, impressed with the turnout for the meeting, listened sympathetically and bowed to these complaints. In an official announcement, the city said: "The citizens in the area effectively spoke at length and in detail on the hardships which would be created. City officials want it known that there are ways other than urban renewal to upgrade areas."

ALTON, ILL., July 24.—A grassroots movement against Federal urban renewal has succeeded in Alton, Ill., where the city council has killed an urban renewal project and agreed to hold a special referendum before considering new projects.

Urban renewal opponents were attacked in the press as John Birchers and right-wing extremists, but these charges failed to cloud the issue. Once again, the soundness of retaining local control over local affairs was recognized.

The people of all the communities are saying they will clean up their own areas and asking others to do the same. No Federal programs are needed. No Federal tax money and deficit financing, and watering our currency is needed.

Strictly American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article chronicling the evils of H.R. 3669, the so-called quality brand stabilization legislation which is nothing more or less than price fixing and legislation, which would mean, in the words of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, "pro tanto repeal of the antitrust laws" with all of the evils that attend legislation of such a kind.

The editorial entitled "Strictly American" appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 11, 1963:

STRICTLY AMERICAN

An organization bearing the august title of the Bureau for the Advancement of Independent Retailing warns that "hundreds of thousands of the Nation's * * * proprietors of independent retail business are today fighting a life-and-death struggle. * * * The great American dream—the opportunity for a citizen to start and run his own business—appears to be verging on a nightmare."

What has made things all that desperate? It's that familiar old monster, competition. Mainly according to the complaint, it's those price-cutting big stores, the discount houses and chains. To fight this competition the bureau urges passage of "fair trade" legislation, a species of which is again before Congress; it would prohibit any merchant anywhere from selling a national brand product at a price lower than that set by the manufacturer.

Under a fair trade law—or, to describe it more accurately, a price-fixing law—the bureau says that "the consumer will be paying no more than her neighbor for a particular branded article. * * * One price to every customer is strictly American."

Is it now? We had always thought competing for customers with lower prices, better service and other ways was one of the most American things about America. Just as we'd thought the same about the consumer's interest in, and ingenuity in finding, a bargain.

Indeed, price fixing is usually considered so un-American that some Americans who try it get thrown in the clink. We are sure the drumbeaters for fair trade, in and out of Congress, wouldn't want that to happen to them. And we can't help wondering what history books they get their nightmares out of.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 22, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Please let us have quick action on House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Let us expose Soviet imperialism for what it is.

President Kennedy has said, "Unless liberty flourishes in all lands, it cannot flourish in one." Let the United States lead the way in making a little noise about Moscow's captive nations. It's the very least that this once-powerful United States can do to help rectify an intolerable situation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. G. FITZGERALD.

BRIGHTWATERS, N.Y.,
July 11, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I know this is upside down, but I feel that it may be the only way you'll get the attention of the Rules Committee on your House Resolution 14; the resolution to form a Captive Nations Committee.

I believe that such a committee would be instrumental in our winning the cold war. Are there people on the Rules Committee who do not want to win—or are they that busy?

For God and country.

E. LEE NORTH.

CIVIL RIGHTS, SI: CUBA FREE IN 1963

ROCKFORD, ILL.,
July 24, 1963.

Re House Resolution 14.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: The reaction of Moscow and her Soviet Socialist Republics to any mention of captive nations in the U.S. Congress shows that she fears our exposing the Soviet imperialist colonial system and the plight of the peoples enslaved under it.

Thus—now—do we urge you to take action on House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

What are you waiting for?

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. BENNICK.

WEST ISLIP, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I am in favor of your House Resolution 14. This will serve to remind Americans that there still are captives of the Communists hoping that the American people will wake up. The future of the whole world is in the hands of the American people.

RAY DECKER.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I support your House Resolution 14 to establish a special com-

mittee on captured nations and urge its passage as soon as possible.

PAUL R. SUTHERLAND.

EL PASO, TEX., *July 11, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This is to inform you that Congressman D. J. FLOOD's House Resolution 211 has our full support. We think it is very important to keep the enslavement of the millions who are behind the various curtains of the Communists constantly in mind as a reminder of what can happen.

May God bless you and guide you to help in every way possible to return freedom to the captive nations of the world.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES L. DUROCHER.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress—Report of Committee on Industrial and Municipal Water Use and Pollution Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress a report of the Committee on Industrial and Municipal Water Use and Pollution Abatement. Because the rapidly increasing pollution of our Nation's waters is a matter of growing concern, I include this summary report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL AND MUNICIPAL WATER USE AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee reviewed its report adopted by the Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held May 16–19, 1962, and reaffirmed the broad and constructive principles set forth therein, emphasizing the need for effective policies relating to conservation, municipal and domestic use, pollution abatement, flood control, irrigation, industrial use and other beneficial purposes.

In the absence of Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman, Judge J. E. Sturrock, vice chairman, presided.

Judge Sturrock invited the attention of the committee to growing national concern with water supply and quality problems, noting the hearings pending before the Water Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, principally concerned with pollution abatement problems; bills before Congress such as H.R. 3166 providing for increases in Federal assistance for pollution abatement projects, creation of an independent administrative agency and prescription of water quality standards, proposed hearings by the Senate Public Works Committee, and a bill, H.R. 6494 to transfer authority in this area from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Department of the Interior.

Judge Sturrock noted testimony before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and power indicating prospects for a shortage of clean water and an approximate doubling of water requirements by 1980. He referred also to testimony indicating the need for expenditures of $2 billion over the next 3 years for sewage treatment plants, involving some 6,000 construction projects.

He then summarized the provisions of H.R. 3166 calling for increased ceilings on grants to metropolitan areas, grants for separation of storm and sanitary sewers, an independent administrative agency and prescription of water quality standards.

The chairman then called on William J. Hull, secretary, who reported conclusions reached by Congressman BLATNIK in his testimony before the Water Resources and Power Subcommittee that, nationwide, we are barely holding our own, and that greater efforts in pollution abatement are urgently required. Mr. Hull also reported that according to Congressman BLATNIK's staff, the Congressman was not prepared at this time to make definite recommendations as to questions of transfers of jurisdiction from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to other agencies or departments.

General discussion followed in which a wide range of pollution control problems was discussed.

Dominant emphasis was placed upon the complexity and frequently local character of these problems, arguing against the prospect of prescription of meaningful standards by Federal authority. Discussion centered also upon the disadvantages of transferring authority to a new agency or to the Department of the Interior. Attention was given to the need for improved processes in the abatement of polution, additional study and research and wider dissemination of available data as to technology, and to the desirability of enlisting the services of industry technicians. Significant accomplishments were recorded by representatives of various State agencies and of interstate organizations such as the Ohio and Delaware River Interstate Compact Commissions. The committee took note of the 14-percent decrease during the past 2 years in the number of communities discharging untreated sewage and the success of the Ohio River Sanitation Commission as evidenced by an increase from 1 percent to 97 percent since 1948 in the population of the Ohio Valley served by sewage treatment. Significant progress in the Delaware Basin was also noted.

It was acknowledged that industry has problems which are entitled to objective consideration by the responsible agencies of government looking toward early and practicable solutions.

All members and visitors accorded full recognition to the growing urgency of the water quality problem.

In the light of the discussion, the committee:

1. Reaffirms its conviction that all uses of water are interrelated and are of concern to the public generally, and that conservation control and equitable utilization of our water resources are matter of profound interest in the development of the national economy, inseparably related to the welfare of all the people. Clearly, also, the increasing pressures of the various public demands for water use urgently require long-range planning and effective coordination to assure maximum realization of the public values inherent in our precious water resources.

2. Recognizing the primary concern of local, State, and regional organizations in abatement of municipal, agricultural, and industrial pollution as well as the legitimate interest of the National Government, recommends:

(a) Improved coordination of the agencies of government at all levels, with full acceptance of responsibility by State and local agencies, supplemented by both intra- and inter-state organizations where feasible and by Federal assistance and enforcement where necessary and appropriate, looking toward a partnership of private interests and governmental agencies cooperating in the solution of this pressing national problem.

(b) Federal programs for assistance to projects for separation of storm and sanitary sewage systems and for increased assistance to metropolitan areas.

(c) Programs of study and research directed toward improved processes for the treatment of municipal and industrial waste and toward development of information with respect to realistic water quality requirements.

(d) A national information center serving as a clearinghouse for pollution abatement technology, and promptly disseminating available information; in this connection the committee recommends speedy enactment of H.R. 4712 by Congressman ASPINALL, providing for a Water Resources Educational Building to be erected in the national park system of Washintgon, D.C., as a gift from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to the Government of the United States.

(e) That the Congress of the United States recognize the complexity and diversity of pollution abatement problems and the consequent need for extreme caution in considering proposals for Federal prescription of water quality standards or for transfers of jurisdiction from established and experienced agencies to new or different entities or departments.

3. Records its continued adherence to the principle that provision be made for storage in reservoir projects to increase needed low flows downstream to the extent warranted at present or during the economic life of the project, without reimbursement, where the benefits of such low flows are widespread, general, and nonexclusive.

4. Emphasizes the desirability of information programs by radio, television, and other means to bring before the public the growing seriousness of stream pollution and increasing water use requirements emerging from industrial expansion and rapid population growth.

5. Affirms the desirability of pollution abatement as an encouragement to recreation and as a protection for fish and wildlife and their habitat.

COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL AND MUNICIPAL WATER USE AND POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chisholm, Minn., chairman.

William J. Hull, legislative representative, Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Washington, D.C., secretary.

Members

New England division: Walter G. White, chairman, Water Resources Board, State of New Hampshire, Concord, N.H.

North Atlantic division: George R. Shanlkin, chief engineer, Division of Water Policy and Supply, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.

South Atlantic division: Ralph N. Walter, former president, city council, Jacksonville, Fla.

Southwestern division: Judge J. E. Sturrock, general manager, Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin, Tex., vice chairman.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Leonard N. White, engineer, Arkansas Geological and Conservation Commission, Little Rock, Ark.

North Central division: P. W. Fitzpatrick, consultant, St. Paul Port Authority, St. Paul, Minn.

Missouri River division: Milo W. Holseveen, chief engineer, North Dakota Water Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Ohio River division: Stephen A. Wakefield, director, Division of Flood Control and Water Usage, Department of Conservation, State of Kentucky, Frankfort, Ky.

North Pacific division: Marshall N. Dana, member emeritus, Portland Commission of Public Docks, Portland, Oreg.

South Pacific division: Reginald C. Price, deputy director (policy), Department of Water Resources, Sacramento, Calif.

Prof. and Mrs. S. M. Powell: Idaho Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, this year in Idaho we are celebrating our territorial centennial and in these celebrations are paying tribute to our pioneer forefathers.

Recently there appeared in the Idaho State Journal an excellent article written by Mrs. Dana Benson, acknowledging the significant contribution of Professor and Mrs. Powell, two of the later pioneers who are still living in Malad, Idaho.

In the small town of Malad very few young people grow to adulthood without sometime coming under the influence of either Prof. or Mrs. S. M. Powell. These two wonderful people of Welsh ancestry have been great leaders in musical and educational activities that contribute so much to the way of life in small communities.

In this centennial year it is a pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues and my friends to this outstanding couple from my hometown of Malad. While Professor Powell made significant contributions to the musical activities of the community, Mrs. Powell spent 44 years instructing students in the fundamentals of English, history, geography, and mathematics. I am sure that everyone who knows this fine couple joins with me in wishing them well and congratulating Dana Benson for reviewing their many contributions to the American way of life.

(By Dana Benson)

MALAD.—Prof. S. M. Powell chose Oneida County over the entire United States and he's glad of it. After a full lifetime of music and teaching.

Fifty-five years ago he came to the United States from London. Quite by accident he came to Malad the same year. On the east coast he met and became a friend of Louis Williams from Samaria, Idaho. The professor came to Samaria with Mr. Williams. He taught music in the Samaria schools in 1909 and 1910. He started teaching music in the Malad schools in 1911.

A product of South Wales, Samuel MacClain Powell was born June 20, 1874, at Mountain Ash, Glamorganshire, a son of John and Mary Sims Powell.

When the professor was 17 he started teaching choral techniques in his hometown, which had a population of 40,000 at that time. For 10 years he taught a children's choir, 104 voices. This choir won prizes throughout South Wales and England. Out of 17 competitions they won 14 first prizes, 2 second prizes, and 1 third prize. Judges were the most noted musicians in England, Sir Hubert Parry and Sir Sidney Randegar.

Professor Powell was a fellow of the Tonic Sol Fa College in London. Trinity College of Music was one of the five chartered colleges in England at that time. He received his degree as a teacher.

COMPOSITION SUNG

He specialized in composition. One composition, "Baby Lou" was sung before King George V, Windsor Castle, in 1922.

He married May Vanderwood Ripley, May 13, 1915, at Malad.

Professor Powell maintained a music studio in his Malad home and taught vocal and piano. He was the director of the Apollo Club, 18 male voices, in 1918. Their singing was in great demand, and they gave of their services at many performances for a number of years.

He also taught music in Twin Falls in 1913 and 1920.

Professor and Mrs. Powell sponsored a tour throughout the eastern United States for the famous Rhonda Valley Welsh Choir, and gave performances in the Salt Lake Tabernacle in 1925.

Both being in their 88th year, Professor and Mrs. Powell humorously comment on the 52 days difference between their ages, and tease who is the older.

During their 48 years of marriage, Professor Powell said their first quarrel is yet to come. He explained, "When she is in the mood to quarrel, I shut up." Mrs. Powell said she follows the same policy.

Both retired from ther teaching careers, Mrs. Powell retired from teaching school in 1946 when she was 72. She had taught 44 years in the Oneida County school district. Professor Powell retired in 1960.

GAINS EDUCATION

Mrs. Powell received her education at Idaho State University, University of Utah, and Albion State Normal College, where she received her permanent life certificate for teaching in September 1924. She attended summer school at Utah State University in 1938.

Mrs. Mary Vanderwood Ripley Powell was born August 11, 1874, in Malad, a daughter of Captain A. William and Catherine Jones Vanderwood.

She was married to James Howard Ripley March 29, 1900, at Malad. He died in March 1907. She was married to Professor Powell May 13, 1915 at Malad.

Mrs. Powell is a charter member and the past president of the Native Daughters of Idaho Pioneers, station No. 1; past president of the Roosevelt-Garner Club, 1932–40; State Democratic committeewoman for Oneida County 1940–44, and past chairman, Federated Club convention, southeastern Idaho in 1938. During World War II she was the only woman member of the Idaho State Council of Defense, Oneida County. She has a certificate signed by Gov. Chase A. Clark for her outstanding work. She is past president of the Womens Democratic Club of Idaho, and a member of same for 10 years. She is listed in "Who's Who in U.S. Politics and American Political Almanac," is past president of the Ladies Aid Society and member of the Presbyterian Church; charter member Malad Fine Arts Club; and invited member of the Delta Kappa Gamma National Honor Society in Education.

FATHER WAS MASTER

Mrs. Powell's father, Capt. A. William Canderwood, was a master mariner. He owned his own vessel and sailed to Asia, Africa, and European ports from his home, the Providence of Friesland, Holland. He spoke seven different languages. She said her father came to Malad in the spirit of adventure and settled down. He was a 33d degree Mason.

Her father owned one of the first stores in Malad City in 1875. The upper room of the store was the courtroom for Oneide County. The family lived in rooms adjoining the store on the ground floor. She had five brothers and two half sisters who are deceased.

The Powells dearly love their adobe brick home, one of the oldest in the city. It was built in 1878 by William Evans. Mrs. Powell's grandmother, Elizabeth Jones, bought the house from William Evans. Then Mrs. Powell's mother, Catherine Jones Vanderwood, purchased it, and Mrs. Powell has lived in the home all her life. The couple say it is a comfortable home, cool in the summer and warm in the winter.

The 80-year-old poplar trees which sheltered the 85-year-old home were felled and removed by city employees earlier this year. The poplar trees were sending roots into the sewer line leading to their home at 291 North 100 West. They miss the stately trees' shade, but another compensation, in addition to fewer plumbing bills, will be not having to rake up all those leaves in the fall, Professor Powell noted.

Professor and Mrs. Powell spend their summer months gardening in a small plot of ground behind their home. Here they raise vegetables to share with the neighborhood.

The couple has one daughter, Mrs. Charles F. (Ida Ripley Powell) Hall, who lives in Ogden, Utah. They have three grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

Vocational Agriculture Study Is Benefit to All of the County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. G. R. Cochran, State supervisor of agriculture for the State of Minnesota, was kind enough to send me a copy of an editorial from the Perham (Minn.) Enterprise-Bulletin, entitled "Vocational Agriculture Study Is Benefit to All of the County—An Open Letter to Richard Wilson." This editorial presents an explanation of the depth and value of vocational agriculture education. For this reason, I am inserting it into the RECORD for the benefit of our colleagues:

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STUDY IS BENEFIT TO ALL OF THE COUNTY—AN OPEN LETTER TO RICHARD WILSON

DEAR MR. WILSON: We read your very interesting article in the July 12 issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune entitled "What Wheat Plan Do Farmers Want?" and your conclusion that neither the farmers nor anyone else seems to know.

However, we were astounded to read in the same article that "But our vocational education system is still training youths for farmwork that doesn't exist—when we need more and better repairmen for household machines and more short-order cooks. The system is out of whack with a return to a free agricultural economy."

Mr. Wilson, it is time you took a sabbatical leave from the Washington fairyland and found out something about the true farm situation. You have been listening to politicians and pseudo farm experts who read statistics and interpret them erroneously.

If there is a farm problem, it exists mainly in and because of Washington. There they dream up programs that have cut our share of the world tobacco market from a half to one-third; who take millions of acres out of production in one section of the country and then spend billions to open up and irrigate desert land; who pay a farmer for clearing one part of his farm and pay him for reforesting another part; who believe it is sound economics to pay someone for not doing something; who allow more farm imports to come into this country each year than our surplus farm products total; who play politics with sugar quotas to foreign countries

while millions of suitable American acres are forcibly idled; and, if you please, men who are so stupid that they consider God's bounty some sort of a curse, instead of an opportunity to serve all mankind. Being exposed to that background, we can excuse that asinine statement of yours providing that once you you do have the correct picture, you'll get on the bandwagon and support a truly superb training program.

Why vocational agriculture training?

1. The average age of the American farmer today is 58. We are not preparing too soon nor too much for a wave of retirements.

2. We never have had over a 5- to 7-percent margin of farm surplus. This is not too much of a hedge against disaster nor population explosion. And what about using it temporarily to feed a hungry world?

3. While the farm population is less than 10 percent of the U.S. total, agriculture uses more steel than the auto industry, has more capital invested than the steel industry, and has five times as much capital invested as the auto industry.

4. Farming and related service establishments constitute 40 percent of the Nation's labor force.

5. Vocational ag education not only teaches people how to make a living, but how to live.

This education, coupled with the Future Farmers of America organization and county extension services of universities—and they all interlock—is absolutely tremendous. It's not a course in how to pitch hay, pull teats, and haul manure.

Just the outline of things to be learned in a 4-year high school ag course covers seven single-spaced typewritten pages. The average net worth of some 70 students in our local FFA chapter was $600 by graduation time, and a year ago one outstanding student had built up his holding to $7,000 by the time he received his high school diploma.

The agricultural curriculum includes:

The place of various types of agriculture in our economy, keeping proper records, ag construction and maintenance courses such as safety, conduct and management, sketching and lettering, blueprint reading; identification, selection, fitting and adjustments, care and use of hand tools; ditto for power tools; rope selection, tying, splicing, and whipping; identification, measuring, cutting, threading of plumbing pipes and tubes; basic carpentry, selection and knowledge of lumber grades, figuring bills of material, purchasing, and hardware selection; sheet metal soldering, riveting, material selection, and equipment use; painting and glazing—selection and use of paint, brushes, and supplies; cold metal work—shaping, bending, drilling, threading, and cutting.

Sound like a lot of valuable training? Well, that is just the freshman curriculum. And it doesn't mention public speaking, how to properly conduct a meeting, leadership, cooperation, and the value of honesty—all of which are part of their agricultural training.

In spite of this fine program, we can only keep about 15 percent of our farm youth, although 10 percent more students who take ag training stay on the farm than students who don't. And, those with ag training gross 33 percent more than farm youths without ag training.

Don't worry about these boys being unemployed. They are in demand. The country boy knows the overall picture, is more ingenious of necessity, and has the basic skills to quickly adjust to changing situations. They are not lost for long in the big city, but the highly trained specialist who has been taught only one thing would be lost for good out here—and would have trouble anywhere if his lone skill becomes obsolete.

Khrushchev: Sober Reminder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States calls upon the free world to sign an international agreement with the Soviet Union, we might do well to give some second thoughts to the type of individual with whom we have been dealing: Khrushchev.

The Macomb (Ill.) Journal of Friday, August 9, published the following editorial, "Matter of Character":

MATTER OF CHARACTER

While legislators and other citizens of the United States continued to consider the probable advantages or disadvantages of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, a man and a woman tried to escape from East Berlin. Machine gun bullets cut down the woman as she ran for freedom. Seconds later bullets struck the man, and he was so gravely wounded he could not escape from a pursuing policeman. The officer, running up to the fallen man, shot and killed him at close range.

There is no immediately apparent connection, at least no direct connection between the question of the treaty and the Berlin border incident. But an actual connection can be established. Approval of the treaty means entering into an agreement with people who are capable of savage and cold-blooded murder to hold together a system of tyranny.

The treaty has been offered as a first step toward disarmament and the establishment of a secure peace in the world. In one of his latest discussions, President Kennedy urged its adoption so that a world peace system based on agreements would be in effect before such nations as Red China get nuclear weapons.

Everyone would like to see a first step and many successive steps in the direction described by the President. But, in regard to the reference to Red China, it is difficult to see much assurance of security in joining with one group of hoodlums to police another hoodlum. It is difficult to have confidence in people whose savagery and depravity have been demonstrated on repeated occasions.

Several years have elapsed since Russian tanks turned their guns on Hungarians who had false hopes of winning a government that would give them a measure of freedom. It was a sickening display of ruthlessness and brutality. However, time is a great healer in all fields. At least many of us nurtured the belief that a change might be taking place in the character of the Communist leaders. Yes, they butchered unarmed Hungarians, but maybe they wouldn't do that sort of thing again.

They're still at the same sort of thing. Nikita Khrushchev, when he visited East Berlin, applauded the tyranny and oppression of that satellite. He gave his stamp of approval to the Berlin wall and the methods used to keep East Berliners prisoners. And he is wholly and directly responsible both for the wall and the terror methods because he is the boss of East Berlin.

It is Khrushchev with whom we are asked to enter into agreement.

Independent Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, enough newspaper commentary has been directed in the last few months to the atmosphere in Washington and its relationship to the forthcoming legislative struggle on civil rights.

We realize it is becoming increasingly difficult to establish and maintain a reasponsible and practical position when pressures on this issue are being generated by both extremes.

Last week, leaders of the NAACP were in Washington laying the groundwork for the forthcoming march, but in addition, staging group conferences with legislators to lobby for their version of the civil rights proposals.

The distinguished minority leader of the Senate, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, received vigorous, and I believe unjustified criticism from spokesmen for Negro groups. I was especially pleased to note an editorial in the Thursday, August 8, edition of the Washington Evening Star which properly and effectively discussed Senator DIRKSEN's position in relationship to the NAACP attitude.

All of us who serve in the Congress should cherish our political independence and should zealously guard the right to maintain our personal convictions. This editorial commentary, which I insert into the RECORD at this point, is worthy of nationwide attention:

INDEPENDENT SENATOR

It would be nice to think that the Members of Congress will vote for or against the various provisions of the civil rights bill in accordance with their own convictions as to what is right and what is wrong. Perhaps it is naive to hope for this, however, and it certainly will not come to pass if Congress follows the suggestion offered by Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP.

Mr. Wilkins told a Republican senatorial group that if they want to win Negro votes they must out-Kennedy the Kennedys. Perhaps this is the way the political game has been and always will be played. But it would be difficult to find a more revealing example of brass-knuckle pressure politics in a matter which should be decided on its merits.

In this connection, a word of commendation should be said in behalf of the Republican minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois. Mr. DIRKSEN is against the public accommodations section of the bill, contending its enactment would erode private property rights. We happen to think that the section, with certain modifications, should be approved. But the difference does not lessen our admiration for Senator DIRKSEN's show of independence when he appeared this week before a delegation of NAACP leaders.

The Illinois Senator generally has had a good record on civil rights, but he did not hedge or trim in stating his position on the public accommodations section. To his unfriendly audience, Senator DIRKSEN said he

does not try to please everyone, adding that "I am a legislator and I'd not be worthy of my salt if I let abuse and invective deter me from my convictions."

Here was an unusual show of political courage, and this holds true despite the fact that Senator DIRKSEN will not be up for reelection until 1968. His personal declaration of independence deserves to be applauded.

Which Way the Tide?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of the annual Human Events Conference in Washington July 13 was an address by David Bryant, of Massillon, Ohio. David, who is 17, is a recent graduate of Massillon Washington High School who won first prize in the Ohio Forensic League's original oratory contest and placed third in the national contest. His address to the human events meeting, which I include with my remarks, will illustrate how well he deserved these honors:

WHICH WAY THE TIDE?

(By David Bryant)

To all who are truly concerned with America and her welfare, I present the following question and discuss with them the possible answers.

We are faced with a threat. However, it is not as simple as that. It does not exist necessarily in the Government or in our military defense, but it is nonetheless a threat to our security and our way of life.

This threat it not new with Americans. In fact, almost every empire in the history of the world has been confronted by such a challenge and has found it overpowering. Hear these words from an ancient authority as they were uttered to a people whose ways were very much parallel to ours today:

"Like as you have forsaken me and served strange gods in your land, so shall ye serve strangers in a land that is not yours * * * saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

So in the fifth chapter of Jeremiah came the words of God prophesying the downfall of Israel, a nation effective in government (as they knew it then), and mighty in weapons; but a nation lost in perverted morals; and note—a nation which did crumble.

Today, there is a wave of disturbance floating over the citizens of the greatest nation in the world. There are some Americans who have the nerve to say that such a prophecy as this could be related to the United States; who actually believe that our moral standards are sinking into the same abyss of the past.

My friends, I am one of those Americans.

Yet, what makes it even more disturbing to me is the fact that the diseases of moral decay are striking hardest at the youth of our Nation. And we who are to be tomorrow's leaders, to defend America's ideals and freedoms, can and will lead America only to destruction if this sickness is allowed to continue. And what are some of the moral diseases with which we are now confronted? The facts will speak for themselves. They aren't nice; they aren't pleasant; but, unfortunately, they do exist.

First of all, we find that moral authority is lacking in the home. This is due in part to the fact that children and parents are away from home much more often and for longer periods of time, but this in itself should not cause the weakening of the family. The American Family Service Association points out these possible reasons, based on a nationwide survey: weak citizenship, alcoholism, emotional stress, and irresponsible parenthood. Irresponsible parenthood? When 1 out 18 babies this year will be born out of wedlock; when one out of six American brides is pregnant when she marries, how can there be strong moral responsibility in the homes of these children? We also find that divorces are more socially acceptable than they once were. Consequently, one out of three marriages ends in divorce. The American Bar Association observes that our present divorce status is "a mess in which perjury, blackmail, and fraud play large roles." The tragedy lies in the fact that the divorce courts make orphans of some 750,000 children each year. Yes, the present breakdown of the American family has provided unhappy and misguided lives for many children. It also paints a darker future for our Nation, because these children who will build homes of tomorrow, which are the very moral fiber of America, transmit the effects of this suffering and lack of proper training to the next generation.

Next on our list might come crime. The years between 1950 and 1960 found serious crimes in the United States rising five times faster than the population. For every $1 spent in church work last year $12 were spent in crime prevention. Shocking as it may sound the members of the criminal conspiracy have moved out of their gang hideouts into the main stream of American life accumulating large sums of wealth taken from organized gambling, prostitution, the sale of narcotics, the sale of obscene material—to mention only a few. A New York policeman returning recently from a study on this subject in London made this comparison when he told the Look magazine staff, "One night's crime in New York about equals a month's in London." What is wrong that there should be such a huge difference? We might also include under this topic the growth of corruption in Government and business; the increase in the use of payolla by our Government officials, or the over $1 billion lost to industry last year through employee dishonestly. Moreover, all of these vices and their byproducts are causing the youth of this Nation to be swept up in crime. Juvenile delinquency has more than doubled since 1950 and is steadily rising. Why do our young people lack resistance? Could it be because moral authority is lacking in the home, that because of adult delinquency these children are not being given the proper guidance and foundation of principles? Future adults take notice. Truly, this has made it easy for the criminal empire to reach youth with the evils that will destroy their characters.

The third disease is the misuse of sex. Sex is, as it should be, a beautiful thing if looked upon with the right attitude. But how do Americans view sex? Dr. Clark Vincent of the National Institute on Mental Health answers the question: "Ours is a society which contrives, condones, and consumes sex enticements." And is this not so? Have you ever noticed on television or in the magazines how sex is used to sell almost everything? The movie scandal, as it is sometimes referred to, is precisely so because of its speculative exploration of sex. Consequently, there have come forth movies and even more so, books which make sex cheap by exploring in extremely interesting and exciting reality such aspects as free love, adultery, and nicrophilia. And how does society punish those who use sex wrongly? Instead of wearing the scarlet letter of Hawthorne's great book, one receives relief from the Government. For example, a woman in Pennsylvania who had 15 illegitimate children to 4 different fathers received over $65,000 in Federal support in a period of 12 years. However, our decline as far as sex is concerned is hurting us even farther than our own borders. Recently, in Rio de Janeiro, an American touring company, sponsored by our State Department, put on a play jampacked with sex. The audience hooted with disgust and walked out. And where did they walk? Right across the street where the Russian ballet company was putting on a beautiful performance for the glory of Russia. Again, how are our future leaders involved? For one thing, being constantly subjected to this passion has caused an increase in illegitimacy and rape. While the birth rate in the United States has risen one and a half times in the past 25 years, the illegitimacy rate has tripled. FBI statistics show that in 1961 a forcible rape occurred every 32 minutes and youths under the age of 18 were involved in about 40 percent of the major sex crimes. Truly, the misuse of sex has been one of the primary reasons for the downfall of past empires. Will it be ours also?

So now we have considered the three major areas which tend to convince me of our moral decay: the weakening of the family, the growth in crime, and the improper outlook on sex. My friends, this is real. We are being faced today with the steady stalking of these "moral monsters." Yet, must such a depressing picture remain? Must our morals become lax and finally lost? Can we ever hope to conquer this growing threat?

Our Puritan ancestors, those who gave us our cherished Nation, were confronted with sin and immorality. However, they found the strength to overcome them and make our country great because their philosophy rested on a granite rock—God. They really had religion.

Churchgoers have increased more than 60 percent since that time but has religious influence? Dr. Liston Pope, dean of Yale's Divinity School, sees signs of the diminishing impact of religion upon our morals in this century. Life magazine's coverage of the 21st Ecumenical Council, called by the late Pope John XXIII, points out that one of its primary purposes was to revitalize the Catholic Church against today's deteriorating moral standards, especially in the United States. The great Billy Graham has evangelized all over our country on our present lack of concern toward religion. In one of his messages he noted: "We have become tolerant about divorce, the use of alcohol; we have become tolerant about delinquency, crime, and wickedness in high places; we have become tolerant about godlessness. Hence, our overtolerance in moral issues has made us soft, flabby, and devoid of conviction." His plea is that the restoration of America lies in spiritual regeneration: a revival of purpose and conviction within the church.

Two thousand years ago, the apostle Paul asked the Romans to present themselves holy and acceptable to God and not to be conformed to this world. But fellow Americans, he was also speaking to you and to me today as we face the possibility of defeat by materialistic communism due not to military weakness or governmental inadequacy, but due to our idolatry and worldly conformity—yes, due to our decaying moral standards. Don't be fooled. History is full of Israels. God has let it happen before and He may do it again through this sinful, atheistic power now set loose in the world, unless we start rebuilding our defense against these moral diseases within, with some of that "oldtime" religion—religion to bind the breaking family; religion to divert the increasing efforts now used in crime into bettering our Nation; religion to remove from our hearts the lust which makes sex so prominent today. "I will deliver thee

in that day, saith the Lord: and Thou shalt not be given into the hand of the men of whom Thou art afraid * * * because Thou hast to put thy trust in Me" (Jeremiah 39: 17–19).

Like waves on the "beach of time" civilizations have risen and fallen. Happily though, there has also been an increasing tide of personal moral development; so that as each civilization comes and goes it washes higher than the last.

My friends, today our Nation, yes, now we are being challenged not to recede with the waters of moral decline but to keep that tide of moral decency coming in.

If in the quiet and solitude of this night you can find it in your heart to pray, do so. Pray that God will bless America with an awakening of moral concern and the recovery of moral strength. For, Americans, this is the hope of America: That with God's help we cannot fail.

Mr. Hoover at 89

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Herbert C. Hoover is one of the greatest men the United States ever produced.

Mr. Hoover has the patriotism, the integrity, the high ideals and humility that I would want my children to emulate.

The following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, August 10, Mr. Hoover's 89th birthday, is a fitting tribute to this illustrious American:

MR. HOOVER AT 89

Herbert Clark Hoover today celebrates his 89th birthday. We wish him well and we wish to express our gratitude for his many substantial contributions to his country.

On the calendar one of these contributions consists of over half of a long life given to public service, almost entirely in the highest levels of our National Government. But this record of service, almost unparalleled in modern American history, is much more significant that the simple weight of years. As the passing of time clarifies our view of the past, Herbert Hoover emerges more and more as a key figure of our era. In several important ways, he was the first American in a position of power to be aware of and to address himself to basic problems that we think of as typical of the immediate present and the future.

First and foremost, he was an engineer. In his youth he practiced his profession in China, meeting at first hand, in the early years of this century, the problem of industrial revolution that will surely dominate the century's end. Long before World War I, he was a confirmed internationalist, with bases in San Francisco, New York, and London and operations in Russia, Australia, Asia, the Americans, and Europe. With the outbreak of the Great War, Herbert Hoover, in conquered Belgium, became the first of a new American breed, the "relief administrator." When America entered the war, he returned home as President Wilson's food administrator. At the war's end he was back in Europe providing the daily bread of people in 30 countries, and managing the railways, waterways, ports, and mines of eastern Europe.

His career in that time marked the emergence of America as the support and guide of the free world. That his country repudiated that role between the world wars in no way lessens the importance of his pioneering work. When, after World War II, we accepted that responsibility again, we built on foundations laid by Herbert Hoover.

To some extent it was an engineer, the modern man, that Herbert Hoover was elected our 31st President in 1928. Four years later he was bitterly rejected as the engineer who had failed. By 1932 this shaken Nation needed a scapegoat and Hoover was the logical candidate.

For President Truman, Herbert Hoover resumed his old task of feeding the hungry in Europe and assisting in the creation of new governments there. But there was another engineer's interest for which we are his debtors.

Since his earliest days in government, he had been fascinated and appalled by the self-generative powers of the bureaucracy and by the increasing difficulty of getting anything done in government. These problems have only in the last 2 years commended themselves to the serious attention of liberal thought; Hoover was onto them decades ago. For Truman and again for Eisenhower, the ex-President conducted exhaustive investigations of governmental inertia and duplication. His hundreds of specific recommendations were seconded by both Presidents and most were put into practice.

The shadow of Herbert Hoover upon this Nation's history has proved to be much longer than anyone imagined 30 years ago. Scholar, patriot, humanitarian, and insistent voice of the American heritage, Herbert Clark Hoover, engineer, has built mightily for his country's good.

Construction Projects in Putnam, Conn. Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have called attention to the unprecedented growth of the eastern part of Connecticut, where my congressional district is located. One of the fastest growing sections of the district is the Putnam-Thompson area in the northeast corner of the State, where eight large projects are underway at a combined cost of nearly $12 million.

Perhaps the most important of these projects is the West Thompson Dam, which is to cost some $3.5 million. In 1955 the city of Putnam suffered extensive damage to property as a result of a flood. To this day Putnam has not fully recovered from that flood, and vast stretches of bare land stand in the middle of the city where once stood many fine homes and businesses. The West Thompson Dam, now under construction, will help prevent a recurrence of that flood. New business ventures and the expansion of existing business enterprises in Putnam will not only restore normal conditions there but should also speed the growth of this city and nearby areas.

Mr. Speaker, a very fine article on the subject was published recently in the Worcester Evening Gazette, in its issue of July 29, 1963. The article, written by the newspaper's very able correspondent in Putnam, Bernard A. Dupont, discusses the various projects under construction in the area and their importance to the local economy. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and to the public at large. It reads as follows:

ALMOST $12 MILLION IN CONSTRUCTION UNDERWAY IN PUTNAM AREA

(By Bernard A. Dupont)

PUTNAM, CONN.—With the recent announcement that works on the West Thompson Dam will get underway within 2 weeks, this northeast corner of the State is experiencing an unprecedented flurry of construction.

Eight large projects have been launched in Putnam and Thompson, an area of only 74.5 square miles.

These include the $3.5 million West Thompson Dam, the $5.8 million Putnam-Thompson relocation of Route 12, the $228,400 extension and modernization of the Putnam Post Office, the $1 million-plus Putnam shopping center, the $305,000 Riverside Artery extension in Putnam, the $60,000 Putnam branch of the Motor Vehicle Department, the approximately $500,000 flood control project along the Quinebaug in Putnam city, and the $200,000 center for the mentally retarded in Putnam or vicinity.

ALMOST $12 MILLION

All told, this work will amount to almost $12 million.

When the great flood of 1955 cut a swath through the heart of Putnam city, there were doubts that the area would recover sufficiently to provide an economic climate that would keep it solvent. Reservations still exist—as expressed, for example, by the defacing of the urban renewal sign on the shopping center property.

But many residents are encouraged. The majority want to be "showed," however, and the spate of construction should go a long way toward reassuring residents and prospective industries that the tide of the long battle for urban renewal is beginning to turn.

FLOOD LESSON

The West Thompson Dam will go a long way toward insuring that the disaster of 1955 will not recur. The dam, to be finished by October 1965, should contain the waters of the Quinebaug River during high water, as well as the overflow from Massachusetts waterways. Four other dams in Massachusetts tied in to the same project have already been completed.

The dam will be about 1,000 feet north of the confluence of the Quinebaug and French Rivers. It will be 2,550 feet wide and be constructed of road earthfill.

The flood control project in the city of Putnam may begin this fall. The city is still negotiating certain rights-of-way and easements in conjunction with the project.

PROJECT DETAILS

Most of the work will be done along the banks of the Quinebaug River between the Bridge Street and Pomfret Street Bridges. The channel will be cut and straightened and the riverbanks will be cut and filled, raising their elevation. The slopes will be riprapped. Walls will be improved between the Morse Nightingale Falls and Providence Street, a new dike will be put in, and floodwalls installed on both sides.

A stoplog barrier will be tied into the wing wall of the Providence Street railroad bridge, with removable stoplogs stored in a building along the west bank of the railroad tracks below the bridge. During the 1955

flood, much water coursed down the trench along which the railroad tracks run which happens to be an old riverbed. The barrier would prevent this during high water. A gate-type dam will be installed at Cargill Falls above the Pomfret Street Bridge, after much of the ledge there has been excavated.

ROUTE 12

Work on the relocation of Route 12 began Wednesday. The 3.3 miles of four-lane highway will extend from a point south of Killingly Avenue below the Grove Street Cemetery in Putnam to a point north of Route 193 in Thompson, about ½ mile from the Massachusetts line. This relocation will tie in with the 4.4-mile segment now in the planning state that will run from Dayville through Putnam Heights.

The present terminus of the Connecticut Turnpike connector is on Route 101 at Dayville. When completed, a modern, limited-access thoroughfare will carry traffic and commerce from New York City and other great cities without hindrance to the doors of this community. The Putnam-Thompson segment should also take about 2 years to complete.

POST OFFICE

The extension and modernization of the Putnam Post Office is slated to begin in 1 or 2 weeks. Awarding of the contract was revealed July 15. Specifications call for completion within 330 calendar days from receipt of notice by the contractor, which would place the date for the end of work at sometime in June.

SHOPPING CENTER

The shopping center is of immediate interest to most residents. The project has not had much success, due to an unworkable agreement with a former developer that dragged on more than 1½ years after the Putnam Redevelopment Agency had entered into a contract in July 1961. The agency terminated its lease early this year with that firm and readvertised for a new developer.

Meanwhile, a contract was signed with a land disposition agent from New York, Henry Halprin, whose job it was to assist the agency in disposing by sale or lease the property in question. The agency eventually approved a proposal made by a local group for developing the property, which goes under the name of Putnam Shopping Center, Inc. and is represented by attorney Jerome Lovesky of Hartford.

Word is presently being awaited by the agency on final approval of the new developer's plans by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of New York. The shopping center area includes 412,000 square feet, almost 9½ acres.

RIVERSIDE ARTERY

Extension of the four-lane Riverside artery from the transformer plant of the Connecticut Light & Power Co. to the Arch Street Bridge, where the road will meet the turnpike connector (Route 12), is in its preliminary stages. Also included in this project is the extension of Canal Street to Arch Street and continuance of Bundy Street to connect Main Street with Riverside Artery. Relocation and installation of utility lines in the new streets is part of the project.

Plans are considered to make Election Hall on Providence Street temporary quarters of the Putnam branch of the motor vehicle department. A new building will be erected if the use of an existing building, several of which are presently under consideration, proves unworkable. An appropriation of $60,000 has already been set aside.

RESIDENTIAL CENTER

The residential center with day-care facilities for nonresidents who are mentally retarded is now being considered. Gov. John N. Dempsey, former Putnam mayor, signed the bill into law on June 28. The State will issue bonds for construction in an amount not to exceed $200,000. The exact location will be designated by the deputy commissioner on mental retardation after study, but the site must be in Putnam or vicinity. Bids will then be advertised.

Present Arguments Merely Repeat of 1933 Position Against Bonneville and TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of public power maintain that continued Federal operation of projects such as the Bonneville Power Administration adversely affected the economic position of adjacent private utility companies. This argument did not, however, originate with the current attacks on Bonneville. As indicated in the following article from the New York Times of October 15, 1933, they are merely a repeat of the similar position taken against both Bonneville and TVA at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the events of the past 30 years have proven this argument to be worthless. In the area adjacent to Bonneville the cost of power has gone down but private utility profits have continued to rise. For example, Portland General Electrics' price for 500 kilowatts of power in 1938 was $8.07, today it is only $6.40. And yet profits for PGE have risen from $1.3 million in 1940 to $7.5 million in 1960.

Similarly in the period 1937–55 the average annual earnings of common stock for all public utilities increased less than three times and their outstanding common stock increased only 60 percent. The nine companies adjacent to TVA, however, increased their annual common stock earning 6½ times and their total outstanding common stock by more than 90 percent.

I think the 1933 article which follows will prove interesting reading for my colleagues:

FAR WEST UTILITIES HIT FEDERAL POWER—AROUSED BY ALLOCATION OF $83 MILLION IN OREGON AND WASHINGTON—EXCESS OF OUTPUT SEEN—ADDITION BY GOVERNMENT IS CALLED A USELESS DRAIN ON PUBLIC FUNDS

Public utility companies in the Pacific Northwest are aroused over the allocation of $83 million from the national public works funds 2 weeks ago for the purpose of building two powerplants on the Columbia River in the States of Oregon and Washington.

This has created for that territory a situation similar to that brought about in the South by the Federal Government's plans for the development of Tennessee Valley power, according to power company executives. The difficulties expected in the Northwest are even more acute, they say, because that section of the country has long been stirred by municipal ownership movements, several of the principal cities already owning their own generating and distributing systems.

What has principally aroused the utility companies at this juncture, however, is not so much the possibility of an extension of municipal ownership as the absence of any markets for the power to be developed in the territory with Government funds.

There is already an oversupply of installed generating capacity in the Northwest, according to figures including all interconnected power companies in Washington, northern Oregon, and western Montana, as well as the city systems of Seattle and Tacoma, showing that present installed capacity is more than twice the sum of all peak loads encountered for any month of the current year to and including August.

SURPLUS CAPACITY CITED

Electric power capacity in the Northwest now amounts to 1,880,000 horsepower, more than twice the aggregate peak loads of 920,000 horsepower encountered in any month this year. The surplus capacity of 960,000 horsepower in this area is sufficient to serve Greater New York on most days of the year, and is two-thirds of the peak load of 1,484,400 horsepower supplied by local utilities on January 4, the record day of the year.

In view of the superabundance of power in the area, the utility companies contend that the proposed plants to be built with Federal funds cannot sell any power except in areas already served by themselves, and that in order to sell the new power, the Government-financed plants will offer rates to municipalities far below those asked by the utility companies.

The same course was taken by the Tennessee Valley Authority in making public rates which experts immediately asserted would fail to cover the actual costs of distribution and would be ruinous not only to private companies but also to municipal plants. All such developments, undertaken with public moneys, the utility men say, could not succeed were it not for the contributions made by utility companies and other corporations, and by security holders, salaried men, and wage earners in the form of taxation.

The Washington Water Power Co., serving an extensive area in eastern Washington in territory adjacent to one of the new proposed plants in the Northwest, announced last month that the average price for domestic electric service throughout its territory was 2.28 cents a kilowatt-hour and that the average consumption by each customer was 1,727 kilowatt-hours for the year ended on July 31. The national averages are 5.55 cents a unit and 600 units consumed annually. Company executives, therefore, express the opinion that their rates cannot even be duplicated by the Government except at a substantial running loss.

LOSS TO STOCKHOLDERS SEEN

Utility men familiar with the entire area assert that if the plans for new construction are pursued, property worth millions of dollars financed by the sale of securities to many thousands of investors will become valueless, and the taxes contributed by private companies to State and Federal coffers will vanish. As against the spending of a total of $106 million Government funds in the two States for the initial stages of the two projects proposed, no lasting benefits are visualized, power men assert. They are hopeful that the main purpose of the program, which is to provide expenditures of these funds in the sharply depressed Northwestern States, can be accomplished by the spending of moneys for purposes which will not put the Government into competition with private industry.

The status of the major of the two projects, that of Grand Coulee, on the Columbia River, about 75 miles west of Spokane, is that $63 million of Federal public works

moneys has been allotted by Secretary Ickes and that a temporary license has been granted by the Federal Power Commission to the Columbia Basin Commission, which is a Washington State organization. The temporary license permits the State group to go ahead with surveys, planning, and preliminary work, to be submitted as evidence before a permanent license is granted. The Federal Power Commission also will require testimony as to the available markets for the power to be generated.

About 670,000 horsepower of electricity is contemplated at this site, where it is eventually proposed to triple the capacity and devote one-third of all the power to irrigation pumping, which will divert part of the water backed up on the Columbia River to the preglacial bed of the river south of Grand Coulee. The irrigation part of the scheme has been dropped as an initial aim because of the overproduction of crops and the ploughing under of cultivated lands throughout the country.

BIG PROJECT AT BONNEVILLE

The other project, to be located at Bonneville, Oreg., about 50 miles east of Portland, is merely the first of a series of ambitious projects estimated to cost $319 million on the lower Columbia River, intended for the generation of power (to make the entire project self-sustaining), to improve navigation, to provide water for reclamation, and to care for flood control.

The Bonneville plant is to cost $43 million and produce 333,000 horsepower of electricity, destined principally to enter into competition in the city of Portland with power sold by two utility companies holding franchises there. This also is viewed as constituting a raid on an existing market, as no outlet for power not already supplied adequately exists in the area, utility men contend. Secretary Ickes has allotted $20 million for this plant.

In addition to the present idle installed electric capacity in the Northwest a large number of privately or municipally owned plants have only a part of their ultimate capacity installed and bays are in readiness for the machinery to supply added capacity if any were required.

In this connection Ralph Nichols, member of the Seattle City Council and chairman of its finance committee, has waged an almost singlehanded battle against the Grand Coulee project, which does, however, have the support of most political bodies in Washington State. Mr. Nichols is endeavoring to obtain a Federal loan of about $26 million for completion of the city's Skagit project, in territory northeast of Seattle, which would provide an additional 640,000 horsepower of installed capacity.

Further signs of sectionalism were evidenced late in September when the mayor of Portland urged the city council to boycott Grand Coulee power unless the Bonneville power project also was provided for by the Federal Government, as it later turned out to be. The Skagit development application has not yet been acted upon.

Of the funds provided by the Federal Government, 30 percent is an outright grant and 70 percent must be refunded over a period of years. Meanwhile, interest at 5 percent annually is charged for the Federal funds. It is significant, utility men point out, that they are liable for interest and principal on 100 percent of the money invested in their plants. Even so, they add, these costs may oblige the States of the Northwest to appropriate moneys to service the Federal loans if they undercut the utility companies' rates in competing for markets, in addition to sacrificing taxes now collected.

Report of Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a copy of the report of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress 50th annual national convention, which was held in Washington during the first week in June. Again I had the honor to serve as chairman of the committee, but much of the credit for this report belongs to J. W. Grimes, State engineer of South Dakota, vice chairman of the committee; Ival V. Goslin, executive director of the Upper Colorado River Commission, secretary of the committee; W. S. Gookin, State water engineer, Phoenix, Ariz., and to William E. Welsh, secretary-manager of the National Reclamation Association. I am also happy to include in my remarks the members of our committee.

The report of the committee follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, 50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, JUNE 7, 1963

INTRODUCTION

The irrigation and reclamation committee was established in 1957 for the purpose of formulating and supporting general policies and programs for the continued orderly development of reclamation and irrigation as part of conservation and utilization of our Nation's water supplies. The committee was directed to recommend ways and means whereby the National Rivers and Harbors Congress may actively support reclamation and irrigation development and coordinate such interests with other phases of the national water resources program.

Irrigation and reclamation developments are seldom built as single-purpose projects. Such developments are now planned and constructed as parts of river basinwide, multiple-purpose concepts which include flood control, navigation, electric power, pollution control, municipal and industrial water supplies, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other purposes. These combinations of purposes to accomplish development, conservation, and utilization of the Nation's water resources to meet the ever-increasing needs for water require continuing public understanding of the multitude of interrelating factors that constitute multiple-purpose, basinwide planning. It is no longer sufficient to understand only the present water needs in specific localities. This understanding must be expanded to include future needs for entire river basins or regions. It is important to remember that these basin or regional components constitute national water resources development.

Our broadening concepts for development of the Nation's water resources can no longer be limited to fixed patterns of water use. The irrigation industry, so vital now to the Nation, will continue to be subject to the expansion of the manufacturing, industrial complexes of the future. Basinwide, multiple-purpose projects must be adaptable to such changes in land and water use.

These broad concepts are recognized by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. The attitude and accomplishments of this organization constitute progress and reflect the value of united approach.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS ARE MULTIPLE PURPOSE

Under Federal and State laws, the term "irrigation project" has far-reaching meanings which are not reflected by the name. Under Federal reclamation laws, Federal investments in irrigation development are justified only if feasible irrigation opportunities exist and owners of irrigable land undertake contractual payments on the investment, assume responsibility for operation and maintenance, and obligate themselves in other particulars. Upon establishment of feasibility, Federal investments in project features are provided for municipal and industrial water, recreation opportunities, fish and wildlife enhancement, pollution abatement, and other purposes. Regulation of, and supplements to, low streamflow are inherent results of such irrigation projects. Water is made available in areas which otherwise are doomed to only a fraction of their optimum potential.

Other than repayment requirements, there is little difference in Federal policies as applied to multiple-purpose irrigation projects from those applied to other Federal water resources developments.

IRRIGATION IS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

On most of our semarid cropland areas (and more humid land, too) little choice exists as to crops to be grown; consequently, surpluses of certain crops have created national problems. Only about 2 percent of these surplus crops constituting the total Commodity Credit Corporation loans and inventories are grown on Federal irrigation projects. Change to other crops on irrigated land provides solution for part of the so-called surplus crop problems.

Our Nation is the best fed in the world. Much of the wealth of dietary need and choice comes from irrigated land (lettuce, 93 percent; broccoli, 84 percent; asparagus, 63 percent; cantaloup, 82 percent; celery, 60 percent; practically all domestic production of olives, dates, figs, nectarines, lemons). These foods and others from irrigated land, with the help of the transportation industry, contribute to the health and fitness of our Nation's people.

Stockraising in the vast arid and semiarid grazing land empire is vastly improved, qualitatively and quantitatively, by irrigation project feed bases. Winter feed supplies for the breeding herds are assured through irrigation. Where available, irrigation removes the critical hazards of widely fluctuating winter hay supplies. Ours is a meat-eating nation. Irrigation supports the base for the meat-producing industry.

Irrigation projects create new, additional, renewable economic bases for the project area, the State, the region, and the Nation. They are stabilizing islands in vast areas of our country whose principal economic problem is a wide fluctuation of gross annual income. Not only the irrigators, but all people become beneficiaries. Here are the living quarters for the expanding population, new businesses, new jobs, opportunities for the young. This is not local economic development; this is the Nation's business.

Many irrigation projects are located in sections of our country that may be designated the last frontiers for natural outdoor recreation and fish and wildlife opportunities. Ir-

rigation reservoirs and water distribution enhance these opportunities for recreation.

COORDINATION IS NEEDED

Basic problems associated with water resources development vary with climatic, geographical and social conditions in our Nation. In recent years many analyses, public and private, have advocated widespread coordination of effort by all interests in solving these problems. Fully coordinated action among Federal agencies, among State agencies and among Federal and State agencies is lacking. Public understanding of the various interrelated aspects of multiple-purpose, water resources development is meager. Current needs and emergencies too often become the basis for piece-meal project construction. Special interests advocate project authorization and construction without regard for, or understanding of, related purposes and needs. Irrigation projects, as well as projects proposed under other Federal authorizing laws, are influenced by such lack of coordinated effort. Enormous accomplishments in this field are possible.

Increasing emphasis is being placed on comprehensive river basin planning for water and related land resources development by concerned Federal and State agencies. Such comprehensive plans provide a guide for coordinated program formulation by the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service for interrelated water resources development and management for an entire river basin or region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress recommends support for the following policies for multiple-purpose water resources development projects where irrigation is one of the purposes:

1. Basin-wide, multiple-purpose, water conservation and water use development should be the primary objective.

2. All benefits, direct and indirect, should be evaluated in order that the full worth to the river basin and to the Nation may be known.

3. More realistic and uniform standards and criteria for project evaluation consistent with modern technology and our expanding economy are urgently needed. We commend the Bureau of the Budget for working with the Departments of the Army, Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate requests in the 1964 budget estimates for funds for coordinated river basins planning for water resources development. This was a result of the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources that river basins be the basis for water resource planning and acceptance by the Bureau of the Budget of the goal that coordinated river basin water resources development plans be prepared for all major river basins by 1970.

4. The Congress of the United States should continue to establish the policies and criteria under which all Federal water resources projects will be authorized and built.

5. Water resources authorization and construction should proceed in an orderly and efficient continuous pattern in order that the future needs of a dynamic growing economy will be met. Recent activity by the Bureau of the Budget towards coordination of planning funds and timing of river basin investigations of the Departments of Army, Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare is indicative of progress along this line.

6. Procedures under which Federal water resources projects are investigated and reported should be simplified.

7. The use of revenues derived from electric power phases of river basin facilities to assist in the repayment of irrigation project costs has proven beneficial and should be continued.

8. The use of conservancy-type districts capable of taxing all project beneficiaries has proved to be of great value in sponsoring water projects and in enhancing their financial feasibility. The creation and use of these districts under State law should be encouraged.

9. Federal water resources projects should be developed in conformity with State water laws.

10. All costs of investigating Federal water resources developments, including those for reclamation and irrigation, should be nonreimbursable in recognition of the principle that the evaluation of such developments is in the national interest.

11. The conservation and development of the Nation's water and land resources should be accelerated in keeping with anticipated future needs.

SPECIAL RECOMMENDATION

Because of interest expressed at committee hearings in the past 3 years by representatives from States, other than the 17 western reclamation States, the irrigation and reclamation committee recommends that membership on this committee be expanded to include representatives from all other States having an interest in irrigation development and who desire representation on the committee. Unless overruled by the board of directors of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, it is assumed that in the future the committee on irrigation and reclamation will be expanded to include representatives from any of the 50 States having an interest in irrigation and reclamation and deserving membership.

SUMMARY

The above principles and recommendations are hereby presented to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress with the request that full support be given to all aspects of multiple-purpose development and utilization of the Nation's water resources.

The committee on irrigation and reclamation recommends adoption of this report.

IVAL V. GOSLIN, *Secretary*.

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Chairman: Congressman J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado.

Vice chairman: J. W. Grimes, Pierre, S. Dak., executive officer, State Water Resources Commission.

Secretary: Ival V. Goslin, Salt Lake City, Utah, executive director, Upper Colorado River Commission.

ATTENDANCE

Arizona: W. S. Gookin, State Water Engineer, Phoenix; A. M. Ward, interstate stream commissioner, Casa Grande.

California: W. B. Camp, Bakersfield.

Colorado: J. E. Whitten, State Engineer, Denver.

Nebraska: Dan S. Jones, Jr., director, department of water resources, Lincoln.

Ohio: D. R. Stanfield, State Commission, Columbus; Sam S. Studebaker, State Commission, Columbus.

South Carolina: W. B. Camp, Gaffney.

South Dakota: J. W. Grimes, Water Resources Commission, Pierre.

Texas: Ralph T. Agar, Engineer-Manager, CCWID No. 2, San Benito; Clifford H. Purdy, Harlingen; J. B. Cocke, Harlingen; Oscor Thieme, San Benito; Earl Holt, High Plains Water District, Hereford; Tony McFarland, Lubbock; John Gammon, High Plains Water District, Lubbock.

Utah: Thomas W. Jensen, Salt Lake City.

Wyoming: Marlin T. Kurtz, Cody; C. H. Davis, Gillette.

Should the Test Ban Treaty Be Approved?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Senate should ratify the test ban treaty. With wise administration, it would be possible for the United States to protect itself from any faults in the treaty. However, it will now be necessary for us to be more vigilant than ever. In order to learn the reaction to the treaty in my district, I sent the following report to my newspapers. I think it would be of interest to our colleagues to read five editorials which have appeared in newspapers in the First District of Minnesota. Two of the newspapers take the more reserved position on the treaty which I take. The other two are more outspoken in support.

First, I would like to insert my report to the newspapers in the district—Washington Report, Thursday, August 1.

The first editorial is from the Rochester Post-Bulletin, dated Monday, July 29, 1963, titled "No Quickie Approval of Test Ban Treaty." The second editorial from the Post-Bulletin is titled "Ban Treaty Danger: False Optimism," and is dated Tuesday, August 6, 1963.

The Monday, July 29, 1963, issue of the Austin Daily Herald carried the editorial, "Senate Should OK Nuclear Test Ban." Other editorials were "Treaty Should Be Accepted," of the Red Wing Republican Eagle, August 1, 1963, and "Test Ban Treaty May Be Faulty," of the Albert Lea Tribune, Tuesday, August 6, 1963.

The report and editorials follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE)

The administration has now announced a new test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. The treaty agrees to a ban on nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. The agreeing parties—the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union—would still be free to continue nuclear testing underground. Article IV states any party may withdraw from the treaty if extraordinary events jeopardize its supreme interests.

The treaty must now be ratified by the U.S. Senate. Senate reaction will depend largely on support for the treaty which is indicated by the public. There are two questions which are being asked. The first, of course, is whether the treaty is in the best interests of the United States. The second is whether our Government made an unwritten agreement with the Soviets that is connected with the test ban treaty but goes beyond it.

The best way for anyone to answer these questions is to study all the arguments. In Apirl 1963, Eugene Rabinowitch, editor of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist and a biophysicist in his own right, stated:

"I must now explain * * * why failing to reach it [test ban agreement] would be a grave setback to mankind's hopes for a peaceful future. An agreement * * * would be a significant demonstration of the community of interests of the two nuclear superpowers. A test ban agreement would be a first step toward the recognition of common U.S.-

U.S.S.R. interests and stabilizing the worldwide political and strategic situation and helping to prevent violent changes which would threaten to involve them in a mutually destructive nuclear war."

Decisions can't be made on hopes alone. If the test ban treaty endangers the future defenses of the United States, it certainly would not be in our best interests. In this regard, Edward Teller, the noted nuclear scientist, wrote to me and other Congressmen. His letter stated in part:

"Negotiations in Moscow may lead to a situation which would exclude future U.S. tests in the atmosphere. At the same time we could not control Russian atmospheric tests if these tests stay well below 1 kiloton. Use of clean explosives may permit even bigger Russian atmospheric experimentation. Such small tests could be decisive in developing missile defense, a field of utmost importance in which the Russians may already have a considerable lead.

"There is little doubt that the Russians are ahead of us in big nuclear explosives. A ban on atmospheric tests would perpetuate this situation."

No doubt there is some truth in Dr. Teller's warning. The question is does the warning include so much truth that the Senate should reject the treaty? Perhaps, wisdom lies somewhere between the hopes of Dr. Rabinowitch and the warnings of Dr. Teller.

All of us want world peace; one free from both the effects of nuclear war and atomic fallout. To achieve that peace requires that we act as well as hope. In our dealings with the Soviet Union, we must remember the nature of the Communists. It is difficult to believe that Khrushchev wants to work with us in the interests of lasting peace and good will. In the past, the Soviets have broken 50 out of 53 treaties and their goal is still the successful spread of world communism. Their quarrel with Red China is not whether that goal should be given up, but how it should be brought about. Let's remember this as the test ban treaty raises our hopes for world peace.

[From the Rochester Post-Bulletin, July 29, 1963]

NO QUICKIE APPROVAL OF TEST BAN TREATY

In his nationwide address Friday evening urging ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, President Kennedy was properly cautious in explaining that the treaty is not the millenium.

We were gratified that he pointed out the limitations of the treaty because some of the fuzzy-minded ultraliberals and crackpot intellectuals in his own party are already trying to convince one and all that the leopard Khrushchev has really changed his spots.

This is nonsense, of course, and must not be seriously considered. We think the leaders of the U.S. Senate are entirely correct in their announced intentions to spend several weeks in studying and probing the test ban provisions and just what they mean and could mean to the security of our Nation.

Pleas for a quickie approval of the treaty must go unheeded.

In the end, we suspect that the test ban treaty will be, and should be ratified; but only after all the details have been fully aired so that there can be no misunderstanding about what they mean.

Even then, however, past history indicates that the United States must proceed on the theory that some time in the future the Soviet Union will renounce the treaty when it deems such action most beneficial to itself. We must not be caught napping.

[From the Rochester Post-Bulletin, Aug. 6, 1963]

BAN TREATY DANGER: FALSE OPTIMISM

The greatest danger to U.S. security in the partial nuclear test ban treaty, we feel, is that it may, by generating a feeling of false optimism, encourage many persons and governments in the free world to lower their guard against communism.

Although we feel that ratification of the treaty is desirable, assuming that the Senate's investigations reveal no "strings" attached, we believe there is little reason for interpreting the partial test ban as meaning very much in the cause of world peace.

All history of the past four decades shows that the Soviet Union has made many treaties and agreements when they suited her purposes, and later renounced or broke them any time she thought it would benefit her.

To believe that it will be different this time would be pure folly. Nevertheless, throughout the free world there will be many persons in high and low places—members of the left crackpoterie, the fuzzy-wuzzy ban-the-bombers and those who just never learn anything from experience—who will indeed see the treaty through rose (or pink) colored glasses.

In this connection, the Vatican radio issued an unusual warning on the eve of the signing of the test ban treaty.

"To promote help and encourage initiatives and understandings that favor peace is a duty," Vatican radio said. "But equally indispensable is the duty of vigilant, constant, and indomitable opposition to the Marxist ideology and the duty to block every line of its penetration. There is no international situation, no easing of tension, no historical pretext that can justify any indulgence or a conciliatory attitude toward Marxism and communism."

Amid the flood of optimism over the treaty signing, much of it for domestic political purposes, it will not be easy for realists to carry the day in pointing out how very little has been changed by the treaty. But they must. The free world must not be fooled again.

[From the Austin Daily Herald, July 29, 1963]

SENATE SHOULD OK NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Some Senators appear to be reluctant about ratification of the nuclear test ban agreement with Russia, because they are suspicious of the sincerity of the Communists in any agreement.

Obviously, there is a calculated hazard in attempting cooperative effort with the Soviet Union. But the hazard is small when you consider the great danger which will confront the world if nuclear tests continue to poison our atmosphere. And the Soviets may very well be sincere about this agreement since they have a natural desire, too, to preserve the world from destruction.

All authorities agree we have enough atomic explosives to destroy the Soviet Union many, many times so that there is no real reason to conduct tests to further perfect our ability to destroy.

Fears have been expressed by a few Senators that we may have made other concessions in the secret agreements reached with Russia. But the President has emphasized that the Moscow talks "reached no agreement on any other subject, nor is this treaty conditioned on any other matter" than to prohibit nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and under water.

In his appeal for public support of the agreement, Kennedy noted that "continued and unrestricted testing by the nuclear powers, joined in time by other nations which may be less adept in limiting pollution, will increasingly contaminate the air that all of us must breathe."

There will undoubtedly be more talks between the United States and Russia in an attempt to work toward further peaceful collaboration. While we should always be wary of any agreements with the Communists, and should examine them closely, the test ban seems to be a safe start and ratification by the Senate should not be delayed. It represents a real hope in working for the survival of this world in a nuclear age.

[From the Red Wing Daily Republican Eagle, Aug. 1, 1963]

TREATY SHOULD BE ACCEPTED

Republicans in Washington continue to take a cool and standoffish attitude toward the partial nuclear test ban treaty which the Kennedy administration has just negotiated in Moscow. As an example, see Congressman AL QUIE's report elsewhere on this page.

To our mind, this GOP reluctance is a serious mistake. Let us explain why:

First, if partisanship is involved, that is inexcusable. World peace and the possible contamination of the atmosphere are issues too grave for any man to consider the implications for his own or his party's political fortunes.

Second, the treaty does not seem to us to endanger U.S. security. There are scientists like Dr. Teller who disagree, we know, and apparently the military would like to keep right on testing. But the military is under civilian control in the U.S. system, and the test ban issue indicates just how desirable this is.

According to the best scientific information we get, the United States will know at once if the Russians violate this treaty. Our instruments would detect their nuclear explosions anywhere except underground. Also, the treaty is cancellable within 90 days. Our laboratories can keep right on researching, and we can maintain our readiness to test should the Russians violate.

It's important to remember at this point that President Eisenhower proposed a ban on nuclear tests in the air, water, and space, and that Moscow is only now accepting. It's also worth remembering that the United States runs some risks in whatever we decide to do—accept the test ban or let the nuclear arms race continue unabated.

Third, President Kennedy flatly declared on television last Friday that the test ban treaty is accompanied by nothing whatever like the unwritten agreement with the Soviets to which QUIE refers. We cannot conceive of John F. Kennedy misleading the country on an issue so grave.

The joint communique from Moscow accompanying the treaty does say—in writing—that both we and the Soviet Union will consult with our allies on a European nonaggression pact "with the purpose of achieving agreement satisfactory to all participants." And the treaty itself pledges both sides to seek "agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objective of the United Nations."

These statements are right out in the open, and what can be wrong with them? Indeed, they represent the hope of all mankind. If both we and the Soviets truly honor their spirit, we can eventually lift the threat of nuclear horror that hangs over every man's head.

Fourth, accepting this treaty with the Soviet Union does not imply a U.S. belief that the Soviets have suddenly become trustworthy or have abandoned their long-term objective of world domination for communism.

Rather, it suggests that the Soviets have decided that their interests run parallel with ours in regard to limiting nuclear weapons. They don't want to be blown to Kingdom come any more than we do, so they have decided that they must coexist with us for a while just as we believe we must coexist with them. If both sides can agree to conduct the long-term contest of freedom versus communism without letting nuclear weapons

spread further, that is a significant step forward.

Fifth, and most importantly, this treaty could be the turning point in history at which civilized man leaves the road toward nuclear catastrophe and starts on a new road toward nuclear control.

Perhaps these hopes will be disappointed. Perhaps the Soviets will dash them before the year is out. But now that they have accepted this very limited treaty—now that they have extended their hand this little distance—dare we spurn them? Dare we slam the door that has been opened ever so slightly? Dare we reject this opportunity to see whether further steps toward arms control may now be taken and whether the world may not someday be made a safe place for little children to grow up without the threat of another Nagasaki, another Hiroshima, or far, far worse?

[From the Albert Lea Tribune, Aug. 6, 1963]

TEST BAN TREATY MAY BE FAULTY

The signing of the nuclear test ban treaty is making news headlines. This diplomatic ploy has a certain popular support since it was first announced. In fact a great many people were hailing it before even the skimpiest details were available. We think this is a function of the longing for peace rather than an intelligent appraisal of the treaty and its contents.

As a matter of fact, full text of the treaty hasn't been generally circulated. Which fact has kept this newspaper from voicing a firm opinion on what we think the value of the treaty is. Besides, we think the sicentists and military experts ought to be heard before this Nation commits itself to what appears to be only a partial ban which operates some of the time among some nations.

At the time of the signing, Secretary of State Dean Rusk observed "Our three governments—United States, U.S.S.R., and Great Britain—have today taken what all mankind must hope will be a first step on the road to a secure and peaceful world." He then dilutes his hope for all mankind by saying "But it is only a first step. It does not end the threat of nuclear war."

We think, too, that Secretary Rusk is unduly optimistic about even his first step. There is no showing in history that Russia abides by treaties when it is in here interest to break them. As late as the Cuban fiasco, we are uneasy about Russian integrity. Nikita Khrushchev indicated to President Kennedy that Russia would recall its missiles from Cuba. There was a great rejoicing in the land. But lately there are disquieting rumors that Nikita didn't keep his promise completely and that some missiles still remain in captive Cuba.

We think it entirely likely that Russia will keep this treaty—which calls for cessation of nuclear testing in the atmosphere—for a few months or even a few years. We think this because Red China and Russia are at odds with leadership of the considerable Communist world at stake. By being able to sign with major parties, Russia takes the initiative for the moment.

We think too, that Russia completed enough tests in its last series to make its scientists current with their theoretical efforts. They have demonstrated their ability to produce a gigantic bomb, but learned—as we have—that the big bombs cost too much, lack the strategic value of smaller bombs and would destroy too much real estate to make their use likely. The Muscovites are turning to smaller yield bombs, just as we have, which can be tested underground.

Much as we would like to join the chorus of hosannahs, we prefer to wait until the Senate begins its hearings and our intelligence, military and scientific people can bring the weight of their testimony to bear.

We'd like to believe this treaty is an easy credit path to world peace, but having found the convenient terms costly in other diplomatic installment buying, we are wary of it.

Monterey Sees Double Growth—Needs Braceros for Supplemental Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, an objective article appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor. It describes, in part, my home valley of Salinas, Calif. It describes well that our community leaders, farmers and industrialists, are working together to solve the mutual problems of growth. People bring problems, but few solutions.

When an area tries desperately and conscientiously to help itself, it would seem that other areas should not hinder and frustrate its efforts.

Presently the bracero program is necessary to harvest crops which will otherwise spoil.

We simply ask the understanding and consideration of Congressmen who may not be faced with our problems. One visit during harvest time would convince you that we need supplemental labor and that no program has yet been suggested which is better than the bracero program.

The article follows:

MONTEREY SEES DOUBLE GROWTH

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

SALINAS, CALIF.—Monterey County, long publicized as "the world's salad bowl," is using a new slogan. Now it's "the sweetest place on earth."

Lettuce is still king in spacious, productive Salinas Valley. But the new structures across its handsome skyline, etched by the Santa Lucia Mountains, house two major candy manufacturers and a nationally known jams and jellies factory. Its oldest big landmark is a sugar refinery.

Maybe the sweetest part of the change from rural to industrial economy, though, is the probability that the county can have the best of both.

BEST OF BOTH WORLDS

In the kaleidoscopic California picture, Monterey County indicates another probability—that California can keep on getting urban without concentrating everything in crowded cities. The big lettuce fields, the mountain playgrounds, the Pacific Ocean resort areas, all promise to keep it spectacularly beautiful.

When the Salinas Chamber of Commerce set up an industrial development committee in 1951 the county had just 131,000 residents. Now it has some 200,000 and its keeps on growing.

Today the chamber's committee is an independent, semipublic agency with 40 directors, known as Monterey County Industrial Development. It has a staff headed by V. H. Moore, executive director.

DOUBLE-EDGED GROWTH

Mr. Moore observes that what is happening here is unique in California in that this is the only county where both irrigated acreage and industry are increasing.

Monterey County is rich in water; the Salinas River is the Nation's longest submerged stream and the region has a major water conservation program.

From the economic angle, Mr. Moore declares, industrialization has become fundamental.

Natural advantages were drawing people. Millions know the Monterey Peninsula, where Robert Louis Stevenson once wrote and where, at Carmel, artists of world renown have made the region's beauty famous.

FARMING TOO SEASONAL

It has great Army and Navy facilities—Fort Ord's 30,000 acres, the historic Presidio at Monterey, the U.S. Naval Post Graduate School, Camp Robert, Camp Hunter Liggett.

To support growth for a place like this, agriculture was too seasonal. Spreckels Sugar Co. hired hundreds when it was operating at full capacity, but when December came, nobody had anything to do. "This doesn't happen any more," Mr. Moore observes.

Monterey County does not imagine, he adds, that it will become an industrial area like the San Francisco-Oakland complex which lies just 100 miles northward.

Salinas is situated on one of the two main California north-south highways, U.S. 101, as well as the main north-south train and air routes, but it is not a crossroad of major national transportation. Its opportunities are regional; as are its advantages.

SMALLNESS A HELP

"A company that ships to the 11 Western States is better off in a small city," Mr. Thomas points out. "Its trucks don't have to wrestle with freeway tieups. Its employees have all sorts of living benefits."

When Paul Smucker was looking around California for a place to put a J. M. Smucker Co. plant, he couldn't resist the Monterey Peninsula's moderate year-round climiate. His factory for making jams and jellies has become a landmark for travelers speeding along the north-south freeway.

Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. was looking for labor supply. Seasonal agriculture and agricultural mechanization increase the supply constantly. As of last December, says Mr. Thomas, there were 3,200 men available for work here.

FEATURES ATTRACT

Climate, livability, and labor advantages account in large part for the growing list of major industrial firms that have located here—Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co., the Nestlé Co., Aerojet General Corp., Basic Vegetables Products, Inc., Peter Paul, Inc., Kuhlman Electric Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., incidentally, is the biggest taxpayer.

What happens to a community distinguished for beauty—clear skies, pure air—when industry comes marching in?

The county has had an air pollution board now for 4 or 5 years. No problem is in sight so far, but the board promises, as Mr. Thomas puts it, to make "a real study" of wind velocity to see what preventive measures must be taken.

"There are times," he says with a smile, "when Nestlé's gives us a real nice chocolate smell."

Has President Kennedy Made Commitments to Castro?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, has President Kennedy confided more in Castro

than he has in the American people? Has an agreement been reached to recognize the Communist regime in Cuba and to permit this Soviet armed base to be strengthened and made permanent? I think Congress and the American people are due a full and frank explanation from President Kennedy in answer to the following item which appears in this week's edition of U.S. News & World Report:

An important Cuban official, visiting South America, sums up relations between the United States and his country this way: "President Kennedy will talk menacingly about Communist Cuba until after the U.S. elections in November 1964. Then, if reelected, he will take gradual, practical steps to reestablish normal relations with Cuba."

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 14th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual lossers and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

The principal newspaper of southern Idaho believes Bonneville would not stand the test if the people of that area were fully aware of what they stand to lose by Bonneville's invasion of southern Idaho.

The continuing stream of letters, editorials, and articles from southern Idaho expressing emphatic opposition to Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho leads me to believe that the people are beginning to realize that the adverse effects and costs of Bonneville power will far overshadow the illusory claimed benefits.

I believe the people of southern Idaho are intelligent enough to understand how stupid and unwarranted Secretary Udall's action really was, when all the facts are presented to them.

The editorial from the Idaho Daily Statesman for July 8, 1963, follows:

WOULDN'T STAND A TEST

Most of the argument that the promoters of Bonneville power for southern Idaho are using is that it is cheap, and that this part of Idaho is entitled to some of it for that reason. There is the further contention that since Idaho has paid part of the cost of building this public power grid the State should receive some of the low-rated power. These are not the pertinent points.

The question is whether or not Idaho wants a forced invasion of public power. There is no proof either way. But if there were to be a test in which Idaho had a voice, we are confident that the answer would not be in favor of extending Bonneville power into this area, or any other. Practical Idahoans would want Bonneville forced into a position where it stood on its own feet and charged rates proportionate to eliminate the roughly $15 million a year it now loses.

To bring Bonneville into southern Idaho, unless invasion without Idaho acceptance is accomplished by confiscation of privately owned powerlines, will cost some $80 million. This money has to come from a Government that is deeper in debt than ever before and borrowing money at record high interest rates. There is not sufficient total revenue in all the public power areas in southern Idaho to pay the 4-percent interest the Government would have to pay on $80 million.

The original legislation creating Federal power required that these projects be operated to at least earn their operating costs. This Bonneville is not pretending to do, and has not done for years. Idaho's resentment is over this fact more than any other. Idahoans know that if Bonneville had to operate at a break-even level that it couldn't compete with taxpaying utilities. This situation must be evident to the promoters of Bonneville power for southern Idaho. If so, they aren't what would be termed persons interested in financial integrity.

Idahoans all need to find out what they will lose as well as what the promoters say they will gain with Bonneville power. Once the story has been made clear, we doubt that our elected officials in Washington will dare continue the promotion. They depend now on sheer Idaho stupidity.

A Discussion of the Nuclear Test Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 the editorial "A Discussion of the Nuclear Test Treaty," by Mr. William R. Mathews, president and general manager, was published in the Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson. It is so timely and discerning, I felt it should be included in the RECORD so as to have as wide a coverage as possible:

A DISCUSSION OF THE NUCLEAR TEST TREATY

(By William R. Mathews)

Elsewhere in the Star today is published the full text of the nuclear test ban treaty agreed to by the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union.

A casual reading of it reflects an old but unsuccessful and mistaken American diplomatic tradition of attempting to abolish wars and armaments by a legal formula.

In its second paragraph it proclaims as its "principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations which would put an end to the armaments race and eliminate the incentive to the production and testing of all kinds of weapons, including nuclear weapons."

After what our country has been through since 1940, it is somewhat astounding to read that the Kennedy administration hopes to abandon all of our armament and place our faith in world peace in the United Nations.

It pledges "each of the parties to the treaty to undertake to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear test explosions, or any other nuclear explosions, at any place under its jurisdiction."

The treaty will be open to all states for signature. It will become effective upon ratification by signatory states. It will enter into force after its ratification by Britain, the United States, and the U.S.S.R.

It conspicuously omits completely the past firm American policy of calling for inspection. Possibly the way we police the air today makes that unnecessary. Six months ago our diplomats and other officials competent to speak, insisted that inspection was absolutely necessary. The Soviet Union evidently refused to budge. Now our diplomats abandon that asserted necessity in order to get a treaty.

It notably provides an escape clause for all signatories which reads: "Each party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events, related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

Three months notice is required. Consequently, this clause opens the way for either the Soviet Union, Britain, or ourselves or other signatories to resume testing within the legal sanction of the treaty itself.

Unless France and Red China sign, they are not obligated. France can go on making tests, China can go on with its prospective first test.

The treaty specifically permits underground nuclear explosions that do not contaminate the air being used by all signatories. That permits the United States, the U.S.S.R., and Britain to keep their atomic weapons up to date.

It takes only a casual reading of its brief provisions to see that the treaty is a greatly overrated document. It does not prevent nuclear war. It amounts to so much eyewash, or the glorification of a triviality as a major diplomatic achievement. It repeats the old diplomatic trick of humbugging the people of the world, including our own, with beautiful, desirable, but unattainable and unlimited objectives. It assumes a moral and political standard that today is nonexistent.

It puts the United States in an embarrassing diplomatic position. It probably will have rough sledding in our Senate. If we do not ratify it, we will be told that we will come under the moral condemnation of the world. If we do ratify it, the only harm it will do is that which comes from deceiving the people of the world, including ourselves.

Finally it is a perfect example of trying to cure a fever with an icepack instead of treating the cause of the fever. It ignores the cause of armaments which arise out of the conflicting political ambitions of governments.

Perhaps the greatest value that this treaty may have is that its success in getting the agreement of the Soviets on a relatively trivial matter may open the way to agreements on more important subjects.

Suggested Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a gentleman in Los Fresnos, Tex., part of which I wish to share with the House. The Texan writes as follows:

Hon. FRANK T. BOW: Read your insert in a recent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to

the use of "Hail to the Chief" as a signoff by some radio stations in this country.

I rather agree that same is inappropriate and would suggest that "Santa Claus Is Coming to Town" be substituted. In view of the increase in these so-called free Federal handouts, the aforementioned title would certainly apply.

Business Week Magazine Endorses Senate Ratification of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial from the August 3, 1963, issue of Business Week magazine calling for Senate ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty.

The editorial, entitled "The Test Ban: So Far, So Good," follows:

THE TEST BAN: SO FAR, SO GOOD

The American people can derive a good deal of satisfaction from the test ban treaty that is to be signed early next week in Moscow. Whatever its limitations—and they are considerable—the United States-British agreement with the Soviet Union is a step toward curtailing the nuclear arms race. At the same time, it promises to keep radiation levels around the world from mounting to a point that would threaten the safety of mankind.

In presenting the proposed treaty to the Nation last week, President Kennedy very wisely cautioned against overrating the significance of the Moscow accord. Among its limitations, he pointed out that it did not cover underground testing, that detection methods are far from perfect for tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space, and that basic conflicts with the Soviets on such issues as Berlin and Cuba are unresolved. Washington has always hoped that any test ban agreement would provide for international inspection and thus set the stage for actual arms control. Since the new agreement provides no on-site inspection, it is a disappointment in that respect.

Clearly, we must approach this agreement with open eyes, refusing to be bemused by any notion that our safety can now be trusted to Soviet good will. The Russian leaders have reasons of self-interest for signing a test ban treaty now, including no doubt their need to divert more resources to economic development and to offset the challenge to their leadership of the Communist world that is coming from Red China. Perhaps also, the Kremlin has decided that it is too dangerous, as well as too expensive, to strive for nuclear supremacy by launching a new test series that would probe for some kind of absolute weapon.

The one thing that is clear is that Moscow has not given up its goal of wresting world leadership from the U.S. and spreading the Soviet system around the globe. Until Soviet leaders renounce this mission, the prospects for establishing a lasting truce in the cold war will remain dim.

WEIGHING THE RISKS

It can be assumed that the Senate, during its debate on ratification, will take all these factors and many more into account. Certainly the Senate will want to be reasonably satisfied, as the administration obviously is, that this partial test ban will not change the existing military balance even slightly in Moscow's favor.

It will be well, though, for the Senators to remember that there is no such thing as absolute security in this world and that the only way to make an intelligent choice is to weigh the hazards on one side against those on the other. In making such a choice, the Senators fortunately can place reliance on the experienced judgment of Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, who negotiated the treaty on behalf of the United States.

If risks of Soviet deception are involved, they seem no greater than those the Truman and Eisenhower administrations were prepared to take in earlier U.S. efforts to contain the atom and improve the chances of peace. President Eisenhower, for example, offered Moscow a limited test ban agreement almost identical with the present one, only to be met with Premier Khrushchev's blunt refusal to discuss it. This fact, incidentally, indicates that the United States did not back down in negotiating the present agreement. If anybody yielded, it was Khrushchev.

Though President de Gaulle's personal rejection of the treaty this week must be regretted, it should not deflect the United States from its course. His charge that Washington and London were going over the heads of France and West Germany to settle the future of Europe with Moscow ignores the realities of the situation. The best way for the United States and Britain to dispel this idea is simply by refusing to compromise West German interests in the followup discussions soon to be held in Moscow on Khrushchev's proposal for a nonaggression treaty between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact countries.

By holding out for French nuclear independence at this moment in history, Gaullist France may well suffer in the opinion of other European nations, and in the free world generally. For the chances are that many of the smaller nations will want to sign the test ban treaty as a demonstration of their fear of nuclear war between the great powers. In this case, Communist China—the other holdout among the potential nuclear nations—may also lose some of the standing it has managed to gain among the unalined countries.

It must be hoped, therefore, that the Senate will deal promptly and constructively with the test ban treaty. If the United States was not prepared to accept a treaty of this sort, it should have broken off negotiations long ago. We have now passed the point of no return, and we cannot step back without giving the Communists a tremendous propaganda victory. Unless the debate produces some new argument far more compelling than any advanced so far, the Senate should ratify.

Pruning Down the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, throughout the summer there has been much talk on the part of some Members on the subject of cutting the budget. There are still a few weeks of summer ahead of us. Perhaps Members would enjoy hearing about budget cutting by way of song rather than by just plain talk. Here is one that can be sung to the tune of "Cruising Down the River":

"PRUNING DOWN THE BUDGET"—TUNE: "CRUISING DOWN THE RIVER"

Pruning down the budget
On these sunny afternoons
Mid spending sprees and gifts o'erseas
Is like reaching for the moon.

The young touch-football player
Keeps tossing us a ball;
What he asked of us in springtime
He will ask as much in fall.

The folks at home with weary groans
All plead for tax relief,
But words around here make a sound
That taxes their belief.

We'll all go broke together
And this may happen soon,
If we don't prune down the budget
On these sunny afternoons.

Kennedy Clan Decides for Itself What Is Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the only oath we took as Members of Congress, the only oath taken by President Kennedy on assuming his office, and the oath taken by all officials of the Federal Government, including the Attorney General, is to defend the Constitution of the United States.

Evidently some, like the Attorney General, had mental reservations when taking the oath. From a recent speech the Attorney General defends his own interpretation of the Constitution, and this could lead to danger for the Nation and the freedom of our people. The Constitution cannot be subject to liberal interpretation or, as so aptly put by Paul Harvey in the following article, "Adlibbing a New Constitution," subject to adlibbing by and and all who do not agree with it. Mr. Harvey's article appeared in Human Events of August 17:

ADLIBBING A NEW CONSTITUTION

(By Paul Harvey)

The events of history are subject to interpretation by historians.

Eyewitnesses differ, sometimes diametrically, in what they witness.

So what we think we see we may not see. How we report an event may be distorted by our personal perspective.

The student of history, including contemporary events, must sometimes read between the lines.

But when a code for human conduct is carefully calculated and prescribed, I'm old-fashioned enough to believe that the authors meant precisely what they said.

That includes the Ten Commandments.

When a blueprint for the administration of a government is deliberated and defined, that blueprint may be presumed to be precise.

That includes the Constitution of the United States.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy in Philadelphia's Independence Hall celebrated the ratification of that civil bible by stating that

we must "read between its lines" to arrive at its full meaning.

Well, let's see now.

When Tom Jefferson referred to "the chains of the Constitution," he did not mention any missing links.

When Abe Lincoln said, "I do not for any cause propose to destroy, or alter, or disregard the Constition. I stand to it, fairly, fully and firmly," he did not cite any exceptions.

But Attorney General Kennedy told this 1963 audience that the Constitution has some things written "between the lines," and "their constitutionality is a matter of commonsense."

He says the broad civil rights legislation being urged by the Kennedy administration is authorized by these unwritten words, by "basic moral principles."

Well, let's see now.

When the Supreme Court recently said no State may require prayers or Bible reading in public schools, it was the Attorney General's position that we must abide by the "letter of the law."

He said nothing about unwritten "moral principles" at that time.

He said nothing about there being any room "between the lines" for "interpreting" the Constitution.

Our Bible, divinely inspired and protected, may withstand the ravages of its "interpreters," but I doubt our Constitution can.

We have progressively retrogressed ever since the Supreme Court began knocking holes in this foundation document.

Read the "opinions" of the Justices on recent issues and it is plain that a majority of "liberals" are now ad libbing a new Constitution for us, as they go along.

That the Attorney General, solemnly sworn to defend that document with his life, should seek further to amend it with his own commonsense would be funny if it were not so frightening.

The Bracero Program by an Editor Who Understands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many big city editors have been writing and editorializing about the bracero program. Their factual data is usually erroneous or misapplied. They have no "feel" for the human beings involved and no appreciation of the socioeconomic problems and conditions of rural agricultural America.

Some rural editors have grappled with the problem of supplying sufficient supplemental farm labor since long before there was a bracero program. The following editorial from the Odessa (Tex.) American indicates a knowledge of the whole problem and an empathy for the people involved—domestic, farmer, bracero, and consumer.

I offer this editorial for the benefit of those in Congress who are sincerely attempting to get at the nub of the problem and do something meaningful to solve it fairly and decently:

THE BRACERO PROBLEM

It may be—as some say and many hope—that Congress will extend the Federal program under which Mexican farm labor is imported to the United States.

On May 29, however, the House rejected a proposal to extend the law for 2 years by a 16-vote margin. The vote came when many Representatives were out of town for the Memorial Day holiday. Only 322 Members voted, and the count was 158 to 174. Congressman ED FOREMAN, of Odessa, voted for the extension. FOREMAN termed the plan as "somewhat of a Peace Corps in reverse, you might say, and a new twist to foreign education and assistance."

Opponents of the measure had no valid reasons for voting against it. They voted as they did for political reasons or in ignorance of its merits. The false propaganda circulated against it is immediately apparent to anyone who has made no more than a superficial investigation of Public Law 82–78.

Evidence of a lack of understanding of the issue showed up in a picture released by United Press International. It showed a mother and child on a farm in Oklahoma, and these were identified as braceros, who would not be permitted to return to the United States next year because Congress had voted against extension of the law which expires in December.

UPI should have known that adult males only are included in the bracero program. The mother and child pictured either were American citizens or here on immigrant visas, which is in no way related to the bracero program.

Two of the loudest arguments against the farm labor importation measure have been that it takes jobs from American citizens and that it is degrading to Mexicans.

Those who contend that American workers are being displaced probably look at unemployment figures to arrive at their conclusion. But they do not consider further. It may be that anyone who is unemployed and drawing an unemployment or welfare check should take a farm job; it may be that he should have to or else forgo a Government handout. But the fact is most of the unemployed won't consider the type of work the Mexican nationals perform, and there's nothing to make them.

But more than that, specifically written into the Public Law 82–78 are provisions under which farmers cannot hire nationals unless there is a shortage of domestic workers, and this is determined by governmental agencies which have shown little sympathy for the bracero program. Additionally, if a domestic worker shows up at a farm where Mexicans are employed and demands a job, the law specifies that he must be hired even if the national is deprived of work promised him.

Nobody would be better pleased than the farmer if he had a dependable source of domestic labor. He is put to considerable trouble and expense to hire Mexican nationals, he is constantly under surveillance by Government agents to see that he complies with all the provisions of the Federal law under which nationals may be imported, and if he had a choice in the matter, he would hire his fellow citizens.

But the point is, he doesn't have a choice. He hires Mexican domestic labor. There are many reasons why American labor is not available. Foremost among them is the fact that under the welfare State, nobody has to work if he doesn't want to, and almost nobody wants to do farm labor and particularly back bending stoop labor. Not only is it hard work. Under the constant preachments of "equality," we have a generation of Americans who are "just as good as anybody else" and they're not "breaking my back for anybody doing farm labor." And they don't have to to live. The Government doles, which they are encouraged by their Government to believe are due even to the most shiftless, take care of that.

Not everybody, of course, who works on the farm "understands" equality to mean that he is equal, by act of Congress, in skill and talent to everybody else. Nor does he feel that farm work is degrading. But there aren't enough of them to perform all the essential tasks on ranch and farm and the Mexican worker makes up the difference.

There is nothing more dignified than honest labor of whatever variety, but one of our honorables in Congress made an impassioned speech in which he stated that extension of the bracero program should be denied because it was demeaning to Mexicans. If that is so isn't it a curious fact that so many thousands of Mexicans are eager to come here under the program? They aren't compelled to. Whatever there may be about the program that they dislike, they dislike even more doing without the things the bracero program enables them to have.

The bracero's wages are important to him and to his nation. Its importance to the overall economy may have been lessened in recent years with the reduction of the numbers allowed to come to the United States, but it was, and may still be, second only to tourism in the cash it brought to Mexico. It ought also to be noteworthy that the Mexican consul in San Francisco took occasion to disagree publicly with the Congressman who said the bracero program was degrading to Mexicans.

The bill to extend the law may have some hope yet, since more than 100 Congressmen were absent when the May 29 vote was taken. If it is given a second chance, it should win approval.

Test Ban Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion about the moral position to be taken in regard to dealings with the Soviet Union, and I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial that appeared in the July 25 edition of the Hairenik Weekly, which vividly and succinctly discusses the grave complications that could follow from the partial test ban agreement. I believe the editorial eloquently expresses the views of millions of Americans:

"AND WITH HELL WE ARE IN AGREEMENT"

It is a striking commentary on the moral atmosphere of the world today that not only does the freeworld deign to sit at peace tables with assassins and aggressors, but that our communicational media can be as ecstatically enthusiastic as they are about an agreement made with the devil.

"We have made a covenant with death, and with hell we are in agreement," the Prophet Isaiah predicted testimonially as if in terms of the limited test ban agreement reported as recently made at Moscow.

The foreboding thing in this latest "agreement with hell" is that it has been done at the precise moment the devil's advocate has been assuring his more belligerent Communist comrade that he intends to communize us not by the bomb, but by subversion.

"During the last 25 years," a report of the American Bar Association's committee on Communist tactics reads, "the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words. All this talk led to

52 major agreements, and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them."

The larger meaning of the "agreement" to many of course is that it might herald a new "amity" between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

But as we have seen, since the leopard has not changed its spots, can we not soon expect a shoe-slamming Khrushchev to defile again the nobility of our intentions?

Remember the "spirit of Camp David"?

No mere "test ban agreement" will prevent the Soviet from testing, if it will serve his interests of world revolution, to which the Soviet is still as dedicated as it has ever been dedicated.

Best in the pursuit of a moral course of life to shun the Devil.

Behind the Fair Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 26, 1963 entitled "Behind the Fair Label" which points out the evils and dangers inherent in fair trade legislation now pending before the Congress in the quality brand stabilization legislation, which would have such an unfortunate effect upon the small businessman, the economy in general, and the customer in particular:

BEHIND THE FAIR LABEL

Some manufacturers certainly owe a debt to the fellow who first applied the term "fair trade" to the system by which retail prices in most States can be maintained at fixed levels.

For fair trade has a good sound, like "fair play." It certainly does not connote, for instance, "price fixing," which to most people doesn't sound good at all.

But the truth is that fair trade is a label in masquerade. Under fair trade a manufacturer can force retailers in an area not to sell his product below a minimum price set by him. So all fair trade really amounts to is legalized price fixing. And, as reported in this newspaper the other day, it is making new headway, especially in the major appliance field.

In 13 States, if a manufacturer can get just one dealer in his State to sign an agreement not to sell his product below a certain price, every other dealer in the State who handles the product must observe the price agreed on. In 18 others, only dealers signing agreements are bound to fair trade pricing, and in the rest this form of price fixing has no legal sanction.

But however this gimmick is operated, its intended victim is the consumer. The manufacturer and dealer are, in effect, conspiring to deprive him of the opportunity to shop around for the best price he can get.

Just for that reason, fair trade pricing, where challenged, has been repeatedly rebuffed in the courts. It has also been rejected in the marketplace, as evidenced by the rapid rise and success of discount houses whose highly competitive operations have led to lower prices in retailing generally.

It is, then, too bad that more businessmen and politicians have failed to get the message. And for those who cling to the illusion that fair trade is as good as it sounds, the proof of how far it departs from sensible business practice is that it works only where it can be constantly and thoroughly policed. Fortunately, even then it doesn't work very well.

Assateague Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, no doubt all of my colleagues have read recent articles in the press concerning the future of Assateague Island, part of which extends along the ocean front in the State of Maryland. Most of these articles point out the disagreement among Federal, State, and local officials regarding the future development and ultimate use of this valuable seashore property.

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended that Congress authorize the acquisition of Assateague Island and provide the necessary funds to develop it as a national park, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Other officials have recommended that the State of Maryland develop the island as a State park, and still other interests feel that private investors should be permitted to keep their land for personal use.

In the midst of this controversy, the distinguished chairman of the Maryland Commission of Forests and Parks, Mr. S. Lawrence Hammerman, has issued a statement expressing his views on the future development and use of Assateague Island. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Hammerman's statement at this point in the RECORD for consideration by Members of the House as well as other interested parties:

STATEMENT BY S. LAWRENCE HAMMERMAN, CHAIRMAN, FORESTS AND PARKS COMMISSION, STATE OF MARYLAND

To establish and preserve Assateague Island as a great Atlantic coastline park for the use of the greatest number of people, there are basic, essential requirements which first must be accomplished.

Acquisition of the remaining land, whether it be by the Federal Government or the State of Maryland, must be speeded to prevent further erosion and deterioration of the island. Another great March storm could spell disaster.

At the moment, Secretary Udall has recommended that the Federal Government acquire this valuable property and has pledged his support of the necessary legislation, which must be approved by the Congress. It would be some time before the State legislature could act and it is not possible to determine at this time if the legislature would wish to burden additionally the Maryland taxpayers to pay for this park land and its constant maintenance.

The continuing, necessary maintenance of Assateague Island after its acquisition and restoration as park land will require constant vigilance and large outlays of public funds.

At the outset, sand dunes must be rebuilt and created; bulkheads must be constructed. A roads system and a sanitary system must be created and maintained in a major construction project.

Certainly, the machinery of the Federal parks system, with its vast experience and its present, dramatic expansion, is best equipped to initiate and perpetuate all of these services with little additional original outlay or future expense to the Maryland taxpayers.

The preservation of the dunes and the protection of the shoreline will be a never-ceasing operation, once the park is established, to withstand the inroads of the tides and winds of the Atlantic Ocean. Surely, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and other related Federal agencies presently have the resources, the equipment, and the experience to underwrite the preservation of the island for the use and enjoyment of future generations.

There is the consideration of local, neighboring interests who would wish neither Federal nor State acquisition of the land for a public park. Over the years, their interests would be best served by a public park which would bring to all the neighboring counties a major tourism to enhance greatly the economy of every parochial interest, whether it be political subdivisions through increased taxes or local, private enterprise through expenditure of the tourists' dollars.

In my judgment, the fulfillment of Assateague Island as a public park can be best accomplished through the application of Federal funds as swiftly as possible, to be followed by the administration of the park and its related areas through the joint effort of the State of Maryland and the Department of the Interior.

The resultant saving to the Maryland taxpayer would be great. The future of a great, natural, coastline asset would be guaranteed. And this preservation would be a lasting achievement in the conservation of one of the few remaining island resources on the east coast of the United States.

Assateague Island represents valuable real estate. But, it is real estate which belongs to all of the people, as a great national park which will provide the greatest good for the greatest number, provided the Government lives up to their end of the agreement and makes Assateague open to the public.

Non-Red Countries Pledge Aid Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see an article in the New York Times recently, which indicated that some of the major non-Communist countries have pledged increases in their foreign aid programs for underdeveloped nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include that article herewith:

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1963]

NON-RED COUNTRIES PLEDGE AID INCREASE

PARIS, July 25.—The major non-Communist powers pledged here today to further increase their aid to the underdeveloped world.

The 20 countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, plus Japan, disbursed $6,000 million of aid last year. This was $100 million less than the year before, a reduction that caused

some concern in the official discussions that have been held here this week and that ended today.

It is expected that the uptrend will be resumed this year and that the aid total may grow by as much as $500 million a year for the next few years. After that it may level off.

The occasion for the discussions and the pledge was the second annual review session of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, an association of the United States, Canada, and 18 West European nations.

The 1962 volume of aid reflected reduced disbursements by three of the five principal aid givers. United States and French disbursements increased, but Britain's, West Germany's, and Japan's declined.

Two other major countries, Canada and Italy, have been singled out this year for giving less aid than it was felt they could afford.

For Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished Member of the House, ROBERT R. BARRY, recently wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times answering some of the criticisms which have been leveled against our foreign aid program. Mr. BARRY's letter is one of the best pieces I have seen on the subject, and I know my colleagues will be interested in reading it:

FOR FOREIGN AID

To the EDITOR:

Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN, in his "Why I Am Opposed to Foreign Aid"—July 7—labels America's efforts in this area as "one of the greatest foreign policy failures in our history." I emphatically disagree.

Since the Marshall plan, the thrust of our mutual security programs has been primarily to meet the needs of developing countries. Why? Most of the developing countries, receiving the bulk of our aid, were colonies of European powers and Japan until a few years ago, and largely provided raw materials in exchange for manufactured goods.

As these countries achieved independence, the question constantly arose as to whether or not it would stimulate trade if industrialized countries helped them to modernize their economies in keeping with their resources. The answer given by the United States and the rest of the industrialized free world was "yes." It is to our advantage and to theirs that they become full-fledged members of the free world trading system, rather than the Communist bloc system, as our system provides the greatest hope for raising the living standards of all nations on earth.

As the developing countries increase their gross national product they will become better customers for Uncle Sam. This means expanding trade for the entire free world and therefore higher levels of prosperity for all members of the great free trading system.

Moreover, as the developing countries increase their trade with the developed countries of the world, they will correspondingly need less foreign aid. Thus, we can look forward to a time when little or no foreign aid will be needed.

Only through the creation of viable economies in other nations of the world can the economic aspirations of free men everywhere be realized. The foreign aid program does just that.

ROBERT R. BARRY,
Member of Congress, Washington.

One of Dallas' Original Dydamic Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Dallas, Tex., observed the 83d birthday of one of her original dydamic men, a civil leader who has unbounded faith in his community and in the private enterprise system. R. L. (Uncle Bob) Thornton was formerly mayor of Dallas and today, at 83, is still one of its important business and civic leaders. Bob Thornton's strength is in his dedication to individual and community responsibility. He is proud of what the people of Dallas have done for Dallas and the challenges the people are ready to face in building an even greater Dallas.

As a tribute to Bob Thornton and in the hope his magnificent story will be an inspiration to other Americans and the Dallas story an inspiration to other communities, I include, as a part of these remarks, the following articles from the Dallas Morning News of August 10, 1963, "He and Big D Grew Up Together:"

HE AND BIG D GREW UP TOGETHER

(By Helen B. Callaway)

Seventy-four years ago, an enduring love affair began between a 9-year-old country boy named Robert Lee Thornton and the young city of Dallas, population 38,000.

The two striplings, the boy and the town, were destined to grow to maturity and fame together. It would be hard to say which has enriched the other the more.

The years have whitened Bob Thornton's hair since that long-ago day when he first came to visit Dallas from the Ellis County cotton fields—wealthy beyond words with 50 cents to spend at the State Fair.

The same years have brightened the twinkle in his brown eyes, sharpened his zest for the adventure of life, and deepened his affection for the wonderful city of Dallas.

This Saturday is R. L. Thornton's 83d birthday anniversary. Friday, he told the Dallas News:

"As long as the good Lord lets me live, I want to help Dallas, in my humble way, to be the outstandin' city in this country.

"We're gonna keep buildin' Dallas. We'll keep it a fine city where people love to live and shop, to work and play, to raise their families and educate their children.

"All these things are a challenge to me. I love Dallas. Nothin' has given me more pure pleasure than helpin' build this great city.

"The years I have worked for the city of Dallas, both as a private citizen and a public official, have been my happiest years."

So spoke tall, slender R. L. Thornton—banker, civic leader, philanthropist, papa of Big D's powerful "dydamic" men, Dallas mayor for 8 years until 1961, longtime State Fair president and onetime champion cotton picker.

Uncle Bob Thornton's birthday wish reaffirmed his basic philosophy, a kind of religion which he calls a superstition.

On a hot August night of 1954, Mayor Thornton told 3,000 people who had gathered at Fair Park for his 74th birthday barbecue-and-beans party:

"I have a feeling, and I've always had it, that when God gives a man good health and reasonable capacities, the man ought to give a lot of that free to others.

"I call it a superstition. Whatever it is, I think God gives us strength and life, and expects us to use it to help others.

"At 74, I'm not retiring' and takin' out—I'm just startin' over. There are many things I want to help Dallas to do."

At 83—thinner of frame and wearing thicker glasses, but still witty and active—Thornton's view is much the same.

He said Friday that he sees vast growth ahead for Dallas—and with it, vast problems to solve.

He added:

"I tell you, in a few more years Dallas will double its population. In a few more years, Mesquite and Garland and Grand Prairie will be cities of more than 50,000 people. Before long, Irving and Garland will pass 75,000.

"It is going to be very important to get these people into downtown Dallas to trade, to work, to play. It's an essential job that must be done.

"Transportation, present and future, is our biggest problem. It is the bloodstream of our growth and development."

Can Dallas cure its huge and growing city transportation headaches—car-clogged streets, parking problems, public transit woes?

Absolutely, replied Thornton.

"It will take time and it will cost a lot of money, but we'll lick the transportation problem. It will be solved in a lot of different ways."

Part of the solution, he said, may be fast commuter trains running over rails which already connect Dallas with Mesquite, Garland, Irving, Richardson, Grand Prairie.

Memories of long ago almost surely jostled Uncle Bob's dreams of the future as he prepared to mark another milestone of his life's journey.

He was born in Hamilton County on the morning of August 10, 1880, the son of an itinerant farmer. The time was only 15 years beyond the Civil War, and the new little Thornton baby was given the finest name the South could offer: Robert Lee.

When he was seven, his family moved to Ellis County, where Bob went to school at Bristol and later at Ferris.

He has often said he is a graduate of C.C. & M.—corn, cotton, and mules. He is literally an alumnus of Ellis County cotton patches, where he became a champion 500-pound-a-day picker while still a skinny kid.

Thornton's Dallas career is joined with that of the Mercantile National Bank, one of the South's biggest. He founded the bank and served it first as president and then as board chairman, a title he still holds.

He plunged into Dallas civic work many years ago.

He recalled Saturday:

"I worked as a young man on the first campaign to raise money to induce Southern Methodist University to come to Dallas. I have never done any job that gave me more pleasure * * *."

He changed focus again, from the past to the future:

"When you're 83 years old, there's no use kiddin' yourself, you're goin' over the hill * * *.

"But in the remainin' time that the good Lord gives me, I hope I can help our great city. Dear God, how I love Dallas."

It was love at first sight for Thornton back yonder in 1889. The city of Dallas long ago learned to return Uncle Bob's immense affection. Each year has strengthened the mutual admiration.

And the end of this particular love affair is nowhere in sight.

Stronger Action Needed To Curb Allied Shipping to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American Maritime Association has taken an affirmative position in regard to my bill, H.R. 7687, which if passed would prevent any article from being transported in interstate or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows vessels sailing under the flag of that country to be used in trade or commerce with Cuba.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the August 1, 1963, bulletin from the American Maritime Association concerning allied shipping to Cuba:

STRONGER ACTION NEEDED TO CURB ALLIED SHIPPING TO CUBA

Since early 1962, the American Maritime Association has sought to bring the seriousness of the problems resulting from the use of free world shipping in the Cuban trade to the attention of the Government. In February 1963, the administration issued National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 to deal with the matter. To date, very little progress has been made in curbing the use of free world vessels in the Cuban trade. A recent Maritime Administration report notes that since January 1, 1963, a total of 149 free world and Polish vessels concluded 205 trips to Cuba.

It is obvious from these figures that the implementation of National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 has not accomplished its desired objective. As a result, this association feels that more stringent steps must be taken by the U.S. Government if its foreign policy objective of economically isolating Cuba is to be achieved.

A measure has recently been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman PAUL ROGERS, of Florida, which would bar all vessels of a foreign country which permits its ships to trade with Cuba from U.S. interstate or foreign trade. Under the terms of the bill, no article could be transported in interstate or foreign commerce to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows ships sailing under the flag of that country to be used in trade with Cuba. This association strongly supports the measure, known as H.R. 7687, and urges its passage by the House.

Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Interest Equalization Tax Act of 1963, H.R. 8000 is designed to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad. This should help to remedy one of the important deficit areas in the balance of payments.

Considerable concern has been expressed by various financial interests that the bill will alienate our oversea allies. The following advertisement from the Japan Times, of July 26, 1963, however, seems to indicate that Japanese investment companies will be able to continue to vigorously compete for American investment dollars. I think the Members will be most interested in this advertisement:

WHO'S AFRAID OF THE BIG BAD TAX?

No one who stops to consider that dividends paid in Japan can amount to two and three times average dividends paid in most Western nations.

No one who stops to consider the growth potential factors that place Japanese securities in the world's No. 1 spot.

No one who stops to consider that the Japanese Government guarantees full dollar repatriation including dollars earned through dividends or capital gain.

No one who stops to consider.

THE DAISHO SECURITIES CO., LTD.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Loss of Freedom Through Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is most refreshing to read the views of an American who is able to succinctly crystalize important issues. Mr. W. B. Murphy, president of Campbell Soup Co., recently made an address at a seminar for the magazine industry at Harvard Business School. I consider Mr. Murphy one of the outstanding examples of American business leadership. His address clearly discusses the key issues facing our people today. The danger of big government controlled by vocal and misguided liberals is gradually leading to a loss of our freedoms. I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Murphy that only an aroused and informed public can save and preserve our freedoms and heritage.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printd in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAGAZINES AND AMERICAN BUSINESS

(By W. B. Murphy)

Whether he likes it or not, the manager of a business today has far more than his own business to be concerned about if that business is to move along. As such a manager and also as a citizen—and thinking in terms of the future—I would like to suggest that all editors and publishers of magazines have some grave and special responsibilities in these times. In the day-to-day rush, it is not always easy to discern the meaning of change; and yet, the solid foundation of our democracy rests on public understanding. What the people of this country want, they will get. It is vital, therefore, that they understand the choices before them. If the meaning of change is not clear, there is always a chance that we may end up where we do not want to go. You, above all, must see clearly the meaning of day-to-day happenings—the strategic nature of political and economic trends—and you are in a position to help your millions of readers to understand events and their influence on the future.

Let me be quite specific and mention things in our economy that give me pause. I am not here concerned with the current economic outlook, but, along with many other Americans, I am concerned about trends which may lead us, during the balance of this century, into unfamiliar and unwelcome places.

Consider, first, the growing power of government. Government powers feeds on itself. It is the most difficult of all powers to combat. If big business gets too big, you can control it. If big labor gets too big, you can control it. But government is the ultimate power—and if government gets too big, who is to control it? Is there any practical way to control it?

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not believe that there is any grand design by some potent few to bring about a highly centralized Federal Government control, but rather, I believe that, with all good intent, we are drifting. We are following our noses with our eyes almost closed. But the result is the same in either case.

Today, to be one of the popular liberals means to advocate increasing Central Government controls and services. To me, this concept is puzzling. Does this not represent a reversal of traditional concepts? If I understand history correctly, the liberal position in the Western World in the 18th and 19th centuries, reflecting both the French Revolution and American Revolution, was one of upholding individual rights and freedoms as against oppressive central governments. But today it is fashionable in liberal circles to drive for central planning and central control. Yet, I believe history demonstrates that the more dominant the power of the state, the less free the society—the ultimate, of course, being a highly centralized control and a loss of much of our freedom. Our ancestors left countries with highly centralized forms of government because of oppression in order to establish a new, free, liberal society. Are we drifting away from the very concepts which have given this Nation its vitality? Are the so-called liberals of today leading us to a nonliberal future?

Consider the increase in the size of government. Between 1860 and 1960, the American population increased sixfold, and the work force 11 times, but the number of Federal civilian employees increased 60 times. The number of Federal civilian employees working in Washington, D.C., increased 100 times. Last year the number of civilians employees of the Federal Government throughout our land reached a total of 2,270,000.

There are, of course, things that the American people can do best only through their Government. I don't think any American of objective mind will question the desirability of carefully worked out and sensible laws and regulations in fields that affect health, care of the aged, and care of those who cannot care for themselves. I think that we can only cheer for laws and regulations that help the individual businessman stimulate the growth of his enterprise and I think that when there is a broad need for correction of an abuse, the American people will give their full support.

But the whole new concept of centralized planning and control inevitably thrusts upon us all a knotty question: To what extent is it wise for politics to invade the world of economics? For he fact is that more and more economic decisions are being made for political reasons. And the business manager of today finds himself with a myriad of Government problems to deal with.

Today more than 15 percent of the electric power output of the United States is geneated in Government-owned plants. Government operation in an industry has advantages in that it escapes all Federal taxation and frequently pays less local and State taxes than private companies do. Interest on funded debt is at very low rates. In computing rates for electricity, private companies must include tax obligations that their Government-owned competitors need not worry about. As Government increases its actual business operations it creates a disadvantage to our economy for it weakens the private sector on which it depends for its tax revenue.

Step by step we have adopted Government control of more and more farm crops and the apparent objective is to control them all. The wheat referendum vote is a setback for these control plans but I fear it will not dampen very much the trends toward further controls. While professing to help the small family farm, the Federalf farm subsidy program benefits mostly the big farm and the corporate farm. Eighty percent of the farm subsidy money goes to the twenty percent of the farms that are largest in size.

This scheme of things is undoubtedly far from the original intent of the program, but is it not typical of the result of political solutions for economic problems? Government controls have not solved our farm problems—they have compounded them. The big problem now is for the public to understand more fully the farm crop situation and the ways and means to extricate ourselves from our predicament. The small family farm is going out of business at a rapid rate. The number of farms has declined from 5.6 million in 1950 to 3.7 million in 1962—a drop of 34 percent in 12 years—and continues to drop at the rate of about 100,000 farms per year.

It would be most enlightening to portray to the public the overall condition of the roughly 50 percent of our agricultural production that is not controlled by the Federal Government and compare it with the 50 percent that is controlled. I can tell you that the uncontrolled portion in the main is healthy and in balance and that the controlled half is in many difficulties and very costly to the American public. Now you might say—so what?—the crops that are in trouble were the ones placed under control. But the best we can say for Government controls is that they certainly have not solved the problems. I do think that our troubles come in considerable part because of the great number of farms of low productivity. These have been going out of business in droves so, theoretically at least, the case for farm controls is getting less urgent each year. A lot of the people from the unprofitable farms are finding work in the plants that are constantly springing up in the small cities and towns in rural areas. I have heard some very knowledgeable farm leaders say that a program of cutting back supports at the rate of 10 percent per year would likely work us out of our main troubles in 10 years with very little hardship to farming as a whole.

Also, we should have a real look at what the farm subsidy program is doing to our balance-of-payments problem and to our strategic position in negotiating tariffs. These are major matters for our country's international relations. Every time our Government disposes of a chunk of surplus farm product on the world market, we invite tariff or quota retaliation by the countries whose normal agricultural positions are disturbed.

There is a lot of talk in Washington and elsewhere about our country's rate of business growth. With all this discussion, there is need for a proper perspective. Our country is growing in population at the rate of about 1.8 percent a year and we all want a continuing increase in our average living

standard. This means we need economic growth greater than our population growth.

An examination of the record since 1900 shows that our gross national product has grown, in terms of 1962 dollars, at the average rate of 3.1 percent per year. This includes all the poor years of the early 1930's and the boom years of the wars. Recently, from 1950 to 1962, this growth has averaged 3.3 percent—close to the average since the turn of the century. Of course, a 3.3 percent rate of growth today means a dollar gain of about $19 billion whereas in, say 1925, a gain of 3.3 percent represented only about $6 billion.

It is much tougher to make our gross national product grow today than it was earlier in the century because growth comes largely from the private sector and we have a relatively much larger tax burden to bear today than we did in the early years of the century. Because of this tax burden, our private domestic investment has grown too slowly—at a rate of only 1.2 percent annually during this same period from 1950 to 1962.

There are lots of ways that business growth can be aided by Government. Business needs a strong Government partner in developing its international trade. It needs tax rates and laws that help growth. It needs vigilant policing by Government of the existing laws. It needs a judicious attitude by Government.

I am also concerned about what is apparently a complete misunderstanding among millions of our fellow citizens of the nature of profits and their vital role in our democratic society.

As you and I know, one of the troubles with our economy today is that net profits are not high enough. Gross profits might be adequate, but net profits, after taxes, are not. We are not being allowed to create capital fast enough to finance a higher rate of national growth and progress. Profits are declining as a percentage of our gross national product. When net profits are substantial, it should be cause for national rejoicing. Profits are capital in the process of being formed—and it is capital which finances growth, development, research, and, above all, jobs for the present and expanding future generations.

If we are to have more jobs for the larger populations of tomorrow, we have got to have profits today to finance them. It is estimated we will need $70 billion of new capital per year within the next 5 to 10 years. These dollars should come from profits—present or future. If more capital is not produced than is consumed in the process, there is no new capital formation and there is a dilution of existing capital.

I have great faith in the judgment of the American people when they are informed and aroused. It has been said that the good sense of the American people should never be underestimated nor their information overestimated. A democracy to be successful must be alert and well informed. This means that effective and constant communication is vital to the health of our economy. Leadership in this process of communication is a duty of men and women in any walk of life—but especially is it a responsibility of editors and publishers.

If this great democracy—which Lincoln called the last great hope of mankind—is to lead the world toward continuing progress under freedom, we must clearly show the incomparable power of freedom in our own national life. Gentlemen—if there is any inclination on your part to think that I have overemphasized that we are drifting in a dangerous direction, I hope you will take a new reading.

Strong Support Indicated for College Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues might know of the vast support given to H.R. 6143, which will be considered by the House tomorrow, I am enclosing correspondence which many of us on the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor have received. You will notice that this support comes from every type of institution of higher education, be they graduate level, 4-year or 2-year institutions, huge universities or community colleges, public or private institutions or strictly liberal arts institutions or technical institutions. We have heard from most organizations which represent institutions of higher education and they indicate their support for this legislation.

H.R. 6143 has the support of the American Council on Education, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, the Association for Higher Education, the American Library Association, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the American Association of University Women, the American Council of Learned Societies, and other groups and individuals interested in higher education. H.R. 6143 also is supported by Robert Evan Davis, executive director of the Division of Christian Higher Education of the American Baptist Convention.

The material referred to follows:

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE:

We urge your continued vigorous effort toward passage of H.R. 6143. The junior colleges of Minnesota are in dire need of the financial assistance this bill will provide.

CHARLES A. HILL,
Dean, Rochester Junior College.

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE:

Respectfully request your support of H.R. 6143 to provide college facilities. Passage of this bill essential to higher education.

OSCAR A. ANDERSON,
President, Augsburg College.

Congressman ALBERT H. QUIE:

We send full support for H.R. 6143. Appreciate your fine work. Higher education faces real problem delay and expanding and strengthening will be serious loss.

Dean R. I. MELAND,
Austin Junior College.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE:

Strongly urge favorable action on H.R. 6143 to provide funds for academic buildings required by colleges and universities in meeting expanding enrollments.

RICHARD C. GILMEN,
Dean of Carleton College.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE:

When H.R. 6143 providing loans and grants for academic facilities for both public and private colleges comes up for a vote in the House on August 13, I strongly urge you to vote in favor of the resolution. Thank you.

PAUL H. GIDDENS,
President, Hamline University.

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
Collegeville, Minn., August 7, 1963.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. QUIE: I am happy to learn that H.R. 6143 is, or will shortly be, the subject of debate on the floor of the House of Representatives. This Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is of vital concern to all of us who must provide additional undergraduate and graduate academic facilities.

The expenditures proposed under H.R. 6143 seem modest indeed in the light of the improvement of the quality of our human resources.

I should like to urge, in the name of the faculty and students at St. John's University, that H.R. 6143 be given favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARNO GUSTIN, O.S.B.,
President.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE:

Repectfully request support of H.R. 6143. Higher education facilities bill need is most urgent.

Sister M. CAMILLE,
College of St. Teresa.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE:

On behalf of the Association for Higher Education I wish to express appreciation for your leadership in getting higher education facilities bill, H.R. 6143, before Rules Committee. It is our hope that the judicial review amendment will be offered when the bill is up for consideration in the House of Representatives.

H. T. MORSE,
Dean, General College, University of Minnesota, and President-Elect, Association for Higher Education.

Hon. ALBERT H. QUIE:

St. Mary's College respectfully urges your strong support of H.R. 6143, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as an excellent long-overdue and much-needed piece of legislation for our constantly expanding institutions of higher learning.

Sincerely,

Brother I. BASIL,
President, St. Mary's College.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE:

Community college buildings are urgent necessity in Minnesota. Hope Higher Educational Facilities Act is so written that we can participate with new State system passed by last legislature.

WESLEY WAAGE,
Dean, Junior College, and President, Minnesota Association of Junior Colleges.

Congressman A. L. QUIE:

Urge support of higher education facilities bill, H.R. 6143.

CLEMENS M. GRANSKOU,
President, St. Olaf College.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN:

Have followed your efforts and statements regarding support for various measures deal-

ing with higher education with high approval. Your vigorous support of H.R. 6143 most important.

JAMES H. JENSEN,
President, Oregon State University.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN:

Delighted that H.R. 6143 is scheduled for a vote on the floor of the House. Am wiring other members of Oregon delegation expressing my hope that it will pass by a wide margin.

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
President, University of Oregon.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Commendations and good wishes in your leadership for college facilities bill. American education needs it. Linfield board of trustees has authorized an application, upon passage of bill, for a grant toward our new science development.

HARRY L. DILLIN,
President, Linfield College.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN:

The University of Portland supports H.R. 6143. The college housing program has demonstrated its efficacy; the facilities bill will make an equally significant contribution to the academic development and growth of our Nation.

PAUL E. WALDSCHMIDT,
President, University of Portland.

EDITH GREEN:

We ask your favorable consideration of the higher education facilities bill, H.R. 6143.

JOHN R. HOWARD,
President, Lewis and Clark College.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Bill H.R. 6143 providing loans and grants for academic facilities for both public and private colleges will come before the House. The officials of Lane College sincerely hope that you will support this bill.

C. A. KIRKENDOLL, *President.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Urge favorable action on H.R. 6143. Federal loans and grants critically needed by Wesleyan and all private colleges, especially in West Virginia.

STANLEY H. MARTIN,
President, West Virginia Wesleyan College.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Illinois Wesleyan is ready to increase enrollment by 300 provided we can secure library facilities. H.R. 6143 would help us greatly in this effort.

LLOYD M. BERTHOLF,
President, Illinois Wesleyan University.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Strongly urge you support H.R. 6143. Education needs have never been greater.

VANCE D. ROGERS,
President, Nebraska Wesleyan University.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Trustees and administration of Southwestern College strongly urge your consideration and support of H.R. 6143.

C. ORVILLE STROHL,
President, Southwestern College.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Provisions of bill H.R. 6143 would bring great benefits to educational institutions. We in Arkansas need this law. Hope you will do all you can to help it to pass the Congress.

Dr. R. D. CROCKETT,
President, Philander Smith College.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

I hope that you will support H.R. 6143 providing loans and grants for academic facilities for both public and private colleges which will help the private colleges.

Dr. EMMETT K. MCLARTY,
President, Brevard College.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Keuka College officially supports passage of H.R. 6143 and endorses your goals to assist institutions of higher learning as they improve the quality of their resources.

WILLIAM S. LITTERICK,
President, Keuka College.

Congresswoman GREEN:

Benedict College trustees and administration earnestly urge you to vote approval of the college facilities bill H.R. 6143. Benedict College trains many teachers, professional and vocational employees. Favorable vote on this bill will aid the college in getting much needed buildings and facilities to do necessary job in education.

J. A. BACOATS,
President, Benedict College.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

Rising tide of student applications at Bishop College accents urgent need for additional classrooms, laboratories, and library facilities in immediate future. Passage of H.R. 6143 will help us meet our inescapable responsibility to provide adequate first-class facilities and academic program for students knocking on our doors.

President M. K. CURRY, Jr.,
Bishop College.

Representative EDITH GREEN:

Urge support of H.R. 6143. Means great deal to all levels of education in State of Oregon and the United States.

CECIL POSEY,
Executive Secretary,
Oregon Education Association.

Hon. EDITH GREEN:

I strongly favor passage of House bill 6143 and urge your support of the bill.

C. W. ROBBINS,
President, Louisburg College.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., July 31, 1963.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: On the occasion of our luncheon discussion in the Vandenberg room a few weeks ago there was all too little time to discuss with you and your Hoosier colleagues of the Congress all of the most pressing problems confronting our public universities in Indiana. But it was certainly a constructive pleasure for President Hovde and me to have as much of your time as you were able to share with us.

One problem, that of obtaining sufficient construction funds with which to provide a bare minimum of learning space and facilities of adequate quality for the overwhelming enrollments of the next few years and beyond, has been compounded by two recent actions here at home in Indiana.

First, though we have been and are in a deficit situation for adequate space, the legislature appropriated $34 million less in construction funds than was the conservatively estimated need for the next biennium. Then, to further compound this deficiency upon a deficiency, the current litigation concerning the State revenues necessitated an executive decision to withhold all appropriated construction funds which were to be available from State general funds. Whichever way the latter exigency is resolved, failure to realize revenues pending the judicial decision may well reduce the construction fund even below the level established by the legislature, even if the revenue bills should eventually stand as passed.

I would respectfully remind you, though I'm quite certain you are fully aware, that the projected enrollments are not mythical. The youngsters are the big wave born in 1946 and after, soon to be 18 years old, graduated from high school, qualified for college, and ready to be admitted. Our projections are, also, based on understandings with the privately supported colleges of Indiana to the effect that we all will try to maintain the relative proportions of undergraduate enrollment as between the public and the private colleges and universities while continuing to hold higher educational opportunity open in Indiana to the really qualified student regardless of his economic or social status. In short, there just is no escape from the enrollment facts. We either will have facilities to continue providing good-quality education in Indiana or we won't.

Economy and efficiency in the operation and in the use of facilities are subjects of constant study and action in an intense effort to do more with what has been made available, and our efficiency of utilization is among the Nation's very best as a result; but facilities which are inadequate now will not adequately accommodate the enrollment increases of the next few years, to say nothing of 10 years and 20 years.

Perhaps I belabor this matter, but I do so because too much wishful thinking and "let George do it" reasoning have already made this situation critical if not well nigh beyond recovery.

My preference would be that Indiana fully carry her own load for the adequate support of public higher education; but confronted, as we are, with the cold facts now surrounding these problems which relate directly to the future of our State and the future of bright Hoosier youngsters, I would consider myself derelict if I did not urge upon you the most serious consideration you can give to H.R. 6143, when and if it is reported out of the Rules Committee.

Congresswoman GREEN is the author of this bill which would provide loans and grants for undergraduate and graduate facilities. The bill, I am told, has bipartisan support, and it does not contain complicating and controversial features such as scholarships, and so on. It is supported by the great majority of public and private colleges and universities across the Nation, for nearly all face similar urgent problems.

If there is any way in which we can provide you with information pertinent to this subject, please call upon us, for we are deeply concerned and would want to provide any factual assistance we can to aid understanding of the problem and this effort to help solve it. It is probably the most serious problem Indiana University faces. Our housing facilities are keeping up with needs pretty well, but our academic facility situation will soon be desperate.

I would be most pleased to have any expression of your feelings on H.R. 6143 and its position and possibility for passage this session.

Thank you for your attention—and best regards.

Sincerely,

ELVIS J. STAHR, Jr.,
President.

VINCENNES UNIVERSITY,
Vincennes, Ind., August 10, 1963.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS: May I call your attention to H.R. 6143 which has already been approved by the House Education and Labor Committee and now is in the hands of the Rules Committee for action to bring it to the floor for debate. This bill, as you will recall, provides a 3-year appropriation of matching grants and loans for the construction of academic facilities, at both public

and nonprofit institutions of higher education.

We here at Vincennes University are particularly interested in the phase of the bill which provides that 22 percent of the funds allotted for each State shall be set aside for junior colleges and vocational and technical institutions.

As I think you know, the State of Indiana is running somewhere between 15 and 20 percent lower than the national average in the number of college age young people who are attending college. The recent post-high-school study commission found that Indiana systems are woefully inadequate in vocational and technical education. If this situation continues, Indiana will be in poor condition to compete with certain other States for industry. In fact, as you know, we have not been able to attract our share of the new electronic and highly technical industrial developments.

I am personally convinced that one of the reasons why Indiana is lagging the national level in the percentage of students attending college is due to the fact that we have not satisfactorily provided sound college facilities within commuting distance of our students at a price they can afford to pay.

As you know, the Indiana Conference of Higher Education, for many years, has fostered what is known as the Indiana plan, which is one of those idealistic projects which sounds good, has good aims, but isn't doing the job. Unfortunately, most of the citizens of Indiana are not aware that it isn't doing the job.

The Indiana plan had two major emphases. In the first place, the State wanted to attempt to keep the college population about equally divided between the public and private institutions. At present, the public institutions have 53 percent of the college population and the private colleges have 47 percent, if we shut our eyes to the 10,000 students who are in the extension centers of the universities.

In the second and most important item, the Indiana plan proposed that there be a college within 25 miles of every student in the State with the thought that students could then commute to college. There is a college within 25 miles of most of the students of the State. Unfortunately, a substantial number of colleges like DePauw, Wabash, Notre Dame, and St. Joseph, to name a few, are just not interested in the students in commuting distance, and among those colleges which are interested in commuting students, the tuition of the private colleges run from $650 upward. The post high school study commission discovered that 40 percent of the families of Indiana have incomes of less than $4,000 per year. A family with three or four children and an income of $4,000 or less, will find college attendance at a cost of $650 to $1,200 a year for tuition plus related expenses, a very discouraging prospect.

What H.R. 6143 will do in Indiana is to encourage the establishment of more vocational and technical institutions and we hope help to bring the costs down to where most of the young people can be expected to pay their way.

As you know, I believe that extension centers in the universities constitute poor education and are entirely unsatisfactory for the needs of the State of Indiana. It is to be admitted, however, that they are better than nothing and that at least 10,000 young people are getting started in college each year, most of whom would get no start at all if they were not present. At present, the students attending these centers are paying $3 for every academic hour to help build the buildings, granted that Indiana is in the rather ridiculous position of taxing the poor kid to pay the cost of building buildings for the kid who comes to attend the resident campuses.

My hope is that H.R. 6143 will not only help Vincennes University but it will help break through the rather tragic circumstances in which the vested interests in higher education have involved the young people of this State. May I urge your support of this bill? Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

ISAAC K. BECKES,
President.

ST. MARY-OF-THE-WOODS COLLEGE,
St. Mary-of-the-Woods, Ind., August 5, 1963.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We wish to join our recommendation to that of many other institutions of higher education in Indiana to request your support of the Green bill, H.R. 6143. We consider this bill most acceptable as a good and much needed piece of legislation to assist our colleges in their efforts to provide the needed facilities for an ever increasing student enrollment as well as the ever present need to improve the quality of our educational services.

Sincerely yours,

Sister MARIE PERPETUA,
President.

JOHN BRADEMAS:

We at Bethel College approve passage of H.R. 6143. We support the stand of the Indiana Conference on Higher Education in favor of this proposed legislation. Your support is urged.

WILBUR B. SANDO,
Dean, Bethel College.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS:

Your sponsorship and support of H.R. 6143 deeply appreciated by all of us concerned with the problems of planning and building sufficient academic facilities to meet the future educational needs of the Nation's young people. Such financial support for academic facilities clearly rates top priority at this time since it takes more than 2 years for new facilities to be planned, built, and put into use. During the next 2 years the number of high school graduates will increase approximately 40 percent. Universities can start to build now. Further delay is truly inexcusable when the future need and demand are so clearly evident.

FREDERICK L. HOVDE,
President, Purdue University.

JOHN BRADEMAS:

I am vitally interested in the favorable passage of H.R. 6143. Georgetown's plans for a law center and library depend on this legislation. I appeal to you for needed support.

Rev. EDWARD D. BUNN, S.J.,
President, Georgetown University.

BALL STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Muncie, Ind., July 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: President Emens has requested me to urge your support of H.R. 6143, the proposed Higher Education Act of 1963.

You will be interested to know Ball State Teachers College has plans that are near completion for an addition to the present science building which will provide laboratories for physics, chemistry, biology, earth science, and physiology. Plans are in process for the renovation of the present science building for general classrooms in science and mathematics. It was built in 1923. A large lecture demonstration room for 300 students is also greatly needed. The total estimated cost for the foregoing is $3,450,000.

Plans are also being developed for the conversion of the present assembly hall into additional library facilities. The estimated cost for this project is $750,000.

We shall be happy to attempt to answer questions you might have concerning Ball State Teachers College programs and projects and thank you for consideration you will give this request.

Sincerely yours,

OLIVER C. BUMB,
Coordinator of Public Affairs and College Development.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT:

The California State colleges are pleased to join with the American Council on Education in urging the 88th Congress to enact into law H.R. 6143 which will be heard by the House on Tuesday, August 13.

This measure will benefit both public and private higher education of which California is the leader by providing assistance in critical areas of development.

GLENN S. DUNKE,
Chancellor, California State Colleges.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT:

University of California urges your support higher education bill H.R. 6143 scheduled for House floor Tuesday, August 13. California higher education—public and private—would receive $22 million matching grants, undergraduate facilities construction, and substantial additional matching grants, graduate facilities construction. These funds would make possible marked acceleration construction needed instructional facilities to meet tremendous enrollment explosion now upon California institutions which cannot be met from State or private funds alone.

CLARK KERR,
President, University of California.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT:

Our association respectfully urges your support of H.R. 6143. California junior college enrollment is growing over 10 percent annually and will soon accelerate even faster. Supplement to local funds for construction is necessary if needed facilities are to be provided.

HENRY T. TYLER,
Executive Secretary, California Junior College Association.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES:

Passage of H.R. 6143, the higher education facilities bill, is vital for higher education in Maryland. We urge you to vote for its passage.

OTTO F. KRAUSHAAR,
President, Goucher College.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES:

I understand that H.R. 6143 is scheduled for vote in the House on Tuesday, August 13. The passage of this bill would be of material benefit to the University of Maryland and I urge you to support it.

WILSON H. ELKINS,
President, University of Maryland.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON,
Dayton, Ohio, August 9, 1963.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SICKLES: Despite the fact that we are straining every local resource at our command, we have spent $16 million in the past 15 years, yet we still fall short of the educational facilities needed to meet the demands made upon us. The situation will be aggravated beyond our means during the next 2 years. We need the assistance promised in H.R. 6143 and urge your strong support and vote to help us help those who depend on us.

Respectfully yours,

RAYMOND A. ROESCH, S.M.,
President, University of Dayton.

MOUNT ST. MARY'S COLLEGE,
Emmitsburg, Md., August 6, 1963.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SICKLES: Mount St. Mary's College would like to recommend your support of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (the Green bill, H.R. 6143). We feel that the provisions of this bill are both excellent and much needed for our growing system of higher education in the United States.

With every good wish,

ROBERT R. KLINE, Ph. D.,
President.

Representative SAM GIBBONS:

Urge your support of H.R. 6143, which provides much needed support for higher education facilities. Support provided in this legislation does not interfere with proper local control of higher education. Would appreciate knowing whether or not you favor this legislation.

GORDON W. BLACKWELL,
President, Florida State University.

Hon. SAM M. GIBBONS:

Would appreciate your active support of H.R. 6143 which provides support for higher education buildings and facilities. We have studied the bill carefully and believe it preserves local control of higher education and a proper balance between public and private education. Enrollments in Florida colleges and universities is expected to double in next 7 years. The need for this Federal supplement to help meet building needs is critical.

Regards,

J. WAYNE REITZ,
President, University of Florida.

CENTRAL FLORIDA JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Ocala, Fla., July 18, 1963.

Hon. SAM M. GIBBONS,
Representative from Florida, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: I should like to invite your special consideration of H.R. 6143, the higher education bill that I understand is presently awaiting action by the Rules Committee prior to introduction to the floor of the House. In my opinion passage of this bill would be particularly appropriate for the needs of Florida at the present time, and I, therefore, should appreciate most sincerely your consideration and, if possible, your active support for the adoption of this legislation.

As you know, the needs for construction for higher education in Florida are at a critical point. In both the junior college and university programs, the possibilities for construction lag significantly behind present enrollments, and there is little possibility for accommodating the rapidly increasing potential college population of the next few years unless significant action is taken at once. The Florida Legislature, in the spring did approve a bond issue which, if approved by the people in November, would provide a solid base for construction that would go far toward meeting most pressing current needs, but would still leave us far short of the space demands over the next few years. If, on the other hand, funds from the bond issue could be coupled with funds available under the provisions of H.R. 6143, Florida would be in the best position that we have occupied in many years for at least a temporary solution to this perplexing and insistent challenge.

We continue to be indebted to you for your service and leadership for the State.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. FORDYCE,
President, Florida Association of Public Junior Colleges.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA,
Tampa, Fla., August, 6, 1963.

Hon. SAM M. GIBBONS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: I understand that there is a reasonably good chance that the college academic facilities bill, H.R. 6143, introduced by EDITH GREEN, may come up for vote soon. I hope you will find it possible to support the measure.

It should be of real help to Florida in facing the terrific expansion in higher education now before us.

Best personal wishes and regards to the family.

Cordially,

SIDNEY J. FRENCH,
Dean.

Progress and Development of Westfield, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 13, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very proud of my hometown of Westfield, N.J. In this day and age of the fast pace, Westfield has managed to keep its small-town identity.

The neighborliness of the town makes it a particularly attractive place in which to live and work. There are occasions in which this friendliness is dramatically expressed. I recently learned of a visit to Westfield by a group of 35 foreign students from 19 different nations. What impressed these students the most was the hospitality with which they were received. I think it is important that they found themselves so welcome on the final few days of their year-long stay in this country; and I am extremely proud of Westfield for affording these students that welcome.

Mr. President, I have an editorial from the Elizabeth, N.J., Journal of July 22 that praises the citizens of Westfield for their good will. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL WORKS

Westfield always has held its communal head high among the better towns of the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, and 35 students from 19 countries who have been visiting there think that pride has foundation. They were impressed by the charm and the greenery and the cleanliness, all evidence of good municipal housekeeping and hometown self-respect.

Not all the visitors were from urban backgrounds, but each expressed delight at the appearance of Westfield and also at the friendliness of its people. These conclusions are the more interesting because the 5-day sojourn in Westfield was the closing stay of a year in the United States. Washington and the White House concluded their tour.

This appraisal of Westfield is a compliment to the town. A compliment can be a gesture, an amenity, but these youngsters were under no compulsion to be polite about a community utterly new to them and which they may never see again. Their words consequently can be traced to a genuine delight at reception and environment.

This encounter is typical of the efficacy of a people-to-people campaign, if it were possible on a broad scale, that would assure Latin American not all Yankees are billionairs, teach Asians that Americans are not exploiters, convince the Russians they do no (and did not) originate the best of everything.

The world has shrunk a lot in a few years, but to the little people who fill it one corner still is far from another. Text and picture, even voice contact, cannot make them fully acquainted. As Kipling discovered generations ago East and West can meet, when "they stand face to face."

The 125th Anniversary of Georgetown, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, as described editorially by the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., Georgetown "is a busy, beautiful, growing community, rightly proud of its past, and rightly confident of its future," and I am very proud as its Congressman, to extend heartiest congratulations on its 125th anniversary.

The current observance of this anniversary is of special interest to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and beyond, for its citizens have contributed immeasurably to the growth and development of the State and Nation. Large numbers of its citizens have distinguished themselves in the field of public service, and have served and lost their lives in the defense of our country.

Georgetown was incorporated as a town in 1838, but Georgetown's proud history dates back 294 years to 1669, when it was a parish under the name of New Rowley. Its first settlers were a band of weavers from Yorkshire, England, who started their lives there as farmers.

In the early 1700's, a boot and shoe factory was established. It was in Georgetown that the first pegs were made, and where the first pegging machine ever used in the world was employed. The introduction of this machine revolutionized the art of shoemaking which had been done before that time by hand. At this time, it is reported that nearly every farmer had his little shoeshop connected with his farm and worked in it in winter as regularly as he planted his crops in the spring.

Shipbuilding also flourished in this little town for a short time in the latter part of the 18th century. The oaks from one of Georgetown's hills provided timber for the construction of *Old Ironsides*.

Georgetown opened its celebration recently with a testimonial banquet to Robert Fisher Metcalf whom the Eagle-Tribune describes as "a distinguished personality not only in Georgetown where he was born and has lived for 83

years but in all Essex County. He is a lawyer by profession and a good citizen by nature. For almost half of Georgetown's years, he has been earning the title now generally and justly bestowed on him, 'Mr. Georgetown.' "

I am happy to extend to the people of Georgetown and its distinguished citizen the greetings and best wishes of the Sixth Congressional District.

De Kalb County, Ga., Industrial Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the fastest growing and most progressive areas of my State of Georgia is De Kalb County which in recent years has grown to be the second most populous county in the State.

Recently, the Governor of Georgia, Carl E. Sanders, dedicated 19 new industries in De Kalb County and this event was reported in Dixie Business, which is published by Hubert F. Lee. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lee's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DE KALB COUNTY, GA., INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Several world records in industrial plant promotion, speed in developing an industrial area, were set in Metropolitan Atlanta June 19, when Georgia's Gov. Carl Sanders cut 19 ribbons dedicating 19 new plants at Stone Mountain Industrial Park, which H. G. (Pat) Patillo, his father H. A., and his brother, Dan, constructed and sold since beginning January 1962.

With plenty of help, of course, from everybody interested in more payrolls.

Chairman Charles O. Emmerich, De Kalb County Board of Commisioners, Decatur, Ga., a man of vision and ability equalled only by such men as his brother, publisher J. Oliver Emmerich, of the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise, said:

"We of De Kalb County are trying to build the best possible image. To do this we must first sell:

"The Southeast.

"The State of Georgia.

"The Metropolitan Atlanta area.

"Then, we give the hard sale * * * to try to bring them into De Kalb County.

"The important thing is, it is a total area of cooperation * * * with an honest attempt to give a great image."

Mr. Emmerich gave the formula for industrial growth:

Working with our chamber of commerce and the leaders of the other 5 counties and 45 municipalities making up the Atlanta Metropolitan area.

Spending funds through our chamber of commerce in advertising the facts of Metropolitan Atlanta.

Cooperating with all the other 49 governments and their chambers of commerce in doing what is best for the entire area.

We strongly advocate and appreciate the forward Atlanta program and what is has done and is doing.

Mr. Emmerich heads a team of industry minded commissioners: James R. Almand, J. M. Callaway, J. C. Haynes and William R. Evans.

William Osborne became so enamored in reporting De Kalb County's affairs he left the Atlanta Journal to head the Research-Information Center when former Journal reporter Dan Sweat was promoted to Mr. Emmerich's executive assistant last January.

As in De Kalb County, the forward Atlanta program is an umbrella covering 5 counties and 45 municipalities in its promotion of Greater Atlanta Metropolitan area.

Never before in the history of man have so many leaders worked together in so diverse an area—to bring and welcome new industries.

NEW SOUTH EXAMPLE

Georgia's Gov. Carl Sanders called the dedication more than just a ribbon cutting ceremony, "It is a clear and living example of the new South and the new Georgia, where the industrial pulse beats stronger each day.

Governor paid tribute to the Patillos * * * Pat who heads the construction company and to his father, H. A. and his brother Dan.

Before the bus tour of all plants, the 300 guests assembled. Roy Blount, president of the De Kalb Chamber of Commerce, gave the invocation. Pollard Turman, veep of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, was master of ceremonies. Mr. Charles O. Emmerich, Commission Chairman spoke and Cam Mitchell, of Georgia State Chamber of Commerce announced that 2 more plants had been signed for the industrial park.

"One Man Industrial Boom" is the caption on a feature on H. G. Patillo by Bob Willimon in the De Kalb Pictorial News, published by Dewey Turner, Tucker, Ga., in which Pat quotes his brother Dan, "you can make your luck by being at the right place at the right time."

The new companies that officially opened are AGN Manufacturing Co., Inc., Allis Chalmers Manufacturing Co.; Bellhouse, Inc.; H. C. Brill Co.; Custom Engineering Co.; Deeks & Co.; Electronic Wire & Connector Corp.; H. Goodman & Sons; Philip Hano Co.; Leslie Welding Co.; E. F. MacDonald Stamp Co.; Perma-Pipe Corp.; Protective Packaging Co.; Raybestos-Manhattan Co.; Southern Ink & Lacquer; Spacemaker, Inc.; Theta Electronics; Thompson Industries and TTT Co.

District of Columbia Crime

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7525) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the colloquy which has taken place among various Members of the House on this bill in the past several hours confirms the misgivings that many of us have had about this legislation. I believe this is a bill that is wrapped in a miasmic mist. I believe it needs a great deal more consideration, and I am going to offer a motion to recommit the bill. I hope that motion when offered will gain the support of a majority of this House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

What Responsibility Does the Federal Government Have for the Chicago Skyway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was presented on the WBBM-TV program, "Standpoint." While it represents the views of the station's management, it also reflects the opinions of many of my constituents. There is grave concern among my constituents, as well as nonresidents of Illinois, that this proposal to have the Federal Government "bail out" the Skyway—a private road owned by bondholders—will set a dangerous precedent. I feel that this concern is reflected in the editorial which follows:

WHAT RESPONSIBILITY DOES THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAVE FOR THE CHICAGO SKYWAY?

All actions of Government are expected to be in the public interest.

The problem is getting agreement as to where the public interest lies.

The controversy over the Chicago Skyway fits this mold. Mayor Daley, testifying in Washington, said public interest demands that the Federal Government bail out the Skyway. He was the first witness in behalf of a bill which would have the Government pay off $26 million of the $87 million owed to bondholders; and operate the Skyway as a freeway.

Chicago officials contend that motorists have failed to use the toll-costing Skyway because of expressway construction under Federal-State programs.

The Skyway was conceived in 1954 to alleviate a bottleneck at the southeast tip of Chicago abridging Indiana. But within 2 years came the Federal Interstate Highway System new freeways, some in direct competition with the Skyway. In the simplest of terms: The motoring public prefers freeways to paying a toll, even if the trip takes slightly longer. Thus, the Skyway, financed through the sale of revenue bonds, is badly in default.

The credit of the city of Chicago isn't actually involved.

This 7½ miles is a private road owned by the bondholders. They bought in with their eyes open at attractive interest rates and discount provisions. But in the name of good business or public interest, it is difficult for the city to wash its hands of them and the Skyway.

The Federal bill, introduced by Congressman JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, would reimburse them up to about 90 percent. This arrangement plus the hoped-for expanded usage of the Skyway as a freeway in the future adds up to the public interest to which Mayor Daley testified.

But there is more to the story in Standpoint's opinion. Admittedly, if the start of the project had been delayed a couple of years, the Federal Government probably would have wound up paying some 90 percent of the $101 million cost, but that would have been taxpayers' money. And if the United

States steps in now, it is still taxpayers' money.

The selling point behind the Skyway was that revenue from use would foot the bill. Hindsight is always better than foresight, but obviously someone erred in estimating the amount of traffic the Skyway would get. That someone was the engineering firm hired to make the forecast.

Much of Indiana toll-road traffic, going west, doesn't continue on the Skyward as predicted. It disperses locally. And Chicagoans, expected to use it for short runs, have found it inadequate to their needs as well as costly. They can't get off or on where they want to. Nor does it flow easily into Outer Drive traffic or to other sections of the city.

This is Monday morning quarterbacking, of course. But it is fact, fact which Illinois Public Works Director Francis Lorenz addressed himself to in his testimony. When and if the road becomes public owned, Chicago, Cook County, and the State will build at least three ramps. These, plus the fact that the facility will be free, will supply the traffic, he said.

The bill, through Democratic political strength, is expected to clear committee, although the Commerce Department opposes it as special legislation and as bad precedent.

We agree.

Would Chicago taxpayers want to pay for a mistake in Texas?

The Skyway was a mistake, the kind Chicago can do without.

Death of Estes Kefauver: A Loss to Us All

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the loss of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER will be deeply felt by all of us in the Congress, by the State of Tennessee, by the Nation and, indeed, by the world.

Senator KEFAUVER was an idealist, a fighter, a humanitarian, and most of all a great American. He espoused a cause, not for its popularity, or political mileage, but for its benefit to our Nation and to mankind.

Throughout his 24 years in the Congress—9 years in the House and 15 years in the Senate—Senator KEFAUVER never shied from a cause he felt was right. His concern was for the underdog, for the common man.

His work in exposing the crime syndicate during the early 1950's, while chairing a Senate subcommittee investigating crime, was a great service to our country, as were his later committee probes including his investigations of corruption in boxing and misleading advertising.

His work in the field of drug regulation shows another facet of the Senator's greatness—his refusal to give up. He pursued the investigation and pushed for legislation in the face of Senate apathy and his action was proved justified when the need for new laws in this field became evident during the Thalidomide scare.

Mr. Speaker, Senator KEFAUVER's untimely death deeply grieves us all. I join with my colleagues in expressing our sympathies to his wife and family.

Nothing New in Substance of Attacks on Bonneville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of public power have always been a well-organized and vocal group. Nevertheless we must not let their tactics obscure the lessons of history. It is apparent from the current attacks on Bonneville that its critics ask us to judge the merits of BPA in terms of the status quo—just as they did 30 years ago.

History has taught us, Mr. Speaker, that only by looking to the future can we accurately determine the power needs and potential of an area. If we had listened to the arguments outlined in the following article there would have been no expansion in the Pacific Northwest—the area adjacent to Bonneville would have remained a land of "coyotes and jackrabbits." But the men of vision prevailed, Mr. Speaker, and instead an industrial revolution took place in the Pacific Northwest.

In recent weeks the attacks on Bonneville have begun anew, but there is nothing new in the substance of these attacks. If we have learned our history lesson, Mr. Speaker, we will ignore the tirades. We will study the projections for 25 years hence and make our decisions on that basis. No series of articles limited by the perspective of the status quo and self-interest should deter us from this task.

The attached article from the New York Times magazine of Sunday, May 31, 1936, examined both sides of the Bonneville controversy. I would like to call the attention of the Members to this article—it is most informative:

POWER BRIDLES THE FRONTIER: IN THE COLUMBIA BASIN A VAST PROJECT RISES

Bonneville and Grand Coulee are the principal divisions of the project.

The Northwest is a land of contrasts, but it offers no more different scenes than those at the two dams now under construction. The 300 miles of twisting river which separate the undertakings might well be an ocean dividing two continents. Grand Coulee is surrounded by barren hills and dry tablelands. Bonneville is the center of an area covered with fir and cedar. One is like some portion of the rocky plains of high Tibet; the other a scene from the forests of Germany and Switzerland.

Reclamation Service engineers are building the Grand Coulee Dam in the bottom of a wide wash or arroyo. On all sides naked slopes roll away to the horizon. On the tablelands beyond are large rock formations which tower like fortresses in the desert. The dam itself will be a bulwark of steel and concrete almost a mile long and 500 feet high. The most massive structure ever built by man, Grand Coulee will contain more than three times as much masonry as Boulder Dam on the Colorado River.

At Bonneville workmen and engineers are surorunded by tree-covered bluffs and crags 3,000 feet high. Above the dam on the Oregon shore is the glacier-flanked peak of Mount Hood. The Washington bank is crowned by the flat summit of Old Table Mountain, a landmark for Captain Lewis when he paddled down the stream 130 years ago. Where once gleamed the campfires of the explorers sent westward by President Jefferson small squares of light now mark the modern cottages of hundreds of men engaged in harnessing the Columbia.

Power will be generated at both Bonneville and Grand Coulee, but the latter will be primarily an irrigation project. Bonneville is listed as a navigation enterprise. Life-giving water will eventually be conveyed to more than 1,200,000 acres from the dam at Grand Coulee. Hillsides and plains now incapable of supporting even sagebrush and jack rabbits will be turned into potential orchard and grazing land, needing only the influx of settlers to be put to use. Sponsors of the Columbia Basin development believe the day is not distant when the world's largest lift-locks at Bonneville will send freighters into the heart of the Northwest to transport to the world's ports the apples, timber, beef, wheat, and wool made possible by the irrigation of Grand Coulee.

Bonneville and Grand Coulee are now separate projects, the former under the supervision of the War Department and the latter under the direction of the Department of the Interior. But the time has been foreseen when there may be a Columbia Basin Authority similar to the TVA. Already Senator Pope, of Idaho, has introduced such a bill in the Senate, although proposals making Bonneville—the dam to be completed first—a separate entity are said to be favored by the President. The latter measures have been introduced by Senator McNary, of Oregon, and Senator Bone, of Washington.

Just as the TVA has had its controversies and litigation, so has the Columbia Basin project had extensive verbal overhaulings. Probably the most relentless opponent is Representative Francis Culkin, of New York, who has described Grand Coulee as "a vast area of gloomy tablelands, interspersed with deep gullies, located in northern Washington. The project has been condemned by the National Grange and other agricultural groups. * * * In the region of the Grand Coulee there is no one to sell the power to except coyotes and jackrabbits. Grand Coulee is that colossal imposition upon the American people."

Attacking from another flank, Philip H. Gadsden and other utility executives have charged that Bonneville and Grand Coulee will produce great blocs of electric energy in a region which already has a "superabundance" of power.

In answer to these complaints—and in reply to the implication that Grand Coulee is a repetition of the Florida canal and Passamaquoddy—advocates of the Columbia Basin enterprise point out that the area drained by the great river is the last frontier. They contend that Bonneville and Grand Coulee look toward the future, when overcrowding in the East will launch a new movement westward.

In the meanwhile, spillways and powerhouses arise in the mountains. Steam shovels bite into slopes of shale and walls of granite. Pneumatic drills hammer a lively staccato against cliffs worn smooth by ages of glacial and water erosion. Men wrestle with the river to set temporary barriers in place before pounding waters undo 2 years of toil and labor.

Advocates of the Columbia Basin project hope that in a decade a transformation will

have taken place. Powerlines will stretch to prosperous homesteads. The navigation hazard of Cascade Rapids will be buried beneath a smooth lake and steamers will plow the waters of the Columbia deep into the Cascade Mountains. Lands in eastern Washington, now dry and bare, will be fields and pastures. Long furrows of corn and potatoes will replace sand slopes and dust patches.

Drive through the Columbia Basin and look up at the lofty crests of Hood, Adams, St. Helens, and the other snow-capped sentinels, which for centuries have looked down on every act in the drama of the river. They will still be there as stony watchers when perhaps the people of another day gaze on two banks of masonry and steel that symbolize the civilization of a past era.

The Arab Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] concerning the so-called Johnson plan to alleviate the Arab refugee problem in the Middle East. The remarks are to be found on page 11647 of the July 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would not want to disparage the gentleman from New York, Congressman HALPERN's deep concern for the security of Israel. I have long admired his energetic support of efforts leading to a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict. I have no doubt that I shall have occasion to subscribe to his suggestions in this area in the future as I have in the past.

Nonetheless, I must take exception to substance of his remarks of July 9. Although he stated that Dr. Johnson's report had not been made public, he described it as "ill-advised," "unrealistic," "ludicrous," "ridiculous," and "dangerous." In short, the Johnson report was inferred to be a "massive scheme for moving mobs of bitter people across disputed frontiers."

Perhaps the gentleman from New York's [Mr. HALPERN] sources of information as to the contents of the unpublished Johnson report are two newspaper articles which he included in the RECORD. But neither of them—the story from the Jewish News nor the one from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency—purports to know what the Johnson report says. However, there is a newspaper report, written by Milt Freudenheim of the Chicago Daily News, which does claim to have a digest of the report my colleague has so castigated. Moreover, the day following this article's publication, October 1, 1962, the Press Secretary of the State Department, Mr. Lincoln White, stated that the Johnson recommendations were, in fact, "along the lines indicated by Mr. Freudenheim."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the Freudenheim article in the RECORD so that my colleagues may judge for themselves whether or not the Johnson report deserves the condemnation it has previously received in the House. In my judgment, this is not a "massive scheme for moving mobs of bitter people across disputed frontiers." Rather, it seems to me to be a reasonable way for the Arab States and Israel to relocate these hundreds of thousands of people who are presently living on the borders of Israel and are greatly adding to her insecurity.

I might add that, although I have never met Dr. Johnson, I believe that his distinguished career merits him more respectful treatment. He has been a professor of history at Williams College, president and trustee of the Carnegie endowment for international peace, and the Director of the Council on Foreign Relations. He has served his country as Chief of the Division of International Security Affairs in the Department of State, as a member of the policy planning staff, and in various other State Department positions. He has served both his country and the U.N. by being an adviser in various capacities to U.S. delegations to the United Nations, beginning with the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. And the report which he authored was the conclusion of more than 1 year's work as special representative of the U.N. Conciliation Commission.

I repeat: Dr. Johnson's distinguished career merits him more respectful treatment. Perhaps a number of my colleagues may see fit to disagree with the Johnson plan after reading the following résumé, but it is my sincere hope that this crucial issue will be discussed temperately and constructively. Invective and careless charges relating to the refugee problem in the Mideast cannot alleviate this dangerous situation.

The article follows:

ARAB-ISRAEL PEACE HOPES RISING

(By Milt Freudenheim)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The first small glimmer of hope for permanent Arab-Israel peace is emerging from secret developments here.

The Arab and Israel Governments are studying a plan for solving the problem of 1 million Palestine-Arab refugees, drafted after a year of diplomatic work by U.N. special representative Dr. Joseph E. Johnson.

The Chicago Daily News has obtained a copy of Dr. Johnson's confidential proposals for a U.N. initiative that would be the first break in the 13-year-old deadlock.

U.N. officials for years have pointed to the refugees of the 1948 war camped around Israel's borders as the potential spark that could bring war to the Mideast powder keg, with worldwide implications.

The U.S. Government has given nearly $300 million since 1950 to U.N. refugee relief, which has cost over $425 million total.

Even so, the U.N. Relief Agency (UNRWA) spends less than 10 cents a day per person on the 1,174,760 refugees now registered. Of these, close to 500,000 still live in U.N. camps.

On a global scale, the unresolved Arab-Israel cold war with its many shooting incidents, and the brief 1956 Suez hot war, is blamed for the heavy commitments of Soviet military aid to the Arabs.

Dr. Johnson, 56, a pipe-smoking former Williams College president, who heads the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has been quietly conferring with Mideast officials since August 1961.

His official title is special representative of the U.N. Conciliation Commission for Palestine (PCC), which consists of the United States, France, and Turkey, working under a mandate from the U.N. Assembly.

In confidential documents dated August 31 and September 6, he set forth concrete proposals now under consideration by top Mideast leaders.

The Johnson proposals include—

1. Appointment of a new U.N. administrator and staff charged with the duty of carrying out the 1948 U.N. Assembly resolution for repatriation (to former homes in Israel) or resettlement of the refugees.

2. Individual refugees and heads of families would be given confidential questionnaires. They would make a preliminary choice, keeping the right to change their minds later.

Possible choices would include return to former property in Israel; return to alternative locations in Israel; resettlement in Arab countries; resettlement elsewhere in the world.

3. The U.N. agents would consult Israel on possibilities for repatriation, and Arab and other countries specified in the preliminary questionnaires regarding resettlement of the refugees.

4. Israel would be asked not to set a maximum number of returning Arabs it would admit. However, Israel would retain the right to reject individual Arabs as security risks, subject to U.N. overall surveillance and review.

Refugees would be expected to agree to uphold the laws of Israel, or any other country they settled in. An impartial organ to hear disputed cases would be established.

5. A special U.N. fund consisting of voluntary contributions from governments and the world public would be set up to help the refugees become integrated.

6. Israel, with help from the U.N. and friends (mainly the United States) would be required to pay indemnities to Arabs who lost property in Israel.

Expenses of the U.N. administrator and agents would go into the regular U.N. budget, assessed against all 108 member countries (including Communists and Arabs that have not paid cash for the U.N. relief program in the past.)

The U.N. agents would be coordinators and catalysts with responsibility to inform the individual refugees and see that they understand and obtain their rights. Illiterates, for example, would get special help.

After consulting with Israel and other governments, the U.N. agents would report confidentially to individuals and family heads, enabling them to change their minds according to the real situation.

All refugees would be entitled to a U.N. fund indemnity covering the hardships undergone by them (something like a veterans bonus).

The Arab host governments (United Arab Republic, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon) and Israel would be invited to name representatives to a council of advisers to the U.N. administrator. These countries signed the 1949 Armistice pacts.

While refugees would indicate preferences on the questionnaires, they would be told from the start that they would not necessarily get their first choice.

It would be expected that refugees, who have established new lives, with family connections, would prefer not to move to Israel (a large proportion of the refugees are young people born since 1948).

* * * * *

The U.N. administrator would set up with Israel a detailed procedure for examining requests.

Property indemnities would be based on the 1947–48 values of real estate, and estimated value of moveable property, with adjustments for lost interest payments, money depreciation, and rights in community properties such as mosques and churches.

Israel would be expected to make a substantial contribution to the special voluntary fund.

* * * * *

The U.N. agents also would take into account the ability of various Arab states to accept refugees. It would negotiate with Arab and other governments on behalf of the refugees.

The new system would somewhat parallel the U.N. high commissioner for refugees office that has supervised the resettlement of 1 million refugees since World War II.

The 50th Armored Division, New Jersey National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 13, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the National Guard units of the United States have long been a factor in our military strength. The Guard throughout our history has always been that reliable standby force that has come so honorably to the aid of the country in a national emergency.

I am particularly proud of the 50th Armored Division of the New Jersey National Guard. The division is now in training at Camp Drum, N.Y. They have left no doubt of their worth in the eyes of the commander of the Continental Army Command, Gen. John K. Walters. The division went directly into the field to start their training upon their arrival at Camp Drum. The division's skills highly impressed the general and has made the unit worthy of its prior rating. I wish to commend the 50th for their determination to learn their job well and for bringing the praise of the Continental Army Command to the State of New Jersey. The State is proud of their men in the field and well they should be.

Mr. President, I recently read an article in the Newark, N.J., Evening News of August 9 concerning the 50th Armored Division. I would like unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a reminder to all of the vital role the National Guard plays in our defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY GUARD DIVISION WINS ARMY COMMANDER'S PRAISE

(By Warren H. Kennet)

CAMP DRUM, N.Y.—Gen. John K. Waters, commander of the Continental Army Command, praised the 50th Armored Division of the New Jersey National Guard yesterday.

The general is responsible for the training of the eight Active Army divisions in the United States and the Army Reserve and also has supervision of the National Guard.

The general flew here from his headquarters at Fort Monroe, Va., for a firsthand look at New Jersey's high priority division. He was given a briefing at Maj. Gen. Edward O. Wolf's headquarters in the field and then was taken on a tour by helicopter of the various units as they trained.

COMMENDS WOLF

At the end of the tour, Waters said he was most impressed with the dedication of the men in the units from privates to officers. He said Wolf was a very qualified commander.

Waters said he was sorry to see that Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan, was retiring from the service. He said he had done more for the Guard and the service than any man he knew.

McGowan, who is chief of the National Guard Bureau in the Pentagon, retires August 31 and will be replaced by his deputy, Maj. Gen. Winston P. (Wimpy) Wilson of Arkansas.

Waters said it was remarkable that a Natoinal Guard division such as the 50th came all the way from New Jersey and went directly into the field for training. He said he highly approved the system of training and hoped that other units of the Guard would do the same thing.

The general had been told in the briefing that the division was assigned a strength of 9,279 men and actually had a camp of 7,605, that 536 reservists were assigned the division on a Military Occupational Specialty Basis (MOS) and that there were only 10 men in the hospital for minor ailments.

COULD USE MORE

On the use of reservists to fill vacancies during summer field training, Waters asked if the division could have used more and was told that the number could have been 1,000.

The general said that definite steps are being taken by the recruiting service, which is under his command, to get men into the Guard, especially in the priority units.

He revealed also that if a Regular Army division was to move overseas for any sort of operation, one of the six priority units of the Guard would be called to active duty. The 50th is one of the six.

Asked what could be done to aid recruiting, which is the Guard's greatest problem, Waters said that directives on the recruitment program do not come from his headquarters but from Department of Army in the Pentagon. But he added, "It is the job of the Army to aid the Guard in recruiting and to see that the priority units, in particular, get the necessary equipment."

After lunch with Wolf in the field, Waters watched bridge construction, saw a squad in an attack service practice of 4.2 mortars, saw an infantry squad in an attack, watched training on the new Honest John launchers and watched the construction of an airstrip by the 411th Engineers.

Episcopal Bishops Endorse Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of three resolutions adopted by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church on civil rights. The resolutions speak for themselves, and I am pleased to commend them to the attention of all my colleagues. They are as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS, PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AUGUST 12, 1963

I

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church urges the Congress of the United States to pass such civil rights legislation as shall fairly and effectively implement both the established rights and the needs of all minority groups in education, voting rights, housing, employment opportunities and access to places of public accommodations.

II

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, mindful of the church assembly to be held in Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963, in cooperation with the march on Washington for jobs and freedom, (a) recognizes not only the right of free citizens to peaceful assemblage for the redress of grievances, but also that participation in such an assemblage is a proper expression of Christian witness and obedience; (b) welcomes the responsible discipleship which impels many of our bishops, clergy, and laity to take part in such an assemblage and supports them fully; (c) prays that through such peaceful assemblage citizens of all races may bring before the Government for appropriate and competent action the critical and agonizing problems posed to our Nation by racial discrimination in employment, in access to places of public accommodations, in political rights, in education and housing.

III

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church commends to all people the presiding bishop's letter dated Whitsunday 1963 as appropriate and helpful in the present racial crisis; and that we support the presiding bishop in this wise and timely expression of Christian leadership.

Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that the death of ESTES KEFAUVER left the country and Congress poorer. As for me, I lost not only a friend but also a man to whom I was joined in a common politic and economic philosophy.

We had joined together as sponsor of considerable antitrust legislation, including the drug bill, and together we had fought through to a successful conclusion the enactment of the Celler-Kefauver Act and the civil investigative demand legislation both highly significant in the strengthening of our antitrust laws. Both of us shared the conviction that our economy to be free, competitive, and strong, must look to the antitrust laws, and their importance, to sustain that ideal. We both felt that economic concentration was an economic evil that had to be fought and resisted.

Behind the soft voice and gentle manner of ESTES KEFAUVER, lay immeasurable strength. He was not afraid to tackle the big job, to take on the giants of in-

dustry, or the masters of crime. He did it without bluster, without threat, and without arrogance.

When we served together on the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, I soon recognized in him the intellectual strength combined with a gentleness that made him unique. Listening to ESTES then, it would have been difficult to predict that he could capture the hearts of millions of our people—so withdrawn and so reticent did he, at times, appear. I write out of a sense of deep personal loss. I will not find his like again.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 10, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

GRAVE QUESTIONS RAISED BY TEST BAN TREATY

The test ban treaty has become the most vital issue America faces. Unless some clear cut answers are given to assure the security of the United States is not being put in peril, the treaty must not be ratified. To date these answers have not been given—on the contrary all indications point to extreme danger for the United States if the treaty is ratified. This week I attended two briefings by Dr. Stefan T. Possony, who is not only a top nuclear scientist, but is an expert on the Communist philosophy and the workings of the Soviet Union. Dr. Possony stated without equivocation, "The test ban makes war inevitable."

Let's explore the reasons why. First to be considered is the Soviet definition of disarmament. In the Communist plan disarmament means disarming the capitalist peoples and strengthening their own power until they control the world and then there will be peace. In the words of Lenin: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historical mission, to throw all armaments in the scrap heap." Khrushchev reiterated his allegiance to the Lenin doctrine of world domination even after the treaty was signed in Moscow this week.

This test ban treaty does disarm the United States. Today the military supremacy of the West, principally in the form of American nuclear deterrent stockpiles, stands as the roadblock in the path of achieving the Communist goal by war. Russia cannot afford to start a war now because the cost of our retaliatory destruction would be too great for them. That military power of the United States also stands in the way of their achieving the goal by means other than war. Khrushchev is fully aware of the dependency of Communist expansion upon Communist military power. No country has been brought under communism except where nonviolent revolutionary techniques have been reinforced by armed conquest or by the close pressure of military power. Getting rid of this bone in Khrushchev's throat by trying to outbuild the United States militarily cannot be done. He recognizes the United States is capable of raising the ante beyond his stakes. So, he has taken the obvious alternative—to immobilize the nuclear weapons system on which U.S. nuclear power is based, while at the same time leaving open the maximum opportunity for improvement of Soviet military capabilities.

In this context the partial test ban treaty is ideal for Soviet purposes! The Soviet Union is clearly ahead in high-yield nuclear weapons. It claims to have solved the antimissile missile problem. Extensive construction at Soviet missile defense sites lends credence to this claim. Development of this type of weapon means we must test in the atmosphere. The treaty will insure that we will not make progress and the Soviet Union will keep its lead in these areas. Tactical nuclear weapons of great significance can be developed by underground testing. That is not barred by the treaty. Therefore, Khrushchev, behind in tactical weapons, is free to catch up. As he does so and we are prevented from further development in the field in which we are behind, our military power will constantly diminish as his gains. Eventually, according to the Soviet time-table within 10 years, the cross-over will be reached, they will be stronger and at that point can issue the ultimatum for our surrender.

Additional points. Averell Harriman, at the President's direction, and Lord Hailsham, the British negotiator, made no demands during the Moscow negotiations for effective inspection procedures to guard against underhand preparations by the Communists for surprise abrogation of the treaty. Also, treaties have no meaning to the Communists. They may be broken at will under Soviet law: Article 49 of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, adopted in Moscow in 1957, under the powers of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. states: "Ratifies and denounces international treaties of the U.S.S.R." The partial test ban treaty is, inded, a first step, as President Kennedy and Khrushchev agree, but it is not a first step in a direction helpful to the free world. It is a first step toward giving communism freedom to wage "peaceful coexistence" backed up by overwhelming Soviet military might, more aggressively and more effectively. This is the means by which Soviet Communists prefer to force the free world to capitulate. The test ban treaty will be ratified unless there is such a public outcry that will force a majority of the Senate to vote against it. The fate of the United States of America is at this moment in the hands of the people. Failure to make themselves heard—acceptance of peace at any price—will mean defeat for the United States and the whole free world. The dilemma—will the people learn the horrible truth? Will the people recognize the situation and act in time?

REASONABLE DISCUSSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The NAACP held national conference in Washington this week so that their members could lobby their respective Congressman for civil rights legislation. Of course, they are in favor of the President's civil rights proposals, although even these do not go far enough to satisfy the Negro leadership. Edwin Washington of Dallas, and Reverend McCardle of Houston visited me. I was glad of the opportunity to discuss civil rights with them. Some Members of Congress do not take time to discuss problems with those who do not support them. I have never taken that position. I have always felt it my duty to represent, and to be petitioned by, all the people of the 5th District of Texas and to do my best to understand their problems and to act in their behalf whether those petitioning are friendly to me personally or not. In this connection, I was happy to make my position clear. I emphatically am against law breaking for whatever good goals it seeks and I am critical of the NAACP for its part in inciting disregard for the law which has led to violence. I am against people, including Ministers of the Gospel, lying in the road to prevent law-abiding citizens from performing their right to work and I oppose using children, even 2-year-old babies by placing them under the wheels of trucks. This is not reasonable discussion—this is anarchy and its perpetrators will not succeed in winning justice, but will suffer, with all of us, the awful consequences of a breakdown of law and order. Interestingly and coincidentally, the visit of the delegation to my office followed by 1 day the debate in the House on inclusion of the Powell equal rights amendment to the vocational education bill. Although I opposed the bill because I do not believe this is a constitutional function of the Federal Government, I supported the amendment because if Federal funds are used the facilities must be open to all citizens. Most of the liberal Democrats opposed the amendment including two Negro Members. Two Negro Members voted for it and one voted "present" which meant he took no position either way. May it not be in order to ask, just who is for civil rights, who is using it for political purposes, and where do the Negroes stand on their own amendment?

Note to chamber of commerce members: The president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Edwin P. Neilan, came under bitter attack in the House this week because of his defense of good government and the private enterprise system. I was glad to join with our good Texan, ED FOREMAN, in coming to Mr. Neilan's defense.

Ave Maria Urges Senate Approval of Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial in the August 10 issue of a Roman Catholic journal published in my congressional district, Ave Maria, urging Senate ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty.

The editorial, entitled, "Fear of the Dark," follows:

FEAR OF THE DARK

The United States-Soviet test ban treaty is hardly the panacea for the cold war, as most Americans are aware. The dispute centers on the question of whether it is a step toward that peace we long for, or whether it will serve the Communist cause in a way yet unknown to us.

There seemed to be an undue fear of entrapment by Soviet diplomacy on the part of the Senators who opposed the treaty's ratification. They are reluctant to sign the treaty not because there is any demonstrable evidence that it will undermine U.S. security, but rather because, if the Soviets agree to it, the treaty bodes only evil for America.

This is a fear of the dark that can have only adverse consequences for the United States. It is a form of irrationality induced by rightwing extremism, which believes the only good Russia is a dead Russia.

What is needed at this moment in history is the intelligent "yes" response, which Pope John XXIII urged last fall when he said that "everything possible" must be done to save peace. "Let them continue to negotiate," the Pontiff stated. "By doing so, they will

spare the world the horrors of a war that would have disastrous consequences such as nobody can foresee."

Later, in Pacem in Terris, Pope John declared: "Men are becoming more and more convinced that disputes which arise between states should not be resolved by recourse to arms, but rather by negotiation.

"It is true that on historical grounds this conviction is based chiefly on the terrible destructive force of modern arms. * * *

"Nevertheless, unfortunately, the law of fear still reigns among peoples, and it forces them to spend fabulous sums for armaments: not for aggression, they affirm—and there is no reason for not believing them—but to dissuade others from aggression.

"There is reason to hope, however, that by meeting and negotiating men may come to discover better the bonds—deriving from the human nature which they have in common—that unite them, and that they may also come to discover that one of the most profound requirements of their common nature is this: that between them and their respective peoples it is not fear which should reign but love, and love which tends to express itself in a collaboration that is loyal, manifold in form and productive of many benefits."

In another passage the late Pope clearly opposed nuclear testing because it contributed to the arms race, adding: "Justice, right reason and humanity, therefore, urgently demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control."

The cause that Pope John pleaded became a reality during the reign of Pope Paul VI, who prior to the agreement on the treaty had asked for prayers of peace.

"These words had an echo far greater than we could have thought, for the whole world welcomed them as a good omen of the events which have in fact been realized this week.

"We welcome these events with the hope that they are really sincere and successful, and that they may prepare the way for others, for the tranquility, order and peace of the world."

Here is the mind of the church in the age of renewal, with Pope Paul as it was with Pope John: a refreshing openness to new ideas along with an understanding that peace is still distant.

The treaty is a minimal but necessary first step toward that peace. It is to be welcomed.

The Discount Rate and the Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board recently raised the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. This action was specifically designed to halt short-term capital movements that had caused an increase in the deficit in the balance of payments.

However, despite assurances to the contrary by both the Federal Reserve Board Chairman and the Secretary of the Treasury, considerable doubt has been expressed by respected members of the economic and business communities that the effects of the raise in discount rates can be confined to the balance of payments. It is feared this action will in fact tighten the money supply and delay the domestic economic recovery.

Although there has been some success in holding down long-term rates while increasing short-term rates, Mr. Speaker, I am most concerned that in the event of a tax cut economic pressures will be such that it will be impossible to hold the line on long-term rates.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the views of Prof. Eric W. Lawson, noted economist, and chairman of the finance department at Syracuse University. I think the Members will find it informative:

THE DISCOUNT RATE AND THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

(By Eric W. Lawson)

The role of the discount rate increase of July 1963 needs to be appraised in terms of possible and probable effects on the U.S. economy as well as in terms of its intended contribution to the solution of the so-called gold problem.

The debate on the domestic effect of changing the discount rate ranges over a wide area. At one end we may find the position of the Federal Reserve authorities, and others, who contend that an increased rate will, when accompanied by supporting measures, act as a brake on the economy. There are some, perhaps, who would even argue this braking effect is brought about by the increased cost of money per se. Others in this camp argue that the effect comes about because of restrictions on the supply of funds. At the other end of the range, we find those who argue that changing the discount rate and relevant rates in the market within practical limits of the previous position of such rates cannot be expected to have a significant influence in restraining a boom or inciting a recovery. As pointed out below, the fact that the United States is not threatened with a boom in July 1963 presents a new dimension for consideration in this debate.

Those who accept the Federal Reserve position, of course, must appraise the current change in the discount rate in the light of that position. Clearly if a discount rate change can be expected to have an appreciable influence on the course of business in the face of a strong upward economic surge, it cannot be expected to have no effect when the economy is operating at less than full capacity with no latent inflationary forces in the offing. On the contrary, it would appear that the alleged effectiveness of the discount rate change would be at its maximum at such a time.

If the argument is made that the true effect of the discount rate change and the upward movement in short-term interest rates is brought about because of a responding movement in long-term interest rates, we have a slightly different but no less serious problem. Recent Federal Reserve and administration policy has indicated an apparent subscription to the proposition that long-term interest rates need to be kept relatively low in order to augment capital formation and thus economic growth. Accordingly, serious efforts have been made to manipulate the yield curve in such a way that long-term rates have been kept constant or actually reduced. These efforts have apparently been rewarded by some small but measurable changes in rates on such things as residential mortgages. It can scarcely be said, however, that such movement as has taken place in the long-term rates can be attributed entirely to Federal Reserve policy. To a certain extent, the effect has come about because of a relatively slack demand for short-term borrowing by business with the result that banking institutions have found it desirable to allocate their resources more to the mortgage area.

As the availability of bank reserves becomes lessened in keeping with the discount rate policy, it is difficult to see how the rates on long-term maturities can be kept from moving up. In fact, the expectations of the long-term suppliers of money, as based on the performance of short-term rates, may be expected to place additional upward pressure on the long-term rates.

Those who are generally skeptical with respect to the efficacy of discount rate changes for the purposes of controlling the domestic economy in an inflationary or boom period are not unaware of the fact that interest rate do change. An upward adjustment in the commercial bank prime rate can be expected to take place relatively soon after market rates move up. We have here an example of an administered price situation. The upward adjustment of bank rates thus requires those who do borrow from the banks to pay higher rates. Cost increases of the magnitude indicated by the recent discount rate change might be deemed to be unimportant during boom periods, but relatively more important during periods of relative slack. Furthermore, those efforts which are made during periods of monetary stringency to ease the impact of such stringency upon business arrangements, thus providing the velocity increase which tends to bypass the reduced availability of money, may well not be undertaken by the businessmen whose expectations for the immediate future are not great. Simply stated, the demand for money may not be sharply responsive to interest rate changes either during a boom or at the bottom of a depression; it may, however, be sensitive during such economic conditions as those prevailing in July 1963.

In addition, interest rate differentials do exert an influence on the channels by which money flows through the economy. That is to say, regardless of the level of interest rates, it may be expected that maximizing principles will be at work to determine the pattern of fund flows. The changing of the rates may then be expected to have an influence on such patterns. Although it cannot be asserted positively that there is any one pattern that is the best, it also cannot be asserted that the pattern at the 3½ percent level is better than the one at the 3 percent level. However, it must be recognized that a disturbance has taken place in the marketplace, which disturbance is of consequence to those who have decisions to make. By no means the least of such disturbances is the transfer of income from debtors to creditors. If we assume that $200 billion of new debt contracts will be made next year subject to the higher costs we see a transfer of $1 billion solely because of the higher levels of interest.

We may conclude this note on the possible domestic effects of a change in the discount rate by observing that the current state of the economy in the latter half of 1963 does not indicate a need for a braking action of any sort. Since most positions which can be taken with respect to the discount rate indicate undesirable results from its change, it becomes highly doubtful whether such a change can be justified. In fact every indication points in the direction of harmful and pernicious results.

Herbert C. Blunk, People-to-People Advocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a dinner given by Samuel F. Pryor on behalf of Pan American World Airways on August 5, in honor of the Civil Air Patrol cadets and their escort officers from 22 countries. Many Members of Congress, representatives of the diplomatic corps, government officials and leading businessmen attended the dinner. Senators VANCE HARTKE of Indiana and HIRAM FONG of Hawaii were the speakers.

Among those present was Mr. Herbert C. Blunck, vice president and general manager of the Hilton Hotels, who is well known for his leadership in the field of promoting international travel and tourism. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Blunck and discussing with him the work he is doing in promoting a people-to-people exchange between the United States and other countries.

According to Mr. Blunck, there is a great need now for an expansion of this people-to-people exchange program in order to create a better understanding and appreciation of American aims in the world in behalf of mankind. He is working quietly, but very hard, for the success of this program. Most of his activity is concentrated in the field that he knows best, the hotel industry, which is making a remarkable contribution toward the success of the program. Through the efforts of Mr. Blunck and his colleagues in the industry, American hotels are participating in the people-to-people exchange program by providing services, accommodations, knowledge about life in the United States, and the exchange of information between countries.

Blunck's interest and association with this exchange program began in 1953 when he was appointed by President Eisenhower as cochairman of the American Hotel Association's People-to-People Committee, along with another prominent hotelman, Albert Pick. For the outstanding job done as cochairman of the committee, Mr. Blunck was subsequently awarded the U.S. Information Agency's Distinguished Service Citation. A similar citation was also given to Mr. Pick.

Under the leadership of these two men, the hotel association's people-to-people committee published more than 100,000 copies of a brochure in five languages entitled "A Guide for Guests From Abroad in American Hotels." They were also instrumental in getting many of the 6,000 hotels affiliated with the American Hotel Association to undertake special hospitality programs for their foreign guests.

Herbert C. Blunck is also active in the International Hotel Association and has served as vice chairman of the "Visit U.S.A. Program", appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. He recently made a special trip to Europe to inspect some of the U.S. Travel Service facilities for the hotel industry.

Mr. Blunck is a native of Seattle, Wash., and attended the University of California. He served on the staffs of the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco and the Huntington Hotel in Pasadena. Later he taught hotel administration at San Francisco Junior College. In 1939 he joined the Hotels Statler Co., serving successively as manager of Statler hotels in San Francisco, Detroit, St. Louis, New York, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C. He was president of the Hotel Association of Washington in the years 1954, 1955 and 1956. He has also held leading posts in the Washington Community Chest Federation and the United Givers Fund.

Herbert Blunck's civic activities include almost every major endeavor in the Washington community, including the Board of Trade, the American Red Cross, Greater National Capital Committee, Washington Hospital Center, Advertising Club, National Press Club, Better Business Bureau, Cherry Blossom Festival Chairman in 1959, and numerous others.

He is truly a man who is civic minded in the highest degree, but his civic interests are not limited merely to his own community or even his own country. It includes the whole world and his fellowmen of all countries. He is an eloquent spokesman of the idea and ideals of the people-to-people exchange program, and he practices what he preaches.

The Scientific Case for Men to the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an article by Sir Bernard Lovell which appeared in the July issue of Air Force and Space Digest. Sir Bernard Lovell is one of the world's most renowned radio astronomers; is the director of the Jodrell Bank Observatory of the University of Manchester, England, and the author of many articles and books on astronomy and cosmology.

The possibility of getting basic answers to questions about the origin of the solar system and the chances of extraterrestrial life as well as the potential of unobscured astronomical observation from the lunar surface are important and basic justifications for the manned lunar effort.

The article follows:

THE SCIENTIFIC CASE FOR MEN TO THE MOON

(By Sir Bernard Lovell)

The great problems that face the intellect of man concern the origin and early history of the universe and of the solar system. The inquiries into these problems and, indeed, into the issue of the uniqueness of life as we know it have recently been reopened with a new enthusiasm because the techniques now available seem capable of providing us with critical information which may at least throw a new light on some of the controversies. Exploration of the moon and the planets by space probes is the most promising and exciting of these new developments.

From studies of the earth's rocks we know that the solar system was born about 4,500 million years ago and that life forms began to emerge on earth about 1 billion years ago. The essence of the problem which faces us is whether the solar system arose by processes that were unique or by processes that are likely to be of frequent occurrence among the trillions of stars in the universe.

For example, in the "tidal" theory which was current a generation ago, the planets and the earth were originally torn out of the sun by the gravitational pull of a passing star, and the hot solar material subsequently cooled in separate masses to form the system as we know it today. Such an event must be so rare that the processes of planetary formation would have to be regarded as unique, and consequently the evolution of life as on earth is unlikely to have been paralleled elsewhere in the universe.

We do not now believe that this was the manner of formation of the system. It seems more likely that in the remote past the sun, as an ordinary star, was surrounded by a nebula of gas and dust and that the bodies of the solar system were formed by the accretion of this material. If this view is correct, then planetary systems are likely to be of frequent occurrence around the stars in the cosmos and thereby the chances of life elsewhere are considerable.

The moon is the one body in the solar system which may yield the most critical information about these early processes. The reason for this is the rather simple one that the moon has no atmosphere, and hence its rocks and surface features are untouched by the erosion of wind and rain. On earth the processes of erosion change the surface features radically over periods of 10 to 50 million years, but the moon contains the untouched history of the 4,500 million years of development of the solar system.

While this view may be accepted, it is frequently argued that the necessary investigations can be carried out by unmanned instruments landed on the lunar surface and that there is no need to go to the enormous expense and difficulty of a manned lunar landing for this purpose. For example, Surveyor, which the Americans hope to land on the moon in (in the mid-sixties), has a drill which will bore a few feet into the lunar surface and will then analyze the material and transmit the data back to earth.

But Surveyor has no brain; it cannot ask the next question. Further series of such unmanned probes would be needed, extending over decades, to find the answers which a trained geologist would get in a few hours on the moon in (in the midsixties), has a bore deep into the lunar substrata to find out if the core of the moon is molten; he will select meteoric material which will have made impact on the moon without becoming molten in passing through the earth's atmosphere, and—perhaps most important of all—he will be able to use judgment in dealing with the unexpected.

Machines cannot display the most important capabilities of man in these explorations. The machine cannot make on-the-spot judgments; neither can it discriminate and select from alternatives which have not been anticipated by its designers. The ability to adapt to the unexpected situation or discovery is a vital factor in exploration.

As regards the existence of primeval life forms outside the Earth, the planets Mars and Venus are important in these investigations since the aridity of the Moon will have militated against any forms of organic de-

velopment. Even so, in sheltered crevices on the lunar surface it may be that some primeval material of biological interest exists. The significance of the proof of the life forms elsewhere is such that it would be foolish to disregard even slight possibilities as far as the moon is concerned.

These tremendous investigations lie before us. They may alter our entire outlook on our abode in space and the uniqueness of ourselves. They must be carried out in the manner best judged to yield accurate results before the lunar environment becomes too contaminated with earthly material. The answer must surely be to land men on the moon rather than to pursue the goal through a lengthy series of unmanned landings of instruments which will never yield the same decisive answers and which may end up over the decades in becoming vastly more costly than the manned projects.

There is another quite different series of scientific arguments for the manned lunar landing. So far, the discussion has centered around the study of the moon itself, but the ability to investigate the stars and the galaxies from the moon opens up wide new fields of scientific endeavor.

Our observations of the universe by earth-bound instruments are limited by the opacity of the earth's atmosphere. There are two gaps, or windows, through which we have obtained our knowledge of space. One exists in the optical part of the spectrum and covers the range of wavelengths from the violet to the red. Through this gap the great optical telescopes in America have penetrated far into the depths of space and have produced information about the state of the universe as it was billions of years ago. More recently, the radio telescopes have been used in astronomical studies, receiving radio waves from space which come to earth through the transparency that exists in the radio part of the spectrum from wavelengths of a few millimeters to several meters.

We have little information either about the radiations which exist in space outside the wavelength regions of these transparencies, or what the universe looks like—for example—between the violet and the radio wave part of the spectrum. However, the instruments which have been temporarily rocketed clear of the atmosphere or which have been placed in orbit have given such a rich reward that we can speculate with confidence that a systematic study from a base clear of the earth would introduce a new revolution in astronomy.

Even within the optical band through which the telescopes work, the conditions in the atmosphere limit the usefulness of the instruments. It has been argued that much of this work can be done by unmanned orbiting space platforms—and, indeed, American projects are in progress for orbiting geophysical and astronomical observatories. These projects will give valuable results but there is little doubt that only when man himself can manipulate the instruments will the full reward be attained.

The moon is the one object in the solar system which will provide the ideal base for a maned observtaory. Even telescopes which are small by terrestrial standards will penetrate far into space becaues they will be entirely unobscured by atmospheric troubles. The extension of the view into the far violet and infrared, and into the obscured regions bordering the present limits of the radio spectrum, will give answers to many questions about the stars and the galaxie that now puzzle us.

In the same way that the physical examination of the moon may give critical information about the origin of the solar system, so we can anticipate that the astronomical observations which will be made from it will answer vital questions about the early history and evolution of the cosmos as a whole.

Pennsylvania Governor's Debut a Smash Hit as Scranton Wins Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of August 4, 1963.

PENNSYLVANIA GOVERNOR'S DEBUT A SMASH HIT AS SCRANTON WINS PROGRAM—PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE ADJOURNS

(By L. R. Lindgren)

HARRISBURG, August 3.—Gov. William W. Scranton had brilliant success in getting most of his vital programs through the legislature.

An analysis of results showed today that, with a few exceptions, the Governor got about what he wanted—and in some instances even more than he asked.

The accomplishment was magnified because the Govenor's Republican Party had only paperthin margins in the Senate and House—and these majorities contained some rugged individuals who were hard to handle.

Govenor Scranton's standout feat came in May when the legislature gave him new taxes totaling $142 million a year, compared to the $138 million he had requested.

This new revenue figure might turn out to be low, especially if business booms.

PREDICTION OF $175 MILLION

At least, the Democrats contend that when all of the dollars are in and counted they might add up to $175 million or more.

The lawmakers, at Mr. Scranton's request, also put up $4 million for an industrial development program designed to attract new industry to the State.

Mr. Scranton also got a bill to make the State civil service system uniform and put 17,000 more employees under the merit system.

The Governor seemingly used a special kind of magic in getting what he wanted from the legislature.

During the 7-month session, he didn't veto a single bill—a performance unequaled in the memory of veteran observers.

This doesn't mean that many bills didn't come to Mr. Scranton's desk that he didn't like.

But instead of arbitrarily vetoing them, as other Governors have done, he sent for legislative leaders, told them he couldn't accept the bill in its present form and suggested that if they wanted to recall it and recast it in the Scranton image, he'd be glad to sign it.

Thus, all through the session, there was a rash of recall resolutions getting bills back into the legislative halls for rewriting to suit the Governor.

In effect, this was a case of the executive branch of the Government reaching into the legislative and exercising a surprising degree of control.

The Governor failed to win passage for his bill to derail the State's plush insurance gravy train.

This would have ended the practice of handing out insurance commissions on State business to political favorites and would have turned them over to the secretary of property and supplies for State use.

During the last administration of ex-Gov. David L. Lawrence, these "plums" ran to $550,000.

The bill was killed in the senate insurance committee under insurance lobby pressure.

The Governor also lost out on providing public school buses for private and parochial school pupils (this died in a conference committee between house and senate members) and on changes in the unemployment compensation act.

Heavy opposition to the unemployment bill from unions forced Mr. Scranton to give up this fight. He may, however, call a special session to deal with it.

On only one score did Governor Scranton denounce the Democrats for blocking action on $72 million worth of appropriations to State-aided universities, medical schools and general hospitals, including several million dollars for Pittsburgh institutions.

They don't need this money immediately, but will later in the fall. It is probable that it will be provided at a special session.

Senate Democrats refused to confirm more than 100 of the Governor's nominations to States positions—but the Governor will give them interim appointments so they can replace the present holdovers.

SCRANTON SATISFIED

On the whole, however, Governor Scranton, himself, was elated with what the legislature did.

"This," he said gratefully, "has been one of the most productive legislative sessions in the history of Pennsylvania. I am tremendously pleased with what has been accomplished.

"Our aim was to build a legislative framework for a better Pennsylvania and this has been done. In an overwhelming number of cases, words have been turned into action and there is not a citizen nor a family in Pennsylvania who will not benefit."

The Governor said the record shows that 50 major administration bills were passed, plus more than 100 others backed by various departments.

"Pennsylvania," he asserted, "is on its way forward. This is the beginning of a better day."

Trade and Economic Prostration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very pointed warning by the distinguished, well-informed president of the Boston Wool Trade Association, Mr. Richard I. Goodrich, concerning the imports of wool manufacturers of all kinds, including apparel, which are pouring into American markets at disruptive levels, and are a threat to American industry, labor, and prosperity.

I have emphasized this situation in the House on many occasions, not only in its impact upon the wool industry, but upon most textiles, and many other industries vital to a healthy, prosperous American economy and the general employment of our fellow citizens.

It is somewhat bewildering that this Congress could remain unmoved by the strong, growing evidence of deep disturbance in our economic system, and threats to our industrial and mercantile survival, presented by the continued, in-

creased flood of cheaply produced imports from abroad.

As I have pointed out before, the issue here is not trade with other nations, because the increase in trade with other nations of good will and cooperative spirit will continue to be a desirable goal of this Nation.

The real issue is whether we conduct our foreign trade in such a way so as to harm, injure, and ultimately cause the collapse of many of our industries and the employment opportunities of millions of our fellow Americans.

There can be no doubt that the increase in cheap imports coming into this country definitely constitutes huge, additional economic aid to the countries sending in these imports. This fact is the negation of the slogan "Trade, Not Aid," since under the present situation—we have every reason to believe that under present trade laws, the challenge of cheap imports undermining American industry may grow more threatening day after day and we have both "trade and aid"—the first at the expense of American industry and its faithful employees, and the second at the expense of all the taxpayers of the United States.

I suggest that our Foreign Affairs Committees and Appropriation Committees give special, very careful attention to the foreign aid program this year to cut its well advertised, undeniable inefficiency, waste, and extravagance, and that the House Ways and Means Committee reconsider and reevaluate the impact of cheaply produced foreign goods on the American economy and take appropriate action to prevent the decline and dismemberment of many of our American industries with consequent, artificially produced, destructive, widespread unemployment and depression of business.

The statistics concerning wool and textile imports are very distressing, because they indicate that in September of 1962 these imports rose above the previous, alltime monthly high figure in August and brought the total for January through September 1962 to 12,600,000 square yards, or 81 percent higher than the total for the same 9-month period in 1961. The figures for the rest of the year are estimated to be even worse.

Let us act before our economic system is prostrated by cheap imports.

The article follows:

GOODRICH CHIDES ADMINISTRATION: BOSTON WOOL LEADER CALLS IMPORTS THREAT TO SURVIVAL

Imports of wool manufacturers of all kinds, including apparel, are pouring into American markets "at unprecedented and disruptive levels" and are a threat to the survival of the domestic industry, the president of the Boston Wool Trade Association said here Tuesday.

Richard I. Goodrich told the 51st annual meeting the closings of two large, modern woolen mills in successive weeks are examples of what "can be expected from other mills unless immediate relief is forthcoming" from the administration. He did not identify the mills.

TALK, BUT NO ACTION

"The wool industry," Goodrich said, "is disturbed and deeply concerned by the fact that, despite the straightforward and unequivocal statements by ranking members of the administration, no constructive action has been taken."

Goodrich said that in addition to other imports, "our tariff laws have been circumvented by the importation of millions of yards of woolen fabrics manufactured in Italy and imported, duty free, through the Virgin Islands."

Goodrich said President Kennedy showed "an obvious grasp of the problems" a year and a half ago when the wool trade spokesman said the President gave the industry his program for assistance.

The President, Goodrich said, gave evidence of recognition of the essentiality of the industry and determination to take action.

"It is to be regretted in the case of the wool industry," he said, "that a stronger position has not been taken by those responsible for our foreign policy."

While other countries demand quantitative quotas as a means of protecting their industry—such as Great Britain's recent action on Japanese imports—the United States avoids such actions, Goodrich said.

He said the reason given is that "nations on which we attempt to impose these restrictions are apt to take retaliatory action or even turn to Communist countries for trade.

"Our conciliatory attitude has not deterred Japan from making a 5-year trade pact with Red China, or prevented many other nations with whom we deal from trading with Communist countries," Goodrich said.

Recordbreaking wool textile imports in September 1962 rose above the previous alltime monthly high figure in August and brought the total for January through September 1962 to 112,600,000 square yards, or 81 percent higher than the total for the same 9-month period in 1961. This 9-month total exceeds the record total for the full year 1960 and exceeds the full year 1961 by 33 percent. Wool fabric imports already exceed 50 million square yards so far in 1962, or 80 percent more than the 28,200,000 imported during the same 1961 period. These 1962 fabric imports include over 7 million square yards of "showerproofed" cloth which continues to be transshipped through the Virgin Islands from Italy.

The Episcopal Church on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following three resolutions of the bishops of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America adopted on Monday, August 12, 1963, relating to the pending civil rights legislation which has been introduced in the House. The adoption of these resolutions coincides with the Emergency Conference of Episcopalians on Civil Rights sponsored by the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which brings this week to Washington some 50 clergy and lay members of that church from Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The New York Times of August 13 notes that these resolutions place the whole weight of the moral authority of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church behind a strong civil rights program, and "such as shall fairly and effectively implement both the established rights and needs of all minority groups in education, voting rights, housing, employment opportunities, and access to places of public accommodation." The resolutions follow:

I

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church urges the Congress of the United States to pass such civil rights legislation as shall fairly and effectively implement both the established rights and the needs of all minority groups in education, voting rights, housing, employment opportunities and access to places of public accommodation.

II

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, mindful of the church assembly to be held in Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963, in cooperation with the march on Washington for jobs and freedom—

(a) Recognizes not only the right of free citizens to peaceful assemblage for the redress of grievances, but also that participation in such an assemblage is a proper expression of Christian witness and obedience;

(b) Welcomes the responsible discipleship which impels many of our bishops, clergy, and laity to take part in such an assemblage and supports them fully; and

(c) Prays that through such peaceful assemblage citizens of all races may bring before the Government for appropriate and competent action the critical and agonizing problems posed to our Nation by racial discrimination in employment, in access to places of public accommodation, in political rights, in education, and housing.

III

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church commends to all people the presiding bishop's letter dated Whitsunday 1963, as appropriate and helpful in the present racial crisis; and that we support the presiding bishop in this wise and timely expression of Christian leadership.

God Favors Nations That Show Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr., editor emeritus of the distinguished Florida Times-Union. It appeared on Sunday, August 4, 1963. It deserves careful reading:

GOD FAVORS NATIONS THAT SHOW PURPOSE

(By Dr. Caleb J. King, Sr.)

("By faith, Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."—Hebrews 11: 8.)

Abraham's courage in obeying God's wish that he go out into an unknown territory to

organize and become the head of a nation is the classical example of courage.

It fits perfectly into the scheme the Jews had devised to make of themselves a great people. They had come up out of the Arabian desert, where they didn't amount to much, determined to build themselves up to greatness. That was long before Abraham appeared on the scene.

It would seem, therefore, that God intervened, and joined up with the Jewish ambition for a top position in the human family, and agreed to give them the great nation he promised Abraham.

Now pick up that story where Abraham sets out on his journey, in answer to God's call, and follow it through. Then place it beside the history of America, and note the similarities.

You will observe that by following God's leadership—after God had selected the Jews as His chosen people—they ascended to greatness. As long as they behaved like His people, they moved forward toward the goal He had fixed for them.

Under David they reached the high spot—the richest and most powerful. Then Solomon succeeded his father David, and headed the great nation toward ruin.

By his stupid, ungodly leadership, Solomon led them into dissolution, and they never recovered. The nearest thing to it is the Israel of today. Whether or not that is the real thing, remains to be seen.

From that heartbreaking disaster we turn to the migration from Europe to the North American Continent five centuries ago. Again we see a people seeking new environment and a new way of life that would develop into a higher standing in human affairs.

They set themselves up in the new surroundings, built homes, cultivated the soil, built churches and altars, and worshipped in accordance with plans that led them to this continent.

As time passed they established industries, set up an educational system, built schools for all levels of learning.

They became prosperous, progressive, helpful to peoples all over the world of lesser fortunes—of lesser ambition, weaker desires, and minimized courage to push themselves forward.

But something has happened to our American people. A national committee is now at work trying to find out what it is that has struck us.

The chairman of that committee, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University, who holds a long string of highly important leadership positions of honor, gives us an inkling of what's wrong.

There has been "a spate of books, articles, and speeches bewailing America's lost leadership. Politician after politician cries out for bold and imaginative action—seldom defined at all and never with any precision.

"Religious leaders bewail moral decay as preachers have since exhortation began. Publishers, dominant in the field of mass media, assert that we have lost our sense of mission."

The distinguished educational leader says the "wailing wall is crowded and ululations fill the air.

"When one asks where new leadership is to come from, who is to define the national purpose, and who will summon us from moral lassitude, the answer is an embarrassing silence."

In concluding his opinion of the status of America today, Dr. Wriston says:

"I am asserting that those who misrepresent the normal experiences of life, who decry being controversial, who shun risk, are enemies of the American way of life, whatever the piety of their vocal professions and the patriotic flavor of their platitudes."

Coming to us from this comparison of Abraham's God-sponsored nation and the America of *Mayflower* origin and sponsorship is a lesson for all of us of far-reaching significance and importance.

That lesson, it certainly seems, lies in the fact that God favors the nation, the people, that has a definite and good purpose in view as its goal, and uses good judgment in pursuing that purpose.

America will never achieve maximum greatness as long as its ruling passion is for security, and homesickness for the "herd" prevails and prevents the development of the kind of leadership the Nation once had.

History will throw the spotlight for you upon the great examples.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 15th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

When the proponents of the expansion of Bonneville's socialistic Federal power empire into southern Idaho try to justify Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in ordering such expansion, they are forced to make claims that bear no resemblance to the true facts.

The following article printed in the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise, Idaho, on June 3, 1963, declares that the area's people deserve accurate information on the Bonneville issue instead of pure political hokum. The article follows:

ROACH HITS STATEMENT BY BENNETT—DEMOCRAT CHAIRMAN ACCUSED OF "HOKUM" IN BPA CONTENTION

Idaho Power Co. president T. E. Roach, branding charges by Ada County's Democratic chairman as "another shining example of political demagogery," said Sunday this area's people "deserve accurate information on the Bonneville Power issue instead of pure political hokum."

Replying to a statement Saturday by Emmett F. Bennett, chairman of the Ada County Democratic Central Committee, Roach called for an end to attempts to mix political fiction with economic fact about BPA's intrusion into southern Idaho.

In his statement, Roach said:

"It will indeed be news to the over 4,000 local shareowners of Idaho Power to learn from Chairman Bennett that the company sends 90 percent of its profits east when they know the real facts to be as follows:

"Idaho owners of Idaho Power hold corporate voting power exceeding that of company shareowners in any other State. This is true notwithstanding the effect of crediting institutional ownership, such as that of insurance companies, to the metropolitan cities in which their principal offices are located. Actually the policyholders who are the principal beneficiaries of this ownership are located in every State of the Union, including Idaho. Idaho residents comprise almost 70 percent of the owners of the company's preferred shares.

"Idaho Power Co. is proud of the fact that investors from every one of the 50 States are shareowners who have voluntarily invested their savings here because of their confidence in the future of the area and in the belief that their investment would receive fair treatment.

"This is public ownership in the truest sense—not dictated from Washington but voluntary with taxpaying capital. With widespread ownership such as this, the '90 percent profits to the east,' statement is seen in its true light—pure political hokum.

"Idaho Power Co. is very proud of its ability to convince people beyond the State of the bright future for Idaho. It is a fact that Idaho Power has been responsible for bringing more venture capital into the State than any other Idaho enterprise. This was not accomplished by downgrading the economic status of Idaho, so chracteristic of the public power politicians. Instead, it was done by truthful promotion of the good things for which Idaho is proud, including its economic future under the stimulation of taxpaying enterprise. I wonder how politicians with Mr. Bennett's philosophy would set about to raise $300 million for a taxpaying enterprise and where they would expect to obtain venture capital in that large amount.

"Mr. Bennett will likewise be surprised to learn that no electric power distributor in the West—taxfree or taxpaying—serves as high a ratio of rural areas or as few metropolitan cities as does Idaho Power with the correspondingly higher investment per customer. Nor are there any but Idaho Power where the rural customer pays the same rates as do the city customers. Neither is there any utility in the West, public or taxpaying, whose ratio of taxes to revenues is as high as that of Idaho Power. Despite these facts, the revenue per kilowatt-hour, excluding tax increment, received by Idaho Power in 1962 was less than that of any other electric power distributor in the Northwest.

"Mr. Bennett's rash and uninformed statement that 'Idaho Power pays not $1 for the water flow of the Snake River which generates its electricity' is another shining example of political demogogery. If he was at all familiar with the sources of Idaho taxes—as a party spokesman should be—he certinly would know that Idaho Power, in addition to the largest property tax in the State, also pays a generation tax of one-half mill per kilowatt-hour to the State of Idaho. In 1962 this generation tax amounted to over $1 million. He evidently was concentrating his thinking on Bonneville power, because that agency certainly pays neither property taxes nor a tax for the use of any river water, including that of the Snake.

"Finally Mr. Bennett might appreciate knowing that in 1962 Idaho Power received from its heavy industrial sales slightly more than 4 mills per kilowatt-hour, which includes the cost of taxes. The subsidy of complete freedom from taxes enjoyed by Bonneville is a cost advantage over Idaho Power of 48 percent. If Idaho Power Co. were on an equal-tax footing with Bonneville, Idaho Power's rate would be 48 percent less, or 2.08 mills per kilowatt-hour. Does he think Bonneville could match that?

"Since Interior Secretary Udall announced his BPA marketing area edict, southern Idaho newspapers have voiced widespread editorial opposition. This reaction, combined with emphatic opposition of the Idaho Farm Bureau, the Idaho State Reclamation Association, and chambers of commerce, shows that southern Idaho people are not going to be fooled by such political doubletalk and uninformed statements as Mr. Bennett has engaged in," Roach concluded.

Dollar Gap Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very informative article by the well-known, able writer, Mr. Peter B. Greenough.

The article deals with certain phases of the dollar gap problem and illustrates that before any lasting final solution to this problem can be found, it will be necessary for this Government to recognize all, not just some, of the factors that are causing the gap.

This would normally mean, together with other factors, the import-export ratio, the huge foreign aid and military outlays abroad and maritime and shipping policy which consigns American goods to foreign bottoms.

Perhaps the two biggest factors in the situation would be our large-scale, fast-growing imports occasioned by our current trade policy which, in effect, in many instances, is just a one-way street and, secondly, the continuance of huge financial and materiel grants to foreign nations, either in regular aid or military assistance in its various costly ramifications.

I do not believe that mere manipulation of foreign currencies is anything more than a palliative in treating this very serious problem of the dollar gap—gold outflow which holds such serious implications for us, unless effective answers are soon found.

It is assuring, to be sure, to know that the international bankers are evidently cooperating to work out a system whereby gold drains may be mitigated, and this may be helpful, as I stated, to some degree, and it entails high costs to the Government. But until the normal basic factors of international trade are brought into balance by this country there will continue to be a gold outflow and a dollar gap. So long as the import account in its entirety exceeds the export account, our gold supply will diminish.

Of course, if we are going to assume the burden of stabilizing foreign exchange with American cash, that is another thing, yet in the long run it will be very costly and will not, of itself, suffice, unless favorable trade balances are developed.

We cannot pull ourselves up by the financial bootstraps. It is my humble thought that much more consideration should and must be given: First, to develop a more stable and more economically feasible import-export balance, one which would involve the lowering of trade barriers and other discriminatory practices directed against American exports overseas; second, curb the increasing flood of cheap imports that is one of the principal factors producing recessionary conditions in American industry and business wherever they have appeared; and third, make a real frontal attack more substantially to reduce lavish, costly, wasteful foreign aid, including certain military aid.

If these things are done, and I believe they can be done without impairing real, beneficial, foreign trade, the security of our Nation or the true interests of our bona fide allies overseas, we will have a much better prospect of finally closing the dollar gap.

Some economists are of the opinion that the trade and dollar gap will widen unless U.S. exporters really get on the ball to meet oversea competition. These sources point out that competition is increasing around the world for American-made goods, that the price advantage once held by the United States because of our technological advancement; that is, superior productivity, no longer exists.

Various efforts have been made to find new markets abroad for American goods while paradoxically, at the same time, Congress has provided tax and other encouragements to encourage foreign investments and manufacture by American firms abroad. Thus, we are encouraging two activities working diametrically opposite to each other; the first, that of seeking more markets abroad for domestic industries and the second, that of establishing American industries abroad, since the latter in marked degree automatically offsets the former.

Two years ago, the Small Business Administration understandably got into this act to find new markets abroad for American-produced goods. It is now stated that under the circumstances, American industries must become more productive to compete with West Germany, Japan, Italy, and other nations. This view contemplates that we must reduce our manufacturing costs. How this can be done is not clear.

It is also suggested that we must do a better sales job abroad, and this deficiency is blamed on so-called isolationism, a non sequitur if there ever was one, since it is postulated on the inaccurate assumption that Americans are ignorant of economic, social, and cultural life outside our own horizons and this is a gross misstatement of the case. Americans are not, and never have been, isolationist in this sense.

The fact of the matter is that we have been active in trying to get other nations to abandon isolationism, to develop profitable foreign trade, and we are not only acquainted with, but practice economic, social, and cultural intercourse and communication with other peoples throughout the world. We want and seek real, mutually profitable trade and commerce with other nations and we seek every friendly exchange of culture and ideas with other nations. This is and has been, basic American policy.

We have also been supergenerous with our money to promote the economic and social well-being of foreign nations and to supply them with American funds, machines, equipment, and most modern technological innovations that enable them to set up highly successful, competitive units at our expense which take away American markets abroad and compete here in our own markets by sending their goods in under low tariff walls established by us to accomodate their goods in competition with our own right here in this country.

We should also take special note of the fact that in many instances and nations, American goods are virtually verboten, shut out, and, in addition, have very high tariff barriers raised against them. This is not only done by some individual nations, but by the common markets which we are now trying to strengthen on some farfetched theory that this is necessary to our own security. This is a crass fallacy, in my humble judgment.

We have exported, not only American free cash, but our technological advancements, scientific inventions, skilled know-how, our total, economic, mass production methods, distribution and marketing procedures.

Some people ask: What good results have come from all these altruistic programs to date? Admittedly, this question would be very difficult to answer in the light of the many clear manifestations of anti-Americanism that confronts us in numerous nations, some of them right here in the North American Continent and pro-Red neutralism that obtains in certain recipient nations.

I think it is long past the time for us to cast an appraising eye on our foreign relationships, vis-a-vis, our domestic prosperity, and realistically reevaluate our economic position in the world as well as in the Nation. That might be one of the most important functions that this Congress, in conjunction with our executive department, should now undertake.

Of these, certainly one of the worst, most astonishing, brazen and contemptuously anti-American developments is the recent United Nations economic aid to Cuba where deadly enemies are plotting and working for our destruction.

It is said that American money is not being used in this deliberate, premeditated affront and injury to the plain security interests of this Nation. But this is neither accurate nor acceptable since the action itself is a clear defiance of our stand against communism in the Western Hemisphere. It is an act of bad faith and unabashed enmity deliberately calculated to weaken our position in Cuba and strengthen and sustain a Communist leadership and movement in that country that is hostile to our Nation and working with other members of the Communist conspiracy to destroy us.

Unless we soon find a permanent solution to the problems presented by the dollar gap, I am fearful that our fiscal, financial, economic and trade problems will gravely deteriorate and certainly few things could be more pleasing or helpful to the Communists.

The article follows:

WHAT U.S. IS DOING TO RETAIN GOLD—NEW YORK BANK'S REPORT TAKES WRAPS OFF HUSH-HUSH PROCEDURES

(By Peter B. Greenough)

Except in their own inner circle, central bankers of this world are a notoriously button-lipped bunch. Only in generalities will they talk about the maneuvers and tools they use for safeguarding currencies. Some of this veil of secrecy is now lifting. Re-

cently the London Economist has been running a series on the intimate details of arrangements of "forward trading" and swapping of money between the United States, Switzerland, and other countries.

These stories have been so accurate as to cause some embarrassment, says Business Week magazine, among Federal Reserve people in this country. They suspect a "leak" within the Bank of England.

All this insistence on hush-hush has always been a mystery to me anyhow, so it comes as something of a relief to read the current issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey, published by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York. It takes the wraps off the entire process of how the United States plays its hand in foreign exchange.

At the root of our Government's new line of policy in this field (actually it dates back 21 months) is the effort to conserve U.S. gold and solve our international balance-of-payments problem.

To illustrate: Although the year-end totals are not yet in, it looks as if our exports this year will jump by $1.4 billion to an all-time record of $22 billion.

On the surface, that looks good.

But imports have exactly kept pace. They, too, are up by $1.4 billion, and will approach $16 billion.

That healthy looking $6 billion "plus" on our side quickly vanishes under the load of military expenditures abroad, plus foreign aid and all our private commitments. So the gold ledger has not been improved one whit—from that source.

Thus we have turned to other methods of easing the squeeze on the dollar, with efforts centered largely around mutual assistance to avoid large-scale movement of capital between countries.

A prime example of this lies in the practice of forward operations in foreign currencies. How does it work?

Behind scenes the free world international bankers have drawn up agreements to hold balances in each other's currencies, up to specified amounts.

Then, if a flow of funds develops from country A to country B, which in turn creates an increase in the official reserves of country B, the latter agrees to hold those resources in country A's currency. It obviates a drain on country A's gold holdings.

Well, the New York Federal Reserve Bank, acting as agent for the U.S. Treasury, began in March 1961, to build up substantial reserves in various foreign currencies. Transactions, says the Morgan Guaranty study, have been "carried out in at least a half dozen currencies, and preparations have been laid down for undertakings in others as well if need should arise."

"This Government policy has quickly become a key weapon in the defense of the dollar. * * * Operations to date are credited with helping to slow down the country's dollar losses, and * * * further applications are intended," says Morgan Guaranty.

Moreover, the "scope of operations to date and the potential for further activity leave no doubt that an important element has been added to the international financial context."

Thus banking history is now being made, for this represents a departure from the basic monetary role assigned to the United States at the Bretton Woods, N.H., conference of 1944.

Essentially the United States was given a somewhat passive position, because all currencies were geared to the dollar. Bretton Woods established no obligations to stabilize exchange rates via forward transactions, yet today we have our country taking a leading and active part in doing just this. It suggests to me that within a relatively short time there may be another major international monetary conference to redefine relations and perhaps rewrite some of the rules.

Even so, "within its network of reciprocal arrangements, the Federal Reserve has the means of coping, at least initially, with temporary pressures on the dollar from any of the principal foreign currencies," Morgan Guaranty's analysis asserts.

These resources were used extensively against exchange disturbances sparked by Canada's devaluation last June and also created by the sharp drop in our stock prices. Morgan Guaranty terms them "an ingenious and useful device."

Still, they cannot be considered as the be-all and end-all of our gold problems. Morgan Guaranty likes the short-range effects but questions if this is a "dependable escape from the consequence of interest rate differentials between countries." In the bank's judgment, "intervention in foreign exchange is not a substitute for needed action in the field of monetary policy."

Our success has been attended by what Morgan Guaranty feels is a certain amount of luck and a willingness to "reciprocate when the hole is in the other fellow's shoe." But we have no permanent guarantees that everyone will continue to be so solicitous of each other's welfare.

The bank warns that "official intervention in the exchange market—successful as it has been in coping with sudden strains and distortions—is by itself of limited force in striking at persistent trouble in a country's payments position."

What we have here essentially is part of a siege rather than a direct assault on America's basic gold ills.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Senator Hruska to National Association of Insurance Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] addressed the National Association of Insurance Commissioners at its annual convention held in Seattle, Wash., on June 20, 1963.

His comments on the role of the Federal Government in the regulation of the insurance industry have been well received by members of State regulatory agencies, officials of insurance companies, and legal scholars in the field of insurance regulation.

Senator HRUSKA's speech evidences his deep conviction that there is no need for Federal encroachment into the area of insurance regulation, which was given to the States under the terms of the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945. Because of the pertinence of the Senator's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS

(By Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska)

My overly generous introducer, Mr. Hayes, president of this association; my Nebraska commissioner, Frank Barrett; officers; members and friends of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, I am very happy to meet with your group here today. Many of my years have been spent in the general practice of law and in the field of insurance, so I have become familiar, at least in some respects, with the many facets of your industry. I must say it was a very happy, interesting, and fascinating experience.

Since coming to the Congress of the United States, I have, from time to time, been brought into contact with legislation having to do with your industry. I am happy to appear on the same forum that was occupied just 48 hours ago by my good personal friend and colleague, Senator DODD, of Connecticut. Our friendship was formed when we served together in the House of Representatives. His office was right across the hall from mine. It was then that I learned that he had served with distinction in the FBI as a member of the War Crimes Commission and in several other capacities. He has since served with distinction in the Senate. So it is with pleasure that I follow him on this forum. On occasion our political and philosophical views have differed. This is one of those occasions. I am happy to report to you, however, that it never has had any effect upon our personal friendship. For that I am very grateful.

The Supreme Court's Southeast Underwriters' decision of 1944 accomplished at least two things which were beneficial to the industry. First, it emphasized the importance of the insurance industry to America and to the American economy. Secondly, it emphasized the necessity of preserving the role of the States in the regulation of this industry.

A Supreme Court decision is not necessarily the final word on any subject. Although we cannot repeal those decisions, we can limit their scope by granting exceptions and exemptions. If Congress hadn't taken such corrective action, the Court's decision in the Southeast Underwriters' case would have meant that insurance—having been declared interstate commerce—would have been subject to Federal jurisdiction and thus to Federal regulation. State regulation and taxation would have been superseded and discarded.

Those of us who followed the decision can recall the confusion and the turmoil which resulted when Congress that year failed to pass a law such as the one which was embodied in the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945. The decision of the Southeastern Underwriters was announced in February of 1944. An effort to correct it was made during the calendar year, but it was not until the following year that the job was completed. Public Law 15 is founded on the principle, as you well know, that the insurance business ought to be regulated and taxed by the States. It provides that no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate or supersede any State law regulating the business; that the Sherman, Clayton, and Federal Trade Commission Acts should be applicable to the insurance business only to the extent that it is not regulated by State law. There were exceptions in the cases of coercion and boycott, but other than that, the act actually preserved the right of the States to regulate the insurance industry.

The Congress was convinced at that time that the States could perform an adequate job of regulation. Because of the nature of the business and the proximity of the supervisory officials to the people affected, it was felt that the States were in a better position to regulate than was the Federal Government. Furthermore, the States already had adequate statutes, established procedures, and trained personnel located in all the States. And, in addition to these compelling reasons, there was the broad and vital philosophical consideration of preserving the federal character of our Republic. If complete centralization is to be prevented, a firm stand must be taken whenever our federal system is challenged. It is just as important for the State to preserve its own sovereignty as it is for it to protect its role as a component part of our federal system. In fact, the two are inseparable.

Now, the McCarran-Ferguson Act embodied a sound principle and concept in 1945. The point I want to make today is that the law is equally appropriate and applicable today.

The judgment of the Congress that the States would take prompt and effective action was fully justified. State legislatures, State commissioners of insurance, and the industry joined in devising a strong system of regulation in conformity with the Southeastern Underwriters' decision.

It has now been nearly 18 years since the McCarran-Ferguson Act was implemented, but it was not long before efforts were made to dilute its force and effect. The most direct attempt to date is to be found in the bill that was introduced a week ago today, S. 1705. It is designed to supplement existing provisions of law by prescribing the extent to which antitrust laws are applicable to the business of insurance.

In due time, hearings will be held and testimony taken by the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member. Without expressing final judgment, I should like to share with you some of the thoughts and discuss some of the points which likely will be explored during those hearings.

Since the McCarran-Ferguson Act is sound law today, a heavy burden rests upon those who now advocate revision. A clear case for such amendment must be made. It must be demonstrated that any resulting advantage which any new bill might bring will outweigh the loss suffered by impairment of the system and its principles. Included in such a showing must be substantial evidence that there is no other non-Federal way of accomplishing the desired purpose.

There are grave dangers in adopting any amendment to this law, however nominal, disarming, limited in character or meritorious it may appear on the surface.

First of all, a precedent for amendment would be established. And as soon as a breach is made, it will be easy to point to in advancing other amendments and changes. The Dodd bill, S. 1705, seems limited in scope—applying only to alien insurers. Yet it is no secret that other areas in the insurance business are being covetously regarded by those with ravenous appetites for Federal jurisdiction. I will read to you from the speech of my good colleague from Connecticut:

"This is not the only problem area in insurance regulation today," namely, the alien insurer. "In such fields as mergers, rates, and forms, and domestic non-admitted insurance, there are presently serious questions concerning the adequacy of State regulation. The McCarran-Ferguson Act is by no means sacrosanct, and it is entirely reasonable to expect Federal action in any area of the insurance industry where the public interest requires action but the States are either unable or unwilling to do the regulatory job adequately."

Two days ago you heard those words spoken by the author of this bill. If those words do not label the bill as being a forerunner of other attempts to amend the McCarran-Ferguson Act, then we cannot understand the English language.

Secondly, by the very nature of the legislative process, consideration of any bill, however nominal, or limited in scope it might appear to be, is hazardous because the final product of that bill is uncertain, uncontrollable, and unpredictable. To say otherwise would mean that the introducer of a bill has complete control of the minds and votes of all of his colleagues of both Houses. This, of course, is never the case. Once a bill is introduced, it can be amended in many ways. It can and often does happen that a seemingly restricted and innocent-appearing measure is transformed into one which is

distinctly different in nature, scope, and intent.

Thirdly, the proposed measure makes a system of Federal regulation of the insurance business inevitable as to the licensees. This is true in spite of the express language inserted to negate such results. Notwithstanding the express language of the Dodd bill, the fact remains that Federal regulation of the licensees necessarily follow.

Consider that the Secretary of Commerce is vested, under the terms of the bill, with power to suspend summarily a license and to revoke it, if in his judgment the licensee has failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the bill.

What does the phrase "in compliance with any requirement imposed by or pursuant to this section" embrace?

First of all, there must be a showing of financial solvency, as well as a reasonable ground for belief that such insurer will continue in the future to be able to fulfill its financial responsibilities under its contracts of insurance. The bill goes on to say that the license issued shall "contain such other terms and conditions as the Secretary shall determine to be required to provide assurance that such insurer (a) will continue to be financially responsible; (b) will fulfill his lawful obligations under contracts of unregulated insurance. * * *"

So you see there will be a continuing responsibility resting upon the Secretary of Commerce to keep the financial condition, operation, and affairs of each licensee under constant review.

Those who are familiar with the insurance business know what this means. But let me quote the 1961 minority report of the Judiciary Committee on the Insurance Industry to illustrate:

"A substantial practice has grown up over the years relating to the form, substance, and the means by which State insurance departments assure themselves of the solvency of insurance companies. These practices vary from the submission of detailed reports on a quarterly basis to some States and the submission of an extremely detailed annual statement by an insurer to every State in which it is licensed, to and including periodic examinations by examiners representing the several insurance departments. These inquiries are extremely searching and may, in a substantial company, require many months by a team of examiners."

There is no question that the Secretary will get into all aspects of the regulations, rates, forms, reserves, investment policies, and the like. If he suspends a license or threatens to do so, the licensee will come to him to ascertain what corrective steps can be taken to remain in good grace. A man with the power of life and death of a business in his hands may say any number of things. He could say, for example, "Your finances show that your rates are too low. Increase them and I will refrain from revocation." Or he may say, "It is plain that your coverage and exposure are too broad. They will financially involve you very soon in my judgment. They will impair your financial situation. Change the form and I will not revoke your license." Or he may say, "Your reserves are not high enough. Increase them and I will not revoke your license."

And what does that imply, ladies and gentlemen? It implies regulation and supervision right down to the end.

Similar illustrations could be given that would not stretch the imagination. It is to no avail that the bill contains express language to the contrary; namely: "(f) Nothing contained in this title shall confer upon the Secretary authority to prescribe or otherwise regulate (1) the form, terms, or conditions of any contract of insurance, or (2) the rate or premium to be charged or collected under any contract to insurance."

That is assumed to guarantee that there will be no regulation. But if we expect the Secretary of Commerce to do the job which is assigned to him, he is going to have to move into the area field which is referred to in this subsection (f).

The bill would also create disparities which would build up already existing pressures for further erosion and the ultimate destruction of the McCarran-Ferguson Act. One ready example is this, domestic nonadmitted insurers will be in a status different from alien nonadmitted insurers. Here we have a disparity. How long will it be before there will be a bill, a successor to S. 1705, which wil say it is not fair to treat alien nonadmitted insurers differently from domestic? It is not difficult to conceive of the time when Congress will be faced with another request to further modify the McCarran-Ferguson Act in this situation or in a similar situation. Again, we have the dangers of another bill, simple in its original form and purpose but unpredictable in its final results, unpredictable because of the complexity of a legislative process which involves two Houses and 535 people.

The net effect will be disastrous if the McCarran-Ferguson concept is allowed to be mutilated. Disastrous for each State, disastrous for the insurance-buying public, and disastrous for the Nation generally.

I have made reference several times to the unpredictable processes which completely transform a bill to one hardly recognizable from its original form and intent. Is this just a figment of imagination? It is a sort of a false notion thrust before you to terrify and intimidate you? Most decidedly not.

First of all, you already have Senator DODD's very candid declaration:

"This is not the only problem area in insurance regulation today. In such fields as mergers, rates and forms, and domestic nonadmitted insurance, there are presently serious questions concerning the adequacy of State regulation. The McCarran-Ferguson Act is by no means sacrosanct, and it is entirely reasonable to expect Federal action in any area of the insurance industry where the public interest requires action but the States are either unable or unwilling to do the regulatory job adequately."

Secondly, let us turn to the 1960 majority report of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. A large part of that report is devoted to a "Critique of the structure of State supervision." Approximately 140 closely printed pages of this report contain analyses and severe criticisms of the present State statutes, regulations, and practices. In the "Summary and Conclusions," its authors undertake to advise the States as to how their duties should be discharged.

And the 1961 report of the subcommittee has a corresponding statement in the majority portion.

Now, I say to you this is not only presumptuous and officious, it is a disregard and invasion of State sovereignty that goes far beyond mere form or good taste.

Significantly, included in the Critique of the 1960 report is the enumeration of 10 points from the final report of the Temporary National Economic Commission report of 1941, which the Critique says, "parallel, and in various respects duplicate, the conclusions of this subcommittee's report."

Among other proposals similar to the TNEC report was the proposal of Senator Joseph O'Mahoney of Wyoming for national charters for all corporations engaged in interstate commerce. While it received some support, it was emphatically rejected. It was reintroduced in later Congresses but never made progress. The reason for this was well stated by Senator O'Mahoney:

"It has been rejected because of an inherent fear that it would lead to political domination of the States by the Federal Government."

He was understanding the cause; he was quoting it accurately but mildly. For to require national charters for companies doing interstate business would not merely dominate the functions of the States, it would result in their complete preemption. Our Republic of federated States as we know it today would be consigned to oblivion. Our form of Government would be completely changed without the necessity of a constitutional amendment. The basic principle of a federated Republic would be destroyed. The States would loose all of their meaning. They would become mere ministerial performers of local duties.

But, it is protested, the TNEC report was made 20 years ago. So it was, but its devotees are still active. The citation of the 10 points in the 1960 report brings us evidence of this. And there are several current examples of this disturbing trend. One example was the original proposal for the drug reform bill of last year. The bill required that all manufacturers of pharmaceuticals must be licensed by the Federal Government. Not registered but licensed by it, with the power held by the Federal Government to summarily and instantly terminate their license.

That proposal was flatly rejected, and rightly so.

Now comes another proposal in S. 1705 along with a declaration of more problem areas to be dealt with in the scope of the McCarran-Ferguson Act, itself described as being "by no means sacrosanct."

The proponents of this concept are shrewd enough to recognize that a frontal attack is obviously foredoomed to failure. Hence, their skillful resort to an approach by segments so the tail will be severed inch by inch until, behold—no more dog.

No well-established concept of freedom can be destroyed by an open, all-inclusive attack. Rather, it is eroded and eventually lost by a series of movements, no single one of which seems of sufficient size to warrant resistance or to raise any suspicion.

The unwary will be caught by surprise and soon dismayed at the tardiness of their attempts to preserve their liberties.

But what are the non-Federal alternatives to S. 1705? Are there any? The members of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners have an accumulated experience and store of wisdom which will serve well in this regard. We can have every confidence in the joint judgment of the commissioners and directors of the 50 States.

The activities of the Committee on Unauthorized Insurance of the past couple of years or so could be well reviewed. Certainly, the present concept of a "Nonadmitted Insurers' Information Office" has merit, as it includes all nonadmitted insurers. There are other avenues and approaches which should be explored if it is found that the situation calls for additional measures. I, for one, have complete confidence in an association as imaginative, aggressive, and resourceful as yours, to find even more and better alternatives. We must bear in mind that your industry, is a dynamic industry. To put such an industry into the inflexible strictures of the Federal Government and its bureaucracy would be an unpardonable sin.

In all of these and similar situations, the central, immediate theme should never depart from the counsel of one of America's insurance authorities when he wrote:

"Administration and supervision of insurance at the national level would never approach the equitable solution of problems which will inevitably arise, with variation, by States, districts, and areas."

With such thinking, solid contribution would be made to the cause of those who firmly and deeply believe that this country does not belong to the Government. This

country belongs to the people. Let's keep it that way.

I want to thank you for inviting me here. I hope that you now better understand some of the thinking that exists in the Senate and in the Congress of the United States. There is substantial feeling in agreement with you; and if by my appearance I have served in some small way to bring new heart to your cause, my journey across the continent has been not only a very pleasant one but one that has been more than worthwhile. Thank you very much for your attention.

Scare Tactics on Foreign Aid Don't Match Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his "Essay on Social Aims," stated:

> Don't say things. What you are stands over you the while and thunders so that I cannot hear what you say to the contrary.

Nowhere is this realistic standard more appreciated than among the nations friendly to the United States as they compare our official statements with our conflicting actions in the field of foreign policy.

Nor is this tragic inconsistency realized only by our friends overseas as illustrated by the following column by Fr. Richard Ginder in the publication, Our Sunday Visitor, of Huntingdon, Ind.:

WIDE VARIANCE: SCARE TACTICS ON FOREIGN AID DON'T MATCH POLICIES

(By Fr. Richard Ginder)

Every time foreign aid comes up before Congress, there is a sort of ritual that involves reminding the Senators and Congressmen that we are at war with the Communist world and that foreign aid is one of our most effective weapons in winning that war.

And yet the news from day to day would seem to indicate that the White House and the Kremlin are not at war but rather in a condition of partnership.

What else can one make of our policy, for example, of harassing, not Castro, but the Cuban exlies bent on overthrowing communism in their homeland?

Why has our State Department turned apologist before the world for the Hungarian traitor Kadar and his Communist regime?

Why the friendly conference of Secretary of State Rusk with Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia?

Why official U.S. opposition to the anti-Communist Moise Tshombe last year in the Congo?

Why are we holding anti-Communist Gen. Chiang Kai-shek on a leash, forbidding him to take any action toward freeing the people of China from their Red tyranny?

Why did we force the anti-Communist government of General Nosavan into a coalition with the Communists in Laos?

The propaganda line is that we are in a life-and-death struggle with communism, but—as just demonstrated—the actions of our Government belie that position.

The answer to the riddle may be contained in a report of Chief Policy Planner Walt W. Rostow, which leaked out last year and was written up by Washington Reporter Willard Edwards.

Rostow believes that Soviet power is mellowing and that the U.S.S.R. is evolving into a "mature" state. Hence we should be not an enemy bent on victory but rather an elder brother helping the younger one to grow up.

We must be "gentle" toward the satellites. We must never be unfriendly toward Communist governments, no matter how they may annoy us.

General and complete disarmament must be our goal. We must work strenuously toward this, despite all rebuffs, and even if it must be done without mutual negotiations.

In accordance with this last, there is a treaty under discussion right now in Geneva calling for the dissolution of our National Defense Establishment within 6 years.

This is what the theorists mean by an "accommodation" with communism. It is what U Thant calls a "synthesis," and what Judge Robert Morris bluntly calls a "merger."

American Newspaper Guild Opposes Disunity Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I note with pleasure that the American Newspaper Guild, which is affiliated with the AFL–CIO, has adopted in convention a resolution expressing its unequivocal opposition to the three disunity amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, adopted by the 30th annual convention of the guild, July 8–12, 1963, in Philadelphia, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A group of State legislators is pressing for adoption of three amendments to the U.S. Constitution which would alter radically the Federal structure of our Government.

The first amendment would change the methods of amending the Constitution by providing for amendment by vote of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States without any approval by Congress or a national convention as now provided.

The State legislatures now are so inequitably apportioned that under this proposal legislators representing as little as 15 percent of the population of the United States could amend the Constitution.

A second amendment would deprive the Federal courts of the right to entertain suits challenging the apportionment of State legislatures. This amendment is sponsored in States whose legislatures are notoriously malapportioned to give disproportionate representation to rural populations.

The third amendment would create a so-called Court of the Union, consisting of the 50 chief justices of the State supreme courts which could be convened at the call of 5 State legislatures and which would have authority to overrule the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving Federal-State relationships.

Now whereas such amendments would halt the steady march toward more representative government; and

Whereas such amendments by concentrating power in the hands of a minority would negate the insistence of the vast majority of our citizens for a larger measure of social and economic justice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Newspaper Guild express its unequivocal opposition to such retrogressive proposals and that its members and locals alert themselves to the dangers of such proposals and express their disapproval to the appropriate legislators.

"We Honor a Dream"—An Editorial by H. E. Clark, of the Tipton (Iowa) Conservative, Selected for Best Editorial Award by National Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the National Editorial Association has selected for the Best Editorial Award this year an editorial, "We Honor a Dream," written by Herb Clark of the Tipton (Iowa) Conservative.

When one reads this editorial, it is easy to see why it was selected for this award. When you know the background of the event which prompted the editorial you can readily surmise that the circumstances were perfect to evoke this type of response from a seasoned observer.

My hat is off to Herb Clark and the Tipton Conservative for the recognition he and his paper so richly deserve. Herb Clark is typical of the thousands of editors across the country in the columns of whose weekly newspapers appears some of America's best writing.

When Herb Clark received the news about the award his editorial had won, he was moved to write another editorial which to me is just as noteworthy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the award-winning editorial, "We Honor a Dream," in the Appendix of the RECORD along with Herb Clark's followup editorial, "It Was Their Honor":

WE HONOR A DREAM

This is the American dream.

This is proof of the opportunity. They stand before you, men of humble birth who have shared responsibility beyond the comprehension of most men. You can feel the warm glow of their personal friendship, the understanding that passes between them.

When the cynics say that the dream is over and gone you will remember the warm August morning and the two men; you will recall the different paths that took them to the highest office the world can give; you will remember their personal courage in the face of circumstances not of their own choosing, and you will know that the dream can never die.

This is America. It is an orphan boy finding a path to riches, to the labor of compassion that saved millions of lives, to political office that left him villified by lesser men, to a second opportunity to aid humanity and finally, as the clouds gather, to enjoy the honors that are so richly deserved.

It is a farmer's son, an Army officer, a business failure, a politician, picked almost by chance to face the most terrible decision

ever made by a single man; a man whom history may well honor for his sure instinct when great decisions had to be made.

What is there in common, besides the humbleness of birth and the responsibility of office? Their paths were not the same, their opinions differ, their personalities are almost in opposition. It is respect and understanding they have in common.

You cannot help but feel good as you watch these men. The pettiness that accompanies much in public life seems to fall away. There is the spontaneous gesture as the younger man tosses a kiss to the elder as the organist plays "Happy Birthday," a gesture so honest and meaningful that only a few see it.

They have lived the dream. They know it for what it is, the grasping of opportunity, the response to a call to duty. It is not a dream realized by wishful thinking, it comes hard and it comes only to a comparative few.

It is a dream that promises nothing, but opens the pathway to everything; it is a dream that may be mocked or cursed, but it never dies; it is the understanding that, within each man, is something of greatness.—H.E.C.

IT WAS THEIR HONOR

It was the kind of day that you would never forget; the kind of day about which you could turn to your son and say "remember what you saw, the United States will never know men like these again." Maybe it was a little sentimental, but we ought to be sentimental about men like Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman.

There had been a lot of time at the dedication of the Herbert Hoover library at West Branch. It was a pleasant August day and you could talk to people and relax and wait for the man whose birthday would be honored and his fellow President who would honor him most of all.

For an hour or so you stood beside the platform, within a few feet of the two ex-Presidents and there was a warm glow that came over you. You weren't the only one, the press association men, the hard-bitten pros of the newspaper business, felt it too and they said so. The friendship of Hoover and Truman, who differed on so many little things, but agreed on so many important issues, was obvious and honest.

You wanted to write something. Nothing important, just something that would convey how you felt after you had seen two old men—after you had seen a vision of the greatness of America. The words came quite easily. Not that they were good enough, but the mood was so strong it compelled the words. When it was done you felt that maybe you had gotten the point across—the sort of thing that you would like to have your children remember; the sort of thing that you wanted to remember when you became cynical and full of doubts.

So an editorial was written. Last week it was honored by the National Editorial Association. But, in a very real sense, it wasn't our editorial—it belongs to those fine old men who so well personify what is great about this country.—H.E.C.

Greetings to 50th Annual Convention of National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would like to insert in the RECORD the message of greeting sent to the 50th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress by the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, on June 7, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the majorty leader's message be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 7, 1963.

To Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN, *President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Greetings from the Senate of the United States:*

It is with sincere regret that I am unable to attend the 50th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. However, I want to assure you that I will be with you in spirit as your organization discusses topics of vital concern to us all. I have long told the constituents of my State—especially the youth, who are our real hope for the future—that the most precious natural resource in this great land is water. Your fine organization is to be commended for focusing the attention of the Nation on this important fact.

As the oldest and most comprehensive organization devoted to the orderly development of our water resources, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been of inestimable value to the Members of Congres in their legislative deliberations. The presence of several members among your leadership, including that of my counterpart in the Senate, minority leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, is proof of our mutual concern over our water resources. Let me assure you of our deep and continuing appreciation for this partnership of effort toward a common goal.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

Nazi Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, not only does the scar tissue of the Nazi era still remain to remind the world of the innocent blood that was shed and the loss of much treasure, but there still persists remnants of the cancer itself, remnants which seek renewal. As the Nazi era fades further into history, to too many the view of it has become distorted over the span of the years. Forgotten are the cities totally destroyed in Holland, Poland, and elsewhere; forgotten are the fire raids on London and the obliteration of Lidice; forgotten is the Nazi policy of obliteration of whole populations of "inferior peoples" defined by Hitler to include Poles, Russians, Slavs, gypsies, as well as Jews; forgotten is the destruction of cultures, art treasures, books, music, and free thought itself.

There are those who seek to bring from the ashes of the holocaust the spit and polish of the Nazi boot and belt, the throb of the martial band, and the discipline of the marching regiments. What is attractive to their eyes can be destructive of our souls.

A distinguished citizen of San Francisco, Mr. Stanley Langendorf, has written an editorial comment on these efforts to revive the Nazi spirit which merits reading by all. It is appended herewith:

Eighteen years have passed since Hitler and his murderous Nazi regime were crushed, yet some misguided people in America and other lands still seek to emulate him. They strut freely about in Nazi uniforms preaching hate against law-abiding citizens. The swastika, a symbol of barbarism and tyranny, is still scrawled day after day on churches and schools in many cities of our country with no regard for its hideous meaning. Though the Nazi regime has gone into oblivion some demagogs still believe in the Nazi structure.

It is high time that we should know the price of Nazi despotism—the invasion of France, the rape of Poland, the fall of other peaceful countries that could not stem the advance of lustful Nazi hordes, drunk with power, bent only on murder, tyranny, and oppression.

Nor can we ever forget the death and maiming of millions in uniform and helpless civilians, while countless others still suffer in the wake of Hitler terrorism.

The Nazi creed is written in blood on the pages of history—a grim record of lust, greed, and cruelty by men who stilled their opposition by extermination, crushed religious freedom, and turned the workingman into serfdom.

Let us never forget that the word "Nazis" and its hideous symbol, the swastika, stand only for inhumanity, destruction, and tyranny; that they typify nothing less than human slavery and degradation. Many American families along with other nations of the world, mourn husbands, fathers, and sons who died fighting the Nazis. Scores of thousands have been crippled or wounded for life. And let us, today and always, take a firm and resolute stand against those who try to imitate the fallen Nazis by preaching their creed of hate. Let us spurn them as traitors to democracy, freedom, human dignity, and progress. And let us understand that while the German Government has outlawed the Nazi Party and forbidden Germans to appear in Nazi uniforms, such a practice is allowed in our own country.

Above all, let's denounce the preaching of their doctrine in this country, which is not in keeping with democracy.

One of Nation's Top Four FFA Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, recently a young farmer from Valley City, N. Dak., Mr. Stanley Amundson, was named one of the four outstanding farmers in the United States by the board of directors of the Future Farmers of America. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story from the July 29 issue of the Valley City Times-Record announcing this award. This is indeed a high honor and I am most pleased that a farmer from North Dakota was se-

lected. North Dakota is very proud of Stanley Amundson's fine recognition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. AMUNDSON NAMED ONE OF NATION'S TOP FOUR FFA FARMERS

Stanley Amundson of rural Valley City Saturday was named one of four outstanding young farmers in the United States.

Amundson, 21, was one of the four star American farmers named by the board of directors of the Future Farmers of America.

Each of the four youths will receive a cash award of $500 at the FFA convention October 10 in Kansas City, Mo. At that time one of the four will be named Star Farmer of America and will receive an additional $500.

The other three youths receiving the Star American Farmer awards were Dwayne Disney, 20, Portales, N. Mex., Robert A. Cummings, 20, Warsaw, N.Y., and Jon Ronald Ford, 19, Helena, Okla.

Stanley is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Amundson, who farm 16 miles north of Valley City. He was awarded the North Dakota FFA's highest honor at the annual state convention in Fargo in June.

He started his FFA career as a sophomore at Valley City high school. He graduated from Valley City high school in 1960, and attended school at Northwestern College in Minneapolis for a time before returning to the family farm.

Government Lotteries of Ireland, Puerto Rico, Russia, Yugoslavia, and Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have brought to the attention of the Members of this House the various government-run lotteries conducted in many foreign countries. Today, I would like to draw the House attention to the lotteries conducted in Ireland, Puerto Rico, Russia, Yugoslavia, and Mexico. These 5 countries bring the total number of foreign government-run lotteries to 77.

Ireland is one of the 77 foreign nations where lotteries are legal and proper and where the gambling urge of its inhabitants is tied in with the need for revenue. In 1962, the gross annual receipts came to over $45½ million. The net profit which was transferred to hospitals came to over $8 million.

Puerto Rico has a profitable lottery which flourishes on American soil. Last year, the total gross annual receipts was almost $52 million. The net income to the government was almost $11 million which was used to help finance local public health programs.

Russia considers all of its Soviet lottery information confidential. However, the Soviet Union has several lottery forms. A straight lottery in which a person can buy a ticket for a chance on winning an automobile or other valuable merchandise. A second form of lottery consists of state bonds sold in denominations of $11 paying 3 percent interest. Bondholders holding winning numbers receive interest in cash prizes.

Yugoslavia operates a national lottery. Last year's gross annual receipts came to almost $7½ million. The total annual net income to the government came to almost $2¼ million which was used for orphanages, hospitals, disabled veterans, and the blind.

Mexico, like the other nations of Latin America, realized the merits of lotteries long ago. Unfortunately, the Mexican Government continues to treat as confidential all figures concerning the proceeds of the lottery. The last figures available reflect the 1956 returns. At that time the gross receipts were almost $56 million of which the government received almost $15 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we in the United States overcome outdated prejudices and biases to take the proper view of gambling and its relation to the Government. We can shut off the flow of billions of dollars now siphoned off by underworld in the United States by adopting our own national lottery which can bring into our Government over $10 billion a year in added revenue which can be used to cut our taxes and reduce our national debt.

Alliance for Progress Promotes Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, opponents of our foreign aid program are apt to criticize the foreign aid principle as contrary to the economic principles on which capitalism is based. Starting out with a general "America first" orientation, they will argue that in helping less developed countries to build stable economies, we are practicing and encouraging a kind of big brother socialism.

More than anything else, such criticis reveal their uninformedness as to the real nature of our aid programs abroad. The fact is that in many countries U.S. foreign aid is laying the foundations for free enterprise institutions which would otherwise never develop—countries where true socialistic and communistic systems are constantly making inroads that would go unchecked if the United States did not offer better alternatives.

A good example is a current project of the Alliance for Progress, in which a number of Latin American nations are establishing savings and loan associations with central home loan banks. Their aim: to finance home building and eradicate substandard housing. The plan is patterned after the American system of regional Federal home loan banks with a supervisory board in Washington.

Recently the New York Times carried a very informative article on this valuable undertaking of the Alliance for Progress.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1963]

UNITED STATES SPURS LATIN AMERICANS TO MOBILIZE SAVINGS TO FINANCE HOMES

(By Edward Cowan)

Spurred by the United States under the banner of the Alliance for Progress, a number of Latin American countries are establishing savings and loan industries and central home loan banks. Their immediate goal is to mobilize personal savings to finance home building and eradicate substandard housing. In doing so, they hope to develop the financial mechanisms—and habits of thrift—that could propel their economies continuously upward.

Achievements have been modest but impressive if one keeps in mind the enormity of the task. Chile is the leader with 22 savings and loan associations. Peru has 12, Ecuador 7, Venezuela 4, and the Dominican Republic 3. El Salvador and Panama recently adopted enabling legislation for home loan bank systems. Uruguay, Peru and Argentina are considering it.

Serving as a pattern is the U.S. system of 11 regional Federal home loan banks and a supervising Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington. Savings institutions that join the system may borrow from their respective loan banks.

Urging and helping Latin American countries to develop sturdy savings and loan industries are the U.S. Agency for International Development, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, a trade group, individual savings and loan executives and the Inter-American Development Bank, an international institution with headquarters in Washington.

Underlying their efforts is the belief that the fastest way to eradicate Latin America's deficiency of decent housing—estimated at 12 to 16 million units—is to mobilize individual savings.

FORTY-FIVE PERCENT OF HOME LOANS

Replacing slums and rural huts with more sanitary, comfortable dwellings is an end in itself. But, importantly, it is also considered an important way of strengthening resistance to Communist and Castroite movements.

In the United States, savings and loan associations made 45 percent of all home loans in 1962. Although the comparison is inapposite in some respects, officials feel there is enough substance to it to justify the attempt to create a Latin American savings and loan industry in advance of the timetable suggested by classical economical development theory.

"The savings are always there," Stanley Baruch, housing chief of the Development Bank, said in a recent interview. "In every country there is a residual resource that goes into counter-productive efforts unless there is a vigorous promotion of saving per se."

The basic problem has been a shortage of long-term housing credit at moderate interest rates. Five-year loans at 15 percent a year have been typical, it is said. By contrast, newly organized savings associations make 15- and 20-year loans at interest rates of 6 to 10 percent.

It has been estimated by Rodman C. Rockefeller, a vice president of International Basic Economy Corp., which builds houses in South America, that 50 percent of urban families there can afford to pay off a home loan.

DEMONSTRATION EFFECT

The workaday philosophy of the bank, AID and the United States industry is what might be called the "demonstration effect." It is that the way to interest people in saving is to show them that the savings and loan associa-

tion in turn will make loans to them to buy a home.

Consequently, the bank and AID have provided seed capital to finance home loans now. "Performance is the best advertisement, not some forlorn hope for 20 years from now," Mr. Baruch said.

To avoid dissipating the limited seed capital available, the bank and AID make their loans and grants to central home loan banks. "You build up your central credit institution so the others can develop around it," explained Marvin Weissman, the AID's director of institutional development.

To be eligible to borrow for its member associations, a home loan bank must regulate the terms on which they lend to home buyers. Another condition is that the associations be true mutual institutions, owned by the depositors—as are most savings associations in this country—and not stock companies.

So far, the AID has provided $38,100,000 of seed capital, in grants and long-term low-interest loans to Chile, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela. A $12,500,000 loan to Argentina has been approved.

The AID also has made direct housing loans to Colombia, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Venezuela, and Uruguay.

LOANS MADE

The bank has made $170 million of seed capital loans from its social progress trust fund. The loans will finance enough construction to employ 116,000 men for 2 years, according to Mr. Baruch, and thus, like AID, money will give a direct lift to local economies as well as yield better housing .

Both the bank and AID require that borrowing governments put up matching sums. Self-help, that is, physical labor on the construction site by home buyers, is counted toward the local contribution. Loans are supposed to be for the building of houses within the pocketbook reach of families of low or moderate income.

The sums available from the AID and the bank are insignificant in relation to Latin America's enormous housing needs. "The mechanism is more important than construction to date," Irving Tragen of the AID said.

His point was that if by the demonstration effect the people of Latin America can be led to save regularly, a whole new pattern of finance and economic activity, a self-accelerating one, will emerge.

Indeed, what the housing and savings and loan experts are doing could spur not only housing but all economic development in Latin America. The region has suffered, and still does, chronic inflation which discourages saving. Financing is lacking for the investment necessary for a takeoff on the path to industrialization and steady increases in national production and income.

READJUSTMENT BACKED

One device intended to overcome the deterrent of inflation to savings is the "readjuste," adopted by Chile at the suggestion of Harold Robinson, the AID's regional housing adviser for Latin America. The "readjuste," or readjustment, provides for increasing savings and mortgage balances in accordance with increases in the official index of wages.

Economists may argue, as the U.S. Treasury did that the "reajuste" encourages toleration of inflation rather than painful anti-inflation measures. But Mr. Robinson, Mr. Baruch and others believe that its practical success outweighs its theoretical demerits. Inflation in Latin America is a fact, they say, and unlikely to end soon. The thing to do is devise ways to improve economic performance despite it.

There is much enthusiasm in the AID and the bank for the proposed International Home Loan Bank. Legislation to create this institution is languishing in Congress. It is felt that the administration has not grasped the potential in the proposal.

The bank would be a creature of the U.S. Government. U.S. savings associations could invest limited sums in it. It would make loans to central home loan banks in Latin America. Thus, up to $10,000 million of the assets of the U.S. industry might be made available for housing in Latin America.

One of the problems that money alone will not solve is the shortage of trained savings and loan personnel in Latin America. Some 40 top U.S. executives have spent from a week to a few months in Latin America giving technical advice. Peace Corpsmen are counseling in Peru. The long-run need is for middle-level savings and loan men who speak Spanish and who can give a year or two of their time.

Alliance for Progress in El Salvador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the nation of El Salvador is demonstrating to this hemisphere that the Alliance for Progress is a realistic and successful program for Latin America.

It has been a little over a year since Julio Rivera was elected to the Presidency of El Salvador. In this short time the annual rate of growth has risen to over 7 percent. In addition, a number of sweeping reforms have been promulgated to raise the standard of living of the downtrodden peasant in the country. Slum dwelling rentals have been cut by one-third. A comprehensive income tax law has been instituted, and the Government is preparing for the introduction of many additional reforms.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, July 14, 1963, by Bert Quint, entitled "Alliance for Progress Makes Progress in Salvador." I believe that this will serve as a good example to my colleagues who feel that the Latin American nations are not living up to their obligations for reform as compared to U.S. assistance.

The article follows:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS MAKES PROGRESS IN SALVADOR

(By Bert Quint)

SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR.—A big, bronze-faced man in an open-necked sportshirt stood talking to a group of Indians in the village of Sierra Colorado, close to the Honduran border.

It was at the inauguration of the first school that the 1,500 people of Sierra Colorado ever had—a school built by the Alliance for Progress. The big man was treated as an important visitor, although he himself was part Indian of humble birth.

The Communists say that the Americans are bad people, he told the Indians quietly. He paused now and then nervously to finger his thin, dark mustache. "Look at that school. The Americans helped us build it. Is that a bad thing?"

INDIANS APPROVE

The Indians listened intently as El Salvador's El Senor Presidente, 41-year-old Julio A. Rivera, took a new tack.

"The Communists tell you that this country is ruled by the rich people. Am I rich? No. I am one of you. Each of you has a vote, and there are more poor people than rich people. You can outvote the rich."

The villagers crowded closer to see and hear. They nodded approvingly. They could not read or write, and they knew nothing of politics, but they understood their President's words.

Standing near President Rivera was another visitor who was no stranger. He was a tall, gangling, fair-haired man with a big grin.

"It is he," one of the Indians whispered, "who got the money to build the school."

The man was U.S. Ambassador Murat Williams. He and President Rivera have been conducting an experiment in El Salvador that officially was 1 year old on July 1, when the President celebrated his first anniversary in office. But the test actually began 18 months earlier.

It was on January 25, 1961, that Lieutenant Colonel Rivera and a group of young army officers seized the government from another army faction—a junta which only 3 months before that had ousted President Jose Maria Lemus.

In its 90 days in power, the junta had permitted a degree of Communist political activity and infiltration in the government. That infiltration worried the younger elements of the army.

From the beginning, Mr. Rivera's provisional government proved that it was not like most of Latin America's military governments, which as a rule are stanchly conservative. Mr. Rivera's pledge was to abide by and carry out the laws of the Act of Bogotá—forerunner of the Alliance for Progress which was to be proclaimed by President Kennedy only 2 months later.

FEUDAL PATTERN

With the help of Ambassador Williams, who provided a sympathetic ear, advice, and American moral and financial support, the Civic Military Directorate set about to change the pattern of life in this coffee-growing Central American country.

The smallest nation in Latin America—barely the size of New Jersey—El Salvador is also one of the most feudal. Most of its 2.7 million people are peasants, and over 60 percent of them live and work on the great fincas owned by masters not unlike the barons of medieval days.

They plant, tend, and harvest their lords' coffee and cotton crops and in return they are given 50 cents a day or less and are permitted to live with their families in miserable huts on the grounds. If the harvest is bad, there is no work and no pay. Even in the best of years there are seasons when the peasants do not work at all.

While the masses live in poverty, just 75 individuals in some 25 interrelated families control 90 percent of the country's wealth. In the past they also controlled the government through rightist military dictatorship. The Directorate went to work to loosen the oligarchs' grip. It issued sweeping decrees that: nationalized the Central Reserve Bank, long exploited by the wealthy as a means of unrestricted credit and of getting their money out of the country; instituted a social security code; established a minimum wage for urban workers; and guaranteed peasants a seventh day off with pay.

CUT RENTALS

Other Directorate decrees made the landowners responsible for the hospitalization of their peasants and forced them to serve the workers staple diets or else pay them extra

so that they could properly feed themselves. They cut the rental of slum dwellings—most of them owned by the same elite families—by one-third, and instituted a sweeping income tax law.

The reforms met with fierce opposition from the wealthy families who saw their privileged positions challenged, and from the Communists, who realized that a government that improved the lot of the masses would destroy their own chances for an eventual takeover.

The result was incongruous—a marriage of convenience of Communists and oligarchs trying to overthrow the Directorate. It is the same kind of cynical alliance which was used to get at Guatemala's now-deposed President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, is still working against President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela, and now seems to be at work against the new Government of the Dominican Republic headed by President Juan Bosch.

There were bombings, subversion in the army, a spate of student strikes, virulent anti-Directorate campaigns in the press. But the Directorate hung on, issuing its revolutionary decrees and working with the United States to put the Alliance for Progress into practice.

The country became an Alliance laboratory: if reforms could succeed in feudal El Salvador, they probably could succeed throughout the Hemisphere. And in little El Salvador, a limited amount of properly spread Alliance money could go a long way.

In the first year of the program, El Salvador got $25 million for housing, schools, hospitals, supervised agricultural credits and economic studies. On the one hand there was money for the reforms which the Alliance demands, and on the other the financial boosts to the country's economy.

HONEST ELECTIONS

The first indication that the experiment was going to work was the election of a new legislature in December of 1961. That the directorate was successful—until then anyway—was evident in the overwhelming victory scored by the National Conciliation Party formed by the directorate in an apparently honest election. The second sign was Mr. Rivera's election as President in April of 1962. Because the December elections showed the other parties that they had little hope, Mr. Rivera ran unopposed.

At that time, this reporter asked a peasant of the village of Ahuachatan, far out in the dusty cotton country why he bothered to vote. His reply: "Our colonel is our only hope for a better life."

That same day, one of the wealthy landowners told me he was staying away from the polls in protest. "With Rivera's gang in power," he said, "I was not able to take my usual trip to Europe last summer."

ADEPT POLITICIAN

The record vote in Mr. Rivera's behalf showed that even if the land barons were not with him, the serfs were.

By the time Mr. Rivera was inaugurated, the barrel-chested career army officer, who was once nearly executed by a firing squad for taking part in an uprising against the dictator, had transformed himself. No longer the soldier whose outspokeness was a political liability, Mr. Rivera had turned into an adept politician, skilled at handshaking, baby-kissing and hatchet-burying.

When he began his 5-year term a year ago, Mr. Rivera pledged to bring about a national conciliation—a peacemaking between the wealthy class and his government. Nobody was willing to wager that he would even be able to stay in office.

Today, he is still in the presidential palace and stronger than ever. His efforts at conciliation have consisted of bringing several members of the aristocracy into his government, seeking its advice on economic matters and trying to prove to the upper class that he is all for private enterprise.

"In order to give a bigger slice of pie to the poor," he says, "we must provide a bigger pie."

But, as one American official puts it, Mr. Rivera is convinced that "you cannot fatten the flies by feeding the horses better," that the poor do not automatically become better off just because their wealthy employers are making more money.

To help both the horse and the flies, the Rivera government is trying to increase overall production by following the advice of the U.S. Government and an American firm of consulting economists.

NO COOPERATION

But the hitch, says President Rivera's capable Vice President Francisco Lima, a political liberal although he is a member of the aristocracy, is that the wealthy class still is not willing to cooperate fully.

"The rich are trying to strangle the government by holding back their investments," he says. "Bank deposits are high because they refuse to circulate the money. If they do not do so willingly, we will have to take bank measures to make them do it."

Some of the more zealous reformers in the Rivera government are starting to worry that their social revolution has been betrayed. They claim that the national conciliation is turning into national appeasement. But so far, at least, there is little reason to think that the Rivera government is giving up on its reforms.

DECREES NOW LAW

Already all the decrees of the provisional directorate have been enacted into law—except the one establishing an income tax law. Mr. Rivera says the delay is only that, and that it is for good reason. "The proposed tax is too high," he says. "It discouraged investment. We are revising it to make it more just and will resubmit to the legislature soon."

While he still has hopes of being able to avoid getting tough with the wealthy classes, Mr. Rivera does not tolerate the Communists. He has kept them relatively quiet with threats of jail and deportation, although there are murmurings that indicate it may be only a temporary peace.

The United States, meanwhile, continues to pump in $25 million a year, with the current emphasis on mobile health clinics for areas that never have seen a doctor.

In return, the United States is getting its money's worth of good will. This is evident in the faces of the Indians who come into the Capital to speak personally with Ambassador Williams.

"We would like a school," they tell him.

"You supply the land and the labor," he replies, "and the United States will supply the building materials and the textbooks."

Now, as President Rivera enters his second year in office, Ambassador Williams is satisfied with the progress already made and is optimistic about the future.

PROBLEMS AHEAD

But he realizes, as does President Rivera, that there are serious problems still unresolved. The delicate task of forcing the land barons to collaborate in a social revolution that frightens them is not yet finished. And while the Communists are down they certianly cannot be counted out.

Nevertheless, says Ambassador Williams, pointing to a significant barometer in the storm centers of Latin American politics, "there has been less talk of a military coup in the last 6 month than ever before."

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *July 20, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I am strongly in favor of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives for the following reasons:

The Soviets and the Red Chinese took over their satellites either by fraud or by force; consequently, they have no legal right or claim to these lands.

The Reds have bullied these people, tortured them, brainwashed them, robbed them, and generally treated them shamefully. They have continued their religious persecution in all the satellite countries.

The United States was in some degree partly responsible for the Reds grabbing much of Eastern Europe. For our officials made at least an implied agreement with Stalin that he could have Poland if he would help us against Hitler. We are bound in honor and in conscience to do what we can to rectify

the results of this immoral, degrading agreement.

Last December when the U.S. Government introduced the motion in the U.N. to drop the watchdog committee on Hungary, we did exactly what Khrushchev wanted. The Communists are delighted, the Kadar government is strengthened, and the hopes of the Hungarian people have been given a severe body blow.

We must resolutely oppose recognition of the Kadar government by the United States. It was put into power by Red tanks. For such recognition would remove another obstacle to Soviet aggression. We'd be telling the Reds that their crimes in Hungary are forgiven simply because they have managed to hold on to their stolen property for 6 years.

We cannot ignore our brethren behind the Iron Curtain. We must protest. We must keep alive the hope of freedom in the captive peoples. We must keep alive in ourselves the awareness of their sufferings, despite the efforts of some of our officials to make us forget them.

Please take prompt action on House Resolution 14. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Hallahan, S.J.
Rev. THOMAS J. HALLAHAN, S.J.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
July 20, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: I liked your letter in the July 11 issue of the Brooklyn Tablet.

You are right about the need of a permanent Committee of Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I am not going to list the reasons for such a committee here, for you know them better than I do.

Your letter inspired me to write to Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee.

I have also written to our two St. Louis Representatives, Hon. FRANK M. KARSTEN and Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.

A copy of the letter I wrote to them is enclosed.

We appreciate the good work you and others are doing for the captive peoples.

Fight the Communists at every level.

And when you find the time, clean out the State Department.

God bless your work.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Hallahan, S.J.
REV. THOMAS J. HALLAHAN, S.J.

JULY 11, 1963.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I beg that you continue your praiseworthy fight for House Resolution 14. It is time someone has the courage to take a stand on this and similar legislation.

MRS. MARGOT LUKER.

BAY SHORE, N.Y.

JULY 20, 1963.

DEAR SIR: Your bill, House Resolution 14, receives our full support.

The increase in the number of "Captive Nations" also presents a grave peril to the United States of America.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. T. MEYER.

BOHEMIA, N.Y.

JULY 23, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: How is your captive nations bill coming along in the Rules Committee? Who could be holding it up there?

Some ridiculous rightwing extremist here says that we are not only gradually giving up the Panama Canal, but part of Texas at El Paso. Please tell me how wrong he is.

Sincerely,

LEE NORTH.

BRIGHTWATERS, N.Y.

CAPTIVE NATIONS MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN

With the approach of Captive Nations Week, authorized by Congress and the President as an annual occasion on which the American people should "study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and * * * recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations," it is all the more imperative that the American people lend their vocal support to House Resolution 14, now pending before the House Rules Committee in Washington. (See the timely letter elsewhere from Orest Szcudluk, public relations director of the Boston branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.)

It is probably the understatement of the year to say that there is less and less enthusiasm in official Washington for this annual observance. The matter of U.S. relations toward Hungary is typical of the general feeling that somehow Communist dictatorships have "mellowed." The current move toward recognition of the puppet Kadar regime was preceded by a series of retreats from the firm U.S. position of 1956, capped by U.S. refusal to push the "Hungarian question" at the U.N. Thus, the Soviet Union has succeeded in arrogantly frustrating every single provision of the U.N. resolution adopted in 1956.

Recognizing this trend toward appeasement, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, introduced House Resolution 14 early this year. The resolution calls for establishment of "a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the House, of whom not more than 6 shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The functions proposed for the committee strike fear into the hearts of every disciple of appeasement who would like to see the discontinuance of Captive Nations Week. For House Resolution 14 provides that the Special Committee on the Captive Nations "shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which include those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful process in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms."

The committee reports to the House of Representatives would serve the purpose of thwarting those who would blur the meaning of Captive Nations Week and dull the impact the remembrance has had in Moscow and other Communist bloc capitals since the captive nations resolution was passed by Congress in 1959.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
July 12, 1963.

Hon. DAN FLOOD,
U.S. House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am 100 percent for creating a House Committee on Captive Nations.

According to Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s article in yesterday's Herald-Examiner it's Dean Rusk who is selling out these nations to Communist slavery.

The State Department has approved the selling of Red Chinese products here in California. No Red China trade should enter our ports.

Let us get rid of that Red outpost, the U.N., an unconstitutional institution on our soil. How can we win when we allow our most vicious enemy to operate here?

How about Cuba? Aren't you and your colleagues alarmed about the rocket build-up there by Russia. Lets do something about it now.

Very respectfully,

MRS. ANGELA RIGGS.

An Astounding Set of Goals of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand what purports to be, and I am sure is, a statement from the annual report of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, I insert at this point that statement:

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ATHEISM

In its annual report says:

"The United States not being a Christian nation and its godless Constitution requiring a secular government, the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism demands:

"1. Taxation of church properties;

"2. Elimination of chaplains and sectarian institutions from the public payroll;

"3. Repeal of laws restricting rights of atheists and those enforcing Christian morals;

"4. Abolition of oaths in courts and inaugurations;

"5. Nonissuance of religious proclamations by chief executives;

"6. Erasure of the superstitious inscription 'In God we trust' from our coins and the removal of the church flag from above our national flag on battleships;

"7. Exclusion of the Bible as a sacred book from the public schools;

"8. Suppression of the bootlegging of religion through dismissing pupils for religious instruction during class time;

"9. Secularization of marriage, with divorce granted upon request;

"10. Repeal of antievolution, antibirth control, and censorship laws."

Mr. Speaker, I believe this astounding set of goals should be a part of the RECORD because it verifies what I have been saying on the floor, in letters to my colleagues and in statements to the press about those whose purpose is to create a legally enforced godless society of America. I do not believe a single Member of the House and the vast majority of American citizens wish any of these goals to become reality. But, in one instance, we are on the way—the elimination of prayer and Bible reading in our public schools. And, as I have heretofore pointed out to the House, the American Civil Liberties Union in California already has filed a suit attacking the constitutionality of the words "under God"

in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Others will follow, I am sure.

Each Member of this House can help to block this spiritual catastrophe. Signing discharge petition No. 3 now on the desk of the clerk will bring this issue to the floor so that House Members, Members of the other body, State legislatures and the American people can decide whether they want the kind of society advocated by the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism.

In Our Books Khrushchev Is Still No Sweetheart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and neighbor, Mr. Colan Henninger, editor of the Crescent City (Calif.) American, wrote an excellent editorial regarding Nikita Khrushchev. I am sure that the other Members of the House will be as interested and impressed with Mr. Henninger's remarks as I was:

IN OUR BOOKS KHRUSHCHEV IS STILL NO SWEETHEART

We hasten to assure our readers that, notwithstanding the fact that many of our Government officials are literally purring at the feet of Nikita Khrushchev, in our books "The Man Is Still No Sweetheart," and his name on a nuclear test ban agreement would be absolutely worthless.

Some of the murmurings calculated to lead us to believe that "somehow, some way this leopard has changed his spots" are not only silly, but they're downright disgusting and, if we, the American people, are foolish enough to ape the Australian ostrich by burying our heads in the sand, and dreaming about a great benevolent father leading the huge Russian bear, we're in for a terrible, probably a disastrous shock.

This noise about peaceful coexistence with Communist Russia and war with Communist China is pure, unadulterated rot. Don't get us wrong—we have no use for a Red, whether he's a Russian, Chinese, American, or what have you.

As between Russia and China, we consider Russia a thousand times more dangerous. If we go to war with China, chances are a million to one it will happen in Asia. But, if we wage a war with Russia, it can happen over here. So, in the category of comparative evils, "China is the lesser."

The amazing readiness of some Americans to swallow one of history's greatest pieces of pure bunk, the idea that Russia does not believe in resort to strong-arm tactics in brainwashing the world to communism, while China believes in forcing this monstrous ideology through the channels of war, leaves us completely stunned. How utterly and fantastically stupid can we get?

Who installed the rockets and pointed them toward our cities on the soil of Cuba just off our Florida coast? Who converted Cuba into a military base, a warlike Communist bridgehead into the Western Hemisphere? Who put foreign troops, stationed there even now, on Cuban soil, and who built a submarine base on her coast? Who gave material aid and comforted the fanatical Castro, and who blowtorched his hatred of the United States and the American people to such intensity that his intestines are as hot as coils of lead pipe in a blast furnace? We can credit all of this to Red Russia—not to Communist China, and these are not acts of love.

Who told the American people, "We will bury you"? It was Nikita Khrushchev—not Mao Tse-tung.

And to whom do our American Reds pay homage? To the Kremlin in Moscow, and not the lords of Peiping. To be sure, Khrushchev would prefer that American traitors subvert and overthrow our government and sell us down the big Red river. But in the meantime, he is not missing any bets. His military bridgehead in Cuba, contrary to our Monroe Doctrine, is already an act of war, and he knows it. He's willing to risk war in his effort to puppetize the nations of South America, so, if we prove stubborn and don't let our traitors take over, they'll be on his side when the blood bath comes.

Khrushchev is interested in only one thing—world conquest. The California Features Service, a highly reliable publication by Whitaker and Baxter last week sized up the situation as follows:

"Putting on our spoil-sport shirt and donning our wet blanket, may we enter a dissent to those happy observers of the international scene who are viewing the action through rose-tinted glasses.

They are seeing pink clouds of peace instead of Red clouds of war. We do not share their optimism.

The apparent split between Red Russia and Red China may have some advantages to those of us in the West but if history is any guide, they will be illusory and short-lived. Although some of our highly placed foreign experts, including the President, seem to feel that Khrushchev can be counted on to contribute concessions to the West in order to maintain peaceful coexistence, there is no evidence whatsoever that his methods have changed.

"Khrushchev's tactics are eminently simple and direct: any deal with the West must ultimately and inevitably contribute to the Communist achievement of world domination; every agreement contributing anything to the West must be at least matched, if not topped, by a concession to the Soviet.

"To think otherwise is dangerous nonsense. And that is something this Nation of ours cannot afford."

Getting back to the question, "Which is worse, Red Russia or Communist China," both governments are communistic, they tolerate no opposition, and the word "good" no more fits either government than it fits a rattlesnake.

But, let us remember, millions of the great people of China are in the same boat as the people of the captive nations of Europe. China was infiltrated and subverted by Russian Communists to the extent that, following a bloody civil war, the government fell.

Hundreds of thousands of loyal Chinese fled to Formosa and other offshore islands where they have successfull resisted the tide of communism, and where they stand as a constant threat to the government on the mainland. We have no doubt but Mao Tse-tung's greatest fear centers around the question of how many of his crushed subjects are still loyal to the courageous people offshore, who, beyond a shadow of doubt, proved they will not bow to the iron heel of communism.

If anyone believes the gory hands of Russia got that way from the sap off green olive branches, let us remember the butchery of Hungary. For a firsthand account, we recommend a chat with Charles Kovach, a Hungarian-American who is now fishing the Klamath River.

"Nine hundred million formerly free peoples," he said, "are now living in 24 Communist-dominated countries. They are prisoners behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and, both their hatred of their slave masters of the Kremlin and their burning desire for freedom from the Communist tyranny knows no bounds."

Kovach, formerly of the Los Angeles Examiner, for 40 years, now retired and a regular Klamath fisherman, went back to Hungary in 1961 to visit friends and relatives.

Unfortunately, Kovach said, Radio Free Europe is seldom listened to by the Hungarians because it is propagandizing socialism and one-worldism. What they have confidence in, and what they want to hear, he said, is about America and Americanism.

We doff our hats to Congressman DON CLAUSEN, who, on the subjects of communism, Hungary, and Cuba, delivered a sensational speech from the floor of the House of Representatives on July 29, which in part, follows:

"May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel the word 'hope' is the key to our dangerous predicament. By our spectacular failure to oppose the admission of Hungary's totalitarian Communist regime into the United Nations, we snatched hope away from the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe as through the torch of freedom had suddenly disappeared from the upraised hand of Our Lady of New York Harbor, the Statue of Liberty.

"Likewise, this country's obvious acceptance of a totalitarian Communist regime in Cuba, crowned by the extreme measure of even hampering the operations of Cuban freedom fighters, has tarnished the hope held by Western European countries in NATO to say nothing of the hopes of the Cuban people. To me there is little wonder that the much-maligned President of France, Charles de Gaulle, has seen fit to involve his country in unilateral defense preparations. Whether this attitude is warranted by the facts is debatable. But the image of the United States as the great hope for the defense of freedom-loving peoples has been tarnished, and President de Gaulle is understandably alarmed.

"This great Nation has led the tide for freedom and self-determination from the days of our colonial patriots. But now there are grave doubts in the minds of free peoples as to whether we are still leading this cause, whether we still are waving the banner of hope to those who are captives behind the Iron Curtain, whether we have traded total peaceful victory of freedom in exchange for appeasement of communism as it steadily takes over the world.

"Mr. Speaker, there have been many proposed solutions to the problems of Cuba. Some of them tread on dangerous ground. Others are reasonable economic and political sanctions that could lead to gradual peaceful rejection of communism in this hemisphere. I need not go into their provisions in detail here, but I will wholeheartedly pledge myself here and now to support and work for the enactment of any reasonable legislation that will restore the United States, in the eyes of the world, as the leader of freedom.

"Mr. Speaker, some of these proposals may constitute a solution, or an approach to a solution, to this serious encroachment into the Western Hemisphere. The solution may be among other proposals made to this body. Whatever it is, it must restore this Nation's prestige among our friends and the respect of our adversaries. It must elevate us again as the shining example of self-government for all nations, old and new, to emulate. And by our own individual example, we can show the freedom-loving peoples of the world how to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, like many of us here on this floor have done."

Slobissmus Americanus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, like all Members of Congress I am genuinely delighted to welcome visitors from across the United States and am happy to see our Capitol City thronged with families and children who have come here to visit those monuments, structures, and shrines which bring alive the contributions in genius and bravery of those who have inspired this Nation.

Because of the general interest in the Nation's Capital and the countless Americans who come to see it every year, I am including in the RECORD an interesting article which recently appeared in the Daily News Record, voice of the men's apparel and textile industry, concerning the attire of some of our visitors. It is by an associate editor—Jerome Kriska, and entitled "A Sight To See."

This has prompted a reply from Ben Stern, president of the well-known public relations organization here in Washington which bears his name, which appeared in the July 19 issue of the same publication. His firm represents a trade organization, National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers, of which there are members in the Eighth Congressional District. Mr. Stern is an old schoolmate from our public school days in Evansville, Ind. Due to the widespread comment caused by these two articles and the general interest in the subject, I include them in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as an indication of how we are beginning to look to others:

A SIGHT TO SEE

(By Jerome S. Kriska)

New York is one of the world's greatest tourist attractions, and hinterlanders flock here in droves to see the sights, some of which are other hinterlanders seeing the sights.

We should, we suppose, explain that native Manhattan Islanders, like ourself, consider any part of the mainland of the United States—which means that vast area lying west of the Hudson and north of the Harlem River—as the hinterland.

As a native and resident New Yorker we duly appreciate the noble efforts of hinterlanders to keep our fair city green by bringing money here. They do, of course, louse up things a bit by further crowding the already overcrowded streets, restaurants, theaters, pubs, and other public facilities—but we believe in being kind to the hicks, because you never know when one of them will take it into his head to move here and get himself elected mayor or governor.

They probably get their money's worth here, even though they get elbowed by the crowds, shoved around by ushers, mildly gypped by cabbies, sneered at by hotel room clerks, and snubbed by maitre d's.

In some measure, though, they invite this sort of treatment by their appearance, which is generally that of classic, unreconstructed slobs.

While New York is often described in tourist guides—which tourists probably never read—as a well-dressed and somewhat formal city, it does have its own homegrown supply of slobs, which is more than ample to fill its needs. In fact, New York could probably provide other communities with slobs on a lend-lease or Marshall-plan basis, and it would probably be glad to get rid of at least a few thousand that way.

Just why so many summer visitors feel compelled to tool about the city in sheer nylon sports shirts, with the tails always alfresco, or in T-shirts, is one of those little mysteries of life. Teamed up with these are generally wash pants, which are never washed. A camera dangling on a strap, necklace fashion, is a standard piece of costume jewelry.

Maybe the men's wear industry ought to dispatch a peace corps to the hinterland to convince the natives that wearing a coat and tie isn't necessarily fatal—not even in summertime.

SLOBISSMUS AMERICANUS

(By Ben Stern)

Where, oh where, have you been these many years that you have missed the impact of what I term "Slobissmus Americanus."

New York is host only to a comparatively small portion of these disgusting representatives of the species.

Come to Washington and you will see it in its full efflorescence.

Wherever one goes—no matter whether it be the Capitol Building, the Halls of Congress, the Archives or the National Gallery of Art, attention cannot help but be attracted by the wig-wagging of pendulous posteriors in short-shorts; the bulbous fore and afts created by stretch slacks or the sleazy shirttails flapping in the breeze.

The same disregard for what we formerly considered the minimal common decencies of attire is flaunted by American tourists abroad. This dishabille, which is a betrayal of standards, is the badge of instant recognition of the species "Slobissmus Americanus."

It has created a revulsion about which the press and radio here and the editorial comment has been justifiably caustic and critical.

After several years of exposure to this form of careless disregard for minimal standards of dress, I am compelled to feel that as soon as an American leaves his native habitat he discards what he feels are the excess baggage of taste and revels in untidiness.

To the students of the mores of our times it appears that we are a nation of slobs—for the outer man is a reflection of the inner—and no matter how impressive be our cathedrals of culture, they are merely facades hiding inner deterioration.

I agree with you completely that a vigorous program of education with a continuing followthrough must be initiated.

The techniques to be employed to make such a campaign effective are now under study by the National Association of Retail Clothiers & Furnishers.

Among the measures to be employed is the conspicuous display of signs at entrances to monuments and buildings which are tourist attractions setting up minimal standards of proper attire as requisites to admission.

Hon. Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many years I enjoyed the friendship of our distinguished and beloved colleague, ESTES KEFAUVER. Last Saturday, in the golden hours of his great life, his soul slipped through the curtain of stars to the place we call "the Great Unknown." He has gone to the other side of the Crystal Sea where he will receive the full reward which his strong faith has purchased.

ESTES KEFAUVER was a brave and a courageous man. By his intelligent devotion to duty, his unswerving fidelity to truth, his great integrity, and by the honest and courageous manner in which he discharged all of the vital functions of his high office, he distinguished himself in the service of his country and endeared himself to all of his colleagues in Congress. The State of Tennessee has lost one of its best loved sons. America has lost one of its great citizens, and I have lost a good friend.

I served with ESTES KEFAUVER in the House of Representatives for many years. I have traveled with him into far distant places of the earth. He was a loyal and devoted member of the Interparliamentary Union and was a real ambassador for America in all of his travels. Wherever he went, ESTES KEFAUVER made a thoroughfare for friendship.

To his lovely wife, Nancy, to his children, and to all the members of his family, I extend my warm and sincere sympathy and express the hope that the love and sympathy of his friends will soften the sorrow they are now bearing. May the Lord of mercy bless and sustain them in their great bereavement.

Hiroshima Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the signing of the first formal test ban agreement putting an end to thermonuclear testing in the atmosphere took place almost 18 years to the day after the bombing of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. The moral implications of that action have been and will, I suspect, continue to be a subject of speculation and heated discussion for many years to come. But the psychological scars upon the victims of that disaster are equally pervasive and lingering, and according to an eminent American psychologist, Robert Jay Lifton, who visited Hiroshima, the memory of that holocaust still haunts the survivors today as they continue to plod their way through the valley of the shadow of death.

Dr. Lifton's findings which are recorded in the current issue of Daedalus should make interesting reading for every thoughtful American and I wish to include it here together with a poignant editorial from the August 6 issue of the Washington Post on the anniversary of Hiroshima:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1963]

HIROSHIMA

Eighteen years after the event, Hiroshima continues to haunt the memory of the world. The question of whether the bomb should have been dropped at all still is debated—witness the article in the current issue of Look. Many of those personally involved have been seared for life. An American aboard the lethal convoy has been wandering the country, burdened by the dreadful story, like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner, and considered unbalanced by those able to take a more detached view.

In Japan, too, among the victims the memory persists as a nagging nightmare. An American psychologist, Robert Jay Lifton, recently visited Hiroshima to interview a sample of the 90,000 survivors. His findings, presented in the summer issue of Daedalus, might suitably be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, the 18th anniversary of Hiroshima.

Mr. Lifton found in his interviews that the first contact with the bomb "left an emotional theme within the victim which remains with him indefinitely: the sense of a more or less permanent encounter with death." The aura of wierdness and unreality, of grotesque and surrealistic scenes, comes through in the interviews. A young university professor, who was not far from the hypo-center, recalled: "The most impressive thing I saw was some girls, very young girls, not only with their clothes torn off, but with their skin peeled off as well * * *. My immediate thought was that this was like the hell I had always read about."

Among the hibakusha, the first children of the bomb, there is a collective sense of fraternity in disaster—an identity with the dead. The survivors, Mr. Lifton found, have incorporated the experience into their beings, "including all of its elements of horror, evil, and particularly of death." The very wantonness of destruction among a people who lay great emphasis on anticipating death with dignity, he goes on to say, produced a vast breakdown of faith, and a loss of trust in the structure of existence.

So the survivors of Hiroshima have been scarred for life by a bomb that was, as the experts say, very "unsophisticated," very "primitive," and a thousand times less potent than new warheads that modern science has labored to produce. On this anniversary of the dreadful ordeal of the hibakusha, the world well may weep for them and their agony and pray that such sorrow may never again be inflicted upon any people. If it ever is, not the inhabitants of a single city, but those of most of the great cities of the world will labor under a collective sense of identity with the dead.

THE THEME OF DEATH

(By Robert Jay Lifton)

Hiroshima commands our attention now 18 years after its exposure to the atomic bomb, perhaps even more insistently than when the event actually occurred. We are compelled by the universal threat of nuclear weapons to study the impact of such weapons upon their first human victims, ever mindful of the relevance of this question to our own future and to all of human survival.

Much research has already been done concerning the physical consequences of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki disasters, particularly in relation to their unique feature of delayed radiation effects. But little attention has been paid to psychological and social elements, though these might well be said to be at present the most vivid legacies of the first atomic bomb.

My own interest in these problems developed during 2 years of research, conducted in Tokyo and Kyoto from 1960–62, on the relationship of individual character and historical change in Japanase youth. I was struck by the significance which the encounter with nuclear weapons had for the Japanese as a whole, even for young Japanese who could hardly remember the event. Also involved in my undertaking a study in Hiroshima was concern with the psychological aspects of war and peace, as well as previous interest in the behavior of individuals and groups under extreme conditions.

I began the work in April of 1962, first through two brief visits to Hiroshima, followed by 4½ months of residence there. My approach was primarily that of individual interviews with two groups of atomic-bomb survivors: Thirty-three chosen at random from the more than 90,000 survivors(hibakusha), listed at the Hiroshima Research Institute for Nuclear Medicine and Biology; and an additional group of 42 survivors specially selected because of their prominence in dealing with A-bomb problems or their capacity to articulate their experiences. Included among the latter were physicians, university professors, city officials, politicians, writers and poets, and leaders of survivor organizations and peace movements. I also sought out all those in Hiroshima (mostly Japanese, but also Americans and Europeans) who could tell me anything about the complex array of group emotions and social problems which had arisen in the city over the 17 years that had elapsed since the disaster.

I was aware of the delicacy of my situation as an American psychiatrist conducting this study, and I relied heavily upon the continuous support and assistance of Japanese groups within the Hiroshima community, so that all meetings and interviews were arranged through their introductions. In the case of the randomly selected group, my first contact with each survivor was made through a personal visit to the home, in the company of a Japanese social worker from Hiroshima University. My previous experience in Japan—including the ability to speak a certain amount of Japanese was helpful in eliciting the many forms of cooperation so crucial for the work. Perhaps of greatest importance was my conveying to both colleagues and research subjects a sense of my personal motivation in undertaking the work, the hope that a systematic study of this kind might clarify important problems often spoken about loosely, and thereby in a small way contribute to the mastery of nuclear weapons and the avoidance of their use.

THE EXPERIENCE RECALLED

The degree to which one anticipates a disaster has important bearing upon the way in which one responds, and the predominant tone in the descriptions I heard was that of extreme surprise and unpreparedness. Since it was wartime, people did of course expect conventional bombing; there had been regularly occurring air raid warnings because of planes passing over Hiroshima, though only an occasional stray bomb had actually been dropped on the city. American planes did drop leaflets warning Hiroshima inhabitants that their city was going to be demolished and urging them to evacuate from it. But very few people appear to have seen these leaflets and those who did tended to ignore them as enemy propaganda. Many wondered at Hiroshima's relatively untouched state, despite its obviously strategic significance as a major staging area for Japan's military operations in China and southeast Asia. There was general apprehension, the feeling that there was something dangerous about Hiroshima's strangely intact state and that the Americans must be preparing something extraordinarily big for the city (though this latter thought could have been partly a retrospective construction). At 8:15 a.m. on August 6, 1945, the moment the bomb fell, most people were in a particularly relaxed state, since, following a brief air-raid warning, the all-clear had just been sounded. People thus had a false sense of immediate security, as well as a total incapacity to imagine the nature of the weapon that was about to strike them.

It was only those at some distance from the bomb's hypocenter who could clearly distinguish the sequence of the great flash of light in the sky accompanied by the lacerating heat of the fireball then the sound and force of the blast, and the impressive multicolored "mushroom cloud" rising above the city. Two thousand meters is generally considered to be a critical radius for high mortality (from heat, blast, and radiation), for susceptibility to delayed radiation effects, and for near-total destruction of buildings and other structures. But many were killed outside of this radius, and indeed the number of deaths from the bomb—variously estimated from 63,000 to 240,000 or more—is still unknown. Falling in the center of a flat city made up largely of wooden residential and commercial structures, the bomb is reported to have destroyed or so badly damaged, through blast and fire, more than two-thirds of all buildings within 5,000 meters—an area roughly encompassing the city limits—that all of Hiroshima became immediately involved in the atomic disaster. Those within the 2,000-meter radius could not clearly recall their initial perceptions: many simply remember what they thought to be a flash—or else a sudden sensation of heat—followed by an indeterminate period of unconsciousness; others recall only being thrown across a room or knocked down, then finding themselves pinned under debris of buildings.

The most striking psychological feature of this immediate experience was the sense of a sudden and absolute shift from normal exitence to an overwhelming encounter with death.

I stress this sudden encounter with death because I believe that it initiates, from this first moment of contact with the atomic bomb, an emotional theme within the victim which remains with him indefinitely: the sense of a more or less permanent encounter with death.

But human beings are unable to remain open to emotional experience of this intensity for any length of time, and very quickly—sometimes within minutes—there began to occur what we may term psychological closure, that is, people simply ceased to feel.

For instance, a male social worker, then in his twenties and in military service in Hiroshima, was temporarily on leave at his home just outside of the city; he rushed back into the city soon after the bomb fell, in accordance with his military duty, only to find that his unit had been entirely wiped out. A certain amount of military order was quickly reestablished, and a policy of immediate mass cremation of dead bodies was instituted in order to prevent widespread disease, and in accordance with Japanese custom. As a noncommissioned officer and one of the few able bodied men left, he was put in charge of this work of disposing of corpses, which he found he could accomplish with little difficulty:

"After awhile they became just like objects or goods that we handled in a very businesslike way. * * * Of course I didn't regard them simply as pieces of wood—they were dead bodies—but if we had been sentimental we couldn't have done the work. * * * We had no emotions. * * * Because of the succession of experiences I had been through I was temporarily without feeling. * * * At times I went about the work with great energy, realizing that no one but myself could do it."

Relatively few people were involved in the disposal of dead bodies, but virtually all

those I interviewed nonetheless experienced a similar form of psychological closure in response to what they saw and felt, and particularly in response to their overall exposure to death. Thus many told how horrified they were when they first encountered corpses in strange array, or extremely disfigured faces, but how, after a period of time as they saw more and more of these, they felt nothing. Psychological closure would last sometimes for a few hours, and sometimes for days or even months and merge into longer-term feelings of depression and despair.

But even the profound and unconscious psychic defensive maneuvers involved in psychological closure were ultimately unable to afford full protection to the survivor from the painful sights and stimuli impinging upon him. It was, moreover, a defense not devoid of its own psychological cost. Thus the same social worker, in a later interview, questioned his own use of the word "businesslike" to describe his attitude toward dead bodies, and emphasized the pity and sympathy he felt while handling the remains of men from his unit and the pains he took to console family members who came for these remains. He even recalled feeling frightened at night when passing the spot where he worked at cremation by day. He was in effect telling me not only that his psychological closure was imperfect, but that he was horrified—felt ashamed and guilty—at having behaved in a way which he now thought callous. For he had indulged in activities which were ordinarily, for him, strongly taboo, and had done so with an energy, perhaps even an enthusiasm, which must have mobilized within him primitive emotions of a frightening nature.

There were also many episodes of more focused guilt toward specific family members whom one was unable to help, and for whose death one felt responsible. For instance, the shopkeeper's assistant mentioned earlier was finally rescued from the debris of his destroyed house by his mother, but she was too weakened by her own injuries to be able to walk very far with him. Soon they were surrounded by fire, and he (a boy of 13) did not feel he had the strength to sustain her weight, and became convinced that they would both die unless he took some other action. So he put her down and ran for help, but the neighbor he summoned could not get through to the woman because of the flames, and the boy learned shortly afterward that his mother died in precisely the place he had left her. His lasting sense of guilt was reflected in his frequent experience, from that time onward, of hearing his mother's voice ringing in his ears calling for help.

Most survivors focus upon one incident, one sight, or one particular ultimate horror with which they strongly identify themselves, and which left them with a profound sense of pity, guilt, and shame.

CONTAMINATION AND DISEASE

Survivors told me of three rumors which circulated widely in Hiroshima just after the bomb. The first was that for a period of 75 years Hiroshima would be uninhabitable—no one would be able to live there. This rumor was a direct expression of the fear of deadly and protracted contamination from a mysterious poison believed to have been emitted by the frightening new weapon. (As one survivor put it, "The ordinary people spoke of poison; the intellectuals spoke of radiation.")

Even more frequently expressed and I believe with greater emotion, was a second rumor: trees and grass would never again grow in Hiroshima; from that day on the city would be unable to sustain vegetation of any kind. This seemed to suggest an ultimate form of desolation even beyond that of human death; nature was drying up altogether, the ultimate source of life was being extinguished—a form of symbolism particularly powerful in Japanese culture with its focus upon natural aesthetics and its view of nature as both enveloping and energizing all of human life.

The third rumor, less frequently mentioned to me but one which also had wide currency in various versions, was that all those who had been exposed to the bomb in Hiroshima would be dead within 3 years. This more naked death symbolism was directly related to the appearance of frightening symptoms of toxic radiation effects. For almost immediately after the bomb and during the following days and weeks, people began to experience, and notice in others symptoms of a strange form of illness: nausea, vomiting, and loss of appetite; diarrhea with large amounts of blood in the stools; fever and weakness; purple spots on various parts of the body from bleeding into the skin (purpura); inflammation and ulceration of the mouth, throat, and gums (oropharyngeal lesions and gingivitis); bleeding from the mouth, gums, nose, throat, rectum, and urinary tract (hemorrhagic manifestations); loss of hair from the scalp and other parts of the body (epilation); extremely low white blood cell counts when these were taken (leucopenia); and in many cases a progressive course until death. These symptoms and fatalities aroused in the minds of the people of Hiroshima a special terror an image of a weapon which not only kills and destroys on a colossal scale but also leaves behind in the bodies of those exposed to it deadly influences which may emerge at any time and strike down their victims. This image was made particularly vivid by the delayed appearance of these radiation effects, 2 to 4 weeks after the bomb fell, sometimes in people who had previously seemed to be in perfect health.

Survivors were thus affected not only by the fact of people dying around them but by the way in which they died: a gruesome form of rapid bodily deterioration which seemed unrelated to more usual and decent forms of death.

We have seen how these initial physical fears could readily turn into lifetime bodily concerns. And during the years that followed, these fears and concerns became greatly magnified by another development: the growing awareness among the people of Hiroshima that medical studies were demonstrating an abnormally high rate of leukemia among survivors of the atomic bomb. The increased incidence was first noted in 1948, and reached a peak between 1950 and 1952; it has been greatest in those exposed closest to the hypocenter so that for those within 1,000 meters the increase of leukemia has been between 10 and 50 times the normal. Since 1952 the rate has diminished, but it is still higher than in nonexposed populations, and fears which have been aroused remain strong. While symptoms of leukemia are not exactly the same as those of acute radiation effects, the two conditions share enough in common—the dreaded "purple spot" and other forms of hemorrhage, laboratory findings of abnormalities of the blood, progressive weakness and fever and (inevitably in leukemia, and often enough in acute irradition) ultimate death—that these tend to merge, psychologically speaking, into a diffuse fear of bodily annihilation and death.

Moreover, Hiroshima survivors are aware of the general concern and controversy about genetic effects of the atomic bombs and most express fear about possible harmful effects upon subsequent generations—a very serious emotional concern anywhere, but particularly so in an East Asian culture which stresses family lineage and the continuity of generations as man's central purpose in life and (at least symbolically) his means of achieving immortality. The Hiroshima people know that radiation can produce congenital abnormalities (as has been widely demonstrated in laboratory animals); and abnormalities have frequently been reported among the offspring of survivors—sometimes in very lurid journalistic terms, sometimes in more restrained medical reports. Actually, systematic studies of the problem have so far revealed no higher incidence of abnormalities in survivors' offspring than in those of control populations, so that scientific findings regarding genetic effects have been essentially negative. However, there has been one uncomfortably positive genetic findings, that of disturbances in sex ratio of offspring: men exposed to a significant degree of radiation tend to have relatively fewer daughters, while exposed women tend to have fewer sons, because, it is believed, of sex-linked lethal mutations involving the X chromosome—a finding whose significance is difficult to evaluate. Moreover, there are Japanese physicians who believe that there has been an increase in various forms of internal (and therefore invisible) congenital abnormalities in children of survivors, despite the absence so far of convincing scientific evidence.

Another factor here is the definite damage from radiation experienced by children exposed in utero, including many stillbirths and abortions as well as a high incidence of microcephaly with and without mental retardation (occurring almost exclusively in pregnancies which had not advanced beyond 4 months). This is, of course, a direct effect of radiation upon sensitive, rapidly growing fetal tissues, and, scientifically speaking, has nothing to do with genetic problems. But ordinary people often fail to make this distinction; to them the birth of children with abnormally small heads and retarded minds was often looked upon as still another example of the bomb's awesome capacity to inflict a physical curse upon its victims and their offspring.

There are also other areas of concern regarding delayed radiation effects. There has been a definite increase in cataracts and related eye conditions, which was not stressed to me by survivors as so great a source of emotional concern as the other problems mentioned, but has been nonetheless far from negligible. There has been evidence, though not yet decisive, that the incidence of various forms of cancer has increased among survivors; if confirmed, this could be an extremely serious problem, since it involves fatal disease entities much more frequent in their normal occurrence than leukemia. There has also been evidence of impairment in the growth and development of children, though contested by some on the grounds of inadequately accounting for social and economic factors. And there is a large group of divergent conditions—including anemias and liver and blood diseases, endocrine and skin disorders, impairment of central nervous system (particularly midbrain) function, and premature aging—which have been attributed by various investigators to radiation effects, but have not shown increased incidence in large-scale studies involving control populations. Even more difficult to evaluate is a frequently reported borderline condition of general weakness and debilitation also believed—by a very large number of survivors and by some physicians as well—to be caused by delayed radiation effects.

These fears about general health and genetic effects have inevitably affected marriage arrangements (which are usually made in Japan by families with the help of a go-between), in which survivors are frequently thought to encounter discrimination, particularly when involved in arrangements with families outside of Hiroshima.

The survivor's identification with the dead and the maimed initiates a vicious circle on the psychosomatic plane of existence: he is likely to associate the mildest everyday injury or sickness with possible radiation effects; and anything he relates to radiation effects becomes associated with death. The process is accentuated by the strong

Japanese cultural focus upon bodily symptoms as expressions of anxiety and conflict. Thus the all-encompassing term "A-bomb sickness" or "A-bomb disease" (genbakushō) has evolved, referring on the one hand to such fatal conditions as the early acute radiation effects and later cases of leukemia; and on the other hand to the vague borderline area of fatigue, general weakness, sensitivity to hot weather, suspected anemia, susceptibility to colds or stomach trouble, and general nervousness—all of which are frequent complaints of survivors, and which many associate with radiation effects. Not only does the expression "A-bomb disease" have wide popular currency, but it has frequently been used by local physicians as a convenient category for a condition otherwise hard to classify, and at the same time as a means of making it possible for the patient to derive certain medical and economic benefits.

These benefits also loom large in the picture. Doctors and survivors—as well as politicians and city officials—are caught in a conflict between humanitarian provision for medical need, and the dangers (expressed to me particularly by Japanese physicians) of encouraging the development in survivors of hypochondriasis, general weakness and dependency—or what is sometimes called A-bomb neurosis. During the years immediately after the war, when medical care was most needed, very little adequate treatment was available, as the national medical law providing for survivors was not enacted until 1957. But since that time a series of laws and amendments have been passed with increasingly comprehensive medical coverage, particularly for those in the "special survivors" group (those nearest the hypocenter at the time of the bomb and those who have shown evidence of medical conditions considered to be related to A-bomb effects). In the last few years the category of "special survivors" has been steadily enlarged: distance from the hypocenter, as a criterion for eligibility, has been extended from 2,000 to 3,000 meters; and qualifying illnesses—originally limited to such conditions as leukemia, ophthalmic diseases, and various blood and liver disorders, all of which were considered to be related to radiation effects—have been extended to include illnesses not considered to be necessarily directly caused by radiation but possibly aggravated by the overall atomic bomb experience, such as cancer, heart disease, endocrine and kidney disorders, arteriosclerosis, hypertension, and others.

Maximum medical and economic benefits, however, can be obtained only by those certified (through a special medical procedure) to have illnesses specifically related to the atomic bomb but some physicians believe that this certification—which can be sometimes given for such minor conditions as ordinary anemia (as well as for more serious illnesses)—tends to stamp one psychologically as a lifetime A-bomb patient. The rationale of these laws is to provide maximum help for survivors and to give them the benefit of the doubt about matters which are not entirely scientifically resolved. But there remains a great deal of controversy over them. In addition to those who feel that the laws foster an exaggerated preoccupation with atomic bomb effects (not only among doctors, but also among city officials, ordinary people, and even survivors themselves), there are other survivors who criticize them as being still insufficiently comprehensive, as having overly complicated categories, and subcategories which in the end deny full care for certain conditions.

My own impression in studying this problem is that, since "A-bomb disease" is at this historical juncture as much a spiritual as a physical condition (as our young clerk made so clear)—and one which touches at every point upon the problem of death—it is difficult for any law or medical program to provide a cure.

The general psychological atmosphere in Hiroshima—and particularly that generated by the effects of the mass media—also has great bearing upon these psychosomatic problems. As one would expect, the whole subject of the atomic bomb and its delayed radiation effects has been continuous front-page news—from 1945–1952 within the limits of the restrictions upon publicizing these matters imposed by the American Occupation, and without such restrictions thereafter. Confronted with a subject so emotionally charged for the people of Hiroshima—its intensity constantly reinforced by world events and particularly by nuclear weapons testing—newspapers in Hiroshima and elsewhere in Japan have dealt with it dramatically, particularly in circulating the concept of "A-bomb disease." Mass media are caught in a moral dilemma in some ways similar to that I have already described for physicians, city officials and survivors themselves; there is on the one hand the urge to give full publicity to the horrors of nuclear weapons through vivid description of effects and suspected effects of atomic bomb radiation—thereby serving warning to the world and also expressing a form of sympathy to survivors through recognition of their plight—and on the other hand the growing awareness that lurid reports of illness and death have a profoundly disturbing effect upon survivors. Responsible media have struggled to reconcile these conflicting moral pressures and achieve balanced treatment of an unprecedently difficult problem; others have been guided mainly by commercial considerations. In any case, the people of Hiroshima have been constantly confronted with frightening descriptions of patients dying in the "A-bomb Hospital" (a medical center built specifically for the treatment of conditions related to the bomb) of "A-bomb disease." In the majority of cases the relationship of the fatal condition to delayed radiation effects is equivocal, but this is usually not made clear, nor does it in any way lessen the enormous impact of these reports upon individual survivors. Also furthering this impact have been the activities of peace movements and various ideological and political groups—ranging from those whose universalistic dedication to peace and opposition to nuclear weapons testing lead them to circulate the effects of the bomb on a humanistic basis, to others who seek narrower political goals from the unique Hiroshima atmosphere.

What I wish to stress is the manner in which these diverse passions—compounded of moral concern, sympathetic identification, various forms of fear, hostility, political conviction, personal ambition, and journalistic sensationalism—interact with the psychosomatic preoccupations of survivors. But I would also emphasize that these passions are by no means simply manufactured ones; they are the inevitable expression of the impact of a disaster of this magnitude upon basic human conflicts and anxieties. And whatever the medical exaggerations, they are built upon an underlying lethal reality of acute and delayed radiation effects, and upon the genuine possibility of still-undiscovered forms of bodily harm.

It is clear by now that exposure to the atomic bomb changed the survivor's status as a human being, in his own eyes as well as in others'. Both through his immediate experience and its consequences over the years, he became a member of a new group; he assumed the identity of the hibakusha, of one who has undergone the atomic bomb. When I asked survivors to associate freely to the word hibakusha, and to explain their feelings about it, they invariably conveyed to me the sense of having been compelled to take on this special category of existence, by which they felt permanently bound, however they might wish to free themselves from it.

Hibakusha look upon themselves as underprivileged in other ways too. Not only are they literally a minority group (one-fifth of the city's population), but they are generally considered to be at the lower socioeconomic levels of society, and have even at times been compared to the burakumin, or outcast group. For once it was realized that Hiroshima was not permanently contaminated after all, not only did the survivors attempt to rebuild their homes, but hordes of outsiders—some from oversea areas, some from the industrial Osaka region, some of them black marketeers and members of gangs who saw special opportunity beckoning: all of them both physically and culturally more vigorous than the atomic-bombed, traditionalistic Hiroshima population—poured into the city and became perhaps the main beneficiaries of the economic boom which later developed. Survivors have encountered discrimination not only in marriage but also in employment, as it was felt that they could not work as hard as ordinary people and tended to need more time off because of illness and fatigue. Of course, survivors nonetheless regularly work and marry; but they often do so with a sense of having, as hibakusha, impaired capacity for both. They strongly resent the popular image of the hibakusha which accentuates their limitations, but at the same time accept much of it as their own self-image. Thus, concerning occupational competition, older survivors often feel that they have lacked the overall energy to assimilate their economic, spiritual, and possibly physical blows sufficiently to be the equal of ordinary people; and young survivors, even if they feel themselves to possess normal energy, often fear that being identified by others as a hibakusha might similarly interfere with their occupational standing. Concerning marriage, the sense of impairment can include the need to have one's A-bomb experience more or less "cleared" by a go-betwen (as we have seen); fears about having abnormal children, or sometimes about the ability to have children at all; and occasionally, in males, diminished sexual potency (thought of as organic but probably psychogenic in origin).

However well or poorly a survivor is functioning in his life, the word "hibakusha" evokes an image of the dead and the dying. The young clerk, for instance, when he hears the word, thinks either of the experience itself ("Although I wasn't myself too badly injured I saw many people who were * * * and I think * * * of the look on their faces * * * camps full of these people, their breasts burned and red.") or, as we have already heard him describe, of the aftereffects: "When I hear about people who die from A-bomb disease or who have operations because of this illness, then I feel that I am the same kind of person as they."

We are again confronted with the survivor's intimate identification with the dead; we find, in fact, that it tends to pervade the entire hibakusha identity. For survivors seem not only to have experienced the atomic disaster, but to have imbibed it and incorporated it into their beings, including all of its elements of horror, evil, and particularly of death. They feel compelled virtually to merge with those who died, not only with close family members but with a more anonymous group of the dead. And they judge, and indeed judge harshly, their own behavior and that of other survivors on the basis of the degree of respect it demonstrates toward the dead. They condemn, for instance, the widespread tendency (which, as Japanese, they are at the same time attracted to) of making the anniversary of the bomb an occasion for a gay festival—because they see this as an insult to the dead. Similarly they are extraordinarily suspicious of all individual and group attempts to take any

form of action in relationship to the atomic bomb experience, even when done for the apparent purpose of helping survivors or furthering international peace. And they are, if anything, more critical of a survivor prominent in such programs than they are of outsiders, constantly accusing such a person of selling his name, selling the bomb, or selling Hiroshima. The causes for their suspiciousness are many, including a pervasive Japanese cultural tendency to be critical of the man who shows unconventional initiative (as expressed in the popular saying, "A nail which sticks out will be hammered down."), as well as an awareness of how readily the Hiroshima situation can be used by ambitious leaders. But there is an ultimate inner feeling that any such activities and programs are impure, that they violate the sanctity of the dead. For in relationship to the atomic bomb disaster, it is only the dead who, in the eyes of survivors, remain pure; and any self- or group-assertion can readily be seen as an insult to the dead.

The hibakusha identity, then, in a significant symbolic sense, becomes an identity of the dead. Created partly by the particularly intense Japanese capacity for identification, and partly by the special quality of guilt over surviving, it takes shape through the following inner sequence: I almost died; I should have died; I did die, or at least am not really alive; or if I am alive it is impure of me to be so; and anything I do which affirms life is also impure and an insult to the dead, who alone are pure.

Finally, this imposed identity of the atomic bomb survivor is greatly affected by his historical perceptions (whether clear or fragmentary) of the original experience, including its bearing upon the present world situation. The dominant emotion here is the sense of having been made into guinea pigs, not only because of being studied by research groups (particularly American research groups) interested in determining the effects of delayed radiation, but more fundamentally because of having been victimized by the first experiment (a word many of them use in referring to the event with nuclear weapons. They are affected by a realization, articulated in various ways, that they have experienced something ultimate in manmade disasters; and at the same time by the feeling that the world's continuing development and testing of the offending weapons deprives their experience of meaning. Thus, while frequently suspicious of organized campaigns against nuclear testing, they almost invariably experience anxiety and rage when such testing is conducted, recall the horrors they have been through, and express bitter frustration at the world's unwillingness to heed their warnings. And we have seen how this anger can at times be converted into thoughts of cosmic retaliation. There remains, of course, a residuum of hostility toward America and Americans for having dropped the bomb, but such hostility has been tempered over the years and softened by Japanese cultural restraints—except, as we have also seen, in individuals who experienced personal losses and blows to self-esteem from which they have been unable to recover. More than in relation to the dropping of the bomb itself (which many said they could understand as a product, however horrible, of war), survivors tend to express hostility in response to what they feel to be callousness toward their plight, or toward those who died, and also toward nuclear weapons testing. Thus, in singling out President Truman as an object of hatred, as some do, it is not only for his having ordered that the bomb be used but also for being assertively unapologetic about having done so.

Survivors tend to be strongly ambivalent about serving as symbols for the rest of the world, and this ambivalence is expressed in Hiroshima's excruciating conflict about whether or not to tear down the so-called A-bomb dome (or peace dome)—the prominent ruins of a dome-shaped exhibition hall located almost directly at the hypocenter. The dome has so far been permitted to stand as a reminder of the experience, and its picture has been featured in countless books and pamphlets dealing, from every point of view, with the A-bomb problem. Three different sets of attitudes on the question were expressed to me. The first: Let it remain permanently so that people (especially outsiders) will remember what we have been through and take steps to prevent repetitions of such disasters. The second: Tear it down for any of the following reasons: It does no good, as no one pays any attention to it; we should adopt the Buddhist attitude of resignation toward the experience; the dome is unauthentic, does not adequately convey what we really experienced, and is not in fact directly at the hypocenter; it is too painful a reminder for us (hibakusha) to have to look at every day (perhaps the most strongly felt objection); and, we should look ahead to the future rather than back to the unpleasant past. And the third: Let it neither be permitted to stand indefinitely nor torn down, but instead left as it is until it begins to crumble of its own, and then simply removed—a rather ingenious (and perhaps characteristically Japanese) compromise solution to the dilemma, which the city administration has proposed. Most survivors simultaneously feel various conflicting elements of the first and second sets of attitudes, and sometimes of all three. The inner conflict is something like this: For the sake of the dead and of our own sense of worth, we must give our experience significance by enabling it to serve wider moral purposes; but to do so—to be living symbols of massive death—is not only unbearably painful but also tends ultimately to be insincere and to insult, rather than comfort, the dead.

We return to the question we raised at the beginning: Does Hiroshima follow the standard patterns delineated for other disasters, or is it—in an experiential sense—a new order of event? We must say first that the usual emotional patterns of disaster are very much present in what I have already described. One can break down the experience into the usual sequence of anticipation, impact, and aftermath; one can recognize such standard individual psychological features as various forms of denial, the "illusion of centrality" (or feeling of each that he was at the very center of the disaster's path), the apathy of the "disaster syndrome" resulting from the sudden loss of the sense of safety and even omnipotence with which we usually conduct our lives, and the conflict between self-preservation and wider human responsibility which culminates in feelings of guilt and shame; even some of the later social and psychological conflicts in the affected population are familiar. Yet we have also seen convincing evidence that the Hiroshima experience, no less in the psychological than in the physical sphere, transcends in many important ways that of the ordinary disaster. I shall try to suggest what I think are some of the important ways in which this is true. And when these special psychological qualities of the experience of the atomic bomb have been more fully elaborated—beyond the preliminary outlines of this paper—I believe that they will, in turn shed light on general disaster patterns, and, of greater importance on human nature and its vicissitudes at our present historical juncture. We may then come to see Hiroshima for what it was and was both a direct continuation of the long and checkered history of human struggle, and at the same time a plunge into a new and tragic dimension.

The first of these psychological elements is one we have already referred to, the continuous encounter with death. When we consider the sequence of this encounter—its turbulent onset at the moment the bomb fell, its shocking reappearance in association with delayed radiation effects, and its prolonged expression in the group identity of the doomed and near dead—we are struck by the fact that it is an interminable encounter. There is, psychologically speaking, no end point, no resolution. This continuous and unresolvable encounter with death, then, is a unique feature of the atomic bomb disaster. Its significance for the individual survivor varies greatly, according to such factors as previous character traits, distance from the hypocenter at the time the bomb fell, fatalities in his immediate family, and many other features of his bomb experience and subsequent life pattern. There is little doubt that most survivors lead reasonably effective personal, family, and occupational lives. But each retains, in greater or lesser degree, emotional elements of this special relationship to death.

In the light of the Hiroshima experience we should also consider the possibility that in other disasters or extreme situations there may also be more significant inner encounters with death, immediate or longer term, than we have heretofore supposed. Psychiatrists and social scientists investigating these matters are hampered by the same factors which interfere with everyone else's approach to the subject: first, by our inability to imagine death, which deprives us, as psychiatrists, of our usual reliance upon empathy and leaves us always at several psychological removes from experiential understanding; and second, by the elaborate circle of denial—the profound inner need of human beings to make believe that they will never die—in which we too are enclosed. But these universal psychological barriers to thought about death become much greater in relation to a nuclear disaster, where the enormity of the scale of killing and the impersonal nature of the technology are still further impediments to comprehension. No wonder then that the world resists full knowledge of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki experiences, and expends relatively little energy in comprehending their full significance. And beyond Hiroshima, these same impediments tragically block and distort our perceptions of the general consequences of nuclear weapons. They also raise an important question relevant for the continuous debate about the desirability of preparedness for possible nuclear attacks: If the human imagination is so limited in its capacity to deal with death, and particularly death on a vast scale, can individuals ever be significantly "prepared" for a nuclear disaster?

The Hiroshima experience thus compels us, particularly as phychiatrists, to give more thought to psychic perceptions of death and dying. Here I would particularly stress the psychological importance of identification with the dead—not merely the identification with a particular loved one, as in the case of an ordinary mourning experience, but rather, as we have observed in atomic bomb survivors, a lasting sense of affiliation with death itself. This affiliation creates in turn an enduring element, both within, and standing in judgment of, the self—a process closely related to the experience of shame. Also of great importance is the style of dying, real or symbolic, the way in which one anticipates death and the significance with which one can relate oneself to this anticipation. Among those I interviewed in Hiroshima, many found solace in the characteristically Japanese (partially Buddhist) attitude of resignation, but virtually none were able to build a framework of meaning around their overwhelming immersion in death. However philosophically they might accept the horrors of war, they had an underlying sense of having been victimized and experimented upon by a horrible device, all to no

avail in a world which has derived no profit from their sufferings.

And this sense of purposeless death suggests the second special feature of the atomic disaster: a vast breakdown of faith in the larger human matrix supporting each individual life, and therefore a loss of faith (or trust) in the structure of existence. This is partly due to the original exposure to death and destruction on such an extraordinary scale, an end-of-the-world experience resembling the actualization of the wildest psychotic delusion; partly due to the shame and guilt patterns which, initiated during the experience itself, turned into longer lasting preoccupations with human selfishness (preoccupations expressed to me by a large number of survivors); and partly due to the persisting sense of having encountered an ultimate form of man-made destruction. Phrased in another way the atomic bomb destroyed the complex equilibrium which ordinarily mediates and integrates the great variety of cultural patterns and individual emotions which maintain any society, large or small. One must, of course, take into account here the disruption accompanying the extensive social change which has occurred all over Japan immediately following World War II; and one must also recognize the impressive reemergence of Hiroshima as an actively functioning city. Nonetheless, this profound loss of confidence in human social ties remains within survivors as a derivative of the atomic bomb experience.

A third psychological feature of particular importance in the Hiroshima disaster is that which I have called psychological closure. Resembling the psychological defense of denial, and the behavioral state of apathy, psychological closure is nonetheless a distinctive pattern of response to overwhelmingly threatening stimuli. Within a matter of moments, as we have seen in the examples cited, a person may not only cease to react to these threatening stimuli but in so doing, equally suddenly, violate the most profound values and taboos of his culture and his personal life. Though a highly adaptive response—and indeed very often a means of emotional self-preservation—it can vary in its proportions to the extent at times of almost resembling a psychotic mechanism. Since psychological closure, at least in the form it took in Hiroshima, is specifically related to the problem of death, it raises the question of the degree to which various forms of psychosis might also be responses to the symbolic fear of death or bodily annihilation.

The psychological closure created by the Hiroshima disaster is not limited to the victims themselves, but extends to those who, like myself, attempt to study the event. Thus, although I had had previous research experience with people who had been exposed to extreme situations, I found that at the beginning of my work in Hiroshima the completion of each interview would leave me profoundly shocked and emotionally spent. But as the work progressed and I heard more and more of these accounts, their effects upon me greatly lessened. My awareness of my scientific function—my listening carefully for specific kinds of information and constantly formulating categories of response—enhanced the psychological closure necessary to me for the task of conducting the research (necessary also for a wide variety of human efforts which deal with problems in which death is a factor). It is the vast ramification of psychological closure, rather than the phenomenon itself, that is unique to nuclear disaster, so much so that all who become in any way involved in the problem find themselves facing a near-automatic tendency to close themselves off from what is most disturbing in the evidence at hand.

Finally, there is the question of psychological mastery of the nuclear disaster experience. Central to this problem is the task of dealing with feelings of shame and guilt of the most profound nature; the sense that one has, however unwittingly, participated in this total human breakdown in which, in Martin Buber's words "the human order of being is injured." That such feelings of self-condemnation—much like those usually termed existential guilt—should be experienced by the victims of a nuclear disaster is perhaps the most extreme of its many tragic ironies. Faced with the task of dealing with this form of guilt, with the problem of reestablishing trust in the human order, and with the continuing sense of encounter with death, the survivor of a nuclear disaster needs nothing less than a new identity in order to come to terms with his postdisaster world. And once more extending the principle beyond the victim's experience, it may not be too much to say that those who permit themselves to confront the consequences of such a disaster, past or future, are also significantly changed in the process. Since these consequences now inhabit our world, more effective approaches to the problem of human survival may well depend upon our ability to grasp the nature of the fundamentally new relationship to existence which we all share.

Representative Gerald Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a nationally syndicated column which appeared August 2, 1963, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Columnist Holmes Alexander considered the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman GERALD R. FORD, an excellent possibility for the Republican vice-presidential nomination in 1964.

It is rather early for predictions, but certainly Congressman FORD's fine work as chairman of the House Republican conference shows his capability for leadership.

Mr. Alexander points out that committees of the House Republican conference appointed by Chairman FORD have made great progress in the study of several areas: nuclear test detection, minority staffing, space spending, improving the work of the conference.

I am confident that under his leadership this progress in the House conference will continue to reap benefits for the country and the Republican Party.

The text of the article follows below:

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD FORD

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Congressman GERALD FORD of Michigan, midcontinent in geography and midconservative in politics, gets frequent mention for the Republican national ticket of 1964. His national image is a little too dim at the moment for presidential likelihood, but he conceivably could run in second place for Barry Goldwater, Nelson Rockefeller, Tom Kuchel or General Lucius Clay. He would do credit to any ticket.

Just turned 50, a balding, onetime blond football star and boxing coach, GERRY FORD, in the role of a national candidate, would represent a trend that began in 1960. Three years ago, both parties left the old presidential supply sources, which for years had been the governorships and military shrines, and reached into the Senate. Mr. Kennedy was preferred to Stevenson, Mr. Nixon to Mr. Rockefeller. The Democrats did the incredible by fielding Senators Kennedy and JOHNSON, despite the fracture of precedent.

Today, with the Senate gone heavily liberal, most of the close party battles are fought in the House, where the Republicans keep gaining membership, and gaining quality, despite losing governorships, Senators and their only President since the great depression.

GERALD FORD came to Washington from Grand Rapids in 1948, when Harry Truman was scuttling Republican majorities in both Chambers and in the Gallup polls. A Yale Law School graduate and a Navy veteran, Mr. FORD took the slow way upward by inconspicuous work on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Defense Spending, the opposite number of Democrat GEORGE MAHON whom he greatly admires.

Mr. FORD was nearly always with the GOP leadership in votes, but not entirely in lock step with the plodding of the "Old Guardsmen." He was part of the youth movement in 1959 which overthrew JOE MARTIN and installed CHARLIE HALLECK as the Republican leader. Then, this year, Mr. FORD himself rode the surge for a new breed of party leadership. He unhorsed the elderly Representative HOEVEN of Iowa, a Halleck henchman, and became chairman of the hitherto moribund Republican conference.

Since then the conference has been a garrison post from which Ford-appointed subcommittees have made daring raids on a number of rather complacent Democratic positions.

The Hosmer, of California, subcommittee has hit the administration some telling blows on the matter of detecting nuclear blasts. Representative SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, leads a subcommittee which has awakened slumbering attention to the scarcity of minority staff workers. A new subcommittee under Representative GUBSER, of California, is readying a study of Democratic assumptions on space spending. An ad hoc subcommittee, headed by Representative POFF, of Virginia, is reporting on ways to improve the work of the conference itself.

By marshalling these and other youngish House Members, Mr. FORD has become something very admired on both sides, and in both parties, of Capitol Hill—a politician's politician. His rise is not dissimilar to the ascendancy a few years ago of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, although without L.B.J.'s flamboyant and publicity-conscious style.

Mr. FORD's economic conservatism would balance a Rockefeller ticket, and bolster a Goldwater ticket. His ideology, while activist and nationalist, is not doctrinaire. He can see some reason in bending a principle to make it fit a historical opportunity—such as invading Cuba at a ripe moment, aiding Yugoslavia to help split the Communist bloc, curbing civil rights (in which he deeply believes) at the point where they intrude upon property rights.

A go-slow, but go-forward product of the postwar House, Representative FORD is one of many Republicans who are willing to march, but not to stampede toward the betterment of his country and party.

Crime in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, enclosed you will find a copy of the crime

report here in the District of Columbia for the month of July 1963. I hope everyone will read this report and compare the crime in the District with the month of July 1962.

We hope that the Senate will pass the crime bill the House passed on Monday, August 12, as it will give the police department an opportunity to get out from under some of the regulations issued by the Commissioners, which the enclosed report shows have encouraged crime in the District:

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

During July 1963 a total of 2,309 part I offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 308 offenses or 15.4 percent from July 1962.

This was the 14th consecutive month with an increase in crime for this city. During this month increases occurred in the categories of criminal homicide, housebreaking, grand larceny, petit larceny, and auto theft; decreases occurred in the categories of rape, robbery, and aggrvated assault. Especially noteworthy is the substantial decrease (10.6 percent) in robbery this month.

The increase for this month brought the trend of serious offenses (number of offenses for the past 12 months) to 23,915, an increase of 1.3 percent from the fiscal year 1963, and an increase of 9.3 percent from the comparable total of last July.

Republicans Take Issue With Recommendations of Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl on Committee Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of the proceedings of the other body on Monday, July 22, I noticed several complimentary book reviews of the recent book by Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl, "Professional Staffs of Congress," which appeared in the 1963 Kansas Law Review, the Washington Star of April 21, 1963, and the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1963.

I recently had occasion to reply to these book reviews and a similar one which appeared in the Harvard Law Review, April 1963; since it appears to be so timely, I respectfully submit the text of that letter, which follows, to your consideration:

JULY 30, 1963.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
Harvard Law Review,
Gannett House,
Cambridge, Mass.

To the EDITOR:

Prof. Kenneth Kofmehl in his recent book "Professional Staffs of Congress," has indeed performed an interesting task by studying in detail the operation of the congressional committee staffing system in its formative years after the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. However, both Professor Kofmehl and your reviewer (Harvard Law Review, April 1963) seem to have ignored several important problems in the area of minority staffing.

Professor Kofmehl's fifth basic premise (p. 14) which relates directly to his subsequent recommendations on committee staffing, assumes that the main function of Congressmen is to act as intimate agencies for their constituents, and that therefore the principal danger is excessive staffing which will lead to the overinstitutionalization of Members of Congress.

However, since Congressmen are delegates to a national legislature, their function is to deal with national problems in the national interest as seen from their districts, not to be mere errand boys for those districts. It is true that historically Congress has often served in the latter capacity, but now, in the mid-20th century, with national problems growing more and more complex, our Nation can no longer afford this luxury, and the realization is growing among Congressmen that if Congress is to retain its constitutional role in our governmental system, it must equip itself to deal more effectively with national problems. This has initiated a fresh interest by Congress in congressional reform. It is scarcely believable that a political scientist would wish to discourage this attempt at reform and reconsign Congress to a role it wrongly acquired and is attempting to discard. Minority staffing is only a single facet, though an important one, of the entire problem of increased congressional staffing to equip the Congress to better fill its proper, and in this age necessary, role.

Increased congressional staffing, and especially minority (presently Republican) staffing, is imperative today to correct a situation in comparison with which the danger of overinstitutionalization of Congressmen pales into insignificance. The executive branch today is this country's largest pressure group. Every Federal department and agency is a lobby with a vested interest in successfully acquiring new appropriations, continuing old and initiating new programs. Administrative staffs unavoidably reflect this bias. Especially when the Presidency and both Houses of Congress are controlled by the same party; that is, when the same party controls both the congressional and also the vast resources of the administrative staff, it becomes imperative for the minority party in Congress (now the Republicans) to have adequate staff resources responsible to it, in order to fulfill the obligations of a responsible minority party to the Nation—to be informed, to criticize constructively, to propose soundly researched alternative legislation.

To imply, as Professor Kofmehl does, that congressional staffs can be nonpartisan, simply ignores political reality. Obviously staff members will have an allegiance to those members of a committee (the now Democratic majority) who hire and fire, promote and demote them, and have first claim on their time.

Professor Kofmehl also finds minority staff unnecessary and undesirable, because he incorrectly assumes cleavages within the parties which are more severe than the split between parties (p. 66) and which result in bipartisan support for most measures. Upon examination at the empirical level, Mr. Kofmehl's assumption breaks down. In the House of Representatives, where current demands for minority staff are strongest, many highly partisan committees may be identified, among them Education and Labor, Public Works, Agriculture, Banking and Currency, and Government Operations. Taking major items of legislation, partisanship in committee and on the floor of the House cannot realistically be assumed away. Prof. V. O. Key, of Harvard University, regards party affiliation as the factor most influential in the determination of a legislator's vote.

However, Professor Kofmehl goes a step further than assuming that nonpartisanship and the cleavages which cause it are empirically true; he also assumes they are theoretically desirable. This is a rather large assumption as it tends to become a self-fulfilling prophecy; minority staff should be denied because cleavages exist, whereas in many instances minority staff would tend to be an integrating factor, speeding the current trend toward more intraparty cohesion.

In dealing with this whole area one must ask two key questions. Is not the proper function of committees, as servants of their House, to expose issues for full floor debate? If so, partisanship is desirable as an aid to full debate. Can the minority perform any constructive functions if it is denied staff resources either through partisan abuse or through congressional understaffing in general? If not, the minority, and the committees as a whole, should be provided with enough staff to deal with the complex issues of our times and to act as a genuine check on the executive branch. The most disappointing aspect of Professor Kofmehl's book is that he does not answer these questions. He does not even ask them. He simply assumes them away.

We in the Congress who have to operate the existing system cannot do this, however. We have to work with a situation in the House of Representatives and in the Senate where Democrats outnumber Republicans 3 to 2 and 3 to 1, yet staff responsible to the Democrats outnumbers staff responsible to the Republicans 10 to 1 and 11 to 1 respectively. We see firsthand that this situation injures both the Congress and the people, whom it represents. To deal with the problem we have formed the House Republican Conference Committee on Increased Minority Staffing, whose members are Congressmen THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri; CHARLES GOODELL, of New York; ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan; JOHN LINDSAY, of New York; JOHN RHODES, of Arizona; PAUL SCHENCK, of Ohio; JOHN ANDERSON, of Illinois; JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire; CATHERINE MAY, of Washington; ROBERT MCCLORY, of Illinois; ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota; and myself as chairman; and the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Increased Minority Staffing including Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, chairman, Congressman THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, vice chairman, Senators CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska; WINSTON PROUTY, of Vermont, Congressmen GLENN LIPSCOMB, of California, and myself. These committees belie Professor Kofmehl's contention of intraparty cleavages. Their members come from every part of the country and represent the full liberal-conservative spectrum. But they are all Republicans.

Minority staffing is not a partisan issue. Republicans will not always be the minority and Democrats the majority. It is therefore strange that Democrats, who claim to speak for all the minorities, neglect so sadly the cause of the minority in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL.

The reviews to which this letter constitutes an answer were placed in the RECORD by a liberal Democrat. It is inconceivable to me that Members of the Congress of the United States should wish to reduce their own professional committee staffs and shackle themselves to the executive branch.

On serious reflection, I am sure, all Members of Congress desire a strong and effective Congress and will not wish to yield their constitutional prerogatives to the Executive as Professor Kofmehl suggests.

Union Monopoly Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the current labor dispute in the railroad industry is a very disturbing situation to the public, the Congress and our economy. We have witnessed this deplorable situation as a perfect example of what constitutes union monopoly power.

It is obvious that congressional makeshift solutions based in each arising labor crisis is not sound legislative procedure. What is needed is a complete study of union monopolies, and the eventual enactment of sound corrective legislation which will curtail future national labor disputes such as in the steel, maritime and now the railroad industry. How many times does this Nation have to be faced with virtual economic blackmail by a few labor leaders before they will awaken to the fact that a serious national issue must be solved?

I am encouraged that this Congress might be moving in the appropriate manner. Recently several of our distinguished Congressmen have proposed the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. This, at the very least, should be supported by every Member of Congress and I heartily endorse any measure which will create a national policy of sound labor-management relations.

Union monopoly power is not a newly created monster—it has been with us for a long time; it has come back to haunt the Congress, who basically created the privileges and immunities that a few labor leaders now maintain.

The major elements advancing union monopoly power are:

First. Immunity from the antimonopoly laws of the Nation.

Second. Industrywide bargaining power of unions.

Third. Compulsory unionism.

Fourth. Use of secondary boycotts.

Fifth. Featherbedding and other restrictive work practices.

Sixth. Violence in labor disputes.

Seventh. Lack of State and judicial authority over labor disputes.

There are a number of other important elements which go into the monopoly power of unions but I call these dozen points to the attention of Congress as a starting outline for any committee or individual who desires to make, as I have, a study of this subject. Some of these points are only outward manifestations of the basic root of the problem, which can be called union's diplomatic immunity from laws applicable to the rest of our economy.

Unless Congress seeks to control the basic cause of this problem, rather than hacking at the limbs, union monopoly power will continue and will even develop new and better ways of gaining further power.

In this regard, I respectfully call to the attention of Congress a bill which I introduced shortly after the opening of the 88th Congress. H.R. 333 is the identical bill introduced in the 87th Congress in 1961 and which has been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. This bill is composed of 15 pages of careful detailed solutions to this national problem.

H.R. 333 is a two-pronged approach. First my bill would eliminate a national emergency labor dispute by requiring that for bargaining purposes, no union could be larger in scope than a single employer with certain necessary exceptions. In this way an entire industry could not be closed down nor could an international union whipsaw one employer in an industry against another. Nor could several international unions gang up on an industry or employer to seek a common wage package.

This bill, therefore, gives back control to the local union best able to respond to the membership and better able to bargain and reach agreement in the light of the individual union member's needs and circumstances.

The second portion of H.R. 333 specifically describes those activities which would be a restraint against trade under the antitrust laws. Such union activities as featherbedding, controlling prices, interfering with production and restricting the number of employees entering a trade would all be prohibited.

Thus, national labor disputes of the proportion we are faced with today would never occur. Yet, all these objectives are accomplished without curtailing unions' right to strike, or further Government intervention such as compulsory arbitration.

Although my bill at present would not be applicable to the present labor crisis, it would, however, negate future national labor disputes from being created. It is for these future situations which I bring this bill to your attention.

I would welcome congressional bipartisan support for this measure and would hope that the House Judiciary Committee could conduct hearings on this measure. If constructive alternatives to my proposal are presented by any Member of Congress, I will do all I can to support such a measure. I do urge that Congress meet its responsibility to the Nation by seeking the necessary labor reform legislation.

The 175th Anniversary of the Town of Brookfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful town of Brookfield this year is celebrating its 175th anniversary. The Danbury News-Times has written a fine editorial tribute which I offer below with my own heartiest congratulations and best wishes. Brookfield, on historic Route 7 is easy to reach by automobile. While it appears that we are not to have any vacation this year, I still wish to invite all Members who may be in the New England area to visit Brookfield and all of Fairfield County. With its roots deep in American history, the county is today one of the most advanced industrial and residential areas of the country. Brookfield, lying in the northern section of the county also a scenic stretch of the Housatonic River, is one of the loveliest towns in the district. I am proud to add my own tribute on this occasion. I know that Brookfield will continue to reflect the best that is in America, past, present, and future.

The editorial follows:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, BROOKFIELD

Like several towns in this area, Brookfield was formed originally as a parish of the Congregational Church and the influence of one of the first pastors is preserved today in the name Brookfield.

The Ecclesiastical Society first organized there was known as Newbury. The "New" stood for both Newtown and New Milford and the "bury" for Danbury, for Newbury occupied parts of all three towns.

After the area was taken from the three towns and set off as a separate town by the legislative in its May 1788 session, the name Brookfield was chosen in tribute to Rev. Thomas Brooks, first pastor of Newbury.

It has the distinction of being the 100th town incorporated in Connecticut. Ninety-nine preceded it and 69 have followed it.

Brookfield will have a celebration Friday, Saturday and Sunday to mark its 175th anniversary.

There will be varied events, with sports contests, a block dance, a country dance, sports car rally, antique car show, a religious service and an auction among those scheduled.

Brookfield has seen more changes in the past 15 years than occurred in the previous 160 years. For the most part, they have been changes which help retain for Brookfield its place as one of the most attractive communities in Connecticut.

Happy birthday, Brookfield.

The 25th Anniversary of Shimshon, Youth Organization of Congregation Ahavath Achim in Fairfield, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to call the attention of the House to the 25th anniversary of Shimshon, the splendid youth organization of Congregation Ahavath Achim in Fairfield, Conn. Members from the age of 8 to 14 have, during this period, participated in an inspiring program of patriotic and civic activities. This wonderful group has helped to shape young lives and direct them along the finest paths of Jewish tradition, teaching love

of family, love of country, and love of God. Shimshon deserves the highest praise and congratulation for its work in the formation of strong character and good citizenship. I am proud to offer my congratulations and heartiest good wishes for its continued success. In particular, I want to salute the newly elected president, Jerry Busker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Busker, of 114 Poplar Street, Bridgeport; Mrs. Sylvia Kaplan, of 1585 Melville Avenue, Fairfield, the president of the mothers council; and the Honorable Samuel Mellitz who, as honorary president of the synagogue, has installed the youth officers for 25 years.

Nation and World Share Tennessee's Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened by the sudden and untimely passing of our late colleague and friend, Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. With other colleagues in the House and Senate, I attended the final rites for Senator Kefauver yesterday in Madisonville, which services were a fitting tribute to the memory of this courageous, tireless, and unselfish leader.

I was necessarily absent from the House on the day of the official announcement of the passing of Senator Kefauver, but I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great Tennessean and great American, and under unanimous consent I insert the very excellent editorial from the August 11 Nashville Tennessean, on the life and character and public service of Senator Estes Kefauver in the RECORD. The editorial from the Nashville Tennessean follows:

NATION, WORLD SHARE STATE'S LOSS OF A DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Upon learning of the death of Senator Estes Kefauver, a great many Americans across this broad land knew they had lost a great and stalwart friend in Congress.

Senator Kefauver had so often spoken and fought for the consumer—the little man—that innumerable people across the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude.

The tall man with the rough-hewn features belonged to Tennessee, but in a larger sense he belonged to the Nation and the countless people who had shaken his hand in primary campaigns and watched his work in the Senate.

A national magazine once said of him in an editorial: "We are not among his constituents but we wish we were. He is the Senate's ablest investigator. In defense of the general public interest he has been diligent, inventive, intelligent, reliable, and, above all, courageous."

For almost a quarter of a century, the senior Senator from Tennessee has battled patiently, continuously, and sometimes alone for the people of his State and Nation and, through his connections with the Interparliamentary Union of the Atlantic Alliance, the world.

His efforts were in behalf of their pocketbooks, their homes, their farms and cities, their basic freedoms, their health, and hopes of living in a peaceful world.

Senator Kefauver went to Washington believing deeply in certain progressive principles. He was determined to do something about them, and the broad sweep of his record attests to how much he did. He went about his work calmly and conscientiously, and that record has been one of courageous resistance against all sorts of pressure, threats, intimidations, and enticements.

He had his share of defeats, legislative and political. And he knew how to take them with dignity. He saw his hopes go glimmering on the floor of the 1952 Democratic Convention, and again in 1956. But he took his reversals with characteristic calmness and in good spirit.

The Senator retained from his presidential battles a most devoted personal following which existed to the day of his death. A Tennessean, visiting in almost any State from New Hampshire to Oregon is certain to find Kefauver admirers.

It is no particular mystery how Senator Kefauver was able to retain such a strong grip on the public's affections. Much of the strong feeling aroused by this tall Tennessean with a sincere smile and a hearty handshake was his sense of conviction and dedication about political goals—no matter whether it was a presidential primary or getting to the bottom of drug prices.

Senator Kefauver was in effect the underdog fighting for all other underdogs. He was a David among the Goliaths of the trusts, the oil cartel, the big pharmaceutical interests, or the crime syndicate. He plunged into fights where there seemed to be no hope of winning, where lesser men would have faltered and turned back.

In his struggles he incurred some powerful enmities, beginning with the machine of "Boss" E. H. Crump, of Memphis, and being added to when he launched the 1951 Senate crime hearings. In that inquiry he proved that racketeers were infiltrating the big city political machines. His trampling on political toes was to haunt him later, but he suspected as much in the beginning and wasn't deterred.

It was the forthrightness and conviction of Mr. Kefauver that cemented a friendship between him and the late Silliman Evans, Sr., publisher of this newspaper from 1937 to 1955. Mr. Kefauver wanted to have a greater part in the fight against "Boss" Crump, and decided to give up his House seat and run for the Senate.

He approached Mr. Evans for advice and was told he could count on the newspaper's support if he would make one promise—to shake 500 hands a day until election time. It was a promise Mr. Kefauver kept and the Nashville Tennessean became the first major newspaper to give him editorial support for the Senate.

The subsequent victory was political history in Tennessee, and the campaign symbol of a coonskin cap—made in response to a Crump remark about pet coons—was fixed in the political scene.

This newspaper did not always argee with Mr. Kefauver, or he with it. But on basic principles there never was a quarrel. There was never anything but pride for a Senator who ranked with men like George Norris, Bob La Follette and others in the quality of statesmanship.

There were occasions when Senator Kefauver stood alone or almost alone on a point of legislation, urging in his calm voice a course of wisdom and restraint. In the end, not only the Congress but his critics saw the pertinancy and wisdom of his view.

For example, he fought Senator John Bricker's efforts to hamstring the President's treatymaking powers. Of his stand, Senator Kefauver said: "It will not be popular, but I cannot in good conscience idly stand by without opposing what I consider a dangerous amendment which would seriously injure our foreign relations * * *"

His fight lasted for 2 years and in 1954 President Eisenhower came out strongly against the amendment, and it quietly died.

As a Senator, Mr. Kefauver will be remembered as one of the all time greats. As a friend, he will be remembered for countless incidents of thoughtfulness and kindnesses to so many.

He was a relaxing person with whom to visit, for his most striking characteristic was his unhurried pace, his calm manner, and methodical speech. He had that quality of being able to sustain two levels of thought, and his concentration at times was such it was mistaken for absent-mindedness of deep gloom.

He could chat with a friend in the folksy, homespun language of the general store, or in legal language while exploring the complex mazes of antimonopoly law. With equal facility he could discuss farm problems at the courthouse square or debate with parliamentarians in Europe's gilded halls.

He was a Roosevelt Democrat, a Truman Democrat, a Stevenson Democrat, and a Kennedy Democrat. And many who followed him in his support of others were first, last, and always Kefauver Democrats.

Senator Kefauver's death will be mourned throughout the State and Nation and across the sea. Tennessee's loss is the Nation's loss and that of free men everywhere.

A courageous and dedicated fighter has fallen. The gaping void left by his passing will not be easily filled, for such men come along but seldom.

Senator Kefauver has, by his total commitment to public service, human welfare, and better government, left his mark on the pages of contemporary history and in the hearts of all his countrymen.

Lobby Campaigns To Revive Bracero Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in May this House wisely defeated a 2-year extension of the Bracero Act. Since then we have been subjected to an intensive lobbying campaign by a small number of privileged growers to procure yet this session some type of extension. At the same time there is no lobby for the migratory farmworkers, one of the more underprivileged economic groups in American society.

In the light of this one-sided pressure now being exerted on the Congress, it is interesting to note the coverage of the battle given by the Washington Post on August 8 in an article entitled "Lobby Campaigns To Revive Bracero Bill."

The article follows:

LOBBY CAMPAIGNS TO REVIVE BRACERO BILL

(By Julius Duscha)

An intensive lobbying campaign is under way on Capitol Hill to revive the bracero bill.

Last May the legislation, which would permit the importing of Mexican farmworkers for 2 more years, suffered a surprise defeat in the House.

Since then the large corporate farmers in California, Texas, and Arizona who use near-

ly all of the braceros have organized a massive effort to rescue the bill.

SHOWDOWN IN HOUSE

The farmers are expected to win in the Senate, where a vote on the legislation is expected to be taken this week or next.

The real showdown will come later in the House, where the legislation will probably be brought to the floor for another vote and where the outcome is in doubt.

The farmers have enlisted the aid of canners and other food processors, who have been bombarding Members of Congress with letters, telegrams, and personal pleas for the extension of the legislation.

In their communications and personal visits to Senators and Representatives, the canners and other food processors have argued that some of them might be forced out of business if braceros were no longer available.

It is also argued that prices of fruits, vegetables, cotton, and other commodities picked by braceros would increase if the Mexicans could not be hired.

Canners and other food processors do not hire braceros, but the use of braceros on farms helps to keep down wage levels throughout the food-processing industry as well as among all farm laborers.

GENERALLY WORK TOGETHER

The big corporate farmers and the food processors generally work together on legislation. Big farms grow fruits and vegetables to processors' specifications.

By enlisting the processors in the battle for the use of braceros, the corporate farms also are seeking to bring national pressures for legislation that essentially benefits only the three States of California, Texas, and Arizona.

Of the 195,000 braceros—strong-armed ones—brought into the United States from Mexico last year, 180,000 worked in the three Southwestern States. Only 1 percent of all the farms in the United States use braceros.

The bracero program is an outgrowth of the World War II labor shortage. During the war "wetbacks" from Mexico swam across the Rio Grande or walked into the United States to work on farms in the Southwest.

In 1950, Congress passed the first bill legalizing the use of the Mexican farmworkers. It has been extended five times since then.

Under the program farmers must prove that they cannot find Americans to weed fields, harvest crops, and do other stoop labor that most braceros are employed to do before Mexicans can be hired.

Opponents of the program, led by labor unions and religious groups, say that Americans cannot be found to do such work because the wages paid by the farmers are so low. The pay is generally only about $1 an hour and ranges as low as 60 cents in some areas.

A Resolution Proposing a Study of the Feasibility of a National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for 11 years, I have urged the Congress to remove its blinders and accept my proposal for a national lottery as a means of painlessly raising additional billions of dollars in revenue to cut the heavy taxes shouldered by our American wage earners. However, the Ways and Means Committee has consistently and stubbornly refused to give this bill a fair hearing.

I have also suggested, Mr. Speaker, a referendum on the question of whether the Federal Government should sponsor a national lottery. Although several nationwide polls have shown that a majority of the American people favor a U.S. Government-run lottery as a means to cut taxes, the Ways and Means Committee has refused to give the voters an opportunity to express their feelings on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to create a select committee composed of 15 Members of this House, appointed by the Speaker, authorizing and directing this committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine the advisability and feasibility of using a Government-run lottery as a means of raising additional revenue for tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether anyone will question the fact that our present rate of taxation is discriminatory and unconscionable. Our Federal, State, and local taxes have reached the point of saturation and a level which has evoked resentment.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come to be logical and realistic, as well as sensible, about this matter. Only an important study and investigation, as recommended by my bill, can furnish the true answer to our fiscal problems and high taxes. I hope that this bill will receive serious and favorable consideration.

Patrick Bouvier Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, all of us were deeply saddened at the death last week of the infant son of the President and Mrs. Kennedy. It was a great loss to the First Family and our prayers are extended to them in this period of their bereavement. A most thoughtful editorial on the passing of Patrick Bouvier Kennedy appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News of Friday, August 9, 1963, and I would like to make this editorial part of my remarks today.

The editorial follows:

FORTY HOURS OF LIFE—PATRICK BOUVIER KENNEDY

In the less than 40 hours of life allotted to him, Patrick Bouvier Kennedy, who died this morning, achieved a prominence few individuals attain, even though they reach a full threscore and ten or even the century mark.

This tiny mite of humanity, who died, as he was born, prematurely, was in the limelight for every second of his brief span of life. The press of the world, as well as other media, followed his every move. No leader or hero, no matter how impressive his record, received more attention.

Millions, now living, will remember the name of Patrick Bouvier Kennedy long after most of his contemporaries are gone and forgotten.

This is, of course, a tribute to his family, especially to his parents, President and Mrs. Kennedy. It should also provide a measure of comfort for them in their hour of bereavement, as will the teachings of their faith that baptized infants are assured of a place in Heaven. They also have the satisfaction of knowing everything was done for him on earth.

God, however, had other plans for Patrick Bouvier Kennedy. These things, which are so hard for the finite mind to understand, must be accepted and not questioned, for his ways are not our ways. There are certain happenings that are beyond human comprehension and the death of an infant with everything to live for is among them. If we, as mature adults, are to believe that eternal life is the reward of all who serve the Divine Master with fidelity, Patrick Bouvier Kennedy is more fortunate than most in entering on it so soon. Then, there is the symbolism 40 hours has to Catholics as a devotion.

Be this as it may, President and Mrs. Kennedy will have the genuine sympathy of the American people under the circumstances. This is the third child they have lost, proof that tragedy is no respecter of persons. Despite their eminence and affluence, they have not been spared the heartaches of their fellow countrymen in more modest circumstances.

An earlier generation, on this occasion, will recall these poignant words of Calvin Coolidge when his 16-year-old son, Calvin, died while the father was in the White House.

"When he went, the power and the glory of the Presidency went with him."

Updating the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during my 8½ years in Congress, I have been a consistent supporter of the mutual security-foreign aid program, which I consider essential to our national security and to the attainment of our foreign policy goals. Such belief and such support, however, are accompanied by an equally strong belief in the need for a constant reappraisal, evaluation and strengthening of all Government programs, including foreign aid.

In this spirit, I submit for the attention of my colleague, a very fine editorial entitled "Aid That Aids" in the August 6 edition of that reputable organ, the Christian Science Monitor.

In part, the editorial states:

Some of the best news about U.S. foreign policy goes largely unnoticed. The very sensitive and highly important plan to make economic reform a condition of U.S. aid is beginning to bite.

It concludes by commenting:

The trend is good. This is a new era for foreign aid. There will be much less misuse of resources and a much sharper aim.

The entire editorial follows:

AID THAT AIDS

Some of the best news about U.S. foreign policy goes largely unnoticed. The very

sensitive and highly important plan to make economic reform a condition of U.S. aid is beginning to bite.

Item: The United States suspended part of its aid to the Congo, in order to compel a variety of fiscal and monetary reforms. This is a very genuine use of the old battle phrase about not pouring money down a rat hole. Aid is useless when an economy is out of control and deteriorating. Aid can actually be worse than useless, because it covers up the bad spots, postpones the inevitable reckoning and often makes it worse.

Item: The inter-American Alliance for Progress is shortly to adopt, mirabile dictu, a new committee to administer this delicate policy. It is to have executive powers to allocate aid in proportion to the recipient country's efforts at self-help. This almost radical forcusing of authority and responsibility in an international body was proposed by former Presidents Kubitschek of Brazil and Lleras Camargo of Colombia and is expected to be adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States at its fall meeting in Brazil.

Item: Considerable progress on measures of tax reform, land reform, and study of the process and techniques of economic development is reported from a working meeting of that same Economic and Social Council at San José.

These are things that the foreign aid system once rejected as improper, and now has established that it can do. To have the inter-American community accept this, as seems likely, is a triumph of no small dimensions.

This newspaper has repeatedly argued that aid must contribute to a pattern of economic growth, else it cheats both the lender and the user. Random projects, or politically motivated projects, or measures of economic support for the military, have often done just the reverse—worked against a sensible growth program.

There are awkward spots in the current picture, too. The State Department is probably doing a foolish thing to insist on a powerful Voice of America broadcasting station in India against heavy opposition. This has unavoidable cold war overtones however discrete the transmitter might promise to be. Also, Congress is likely to drive Indonesia into Communist Chinese hands by banning aid to that country as a committee seeks to do.

Some heavy cuts that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has made in Latin-American aid come awkwardly, just when a big effort to improve that aid seems about to be accepted by the recipients themselves. We have doubts, too, about the effort in Congress to ban loans for a government-owned steel mill for India considering the responsible character of India's development program. Only if this could reasonably reinforce a serious domestic effort to enlarge the private sector would it be advisable.

But the trend is good. This is a new era for foreign aid. There will be much less misuse of resources and a much sharper aim.

The Lower Depths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Lower Depths," written by the well-known columnist, Joseph Alsop, and published in the Washington Post of July 31, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOWER DEPTHS

(By Joseph Alsop)

PHILADELPHIA.—For any fairly prosperous white American, who is also proud of his country, on-the-spot reporting of the civil rights crisis in a big northern city like this one is an almost unbearably painful experience.

If anything, the situation of the Negroes here in Philadelphia is rather better than in most of the great northern cities. But go into Philadelphia's Negro slums, with their countless blocks of half-ruinous row houses, in which it is not uncommon to find 20 or 30 people living in 6 filthy little rooms, with a single, unspeakable common toilet.

You find squalid, teacher-short high schools from which more than three-quarters of the children drop out before completing the course. You are led to one 12-block area where 80 percent of the young were found to be jobless by a recent survey.

You hear such tales of slum landlordism as the case of the respectable and hard working Negro woman who is fruitlessly trying to collect damages because the floor of her apartment gave way, dropping her into the next apartment, where the floor also gave way, dropping her onto another unfortunate woman in the cellar and gravely injuring them both.

"Things are better," people tell you. But when you ask how much better, you get such an answer as I got from one of the leaders of the Philadelphia Ministers Conference, the Reverend Amos Brucker. He had been explaining how the ministers conference was using the weapon of the boycott to break job discrimination in large local industries.

"You can't imagine what it means to my people," he said very simply, "to see the gas meter being read or a few cases of soft drinks being delivered by men of their own race. Those are jobs involving money, receipts, paperwork. They weren't jobs for Negroes before just the other day."

Of such data, a few days' work will produce enough to fill a book. And on every page of that book will be written the shame, the dishonor, the failure of American society.

The 9 Americans in 10 who belong to the affluent America should be sentenced by law to spend 1 day a week in that "other America" that you find in the slums of North Philadelphia. See at firsthand, and the actual physical impulse to cry out for instantaneous, radical remedies is not easy to restrain.

See the situation at firsthand, furthermore, and you will learn the bitter truth that although discrimination is being worn away by daily pressure, the underlying problem is still growing more difficult rather than more easy. Already, the earnings of Negro women are estimated to exceed the earnings of Negro men by as much as 80 percent. There are more unskilled jobs open for women than for men; so the men rot in idleness and the women keep them.

Every building that installs automatic elevators abolishes 4 or 8 or 10 Negro jobs. Every industrial process improved to eliminate rough, strong-backed work eliminates 30 or 40 or 50 Negro jobs. And in Negro ghettos, educational deprivation has always gone hand in hand with economic deprivation; so those who lose their jobs as common laborers are never able to find jobs as skilled workers.

This is not just a Negro problem, either. In the "Other America" of economic and educational deprivation the national statistics show that more than half the inhabitants are white men and women and children in depressed areas or unlucky cities or impoverished rural regions. The time has come—indeed, the time came long ago—for a massive national effort to help all the inhabitants of this "Other America" to escape into normal American society.

For the Negro people, the end of racial discrimination is the most essential part of that effort. For all the inhabitants of the "Other America," huge investments are also needed, in education above all, but also in job retraining programs, in some sort of revived CCC to make a bridge into normal life for the jobless young people, and so on and on.

Even then, the problem will not be solved for the Negro people unless their leaders quickly begin to recognize an additional duty besides the duty to be militant against discrimination. Resignation, hopelessness, the feeling that "it's no use learning to do jobs that aren't for Negroes," have played and still continue to play as large a role in Negro educational deprivation as the shocking badness of so many segregated schools.

Only the Negro leaders can combat these ingrained attitudes of their own people. Only the Negro leaders can stimulate the block-by-block organization that is needed to combat slum conditions, and to insure better schools by strong parent-teacher organizations, and in many other ways to work from the grassroots to make life better.

Only the Negro leaders, in short, can make sure their people are ready to pass through the doors when the doors open at last. As for the rest of us, our task is to insure that the doors open wide and open fast; and if we fail, we shall be derelict in our duties to our country and our God.

The Invisible Costs of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are constantly harassed by the amount of paperwork that has to be taken care of over the slightest transaction in business or in government.

The following article gives a clear picture of this annoying modern development. This article appeared in a recent newsletter put out by the First National City Bank.

Most of this work is no labor of love, but a frustrating, aggravating labor in vain.

The article follows:

THE INVISIBLE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

As everybody knows, government costs a lot of money. Revenues of all our governments—Federal, State, and local—are running up past $150 billion a year, equivalent to $1,400 for every adult in the United States. While devoting tens of billions to putting a man on the moon—described by former President Eisenhower as "a mad effort to win a stunt race"—government has taken on dependents all over this earth. Checks go out to more than 40 million persons at home: 12 million to employees and the others to welfare beneficiaries. Abroad, no less than 95 countries and territories are receiving U.S. aid.

The true cost of government runs far beyond $150 billion a year. Many people, after

gathering figures and receipts all year long, worked on into the night last Easter on governmentally prescribed arithmetical exercises, filling the forms for Federal (and perhaps also State) income tax returns due the next day, April 15. No one has tried to calculate the manhours of dismal drudgery going into the preparation of tax returns. The rates of tax rise progressively. And so does the effort demanded. The more a man earns—and the more his time is worth—the greater the obligation imposed to amass detailed records and comprehend the complications of the law.

Form 1040, which 35 million persons find it necessary to use, can require upward of 500 entries (including supplemental schedules) and as many as 200 additions, subtractions, multiplications and divisions. The Superintendent of Documents in Washington has on sale a 144-page volume which elucidates some of the major technicalities. Yet no one can settle back and say he understands the whole of the law. Not only is the law itself in process of repeated change, but the regulations are changed and court decisions alter the interpretation of law and regulations. The Internal Revenue Service itself has a major problem of training qualified agents, numbering some 30,000. Publishing technical books on taxes, and advising people on taxes, have become big business. The core of tax experts outside government is represented in the 71,000 enrolled practitioners recognized by the IRS.

The work imposed on individuals is nothing compared to that imposed on employers. Not only are there many more forms but employers must serve as uncompensated tax collectors, taking money out of the pay envelopes of workers according to formula and, often, adding a tax bite assessed on customers. The IRS has a total staff of 64,000 and a budget of $674 million. These are big figures. But there is little doubt that business firms collectively employ even more people and spend even more money gathering in tens of billions of revenues.

And burdens of calculating and assessing taxes are just part of the story. Besides the IRS and State and local tax authorities, there are thousands of Government offices and agencies with overlapping jurisdictions over business. Thus, lying beneath the visible costs—set out in the budgets prepared at various levels of government—is an iceberg of invisible costs.

SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

Such costs take an infinite variety of forms, ranging from a simple postcard report for an official agency to interminable procedures required by regulatory authorities and tedious investigations launched by congressional committees or executive departments—all too often simply uncovering facts already known to anyone who has taken the trouble to find them. A major company may be called upon to supply hundreds of thousands of figures in a year's time. Many valuable statistics emerge from official compilations but the truth is that the quantity of data overwhelms the capacity of statisticians to digest them. Some required forms have no more important use than getting bundled up for sale as waste paper.

The second Hoover Commission gave some idea of the dimensions of the problem at the Federal level. As of 1955 it was estimated that paperwork within the Federal Government cost $4 billion a year, consumed 25 billion sheets of paper, required office space equal to 36 Empire State Buildings and storage space equal to 7 Pentagons. Paper handling is a more popular exercise than 50-mile hikes. It fans out across the country.

Forms go out to business firms and individuals to be completed and returned for regulatory, statistical, or tax purposes. Though the Hoover Commission made no overall estimate of the total costs involved, it pointed out that the private cost is far greater than the Government's cost of totting up the figures.

Since 1955, both costs have grown. By latest count, the Federal Government has some 5,300 forms in use for regular reporting. And this does not include reports to the IRS, certain other agencies of the Treasury Department, and the several layers of banking authorities, which are exempted from the Federal Reports Act.

These are, besides, reports for State and local government units. The Hoover Commission found that State and city governments impose more than 50 percent of the Nation's burden of paperwork.

As John E. Swearingen, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, describes the situation:

"We have arrived at the unhappy point at which the Cyclopean eye of some almighty regulatory agency is upon us when we buy or sell, ship or receive, hire or fire, grow or manufacture, save or spend, drink or diet, profit or lose, talk or listen."

Amid all the hue and cry about accelerating economic growth—which means cutting out useless effort and getting more production per manhour—we tend to ignore the multiplication of burdens placed upon people to comply with laws. And while we lament the shortage of employment opportunities, we overlook the endless rules and regulations that discourage people from going into business or invite them to get out.

COSTS OF TAX REPORTING

The most familiar kind of invisible cost to the average American is the paperwork involved in his income tax return. Partly because the tax rates are so high, the Government takes a proprietary interest in the money a man earns. And all the time people are being put to more and more trouble to defend their take-home pay. Even so, there was considerable public support for changes in expense account rules—including the requirement for the keeping of a day-to-day diary—put into the Revenue Act of 1962 as a means of checking abuses. This makes bookkeeping a large part of the job of everyone who has responsibilities to pay out money in connection with business travel.

In response to businessmen's advice, the IRS later loosened up a bit on the rules. But all this paperwork becomes a burden to the employer's tax department. One corporate executive, quoted by Business Week, predicted that "we'll have to rent a separate warehouse for the literally millions of pieces of paper we'd have to keep." No one will ever have a chance to go through them all. Nevertheless the law requires that they be there for years until the related tax returns are audited and approved or the statute of limitations mercifully permits disposal of the waste.

The scope for additional layers of State and local government taxation has been broadened by Supreme Court decisions giving them greater leeway for taxing out-of-State corporations. What this has meant in terms of paperwork burdens was effectively presented before the Special House Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce in June 1962 by Werner N. Davidson, secretary-treasurer of the Caloric Corp.:

"The cost of additional help to file only for state tax purposes, the space required for the storage of such otherwise useless records, the cost of one additional invoice copy for each charge to our customer, will add at least $20,000 annually to our cost of doing business.

"By taking into account machine time, salaries paid to our people who perform the tax reporting function, subscriptions for tax services, endless correspondence with taxing authorities to support our returns, payment of travel and per diem allowances to tax auditors of foreign states, we spend an additional $50,000 per year.

"Our corporation and its subsidiaries file a total of 999 tax returns of all kinds per year and the cost of each tax return amounts to $70."

Just in the year since his testimony, Mr. Davidson reports that the number of tax returns has risen further to 1,140. Larger companies have even more. In 1959, the Union Carbide Corp. was filing 3,600 tax forms a year.

CASE STUDIES FROM BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

Some other cases were presented in a 1959 report of the House Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics. One of the most striking was that of a large midwestern manufacturer, which kept a detailed record for 1 year:

"In the year, the company handled 173 different Federal forms ranging in frequency of filing from daily to annual, and involving the filing of 37,683 reports. The workload amounted to 48,285 hours. In addition, the company received a number of other Federal forms, presumably voluntary, which it did not respond to because it objected to the apparent duplication, felt that the data requested were confidential, or for other reasons. * * * Requests from State agencies which were complied with included 63 different forms, involving the filing of 1,145 reports at a cost of 3,266 hours."

While it is difficult to generalize, reporting requirements arise at the birth of a fledging enterprise and ever after distract from the work of keeping alive. The requirements tend to be heaviest for the biggest companies, for firms in regulated industries, for corporations holding Government contracts and for firms dealing in agricultural products.

Regulated industries typically have much more Government-imposed reporting and record-keeping expense than business generally. After the Hoover Commission study in 1955, some progress was made toward simplifying and thinning out reporting workloads in certain industries. The contrary drift is exemplied in the field of banking where financial institutions this year are being required to file information returns on each account with interest payments of $10 or more. Also, along with other payers of interest or dividends, banks are devoting a good deal of time and money to obtain social security numbers from customers to be put on reports to the IRS.

The classic case, of course, is that of the railroad business, put under the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887. Over the decades, reports required to meet the needs of the day were enlarged until the industry found itself preoccupied with paperwork. The last time the Association of American Railroads made a listing of the reports required by Federal agencies—in 1954—it took 10 pages to give the titles of 164 separate reports. This list did not include reports connected with the handling of mail.

Some reports are required annually, others semiannually, quarterly, monthly, weekly, daily or as certain events occur. The longest annual report, "Form A" of the ICC, runs to 117 pages of detailed schedules.

One monthly report for the Department of Agriculture is labeled:

"Report to USDA, San Francisco, of number of carloads of corn westbound passing Needles, Calif."

Such detailed reports are only one aspect of a general problem of overregulation of the railroads; reporting to the ICC alone is figured as costing more than $5 million a year.

Similar problems are found in other public utility fields. The Hoover Commission reported in 1955 that it cost gas and electric companies more than $14 million a year to prepare requests for rate changes. It cited one example of how expensive rate proceeding can be:

"One company fills its plane with several tons of documents and exhibits for such a case. Company executives are forced to fly to Washington separately in commercial airlines. Normally one or more Federal Power Commission representatives then visit the utility.

"Some measure of how lengthy a process this is, is the fact that the Government man commonly buys or rents a house in the locality, checks on schools for his children, etc. There he audits the company's books to see if they support the facts in the reports. In practice he seldom agrees with costs claimed by the company. His suggestions, therefore, cause the company to revise the voluminous data originally compiled."

Industry sources say $14 million is still a conservative estimate of rate proceeding costs, and that instances like the case cited above are not unusual.

NIGHTMARES AT HIGH NOON

Even if a manufacturer or distributor is not in a regulated industry, it may still find itself immersed in a similarly expensive procedure. An everpresent danger is the possibility of running afoul of the vague but potent antitrust laws.

In 1959, for example, three salt companies—Morton, International, and Diamond Crystal—were charged with fixing prices of rock salt. Two and a half years later, a Federal jury found them not guilty. In the interim, the work of assembling data and materials to defend themselves—plus lawyers' fees—had cost the three firms $775,000, a sum far greater than the $150,000 maximum in fines they might have been liable to pay if found guilty. But the invisible costs go beyond these figures. As reported by the Wall Street Journal, Morton Salt Co. president Daniel Peterkin described the lingering effects:

"We've been in business more than 100 years and we think we have a fine reputation. Anytime you're accused of violating the law, particularly the antitrust laws, it's extremely damaging to you. After acquittal, the damage still exists. The mere fact that you're accused is enough to hurt you in many people's minds."

A similar, but much lengthier, case involved Standard Oil of Indiana, which was cited for alleged price discrimination by the Federal Trade Commission in 1940. After extensive litigation involving two trips to the Supreme Court, the company finally won its case in 1958.

President Swearingen, however, found the victory worth the cost:

"In our judgment, the net effect was to preserve a competitive system for American business, but it took 17 costly and trying years of litigation to do it. And, to preserve our right to compete, we had to fight off a Federal agency originally established to insure the continuance of effective competition.

"I submit that this is the kind of thing that can give any responsible businessman nightmares at high noon. In our instance, the continuing threat to our ability to compete also threatened the interests of our thousands of stockholders and employees."

ATTEMPTS TO STEM THE TIDE

While the growing burden of paperwork and other expenses imposed by Government has naturally evoked recurrent protests, attempts to stem the tide have met with only limited success.

In 1942, when World War II had stimulated a vast outpouring of Government regulations and requests for information, Congress passed the Federal Reports Act, authorizing the Bureau of the Budget to coordinate Federal reporting with a view toward eliminating duplications and minimizing burdens. In 1951, during the Korean conflict, this authorization was supplemented by an Executive order.

The Budget Bureau's Office of Statistical Standards, charged with carrying out this function, has been largely responsible for making the Federal statistical system more orderly and appreciative of the needs of the public and of the problems of respondents. Helping to accomplish this has been an Advisory Council on Federal Reports, sponsored by five national business groups.

The work of these groups was given impetus by the Hoover Commission. But, as the Office of Statistical Standards has pointed out, progress is slow and requires contining, persistent efforts because changes in administrative reports involve legal or policy problems.

THE NUB OF THE PROBLEM

Therein lies the nub of the problem. The growth of "invisible costs" has accompanied the expansion of Government activities—through the great depression, two major wars and the postwar burgeoning of the welfare state.

As more and more money is disbursed by public agencies and as more private activities are regulated by Government, public officials want at hand more minute information about what's going on. Hence, more paperwork.

It is perhaps no accident that the agency with the largest number of regularly required reports—the Agriculture Department—is the one that encountered outright rebellion last May when wheat growers, in a national referendum, rejected high price supports and tighter controls. There comes a time when self-respecting individuals resist encroachments upon their privacies and freedoms.

About the worst thing that can happen to a people is to become servants of the state. It is well to recall the warnings of Alexis de Tocqueville, more than a century ago, describing how despotism might conquer a democratic society:

"Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild.

"After having thus successfully taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting.

"Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd."

The 344th Anniversary of First Legislative Body in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I prepared for delivery on the occasion of the 344th anniversary of the First Legislative Body in America.

This celebration was held at Jamestown, Va, on July 30, 1963, and was sponsored by the Jamestown Foundation, of which my friend, the Honorable Lewis J. McMurran, Jr., is chairman.

By reason of the sudden and serious illness of Mrs. Byrd, I was unable to be present and my address was read by the Honorable THOMAS N. DOWNING, Member of the House of Representatives from the First Virginia District.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 344TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST LEGISLATIVE BODY IN AMERICA

(NOTE.—Speech by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, prepared for occasion of the 244th anniversary of the First Legislative body in America, Jamestown, Va. Delivered in absence of Senator BYRD by Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, Member of House of Representatives from the First Virginia District.)

It is a pleasure to be here today with so many friends to commemorate the anniversary of the first legislative body in America, which was convened 344 years ago on July 30, 1619.

The efforts of the Jamestown Foundation in arranging these ceremonies, in cooperation with the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, and the National Park Service, are appreciated.

Jamestown is part of the heritage of all Americans, wherever they are, and it is appropriate that the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Federal Government, and individuals through the APVA should work together for its preservation.

It is an honor to participate in these ceremonies with my friend Lewis McMurran and the trustees of the Jamestown Foundation, along with representatives of the government of Virginia, and others who are here.

I could never come to Jamestown without expressing my gratitude to the APVA for its untiring and invaluable work, over the years. I doubt if we would be here today, had it not been for the early interest of that organization.

And I am always delighted to be in company with Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. I regard him as one of the most able men in public life, and I think the Park Service is one of the most worthwhile of Federal agencies.

I suspect that it was more than coincidence that Mr. Wirth chose the site where our Nation has its roots for the beginning of the Park Service Mission 66 under which the Service has made such fine progress.

With Jamestown as a symbol, areas included in the National Park System mirror both the Nation and the history of its people. It is preserving the scenic areas such as Yellowstone, and the scientifically wonderful areas such as the Grand Canyon.

And then there are the cherished historical areas, numbering about 100, with Jamestown at the beginning of the list. The cooperation between the APVA, the Park Service, and the State here at Jamestown is a source of great pride.

It has been noted here that this year marks my 30th anniversary in the Senate of the United States. I am sincerely grateful to you and all of the people of Virginia for this high privilege.

Over these years we have witnessed some epic events. Tremendous changes have occurred in the world. Some national governments have fallen. Many new nations have been created.

But under a system of government envisioned at Jamestown, the United States

has grown great and to a position of world leadership. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and the best.

But we are showing signs of weakness: Staggering national debt, continuing Federal deficits, widespread civil disorder, and disregard for economic and fiscal discipline. These are matters of deep concern.

Our early crises were met and mastered on this sacred spot beginning in 1607. It may be appropriate for us today to turn to the stalwart men who have gone before us for the stern guidance needed in our time.

Historically, basic moral and political issues have appeared time and again in different form. Toynbee, the historian, says the manner in which a civilization meets its challenges determines whether it stands or falls.

What are the lessons for us to be drawn from the experiences of those who founded the first permanent English settlement in the new world here at Jamestown? I am thinking of at least three we should never forget.

Too many of those first settlers, despite the hazards of the Atlantic, looked to Mother England for provision of their food and clothing; and many of them died needlessly in the starving time winter of 1609–10.

The wiser men had realized that the sooner the company became self-sufficient, the better the chance to survive and prosper; they needed fisheries, food crops, and tobacco for trade in England. And their wisdom finally prevailed.

This is Jamestown's first lesson: Man's first duty to himself is to be as independent and as self-sufficient as possible. John Smith and John Rolfe knew that survival accepts no substitute for work.

Successful culture of tobacco for export, and other developments, attracted new settlers, and as the colony grew the people became restless under harsh martial-type rule. And this leads to Jamestown's second lesson.

The London Co., influenced by Sir Edwin Sandys, granted the so-called Great Charter for Virginia. This abolished the company ownership of land and tools, and substituted rule of law for martial restriction.

As we know, much more was to happen; but it was this action by the London company which permitted the colonists to elect their own representatives and participate with the company in making the laws for their own government.

Sir George Yeardley, as Governor, called the first elected representatives in the new world into their first assembly on July 30 of the old calendar 1619, here at this place on the banks of the historic James River.

When they arrived from their respective settlements along the river, they met with the Governor and his council of advisers in the old wooden church, and for the next 5 days—without the benefit of air conditioning—they made history.

This set the precedent for all succeeding British colonies in America to share in the making of laws, levying taxes, and other local matters. Dr. Charles M. Andrews, the historian, says:

"The principle was finally laid down that a royal colony should be, in part at least, a self-administering community, with a Governor and council appointed in England and a representative assembly chosen by the freemen or freeholders of the colony * * * a factor of vast consequence in the development of American political practices."

The blessing of freedom which can be gained under representative government is the second lesson of Jamestown. But success depends upon sound economic conception and individual responsibility toward government.

We have seen regimes in Central and South America and elsewhere go by the board because they lacked sound fiscal basis, or the willingness, or capability, to accept responsibility for honest efficient government.

There is one more Jamestown lesson on my mind today. Popular government had been in effect in Virginia only 16 years when relations between the Governor and the assembly came to a critical point in the colony's affairs.

As we know, the separate but equal status of legislative, executive, and judicial branches is fundamental to our system of government. It provides the balance, and establishes the checks against usurpation of power.

Like more recent experiences with executives, the colonists in 1635 had difficulty with Governor John Harvey who sought to override the will of the assembly. As matters grew worse, the assembly met and forced him out.

Although Governor Harvey partially cleared himself in London and returned to Virginia, his experience stood forever as a warning to colonial governors that they were answerable to the people of the colony.

History might have been different if this warning had been heeded by Governor Berkeley in 1676, or King George III a hundred years later. They should have known the people of Virginia would resist arbitrary rule.

It is not necessary here to trace the spread of representative government. Ours is not a pure democracy, but it is a brilliant and practical approach to it; and Virginians take pride in their contributions to its development.

The people of no colony had a greater role in the growth of our political institutions than the people of Virginia. And when the Federal Union was constructed after the Revolution, Virginia could offer the unsurpassed skills and talents of George Mason, George Wythe, George Washington, Edmund Pendleton, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Edmund Randolph, and John Marshall.

The lessons of Jamestown are still clear for those who will accept their guidance. They provide a lodestar to set the course for good government in the United States.

If we would practice the lessons in the power of freedom and self-government we learned at Jamestown, I would have no fear for the future. We would meet the challenges of today—at home and abroad—firmly and justly.

We would recognize our weaknesses and correct them.

We would recognize the virtues of prudence and industry.

We would protect our people against civil disorder.

We would provide for our national security.

We would promote our enterprise system.

We would preserve our form of government and our freedom.

Let me conclude with the words of His Majesty's Council for Virginia to the settlers as they departed in 1606: "The way to prosper and achieve good success is to make yourselves all of one mind for the good of your country and your own, and to serve and fear God, the Giver of all Goodness."

We need frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and the courage to put them to good use.

Poland Steps Up Curbs on Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since emphasis has been placed in recent weeks on the East-West thaw and statements have been forthcoming from the State Department, complimenting the liberalization policies by eastern European satellite regimes, it is practical for us to take note of reports from Poland of increased persecution by the Communist government of the Catholic Church.

As evidence of this fact, I submit for the RECORD an article which appeared in the August 9 edition of the New York Times, indicating the repression carried on by the government against religious activities.

It is ironic that State Department experts do not take note of the actual conditions behind the Iron Curtain, but rather see fit to accept at face value the public pronouncements by the Communist regimes.

The article follows:

POLAND STEPS UP CURBS ON CHURCH: ANNUAL REPRESSION AFFECTS INSTITUTIONS AND PILGRIMS

(By Paul Underwood)

WARSAW, August 8.—The annual summertime step-up of pressure by Poland's Communist regime against the Roman Catholic Church is underway, informed sources reported today.

As in previous years, the Government has taken advantage of the vacation period to slice off some of the church's ancillary activities.

The sources said it may be some time before the full effect is known but the following steps have been confirmed:

A nursery in Warsaw operated by the Sisters of the Resurrection has been closed. The nuns who conducted it were transported by truck, along with their belongings, to a convent of the same order elsewhere in in Warsaw.

Two seminaries in Cracow have been ordered to turn over part of their dormitory space to the authorities.

The Government has barred organized pilgrimages from Warsaw to Czestochowa for the annual Assumption Day rites there, always one of the great manifestations of Polish Catholicism.

REGIME CITIES EPIDEMIC

In issuing the ban on pilgramages, the Government pleaded the necessity to prevent the spread of a smallpox epidemic that has broken out in the southwestern city of Wroclaw. However, the regime has made no move to bar ordinary tourist travel throughout the country.

Taking advantage of this, one group of more than 1,000 pilgrims left Warsaw yesterday, traveling as tourists rather than in their customary religious procession.

The closing of the Warsaw nursery appeared to be a continuation of an action started last year. In a pastoral letter issued last August 15, Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski complained about the seizure of two other nurseries run by the Sisters of the Resurrection.

The regime's moves this summer took many observers in Warsaw by surprise. Despite a sharp attack by Wladyslaw Gomulka, the First Secretary of the Polish Workers (Communist) Party, on the Polish bishops earlier this year, there had been signs of an improvement in church-state relations.

A joint church-state commission has been reactivated after several years of inaction. Both the Government and the official press raised the late Pope John XXIII as a man of peace and applauded the election of Pope Paul VI as his successor.

Even Mr. Gomulka's attack on the bishops, delivered July 4, in a speech to a plenary meeting of his party's Central Committee, was not considered an indication of trouble ahead. The Communist leader devoted only two paragraphs of a 4-hour speech to the church, charging the bishops with hostility to communism.

The Government has sought in recent years to avoid a dramatic major conflict with the church but has worked steadily to reduce the church's influence. The annual summer action normally does not involve interference with religious services or worship but is aimed at the slow elimination of the church's ancillary activities, such as schools, hospitals, charitable institutions and social work.

One of the Government's weapons, used against the Cracow seminaries, is a housing law rationing the living space of an individual and providing for the seizure of any surplus.

"HIKERS" VISIT SHRINE

WARSAW, August 8.—Hundreds of Roman Catholics took part today in a 120-mile pilgrimage on foot to see the famed "Black Madonna" painting in the monastery at Czestochowa. They went as "hikers" because of the Government ban on a formal procession.

REA Still Growing on the Western Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in this day of electronic computers and space satellites, the small Montana city of Troy is mobilizing to celebrate the coming of electrical power to a long, narrow, mountain valley. Such celebrations are a continuing tribute to the wisdom of the Rural Electrification Administration program of the Roosevelt era, and continued by the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations. Loans at reasonable rates of interest from the public treasury bring the benefits of electrical energy to remote areas—electrical energy which 90-odd percent of America views as part and parcel of the necessities of life. It is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article from page 1 of the August 8, 1963, edition of the Western News, of Libby, Mont.:

OCTOBER 10 IS TENTATIVE DATE SET FOR DEDICATION OF YAAK SUBSTATION

Citizens of Troy are making plans to celebrate the coming of power to a long, narrow, mountain valley. Electric power this fall will begin to flow over 21 miles of new line built up the remote Yaak River valley.

Northern Lights, a tristate cooperative with headquarters at Sandpoint, Idaho, will spend nearly $125,000 in the next 2 or 3 years to bring power to the area and about $75,000 will be expended this year, according to William T. Nordeen, Northern Lights general manager. Nordeen said the co-op will serve 83 customers in the Yaak.

Bonneville Power Administration has started construction on a $56,000 substation to tap its 115,000-volt line between Bonners Ferry and Troy.

The Troy Business and Professional Men's Club is organizing the celebration for the big day when a switch is thrown to energize the substation and the first 21 miles of the new line up the valley. That day is expected to be October 10.

The honored guests will include the residents of Yaak Valley.

Invitations also are going out to industrial and public leaders in northern Idaho, western Montana, northeastern Washington, and Washington, D.C.

Among those invited are Gov. Tim Babcock, BPA Administrator Charles F. Luce, U.S. Senators LEE METCALF and MIKE MANSFIELD, and Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN.

Robert Steiner, Troy District ranger for the Kootenai National Forest, is chairman of the committee. Other members include Robert Souhrada, Howard Hunt, Gerald Kensler, Charles Cone, Oscar Cooley, Ford Cripe and Ray Cole.

"It took a lot of work by the valley residents and the cooperative efforts of the Forest Service, Northern Lights, Bonneville and the General Telephone Co. to get the line started," Steiner said. "This is a great day for the folks up the Yaak Valley and we intend to see that it gets proper recognition."

Foundations for the substation are being laid, and Northern Lights crews have cleared nearly all of the right-of-way.

The total number of residents in the Yaak is estimated at 150.

The valley is one of the last settled areas in the Nation to be without central station electric power. A few of the larger farms have small gasoline generating units that provide electricity. A ranger station, sawmill and gold and silver mine have diesel generators.

About 80 homes are strung out along the Yaak River road for a distance of 45 miles from U.S. Highway 2. There are two concentrations of population. One is 13 miles from the highway at the Sylvanite Ranger Station where there is a school, 17 homes and the sawmill. The other is the settlement of Yaak 31 miles from the highway.

Landmarks at the settlement include an abandoned Air Force radar station which was equipped with diesel generators, and a tavern named the Dirty Shame, Jr.

Sylvanite Ranger Station and the mill, which is owned by Bruce Leighty, will be the two heaviest users of electricity on the line. Twenty-five men work at the sawmill. An equal number of loggers supply it with logs.

The ranger station has a permanent staff of 17 men and a summer work force that goes as high as 60 men.

Dr. Charles Seymour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut and the Nation both have lost an outstanding citizen in the death of Dr. Charles Seymour. As president of Yale, he led a great university through depression, war, and the vast problems of the postwar period. He did it all with grace, courage, and foresight. We probably will remember him most for his inflexible defense of academic freedom which he coupled with a recognition of the tremendous responsibilities which such freedom carries. From his high position as head of one of the free world's great universities, he consistently warned against dangers of governmental encroachment on academic freedoms. In one of his last speeches as president, he declared:

We insist upon the importance of our independence from external control, whether, as in early days, it was threatened by clerical or denominational influence, or today, as we recognize the perils implied in a system of governmental grants. We cannot carry forward our special mission unless we are free to do so in our way.

It is certain that Dr. Seymour fulfilled his special mission magnificently. We have lost a wise gentleman whose influence will long survive him to the lasting benefit of American education.

Foreign Aid Dollars Come Back to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, critics of foreign aid often have charged that our foreign aid funds are funneled down a rathole from which there is no return.

Unfortunately, few people realize that when we appropriate money for this purpose we are not shipping all those dollars overseas but actually are helping to promote the economy of our Nation, our individual States and our own communities.

At present nearly 80 percent of the foreign aid dollars spent to assist nations to buy products return to the United States. In the case of loans for development, the return is more than 90 percent. Factories and workers all across America are benefiting directly from oversea orders made possible by foreign aid. It is estimated that the aid program affects 700,000 jobs directly and even more indirectly.

According to conservative estimates, firms in my home State of Wisconsin received a total of $30,851,200 in foreign aid procurement orders in the period between January, 1954, and May, 1963. Figures released by the Agency for International Development just today show that foreign aid orders to Wisconsin companies totaled $171,027 last month for a cumulative total of $1,990,340 for 1963.

I have used Wisconsin as an example of what is occurring all across our Nation. A recent article in the Washington Post contained further information on the impact of foreign aid on our domestic economy. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

MOST FOREIGN AID NOW SPENT WITH U.S. FIRMS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—Early last summer a steel mill in Birmingham was preparing to close because of lack of orders. At the last moment the company obtained an order to produce 56,000 tons of railway track and fastenings for Pakistan.

The order meant that the jobs of an estimated 1,100 persons at the mill or in the railroads and factories that service the mill were saved.

It meant employment and income to the port of Mobile, which handled the shipments, and payments of $1.4 million to American shipping lines which handled the equipment to Pakistan.

This was a foreign aid order. It is but one of a large number of examples of the impact of foreign aid on the domestic economy.

MONEY COMES BACK

In the first 6 months of the current fiscal year, 77 cents of every foreign aid dollar spent for commodities went to American firms.

Because of this increasing reliance on American suppliers to fill foreign aid requirements, foreign aid is gaining an important constituency. It is too early to measure exactly the strength of the constituency and its influence on Congress, but its weight has been felt. Some persons think the program may no longer be quite so unpopular on Capitol Hill.

Farmers long have known that were it not for food-for-peace shipments, their surpluses would be larger and their incomes smaller. Shippers also have recognized the direct benefit to them from foreign aid. Now business and labor are learning that they have a stake in the aid program.

NO DIRECT ORDERS

The Agency for International Development (AID) does not award contracts to American suppliers. It authorizes loans to a country and requires the country to buy materials for the aid project in the United States to the largest extent possible. The recipient country, working through middlemen, makes the awards to individual suppliers in the United States.

Recently a number of business advisory services have provided American businessmen with advice on how to get these orders. The Commerce Department provides free service in line with its efforts to promote exports.

Some Congressmen are pleased to be able to announce that a company in their district has just received an order to manufacture road-building equipment for Ecuador or drugs for India. Some other Congressmen complain that AID is using these announcements to try to influence their votes.

When AID learns that an order has been placed with an American company, it gives the information to the Senator and Representative from the State and district involved so that they may make the original announcement if they wish to do so.

As late as 1960, 49 cents of every American aid dollar used to buy commodities was spent in Western Europe. Now only about 8 cents of every dollar is spent in Europe.

Procurement in the underdeveloped countries, which is still encouraged, has increased from 10 cents on the dollar in 1960 to 15 cents at present. Most of the purchases in the underdeveloped countries consist of such items as petroleum, crude rubber, lumber and fiber products.

The American share of commodity expenditures increased from 40 cents on the dollar in fiscal year 1960 to 41 cents in 1961, 64 cents in 1962 and 77 cents in the first half of fiscal 1963.

SHARE IN BUSINESS

Forty-four States and the District of Columbia shared in the business last year. AID press releases report such orders as $20,615 to a Troy (Ohio) supplier of welding equipment for India; $37,943 to a Scranton (Pa.) manufacturer for yarn for South Korea; $6,586 to a Connecticut pharmaceutical company for South Vietnam; $3.1 million to Trans World Airlines for aviation equipment for Ethiopia.

As one AID official explained, "The largest part of our foreign assistance is not money but rather the shipment abroad of American goods and services needed by recipient countries."

Military assistance is almost entirely in American-built materiel and American-supplied training. Virtually all the loans of the Export-Import Bank are disbursed to American producers of capital equipment for use overseas.

Bobby Kennedy's Totalitarian Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will shortly be considering the administration's measure on civil rights, it occurred to me that Mr. Lucius Beebe's article on the subject certainly gives one point of view which is worthy of consideration by the House. His article appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on Monday, August 12, 1963:

BOBBY KENNEDY'S TOTALITARIAN PRESS

(By Lucius Beebe)

Although prudence does not suggest the entry into the current and now long overplayed, overextended, and overprejudiced civil rights hassle on any but the side of the angels, which is overwhelmingly the side espoused by the American newspaper and periodical press, especially in regions where civil rights were never in question, it may yet be possible to raise a still, small voice to ask if the whole business hasn't been carried to unseemly lengths for the self-interest of a number of people in no way concerned in it?

To name right out in meeting two of the most gratuitous beneficiaries of the tumults and commotions they have recklessly instigated and which will for a long time endanger the peace of the community, the sensational and irresponsible newspaper press and a number of its weekly contemporaries run neck and neck with the Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy.

No Kennedy, father or son, has ever let any consideration of statesmanship, the public welfare, responsibility to high office or the amenities of public conduct stand in the way of his personal political advantage. No shadow or trace of the high standards of official integrity to which even the meanest opportunists and time servers in Washington pay at least lipservice has ever clouded his thinking.

The maintenance of himself and his family in positions of power has been the only standard by which the Attorney General has ever measured any public action or private conniving, and he saw in the alleged "Negro revolution" an opportunity no rabble-rousing demagog could afford to let slide.

It is a safe bet, predicated on the Kennedy family tradition of opportunism in politics, that Robert Kennedy cares less for the advantage of the Negro cause or for his loudly espoused civil rights program than Governor Faubus or any of the self-declared segregationists of the Deep South. It is a bet that assuredly will find no takers in the editorial rooms of any informed newspaper in the land.

Yet, despite the enlightened sophistication which obtains in all American newspaper offices regarding the motives governing any aspect of public policy by the younger Kennedy, the press of the Nation has ranged itself with totalitarian solidarity behind him in an issue he has ruthlessly exploited for his own political advantage and with a cynicism unknown to American politics until the ascendancy of the Kennedy family.

With doomsday screeches or rectitude and social-minded breast beating to endanger the human rib cage, the supposedly responsible newspaper and magazine press of the Nation has gone all out and without any least qualifying trace of impartial aloofness for a cause that has to date manifested itself in little but riot, mob rule, civil commotion, and tangible evidence of immaturity and incapacity for self-government from which these same editors avert their gaze in dismay when confronted with their precise parallels in Africa.

The reporting of Negro disorders in the South, both pictorially and editorially, has been so prejudiced in favor of mob rule by a lawless minority as seriously to compromise the reputation of the American newspaper press for dispassionate reporting. It has abounded in the now familiar photographic record of Negroes set upon by "ferocious and inhuman" police dogs and repulsed with fire hoses out of all proportion to the importance or significance of the episodes involved, and only the Luce magazines, to their incalculable credit, have even tentatively printed photographs of vast mobs of hostile Negroes taunting and setting upon lone unarmed policemen or of Negro hoodlums baiting police dogs with garments as a bullfighter incites a bull in the ring.

Like the great and universal smear of the Birchers, the newspaper smear of honest segregationists and States rights advocates, especially in regions where the question has no least local applicability, has been too pat and too unanimous to escape the suspicion of a widespread conspiracy. The editorial attitude of the American newspaper press is no longer, to the sophisticated intelligence, believable. It is as totalitarian in the matter of "civil rights" as the police-dominated official press of Communist China. And as shatteringly boring.

No voice has been raised to suggest that perhaps full membership in the club might well be predicated on its being earned and deserved by Negro aspirants rather than on mob rule and civil insurrection instigated by the Attorney General of the United States.

Nor has any voice been raised to point to the sober, factual record of a large and conspicuously respectable class of colored people with eloquent success stories who are in the upper income tax brackets, respected professionally for their scientific and economic achievements, and who go about their business in civilized circles without consciousness of racial discrimination of any sort.

The newspaper and magazine press of the Nation has reduced the Negro population to an estate of filth, blasphemy, ignorance, crime, and squalor dictated only by its hanker for unbridled sensationalism and circulation through shock impact. The Attorney General of the United States views the colored population with equal cynicism as nothing more or better than a limitless source of political suffrage.

A large part of the intelligent population of the United States is coming to view the whole business as a contrived imposture and an unmitigated bore.

Georgia Mayors Oppose Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Georgia Municipal Association has sent to me a timely and well-expressed resolution which opposes the report of the Committee on Equal Opportunities within the Armed Forces. I find the resolution reflects my own convictions on this important threatened invasion of civilian authority in America and I am glad to call the attention of the House Members to the

resolution passed unanimously by leading mayors of Georgia:

A RESOLUTION BY THE LEADING MAYORS OF GEORGIA

Whereas the President of the United States has appointed a "Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services"; and

Whereas this committee in its report to the President has recommended certain actions, to be enforced through the Military Establishment, the objective of which is to force compliance with executive policy upon business establishments and other facilities in proximity to military bases, including among other things, recommended use of "off limits" powers, the replacement of local transportation facilities with military transportation and even possible closing of bases; and

Whereas at least one of the committee recommendations has been placed in effect; and

Whereas this action is of direct and vital concern to municipal officials; and

Whereas the scope of the action recommended exceeds the normal and traditional function of military command in its relationship to civil authority, and seeks to reach objectives not peculiar to the military, but common to all Americans and thereby seeks to compel an overall civil policy through use of the Military Establishment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of directors of the Georgia Municipal Association, That we vigorously oppose such use of the Military Command to transcend the functions and responsibilities of duly constituted local authority in matters of concern to the entire citizenry.

Washington, D.C., Newspapers Are on an Emotional Test Ban Treaty Jag and Present Only One-Sided Coverage; New York City Newspapers Are No Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that Washington and New York newspaper readers are going to have to look hard for other sources to get anything about the partial test ban treaty at all that is not in glowing affirmative terms. These newspapers, in my opinion, have imposed an almost total embargo on any unpleasant facts raised about the pact. Fortunately, the Manion Forum of South Bend, Ind., found enough funds to buy a full page ad in yesterday's Washington Post to give local residents a chance at seeing at least a part of the other side of the picture. This was a reprint of a speech by Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired. Several days earlier wire service stories were available on the Ward speech, but the Washington Post failed run them. The only way it has done so is for pay. I have personally made available to that newspaper at least half a dozen stories raising questions about the test ban pact in the past 2 weeks and all of them have been ignored. This is just to point out that material raising questions about the test ban has been available. It has been used by other newspapers in various parts of the country. It has not been used by the newspapers in the New York and Washington area. I say this so that the editors of these newspapers cannot claim the other side of the story has not been available to them. Perhaps those editors should recollect that President Kennedy called for a debate on this issue, in which everyone should take part. He did not just call for eulogies all over the news and editorial pages. I presume his call for a rounded discussion was directed to the news media of the country as well as to individual citizens. Maybe if the Manion Forum can dig up a few more thousands of dollars for paid ads, the people around Washington and New York will get enough information to carry on an intelligent debate of the pros and cons of the test ban issue. It is quite apparent they are not going to get it if the Washington and New York City newspaper editors have their way. In order that it may be confirmed that there actually are two sides to the test ban question, I include the following samples from letters I have received about it in the RECORD:

WHITTIER, CALIF.

China will do the testing for Russia.

SEWICKLEY, PA.

Vote against the test ban treaty.

GLENOLDEN, PA.

Why all of a sudden that which has appeared to be so elusive has been attained and why is the haste to get it approved by the Senate so imperative?

BURBANK, CALIF.

In all of the relationships in the past, the result has been that the United States has given and Russia has stolen.

FALLBROOK, CALIF.

The test ban treaty is only a ruse to open the way for further concessions on our part.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Defeat the test ban treaty, which seems to be just another Soviet trap.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

The test ban treaty does the United States no good, only an accommodation step up for Russia who has broken 50 out of 53 treaties.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The treaty is not worth the paper in which it is written. If Khrushchev finds it serves his purpose to break it he will break it instantly. Already it seems to be serving the Communists.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.

Defeat the purposes of the Communists.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.

Against ratification of the treaty.

Minority Staffing and Victory in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 1963, my colleague on the House Republican conference committee on increased minority staffing, the gentleman from Arizona, Congressman JOHN J. RHODES, gave an excellent speech on minority staffing to the Human Events Political Action Conference at the Statler Hotel.

Congressman RHODES' speech, which he gave twice, each time to half the conference, and the fruitful question-and-answer sessions which followed each presentation were enthusiastically and thoughtfully received by the participants at the conference. In fact, within 30 minutes of the time he finished speaking, a constituent was in my office to tell me of the excellent minority staffing presentation at the Human Events Conference.

Such a fine speech merits the attention of all thoughtful people, in the Congress and in the country. Therefore, I respectfully submit the full text of this speech and commend it to your attention:

MINORITY STAFFING AND VICTORY IN 1964

You all know that the Republican Party is in the minority in Congress at present. You also probably all know that each committee of the Congress has a professional staff to do research, draft reports, arrange witnesses for hearings, do background studies of new fields, and so forth. The controversy over minority staffing has come to the fore because some Republicans in Congress this year have stood up and said what all have known for a long time—that the minority members of most committees need several members of the committee's staff responsible to them. The present situation is that almost all staff members are hired and fired, promoted and demoted by the chairman of the committee; naturally, then, their first allegiance is to the majority on the committee. They haven't the time or the inclination to work on minority projects.

Here is what we're up against: Democrats outnumber Republicans in both Houses less than 3 to 2. Yet professional committee staff responsible to the Democrats outnumbers staff responsible to the Republicans 11 to 1 in the House and 12 to 1 in the Senate.

Action is being taken which we hope will remedy this incredible abuse. The House Republican conference, by unanimous vote, has formed a subcommittee, of which I am a member, on minority staffing. We are working to expose, on the floors of Congress and to the public, the loaded dice the Democrats are using. Senator WINSTON PROUTY and Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL have submitted resolutions proposing a 60–40 percent division of staff on Senate and House committees, with 40 percent of the staff responsible to the Republicans.

However, the Democrats, who bleed for all minorities, are determined to thwart this attempt to give the minority in Congress a real voice. Last year Senator CARL CURTIS submitted an amendment providing simply that the minority on the Aeronautics and Space Sciences Committee, which, incidently, oversees the $5.7 billion budget of the civilian space agency, NASA, be entitled to appoint 1 staff member for every 10 appointed by the majority. Every single Democrat in the Senate who voted on that rollcall voted against this proposal.

I know from experience how tough it is to buck the system. I am a member of the House Appropriations Committee. Last year I offered an amendment to the legislative appropriation bill for 1963 which allocated approximately 35 percent of the funds for staff salaries exclusively to the minority to hire minority staff. My amendment never reached the floor. It was killed in commit-

tee by the united efforts of the Democratic members.

When the Democrats refuse to give us adequate staff they are really saying, "We're afraid our programs aren't good enough to stand up against the real scrutiny you could give them if you had more staff." The fact that they are thwarting the processes of responsible, representative government doesn't seem to bother them. The function of the minority is supposed to be to draft sound, constructive alternatives to legislation proposed by the majority so that genuine debate can take place and the best solution be found, or the two sides can be presented clearly to the voters. But Congressmen don't have time to do all this themselves. Minority reports haven't been drafted on many pieces of New Frontier legislation, not because there is no minority objection but because there isn't minority staff to do the job.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER devoted an entire article in his syndicated column this Spring to the importance of minority staff. He said, in part:

"Insufficient minority staffing makes legislation more dependent than ever upon the statistics, the witnesses, the proposals of the Democratic administration as transmitted through the majority. * * * Just because a President sends a message to Congress and follows it up with specific legislation doesn't automatically assure that this is the best thing that could be enacted for the people. * * * Because of this, the minority effort is extremely important. It definitely should be supported by the best staff work available."

The situation as it exists now is also wasting your tax money. An important function of congressional committees is to carry on investigations to keep the executive branch honest, to prevent padding, and waste in the vast administrative bureaucracy, in short to check the executive branch as our Constitution provides. Naturally enough, however, the Democrats in Congress are often reluctant to initiate investigations of New Frontier agencies and projects. And we Republicans haven't enough staff to make these investigations, or even to make the background studies which prove that an investigation is necessary. Cuba and Billie Sol Estes are two areas which you can be sure would have had much fuller investigation if the minority had more staff.

And finally, the lack of minority staff keeps the Republican Party politically weak. Because of it we Congressmen are too often reduced to sniping blindly at New Frontier proposals instead of presenting constructive alternatives. This doesn't give the voters a clear-cut choice. Furthermore, when organizations of all kinds come to Washington to testify they are met by majority staff aids who direct them to the Democrats. The result is that they come to believe that only the Democrats are interested in them. If we are not going to settle permanently for being the minority party, we had better act now.

This problem can be worked into an excellent campaign issue for 1964. The Democratic Party claims to care for all the "persecuted minorities" and to speak for the "little man," but it refuses to take steps to correct the most glaring injustice to that minority which is the very backbone of our free government, the minority party in Congress.

But we can't afford to wait until 1964 to act. We need minority staff now in order to make further conservative gains in the 1964 election. We have to present a constructive program to oppose the nonsense the New Frontier has been grinding out. But the bright ideas of where and how to attack develop in committee hearings, and good ideas have to be backed up by good research. Only staff loyal to the minority can do this job.

Minority staff aids are also essential for communications between the grass roots and Washington. They are an important contact with new ideas and new people who come to Washington and who, otherwise, the minority might never know about.

Furthermore, if we do not have minority staff aids now, what will happen when we control Congress? We won't have the staff talent we need to be an effective majority either. Loyal and professionally competent staff members can't be discovered overnight. They need time and experience to become good. It's not a simple matter of just electing more conservatives in 1964. We have to begin now to lay the groundwork which will help them be effective when they are elected.

What can you do? Our goal is to pass the SCHWENGEL and PROUTY resolutions, calling for a 60–40 percent division of staff, on the floors of Congress, or something similar to them. Here is where you can help. The most important thing, as always, is to write letters to your Congressman. Letters will encourage Republicans to fight harder because they see a better chance for success. This has already been proved by the greater effort which has resulted from the volume of letters our subcommittee has already received. It is more effective though to write to individual Congressmen.

Letters will also make Democrats fear repercussions back home. The Landrum-Griffin Act comes to mind here. I know many Democrats who would have said beforehand that they would never support such a bill but who voted for it because pressure from their districts was so strong. So, write to Democrats, too. Make it clear that you understand that they are preventing the operation of an effective Congress and of responsible representative government. They will respond if we make it hot enough for them.

Discuss this issue with your friends, neighbors, conservative clubs, business and civic groups. Tell them how the lack of minority staff prevents effective legislation, costs the taxpayers millions of dollars in poor or unnecessary programs, and strangle the voice of the 49 percent of the American people who didn't vote for the Democrats and the Kennedy administration.

The right of the minority to a voice in the government of our Nation is a hallowed tradition based on every principle inherent in our Constitution. When the minority can no longer be heard we are well on the road to dictatorship. By acting now and demanding adequate staffs responsible to the minority we can help to create a victory for conservatism in 1964 and to insure that the principles of free, representative government will endure as the basis for the practice of government in this great Republic of ours.

Congress Needs Science Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Rustum Roy, of Pennsylvania State University, recent wrote the New York Herald Tribune an excellent endorsement of the principle of my bill, H.R. 6866, under which Congress would be given permanent and independent scientific and technical staffs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit Dr. Roy's excellent letter in the hope that it will receive the earnest attention of every Member:

CONGRESS NEEDS SCIENCE ADVISERS

To the HERALD TRIBUNE:

A large part of the Federal budget is spent in areas involving a degree of technological or scientific judgment. An inexpensive piece of legislation sponsored by Representative A. W. SIBAL, of Connecticut, and called the Science Advisory Act would provide the two Houses of Congress with their own offices for scientific information, interpretation, and liaison.

Two objections have been raised to it. One denies the need for such education and information. I believe that a basic education provides sufficient background for acquiring a working understanding of any area of science and technology. But a specialist in the particular field must be willing to impart his knowledge to the layman.

The second objection is that the Government already employs thousands of scientists and that their services are available to Congress. The executive branch does bring its scientists to testify before congressional committees, but only in support of its own point of view. Where does Congress get representative views of the entire scientific community?

The Science Advisory Act would provide this point of view, costing the taxpayer almost nothing by today's standards. It could save billions. But its chief contribution would be in providing more effective 20th century legislation.

RUSTUM ROY,
Professor of Geochemistry and Director, Materials Research Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University.
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.

Independence of Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Pakistan celebrates the 16th anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic, Mohammed Ayub Kahn; and His Excellency the Pakistani Ambassador to the United States, G. Ahmed.

Sixteen years ago the name of Pakistan appeared for the first time on the map of the world. On August 14, 1947, the new state was formed amid great rejoicing by millions of Moslems of the former British India. At the time, there was speculation that Pakistan would not survive the first few years of its life. The country emerged as two widely separated areas, each containing about half of its population. At no time in previous history had the two wings of Pakistan shared a common identity, whether ethnic, political, linguistic, or economic. There was only one feature in common—a population that was predominantly Moslem.

Pakistan has, indeed, experienced more than its share of trouble and turmoil. The period after independence

was one of bloodshed and massacre as 6 million people fled from India to Pakistan and a similar number in the opposite direction. The relations between Pakistan's two wings have not always been easy. There have been serious difficulties between Pakistan and India over the continuing flight of refugees, the quarrel over Kashmir, and the waters of the Indus River.

In October 1958 the Pakistan Army seized power in a swift coup d'etat. Corruption and inefficiency almost everywhere had brought political and economic chaos to the country. There were many people who were disillusioned with Pakistan's attempt to create a parliamentary democracy and were relieved to see Gen. Ayub Khan take over the leadership of the country. The nation was placed under martial law but little evidence of that was visible. There were no troops about, no conspicuous military precautions, no evidence of apprehension, no executions or liquidations.

Ayub Khan is still Pakistan's leader and exercises the powers of government with almost no restrictions. There is grumbling in the country about the freedom of the press, about the treatment of the political parties, about the abandonment of the constitution, about the departure from parliamentary forms—but these are only murmurs which are scarcely audible in the chorus of national approval for President Ayub Khan and his changed order.

President Ayub Khan, as Pakistan's leader and statesman, is attacking the problems of his country in all directions at once. At the same time, he is giving Pakistan a new political structure, a new social order, a new economic policy, an industrial revolution and a new capital city. There is a fair prospect of success in several of these directions.

At the outset Pakistan was handicapped by almost every conceivable disability. Pakistan has survived as a state and with each passing year has shown greater stability and strength. It is possible now to regard Pakistan as one of the countries of the developing world where the combination of leadership, trained personnel, and resources makes success in the future a reasonable expectation. The people of Pakistan deserve credit for their record of accomplishment.

Something for Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the NASA authorization bill for 1964 will soon be before the House for final consideration. The measure, as it now stands, includes funds for the construction of an electronics research center to be located in Boston. An editorial written by William J. Coughlin, appearing in Missiles and Rockets, August 5, 1963, points out that if NASA can prove that there is a definite need for the new center, which thus far it has failed to do, the advisability of locating such a center in the Midwest should be given serious consideration.

The editorial follows:

SOMETHING FOR BOSTON

Senator TED KENNEDY is quoted as saying that, despite the setback by the Senate Space Committee, he still hopes the proposed National Aeronautics and Space Administration electronics center may be saved for Boston.

The Kennedy administration has brought considerable pressure to bear on behalf of the center in an effort to help young KENNEDY carry out his campaign promises of doing more for Massachusetts.

One Congressman goes so far as to call it an "affront to the intelligence of Congress."

The House Space Committee chopped more than $1 million from the $5 million request for the center and tied the remaining authorization to a requirement for further justification of the project. This specifies that no money may be expended until NASA has further justified both the need for the center and its location.

It is evident that NASA has not made a satisfactory case for the proposed electronics center in either space committee of Congress. Senator KENNEDY's reference to saving the center for Boston makes plain the reason why.

In the effort to snag this as a political plum for Boston, its backers have failed to prove the need for any center at all, regardless of location. If more attention had been devoted to proving that the Nation needs the center and less to proving that Boston needs it, the proposal might have been more successful.

We frankly do not believe that the fiscal 1964 authorization bill for NASA should be regarded as a pork-barrel opportunity for the President's relatives. It is one thing to exert political pressure in favor of a specific geographical location for a project after a need for it is established. It is an entirely different and completely reprehensible thing to exert such high-level political pressure for a project which may not be needed at all.

We agree with the representative who calls it an affront to congressional intelligence. We are glad to see Members of both Houses standing up to the pressure of this ham-handed effort on behalf of the new KENNEDY from Massachusetts.

There certainly has been an unhealthy air about the project from its inception. It is customary to first develop the requirement and authorization for such an establishment and then study possible locations. But from the first it has been made clear that this was to be a Boston electronics center. NASA also failed to present the customary architectural renderings to support the project—a hint that it might have been drawn up in some haste.

Even in the case of such a politically oriented site selection as Houston for the Manned Spacecraft Center, there was at least the outward form of a competition. No such competition was contemplated in the proposal for NASA's electronics center.

We do not regard as unethical the effort to spread the base of the space effort by distribution of contracts and NASA establishments throughout the Nation—if quality and cost of the work do not suffer. Nor do we go along with those who are beginning to refer to it as the "Confederate Space Agency."

The growth of such NASA establishments as Marshall, Michoud, Houston, and the Mississippi test site have a long-term and beneficial effect for the communities in which they are located, for the Nation and for the space effort. The impact of the national space program on southern communities, in particular, has been considerable. Educational standards are climbing, racial integration is being speeded, new technical skills are developing, and a wider industrial base is emerging. Prosperity is flowing into an area which was falling behind the rest of the Nation in its industrial development.

These are legitimate considerations in the distribution of the many billions of dollars involved in the space effort. The wider spread of the space dollar also means wider political support for the expensive space program, a factor which has not been overlooked by NASA's politically astute Administrator, James Webb.

If NASA can prove a need for the new center—which it has failed so far to do—we suggest that advantages of its possible location elsewhere be studied. The Midwest, oriented to the long production runs of the automotive industry, has not easily made the transition into the research and development atmosphere of the missile/space industry. Might not the location of a NASA electronics center in the Midwest, where there is no extensive electronics industry, do much to stimulate both universities and industry in that area?

Boston, southern California and the San Francisco area are strong electronics centers. Would not establishment of a NASA electronics center in the Midwest lead to development of a fourth electronics complex—just as location of MSC in Houston has stimulated growth of space age industry there?

The arguments which the administration employs on behalf of the Boston site—its nearness to Harvard, MIT, and electronics firms—would have applied equally well in a rejection of Houston for MSC.

Two questions about the electronics center still remain: Is it needed? Should it be in Boston? An affirmative answer to the first should not be regarded as an affirmative answer to the second. To date, however, no strong case has been made for an affirmative answer to either.

WILLIAM J. COUGHLIN.

Estes Kefauver—A Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER was one of America's greatest statesmen. I knew Senator KEFAUVER from the time he came to the Congress. In fact, as the minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] said this morning, he served on the Select Committee on Small Business when he first came here, a committee that I had the honor to be the chairman. Representative KEFAUVER was made chairman of a subcommittee and by reason of that chairmanship he commenced immediately to make a good name for himself. He conducted hearings over a period of time. The testimony was printed in the book of hearings.

Even now the Select Committee on Small Business receives requests for that particular volume on monopoly; it was so impressive, so good.

Senator KEFAUVER was always for the little man, the small businessman, the underdog. He was not against Big Business. He was always insisting that

all business must be fair to their customers and among themselves, that they must not do anything that would cause unfair practices in business and that all unfair practices should be stopped.

Senator KEFAUVER was one of the most courageous men I ever knew. He would take sides oftentimes when it was unpopular for him to do so. Very few men in public life will do things that Senator KEFAUVER was anxious to do always in the public interest.

Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, was the kind of citizen that Thomas Jefferson must have envisaged at the inception of our great adventure in American democracy. Senator KEFAUVER was born in Monroe County, Tenn., in 1903. This Nation's new experiment in community self-government and individual freedom was then slightly over 100 years old and ESTES KEFAUVER was its product.

As a boy, young ESTES received his education in the Monroe County public schools; received his A.B. degree at the University of Tennessee in 1924; his LL.B. degree at Yale University in 1927. Later numerous honorary degrees were fittingly bestowed upon him. As soon as his schooling was complete he practiced law in Chattanooga.

ESTES KEFAUVER's chief assets were his education, his individual courage, and a strong sense of what he wanted for his country. Such assets were needed in the Congress of the United States and he became a Member of the 76th Congress. Reelected to the 77th, 78th, 79th and 80th Congress, ESTES KEFAUVER was successful in election to the Senate in 1948.

Early in life, the Tennessee statesman learned to separate the truth from the false. This characteristic enabled him to make a lasting contribution to the American scene in the area of crime investigations.

During the years that Senator KEFAUVER and I served together in the House of Representatives, I learned to respect and admire the ability and the good sense that he brought to Washington with him. He demonstrated courage and vision in the legislative struggles that were his to indulge in for the citizens of Tennessee and the Nation.

Whether at the committee table, in private conference, on the floor of the House or Senate, or on the public platform, his measured words produced a keen respect for his views. Through the years he became a symbol of American honesty. He was always reasonable and sympathetic. He never betrayed a confidence.

All the citizens of the United States benefited from ESTES KEFAUVER's activities. He despised shoddy and the underhanded methods. He spoke with clarity and conviction. One knew his position in the Halls of Congress.

His endeavors in the worthwhile organizations of our 20th century read like a cross section of American life. He regarded his constituents as the finest and the kindest people in the world—and he was one of them. He shared with distinction the heavy responsibilities of committee work in the Congress. His duties he regarded as a sacred trust.

In his death, ESTES KEFAUVER has left a record as high in achievement as it was faithful in performance. He never temporized nor bargained where the public interest was the issue. But, day by day, through long and devoted service in high office, he brought to the State of Tennessee and to the Nation the contribution of learning and sound wisdom.

ESTES KEFAUVER will be remembered by his fellow countryman as a great American. His accomplishment will be an inspiration to those who believe in democracy as the best instrument for advancing the cause of world peace.

To his wife and family I extend my deep personal sympathy and ask them to remember his steadfast devotion to those things be believed to be right and just.

His belief in his country, his party, and moral justice was most sincere. He lived his belief that "government cannot be static in this dynamic world." But perhaps what was even more important about ESTES KEFAUVER was his profound personal belief in every task he undertook. He will long be remembered by those who were privileged to be associated with him.

Resolution Adopted by the St. Joseph's Council No. 1642, Knights of Columbus, Summit, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, St. Joseph's Council No. 1642, Knights of Columbus, has sent me a copy of a resolution passed at their meeting in June 1963, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

A RESOLUTION BY THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, ST. JOSEPH'S COUNCIL NO. 1642, SUMMIT, ILL.

Whereas there is in process in the State of New Jersey an effort being made through the courts to eliminate the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance; and

Whereas the U.S. Government in many of the legislative branches makes reference in diverse manners to our dependence on God as a nation, and such dependence is also declared on our coinage; and

Whereas the Founding Fathers of our country also declared their dependence on God: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by St. Joseph's Council No. 1642, Knights of Columbus, in regular meeting assembled, That as a representative body of Christian men, we most strongly urge that the reference of God presently contained in our Pledge of Allegiance is right and proper since we claim to be a Christian nation; and be it further

Resolved, That should the effort being made by the State of New Jersey be attempted either in this State or the Nation generally, that our representatives in both the State and the Nation be advised that we strongly deprecate any such effort, and that they should declare strongly against any such effort should it be made; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our State and congressional representatives.

(Resolution presented by J. Wilfred Ramsden, past grand knight.)

ANTHONY TOMLAR,
Grand Knight.
HARRY R. CUSTER,
Recorder.

The resolution is self-explanatory. In view of the growing congressional concern over implications of recent Supreme Court decisions, I feel the resolution has special significance.

Here Is a Newspaper Editor With Courage Enough To Question the Wisdom of Administration Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram newspaper, on August 13, editorially posed a most excellent question about the administration's foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

WHEN VILLAIN TURNS NICE GUY, THERE'S A REASON

A tiger does not become a kitten, a serpent does not turn into a saint overnight.

Nor does a vicious, doublecrossing villain become an upright member of society by the mere act of smiling and slapping folk on the back.

When the villain starts acting like that, people should ask what pressures are at work and what the motives are.

What, for example, is the explanation of Nikita Khrushchev's sudden, effusive, out-of-character friendliness toward the West?

Why does this man, who told us he'd bury us, suddenly toast us with champagne, sign treaties, and talk of the millennium?

The answer is readily apparent. Khrushchev, already troubled by discontent at home and among the satellites of Eastern Europe, recently awoke to find himself in trouble with the powerful Chinese Communists. He was "two fronted" on one side by the Red Chinese, on the other by the Western Powers.

He had to relieve the pressure, find a friend. Which way to turn? Toward the Red Chinese? No, they understand his game and his character too well; for they're playing the same game and have the same character. And so he decides to turn to the Americans, whose softheadedness and gullibility in dealing with the villains of this world have been demonstrated time and again.

From the Western point of view, there has rarely been a better time for exerting pressure on the Russians. They are in a weak position and off balance. Yet, the West appears to be doing little or nothing to exploit the situation; if anything, the West is easing Premier Khrushchev's pains.

This country is good at that; but, then, we have practice. We had him reeling and dead to rights at the height of the Cuban crisis, but instead of keeping him off balance, we looked surprised and embarrassed and hurriedly began doing what we could to make it easier for him.

This would seem an excellent time to bring up the question of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, or the issue of Russian troops in Cuba, or the matter of the Berlin wall. Instead, we sign a debatable and some feel a dangerous treaty with Khrushchev and give him the prestige of being locked arm-in-arm in good fellowship with American diplomats.

That this is the hood with the black mask and the lead pipe who raped the neighbor's daughter and held up the grocer appears suddenly forgotten.

Surely we must one day pay for such stupidity.

Railroad Firemen Face Troubled Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. Russell R. Boring, a constituent from Winslow, Ariz., in my Third Congressional District. As an official of the Arizona Legislative and Education Board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, Mr. Boring is naturally deeply concerned with the proposed railroad rules change. His letter contains some information relative to the economic impact the rules change may have on the community of Winslow, which I feel will be of interest to my colleagues:

WINSLOW, ARIZ., *July 18, 1963.*

Congressman GEORGE F. SENNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: Referring to our phone conversation of July 17, 1963, I called the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen secretary to obtain figures as to the effect the rules change would have on Winslow. Ninety firemen would lose their jobs, with over 50 percent being affected immediately.

Recently, the Winslow firemen members of Pacific Lodge No. 173 published our viewpoint in a public advertisement in which we outlined our functions as second man on the diesel locomotive. Among these duties outlined in detail are: lookout duty, assistance engineer, power unit inspector, power unit patrol, power maintenance and malfunction diagnostician. If the firemen are eliminated, these jobs will have to be transferred to another craft.

Dr. David Lewis, professor of sociology at Miami University, made a factual study of the adverse effect the ensuing reduction in force would have on such a community as Winslow. This analysis was made by using a formula devised by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

In this instance, the force reduction amounted to 100 men, which would create the following adverse effect: 112 less households, 296 less people, 51 less school children, $580,000 less personal income per year, $360,000 less retail sales per year, $270,000 less bank deposits, $1 million less investments in real and personal property, 107 less passenger cars registered, 4 less retail establishments, 74 less jobs in addition to the railroad jobs.

The value of the railroader as a homeowner was pointed out by the following statistics of Dr. Lewis: 83.3 percent of the railroaders in Winslow own or are buying their own homes, as compared to 64 percent of the total population.

Local business in Winslow will be concerned with the following breakdown of consumer spending which reflects the effect 100 unemployed railworkers have on a community. This breakdown was derived from "Survey of Consumer Expenditures in 1950" by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor. I am sure it is safe to assume that the amounts would be proportionately higher at this date: $52,300 in workers taxes, $159,600 spent on food, $9,300 spent on tobacco, $49,800 spent on housing, $19,800 spent on household items, $41,600 spent on furniture, $60,900 spent on clothing, $87,700 spent on transportation, $24,600 spent on medical care, $11,300 spent on beauty aids, $34,000 spent on recreation, $5,800 spent on miscellaneous items, $19,200 spent on charity, $24,300 spent on insurance. Total loss to the community: $600,200 per year.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL R. BORING.

Arizona Editor Endorses Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial published originally July 26 and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 12 Mr. William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Ariz., spelled out at some length all the things the nuclear test ban treaty is not. Subsequently, on August 7, he published a second editorial summarizing what the test ban is and why the treaty should be ratified by the Senate.

Since Mr. Mathews is one of this Nations' best-informed writers on foreign affairs, I find his support for the test ban treaty significant and encouraging. The editorial of August 7 follows:

RATIFY THE TEST BAN TREATY

Now that the test ban treaty has been signed, the next step in its enactment is ratification by a two-thirds vote of Senators present and voting. That it will encounter some vigorous opposition from the extreme rightwing of the Senate seems to be assured. What they will charge is pretty well known already.

Much will be made of the Soviet record in deliberate treatybreaking, and, more recently, breaking the test ban armistice, which they violated without notice. Some will make much ado over the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff oppose the termination of air and underwater blasts, which is something to be expected from the best of military minds.

There will be justified lamentations over the fact that after years of making inspection an official and unwavering policy, our negotiators gave it up without any explanation. When people, throughout many years, have been taught over and over again that it was necessary, "because the Soviet could not be trusted," many of them are bound to be bewildered. Just when can the Washington administration be trusted on other high policies?

Some Senators will make notable orations on how the treaty will undermine the security of our country. A careful reading of this brief treaty fails to disclose how that can occur, as long as our political leaders practice normal alertness.

Indeed, the treaty amounts to nothing more than denouncing sin and glorifying virtue. If, after ratification, some serious flaw is found, the treaty itself specifically provides that any signer can withdraw from it by giving 3 months' notice. We have not traded away our birthright or our security. We have not done anything that we can be sorry for in the future.

On the other hand, there are good reasons why the Senate should ratify it. Rejection would amount to telling the world that we believe in sin and vilify virtue. Its defeat in the Senate would hand to Moscow Communists a reverberating propaganda victory. We would become, in the eyes of the world, the champion of hydronuclear war, while the Soviets would become the champions of peace.

There is another good reason why the treaty should be ratified. That is, it might be the first step toward the more practical goal of reducing the strained tensions that have characterized the past 15 years. It thereby might ease the mad armament race we are in today. Our current diplomatic course makes nuclear war inevitable. Wisdom should caution us to steer away from that catastrophe. Since the treaty is completely harmless, but does open a possible way for the mutual improvement of diplomatic relations for the two giants, it should be ratified.

Good Man With a Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the fascinating public relations techniques in international diplomacy is the deliberately produced stories of the friendly, social, human atmosphere which has prevailed in the conduct of semisecret discussions between our Government leaders and those of the Soviet Union dictatorship.

One of these human stories was the badminton game between Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Dictator Khrushchev. I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune which penetratingly interprets the Rusk-Khrushchev game:

GOOD MAN WITH A RACKET

At the conclusion of a series of conferences at Premier Khrushchev's Black Sea villa, the Soviet leader maneuvered Secretary of State Rusk onto a convenient badminton court which was luxuriously fitted with an oriental rug but lacked what most players regard as more important: a net.

Using an imaginary net, Mr. Khrushchev whipped Mr. Rusk, 4 to 1.

Mr. Rusk's later explanation was a familiar one: "Mr. Khrushchev is pretty good with a racket. My game has always been basketball."

It's the old story. We're constantly maneuvered into playing our Communist opponent's game. Khrushchev doesn't need a racket in his hand to run a policy racket against us. As in his badminton game, the nuclear test ban is to proceed with an invisible net, with a set of spectral rules, and imagination is to substitute in their absence.

Mr. K. isn't going to play Mr. R.'s game, and as long as we play his the chances are we will be losing the cold war, 4 to 1.

The Gesell Report Is Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1962, President Kennedy appointed a study committee to look into and make recommendations concerning equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States. The President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces consists of seven distinguished American citizens, chaired by Washington Attorney, Gerhard A. Gesell. On June 13, 1963, the Committee issued its initial report, including its several recommendations; and on June 21, 1963, the President urged the Secretary of Defense to give the report his prompt attention. At that time, President Kennedy requested that the Secretary's review and report on the Committee's recommendations be completed within 30 days or by August 21, 1963.

The Gesell report, as the Committee's presentation is called, is a remarkable document in many respects. It is frank and hard hitting. It is concise and thorough. It is temperate and thoughtful. It justifies fully the President's confidence in the members of the Committee and its reflects the depth and intensity of his sincere concern for the problem with which it deals.

The substantive aspects of the report are the results of exhaustive investigatory efforts over the better part of the past 9 months. During this period, members of the Committee observed, at first hand, the situations at and near numerous bases and other military facilities and talked with base personnel at all levels. Some of the findings were gleaned from reports from installations, the Defense Department, interested Federal departments, the Commission on Civil Rights, and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. However, the Gesell Committee did not encroach upon the jurisdictions of other agencies and committees and its relations with them were cordial.

The Committee's June 13 report consists of 93 pages of data and considerations dealing objectively with the opportunities and treatment of Negro military personnel and their dependents. It examines conditions both on and immediately surrounding military facilities of many types in all of the armed services. It deals with recruitment, assignment, promotion, communications and facilities within installations, and off-base racial discrimination in education, housing, personal services, recreation, transportation, and public accommodations. In short, all race-related factors which affect the efficiency and morale of Negro military personnel were looked into both thoroughly and objectively.

If the implication is that Negro servicemen are being given special attention, it is only a reflection of the undeniable fact that such attention is merited by the gravity of the situation. It is an injustice that these Americans, whatever their circumstances, are denied basic human rights. It is a further imposition upon Negro servicemen and their families that they are required to make far greater sacrifices as to both service-connected and personal circumstances than are required of virtually all other members of the Armed Forces. As if it were not enough that they must be in danger of losing their lives and limbs in defense of the Nation and all of its people, they and their dependents are accorded grossly discriminatory treatment amounting to humiliation, degradation, and injustice both on base and in virtually every civilian community off base all over the country—North, South, East, and West.

Neither the report nor my own views concerning the problems with which it deals are at all primarily negative. Tremendous progress toward complete racial integration in the armed services has been made over the past 15 years since 1948 when President Truman issued the initial order regarding Armed Forces desegregation. Still more developments are unfolding, under the sincere and persistent leadership of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, and the resolute actions of the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. However, an equally important phase of the desegregation job is still largely undone. This concerns effective and immediate action toward bringing about the desegregation of civilian communities adjacent to and dependent upon military installations. So acute is this problem that Negro servicemen and their dependents frequently have to travel 20 or more miles from their bases to attend public schools and to eat in a civilian restaurant, to mention only two of the major inconveniencies.

As of September 30, 1962, the Armed Forces of the United States contained 198,582 Negroes, constituting 8.2 percent of all armed service personnel. Negroes constituting the following totals and percentages in the individual services: Army enlisted men, 12.2 percent, officers, 3.2 percent, total, 106,753; Air Force: enlisted men, 9.1 percent, officers, 1.24 percent, total, 47,864; Navy: enlisted men, 5.22 percent, officers, 0.24 percent, total, 30,584; Marines: enlisted men, 7.59 percent, officers, 0.21 percent, total, 13,383. Of the total number of Negroes in the Armed Forces, 193,926 are enlisted personnel and only 4,656 are officers; or, percentagewise, only 2.8 percent of all Negroes in the Armed Forces are officers. This excludes almost entirely the very top rank of general and admiral in all Army services; the top four ranks above captain in the Marine Corps, and the top two ranks of captain and admiral in the Navy. Only the Air Force has a Negro general in the very top rank.

While the Gesell report views these statistics as reflecting disparities between the percentages of military personnel by rank and the overall Negro population percentage in the United States, the fact of racial discrimination in promotions and commissions is patently clear from any point of view. This comparison, however, provides a relatively concrete standard in the form of the ratio of Negroes to white persons in the total population. Nevertheless, racial equality is not a numbers game. What the data reflect is the fact that Negroes are not being promoted and commissioned according to merit and, therefore, present practices are contrary to national policy. The percentage of Negro officers is ridiculously low by any standards of measurement; a fact which the Gesell report makes obvious without any semblance of acrimony.

These data partially reflect one in-service problem, but the more flagrant examples of lack of opportunity and unreasonable discrimination occur in civilian communities immediately adjacent to military installations in every section and State in the country. It has come to my attention that in one far northern locality, Negro service personnel and their dependents must travel at least 250 miles—from Minor, N. Dak., Air Force Base—for off-base accommodations in restaurants, bars, theaters, hotels, and the like. This is 100 miles farther than regulations permit personnel to travel on a weekend pass. Thus, Negro personnel at this Air Force base are confined to the installation by virtue of the segregated nature of the off-base community. In the South, there is no choice either, since public facilities adjacent to military installations in that section are segregated thoroughly, in most cases, solely because of race. If freedom of choice is an American right, and I submit that it is, it must be equally available to the Negro in every section and community in the Nation.

The extent of local segregation, as it affects Negro military personnel and their dependents, is illustrated by the fact that public schools are racially segregated in communities adjacent to 48 Army, 143 Navy, and 53 Air Force installations; restaurants and bars adjacent to 68 Army and 238 naval bases; theaters adjacent to 26 Army and 223 naval facilities; bowling alleys adjacent to 32 Army and 194 naval establishments; golf courses adjacent to 38 Army and 164 naval bases; hotels and motels adjacent to 12 Army and 252 naval operations; and residential housing everywhere. Public school segregation affects between 15,000 and 20,000 school-age Negro military dependents. All military installations covered by these statistics have 100 or more assigned personnel.

All of these facts are set forth in the wholly constructive Gesell report, which concludes:

First. That on-base operations and activities of any sort whatever must conform to national policies of nondiscrimination;

Second. That positive sanctions must be applied to segregated civilian communities, including termination of all military activities near those towns where discrimination is particularly prevalent;

Third. In view of the obvious inadequacies and negative predispositions of base commanders, that base commanders place the welfare and equal treatment of their men above considerations of a false sense of security, establishing biracial local committees and taking other positive steps to bring an end to racial segregation in towns adjacent to military bases;

Fourth. That overall responsibility for equal opportunity and treatment of service personnel and their dependents should be under a full-time Defense Department official—which has been done—and each service should have an officer charged with such responsibility;

Fifth. That, since 74,250 service families live in inadequate quarters; that another 27,284 must live too far away from the base; and that 23,859 cannot get housing at all; responsible base officials should engage in serious and continuous efforts to secure equal housing opportunities and facilities for Negro military personnel and their families;

Sixth. That school-age dependents of Negro service personnel should not be discriminated against either on or off the bases and should not be compelled to engage in or await costly and time-consuming litigation in order to achieve equal educational opportunities; and

Seventh. That, while the Armed Forces should continue to compile and make use of racial data, sufficient controls should be employed to insure its proper use so that, for example, such data should not be used in relation to ratings, assignments or promotions as a basis for discriminatory treatment unfavorable to Negroes.

The Gesell report represents one of the most constructive efforts in the current drive to remove obstructions which deprive Negroes of equality of opportunity and treatment in the United States. Some of the Committee's recommendations have been implemented—before the final report was issued in a few cases; since then in others. It is encouraging that the present administration shows determination and conviction in seeing that democracy's promise is made a reality in this great Nation. Thus, I wish to express my sincere appreciation and commendation for the job which the Gesell Committee has done and is doing and for the manner in which the administration has moved steadily and courageously ahead in promoting all things essential to liberty, justice, and equality for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Aid Cuts No Solution to Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter sent by the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, ostensibly to aid American taxpayers, there is contained a statement which reads, "Only deep cuts in foreign aid and in oversea military spending and a balanced Federal budget will restore confidence in the dollar and thereby arrest the flight of gold." Statements such as this have been occurring frequently in the press and in literature sent to Members of Congress. For the purpose of correcting this misconception I offer a letter written by Mr. David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, which was printed in the New York Times. Mr. Bell, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I believe fully qualifies to make the statement contained in the letter heretofore mentioned. This letter should make evident that our balance of payments are not affected by our foreign aid expenditures:

ECONOMIC AID ANALYZED: U.S. GOODS AND SERVICES ACCOUNT FOR 90 PERCENT, BELL SAYS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Some of your readers might have drawn incorrect inferences from figures you published in section IV of your July 21 edition regarding the relationship of economic aid to the balance of payments of the United States.

You showed "economic aid" as a debit in the U.S. balance of payments for 1962 amounting to $3.5 billion—in a year in which the total deficit was $2.3 billion. An unwary reader could easily have drawn the inference that all we need to do to remove the deficit would be to cut "economic aid" by $2.3 billion.

Such an action would of course be ineffective. "Economic aid" as shown in your figures includes the outflow of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 (about $1.3 billion in 1962), plus the outflow of goods and services—and dollars—financed by loans and grants under our foreign aid.

With the policies that are now in effect, more than 90 percent of total economic aid represents U.S. goods and services—not dollar outflow. Under these circumstances, a cut in congressional appropriations would principally reduce U.S. exports—without affecting the balance-of-payments deficit substantially.

EFFECT OF CUTS ON EXPORTS

Recognizing the difficulty of estimating precisely the effects of a change in a single factor in the balance of payments, it can be said as a rough approximation that a $1 billion cut in economic aid would reduce U.S. exports by $900 million and the deficit in the balance of payments by $100 million. (If the hypothetical cut were assumed to affect what is ordinarily called foreign aid—and not to affect Public Law 480 and the Export-Import Bank—the proportions would be about $800 million reduction in U.S. exports, and $200 million in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.)

The conclusion is clear. Under present policies, with economic and military assistance to other countries almost entirely taking the form of U.S. goods and services, almost no gain to the balance-of-payments deficit can be achieved by reducing our foreign aid programs. Moreover, a foreign aid cut made on the mistaken assumption it would have a major impact on our payments deficit would instead serve chiefly to reduce U.S.-produced goods and services purchased for use abroad.

I should also like to point out the positive gains to the United States from the establishment of progressive growing economies abroad—which is the main purpose of our economic assistance. U.S. exports to the Marshall plan countries more than doubled from 1953 to 1962.

Our exports to Japan more than tripled from 1950 to 1962. In many of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where our economic aid goes today, aid-financed U.S. exports are finding acceptance and becoming familiar to consumers—which will enhance our normal commercial export markets in the future as those countries increase their incomes and their international purchasing power.

DAVID E. BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development.

WASHINGTON, *July 22, 1963.*

John Q. Public and the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of Space Digest includes an article by Leonard Silk, that skillfully analyzes the Nation's space program in relationship to social, political and economic factors. The article is based on a public survey in which the author sought to determine what the public wants from advancing technology.

Written by the distinguished business analyst, Leonard Silk, who is senior editor-economics for Business Week magazine, the article not only describes the response to his poll, but offers his own views on what this country can expect from its heavy investment in out-of-this-world R. & D.—research and development.

The article follows:

JOHN Q. PUBLIC AND THE SPACE AGE

(By Leonard Silk)

In our democratic society, it is supposed to be the people who determine—both through their dollar votes and through their political votes—what direction the society shall take. What does the public demand of research and technology?

I have sought an answer to this key question in the way traditional in my [journalist's] profession. I have gone out and asked a sample of the public what it does demand of research.

I shall not disclose the precise size of my sample * * * but, as any good pollster or Soviet statistician would do, I shall report my results in percentage terms.

Of all the persons interviewed as to what they demanded of research, 59.5 percent replied: "Don't know." Among my "don't knows" I include all those people who replied, "I don't understand what you mean." Their confusion is understandable: Can a democracy determine the aims of research?

Among the remaining 40.5 percent of my sample, however, I got a fascinating set of answers. In order to get them, I had to talk at great length to my respondents, clarify the question in my own way, probe and lead the witnesses hither and yon, and thereby destroy the scientific and objective nature of my survey. I cannot, therefore, give you any further precise percentage distributions of what my respondents demanded. However, among their answers (in which some people thought they were talking for the rest of the public, and some only for themselves),

the following were the major themes of what my public said it demanded of research:

Discoveries that would lead to useful inventions;

Discoveries that would make people, business organizations, and the Nation, richer;

Scientific and technological breakthroughs that would establish our superiority over the Russians;

Intellectual achievements that—apart from whatever the Russians did—would strengthen our pride in America;

Findings that would cure diseases and prolong human life;

Intellectual adventuring that would give us a more meaningful national purpose than simply more and more consumptions;

Discoveries for the sake of discoveries;

And, finally—this from a sophisticated and rather cynical element in my sample—entertainment.

The views of this last element deserve somewhat more detailed reporting. Their contention was that, in the past, the public really wanted practical results from research and technology: machines to lift great weights or weave cloth or cut logs or carry people and freight or increase crop yields, etc. But such objectives applied in the era of the economics of scarcity—you will here recognize the hand of Harvard economist J. Kenneth Galbraith. But now that era of scarcity has given way—at least in the United States—to one of affluence; boredom or a surfeit of honey have begun to strangle the growth of a free society; capitalism is in danger of dying—as the late Prof. Joseph Schumpeter of Harvard once warned it would—of inanition. Little remains to demand of research and technology but entertainment. We have a great many intelligent and well-trained people around—and we are going to have more and more; but it is a rather foolish waste of their talents to put them to work making even faster lathes and cutting machines, etc., because all of these devices are designed either to turn out more goods—which we allegedly don't want, anyhow—or to disemploy more human labor, and the difficulties in finding work for the intellectually inferior members of society is getting to be a bothersome enough problem as it is.

Of course, the argument runs, we might choose to make leisure for everyone the great social goal, but most people still dislike or even fear an excess of leisure, and they either grow despondent or get into trouble if you give them too much of it. This is particularly true, incidentally, of scientists and technologists, who just can't let work alone. Therefore, we have devised their scientific adventure, this space-exploration business, as a means of giving employment to our scientists and engineers and, at the same time, of giving entertainment to the masses, just as the Middle Ages invented the tournament to give employment to warlike knights and to provide fun and games for the people (because you simply couldn't be waging real wars all the time—that would be simply too destructive).

This new version of the medieval tournament the race into space and other sectors of the unknown has in a highly industrialized society, the added advantage of providing opportunities for industry, and thus preventing a breakdown in the existing economic political, and social order. This might be even more important than it is today if we were ever to get an effective arms-control or disarmament agreement involving substantial reductions in expenditures for defense.

President Kennedy has himself maintained that our journey into space is, if not for the purposes of entertainment (a thin word, but not one ordinarily despised by Americans), then for adventure, in response to a great challenge.

President Kennedy said that many years ago, the great British explorer George Mallory, who was to die on Mount Everest, was asked why did he want to climb it. He said: "Because it is there." Said our President: "Well, space is there, and we're going to climb it. And the moon and the planets are there, and new hope for knowledge and peace are there. And therefore as we set sail, we ask God's blessing on the most hazardous and dangerous and greatest adventure on which man has ever embarked."

In this complex century in which we live—in which total cynicism coexists with high idealism, scientific brilliance coexists with social stupidity, utter selfishness with dedication to all of mankind—there are those who react to the President's words with inspiration, and others who react with deep skepticism, regarding his words as a rationalization for a program undertaken for a set of political economic, and military purposes.

Pure truth in matters affecting human behavior is awfully hard, if not impossible, to come by; everyone sees reality through his own eyes, interprets it out of his own experience, images, values.

May I give my own view of what we Americans demand of space research, and of scientific and technological advance more generally, since it is all part of a great and unified whole?

We live in a world still struggling for human freedom, still in danger of the most terrible destruction ever visited upon the human race.

Thus far we have preserved the peace—the imperfect peace, such as it is—through the threatened use of our military power, so dependent upon our scientific and technological prowess. An uneasy balance of terror exists in the world. But new technological breakthroughs could upset the present balance of terror; the research revolution of our time makes that a constant possibility. In fact, as Dr. Stefan Possony, of Stanford University's Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, has said, "The rapidly accelerating technological race is the essence of the conflict."

For years to come, we shall have to rely on information and intelligence systems, and on research and development work to forestall any enemy surprises in operations or in technology. This technological competition makes our laboratories and testing grounds and—alas—our universities critical theaters of the world conflict. But these are also the places where the turning of the conflict into a nuclear holocaust may be prevented—where, conceivably, we may find it possible to moderate and break down the conflict itself. Space—the unfathomable ocean in which our all-too-little lifeboat of a world moves—may hold the answer to man's fate.

I should like to quote what seems to me a most important passage from Hannah Arendt's "The Human Condition":

"Three great events stand at the threshold of the modern age and determine its character: the discovery of America and the ensuing exploration of the whole earth; the Reformation, which by expropriating ecclesiastical and monastic possessions started the twofold process of individual expropriation and the accumulation of social wealth; the invention of the telescope and the development of a new science that considers the nature of the earth from the viewpoint of the universe. * * * In the eyes of their contemporaries, the most spectacular of these events must have been the discoveries of unheard of continents and undreamed of oceans; the most disturbing might have been the Reformation's irremediable split of Western Christianity. * * * However, if we could measure the momentum of history as we measure natural processes, we might find that what originally had the least noticeable impact, man's first tentative steps toward the discovery of the universe, has constantly increased in momentousness as well as speed until it has eclipsed not only the enlargement of the earth's surface, which found its final limitation only in the limitations of the globe itself, but also the still apparently limitless economic accumulation process."

This, then, is the adventure upon which we are launched. A part of the irony of man's fate—and of his greatest adventures of the body or the mind—is that he can never escape the prison of his skin, and never escape the tangle of economic causes and consequences, vested interests and ideologies that are his inheritance.

On the assumption that we do continue to maintain a very large level of expenditures for space research and exploration, what will be the consequences for our national economy? So great are the technical, scientific, and political uncertainties that only a charlatan would pretend to give a very tight prediction of the economic effects of space developments. However, a few general statements will at least indicate what I believe some of the most important effects will be:

There will be some significant technological benefits to the civilian economy, resulting from the "spin-off" of space research. The most obvious immediate example is that of international communications systems, based on earth satellites. Existing cost and demand projections make such systems look like not only a good bet for the new communications company, but virtually a necessity if the world is to achieve the degree of integration conducive to optimal economic development as well as to social and political stability. Weather satellites also promise real benefits to business decisionmaking and planning in many areas. In addition, there should be a continuing stream of other innovations in new materials, such as dryfilm lubricants, ceramics, and metals; paints and coatings; more effective shielding materials, such as pyrolytic graphite; new methods of metal fabrication and forming, such as the technique of explosive forming; new or improved power and propulsion forces, especially small nuclear-electric generating systems; new biological applications, affecting medicine, food processing, air purification, control of temperature and humidity, etc.; electronic applications, for instance, involving new uses of masers and lasers.

It is well, however, to be cautious in predicting the speed with which innovations are absorbed into the civilian economy. In some cases, the applications may take only a few years, in others a few decades. The most important consequences may indeed be a long time coming. It would seem to me, however, that over time the advances that are being achieved in so many fields—physics, chemistry, biology, electronics, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering—are bound to permeate our entire industrial organism. The real problem is overcoming the social, economic, and institutional resistances that make the absorption process a slow one. Among the most serious types of resistances are those of unemployment, and vested interests in existing technologies, on the part of both labor and management. One of the most important areas for investigation is how to facilitate technological advance, while minimizing its disruptive effects, in our complex semiprivate, semipublic economy.

Space programs will importantly influence manpower requirements in the United States. Obviously, the programs have already had a terrific effect in increasing the demand for highly trained professional and technical manpower. The mistake should not be made, however, of underestimating the number of jobs of all kinds that will grow out of heavy space expenditures. My own rough calculations suggest that a $10 billion level of space expenditures will imply jobs for a total of approximately 1 million employees. A Rand

study suggests that in 1970, total projected space expenditures of $13 billion would imply jobs for a total of 528,000 men and women who would be employed by prime contractors alone.

The types of knowledge and skills required for so great a space effort as is presently envisioned will mean a great impact upon our educational institutions. This will intensify problems of governmental involvement in education in both our public and private schools and colleges and universities. It will also intensify the problem of making wise choices in how we allocate scarce intellectual resources to all the areas of science, social science, the humanities, politics and Government, business, labor, and other welfare activities in our society.

The space effort will provide a possible substitute for a part of our huge military outlays, should it become possible to scale these down appreciably at some time in the future. Some will regard this as a boon that will enable us to avoid serious dislocations or unemployment that might result from disarmament. Others will regard this as an unfortunate temptation (to both industry and labor)—and a guarantee that our mixed economy will continue to have a large and growing sector that is dominated by government, financed out of taxes, and regulated in large measure outside the market economy. Some will see this as damaging the efficiency and freedom and welfare-satisfying characteristics of our economy. But others will argue, as Dr. Edward C. Welsh, the executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, has done, that "the economic benefits for a viable space program tend to make it self-supporting through its stimulating effect upon the economy over a period of time."

There can be no doubt that space raises extremely difficult and delicate systemic questions. General Electric's president, Ralph Cordiner, on one side, has declared that space, like national defense, will necessarily require "a close partnership" between the Federal Government and private industry:

"Each of the partners must perform its appropriate role, and the problems and delays occur where government tries to do the managerial and technical work for which industry is best qualified, or industry tries to take on the functions of government."

On the other side, Prof. Wassily Leontief of Harvard has argued that—

"The nature of advanced modern technology is such that it cannot be exploited economically without effective, sometimes ruthless, overall coordination. Such coordination must affect not only operations within a single plant, but also the relationship between plants within an industry and of all industries within a national economy as a whole. Supranational cooperation and coordination becomes more and more necessary for efficient functioning of the individual national economies as well."

Anyone who broods very much about the space program and related social and political and economic activities will, I believe, begin to get at least a sense of the stresses and problems that are going to continue to affect our society in the years ahead. Whether this embryo becomes a creature of joy and excitement and benefit to mankind or whether it becomes and monstrosity that needs to be chained up remains to be determined. It will depend, not upon the blind operation of that mythical being variously called History or the Future, but upon the decisions that reasonable men in a still free society are capable of making.

(NOTE.—Leonard Silk is senior editor of economics of Business Week and author of the recent book "The Research Revolution." A Fulbright scholar who taught economics at the University of Maine, Simmons College, and Duke University, from which he received his Ph. D. in economics, Dr. Silk was Assistant Economic Commissioner, U.S. Mission to NATO, from 1952 to 1954 and has served as Consultant to the President's Labor-Management Policy Committee. Above is excerpted with permission from a longer presentation to the Space Problems Seminar of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, held in New York in the spring of 1963.)

The Approach to Russ Weak Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday August 14, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are debating the question of a limited test ban treaty with the Russians, it seems to me that the following talk by Dr. Stefan Possony, director of international studies program of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, throws considerable light on the problem which we face.

These are excerpts from a talk which Dr. Possony delivered before the Commonwealth Club of California on August 2, 1963:

APPROACH TO RUSS WEAK POINT WOULD BE VIA MEDITERRANEAN, SAYS DR. POSSONY

Ever since the Polaris was developed, the Mediterranean has come back into world strategy.

Let me remind you of three basic geographic facts. One is that the Mediterranean is a sea bounded by two narrow straits and a canal. Anyone who controls any of these exists has a great deal of control over what is floating around there.

The second point is that the Mediterranean from Gibraltar to Cyprus is approximately some 2,200 miles. It is that distance of overland travel which an Atlantic country could save in moving into Eastern Europe.

The Mediterranean is one of the best highways for moving into the heartland of Soviet power. It has characteristics of a one-way street: For the Soviets, the advantage against us is much less than the other way around. The Black Sea adds a few hundred miles.

If you use a 2,000-odd-mile missile from a submarine, you have bascially within your target area, places like Tashkent in the east, through the main industrial areas of the Urals, Leningrad and Moscow, and essentially all Soviet European parts. That is just about the main area of Soviet power.

MEDITERRANEAN IS THE "SEA OF OIL"

The Mediterranean is the sea of oil communications. The European countries, in one way or another, depend on the Mediterranean to get their fuel.

The Soviets' oil economy is based on the Baku area bordering on the Caspian, but for international traffic they have to move over to the Black Sea and down to the Mediterranean.

The second main area of Soviet oil is between the Urals and the Volga River which again is a Caspian Sea arrangement, but to get it out, it has to go to a Black Sea port. Sooner or later we will have to face the problem of medium-range missiles in the Mediterranean. At present you have an imbalance: The Soviet has 700 MRBM's and there is no defense or counterdefense anywhere in the European theater against this threat.

VERY BAD GAP IN WESTERN DEFENSES

There is a very bad gap in the Western defenses, and one way to block it is to put missiles into the Mediterranean areas.

A missile site on an island has a lot of attractions over the mainland. We still have the Spanish SAC bases; the Moroccan bases we won't have much longer. There is a big airfield in Libya. The significance of these airfields is not necessarily that you use them for B-47 strikes, but if you can get the airplane back to one of the Mediterranean bases, it is good for another mission.

Potential wars in the Mediterranean are considerable in number. You have the Israel-Arab problem, you have a lot of problems within the Arab world; the Balkans are split in three ways. Suez is a dagger that can easily create problems. There is a very large area not too far removed, U.S.S.R.-Turkey, U.S.S.R.-Iran. The Soviets have been trying to get the Kurds to be more active. Any of these areas could blow up.

CHANCES FOR SOME CIVIL WARS

We have had crises in Turkey; there is always a dubious situation in Iran. The possibilities of a local war in the Mediterranean area becoming nuclear are perhaps remote, but by no means excluded. There is a chance that there will be some civil war breaking out in a number of areas, including Spain and Italy, but I don't believe Italy will end in civil war.

The strategic objectives of the Soviet Union in an attack against ourselves cannot be anything but destruction. It cannot be occupation. There is no way for the Russians to come over here.

DESTRUCTION FOR SOVIET UNION

If war comes about, and by miscalculation the Soviets find themselves on the receiving end of the nuclear bombs, a lot of destruction is going to take place in the Soviet Union. This leaves Western Europe as the great industrial prize. He who controls Western Europe has the power to impose his law on the world. It is entirely conceivable that in a war between the Soviet Union and ourselves the main strategic forces were mutually destroyed and either we or the Soviets go out and take Western Europe.

With respect to total war, this is a theater for American offensive operations and a major problem for Soviet defensive operations.

The Mediterranean has the very great disadvantage of very clear water, it isn't too difficult to discover submarines. But discovering is one thing and knocking them out is something else.

LONE ROCK AND DESERT BASES ADVANTAGEOUS

According to statistics it costs a lot of fire power. In 1943 Mussolini built up the little island of Patelerria, a lone rock, into a gigantic fortress. It was a major operation to get rid of it. A lot of the missiles would drop into the water.

Desert missile bases offer a similar advantage. A lot of enemy missiles would hit sand and not people. And these would not be aimed at the United States.

We are presently undergoing an eclipse in air power due to the fact that the B-47 is out of business essentially; and we don't yet have the supersonic aircraft; but this will come.

SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT TROUBLES

With the supersonic aircraft we will have some real troubles, including lack of range. With the first generation of these we are back with the problem we had to face in the late 1940's with the B-47's, which meant requirement of oversea bases.

If you have strong fire-bomber forces in Turkey, they are capable of reaching many important targets in the Soviet Union. Not the least advantage is short warning time.

If war should come we must win it. How do you get into the Soviet Union? If you move across from West to East you do it the

hard way. The way to get into the Soviet Union is through the Mediterranean.

We are not using the Mediterranean's potential in our present strategy.

THE POLARIS AND NUCLEAR BLASTS

If we sign the test ban treaty as presently drafted, we will not find out until too late what the precise possibility of the Polaris submarine is for nuclear blast; we will not be able to develop undamageable defenses.

Without proper undamageable defenses, our Mediterranean position will remain weak.

We are not really using tactical weapons for ground defense in the Mediterranean area, and the result is that we let go the enormously important Turkish bases which could bring enormous deterrent pressure on the Soviet Union.

Politically speaking, our attention to important strategic countries like Turkey, Greece, and Italy is vacillating.

We have no particularly constructive approach to the desert areas. If war is fought with nuclear weapons, the desert can be used imaginatively to cut down the casualty rate.

The conclusion I draw is that the Mediterranean has enormous value in defensive terms under conditions of nuclear warfare. It is more important as a defensive assignment for the Soviet Union than for us; for us, its great importance is its offensive potential.

WISE USE OF MEDITERRANEAN WOULD PRECLUDE SOVIET ATTACK

The great value of the Mediterranean is also to weaken the Soviet Union by forcing her to expend firepower against targets of no use and diverting them from the United States.

If we were to make full and imaginative strategic use of the Mediterranean, we would enormously strengthen our deterrent and I would be very confident this would preclude the Soviet Union from ever attacking the United States and Western Europe.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (Col. James S. Hughes). Chances of limited war without use of at least tactical atomic weapons?

Answer. In Congo these were not used, probably would not be used in Asia or Latin America. Against Soviet bloc they would probably be required because Soviet Union would attack with superior force. The way to prevent escalation to big war is to be so strong it won't pay for other side to escalate up.

Question (E. L. Bledsoe). Will conflict be sparked, or be part of well-thought-out plan?

Answer. Stakes are such that any nation that moves impulsively will rue the day. War will come, if it does, as result of cold-blooded Russian decision.

Question (Roy P. Newell). Max Rafferty says communism is rotten. What is refreshing, right, and invigorating about capitalism?

Answer. What is refreshing about capitalism is that under it you live your own life. "Communism" is a word used to camouflage what really exists in the Soviet Union—namely, a military dictatorship, very similar to the Fascist and Prussian regimes. Communism would be no greater danger than it was 20 years ago if we still only had the technology of 20 years ago. It is its military organization with nuclear power and space possibilities that creates the most unprecedented threat we have ever faced.

Question (Col. Carter Collins). Your opinion re our administration's downgrading of bombers, antimissile missles, and carriers?

Answer. Greatest mistake we've made. These things are done under false reasoning. Technology is not static and if you do not keep up, you fall by wayside. Current policies seem to be based on hope that if we do not have provocative weapons Soviet Union will negotiate in more relaxed atmosphere. This is upside down thinking. Instead of "more bangs for the buck," administration will have us pay more bucks for fewer bangs.

Question (W. Russell Werner). Do you approve test ban?

Answer. Some of us opposing a test ban were called all sorts of names because we said underground tests could not be detected. Now same people who attacked us have agreed they cannot. We are not talking about an "absolute weapon" but we have never tested a complete weapon system, and cannot be sure antimissile missiles will work without atmospheric tests. If we are not equipped with antimissile missiles, and Soviets are, that will be close to the "absolute weapon."

Question (W. M. Strother). Red China-Soviet dispute?

Answer. It exists, but notice that all they've done is call names, whereas by semantics this name calling has become in this country a "dispute" or "split." Communists can't afford a split. Also, China is world's most vulnerable country to nuclear attack. Everybody knows it, and to ask us to believe that Soviets will side with us because of fear of China is merely psychological warfare.

Civil Rights Meaningless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Phrase 'Civil Rights' Is Meaningless." This comes from the Columns of the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, an outstanding semiweekly newspaper published at Wytheville, Va., in my congressional district. Mr. James A. Williams, Jr., the editor of this publication, is one of our finest citizens, a serious thinker who has expounded on many worthwhile subjects looking toward the betterment of this Nation.

His editorial, which I would like for all of my colleagues and the public at large to read, follows:

PHRASE "CIVIL RIGHTS" IS MEANINGLESS

Millions of words have appeared in print during the past several weeks on one subject—"civil rights." An uncountable number of sentences, long speeches, short speeches, angry speeches, moderate speeches, plus sermons and the politically motivated personal views (or that of their bosses) of commentators and reporters. Yet in the midst of all the chaos, no one has reached to the very depth of the issue. It is past the time to cut away the flimsy exterior of ballyhoo and get to the foundation—or the very fundamentals.

We contend that there is no such a thing as "civil rights." The Constitution sets forth and recognizes that the American people do have certain rights, and that each and every sovereign State making up the United States has certain rights. But let it be noted that they are just plain rights, and not "special," or "civil," or "emergency," or "democratic." Somewhere in the past a few smart politicians invented the phrase "civil rights." But such is not correct. There are privileges—but again we emphasize the privileges must be earned, and under the present constitutional form of government they are not to be granted to certain favored groups by the Government.

In the obvious overwhelming desire to secure the vote of the Negroes (or at least the liberals think so), a social revolution has been introduced, and the results are lawless actions of mobs.

Lon F. Backman, a well-known columnist of Richmond, whose articles have appeared in the Enterprise at intervals hits the nail squarely on the head with a statement he issued and received by this newspaper yesterday. He said:

"One could almost believe we have finally accepted as a national doctrine the Marxian principle that the means are justified by the ends. Here we are confronted with violence rampant on the face of the Nation, and the lawless actions of mobs are quietly tolerated with the statement, 'Those poor people have just taken all they can. We can't blame them.'

"So what do we do about this violence? We lay the blame at the doorstep of private merchants and law abiding citizens and say that we must change their way of life in order to alleviate the cause of the actions of the minority.

"We cannot help but adhere to the principle that an individual is responsible for the consequences of his own respect or lack of respect for law and order.

"Were the mobs that rage through the streets of our cities throughout this land composed of whites protesting the cramming of social revolution down their throats, Federal troops would be and have been dispatched immediately and ruthlessly to the scenes of disorder. But the Negroes, apparently, are considered mere peaceful protestors when they hurl rocks at local law enforcement officers, defy the ordinances of duly elected and installed governing bodies, and inflict personal injury on both individuals and the peace of the land."

The Enterprise again reemphasizes the fundamentals and not a so-called civil rights.

But the issue—which concerns every free American—is not segregated or integrated schools. Not serving white and colored in restaurants, or similar services at lunch counters and hotels, etc. The fundamental issue is that the National Government has no right under the Constitution to interfere in any way in the school systems or in the manner in which individual business firms operate their business of the sovereign States.

There are two major points which must always be kept in mind in dealing with this explosive subject. The first is that there is only one lawful and legal means by which the Federal Government can be given power over those areas reserved to the people and to the States in the Constitution. That is by amending the charter under which the National Government operates—which means amending the Constitution itself. This can be done only with the approval of three-fourths of the States. In other words, to take the example just cited, the National Government has no power to interfere in the schools and never will have—no matter what a packed Supreme Court says to the contrary—unless and until it is granted that power by amendment to the Constitution.

The second point is that we should never permit the idea to become implanted in our minds that the Government can give us rights. This applies especially to all those minority groups whom the politicans profess to love so much. Anything that Government gives, it can also take away. Once we acknowledge that we can get rights—any kind of rights—at the whim of Government the time might come, as it has in totalitarian systems, when the supposed beneficiaries of these Federal gifts discover that unrestricted Government is an Indian giver.

Equal Rights for Every 10th American and Every 7th Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1963, my good friend and esteemed colleague, HUGH L. CAREY, was awarded the Judge Anthony Award by Dr. Mark Murphy, president of the New York Chapter of the Citizens for Educational Freedom, for his outstanding work in the fight for a fair Federal aid bill. The occasion was the fourth national convention of the organization.

In accepting the award, Representative CAREY stated his gratitude to the Citizens for Educational Freedom and pledged to continue the fight along with his colleague, Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY of Queens, for a fair distribution of all funds for all children in all schools, public, private, and parochial.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address:

"EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERY 10TH AMERICAN AND EVERY 7TH CHILD"—ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH L. CAREY, AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE CITIZENS FOR EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM, DETROIT, MICH., AUGUST 9, 1963

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."—THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN CONGRESS, JULY 4, 1776.

"America is the only nation in the world that is founded on a creed. That creed is set forth with dogmatic theological lucidity in the Declaration of Independence."—G. K. CHESTERTON.

The spirit of the land is insurgent and the Nation tosses with unrest. We suffer national pangs of conscience, because we are not living up to the spirit of our national creed. That creed as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and codified in the Bill of Rights is an egalitarian doctrine, which suffers inequality in no degree. It places the individual at the heart of society, makes the state his servant and the civil law the protector of the equal station he holds under the laws of nature and nature's God.

Under the American creed, the equalitarian doctrine, and the moral law, there can be no lesions on the personal liberty nor fetters on the freedom of any individual.

Today the Congress is locked in debate in order to enact a restatement of our creed and doctrine. The debate does not arise because every 10th American, a Negro, has less than equal opportunity in the Ghettoes of the North or the Corridors of the South. It is joined that we may live under our American creed—that we may legislate what we believe—that while any American is under distraint or denial by reason of race, religion, or origin, the rights of none of us are safe and the freedom of all of us is in doubt.

We are convened today as citizens of all faiths and races for the preservation of freedom of the individual in education. In that interest I urge you to call upon our Nation to make the dialogue and debate as broad and extensive as our American creed and equalitarian doctrine.

EVERY TENTH AMERICAN—EVERY SEVENTH SON

The debate now centers on every 10th American, the Negro, and equality. Let it also extend to the individual and parental rights of every seventh child in American education. That seventh child, one of 7 million, attends a State licensed and accredited school in compliance with the State compulsory attendance law; a school which fulfills the public purpose in its curriculum.

In the exercise of his freedom of conscience the parent in the seventh child schools has added religion and morality to the required curriculum. This addition does not cause the State to withdraw accreditation because the curriculum has not been modified, it has been enhanced. But by reason of that exercise of freedom of conscience he does forfeit his right to a fair share of the taxes which are levied on all for the educational support of all.

When was forfeiture for exercised freedom of conscience ever condoned under the American creed and the equalitarian doctrine? The seventh child pays a price for the conscience of his parents as the 10th American does for the color of his. I do not seek to hitch a freedom ride for my seventh son on the back of the 10th American. But their plight of inequality presents arresting similarities.

First, they both seek individual freedom of choice on a plane and par with every other American.

Second, they proceed on moral and religious, as well as a legal, basis because morality and religion are part of the American creed and part of public life. It is significant that clergymen provide substantial leadership for the 10th American and that on the same day as the Supreme Court was striking the Lord's Prayer and the Bible from the public schools the President assembled 243 religious leaders of all faiths at the White House to ask their help.

Third, they both seek equality in education and equality in opportunity. The Negro is a second class citizen under the archaic custom of the segregated schools. Every seventh child is a second-class citizen because he pays the price of fiscal segregation for the exercise of freedom of conscience.

What is the 10th American who also attends a 7th child school, a 3d-class American? Fortunately, not, because civil rights leaders have testified before my committee on two occasions that the schools which teach religion are far ahead of other schools on integration. It would seem that as to the 10th American, public schools are not so public and that so-called private schools are more public indeed.

Fourth, they both have an adequate basis in the law for their rights but seek the means to implement them. The 10th American was told in the Brown case, in 1957, that integration was to proceed with all deliberate speed. But the decision was not self executing. State and local laws resisted it and the Negro is in the streets in Biloxi, Birmingham, and Englewood. Every seventh child under the Pierce case, decided in 1925, is in a State accredited school, selected by his parents as a matter of right. But that right, without the means to exercise it, is nugatory. That right is being erased due to the economic erosion of the position of the nonsupported school by increased public spending.

While public school attendance has increased 42 percent in the last 20 years, expenditures have increased 567 percent. The seventh child schools without support cannot keep pace and they are closing down grade by grade, in Billings, Fairfax, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. They, too, are being turned into the streets.

The parallel is complete. Subject to economic forces, the Negro stands stagnated due to growing affluence of middle-class society which has moved away from him, creating an insufferable living gap. The seventh child stands in economic isolation due to the economic restrictions imposed upon him by unfair and illogical selectivism in school finance.

GROUNDS FOR FEDERAL AID

I say the Federal Government must respond to the needs of all the children in the United States as individual citizens without difference or distinction. The only ground on which the Congress can legislate in this field is by reason of the general welfare and the security of all. Citizens of the several States are citizens of the United States and it is the policy of this Nation to develop the capacity for educational excellence of every young American. This does not mean 6 out of 7 or 9 out of 10 but every young American. The Congress is not bound and must not be bound by discriminatory State laws and outmoded customs in assisting every individual.

The dollar must follow the child.

AIM OF FEDERAL AID

The aim of Federal aid must be to adjust imbalances and inequities which are visited upon its citizens from State to State or within the States. It must not distribute funds in such a way that it will sustain the structure of inequality but rather a way that it will stimulate quality for all. What the States have chosen to regulate, the Federal Government may stimulate. If a school is accredited and licensed by the State then the Federal Government must recognize the students of that school as eligible for its benefits. It is unthinkable that any Federal aid would accentuate the present difficulty of the seventh child schools by giving to all others the funds that will help to hire away their teachers and otherwise increase their hardship.

The clear way to equal aid for all is before the Congress. H.R. 320 by Mr. DELANEY is the GI bill for children. It has more companion bill sponsors than any other general education bill now pending. I am sure that you are familiar with its provisions which aid all individuals as did the GI bill on a fair and equal basis. One of the most important features of this bill is that it would provide aid without Federal control or increased administration. Because there can be no contact with institutions there is no need for expanded bureaus.

As a grant to an individual it deals with the unit in our society which is, and must remain, beyond control, the individual. Support for this bill is mounting because it appeals to fairness, it appeals to commonsense. The recent endorsement of H.R. 320 in the Saturday Evening Post by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, one of this Nation's most enlightened educators, is a milestone. There are other bills which square with the principles of equality and they are moving in the Congress. The medical education bill and the higher education bill are broadly supported and favorably reported. The first passed the House—the second is now pending before the House. Both make provisions for every American student who has a will to learn.

We can point with satisfaction to the advances at State levels in scholarship and student incentive plans for all students providing freedom of choice in California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York. As a New Yorker I am particularly proud of the statement of the regents in my State referring to that plan: "Hand in hand with the development of increased public facilities must go the strengthening of the private institutions. Our system of education in the United States is characterized by a wholesome diversity. The variety of sponsorship and support reflects the pluralism of our country. In a real sense, this variety is a safeguard against any encroachment on the intellectual freedom which must be accorded our institutions of higher learning. We have a commitment to foster such diversity and, therefore, the distributive re-

sponsibility for the conduct of higher education."

Especially let us salute Rhode Island, the plantation of freedom of thought and conscience in America and its new textbook loan plan. And "hail to Michigan" with its fine and fair new school bus law.

Since I last addressed you in 1961 we can truly recount much progress. Many new faces are counted in the ranks of those who support educational freedom and this is a tribute to the efforts of those organizations such as yours which plead the cause of freedom and fairness. You have had criticism levelled at you but that is the risk of those who travel in the advance guard of freedom, keeping the American creed. Know your opponents and hear them, but fear them not. From my seat on the Committee on Education I have looked down the barrel of their objections and they are black and empty. Without shin kicking and shoe pounding, let us have a discourse on fair and equal treatment and examine the objections of the pedantic professional opposition.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

Objection number one is that aid to the seventh child schools would cause proliferation. This is a professional pedantic swearword meaning spread, growth, and diversity.

In the words of the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel: "The glory of our system of education is its diversity." Schools cannot proliferate unless approved by the State educational agency. How can the Federal Government preclude the growth the State would approve?

Objection number two is the fear of rivalry between State schools and those of every seventh child school. To that I say the essential ingredient of free enterprise is the maximum effort by everyone, in harmony, in the educational marketplace so that no one agency monopolizes. The alternative to competition is unthinkable under the American creed of free enterprise. To cite Rabbi Morris Sherer, executive vice president, Agudath Israel of America, before my committee:

"Our Founding Fathers never intended that our children be reared in a monolithic educational straitjacket. Our educational plant is a mosaic, with the free play of the many faceted cultures of our people blending into the molding of an informed, dedicated, and loyal citizenry." The rabbi correctly stated what this Nation must be prepared to admit: That we are racially and religiously and culturally pluralistic.

Our educational assistance must recognize this and provide for it.

As to the cabal that religion permeates the curriculum in the seventh child schools and that it makes the obvious secular and public purpose subjects indivisible from religious indoctrination, I point out that the American creed, the Declaration of Independence, is permeated with theology and our public life is replete with religion reference points. The overriding concept is that the nature of the subject matter in the public purpose seventh child schools is secular and governments must deal with the nature of things. Education is education and permeation does not change its nature whether that permeation be secularistic or theistic.

Finally, what of the separationists among the objectors who saw the whole edifice of government falling into the hands of the clergy when the seventh school child ate his first hot lunch and boarded a New Jersey bus. The answer for all of us who believe in separation of church and state is that we must have safeguards that will guarantee not only separation of church and state but also separation of school and state in the sense that the mind of the child must remain free from the control of government.

We must have safeguards and we want safeguards but there must not be stumbling blocks in the path of every seventh child.

Two years after the enactment of the GI bill for Junior the education of all our children would be enriched by $1.5 billion. The state would be no weaker because it invested in its own citizens. The church and state would be as separate as before—but the student—the interest of both, would be a more enlightened citizen and church and state should be more secure in that confidence.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK—ECUMENISM IN EDUCATION

The President has proclaimed November 10 to 16 this year as American Education Week. Not Nationalized Education Week, or Monopolized Education Week, but American Education Week. I hope that the spirit of American Education Week will be that cited by the first two administration witnesses who appeared before the Education Committee this year. It was an extension of the American creed as contained in the Northwest Ordinance of 1789, as follows:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

In the spirit of that ordinance, for American Education Week I suggest that we promote the theme of ecumenism in education. Ecumenism in education, not for the benefit of the 10th American and the 7th son, but for all men. I want all my children and all the children of America to know about a man who was not an American but who had America in his heart and lived the American creed. It was he who gave us "Mater et Magistra" to take us to the plane of understanding and "Pacem in Terris" to bring us back from the brink of annihilation. We need ecumenism in education so that as individuals we can see our differences, minimize them and rejoice in our unity in diversity. With John XXIII, as a basis for ecumenism in education and peace, let us advance the universal declaration of human rights—that document which, in most solemn form, acknowledged the dignity of every person, be he that 10th American or my 7th son, the right of free movement in search of truth and in the attainment of moral good and justice—and the prior right of the parent in the education of his children. It would be my hope that through ecumenism every child might learn of John's wish for mankind, that we might become more equal to our task so that every human being will fully enjoy those rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable. I express this hope for every 10th American and for all Americans, but especially for 1 American—my 7th son. You see, his name is Paul—and he and I have much to do. We need your help.

Let us advance the cause of educational freedom and the new ecumenism in a most militant way. March we must, as far at least as the corner mailbox, the local Citizens for Educational Freedom chapter, the Congressman's district office. The fairness and force of our idea will carry, your ranks will swell. It has been said: "More powerful than the tread of mighty armies is the idea whose moment has arrived."

The moment for this idea to become reality, to fulfill the spirit of our American creed is now; the moment has arrived.

The Military Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINISKI. Mr. Speaker, since the other body has recently processed the pay raise for military servicemen, the differences are now being resolved in conference. It is practical for us to associate the impact of the increase in military pay on our national budget.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial of Thursday, August 8, dramatically illustrates the significance of this entire question. I place this editorial into the RECORD at this point, and feel it will stimulate the necessary review of our congressional steps to effectively appropriate for Federal expenditures.

THE MILITARY PAY RAISE

The Senate, acting with unusual dispatch, has unanimously approved a pay raise for military services. The bill now goes back to the House.

There is no doubt that this pay raise is essential. It will improve the morale of the services immeasurably. It will make the Armed Forces more attractive as a career for men with skills vital to our defenses.

High morale and the retention of needed men in the military services are vitally necessary if we are to maintain a strong defense. Both of these necessities are riddled when financial want is present.

A survey made by the Associated Press showed that thousands of servicemen have had to turn to charity. Some have had to ask local welfare agencies for food and clothing for their families.

For example: A highly skilled second-class Navy petty officer (equivalent in rank to an Army sergeant) is paid $210 a month if single. If he marries and has children his total pay and allowances come to $345 monthly—less than $80 a week. The average pay for a secretary in Chicago is $84 a week.

There is no indication that our expenditures for military strength can be safely reduced for a long time. The signing last week of the nuclear test-ban treaty may have raised this hope in some minds; it should not have. The ultimate aim of the Communist world is to overcome the West. A strong and effective military force is insurance against that ambition.

As we pointed out on this page on January 7 when Defense Secretary McNamara proposed this pay raise, the necessity of it should not be an excuse for increased deficit spending by the Government.

The pay raise would add about $1.2 billion annually. The extra expense is not the last the administration will be faced with; there will be others as essential as it.

These extra costs of Government point up the need for increased vigilance in bringing the budget under control. Outgo must be kept in line with income if there is to be any exercise of fiscal responsibility. Deficit financing cannot go on forever.

Until such vigilance is exercised, until strong and effective means of cutting back useless expenditures and waste are brought to bear there can be no hope of any cut in the tax load now borne by the taxpayer.

National Young Republican Federation Adopts Resolution Stressing Need for Staff Members Responsible to Minority on Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a resolution stressing the need for minor-

ity staffing of congressional committees, the National Young Republican Convention pointed out a situation which found 8 percent of the committee staff members responsible to House Republicans whereas some 40 percent of House membership is Republican. In the Senate, a similar ratio of 7 to 34 percent exists.

The convention strongly asserted that its minority rights could not be protected nor could its organization function in Congress unless a fixed percentage of each committee's budget be apportioned to the minority for the purpose of the employment of an adequate minority staff on each committee if the Republican members so request. This plank, if implemented, would give the GOP the help it so badly needs to formulate and enunciate sound, positive principles as related to legislative issues in this and in future Congresses.

The "be it therefore resolved" clause of the resolution follows:

Therefore be it resolved, That the convention supports, as all fairminded Republicans and Democrats should support, the allocation of a fixed percentage of each committee's budget to the minority for the employment of minority staffs on each congressional committee, provided the majority of the minority members of a committee so request.

Growing Overdependence on Courts Perils Judicial System, Harlan Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during the American Bar Association meeting in Chicago this week one of the speakers was Justice John M. Harlan, a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. I was pleased to read in the Washington Post, of August 14, a news story setting forth some of the statements made by Justice Harlan to the lawyers of America.

It is my feeling that the warning which Justice Harlan has sounded is one which should be heeded by lawyers and laymen alike when he points out that there is a growing overdependence on the Federal courts. Justice Harlan has eloquently stated some of the basic principles of States rights which many of us have asserted in the Congress from time to time. His warning adds emphasis to the validity of the position of those of us who believe that constitutional government is in jeopardy if the present trend of judicial decision is not halted.

Under unanimous consent I include the Washington Post story referred to above to be made a part of the RECORD today:

GROWING OVERDEPENDENCE ON COURTS PERILS JUDICIAL SYSTEM, HARLAN SAYS

CHICAGO, AUGUST 11.—Supreme Court Justice John M. Harlan said today that the entire judicial system is being threatened by the idea that courts can solve all of the deficiences in modern-day society.

Speaking at the dedication of a large addition to the new American Bar Center here, Justice Harlan also called upon all lawyers to work vigorously to help the Nation solve the "many burning issues of the period."

The Justice's remarks were a direct reflection of his view that too many of those issues are being carried into the courts and the courts, including the Supreme Court, have gone too far in attempting to solve them.

Justice Harlan was the leading dissenter on the Supreme Court at its last term, disagreeing with the majority in 43 cases and writing dissenting opinions in 22 of them.

FAVORS LONG-RANGE VIEW

He has dissented when the Court applied Federal standards of search and seizure to the States, when it stepped into the reapportionment tangle, and when it struck down some Federal and State laws. He has said the Court's majority sometimes decides cases with an eye to immediate justice rather than to a long-range view of the decision's effect upon the law.

The reasons given by those who take the cosmic view and think the courts should solve more and more problems, Justice Harlan said, are doubt whether the Federal system is still adequate to meet the needs of society, impatience with the slowness of political solutions, and an urge for quick panaceas for things that require reform.

He said the Federal system is "difficult to operate" and does require "accommodations * * * that may often seem irksome or inefficient." But out of that process, he said, "usually come pragmatic solutions of more lasting value than those emanating from the pens of the best of theoretical planners."

URGES BALANCE BE KEPT

"Unless we are prepared to consider the diversified development of the United States as having run its course and to envisage the future of the country largely as that of a welfare society, we will do well to keep what has been called 'the delicate balance of the Federal-State relations' in good working order," he said.

In addition to regarding the Federal system inadequate, Justice Harlan said, "some well-meaning people apparently believe that the judicial rather than the political process is more likely to breed better solutions of pressing or thorny problems. This is a compliment to the judiciary but untrue to democratic principles."

The argument, he added, makes it difficult for judges to refuse to revise inadequate laws passed by Congress or to refuse to strike down laws that are "manifestly unwise, harsh, or out of date."

CRITICISM ENCOURAGED

But carried to its logical extreme, Justice Harlan said, the idea would eventually lead to a "substantial transfer of legislative power to the court," and a lessening of judicial independence and of legislative responsibility.

"A judicial decision which is founded simply on the impulse that 'something must be done' or which looks no further than to the justice or injustice of a particular case is not likely to have lasting influence," he said.

Justice Harlan urged all lawyers to keep abreast of current constitutional trends, to engage in "constructive criticism" of judicial decisions, and to help inform the public about what judicial decisions mean.

He said "constructive criticism of judicial decisions * * * is a good thing for the judiciary and for healthy development of the law. But it is surely equally true that ill-informed or intemperate criticism of the doings of the courts only serves to breed misunderstandings and ultimately disregard for law."

Truth in Lending: Letters From a Merchant's Wife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since I first introduced my truth in lending bill several years ago, I have heard from thousands of concerned citizens who support the principle of full disclosure of finance charges and interest rates on personal credit.

Among these communications are a series of remarkable letters written by the irate and witty wife of a Pasadena, Calif., retailer. I have enjoyed these letters so much that I think they should be shared with the Congress and the public, for in a delightful fashion they state the case for S. 750. I have prepared these letters, some of which are directed to me, and others of which are directed to various business and Government officers with copies furnished to me, for insertion in the RECORD only by deleting the name of the author and certain other personal references.

I ask unanimous consent that these nine letters, in chronological order, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1963.

Re S. 1740.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Enclosed is photocopy of a statement from a California retailer showing a service charge at the interest rate of 37 percent per month, 444 percent per annum. A letter from our State attorney general advises me that this 444-percent rate is perfectly legal in California, under the ambiguities of the credit law that retail lobbyists claim to have helped to write.

I wish you the best of luck, Senator, in getting your "truth in lending" legislation out of committee this year. It is legislation vitally needed—especially here in California where State government has lulled the public into believing that 18 percent per annum is the legal maximum for service charges on the unpaid balances of revolving credit accounts. On the contrary, however, the untested ambiguities of the law provide for whatever excesses any credit merchant stoops low enough to reach.

But government's misrepresentations of fact, I believe, the American electorate has an absolute right to know about—and the U.S. Senate, a solemn duty to investigate. With a view to acquainting the electorate with credit truths, I am doing research on comparative, State-by-State interest rates available to credit merchants throughout the Nation. I'd be most grateful to receive whatever statistics on this you might care to send me.

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 18, 1963.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Subcommittee hearings on your "truth in lending" bill

have jolted me into shock. It's nothing short of insulting, the battle required of you to champion the right of consumers to see credit prices stated as explicitly as cash prices. Why should consumers have to wallow through a maze of arithmetic to find the interest rates of credit financing? Are credit-grantors paying either consumers or the U.S. Senate to calculate percentages for them?

A price is a price is a price, for heaven sake. For merchants, the price of cash is no further interest on their investment beyond the moment of sale. For merchants with nothing but money to sell, the price is jail or starvation—one way or another, something's wrong with the inventory. And why should Government worry about that? A man who can't do his own worrying shouldn't be a merchant. He should be a bum.

For consumers, the price of credit is paying interest for buying something they didn't save the cash to pay for. But for Government, the price of voting against consumers is finding another job. So what's all the argument about? At such percentages, who's voting against motherhood?

My personal interest soared to the sky over the credit-grantors' side of the story as presented by Under Secretary of Commerce Edward Gudeman (lately resigned). Mr. Gudeman described Sears, Roebuck as but a series of small, local-merchant-type stores, not actually the giant omnipotence of its public image. This interested me because my husband, too, is a small retailer. He has a shop in Pasadena—only a few blocks, as a matter of fact, from one of Sears' "little stores."

Taking Mr. Gudeman's testimony at face value, the basic difference that I could find between Sears, Roebuck and our shop is that I'd be ashamed to stay married to my husband if he service charged with the revolving credit policy that Sears uses. But it's a distorted picture of the Nation's credit financing as a whole to limit comparisons to us small, local merchants. The big chain ones certainly merit equal attention.

Japanese-owned Seibu's and America's J. W. Robinson chains in California are the only really big ones I could find, in a 3-year search, who service charge in a manner with which it would be hard to quarrel. In lonely splendor, these two giants of merchandising make no attempt whatsoever to trick consumers with credit doubletalk; they simply charge at the interest rate which California's attorney geenral and consumer counsel tell the public is the State's legal maximum, according to the credit law that was written in 1959.

Speaking of big, Broadway-Hale is so flabbergastingly big that its president was appointed to a cabinet member's "code of business ethics" steering committee. Broadway operates with a credit policy identical to Sears except for charge-account agreements more ambiguously worded. Bullock's is another in the Sears bracket of credit policy, if not in size.

Doubtless there are still other retailers, big and small, who follow the buried-interest credit policy initiated by little Sears, Roebuck in New York in 1957 (1955?) and since spread by credit grantors' lobbyists throughout some 40 States of the Union. Who knows what injury their monthly compounded hidden interest has caused to production and distribution industries by diverting consumer dollars from normal channels of inventory replacements? Nobody knows. Everybody's like watching a golden goose in the process of laying an egg. But men who can be so good at hiding things can learn to be good at finding them again—and this without the aid of computers, I'm hoping.

I'm hoping, too, that Utah's Senator BENNETT will be among the first to understand the Nation's economic dilemma outlined here, for he and I are soul counsins: I share his dread of computer machines. Especially, I have a phobia about the revolving kind that so many retailers use nowadays for an answering service whenever anyone questions why they're calling paid balances unpaid balances on credit consumers' partially paid bills. Ask a stupid machine a why question, though, and you get a stupid answer. Why? Because the smart aleck machine hasn't been invented yet that can answer a why to anything.

In short, this illustrates perfectly why I'm in favor of Federal rather than State legislation on credit truths. I'm in favor of scrapping on a nationwide basis (it's the Irish in me, I guess) all those infernal machines that have beheaded human intelligence in merchandising. I'd like to see them, for their hard hearts, get tarred and feathered.

Yours sincerely,

———

PASADENA, CALIF.,
March 12, 1963.

BANK OF AMERICA,
Public Relations Department,
Los Angeles, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: It's not generally known among consumers that banks charge lower interest for revolving credit than most national chain retailers charge for the same service. Nevertheless, the American Bankers Association is battling in Washington to defeat Federal truth-in-lending legislation as championed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

What's the matter with you banking people? Don't you like yourselves very well? Your public image is being dragged to the lowest level of credit financing ethics rather than being proudly displayed at the much higher level upon which you actually operate.

Most housewives, who are the principal users of revolving credit, do not understand that some credit grantors will take more deceptive advantage of ambiguous State credit laws than others will. If a business is large and prominent, the average consumer assumes it is also ethical, and usually this is true because competition keeps it so. But in the area of retail credit, competition, although present, is not spelled out clearly to consumers.

For example, I have a retail statement showing a service charge at the simple interest rate of 444 percent per annum. When I tried to explain to my neighbors that this was 426 percent higher, at simple interest, than a Bank of America credit arrangement would have cost, the neighbors thought I was crazy. They replied, in effect, "Oh, don't be silly. No retailer would dare to charge a higher interest rate than the Bank of America."

Gentlemen, I leave it up to you to decide how long decent, ethical American businessmen will sit out on the limb they're sawing off between themselves and the tree. Certainly Senator DOUGLAS can't fight all your battles for you, all alone. And it's for sure that I'm not going to bother defending you any longer in the face of your own opposition. The next time the bridge club girls tell me that your bank service charges at the same hilarious interest rates of so many national chain retailers, I'm going to keep my little mouth shut and let you speak for yourself.

Yours sincerely,

———

MARCH 12, 1963.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP.,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Do you manufacture the revolving machine that so many department stores use nowadays as an answering service whenever anyone questions why they're calling paid balances "unpaid" balances on credit-consumers' partially paid bills? If you don't, you'd better get busy and support Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' truth-in-lending legislation, lest all the housewives in the Nation think it's your machine that can't do fourth grade arithmetic.

This revolving thing so widely used in service-charge computations seems to have a screw loose somewhere and is reflecting upon the quality of more reliable business machines. For example, California's attorney general tells us housewives, who are the principal users of revolving credit, that 18 percent per annum is the State's 'legal maximum for service charges on the unpaid balances of retail charge accounts. So, naturally, when I received a service charge at the rate of 70 percent per annum, I figured that somebody's computer had goofed and phoned the department store to complain. That was when this revolving answering service first came to my attention.

The switchboard was set at: "Good morning. What department are you calling, please?"

The bookkeeping board was set at: "Good morning * * *. That's what you signed to pay us, lady, on your revolving-credit agreement * * *. I am sorry. I cannot close your account for you; you will have to speak with our counselor first."

The credit manager's board was set at: "Good morning * * *. Please do not talk about our directors that way. Our directors are completely unapproachable. Therefore, in any controversy between a customer and the directors' board, the customer is always wrong."

One could only pray. There was not a single thing else to do. One could pray that the counselor one must consult, before being allowed to close one's own charge account, would be an ipso factor psychiatrist specializing in head noises. The bookkeeper sounded like the switchboard; the switchboard sounded like the credit manager; the credit manager sounded like a fuse blew; and everything together sounded like Shelley Berman on the top of the morning after the night before.

Now ordeals like this are being suffered by credit consumers throughout the 40-plus States of the Union where credit grantors' lobbyists have succeeded in guiding ambiguous credit laws through State legislatures. And those same lobbyists are presently in Washington trying to convince the U.S. Senate that true and accurate percentage computations will only confuse consumers. In the meantime, fury is mounting in the hearts of housewives who are being given the royal runaround by both credit managers and their own State governments.

Thus is seems merely in the best interests of reliable business machine manufacturers to get the truth about interest rate computations straightened out on a nationwide basis. And thus I hope you will urge all your employees to write to their elected representatives in Congress in support of the truth-in-lending bill as championed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Yours sincerely,

———

MARCH 14, 1963.

Mr. HERBERT J. MILLER, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Following your recent TV program on the public's responsibilities in law enforcement, the commentator quoted from Justice Holmes: "To be respected, the law must first be respectable."

This is by way of mentioning that deceptive credit practices are still rampant, despite our correspondence of 2 years ago. It strikes me that the basic difference between a juvenile who snatches an old lady's purse and a merchant who deceives the lady about the interest rates of his credit financing lies in the area of penalties. The juvenile gets a court sentence; the merchant, likely as not, gets appointed to the U.S. Commerce Secre-

tary's "Code of Business Ethics" Committee. And who can respect a law like that?

Is there no redress for a public whose own State government acts as "front" for deceptive business practices? Your TV comments suggested that citizens frustrated by inept local governments can always vote for a reform group. But in California there was no credit reform group to vote for in 1962. And it seems strange, indeed, to credit-rooked housewives that Federal antitrust laws do not cover the activities of retail lobbyists who run around the country writing and interpreting State credit laws to suit themselves.

Far from receiving a slap on the wrist, however, those lobbyists find themselves elevated to positions of high prestige from which they can look down on the American electorate in utter contempt. While they're up there, if their fantastic greed succeeds in accelerating unemployment in production and distribution industries by diverting consumer dollars from normal channels of inventory replacements—well, what if it does? Perhaps if the peasants run out of bread, they'll settle for cake. And then, again, perhaps they won't.

One way or another, Californians have exhausted all avenues for credit reform except an appeal to the good Senator from Illinois and to you. If you have any further suggestions for the exercise of responsible citizenship in law enforcement, I'll be most eager to hear your thoughts on it.

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

MARCH 16, 1963.

PASADENA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Pasadena, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: Are you, perchance, out of your minds? The reason I ask is because you sit so quietly acquiescent while the U.S. Chamber of Commerce warns our Government in Washington that small retailers would be forced out of business if they were required to tell their customers the truth about credit-finance interest rates. I'd be willing to wager that you you'd be on your feet pronto, shouting in holy horror, if government made an accusation like that about the integrity of free enterprise. Why, then, do you tolerate it when it comes from within the family?

Being a merchant's wife myself, I make it a point to patronize only those retailers—big or small—who tell me money truths promptly and with no arm twisting. I feel the same way about doctors, lawyers, dentists, bankers, brokers, manufacturers, politicians, schoolteachers, and even clergymen.

If you share my feelings about economic honesties, write to your Federal Senators and Representatives in support of truth-in-lending legislation as championed by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Defend American businessmen against those who blacken their public image.

Yours sincerely,

——— ———.

APRIL 1, 1963.

The EDITORS,
Business Week,
New York, N.Y.

MESSIEURS: In line with your March 30 praise of California's consumer protection programs, would any of the men in your office care to buy the Golden Gate Bridge on the revolving credit terms we can offer out here in P.T. Barnum heaven?

According to the law that credit-grantors' lobbyists helped our State legislature to write in 1959, the terms would be 1½-percent service charges compounded on the buyer's outstanding balances from month to month. But please don't ask from what month to which month because California hasn't made up its mind yet. Maybe it's waiting to see what precedent New York will set in case anyone wants to buy the Brooklyn Bridge under the revolving credit terms that retail lobbyists helped you more sophisticated easterners to write into your State law back in 1957.

In fact, New York's lead has become a national conversation piece now that the same lobbyists have supervised the credit law writing for some 40 States of the Union. It's getting so that if a prospect wants to buy Yellowstone Park—or even just a new suit or an old rocking chair—on revolving credit, a salesman has a devil of a time figuring which months to compound the service charges on, no matter what States he's operating in. The trade magazine, Western Merchandiser, issued this warning on it as long ago as November 1961:

"It is better to use a chart than to tell the customer that the (service) charge is a percentage of the balance due. Interpretation of a percent often involves lengthy explanation—rarely satisfactory to a customer. A merchant can explain that his chart is exactly like that of such-and-such a department store, or Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward."

So that, I suppose, is how California's attorney general came to be inundated with letters from housewives—the principal users of revolving credit. Maybe the girls were in hysterics about something. Possibly they wanted to know if the A-G was the one who approved the charts that Sears advertises as being "legally approved". They'd wonder, womanlike, if "Such & Such's" department store has become the supreme law of the land. And they'd naturally feel that if it has, the U.S. Senate should be duly notified along with magazine editors, the FBI, and the PTA.

Actually, that's why I resolved early in life never to try selling public property to women. When a man gets stung on something so corny as an ambiguous credit law, he's likely to feel so ashamed of himself that he'll keep quiet about it. But let the same thing happen to a woman, and she'll scream it to the entire Nation that ambiguous credit laws pose a potential hazard to the U.S. gold reserves—in case a foreign-controlled merchant should take the hidden-interest advantage of ambiguities that so many American merchants take. And honestly. Women can be such blabbermouths about their money problems that it's enough to make a struggling Eiffel Tower salesman almost feel like jumping off one. N'est-ce pas?

Mais c'est la vie, et les femmes aussi. Anyway, please let me know as soon as possible, messieurs, if you find any male prospects for the Golden Gate.

Avec les sentiments bien agreable,
Sincerement,

——— ———.

APRIL 16, 1963.

Re Federal truth-in-lending legislation.

Gov. EDMUND G. BROWN,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR BROWN: Just because California's "Big Daddy" votes against motherhood is no reason for you to follow his ludicrous lead. Whatever your personal worries, you should at least recognize that our boss-daddy does everything in such big and dramatic ways that even his political goofs are colossal ones. It's merely academic to wonder how many goofs he can afford before ruining his career.

Most revolving-credit consumers are either women or children (teenagers). To betray these particular consumer groups is to violate the most deeply ingrained taboos of human life—indeed, of the entire animal kingdom. And yet that's exactly what many of America's leading credit merchants are doing; in California, under the auspices of the ambiguous revolving-credit law. To make matters worse, your subordinates have misled those women and children about the meaning of California Civil Code 1810.4.

History will record it that an amazing breed of caddish moneylenders achieved their heights of infamous success in outwitting the feeble, the lame, and the immature—only with the aid of government under your administration. And history's brutal facts will be unfair to you in this respect, for you've been manuevered into an awkward political position.

Under the circumstances, it appears that the retrieving noble gesture for you is to throw your gubernatorial weight unequivocally behind the Federal Truth-in-Lending bill proposed by Senator Paul Douglas, with a view to settling State credit disgraces on a national basis—as our President has so wisely urged us to do. (Your enemies you manage rather well by yourself, Governor; but like politicians before you, you and the President both need God's own protection against your friends.)

Sincerely,

——— ———.

JULY 8, 1963.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Banking and Currency,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: In reply to your letter of July 1 expressing your interest in knowing the amount of my contribution sent in care of Senator DOUGLAS toward defraying expenses for out-of-town hearings on truth-in-lending legislation:

I blush with embarrassment in telling you that my contribution was only $10. I wish it might have been ever so much more, for I feel deeply that a principle of government is involved here that far transcends the mere finances of the 5-to-1 ratio you indicate it would cost the Senate to weigh the testimony of consumers alongside that of credit grantors. (Your letter states that you have already spent more than $50,000 and estimate that it will cost a prohibitive $10,000 more for what you believe will be largely irrelevant testimony on legislation that affects the financial welfare of the families of every housewife in the Nation.)

Your opinion that no new evidence on the credit subject can be produced by out-of-town hearings strikes me as analogous to the attitude of a judge who would dismiss a case after hearing only one side of it. As a matter of actual fact, I have a suitcase full of written evidence that neither you nor any other Senator has ever laid eyes on, and I fail to comprehend the logic of anyone's assuming, sight unseen, that the contents of that suitcase are irrelevant.

Moreover, I am merely one among many credit-indignant American housewives. How is it possible to hold the opinion that America's millions of credit consumers have no new evidence to offer without even granting them the courtesy of their day in court? After all, this is their U.S. Senate we discuss here fully as much as it is the Senate of national chain department store executives. And it's hardly compatible with the volatile nature of the species that reputedly controls 90 percent of our Nation's consumer economy to expect women to think statesmanlike thoughts of politicians who appropriate $50,000 to hear the credit grantors' side of the story and then balk at spending one-fifth of that amount to listen to the ladies speaking for themselves.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Home Rule's Dangers Revealed at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article written by Bill Gold entitled "Home Rule's Dangers Revealed at Last."

I think Mr. Gold has placed his finger on an important point in connection with the so-called home rule proposed legislation. The longer I live the more sense I think George Washington and our forefathers had when they set aside a 10-mile square for the seat of our National Government and the provisions they inserted in the Constitution giving the Congress exclusive jurisdiction over all legislation for the District of Columbia. I realize by Executive orders from the White House and regulations through the District Commissioners this provision of the Constitution has been almost ignored by some of our leaders. I hope every Member of the House will take a few minutes to read the enclosed article:

HOME RULE'S DANGERS REVEALED AT LAST

(By Bill Gold)

It's never too late to learn. For years, I thought that Washington's residents should be permitted to vote, just as other Americans are. But an editorial in another newspaper has opened my eyes to the dangers inherent in permitting freemen to run their own affairs. The editorial made reference to the fact that several Kansas City policemen have been charged with burglary, and several others face similar charges in Mineola, Long Island, "another home rule community."

The editorial points out that Washington, which does not have home rule, has a fine police department. It concludes that if Washington's citizens are ever permitted to vote, conditions here might become as bad as they are in Kansas City and Mineola.

I must confess that this editorial has opened my eyes. The cause-and-effect relationship had previously escaped me. But now, for the first time, I can see the dangers of democracy.

Chicago is a home rule city. Do we want Chicago-type gangsters and gang wars in Washington? I should say not.

Do we want the fiscal difficulties of Philadelphia? Do we want the political machines of Boston, a home rule city in which a candidate sometimes conducts his campaign for office from a jail cell? Every red-blooded American knows the answer to that question.

In Dallas and Fort Worth, home rule has given rise to braggadocio and antagonism. And this is not just an isolated example. Home rule has had the same predictable result in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

In Detroit, the infamous Purple Gang flourished in a hotbed of home rulers. The residents of Phenix City (Ala.) and Newport (Ky.) were permitted to vote, and misused their freedom to run wide open dens of iniquity. Canton (Ohio) never seemed to bother about its red light district, and down in Columbus, two large gambling houses operated for decades smack across the street from the Governor's mansion. Home rule, bah.

The citizens of Memphis used their ballots to keep Boss Crump in power, just as the deluded home rulers in Jersey City kept Boss Hague at the head of a graft-ridden machine.

It's the same story the world over. In London, sex and depravity are so rampant they make headlines; in Paris, another home rule community, they're so bad that they are no longer considered news. Rome's dolce vita is an open scandal.

And in Moscow, where citizens are also permitted to vote, they have turned openly Communist. Is that what we want in this country?

I trust that you will not waste any time in sending me letters that point out that voteless Washington has had eras of police corruption as well as eras of high police achievement. You won't fool me with a red herring of that kind. The editorial has made it plain to me that permitting people to vote for their city officials is an inherently dangerous idea. In any home rule city where the police fail to become burglars, it's obviously because they're just too lazy to get out and hustle. No initiative.

Under the circumstances, I intend to halt my efforts on behalf of home rule for Washington. Instead, I propose to devote my energies to bringing to other American cities the blessings of appointive government that Washington now enjoys. We mustn't be selfish about this. Let's take away everybody's vote.

Heretofore, I had the foolish notion that we have a good police force here because Police Chief Robert V. Murray is an honest and able public servant, and because he has worked diligently to weed out the few rotten apples that one must expect to find in any large group of human beings.

But the editorial has set me straight. The reason we have a good police force is because Washington residents are not permitted to select their own public officials. I can see now that the policemen themselves deserve none of the credit.

But for a while there, they sure had me fooled.

Protest Versus Indecency or Riot of Racists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tablet of August 1, 1963, "Protest Versus Indecency or Riot of Racists?":

PROTEST VERSUS INDECENCY OR RIOT OF RACISTS

A citizens' protest against indecency was twisted in news stories to make it appear as an action of racists, according to the editor of a national anti-Communist biweekly published in Staten Island.

Frank A. Capell, editor of the Herald of Freedom and Metropolitan Review and former chief of the Subversive Activities Control Board of Westchester County, reported on the results of a special edition of his publication dealing with Summerlane School and Camp of Manhattan and Rosman, N.C.

NO CENSORSHIP

The special July 3 issue reproduced promotional literature for the camp, widely advertised as integrated, stating that there is no censorship of any kind and no regulation of private behavior of the teenage campers, and that teachers and counselors "are not expected to hide their weaknesses from the children."

The issue also contained information on George von Hilsheimer, camp director, whom it described as "a former minister who admittedly has engaged in acts of sexual degeneracy, who is a radical and a nihilist." A brochure was quoted saying many of Summerlane's teachers had worked in the Highland Folk School, cited as a Communist enterprise by the State of Georgia.

Copies of this issue were supplied to the Rosman Chamber of Commerce for distribution to State legislators, judges, prosecuting officers, and civic groups. This was done, Mr. Capell said, to provide documentation on which to base a demand for action by the proper authorities.

Mr. Capell reported that protests were made to the camp operators after complaints of gross immorality at the camp in the form of nude mixed bathing (to which a local Baptist minister was reportedly an eyewitness) and a camp newspaper containing a sexual promiscuity theme (not fit for gentlemen to read, according to the local sheriff).

"The conduct at the camp so incensed the local citizens," Mr. Capell continued, "that residents of the camp were warned not to come into town and to stay in the camp to avoid trouble. The campers disregarded the warning and after several incidents the local citizenry took matters into their own hands. Several hundred people marched on the camp, destroyed the main building and told the campers to get out."

Then, Mr. Capell said, came the newspaper stories which distorted the protest into a mob action prompted by racism.

MOVE TO RED PICNIC SPOT

A check of the local records, Mr. Capell stated, reveals that reports of injuries were grossly exaggerated in news stories. A stabbing turned out to have been the taking of a knife away from one of the camp counsellors who was then relieved of the seat of his trousers with it, with no personal injury.

He said the campers have found refuge in a New Jersey camp "well known for the number of Communist activities which have taken place there. Camp Midvale is located at Ringwood, N.J., and has long been a favorite vacation and picnic resort of Communist and Communist-front groups. The Communist paper, the Worker, holds its annual picnics there."

The article concerning Summerlane in the Herald of Freedom recommended action by the "proper authorities" and "bringing such activities to an end by lawful methods," Mr. Capell pointed out. "However," he concluded, "the invaders of the South goad the normally peaceful and religious people into acts of violence by refusing to obey the law and to cooperate with local authorities for their own protection. Their agitation creates violence."

Commissioning of the U.S.S. "William F. Halsey"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, last month in San Francisco, the Navy commissioned the U.S.S. *William F. Halsey*, which is the latest type of guided-missile destroyer. This was a significant event for the Nation, not only because the

Navy needs to replace its aging fleet with modern warships, but because this ship carries the name of one of the greatest military heroes of all time, Admiral "Bull" Halsey. The principal speaker at this occasion was the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Fred Korth. Secretary Korth delivered a fine address which truly lived up to the importance of the occasion. But the speech was even more significant because it dealt with one of the foundation blocks of U.S. power, U.S. naval supremacy. Mr. Korth pays high tribute to the deserving name of Halsey, but he tells us about the subtleties of seapower, present and future, which Admiral Halsey believed in so strongly. Mr. Korth projects the story of the Navy-Marine Corps team, in war or peace. The most profound change in the history of warfare is that in the event of hostilities, virtually no spot on earth is beyond the range of attack from the seas. This is the direct result of advancing science and technology.

Mr. Speaker, I was closely associated with Admiral Halsey during World War II and I would like to insert a copy of Mr. Korth's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time. This speech is enlightening, comprehensive and timely. It should be widely read:

REMARKS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, HON. FRED KORTH, FOR THE COMMISSIONING OF U.S.S. "WILLIAM F. HALSEY," SAN FRANCISCO, JULY 20, 1963

Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Yeomans, Captain Anderson, officers and crew of the U.S.S. *William F. Halsey*, ladies and gentlemen, this is a truly significant occasion. I am, of course, delighted to be here with this distinguished company and with a naval officer who, along with Admiral Halsey, calls to the mind of every American the very finest image of the U.S. Navy in its greatest hour. In World War I and World War II, and the years between, Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Halsey were instrumental in insuring that our Navy was strong and capable. It seems to me completely fitting that this proud ship—the newest of her type—should bear the name of a great naval officer who has taken his rightful place in our Navy's and our Nation's history.

Those of you who will proudly serve on her I know share my feeling. Soon you will join the fleet and I am confident will add even more luster to the name, William F. Halsey.

In the more than 18 months that I have been Secretary of our Navy, a somewhat curious thought has often crossed my mind. It seems to me that many Americans have a somewhat imperfect understanding of seapower. The average American often asks the question, if not directly, then by implication, "Why do we need the world's largest, the most modern, the best navy?" In a very real sense, persons who ask that question are paying the Navy quite a compliment. They are taking for granted that we will always retain control of the seas.

It would seem that we in the Navy have sometimes experienced difficulty in making the answer plain. One simple answer might be that whenever anything has happened, or has threatened to happen, we have needed the Navy and used it promptly. We did so in Korea in numerous ways—in attack, in support of forces ashore and as a lifeline.

The carrier-borne airpower of the 6th Fleet has been used in the Mediterranean to bolster the southern flank of our NATO defenses. The actions of the 7th Fleet in in the Western Pacific have become legend.

All this is so obvious that many people are inclined to forget it, or take it for granted. Perhaps we have somehow failed to make vivid to our contemporaries the real value of naval armament in the current world. No doubt it is because the Navy is built around a rather more subtle, less understandable concept than our other arms. The Navy is not a weapon. It is, rather, a system, using any and all kinds of weapons and tactical methods to the one end of exploiting the strategic value of sea communications.

The function of our team is to exploit sea communications, so as to carry wars to our enemies rather than allowing them to bring them to us, so as to endow the national strategy with the power of flexibility throughout the world which it could not otherwise enjoy.

The Navy is not a strategic or a tactical machine. It uses many weapons, many strategies, and many kinds of tactics to perform an overall function. The performance of this function will not alone, of itself, win wars. But it will have a decisive effect on who wins them, how soon, how easily. Naval power, in all its aspects, is a tremendous instrument of national power, useful in countless ways. Surely, that is one reason why Americans so often fail to grasp its significance.

It is a truism of history that seapower was a critical factor in the foundation of our Nation, and that all our wars, without exception, have been amphibious in many important respects. It is also a fact that commerce over the oceans is vital, not only to our own economy, but of equally serious importance to our allies and to our potential enemies as well. Seapower has been our first, and almost an automatically chosen weapon whenever sudden emergencies have appeared on our threshold.

Because of this quiet assumption that all is well because of our Navy, it seems to me that it is worthwhile for us to make a periodic accounting of why our Navy is so vitally important. Some will say we need a Navy for one simple reason—to win a war. But as we need naval power in wartime, we need it also in peacetime and in that neither-war, neither-peace area in which we now abide.

A Navy is certainly essential in war, both offensively and defensively. On the offensive side of the ledger, we are capable of carrying the fight to the soil of the enemy. We can make his land the battleground. We can use the sea and from it apply force, both direct and indirect, against the enemy.

The highways of the ocean are our routes for retaliation, for invasion or for attack. In our ships we can transport the personnel of our land forces, their equipment and their supplies. The oceans enhance our capability for massive retaliation. Our Navy-Marine Corps team has superiority on the seas, and in the skies above them, when they make an amphibious assault or a vertical envelopment.

In the defensive view of the art of warfare, we see that our Navy is necessary to deny the use of the oceans to our enemies. By confining them to overland resources in time of war, we strangle their industrial warmaking potential. We make their task of fighting us just that much more difficult. It is easy to recall that during World War II, if we had not retained control of the seas around the great peninsula that is actually Europe, our massive land forces could have been easily outflanked from either the north or the south. Our supply lines across the Atlantic could have been severed much too readily. Our own harbors and our coastal cities would have been prone to attack from the sea. Our Navy prevents these things. Conversely, our potential enemy today sees this same peninsula as he looks to the West. He knows that further expansion in that direction exposes his flanks to attack from the sea.

It stands to reason that as our Navy is vital in time of war, it is also essential in time of peace. We don't have time to build a Navy and train personnel after hostilities begin. Our Navy is important in time of peace in so many ways, other than preparing for war, while we seek to maintain the peace.

The Navy contributes to our Nation's progress. It protects our interests at home and abroad. It implements national policy, for the Navy is capable of presenting visible evidence to our friends that our support is real, that our determination is firm, and that we are ready to come to their aid if called upon. This particular strength of our Navy has been demonstrated in Lebanon, off the shores of the Dominican Republic, off our own southern shores last fall, and continuously in the waters lapping the shores of southeast Asia. The "show of the flag" gives new hope and adds great fervor to the hearts and minds of those who view it.

I am firmly convinced that our Navy, in time of peace, assists in making better citizens, physically, mentally and morally. Our men are trained for more than 100 trades, many of which are vital to our country's industries and which can be followed when their Navy careers have been concluded. Our research program has made tremendous contributions to the scientific world.

The explosion of the world's population has caused an expansion at the rate of about 50 milion people per year. Such an increase necessitates a great exchange of raw materials and industrial products between nations, the greater portion of which must be transported by ships across the sea lanes of the world. The ability to use the seas for these purposes and for all commerce and for their resources will depend upon freedom of the seas in peace and control of the seas in time of war.

Each year over a trillion tons of cargo is moved by ships. Increased development of air transport will not materially reduce the need for surface transportation. As a matter of fact, the heavy demands for fuel and operational maintenance for aircraft put greatly increased demands on searborne transport. The main reliance for transport of aircraft fuels, spare parts, and bulk cargoes will still be on surface ships of our Navy and our merchant marine.

In the third area, the cold war, the Navy is a deterrent to the outbreak of general war. With our carrier forces, our Polaris submarines and guided missile ships and our nuclear surface ships, we demonstrate to the enemy our power to strike, to retaliate, to defend.

Our seapower give the maximum freedom of choice to the President, and provides the ultimate in economy of force. When it is deemed prudent to apply force, he has a maximum of selectivity as to amount and type. The presence of our naval strength permits the kind of choice that obviates any attempt at blackmailing techniques by another nation. Our control of the seas actually can halt the spread of communism, and without complicating policy decisions on foreign aid. The mobility of our forces on the oceans of the world provided for swift disengagements without leaving costly investments behind.

It is a fact of life that the present economic potential of Cuba is practically nil because of our control of the seas. We are able to monitor the shipping lanes to her ports. Should it be determined that a stringent curtailment is the proper course, our Navy will be the tool for the implementation of that program.

As you may readily determine, I am firmly convinced that a strong, flexible, alert Navy is deeply vital to the future freedom of our Nation and, in fact, of the entire world.

The Communist bloc must necessarily move in a direction with which they are unfamiliar if they are to do any further expansion. They will be unable to increase their holdings without the use of the seas, which would

bring them into direct contact with our naval power. The example off our southeastern coast, in the Atlantic, last fall proved their unwillingness to do this.

To resist the challenges of the future, we must continue to maintain strong, balanced seapower. We need our mobile islands like *Enterprise, Kitty Hawk* and our other great carriers with their embarked aircraft. We need submarines to search out and destroy, if necessary, those of another power. We need underwater craft capable of unleashing tremendous nuclear power should our potential enemies decide upon national suicide. We need our cruiser and destroyer forces with their great flexibility and capability of rapid movement to any potential troubled area. It is essential that they provide air defense, antisubmarine protection, and gunfire support for amphibious operations. And finally, but by no means least of all, we need our Navy-Marine Corps team, unique in history, because of its mobility, its versatility, its readiness, and its ability to engage in all forms of warfare on land, on sea, and in the air. It is a force, unprecedented in the history of warfare, for use in the interest of our security. No nation today possesses the capability that is ours. It is an area in which the United States is clearly superior. We must continue to exploit this tremendous advantage in the years to come.

I am certain that there is no one within the sound of my voice who does not subscribe to the thoughts I have presented to you. These are the answers to the questions, why a Navy—what is the Navy for?

I am also deeply aware of the fact that Navy and Marine Corps men and women are tremendously dedicated, motivated, and serve in their respective branches because they love their service and their country. They are convinced of the importance of the role of the Navy-Marine Corps team in American national interests. It is my firm belief that these services must be retained in their individual state and by no means allowed to be assimilated into any mixture that could be less efficient.

It is likewise my belief that civilian leadership of all of our military departments must be continued. It is a part of our Nation's welfare that has been handed down as a part of our heritage by those who drafted our Constitution. It is a vital situation that cannot and must not be minimized.

In the past 18 months, it has been my experience that those senior Navy and Marine officers with whom I come in contact almost daily, would have this relationship in no other manner. They subscribe wholeheartedly to the premise.

It is also mandatory that our military leaders not be relegated to any role of lesser importance, but must be shown the respect, the loyalty that is their rightful due. They are the operational commanders. They are the professional experts. In my own department, this has always been the case and will continue to be. I know that the other service secretaries, as well as the Secretary of Defense, share this feeling.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The roads to be followed by the leaders, both civilian and military, are parallel at all times, and ultimately merge and arrive at the same destination. Neither can guide the destinies of hundreds of thousands of people and disburse billions of dollars annually without the assistance and counsel of the other. Those in mufti have the politicoeconomical experience and background that is vital in the international scene of today. Those in uniform, whether it be blue, green, or khaki, have the experience and technical skills in matters military and naval, without which our Nation would long ago have lost her stature in the community of nations of the world.

There is, and must be, a feeling of mutual trust and respect between our military and our civilians which has endured since the birth of our country. This is an extremely healthy situation, of which we can be proud and thankful, for there are few, if any, nations on the face of this earth that can count this spirit of understanding as one of their strengths.

We are gathered here today to raise the pennant of commission on a splendid product of the shipbuilder's art. This ship becomes a vital portion of our defensive and deterrent strength. I know that Captain Anderson and his crew are anxious that she become the finest ship in the finest Navy in the world. I am confident that this will become so. You know you have my personal best wishes for fair winds and following seas and for good hunting should that be your future mission. I know you are ably equipped to hit—hard, fast, and often—as per Admiral Halsey's famed motto.

You know, men who go to sea have long believed in signs and omens; perhaps more responsive than others in attaching meanings to unusual happenings in the world about us.

It sems fitting today, that we take note that our planet is just about now emerging from an eclipse of the sun; and liken this phenomenon to U.S.S. *Halsey* as she, at this same time, is emerging as a commissioned ship into the light and warm energy of a ready Navy.

I urge that all of us, military and civilian alike, recall that the basic principle still remains the same. He who controls the sea and the air above, controls the destinies of the world. If we lose that control, we lose all.

Thank you for being here and to you particularly, Admiral Nimitz, for honoring us with your gracious presence. It is deeply gratifying to have you here to help us honor one whom I know you revere most highly. Good fortune to you in the days ahead. Captain Anderson, to you and your crew, my very highest regards and good luck.

Let's Abolish the Death Penalty in Federal Jurisdictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been opposed to the death penalty. I have introduced H.R. 545, which would abolish this extreme punishment from all Federal jurisdictions. Monday, on the floor of this House, we passed an omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia which included many bad provisions. I was pleased that the House amended the bill to remove the mandatory death penalty provision for rape, which would have truly been a step backward.

The following article appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of August 4, 1963, and gives a summation of the current efforts to rid ourselves of this barbarous relic of the past. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

NEW BID TO OUTLAW DEATH AS PENALTY FOR U.S. CRIME

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Progress toward outlawing capital punishment in the United States has been slow since Wisconsin abolished it 110 years ago, but the efforts to rule it out continue, on Federal and State levels.

Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, has again introduced his bill to abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions except the military services and cases of treason. The Brooklyn Congressman proposed the same measure in the last session of Congress but it never got out of the House Judiciary Committee.

A proposal by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York, to amend the Constitution to abolish the death penalty throughout the United States also died in committee last year and has not been reintroduced.

KASTENMEIER BACKS IT

MULTER argued that the death penalty is unfair because most executions are of poor people, who cannot afford expert legal help.

In this view he is supported by Representative ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, a member of the Judiciary Committee, who favors MULTER's proposal over POWELL's because it would be easier to enact.

The Watertown Congressman opposes capital punishment for the additional reasons that it does not, in his opinion, deter crime, it results in the execution of innocent persons, and because society is amply protected by life imprisonment.

KASTENMEIER said that if legislation to abolish the death penalty is passed at the Federal level it will do much to set a moral example for the States.

The fact is that of 3,812 executions by electrocution, gas, hanging, or shooting by firing squad since 1930, only 31 have been in Federal cases.

Infliction of the death penalty is now authorized by laws of the Federal Government, 42 States, and the District of Columbia.

Wisconsin abolished capital punishment in 1853, following similar action by Michigan in 1847 and Rhode Island in 1852. Maine did the same in 1887, Minnesota in 1911, North Dakota in 1915, and Alaska and Hawaii in 1957, while still territories.

Delaware did away with the death penalty in 1958 but reinstituted it in 1961.

Congress last year abolished the mandatory death penalty for first degree murder convictions in the District of Columbia, the only jurisdiction where such a penalty was required.

New York State, the last jurisdiction in the country to require imposition of the death penalty for premeditated murder, dropped that mandatory provision on July 1.

Bills to abolish the death penalty have been bottled up in committees of the New York Legislature for 12 years.

Despite the laws permitting it, there has been a growing reluctance to invoke capital punishment, and executions to punish crime are becoming increasingly rare.

Last year there were 47 executions in only 18 of the 44 jurisdictions permitting such punishment. That was up from 42 the year before, but it was still the second lowest figure since the Federal Bureau of Prisons began keeping count in 1930. The peak year was 1935, when 199 persons were put to death.

NEGROES HARDEST HIT

Georgia, with its large Negro population, leads the States in the number of executions since 1930, with 362 persons put to death by electrocution. New York was second, with 327.

Representative MULTER commented that a majority of the persons put to death are Negroes and other members of minority groups who cannot afford good lawyers.

Since 1954 the death penalty can be imposed in Federal cases for espionage in time of peace as well as war. If a jury recommends it, the death penalty can also be imposed in Federal cases for disclosure of

atomic information with intent to injure the United States.

Since 1961 the hijacking of an airplane in flight has been punishable by death in Federal cases. A model penal code proposed that year by the American Law Institute would limit the death penalty to murder.

Some enforcement officers, including FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, favor retention of the death penalty to keep down rising crime rates.

"It is my belief that a great many of the most vociferous cries for abolition of capital punishment emanate from those areas of our society that have been insulated against the horrors man can and does perpetrate against his fellow beings," said Hoover.

"The savagely mutilated bodies and mentally ravaged victims of murderers, rapists, and other criminal beasts beg consideration when the evidence is weighed on both sides of the scales of justice."

The National Council of the Episcopal Church hit back at Hoover, declaring:

"With the aura of authority which surrounds such a public figure, his unsupported assertion is devastating against a more enlightened penology, and in the eyes of politically minded legislators, outweighs all the careful statistical studies that have been made of the question."

Oregon, which has sent 19 persons to the gas chamber since 1930, including 1 last year, will put the controversy to a public test. In November 1964, the voters will decide whether their State will be the ninth to abolish capital punishment.

California's Half-Million-Acre Greenhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the August 1963 Reader's Digest, regarding Imperial Valley, Calif. Behind the Imperial Valley, perhaps the world's most remarkable plant-growing machine, is the little-known story of man's triumph over the curse of desert farming: salt. This thrilling story speaks for itself:

Every year for the past 5 years foreign agricultural experts have flocked by the hundreds to an obscure region of California that most Americans can't even locate on the map: the Imperial Valley, a Rhode Island-sized splotch of green pressed tight against the Mexican border.

Most of the visitors are from water hungry countries, and they carry away with them a lesson of the profoundest significance. For this valley, the largest irrigation district of its type in the Western Hemisphere, is one of the world's most intensive experiments in new techniques of desert agriculture. And it demonstrates that, after centuries of failure, man has finally learned how to deal with the curse of salt in desert water.

The significance is this: Since civilization began man has known how to make the desert green with irrigation, but he has never known how to keep it green. The water he has poured onto his soil has always, ultimately, poisoned the land with the salt it carried. In vast areas of the world it is still poisoning thousands of acres annually, and millions of people are underfed in once fertile farmland that lies abandoned under a snow-white caking of salt.

It's an amazing invention, this Imperial Valley. Its green fields stand out from the surrounding desert like a straightedge. Drive westward across the desert from Yuma, Ariz.; one second you are in country used by Hollywood as a location for its Sahara movies; the next second in fields and orchards stretching to the horizon.

The rest of the Nation depends heavily on these fields. They can grow crops all year long. In January and February a third of the country's carrots and cabbages come from here. In lettuce alone, $28 million worth streams out in the winter months, at the rate of up to four 100-car freight trains a day. In cotton, the valley averaged 3.6 bales an acre in 1962—almost four times the national average. Last year its 172 feedlots shipped 549,000 head of cattle to market. No great wonder, the land costs $1,000 to $1,500 an acre.

Hard as it is to believe today, at the turn of the century this valley was one of the world's cruelest deserts. It still bore its true name, the Colorado Desert. In its grim statistics it was just a step behind its desolate brother to the north, Death Valley. Its lowest point: a bone-dry salt bed at its northern end called the Salton Sink, 273 feet below sea level. Its annual rainfall: less than 3 inches. Practically the only living things in it were horned toads, salt weeds, and cresote bush. Hundreds of pioneers and prospectors died in its waterless dunes and arroyos. Its heat was so intense that it is said an old Colorado Desert prospector, hanged for murder and sent to hell, was permitted by the devil to go back for his overcoat.

But in its scorching blankness there were qualities that could make it bloom. It was all topsoil. Brought in by the Colorado River over millions of years as it periodically overflowed its banks and flooded the valley, this soil went down layer after layer, in some places 2 miles deep. Its desert climate—365 days of sunshine, with only an occasional light frost—could support an immense variety of crops. And its gradual slope away from the mighty Colorado River gave it a potential of plentiful, cheap, gravity-supplied water.

All it needed to come leaping to life was a canal system, and in the 1890's promoters raised the capital to build one, changed the desert's name to Imperial Valley, advertised far and wide for settlers, and in 1901 turned on the spigot. Gradually, 1,700 miles of canals were built, and the desert grew green.

But they couldn't change its climate, and in fact today the summer heat is worse than before. When the temperature gets near 120 in the shade, the evapo-transpiration of the soil and plants pumps thousands of tons of humidity into what used to be dry desert air. The heat gets so bad that soil temperatures rise to 160 degrees.

"We don't fry eggs on the sidewalk like they do in New York," says one rancher. "We boil them in the swimming pool."

The heat is a major reason why, despite attempts to lure industry and develop tourism, the valley today remains strictly a farming area, the wide main streets of its half-dozen towns clattering with pickup trucks, its motels crowded with fertilizer and machinery salesmen.

Even its telephone lines are farm-dominated: "I'm at gate 30 on the Marigold," goes a call, "and I'd like 10 second-feet tomorrow morning."

In response, at the main water-control office in the town of Imperial, a clerk will press a button on a control panel, and the water in the Marigold Canal will begin to rise into a head containing precisely enough to supply gate 30—one of some 7,000 such gates—with 10 cubic feet a second for 24 hours. A canal employee will lower the farmer's delivery gate, and the equivalent of a 2-inch rainfall will tumble over the barrier and creep down the long furrows of his 120-acre field; later he'll be billed $40 for it.

This desert valley never worries about a drought and is watered only when it needs to be. In fact these farmers hate rain. When a vagrant shower does sneak over the mountains, it upsets tightly planned growing schedules, washes off insecticides, makes fields too muddy to work. But, worst of all, a shower can actually kill crops. And here we come back to that villain, salt.

There are huge quantities of salt in Imperial Valley's soil and in its water supply. A shower, penetrating only the top few inches of soil and then evaporated upward by the sun, sucks salt to the surface where it kills the roots of seedlings and slows the growth of mature plants.

The chemistry of how the salt got into Imperial Valley is simple. Most rocks and minerals contain salt and, as they decompose, it becomes part of the soil. In areas with plenty of rainfall this salt is washed away as the rain leaches it deep into the ground or floats it down rivers into the ocean. But in arid areas, where soil moisture evaporates into the air, the salt content is built up instead of washed away; and the rivers cutting through these regions become heavy with it. This is the curse of desert agriculture: The more an area needs irrigation, the saltier are both its soil and its water. Irrigate the land and—in a matter of only a few decades—you poison it.

You can fly for hours over the Middle East and look down on abandoned, salt-poisoned land. Most of the once-fertile Tigris-Euphrates Valley died of salt poisoning, as did huge areas of North Africa and Asia. Today in Pakistan half the 23 million irrigated acres are suffering the effects of salt-poisoning; between 70,000 and 100,000 of them are abandoned annually.

In the Imperial Valley some fields succumbed after two or three crops. By 1920, 50,000 acres had been abandoned. The same fate was hitting many other irrigated areas of the recently developed American West. In the 1920's and 1930's a host of Federal and State agencies joined the universities of the arid States in the most intensive attack on soil salinity ever undertaken, and out of their work emerged a knowledge of how to meet the salt problem.

Today the basic secret of what keeps this desert green is a $30 million engineering installation that lies buried beneath its soil. Dig down 6 feet below one of its lush acres and you will make a remarkable discoverey: This great greenhouse is so designed that it can flush out its used water as efficiently as it brings in new water. For the whole field is laced with long tile drainage pipes. Without them the valley would be a desert again in 20 or 30 years; with them, says Jerome Molof, local representative of the Soil Conservation Service, "We can go on producing forever."

With 300,000 acres already tiled, 9,500 miles of drains soak up the irrigation water and spew it into a 1,375-mile network of waste ditches that send it rushing into the great catchbasin of the former Salton Sink, now the Salton Sea. So huge are the quantities of salt disposed of that two 100-car freight trains daily would be needed to haul it away. Once-poisoned acres are being reclaimed every year. In the first 6 months of last year 1,900,000 tons of salt came into the valley and 2,100,000 were flushed out.

It is a historic victory, but the cost has been high, in water as well as in money. Here in the water-starved West, the All-American Canal, mainly serving this valley, sucks up a full quarter of the Colorado's flow, three times as much as is allotted to metropolitan Los Angeles and San Diego. Some 20 to 30 percent of this water is used purely for leaching the salt down into the tiles.

To city watermen this is a flagrant waste. Why keep the desert green, they ask, at such a cost in water? Answers George D. Peterson, Jr., of the University of California Agricultural Extension Service: "Where else will the world get its food in the future? Right here in California, urban sprawl and the freeways overrun thousands of good farm acres annually; yet every day the State has 1,500 additional mouths to feed. As more and more farmland is taken out of production, the only place left to go to replace it is into the mountains or the deserts."

The question of how, over the coming decades, the world will be able to feed its exploding population is complicated and controversial. So, too, is the question of how soon the Imperial Valley's remarkable example can be copied by the poorer nations of the world. For a mechanism as economically and scientifically complex as this great plant-growing machine requires tremendous reservoirs of money and skill to build and to keep running. But it proves one thing. Wherever there are rivers, man can make deserts green and keep them green. For today, finally, he knows how to lift the salty curse of desert water.

The Inalienable Rights of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an extraordinarily moving address by the Reverend William J. Kenealy printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Father Kenealy's address should help to pierce the consciences of us all. I urge that it be widely read and conscientiously pondered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REV. WILLIAM J. KENEALY, S.J., PROFESSOR OF LAW, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY IN CHICAGO, JULY 10, 1963, AT THE CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AND CITY MANAGERS, SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Once upon a time there was a tiny Negro girl who lived in the Deep South. Every time she left her home she had to sit in the back of the bus, the back of the streetcar, the back of the movie theater, the back of the church, the back of this and the back of that. While she was still a little girl her family moved to the far North. One day her mother took her to the most wonderful fairyland her eyes had ever seen. It was a beautiful amusement park, with swings and slides and tunnels and boats and roller coasters and, best of all, a fantastic merry-go-round. The child was entranced by the merry-go-round. She ran up close to listen to the gay music, and to watch the laughing children riding round and round in the lovely chariots, and galloping up and down on the charging horses. She clapped her hands and jumped with joy. Then she wanted, so much, to climb right on, to join the fun, to ride around with the other little children. But she was afraid. And puzzled, too. Finally, as the merry-go-round slowed down and the music grew softer, the tiny Negro girl turned to her mother and cried: "Oh, mother dear, tell me please, where is the back of the merry-go-round?"

This apocryphal story symbolizes, for me, the great tragedy which saddens the hearts and frustrates the lives of 20 million Americans, both in the South and in the North. From the depths of this American tragedy, the anguished cry of human pain is heard evermore urgently throughout the land. And from the depths of the American conscience, the answering cry of sympathetic protest is echoing evermore clearly throughout the land—demanding that the tragedy be ended, insisting that American ideals be realized in American life in our time, here, now. It is the cry of pain and the cry of protest, I think, which have really summoned this Conference on Civil Rights. As the Governor of Illinois, as the mayors and city managers of this great State, you are the chosen representatives of a people in distress. You are the honored servants of a people who chartered their philosophy of law and of government 187 long years ago. You are the responsible leaders of a great people who solemnly and hopefully declared to a cynical world in 1776:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

These familiar words of the Declaration of Independence are not part of the organic law of the land. They epitomize, however, the living philosophy of our law and our democratic government. They give voice to the living spirit of freedom and equality which is necessary to enable all members of our society to cooperate in peace and prosperity, to attain their perfection, to achieve their happiness, and thereby to fulfill, in human dignity, their divine destiny, decreed by the one good God who is the Father of us all. The Declaration appealed in express terms to God, to the Creator, to the Supreme Judge of the world, and expressly committed our young Nation to His Divine Providence. Despite the cynics, the Declaration of Independence was a solemn and deliberate profession of politicoreligious faith in the essential dignity, unity, freedom, and equality of all men under God.

But a philosophy is not enough. It must be put to work. General principles alone do not solve particular problems. Ideals are not self-executing. Herein lies a great historical and constitutional lesson, which has tremendous pertinence to the problems and the arguments which face us this day.

Our Federal Constitution was ratified 13 years after the Declaration of Independence. In most respects it was a magnificent and dynamic document. But it was by no means perfect. It was not written in heaven. Despite the solemn declaration of the equality of all men under God, some of the Founding Fathers were slaveowners. They wrote the original Constitution of 1789 which provided for human slavery, protected the slave trade until 1808, and required the return of fugitive slaves to their so-called owners. The Declaration of Independence remained a politicoreligious dedication to things hoped for, but not yet seen. Not seen in 1789. Nor in 1863. Nor in 1963.

How could that be? The Founding Fathers were not gross hypocrites. The people of the time were not moral monsters. Profoundly influenced by the customs and traditions of their own times (as, indeed, all of us are), partially blinded by the persuasiveness of property (a myopia not uncommon today), and compromised by the bitter conflicts of sectional politics (a perennial problem still unsolved), they failed to appreciate to the full, or at least to implement in the Constitution, the majestic philosophy of the Declaration of Independence. They capitulated to the demands of slaveowners and slavetraders, they yielded to the claims of irrational property rights, they consented to the desires of arbitrary States rights. As a result, human slavery continued for another 75 years, and the Nation suffered the catastrophe of the bloodiest Civil War in history.

I have a profound reverence for the Founding Fathers. I am sincerely inspired by their great positive achievements. But I do not deify them. They were great men, but not divine. They were wise men, but not infallible. And I confess to impatience with patriotic speeches, in or out of political conventions, urging an uncritical return to the Founding Fathers. Is it not given to nations, as to men, to grow. And not merely in age and in size, but in grace and in wisdom as well? Wherefore, in the growth of American democracy and the realization of American ideals, it seems to me imperative that we proceed, not back to the Founding Fathers, but forward from their mighty positive achievements.

We have done so, thank God, to a considerable extent. We have not been entirely shackled by a blind and unreasoning adherence to all the racial injustices of the bitter past. The Civil War destroyed forever the abomination of human slavery. The Civil War amendments made a fundamental change in our entire constitutional system of Federal-State relationships. The Nation moved forward in giant strides from the status quo of the Founding Fathers in the direction of personal dignity, of human liberty, and of genuine equality of all men under God. We did grow in grace. We did advance in wisdom. The philosophy of the Declaration of Independence, the teaching of Judeo-Christian religion, became clearer in the Nation's conscience.

Many of the framers and ratifiers of the Civil War Amendments believed that they had finally abolished, not merely slavery, but all forms of racial degradation and discrimination, at least by official action. Their beliefs were doomed to frustration, however, by a tragic decision of the Supreme Court. In 1896, in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, the Court decided that the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the 14th amendment was satisfied by a Louisiana statute which required railroads in that State to provide "equal but separate" accommodations for the white and colored races; and, therefore, that compulsory racial segregation was constitutional.

There were very few segregation statutes anywhere in the country before 1896. But *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was immediately seized upon as a legal benediction for racism generally. The flag of white supremacy was raised in the land. The badge of racial degradation was fastened upon the Negro. The decision unleashed a horde of racial segregation statutes in a dozen States affecting, not merely transportation, but schools and libraries, clinics and hospitals, courts and assemblies, restaurants and hotels, theaters and concert halls, parks and playgrounds, beaches and swimming pools, golf courses and athletic events, practically all public necessities and conveniences, Negro men, women, and children, were humiliated, harassed, and herded into lives of bitter frustration and second-class citizenship. White men, women, and children, were hurt too, in consciences perverted by un-Christian arrogance and cruelty, and by the moral deterioration which inevitably infects the strong who oppress the weak. The Nation retreated again from its ideals. Sixty-seven years later, as a result of that retreat, we are faced with our greatest domestic evil.

Of course, beginning with the School Segregation cases of 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States has expressly reversed *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, adopted the 1896 dissent of Justice Harlan of Kentucky, and repudiated all constitutional justification for rac-

ism. In doing so, the Court proved its humility, its courage, its devotion to the Constitution, and its constant pursuit of the American ideal. But racism, with the momentum of 67 years, marches on. We see it all around us in public and in private life, in the South and in the North. We hear it in the storm of abuse and vilification heaped upon the Court since 1954.

The Court has been accused of violating States rights by usurping authority to tell the States how they shall run their own schools and local activities. But the fact is that the Court has not told the States how they shall run their own schools or local activities. The Court has told them how they shall not do so, which is a vastly different matter. The 14th amendment, which was ratified as an express limitation on State power, has told the Federal Government to see to it that the States do not deny to any person, in school or anywhere else, the "equal protection of the laws." The necessary and fundamental principle of federalism, known as States rights, cannot be tortured into a justification of States wrongs in defiance of federally protected rights.

It has been charged that the School Segregation cases were predicated, not upon law, but upon sociology—apparently because the Court relied in part upon the data of social scientists as to the harmful effects of segregation upon schoolchildren. But law deals with life. The law should not ignore any human knowledge or experience pertinent to the practical problems it must solve. Justice is blind in the sense of being impartial, not in the sense of being ignorant. It seems to me a pity that the Court did not use similar sociological data in 1896, when it decided the Plessy case. It seems to me incredible that Negroes were not hurt by segregation then, but began to be hurt only a few years ago, or that their hurt became known only a few years ago by the formal findings of social scientists. Justice Harlan knew it in 1896, and so did many others. Human nature does not change that fast.

How, then, account for the Court's reversal of judgment. It seems to me that an evolution has taken place: the intellectual evolution of a clearer understanding and a deeper appreciation of the legal, social, and moral values which were always implicit in the constitutional concept of "equal protection of the laws." A spiritual evolution which developed and matured us to the point where we began to realize, a few years ago, how unjust and how immoral it is to hurt little Negro children, or big Negro men, or any other human beings. In any event, the Supreme Court since 1954 has properly invalidated all compulsory racial segregation, regardless of whether children or adults are the victims.

Legally, we are again moving forward. Legally, we are again advancing in wisdom. Legally, we are again growing in grace. Yet there are many who assert that, despite the Constitution and the Supreme Court, the Negro is inferior to the white man in his standards of health, intelligence, culture and morality, and therefore racial segregation is necessary for the common good.

The first answer to this assertion is that racial segregation is not based on any standards of health, intelligence, culture or morality. The Negro of robust health, refined intelligence, gentle culture and heroic virtue, must still sit in the back of the bus; while the most diseased, stupid, uncouth and immoral white man rides serenely up front. Nearer to home: the notorious gangster can purchase and live in a palatial home in a beautiful suburb, while a respectable Negro cannot even lease an apartment in the same community.

The second answer to this assertion is that the statistics offered in its support do not prove the premise and actually disprove the conclusion. Statistics do show that many Negroes are less healthy, less educated, less mannered, and less law abiding than many white men who enjoy favored status and a happier environment. They do not prove that the Negro has a lesser potential for health, a lower aptitude for education, a smaller receptivity for manners, or an inferior capacity for virtue than the white man who suffers the grave handicaps of a like status and a similar environment. In fact the statistics do prove that racial segregation and discrimination, by forcing the Negro to exist in a substandard physical, educational, economic and social environment, by stripping him of legitimate hope and laudable ambition, by condemning him to a lifelong career of frustration and bitterness, gravely and tragically handicaps his efforts to actuate his potential, to develop his talent, to achieve his fulfillment. Ironically, the statistics offered in support of racial discrimination constitute the most powerful evidence against it. Surely it is a cruel and cynical logic which argues for segregation from the very evils which segregation has produced. This is the abdication of logic and the exile of reason.

Racism, whether by compulsion of unconstitutional statutes in the South or by force of un-Christian snobbery in the North, is essentially the same vicious evil. It is fundamentally a moral evil. It cannot be completely eliminated by the courts or the law. It must be eradicated from the hearts of men. Certainly we have not solved the problem here in the North. Having lived in both the North and the South, I must confess in all candor that I think there is more hypocrisy about race relations in the North than in the South. We northerners usually manage to say the right thing. But do we practice what we preach? The white town of Deerfield is in northern Illinois, not in southern Mississippi. I hasten to point out that it would be grossly unfair to condemn everyone in Deerfield because of the actions of the majority. But there are many other Deerfields in Illinois upon which the national and international spotlight has not alighted.

Since racism is basically a moral problem, one of the most disturbing factors about it, in my mind, is that the great cardinal virtue of prudence is being misused as an excuse for not practicing the great moral virtues of justice and of charity. Prudence is becoming a dirty word for cowardice.

In the name of prudence, we are told to play down the issue, because racial tensions have increased since the Supreme Court spoke out. It is true that racial tensions have increased since 1954. There would be no racial tensions if racists could enjoy the privileges of white supremacy, and Negroes would be content with the disabilities of second-class citizenship. But the day of Uncle Tom is gone. Racial tensions are the price of progress in interracial justice. They are the growing pains of eventual interracial peace.

In the name of prudence, we are cautioned to be tender with deep and traditional emotions. It is true that such emotions are an important part of the whole practical problem. But it is difficult at times to know whose emotions we are to be tender with, and in what proportion. The irrational emotions of racists? The rational emotions of Negroes? All human beings have emotions.

In the name of prudence, we are urged to pursue a course of gradualism. It is true that a certain amount of gradualism unfortunately seems to be necessary, or in any event inevitable. But Negroes grow old, as other men. How long must they wait? For many of them the hour is late, the evening of life approaches. All the weak and natural inclinations of selfishness, laziness, timidity, complacency and conformism, tend to strengthen the thesis of gradualism and to support the plea of pseudoprudence. But the real virtue of prudence has nothing to do with these moral weaknesses.

Prudence is the great intellectual virtue which enables men to appreciate the moral issues in practical problems, and to choose the most efficient morally good means to morally good solutions—whether such means are easy or difficult, popular or unpopular, attractive or frightening. Prudence is opposed to rashness, not to courage. Prudence may exact high heroism. What is needed most today, it seems to me, is not more emphasis on prudence, but a greater insistence upon courage. The crying need is to find, somehow and somewhere, the moral courage to practice what we preach.

Sometimes when I feel secretly ashamed of my own complacency and cowardice, and the abstractions of philosophical and legal considerations seem insufficient to move me out of my lethargy, I turn, as I suppose all of us do, to more personal experiences. I think back some 20 years ago when the armies of dictator states were shattering the civilization of Europe. The United States was not yet formally in the war. But the impact of the spreading conflict had transformed our country into 48 vast debating societies. The atmosphere was vibrant with principle and policy, argument and rebuttal, invective and recrimination, fear and hysteria. The paramount issue of the day was: should we enter World War II or stay out of it? But the question was suddenly settled by others, on December 7, 1941.

The shock of Pearl Harbor seemed to paralyze the country, that fateful Sunday afternoon, for a brief and fearful moment. But the next instant it swept us into swift and unified action. Our debates were over. Our disputes were ended. Our arguments were done.

From all over the land, from home and school, from farm and factory, from office and shop, from hopes and ambitions and the arms of their loved ones, millions of American boys—Protestant, Jew, and Catholic, white and black and red and yellow and brown—rushed in dedication to camp, to ship, to plane, to foxhole. A united voice from pulpit and platform, from press and radio and newsreel, begged them to wage courageous battle against the scourge of racism which had the civilized world by the throat; exhorted them to fight, to suffer, to die if necessary—not in the name of race hatered or segregation or discrimination or snobbery—but in so many words for the American philosophy of life, for the inalienable rights of man, for the dignity of human personality, for the equal rights of minorities, for the four freedoms everywhere; that by their sacrifice, the lights of human liberty and equality might go on again, all over the world.

And so inspired they fought, they suffered, and multiple thousands of them laid down their young lives on the seven seas and in every land from Berlin to Tokyo. I remember that they were white and black and red and yellow and brown. I cannot forget them, because it was my high privilege to know many of them personally, to live with them, to laugh with them, to share with them, to fear with them, to grieve with them, to confess them, to anoint them, to love them. I can never forget them. In the deafening thunder, in the acrid smoke, in the lurid flame of battle I can still see them going down. And in the Marianas, in the New Hebrides, in the Philippines, I buried them—white and black and red and yellow and brown. But I buried every one of them in a first-class grave. I buried them all in the unsegregated sea.

Yes, these, our own, are dead. I cannot flee the sorrow of their absence. But never can I lose the inner peace and the fierce pride which stems from my conviction that they died, under the Living God, at least for ideals that are worthwhile. They saved this country of ours. They earned with their young deaths the undying gratitude of their countrymen.

Yet, 20 years later, living Americans are still debating, still arguing, still making pretty little speeches and writing fine learned briefs to decide whether or not, after all, we really intend to practice the ideals we begged them to die for. Twenty years later, may God forgive us, we are still segregating the living and the dead. Racist politicians running on racist platforms, are elected to responsible public offices. The Congress of the United States has yet to enact a Civil Rights Act of courage and of substance. Federal troops are needed to escort nine little Negro children to their grade school. Federal forces are required to admit one qualified veteran to his State university. State legislators are still dragging their reluctant heels over bills for fair housing and fair employment and educational practices. Police unleash dogs upon people crying for freedom. Private citizens burn buses, throw bombs, swing clubs, pour catsup, smear mustard, and grind cigarette butts into the patient backs of citizens who want a sandwich at a lunchcounter. This is not our proudest day. But it is, nevertheless, a day of great opportunity.

The ranks of those who are determined to defeat racism and to realize the American philosophy of life are growing daily in size and strength and influence. The historic National Conference on Religion and Race, held in Chicago last January, is a sign of the trend of victory. All major faiths have united in a common effort for the cause of freedom and equality. I might interject that Catholics, like other religious groups, have their skeletons in the closet; in fact, some of ours insist upon sitting upright in the front pew; and a few pop up on the other side of the sanctuary rail; but, thank God, they are skeletons. All major religious faiths are one in teaching that racial segregation and discrimination is morally wrong. It is a cancer in the body politic. It is a desecration of Judeo-Christian civilization. It is a blasphemy in the mystical body of Jesus Christ. It is (and I say this with all accuracy and reverence) a God-damned thing.

Federal District Court Bench Is Logical Step for Homer Thornberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in an article of August 4, by Leslie Carpenter, Washington correspondent for the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, he tells of the exceptional and highly distinguished career of one of the most responsible Members of this House, Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY.

The article portrays vividly the sturdy foundation upon which Representative THORNBERRY's propensity for success is based, and which will serve him well when he assumes his judicial duties as a Federal district judge.

I commend this excellent article to the attention of the entire membership of the House:

TEXAN'S SUCCESS STORY—FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT BENCH IS LOGICAL STEP FOR HOMER THORNBERRY

(By Leslie Carpenter)

WASHINGTON.—The law and HOMER THORNBERRY have had a multitude of experiences with one another.

The Austin Congressman soon will leave Capitol Hill, and the robes of a Federal district judge will be wrapped around his shoulders at El Paso.

VARIED CAREER

The ceremony will climax many years of activity, in many facets of the law. THORNBERRY has written and passed laws at the local, the State, and Federal level. He has practiced law publicly and privately.

And he is, as he prepares to sit in judgment over other men, one who has known much of life in his 54 years.

His father, William Thornberry, was a deaf mute who died when HOMER was 9. Thereafter, THORNBERRY had to help support his mother, also a deaf mute.

THORNBERRY was to grow up to become a lawyer people turned to. And when he ran for office, he was to be elected every time to a series of steadily rising political positions.

EDUCATION STRUGGLE

Getting through school was tough. He had a drop out 1 year to earn money.

There were times later when it was touch-and-go as to whether he could complete his education, but he managed somehow to earn a law degree from the University of Texas. Financially it was something like a photo-finish, but scholastically he excelled all the way.

The degree his, he went immediately into one of Austin's largest and most respected law firms—Powell, Wirtz, Rauhut, and Gideon. He also was elected to the Texas Legislature. In the statehouse, he attracted attention immediately, along with Price Daniel and other young legislators, as part of the so-called immortal 46 who prevented then Gov. W. Lee O'Daniel's proposed sales tax from becoming law.

After 4 years with the law firm and two terms in the legislature, he was elected district attorney in Austin. He still is remembered and admired in the capital city as a district attorney, but World War II interrupted that chapter of his career. After 2½ years as the public prosecutor, he resigned to join the Navy.

CORPUS CHRISTI DUTY

For a short time he was at the Naval Air Station at Corpus Christi, and there he met Eloise Engle from San Antonio, who had been a campus beauty at the University of Texas. They married, and today have three children with the sort of good looks you see in magazine advertisements. They are Molly, 17; David, 15; and Kate, 13.

After the war, THORNBERRY returned to Austin to enter private law practice as a partner of Herman Jones, now a district judge at Austin. He also was elected to the city council at Austin, where he was to become mayor pro tem.

In 1948, he was elected to Congress to succeed LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who had moved on to the U.S. Senate.

RAYBURN PROTEGE

The late House Speaker Sam Rayburn sensed THORNBERRY's depth of talent and intellect immediately and made him a protege. Rayburn arranged for him to become a member of the powerful House Rules Committee. THORNBERRY was, almost from the start, an influential Member of the House.

His reelection victories from the central Texas district have been one-sided and conclusive. Presumably, THORNBERRY could have remained indefinitely on Capitol Hill as one of the best-known and most widely respected Democrats.

But President Kennedy saw him as a judge who would at all times be completely fair and just.

LONG TRADITION

Twenty-seven of the Federal judges who sit today served in Congress. From the beginning of the Nation, Presidents have looked to men who have had the experience of making Federal laws—and who have adjusted to the human compromise that politics requires—to keep the scales of justice held high.

THORNBERRY's many friends in official Washington consider his appointment to the Federal district judgeship in El Paso to be in that tradition.

Nuclear Test Payoff: Defective Children and Family Heartbreak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently many people have written to me about the nuclear test ban. I have written to them that the wives and children of the future deserve every consideration from us in an effort ot stap the fallout, and, like every other American, I want my grandchildren, if I am blessed with any, to have the benefits of good health without the debilitating affliction or deformity. I do not trust the Russians any more than anybody else but we have to start somewhere.

In consideration of the reasoning, I wish to include in my remarks a brilliant editorial by Senator Wilton E. Hall, taken from the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C., of August 8, 1963, which is as follows:

NUCLEAR TEST PAYOFF: DEFECTIVE CHILDREN AND FAMILY HEARTBREAK

Talk to anybody who isn't a political seeker of the kind who's for No. 1 only and you will find a majority of the people are 100 percent for that nuclear test ban agreement which President Kennedy submits to the U.S. Senate today.

Mothers and fathers we've talked to—no matter what their political views on other issues—express hope and relief that this first short step has been taken.

There may be 1,000 miles ahead—but the first step is beginning of a journey that may lead to sanity in dealing wtih the nuclear threat facing Andersonians, other Americans, and people throughout the world.

Hard facts back up the damage already done to future generations by deadly poisoning of the atmosphere by past bomb tests.

The Anderson area has been fortunate in having abundant rains the past 2 months. Crops are flourishing. Rains have been beneficial—up to the generally accepted point.

But here in this area and around the globe rains have brought more than benefits. Today rains bring other things to an earth where mankind has poisoned the atmosphere with tests of nuclear weapons.

In some regions the effects have yet to be felt. In others, where nuclear radioactivity has been swirling around the earth in greater intensity, the evidence already has been docketed.

Radioactivity isn't the kind of menace you can see.

It doesn't knock you in the head. Adults of today aren't sharply affected.

But what about your little kids playing out there in the yard?

What about babies being born or yet to enter this world?

Radioactivity is insidious. It bides its time. It deals out its heartbreak in children born with defects. It packs the punch of mutations.

God, how deadly it is.

Facts? When nuclear testing in the atmosphere began again in 1961, Dr. L. J. de Vann kept records. Dr. de Vann is chief medical officer of the School for Retarded Children in Canada's Alberta Province.

In the year 1962 when mankind began polluting the atmosphere again, the doctor found that the number of children born with birth defects nearly doubled over the year 1959.

The percentage of defects was one-third higher in the Province's northern regions than in the dusty southern plains.

The only environmental difference between the regions was in amount of rainfall. His conclusion: Radioactivity in the rain was the direct cause of the upsurge of birth defects.

The results of this study were presented as the hypothesis in a recent issue of the Canadian Medical Association Journal. The findings:

The number of babies born in Alberta with physical deformities had increased from 7.9 per 1,000 live births in 1959 to 13.8 in 1961.

There was a 30 percent higher mark in the north (the rainy region) than in the south.

On basis of his hypothesis, Dr. de Vann writes the number of children born deformed was even higher in 1962. That was the year nuclear testing was even more intensive.

Danger of nuclear poisoning of the atmosphere is too great for mankind to fully understand—but when a proud new father sees his firstborn and is shocked and heartbroken by unexplainable defects the shock must be terrific enough to make him think—and pray.

That is what Anderson area and other Americans and people around the world should do with all the sincerity in their hearts—pray that the limited treaty submitted to the Senate will find forward-looking statesmanship and concern overwhelming the petty partisan politics and headline hunting of some of their colleagues.

The U.S. Senate should ratify this treaty as quickly as possible.

In no way will it increase dangers already faced. In no way will it endanger national defense. We already have enough nuclear weapons and methods of delivering them to destroy not only ourselves but all of mankind.

May God in His wisdom dictate that this first short step toward ending deadly poisoning of the world's atmosphere shall prevail.

Twisting an Export Angle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of August 13, 1963:

A group of Senators has come up with a new twist on the familiar arguments for import restrictions. It seems that the shoe industry is troubled by foreign competition so the Senators, doubtless at industry urging, are asking the President to back quotas on imports of foreign-made shoes.

Part of the Senators' plea runs along usual lines. "There are more than 1,300 shoe factories in some 600 American communities," says Senator MUSKIE of Maine, the head of the group. "Continued foreign imports at the rate of the past 8 years will inevitably see * * * the loss of jobs for American workers."

But Mr. MUSKIE's argument goes beyond that. If the Government will only protect the domestic shoe industry, he says in effect, U.S. shoe manufacturers will not only do better domestically but will "play their full part in building a vigorous, expanding American export market."

An ingenious theory, you must agree, even if a bit hard to follow. Here is an industry which admits its inability to compete with foreign goods on its home grounds; if sheltered from that competition, it is somehow going to be a more vigorous competitor overseas.

On that basis, we wouldn't care to be in its shoes when it tries to walk over the foreigners in their own markets.

The Attraction at Club 55

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was shocking to read the revelations about the greedy, unwarranted acceptance of unemployment benefits by a few of our richest Americans—Time magazine, August 9. It is especially disturbing at a time when Congress is being asked to load the hardworking American taxpayer, including the very poorest, with increasingly heavier tax burdens in order to provide unemployment and other relief supposedly only to those who need it.

I include the Time report in today's RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTRACTION AT CLUB 55

In Hollywood these days, Club 55 is packing them in. Its parking lot is jammed with expensive and flashy cars. Inside, the crowd is sprinkled with cinema luminaries. But they are not waiting for the floor show. Club 55 is showbiz lingo for the Hollywood unemployment office, and the attraction is $55 a week tax-free. Any out-of-work Hollywood toiler, even if he earned a quarter of a million in his last picture and is scheduled to start on a new one next month, can collect his $55 a week during the interim.

It is perfectly legal. Unemployment compensation is not relief but insurance, paid for by employer contributions, and anybody who is out of work involuntarily is entitled to it whether he needs the money or not.

DRAWING THE MAXIMUM

Those who take compensation they do not need are not confined to show business.

In Miami, a recently retired Army colonel applied for compensation, explained that he had been retired involuntarily and would be perfectly willing to take any colonel's work the unemployment office could offer. There is precious little demand for regimental commanders in Miami, so the ex-colonel collected the Florida maximum of $33 a week for 26 weeks to add to his comfortable pension.

In Houston, the retired president of a large corporation made a bet that he could collect compensation, told the unemployment office he had been retired only because of the company's age limit. Since the unemployment office failed to find him any work in his field, bossing corporations, he collected $18 a week for 18 weeks.

Show business people, however, display a special affinity for unemployment compensation. As soon as Nanette Fabray finished her starring stint in the Broadway musical "Mr. President," she headed for the Manhattan unemployment office to collect her $52 a week. In Hollywood, so many notables line up at Club 55 that movie people refer to it as "Central Casting." Says Chick Chandler, longtime character actor and Club 55 regular: "If you wanted to cast a very fine picture, from producers to hairdressers to extras, you could do it all by standing here for a week."

DRAWING GUFFAWS

Actors Michael Wilding, Fernando Lamas, and Ricardo Montalban have all appeared at the club to collect at one time or another; under California law they could keep coming back for 26 weeks in a row, make one well-paid movie appearance, and then begin again. Adolphe Menjou is a frequent visitor. After completing her part in "Burke's Law," Rebecca Wells drove to Club 55 in her $10,000 Facel Vega. William Beaudine, director of TV's "Lassie," often works 1 week out of 3, collects his compensation the other 2. After a filming of the "Perry Mason" TV show with a lapse in work ahead, the whole cast and crew turned up at Club 55.

No wonder Steve Karmen, a folksong satirist, draws guffaws in Hollywood with his recording of a not very funny takeoff on "Gimme Dat Ol'-Time Religion."

"Give me that old unemployment.
Give me that old unemployment,
Give me that old unemployment,
It's good enough for me."

Disregard for the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House passed H.R. 7525, the so-called omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia. This Hydra-headed monster would allow, as the following editorial from this morning's Washington Post states, the Metropolitan Police Department to disregard the Constitution. I hope that the other body will disregard the bill. The Washington crime rate is no different than the crime rate in other cities of comparable size; it has the same problems that other cities have. Is any Member advocating that we override the Constitution in the cities located in his home State, because of the crime rate? I think not. How in good conscience then can we recommend that that very thing be done in our Capital City?

The editorial follows:

CONTEMPT FOR RIGHTS

In a geyser of oratory on Monday the House of Representatives denounced crime in the Capital. And then, on the pretext of combating crime, it passed a hodgepodge bill which the Senate cannot conceivably endorse and which the courts of the country cannot possibly sustain. It is a bill which, in the name of law enforcement, authorizes the police of the District of Columbia to disregard the Constitution of the United States.

In support of this bill, Representative BASIL L. WHITENER, one of its principal sponsors, said that there has been too much

"wailing and moaning about the so-called rights of the criminals" and then added the observation that the greatest deterrent to crime is "the certainty of punishment." In both of these reckless statements he flies into the face of history.

The so-called rights of criminals are the great procedural protections written into the Bill of Rights to safeguard Americans against arbitrary action by Government officials. They were purchased at a heavy price in blood and suffering by Englishmen and Americans who had learned from bitter experience that monarchs and parliaments alike must have their power restrained by fundamental law. The English civil wars of the 17th century and the American Revolution of the 18th century were fought to establish these rights. They are of the very essence of human liberty.

What a world of contempt and ignorance is contained in that slurring phrase "the so-called rights of criminals." The right to be free from arbitrary arrest, the right to be taken promptly before a judicial officer and charged with a specific crime, the right to be dealt with in accordance with due process of law—these are not rights of criminals; they are the fundamental rights of free men. Without such checks on the power of the police, no community can consider itself genuinely free.

Mr. WHITENER thinks that the greatest deterrent to crime is the certainty of punishment. We think that the long, futile record of savagery in dealing with crime shows him to be mistaken. The greatest deterrent to crime is a rigorous respect for the law. That kind of respect can be maintained only when those who speak in the name of the law observe with the utmost nicety the rights of individuals.

To disparage those rights which have been the bench marks of American liberty, to throw them into the discard for the sake of temporary expediency, to exalt order at the cost of liberty—these are acts of desperation. This is not lawmaking; it is contempt for the rule of law.

Congressmen's Public Image Needs a Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared on July 7, 1963, in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, an outstanding south Texas newspaper. This article, by a distinguished Washington correspondent, tells of the career of Hon. Frank N. Ikard, a highly respected former Member of this body who now serves as president of the American Petroleum Institute. The content of this article is timely, and I think it is of such merit as to be of genuine interest to Members of the House.

CONSTITUENTS TOO CRITICAL—CONGRESSMEN'S PUBLIC IMAGE NEEDS A BOOST

(By Leslie Carpenter)

WASHINGTON.—A Texan who has thoughtfully viewed Congress both as a participant and a spectator thinks Mr. John Q. Citizen's attitude toward his Congressman is far too contemptuous.

There may be Congressmen "who cheat," as a sensational magazine article recently alleged. And there may be quite a few bugs in the procedures and practices of Congress.

But Congress has throughout the Nation's history been the greatest strength of a people's government, the most responsive ear in Washington to individual citizens everywhere and the real hub around which the democratic system has been fashioned. To weaken its powers or its effect now with drastic reforms and abusive slogans is a seriously dangerous undertaking.

This was the message given by Frank Ikard, formerly of Wichita Falls, to a convention of the Texas Bar Association in Dallas the other day. Ikard was one of the most respected Members of the U.S. House prior to his resignation to become president of the American Petroleum Institute. Ikard was everyone's choice to take the leadership of the Texas congressional delegation after the death of House Speaker Sam Rayburn, and it was widely predicted that he might some day be Speaker of the House himself. He relinquished all that, however, in quitting Congress.

Ikard obviously enjoyed being a Congressman, because he was good at it. But these are the days when a large segment of the public is making public service a painful thing.

For instance, congressional mail daily contains a plentiful supply of what is known as "Dear Sir: You Cur!" letters. These are the letters which complain about everything in Washington in general, and the Congressman to whom they are addressed in particular. Some of them are sent anonymously. Others carry a name boldly signed at the bottom. Some letters even begin with insults and wind up with requests for special favors.

Then there is, for every Congressman, the more troublesome problem of a constantly increasing number of demands for errands in Washington.

The Federal Government adds new programs endlessly. As it does so, the average citizen becomes more deeply involved personally in Washington and collects more special problems. The Congressman is called on to help with these. Each additional errand having to be handled for a voter back home takes time which otherwise could be spent on enacting legislation, which, after all, is the primary duty and responsibility of a Congressman.

It is a vicious circle. If a Congressman doesn't take the hours necessary to run down all special requests from individual voters to the most successful conclusion possible, he is likely to be voted out of office. But if he does use a major share of his time on such trivia, he can hardly be prepared to debate and vote knowledgeably on the vital legislation of the day.

In such a situation, it is a small wonder that Ikard walked out of Congress when API, the respected national trade association of the oil and gas industry, offered him the association presidency, about $100,000 a year in salary and lush expense-account privileges. He left behind a bright political future, a $22,500 a year salary, the heavy expenses a Congressman must bear himself and the insults and headaches a Congressman suffers daily.

But now that he has taken his departure from Congress, Ikard would like to do what he can to make life easier for other congressmen who are sincerely attempting to serve the public interest.

His Dallas speech was an example.

"I am not disturbed," Ikard said, "by calls for reform aimed at helping the Congressman do his job better. But I am disturbed by the increase in the number of calls for drastic reforms. They indicate to me that a growing number of Americans believe the representative arm of their government either cannot or will not perform its job * * *."

"Congress," the critics say, with its many diverse local loyalties, is too big, too cumbersome, too slow-moving to meet the needs of the mid-20th century. It should, they argue, give up some of its powers to the executive branch and to the regulatory agencies.

"It can do so, in my opinion, only at the greatest peril. Those who advance this argument believe—no doubt sincerely—that the Federal agencies 'can do it better.' But can they? Isn't the great reason for this country's strength the fact that Congress has stubbornly refused to grant unwarranted powers to the executive and administrative agencies?"

The executive branch of Government, under the firm hand of a popular President, can move efficiently and effectively, he observed. Congress, on the other hand, with its ancient customs and traditions, is in the public spotlight, stalling, deliberating and debating. This causes the critics to hurl the trite phrase, "Don't just stand there, Congressman—do something."

According to Ikard, Congressmen, with all the other demands on them, should take time to weigh carefully the major legislation of the day.

"For Congress," he said, "there are times when it is better not just to do something, but to stand there * * *. The true measure of a Congress could very well be the measure of bad bills it refuses to pass."

Waste in Military Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, they are at it again. The Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, issued June 11, 1963, a sole-source—no competition—document for the procurement of 85 interference blanker subassemblies priced at $156 each. They tried to justify this purchase on the grounds that there were no drawings available to make competitive bidding possible.

Mr. Speaker, drawings are available and I have proven this with the help of Brig. Gen. Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, commanding officer of the Army Electronics Materiel Agency. Not only are drawings available, but also there is a stockpile of these equipments on hand to fill present needs. This was also proven with General Stanwix-Hay's help.

As a result of these disclosures, this sole-source procurement has been canceled—pulled off the street if you please—and the taxpayers have been saved thousands of dollars that would have been poured down the drain through a sole-source buy. Additionally, I have General Stanwix-Hay's word that future purchases of this equipment will be made through competitive bidding.

When this set is purchased competitively, it is my prediction that the $156 price tag will be cut by at least one-third. This will again illustrate what I have been saying on the floor of the House for over 2 years now and that is that truly competitive bidding will save billions of dollars of military hardware.

To further prove this theory, I am going to show today how just such a modest savings as the one I am speaking about here today triggered a widespread study of many equipments by the Army Electronics Command. This study could save more thousands of taxpayers' dollars in the future.

Mr. Speaker, an interference blanker subassembly is a small part of a radar set known as the AN/FPS 6.

Upon spotting this purchase in my study of bid sets which I have picked up daily at the Small Business Administration I noticed the old bugaboo of "no drawings available." I immediately set out to look behind the forms and the red-tape to get at the truth. A call was made to the Pentagon June 12, requesting full information on the purchase. On June 14 the answer came back and it was typical Pentagonese which said nothing. Putting it mildly, it was totally unsatisfactory.

That same day—June 14—I decided to go to the source and called General Stanwix-Hay. He was asked to investigate closely whether or not drawings were available and was told he would probably find them in the Air Force. An answer to the question "How could such a sole-source purchase be routinely approved without a thorough check being made by responsible officials?" was also requested.

Just 3 days later General Stanwix-Hay wrote to me stating that he had, indeed, found manufacturing drawings for this equipment in the Air Force. He also supplied me with the Determination and Findings signed by Maj. Gene C. Pickett, contracting officer, which sought to justify the sole-source purchase on the grounds that sufficient manufacturing data and drawings and plans were not available.

Think of it. It took General Stanwix-Hay only 3 days to knock down the technical fairy story it took engineering bureaucrats weeks and months to rig.

After receiving General Stanwix-Hay's letter, I again wrote him, trying to find out how such scatterbrained tactics could be allowed to go on and asking him to make sure that any future procurement for the equipment would be competitive.

That letter was answered last week. General Stanwix-Hay said he learned of the existence of manufacturing drawings for the equipment on June 17, 1963—3 days after we talked. At the same time, he found a present stockpile of 52 of these very items on hand and on July 1, 1963, he canceled the entire procurement, stating it is very probable that future procurement, when needed, will be made by competitive bidding.

When, and if, such a procurement is undertaken for this equipment, the price will fall dramatically under the force of competitive bidding, and there will be many thousands of dollars that will remain in the U.S. Treasury.

I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that General Stanwix-Hay has given me close cooperation in the past. Working together, we have made considerable progress in the procurement of items for the Army Electronics Command. The $10.2 million saved on the AN/PRC 25 some weeks ago is just one example.

It was General Stanwix-Hay who canceled procurement of three attitude indicators—equipments that visually indicate the flight attitude of an aircraft—some months ago. He did this after my questions turned up huge stockpiles of the overstocked, overpriced and almost obsolete equipments.

As a result of my additional questions, a full scale study of procurement of similar and allied items was undertaken at the direction of General Stanwix-Hay. Last week, I received a letter telling me this full review is underway "to preclude the possibility of any such occurrences" such as the waste that was stopped by cancellation of the ID-998, 999 and 1000 "in the future."

Although the investigation is not as yet complete I can state to you today that Army Materiel Agency people at Fort Monmouth, N.J. are checking out 13 fuel measuring devices, 7 fire detection devices, 2 temperature transmitters, 2 oil temperature indicators, 2 temperature indicators and a test set to induce competition into future purchases.

This is how the stopping of one small purchase can spread out—like a rock in a millpond—and save the taxpayers thousands.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of the incompetence and waste in military procurement and how it can be stopped if the Congress rides herd on Pentagon procurement activities through enactment of my bill, H.R. 4409, which will set up a joint blue ribbon watchdog committee to maintain a close surveillance over all sole source and negotiated purchases. Such waste and incompetence can also be corralled through enactment of my H.R. 5258 which will give the General Accounting Office authority to pass on sole source procurement such as those I have been describing here on the floor of the House.

We are spending over $50 billion a year for defense. It is time we started pulling the Federal pursestrings as tight as we do at the city, county level and in our private lives.

Fool Us Twice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of hearings now being held on the nuclear test ban treaty, the doubts being raised by many editors should be of real concern. For example, the Fairmont (Minn.) Sentinel is extremely skeptical about trusting Russia. I include the Sentinel editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOL US TWICE

(By Walter K. Mickelson)

Everyone must wish they could be as optimistic and as sure of themselves as Minnesota's HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Although he did not have time to see the treaty, the Minnesota senior Senator endorsed it and considered the two-thirds approval as just another of his Senate whip jobs to put over. Most people just don't have the self-confidence our Senator has.

Normally, most Americans would toss their hat in the air and say "three cheers." Everyone is afraid of these devilish, destroying atomic bombs. Everyone would like to see them put under strict control if we cannot work out an agreement to abolish them altogether.

This could be done easily and would have been done long ago except for one country—Russia.

Probably it would have been long ago—or would not have been necessary at all. We did not have any agreement on the use of poisonous gases in wartime but because they were so dangerous to all sides in war, nobody used these wicked gases.

The United States would gladly sign a nuclear test ban treaty with Great Britain, France, or Western Germany and it would mean something and be kept. It seems tragic that the country which has the power to keep or break the test ban treaty is Russia whose word isn't worth much. Russia seems to keep only those treaties which help her or which she wishes to keep.

That is why most thoughtful people in the world are so skeptical of this test ban treaty.

They want to be sure that Russia isn't using this as a treaty to trap us and they want to be sure she will keep it.

Maybe Russia is breaking with China for good but the average man is from Missouri and wants to be shown. The average American feels that if a country fools us once, shame on them. If they fool us twice, shame on us.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 16th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

It is fully apparent that Secretary Udall put his socialistic power program ahead of Reclamation when he issued his unwarranted and untenable order for the expansion of Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho.

Mr. Tom Olmstead, president of the Idaho State Reclamation Association expressed his emphatic opposition to Secretary Udall's indefensible action. His statement on the matter was the basis for the following editorial from the Idaho Evening Statesman of Boise, Idaho, for May 23, 1963, entitled "A Slap at Reclamation":

A SLAP AT RECLAMATION

One aspect of this week's Interior Department edict putting southern Idaho public power sales under the control of the Bonneville Power Administration is its effect on reclamation—a vital matter in Idaho.

Listen to Tom Olmstead, of Twin Falls, president of the Idaho State Reclamation Association, in his biting comment on Secretary of the Interior Udall's order placing the

entire public hydroelectric resources of the Columbia River basin under BPA control. This of course includes southern Idaho plus segments of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada. The Udall order abruptly removes the Federal Bureau of Reclamation from control of the area's public water and power resources and puts BPA in full authority. Says Mr. Olmstead:

"Idaho irrigators for many years have enjoyed a fine working relationship with the Bureau of Reclamation here. The Bureau always placed its reclamation program ahead of its power production program. The Bureau here understands Idaho's problems far better, I am sure, than does BPA in Portland.

"We irrigators deeply regret the reduced stature which the Bureau is being assigned by Secretary Udall."

And he goes on succinctly:

"Until now, power revenues from southern Idaho reclamation projects have been sufficient to help pay reclamation development costs, and as a result Idaho has built a healthy agricultural economy. Now BPA would eliminate that reclamation rate base, and substitute rates that cannot possibly assist reclamation."

BPA rates, points out Mr. Olmstead, "cannot even support present BPA costs, without consideration for reclamation."

Fortunately, Congress must vote to supply the money to put the planned BPA extension into southern Idaho into full force, perhaps $60 million for BPA transmission facilities. There is no sign that this money will soon be forthcoming. The reclamation association spokesman avers: "I hope that Congress will refuse to permit this wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' money."

Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963—Statement of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963 is one of the organizations that recognizes the need for a tax cut to stimulate the economy and provide jobs. The leadership of this group includes such distinguished Americans as Howard R. Bowen, Alexander Allen, D.W. Brooks, Phil David Fine, George Meany, Geritt Vander Ende. I would like to call the attention of the Members to the committee's statement of principles which follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION AND REVISION IN 1963—STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

1. We, the undersigned, acting in our individual and personal capacity, believing that the national public interest will be served by the enactment in 1963 of a Federal law revising the Federal tax structure, including a substantial net tax reduction, associate ourselves together in a temporary organization called "The Citizens Committee for Tax Reduction and Revision in 1963."

2. The purpose of this organization, to be established and maintained on a nonpartisan basis, is to gain widespread public understanding and acceptance of the national need for prompt and effective action in this session of Congress to achieve a meaningful revision in Federal income tax laws, including a substantial net tax reduction of individual and corporate taxes totaling about $10 billion, a substantial part to take effect as early as possible in 1963.

3. Accordingly, we urge prompt enactment during the present session of Congress, in a single comprehensive bill, of the following:

(a) A substantial, meaningful reduction in individual tax rates from the present levels of 20 to 91 percent to a substantially lower range from bottom to top;

(b) The removal of certain inequities and hardships in our present tax structure as they affect taxpayers in the low income and elderly groups.

(c) The reversal of the corporate normal and surtax rates so that the tax rate applicable to the first $25,000 of corporate income would drop from 30 to 22 percent, so as to give particular encouragement to small business;

(d) A meaningful reduction in the rate of corporate income tax; and

(e) The broadening of the base of the income tax to remove unwarranted special privileges, correct defects in the tax law, and provide more equal treatment of taxpayers—thereby permitting a larger reduction in tax rates than would otherwise be possible and achieving greater equity in the distribution of the tax burden.

4. We further believe that if the tax program is to attain its objective in a manner consistent with the principles of fiscal responsibility, it must be carried forward as a part of a comprehensive financial program that protects the Nation against any danger of new inflationary pressures.

5. Membership in this committee shall not preclude the exercise by any member of his right to disagree with any specific features of the committee's proposals, or to advance other proposals of his own.

6. Our current tax system exerts too heavy a drag on employment, private purchasing power, profits, and incentives—its high rate structure being designed in time of war and postwar inflation to hold back consumer demand, initiative and investment. It now checks growth. It discourages extra effort and risk. It invites recurrent recessions and prevents the attainment of our national economic objective of full employment and use of resources. We shall invite those who believe with us that 1963 is the year to make a substantial beginning on the revision of our tax system, along the general lines indicated in the President's messages, to join with us in seeing to it that this program receives the understanding, acceptance, and support it deserves.

William H. Flaherty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week Woburn, Mass. lost one of its most distinguished and inspiring citizens. William H. Flaherty, totally blind since 1938, died unexpectedly at the age of 59 after a life filled with dedicated service to his family and his community. Bill Flaherty never considered blindness a handicap; it was merely an inconvenience. At the time of his death he was clerk of the city council of Woburn and veterans' agent for the city. He was a former city councilor and school committeeman.

He raised a fine family of 4 daughters and a son and leaves them and his devoted wife and 12 grandchildren.

Bill Flaherty's death was a shock to us all, but he will live on as an inspiration not only to those who suffer severe physical handicap but to all of us who are tempted to bear much lighter burdens with far less grace and courage.

A Coal Mine That Yields Tourist Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, something is wrong somewhere when the Washington press corps is treated to an attack on a Federal program on the grounds that it destroys local initiative, when that very program actually stimulates and nourishes local initiative.

The president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Neilan, last week attacked the area redevelopment program with the familiar complaint about "destroying local initiative." Yet, the record shows that the area redevelopment program is based 100 percent on local initiative.

For instance, no area can qualify for financial assistance under Area Redevelopment Administration unless it has first formed a local, broad-based organization and prepared an overall economic development program. Over 700 such organizations have already been formed under ARA. Local chamber of commerce officials play active roles in these local community groups.

Every applicant for assistance under the ARA program must be approved by the State—and in every project so far approved by ARA—these applicants have also been approved by the local group.

At least 10 percent of the project cost must be supplied by a State or local organization. In many areas of the country local groups, spurred by the prospect of an ARA-financed job-creating project, have performed miracles of local civil cooperation, fundraising, and planning for economic development.

In distressed coal mining communities in the Sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania these redevelopment programs are bringing a new life, progress and jobs.

Mr. Speaker, no Federal program has done more to spark local initiative in areas where such initiative had been lacking in the past than the area redevelopment program. It is not only ironical that this program should be attacked on the grounds that it destroys local initiative, but it proves that those who are opposing this program have done nothing to try to understand how it works.

Those of us who know how it works are confident that ARA deserves and will get the support of this House in its need for

additional authorizations to supply 200,000 more jobs by July 1, 1965.

As an example of what ARA is doing, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks an article which recently appeared in the Baltimore Sun, August 4, 1963, in their Sunday magazine section.

The article, "A Coal Mine That Yields Tourist Gold," by John Dorsey and Richard Stacks tells one of the many stories being duplicated throughout Pennsylvania and the Nation with the help of ARA. The article shows how local people, a group of Ashland's businessmen and civic leaders—owners of the local pumping company, knitting mill, and metal mill, a lawyer, an undertaker, and a hotel manager—took hours from their regular work to make this project work. Because of their willingness to do something for Ashland and for themselves, ARA was able to offer them a loan of $43,000, the first loan to be granted by ARA in the field of tourism.

This is the story told in this interesting article:

A COAL MINE THAT YIELDS TOURIST GOLD

Slowly the small crowd gropes its way through the dark, each of its members pointing his miner's light ahead of him and stepping carefully along the damp planks of the tunnel floor.

Ahead, the guide, an oldtime miner, explains things. "This is a typical anthracite coal mine," he says, "except that since it was cut right into the side of the mountain we can walk in rather than take an elevator 200 or 300 feet down."

About 150 feet in, he pauses and shines his light on a niche in the rock. "That's where some miner, 40 or 50 years ago, drilled a hole for a dynamite cap."

"What's that lamp for?" asks someone.

"That's a safety lamp. If the flame gets blue on top, you know there's gas in the mine, but we've never had any gas here."

"How cold is it in here?"

"About 58°."

After a 20-minute tour, including a view of a coal vein and an explanation of how coal is produced and mined, the crowd returns to the tunnel's entrance and emerges into the cool, clear air so common in Ashland and other Pennsylvania mountain towns. Opinions of the tour vary, but almost everyone is enthusiastic in one way or another.

"It's interesting," some think.

"It's exciting," say others.

"It's eerie."

"It's fun."

And, hope the business men and citizens of Ashland, it's going to be popular. If Pioneer Tunnel, once a coal mine, now a tourist attraction, lives up to their hopes it will reward the hard work of Ashland's leading citizens by lifting the former mining town out of the economic doldrums.

Ashland, situated in the low mountains of northwestern Schuylkill County, sprang up about 100 years ago as a coal mining town. But with the recent decline in the coal industry the town has lost its former prosperity. For the last 4 years there have been no operating mines in the area.

Population has dwindled from a peak of 8,000 to about 5,000. Many of those Ashlanders who have remained now commute to work in Harrisburg, Reading, or Allentown. As a result, local businesses, such as stores, banks, hotels, restaurants, and gas stations, have suffered.

Late in 1961, a group of Ashland's businessmen and civic leaders, disturbed by the recent exodus and the lack of hope for new industry, met to investigate whether something could be found in the town to attract visitors. At the suggestion of Emil Ermert, borough manager, they decided to take advantage of what had long been the mainstay of the Ashland economy, coal mining.

Somewhere in a hill above town there was a mine tunnel, closed since 1931, which had been dug back from an entrance in the side of the hill rather than hundreds of feet below the ground. The entrance had been covered over for years, but if it could be located, opened, and made safe for visitors it might become a tourist attraction. Similar ideas had been tried in one or two other Pennsylvania towns with considerable success.

Taking hours from their regular work, putting in time nights and on weekends, the men formed Ashland Community Enterprises, a nonprofit organization for the development of the tunnel. Its directors included, besides Mr. Ermert, owners of the local pumping company, knitting mill, and metal plant, a lawyer, an undertaker, and a hotel manager.

They first got permission to use the land from the coal company that owns it. The borough of Ashland gave the association the right to use any coal taken from the mine. About $75,000 was raised through private subscriptions and loans from Government agencies, principally a $43,100 loan from the Federal Government's Area Redevelpoment Administration. It was the first loan ever granted by this agency in the field of commercial tourism.

By the time work could begin it was the summer of 1962. This was too late to open the tunnel during last year's tourist season, so the organization first went ahead with plans for a locomotive ride nearby as an added selling point. An old steam mine locomotive, called a "lokie," was bought for $1,200 from a junkyard, cleaned, painted, and put in working condition.

A coal mine operator donated six mine cars to the project, and these were remodeled and repainted. Each carries about 20 passengers on a 1¼-mile run. The "lokie" opened last summer and was an immediate success. By the end of 1962 it had carried over 14,000 passengers.

The mine entrance was located and opened the first part of this year. The 250-foot tunnel, with a smaller branch running off to one side, was completely retimbered along the sides and roof to make it perfectly safe.

A board floor was installed. Two mine chutes, extending up into the hill from the tunnel, were opened and some mining was done. The coal removed was used in part to run the "lokie," and the rest was sold to a cleaning company.

On Saturday, May 4, Pioneer Tunnel was opened to the public, after being thoroughly inspected and approved for safety by the proper governmental authorities. Hours for the tours and "lokie" rides are 10 a.m. to dusk daily through Labor Day. Between Labor Day and the end of October the tunnel will be open only on weekends and for special groups during the week.

Miners have been hired to conduct the tours, the project directors feeling they will lend an air of authenticity and will be able to answer questions.

So far this year, more than 10,000 people have ridden the "lokie" and about 4,500 have toured the tunnel. Aside from individuals and families, several groups have made bus trips to the site. Churches, schools, colleges, and various fraternal organizations have been welcomed, and the project's directors are trying to encourage more group visits.

"We are pleased with the results we've had so far this year," says Mr. Ermert, "and are hoping attendance will pick up considerably as the summer goes on.

"If we can pay off the loans and get on our feet, we may give Ashland the lift it needs. The main boost to the economy will not be the people we hire, but the money we get tourists to spend in town while they are here. If local business picks up fewer townspeople will move away, and some who have left may even come back."

Not satisfied to sit still, Mr. Ermert and the other members of the association are planning to enlarge the tunnel.

After this has been done and the loans have been paid back, any profits from the venture will be used to improve the town's parks and playgrounds.

Pennsylvania Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania:

(NOTE.—On Tuesday, May 14, 1963, the Nation's newest and one of its largest pharmaceutical manufacturing facilities was officially opened in West Point, Pa. Joining Stuart T. Henshall, president of Merck Sharp & Dohme, in the dedication ceremonies for the new $2¾ million structure were John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., and William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. With over 650 business and community leaders on hand, Mr. Connor introduced Governor Scranton.)

EXCERPTS FROM INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY JOHN T. CONNOR, PRESIDENT, MERCK & CO., INC., RAHWAY, N.J.

Our achievement is an achievement of Pennsylvania, for this State has provided a natural and advantageous location—near one of the fountainheads of American medicine with its five major medical centers and excellence in research—convenient to the populous megalopolis of the East—and enlightened in its climate of governmental encouragement to business and industry.

It is a particular pleasure and honor to welcome the Governor of Pennsylvania to our platform. To me this platform—occupied jointly by industry and government—symbolizes a new spirit of common purpose that must surely be our standard in the years ahead.

ADDRESS OF GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

Today's the kind of day when it feels particularly good to be a Pennsylvanian.

We come here to dedicate this gigantic and gleaming new building, within the walls of which Pennsylvanians will work to produce lifesaving drugs and medicines.

One of the largest pharmaceutical laboratories in the world, it cost nearly $3 million to build and it stretches out under one roof to fill the area of six football fields.

Certainly, the company is proud of it. Certainly, the people who work here are proud of it. But, just as important, every man and woman in Pennsylvania can be proud of it, too.

We hear a lot of what's wrong with Pennsylvania, and it's good that we do, particularly when the criticism is constructive and includes a plan to correct faults wherever they can be found.

But, unfortunately, we don't hear enough of what's right with Pennsylvania.

If a firm employing over 2,000 people in Pennsylvania decides to close a $3 million plant and move elsewhere, the event would explode in headlines across the State and far across the Nation as well. But, unfortunately, the nature of "news" is such that

the opening of a facility of the same size ordinarily does not attract the same amount of widespread attention.

This is not the fault of the newspapers and other news media. They have the remarkable ability to reflect the interests of their readers and it happens to be one of the perverse facts of human nature that for most people "bad news" makes a better story than "good news."

You might say it's human nature, but, frankly, in terms of our economic growth and the future of our State we sometimes let our addiction to bad news run away with us.

When you come right down to it, however unfortunate the closing of an old plant is, it is not always unexpected or unpredicted in this rapidly growing age. We've been a leader in developing the industrial might of the Nation for more years than there has been a nation. Many of our plants are obsolescent.

Production patterns and other factors change. Such reverses are therefore hardly proof that we are living under a black curse.

Fortunately, such economic reverses are far from the most significant events in Pennsylvanias' economic growth pattern.

The most significant events—the truly "newsworthy" events in the purest sense of that term—are those such as we are commemorating today.

I wish every Pennsylvanian could see this new laboratory, and I wish every Pennsylvanian could take a few minutes to ponder the very intriguing question of why it is here.

Certainly, it's not by accident. Merck Sharp & Dohme has been in Pennsylvania since 1929. That's plenty of time to decide that Pennsylvania is the right State in which to be located.

Fifteen years ago the management of this company decided that its future could best be served by moving out of downtown Philadelphia. The dedication of this laboratory today marks the completion of that long-range plan, completing for the time being at least the multibuilding industrial-scientific complex that we see before us today.

When the company saw that it must move from its original Philadelphia location in order to expand, it could easily have decided to move right out of Pennsylvania.

Merck Sharp & Dohme and its parent firm—Merck & Co.—have worldwide investments. No strings compel them to be here in Pennsylvania. They are here only because they want to be. They have concentrated so much of their expansion within Pennsylvania because it makes good, solid business sense to do so.

And, that's why we Pennsylvanians can be proud of it. That's why we ought to make sure that the entire American business community hears about it.

I asked the company to tell me exactly what Pennsylvania has that makes her attractive to a company like Merck Sharp & Dohme.

Every Pennsylvanian ought to hear the answer in the exact words of the company:

First, I was told, in Pennsylvania there is proximity to the world's leading centers for medical education and medical research.

Two, availability of a good supply of technical and scientific personnel—products of Pennsylvania's outstanding public and private high schools and colleges.

Three, the educational, cultural, and residential advantages of the area—so desirable in making the homelife of employees attractive, and so essential to induce top-rated scientific people to come here to work.

Four, a healthy business climate, created by a cooperative attitude on the part of local and State governments.

Five, the availability of rapid domestic and foreign communications.

Six, the availability of economical transportation for finished products and raw materials by land, sea, and air carriers, giving ready access to domestic and foreign markets.

Seven, the availability of suitable land sites that allow freedom for today's operations and sufficient elbowroom for expansion.

Eight, the fact that the local community welcomed the company's location here.

Nine, the availability of needed business and service facilities.

Those are the reasons the company gave me for its decision to expand in Pennsylvania. They came from the company, not from the State commerce department.

Important as this new laboratory is—and excited as we are that it is here—the reasons listed by the company for its expansion here have significance that far outreaches just this one facility that we are dedicating today.

Think of them once more: Nearness to scientific institutions, trained personnel, attractive communities, healthy business climate, communications, transportation, good plant sites—these qualifications add up to a complete endorsement of Pennsylvania as a location for the growth industries which have their roots in science and technology.

As Pennsylvanians we thank Merck Sharp & Dohme for its kind words, and we thank them for their action of building this laboratory here, because it speaks even louder than the kindest words.

We realize that as Pennsylvanians we owe a corresponding duty to this firm and to others in exchange for their vary tangible expressions of belief in Pennsylvania's future.

That duty comes in the form of our solemn promise to do all in our power to make Pennsylvania an even more attractive place in the years ahead for business to locate, to grow, to expand, to create more jobs.

Compensation for Seneca Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress of the United States voted to build the Kinzua Dam within the Allegany Indian Reservation in Pennsylvania and New York it tore into shreds the first treaty this country ever made. It was a treaty made between the Seneca Nation and the United States, signed on behalf of George Washington November 11, 1794.

The action was reexamined by Thomas Jefferson March 17, 1802, when he stated that these lands shall remain the property of the Seneca and Onandago Nations forever unless they shall voluntarily relinquish or dispose of them but the treaty was broken and about one-third of the land taken. Now that the dam is being constructed the least we can do as a nation is to compensate these people for the loss of their homes and lands. Hearings are now underway before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the bills introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Congressman HALEY, and the gentleman from New York, Congressman GOODELL, to provide compensation. George Kennedy's column which appeared in The Washington Evening Star of August 12 discusses the hearing last week. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Kennedy's column which follows:

SEES U.S. CONSCIENCE

(By George Kennedy)

The American conscience walked to the witness chair in room 1324 of the Longworth (the New House Office) Building at 11 a.m. on Friday.

The conscience was Walter Taylor of the Friends' Indian Committee.

The House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs was conducting hearings on a matter that has engaged the members' attention for several months.

This is the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania near the New York border.

The dam, already under construction, will flood the Allegany (the name has various spellings) Indian Reservation near Salamanca, N.Y.

"As you know, Mr. Chairman," Mr. Taylor said, "the Friends' Indian Committee is an old one. It is the same committee which sent four delegates in 1794 to attend the treaty negotiations at Canandaigua in New York State between the young U.S. Government and the Seneca Nation.

"The Indians, who could not read or write, apparently did not trust the Government.

"They asked the Friends (Quakers) in Philadelphia to read the treaty to assure them that it was one they could sign.

"It was this treaty that acknowledged the land to be the property of the Seneca Nation and specified that the United States would never claim the same or disturb the Indians in their free use and enjoyment of it."

It was heartening to realize that a committee that served as the American conscience 189 years ago was still functioning.

The chairman Mr. Taylor addressed was Representative JAMES A. HALEY of Florida, who had just been called "the conscience of Congress in this matter" by Representative EDMONDSON of Oklahoma.

Otherwise there is little comfort for the American sense of honor in the story of what has happened to the Senecas, one of the Iroquois' Six Nations.

Manifest destiny has made "scraps of paper" out of treaties with the Indians (that is the phrase Chancellor Bethmann Hollweg used in 1914 in dismissing the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium).

As canals, railroads, highways and irrigation projects were constructed—and Indian land became more desirable—Indian treaties were modified, usually unilaterally.

But this one seems to have special appeal to the national conscience.

For one thing, it was the first treaty signed by this Nation "with the advice and consent of the Senate" after the adoption of the Constitution.

George Washington, who was President, sent Timothy Pickering as his personal representative from Philadelphia, then the Capital, to negotiate with the Six Nations.

In 1936 a flood control dam on the Allegheny was authorized. In 1958 money was finally appropriated to begin work.

Not much attention was given to the moral problem posed by the treaty, until Edmund Wilson wrote a series in the New Yorker magazine, later published as a book entitled "Apologies to the Iroquois."

The $119 million dam now under construction will back up a lake 35 miles long which will flood one-third of the land remaining to the Seneca Nation (about 10,000 acres).

About 130 Seneca families will have to be moved by October 1964.

The hearings, which will continue this week, are on H.R. 1794, introduced by Mr. HALEY to provide for the rehabilitation and resettlement of the Senecas.

Most of Friday's hearing was taken up by a report of the Brill Engineering Co. of New York, which was commissioned to study the

possibility of making the area a tourist attraction.

The company's experts reported that an estimated expenditure of $29 million would attract 650,000 tourists a year. The Indians would be employed as guides.

Aiding Underdeveloped Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Willard L. Thorp, chairman of the Development Assistance Committee, has urged a greater effort by the Western nations in carrying out their obligation to aid those countries which are now in the first stages of their development. Benefits will flow to the United States and the industrial nations of Western Europe not only in terms of economic stability and security, but also in providing a base for increased and expanding trade. The Development Assistance Committee is a committee of the 12-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, composed of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Thorp's statement as reported in the Journal of Commerce of August 2, 1963:

BUT GREATER EFFORT ASKED—FURTHER HIKE EXPECTED IN AID TO NEEDY NATIONS

PARIS, August 1.—The United States and other major industrial nations are expected to step up their aid to developing countries in 1963 but an even greater effort is needed, the 12-nation Development Assistance Committee (DAC) was told today.

The warning was contained in a report by DAC Chairman Willard L. Thorp of the United States.

DAC is a committee of the 22-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The DAC member states are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and United States.

SPENDING GAIN

Mr. Thorp estimated government spending by the 12 nations in 1963 will be between $6.5 and $7 billion compared with $6.35 billion in 1963.

The total government and private aid given in 1962 was estimated at $8.4 billion compared with $8.651 billion in 1961.

There was no estimate for probable private aid spending in 1963.

NEEDS TO BE MET

"There are investment needs of less developed countries which have yet to be met," Mr. Thorp said. "Continued efforts, therefore, are required by DAC members both to increase the volume of assistance and to provide it in forms best adapted to the economic and social development in these countries. It is important for each country to examine the adequacy and the level and nature of its aid efforts. Certain members whose contributions appear not to be commensurate with their capabilities should make special efforts to do so."

The report showed the United States again was by far the biggest foreign assistance giver in 1962, with a total of $4.52 billion in Government and private aid. France again was second with $1.38 billion—most of it to former French African colonies—Great Britain third with $836.7 million, West Germany fourth with $681.4 million, Japan fifth with $281.9 million, and Italy sixth with $278 million.

Others were the Netherlands, $140.5 million; Belgium, $96.9 million; Canada, $350.3 million; Portugal, $37.3 million; Denmark, $1.4 million; and Norway, $3.1 million.

In the cases of Belgium, Canada and Portugal the figures covered only Government aid. No private aid figures for these three were available.

Mr. Thorp said France, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States continued to increase their Government aid spending in 1962.

WEST GERMAN SLUMP

But West Germany slumped from $589 to $427 million. This, the report said, was due to the fact that the West German Bundesbank did not repeat its purchase of $212 million of bonds of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development which it made in 1961.

Canada also showed a sharp drop from $62 to $50 million in Government aid spending. This was due, the report said, to the financial crisis and devaluation of the Canadian dollar.

Japanese official aid also dropped from $214 to $165 million. The report said this followed an exceptionally strong increase in 1961.

Mr. Thorp said Canada, West Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Norway, Portugal, and the United States all expect overall increases in 1963.

In his report Mr. Thorp urged expansion of the flow of private capital to developing countries, close attention to the relationship between trade and aid, and better coordination of aid among donor countries.

The Athens Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association:

THE ATHENS CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW

Report of Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association, and presently an outstanding attorney practicing in Washington, D.C.

The First World Conference of Lawyers was convened June 30-July 6, 1963, in historic Athens, to seek and proclaim ways in which the rule of law could replace force in international relations. It achieved tremendous accomplishments in welding together the world's 1 million lawyers into an effective organization to further world peace. It is certainly accurate to say that out of the Athens Conference a new force for peace has arisen.

Delegates were present from over 100 nations, not as representatives of states but as private individuals free and eager to express their own ideas and support their own convictions. There were also many observers and specialists available to add their experience and wisdom at Conference discussion sessions, bringing the attendance to more than 1,000. Among the principal speakers at the Conference were King Paul of Greece; the Prime Minister of Greece, P. Pipinelis; the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren; the president of the American Bar Association, Sylvester C. Smith, Jr.; the Chief Justice of India, B. P. Sinha; and the Honorable John J. McCloy, Publisher Henry Luce, and Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association, of the United States.

For several years the World Peace Through Law Movement has been sponsored by the American Bar Association. Continental Conferences had been convened in Costa Rica, Japan, Nigeria, and Italy, in order to lay a foundation for this important World Conference by studying problems and developing areas of agreement. A working paper, prepared in English, French, and Spanish, the three official languages of the World Conference, aided Conference discussions and recommendations. Working sessions were carried out in panel discussion groups, which dealt with many vital subjects the most important being the improvement of methods and institutions for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, the development of legal rules to encourage international investment and facilitate international trade, law rules and institutions for disarmament programs, the creation of law for outer space, international efforts in legal education and research, the unification of private law, organizing lawyers internationally for effective cooperative action, and the identification of general principles of international law required for the effective application of the rule of law.

The discussions in the work sessions in Athens brought forth many fresh ideas along with a meld of idealism and practicality in the program adopted. The gradual development of supranational law out of the necessities of our unified interdependent world was a fact often stated and accepted by all in attendance. The only question debated was how to speed up the process of law building. A law system as a design for a disarmed world was agreed upon as the ultimate great objective of mankind which lawyers can help most in achieving.

The participants in the historic Athens Conference can certainly proudly claim very outstanding achievements. One of the intangible but significant accomplishments was the development of understanding, friendliness, and agreement among lawyers the world over. Skeptics and casual supporters of the program were converted to the soundness and importance of the world peace through law movement. The differences in legal, cultural, and geographic backgrounds of so many distinguished lawyers made the enthusiasm for the movement and the broad agreement on general principles and on the necessity for immediate action the more remarkable.

Among the tangible achievements of the Conference were several documents of the greatest significance which should be read and pondered the world over. In its proclamation of Athens the members of the Conference declared that "law must replace violence internationally as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity," and pledged their support of a global work program of research, education, and action to develop and strengthen legal rules and institutions in order to replace force by law. Its declaration of general principles for a world rule of law emphasized equality before the law and fairness, justice and fundamental human rights which protect the dignity of man; the

need to resolve international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, or other peaceful means; and the support of the United Nations as "the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law." The lawyers' global work program to advance a world rule of law consists of suggestions which emerged from the Conference panel sessions for work to be carried out by the new center, some 90 specific projects. To further these, 95 new committees were proposed. These will be manned by lawyers from throughout the world so as to bring the manpower and brainpower of the world's lawyers to bear on the problem of world peace. Perhaps the most important document approved at the Athens Conference was the set of resolutions creating the world peace through law center, since here we have a concrete creation to mobilize lawyers the world over in a program of research, education, and action. The new center is open to the membership of every lawyer of the world. Through this center the legal profession will grow in strength, capacity, and influence.

The world conference on the rule of law and the magnificent work program it is sponsoring for the future certainly have the greatest merit. The four documents adopted at Athens are giant steps toward a world ruled by law. Such a world requires first of all a consensus of agreement among the lawyers and people and governmental leaders of all nations. Athens either stated or laid the foundation for this consensus. The steps set forth in the work program will achieve it. The efforts of the Athens pioneers in this vital field should therefore receive the wide support which they so richly deserve.

PROCLAMATION OF ATHENS

(Adopted and released by the First World Conference on World Peace Through Law, July 7, 1963)

This Conference of members of the legal profession from more than 100 nations throughout the world, being well aware of and deeply concerned with the fact that violation of the rule of law in international affairs by nations can only lead to disturbance of the peace and destruction of mankind through nuclear holocaust, has concluded and hereby proclaims that law must replace violence internationally as the controlling factor in the fate of humanity.

We firmly believe that a world ruled by law is attainable by those to whom this proclamation is addressed—the 3 billion people who inhabit the earth.

We recognize and willingly accept our special responsibility as professional men technically trained in procedures for the just and peaceful resolution of disputes, to create and support effective and equitable means for the peaceful settlement of transnational differences between men and nations.

We have adopted at this Conference a global work program for developing and strengthening rules of international law and international legal institutions and procedures, and we solemnly pledge ourselves to carry it forward with dispatch, enlisting the joint efforts and resources of the 1 million members of the legal profession of all nations. The urgency of the need and the determined leadership now available as a result of this Conference make us confident that our program of research, education, and action will cause the force of law to replace the law of force in the world community.

We call on the people of all nations throughout the world, and especially their governments, to support this Proclamation of Athens to the end that the program here adopted can be translated from idea to reality thereby assuring mankind that the ever-accelerating arms race and the threat of annihilation by war may be ended forever.

DECLARATION OF GENERAL PRINCIPLES ADOPTED AT THE FIRST WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW, ATHENS, GREECE, JULY 7, 1963

In order to establish an effective international legal system under the rule of law which precludes resort to force, we declare that—

1. All states and persons must accept the rule of law in the world community. In international matters, individuals, juridical persons, states and international organizations must all be subject to international law, deriving rights and incurring obligations thereunder.

2. The rule of law in international affairs is based upon the principle of equality before the law.

International law and legal institutions must be based on fundamental concepts of fairness, justice, and human dignity.

4. International law and legal institutions must be capable of expansion, development or change to meet the needs of a changing world composed of nations whose interdependence is ever on the increase and to permit progress in political, social, and economic justice for all peoples.

5. All obligations under international law must be fulfilled and all rights thereunder must be exercised in good faith.

6. A fundamental principle of the international rule of law is that of the right of self-determination of the peoples of the world, as proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations.

7. Each individual is entitled to effective legal protection of fundamental and inalienable human rights without distinction as to race, religion, or belief.

8. Those who are subject to international law must resolve their international disputes by adjudication, arbitration, or other peaceful procedures.

9. International obligations, including decisions of international tribunals, must be enforced by appropriate international community action.

10. The United Nations organization is the world's best hope for international peace under the rule of law and must be supported and strengthened by all possible means, and to this end we reaffirm our support of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE FIRST WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH THE RULE OF LAW

This world conference convened at Athens, Greece, on July 1, 1963, in which delegates and observers from 105 nations participated.

Resolves—

I. To adopt the Proclamation of Athens, the Declaration of General Principles, and the Work Program in the form attached to these resolutions;

II. To participate vigorously in the work program adopted by this conference toward the end of worldwide acceptance and application of the rule of law in international relations; and to that end

III. To encourage the formation and activity of national committee on World Peace Through Law within associations of lawyers and jurists.

In order to implement the foregoing resolutions, and recognizing the need for immediate and specific action, this conference further resolves—

IV. 1. The world peace through law center is hereby created to unite the members of the legal profession of the world for the purpose of furthering World Peace Through Law.

2. The present executive committee of this conference under the continuing chairmanship of the conference general chairman shall prepare and adopt, the charter, and bylaws, designate the first governing board, select the headquarters, the country of incorporation, employ the initial personnel and take any and all necessary action to accomplish the purposes, objectives and resolutions of this conference.

3. The charter shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) All members of the legal profession and specially invited guests participating in this conference shall be charter members upon their written acceptance and in accordance with the charter and bylaws. Appropriate and additional memberships, and dues shall be determined by the executive committee.

(B) The center shall establish a clearinghouse and information center relative to the activities of the legal profession of all nations concerning the progress, ways, means, and implementation of world peace through law.

(C) Without duplicating the work of other international or national organizations, the center may engage in research, conferences—international, regional or national, and other constructive activities in all phases of international law and especially the rule of law in international affairs, together with available institutions and procedures for the settlement of international disputes.

(D) The center shall operate with existing organizations of the legal profession, law schools, legal centers, the judiciary, and other established organizations engaged in the improvement, research and study of international law.

(E) It shall encourage the teaching and study of international law; recommend and assist exchanges of students, scholars, jurists, and other leaders of the legal profession, especially with the small and emerging nations.

(F) Disseminate the results of such international studies and research through appropriate means and publications to its members, cooperating organizations and all governments.

4. The center shall limit its efforts and objectives to the improvement and use of international law and international legal institutions to the end that international disputes shall be prevented and settled through the judicial or legal processes in lieu of force.

V. That the lawyers here assembled approve the establishment of "world law day", and declare their support of it.

VI. That the lawyers here assembled approve a "world rule of law year" during which the lawyers of the world will make a concentrated effort to advance the rule of law in international affairs through a coordinated program of research, education, and cooperative action, utilizing existing national and international institutions and organizations, and establishing such new institutions and organizations as may be desirable for the fulfilment of the objectives and purposes of the world peace through law program.

DRAFT RESOLUTION—BLUEPRINT FOR CONTROLLED DISARMAMENT

(Proposed by J. C. White, New Zealand, seconded by John Carrigan, Ireland, at a meeting of Topic 6, July 2, 1963)

That this world conference of the legal profession from over 100 nations meeting at Athens, deeply conscious of mankind's need for reaching agreement without delay on a plan for controlled disarmament calls on the executive committee to set up a special committee of experts in international law and representatives of the practicing profession, as representative of world opinion as possible, to prepare a draft plan for an organization to direct and supervise a disarmament agreement containing provisions for settling disputes and provisions to in-

sure compliance with the obligations of the agreement, the plan to be submitted to national organizations of lawyers and governments and to the appropriate organ of the United Nations.

Portrait of Pittsburgh—Markets Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive-minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing in southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the first of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

PORTRAITS OF PITTSBURGH—MARKETS UNLIMITED

Pittsburgh, city of steel and renaissance city of America, offers 2 markets—a huge consumer market of 7 million persons within its 56 county marketing area and a diversified industrial market comprised of 7,800 manufacturing plants within a 100-mile radius of the Golden Triangle.

Nationally, Pittsburgh is the center of the fabulous northeast quadrant of the United States. Within 600 miles of Pittsburgh is over 70 percent of all manufacturing industries and over 80 percent of all the industrial workers in America, two-thirds of the Nation's income, three-fifths of its retail trade and 8 of the 10 largest cities.

Located within the Pittsburgh marketing area are 75 of the 185 largest standard metropolitan county areas in the Nation.

Internationally, the possibilities are so great that today some 250 major industrial concerns and many smaller businesses which headquarter in the Pittsburgh region, annually ship over $260 million worth of goods directly from plants here to international markets abroad.

Pittsburgh is 8th largest market in the Nation, is the 16th largest city, and ranks 9th in effective consumer buying power, and 7th in retail sales and wholesale sales.

The geographic importance of Pittsburgh is emphasized by its proximity to other major cities. It is the very center of the third largest heavily populated area east of the Mississippi River—only 220 miles from Buffalo, N.Y., 125 miles from Cleveland, Ohio, and 231 miles from the Nation's Capital, making it the center of the most important part of the United States.

With the continued growth of large metropolitan areas into one continuous mass of citified land including sprawling areas of mass housing, residential areas, factories, and commerce; regions of population rather than areas of population have been created. Usually these regions include two or more metropolitan areas and several pockets of rural population.

There are 18 urban regions in the United States, and Pittsburgh is within the third largest urban region—third only to the huge eastern seaboard urban region of Boston to New York to Washington, D.C., and Chicago-Milwaukee urban region.

THE STATE

Pennsylvania ranks as the third largest State in the Nation with more than 6 percent of the total U.S. population. Latest U.S. population census figures estimated it at 11,493,600.

The economic geographic advantages of doing business in Pittsburgh are so great that it can truly be called a "market unlimited."

Congress Lag on Student Aid Hits Thousands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on August 13, 1963, the Philadelphia Inquirer carried a report on the thousands of college students in the Philadelphia area who are being affected by the delay in the final agreement on the Health, Education, and Labor appropriation bill, which contains funds for loans under the National Defense Education Act.

Because I think this problem is being experienced nationwide, with Philadelphia as an example, I am including the article for the Members:

CONGRESS LAG ON STUDENT AID HITS THOUSANDS

Several thousand college students in the Philadelphia area are caught in a financial bind through delay in Congress in appropriating funds for the National Defense Education Act loans.

The National Defense Education Act program is part of a package providing funds for all the programs administered by the Labor Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

IN JOINT CONFERENCE

The bill passed the House in April and the Senate on August 7 with a few minor changes and is now in joint conference to iron out the differences.

Meanwhile colleges have been forced to throw together emergency programs to carry over students who depend on National Defense Education Act loans to finance their educations.

Drexel Institute of Technology has decided to carry the program through the fall semester itself, according to William Toombs, chairman of the Scholarship Committee.

PENN TO DO LIKEWISE

The University of Pennsylvania will do likewise, as will La Salle College and, to a certain extent, St. Joseph's College and Villanova University.

Temple University's financial aid committee is currently in session and the student loan situation is one under discussion. No statement on loan policy will be made until the committee completes the discussion.

St. Joseph's College, because it expects its loan total to be less than that received last year, has notified students they can be promised only a portion of their proved needs.

TO BACK COMMITMENTS

Villanova University has alerted students from States which have student loan programs to apply for aid and will try to help those from areas which have no such program, stating it will stand behind commitments to students under the National Defense Education Act program.

At La Salle, Joseph J. Sprissler, vice president for business affairs, said a letter had been sent out to students stating that the college would make sure money was available for the term for National Defense Education Act students.

In addition to tying up their own funds the colleges and universities face a further burden through the cost of administration, doing their own bookkeeping analysis and evaluation and paying for clerical help needed in the emergency.

In the wider view, the burden can be multiplied by the hundreds of colleges throughout the country where no State aid prevails to fill the gap left by congressional procastination.

In Philadelphia, Drexel reported some 550 students had been on National Defense Education Act loans last year for better than $150,000; University of Pennsylvania, 560 students for $270,000; St. Joseph's College, 545 students for $155,000; Villanova University, 300 students for $150,000.

Drexel notified all its loan students by letter of the situation.

Douglas R. Dickson, director of the Office of Student Financial Aid for the University of Pennsylvania, said that Penn was "roughly in the same position as Drexel."

"We don't have National Defense Education Act funds and we don't know for certain if we will get them."

He said that about 6 weeks ago he realized that Congress had not appropriated the money for the coming college year and brought the situation to the attention of university officials. He said they approved his suggestion that the university loan the students the money they would have received under the National Defense Education Act had the appropiration been passed in time for the start of the semester.

PASSED IN 1958

Accordingly he said the university will loan the money on the assumption the National Defense Education Act appropiration will come through and if it doesn't the university will borrow bank funds.

The loan act was passed in 1958 and appropriations have been renewed yearly. It provides student funds at 3 percent interest payable within 10 years after graduation with certain provisions for those entering the armed services or the teaching field.

"The appropriations have been out of phase," Toombs said. "They have always been renewed in the summer or late in the fall but this year it has really been late. We anticipated it in the springtime so that colleges could allocate the funds for the fall but it didn't come through."

At St. Joseph's College the treasurer, the Reverend Danil J. Leahy, S.J., said the college has been able to give loans to 545 students under the National Defense Education Act.

"This has been an extremely valuable program and has enabled many students to complete their education who would otherwise be forced to drop out of school," he pointed out.

"At present we do not know exactly how much money will be allocated to the college for the coming school year by the Government. In the face of this uncertainty we have been forced to allocate about $155,000, which we believe will be lent to us, among the 545 needy students.

PROMISE ONLY PORTION

"We are hoping this is what we are going to get. It seems it will be less than we received last year although we requested 10 percent more funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Conse-

quently we have notified our students that at present we can only promise them a portion of their proved need for these Government loans."

At Villanova University, Vincent Femia, director of financial aid, said that institution was doing the same as the others although "we have not committed ourselves."

FURNISHED NAMES

"Students from States where we know there are student loan programs," he said, "have been furnished with the required names and addresses of authorities handling such funds.

"We are hoping Congress appropriates the National Defense Education Act money soon. We are going to try to help the boys from the States where there are no such programs.

"There has been some money available—grants in aid and the like—but it has run out. I have encouraged students who have graduated under the National Defense Education Act program to repay their loans to help others."

Ex-Lansing Man Says U.S. Aid Helps Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think we all recognize that our foreign aid program has not always worked perfectly. Over the past few years through the press and in other ways, we have been made painfully aware of deficiencies in our aid program. I believe, however, that it is to the everlasting credit of the Congress that the foreign aid program has continued to receive bipartisan support under three Presidents since World War II.

In the near future, we shall again be considering the foreign aid authorization which, I am confident, will receive support from both sides of the aisle. We should not try to cover up the mistakes that have occurred from time to time in our foreign aid program. We should profit from our past experience to improve upon our previous foreign aid efforts.

As evidence of what foreign aid can accomplish, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal. The article, based on an interview with Mr. Frank M. Landers, a foreign aid official in Korea, points out that foreign aid is working fine, but it cannot produce miracles. Too often, I think, we have been guilty of expecting miracles from our foreign aid.

I believe the article from the Lansing State Journal represents a significant contribution to the discussion of our foreign aid program and its effects, and under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EX-LANSING MAN SAYS U.S. AID HELPS KOREA

(By Frank Hand)

Foreign aid is working fine but it cannot produce miracles.

That is the opinion of Frank M. Landers, formerly State budget director, now a foreign aid official in Korea.

Landers is stationed in Pusan, Korea, as chief of the public service division. He is presently home on a 2-month leave and visiting Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. McLaury, of 302 University Drive, East Lansing.

"In Korea, people have lived under an authoritarian type of government for 4,200 years," he said. "You simply cannot change this type of experience overnight."

One example of the change is the Korean national police, he said.

"In the past they were known as the most brutal in the Far East. But during the mass demonstrations a few years ago, not a single civilian was injured despite the fact a few policemen were hurt," he said.

COME A LONG WAY

Economically the nation that first came to the attention of America during the "police action" 10 years ago "has come a long way," Landers said.

Within a few years it will produce enough electrical power to meet all its needs, he said. This is very important because in 1950 it had no power or industry, he said.

Housing shortages still plague the nation, he said. "In Seoul, which has a population of 2.5 million, there is still a need for 1 million housing units," he said.

Private investors are being organized to take up this slack because the nation cannot do it, he said. Currently about one-third of the nation's economy is being used to support the military, he said.

Foreign aid during the past few years has undergone major changes from the days of the Marshall plan, Landers pointed out.

"In Europe it was one thing to just rebuild plants because they already had the know-how," he said. "But in the Far East you have to start almost from nothing, including a new type of government."

DESCRIBES AID

At present the foreign aid program is aiming its resources to give the receiving nation as much immediate help as possible, he said.

Prior to his assignment in Korea, Landers was stationed with the foreign aid program in the Philippines. He has great hopes for the Philippines.

"Like the Koreans they are wonderful people personally," he said.

Despite wide claims of corruption in the Philippine Government, Landers is philosophical about it.

"It is no worse than it was in early America," he said.

The people, he explained, are just beginning to learn to live under a Western type of democracy.

Before going to work with foreign aid, Landers was employed in state government for 26 years. He was the director of the budget division of the department of administration from 1949 to 1961.

Hon. Eduardo Uribe-Botero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Colombia has always been well represented in Washington by conscientious and able Ambassadors who have strengthened the friendly relationship which has existed for so many years between our respective governments.

We are fortunate in having with us the new Ambassador to the United States from Colombia, the Honorable Eduardo Uribe-Botero, who brings with him an outstanding background in public affairs and service to his nation.

Dr. Uribe-Botero was born in La Ceja, Department of Antioquia, Colombia, on March 3, 1910. He attended primary school at the Colegio de Varones at Rionegro, Department of Antioquia, and completed his secondary studies at the Colegio de San Ignacio, a Jesuit school in the city of Medillin. He was awarded the degree of bachiller in November 1929.

He studied law at the University of Antioquia and received his degree in 1934. He has continuously practiced law since 1936 except while he was holding public office.

Dr. Uribe-Botero has served as councilman of the city of Medillin; deputy to the assembly of Antioquia; Secretary of the Interior of Antioquia; Member of the Colombian House of Representatives; Governor of the Department of Antioquia; and Minister of Government, a position he held until his recent appointment as Ambassador of Colombia to the United States.

I am sure my colleagues join in welcoming this distinguished gentleman to Washington, and we are certain that he will continue to further the cooperation and understanding between our two nations.

Foreign Aid Group Weighs Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in the July 31 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, Harry B. Ellis, the chief of the Paris bureau of that publication, wrote an article on the recent 2-day meeting in Paris of the Development Assistance Committee, which is a subsidiary of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, created to foster economic growth in the 20 member countries and to contribute to the development of world economy.

In view of the fact that this House will shortly have before it for consideration our foreign assistance legislation. I believe Mr. Ellis' report would make worthwhile reading for my colleagues, in that it pointedly cites Development Assistance Committee's foreign aid contributions and programs.

The article follows:

FOREIGN-AID GROUP WEIGHS PROGRAMS

(By Harry B. Ellis)

PARIS.—France, in addition to being the world's per capita leader in foreign aid, is also one of the most generous in the overall terms of aid it offers to recipient countries.

This was one of many conclusions emerging from a 2-day study here of the foreign-assistance programs of the 12 member nations of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), a subsidiary body of the 20-nation Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

In 1962 the average of U.S. loans to underdeveloped countries was for 30 years at 2.6 percent interest.

This average was struck by lumping together Agency for International Development (AID) loans (40 years at three-quarters of 1 percent) and loans by other U.S. agencies, like the Export-Import Bank, at much higher rates of interests.

AVERAGES COMPARED

Striking a similar average for the 11 other members of DAC, the result in 1962 was a composite picture of loans for 19.7 years at 5.1 percent interest.

This would indicate that the United States was the softest of any DAC member in the terms of its loans, which indeed it is, when only AID loans are considered.

But such a picture is only partial, since some nations, including, notably, France, give a very large percentage of their total foreign aid in grants, instead of loans. Grants rank as the softest form of foreign aid.

Taken as a whole, roughly two-thirds of foreign aid extended by DAC members in 1962 was in the form of grants and one-third in loans. This also was approximately the division of U.S. aid in 1962, though the percentage of U.S. grant aid is declining in favor of more loans.

AMERICANS GRATIFIED

American officials were gratified by the extension of French Government loans this spring to Turkey, Greece, and Mexico at relatively attractive terms—about 20 years at 3 percent.

These loans marked a broadening of the French foreign-assistance program beyond the geographic limits of its former colonial empire, though the latter (and principally Africa) still absorbs the bulk of French aid.

This spring and summer the British Government also softened its loan terms by granting a 7-year moratorium on debt repayment, which in effect considerably reduces the overall interest rate of a loan.

U.S. officials welcomed these French and British actions as efforts to implement a DAC resolution of last April, calling for liberalization of loan terms and greater comparability of terms granted by DAC members.

SYMPATHETIC TO UNITED STATES

During the 2-day DAC study here July 24–25, member delegations expressed understanding of the U.S. need to tie its loans, in an effort to reduce the American balance-of-payments deficit, now running at about $3 billion yearly.

A tied loan requires the recipient nation to spend its loan in the country of origin. In principle the United States, as well as other DAC members, oppose tied loans, since they sometimes force an underdeveloped nation to pay more for goods and equipment than might be the case on the open market.

At present, according to David E. Bell, Director of AID, more than 80 percent of U.S. loans are tied.

Citing this fact, Mr. Bell said a congressional cut of $1 billion in U.S. foreign aid would reduce the dollar outflow by only $200 million, because such action would slice American exports by about $800 million.

AID EXPANDED

The United States was trying to reduce the cost of its tied loans to underdeveloped nations by offering them a variety of American products from which to choose.

Government aid proffered by DAC members in 1962 totaled $6 billion, about the same level as in 1961. A 20-percent gain was chalked up in 1961 over 1960.

Private aid, however—that is, loans by private capital sources in DAC member nations—declined from $2.6 billion in 1961, to $2.4 billion in 1962, a loss of $200 million.

Concerned by this drop in private capital aid, DAC members agreed to study what factors were restricting this flow, both within the capital-source countries and in recipient nations.

Members of DAC are Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States, plus the commission of the European Economic Community.

DAC foreign aid contributions overwhelmingly outweigh those made by Sino-Soviet bloc governments, which in 1961 gave $294 million to underdeveloped nations and $186 million in 1960.

U.S. aid officials, however, cannot point to any greater assumption of the overall assistance burden by the other DAC countries. Last year, the United States continued to provide about 60 percent of all governmental credits to less developed lands.

Governmental disbursements by the 13 DAC countries also did not climb from the total 1961 aid level, holding at about the $6 billion mark. This contrasts sharply with the 20-percent gain in total disbursements that took place in 1961.

DISBURSEMENT HIKE

But government aid experts here predict that disbursements this year will show a marked rise over the 1962 performance. The failure of disbursements to increase last year is described as only a temporary plateau.

The reason for the optimism is that the 13 countries last year expanded their loan commitments to the developing nations by about one-fifth. A timelag always follows before the actual disbursements are made.

U.S. officials see further progress as a result of DAC's encouraging its member countries to spread their credits over a larger geographical area. France, for example, is for the first time issuing loans in significant amount to less developed nations beyond the franc zone, as evidenced by a sizable credit to Mexico.

Meetings are meanwhile being held by DAC members to coordinate their credits in particular countries or regions, and international consortia are playing an increasingly significant role in foreign aid, it is reported here.

Not much progress, however, looks likely to be coming soon on the question of "tied" loans. DAC encourages its members to require that loan proceeds be spent in the creditor country only where there are balance-of-payments troubles. The United States is generally expected to suffer payments difficulties for at least a few more years.

CANADA'S EFFORTS

PARIS, July 31.—Canada's financial assistance to less developed countries ran at a low rate in 1962, informed sources said a report of the development assistance committee to be released shortly will show.

The report, which will release information about the other 12 members of the committee, shows that Canada's official aid corresponded to 0.16 percent of its gross national product. Only Denmark is at a lower level, with 0.11 percent.

The section of the overall report corresponding to Canada was drafted by the OECD Secretariat after a 2-day annual session of the DAC in Paris.

On Understanding the School Prayer Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1963, the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the two school prayer cases. The Court held that State laws which require schools to begin each day with readings from the Bible are unconstitutional.

Since that day there has been a great deal of comment on the decision. Some have praised it, while others condemned it.

I am pleased to note, however, that religious leaders of all faiths have expressed their approval of the decision. I believe this demonstrates that most clergymen agree with the Court that the Constitution requires the States and the Federal Government to remain neutral toward religion. It further shows that these officials think the maintenance of a strict separation between church and state is in the best interest of both.

I have read many fine statements supporting the Court decision. Two of the best appeared in the Baptist publications, Crusader and Missions, in conjunction with a resolution of the American Baptist Convention which opposed prayer and religious practices in public schools.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these editorials to all those who seek to understand the legal and moral principles on which the Supreme Court decision is based.

The articles follow:

[From Crusader, May 1963]

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

Any day now the Supreme Court of the United States is due to announce its decision in the Bible reading and Lord's Prayer cases originating in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

In the Pennsylvania litigation, attorneys for the Abington Township School Board are endeavoring to reverse a Federal district court decision that the law requiring the reading of at least 10 verses from the Bible each day in public school classrooms is unconstitutional.

In the Maryland suit, attorneys for William J. Murray III and his mother, Mrs. Madalyn E. Murray, are attempting to prove that the State's court of appeals erred in a 4-to-3 decision upholding reading from the Bible and the use of the Lord's Prayer in public school classrooms.

Pro and con oral arguments were heard on February 26 and 27. A decision is expected in May. We anticipate that the Court will rule against religious devotions in the cases presented. There are no advance leaks and we have no inside information. But we simply do not see how the Justices can decide otherwise unless they are prepared to reverse much longstanding precedent in church-state matters.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Subsequent interpretation has decreed that this prohibition upon Congress applies to State legislatures as well.

The nub of the question therefore, is this: does the use of the Bible and the Lord's Prayer in public school classrooms constitute "an establishment of religion" and/or violate "free exercise thereof?"

Non-Christians see this preferment for the indicia of the Christian religion an establishment real or potential of one religion over another.

Speaking for a three-man court in the previous Pennsylvania decision, Circuit Judge Biggs declared that the Bible's "essential character" is "religious" and that the reading of this book "can hardly do less than

inculcate * * * religious doctrines in childish minds." He concluded that such reading "aids and prefers the Christian religion," and, in conjunction with school attendance factors, violates the free exercise clause.

Attorneys who have claimed that these practices are intended only to teach "morality" have been hard pressed to explain why, if this is so, children can be excused on request of parents.

In any case, if the Supreme Court rules against these practices, expect chaos primeval to leap from press and pulpit. Leading the assault will be:

(1) Those who don't understand the decision. Without bothering to read the text of the pronouncement or to understand its precise meaning, many will assume that the Court has outlawed religion in all areas of public life. They will claim that the Justices have legislated "secularism" and have deprived the Nation of its long-standing spiritual traditions. They will revile the Unitarians and atheists who instituted the legal actions, and attempt to find ways to curb the Supreme Court. There will be a rash of proposed constitutional amendments introduced in Congress, each attempting in one way or another to legalize classroom religious devotions.

How unfortunate.

How unfortunate, especially, if the proposed amendments to the Constitution make substantial headway. Any Baptist inclined to side with such movements would do well to consider the Pandora's box that would be opened up thereby. If such amendments were approved, then schools that inculcate religion (Bible reading, the Lord's Prayer) would continue to get public funds. On what grounds, then, could anyone deny public money to parochial schools which simply go a little further and make religion a little more evident?

(2) Those who understand the decision only too well. This group would include the Roman Catholic hierarchy which would surely see its pitch for public funds for private schools almost certainly aborted. This is a decision for which it would likely never forgive the Supreme Court. It might well mark the beginning of a determined drive to downgrade the Court in our system of jurisprudence. It would surely put these prelates on the side of constitutional change.

If the Court decides as we think it will, are the traditional moral values of the American way of life in danger? Not really, for these belong principally to church, and home. Few can honestly assert that the perfunctory reading of the Bible or the recitation of prayers—often led by those who have no respect for such things—accomplishes very much for the national character.

If the decision comes through as we think it will, examine it closely. It will likely be much more limited than newspaper headlines will make it appear. In any case, such matters as the use of chaplains in the Armed Forces or in Federal institutions will be unaffected. To refuse such ministries to men who have been sent overseas or segregated from society would in fact be "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion.

None appears to argue that the Bible should be excluded from the classroom when it is being used to study history or literature. It is the use of the Bible or prayer for religious devotion to which objection is made.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs wrote recently: "When one thinks of prayer as sincere outreach of a human soul to the Creator, 'required prayer' becomes an absurdity." To which we would add: when we contemplate the evils certain to follow the confusing of the separate functions of both Government and religion, we are prepared to let our children devote themselves at home to the Bible and prayer and in school to history and math, with the hope that spiritually alert parents and wise teachers will join hands to provide total preparation for total life.

[From Missions, June 1963]

BIBLE READING AND PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Before it adjourns, this month, the Supreme Court of the United States is expected to rule on the constitutionality of the use of Bible readings and the Lord's Prayer in the public schools in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

In Maryland, William J. Murray III, a student attending a public school in Baltimore, and his mother, are challenging the constitutionality of a ruling that requires a reading from the Bible and/or the use of the Lord's Prayer in the opening exercises of the schoolday, even though the ruling, as later amended, stipulates that any child shall be excused from attending the exercises upon written request of his parent or guardian. The Murrays contend that the regulation violates their freedom of religion and the principle of the separation of church and state.

In Pennsylvania, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Lewis Schempp, parents of 3 children attending the public schools in Abington Township, declare that the Federal Constitution is violated by a Pennsylvania law which requires that at least 10 verses of Scripture shall be read, without comment, at the opening of each day in the public schools.

In all probability, the Supreme Court will declare both these State laws unconstitutional—and rightly so, just as it did in the case of the regents' prayer in New York State (June 1962). All that the Court did in the New York case, and all that it most likely will do in the Maryland and Pennsylvania cases, is to say what the first amendment to the Constitution said long ago—that Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." As the 14th amendment made this provision applicable to the States, the Court ruled, in the New York case, that the board of regents had no constitutional right to prescribe an official prayer for the public-school children to read or recite at the beginning of the schoolday.

Now, that ruling, far from opposing religion, actually supports religion; it is not against religious liberty, but for it. Its intention is to prevent the State from interfering in religious affairs—to keep religion free from political regulation or control. It should go without saying that if a State has the right to prescribe a prayer acknowledging dependence on God, it has the same, identical right to prescribe a statement denying the existence of God. In short, the Court said that religion must be kept free—free from governmental control, free for people of all faiths or of no faith at all. It said, as the 1st and the 14th amendments had said, that in matters of religion, both the Federal and the State governments must be neutral, must keep hands off.

There is, of course, a vast difference between required readings from the Bible as a religious service at the opening of the schoolday and using the Bible as a source or reference work in courses of history, literature, and social studies, which are a part of the regular school curriculum. Inasmuch as the Scriptures of other faiths, such as Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism, could be used in the same way, there would be no discrimination against any religious group, or against avowed nonbelievers.

The importance of a Supreme Court ruling on this intricate problem may be seen in the present confusion over it. Whereas 26 States require or permit Bible reading, and often the Lord's Prayer, 10 States forbid such activities. An Illinois law passed in 1910 is the exact opposite of one in Georgia passed in 1921. In the interest of upholding the Constitution, as well as keeping intact the wall of separation between church and state, we are in desperate need of uniformity on this national issue.

Until that happy state of affairs arrives, we Americans must not forget that we came by our religious freedom the hard way. Though the desire for freedom from England's established church brought many colonists to America, they soon found themselves in similar difficulties here. As late as 1776, at least 8 of the 13 colonies had government-established churches. Despite the crusade led by Roger Williams, William Penn, and others, it was not until after the Revolution that religious freedom for all, including minority groups and nonbelievers, made significant headway.

In time, however, the principle of the separation of church and state, with religious liberty as it corollary, captured the imagination of the Founding Fathers and was written into the basic documents of our national life. In "A Memorial and Remonstrance on the Religious Rights of Man" (1778), James Madison wrote: "We maintain, * * * that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society; and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance." And in the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty, drafted by Thomas Jefferson and enacted in 1786, were these words on the separation of church and state: "No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatever, nor shall * * * suffer on account of his religious opinions or beliefs, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities."

At last, in 1791, came the first amendment to the Constitution, written by Madison and adopted as a part of the Bill of Rights. "Congress," the amendment stated, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

So was erected what Jefferson, in a letter to the Danbury Baptists, called "a wall of separation between church and state," which has stood the test of time. Whether it will survive current efforts to breach it, remains to be seen. The choice is between religion dictated by conscience and religion regulated by law. So long as the wall stands, there will be religious freedom for all citizens. If the wall falls, or is breached, that freedom will vanish. The outcome is in the hands of the American people.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Citizens First, Veterans Second

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the last 20 years the American Veterans Committee has been devoted to veterans welfare, while remaining faithful to its motto: "Citizens First, Veterans Second." The priority of loyalties as expressed by the motto can be observed in the organization's platform for 1963–64. The veterans and armed forces affairs section of the platform exemplifies the spirit of the American Veterans Committee. Rather than setting veterans apart from their fellow citizens, American Veterans Committee believes that the rehabilitation and integration of veterans into society is the proper goal. I hope that my colleagues will read the following platform recommendations adopted at the organization's 20th anniversary convention, May 30–June 2, 1963:

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES AFFAIRS

I. VETERANS' BENEFITS

The American Veterans Committee has constantly reiterated, since its founding, its fundamental belief that rehabilitation and integration of veterans into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program. The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning for all citizens rather than through special grants or favors to veterans is basic AVC policy.

For many years, AVC has pointed out the need for a thorough review and reappraisal of this Nation's policies on veterans policies is as follows:

1. We oppose bonuses and general pensions as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans and tending to set veterans apart from their fellow citizens.

2. Two basic standards should be applied in evaluating veterans' benefits. They are:

(a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors, taking account of the veteran's ability and opportunity for gainful employment?

(b) For all veterans who did not incur disability: Are the benefits so designed as to enable the veterans to readjust from military service to civilian life with minimum economic loss?

3. Veterans' benefits should be administered without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. Since benefits are a Federal responsibility, uniform standards of administration and compensation should be applied throughout the Nation.

4. The present scale of compensation for disability, and for compensation to survivors, provides amounts which we believe are not commensurate with an adequate standard of living.

5. Provision should be made to maintain automatically the purchasing power of the benefit dollar. Monetary benefits should be adjusted annually on the basis of the year-to-year change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.

6. We endorse the proposal of the Bradley Commission that special consideration should be given to disabilities rated at 10 and 20 percent to determine whether significant economic impairment exists. The Government should discharge its financial obligation in static cases rated 10 and 20 percent by an appropriate lump-sum or short-term settlement. AVC proposes that when a disabled veteran with a 10-percent disability has collected $3,500 and a veteran with a 20-percent disability has collected $7,000, the Government's financial obligation is terminated.

(a) We believe that the present system of periodic reviews of cases of disability of any degree are not really continuously periodic. Therefore, we urge that the VA conduct the reviews regularly. We believe that these reviews should take into consideration whether the present disability remains a handicap to earning a living or to living a normal life. In cases in which this handicap to earning a living has lessened or no longer exists, the disability payment should be graded downward or eliminated.

7. We believe initial appointment preference of 10 points in the Federal civil service should be granted only to seriously disabled (30 percent or higher) veterans. However, this consideration should be limited in three major respects:

(a) No veteran should receive a position unless he is fully qualified to perform duties entailed.

(b) Preference for handicapped veterans should be limited to initial appointment only.

(c) Absolute preference for nonhandicapped veterans should not be granted in any event, nor should any job be reserved for such veterans exclusively.

8. We endorse the provision for mustering-out pay as necessary to bridge the gap between military service and civilian life.

9. We urge equalization of benefits, aimed at eliminating differences in the present treatment of veterans, widows, and orphans of World War I, World War II, and Korea.

II. VETERANS' HOUSING

American Veterans Committee believes that steps must be taken to discourage the practice of discounting, and adding special charges on GI mortgages, during a tight money market. American Veterans Committee urges that the Secretary of the Treasury invest up to 25 percent of national service life insurance premium reserves in VA-guaranteed GI mortgages to provide, if needed, supplementary financing in this field.

American Veterans Committee urges that the President's Executive Order 11063, which forbids racial discrimination in the sale or lease of housing by persons who obtained a commitment after November 20, 1962, for GI loan guarantees on purchase of housing, must be administered vigorously to fulfill its purpose, and must, in addition, be broadened to apply to all housing financed in whole or in part by funds of institutions aided by the Federal Government through loan insurance or guarantee, or other Government financial aid.

American Veterans Committee proposes the eventual integration of the veterans' housing program into the Federal Housing Administration to eliminate the duplication of administrative costs for both programs.

III. PEACETIME GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Experience with the World War GI bill of rights has given ample evidence of the value in increased productivity to the Nation and in the increased taxes to the Government of that law's education and training provisions.

American Veterans Committee endorses a modified GI bill of rights for peacetime draftees and volunteers who have been on extended active duty. It is our belief that such men who enable our country to maintain peace and meet its commitments and responsibilities to our allies are entitled to basic readjustment benefits to enable them to return without distress to civilian life at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities.

Therefore, in principle, American Veterans Committee endorses any peacetime bill of rights which will carry out the principles hereinabove set forth and which will allow for equitable readjustment benefits to peacetime veterans.

IV. GENERAL PENSIONS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

We believe that general pension benefits for non-service-connected disabilities should be eliminated entirely for World War II and Korean veterans due to the greatly expanded social security, public assistance, and veterans' benefits programs which World War I veterans and their dependents were not provided.

We endorse the recommendations of the Bradley Commission, to continue the general pension program for World War I veterans as the reserve line of economic defense.

American Veterans Committee believes that the Government should rely on the social security program to the greatest possible extent in providing income-maintenance benefits for veterans and nonveterans against some of the economic and medical hazards of life. The VA non-service-connected pension program should be essentially a reserve line of economic defense for veterans and their dependents until such time as their minimum income requirements are met under OASI or through their own sources of income. Benefit and eligibility provisions of this program and OASI should be coordinated to eliminate overlapping and duplication of payments with pensions being reduced by OASI benefits rather than the present reversed situation.

V. NONSERVICE TREATMENT IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Present policy and regulations of the Veterans' Administration, in effect, provide that any Veteran with a non-service-connected disability may obtain free medical care upon certifying that he is unable to pay for the same and there is a bed available. Such certification is a formality; no investigation of ability to pay is ever conducted.

We feel that—

1. The high standards and excellent caliber of VA medical personnel depend, in large part, upon the presence in VA hospitals of patients with all types of ailments, and not merely those resulting from the aftereffects of war service. Restricting hospital admissions to service-connected cases only would

cause deterioration in the treatment available to these very cases, and would disrupt research which is carried on for the benefit of the whole country.

2. In many areas of the country, especially in the South, veteran members of minority groups cannot obtain adequate medical treatment at any price at other than VA hospitals. In other areas local health facilities are insufficient to cope with the increasing needs of the country.

In view of the above, American Veterans Committee has reformulated its views, without departing from its basic principles. American Veterans Committee feels that if the veteran who wishes a non-service-connected disability treated at a VA hospital pays the full cost of such treatment, he is not receiving a service to which he is not entitled.

Therefore, American Veterans Committee urges that:

(a) Treatment of non-service-connected disabilities in VA hospitals be continued on a space-available basis, but that such treatment be charged at the full cost, if a patient has the means to pay for such service; certificates that a veteran is unable to pay should be investigated thoroughly to determine the true ability to meet the cost of hospitalization.

(b) That the terms of coverage of all prepaid medical associations, plans and companies be amended, by action of the legislatures, supervisory bodies or membership, so as to provide payment to VA hospitals for non-service-connected treatment on the same basis as payment to private, voluntary and public hospitals.

VI. UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

American Veterans Committee believes that the Department of Defense has begun to take steps, and is using its authority, to unify the Armed Forces, against the opposition of the leadership of the various services. American Veterans Committee commends the actions hertofore taken in this regard and urges that it continue these efforts vigorously.

American Veterans Committee urges that the authority of the Department of Defense be strengthened and that the command structure be reorganized so as to eliminate duplication and waste, permit cross utilization if ideas, inventions, procedudes and research, and to reduce the opportunities for interservice disagreements.

VII. SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

We maintain that no assignments of any personnel should be made to oversea posts on the basis of segregation because of color, religion, ancestry, or national origin.

VIII. ARMED FORCES TRAINING

We owe the men of our armed services the best possible training to equip them for the rigors of modern combat under the most adverse conditions of weather, terrain, supply, and enemy action. We further recommend that an orientation program be insituted in order to acquaint the prospective draftee, at the time of registration, with the rights, privileges, benefits, and special training he and his family will be entitled to if and when he is inducted into the armed services.

IX. MILITARY MANPOWER, RESERVE FORCES AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The world we live in, despite recent changes in the climate of international hostilities, with its emphasis on speed of operation and technical superiority, demands standing Armed Forces of sufficient size, training and equipment and organization to be immediately effective for defense and counterattack. No matter how effective the Reserve program of the future may be, it is apparent that the Regular Armed Forces must remain our first line of defense. They must be of sufficient size and mobility for deployment anywhere on the globe within a minimum of time so that we may continue to provide, when necessary, those forces needed for collective security under our international obligations in peripheral conflicts occurring in the strategic localities of the world. Reliance on strategic airpower and massive retaliation alone is not only insufficient in the long run, but may weaken our military security and increase international tensions.

American Veterans Committee believes that any Reserve program, present, and future, which does not completely revoke segregation in the Armed Forces is incompatible with democratic ideals and frustrates the moral fiber of our society. It is essential for the future security of this Nation that our manpower resources be used for the defense of our way of life without regard to regional prejudices. We urge therefore, that an anti-segregation amendment be added to the Reserve law, and the Congress prohibit racial segregation in any federally recognized and/or federally aided National Guard unit.

We believe that reservists and National Guardsmen should not suffer loss of job rights and privileges and employment opportunities because of their participation in Reserve or National Guard training.

American Veterans Committee is opposed to any policy whereby the Armed Forces award discharges other than honorable to Reserve personnel based upon the political or other activities in which these individuals may participate following separation from active service under the draft law.

We believe that the conditions of discharge should be based solely upon the military activity and efficiency of the reservists.

American Veterans Committee believes that, despite the deficiencies of the Selective Service System, some form of compulsory draft is presently essential to national security.

We recommend, therefore, that the President institute a survey of contemporary conscription methods and military manpower needs.

American Veterans Committee would endorse incentives that would result in a Military Establishment composed largely of voluntary enlistments.

X. UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

The Supreme Court has invalidated the provision of the Uniform Code of Justice with regard to the trial after discharge of ex-servicemen for offenses committed in service. We believe that the ex-servicemen should not escape punishment for serious offenses committed while in service, but should be tried before civilian courts; and we urge Congress to enact legislation covering these situations. The legislation should be limited to crimes of the same degree of seriousness as felonies at common law. It should also grant such ex-servicemen the same rights to a preliminary hearing before removal from the Federal district of apprehension as persons apprehended under other laws.

The Supreme Court has also invalidated the provision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice which extends jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces. We believe such civilians should not be allowed to escape punishment. We urge Congress to enact legislation which will provide a constitutional means of dealing with this problem.

XI. MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES

American Veterans Committee recognizes that the conditions of modern military technology require a well trained mobile and technical force. That in order to achieve this purpose it is essential that the pay and allowances of the armed forces be sufficiently attractive to encourage reenlistments and to maintain adequate military manpower levels.

American Veterans Committee feels that an adequate pay and allowances legislation must take into consideration the following:

1. Any pay increases in the services must be equitably distributed betwen both officers and enlisted men.

2. All pay scales should be periodically reviewed on a cost of living basis to keep them up to date.

3. All legislation should be so drafted as to aid in maintaining adequate military manpower levels.

4. That all military personnel should be entitled to reasonable allowances for transportation of dependents, movement of household goods, and dislocation costs.

5. Dependency allowances should be increased to an adequate level to recognize the legitimate differences which exist between personnel of all ranks with dependents and those without. Increases should primarily be in the form of adequate dependency allowances rather than increases in basic pay.

XII. MILITARY DECORATIONS

All laws of the United States pertaining to the granting of military medals or decorations, military disability retirement or compensation, dependents and survivors benefits, veterans benefits (including benefits to dependents or survivors), or other special benefits to military personnel or their dependents on the basis of wartime service of such military personnel shall apply in like manner to—

(a) Service performed in such areas and during such periods as proclaimed by the President where combat or combat conditions exist and the U.S. forces to which such person is attached are either engaged in the combat, engaged in military operations designed to carry out any treaty or other international obligation of the United States, or in rendering technical or military aid or advice to a party to the combat;

(b) Service performed in carrying out operations ordered by the President to meet a specific military threat to the security of the United States, where possible military contact with a hostile force is anticipated regardless of whether or not such contact actually occurs; or

(c) Injury, disability, imprisonment, or death resulting from the performance of military duties for the United States and caused by an adversary foreign power, whether or not the United States recognizes such power as a lawful government, and to persons and dependents of persons missing under conditions in which such injury, disability, imprisonment, or death can be presumed.

Proof of Water Development Need for National Growth Given by Chief of Army Engineers, General Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the golden anniversary convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington June 7, 1963, Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, delivered a highly informative address on "Water Development for National Growth."

In it he discussed flood control, water quality, water based recreation, waterways, and the Government's role therein. This is a timely speech. It illustrates the difference in "pork" and progress. To fail to develop our water resources

is to fail to develop America. Failure to develop our natural resources is a road to stagnation. I join General Wilson in a refusal to follow the road to oblivion.

Because of the importance of this subject to the Nation as a whole, and particularly to regions of the South and the Southwest, plagued by periodic drought, I ask that General Wilson's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER DEVELOPMENT FOR NATIONAL GROWTH

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army)

Though men have made progress in controlling some processes of nature, as in the harnessing of the atom and the exploration of space, there are basic forces which still challenge our technology and to which we must seek an accommodation.

Among these are the relative constancy of the amount of water nature makes available, plus her perversity as to when, where, and in what amounts she may do it.

As we strive to meet our water problems, we find the effort made more difficult by another basic fact of life—the constantly swelling stream of humanity and the consequent explosion of human needs, throughout the world and in our own country.

In the 1520's, when it took Magellan's expedition 4 years first to circumnavigate the world, it held less than half a billion people.

In 1870, when Jules Verne recorded Phileas Fogg's fictional 80-day trip around the world, it had less than 1½ billion people.

Last month when the advance of technology enabled Maj. Gordon Cooper to circle the earth 22 times in little less than a day and a half, the total had climbed to close to 3 billion.

Both the increase in the speed with which we can circumnavigate the world and the growth of our native ability to overpopulate the earth have a profound effect upon the kind of world we live in. We are multiplying people faster than we are adding water development; yet people must rely increasingly on water development for their welfare and ultimately, their survival. Thus, one of the major problems confronting society, in our own country as well as abroad, is how to get its rate of water development into gear with its rate of reproduction.

I think most of us are becoming more familiar with our national water-development requirements over the next two decades. In my opinion, we have made a fair start toward their satisfaction—but considering the magnitude it is only a start. I will remind you that their full satisfaction will require an accelerating effort which would bring the Corps of Engineers' investment in new construction from its present level of about $800 million a year to the neighborhood of $1½ billion by the end of this decade, and about $2½ billion per year by the end of the next decade. In other words, we must not only maintain but increase our rate of progress—year by year and every year.

Let me summarize where the Corps' nationwide water-resource programs stand at this moment.

First, flood control. The national authorized program is about 50 percent complete, when measured in dollars. But the Nation's need for flood-control work is increasing at least as fast as our effort to meet those needs. The half-finished authorized program now prevents an average of about $500 million in damage each year and so far has saved more than $11 billion. Yet the Nation is still vulnerable to severe flood damages which are estimated to average about $700 million annually under present conditions of development. This is mainly due, of course, to the intensive use of areas exposed to floods.

We had a good example of the value of flood-control programs in the Ohio Valley this spring. The authorized program for that basin is less than 50 percent complete; only 38 of the 90 authorized reservoirs are ready for service, and 62 of the 137 local projects. Thirty-one of the thirty-eight completed reservoirs, plus three others under construction, were in a position to provide help last spring, although because of the geographic pattern of the runoff not all of their capacity could be fully utilized. Those reservoirs, along with the levees and local protection works, saved about $150 million in damage. Unfortunately, $100 million in damage did take place in areas not yet protected.

Flood control is obviously linked to reservoir storage, which in turn is the clue to many other water-resource development functions—power generation, recreation, stream-flow regulation, water-quality control, municipal, industrial, and agricultural water supply, and so forth.

Our active authorized reservoir program is well underway. We have completed or under construction about 275 reservoirs with a total storage capacity of over 200 million acre-feet, of which over 60 million acre-feet are reserved for flood control. Substantial additional storage capacity will be provided by the more than 400 reservoir units authorized but not yet under construction. Yet this is not enough. You may recall that the Senate select committee report indicated needs which probably would require more than doubling the corps presently authorized reservoir program by 1980.

Water quality may soon become the Nation's No. 1 water problem. Waste disposal is already one of the heaviest uses of American rivers, and it is a use that conflicts with or impairs most other uses. With population rising, we are threatened with serious deterioration of the usefulness of surface waters in the years ahead. Increased and improved waste-treatment techniques will help solve this problem, but low-flow regulation through reservoir storage also will be needed increasingly as a remedial measure.

The water-quality problem cuts directly across the recreation picture. Many areas, including the Nation's Capital, are being deprived by pollution of some or all of the recreational benefit from their rivers and streams. Pollution by sediment interferes with the operation of navigation, flood control, and irrigation projects. Bacterial pollution is a costly problem in providing municipal water supply. Chemical and heat pollution result from many industrial processes. Salinity in some areas impairs irrigation, municipal, and industrial use. Hence, water-quality improvement is a basic purpose that makes a many-sided contribution to water-resource availability.

The public demand for water-based recreation appears to be insatiable. Recreational attendance at Corps of Engineers reservoirs last year was 127 million—an eightfold increase in little more than a decade. We anticipate that by 1980 our attendance will reach perhaps 300 million. This is a satisfying trend, because recreation can be provided at our projects with relatively little extra cost in either land or money, but with relatively great extra results in public benefit.

On new projects, we propose to acquire lands and provide basic facilities for recreational development whenever justified. On many projects already built, we propose to provide needed additional recreational facilities that were omitted originally. Of course, much recreational development at our projects is carried out by non-Federal interests. This is one of the most fruitful fields for coordinated development under comprehensive basin plans.

Our present authorized programs envision the ultimate installation of 20.6 million kilowatts of hydroelectric power generating capacity. We already have 8 million on the line and another 4½ million under construction. However, when we view the potentialities of the projected reservoirs program, we envision an ultimate capacity of perhaps 33 million kilowatts at corps projects.

On waterways, we have a $6½ billion authorized program. About $2 billion of this has been completed, about $3 billion is under construction, and about $1.5 billion remains to be started. However, the inventory of future needs for navigation that we made in 1960 for the Senate select committee revealed the possibility of providing more than 13,000 miles of improved and new waterways costing perhaps $8 billion, and harbor improvements costing about $2 billion in addition. Hence there is no ground for complacency because our present program is 80 percent underway.

To sum up our position, we are making good progress, and our projects are proving to be excellent investments. However, we still have much unfinished work to do on our presently authorized programs, and we shall have to keep on stepping up our rate of progress if we hope to keep abreast of the Nation's needs.

As you know, the Government has launched a determined effort to take a comprehensive new look at water needs, plans, and programs in the Nation's river basins. Comprehensive basinwide planning is probably the process by which most future development undertakings will be conceived.

Planning programs, like construction programs, should be economically as well as technically sound, and yield results commensurate with the investment of money and effort which they represent. But the justification of a planning undertaking involves questions quite different from those of a construction undertaking. How far ahead, and over what areas, shall we carry out detailed planning? When does the gathering of huge and costly volumes of detailed data cease to be useful and realistic? To what extent are we duplicating effort by planning from a variety of viewpoints? Questions like these can only be solved by practical experience.

As a general rule, we believe that comprehensive planning should aim at three objectives: It should seek to identify the general nature and scope of future long-range development needs, with studies held to the minimum level needed to accomplish this purpose. Within this long-range background, it should seek to define projects for which Federal authorization is necessary and which should be started within the next 20 years or less. Studies for this shorter-range purpose should be sufficiently detailed to provide a basis for authorization. And, it should seek to block out the functions that should be undertaken by non-Federal interests, this too on a minimum basis.

In the Corps of Engineers we are seeking vigorously not only to intensify our planning effort, but also to improve our grasp of the planning process. As you may know, I recently established in Washington the position of Deputy Director of Civil Works for Comprehensive Basin Planning. The first incumbent of this position is Brig. Gen. Howard Penney—a man whom many of you already know through his work as Tulsa District Engineer and his previous assignments in my office. Under his leadership, planning staffs are being established, expanded, and specially trained in all our divisions.

In this brief talk, I have tried to show you where we stand with construction on our present program, and with planning to keep those programs adequate. If today's problems and programs seem broad and big, it is because today's needs are broad and great. Never before has a huge and varied

nation launched such a comprehensive, nationwide attack on the problems of a basic resource, present and future, as we are attempting now. We can expect to encounter difficulties; but we can also be confident of overcoming them, take what it must to do so.

Independence of Gabon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, the Republic of Gabon will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Leon M'Ba; and His Excellency, the Gabon Ambassador to the United States, Jules Mbah.

The Gabon Republic, a small country on the West African Coast astride the Equator, is far less well known in the United States than some of the larger countries of West Africa. Few Americans realize that although Gabon is the smallest and most sparsely populated of the countries which make up former French Equatorial Africa, it is also the wealthiest. Gabon has a viable economy with full urban employment, a favorable trade balance, and the prospect of financial independence in the fairly near future. The mainstays of Gabon's burgeoning economy are the country's vast equatorial forests and important mineral deposits.

The first Europeans to explore Gabon were Portuguese traders in the 15th century. The name "Gabon" in fact is of Portuguese origin, for the estuary of the Como River reminded the Portuguese of a gabao, a Portuguese coat with sleeves and hood. French occupation dated from 1882, and in 1910 Gabon became one of the four territories of the Federation of French Equatorial Africa, along with the Middle Congo, Ubangi-Shari, and Chad. In 1946 Gabon became an overseas territory within the French Union, and in 1958 Gabon chose to become an autonomous state in the French Community. Gabon was one of the 16 African states to achieve independence during 1960.

In February 1961 the Government was converted from a parliamentary to a presidential system through constitutional reforms enacted by the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Leon M'Ba, the first Prime Minister of the country, was elected President of the Republic. Gabon's relations with its neighbors and with the rest of the world have been amicable from the outset. Gabon has signed agreements with the neighboring republics of Chad, Congo—Brazzaville—and the Central African Republic providing for a customs union, economic cooperation, and joint administration of services previously performed by the Government of French Equatorial Africa.

Perhaps Gabon's most striking achievements since independence have been in the economic sphere. A serious hindrance to Gabon's economic development at independence was the lack of an adequate transportation system. Recently, however, a 170-mile-long railway system, built as a cooperative enterprise by a British, a French, and an American construction company, has been completed; it provides access to the country's rich manganese deposits deep in the interior. A development scheme, based on a survey by the World Bank and concentrated on the development of oil, uranium, and manganese has resulted in significant increases in the country's mineral production. The value of Gabon's mineral output increased by nearly 70 percent in 1961. A liberal investment code designed to encourage foreign private investment and protect current investors was signed into law in 1961.

Thus, Gabon's economy has expanded steadily since independence, with the most dramatic contributions to the economy coming from the mining and petroleum sector. A most important factor in stimulating Gabon's economic progress has been the Government's maintenance of a liberal political climate, for governmental stability and moderation have given confidence to investors and created a very favorable environment for private business.

We congratulate you, President M'Ba, the members of the legislature, and the people of Gabon, for so wisely directing your country through the first crucial years of independence. We are confident that under your able leadership Gabon's remarkable progress will continue.

Runaway Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, corporations that move plants from one State to another in search of so-called favorable labor climates often deceive themselves. After a year or so of a nonunion paternalistic "honeymoon" the corporations often find their new employees looking around for union protection, too.

Then a struggle results, not just the usual labor-management dispute, but on occasion involving also the local officials who seemingly need to make good on "no union" promises that lure corporations to such towns in the first place.

A current example of this type of situation was described in some detail in the August 8 issue of the Machinist, the weekly newspaper of the 1-million-member International Association of Machinists.

The case involves Utica Tools, made for many years by the Utica Drop Forge & Tool Co., of Utica, N.Y., under union shop conditions negotiated by the International Association of Machinists.

Last year, the Kelsey-Hayes Corp., which earlier had won control of Utica Drop Forge & Tool Co., moved the manufacture of Utica Tools to Orangeburg, S.C., a city that reportedly promised incoming industry a favorable labor climate.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article, "How City Fathers Protect a Runaway," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CITY FATHERS PROTECT A RUNAWAY

City fathers who solicit runaway plants with promises of low wages and no union sometimes have trouble keeping faith.

How much trouble was demonstrated in * * * Orangeburg, S.C., newly adopted home of the Kelsey-Hayes tool plant, formerly of Utica, N.Y.

Kelsey-Hayes, according to Orangeburg officials, moved its hand tool manufacturing operation away from Utica in order to be free of its obligations to its employees, members of IAM District 157.

In Orangeburg, a group of the company's new employees petitioned for a union election. The campaign that followed was marked by distortion, misrepresentation, intimidation, coercion, and slander against the IAM.

So crude were the antiunion efforts * * * that Reed Johnson, the National Labor Relations Board regional director, recommended the election results be set aside and a new election held.

Johnson's recommendations brought vigorous denunciations from the Orangeburg daily newspaper that assisted Kelsey-Hayes in its fight against the union.

Here, from the official record, are examples of the kind of activity:

One employee testified that "Dr. Henry F. Frierson, a doctor whom the witness and his family used from time to time, stopped by his house. Dr. Frierson asked the witness to come out to his car where they could talk in private. The witness complied. Dr. Frierson stated that he knew that the witness was interested in forming a union at the Kelsey-Hayes plant, that interested citizens did not want a union in Orangeburg, and that he was visiting employees to get them to vote against the union.

"The doctor talked about an hour. Before leaving, Dr. Frierson tried to extract a promise from the witness that he would vote against the union."

Another employee testified that "two Orangeburg policemen stopped by his house and asked him to get in their car. They talked about working conditions at the plant. They then discussed the merits of unionization and the possibility of the plant moving out of the area."

A third witness testified that Mayor Clyde Fair of Orangeburg visited his home to warn "that other industries were thinking about locating in Orangeburg but would not if the union was voted in."

A group of prominent citizens, led by three bank presidents, conducted a saturation newspaper and radio advertising campaign falsely identifying the union with violence, loss of pay and jobs and predicting that "the union will make a distressed area out of our community."

The ads appeared daily during the week of the election. They were signed simply, "Interested Citizens of Orangeburg County."

Forty-four similar radio commercials were broadcast during election week on each of three local radio stations.

C. Walker Limehouse, an attorney and former member of the South Carolina Legislature, sent a letter to employees explaining that Orangeburg's "favorable labor climate" has been a major factor in attracting industry. To permit the union to come in would be "a betrayal of trust," he warned.

Employees also received letters from the Orangeburg County delegation to the State legislature ("We should not permit outside agitators.") from Mayor Fair and the city council ("A Vote against the union would be a vote for progress.") and from Plant Manager B. E. Derry ("The only way this union can get any concessions from this company is by a strike.").

During the week prior to the election, the banks of Orangeburg offered free copies of "Dear Mom," a booklet version of the anti-union propaganda film, "And Women Must Weep." The Labor Board has ruled that the "Weep" film is such an extreme distortion of the facts that it is not permissible as election propaganda.

"In evaluating the evidence in its entirety," Johnson concluded that "the barrage of propaganda issued by the employer and others in the community, including the newspaper editorials and radio broadcasts, generated an atmosphere of fear of economic loss and complete futility in selecting the union as bargaining representative, thus destroying the laboratory conditions deemed necessary in the conduct of Board elections and prevented the expression of a free choice by the employees."

If the Labor Board accepts Johnson's recommendations, Kelsey-Hayes employees at the Utica-Herbrand Tool Division, Orangeburg, will soon have a new opportunity to win union representation.

The Supreme Being, the Supreme Court, and the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written about the decisions of the Supreme Court in relation to the reading of the Bible and the saying of prayers in public schools. Ralph McGill has finally brought some light into this muddled discussion and has posed the important problems that must be solved: What is the relation of the individual to his society and to his God? The Supreme Court cannot decide these issues; the Court can only tell us what the Constitution means. If by doing so, the Court puts the problem right back into the heads and hearts of our citizens then it has done more than interpreted the document on which our Nation is founded.

Mr. McGill's column appeared in the Washington Star of August 13, 1963, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

AMERICA'S FRETTING FRUSTRATIONS

(By Ralph McGill)

Psychologists noted with professional interest the outcry against the U.S. Supreme Court decision that quite properly said prayers and Bible reading may not be constitutionally required in public schools. The largely irrational and irrelevant criticisms of the Court revealed at least one aspect of the national sickness. We have not managed to bring the citizen, young or old, to a confrontation of the central problem of his existence—the nature of man and his relationship to the human condition or, if one pleases, the universe in which he lives and has his being. This cannot be simply a failure of education.

A startling amount of nonsense was said and written about the Court's decision. It did not, of course, outlaw the Bible or prayer per se. It said the State might not require them. There was not too much clamor about the decision—not nearly so much as a year ago when the Court barred a prayer written, and required, by the regents of New York State.

SYMBOLIC PICTURE WINDOW

The Court went to great care to acknowledge and illustrate the essential role that religion consistently has played in our life as a nation. Certainly in this society of freemen, to whom God gave free wills, we cannot require a prayer or Bible reading. If we can, then we can also have the public schools offer sermons, revivals and calls for converts.

Even so, we have had a number of ministers, who apparently had not read the decision, bemoaning the secularism of the Court. Here and there ignorant or befuddled professors of religion or political science piously spoke up in behalf of the Christian faith and denounced the Court for revealing atheistic tendencies.

Psychologists found all this of interest—and a symbolic picture window looking in on the fretting frustrations of the average American. He is a troubled person. There is the threat of a great nuclear barbecue. One school of thought asks him to believe the Russians and Chinese are weak, because to do otherwise would be to ascribe some meaning to communism. Another wants us to believe the Russians and Chinese are strong and that communism is about to conquer the world, in order to make him fear communism the more.

Still others find that the President is a failure because he cannot make the Chinese and the Russians go away and let us alone. We ought to be strong—but we ought to cut taxes. We should launch more powerful missiles and build more Polaris submarines, but cut the budget. The President also should wave a wand and order the racial problem to go away. It would not be necessary to go back to slavery—just almost back. Anything to get rid of the problems. There is a lot of talk about going back to the founding virtures—the oldtime religion, the old ways. Meanwhile, life—and the world—goes forward.

In addition to all this, the younger generation is a worry. If we could just get them to mumble routinely through a prayer each morning at school, and have the teacher read a Bible verse, maybe this would stop all this dreadful juvenile delinquency we are having. There just isn't time to do this at home. Church comes only once a week; so, of course, the schools will simply have to teach religion, read the prayers, and bend the twigs to conform to the standards of morality of our time.

WHAT ARE THOSE STANDARDS?

What are those standards? What does the kid see at home? What is he hearing in church school? It may be the moral standards of his parents leave much to be desired. The atmosphere of his home may be one of the crassest and most vulgar materialism. The youngster reads, or hears, of corruption in government and business. But surely the teacher can remedy that. All the child needs is the aspirin or the vitamin of a Bible verse before classes. That will make him a good boy or girl.

Colleges and universities, meanwhile, go on telling us that a majority of students enrolled each autumn have not been introduced to the problem of the individual and his relationship to life. The home hasn't done it. The church hasn't done it. Rare is the church that relates religion to the problems of life save in the most theological and superficial manner. Some churches preach race prejudice. Some don't. Some don't mention it at all. Is race a part of our lives? What is the morality of it?

Certainly the public school in a pluralistic society is not the place for token religious routines. The Court, by its proper constitutional decision, may help us to reassess what the problem is—and how to do something about it.

Christianity and Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of a charter member of the American Legion, past commander of the State department of the American Legion, a lifelong Baptist layman, a distinguished Virginia lawyer and former member of the Virginia State Senate, chairman, 1959, and member, 1960, Virginia Baptist Christian Life Committee; Fellow of American Bar Foundation and International Academy of Trial Lawyers; temporary chairman of Constitutional Convention of Virginia, 1945; B.A., LL.B. and LL.D. of University of Richmond, Hon. John J. Wicker, Jr., of Richmond, Va., entitled, "Christianity and Race Relations."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIANITY AND RACE RELATIONS

(By John J. Wicker, Jr.)

Numerous articles have appeared in the Religious Herald and other publications recently on this subject with such frequency in recent times as to indicate that some of our best people have suddenly become seized by some sort of hysteria, generated by a Court decision a few years ago, which many of our best judges and lawyers regard as unconstitutional and invalid.

Most of these articles start out with the preamble that the problem of race relations is serious and that Christians should face it honestly and courageously. With this preamble I am in full agreement.

However, I believe I share the opinions and convictions of many thousands of other Christians, who disagree totally with the arguments that in order to be a good Christian you must be "color blind" and that it is "un-Christian" to have churches that are not integrated with a mixture of Negro Christians and white Christians.

Their implication is that white churches—by confining their membership to white people—are denying Negroes access to the worship of our Lord and Master.

The truth is that the Negro churches were established many years ago at the direct insistence of the Negroes themselves that they have their own churches, where they could have their own characteristic type of religious service and be assured of Negroes

holding positions of honor in the church and having Negro pastors.

While they may not admit it publicly (because of fear of reprisals by militant Negro race organizations), the big majority of Negro church members are much happier with their own churches, and certainly would not want to give them up for a mixture.

Most of those who argue for mixed churches base their arguments on quotations from various letters of the apostle Paul—most especially on his letter to the Galatians in which he wrote:

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female—for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (3 Galatians: 28).

Integrationists seek to apply the first portion of this quotation solely to race relations and denounce any kind of racial separation or segregation—whether in churches or elsewhere—as "un-Christian." But they carefully ignore the last parts of the quotation because the same application of it would make it "un-Christian" to have segregation or separation by sexes (e.g., separate toilet facilities for men and women in church).

Furthermore, those who so freely quote and rely upon the racial part of the foregoing quotation studiously ignore many other equally important writings by apostle Paul.

For example, consider the following statements by apostle Paul, which are just as much a part of the Bible and are entitled to just as much application to present-day conditions as his statement to the Galatians:

"Let your women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience as also says the law. And if they will learn anything let them ask their husbands at home, for it is a shame for women to speak in church" (I Corinthians 14: 34–35).

In order to be either fair or consistent, those who rely upon one part of Paul's letter to the Galatians (to support their argument that racial separation is un-Christian) must necessarily also argue against the active participation of women in our churches.

All of us know that our churches would soon be in deplorable condition without the invaluable activities—speaking and otherwise—of devoted Christian women.

But what right has anyone to piously proclaim one isolated part of Paul's writings as "the word of God" and at the same time ignore and repudiate other parts of equal dignity?

Consider also Paul's statement in his letter to the Ephesians wherein he directed:

"Wives submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord, for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is head of the church" (Ephesians 5: 22–23).

And in first Corinthians, 11th chapter, verses 5–9, the apostle Paul actually declared it to be sinful for a woman to pray with her head uncovered.

Applying the "logic and reasoning" of the integrationists, no woman should ever fail to wear a hat in church; and no woman should ever pray even in her own home or bedroom without a hat on her head.

Paul was not alone in writing things that cannot be applied liberally today. For example, apostle Peter directed:

"Ye wives be in subjection to your husbands" (1 Peter 3: 1).

Peter also condemned as sinful the plaiting of hair and the wearing of jewelry by women (1 Peter 3: 1–3).

Incidentally interesting in connection with the current arguments between some seminary professors and some fundamentalists, consider how Paul blasted all who preached the gospel any differently from him:

"If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Galatians 1: 8–9)

In the same letter to the Galatians, Paul also wrote:

"Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman" (Galatians 4: 30).

Would any of those who seek to buttress their integrationist arguments by quotations from Paul argue that communism is scripturally right and that anyone is un-Christian who withholds any of his private property from common ownership by the church?

Yet the Bible tells us, with approval, how the early Christians practiced communism:

"And all that believed were together, and had all things in common. And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need" (Acts 2: 44–45; see also Acts 4: 32).

And the withholding of any part of private property was then so un-Christian that Ananias and Sapphira were denounced by Peter unto their death (Acts 5: 1–11).

Many other biblical references could be made that are not quoted or even recognized as valid today by these same integrationists who condemn racial separation on the strength of part of Paul's writings. But the foregoing should suffice to show the fallacy of the "biblical argument" of the integrationists.

I believe that calm and thoughtful consideration of the practicalities involved will lead most of us to the conclusion that general mixture of the races in our churches would inevitably result in the abandonment and closing of a large number of churches, and would disastrously reduce church membership, church attendance and church support.

As one group of prominent Negro Baptists told me in a conference not too long ago, if our Baptist churches in Virginia were to become mixed, "most of our 1,000 Negro pastors in Virginia would be out on the streets without any churches; most of our more than 1,000 Negro brethren who have been elevated to such high positions as chairman of their board of deacons and superintendent of their Sunday school would no longer be in those positions; most of our more than 10,000 Negro laymen who have been honored by being elected as deacons of our churches would no longer be deacons." Obviously, the end result would be a serious loss to the Christian church as a whole.

It is argued that, in some sections of our country, churches with mixed membership get along well. But the fact is that in those churches the percentage of Negro membership is so small as to be negligible. Conditions are entirely different in sections where Negroes constitute a large and substantial part (sometimes a majority) of the population.

You can mix a small quantity of black paint in a large bucket of white paint, or a small quantity of white paint in a large bucket of black paint, without any noticeable difference. But if you mix any substantial quantity of black paint with white paint, or vice versa, the result is neither black, nor white, but merely a nondescript muddy mess.

Some argue that since Christians are all trying to advance the Kingdom of God we ought to do without any barriers of segregation.

Should we therefore abolish all doctrinal or denominational differences—Catholic, Protestant; immersing Baptists, sprinkling Methodists; open communion, closed communion Baptists? Of course not. The cause of Christ is advanced much better when Christians who are of similar type and belief have their own churches. Thus they work more effectively for the Kingdom than if they were indiscriminately mixed together.

A great battleship depends on oil and water and electricity for its operation. In order to function best, each is completely segregated from the other. Yet no one argues that this segregation implies superiority of one and inferiority of another. Each is of equal dignity and each makes its best contribution to the common goal when segregated from the others. If they were to be mixed, they would be useless. Similarly, in automobiles, gasoline and water are completely segregated because mixture would greatly impair the usefulness of each.

Many good people sincerely believe that racial separation or segregation is wrong. They are certainly entitled to entertain and express their opinions without being regarded as un-Christian. By the same token, they have no right to condem as un-Christian those who—like myself—sincerely disagree with them.

Perhaps the best solution would be for those who believe in racially mixed churches to establish such churches and thus give their theories and opinions the trial of practical experience.

School Item

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, "School Item," which appeared in the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky., on August 8, 1963.

The editorial is as follows:

SCHOOL ITEM

There has been a lot of talk in the last few years about more efficient use of the Nation's school properties, rather than letting them lay idle for one-fourth of the time. It might just be possible that the people who are thinking along this line—about making the schools suitable for summar usage, etc.—should talk to some of the high school kids about it.

There are quite a few indications that more teenagers are going to school this summer. In Nashville, for instance, teenagers are going to school in rather impressive numbers, and Nashville is not an exception. In the Tennessee capital, we note, more than 9,000 students are taking summer courses, out of an enrollment of 80,000 in the city's schools. Of the number taking summer work, about one-third are high school students.

Summer classes have been looked upon mostly as "makeup" classes, and to quite an extent this is true. However, it is different in the Tennessee bigtown, where it is shown that many of the students are taking subjects they were unable to work into their regular programs during the fall-winter terms.

The result in Nashville is that the town's school authorities are taking a new look, with emphasis on the idea of operating schools there on a 12-month basis. The town authorities are taking an interest in the situation, too, and Mayor Beverly Briley has instituted a speedup study of a 12-month program as applied to his town.

There are plenty of indications that more high school students than usual are attending summer classes in other cities, too. Some of the kids are thinking in terms of getting their education over with as soon as possible. Indeed a vacationer returning from a long trip said the other day he was im-

pressed by the sight of teenagers headed for classrooms early in the summer mornings, rather than for playgrounds or just loafing away the lazy summer's day.

More and more we read pieces to the effect that school authorities, rather than sending up cries for more and more money for education, are questioning the sense of letting expensive buildings be idle the 3 months of summer. Air conditioning could make them as comfortable in July as in December, and brief interludes between the summer study and the other seasons might be considered sufficient by the kids—or at least many of them.

If students themselves are showing an inclination not to while away the summer months, and if they are serious minded enough to want to hurry up their education, then there's no reason not to let them do it. Education is a serious matter—indeed, life itself is an intensely serious matter—and there is at least a lot of reason to talk about this proposition, even though a fellow might get swung up by his heels or ridden on a rail if he proposed it to a group of kids without being tactful and sensible about the manner in which he presented it.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 17th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

In the eighth article of this series I called attention to the change in heading to "Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho" because my colleague from southern Idaho advised me that the former heading was personally offensive to him. It now appears that my colleague may have to advise his constituents of his aversion to the slogan, because I am beginning to get letters from southern Idahoans who have adopted the slogan. The following letter from Juanita van Ostran of Buhl, Idaho, indicates her adoption of the slogan:

BUHL, IDAHO,
July 31, 1963.

Re Representative HARDING's statement in the House, "The only people in Idaho who are against Bonneville Power is the Idaho Power and Utah Power."

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR: I am not in favor of the Bonneville Power Administration extending its service area into the State of Idaho. My slogan is "Bonneville, please include us out."

JUANITA VAN OSTRAN.

However, I am sure if these constituents are informed of my colleague's aversion to the slogan, they will defer to his tender feelings and express their objection to Bonneville's invasion of southern Idaho by some other appropriate phrase.

A Mr. Sidney C. Wade, of Weiser, Idaho, expresses his feelings about Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action of extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho by saying he was "sorry the Russians did not keep him in Russia when he was over there." Mr. Wade's letter follows:

WEISER, IDAHO, *August 2, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been my privilege to read your recent speech to the House of Representatives regards the extension of the BPA, marketing area into, and over southern Idaho. I wish to compliment you on your stand regards this vicious action taken by Mr. Udall. Really, I am sorry the Russians did not keep him in Russia when he was over there. We in Idaho have been confronted with all sorts of attacks from his kind for the past number of years: Columbia Valley Authority, PUD's co-ops and REA. Seemingly any kind of socialist thinking that could be conceived has been pushed at us by the Government power group. In my work I talk with many people and by far the majority are resenting bureaucratic control—a shining example was the Brother Freeman's wheat program. I feel sure if given a chance to express themselves, southern Idaho would have turned the extension down.

I sincerely hope the House will take a more realistic look at the cost involved, than did the Senate.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY C. WADE.

Views of the Joint Chiefs on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, after 18 years of cold war tensions, most Americans would like to be able to believe that the nuclear test ban treaty is a genuine step toward the establishment of peace with honor.

At the same time, many of us have entertained some reservations about the treaty, wondering whether it might somehow compromise the security of the United States.

We have been looking for a realistic, hardheaded appraisal from our professional military experts on the long-range effects of this agreement.

Now we have received such an appraisal. It was presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

The views of the Joint Chiefs are in many ways reassuring. Believing that this objective appraisal of the treaty will be of interest not only to my colleagues but to all Americans, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of their statement:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY JOINT CHIEFS ON TEST BAN TREATY

1. Upon receiving the final draft on the three-environment nuclear test ban treaty recently negotiated in Moscow, the Joint Chiefs of Staff began a comprehensive review of the terms of this treaty in order to determine what effect its ratification would have on the security of the United States. In this review, they deliberately set aside all considerations of former positions taken on other occasions on the subject of a test ban treaty and focused their attention on this particular treaty at this particular point in time. As a base of departure for their appraisal, they first established certain criteria to assist them in evaluating from a military point of view the acceptability as to content and timing of a limited test ban treaty which would prohibit nuclear test explosions in all environments excepting underground.

2. It was the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that four criteria or conditions would have to be met for a limited test ban treaty to be compatible with the national security. First, the United States should not accept limitations on testing if the Soviet Union had or could achieve a significant advantage in any militarily important area of nuclear weapon technology which, under the treaty could not be overcome by the United States. Second, recognizing the possibility that the U.S.S.R. might take advantage of an opportunity for clandestine testing, the Joint Chiefs determined that a test ban treaty could be accepted only if clandestine testing would have no seriously adverse effect on the relative balance of military power. Third, it was considered important that withdrawal from the treaty should be uncomplicated, allowing the United States to withdraw without undue delay upon acquiring reasonable evidence of a treaty violation or in the event our national interests were imperiled. Fourth, if the conditions of criteria one and two were not completely met, the treaty must convey adequate compensatory advantages elsewhere.

3. As a closely related matter, but not as a criterion for the treaty itself, the Joint Chiefs of Staff noted the importance for the United States, if it embarks on this treaty, to continue underground testing at a rate to insure continued progress in nuclear technology. They were equally impressed with the need for the United States to maintain the readiness and the determination to resume atmospheric testing promptly. Finally, they believed that account must be taken of the dangers of any relaxed military effort by the United States and our allies; hence, that ratification of the treaty should be accompanied by evidence of a clear intent to maintain and improve the military posture of the West.

CONCLUSIONS REACHED

4. Having determined the foregoing conditions of acceptability, the Joint Chiefs of Staff then undertook to measure against them the specific terms of the three-environment test ban treaty drafted recently in Moscow. To assist them in their deliberations, they consulted with those officials who have particular responsibilities and competence in this field. These were officials from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Department of State, the Atomic Energy Commission including field laboratories, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, and from technical agencies of the Military Establishment.

5. With regard to the current relative position, the Joint Chiefs of Staff reached the following conclusions:

(a) It is indicated that the U.S.S.R. is ahead of the United States in the high yield (tens of megatons) technology, in weapons effects knowledge derived from high yield nuclear explosions and in the yield-weight ratios of high yield devices; and that the U.S.S.R. lags somewhat behind the United States at low yields.

(b) In the antiballistic missile field, development of the U.S. system does not depend on atmosphere testing and hence this

treaty will not significantly influence any imbalance that may exist.

(c) In the field of tactical nuclear weapons, particularly in the field of very low yield weapons, the United States is probably ahead in the quality and diversity of systems.

6. It is important to emphasize that the superiority under discussion in the preceding paragraphs refers essentially to technological superiority. It does not take into account such superiority as derives from numbers of weapons, variety of delivery systems and the magnitude of nuclear plant and stockpile. Hence, technological superiority is only one aspect of the net superiority which must take into account all of these factors. As to net superiority in ability to inflict damage on the enemy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that the United States at present is clearly ahead of the U.S.S.R. in the ability to wage strategic nuclear war, and is probably ahead in the ability to wage tactical nuclear war, whereas the Soviets have developed a substantial midrange ballistic missile capability.

EFFECTS ARE CONSIDERED

7. Considering the foregoing to be a reasonably accurate statement in broad terms of our present position relative to that of the U.S.S.R., the Joint Chiefs of Staff then considered what the effects would be if the proposed test ban treaty should go into effect and both sides faithfully observe its provisions. They concluded that the United States would not be able to overtake the present advantage which the U.S.S.R. probably has in the high yield weapons field, whereas the Soviets, by underground testing, probably could retrieve in time any lead which we may presently have in the low yield tactical field. Both sides could achieve an antiballistic missile, but one with less desirable characteristics than would be the case if additional atmospheric tests were conducted.

8. There are other disadvantages which apply in varying degree to both sides. For example, knowledge of weapons effects is incomplete at best and although knowledge could be gained from underground testing, knowledge which only testing in the prohibited media could provide would be denied. Also, there would be no opportunity to conduct environmental tests of current weapons or of those which might be acquired in order to verify their performance.

9. Such disadvantage as might accrue to the United States under conditions of honest fulfillment of treaty conditions would be further aggravated if the Soviets successfully tested by illicit explosions in the atmosphere, underwater, or in outer space. By such clandestine testing, they might carry out investigations of weapons effects in the field of ballistic missiles, ballistic missile defense, antisubmarine warfare, and high-yield technology (the latter only if the testing were done in outer space). However, the dangers of detection and the cost and difficulty of testing in outer space would tend to impose severe restrictions upon such clandestine testing. Other clandestine tests in the atmosphere or underwater, depending upon their size, would involve a fairly high probability of detection by our conventional intelligence or our atomic energy detection system. Moreover, the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider the resulting progress which the Soviets might make clandestinely to be a relatively minor factor in relation to the overall present and probable balance of military strength if adequate safeguards are maintained.

WITHDRAWAL PROVISION

10. The Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that the withdrawal provision requiring 90 days' notice following a unilateral U.S. decision provides a satisfactory means of escape in case we believe our national interest is being threatened. They are impressed, however, by the possibility of an abrupt abrogation by the Soviets, followed by a comprehensive series of atmospheric tests.

11. Recognizing the foregoing disadvantages and risks, the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that they can be reduced through certain safeguards. These safeguards include:

(a) The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs designed to add to our knowledge and improve our weapons in all areas of significance to our military posture for the future.

(b) The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology which will attract, retain, and insure the continued application of our human scientific resources to these programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

(c) The maintenance of the facilities and resources necessary to institute promptly nuclear tests in the atmosphere should they be deemed essential to our national security or should the treaty or any of its terms be abrogated by the Soviet Union.

(d) The improvement of our capability, within feasible and practical limits, to monitor the terms of the treaty, to detect violations, and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

BROAD EFFECT NOTED

12. Having considered the technological and withdrawal aspects of the proposed treaty and the safeguards we should take, the Joint Chiefs of Staff then took note of the effect of the treaty in the broad field of international relations and of worldwide military strategy. They recognized that considerations of nuclear technology and weaponry were not the sole determinants of the merits of the treaty; that it could contribute to major political achievements with important and favorable military implications. If this treaty attracts signatories representing the vast majority of the nations of the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain, it should make an important contribution toward the restraint of the further proliferation of nuclear weapons and the reduction of causes of world tension. Both of these advantages, if achieved, should contribute to the fundamental objective of the U.S. Armed Forces; namely, the deterrence of war and the maintenance of peace on honorable terms. These possibilities are of such importance to the United States that they offset the foreseeable technological disadvantages noted above.

13. In conclusion, the Joint Chiefs have reached the determination that, while there are military disadvantages to the treaty, they are not so serious as to render it unacceptable. In the past, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not regarded as important the attainment of weapons in the 100-megaton range from which the United States will be debarred by the treaty. They feel that the types and numbers of megaton yield weapons available to us now or in the future could give us an adequate capability in the high-yield weapon range. Under the treaty, both sides could make about the same technical progress in the ABM field although the Soviets may possess some information not available to the United States. If the Soviets are to catch up with the United States in the low-yield field, particularly in numbers, they will be subjected to a major additional expenditure of national resources which are already under heavy strain.

14. The broader advantages of the test ban treaty have led the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conclude that it is compatible with the security interests of the United States and to support its ratification. If we can achieve significant political advances, these will compensate for foreseeable fluctuations in nuclear technology. The most serious reservations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with regard to the treaty are more directly linked with the fear of a euphoria in the West which will eventually reduce our vigilance and the willingness of our country and our allies to expand continued effort on our collective security. If we ratify this treaty, we must conduct a vigorous underground testing program and be ready on short notice to resume atmospheric testing. We should strengthen our detection capabilities and maintain modern nuclear laobratory facilities and programs. Finally, we must not for a moment forget that militant communism remains committed to the destruction of our society.

15. Having weighed all of these factors, it is the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that, if adequate safeguards are established, the risks inherent in this treaty can be accepted in order to seek the important gains which may be achieved through a stabilization of international relations and a move toward a peaceful environment in which to seek resolution of our differences.

Independence of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, the Republic of Cyprus will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Archbishop Makarious; and His Excellency, the Cyprus Ambassador to the United States, Zenon Rossides.

Cyprus, the third largest island in the Mediterranean, is one of the oldest cradles of ancient civilization. Its early history is buried deep in the dim and distant ages, but enough is known of its history of the last 4,000 years to make it a most important center of the Mediterranean world. For centuries before our era it served as a stepping-stone, a bridge, to conquering and seafaring merchants from the West, ancient Egyptians from north Africa, Assyrians and Persians from western Asia, and the Greeks and Romans from the west. They all fought for its possession and control, and during all that time it was noted as a haven for pirates. It was an important kingdom during the Middle Ages and its inhabitants had their part in the Crusades. Its turbulent and modern history began in the late 16th century when it was conquered by the Ottoman Turks in 1571.

The Turks ruled the Cypriot Greeks with an ironhand. In the course of several centuries thousands of Turks settled in Cyprus, first as government officials and members of the ruling class, and later as part of the settled community of the island. Today the preponderant majority of its people, 480,000 out of 590,000 are Greeks, while the Turks number less than 100,000. Not much love was lost between the majority Greeks and minority Turks at any time, and the British overlordship of the island since 1878 did not change the situation, though the administrative machinery of the government was more efficient and just.

But the relations of the two irreconcilable groups deteriorated since the end of the last war. The majority Greeks felt that their right to self-determination and their hope for eventual union with Greece were being ignored and deliberately delayed by the British. The Turks felt that their only chance of securing and maintaining autonomy and communal self-government lay either in the partition of the island between Greeks and Turks or by the annexation of the island by Turkey. At times these extreme views prevailed and their advocates preached terror and war. For more than a decade the situation seemed out of hand, beyond the control even of the British. Finally and fortunately, however, saner and cooler counsels prevailed. Terror and murders ceased; some order was produced out of a sad chaos; Cypriot Greek and Turkish leaders agreed to be content by proclaiming the independence of the island. The agreement to that effect was signed on August 16, 1960, and on that day Cyprus became an independent republic.

Today these proud and restless citizens of Cyprus, Greeks, Turks, and others, some 600,000 in all, live in relative peace and enjoy the fruits of their labor as astute merchants and keen traders under their own government.

My best wishes go out to these citizens of Cyprus on the third anniversary of their Independence Day.

So This Is Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of the Area Redevelopment Act in 1961, many hopeful expressions were heard from labor surplus areas such as Greene County, N.Y., the home of K-B Products, a nationally known and heretofore successful canner of mushrooms. In the interim, we have also been assured that the President's foreign trade bill would provide adequate protection for domestic industries; however, neither boast has materialized nor proven itself accurate.

Under the supervision of ARA officials, a Greene County committee was formed to enhance the sagging local economy and boost employment. In their efforts to obtain assistance from the gargantuan Federal slush fund, local officials were turned down on numerous occasions. When one considers the plethora of official sounding terms and ever-changing regulations which middle layer bureaucrats use, it is no surprise, but the end, unfortunately, is not affected. The most recent account of this fiasco in operation is vividly portrayed by an article from the Hudson Register Star, which I have asked to be included herewith. While increasing bankruptcies have been obscured in the Washington press of late in favor of our Nation's "moving" progress, it would appear that this is a prime eaxmple for the elimination of ARA:

KNAUST BROS. FILES VOLUNTARY PETITION OF BANKRUPTCY

Knaust Bros., Inc., Catskill, growing mushrooms and grain, has filed a voluntary petition in bankruptcy in the southern Federal district court, under chapter XI, listing liabilities of $1,097,770 and assets at $1,365,002 as of June 30, 1963, audit.

Also listed was K-B Products Corp., Catskill, mushroom canning and sales, listing liabilities at $1,001,845 and assets at $1,311,602 as of the June 30 audit.

Both notices said, "Terms of settlement to be submitted."

Knaust Bros. at Catskill today released the following statement:

"With great regret, we have been compelled to file under chapter XI of Federal Bankruptcy Act for the protection of all creditors of Knaust Bros., Inc., and K-B Products Corp. "The vast majority of the companies creditors, have been willing to wait out our possible solution, but a few were not. In order for all to receive the same treatment and to afford the companies time to reorganize and refinance, we had to take this step.

"We, as a proud company in a proud industry, asked no handouts and no subsidies from local, State or Federal Governments. Now, through our Federal Government (State Department), a near-fatal blow has been dealt to us."

"Formosan mushrooms flooding the American market, made possible by our State Department, have taken approximately one-fourth of the American market. As a result, the price of our product has been pushed so low that we cannot meet operating costs.

"We are desperately working to refinance our operations. Our executive officers have refused to accept compensation since April 15, while we could not meet our obligations as they materialized.

"We feel there is possible relief coming from Washington by imposition of an enforced quota on Formosan imports. The cycle, we believe, is on the upturn."

The Hudson and Catskill plants continue to operate on a normal employee basis.

As of last week, the Hudson plant employed about 132 and the Catskill plant about 151.

A Wily Scheme Comes Out of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "A Wily Scheme Comes Out of Japan," which appeared in the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky., on August 9, 1963.

The editorial is as follows:

A WILY SCHEME COMES OUT OF JAPAN

Speaking of the Japs and their rapid strides in steelmaking, with invasion of the American market, we note that the Jap automakers have worked out a plan to standardize basic parts on car models and makes, and some in the manufacturing world are hailing this as bordering upon the brilliant.

The Japs will start with the standardization of nine parts comprising about 10 percent of everything that goes to make up a car—tires, batteries, electric wiring, brake drums, horns, switches, chassis springs, gage and insulation.

This, the wily Japs opine, will eliminate in large part the familiar comment which goes something like this: "I'd buy one of those cars but where would I get parts if I needed them?" This is designed, of course, to give the Jap motorcar makers a leg-up on the foreign market.

The standardization, even if it is eventually extended to 25 parts, as announced in some of the trade papers, won't make a whit of difference as far as car individuality is concerned, it is said. As long as the car stops promptly, say the Jap designers, who knows or cares what the brake drums look like? And if the lights and the ignition work, who gives a hang whether the wiring is standardized or is individualistic, varying from car to car?

These are some of the points which are being made in Japan, and they will be part of the Jap sales talk when the standardization of basic parts becomes general in the Pacific Isles.

One fellow remarked not long ago that it has been true for some years since the war that if you looked closely at a souvenir from Gatlinburg or Cherokee or Niagara Falls or the Empire State Building or otherwheres you would like as not find the legend "made in Japan" stamped on the bottom or somewhere else.

It is true that some of the Indian souvenirs these days are stamped "made in Hong Kong," but this only goes to show that the Japs have competition in their bidding for the vast American souvenir market, just as the Jap steelmakers have competition from West German industrialists and must needs cope with them by slicing up the American steel market, pie fashion.

In recent years the Japanese have successfully wrested world markets for several substantial items of manufacture. Portable radios, for instance, come from Japan in a quantity which can best be described by the word "flood." Germany and the United States no longer lead the world in cameras, binoculars, and similar optical equipment, having yielded dominance in these items long ago to the Japanese.

Latest inroads, it should be added, have been in the garment trade and in electronic components and subassemblies, and if a fellow takes the cover off an expensive American hi-fi he most likely will find the rest is pure Nipponese.

Even the great firearms firm of Winchester-Western, we note in the outdoor magazines, is building an expensive over-under shotgun, not in the good old U.S.A., as was always the case, but in Japan, where the payrolls go to Japanese, as indeed do the taxes.

What it seems to add up to is that the Japanese can imitate anything, and in most instances, due to their willingness to work feverishly for long hours for low pay, they can make it cheaper. If you add a touch of ingenuity—such as this standardized auto parts business—you have a truly formidable economic competitor, and that is what we have, in truth.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling

for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MEDFORD, OREG.,
July 17, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Until I read your letter in the Thursday, July 11 issue of the Tablet, I was only vaguely aware of a move to support a Captive Nations Committee in the House.

Thank you for writing such a letter to the Tablet.

Attached, as you requested in your Tablet letter are carbons of my letters to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH and Hon. ROBERT B. DUNCAN, the latter is from my own 4th District here in Oregon.

Again, thank you.

ROBERT J. HOWARD.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
July 17, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Since it is universally known that all leaders of communism (both in Moscow and among the puppet Communist nations) fear our mentioning and exposure of their degrading imperialism, and the suffering people under their tyrannical, godless heel, I ask you to join with many of your colleagues in the House by submitting a resolution supporting the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. There are many such resolutions presently before the House Rules Committee.

Should you feel this move might be unsound, please let me know your reasons.

Thank you for the copy of your newsletter (July 10), and thank you also for the copy of the President's ideas on civil rights legislation.

Has my name now been added to the list receiving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. HOWARD.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
July 17, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I ask you to please support House Resolution 14, designed to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

I ask that swift and favorable action be taken on this resolution.

If you disagree with my position, please let me know your reasons.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. HOWARD.

JULY 11, 1963.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I support your House Resolution 14 to the fullest extent.

Why does not the Rules Committee wake up and get on with it—are they asleep?

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LOLLEGGEN.

BRIGHTWATERS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

SARASOTA, FLA.,
July 18, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMIN SMITH: This is to urge prompt action on the measure to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives (H. Res. 14).

In my opinion, the free nations are throwing away one of their most powerful weapons by not exposing, every chance they get, the Soviet imperialist colonial system.

It is high time that we get over the fear of hurting Mr. Khrushchev's feelings and cut him and his pals down to size. It is quite evident now that the administration is not going to do it, so it's up to the Congress.

Sincerely,

J. A. STEWART,
Colonel, Retired.

JULY 14, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: Greatly concerned, to say the least.

Strongly urge quick action, and passage of bill now pending, House Resolution 14.

Respectfully,

MARIE BALLINGER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

JULY 11, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: This is being written to inform you that I heartily support your efforts regarding captive nations as expressed in House Resolution 14. I have written my Congressman, Hon. OTIS G. PIKE accordingly.

Yours respectfully,

JAMES J. CRIBBIN, Sr.

BAY SHORE, N.Y.

The Late Phil D. Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I think that only a half-dozen of our most senior Members will recall serving in this House with Phil David Swing. Mr. Swing represented my district in Congress at a time it included almost all of southern California lying south of Los Angeles.

Mr. Swing died last week at 78. He had maintained an active life to the end.

His onetime constituents remember this man gratefully as "the father of Boulder Dam." My own feelings are somewhat more personal. In the crowded days following my election in a particularly hard campaign last November, I felt honored to receive a luncheon invitation from Mr. Swing, always an active Republican. I listened attentively for nearly 2 hours as this elder statesman recalled for me his own early days in Congress. He advised me with suggestions for becoming a more effective Member on behalf of my district, to the extent that this coincides with the national interest. He made clear his desire to see me succeed, despite our diverse party loyalties.

I take pride, therefore, in offering for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune of August 10, assessing Mr. Swing's many monuments:

MANY MONUMENTS MARK COURSE OF ATTORNEY PHIL D. SWING

Many are the enduring monuments to the life and work of Attorney Phil David Swing, whose death occurred Thursday. He was 78 years old.

In the main, the monuments to his well-spent life are expressed in terms of water and water development in the region he loved. That region consists chiefly of San Diego and Imperial Counties.

Phil Swing got his first taste of politics as district attorney for Imperial County, and it was in that office that he dedicated himself to the task of obtaining a sure supply of water for his county. There was the need; he was the man.

His purpose was interrupted briefly by World War I, when he was enrolled in officers' training camp. He came out of that to accept an appointment as superior court judge, a position he soon relinquished to run for Congress from what then was the 11th Congression District.

He was elected and for 12 years represented the region including San Diego, Imperial, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties.

Swing's reason for going to Congress was water. He joined with Senator Hiram Johnson, of California, to advance the cause of Hoover Dam, and together the two men brought their dream to fruition.

He promoted the All-American Canal, for which Congress appropriated a vast sum.

These projects, he felt, were necessary to insure the interests of the Imperial Irrigation District, the largest such district in the Nation, which he had organized while district attorney.

While attending to those major legislative matters, he handled the bills which brought the creation of the metropolitan water district, of which San Diego now is a member.

In 1932 he retired voluntarily from Congress to enter private practice in San Diego, where he specialized largely in water litigation.

Because of his long experience in water, his advice and counsel were constantly sought by official and unofficial groups seeking solution of water problems until his last illness. In committee meetings, as well as in his court appearances, he had a Lincolnesque knack of making his point with an apt story.

Indeed, his ready wit made him a welcome addition to any serious, deliberative body. Here his rich vein of humor often broke up a tangled discussion when he would lean back in his chair and begin, "You know, this reminds me of a story."

The contribution of Phil David Swing to southern California's welfare can be measured only by considering what it would be had he done none of the things he did do.

Truly, he built the foundation upon which the region's water edifice rests.

Independence of Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 17, the Republic of Indonesia will celebrate the 14th anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, President Sukarno; and His Excellency, the Indonesia Ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Zain.

On August 17, 1945, the Republic of Indonesia was proclaimed by a small group of determined men. The next 4 years were marked by extensive but futile efforts by the Netherlands to reestablish its power in Indonesia. The new republic, led by Sukarno and Hatta, resisted the Dutch attempts to regain control. A settlement providing for independence was finally reached in late 1949 at The Hague in discussions between the Dutch authorities and the Indonesian nationalists. Today the people of Indonesia are observing the 18th anniversary of their independence day.

The new state of Indonesia began operations under a provisional constitution that provided for a parliamentary system of government. There was a President, a Vice President, a unicameral legislature, and a cabinet. In the period 1950–59, however, Indonesia had eight cabinets, some of which lasted only a few months; the Constituent Assembly was unable to agree on a new constitution; political parties were fragmented and failed to function effectively; and a general mood of disaffection in the country led to rebellion and revolt against the Government.

President Sukarno and other Indonesian leaders become convinced that the parliamentary form of government was not suited to Indonesia, and in 1959 steps were taken to create a new system of government. The Constituent Assembly was dissolved and the Constitution of 1945, which provided for stronger leadership at the top, was made the country's permanent charter. The strength of the executive was enhanced while the powers of the political parties and the legislature were greatly reduced. President Sukarno filled the role of head of government in addition to the position as head of state. He was widely supported by the Indonesian people in his efforts to strengthen and stabilize the government.

The basic objectives of Indonesia's domestic policy are to mold the Indonesian people into a great nation, to develop the country's resources, and to improve the living conditions by giving the Indonesian people a greater share in the benefits of an expanding economy.

Indonesia's potential for economic development is great. There are large areas of land that have not yet been developed agriculturally, and the islands are rich in untapped mineral resources such as petroleum, tin, and bauxite. An 8-year plan for economic growth was launched in January 1961 as a blueprint for Indonesian development.

The United States has had an interest in Indonesia from the very outset. The United States played an important role in helping Indonesia negotiate its freedom from Dutch rule, and it has continued to encourage the development of a stable and democratic country. The American foreign aid program has helped to strengthen the Indonesian economy and to improve the living conditions of its people. The two countries have established a long record of cooperation and friendship. On the occasion of the 18th anniversary of Indonesian independence, the United States takes the opportunity to express its desire to maintain close and cordial relations with Indonesia on a basis of mutual respect.

Civil Rights Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am certain the "Resolutions Adopted by the House of Bishops, Protestant Episcopal Church, Toronto, Ontario, August 12, 1963," will be of interest to Members. These important resolutions were brought to my attention by the Rev. William E. Craig, director, St. Francis Boys' Home, Salina and Ellsworth, Kans., who is sincerely concerned with the rights and needs of all minority groups.

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church urges the Congress of the United States to pass such civil rights legislation as shall fairly and effectively implement both the established rights and the needs of all minority groups in education, voting rights, housing, employment opportunities, and access to places of public accommodation.

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, mindful of the Church Assembly to be held in Washington, D.C., on August 28, 1963, in cooperation with the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, (a) recognizes not only the right of free citizens to peaceful assemblage for the redress of grievances, but also that participation in such an assemblage is a proper expression of Christian witness and obedience; (b) welcomes the responsible discipleship which impels many of our bishops, clergy, and laity to take part in such an assemblage and supports them fully; (c) prays that through such peaceful assemblage citizens of all races may bring before the Government for appropriate and competent action the critical and agonizing problems posed to our Nation by racial discrimination in employment, in access to places of public accommodation, in political rights, in education, and housing.

Resolved, That the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church commends to all people the Presiding Bishop's letter dated Whitsunday 1963, as appropriate and helpful in the present racial crisis; and that we support the Presiding Bishop in this wise and timely expression of Christian leadership.

Call to Political Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in his keynote speech to the workshop meeting of the Republican Citizens Committee not long ago Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower called strongly upon "political amateurs" to participate in politics. This call is well worth remembering and pondering for the vast majority of citizens who find it so much easier to sit back and do nothing and then complain because they are not governed as they would like to be. History plainly indicates that democracies remain strong only so long as their citizens remain actively interested in their governments.

Therefore, I call the attention of every citizen to former President Eisenhower's remarks in the article from the Saturday Evening Post of August 10, 1963, which follows below:

A CALL TO POLITICAL DUTY

After an illustrious career in public service, no one would criticize Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower if he decided to take it easy in his retirement. But the former President seems to be going stronger than ever. Recently he has shown a zest for close political combat unlike anything that he showed during his "active" career.

Not long ago a group of distinguished Republicans from all sections of the country gathered at Hershey, Pa., for a workshop meeting of the Republican Citizens Committee. General Eisenhower delivered the keynote speech.

He let the New Frontier have it. Duty "requires that we call the roll, clear and loud on the opposition's record," he said, "the sorry record that stands naked to behold, when the cunningly manipulated veneer of imagery is peeled off. * * *For the sake of its future, the American electorate * * * should become fully aware of the political connivance that is a way of political life for those who avidly seek power at any cost—and having won it, reach out for more and more."

The main thrust of General Eisenhower's speech was a call for massive participation by Republican-oriented citizens in the campaign of 1964. "I hope this town meeting is the forerunner of many, many more across the country by different citizens' groups, all of which make their contribution toward the growth of Republicanism," he said. "Political 'amateurs,' " he added, "bring verve, sparkle and fresh ideas which perk up a

political party the way a well-advertised medicine does tired blood. Many of today's finest public officials and party organization leaders were yesterday's 'political amateurs.' "

The general speaks from experience. "Dedicated nonprofessionals," he said, "were to a considerable extent responsible for my decision in 1952 to enter the political arena."

We heartily endorse General Eisenhower's call for massive Republican citizen participation in the coming campaign. The so-called amateurs can give the party something that the tired party pros seem unable to supply—a renewed energy and a hefty injection of idealism. Perhaps the "amateurs" will even uncover a Republican candidate who will give Jack Kennedy a run for his money in 1964.

Trotters Shoals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry is the leading industry in the Carolinas and Georgia. This great industry, the very backbone of our economy, must never become dependent upon the Federal Government for its power. Another Federal Government dam at Trotter Shoals on the Savannah River would give the Federal Government a complete monopoly over that great river. If the Federal Government controls power and water, it will control people and their employment.

The following editorial is from the August 3, 1963 issue of Southern Textile News:

PRIVATE VERSUS SOCIALIZED POWER

With the textile industry's vital interest in taxes and electrical power, close watch should be kept on proposals for Uncle Sam to construct the Trotter Shoals Dam on the Savannah River in South Carolina rather than for private enterprise. This is not of interest just to South Carolinians, but has far-sweeping interests to all taxpayers.

The pseudoliberals, whatever party label they wear, like to call themselves "The party with a heart," or "The party of the people." This infers that conservatives are heartless and unconcerned with people. But close examination of the doctrine and programs of the liberals often discloses that, either their heart is blind or they are more interested in power than people. This is illustrated in the Trotter Shoals project.

As a matter of heart, the liberals argue that all of the natural resources of the Nation "belong to all the people." This is the argument they use to justify Federal construction of hydroelectric dams, notwithstanding the fact that Federal electricity is sold at cutrate prices to only a favored few of the people. Specifically, this is the argument behind Interior Secretary Udall's demand that Uncle Sam, rather than private enterprise, construct the $78.7 million Trotter Shoals Dam, a project which would remove 22,000 acres of land from State and local tax rolls.

Would Federal construction of this dam help "all the people?" Here is what is in store for this area (and other areas in time) if the Government does not build the dam:

1. The Mead Corp. will employ 1,400 workers in the construction of a $40 million plant at the site which will create 650 permanent jobs. The plant will purchase $9 million worth of pulpwood a year which will create another 1,850 jobs. The plant will pay $3.8 million a year in local, State and Federal taxes (not counting the taxes which the new workers will pay.)

2. Duke Power Co. will employ 1,000 workers in the construction of an electric steamplant at the site which will create 135 permanent jobs. The steamplant (which will generate 24 times as much electricity as the Federal dam) will purchase $25 million worth of coal a year which will create more new jobs in the mining industry. The investor-owned steamplant will pay $13 million a year in local, State, and Federal taxes.

As a matter of "heart," which would do more for the most people, the Federal Government or private enterprise?

Is President Kennedy Afraid To Trust the American People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, why does President Kennedy refuse to trust the American people? Why does he enter into secret negotiations with Khrushchev? What has he promised Khrushchev? Who is calling the shots, our President or the Soviet dictator?

It is time the American people know just what President Kennedy has in mind for them and what kind of country he intends to leave for our children. The reports of secret agreements reached with Khrushchev should fill us with fearful foreboding.

It seems to me Congress should demand a full explanation to the questions raised in the following article from the Washington World of August 19, written by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott.

Even Averell Harriman, famous for his negotiations with the Russians, says our goals and theirs are absolutely irreconcilable. Therefore, any agreements acceptable to Khrushchev must be against the best interest of the United States.

The article follows:

KENNEDY AND KHRUSHCHEV MUCH CLOSER ON AGREEMENT THAN STATEMENTS INDICATE

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev are much closer to a step-by-step agreement on a nonagression pact between the West and the Soviet block than their public statements indicate.

In fact, they already have reached an understanding in their exchange of letters on a plan for a piecemeal approach to cope with the opposition of West Germany and France.

SCHEDULE OF TALKS

Under this Kennedy-Khrushchev strategy, the following "escalator procedure" will be pursued in the "second round" of negotiations underway in Moscow:

Exchange of military missions between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact, the Iron Curtain military alliance.

Resumption of discussions on the security of West Berlin and its access routes.

A joint declaration to be signed by the military commanders of the two alliances, General Lemnitzer or Marshal Grechko, or by the NATO secretary-general, Dr. Stikker, and a Communist equivalent.

Formal signing of a NATO-Warsaw Pact non-aggression agreement by individual nations.

Although Khrushchev has publicly called for an immediate signing of a nonagression pact, he has privately bowed to the President's step-by-step plan to counter the difficulties he faces from France and West Germany.

Under Kennedy's formula, the joint nonaggression declaration to be issued by the NATO-Warsaw Pact military commanders would explicitly define the area it covered by many references and not by listing countries—thus sidestepping the East German recognition pitfall.

Later a pact would be signed by the individual countries involved, with some special arrangement for the East and West German signatories similar to that concocted at the Geneva Conference of 1959.

An exchange of military missions between NATO and the Warsaw Pact already has been informally agreed on by Khrushchev and Kennedy, and the current discussions in Moscow are being used to work out details.

The President directed Secretary Rusk to proceed on the basis that West Germany would approve and France would not veto this move.

Rusk also was instructed to explore the possibility of effecting a West Berlin settlement by placing the long-beleaguered city and its access routes under United Nations control. This proposal is one reason for the inclusion of U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson in the delegation sent to Moscow for the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty.

The Unsinkable REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial entitled "The Unsinkable REA," by Raymond Moley, which appears in the August 19, 1963 edition of Newsweek:

THE UNSINKABLE REA

(By Raymond Moley)

In a discursive speech attacking critics of some of the Kennedy spending policies, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT reveals the essential demagogue beneath his academic and official credentials. Critics of the Rural Electrification Administration are, he implies, supporting the "freedom of the farmer to live in poverty and deprivation—by candlelight." I suggest that we hold the candle up to the facts.

No doubt, the Arkansas Senator had in mind identical bills introduced recently by Senators LAUSCHE and BENNETT and by Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE. These bills would not destroy the REA. They would require the Government to charge interest on loans to cooperatives for electrifying farms at the same rate the Treasury is paying for the money it borrows. Money for purposes other than those originally contemplated in the law creating the REA would have to be raised in the open market.

When the REA was created by Congress in 1936, only 11 percent of our farms had electric service. It was uneconomical for private power companies to extend their lines

to the other 89 percent. The plan for Government loans to cooperatives to service those farms was to be limited to 10 years. The interest charged during those 10 years was more than the Treasury was paying for its money. But in 1946 the interest charged to cooperatives was 2 percent, where it has remained. The annual interest rate paid by the Treasury rose from that level to 3.29 in 1962. The average REA loans outstanding rose to $3,568 million.

PURPOSE ACHIEVED

Meanwhile, the original purpose of the REA has been achieved. By 1962 nearly 98 percent of the farms had electric service—about half from the co-ops and half from private power companies.

But with the subsidized money still available, the co-ops have moved into areas already supplied by private companies, constructing generating plants and transmission lines for that purpose. They have also used their funds for purposes not even remotely related to supplying farms with electricity. Moreover, a very powerful lobbying agency, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, has been built.

In this competition, the co-ops have two advantages: they can borrow money for expansion at a rate far lower than the private companies can get theirs and they pay no Federal income tax.

To illustrate what these advantages mean, I use figures supplied by the Northern Indiana Public Service Co. This company must pay from 6 to 6.5 percent for the money it must have for growth and maintenance. The difference between this expenditure for capital and that which would be paid by an REA-supplied co-op would amount to $14 - 543,000 annually. The company pays Federal income taxes amounting to $11,973,000 annually. Thus the subsidy, if enjoyed by the company, would amount to $26,516,000.

DRAG ON GROWTH

The president of the nothern Indiana company says:

"If we had the tax and the 2-percent money subsidy and applied it to residential and farm use, we could give these customers free electric service all year and the company would be better off than we now are. If we had just the Federal income tax subsidy, we could give free electric service to all residential and rural customers for 6 months a year."

Consider this effect of subsidizing competition in the light of the professed objectives of the Kennedy Administration. It says it is trying to promote growth of the gross national product and thus have more income to tax. But this competition with taxpaying industry is a brake upon growth. The money for the REA loans to co-ops is a further burden and thus increases the deficit.

The Kennedy administration also says that it wants to enrich the living standards of the American people. This can be done by cheap electric service no matter who generates the power. But 85 percent of Americans are customers of private companies. Subsidized competition is a charge on those companies. REA subsidies are not a stimulant. They are a drag on growth and well-being.

Minority Staff at the State Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 20, 1963, shows clearly that the problem of adequate staff resources responsible to the minority party is by no means confined to the Congress of the United States but exists in State legislatures and, indeed, in any representative body whose function is to seek solutions to complex problems.

As this article points out, without adequate staff the minority in State legislatures tends to become "criticizers, nit pickers, and even obstructionists." While at the same time the majority, knowing that the minority cannot present an effective opposition, tends to become careless and irresponsible.

The situation described in this article is one which the Congress would do well to ponder. I therefore submit the full text of it to your consideration:

JEFFERSON CITY

(By Margaret Sheppard)

JEFFERSON CITY.—Too much success can be almost as unhealthy for a political party as too much failure.

Witness the Missouri Legislature, where Democrats have had control of both houses—and the Governor's office, too, incidentally—since 1955.

There were signs during the 1963 session that the Democrats were getting spoiled. On the other hand, the long vote drought did not seem to be doing the Republicans any good, either.

In the house, the Democrats had 101 of the 163 seats, and they seemed to believe the majority was big enough to allow them to do what they pleased—literally.

Time after time, as the legislative week drew to an end, or a session ran long, there were dozens of empty desks on the Democratic side, showing representatives had ducked out and gone home. Sometimes there seemed to be more Republicans than Democrats on the job.

Time after time, Republicans were victims of brusque rulings from the speaker's chair.

Leaders in the house sometimes started off with flags flying, only to find hardly anybody following.

Some of the most stubborn and effective opponents of the Democratic administration's programs were Democratic legislators, and it was only with the help of Republicans that some of the most important legislation was passed.

Democrats often seemed to be more interested in advancing the interests of their own factions than of the party as a whole, or the State of Missouri.

There were leadership problems in the senate, too, though they were not as obvious. Democrats, with a 28-to-6 margin, must take the blame for the grand end-of-session jam which saw more than 100 bills die on the senate calendar because of earlier dawdling.

Though it is hard to pinpoint blame for such situations, it seems reasonable to expect that grown men, elected to positions of public trust, might do better.

For Republicans, an extended minority existence is frustrating and at times embittering. Willy-nilly, they become criticizers, nit-pickers and even obstructionists.

Knowing members of their own party will be prevented by the majority from successfully pressing any significant piece of legislation, some wind up voting against nearly every important Democratic-sponsored bill, good or bad.

Secure in the knowledge the Democrats have to bear the responsibility for whatever the legislature does, they feel free to oppose things they might approve if they were in the majority.

A simple reversal in the partisan balance of the legislature would not work miracles. There will always be factions, selfishness and irresponsibility across party lines, and legislators apparently will forever fight with the Governor.

Yet Democrats might benefit if they knew firsthand what the frustrations of the minority are. Republicans might be helped if they had to be for, instead of against, something.

Apart from any considerations of party platform or personalities, an exchange in roles could help both parties—and the State.

John Heath Retires After 51 Years of Carrying Tyringham Valley Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of ABCD, ZIP, vim, and who knows when the "vigah" will appear, it is certainly refreshing to read of a man who has served the Post Office in the highest ideals of individual service.

I refer to a distinguished man in my district, John Heath, of Tyringham, who carried Tyringham Valley mail for 51 years and who is now retired.

His story is a picture of the New England, Mr. Speaker, which contains the individual virtues of accomplishment and service.

He has become, as this fine article from the Berkshire Eagle in Pittsfield states, a "Landmark in Tyringham."

I am sure that my colleagues in the House will enjoy this article and read it as a picture of genuine New England.

For Mr. Heath, I wish many years of happiness which he deserves for a life well lived and a job well done.

The article appeared on August 7, 1963:

TYRINGHAM.—A reliable team of horses was all that John Heath ever needed to assure that the mails reach Tyringham. There were no such frills as ZIP code numbers in those days.

But now, more than 40 years after he first got the contract for the star route from Lee to Tyringham, Mr. Heath has retired. He leaves the mail delivery to data processing machines and the younger generation.

Last month, 76-year-old Mr. Heath gave up the job he has held since 1912. Ill health forced his retirement.

In the beginning the trip from Tyringham to Lee and back was made with a pair of black horses and a rig. In addition to carrying the mail, Mr. Heath also transported eggs and milk from Tyringham farms to Lee and returned with bread and other staples needed by residents in this isolated village.

TWICE A DAY

He would meet the train twice a day in Lee and deliver the mail to Tyringham residents along the route back to town. He was a lifeline down the Tyringham Valley.

Occasionally there would be a call to get some medicine or groceries in Lee and Mr. Heath would hitch up the rig. Assuming the roads were passable, he could make it to Lee in about 30 minutes.

Later he bought a truck. The horses were used only for heavy loads such as casks and kegs of staples he carried from the Lee railroad station to the general store in Tyringham.

PRIVATE LIVERY

To supplement his income he also operated a private livery service. Before the days of general use of automobiles, Mr. Heath would meet the influx of Tyringham's summer residents and their trunks at the railroad station. When someone had to meet a train in Lee, Great Barrington or Hillsdale, N.Y., he would call Mr. Heath. The Howards, the Gilders, the Littels all depended on him for transportation.

In 1926, Mr. Heath started carrying Tyringham students to Lee High in a Ford station wagon. Thirty-three years later, in 1959, he made his last trip. The number of students making the trip had increased considerably in 1939 when Tyringham fifth and sixth graders joined high school students in commuting to Lee.

SEVEN-PASSENGER PACKARD

The Heaths acquired a seven-passenger Packard and in 1944 they acquired their first bus. A native of Tyringham, Mr. Heath lived in Monterey several years before returning to this town in 1912. While in Monterey, he drove a team of horses for his brother on the mail route from Monterey to Great Barrington.

But he has become a landmark in Tyringham. There has not been a summer or winter resident of the town that did not come to depend on him for something—the mail, their groceries, the safe passage of their children to school, or their entire physical contact with the world beyond this little valley.

Maybe Our Dollars Should Come Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Maybe Our Dollars Should Come Home," which appeared in the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky., on August 8, 1963.

The editorial is as follows:

MAYBE OUR DOLLARS SHOULD COME HOME

If a fellow thinks he is not affected by the restrictions imposed upon American products by the Common Market which has been set up in Europe—or if he thinks his neighbor isn't affected—he should take a closer look at the facts.

It has come to the point where the chicken has become a symbol of the uncertain situation which confronts the United States as its citizens attempt to deal with the Common Market folks.

The Common Market refused last week to reverse its prohibitive tariff against American poultry exports, and as we remarked a day or so ago there is weeping in Kentucky and Georgia and other poultry-producing States, and the tears are genuine ones, wrung from people who have raised a lot of chickens, can't sell them, and don't see how they can profitably produce more.

It seems to the poultry producers, just as it looks to the coal people in their contest with foreign waste oil dumped on our shores, that the powers that be in Washington should take time out from efforts to bludgeon the population into discrimination in favor of the racial minority and do some hard thinking and hard acting about practical matters such as the plight of some of our home industries.

Far more important than our image abroad, about which there is so much talk in the United States and U.N., is the matter of whether poultry raisers' children have shoes on their feet, and this goes for coal miners and steel makers, too—and tobacco growers, we will toss in, since tobacco is an export item of high consequence to our community and State.

Anybody who has any acquaintance with the facts can tell you that a tariff war can be a tough thing, and a lot of people can get hurt in it, but as the Common Market's policies with reference to American products stiffen, it may come to the point where nothing short of sharp retaliation by the United States against European products can bring these Market fellows to their senses. Mr. Herter is making noises in that direction, and our news columns yesterday told of an impending tariff war.

Already, in case you haven't seen the figures, the action of the Common Market against poultry is costing American producers $46 million a year. That big sum of money, anyone can see, can make the difference between survival and business failure for many farmers. So the Common Market's tariffs cease to be merely a news item when they touch the local economy of Kentucky and Georgia and Alabama and other States which produce most of the poultry in this country.

The sad fact is that the $46 million may be only a beginning, for the ultimate aim of the Common Market seems to be to exclude almost all American farm products from the big European markets, in which event there will be a big trade war which could damage a lot of people on both sides of the big water. At the same time, an economic threat has to be met with the same resolution that a military threat is met, and our country's patience is not unlimited—nor should it be.

These European fellows who have set up this market business are the same ones who helped drain our country's gold to support a tremendous involvement in European affairs in Europe's time of need. It is a crying shame, the way we're being treated, but folks who warned us it might turn out this way were hooted down as bloomin' provincials who did not have the world outlook, shame on 'em.

Some of the fellows in Congress have already suggested that if our chickens aren't welcome in Europe, then maybe our dollars—and our soldiers, too—ought to come home.

The Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as you know we shall soon have before us the foreign aid bill. Therefore, I think it appropriate to place before the House an article which appeared recently in the Journal of Commerce. The article tells of the need for additional funds for the Alliance for Progress. I commend it to your attention.

LATIN ALLIANCE NEEDS FOR FUNDS FOUND HIGHER

WASHINGTON, August 4.—President Kennedy's remarks last week that the road to economic and social progress in Latin America is "looking long and longer" echoed a significant but little noted speech made in Costa Rica a few days earlier by another knowledgeable American.

The American—T. Graydon Upton, executive vice president of the Inter-American Development Bank—said that to carry out the Alliance for Progress goals as set forth nearly two years ago, still more money than first estimated will be needed from the United States and other non-Latin countries.

Originally, the United States and the 19 Latin American Governments forming the Alliance for Progress—a self-help program aided by U.S. funds—figured that the program would succeed with about $2 billion a year in United States and other foreign assistance.

But Mr. Upton, in Costa Rica to attend an Inter-American conference on "industrial development and financing of the private sector," revealed that a reevaluation had been made. About $2.5 billion annually will be needed, he declared.

The primary basis for this upward evaluation, he said, is the new development plans recently presented to the Organization of American States by Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela.

Latin American exports will not be able to push aside the new $2.5 billion estimate, since no institution is more qualified to appraise Latin America's financial needs than the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. Upton filled out the gloomy picture by saying, as everyone knows, that the United States, Europe, Canada, and Japan—the nations counted on for the outside help—have failed to provide even the $2 billion, including both governmental and private capital flow.

The United States, far and away the largest contributor to Latin America's economy, last year provided about $1.1 billion in governmental help to Latin America while private capital furnished about a net $150 million.

LARGER AID UNLIKELY

Mr. Upton further revealed that an analysis of U.S. and European attitudes toward foreign aid indicates that it is quite unlikely that Government outlays to Latin America will be increased from present levels.

His conclusion—only a great surge of private U.S. and European capital into Latin America will enable the Alliance for Progress to meet such goals as an average increase in per capita national product of 2.5 percent.

Greater investment promotion by the Latin American countries, he suggested, might be one way to encourage this investment flow. But given the apparent limits of Latin American self-help—actual or threatened political instability, controversial policies toward foreign capital and the lack of sound overall planning—it seems that it would take more than investment centers to rescue the Alliance for Progress at this time.

Independence of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Korea celebrates the 15th anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the acting President of the Republic, Chung Hee Park; and His Excellency,

the Korean Ambassador to the United States, Chung Yul Kim.

The Republic of Korea was formed on August 15, 1948, and today the country celebrates the anniversary of that occasion. The 15 years of its life have been a continual test of its strength and will to survive. At the very outset the country was torn by war and its people underwent great hardships. The Communist invasion from the north in 1950 came very close to sweeping across the peninsula. Showing great strength and courage, the Army of the Republic of Korea and the United Nations forces launched a counterattack. After 37 months of rugged fighting they succeeded in repelling the aggression against the Republic of Korea. The efforts to accomplish the unification of all Korea, however, were frustrated by the massive military intervention of Communist China. Finally an armistice agreement was signed in 1953 which formally ended the hostilities.

Ten years have passed since the Korean truce was negotiated at Panmunjom. There has been no more war—but there has been no real peace, either. American, South Korean, and North Korean Communist soldiers still stand guard along the cease-fire line, which is the 38th parallel line. From time to time there are clashes with the enemy. Three Americans were recently ambushed and killed by Communist soldiers in the demilitarized zone. The unprovoked and brutal gunning of these men was a tragic reminder to all of us that the Korean conflict is not yet settled. It was also a reminder that the Republic of Korea is still an important and vital fortress of the free world against communism.

With the assistance provided by the United Nations and the United States, the Republic of Korea has rebuilt its war-shattered land. The positive measures taken by the United States have included a continuous and extensive program of economic aid. The United States has also provided military assistance to maintain the defense capability of the Republic against the hostile Communist regime to the north. The great burden of responsibility, however, is shouldered by the South Koreans, themselves. Over 600,000 Republic of Korea soldiers at this very moment wait in readiness for any sign of attack by the North Koreans.

It is very difficult to know how much longer the Republic of Korea will be in danger of invasion from the north. The recent intensification of Communist activities in the region of the 38th parallel indicate a stepping up of espionage and subversion attempts. It will call for increasing vigilance by the combined American and Republic of Korea forces. A powerful defense posture is still one of the most effective deterrents to aggression. Whatever the answer to the question of time may be, the record of the South Koreans who have been on freedom's firing line for 15 years deserves the salute of the United States and the free world.

A Worthy Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, recently showed his deep concern for American taxpayers in offering an amendment requiring congressional authorization for all new foreign aid projects costing more than $100 million to the foreign assistance bill of 1963. In light of the widespread dissatisfaction with results of the foreign aid program, his timely proposal would give Congress opportunity to express its will on sizable additions to our foreign aid program.

It is regrettable that Mr. BROOMFIELD's worthy suggestion was rejected by a very close vote in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Since I understand that this amendment will be offered when the House considers the foreign aid authorization bill, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., dated August 5, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD as an indication of local interest in Mr. BROOMFIELD's efforts:

A WORTHY CAUSE

Because an amendment sponsored by Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Republican, of Michigan, would provide an additional check on this country's multibillion-dollar annual foreign aid spending, it is regrettable that the proposal was defeated last week by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Michigan Congressman's amendment would have required specific congressional authorization for all new foreign aid projects costing more than $100 million.

Such a regulation would have called for a congressional review of any decision by the administration to help India build a giant new steel plant. Representative BROOMFIELD had hoped that the amendment would help to prevent participation by the United States in the proposed steel mill project.

Even though a review of the steel mill transaction might not have the result that Representative BROOMFIELD hoped for, a requirement for specific congressional authorization for foreign aid projects costing U.S. taxpayers more than $100 million could serve a highly useful purpose.

It is possible that one effect would be a significant reduction of America's foreign aid outlays that might lighten the Federal tax burden and improve this country's serious international balance-of-payments situation.

There is some encouragement in the fact that 15 of the 32 committee members voting supported the amendment. Perhaps some of the congressmen will change their minds after further consideration of the possible benefits of Representative BROOMFIELD's proposal and the committee minority will become the majority.

The workload of Congress probably would be increased considerably if every foreign aid project costing more than $100 million required specific authorization by the lawmakers, but the additional effort would be devoted to what millions of taxpayers would consider to be a most worthy cause.

Fred M. Myers, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished lawyers in the United States died recently in my home town of Pittsfield, Mass. He was a dear friend of mine, and a man whose life history is the ultimate in inspiration, as well as genuine accomplishment. F. M. Myers overcame the numbing effects of polio in his early life and graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Williams College before completing Harvard Law School.

A fellow of the American Bar Association, a member of the American College of Trial Lawyers, past president of the Harvard Law School Association of Massachusetts, Fred was also past president of the Berkshire Bar Association, librarian of the Berkshire County Law Library and director of the Berkshire Bank and Trust Co.

But these and other listings of Mr. Myers' great civic and community contribution, Mr. Speaker, do not summarize the life of a man who never deviated from principle, a man of integrity and courage.

As a young lawyer in Pittsfield, I came to know Fred Myers and can honestly say that I have never met a more inspiring lawyer and individual. All of us who were fortunate to know him feel a great sense of loss, not only for the community that is ours but for the greater State and Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit for the RECORD, a review of Mr. Myers' life which appeared in the Pittsfield Berkshire Eagle of August 12, 1963:

FRED M. MYERS, SR., 75, DIES; LEADING LAWYER, CITIZEN

Attorney Frederick M. Myers of 106 Crofut Street, for many years a leader in area legal, business, and civic affairs, died yesterday at the Albany (N.Y.) Medical Center. He was 75.

Mr. Myers was born in Pownal, Vt. He attended public schools in Bennington, graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Williams College and became a member of the Bar Association in 1912, shortly after graduating from Harvard Law School.

He started his practice in North Adams, moved to Pittsfield in 1913 and joined Attorney Clarence P. Niles here in 1914. Later he was a member of the firm of Kellogg, Cande & Myers, and since 1940 had operated his own firm. His son, Frederick M., Jr., has been associated with the firm since 1950.

The Berkshire Bar Association last December honored him on his completion of 50 years as a lawyer. Attorney Paul A. Tamburello, then president of the association, termed Mr. Myers a "worthy foe and a legal giant." Mr. Tamburello said the association had decided not to present Mr. Myers with the customary illuminated certificate of honor because of the certainty he would not display it in his office. Mr. Myers crustily agreed that the association was correct in its assumption.

SPECIAL JUSTICE

Mr. Myers had been a special justice of the Central Berkshire District Court in Pittsfield since he was named to that post in 1920 by the then Governor, Calvin Coolidge.

A lifelong Republican, he never ran for public office, but there are many people who have more than suspicions that he saw to it that a lot of other people did run.

In Pittsfield civic affairs, he was a leader in the movement which produced a nonpartisan charter for the city 31 years ago. He was named to the Pittsfield Planning Board when it was formed in 1937 and served as chairman from 1948 until he was replaced in 1959. As chairman, he also headed the city's capital outlay committee.

We was on the board of the Pittsfield YMCA 22 years and was chairman of the Board of Permament Funds of the First Baptist Church.

A POLIO VICTIM

Mr. Myers was severely crippled in his youth by polio. However, despite this handicap he was one of the most adamant physical and mental independents in the county Adversaries in or out of the courtroom who didn't learn to answer Mr. Myers' vocal attacks in kind found they were no match for him.

He handled many important cases during his 50 years as a lawyer. In the legal profession his most lasting contribution probably will prove to be the establishment of the validity of out-of-State consent divorces.

This resulted from the Sherrer case, which was initiated by Judge Myers in 1947. Mr. Myers representing Mrs. Margaret E. Sherrer, formerly of Monterey, argued that her Florida divorce was valid in Massachusetts. The Massachusetts Supreme Court ruled against Mr. Myers, but the U.S. Supreme Court upheld him.

The High Court ruled to the effect that a divorce is valid in any State if it is secured through due process of law in any State. The Supreme Court, in a decision by the then Chief Justice Vinson, said it was not the business of the Supreme Court to weigh the merits of various State divorce laws.

Judge Myers is survived by his widow, the former Ethel M. Murgittroyd; one son, Frederick M., Jr.; two daughters, Mrs. Barbara Cross, of New York City, and Mrs. Judith Shinn, of Vestal, N.Y., and four grandchildren.

GOP Critical Issues Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 4, 1963, the Republican Citizens Committee announced the formation of a Critical Issues Council, according to a Herald Tribune article of August 5.

Like the formation of the Committee on Increased Minority Staffing, the creation of the Critical Issues Council is another indication of the Republican Party's concern that the vital issues of our times be thoroughly and constructively debated, thought through, and acted upon. Coupled with adequate minority staff, the council will help make the Republican Party in Congress more effective than ever.

Below follows the full text of the Herald Tribune article about the Critical Issues Council:

GOP ISSUES GROUP PLAN—POSITIVISM

WASHINGTON.—The Republican Citizens Committee, 1-year-old organization of prominent non-office-holding members of the GOP, announced yesteday the establishment of a Critical Issues Council.

Its job will be to prepare position papers on major national issues. Its chairman will be Dr. Milton E. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University and brother of former President Eisenhower.

Among the 23 council members named so far are six ex-Cabinet members and Gen. Lauris Norstad, the former commander of NATO.

Undedlying the move is a major effort on the part of the party to erase the impression that Republicans lack positive programs. It has not received ringing endorsement from the congressional leadership.

Separate task forces will be set up, each to deal with a specific policy area such as defense, space, agriculture, population problems, education, nuclear testing. These are expected to draw heavily on academic sources for research assistance.

A special concern of the council's founders was the proliferation of public policy problems requiring expert knowledge. The council aims to mobilize the now largely dispersed experts on the Republican side as a counter to those concentrated in the Democratic administration.

Council members stress that their aim, as one put it, "is to inform the voters, not to influence the legislators."

The council, like its parent citizens committee, is to be made up entirely of nonofficeholders.

In preliminary soundings among GOP leaders on Capitol Hill, the committee got a mixed but generally favorable response to the critical issues council project. There was a smattering of outright opposition, based largely on feelings that it represented an invasion of the legislators' prerogatives. CHARLES HALLECK and EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican leaders of the House and Senate, respectively, were cool but not opposed. Most of the key GOP policymakers contacted, however, were enthusiastic in giving the committee a green light.

In part, this enthusiasm was tied to a complaint being voiced with increasing urgency by a number of congressional Republicans: that committee staffs are lopsidedly weighted in favor of the majority party, with minority members getting inadequate staff assistance.

The council expects to work with Republican members of the congressional committees and with the Republican National Committee, but not to be bound by specific Republican congressional positions. "The positions taken," Dr. Eisenhower said, "will be those of a citizens' organization and not those of a particular elected official or group."

As the project has taken shape, there have been fears expressed that it would result in an effort to rewrite basic Republican doctrines. But leaders in the move disavow any such aim, insisting that they want only to apply generally agreed-on Republican doctrines to specific problems.

What the council chiefly hopes to accomplish according to its founders, is:

To provide a mechanism by which Republicans can both formulate and air specific alternatives to specific administration proposals, and also develop policy initiatives of their own.

To give greater visibility to Republican proposals.

To make additional research facilities available to Republicans both in and out of Congress.

To enlist broader academic participation.

On problems requiring expert knowledge, to utilize the experience of Republican experts not now in office.

Those named to the critical issues council so far are—

Robert B. Anderson, Elliott V. Bell, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Albert L. Cole, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Marion B. Folsom, Thomas S. Gates, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Dr. Walter H. Judd, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, Dr. Deane Malott, James P. Mitchell, Gen. Lauris Norstad, Dr. Don Paarlberg, C. Wrede Petersmeyer, Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., Charles S. Rhyne, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, Lewis L. Strauss, Walter N. Thayer.

Independence of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, the Republic of India celebrates the 16th anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru; and His Excellency, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, B. K. Nehru.

Sixteen years ago Great Britain gave up the brightest jewel in the crown of its world empire. On August 15, 1947, India received its freedom and independence and took its place amon gthe great countries of the world. The people of India today celebrate the anniversary of the historic and happy occasion.

Under the great leaders, Gandhi and Nehru, India has achieved a position of influence and leadership in Asia. It has a democratic representative form of government that makes it the most populous democracy in the world. The Indian constitution provides for universal adult suffrage. A method of simplified and secret ballotting is used during elections. On three occasions India has successfully conducted the largest free elections ever held in the world.

India has made important beginnings in economic growth and social progress and has carefully considered its approach to the problem of development as a whole. The massive 5-year plans have brought an improved standard of living to the people of India. In these efforts to develop its economy, India has respected the will of the people and has not resorted to the totalitarian methods used in Communist countries. India and the Indian people can feel a sense of pride and accomplishment about many things they have done since independence. But there are many problems and difficulties that remain to challenge their ingenuity.

The standard of living in India is still one of the lowest in the world. How can it be raised significantly? Is it possible for India to greatly increase its agricultural yield and, at the same time, to effectively slow down the growth of its population? Can India, largely agricultural and unaccustomed to machines, be rapidly transformed into a modern industrialized country? How can the 80 percent of the Indian people who are illiterate be taught how to read and write, and also how can they be made to fill

their roles as responsible members of a democratic country?

These are some of the questions and difficulties that confront India today. But no list is complete that does not include the problem of Communist China. India and China are the two great rivals in Asia. In their developmnt both countries have started at about the same time at the same level. But in their approaches to development there has been a great contrast. Will India and the democratic path to development that it follows produce results as fast as the Chinese Communist totalitarian rule? The leaders in both countries know that the stakes in the contest are very high. The other countries of Asia and the rest of the developing world are watching closely to see whether India or China succeeds best in handling the problems of progress. The outcome will have a profound impact on the future.

The interest of the United States in India centers on the question of whether or not India can remain outside the Communist bloc and can achieve growth and prosperity as a democracy. As the leader of the democratic world, the United States must be sensitive to the needs of the people of India. In the past the United States has contributed generously to India's development. This country should continue to do what it can to help the world's most populous democracy along the path of progress.

Castro Strangles Cuba's Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1963, Radio Havana beamed a propaganda broadcast in English to Europe which it described as a interview of certain students from the United States who made an unauthorized trip to Cuba and accepted the hospitality of the Castro government.

While the broadcast comments of the students were generally favorable to the Castro regime, it was interesting to note that their comments confirmed the repression of press freedom. These students from the United States seemingly saw little cause for concern in this, and several accepted the mission of the Cuban press as a government instrument to educate and unite the people as reasonable and proper. They suggested, in fact, that press criticism of the regime could not be expected, anyway, because there was so little anti-Castro sentiment on the Cuban island.

It is most regrettable that these students should lend themselves to the propaganda effort of the Soviet-directed Communist dictatorship which has enslaved the Cuban people and made of the island a base for subversive excursions against the free republics of the hemisphere. Their willingness to assist in the attempt to justify press manipulation by the Castro government serves to recall, however, the methodical strangulation of Cuba's channels of free information.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an article which appeared in the June 1963, issue of Author and Journalist, a magazine published in Denver, Colo. The article, which follows, was written by George Holcomb, a member of the editorial staff of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C., who also is active as a freelance writer, particularly on matters related to the techniques of the world Communist conspiracy:

AND THE FREE PRESS WAS DEAD

(By George Holcomb)

Cuba's free press did not die in silence in 1960. Fragile though she was, she screamed and fought as the hammer rained blow after blow upon her and the sickle relentlessly ripped out her vitals. She cried out to the world in her mortal agony, but the neighbors all around would not hear. She expired alone.

Why? What was the world press doing during those lost free moments of the Cuban press? Where were the correspondents of the U.S. magazines and press associations and giant dailies?

Writing of the assassination of Cuba's free press, I see her blood staining the hands of every free journalist who was there when it happened but did not let us know. How many saw, heard, spoke of no evil, until the deed was done?

There are many ways to sap the life out of a free press, and Fidel Castro and his Communist and fellow opportunists used most of them. The methods are always alike, whether used by Fascists, Communists, Nazis, opportunists, politicians, quislings, or what have you.

First and foremost is the method of intimidation used against newsboys, drivers, reporters, newscasters, editors, typographers, artists, publishers, advertisers, readers, television viewers, legislators, foreign correspondents, and government officials. Different means of intimidation are used against different types of persons.

Name calling was the most common weapon. Any writer who charged that Communists were moving into Castro's government was repeatedly smeared as irresponsible, an extremist, as a former hireling of Fulgencia Batista, a Fascist, as a current hireling of the U.S. State Department or the "sia"—CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), and finally as a promoter of counterrevolution. Perhaps, indeed, some of the smears were not smears; perhaps some of the name calling was truthful. But it made no difference, obviously not to the principal smear artists, such as Fidel and his little brother Raul, who liked to wear his hair long.

There are many other methods of intimidation, and they were used. Mobs were organized outside radio stations and newspaper plants from which offending words had come. Newsboys were beaten. Newstrucks were sabotaged. Papers were stolen and burned. Rocks were hurled, windows broken. Pickets were active. Mock burials of newspapers were conducted by parading activists. Effigies of writers and publishers were hung and burned. Advertisers were threatened, stoned, boycotted. Employees were forced to choose between loyalty to their employer or to their Communist-led unions, and they were pressured and browbeaten until they either turned against their employer or quit jobs in defeat and frustration. And then there was blackmail. And confiscation by the revolution.

It began the very day Batista fled the island, January 1, 1959. Although the sudden departure reportedly surprised Castro, he obviously had plans ready for immediate action with regard to the press.

Before the end of the day, armed men took over five daily Havana newspapers and some radio stations. Who was to object? They had been identified as Batista papers and stations. Similar outright and lawless confiscations took place in other cities.

Also on that same day, the Communist Party daily, Hoy, resumed publication in the city of Santiago de Cuba. This publication had been stolen from the Cuban Confederation of Labor some years earlier, but the confederation officials were not ready to assert their claim. Only the Communists were prepared. Hoy's editor: Communist Carlos Rafael Rodriguez.

Thus, before Castro entered Havana triumphantly on January 8, he already had several important press outlets grinding out propaganda for him. One of the stolen Batista dailies was renamed Revolution, and Castro designated it as his official publication, spokesman for his 26th of July movement. Its editor: Communist Carlos Franqui. Thereafter Franqui attended Castro's Cabinet meetings.

Castro also had ready access to television, and he made frequent use of TV as he discovered how effective were his speeches. He easily matches Mussolini and Hitler in demagoguery.

The bearded leader was now ready to manage the news in several ways: By feeding handouts to favored publications; by permitting only reporters for the Communist papers to have access to government offices—to police, military, and judicial areas; by openly demonstrating his pique about articles which did not please him; and by monopolizing a considerable amount of television time as a means of creating a mob psychology in his favor.

Two days after he arrived in Havana, Castro announced he was clearing the path for the "Communists to act as a legal party," using the name of "Popular Socialist Party."

Daniel James, author of the well-researched "Cuba—First Soviet Satellite in the Americas," noted that the only party Castro legalized was the Communist and said:

"More incredible, in a sense, than Fidel Castro's brazen show of partisanship in favor of the Cuban Communist Party was the fact that no powerful voices were raised against this act."

But this was the executive of the nation. There was no Congress to counter his power. The judiciary was in no position to oppose him; already he was setting up "people's courts" to try persons singled out as Batistianos, especially to the military. The military forces, however, were divided and disorganized. Ultimately, Castro destroyed the organized military forces, since they represented the only possible group that could copy with the paramilitary might of the Communists and their allies who thought Fidel could do no evil.

It has been estimated that at least 60 men, including several army officers, were sent a paredon—to the wall—for execution that night of January 10, 1959, in the Havana area alone. For many there was not even the formality of a trial. Their bodies were covered by use of a bulldozer.

Who could dare to raise a voice against Fidel and the Communists under such circumstances?

But the circumstances were soon to grow worse, as Fidel used various tactics popularized by misguided or unethical trade unionists. For example, Castro addressed a union rally and attacked a weekly publication, Zig Zag, which had published an editorial cartoon showing a number of bureaucrats who had been Batista sychophants in the past but who now were trailing a parade led by Fidel. He also reportedly criticized Jorge Zayas, publisher of Avance, a major Havana daily.

What was wrong with this? Castro said he would never engage in censorship of the press, since there were other ways to handle it. He mentioned the boycott.

Carlos Todd, then editor of the Times of Havana, has reported that he alone among the many editors in the city expressed concern about Castro's obvious hypocrisy and attempt to censor the press while saying he would never censor the press.

What harm in a boycott? Didn't the Bostonians do worse in protest against a certain tea tax nearly 2 centuries ago? But there is a difference. On the one hand you have the head of a government trying to use his vast powers to reduce dissent, to create a one-party machine, a state-run political monopoly. The Communists call it "monolithic unity," or the use of "discipline." On the other hand you have the Bostonians protesting the use of monopoly powers by the government of King George.

Before going any further with this, we might well pause and ask ourselves whether we, under similar circumstances, would recognize the early phases of a takeover by a totalitarian-minded regime? What are some touchstones of democracy? I believe there are at least four, which I've tussled with considerably so as to make them as meaningful as possible: (1) Even the least amongst us is free of coercive influences; (2) at decisionmaking times, the use of a secret ballot which affords ample opportunity for dissent is automatic; (3) everyone amply and equally has easy access to truly competitive points of view before making decisions; (4) every adult has freedom of choice between at least two openly opposing factions during the regular selection of government executives and legislators. Perhaps a fifth should deal with certain basic rights of which no one may be deprived even by government, but I believe this is covered under the first point.

On January 29, 1959, Humberto Medrano, an editor of the Presna Libre, published by his father-in-law, wrote an article recalling that in the famous Castro Manifesto of the Sierra Maestra dated July 12, 1957, Castro had promised his provisional government would be based on "absolute guarantee of freedom of information of the press * * * and of all individual and political rights guaranteed by the Constitution" of 1940.

The response was indirect, and hindsight shows it was part of the intimidation strategy. The Castro mouthpiece, Revolucion published an exclusive scoop—a list of names of writers and others on an undated unsigned sheet of stationery of the kind used by Batista. Revolucion stated as a fact that this was a list of persons who had been on Batista's payroll. The Big Lie technique.

Todd later reported that the "delirious and credulous people of Cuba" accepted the statement from the Communist-run newspaper as "gospel truth." Hitler, Mussolini, and others often used such tactics which they picked up from their associations with Marxists and Machiavellians.

But if the Cuban non-Communist editors were too numb to question the Big Lie, still, they were getting somehow uncomfortable. Sergio Carbo, publisher and editor of Presna Libre, and the editors of El Diario de la Marina, published by Jose Ignacio Rivero, began suggesting it was time to prepare for the free elections so long acclaimed by Fidel.

This time the response was more undisguished than ever before. At a gigantic open gathering in the Plaza of the Alameda de Paula, Fidel Castro flourished copies of Presna Libre and the Diario and shouted forth his displeasure. They were trying to undermine the prestige of the "revolution," he charged with great apparent emotion. He seemed especially incensed at Carbo's questioning the mass dismissals of Government employees in certain key departments.

Carbo has said that months later he recognized why Castro had reacted so sensitively; Communists were being brought in to fill some of the vacancies resulting from the mass layoffs or discharges. Castro obviously was trying to cover up.

Castro's denunciations were carried live on radio and television throughout Cuba. Many Cubans expressed shocked anger at the publishers for having suggested that Fidel was not a great patriot giving his all for his people. Here and there, it is said, some Cubans were troubled by Fidel's attack on the publishers. But these were the gentler folk, who kept their mouths shut. This was in March 1959.

El Diario, an open advocate of private enterprise and, even, of profits, had survived 127 years, through many dictatorships. It had been owned by Rivero's family since 1895. Occasionally it opened its columns to Lopez Fresquet, Castro's Minister of Finance. It was conservative but hardly antirevolution.

Even so, it was a major obstacle to the state-press monopoly toward which Castro was driving. He brought Lazaro Pena and other experienced Communist labor agents to Havana. The Communist Pena had headed the labor federation for Batista some years earlier.

The labor agents moved cautiously, for they did not control the unions at this time. A few months of preparation were needed.

By July 9, 1959, Castro was ready with his "Code of Special Defense." He explained its necessity. The "revolution" was being endangered by critics whose intentions were evil. The code contained many provisions, such as a couple which would enable Castro lawfully to execute any writer or broadcaster found guilty of inciting "counterrevolutionary crimes" resulting in deaths.

Article 149 said "whosoever shall introduce, publish, propagate, or try to control in Cuba any dispatch, order, or decree which tends to impair the independence of the nation or encourage nonobservance of the laws in effect" was subject to imprisonment for from 6 to 18 years. Who could object to a law in favor of "independence"?

Article 156 said "the incitement, carried out publicly, of feelings that may lead to the commission of some of the counterrevolutionary crimes noted in articles 128, 147, 148, and 149 shall be punished by imprisonment of from 10 to 20 years. But if, as a direct or indirect consequence of that incitement, acts of violence result against the revolutionary government in which lives are lost, the penalty shall be from 20 years' imprisonment to death."

On September 28, 1959, Castro in one of his television spectacles charged three writers of Avance with being guilty of writing "counterrevolutionary" articles. But he did not move to prosecute.

He didn't need to; some of the writers and editors could take the hint, and they began the exodus from Cuba that will continue so long as Castro finds it convenient to expel rather than to kill the gusanos—the worms, those who do not cooperate willfully.

By November, the Communists with Fidel's open, direct, and personal intervention managed to force a united-front management upon the main labor confederation, despite what has been described as the overwhelming opposition of delegates at the crucial convention. The tactics of some unionists, the obtaining of monopoly control over a labor force and the use of that monopoly to prevent competition by "dissidents," were strangely identical to those of the Communists. How could the non-Communists object to giving the Communists an equal opportunity to participate? Weren't they for fairplay?

This fairplay ploy soon appeared in another form. On January 11, 1960, Fidel opened the New Year with a major speech. Once again he denounced the privately owned press and announced that henceforth all press association articles permitted to circulate by sufferance of his Government must—in the interest of fairplay—be accompanied by statements of "clarification" of any facts or opinions deemed not in the public interest.

The Prensa Libre, biggest Havana daily, promptly labeled the "clarifications" as "coletillas," or postscripts.

Who wrote the coletillas? By now Fidel felt this duty could be performed by certain loyal followers who were beginning to run the newspaper unions.

Some publishers, notably Jorge Zayas of Avance, refused to run the coletillas. Zayas had been recalcitrant for some time. Thus, one time when he returned home from a trip to the United States, he had been detained and questioned by the police.

The right of private ownership and control of a newspaper was at stake. Did the unions, acting with the consent and encouragement of the government, have the right to dictate what the publishers should print?

"Yes," said the Communists; it was in the public interest and was part of the right of freedom of choice and of fairplay. No publisher should be the sole judge of what he published; the unions equally had the right to determine how their product was used, insisted the Communist.

On January 18, 1960, according to Zayas' report, a mob of printers—members of the graphic arts union—marched on Avance and took possession of it in the name of the "revolution." The leader of the mob was Communist Dagoberto Ponce. Zayas wisely fled, the first of the major publishers to be driven into exile.

Does the tale grow too long? Do the details bore you? Well, suffice to say, about the same tactics soon brought down all but the two biggest dailies: Prensa Libre and El Diario de la Marina.

By June 1960 the coletilla directive had been extended to every publication, to every article circulated in public, in the public interest.

The association of journalists, the news reporters' union, was now headed by Communist Tirso Martinez. If any publisher refused to publish a coletilla demanded by the association of journalists or by the graphic arts union, he could be charged with provoking a strike by locking out his employees.

After all, jobs were growing scarce in the business, what with the folding of so many newspapers, so a publisher would be quite an ogre to refuse to publish copy produced by his own employees, now, wouldn't he?

Now the parades of unionists carrying coffins labeled "Prensa Libre" and "Diario" became common.

Yet nearly 80 percent of Prensa's staff signed a bold statement supporting the publishers right to private property. So, the next day they were called to a major union meeting, presided over by David Salvador himself, head of the Labor Confederation. It is reported that for 7 consecutive hours the Prensa workers were harangued and badgered until they finally agreed to sign a statement pledging first loyalty to the union rather than to their employer. Otherwise, they could be smeared as "finks."

A similar situation hit Diario. A letter of support for the publisher's rights to publish was signed by some 400 Diario employees.

Editor Jose Ignacio Rivero has reported that he decided to publish the Diario employees' letter, and he sent it to the composing room for preparation. Some time later, while at lunch, he received a frantic call to return to the plant. He arrived to find 20 unionists using hammers to destroy the plate on which the letter had been cast.

Shaken but not intimidated, Rivero ordered the casting of another cylinder, and he stood by until he saw the presses begin their run. Finally, he went home.

The next morning he was confronted by his own newspaper's headlines labeling him a "Fascist" and "Yankee imperialist," according to Reader's Digest Editors James Monahan and Kenneth O. Gilmore.

Rivero went to the Peruvian Embassy and obtained asylum. That evening on television he watched the final "burial" of the Diario being conducted at the foot of a monument on the campus of the University of Havana.

The Prensa editors bravely published complete details of the destruction of the Diario's freedom and printed an editorial attacking the "gravediggers."

Not unexpectedly, the Communist Revolucion responded with headlines screaming the signal to faithful fellow travelers: "Prensa Libre Going the Way of Diario de la Marina."

And it did. A mob gathered. Goon squads seized newsstands' supplies of papers, etc. The mob, including a few Prensa employees, stormed through the plant and took over.

It was May 16, 1960, not even 17 months after Castro was handed Cuba. And the free press was dead.

Distorted Farm Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with the question of agricultural legislation still pending before this Congress, I feel it is timely to call attention to a thoughtful editorial which appeared on August 4, 1963, in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich. This editorial underscores the importance of the American farmer to our economy and I commend it to my colleagues:

DISTORTED FARM IMAGE

Using a Madison Avenue expression, Veril Baldwin, founder of the 1,500-acre Baldwin Farms enterprise near Stockbridge, says he believes there is a great need for improving the image of American agriculture.

Mr. Baldwin insists there are many misconceptions in the public's mind about the role of the farmer in our Nation's economy. Instead of the public's subsidizing agriculture, for instance, he contends that in many instances the farmers are in fact subsidizing the public.

Here is the reason for the reverse twist: While the prices the farmer receives for his products have remained quite constant the past two decades, the prices he pays for machinery, equipment, and other things to keep his farm operating have doubled or more. Mr. Baldwin cites as an instance a tractor, for which he paid $7,500 a decade ago. Today it would cost $14,000, he says.

Statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture bear out these viewspoints.

Farming has become big business. It requires a much larger investment than was the case not so many years ago. The average farm today involves an outlay of $42,000 for land, buildings, and equipment. That's seven times what it cost in 1940. But many have more than $100,000 invested. The average return on the farmer's investment is less than 4 percent.

The trend is toward fewer and larger farms. American farmers are using less than half the manpower and 12 million fewer acres than they did in 1920, but they are now able to produce nearly twice as much food and fiber for us and the rest of the world. The average farm size increased from 215 acres in 1950 to 302 acres in 1960.

As Mr. Baldwin points out, food is a better buy today than ever before. The consuming public spends a much smaller percentage of its income for food, the quality of which also has improved.

Arthur Mauch, extension specialist in agricultural economics at Michigan State University, says that Americans spend less for food now in relation to our income than in all of our history and less than any other country in the world. In 1947, our $46 billion food bill took 27 percent of our income, while the $70 billion spent for this necessity of life in 1959 took only 21 percent of our income.

Mr. Mauch points out that the food bargain is even more striking when compared with the income and food expenditures of the American factory worker. The factory worker now spends only 23 percent of his earnings for food. Only 10 years ago the percentage was 35; 20 years ago, 41; and 30 years ago, 48, or nearly half of his earnings.

Scientists in agriculture have directly improved health and helped cure some of man's oldest ailments. Nutritional diseases, such as goiter, rickets, anemia, pellegra, beriberi, scurvy, and night blindness, were common a few decades ago but now are comparatively rare.

There is no denying that agriculture has a good image as a customer. Dealers in livestock feeds, fertilizers, insecticides, automobiles, trucks, tractors, combines, and other farm equipment appreciate the business they receive from the farmers. American farmers spent about $27 billion for all the seed, fertilizer, and equipment it took to produce the 1961 crops. In addition, farm families spent $15 billion for household appliances, homes, medical care, education, vacations, and other things that Americans enjoy.

Yes, agriculture plays a vital role in the national economy. Its importance explains to some extent why there has been so much effort, some of it admittedly misguided, on the part of Congress to support this industry. The Federal Government is now spending about $7 billion a year in a quite unsatisfactory program aimed at reducing farm surpluses and rural poverty.

Out of the welter of criticisms aimed at the agricultural aid program may come revisions that will offer at least partial solutions for the farm dilemma.

Any step in that direction would be welcome and potentially beneficial to the farmer and public alike. Particularly encouraging would be constructive action to pare down the mountains of surplus farm products and the huge annual Government subsidies.

This would be progress and it would tend to do what Mr. Baldwin suggests is needed. It would be one way of improving the image of American agriculture.

Independence of the Republic of the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, the Republic of the Congo celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Fulbert Youlou; and His Excellency, the Congolese Ambassador to the United States, Emmanuel Dadet.

Three years ago the Republic of the Congo—Brazzaville—not to be confused with its sister republic across the river, the former Belgian Congo—achieved independence from France after some 80 years of colonial rule. Its accession to independence was far less turbulent than that of the former Belgian Congo, with the result that in general much less is known about the country, its people, and its progress since independence.

The Congo has been said to be the "least favored by nature" of the countries which formerly comprised French Equatorial Africa, but if this is so, its people have more than made up for any natural barriers to progress by their diligence and determination to build a politically and economically viable republic. Its parliamentary government, headed by its able President, Mr. Fulbert Youlou, has already gained a reputation for stability and realistic planning. With its neighbors—Chad, Gabon, and the Central African Republic—it shares a customs union and has agreed upon procedures and organizations for joint administration and development of regional transportation, communications, fiscal matters, research, and other services. The Congo Republic has become one of the staunchest leaders of movements for African unity, and its capital city, Brazzaville, gave its name to the moderate Brazzaville group of 12 French-speaking states. Its relations with other countries on the African continent and with the world at large have been marked by cooperation and clear-sightedness.

It is true that nature could have been more generous toward the Republic of Congo. The chief livelihood of the people is agriculture, and the inland Niari Basin is a fertile agricultural region. But except for this area, the land is generally unfavorable. The swampy coastline fades into a sandy treeless plain cut off from the fertile interior by a range of forest-covered mountains. The northernmost part of the country is dense rain forest. The Congo has little mineral wealth to be exploited, but in spite of these obstacles the economy is expanding.

Industry is growing, and output now accounts for 11 percent of the country's gross national product. Food processing, lumber and woodworking, shipbuilding, iron and metal works, soap and cigarette manufacture, and the construction industries are presently the most important. The Congo does have one important natural resource—its forest wealth—which is still just being tapped. Timber and timber products accounted for over two-thirds of the Congo's export earnings in 1962.

Although the terrain makes transportation and communications difficult, the Congo has one of the best transportation systems in Africa. The 320-mile Congo-Ocean railroad links its two major cities, the ocean port of Pointe-Noire and the Capital and Congo River port of Brazzaville. This railroad runs through

What was wrong with this? Castro said he would never engage in censorship of the press, since there were other ways to handle it. He mentioned the boycott.

Carlos Todd, then editor of the Times of Havana, has reported that he alone among the many editors in the city expressed concern about Castro's obvious hypocrisy and attempt to censor the press while saying he would never censor the press.

What harm in a boycott? Didn't the Bostonians do worse in protest against a certain tea tax nearly 2 centuries ago? But there is a difference. On the one hand you have the head of a government trying to use his vast powers to reduce dissent, to create a one-party machine, a state-run political monopoly. The Communists call it "monolithic unity," or the use of "discipline." On the other hand you have the Bostonians protesting the use of monopoly powers by the government of King George.

Before going any further with this, we might well pause and ask ourselves whether we, under similar circumstances, would recognize the early phases of a takeover by a totalitarian-minded regime? What are some touchstones of democracy? I believe there are at least four, which I've tussled with considerably so as to make them as meaningful as possible: (1) Even the least amongst us is free of coercive influences; (2) at decisionmaking times, the use of a secret ballot which affords ample opportunity for dissent is automatic; (3) everyone amply and equally has easy access to truly competitive points of view before making decisions; (4) every adult has freedom of choice between at least two openly opposing factions during the regular selection of government executives and legislators. Perhaps a fifth should deal with certain basic rights of which no one may be deprived even by government, but I believe this is covered under the first point.

On January 29, 1959, Humberto Medrano, an editor of the Presna Libre, published by his father-in-law, wrote an article recalling that in the famous Castro Manifesto of the Sierra Maestra dated July 12, 1957, Castro had promised his provisional government would be based on "absolute guarantee of freedom of information of the press * * * and of all individual and political rights guaranteed by the Constitution" of 1940.

The response was indirect, and hindsight shows it was part of the intimidation strategy. The Castro mouthpiece, Revolucion published an exclusive scoop—a list of names of writers and others on an undated unsigned sheet of stationery of the kind used by Batista. Revolucion stated as a fact that this was a list of persons who had been on Batista's payroll. The Big Lie technique.

Todd later reported that the "delirious and credulous people of Cuba" accepted the statement from the Communist-run newspaper as "gospel truth." Hitler, Mussolini, and others often used such tactics which they picked up from their associations with Marxists and Machiavellians.

But if the Cuban non-Communist editors were too numb to question the Big Lie, still, they were getting somehow uncomfortable. Sergio Carbo, publisher and editor of Presna Libre, and the editors of El Diario de la Marina, published by Jose Ignacio Rivero, began suggesting it was time to prepare for the free elections so long acclaimed by Fidel.

This time the response was more undisguished than ever before. At a gigantic open gathering in the Plaza of the Alameda de Paula, Fidel Castro flourished copies of Presna Libre and the Diario and shouted forth his displeasure. They were trying to undermine the prestige of the "revolution," he charged with great apparent emotion. He seemed especially incensed at Carbo's questioning the mass dismissals of Government employees in certain key departments.

Carbo has said that months later he recognized why Castro had reacted so sensitively; Communists were being brought in to fill some of the vacancies resulting from the mass layoffs or discharges. Castro obviously was trying to cover up.

Castro's denunciations were carried live on radio and television throughout Cuba. Many Cubans expressed shocked anger at the publishers for having suggested that Fidel was not a great patriot giving his all for his people. Here and there, it is said, some Cubans were troubled by Fidel's attack on the publishers. But these were the gentler folk, who kept their mouths shut. This was in March 1959.

El Diario, an open advocate of private enterprise and, even, of profits, had survived 127 years, through many dictatorships. It had been owned by Rivero's family since 1895. Occasionally it opened its columns to Lopez Fresquet, Castro's Minister of Finance. It was conservative but hardly antirevolution.

Even so, it was a major obstacle to the state-press monopoly toward which Castro was driving. He brought Lazaro Pena and other experienced Communist labor agents to Havana. The Communist Pena had headed the labor federation for Batista some years earlier.

The labor agents moved cautiously, for they did not control the unions at this time. A few months of preparation were needed.

By July 9, 1959, Castro was ready with his "Code of Special Defense." He explained its necessity. The "revolution" was being endangered by critics whose intentions were evil. The code contained many provisions, such as a couple which would enable Castro lawfully to execute any writer or broadcaster found guilty of inciting "counterrevolutionary crimes" resulting in deaths.

Article 149 said "whosoever shall introduce, publish, propagate, or try to control in Cuba any dispatch, order, or decree which tends to impair the independence of the nation or encourage nonobservance of the laws in effect" was subject to imprisonment for from 6 to 18 years. Who could object to a law in favor of "independence"?

Article 156 said "the incitement, carried out publicly, of feelings that may lead to the commission of some of the counterrevolutionary crimes noted in articles 128, 147, 148, and 149 shall be punished by imprisonment of from 10 to 20 years. But if, as a direct or indirect consequence of that incitement, acts of violence result against the revolutionary government in which lives are lost, the penalty shall be from 20 years' imprisonment to death."

On September 28, 1959, Castro in one of his television spectacles charged three writers of Avance with being guilty of writing "counterrevolutionary" articles. But he did not move to prosecute.

He didn't need to; some of the writers and editors could take the hint, and they began the exodus from Cuba that will continue so long as Castro finds it convenient to expel rather than to kill the gusanos—the worms, those who do not cooperate willfully.

By November, the Communists with Fidel's open, direct, and personal intervention managed to force a united-front management upon the main labor confederation, despite what has been described as the overwhelming opposition of delegates at the crucial convention. The tactics of some unionists, the obtaining of monopoly control over a labor force and the use of that monopoly to prevent competition by "dissidents," were strangely identical to those of the Communists. How could the non-Communists object to giving the Communists an equal opportunity to participate? Weren't they for fairplay?

This fairplay ploy soon appeared in another form. On January 11, 1960, Fidel opened the New Year with a major speech. Once again he denounced the privately owned press and announced that henceforth all press association articles permitted to circulate by sufferance of his Government must—in the interest of fairplay—be accompanied by statements of "clarification" of any facts or opinions deemed not in the public interest.

The Prensa Libre, biggest Havana daily, promptly labeled the "clarifications" as "coletillas," or postscripts.

Who wrote the coletillas? By now Fidel felt this duty could be performed by certain loyal followers who were beginning to run the newspaper unions.

Some publishers, notably Jorge Zayas of Avance, refused to run the coletillas. Zayas had been recalcitrant for some time. Thus, one time when he returned home from a trip to the United States, he had been detained and questioned by the police.

The right of private ownership and control of a newspaper was at stake. Did the unions, acting with the consent and encouragement of the government, have the right to dictate what the publishers should print?

"Yes," said the Communists; it was in the public interest and was part of the right of freedom of choice and of fairplay. No publisher should be the sole judge of what he published; the unions equally had the right to determine how their product was used, insisted the Communist.

On January 18, 1960, according to Zayas' report, a mob of printers—members of the graphic arts union—marched on Avance and took possession of it in the name of the "revolution." The leader of the mob was Communist Dagoberto Ponce. Zayas wisely fled, the first of the major publishers to be driven into exile.

Does the tale grow too long? Do the details bore you? Well, suffice to say, about the same tactics soon brought down all but the two biggest dailies: Prensa Libre and El Diario de la Marina.

By June 1960 the coletilla directive had been extended to every publication, to every article circulated in public, in the public interest.

The association of journalists, the news reporters' union, was now headed by Communist Tirso Martinez. If any publisher refused to publish a coletilla demanded by the association of journalists or by the graphic arts union, he could be charged with provoking a strike by locking out his employees.

After all, jobs were growing scarce in the business, what with the folding of so many newspapers, so a publisher would be quite an ogre to refuse to publish copy produced by his own employees, now, wouldn't he?

Now the parades of unionists carrying coffins labeled "Prensa Libre" and "Diario" became common.

Yet nearly 80 percent of Prensa's staff signed a bold statement supporting the publishers right to private property. So, the next day they were called to a major union meeting, presided over by David Salvador himself, head of the Labor Confederation. It is reported that for 7 consecutive hours the Prensa workers were harangued and badgered until they finally agreed to sign a statement pledging first loyalty to the union rather than to their employer. Otherwise, they could be smeared as "finks."

A similar situation hit Diario. A letter of support for the publisher's rights to publish was signed by some 400 Diario employees.

Editor Jose Ignacio Rivero has reported that he decided to publish the Diario employees' letter, and he sent it to the composing room for preparation. Some time later, while at lunch, he received a frantic call to return to the plant. He arrived to find 20 unionists using hammers to destroy the plate on which the letter had been cast.

Shaken but not intimidated, Rivero ordered the casting of another cylinder, and he stood by until he saw the presses begin their run. Finally, he went home.

The next morning he was confronted by his own newspaper's headlines labeling him a "Fascist" and "Yankee imperialist," according to Reader's Digest Editors James Monahan and Kenneth O. Gilmore.

Rivero went to the Peruvian Embassy and obtained asylum. That evening on television he watched the final "burial" of the Diario being conducted at the foot of a monument on the campus of the University of Havana.

The Prensa editors bravely published complete details of the destruction of the Diario's freedom and printed an editorial attacking the "gravediggers."

Not unexpectedly, the Communist Revolucion responded with headlines screaming the signal to faithful fellow travelers: "Prensa Libre Going the Way of Diario de la Marina."

And it did. A mob gathered. Goon squads seized newsstands' supplies of papers, etc. The mob, including a few Prensa employees, stormed through the plant and took over.

It was May 16, 1960, not even 17 months after Castro was handed Cuba. And the free press was dead.

Distorted Farm Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with the question of agricultural legislation still pending before this Congress, I feel it is timely to call attention to a thoughtful editorial which appeared on August 4, 1963, in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich. This editorial underscores the importance of the American farmer to our economy and I commend it to my colleagues:

DISTORTED FARM IMAGE

Using a Madison Avenue expression, Veril Baldwin, founder of the 1,500-acre Baldwin Farms enterprise near Stockbridge, says he believes there is a great need for improving the image of American agriculture.

Mr. Baldwin insists there are many misconceptions in the public's mind about the role of the farmer in our Nation's economy. Instead of the public's subsidizing agriculture, for instance, he contends that in many instances the farmers are in fact subsidizing the public.

Here is the reason for the reverse twist: While the prices the farmer receives for his products have remained quite constant the past two decades, the prices he pays for machinery, equipment, and other things to keep his farm operating have doubled or more. Mr. Baldwin cites as an instance a tractor, for which he paid $7,500 a decade ago. Today it would cost $14,000, he says.

Statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture bear out these viewspoints.

Farming has become big business. It requires a much larger investment than was the case not so many years ago. The average farm today involves an outlay of $42,000 for land, buildings, and equipment. That's seven times what it cost in 1940. But many have more than $100,000 invested. The average return on the farmer's investment is less than 4 percent.

The trend is toward fewer and larger farms. American farmers are using less than half the manpower and 12 million fewer acres than they did in 1920, but they are now able to produce nearly twice as much food and fiber for us and the rest of the world. The average farm size increased from 215 acres in 1950 to 302 acres in 1960.

As Mr. Baldwin points out, food is a better buy today than ever before. The consuming public spends a much smaller percentage of its income for food, the quality of which also has improved.

Arthur Mauch, extension specialist in agricultural economics at Michigan State University, says that Americans spend less for food now in relation to our income than in all of our history and less than any other country in the world. In 1947, our $46 billion food bill took 27 percent of our income, while the $70 billion spent for this necessity of life in 1959 took only 21 percent of our income.

Mr. Mauch points out that the food bargain is even more striking when compared with the income and food expenditures of the American factory worker. The factory worker now spends only 23 percent of his earnings for food. Only 10 years ago the percentage was 35; 20 years ago, 41; and 30 years ago, 48, or nearly half of his earnings.

Scientists in agriculture have directly improved health and helped cure some of man's oldest ailments. Nutritional diseases, such as goiter, rickets, anemia, pellegra, beriberi, scurvy, and night blindness, were common a few decades ago but now are comparatively rare.

There is no denying that agriculture has a good image as a customer. Dealers in livestock feeds, fertilizers, insecticides, automobiles, trucks, tractors, combines, and other farm equipment appreciate the business they receive from the farmers. American farmers spent about $27 billion for all the seed, fertilizer, and equipment it took to produce the 1961 crops. In addition, farm families spent $15 billion for household appliances, homes, medical care, education, vacations, and other things that Americans enjoy.

Yes, agriculture plays a vital role in the national economy. Its importance explains to some extent why there has been so much effort, some of it admittedly misguided, on the part of Congress to support this industry. The Federal Government is now spending about $7 billion a year in a quite unsatisfactory program aimed at reducing farm surpluses and rural poverty.

Out of the welter of criticisms aimed at the agricultural aid program may come revisions that will offer at least partial solutions for the farm dilemma.

Any step in that direction would be welcome and potentially beneficial to the farmer and public alike. Particularly encouraging would be constructive action to pare down the mountains of surplus farm products and the huge annual Government subsidies.

This would be progress and it would tend to do what Mr. Baldwin suggests is needed. It would be one way of improving the image of American agriculture.

Independence of the Republic of the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, the Republic of the Congo celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Fulbert Youlou; and His Excellency, the Congolese Ambassador to the United States, Emmanuel Dadet.

Three years ago the Republic of the Congo—Brazzaville—not to be confused with its sister republic across the river, the former Belgian Congo—achieved independence from France after some 80 years of colonial rule. Its accession to independence was far less turbulent than that of the former Belgian Congo, with the result that in general much less is known about the country, its people, and its progress since independence.

The Congo has been said to be the "least favored by nature" of the countries which formerly comprised French Equatorial Africa, but if this is so, its people have more than made up for any natural barriers to progress by their diligence and determination to build a politically and economically viable republic. Its parliamentary government, headed by its able President, Mr. Fulbert Youlou, has already gained a reputation for stability and realistic planning. With its neighbors—Chad, Gabon, and the Central African Republic—it shares a customs union and has agreed upon procedures and organizations for joint administration and development of regional transportation, communications, fiscal matters, research, and other services. The Congo Republic has become one of the staunchest leaders of movements for African unity, and its capital city, Brazzaville, gave its name to the moderate Brazzaville group of 12 French-speaking states. Its relations with other countries on the African continent and with the world at large have been marked by cooperation and clear-sightedness.

It is true that nature could have been more generous toward the Republic of Congo. The chief livelihood of the people is agriculture, and the inland Niari Basin is a fertile agricultural region. But except for this area, the land is generally unfavorable. The swampy coastline fades into a sandy treeless plain cut off from the fertile interior by a range of forest-covered mountains. The northernmost part of the country is dense rain forest. The Congo has little mineral wealth to be exploited, but in spite of these obstacles the economy is expanding.

Industry is growing, and output now accounts for 11 percent of the country's gross national product. Food processing, lumber and woodworking, shipbuilding, iron and metal works, soap and cigarette manufacture, and the construction industries are presently the most important. The Congo does have one important natural resource—its forest wealth—which is still just being tapped. Timber and timber products accounted for over two-thirds of the Congo's export earnings in 1962.

Although the terrain makes transportation and communications difficult, the Congo has one of the best transportation systems in Africa. The 320-mile Congo-Ocean railroad links its two major cities, the ocean port of Pointe-Noire and the Capital and Congo River port of Brazzaville. This railroad runs through

rugged terrain and dense rain forest, crosses 92 bridges, and passes through 21 tunnels.

The Congo Republic also surpasses many of the other African countries in the fields of education and public health. The Government is spending about one-fourth of its annual budget on education, and school enrollment, encompassing nearly 75 percent of the children of school age, is one of the highest among the French-speaking countries of Africa. The development of medical facilities and a public health program has also been emphasized. The Congo has 2 large hospitals, 13 medical centers, and over 100 dispensaries.

We salute you, President Youlou, and the people of the Congo Republic for your admirable accomplishments since independence. May your future endeavors be equally successful.

Threat to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is well to remember the words that former President Eisenhower spoke recently in behalf of individual liberty and self-respect. We must be constantly aware and in control of our duties as responsible citizens, least we forsake our privileges to government control. A paternalistic government is no replacement for a government dedicated to democracy. Let us keep in mind the words of Eisenhower as quoted in the New York Mirror editorial of July 4, 1963, under the title "Threat to Liberty," which follows below:

THREAT TO LIBERTY

The "instant liberals" dismissed the speech as the counsel of a fuddy-duddy, but more reflective Americans could do worse than consider, on this anniversary of U.S. independence, some penetrating observations by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on the general subject of individual liberty and the survival of self-government.

Although Ike spoke on the eve of the centennial commemoration of the Battle of Gettysburg, it was by no means just a "Civil War talk." The issues he raised are philosophically much deeper and broader.

Ike posed a number of searching questions that he suggested all Americans ask themselves. Among them:

"Does self-government, for me, mean sturdy self-reliance—depending upon myself for all those things, tangible and intangible, that I am able, without government interference, to provide myself and my family? Or would I rather take from a paternalistic government every possible immediate advantage it can give, even if I do not really need it?

"Do I understand that for every responsibility I hope to shift to government I lose something of my individual rights and opportunities?"

The former President agreed that no American would consciously surrender his personal and political integrity, but.

"Bemused by glittering governmental pledges to relieve us of sometimes burdensome responsibilities for self, family and community, and bewitched by enticing offers of unneeded subsidies, we need constantly to rededicate ourselves to liberty, duty and democracy—never forgetting self-respect."

Well said, Ike. External threats to personal liberty are comparatively easy to spot. Internal threats are trickier, involving as they do the erosion of character and subtle abdication by default.

The Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy propaganda machine is in full operation to force acceptance of the test ban treaty by making it unpopular to oppose it. There are those who say it will be political suicide to be against the treaty. Perhaps, but I am not convinced the American people are so easily taken in, even by the publicity experts in the White House.

All of us are for peace. There are few who be for war and certainly we pray that a nuclear holocaust will never be visited upon the world. But even this terrible fate would not compare with the enslavement of the world by the Communists.

Up to this point the Kennedy spokesmen have relied entirely upon arousing the emotions of the people in order to get the test ban accepted. In the briefings and in the hearings now being conducted by the Senate, administration spokesmen shy away from facts. But facts must be presented before we are asked to accept the treaty. We must know that the United States is going to be protected against a doublecross by the Soviet Union, that we are not going to lose our lead in nuclear weapons systems, that we can develop an antimissile missile. None of the experts have presented evidence that we can, but our leading scientists have presented evidence that we cannot.

It is not enough for President Kennedy's spokesmen to tag opponents of the treaty with being for war and against peace. All the facts must be known to the American people and I, for one, intend to keep asking questions and urging thorough investigation before the lives of the American people and other nations are auctioned off on the block of Soviet intrigue.

Two significant articles appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 14 and I include them here in hope they may arouse others to demand that all sides be heard on this very vital question. The first is by David Lawrence, "Behind the Bright Treaty Facade," and the second by Richard Wilson, "Treaty and Khrushchev's Moods":

BEHIND THE BRIGHT TREATY FACADE: TIGHTENING OF THE IRON CURTAIN IS SEEN IN NEW SOVIET CONTROLS ON INFORMATION

(By David Lawrence)

Because of a superficial acceptance of the emotional cry that world peace is a step nearer by reason of the treaty limiting nuclear tests, Nikita Khrushchev and his Communist government are getting applause in many parts of the world, including this country. The dispatches from abroad give the impression that some kind of major step has been taken in the cause of humanity. Many Americans also have been led to believe this, since President Kennedy has called the treaty a "victory for mankind."

But the real news is to be found in the fragmentary disclosures of what goes on inside the totalitarian government in Moscow. A United Press International dispatch last Saturday night escaped general attention. Is it because Communist censorship, too, is accepted now as "normal"? The news item didn't make many front pages. But it contains the key to what's going on behind the Iron Curtain and tells more about the danger of war than do the hackneyed phrases of the treaty on nuclear testing. The dispatch says:

"The Soviet Union took the first concrete step toward a planned reform of information media today by setting up a state committee for the press with a little-known Communist official at its head.

"The plan to tighten control over Russian newspapers and publishing houses has been in the works for several months. It was formally announced during the ideology conference of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee in June.

"The announcement of the new state committee was made in two paragraphs in the government newspaper Izvestia, edited by Premier Nikita Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei.

"The June Central Commitee meeting on ideology described the Russian press, radio, television and cinema as 'the assault forces of the ideological front.'

"Under the reform plans, Moscow's 30 national and local newspapers were expected to be cut down sharply with the liquidation of specialized newspapers. But the Izvestia announcement gave no indication whether this plan would be carried out. It was expected the new state committee on the press would concern itself with raising the ideological content of Soviet newspapers and inculcating Russian leaders with Marxist-Leninist philosophy."

It so happens that state committees for radio, television, and the movies have been functioning in Russia for some time. The addition of a state committee for the press, which has just been announced, merely completes the process of concentrated control of all communications media throughout the Soviet Union.

Thus, a nation of 200 million people, as well as the peoples in other Communist-held countries in Eastern Europe, will not only continue to be deprived of much of the news of the rest of the world, but will be given heavy doses of Communist ideology every day in a massive "brainwashing" of the public. With only one political party permitted to have names on the ballot and with elections more or less perfunctory affairs, the dictatorship which holds sway in Moscow can at any moment persuade the people that the West is planning a war, that it is aggressive and may launch a surprise attack, and that hence the duty of the Soviet Union is to strike the "first blow."

This is the heart of the peace-or-war issue, and no amount of treaty-making to prevent a world conflict will be of avail if there is no free communication continuously between the peoples of the East and the West. To draw the Iron Curtain tighter than before and to erect walls and barriers to the flow of truth is to threaten world peace and to relegate to a position of unimportance all the agreements about nuclear testing in the air and in outer space and underwater. Because there is mutual distrust, both the East and the West will continue testing underground and will build bigger and deadlier missiles.

The truism that dictators and not people make wars has long been obvious, and that's why the sad news which has just come from Moscow is worthy of the attention of free peoples everywhere. For apparently suppression of truth is to be carried on even more comprehensively than before.

There is in this little cause for rejoicing about a "victory for mankind." The intensification of the censorship inside Russia and the second anniversary of the building of the Berlin wall certainly give symbolic emphasis to the fact that Western governments have failed to speak out forthrightly for the cause of human freedom. This is really a defeat for mankind.

TREATY AND KHRUSHCHEV'S MOODS: THOSE WHO RAISE RATIONAL OBJECTIONS ARE BELIEVED ENTITLED TO RESPECT

(By Richard Wilson)

The moods of Premier Khrushchev are wondrous to watch. They remain vivid in the mind of the witness. There was the Khrushchev in Paris snarling unprintable phrases at West German reporters in the front row of a 3,000-man press conference. The chairman was explaining why he broke with his "fishy friend," President Eisenhower, and torpedoed the summit conference of 1959 after the U-2 incident.

The benign, paternal Khrushchev was at his best in the parlor of an Iowa farmer, Roswell Garst, handing out gifts and remembrances to his American friends. A couple of days earlier he was bellowing at midnight because he thought he was insulted by the mayor of Los Angeles, and sent a representative to Henry Cabot Lodge, who was sitting around his hotel room in his underwear, to announce that he intended to break off his American tour and fly back to Moscow. He felt better the following day in San Francisco.

The bellicose Mr. Khrushchev practiced verbal assault and battery at the U.N. Those who saw him do it could not really believe afterward that he had actually hammered the desk with his shoe. It looked for a while as if Mr. Khrushchev would never go home but would stay in New York all winter.

Khrushchev, the debater, reached forensic heights in his wordy and menacing wrangle with Vice President Nixon in the exhibit kitchen of the American fair in Moscow. This was the intractable Khrushchev who did not even hesitate to rise later to object to a Nixon statement during a formal public speech.

The reasonable, rational Khrushchev was at Camp David with President Eisenhower. Khrushchev, the good guest, was also with General Eisenhower on the White House lawn, sheepishly and in some trepidation entering a helicopter for the first time for a closeup air tour of Washington's housing developments.

There was everyman's Khrushchev who, welcomed by the President at Andrews Air Force Base near Washington, could find no one to take his hat, so he hung it on a post.

The possessive, proud Khrushchev was at the Moscow airport, dressed in a white embroidered Ukrainian shirt, and just back from a brief holiday. Everything he could see seemed to be his. He patronizingly inpected the American jet that had flown nonstop to Moscow in record time, took a sip of bourbon, and pointed out how much better everything was in Rusia than in the capitalistic countries.

The menacing, blunt Khrushchev was in Vienna for face-to-face conferences with President Kennedy. He smiled little then but presented his implacable Slavic countenance to those who saw him publicly, and privately he told President Kennedy he could have war if he wanted it. And we came close to it over Cuba.

Now Mr. Khrushchev is smiling. In all the photographs with Averell Harriman and Secretary Rusk he is beaming. Everyone is sunny. It is almost like the smile festival at Geneva in 1955.

Mr. Khrushchev's changing moods match the Kremlin's shifting policies, a zig here, a zag there—backward, then forward. This, basically, is the reason for the massive distrust in the U.S. Senate on the test ban treaty.

Massive distrust is not an overstatement. Few Senators do not have their fingers crossed in private if not in public. Yet this treaty will be ratified by an overwhelming majority.

Honest objections are being submerged in a wave of public sentiment. Senators who now say they have serious doubts will end up voting for the treaty. They cannot bear the onus of being classed, however wrongly, as prowar and antihumanity. They cannot reject the last best hope, however illusory it may later prove to be.

Yet a rational basis exists for opposition to the treaty. It would be a disservice to truth and fairness if those who hold to their rational objections are pilloried as fellow travelers of Robert Welch of the John Birch Society.

A Senator who wishes to put his mind at rest on why Mr. Khrushchev turned an about-face on this treaty in 6 weeks time is entitled to a better judgment than that he wishes to spawn nuclear-bred misfits in the human race for untold generations.

The treaty needs to be fully explored and debated. Haste in ratification will not make the first step any longer.

When in the end this treaty is ratified, as it ought to be, those who honestly and rationally object are entitled to respect. No one can know for sure where it will finally lead, least of all those who have watched firsthand the changing moods of Mr. Khrushchev.

Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, equality of opportunity is a feature of our system of government which, perhaps more than any other single feature, has distinguished our system of society from all others, and which has contributed to the greatness of our Nation.

Equality of opportunity necessarily involves the availability of the necessary education for the development of one's capabilities to the maximum possible extent. The evidence as presented to the Committee on Education and Labor clearly indicates that higher education is not being made available to all who seek it in this our "land of opportunity," not because those who seek it are unqualified, but because there are inadequate facilities to accommodate them all. Our Nation's existing institutions of higher education have not been able to keep up with the rapid growth in our college-age population.

The record clearly shows that our country's colleges and universities need immediate assistance if they are to provide college education for what has been termed "the tidal wave" of students seeking admission. The predictable increase in enrollment is an irreducible factor, and as Dr. Mason Gross, president of Rutgers State University of New Jersey stated, "for the first time in history, American higher education is faced with the possibility that it will have to deny an opportunity for higher education to some young men and women simply because there is no place for them in our existing academic institutions."

This is indeed a sad commentary, but it would be sadder still if we were to do nothing about correcting the situation. H.R. 6143, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, presents us with the opportunity to do something about it. Its passage and enactment into law will help to put real meaning into that cherished ideal of ours, "equality of opportunity."

Mr. Chairman, I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 6143.

Senator Estes Kefauver, in Memoriam

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected passing from the congressional scene of Tennessee's senior Senator, ESTES KEFAUVER, shocked the Nation and saddened countless people like myself, whom he went out of his way to befriend. I was among many, I am sure, who was fortunate enough to have our personal paths cross from time to time, and on each occasion his stalwart example in pursuing the public interest served as an inspiration to a degree that leaves us profoundly in his debt.

As a vigorous and tireless campaigner for the Presidency, Senator KEFAUVER came to know my State of Wisconsin and its Second Congressional District well, and I was more than privileged to serve as a delegate to the national convention in his behalf. But long after he aspired to the Presidency, he came to my aid and campaigned for me with all the drive and energy that he exhibited in his own campaign.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, my attention naturally focused on his activities in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary where I was able to observe and get a full measure of appreciation of the courage that has characterized the special investigations which he spearheaded and chaired. It takes a very special kind of courage to cross swords with giant drug interests and the powerful steel and telecommunications industries, racketeers and gambling syndicates. But Senator KE-

FAUVER refused to be deflected from his singular role of guardian and protector of the American public in his endless crusade against monopoly and organized crime.

With much the same courage, the coonskin-capped Tennessean stood out among his southern colleagues as a champion of civil rights and defender of racial equality long before the words "sit-in" and "freedom march" became part of the daily American lexicon.

It is too soon to try to evaluate the breadth and depth of his impact on American social, political, and economic life, but I have every confidence that his influence will continue to be felt for many years. His passing leaves a tragic void in the Halls of Congress and in the hearts of his countrymen.

"Justice" Seeks Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the August 15 issue of Justice, the publication of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, points out how historically the concept of property rights has been used to defend the status quo. The editorial soundly observes:

> Throughout history, the greatest threat to property rights has been the denial of human rights to a portion of society.

Society must serve human rights first. The enactment of the President's civil rights proposals is vital to "preserve American rights—human and property—for all." Under leave to extend my remarks I include the ILGWU editorial:

MOTLEY AND UNDEFINABLE

Back in 1821, qualifications for voting were the subject of a profound debate at the convention held to revise the New York State constitution. A distinguished jurist, James Kent, warned, with many learned references to history, that the survival of freedom was being jeopardized by the proposal to abolish the property qualification.

Until then, Kent reminded the delegates, only "the free and independent lords of the soil worth at least $250 in freehold estates," had enjoyed the privilege of electing senators. Only so, Kent warned, had society been preserved as "an association for the protection of property as well as life."

What frightened Kent was the prospect that rule by his own class of landowners would be ended by the changes being sought by "the men of no property, together with the crowds of dependents connected with the great manufacturing and commercial establishments, and the motley and undefinable population of crowded ports."

This Republic has survived Kent's fears. In a free society, the law is a living thing. It responds to pressures for growth and change. Where liberty is lacking, the law remains unchanged. Where it does not respond to mankind's cry for freedom, it becomes first a brittle barrier and then breaks.

Kent's motley and undefinable ones were only one group among many weighed in the scale of history against property rights. In 1821, granting them the right to vote for senator was, according to Kent, an invasion of the property rights he sought jealously and learnedly to monopolize for his own group.

Until a landmark 1842 decision in a Massachusetts court changed the law, any three men discussing common action to raise their wages were held to be engaged in a conspiracy against property rights and were subject to severe punishment.

And for the same kind of sacred property reasons, the Supreme Court which had upheld in 1917 an Oregon law establishing minimum wages for working women, fluctuated in 1923 and threw out such a law.

Now the issue of property rights has been raised in connection with the drive to extend full civil rights to the Negro citizens of this Nation.

It is raised and bandied about as if there were a hard and fast distinction between property rights and human rights, as if we Americans could accept and enjoy inhuman property rights or propertyless human rights.

Human rights and property rights are two sides of the coin whose basic value lies in respect for the individual human being. For this reason we have removed the separation between property rights and the right to vote, property rights and the right to organize, property rights and the right to pull back the length of the work day to decent limits.

Through such changes in interpretation, the law has been kept as a living thing, privileges and responsibilities of liberty have been spread and expanded, this Nation has grown stronger, and the rights of property have been made firmer in this land than anywhere else on earth. Throughout history, the greatest threat to property rights has been the denial of human rights to a portion of society.

In the end, Negro citizens will achieve their full rights through the law. But the law is laggard. It responds only to the pleading of the aggrieved.

On August 28, thousands of Americans—motley and undefinable—will fill the streets of Washington to plead with pride in a traditional American manner for the enactment of President Kennedy's civil rights legislation in order to strengthen and preserve American rights—human and property—for all.

District of Columbia Business

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7525) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am as much concerned as anyone with the existence of crime in the District of Columbia unlike many of my colleagues who live in Maryland and Virginia. I am an active resident of the District during the sessions. At night I attend many meetings in Washington. I walk its streets from the Capitol to my residence and visit friends in various neighborhoods. The protection of citizens, including my own family, is therefore of vital concern to me.

While I favor reasonably stringent laws, I also believe that good law enforcement depends on much more than building more jails and giving policemen bigger clubs. Congress must recognize that many factors contribute to crime, especially unemployment, poor schools, slums, and the denial of civil rights.

Until the Members of Congress do something real about these problems in the District they must share a substantial part of the blame for crime in the Nation's Capital.

A Report to Life Magazine's Pork Barreling Attack Upon the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a letter I have written to the assistant to the publisher of Life magazine and a letter to the editors of Life magazine in reply to a "pork barreling" attack upon the Congress contained in the issue of August 16, 1963. The letters follow:

AUGUST 14, 1963.

Mr. MORTON B. WHITE,
Assistant to the Publisher, Life Magazine, Time and Life Building, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WHITE: In reply to the invitation extended in your letter of August 9, 1963, I am enclosing a statement on the "pork barreling" article contained in Life magazine, issue of August 16.

I was interested to note that there was no reference in the article to the heavy subsidies enjoyed by the users of the second-class mail such as Life magazine. I shall not mention any specific sum, due to a desire on my part for accuracy, but it is my understanding that during my tenure in the Congress the subsidy enjoyed by the Luce Publications would have constructed at least two ports of Sacramento.

I suppose that since this is a "good" subsidy it doesn't constitute governmental "pork." In case you feel impelled to reply with the old threadbare argument that second-class mail places no burden on the postal system, let me tell you that I have examined this one too thoroughly to buy it. Suffice it to say that second-class mail pays about 30 percent of its costs when all current increases become effective.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

AUGUST 14, 1963.

The EDITORS,
Life Magazine, Time and Life Building, New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: I have not had the time to check the accuracy of the other items contained in the shotgun attack on the Congress in the August 16, 1963, issue of Life, but if they are as accurately reported as the project which is characterized as the "42 mile canal to link Sacramento with the sea" they constitute part of a body of massive misinformation. I have difficulty believing that Life deliberately set out to build a story to support conclusions already arrived at, but one suspects that must have been the case.

The Sacramento-Yolo Deep Water Ship Channel was authorized through the efforts

of my Republican predecessor, the Honorable Leroy Johnson, in 1946. It was authorized because it met the criteria rigidly prescribed by the Congress—that of returning more than $1 for every Federal dollar expended on construction. Not mentioned in your article is the important fact of local participation in the project. The local people have overwhelmingly supported the project because of their conviction of its economic soundness in one of the most rapidly growing areas of the United States. The local people have bonded themselves for $13,600,000 for the construction of facilities on the port. The State of California also has spent over $1 million for rights-of-way, easements, and special highway facilities. Local property taxes for the port project have amounted to $4,789,902 since the port district was formed.

The project, along with many other civil works projects, was suspended during the Korean conflict. It was never characterized as unnecessary or undesirable by the Bureau of the Budget. That agency held up planning funds in conformance with a policy of the Eisenhower administration of not resuming any new project starts at that time. However, at my insistence, a restudy of its economic soundness was made prior to an all out effort to secure funds. The restudy, completed in 1954, indicated the Corps of Engineers conviction that the project was economically feasible. The estimate at that time showed the proposed port would return $1.12 for each $1 of Federal money invested. Incidentally, in 1962 the engineers estimated the benefits at $1.80 per $1 invested, and early in 1963 the Corps of Engineers raised their estimate to $2.20 for each $1 of investment. At no time did the Corps of Engineers urge abandonment of the project. It was found desirable by both General Chorpening and General Itschner, former Chiefs of the Army Corps of Engineers. Any inference that the Corps of Engineers desired otherwise is false. It is just as false as your statement, "Now the channel, which can silt up quickly because of its soft banks, will require constant dredging (above) to keep open a port nobody has to have."

Life researchers could have easily acquainted themselves with the fact that one of the strong points favoring the Sacramento deepwater port was that it would experience an absolute minimum of silting and that maintenance would be an insignificant factor. This has been repeatedly attested to by the Corps of Engineers, officials of the port of Sacramento, and others qualified to judge such factors. For your information the port has a minimum of tidal action, characterized as a slack water port, and silting of the channel is not characteristic of this operation.

The picture on page 22 showing a dredger deliberately left the impression that the dredger is in the process of desilting a channel which has barely begun operation. This is not the case. The dredger was not in operation at the time the picture was taken, although there was some cleanup work in progress at that time. The Corps of Engineers can maintain a 30-foot-deep channel in the port at less annual cost than it can maintain a 10-foot channel in the Sacramento River, which formerly was the chief artery of water navigation for the area.

It demeans Life to resort to such shoddy tricks of reporting. As the Member of Congress who proudly claims credit for reviving the project, I suppose I should thank Life for conveying to my constituents the impression that I could twist enough arms, exert enough pressure, to resume work on a project which was totally without merit. But it would be dishonest if such an impression were allowed to remain. The project is sound and meritorious and the investment in both Federal and local dollars will be thoroughly vindicated in the years ahead.

Just this past week one shipper alone estimated he would save $350,000 annually in shipping costs by having a port in Sacramento. It is believed by reliable local officials that annual savings to the 24 county northern California agricultural empire as a whole could total as much as $2 million. It is estimated that a minimum of 300,000 tons of cargo, almost all of it outbound, will be handled at the port the first full year of operation, rapidly accelerating in a few years to more than 700,000 tons.

Sacramento and her people have never been afraid of criticism, honestly and constructively made. Sacramento and her people resent distortion and falsehoods of the type contained in this article.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

Federal Obsession With Race Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of our time is that semantics is being used as the camouflage of power politics.

The situation of "double talk" and "double think" is such today that one is reminded, horrifyingly, of George Orwell's novel, "1984."

Thus it is that pious pronouncements of racial peace are, in actuality, diatribes of racial dissension. Nonviolent protests are, in truth, bloody and ruthless transgressions of public law and private property.

Worse yet, the Nation has been exposed to the rank hypocrisy of seeing proposals for the domestic welfare revamped into creations rivaling the work of Dr. Frankenstein. By amendment—or by Executive order—or by any means at hand, this administration has hung racism on the law of the land. It well may be called the "malevolent obsession."

The Times-Picayune of New Orleans recently summed up this siege of intemperance with an editorial entitled "Federal Obsession With Race Issue." I concur with the conclusions of the editorial, and I urge my colleagues to consider this appeal to rationality:

FEDERAL OBSESSION WITH RACE ISSUE

For conscientious Congressmen who would like to restore reason and proportion to activities of the Federal Government, certainly now is the time to do it.

The Kennedy administration, by making desegregation virtually the sole criterion of validity of nearly all Federal-finance programs, seems to deny any real warrant for aid to education, hospitalization, roadbuilding, welfare and the rest. Under the new dispensation, these expenditures now are justified only so far as they promote the social conceptions of the regime.

Southern Congressmen, whether liberal or conservative, can do nothing but oppose future expenditures for programs in which, through Executive order, their States may not be able to share. These "loaded" programs may discriminate by outlawing areas that need them most.

The logic of even the most worthwhile Federal programs falls under the weight of obsessive racism. School districts that burden their facilities to serve transient children from Federal installations on equal basis with resident pupils, are not, henceforth, to be reimbursed by the Government; they are sued post-facto to make them accept dogma with the Federal grants. Communities that plan new or enlarged hospitals are not to be assisted on the basis of demonstrated need, as specified in the Hill-Burton Act, but on their acquiescence in extraneous impositions. In areas of acute unemployment, the criterion for Federal vocational education assistance is not the prospect of preparing idle workers for new jobs, but racial predilection.

In short, nearly every function of the Federal Government seems now predicated on one obsession. The administration of justice is perverted by it; the defense establishment is subverted by it; civil defense is swayed by it.

The very balance of power within the Government is menaced by it.

Conscientious Congressmen should strive to set the Nation's racial problems, and other problems, in their proper context and restore perspective to the valid functions of the Federal Government: A highway program should build highways, not utopias. The Armed Forces should look after the defense of the Nation, not its mores.

In many cases the executive has been specifically denied the authority it now assumes to append racial standards to Federal programs. Congress is not powerless to rebuff this usurpation which has resulted in a warping of Federal activities. Congress does hold the purse strings.

Duke Power Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Piedmont area of North Carolina and South Carolina is experiencing fantastic industrial growth. One of the principal reasons for this growth is cheap electricity made available by Duke Power Co. This great free enterprise company can pay taxes, support philanthropic organizations, education, and medical centers and still generate electricity cheaper than the Federal Government. The following is an editorial from the August 7 issue of the Anderson Daily Mail, Anderson, S.C.:

SOUTH'S INDUSTRIAL RECORD

The South, and especially the Piedmont area, has long stressed its rapid economic growth.

Such claims are written into the records and are readily verified.

Duke Power Co., of course, serves the central area of the great Piedmont section of North and South Carolina.

Here is a compilation of the industrial development in the Duke territory within the past 6 months:

One hundred and fifteen industrial plants have moved into the area.

Eighty-six have expanded their existing operations.

New industrial investments in the area amount to almost $104 million.

The expansions have created 13,786 new jobs, and added to payrolls by $46 million.

We doubt that another area of similar size in the Nation can boast an equal record of industrial expansion.

America Needs Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the utter failure of President Kennedy as a leader of the Nation emphasizes the desperate need for a change. That this feeling is becoming general across the United States is indicated in the following editorial from the July 30 issue of the Delano Record, Delano, Calif.:

THE OTHER SIDE

(By Mel Baughman)

In 1912, when the Bull Moose Progressives of the great Theodore Roosevelt were battling the Republican forces of President William Howard Taft, they proudly proclaimed, "We stand at Armageddon, and we battle for the Lord."

If it were Armageddon, and if they were battling for the Lord, they lost, the Lord lost, and William Howard Taft lost to the Democratic forces led by Gov. Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey.

And thereby was changed the course of American history.

All of this comes to mind as one views again the peculiar ability of the Republican Party to cut itself into little pieces and permit its opponents to sweep to victory.

This month we have seen the curtain rise on another exasperating example of Republican divisiveness in the intemperate attacks of Governor Rockefeller upon Senator GOLDWATER.

Surely, it must be realized that the important problem confronting the Republicans and the Nation is to find a legal way to rid themselves of the Kennedy administration. This is the No. 1 unfinished task for all persons who want to see America remain a strong and a free and an intelligent democracy.

On the basis of the performance of the past 3 years, one can make the categorical statement that America, as we have known it, cannot survive another 4 years of the Kennedy administration. Thus, it is essential for the Republicans to avoid the kind of fatal political infighting that has characterized their behavior for so many years.

A record of 3 empty and futile years is presented to the American people by the Kennedy administration. It is an administration which is out of tune with the times and the temper of the people.

The other night this observer looked back through his stack of press releases issued by the Democratic National Committee during the 1960 campaign. The releases were the texts of Senator Kennedy's campaign speeches. Surely the empty eloquence of those words must haunt him today.

He has failed in every program. His farm plan has been repudiated. His education program has been rejected. His tax plan is stalled. And his foreign policy is carrying us to another Yalta.

Leadership means the ability to get others to follow. Leadership means the ability to translate one's ideas into action for the greater welfare of all. As a leader, Mr. Kennedy has failed completely.

America, as never before in its history, needs real leadership today. America will listen to the man who speaks for America, the man who knows what it is to be an American, the man who can lead us in the restoration of fundamental values.

That man is BARRY GOLDWATER.

The men who are second and third generation aristocrats speak for the urban society of the East. It makes no difference whether they represent the established wealth of oil fortunes or the "new rich" of the Boston Irish. They do not speak for America. They cannot lead America. For they do not understand America.

Today the world is in chaos. Today America is showing signs of growing decay.

Why continue the leadership which has so appallingly revealed its inability to lead?

Why continue to place faith in men whose philosophy has proved to be worse than ineffective? Theirs is a philosophy that is timid in meeting the challenges of the world. Theirs is a philosophy that destroys the Jeffersonian faith in the worth and ability of the people. Theirs is a philosophy that has brought this Nation to the edge of an abyss at the bottom of which lie the rocks of moral collapse, economic disaster and political tyranny.

It is time for a change. It is time to change leaders. And it is time to change philosophies.

It may be that the men of Bull Moose were 52 years ahead of themselves.

It may be that it is today when we stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord.

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, I am most pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the resolution on nuclear test ban treaty adopted at the meeting of the organization's executive officers and international vice presidents on July 29, 1963. The resolution acclaims the treaty as a most promising "first step" towards the achievement of "mankind's age-old dream: Peace, the abolition of poverty, and the universal fraternity of man." First step that it is, this progress towards averting the threat of destruction that hangs over the world must cause us to redouble our efforts to bring about a worldwide regime of law and order. As the President of the United States wrote Mr. James B. Carey, IUE president, on August 9, the treaty "is a successful effort to negotiate a beginning in the long and tortuous road toward peace."

The resolution and President Kennedy's letter follow:

RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

July 24, 1963, may well mark one of the most crucial turning points in the entire history of humanity.

On July 24 in Moscow mankind took an unprecedented step backward from the brink of the abyss. For the first time in all the years since the Soviet Union's development of its own atomic weapons, there has been a slight—but extremely auspicious—lifting of the threat of global devastation and the annihilation of mankind.

Today, because of the test ban agreement reached in Moscow by representatives of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, there is for the first time in our nuclear age the hope and the promise that mankind will not destroy itself and that the vast edifice of civilization, its culture, its arts, scientific progress, and spiritual values will survive.

Nothing could be truer than President Kennedy's statement, in his address to the Nation on July 26, that "both sides have come to possess enough nuclear power to destroy the human race several times over." Nor can we, in judging this treaty, permit ourselves to forget President Kennedy's statement:

"If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped in any American, Russian or other city—whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or an enemy, by a large nation or small, from any corner of the world—that one bomb could release more destructive force on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped during the Second World War."

We agree with President Kennedy that the July 24 test ban treaty has not by any means dispelled the threat of a possible doomsday, but that it does constitute "a first step" and an "opening wedge" in mankind's desperate efforts to avoid the ultimate catastrophe: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the executive officers and international vice presidents of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers AFL–CIO–CLC acclaims the test ban treaty as "a first step," but a most promising one, in the direction of disarmament and the achievement of an enduring peace; and be it further

Resolved, That we warmly congratulate and commend President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk for this initial accomplishment, and with a special note of praise for the superbly successful work of Under-Secretary of State Averell Harriman, our Nation's chief representative in the Moscow negotiations; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which today begins hearings on the treaty, to give the agreement its full approval and support, and similarly we urge that the Senate as a whole give overwhelming endorsement to the treaty, and be it finally

Resolved, That we heartily urge President Kennedy, the United States Disarmament and Control Agency, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee to carry forward, with intensified vigor, the achievement of the second step, an agreement on partial or total disarmament which will open the door toward mankind's age-old dream: peace, the abolition of proverty, and the universal fraternity of man.

James B. Carey, President; George Collins, Acting Secretary-Treasurer; Harry Block, Vice President, District 1; Earl Riley, Vice President, District 2; Milton Weihrauch, Vice President, District 3; George Hutchens, Vice President, District 5; David Fitzmaurice, Vice President, District 7; Harold Zeisse, Vice President, District 8; Charles Snodgrass, Administrator, District 9; Charles Copeland, Administrator, District 10; Ken Mueller, Administrator, District 11; William Drohan, Administrator, District 12.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 9, 1963.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I have your letter and the attached resolution, and I want to thank you and the executive officers and international vice presidents of your organization for your generous expression of support for the nuclear test ban treaty. As I pointed out in my statement, the treaty does not represent the millennium. It does not resolve all of the issues and conflicts that separate the nations of the world. But it is a successful

effort to negotiate a beginning in the long and tortuous road toward peace.

Now the Senate and, in the larger sense, the people of the United States must decide whether the treaty should be ratified. The assistance of people like you and your associates will make the process of ratification more expeditious.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

United States Is Concerned Over Airport Soviet Is Building for Yemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard claims from the Department of State that the Nasser regime, the United Arab Republic, has grown closer to America and is deserving of increased economic assistance financed by the American taxpayer.

Because the new foreign assistance bill is before the Congress, I feel it my duty to invite the attention of all Members to two New York Times reports that are in direct contradiction to the allegations of Mr. Nasser's apologists in Washington.

One of these reports deals with the action of Nasser's satellite, the Yemen Arab Republic, inviting the Russians to build a huge, modern jet airport that would give the Russians a steppingstone to Africa. The other pertains to the continuing restrictions on free enterprise in Egypt and the socialization of private holdings in a drive for Nasser's version of a sort of Marxist "Arab socialism."

I feel that standards of morality and responsibility should be linked to our aid program. Many other Members certainly share this conviction. In this light, a reading of the following two reports can only raise doubts as to whether another cent should be voted to the United Arab Republic:

UNITED STATES CONCERNED OVER AIRPORT SOVIET IS BUILDING FOR YEMEN

(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, July 29.—The Soviet Union is building a modern jet airport for Yemen. The United States fears that the Russians are planning to use the airport as a steppingstone to Africa.

The project is part of an extensive Soviet campaign to develop access to Africa and to find a means of hopping across that continent to reach Cuba by air.

About 500 Soviet technicians are at work on the Yemeni airport, which will have an 11,500-foot runway that can handle the largest four-engine Soviet jet aircraft.

Although the project was requested by the new republican Government of Yemen, that barren Middle Eastern country has little use for such a modern facility.

Washington is watching the project with concern. Analysts here believe the Soviet Union is counting on the airport to provide access to East Africa, improve air connections with India and help open shorter routes across Africa to Latin America.

The importance of African air routes to the Soviet Government was brought home to the Kennedy administration during the Cuban missile crisis last fall.

At that time Guinea refused to give the Soviet Union permission to land planes on her territory en route to Cuba with personnel and supplies. This action helped reinforce the United States naval blockade of Cuba.

In the intervening months, Soviet diplomats have been engaged in a major effort to extend Soviet air routes into Africa.

Guinea, Algeria, and Morocco have been under pressure to let the Soviet commercial airline, Aeroflot land on flights to Havana, Ethiopia and Somali have been urged to permit Soviet planes to land and proceed down the east coast of Africa.

The Sudan which now permits Soviet planes to land and fly westward, has been asked to let the planes fly south from Khartoum. None of these countries has yielded to Soviet demands.

VITAL TO PLANS

Yemen is vital to Soviet plans because of her location on the Red Sea opposite East Africa and about 1,000 miles south of Cairo.

As long ago as June 10, 1962, Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, published a map showing a proposed Soviet air route from India to Madagascar via Yemen.

Officials here also believe the Soviet Government could link its India route with its route into Egypt and the Sudan if it could use Yemen. Yemen could also provide an alternate landing point to the Sudan for a Soviet air route across Africa.

The Soviet Government has been trying for more than a year to get an air agreement with Yemen. The proposal was turned down last year by the royalist government before it was overthrown.

Officials here assume that the new republican government will sign such an agreement when the new airport is completed. The Soviet Union is providing manpower to build the airport and it is believed to be providing the funds from a $20 million development loan recently extended to Yemen.

Officials say it will be several months before the new airstrip is in operation. About a fourth of the 11,500-foot runway has been completed.

FIELD IS NORTH OF CAPITAL

The airport is a few miles north of Sana, the capital of Yemen, on a plateau 7,000 feet above sea level. Officials said the high altitude necessitated the unusual length of the runway, to give jets enough space to take off in the thin air.

The United Arab Republic is expected to benefit as much as Russia from the new airport.

The United Arab Republic has 28,000 troops in Yemen supporting the republican government in its war against royalist forces. The new field could expand the supply lines and also provide a base for the United Arab Republic's TU-16 bombers. These big planes have been forced to use a dirt airstrip near Sana.

Officials here also expect the United Arab Air Lines to make the new airfield a regular stop.

CAIRO ORDER NATIONALIZES 240 MORE INDUSTRIES

(By Jay Walz)

CAIRO, August 12.—The process of socializing the United Arab Republic went a step further today with the nationalization of a wide range of light industry and related enterprises.

Informed sources said a new wave of Socialist laws was in the offing. These would establish new limits on individual incomes and company profits. They would also increase taxes and place new restrictions on activity in certain fields of private enterprise.

At least 500 companies and businesses were said to be affected by the new nationalization orders. Dr. Aziz Sidky, Minister of Industry, listed 240 industries that were being taken over.

These included rubber products manufacturers, tanners, textile and flour mills, makers of paints, food processors, including dairies, soft-drink makers, and candy manufacturers. Both domestic and foreign companies were on the list.

Service businesses affected included most enterprises engaged in domestic transport, such as trucking companies and Nile River barge lines. These are largely small companies that had escaped the sweeping nationalization orders of 2 years ago.

Government sources said the new measures were in accordance with President Gamel Abdel Nasser's national charter, promulgated in May 1962. The charter provides that the "tools of production" shall be controlled by the people.

Former private owners of businesses receive long-term Government bonds for their stock holdings.

THREE CATEGORIES SEIZED

CAIRO, August 12 (Reuters).—Companies subject to today's nationalization order were listed in three categories: those partly nationalized and partly privately owned, companies under sequestration, and private companies. All now will be fully nationalized.

Owners of shares will be paid the nominal value by the Central Bank—up to 1,000 pounds ($2,240) in cash, the balance in 15-year bonds.

PROGRAM BEGUN IN 1961

President Nasser inaugurated in 1961 a program of "socialism" under which most remaining private property and industry was commandeered. Estates of more than 100 acres were sequestered. As of May 1962, 82 percent of business and industry had been nationalized. The Government owned outright all utilities, railways, maritime, bus and airlines, banks and insurance companies.

One effect of this was to stimulate the emigration of foreigners and non-Arab minority groups of city dwellers—Greeks, Italians, and Jews.

Under the new laws, it was forbidden to earn more than $11,500 a year or to accumulate large stockholdings.

The program of "Arab socialism" has been described as ruthlessly cutting down the rich and risking all on winning political support from the great masses of the poor.

The application of such laws is not always immediately clear. On June 15, a law nationalizing the pharmaceutical industry was promulgated. A spokesman for the Government said it did not apply to foreign companies engaged in joint manufacture with the Egyptian General Organizations for Pharmaceuticals and Drugs. One of these joint ventures is Pfizer Egypt, 60 percent owned by Charles Pfizer & Co. of New York.

Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of criticism recently to the area redevelopment program. One of the complaints has been that it is too heavily weighted in favor of rural communities.

The fact of the matter is that in the process of this country's economic de-

velopment there are areas which are not participating in rising prosperity, and a large percentage of which happen to be in less populous counties. There are several reasons for this, Mr. Speaker, but one of the most apparent is that these areas do not share in the $50 billion-plus expenditure for national security and space exploration, which supports the economies of some more thickly populated areas. It should be observed that the funds requested from ARA are less than 100th the size of our national defense effort, and seems small, indeed, as an investment in a more prosperous America.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], understands the facts in this matter, and is an extremely able exponent of fairness toward ARA and its program. In a letter to the editor printed in today's Washington Post, he answers critics of ARA. I wish to commend him for his fine statement, and am sure that my colleagues will find his letter well worth reading. The article follows:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Your August 1 editorial presented two apparent views which are not supported by the facts; the purpose of this letter is to solicit your editorial reconsideration of a subject of vital importance to millions of Americans who have obviously failed to win either your consideration or understanding. The people for whom I speak are the citizens of small town and rural areas who have been given an opportnity under the area redevelopment program to secure jobs and make a decent living for their families.

Your editorial states that "the scope of the program was diluted by including under it a large number of rural counties, whose problems are essentially different," and further states that "of the total funds, 60 percent are being assigned to rural counties," with the result that "no real impact can be made on the areas that need it most."

As representative of a congressional district with both urban and rural areas participating in redevelopment, I find it impossible to understand your reasoning that small town and rural areas should be excluded from the program because they have essentially different problems. The burden of unemployment falls just as heavily upon men and women living in small towns and rural communities as it does upon their neighbors in the cities; their need for job training is just as acute; the lack of diversity in job opportunities in their area makes even more urgent the mission of area redevelopment.

The statistics show that ARA loan applications from these small town and rural areas total $198 million as compared with $112 million from the urban areas. This fact, more than anything else, accounts for the fact that their approved loans total $48 million, as compared with $32 million in the urban areas.

The fact is that both the law and the appropriations provide equal sums for the two classes of redevelopment areas—and no urban money has been assigned by ARA to rural areas. The small towns and rural areas have simply moved faster to avail themselves of this worthwhile program. The money provided by law for the urban areas will go to the urban areas, as it should. You may be sure of that. Surely the Washington Post will not want to let its acknowledged zeal for progress in city areas blind it to the fairness of programs which seek parallel progress in the country and in small towns.

ED EDMONDSON,
Representative, Second District, Oklahoma.
WASHINGTON.

Portrait of Pittsburgh—Trade, Commerce, Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive-minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing in southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the second of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

PORTRAIT OF PITTSBURGH—COMMERCE, AGRICULTURE

Trade and commerce in the Greater Pittsburgh metropolitan area is directly related to the economic and geographic characteristics of the country.

Geographically in the heart of the Middle Atlantic States, almost half way between New York and Chicago and influenced by the commerce on the Great Lakes and the Ohio-Mississippi River systems; Pittsburgh has become a major trading center for the wide 56-county marketing area in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia.

WORLD TRADE

With its natural routes of surface and air transportation, its basic industrial activities and tremendous wealth in capital and natural resources, Pittsburgh serves the Nation and the world as a leading export and import center. More than $500 million worth of manufactured goods are shipped annually to oversea markets by some 300 Pittsburgh area firms. A brief analysis of Pittsburgh's industrial activity reveals that out of a total work force of 850,000, about 300,000 are employed in production industries directly affected by foreign trade.

Some of the steel products which are exported from the Pittsburgh area include unfabricated structural steel shapes, unfabricated plates, rails over 60 pounds per square yard, line pipe, tubing, hot dipped and electrolitic tinplate, hot rolled sheets, cold rolled sheets, galvanized and other coated sheets, electrical sheets and strip, cold rolled sheet steel, tin cans, bolts, nuts, rivets and washers.

Other categories of manufacture which are exported from the Pittsburgh area are fabricated metal products; machinery other than electrical, such as oil well machinery, construction and mining machinery, farm machinery, metal working machinery, etc.; electrical machinery, such as powerplants, telephone and telegraph equipment, electrical industrial apparatus and all the elements which go into these; transportation equipment, such as railroad equipment, streetcars and their components, and aircraft parts and accessories; textiles and apparel, such as floor coverings, blankets, plastics and linoleum, hats, upholstery, acetate, nylon and rayon fabrics; chemicals, such as paints, drugs, medicines and industrial chemicals of many sorts; clay and glass, such as all forms of glass, industrial porcelain, pots, fire clay, chrome brick, silica, and magnesite.

When coupled with the import traffic of vast amounts of raw materials necessary to manufacture the products produced in this area the importance of world trade to the Pittsburgh area is enhanced even more.

RETAIL-WHOLESALE TRADE

Pittsburgh's retail market is conspicuous because of the number of large department stores, as well as the numerous smaller retail establishments in the downtown and suburban areas. Pittsburgh's downtown business activity has shown substantial gains during the past 15 years.

Approximately 147,600 persons are employed in retail and wholesale trades in the four-county area. Retail sales in 1961 reached $2.7 billion.

In recent years, more than 60 new suburban shopping centers have sprung up in Allegheny County alone. They include approximately 1,400 shops and 54,000 free parking spaces.

AGRICULTURE

Because of the area's industrial reputation few persons connect Metropolitan Pittsburgh with agriculture. Yet, of the 100,051 farms in Pennsylvania, 7,080 are located in the four counties around Pittsburgh and of these, 930 are in Allegheny County.

The farms supply milk, eggs, poultry, fruits, and vegetables to the city. The value of field and fruit crops, milk and butter products in the four-county area was $36 million in 1962.

Treaty and Khrushchev's Moods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the many faces and moods of Nikita Khrushchev are vividly portrayed in an article by Richard Wilson in the Washington Star and other newspapers, as a sharp reminder that those who insist on a close, hard look at the nuclear test ban treaty are not to be assailed as warmongers. The point, of course, is that in ratifying the treaty, this country should not be fooled by the changing moods and the uncertain promises of the Soviets. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Wilson's article in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 14, 1963]

TREATY AND KHRUSHCHEV'S MOODS—THOSE WHO RAISE RATIONAL OBJECTIONS ARE BELIEVED ENTITLED TO RESPECT

(By Richard Wilson)

The moods of Premier Khrushchev are wondrous to watch. They remain vivid in the mind of the witness. There was the Khrushchev in Paris snarling unprintable phrases at West German reporters in the front row of a 3,000-man press conference. The chairman was explaining why he broke with his "fishy friend," President Eisenhower, and torpedoed the Summit Conference of 1959 after the U-2 incident.

The benign, paternal Khrushchev was at his best in the parlor of an Iowa farmer, Roswell Garst, handing out gifts and remembrances to his American friends. A couple of days earlier he was bellowing at midnight because he thought he was insulted by the mayor of Los Angeles, and sent a representative to Henry Cabot Lodge, who was sitting around his hotel room in his underwear, to announce that he intended to break off his American tour and fly back to Moscow. He felt better the following day in San Francisco.

The bellicose Mr. Khrushchev practiced verbal assault and battery at the U.N. Those who saw him do it could not really believe afterward that he had actually hammered the desk with his shoe. It looked for a while as if Mr Khrushchev would never go home btu would stay in New York all winter.

Khrushchev, the debater, reached forensic heights in his wordy and menacing wrangle with Vice President Nixon in the exhibit kitchen of the American fair in Moscow. This was the intractable Khrushchev who did not even hesitate to rise later to object to a Nixon statement during a formal public speech.

The reasonable, rational Khrushchev was at Camp David with President Eisenhower. Khrushchev, the good guest, was also with General Eisenhower on the White House lawn, sheepishly and in some trepidation entering a helicopter for the first time for a closeup air tour of Washington's housing developments.

There was everyman's Khrushchev who, welcomed by the President at Andrews Air Force base near Washington, could find no one to take his hat so he hung it on a post.

The possessive, proud Khrushchev was at the Moscow airport, dressed in a white embroidered Ukrainian shirt, and just back from a brief holiday. Everything he could see seemed to be his. He patronizingly inspected the American jet that had flown nonstop to Moscow in record time, took a sip of bourbon, and pointed out how much better everything was in Russia than in the capitalistic countries.

The menacing, blunt Khrushchev was in Vienna for face-to-face conferences with President Kennedy. He smiled little then but presented his implacable Slavic countenance to those who saw him publicly, and privately he told President Kennedy he could have war if he wanted it. And we came close to it over Cuba.

Now Mr. Khrushchev is smiling. In all the photographs with Averell Harriman and Secretary Rusk he is beaming. Everyone is sunny. It is almost like the smile festival at Geneva in 1955.

Mr. Khrushchev's changing moods match the Kremlin's shifting policies, a zig here, a zag there—backward, then forward. This, basically, is the reason for the massive distrust in the U.S. Senate on the test ban treaty.

Massive distrust is not an overstatement. Few Senators do not have their fingers crossed in private if not in public. Yet this treaty will be ratified by an overwhelming majority.

Honest objections are being submerged in a wave of public sentiment. Senators who now say they have serious doubts will end up voting for the treaty. They cannot bear the onus of being classed, however wrongly, as prowar and antihumanity. They cannot reject the last best hope, however illusory it may later prove to be.

Yet a rational basis exists for opposition to the treaty. It would be a disservice to truth and fairness if those who hold to their rational objections are pilloried as fellow travelers of Robert Welch of the John Birch Society.

A Senator who wishes to put his mind at rest on why Mr. Khrushchev turned an about-face on this treaty in 6 weeks' time is entitled to a better judgment than that he wishes to spawn nuclear-bred misfits in the human race for untold generations.

The treaty needs to be fully explored and debated. Haste in ratification will not make the first step any longer.

When in the end this treaty is ratified, as it ought to be, those who honestly and rationally object are entitled to respect. No one can know for sure where it will finally lead, least of all those who have watched firsthand the changing moods of Mr. Khrushchev.

Alliance for Progress Plan Will Ask More of Latins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herewith an article which appeared in the New York Times of July 28, regarding recent changes in the Alliance for Progress, which would increase Latin America's participation and responsibility in this foreign assistance program.

The article follows:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PLAN WILL ASK MORE OF LATINS

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The administration has approved changes in the Alliance for Progress that would increase Latin America's participation and responsibility in guiding the 10-year program of social and economic growth.

Some shifts in the leadership of the program are also expected. For example, Graham Martin, deputy coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, is understood to have been selected as Ambassador to Thailand to succeed Kenneth P. Young.

Specifically, the administration has endorsed the formation of a new inter-American committe with executive powers to allocate aid in proportion to the recipient countries' efforts at self-help.

The new body would not impair Washington's ultimate authority over U.S. aid funds, or in any way diminish its freedom to set policies toward individual Latin-American countries.

FUNDS COULD BE REFUSED

Thus, if the United States objected to aiding a country whose program had been approved by the committee, the group would turn to other sources of financing, such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Western Europe, or Japan.

Conversely, if the committee found a country to be ineligible for aid by the Alliance, the United States could assist that country on a nation-to-nation basis if it were considered to be in the national interest.

Establishment of the new committee, tentatively known as the Committee for Inter-American Development, was recommended last month by two prominent Latin American statesmen, former President Alberto Lleras Camargo, of Colombia and former President Juscelino Kubitschek, of Brazil, in separate reports on the Alliance submitted to the Organization of American States.

With U.S. approval assured, the committee is expected to be formally established at the meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council to be held in October at Sao Paulo, Brazil.

The big advantage of the new group, in the eyes of the administration, is that a truly hemispheric body would assume responsibility for setting and enforcing standards for economic and social policies qualifying for Alliance support.

In the past this complicated task has been carried out mainly by Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, within the Administration for International Development.

As a result, standards intended to serve as guidelines for the development of healthy political and economic institutions for the whole continent often had to be adjusted to Washington's immediate relations with specific countries.

The present arrangement also left the United States open to the criticism that it was seeking to impose its economic philosophy on the Latin American nations.

OTHER COUNTRIES INFORMED

Officials here reported that the U.S. decision to put the Alliance on a broader basis was communicated informally this week to Latin American representatives attending a technical meeting on economic and social development in San Jose, Costa Rica.

Senior U.S. participant at that meeting was William D. Rogers, legal counsel for the Alliance, who shortly will succeed Mr. Martin as Mr. Moscoso's deputy.

The announcement of Mr. Martin's appointment to the Thailand post is expected soon.

President Kennedy had hoped from the outset to make the Alliance an agency of all the American nations. In announcing the program at the White House in March 1961, he called for a common effort that would require equal participation from all the members if they were to achieve the ambitious objectives of ending poverty, disease, and illiteracy in the New World.

At the Punta del Este Conference in August 1961, which drafted the charter of the Alliance, the United States proposed to empower a committee of nine distinguished economists, seven of them Latin Americans, to determine which countries had undertaken meaningful economic and social reforms within the concepts of the Alliance, and deserved aid.

Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico opposed the plan on the ground that it would subordinate to an international committee a country's sovereign power to determine its internal policies.

Thus the committee of nine has been functioning only in an advisory capacity, although it has had a major role in the formulation of the economic development programs of individual countries before they apply for assistance.

Ironically, 2 years later the Latin Americans themselves are complaining that the Alliance has been left too much to the sometimes uncertain direction of the United States.

Dr. Kubitschek and Mr. Lleras agreed that instead of setting broad goals for the hemisphere the Alliance had become bogged down in the details of Washington's relations with the separate Latin American nations.

While Dr. Kubitschek blamed the United States for this development, Mr. Lleras found that the Latin American countries themselves had lagged in their efforts to make the Alliance a meaningful hemisphere agency.

They agreed that the proposed Committee for Inter-American Development should be established to give the programs a new perspective.

In some ways the Committee would operate along the lines of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which elaborates common goals for Western Europe.

Sidewalks to Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the slow, steady march toward dictatorship and

tyranny is becoming more and more apparent with every passing day of the Kennedy administration. Unless we demand a return to constitutional government and the constitutional responsibilities of the three branches of government, the States, the local communities, and the people may soon lose all their freedoms.

How far we have come along this road is well said in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of August 11. I commend it for your thoughtful consideration:

SIDEWALKS TO TYRANNY

Bring up the subject of States rights or mention that the Federal Government seems to be growing bigger at the expense of State and local governments—and the specter of paratroopers marching in Birmingham, Little Rock, or Oxford immediately comes to mind.

But Federal interference in State and local government is not restricted to forced integration of schools, parks, and restaurants. It is not limited to the Supreme Court's telling local school boards that they must no longer permit praying or Bible-reading in their schools. Nor is it confined to a Washington agency czar's telling the citizens of Dallas that they must close a profitable airport.

These are obvious and blatant examples of Federal intervention in local affairs. But they are not the most dangerous. They are only the symptoms—perhaps, the by-products—of a deeper and more extensive invasion.

The biggest item of Federal interference is contained in the multitude of programs designed to do for State and local governments what they should be doing for themselves.

A short news item the other day in the Albuquerque Tribune emphasizes this point. It was an announcement that Federal approval has been given for 11 accelerated public works projects in New Mexico totaling $1,055,730 in spending.

The political implications of those projects—though important—are not the subject of our immediate concern. More significant is the nature of the projects themselves.

All of the projects were limited to the construction, improvement, or extension of purely local facilities—water systems, streets, municipal gas works, sewers, and sidewalks.

How much longer can local government survive when Washington begins to pave local streets and build sidewalks?

As a simple matter of efficiency, sidewalks ought to be cheaper and easier to build without Washington's help. It's not as if Washington were pulling the money for these projects out of thin air or picking it off a tree. That money is coming from taxes collected in the same towns that are now having their sidewalks built by Potomac engineers.

The insidious aspect is that few State and local officials or citizens complain about this type of intervention—as they are prone to object to the more obvious types of interference such as militarily enforced integration or dictation of the school curriculum.

Yet these more obvious forms of interference are made possible by the less obvious. It is only because the Federal Government has already dipped its hand so far into local affairs that it is able to use the clenched fist in Birmingham or Oxford.

When local and State governments abandon their own responsibilities and turn to Washington for help in so many different areas, they are merely building the instrument of oppression that can be used against them at a later day.

Politicians who expect Washington to build the sidewalks in their home towns are merely getting what they deserve when Federal troops and marshals march down those sidewalks to enforce Washington's idea of how other local affairs should be run.

Wall of Shame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday was the second anniversary of the erection of the wall in Berlin, one of the tragic developments and setbacks in our foreign policy position.

Since under the propaganda barrage of the New Frontier, attention is being directed to peaceful coexistence with the despotic Soviet regime, we could not expect any practical effort by the administration to face up to the Red challenge.

We are thinkful, however, for the fact that the press of our Nation is still reasonably free, with its editorial comment officially uncensored. Therefore, I place into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the Monday, August 12, edition of the Dallas Morning News, appropriately calling our attention to the "Wall of Shame":

WALL OF SHAME

Tomorrow is an anniversary that both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev would like to forget. Two years ago, on that date, East Berlin troops began building what has come to be known as the wall of shame.

For President Kennedy, it represents vacillation in time of crisis. A year before he had uttered brave words on Berlin:

"The United States is there, the United Kingdom and France are there, the pledge of NATO is there—and the people of Berlin are there. It is as secure, in that sense, as the rest of us—for we cannot separate its safety from our own. * * * We cannot and will not permit the Communists to drive us out of Berlin, either gradually or by force."

Yet when the Reds began to wall in the eastern half of the city, nothing was done. Subsequently it was reported that the East German troops who put up the first barbed wire had not been issued ammunition. The wire apparently was the first step in a Red bluff that was not called by the West.

For Khrushchev, the wall was a tacit admission that communism cannot win in fair competition with capitalism. Communist East Germany had been bleeding to death through Berlin, as her professional people, skilled workmen and young people deserted the socialist paradise for a better way of life in the West. Some 200,000 East Germans had escaped to West Germany in the first half of 1961.

Today the wall still stands, and its counterparts along other borders of the Iron Curtain have turned half a continent into a prison. West Berliners say that nothing really prepares one for the first sight of the wall of shame. This summer, 2 weeks after making a speech saying that accommodation with the Reds is not impossible and advising Americans to reexamine their attitude toward the Soviet Union, President Kennedy arrived in Berlin to view the wall.

Visibly shaken, he declared, "There are some who say in Europe and elsewhere, 'We can work with the Communists.' Let them come to Berlin."

Too often our Government has seemed to approach communism as a political theory. At the wall, the President was faced by a Communist fact.

From Frowning Russian Rocket Rattler to Smiling Russian Treaty Peddler and Back and Forth Again as Told by Richard Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe Democrat's Washington correspondent, Richard Wilson, recently reported on Khrushchev's application of Pavlovian psychology and an international scale as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 12, 1963]

K.'s MANY FACES—ALL RED

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—The moods of Khrushchev are wondrous to watch. They remain vivid in the mind of the witness. There was the Khrushchev in Paris snarling unprintable phrases at West German reporters in the front row of a 3,000-man press conference. The chairman was explaining why he broke with his "fishy friend," President Eisenhower, and torpedoed the summit conference of 1959 after the U-2 incident.

The benign, paternal Khrushchev was at his best in the parlor of an Iowa farmer, Roswell Garst, handing out gifts and remembrances to his American friends.

A couple of days earlier he was bellowing at midnight because he thought he was insulted by the mayor of Los Angeles, and sent a representative to Henry Cabot Lodge, who was sitting around his hotel room in his underwear, to announce that he intended to break off his American tour and fly back to Moscow. He felt better the following day in San Francisco.

The bellicose Khrushchev practiced verbal assault and battery at the U.N. Those who saw him do it could not really believe afterward that he had actually hammered the desk with his shoe. It looked for a while as if Khrushchev would never go home but would stay in New York all winter.

Khrushchev, the debater, reached forensic heights in his wordy and menacing wrangle with Vice President Nixon in the exhibit kitchen of the American Fair in Moscow. This was the intractable Khrushchev who did not even hesitate to rise later to object to a Nixon statement during a formal public speech.

The reasonable, rational Khrushchev was at Camp David with President Eisenhower. Khrushchev, the good guest, was also with Eisenhower on the White House lawn, sheepishly and in some trepidation entering a helicopter for the first time for a closeup air tour of Washington's housing developments.

There was everyman's Khrushchev who, welcomed by the President at Andrews Air Force Base near Washington, could find no one to take his hat so he hung it on a post.

The possessive, proud Khrushchev was at the Moscow airport, dressed in a white embroidered Ukrainian shirt, and just back from a brief holiday. Everything he could see seemed to be his. He patronizingly inspected the American jet that had flown nonstop to Moscow in record time, took a sip of bourbon, and pointed out how much better everything was in Russia than in the capitalistic countries.

The menacing, blunt Khrushchev was in Vienna for face-to-face conferences with President Kennedy. He smiled little then but presented his implacable Slavic countenance to those who saw him publicly, and privately he told President Kennedy he could have war if he wanted it. And we came close to it over Cuba.

Now Khrushchev is smiling. In all the photographs with Harriman and Rusk he is beaming. Everyone is sunny. It is almost like the smile festival at Geneva in 1955.

Khrushchev's changing moods match the Kremlin's shifting policies, a zig here, a zag there—backward, then forward. This, basically, is the reason for the massive distrust in the U.S. Senate on the test ban treaty.

Massive distrust is not an overstatement. Few Senators do not have their fingers crossed in private if not in public. Yet this treaty will be ratified by an overwhelming majority.

Honest objections are being submerged in a wave of public sentiment. Senators who now say they have serious doubts will end up voting for the treaty. They cannot bear the onus of being classed, however wrongly, as prowar and antihumanity. They cannot reject the last best hope, however illusory it may later prove to be.

Yet a rational basis exists for opposition to the treaty. It would be a disservice to truth and fairness if those who hold to their rational objections are pilloried as fellow travelers of Robert Welch of the John Birch Society.

A Senator who wishes to put his mind at rest on why Khrushchev turned an about-face on this treaty in 6 weeks time is entitled to a better judgment than that he wishes to spawn nuclear-bred misfits in the human race for untold generations.

The treaty needs to be fully explored and debated. Haste in ratification will not make the first step any longer.

When in the end this treaty is ratified, as it ought to be, those who honestly and rationally object are entitled to respect. No one can know for sure where it will finally lead, least of all, those who have watched firsthand the changing moods of Khrushchev.

Resolution by Connecticut Democratic Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted recently at the convention of the Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs. The resolution urges support for civil rights legislation and passage of the Youth Employment Act, establishment of a National Service Corps, and expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act to provide greater opportunities for employment for youths and for unskilled and semiskilled workers.

The Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs is headed by Mrs. Aubrey McGann of Guilford, Conn., president; Mrs. Henry Belcher of Clinton, Conn., corresponding secretary; and Mrs. John Foohey of Hartford, treasurer. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION BY CONNECTICUT DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S CLUB

Whereas our hearts and minds are with our fellow Americans in the South in their struggle for equal rights in voting, in educating, in the use of all public facilities, and in employment; and

Whereas an objective look at our own State of Connecticut and the rest of the North shows that there is still a great deal of work to be done in the field of civil rights here at home, especially in the fields of education, housing, employment, and most important and completely unlegislatable, simple human understanding: Be it

Resolved, That this convention urges congressional passage of the Youth Employment Act (to provide a labor market and training ground for young people looking for their first jobs), the establishment of the National Service Corps (a domestic Peace Corps which would work on special projects in big city slums, migratory worker camps, on Indian reservations, and in other areas of particular need), and the expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act (which raises the level of skills of the unskilled and semiskilled workers so that he may be qualified for jobs in an increasingly sophisticated labor market). At the same time, we pledge ourselves to the task of helping assure equal opportunity for all and of combating discrimination, whether based on race or religion or country of national origin, no matter how close to home it may come.

Idaho Power Co. Suggests Slogan and Invites Letters to Pennsylvania Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues has been placing in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of anti-Bonneville Power Administration articles and speeches. Originally he was using the title "Southern Idaho's New Slogan—Bonneville, Please Include Us Out." When I objected on the basis that Idaho has its own elected representatives in the Congress who were elected by the voters of Idaho, he agreed to change the title but said he had received it from Idaho. As you can see from the following letter, the title did come from Idaho, from the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD one of the thousands of personal mailings that this power company is presently making throughout the State of Idaho:

DEAR FRIEND: This enclosed editorial from the Boise Statesman puts in perspective the recent statements of Lloyd Walker. I am sure you will be interested in the opinions expressed here.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., who has been challenging Representative HARDING's statements on Bonneville power invites you to write him regarding your feelings on the subject.

Suggested subject title: "Bonneville, please include us out."

Sincerely,

E. E. HAROLDSEN,
Division Manager.

You will note the power company extends the invitation of our colleague to the people of Idaho to write to him about Bonneville power. It also conveniently suggests the title which our colleague adopted, "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out." Of course, it comes as no surprise that the power companies were the source of the title and that the power companies are extending invitations, in behalf of our colleague, to correspond with him. However, in order for the rest of my colleagues to know that this is not just a spontaneous outpouring of public feelings on this subject, I have included the above letter from E. E. Haroldsen, who, everyone in Idaho knows, is a division manager of the Idaho Power Co.

I only regret that the power companies continue to ignore the pleas of the majority of the Idaho congressional delegation and many other groups to compete and to cooperate with Bonneville Power Administration, not attack them.

The expensive mass advertising campaign conducted by the power companies, the door-to-door campaigning they are now carrying out, and the mailing of thousands of pieces of literature attacking Bonneville power are costing the power users of Idaho thousands and thousands of dollars. I regret that the power companies are using up the dollars collected in their recent power rate increase in a vindictive and vicious campaign against the Bonneville Power Administration.

Joseph Knowland Marks 90th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, August 5, 1963, marked a milestone in the life of Joseph Knowland, publisher of the Oakland Tribune. On this date Mr. Knowland reached the age of 90 and in doing so he reached another plateau in an illustrious lifetime of civic service.

Mr. Knowland was born in my home town of Alameda, Calif. He was a predecessor of mine in the California State Assembly. He also was elected to the 58th, 59th, and four succeeding Congresses. My predecessor in this office retired from Congress to resume his newspaper career as publisher of the Oakland Tribune.

While I have not always agreed with the political philosophy of this illustrious Californian and his distinguished son, William F. Knowland, I have long admired his selfless public contributions in his lifetime.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Mr. Knowland on his 90th birthday. I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fitting tribute to him which was published in the Oakland Tribune of August 5, 1963.

JOSEPH KNOWLAND MARKS 90TH YEAR

The calendar today conferred a new distinction upon a man who has a lifetime of distinction.

This is the 90th birthday anniversary of Joseph R. Knowland, publisher of The Tribune.

Mr. Knowland observed the day quietly at his Piedmont home, with members of his family and a few old friends. He was pleased by hundreds of congratulatory messages from governmental, newspaper, business, and civic leaders.

He marked the occasion by recalling the seldom-told story of his first venture as a newspaperman.

SEVENTY YEARS AGO

It was some 70 years ago, in Alameda, where he had been born, August 5, 1873.

"As a small boy, I frequently visited newspaper offices and was enthralled by them. When I became a young man, I started writing rather profusely for the Alameda papers," he said.

"I must confess that my most popular contribution was anonymous.

"It was a gossip column, and it ran a little magazine published in Alameda. I signed the column 'Native Daughter' and it attracted a great deal of interest.

"This was probably because I wrote frequently about the Native Sons."

Mr. Knowland said the bulk of his writing was about politics and political meetings, in which he was becoming active.

"I had real pride of authorship when I saw my articles in print, although sometimes I wondered why the editors accepted my copy so readily," he remarked.

"After I became a newspaper publisher myself,I began to surmise that the fact that I did not expect any pay may have had something to do with it."

POLITICAL CAREER

He recalled that an opportunity to run for the State assembly in 1898 lured him away from newspapering and started a 17-year governmental career including two terms in the assembly, one in the State senate, and six in congress.

In Washington, he backed legislation for the Panama Canal, led the fight that brought the 1915 Panama Pacific International Exposition to San Francisco, initiated appropriations for the Alaskan Railroad, and obtained funds for Oakland's first harbor development.

His associations in the Capital have remained firm throughout the years. In 1932 they helped Knowland and the local delegation of which he was a member to win a Government RFC loan for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

Retiring from office in 1915, Mr. Knowland returned to his first love, becoming publisher of the Tribune.

Since then, he has combined active direction of the newspaper with a career of leadership and distinction in a score of civic, business, and fraternal activities.

In recent months, Mr. Knowland has limited his activities, but he retains his keen interest in public affairs and his awareness of developments in his community, his State, and his Nation.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS

"We seem to face critical problems in almost every field, including the economy, human relations, and international tensions," he said.

"But as I look backward it occurs to me that we have always faced problems, and they always appeared to have tremendous intensity. Some we have solved, some are still troublesome, and new ones arise.

"I am confident that if we meet all issues squarely, applying to them the principles expounded by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, exercising the spirit, energy, and ingenuity that moved us forward in the past, we need not fear to face the future."

Mr. Knowland recalled that in his first statement in the Tribune, he promised that it would be "a helpful and good-tempered newspaper," and observed that "the issues that divide good citizens, starting bitter feuds, are often trivial in the light of subsequent events."

Today he commented: "The years have proved that more fully than I could have anticipated."

Urban Renewal, American Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, urban renewal, American style, is going on daily in my hometown, Dallas, Tex. Its amazing skyline is constantly changing, our slum areas are being cleaned up, our construction of homebuilding is unequaled, and it is all being done by the people of Dallas, not by the Federal Government.

The Dallas story is one of which any community can be proud and is a sterling example of what can be done through private initiative, willingness to invest, ability to tackle current problems with vision and then being willing to put in the toil and sweat necessary to reach the goal of a better community. The miracle of Dallas is constantly recurring and it is the miracle of a free people and their accomplishments.

The following article by Sam Acheson, editorial staff writer of the Dallas Morning News, tells part of the story:

DALLAS BUSINESS CORE REVITALIZED

(By Sam Acheson)

Most local residents know that more new office space was built in downtown Dallas during the decade of the fifties than in any other U.S. city except New York.

Less widely known is the prospect for the sixties. Writing in the July issue of Traffic Quarterly, Executive Director Lloyd Braff of Dallas' Central Business District Association reports that construction in the business core of the city promises to "far surpass that during the booming fifties."

Mr. Braff cites the fact that since January 1, 1960, 10 major new downtown building projects have been completed. Eight others are under construction, including three skyscrapers of 30 to 50 stories.

In all, 22 new buildings started since the opening of the present decade will add a total of 430 floors and 10,130,850 gross square feet. This is the record for the first third of the sixties. Mr. Braff and others are justified in believing that the remaining years before 1970 will bear out the prophecy amply.

Continuing performance in the central business district of Dallas is one of the most strikingly successful examples of downtown rehabilitation on the North American Continent. Most significant thing about it, as Mr. Braff points out, is that it was sparked and is being carried out almost exclusively by private enterprise.

Except for the 12-story County Courts Building at Commerce, Market, Jackson, and Houston Streets, all present construction is financed by private business funds. Mr. Braff's own organization, CBDA, has played no small part in arousing and channeling the constructive forces of private initiative in Dallas.

In the same magazine article Mr. Braff summarizes the revitalization of Dallas' traffic network since the end of World War II. Local taxpayers have put up $85 million in street bonds. State and National Governments have spent even more to provide improved trafficways, including seven urban expressways.

Resoluting score from 1950 to date is:

Dallas City has constructed 88.86 miles of thoroughfares.

Dallas County has built 37.90 miles within city limits.

The State has built 55.47 miles of roads in the city.

State and Federal Governments have built or have in progress 71.94 miles of freeways within city limits. An additional 67.40 miles in Dallas County outside city limits have been completed.

Altogether, Dallas now has 321.57 miles of first-class traffic arteries that were not in existence a decade and a half ago.

Naturally enough, the greatest density of traffic is found in the business heart of any city. It was determined 5 years ago that 70 percent of the 67,000 people a day entering downtown Dallas arrived by private car. The figures for 1963 are much higher.

There is a direct relationship between the revitalization of downtown Dallas and the drastic upgrading of the city's traffic network. As Mr. Braff says, it is improbable that Dallas' remarkable growth and development since 1935 would have been as rapid as they have been but for major improvements made to accommodate Dallas' growth in traffic.

Economic Aid Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday, August 4, 1963, carried a most constructive letter on our AID program written by David E. Bell, Administrator for the Agency for International Development. Our foreign assistance programs have been much in the limelight for many years and many questions have repeatedly come up in regard to them. I know that my colleagues would like to read Mr. Bell's perceptive analysis. His letter to the Times, which is a clear evaluation of the program, is most timely since the foreign assistance bill will be before the House next week.

The letter follows:

ECONOMIC AID ANALYZED: U.S. GOODS AND SERVICES ACCOUNT FOR 90 PERCENT, BELL SAYS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Some of your readers might have drawn incorrect inferences from figures you published in section IV of your July 21 edition regarding the relationship of economic aid to the balance of payments of the United States.

You showed "economic aid" as a debit in the U.S. balance of payments for 1962 amounting to $3.5 billion—in a year in which the total deficit was $2.3 billion. An unwary reader could easily have drawn the inference that all we need to do to remove the deficit would be to cut "economic aid" by $2.3 billion.

Such an action would of course be ineffective. "Economic aid" as shown in your figures includes the outflow of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 (about $1.3 billion in 1962), plus the outflow of goods and services—and dollars—financed by loans and grants under our foreign aid.

With the policies that are now in effect, more than 90 percent of total "economic aid" represents U.S. goods and services—not dollar outflow. Under these circumstances, a cut in congressional appropriations would principally reduce U.S. exports—without affecting the balance-of-payments deficit substantially.

EFFECT OF CUTS ON EXPORTS

Recognizing the difficulty of estimating precisely the effects of a change in a single factor in the balance of payments, it can be said as a rough approximation that a one-billion-dollar cut in "economic aid" would reduce U.S. exports by $900 million and the deficit in the balance of payments by $100 million. (If the hypothetical cut were assumed to affect what is ordinarily called foreign aid—and not to affect Public Law 480 and the Export-Import Bank—the proportions would be about $800 million reduction in U.S. exports, and $200 million in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.)

The conclusion is clear. Under present policies, with economic and military assistance to other countries almost entirely taking the form of U.S. goods and services, almost no gain to the balance-of-payments deficit can be achieved by reducing our foreign aid programs. Moreover, a foreign aid cut made on the mistaken assumption it would have a major impact on our payments deficit would instead serve chiefly to reduce U.S.-produced goods and services purchased for use abroad.

I should also like to point out the positive gains to the United States from the establishment of progressive, growing economies abroad—which is the main purposes of our economic assistance. U.S. exports to the Marshall Plan countries more than doubled from 1953 to 1962.

Our exports to Japan more than tripled from 1950 to 1962. In many of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, where our economic aid goes today, aid-financed U.S. exports are finding acceptance and becoming familiar to consumers—which will enhance our normal commercial export markets in the future as those countries increase their incomes and their international purchasing power.

DAVID E. BELL,
Administrator, Agency for International Development.

The Job of Ending Job Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the elimination of discrimination in employment is crucial to the civil rights battle. Until there is equality of job opportunity for all our citizens, full equality cannot be realized. A major barrier has been discrimination in the apprenticeship programs for skilled jobs. The worker of the future must be a skilled worker, and the Negro has been hurt in his search for a job because he is often, too often, unskilled. John F. Henning, Under Secretary of Labor and Manpower Administrator for the Department of Labor has written a searching statement of the problems facing Government apprenticeship programs which appeared in the July 1963 issue of the American Federationist, the official monthly of the AFL–CIO. I wish to bring his article to the attention of my colleagues:

EXPANDING APPRENTICESHIP FOR ALL AMERICANS

(By John F. Henning)

American Negro demands for fair employment have turned sharply to a precise area of dispute: apprenticeship training.

The new emphasis is hardly surprising. Skilled journeymen are the income elite of manual labor. They look to a brightening future. All responsible projections of U.S. labor force needs cite the continuing call for skilled labor and the declining proportions of unskilled work.

Back in 1957 the U.S. Department of Labor issued its now historic projections of the labor force requirements of the 1960's. The study estimated that in 1970 America will need 42 percent more professional and technical workers than in 1960, 24 percent more sales and service personnel, 22 percent more skilled workers, and 18 percent more semiskilled. The percentage of the unskilled will be down.

The prophecy presumes a full employment economy in 1970. Without economic growth, both skilled and unskilled will suffer. But not alike. For example, during the past 5 years, the national unemployment rate has approximated a disturbingly high 5.5. percent, but in this period the jobless rate among the unskilled has been at least twice that of the skilled. Whatever the course of the economy, the days of the unskilled appear numbered.

Long ago Benjamin Franklin observed that he who hath a trade hath an estate. The difficulty is that he who rath a trade usually hath a white skin.

As in Franklin's time, the one certain road to journeyman training is the apprenticeship system. To some the road seems a narrow, twisted trail, bordered by bigotry and privilege. Whatever its hazards, more than 150,000 young Americans today are found in registered apprenticeship programs.

The average apprenticeship embraces 4 years of on-the-job training and normally entails 144 hours of related classroom instruction a year.

The tripartite forces of labor, management, and Government shape the character of apprenticeship training. But the shape of things does not satisfy any American sensitive to the demands of democracy.

Federal responsibility came to apprenticeship with the adoption of the Fitzgerald Act in 1937.

The Fitzgerald Act called for Federal and State Government promotion of labor-management apprenticeship programs. The Government role has been noncontrolling in that actual on-the-job training has been directed by the employer, usually under union-negotiated conditions.

The Government role has been significant in that the U.S. Department of Labor and the several State apprenticeship agencies fix minimum standards for program registration. Registration entitles apprentices in approved programs to employment on Federal public works projects and assures approved programs of the services of the Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training or the services of the pertinent State agency. Historically, Federal registration of programs has applied alike to State sponsored as well as federally directed programs.

Thirty States manage their own apprenticeship agencies. In the remaining 20, the Federal Government alone sponsors and guides apprenticeship.

Civil rights spokesmen long have held the idea that Federal registration should be denied any program stained by ethnic discrimination. AFL–CIO President George Meany agrees. Meany backed a 1961 attempt to write such a denial into Federal law. Meany noted, however, that discrimination in apprenticeship is only part of total job discrimination. He urged enactment of a National Fair Employment Practices Act with full powers of enforcement.

But the immediate question is, What can be realized in the absence of a national FEP law?

In July 1961, then Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg announced the Department of Labor would thereafter require the inclusion of a specific nondiscrimination statement in all apprenticeship standards of firms handling Government contracts. He further declared a similiar provision would be required in the registration of any new apprenticeship program regardless of its relationship to Federal works.

Labor Department action did not die with the Goldberg pronouncement. The following achievements merit attention:

I. Within the past year, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training assigned four minority consultants to the task of opening opportunities to Negroes and other minority peoples. Now located in Washington, New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, they counsel with employers, joint apprenticeship committees and unions on a regional basis to encourage acceptance of qualified minority applicants. Additionally, they advise minority groups on apprenticeship fundamentals and admission processes.

II. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz on February 27, 1963, announced the appointment of a National Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunity in Apprenticeship and Training. The Committee consists of 15 members; 4 from management, from labor, 5 from minority organizations, and 2 from the public.

The Advisory Committee held its first meeting in Washington on May 14 under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Labor. The committee developed a five-point action program:

1. The establishment of apprenticeship information centers in certain critical cities throughout the Nation.

2. The fostering of apprenticeship information centers through State apprenticeship councils wherever feasible.

3. The creation of research programs to measure the present depth of minority participation in apprenticeship programs.

4. The implementation of present antidiscrimination provisions in apprenticeship programs registered with the U.S. Department of Labor.

5. The consideration of preapprenticeship programs for the training of young workers not qualified for admission to apprenticeship programs.

III. The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, the District of Columbia Commissioners and school authorities, the U.S. Employment Service, labor and management, opened its first Apprenticeship Information Center on June 17 in the Nation's Capital.

The Information Center, which the Department proposes to extend throughout the Nation, offers young apprenticeship applicants personal and group counseling, aptitude testing, information on educational requirements and related data pertaining to District apprenticeship programs. It also offers an orderly system of referral to joint apprenticeship committees and serves as a point of contact for unions, employers, and minority groups.

The values of the Information Center are intended for all young Americans, whatever their race, color, creed, or national origin. But the Center should be of particular value to Negroes and other minorities from whom the knowledge of admission procedures and requirements often has been withheld.

IV. Secretary of Labor Wirtz issued a directive to all joint apprenticeship committees of the District of Columbia June 5, 1963, on the discrimination crisis in the District jurisdiction. The Secretary listed the following requirements for programs hoping to enjoy Federal registration rights:

1. If apprentices are not selected by a merit system alone, selections must be made in a manner that demonstrates equality of opportunity.

2. Waiting lists which reflect previous discriminatory practices must be subjected to whatever action is necessary to offset such discrimination.

V. President Kennedy on June 4, 1963, directed the Secretary of Labor to require that "admission of young workers to apprenticeship programs be on a completely nondiscriminatory basis."

VI. Following Secretary Wirtz' order of June 11, 1963, the Bureau of Apprenticeship began a 50-city check of Negro apprenticeship participation in Federal construction projects.

The varied activities here cited indicate the commitment of the Kennedy administration to equaltiy of opportunity in apprenticeship.

The President held a national conference with 300 labor officials at the White House June 13 in which he called for the end of job discrimination at every level of union jurisdiction. This was one of a number of conferences on civil rights held with businessmen, educators, clergymen, and lawyers.

However, the President noted that genuine equality of opportunity could be meaningful only in a full employment economy.

National morality and the times will permit nothing less than full job equality, but without full employment this means sharing job scarcity regardless of race, color, creed or national origin. Job equality must mean sharing the bounty, not the scarcity of national life. But apprenticeship at its fullest would hardly have the capacity to solve youth unemployment. The problem is beyond that.

During the calendar year 1962, teenage unemployment averaged 13 percent against an overall national figure of 5.6 percent. During 1962 the average teenage unemployment total was 816,000 workers.

Between 1957 and 1962 the total number of registered apprentices in training averaged 150,000.

Apprentices in training today average only 3 percent of the 5,077,000 teenage workers in the U.S. labor force. Of the teenage total, 3,017,000 are male.

The apprenticeship solution assumes even less promise when pictured against a 50-percent mortality rate. The consistent national experience suggests that only one-half of those now in training will know journeyman status.

The proportionate place of apprenticeship must also be seen in the perspective of the awesome burdens the American economy will confront in the 1960's.

The U.S. Department of Labor tells that the economy must provide 34.5 million new jobs in the 1960's to match the demands of population growth and technological change.

The labor force will realize a net increase of 12.5 million through population expansion. This involves an increase of 26 million young workers. Death and the retirement of older workers will determine the 12.5 million net figure.

The technological impact will be greater. The Labor Department estimates the annual rate of productivity increase will be about 3 percent throughout the 1960's. This means the output per man-hour will jump about 3 percent each year. The job displacement statistics become frightening when the 3 percent productivity rate is applied to an annual average employment figure of 74 million workers. For the 1960's this means the economy must provide 2.2 million new jobs each year to care for technological progress. The decade's demand will be 22 million jobs.

The statistics are germane because apprenticeship, unlike vocational education, always has been a job-related training system. Unless employers determine to hire apprentices there is no apprenticeship system. Further, unions relate the number of admitted apprentices to the number of employed journeymen.

Given full employment, apprenticeship could come to its greatness.

But at this hour, the immediate crisis of apprenticeship discrimination plagues the national conscience and cries for action.

The Kennedy administration reforms must succeed. There is hope and precedent in the experience of California.

Four years ago Gov. Edmund G. Brown named apprenticeship bigotry a special evil and called for remedies. Adoption of an FEP law in 1959 helped greatly but was not quite enough. The subtleties of apprenticeship bias often escape FEP enforcement.

California's plan has won national praise. It features (1) statewide and local committees on apprenticeship opportunities for members of minority groups; (2) local apprentice information centers for making vital data available to high-school students and graduates.

The statewide opportunities committee was founded in 1960. It is comprised, like the National Advisory Committee, of labor, management and minority group representatives and includes Government spokesmen.

The California committee last year developed two precedent-smashing surveys of the depth of discrimination.

The initial study approached the ethnic identity of the more than 20,000 apprentices receiving training in California. The second involved an ethnic sampling of journeymen who completed their apprentice training in 1955.

The first survey, based on a one-third return of questionnaires, revealed the startling evidence that there were 283 American Indians participating in California apprenticeship programs as against 150 Negroes. Mexican-Americans numbered 521, Japanese-Americans 31 and Chinese-Americans 18.

The findings suggest that Negroes number just a bit more than 2 percent of California's apprentices. In the Federal census of 1960, Negroes formed 5.8 percent of the total State population and 4.7 percent of the State's male labor force.

The State committee data on minority representation among journeymen certified in 1955 also are revealing.

A one-fourth return of inquiries pegged Negro participation at 1.5 percent.

The journeymen survey indicates the rewarding nature of skilled employment. Seventy-two percent of the graduate apprentices were earning $7,000 or more a year, while 52.4 percent were earning over $8,000 per annum. Only 11.2 percent were earning less than $6,000 per year.

Ninety percent were enjoying full employment on a yearly basis.

Both surveys confirm the skilled labor problem of the Negro. But the totals do not necessarily prove discrimination. For example, in certain survey areas Negroes had rarely, if ever, applied for apprenticeship admission. The failure could represent either resignation to bias or the absence of training qualifications.

Traditionally, Negroes have been the particular victims of hasty and frequently indifferent counseling in the high school systems. In California's soaring school population, a senior student is fortunate if he receives 1 hour of personal counseling in his final year. This obtains for any student whatever his race or skin. The national practice is scarcely different.

Each year thousands of young Americans emerge from the secondary schools without any sense of occupational direction. Adequate high school counseling would be of particular benefit to the children of Negro families recently removed from the agrarian South. These young people suffer the same lack of skilled labor tradition as did most of the 19th century European immigrants who poured into America searching for freedom and opportunity.

But where immigrant Europeans could seek manual labor in coal and steel and maritime employment, today's young Negro faces a labor market in which there is little future for the unskilled.

Not only because of discrimination but also because of lack of skills, Negro unemployment is consistently twice the overall national average. In the calendar year 1962 the rate of unemployment among Negroes was 11 percent against a national average of 5.6 percent. Negroes represent 11 percent of all American workers but represent 22 percent of all unemployed.

As indicated earlier, economic growth is the first requisite of full employment in the 1960's, the full employment that will give job opportunity to all Americans.

Economic growth, however, will not find employment for the unskilled.

America needs an active labor market policy to accompany the fiscal and monetary policies of growth. An active labor market policy would directly answer the training needs of the U.S. labor force. The rate of unemployment among unskilled workers in the calendar year 1962 was 12 percent against the national average of 5.6 percent.

An active labor market policy also would end racial and ethnic discrimination in employment.

But it would do more than that. It would also achieve these ambitions:

1. An updated labor market information service for workers and employers.

2. An employment service warning system for impending technological changes and other changes causing serious job displacement.

3. An effective informational service for career guidance and counseling.

4. An educational system, vocational as well as academic, which would answer current and upcoming manpower needs.

5. An expanded apprenticeship training program.

6. An improved system of job placement services.

7. A program for aiding the mobility of workers.

In summary, it is obvious that Negro discrimination in apprenticeship has its unique and general features. The Negro suffers because of his skin. But he suffers also because he often is an unskilled worker in an economy which has limited place for the unskilled. Finally, he suffers because he is a worker in a society which has not yet found the way to full employment.

The issue of employment discrimination is not peculiar to apprenticeship. It will be found everywhere, including the banking, insurance, and newspaper worlds. It will be found in the professions and the religions of America. Indeed, discrimination is often strongest in sectors of nonunion employment.

American labor must persist in its efforts to realize full employment and the abolition of the last measure of job discrimination. The efforts must reach to the State councils, local councils, and local unions.

The matter is moral. For more than 100 years labor has served as the social conscience of the Nation. Unpurchased and unafraid, it has led the everlasting struggle to attain a society in which bread, security, and freedom shall be the right of all Americans whatever their racial, religious, or ethnic identity.

Labor holds priceless credentials of sacrifice and struggle. It must use these credentials now as mortal conflict shakes the Nation. The honor and duty of leadership rest with the trade union movement.

Diplomatic Relations With a Quisling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the proofs of retreat of the appeasement-minded dreamers of the New Frontier is their handling of the Soviet-imposed Eastern European Red governments.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in an editorial on Monday, August 12, very concisely discusses our relations with Hungary, and under unanimous consent, I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH A QUISLING

As was widely predicted, the United States is seeking to resume full diplomatic relations with the Hungarian regime. Readers will recall that diplomatic ties were curtailed during the 1956 revolution against Soviet control.

The loss of that revolution yoked the Hungarians with a quisling regime run by the traitor, Janos Kadar, the liaison man with the Soviet tank commanders who decimated his people.

Doubtless, the new American move will be hailed by those who seek to avoid irritants in our relations with the Soviets. But what in the name of diplomacy do we have to gain by sending an American minister to exchange views with the special toady of Mr. Khrushchev in Budapest?

Can anyone actually believe that 7 years after the Budapest bloodbath, the regime ensconced at the point of victorious Russian bayonets is now the legitimate representative of the Hungarian people?

If this American palliative to the touchy Soviet sensibilities over their wretched role in Eastern Europe is to be typical of our moves to ease tensions, we would prefer to return to the cold war.

The Legacy of Project Mercury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the companies actively engaged in the conquest of space is the Garrett Corp. of Los Angeles. This company employs more than 10,000 skilled personnel and produced the important environmental control system (ECS) for Project Mercury.

In the Spring issue of New Frontiers, a Garrett publication, an article dealing with the aspects of both the Project Mercury program and the Project Gemini program has caught my interest. I know many Members of the House are constantly searching for more information on the race to the Moon, and I therefore bring this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article is as follows:

THE LEGACY OF PROJECT MERCURY

(By John W. Bold)

He was the last to go. Shepard, Grissom, Glenn, Carpenter, and Schirra already had experienced the tense countdown, the surge of rocketing into space, the exhilaration of weightlessness and the security of recovery. But Gordon Cooper's 22-orbit flight was the longest and most precise.

His was, for 29 hours, a textbook flight. But in the last few hours the NASA-McDonnell team used "all the pages in the book." In the last few minutes, an electrical problem forced the youngest astonaut to carefully position his spacecraft, fire the retro rockets and guide his Faith 7 spacecraft down through the atmosphere—all by hand. He completed his long 34-hour, 600,000-mile flight without the aid of automatic equipment.

It was a suspenseful epilogue to the 4 year saga of Project Mercury. Shepard's flight was the daring first. Grissom confirmed data and prepared us for an orbital mission. Carpenter's took a breathless "month" of minutes before recovery was accomplished in the Atlantic. Astronaut Glenn's was a "real fireball." Schirra flew the first "textbook" flight. All six, each in his way, contributed new data, new drama, to the story of manned space flight, told in an unprecedented frankness by NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center.

But now is the time for retrospection. The highly successful Project Mercury program has ended. During this 5-year program, what have we learned? What new theories have evolved from this Nation's first manned space program? What new engineering concepts wil help us in future spacecraft development work? In particular, what have we learned from Project Mercury that will aid us in Project Gemini?

An insight into the answers to these questions can be gained at Garrett-AiResearch, which produced the vital environmental control system (ECS) for Project Mercury, under contract to McDonnell Aircraft Co. It is now developing a similar system for Project Gemini, again under a McDonnell contract. Both programs are under the technical direction of NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center.

Naturally, the experience of both companies gained in Project Mercury transcends into the Gemini program. "Experience is the best schoolmaster, and it has taught us a great deal," reflects R. C. "Dick" Nelson, AiResearch's program manager for the Project Gemini environmental control system. "At an early meeting at McDonnell," he recalls, "we were able to sit down and quickly determine and analyze problem areas. Immediately we foresaw changes in the ECS which would be necessary because of changes in the mission profile and what we learned from Mercury.

"From our point of view," Nelson believes, "there's one important thing we've learned from Mercury. That's about the man. He has shown that a well trained 'test pilot,' who can think and act is more desirable than the most sophisticated, automatic equipment yet designed."

"As a result," Nelson continues, "the Gemini environmental control system will have less automatic control more manual operation. By reducing the complexity of the system we will increase reliability. Since the Gemini astronauts will have 'time on their hands' to think and act during their 2 week mission, less automation is required."

(Following Gordon Cooper's flight, Walter C. Williams, associate director for NASA's Manned Spacecraft Center, told the press that if a man were not aboard the Faith 7 he doubted if it could have reentered and been recovered.)

In Project Gemini, man's requirements will be basically the same. Thus the function of the ECS remains unchanged—to provide two astronauts a safe and comfortable atmosphere for 2 weeks in space.

The system will provide fresh oxygen, cabin and suit pressurization, thermal control, water management and toxic gas removal. To accomplish these functions, the Gemini ECS can be grouped into the following functions: the loop, or circuit, for suit cooling and pressurization; the cabin loop for cooling and pressurization; the fresh oxygen supply—primary secondary, and emergency egress; the water management loop; the coolant loop. The egress oxygen supply is part of the launch abort system, similar to aircraft type ejection seats. It will be used in Gemini in lieu of the escape tower system which was used in Project Mercury.

The learning curve which "lifted off the pad" with Mercury has dictated some changes in the Gemini system as compared to Mercury.

Nelson lists seven areas in which Mercury experience has resulted in improvements:

1. Coolant subsystems and thermal regulation.
2. Pressure regulation.
3. Moisture removal.
4. Suit compressors.
5. System geometry and installation.
6. Testing.
7. Reliability.

In addition, the longer mission profile has resulted in new concepts in the following areas:

1. Oxygen supplies.
2. Heat transfer equipment.
3. Power supplies.
4. System servicing.
5. Water management.

For oxygen storage, a different source replaces the high pressure system (7,500 pounds per square inch) used in Mercury. The new source, a supercritical system, will serve as the primary source of oxygen. A high pressure source (5,000 pounds per square inch) will be secondary. Supercritical storage defies definition in layman's terms. However, it is oxygen compactely stored in a state between a gas and a liquid. In orbit the supercritical storage provides enough oxygen with ample reserve for two men, for 14 days, in the Gemini spacecraft—occupying a minimum of space and weight. During reentry, the high pressure source, which also serves a backup for the supercritical system, will supply the necessary oxygen, pressurization and cooling.

In Project Mercury, cooling was totally dependent on a cabin and suit heat exchanger boiling water as the coolant. These water boilers were ideal for the weight and short mission of Mercury. In fact, in some instances, water will continue to be used for cooling in Gemini. However, the cooling burden in Project Gemini will fall on six heat exchangers using a recycling oil-type coolant instead of water. Heat absorbed by the coolant will be radiated into space instead of boiled off as steam as in Mercury.

The constant manual control of the heat exchangers will also be eliminated. This operation, similar to adjusting a home air conditioning system, will be replaced by an automatic system with manual override. This will eliminate excessive temperatures incurred before the boiling process stabilized temperatures in the spacecraft—usually before the end of the first orbit.

Expulsion of the coolant in Mercury was accomplished in a pressurized tank with a bladder forcing the water out. The Gemini system will comprise a closed loop unit including four parallel pumps—two in a loop—for more effective coolant circulation.

During each launch the Mercury lithium hydroxide canister required special attention. Engineers kept an accurate count on the time each cannister was used and tested. This way, launch personnel were assured sufficient lithium hydroxide was available for carbon dioxide removal for the entire length of the mission. In Gemini, lithium hydroxide will be used again; however, the amount installed in the re-entry module will be more than adequate.

The water separator, which was a pneumatically operated sponge type, will be replaced by a static type separator with no moving parts. This development is an outgrowth of Garrett's extensive aircraft air conditioning and pressurization experience. It eliminates the possibility of high moisture content (humidity) in the spacecraft, and with no moving parts, is more reliable.

Suit and cabin compressors will have greater capacity (23 and 88 cubic feet per minute respectively) but will require little additional power. Conservation of electrical power has been a design objective throughout the Gemini program. But it is not an easy goal.

In Mercury, AiResearch delivered 49 different ECS components to McDonnell where they were assembled. The Gemini system contains 114. However, as Dick Nelson puts it, "we are marrying many of the components here at AiResearch," so that 84 components will be integrated into 11 modules. This marriage, instigated by McDonnell, insures optimized design and better performance. The other 30 components will be delivered individually.

The marriage of components into compatible modules enables the subsystem to be quickly divorced from the spacecraft. Thus, during the countdown if a malfunction occurs in a module it can be quickly removed and replaced. In fact the entire Gemini suit module ECS can be replaced in 40 minutes. By comparison, in Mercury it required 24 hours to remove the carbon dioxide absorption canister alone.

What is the status of the Gemini environmental control system? In May, the first major segment of the Gemini environmental control system was shipped to McDonnell, St. Louis for testing. Dick Nelson took personal charge of the shipment. After telephoning several department heads to insure proper packaging and shipment, Nelson swung his 6-foot, 6-inch, 220-pound frame around and said, "I feel I'm sending my first child on a trip." Without a doubt, every AiResearcher who had nursed the production of teh equipment along felt the same way.

Today, comprehensive manned tests are being conducted to prove the operational compatibility of the environmental control system to the man. These tests are being conducted in AiResearch, Los Angeles and soon reliability and qualification tests will begin in AiResearch's new lab in Torrance. This new multimillion-dollar facility is replete with clean rooms and high altitude chambers (capable of simulating 240,000 feet altitude). New data acquisition equipment electronically records more than 300 measurements on each test. This equipment enables detail-conscious engineers to analyze test data in hours when previously it required days, often weeks.

The meticulous task of designing, fabricating and testing the Gemini environmental control system is a carryover from Project Mercury. Much of the technology gained in Project Mercury ECS is directly applicable to Gemini. As an example, Nelson cites the Gemini testing program: "We are not trying to devise new testing procedures," he said. "Experience enables us to retain the valid concepts used in Mercury and add improvements."

"The experience we gained in Mercury has given us confidence in our Gemini work and in systems for the future," says Nelson.

And what of the future? Our national goal is to land a man on the moon. Just as experience gained from Project Mercury is applied to Gemini, so will Project Gemini data be applicable to Project Apollo. The Apollo Spacecraft, with an AiResearch environmental control system aboard, will carry three men to the moon.

Cost of the Nation's space program rests heavy on the Federal budget. Today, cost conscious engineers are optimizing their design and using their creative ingenuity to minimize development costs. Certainly, the carryover experience from Mercury to Gemini will result in vast savings.

Willard E. Wilks, in his new book "The New Wilderness—What We Know About Space" notes that it will require an average of $7 billion a year to accomplish our national space goal. "It is less than the $7.5 billion Americans spend annually on cigars and cigarettes," he wrote.

At first glance the cost of the Nation's space program seems as high as the apogee of Gemini itself. However, erudite planning on the part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has kept costs nominal.

Already, nine new astronauts are selected and are gaining from experiences of the original seven. (At a recent Cape Canaveral press conference, astronaut "Deke" Slayton, who is coordinator of Astronaut Activity, quipped to newsmen that they preferred to be called the "original" rather than "old" astronauts.) Of the original astronauts Wally Schirra was assigned the environmental control system as his special assignment. In the new group, John Young, a Navy pilot, will concentrate on the ECS.

But it took one of the "original" sages to place the manned space program in proper perspective. Astronaut John Glenn said, "But the greatest of all benefits from manned space flight will undoubtedly come from some now-unforeseen discoveries occasioned by man's ability to assess the new things he encounters in the unknown."

For the present little is unforeseen or unknown. The Nation's space program stands strong, bolstered by legs of experience.

Civil Rights by Bishop Andrew Grutka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from a pastoral letter by Bishop Andrew G. Grutka of the Gary, Ind., Catholic diocese.

Bishop Grutka's diocese contains the great Calumet industrial region of Indiana. It is made up of many nationalities, races, and religions.

This great cosmopolitan region for over a quarter of a century has been actively making a sincere effort to practice civil rights. Our area is probably more free from racial agitation than any area in the Nation.

Religious leaders like Bishop Grutka, business leaders, public officials, and all segments of business have been making a sincere effort to practice civil rights.

The following is a news item on Bishop Grutka's message and also an editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune commenting on the message:

GRUTKA ASSAILS RACE PREJUDICE IN PASTORAL LETTER

A pastoral letter issued today by Bishop Andrew G. Grutka of the Gary Catholic diocese brands racial prejudice and injustice as heinous crimes against God and man.

Divided into three parts, the letter follows the theme of racial justice and charity. It explains Christian teaching, areas of concern, and the roles of the church and the individual in eliminating racial discrimination, prejudice, and segregation.

The bishop wrote that the letter wasn't fulfillment of an official duty. "It is rather the expression of a deep and painfully felt concern for many sorely tried and shamefully treated members of our community, Negroes in particular."

He cited the fact that Negroes are pooling resources and energies and enduring hardships to get free exercise of human rights and dignities. He urged "right-thinking persons and practicing Christians" to lend Negroes a hand in this effort.

Admitting the message offers no simple or easy solution for the elimination of prejudice, discrimination, or segregation, the bishop said it hopes for a change in attitude and that Christians will follow the meaning of John 13:34: "A new commandment I give you that you love one another."

Grutka explains the unity of the human race by references to the teachings of the story of creation in the Bible, to statements by Pope Pius XXII, Pope John XIII and to action of the bishops of the United States in 1958. The equality of all men, the human dignity of all men and the honor of all men are cited in his explanation.

He explains how foreign immigrants, once rejected, have been assimilated into our society and are not easily recognized as distinct ethnic groups.

Then, he writes, "The Negro is faced with similar challenges in housing, employment,

education, and political domination. For him, however, the challenge is intensified and perpetuated by the high visibility of his darker skin. Regardless of his personal qualifications, he is seldom, if ever, acceptable without any reservation in the dominant white society. He is not free to live where he chooses in accordance with his economic status. He is often thwarted in his employment and educational aspirations. He is politically restricted, religiously frustrated, socially ostracized and individually demoralized."

The bishop specifically mentioned areas of concern caused by prejudice, segregation, and discrimination. The areas cited are: housing, employment, education, political domination, religion, and associations.

Here are some of his statements on the areas of concern:

Housing: "Evidences of segregation in housing are strikingly acute. So is the evidence that this is deliberate. This containment implies that one race is not fit to live with another. This is immoral. Christian doctrine and democratic principles affirm the rights of all persons to live where they choose and in homes which their economic position can afford," said the bishop.

Creation of slums: "Segregated housing inevitably leads to overcrowded housing. This in turn gives rise to slum conditions and the consequent problems of physical, social, and spiritual deterioration. It is cruel to advertise the benefits of good housing and then tolerate slums in which culture and the practice of virtue are practically impossible."

Open occupancy: "The warmly inviting welcome of good housing—sincerely open—can banish the irritating barriers of discrimination. As a consequence the climate of social relations would be vastly improved."

Employment: "Closely alined with the housing problem is the inequality of economic opportunity. Significant gains have been made in diminishing racial discrimination in hiring but much more remains to be accomplished."

Trades, etc.: "Discrimination in professions, crafts, and trades discourages the acquisition of proficiency and skill. No one gives his best where his talents are not appreciated," wrote the bishop.

Education: Hitting hard at education, the bishop said, "racial segregation of schools can no longer be tolerated. It is hypocrisy to teach democracy in segregated schools. Segregated schools exist because there is segregation in housing. Eliminate one and the other will soon vanish.

"Other institutions and associations: Our hospitals have made praiseworthy strides in the integration of patients and personnel. They should be on constant alert to eliminate any remaining vestiges of discrimination."

Catholic groups: "Organizations bearing the name 'Catholic' or associated with Catholic causes ought to have qualifications for membership which are identical in every respect for any sincere applicant."

Right to join: "No one who considers himself a Christian should join any association which has as its stated or implied purpose the hindrance or the humiliation of another group because of race. On the other hand, no one should take issue with another for joining an organization designed specifically to promote the uniquely distinct interests of its members."

The roles of the church and the individual in ending segregation, discrimination, and racial prejudice are also given.

The parish's role is to act promptly and decisively to further racial equality. They are asked to inspire parishioners to work for and cooperate with civic and neighborhood organizations toward the following goals and objectives:

1. Housing legislation completely fair and strong enough to shatter the present pattern of compulsory segregation.

2. Systematic enforcement of building codes, fire prevention ordinances, and zoning laws.

3. Realistic preparation of people in changing neighborhoods for integration.

4. Welcome newcomers into the neighborhood warmly with an evident interest in their welfare.

The role of the individual is outlined for both white and Negro in the bishop's letter. People are asked to share opinions, views, and experiences and learn about the other race's fears, frustrations, aspirations, and reservations.

Demonstrations of a peaceful pattern are also approved.

The bishop wrote, "Peaceful demonstrations which are a part of our American heritage are being used by our Negro neighbors to attract attention to their claims. As long as they serve a useful purpose under the guidance of responsible leadership they deserve our sympathetic attention and cooperation. Violence in any form is to be deplored. It only fans the flames of angry passions and stretches tension to the breaking point."

Concluding the message, the bishop writes, "The key word in this message is charity; charity as it connoted the love of neighbor based on the love of God. * * * Without charity, genuine peace among people is not possible."

He pleaded for each person to be a neighbor, stating, "Being a neighbor is the personal way in which I meet someone else. It is the substantialization of the query, How good a neighbor am I?

"I call for a courageous and unfaltering response to the challenges of racial justice and brothely love. I plead for clear thinking, convincing speech, forthright action. I pray that divine assistance remain with us," the bishop concluded.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Aug. 9, 1963]

THE BISHOP SPEAKS FOR MANY

Bishop Andrew Grutka is the spiritual guide for the Gary area's large Roman Catholic population. A story carries his cogent and pointed views on the current racial problems.

While his pastoral letter is addressed to his own people, it contains food for thought and guideposts for direction for all the people of the community—Protestants, Jews, Orthodox Christians, and those who embrace no particular religious faith, but who maintain a belief in basic American precepts.

As a matter of fact, the leaders of the other faiths, through the National Council of Churches, through their individual national organizations and through many sermons of individual rabbis, priests, and ministers from the pulpit have spoken out with equal clarity before.

The bishop's effort to shine the light of divine truth brightly enough to dispel the blinding darkness of prejudice is not a sectarian approach.

True he specifically cites the stands of two Catholic Popes and of the Catholic bishops of the United States, but he cites also various texts from the New Testament common to all Christians and from the Old Testament, common to both Christians and Jews, and from the Declaration of Independence, common to all Americans.

His appeals are both universal and specific.

There is universality in his belief that: "It is clear, or should be, that prejudice, discrimination, and segregation based on race alone violates man's obligation to his neighbor and makes a mockery of the virtues of justice and charity."

There is universality in his saying that "The inbred social evils of generations will require strong and sometimes drastic action to dispel."

He is specific in saying that "The evidences of segregation in housing are strikingly acute" along with "evidence that this is deliberate" and "immoral" and in adding that those "who resort to unwritten restrictive covenants and rely on the feebleness of law enforcement against discriminatory selling are guilty of perpetuating segregation."

He is specific in saying that despite "significant gains * * * made in diminishing racial discrimination in hiring" that there is still "insufficient * * * concern given to the flagrant discrepancies evident in upgrading and promotion practices."

There is much more that is both specific and general, but the essence is its appeal for a righteous understanding of the evils of segregation.

In the bishop's own words, "This message offers no simple or easy solution for the elimination of prejudice, discrimination, or segregation. It proposes a search of the soul, piercing enough to recognize the devilishness of the evil and contrite enough to bring about a real change in attitude."

It deserves study by all of us.

The Political Scene in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD a very interesting article on "Mexico Reaches Political Maturity," written by Fred A. Orleans. This is one of a series of articles, written by Mr. Orleans on Mexico. He is a well-known international lawyer, economist, and authority on Latin American affairs. He has lived in Mexico for a number of years and is personally acquainted with many of its leaders and statesmen. I am pleased to bring his views on the current political situation in Mexico to the attention of my colleagues. The article is as follows:

MEXICO REACHES POLITICAL MATURITY

(By Fred A. Orleans)

In a period of extreme unrest in many parts of the world, including Latin America, it is indeed gratifying to find one country calmly preparing its program for the 1964 presidential election. It is in an atmosphere of self-confidence and political maturity that Mexico is readying itself for another 6 years of hard work and real progress. It is almost without precedent in Latin America for any country to approach a presidential election without strong political clashes which usually reflects itself in the economic life of the country, seriously affecting same and creating a period of unrest and violence.

It is certainly to Mexico's credit that none of this is happening in Mexico today and that this country is able to pass peacefully from one regime to another, concerned only with the thought that the next presidential term of 6 years, from 1964 through 1970, shall see the continuation of the progress and peace which the present regime has attained. Mexico has ceased expending its energy on

political struggles, and instead, is able to concentrate its energy on programs that will benefit all its people in all phases of life.

A great deal of the credit for the political maturity that Mexico has attained is due in no small measure to President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, who has succeded in not only being respected by the countries of the world, but appreciated and loved by his own people. There was a time when the President was attacked when he first entered office, but President Lopez Mateos wisely chose to ignore those attacks from within and without and instead dedicated himself to serving his country. In the end, he won the admiration of all.

In writing about the political maturity of Mexico, one cannot do so without mentioning Alfonso Corona del Rosal, well-known attorney and president of PRI, the official party to which the majority of Mexican citizens belong. It is this gentleman, working discreetly and persistently for many years, who can be credited with changing outdated formulas and creating motives of interest for the people in belonging to the party, giving it tremendous strength, confidence in its respectability—in its prestige. What he has brought about, will to a great extent result in who is designated to be the candidate for president by the PRI, and will be, by the overwhelming will of the people, democratically elected without trouble of any kind.

President Lopez Mateos and the head of the PRI Party are not only approaching the conclusion of their term in office with a great amount of strength and prestige, but they have already assured the continuation of political peace and progress in Mexico for the next 6 years.

Perhaps one of the most important acts Alfonso Corona del Rosal has undertaken is to install a special commission which will prepare the Government program for the next 6 years. This will not be done in the form of directives, thus converting a president into an intrument of execution. It would certainly be an absurd pretense and never possible, but rather will be done in the form of detailed studies of Mexican problems and their possible solutions which will save the next president an enormous amount of time and study. Only countries of political stability can prepare in advance their next 6 years of presidential action. Mexico and its great President have arrived at this position. I think it is safe to predict that the overall program of the PRI will be, in its major aspects, the working program of the next president of Mexico, whomever he shall be.

President Lopez Mateos and the president of the PRI party, Alfonso Corona del Rosal, who is unquestionably one of the important political figures of the future, have designated two men of great capacity and prestige to take charge of and to coordinate what has become known as the next national program. Mr. Octaviano Campos Salas has been named director of this program. He is an economist and a man of great sincerity, competence, and experience. This gentleman will prepare the Government program, choosing only the most worthwhile of the suggestions submitted by the commissions. There is little doubt that Mr. Campos Salas will play a very great part in the future politics of Mexico.

The other person upon whom rests the responsibility of preparing the program for the next presidential regime, is the coordinator, Guillermo Rosell, who is, without a doubt, one of the most competent men in the Western Hemisphere for handling this important task. He performed a similar function in the campaign of President Lopez Mateos and obtained brilliant success. His is a clear talent which permits him to project large governmental plans with mathematical precision and he has the knack of surrounding himself with men of great merit.

The next program of the Government of Mexico has been divided up into commissions following the specific aspects of the political picture, and to preside over each commission has been designated a specialist in the field. All of them are men of great importance and ability.

One of the most important of these commissions is the one on foreign relations since Mexico has become a nation which is not only a leader in the Western Hemisphere, but in the family of nations as well. Mexico is to be congratulated on naming as president of the commission of foreign relations, Dr. Luis G. Sevilla. He is known in the Western Hemisphere as one of the most competent people in the field of foreign relations and has vast diplomatic experience which enables him to understand world problems.

Dr. Sevilla is deeply respected in all parts of the world for his moral integrity. He is a former president of the Mexican Academy of International Law and one of the founders of the Latin American Academy of International Law in which he was assigned the difficult position of Secretary-General. This gentleman was adviser to various presidents of Mexico and Ambassador at Large under former President Miguel Aleman. As a mature statesman, Dr. Sevilla is no longer concerned with political aspirations; he is a man concerned with the peace of the world through the rule of law, a formula which he believes represents for the peoples of the Americas the standard of our conduct and for our protection. Thus, Mexico can rest easy knowing that a man who values this norm of conduct will help prepare the foreign policy for the next President of Mexico.

For those of us who have for many years been studying and writing about the importance of Mexico, the strength of its regime, and the statesmanship ability of its President, this new political lesson of our neighbor is not surprising, but it does give us tremendous satisfaction. In view of recent important developments, we can predict an era of great understanding between Mexico and the United States; understanding based on mutual respect and friendly solutions of common problems and a sound and sincere desire on our part for the well-being of the Mexican people, as well as great faith in the destiny of the Western Hemisphere.

AFL-CIO Picks a Political Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call attention to an article that appeared in today's New York Times. It is the announcement by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO of the appointment of Mr. Al Barkan as the new political director of the AFL-CIO. Mr. Barkan is one of the most distinguished citizens to be born in the city of Bayonne, N.J., which I have the privilege of representing in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Barkan is one of the most able, energetic and conscientious leaders in the long history of the American labor movement. He made a significant contribution to the election of President Kennedy through his abilities as a planner and a strategist.

I am happy to add my congratulations to his appointment. It is an appointment that will serve not only the best interest of labor but will also serve well the interest of our country.

The article follows:

AFL-CIO PICKS A POLITICAL CHIEF—ALEXANDER E. BARKAN NAMED TO EDUCATIONAL POST

UNITY HOUSE, PA., August 14.—Alexander E. Barkan was named today the new political director of the AFL-CIO.

George Meany, president of the labor body, announced his appointment of Mr. Barkan at a meeting of the administrative committee of the federation's committee on political education. The committee is the political arm of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The administrative group began to discuss plans for the 1964 election campaign, which undoubtedly will see the AFL-CIO allied with the Democratic Party in an effort to reelect President Kennedy.

The federation's principal contribution is expected to be a drive to register voters and get them to the polls on election day. The drive will be concentrated in areas where there are large numbers of union members.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENT INDICATED

The indications from today's meeting were that it would be financed by a special assessment on the AFL-CIO affiliates of 3 cents a number supplemented by contributions directly from the treasuries of the federation and other labor groups. About $750,000 was raised in this fashion last year, about $360,000 of it from the one-time 3-cent levy.

Mr. Barkan, a 54-year-old registered Democrat of liberal persuasions, succeeds the late James L. McDevitt as director of the political education committee. Mr. McDevitt died last March.

Mr. Barkan has had long experience in labor political action and is regarded both as an able speaker and a capable planner and strategist.

Mr. Barkan was born in Bayonne, N.J. He was graduated from the University of Chicago in 1933 and taught for 4 years at the Bayonne High School.

He joined the staff of the Textile Workers Union organizing committee of the former CIO in 1937. During World War II he was in the Navy.

In 1945, Mr. Barkan was named veterans director of the CIO community services committee. A year later he became executive secretary of the New Jersey State CIO Council and in 1948 returned to the CIO textile union as its political action director.

With the merger of the AFL and the CIO in 1955, Mr. Barkan became assistant director of the political education committee. He was named deputy director in 1957 and has been acting director since Mr. McDevitt's death.

Many Americans Oppose the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as a refreshing contrast to reports by Pierre

Salinger about the White House's test ban mail bag, I am asking that the following extracts from letters received by me on the subject be included here in the RECORD:

St. Paul, Minn.: "I sincerely hope we have enough patriotic Members of Congress to kill this treaty with the treacherous Russians."

Laguna Beach, Calif.: "Our only hope now is that Congress will refuse to ratify this perilous test ban pact. It is nothing but further capitulation to the U.S.S.R."

Rancho Santa Fe, Calif.: "Be wary of test ban treaty."

Newport Beach, Calif.: "Vote 'No' on the proposed test ban treaty."

Benton, Ill.: "I'm merely a legal secretary and voter, but my concern at Russia's seeming congeniality over the test ban is as real as yours. Must we unwittingly sacrifice mankind in a gesture so typically American and openhearted by assuming that Russia is acting in other than self-interest?"

Payette, Idaho: "We are going to make a sad mistake."

Menlo Park, Calif.: "I cannot see how anything could justify taking such chances with our national security and our children's future."

Owensboro, Ky.: "From our past experiences with tyrants, it would seem that we would eventually learn that you cannot negotiate or compromise with tyrants and that they recognize only force or the threatened use of force."

Greenville, S.C.: "The test ban treaty * * * was made to order by the Russians, in order to give them time to catch up and evidently pass the United States. I would turn thumbs down on such a blunder."

Bonita, Calif.: "As usual, we will be the monkey on the string with all to lose, and losing fast anyhow, but why help the enemy to plan our destruction?"

Los Angeles, Calif.: "How can sane men who are sent to represent the people sign away our very liberty and freedom?"

Bridgeville, Pa.: "Our country is in dire peril."

Pasadena, Calif.: "To imperil our very survival in our so-called free society with a nuclear test ban treaty is to commit national suicide."

La Mesa, Calif.: "It is utterly amazing how our Government can seriously consider signing anything with Russia. We are truly hamstringing ourselves in many, many ways. If our country falls, the world goes with us, and degradation and slavery reign in the world."

Bartow, Fla.: "How could the Congress consider yielding up the only war deterrent America has?"

Marblehead, Ohio: "Khrushchev must have received some kind of concessions from this country, Harriman, Rusk, etc., or he would not be so willing to agree. What is the deal?"

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Lawyers' Global Work Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 1963, the First World Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law adopted a program for the lawyers of the world. This program adopted by the Conference is worthy of the attention of my colleagues; so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit the report entitled "Lawyers' Global Work Program" at this point in the RECORD:

LAWYERS' GLOBAL WORK PROGRAM

(Adopted by the First World Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, July 7, 1963)

This world program for the lawyers of the world is based upon the ideas expressed and objectives described at the First World Athens Conference on World Peace Through the Rule of Law, held from July 1 to July 7, 1963. It is not intended to constitute, in any sense, a summary of the papers which were presented during the week but rather a list of some of the subjects lawyers should study in their worldwide joint and cooperative efforts to strengthen world law rules and world legal institutions. While by no means intended to be exhaustive, this program is designed to suggest some of the many steps which may be taken, studied, or supported by the proposed World Peace Through Law Center and by lawyers and jurists throughout the world to help achieve a just and enduring peace under the rule of law. The order in which the items appear below has no significance other than that they were discussed in this order at the Conference.

We, therefore, refer to the Center the following subjects which have been raised at Athens and urge the executive committee of the Center to consider them and establish priorities having regard to the work being done by other international and national organizations, the intention being to support and avoid interference with such organizations.

I

With respect to the International Court of Justice, the work program should include studies which will:

1. Encourage states to refer international disputes for adjudication by the International Court of Justice or other international courts, particularly by means of the inclusion in treaties of a provision that disputes relating to their interpretation shall be decided by the International Court of Justice or such other appropriate international tribunals as may be established.

2. Encourage the respective states to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; or, if such jurisdiction has been accepted with reservations, to withdraw reservations which reserve to the respective states the right to determine whether a matter is within their domestic jurisdiction.

3. Further the establishment of regional chambers of the Court, sitting from time to time at locations more convenient to the litigant states.

4. Consider the question of rights of appeal from decisions of regional chambers of the Court to the International Court of Justice.

5. Consider the modification of the Court's present composition in view of the changes which have occurred in the world since the Court's establishment.

6. Consider whether the various states should adhere to treaties or adopt law under which decisions of the International Court of Justice, and other international courts, can be enforced through local judicial procedures.

7. Consider amendment of article 34 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice to permit certain international organizations to have direct access to the Court as parties on a basis of equality with states.

8. Encourage greater use of the International Court of Justice by the United Nations itself, particularly through requests for advisory opinions.

II

With respect to regional and specialized courts, the work should include studies on:

1. The feasibility of the establishment of regional courts for the principal geographical regions of the world, and specialized courts with jurisdiction over specific subject matter.

2. Whether there should be a right of appeal from decisions of either or both such court systems to the International Court of Justice.

III

With respect to the promotion and protection of foreign investments, the world program should include studies on:

1. The establishment by intergovernmental action of institutional facilities for the settlement through conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration of international investment disputes in those cases where adjudication is not yet practicable or desirable, perhaps under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

2. The means for and the establishment of effective procedures for the impartial resolution of international investment disputes.

3. The recognition of the special rights and needs of the developing nations.

4. The use of multilateral treaties for the clarification of rights and obligations with respect to foreign investments.

4. The elimination of double taxation, and the adoption of the principles of due process of law in all matters, including those with respect to taxation.

6. The repeal of laws that discriminate against foreign investors.

7. The problems involved in expropriation or nationalization and the provision of prompt, adequate, and effective compensation with due consideration of the varied interests involved.

8. The work of the International Law Commission in this area.

9. The principle that international investors should be independent of international politics.

10. A model international investment code.

11. Creation of domestic foreign investment committees, composed at least in part of lawyers, to make recommendations and take action in this field.

IV(A)

With respect to the development of international trade and international economic associations, the work program should include studies to:

1. Stimulate and encourage greater cooperation on trade and economic matters among the more newly developing nations.

2. Current legal obstacles to the expansion of international trade, and recommendations for their removal.

3. Support organizations working on the unification of private international law, especially, but not exclusively, in the areas of arbitral awards, aribtral procedure, contracts, international judicial cooperation, recognition, and enforcement of foreign judgments, and sales.

4. Support the establishment and expansion of common markets whenever appropriate.

5. Develop international law codes in the areas of law that relate to international business.

IV(B)

With respect to the international protection of industrial property, the work program should include studies to:

1. Encourage states which have not adhered to the Paris Convention for the International Protection of Industrial Property of March 20, 1883 (as revised to date) to join with the 80 states which are now signatories.

2. Develop uniform laws in the field of industrial property.

3. Support the establishment of a system of central examination for novelty of inventions to encourage investment and promote international licensing of patents.

4. Support the creation of a central notification and search office to identify company names and trademarks as well as common denominations.

5. Encourage governments to promote international cooperative efforts in the industrial property field in order to remove obstacles to international trade.

6. Develop a uniform law for the protection of know-how in order to encourage communication of technical knowledge and manufacturing secrets on an international basis and particularly to newly developing countries.

V

With respect to arbitration, conciliation, and related means of resolving international disputes, the work program should include studies to:

1. Promote through research and study the use of nonjudicial means of settling disputes (advisory opinions, conciliation, conferences, good offices, mediation, arbitration, etc.) whenever their use seems appropriate.

2. Encourage the use of the Permanent Court of Arbitration created by the Hague Conference of 1899.

3. Further the proposed establishment of continental international arbitration tribunals composed of men of high repute.

4. Support the principle that fair and effective arbitral clauses should be inserted in all treaties that do not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or its equivalent.

5. Encourage the reporting of public and private arbitral decisions effectively and universally, and effective enforcement measures with respect thereto.

6. Encourage the study and possible use of the Model Rules on Arbitral Procedure adopted by the United Nations International Law Commission.

VI

With respect to disarmament and peace keeping, the work program should include studies to:

1. Educate lawyers themselves, everywhere, and government officials of their respective states, concerning the complex problems involved in establishing an effective disarmament program.

2. Establish committees to draft a comprehensive disarmament treaty for submission to the various states for adoption.

3. Study the nature, scope, and functions of an international disarmament agency.

4. Consider and recommend appropriate peacekeeping machinery which would take effect during the process of disarmament, to protect disarming states from attack.

VII

With respect to outer space and space communication, the work program should include studies to:

1. Encourage states to support the following principles adopted by the United Nations General Assembly:

(a) International law, including the Charter of the United Nations, applies to outer space and celestial bodies.

(b) Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states, in conformity with international law, and are not subject to national appropriation.

2. Clarify the legal problems arising from the exploration and use of outer space, including liability for space vehicle accidents, responsibility of states with regard to assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles, and space communications.

3. Assist in the immediate orderly inauguration of a global system of communications by satellite which will meet the present needs of states and will provide ample opportunities for planned expansion of the services to all states, without now burdening those states having no immediate demand justifying their joining the system at this time.

VIII

With respect to the United Nations and regional political organizations as sources of law rules and legal institutions, the work program shall include studies to:

1. Clarify the role of law and legal institutions in the United Nations and their relationship to political factors such as the veto.

2. To improve the climate of professional attitude toward the United Nations with a view to attracting to it more general support and cooperation from practicing lawyers and judges throughout the world.

3. Encourage more rapid codification and development of international law by various organs of the United Nations.

4. Support, in particular, an increase in the work of the International Law Commission by lengthening its sessions and equipping it with additional staff able to prepare preliminary drafts with supporting documentation and commentaries.

5. Support the use of regional political organizations for developing new rules of international and legal institutions needed to deal with regional problems, on occasion, or where appropriate, with other problems for which United Nations action would not be appropriate or feasible.

6. Bring to the attention of the lawyers of the world the new rules of law and legal institutions being developed by the United Nations, its specialized agencies and regional organizations, as an example of the dynamism of and constant development of the international legal system.

7. Encourage and support a thorough historical study and analysis of the utilization of the various articles of the United Nations Charter.

IX

With respect to international cooperation on legal education and research, the work program shall include studies to:

1. Encourage law schools and bar examiners to require from all law students a background in international law.

2. Encourage and support comparative studies throughout the world of the quality and extent of international law training, and prepare recommendations for improvements.

3. Encourage expanded programs for exchanges of lawyers, law professors, law students, and law books and materials.

4. Encourage and support the creation of an International Research Center in order to proceed with the numerous research projects which the Conference has approved.

5. Encourage and support the creation in the various countries of international law research centers.

X

With respect to international unification of private law, the work program shall include studies to:

1. Encourage and support the worthwhile work of existing organizations and institutions, including the United Nations, that are active in this field.

2. Encourage and support studies designed to select areas of law most suitable for unification, especially where there are common principles, and perhaps especially in fields of commercial law; to unify the law in such areas; and to develop means of avoiding divergence of interpretation of uniform laws.

3. Encourage and support studies of the difficulties and obstacles in the way of making certain branches of law uniform and seek means of avoiding or removing them where unification seems wise.

4. Encourage and support studies of the needs of the more recently developing countries insofar as they relate to possibilities of unification.

5. Encourage the appointment of permanent national committees of lawyers to study problems of unification and make appropriate recommendations with respect thereto.

6. Consider the establishment of a permanent top level international consultative committee for the selection of law subjects suitable for unification.

7. Develop better and broader means, including regular information bulletins, for informing the lawyers and jurists of all countries concerning efforts being made for unification of laws.

XI

With respect to organizing lawyers internationally for effective cooperative action, the work program shall:

1. Establish a permanent World Peace Through Law Center to further the objectives of the Conference in the fields of research, education, and action. Such program should include determination of methods of financing, adoption of a charter and bylaws, selection of a headquarters, employment of necessary personnel, and formulation of policies and programs.

2. Establish regional world peace through law centers in the major geographic areas of the world.

3. Foster the creation of national bar associations in every country and work to aid and strengthen those national bar associations not presently active and strong.

4. Urge national bar associations to establish committees on world peace through law.

5. Encourage religious organizations of all faiths to express to their followers the concept of world peace through the rule of law.

6. Organize periodic regional conferences on world peace through law.

7. Promote a program of technical assistance in the field of law, by exchanging lawyers between developed and developing countries for education and training, exchanging lawbooks, and furnishing financial assistance.

XII

With respect to the problems of stating the general principles of international law, the work program shall include studies which:

1. Support research efforts to determine the general principles of law recognized by the community of nations as well as general principles of international law.

2. Encourage studies and research in support of the work of the United Nations with respect to the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among states, as recommended by Resolution 1815 of the General Assembly of the United Nations of December 18, 1962.

WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW COMMITTEES

Administrative Law and Procedure.
Aliens and Nationality Problems.
Arbitration.
Atomic Energy Law.
Aviation Law Internationally.
Codification of International Law.
Commercial Law.
Comparative Law Studies.
Conciliation and Mediation of Disputes.
Constitutional Guarantees of the Rule of Law.
Contracts Internationally.
Coordination With Other Organizations and With Individuals.
Copyrights and Trademarks Internationally (intellectual property).
Cosmetics Law.
Criminal Law Problems (International Criminal Jurisdiction).
Customs Law.
Diplomatic and Consular Law.
Disarmament Law.
Double Taxation Problems.
Drafting of Model Treaties and Conventions.
Drugs Law.
Extradition Treaties.
Fisheries Law.
Food Law.
Foreign Investments.
General Principles of Law Recognized by Civilized Nations.
Human Rights.
Inland Waters Law.
Insurance Internationally.
Interchange of Lawyers and Law Students.
International Commercial Arbitration.
International Communications (including space and satellites).
International Court of Justice.
International Judicial Cooperation.
International Judiciary.
International Law Commission.
International Law in Municipal Courts.
International Law Weaknesses.
International Trade Regulation.
Interstate Peace Committee (to anticipate crises and recommend peaceful solutions).
Judicial Cooperation Between Nations.
Labor Law.
Law and Lawyers.
Law Books.
Law Libraries.
Law Schools and Legal Education.
Lawyers' World Directory.
Legal Aid.
Legal Education.
Maritime Law.
Membership.
Money, Banking, and Securities.
Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices.

Municipal Law Decisions Affecting International Law.
Nuclear Test Ban Law.
Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.
Patents (Industrial Property).
Private Claims Against Governments.
Private International Law.
Public Relations.
Publications.
Regional Courts.
Research.
Space Law.
Specialized Courts.
Specialized United Nations and Regional Agencies.
Transportation Law.
Treaties.
Unification of International Law.
United Nations Charter.

Bootlegging Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial, "Bootlegging Prayer," by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers, because I think it points up one of the most dangerous situations facing our Nation today. During the past 3 months I have been attempting to call to the attention of church and lay leaders, to various groups I have been privileged to address, and in other ways the fear I have that unless Congress and the American people take some action to nullify the action of the Supreme Court, we are in danger of losing some of the strength which has been responsible for the sound foundation upon which this Nation was founded.

I hope that my colleagues will read this editorial, and pray for guidance that will enable them to make a contribution that will insure the continuance of this Nation as a nation "under God."

The editorial follows:

BOOTLEGGING PRAYER

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN SIMEON.—The results of two national surveys, showing the extent of the shocked opposition of the American people to Supreme Court decisions banning prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, came as no surprise to me this week. The volume and tone of letters from readers to me and to our Hearst newspapers had forecast the overwhelming sentiment.

The surveys were made by the two great news services, United Press International and Associated Press, and they both reported widespread refusal to go along with the Court.

UPI reported that "the Court's June 17 decision is being openly defied in some areas and circumvented elsewhere by 'interpretations' which seem to ignore the plain language of the ruling."

AP reported that "one way or another many of the Nation's schools plan to preserve a classroom religious note despite the Court decision banning prescribed devotional exercises."

In case you didn't read those stories, it was pointed out many States have announced their intention of circumventing the Supreme Court's rulings, otherwise known as "the law of the land," and where States have gone along, localities are defying the ban on their own.

To call the ruling unpopular, therefore, would be one of the great understatements of our time. The heritage of religious faith is the heart and core of America. Most of us are the descendants of people who came to this country to get away from the coercion and persecution of some sort—more often than not to worship as and when they felt inclined.

It just couldn't be expected that a people—whose motto "In God we trust" has been accepted by Americans of all faiths as embodying their common ground—would sit still for the Court's kowtowing to a handful of atheists and their "liberal" but misled civil liberty worriers.

It is positively tragic, then, that our children's prayers must be contraband—that reading of the Bible must be in defiance of the law or in bootlegged circumvention of it.

The 18th amendment, prohibiting liquor in the twenties and thirties, certainly was not a law which hit at our highest aspirations—merely at our pleasures. But it suppressed what most of us believed was a personal freedom. It was a tyranny of a zealot minority imposed on a live-and-let-live majority. It was a negation of the very idea of democracy.

So the American people defied it on such a scale that we became a country of "scofflaws." Remember?

What on earth ever made anyone think that our people who would defy a law which merely interfered with a pleasurable liberty would react in a less outraged way to Supreme Court "law" which interferes with our deepest convictions..

I make that point of calling the prayer ban Supreme Court "law" because it is an interpretation of the Constitution by this current set of black-robed Justices which goes against the interpretations by previous Courts and absolutely negates the intent of the Founding Fathers who wrote our basic law.

In fact, practically all the historic documents which marked the birth of our Nation—from the Declaration of Independence onward—made a point of invoking God. It thus becomes a savage irony indeed that this Court should outlaw prayer to Him.

Lest we forget, the current Court has in 2 short years overthrown more than four and a half centuries on this continent of unashamed acknowledgement of dependence on the Deity.

This was accomplished by three decisions—all directly involving public schools but claimed by at least one member of the Supreme Court to apply to all public life.

This has conceded the objective sought by nonbelievers for decades—to impose their will on the rest of us.

The narrow ground on which the Court rests its first decision—that the New York State Regents' prayer for schools (although it was nonsectarian and noncompulsory) was written by a government agency and therefore was "establishment of religion"—had some legal force even if it defied commonsense and public sentiment.

We of the great majority of believers in God, outraged as we were, could still see it as typical of lawyers' love for hair-splitting quibbles. Recalling the line in a John Galsworthy play of some years back that said: "Public opinion's always in advance of the law," we could hope the Court might catch up.

That hope went out the window a couple of months ago.

Two rulings did it—one declaring the Lord's Prayer was taboo and the other making the reading of the Bible in schools illicit.

It became clear then that the philosophy of the present majority of the Court considered all reference to God in the public schools as violating the 1st amendment to the Constitution, more usually referred to as the first article of the Bill of Rights.

To refresh your memory about the wording of that amendment, here is its reference to freedom of religion:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *."

More than a century and a half has passed since the architects of the Constitution carefully selected those words. But until this court advanced its peculiar interpretation, "an establishment of religion" had always been held to mean giving privilege to one sect over others.

That's the way the writers of the 1st amendment meant it (and I'll tell you more about that next week), because their philosophies, no matter how much they differed on other matters, were unanimous in being for religion and prayer to God and against establishment of any church. To them "establishment" meant official support (and inevitably some degree of control) of any one church.

How then has the Supreme Court arrived at treating prayer to God as shameful or dangerous, not to be allowed to sully the tender ears of schoolchildren?

How has it arrived at what it is only fair to call an establishment—the establishment of atheism, as a favored church—if you'll pardon the expression?

More thoughts on how this happened—and what we may do about it—in this column next week.

Secret Deal Over A-Pact Charged—Full Revelation Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows a release to news media dated this evening in which I discuss why a secret side understanding must exist relative to the partial test ban treaty and demand that its terms be disclosed:

SECRET DEAL OVER A-PACT CHARGED—FULL REVELATION DEMANDED

Representative CRAIG HOSMER today charged a secret side agreement has been made with Russia on the partial test ban treaty and demanded the administration make public its terms.

Unless there is such an unrevealed compact, he asserted, "the language of section 2 of article 1 of the treaty will specifically prohibit the United States from using its nuclear arsenal in time of war."

HOSMER, ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of the House GOP committee on nuclear testing said the secret document has long been rumored. He said it probably is in the form of an informal memorandum of understanding between Moscow, Washington, and London as to what the published text of the treaty actually means. It also could consist of notes and memorandums made separately, but contemporaneously, by

the parties to the transaction during negotiations or at followup meetings, he stated.

The California solon said suspicions of the existence of the hidden document first were aroused by repeated "ready and positive" statements by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster as to "exact meanings of certain provisions of the pact." He said no one familiar with Russian tactics in twisting treaty terms could make such statements wtih assurance unless detailed interpretations had been hammered out with the Russians before hand and put down in black and white.

"As a practical matter," he declared, "it would be reckless and improvident to conclude a treaty with the Soviets without doing so."

President Kennedy has denied any agreements were reached at Moscow other than the treaty itself, as has our chief negotiator, Undersecretary of State W. Averell Harriman and others, including Rusk and Foster. HOSMER said these denials would apply to formal treaties and international agreements, in the usual diplomatic definitions of those terms. He asserted the denials could truthfully not apply to a side-agreement memorandum of understanding or contemporaneous notes, such as he charges exist.

HOSMER said he makes his charge after examining testimony by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Thursday before the combined hearing conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations, and Armed Services Committees and the Senate section of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

Taylor testified concerning the Joint Chiefs' concern over the possibility that the treaty might bar firing of nuclear weapons in time of war. He said the Joint Chiefs "in a body" called on Secretary Rusk and gained assurance that the treaty has "nothing to do with (preventing) the firing of nuclear weapons in time of war."

"Such an assurance," HOSMER declared, "could only be based on a definite and firm understanding between the United States, Russia, and England of the definition of "war" as it relates to this treaty. Otherwise the assurance is in direct contradiction to section 2 of article 1 of the treaty which outlaws, without exception for war or any other circumstance, any nuclear explosion whatever, test or otherwise, in the air, underwater, or in space."

(Text of section 2: "Each of the parties to this treaty undertakes furthermore to refrain from causing, encouraging or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this article.")

"In the face of this treaty provision," HOSMER continued, "it would be impossible for such assurance to have been given to the Joint Chiefs unless a side understanding had been reached as to circumstances under which nuclear explosions nonetheless could be carried on despite the treaty's explicit and blanket prohibition."

"The existence of a side arrangement on this point most certainly means that the unrevealed and secret understanding is a comprehensive one, covering all other major points of the treaty," he reasoned.

"All its terms must be revealed if the Senate is to know what it is ratifying or rejecting, and all the other countries who since have signed the treaty are to know to what they are bound."

HOSMER called for an end to "diplomatic doubletalk denials" and "semantic tricks" and for "full revelation of all the understandings reached at Moscow."

His charge was made on Westinghouse Broadcasting System's "Washington Viewpoint" program and amplified in a statement to news media.

One Pulp and Paper Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Southeast have the greatest and most varied recreational facilities in the world. We now need to develop our resources to create more jobs. Our greatest resource is our pine trees and forests. The paramount need in southwestern South Carolina and northeast Georgia, is for a large pulp and paper mill to bolster our farm and industrial economy. Mead has one of the best sites in the Nation, ideally located on the Savannah River in this area.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope no Federal Government roadblock will be devised to prevent Mead from building.

The following by a great American is excellent advice and should be carefully studied by every planning board, chamber of commerce, and citizen in the Southeast interested in the future of the South:

[From the Knoxville Journal, Aug. 10, 1963]

WAGNER ASKS CAUTION IN DEVELOPMENT

Caution against putting too much emphasis on recreational facilities as a factor in expanding the economy of this region was expressed last night by Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman of Tennessee Valley Authority, in a talk at Tennessee Polytechnic Institute in Cookeville.

Addressing the Conference on Resources Development in the Upper Cumberland Regions, the TVA chief declared.

"Important as it can be, we must not assume that recreation alone can solve the economic problems of any sizable area. Rarely, if ever, is this true.

"I have pointed out that $156 million has been invested in water-based recreation facilities in the Tennessee Valley. The waterfront docks and resorts directly furnish the equivalent of 2,000 full-time jobs. These are impressive figures.

"Yet a single newsprint mill in the valley provides more employment than all of the boat docks, and its investment surpasses the entire investment in recreation on all of TVA's reservoirs. This is an important comparison to remember."

The Best Argument Against Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. (TIC) FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the racial demonstrations in New York City and Chicago, occurring at a time when Congress is being deluged with the latest editions of civil rights proposals, seem to provide the most graphic argument against these proposals that a reasonable person charged with the responsibility of determining their validity could desire.

The editor of the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Mr. Millard Grimes, in an editorial of August 11, gives a clear-cut description of the situation we find ourselves in today regarding the demand for new civil rights laws, and I think his points are well worth a public hearing.

Mr. Grimes points out that we are told from quarters both high and low that these proposals are urgently needed to answer the grievances of the demonstrators. Yet both New York and Illinois, where these racial demonstrations are occurring, have on their books all of the civil rights laws now proposed for the Nation—and these laws are, we presume, strongly enforced.

Among the major civil rights laws of the State of New York are four public accommodations laws, including housing; public schools antidiscrimination laws, laws prohibiting discrimination by labor unions, an executive order against discrimination, and a fair employment statute against discrimination on public works.

The State of Illinois, among other civil rights laws, has a fair employment practices act, two public accommodations laws, including housing; several public schools antidiscrimination laws, and a division of the attorney general's office for enforcement of civil and equal rights.

Yet, in spite of all these laws, there are charges of and demonstrations against racial discrimination in New York and Chicago. These States possess the power, through both civil rights laws and sympathetic officials to enforce these laws, to bring about the changes the demonstrators desire. Still, there is conflict and there is a racial problem.

We are told that the proposals before Congress now will achieve the goals the demonstrators desire. The bare facts would seem to indicate to those who would look at the situation objectively that laws are not only ineffective but unworkable in this area, even when diligently supported and enforced by official power.

The demonstrations of this summer have occurred wherever Negroes compose a sizable portion of the population, and the only States that have escaped them are the ones where the population is mostly of one race, not the States with stringent antidiscrimination laws.

What all this shows is that the promise of fulfillment through the passage of a few so-called civil rights laws is grossly misleading both to the demonstrators and the Nation, and could be only the beginning of more serious trouble when the truth breaks through the deception.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial I have referred to from the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer:

THE BEST ARGUMENT: AGAINST RIGHTS PROPOSALS

(By Millard Grimes)

There are demonstrations, parades and pickets, all clamoring for Negro rights in

New York City, Chicago and points north no less than in various cities of the South.

Indeed, recently, the action appears more intense on the far side of the Mason-Dixon line.

This is no reason for delight or smugness in Dixie. Such incidents do not lessen our own difficulties or responsibilities.

But coming as they do while Congress is debating the new batch of civil rights proposals, they do provide an eloquent argument against those proposals.

Presumably, the demonstrators—including those thousands planning to descend on Washington—believe their actions bolster the case for additional rights laws. President Kennedy, in proposing the measures, argued that they were needed to answer the protests of the demonstrators.

But no filibustering southern Senator could ever present such convincing evidence to the contrary as is being done by the chained pickets at the Brooklyn construction sites, or by the encamped demonstrators at the New York Mayor's and Governor's offices.

There we see a State which has all the civil rights laws now proposed for the Nation—and more—strongly enforced by the political power structure. Yet, there are incidents and charges of discrimination.

Negroes will find no Governor so sympathetic to their troubles as Nelson Rockefeller. In addition, he possesses the State powers to exercise every effort to bring about the changes they desire.

But still, there are demonstrations in New York. There is discrimination. There is conflict and, despite all of New York's laws and officials, there is a racial problem.

So, it is argued in Congress that milder laws than those in New York will produce a better situation in other States. The evidence, of course, indicates that laws are inadequate, even when rigidly supported by the official power, which they would not be as diligently in other States of the Union, as they are in New York.

New York is not an exception, however. Illinois has many antidiscrimination laws, yet harbors serious trouble. More than half the States have laws forbidding discrimination in private businesses, which is the main rights proposal before Congress.

Yet, the record shows that the demonstrations of this summer have followed no sectional lines. They have occurred wherever Negroes composed a sizeable portion of the population. The only States to escape are not the ones with stringent antidiscrimination laws but those where the population is mostly of one race.

Governor Rockefeller, of course, has gone to some pains to depict himself as the champion of civil rights advocates among high officialdom. He constantly attacks President Kennedy for "doing too little" on civil rights and "pussy-footing."

Last week, he went to California for a round of speeches in which he declared his devotion to eliminating discrimination. Meanwhile in New York City, pickets sat in his outer office and demonstrators ringed State construction projects, protesting job discrimination.

Thus, the impression is given that while Rockefeller talks a good game, he is less effective in dealing with specific complaints of Negroes in his own home State.

All of this should never obscure the quite valid and enormously compelling problem of racial relations and racial problems in the United States.

But it does show that the promise of relief through enactment of a few laws sadly misleads the complainants and could lay the foundation for more serious trouble when the cruel truth breaks through the deception.

No fact seems clearer—no argument against further Federal edicts so cogent—as the failure of laws to bring racial utopia in States where they have been tried with sincere determination.

Legal remedies are a delusion. What is needed are human remedies for these human problems.

The U.S. Bill of Rights is primarily an exhortation against the encroaching power of government. The ultimate freedom—of white man or black—can hardly be served by slicing away at the areas still beyond the government's control.

Our National Water Supply and Pollution Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, experts warn us that America's facilities for the control of water pollution must be increased and improved if we are to win the battle for sufficient clean water to meet our ever-increasing needs. Dr. Gordon E. McCallum, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and Chief of its Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control, delivered an able address at the 50th national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress entitled "Our National Water Supply and Pollution Control Program." Dr. McCallum mentioned the extensive and highly significant hearings on water pollution control now being conducted by the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, of which my esteemed colleague and very dear personal friend, the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, is chairman, and pointed out important aspects of the Federal Government's pollution-control program. He emphasized, and I agree, that it will require a major effort to meet our water needs in coming years. I believe his speech provides very useful information, and I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL WATER SUPPLY AND POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

(By Dr. George E. McCallum)

I am very pleased to have this chance to appear before the Rivers and Harbors Congress. For a good many years, this group has been one of our country's most effective and persuasive advocates of sound water policy. You have fought hard and long for your objective, "the adequate, orderly, and prudent use, control, and conservation of the Nation's water resources." And in so doing, you have become one of the chief supporters of water pollution abatement, the particular branch of water conservation in which I am involved.

For the past three weeks, a Committee of the Congress has been examining this country's water pollution abatement problems. Under the very able chairmanship of Congressman JONES of Alabama, this committee has heard a succession of witnesses testify as to what the United States should be doing to protect the quality of its waters. There have been some sharp difference of opinion as to how this problem should be attacked; there has been no argument, however, that the problem does exist or that we do need to do more about it.

This is not a new conclusion. It has been recognized by the Rivers and Harbors Congress for a long time. It was thoroughly documented 2 years ago by the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources. It was expressed over and over again at the National Conference on Water Pollution in 1960.

The facts are that our demands for water are increasing, faster even than our population growth or our agricultural and industrial production. The only way we can meet this demand for water is by using it over and over again, and the only way we can do this is by keeping our water clean enough so that it can be reused.

The Congress has responded to this national need by enacting the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which is administered in our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Public Health Service. The law is honored by its familiar title "The Blatnik Act." This outstanding legislator as its sponsor in 1956, took the leadership again in 1961 in strengthening and broadening the act.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which is its official title, provides for much more than just a Federal program. It established the framework for a national program. That is what I liked about the title you gave me, because what I am saying relates not only to the Federal Government's role but that of States, local communities, industries and others including the responsibilities of the individual citizen.

The law, as written and as administered, recognizes that there are, at least, three principal ways to control pollution. The first is by prevention, the second is by treatment, and the third is by dilution.

Prevention and treatment are the main objectives of our national program with local, State, and Federal agencies working in concert. If a certain pollutant can be kept out of water in the first place, so much the better. If it cannot be, then certainly every effort should be made to remove the pollutant, or at least render it innocuous. Using good water to dilute bad water is a last and expensive measure, although as I shall point out later, a necessary one.

To encourage, and in some cases to enforce prevention of water pollution, the Federal program has a variety of weapons. We have enforcement powers over interstate and, under certain conditions, over intrastate waters. We have a grant mechanism to support State and interstate and university programs. We have research facilities and shortly will have more through new regional laboratories. And finally, as this audience knows, we are able to help municipalities build waste treatment plants, by contributing Federal funds toward their cost. We can grant 30 percent of construction costs up to $600,000 for a single project. Under the current and much-needed accelerated public works program we are able to contribtue considerably more than this in areas where it applies.

Since 1957, more than 4,000 projects have received Federal aid. When finished, they will serve a population of 40 million people and restore the quality of some 43,000 miles of stream. This represents a phenomenal increase in national waste treatment construction over any previous period in our history. This program is truly a cooperative one, administered through the States with local communities putting up $5 for each $1 of Federal funds.

We are making progress on other fronts, as well, in research, in comprehensive pollution control planning, in use of our enforcement powers. We are beginning to utilize the third method of pollution abatement of which I spoke earlier, dilution.

The 1961 amendments to the act require that the need for water quality control must

be considered in the planning of Federal reservoirs. This need will be determined by the construction agency concerned, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, or other agency, with the advice of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This advice to be contained in any report to the Congress. In many instances, the need for such storage will provide a significant additional justification for construction.

The concept and practice of streamflow regulation of water pollution abatement are of course not now. I recall that my first assignment to the Public Health Service was to assist the Corps of Engineers in the 1938 survey of the Ohio River, and this survey took augmented streamflow into consideration. Our approach was naive by today's standards, but the principle was known to us and it was applied.

When used in conjunction with the best methods of prevention and treatment, streamflow regulation can be a powerful tool in maintaining stream quality. We are incapable by prevention and treatment of protecting a stream against all the wastes of industry, mankind, and nature. We must therefore attempt to provide enough water at all times of the year to absorb, dilute, or carry away these hard-core wastes.

The situation today in Chicago is a well-known example of this problem. The Metropolitan Sanitary District maintains a treatment facility of high efficiency, yet each day it discharges 1,800 tons of dissolved solids into the drainage canal and eventually into the Illinois River. Many communities are faced with similar problems.

Another problem we are encountering in more and more parts of the country is pollution from land runoff resulting from changing land uses. Without question, stream flow regulation represents one of the promising ways of counteracting this and other difficult types of pollution such as natural salt pollution in the southwest and the acid mine problems encountered in Appalachia. In urban areas "natural" pollution results from simple storm runoff.

At the present time, we have completed investigations on 130 water storage projects. The annual benefits attributed to these projects amount to more than $35 million. We have 95 additional projects under study and about the same number scheduled for the near future.

Under the act, storage cannot be substituted for adequate treatment of wastes at the source. With this restraint in mind, water quality studies are made for each season of the year at appropriate locations in a river basin to determine the need for streamflow regulation. Water uses are inventoried and instances are identified where poor quality adds to the cost or hampers legitimate uses. A determination is made of the water quality improvement required to reduce cost or protect these uses. Finally, waste-treatment practices are evaluated to find if better control and treatment at the source could provide the necessary improvement. If not, additional storage to provide increased streamflows are determined and recommended.

Reservoirs are usually constructed to satisfy needs for periods of 50 and sometimes up to 100 years. For that reason, an economic study is made to project future water uses and waste water discharges. These projections form the basis for estimating water needs at various locations.

Most important in studying the need for flow regulation is consideration of instream needs as well as withdrawal uses. Instream needs include recreation, propagation of fish and wildlife, and preservation of the natural appeal in the stream. It is not uncommon that instream quality requirements are higher than for withdrawal uses. The bacterial quality of water for swimming, for example, is higher than that required for a raw drinking water supply.

Where the benefits of water quality control are widespread or national in scope, their cost is nonreimbursable. We have found this situation to prevail frequently.

In cooperation with other Federal agencies and the States, we are proceeding with plans to develop comprehensive water pollution control programs in each of the 21 major drainage basins of the United States, within the next decade. By the mid-1970's, the national pollution control program will thus be cast in the framework of comprehensive control programs for each of the 21 basins. We will then have a national plan for water pollution control.

Without question, it will take such a plan and the cooperation of all agencies to meet our water goals of the coming years. President Kennedy has expressed these goals in the now-familiar phrase, "sufficient water, sufficiently clean, at the right place and the right time." It is a goal which can be achieved but will require a major effort. It seems to me this may be one of the important projects of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Federal Trade Commission Drug Inquiry Serves the Public Health and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission performs one of the most important and necessary services of any of the regulatory agencies. The Commission has recently found that six of the largest drug companies conspired to fix prices in the sale of a certain antibiotic.

The Nashville Tennessean, in an editorial on August 14, 1963, points out that the Federal Trade Commission and Chairman Rand Dixon have done a commendable job in bringing charges against these drug companies.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION MAKES USE OF POWER IT HAS

The five-member Federal Trade Commission has found that six of the Nation's largest drug companies conspired to fix prices on an antibiotic that brings in $100 million a year.

The Commission ordered the firms to stop fixing prices and to set new prices for all their antibiotics within 60 days after the order becomes final.

Four of the drug companies denied the charges, and two said they would appeal the order to Federal court. Three of the companies are already under indictment in New York Federal district court but no trial date has been set.

Although the firms have not been found guilty of a crime in court, the unanimous decision of the FTC indicates that drug prices have been fixed at excessive levels.

It is also an indication that the public health and welfare are still being considered lightly—if at all—by both some drug firms and the Nation's lawmakers.

With the death of Senator Estes Kefauver, the continuation of his fight to pass strong drug control legislation has been put in doubt. However, the public is fortunate that the FTC is headed by a former associate of Senator Kefauver's in the antimonopoly struggle—Mr. Rand Dixon of Nashville.

Until another Senator with sympathy for the consumer takes up the fight for drug control, the FTC, it appears, can be counted on to make use of laws that are available to prevent the public from being gouged.

John R. Dover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 15, 1963, North Carolina lost an outstanding citizen in the passing of Mr. J. R. Dover, Jr., of Shelby, N.C.

He was a member of a pioneer North Carolina textile manufacturing family. At the time of his death Mr. Dover was board chairman of the Dover Textile Group, seven textile plants in my Congressional district.

Mr. Dover was a quiet, unassuming gentleman of sterling Christian charactor. His life was marked by a devotion to his work and a dedication to the service of his fellow man. He made many contributions to civic, religious, and educational institutions. He was particularly interested in the welfare of Gardner-Webb College, an outstanding educational institution in Cleveland County, N.C. The Dover Memorial Library, which he gave to the college, is a lasting monument to his interest in educational opportunities for the young people of his State.

The people of my congressional district and the State of North Carolina have lost a fine citizen. On August 16, 1963, the Shelby Daily Star and the Cleveland Times, outstanding newspapers published at Shelby, N.C., carried very fitting editorials in tribute to Mr. Dover. I wish to insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Cleveland Times, Aug. 16, 1963]

JOHN R. DOVER

Cleveland County and the larger textile community of North Carolina was shocked yesterday by the untimely death of one of this area's industrial giants, John R. Dover, Jr. Though his life had been ebbing away for over a year under the onslaught of a fatal disease, Dover's death, like that of any leading citizen of a community, leaves its people saddened with the thought that another outstanding life has passed from the scene.

Dover was a giant of a man in Cleveland, following in the footsteps of a hard-working father who founded a textile group that literally became the backbone of a community. All in the textile industry admired the progress and growth that established the Dover Textile Group as Cleveland's leading industry. Jack Dover made many contributions to—and sacrifices for—that industry. "They're good people to work for," has been

echoed thousands of times around Cleveland County.

First and foremost, Dover was a dedicated Christian gentleman. Deacon and leader in his church, he established a shining example that others could—and did—follow.

His interests were many, but none was greater, perhaps, than that in education. Folowing in the footsteps of other outstanding benefactors in the country, Dover saw the need for a better educated citizenry in Cleveland and took steps to see that end accomplished.

His contributions were in money, but they went beyond that. Most important they included his leadership. "Gardner-Webb has lost a great friend," its leaders say. Truly, he was a friend to Gardner-Webb, whose Dover Memorial Library stands symbolic of the family's long and continuous interest in the school.

These were the areas of his life: Christian leadership and service; industrial and economic leadership; and a devotion to education.

Jack Dover is dead, but the life he lived will endure for many generations, reflected in the contributions he made to his fellow man while of the living.

[From the Shelby (N.C.) Daily Star, Aug. 16, 1963]

AN UNSELFISH LIFE

Within a few short hours on Thursday, the Dover Foundation took a giant step forward in the field of educational philanthropy and one of the foundation's mainstays, J. R. Dover, Jr., died at Duke Hospital.

The former was an encouraging development for the young men and women of Dover-employed parents. The latter saddened the hearts of many throughout Cleveland County and the Nation's textile industry.

Dover Foundation announcement of the awarding of three new college scholarships is indicative of the progressive posture the Dover textile group always has taken toward civic, religious, and educational problems, needs, and advances in Cleveland County.

The late Lee B. Weathers once wrote of the Dover chain's founder, John Randolph Dover, "Wherever Mr. Dover built a mill, he erected a church and school and also inaugurated betterment programs among his employees."

J. R. Dover, Jr., held firmly to that enlightened heritage from the time he assumed the presidency of the Dover textile group after his father's death in 1935 until he died Thursday as chairman of the organization's board of directors.

His influence and contributions and the influence and contributions of other members of his family have left the Dover brand of generosity and interest firmly stamped upon the character and future aspirations of Gardner-Webb College.

The textile plants he and his associates nurtured into thriving productivity have provided the wherewithal for thousands of Clevelanders to build homes, raise families, and enjoy a modern-day standard of living. The Dover group actually became the backbone of a large segment of the Cleveland economy.

Although plagued for over a year by a disease that was to finally contribute much to his death, Mr. Dover guided his organization to a ground-breaking ceremony for another plant to add even more to the growth and prosperity of a community he loved so deeply.

J. R. Dover, Jr., was a man who shunned personal publicity and public acclaim throughout his life. But his many solid contributions will stand as permanent testimonials to a successful but totally unselfish life.

District of Columbia Crime Gets a Fist in Its Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said in the press about the omnibus crime bill which the House passed on Monday, August 12. Much that has been written has been distorted and has missed the mark completely.

My hometown newspaper, the Gastonia Gazette, on Friday afternoon, August 16, 1963, had a very excellent editorial which indicates that its writer was aware of the problem and the necessity for a realistic approach, as contrasted with the bizarre contentions of some newspaper editors.

The Gastonia Gazette is one of North Carolina's outstanding daily newspapers. With the thought that the Members of the House would be interested in seeing the comments of this great newspaper, under unanimous consent I include it as a part of the RECORD of this date:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME GETS A FIST IN ITS FACE

The U.S. House of Representatives passed Congressman BASIL WHITENER's crime bill the other day and sent it along to the Senate.

If any city needs its crime laws tightened up, it is Washington, D.C.

The chart on crime in the Nation's Capital is curving upward at an alarming rate. Washington ranks first in aggravated assaults among 17 U.S. cities with 500,000 to 1 million population; second in robberies, fourth in murders, sixth in housebreakings, and sixth in overall crime rate.

Washington crime last January was up 17.4 percent over January 1962. In 1 month, 2,011 major offenses were reported—more than 64 a day.

Schools are a real problem. Girls in Washington public schools gave birth to 265 illegitimate babies during the past school year, 250 of these nonwhite.

In the 15–19 age group, the venereal disease rate in Washington is 5,718 per 100,000 population, as against a national average of 416 per 100,000.

More importantly, perhaps, idle youngsters—school dropouts and truants—turn quickly to crime. Juvenile crime in the District jumped 17.7 percent last year.

It used to be that when touring high school groups came to town during cherry blossom time, the students were allowed to go out on their own at night to a downtown movie. This is now passe. It is too dangerous and too much of a chance to take.

In spite of the overwhelming evidence in favor of stricter crime laws in Washington, there are those who gnash their teeth at the idea of pulling in the tether.

The Washington Post is one. This self-styled leftwing newspaper has been on WHITENER's back ever since the Congressman, serving on the District Committee, undertook the project of trying to do something about the upsurge of crime in the District of Columbia.

All during the hearings that WHITENER and his committee have been conducting in Washington on this serious problem, the Post has been acting like a spoiled child demanding another piece of candy.

The editor assumed the attitude that it was completely assinine to consider a Washington crime bill, that what is needed is more understanding, more schools, more money for guidance and rehabilitation—and less talk from the committee about an omnibus crime bill.

On Wednesday of this week after the bill had passed on Monday, the Post moaned: "In a geyser of oratory on Monday, the House of Representatives denounced crime in the Capital. And then, on the pretext of combatting crime, it passed a hodge-podge bill which the Senate cannot conceivably endorse and which the courts of the country cannot possibly sustain.

"The 'so-called rights' of criminals are the great procedural protections written into the Bill of Rights to safeguard American against arbitrary action by government officials. They were purchased at a heavy price in blood and suffering by Englishmen and Americans.

"Mr. WHITENER thinks that the greatest deterrent to crime is the certainty of punishment. We think that the long, futile record of savagery in dealing with crime shows him to be mistaken."

Perhaps Mr. WHITENER ought to ask the Post to draw up a bill. Then crime in the District could really flourish. Rights of criminals? Indeed! It seems that the newspaper has more regard for the rights of criminals than it does for the rights of law-abiding individuals who come to know more and more the molestations of the law-breakers.

We have perused the bill which the House has passed. It is strong. It stands on its own feet and, if passed by the Senate, must of necessity, throw up a roadblock to the onrushing vehicle of District crime.

The District—yea, even the whole of the country—has displayed a lenient attitude toward criminals, especially juveniles, that needs a turning around.

We hold nothing against the theory of being kind and humane, but, unfortunately, the criminals of this day will take your kindness and humaneness and boomerang it around your head.

Mr. WHITENER gained some valuable experience in Gaston County prosecuting criminals as solicitor of the superior court. He knows and understands the criminal well. His convictions are written into the bill.

It is high time that Washington and the rest of the country, Gastonia and Gaston County included, put an end to pampering the wicked, especially at the expense of the law-abiding citizens who want nothing more than to be left alone.

In our own localities, the laws are ample. But sometimes our officials are anxious to reduce a charge or lighten a sentence for the sake of expediency.

More power to Mr. WHITENER in his fight against Washington crime.

More understanding of the situation to influential newspapers like the Washington Post.

Kremlinologist Explains Why Khrushchev Wants Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Edward Ellis Smith is a widely recognized expert on Soviet strategy and tactics. In the

following essay this respected Kremlinologist discusses Premier Khrushchev's motives in deciding there shall be a partial test ban treaty:

A REASONABLE CASE OF DOUBT

(By Edward Ellis Smith)

I. RECENT SOVIET EVENTS: A PRELUDE TO THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

Nikita S. Khrushchev delivered a 15,000-word speech in the Kremlin 6 months ago (Mar. 8, 1963) that identified the posture he was about to assume in domestic and international affairs; it also was a display of Soviet strengths and weaknesses, and for the observer of Soviet affairs it was a presage to the recently concluded "test ban."[1]

While Khrushchev dealt with many things then in his speech before the assembled Soviet power elite, his emphasis was on potential or real threats to his personal dictatorship of the Soviet empire.[2] On one hand, he conveyed an impression of elation that he had disposed of personalities inimical to his power position in the Kremlin. On the other hand, a strong trace of real concern apropos residual problems in Soviet society and policy was discernible in his remarks.

Dwelling on real or imagined treason in high places against his dictatorship, he thundered invectives and promised destruction of traitors. Alternately raving and ranting and then approving on the subject of Soviet youth, he showed concern for the so-called "father-son" problems in the U.S.S.R., a phenomenon revolving around the failure of the Soviet adult strata to have worked actively against Stalin's terrors from 1928 to 1953.

However, the most dramatic and serious theme that ran through his speech was reapprobation of Stalin and his policies. In effect, he enunciated a neo-Stalinism at the same time exculpating Stalin and his crimes. And he announced a purge of important, if yet undefined, dimensions.

II. KHRUSHCHEV AND NEO-STALINISM IN SOVIET FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Just prior to and after Khrushchev's March 8 speech, more than a few high-level Soviet political and military personages were assigned to a position of permanent limbo, i.e., purged. Those who disappeared by way of illness or removal were important, but less so than the persons elevated to positions of authority only secondary to that of Khrushchev himself. Foremost among these was the appointment of Ustinov, a military expert, to the head the Soviet economy and Marshal Biryezov, the top Soviet rocket expert, as chief of the Soviet Armed Forces. What is important here is that Khrushchev moved rocket, space, missile, and antimissile experts to the fore. The stage was thus set for the next act.

III. THE STABILIZATION OF KHRUSHCHEV'S POWER POSITION

Having concluded a successful purge of his domestic political opponents in the finest tradition of Stalin, and having positioned in the Sovet high command some of the most offensively minded and expert missilemen in the U.S.S.R., Khrushchev was still in trouble. Spring and summer of 1963 saw him beset with an abysmal economic situation that included major shortages of food and a critical lack of consumer goods for a demanding Soviet populace. Also, he was in the octopus-like grip of domestic disquietude among the Soviet literati: having embraced Stalinism and damned it too, he could not allow an increase of libertarianism, but he could not disallow it either.

Nor was there apparent surcease from the ideological yapping of Mao and Co. on his eastern flank.

In short, Khrushchev had concluded a successful flushing (ochishcheniye), as he was wont to say, of his enemies and the placement of bellicose lieutenants in the Soviet hierarchy. Problems remained. He required prestige. In military terms, the situation had to be stablized while Khrushchev attempted to cope with problems that required, above all, time for resolution.

IV. THE WAY OUT

Contrary to widely disseminated official and unofficial opinions, Khruschev did not agree to a test ban treaty because he knows that the U.S.S.R. is lagging behind in the missile and antimissile race. Any informed person on either side of the Iron or Bamboo Curtains recognizes such reasoning as specious.

By the same token, he did not order his satrap Gromyko to affix the Soviet imprimatur to the test ban because he wanted to demonstrate that his Marxism-Leninism was superior to that of the Chinese Communists. In Communist infighting it is power (encompassing many items—from weaponry to secret police) that counts; and, Khrushchev knows his power base is ever so much more significant than that of Mao's. He need not worry on this score.

On the contrary, the very preponderance of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and their delivery potential on the part of the Soviet Union reduces any ideological argument between the Russians and Chinese to a mere cover story.

What is at issue, of course, is the fact apparent to anyone with an open mind: the Soviet Union's chaotic economic condition cannot sustain the U.S.S.R., much less, China. Furthermore (and in addition) every resource in Soviet Russia is needed to assauage the Soviet people's demand for food and consumer's goods. Ideology is of secondary importance, at least.

V. TIME OUT FOR DECEPTION

Why then, did Khrushchev agree to a test ban treaty?

First and foremost, it fitted his strategy of entrapment of the free world, i.e., the United States. It also dovetailed with his attempt to prove (and indeed he did) to the high level Soviet leadership that he was more clever than the American "imperialists."

Secondly, on a lower level of Soviet society, he became a "man of peace." Let there be no doubt about the desire of the Soviet citizenry for succor from the threat of hydrogen bombs. The corollary is that an apparent (as opposed to real) reduction in the arms race ostensibly will mean more edibles in the bowl of Ivan's borshch. Every Soviet citizen understands that * * *.

Furthermore, it fits in with Khrushchev's overall long range strategy vis a vis the United States. We (the United States) have been fantastically gullible when it comes to negotiations and agreements with the U.S.S.R.[3] Incredible as it may seem, we have signed scores of treaties with the Soviets, always in a trusting vein. All have been broken, save one or two. Some of the negotiators and signers of the instant treaty have been party to the violated treaties.

Khrushchev's strategy does not center on the feelings of our negotiators: he is much more realistic. His strategy is to gain time, to promote a feeling of camaraderie which in turn will allow him to increase trade with the free world, cancel out other "nuclear powers to be" and figuratively aline the U.S.S.R. with those self-appointed forces of peace, in addition to the advantages cited above which accrue to him.

VI. CONCLUSION

Chairman Khrushchev agreed to a test ban treaty because he needed it—for domestic reasons. In line with his long range strategy, he will break it when it suits his geopolitical aims.[4]

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Pravda, Mar. 10, 1963, pp. 1–4.

[2] See speech of Hon. CRAIG HOSMER of California in the House of Representatives, Apr. 25, 1963, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, Apr. 26, 1963, pp. A2533–A2537, "Stalinism Returns to the U.S.S.R."

[3] Secretary Rusk's testimony is a depressing case in point. New York Times (W. E.) Aug. 13, 1963, p. 2, col. 6. "For 18 years we have held the Communist drive in check largely by the deterrent force of our massive military strength. But throughout we have known that a lasting peace could not be founded upon armed might alone. It can be secured only by durable international institutions, and by a respect for law and its procedures. The problem has been to convince the Communist world that its interest also lay in that direction."

In the first place, Secretary Rusk overlooks the crucial takeover of Czechoslovakia by the Soviets within the 18-year period. Other Soviet-Communist incursions since that time are well known and need no elaboration.

[4] The U.S. negotiator, Governor Harriman, is not famed for his prescience in Soviet affairs. His record should be considered in light of his conviction some years ago that the Katyn Forest massacre was a Nazi, as opposed to a now proven Soviet murder, and his feeling (which Khrushchev would probably dispute) that Stalin's aggressions stemmed from a warlike faction in the Politburo. As the Soviets said under Khrushchev's aegis on July 14, 1963, "We stand fully for the destruction of * * * capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but (we) are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

Stricter Discipline and the Three R's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, is serving this country beyond the call of duty. Patriotic Americans who love the Constitution are grateful to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] for his devotion and dedication to our Federal City—a Federal City as envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

As the father of five children, I enthusiastically endorse the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN'S] article which appeared in the Washington Star, Sunday, August 18. I commend a study of this article to each Member of the Congress and to educators and parents everywhere:

STRICTER DISCIPLINE AND THE THREE R'S

(By Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Chairman of the House District Committee)

In my opinion, the first and greatest need existing in the public schools of the District of Columbia today is more effective discipline. The steady increase in the juvenile crime rate in the city, the McCarthy Committee's report on the riots at the District of Columbia Stadium last Thanksgiv-

ing Day, the many complaints which my colleagues and I have received from distraught parents, all point to a desperate need for drastic tightening of discipline in the District of Columbia schools. A child who is not taught to respect the rights of others cannot be expected to grow into a responsible adult citizen, and in too many cases the school children of the District of Columbia are not being so trained today. I acknowledge that the ideal place for such molding of character is the home, and certainly many of the District's children are being properly guided and developed by their parents. However, the best of home training needs to be supplemented by a firm disciplinary control in the schoolroom; and in those cases where the proper home training is utterly lacking, the school's training in this respect is essential, both for the unruly child himself and for his classmates as well.

When the House District Committee was apprised recently of the fact that D.C. school children of compulsory attendance age cannot be suspended or expelled from school under present law, and that the D.C. Board of Education has a strict rule against the use of corporal punishment which is militating seriously against the teachers and principals in their efforts to control unruly pupils, we took prompt steps and got legislation approved by the House of Representatives which is designed to remove these two impediments to discipline in the schools.

I maintain that insistence upon strong discipline starting in the lowest grades will greatly diminish the need for special schools and classes for incorrigible older students, as well as the need for so many psychiatrists. Also, the restoration of order and discipline in the classrooms, without which there can be no teaching, will again enable the District of Columbia public school system to attract and retain good teachers in far greater numbers than is possible today.

Another obvious need in the District system is for greater stress upon the fundamental subjects—the three R's—particularly in the lower grades. This is evident, I think, from the results obtained by exactly such a curriculum at the Amidon School in the past 2 years. Children in this school, brought from all parts of the city and exposed to a steady diet of fundamental education, averaged far higher on standardized subject tests this year than did most classes of comparable size and mental ability elsewhere in the city. This does not surprise me, however, because this Amidon experiment is not new at all, but nothing more nor less than the approach to education which was departed from only when the so-called progressive education became fashionable.

Perhaps this increased emphasis upon the fundamental subjects might also eliminate the need for so many counselors; for it seems to me that more teaching and learning would necessitate less counseling. Also, I am convinced that this return to the true aims of education would make the District of Columbia more attractive to good teachers.

In connection with curriculum, I believe also that increased emphasis upon vocational training, particularly for the high school students in the lower tracks, would captivate these pupils' interest and help materially to improve discipline and to lessen the problem of drop-outs on the high school level.

I feel that the greatest threat to the future of the District of Columbia school system is the often-repeated statement that the solution to all its problems lies in the appropriation of more money for the schools. I and my colleagues in the Congress have always recognized the need for adequate financing for the schools of the District, and through our efforts more than $50 million has been spent on new school buildings in the past 9 fiscal years—much more than has been spent during this period in any other U.S. city of comparable size. Also, teachers' salaries in the District have been maintained on a very favorable level in comparison with other large cities, and today the District of Columbia teachers are the most highly paid in the Washington metropolitan area.

But the two greatest needs in the District of Columbia schools today, as I have pointed them out above, will not involve any additional expenditures whatever. What they will require, however, is sound, realistic thinking and positive action on the part of the entire District of Columbia school administrative system, from the Board of Education on down. And until and unless such a philosophy prevails, the expenditure of any amount of additional money will not permit the city's schools to perform their proper function.

Should the Government as an Employer Set the Example?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is great alarm in the ranks of employees everywhere, in Government and industry, because of the threat to their jobs from automation which is so rapidly increasing everywhere. I am fully cognizant of the fact that the Post Office Department has installed many welcome systems for speeding the collection and delivery of the mail for the single, highly desirable purpose of service to the people.

However, I am also aware that many departments have turned to automation to provide service, and then, too late, behold that they have eliminated jobs and contributed to unemployment.

A man without a job has nothing. Certainly the Government should be able to plan its improved service program so that the faithful employees are benefited and not injured. It takes years of planning these new, better service systems. Part and parcel of that planning should be the human lives involved.

As a reminder to my colleagues in the Congress, I direct their attention to the following article from the August issue of the Union Postal Clerk and the Postal Transport Journal, written by Paul A. Nagle, administrative vice president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks:

WILL POST OFFICE JOB GRAPH ZIP DOWN?

The ZIP gun is pointed at your job. ZIP threatens not only to eliminate the craft of the postal clerk, but also to endanger the program designed to solve the Nation's unemployment problem.

Any endorsement or acceptance to be given to ZIP by postal clerks must be preceded by more than pious assurances that present postal employes have nothing to fear from the inroads of Zipped-up automation.

To the extent that ZIP specifically, and mechanization generally, may cause the rate of increase in postal jobs to fail to keep abreast of the increase in the national work force, the Post Office Department will be adding to the Nation's unemployment burden. The postal employee today pays taxes to enable the expenditure of Federal money on automation which will sharply reduce or eliminate the chances for his or her child to secure a postal job.

RATE OF AUTOMATION'S IMPACT

Automation is canceling 35,000 of the country's jobs each week. With 25,000 new persons per week entering the labor force, it means that 60,000 new jobs must be created weekly to enable the Nation merely to keep tottering on the brink of the unemployment abyss.

While the Appropriations Committees may look happily at the way in which the Post Office levels its employment graph, there can be no doubt that the more we succeed in the leveling area, the more we fail in the zone of national unemployment.

MAIL VOLUME VERSUS EMPLOYEES

Appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee on April 17, 1963, Postmaster Day testified:

"We proposed to handle 2.4 billion more pieces of mail with only 78 percent of the man-years required to absorb that same volume increase in 1960."

Were the rate of increased productivity cited by the Postmaster General to be continued, were the rate of growth of mail volume to remain constant, and were there to be no added automation, the increase in man years required to process the expanded mail volume would be converted to a manpower decrease in just 15 short years.

DAY SEES NO JOB DANGER

Postmaster General Day denies any impact of postal employment on national unemployment. In a letter on April 11, 1963, to Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Day said:

"On the floor of the House the ranking minority member of the House subcommittee said that the subcommittee had pressured the Department to take into account unemployment figures so that automation would not take away jobs. With the postal workload increasing rapidly, there is no danger of postal mechanization taking away jobs."

The reference by Mr. Day to the "ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee" is to a remark by Mr. JOHN R. PILLON, Republican, of New York, who said on the floor of the House of Representatives on April 4:

"It is this subcommittee that has pressured the Post Office Department to take into consideration our unemployment figures, so that automation does not take away jobs in periods of unemployment."

We believe that a period of unemployment now exists.

ZIP TO CUT HANDLINGS

Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen commenting on ZIP code in his statement to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on April 18, 1963, said:

"This request includes two technical personnel for our expanded automatic data-processing program, to provide additional technical guidance in planning and developing automatic data-processing techniques. This is a program which will play an ever-increasing role in improving the management of the postal service and providing a basis for cost control and significant cost reduction. This is also a program area which lends significant guidance to the development of the Department's new ZIP code program. The ZIP code, as you may recall, divides the country into geographical divisions, subdivisions, and sectional centers, identified by a 5-digit number. Mail carrying this number will bypass numerous handlings and go directly and speedily to its destination."

Mr. Belen testified earlier that manpower costs constitute 78 percent of the total budget of the Post Office Department. Hence the field of postal employment must be the obvious target for "significant cost reduction."

Let there be no misunderstanding but that to "bypass numerous handlings" means drastic reduction of future clerk employment and to expose to the charge of "featherbedding" that union which insists that the services of its members are being slandered in the process.

With raised or otherwise sensitized type faces and with standardized envelopes, the ultimate application of ZIP would virtually eliminate the craft of the postal clerk.

This prospect is underscored by the Post Office Department's Philatelic Release No. 48 wherein it is declared:

"Widespread use of ZIP code will pave the way for a smooth transition to optical scanning equipment, probably to be placed in use within the next several years."

On June 30, 1963, in General Release No. 108, Postmaster General Day is quoted as having predicted:

"This July 1 changeover to the ZIP code will revolutionize the postal service and provide a foundation for new and highly efficient advances in mail distribution now in development. Contracts for a ZIP code optical reader to automatically read and sort coded mail are being let with the expectation of field testing of the device on coded mail within 2 years."

The cap pistol and the zip gun may be weapons which are far too sophisticated for any but an engineer to handle intelligently. Ours may be merely to do or die, rather than to reason why. It is undeniable however that some of the tax dollars of the United Federation of Postal Clerks members and at least a part of the manpower money saved by ZIP will be used to attempt to relieve the national unemployment dip which will be aggravated by ZIP.

On Helping Themselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the debate on foreign aid, and as the people of this country, particularly those of west Texas, express their concern over our multibillion foreign aid giveaway program, I think this editorial, "On Helping Themselves," by Oscar Cooley, printed in the Odessa American, Thursday, August 15, 1963, is particularly appropriate at this time. I commend it to you for your reading and reflection:

ON HELPING THEMSELVES

(By Oscar Cooley)

Since World War II, the U.S. Government has given to other governments more than enough money to pay Uncle Sam's entire budget for a year.

This is the greatest giveaway in all history. And it continues. At this writing Congress is about to vote a dole of $4,100 million to neary 100 countries in fiscal 1964.

Some criticize the foreign dole on the ground that we cannot afford to give away so much wealth, that to do so will bankrupt us. But, in fact, we have afforded it for 15 years and our country is far from bankrupt.

Others attack the program on the ground that it is wrong to compel Americans to sacrifice wealth to be given away to others. Apparently, if the money for foreign aid were raised by voluntary subscription, they would cease criticism. But is compelling people to give up money wrong merely because of what is done with the money? If so, one might infer that it is right and proper to take money from people when it is destined for a good purpose, such as caring for the destitute.

What such critics are really saying is that no man should be taxed for any purpose that he, personally, has not approved. But if a person approves channeling money into a given project, it seems he would give voluntarily toward that project, in which case there would be no cause to tax him. One reason governments take money by taxation is that they are aware that citizens oppose some of the purposes for which the money is to be spent and therefore would not give it voluntarily.

A third and sounder reason for condemning the foreign dole is that it corrupts the recipients. It leads them to believe that they can get without giving, that indeed this is the way to develop their countries, for is not this great giveaway being sponsored and carried out by the richest, most highly developed nation on earth? Whatever America, the country of the almighty dollar, does with dollars must be the right thing to do.

Far from stimulating foreign peoples to produce more goods to sell in the marketplace, foreign aid tells them that they do not need to produce, that they can receive without producing. Haven't they received $100 billion since 1945?

But they should not deceive themselves. Something does not come out of nothing. The world needs markets, not poorhouses. Until people accept the responsibility of paying their own way, their nations will always be underdeveloped.

But, it is said, our aid is helping them to help themselves. This, too, is a deception. Putting a person on a dole does not help him to help himself, but quite the contrary.

If foreign dole recipients are being helped to help themselves, presumably they are using the aid as seed corn to generate production. But if so, they could use some of the newly produced wealth to pay back the aid, and hence it should be loaned to them on a business basis, not given. When they receive it as a gift they know they need not pay it back; hence, they are not motivated to increase their production. They are not moved to help themselves; rather they are influenced to swallow the dole and come back for more.

Private loans, made by private banks for definite periods and at market rates of interest—that is, at rates that other borrowers pay—would have maximum effectiveness in helping people to help themselves.

"The Man" Announces His Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the sports editor of the St. Louis Dispatch, Bob Broeg, who has covered the St. Louis Cardinals during much of Stan Musial's great career with that team, put it this way the other day when Stan Musial announced his coming retirement:

Has there ever really been, except perhaps Babe Ruth, a more popular player than the poor Polish immigrant's son who struck it rich—and the public's fancy—in baseball?

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare thing, indeed, when a Member of Congress feels called upon to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the retirement of an athlete, but the career of Stan Musial has been such an inspiration to youth in this country for so long that this event deserves to be noted here. We in St. Louis regard him as one of our finest examples of Americanism.

The baseball fans of St. Louis, and of every city where the St. Louis Cardinals play, will miss his fine sportsmanship, as well as his great ability, on the field. Just what Stan Musial has meant to baseball, and what baseball has mean to him, can be found in an excellent article in the Post-Dispatch by Neal Russo last Tuesday on the announcement at a Cardinal picnic of the coming retirement on September 29 of "Stan, The Man." Under unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, I submit the article for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, as follows:

A MAN-SIZED ANNOUNCEMENT: THIS SEASON IS MUSIAL'S LAST—"I'VE HAD MY SHARE OF BASEBALL," STAN SAYS

(By Neal Russo)

The Muny Opera, the Zoo and Gaslight Square will be on their own after September 29. That day a companion St. Louis attraction will say goodby, for Stan Musial announced last night he would end his 22-year baseball career with the Cardinals next month.

The Redbird hero, who will become an executive of the club, as announced earlier, is certain to have a farewell that will be noisier than his arrival in St. Louis in September 1941.

Cincinnati will be at Busch Stadium on Sunday, September 29, when No. 6, famous wiggle and all, goes into battle for the last time—barring a world series appearance.

When Musial arrived in Union Station as a 21-year-old from Donora, Pa., he was alone, and there was no reception committee.

Since then, the man has played before close to 50 million fans in one of the longest and greatest careers in baseball

THANK YOU

"Baseball has been my life," Musial said. "I love baseball. I love St. Louis. I've had fun all these years. I want to thank you very much."

Musial was tearful and red-eyed as he made the announcement early last night at the Cardinal players' annual picnic at Grant's Farm.

"There's nothing I'd rather do than be connected with baseball," Musial said. "There's nothing like playing and hitting."

Even though No. 6 will be missing from the scoreboard when the home team is at bat at Busch Stadium after 1963, "The Man" promises to sneak out regularly to take a few swings in practice.

Musial, who didn't forget his warm smile, said he had pretty well made up his mind to retire after this season when he signed for 1963 last winter. However, he did not make his final decision until he huddled with general manager Bing Devine last week.

"After all, I'll be 43 next season," said the man, who has played with one club longer than anyone else in baseball history. "I've had my share of baseball. The Cardinals have some good, young outfielders coming along, and I'll still be able to put on a uniform in my new connection with the Cardinals."

Musial's title (it's expected to be vice president) and his duties will be spelled out later, Devine said. Stan's assignments most likely will include tutoring of batters, helping sign

free agents, scouting and serving as an adviser.

Musial has played on four Cardinal pennant winners and he would like to go out the way he arrived in his first full season, on a first-place team.

"Our 1942 team was further out and won," Musial said. "We have a chance yet."

Owner of dozens of records, the man with the coil stance has collected 3,608 hits (only Ty Cobb had more). He has 1,370 extra-base hits, the most by a big leaguer, including 472 home runs, 177 triples, and 721 doubles. He went into the 1963 season with a lifetime batting average of .333.

Although the man has dipped to .260 after an eye-popping .330 in 1962, he has delivered more than his share of key hits to keep the Cardinals in contention. Just last Saturday his pinch-single was a key blow in a victory at Milwaukee.

WON'T MANAGE

Musial long ago abandoned any idea of managing a club, stressing that he did not care to take on all the headaches. He also had said he would not be interested in hanging on as a benchwarmer making only occasional appearances as a pinch-hitter. The man, whose retirement announcement probably caused 70 or 80 enemy pitchers to rejoice, probably could hit until he is 50.

Al Fleishman, public relations director for Anheuser-Busch, began the program at Grant's Farm by announcing that August A. Busch, Jr., the Cardinal's president, and Dick Meyer, vice president, were out of town to attend the wedding of Busch's son.

Said Bob Broeg, sports editor of the Post-Dispatch who covered the Cardinals much of Musial's long career, "I am sorry that Mr. Busch isn't here because his favorite ballplayer is retiring."

Addressing the younger Cardinal players on hand, Broeg said, "I just wish you could have seen Musial as we saw him. He was not just a good hitter, but a great one. He was not just a good team man but a great all-round player. Fred Hutchinson used to say he ran like a wounded turkey."

Broeg predicted that Musial, in his new job in the Cardinal front office, would be "the best hitting coach since Abner Doubleday, the best super scout since Kit Carson and the best recruiter since the long arm of Uncle Sam."

The St. Louis chapter of the Baseball Writers' Association of America soon will make an important announcement regarding Musial, Broeg said.

Bob Burnes, sports editor of the Globe-Democrat who saw Musial in his first game on September 17, 1941, against the Boston Braves here, introduced Stan. No. 6 got a standing ovation from the crowd of about 300, whose picnic was spoiled by rain.

Musial brushed away the tears that crept from his eyes as he was obviously overcome by the retirement announcement.

"This is a happy occasion in a sense, and not so happy in another sense," said the seven-time National League batting champion and three-time Most Valuable Player.

Paraphrasing an earlier comment by Broeg, Musical said, "This is really only the end of the beginning, not the beginning of the end, because I'll be associated with the Cardinals in other capacities."

Lil Musial, Stan's wife, was next at bat. After breaking into tears, she turned from the microphone looking for Stan and help, and asked, "Where are you?"

Red Schoendienst, now a Cardinal coach, provided a cheerful change of pace when he said, with a big smile, "Lil, I would have to say I know Stan better than anybody because I roomed with him so long. Stan's been a great inspiration to the youth of our country. On and off the field, I say you don't meet a man like Musial. He can really eat. That's why he opened a restaurant.

"Maybe Stan could have lasted another year if he didn't have to play first base while I was making mistakes at second."

WARD HAS IT MADE

Leo Ward, the Cardinals' traveling secretary, said that Garry Shumacher, a Giants' executive summed it up best when he said, "Leo Ward has the best job. All he has to do is travel with the Cardinals and watch Musial hit."

Devine, welcoming Musial to the front office, said "The Man" would be put to work attending the organizational meetings before the season ends.

Broadcasters Harry Caray and Jack Buck also hailed No. 6.

"Stan, if it hadn't been for you and your feats, I couldn't have lasted on the job as long as I have," Caray said. "You made my job easier."

Buck emphasized that the timing of the retirement announcement gave fans ample notice in case they wanted to let their youngsters get a look at "one of the greatest of all players."

Manager Johnny Keane said he was not shocked so much by the retirement announcement as he was by the prospect of no longer having Musial's name to insert in the batting order.

"One of the biggest honors and privileges of my life has been to put on a Cardinal uniform the same as Stan's, dress in the same clubhouse as Stan, and be on the same field and club as Stan," Keane said.

The manager added that Musial's bat would be very much in the picture the rest of the season.

Howie Pollet, now a Cardinal coach, remembered that he was brought up by the Redbirds a few days before Musial was called up in 1941.

"They put us in the end of the clubhouse, as Butch Yatkeman usually does with rookies," Pollet said, "but Stan didn't stay there very long. He made a great imprint on the National League."

Pollet called Musial "one of the most cooperative and friendly players. He never criticized players and always was willing to help."

Teammate Ken Boyer has had a locker next to Musial in the clubhouse since he came to the majors 10 years ago.

"Every time Stan broke a record, he said the record belonged not to him but to the modern ballplayers as against the oldtimers," Boyer said, "He's our inspiration, our leader. He wins for us. Congratulations to the greatest ballplayer who ever put on a uniform."

Stan said to Lil, "I don't suppose you want to kiss an old retired ballplayer."

Replied Lil, "You don't want to kiss an old grandmother."

Their son, Dick, and his wife, Sharon are expecting their first child in 3 weeks. Dick, a finance officer in the Army, is stationed at Fort Riley, Kans.

Other quotes:

Trainer Bob Bauman: "Stan, you're probably the greatest athlete I ever worked on."

Equipment manager Butch Yatkeman: "Stan set a good example for everybody in the clubhouse."

Cardinal Lew Burdette—who had to face Musial so many years: "You should be coming out of retirement now."

Manager Keane: "Just having Musial around in any capacity is bound to be a big help to the Cardinal club."

Musial: "If anybody wants to cry, I'll join him."

Rusk Assurance to Joint Chiefs on Use of Nuclear Weapons Is Deadly Fiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows a release to news media dated today in which I have discussed the lack of meaning of Secretary Rusk's assurance to the Joint Chiefs of Staff relative to use of nuclear weapons if military situations require:

RUSK ASSURANCE TO JOINT CHIEFS ON USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IS DEADLY FICTION

Based on test ban treaty testimony by Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the charge was hurled yesterday that U.S. hands will be almost completely tied in dealing with Communist armed aggression by force and violence worldwide.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of the House GOP's Committee on Nuclear Testing said Taylor and other members of the Joint Chiefs were so seriously concerned that the treaty would bar use of nuclear weapons if war breaks out they called on Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a body to discuss the question. Taylor testified Thursday that assurance was gained from Rusk that the treaty has "nothing to do with [preventing] the firing of nuclear weapons in time of war."

HOSMER declared Rusk's assurance to the Joint Chiefs is meaningless and deadly because "war" no longer has "any meaningful definition," except in the sense of an all-out nuclear exchange between the great powers.

The California Congressman recalled that notwithstanding many costly battles, thousands of American dead and wounded, and 3 years' fighting in Korea, the entire action never was officially called a war. It was defined as a "police action."

"Secretary Rusk's assurances are no aid or comfort to the U.S. fighting men who could again be called on to wage battle if the Korean Communist regime decides to break the truce and resume hostilities. In the eyes of the State Department and under terms of the treaty, only a 'police action' would be restarted. Under terms of Rusk's test ban assurance, it would not be a war. The United States would not be allowed the discriminate use of tactical nuclear weapons to stabilize the situation and avoid more thousands of casualties.

"Almost daily Americans in uniform are being killed, maimed, and taken prisoner by weapons of war in Vietnam. Purple Hearts are awarded and legislation is pending to provide combat pay. Yet this is not a 'war.' Rusk's assurances do not apply here, no matter how badly things might get out of hand, no matter how vastly our conventionally armed forces might be outmanned by a deadly enemy.

"The situation would be the same anywhere else in the world where armed aggression of this kind might take place and U.S. troops could become engaged—for example, Laos, Formosa, and India where Chinese Communist hoards might invade with tanks, artillery, aircraft, mortars, and machineguns. These would not be wars, our diplomats say. They are only incidents—police actions. But

they are very real places where Americans could be sent to do battle and to die because a scrap of paper conceived in Moscow ties U.S. hands and bars discriminate use of small, relatively clean and discreet U.S. tactical nuclear weapons to control the aggressor as he deserves to be controlled. These are only instances where the needless slaughter of the bridge at Toki-Roi could be suffered over and over again on a magnified scale.

"The vital national interests of the United States and the lives and bodies of much of its young manhood—and the fears of their loved ones—demands far greater assurance from Secretary Rusk than he so far has given the Joint Chiefs.

"What Rusk has assured to date is no more than that the United States will not use its national power effectively to prevent aggression, that we will submit meekly to conventional and guerrilla warfare harassment, losses and casualties—continued Communist armed encroachment on free world soil—all because of the naive and dangerous legal fiction, conceived by diplomats, that this is not war, simply because the Communists choose not to call it war, but revolution of the proletariat.

"The President and Secretary Rusk, as well as the U.S. Senate, are under deep obligation to declare that this gimmick in the tricky treaty must not be allowed to hamstring vigilant and effective U.S. action wherever and whenever vigilance and effectiveness are demanded by the dangers at hand.

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the execution of their solemn obligation to protect the United States of America courageously should march back in a body to Dean Rusk and demand the kind of assurance that will give our country the ability to insure its survival in a very hostile world—not the kind of half assurance they received by their first try at it," HOSMER concluded.

Arizona High School Students Define Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, during last month's celebration of our country's Independence Day two young high school students of Winslow, Ariz., wrote thoughtful definitions of a highly cherished word in our Nation's vocabulary: "freedom." Katherine Jue and Michelle Mileham won top honors in an essay contest sponsored by their hometown radio station KINO and I know my colleagues in Congress will find fresh inspiration in the essays which follows, as printed in the Winslow Mail of August 2, 1963:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Katherine Jue)

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain alienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

To me, freedom is essential to a nation in order to progress and grow to be a great country. A nation needs great men who will work freely for its growth. For it is good men, not gold, that becomes the chief worth of nations. All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing.

It is our Nation's pride that by exacting the innate dignity of the individual we have opened the doors of progress for all mankind. With free men, no setback is permanent, no achievement beyond reach. Our national example—"clad in the armor of a righteous cause"—is a torch leading the people of the world to a richer, fuller, and more peaceful life.

As Thomas Jefferson once said "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be."

Democracy is the only political system that makes it possible to effect change without violence. A society of maximum liberties works only because we accept the obligation to check the natural human impulse to beat up those we dislike, imprison those we fear, or murder those we hate.

The true and final purpose of government is to arrange life that each man can do what he pleases—so long as it does not harm or menace others.

This decalog of freedom rests on the conviction that government must protect men from each other's stupidity, greed, and passions.

Above all, we must both demonstrate and develop the affirmative power of the democratic ideal—remembering always that nations are great, not for what they are against, but what they are for.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Michelle Mileham)

I place myself on a ship and call it the *Mayflower*. I am one of a group of people who are called Pilgrims and am in search of a new country where we can escape the bonds of tyranny and live as a free people.

I join a wagon train west and endure the hardships encountered by our forefathers, that of hunger, loss of life brought about by sickness and disease and raiding Indian war parties determined to prevent us from proceeding farther into their domain. However, these are repelled and nightfall finds us 1 day closer to our goal, a new way of life and freedom.

I am now at the side of Jim Bowie, Davy Crockett, and others in a place called the Alamo. We, enclosed within the walls, are going to make a desperate effort to defend it against a fanatical enemy who has us badly outnumbered. We failed in our efforts to repel Santa Anna but perhaps our sacrifice was not in vain; we have died for an ideal which has brought us a little closer to freedom.

The North and the South are now engaged in a Civil War. I sit at the side of Abraham Lincoln, a man who believed strong enough in the freedom of man to subject a nation to war in an effort to free the slaves. The war has ended now, the slaves are freed, but not without tragedy, heartaches, bloodshed, and resentment that will last many years. This then is the price of freedom, a price that must be paid if freedom is to be retained.

I will pass over the world conflicts, the First and Second World Wars which were of course fought to retain our freedom and arrive at the present day and once again another struggle for freedom and equal rights of the Negroes.

I will place myself in President Kennedy's chair and carry out those things that are provided for by the Constitution of the United States of America, and also those things provided for by civil rights. I will then ask the Lord for guidance and that my decisions be just and fair regardless of race, color, or creed in this and other issues which are yet to be settled.

These then are but pages of American history written in blood, but they, far better than I, depict what value man places on, and the price he will pay for, freedom. This heritage is an American's most prized possession. It permits freedom from fear, the privilege of raising and educating our children in a country full of opportunity, freedom to seek the religion of our choice, freedom of speech, freedom to vote and voice our opinion in city, State and general elections. These and many other things too numerous to mention are what freedom means to me.

Voices of Protest: The Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last August 7, this body witnessed a most unusual and informative session under special orders. A large turnout from both sides of the aisle remained for over 4 hours to discuss the Gesell report, Secretary McNamara's directive implementing this report, and the awesome dangers implied.

During my remarks at that time, I pointed out that because many southerners were in attendance and speaking against this dangerous move, there undoubtably would be attempts to whitewash the entire 4-hour discussion as "just another southern segregationist strategy."

Fortunately, several of my distinguished colleagues from other areas of the country were quick to discern the real issue. It was, and is, simply whether or not the military forces shall be ordered to formulate Executive directives and fiats to impose on the civilian populace.

The courageous Members, not from the South, who voiced their concern on August 7 recently were recognized in an editorial in the Times-Picayune of New Orleans. It is, therefore, a pleasure to include that editorial into the RECORD, adding my own personal note of appreciation to men of principle:

AWAKENING TO THE "GESELL GESTAPO"?

The text of the Gesell report; new directives that can only result in altering and abusing fundamentals of the military mission and civil-military relations; and previous directives that show clearly enough the hitherto voluntary (noncoercive, persuasive) nature of Defense Department and base commander policies and acts relative to segregation off limits, were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 7.

Though it may take time for the distinctions, implications, and facts to penetrate to the minds of the membership of Congress, or of principled outsiders, the Nation has cause to be grateful to U.S. Representatives from outside the South who so early showed their grasp of the far-reaching incursions and threats involved.

Included were advocates of civil rights who realize that the basic issues transcend that subject, and should not be overawed by the emotionalism and extremism which are made to surround it.

As to the contributions made that day by southern Congressmen, we mean of course no disparagement. They know from experi-

ence that theirs has become almost a voice from the wilderness in exposing evils multiple in consequence and import compared with any evil sought to be cured. Yet, they drew to the House floor, it is said, one of the largest, most attentive bodies ever assembled for special order of business.

The Congressmen who to varying degrees supported them limited themselves to brief remarks, which we should like very much to see expanded on. Six other Congressmen spoke in praise of the Gesell report, etc. With all deference to their sincerity, they conveyed in sum the argument that "Nothing has changed at all. Anyhow, the intent of this change justifies the means and methods."

On the other hand, Minority Republican Leader LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, asked for enlightenment as to Secretary McNamara's exact attitude toward all this. Representative H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, predicted "political dictatorship, a commissar on each base, the biggest army of snoopers and informers the country ever heard of." Representative D. G. HALL, of Missouri, called the report and directives "shocking, indefensible"; showing "narrowness of vision as to propriety"; compelling commanders to be judged on political issues and made to lead crusades.

Representative M. A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, wanted to know where he could read the report. Representative C. B. HOEVEN, of Iowa, wanted to know what the House could do concerning the almost unbelievable developments. Representative L. C. WYMAN, of New Hampshire, fearing the orders would destroy the combat effectiveness of the Military Establishment; that they amount to deliberate scuttling of morale and efficiency, wanted legislation right now to undo them. Representative J. A. YOUNGER, of California, expressed reluctant suspicion of graver influences than the purely domestic. Representative M. R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, furnished interesting information on side developments and as a civil rights advocate, spoke against preferential treatment for any race.

These are, we confess, straws in the wind, and not too many. We sincerely hope for a more thorough awakening. To characterize as an incipient gestapo the new branch of military service proposed among other things by the Gesell report is not unjust. It remains to be seen if it is in fact being organized, from the top down. Equivocal directives, on a pass-the-word basis, unfortunately are not new.

Hon. Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I join in observing the passing of the late distinguished Senator from Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER. Far removed though it may be from his native Tennessee, the State of Washington will genuinely feel the loss of a good friend in Senator KEFAUVER'S death. He came into our State many times and in my own district his friends are legion. His warmth, his understanding, and his deep conscience for humanity made him beloved.

My own personal feeling for Senator KEFAUVER has always been one of great respect and admiration. I have indeed lost a good friend.

My sincerest sympathy to his lovely wife and his four splendid children.

What the Public Thinks About the A-Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 12, the Indianapolis News ran a column by Ralph de Toledano rightfully questioning whether Pierre Salinger's release of White House mail regarding the partial test ban treaty fairly presents the picture of American public attitude. The column is as follows:

[From the Indianapolis News, Aug. 12, 1963]

THE TEST BAN TREATY AND PUBLIC OPINION

(By Ralph de Toledano)

WASHINGTON.—Pierre Salinger, the President's press secretary, has shown no shyness whatsoever in informing the White House press corps that mail on the test ban treaty with the Soviet Union is running 12 to 1 in favor. This may well be, though it could be predicted that the promail would go to the White House, the antimail to the Senate.

That there is any mail at all against the treaty is surprising, but not because there is little opposition. There has been no anti-treaty leadership yet visible and no anti-treaty formulation presented. Most of the mass media comment has been favorable without quite saying so. Many people, moreover, are confused by the manner in which the treaty is being presented by the administration to the public. The sales pitch simultaneously follows two lines:

1. The treaty really is meaningless and will change very little—if anything. The United States wasn't testing in space, the atmosphere, or underwater, anyhow, and (for the time being) neither were the Soviets. What, then, do we lose?

2. The treaty is historic and of tremendous importance as a "first step" toward an understanding with the Soviets. It will "reduce tensions" and may lead to an end to the cold war.

Many Americans can be lost in a morass of scientific controversy and military inhibition as the meaning of the treaty is debated. It is the second point that most clearly worries people and may be the cause of votes against the treaty by some Senators. For if it leads to a non-aggression pact, as the administration seems to hope, the American people will be up in arms. One of the letters offered to the press by Mr. Salinger for its inspection points this up:

"If a nonaggression pact is signed with Russia, I guarantee that I'll vote straight Republican in every election even if they run the biggest crooks in town."

Other letters in opposition urge that the United States demand as the price of any treaties with the Kremlin a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Cuba (and the captive nations) and the tearing down of the Berlin wall. Such a quid pro quo would satisfy the Nation's horse-trading instincts.

Key legislators hope that there is a real outpouring of mail critical of the test ban treaty—letters to Senators and newspapers. The mail will stiffen the backs of some in the Senate leadership who wish to take a stronger stand against the treaty but fear it will hurt their party without accomplishing anything.

As of this writing, few believe that President Kennedy will not get Senate ratification for the treaty. But if the vote should be close, it will be a warning that a nonaggression pact would stand no chance. The idea would then be dropped by the White House. Nothing, after all, could more certainly put a quick end to the political career of the Kennedy's than the rejection of a treaty signed by the President's surrogate in plain view of the world.

Many Americans have, in fact, taken the time and trouble to write views to Members of the Congress which disapprove the treaty. The following are extracts from some letters which I have received:

Santa Ana, Calif.: "As J. Edgar Hoover said December 7, 1961, 'We are at war with Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.' "

Atherton, Calif.: "After studying the terms of the test ban treaty I feel as though passing it would be a grave mistake."

Pacific Grove, Calif.: "Treatybreaking is an instrument of Soviet national policy. Remembering how the Russians tricked us on the last test ban, I do not think the majority of the American people want this treaty ratified."

Phoenix, Ariz.: "The Soviets in the person of Mr. Khrushchev have made it clear that they negotiate nothing on a give-and-take basis as they give nothing. What are we giving? We are already disarminfi at an alarming rate to 'relieve tensions.' "

Los Angeles, Calif.: "We all know the Soviets cannot be trusted. They think treaties are like piecrusts, 'made to be broken.' Do you think you or your family would survive a Soviet conquest of our country? Do you think our country will be safe if the Soviets gain military superiority in any manner?"

Newport Beach, Calif.: "Our national security depends on future tests. Why give Khrushchev an open door to more concessions?"

Arlington, Tex.: "Why is it our administration, and a lot of our Congressmen, are willing to go along with the Communists on this point (and other points) when any clearheaded person can see the disastrous effects that will come from such an agreement. How can they do business with gangsters?"

San Francisco, Calif.: "It is quite baffling to many of us why some of our leaders are so determined to consummate a treaty at any price of compromise on our part. When the day arrives that we see the Communists release the captive nations, such as the Hungarians (instead of murdering freedom fighters as they did); when they withdraw from Cuba; when they withdraw from Laos; in short, when they demonstrate by deeds and not hollow words that they are prepared to honor the identity of other nations, then and only then should we even consider negotiations with the atheistic Communists."

Muskegon, Mich.: "Let the Russians get out of Cuba as promised before we sign any more worthless paper. How can we citizens trust the CIA and the so-called military brains when a situation like Cuba took place under their noses?"

Bakersfield, Calif.: "Morass of intrigue."

La Jolla, Calif.: "Perhaps the average American does not understand a great deal about 'nuclear affairs,' but we do know about the perfidy of the Soviets over a period of 40 years or more."

Newton, Kans.: "Vote 'no.' "

New Orleans, La.: "Vote down any test ban legislation. Enough was done behind the American people's backs."

Milford, Conn.: "Don't let the Congress sign that or any other treaty Kennedy wants."

Brooklyn, N.Y.: "I hope the few Americans left will wake up to reality soon—or else it will be too late."

San Mateo, Calif.: "God help us, we couldn't be in a worse mess."

The Duty To Inform—Morris K. Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, on occasion, we are constrained to note the example of a colleague. Sometimes it is necessary that such example be called to our attention by some source from outside the Congress. In an article in the Arizona Republic, in Phoenix, Ben Cole, the astute Washington columnist for that newspaper, graphically calls attention to the example of our colleague, MORRIS K. UDALL, my friend, fellow Arizonian, and distinguished Representative from District 2 of the State of Arizona.

In his comment upon the posture of this distinguished colleague, who does indeed stand tall in the Congress, Mr. Cole calls us to a new understanding of, and a firm commitment to our duty to inform as well as represent. For the benefit of all who sit in this House, I, therefore, place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, the article which appeared in the Arizona Republic on August 11, 1963:

MORRIS UDALL CALLED FOOLHARDY—ARIZONIAN INFORMS, REPRESENTS CONSTITUENTS

(By Ben Cole)

WASHINGTON.—Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, has a quaint belief that a Congressman should inform as well as represent his constituents.

From this conviction has come a long series of monthly Udall study papers dealing in depth with issues from agriculture to water conservation, rightwingers to legislative reform.

Some of his colleagues regard the tall Tucson attorney as needlessly courageous—in fact, downright foolhardy.

"I never say anything I don't have to," observed one cautious, long-surviving Congressman. "Why does a guy want to go out looking for trouble?"

UDALL has even heard mild protests from his own staff when he has proposed taking up some slumbering issue certain to raise a ruckus.

He has waded right into subjects like medicare, Federal spending, Federal power, etc.

Research and writing for the papers are done by Roger Lewis, a scholarly, precise ex-reporter for the Arizona Republic, and Dick Olson, an equally studious former newsman in Tucson. They have been described as approaching each paper as though it were a doctoral dissertation.

Most congressional newsletters are designed to keep the lawmaker as far from trouble as possible. They are usually written with one eye on the political barometer and the other on the poll book.

A farm State solon, thus, rails at the Agriculture Department in season and out. A deep southerner denounces Federal interferences in civil rights. A New Englander goes in big for comment on the fishing industry. And so on and on.

Citizens reading this enlightening material nod in joyful agreement and congratulate themselves on having sent such a wise head to Congress.

But UDALL's case is different. He sometimes seems to be groping for tender shins to bark.

Lifesaving Phone Calls for Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that only that people is great that cares for its youth and its aged. I think all of us can agree that one of the distinguishing characteristics of our great Nation is its compassion and generosity toward the ailing and needy, not only of this country but of the world. Many of the great movements to advance the cause of those in need of special consideration have been initiated in the United States. One need only recall the administration's efforts in behalf of the mentally retarded as a recent expression of our collective and individual approach to these things.

It is my pride and pleasure to draw the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Sunday, August 18, issue of Parade, the famous weekly magazine newspaper supplement. Headed "Lifesaving Phone Calls for Older People," it tells the story of a telephone buddy system for aged live-alones which has mushroomed all over the country, saving lives and bringing help, cheer and emotional security to thousands of elderly people.

Among the greatest needs, we are told, of our older citizens is to feel needed, emotionally, and to remain in close touch with the outside world. This splendid program, started by Mrs. Clara Sample McClure of Saginaw, Mich., contributes much needed assistance in these areas of daily existence.

Two of the most successful of these community efforts are in my own State of Florida. One is in Greater Miami, the district which I am privileged to represent.

For $1 a month, old people in the Miami area can subscribe to Friendly Neighbors, Inc., a nonprofit telephone answering service run by Francis Zeller, 24 years old and blind. Sponsored by the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce Committee on Total Employment, Friendly Neighbors not only helps the aged, but also employs handicapped workers to do the phoning.

Dr. R. M. Applebaum, of South Miami, was instrumental in bringing the Saginaw idea to the Miami area. He and Mrs. Florence Fox, chairman of the Dade County Committee on Total Employment, together with other residents, worked out a double-benefit plan—help for the aged and work for the handicapped.

One subscriber in his late seventies exclaimed that he is no longer afraid of being alone. An elderly widow, with high blood pressure, has expressed relief and reassurance at the daily calls. An 86-year-old widow, who enjoys living alone, finds much comfort in the daily phone call and the protection it affords should she have a fall or household accident.

Perhaps many other communications will be inspired by this community effort sponsored by the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce to initiate similar programs. I am therefore setting the complete article before my colleagues:

LIFESAVING PHONE CALLS FOR OLDER PEOPLE

(By Sid Ross)

A telephone buddy system for aged live-alones, first reported by Parade (November 18, 1962), has mushroomed all over the country, saving lives and bringing help, cheer, and emotional security to thousands of elderly people.

Inaugurated in Saginaw, Mich., by Mrs. Clara Sample McClure as Reassurance Service, it has spread to more than 300 communities. Here's how it works: a daily call is made at a specified time to an elderly person living alone. If the call is not answered, an immediate investigation is made.

In some places a public-spirited individual foots the telephone bill, in other towns the community takes over and in some cities a nonprofit answering service keeps in telephone touch with the elderly.

Dr. Wilma Donahue, chairman of the Department of Gerontology of the University of Michigan, recommends this service for nationwide adoption. She says: "This creative yet unusually simple solution provides needed security for old people who want to live alone and not be a burden on others. This service is a practical guardian for the well-being of old people who want to live independently and with dignity."

THE WAY IT WORKS

To show how these telephone lifelines work, here are two examples, both in Florida and both inspired by Parade's article.

For $1 a month, old people in the Miami area can subscribe to Friendly Neighbors, Inc., a nonprofit telephone answering service run by Francis Zeller, 24 years old and blind. Sponsored by the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce Committee on Total Employment, Friendly Neighbors not only helps the aged, but also employs handicapped workers to do the phoning.

Dr. R. M. Applebaum, of South Miami, was instrumental in bringing the Saginaw idea to this area. He and Mrs. Florence Fox, chairman of the Dade County Committee on Total Employment, together with other residents, worked out a double-benefit plan—help for the aged and work for the handicapped.

Subscribers to Friendly Neighbors (and to other phone plans) fill out an application form which lists nearest relatives, chronic diseases, if any, physician's name, and the time they wish to be called. This record is kept by the answering service in case of emergency. One subscriber in his late seventies says, "I'm not afraid of being alone any more."

Mrs. Louva Hilliard, a 66-year-old widow, says, "I've got high blood pressure. It's dangerous. But with this service I feel relieved and reassured."

An 86-year-old widow, Mrs. Lillian R. Hale, likes to live alone so she can do as she pleases; but she finds it comforting to get a daily phone call. "I like someone calling me to check if I'm all right and haven't fallen and hurt myself," she says.

Just 250 miles away in St. Petersburg, Fla., a public-spirited citizen, Jack G. Powell, operates Check-Mate, a free phone checking

service. Powell, whose business includes operation of an ambulance service, not only provides twice-daily phone calls to over 75 subscribers, but also delivers prescriptions and sends an ambulance if needed. He relates an incident in which Check-Mate saved a life.

"We called a subscriber three times and got no answer, so we sent a radio car out. When we got there the man was having trouble breathing. His fingers were turning blue. We called an ambulance, administered oxygen, and rushed him to the hospital. He would have been a goner."

If you're interested in helping start a similar service to provide reassurance to the elderly in your community, write for information to Parade, Department L, 733 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Administration Reelection Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 29, 1963:

ADMINISTRATION REELECTION AGENCY

The House of Representatives by a five-vote margin last month refused to grant $455 million in additional appropriations to the Area Redevelopment Administration. The Senate, however, later passed a similar bill and sent it to the lower chamber. If three Representatives change their original votes, the administration may get the nearly half billion in funds it so desperately wants.

The House should reaffirm its original vote. As JOHN LINDSAY, New York liberal Republican Congressman who initially supported ARA, put it, the program has "utterly failed to get off the ground and is leaving in its wake a shameful record of mismanagement, stodginess, and waste."

Besides ineptitude the ARA is guilty of gluttony. By April 1963 it had spent only $83 million of the $394 million authorized in the 1961 act. What need has it of such an additional outlay of funds?

The purpose of ARA was, in the words of Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, to act as "a rifle that should pinpoint areas of greatest need." Now, according to the Senator, the whole idea has been degraded into a "pork barrel" program. Instead of being aimed at pockets of unemployment, more than 1,000 counties are now eligible for such aid—a third of the United States.

When Mr. SCOTT sought to amend the ARA appropriations bill by eliminating 21 percent of the counties eligible, his wary colleagues rejected the amendment with an eye to just whose ox would be among the 21 percent gored.

However, the strongest argument for rejecting the fund request is the cynical and obvious political purposes for which they have been used. The initials ARA should stand for Administration Reelection Agency, one disgruntled legislator commented.

In a single example ARA sent $6,100,000 to Duluth, Minn., to build a new convention center—$3 million in an outright gift. The project will create 22 permanent jobs—at a cost of $277,272 per job. By some strange coincidence Minnesota Senator and good Frontiersman EUGENE MCCARTHY is facing tough opposition in the 1964 election.

ARA boasts that the project will attract tourists to Duluth, and convention planners will give the city a second look. What this means is Duluth will have Federal aid in competing with other area cities.

Congress should not give the administration an opportunity to add to this already huge slush fund for the 1964 campaign.

On Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend John C. Harper, rector of St. John's Church at Lafayette Square here in Washington, has sent his parishioners a letter which I feel should be brought to the attention of all.

This letter is full of wisdom and is typical of the positive effort being made by all the churches of America during the grave civil rights crisis confronting this Nation.

A long tradition of humanitarianism gives our churches a strong voice in providing leadership to correct injustices. They are doing their part.

We as legislators must do ours. Laws are needed to insure every American the rights guaranteed by our Constitution. The need is urgent.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Reverend Harper's message to my colleagues:

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1963.

DEAR FRIENDS: In view of the distressing racial tension in our beloved country and with the pending March of August 28 in mind, I feel compelled as your rector to write you this letter in order to present my own feelings in these unhappy days.

St. John's Church is often spoken of as a spiritual beacon in the Capital, a parish church which stands for the fullness and the strength of the Christian religion. For almost 150 years men and women have worshipped in this historic Washington church, and they have heard, as you and I today hear, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And what is that Gospel? It is none other than the good news that all men are brothers in Christ, that there is "neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female" but that we are one family here on earth. If we believe this central Christian teaching, how can we today accept the Negro as anyone less than one of us, a member of Christ's flock? If we believe what is written in the Constitution, how can we in 1963 allow anything less than full human rights for all our citizens regardless of their color? As Christians we cannot reject the demands of the Gospel; as citizens we cannot reject the full implications of American citizenship.

The church has too long been silent on this important issue. Now at long last Christians like ourselves are aroused by the injustice of discrimination in any form and by any kind of segregation on the basis of a man's color. This summer our Episcopal Church has issued a call to its members to support in every way possible all forms of nonviolent activity which lead to the end of segregation and discrimination. Our presiding bishop and the bishop of this diocese have called upon each member of the church to take whatever action seems appropriate to bear witness to his belief that Christians cannot tolerate racial inequality or human indignity in any form. The house of bishops of our church will meet on August 12, and a statement will be issued thereafter again setting forth the position of this church in regard to civil rights. I urge you to read this statement carefully when it is published in the newspapers, and I would also remind you that every other major Christian denomination has also taken an equally strong stand in favor of human rights for all our citizens.

As your rector, I do not tell you precisely what you should do. For some in our parish the march of August 28 will be an occasion to demonstrate in behalf of full civil rights. For others frank and honest discussion, together with an examination of one's own conscience, will help us see the issues which are involved. For still others these days of 1963 provide the opportunity to become Christians in deed as well as in word, to put to the test our love and our concern for all God's people. Whatever you do, may your actions and your words be those of love and of understanding. Above all, may they reflect your faith in the power of Christ Jesus to command us to act and speak and think as Christian brothers.

Regardless of what one does in August about this cause, which I believe is ultimately right, I want to make it perfectly plain that as a Christian, as a citizen, and as the rector of St. John's Church, I support the objective of equal rights for all our people. This church building is open, as it has always been, to all who want to worship here; the ministry of this parish is extended to any who seek it; our fellowship one with another has no limitations whatsoever. St. John's Church must today still be a spiritual beacon, and no issue facing us demands any greater leadership than that of the racial issue in our country. If St. John's is to bear witness for Christ, then you and I must make that witness now.

Accordingly, I have informed the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and the officials of this diocese that St. John's stands ready to help in these difficult days in order that we may express our belief in our American tradition of protest and appeal. I have asked our parish staff to be of any help possible to fellow Christians who will be in Washington on August 28 in order that the march may be a peaceful and constructive demonstration of our Christian beliefs. And, finally, I have instructed my assistant, the Reverend F. Everett Abbott, in my absence, to read from the pulpit this Sunday the request from the presiding bishop for your concern and for your involvement in this all-important issue of 1963.

You and I love this parish church, for it has been a force for good in past years. Let us continue to love it by making St. John's today the visible evidence of the presence of Jesus Christ. Let us in this summer month and as we move ahead be the kind of Christians we have always professed to be, so that our religion may today count for something great.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN C. HARPER,
Rector.

Chaos in the Lettuce Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following is a weekly report of the ship-

ments of lettuce throughout the United States that recently appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Salinas Californian. We, of the Salinas Valley, are quite proud not only of the quality, but of the quantity of our lettuce. As you will note in the report, the Salinas-Watsonville area accounts for over 50 percent of all of the lettuce shipped during the week of July 25–31. During the height of our lettuce season we will continue to dominate the Nation in the shipping of lettuce.

SALINAS-WATSONVILLE LETTUCE REVIEW

(By H. B. Wolters)

Generally slow demand and low price levels characterized the Salinas-Watsonville-King City lettuce market during the past week.

Widespread competition from a multiplicity of producing districts prevailed. Average recorded daily shipments from United States, excluding Sunday, showed 144 cars and carlot equivalents compared with 486 a week earlier. District loadings averaged 242 daily. Colorado was the principal competitor averaging 80 cars and carlot equivalents daily which was a slight decrease compared with last week. Michigan points had only moderate offerings due to blasting of considerable acreage after prior rain. Weather past week has been hot in Michigan growing sections with no rain. Wisconsin movement was light as a result of recent warm weather and hail damage of a week earlier which curtailed cutting in most areas. In New York State, supplies were originating in the Oswego County and in the Potter Muck. In New Jersey offerings of lettuce were largely confined to Great Meadows section.

Following is a table giving lettuce movement this season for the week of July 25–31, with figures for a comparable week a year ago and a projected next week for a year ago:

Combined rail and truck movement of lettuce

	This week this year	Last week last year	Next week last year
Salinas-Watsonville	1,455	1,295	1,248
Other California	304	337	266
Colorado	493	341	383
Other States	437	531	502
Total, United States	2,689	2,504	2,399

This tremendous production of lettuce obviously requires a multitude of field workers—many more than the domestic farm labor force of the United States. The bracero fills the gap. He comes into our valley for several months a year. While he is here he is well housed and provisioned. While he harvests our lettuce, he is earning more than $1 an hour—about half of which he spends in the United States and half of which he sends to his family in Mexico. He is neither a burden to our community nor a disruptive force to our schools or welfare agencies.

Consider the chaotic situation if we had to rely on the migratory worker as the only source of farm labor. Does anyone sincerely believe the farmer could provide housing, food, transportation, and medical care for the migratory worker and his family? Could a small but productive region such as the Salinas Valley possibly accommodate over 50 percent of the total lettuce work force—and their families—for a few months? It would be an enormously disruptive and burdensome force on any large community.

Then where do these unfortunate migrant workers and their families go, and what do they do, when the harvest is finished and there is no more work within a thousand miles?

We solicit your empathy for our problem because it affects every district in America. Your ideas are welcome now.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat Gives Warning on the Test Ban Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on July 30 relative to the test ban pact has been brought to my attention. It gives the timely warning to go slow on ratification. The editorial is as follows:

GO SLOW, MR. PRESIDENT

Before the American people are asked to render a judgment on the nuclear test ban treaty, and before the Senate is asked to ratify it, all of the information presented to the Senate Preparedness Committee—of which Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, is chairman—should be made public, within the bounds of national security, and the administration should tell whether or not any commitments leading to a nonaggression pact were offered, directly or indirectly, during Mr. Harriman's negotiations in Moscow.

The major doubts on the treaty fall mainly into three groups:

First, the extent to which this will inhibit U.S. development of an antimissile missile.

Second, the possibility that the Russians already have a weapon which could blackout all communications in this country and, thus, make the launching and coordination of our second strike impossible.

Third, the extent to which the United States is being taken down the path of disarmament by the President's appeasement and accommodation-minded advisers—particularly Walt Whitman Rostow and Jerome B. Wiesner.

In the past few years, the Kennedy administration has been phasing out airplanes and manned bombers. Within the next 4 or 5 years—unless the current trend is reversed—missiles will be our only major deterrent to war and protection of peace.

Khrushchev, by his own admission, has exploded 10 times more blasts in the atmosphere than we have. He now apparently has an antimissile missile which, according to most experts, can be extended and tested only in the atmosphere, and not underground. We do not have such a weapon. This, more than his present difficulties with China, might be the reason for his sudden willingness to agree to limit atmospheric testing.

On one thing we can be absolutely sure—whatever Khrushchev's reasons, they are good only for Khrushchev and that not in any way is he a convert to sweetness, light, and peace except on his own terms, which are to bury the free world.

Within the same context, there is a strong possibility—based on recent happenings—that bombs which the Russians already possess, and which we do not, have a capability of knocking out all of the U.S. communications and controls. If this happened, we would be at the mercy of the Russians—for they would be able to hit us with impunity while our defenses were immobilized.

There is a great realm of ignorance in this field which should be explored before any agreement—even an innocuous one—is ratified.

While the President has disclaimed secret agreements, there is widespread apprehension that he has agreed to much more than has ever been announced—at least so far as his 1-day triumphant confrontation with Khrushchev over Cuba last October is concerned.

It taxes credulity to believe that there was just coincidence between the President's short-lived triumph, which he needed so badly just before the national election, and the subsequent—within a month—withdrawal of the Skybolt from Britain and the removal of missiles from Turkey and Italy.

Khrushchev's avid desire is to bolster his prestige within the Communist bloc by a nonaggression pact which would recognize his acquisition of the satellite countries and East Germany and legalize the rape of Hungary. According to Khrushchev's own report, the possibility of such a pact was discussed with Mr. Harriman.

If this is a quid pro quo, directly or indirectly, for a nuclear test ban treaty, it would be a desperately high price to pay. The American people should know if this has been indicated.

As our Washington Bureau Chief Edward O'Brien pointed out in his masterful article in yesterday's paper, American disarmament efforts, the eschewing of victory, and the actual destruction of arms, are part of the strategy often expressed by top Presidential Advisers Rostow and Wiesner. A nonaggression pact is in character with their peace-through-weakness philosophy—a strategy which has never yet worked in the history of the world, and which only misty dreamers feel holds any real hope for the future.

The American people know for a certainty that any treaty with the Russians is not worth the paper it is written on, and we should not be beguiled or enchanted into anything that diminishes American strength as a deterrent to war, and a preserver of peace, until we are absolutely sure that the Russians have changed. There is no indication of that to this moment.

Before we give credence to any change, we should have more tangible evidence of Russian desires along this line—such as the removal of offensive weapons in Cuba, taking down the wall in Berlin, an end to supplying revolutionaries throughout South America and Communist forces in South Vietnam and Laos, and the holding of free elections in all the captured countries of Eastern Europe.

When these reasonable requirements for peace are met, then perhaps we can proceed toward a nuclear test ban, and even a disarmament treaty.

But, so long as the Russians remain pledged to bury us, and so long as their word is utterly worthless, the American people and the U.S. Senate must have far more assurance than has been given.

In this deadly business, we are playing for keeps. The President can make many mistakes in domestic policy and the Nation will still survive, but a miscalculation in nuclear deterrents, antimissile missiles, and defensive strength to preserve the peace would be fatal to freedom throughout the world.

We just can't afford to make a big mistake on this.

The issue is not merely a relatively unimportant treaty with a perfidious nation. What is at stake—with this as a beginning—is the entire future of mankind.

The President and the administration owe the American people and the Senate full information and full disclosure, without any reservations whatsoever, before we are asked to take so fateful a step.

Supreme Court's Decision Threatens Complete Eradication of Religion From Our Government and All Its Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, many of us who do not have formal legal training have nevertheless studied the decisions of the Supreme Court in the light of logic and history.

Among those who have done so is the Reverend Walter G. J. Hards, Th. D., rector of St. David's Episcopal Church of Baltimore, Md.

The Reverend Hards discussed with his congregation the results of his study in a statement on June 23, 1963, a few days after the Court's decisions in the Maryland and Pennsylvania cases.

His discussion is so profound and his conclusions so logical that I feel the Members should have the benefit of his counsel, particularly at a time when many are deciding whether they will sign discharge petition No. 3, now on the desk of the Clerk.

I insert the Reverend Hards' statement at this point:

SUPREME COURT'S DECISION

(By Rev. Walter G. J. Hards, Th. D.)

I have no Biblical text for this morning and have no intention of preaching a sermon. I am speaking as a citizen, not as a priest of the church. What I am going to say, therefore, must not be understood as the teaching of the Episcopal Church, but as my own beliefs, shared, indeed, by many other people.

I was disappointed by the ruling of the Supreme Court last Monday. The decision is now the law of the land and we must obey it, of that, there is no doubt. My dismay is occasioned by three considerations.

First, I cannot for the life of me see how this decision is an interpretation of the first amendment. You may object that I am not a lawyer, and that is why I cannot square the decision with the amendment. I'm not a lawyer but I can read English and know something about English and American history. The first amendment seems so perfectly clear to me. You know it: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The elected representatives of the people, the Congress, alone, has the power to make laws. The Supreme Court does not. There is no disagreement about that. The crucial word in the present decision of the Supreme Court is the term establishment. The Fathers of the Constitution and of the amendments knew full well the significance of the term. Some of them had lived under an established religion. Others were fully aware of the problems which arose when one faith was the established religion of a country.

Consider the religious situation when the amendment became the law of the land. The Anglican Church, the established church of England, Ireland and Wales, harassed the Puritans and the Papists who were not members of the established religion. The Roman church had been the established church of France, and the Huguenots had suffered for their faith under that establishment. Congregationalism was the established church of Massachusetts and the Anglicans and Roman Catholics were persecuted by the Puritans.

The evidence was conclusive. The Fathers of the Constitution saw that the establishment of a religion resulted in the persecution of dissenters. The Fathers willed that no religion should be established in this country, in order that all men might be free to practice their own faith. Hence the first amendment.

What concerns me is that the present Supreme Court has changed the definition of the word "establishment," and by that very fact has altered the meaning of the first amendment. Establishment now means the association of religion with the state, and the majority of the Justices have ruled that religion cannot be associated with the state. We are now to have a secular government, that is to say a government which recognizes no power other than its own. The government as government no longer stands under God. Individuals in government do, of course, but not the government. This bothers me.

Two other questions related to this point equally concern me. The first is a purely political one. This: If the Supreme Court by changing the meaning of words can in effect make new laws, what happens to the constitutional framework of our Government which states that Congress shall make laws?

The second question is simply this: Where will the implementation of this new law end? The beginning is clear—no more religious services in our State schools. A movement is now under foot to remove the legend, "In God We Trust," from our coins. Will the iconoclasts then go to work on our public buildings and with cold chisel remove from them every sign or word which has any religious significance? Will there be protests that the prayers with which Congress begins its day be declared unconstitutional? Will all prayers at State and Federal inaugurations of government officials be prohibited? If not, why not? Will chaplaincies in State institutions, hospitals, prisons, be forbidden? On what grounds will the State pay the salaries of chaplains in the Armed Forces? It has been argued that in order that the military may have freedom of religion the State must provide chaplains for them. But will not someone point out that chaplains are needed only on the field of battle or when our servicemen are assigned to pagan countries? The military can certainly attend the local churches in this country. So why chaplains on stateside installation?

On the basis of the Supreme Court's decision I can see no logical stopping place, except the complete eradication of religion from our government and all its agencies. And when that happens, whether in our life time or that of our descendents, it will be difficult to distinguish this country from the Soviet Union.

"Oh," you say, "that's not fair. The first amendment clearly states that the Government shall make no laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion." I know it does. But what will that mean when the state is completely secularized. The Constitution of the Soviet Union in chapter 10, article 124, states: "In order to insure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separate from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." What's wrong with that? What has happened to religious people in Russia?

Where are we going? This is what bothers me.

In the second place, I am equally concerned about the secular concept, accepted by some of our religious leaders, that religion is for the home and church. Well, of course, it is. It is the primary task of parents to pass on to their children the religious heritage they have received from their fathers. It is the work of the church to complement this teaching. Sectarian teaching of religion belongs nowhere else than in the home and the church. Such teaching in the schools is only possible where the church, whichever branch of it may be, is the established church of a nation. Obviously in a pluralistic society, such as ours, there can be no sectarian education in public schools.

But can there be any religious education? The Supreme Court says "No." This bothers me. There are vast numbers of children who never set foot inside a church, whose parents are not antireligious, but merely areligious. These children are now to be educated without any notion of the fundamental principles derived from our Judeo-Christian heritage. When questions of morality are raised, they will be answered, I presume, in terms of what the state believes is right or wrong. They will no longer hear the Ten Commandments, for they are taken from the Old Testament. They will no longer hear the Lord's Prayer.

The other evening I listened to a TV program in which there was a scene from a schoolroom during the opening religious exercises. The children repeated with reverence the Lord's Prayer. As I listened to them I could not but think what a powerful influence for good these words must have on them, even when at this stage of life they may well have said them by rote. "Our Father." Here is the affirmation that there is a power, a benevolent power, above the government. I thought about each phrase in that prayer. Some might never be understood by those whose religious education is limited to this simple service. But, at least, they heard the words "forgive," "temptation," "evil." In years to come they will need to forgive, to fight against temptation, to avoid evil.

Multitudes of our youth will no longer have this aid to a moral life.

I am also bothered because this new philosophy, that religion is to be taught in the home and the church, suggests that religion is for the home and church. The secularists in Russia have no objection to religious practices in the home and to prayers being said in the church. This is allowed. What is not permitted is that religion should move out into the mainstream of life.

The decision of the Supreme Court is not antireligious in itself, but in its implications it encloses religion and in the long run will tend to stifle it.

The third, and last, question which concerns me about the Supreme Court's decision, is that it seems that minorities unduly influence our Government. I hear a great deal of disparagment of rule by the majority, but I believe in it. The President is elected by a majority vote. The Governor is chosen in the same way. The men who make our laws are put into office by a majority of the electorate.

The members of the Supreme Court, political appointees, are not elected. It bothers me that they seem to be interpreting the law in favor of the minority. Mrs. Madeline Murray, in a television interview, said that there are 6,000 students at Poly, and that her son alone protested against the religious ceremonies. That is some minority, isn't it? One to 6,000. The minority, needless to say, has rights, but not the right to impose its will on the majority.

This adulation of the minority is evident in our news media. A change of the subject matter will only illustrate the point. In the troubles at Cambridge I have read in the newspapers Mrs. Gloria Richardson's remarks about the white political leaders of that city. I have seen on television the same lady and other integrationist leaders. But, to date, I have heard very little of the other side.

I am not suggesting that the minority, whether racial, religious, or political does not have the full rights of citizenship. I am not intimating that the majority is always right. All I'm affirming is that the rights of the majority cannot be set aside by the minority. That is one reason why I am diametrically opposed to the Communist system.

The Supreme Court has spoken. We must obey. But I heartily concur with the statement released by the Archbishop of Baltimore in which he said that the Supreme Court's decision was "another regrettable step on a journey which the Supreme Court should never have commenced." The question is, Where will this journey end?

If you are concerned that the journey not end where the present decision of the Supreme Court seems to indicate that it will, then may I suggest that you contact your Senator and let him know of your feelings. Senator BEALL, of Maryland, has introduced a proposed constitutional amendment allowing prayer in public schools. His proposed amendment states that nothing in the Constitution shall be construed as prohibiting the public schools "from providing for the voluntary participation by the students thereof in the reading of passages from the Bible or in regularly scheduled periods of nonsectarian prayer." If you agree with him, tell him.

Credit Tomfoolery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the subject of credit is of major interest to all Members of Congress, both as elected Representatives of the people and as private citizens who labor over their personal accounts—"robbing Peter to pay Paul." The matter of "strained credit" is one which has demanded and will continue to demand much attention from us as stewards of our national budget. The same strain is being felt at the family level among far too many Americans. With the permission of my colleagues, I wish to insert the editorial reflections of a trade association executive. Joe Meek, president of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association says:

CREDIT TOMFOOLERY

Credit is a good adjunct. But cash, when available, seems to still be a pretty good medium of exchange. We ought to use it more, encourage it more. Not yet are we sold on the lack of investigation when credit is granted. Not yet do we like the idea of lining up the high school kids for a line of credit * * * the "easy way." Not yet do we like the argument of the "friendly Bob Charmings." Not yet do we like to have it made easier for us to charge than to pay cash. Not yet do we like it when the biggest of the stores pressures folks for a line of revolving credit, even sending out a product to show its anxiety and against express wishes. Not yet do we like the fancy brochures which show credit as all charm and no headache.

(Much to the point was the comment of a headwaiter when we asked if such-and-such a credit card was available. "Any card is okay," he said, "it's when you try to pay cash that we give you trouble.")

If those who use credit want far less legislation against its use, they should the sooner make credit a matter of judgment—not happy usage.

A quote from the Ann Landers column in the ChiSun-Times: "Sickening is this ad 'Teen accounts welcomed. Rings with diamonds for the girl you are going with. Beautiful twin hearts with a sparkling diamond. Only $11.95. Can be paid out at 50 cents a week. Open your teen account today. Princess diamond ring for your steady girl * * * $39.50 at $1 a week * * * 15 brilliant diamonds.'" Of such, come laws.

House Small Business Committee Foundations Study Applauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee is engaged in an extensive investigation and review of tax-exempt foundations.

This study so far has produced startling information, indicating that some have used foundations as tax dodges and certainly have not operated their foundations in the spirit intended by Congress in authorizing these foundations.

Mr. Malcolm S. Forbes in his column "Fact and Comment" in the August 15 issue of Forbes magazine applauds this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent column be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The column follows:

FACT AND COMMENT: FOUNDATIONS UNDER FIRE

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

Today Congress rightfully is investigating tax-exempt foundations. In 1913 when John D. Rockefeller set up the Rockefeller Foundation there were fewer than 50 foundations. Today there are 15,000.

Some of them appear to be flimsy tax dodges with a few salaries and administrative expenses consuming most of the income in pursuit of vague, frequently undocumented activities. There are a few others only too well documented in the form of support for virulent propaganda via press and airwaves for extreme political ideologies.

It should be possible to establish some standards, some criteria that will curb the the tax abuses and fund misuses without hampering or harassing the enormous, increasing, immeasurable good that is daily achieved by the overwhelming majority.

What brought this subject to my mind is the Rockefeller Foundation summary of its activities since its establishment 50 years ago. A truly extraordinary record of how the grandiose objective of its founder—"to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world"—has been implemented.

Initially, concentration was on public health and medicine. From the highly successful tackling of causes and cures of specific endemic diseases, the fund broadened its approach to include emphasis on sparking the establishment of institutions to train the specialists so vital to the successful functioning of local health agencies—the school of hygiene and public health at Johns Hopkins, first of its kind, and the development of similar public health schools in 21 countries.

During ensuing decades, with the guidance of trustees of genuine intellectual caliber, the Rockefeller Foundation has broadened the scope of its activities to include meaningful studies, activity and scholarships in the fields of economics, sociology, political science, the natural sciences, as well as the humanities and the arts.

It is fascinating to see how attempts to alleviate specific needs have led to ever-wider programing. In Mexico, for instance, the Foundation set out to tackle the problem of food for the hungry. Intensive, extensive practical research to develop higher yielding, disease-resistant hybrids had to be accompanied by studies in soil fertility and pest control. With greater potential yields came the necessity for a vast educational program to apply what had been learned. The need for better marketing and distribution, the need for irrigation and the need for chemicals and fertilizers all were reflected in a basic need for an economy that could support such programs. A sound economy requires stable government. A stable, free government's first requisite is a broad educational base. It is an endless chain, from a specific program to root causes and basic needs; always an ever-widening spectrum affected by the dependence and interdependence of such ostensibly unrelated fields as the social sciences and the improvement of maize crop yields.

Basic, of course, to the Rockefeller Foundation's effectiveness, as well as its viability, is a principle adhered to since 1913: Those people and projects assisted must contribute substantial help themselves toward solution of their problem, with no indefinite and/or perpetual grants for any undertaking.

Incidentally, the young men and women working abroad in the Peace Corps should in their training period be made familiar with a couple of the basic principles that the Rockefeller Foundation has learned through experience to apply to its undertakings in aiding developing nations: "There must be continuity of effort over years and often decades. It takes time for people to change their habits and their environment * * * the achievements of highly developed nations cannot be transplanted intact to underdeveloped countries." Many currently returning from their Peace Corps stint reflect in their public comments some disappointment that they have not been able to accomplish very much in their 12 or 18 months abroad.

Because of patent abuses by some more recently established foundations, and because some foundations have been established in recent years as a result of our tax structure, there is some sentiment for drastically curbing them. This would be a terrible mistake.

As the Rockefeller Foundation's record establishes beyond dispute, private foundations can make, have made and are making valuable contributions to the betterment of mankind. To quote from their report:

"A private foundation can take initiative; it can pioneer; and, by mustering available knowledge and human competence, it can identify causes and experiment with solutions. It can move without the political complications created when governments are involved with other governments. It can encourage cooperative effort across national and political boundaries. It can bring a high order of individuality and diversity of viewpoint into the field of human betterment. It can provide a decentralization of social initiative and responsibility. And it can elist the interest and support of vigorous, enterprising, and public-spirited benefactors."

As our lawmakers wrestle with the problem of dealing with the relative handful of abuses in this field, it is to be hoped that they keep foremost in mind the unmeasurable quantity of the good that the foundations have been and are accomplishing.

Central Illinois Light Co., of Peoria, Drives To End Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the following editorial which lauds the Central Illinois Light Co.'s efforts to end discrimination in the community. CILCO officials were alerted to the problems through an orderly NAACP demonstration.

However, the editorial goes on to point out that once such a demonstration has been held and attention has been called to the grievances of the Negro in the community, an end should be put to those demonstrations. The editorial emphasizes that the NAACP demonstrations can reach a point of diminishing returns and the public can lose patience—the net result being unfavorable to the cause of the Negro.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that Negro leaders have given such thought to their imminent demonstration here in Washington on August 28. Should a holocaust develop, the Negro will have sacrificed everything for nothing. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial at this point:

PATIENCE, PICKETING, AND PEORIA

In his long march for equal rights, the Negro—whether he wants to believe it or not—has found the going a little bit easier in Peoria.

To be sure, the Negro faces plenty of discrimination in our town. His position is not envious. Neither is it hopeless.

But Peoria is different than most other cities in mid-America. It is different because it has a heart brimming full with patience and concern for its underprivileged citizens no matter the color of their skins.

We have seen in recent weeks proof after proof that the majority of Peoria's white citizens care about the problems Negroes face.

We have seen three big public utility firms—the bus company, the light and gas company, and the water company—exercise good judgment in the face of NAACP demonstrations which would have made some firms panic.

We saw in the case of the Central Illinois Light Co. reaction not only good judgment but also a kind of compassionate concern that has been unlike anything we have seen reported from anywhere in America.

The light company—with pickets inside its doors—did more than turn the other cheek. It—to put it very simply—pleaded guilty to discriminating and joined its attackers.

Two light company executives said they would not only quit discriminating against Negro jobseekers but would try to mount a drive among other business leaders in the community to get all employers to do the same thing. In return the president of the NAACP agreed to maintain an attitude of tranquillity.

That was nearly a month ago. In the past week we have heard the NAACP charge that the light company has not been moving fast enough. And an alderman counter that the NAACP's demonstrations against the waterworks is a violation of its agreement with CILCO.

Neither charge is right. The light company has not had time to do what it said would take 6 months to get off the ground. And the NAACP can hardly be expected to abandon its longstanding complaint against one company because of a promise from the executives of another company that they would try to do something about it.

John Gwynn, the NAACP president, says frankly that Negroes have lost their patience after 100 years of limited freedom. He says he cannot ask his youth council pickets who are considerably more militant than the adult chapter, to be patient.

In this Gwynn is wrong. Patience is important, and the Negro children we saw blocking trucks at the waterworks yesterday had better learn this. The problem of intolerance is not going to disappear overnight. It is not going to be picketed to death.

It is going to take time. And time requires patience.

Happily for the Negro youngsters of our community, they have had the opportunity to see the exercise of a great deal of patience by the police officers of the city of Peoria who during the past week repeatedly let them do things they could not have done if their skins had been white.

But this lesson about patience is only the first one. There is an additional lesson to learn and it is much harder to comprehend.

For patience is a two-way street. The Negro child—like any child who is nagging for privilege—must learn when to stop nagging. He must learn to know when he has said all that can do any good.

One nag too many usually results in a punishment. And so it is with picketing. Too much is just too much.

We are inclined to think that the NAACP is approaching this point in Peoria. While the children on the picket lines may have the patience to picket forever, the community may not have the patience to tolerate it much longer.

It is time that Gwynn and the other adult leaders of the Peoria chapter of the NAACP realize this. They may be inspired by what has happened because of demonstrations elsewhere in the Nation, but they must not lose sight of where they are.

Their problems are in Peoria. The object of their picketing was to remind Peoria of these problems. This has been done.

If there is anyone in town who does not know that the water company does not employ Negroes, he is blind and deaf.

To disrupt the service of the water company as the youthful demonstrators did yesterday is not in the community interest. Neither is it in the interests of Negroes themselves.

Peoria is different, but Peoria is not perfect.

If its patience wears thin, so could its concern.

A Thought-Provoking Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a constituent in South Dakota, Dennis M. Wolff, of Rapid City, which deserves being read by every Member of Congress. His letter raises the following questions:

Why did I serve 20 years ago to free foreign peoples?

Why am I being placed closer to their position of 20 years ago each day in this country?

Why was I schooled that this is a free country only to find I'm forced to participate in purchasing welfares I neither desire nor need?

Why am I being discriminated against economically because I have ambition and ability?

Why am I discriminated against taxwise because of my race?

Why am I forced to support foreign governments against my wishes and the guarantees of the Constitution?

Why am I forced to support or donate to charities not of my choosing?

The Kennedy Slump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News, of July 22, 1963:

THE KENNEDY SLUMP

As Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller contend for leadership of the Republican Party, developments are afoot which could make that position increasingly worth having.

Without a great deal of fanfare, the popular esteem of President John Kennedy has lately been in a state of sharp decline. Although public polls still show the President holding favor with a majority of those questioned, private surveys tell a different story.

James Reston recently observed in the New York Times that "for the first time since he entered the White House, the President is getting less than 50 percent approval from those questioned. And the more he slips, the more valuable the Republican nomination becómes."

Reston was referring to private polls conducted by the President himself. The Times also reports that Kennedy polls on the single question, "Do you think the President is doing a good job?" elicited a response of less than 48 percent in the affirmative.

The Shreveport (La.) Times comments: "It is believed that no President has sunk to such a low point since polls by professional organizations of the present types began to function in widespread manner near the end of the second Franklin D. Roosevelt administration."

Private and public polls alike show that, whatever the comparison with previous Chief Executives, Kennedy's rating has dropped rapidly. In April 1961, following the Bay of Pigs disaster, the public rallied behind the inexperienced President, giving him an 83 percent popularity mark in the public polls. By May of this year that figure had dropped to 70 percent. This month it has dropped to 54 percent.

As one New York Times man puts it: "If the polls and politicians are to be believed, Mr. Kennedy is riding the longest, steepest downgrade of his administration, with no evidence that his reputation as a national leader is doing anything but dropping steadily."

Whether this trend will continue is, of course, highly uncertain. Continued bungling and inaction over Cuba, the civil rights controversy, and other badly handled matters have penetrated the Kennedy aura of

glamor, and tarnished the President's carefully nurtured image. Future events in the year ahead might reverse this.

Nevertheless, this long slide toward unpopularity shows Kennedy is not invulnerable. A vast opportunity may be opening up for the Republicans, if they know how to capitalize upon it.

States Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives a very interesting editorial written by Mr. Walter S. Farquhar for the Pottsville Republican, Pottsville, Pa.

The article is a splendid presentation on the fundamental issues pertaining to States rights and the so-called "crusade against big government."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this informative column be included with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

STATES WRONGS

(By Walter S. Farquhar)

Dr. Henry Steele Commanger, of Amherst, writes that the revolt against what is called Federal centralization is not just a revival of States rights nor even the natural pride which citizens hold toward their respective States, but a crusade against "big government." He writes, in part:

"The most notorious use of the doctrine of States rights was to protect the institution of Negro slavery. States rights were invoked, too, to delay expansion into the West, to defeat the regulation of trusts, to frustrate prohibition of child labor, to hold up the grant of suffrage to women, and to oppose social security, the conservation of natural resources, creation of hydroelectric power, the encouragement of public education, and the protection of equality.

"The modern champions of States rights have none of that loyalty to the community which impelled a Jefferson to build the University of Virginia. No, the States rights champion of our time displays no real pride in his State, no feeling for its traditions, no pride in its future.

"One might imagine to hear some of our contemporary nihilists talk, that we were not one people, not Americans but Virginians and Mississippians; one might suppose that Jefferson Davis was right when he wrote, long after the Civil War, that 'no such political community as one people of the United States existed, has ever been organized, or yet exists, and that no political action by the people of the United States in the aggregate has even taken place under the Constitution.' One might conclude that the attempt at Federal Union, so hopefully inaugurated in 1787 and so widely copied throughout the globe had proved a failure, and that we were called upon to go back to 1787, reject the Constitution and cleave to the old Articles of Confederation.

"But anyone familiar with the history of freedom in the United States knows that it is the States that interfere most frequently with academic freedom, the States that set up censorship of press and stage and films, the States that threaten freedom of association, the States whose un-American activities committees have chalked up the most shameful records, the States that have most frequently flouted due process of law and denied equal protection of the laws, and challenged or denied religious freedom. The vast majority of civil liberty cases in the Supreme Court come up from the States, and involve local ordinances on State laws.

"It is precisely because the Federal Government does promote the general welfare that proponents of States rights fear it. They proclaim that these enterprises should not be performed by the National Government but by the States. But they are not truly concerned with the general welfare, but only with that of members of their own faction. All too often, the States have wasted their resources of water, forest and soil, or handed them over to predatory private interests.

"There has never been an adventurer, a soldier of fortune, a dictator, nor a tyrant in the Executive's chair. The only threats come from the States. States rights imperiled the Union in 1803 when New England States flirted at secession because Congress had bought Louisiana. States rights threatened disruption of the Union during the War of 1812, when States refused to permit their militias to serve outside State territories. States rights threatened integrity of the Union in the 1820's when Georgia nullified Federal treaties and Supreme Court decisions protecting the Cherokee Indians, and in the 1830's when South Carolina nullified tariff laws. States rights actually broke up the Union in 1861.

"And what of the States, have they lost any of the rights or powers they originally possessed? They have lost the right to secede. That, at least, was settled at Appomattox. They have lost the right to deprive persons of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny the equal protection of the laws; they have lost the right to deprive any person of suffrage on account of race or color. These rights they did indeed forfeit, and it was Appomattox which settled them all."

St. Stephen's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, for Americans of Hungarian descent August 20 has particular significance. On this day they pay homage to the great national hero of Hungary—St. Stephen I.

It is not an exaggeration to consider St. Stephen as the father of Hungary, for he was crowned the first King of Hungary in the year 1000 A.D. This act—probably the most significant in the Nation's long history—marked the formation of a kingdom out of the former tribal confederacy.

Stephen's 38-year reign was devoted to consolidating the new state. He developed political institutions which combined the advances made by his western neighbors with the solid foundation of Hungarian traditions. He showed great activity in administrative, legislative, and financial matters.

No wonder, then, that the feast of St. Stephen, the patron saint of the Magyars, has special meaning for Americans of Hungarian origin. I know this to be true in my own city of San Francisco where there are more than 2,500 Hungarian Americans. The many distinguished individuals among them—musicians and teachers, men of great learning and culture—have immeasurably enriched the life of San Francisco. It therefore gives me great pleasure to join with the Hungarian Americans of the San Francisco area and of our country in celebrating St. Stephen's Day.

The House That Jack Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress have been closely following the work of Frank L. Kluckhohn, prominent newspaperman, State Department security expert, political leader and author. His three most recent books include "America Listen," "The Naked Rise of Communism," and "What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy," and already the first-named has sold more than 1 million copies.

It is most interesting to note that a recent State Department report of a field trip of the Cairo Regional Publications Officer, Mr. Anthony E. Lewis, reveals a series of lists of banned publications issued by the Censor Bureau, Ministry of Guidance and Information, Kuwait. The Government of Kuwait, in addition to banning many Communist and leftist publications, also has banned obscene literature from Kuwaiti shelves.

Included in such a list of books as "Mr. Hot Rod," "Naked Lovers," "Nurses' Quarters," "One Flesh," and "A Need for Love," is Mr. Kluckhohn's work, "The Naked Rise of Communism." Yes, this most valuable treatise on what communism is and what it has done to individual freedom, liberty and initiative throughout its history was banned on the grounds of the title alone, which apparently made Kuwaiti censors think of things other than international politics.

I am glad to note that Mr. Kluckholn has chosen a "nonobscene" title for his newest book, "The House That Jack Built," which is being published in November by Devin-Adair Co. of New York. This analysis of the men around our President—their backgrounds, philosophy and influence over all of our lives—will feature the following chapter headings, according to the latest catalog information from the publisher. Under unanimous consent, I include these most descriptive and promising chapter outlines at this point in the RECORD:

A list of the chapters will convey the spirit of the book:

"What Breed of Men Are Making Over America?"

"Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.—His Father's Only Son."

"The Genius From MIT, Walt Whitman Rostow."

"The Maxwell Mythologist, Harlan Cleveland."
"Backstage at the Pentagon, Adam Yarmolinsky."
"The Grey Man With Flaming Ideas, Dean Rusk."
"An End to Security."
"Kennedy's Economic Genius, J. K. Galbraith."
"A Bouncing Ball."
"Marvelous McGeorge."
"Lucky, Portly Pierre."
"The Boys From A.D.A."

Tax Cuts Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have remarked on the very unfavorable effects and dangerous implications that current very high taxes were having on our economy and our people.

Every year additional billions are exacted from the pockets of the American people, from the coffers of business operations, large and small.

These exorbitant taxes cover every field, Federal, State, and local, although Federal taxes are clearly especially onerous and repressive in their effects.

Social security taxes were increased as of January 1 stepping up the combined taxes on employees and employers to 7¼ percent and taking additional $2 billion from income in 1963 over 1962.

The tax on self-employed persons has also increased this year. State and local taxes are truly skyrocketing all over the country and include exactions on sales, corporate and individual income, gas, cigarettes, alcoholic beverages and real and personal property.

Our progressive tax rates are so high that they are paralyzing initiative and incentive and draining away seed capital of many business operations in the Nation.

I concluded long ago that a tax reduction bill should have been passed in the last session of Congress.

However, it has been delayed, extensive long continued hearings are still going on, and the economic indicators of our economy definitely show signs of flattening out and needing the impetus that tax reduction would give. If tax relief had been provided last year, practically all economists agree that our economy would be in much better shape and be moving along toward necessary high levels to sustain employment, prosperity, and population growth.

The longer tax reduction is delayed, the more pronounced will be the adverse effects upon the economy.

Moreover, if the pending tax bill in its final form provides substantial tax reductions accompanied by substantial tax reforms at this time, the gains and benefits to the economy and to the people may be largely offset, certainly they will be offset to the extent that these reforms produce additional substantial revenue to the Treasury from the pockets of business and the people.

If the Congress wants to hold up consumer and business spending and give the economy the impetus it needs, an across the board, general income tax reduction must be made as soon as possible. Further delay is very dangerous.

I hope and urge that the pending tax bill be expedited and that it may provide appropriate relief to the American people and American business in line with some of the considerations that I have outlined in these remarks.

The Latin Sky Is Brighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives is considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

As we debate the pros and cons of the various military and economic assistance programs, it is important that we take a cold, hard, businesslike look at each of them. Our final decision should rest on whether or not, or to what extent they contribute to and advance our national interest, and the interest of the other freedom-loving countries of the world.

We want no part in any giveaway program that does not advance the cause of our national security. We have never had, do not now have, and never will have sufficient resources to be able to afford any wasteful or extravagant programs that do not stand on their own merit as making the world a more secure and better place in which to live.

On the other hand, who can doubt that the military and economic assistance we gave to the war-ravaged nations of Europe, and later to Greece and Turkey, was not a major cause of their stout and successful defense against the threat of Communist takeover during the perilous days after World War II?

Many nations, who had been receiving assistance from us, are now able to stand on their own and not contiue their dependence. They are still in the front line of defense against international communism, but they are able to shoulder their own responsibilities, without assistance from us.

Other countries are in a somewhat middle position: they continue to require substantial amounts of assistance from us, but they are moving in the direction of independence, and in the not-too-distant future they should be on their own.

There is a third category, made up largely of the underdeveloped countries of Africa, southeast Asia, and Latin America, which will need large amounts of financial, technical, and other assistance for some time to come.

The main requirement for this large third category of nations is that they bend every effort to help themselves. They must make the necessary changes and reforms to enable outside assistance to be effective.

The Alliance for Progress is the phrase we use to describe this effort in the Latin American area. Though getting off to a slow start, the Alliance gives promise of making fundamental changes and improvements in the life of those countries.

Life magazine, in its August 16 edition, carried what I consider to be an excellent editorial on the Alliance and its prospects for success in the future.

The editorial follows:

THE LATIN SKY IS BRIGHTER

The Alliance for Progress passed its first anniversary in deliberate silence because Coordinator Teodoro Moscoso saw nothing to celebrate. That was a year ago; now he has more to talk about. Said he to his staff last week: "We have reason to observe our anniversary this year—not with the hoopla that marks a triumph, but with the satisfaction of builders who have dug the foundation and begun to pour the footings." There are signs of hope in Latin America, not all due to the Alliance by any means, but generally supporting Moscoso's confidence that the Alliance is on the right track.

The Alliance is a very ambitious long-term program agreed on by the United States and 19 Latin republics. Its goals are nothing less than to raise the incomes, diversify and integrate the economies, reform the tax and land structures, improve the health, housing, and schooling and enlarge the freedom of 200 million people in the next 8 years. Unlike the Marshall plan, which rebuilt a damaged but going concern, the Alliance aims to shape a society and an economy that have not existed before. To this revolutionary goal the United States has committed about $1 billion a year, which the Latin Americans first naturally thought of as a huge pork barrel. Now they are beginning to accept Moscoso's insistence that the United States is the junior partner in a joint effort, the key to which is Latin American self-help.

By North American standards these efforts at self-help are slow and spotty, but they exist. Central America, the Alliance's showcase, is consolidating its own common market, diversifying its crops and enjoying more economic ebullience and political stability than in many years. Recent (though inadequate) tax reforms in almost all countries will increase total Latin American income tax receipts by 15 percent this year. Schools and textbooks are multiplying (though not fast enough). A new class of progressive-minded businessmen and agriculturists is sprouting among the tough old stalks of the landed gentry. Even political discussion is changing character and shifting its focus from the next dictator to the next election. For example, although Brazil remains a scandalous example of misgovernment, the rich Argentine, which used to be cited as an example of political hopelessness, has just emerged from turmoil into what could be 6 years of stable and prosperous democracy.

David Rockefeller cited other hopeful signs in a recent speech in Mexico City. Private investment in Latin America, both local and foreign, is rising. Exports are generally rising and commodity prices are stabler. Manufacturing is more diversified, and its growth is hastening regional integration. All this despite a political climate that is still clouded by leftwing violence and residual hostility to private enterprise. The automakers in Argentina and Brazil struggle with inflation, exorbitant excise taxes, bureaucratic harassment, low volume and meager profits; yet they are increasing their in-

vestments each year. If the climate were more hospitable, the boom in the private sector—which now generates 80 percent of all Latin American income—would be spectacular. Such a boom is the key to the Alliance's goal of a faster growth rate.

"Revolution in Latin America is inevitable. Only the form it takes is uncertain." This is the message of Milton Eisenhower's recent book, "The Wine Is Bitter," a sober assessment of Latin America. The revolution can take either violent form, on the Castro pattern, or peaceful, as blueprinted in the Alliance for Progress. Milton Eisenhower, like many other experts on Latin America, is in doubt whether the Alliance did not come too late. The question will be answered by the rate at which Latin American governments, by fostering stabler currencies, freer markets, and saner politics, continue to earn the confidence of private capital and enterprise—their own and that of the free world. The more they earn that, the more peaceful the inevitable revolution will be.

A Tribute to Brooklyn's 50-Year Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, never before in this Nation's history has there been such a profound concern over the need to ease the pressing shortage of physicians as there is today. While the Nation's medical schools each year produce well-trained and competent graduates, new programs and new concepts designed to alleviate this shortage are constantly being advanced in virtually every segment of the community.

Certainly, every effort must be made to ameliorate this persistent crisis. In meeting the challenge before us, however, we must not overlook the notable achievements of those devoted men and women who have been and are now actively engaged in the practice of medicine. These individuals, without fanfare, live a new drama each day. The hopes and dreams of countless people are largely dependent upon their skill, their wisdom and their compassion. No yardstick has yet been devised which can adequately measure the contributions physicians have made to the health and happiness of those they serve.

Today's physician, be he a general practitioner or a specialist, shoulders a most fantastic burden because of the very shortage I have mentioned. He recognizes that the number of new men entering the profession each year does not compensate for those who either retire or leave the profession for other reasons. He must assume responsibilities which are awesome in their magnitude.

I think you would agree that they have not withdrawn from this challenge. Rather, they have responded with boldness and vigor to the general betterment of the entire community.

In an effort to offer a measure of recognition to the physicians in Brooklyn, the Kings County Physicians Guild, a most distinguished organization representing 3,000 doctors in the borough, will cosponsor with Amfre-Grant, Inc., an ethical pharmaceutical firm, a luncheon on December 11. This function will offer a tribute to those men and women who have given 50 years or more of service to the Brooklyn populace.

Dr. Solomon Schussheim, a most respected physician and board chairman of the guild, and Lewis Stern, president of Amfre-Grant, Inc., will be cochairmen of this important salute, and will jointly present appropriate awards to Brooklyn's 50-year doctors. Dr. Schussheim and Mr. Stern are already making preparations for this fete, and I believe they are to be lauded for manifesting enormous community spirit.

A healthy America is a strong America. A 50-year doctor who has witnessed the evolution from the era of the horseless carriage to the age of exploration in outer space, himself has not basically changed since the day he greeted his first patient. Now, as then, the conquest of disease and the relief from suffering are his fundamental concerns. The tribute to Brooklyn's 50-year doctors is one which is richly deserved.

A Tribute to the Late Senator Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late senior Senator of Tennessee, ESTES KEFAUVER, whose untimely passing shocked and saddened the Nation.

ESTES KEFAUVER was not only known and beloved in Tennessee, but he was a major national figure whose coonskin cap and handshake became a legend of American politics during his time. He was a tower of strength and conviction—a tall and sturdy oak, often the victim of the storm but never uprooted and always firm in his convictions. He will be sorely missed by his many friends in Tennessee, the Nation, and the world.

I was privileged to serve with ESTES KEFAUVER during one term in the House—during the years he was campaigning against great odds for the Senate. I often kidded ESTES that I did not get to see very much of him during those first 2 years because he was necessarily in Tennessee so frequently. I did see him often after his election to the Senate, both socially and otherwise, and was pleased to cooperate with him in working for many important projects for Tennessee and the Nation.

Many throughout the Nation knew Senator KEFAUVER as a persistent investigator or as a tireless campaigner. This was certainly a part of ESTES KEFAUVER, but I also was privileged to know him as a friend and as a tireless plugger for legislation and projects in which he believed, including minor projects as well as major ones which he believed important.

No Tennessean since Andrew Jackson has drawn more enthusiastic support and devotion from the common man than ESTES KEFAUVER. He made an impact on Tennessee. He is assured of an important role in history along with other Tennesseans, such as Jackson, Polk, Johnson and Cordell Hull. His contributions were vast and varied.

A smalltown boy who became a great Senator, ESTES KEFAUVER mastered one of the Nation's most complex occupations, was a mixture of simplicity and greatness. He hid a true egghead under his coonskin cap. He was a foe of all who tried to grow rich at the expense of the American people; whether a gangster, a corrupt politician, or a greedy monopolist. He championed the public interest.

Tennessee, the Nation, and the world share in the loss of this distinguished Senator and public servant.

I extend an expression of my sincere sympathy to his wonderful wife Nancy and their four fine children in their bereavement.

To Lower Taxes but Not Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Labor Day, with a great deal of fanfare, the administration tax cut measure will reach the floor. Like all tax cuts, it is safe to assume it will have substantial political magic.

One of the major unanswered questions remaining in the minds of the American public is whether a government can afford a reduction in income at the time its spending programs are increasing. Or, to rephrase it—Is the public to be cheated by having tax rates reduced at a time when deficit spending adversely affects the spending power of the dollar?

The matter was summed up in very effective fashion in an editorial in this morning's Chicago Sun-Times.

Since it is a timely, penetrating, and objective editorial, I place it into the RECORD at this point, hoping that its logic will have some impact on our consideration of the issue when it reaches the floor next month:

TO LOWER TAXES BUT NOT SPENDING

If Congress insists on voting a tax cut this fall—which is not a sure-thing bet—there ought to be some relationship established between the size of the Government's debt and the size of the cut in taxes.

A Republican proposal to do just this seems to us to deserve serious study. It was turned down by the House Ways and Means Committee but undoubtedly will come up for debate in the House and Senate later.

The committee approved a cut in individual rates that would reduce the tax about

$170 for a family of four with an income of $7,500. The Government's net revenue from individual taxes would be reduced about $8.9 billion. Two-thirds of the program would go into effect next year and the remainder in 1965.

Representative HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, proposed that the 1965 cut should not go into effect if the net national debt were higher than $304 billion next June 30.

The net national debt is the total of Government securities outstanding minus Treasury cash on hand. At present it is about $299.5 billion. As a practical matter Baker acknowledged that the administration is bound to take the Nation deeper into the red in the next 10 months. He merely wished to establish the principle that there ought to be some limit on the depth to which the Government can go into the red while at the same time cutting its main source of income. He would allow some $4 billion more in red ink.

The proposal obviously is intended to force the administration to exercise some restraint in spending, particularly next year when President Kennedy will run for reelection.

Hearings of the Ways and Means Committee are closed to the public so we do not know firsthand the details of the debate which preceded the knocking down of the proposal 13 to 12. Two Democrats joined the committee's 10 Republicans in favoring it.

As our readers know, we believe that it would be fiscal folly of the worst sort to cut taxes unless Government spending is cut or unless new revenue is found. The Government should not deliberately go deeper into debt to put more money into the pockets of consumers, particularly during this period of prosperity.

The administration argues that taxes must be reduced to boost consumer purchasing to insure against a possible recession, to reduce unemployment and eventually, by increasing wages and profits, to raise the level of Government income. It is ready to gamble close to $9 billion on its theory, going deeper into debt to do so.

Lack of consumer spending is hardly the main reason for the bulk of the joblessness that persists despite the high profits and high employment the Nation is enjoying. Many of the unemployed are victims of automation, of insufficient schooling or lack of skill. They would likely still be out of work even if consumer spending, now at a high level, were to go still higher.

The new tax bill gives with one hand and takes away with the other. It includes some reforms that would recoup for the Government about $1 billion (instead of the $3.3 billion originally asked by Mr. Kennedy) by ending such deductions as those for State and local taxes on gasoline, liquor, and cigarettes. This hits at those persons who itemize their income tax returns, persons carrying mortgages, those with heavy medical bills, etc. On the other hand, those who take the standard deductions will get an even better break under the proposed new regulations and some 1,500,000 persons will be relieved of paying any tax at all.

It seems quite apparent that the main purpose of the tax bill is to put money into the pockets of consumers in an election year. Mr. Kennedy says it also is intended to increase investment (which creates more jobs) but the benefits seem proportionately greater for those who would spend rather than for those who would invest.

The tax on corporate profits is scheduled to be reduced in two steps from 52 to 48 percent. But there would be a speedup in collections which would postpone the full effectiveness of the reduction, for some companies, and hold down the total estimated deficit of $2.2 billion it would create in the next 2 years.

There has long been no doubt that the Nation needs a thoroughgoing tax reform, one that would encourage private industry and individuals to invest more in job-making facilities. There is a need to bring Government financial income and outgo into balance so that eventually the great national debt might be lowered. True tax reform seems to have been forgotten by the administration.

There is talk in Congress that the tax bill may still be being debated by Christmas. Our advice to readers: Don't count on getting a tax deduction until you see it in cash. And remember that dollars keep buying less and less as the Government keeps going deeper and deeper into debt.

Protecting the Migrant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert at this point an editorial which appeared in this morning's New York Times, entitled "Protecting the Migrant."

The article calls attention to the fact that the Senate last week approved a 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor importation program, despite the fact that this House over 2 months ago defeated an effort to extend the program.

As recommended by the Times, the importation of braceros to the detriment of our own migratory workers should terminate when the current law dies at the end of this year.

The editorial follows:

PROTECTING THE MIGRANT

This country's most exploited workers, its half-million migratory farm laborers, got half a loaf last week when the Senate voted to keep alive the program under which hundreds of thousands of Mexicans have been brought in to harvest U.S. crops. The Senate authorized a 1-year extension, but it softened the hurt its action would inflict on domestic migrants by requiring that they be offered benefits equal to those guaranteed the Mexican laborers.

American migratory workers have such inadequate protection in housing, transportation, workmen's compensation and assurances of employment that these guarantees are much needed. However, the welfare of the migrants is likely to advance even more if big corporate growers in California, Texas and other States are deprived entirely of the privilege of drawing on a limitless supply of low-wage labor from south of the Rio Grande. Once this source of manpower is withdrawn the growers will have to offer wages and living standards that provide a more substantial approach to decency for domestic workers and their families.

The House of Representatives decided 2 months ago that the program for importing Mexican braceros ought to die when the present law expires at the end of this year. With so many Americans unemployed and with the average annual earnings of the domestic migrant still under $1,000, that is the right decision. It is the one that should emerge when the bill goes to conference.

Alamedan Leads Group on Hunt for Indian Paintings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the wilderness areas of our great Nation hold stores of untapped treasures which link the past with the present. Randal F. Dickey, Jr., is one of the courageous individuals devoting free time in a dedicated avocation of exploring and preserving great archeological specimens.

Commendably, Randal's assiduous devotion to this work oftentimes leads him to give more emphasis to his avocation than his vocation.

I am pleased to offer for inclusion in the RECORD a newspaper account of Randal Dickey's latest trip to the Upper Colorado River area searching for Indian petroglyphs. These petroglyphs are in danger of being lost forever if not preserved in the next 2 years. A few members of the Sierra Club are accompanying Randal on this trip.

The article appeared August 3, 1963, in the Alameda Times Star, Alameda, Calif.:

ALAMEDAN LEADS GROUP ON HUNT FOR INDIAN PAINTINGS

(By Wally Burke)

Randal F. Dickey, Jr., 39-year-old partner in his father's Alameda law firm, threw the last can of beans into his knapsack yesterday and prepared to lead eight of his fellow Sierra Club members on a 2-week hunt for centuries-old Indian petroglyphs that will be lost forever in another 2 years.

The hunt will take place in the rugged side canyons of the upper Colorado River, one of the wildest and most inaccessible areas of the Far West.

"Packing the supplies and equipment for a small group like this," Dickey said, "sometimes takes more planning than for the party of 60 or more I usually take."

Dickey, as conservation committee chairman of the Sierra Club, has guided parties into Colorado River areas several times before.

The tours have included picture taking excursions and hunting and fishing expeditions.

"I never get a 'straight' vacation," he said. "Although the trips themselves are relaxing, they are usually a part of other business in the interests of the club."

Besides the beans, he included in his equipment sleeping bags, mountain climber tents, assorted other camping gear and several "faltboots." The faltboot is a collapsible German kyack which fits into a waterproof roll a man can easily carry in his arms or on his back. In addition, cameras and other photo supplies are an important part of the gear.

Randal, a friend of Ansel Adams, is a crack photographer in his own right. The Sierra club has published several prize-winning picture books in color of the area they will explore on this trip and some of the pictures are his. He has a collection of more than 600 color slides covering his many trips into the rugged areas of the Rockies.

The main objective of Dickey's current trip is to be found in about a 100 miles of

side canyons leading off the Colorado River above Glen Canyon Dam, located approximately at the borders of Utah and Arizona.

His party will be working to preserve samples of prehistoric Indian picture writing found on the walls and in the caves of some of these canyons.

Petroglyphs are preserved by taking tracings and photographs directly from the canyon and cave walls.

Dickey said that in about 2 years Powell Lake, which is being formed by the Glen Canyon Dam, will cover all these canyons with water. Hence this will be one of the last opportunities to save these archeological specimens.

The picture writings were by Indians who made their homes in the canyons 12 to 15 centuries ago.

The party will begin their explorations at Page, Ariz., cover the nearly 100 miles of Colorado River and return to Page.

As "mother" ships, they will have two 18-foot outboard motorboats. Some of these canyons which have been eroded for thousands of years are so narrow that the explorers will use kyaks to navigate into otherwise inaccessible chasms.

Member's of Dickey's party include Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Ramsden, Dr. Larry Phillips, Dr. Don Poulton, Fred Hodgkin, Keith Kronmiller, Dr. Herb Von Rusten and Mrs. Jennie Schumacher, local author and historian.

Dr. Poulton and Mrs. Schumacher are flying from here to Page, Ariz., while the rest of the party and their equipment are making the trip in two station wagons.

Dickey will spend 2 weeks with the starting group, but will continue his trip as Sierra club conservation chairman visiting national park areas in Colorado, Arizona, and Utah. He expects to return around Labor Day.

Johnstown Area Has the Lowest Crime Rate in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an article from the Tribune-Democrat, Johnstown, Pa., commenting on the recent Federal Bureau of Investigation report:

AREA HAS LOWEST CRIME RATE IN UNITED STATES

There are many advantages to living in greater Johnstown although we often tend to overlook them. There is the wonderful climate, the beautiful topography, the friendliness of its residents, the great industrial tradition, the many cultural, educational and recreational opportunities.

And now add to these the finding of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that the Johnstown district has the lowest crime rate of any place in the United States. Now that's something to crow about.

FBI statisticians found that the standard metropolitan statistical area composed of Cambria and Somerset Counties in 1962 had 357.1 criminal offenses per 100,000 persons, a rate less than one-eighth that of Reno, Nev., which has the highest in the Nation.

Incidentally, at least one major newspaper, the Chicago Tribune, has taken note editorially of Johnstown's low crime rate.

We recognize that the number of criminal offenses is rising here as elsewhere and that even though we have the lowest rate in the country, there is room for improvement. But we can be proud that ours, more than any other in America, is an area of law-abiding citizens.

Certainly, we do not consider crime statistics an asset to our community, but we do feel that it is noteworthy that our law enforcement officials have been pursuing their tasks to make our area a better place to live, and to protect our citizenry from the criminal offenses constantly on the rise in this country.

United States Spurs Foreign Tax Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I addressed the House on the important role that tax reform has assumed in our foreign aid program, especially in Latin America. The following day the Washington Post reported the passage of a tax reform bill in Colombia—a bill which will provide the Colombian Government with $100 million a year in additional revenue for economic development.

Tax reform is the key objective in U.S. technical assistance to Latin America under the Alliance for Progress. When one considers that the entire appropriation proposed for the Alliance in 1963 is only $600 million, a return of $100 million to a single country in a single year represents truly astonishing results. Such results are far from isolated: major tax reform programs are underway in 11 Latin American countries and 7 others have reform legislation pending.

Tomorrow the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 will be considered on the House floor. I hope that in their deliberations my colleagues will keep in mind the tremendous strides that underdeveloped countries are taking toward economic independence, as a result of American foreign aid.

The article on the Colombia tax reform measure follows:

UNITED STATES-BACKED TAX REFORM PLAN PASSED BY COLOMBIAN SENATE

(By Dan Kurzman)

The Colombian Government rammed a tax reform plan through the Senate on Wednesday after American Ambassador Fulton Freeman made it clear that failure to institute such a program soon would hold up $30 million in economic aid authorized under the Alliance for Progress program.

The tax scheme, part of a special-powers bill calling for economic social reform, was previously passed by Colombia's lower house and is expected to be signed into law by President Guillermo Leon Valencia in the next few days. The Senate action is considered an important victory for Valencia.

TARNISHED SHOWCASE

Colombia may thus qualify for the $30 million in conditioned aid if Alliance leaders are convinced the Government can implement the new measures. But the image of Colombia as an Alliance showcase is seen as slightly tarnished in view of the legislative difficulties encountered by the bill.

The United States reached an agreement with Colombia early this year under which the Latin nation would receive $30 million for immediate use and an equal amount when that sum was spent—provided tax reforms were instituted.

With the first $30 million almost used up and the reforms still in the discussion stage, Ambassador Freeman reminded Colombian officials last week that release of the second sum would hinge on prompt action.

The Colombian Government, which has long supported just such action, increased pressure on the Senate, warning that this body would be kept in permanent session until the controversial bill was passed.

This combined pressure from the United States and from the Colombian Government finally broke the resistance of wealthy senatorial oligarchs who were reluctant to approve measures that would hit their pocketbooks hardest.

Implementation of these measures is expected to provide the Government with some $100 million a year in additional revenue for economic development purposes.

It may also spur investment by an international consultative group, including three financing agencies and 16 countries, that was set up in January to back Colombian projects. This group, led by the World Bank, is believed to be taking its cue in considerable degree from the United States.

Since the Alliance was inaugurated in 1961, the United States has committed $197.8 million, including the conditional $30 million to Colombia's development program. This sum represents less than half of the $450 million needed to carry the program through 1964. Under the consortium plan, other countries are to provide much of the remainder.

FEW COME THROUGH

Up to now, however, only Belgium, Switzerland, and Britain have come through with loans—for the development of electric power. The Netherlands, Italy, Japan, and France have indicated they may contribute to a government-operated investment fund, but have not yet agreed to do so.

Under the new tax bill, income tax rates have been increased and enforcement measures provided for. Should Colombia receive the conditional $30 million, the flow of future U.S. aid will be tied to enforcement.

Alliance officials, while disappointed by the pace of Colombian reform, are gratified that the policy of making aid conditional on reform has yielded significant results.

A Sum of $1,300 Million in Foreign Aid Spent in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of August 4, 1963, pointing out that $1,300 million in U.S. foreign aid money was spent in the United States during the 1963 fiscal year.

The article follows:

A SUM OF $1,300 MILLION IN FOREIGN AID SPENT IN UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, August 3.—The Government announced today that $1,300 million of foreign aid money was spent in the United

States in the 1963 fiscal year and served notice that its Buy American program will be strengthened.

The Buy American policy has a twofold aim, to help American industries, and business and to cut down on the critical dollar flow abroad. It requires foreign aid recipients to purchase commodities and other items as much as possible in this country.

The Agency for International Development (AID) said that steps were being taken to increase the proportion of foreign aid buying at home.

The program is not welcomed by many countries because they feel that U.S. prices are too high. These countries contend that they can buy the same commodities in other countries at a lower price, and thus cut down on the cost of development.

POLICY REVERSED

The United States began laying stress on the policy in November 1955 when the Development Loan Fund, a predecessor of AID, reversed a policy of worldwide competitive bidding and began placing emphasis on the export of U.S. goods for foreign aid dollars.

In December 1960, the International Cooperation Administration, also an AID predecessor, took the second step by refusing to approve procurement of goods with U.S. aid dollars from 19 industrialized countries.

These countries, generally in Western Europe, had been accumulating dollar and gold surplus while the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit continued to grow.

President John F. Kennedy on October 18, 1961, served notice that the bulk of procurement from AID dollars would have to come in the United States.

AID Chief David E. Bell announced today further steps, now in effect, to step up aid expenditures at home.

OTHER MEANS POSSIBLE

"AID will not finance, for delivery to countries receiving U.S. economic assistance, the purchase of designated commodities of which the United States is a consistent net importer, except under exceptional circumstances," Bell said.

This refers to commodities which the AID-receiving nation would have to procure from sources other than the United States. But AID said also it will assist developing countries to obtain commodities of this nature by "means other than dollars."

Although the United States will continue to allow spending of foreign aid funds in the underdeveloped countries for goods which the United States also exports, "procurement authorizations will place stronger emphasis on commodities in which U.S. exporters can normally compete successfully," Bell said.

AID said that the $1,300 million in foreign aid funds spent here in fiscal 1963 represented an increase af almost $500 million over 1962.

Pakistan Now Produces More Food for Its Hungry Millions Through U.S. Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, more than 90 million people live in Pakistan, most of them under conditions of extreme poverty. Pakistan has not been able to produce enough food for its people, and hunger has become almost a normal condition.

This situation has been alleviated to some degree by the technical and other assistance furnished by the U.S. Government through the Agency for International Development. The AID fishery project in West Pakistan has been a tremendous success and shows what remarkable results a relatively small amount of "seed" money can produce.

An original investment of $525,000 in machinery and material, delivered with technical assistance and a loan of $179,200 to fishermen, has grown into an export industry mainly of shrimps and lobsters, grossing more than $13,5 million a year, and still growing. The increased fish catch has also added much to the local consumer diet in Pakistan.

This tremendous return on AID dollars has been written up in an article published in the Christian Science Monitor for August 12, 1963, which reads as follows:

PAKISTAN FISHING GROWS

KARACHI, PAKISTAN.—The Arabian Sea—one of the world's great untapped sources of food—is giving up more of its riches to newly active and efficient West Pakistan fishermen.

A profitable export industry has grown up in less than 4 years. Fishermen are moving from centuries-old habits to double and triple income and a slight dent has been made in the reluctance of the people of this underfed land to eat more fish.

Development of one of the most promising fishery potentials in Asia, according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, is taking place under the Karachi fish harbor, a modern complex bringing together government and private enterprise.

SHRIMP GO TO THE UNITED STATES

It is the slow season now. Monsoons make fishing difficult. But hundreds of brightly packaged cartons of frozen shrimp are still being shipped off to the United States.

The United States provided 187,500 pounds ($525,000) in machinery and material together with much technical assistance for the harbor, opened in October 1959.

Now the United States is West Pakistan's best single customer, taking all its production of frozen shrimps and lobsters. This was worth 127,750 pounds ($361,000) in 1960, 221,250 pounds ($619,500) in 1961, and 446,700 pounds ($1,250,760) in 1962.

From one trawler in 1958, the shrimp fleet has grown to 133 today.

INDUSTRY DEVELOPS

Pakistan's other main markets are Britain, for canned shrimp and fish bladders, and India and Ceylon, for dried fish. Total exports of fish and fish products earned Pakistan 2,187,000 pounds ($6,123,000) in 1958, but over double that, at 4,875,000 pounds ($13,650,000) in 1962.

With the larger and developing fishing industry in the teeming rivers and the fish-thick Bay of Bengal in East Pakistan, fisheries have climbed to fourth among Pakistan's foreign exchange earners.

The Karachi fish harbor handles almost the total West Pakistan fish catch.

The 1,500-member fishermen's cooperative is run by representatives of the government and fishing industry.

AID ADVANCE CREDITS

The U.S. Agency for International Development has advanced some 64,000 pounds ($179,200) in credits to fishermen for the purchase of trawlers and equipment.

The harbor sells the fish catch through auctioneers to exporters and local retailers, cutting out most of the middlemen.

Fishermen and boat owners divide the proceeds of the catch.

"There were about 70 powered boats before the fish harbor came and they were mostly used to smuggle gold and cloth," says Sheikh Abdul Jaleel, the deputy director. "Now there are 430, admittedly only a fraction of the 5,000 boats of all types on the West Pakistan coast, but nevertheless a very good start."

Hawaii Leads the Way to East-West Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in Hawaii we are proud of the fact that peoples of diverse cultures have met and mingled in a spirit of aloha and produced what some observers have called the closest thing to a true cosmopolitan community where individuals are held in respect for their own worth and individual achievements, regardless of their ethnic or cultural background.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress that because of this social and cultural advancement, Hawaii has been able to offer itself as a world laboratory for studies and experiments in the social sciences and in the field of philosophy.

An article written by Helen Altonn and printed in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of Friday, August 9, 1963, describes one of these efforts of the Hawaii community on a multiracial cross-section basis at the grassroots level to support an endeavor which has been carried on at the University of Hawaii since 1939 under the farsighted leadership of Dr. Charles A. Moore, senior professor of philosophy at the institution—the East-West Philosophers' Conference.

The East-West Philosophers' Conference is a project sponsored by the University of Hawaii which has as its aim the clarification of attitudes and a building of a bridge of understanding and mutual respect for the viewpoints of the peoples of Asia and the West. It has won worldwide acclaim for its accomplishments in the past.

I earnestly believe that Members of Congress will join me in congratulating the perceptive business and community leaders such as Dr. Hung Wo Ching for actively and visibly supporting this worthwhile project.

The news article referred to reads as follows:

ISLANDERS RAISE $100,000 TO NARROW EAST-WEST GAP

(By Helen Altonn)

A grassroots movement representing Hawaii's wide racial spectrum has raised $100,000 toward an effort to give the world a better understanding between the East and West.

The contributions enable the University of Hawaii to hold the fourth East-West Philos-

ophers' Conference next year instead of in 1969.

When the conferences originated here in 1939, they were scheduled at 10-year intervals because of the difficulties in raising enough money from foundations to meet the expenses.

However, donations from more than 100 local residents, firms and organizations in the Islands allow the next conference to be held within 5 years of the last one in 1959.

The donors reportedly represent a cross-section of the State's various racial communities.

Hung Wo Ching, Aloha Airlines president and a participant in the movement supporting the philosophers' conference, indicated that further aid may be given in future years "if the meetings result in outstanding performance."

He said the $100,000 collected expresses "aloha by these various donors toward the work that has been accomplished by the university philosophers' project.

"We strongly feel that grassroots support by many individuals, particularly in Hawaii, would be more meaningful than a few foundations."

FREE HAND

Ching said the group's objective is "to give the university a completely free hand, far in advance of the scheduled activities, to prepare and develop the entire conference."

He said he has attended several of the conferences and feels they are one of Hawaii's "outstanding contributions toward better understanding of people in the world."

Forty senior panel members have been invited to present papers and participate in formal discussions at the 1964 conference, June 29 to August 8, on the Manoa campus.

They will come from the mainland, Europe, India, China, Ceylon, Japan and Latin America.

OTHERS

An indefinite number of other persons also will be selected upon application to attend the sessions in an effort to introduce and encourage younger people in the field.

Transportation costs and living expenses for the delegates while they are here 6 weeks will be paid from the conference funds.

Plans are well underway for the meetings, which will center on the theme, "The World and the Individual in East and West."

In past years, the conferences have dealt with East-West philosophy in an attempt to develop knowledge, widen perspective and understanding of cultures in the two areas.

But this year, the conference will attack one specific and highly controversial problem—the status of the individual in all of the basic cultures of the East and West, both in historical and contemporary times.

MISUNDERSTANDING

"There is a great deal of misunderstanding and antagonism between the East and West on this thing," it was explained.

"The general thinking is that the West takes it too seriously, dealing only with an individual, while the East ignores the individual."

The conference hopes, through mutual critical evaluation, to clarify these attitudes and build an understanding of the respective viewpoints.

Charles A. Moore, senior professor of philosophy at the University of Hawaii, is conference chairman.

The program will include eight special summer session courses, public lectures by panel members and formal discussions emphasizing the individual's status in the East and West in metaphysics, methodology, religion, ethics, social thought and practices, and legal and political thought and institutions.

A feature of the conference is the personal relationship and exchange among the delegates who live, eat and associate with each other for the 6-week conference period.

This stimulates "a wonderful spirit of cordiality and cooperation," Dr. Moore commented. "Everyone is on an equal basis with a mutual approach to the problem."

He said the international delegates "say there is no place else in the world to hold such a conference because no one in Hawaii is a stranger or a foreigner. Everyone is on an equal footing."

Papers presented at the conference will be published in book form following the conference, as in previous years.

And, for the first time, a book will be written about the conference, attempting to present the results to the general public in nontechnical terms.

If There's Trade With Cuba, Greeks Have a Ship for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I pointed out that free world shipping to Cuba continues at a rate higher than that of the Soviet bloc. Many of those countries engaged in this traffic have received the benefit of huge sums of U.S. aid, and the Armed Forces of this country stand ready to come to their defense under treaty obligations. Yet they continue to trade with Castro, and thereby assist him in his subversion and conquest of the Western Hemisphere for communism.

It is particularly disturbing to see the number of ships from Greece engaged in this Communist trade. It was not too many years ago when the Truman doctrine helped Greece maintain its independence in the face of all out Communist warfare. But of course that is now in the past.

We have learned to expect as much from the British. They are apparently not even able—or willing—to defend their own territory against Castro raids. But the Greek Government issued a decree last fall to halt this trade. Now the profits seem to be outweighing the decree.

In an excellent column by George Weller, the Miami Herald points up the Greek problem. Because of its importance in regard to the consideration this week in the House of Representatives of the foreign aid authorization act, I insert the article here in the RECORD:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Aug. 17, 1963]

IF THERE'S TRADE WITH CUBA, GREEKS HAVE A SHIP FOR IT

(By George Weller)

PIRAEUS, GREECE.—America's loose embargo on trade with Cuba has split the Greek shipping millionaires into two rival classes: the haves, who are already wealthy enough and want Greek embargo-breaking to stop, and the want-mores, halfway to affluence, who are defying the Kennedy trade boycott.

The abstaining haves are led by the famous aristocratic trinity of the 8-million-ton merchant marine: Aristotle Onassis, Stavros Niarchos and the heirs of Stavros Livanos, who died last month.

Their fleets are huge. Their international involvements, especially with American oil companies, are enormous. The wives in these families tend to have U.S. passports.

Niarchos, a cautious maverick, brings down from the Black Sea the Soviet crude oil that is 30 percent of what is used in Greece's nationalized refinery, which is American operated.

Drop from multi to simple millionaires and the want-mores appear: the new class that doesn't mind defying both Greece's King Paul and President Kennedy, as long as no teeth are put in the laws.

These new millionaires are gambling that Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat of Florida, who wants to put muscles into Washington's flabby foreign trade act, will be flagged down by party loyalty.

This class cannot afford the time for Riviera villas or operatic love affairs. Like the brothers N. and J. Vlassapoulos, with 10 British and 4 Greek embargo runners, they are too busy. Several of this class have three passports: Greek, British and American. What's more, they enjoy high influence in Greece.

Under American pressure last March, King Paul passed a decree banning, with easy exceptions, Greek ships from trading with Cuba. But in July shipowner Anastasios Potamianos became minister of communications. Potamianos is coowner with his brother George in the Epirotiki Steamship Line, which operates the ship *Everest*, seen by the U.S. Navy trading with Cuba.

Among the most successful challengers are the Franco line, with 4 ships under the Greek flag and about 10 under the Lebanese. The operators are the Frangistas brothers, Achilles and George one a physician in Athens. Starting with Soviet lumber trade, they have built up an 18-ship fleet.

The Frangistas brothers are unimpeded by the royal decree. They have highly placed influence. A third brother and investor, Charilambos, with royal approval, enjoys the important post of governor of northern Greece.

The "flagship" of the trade runners is the 16,000-ton tanker *Sirus*. It is top ship of the 16-ship flotilla operated by Emmanuel Kulukundis, a big New York operator, and the two brothers Nicholas and Minas Rethymnis, American and British citizens.

Kulukundis, past president of the Greek-American Shipowners Association of New York bought the Baltimore-to-Caribbean Bull Line from United Mine Workers but lost it again. In the Russia-Cuba traffic he operates through twin freighter and tanker companies known as London and Overseas Traders.

One legal dodge of the Cuban runners is for owners to set themselves up as two independent companies for each ship, one company as operators and the other as owners. When Washington tries to pin them down, they escape by placing responsibility for the Cuban deal on the opposite company, often organized in a different country.

Greek ships are always changing flags. Even Niarchos, though no infringer on the trade embargo, keeps his three-masted yacht *Creole* out of tax reach. He flies the Liberian flag, operates in Greek waters but puts ownership in a Bermuda-based ghost called the Imperial Investment Co.

Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, on her last summer's trip to Greece, played an unknowing role in the comedy of flags. While she was aboard the yacht *North Wind*, owned by Marcus Nomikos, it hoisted the Greek flag for the TV cameras. When Jacqueline departed up went the tax flag, the British ensign.

Sheerest Fancy—The Liberty Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of gratification to me that many of the Nation's smaller daily newspaper editors continue to deal in hard fact and reject the temptation to fanciful phrase-making. Such a one is Platt Cline of the Flagstaff Arizona Daily Sun.

It seems worthwhile that we remind ourselves of this sound basis for word and deed. The following editorial is a fit example and a fit reminder. Mr. Speaker, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Platt Cline's recent editorial from the Flagstaff (Ariz.) Daily Sun:

Half a dozen States have approved the so-called liberty amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which would abolish the Federal personal income tax and other levies while prohibiting the Government from competing with private business.

These proposals also have been introduced in Congress in hope the amending process might get started there.

When the States initiate a constitutional change, two-thirds of them must aprove before Congress goes into action. Wherever a measure begins, it ultimately requires endorsement by three-fourths of the States.

The amendment that would eliminate the U.S. personal income tax plus levies on estates and gifts is framed so that it would not take effect unless and until the companion plan was already approved—the removal of the Federal Government from private competition. A 3-year gap between effective dates is provided.

The notion here is that savings resulting from this latter action, and the predicted rise in business earnings with parallel gains in business tax revenues, would be an important offset to the revenue losses incident to ending the personal levies.

Yet there is no contention that the offset would be more than partial. Drastic budget cuts would be required to bring the budget into balance and produce a surplus.

The proponents of the liberty amendments make no secret of it. They would chop $23 billion out of defense. They would wipe out all foreign aid and other "international" outlays to the tune of more than $2.5 billion. And they would slash $2.1 billion from "natural resources," which include atomic energy outlays.

From agriculture expenditures they would peel off $5 billion, from welfare costs some $4.3 billion, from "commerce and housing" another $2.5 billion.

The question Americans must ask is: just how realistic are the prospects that such cuts could be made?

Leave out of account the proposed slash of some $12 billion from various Federal activities in the domestic field. These of course would affect materially the lot of the U.S. farmer, the growth of our cities, the handling of our underprivileged.

The really stunning blow is to defense and atomic energy. Today outlays in these areas run between $50 and $60 billion. It is being suggested that they be reduced by half.

What kind of military establishment would this leave us? What would this do to our effort in the nuclear arms competition? The effect could hardly be less than catastrophic.

Yet many of the same people who favor the liberty amendments not only want the United States strong militarily, but demand that it undertake the conquest of Cuba and other foreign adventures where Communists are pressing hard.

The 3-year Korean war, not exactly a massive conflict, added $11 billion to the Federal debt above and beyond outlays which could be offset by tax revenues. Costs are higher today.

Set against the harsh facts of life in 1963, the liberty amendments must surely strike most Americans as the sheerest fancy.

The Captive Nations: A Powerful Deterrent Against War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 18, 1963, Americans of Ukranian descent in Youngstown, Ohio, observed Ukrainian Day. This is an annual event of great significance for large numbers of our citizens living in the Youngstown area. The purpose of this annual affair is to spotlight the global struggle between the cause of human freedom and the organized forces of Russian tyranny. It provides an opportunity for public-spirited citizens to renew their commitment to the principles of liberty and national independence. Believing that an alert and informed citizenry is the front line of democracy's defense, the leaders of this annual affair have chosen the theme of captive nations for 1963.

At the request of Michael Yurchison, general chairman of this year's observance, I have provided a statement on "The Captive Nations: A Powerful Deterrent Against War," which follows:

THE CAPTIVE NATIONS: A POWERFUL DETERRENT AGAINST WAR

There is no more important issue before the American people today than the captive nations. The gathering storm within the multinational empire of the Russians confronts the United States with a unique leadership opportunity to move ahead in winning peace with justice and freedom. Rising Chinese nationalism in the Far East is exerting pressures on imperial Russia to return the former Chinese territories taken from China more than a century ago by the czars. The strong tide of national independence running in the captive European nations, from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian Sea, is exerting even stronger pressures on imperial Russia. It is these develpoments which have forced the Russians to adopt the tactics of smiling diplomacy, to agree to a limited test ban treaty and to put pressure on the United States for a nonagression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact.

The real issue involved here is whether the United States will play an active role in preserving the Russian Communist Empire or whether the United States will take an active role in promoting the emancipation of the captive European nations. A nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact would no nothing but place a protective Western shield over the Russian empire. On the other hand promotion by the United States of the right of self-determination and self-government for the peoples in all the captive nations, under the prevailing circumstances, would provide a powerful deterrent against war. The Russian empire is the only threat to the security of the United States and to peace. We must never lose sight of this reality.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times concerning our forgotten people—migratory workers. The editorial correctly points out the connection between the Mexican farm labor program, the bracero program, and the plight of our own migratory worker. It praises the House decision, which I supported, to allow the bracero program to terminate at the end of this year. The editorial follows:

PROTECTING THE MIGRANT

This country's most exploited workers, its half million migratory farm laborers, got half a loaf last week when the Senate voted to keep alive the program under which hundreds of thousands of Mexicans have been brought in to harvest U.S. crops. The Senate authorized a 1-year extension, but it softened the hurt its action would inflict on domestic migrants by requiring that they be offered benefits equal to those guaranteed the Mexican laborers.

American migratory workers have such inadequate protection in housing, transportation, workmen's compensation and assurances of employment that these guarantees are much needed. However, the welfare of the migrants is likely to advance even more if big corporate growers in California, Texas, and other States are deprived entirely of the privilege of drawing on a limitless supply of low-wage labor from south of the Rio Grande. Once this source of manpower is withdrawn, the growers will have to offer wages and living standards that provide a more substantial approach to decency for domestic workers and their families.

The House of Representatives decided 2 months ago that the program for importing Mexican braceros ought to die when the present law expires at the end of this year. With so many Americans unemployed and with the average annual earnings of the domestic migrant still under $1,000, that is the right decision. It is the one that should emerge when the bill goes to conference.

Changes in Foreign Aid Policy Will Mean More Dollars Spent in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, August 14, in a noteworthy

address to this House, the amiable Congressman, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] pointed out that more than 80 percent of our expenditures in our foreign aid program is made right here in the United States. I was happy to note that Mr. David E. Bell, the able Administrator of the program, has recently announced policy changes aimed at tying more foreign aid procurement spending to purchases in our own country. An article which appeared in the New York Daily News—RECORD of August 5, 1963, tells of these changes in policy and pursuant to the unanimous consent of this body, I include it here in the RECORD:

"BUY AMERICAN" NEW KEYNOTE TO FOREIGN AID PLAN

(By John T. Norman)

WASHINGTON.—The "new look" in the U.S. foreign aid spending program is tailored tighter to the "buy American" concept.

David E. Bell, U.S. Foreign Aid Administrator, Saturday outlined policy changes aimed at tying more foreign aid procurement spending to purchases in this country.

Mr. Bell's timing also was considered excellent—since the House of Representatives shortly will debate a $4 billion foreign aid authorization bill for the current fiscal year, and opposition in Congress to foreign aid spending is formidable.

What the Agency for International Development is doing is not something brand new—rather, it's a tightening up of policies already in effect.

Mr. Bell estimates that about $1,346 million of foreign aid funds were spent in this country in the 12 months ending June 30, 1963, and, because of the policy changes, forecast that the "tied" procurements will increase to $1,577 million in the year ending next June 30.

AID officials said the revised policies, part of the Government-wide effort to ease the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, do not directly affect either textiles or textile machinery. For some time, AID has followed the policy that, when such items are involved in the economic aid program, the procurements have to be made here in this country.

Here's what the AID policies cover:

1. The United States will not finance foreign aid procurements covering products—even those shipped from the United States—if foreign-produced components amount to more than 30 percent of the final cost. This restriction will apply in most instances; and to the foreign components coming from industrialized countries of Western Europe, or Canada or Japan, it was explained.

2. AID will not finance the purchase of certain commodities of which the United States itself is a consistent net importer, "except under unusual circumstances."

The commodities affected by this include wool, silk, jute, vegetable fibers other than cotton, and other items.

3. Limited foreign procurements will be allowed in cases where the United States itself is a net exporter of such items, if the procurement benefits a less-developed country (not those in Western Europe, or Canada, or Japan).

But even on such deals, Mr. Bell said AID will "place stronger emphasis on commodities on which U.S. exporters can normally compete successfully."

4. In instances where less-developed foreign countries, eligible for U.S. economic assistance, want something the United States is not in a position to supply, the United States will continue to try to work out swap deals so that there will not be a direct dollar drain.

Business Leaders Want Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, 1963, 45 of our Nation's leaders of industry and business took 2 full pages in the New York Times to urge the ratification of the test-ban treaty. The subscribers state their reasons for supporting the nuclear test ban. This is a signal public service and should be noted by all of us. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the advertisement and the list of subscribers and their business affiliations:

These business leaders want the nuclear test ban:

Winthrop Aldrich, director, Rockefeller Center.

G. T. Baker, former chairman, National Airlines.

John D. Biggers, chairman of finance committee, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

Harold Boeschenstein, president, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.

Thomas D. Cabot, chairman, Cabot Corp.

William L. Clayton, founder, Anderson, Clayton & Co.

John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co.

John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

Howard S. Cullman, president, Cullman Bros.

Oscar de Lima, chairman, Roger Smith Hotels Corp.

Marriner Eccles, chairman, Utah Construction & Mining Co.

Charles Engelhard, chairman and president, Engelhard Industries, Inc.

Robert V. Fleming, advisory chairman of the board, the Riggs National Bank.

Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co.

Bowman Gray, chairman, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Earle V. Grover, chairman, Apex Steel Corp., Ltd.

Robert Heller, president, Robert Heller Association.

Paul G. Hoffman, chairman, Hoffman Specialty Manufacturing Co.

Preston Hotchkiss, president, Fred H. Bixby Ranch Co.

Wayne A. Johnston, president, Illinois Central Railroad.

Harrison Jones, retired chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Co.

Devereux C. Josephs, director, New York Life Insurance Co.

Donald P. Kircher, president, Singer Co.

Philip N. Klutznick, president, Klutznick Enterprises.

Sol Linowitz, chairman of the board, Xerox Corp.

Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus Co.

Armand May, president, American Associated Cos.

S. M. McAshan, Jr., president, Anderson, Clayton & Co.

Thomas B. McCabe, chairman, Scott Paper Co.

Charles G. Mortimer, chairman, General Foods Corp.

Robert R. Nathan, president, Robert R. Nathan Association, Inc.

J. Wilson Newman, chairman, Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Howard C. Peterson, president, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.

John A. Roosevelt, partner, Bache & Co.

Harry Scherman, chairman, Book-of-the Month Club.

C. R. Smith, president, American Airlines, Inc.

John I. Snyder, Jr., president, U.S. Industries, Inc.

A. M. Sonnabend, chairman, Hotel Corporation of America.

Herman Steinkraus, president (retired), Bridgeport Brass Co.; former president, Chamber of Commerce of United States.

Edger B. Stern, Jr., president, Rohal Street Corp.

James M. Symes, chairman, Pennsylvania Railroad.

Juan T. Trippe, president, Pan American Airways.

Sidney J. Weinberg, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

David J. Winton, chairman, Winton Lumber Co.

Raymond H. Wittcoff, president, Transurban Investment Corp.

And this is why:

Successful businessmen—and the industrial leaders listed here are certainly that—are not given to wishful thinking.

Their call for a test ban treaty is based on the realities of our nuclear world.

Such as:

1. Continued nuclear testing holds far greater risks for us than a test ban.

2. Continued testing would increase the tempo of the arms race and encourage the spread of nuclear arms to non-nuclear powers. This would vastly increase the likelihood of war.

3. The test ban treaty will not threaten our national security. Under the treaty's terms we can resume testing on 3 months notice if, for any reason, we feel our security is threatened.

4. The treaty will protect us and our children from exposure to further and perhaps lethal radioactive fallout.

5. The treaty will create a better climate on both sides for a slowup in the arms race. It is a first and necessary step toward a rational, peaceful ordering of our world.

If these realities make similar good sense to you, say so.

Say it to your Senators. Say it by letter, say it by wire.

Say it now.

While they're making up their minds.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A NUCLEAR TEST BAN,
JAMES J. WADSWORTH, *Chairman*.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Iran, Foreign Aid Helps Trigger Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent New York Times article tells of the dilemma facing a peasant farmer in Iran who received title to part of the estate of his former landlord.

It seems that a neighbor's sheep wandered onto the peasant's newly acquired land and destroyed his crops. Under Iran's old land system, this problem would have been settled by the landlord. But now that he owns his land, the

peasant is faced with the new task of settling the problem himself.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks this very interesting story from the New York Times, which describes the revolutionary changes being brought about by Iran's progressive land reform program.

U.S. foreign aid has been a key factor in stimulating the modernization of Iran's political, economic, and social institutions, and in the development of its resources. With our financial and technical help, the Government of Iran has assumed the responsibility and initiative for instituting these changes, directing its major development efforts at relieving the poverty of its people. But, as the story of the peasant suggests, the road toward political and economic development and stability in Iran promises to be long and hard.

Iran is a good example of the tremendous problems encountered by less-developed countries in attempting to change ancient attitude and ways of life, and to alter established patterns of political and economic power. It is also a good example of the catalytic influence of U.S. foreign aid in setting in motion basic reforms essential for development. For these reasons, the experience of Iran has general implications for other less-developed countries, as well as for evaluating the success of the U.S. aid program.

The most far reaching and dramatic of the revolutionary changes occurring in Iran is the breaking up, under the enlightened personal leadership of the Shah, of the established system of land ownership and agricultural production. The Government of Iran has instituted a major land reform program, dividing up the large estates of the wealthy, feudal landlords, and transferring ownership to individual peasants whose ancestors for centuries worked the land virtually as serfs. The transformation of these former sharecroppers into independent farmers, besides creating new incentives for increased agricultural productivity, will have a profound impact on the economic and political structure of Iran.

The Shah and his Government have firmly committed themselves to the task of channeling these political and economic changes toward a democratic system based upon the rights of property and ownership, recognition of the integrity of the individual, and the responsible rule of law.

Besides agrarian reform, one of the keys to economic, social, and political development, Iran is also making a good showing in other respects.

There is no question about where the Iranians stand in the struggle for freedom around the world. Iran has firmly alined herself with the free world, having joined the Cento Pact in 1955, and in 1959 signed a bilateral mutual cooperation agreement with the United States.

Generally, Iran has been making substantial economic progress. Under its "second 7-year plan," which ended in September 1962, economic growth has averaged 5 percent of gross national product per year. The third development plan, now underway, has a goal of 6 percent per year.

But the obstacles to progress in Iran are many. Only 10 to 15 percent of the people are literate.

The Shah's firm alinement with the West has brought Communist infiltration from the Soviet Union, preying upon widespread illiteracy and political and social instability.

The land reform program has caused internal political unrest, alienating the powerful landlord class on which the Shah and his government has traditionally relied for political support.

Among the peasants of Iran who stand to benefit most from change there is confusion and fear at having suddenly to face new situations and new problems.

United States aid to Iran is helping the Government overcome these obstacles. The success of the land reform program will depend upon the Government's ability to provide the newly independent farmers with credit and agricultural advisory services. Through our technical assistance program, we have already helped the Government of Iran set up an agricultural extension service and cooperative farm credit system and are training the technicans required to staff this program. These facilities will soon have to be expanded to meet increasing demands created by continuing land reform.

U.S. foreign aid is assisting Iran in expanding its educational system to overcome the acute lack of technical knowledge and skill, a major obstacle to modernization. AID is also providing advisory assistance for the extension and improvement of services available to the people, including public health facilities, law enforcement, and investment loan services to encourage private industry.

The Government of Iran is paying increasing attention to the growing working class, especially in expanding urban areas where unemployment presents a potentially serious problem. Trade unions are growing in size and importance, especially in the oil and textile industries. A minimum wage law has recently been enacted. The Ministry of Labor, with the help of U.S. advisers, is working to improve the skills and opportunities of Iranian workers through job training, the establishment of the Iranian Employment Service, and through the dissemination of literature on modern labor practices and methods.

The problems faced by the peasant described in the New York Times article are representative of the many problems still confronting Iran in its struggle to progress, as well as being exemplary of the kinds of problems facing the entire less-developed world. But Iran is also a good example of the revolutionary results which can be achieved through foreign aid provided the recipient country takes adequate steps to help itself.

Although Iran has a long way to go in catching up with the modern world, it is making a courageous effort, and deserves our steady support during the long struggle ahead.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1963]

IRANIANS DEBATE PACE OF REFORM—SOME WANT LAND TRANSFER SPED, OTHERS ASK CAUTION

(By Jay Walz)

TEHERAN, IRAN, May 1.—A peasant who recently received title to part of the estate of his former landlord burst angrily into the office of the director of land reform in Tabriz one day last week. He demanded immediate action to settle a dispute with a neighbor, also a new landholder.

The peasant charged that his neighbor had allowed his sheep to trespass on the peasant's fields and that his crops were being ruined.

The director interrupted a conference to try to mollify the intruder. But he would not be easily set aside. The farmer waved his arms and shouted about his neighbor's failure to respect property rights.

The director tried to assure the peasant that all would be set right but that the place to take his grievance was the local committee in his village.

"You see they used to take all such troubles to the landlord," Rahim Sagheb, the land reform official, explained later. "Now they come to the Government about everything."

MANY OTHERS WAIT

Outside Mr. Sagheb's office 50 more new landowners waited their turn to present their problems. And if this scene were multiplied many thousands of times, the result would give some idea of the turmoil and confusion as Iran carries out the land reform program introduced by Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi.

According to Gen. Ismail Riahi, Iran's new Minister of Agriculture, the farmlands of 15,000 of Iran's 54,000 villages will have been distributed to peasant owners by September. That will complete the first stage of the program, the dispersal of estates formerly belonging to landlords owning more than one village. The landlords were told they might keep one village, but must sell all the rest to the Government in exchange for bonds.

Other sources say that so far only about 4,000 owned by these major landlords have been distributed.

TIME A BIG FACTOR

The big issue in Iran today is the speed with which the reform is to be carried out. There are grave problems of financing and of organizing the cooperatives that must, as soon as possible, take over the role formerly assumed by the landlords.

The cooperatives must guide and offer technical assistance to the largely illiterate landholders. They must provide the administration of Government loans for farm development—irrigation, fertilizer and seeds.

Unfortunately for the program, the establishment of cooperatives is not keeping pace with the land distribution.

The Ministry of Agriculture has enough money to finance the 2,000 cooperatives now underway. But Government sources estimate that at least 20,000 cooperatives will be needed to make the program work.

Without a cooperative available, peasants have no recourse but to go to the nearest land reform office, as in Tabriz, to unload their troubles.

ONE GROUP URGES SPEED

One school of reformers, led by Dr. Hasan Arsanjani, former Minister of Agriculture who initiated the far-reaching program, is pressing the Government to establish cooperatives as fast as possible. He says money should be raised immediately by diverting most of the nation's annual oil income of $300 million, or by massive foreign aid.

Dr. Arsanjani resigned last March after Abdol Hosain Behnia, the conservative Minister of Finance and others persuaded Premier Assadellah Alam and the Shah that the program should move with less speed and more order.

The agriculture bank agrees that while land reform is still urgent, it should take into account the difficulties of raising capital, and the even greater problem of finding trained men to run the cooperatives.

ESTIMATES DIFFER

The conservatives in Iran say no more than 5,000 cooperatives a year can be organized properly. This would mean spreading land reform over the next 4 or 5 years. Dr. Arsanjani said the program should be accomplished in less than half the time and demanded that Premier Alam raise the money at once. It is reported that the cost would be about $200 million.

The Shah has offered his former land reform administrator the ambassadorship to Rome, to remove him, it is widely believed, from the scene of controversy. But Dr. Arsanjani says he is staying in Teheran to write a book.

Dr. Arsanjani is reported to have political ambitions and is said to be waiting the opportune time to pursue them. If land reform remains the burning issue in Iran, the Shah might find it difficult to avoid asking Dr. Arsanjani to take the premiership and form a new cabinet after the parliamentary elections in June or July.

Portrait of Pittsburgh—Heart of Industrial America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive-minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing in southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the third of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

PORTRAIT OF PITTSBURGH: HEART OF INDUSTRIAL AMERICA

For more than a century, Pittsburgh has been recognized as the industrial capital of the world. This industrial wealth and strength is demonstrated by the fact that 55 of the largest 500 industrial companies in the Nation have one or more plants in this district. Twenty-four of these make Pittsburgh their headquarters. Within 600 miles are 16 of the top 20 U.S. industrial markets.

Concentrated in the four counties (Allegheny, Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland) which the U.S. Department of Commerce recognizes as the Pittsburgh Standard Metropolitan statistical area, is nearly one-fifth of the steelmaking capacity of the United States. The Pittsburgh district produces an estimated 20,973,115 tons, well over 21 percent of the total national output.

In the Greater Pittsburgh area, nearly one-fourth of the Nation's iron ore is smelted. From the mines of western Pennsylvania come approximately 34 million tons of bituminous coal annually.

While coal and steel play an important role in Pittsburgh's productive might, it by no means tells the entire story. Actually, nearly 6,000 different products are manufactured in the four-county area.

To help produce this myriad of goods requires the services of over 269,900 men and women whose combined income exceeds $1.6 billion a year.

The Pittsburgh area has 200 manufacturing establishments with 100 or more employees. Of the other 1,400 plants, 1,000 manufacturing establishments employ fewer than 20 employees. Thus, there is a good balance of both large and small businesses in this area.

The Pittsburgh four-county metropolitan area is the ninth ranking manufacturing center in the United States. Allegheny County's manufacturing activity alone exceeds that of 31 of the 50 States.

Within the 100-mile radius of the area are more than 7,800 manufacturing plants employing nearly 1 million persons.

Industries here have pioneered in nuclear development. A number of other industries, making products generated by 20th century progress, have found Pittsburgh an ideal location for manufacturing and growth.

At present the Pittsburg area has no less than nine major installations directly concerned with development of nuclear power. There is nothing comparable to this in any other section of the United States or abroad. In late 1957, homes, offices, and industrial plants in the immediate vicinity of Pittsburgh became the first in the world to use electricity produced by atomic fuel from the Shippingport plant, 25 miles from Pittsburgh—one of the outstanding industrial achievements of the century.

Research and development has become the 12th largest industry in this area. With over 20,000 employees, the 115 research and development units in the Pittsburgh district have a payroll of over $150 million and an investment of nearly $300 million. They spend an additional $75 to $100 million to probe new uses for old products and new products. Many of these research units are in the midst of extensive expansions involving many millions of dollars. Today, approximately one-fifth of all research expenditures of the United States is being spent here in the Pittsburgh area.

This wealth of industrial know-how is invaluable to new and expanding industries through the facilities of Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and many other local industrial research resources.

Foreign Aid Now Conditioned on Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid has long been criticized for not having enough strings. In the past, the usual reply has been that to attach conditions to aid would be to interfere politically in the domestic affairs of other countries. Now, after years of learning the hard way, the United States has finally begun insisting on conditions before providing foreign aid. Strings are now attached not only to grants and loans for specific programs and projects but to aid programs for entire countries, such as Brazil. At long last, our foreign aid officials are making a careful and concentrated effort, not only to see that our funds are used effectively, but also to insure that recipient countries fully utilize their own resources.

Foreign aid is an investment of the taxes of the American people, and every American taxpayer has a stake in the prudent and businesslike management of the aid program. Americans particularly object to having their tax dollars used for the benefit of the privileged few of another country.

Basically, most Americans are in favor of foreign aid. Recent polls, show increasing public support for the foreign aid program. But public confidence in the efficacy of the program has been shaken by stories of graft and corruption in other countries, or stories about the failure of other countries to do their share, or stories about programs or projects where U.S. funds were wasted because of one failure or another. The feeling has been growing among even the most ardent supporters of foreign aid that the program can work effectively only if these weaknesses are corrected, and that they can be corrected only if the United States conditions its foreign aid on performance.

For these reasons, the new emphasis on establishing conditions for aid is good news for every taxpayer. Americans can now have greater confidence that their tax dollars will be used more prudently and effectively, and that the program will achieve better results.

What kinds of conditions are now being agreed upon by the United States and the recipient governments, and how do these conditions work?

There are two categories of conditions. First, there are conditions based on the performance of an entire country, and applied to all aid programs and projects in that country. Second, there are conditions for specific programs or projects in a country, even where the country as a whole does not have to take certain agreed upon self-help steps.

Under the Charter of Punta del Este, which established the Alliance for Progress, every country in Latin America is committed to undertake certain self-help measures. It is explicitly recognized in the charter that U.S. assistance to Latin American development will be conditioned upon the necessary structural reforms and measures for the mobilization of internal resources on the part of recipient countries.

The recent United States-Brazilian agreement, which conditions further U.S. aid to Brazil upon the taking of certain steps by the Brazilian Government, was made in accordance with the charter. Under this agreement, which is the first of its kind, Brazil was to—

First. Increase revenue by reforming the tax system, as well as improve tax collection and administration;

Second. Reduce government budgetary deficits by eliminating subsidies on wheat

and petroleum, eliminating deficits on publicly owned enterprises including transportation and power systems, and curbing public pay increases;

Third. Control inflation by limiting the expansion of credit by the banks, by establishing better central banking machinery, and by appealing to unions and businesses to hold the line on wages and prices;

Fourth. Reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by establishing a realistic exchange rate and by adopting specific measures to increase exports;

Fifth. Stimulate economic growth by adopting measures to encourage outside private investment; and

Sixth. Increase agricultural growth and productivity by seeking a broad program of agrarian reform.

In addition, it was understood that Brazil should arrange with the International Monetary Fund to defer payment on an IMF obligation, as well as secure a standby arrangement under which the IMF would make temporary credits available to offset Brazilian export losses. It was also understood that Brazil would secure additional aid from other free world countries.

In several other cases development loans for Latin America countries have been made contingent upon acceptable arrangements with the International Monetary Fund for exchange rate reform and an economic stabilization program.

One example is the recent $35 million development loan to Chile which is conditional upon a satisfactory stabalization program. The loan will be disbursed at a rate corresponding to the rate of Chile's budgetary performance. Better budgetary performance will speed up the rate of loan disbursement, and vice versa.

In some cases there is a condition that the borrowing nation secure aid from other donor nations before the United States will promise assistance. A stabilization loan for Egypt, and the consortia arrangements for Pakistan and India, and more recently for Turkey, are examples of this type of condition.

There are numerous examples of specific types of conditions required by the United States on development grant and development loan projects.

In one Middle East country the government undertook to reorganize the port administration, to establish separate organizations for the goods handling and customs functions, and to finance the timely completion of complementary requirements such as connecting roads. Management, organizational, financial, and budgetary arrangements for the port satisfactory to the United States were made conditions of an AID loan.

In another Middle East country, specific conditions were set forth in a U.S. loan made for the purchase of construction equipment. Because several Government departments were involved, one condition of the loan was that a new central agency be established to handle the equipment. Employment of qualified foreign advisors and the establishment of an acceptable spare parts and maintenance system were other conditions of the loan.

A home savings program in a Latin American country requires that the U.S. contribution of $7.5 million to the savings bank be matched, and that there be established a National Housing Institute to administer the program.

Conditions to ensure repayment of U.S. loans, including Government guarantees of loans to private or semipublic institutions, are common practice. In one such case, the United States insisted upon the financial reorganization of a truck company to open up prior mortgage bonds so that AID would be ratably insured, the sale of common stock rather than of senior convertible debentures as proposed by the company, establishment of a ratio of debt to net worth not to exceed 2 to 1, and a limitation on dividend payments.

A normal condition of cost sharing between the United States and a recipient country in a grant project is exemplified by a recent work relief project emphasizing rural reconstruction. Under this agreement, the United States provides surplus agricutural commodities for food, hand tools and equipment, Soil Conservation Service specialists and junior level technicians, and the cooperating Government guarantees the provision of cash wages for 60,000 workers.

Establishing conditions for aid is one thing; enforcing those conditions, especially when political considerations are involved, is another. Flexibility in enforcing foreign aid conditions is just as essential as flexibility in enforcing the conditions of a commercial contract. Up to a certain point, exigencies must be taken into account. The problem, of course, is knowing where to draw the line.

In agreements on conditions, especially those involving an entire country program, it would be a mistake to expect the line always to be drawn where it was marked out originally. But allowing for reasonable adjustments, it is reasonable to expect conditions to be carried out, as nearly as possible, as agreed upon. Otherwise agreements on conditions will not be taken seriously.

The difficulty in carrying out conditions while at the same time serving broader foreign policy interests can be seen in the case of Brazil. U.S. aid to Brazil is being held up at the moment because the government of Brazil has not met the conditions agreed upon earlier this year. Since the Brazil-United States agreement was signed, the Brazilian Government has done little, in fact, to live up to its pledge. Inflation increased by more than 25 percent in the first half of 1963, and probably will increase by more than 50 percent before the end of the year. The Government of Brazil has loosened rather than tightened credit. The Brazilian budget deficit has gone up rather than down. Government pay raises, rather than being held to the announced 40 percent, have been increasing by 70 percent.

What happens next? From the standpoint of general foreign policy considerations, Brazil must not be allowed to founder. If the enforcement of conditions on our aid program were predicted to have that effect, it would be very difficult to make the conditions stick. On the other hand, if the conditions are modified to the point of being substantially softened or virtually removed, it would be very difficult in the future to persuade any government to live up to its commitments. The answer may lie somewhere in between. But even if there should have to be some adjustments in the original agreements—and they certainly should be kept to a minimum—we will at least have made a start on establishing, together with the host government, performance standards for a country receiving U.S. assistance. This is one of the most encouraging improvements made in foreign aid since the new program was established in 1961.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in the most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interest. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to

House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 19, 1963.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH.

Thank you for alerting us and for your work in obtaining passage of this bill.

Sincerely,

LILLA SCHMITZ.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 19, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I urge you to obtain quick action on House Resolution 14?

Thank you for your interest and action in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Miss LILLA SCHMITZ.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

WEST ISLIP, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily support your fight in re House Resolution 14.

JOHN E. MURDOCK.

LEVITTOWN, PA.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Following is the copy of a letter which I sent to Mr. SMITH.

MRS. MCGRANAGHAN.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I am writing in reference to the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. It seems to me to be of the utmost importance to have quick action on House Resolution 14.

Sincerely,

MRS. CORINNE MCGRANAGHAN.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

BRIGHTWATERS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
July 11, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I heartily support your fight in regard to House Resolution 14. Best of luck in putting it through.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. HORTON.

JULY 18, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: It is with grave alarm that I note the definite change in the administration's attitude toward the Soviets and the prosecution of the cold war in general, as propounded in the President's infamous June 10 speech. As a result there will probably be great pressures brought to bear on you and your committee.

In view of that I wish to serve notice of my support of a realistic view of the international Communist conspiracy and request that you do all within your power to encourage action by your committee which will be favorable to House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House. It is only through the honest factfinding and reporting of such a congressional committee that the administration can be blocked from whitewashing the cruelties and rape inflicted on those held down by the iron boot of Khrushchev-Mao Inc., by an informed public rising up in righteous indignation against this compromise with evil.

Don't give up the ship.

Sincerely,

HARRY W. FRAZEE, *C.L.U.*

(Copies to the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD and the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY.)

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 17, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

COMMITTEE COMPLETES STUDY ON TAX PROGRAM

The President's tax recommendations for 1963 have occupied the Ways and Means Committee almost daily since February. Finally, a draft bill has been completed, after months of public hearings followed by executive sessions. Both so-called structural reforms, some 32 basic areas (including individual deductible items, real estate depreciation, dividends exemption and inclusion, sick pay exclusion, medical and casualty loss, child care, moving expense, charitable, natural resources, sale of mineral properties, stock options, capital gains, etc.) and rate reductions both individual and corporate.

The structural reforms unbelievably complicate the law with changes and new formulas. Few persons, if any, will be able to fill out a tax form without legal or expert help. So our goal of simplification becomes a hollow joke. Only $1 billion additional in revenue is secured for the Government by all these changes. The rate reform or reduction is divided between individuals and corporations. The total tax cut is approximately $10.7 billion, of which individual rate cuts is about $8.6 billion and corporate $2.1 billion, phased over 2 years; two-thirds cut in calendar year 1964 and one-third in calendar 1965.

The individual rate cuts are dropped from 20 percent to 6 percent to 14 percent in the lowest bracket while in the highest bracket the rate changes are 91 percent to 77 percent to 70 percent. Corporate rates are dropped from 52 percent to 50 percent (22 normal, 28 surtax) to 48 percent (22 normal, 26 surtax). The individual rates in all but the lowest brackets, that is from $4,000 tax liability on up, have a lesser reduction. Always for political reasons of course, the lowest brackets get preference.

My suggested amendment for the individual rate cut was a flat 20-percent cut for everyone. Tax would be figured as at present and then 20 percent of the tax eliminated to reach tax payment. This would have been fairer as I see it, although no permanent solution inasmuch as this is not a good rate readjustment. My amendment was an effort to improve the bill as were my efforts in oil taxation, real estate depreciation, and others. Yet, in the final analysis many of us knew we should relate any tax cut to reduced Federal spending. Republican efforts in this direction were defeated by votes of 13–12, almost straight party line votes. The bill will now be drafted, studied, and changed before final committee approval or rejection. Then to the Rules Committee and the Floor of the House. Since amendments are not permitted under the rule it is obvious that 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee write the tax law. Members can only approve or reject the final package. Then the Senate will act independently. It looks like no tax bill, if at all, until next year. This gives people a chance to demand reduced spending, a balanced budget, and debt reduction, as equally important to a tax cut.

AID TO EDUCATION

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, H.R. 6143, passed the House (287 to 113) with ALGER voting against. This bill authorizes Federal assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions. My own opposition to the bill was summed up in the minority views of Congressman DAVE MARTIN of Nebraska: (1) This is not a proper function of the Federal Government. Our institutions of higher learning should stand on their own feet, whether private or State supported. There has been a great building boom since World War II at our colleges and universities throughout the country. Most of these buildings have been most elaborate and costly and do not indicate that an austerity program is in effect. (2) This bill would authorize to be appropriated during the next 3 years $1,195 million, divided as follows: $660 million for loans for construction grants to graduate schools, and $360 million for loans for construction. In view of the budget deficit during the present fiscal year, and in view of the projected $12 billion deficit for fiscal year 1964, as well as the expected deficits for future years, I feel that it is fiscally irresponsible to authorize new spending programs at this time. Approximately $2.5 billion is presently being spent for educational purposes by the Federal Government. This involves a hodgepodge of programs among which there is already a great overlapping and waste of the taxpayers' funds. It would be much more pertinent to make a complete study of these programs and come up with recommendations where saving could be made and expenditures reduced. (3) Although I generally do not favor special deductions to get our people to do those things the Government feels they should, I think Congressman MARTIN's approach of allowing an income tax deduction of $1,000 to a parent who is sending his or her child to an institution of higher learning and who is contributing a major portion of the student's expenditures, is a better approach than Federal aid directly to colleges and universities. Additional points against the bill were raised in further minority views by other members of the Commttee. To just menton several: The fine balance between research and instruction which many institutions have sought to maintain has already been upset, and there has been a disruption of normal internal relationships in universities. University departments favored by Federal grants can become virtually independent of institutional administration. The needs of vast enrollment increases in colleges and universities since World War II have been met through traditional sources, private endowments, etc. Large-scale Federal aid could discourage and dry up these sources. There is no evidence justifying the conclusion that the needs for higher education for academic facilities cannot be met from present State and private agencies.

BRINGING HOME THE BACON

Once again the issue has been raised on whether a Congressman should be concerned with principle, in preserving the freedoms of the people, in watching out for their tax dollars, or should he forget the basic responsibilities in order to bring home the bacon, get Federal handouts for his district. If the Representative of Dallas County is to be judged on how much he can get for Dallas, then the only kind of representative would be one who would be completely subservient to the New Frontier. No Republican, no conservative Democrat, no one who opposes the Kennedy administration in any way will

be free from the blackmail and political coercion practiced by this administration. My own position, and I am firmly convinced, the position of the majority of the people of Dallas County is that the principle of self-government comes first. We shall demand and fight for those things to which Dallas is legitimately entitled, but will not accept the welfare programs and planned economy theories of the New Frontier in order to get them.

Congressman's Duty to His Own People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial from the Rock Hill Evening Herald, of Rock Hill, S.C., Thursday, August 15, 1963. It certainly answers unjust criticism by Mr. Neilan made of the Members of Congress and I will not elaborate because the treatment of the editorial is complete.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESSMAN'S DUTY TO HIS OWN PEOPLE

The president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has put his finger on a sore spot when he raises questions concerning national morality in the area of getting something from the U.S. Government.

Edwin P. Neilan does not have a very high opinion of Congressmen in general, or of voters in general. And consequently, it should follow that he doesn't have too high an opinion of business of which he is the representative, for businessmen, too, are voters—and generally pretty influential ones.

Mr. Neilan's basic premise is true enough—that we have become so used to looking to Government for benefits that this is apt to color our thinking on Government events and the people who make up Government. The idea is not new. While it has some validity, we do not think it represents the imminent crisis Mr. Neilan would make of it. It is not difficult to recall that the oldsters have been viewing with alarm the growing tendency of the younger generation to get all they could for some years—as far back as Plato, in fact.

Mr. Neilan conveniently divides voters into two classes—the "pushers" who force Members of Congress to get Government contracts as their price for votes—and the "takers" who vote for the candidate who promises fatter handouts than his opponent.

He seems to have forgotten a very basic thing. We do not send representatives to Congress, as Mr. Neilan's company hires a president to make the balance sheet look good. We elect Congressmen to represent their constituents, to be responsible to their views, and to try to make Government function so that all these divergent views, taken together, operate in the best interests of all of the people.

It is nice to dream of balanced budgets and efficiency. But ideals and the facts of life are seldom in balance.

A Congressman's first duty, Mr. Neilan to the contrary, is to represent the people of his district. This includes getting benefits for his people where these benefits fulfill a need, as well as protecting them from disadvantages.

Mr. Neilan sounds like the kind of man who would eliminate voter representation in favor of a board of directors who would have the power to decide what's good for the people. We might get a lot more efficiency and probably a balanced budget. But we would not have a government capable of meeting the needs of the people—we would not have a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

President of San Diego Medical Society Knocks Proposed "Fedicare" Bill as Aid to Unneedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Home Builder:

PRESIDENT OF COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY KNOCKS PROPOSED "FEDICARE" BILL AS AID TO UNNEEDY

(By Robert T. Plumb, M.D., president, San Diego County Medical Society)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—With the influx of senior citizens into San Diego County to settle down and enjoy their golden years in one of our many attractive retirement communities, the subject of medical care for those over 65 becomes even more important to all San Diego residents. This is a plea for deliverance from Federal control of this important matter by the President of the San Diego County Medical Society.)

For domestic issues during the last two decades have generated more heat than the debate over health care for the aged. No question has been more widely discussed with less understanding or on a basis of greater misinformation. There has been heat with little light.

America's 17,000,000 citizens over 65 years of age have been portrayed as a class of ailing, destitute and helpless people who can not obtain medical care when they need it. Supporters of "Medicare," or "Fedicare" as we prefer to call it, have presented misleading statistics that have clouded important basic facts. The story of the Federal Kerr-Mills Law of 1961 and of its implementation and success throughout the country has faded into obscurity.

A majority of the people in the over 65 age group can afford to pay for their own medical care. The liquid assets of people over 65 are the highest of any age group in the Nation and their financial responsibilities are less than those of the working age group. Seventy percent own their own homes and 87 percent of these homes are mortgage free. More than 4,000,000 are still employed and many also receive pensions, annuities or other benefits. More than 9,550,000 have health insurance. Persons over 65 are joining Blue Shield plans at a rate more than four times faster than all other age groups combined.

SERVICES DONATED

Physicians, who traditionally have donated their services to care for indigent patients at county hospitals and at other institutions such as Mercy Guadalupe Clinic in San Diego, are keenly aware of the facts that when older people become ill they may be ill for longer periods of time than younger persons and their medical care requirements are greater and more costly. We know that many of our "over 65" patients who manage well under ordinary circumstances need help in paying for medical care when they suffer chronic or catastrophic illnesses.

Because of this, the medical profession strongly supported passage of the Kerr-Mills law by Congress in 1960 and the Rattigan act by the California Legislature in 1961 which established California's medical assistance for the aged program effective January 1, 1962.

The medical assistance for the aged program, administered by local welfare departments, uses Federal Kerr-Mills tax funds on a matching basis with State and local funds to pay for long-term medical care for people over 65 who are unable to pay for this care themselves.

QUALIFICATIONS UNDER MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE AGED

At present, a person qualifying for assistance under the medical assistance for the aged program must:

1. Require long-term care in a hospital or nursing home in excess of 30 days. (After February 1, 1964, payment shall be made within the first 30 days of confinement in any hospital when the cost of care exceeds $3,000 or when confined in a county hospital.)

2. Not possess real property other than his home assessed at over $5,000.

3. Not possess personal reserves (cash, savings, investments, etc.) worth more than $1,200.

4. Not have income exceeding the cost of his or his dependents' maintenance plus the cost of his medical care.

This assistance includes all services necessary for the treatment of illness including room and board in hospitals and nursing homes, nursing care, physicians' services, dental care, eye care, physical therapy, and drugs.

Medical assistance for the aged and similar Kerr-Mills programs in 43 other States and in three territories and the District of Columbia, partially supported by Federal tax funds and administered at the local level, seek to help the aged person who is ill to regain the maximum of self-dependency and self-care, to help obtain the kind of medical care arrangements most appropriate for them and to support the efforts of all those groups who work for better quality of medical care. The Kerr-Mills law embodies the age old tradition of providing assistance where it is needed. The American people are accustomed to such financial aid from local government.

KING-ANDERSON PROPOSAL

On the other hand, the King-Anderson "Fedicare" proposal would pay for hospitalization for 90 days after a $90 deductible, hospital out-patient diagnostic services after a $20 deductible and up to 180 days of home nursing care. It would not cover physicians' services, drugs, etc., and some authorities say it would cover less than 25 percent of the cost of illness for an individual eligible for its benefits.

The "Fedicare" benefits would be available to all social security benefit recipients over 65 years of age regardless of whether they are millionaires or paupers. It would be administered from Washington with all the rules, regulations, and limitations characteristic of government controlled medical care programs. The first rule would be a compulsory boost in social security taxes for all employers and employees. It would hit hardest those least able to pay with the $100 a week worker paying the same in new taxes as the $1,000 a week executive. It would cost untold billions of dollars. It would be one more major step toward socialism.

We as physicians are concerned about good medical care for all, concerned about your taxes and mine, concerned about the Federal Government driving a wedge between us and our patients. We must be concerned about politics—whether we like it or not.

The King-Anderson multi-billion-dollar "Fedicare" proposal would provide something

for everyone regardless of need but would provide little help for those who really need help with catastrophic or chronic illness.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the accomplishments of Project Hope—Health Opportunities for People Everywhere—in bringing the benefits of American medicine and health care to many of the developing countries of the Far East and Latin America are directly contributing as well to American prestige.

Project Hope is a private enterprise medical mission, supported by contributions of Americans from all walks of life, which was conceived by Dr. William B. Walsh of Washington, D.C. Its base of operations is a former U.S. Navy hospital ship recommissioned the SS *Hope*, which since 1960 has treated thousands of patients in the Far East and Latin America, as a floating hospital.

The experiences in Peru of one prominent physician who contributed his services offer a worthy description of these efforts. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on Project Hope written by George M. Saypol, associate professor of clinical surgery at the New York University School of Medicine and chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislation of the Medical Society of the County of New York, which appeared in the July 20, 1963, issue of New York Medicine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOPE OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY THAT COMES FROM THE SS "HOPE"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We have asked Dr. George M. Saypol, as a surgeon on the last visit of the SS *Hope* to Peru, to recount some of his impressions and experiences so that other physicians may share his great adventure in the service made possible by this people-to-people project.)

(By George M. Saypol, M.D.)

The door slammed in the taxicab at the airport at Trujillo, Peru, and the cab driver took off—as all cab drivers in South America will—on the road to the port of Salaverry, where the ship SS *Hope* was moored during most of 1962 and part of 1963. I was on my way to my assignment as a surgeon aboard the *Hope*.

Hearing my destination, my driver asked, "Is it true that all of you American doctors are giving your services free?" The question is revealing for I found that most of the persons we met and treated on the SS *Hope* were unaware of the mission of this wonderful experiment in bringing the attainments of modern medicine and surgery to the peoples of other lands. And the same is true, to a large degree for many persons in the United States.

Some people still believe—but erroneously—that Project Hope is some kind of governmental mission of the United States of America; like a medical Peace Corps or what have you. This is not correct. Rather, Project Hope is a private enterprise, conceived by Dr. William B. Walsh, a Washington, D.C., internist who was interested in a medical approach to the promotion of good will on an international scale. It was Dr. Walsh who conceived the idea of using a hospital ship—traveling to many parts of the world—whose purpose would be to provide facilities and physicians to teach the skills and techniques of American medicine to the health professions of other lands, in those other lands.

The enthusiasm and energy of Dr. Walsh enlisted the support of many distinguished citizens (including the then President Eisenhower) and he created the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc. Through his foundation he was able to obtain medical supplies, instruments and a hospital ship. I use the word his foundation because Dr. Walsh created the foundation and serves as its president.

Project Hope really began on March 16, 1960, when the U.S. Navy hospital ship—the *Consolation*—was taken out of "mothballs" and recommissioned as the S.S. *Hope*. Veterans of World War II and Korea know the *Consolation* well.

The 15,000-ton floating hospital was outfitted, equipped, and staffed, and in 1961 carried out its first mission to the Far East, including among its ports of call Surabaya, Bali, Makassar, Ambon, Kupang, Bima, Lombok, Semarang, and Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam.

During that year, thousands of patients were treated on ship and shore for medical and surgical conditions. Numerous lectures, clinics, and seminars were held for native physicians. A mass inoculation program was instituted and nutrition was improved, at least temporarily, by the distribution of 80,000 pints of fresh milk. Of the milk I will have more to say later.

After returning to the United States, the S.S. *Hope* was refurbished and in April 1962 departed for Peru. The ship spent the next 10 months in Peru with the same type of program that had proved so valuable and successful in the Far East.

A word about the medical personnel aboard the S.S. *Hope*. It has a permanent and also a rotating staff. The permanent staff is paid by the foundation and consists of approximately 35 nurses, 25 ancillary personnel including laboratory technicians, a librarian and secretaries, and 5 physicians, mainly pediatricians. The rotating staff—on which I had the honor to serve—consist of teams of from 20 to 25 physicians serving 8-week terms. These men are flown to wherever the ship is, and there are actually seven periods of service with 1 week's overlap for each team for orientation and to permit continuity of staff. The rotators represent all the medical and surgical specialties and serve without pay.

The SS *Hope* has facilities that equal any to be found in the finest hospitals of the United States. It has 125 beds with a possible expansion of 150 to 200 beds; the number is limited only by the number of available nursing personnel. There is an intensive care unit of 15–20 beds. Its three operating rooms were in use 5½ days each week for elective cases. The nurses and other auxiliary personnel thought nothing of working second 8-hour shifts when required by the pressure of the work.

It is well for American physicians to render medical and surgical care to natives of distant lands but another great goal of the SS *Hope* is to train native physicians and other personnel. Assigned to American doctors, nurses, and the technicians, therefore, were their Peruvian counterparts. These participated in rounds, attended lectures, and demonstrations and assisted at operations. Some of the Peruvian doctors, notably Dr. Juan Rodriguez, my counterpart, assisted us on the ship from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. and then returned to conduct their own private practice ashore in the evenings. I am sure they were more tired than we were.

But the SS *Hope*—as a hospital ship—was only part of the story. Additional work was carried out at the 500-bed hospital at Trujillo, Peru. Here clinics were held daily, morning and afternoon, and as many as 150 patients were seen at each session. From these clinics were selected patients, according to the greatest need, for transfer to the SS *Hope* itself.

It was at this same Belen Hospital in Trujillo that the staff of the SS *Hope* had the opportunity to teach, for it was there that the medical students of Trujillo University obtained their clinical experience. They also made the grand rounds and witnessed operations.

The work of the personnel of the SS *Hope* was not confined to the ship and the hospital. Public health clinics were set up in the "barriadas"—the notorious slum areas—surrounding Trujillo. Rising tier after tier from the city, up the hillsides, the barriadas can match the slums of Hong Kong or any other oriental metropolis.

There were no suitable buildings to house these clinics but the arid climate and absence of rain made it possible to hold them in the open air. The doctors and the staff inoculated against polio and tuberculosis, examined patients, took chest X-rays and performed the lab work of urinalysis and blood counts in these primitive surroundings.

For the unfortunates of the barriadas, also, the SS *Hope* was a floating dairy farm with its mechanical cow which—from distilled sea water, butter fat, and powdered milk—created 2,000 quarts of milk for the underprivileged children of the slums.

When the SS *Hope* arrived in Peru, the ship's library contained over 13,000 educational pamphlets and over 2,000 medical books. When the ship left, the Trujillo Medical School was the richer by 2,000 of these books and pamphlets on medicine and public health subjects.

Commonly seen conditions included those resulting from malnutrition, polio and tuberculosis, congenital deformities, and poorly treated or untreated fractures resulting from accidents. Other common diseases were echinococcus cyst, Madura foot, and gall stones. Illustrative of the high incidence of gall stones and the severity of their complications were 22 patients operated upon by me during the first 4 weeks. Among them were seven with common duct stones, the ducts being unusually thickened and dilated, one duct measuring 4.0 cms. in diameter.

Inability to obtain medical care was exemplified by harelips seen in older children, and in a 32-year-old man with double harelip who was operated on by our oral surgeon. Unusually large hemangiomata of the face and body, large breast tumors including fibroadenomata and cystosarcoma phyllodes, and vesicovaginal and rectovaginal fistulae resulting from accidents of childbirth, were also seen. The need for cataract operations was so great and pterygium so common, that many procedures were being done on an outpatient basis on the ship.

Among the difficulties encountered in Peru was the unpredictable current in Salaverry Harbor. Transporting patients, especially stretcher cases, to and from the ship by tug posed a problem in synchronization. Transfer to the landing platform of the ship had to be at the proper height of a wave, usually the crest, in order to prevent falling into the brink.

Maintaining order among patients seeking entry to the clinic at Belen or direct admission to the ship, required policing by naval and military police at times. Not infrequently there were well-dressed affluent-looking patients on line with many poor Indians who had spent hours and days coming by mule and mule-cart to obtain medical

care. Poignant sights were old people, covered with burlap bags used as shawls, literally crawling on hands and knees up the outside steps to the clinic floor.

Supplied as we were with disposable linens, disposable suture sets, drugs, and every conceivable item necessary for good medical care, it seemed odd that no colostomy bags were available; undoubtedly they were misplaced in the hold of some supply ship.

Another odd episode occurred during my period on the SS *Hope*. A visiting American doctor, in Peru to lecture, took a taxi from our ship to the Trujillo Medical School. On alighting from the taxi, he missed his wallet containing about $100. The thief was quickly caught by the local police who witnessed the unusual sight of someone running. Nobody in this environment moves fast, so this culprit literally ran himself into the arms of the law.

The purpose behind the SS *Hope* is described in a brochure that is handed to every patient who boards her for treatment. The brochure reads as follows:

WELCOME ABOARD THE SS "HOPE"

"This ship is a floating hospital invited to Peru to exchange medical knowledge and ideas between Peruvian and North American personnel. Our doctors are all well-trained specialists who work without salary and are here voluntarily on this mission of friendship and understanding between our peoples. Project Hope is not a Government organization. It is a people-to-people program. HOPE stands for Health Opportunities for People Everywhere.

"There is no charge for anything you will receive on the ship because the project is supported by contributions from North American friends of Peru in all walks of life: Workers, farmers, schoolchildren, professional people, and industry.

"Our ways may seem a little different to you, but do not be afraid. We understand your illness and will do everything necessary to make you comfortable. If you have any difficulty, mention it to your doctor or nurse. A Catholic priest and a Protestant minister are available for your needs.

"We wish you a pleasant stay aboard and good health."

Among the rotators who served on the SS *Hope* during its Peruvian trip were 11 other physicians from the Greater New York area. They are Doctors Arno Gurewitsch, Alfred Hurwitz, Nancy Kester, William F. Kremer, Walter Lentino, Thomas F. Leo, Lester Mount, Alex Sahagian-Edwards, John E. Sarno, Byron Smith, and F. Howard Westcott.

At the end of the SS *Hope's* 10-month tour of duty off the coast of Peru, the ship departed for New York to be refitted and made ready for service to the people of Ecuador.

Before it did so, however, the ship's staff was at the receiving end of 2 weeks of ceremonies and celebrations designed to show the Peruvian people's gratitude to the SS *Hope* for all it had done for their health and welfare. According to Nick Craw, director of logistics for Project Hope, the festivities reached a climax on February 27, the day before the ship left, when the stadium at Trujillo was taken over for speeches and merrymaking that lasted until dawn. During that same evening, there also was a first-rate fireworks display with scores of automobiles parked along the coastline and providing additional illumination for the event. The fireworks lit up the hull and superstructure of the ship with dazzling patterns of exploding color. A brass band set off dancing on the dock until far into the night.

On the morning of the sailing, cars, trucks, and mule carts brought thousands of 20-foot-long garlands of flowers, palm fronds, and flower wreaths, on which the women of Trujillo had undoubtedly worked all night. These, along with a sign made of flowers and reading "Gracias, *Hope*," were strung over the rails, the lifeboats, and the side of the ship until the white vessel was a mass of floral color. By noon, it seemed that every available vehicle in the area had been pressed into service to transport people from Trujillo and the surrounding region to the shore, where they stood 30 deep for several miles. Some were curious, but most appeared grateful and friendly, and sad to see the *Hope* finally sail. In fact, many had spent precious money to attend the ship's departure, while others had walked the 10 miles from Trujillo to the harbor. Many of those who could not walk had been carried that long distance, so that they, too, could participate in the festivities.

In the ceremonies on board ship, a number of local and national Peruvian officials delivered speeches and Doctor Walsh, in his capacity as president of Project Hope, presented diplomas to some 50 physicians, 21 dentists, 46 technicians and auxiliary nurses, 50 nurses, and 65 students who graduated that day from the program of study and training they underwent in connection with the *Hope's* 10-month visit to Peru.

As the ship made ready to sail, every deck was the scene of tearful goodbys. The medical staff and crew members received bouquets of flowers from people who did not even know them—people who had no shoes and wore rags for clothes. Literally hundreds of people begged to depart with the ship for the United States.

When the last line was let go, a wing of Peruvian Air Force jets buzzed the ship and performed acrobatics overhead. A Peruvian airliner diverted its flight so that it could see the ship and dip its wing in salute as the *Hope* blew its whistle in long, mournful blasts. As the *Hope* pulled away from shore, the mass of people along the coast erupted into a sea of waving handkerchiefs and a cacaphony of horns, sirens and whistles.

During its sojourn off the coast of Peru, the SS *Hope* had treated 46,000 patients and won many friends for the United States. It had also left behind a legacy of knowledge and skills of immeasurable value that will be transmitted to hundreds of others in the years to come.

As the ship pulled out of Salaverry Harbor, the Peruvian pilot on the bridge turned to Mr. Craw and said:

"Tell your country not to send money to Latin America; it is wasted. Tell them to send people, people like the 'HOPEES' for this is what reaches the hearts of our people. Look at the thousands of people on the shore. There is your living proof of what you have done. They have been deeply touched by the *Hope* and their lives have been changed.

"Tell them to send more *Hopes*."

As for me, the questions that have been asked most often are: "How could you afford to be away so long?" "What was the reaction of your family?" and "Would you go again?"

Answering these questions in order, I would say that the trip was costly, but it had many compensations in accomplishment, grateful people and priceless experiences.

As for my family, my wife, Grace, was supposed to serve as an occupational therapist but circumstances prevented this. However, with our children Marjorie and David, she joined me in Peru (at our own expense, of course) for the last few weeks of my assignment.

Would I go again? Gladly.

And U.S. Planes "Watched"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the news of the kidnaping by Castro military units of refugee women and children from the Bahamas came as a shock to most Americans, and for those of us in Florida a further indication of the lawless acts of a Communist puppet.

Many of us in the Congress have been calling for a stronger U.S. policy toward Castro. All we are able to get from our State Department are mild assurances. We ask ourselves once again: What is our Cuban policy?

The Miami Herald headlined an editorial for August 16, "The Outrages Continue—and U.S. Planes 'Watched'?" Under consent granted I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE OUTRAGES CONTINUE—AND U.S. PLANES "WATCHED"?

We don't buy the bland statement that U.S. warplanes had to look on helplessly while two warships and a helicopter from Communist Cuba kidnaped 19 Cuban refugees from Anguilla Key.

A State Department spokesman contends that the watching U.S. airmen were not in a position to do anything because of international law. Why not? Anguilla Key is a British island. We recall that the United States enlisted the cooperation of British patrol craft to prevent Cuban exiles from raiding Castroland. Can't the same teamwork defend British—or American—soil from raids by forces of the Red Cuban Government?

It seems to us that any witness to this crime had a right and duty to try to rescue the 19 victims from their abductors.

The outrage at Anguilla Key is the third in a series committed by the Reds in Cuba.

The first was reported by a young member of the underground who reached Florida August 1. Using only his war name, "Tardeo," he told of seeing some 200 uniformed Russians in 30 trucks who killed 6 Cuban freedom fighters and captured 34 in Pinar del Rio Province on July 26.

The second recent outrage was reported direct to President John F. Kennedy on August 7 by Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo, former Chairman of the United Nations Security Council. The respected diplomat, who is living in Fort Lauderdale, wired the President:

"I must assume the responsibility of notifying you that in the caves of the Mercedes Estate, Matanzas Province, 200 Cubans who had sought refuge there, including women and children, were murdered with lethal gas. The Cuban militia was ordered to do so by Russian officers."

The silence from Washington has been deafening.

Yet the President himself has said that this country would not tolerate use of the Russian garrison in Cuba to stamp out a patriot uprising as in Hungary.

Now comes a Communist invasion of a British Bahaman island under the eyes of the U.S. Coast Guard and fighter planes. And they didn't even radio British authori-

ties while the kidnaping was being committed.

Where will the United States draw the line, if anywhere?

Insurers Widen Coverage of Aged To Kill J.F.K. Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 11, 1963, by Eve Edstrom entitled "Insurers Widen Coverage of Aged To Kill J.F.K. Plan."

The article very well indicates that in their enthusiasm to prevent hospitalization for the aged within the framework of social security many of the Blue Cross plans and other private insurers are offering fiscally irresponsible and actuarially unsound programs of health insurance which require either deficit financing or subsidy by other policyholders for the special programs for the aged offered.

INSURERS WIDEN COVERAGE OF AGED TO KILL J.F.K. PLAN

(By Eve Edstrom)

The ammunition to kill President Kennedy's health insurance plan for the aged is being stockpiled now.

In a radical departure from past practices, private health insurers are offering policies to anyone over 65 without requiring medical examinations or, in some instances, answers to questions about health.

By the time the crucial battle over social security financing of health care is fought later this year, or in 1964, the private insurers hope to prove that a national health plan is not needed because so many of the elderly have protection.

Yet supporters of President Kennedy's social security method insist that the health insurers' ammunition could backfire.

There are two major areas of concern: how many oldsters can afford the policies, and how long the companies can afford to include the oldsters without jacking up current premium rates.

The new comprehensive hospital and medical policies—known as guaranteed insurance because insurers "guarantee" protection to persons whether they are in good or ill health—cost from $10 to $20 a month.

For an aged man and wife, this could mean an expenditure of $40 a month, $480 annually—or almost one-fifth of $2,530, which is the median income of aged couples in the United States.

COST FACTOR

To overcome the cost factor, many of the new plans are being presented to family members of the aged.

"Sons, daughters, and relatives may enroll loved ones 65 or over (without the signature of insured)," the "New York 65" health insurance plan states.

It is estimated that between 25 to 30 percent of the new policies are paid for by persons other than the aged.

This, in itself, points up an inconsistency in the arguments of foes of social security financing. They have said it is unfair to burden today's workers with social security taxes to pay for the care of the Nation's 17½ million aged.

Yet not only are some sons and daughters picking up the tab for the new insurance policies but it appears that other means to subsidize the plans will be necessary to maintain their solvency.

A spokesman for the nonprofit Blue Cross plans, which began offering the "guaranteed over-64 insurance" last fall, states that "insuring everyone over 65 is a losing business that must be subsidized somehow."

A $555,000 DEFICIT

And "Connecticut 65"—the first State plan, and under which 32 health insurance companies banded together to pool the risk and issue joint policies—paid out $555,000 more than it collected during its first 15 months of operation.

In addition, member companies did not receive an anticipated allowance of $54,848 for their own expenses and risk. However, part of the deficit is attributed to expenses involved in developing the plan and will not recur.

The statewide pool plans are expanding. New York and Massachusetts followed Connecticut's lead and California is expected to have such a plan in operation next year.

Numerous other States either have legislation to establish the plans, or are drafting it. Legislation is necessary so that the plans will not violate antitrust laws. Most of the State plans, as well as those of the private companies, aim at break-even operations.

Of the more than 80 companies which issued the new over-65 policies in 1962, only Continental Casualty of Chicago claims a profit: about 1 percent on gross premium incomes from the more than 1 million subscribers to its "Golden 65" plan. It states that administrative costs are greatly reduced by offering a prepackaged policy to all subscribers instead of tailoring insurance to each individual.

In addition, most of the health plans which protect the aged regardless of physical condition keep costs down by selling the insurance during limited enrollment periods.

For example, the Blue Cross senior citizen plan was offered to Maryland's oldsters during only 20 days in June and without advance notice. Such limited enrollment periods are designed to obtain a reasonable cross section of risks. Continuous enrollment would attract oldsters in urgent need of health care.

The health insurers insist that they are well on their way to meeting the present demand for providing health protection for the aged.

They note that the number of aged with some type of health insurance has increased from 3.4 million to 9.5 million (55 percent of the total) in the last decade.

But many of the 9.5 million have only minimum coverage. Only 2 million are covered by the new plans.

And although the number of insured aged has risen, the number of uninsured has not decreased as dramatically because of the increase in the Nation's aged population.

In 1952, there were 9.5 million uninsured. In 1962, there still were 8 million uninsured.

For oldsters of the future, the health insurers State protection will be available because of the increasing trend in employee group health insurance plans to provide coverage after retirement. The Health Insurance Institute reports that four out of every five employees covered under such policies issued last year have the right to retain their health coverage when they retire.

Consequently, a Health Insurance Institute spokesman states that the Federal Government should not become involved in a permanent health care program to deal with an interim problem.

But an administration spokesman said the basic issue is whether part of the cost of health protection after 65 should be paid through social security during an employee's productive years or whether it should be paid out of reduced retirement income.

Although the social security method has been labeled "medicare," the legislation actually is designed to pay for the cost of hospital care and related health services. It does not cover physicians' care nor does it change the existing doctor-patient relationship.

Under the social security hospital insurance bill, those over 65 would have the choice of these hospitalization plans:

A maximum of 45 days of hospital care for each period of illness at no cost to the patient.

A maximum of 90 days of hospital care with the patient paying $10 a day for the first 9 days.

A maximum of 180 days of hospital care with the patient paying the average cost (about $92.50) for the first 2½ days.

In addition to the hospitalization benefits, the social security plan would provide:

Skilled nursing home care for 180 days following hospitalization at no cost to the patient.

Home health benefits such as visits from nurses or physical therapists, for a maximum of 240 visits during a calendar year.

Outpatient hospital diagnostic benefits in excess of the first $20 for all diagnostic studies made during a 30-day period.

The above benefits would be financed by an increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in social security contributions for both employees and employers, and an increase in the taxable earnings base from $4,800 to $5,200.

The maximum that an employee would pay for the benefits would be $17.68 a year. An average employee, earning $4,800 a year, would pay $12 a year.

In contrast to the $1 monthly cost of the social security coverage, the "New York 65" policyholder pays $19 a month for two policies.

One policy, called Regular Basic, pays hospital bills up to $18 a day for 31 days, miscellaneous hospital charges up to $150, nonsurgical doctors' fees up to $145, and surgery costs up to $250.

The second policy, called Major Medical, begins paying hospital and nursing home costs after the regular basic benefits have been exhausted. Major medical pays a maximum benefit of $3,600 for each hospital confinement. Total maximum benefits during any policyholder's lifetime cannot exceed $10,000.

Similar coverage in three policies is offered by Continental Casualty at a cost of $21 monthly. Its basic policy provides $10 a day hospitalization for 31 days and a maximum of $200 for surgery. This is supplemented by two major medical policies which cover up to $10,000 hospital, nursing home and surgical expenses and up to $5,000 for out-of-hospital costs such as doctors' visits and drugs.

But as the National Council of Citizens points out, such policies "contain plenty of large holes through which the senior citizens' already inadequate finances can drain." For example, the $10 daily hospital benefit is not too much help when the average daily hospital cost is $35.

Consequently, the council argues that if the aged had basic hospitalization protection under the social security system, they then could afford to purchase private insurance for doctors' care, prescribed drugs and other medical needs not included in the Administration's measure.

"Thus Government and private insurance could play complementary roles in meeting the need," the council states.

"The role of the Government in the health insurance area, just as it is in the area of retirement income, would be to provide a guarantee of basic protection for the aged

through the Nation's social insurance system.

"The role of private insurance would be to build supplementary protection on this base. Neither can do an adequate job alone, but in partnership the result could be a new level of security for our people in their retirement years."

Licensing Procedures in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I am always interested in worthwhile suggestions for improvement of the organization and operation of the District of Columbia government.

In the August issue of the District of Columbia Bar Association Journal, there appears an article by Marion Edwyn Harrison, Esq., a partner in the law firm of Reeves & Harrison, entitled "Licensing Procedures in the District of Columbia." As a part of my remarks, I include two news articles, one each from the Washington Post and the Evening Star of August 5, and an editorial from the Washington Post of August 6, all on the same subject. Mr. Harrison's article itself, while well worth reading, is rather lengthy for inclusion in the RECORD. It is, however, available for a nominal fee from the District of Columbia Bar Association office, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

It is possible that the matters about which Mr. Harrison writes should be scrutinized by our committee. The Bar Association of the District of Columbia has for some years been seeking approval of a proposed administrative procedure code for the District of Columbia. At the appropriate time, our committee may want to consider very carefully the proposals of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. In the meantime, as the Washington Post editorial points out, the District of Columbia Commissioners appear to have authority to make necessary changes in many areas, and they might be well advised to do so to the extent of that authority.

I should like to commend the bar association generally and Mr. Harrison particularly for their efforts toward improvement of governmental procedures in our Nation's Capital.

The material follows:

THE LICENSE LAWS

"As folk ballads vary from singer to singer and from generation to generation," Marion E. Harrison writes in the current Journal of the District Bar Association, "so in large measure District Government licensing procedures are somewhat informal and sometimes erratic." The bar association has urged for years a thorough reform of the accretion of rules that comprise the District's license law.

That association has drafted a bill upon which hearings, in the House, have now been held. The District Corporation Counsel trenchantly objects that the bill provides no improvement that the District Commissioners themselves cannot enact. In this city, of course, it is unwise in the extreme to seek congressional legislation where any alternative exists. A misjudgment, once sealed into law by Congress, is likely to be with us forever. The Commissioners would be well advised to proceed promptly, with the assistance of the bar association, to establish by their own considerable authority the uniform and equitable procedures that the rising standards of municipal regulation make increasingly necessary.

DISRICT OF COLUMBIA LICENSING PROCEDURES HIT BY BAR REPORT

(By Jerry Doolittle)

A survey of District government licensing procedures in the August issue of the District of Columbia Bar Association Journal finds them often "informal," "erratic," and "vague or incomplete."

To sum up his findings, lawyer Marion Edwyn Harrison ended his article with a quote from the Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám:

"To grasp this Sorry Scheme of Things entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits—and then
Remold it nearer to the Heart's Desire!"

For some 10 years the bar association has been trying to make uniform the city's licensing procedures and has drafted a bill to that effect. Harrison backed such a bill in his article.

But Corporation Counsel Chester Gray, the city's legal officer, has held that the District Commissioners already have the authority to do the job if it seems necessary.

Harrison wrote that what procedural rules there are in most sections of the Department of Occupations and Professions "contain little or no exposition of one's rights, few procedural details, inadequate references to the availability and types of hearings, no hint as to appellate review, vague or incomplete statements as to applicable standards and no reference to statutory citations."

He came to no conclusion on the administrative procedures followed by the Department of Licenses and Inspections, except to note that it was good to find that set procedures did exist.

But he found the situation in the Department of Occupations and Professions far less orderly.

The Department consists of 22 boards, commissions and committees set up separately by Congress to regulate fields as varied as cosmetology and undertaking. Of the 22, Harrison said, 14 have no rules of procedure at all.

Of these 14, the Harrison report noted only that "There is very little to say * * * execpt to say they should have rules."

Of the eight which do have rules, Harrison wrote that only those of the Practical Nurses' Board approach adequacy.

In the remaining seven, he said, "The quality of these rules varies considerably as does their scope. Not all would readily be recognized as rules if they were not so entitled."

Lawrence E. Duvall, Director of the Department of Occupations and Professions, was out of town yesterday and unavailable for comment.

Harrison noted, however, that the law specifies that Duvall could deal only with administration, fiscal matters, and housekeeping anyway.

The report did not cover zoning or liquor licensing. It is the first in a series planned by the administrative law section of the District of Columbia Bar Association.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LICENSE PROCESSES INFORMAL, STUDY FINDS

Licensing procedures in the District are characterized as "somewhat informal and sometimes erratic" in an article in the August issue of the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

But the study, written by Attorney Marion Edwyn Harrison, added that "these qualities are not necessarily noted as deficiencies."

The study concerned the Department of Licenses and Inspections and the Department of Occupations and Professions.

Mr. Harrison concluded that the various boards, committees and commissions of occupations and professions licensing "must inevitably publish systematic and coordinated rules which fulfill the established requirements of the law of administrative procedure."

The procedures of Licenses and Inspections were described as "simpler and more coordinated" by Mr. Harrison.

The varied collection of committees, commissions and boards in occupations and professions "stems partially from the collection of statutory enactments, seemingly created almost willy-nilly by Congress," Mr. Harrison wrote.

He wrote further that this was also caused partly because the committees, commissions and boards "do not appear to correlate their activities or, unduly, to be aware of the existence of each other."

He noted that the proposed administrative code for the District, to make uniform the city's licensing procedures, would eliminate several statutory peculiarities.

Fairplay in Staffing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, August 18, which I believe states the case for more equitable staffing of congressional committees in a most realistic and persuasive way. I commend it to our colleagues as further evidence of the growing public interest in what many of us believe is an issue of crucial importance to the future of an effective two-party system in Congress:

THE GREAT STAFF STEAL

It's in committee that Congress does most of its work, and it is on the committee staffs that individual Congresmen have to place their chief reliance for legislative assistance. If one party hogs the bulk of the committee staffs, that party has a lopsided advantage over the opposition.

This is precisely the condition that prevails in Congress today, and against which a small band of Republicans has been waging a long but largely unsuccessful fight.

Committee staffing may seem a parochial issue, but it cuts to the heart of the legislative process and of the two-party system. When one party controls all the vast staff resources of the executive branch, and also maintains a disproportionate control over the legislative staff, what chance does the opposition have to oppose effectively? Staff assistance, loyal and responsible to the minority members, is essential if the opposition is to find the flaws in the majority proposals under committee consideration and to develop responsible alternatives.

Theoretically, most congressional committee staff members are nonpartisan. But they are under the control of the committee

chairman, always a member of the majority and usually a skilled political partisan.

It is impossible to divide most of the committee staffs definitely into minority, majority and nonpartisan members; the lines are often blurred. But a study of Senate staffs made last spring by the Legislative Reference Service, at the joint request of Majority Leader MANSFIELD, and Minority Leader DIRKSEN, came up with these ratios of majority to minority professional staff—which are typical—on several Senate committees: 2:0; 2:1; 3:2; 4:1; 5:1; 12:1. Is this fair to the minority? Is it fair to the public, which can't have effective two-party government unless both parties have the resources needed to function?

The Democrats, who control both houses, have stubbornly refused to yield up this partisan plum. But if enough of the public cried out for fairplay, they might conclude there was some political advantage to playing fair.

Humane Treatment of Animals in Experiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced H.R. 5430, a bill which would establish procedures to insure that animals used for experiments conducted by or for the Federal Government be humanely treated. At that time I expected the ridicule of those who do not understand that the imposition of needless pain and suffering on animals corrupts those who practice it and disgraces those who permit it. What I did not realize was the enormous support, reflected in the hundreds of letters which I have received, for a humane treatment program that recognizes all the legitimate needs of scientific research.

Recognition of an approach that recognizes the needs of science with the impulse toward humanity is shared by hundreds of millions of Americans. The subject is one to which responsible publications and other media are devoting more and more attention. The following editorials, broadcast on July 30 and August 5 of this year, reflect the concern of well-informed, responsible people and the need for prompt congressional action:

WCCO–TV, JULY 30, 1963

On Saturday and Sunday, on this newscast, channel 4's reporter Pete Hively brought you the pros and cons of a current argument over proposed Federal legislation on the use of animals in scientific experiments.

Let's get one thing straight from the start. We do not oppose animal experimentation. It is necessary and it can serve a high purpose. We do not agree with those who allow sentiment to so obscure their good sense that they would halt or cripple research for the sake of saving animals discomfort or pain.

But, neither do we believe that all those who raise their voices in protest against certain practices in connection with experimentation are "sentimental nuts," or "fuzzy thinkers" or that they can be lumped under the terms "antivivisectionists" or "neo-antivivisectionists."

We believe there is incontrovertible evidence that there is enough neglect, cruelty, and inflicted pain, outside the scope or needs of the actual research to warrant support of the proposed legislation.

We are talking about conditions in which animals are kept in some laboratories; about the conditions in which they are often kept at animal collection stations; about the care they receive before and after the experiments have been performed, and about needlessly repetitive and duplicated experiments. Testimony before Congress has proven, it seems to us, that there are glaring instances of abuses.

The scientists tell us that it is necessary sometimes to inflict pain on animals; that it far better than a dog shall suffer so that a child shall not. We must agree. But when pain or suffering is inflicted through carelessness, neglect or callous indifference, there can be no defense—even if the subject is only a dog.

EDITORIAL PRESENTED ON WCCO–TV NEWS, AUGUST 5, 1963

The response to our editorial of the other evening, calling for support of legislation to control the use of animals in experimental laboratories, has been heavy.

The letters and cards and the little bunches of clippings have not come from fuzzy sentimentalists or unrealistic antivivisectionists. They have come, for the most part, from persons quite aware of the need to use animals for scientific purposes, persons whose only concern is that the animals get ordinarily thoughtful care and are spared the needless pain and suffering caused by neglect, by indifference, and by experiments that serve no honest purpose.

One letter, however, came from a viewer who apparently got the impression we were against laboratory use of animals. We repeat that we are not.

At the end of her letter, in which she detailed some important medical research done through use of animals, she expressed strong opposition to the proposed legislation and added that one of the research workers is now "working to promote proper care and use of experimental animals without Government intervention."

This is a rather revealing statement. It seems to admit the need for "proper care and use of animals," while opposing laws to effect this as "Government intervention."

It is the Government—in other words, the people through their Government—who pay much if not most of the cost of scientific research these days. Few scientific voices object to this kind of government intervention. If the Government pays the bills, is it not reasonable to expect that it should be interested in the conditions under which its money is spent?

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 18th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

In my speech to the House recorded on pages 13064–13065 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 31, 1963, I stated in clear unmistakable language that the slogan "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out," which was a part of the heading on earlier articles of this series, came from a chance remark of a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies. In his remarks on page A5237 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1963, my colleague from southern Idaho questioned the veracity of my statement when he said the power companies were the sources of my title and that the title did come from Idaho, the Idaho Power Co. This I categorically deny as not having a shred of truth to it. I again repeat my true and factual statement from my speech on July 31, 1963:

Actually, the slogan "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out" was not my own composition but was coined from a chance remark made by a southern Idahoan who has no connection whatsoever with the power companies. The slogan immediately appealed to me.

Furthermore, I have neither corresponded with nor talked to any official or employee of the Idaho Power Co. relative to editorials, letters, or any other matter regarding Secretary Udall's order extending Bonneville's power-marketing area into southern Idaho.

As a free-born American, I have always opposed the expansion of the socialistic Federal power empire regardless of the river basin it might be in. Subsidized, tax-free competition of the Federal Government with taxpaying power companies is neither right nor proper in any section of the country.

As ranking minority member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I feel that I have a duty and an obligation to expose and oppose the unwarranted and untenable action of Interior Secretary Udall in ordering the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho, when I feel—as I do—that such action is totally unjustified, and is inimical to the best interest of the Nation as a whole and of the area involved. It is part and parcel of the Kennedy administration's plan to extend the socialistic Federal power empire to all sections of the country.

With regard to the purported undated letter of a division manager of the Idaho Power Co., saying I invite people to write me regarding their thinking on Bonneville power, I solemnly swear that I neither requested nor had any knowledge of such an invitation or letter being sent out. The context of the purported letter discloses that it was written long after I had started using the heading "Southern Idaho's New Slogan: Bonneville, Please Include Us Out." The key to this is the reference in the letter to an editorial from the Boise Statesman regarding a recent statement of Lloyd Walker. It so happens that I have a copy of that editorial, which was published in the Idaho Daily Statesman on July 28, 1963. This editorial was in my possession on July 31, 1963, when I presented my rebuttal to the attack on me

by the gentleman from southern Idaho. The editorial in question also related to southern Idaho's objection to the invasion by Bonneville but it contained so many derogatory references to the character and honesty of the gentleman from southern Idaho that I refrained from using it or making reference to it.

It is fully evident from the facts that here is a deliberate attempt to use a letter written long after I had coined the slogan "Bonneville, Please Include Us Out," in order to question the veracity of my straightforward statement on the origin of that slogan. I must therefore make reference to the editorial in question and say that it is readily understandable why an editorial so derogatory of him was not included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my colleague from southern Idaho.

In order that I may have the facts for the record relative to this purported letter, I have sent the following letter to the president of the Idaho Power Co.:

AUGUST 19, 1963.

Mr. TOM ROACH,
President, Idaho Power Co.,
Boise, Idaho.

DEAR MR. ROACH: Enclosed is a copy of the remarks of Congressman HARDING, of Idaho, which were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, 1963. In view of the fact that I have neither written nor talked to you or any other official or employee of Idaho Power Co. relative to Secretary Udall's extension of the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho, I am placing a categorical denial of Congressman HARDING'S accusations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Will you please have the matter looked into and advise me if the purported letter was sent out, and if so, what was the date and why did your division manager assume the authority for issuing invitations for letters in my name?

I fully realize that your company has an outstanding record of service at rates well below the national average and that you have loyal employees who naturally resent the invasion of southern Idaho by a subsidized, tax-free Federal power empire that is now operating with multimillion dollar annual losses. Nevertheless, I do not want nor need the help of an overzealous employee of your company in extending invitations in my name for letters about Bonneville.

The flood of letters and editorials I have received and the context thereof indicates to me that there is a widespread buildup of grassroots opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. Here is no stereotyped letter campaign but the varied personalized opinion of a people concerned with the unwarranted extension of a Federal bureaucracy which can only have an adverse effect on their area and lives. The letters have come from all walks of life and I shall continue to utilize them and the editorials and statements of responsible organizations opposing Secretary Udall's unwarranted action as long as that opposition is maintained.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR.

In conclusion I present two letters from my mounting pile which are illustrative of the individual opinion of southern Idahoans who object to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. First, a letter from a schoolteacher with a farming background who has lived in southern Idaho for over 60 years. Here is the reasoning and the opinion of a studious man who has lived close to the soil:

BLACKFOOT, IDAHO,
August 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your address listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, "Proceedings and Debates of the 88th Congress, 1st Session," Volume 109, No. 102, under date of July 8, 1963, came to my attention and was read with keen interest and appreciation. This address questioned the advisability and need and cost of extending Bonneville power into southern Idaho. Your questions were pertinent, your reasoning logical, and your conclusions practical.

I've lived in southern Idaho over 60 years and paid taxes most of my adult life. An agricultural background and with about 35 years of schoolteaching experience and a keen interest in the development and future of southern Idaho—have given me some strong feelings as to our needs and possible prospects.

Idaho is a comparatively large State geographically but sparsely settled, so there are few taxpayers and also few power users. We do well to support one set of public utilities. Local rail service has been reduced in recent years to a marked degree. Telephone service lags necessarily in most southern Idaho areas because of low population and many miles. Power service likewise is in low demand and despite reasonable industrial expansion it seems ridiculous to bring in an additional competitive public utility such as Bonneville power even if it could be done at no construction cost.

I favor legislative, administrative, and normal business support of existing utilities so that they may survive, expand, serve, and pay taxes to assist in meeting Idaho's financial and growth needs rather than spending more tax money to bring in what we don't need, can't afford, and what would reduce current utilities ability to reduce rates, and pay taxes and all at the expense of the "You Know Who's" in Idaho, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere.

Your efforts to block BPA's extension into southern Idaho is sincerely appreciated. May you have adequate help in this endeavor is my personal hope.

Respectfully yours,

IRVEN CHRISTENSEN.

The second letter is from a newspaperman who is fully aware of the complete lack of justification for Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho. His letter follows:

THE TIMES-NEWS,
Twin Falls, Idaho, August 6, 1936.

Hon JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which carries your presentation of your ideas concerning the BPA which is slated to be brought into southern Idaho. Your arguments follow my line of reasoning in this respect and I wish to strongly commend you for such a masterful presentation and stand.

One does not have to be a Harvard economist to understand that when a source of tax revenue is cut off the remaining sources have to carry this additional load. Further than this it is frightening to know that this is but one step more in being eventually submerged in a Federal autocracy. And then what?

Yours sincerely,

E. BORDEWICK.

Senator Kuchel Can Read the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the 1958 Military Pay Act, a situation has existed wherein those who retired on May 31, 1958, received considerably less retired pay than those of equal rank and service who retired 1 day later. This has created a situation where those who were discriminated against when the 100-year tradition of recomputation was violated without notice have repeatedly voiced their strong feelings with the Congress.

This is why the House adopted the Rivers amendment to allow those who retired prior to June 1, 1958, the privilege of recomputation. In effect, the House voted to equalize the retired pay of those who retired before and after June 1, 1958.

The Senate amended the bill so that the discrimination between these two groups will continue. During the Senate debate, Senator KUCHEL attempted to gain information regarding the relative status of these two groups. Since there has been some confusion regarding the reply he received as compared to the printed version in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit herewith an article written by an eye witness who heard the Senate debate. The article appeared in the August 17 issue of the Army Navy Air Force Journal and Register:

SENATOR KUCHEL CAN READ THE ANSWER

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican of California, made a valiant effort to get at the facts, but fell under an avalanche of snow during Senate debate on the military pay bill.

He was seeking an answer to a significant question about retirement recomputation: Will two officers of the same rank and length of service "be treated differently" in computing their retired pay under the Senate bill if one retired May 31, 1958, the other on June 1, 1958?

The answer he eventually received, after repeated demands, sounded reasonable. He accepted it.

Senator HOWARD CANNON, Democrat of Nevada, listened to whispered comment from Armed Services Committee Counsel T. Edward Braswell, Jr., and then told Senator KUCHEL that, under the terms of the Senate bill, both officers will be entitled to compute their retired pay on the 1958 pay scales.

This is not quite the case.

The May retiree will be entitled to compute his retired pay on the 1958 scales only if recomputation gives him an increase of more than 5 percent. Many will not qualify for recomputation. But, whichever amount the May retiree receives—recomputation or 5 percent—he still will get less than the June retiree.

This is what Senator KUCHEL wanted to know. The answer implied that there will be no difference.

When the debate was printed, Senator CANNON'S answer had been modified to show that the "one difference" does exist.

By then, however, it was too late for Senator KUCHEL. All he could do was read the printed reply. The bill had been passed.

Mr. Braswell, sitting at Senator CANNON'S side during the debate, could have supplied the correct facts when the question arose.

What does the "one difference" mean?

Here's an example: A colonel or Navy captain retired with 21 years' service on May 31, 1958, will receive $5,465, under the Senate bill; the June retiree will get $5,735.90. Both would have received the latter amount under the House bill. The difference for the May retiree is a loss of $270.90 annually.

Career Compensation Act retirees currently consist of two classes: those retired before and those retired after the 1958 Pay Act. The House language would have eliminated the second-class status of thousands of officers and enlisted. The Senate bill will perpetuate the distinction and assure that Senator KUCHEL and other Congressmen will continue to get mail on the subject for a long time to come.

As the article shows, the discrimination between retirees of equal service and rank who retired before and after June 1, 1958, is definitely continued by the Senate amendment.

The Property Tax and Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, writing in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Raymond Moley has some interesting thoughts to express on the subject of property taxes and the urgent need for reforming the property tax system, and especially its method of assessing the value of property.

In doing so, Mr. Moley refers to a study made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

In view of the importance of the subject and of the Commission's study, and its significance in terms of developing a more perfect Federal Union, I include Mr. Moley's article as a part of my remarks:

[New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 18, 1963]

A FORGOTTEN TAX SOURCE

(By Raymond Moley)

In one of his debates with Richard Nixon in 1960, John F. Kennedy said that the property tax was practically exhausted as a source of revenue. On this assumption he advocated vast new Federal expenditures for local facilities such as public schools.

It is a pity that Mr. Nixon did not remind his opponent that it was the Federal income tax, not the property tax, which had reached the point of diminishing returns. Mr. Kennedy has admitted that in asking for tax rate reductions this year.

The soundest of all principles of taxation, expounded ever since Adam Smith, is that a tax should bear as lightly as possible on the source of production. From this, the inference can be drawn that the best and most equitable tax is one which bears heavily upon unearned wealth. Let us bring this principle home to our great urban centers which are demanding so many Federal handouts for local improvements.

Those cities and their suburbs have not grown efficiently and attractively. They have sprawled over great areas, with much of the land therein either vacant or occupied only by obsolete buildings.

A major reason for this is inequity in taxation. Property taxes almost universally are levied upon both buildings and the land under the buildings. Generally the land is underassessed and new improvements are overassessed for tax purposes.

This enables holders of unused land and slum property to reap profits as the communities grow around them. Show me a vacant piece of land or a slum, and I will show you that the owner is speculating on getting a large profit when he sells—an unearned profit.

Most of the great American fortunes in the past and to a degree in the present have been made by holders of land. They have not improved the community. They have profited by the growth of large populations in their areas.

To cure this inequity and to raise more money for local services such as schools, hospitals, and streets and also to stimulate private housing, two factors should be considered. The State and local laws should differentiate between the tax on land and the tax on improvements. Also, in the assessing of property, a heavier burden should rest upon land and lighter burdens should be placed upon improvements.

Since the more immediate method of reform is in assessments, a very comprehensive study is about to be issued on the subject by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The new study is on the reform of the property tax. The commission's report points out that the amount raised now from the property tax is more than $20 billion. The assessed value of property subject to the tax, determined by assessors throughout the country, is more than $350 billion. But this represents a market value of three times that amount, or more than a trillion dollars.

With this vast wealth now underassessed and inequitably taxed, the commission regards reform in assessments as a major step toward shifting responsibility back to the States and local communities.

At the present time the business of assessments is probably the most unsatisfactory of all Government operations. Assessors are in large part elective. Assessments are ridden with favoritism, special considerations which are not relevant to raising revenue and the lack of training and the incompetence of assessors.

A major need is to establish assessment machinery by State law so that assessors will be trained, professional people removed as far as possible from local political or economic interests.

It is hoped that by such reforms it may be possible to check the growth of Federal control of local affairs. Essentially, the money for all revenues—Federal, State and local—is in the local communities. A first call upon revenues there is to care for local needs. For there is no point in complaining about the centralization of power in Washington as long as there is a lack of disposition or ability on the part of States and cities to shoulder their own burdens.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

A Place in History for Senator Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, back in 1952 an economist from Denver University and another from Pennsylvania State made a rating based on expert judgment as to the most competent men in the U.S. Senate. A group of political scientists specializing in legislation of different political faiths and geographical locations were asked for their opinion based in personal intelligence, grasp of issues, legislative ability, and personal integrity. The Philadelphia Bulletin of February 29, 1952, listed those selected as the 10 best. I will mention only the top two for the purpose of inserting articles and editorials in tribute to the late Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee.

Senator Kefauver at that time was selected as the second best of our national legislators, the top selection being Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois.

Since 1952 Senator Kefauver has become better known to people in all parts of the Nation as a man of high principles, integrity, and dedication to the public welfare. He has made an excellent record that will go down in history. His stature is sure to grow with passing time.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks the following editorials and newspaper articles which pay well-deserved tributes to the courageous Senator from Tennessee:

[From Newsweek]

PEOPLE'S CHOICE

Tennessee's Carey Estes Kefauver provided many a surprise. As an obscure Congressman he surprised a powerful foe, Memphis' late Boss Ed Crump, by vaulting into the U.S. Senate in 1948. A nation, too, was soon surprised that Tennessee should produce such a crusading liberal, an anomaly in a South best known for its Bilbos and Eastlands and Ross Barnetts. Kefauver was such a big man, 6 foot 3 and 200 pounds, that new acquaintances were apt to be surprised to find that he spoke with an extraordinarily gentle voice.

Not surprisingly, Estes Kefauver was quietly fighting the Nation's mammoth communications industry in the Senate last Thursday. To allow private business to profit freely from publicly financed satellite developments, he argued, was sheer giveaway. Kefauver had to retire from the debate, feeling what he believed to be severe indigestion. But doctors at Bethesda Naval Hospital diagnosed something more serious—a heart attack—and promptly ordered Kefauver to bed. The next night, as his red-haired wife, Nancy, and two of their four children were flying in from a Colorado vacation to be with him, the main artery from the Senator's heart ruptured. Estes Kefauver, at 60, was dead.

He had come a long way from the plain, dusty country town of Madisonville, Tenn., where, working hard on his father's dairy farm, he became strong enough to push the caps off soft-drink bottles with his thumb. Even as a boy, Kefauver knew what the country was to learn well in 1952 and 1956. "My ambition is to be President of the United States," he wrote at 17, in a classmate's friendship book.

Kefauver came tantalizing close to realizing his boyhood dream in 1952, when he led the first two ballots at the Democratic National Convention. Tirelessly, he had stumped the Nation, winning 14 of 17 State primaries with virtually no organization. His was a campaign of perpetual-motion handshakes, a wide, friendly, jack-o'-lantern smile, and a simple soft-spoken declaration: "My name's Estes Kefauver, and I'm running for President of the United States." The folksy technique proved insufficient. Organized politicians two times turned back Kefauver in favor of Adlai Stevenson. But the Keef, as some friends spoke of him, beat out John F. Kennedy for the consolation prize, second spot on the ticket, in 1956.

By then Kefauver's place as a national figure had long since been assured. Millions of Americans got to know his long-jawed, wide-mouthed face in 1950–51 during televised hearings held by his Senate Crime Investigating Committee; many of the country's biggest racketeers were hauled before it. More recently Kefauver's Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee has investigated drug-pricing practices and criminal connections in professional boxing.

Whoever wins in the jockeying for the seat, nobody is likely to take Kefauver's place.

To many Americans—though he was a Yale Law School man—Kefauver would always remain the gangling, handshaking backwoodsman who campaigned for the U.S. Senate wearing a coonskin hat. It was a trademark he adopted after Boss Crump, whose opposition usually meant political death in Tennessee, said Kefauver reminded him of a pet coon that looks in one direction while reaching in another for what it really wants. Kefauver promptly put on his coonskin cap and gave the epithet reverse English. "I may be a pet coon," he said, "but I'm not Mr. Crump's pet coon."

Kefauver, in truth, was nobody's pet coon. His mulish independence and formidable courage (in 1954 he stood alone to vote against passage of the bill outlawing the Communist Party) made him a political loner, in fact, a maverick that the inner circle of the Senate could never quite accept as one of its own. "He would always stand up for what he thought was right," one colleague said, "but that doesn't make you a member of the club." And the same qualities of mind that alienated some of his southern colleagues made the national machine politicians shy away from him as he sought the Presidency.

Perhaps Keef's finest epitaph was uttered after the 1952 Democratic convention when all his primary victories went for naught.

"Estes' trouble," said one politician, "is that nobody loves him but the people."

MEMORY OF KEFAUVER HONORED BY AFL–CIO

President George Meany of the AFL–CIO announced this week, at the opening of the federation's executive council meeting in Unity Park, Pa., that the annual Murray-Green award had been conferred on Senator Estes Kefauver for his outstanding work in exposing and curbing abuses in the drug field. Also, the council adopted a resolution mourning his passing.

The award—of $5,000 and a medal—was decided upon prior to Kefauver's death, but will be presented posthumously. It is granted in memory of the late William Green and Philip Murray, who were presidents of the AFL and of the CIO, respectively.

[From the Evening Star]

HE WAS A SYMBOL TO PLAIN PEOPLE—SENATOR KEFAUVER'S LIBERALISM VIEWED AS AN INSTINCT TO HELP THE LITTLE MAN

(By Charles Bartlett, Washington Star Columnist)

Senator Estes Kefauver combined oxlike strength with an extremely gentle spirit, and his sudden death at 60 is a testimony to the demanding rigors of American public life.

Senator Kefauver played his political role with far more drive and thoroughness than most politicians. His campaigns in the presidential primaries of 1952 and 1956 set a pace that none of his competitors could emulate. He applied awesome stamina and bold daring to achieve a degree of national support that astounded the hierarchy of the Democratic Party.

He became in these travels a symbol to plain people in small towns who had been attracted by his crusade against the mobsters and found assurance in his unadorned, halting manner. He was one of them who had left his own small town and gone forth to slay the dragons in the cities.

The significance of Senator Kefauver's grueling forays into national politics lay less in his ultimate capture in 1956 of the Democratic vice presidential nomination than in his awakening of many small people to the potential of their strength in politics. He set a pattern of handshaking through the grassroots and passing along the factory workbenches which has since been emulated by a majority of the successful candidates for office.

His untimely death is almost certainly a consequence of these exertions, which became a physical ordeal of massive proportions as he moved from State to State to contend, with bare financial backing, against the party organizations. An incredibly robust man when he began, Estes Kefauver never seemed as hearty after it was over.

His odysseys underlined the points that running for President is forbiddingly expensive and that the present random pattern of primaries is a haphazard method of selecting nominees for the highest office in the land. His experiences will have been the initiating force if Congress someday enacts a national presidential preference primary.

Senator Kefauver did not succeed in national politics because he was a loner, invariably withdrawn in the company of his colleagues, and because he was more liberal than his times. He carried with him a mountaineer's reserve which balked at easy congeniality and often masked a very deep and sincere kindliness.

He seemed to like doing things for people more than he liked talking to them and he never pulled back from the chance to perform a gentle act or remember a friend. Few of his colleagues knew him well, but many of them regarded him as a uniquely human and admirable individual.

His liberalism seemed to stem from an instinct to help the little man and a partiality to causes. He was dogged in his causes and stubborn in pressing them in a hostile climate. He was a populist in his tilts against varying elements of the status quo and he brought qualities of persistence and courage to these ventures which distinguished him among liberals.

At the start of a his presidential campaign in 1952, an overzealous supporter brought a live and angry raccoon in a cage to a Kefauver rally. The coon was his campaign symbol and the photographers pressed around. "Estes, reach in and take him out," someone cried.

No one would cheerfully have braved those teeth for the doubtful advantage of a photograph. But the Senator compressed his lips and complied. This was, like the presidential race itself and many other chapters in Estes Kefauver's career, the gesture of a man who could not bring himself to turn his back on a challenge.

[From Labor-Railroad Labor Publication]

KEFAUVER'S DEATH A GREAT LOSS TO LABOR AND NATION

Railroad workers and all other Americans suffered a heavy loss last week when Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, died in a Washington hospital. A heart attack which at first seemed mild proved fatal.

Kefauver, 60, literally worked himself to death for the public good. In his last 2 days, he led a group of liberal Senators in a strenuous but losing fight against another giveway—this time of $44 million of the taxpayers' money, to the Communications Satellite Corp. dominated by giant American Telephone Co.

After long and hot debate, the Senate passed a $5.5 billion Space Agency authorization bill with the $44 million in it.

Kefauver was serving his third term in the Senate and had previously been in the House for 10 years. In his election campaigns, the wholehearted support of railroad labor and the union movement as a whole helped him overcome powerful opposition by selfish and sometimes sinister interests, who hated him for his courage and independence.

BATTLING FOR RAILMEN

In this session of the Senate, Kefauver was pushing his bill to declare a moratorium on railroad mergers until December 31, 1964, so as to give Congress time to study the shattering effects of the huge mergers on rail employment and the public interest.

Also, he cosponsored legislation for an investigation of railroad finances and ownership. And he cosponsored a resolution for continued negotiations in the big rail work rules dispute under the eye of a watchdog committee of Congress.

These latest actions by Kefauver are typical of the helpful hand he has given to rail workers and labor as a whole many times in the past.

Son of a pioneer Tennessee family, Kefauver won fame as an athlete at the State's university, and was elected president of the student body. He worked his way through Yale Law School, taught and practiced law in Chattanooga, helped win the fight for TVA, and was active in local and State civic affairs until he was elected to the U.S. House, where he served with great distinction.

EXPOSED UNDERWORLD

After moving up to the Senate, Kefauver gained national renown by his investigation of organized crime and its corrupting effects on public morals and politics. Lords of the underworld, and some political leaders, never forgave him for that, and contributed lavishly to the campaign funds of some of his opponents in later elections. Nevertheless, Kefauver always won.

By 1952, Kefauver had gained such national stature that he won 14 of the 17 State presidential primaries, but he lost out to Adlai Stevenson in the party nominating convention. The same thing happened in the 1956 presidential campaign, but he was chosen then as vice-presidential nominee.

FOUGHT MONOPOLISTS

Always a leading fighter for consumers and against monopolists and price fixers, Kefauver conducted famed probes of price rigging in the steel, electrical equipment, drug and other industries. He succeeded in putting new teeth in the antitrust laws and stronger controls over marketing of drugs after the shocking thalidomide scandal broke.

The latest result of his battles in the drug field came on the day he died. The Federal Trade Commission ruled that six big drug manufacturers "conspired to raise and fix prices on tetracyline, the leading antibiotic drug, with sales over $100 million a year."

Success of this illegal conspiracy, the FTC said, was made possible by a patent which "Chas. Pfizer & Co., a giant of the drug industry," obtained by deceiving the U.S. Patent Office. Kefauver, in his reports on his drug probe, always emphasized that misuse of patents is a main foundation for the monopolistic system which makes old and ill people pay exorbitant prices for prescription drugs.

MANY TRIBUTES

Messages of tribute to Kefauver poured in from all over the Nation. Foremost among these was one by President Kennedy. He declared that Kefauver's "devotion to the public interest and the welfare of the people made him a powerful influence." Kennedy added that his death "deprived the Nation of one of its most distinguished leaders."

Some words spoken by one of Shakespeare's characters might well be applied to Estes Kefauver: "He was a man, take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 1963]

THE TALL MAN FROM TENNESSEE

(By Jack Anderson)

If President Kennedy should choose to expand his book, "Profiles in Courage," I suggest he write about the only man who ever bested him in politics, the man who took the vice-presidential nomination away from him in 1956: the late Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee.

This Lincoln of a man, homespun, ungainly, often stood alone in the U.S. Senate. But he stood tall.

Consider these flashbacks. 1956: Kefauver dug deep into his own pocket, mortgaging his home and hiring out as a lecturer, to pay off old campaign bills. Yet, as a presidential candidate in 1956, despite his campaign poverty, he refused a $10,000 contribution with strings attached.

All he had to do was condemn, in a public speech, a United Nations pronouncement against Israel. This would be worth $10,000 to his campaign, he was told. But Kefauver, though pro-Israel, refused to bargain for his contributions. 1954: The late Senator Joe McCarthy threatened to attack Kefauver in Tennessee, painting him as a political pink, if Kefauver accepted an invitation to speak against McCarthy in Wisconsin.

Estes took up the warning with his staff, listened silently as each one begged him not to pick a fight with McCarthy on the eve of the Tennessee elections. He thanked them for their advice, then quietly announced his decision: "McCarthy is bad for the country. I reckon I'll have to say so."

In 1954: Stung by charges they were soft on communism, Democratic Senators introduced a bill to outlaw the Communist Party and dared the Republicans to vote for it. This would have subjected people to prosecution because of their political beliefs.

The Republicans accepted the challenge and lined up unanimously with the Democrats for the bill. Only Kefauver, refusing to play politics, stood against it.

His anguished political advisers warned that his stand would be misinterpreted back home, that he would be called a Red.

"The least you can do," begged a friend, phoning from Tennessee, "is duck out on the vote."

But the final rollcall was 81 to 1; Kefauver was the lone dissenter.

(Later, the bill was pigeonholed after FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover joined Kefauver in warning that it not only would be unconstitutional but would drive the Communists underground.)

In 1952, in the presidential race, Kefauver bucked the party bosses, beat all comers in the primaries, and entered the Democratic convention with the most pledged delegates. Still, he needed more support to win the nomination.

Texas Gov. Allen Shivers, boss of the big Texas delegation, chose this crucial moment to pay a secret call on Kefauver. Shivers wanted to know how the Senator felt about turning the tidelands over to the States, so the big oil companies could drill for oil.

Would Kefauver agree to let Congress decide the issue and not use the veto if he were elected President? No, said Kefauver. Would Kefauver agree to turn offshore oil over to the States within a 3-mile limit? No, Kefauver said again.

Thus Texas slipped irretrievably from his grasp. And he lost the nomination on the third ballot after leading on the first two.

In 1950, digging into organized crime, Kefauver turned over a compost pile of gangland-political connections. Deep in the pile was $2,500 contribution that crime czar Frank Costello had given to the Democratic National Committee in 1947.

"Is this to be brought out at the public hearings?" demanded Democratic leaders.

"It is," said the Senator. And it was.

In 1949, though a southerner, Kefauver managed to stir up the mighty wrath of the South by supporting civil rights legislation. When a resolution was offered to curb Senate filibusters, Kefauver at once announced support for it.

Thus the Senate was treated to the unusual spectacle of a Senator speaking with southern accent against the filibuster.

In 1920, Kefauver came out of the Tennessee hills to the University of Tennessee, a straw suitcase in one hand, a cap perched atop his head. Tightly drawn against his huge bulk was an ill-fitting suit, which seemed red in one light, green in another. Across his chest in a neat row were all the ribbons Estes had accumulated for perfect attendance at Sunday school.

From this unlikely beginning, Estes Kefauver went on to become editor of the college newspaper, president of the junior class, president of the All-Students Club, president of the Southern Federation of College Students, and a football star who earned the affectionate nickname, "Old Ironsides."

He continued on to Yale and academic glory. He became a corporation lawyer, a Congressman, a Senator, and a presidential candidate.

But he never lost touch with the Tennessee hills, with the everyday people who make up the backbone of America.

They are the ones now who will miss him the most.

[From the United Mine Workers Journal]

WE MOURN THE DEATH OF SENATOR KEFAUVER

The UMWA joins with millions of other Americans in mourning the death of Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Senator Kefauver was respected and loved by the common people of America, including the members of organized labor, for his lifelong battle against monopoly power and vested interests in American economic society—and in the U.S. Senate.

The Senator was not a member of "the club," as it is known on Capitol Hill. He was essentially a loner in that he invariably spoke out for the things in which he believed without regard to whose political toes were squashed. He was a fighting liberal in the true sense of that phrase.

In behalf of our union, UMWA President W. A. Boyle sent the following telegram to Mrs. Kefauver:

"The officers and members of the United Mine Workers of America join the millions who mourn the death of your distinguished husband, Senator Estes Kefauver. We offer heartfelt condolences for your personal loss which has deprived the country of a great leader, the Senate of an outstanding Member, and the laboring people of America a true friend and stalwart champion."

Senator Kefauver, who died suddenly on August 10 at the age of 60, had fought all of his political life against the forces of greed and special privilege. He was a longtime friend of the UMWA and working coal miners, and his voting record in Congress down through the years was excellent. The cynical politicians of both political parties liked to picture him as something of a country bumpkin, and with typical good humor the Senator played along with them to a degree.

But the Senator was a man of honor and courage. He will be sorely missed, especially by working people who respected him and admired his intestinal fortitude in the face of much opposition from the so-called wise guys in the Nation's Capitol.

Tribute to Mrs. Mary Dewey, Director, Connecticut State Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in recent months, we have heard and read a great deal about the unemployed youth of America. Mrs. Mary Dewey, the very able director of the Connecticut State Employment Service, has this summer directed a youth employment service which sets an example for us all as to how to deal constructively with them.

With offices in Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven, the service has been helping jobless Connecticut boys and girls get employment through counseling, job training, and placement. Experienced counselors talk to the youngsters, give them aptitude tests, and coordinate each individual's interests and skills with the specific jobs available in the community. Often, a high school dropout has been motivated to complete his education after talking with one of the counselors.

The youth employment service is only a beginning, and can touch only a fraction of the State's unemployed youth. But it is an admirable step in the right direction, and I want to commend Mrs. Dewey for the fine job she is doing. The current issue of Connecticut Life, in an article entitled "Still a Booking Agent," pays her just tribute, and I ask unanimous consent that this article about her to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL A BOOKING AGENT

Mary Dewey, the bright, effervescent, warmhearted idealist who directs the Connecticut State Employment Service, got her first job at age 15.

She let down her skirt, tucked up her hair and landed a position booking vaudeville acts into the Poli Theater in her native Waterbury.

As a job, vaudeville booking has gone the way of horseshoe fitting and ice hauling—and the way operating elevators, ditch digging and thousands of other jobs are going.

The type of booking Mary Dewey must do today is more nimblefooted than any of her Poli acrobrats. Old skills become obsolete. Machines take over unskilled and semiskilled jobs. Then systems analyzers, data processors and other new breeds are needed to run the machines.

And all the while hundreds of thousands of Connecticut youths march on toward the job market, hoping someone will want whatever talents they may have. Each year during the 1950's Connecticut had about 25,000 18-year-olds. The figure jumped to 40,000 last year. It will hit 56,500 in 1975.

Connecticut's 18–24 age group, which includes college graduates entering the labor market, grew only from 192,300 to 193,600 between 1950 and 1960. It will hit 384,400 by 1975.

How to match these multitudes to the increasingly sophisticated jobs that Connecticut industry can be expected to offer has become one of Connecticut's first orders of business.

Governor Dempsey sets almost as much store by the youth commission which the 1963 legislature established as by anything else that passed. This summer the Connecticut State Employment Service set up special youth offices in Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven. They were immediately swamped with thousands of registrants. Many of these could have registered, but didn't, when youngsters signed up in adult centers.

Student art adorned the centers. The initials of the youth employment service—YES—were stamped on everything. One 23-year-old, just too old to register at the youth center, saw his younger friend's application stamped "YES" and wanted to know why he wasn't approved, too.

The gung-ho spirit of the YES reaped one immediate benefit, even before the first job was arranged. Mrs. Dewey said the youngsters behaved much better in their own center than they had when mixed in with adults.

In its first 3 weeks, the youth employment service got 3,565 new applications from youngsters. A total of 652 got extensive counseling; 490 were tested; 701 got jobs. Including old applicants who had been job hunting before the youth offices opened, the YES had 10,461 in its active file.

This, of course, was only a fraction of the young men and women coming into the labor market. More than half of Connecticut youth now go to college. Few college students use the State service, except for summer work. (The CSES does provide close liaison with college placement services.) Thousands of skilled high school graduates get jobs on their own, or through private employment agencies. And some "hard core" dropouts, with a distaste for work, never get to the YES, despite painstaking efforts by schools and the employment service to corral them.

The fraction the YES does get is the crucial one; it represents youth who want jobs and can't easily find them. It represents Connecticut's future industrial strength—or its welfare rolls. Hardly anyone expects the State's industries, competing against the world, to fit the jobs to the would-be workers. Somehow Mary Dewey and the hardheaded but remarkably devoted interviewers and counselors under her must get youth ready for the jobs. And all the while the jobs shift at kaleidoscopic speed, always toward the more complicated.

For some who come into the youth centers for interviews, any role in the mainstream of the age of automation seems out of the question. At Hartford, a 20-year-old explains that he was just laid off as a short order cook. A year before he lost a stock boy job. He had quit school at 16 for good reason—his inability to pass most of his subjects. The job interviewer riffles through a dozen or two employer requests: assemblyman, machine tool operator, expediter. Under "qualifications" all of them are marked "Sufficient for job," even if they don't demand actual experience. The interviewer shakes her head. Check back next week. Some diner may lose its dishwasher.

But a smalltown farm boy, who dropped out at the eighth grade, offers more room to work. The interviewer notices several things. The boy's manner is good. So is his use of language. He is sent to counseling.

The counselor gives both interest and aptitude tests. (The tests are "validated" by checking how people successfully employed in various fields scored on them.) The boy rates well enough in general intelligence and is very high in finger dexterity. To an employer, he is still a school dropout with no skill and no experience in skilled work. But to the yes he now is a good training prospect.

"In their very youth lies the opportunity for success," says State Labor Commissioner Renato E. Ricciuti. (The employment service is part of his State labor department, though it is totally supported by Federal funds.) "Their age makes it easier to direct them to training opportunities in new occupations in growing industries."

In the retraining of workers for specific jobs that actually exist in their community, Connecticut has led the Nation, beginning with a highly successful pilot program for machinists in Bridgeport in 1961. Retraining now goes on all over the State. The Federal Manpower Development and Training Act now provides funds, both for instruction and for modest payment to the trainees.

The key to the Manpower Development and Training Act training programs, whether they are for machinists or for waiters in expensive restaurants, is that they prepare trainees quickly for jobs that they can be reasonably certain of getting. This, of course, requires cooperation from manufacturers. Mrs. Dewey says the most help has come in Bridgeport, where the forward-looking Bridgeport Manufacturers Association has strongly supported the program. The biggest single effort involving one employer has been the retraining of 677 workers from Danielson and the Norwich-New London area for atomic submarine work at Electric Boat. Of these, 613 were hired.

The youth counselor's job at the YES goes far beyond finding candidates for further training. A Negro boy with good skills will put himself down as a short-order cook. The counselor will try to show him that enough

doors are open to him to aim higher. Sometimes sights must be lowered. A would-be architect, of modest ability and limited training, will be led to think about blueprint work.

In each case, the counselor must match up three factors—the youth's interests, his skills, and the kinds of specific jobs available in the community, and likely to remain available. Then the counselor brings up a half dozen or so types of jobs, to see which ones light a fire in the youth's eyes. When one does, the counselor and the boy work out an employment plan. This may involve trying to get the job he wants now; trying to get a lesser job that will lead to it, or going into special training.

Anyone watching the YES's highly skilled, broadly experienced counselors go through these steps with individual youths cannot help but be impressed. Boys who saw no use at all for schooling rush back to class when they can see a specific job ahead. Others who sneered at school career days get interested when it's their personal career getting all the attention.

This type of bailing out operation obviously can be applied only to a tiny fraction of the hundreds of thousands of youths entering the Connecticut job market. The Federal funds which entirely support the Connecticut State Employment Service have their limits. If youths who most need the service do not show up, they cannot be helped. If manufacturers or other employers do not list their best jobs with YES, then youths are less interested in its services.

Mary Dewey spends much of her time badgering more funds, talking employers into taking her refurbished dropouts, and organizing programs to keep them from dropping out of school in the first place. Last year she carried on programs in almost all Connecticut high schools. A total of 89,818 saw "When I'm Old Enough, Goodbye," an anti-dropout film, in school, in drivein theaters, and wherever it could be shown. Elaborate systems were designed so that schools could tell the employment service of dropouts, and the employment service could tell schools.

The dropout problem, which will be a major worry for the State's new Youth Commission, involves far more than telling a boy or girl to go back to school. Sometimes the reasons for quitting school are idealistic—sickness in the family. Sometimes complicated antagonisms between child and school, or child and family, are involved. A frequent pattern involves a boy who quits at 16 or 17 to get an unpromising job. As long as he holds a job, it is hard to tell him how much school means to his lifetime career. Then at 19 or 20, or at 25 or 30, he shows up unemployed, willing now to get proper training, but too old for regular high school.

Today's dropouts, numbering more than 5,000 a year in Connecticut, are defined as those who do not finish high school. At the rate industry's technical requirements are increasing, the day may come soon when anyone who doesn't finish 2 years of posthigh school technical training is a "dropout," as far as getting hired is concerned.

To some, this has raised a fear that industry is coming to demand more of its potential employees than they can supply, even when perfectly trained and strongly motivated. But Mary Dewey, surrounded by Federal and State bureaucracy, committed to pair up hundreds of thousands of workers with hundreds of thousands of jobs for which there is no predestined affinity, is never given to despair.

"Her unbounded enthusiasm for her work, her skill and her devotion to duty have made the employment service an outstanding agency in Connecticut," says Governor Dempsey.

After her stint in the Waterbury theater, Mrs. Dewey finished 2 years of high school, then dropped out to be general aid to a contractor doing work for the Scovill Manufacturing Co. in Waterbury. Her office was a shack next to a rat-infested soft coal pile. From there she went into Scoville and got to do professional personnel work under Dr. Millicent Pond, the distinguished psychologist, now retired and living in New Haven.

In 1934 she began with the employment service. Her husband, an electrical salesman, died in December 1941, leaving her with two daughters, now married. She became head of the employment service in 1960. Along the way she finished high school through extension courses, took a raft of subjects through the University of Connecticut extension, and recently completed accelerated management courses through the Brookings Institute.

Today she seldom gets to counsel individual job applicants. She is the catalyst in committees to get employers to reclassify jobs so that her dropouts can get them, and in other committees to keep the potential dropouts in school. Most people would find the endless talk stupefying. But not Mary Dewey.

"The ideas that come out sitting around until 11 o'clock at night," she says. "Sometimes it's so stimulating I can't sleep when I get home."

Once in a while, she concedes, she would like to pull a little shade down over her eyes and forget the phalanxes of Connecticut unemployed, or underemployed, present and future, who march center stage in most of her waking moments.

But until both the "Help Wanted" and "Positions Wanted" columns disappear from the newspapers, she probably won't.

Equal Rights for Every 10th American and Every 7th Child

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1963, my good friend and esteemed colleague, Representative HUGH L. CAREY, delivered the keynote address before the Fourth Annual National Convention of Citizens for Educational Freedom. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, HUGH CAREY has worked tirelessly and effectively in the cause of equal rights for all children where education is concerned. In 1962, in recognition of his outstanding work in the fight for a fair Federal aid bill, he was awarded the Judge Anthony Daly Memorial Award by the Citizens for Educational Freedom. His magnificent keynote speech which I now have the privilege of calling to the attention of my colleagues is a cogent summation of Representative CAREY'S deep understanding of the complex problem of Federal aid to education.

"EQUAL RIGHTS FOR EVERY 10TH AMERICAN AND EVERY 7TH CHILD"—ADDRESS BY HON. HUGH L. CAREY, AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE CITIZENS FOR EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM, DETROIT, MICH., AUGUST 9, 1963

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."—THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN CONGRESS, JULY 4, 1776.

"America is the only nation in the world that is founded on a creed. That creed is set forth with dogmatic theological lucidity in the Declaration of Independence."—G. K. CHESTERTON.

The spirit of the land is insurgent and the Nation tosses with unrest. We suffer national pangs of conscience, because we are not living up to the spirit of our national creed. That creed as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and codified in the Bill of Rights is an egalitarian doctrine which suffers inequality in no degree. It places the individual at the heart of society, makes the state his servant and the civil law the protector of the equal station he holds under the laws of nature and nature's God.

Under the American creed, the equalitarian doctrine, and the moral law, there can be no lesions on the personal liberty nor fetters on the freedom of any individual.

Today the Congress is locked in debate in order to enact a restatement of our creed and doctrine. The debate does not arise because every 10th American, a Negro, has less than equal opportunity in the ghettoes of the North or the corridors of the South. It is joined that we may live under our American creed—that we may legislate what we believe—that while any American is under distraint or denial by reason of race, religion, or origin, the rights of none of us are safe and the freedom of all of us is in doubt.

We are convened today as citizens of all faiths and races for the preservation of freedom of the individual in education. In that interest I urge you to call upon our Nation to make the dialog and debate as broad and extensive as our American creed and equalitarian doctrine.

EVERY 10TH AMERICAN—EVERY 7TH SON

The debate now centers on every 10th American, the Negro, and equality. Let it also extend to the individual and parental rights of every seventh child in American education. That seventh child, one of 7 million, attends a State licensed and accredited school in compliance with the State compulsory attendance law; a school which fulfills the public purpose in its curriculum.

In the exercise of his freedom of conscience the parent in the seventh child schools has added religion and morality to the required curriculum. This addition does not cause the State to withdraw accreditation because the curriculum has not been modified, it has been enhanced. But by reason of that exercise of freedom of conscience he does forfeit his right to a fair share of the taxes which are levied on all for the educational support of all.

When was forfeiture for exercised freedom of conscience ever condoned under the American creed and the equalitarian doctrine? The 7th child pays a price for the conscience of his parents as the 10th American does for the color of his. I do not seek to hitch a freedom ride for my 7th son on the back of the 10th American. But their plight of inequality presents arresting similarities.

First, they both seek individual freedom of choice on a plane and par with every other American.

Second, they proceed on moral and religious, as well as a legal, basis because morality and religion are part of the American creed and part of public life. It is significant that clergymen provide substantial leadership for the 10th American and that on the same day as the Supreme Court was striking the Lord's Prayer and the Bible from the public schools the President assembled 243 religious leaders of all faiths at the White House to ask their help.

Third, they both seek equality in education and equality in opportunity. The Negro is a second class citizen under the archaic custom of the segregated schools. Every seventh child is a second-class citizen because he pays the price of fiscal segregation for the exercise of freedom of conscience.

What is the 10th American who also attends a 7th child school, a 3d-class American? Fortunately, not, because civil rights leaders have testified before my committee on two occasions that the schools which teach religion are far ahead of other schools on integration. It would seem that as to the 10th American, public schools are not so public and that so-called private schools are more public indeed.

Fourth, they both have an adequate basis in the law for their rights but seek the means to implement them. The 10th American was told in the Brown case, in 1957, that integration was to proceed with all deliberate speed. But the decision was not self executing. State and local laws resisted it and the Negro is in the streets in Biloxi, Birmingham, and Englewood. Every seventh child under the Pierce case, decided in 1925, is in a State accredited school, selected by his parents as a matter of right. But that right, without the means to exercise it, is nugatory. That right is being erased due to the economic erosion of the position of the nonsupported school by increased public spending.

While public school attendance has increased 42 percent in the last 20 years, expenditures have increased 567 percent. The seventh child schools without support cannot keep pace and they are closing down grade by grade, in Billings, Fairfax, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. They, too, are being turned into the streets.

The parallel is complete. Subject to economic forces, the Negro stands stagnated due to growing affluence of middle-class society which has moved away from him, creating an insufferable living gap. The seventh child stands in economic isolation due to the economic restrictions imposed upon him by unfair and illogical selectivism in school finance.

GROUNDS FOR FEDERAL AID

I say the Federal Government must respond to the needs of all the children in the United States as individual citizens without difference or distinction. The only ground on which the Congress can legislate in this field is by reason of the general welfare and the security of all. Citizens of the several States are citizens of the United States and it is the policy of this Nation to develop the capacity for educational excellence of every young American. This does not mean 6 out of 7 or 9 out of 10 but every young American. The Congress is not bound and must not be bound by discriminatory State laws and outmoded customs in assisting every individual.

The dollar must follow the child.

AIM OF FEDERAL AID

The aim of Federal aid must be to adjust imbalances and inequities which are visited upon its citizens from State to State or within the States. It must not distribute funds in such a way that it will sustain the structure of inequality but rather a way that it will stimulate quality for all. What the States have chosen to regulate, the Federal Government may stimulate. If a school is accredited and licensed by the State then the Federal Government must recognize the students of that school as eligible for its benefits. It is unthinkable that any Federal aid would accentuate the present difficulty of the seventh child schools by giving to all others the funds that will help to hire away their teachers and otherwise increase their hardship.

The clear way to equal aid for all is before the Congress. H.R. 320 by Mr. DELANEY is the GI bill for children. It has more companion bill sponsors than any other general education bill now pending. I am sure that you are familiar with its provisions which aid all individuals as did the GI bill on a fair and equal basis. One of the most important features of this bill is that it would provide aid without Federal control or increased administration. Because there can be no contact with institutions there is no need for expanded bureaus.

As a grant to an individual it deals with the unit in our society which is, and must remain, beyond control, the individual. Support for this bill is mounting because it appeals to fairness, it appeals to commonsense. The recent endorsement of H.R. 320 in the Saturday Evening Post by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, one of this Nation's most enlightened educators, is a milestone. There are other bills which square with the principles of equality and they are moving in the Congress. The medical education bill and the higher education bill are broadly supported and favorably reported. The first passed the House—the second is now pending before the House. Both make provisions for every American student who has a will to learn.

We can point with satisfaction to the advances at State levels in scholarship and student incentive plans for all students providing freedom of choice in California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey and New York. As a New Yorker I am particularly proud of the statement of the regents in my State referring to that plan: "Hand in hand with the development of increased public facilities must go the strengthening of the private institutions. Our system of education in the United States is characterized by a wholesome diversity. The variety of sponsorship and support reflects the pluralism of our country. In a real sense, this variety is a safeguard against any encroachment on the intellectual freedom which must be accorded our institutions of higher learning. We have a commitment to foster such diversity and, therefore, the distributive responsibility for the conduct of higher education."

Especially let us salute Rhode Island, the plantation of freedom of thought and conscience in America and its new textbook loan plan. And "hail to Michigan" with its fine and fair new school bus law.

Since I last addressed you in 1961 we can truly recount much progress. Many new faces are counted in the ranks of those who support educational freedom and this is a tribute to the efforts of those organizations such as yours which plead the cause of freedom and fairness. You have had criticism leveled at you but that is the risk of those who travel in the advance guard of freedom, keeping the American creed. Know your opponents and hear them, but fear them not. From my seat on the Committee on Education I have looked down the barrel of their objections and they are black and empty. Without shin kicking and shoe pounding, let us have a discourse on fair and equal treatment and examine the objections of the pedantic professional opposition.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

Objection number one is that aid to the seventh child schools would cause proliferation. This is a professional pedantic swearword meaning spread, growth, and diversity.

In the words of the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel: "The glory of our system of education is its diversity." Schools cannot proliferate unless approved by the State educational agency. How can the Federal Government preclude the growth the State would approve?

Objection number two is the fear of rivalry between State schools and those of every seventh child school. To that I say the essential ingredient of free enterprise is the maximum effort by everyone, in harmony, in the educational marketplace so that no one agency monopolizes. The alternative to competition is unthinkable under the American creed of free enterprise. To cite Rabbi Morris Sherer, executive vice president, Agudath Israel of America, before my committee:

"Our Founding Fathers never intended that our children be reared in a monolithic educational straitjacket. Our educational plant is a mosaic, with the free play of the many faceted cultures of our people blending into the molding of an informed, dedicated, and loyal citizenry." The rabbi correctly stated what this Nation must be prepared to admit: That we are racially and religiously and culturally pluralistic.

Our educational assistance must recognize this and provide for it.

As to the cabal that religion permeates the curriculum in the seventh child schools and that it makes the obvious secular and public purpose subjects indivisible from religious indoctrination, I point out that the American creed, the Declaration of Independence, is permeated with theology and our public life is replete with religion reference points. The overriding concept is that the nature of the subject matter in the public purpose seventh child schools is secular and governments must deal with the nature of things. Education is education and permeation does not change its nature whether that permeation be secularistic or theistic.

Finally, what of the separationists among the objectors who saw the whole edifice of government falling into the hands of the clergy when the seventh school child ate his first hot lunch and boarded a New Jersey bus. The answer for all of us who believe in separation of church and state is that we must have safeguards that will guarantee not only separation of church and state but also separation of school and state in the sense that the mind of the child must remain free from the control of government.

We must have safeguards and we want safeguards but there must not be stumbling blocks in the path of every seventh child.

Two years after the enactment of the GI bill for Junior the education of all our children would be enriched by $1.5 billion. The state would be no weaker because it invested in its own citizens. The church and state would be as separate as before—but the student—the interest of both, would be a more enlightened citizen and church and state should be more secure in that confidence.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK—ECUMENISM IN EDUCATION

The President has proclaimed November 10 to 16 this year as American Education Week. Not Nationalized Education Week, or Monopolized Education Week, but American Education Week. I hope that the spirit of American Education Week will be that cited by the first two administration witnesses who appeared before the Education Committee this year. It was an extension of the American creed as contained in the Northwest Ordinance of 1789, as follows:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

In the spirit of that ordinance, for American Education Week I suggest that we promote the theme of ecumenism in education. Ecumenism in education, not for the benefit of the 10th American and the 7th son, but for all men. I want all my children and all the children of America to know about a man who was not an American but who had America in his heart and lived the American creed. It was he who gave us "Mater et Magistra" to take us to the plane of understanding and "Pacem in Terris" to bring us back from the brink of annihilation. We need ecumenism in education so that as individuals we can see our differences, minimize them and rejoice in our unity in diversity. With John XXIII, as a basis for ecumenism in education and peace, let us advance the universal declaration of human rights—that document which, in most solemn form, acknowledged the dignity of every person, be he that 10th American or

my 7th son, the right of free movement in search of truth and in the attainment of moral good and justice—and the prior right of the parent in the education of his children. It would be my hope that through ecumenism every child might learn of John's wish for mankind, that we might become more equal to our task so that every human being will fully enjoy those rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and are therefore universal, inviolable, and inalienable. I express this hope for every 10th American and for all Americans, but especially for 1 American—my 7th son. You see, his name is Paul—and he and I have much to do. We need your help.

Let us advance the cause of educational freedom and the new ecumenism in a most militant way. March we must, as far at least as the corner mailbox, the local Citizens for Educational Freedom chapter, the Congressman's district office. The fairness and force of our idea will carry, your ranks will swell. It has been said: "More powerful than the tread of mighty armies is the idea whose moment has arrived."

The moment for this idea to become reality, to fulfill the spirit of our American creed is now; the moment has arrived.

Down-to-Earth Idealism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an effort to aid the civil rights movement at a very practical level has been provided by a group of northern college students whose name is the Northern Student Movement. An article in the May 17 issue of Time magazine describes the group's program of tutoring Negro youngsters in northeastern cities. I have been advised that the program this summer has fulfilled the predictions made in the Time article and that the emphasis on tutoring has been broadened to include community action to improve neighborhood cleanliness and ultimately voter registration and education generally. I ask unanimous consent that the Time magazine article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN-TO-EARTH IDEALISM

Northern collegians have in recent years gone South on freedom rides, tried to integrate Louisiana lunch counters, been shot at for helping Negro voter registration in Georgia. Out of such idealistic activism, so strikingly missing in the apathetic 1950's, has come a more down-to-earth student project. The newest task is tutoring thousands of Northern Negro children who lack the skill or the incentive to keep up in school. A timely push from a collegian can change their lives and the tutor's as well.

Such is the aim of the Northern Student Movement, a loose-knit, Yale-based fraternity of 2,200 collegians at 50 campuses, from MIT to Oberlin to Swarthmore. They give several nights a week to tutoring about 3,500 Negro youngsters in cities all over the Northeast. Results have been undramatically good. In Philadelphia, a survey of 240 kids showed 50 percent of them doing a little better in school and 41 percent doing much better. In Hartford, Conn., 13-year-old Pearley-Mae Sampson has hiked her average from C to B under the guidance of Trinity College senior, Henry Whitney, 21. In Harlem, Tutor Carl Anthony took a seventh-grader with third-grade reading ability and in 2 weeks helped her to get 90 on a seventh-grade spelling test. Step by step, the kids are getting with it.

COUNTRYMAN & CO.

The main force behind Northern Student Movement is its paid ($50 a week) director, Peter Countryman, an intense Chicagoan of 21 who normally would have been a senior at Yale this year. Countryman got stirred by southern Negro student sit-ins in 1961, began to see the academic world as pretty sterile. Cutting classes, Countryman in 2 weeks collected 6,000 books for a hard-pressed Negro college in Virginia, wound up spearheading a northern campus fund drive for sit-ins. He dropped out of Yale to run Northern Student Movement because "I felt a call to do it."

Last summer Countryman & Co. set up classes for the schoolless Negro youngsters of Virginia's Prince Edward County, and also tackled North Philadelphia, where the high school dropout rate is 60 percent and only 2½ percent of the kids get to college. Northern Student Movement recruited 175 tutors (including about 70 Negroes) at colleges from Amherst to Sarah Lawrence, put them to work with 375 youngsters for 4 hours a week all summer. One byproduct: Countryman's marriage to Tutor Joan Cannaday, a Negro Sarah Lawrence graduate and daughter of a Philadelphia high school guidance counselor.

BUILDING CONFIDENCE

In Hartford this year, Northern Student Movement's 100 tutors from Trinity and other colleges have worked with 300 kids in evening sessions at three high schools. Hartford Seminary Student Peter Morrill, 22, who says that "this is the only way to actualize the things in the Bible," set up a shabby Northern Student Movement office in Hartford's heavily Negro North End. Going beyond tutoring, Morrill and 25 coworkers get people to the polls and campaign against rent gouging. "We're showing these people they have a chance," says Joe Norman, 18, a Negro student at the Hartford Art School.

Countryman, who is duly wary of white Lady Bountifulness, is now searching for a Negro to take over his job. He plans to return to Yale next fall, aims to leave full-time Northen Student Movement offices running in Boston, Hartford, New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Washington, and Chicago. His summer agenda is to muster 2,400 collegians to tutor 4,000 high school students. To foot the bill, he has $30,000 from foundations and a Philadelphia drug house. Northern Student Movement clearly can make only a dent in the great mass of Negro slum kids who consider education strictly square, but it has started something worth doing well.

Decline of the National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this week at Indiana University in Bloomington, Ind., the 16th National Student Association Congress meets for its annual excursion into leftwing politics. In view of the fact that NSA claims to represent more than a million American students, I think it well to place NSA in its proper perspective. Toward this end I include two newspaper articles concerning the National Student Association. The articles follow:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.), News]

LIBERAL GROUP LOSES FAVOR AT HOOSIER COLLEGES

(By Stan Evans)

The temper of American college campuses becomes increasingly conservative.

Witness the hard times which have come upon the National Student Association—a youth group of liberal persuasion which has for years held sway unchallenged in the colleges and universities.

NSA was conceived a decade and a half ago as a consortium of student governments, allegedly to deal with the common problems of academic life.

From the outset, however, the group has been involved deeply in matters of politics—invariably on the liberal side. In the name of the American student, it has concerned itself with issues of small relevance, if any, to its stated purposes.

Among NSA pronouncements have been a demand for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee, a consistent clamor for Federal aid to education, attacks on the colonialism of various allies of the United States and a declaration of solidarity with the Japanese who rioted against President Eisenhower in 1960.

All of this has been put forward as though it represented the opinion of American students as a whole—while in fact it did nothing of the sort. Some American students, therefore, have come to resent NSA, and have started to do something about it.

Indiana University provided an example of the strong countertrend a few weeks ago when, in a student referendum, it severed its NSA connection. The vote was an overwhelming 4,071 to 2,525 against NSA—in large part, according to Tom Huston, a leading campus critic of the group, because of its unwarranted forays into deep left field.

Other Indiana institutions which have recently given NSA the back of their hand include Ball State and Earlham College, which withdrew, and Purdue, which rejected a proposed affiliation. An incipient effort was made a few years ago to stir up interest at Butler, but at that time nothing came of it.

Among the young people who have fought NSA, and who have helped it along the road to unpopularity, are the members of Young Americans for Freedom. Combating NSA has been a major activity of the conservative youth group, in which it has experienced some notable successes.

YAF's most recent blow against the liberal organization is the publication of a booklet entitled "NSA Report," which contains an excellent summary of NSA's claims, its actual operation, and its recent difficulties. The pamphlet lists the schools which have dropped out of NSA since 1961, a roster which adds up to something approaching a mass exodus.

In addition to the Indiana schools mentioned above, other midwestern colleges which have quit the group include Ohio State, Northwestern, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Denison, Simpson College, and Kansas Wesleyan.

Other notable withdrawals include the University of Texas, Oklahoma, Vanderbilt, Utah State, Randolph-Macon, and Bennington. Among those refusing affiliation have been George Washington, Virginia, Kentucky,

Texas Christian, Tufts, Fordham, and Washington and Lee.

In addition to providing an up-to-date survey of NSA's recent fortunes, the YAF booklet includes a concise discussion of the group's internal mechanics, finances, tax-exempt status (although it clearly engages in political activity), extreme liberal politics, and nonrepresentative nature.

The pamphlet points out that, although NSA claims to speak for "over 1 million American students," most of the students being "spoken for" have only a dim idea of what is going on. Reason: "NSA membership is student government membership. * * * To sign up member schools, NSA does not go to the students for approval. It deals with a handful of student leaders."

For those who would like to know more about the NSA battle, this YAF document is highly recommended. It is available, at $1 per copy, from: Young Americans for Freedom, 514 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) News]

NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION DESCRIBED AS LEFT LEANING: LEADERS HAVE TAKEN PART IN "RABBLE ROUSING" POLITICAL ACTIVITIES, ANOTHER YOUTH GROUP SAYS

(By Fred Turner)

The U.S. National Student Association, which of recent years has come under increasing campus criticism, is currently the target of an attack by the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., with headquarters in Washington, D.C.

In a 54-page brochure just issued, YAF charges the student association has an "established leftist political complexion" and labels its claim to represent American students "a fantastic fraud."

The YAF notes that, in the past 3 years, 33 colleges with a student body of 230,000 have withdrawn from NSA—among them some of the largest schools in the country.

The NSA constitution says it prohibits political agitation and all activity "which does not affect students in their role of students," a status which earns it tax exemption and permits major contributors from tax-exempt groups which could not legally contribute otherwise.

PUT STUDENTS ON RECORD

The YAF booklet contends that despite this, NSA, claiming to represent 1 million American students, opposed nuclear testing, agitated against the House Committee on Un-American Activities and urged cessation of military and/or economic aid to countries friendly to the United States ("but not suggesting similar action toward a single Communist nation").

It also placed American students on record as condemning U.S. involvement in the Bay of Pigs Cuban invasion; regretting the absence of contact with the Chinese Communist Student Union and upholding the Communist-led Japanese students who rioted against President Eisenhower's visit.

Through a device whereby the national executive committee "minds the store" between national congresses of NSA, many resolutions published to the world as the thinking of all American students never were passed on by the delegates.

ACCUSES NATIONAL STAFF

They were the work of the NEC of as few as 10 and not more than 31 members. Of 83 policy resolutions adopted in 1962–63, less than 35 percent, YAF contends, were adopted by the national congress in plenary session.

YAF accuses the NSA national staff of continuing "to engage in rabble-rousing political activities" and insists it maps out predigested programs for delegates to follow.

While conservative speakers find it difficult to get recognition at NSA congresses, here is a sample of speakers who were "placed for top priority" at the 1962 congress:

Daniel Rubin, national youth director, Communist Party, U.S.A. and editor of Communist Viewpoint, a new publication aimed at youth.

LITERATURE DISPLAYED

Phillip Luce of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee cited as a subversive group by the U.S. Attorney General.

Burton White, key figure arrested for his part in the Communist-instigated riots in San Francisco in May, 1960.

Marvin Markman, executive vice president of Advance, New York, which Attorney General Kennedy described as a Communist front.

Communist and Trotskyist-Communist literature was given prominent display at the 1962 congress.

Of the 33 colleges withdrawing from NSA since 1961, included are such large ones as Indiana, Ohio State, Texas, Northwestern Missouri, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Kansas, Utah State and Vanderbilt.

NYU FOR WITHDRAWAL

Among those which have rejected proposed NSA affiliation are Purdue, George Washington, Fordham Virginia, Kentucky, Tufts, Texas Christian, New Hampshire, Franklin & Marshall, Gettysburg and Washington & Lee.

New York University (Washington Square branch) with an enrollment of 32,000, favored withdrawal on a referendum.

Canisius College is listed as having withdrawn, while the University of Buffalo State University College, Rosary Hill, D'Youville and Niagara are still listed as members.

YAF notes that only those schools which maintain student-elected councils may be NSA members.

What the Small Towns Mean to America—Speech at Huntington Homecoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 29, 1963, I attended a heart-warming homecoming in Huntington, Angelina County, Tex. It was one of those old-fashioned dinner-on-the-grounds events enjoyed by all. I have had numerous requests for copies of my remarks on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE SMALL TOWN MEANS TO AMERICA

Chairman Flournoy, fellow east Texans, thank you, Benton Musslewhite for that eloquent and generous introduction.

Here in east Texas in the heart of the Pineywoods, on a ridge of land between the Neches and Angelina Rivers, the pioneers found abundant wood, water and game, and a fertile soil for ample food and fiber. Here they settled and made a small city. Here more than a thousand of their descendants live today, and many other thousands of descendants of those early settlers are here to help you celebrate this Huntington homecoming.

Your home county of Angelina is a good place to live as shown by the fact that you have in it five cities of over a thousand population, four of them with a population of between 1,000 and 3,000 people in addition to the county's capital city of Lufkin, a city of 20,000.

This is a fair land, but the highways to the cities are calling the boys and girls from the farms and ranches and forests and small towns of America.

Those who know the stability and courage and endurance of people from quiet places are alarmed at the drift to megalopolis. You who left Huntington for the cities are back because of the native heath call, the nostalgia for your ancestral home, the inherent instinct of a man for nature, the unrequited longing of a machine man for the quiet of field and forest.

From such environment came the Founding Fathers of America. Such an environment is the native soil of democracy, the kind of heritage that breeds free men and free and progressive political institutions. Nearly two centuries later, with vast cities all around us, it is worthy to note that the first seven astronauts chosen in America, came from small towns.

Those who were calm in space, came from calm spaces. If all of the young people of America leave the small towns, from whence will come this stable leadership for the future?

More than space and quiet is involved in smalltown living. There is a family unity, a family spirit, a family gathering together in the morning, at midday sun, and in the evening's cool, that the big cities do not allow. In these three-times-a-day family gatherings, the family is knit together and a spirit of helpfulness and mutual consideration and cooperation is born, that those in cities miss, and feel a strange unquiet at its absence.

As darkness falls over the trees and town lots and the fireflies throw their stars into the weeds and grass and the whippoorwill gives his deepwoods call, old memories will surge up in the hearts of all the homecomers here of the days they lived these streets and acres. You will look at trees whose shade you knew as a child, standing yet, waiting for your return to the comfort of their shadows.

Your east Texas is my east Texas. My father, now 98 years of age, still lives in the old home I was born in at Chandler, Henderson County, 1 mile from the bank of the Neches.

As a boy, I knew its cool waters, its currents, and eddies, its banks and its mud bars, its sluggish sloughs and swift-moving current. Its riches in fishes, its turtles and terrapins, its alligators and poison water moccasins that add to the background of adventure that every east Texas boy lives.

The catamount's howl and the panther's scream still split the solitude of these woods a few years ago. Some say they hear them yet.

The stately heron, the long-necked water turkey, the large woodpeckers of the deep forests, the many songbirds of brilliant colors, all bring moving color to the countryside and inspiration to the spirit of man. They are art and beauty on the wing, and they lift the spirit of man.

These pioneer east Texas woods, too, had an abundance of game from quail to wild turkeys, from squirrel to deer, from teal to Canadian geese, that gave to the zest of the hunt and added to the material well-being of man.

Here in the small town, nature hugs a man as tightly as the air does; it is a part of his life, his soul, his being. The concrete and asphalt jungles of the giant megapolis have not imprisoned the soul of man. Here his spirit is freer than anywhere else on earth. This is a fair land, a good way of life.

Here the spiritual man lives too. Here live a God-fearing people, loving justice and

democracy, and walking humbly with their God.

During these past 20 months, I have visited every inhabited continent on earth, except Australia. I have viewed the length of the Nile, the sands of the Sahara, the cool green hills of east Africa, and the mystic shores of the Congo in the sultry rain forests south of the Equator.

I have watched the mighty Amazon, seen the fabulously rich pampas of the Argentine, the high Andes of Peru, the cedars of Lebanon, the citrus groves of the new Israel, the emerging Arabs in Morocco, Persian gardens in Iran, the herds of Pakistan at Kyber Pass, the vineyards of Italy, and the close-ploughed fields of France and Germany. But, fellow east Texans, for good kindly pleasant living, in an abundant land with a mild climate, east Texas is the best place I've ever lived. Here a beneficent providence touched the earth. Here man can be happy.

So that future generations can contine to live and enjoy this good earth and earn a living, we are building the great McGee Bend Dam, to impound the largest lake wholly within the boundaries of Texas. With the Area Redevelopment Act, we are rebuilding the economy of east Texas, with a tourist inn already approved for Woodville and new plants at Jacksonville. Applications are pending for a historical restoration at Nacogdoches, $3½ million in job-creating projects at Diboll, a $578,000 nursing home for Lufkin, and many other projects near you in east Texas.

You in Huntington are in the center of this activity, with industrial growth at Lufkin and Diboll to the west and the great McGee Bend Dam and lake recreation area to the east. You have the best location of all to grow with the great tourist traffic that can be yours. Your growth is certain, your future can be bright. With the opportunities soon to open to your youth, scarcely dreamed of 10 years ago, you know that there will always be a Huntington.

The homecoming participants today can rejoice in the knowledge that your city is on the eve of a new growth, comparable to that you knew with the coming of the T. & N.O. Railroad, which tied Dallas to the sea at Beaumont and opened the markets of Texas and the world to the products of your fertile fields and rich forests.

But your greatest export has been people, able, honest, dedicated Americans. Now you will open these treasures to visitors coming here. Your natural treasure will be enjoyed in this area by a multitude of visitors who will come to be rested and re-inspired, and their bodies and spirits strengthened, by the greatness of your natural resources and the kindness of you good people.

In this mad, mad world, may this middle Neches area always be one of God's gardens.

Public Sentiment on Test Ban Treaty as Revealed by Congressional Mail Is Hardly One Sided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the August 13 issue of the Knoxville Journal carried Ralph de Toledano's column discussing the gradual increase of antitest ban treaty letters to Members of the Congress. The column is as follows:

CONGRESS, PUBLIC, AND TEST BAN TREATY

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Senators, Representatives, and the White House staff have been busily counting letters on the test ban treaty. Any analysis of this mail is premature, if only because those who receive it are fudging a little on what is says. But one fact is crystal clear:

Most of the country doesn't give two hoots and a holler about the treaty.

As a corollary to this sentiment, the majority of letterwriters—even those favoring the treaty—don't trust the Soviets as far as you can throw the Washington Monument.

The volume of mail has been so small, in fact, that many Representatives and Senators have had to go burrowing for it. Their statistics—"it's 10 to 1 for" or "it's 10 to 1 against"—are meaningless when you pin them down and find that the total mail sometimes runs no more than 18 letters.

President Kennedy's mail is a perfect example of this. When he made his speech denouncing Comrade Khrushchev and ordering a blockade of Cuba, more than 40,000 letters poured in. Today, Press Secretary Salinger says that the mail is running 12 to 1 for the treaty. But at the last count, the total was a meaningless 3,500. Experts on Washington mail response say that the President was probably getting close to that number of letters on nuclear testing over a similar period of time in the past without even noticing them.

That the White House should receive such a thin flow of mail on this topic is a little surprising. Mr. Kennedy has pleaded for mass support of the treaty, and this is usually a sure-fire way of pulling in correspondence. The Committee for Sane Nuclear Policy and the Women's Strike for Peace, if they had a small fraction of the membership and support they claim, could alone have done better.

But on Capitol Hill, how does it go? Some Senators believe that the voters will cut the throat of any candidate who opposes the treaty. There is no evidence to back their view, but fears of this kind die hard. To get some idea of how the mail shapes up, a staff member of National News-Research conducted a check for me.

A liberal Republican Senator reported that his mail was running 2 to 1 against the treaty. This ratio was steady. A Midwestern liberal Democrat, on the other hand, said that he had received 300 letters and wires on the test ban treaty—roughly what he was getting on other major issues. Though his mail is 4 to 1 in favor statewide, it is overwhelming against from the big cities—real surprise.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, noted very thin returns—some 50 letters in all since the President's speech. They favored the treaty, but the returns were so small that FULBRIGHT seemed not to be paying much attention to them.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE of Wisconsin, who has been beating the drums for a nuclear test ban treaty, received almost no mail until the last few days. The "official" figure for the hundred or more letters he has had to date is 60 to 40 in favor. A little questioning, however, indicated that it was almost squarely 50–50.

Mail for Senator KENNETH KEATING, middle-of-the-road New York Republican, has shifted from 6,305 for and 968 against (6½ to 1) to 1,857 for and 500 against (3½ to 1)—a marked change. Republican Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota has received 18 letters in all—10 of them against.

A sampling of 10 other Republican Senators showed everything from "strongly for" (in the East) to 'heavily against" (in the Midwest and Mountain States) but all pointed out that their mail was very light. This roughly followed the pattern of a survey made by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN.

The public apathy, if such it can be called, may help the Senate arrive at a careful decision when it debates the treaty. For if it finally penetrates the upper reaches of the Senatorial consciousness that the voters are not breathing down the necks of those who oppose (or favor) the test ban treaty, then the issues can be thoroughly explored. The wiser heads in Washington are calling precisely for this, as they warn that the hysteria being pumped up by the State Department helps neither the treaty nor the Nation.

Having expressed many doubts about the treaty, my own mail, of course has run almost entirely unfavorable toward ratification of the pact. There follows extracts from some of this correspondence:

Fort Worth, Tex.: "Stop and consider what it will be like when we capitulate to Russia."

Chicago, Ill.: "It is certainly going to be very difficult for even those Senators who have strong reservations on the treaty to vote against it because of the political repercussions of being branded a 'warmonger.' It will take great courage on their part, but I still have the hope that perhaps we can get as many as 34 Senators who are that courageous."

Santa Barbara, Calif.: "Put me down as one more voice crying out against the President's Test Ban Treaty. We must not lose another strategic battle to them."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "Let us have no nuclear test ban with bloody Khrushchev until he gets out of Hungary, Poland, and Latvia and frees them from Communist dictatorship."

McAllen, Tex.: "Isn't it the silliest thing you ever heard of to buddy, buddy up with Khrushchev and beg him to fetter us with a partial test ban treaty?"

Lancaster, Calif.: "There is nothing in the agreement that China cannot do atmospheric testing so why would it not be logical that they could move all their scientists and do all their testing across the line in China where they could not be observed? It is silly on our part to trust Russia as they have never kept an agreement, to say nothing about China, and by cutting down they could go ahead and use the Chinese blind to their advantage and before we could turn around, they could lay us all to rack and ruin."

La Habra, Calif.: "America must come first."

Salt Lake City, Utah: "The love fest and secret agreements with Khrushchev are indeed dangerous to America and its freedoms."

Bell, Calif.: "While I believe we are all interested in peace, we are not in favor of a sellout."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "A test ban at this time would surely weaken this country, and I am quite sure it would aid the Russians."

Winter Park, Fla.: "America will stop all testing while Russia's great nuclear testing force will be somewhere deep in China making hundreds and hundreds of new and newer tests all the time. Don't fall for this big doublecross."

Glen Ellyn, Ill.: "We do not trust the Russians, in fact, we feel the Sino-Russo fuss could be a blind for us to fall into."

Orinda, Calif.: "No signed agreement with Khrushchev is worth the paper it is written on. We should be strengthening our defenses instead of reducing them."

San Diego, Calif.: "I do not believe a 'leopard' changes its spots. As far as I know Communist Khrushchev has never withdrawn his statement: 'We will bury you.' It is possible the test ban treaty will speed the day for making good on this threat."

Aurora, Ill.: "Preserve peace through maintaining a strong Military Establishment."

Racine, Wis.: "It would be unreasonable to think that the Russians would cease their extensive nuclear research for warmaking capability if a test ban treaty were signed."

Versatility and Diversification of Capitol Airways Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Capitol Airways Head Has Come a Long Way From Barnstorming," written by George Horne, and published in the New York Times of Sunday, May 12, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL AIRWAYS HEAD HAS COME A LONG WAY FROM BARNSTORMING—JESSE STALLINGS' FLEET CARRIED 18,465 OVER ATLANTIC IN 1962 AS BIGGEST OF COMMERCIAL CHARTER LINES

(By George Horne)

The man who heads the largest charter carrier among the trans-Atlantic supplemental airlines learned to fly as a youngster in 1924 with a $200 Curtis Jenny.

He is Jesse F. Stallings, president of Capital Airways, Inc., which last year carried 18,465 charter passengers in the growing trans-Atlantic business. No other American-flag line carried this many, including certificated carriers in the charter business.

Capitol is now the largest commercial charter carrier and one of the major contract carriers for the U.S. Air Force.

From a one-plane operation that began in 1946 when Mr. Stallings resigned his $1,200-a-month job as a captain with American Airlines, Capitol has grown rapidly. It has a fleet of 41 planes and has just ordered a new one in the $7 million bracket.

CONVERTIBLE JET TRANSPORT

It will be the first pure jet for the Capitol fleet—a Douglas DC-8F Jet Trader—a convertible transport that can be moved back and forth between the line's diverse cargo and passenger trades.

Capitol was one of the first commercial airlines to get into contract operations with Logair, the domestic scheduled air freight service between military installations operated by the Logistics Command of the Air Force.

The company has a fleet of five Argosy turboprop freighters and 17 C-46 carriers in the Logair service. They fly 8,150 miles daily.

Of its 41 planes, 33 are committed to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, known as CRAF. This is the backup fleet of commercial craft which would go into airlift service for national defense in time of emergency. Capitol is one of the three top airlines in the country—including the big trunk airlines—in the number of planes committed to CRAF.

DOUBLE-END LOADER

The British Argosy, built by Whitworth Gloster Aircraft, is a double-end loader of interesting capabilities. Mr. Stallings recently speeded up the plane's loading arrangement, putting in a new mechanized idea developed by the Air Force, called the 463L system. Cargo taken aboard at one end in effect pushes along cargo for unloading at the other end.

The ex-airline captain would deny that he is a man in a hurry. He is definitely relaxed, and somehow seems to "make haste slowly." His Alabama drawl heightens the impression.

But he moves fast and far, and he has done so since his first solo in the Jenny as a 15-year-old cadet at Kentucky Military Academy. Today his interests and responsibilities are widely scattered.

In addition to the transatlantic charter business, Capitol charters domestically. It airlifts military passengers and cargo for the Military Air Transport Service, from the MATS terminal at Charleston, S.C., to Air Force installations in the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and as far away as Libya.

The company's headquarters is at Berry Field, in Nashville. Its chief maintenance and operations base for the Argosy and Constellation fleets is at Wilmington, Del.

That is where the new jet will be based when the airline gets it in August.

Oklahoma City is the base for flight crews and maintenance for Logair carriers. Flight crews for the MATS service are based at Charleston. And the company maintains offices abroad and in New York and Chicago.

BORN IN BIRMINGHAM

All of which means that Capitol's president is almost always on the move. To facilitate his work, Mr. Stallings flies his own Twin Beech executive aircraft. It logs between 100,000 and 125,000 miles a year.

Mr. Stallings was born in Birmingham, Ala., the son of the late Jesse F. Stallings, Sr., an Alabama lawyer and a former Member of Congress. He studied engineering and business administration at the University of Alabama. At night he studied law for a while. When the family's fortunes faded in the depression, he earned college money hopping passengers in a biplane he had bought.

Like many a pilot he turned to barnstorming, and once got into some trouble by landing a light plane on the back of a running mule by accident, in darkness.

He joined American Airlines in 1936, and, in World War II, was assigned to fly under contract with the Air Transport Command.

REVENUES RISE FAST

After the war, he and another pilot put up $5,000 each and started Capitol at Nashville as a fixed-base operation offering flight training, aircraft sales, service, and maintenance. He kept on at American, but his partner pulled out of the company and Mr. Stallings left airline flying to devote full time to his struggling enterprise. It paid off.

By 1953 Capitol revenues had passed $1 million, and by last year they had risen to $18,750,000.

What Mr. Stallings emphasizes—without saying so—is that his company has been one of the stable and consistent growth companies in the industry.

He can hardly wait for the new DC-8F. It will range through the various services, and in rush periods carry Atlantic passengers.

Mr. Stallings has a lot of faith in the development of this business, and small wonder. Last year he had 181 Atlantic flights. This year it will be 200.

One interesting development has been noted in the Atlantic charter business. In 1959 only 3 percent of the line's passengers began their trips in Europe. In 1961 the group charters were 19 percent European in origin. Last year the ratio was 42 percent. This year it will be about half and half—perhaps a good augury for the future of the balance-of-payments problem.

Welcome to Greensburg, Bearings Co. of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensburg (Ind.) Daily News:

WELCOME TO GREENSBURG, BEARINGS CO. OF AMERICA

The Bearings Co. of America Division of Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearings, Inc., will hold open house to the public on Saturday afternoon, August 17.

This will afford the initial opportunity for residents of Greensburg and surrounding area to inspect these modern new industrial facilities.

Escorted tours have been arranged to enable the public to see the precision machinery used in BCA operations and to inspect the plant and equipment, representing a multimillion dollar investment.

The program, following two earlier events, dedication of Interstate 74 by Gov. Matthew E. Welsh and a Chamber of Commerce luncheon at 11:30 p.m. at the Elks' Club, will open at 1 p.m. at the BCA plant.

The building will be officially dedicated in a ceremony in which both the American flag and the Indiana flag will be raised.

At 1:30 p.m., the plant will begin its open house, which will continue during the afternoon. Governor Welsh will remain in Greensburg for the luncheon and the BCA open house.

Important leaders of industry, including key figures of Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearings, Inc., and Bearings Co. of America Division, will come to Greensburg for the open house.

Open house at the imposing BCA plant will signalize an important milestone in the progress of Greensburg and community.

Announcement of the decision of Bearings Co. of America to locate a new plant in Greensburg was made on May 15, 1962. Operational plans of BCA here were presented to a group of civic leaders on August 15, 1962. Ground on the 36-acre tract on U.S. 421 was broken late in July last year.

Actually, bearings have been produced at the new plant for several months. The open house, however, affords the initial opportunity for the public to inspect the plant and operations.

Without question, Greensburg has secured one of the fine industrial facilities to locate in the Hoosier State in recent years. Present employment is slightly over 100, and the operating program calls for expansion to an employed personnel of 200 before the end of 1963. And, there is a possibility of enlargement of plant facilities in the future, since the present building is expandable.

Significant in the BCA open house will be the economic impact to this community. This will be reflected in more jobs, greater payroll, new families, more retail business, enhanced opportunity for employment for youths leaving the farms and an overall upgrading of the economic life of this community.

The open house will enable citizens of this area to appreciate the scope of BCA precision operations in the manufacture of ball bearings.

It will also afford an opportunity for area residents to become acquainted with key personnel of BCA and Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearings, Inc.

At the same time, it will instill an enhanced faith in the economic future of this community, evidenced in the past 15 years by the other fine industries which now claim Greensburg as their home.

On the occasion of the plant dedication and open house, citizens of Greensburg and surrounding area will welcome Bearings Co. of America to this community.

It's Time for a Look at the Rabble Rousers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached editorial from the Nashville Banner of August 15, 1963, entitled "It's Time for a Look at the Rabble Rousers."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S TIME FOR A LOOK AT THE RABBLE ROUSERS

A Negro called the office of the Associated Press in Chicago the other day and suggested that if reporters would go and talk to Negroes where they live, instead of chasing around after self-designated leaders fomenting the current racial turmoil, the wire service might just come upon some truth to pass on to the rest of the country.

The reporter went to the South Side neighborhood and found that most colored persons he interviewed were not ready to march on Washington, or planning a sit-in at the mayor's office. They were mainly interested in the economic facts of life, education, and the employment of their abilities to make an honest living.

If the U.S. Attorney General had been along, he would have heard no threats of violence and bloodshed to take back to Washington and hurl at Congress.

Instead, he might have talked in Chicago to S. B. Fuller, Negro businessman, whose firm this year will sell $10 million worth of soap and give employment to 600 persons, colored and white.

Mr. Fuller, born in Louisiana, told U.S. News & World Report that (without congressional action) he started selling soap door to door as a child to keep himself and his brothers and sisters off charity. In his family it wasn't considered respectable to live off the community. Charity did not become a way of life until social workers began calling it relief.

The successful Chicagoan said, in effect, that he was able to obtain a good sixth grade education without being hauled for miles for forced association with white children. He was even neglected to the extent that the Supreme Court of that day did not tell him he had an inferiority complex. And now, he makes the astounding statement that obtaining an education depends on the attitude of the student, not the type of school or the extent to which it is integrated.

The president of the Fuller Products Co. did not waste any time in his youth on sit-ins for civil rights. He said he always had all the rights he needed, then and now. He sees no necessity for new laws.

To quote the executive: "The Negro has the same rights that other people have in America. He has a right to vote, he has a right to start a business for himself, and he has a right to find a job, providing there's anybody he can sell his services to. But he must learn to use those rights."

In other words, this businessman believes the American system as presently constituted is the best for him and his race. He does not cry out in his frustration for advice from a Ph. D. in nonviolence, who has studied in India or Russia. But most remarkable of all, he has achieved a role of leadership among his people without ever being locked up in a jail or a penitentiary. He has mostly just served his country and sold soap.

All of which tends to remind that the time has come for a long hard look at the contending rabble-rousers who claim to speak for the American Negro. The American Bar Association and the AFL-CIO studied the matter several hours Tuesday and the findings of these two organizations could not be construed as an endorsement for mob rule.

The march on Washington is not to promote needed legislation, but to seek to force the enactment of laws to penalize self-respecting white and Negro citizens for the benefit of a raucous segment of the population, devoid of any sense of obligation or gratitude. They demand bread without work and exaltation through bestowal of privileges that restrict the freedom of the diligent who must pay the bill. This militant mass that will move on the Capital August 28, sponsored by misguided do-gooders and jailbirds, has pushed the administration beyond a point of no return.

The future of the country is in the hands of Congress—and Congress should act like it's aware of the seriousness of the assignment. Because responsible American citizens, white and black, are not going to be pushed around by a mob organized by Bayard Rustin, dubbed "Mr. March on Washington" by fellow officials.

That's not what the Pasadena Police Department calls him. He's listed there as a pervert and was in residence at the western hoosegow for 60 days.

A couple of Federal prisons know him as a draft dodger and an agitator.

We don't know what they call him in Moscow.

The Marvels of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the Community News and Baltimore Countian for August 16, 1963, Editor Paul T. Morgan anticipated President Kennedy's proclamation of August 19 as National Aviation Day by writing a timely and informative editorial on the great benefit aviation has been to our Nation and the world. I am delighted to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE MARVELS OF AVIATION

By Presidential proclamation, National Aviation Day will be observed on August 19. The very name turns the mind back to that most daring and romantic of modern eras, when the Wright brothers and their intrepid successors were proving to a skeptical world that manned flight was possible. Memory turns also to the fabled "circuses" of the First World War, when a gallantry in combat that has since gone out of the world was shown.

The mind moves on to the amazing planes of the present that will whisk around the world in a matter of hours, almost confounding the sun itself. Then on to the future which the scientists blueprint for us, in which passenger flights will move at thousands of miles an hour and the cities of Europe, Asia and South America will be, in point of time, as close as the next town.

The aircraft has added a new dimension to life. May that dimension, in all the years to come be one of peace and service to the human race.

Spurs to Housing Development in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a recent newsletter of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, referring to forthcoming hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee on legislation to create an International Home Loan Bank, enclosed an interesting article which appeared in the New York Times on July 28, 1963, entitled "United States Spurs Latin Americans To Mobilize Savings To Finance Homes."

One of the most significant aspects of this roundup of assistance to Latin American housing is the conclusion that the "longrun need is for middle-level savings and loan men who speak Spanish and who can give a year or two of their time." I have long contended that a longrun need exists most urgently in Latin America, as well as in other less developed areas, for middle level technical assistance, beyond the types of personnel provided at the executive level by AID and at the working level by the Peace Corps. The mutual effort of government agencies and private savings and loan associations and individual executives, which is outlined in this article, suggests that the manpower shortage can be tackled in the same energetic way.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SPURS LATIN AMERICANS TO MOBILIZE SAVINGS TO FINANCE HOMES

(By Edward Cowan)

Spurred by the United States under the banner of the Alliance for Progress, a number of Latin American countries are establishing savings and loan industries and central home loan banks. Their immediate goal is to mobilize personal savings to finance home buildings and eradicate substandard housing. In doing so, they hope to develop the financial mechanisms—and habits of thrift—that could propel their economies continuously upward.

Achievements have been modest but impressive if one keeps in mind the enormity of the task. Chile is the leader with 22 savings and loan associations. Peru has 12, Ecuador 7, Venezuela 4, and the Dominican

Republic 3. El Salvador and Panama recently adopted enabling legislation for home loan bank systems. Uruguay, Peru, and Argentina are considering it.

Serving as a pattern is the U.S. system of 11 regional Federal Home Banks and a supervising Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington. Savings institutions that join the system may borrow from their respective loan banks.

Urging and helping Latin American countries to develop sturdy savings and loan industries are the U.S. Agency for International Development, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, a trade group, individual savings and loan executives and the Inter-American Development Bank, an international institution with headquarters in Washington.

Underlying their efforts is the belief that the fastest way to eradicate Latin America's deficiency of decent housing—estimated at 12 to 16 million units—is to mobilize individual savings.

FORTY-FIVE PERCENT OF HOME LOANS

Replacing slums and rural huts with more sanitary, comfortable dwellings is an end in itself. But, importantly, it is also considered an important way of strengthening resistance to Communist and Castroite movements.

In the United States, savings and loan associations made 45 percent of all home loans in 1962. Although the comparison is in an opposite in some respects, officials feel there is enough substance to it to justify the attempt to create a Latin American savings and loan industry in advance of the timetable suggested by classical economical development theory.

"The savings are always there," Stanley Baruch, Housing Chief of the Development Bank, said in a recent interview. "In every country there is a residual resource that goes into counterproductive efforts unless there is a vigorous promotion of saving per se."

The basic problem has been a shortage of long-term housing credit at moderate interest rates. Five-year loans at 15 percent a year have been typical, it is said. By contrast, newly organized savings associations make 15- and 20-year loans at interest rates of 6 to 10 percent.

It has been estimated by Rodman C. Rockefeller, a vice president of International Basic Economy Corp., which builds houses in South America, that 50 percent of urban families there can afford to pay off a home loan.

DEMONSTRATION EFFECT

The workaday philosophy of the bank, AID and the U.S. industry is what might be called the demonstration effect. It is that the way to interest people in saving is to show them that the savings and loan association in turn will make loans to them to buy a home.

Consequently, the bank and AID have provided seed capital to finance home loans now. "Performance is the best advertisement, not some forlorn hope for 20 years from now," Mr. Baruch said.

To avoid dissipating the limited seed capital available, the bank and AID make their loans and grants to central home loan banks. "You build up your central credit institution so the others can develop around it," explained Marvin Weissman, the AID's Director of Institutional Development.

To be eligible to borrow for its member associations, a home loan bank must regulate the terms on which they lend to home buyers. Another condition is that the associations be true mutual institutions, owned by the depositors—as are most savings associations in this country—and not stock companies.

So far, the AID has provided $38,100,000 of seed capital, in grants and long-term, low-interest loans to Chile, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela. A $12,500,000 loan to Argentina has been approved.

The AID also has made direct housing loans in Colombia, Honduras, Jamaica, Panama, Venezuela, and Uruguay.

LOANS MADE

The bank has made $170 million of seed capital loans from its Social Progress Trust Fund. The loans will finance enough construction to employ 116,000 men for 2 years, according to Mr. Baruch, and thus, like AID money, will give a direct lift to local economies as well as yield better housing.

Both the bank and AID require that borrowing governments put up matching sums. Self-help, that is, physical labor on the construction site by home buyers, is counted toward the local contribution. Loans are supposed to be for the building of houses within the pocketbook reach of families of low or moderate income.

The sums available from the AID and the bank are insignificant in relation to Latin America's enormous housing needs. "The mechanism is more important than construction to date," Irving Tragen of the AID, said.

His point was that if by the "demonstration effect" the people of Latin America can be led to save regularly, a whole new pattern of finance and economic activity—a self-accelerating one—will emerge.

Indeed, what the housing and savings and loan experts are doing could spur not only housing but all economic development in Latin America. The region has suffered—and still does—chronic inflation which discourages saving. Financing is lacking for the investment necessary for a take-off on the path to industrialization and steady in-increases in national production and income.

READJUSTMENT BACKED

One device intended to overcome the deterrent of inflation to savings is the "reajuste", adopted by Chile at the suggestion of Harold Robinson, the AID's regional housing adviser for Latin America. The "reajuste," or readjustment, provides for increasing savings and mortgage balances in accordance with increases in the official index of wages.

Economists may argue, as the U.S. Treasury did, that the "readjuste" encourages toleration of inflation rather than painful anti-inflation measures. But Mr. Robinson, Mr. Baruch and others believe that its practical success outweights its theoretical demerits. Inflation in Latin America is a fact, they say, and unlikely to end soon. The thing to do is devise ways to improve economic performance despite it.

There is much enthusiasm in the AID and the bank for the proposed International Home Loan Bank. Legislation to create this institution is languishing in Congress. It is felt that the administration has not grasped the potential in the proposal.

The bank would be a creature of the U.S. Government. U.S. savings associations could invest limited sums in it. It would make loans to central home loan banks in Latin America. Thus, up to $10 billion of the assets of the U.S. industry might be made available for housing in Latin America.

One of the problems that money alone will not solve is the shortage of trained savings and loan personnel in Latin America. Some 40 top U.S. executives have spent from a week to a few months in Latin America giving technical advice. Peace Corpsmen are counseling in Peru. The longrun need is for middle-level savings and loan men who speak Spanish and who can give a year or two of their time.

Newspaper Asks Clarification of President Kennedy's Contradictory Statements on Vulnerability of Atmospheric Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in a series of editorials on August 6, 14, and 16, the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram uneasily points to contradictory estimates by President Kennedy relative to the partial test ban treaty. It raises questions which the President himself should answer. The editorials are as follows:

A TEST BAN FISHHOOK

Amid the familiar mood of undaunted optimism which has pervaded the signing of many ill-fated treaties between Russia and the West, three great world powers yesterday signed a partial ban on nuclear testing.

Although American Secretary of State Dean Rusk describes the treaty as "a good first step" toward world peace, the worth of the treaty is as questionable as the good faith of the Russian signers. Nothing could be more tenuous than that.

It is now up to the United States to decide whether this country will participate in the treaty. From all indications, sufficient votes are available for ratification, but there will be no decision, we trust, without thorough consideration of the possible dangers.

One of the big dangers noted by opponents of the treaty lies in the possibility that Russia might break the treaty and resume testing on a moment's notice, leaving this country at a disadvantage. The stock answer to this argument is that the United States can maintain its own readiness to test and resume testing if and when the Russians do.

We hope that on this point the words of President Kennedy, himself, will be introduced as testimony in the Senate hearings.

On March 3, 1962, Mr. Kennedy said in a radio and television speech:

"If we are to be able to be alert to new breakthroughs, to experiment with new designs, then our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves."

He also said:

"In actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

If the President was correct in these very positive statements of slightly more than a year ago, the partial test ban, which confines weapons progress to laboratories and caves and to the preparation of experiments "which may or may not take place," contains a monstrous fishhook for the gullible West.

Let's take a long, hard look at that bait before we grab it.

CAN WE OR CAN WE NOT STAND READY TO TEST?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk was both earnest and positive in his statement to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in behalf of the treaty to outlaw nuclear tests.

Anticipating the argument that United States nuclear preparations might lag while the Russians prepared in secret to break the treaty, Secretary Rusk said:

"We shall be on the alert for any violation. And we will be ready at all times to resume testing in all environments, and promptly, if that should be necessary."

What troubles us is the fact that on March 2, 1962, in announcing resumption of atmospheric testing following breach of a moratorium by the Soviet Union, President John F. Kennedy was just as earnest and just as positive in asserting the inability of this Nation to be ready at all times to resume testing.

We quoted his statement in detail here once before. It bears repeating in summary:

This Nation's weapons progress must not be limited to the confines of laboratories and caves.

Three years at Geneva proved the Soviets would not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as an agreement without controls would enable them to prevent the West from testing while they, the Soviets, prepared in secret.

Although some persons might urge keeping preparations to test in a constant state of readiness, it cannot be done. "This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution."

When the President and the Secretary of State, speaking on occasions only a few months apart, make such contradictory remarks, the ordinary citizen is left not knowing what to think.

Are the administration's remarks on this subject based on a set of known facts at a given time, or do they merely support a tortuous political strategy?

Perhaps this is a case in which a scientific, nonpolitical authority can offer enlightenment. While Secretary Rusk was delivering his statement to the Sentae Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. Edward Teller was testifying before the preparedness subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Dr. Teller, the famous physicist who played a major role in development of the hydrogen bomb, warned that the treaty would jeopardize the security of the West. He fears, particularly, that the treaty would inhibit the development of a missile defense for this country.

What is the answer to Dr. Teller's statement? What is the explanation of the administration's contradictory views? The American people deserve to know before the Senate votes on this most crucial issue.

THE PRESSURE IS ON

As things look now, approval by the Senate of the nuclear test ban is almost certain.

The pressure from the army of administration witnesses and from a world tired of conflict and eager to grasp at straws will surely be too much for the Senators to withstand.

Under such pressure, people who have genuine misgivings are going to be shouldered aside or squeezed into submission. Many Senators are going to sign a treaty in which they have no real confidence. The pressure is on, and to vote otherwise will be to court disaster at the next election.

Many of the Senators who support the treaty do so out of genuine conviction, of course. They see in it a long stride toward world peace.

We hope they are right.

We fear they are riding a wave of euphoria that could dash us all on the rocks.

It is unbelievable that Soviet Russia would tie its own hands in the field of nuclear testing while Red China proceeds to develop nuclear weapons. It is unbelievable that Russia, after all the events of recent history, has suddenly become trustworthy. Yet, in a sense the approval of the treaty will mean that this country is willing to believe these things.

In his testimony Wednesday, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave what only could be interpreted, as very cool support to the treaty. He said that the Joint Chiefs see military disadvantages in the treaty but none serious enough to make the treaty unacceptable. But he proceeded then to point out that the treaty will prevent this country from catching up with Russia in the field of high-yield nuclear weapons and will allow Russia to overtake this country's lead in the low-yield tactical field.

What are we getting in exchange for giving up an advantage in one field and forfeiting the right to come abreast in another?

A promise.

From whom?

Russia, the nation which little more than a year ago inspired the following remarks in a nationwide speech by the President of the United States:

"The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret."

Charles F. Noyes Celebrates 85th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last month one of America's and New York's most outstanding citizens, Charles F. Noyes, celebrated his 85th birthday. Charles Noyes has dedicated his life not only to the pursuit of his chosen field of real estate brokerage, in which he has been involved in many of the most significant transactions both in New York City and nationwide, but also to myriad civic, educational, and philanthropic endeavors. To this day, he actively manages the affairs of the Jesse Smith Noyes Foundation, named after his wife, which he created to provide financial aid to deserving students without regard to their race, creed, or religion, and nearly 4,000 students have been the beneficiaries of grants and loan funds administered by this noteworthy foundation.

Charles Noyes' life has been a brilliant example to his fellow Americans. It demonstrates that the right combination of intelligence, integrity, high idealism, and diligence will find its deserved rewards—in worldly success, and in the great cultural and spiritual contributions to a society of fellow men that such success makes possible. With humility, with love in his heart for mankind, with utmost devotion to the tasks he has set out for himself, Charles Noyes has richly earned the tributes that have been paid him as he begins his 86th year and his 66th in the world of the New York real estate business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article paying honor to Charles F. Noyes, which was published in the July issue of Real Estate Forum, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOYES CELEBRATES 85TH BIRTHDAY; NATIONALLY KNOWN BROKER IS ACTIVE IN REALTY FIELD ALTHOUGH RETIRED FROM COMPANY HE FOUNDED IN 1898

(By Richard L. Stanley)

A man whose name has been synonymous with real estate for 65 years, Charles F. Noyes, this month celebrates his 85th birthday. And although he voluntarily relinquished control of the realty firm he established in 1898, Noyes remains typically busy, putting in a long workday tending to his personal and family real estate matters, and particularly those matters pertaining to the Jesse Smith Noyes Foundation, a philanthropic organization named for his wife, which he created in 1947 to provide financial aid to deserving students regardless of race, creed, or religion.

In 1959 Noyes made a substantial gift of stock of the Charles F. Noyes Co., Inc., to his business associates which, with prior gifts, amounted to $1,050,000 and last year the reins of this nationally known business were turned over to Paul T. O'Keefe, formerly deputy mayor of the city of New York as well as its commissioner of real estate, who became president and chief executive officer.

As a broker, Noyes has closed many important deals, the most famous perhaps being the sale of the Empire State Building in 1951, when he was 73—a $51.5 million transaction which ranked as the largest in the world at that time.

The negotiations which Noyes carried through in 1948 in connection with properties belonging to the New York Hospital won for him the annual award of the Real Estate Board of New York, Inc., as the most ingenious real estate deal of that year. Involved was the property bounded by Broadway, Worth, Church, and Duane Streets, about 150,000 square feet.

The ground had been deeded to the hospital in 1772 and included 17 buildings, mostly 5 stories with 2 basements, containing about 700,000 square feet. In 1928–29 Noyes persuaded David A. Schulte to join him and buy the buildings and leaseholds for $600,000. The Noyes Co. was the broker, as it was again in 1935 when Noyes-Schulte sold the entire package back to J. P. Morgan, Sr., acting for the hospital. In 1948 Noyes, the Honorable Samuel Levy and Aaron Rabinowitz bought back the property for $3 million cash through the Noyes organization, and the individual properties were resold by the Noyes Co. to the tenants for a total price of $4,482,500. When most of the firms who were tenants in the properties migrated to the new textile center between 34th Street and 42d Street in 1957 and 1958 Noyes individually bought back five of the 50 foot by 100 foot buildings on Worth Street and an entire blockfront on Church Street from Worth to Thomas Streets for cash and spent several hundred thousand dollars on improvements. The properties are today held free and clear of mortgage. Little did Noyes know then that 5 years hence in 1962–63 that the largest Federal building except for the Pentagon—the size of the Empire State Building—would be erected on a 130,000-square-foot plot just east of his five Worth Street buildings; or that Mayor Wagner would, as he did a few months ago, approve the plans for the enlarged Civic Cen-

ter; or that the Port Authority would sponsor the World Trade Center to the south. This is one of many examples of Noyes' real estate sense or possibly his intuition.

Again, in 1928 this so-called New York Hospital property would have been the greatest tribute of all to Noyes' record in the real estate field. But for the great panic of 1929 Noyes and Schulte with John J. Raskob as their partner would have proceeded with the most spectacular building of all time on their land. On October 6, 1929, just 23 days before the stock market's disastrous plunge, the New York Herald Tribune devoted the entire front page of its Sunday section to the announcement of a project which staggered the imagination—a 150-story superskyscraper which would dwarf the Empire State Building then in the planning stages. "There is no question in my mind," says Noyes, "that this building would have been erected if we had not come into the panic of 1929–30."

Incidentally, Raskob did figure in Noyes' business life other than in the potential deal for the 150-story building on plot of 150,00 square feet because it was Noyes, as broker, who with Raskob of General Motors worked out for Max N. Natanson, as principal, all the ramifications of the deal in connection with the present General Motors Building, including the obtaining of the leasehold covering the ground owned by the Wertheim estate and the negotiation of the terms of the General Motors lease, the financing and the complete rental and management of the building until it was sold to Louis Glickman.

As early as 1915 Noyes forecast the trend north to Fulton Street of the insurance district, then on William Street south to Wall Street including buildings on Pine Street to Maiden Lane. In 1935 he likewise foresaw the the advantages of the Avenue of the Americas (then Sixth Avenue) would be recognized by investment builders. Noyes himself purchased three adjacent 20-foot residences on 51st Street between Fifth and Sixth Avenues, two in 1935 for $78,000 and the other in 1940 for $35,000. During the last 5 years there has been a spectaular wave of construction on that avenue and the Noyes properties cost the developers of a large office building $1 million to acquire for demolition plus an additional $1.5 million to acquire a tenant's lease.

Noyes has always considered well-located property in New York City "the best of all investments." He further feels that any boy with average intelligence, strict integrity and high ideals, and willing to work hard has a chance to achieve success in the real estate profession.

By the middle 1920's Charles F. Noyes Co., Inc., was closing about 7,000 sales or leases a year as broker or agent, involving a gross of more than $300 million. This included the operations of Noyes National, active in the South, Midwest and west coast. About 1930 this business was transferred to New York City, where it was reported that the company managed about 300 office, loft and commercial buildings, and its 3,000 clerical and building service employees collected some $40 million in rents annually from 5,500 tenants.

During the boom days of 1926, the United Cigar Stores Co., Inc., bought a half-interest in the Noyes company for $1.2 million and insured Noyes' life for $2.4 million—at that time one of the largest insurance policies ever issued on an individual's life. When United Cigar had financial difficulties Noyes personally bought back the half interest.

Early in Noyes' business career he showed his positive ideas against discrimination and on July 1, 1947, he personally organized the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Inc. For the fiscal year 1948 the amount distributed by the foundation was $54,528. By 1961 the figure had increased $398,970. During the period that the foundation has been in operation, 3,787 students have been helped to become better citizens.

Among many honors bestowed on Noyes he particularly cherishes the J. P. Morgan Medal of the New England Society in 1962 for having established student loan funds in several New England colleges and universities; the Horatio Alger Award bestowed in 1959; and the title "Honorary Citizen of Texas," awarded him by Gov. Price Daniel in 1958. In 1953 Noyes was made an honorary doctor of laws at St. Lawrence University in Canton, N.Y., and received a similar degree in 1955 from Park College in Parkville, Mo. The following year Pace College honored the veteran broker with the degree of Doctor of Commercial Sciences.

Besides being a member of 34 different real estate and civic organizations, Noyes has over the years been a director of the American Red Cross; president and trustee of the Heckscher Trust; trustee and at times member of the executive committee of the Title Guaranty & Trust Co.; for nearly 30 years, a member of the advisory board of directors of the Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.; and for 65 years a director of the Norwich (Conn.) Daily Bulletin, the sixth oldest newspaper in the country, established in 1790. Incidentally, Noyes' father, Charles D. Noyes, was president of the Bulletin Co., a position now filled by Harrison C. Noyes, a brother.

Political Picture by Ellis Binkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a political column entitled "Political Picture" by Ellis Binkley, which appeared in the Kingsport Times-News, Sunday, August 11, 1963.

Mr. Binkley is one of the foremost political writers in Tennessee and the Nation. His "Political Picture" column is carried regularly in the Kingsport Times and the Kingsport News, daily newspapers published in Kingsport, Tenn. His subject matters are always very interesting, and this particular column I thought so dynamic that I wanted to make it available to the other Members of Congress and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ANTI-BOBBY FEELING BROUGHT INTO OPEN

[By Ellis Binkley]

A few columns back we reported that a prominent Young Democrat in the State is concerned over the chances of his party carrying Tennessee next year for President Kennedy.

He said that Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the President's brother, was the thorn in the party's side, more so than the Chief Executive himself.

This anti-Bobby sentiment is growing all across the State. Last week it was brought out into the open by a Chattanooga attorney.

Fletcher R. Morgan, who was Hamilton County campaign manager for Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Kennedy, has written the President saying that he will oppose him when he runs for reelection.

The prominent civic and political leader charges in his letter that the President is using the civil rights issue for "political expediency" and the power he and Bobby are seeking would make the Governor of each State "a humiliated puppet of the Kennedys."

He also told the President that had he known that Bobby would have been named Attorney General he would have opposed him, rather than managed his campaign in 1960.

Morgan, a former district attorney general, has been a top leader in the Democratic party for more than 40 years.

Full text of Morgan's letter, copies of which were sent to Vice President Lyndon Johnson, Senators Kefauver and Gore and Representative Brock, follows:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am a lifelong Democrat. In 1939 I managed the campaign in this county for Franklin D. Roosevelt and in that campaign the first integrated meeting was held in our auditorium and the principal speaker was a Negro Congressman.

"In 1960 I managed your campaign in this county and a rally was held at the same place in your behalf and at that meeting it was my pleasure to introduce Senator Lyndon Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson.

"Managing your campaign was not a popular assignment. Many people were skeptical of you because of your religion. I am a Baptist, but I have no religious prejudice, nor do I possess any racial prejudice.

"Your every act from the date of your inauguration has justified my belief that your religion would not dictate your judgment as President of the United States.

"But, had I known then that it was your intention to appoint your brother Robert Kennedy as Attorney General and that you and he together would try to usurp the freedom of the people and supplant our free government with a dictatorship and a police state, I would have done what I shall do when you run again—oppose you.

"There is no way to justify the spending of $15 million to keep one person in one particular college, when there are thousands of worthy boys and girls, both white and black, that are denied a chance to attend any college because they have no funds.

"Nor do I sanction your course in taxing to death the people of this Nation to give foreign aid to countries who don't even levy a tax on their own people.

"In my judgment the course you and your brother are taking is a menace to this country and could easily lead to a dictatorship and a police state, and that this Nation can no longer say the Land of the Free, but can still say the Home of the Brave.

"You are destroying the trust that the people of this Nation have always had and should have for its Chief Executive and you are striving to place in the hands of Robert Kennedy more power than any man should ever seek or have. The image the people have of Robert Kennedy is that he is a small bigot and that he is a menace to the liberties of this Nation.

"The power that you and he are seeking under the mask of civil rights is but a means to attain the power to supress the will of all who oppose you and to make the chief executive of every State of this Union a humiliated puppet of the Kennedys.

"Why doesn't your heart bleed for the North American Indians who are citizens of the United States and whose rights are trampled under foot in every State of this Union, where they live?

"You spend more than $15 million of the people's money to keep a man in school, because you say his constitutional rights were denied—I fail to see where you have spent 15 cents to secure the Indian in his equal rights. I'll answer that question for you—political expediency.

"You are riding a high horse, roughshod, but I warn you that you are fomenting a revolution, and if it comes, you, your high horse and little brother Bobbie will know just how great is the might of the wrath of the people of this Nation.

"Yours very truly,

"FLETCHER R. MORGAN."

U.S. Relations With Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a very fine article on our relations with Yugoslavia recently appeared in the Arkansas Gazette. It was written by Mr. Perrin Jones, who is the publisher of the Searcy, Ark., Daily Citizen. Mr. Jones is one of the outstanding young newspapermen of my State and, I believe, has done an exceptional job of defining the complex issues involved in our relations with Yugoslavia. I ask unanimous consent that his article entitled "Arkansas Publisher Looks at Yugoslavia," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS PUBLISHER LOOKS AT YUGOSLAVIA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This article is reprinted from the Searcy, Ark., Daily Citizen, whose publisher, Perrin Jones, has been writing a series of articles on his observations while traveling in Central and Eastern Europe.)

(By Perrin Jones)

America has given the Tito government of Yugoslavia a total of $2 billion in foreign aid since the Tito break with Stalin in the late forties. At present, in addition, Yugoslavia owes the United States about $100 million in loans and repayment of seized American property. Yugoslavia is repaying this debt on schedule.

But Yugoslavia, no matter what may be said for her people, her system, or her prosperity, is still a country which embraces communism. In this fact lies a basic problem for the United States that is already a hot potato and one which will get progressively hotter in the future. Can the greatest democratic power on earth afford to give massive aid to a Communist government in order to help it build prosperity? Or to put it another way, are we helping to promote communism by bolstering the Government of Yugoslavia? This question bothers a lot of Americans. I must admit it bothered me before I went to Yugoslavia and actually got the feel of the conditions and saw what our American aid has done.

Some will say that I was brainwashed on this subject, but not being at all naive, I prefer to think that for once, I see what our country is trying to do in Yugoslavia and I approve of it.

The basic theory behind American aid to the independent communism of Tito is that the money we spend there is helping Tito to remain independent of the Kremlin, that it is fostering a difference of opinion withtin the monolithic structure of world communism. One thing that radically disturbs the quiet and peaceful movement of communism in its efforts to engulf the world is when a difference of opinion arises. This little thing—this difference—that would go unnoticed in the West brings the gears of world communism crashing into each other with a force that an American cannot understand. In short, we've paid $2 billion to keep Tito from having to go to Moscow with his hat in his hand. It is a stiff price, but I think I can show that it was worth it.

Before Tito broke with Stalin, Russian troops actually had naval bases on the Adriatic and the front line of Communist expansion was just across this little body of water from Italy. Stalin had the warm water ports in Europe that not even the grandest of the Russian czars ever hope to gain. Subversives could infiltrate Italy *.* * already with a strong Communist front. Greece was in constant turmoil with Red agitators drifting through Yugoslavia and a civil war there actually occurred. Tito was a heroic figure in Europe from his resistance to the Germans and the Russians got full mileage out of this.

Then Stalin cracked down to consolidate his empire and Tito stood up and said "no." This was the first chink in the wall and we rushed in with immediate and extensive support. Now, more than a decade later, Yugoslavia is still independent and extremely prosperous.

We Americans talk a lot about the "self-determination" of peoples. Even, we explain this to mean that we don't really care what sort of government a nation has so long as it is freely arrived at and so long as personal freedom is promoted. If these are really our criteria—if we believe in this—then we have no right as a Nation to penalize Yugoslavia just because she travels under the "Communist" banner. Our own State Department admits that Yugoslavia is the only nation in the Eastern bloc that has no agents butting into our affairs or the affairs of her neighbors, she is definitely not a part of the world movement of Communist subversion.

American aid to Yugoslavia is over. The plan has expired and the Yugoslavs are not asking for additional aid. But, in order that the Yugoslavs have enough hard currency to pay us the $100 million owed to us, she must continue her favored position in trade with the United States. Yugoslavia and Poland, the two "independent Communist" nations were given "most favored nations" treatment by the United States several years ago but there is now a move afoot in Congress to remove this distinction this year and, if it is done, the Yugoslavs will have no way to continue competitive trade with the United States, there will be no way to pay off the U.S. debt. The country will immediately have to begin an austerity program and eventually, if she is not strong enough to go it alone, she will be forced to go back to Moscow. This, to me, is unthinkable.

Democrats Urge Ties With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the positions taken on various national issues by the Young Democrats from 13 Western States at their recently concluded convention in Berkeley, Calif. The Evening Star of August 19, 1963, reported on some of the resolutions adopted at this convention and I believe the Members and the Nation should be familiar with the positions taken on these matters by this group of Democrats.

The article follows:

DEMOCRATS URGE TIES WITH CUBA

BERKELEY, CALIF., August 19.—Young Democrats from 13 Western States ended their convention in Berkeley yesterday with resolutions concerning Cuba, civil rights, and American military deployment.

A total of 32 resolutions demanded, among other things, that the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba, that the August 28 Negro civil rights parade on Washington be "carried out as planned," that a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations and that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam.

Other points covered included demands for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act, revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, the elimination of compulsory arbitration in strikes, and abolition of the death penalty.

The delegates condemned various organizations, the aim of which they said, is to limit the civil rights of nonwhites. These included, the Young Democrats said, the John Birch Society, the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Christian Crusade.

Michel Blasts REA Loan to Ski Resort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, has been waging a vigorous battle to bring some sense of responsibility on the part of Departments and Bureaus to see that moneys appropriated are spent in a proper manner.

Once again he has brought to the attention of the House the irresponsible manner in which the REA continues to make foolish loans at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Under unanimous consent I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune on August 17, 1963, concerning this subject:

MICHEL BLASTS REA LOAN TO SKI RESORT

(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—Representative ROBERT MICHEL, Republican, Illinois, accused Rural Electrification Administration officers of acting like juvenile delinquents today by continuing to lend money to ski resorts over objections of Congress.

MICHEL, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, charged the REA with having "defied the intent of Congress" in announcing a $110,000 loan yesterday to a Pennsylvania ski resort.

MICHEL said the loan to the Blue Knob Development Corp. of Altoona, Pa., by the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Huntingdon, Pa., will be used to purchase snowmaking equipment and a ski lift.

CITES EARLIER LOAN

Congress went on record against such loans last year, MICHEL said, when a similar loan was made to a northern Illinois ski resort by an REA cooperative.

"It is a sad commentary on the present state of burocratic thinking when an agency established by the Congress, such as REA, thinks it can blantantly disregard parental instruction and guidance," MICHEL said.

"REA is acting like a juvenile delinquent, and, therefore, deserves to be treated like one. Congress, as a concerned parent, may be compelled to apply stern disciplinary measures on this wayward agency."

WARNED BY COOLEY

Chairman HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, warned REA Administrator Norman Clapp at a House hearing last February on REA loans to ski resorts "to be very careful not to make loans that are going to go so far afield," MICHEL recalled.

COOLEY told Clapp if he did not stop, Congress would have to rewrite the REA law to make it clear that Congress did not intend such loans.

The Law Applies to Congress, Too—Rights Statutes Viewed as Based on Future Supreme Court Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. David Lawrence appeared in the Evening Star of August 19.

This article brings to our attention a very disturbing fact, and one that caused much concern to Members of the legislative branch of our Government. This is the increasing tendency of the courts to legislate, something that is in no sense their function.

Justice Harlan, who is liberally quoted in the article, sums the whole matter up admirably when he says "a function more ill-suited to judges can hardly be imagined, situated as they are, and should be aloof from the political arena and beholden to no one for their conscientious conduct."

The article follows:

THE LAW APPLIES TO CONGRESS, TOO: RIGHTS STATUTES VIEWED AS BASED ON FUTURE SUPREME COURT ACTION

(By David Lawrence)

Much talk is heard and much is written about the obligation of everybody to obey the law of the land. But who says what is the law of the land. And if the Supreme Court does, then shouldn't the President and the Congress obey it, too? These questions arise now because, despite rulings in previous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, Congress is being urged by the administration to pass certain civil rights laws which are based on the speculation that the High Court will reverse itself.

When, however, Governor Wallace, of Alabama, and Governor Barnett, of Mississippi, endeavored to secure a reversal of Supreme Court decisions by challenging them in an orderly way in the lower courts, each of the two Governors was widely denounced as defying the law of the land.

It is being openly asserted now by exponents of the proposed civil rights legislation that the Supreme Court will in due course invalidate or reverse its 1883 decision denying Congress the right to use the 14th amendment to pass Federal laws that would, for example, punish a hotel owner if he chose his own customers. The contention advanced in administration circles is that the 1883 decision is out of date and that the Supreme Court will modernize its rulings.

The same 1883 ruling of the High Court implied, incidentally, that vehicles or public conveyances passing from one State to another might be regulated under the commerce clause of the Constitution. But there is nothing in that or any other decision which justifies a confident assumption that the selection of guests by managers of hotels can be regulated by the Federal Government under any present clause of the Constitution.

What becomes, then, of the law of the land and the oath to support and defend the Constitution which all Members of Congress, Cabinet officers and the President of the United States take when they assume office? Can the Department of Justice in all conscience recommend passage by Congress of a law which is of doubtful constitutionality, and do so because an ideologically sympathetic Supreme Court is expected to uphold such a statute? Should Members of Congress vote for legislation which they believe may be held unconstitutional? Are the justices supposed to forget their oath of office and decide cases in tune with "the spirit of the times"?

Associate Justice John M. Harlan of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a speech in Chicago a few days ago at the dedication ceremonies of the American Bar Center, had some pertinent things to say on the general subject of legislating by the courts. He declared:

"Our system of Government is being challenged from abroad and readjustments of one kind or another are facing us at home. * * * Yet it would be shortsighted not to recognize that times like these are bound to produce temptations and pressures to depart from or temporize with traditional constitutional precepts or even to shortcut the processes of change which the Constitution establishes. It is the special reponsibility of lawyers, whether on or off the bench, to see to it that such things do not happen."

Justice Harlan said one of the current notions is that "deficiencies in our society which have failed of correction by other means should find a cure in the courts," and he cited "impatience with the slowness of political solutions generally." He said there is an "urge for quick and uncompromising panaceas for things that call for reform," but that this view of the "cosmic place of the judiciary is not only inconsistent with the principles of American democratic society but ultimately threatens the integrity of the judicial system itself."

There is plainly a tendency today to pass the buck to the Supreme Court. Justice Harlan cited the general expectation that an inadequate statute or one that is "manifestly unwise, harsh, or out-of-date" will be "abrogated by the exercise of the power of judicial review."

Back in 1935, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt urged Members of Congress to pass a certain law irrespective of their doubts as to its constitutionality. When he didn't like subsequent Court decisions—including one in 1936 invalidating that same law—he tried unsuccessfully in 1937 to get a law through Congress to enable him to enlarge the Supreme Court from 9 to a possible 15 members so he could appoint a new majority to do his bidding. Mr. Roosevelt argued that the process of amending the Constitution in the way prescribed in that document itself was too time-consuming and difficult. He preferred, in effect, amendment of the Constitution by the judiciary.

Twenty-six years have passed since these recommendations were made to a nationwide radio audience by a President of the United States who had sworn to uphold the Constitution, but there is still a feeling that the Supreme Court must respond to the political pressure of the Executive. The new frontiersmen and the new dealers talk the same language—that no matter how the Constitution has been previously construed in the decisions of the Supreme Court, Government officials, even though sworn to uphold the law of the land, must press for new decisions to reverse those of the past.

Justice Harlan's advice to the Nation is to avoid the transfer of legislative power to the courts. For, he says, "a function more ill-suited to judges can hardly be imagined, situated as they are, and should be, aloof from the political arena, and beholden to no one for their conscientious conduct."

Racial Equality a Religious Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Fredrik Schiotz, who grew up in my State of Wisconsin, was elected to the presidency of the Lutheran World Federation, an organization of 53 million Lutherans in more than 38 nations around the world. Among his other accomplishments, Dr. Schiotz is known for his concern with the issue of racial segregation in this country.

In an article in the August 17, 1963, Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel concerning Dr. Schiotz's election the leadership of the Lutheran World Federation, a five-step program for achieving racial equality that Dr. Schiotz had outlined for the use of pastors of his own denomination is described. The program is a judicious blend of looking inward at the principles and practices of his own church and looking outward at the practices of communities and the Nation. Dr. Schiotz is to be congratulated on his election to the highest office in the Lutheran Church and for his fine leadership in an area of great concern to us all, the equality of all men before God. I include the Sentinel article in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN MAN LEADS 53 MILLION LUTHERANS

(By James M. Johnston)

The leadership of 53 million Lutherans throughout the world passed from one American to another last week. At Helsinki, Finland, delegates from 38 nations elected the Reverend Dr. Fredrik Axel Schiotz, who grew up in northwestern Wisconsin and taught high school at Ladysmith, to the presidency of the Lutheran World Federation.

Handing over the gavel to Dr. Schiotz (pronounced "Shutz") was the Reverend Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, who is also president of the Lutheran Church in America, chairman of the policymaking central committee of the World Council of Churches, and a leader in the National Council of Churches.

Dr. Schiotz is president of the American Lutheran Church, with headquarters in Minneapolis.

Beyond the fact that Drs. Schiotz and Fry head large Lutheran denominations in America, they have few similarities and present many contracts. Towering above 6 feet, Dr. Fry stands out in a group, not only for his height, but for his rollicking extroversion and quick wit. There is little of the dramatic in quiet, deliberate Dr. Schiotz, whose warm personality and patient diplomacy "qualify him as a mediator among the various traditions of the Lutheran Churches and as a representative of world Lutheranism on the ecumenical level," as one Lutheran spokesman put it.

"Come, let us reason together" is the favorite plea of Dr. Schiotz to an adversary. His experience in mediation dates from the

1930's when he took the pastorate of a Duluth, Minn., church as it was recuperating from a congregational split. Under his leadership, the flock convalesced.

Shortly after Fredrik was born in Chicago in 1901, the family moved to Hawkins, Wis. His father, a cabinetmaker, was a native of Norway. At the age of 10, Fredrik was inspired to enter the ministry by the sermon of a Methodist preacher whose congregation had "borrowed" the Lutheran Church for the night.

Several years later, the family moved to Ladysmith, where Fredrik worked in a hardware store before entering St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. After graduation in 1924, for 2 years he taught English and public speaking at Ladysmith High School and led a Hi-Y Club. Then he entered Luther Theological Seminary at St. Paul, from which he received his theological degrees and took advanced work at Northwestern and Chicago Universities.

During his 33 years as a clergyman, Dr. Schiotz has been a student leader, foreign missions executive and church administrator, as well as parish pastor. Delegates at Helsinki relied on his experience in the foreign field to equip him for the Lutheran World Federation presidency, where knowledge of the churches of Europe and America and the younger churches of Asia and Africa is a requirement. In 1935–36, Dr. Schiotz took a year's leave to visit mission stations in Japan, China, India, South Africa and Madagascar.

He served 6 years on the National Lutheran Council commission on younger churches and orphaned missions, and for 8 years headed the Lutheran World Federation commission on world missions.

In 1954, delegates at Minneapolis elected him president of the former Evangelical Lutheran Church. When the Evangelical Lutheran Church and other groups merged into the new American Lutheran Church in 1960, delegates elected Dr. Schiotz president, again at Minneapolis.

Immediately after his election, Dr. Schiotz called for a campaign to fight housing discrimination in Minneapolis. "As long as discrimination exists in our fair land, the blood of South Africa's race riots besmirches our own hand," declared the new president of the American Lutheran Church in the capital city of the new denomination on April 25, 1960. He alleged that Negroes in Mineapolis do not have access to the total housing market.

Recently, Dr. Schiotz dispatched to pastors of his own denomination a five-step program for racial equality:

"1. Let your people know where you stand. (If you have no convictions on this issue, ponder the gravity of this hour of judgment in the life of our Nation.)

"2. Be sure your congregation is ready to offer the hand of welcome to the Negro as a guest and as an applicant for membership.

"3. Lead congregational prayer that God may dispose your hearts in penitence for our racial sins and in a hunger to allow 'justice to roll down like waters.'

"4. Encourage church members to write to their Congressmen and Senators of their concerns. (Let legislators be advised that this is no time to stymie action by filibustering.)

"5. Encourage lay leaders to participate in community interracial consultations for peaceful action."

Presiding over the national convention of the American Lutheran Church here last October, Dr. Schiotz's calmness prevented an occasional storm from becoming stormier. A bit of dry humor here and there eased tension for many a delegate worried not only about the spiritual health of today's believers, but about the Cuban crisis.

Dr. Schiotz, a leader in church unity and cooperation, knew the denomination disagreed about retaining its membership in the World Council of Churches, a federation of Protestant denominations throughout the globe. Some delegates opposed membership because of the presence of the Russian Orthodox Church in its midst. Others argued that members of the World Council of Churches advanced liberal theology.

In his preconvention report, Dr. Schiotz strongly defended the world council.

"Many people are making the extreme assumption that because the Russian Orthodox Church was admitted to membership in the World Council of Churches, the council is now the subject to the will of the Soviet Government. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Your president, along with other American Lutherans, had a 2-hour conference with two of the Russian delegates. * * * No one could sit in at that meeting without being fully aware that he was speaking to brethren in Christ. * * * Because the World Council of Churches is a council of churches, it cannot allow political boundaries to determine who may and who may not belong."

Dr. Schiotz further contended that "the World Council of Churches' emphasis on unity is from a scriptural point of view." The delegates voted to stay in the World Council of Churches' fold.

"Come, let us reason together" will be heard in many languages of world Lutheranism for the next 6 years, at least.

Vocational Education, Manpower Retraining and Social Security in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, due to the interest that my committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, has shown in vocational education and manpower retraining and the responsibility we have had in preparing legislation, I went to Spain to note what was happening in that country in this vital area of living.

During my visit, it was my privilege to inspect the Spanish program in vocational education. I wish to report on the interesting experiment which is already providing excellent results for Spain and its workers.

First of all, there are 3,595 vocational training schools operating as sections of primary schools. However, the most important institutions are the industrial vocational schools, the vocational training high schools and the vocational training universities. Most of these schools were developed after the termination of the Civil War and pursuant to the provisions of the legislation asking for equality of employment opportunities for all Spaniards. These requirements could be met only through adequate vocational training and worker education programs.

After a few years of experience, in 1955 a law was passed which, as well as establishing a really ambitious and comprehensive program for vocational education, reclassified and regulated the various types of vocational schools in existence and granted special privileges to private persons, companies and institutions willing to cooperate in the state's effort to raise workers' educational and vocational standards.

The industrial vocational schools number over 700 and are operated not only by the Government agencies, but also by the church, the trade unions, and by private companies. These schools charge no tuition fees and, in the case of the union schools, provide free meals and lodging for an important percentage of those attending.

Students enter these schools at the age of 11 and take four 9-month courses, where technical and on-the-bench instruction is combined with more general subjects designed to improve the cultural background of the future worker and to make him able to take an active part in community life.

The vocational training high schools, operated by the department of national education, have been created in small cities and villages throughout the country where there is no regular high school. The vocational baccalaureate is taught in these institutions which combine technological instruction needed by specialized workers and humanistic instruction as given by regular high schools. This new type of baccalaureate, which is contributing greatly to eliminate the class consciousness produced by the exclusively humanistic classic baccalaureate, has four branches, according to the geographic location of each school and, therefore, to the specific needs of the population involved. The first branch is intended for industrial zones, specializing the students in industrial trades predominant in the area. There is an agricultural branch, there is another which specializes in maritime trades and fisheries, and there is a fourth branch mainly intended for girls, to train secretaries and administrative workers.

The vocational training universities present a very special feature. While the vocational training high schools, as well as the Government- and church-operated vocational schools are open to every Spaniard, only the children of workers are eligible for the vocational training universities. At these institutions the students take a preliminary 18-month course designed to cover general cultural subjects. Likewise opportunity is given to enable the teachers to become acquainted with each student's vocational aptitude. After this course, there is another of the same length of time to provide the students with the skill needed to be a specialized worker and even a foreman. Outstanding students are sent to engineering schools of the university level.

The trade unions system is carrying out, in addition to the operation of vocational training schools, a very important manpower development program called accelerated vocational training. The purpose of this program is to train unskilled workers into skilled or semiskilled ones through a 6-month course. There are five of these schools in operation and two more under construction.

Social security is an aspect of the workers' welfare that is not neglected by any modern country. In this connection, Spain has established one of the most complete systems which covers some 20 million persons. Every Spanish worker

and his dependents benefit from the following social insurances: health insurance, old age and survivors insurance; unemployment insurance: workmen's compensation insurance and professional diseases insurance. In addition, there is a system granting family allowances for each dependent of the insured worker. Finally, there is a program called Labor Mutual Benefit Societies which supplements the Social Security Administration program by granting old-age and survivors pensions in addition to the regular social insurance payments when the insured has exhausted the 39 weeks per year that the health insurance allows to each worker. The Mutual Benefit Societies also grant disability pensions, provide health insurance benefits to retired workers and their dependents and grant cash loans carrying very low interest rates to workers who wish to improve their small businesses. Last but not least, every year the Mutual Benefit Societies grant a number of scholarships to the children of workers.

Social security in Spain is financed by contributions from the employers and the workers plus a contribution from the state. The employers pay five times the workers' quota. The administration of the state social security program is carried out by the Social Security Administration—Instituto Nacional de Prevision—which seats elected representatives of the workers and the employers on each of its policymaking boards. The Mutual Benefit Societies are directly administered by committees of workers and employers under the supervision of the Department of Labor.

There is another interesting aspect of the Spanish labor organization to which I would like to refer. The Unions are carrying out their regular duties in connection with labor conditions and collective bargaining with great efficency, to the extent that 2,787 agreements covering 5 million workers have been negotiated and signed since 1958, when collective bargaining was established. but in addition to this, the Trade Union Organization maintains a recreational and educational service which provides the workers and their families with 49 winter and summer residences where they can spend their vacation at incredibly low rates. Since 1940, when this union service was created, some 600,000 workers have benefited from it.

A basic point of Spanish labor philosophy is the admission that every labor-management conflict can be resolved without having to resort to strikes. In order to reach this goal a special branch of tribunals was established in 1940, the Labor Courts, which were to deal with every conflict between a worker and his employer. Recently, these courts have also been entrusted with the task of dealing with collective labor-management conflicts not settled either through negotiation or mediation. It must be noted that prior to going to the courts the conflict must be submitted to a Union Conciliation Committee, which tries to avert judicial intervention by working out a solution which may be acceptable to both parties. Approximately 60 percent of the individual conflicts brought before the Union Conciliation Committees are resolved there.

The Labor Courts are composed of professional judges who specialize in labor matters. In principle, there is one in each provincial area, except in those industrial areas where there is a large working population, such as Madrid, Barcelona, Bilbao, Oviedo, et cetera. In each of these areas there are several courts.

We all know that it is extremely difficult to avoid all of the strikes, but the institution of labor courts, which exist not only in Spain but also in other countries such as Australia, is proving to be a good instrument to keep industrial peace, to the benefit of the workers and employers in particular and of the national interest in general.

Thus, the vocational education of the Spaniard is seen as a continual whole from the time he first begins his training, throughout his employment, and even during his retirement and periods of unemployment.

Hon. Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, the minority leader, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], the dean of the Tennessee delegation, have paid moving and fitting tributes to one of our great Americans, ESTES KEFAUVER. I had the great privilege of getting to know Senator KEFAUVER many years ago. I knew him and Nancy and his family well and intimately, lo these many years. It is difficult for me to add to what has already been said. Senator KEFAUVER came from a State which has produced great men—Secretary of State Hull, Presidents Andrew Johnson and Andrew Jackson, Speaker Sam Rayburn and others—all of whom had a profound understanding of the United States and the strength of the United States as a union of States.

Senator KEFAUVER was in that great tradition. While he loved his State, and his section, he could never be accused of sectionalism. And while he loved the average man, the common man, he could not be accused of being unfair to any group of men anywhere in our country. He was a big man, not only in stature, but a big man in every sense of the word; big in understanding, big in size, big of heart.

He understood the international problems of the United States. I had the privilege of traveling with him to various meetings, such as those of the Interparliamentary Union, and on many occasions I heard him speak at these meetings and articulate, as he so well could, in his homely but convincing and sincere fashion, the mission of our great country.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a great friend. Tennessee has lost a great leader and our Nation has lost one it can so ill afford to lose at so early a time in his active, vigorous, successful, and productive life.

My wife and I have lost a good friend. I join with my colleagues from Tennessee in extending to his lovely wife, Nancy, who campaigned up an down the Nation with him time in and time out, our deepest sympathy and our love and affection.

Chairman Aspinall Outlines Public Lands Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presented a most interesting and enlightening discussion of public lands policies of the United States in an address before the Section of Mineral and Natural Resources Law at the American Bar Association annual meeting August 14 in Chicago.

Chairman ASPINALL reviewed conservation philosophies, legislation, and proposals affecting our public lands. He concluded his speech by presenting a legislative program designed, as he said, "to satisfy urgent demands for the use of the public domain while at the same time making certain that we shall obtain a reconsideration of all the public land laws and the policies underlying them in the light of conditions as they exist in the mid-20th century."

Because of the great importance of this subject to all of the people of our country it is my privilege to include in the RECORD this fine statement by Chairman ASPINALL. His address was entitled "Issues Affecting Natural Resources—1963: The Public Lands":

ISSUES AFFECTING NATURAL RESOURCES—1963: THE PUBLIC LANDS

(Remarks of the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado)

The invitation to participate in this panel discussion challenged each panel member to "discuss the important issues which he sees affecting natural resources in 1963." I was pleased to accept because I think that in this year 1963 we must make far-reaching decisions concerning one of the most vital of our natural resources: land. I particularly welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter at a forum of attorneys interested in the management of natural resources and to solicit your support of a program that I believe will permit the most beneficial management and use of our Federal public lands.

In selecting "land" as the natural resource to which I think the most important issues attach in 1963, let me cite these statistics: approximately 167 million acres of land in 27 States and an addition 271 million acres in Alaska under the ownership of the Federal Government have not been committed to any specific use. It is to these lands that a

burgeoning population, an expanding economy, as well as a recreation-minded America, must look for future development. Most of these so-called vacant and unappropriated lands, except for Alaska, are concentrated in the 11 Western States but the Federal Government has landholdings in all 50 States and the use or disposition of Federal lands generally is a matter of national concern. You cannot consider the disposition of land in the Western States without considering the possible use of land in other States. In addition, consider the fact that outside of Alaska of the 405,726,715 acres owned by the Federal Government, 354,320,451 acres are reserved and unreserved public domain land.[1]

My concern with the use of our lands is not new. Having always subscribed to the principles of the Pinchot-Roosevelt conservation theories, I became disturbed when I discerned what I sensed to be a drifting away from those principles by many of my fellow conservationists. My basic views on conservation movement were set forth in a paper which I presented to the White House Conference on Conservation on May 24, 1962. I am glad the proceedings of that conference have been published and are available for permanent reference.

At the White House meeting, I traced for the conferees much of the thread of conservation philosophy in the United States and related it to policies adopted by Congress. Both the conservation philosophy and the congressional actions added to the definition of a concept that called for use of our resources by providing for our present needs but not exhausting the source of supply. Closely aligned with this theory was the philosophy that our natural resources be developed for the maximum good for the maximum number. At that time, I questioned how the purist-preservationist group had managed to assume the mantle of the conservationists.

In the summer and fall of 1962, our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives had under consideration, as you all know, legislation designed for the preservation of wilderness areas. I found—and still find—it inconsistent for those advocating wilderness preservation to say on the one hand that they want to establish stricter congressional control over public land actions while at the same time, on the other hand, seeking to freeze, without affirmative congressional action, Executive decisions concerning the preservation of wilderness. The committee report[2] on H.R. 776, 87th Congress, as amended, providing for the preservation of wilderness areas, for the management of public lands, and for other purposes, detailed the committee's philosophy, to which I subscribe: that all public lands should be managed for the greatest good for the greatest number. We pointed out that there are no general statutory guidelines governing the use and disposition of public lands and that the act of widest application, the Taylor Grazing Act, authorizes certain withdrawals "in order to promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal."

The deliberations at the White House Conference and our intensive study of the wilderness legislation led me to the inescapable conclusion that there is little relationship between the management and administration of the public lands and the policies enunciated by Congress in enacting the great body of public land laws.

The depth of my convictions, coupled with the need to make vacant lands available for the national good, led me to probe further into the subject while at the same time trying to cooperate with the executive branch in finding the solutions to the manifold problems facing us. On October 15, 1962, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States and invited him to use his good offices to facilitate action on conservation measures affecting public lands. The President, by letter dated January 17, 1963, acknowledged the need for a broad review of the public land laws and left it to the Congress to determine how congressional surveillance over executive agency action should be effected.[3]

In expressing his views, the President took cognizance of the fact that article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution imposes on Congress the responsibility of, and authority for, the disposal of all Government property. I had been, and still am, concerned with the failure of Congress to respond to what we lawyers might call ultra vires acts by the Executive. It also concerned me that Congress had failed to come to grips with the overall land-use problem and has allowed outmoded public land laws to remain on the books without significant modification.

Permit me to review for a moment the most significant public land disposition laws and the philosophy behind them. First, of course, we sold our lands to raise money. Then the Homestead Act of 1862[4] enunciated the principle that in exchange for the development of 160 acres of agricultural land the developer would get title. In 1872 the Mining Act[5] established a parallel principle, i.e., that a discoverer of a valuable mineral deposit could, in consideration of its development, purchase the land in which the minerals are located.

As the West began to be settled, it was realized that some lands, being more arid, could not readily be developed as economically as other lands. This led to the Desert Land Act[6] permitting entry on desert lands up to 640 acres, reduced to 320 acres in 1891.[7] Then, again, as the lands most suitable for agricultural development were settled upon, it became apparent that an increase in the size of economical units was necessary. Accordingly, the Act of December 29, 1916,[8] commonly known as the Stock-Raising Homestead Act, authorized stock-raising homesteads on areas not exceeding 640 acres of public lands.

We have, subject to isolated exceptions, for all intents and purposes run out of compact areas of 160, 320, and 640 acres of land that can be utilized economically for agricultural purposes. At the same time we have become urban-suburban-industrialized country in which the overall need for additional agricultural production has diminished. In 1934, the Taylor Act,[9] partially in an effort to stabilize the great cattle and sheep industries of the United States, as I indicated earlier, laid down guidelines for the use of public lands pending their ultimate disposal. In 1938, the Small Tract Act[10] became the first congressional recognition of the need to make public lands available for permanent disposition for nonagricultural and nonmineral development. However, the Small Tract has not achieved any significant benefits.

The postwar expansion of our population and of our commerce and industry has placed new demands on the use of public lands; so has the increased leisure time of our people and the resultant demands for recreation areas.

I have traveled through public land areas, I have discussed the problems with Government officials and with the users of the public land; and I have given the matter considerable thought. During this time I have accepted the opportunity of speaking to various organizations on the subject of public lands while, through the Subcommittee on Public Lands in hearings, we received the thinking of interested people and groups.

Users of the public domain under grazing permits, for example, realize that the Taylor Grazing Act did not give them anything but revocable permission; but they believe that, because of the investments they have made in improvements on the public lands, they are entitled to some kind of tenure. Therefore, at hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands on various pieces of legislation affecting the public lands, representatives of livestock organizations have testified to the effect that tenure is their major concern. And, quite naturally, they are suspicious of any legislation proposed to establish general procedures for either the management or disposal of public lands.

Some people, frustrated by the current inability to have lands classified for agricultural use under existing statutes, have suggested that we take cognizance of the fact that remaining public lands cannot be settled economically in units previously authorized and that we should therefore establish a new category with an increased acreage for an economic unit that could be disposed of for agricultural purposes. I unequivocably reject this proposition, just as I reject the proposition that would permit all public lands to be put up for sale to the highest bidder. I have seen what will happen when you do this. Permitting marginal lands to be settled, or putting the public lands up for the highest bid, will permit individuals who have the monetary ability to do so, to invest a disproportionate amount in the land or to outbid others just so that they can obtain ownership of a block of land from which to exclude others. Thereafter many of these people shun normal agricultural operations and establish private hunting preserves. This I will resist to my fullest capacity.

If the land is to be devoted to hunting and fishing then I submit that it should be devoted to hunting and fishing by the public at large. But, if the land is needed for development, then the means must be found by which to encourage and permit its development.

The testimony that we received has been as divergent as any sets of views could possibly be. We have been urged by some to dispose of all the public lands. We have been counseled by others to retain most of the public lands in Federal ownership and allow them to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

While the testimony we have received was on legislation not involving the mining laws, we must bear in mind that our basic mining law is likewise a disposition law. Accordingly, no discussion of the future use or disposition of our public lands is complete without taking cognizance of the proposals that have been made for revision of the basic mining laws governing the occupation and purchase of public lands in which valuable mineral deposits are found.

I am convinced that primarily the demands for revision of the mining laws stem from the various uses competing for recognition on the public lands. While mining activity on a 320- or 640-acre homestead was not generally incompatible with agricultural use, it is incompatible with the use of public lands for industrial, commercial, or residential purposes where relatively small tracts are involved. Likewise, the newer requirement to satisfy our recreation needs has established yet another category in which there may be a basic conflict with mining activity.

All of this serves to underline the fact that we do have an immediate problem: many landlocked communities must look to federally owned or controlled lands as the only means of expansion. The Congress should not be required to take up each of these cases individually and provide for the sale of 2,000 acres here and 10,000 acres there. But, in the absence of an overall national policy concerning the retention, use, and disposition of Federal public lands, the Congress has been reluctant to grant general sales authority to the executive branch. At the same time, the Congress and its committees have been so burdened with the normal legislative functions that we have been unable to devote the time and attention neces-

Footnotes at end of speech.

sary to establish national policy required for the changed times and conditions.

With these circumstances as background, I offer the following legislative program designed to satisfy urgent demands for the use of the public domain while at the same time making certain that we shall obtain a reconsideration of all the public land laws and the policies underlying them in the light of conditions as they exist in the mid-20th century:

1. The establishment of a bipartisan commission made up of representatives of the executive and legislative branches that will be given the time, money, and staff necessary to undertake a complete review of all laws and regulations affecting Federal public land ownership and the natural resources thereof. As I indicated earlier, the President has acknowledged the need for an overall review; his representatives, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, have concurred generally in the Commission approach to the solution of the problem. On the assumption that an act authorizing a Commission study will be passed before June 30, 1964, it is my hope that the Commission can report not later than December 31, 1967, which would provide a period of 3 years for the study and approximately 6 months for the preparation of the report itself.

2. The enactment of interim legislation, to expire 6 months after the submission of the Commission's report; i.e., June 30, 1968, establishing the principle of multiple-use for the interim management and administration of public lands under the stewardship of the Department of the Interior.

3. The enactment of interim legislation, likewise expiring 6 months after the submission of the Commission's report, to give the Secretary of the Interior general authority to sell public domain lands that are required for the orderly growth and development of communities.

4. The enactment of interim legislation, similarly keyed to expire 6 months after the Commission's report has been submitted, to provide a new category of exploration claims that will grant prediscovery protection to prospectors on the public lands who are, by the nature of modern methods, required to expend large sums of money in any exploration efforts.

5. The enactment of legislation that will require the executive departments, during the period while the public land laws are being reviewed and their possible revision studied by Congress, to furnish to the Congress, through the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs (1) advance notification of significant actions involving modifications or changes in use or classification of lands, and (2) a periodic reporting of all land actions in order to assure that, through such congressional surveillance, there will be no extensive and irrevocable large-scale modifications of land-use patterns effected during the period of the Commission's study.

Legislation has already been introduced to establish a multiple-use principle in the management of Interior Department lands and to establish broader sales authority in the Secretary of the Interior. I am today introducing a bill proposing the establishment of the Public Land Law Review Commission. In addition, I have directed the preparation of bills to carry out the other points of my program and, as soon as I have had an opportunity to go over the details, I shall introduce the bills.

It is my firm hope that we can obtain reports on the new bills promptly and proceed to hearings next month.

In the last analysis, it is my hope and belief that the program I have outlined will result in the use and disposition of our Federal public lands and all the resources thereof in the highest traditions of the conservation movement of the United States as symbolized by the Roosevelt-Pinchot era, during which the philosophy was permanently ingrained on the national conscience that conservation is equated with wise use and that we should dedicate our lands and the resources thereof to accomplish the maximum good for the maximum number for the longest period of time.

In keeping with this latter concept, I see no reason why Congress cannot immediately give statutory protection for the preservation as wilderness of the over 8 million acres of land in the national forests that are now classified as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe," continuing those uses not inconsistent with wilderness preservation and permiting other presently authorized uses for a reasonable time. I have never taken the position that all wilderness legislation must await a final review of either all land laws or even all areas that might qualify as wilderness.

Subject to proper safeguards, it should be possible to enact legislation that will provide for our immediate and known requirements while broad reviews of our land use policies move ahead.

I solicit your support of my program.

---

[1] Inventory Report on Real Property owned by the United States as of June 30, 1962, prepared by General Services Administration, which discloses the following:

	Acres
Total land owned by the United States in the 50 States	770,796,843.1
Total public domain	719,373,123.5
Alaska total	365,069,285.3
Alaska public domain	355,052,672.2

[2] H. Rept. No. 2521, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[3] Text of letters referred to published in Committee Print No. 2, 88th Cong., printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives.

[4] Act of May 20, 1862 (12 Stat. 392).

[5] Act of May 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 91).

[6] Act of Mar. 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377).

[7] Act of Mar. 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1096).

[8] 39 Stat. 862.

[9] Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269).

[10] Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609).

Recreation Facilities in Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I am happy to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of Congress an excellent article on our great State of Oklahoma.

It is written by Mr. Charles Yarbrough of the Washington Sunday Star and is about the wonderful recreation facilities in Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I invite all who may see this article to visit Oklahoma and personally see what Mr. Yarbrough describes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCLAMATION MARK IN "OKLAHOMA!" HAS TAKEN ON A NEW SIGNIFICANCE

(By Charles Yarbrough)

TULSA, OKLA.—Twenty years or so ago, a forthright boatwright opened up a modest shop on Oklahoma City's near midtown Reno Avenue, only a few blocks from city hall.

Undaunted by the incongruity of it all, his first production of note was a handsome cruiser with a beam 4 feet wider than his double doors. To quiet the sneering ones, he hung out his second shingle:

"You buy this boat. We'll get it out." Someone did and the boatbuilder removed the whole store front.

If there is any moral at all to this it must be "you don't necessarily have to have water to make a boat work. Just wait it out, the water will be along in due time."

This doughty prophet may not have retained the place in history of the man who first found oil in Oklahoma, but he has made his mark.

FLOOD CONTROL BONUS

Today, in a burgeoning vacation land of manmade lakes, Grand Lake alone has 7,600 boats registered. Their taxable value exceeds the taxable value of the land inundated by the impounded waters. Around its 1,300 miles of shoreline are $20 million worth of summer homes and retirement residences.

And the Grand Lake of the Cherokees is but one in a system dotting northeastern Oklahoma with what is probably the most enjoyable and exhilarating byproduct flood control has ever produced. The tourist and the vacationer are just beginning to find out what that exclamation mark after Oklahoma really means.

Accommodations range from plush (at surprisingly low rates) to modest. The State-operated Western Hills Lodge on Lake Gibson in Sequoyah State Park can stand on its splendid merit against most any resort in the East and the Caribbean.

Things are so plush in Eisenhower Park on Lake Texoma, astride the Oklahoma-Texas line, that even the boats in marina are under cover.

The water situation in Oklahoma has come a long way since the easterner drove over the bridged, dry-sand bed of the North Canadian River and, as an afterthought a few miles down the road, remarked "come to think of it, that was a good location for a river."

DODGING TREETOPS

The water hoarding and subsequent vacationland building is moving so fast that waterskiers still have to steer clear of treetops in the new lake forming behind the Oologah Dam, 27 miles northeast of here. Beneath the water is brush where the moonshiners nested when Oklahoma was really dry.

It isn't very funny in Texas, but the contention is going the rounds here that if Oklahoma tipped over, Texas would be flooded.

Oologah is the first unit to be completed in a daring plan to tame floods and harness power in the Verdigris River Basin and is a key element in a broad plan to open the Arkansas River and its tributaries to navigation. Two more mighty dams are to come and by 1970, the Arkansas and Verdigris should be open to river boats to Catooda, 14 miles east of Tulsa.

If some prophet could have foretold in the early days of oil, just what vast effect the black gold would have on Tulsa and Oklahoma, he likely would rank with those of today who are forecasting nothing but a bright future for northeastern Oklahoma because of the water projects.

WORK OF ENGINEERS

Save for Grand Lake, which is a State project, the remainder of the system is the dedicated work of the Army Engineers, who go at it with the zeal and conscientious drive of a native citizen.

Writing a special article for the Tulsa World recently, Senator MONRONEY put it this way:

"This project represents the drive of Senator Bob Kerr, the skill of the Corps of Engineers, the dedication of scores of noble men and the beginning of a new day for Oklahoma and her neighboring States."

Sixteen splendid State parks—with alluring names like Quartz Mountains, Osage Hills, Robbers Cave, and Black Mesa—have barely scratched the surface of Oklahoma's vacation potential. The 16 already list 42 facilities available to guests—from babysitters to air strips; water ski tow service to mountain forests.

Any questions? The Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, 616 South Boston or the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, Oklahoma City, have details.

Test Ban Pact's Built-In Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the built-in risks of the pending partial nuclear test ban pact are cogently discussed in an editorial appearing August 15 in the respected St. Louis Globe Democrat. The editorial is as follows:

TREATY OF BUILT-IN RISKS

For more than 3 days a distinguished group of Senators has been listening to a parade of administration witnesses indorse a test ban treaty based on unsupported trust of the Soviets, who during 1961–62 betrayed a similar moratorium with the biggest nuclear blasts in history.

All vigorously backed the President's treaty plan. What else? They are part of the Frontier family. No doubt they have convinced themselves the treaty is sound, though some seemed to evince reservations.

While their comment was poured out in considerable detail, the testimony of Dr. Edward Teller, hydrogen bomb expert, was mostly held secret.

It was called "restricted" information, and no doubt some of it was. The only fact that seeped into print was Dr. Teller's statement that the treaty would have grave consequences for the security of the United States and the West.

On its face the document looks extraordinarily innocuous. On its face it appears so flaccid, it seems a wonder the President has made so big a thing out of it.

The treaty has no guarantees whatever. It abandons inspection or on-ground supervision. It does not ban nuclear tests underground. It puts no brake on development of many nuclear weapons. It takes not a single kiliton bomb out of world arsenals.

It cannot assure world peace or prevent nuclear warfare. It can't bar the spread of nuclear arms, or the development of France and Red China as nuclear powers.

In fact Mr. Kennedy in his treaty message to the Senate spent about half his time telling what the pact does not do. Yet he called it "a victory for mankind."

But there are risks. Obvious, built-in risks. Secretary of Defense McNamara, while approving the agreement, bluntly stated, "I do not pretend that this or any other agreement between great contending powers can be risk free. This one is not."

The hazards are not clearly known to the country. They certainly should be before the Senate casts its vote on this issue. Public polemics have already reached a point where anyone voicing honest concern is dubbed a hard-nosed chauvinist. Effort is made to gag him by the goof-ball slogan: Do you want war?

No one in America wants war. But such a treaty will not stave off war, or nuclear Armageddon.

The treaty, on the contrary, gives Russia apparent advantage in the big weapon nuclear field. The Soviets' massive blasts last year put them ahead. We surpass in smaller nuclear defense.

This treaty almost certainly—despite Dr. Seaborg's guarded opinion—prohibits the United States from creating an anti-missile defense. U.S.S.R. anti-missile development is understood considerably ahead of ours.

This area alone could spell the difference between safety and annihilation, between war and peace.

This treaty inhibits developing defense against Soviet disruption of our communications system.

Most dangerous of all is the imminent possibility this pact could lead to further unbuttressed deals with Moscow for disarmament, and for recognition of East Germany and all of Eastern Europe.

The preamble to the treaty proclaims the principal aim of the three test-banning nations is a speedy agreement on "complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the United Nations."

Disarming America and submission to the U.N. would be fatuous peril in the present state of the world and of the U.N.

The President has made it wholly clear he regards the present treaty as only a "first step." There is already talk of discussions on Germany, of a new summit conference.

Premiem Khrushchev has always sought recognition of his European satellites, especially East Germany. He wants a Rapacki "neutral" area in central Europe, including Germany, which would mean the disintegration of NATO.

Competent strength, military and economic, is the only classic and realistic safeguard in this faithless world. The test ban treaty cannot help our defense posture. It can imperil it.

Freedom House and the Crisis in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Freedom House, of whose board of trustees I am a member, has recently issued a pamphlet entitled "The Crisis in Race Relations." I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which has been endorsed by, among others, the Commission on Religion and Race of the Churches of Christ, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE USE OF MASS PRESSURE IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

This is the year of "breakthrough" in civil rights. If that breakthrough is not to become a breakdown, and the process of winning overdue freedoms for the Negro is not to turn into a tragic loss for everyone, responsible men and women must speak up now—not as Negroes or whites—but as Americans who understand that there can be no democracy without responsibility.

First, let us stop lamenting the direct-action demonstrations and the agitation; let us face them squarely and deal with them not as some strange tragedy but as part of the American character. There is an unruly streak in us as there is in all free peoples. The responsibility for the current manifestitation of its rests squarely on the white majority which, like most satisfied majorities, preferred to wait until the crisis was upon us before moving. For this we are paying a price, and no attempt should be made to pass the blame to the demonstrators.

Let us also remind ourselves that our crisis took this form not in defiance of our democracy but because of it. There are no sit-ins, freedom rides, picket lines, violent or nonviolent resistance under Nazi, Fascist, or Communist dictatorships. We have them because many of our people are exasperated and because the right to assemble and petition is our last-resort way of giving vent to such exasperations.

Second, let us recognize this new revolution for what it is: the consolidation of a longstanding struggle. There is no question of overthrow or takeover, or of a bloody Hungary-type repression, except in the minds of a negligible few. The insurgents do not want out of the order they are attacking; they want in. Attackers and attacked alike have only one real ultimate quest: how to live with each other. Finding the way is painful and will continue to be, because justice for one may mean some sacrifice of privilege by another. But it is both incorrect and irresponsible to talk as though this were 1776 or 1861.

Third, we must be mindful that the means of direct action must not replace the ends of negotiation and settlement. Responsible members of both the majority and the minority have made common cause not because either embraces direct action for its own sake but because both have reason to assume that no just resolution of the grievances will be attained without it. If direct action becomes the goal, or if it cuts itself away from realistic goals, or permits the end to justify unworthy means, the common cause will be debased and no one will win.

The distinction between responsible and irresponsible uses of mass pressure does exist, but it cannot be measured by a neat, mechanical formula. It can only be determined on the basis of the sense of fairness and justice, coupled with the sense of what can and ought to be achieved, situation by situation.

Freedom House believes the turmoil has already begun to yield some indication of what actions will serve the cause of civil rights and those which will impede it:

We believe that the proposed "march on Washington" under unified and responsible leadership, assuring a demonstration free of violence, will dramatize the urgency of the civil rights legislation now before the Congress. We do not support sit-ins at the Capitol or any other efforts to force Congress to legislate under threat of physical pressure.

We believe no one should be barred from jobs at any level merely because of his race; employers and unions alike should be put under compulsion to remove that barrier, and any traditions or practices that stand in the way should be ended. But we do not believe this should be at the cost of depriving workers of jobs they now hold, or of creating operationally unnecessary jobs. Neither do we think quotas are desirable. Short run they produce some gains; long run they reinforce the very sense of separateness which is at the heart of all the trouble.

We support the integration of schools to the maximum extent feasible, irrespective of so-called zoning regulations. We do not sup-

port integration without limit for its own sake in areas of heavy racial concentration where undue hardships would be imposed on the children and the educational system itself. We believe far greater efforts to find remedies for segregation in those cases should be made where the causes actually lie, in more and better jobs, in training for those jobs, and in more, better, and colorblind housing.

We are for actions to break the barriers such as were taken at Baltimore's whites-only Gwynn Oak amusement park, where clergymen of all faiths chose jail as the price of their convictions. We are against the lyings-down at New York's Jones Beach, which is not segregated.

We strongly urge that the right of all to be seen and heard be kept inviolate. We deplore both the rowdyism that forced a Negro minister off a Chicago platform and silenced that city's mayor, and that which broke up the picket lines before a Bronx diner. Storm trooper tactics are reprehensible, whether employed by the aggrieved or the aggrievers.

Last, we urge that the term "moderate" be restored to grace—not as any endorsement of a slow pace toward full freedom but as a recognition of how this struggle must finally be resolved. There has been too much emphasis on both sides upon the "uncontrollability" of their extremists, on the "inevitability" of bloodshed. This will prove to be a self-fulfilling prophecy unless it once more becomes respectable to advocate negotiation and settlement. The sooner moderates talking to moderates begin to make the struggle their own, the less anguished the resolution is going to be.

There is no cause for panic over what the American people are going through. We should, rather, face up to our responsibilities in the realization that the world tide of rising expectations is coming to flood stage here, where so much of it began. There remains only the unfinished business of proving that American leadership is farsighted and strong enough, American institutions and the people's innate creed of responsibility elastic enough, to draw attention from the excitement of the moment and concentrate it on the necessary solutions for the achievement of those goals to which this Nation is committed.

Board of trustees: Roscoe Drummond, chairman of the board; Harry D. Gideonse, president; Leo Cherne, chairman, executive committee; Harry J. Carman, George B. Ford, honorary chairmen; Rex Stout, treasurer; Mrs. Henry Gale, assistant treasurer; and George Field, executive director.

Herbert Agar, Irving Brown, Ernest Cuneo, Christopher Emmet, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Paul G. Hoffman, Mrs. Andrew Jackson, Jacob K. Javits, Maxwell A. Kriendler, John V. Lindsay, Francis Pickens Miller, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Dwayne Orton, Mrs. Bonaro Overstreet, Rudolf Rathaus, Whitelaw Reid, John R. Richardson, Jr., Elizabeth M. Riley, Francis E. Rivers, Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Eric Sevareid, Whitney North Seymour, Mrs. Caroline K. Simon, Nathaniel Singer, Gerald L. Steibel, Herbert Bayard Swope, Jr., William L. White, and Roy Wilkins.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WYCKOFF, N.J., *July 17, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith are copies of letters I sent to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH and Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL regarding captive nations.

I thought you would like to see them.

Sincerely,

G. ALBIN LIVA, M.D.C.M.

WYCKOFF, N.J., *July 17, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I agree with the point of view of DANIEL J. FLOOD, Member of Congress, regarding the mention of the captive nations in the Congress of the United States.

I strongly urge you to support Congressman FLOOD's efforts to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives and urge quick action on House Resolution 14.

Sincerely yours,

G. ALBIN LIVA, M.D.C.M.

WYCKOFF, N.J., *July 17, 1963.*

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter I sent to the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of Committee on Rules, regarding captive nations.

I strongly urge you to support this stand and recommend that you, too, add a resolution of your own to the two dozen or more now before the House Rules Committee.

Sincerely yours,

G. ALBIN LIVA, M.D.C.M.

NEWBURGH, N.Y., *July 17, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a letter to Congressman SMITH, as suggested in your letter which appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet of July 11. May your efforts succeed in establishing this Committee.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM A. O'DEA.

NEWBURGH, N.Y., *July 17, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This week we are giving slight pause to mark the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week here in the United States. Precious little is being done by word or work to keep faith and promise with the hundreds of millions now living in abject slavery under the yoke of atheistic communism. Rather do we perpetuate the plight of these victims by pouring American tax dollars, in the form of foreign aid, into the economies of such as Poland and Yugoslavia. Nor is their lot any easier to bear when those in Hungary now witness the U.N., accepting the credentials of the present regime, whose bloody enthronement, back in 1956, was guaranteed by the Butcher of Budapest, Mr. Khrushchev.

The Congress of the United States can exert an influence and provide a measure of leadership in the free world, to keep alive their hopes, by establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. May I therefore respectfully urge you to expedite passage of House Resolution 14.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM A. O'DEA.

SARASOTA, FLA., *July 15, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Committee on Rules, The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I urge prompt action on House Resolution 14 which authorizes the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Action in the United Nations recently removing the U.N. special representative on Hungary and delay of any proclamation on Captive Nations Week indicates an indifference of the executive department to the plight of the captive millions throughout the world. I hope that the legislative branch, particularly the House of Representatives, will indicate that our Government does have an interest in these unfortunates.

Sincerely,

GEORGE KUMPE.

TRENTON, N.J., *July 10, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am sending you a copy of the letter I sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES MANTEL.

P.S.—I also sent a letter to my Congressman asking him to send a similar resolution.

TRENTON, N.J., *July 16, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I urge you to get quick action on House Resolution 14.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES MANTEL.

CAMP HILL, PA., *July 15, 1963.*

HON. DAN FLOOD: I've been reading of your aggressive, stellar work to insure the press and public are all aware that captive nations are still with us and the Communist drive

has not lessened. Keep up the good work and give Senator STENNIS a hand. There are very many people will back you up. Good luck and good legislating.

Sincerely yours from an old Wilkes-Barre acquaintance.

THOMAS P. LAVIN.

Interstate 74 Dedication—Mark of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensburg (Ind.) Daily News:

INTERSTATE 74 DEDICATION—MARK OF PROGRESS

Saturday, August 17, promises to be a memorable day for Greensburg and community.

Two dedicatory events, each noteworthy in character, will be held.

They are: Dedication of Interstate 74 in the morning; and dedication of the new BCA plant in the afternoon, followed by an open house.

Gov. Matthew E. Welsh will officially dedicate a stretch of Interstate 74 from north of St. Paul to near New Point.

The ceremony, open to the public, will take place at 10:30 a.m. at the cloverleaf, north of Greensburg. The highway will be open for travel by that time.

Completion of Interstate 74 from Indianapolis to Cincinnati with the exception of 5 miles in the St. Leon area in Dearborn County is scheduled for early in December. The section of the highway between New Point and Batesville will be open for travel about a month earlier.

This will mean that Greensburg will be on one of the important interstate highways of the Nation.

In addition, Greensburg will be situated strategically near the midpoint between Indianapolis and Cincinnati.

Interstate 74, even on the basis of its present extension to near New Point, should make Greensburg more attractive for business, industry, and even for residence. Even more than in the past, Greensburg will be the gateway to southeastern Indiana with its important tourist assets.

Greensburg may lose some transient business that has stopped here. On the other hand, many motorits will use the interchange north of this city to enter or leave Interstate 74.

It will mean that Greensburg will be closer to both Indianapolis and Cincinnati. At the same time, residents of some nearby areas will be closer to Greensburg with its excellent stores and accommodations.

It should not be amiss to state that industries attach a high rating to cities located on interstate highways. Greensburg should also develop to an even greater extent as a wholesale center.

The first stretch of Interstate 74 was opened between Indianapolis and Shelbyville on October 4, 1960. The highway to Indiana 244 was open for travel on September 22, 1961. Ribbon-cutting ceremonies to the Shelby-Decatur County line, north of St. Paul, were held on December 10, 1962. Now, the highway is to be opened to near New Point.

The Federal Government has expended millions of dollars in construction of the highway from Indianapolis to near New Point. Indiana has paid about 10 percent of the cost.

The dual lane highway is one of the most modern in Indiana, embracing the principle of limited access. For the future of Greensburg and community, it is fortunate that the highway extends across Decatur County.

Dedicatory ceremonies for Interstate 74 on Saturday morning, August 17, will constitute another token of progress for this community.

Is Agriculture Department Move Driving Small News Service Out of Business a Precedent for Bigger Government Moves Aimed at Bigger Wire Services?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under a decision and orders of the Federal Communications Commission adopted January 28 and May 27 of this year, the Federal Government has been empowered to engage in the dissemination of news in direct competition with, and to the great detriment of, a private news agency operating under the American free enterprise system.

As a result of the FCC action, the Department of Agriculture, on May 20 and July 10, announced the establishment of a new Market News Service which will provide, without cost, data and reports on agricultural and farm market activities to newspapers throughout the country.

This is a new venture of the Federal Government into the business of collecting and dissemination news in competition with private news agencies. One of the latter, the P.A.M. News Corp., is a small wire service serving over 300 customers in the wholesale fresh produce business which is threatened with extinction by the new Agriculture Department activity.

There is no statutory authority by which the Department of Agriculture may expend Federal tax funds for this purpose. The American Newspaper Publishers Association is on record as stating that "the highly improper nature of the new service is characterized by the following condition imposed upon the service:

"The new service is available to all who want it, and no application need be made to USDA to receive service. However, USDA reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who abuse the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable."

This provision would permit the U.S. Government censorship in one of its most odious forms. Any newspaper seeking to subscribe to this new service could be denied service for any reason. Any newspaper already subscribing could have its service canceled without notice or reason. Editorials written by a newspaper that the Department of Agriculture didn't like would, under the above-quoted quotation, be grounds for denial or cancellation of service.

Thus, this news service has transcendent importance. If it is not halted now it could lead to further ambitious attempts by this and other U.S. Government agencies to expand and enter into competition with private news agencies. An expansion of this concept would result in a Government-controlled news service such as presently exists in some other countries, including the Soviet Union, where the so-called news service Tass is Government-owned and operated.

That is what the newspaper publishers of this country think about competition from the Government in the news dissemination field. And I say that it is a shameful intrusion of the Federal Government into a business where it has no business being. Such private news agencies as the PAM News Corp., must expend substantial sums to employ reporters and to maintain a staff of statisticians, analysts and others to gather, analyze, collate and prepare market news whereas such workers in the Department of Agriculture are paid at the expense of the taxpayers.

As I have noted, this Government activity is not supported by any statutory authority. But I know of no statute which directly prohibits it. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation denying the Federal Government the power to engage in competition with private wire services in the dissemination of news. I believe this legislation will receive the support of all Members who oppose Government-controlled news dissemination and Government censorship of the news and who are believers in the American free enterprise system.

Survey of Consumer Finances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a recent issue of Public Health Economics carried a release from the University of Michigan Survey Research Center on the center's survey of consumer finances. The examination of medical costs provided some interesting information on the special problem of the aged in meeting their medical expenses. For example, the report found "more than half of those 65 years and older who had large medical expenses reported having no insurance for medical or hospital expenses."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the University of Michigan News Service Press Release, July 17, 1963]

LARGE MEDICAL EXPENSES COMMON SURVEY SHOWS

Forty percent of all U.S. spending units reported in 1962 that they had large medical expenses the previous year according to

the University of Michigan Survey Research Center.

Almost half of the people (spending units) who incurred large medical expenses reported having no medical insurance at all, or insurance which did not cover any of the expense. Yet almost 7 in 10 were insured.

National statistics compiled in the center's "1962 Survey of Consumer Finances" indicate that about one-fourth of all spending units—families and individuals—owed money to a doctor, dentist, or hospital in early 1962.

Debt to financial institutions or other lenders for medical expenses is not included.

The average amount of medical debt outstanding in 1962 was $175, an increase of approximately $60 over 1957, according to the report.

The incidence of large medical expenses is somewhat higher among spending units whose head is 65 years or more. This has added significance since the exposure of this group is lower than for any other group, as measured by the average numbr of persons per spending unit, said Charles Lininger, director of the survey. The very young and those in the 55–64 year age group reported somewhat lower incidence of medical expenses than other age levels. The frequency expenses for hospitals was greater among younger people, and expenses for drugs were more prevalent among senior citizens.

More than half of young families with children under six, however, reported large medical expenses. Of these, four out of five reported hospitalization, reflecting the high frequency of children born to this group and the almost universal use of medical care and hospitalization for childbirth in this country, it was pointed out.

Sixteen percent of all spending units reported large medical expenses during 1961 not covered by insurance ranging from $200–$499, and 6 percent reported expenses ranging from $599 to $999. About 3 percent had medical expenses not covered by insurance of over $1,000.

Nearly one-third—30 percent—of those reporting large medical expenses had no medical insurance, and an additional 16 percent had insurance which did not cover any of their expenses. More than half of those 65 years and older who had large medical expenses reported having no insurance for medical or hospital expenses.

Translated in terms of U.S. population, about 1,800,000 spending units had personal medical expenses of $1000 or more during 1961 which were not covered by insurance.

Most of the people with large medical expenses paid in part out of current income. One in ten borrowed money and one in four took money from savings. Public assistance was reported by about 3 percent of the spending units with large medical expenses.

Older people were more apt to use savings to pay medical bills, since they often have fixed incomes and have had more time to accumulate savings resources. The higher a spending units income, naturally, the better able it was to pay medical bills out of current income.

At least one-third of the units which had $500 or more of uninsured medical expenses in 1961 still owed $200 or more to doctors, dentists, or hospitals when SRC figures were gathered in 1962.

Civil Rights Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, certainly the President's civil rights program, as contained in H.R. 7152 is one of the most important and significant issues to be considered by the Congress this year. On July 12, 1963, I testified before the House Judiciary Committee in support of this bill and in support of two bills which I have introduced, H.R. 6300 and H.R. 6301. My testimony is included herewith, as a record of my endorsement of this program:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, ON H.R. 7152, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963, JULY 12, 1963

Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you and offer to you my wholehearted support for the strongest Civil Rights bill which can be passed by the Congress this year.

On this basis I support H.R. 7152, but I hope that this committee will also consider by way of strengthening amendments some of the provisions in certain bills which I have introduced—H.R. 6300, H.R. 6301, and H.R. 7502.

I particularly request the committee's consideration of the bill, H.R. 6300, which as nearly as legislatively possible embodies all of the recommendations of the 1960 Democratic Party platform. H.R. 6300 has a symbolic number—because it expresses the 100 years that have elapsed between 1863 and 1963 and the shame that so little has been done in these 100 years.

One hundred years after 1863, when American citizens are courageously struggling for their constitutional rights and are being shot, beaten, jailed, and harassed for doing so, it is imperative that the Congress take all possible steps to eliminate discrimination.

Does H.R. 7152 meet this test? I hope that before this committee reports H.R. 7152 it consider some additional proposals. H.R. 7152 does not include a Fair Employment Practices Commission, which is so vital in providing economic rights for minority groups. In the district which I represent Negroes are too economically deprived to exercise their right to equal use of public accomodations to which they are legally entitled in Pennsylvania. The extent to which economic deprivation is a problem becomes quite evident when one looks at a statistical picture of the people involved. According to the 1960 U.S. census, the median family income in Pittsburgh was $5,605. Yet 51 percent of all Negro families had incomes of less than $4,000. Almost 25 percent made less than $2,000. Such an income generally qualifies a family under the criteria for publicly subsidized housing. For every white person in Pittsburgh looking for a job there are two nonwhites.

Part of the barriers which created this situation has been taken down, I am pleased to say, with the Monday, July 8, announcement from Mayor Joseph M. Barr, that any residue of discrimination in the building trades would be eliminated. In announcing this agreement, Mayor Barr said that it "represents a significant beginning in a concerted and genuine effort by all parties to provide equal opportunity for employment in the local construction industry to all persons." The mayor continued: "Some persons regard these days as dark and dangerous ones because of the ever-present threat of racial unrest. It seems to me there is a more positive way of looking at this moment in history. Never has there a time in the past 100 years when the possibility for achieving real equality of opportunity has been greater."

I ask permission to insert the entire statement of the mayor, including the interim report of the subcommittee involved in the agreement.

H.R. 7152 does not adequately expand the power of the Attorney General to bring legal action against all forms of unlawful discrimination. In the field of school desegregation, a time compliance is not mentioned, only a 2-year situation report. These and several other constructive suggestions are embodied in various proposals I have submitted to the Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service Committees, namely, H.R. 6300, H.R. 6301, and H.R. 7502.

But I think we can go a small part of the way, through enactment of H.R. 7152, toward building the legal foundations of integration and providing all citizens with the peaceful weapons they need to fight their way to the freedom they were promised a century ago.

It is in the field of public accommodations that I feel we must pass the moral divide in guaranteeing this freedom. To those who contend that freedom would be diminished by this law, I submit the eloquent statement of the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, on the subject: "I could not agree that such a law would diminish freedom. The purpose of law in a free society is to enlarge freedom by letting each know what kind of conduct to expect from the other. And it is through our laws that personal freedom is not only protected by constantly enlarged, so we can pursue our orbit with a minimum of collisions."

Mr. Chairman, all Americans of all racial and national orgins are proud. They are more interested in the possession of a right than in the exercise of that right.

Once the pseudolegal basis for the denial of a constitutional right is abolished, the importance of the exercise of that right is minimized.

I would like to cite Pennsylvania as a State which has been successful in its accommodations law.

The history of Pennsylvania shows that we were like many other States in the development of its relations to Negroes. Although the number of Negroes involved was never large, Pennsylvania had its slave practices and codes, too, until checked in 1780 by an act for the gradual abolition of slavery. This act was the first of its kind passed anywhere in America and was due directly to the splendid efforts of John Woolman, of the Friends Society, and of the first abolition society in America, of which Benjamin Franklin later became president.

In 1780 the old laws relating to the Negro were abolished, the restrictions placed upon him were removed, and after that time he stood upon a plane of legal equality with the white man, except that the State constitution did not give him the right of suffrage, and that acts of the legislature denied him the right of becoming part of the State militia. This latter was no serious hardship, while his right to vote had as yet been neither urged nor questioned. He was now tried in the same courts, punished with the same penalties, and given the same civil rights as a white person.

Nothing approaching real legal equality, however, was achieved until the Pennsylvania Legislature, on the 19th of May, enacted a measure to assure civil rights for all people, regardless of race or color. This was a criminal measure declaring "that any person, company, corporation, being owner, lessee, or manager of any restaurant, hotel, railroad, street railway, omnibus line, theater, concert hall, or place of entertainment or amusement, who shall refuse to accommodate, convey, or admit any person or persons on account of race or color over their lines, or into their hotel, or restaurant, theater, concert hall, or place of amusement, shall upon conviction thereof be guilty of a misdemeanor, and be punished by a fine not less than $50 nor more than $100" (Pennsylvania Laws 1887, p. 130).

This statute has been explicitly upheld as within the constitutional power of the legislature. The Dauphin County court, in upholding this act against a contention of invalidity in the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Athens George*, 18 Dauph. 40 (1914), relied upon the Supreme Court case of *Munn* v.

Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 126 (1877), wherein the Court reviewed the historical and jurisprudential bases for governmental regulation of the use of private property. "When", Chief Justice Waite declared, "one devotes his property to a use in which the public has an interest, he, in effect, grants to the public an interest in that use, and must submit to be controlled by the public for the common good, to the extent of the interest he has thus created."

The Pennsylvania court also followed the reasoning of the New York court in *People* v. *King*, 18 N.E. 245 (1888). The court there held that where, in the judgment of the legislature, the public has an interest to prevent race discrimination between citizens on the part of persons maintaining places of public amusement, the quasi-public use to which the owner of such a place devotes his property gives the legislature, acting under its police power, the right to prescribe regulations as to its use.

On appeal from the judgment of guilty entered in this case, the Pennsylvania Superior Court reiterated the doctrine that the statute, as a proper exercise of the police power, is not an arbitrary deprivation of property without due process of law. "In the enactment of laws under the police power, there is always a certain amount of interference with property rights, but laws are not condemned on that account, unless this interference amounts to a practical confiscation." *Commonwealth* v. *George*, 61 Pa. Sup. 412 (1915).

In construing this act making the refusal to admit a person on account of his color a misdemeanor, the Pennsylvania court, under the influence of the then prevailing separate-but-equal doctrine, espoused by the Supreme Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), held that the owner of a theater with a segregated section for Negro patrons had not violated the 1887 statute. It should be noted that the statutory language now reads that all persons are entitled to free and equal accommodations.

In 1935, the 1887 statute was amended. Pennsylvania laws 1935, page 297. First, the act affirmatively stated that all persons within the jurisdiction shall be entitled to the full and equal accommodations of public places, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons. Secondly, it was declared that no person, directly or indirectly, was to refuse, withhold from, or to deny such accommodations on account of race or color, or to advertise to that effect or to the effect that the patronage of persons of a particular race was unwelcome. The production of any such advertising was declared to be presumptive evidence in a criminal proceeding. Thirdly, places of public accommodation were broadly defined. It was expressly stipulated that the act did not apply to places which were distinctly private in nature, nor did it prohibit written communications sent in response to a specific written inquiry.

Finally, the act recited that any person violating, aiding, or inciting another in the violation of any provision should for each violation be fined from $100 to $500, or imprisoned from 30 to 90 days, or both.

This act, as amended, was upheld as a valid exercise of the police power of the State. *Commonwealth* v. *Moore*, 45 Dauphin 364 (1938). The act, as amended, did not specify that the violation thereof was a misdemeanor, as had the original measure. Nor did the act specify that the penalties were to be imposed upon conviction of violation. The *Moore* case held that, notwithstanding these omissions in the amendatory act, the only reasonable construction is that the violation thereof is a misdemeanor and that the penalties are to be imposed upon conviction. Ibid.

In 1939 the act was amended to correct these deficiencies and to change the fine to a maximum of $100; Pennsylvania laws 1939, page 782, section 654, title 18, section 4654.

The Pennsylvania courts have held that the fact that the statute enumerates some 40-odd places which "shall be deemed" places of public accommodation does not imply that only the places thus mentioned are within its purview; *Commonwealth* v. *Figari*, 70 A. 2d 666 (1950); *Everett* v. *Harron*, 110 A. 2d 383 (1955); *Commonwealth* v. *Gibney*, 9 Chest. 152 (1959).

The 1887 act as amended is a part of the penal code of Pennsylvania and therefore permits an aggrieved person to initiate a prosecution against a violator of the act. It has been held that an aggrieved person is entitled to redress the grievance thereby suffered by bringing a civil action for damages. *Everett* v. *Harron*, 110 A. 2d 383 (1955). The statutory basis for this decision was the statement in the act that the production of any communication prohibited therein "shall be presumptive evidence in any civil or criminal action." Further, the statute has been interpreted as conferring a right to equitable relief. In the Everett case, supra, operators of a recreation park with a swimming pool were held to be properly enjoined at the suit of a private individual from excluding the complainant, on the sole ground of race or color, from the use of the pool. And in *Commonwealth* v. *Gibney*, supra, the statute was further construed to permit the Attorney General to file a complaint in equity to seek a preliminary injunction and ultimately a final decree enjoining the defendant from refusing the accommodations of his business on account of race or color. (Citing *In re Debs*, 158 U.S. 584, holding that the Federal Government may apply to its courts to enjoin actions which would jeopardize the public welfare.)

Thus the remedies available under the statute include (1) a criminal action instituted by the aggrieved preson, (2) a civil action for damages, (3) a civil action by the aggrieved person for an injunction, (4) an action by the Attorney General for an injunction.

In addition to this provision of its penal code, Pennsylvania has another relevant provision. In 1961 the Fair Employment Act (Pennsylvania Laws 1955, p. 744) was amended so as to embrace discriminatory practices in housing and public accommodations, as well as those in employment. Sections 953, 954(1), 955 are relevant. This act creates the human relations commission in the department of labor and industry, defines its functions in hearing complaints of discrimination, provides for procedures of education and conciliation, establishes enforcement procedures, provides for judicial review and enforcement, and imposes penalties.

Thus Pennsylvania has the dual approach to the problem of racial discrimination in places of public accommodation endorsed by Konvitz and Leskes, "A Century of Civil Rights" (1961) in their analysis of the operation of State public accommodation statutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to request permission to include in my testimony section 4654 of title 18 of the Pennsylvania Penal Code and pertinent sections of title 43, the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

To continue, as a result of the 1961 law, for the first time, there was created efficient machinery for proper administration of public accommodation complaints. During the annual report year 1962 (ending February 28, 1962), a total of 50 complaints were filed by individuals or the commission. The type of respondents are as follows:

Hotels, motels, 13; eating, drinking places, 13; retail stores, 1; recreation, amusements, 17; personal services (barber shops, beauty salons, etc.), 4; resorts, loges, 1; other, 1.

Of these seven cases were found as charges and adjusted, seven cases were found to have no specific charge; the other 36 had adjustment pending.

The important thing to note here, I think, Mr. Chairman, is the amazingly small number of cases in a year's time. Pennsylvania has a total of 864,616 nonwhite residents, or over 7 percent of the population and relatively speaking these individuals would not fail to lodge a complaint should the need arise. This seems to point out to me that public accommodations laws have not resulted in chaos, in legal confusion, or in governmental bullying. I have neither seen nor heard any objections from the vast majority of businessmen of our State who have responded admirably to the law in point.

In the city of Pittsburgh we have had a Commission on Human Relations since 1955. I ask leave to include as part of my testimony a letter and report to me from Mr. Louis Mason, Jr., executive director of the commission. In his letter, Mr. Mason based on his experience in this field says: "None of the fears expressed by respondents such as loss of business, customer objection, etc., were ever realized in the adjustment of our cases. I sincerely hope that Congress sees fit to make the question of public accommodations a national public policy through the enactment of adequate civil rights legislation."

It seems absurd to me that someone like the U.N. Russian diplomat, Sevastyanov, recently arrested for spying, could have eaten nearly anyplace he wished and plot his machinations against the United States, while Ralph Bunche, another U.N. official, and a famous American and patriot, could be refused accommodations at the same places.

Oh the irony that a democratic nation whose political parties are philosophical descendants of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln could permit such a travesty of justice.

Our Nation by its very motto—"In God We Trust"—recognizes the fatherhood of God. Can we who believe in the fatherhood of God dispute the brotherhood of men?

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as you thoughtfully and prayerfully undertake the consideration of this difficult and controversial legislation I hope that you will have before you as your text the 26th verse of the 17th chapter of the Book of Acts where it is said "God hath made of one blood all people to dwell in all the earth."

New York Daily News Supports Fino's Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News, America's greatest publication, on Monday, August 19, 1963, entitled, "Look at What We Are Missing." I recommend this editorial to every Member, more particularly those who have some degree of reluctance in supporting this painless and voluntary tax proposal:

LOOK AT WHAT WE ARE MISSING

As is his annual custom, Representative FINO, Republican, of New York, has just come up with a tabulation of gross receipts and net incomes from government lotteries around the world.

There are 77 nations operating or permitting public lotteries of one kind or another. Mr. FINO was able to get the 1962 figures on

the great majority of these, and those figures make exceedingly dreamy reading.

As in previous years, the biggest single statistic came from West Germany, where the gross lottery receipts for 1962 were $395 million, and the net income $160 million. The latter sum was sluiced into youth, sports, and health activities.

France had the second largest lottery returns—gross, $144 million; net, $46 million—and Spain the third largest: $112 million, and $32 million.

Britain was just a shade behind Spain. Its 1962 turnover in the popular premium lottery bonds was $111 million gross and $68 million for the British Treasury.

Ireland's famous sweepstakes grossed $45.5 million (with Americans, it seems safe to say, buying most of the tickets and too bad about the illegality of that) and Ireland's hospitals got $8.3 million from the sweeps.

Our own Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, whose citizens in this respect at least have long had more sense than most of their mainland fellow Americans, ran its lottery as usual through 1962—for a gross of $51.8 million and a net of $18.1 million for its public health program.

And so it went last year, in 77 of the world's nations, large, and small—but with the United States conspicuous by its absence from the list of lottery operating countries.

This being the world's wealthiest Nation as of now, and most Americans being enthusiastic gamblers, it is a safe bet that a U.S. Government lottery would have by far the biggest gross receipts and net income in the world.

Representative FINO, who has long agitated for such a lottery, estimates its net income at $10 billion a year, which could be used to offset tax cuts or applied on the national debt.

Just what are we waiting for, anyway?

Justice Department Less Interested in Sleuthing Than Press Agentry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the information fed to the press on the Valachi case by the Justice Department appears to be a good publicity effort but a poor preparation for serious prosecution of the mobsters. Beside putting all criminals involved on guard and needlessly endangering a tipster's life, the case seems to be handled by the Nation's top legal department in a manner that leaves a lot to be desired.

The recent editorial "The Valachi Ballyhoo" appeared in the Macomb (Ill.) Journal:

THE VALACHI BALLYHOO

The Department of Justice, under Attorney General Bobby Kennedy, is ballyhooing revelations in crime by Joseph Valachi as such revelations have never before been ballyhooed. Valachi's story is being billed as a major breakthrough in the fight against crime.

It will be interesting to see whether the crime syndicate is smashed as the Department implies it will be.

Valachi, a high-ranking hoodlum who was serving a term for a narcotics violation, murdered a fellow convict in prison. The story is that Valachi got word that syndicate chiefs had ordered his death and that he had suspected the convict he killed as the assigned hatchetman.

Subsequently, so the story goes, an officer was assigned to stay with Valachi, talk to him and try to prevail upon him to give information. It is claimed Valachi finally told his story and provided evidence that can be used to convict top criminals.

The Department of Justice has leaked many bits of information on the Valachi story which is strange procedure for any investigating agency. The practice is to keep secret information of this kind, particularly information against powerful criminals who are experienced in rigging evidence for their defense and getting rid of prosecution evidence.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation would never leak information of this kind unless forced to do so by superior authority. The FBI is close mouthed even when it is working with other officers.

A number of strange circumstances are to be found in any checking of the Valachi story.

One is that Valachi is supposed to have talked more than a year ago, but no major success against criminals, or steps toward major successes, have been made. The criminals whom Valachi is supposed to have named as the top commanders of the crime syndicate are all of Italian origin. Certain criminals who are not of Italian origin are known to be equally powerful. Indeed, certain gang lords who have been objects of investigation for years are not even named.

We hope the Valachi statement means the breakthrough that the Justice Department claims it does. We strongly suspect the leaked account is an exaggerated account and that little will come from it.

Suspicion is based not only on the way the story has been leaked, but on a well known Kennedy political method.

James Hoffa was a favorite target of the Kennedys in the presidential campaign. People were told men of his type shouldn't be enjoying their freedom, and were given the impression that he would be dealt with. Bobby boasted that as Attorney General he would take care of Hoffa. Hoffa is still at liberty and getting along fine.

ARA Loans Create Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has opposed many legislative programs designed to reduce our Nation's unemployment and improve the economy. Last week, Edwin P. Neilan, speaking as president of the chamber, attacked the Area Redevelopment Administration as an agency which has increased unemployment rather than decreased it. After his attack received mention in the news, I was enheartened by the prompt and strong rebuttal issued on the Senate floor by our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I was further encouraged by a logical answer to the attack issued by Mr. Richard E. Lassar, regional director of the Small Business Administration in Chicago. Mr. Lassar's refutation of the chamber's publicity is clear and concise, and I ask unanimous consent that the article from the August 9, 1963, Chicago Tribune, covering Richard Lassar's statements, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LASSAR SAYS ARA LOANS CREATE JOBS

Richard E. Lassar, regional director of the Small Business Administration in Chicago; yesterday raised objections to charges made Wednesday in Washington that the Area Redevelopment Administration has failed to help depressed areas.

Lassar said that in the year since the program went into effect, 12 loans for almost $6 million have been processed through his office which will result in the creation of 2,057 new jobs for the area served by it—Indiana and major parts of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

MORE JOBS EXPECTED

"That is an average of $2,873 per job created," he said. "And in addition, another 2,000 jobs are expected as an indirect result to serve those new industries."

His comments were in response to assertions by Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, that the ARA has done nothing to bring prosperity to depressed areas.

ARA activity has "exceeded all expectations" in his region, Lassar said. Loans originating through the ARA are processed and handled by the SBA Office.

AIDS VARIED ENDEAVORS

The list of industries represented by the loans approved so far is widely diversified and includes production of items ranging from rubber footwear to wood cabinets and shipping crates, Lassar said. He termed the program "highly successful" in terms of the number of jobs created for the number of dollars spent.

Three of the loans approved by his office are for facilities in Illinois, he said. Only the upper two-thirds of the State comes under the Chicago region, and additional loans affecting the lower third have been handled by the St. Louis office.

Steve Trumbull, Honored and Honorable Member of the Fourth Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak only a few words, of the many thousands which could be spoken, in tribute to a greatly respected and much admired newspaperman, Steve Trumbull, of Miami, Fla.

After 40 years as a working newspaperman, 25 of them with the Miami Herald, Steve Trumball recently went into voluntary retirement. His decision so to do aroused a sentiment with almost as much velocity as Hurricane Carla. This culminated in a farewell banquet attended by some 200 people from all walks of life—public officials, business executives, sportsmen and coworkers—all assembled to pay honor to a dedicated

newspaperman who has become a legend in his lifetime.

Steve's typical reaction was:

No soft music, please. I asked for this retirement. I walk into it with open eyes. I hope I can walk out without looking back. I seem to recall that something terrible happened to Lot's wife when she did that.

Steve is, in newspaper parlance, "a real pro" and as such it is fitting to salute his record by reference to the story of England's statesman-orator, Edmund Burke. It is said he looked upward at the reporters' gallery in the House of Commons and said, "There are three estates in Parliament (clergy, nobles, and commons) but, in the reporters' gallery yonder, there sits a fourth estate, more important far than they all."

Steve Trumbull is in the fullest sense a fourth-estater.

How You Can Attract and Develop Nuclear and Space Industries in Your State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech made yesterday at the Southern Governors' Conference by Nat Welch, who is the Federal representative on the southern interstate nuclear board. Nat is a native of Alabama, and is doing a distinguished job in working with this pioneer interstate nuclear compact. His address, "How You Can Attract and Develop Nuclear and Space Industries in Your State" should be of interest to all of us, and I therefore place it in the RECORD at this point:

HOW YOU CAN ATTRACT AND DEVELOP NUCLEAR AND SPACE INDUSTRIES IN YOUR STATE

(By Nat Welch)

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be with you * * * such an august group in such pleasant surroundings. The Southern Governors' Conference has always been a strong and an active one. May I congratulate you on your efforts to strengthen and expand its activities.

I bring you this message from the President of the United States:

"The challenge to our Nation in the areas of nuclear energy and space applications demands maximum effort and the highest degree of dedication at all levels of industry and government. The action of the 17 States of the Southern Governors' Conference in establishing the southern interstate nuclear board as a mechanism to pool the energies and resources of the jurisdictions is in keep with the best traditions of progressive and prudent governmental planning.

"In affixing my signature to Public Law 87-563 and more recently appointing a representative of the Federal Government to the southern interstate nuclear board. I have recognized the potential of this interstate compact in serving the common interests of the States and agencies of the Federal Government concerned with nuclear energy, space, and related technologies.

"You have my best wishes for continued success.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

Since my appointment in late April, I have had conferences and briefing sessions with Chairman Seaborg, Commissioner Ramey, Commissioner Wilson and most of the top echelon of the Atomic Energy Commission; with Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Budget, and his staff; and with the top officials at Oak Ridge and the Savannah River installations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have been warmly received by all of these gentlemen. To a man each has expressed a sincere interest and a genuine desire to help the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board.

Several at the Washington level pointed out that the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board is the first and only interstate nuclear compact and for this reason they have a special interest in our success because we are the pacesetter. Federal officials also realize that many of the most important space and nuclear installations are in the South and what strengthens the Southern Region strengthens the Nation.

The Federal agencies place a high value on the services of Southern Interstate Nuclear Board as a vehicle for coordination with the States of the South. Mr. G. W. Morgan, Chief of the State Relations Branch of AEC, has said, "I wish I had a Southern Interstate Nuclear Board in every section of the country."

The Southern Interstate Nuclear Board has been approached in the past 2 years by three major offices of the AEC * * * International Affairs, Isotopes Development, and State Relations * * * requesting assistance in implementing State-oriented features of their programs. In addition, the Executive Office of the President, the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Public Health Service, and NASA have requested, and received, the same kind of assistance. I think this demonstrates that the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board not only serves the States of the South but serves national interests as well.

As part of my responsibility, I serve as liaison representative between the Federal agencies and Southern Interstate Nuclear Board. Section 4 of Public Law 87-563 states: "The Atomic Energy Commission; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Agriculture; and heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government are authorized, within available appropriations and pursuant to law, to cooperate with the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board."

I have been instructed that the technical staffs of these agencies may be detailed to work with me on specific assignments for reasonable periods of time.

One of your foremost objectives, I assume, is attracting new industries to your State. For this reason, I thought it appropriate to speak to you on, "How You Can Attract and Develop Nuclear and Space Industries."

I was born and raised in the agricultural town of Selma, Ala. I vividly remember those depression days of 5 cents cotton, boll weevil, and an area held down by a one-crop economy. I vowed as a teenager to make as my life goal the stimulation of the industrial growth of the South. So I welcome the challenge of working with you in the development of nuclear and space industries of the southern region.

In 1942, I was in graduate school at the University of North Carolina studying the economic problems of the South. Governor Sanford and I were contemporaries. The most stimulating professor that I ever had was Dr. Erich Zimmerman who had developed his own course in world resources. Dr. Zimmerman maintained that the lowest type of economy on the ladder was the agricultural economy * * * personified by the banana republics of Central America; and that the highest form was the industrial economy centered around iron and steel like the Saar region in Germany, Pittsburgh and Detroit. As Dr. Zimmerman looked to the future, he speculated whether complexes centered around large sources of electric power such as the TVA might supplant coal and iron centers in importance. The huge aluminum plants like Alcoa's at Maryville, Tenn., and the Reynolds plant at Listerhill, Ala., developed because of large quantities of electricity available. Naturally, Zimmerman could not foresee the huge AEC installation at Oak Ridge which uses more power than most of our largest cities. Perhaps we should take this one step further and predict that the most sophisticated industries of the future will be centered around complexes like Oak Ridge, Savannah River, Cape Canaveral and Houston where nuclear energy and space-age brain power is available.

You ask, "What can I do as Governor to develop nuclear and space industries in my State?" My answer: "There is plenty that you can do." Here are 10 specific suggestions:

Suggestion 1. Be a champion of education: You are all familiar with the great contributions that the University of California and Cal Tech have made to the growth of nuclear and space industries in California. MIT has had a similar influence on the growth of the electronic industries around Boston. Better education may not produce immediate results tomorrow but is going to provide the necessary foundation for the future growth of nuclear and space industries. Governor Aycock was a great champion of education in North Carolina in his day as was Governor Comer in Alabama. These men will rank high in the history books because of what they did for education.

What we cannot do as individual States we can do collectively through such regional efforts as the Southern Regional Education Board, the Southern Interstate Nuclear Compact, and the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies. Our best chemists and physicists from southern universities had been assembled at Oak Ridge during World War II. Once this momentum had been built up, these scientists wanted to continue their cooperative efforts at the end of World War II. This led to the creation of the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies, a nonprofit corporation of 39 southern colleges and universities. Since that time the institute has grown to the point where it administers more than a score of projects from the secondary-school to the post-doctoral level.

Your greatest contribution in your State is to see that educational budgets are substantially increased. This need is being continually pointed out to you by educators, legislators, and interested citizen groups. I will not belabor their emphasis on money except to say that I too place it as No. 1 in importance.

There are other areas where you can make a significant contribution to education that take very little money. You can provide educational leadership. Dr. Howard Carr, head of the physics department at Auburn University, told me, "When the political climate in a State does not support higher education, it is not going anywhere." Former Governor Collins provided a climate for educational progress in Florida. When the president of Florida State University was recruiting a top scientist, he would bring this man by to see Governor Collins who would emphasize to the scientist Florida's support of higher education.

You can encourage the able professors and bright students as well as the football coaches. Governor Bryant has recently inaugurated a commendable project in Florida.

He and Tom Bailey, State superintendent of education, are writing every ninth grade student in the upper 10 percent of his class a letter of recognition and encouragement to pursue his education. In other words, make it known that excellence in education has top priority in your State.

The southern region has produced many writers like Thomas Wolfe and William Faulkner with worldwide reputations but has yet to produce a scientist of world renown like Dr. Glenn Seaborg. Governor Barron, here is a specific project that would require very little money that you might consider for West Virginia. You might institute an annual award to the outstanding scientist in West Virginia with a prize of $1,000 and an engraved plaque.

Suggestion 2. Capitalize on the nuclear and space industries in your State. Industry begets industry. This Governor Sanford knows from the way the furniture industry has spawned and spread in North Carolina. Governor Bellman can tell you how the petroleum industry in Tulsa has been responsible for the growth of many supporting industries. We are fortunate in having many of the most important nuclear and space industries in the South. One of the most vigorous growth industries in Alabama has been Brown Engineering Co., of Huntsville, which does contract research and development work in the space program. The company has blossomed under the leadership of a native of Huntsville, Mr. Milton Cummings. Brown Engineering's employment has risen from 150 in 1956 to over 3,000 in 1963. Its sales have increased from $1,500,000 to a projected $36 million during this 7-year period. Heretofore most of the engineers trained in Alabama left the State. Now Brown Engineering is one of the largest employers of engineers graduating from Auburn and the University of Alabama.

Governor Clement, I am sure that you are aware that the Mayor of Oak Ridge and the Atomic Energy Commission are working very closely in developing more civilian nuclear industries in the Oak Ridge area.

If you have a major nuclear or space installation in your State, may I suggest that you vigorously pursue the development of supporting industries as is being done in the Oak Ridge and Huntsville areas.

Suggestion 3. Exploit your new breakthroughs: Governor Davis, by a major breakthrough I refer to NASA's new Michoud plant near New Orleans where the Saturn space vehicles will be produced and Governor Barnett, the new NASA $500 million Mississippi Test Facility.

Texas had a major breakthrough when NASA located the Manned Space Craft Center in Houston. The total cost of the mission control center is expected to exceed $50 million. Gov. John Connally has announced plans for a statewide conference involving representatives of education, industry, and Government to evaluate the impact of major technological developments with particular attention to the installations of NASA in the Houston area. The conference, which will be coordinated by the Texas Committee on Atomic Energy, will look into the respective roles of representative groups in meeting responsibilities growing out of the rapid development of science related industries.

When you get a major space or nuclear installation * * * move with vision and vigor as Governor Connally has done.

Suggestion 4. Build a solid legislative base now for the growth of nuclear and space industries: Governor Combs will tell you that primarily because Kentucky had its own nuclear legislation in order, Nuclear Engineering Co. of Pleasanton, Calif. selected this State for location of its nuclear service center. Governor Harrison did an outstanding job in his preceding remarks in outlining what you need to do to get your legislative machinery in order for the nuclear and space age. The Southern Interstate Nuclear Board is experienced in the area of nuclear legislation and can be of great assistance to you.

I would like to commend the States of Kentucky, Texas, Mississippi, and Arkansas in moving ahead in this area. They are four of the six States in the Nation who have taken over certain responsibilities for the regulation and inspection of licensees of radioactive materials as provided for in the law passed by Congress in 1959.

Suggestion 5. Work with your congressional leaders: Enabling legislation and funds for nuclear and space programs originate in Congress. The Southern States have many influential and important members on key congressional committees. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy includes Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, Senator GORE of Tennessee, and Representative THOMAS of Texas. The Senate Committee on Science and Space includes Senator RUSSELL, Senator HOLLAND of Florida, Senator STENNIS of Mississippi, and Senator EDMONDSON of Oklahoma.

Suggestion 6. Romance your unique advantages: Florida Governors have done just that. I have been in the electronic industry for the past 10 years. I recall a business trip I made to Florida in 1954. Our sales representative kept talking about the forthcoming electronic boom in Florida with the same enthusiasm a real estate promoter would have on the eve of the Florida land boom in the twenties. Obviously someone had done a terrific selling job. I couldn't see it. In fact I could have given you many good reasons why Florida could not successfully industrialize: Florida is where the old folks go to die; it's too hot in the summer; the State is cursed with too much sand, scrub pines and swamps; Florida is off the main track of the American economy; freight rates on heavy items are too high to major markets. How wrong I was. Governor Collins and Governor Bryant picked out their main advantages and have exploited them. Engineers and scientists like the Florida climate. Shipping charges are not a big factor on small electronic components. The Cape Canaveral complex has provided a great impetus for space and electronic industries. Employment in Florida's electronic industry has soared from 2,300 in 1956 to 12,793 in 1962 a 474 percent increase. Governor Bryant announced 770 new plants and expansions of existing plants in 1962 which created 22,000 new jobs.

Governor Sanders, I have crossed the Savannah River many times and each time I think it is the muddiest river I have ever seen. In June I crossed the Savannah with Mr. Lum Squires, the Du Pont official in charge of the Savannah River plant. You should have heard Squires extolling the virtues of the Savannah River water. The low mineral content of this water was one of the key factors for the location of this $1,300 million plant on the South Carolina-Georgia border. The Savannah River water removes heat from the reactors and the plant uses as much water as the city of Philadelphia when it is running at full capacity.

My point: Carefully inventory your industrial advantages. Each State has unique advantages. I never dreamed that even muddy water was one of them.

Suggestion 7. Encourage the entrepreneur as well as the scientist: I will never forget when I was taking a sophomore course in economics at Furman University I ran across this word "entrepreneur" and how this word stirred my imagination—the creative person who took raw materials, capital and labor and harnessed these into a productive effort.

The southern region has not produced its share of entrepreneurs—not enough men like Dean McGee of Oklahoma, Jimmy Ling of Dallas, Roy Hoffheinz of Houston, Milton Cummings and J. Herbert Orr of Alabama.

I strongly feel that our schools of business administration and industrial management departments could do a better job in firing the imagination of their students to aspire to be the builders of tomorrow in their native States.

Suggestion 8. Lend a helping hand to your existing industries, which are ready to expand. You can imagine how proud and excited Governor Wallace was when he announced the new $21 million U.S. Rubber plant for Opelika, Ala., recently. Certainly this is dramatic news. But in the first 6 months of the Wallace administration, expansion of existing plants accounted for 80 percent of the new plant investment. This percentage is fairly representative of other States, also. My point is, Shouldn't we pay a little more attention to the expanding plants we already have?

Suggestion 9. Recognize and appreciate. Let's use some of that southern hospitality we talk about on our home folks. Governor Faubus, how about an annual dinner at the Governor's mansion for the five industrialists who have made the greatest contribution to the growth of Arkansas? Or Governor Russell, each year you might give a dinner to honor several managers of South Carolina plants of national corporations for their role in helping to build South Carolina. Or Governor Tawes, you might have a dinner for several small manufacturers on their way up. Have your photographer take a picture of each with you and send some press releases to his trade journals.

Suggestion 10. Do your homework well. Luther Hodges did an outstanding job in the development of industry in North Carolina when he was Governor. Because of his outstanding record, President Kennedy named him Secretary of Commerce. I asked Secretary Hodges what was his secret weapon in recruiting industry for North Carolina. His answer was not very revealing. "A lot of hard work." He went on to say that the two most important factors in the North Carolina success from 1956–60 were, first, the large amount of preparatory work which was done to show North Carolina's advantages in tax structures, healthy climate for business, technical education and in higher education, and, secondly, the back up of the 200 communities participating in the program. Secretary Hodges said he merely spoke for the State but that key community leaders were prepared to carry out the industrial development program at the local level.

So get your local government officials and chamber of commerce executives to do their homework. Make them a part of your whole program.

Your efforts in promoting the growth of nuclear and space industries will help not only your State but the entire region. For instance, to provide the power for the Savannah River AEC plant, Du Pont and the South Carolina Gas & Electric Co., purchased $3,286,000 worth of coal from Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia coal fields last year.

Your efforts will also substantially contribute to the attainment of national goals. As President Kennedy points out if we can increase our growth rate from 3 to 5 percent a year this will substantially aid in providing employment for all of our people, in increasing Federal revenues, and in creating a more dynamic economy.

A Career of Eloquence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Philip Graham took from

the American scene a great newspaper publisher, a dedicated citizen, a man devoted to the welfare of his community and his country who was especially conscious of the needs of the less fortunate.

His contributions to the well-being of his fellow man are beyond measure.

Mr. Graham, although he was not trained as a journalist, proved to be one of his newspaper's most qualified writers. Much of what he wrote had great substance and reflected the depth of his thinking, his great knowledge and vast experience.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, the newspaper which Philip Graham so ably published, in its issue of Sunday, August 11, 1963, reprinted some of its late publisher's commentaries. Excerpts of some of the reprinted material follows:

DIGNITY AND FREEDOM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The hundreds of thousands of words that Philip L. Graham produced in an intensely articulate career revealed a constant reaching for ideals and a consistent rejection of ideology. There were only two pieces of doctrine he was willing to embrace and these, perhaps, were only opposite sides of the same coin: All men are children of God; their dignity and freedom are ends in themselves.)

At that year's [1903] conference of the Russian Social Democratic Party, which was held in exile abroad, a delegate asked whether the absolute authority of the party, demanded by Lenin and his associates, was not contradictory with those fundamental liberties which were the avowed end of socialism. He asked whether even the "sacrosanctity of the person" could be violated by the party. The party's answer was that, if the revolution demanded it, everything must be sacrificed. There was no "sacrosanctity of the person" * * *

These doctrines have developed into terrifying new mark of our times. Up to now, whatever the disagreements between philosophers and politicians as to the answers of questions, there was agreement about the importance of the questions. Questions about what kind of life man should lead, about the existence and meaning of God, about the way man should be governed.

The new mark of Leninism was the assertion that the way to answer questions was by wiping out the questions themselves. This meant what we have come to see in the Soviet Union—the elimination of reason except for narrow practical and technical accomplishments. The aim of the system is to eliminate great questions from the minds of its citizens by propaganda, by terror, by death. Then it is possible to have a state with only one goal, "a smoothly working machine providing for the needs of such of its members as are permitted to survive." When we understand that, we understand the seriousness of happenings that once struck us as strangely odd if not even humorous. Thus, the punishment of Shostakovich for not following the "line" in music. Or the violent insistence on opposition to all established knowledge about genetics.

Here is the complete triumph of security over freedom. It reaches its fullest flowering in that complete degradation of mankind shown by the late George Orwell in his "1984." Implicit in the system is the idea that man was created with a brain not to seek after truth, but just so he could have a somewhat better knack than rhinoceroses in creating material wealth.

It should be obvious then that our peril lies not just in the Russian manifestation of this system but in the broad system itself. The possibility of "coexistence," to which Stalin refers with purring calm at intervals that suit his purposes, is obviously inconceivable. The chasm between us is as wide as our belief in the meaning of man. The stakes are not just "free enterprise," or "The American way of life." They are the stakes of civilization, that period whose name connotes man's emergence from the animal kingdom.

THE CERTAINTY OF UNCERTAINTY

(EDITORS NOTE.—Because he rejected ideologies, and because he loathed pretensions, Mr. Graham reserved his strongest vitriol for the concept of "certainty." He spoke on the subject at the Founders' Day dinner of Lincoln University, on February 25, 1952, in Philadelphia.)

My feelings of doubt arose because of a particular quality with which we seem recently to have invested some of the more disputatious areas of life. That quality is the quality of certainty—of dogmatic, unbending sureness. You are familiar with the quality—with this peculiar state of mind. You are told that such and such action must be taken—and taken at once. Not tomorrow—but now. Otherwise, the world will certainly come to an end, and you will be at fault.

Well, it seems to me that we are coming more and more to exhibit that quality about more and more difficult and vexatious subjects. The area of race relations, regrettably but certainly, we must admit remains such a difficult area. Numerous other examples of difficult problems come to mind—many aspects of foreign policy, the problem of academic freedom in our universities, the clash of individual rights and governmental powers, the direction of modern economics, and so forth.

Increasingly, it seems to me, we find an almost mathematical rhythm about such matters. As the complexities and the difficulties of the subject matter increase, the dogmatic certainties of those involved with the problem increase in direct proportion.

For example, in the more detached and rational parts of our mind we recognize that historians are still giving us new light on the sources and direction of our Civil War. And that war ended almost 90 years ago. Yet today we listen to the most positive and pompous utterances pretending to give the exact truth about the Korean war—a war where the guns are not yet even quiet and where the facts are necessarily only partially available.

As another example, take the subject of how we should deal with the vast problems of China and the rest of Asia. It is a problem with the most unimaginable complications. And yet in the town from which I come, there are thousands of noisy people with dogmatic solutions in contrast to only a handful with the patience to study some of the relevant facts.

In a different area, I think most of us realize the enormous complexities arising from modern industrial life. We know that the improvement of institutions to help make it a better life is inevitably a drawn-out job of trial and error. Yet there is almost no indication of that in the outpourings of those who are most articulate. Manufacturers' associations pronounce that the adoption of this or that bit of legislation means inevitable progress down the road to socialism—and probably the road to hell. Simultaneously, great labor organizations indulge in the fraudulent pretension that they can mathematically evaluate the soul of a legislator. They claim they can total up his votes on a few measures, and then grade him in a range that runs from 100 percent virtue to 100 percent evil.

Now that kind of certainty, I suppose, must offer a kind of personal enjoyment. It must become a rather efficient anesthetic, as it dulls the lively pains which doubt and uncertainty can kick up. But it is an anesthetic to which, happily, most of the human race are allergic. Although the attitude of dogmatic sureness seems to be growing, it still remains true that the majority of men cling to the old-fashioned concept that infallibility is a quality reserved for God.

Life's Indiscriminate Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Life's Indiscriminate Attack" which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune, August 4, 1963:

LIFE'S INDISCRIMINATE ATTACK

Life magazine in its Arkansas River smear singled out Democratic Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, as one of the stalwarts "in a thin line of Senators and Representatives who, since the Republic was founded, have fought consistently against (Congress) spending money faster than it came. * * * As pork barrel fighters they have all been losers. * * * Chairman (of the House Appropriations Committee) CANNON stands astraddle the Federal Treasury and hates to part with any of it. He is also likely to get upset when somebody outmaneuvers him. This happened last year when President Kennedy's budget included $250,000 for preconstruction work on the highly dubious cross-Florida barge canal. CANNON's committee chopped the item out; the freer spending Senate put it back in; and CANNON lost a House floor fight to amend it out again. 'They are as redoubtable a gang of pirates as ever sailed the Spanish Main,' CANNON said in introduction to his remarks about the Florida delegation."

We thank Life magazine for establishing Representative CANNON clearly in the public mind as the discerning Congressman he undoubtedly is and always has been. For here we want to quote what he said of the omnibus bill that went through Congress last year carrying the major appropriation for work on the Arkansas River navigation and flood control project.

"This bill changes the face of America," he declared. "It reconstructs the continent. It preserves and activates and vitalizes the resources of the Nation.

"The bill promotes universally the health, happiness, and prosperity of the people as a whole of every section of the country.

"It rejuvenates and accelerates the business progress of the country. It starts new wheels turning, both urban and rural. It moves up the pace both in the factory and on the farm. It creates new jobs and new markets.

"It opens up new avenues and develops new skills and starts the cash registers ringing in every community.

"It protects and renews depleted national resources. It purifies rivers and curbs unruly floods. It integrates and simplifies power production and transmission at reasonable rates.

"It is true that the cost is heavy and that some of the cost must be paid by the children and grandchildren, but it saves and transmits to posterity invaluable resources and national wealth and economic democracy,

which otherwise would be lost to the people forever."

Representative BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa, is the ranking Republican member of Chairman CANNON's committee. Speaking of the bill which committed Congress to the full development of the Arkansas, he said:

"I come before the House today in support of the bill.

"There is scarcely a district in the entire United States that does not suffer a disastrous flood at least once every 10 years, and there are many districts, many areas in this country which will suffer devastatious floods three, four, and five times every 10 years.

"This is an all-American bill. It is to develop our national resources, to control our rivers, to preserve and conserve our water and soil resources, and for everything that is good for the progress of America.

"It has been said that God made Heaven perfect in all its aspects.

"But God purposely made the earth imperfect. Had He not done so, we would have long ago become a nation of drones and we would have perished as the drone in the beehive soon perishes.

"Yes, it is our duty as Members of the Congress and the duty of every American, as I see it, to assist in making this earth a little more perfect in all its physical aspects. We call it reclamation. Had we not done this long ago our land would have eroded, washed away, and blown away."

We prefer the evaluations of these two favorites of Life magazine to the shallow criticisms of its editors who themselves are beneficiaries of $9 million in mailing subsidies yearly, Representative ED EDMONDSON pointed out yesterday.

Gold: The Global View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor editorial of August 3, 1963, entitled "Gold: The Global View" alleged that the Federal Reserve Board's decision to increase the discount rate was a step in the right direction toward solving the balance-of-payments problem. The Monitor editorial ignored, however, the possible harmful effects action of this type might have on the domestic economy.

Prof. Eric W. Lawson, distinguished economist and chairman of the finance department of Syracuse University has written an excellent answer to the Monitor's editorial. He calls our attention to the problems the raise in the discount rate may create for the domestic economy. In my opinion Professor Lawson's statement merits the careful study of my colleagues.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Syracuse, N.Y., August 9, 1963.

The EDITOR,
The Christian Science Monitor,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Your usually thoughtful policy was, in my judgment, not followed in your editorial of August 3, 1963, entitled "Gold: Global View." Among other things, your allegation was that the recent increase in the discount rate by the Federal Reserve System was a step in the right direction toward stemming the outward flow of gold from the United States. With respect to this matter, an institutional position has been adopted by the Federal Reserve officials, particularly Mr. Martin. This position is being echoed in many places throughout the world. Let us examine some relevant questions.

1. Is the outward flow of gold of critical importance? The domestic economy has been largely insulated from gold for more than 30 years. Domestically we can dispense with the gold ties of the dollar and benefit by the change. In an international sense, assuming gold to have some significance, we have more than two and a half times the amount of monetary gold we had when we began to be inundated with it in the thirties. The rest of the free world has only one and half times the amount of monetary gold it had then. There are no rules which say what the proportions should be, but there are strong arguments for saying that a further redistribution is not harmful.

2. Why is the gold moving out of the United States? There are two answers to this question. Basically, our official international economic and military programs have no immediate balancing economic counterpart. Further, our position as a capital-rich country induces long term capital outflows as Americans invest in business opportunities abroad. These activities make dollars available to the rest of the world. At this point the second answer applies. These dollars come into the possession of a few central banks and treasuries overseas. Purely administrative decisions by a few central bankers in Europe are made to convert the dollars to gold. We are thus faced with the spectacle of these central bankers telling us that the strength of the dollar and the stability of international finance depends on our keeping gold. At the same time they are systematically doing just what they say we should not permit.

3. Given the fact that foreign central bankers are acting irrationally, will the increase in short-term interest rates in the United States cause them to act rationally? The traditional method for stemming a temporary outward flow of gold has been an increase in interest rates. However, this tool was shaped to fit gold standard conditions of a bygone era and was based on the notion that the gold flows were guided by profit motives. As Mr. Martin applies this tool to 1963 conditions one is reminded of the farmer who, being displeased with the performance of his tractor, applies the whip and spurs. I look forward to the day when our international financial affairs will no longer be guided by the shadows of the past.

4. Does the increase in the discount rate affect the domestic economy? According to Mr. Martin it certainly does. He has consistently used it over the years as he has elected to fight the mirage of inflation with clear disregard for the problems of domestic economic growth. He is presently in the impossible position of explaining the "good" to come from such an increase in light of the current unemployment, production and expectation levels of the economy. Regardless of the position one may take on the use of the discount rate as a domestic stabilizer, it is clear that debtors are going to pay more as a result of higher interest rates. Thus, if we assume that $200 billions of new debt will be contracted during the next year, the increase of one-half percent will cost debtors $1 billion. Unless it can be argued that creditors are entitled to this $1 billion as a necessary condition to a healthy economy it seems that debtors are being asked to pay $1 billion as tribute to an outmoded tool of international finance.

In light of the above considerations it would appear that the discount rate increase not only was not a step in the right direction but was rather an example of "doing something, even though wrong." One might speculate that Mr. Martin was once again prescribing—and administering—his patented cure-all for the world's economic growing pains.

Very truly yours,

ERIC W. LAWSON,
Chairman, Finance Department.

Question About Mica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the Congress, I have been very much interested in the welfare of our mica miners. Two of the great counties in my congressional district and a number of other counties in western North Carolina are experiencing economic hardship by reason of the termination of the Government mica stockpiling program.

Although our Governument can see fit to barter American agricultural products for Brazilian and Indian mica, the Government cannot for some reason take constructive action to keep our domestic mica mines in operation. It is a tragic fact that we are today keeping the mica mines in India and Brazil operating while thousands of our domestic mica miners are unemployed.

The Franklin Press published at Franklin, N.C., carried a most interesting editorial on July 18, 1963, with respect to this serious problem. I believe my colleagues in the House will find the editorial to be very informative, and I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Franklin (N.C.) Press, July 18, 1963]

QUESTION ABOUT MICA

North Carolina's Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER has raised a pertinent question about mica. So far as we can learn, the question remains unanswered.

The Federal Government's program of purchasing mica for national defense came to an end a year ago. The effect in this State, which produces 65 percent of the Nation's mica, was serious. Mr. WHITENER introduced bill in Congress for a substitute program.

Reports on the Whitener plan were sought by a congressional committee from the Department of the Interior and the General Services Administration. Both turned thumbs down on the proposal. Their quite logical reason was that there already was enough mica on hand for the foreseeable future.

But now comes a report that the Washington Government has made a barter agreement with Brazil. The deal provides for the exchange of American wheat for Brazilian minerals. The minerals will include Brazilian mica, with a value equal to that of the entire U.S. production in 1962.

Mr. WHITENER wonders why, if it doesn't make sense for the Government to continue to buy mica from domestic producers, it makes sense to buy it from Brazil.

We wonder, too.

Commonsense on Bokaro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, during the last several weeks there has been a great deal of public discussion with respect to the possibility of U.S. assistance to India in constructing a steel mill at Bokaro. To me it seems unfortunate that the lines for and against this project have been drawn so tightly when all of the facts upon which to base an informed decision are not in.

An incisive editorial on this subject appeared in this morning's Washington Post, and I commend it to the Members for their consideration in connection with the current debate on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1963]

COMMONSENSE ON BOKARO

It would be most unfortunate if Congress were to make an irrevocable decision on assistance to the proposed Indian steel mill at Bokaro before it has had an opportunity to consider the feasibility of the project in an atmosphere that is less charged with emotion about the relative merits of private and public enterprise.

In making a judgment on whether American resources should be made available for so large an undertaking as that of the 1.4-million-ton steel mill, the first issue which must be resolved is its technical feasibility. Are the requisite raw materials and transport services available for its efficient operation? The next issues to be analyzed revolve about the economic benefits to be derived from the undertaking. Will the construction of a large-scale, flat-products steel mill bring the Indians a greater economic return than could be obtained by investing scarce dollars in other projects?

At the moment the Agency for International Development (AID) has not completed the first stage of a meticulous feasibility study. AID commissioned a technical analysis of the project by the United States Steel Corp., which reports that the Bokaro project would be feasible if the mineral reserves can be proven and if adequate transport facilities are made available. Neither of these questions has been resolved, and Mr. David Bell, the AID Administrator, assured Congress that no action would be taken until it has had an opportunity to evaluate the completed studies.

What is arousing so much opposition in Congress is the essentially ideological issue of whether American funds should finance a project in the public or Government sector of the Indian economy. Those who oppose Bokaro cite a passage in the Clay report on foreign assistance which states that the "United States should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavors."

But in their emotional attacks, the premature antagonists of the Bokaro project are overlooking several important issues. At this stage of Indian economic development, private enterprise is unable to shoulder a burden so large as the plant at Bokaro, and it is significant that the private steel interests have expressed the hope that the United States would support the project. Moreover, the antagonists have chosen to ignore that passage in the Clay report which declares that "in aiding foreign countries, we cannot insist upon the establishment of our own economic system, despite its remarkable success and progress."

Although the Bokaro project would become a part of the public sector, the Indian Government has indicated a willingness to set up a public corporation which would be granted a large measure of autonomy in its management. Public corporations of the kind which India envisages were widely used in this country during the antebellum period when State and Federal Government loans were floated in London for the construction of railroads and canals. Both the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad were launched in this manner.

A premature decision on the Bokaro issue could serve no other purpose than to alienate Indian friendship at a time when that country is cooperating more closely with the free world than ever before. The Bokaro project should be calmly evaluated on its economic merits, and that task cannot be undertaken until the facts are available.

The Law Applies to Congress, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me, I should like to call the attention of the Congress to another splendid article by that outstanding advocate of government by law rather than by men, the Honorable David Lawrence. Since the Members of the Congress will be called upon shortly no doubt to ram through the Congress another miscalled civil rights bill, it might be well for the Members of this Congress to give some serious and conscientious consideration to this timely article, "The Law Applies to Congress, Too."

While this humble Representative has no doubt about what this packed Supreme Court, as now constituted, will do if and when the administration's bill reaches the marble palace across the Plaza from the Capitol, we would like to emphasize that the Members of the Congress cannot escape their responsibility and their oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Certainly, the modern self-styled liberals, in the Congress, who advocate this so-called public accommodations provision of the civil wrongs package and who subscribe to the edicts of the Supreme Court as being the law of the land should at least be consistent and abide by the 1883 Supreme Court decision denying Congress the right to pass such a law.

Mr. Speaker, the timely article is as follows:

THE LAW APPLIES TO CONGRESS, TOO—RIGHTS STATUTES VIEWED AS BASED ON FUTURE SUPREME COURT ACTION

(By David Lawrence)

Much talk is heard and much is written about the obligation of everybody to obey the law of the land. But who says what is the law of the land. And if the Supreme Court does, then shouldn't the President and the Congress obey it, too? These questions arise now because, despite rulings in previous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, Congress is being urged by the administration to pass certain civil rights laws which are based on the speculation that the High Court will reverse itself.

When, however, Governor Wallace of Alabama and Governor Barnett of Mississippi endeavored to secure a reversal of Supreme Court decisions by challenging them in an orderly way in the lower courts, each of the two Governors was widely denounced as defying "the law of the land."

It is being openly asserted now by exponents of the proposed civil rights legislation that the Supreme Court will in due course invalidate or reverse its 1883 decision denying Congress the right to use the 14th amendment to pass Federal laws that would, for example, punish a hotel owner if he chose his own customers. The contention advanced in administration circles is that the 1883 decision is out of date and that the Supreme Court will modernize its rulings.

The same 1883 ruling of the High Court implied, incidentally, that vehicles or public conveyances passing from one State to another might be regulated under the commerce clause of the Constitution. But there is nothing in that or any other decision which justifies a confident assumption that the selection of guests by managers of hotels can be regulated by the Federal Government under any present clause of the Constitution.

What becomes, then, of the law of the land and the oath to support and defend the Constitution which all Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and the President of the United States take when they assume office? Can the Department of Justice in all conscience recommend passage by Congress of a law which is of doubtful constitutionality, and do so because an ideologically sympathetic Supreme Court is expected to uphold such a statute? Should Members of Congress vote for legislation which they believe may be held unconstitutional? Are the Justices supposed to forget their oath of office and decide cases in tune with the spirit of the times?

Associate Justice John M. Harlan of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a speech in Chicago a few days ago at the dedication ceremonies of the American Bar Center, had some pertinent things to say on the general subject of legislating by the courts. He declared:

"Our system of government is being challenged from abroad and readjustments of one kind or another are facing us at home. Yet it would be shortsighted not to recognize that times like these are bound to produce temptations and pressures to depart from or temporize with traditional constitutional precepts or even to shortcut the processes of change which the Constitution establishes. It is the special responsibility of lawyers, whether on or off the bench, to see to it that such things do not happen."

Justice Harlan said one of the current notions is that "deficiencies in our society which have failed of correction by other means should find a cure in the courts," and he cited "impatience with the slowness of political solutions generally." He said there is an "urge for quick and uncompromising panaceas for things that call for reform," but that this view of the "cosmic place of the judiciary is not only inconsistent with the principles of American democratic society but ultimately threatens the integrity of the judicial system itself."

There is plainly a tendency today to "pass the buck" to the Supreme Court. Justice Harlan cited the general expectation that an inadequate statute or one that is "manifestly unwise, harsh, or out-of-date" will be "abro-

gated by the exercise of the power of judicial review."

Back in 1935, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt urged Members of Congress to pass a certain law irrespective of their doubts as to its constitutionality. When he didn't like subsequent court decisions—including one in 1936 invalidating that same law—he tried unsuccessfully in 1937 to get a law through Congress to enable him to enlarge the Supreme Court from 9 to a possible 15 members so he could appoint a new majority to do his bidding. Mr. Roosevelt argued that the process of amending the Constitution in the way prescribed in that document itself was too "time-consuming" and "difficult." He preferred, in effect, amendment of the Constitution by the judiciary.

Twenty-six years have passed since these recommendations were made to a nationwide radio audience by a President of the United States who had sworn to uphold the Constitution, but there is still a feeling that the Supreme Court must respond to the political pressure of the Executive. The "new Frontiersmen" and the "New Dealers" talk the same language—that no matter how the Constitution has been previously construed in the decisions of the Supreme Court, Government officials, even though sworn to uphold "the law of the land," must press for new decisions to reverse those of the past.

Justice Harlan's advice to the Nation is to avoid the transfer of legislative power to the courts. For, he says, "a function more ill-suited to judges can hardly be imagined, situated as they are, and should be, aloof from the political arena and beholden to no one for their conscientious conduct."

Try Again, AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Trainman News, of August 19, 1963, entitled "Try Again, AMA."

The article speaks for itself, but it again chronicles the devious and misleading information willfully published by the AMA to prevent enactment of the administration's program for hospitalization for the aged within the framework of social security.

The article follows:

TRY AGAIN, AMA

In its never-say-die efforts to block legislation which would provide medical care for the Nation's elderly citizens under the social security and railroad retirement systems, the American Medical Association maintains without letup that most of the oldtimers are in good shape—financially—and therefore need no help along the lines of medicare.

Backers of mediacre have contended all along that AMA's position lacks foundation—and recent statistics released by the U.S. Department of Commerce strongly support them.

For instanace, of the 5,100,000 families in the Nation in 1960 with either the husband or wife 65 years of age or older, more than a third of 3,700,000 of these families with no other breadwinners—1,300,000—had a family income of less than $2,000 a year.

An annual income of less than $1,000 a year was reported by 451,000 families; between $1,000 and $1,500 by 477,000 families, and between $1,500 and $2,000 by 460,000 families.

In the 4,800,000 families where the husband was 65 or older, approximately 150,000 of them had no money income at all, and 2,300,000 received incomes under $2,000 a year.

Of the 977,000 mothers or mothers-in-law 65 or older who resided with married sons or sons-in-law, 296,000 reported no income and 519,000 received less than $1,000.

These oldtimers need no help to meet the high cost of medical care?

AMA had better come up with a better alibi for its position.

A Minority View of the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following article from the Dallas Morning News of August 17. It is written by Howard Imazeki, English editor of the Japanese-American newspaper Hokubei Mainichi, in San Francisco.

MINORITY VIEW OF THE NEGRO

We have had the pleasure of meeting some outstanding Negro leaders.

We are sad to confess, however, that we have had more occasions to come in contact with lesser Negroes who make a great number of our people afraid to come out to Nihonmachi (Japanese-Fillmore district) at night.

Some of our respected Negro leaders, too, often present themselves as being small.

They will tell you the reason there is a large number of crimes being committed by the Negroes is because the colored people are not equally treated. They will tell you that the reason why there are more Negro dropouts from high school is because the colored children are not given opportunity to follow the kind of work they want after graduation.

They blame society for their womenfolk giving birth to illegitimate children and living on welfare checks.

They blame society for petty thefts and rapes being perpetrated by their menfolk in Nihonmachi. In short, they blame all of their antisocial habits and cultural maladjustment on the "unjust" community in which they live.

We have yet to hear any Negro voice "blaming" themselves for their social maladjustment.

We once told a prominent San Francisco Negro leader at a NAACP gathering that one doesn't have to have a penny in his pocket to check himself from stealing or raping a woman, for that was what he had implied in his chip-on-the-shoulderish defense of Negro misbehavior.

What we are trying to say most sincerely here is that the Negro community leaders should do a little soul-searching of their own today and see if their backyards couldn't be tidied up a bit, find if their children couldn't be given a little more community push and encouragement for education, and examine if there is not one rock too many on their shoulders needlessly.

From the looks of the Negro papers in San Francisco there is an apparent lack of this sort of leadership, this sort of self-reflection.

We have no intention at all of expecting the Negro children to be long-suffering for education like the Oriental children—who are impressed with the virtues of long-suffering—for this may be considered feudalistic and anachronistic in this age of pragmatic living.

We have no intention at all of telling the Negro community leaders, brazenly, to soften their fight for integration and for equal opportunity—for that is our fight, too.

But we believe there is a crying need on the part of the Negro community as a whole to make a concentrated effort sincerely to better themselves. And this effort should be made hand in hand with their effort to break down the social and economic barriers. These two efforts can and should be made together.

Do not say, impatiently, there is no time. Life is long, and America will be here for centuries and centuries after we are gone.

This is the time for soul-searching for all Americans—from President Kennedy down. And America is doing it today. Negroes should be a part of it, too.

The Latin Sky Is Brighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress, the imaginative U.S. attempt at peaceful, social, and economic revolution in Latin America, is observing its second anniversary. In view of the impending discussion of the foreign aid bill, I think it appropriate to place before the House an editorial which appeared in the August 16 issue of Life magazine.

Discussing the beginning of progress in the 20-nation alliance, the article cites a number of specific achievements. I commend it to your attention.

The Alliance for Progress passed its first anniversary in deliberate silence because Coordinator Teodoro Moscoso saw nothing to celebrate. That was a year ago; now he has more to talk about. Said he to his staff last week, "We have reason to observe our anniversary this year—not with the hoopla that marks a triumph, but with the satisfaction of builders who have dug the foundation and begun to pour the footings." There are signs of hope in Latin America, not all due to the Alliance by any means, but generally supporting Moscoso's confidence that the Alliance is on the right track.

The Alliance is a very ambitious long-term program agreed on by the United States and 19 Latin Republics. Its goals are nothing less than to raise the incomes, diversify and integrate the economies, reform the tax and land structures, improve the health, housing and schooling, and enlarge the freedom of 200 million people in the next 8 years. Unlike the Marshall plan, which rebuilt a damaged but going concern, the Alliance aims to shape a society and an economy that have not existed before. To this revolutionary goal the United States has committed about $1 billion a year, which the Latin Americans first naturally thought of as a huge pork barrel. Now they are beginning to accept Moscoso's insistence that the United States is the junior partner in a joint effort, the key to which is Latin American self-help.

By North American standards these efforts at self-help are slow and spotty, but they exist. Central America, the Alliance's showcase, is consolidating its own common market, diversifying its crops, and enjoying more economic ebullience and political stability than in many years. Recent (though inadequate) tax reforms in almost all countries will increase total Latin American income tax receipts by 15 percent this year. Schools and textbooks are multiplying (though not fast enough). A new class of progressive-minded businessmen and agriculturists is sprouting among the tough old stalks of the landed gentry. Even political discussion is changing character and shifting its focus from the next dictator to the next election. For example, although Brazil remains a scandalous example of misgovernment, the rich Argentine, which used to be cited as an example of political hopelessness, has just emerged from turmoil into what could be 6 years of stable and prosperous democracy.

David Rockefeller cited other hopeful signs in a recent speech in Mexico City. Private investment in Latin America, both local and foreign, is rising. Exports are generally rising and commodity prices are stabler. Manufacturing is more diversified, and its growth is hastening regional integration. All this despite a political climate that is still clouded by leftwing violence and residual hostility to private enterprise. The automakers in Argentina and Brazil struggle with inflation, exhorbitant excise taxes, bureaucratic harassment, low volume and meager profits; yet they are increasing their investments each year. If the climate were more hospitable, the boom in the private sector—which now generates 80 percent of all Latin American income—would be spectacular. Such a boom is the key to the Alliance's goal of a faster growth rate.

"Revolution in Latin America is inevitable. Only the form it takes is uncertain." This is the message of Milton Eisenhower's recent book, "The Wine Is Bitter," a sober assessment of Latin America. The revolution can take either violent form, on the Castro pattern, or peaceful, as blueprinted in the Alliance for Progress. Milton Eisenhower, like many other experts on Latin America, is in doubt whether the Alliance did not come too late. The question will be answered by the rate at which Latin-American governments, by fostering stabler currencies, freer markets, and saner politics, continue to earn the confidence of private capital and enterprise—their own and that of the free world. The more they earn that, the more peaceful the "inevitable" revolution will be.

Foreign Assistance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to take up the foreign assistance bill at a time when increasing evidence is being received here that a beneficiary of our aid, the United Arab Republic, is diverting its own resources to proliferate the rocket race, engage ex-Nazi military technicians, and purchase Soviet jet bombers and munitions, while simultaneously plotting against other nations.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, not to the old well-known Arab hostility to the State of Israel but to another of several instances of United Arab Republic intrigue against Near Eastern nations friendly to the United States and anti-Communist. I refer to recent attempts by President Nasser of the United Arab Republic to overthrow Iran, a country linked to America in mutual security commitments.

During the recent coup attempted against the Iranian Government it was found that behind the revolt was the plotting of the United Arab Republic. The revolt, fortunately, was suppressed.

The Shah commented that despite all the Cairo propaganda claims, Nasser's revolutionary regime had in fact carried out far fewer reforms than had been achieved in Iran. He though Nasser's hostility toward Iran was rooted largely in the desire to prevent a successful pattern of social reform being carried out by a monarchy. For example, the distribution of land among the peasants was going ahead far more quickly in Persia than in Egypt.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that in the United Arab Republic a new class has been created—a class of military rulers, a junta, which has arrogated to itself power and privileges, living on the toil of the struggling masses, and plotting war, intrigue, and aggression against neighboring countries.

I wish to stress that our assistance, paid for by the hard-earned dollars of American taxpayers, must not go to subsidize the threat to peace emerging in the United Arab Republic. Our assistance must be linked with standards of morality and conduct conducive to peace. Our assistance must in no instance facilitate one beneficiary of our aid waging aggression, overt or covert, against other beneficiaries. This would be counterproductive and absurd.

I wish to invite attention of my colleagues to the following authoritative reports from the Teheran newspapers:

[From the Teheran Journal, June 16, 1963]

NASSER BEHIND IRAN RIOTS—AGENT CONFESSES PART

Abdol Qader Rabaat, a known professional international agent for subversion in the Middle East was yesterday mentioned as one of the key figures behind the antinational activities that have taken place in Iran in the course of the past few months.

Revealing portions of the confessions of an Arab spy, Mohammad al-Tewfig Al-Ghaisi, a Palestinian Arab and the son of a Beirut taxi driver, Major General Pakravan, Deputy Premier and Chief of the State Security and Information Organization, told the press that in the course of his four visits to Iran within 1 year Al-Ghaisi alone had brought in more than 50 million rials for subversive activities in this country.

On his fourth and last visit to Iran, when he landed at the Mehrabad Airport at 1 a.m., June 1, 1963, from Beirut, General Pakravan said Al-Ghaisi had on his person more than 5 million rials in Iraqi dinars, Turkish liras, and German marks.

Besides Al-Ghaisi, the security chief revealed, several other agents, all carrying large sums of money, had come to Iran. The full and complete identity of all their contacts here and that of those into whose hands these moneys passed for subversion have been established.

However, he said, since all investigations and interrogations have not yet been completed it is not in the interest of the investigation to reveal all facts and details of the evidence at hand.

[From the Kayhan (international edition) June 16, 1963]

I SMUGGLED NASSER MONEY—COURIER TELLS OF DAMASCUS SOURCE

The Government yesterday published the confession of an Arab courier, who, on four trips between Beirut and Tehran, smuggled 50 million rials' worth of foreign exchange into Iran from "supporters of Gamal Abdel Nasser and members of the United Arab Republic Nationalist Party."

In a signed statement, photostat copies of which were issued to the press yesterday, Mohammed Towfiq Al-Qaysi, alleged he had handed over the money to a bazaar merchant, his son and two brothers, and had seen the family distribute the funds among Iranians not known to him.

Al-Qaysi, the son of a Palestinian refugee currently working as a taxi driver in Beirut, was arrested at Mehrabad Airport on June 1, after he had aroused the suspicions of security officials.

He declared he had 20,000 Iraqi dinars with him and had come to buy Iranian carpets, but a body search revealed, in addition to the dinars, 30,000 German marks and 500,000 Turkish lire—a total of about 10 million rials.

In his confession, Al-Qaysi said he received the money from Abdul Qader Rabat (another alleged agent) in Beirut and that he was sure the money came from "Yasin Diyab and Abu Ahmad Al-Seyrfi in Damascus." Al-Qaysi insisted that he was not aware of the actual purpose for which the money was used in Iran.

The Government, in a lengthy statement accompanying the photostat confession, yesterday claimed Al-Qaysi's mission was "a part of the activities and interference of foreign elements, from whom the internal enemies of the movement of the Iranian people had obtained financial support."

It promised that the curtain would be further lifted on the intrigues of foreign elements, as soon as investigations had been completed. Those implicated would be given a public trial.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 19th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in souther Idaho."

Proponents of the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho would have us believe that the only opposition to the invasion is from the Idaho Power Co. and that the mounting piles of editorials, letters, and statements which I am getting from southern Idaho are figments of my imagination. May I say to my colleagues that I have never during all my years in Congress received a more representative cross section of opinion on any subject than that being received in opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. It includes doctors, lawyers, insurance men, housewives, farmers, chamber of commerce officials, bankers, seed men, automobile dealers, probate court judge, newspaper editors, State

representatives and senators, professional engineer, mayor, and so forth. There is hardly a classification that you could name that is not among the mounting pile of letters I am receiving on the subject.

The following editorial from the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, classifies Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho as the "sort of thing which can make a shambles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States." The entire editorial follows:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, May 30, 1963]

WHAT UDALL DID

For years we've been trying to say in these columns that the expansion of Federal Government in the United States is a threat to the liberty of American people. Gigantic appropriations, new bureaus and departments, laws and regulations pyramid into one inevitable result—centralized power. In the end, liberty flies out the window.

The point has been emphasized—in opposite directions—by two recent events of concern in Idaho. The two—the wheat referendum and Secretary Stewart Udall's order incorporating southern Idaho in the administrative area of the Bonneville Power Administration.

We are, at the moment, concerned with the latter because here is precisely what we've been talking about all these years.

It is astonishing how many people have said to us since Secretary Udall issued that BPA order:

"Can the Secretary do that? Can he, legally, do something like that by simply issuing an executive order?"

Certainly he can. We've pointed out, time and again, that it was not only possible but that, in all probability, it's exactly what Secretary Udall would do.

Well, he did it. We're not arguing here whether the action was right or wrong, good or bad, for Idaho. The point is that, after the most perfunctory investigation with only the sketchiest attempt to find out what Idaho people wanted, the executive order was issued.

That's government by edict. It's precisely the sort of thing which can make a shambles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It's government by men, not law.

In the light of all that, there's good reason to cheer wheat farmers who turned away from the possibility of dictation of the same order.

Mr. Speaker, the Times News, of Twin Falls, Idaho, lists its editorial on Secretary Udall's action under the heading, "He Needs Control." The editorial follows:

HE NEEDS CONTROL

When the House Interior Subcommittee voted to require congressional approval for a Federal power transmission line from the Pacific Northwest to California, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall started screaming. It's one of the few setbacks Secretary Udall has encountered since he started gobbling up territory for the Federal power monopoly. And it's high time someone started putting an end to his government by edict that was demonstrated so graphically by his arbitrary order extending the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho.

The Secretary termed the subcommittee action "wholly unacceptable" and "anti-public interest," among other things. He might also learn his protests will fall on deaf ears in Congress which usually reacts a little differently than an apathetic public which can show interest only when someone starts interfering with the individual's personal pleasures.

If Secretary Udall were to have his way, he would gallop the Nation down the socialistic road. He has demonstrated he's not the slightest bit interested in what's in the public interest and when he says something is "wholly unacceptable," he means unacceptable to Secretary Udall.

Politicians grabbing for powers have to be controlled somehow, in the public interest, and in the case of a Cabinet Secretary Congressmen must recognize their responsibility and live up to it, screams or no screams.

Mr. Speaker, the secretary of the Buhl Chamber of Commerce of Buhl, Idaho, indicates his liking for the slogan, "Bonneville, please include us out," as he begins his letter to me in that fashion. His letter follows:

BUHL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Buhl, Idaho, July 30, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: "Bonneville, please include us out."

I read your comments on Bonneville power which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am opposed to the inclusion of southern Idaho as a marketing area for Bonneville power and appreciate your efforts in trying to put some checks on the Bonneville Power Administration.

Yours truly,

L. E. BYRNE,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, a lawyer from Buhl, Idaho, commends me for my stand against Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho in the following words:

HEPWORTH & NUNGESTER,
Buhl, Idaho, August 2, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I am writing to commend you on your approach to the extension of Bonneville power to southern Idaho. Unfortunately, Idaho has no one from our own State who is willing to represent the majority for us, at least as I have observed it, in southern Idaho. Most of us view this possible extension as a real threat to our irrigation rights and an obvious fraud on the citizens of the entire Nation. I will not elaborate further except to say that you have my personal thanks and I am sure the thanks of a great many people in southern Idaho for your stand on this problem.

Respectfully,

JOHN C. HEPWORTH.

And the owner of a tire store in McCall, Idaho, puts his thanks for my efforts as follows:

SONNY'S OK TIRE STORE,
McCall, Idaho, August 9, 1963.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I have just read your report or statement as the case may be and think that BPA coming into Idaho is utterly ridiculous. I can see no other way but for it to cost us taxpayers money. Please put me on record of opposing BPA in Idaho or any place else for that matter.

I realize that my little voice will mean nothing as far as the masses are concerned but I am definitely against Federal power. For that matter Federal or Government business of any kind. If I practiced the methods of doing business the Government does I would have been broke in the first 6 months of business. As it is I have managed to get by for nearly 8 years. Thank you for the effort you are putting forth to curtail such nonsense.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE A. LAWRENCE.

How Freedom Is Lost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people may lose their freedom and what is actually a dictatorship will be established without many people knowing that it has come about. Already the majority of our citizens are being subjected to regimentation that needs very little implementation to give the Federal Government complete control over the individual citizen.

In spite of the warning signals being flashed, far too few are concerned with saving freedom. Even those who recognize what is taking place somehow feel we can continue to build the pork barrel by larger and increased local projects and somehow keep free of the Federal spiderweb. Unfortunately, it would not work. As the Federal octupus grows it feeds upon the only thing it can feed upon, the freedom of the people.

How far we have come in losing our freedoms is shown in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today, August 20, "A Creepy Sort of Service":

A CREEPY SORT OF SERVICE

It's fashionable these days to say that Government must grow as the population grows and society becomes more complex. Not only Government officials but many private individuals as well seem to regard a steady expansion of Government as an inescapable fact of contemporary life.

Actually there is no intrinsic or logical connection between population growth and Government girth. And before accepting such a connection too complacently it is well to reflect on its implications. Government growth means not only constantly increasing spending. It also has proved in practice to entail an even more rapid erosion of the citizen's privacy and free choice.

The specifics behind that generalization are both startling and chilling, as an article in the First National City Bank of New York's Letter amply attests. To begin with, the Letter notes that people are now compelled to pay more than $150 billion a year in taxes to all levels of government.

On top of that are the "invisible" costs—the time required to prepare tax returns, the money corporations must spend to collect taxes for the government the development of a whole industry of tax advisers, the expense of the innumerable reports of all kinds demanded by government, a company's loss of money and respect as a result of litigation stemming from an often baseless accusation by some government agency.

These invisible costs are truly incalculable, but plainly enormous. What is even more striking is the arrogance and absurdity of many of the government requirements, the intimacy with which it is now involved in private activities, especially of business.

Item: In a recent year, Union Carbide Corp. had to file 3,600 forms—all relating just to taxes.

Item: In a recent year, a midwestern manufacturer reports that "the company handled 173 different Federal forms ranging in frequency of filing from daily to annual and involving the filing of 37,683 reports. The workload amounted to 48,285 hours. * * * Requests from State agencies which were complied with included 63 different forms, involving the filing of 1,145 reports at a cost of 3,266 hours."

Item: In a recent year, the Association of American Railroads found it took 10 pages to give only the titles of 164 separate reports to Federal agencies, particularly the Interstate Commerce Commission, which ironically is one of the chief roadblocks to railroad improvement. That didn't include reports dealing with mail-handling. The estimated dollar cost of reporting to the ICC alone is more than $5 million a year.

Much of this paperwork, for unregulated as well as regulated industries is useless; in fact, even today there aren't enough bureaucrats to wade through it all. Yet the trend is worsening. Financial institutions now have to file information on each account with interest payments of $10 or more; all businesses have to keep carloads of meaningless records in case the Internal Revenue Service should ask for them in pursuit of its new rigmarole of rules for expense-account spending.

Anyone who thinks there is no trace of regimentation in all this would do well to think again. It may seem inconsequential that the IRS now treats people as computerized numbers or that it assumes that the individual is wrong if it questions his return, but it is symptomatic. Certainly it is not inconsequential that Federal agencies hold what amount to life-and-death powers over businesses, whether legally regulated or not.

The unpallatable but all too likely prospect is that the prying will intensify with the growth of Government, for it is the nature of bureaucracy to demand ever more minute details. The population growth itself will spur the urge to control, on the Government theory that so many more people naturally will make a mess of things if left to their own devices.

Officials love to talk about how they have to serve the needs of an expanding population. Apart from the incalculable cost and the incredible waste, what kind of service is it to take the people's substance and increasingly control their private lives?

Should Army Enforce Integration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now I have been among those who have attempted to bring national and congressional attention to the dangers inherent in the recent Defense Department directive conceived under the Gesell report.

I am pleased to note that more and more of the news media are taking interest in the issues behind the Gesell report and the subsequent directive.

In this connection, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent column by Warren Rogers, the chief Washington correspondent for the Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Rogers is a veteran reporter, an expert on the Department of Defense, and a stanch advocate of civil rights. Nevertheless, Mr. Rogers was not misled by the red herrings thrown across the trail of the Defense Department directive. He views this report and directive as a "grave constitutional question of the division of power through checks and balances."

And, Mr. Rogers asks:

If the President can do this, of what use is Congress?

This is exactly the point in this case.

It is indeed gratifying that a reporter of national stature such as Warren Rogers has grasped the threat posed by the Gesell report and the Defense Department directive.

I urge my colleagues to consider the counsel offered by Mr. Rogers in the following column, which appeared in the Albany, N.Y., Times-Union on August 14, 1963, and other Hearst newspapers:

SHOULD ARMY ENFORCE INTEGRATION?

(By Warren Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—It sometimes happens that, when a man pursues a noble goal, he is tempted to use tactics which in themselves are ignoble. In our society, we decry any succumbing to this temptation and properly so, because we do not believe that the end justifies the means.

We are witnessing an example now, in President Kennedy's use of the Armed Forces as one means to bring about the national goal of first-class citizenship for every American.

There are a number of things wrong with the Pentagon's adoption, with the full blessing of the President, of the Gesell report. Southerners in the House attacked it last week, for more than 4 hours last Wednesday, and it is too easy to dismiss their objections as simply another segregationist onslaught.

The Gesell report is named after Gerhard A. Gesell, a Washington lawyer serving as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. It was adopted, with a very few reservations, by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and it is now gospel in the Armed Forces.

This means that military base commanders in the United States are now empowered to declare off limits to their personnel any business establishment anywhere that practices racial discrimination.

It also means that base commanders will be watched and graded—and therefore promoted or not promoted—on how efficiently they attempt to desegregate the communities in which their commands are located.

It means further that President Kennedy is not waiting for Congress to act on his controversial bill to outlaw segregation in public accommodations. He is achieving by Executive order, at least insofar as military personnel are concerned, the very thing that he conceded was the prerogative of Congress when he asked Congress to pass a public accommodations law.

Finally, adoption of the Gesell report threatens to destroy morale in the Armed Forces rather than to enhance it, which is its objective. This is because it sets up a special channel through which Negroes may complain of unfair treatment—thus, in effect, discriminating against white soldiers.

There is a heavyhandedness, a damn-the-torpedoes arrogance implicit in the way the President and the Secretary of Defense have suddenly sprung the sweeping directive. It is characteristic of the Kennedy-McNamara approach to military policy, what with the now-you-see-it-now-you-don't missile gap and all.

But in military policy, they have all the rest of us at a disadvantage because, unless you are privy to monumental defense secrets, it is impossible to follow the esoteric IBM-machine logic on which their arguments are based. Only time will tell. If we are not wiped out in a nuclear war, they are right. If we are, they are wrong.

In civil rights, it is a different matter. We are all intimately involved in the dilemma and, one way or another, we are going to work our way out of it. Precipitate Government fiats, issued without debate or congressional action or court decisions, will not work, not the way we do things in this country.

Moreover, it is unfair and unwise to confront communities which are trying to solve the civil rights problem with the overwhelming power of the U.S. Military Establishment. The Gesell report even went so far as to recommend economic reprisal—removal of the military base from a community which refused to cooperate. McNamara rejected this as not "a feasible action at this time," but he left dangling the threat that it might be considered feasible at some later time.

Above and beyond all this, there is the grave constitutional question of the division of power through checks and balances. If the President can do this, of what use is Congress?

One is reminded of the recent warning by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican of Maine, against what she called "the ever-increasing pattern of those forces which would discredit and undermine public confidence in Congress until it is driven to complete subjugation and subservience to the President."

Cuban Raid on British Cay Is Bold Act of Aggression and Disgrace to U.S. Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent kidnaping of 19 Cuban refugees from the British island, Anguilla Cay, by Castro forces, the Fort Lauderdale News, an outstanding Florida newspaper, branded the kidnaping as a bold act of aggression. I must concur in this position, and stress the need for a firm policy toward Cuba by the United States in the event that any similar incident should occur again.

The Secretary of State said in his news conference last week that the United States was concerned over this incident, and that it was discussing measures that might be taken to protect Cuban refugees from any similar situation in the future. I hope that this can be accomplished, and if Castro's agents attempt another similar act of aggression, then the United States should act to insure the safety of any Cuban refugees involved.

A copy of the Fort Lauderdale News editorial on this matter that appeared in that newspaper on August 18, 1963, is entered at this point in the RECORD:

CUBAN RAID ON BRITISH CAY IS BOLD ACT OF AGGRESSION AND DISGRACE TO U.S. HONOR

In the light of last week's kidnaping of 19 Cuban refugees from the British island of

Anguilla Cay by armed militiamen from Cuba, we think the American people are entitled to ask how long our weak-hearted policymakers are going to procrastinate about taking firm action to stop this sort of thing.

The sad part of this kidnaping episode is that it was conducted in full view of American military forces who, according to a State Department spokesman, were helpless to intervene because the action was taking place on British territory.

Presumably, we have a contract with the British which calls for our military and Coast Guard patrols to keep an eye on islands owned by the British to prevent their being used as bases from which Cuban exiles could launch attacks against Communist Cuba.

Assumedly, also, if our patrols noted evidence that any of these islands, or cays, were being used for that purpose we would immediately contact British authorities so they could take quick steps to prevent such attacks.

But what is our procedure if our patrols happen to find Cuban forces invading these islands, contrary to all principles of international law, and carting refugees forcibly back to Cuba under threat of immediate death if they resist?

This is exactly what happened last week, and to the consternation of a great number of our people, our patrolling forces not only didn't intervene to stop a clear violation of international law, but they didn't even notify British authorities of the incident until it was far too late to prevent the kidnaping.

Supposedly, we have pledged not to permit Fidel Castro to engage in any kind of military action outside of Cuba. Yet, what does one call an armed excursion by two Cuban gunboats and a helicopter into British territorial waters and onto a British-owned island for the express purpose of seizing Cuban refugees and taking them against their will back to Cuba?

If this isn't an act of armed aggression, what is it? And if we are not pledged to resist such an action by all the forces at our command, then the Kennedy administration stands guilty of once against soft-soaping the American people about its Cuban policy, if there is such a thing.

More and more it seems that what we are committed to is nothing more than protecting Fidel Castro and his Communist regime rather than helping Cuban refugees and exiles overthrow it and bring freedom back to their homeland.

We have always been under the impression that when a person witnesses a law being broken, he is justified in doing what he can to stop the infraction even if it is nothing more than notifying the proper authorities that a law is being broken and they should hasten to stop it.

Doesn't this principle also apply to international law or have we become so afraid of offending Castro and his Russian buddies that we are no longer even willing to make a pretense of coming to the aid of innocent people he is going out of his own territory to seize and punish?

The refugees whom the Cuban militiamen kidnaped last week had made their escape from Cuba and had reached the territory of a free nation. Castro's armed forces had no more right to land on Anguilla Cay and seize them than they would have to invade the Florida Keys and seize any Cubans they could find there.

Yet, even though we witnessed this entire incident from the air and even summoned Air Force and Navy fighter planes to provide cover for the Coast Guard seaplane which originally discovered what was going on, we did nothing to prevent the refugees from being kidnaped. What's even more disgraceful and unexplainable, we apparently made no effort to alert British authorities to the fact their territory was being violated until it was much too late to help the victims of Castro's law-breaking foray.

In the words of the State Department we were "helpless" because it wasn't our territory that was being invaded. Even though we saw a crime being committed we couldn't stop it because to do so would make us guilty of breaking international law in the eyes of our befuddled State Department.

Who, we might ask, would charge us with breaking the law? Would it be the British whose territorial rights we would have been protecting? We doubt that. Would it have been Fidel Castro? Quite probably, but what position would he have been in to protest when his forces were clearly in the process of committing an aggressive act against a territorial possession of one of our allies? Would it have been the Russians? Quite probably, also, but what position would they have been in when they have supplied Castro with the arms and the equipment which makes this kind of aggression possible to begin with?

The facts of this incident clearly indicate we could have prevented this kidnaping if we had wanted to do so. But, apparently, our fearful diplomats again didn't want to rock the boat, so 19 more people who sought freedom from Communist tyranny and thought they had won it, have found out our noble words in their behalf mean little when they have to be translated into action.

JACK W. GORE.

Taking Uncle Sam for Granted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a thoughtful article appearing in the New York Times of August 18, the distinguished columnist, James Reston, has made a number of important observations regarding the Western Alliance.

In brief, Mr. Reston has cited the "disturbing" contrast between the thinking of our Government and those of our Western European Allies:

The widely held assumption in West Europe is that Europe can be both protectionist and prosperous, self-sufficient economically and dependent on the United States militarily, and that Washington will go on putting 11 percent of its gross national product into defense and foreign aid while some of the allies are doing less than half as much proportionately.

As Mr. Reston has so correctly stated:

The growing domestic problems of race, unemployment, housing, and transportation in America, plus the increasing competition with a prosperous Europe for the export markets of the world, are bound one day to force a reappraisal. The only question is when this reappraisal will come, and whether it will come under calm circumstances, as now, when it might be controlled, or under urgent and emotional circumstances, when it could get out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, these are significant questions and I commend this excellent article to our colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

HOW TO TAKE UNCLE SAM FOR GRANTED

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—The condition of the Western alliance is worse than it seems. For while the alliance has succeeded in relieving the fear of major war in Europe, it rests on the dubious assumption that the United States will continue indefinitely to carry the present share of the burden.

The contrast between the thinking at the top of the Government here and the thinking at the top of the governments in Western Europe is disturbing. The leaders in London and Bonn increasingly talk as if they were spectators rather than participants in the conflict between the giant nations.

Britons see nothing odd in the fact that America should conscript its men to defend Europe while Britain has not only abandoned conscription but is hoping to bring its army back from Germany.

The widely held assumption in West Europe is that Europe can be both protectionist and prosperous, self-sufficient economically and dependent on the United States militarily, and that Washington will go on putting 11 percent of its gross national product into defense and foreign aid while some of the Allies are doing less than half as much proportionately.

How this attitude of mind developed in Europe is clear enough. In the early postwar years of poverty and reconstruction, Western Europe not only came to rely on the United States but gradually accepted the idea that power in the modern world had become proportional to mass, and therefore that only gross material size (population, area and raw materials) could be effective in world politics. There is now less evidence of poverty and unemployment anywhere in Western Europe than in many parts of the United States but this attitude persists and, what is more disturbing, seems to be growing.

De Gaulle is an exception. He at least is challenging the assumption of permanent dependence on the United States. Unfortunately, he is doing it in such a way as to break the movement toward European unity and Atlantic partnership.

ADENAUER'S LECTURE

The presumption of some of the European leaders is astonishing. Chancellor Adenauer lectured Secretary of Defense McNamara the other day in Bonn for 53 minutes on the dangers of a nuclear test ban treaty before ever listening to McNamara's assurances that Germany's interests would be protected.

De Gaulle's reaction to President Kennedy's oblique offer of nuclear help was an immediate rejection. And the Macmillan government, having contributed to the muddle in the European unity movement by its delays in trying to join the Common Market, is now hampering the movement toward Atlantic partnership by refusing to go along with Kennedy's proposal for an international mixed-crew surface navy.

All this is gradually but persistently eroding the confidence of leaders here in Washington in the idea of an effective Atlantic partnership. It is not the traditional critics of Western Europe here who are most upset, but Europe's best friends: Kennedy, Rusk, George Ball and influential Senators such as FULBRIGHT, MANSFIELD, and HUMPHREY.

It may seem paradoxical to emphasize this imbalance in the alliance just at the moment when the Soviets show signs of accepting a European balance of power based on NATO. But before the new generation of leaders comes to power in Europe, the dangers in the present European set of assumptions had better be discussed.

The Kennedy administration does not make a major issue of all this now, partly because the present system of defense seems to be working fairly well, partly because Europe is going through a period of political instability and transition, and partly because it fears Western Europe might not generate enough self-discipline to make a greater effort, even if Washington announced a policy of gradual withdrawal.

Yet the growing domestic problems of race, unemployment, housing, and transportation

in America, plus the increasing competition with a prosperous Europe for the export markets of the world, are bound one day to force a reappraisal.

The only question is when this reappraisal will come, and whether it will come under calm circumstances, as now, when it might be controlled, or under urgent and emotional circumstances, when it could get out of hand.

Children Pawns in Civil Rights Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled, "Suffer, Little Children," which appeared in the News of Lynchburg, Va., on August 13. The News is one of the finest and most widely read papers in the State of Virginia. It is published by Col. Carter Glass III, and the Honorable Thomas R. Glass, able and courageous grandsons of the late, distinguished, highly respected, and beloved U.S. Senator Carter Glass of Virginia.

The editorial is as follows:

SUFFER, LITTLE CHILDREN

We are haunted by the eyes of little children.

The wide, dumb eyes of the little Negro child whimpering as its mother clutches him in her arms and lies down before the wheels of a truck.

The fearful eyes of the young Negro boys and girls not yet in their teens as they clasp hands at the command of an adult and block the entrance of a construction site.

The apprehensive eyes of half a school transported miles from their neighborhood world to be herded into strange classrooms.

The uneasy eyes watching their arrival, equally apprehensive of this "invasion" from another heritage.

These are the helpless pawns of the political and sociological prejudices of their parents and the so-called white "men of good will" who are using them for fodder in their racial war.

We are haunted by the wide, dumb, fearful eyes of these little human weapons wielded by men and women of both races with complete disregard of the aftermath.

Do they realize, their parents, the "men of good will," what it is they are doing to these little children, black and white alike?

Do they realize they are planting the seeds of hostility—which were not there in the first place—in the breasts of a whole generation?

Do they realize that they are emphasizing differences instead of eradicating them? Do they realize that to be different is not wrong but it is wrong to think so, and the thought is theirs, not their children's?

Do they realize that they are providing their children with a fresh and deep-rooted grievance which will fan the flames of racial passions for decades to come?

Not since the Crusades have little children been so sacrificed upon the altar of their parents' misguided aims. The world still censures the parents of that time for the unmentionable miseries which befell the children's army.

What sort of parent is it that will place his child in jeopardy? What parent is it that will consent to the use of his child's life as an experiment?

These are the eyes of little children in New York, St. Louis, and New Jersey. Theirs is the heritage of feelings which the North founded in the South, come home now and being recognized.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, after our valiant struggle for freedom is America to lose the cold war because, stirred by Kennedy administration propaganda, the people are failing to remember the real objective of Communist Russia, our destruction? This may be tragically so.

Lest we forget that Communist Russia has not given up its goal and that its primary purpose is still to disarm and make effective the only deterrent to its march to world conquest, the United States, I include as a part of these remarks, the following column by Dr. Robert Morris, educator and authority on the Communist conspiracy. Dr. Morris reminds us that we are not playing games, but are dealing with the life and death of the United States of America.

The article follows:

BASKETBALL IS DEAN RUSK'S GAME

(By Robert Morris)

The observation of Secretary of State Dean Rusk after losing badly at badminton to Nikita Khrushchev on the latter's own oriental rug at the Black Sea resort of Garga, "that basketball is my game" is so characteristic of our foreign policy over the last 20 years.

We have been playing the Communists' game, with their rules, and on their side of the playing field. As a result we have been trounced time and time again. We are being trounced in the present disarmament negotiations that have reached the first stage of implementation with the test ban treaty.

Disarmament to Khrushchev is a weapon of conquest. He has said so many times. On January 16 of this year in East Germany he said:

"Disarmament, primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly developed countries. * * * General disarmament does not mean disarming the peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence."

Unfortunately it is not a game that we are playing but instead a life and death struggle with a perfidious foe who is determined to subjugate us.

So much damage has already been done that it is imperative that we look down the road where all this is leading, before it is too late.

The end of the road is clearly marked. The particularly frank Walt W. Rostow our chief policy planner has spelled it out for us in his volume "The United States in the World Arena":

"It is the legitimate American national objective to see removed from all nations including the United States, the right to use substantial military force to pursue their own interests. Since this residual right is the right of national sovereignity and the basis for the existence of an international arena of power, it is, therefore an American interest to see an end of nationhood as it has been historically defined."

The route to be taken toward this goal is "disarmament." The disarmament aspect is only incidental, though and the means to achieve Mr. Rostow's goal. As everyone should know our disarmament policy, fixed and affirmed by the President himself is to work for the dismantling, in three stages of our defense establishment and the creation of an all-powerful world organization in which we would be an insignificant minority of 1 in 126. It would clearly mean the end of the United States as we have known it.

The test ban treaty is only the "first step" down this road according to Secretary Rusk himself before the Senate on March 11, 1963.

This has been on the road signs since the same Walt W. Rostow at the Pugwash Conference in Moscow in December 1960 called for: "Completion of test ban negotiations which should build confidence and open the way to the step beyond."

The press tells that U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations and as such top man at the control tower, just happens to be standing at a roadstand with a disarmament treaty in his pocket.

This presumes that all the Communists from Nikita Khrushchev, Andrei Gromyko, to Gus Hall here in the United States, flushed as they are with successes, will renounce their work of a lifetime, with all its dedication and sacrifices and adopt in a short time what we call an international rule of law but which to them is hated bourgeois way of life.

Mr. Rostow and Mr. Rusk should be told we are not playing games.

A Talk With Ira Hirschmann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great humanitarians of our country is Ira Hirschmann. He has been in the business of helping people for many, many years. In its July–August issue the National Jewish Monthly published the following interview with Mr. Hirschmann which I commend to the attention of our colleagues:

A TALK WITH IRA HIRSCHMANN—THE MAN WHO SAVED THOUSANDS OF JEWS DURING WORLD WAR II IS TODAY HELPING REHABILITATE THOUSANDS OF ARAB REFUGEES

(By Jean R. Herschaft)

The 8- by 10-inch photograph of Gamal Abdel Nasser in full military attire is personally autographed "with best wishes and highest regards." That the Egyptian chief of state gave this photo as a token of friendship to a dedicated American may not seem newsworthy—but the fact that the man is a dedicated Jew is astounding.

The place where this friendly overture occurred is even more unbelievable: the Nasser home in the suburbs of Cairo. There, in 1960, for over 2½ hours Nasser was gracious host to a man he knew to be a Jew—one responsible for saving thousands of Jewish lives during World War II as an American

diplomatic agent: Ira Hirschmann. In this Arab land he was, technically, a state representative, although his mission was on a "personal level," that of seeking a basis of peace between Egypt and Israel.

More than 10 days elapsed between Ira Hirschmann's arrival in the land of the Nile and the granting of his request for an audience with Nasser. During that time he was screened, checked, and double checked by the secret police, albeit discreetly. His meeting with Nasser was obtained through letters of introduction. One was from Ralph Bunche to an Egyptian military aide who had been friendly during Bunche's work with the U.N. armistice force; the other was from Arthur Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, to the paper's Mideast correspondent, Kenneth Love, who likewise directed the Hirschmann request to the proper channels.

"Nasser's home was middle-class suburban in appearance, surrounded by a garden; the furniture was plain, simple, and durable," Hirschmann recalled in his New York office. He had just removed the Nasser photograph from a drawer in his desk and passed it to us, at our request.

"He's a handsome, swashbuckling man," he said. "As a man he is extremely clever and poised, cold and calculating—who allows no emotion to show. He constantly smoked and sipped of the same drink he had had served to both of us. A gracious man, he nevertheless impressed me as being ruthless."

"Peace is not for me to decide," he recalled as Nasser's evasive answer to the vital question which had brought them together. The concessions Nasser wished Israel to make in return for Egyptian concessions along the borders never materialized. Although Hirschmann presented them personally to Ben-Gurion and Sharett, who were willing to negotiate, Hirschmann on his return to Egypt could not gain another audience with the Egyptian head. "Mission for peace: negative" is the way it was filed diplomatically.

But with the new United Arab Republic now in formation, Hirschmann expressed grave concern for Israel and peace. For King Hussein and Jordan, which have held the power balance in this area, he expressed similar anxiety.

"Hussein is the opposite of Nasser," he noted. "He is cultivated, quiet, and self-effacing." (Ben-Gurion, he declared, is the one truly great man of the Middle East, far ahead of Nasser.) He recalled a garden party in Jordan where he had met King Hussein. It was on a visit sandwiched in between his mission to Egypt and Israel, and the party was held at the home of American Ambassador Mills. The words used by the Ambassador to introduce him to the guests were, "Meet Mr. Hirschmann, a Jew, who is here to seek a basis for peace in the Middle East." He was accepted by the guests, foes of Israel and Jews generally (although they disclaim the latter, he states) as a "special, different type of Jew."

But behind his composed facade, Ira Hirschmann often found himself "sick to the stomach" at the hatred displayed not only by Arab nationals but by the international United Nations staff of 12,000 who administered the gigantic refugee program in the Arab lands. "They are pro-Arab," he said, "and anti-Jewish." They think the refugees exist because Israel declared itself a state. As a result, they, the U.N. workers, are forced to work in these primitive and unclean lands. Their resentment is further enlarged by age-old canards. The Arab overlords, for their part, support this propaganda because it blinds their own people, and others, to the true issue of Israel progress versus Arab primitivism.

Ira Hirschmann is the one Jew who works for Arab refugees in the midst of millions of Moslems. He is known to be a Jew. He was appointed Counsel to the Director of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency in 1960, following his personal mission of peace in the Middle East, which terminated negatively.

The solution he envisions for the refugees is vocational training to make them economically self-sufficient. There is a great need for trained people in resource-rich, underdeveloped African countries, he pointed out. Erase the refugee problem and there may be a closer basis for peace in the area, he believes. Since his appointment he has seen 13 vocational centers erected in Arab lands for the refugees. Hirschmann surveyed and implemented the construction of the schools, as he traveled through the Middle East.

He admits quite frankly, however, that U.N. machinery is big business in the Arab states, which may not want to see an end to the refugee problem and the U.N. program. It would halt what amounts to a full size profitable industry.

Ira Hirschmann is an amazingly candid diplomat. His autobiography, "Caution To The Winds," was published last winter. Now in its fifth printing, it reveals, among other things, how the late Pope John XXIII was instrumental in saving thousands of Jewish lives in Hungary. It was during World War II that Hirschmann, working as a diplomatic agent for the United States in the business of rescue, approached the Pope, who was then in Turkey as Apostolic Delegate Angelo Roncalli, and asked his help for the Jews of Budapest.

He recalls how Pope John arranged for baptisms-of-convenience so that the "converts" would receive exit visas. Thus, in cellars throughout Budapest, wholesale conversions were conducted by nuns. They were conversions in ritual only, Hirschmann states. "And the kindly man of the cloth devised his plan only in that light," he adds.

Another poignant chapter of the book deals with the 4 American visas Hirschmann traded for the freedom of 100,000 Roumanian Jews. It recounts his secret mission to Turkey for President Roosevelt to negogiate with Eichmann's agents for the rescue of Jewish children. "Roosevelt gave me his full cooperation," he recalled with warm admiration. "He cut all red tape to expedite rescue of the Jews * * * for everything I needed I had only to wire Washington."

Ira Hirschmann is not an affiliated Jew, but he states that he's proud of his heritage. He believes that being a Jew makes him neither superior nor inferior. He is convinced, though, that most Jews are either over-secure or insecure.

"I have not been limited by my Jewishness," he says. "I have sought to be useful to humanity. The tragedy of our people has always challenged me." He believes Israel has done tremendous good to bolster the dignity of all Jews.

He has always chosen to work alone. In the 1930's he conducted a one-man boycott against German goods in New York department stores to protest Nazi brutality. Oddly, he states, it took a Gentile-owned store, Lord & Taylor, with which he was associated as advertising director, to lead where Jewish-owned stores had feared to tread. Eventually, most joined the boycott.

Again, in the 1940's, he took up public arms to keep the Nazi conductor Fuertwaengler from taking over the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra—and he finally succeeded.

In 1949 Ira Hirschmann received the One World Award. It followed his assignment as Special Inspector General of UNRRA, the agency headed by Fiorella LaGuardia, who was a close friend.

In private life he is head of a television systems corporation. A profile of Franz Schubert that adorns his modest office wall hints of his lifelong devotion to music—the piano in particular.

This summer he'll be back in Arab lands again, working for Arab refugees, if Nasser and the United Arab Republic permit, that is.

The Bokaro Steel Mill—A Statement by Former U.S. Ambassador to India, John Kenneth Galbraith, and an Editorial From the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant if controversial aspects of the foreign aid bill we are this week considering in the House of Representatives is the question of providing U.S. support for the proposed Indian steel mill at Bokaro.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two valuable statements on this matter. The first is a thoughtful and candid analysis by the distinguished former U.S. Ambassador to India, and a distinguished economist in his own right, John Kenneth Galbraith. Mr. Galbraith's views are contained in an article published in the August 18, 1963, issue of the Washington Post, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 18, 1963]

PROPOSAL FOR STEEL MILL IN INDIA STRIKES IRON RESISTANCE

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

For some years the Indian Government has been planning the construction of a flat products steel mill at Bokaro in the State of Bihar about 150 miles northwest of Calcutta. Because engineering studies have confirmed the feasibility of the plant, Indian authorities have asked that it be one of the projects financed from our economic assistance funds.

The decision has become the cause of considerable controversy—not surprisingly, for it is an important one. I have, I suppose, been more intimately involved in this matter than any other American and I more than welcome a chance to comment on it. And I have been struck by the fact that whatever the starting point, when there is full information on a project, people almost always agree on its merits.

Let me first deal with those questions concerning Bokaro which are not seriously in dispute. Although it would be a large mill—an initial capacity of 1.4 million ingot tons and an eventual capacity of 4 million tons—there is no doubt that the steel is needed. In spite of the expansion of recent years the Indian steel industry is still very small—it is roughly comparable in capacity with that of Canada and serves a population more than 20 times as large. While the plant would be costly, it would soon pay for itself in the imports that it would save. To import a million tons of flat steel products would cost the Indians about $200 million. A fully integrated mill with an annual capacity of 1 million tons of flat products—the first of the planned stages—would cost, according to the estimates of the experts of the United States Steel Corp., $513 million. Three years of operations would thus recover the dollar cost of the mill and more. Since India combines her pressing needs for steel with an equally acute shortage of dollars,

the economic attraction is obvious. She could not, in fact, afford to import the steel that the mill could supply.

It is also agreed that the mill, so far from being damaging, would be profoundly helpful to the private sector of the Indian economy. The Indian steel industry is partly in public and partly in private ownership, a pattern incidentally which was followed by Japan and other countries in the early stages of industrialization. Because of the heavy demand for steel, there is no question of taking markets from the private producers. The head of the largest private steel mill, J. R. D. Tata, of the Tata Iron & Steel Co., stated last spring that Bokaro "is simply beyond the financial resources" of Indian private enterprise. He made clear his hope that the United States would finance the project and strongly reaffirmed this position in his annual report to his board of directors a few days ago.

Meanwhile, Indian private steel users, large and small, are looking forward eagerly and even hungrily to this new source of supply. Their spokesman, Bharat Ram, president of the Indian Federation of Commerce and Industry, the Indian counterpart of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the recognized spokesman of private enterprise in India, emphatically endorsed the project this June.

There is also agreement that support for this project would be extremely well received in India. Unless a country is very short of steel it is hard to imagine how much popular interest there can be in increasing the supply. The Bokaro plant has acquired a vast symbolic interest in the subcontinent. On no subject during my tour as Ambassador was I so intensively queried as on the prospects for help on this project. When the American Mount Everest team returned to New Delhi after its successful climb, it was said, jokingly, that the first question addressed to the leader at his press conference concerned his attitude on Bokaro. I have heard, incidentally, that I am supposed to have committed the American Government to this enterprise. Both the Indian Government and I are equally aware of the fact that American Ambassadors have no such breathtaking power to promise money. There is no commitment. It is a decision to be taken on the merits.

There is also agreement that Bokaro would usefully dramatize the role of American aid to India. Partly because large and dramatic projects are usually somewhat controversial, we have concentrated in the past on equally useful but less publicized enterprises. A hydroelectric plant in north India is very important to the people of the area. But in south India it is of the same popular interest as, say, the Passamaquoddy project in California. The Soviets got far more mileage out of their steel mill at Bhilai than we have from any one of our projects. I have thought our reticence a mistake. We should not look for dramatic enterprises merely because they are dramatic. But neither should we avoid such projects if they are good and useful. It is troublesome to discover the Soviets have a better sense of public relations than we.

Finally, there is agreement, or at least it would be hard to imagine disagreement, on the favorable effect of this plant on the American economy. Our own steel industry is not expanding. As a result, firms engaged in this kind of construction and machine building have a good deal of excess capacity and idle labor force. Heavy engineering firms in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, northern Indiana, Illinois, and elsewhere would especially welcome the business and employment. The rumors of the Bokaro plant had already brought their representatives to India long prior to my departure. They made no secret of their eagerness. If Bokaro is not approved, the orders would go for other types of equipment but not to industries where the need for business is so pressing.

I turn now to the case against the plant. This is twofold. First, that it is large. And, second, that it would be publicly or largely publicly owned.

While it would be a large plant, I have some difficulty in seeing the force of this objection. The cost would be spread over several years. And it is not as though Americans were unaccustomed to large enterprises. The cost would not be in addition to other aid. It would replace other projects, most notably in the field of electric power production (and also one might note in the public sector) and more general assistance to development that is not identified with any particular project. Because of the urgent need for steel the Indian Government has agreed to this substitution. It is the size of this project and its national character which will identify it so dramatically with our help. There is no intrinsic advantage in doing the second best things unostentatiously in a small way.

The stronger feelings are, of course, against the public ownership. Without wishing to challenge the convictions of those who feel deeply about the advantages of private ownership, I would like to plead for understanding on this issue.

In the first place, it will be seen that there is a strong practical case for public ownership, as private Indian capitalists concede and urge. As I have also noted, India is not the only country where the launching of a steel industry has required a large measure of public sponsorship and capital.

But there is also a strong preference in India for mixed public and private ownership of the steel industry. The case for public ownership is defended with something of the same passion as the case for public power in the Western United States. It is most important that we take a tolerant attitude on this issue. The experience of countries such as India with private capitalism has been different from ours. It is identified in many minds with the foreign ownership of earlier times.

The Communists offer public ownership, or socialism, and excoriate private ownership. If we excoriate public ownership, and insist in an equally dogmatic way on private capitalism, we leave those who believe deeply in democratic socialism no choice but to aline themselves with the Communists. This is a mistake we have made in the past and which we have rectified in India with real gains for our position. We know from experience in Scandinavia, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, and even our own past that a pragmatic combination of public and private ownership is quite compatible with personal liberty. If we offer a broad choice in economic organization as against the narrow Communist choice we cannot lose. If we offer a narrow alternative of a specific form of private capitalism to the narrow Communist choice we could lose.

This is not an academic issue. The Communists have been having a difficult time in India. The Chinese attack cost them heavily. They have been quick to seize upon gleams of daylight. The Clay Committee report, with its implied criticism of support to public enterprises, was greeted with unalloyed enthusiasm by the Indian leftwing press last spring. They took it as proof that the democratic socialists had no future on our side. As I cabled at the time, the Communists were gleefully concluding on this matter that we were going back to our old maladroit ways.

We shouldn't. We have a right to insist that public enterprise be efficient. The other publicly owned steel companies in India have had serious teething troubles and I have not been impressed by the efficiency of the operating company, the Hindustan Steel Co. As a result, the Indian Government has indicated a willingness in the case of Bokaro to set up a separate corporation and to accord the American builder not only a large measure of autonomy during the construction period but also, thereafter, for a several year period of running in. In some ways what would be a public operation from the Indian viewpoint would be a private operation from ours. On this issue we should be both clear and firm.

But on the question of public ownership I would urge that we be tolerant and practical and that the test be not ideological preference but the American interest. There is sound precedent for such a practical view. In 1943, the late Senator Robert A. Taft went to Puerto Rico as a member of a subcommittee of the (then) Senate Territories Committee. On his return he addressed a letter to the War Production Board on behalf of a publicly owned glass industry in Puerto Rico. I quote from it as follows and urge a similarly broad view as regards India:

"I have just been in Puerto Rico with the Subcommittee of the Senate Territories Committee, investigating social and economic conditions there. In view of the number of people crowded into a small island, I believe that the only possibility of a decent standard of living lies in the industrialization of the island.

"The situation in Puerto Rico is not like that in the United States. * * * I have never been very strong for Government-supported industry, but the situation in Puerto Rico is such that I believe the Government has a proper function in promoting the development of new industry."

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to include at this point in the RECORD an excellent editorial, "Commonsense on Bokaro," from the August 20, 1963 issue of the Washington Post, as follows:

COMMONSENSE ON BOKARO

It would be most unfortunate if Congress were to make an irrevocable decision on assistance to the proposed Indian steel mill at Bokaro before it has had an opportunity to consider the feasibility of the project in an atmosphere that is less charged with emotion about the relative merits of private and public enterprise.

In making a judgment on whether American resources should be made available for so large an undertaking as that of the 1.4-million-ton steel mill, the first issue which must be resolved is its technical feasibility. Are the requisite raw materials and transport services available for its efficient operation? The next issues to be analyzed resolve about the economic benefits to be derived from the undertaking. Will the construction of a large-scale, flat-products steel mill bring the Indians a greater economic return than could be obtained by investing scarce dollars in other projects?

At the moment the Agency for International Development (AID) has not completed the first stage of a meticulous feasibility study. AID commissioned a technical analysis of the project by the United States Steel Corp., which reports that the Bokaro project would be feasible if the mineral reserves can be proven and if adequate transport facilities are made available. Neither of these questions has been resolved, and Mr. David Bell, the AID Administrator, assured Congress that no action would be taken until it has had an opportunity to evaluate the completed studies.

What is arousing so much opposition in Congress is the essentially ideological issue of whether American funds should finance a project in the "public" or government sector of the Indian economy. Those who oppose Bokaro cite a passage in the Clay report on foreign assistance which states that

the "United States should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with existing private endeavors."

But in their emotional attacks, the premature antagonists of the Bokaro project are overlooking several important issues. At this stage of Indian economic development, private enterprise is unable to shoulder a burden so large as the plant at Bokaro, and it is significant that the private steel interests have expressed the hope that the United States would support the project. Moreover, the antagonists have chosen to ignore that passage in the Clay report which declares that "in aiding foreign countries, we cannot insist upon the establishment of our own economic system, despite its remarkable success and progress."

Although the Bokaro project would become a part of the public sector, the Indian Government has indicated a willingness to set up a public corporation which would be granted a large measure of autonomy in its management. Public corporations of the kind which India envisages were widely used in this country during the antebellum period when State and Federal Government loans were floated in London for the construction of railroads and canals. Both the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad were launched in this manner.

A premature decision on the Bokaro issue could serve no other purpose than to alienate Indian friendship at a time when that country is cooperating more closely with the free world than ever before. The Bokaro project should be calmly evaluated on its economic merits, and that task cannot be undertaken until the facts are available.

Airline Amputation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 17, the Washington Post carried a very thoughtful editorial on the recent decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board denying Northeast Airlines' application for certification of its routes south of New York. The Post criticized the Board for "issuing what amounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route." Such a decision, the Post argued, should have been taken only with a closely reasoned explanation. The failure to provide such an explanation has been a cause for serious concern to me and to many of my colleagues from New England. It was this decision that led me to tell the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Aviation that a "thorough study of the policies of the CAB may be in order." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINE AMPUTATION

The Civil Aeronautics Board's final decision in the Northeast Airlines case once again underscores the need for a coherent set of policy guidelines if the airline industry is ever to be regulated in a rational manner. Last year the CAB rejected the American-Eastern Airlines merger on the ground that it would have significantly reduced competition. But now the Board argues that there is excessive competition on the heavily traveled east coast-Florida route. And by denying Northeast certification to service points south of New York City, it is making the east coast route the exclusive province of two carriers, National and Eastern.

There can be little doubt that the airline industry has in recent years been afflicted by excessive competition on a number of routes, largely as a result of unwise decisions by the CAB. But the majority of the Board has not made a strong case for the existence of excessive competition on the east coast-Florida route. Much of its fire was centered on the financial weakness of Northeastern, which is incurring large deficits.

A convincing argument can be made, however, that many of Northeastern's woes stem from the uncertainties engendered by its temporary Florida certification. So long as there was doubt about its right to continue on the lucrative Florida run, cash was hard to come by. The CAB majority asserts that granting Northeastern permission to fly the Florida route has failed in its purpose of strengthening the airline. If this charge is valid, it must be said that the Board bears much of the responsibility for that failure.

Having deprived Northeastern of the only route over which it can hope to make any profits, the Board assumes that the amputated airline can operate successfully as an intraregional carrier, based almost solely upon New England routes. This is a highly dubious assumption in view of the fact that the Mohawk and Allegheny Airlines have been certified to service a number of New England cities. Moreover, it begs the question of what is to become of the large organization created by Northeastern discharging its responsibilities as an interregional carrier.

Issuing what amounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route is a step that should not have been taken without a closely reasoned explanation. None was offered, and there is much substance to the minority charge that—

"The majority decision does not rest on any major policy grounds. It does not go beyond holding that Northeast shall not be permitted 'now,' and 'now' only, to furnish services in the Boston-New York-Florida markets. It establishes no guidelines, which the industry has a right to expect, as to the degree of competition which the Board will be prepared to consider seriously tomorrow or in the days thereafter."

"Reds in Indonesia Face Policy Crisis: Party Upset by China-Soviet Rift and Sukarno Actions," Says New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, because I had the opportunity a few months ago of visiting Indonesia, I am naturally interested in that part of the foreign aid bill we are now considering which deals with U.S. assistance to that country.

Strategically located, with a population of nearly 100 million persons and caught in the conflict not only between the Communist world and the free world but between Moscow and Peking as well, Indonesia is a country which requires careful, thoughtful, and unemotional consideration by the United States.

I believe a particularly interesting analysis of the difficulties of the Communist Party in Indonesia at this time is contained in a dispatch in the New York Times of August 20, 1963, by Seth S. King and under unanimous consent I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

REDS IN INDONESIA FACE POLICY CRISIS: PARTY UPSET BY CHINA-SOVIET RIFT AND SUKARNO ACTIONS

(By Seth S. King)

DJAKARTA, INDONESIA, August 18.—The Indonesian Communist Party, one of the largest and best organized political groups in the country, is faced today with a crisis of decision.

The largest Communist Party in the world outside Communist nations, is not only caught in the conflict between Moscow and Peiping but also is in an increasingly difficult position as a supporter of President Sukarno.

The status of the party in the political structure has not changed. It continues to participate with nationalist and religious parties in the front of political organizations that are still permitted to exist.

As part of the front, the Communist Party is supposed to observe the principle of unqualified cooperation after all members of the front have discussed a problem and reached agreement.

POLICY CLASH WITH SUKARNO

But in recent weeks the Indonesian President has done a number of things that are directly opposed to the Communist Party's principles.

Mr. Sukarno has adopted unpopular economic reforms, most of which were suggested by experts from the International Monetary Fund in Washington with the support of U.S. economic specialists.

In supporting the proposed association of Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaya in an organization to be called Maphilindo, President Sukarno has moved Indonesia toward alinement with two of the most solidly anti-Communist countries in southeast Asia.

The Communist Party has had to accept the idea of this association, which Indonesian officials have said could serve as a barrier to the influence of Communist China, as well as that of the United States and Britain.

MALAYSIA STAND IRKS REDS

The Indonesian Communists have been the loudest and most persistent opponents of the proposed Federation of Malaysia. Mr. Sukarno has not changed his initial opposition to this union. But he now appears ready to accept United Nations findings on whether the British colonies of Sarawak and North Borneo genuinely wish to join Malaya and Singapore to form the federation.

If these findings are favorable to the federation plan, the Communists would be forced to accept Indonesian support of a new country that would be actively anti-Communist.

Finally, Mr. Sukarno has continued to ignore the Communists' persistent demands for appointment of a Communist to the President's inner Cabinet.

D. P. Aidit, the Communist Party leader, and M. H. Lukman, its first deputy, have been appointed Ministers Without Portfolio in the National Advisory Council. But while other elements of the political front organization are represented in the inner Cabinet, the Communists are not.

The Communist Party has remained publicly uncommitted in the break between Peiping and Moscow. It is known that the leadership of the party is divided on the issue.

RED LEADER TOURING WORLD

Mr. Aidit is on an extensive tour of the Communist world. He has already been to Eastern Europe and Moscow. He will return by way of Peiping.

The party is believed to be waiting for his return before making any overt moves in the Communist dispute.

Mr. Lukman, most observers believe, is inclined toward Peiping. Recently, in Mr. Aidit's absence, he criticized Moscow, as Peiping has done, for entering the nuclear test ban agreement.

In the past, the Communist Party, which has a membership of 2 million plus a front group of 8 million, has shown a preference for remaining on the fence in the Moscow-Peiping struggle. But the policy has been made more difficult by Moscow's current warmer relations with the West.

The effects are already being felt in Indonesia. Moscow has cooperated in Mr. Sukarno's new economic reforms, which the Indonesian Communists oppose, by agreeing to postpone this year's payments on the huge debt owed the Soviet Union for arms and industrial purchases. Western diplomats in Jakarta have been told that Moscow is unlikely to oppose the Maphilindo association's formation, which could check further Chinese Communist expansion in southeast Asia.

"Indonesia is likely to become one of the major battlegrounds in the Communist dispute," an Indonesian source said today.

Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, a body consisting of 16 prominent State leaders, has prepared and distributed the booklet, "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs." In view of the fact that the entire resources of the Federal Government have been thrown behind the support of the President's civil rights bill and since, as a consequence, many Americans have heard only a case for the bill, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government has completed this very exhaustive study in an attempt to present the other side. They do so in a most forceful and enlightening way and I believe every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will want to review this report. In view of this, I insert the text of this report dealing with title I, relating to the voting rights section of the administration's bill:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LEGAL WRONGS

The logic is said to go something like this: All decent Americans should support good things. All decent Americans should oppose bad things. Racial discrimination is a bad thing. Bills to prohibit racial discrimination are good things. The President's pending civil rights bill is intended to prohibit racial discrimination. Therefore, his bill is a good thing, and all decent Americans should support it.

If this were all there were to it—if the problem were as simple as A plus B and therefore C—nothing could be gained by further discussion of the President's proposal. All decent Americans would be of one mind.

But the problems that have produced this bill are not easy problems, and the bill is not a simple bill. One of the great distinctions of the American system is that we try always to distinguish between the means and the end—between the goal itself, and the way in which a goal is reached. Such careful distinctions need to be made in this case.

We believe this bill is a very bad bill. In our view, the means here proposed are the wrong means. The weapons the President would contrive against race prejudice are the wrong weapons. In the name of achieving certain "rights" for one group of citizens, this bill would impose some fateful compulsions on another group of citizens. The bill may be well-intentioned—we question no man's motivation in supporting it—but good intentions are not enough. In this area, we need good law. And the President's bill, in our view, is plain bad law.

That is perhaps the least that could be said of it. In our judgment, this bill violates the Constitution in half a dozen different ways:

It would tend to destroy the States' control of their own voting requirements.

I would stretch the commerce clause beyond recognition.

It wrongly would invoke the 14th amendment.

It would undermine the most precious rights of property.

It would raise grave questions of a citizen's right to jury trial.

The bill would open new doors to the forces of government regimentation.

And in the end, because of the violence that would be done to fundamental law, Americans of every race would suffer equal harm.

The emotionalism of this turbulent summer is largely responsible for the serious attention now given the bill and for the eminent voices raised in its behalf. In a calmer climate, the bill's defects would be readily apparent. But this is not a calm time; it is a passionate time, and dispassionate thought comes hard. What is here proposed, in this brief pamphlet, is simply that we sit down and reason together. Those of us who strongly oppose the bill believe our position is sound. We should like to explain this position to you.

THE BILL ITSELF

Mr. Kennedy's omnibus civil rights bill of 1963 (S. 1731) is divided into seven major titles. Briefly:

Title I relates to "voting rights." It would place elaborate new controls upon the States' constitutional authority to fix the qualifications of voters.

Title II relates to "public accommodations." It would compel the owner of almost every business establishment in the United States to serve all persons regardless of race.

Title III, relating to the "desegregation of public education," would vest sweeping new powers in the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General to deal with "racial imbalance" in schools throughout the country.

Title IV would set up a new Federal Agency, the "Community Relations Service."

Title V would continue the Commission on Civil Rights until 1967, and endow it with broad new authority.

Title VI amends all statutes providing financial assistance by the United States by grant, contract, loans, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise. It would permit such assistance to be suspended upon a finding of racial or religious discrimination.

Title VII authorizes the President to create a "Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity," possessed of "such powers as may be conferred upon it by the President" to prevent discrimination under contracts in programs or activities receiving direct or indirect financial assistance from the U.S. Government.

This is what the bill is all about. At first glance, perhaps, many persons may see nothing wrong in the several proposals. In this emotional hour, one is tempted to leap from a sincere conviction that discrimination is wrong, to a false conclusion that a Federal law is the proper way to prevent it. We do not believe the intensely personal problems of racial feeling can be solved by any Federal law; the roots go deeper than Congress can reach. In any event, we believe that whatever might be gained by this particular Federal law, if anything, the positive harm that would be done to constitutional government would far outweigh the hypothetical good.

TITLE I—VOTING RIGHTS

In the United States, beyond all question, the right to vote is just that—a right to vote. For most Americans, probably the ancient right of property ranks first in their daily lives; it is the oldest right of all. But as political beings, they view the right to vote as basic. As the President has said, it is ultimately the right on which the security of all other rights depends.

A moment's reflection, however, reminds us that the right to vote is not an absolute right. Children cannot vote. Lunatics cannot vote. Certain convicts cannot vote. Beyond these obvious limitations, it is evident that persons in Virginia cannot vote for a Senator from New York. Residents of Albany cannot vote for the City Council of Schenectady. And the man who moves to Manhattan on a Monday cannot vote for the Mayor on Tuesday. These are elementary considerations, of course, but it does no harm to spell them out.

Why is all this so? It is because the right to vote, though it is described in the 15th amendment as a right accruing to "citizens of the United States," is in its exercise a right accruing to citizens of the several separate States. It never should be forgotten that whenever we vote, we vote as citizens of our States. We never vote nationally. We are always, at the polls, Virginians, New Yorkers, Texans, Missourians. As voters, we are never "Americans." The idea is hard to get accustomed to; but it is so. The Constitution makes it so.

Three provisions of the Constitution merit attention. First, the 15th amendment. It is very short:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The briefest perusal of Mr. Kennedy's pending civil rights bill will disclose that some of its most important provisions are not related to the denial or abridgment of the right to vote "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The 15th amendment is not relied upon at all. If the bill were based clearly upon the 15th, the position of the Virginia Commission would be wholly different. We might object that a bill along these lines were unwise, or unwarranted; but we would not oppose it as unconstitutional. No. In its provisions relating to a standard literacy test, and in other provisions, the administration's bill has nothing to do with State deprivals in the area of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." This bill applies to all citizens, everywhere.

Therefore, other provisions of the Constitution come into play. The first of these provisions appears in the second paragraph of article I. It tells us who shall be qualified to vote in what often are termed Federal elections—that is, who shall be qualified

to vote for Members of the Congress. It reads:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The final provision of the Constitution of concern to us here is to be found in article I, section 4. It reads:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof: But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Now, keeping these provisions in mind for the moment, consider what is proposed in Title I of Mr. Kennedy's omnibus bill. We find some astounding things.

First, and this is merely by way of example, we may note that the power of the States to impose a poll tax (for good or ill) has not yet been repealed. A constitutional amendment to achieve that end is actively pending. At the time the President's bill was introduced, 36 States—but not the necessary 38 States—had agreed to a constitutional amendment to prohibit such taxes. As this is written, poll taxes are as lawful, as constitutional, as any other tax. But the President's bill simply ignores the process of formal constitutional amendment. It is as if the pending constitutional amendment did not exist. The bill proposes by simple statute to declare that "no person acting under color of law shall * * * deny the right of any individual to vote in any Federal election because of an omission of such individual relating to payment of poll tax." The Virginia Commission takes no position, one way or another, on the merits of a poll tax. Obviously, with the votes of only two States to go, the levy is about to be abolished. Very well, we would say; let it go. The point is that the machinery already is fully in motion for abolition of this tax by proper constitutional process, but the administration is unwilling to wait upon such machinery. It is filled with impatience. It cannot pause. So the President's bill undertakes to accomplish by simple congressional enactment what the Congress has decreed may be accomplished only by constitutional amendment.

This comparatively minor provision, of potential application to five States only, is cited by way of example, to suggest the zeal for hurried change that underlies this title of the bill. Title I goes on to lay down rules for the use of literacy tests, not as such tests may affect persons of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," but as they may affect every person. Here the bill leaves the 15th amendment altogether, and trespasses upon the other constitutional provisions quoted. The bill would prohibit the use by any State of a literacy test unless such tests met Federal requirements—unless the tests were "wholly in writing" and unless a copy of such test were furnished the individual registrant "within 25 days of the submission of his written request." Beyond this, the bill would provide that State literacy tests were of no consequence anyhow: Any person who had completed the sixth grade in a public school or an accredited private school would arbitrarily be deemed to possess "sufficient literacy, comprehension, and intelligence to vote in any Federal election."

We take no position here on the merits of these proposals as such. They are as may be. Our contention is that such proposals plainly deal with the qualifications of electors in the several States. These proposals have nothing whatever to do with the "times, places, and manner of holding elections." In our view, they are simply beyond the authority of the Congress to enact. They plainly encroach upon the power of each State to fix "qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The President's bill continues with a provision aimed at certain of the Southern States, in which—in a scattering of counties—fewer than 15 percent of the adult Negroes have registered to vote. The Virginia Commission would make its own position clear: We have no patience with conspiracies or chicanery or acts of intimidation intended to deny genuinely qualified Negroes the right to vote. We have no patience with acts of bland partisanship that may give the vote to certain white persons and prohibit the vote of Negroes of equal stature. Wherever such acts have occurred, they are to be emphatically condemned. We do say this: There is abundant law on the books—there was abundant law on the books even prior to enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and 1960—to prohibit and to punish such willful acts by local registrars. All that is required is that the existing laws be enforced. If the Congress somehow is persuaded that still further law is required to enforce the 15th amendment, the Virginia Commission will raise no constitutional objection. In the area of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude," the amendment plainly vests in Congress the power to adopt appropriate legislation.

We come back to the larger point. The key provisions of title I, as a whole, have nothing to do with "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." These provisions assert, on the part of the Congress, some power to fix general qualifications for voters throughout the United States. If this principle be accepted, as to literacy tests and the rest, it must follow that the Congress may fix a uniform age for voters, a uniform period of residence in State or city or precinct, and in every other fashion control the qualifications of electors. For sound reasons, the Constitution deliberately left the fixing of such qualifications in the control of each separate sovereign State. When the President's bill attempts to ride roughshod over this plain provision of the supreme law of the land, the President's bill violates the Constitution. And we object.

The person who takes the time and trouble to read the remaining provisions of title I will find many other areas of grave concern to those who believe in adhering to the Constitution. Only in the interests of a decent brevity do we pass over them here, in order to get to the even more outrageous provisions of—

Mortgage Guarantees for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address of Mr. Frank G. Binswanger, chairman of the board of the Binswanger Corp., before the New England Industrial Real Estate Seminar held at Boston in early June.

Mr. Binswanger presents the problem facing many small businesses in America, that of finding loans with which to build new plants. A system of guarantees for mortgages for small business so that they can obtain these loans more easily may be an answer. I am presently considering the introduction of legislation to establish such a system.

Mr. Binswanger's remarks follow:

ENCOURAGE PRIVATE CAPITAL TO AID AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(By Frank G. Binswanger)

As background for my own part in this discussion of Federal or State assistance in industrial mortgage financing, I'd like to make clear my own economic and political philosophy.

I don't like to see any governmental unit—Federal, State or local—entering into normal business transactions. I believe in less centralization of power in the government. I believe that the strength of our free enterprise system lies, not in what the government can do for people, but rather in what millions of Americans can and will do for themselves.

Therefore, I agree in a sense with criticisms of proposals to put the government into the business of helping industry finance modern, efficient plants. It would be better if this could be done without any governmental action at all.

But I also believe this. When we are confronted with a problem which affects the well-being of millions of people, we should work together to solve it. Problems won't disappear if we pretend they don't exist. They won't go away if we simply examine the routine, traditional ways of dealing with them and decide nothing can be done. Times do change, and often old problems call for new, imaginative approaches.

Anyone in this audience who has been a member of the Society of Industrial Realtors, or active for years in the industrial plant location field knows that a large segment of American industry has a serious problem. Many companies have great difficulty in obtaining sufficient mortgage loans to finance the buildings they need to operate successfully, and need, moreover, to expand their production and employment.

This is not a new problem. The SIR has made surveys for many years of the attitude of private lending sources toward granting loans for industrial mortgages. These surveys show a pattern. Normally, these lending institutions are reluctant to make industrial mortgage loans. When they do, the loan is usually made to a Triple-A corporation, which has no trouble obtaining financing. In addition, the loans are often only one-half or two-thirds of the value of the property, since many lending institutions are restricted by law in the amounts they can lend for such purposes.

Now let us look at the other side of the picture. What does this difficulty in financing efficient plants do to the small- and medium-size company?—and remember, these companies, with a net worth of $1 million or less, are the backbone of American industry and of the American economy. They produce most of the goods, employ most of the people, and create most of the purchasing power in the country.

A few years ago, I traveled through Russia. In fact, I've traveled through most of the world. Russia isn't up to us, industrially—not yet. But as the Kremlin drives Russia to change from an agricultural economy to an industrial one, Russian industry is growing. It is growing in new, modern, efficient buildings, with new, modern, cost-saving equipment.

Take the Common Market countries in Europe. Many of their old antiquated industrial buildings were destroyed in the war, along with the prewar equipment. These countries have made a fantastic comeback industrially—and they are doing it with new buildings and new equipment.

Contrast those situations—and the competitive pressures they place on American industry—with the situation of many American companies, especially those in the older industrial areas in New England, the Midwest, Pennsylvania and surrounding States.

Hundreds of companies are locked in ancient, multistory, chopped-up buildings, where they are trying to compete with the rest of the world and with other companies in America. Inefficient space raises their costs. It prevents them from expanding and it handicaps them when they want to modernize their equipment.

Many of these companies are in trouble—and because they are, the economy could be in trouble. If they cannot expand, or acquire the physical property which enables them to remain competitive, they have growing difficulty in maintaining employment, to say nothing of increasing employment. Yet the Nation as a whole has been living with a nagging employment problem for several years, and so far has been unable to get the unemployment figure below 5½ or 6 percent, and keep it there. In some areas, of course, the unemployment figure is much worse. Every time an industrial company fails, the unemployment rolls increase.

There is one more fact about these small and medium size companies. Very few of them can afford to go out and buy the building they need, or to rehabilitate an older one, with the money they have on hand. The reserves they have are needed for working capital, new equipment and normal operations. They don't want to tie up their money in bricks and mortar—and they shouldn't.

So, we have a serious situation. We have failed to solve the unemployment problem. Companies which might expand—or might just stay in business—if they could acquire efficient operating space have trouble in doing so. Traditional sources of financing are not available to the extent that is necessary.

I've never been able to comprehend why all types of real estate—hotels, motels, bowling alleys, shopping centers, office buildings, and apartment houses—can obtain financing, but when industrial financing is sought from some lenders it is seldom available. In the latter case, the lenders insist on examining a company's net worth, its 5-year record of earnings, and so on, and do not indicate a willingness to give proper attention to the value of the land and the buildings involved.

Further, they do not take into account the savings a company realizes by moving into more modern quarters. There are savings due to increased efficiency of operations, and there are savings due to the fact that in many cases the carrying charges on the new quarters are less than the company has been paying.

Personally, I would greatly prefer that this problem of financing the rehabilitation of old plants or the purchase of newer ones could be handled by private lenders without any help from government. But experience tells us that this isn't being done and isn't likely to be done. The private lending institutions are limited in what they can do, and besides, they have to overcome a sort of mental block against recognizing the value of real physical property as security for their loans.

Therefore, I have been a missionary for several years on this subject of devising ways of luring private capital into the business of helping private industry obtain the manufacturing space it needs to survive, to compete and to expand.

We are all familiar with the various means that have been tried to help small industry. The Small Business Administration, and the Area Redevelopment Administration have been helpful to some extent, but there is still a gap in what is being done for these small firms.

The most effective means of filling this gap, I believe, and the one most in keeping with our free enterprise system, is that of establishing a guarantee for mortgages for small industrial firms, along the lines of the FHA guarantee for residential mortgages.

Even after 30 years, the mere mention of FHA raises blood pressure in some circles—including those which have benefited most by FHA. These people forget the tremendous boost to homeowning and homebuilding that resulted from adoption of the FHA law. They forget how, over the years, living standards were raised for millions of Americans because they were enabled to own decent, modern homes. They forget the shot in the arm given to the construction industry and to our overall economy. And some realtors, I am afraid, forget that they might not be in business if it weren't for FHA. With all the mistakes that it made—and there were plenty of them—FHA has been a good thing for the country.

And one thing more—FHA is the only major Federal program which hasn't cost the taxpayers a cent.

That same principle can be applied to the industrial mortgage field. There is evidence that the principle is sound in the Maine and Connecticut programs about which you have heard. In the past few months, I have been meeting with bank presidents, insurance company officials, and other lenders to see what their attitude would be. They have different interests and points of view, but they agree that a sound insurance program would lead them to consider loans for industry in a more favorable light than they do now.

Also in the course of my missionary work, I have discussed this idea with officials of the Federal Government—up to the very top. I spent a long afternoon in the Treasury Department, and the officials there agreed that this question of financing buildings for small industry represented a gap in present Federal credit programs. I have discussed it with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, the SBA, the Senate Small Business Committee, and leaders in both Houses of Congress. The reception has been entirely favorable.

My own personal preference is that industrial mortgage guarantee programs should be administered by the States, rather than by the Federal Government.

The States are closer to their own situations, and know the needs of both lenders and industrial borrowers. On a State basis, the programs could be administered by people familiar with the experience and practices of their own local businesses, and this would permit the flexibility that would best meet the economic requirements of each section of the State.

In Pennsylvania we have been watching these programs in other States, and have been conducting studies throughout our own area, with a view to the possibility of inaugurating similar programs. I believe that mortgage guarantee programs will be seriously considered in many States in the near future. If the States do not act they will increase the likelihood that the Federal Government will.

The need is felt in many parts of the country, and I believe men with real experience in industrial plant location are beginning to recognize it. Many of those who object are the same ones who run to the Government for some kind of subsidy when the going gets rough.

I hope all of you will think seriously about a guarantee program. If you are in the lending business, it will enable you to expand your portfolios with proper regard for the safety of the funds entrusted to you. If you are in the industrial real estate business, it will help you to make deals.

But these are not good enough reasons for the program. The basic reason is that we need to do something to encourage industry to compete and expand, to help small companies grow into big ones, to prevent more unemployment through failures of industrial firms, to provide more jobs for those now unemployed. The necessity of meeting those problems will become more insistent as the population expands and as competition from the rest of the world grows more severe. By attracting private capital into the industrial mortgage field, we can perform a valuable service for the entire country.

Views on Title II of the Proposed Civil Rights Legislation—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the booklet, "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs," issued by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, contains a very extensive study of title II of the proposed administration's civil rights legislation, relating to public accommodations. Since this particular section of this legislation is so controversial and far reaching in scope, I felt the readers of the RECORD would benefit from the views of the Virginia Commission on this section. I insert herewith their text:

TITLE II. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Perhaps the most obvious wrongness of title II may be summed up in a phrase: This section is conceived in hypocrisy, and cannot rise above its shabby origins.

Title II opens with a long recital of findings. In these opening paragraphs, the Congress purportedly finds all sorts of burdens upon interstate commerce, all resulting from acts of racial discrimination. It is of passing interest to inquire how the Congress has found these things, for the administration's witnesses have provided no convincing evidence to point them out. Possibly we are to rely on faith alone. In any event, the Congress here finds that a substantial number of Negroes, traveling in interstate commerce, are denied convenient access to hotels, motels, and eating accommodations; that practices of audience discrimination in the entertainment industry create "serious and substantial" burdens upon interstate commerce; that fraternal, religious, and scientific conventions "frequently" are dissuaded from meeting in particular cities by reason of discriminatory practices; that business organizations "frequently" are hampered in setting up branch plants by reason of discrimination; and finally, that—

"(h) The discriminatory practices described above are in all cases encouraged, fostered, or tolerated in some degree by the governmental authorities of the States in which they occur, which license or protect the businesses involved by means of laws and ordinances and the activities of their executives and judicial officers."

This is the strange and ominous foundation on which title II is made to rest. Read it, we beg you. Ponder it. Reflect, if you please, upon this assertion of some Federal authority over any business that may be "licensed" by State authority. Reflect, if you please, upon the vagueness of these "activities" of a State's executive and judicial officers. Because the very next sentence of this finding ties it all together:

"Such discriminatory practices, particularly when their cumulative effect throughout the Nation is considered, take on the character of action by the States and there-

fore fall within the ambit of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

The object of this smooth leaping and hurdling is apparent to the most casual student of the Constitution. Obviously, the 14th amendment does not prohibit acts of private discrimination in ordinary daily life. The Supreme Court of the United States repeatedly has said so. In an unbroken chain of opinions reaching back to 1883, the Court has ruled that the amendment prohibits only those acts of discrimination that may be charged to the States themselves in such areas as voting rights, jury service, and access to public institutions. The amendment says that no State shall deny equal protection. What individuals do is their own business. But suppose—as this bill proposes—that individual acts "take on the character of State acts"? In this event, the smallest retail establishment, the humblest soda fountain, "takes on the character" of the State itself. In effect, it becomes an agency of the State. Its acts are State acts. Its denials are State denials. And in this fateful moment, the ancient distinctions between private property and public agencies fly out the window. Under the precedent here proposed, private property, as such, in this regard will have ceased to exist.

This is the very crux of title II of the President's bill. These easy findings do not affect the South alone. They affect every State, every locality, every businessman. In this mad confusion of the commerce clause and the 14th amendment, nothing makes sense. The alleged acts of racial discrimination by private business establishments simultaneously are found to be burdens upon interstate commerce and denials of equal protection by the States themselves.

The final finding reflects this confusion:

"(i) The burdens on and obstructions to commerce which are described above can best be removed by invoking the powers of Congress under the 14th amendment and the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin in certain public establishments."

We invite the thoughtful reader to go back and read that paragraph once again. Ostensibly, the bill is here concerned with "burdens on and obstructions to" commerce. The power of the Congress in this area derives from article I, section 8, vesting in Congress the power "to regulate commerce among the several States." But the object of this bill is not really to regulate commerce. The object of the bill, in its own revealing words, is "to prohibit discrimination." The commerce clause is here being deceptively adapted not to commerce, but to social reform.

The substantive provisions of the President's bill then are set forth:

"SEC. 202. (a) All persons shall be entitled, without discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of the following public establishments:"

And the bill sets them forth. We put them line by line, the better to emphasize the sweep of this bill. The law, by its own terms, is to apply to:

"Every hotel,

"Every motel,

"Every other public place engaged in furnishing lodging to transient guests, including guests from other States or traveling in interstate commerce,

"Every motion picture house,

"Every theater,

"Every sports arena,

"Every stadium,

"Every exhibition hall,

"Every other public place of amusement or entertainment which customarily presents motion pictures, performing groups, athletic teams, exhibitions, or other sources of entertainment which move in interstate commerce, and

"Every retail shop,

"Every department store,

"Every market,

"Every drugstore,

"Every gasoline station, and

"Every other public place which keeps goods for sale,

"Every restaurant,

"Every lunchroom,

"Every lunch counter,

"Every soda fountain, and

"Every other public place engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, and

"Every other establishment where goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations are held out to the public for sale, use, rent, or hire."

Then follows the superficial saving grace of "if." The provisions of section 202 are to apply to such establishments "if":

"(1) The goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations offered by any such place or establishment are provided to a substantial degree to interstate travelers, or

"(2) a substantial portion of any goods held out to the public by any such place or establishment for sale, use, rent, or hire has moved in interstate commerce."

There are two other such provisions, but it is needless to quote them. The second proviso impales the smallest hotdog stand upon the transportation of its mustard. There is not a neighborhood soda fountain in America, not a dress shop, not a hat shop, not a beauty parlor, not a single place or establishment beyond the tiniest roadside stand of which it may be said that a substantial portion of its goods, held out for sale or use, has not moved in interstate commerce.

We would urge thoughtful Americans, wherever they may live, whatever their views may be on questions of race relations, to ponder the twisted construction here placed upon the commerce clause. When the Congress first began to regulate "commerce among the several States," the object was to regulate the carriers in which the goods were hauled. In time, a second area of regulation developed, as the nature of the goods themselves came into the congressional power. Then a third area developed, as Congress sought to regulate the conditions under which the goods themselves were manufactured.

In this bill, a fourth area is opened up. It is as wide as the world. Here the Congress proposes to impose a requirement to serve. Heretofore, such a requirement has been imposed solely in the area of public service corporations—the telephone companies, electric power companies, gas and water companies—the companies that operate as regulated public utilities. Now the restricted class of public service corporations is to be swept aside. Here Clancy's Grill and Mrs. Murphy's Hat Shoppe are equated with A.T. & T. The neighborhood drug store is treated as the gas company: It must serve. Within the realm of section 202, the owner has no option, no right of choice. Yes, he may reject drunks, rowdies, deadbeats. But his right to discriminate by reason of race or religion—or any other related personal reason—is denied him under the pain of Federal injunction and the threat of prison sentence for contempt of court.

At this point in our argument the Virginia Commission would beg the closest attention: We do not propose to defend racial discrimination. We do defend, with all the power at our command, the citizen's right to discriminate. However shocking the proposition may sound at first impression, we submit that under one name or another, this is what the Constitution, in part at least, is all about. This right is vital to the American system. If this be destroyed, the whole basis of individual liberty is destroyed. The American system does not rest upon some "right to be right," as some legislative majority may define what is "right." It rests solidly upon the individual's right to be wrong—upon his right in his personal life to be capricious, arbitrary, prejudiced, biased, opinionated, unreasonable—upon his right to act as a free man in a free society.

We plead your indulgence. Whether this right be called the right of free choice, or the right of free association, or the right to be let alone, or the right of a free marketplace, this right is essential. Its spirit permeates the Constitution. Its exercise colors our entire life. When a man buys union-made products, for that reason alone, as opposed to nonunion products, he discriminates. When a Virginian buys cigarettes made in Virginia, for that reason alone, as opposed to cigarettes made in Kentucky or North Carolina, he discriminates. When a housewife buys a nationally advertised lipstick, for that reason alone, as opposed to an unknown brand, she discriminates. When her husband buys an American automobile, for that reason alone, as opposed to a European automobile, he discriminates. Every one of these acts of "discrimination" imposes some burden upon interstate commerce.

The examples could be endlessly multiplied. Every reader of this discussion will think up his own examples from the oranges of Florida to the potatoes of Idaho. And the right to discriminate obviously does not end with questions of commerce. The man who blindly votes a straight Democratic ticket, or a straight Republican ticket, is engaged in discrimination. He is not concerned with the color of an opponent's skin; he is concerned with the color of his party. Merit has nothing to do with it. The man who habitually buys the Times instead of the Herald Tribune, or Life instead of Look, or listens to Mr. Bernstein instead of to Mr. Presley, is engaged in discrimination. Without pausing to chop logic, he is bringing to bear the accumulated experience—the prejudice, if you please—of a lifetime. Some nonunion goods may be better than some union goods; some Democrats may be better than some Republicans; some issues of Look may be better than some issues of Life. None of this matters. In a free society, these choices—these acts of prejudice, or discrimination, or arbitrary judgment—universally have been regarded as a man's right to make on his own.

The vice of Mr. Kennedy's title II is that it tends to destroy this concept by creating a pattern for Federal intervention. For the first time, outside the fully accepted area of public utilities, this bill undertakes to lay down a compulsion to sell.

We raise the point: If there can constitutionally be a compulsion to sell, why cannot there be, with equal justification, a compulsion to buy? In theory, the bill is concerned with "burdens on and obstructions to" commerce. In theory, the owner of the neighborhood restaurant imposes an intolerable burden upon interstate commerce if he refuses to serve a white or Negro customer, as the case may be. But let us suppose that by obeying some injunction to serve a Negro patron, the proprietor of Clancy's Grill thereby loses the trade of 10 white patrons. In the South, such a consequence is entirely likely; it has been demonstrated in the case of southern movie houses. Can it be said that the refusal of the 10 whites imposes no burden on interstate commerce? Plainly, these 10 intransigent customers, under the theory of this bill, have imposed 10 times

as great a burden on commerce among the several States. Shall they, then, be compelled to return to Clancy's for their meals? Where does this line of reasoning lead us?

How would all this be enforced? Under title II, the Attorney General would be required to investigate complaints of denial of service. Persistent acts of discrimination would be prohibited by Federal injunctions, obtained in the name of the United States. Any person who attempted to interfere with Clancy's decision would be subject to individual injunction. And at the end of every such proceeding lies the threat of fine or imprisonment for contempt of court. There would be no jury trials.

This has been a very abbreviated summary of the "public accommodations" features of the President's bill. A definitive analysis could be much extended. Not only is the commerce clause distorted beyond recognition, the provisions of the 14th amendment also are warped to cover individual action as opposed to State action. Our hypothetical Clancy could not call upon the police to eject an unwanted customer, trespassing upon his booths and tables. Reliance upon local police to enforce old laws of trespass, under this bill, would be regarded as an exercise of "State action." Clancy has become the State. Like Louis of old, he too may say, "L'état, c'est moi."

The Alliance for Progress: Its Problems and Its Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Adolf A. Berle is both one of our most outstanding economists and a leading expert on Latin America. He has served as a special assistant to the Secretary of State, Ambassador to Brazil, and as Chairman of President Kennedy's Task Force on Latin America.

In the following article, which appeared in the July 13 issue of Saturday Review, Mr. Berle gives what I feel is an excellent analysis of the Alliance for Progress, discussing its pressing problems, its mounting urgency, and its abundant promise for the future. In view of our current consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act, I highly commend this article to my colleagues:

LATIN AMERICA'S TRUE VOICE

(By Adolf A. Berle)

The Alliance for Progress, a positive program for social and economic development of Latin America, works on a platform of objectives adopted by all Latin American countries at the conference of Punta del Este and is backed by political parties representing a majority of all Latin American voters. Under freedom, the Alliance program can revolutionize Latin America into well-distributed prosperity. Puerto Rico's brilliant success in achieving democratic social and economic revolution, an explosion of productivity, proves its feasibility. By comparison, the wreck of the once-strong economy of Cuba displays the ghastly reality behind shimmering Communist promises.

Simultaneously, the imperialist push of the Soviet Union and China is ruthlessly driving into the explosive Caribbean area. Its aim: Reduction of Latin American countries to the status of Russian or Chinese provinces—with an eye to an eventual attack on the United States.

Slowly, all too slowly, perhaps, the Alliance for Progress gains new social and political adherents throughout the hemisphere. The Communist imperialists meanwhile maintain a Russian army of occupation (perhaps underestimated at 17,500 men) in Cuba, and have mounted a clandestine drive in Haiti. Cadres of armed guerrillas (locally camouflaged as "armies of national liberation"), paid and supplied from Havana, are being maintained in Venezuela, in Colombia, and possibly also in the northern jungles of Guatemala. Unactivated nests and arms dumps have been organized eleswhere in the Caribbean littoral.

The Alliance for Progress has started constructive projects throughout most of the hemisphere. By 1965 enough will have been completed to affect the lives of about 18 million people; and this is only the beginning. Results are already appearing in Venezuela, in Colombia, in parts of Central America, in other areas like the city of Rio de Janeiro, and are foreshadowed in the northeast shoulder of Brazil.

Contrast could not be clearer, nor could necessity be highlighted more violently. The Alliance program presents unlimited opportunity and hope—but must be forwarded and defended against military armed attack whose ultimate target is the United States. The attack may become more intense. Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze warns that the Soviet Union will probably stiffen its cold war drive. Washington sources report that Khrushchev agreed with Castro to abandon a "soft line" and increase the scale of armed aggression. The Organization of American States, as of June 5, documented the proven facts and methods of the Soviet military and subversive invasion carried on from her Cuban bridgehead.

Americans and Latin Americans alike enjoy talking about and working at the objectives of social reform, social progress, and increased education, production, and distribution. Both dislike to face the pressing but bloody fact that a military attack against them is going forward. This is natural; but, unhappily, social and economic welfare projects (let alone plans) do not by themselves stop bullets coming your way.

Grave as all this is, the problem is not new. When the Marshall plan for Europe was announced in 1947, the Soviet Union presently declared war on the whole conception, and used all the weapons in its paramilitary armory to abort its apparatus. A year of violent struggle ensued before the Marshall plan machinery could really become effective. A similar policy was followed by the Communist empires when the Alliance for Progress was announced in March 1961. So it comes about that as summer 1963 begins, we are halfway along in the battle to establish those conditions of order, administration, and organization under which economic and social development can go forward. Unlike Europe, Latin America has no long tradition of honest and effective administration, organizing power, and high educational background.

The Alliance task is thus harder, and Communist capacity for sabotage and armed revolution correspondingly greater. On balance, nonetheless, the battle is gradually being won—though Haiti is a current battleground, though Castro-directed terrorism is fighting a bloody last-ditch struggle against President Romulo Betancourt's brilliant achievements in Venezuela, though Brazilian opportunist politicians falter, and though Communist propaganda machines work at full blast.

In it entirety, the situation poses as square a challenge to the Congress of the United States as could well be imagined. The Congress must, and should, and does, insist on defense, and on continuing effort to seek expulsion of the Soviet and Chinese imperialists from Cuba and the Western Hemisphere. Yet to do this effectively it must and should also support, with appropriations and necessary measures, the Alliance for Progress program. Defense can perhaps stop or contain the paramilitary operations of Russian and Chinese imperialists. But the battle of the hemisphere cannot be won save by triumph of the Alliance program—the declared objective of all Latin American governments save Cuba.

Increasingly it is plain that with solid support the Alliance program can be realized. The 10-year period it envisaged will lay a visible physical economic and psychological foundation—in some places, indeed, it is beginning to pay off now. Ten years from now the economic stage will be set for an explosion of economic progress somewhat comparable to the reconstruction miracle accomplished by the Marshall plan in Western Europe. True, the Alliance for Progress without defense would have doubtful prospects. Yet defense without the Alliance for Progress would in long range be an impossibility. When Teodoro Moscoso, Director of the Alliance for Progress, and his men come before Congress for their next set of appropriations, they are entitled to full support.

True, many changes can and should be made. Bureaucracy, both in Washington and in Latin American capitals, can be eliminated. Wider action than mere government-to-government arrangements—coupled with a corresponding speedup in effectiveness—can be worked out. But the main structure of this great program can be maintained, strengthened, and implemented. Latin America is not a "primitive area." Its resources of men, organizing capacity, ideas, and techniques are great. Governor Louis Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico demonstrated that more progress for more people can be made in quicker time under freedom than under any totalitarianism, let alone under any overseas imperialism. Most Latin American countries are gold mines of natural resources compared to Puerto Rico.

Sentiments of American Congressmen are understandable and command sympathy. Noisy demagogs stalk Latin American politics, seeking votes by attacking Uncle Sam much as Mayor (Big Bill) Thompson, of Chicago, used to seek votes by promising to punch the King of England. Some vocal and self-appointed spokesmen for Latin American youth declare their dislike of a United States they know only through Communist propaganda. Others indulge a naive dream (frequently called Nasserism) that they can create a native nationalist communism with Russian aid, escape from the imperial leading strings of Moscow, or perhaps Peiping, and establish themselves in semihostile isolation, alternately blackmailing, cajoling, and deceiving both the Soviet Union and the United States into granting gifts, loans, preferential markets, or other aid. But, in 1800 European youth flirted with Napoleon's agents seeking help in their private revolutions, only to wind up under the heel of Napoleonic tyranny if not dead at its hands.

The real Latin American masses are not heard, partly because there is no foreign propaganda machine to magnify their voice. These men have no quarrel with the United States. They even like the Monroe Doctrine as a defense against outsiders. They want material progress, education, breaking of outworn social limitations, and reform, assuring that materials and political success shall result in solid dividends to the least favored rather than the most favored Latin American classes. Slowly, perhaps even rapidly, they are becoming fed up with shouters, talkers, and petty brass too often mistaken for Latin

American opinion. They have no wish to be converted into Cuban-type helots, to become serfs of state collectives, to have their families torn apart, to have their teenage children converted into rifle-toting gangsters. They demonstrated and exulted when American power successfully confronted the Russians in Cuba last October, regretting only that the American victory was not more complete. If these people could speak, Washington impressions of Latin America would be quite different from what they now are.

Defenses will have more dramatic and transitory crises than will the Alliance for Progress. Yet the slow working of the Alliance as it unrolls can and should lead to a mightly and permanent improvement in Latin American conditions. To this plow the United States has set its hand. Defense, economics, common sense, and common humanity all indicate that it should not falter now.

Study Prepared by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government in its booklet titled "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs," presents a very thorough analysis of the proposed administration's legislation on civil rights. I respectfully commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House the results of the commission's study dealing with Title III: Desegregation of Public Education; Title IV: Establishment of Community Relations Service; Title V: Commission on Civil Rights; Title VI: Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs; and Title VII: Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. I also would like to insert into the RECORD a list of the members of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government:

TITLE III: DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Title III of the President's bill goes far beyond all decisions of the Supreme Court in the field of school desegregation, for it implicitly couples the formal desegregation of public schools in the South with the elimination of racial imbalance in schools throughout the land. The bill proposes to achieve these aims by vesting broad new powers in the Commissioner of Education and the Attorney General. Even private schools, if their pupils received tuition grants from a governmental source, would be brought into line.

The opening provisions of title III authorize the Commissioner, upon application from local school officials, to engage in a wide variety of programs of advice, technical assistance, grants, loans, contracts, and training institutes. The Commissioner would control the amounts, terms, and conditions of such grants. They would be paid on the terms he prescribed. He alone would fix all rules and regulations for carrying out these programs to promote desegregation and to relieve racial imbalance.

Presumably, the authority of Congress to promote this busywork for the Commissioner is to be found in the fifth section of the 14th amendment. This is the section that empowers Congress to adopt appropriate legislation in support of the equal protection clause. If the equal protection clause truly were intended to prohibit a State from maintaining racially separate public schools, such legislation perhaps would be appropriate. The history of public education in the United States, in the years immediately following the purported ratification of the 14th amendment in 1868, utterly denies any such intention. To this day, no law of the United States requires desegregation. These programs of the Commissioner of Education are cart before horse; they are the sort of programs that would implement a law if there were a law; but there is no law. There is the Supreme Court's opinion of 1954 in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, and there are other High Court opinions emanating from it, but impressive and historic as these decisions may be, they are still no more than judgments binding named defendants in particular lawsuits.

It should be emphasized, again, that these decisions have nothing to do with racial imbalance in public schools. They are limited to judgments requiring that the States shall not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school it maintains. The shifting of students from school to school in order to remove racial imbalance, with or without Federal aid and regulation, is not within the ambit of the desegregation decisions. Under this gross distortion of the 14th amendment, schoolchildren throughout the country would become pawns in a game of power politics.

It seems to us desirable to keep this distinction in mind, between laws enacted by the Congress, and judgments imposed by the Court. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land, but when the Court acts in a suit arising under the Constitution it acts judicially, not legislatively. If local school boards throughout the South are to be prohibited by law from maintaining separate school systems, a law must be passed pursuant to the Constitution to impose such a prohibition. Until then, any such grants and loans and training programs as these would appear premature. And we would take the position, in the light of the history of the 14th amendment, that such a law would not be pursuant to the Constitution. It would violate the plain intention both of those who framed the amendment and also of the States that ratified it. Such legislation would not be appropriate legislation.

Meanwhile, we do not intend to be captious or legalistic. The Brown decision has been treated as if it were indeed legislation. For good or ill, the desegregation of public schools proceeds. These particular provisions of title III are better subject to criticism simply as manifestations of the bureaucratic Federal sprawl.

More serious, in our view, are the provisions of title III that would vest elaborate new powers in the Attorney General. The effect of these provisions would be to throw the entire massive weight of the Department of Justice, with its unlimited resources, into the scales of almost any parent in search of a free lawsuit. The basic complaint would be that some local school board had failed to achieve desegregation. But as we have tried to point out, in the overwhelming majority of school districts in the South, there is now no legal requirement that local school boards even attempt to achieve desegregation. Before there can be a failure of a duty, there must first be a duty. These provisions of the bill simply assume the duty, and leap to its failure.

Our apprehension is that the awesome power here proposed, for a proliferation of suits in the name of the United States, would create more turmoil than it would settle. The orderly progress of desegregation in public education would not be enhanced, but impaired, as resentments were stirred up that otherwise might be peacefully resolved. And we cannot see the end to the bureaucracy that could be required to prosecute suits in the name of the United States once this precedent were set in the single area of school desegregation.

TITLE IV: ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

This title would create a new Federal agency, the Community Relations Service, headed by a director at $20,000 a year. Presumably, it would fulfill some functions not now fulfilled by the Civil Rights Commission, the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee, the established churches and various civic bodies, the countless racial commissions around the country, and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The duties of this Service would be to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices.

We are not inclined to haggle over the amount of time, energy, and money that might be wasted by one more Federal agency in the civil rights field. We do call attention to the italicized language. In our own view, it simply is not the function of Congress, under any provisions of the U.S. Constitution, to dispatch Federal agents to countless communities in order to resolve racial disagreements among persons therein.

TITLE V: COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government expresses neither opposition to nor support of title V of the President's bill. This portion of the bill would extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights to November 30, 1967, and would lay down certain standardized rules for its further hearings and investigations.

In our own view, the Commission on Civil Rights has contributed little or nothing toward the unraveling of the knotty tangles of race relations in the United States. Its recommendations in the spring of 1963, proposing the withdrawal of grants, loans, and even contracts from Southern States that did not meet its own notions of right conduct, amounted to an outrageous proposal for denial of the very equal protections it professes to support. We perceive no useful achievements of this Commission, but we raise no constitutional objections to its continuance.

TITLE VI: NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

Title VI of the President's bill is not long. It had perhaps best be quoted in full:

"SEC. 601. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. All contracts made in connection with any such program or activity shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe for the purpose of assuring that there shall be no discrimination in employment by any contractor or subcontractor on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin."

The thinly veiled intimidation of title VI goes back to a statement made by Attorney

General Robert Kennedy in London in October of 1962. At that time, he speculated publicly that a threat to withdraw Federal subsidies, grants, loans, and contracts might be used as a club over the Southern States. Mr. Kennedy was quick to point out that such a threat would have to be used with great delicacy. He seemed unsure of its desirability. He did not defend its constitutionality. He was just thinking aloud.

In April of 1963, the Civil Rights Commission evidenced no such finesse. The Commission recommended flatly to the President that he seek power to suspend or cancel either all, or selected parts of, the Federal financial aid that now flows to such States as Mississippi, "until (such States) comply with the Constitution and laws of the United States." It was unclear precisely how a judicial determination would be reached that entire States had failed to comply with the Constitution and laws of the United States, but this small question of due process apparently troubled the Commission not at all.

The question troubled Mr. Kennedy. In his press conference of April 17, the President blinked at this startling proposal and turned away from it:

"I don't have the power to cut off aid in a general way as was proposed by the Civil Rights Commission, and I would think it would probably be unwise to give the President of the United States that kind of power because it could start in one State and for one reason or another might be moved to another State which has not measured up as the President would like to see it measure up in one way or another."

It is a fair question to ask what happened. What happened between April 17, when the President voiced these comments at his press conference, and June 19, when his majority leader introduced his civil rights bill? How did a power that was probably unwise in April become a power that was essential in June? The obvious answer is that the interim was marked by widespread racial demonstrations. But it is not pleasant to conclude that the President of the United States may be coerced, intimidated, or blackjacked into changing his mind so swiftly on a legislative proposal of fateful importance. What happened?

We earnestly submit that the punitive terms of title VI of this bill threaten gross violation of every principle of due process of law. No provision whatever is made for determining when individuals participating in or benefiting from various programs are discriminated against. The two sentences of this title define no terms. They propose no judicial inquiry. They leave hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal funds, paid for by all of the people—black, white, liberal, conservative—at the uncontrolled discretion of the President or someone else who may determine this discrimination.

These programs include aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently disabled. They include funds for vocational education, hospital construction, public housing, the insurance of bank deposits. Federal personnel would be authorized to supervise loans by banks and building and loan associations, farm financing of all kinds, government subsidies, conservation programs, small business loans and contracts in any activity affected by government loans, insurance, guaranties, or grants. If a Federal agency made an administrative finding that discrimination exists, Federal support could be withdrawn and the institution or program wrecked.

To permit a President—any President—to suspend such programs on his own unchecked conclusion that certain beneficiaries are discriminated against would violate the whole spirit of uniformity that pervades the Constitution. The supreme law of our land provides that direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers. Duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. There must be a uniform rule of naturalization and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies. Many other provisions attest this same concept of equal treatment among the States.

Only by a fantastic distortion of the congressional power under the 14th and 15th amendments could this title VI be justified. Its effect would be to penalize the many for the occasional unlawful conduct of the few. Its potential application would jeopardize the very lives and well-being of thousands of innocent and law-abiding persons, including veterans, blind persons, and disabled persons, in order to bludgeon a handful of State officials into line with a President's desires.

It seems to us sufficient merely to quote the language of this tyrannical title of the President's bill. The language speaks most eloquently for itself.

TITLE VII: COMMISSION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

This final substantive section of the bill authorizes the President to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. This permanent agency of the Government would be headed by the Vice President; the Secretary of Labor would serve as Vice Chairman. There would be up to 15 members in all. An Executive Vice Chairman would run the operation. The Commission would be empowered to employ such other personnel as may be necessary. The bill defines the Commission's duties:

"It shall be the function of the Commission to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance by the U.S. Government is provided by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise. The Commission shall have such powers to effectuate the purposes of this title as may be conferred upon if by the President, the President may also confer upon the Commission such powers as he deems appropriate to prevent discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin in Government employment.

Again, it seems to us necessary merely to quote the provisions of the bill in order to make their autocratic nature evident to every thoughtful observer. The power here proposed to be conferred upon the President is virtually unlimited. No legislative limitations of any sort are suggested. The President may confer upon the Commission such powers as he deems appropriate. And whether these include the power to impose criminal sanctions, or to seek civil injunctions, or to abrogate contracts awarded under sealed bid, no man can say. The Commission's powers would be whatever the President regarded as appropriate; and the definition of "Government employment" is as wide as the Federal budget itself. The administration's bill proposes, in effect, that the Congress abdicate, and turn its legislative powers over to the White House. The powers here demanded are not the powers rightfully to be exercised by a President in a free country. These are the powers of a despot.

There is a final title VIII in the bill, authorizing the appropriation of such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. What these sums might amount to, again, no man can say.

This is the package Mr. Kennedy has asked of the Congress. He has asked it in an emotional hour, under the pressures of demonstrators who have taken violently to the streets, torch in hand.

We, of the Viriginia Commission, ask your quiet consideration of the bill. And we ask you to communicate your wishes to the Members of the Congress who represent you in the House and Senate.

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

David J. Mays, chairman, Richmond, Va.; attorney; Pulitzer Prizewinner for historical biography.

James J. Kilpatrick, vice chairman, Richmond, Va.; editor, the Richmond News Leader; author.

Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Richmond, Va.; ex-officio member of commission; Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia.

E. Almer Ames, Jr., Onancock, Va.; attorney; member Virginia Senate; vice president and director, First National Bank, Onancock, Va.

Hale Collins, Covington, Va.; attorney; member Virginia Senate.

W. C. (Dan) Daniel, Danville, Va.; business executive; member Virginia House of Delegates; past national commander, American Legion.

John A. K. Donovan, Falls Church, Va.; attorney; member Virginia Senate; general counsel and director, Security National Bank, Fairfax County, Va.

J. Segar Gravatt, Blackstone, Va.; attorney; trial justice for Nottoway County, Va.

Frederick T. Gray, Richmond, Va.; attorney; former attorney general of Virginia.

Burr P. Harrison, Winchester, Va.; attorney; former member of the U.S. Congress.

Edgar R. Lafferty, Jr., King William, Va.; business executive; farmer.

Garnett S. Moore, Pulaski, Va.; attorney; member Virginia House of Delegates.

William T. Muse, Richmond, Va., dean, T. C. Williams School of Law, University of Richmond; author.

W. Roy Smith, Petersburg, Va.; business executive; member, Virginia House of Delegates.

W. Carrington Thompson, Chatham, Va.; attorney; member Virginia House of Delegates.

William L. Winston, Arlington, Va.; attorney; member, Virginia House of Delegates.

Answers to Questionnaires—An Accurate Cross Section of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent a questionnaire, including 12 questions, to the voters of the 21st Congressional District of Texas. The response from the nearly 300,000 people who live there was very gratifying. More than 20 percent of those mailed out were returned, and I understand this approaches being a record, as compared with the experience of others.

Because of this widespread response, coming from every one of the 27 counties in the district, including people from every walk of life, it can be safely assumed that the results of the tabulation reflect a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion in the area covered. The results of the tabulation follow:

1. Do you approve of the President's civil rights proposals?

	Percent
Yes	8.9
No	85.1
No opinion	6.0

2. The President has proposed cuts in income taxes, but at the same time has submitted a $12 billion budget deficit for the current fiscal year. Should Congress—

(a) Cut taxes regardless of the deficit?

	Percent
Yes	6.3
No	54.2
No opinion	39.5

(b) Cut taxes only if spending is reduced?

	Percent
Yes	45.7
No	17.6
No opinion	36.7

(c) Reduce spending, balance the budget, and then consider a tax cut?

	Percent
Yes	78.1
No	5.7
No opinion	16.2

3. Do you favor the President's proposed Federal aid for mass transportation for cities, initially costing $500 million in grants and loans?

	Percent
Yes	4.0
No	84.9
No opinion	11.1

4. Do you think our foreign aid program, which now approximates $4 billion a year, should be reduced this year?

	Percent
Yes	91.0
No	5.0
No opinion	4.0

5. In view of the continuing Cuban crisis, do you believe the United States should—

(a) Continue its present policies?

	Percent
Yes	9.6
No	44.2
No opinion	46.2

(b) Prohibit any ship that trades in a Cuban port from thereafter entering a U.S. port (which I have proposed)?

	Percent
Yes	80.5
No	4.9
No opinion	14.6

(c) Take whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?

	Percent
Yes	55.6
No	11.4
No opinion	33.0

6. Do you favor increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home care for those over 65?

	Percent
Yes	17.5
No	74.0
No opinion	8.5

7. Do you favor a Domestic Peace Corps?

	Percent
Yes	17.0
No	64.7
No opinion	18.3

8. Do you favor a pending bill which would create a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC of the thirties, at a cost of $100 million the first year.

	Percent
Yes	14.2
No	73.8
No opinion	12.0

9. Do you favor a bill which I introduced requiring secret ballot before a strike can be called?

	Percent
Yes	90.0
No	3.1
No opinion	6.9

10. Do you feel the United Nations is an effective force for world peace?

	Percent
Yes	32.0
No	55.5
No comment	12.5

11. What is your opinion of the President's record on—

(a) Foreign affairs?

	Percent
Good	16.9
Poor	71.3
No opinion	11.8

(b) Domestic affairs?

	Percent
Good	10.1
Poor	80.3
No opinion	9.6

12. If you should like to indicate a preference at this time, who among the following who have been mentioned for President in 1964 would you prefer? (Your expression will be treated confidentally.)

	Percent
Kennedy	11.5
Rockefeller	3.1
Goldwater	57.3
Romney	8.9
No opinion	19.2

Mr. Speaker, these views are from God-fearing, taxpaying citizens—people who are devoted to our form of government and its preservation. They are the sort of people who believe that two and two still make four, and that all the glitters is not necessarily gold.

These people are understandably skeptical of unsound projects and Federal handouts that are manifestly unnecessary and unjustified, because as taxpayers they know that every dollar that is received from Washington must be paid for by them or borrowed and later paid by their children or grandchildren, with interest added. They know that the Government has no money and no way of obtaining money except the dollars that are extracted from the people in taxes.

My constituents are deeply concerned about modern trends away from basic concepts of good government. Most of them insist that they are today getting more government than they need and more government than they want. They are dedicated, devoted people—folks who put the welfare of their country ahead of petty partisan considerations. I share that viewpoint.

SOLIDLY OPPOSED TO CIVIL RIGHTS PROPOSALS

At the outset it will be noted that the people in the 21st District are solidly opposed to the President's civil rights program. This is paricularly significant in view of the fact that there are relatively few Negroes living in that area. Those people are tolerant-minded, free of racial prejudice, and are devoted to the principle of equal rights and equal justice, under the law and the Constitution, for all Americans, regardless of race or creed.

But they are opposed to special rights and special privileges for any one group, particularly when it deprives them of their own basic rights and freedoms under the Constitution.

By their answers and numerous comments they raise many serious questions concerning recommendations which the President has submitted to the Congress and otherwise advanced on this subject. One citizen, commenting on the public accommodations provisions, points out that any traveler can decide not to stay at a certain inn or motel because he does not like the owner, his moustache, his accent, his race, religion—or lack of religion, or his other customers.

This citizen wants to know why that innkeeper or motel owner should not have precisely the same right to refuse to serve that traveler? After all, it is his own business, his own private property, the fruits of his own labors and investment that are involved.

Another query points out that the U.S. Supreme Court in 1883 held a similar Federal law to be unconstitutional, and this citizen wonders why the Congress would consider violating the Constitution by passing such a law, in view of our oaths to protect and defend the Constitution.

Another timely comment reminds that the Constitution protects three basic American rights—life, liberty, and property. These rights and their reasonable enjoyment are fundamental, deeply enmeshed in our free enterprise system, and the very soul of Anglo-Saxon civilization. And they can be lost through a process of nibbling and erosion. It is indeed seldom in the history of any people that liberty is lost all at one time.

Other comments question the President's recommendation for the establishment of a fair employment practice commission which would give that agency the arbitrary power, by the use of jails, to force a merchant to hire, fire, or promote a man, where questions of race or creed are raised by a disgruntled complainant. Not even a jury trial would be allowed. It is felt that this is more power than any good man should want, and more power than any bad man should have.

Still another comment refers to the President's request for authority to withhold Federal funds from any State which the President should decide is practicing some form of racial discrimination. This request, which one says smacks of dictatorship, is known as the genocide provision. Under it, a President would be given the arbitrary power to withhold from such a State, and from any and all of its citizens, Federal funds for payment of social security benefits—benefits which a citizen is entitled to by virtue of his own contributions, in a good faith contract with the Federal Government.

Or, a President would have the power to withhold funds for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, the blind, and for any and all other purposes where Federal money is involved.

There are but a few of many questions raised by my constituents. The

objections are valid and sound, and I wish to associate myself with them.

DISPLEASED WITH HANDLING OF CUBAN CRISIS

It will be noted that the vast majority of my constituents are displeased with the way the Cuban crisis has been handled. More than 8 out of every 10 of them think well of my suggestion that our Government should prohibit any ship that trades in one of Castro's ports from thereafter entering a U.S. port. This plan could be further implemented until we could effectively cut off trade with Cuba by any country except the Iron Curtain nations, and it would even put some of them in a squeeze. Castro's economy is known to be very weak, and it is believed that this move would go a long way toward putting him out of business. Many countries would have to decide which country they want to continue to trade with—the United States or Cuba.

PEOPLE FAVOR RETRENCHMENTS

It will be noted that the overwhelming majority of the people in the 21st District are opposed to the medicare program, which would give aid only on hospital bills, the mass transportation aid for cities, the Domestic Peace Corps, and the Youth Conservation Corps. Faced with a huge deficit, they feel the Congress should forego these new ventures in more Federal spending.

More than 90 percent want foreign aid reduced, and I heartily agree with them. We are reminded that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit has been widened in the second quarter of this year to a $5.2 billion annual rate. This trend is admittedly dangerous, and could lead to national disaster. Yet we go merrily along depleting our gold reserves with excessive imports of oil that are not needed, and vast outlays in foreign aid that are not necessary. There should be a drastic reduction.

Being realistic, nearly 80 percent of my constituents think we should reduce federal spending, balance the budget, and then cut taxes. If we would but set our minds to this task it can and should be accomplished this year. But it cannot be done, on a sound basis, if the Congress continues to create new spending programs, adding hundreds of thousands more to the federal payroll, expanding old programs, without regard to the financial jam we are in.

Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago I sent out another questionaire to the people whom I represent. It included several issues which, to save space and avoid repitition, were omitted from this one. I shall here report the results of a few of them, because the issues are still with us and the answers are current.

It was then found that 7 out of every 10 opposed Federal aid for school construction, and 8 out of 10 were against Federal aid for teachers' salaries.

A total of 93.16 percent favored right-to-work laws, and 81.4 percent were for legislation requiring labor unions to conform with antitrust laws.

Let me respectfully urge my colleagues, and our national leaders, regardless of party affiliations, to give heed to the voice of the American people. Let us rededicate ourselves to the task of preserving our constitutional rights and our great heritage, cut out wasteful spending, then give the people some tax relief, and place the welfare of this country ahead of political considerations.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Blueprint for Peace: A Threat to Gun Ownership?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the August 1963 issue of Sports Afield I found a very interesting article entitled, "Blueprint for Peace: A Threat to Gun Ownership?" by Pete Brown.

Whether we agree or disagree with the proposed treaty on disarmament, I believe it would be illuminating for everyone to read the article, for it is very thought provoking.

The article follows:

BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE: A THREAT TO GUN OWNERSHIP?

(By Pete Brown)

Is the Government about to sell the second amendment (right to bear arms) for a doubtful peace? Here are the grim hidden facts.

Are the 30 million private American gun owners a threat to peace and security in this country—or the world?

Yes, under certain conditions this is entirely possible. There is little doubt that this possibility of a threat was fully intended by those States of the Original Thirteen which insisted upon adoption of the first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution. We can be forever thankful that some of the original States were very suspicious of unbridled Government power and demanded that these amendments, later to be known as our Bill of Rights, be passed as soon as possible after the establishment of the Government to be formed under the Constitution.

Of course our response to the words "peace" and "security" depends on our understanding of these two terms. Peace and security do not mean the same to all people. To the growing cult of mildness, peace means simply freedom from the threat of war. We can have this brand of peace any time we seek it. All we have to do is surrender our sovereignty and our capacity for self-defense, and thereby throw ourselves on the mercy of the powers that be. Security, to some people, means being taken care of from cradle to grave. These people generally reason that an all-powerful Federal Government is best qualified to take on this responsibility. We can get this kind of security at any time by merely surrendering our liberties. Those who seek the power to impose their will on the majority are only too happy to assume full responsibility for the peace and security of others. Naturally, those who relinquish their responsibility are expected to surrender their capacity to disturb the "peace." Not too long ago we had an offer to "bury us," and I'm quite sure it was intended that this service be rendered entirely free of charge.

Although a kind of peace and security is always easily and instantly obtainable, the conditions have always been repugnant to the vast majority of the American people. We are endowed with a heritage which inspires us to fight—if necessary—to preserve our national sovereignty and our individual liberties. Need I point out the fact that without forefathers, friends, and relatives willing to die for this cause—as many have—we would not enjoy our liberties today?

Yes, I think we can say quite definitely than 30 million gun owners are a threat to a peace and security which involves surrender of our liberties or a surrender of our government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Most of our Founding Fathers who were responsible for our Constitution were learned men. They were aware of the poisoning influences which seeped into the Roman Empire and brought about its fall. They knew that a nation of people not ready and willing to fight its own battles is effete. They themselves were fresh from one of freedom's greatest struggles, and they were satisfied that the government of a free, self-governing people has no reason to fear its own citizens. They knew that citizens experienced in the use of firearms add strength which only a nation of free people can muster.

By the same token, our Founding Fathers were apparently fully aware of the fact that the government of an oppressed people does fear its subjects. That, in a nutshell, is a very good reason for there always being a right to keep and bear arms—our second amendment. Lose our second amendment, or pervert its meaning, and it will signal our downfall as a great nation—the bastion of freedom.

The legislative attempts at outlawing guns can be dealt with by an alert people, and wrong-way legislation can be corrected; but there is an entirely new threat looming big in the form of a disarmament treaty proposed by our Government. If accepted, it would leave us powerless to act. The decisions relative to whether or not we can have guns and the conditions under which we will be permitted to use them—if at all—will not even be made by our Government. These decisions will be made by representatives from various countries, including enemy powers. It also appears that we would have foreign inspectors in this country to see that the conditions imposed on us are enforced. Our only recourse as a nation will be through the World Court. The World Court consists of 15 judges, of which one may be an American. The other 14 will be from various countries, including enemy countries. Can we expect them to be sympathetic to our cause? Does this sound like a pretty package? It is not exaggeration. Unless you have studied the provisions of the proposed treaty, you do not know the half of it. It is far worse than I've been able to reveal in a few words.

The treaty outlines a three-phase disarmament plan. All parties to the treaty would agree to do away, for all practical purposes, with their entire military forces and all armaments within a period of something over 6 years. The only military force, as such, remaining would exist only to be placed at the disposal of a United Nations command. This would be called a peace force. As the treaty puts it, by the final stage of the plan: "Parties to the treaty would complete the reductions of their force levels, disband systems of Reserve Forces, cause to be disbanded organizational arrangements comprising and supporting their national Military Establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing." There are vague provisions for retaining armaments for forces which parties to the treaty would be permitted to retain to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of their citizens. Dictator states don't dare permit an armed citizenry. Is it likely that the administrators of the proposed treaty would permit U.S. citizens to have weapons?

The United States presented this treaty, referred to as an "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," at the 17-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva. Reports coming out of Geneva would indicate that the negotiations are concerned with nuclear weapons only, but this by no means reflects the thinking behind the entire disarmament picture as revealed in the treaty proposed by our Government.

The provisions of the treaty are found in a seldom-mentioned Government publication "Blueprint for the Peace Race—Outline of the Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." It is U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Publication 4, General Series 3, released in May 1962. It has been available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The basic provisions outlined in this treaty were presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations by President Kennedy on September 25, 1961. This was just 2 days after the Congress had approved the Disarmament Act establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, now headed by William C. Foster.

The fact that this treaty proposes that we do away with our entire Military Establishment and place ourselves militarily at the mercy of a world order means surrender of our national sovereignty. It would seem that such a drastic, historymaking proposal by our own Government would be top news. But it has had very little mention in the press or on the air. The long silence regarding the terms of this treaty is, I think, one of the most baffling mysteries of our time.

As late as April 5, 1962, about 6 months after the President presented the disarmament plan to the United Nations, even key Senators in the U.S. Senate stated that they had no knowledge of the plan. A colloquy on the floor of the Senate, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 5, 1962, reveals this very clearly.

Some Members of Congress have since indicated that this treaty does not include sporting weapons. It doesn't mention sporting weapons specifically—nor does it exclude them. It would be exceedingly naive to expect specific mention of sporting weapons. However, if you read the treaty, you can see that these can easily be included after the treaty is put into force. But from that time on an aroused American public won't mean much. The treaty does refer to all armaments, with certain exceptions for what is apparently a police force. "Subject to agreed requirements for nonnuclear armaments of agreed types for national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens, the parties to the treaty would eliminate all armaments remaining at their disposal at the end of stage II." We'll be told that sporting weapons are not included in the treaty terms. Then try to get sporting weapons (carefully

defined) excluded and see how far you get.

As soon as the proposed treaty is agreed upon, ratified by the Congress and put into force, the International Disarmament Organization would be established to function within the framework of the United Nations in accordance with the terms and conditions of the treaty.

After a careful reading of the terms of the treaty, it becomes apparent that it makes little difference whether sporting weapons are mentioned or not. If the International Disarmament Organization decides to include them, they can do it. There are provisions for amending the treaty and/or adopting rules for implementing the broad terms of the treaty. As a nation, we have only one vote in the matter. As a nation our only recourse is to the World Court, where at present we have only one vote—not as a nation, but a vote cast by one U.S.-appointed judge out of 15 sitting on the World Court.

As individual citizens, we would have no recourse, because our elected representatives, once the treaty is signed, have no voice in disarmament matters, and it appears that our courts would have no jurisdiction. The disarmament treaty would spell the end of the Connally reservation. This reservation consists of six little words "as determined by the United States." When the United States accepted jurisdiction of the World Court in 1946, we excluded disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. By the Connally reservation we also reserved the right to determine whether or not a dispute is within our domestic jurisdiction. We might point out that the Communist nations have not accepted the World Court, and there are other Western nations which have also placed restrictions on acceptance of the court's jurisdiction.

A careful reading of the disarmament treaty also reveals that we will be under the surveillance of a foreign "Peace Observation Corps" and policed by a foreign "Peace Force." The individual citizens of this country will have no control over these peace cadres. They will constitute an international gestapo. Let's face it, replacing the word "police" with the word "peace" in the names of these organizations doesn't really change a thing—another subterfuge.

There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution which allows for this sort of thing, but there is reason to fear that the Supreme Court, citing article VI, section 2 of the Constitution, will decide that treaties supersede the Constitution. If we are not intent on upholding the Constitution and wish to circumvent it, then I suppose the treaty route is the quick and easy way to do it. If this is our Government's decision, even if we offer no protest, let's at least go into it with our eyes wide open. Our Bill of Rights will no longer have any meaning—least of all the second amendment, guaranteeing the right to keep and bear arms. Surrender our military forces, our armament and our sovereignty, and we are heading up a one-way, dead-end street. After all of the blood that has been shed to gain and protect our freedoms, why should we now offer them up on a silver platter as a sort of sacrifice to the United Nations? Do we have the right to subject future generations to possible untold misery and possible enslavement because we have surrendered their sovereignty and destroyed their means of protection?

Now, if we disband our military forces, and destroy all of our armament—except what we turn over to the command of the "Peace Force"—who will then be the guardians of our liberties? Perhaps this deserves looking into. The United Nations Security Council directs the U.N. military actions, and I presume that this will also be the case with the U.N. "Peace Force." I wonder how many people know that since the beginning of the United Nations, the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs has always been a Russian?

From 1946 to 1949, Arkady S. Sobelov, U.S.S.R.; 1950–53, Konstantine Zinchenko, U.S.S.R.; 1953–57, Ilya Tchernyshev, U.S.S.R.; 1957–60, Anatoly Dobrynin, U.S.S.R.; 1960–62, Georgei O. Arkadev, U.S.S.R.; 1962–63, Eugeney D. Kiselev, U.S.S.R.; 1963, Vladimir Suslov, U.S.S.R.

Instead of simply standing ready to go on the defensive, the American people should be demanding the repeal of some objectionable and useless legislation now on the books. At the Federal level, let's take a look at the National Firearms Act. This act is another subterfuge. It is a tax act, but its real purpose was to prevent criminals from obtaining gangster weapons. The so-called "gangster weapons" include fully automatic weapons, shotguns with barrels less than 18 inches, rifles with barrels less than 16 inches, altered shotguns or rifles with an overall length less than 26 inches, pistols with shoulder stocks and silencers. This act has caused legitimate gun users and gun collectors much inconvenience and many headaches. After I tried, unsuccessfully, to ascertain the number and the nature of convictions under the act, I have concluded that the act has done little or nothing in the way of curbing crime. I am informed by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Department that the only figures available show seizures and arrests. The figures they sent me do not reveal the number of convictions. Why not get rid of the tax act and deal directly with the criminal, as was indirectly intended?

We might ask the same question concerning the Federal Firearms Act. This is an act to regulate interstate traffic in firearms, but it was designed to deny the criminal lawful access to firearms. This act is of little, if any, concern to the criminal, but it does cause the sportsman and dealer inconvenience and some anxiety. Both acts are good cause for anxiety—for the reason that the Internal Revenue Department, administrator of the act, has the power to make regulations for administering it. In 1957 this bureaucratic power to make regulations was exercised, and regulations which would have worked a real hardship on sportsmen and dealers, even concerning the purchase of ammunition, pretty nearly got by the American public. An alert dealer happened to spot the advance notice of these regulations in the Federal Register. He sounded the alarm. Dealers and sportsmen throughout the country rallied to the cause, and another objectionable bit of legislation was given the heave-ho. The matter shouldn't have ended there. The power to make law by bureaucratic fiat has no place in our form of government. This power should be removed, and I don't know of a better way to do it than to shoot at getting the acts repealed entirely. If anyone can prove any real merit in these acts, perhaps it can be preserved in new legislation which is directed squarely at the real problem—the criminal, not the gun.

Sometimes even legislative action at the Federal level slips by. In 1961 a bill was written to "strengthen" the Federal Firearms Act, and this bill was passed. The significance of this bill was not recognized at first and even received some support from the sportsman's corner.

Among other things, the Federal Firearms Act before the 1961 change prohibited the shipment of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce to or by a felon (convicted of a crime of violence), a fugitive or a person under indictment for a crime of violence. A crime of violence is defined as murder, manslaughter, rape, mayhem, kidnaping, robbery, burglary, housebreaking, assault with intent to kill, commit rape or rob, assault with a dangerous weapon or assault to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year. This regulation, as it stood, was not readily abused, because it is not too easy to trump up a charge of a crime of violence.

However, the 1961 bill amended the act to eliminate the term "crime of violence" and inserted in lieu thereof the words "crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year." It is doubtful that this change will do one particle of good in curbing crime. It does open up the possibility of abuse of the act. There are numerous things for which a person can be indicated and for which punishment involves imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year. Revenue agents may, for example, have a dealer indicated for selling a certain collector's item which the agents claim is illegal, or perhaps indicated for something in connection with his income tax. Let's assume that there is no idea of convicting the dealer, but while he is awaiting trial and a verdict, he is prevented from shipping or receiving firearms in interstate commerce. This could work such a hardship on this dealer that it could put him out of business without his ever having had a trial. This new amendment makes it possible to use the act as a threat of harassment and nothing more. It's another subterfuge and avoids coming to grips with the real problem—the criminal.

Has the second amendment outlived its purpose? Is it out of place in our modern society? Of course not; there has never been a greater need for the second amendment. Stand before a globe of the world, turn it slowly, and look at the countries which have fallen to tyranny since World War II. They comprise a vast area of the globe's surface, and their boundaries confine millions of people who have lost their liberties.

Why have so many nations fallen, and why have the suppressed people not been able to gain or regain their freedoms? The reasons may not be quite the same in every case, but these people in every case most certainly lacked either the power or the will to resist the takeover. We won't explore all the reasons, but it is axiomatic that compulsory registration of sporting and protection weapons preceded their downfall. Please note that I said registration preceded their downfall. Registration doesn't necessarily lead to downfall. However, an efficient registration of weapons makes confiscation a very neat, easy and rapid procedure. And when this confiscation takes place, it is for one reason only. The citizens have lost or are about to lose their freedoms. The government—be it their own or a government imposed by outside influence—feels that it has good reason to fear the governed.

Of course, people will argue that weapons must be registered or confiscated to curb crime.

In the first place, individual citizens in the past have been responsible for the taking of a large percentage of criminals. A study made in Chicago several years ago revealed that 45 percent of the criminals killed while committing a crime were killed by unofficial self-defenders.

I'm not aware of any more recent comparative figures, but I suspect that the percentage of criminals taken by private citizens has been drastically reduced. The trend has been toward discouraging people from defending themselves. It seems that if a person is so rash and undisciplined as to attempt self-defense, he had better be in a position to prove that he was unsuccessful in an attempt to run from his assailant. (A knife in the back is generally accepted proof.) I've actually seen where authorities have advised people to submit to whatever abuse or indignity is demanded and then scream for the police.

The trend has also been toward making it more and more difficult for the private

citizen to have a gun readily available for self-defense. The American citizen is thereby frequently denied the weapon which, under certain circumstances, would be the most effective means of protecting himself and his family. This denial, of course, tends to give the criminal a tremendous advantage. Legislating against the gun rather than the culprit can successfully remove guns from the hands of law-abiding people, but it is mighty difficult to prevent the criminal from getting a gun. This has been demonstrated in New York State where they have the disarming Sullivan law. Even young punks are able to fashion handmade guns. These guns don't look like much, but at close range they are just as deadly as the most expensive gun money can buy. If some nervous thug puts a gun in my ribs, I'd prefer it to be a regular factory-made gun. While I'm deciding my next move, I'd hate to contemplate the uncertain mechanism of a crude, handmade zip gun. I wouldn't gamble on its not working, but on the other hand it might be a trifle too sensitive in the hands of some hopped-up twerp with trigger-finger twitch.

There is only one way to stop crime with guns, and that is to make it very tough on those who use a gun in the commission of a crime. It is doubtful that this will prevent crime. Let's not forget that there are such things as knives and all sort of everyday instruments which are silent, practically impossible to trace and very deadly. I detest the idea of having someone hacking at me with a knife. I even protested having my tonsils removed.

Try to outlaw all weapons—impossible. Legislating against inanimate objects is no substitute for dealing directly with the individual. We have an obligation to teach our young people responsibility and self-discipline. Failing this, we have no choice but to be tough on those convicted of criminal activity. We can deal severely with the criminal and still make every attempt to get him back on the right track. With severe and fair treatment, we would certainly discourage new entries, and perhaps make possible the quicker rehabilitation of the habitual offenders.

How about the police? Do they recommend the registration and outlawing of guns? Sure, you can find some police authorities favoring the outlawing of guns. I do not know of any police who do, but I have not really been looking for them. There are a lot of police I know who favor private ownership of firearms.

The National Police Officers Association of America and the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc. recently signed a joint resolution. I will not repeat every "whereas" and "be it further resolved," but here are enough to indicate the feeling of the National Police Officers Association of America:

"Whereas the beginning history of our Nation was written and our sovereignty assured by the heroic sacrifice of volunteer riflemen, adept in their use and armed by their own personal weapons; and

"Whereas the professional military forces of our country have through the conflicts of the past relied upon trained citizen soldiers who were capable in the use of firearms; and

"Whereas it is reasonable to believe that a capable and well-armed citizenry, as a potential backup to our regular forces, could well deter an aggressor from our shores and effectively assist in interdicting the enemy's progress, should he effect a bridgehead; and

"Whereas restrictive antigun laws do not succeed in disarming the criminal, but do disarm the law-abiding citizen, thus denying the law-abiding citizen effective self-defense, as well as jeopardizing his opportunities for training in the use of firearms and discouraging his hunting and gun sports afield. We, the undersigned, make the following statements for and in behalf of the National Police Officers Association of America and National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc. in the best interests of all law-abiding citizens of the United States of America; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we now commend the prosecutors of the Federal Government and the various States for the vigorous action taken on their part in the prosecution of criminals committing felonies while armed with a firearm. And, further strongly recommend to the courts a continuance of the policy of strict enforcement of the penalties prescribed wherein a crime is aggravated by the use of a firearm; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we believe that an American citizen of voting age or a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, of whatever age, should have the right to legally purchase, without restriction, a handgun, rifle, air rifle, shotgun or a like item, excepting fully automatic firearms."

We are accustomed to resisting what we consider misdirected legislation on local, State and national levels, but now we are faced with international control outside the sphere of our Government, and this calls for a new awakening wthin the framework of our Government, even when we lose a round, there is always the possibility of changing the law. In the final analysis, the will of the people prevails, and in this we believe. With our background of freedom and self-government, we have confidence in the will of an informed U.S. public. The fact that our people do not seem to be informed about the general disarmament treaty proposed by our Government at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva is cause for alarm.

We feel sure that the American people, fully aware of what is involved in our Government's "Blueprint for the Peace Race"—a treaty on general and complete disarmament—would flood the Congress with mail protesting this instrument for national suicide. Our best hope is to keep in touch with our Senators and Representatives regarding this treaty and to let them know what we think about it.

Nebraska Congressional Delegation, 1855–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Nebraska has been represented in the U.S. Congress since 1855. In all those years, the State has had 82 men from four political parties as Members of the House of Representatives, 29 men and women from three parties as Senators, and 6 men from two parties as Delegates to the Congress, before the Territory was admitted to the Union as a State.

No one has served fewer days than our first Representative, Turner M. Marquette, of Plattsmouth. He was sworn in March 2, 1867, and served only the last 2 days of the 39th Congress. He was succeeded March 4 by John Taffe, of Omaha. Both were Republicans.

Longest term of service was by George Norris, with 10 years in the House and 30 years in the Senate. The McCook Republican served from 1903 to 1943.

Representative Moses P. Kinkaid, an O'Neill Republican, served in the House from 1903 to 1922 to set the record for Nebraska service in that body.

Besides Republicans and Democrats, Nebraska has been represented by five Populists and by one Fusionist, Samuel Maxwell of Fremont, who served in the House 1897–99. One of the Populists served in the Senate, William V. Allen, of Madison, while four had House service between 1891 and 1903.

But through the years, Nebraska has had a strong Republican flavor, especially in the Senate. There have been 24 Republican Senators who served a total of 170 years, 4 Democratic Senators who served just under 20 years, and the Populist with 10 years.

In the House, 51 Republicans have served 258 years, 26 Democrats served 127 years, the 4 Populists totaled 15 years, and the lone Fusionist had just the one 2-year term.

Our first Delegate to Congress was Napoleon B. Giddings, of Nebraska City, a Democrat who served in the 33d Congress in 1855. Our first Senators in 1867 were John M. Thayer, of Omaha, and Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownsville, both Republicans.

Our Delegates had some unusual names. Besides Napoleon Giddings, there was Bird Chapman, of Omaha; Fenner Ferguson, of Bellevue; Experience Estabrook, of Omaha; Samuel G. Daily, of Peru; and Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha.

Hitchcock later served as a Senator, and his son, Gilbert, was both a Representative and Senator. I believe this is the only father-son team in our State history who both served in Congress. Gilbert Hitchcock founded the Omaha World, forerunner of the World-Herald.

In 1867 when Nebraska was first admitted to the Union as a State, we had one Representative. The number grew rapidly as settlers moved west into the State until we had six Representatives by 1893, where it remained until 1933. The depression, drop in farm population, and rapid growth of the Southwest and west coast since World War II have caused a decline in our delegation to three Representatives.

I include now a list of the men and women who have served Nebraska in the Congress, including the number of each Congress, years of the Congress, name, home town, congressional district—where appropriate—and party affiliation of each Delegate, Representative, and Senator:

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963

Nebraska Territory was granted a delegate in Congress by Act of Congress, May 30, 1854.

Year	Congress	Delegate
1853–55	33d	Napoleon B. Giddings, of Nebraska City, Democrat. Took seat Jan. 5, 1855.
1855–57	34th	Bird B. Chapman, of Omaha City, Democrat.
1857–59	35th	Fenner Ferguson, of Bellevue, Democrat.
1859–61	36th	Experience Estabrook, of Omaha, Democrat. Served until May 18, 1860, when election was successfully contested.
		Samuel G. Daily, of Peru, Republican.
1861–63	37th	Samuel G. Daily, of Peru, Republican. J. Sterling Morton, of Nebraska City, Democrat, elected Oct. 9, 1860, but 6 months later Gov. Samuel W. Black without any recanvass issued certificate of election to Daily who had months before contested Morton's right to the seat. Contest was never decided, but Daily held the seat under the second certificate.
1863–65	38th	Samuel G. Daily, of Peru, Republican.
1865–67	39th	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican. Served until Mar. 1, 1867.

Nebraska granted statehood on March 1, 1867.

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1865–67	39th	Senate	John M. Thayer, of Omaha, Republican. Elected but did not take seat until Mar. 4, 1867.
		Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican. Elected but did not take seat until Mar. 4, 1867.
		At large	Turner M. Marquette, of Plattsmouth, Republican. Took seat Mar. 2, 1867; served 2 days.
1867–69	40th	Senate	John M. Thayer, of Omaha, Republican. Took seat Mar. 4, 1867 to expire Mar. 3, 1871, as determined by lot.
		Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican. Took seat Mar. 4, 1867, to expire Mar. 3, 1869, as determined by lot.
		At large	John Taffe, of Omaha, Republican.
1869–71	41st	Senate	John M. Thayer, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican.
		At large	John Taffe, of Omaha, Republican.
1871–73	42d	Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican.
		Senate	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	John Taffe, of Omaha, Republican.
1873–75	43d	Senate	Thomas W. Tipton, of Brownville, Republican.
		Senate	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	Lorenzo Crounse, of Fort Calhoun, Republican.
1875–77	44th	Senate	Phineas W. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		At large	Lorenzo Crounse, of Fort Calhoun, Republican.
1877–79	45th	Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		Senate	Alvin Saunders, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	Frank Welch, of Norfolk, Republican. Died Sept. 4, 1878.
		At large	Thomas Majors, of Peru, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Welch, and took seat Dec. 2, 1878. Majors had been elected as a contingent (or additional) Member and was also so elected to the 46th and 47th Cong., but the House, on Feb. 24, 1883, disallowed Nebraska's claim to an additional Member and refused to seat him.
1879–81	46th	Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		Senate	Alvin Saunders, of Omaha, Republican.
		At large	Edward K. Valentine, of West Point, Republican.
1881–83	47th	Senate	Alvin Saunders, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Charles H. Van Wyck, of Nebraska City, Republican.
		At large	Edward K. Valentine, of West Point, Republican.
1883–85	48th	Senate	Charles H. Van Wyck, of Nebraska City, Republican.
		Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Archibald J. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican.
		3d	Edward K. Valentine, of West Point, Republican.
1885–87	49th	Senate	Charles H. Van Wyck, of Nebraska City, Republican.
		Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Archibald J. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican.
		3d	George W. E. Dorsey, of Fremont, Republican.
1887–89	50th	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		1st	John A. McShane, of Omaha, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican.
		3d	George W. E. Dorsey, of Fremont, Republican.
1889–91	51st	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		1st	William J. Connell, of Omaha, Republican.
		2d	James Laird, of Hastings, Republican. Died Aug. 17, 1889, before Congress assembled.
		2d	Gilbert L. Laws, of McCook, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Laird, and took seat Dec. 2, 1889.
		3d	George W. E. Dorsey, of Fremont, Republican.
1891–93	52d	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Algernon S. Paddock, of Beatrice, Republican.
		1st	William J. Bryan, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	William A. McKeighan, of Red Cloud, Democrat.
		3d	Omer M. Kem, of Broken Bow, Populist.
1893–95	53d	Senate	Charles F. Manderson, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		1st	William J. Bryan, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	George D. Meiklejohn, of Fullerton, Republican.
		4th	Eugene J. Hainer, of Aurora, Republican.
		5th	William A. McKeighan, of Red Cloud, Democrat.
		6th	Omer M. Kem, of Broken Bow, Populist.
1895–97	54th	Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		Senate	John M. Thurston, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Jesse B. Strode, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	George D. Meiklejohn, of Fullerton, Republican.
		4th	Eugene J. Hainer, of Aurora, Republican.
		5th	William E. Andrews, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Omer M. Kem, of Broken Bow, Populist.
1897–99	55th	Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		Senate	John M. Thurston, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Jesse B. Strode, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Samuel Maxwell, of Fremont, Fusionist.
		4th	William L. Stark, of Aurora, Democrat.
		5th	Roderick D. Sutherland, of Nelson, Populist.
		6th	William L. Greene, of Kearney, Populist.
1899–1901	56th	Senate	John M. Thurston, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Monroe L. Hayward, of Nebraska City, Republican. Died Dec. 5, 1899.
		Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist. Defeated in 1899 by Hayward; appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Hayward, and took seat Dec. 19, 1899.
		1st	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	John S. Robinson, of Madison, Democrat.
		4th	William L. Stark, of Aurora, Democrat.
		5th	Roderick D. Sutherland, of Nelson, Populist.
		6th	William L. Greene, of Kearney, Populist. Died Mar. 11, 1899.
			William Neville, of North Platte, Populist. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Greene, and took seat Dec. 4, 1899.

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963—Continued

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1901–03	57th	Senate	William V. Allen, of Madison, Populist.
		Senate	Charles H. Dietrich, of Hastings, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Hayward, in preceding Congress and took seat Dec. 2, 1901.
		Senate	Joseph H. Millard, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	David H. Mercer, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	John S. Robinson, of Madison, Democrat.
		4th	William L. Stark, of Aurora, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	William Neville, of North Platte, Populist.
1903–05	58th	Senate	Charles H. Dietrich, of Hastings, Republican.
		Senate	Joseph H. Millard, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican. Resigned Mar. 4, 1905, before commencement of 59th Cong., to which he had been reelected, having been elected a Senator.
		2d	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	John J. McCarthy, of Ponca, Republican.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1905–07	59th	Senate	Joseph H. Millard, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		1st	Ernest M. Pollard, of Nehawka, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by resignation of Burkett in preceding Congress, and took seat Dec. 4, 1905.
		2d	John L. Kennedy, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	John J. McCarthy, of Ponca, Republican.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1907–09	60th	Senate	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		Senate	Norris Brown, of Kearney, Republican.
		1st	Ernest M. Pollard, of Nehawka, Republican.
		2d	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	John F. Boyd, of Neligh, Republican.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1909–11	61st	Senate	Elmer J. Burkett, of Lincoln, Republican.
		Senate	Norris Brown, of Kearney, Republican.
		1st	John A. Maguire, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	James P. Latta, of Tekamah, Democrat.
		4th	Edmund H. Hinshaw, of Fairbury, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1911–13	62d	Senate	Norris Brown, of Kearney, Republican.
		Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	John A. Maguire, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	James P. Latta, of Tekamah, Democrat. Died Sept. 11, 1911.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Latta, and took seat Dec. 4, 1911.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1913–15	63d	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	John A. Maguire, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Silas R. Barton, of Grand Island, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1915–17	64th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1917–19	65th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Charles O. Lobeck, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Daniel V. Stephens, of Fremont, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1919–21	66th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Albert W. Jefferis, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert E. Evans, of Dakota City, Republican.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	William E. Andrews, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican.
1921–23	67th	Senate	Gilbert M. Hitchcock, of Omaha, Democrat.
		Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		1st	C. Frank Reavis, of Falls City, Republican. Resigned June 3, 1922.
		1st	Roy H. Thorpe, of Lincoln, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by resignation of Reavis, and took seat Nov. 27, 1922.
		2d	Albert W. Jefferis, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert E. Evans, of Dakota City, Republican.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	William E. Andrews, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Moses P. Kinkaid, of O'Neill, Republican. Died July 6, 1922.
		6th	Augustin R. Humphrey, of Broken Bow, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Kinkaid, and took seat Nov. 20, 1922.
1923–25	68th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963—Continued

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1925-27	69th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Melvin O. McLaughlin, of York, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1927-29	70th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	John N. Norton, of Polk, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1929-31	71st	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Willis G. Sears, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Charles H. Sloan, of Geneva, Republican.
		5th	Fred G. Johnson, of Hastings, Republican.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1931-33	72d	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	John H. Morehead, Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	H. Malcolm Baldrige, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	John N. Norton, of Polk, Democrat.
		5th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		6th	Robert G. Simmons, of Scottsbluff, Republican.
1933-35	73d	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Robert B. Howell, of Omaha, Republican. Died Mar. 11, 1933.
		Senate	William H. Thompson, of Grand Island, Democrat. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Howell, and took seat May 26, 1933.
		Senate	Richard C. Hunter, of Omaha, Democrat. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Howell, and took seat Nov. 7, 1934.
		1st	John H. Morehead, of Falls City, Democrat.
		2d	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Edgar Howard, of Columbus, Democrat.
		4th	Ashton C. Shallenberger, of Alma, Democrat.
		5th	Terry M. Carpenter, of Scottsbluff, Democrat.
1935-37	74th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	Henry C. Luckey, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Charles G. Binderup, of Minden, Democrat.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1937-39	75th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	Henry C. Luckey, of Lincoln, Democrat.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Charles G. Binderup, of Minden, Democrat.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1939-41	76th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Edward R. Burke, of Omaha, Democrat.
		1st	George H. Heinke, of Nebraska City, Republican. Died Jan. 2, 1940.
		1st	John Hyde Sweet, of Nebraska City, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Heinke, and took seat Apr. 17, 1940.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1941-43	77th	Senate	George W. Norris, of McCook, Republican.
		Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		1st	Oren S. Copeland, of Lincoln, Republican.
		2d	Charles F. McLaughlin, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		5th	Harry B. Coffee, of Chadron, Democrat.
1943-45	78th	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1945-47	79th	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1947-49	80th	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1949-51	81st	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Eugene D. O'Sullivan, of Omaha, Democrat.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1951-53	82d	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Kenneth S. Wherry, of Pawnee City, Republican. Died Nov. 29, 1951.
		Senate	Frederick A. Seaton, of Hastings, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Wherry, and took seat Jan. 8, 1952.
		Senate	Dwight P. Griswold, of Scottsbluff, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Wherry, and took seat Jan. 3, 1953.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		2d	Howard H. Buffett, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Karl Stefan, of Norfolk, Republican. Died Oct. 2, 1951.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Stefan, and took seat Jan. 8, 1952.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.

Nebraska congressional delegation, 1855–1963—Continued

Year	Congress	District	Member of Congress
1953–55	83d	Senate	Hugh A. Butler, of Omaha, Republican. Died July 1, 1954.
		Senate	Sam W. Reynolds, of Omaha, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Butler, and took seat July 7, 1954.
		Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Butler, and took seat Nov. 8, 1954.
		Senate	Dwight P. Griswold, of Scottsbluff, Republican. Died Apr. 12, 1954.
		Senate	Mrs. Eva K. Bowring, of Merriman, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by death of Griswold, and took seat Apr. 26, 1954.
		Senate	Mrs. Hazel H. Abel, of Lincoln, Republican. Elected to fill vacancy created by death of Griswold, and took seat Nov. 8, 1954. Resigned Dec. 31, 1954.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican. Appointed to fill vacancy created by resignation of Mrs. Abel. Appointed Jan. 1, 1955, but was not able to take seat because Congress was not in session.
		1st	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican. Resigned Dec. 31, 1954.
		2d	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican. Resigned Nov. 8, 1954.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1955–57	84th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Jackson B. Chase, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk ,Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1957–59	85th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden ,Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Robert D. Harrison, of Norfolk, Republican.
		4th	Arthur L. Miller, of Kimball, Republican.
1959–61	86th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Lawrence Brock, of Wakefield, Democrat.
		4th	Donald F. McGinley, Ogallala, Democrat.
1961–63	87th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Phillip H. Weaver, of Falls City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Ralph F. Beermann, of Dakota City, Republican.
		4th	Dave Martin, of Kearney, Republican.
1963–65	88th	Senate	Roman L. Hruska, of Omaha, Republican.
		Senate	Carl T. Curtis, of Minden, Republican.
		1st	Ralph Beermann, of Dakota City, Republican.
		2d	Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, Republican.
		3d	Dave Martin, of Kearney, Republican.

Keep It That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville News of August 16, 1963:

KEEP IT THAT WAY

It now appears that the Federal Government wants to extend its oar—and what a long oar it has become—into the cattle industry.

An administration plan would pay subsidies to farmers who converted cropland into grazing land. It is backed by the argument that, unless some such step is taken, there will be a shortage of beef by 1970.

This is easier to say than to prove. Production of any commodity follows the market. If there is increasing demand, producers react accordingly. Of late, in fact, there has been an abundance of beef and at times prices sagged to the point where many producers found themselves operating at a loss. It can be added that the Government subsidy program has been one of the most costly failures in history, and there is no reason to believe that this new scheme would do other than add more trouble to top off catastrophe.

The American National Cattlemen's Association says: "Cattlemen do not object to free, vigorous competition or investment of risk capital, but they do strongly oppose current administration proposals to use tax dollars to subsidize newcomers into the already crowded beef cattle business." It adds that those now in the business obtained their grazing lands at their own expense, and to bring in newcomers under a tax subsidy program would be manifestly unfair.

The beef business has been something of a model among agricultural pursuits. Boom or bust, producers have chosen to take their own chances, free of the strangling force of the Government controls that come with Government handouts. They have provided the country with an unfailing supply of beef at competitive prices. Let's keep it that way.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, from time to time the Members of this Congress are charged in the press and in magazine articles with supporting expenditures for political profit or advantage. I think the foreign aid program, though, is one program where certainly such charge cannot be made. On the contrary, many of us get some political heat about this program. However, we support it because it is in the interest of our national security. And we support it because there are humanitarian considerations which I think are too infrequently talked about in connection with the mutual assistance program.

The Alliance for Progress has been talked about and it has been called a failure. But I would like to recall to the attention of my colleagues that just about a year ago last fall we had a crisis in Cuba. The Organization of American States met and 19 of those nations unanimously voted to support the President's strong, firm policy on Cuba. I shudder to think what the state of the world would be today if at that time we had been in a posture where we turned our back on Latin and South America and told those people to go it alone. We might not be enjoying the peace that we have today.

I think the American public has a misunderstanding about foreign aid. They think it is a program under which foreign nations line up, and all we do is ladle out the taxpayers' money. I think it is up to us to disabuse the American citizen of this misconception. We ought to let him know that a great portion of this program is in the form of loans and that there are standards for making these loans and provisions for repayment. I think we ought to let him know, too, that we do not just give money; we give goods and supplies and equipment which are manufactured right here in the United States and which are a boon to our own economy.

Most importantly, I think we ought to emphasize the fact that much of this program is military aid. And we have the choice of saying to the people of the world that, "We turn our backs on you and we abandon you to communism and to aggression," or on the other hand spread the American Army into every nook and cranny of this globe at a risk of life and at a much greater expenditure than is involved today.

So this is not a giveaway program. It is easy to criticize. It is easy to give "wise guy" labels but this is a mutual assistance and a mutual security pro-

gram. True, there have been faults in the administration, but that is no reason to scuttle a good program. The answer to that is improve the administration, and that is what we are trying to do. True, our allies who are now on their feet should be making a contribution to our mutual assistance. And it is the duty of our administration and our State Department to try to induce them to do so. But this is a longtime program. You do not fight communism over night. You do it year in and year out. And it is only the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot who will get tired and throw up his hands and say, "We give in." There are those of us here who are responsible enough to see our duty and to rise to our obligation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I commend my colleague from New Jersey for his contribution to this important legislation. In line with the gentlemen's statement I would like to point out that over 80 percent of our economic assistance is spent right here in the United States and well over 95 percent of the military assistance is spent right here in the United States—on procurement.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

India: Another Billion Dollar Impact?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussions on our foreign aid giveaway programs, and particularly in view of my own personal opposition to the many irresponsible and wasteful expenditures included therein, I am pleased to include a very well written and thought-provoking editorial on this subject by Mr. Robert W. Lee, editor of the El Paso Herald Post, El Paso, Tex., for the review of my colleagues:

BILLION DOLLAR IMPACT

There's no current reason to get up a sweat over the proposed loan of something like a billion dollars to India to build another Government-operated steel mill. It's unlikely the proposition will be considered seriously by Congress before next year, if then.

But of all the arguments we've heard in favor of the loan, we are least impressed by one submitted by J. Kenneth Galbraith, our just-retired Ambassador to India.

Speaking before a panel of the House Appropriations Committee, he is reported as saying—at a closed session—that we should come across with this large chunk of cash to make an impact on the Indian people. The Soviets, he pointed out, built the Indians a steel mill and made such an impact, so we should go and do likewise.

U.S. aid to India adds up to several billion dollars but this has gone into projects of lesser magnitude—such, maybe, as saving millions from starvation—and this hasn't made the proper impact.

This is the friend-buying approach to foreign aid which has involved us in extravagant boondoggles around the world and if it's bought us any substantial number of friends, maybe Professor Galbraith would want to name them.

Before we load the U.S. taxpayers with another billion—and presumably the Indians with another obligation of the same size—it should be determined how the Indians are doing with their present five mills, whether they could reasonably be expected to operate a new one efficiently and what are the prospects that any of this so-called loan ever could be repaid. And forget about the impact.

Hometown of Calvin Coolidge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune to come across an article written by a distinguished husband and wife team some years ago on the family homestead of Calvin Coolidge at Plymouth, Vt.

Entitled "Hometown of Calvin Coolidge," the article describes the kind of environment that gave both strength and substenance to Mr. Coolidge.

In view of the fact that the Calvin Coolidge room at Forbes Library in Northampton, Mass., has the finest collection of Coolidge material extant, I am indeed proud to make this article by Kathleen Hargrave Frantz and Harry Warner Frantz available for wider circulation.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, these two excellent writers have traveled to various sectors in the United States and, out of their deep concern for the preservation of historical environs, have contributed a number of outstanding articles on various Presidential home grounds and surrounding areas. To note a few in particular, I have read with interest an article on "Lindenwald" which describes Martin Van Buren's home 2 miles southeast of Kinderhook, N.Y., and the unsuccessful efforts to make this home a public shrine; excellent articles on the homes of the Adams' family, the tailor shop of Andrew Jackson and others.

I think that Harry Frantz and his wife have contributed a great deal to what should become a continuing dialogue on the importance of these shrines.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include, with honor and gratitude, this excellent article on the Coolidge homestead:

HOMETOWN OF CALVIN COOLIDGE

(By Kathleen Hargrave Frantz and Harry Warner Frantz)

We motored through the wooded foothills of the verdant Green Mountains, and suddenly arrived at a fork in country roads where a sign "Coolidge Homestead" revealed our destination.

On the east side of the road were large unpainted barns. On the other side was a country store, which offered general merchandise and the U.S. postal service for Plymouth, Vt.

At a corner of this store was an iron sign in black letters which read: "Birthplace of Calvin Coolidge." By the road was a small granite monument, with an American flag, but this proved to be in memory of World War veterans of the community rather than the President. Down the road southward were hills and open pasture lands. Along road to right were a church, school, and a few houses such as might be seen in any New England mountain village.

The homely simplicity of the place caused one to feel that perhaps after all this could not really have been the birthplace and residence of the man who for 6 years ruled the destinies of the American people. Except for the post office sign and the American flag, there were no direct reminders of the Washington scenes to which Plymouth's onetime barefoot boy had found his way in lifetime.

Often in Washington we had thought that the great legend of simplicity, thrift, and brevity that grew around the Coolidge name might be largely the creation of clever political propagandists. Yet here in Plymouth all of those attributes were proven intuitively by the humble scenes of farm, store, and church.

Mr. Herbert Luther Moore, onetime schoolmate of Calvin Coolidge, is an unofficial host to tourists arriving at Plymouth. He greets the hundred or more cars that arrive daily in the summer season, gives prompt assurance that this little hamlet of a scant dozen buildings and 30 people is in fact the shrine you seek; and points to the places of interest. These you can see amply in a 10-minute stroll.

Mr. Moore offers, too, his excellent little pamphlet, "Calvin Coolidge—From the Farm to the White House," and the payment of a modest sum for this entitles you also to his ample store of verbal information concerning the 30th President of the United States.

"That was Calvin Coolidge's home for 55 years," he said, pointing to a house at the right of the road. "I am 69; he was born July 4, 1872. We went to school together at the District School and at the Black River Academy at Ludlow. When we got back from the academy he went away and finally became President of the United States. He's gone; I'm still here. It doesn't pay to be President."

The Coolidge house is an unpretentious residence, two stories high at one end, one and a half at the other, painted white. In the front yard are a large maple tree and one cedar; across the road is a row of maple trees, so common in Vermont. The plain parlor room where Coolidge took the oath has a board floor, three windows, an iron stove for heating, a few family pictures, a portrat of Coolidge when Governor of Massachusetts, and a table where a pleasant elderly lady offers postcards and other small souvenirs of the vicinity.

Your curiosity is satisfied in a moment, you reflect briefly on the strange contrast between this frugal scene and the palatial mansions of the Virginia Presidents, and then stroll up the road past barn and country schoolhouse. Your attention is easily diverted from the historical reminders of the President to the restful scenes of hay lands and old apple trees, and woods that gently cloak the granite foundations of Vermont.

You return to the small Congregational church, which was built in 1816, and remodeled 35 years ago, and has never had a bell. The exterior is painted white. The pinewood interior is neatly varnished, and the pews are of stout oak. On left side, third pew, an American flag marks the scene of Coolidge's worship. Later we were to learn, curiously, that the Roosevelt pew in St. James Church near Hayde Park is also the third on left side.

In a black spring rocker outside the church Mr. Moore waits to supplement whatever information the tourist may have gleaned from his brief excursion about the town. He wears a straw hat, a gray suit,

smokes a pipe, and endeavors in a most earnest and instructive manner to acquaint all visitors with the greatness and homely manner of his one time schoolmate who became President.

"He took the oath of office at 2:47 in the morning by the light of a kerosene lamp," he said. "A special train waited in Rutland to speed him to Washington. But after he took the oath he went back to bed. Next morning he got to Rutland in time for the regular train at 9:15. Instead of taking a special train he made them hitch the special car to the regular train."

Mr. Moore said that President Coolidge used a hall above the nearby store as his "White House" in the summer of 1924. This hall now is used occasionally for dances, Grange meetings, or a Bible class. After his Presidency, Coolidge spent his last two summers in Plymouth. In 1932 he had a wing built on his house, and he brought 17 cases of books from Washington.

Our informant said that Plymouth is in the foothills of the Green Mountains, at elevation of 1,442 feet. He poitned to Mount Saltash, at one end of a 10-mile chain now called the Coolidge Range. Not far from town is the Coolidge State Forest. The entire Plymouth Township, 6 miles square, now has a population of only 350 people, although in 1870 it boasted 1,450.

We went to the country store, where the chief items of interest were old calf-bound books imported to satisfy the demand of tourists for antiquities and a big stuffed horned owl above the postoffice window. An enlistment poster of the U.S. Marines and a scratchy pen for addressing postcards of local scenes marked this as many other postoffices. Maple sugar for the homefolks was part of the tourist merchandise.

The mild excitement that attended our arrival in Plymouth had dissipated completely when we boarded our car to leave. Swallows chirped about the old barn, a yellow butterfly flew over the road, and the breeze moved listlessly through maple and elm. Mr. Moore did not leave his rocker but waved good-bye, and shouted, "Every right hand turn to Rutland."

Less than a quarter mile south of town we stopped at a little country cemetery, perhaps an acre in extent, sheltered at the roadside by stately pine and maple trees. Not far from the road is a long straight row of gravestones of members of the Coolidge family. The largest stone in the row is a granite obelisk, for Calvin Coolidge, but not the President. This Calvin was born September 22, 1815, and died December 15, 1878. The stone of the President himself is in next place to end of the row. It is about 6 feet high. At top is the United States coat of arms. The only inscription is: "Calvin Coolidge, July 4, 1872, January 5, 1933."

The smaller stone at the right is reminder of the President's sadness during his White House days. It marks the grave of Calvin Coolidge, Jr., who died in Washington and was brought here for burial.

As you motor over country road, through Woods, past lakes, back to Highway 4, your thoughts are completely distracted by the mystery and wonder of democracy, revealed at Plymouth in potent human symbols. From this environment, your imagination can most easily picture a country boy, driving cows, walking to school, or bidding farewell to friends and parents as he went off to school. And yet you know that this same boy, after many adventures, came to sit before a big mahogany desk in the White House, that he presided over an era renowned as "Coolidge prosperity," enjoyed a triumph at the national polls, did not choose to run again, and retired to the New England towns that were close to his heart. The homely talents by which this career was wrought will forever remain an inspiration to all plain and humble people.

In the church at Plymouth is a framed excerpt from a speech made by President Coolidge at Bennington, September 21, 1928. In this text, autographed "To the town of Plymouth," the President revealed the rock-ribbed origins of his personal pride and political creed.

"Vermont is a State I love," he said.

"I could not look upon the peaks of Ascurney, Killington, Mansfield, and Equinox without being moved in a way that no other scene could move me.

"It was here that I first saw the light of day; here I received my bride; here my dead lie pillowed on the loving breast of our everlasting hills.

"I love Vermont because of her hills and valleys, here scenery and invigorating climate, but most of all, because of her indomitable people. They are a race of pioneers who have beggared themselves to serve others. If the spirit of liberty should vanish in other parts of the Union and support of our institutions should languish, it could all be replenished from the generous store held by the people of this brave little State of Vermont."

Life's Blow at Our Port Is Far Less Than Bright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an editorial from the August 19, 1963, issue of the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee entitled "Life's Blow at Our Port Is Far Less Than Bright." The editorial follows:

LIFE'S BLOW AT OUR PORT IS FAR LESS THAN BRIGHT

Life magazine's attack on public projects, including the Sacramento deep water ship channel, displays an almost invincible inability to learn the facts of the Nation's needs.

Some Federal projects may be pork, as charged by Life, although it is difficult to see how many of them could be unproductive since Congress require that every local project subsidized by the Federal Government must return more than a dollar for each Federal dollar spent.

Localities cannot be neatly separated from the Federal Government. Nearly 80 percent of the American people live in urban areas. In adding these regions the Federal Government is trying to assure the prosperity of the Nation and provide itself with a sound tax basis.

If Washington does not aid urban undertakings to what part of the Nation should its aid go? The farmers? This segment represents only 20 percent of our population and it has been getting massive help for years.

Life seems to think the Federal Government should aid no part of the Nation but that each area should shift for itself. Does it think also the Luce publications, of which Life is one, should forego their second class mailing subsidy which amounts to double the $41 million Sacramento project? Congressman JOHN E. MOSS of the Third—Sacramento County—District was quick to pose this challenge.

The magazine's statement that the Army Engineers were against the port project Moss declares to be completely false.

To be sure, Members of Congress try to get Federal subsidies for public works in their areas. But if Life studies the results objectively, divested of antediluvian concepts, it will find the total of these projects has vastly strengthened the national economy by aiding commerce and attracting capital investment.

Are the great dams and reservoirs which provide cheap power and water over the Nation pork barrel undertakings?

Life shot from the hip when it drew on the Sacramento port and its aim was that of a man who never had handled a gun.

League of Women Voters Expresses Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in line with the current debate in the House on this year's Foreign Assistance Act, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter to the editor of the Westbury (N.Y.) Times, contained in the July 25 issue of that paper.

The letter is from Mrs. J. Raymond Popkin-Clurman, chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Committee of the Westbury League of Women Voters, and it sets forth unequivocally the support of that organization for this legislation.

I commend it to my colleagues:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS EXPRESSES CONCERN

THE WESTBURY TIMES:

The Westbury League of Women Voters supports the economic aid features of the Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1963 currently in committee in both Houses of Congress.

We recommend the full amount requested for the Development Loan Fund—$1,060 million and the full $257 million for development grants and technical assistance.

We also support the development loans, development grants and social progress trust fund programs under the Alliance for Progress.

Since many citizens are honestly concerned with the amount of money the United States spends on foreign aid and feel that we, alone, carry the burden, and since the arguments of lack of effectiveness and poor administration of funds are being advocated by many as reason to whittle still further President Kennedy's requests for aid, we wish to point out some enlightening facts.

As for the criticism that U.S. funds are misused, there is every sign that we have learned many valuable lessons in administering aid. The Clay Committee report (which, unfortunately has been misinterpreted too often) approves of the 1961 Act for International Development and cites important changes achieved under it—such as the consolidation of aid agencies, improvement of personnel, reduction of marginal aid activities, and better analysis of development requirements.

In his aid message, President Kennedy pointed out the need for "stricter standards of selectivity and self-help" in aiding nations. He also stressed the need for "constant review" of our aid program.

In view of all the positive steps taken to overcome our acknowledged inadequacies in administering our aid program, it would be unwise if meat-ax cuts were made now,

under the pessimistic viewpoint that we have tried long enough and should quit.

How much more realistic and American in character is the true message of the Clay Committee report: "We believe these programs properly conceived and implemented, to be essential to the security of our nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities."

We would urge that readers write their Congressman or Senators expressing their concern over the fate of the act.

Mrs. J. RAYMOND POPKIN-CLURMAN,
Chairman of Foreign Economic Policy Committee, Westbury League of Women Voters.

Two Editorials From the Aegis of Bel Air, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE D. LONG
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials written by Editor John Worthington for the August 15, 1963, issue of the Aegis, Bel Air, Md. The first is the expression of the deep sympathy which all Americans extend to President Kennedy on the death of his son, Patrick Bouvier. The second expresses the consensus of opinion of all those served by the Post Office Department—and who in this Nation has not benefited by its services?—on the resignation of Postmaster General Day:

WIDESPREAD SYMPATHY EXPRESSED

Thousands of sympathy messages from friends and public officials all over the world have been received by President and Mrs. Kennedy, since the death of their infant son last week. Everyone recognized the little fellow's condition was critical, but some indications of slight improvement had given rise to hope that the child might recover.

Parents everywhere who have experienced the joy of having a little newcomer join the family circle, know full well the shock when the end comes suddenly. It is small wonder that world citizens responded as they did in this case, knowing the close ties which exist in the Kennedy family circle.

The grief-stricken parents have the very definite consolation of knowing that every medical aid was given, so there is no cause for any misgivings.

A GOOD FEDERAL EMPLOYEE RESIGNS

It was with genuine regret the average citizen of the United States bade farewell to J. Edward Day last Friday after 2½ productive years as the country's 48th Postmaster General.

Few functions of the Federal Government are more important to every segment of its population than the postal service, operated by 587,000 employees.

The resignation of Mr. Day further points out that top men in government, whether on the local or national level, must be paid a salary compared to private enterprises or they are forced to leave for better paying positions.

Postmaster Day said of his situation, "I'd love to stay in public life, but it's my bad luck that I've run out of gas financially."

Under Mr. Day's guidance the Post Office Department is now closer to operating on an almost break even basis, compared to huge deficits prior to his appointment to the cabinet post.

Automation, increased operating efficiency and, like it or not, recent increases in postal rates, will bring the Department's income to within 95 percent of its expenses, according to the retiring official.

Probably, Mr. Day will be most remembered for the recently installed ZIP code numbers or zone improvement plan for speeding distribution of out-of-town mail. Through his efforts the Department has had a number of accomplishments in a short period, become more efficient so that service to the public has improved, and the morale of employees has been high.

Mr. Day has shown what can be done with a Federal department under good management and it is to be hoped the new Postmaster General will not only receive the benefits of Mr. Day's foresight but initiate a few more improvements himself.

Leader Chides Northern Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest an article in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, August 19, 1963, entitled "Leader Chides Northern Negroes."

The article relates the words of Charles Evers, brother and successor of slain Mississippi integrationist leader, Medgar Evers, and I would like to present a copy at this time as food for thought:

LEADER CHIDES NORTHERN NEGROES

DETROIT, August 19.—Two thousand Negroes marched 2 miles in a peaceful demonstration yesterday, only to be scolded by one of their heroes for being "so satisfied, it's sickening."

Charles Evers, brother and successor of slain Mississippi integrationist leader, Medgar Evers, led the orderly march through two industrial Detroit suburbs and took the occasion to lambast the "Uncle Toms" and what he called the complacent northern Negro.

The march, billed as a "Crusade of 10,000," was a failure numerically, but was followed by a spirited rally in a high school stadium where Mr. Evers compared the northern and southern brands of racial discrimination.

"You don't know where you're going," the Mississippian told the nearly all Negro stadium audience. "In Mississippi, we know."

He said Negroes of the Deep South must struggle and sacrifice in their efforts to vote, and noted that Negroes in his audience were not prohibited from registering to vote.

"Stop blaming the white man" for racial inequality, the Negro said from the flag-decked bandstand, "it's your fault now."

He made fun of northerners who sent old clothes and canned fruit to southern NAACP offices.

"You may not believe it, but we have enough food and clothes in Misssissippi," he said. "You can help us not with canned peaches, but by registering and voting to get the civil rights bills through.

SUBTLE FORM ATTACKED

"Stop fighting among yourselves. Stop calling yourselves Republicans and Democrats. We are our only party. Get together behind one good man.

"Just because he's Negro doesn't mean he's a good man," Mr. Evers warned. "You're in worse shape with a no-good Negro than with any white man in office—you trust him more."

Mr. Evers said the blunt, aboveboard segregation of Mississippi was easier to fight than more subtle discrimination practices in the North.

"The person-to-person relationship between Negroes and whites is better in Jackson, Miss., than it is here," he said.

"I have never lived in a segregated neighborhood in Mississippi," he said. "The man who shot my brother was standing in a white woman's yard."

"In Mississippi we know where to hit, how to hit, and when to hit," he told reporters in a press conference. But he said welfare programs in the North had made Negroes complacent.

MIGRATION CRITICIZED

"The white man has taken one or two of us and made us King Kong," he said. "The Negro here is in worse shape than the Negro in Jackson."

He said Negroes who came North for jobs were fools, and they were irresponsible. The hot, hard, dirty work in factories here is no better than the hot, hard, dirty work on plantations.

"Every Negro should remain wherever he is and make that place suitable," he said.

"I hope we never have the ADC (aid to dependent children) and welfare to the extent it is here," he said, adding that Government handouts had given Negroes in northern cities a false feeling of satisfaction.

"You have become complacent," he told the rally. "You have become so satisfied, it's sickening." The remark was loudly cheered.

Indiana University Provides New Lawbooks for Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Herald-Telephone of June 19, 1963, Bloomington, Ind., entitled "Indiana University Provides New Lawbooks for Indonesia":

INDIANA UNIVERSITY PROVIDES NEW LAWBOOKS FOR INDONESIA

A "critical shortage" of lawbooks at two Indonesian universities has been solved as a result of a project undertaken by Indiana University in 1962 at the request of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID).

Selected by Indiana University's School of Law Library staff, and financed by AID, 400 volumes were acquired for each of the law schools at the University of Indonesia at Djakarta and Gadjah Mada University in Jogjakarta through R. E. Banta, Hoosier bookseller and publisher from Crawfordsville.

To help in making the selections, Mrs. Betty V. LeBus, Indiana University law librarian, supervised the compilation of a 514-title bibliography which was printed and distributed to the Indonesian law schools.

The list, Miss LeBus noted, gives particular attention to the jurisprudence and phi-

losophy of law, legal history, constitutional law, comparative law, international law and related areas essential to equipping a basic library for general legal education.

Indiana University's contact with AID was through the department of government, which for the last 4 years has been assisting in the development of a training program in public administration in Indonesia.

Voluntary Arbitration Could Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Voluntary Arbitration Could Work," by Mr. Hugh E. Sheridan, impartial chairman of the New York City Trucking Authority, which appeared in the July 1963 issue of Motor Truck News of New York.

I have worked very closely in the past with Mr. Sheridan in many labor problems in the New York area and found him to be a most dedicated labor-management arbitrator and mediator. It is significant to note that Mr. Sheridan, although the owner of a trucking company, was picked by the New York Teamsters locals to be the impartial chairman of the New York City Trucking Authority. His knowledge of the industry as well as his understanding of the people in the industry, both truckdrivers, helpers and warehousemen, and the men who work in related trades, has earned for him the respect of the entire industry.

He was awarded the coveted Rerum Novarus Medal by St. Peter's College in 1958 for his contribution to labor-management relations.

It is significant to note that the west coast stevedores and longshoremen contract calls for voluntary arbitration in much the manner described in Mr. Sheridan's article which follows. It is also significant to note that the Maritime Union and the American Merchant Marine Institute recently completed negotiations on Friday, August 16, agreeing to a no-strike pledge until the expiration of their contract. Other national and international labor leaders have recognized the merits of voluntary arbitration and have entered into agreements which bind them throughout the term of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article:

VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION COULD WORK

(By Hugh E. Sheridan)

We hear about long strikes and everybody is talking about compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.

I, as an arbitrator, am not in accord with compulsory arbitration. I don't believe in it because unions and employers wouldn't want to give in to anything. Knowing there was to be compulsory arbitration, they wouldn't make any effort toward an agreement.

The union leaders wouldn't dare to suggest anything because the rank and file would say they had been sold out or this or that had been done. Neither union nor employer would budge under compulsory arbitration.

So then the city or the State or the Federal Government would set up arbitrators with the authority of the state behind them and this would lead to the setting of the wages and when they set the wages they would be setting prices. We would be right into it—call it socialism, call it what you like—the Government would be running it.

This we don't want to happen. I don't believe it should be done.

What about voluntary arbitration?

You say that doesn't seem to work out. You say, these fellows have long strikes and that there is nothing we can do about it.

You must remember this: When unions and employers agree to an arbitration authority, they give up some of their rights.

The union gives up its most valuable weapon—the strike weapon. It agrees not to strike. It agrees to let somebody else settle its disputes.

The employer also gives up some rights—the right to fire, the right to run his business any way he wants to. He gives up many rights when he agrees to arbitration.

Voluntary arbitration, in my opinion, could work.

All that we would have to do in a voluntary arbitration setup is to agree, at the time a contract is signed, that the arbitration authority would arbitrate the matter if the union and the employer hadn't reached an agreement on a new contract by the expiration date of the existing contract.

This could be done in many industries. This could solve many things. It wouldn't be compulsory arbitration, but it would mean giving up some rights and taking arbitration.

Such an arbitration authority as the New York City Trucking Authority may be the answer to so-called compulsory arbitration in the settlement of labor disputes and the promotion of sound industrial relations.

If all industries would make up their own authorities based on the peculiarities of each industry and have on the authorities men who know the industry, much could be done. If the question of wages and working conditions couldn't be settled by the time a contract ended, at least the person who would be arbitrating the case would know the industry and could bring out a fair decision.

The New York City Trucking Authority came into being in 1940. In the depression, from 1929 on through the 1930's, we had a chaotic condition in New York. We had contracts with the union for most truckmen but very few people lived up to them. We had cheating on wages and overtime and the unions were not enforcing the contracts.

In 1940, when the contract was due and it looked as if we were going to have a big strike, Mayor LaGuardia called us to city hall. After he had heard the statement of the employers that the unions didn't make people live up to the contract and that out of some 5,000 contracts, the unions couldn't present 10 employers who lived up to the contracts, Mayor LaGuardia said something would have to be done. He said that we would have to set up some kind of an authority for policing. Out of that came the rules and regulations of the New York City Trucking Authority.

It is strange that in picking a chairman for this authority, the union picked an employer who was chairman of the negotiating committee. Mayor LaGuardia said, "That's a conflict of interest; you can't do that." The union said, "We'll have Sheridan or we won't have an authority." The employers agreed, after some grumbling by the road carriers because the choice was a local man, a local operator. But after some weeks everything worked out.

The authority was formed with its rules and regulations. In the regulations it was stated that the impartial chairman was to see that the contract was to be carried out and enforced by the union and the employers. He was given the authority to penalize unions and employers for violation of the contract. He was given great power; in my opinion, more power than should be given to any one man. He had an advisory board. Its function was just to make the budget and serve as adviser to the chairman. So he had full control.

After the chaotic condition, the contract violations, it was necessary to proceed slowly in taking disciplinary actions, especially with men who had had their own way for a number of years. Employers, too.

Nevertheless, in the first 2 years of the contract, the impartial chairman awarded damages against employers for failing to pay the proper wages, the proper overtime, of some $80,000. Some of these awards were as high as $14,000.

And then he also fined the union $7,500 for tying up a job. We had more than one local; we had a lot of locals, under this contract. And each and every local was fined. We had one particular case in which there was a dispute between the union and the men in regard to seniority on one of our large jobs. The employer was not involved. But the union struck. Some 300 men stopped work. Of course, the authority ordered them back, and after 2 days they went back. The employer put in a claim for $10,000, and the impartial chairman awarded him $4,100. Now the unions said they would never pay this, and they took it to all the State courts and finally to the Supreme Court. The position of the impartial chairman was upheld, and the union had to pay. And from then on, we have made lots of fines against both unions and employers.

We have had one union that for a number of years was very careless. There were employers who cheated on pensions, welfare, and wages. The union, in conjunction with this authority, has collected back wages, pensions, and welfare in the sum of over $500,000.

These are the things that happen. This stops strikes while the contract is in existence. The impartial chairman has power only from the time the contract is signed until it expires. When the contract expires, the unions and the companies negotiate a new contract, unless they ask the authority to arbitrate it. Then the authority would arbitrate it.

In 1942, the authority arbitrated the contract. In 1944, the authority also arbitrated the contract. In 1946, the unions and the employers elected not to have the authority in. They negotiated a contract which caused them to have a strike—and the strike lasted 8 weeks. After the contract was signed, part of the employers didn't want to have anything to do with the authority because they said the union forced the contract on them and they weren't going to be party to enforcing it, that the union could go on and enforce its own contract.

At that time, we had in the authority at least three Jersey locals and some of the New York locals stayed in, but the employers who dealt with one of our biggest locals withdrew from the authority. When the next contract came due, the employers who had withdrawn agreed to go back into the authority. They had sued the union for $10 million for the 1946 strike. After examination before trial, the union wanted to make peace with the employers and they entered into a peace pact—a 5-year peace pact—and the authority was to enforce it. Maurice Tobin was then Secretary of Labor and he appointed me as chairman of this authority to enforce the pact.

The authority has been going ever since. Now, we in this authority don't just arbitrate contracts. We have other functions—along the waterways, on the docks, in loading, in things of that kind. We are interested in traffic, in city and State legislation,

in other matters that affect management and labor.

This arbitration authority has been functioning since 1940. And the same man has been the arbitrator. This doesn't usually happen. When you are an arbitrator and you rule against the unions, they get rid of you, and if you rule against the employers, they get rid of you. In the New York City Trucking Authority, the impartial chairman is elected every 2 years.

The authority is financed by employers and unions. The employers pay two-thirds of the budget, the unions one-third. In one union, the employer is obligated to pay on a per man basis. On others, they pay a flat sum. On some, employers pay only by the case. The unions pay as a group.

This authority and its chairman have been called on in strikes in other industries and the chairman has served on panels to solve disputes—under Mayor LaGuardia, under Mayor O'Dwyer, and under the present Mayor Wagner. Many cases involve important industries—fuel, for example. This authority and its chairman have engaged in arbitrations involving cemeteries, casket people, longshoremen—people who do not belong to this authority but who do come to it for arbitration.

In 1961 and 1962, the authority handled and gave decisions in more than 600 arbitrations. This isn't all that we do. We mediate cases. We settle disputes over the telephone. The employer will call up and say he is going to fire somebody, and we will tell him, "Don't do that." The delegate says, "I can't do anything with this fellow; I'm going to tie him up." And we tell him, "Don't do that." Most of these cases are settled when people call up and say they are going to do something and they are told not to do it.

We have lots of calls from people who don't understand situations—in relation to holidays, to a death in the family, things of that kind. Questions come in: "I want to do this. Can I do it?" We have continuous contact with both the employer and the union and this avoids many arbitrations. We are a sort of information bureau—and in that way we keep peace in the industry.

They Chose Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, so many times in recent history, our attention has been drawn to the various types and volume of assistance which our great Nation has extended to all areas of the free world and even to our former enemies. Perhaps, therefore, it is a temptation, at times, to assume the posture of one who is, however graciously, only a giver. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, that on many occasions, to use a colloquial expression "bread on the waters has come back iced cake."

This has been further impressed upon me by a most informative booklet which has come to my attention—and which, I am sure, has also been received by my colleagues. It is published by the International Rescue Committee, Inc., in commemoration of its 30th anniversary year.

Entitled "They Chose Freedom," the booklet tells the story of the refugees from political tyranny since 1933, as well as the history of International Rescue Committee's three decades in the service of freedom. Its stated objective is to make every American aware that the refugee is a vital asset to our Nation, society and culture—and to pay a fitting tribute to the millions who have risked their lives to reach freedom.

The foreword bears this dedication:

Dedicated to the men and women from behind the Iron Curtain who chose freedom, to those who succeeded in reaching their goal and to the anonymous thousands who failed, to those who will still try the precarious venture, to all who burrow under the walls of shame, or crawl through the barbed-wire barriers—workers, farmers, shopkeepers, businessmen, artists, professionals, students, who dare to struggle for the way out to join their brothers and sisters of the West in the task of strengthening freedom * * * and to the men and women in the West who reaffirm their own choice of freedom by helping others to be free—the people in all walks of life who contribute time, energy, and money to the 20th-century underground railway, those in government, business and labor, in religious organizations, charities and foundations, who provide the vital resources so that the choice of freedom may be implemented for all mankind.

As Representative of Florida's Fourth District, which includes Greater Miami and the Florida Keys, the work of the International Rescue Mission with refugees from Castro's tyranny is of special interest to me. The comments in the booklet underscore the many statements I have made on the floor of the House these past years and in my many conferences in that time with the administration and Government agencies.

As the booklet sets forth:

For the United States, this was a new experience. Never before in American history had this country been the point of first asylum for such large numbers of political exiles. And because this was the first tidal flood of refugees created by a Communist government in the Western Hemisphere, America could not afford to fail. All Latin America was watching.

The strongest commendation I can give the International Rescue Committee is to repeat its own statement:

In our lifetime, totalitarian systems have plunged countless millions into slavery and death. At least 10 million people have crossed over into freedom.

No man alive can say how long it will be before the work of the International Rescue Committee will no longer need doing. The only certainty is that the path immediately ahead will continue to be difficult. IRC will have to be prepared for ever greater challenges.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that each of my colleagues joins me in extending best wishes on the 30th anniversary year of this nonsectarian, nonprofit and dedicated organization which has rendered so magnificent a service to our Nation and to the world.

I respectfully suggest that my colleagues would find a careful reading of "They Chose Freedom" a valuable expenditure of time. So clearly and so accurately does the IRC statement set forth the story of the Cuban refugee problems and the admirable efforts of the local citizenry to meet them, that I am including, for the RECORD, pages 31 and 32 of the booklet:

CARIBBEAN HURRICANE

Tyrants breed tyrants. Fulgencio Batista fell in Cuba, and his place was taken by Fidel Castro.

When the "July 26 movement" inherited the reins of government in Havana during the first days of 1959, Castro proclaimed that free elections would soon be held. But on May 1, 1961, he announced that Cuba was a "Socialist country" and there was no need for elections. The mask had dropped. On December 2, 1961, he declared that "I absolutely believe in Marxism"; to the consternation even of Kremlin apologists, he gloated that he had always held Communist views but had concealed them lest he lose popular support during the fight for power.

Since his achievement of mastery over Cuba, Castro has forced some 7 million of his countrymen to submit to the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. He deliberately converted his country into a military base for potential Russian aggression against the United States and Latin America. He seized church schools, expelled priests from Cuba, purged the universities of independent minds, and subordinated the trade unions to government control. He jailed more than 50,000 Cubans for "political crimes" and executed over 1,000 people, including 22 American citizens.

By the beginning of 1963, some 255,000 refugees had fled, all but 35,000 of them receiving asylum in the United States. Another 200,000 Cubans were in possession of visa waivers and were desperately waiting for some method of transportation. In short, about half a million Cubans were choosing freedom. They had learned that Castro's revolution was nothing less than a fraud on freedom.

It took only 6 months for Castro to reveal that he had no respect for constitutional government. On July 17, 1959, Dr. Manuel Urrutia Lleo, first president of Cuba after Batista's overthrow, was removed by Castro for publicly expressing opposition to communism. That event alone was enough to indicate the direction in which the regime was going. It was, therefore, no surprise in 1962 when he world learned that Russian troops were digging in on the island and that missile ranges were being built.

The disillusionment of Cubans who had fought with Castro against the Batista dictatorship came very quickly, as the IRC was among the first to discover. The subsequent ouster of Dr. Urrutia from the presidency and his house arrest in July left no doubt that IRC's services would be needed on this new battlefront. Moreover, the turmoil in Cuba had highlighted the ferment of resistance to both rightist and leftist dictatorships in the Caribbean. In September 1959, IRC's board of directors formally offered its aid to democratic refugees from Castro's Cuba; Trujillo's Dominican Republic and Duvalier's Haiti. Since then, refugees from the Trujillo terror who were aided by IRC have been able to return to their land—a result yet to be achieved in the other two countries. Several IRC-aided Dominicans played important roles in the democratic government established in 1962.

The Caribbean refugee program, under the chairmanship of Nicholas Duke Biddle, was IRC's answer to the greatest challenge of its career. Not even the Hungarian crisis, which produced 180,000 refugees, could match the magnitude of the task now presented.

For the United States, this was a new experience. Never before in American history had this country been the point of first asylum for such large numbers of political exiles. And because this was the first tidal flood of refugees created by a Communist government in the Western Hemisphere,

America could not afford to fail. All Latin America was watching.

MIAMI—THE AMERICAN "VIENNA"

Only 90 miles from Castro's island-tyranny, Florida was the logical first port of call. The refugees came by all routes and through a variety of ruses:

A Cuban airline pilot stowed away on a commercial plane. IRC helped him with clothes, expense money, and finally with a job. Working and saving he was able to buy plane tickets for his family to join him.

A distillery worker, refusing to serve in the Revolutionary Militia, decided with seven other men and two women to escape the imprisoned island. In a small outboard motorboat, they navigated for Key West, but 16 miles from their destination they ran out of gas. Caught in a gale, they were blown out to sea, losing sight of the land. Next day, their food and water gave out. On the third day, after abandoning hope of rescue, they were sighted by a merchant ship which radioed the Coast Guard to bring them in.

The files of the IRC case workers are replete with the stories of average men and women who risked their lives rather than remain under Castro's tyranny. Many of them had fought alongside Castro against the Batista tyranny, only to find themselves betrayed into the hands of the Communist tyranny. But they retained their love of freedom, and refused to yield to disillusionment and cynicism.

A good many first reached Mexico, then crossed into the United States to make their way to Miami where friends and relatives had preceded them. Ignorant of American law, they lived in terror of deportation to Cuba, until steps could be taken to legalize their position as political refugees.

In Florida, America learned at first hand the kind of problem that European cities like Vienna had experienced when the refugee streams were let loose. The pressure on Miami was compounded when Castro applied Hitler's technique of using would-be refugees as a source of income. People would be permitted to leave, provided they agreed to turn over all their property to the regime. At the gangplanks of ships and planes, refugees with exit visas would be stripped of wristwatches and wedding rings before being allowed to board. Arriving in Florida with no possessions but the clothes on their backs, with no money, no place to stay and no jobs, they had no hope of making a new start in life, except for the help of the American people.

Governmental action was based on the premise that the voluntary agencies would do the basic resettlement job. In the Miami area, Federal policy allowed for direct refugee relief payments up to $100 monthly per family. The local school system was reimbursed for the additional pupil load, and a small sum was provided for those who sought to move out of Miami.

RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

America's volunteer organizations once again filled the gap. As the one nonsectarian agency whose basic objective is to help the victims of political tyranny, the International Rescue Committee joined the religious organizations in providing immediate relief, followed by the more enduring aid of finding jobs, reuniting families, speeding resettlement and integration in other localities. Some idea of the achievement can be gathered from these figures: of the 162,210 Cubans officially listed in Miami by the beginning of April 1963, 35,623 were registered with IRC; of the 58,000 refugees moved to other parts of the United States, 13,000 were resettled by IRC.

In a 22-month period, the record shows that IRC-New York alone has carried a caseload of more than 20,000. In addition, it operates the only clothing center for Cuban refugees in the area, which in the same period provided items of apparel without charge to over 30,000 men, women, and children, largely in bitter winter months.

Again, because of its long experience with the problems of refugee-professionals, IRC found itself in a position to render special service. It was able to assist Cuban physicians to qualify for practice in the United States with the help of special foundation grants.

A DEMOCRATIC TRUST FUND

America was meeting a new kind of refugee. IRC had no difficulty understanding why so many—and particularly the most political-minded—of the Cubans wanted to remain in Miami. Their thoughts were back in Havana, and with the conviction that liberation would inevitably come for their country, they did not seek integration in some distant city. Cuba will reclaim these men and women some day. The democratic lessons they learn here in America, the spirit they perceive and come to share, will be carried back across the straits of Florida. They are a human trust fund left in our care; in our hands, this fund must appreciate in value as part of the world's democratic treasure, to be used as freedom's resources in the time of liberation that will ultimately come.

In stressing the responsibility of the American people to help the Cubans, Nicholas Biddle stated, "We are dealing with people who have lost a great deal more than their material possessions. They can be our allies and advocates at a time when we need maximum support in the Western Hemisphere. This can be so only if their exile does not become an experience to be recalled in the future with bitterness, associated with memories of indifference and lack of understanding on our part."

One effort to overthrow Castro had failed. Cubans who chose to fight for the freedom of their country were captured and endured long imprisonment until their release was effected in December 1962. The political dangers of subversion confronting all Latin America, and the military threat represented by the Soviet presence only 90 miles from the United States, make it all the more imperative that aid be given to the Cubans who have chosen freedom's side. Some day they will go home to establish democracy on their island. Alone among the refugee groups, they have good reason to expect an early end to their exile. Until that day arrives, the assistance of the American people is needed to sustain them.

Hon. Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has left an indelible mark on the history of our time. His courage in facing the issues, his determination to voice his convictions will furnish a continuing example to those who are to follow.

Our families have been friends for many years, and I consider his loss a personal one.

Without apology, we differed on matters of political philosophy, yet it was a difference based on respect. His warm friendliness, soft voice, and pleasant manner were basic to the character of this man who was truly interested in his fellow man.

Such personal gentleness, however, hid a determined spirit and a resolute will. Working constantly, ESTES KEFAUVER enjoyed engaging the toughest opposition, whether they be political bosses, captains of industry, of leaders or organized crime.

Excelling in courage and resolute in completing his task, ESTES KEFAUVER never lost the rugged independence and individualism which is so characteristic of the great people of Tennessee.

Though none can ease the loss to Nancy and his children, we may only share their sorrow and say that we will miss him too.

I commend the following editorials from Senator KEFAUVER's hometown newspapers to your attention:

[From the Chattanooga Times, Aug 11, 1963]

KEFAUVER OF TENNESSEE, 1903–63

On the threshold of another quarter-century of internationally recognized service in the U.S. Congress, ESTES KEFAUVER suddenly is cut down. A fighting heart has stopped. It is with a deep and stinging sadness that we note the death of a great Chattanoogan, Tennesseean and American.

East Tennessee courage, determination and ability drove ESTES KEFAUVER to follow the counsel of poet John Donne: "Go and catch a falling star.* * *" He reached high. And he found a towering place indeed.

Not soon will that place be filled, if ever. For his advent to the Senate 15 years ago, after a decade as the Third District Representative in the House, marks a distinct political era in State history; an era now ended.

Senator KEFAUVER's election in 1948—one of many races which stamped him as a campaigner without parallel in Tennessee, and which subjected him to fearful strain—eliminated the Nation's last statewide political machine. His service in bringing representative government to Tennessee was signal among his accomplishments.

Service had long since become his life. As a boy in Madisonville; as a popular University of Tennessee student; at Yale law school where he paid his own way, he worked to that end.

It was in Chattanooga, as a young lawyer, that his concepts of service were refined and oriented. As chairman of the county planning commission and in numerous other activities he won, in 1937, the Jaycee Young Man of the Year award. Many more honors were to come.

By 1946 he had been named by Collier's magazine as one of the 10 outstanding Members of the House. The first of his two books (the other was "Crime in America"), "20th Century Congress," had been termed "must reading" by Bernard Baruch. In its plea for more efficient congressional machinery, it revealed him as a serious student of government with a broad grasp of the democratic function.

During his sponsorship of countless bills aimed at progress and reform, he was named by Time as one of the 10 best Senators.

And only last Thursday in the Senate, his detailed arguments on the communications satellite issue filled 10 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He went down as he would have desired, a vigorous battler for principles in which he believed. Throughout his entire career his actions were open and aboveboard. He was not a straddler. Often, he was clairvoyant in his approach to the divisive and controversial questions, such as human relations. He earned both the enmity of powerful groups and parochial epithets of "anti-

South." But history will judge him, we are sure, as southern, and American, to the core.

During two mighty, fascinating efforts for the Presidency, in 1952 and 1956, no one seemed for him but the people. He stormed the primaries, and lost in the smoke-laden rooms.

The voters became acquainted with, and liked, his soft tones and his unassuming directness, his gentle manner and dogged pursuit.

As Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1956, he drew further distinction to his State.

He was dedicated from youth to the ideals and objectives of the Tennessee Valley Authority. And in his passing, the TVA has lost perhaps its best and most influential friend.

He took an active role in constructive legislation involving every phase of domestic life, as the news columns attest. These efforts alone, climaxed in his crime investigations, made him known in every capital of the world.

But he was equally concerned with the future and strength of the free world. As an original supporter of the Atlantic Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, he styled himself forthrightly and commendably as an internationalist. Often a delegate to world parliamentary councils, he never spared himself in his hectic travels.

It was not easy to capture the essence of ESTES KEFAUVER. There were times when turmoil and relentless pressures of public life closed in around and depressed him. When the campaigns seemed to offer imposing or impossible odds, there occasionally was a withdrawal that accompanied his continuous handshaking.

Incredibly, and sustained by a basic love for people in the mass, he bounced back time and again.

From his boyhood in Madisonville, in the shadow of the Great Smokies, there was about him a friendliness, a strength and a stern independence of thought that thrust him toward prominence.

By 1960, when he won his third Senate term, he had appeared to achieve that illusory status, political invincibility in the State—despite his implacable enemies. But his punishing life had taken its toll. And today, with three and a half years of his term yet to run, he is gone.

ESTES KEFAUVET carries with him the respect and affection of thousands, even of those who frequently disagreed with him. He has been a force for good in the Nation and in the world. As the late conservative Republican Senator Charles Tobey, of New Hampshire, said of him, he "had in his heart a need of decency in America." We, who have followed him since the early days, shall treasure his memory.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Aug. 10, 1963]

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

One of Tennessee's most colorful and widely known political careers came to a sudden and shocking close this morning when Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, active in debate on the Senate floor as late as yesterday, died at 3:40 a.m.

While the Senate considered the program for communications satellites, Senator KEFAUVER suffered what he at first thought was discomfort caused by indigestion. He rode to Bethesda Naval Hospital in a private car, where tests brought the diagnosis that his illness was a mild heart attack that would require him to rest for 3 weeks. In this day when former President Dwight D. Eisenhower suffered a severe attack and not only survived but returned to good health to run for a second term, and when Senator LYNDON JOHNSON recovered from a heart attack to run for and be elected Vice President, it appeared possible the illness of Senator KEFAUVER might be only a temporary delay in the career that brought him international prominence.

But his condition suddenly worsened and death came from what doctors described as "a rupture of the main blood vessel from the heart."

In his 60 years, Senator KEFAUVER carried on the prominence of his family which had begun as early as the time of Tennessee statehood.

Early in his career as a Chattanooga attorney, ESTES KEFAUVER involved himself in government. It attracted him as a moth is drawn to a flame, and he developed a highly personal technique that drew to him voters with a spirit of mission and loyalty that was to stand him in good stead throughout his life.

CAMPAIGNING

Senator KEFAUVER was never a brilliant speaker or a shining personality who awed or overwhelmed his audiences. Rather, he was somewhat hesitant and low pitched in his approach. He gave the impression of utter simplicity that was disarming and accompanied by a tirelessness in personal campaigning that has been unexcelled by any modern political figures. His big hand was constantly outstretched as he said quietly, "I'm ESTES KEFAUVER."

The effectiveness of his technique was first noted as he served as representative for the Third Congressional District. He was a rather extreme liberal in political approach, far more so than the electorate that repeatedly returned him to office by large margins. He rose with the tide of the Roosevelt New Deal, coasted with the waves of liberalism in the Truman Fair Deal, crested in the political cross currents of the 1950's.

After 10 years in Congress, he chose odds which to many seemed too much. But ESTES KEFAUVER never was awed by odds. He challenged the Crump political organization in the race for the U.S. Senate seat held by Tom Stewart. His campaign style, that was to become a nationally known trademark, and the errors of Boss Ed Crump brought him victory. Mr. Crump turned in that 1948 election from his previous backing of Senator Stewart to support relatively unknown Judge John Mitchell. This divided the forces against whom ESTES KEFAUVER had to fight. Then, at a time when the Chattanooga Congressman was not well known in distant parts of the State, Mr. Crump by his opposition gave him the kind of publicity that proved to be the greatest asset of the Kefauver campaign. As Mr. Crump attacked him in full-page newspaper ads by calling him a political pet coon, ESTES KEFAUVER donned a coonskin cap and assumed the role of champion of those who fought against political bossism, declaring that if indeed he were a pet coon, he was not Mr. Crump's pet coon. That campaign took ESTES KEFAUVER to the U.S. Senate although he gained only a little more than 40 percent of the total vote, with Senator Stewart and Judge Mitchell splitting the rest.

Having achieved this political pinnacle, Senator KEFAUVER quickly consolidated his position. He maintained close touch with the grassroots and carefully built patronage fences.

SOURCE OF STRENGTH

The backbone of his political strength was the powerful labor unions and their political arms, plus minority groups and those who sought from Federal Government special welfare State programs. To this core he added many by his ardent campaigning, sustained even in nonelection years by the familiar letters by the hundreds signed simply ESTES and Christmas cards and other communications of very personal nature.

He was reelected to the Senate twice, and was never to suffer serious political setback except in his ambitions to be President.

His liberal philosophy was aimed toward attainment of the Nation's highest office. He yearned for it and built his record to move toward it. While less determined men would have been discouraged by the inability to gain an "in" status with the National Democratic Party's "pros," Senator ESTES KEFAUVER fought for the presidential nomination in preferential primaries and with direct appeals. Using a nationwide reputation won by his televised investigations of crime that showed him off to advantage questioning known racketeers, he became a serious presidential contender in 1952 and again in 1956, only to be defeated at the Democratic convention both times.

But in 1956, his fight won him the "consolation prize" of the vice presidential nomination over a young Senator named John F. Kennedy.

Senator KEFAUVER'S voting record reflected his national political aims and the liberal trend of his party. He constantly advocated policies of more centralized power in Washington, of larger Government, of more Federal spending, of increased handout programs domestically and foreign aid abroad. He was an internationalist, an early advocate of Atlantic Union and a sort of world government.

Though he was from a Southern State, he excluded himself from the band of southern Senators who over the years have fought the many battles in defense of the Constitution and against Federal intervention to force racial integration.

TYPICAL BATTLE

His last battle on the Senate floor yesterday was typical of his position throughout his career. He was fighting for governmental control of satellite communications and opposing ownership and management of this field by private enterprise.

By his sudden death, a political figure of historic proportions has been removed from the turbulent Tennessee scene that he so effectively mastered from Bristol to Memphis for many years.

His rise to power marked a new political era in our State and reflected strong political currents on the national level. His passing surely will mark the beginning of still another new era in Tennessee political and governmental life.

As Tennesseans express condolence to Mrs. Kefauver and their three daughters and one son, citizens of all political persuasions will recognize that the career of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has been a powerful and historic one that has had a significant influence in our Nation.

Aid Our Friends, Then Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker. An editorial which appeared in the Friday, August 16 issue of the Kewanee (Ill.) Star-Courier, one of the fine daily newspapers in my congressional district, vividly points out the position many of us have with respect to our foreign aid program.

After attentively listening to the debate on H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, I am more than ever convinced that the bill in its present form should be defeated.

It is high time this entire program be carefully reviewed and revised. I can see no reason whatsoever, with the staggering public and private debt facing us today, why we should continue to spend billions on foreign aid when many of these recipients—the rich and poor alike—both friend and enemy appear so little concerned about helping themselves.

I quite agree with the following editorial—a drastic change in policy is long overdue. If we have to help, let us help only our friends and stop right there:

AID OUR FRIENDS, THEN STOP

Looking back to the beginning of foreign aid, and to the idealistic yet practical principles on which it was then postulated, gives one something of an Alice-in-Wonderland feeling.

The start is found in the Marshall plan. The idea was to use American resources to help rebuild war-shattered nation, and to bring about a peaceful, cooperative world based upon free institutions—including free popular elections.

The tragedy is that many billions of our foreign aid have been used for very different ends. It has gone to dictatorships, in which the people have no voice at all in affairs. Worst of all, it has gone, in instance after instance, to members of or sympathizers with the Communist bloc. Thus, our own dollars have been used to strengthen our enemies—and even to buy them advanced weapons of war.

One can understand that foreign aid distributions of billions of dollars are often wasteful and misdirected. That is inevitable in so vast an undertaking. But there can be no excuse for employing it to our own disadvantage and danger. A drastic change in policy has long been in order. Let us aid our friends, and stop right there.

Northern Pastors State Civil Rights Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, recently nine Negro pastors in Rockford, Ill., my home community, addressed a letter to the editor of the Rockford Morning Star. I wish at this time to include with these remarks a copy of that letter.

I have been deeply concerned by the racial strife that has torn and divided our county in recent months. It has become only too apparent that with the passage of time and the failure to resolve some of the basic difficulties that underlie these tensions there has been an upsurge in violence in some places and a corresponding diminution of that reasonable and Christian spirit which is truly needed if we are to solve this crucial problem. Therefore, when I read this particular letter, written and signed as it is by nine Negro pastors, I was tremendously heartened and reassured to note the high level of their commonsense and devotion to the principle of nonviolence. These men of the church are all of them sincerely interested, I know, in bettering the lot of the Negro citizen and assuring him the kind of first-class citizenship to which I strongly feel he is entitled under the Constitution of our land. At the same time they have clearly indicated their desire and willingness to proceed to negotiate, as they put it, "without rancor or unfair demands."

Mr. Speaker, it is with real pride and pleasure that I take advantage of this opportunity to publicly praise and commend these men who, I think, are truly motivated by a Christian conscience and a desire to bind up and heal the wounds that have been created in our beloved country in recent weeks and months. I hope that their example will be followed by others who are called upon to play a leading role at this critical juncture in our Nation's history.

The letter follows:

NEGRO PASTORS STATE CIVIL RIGHTS STAND

To the EDITOR:

As leaders of Rockford and Winnebago County, the Minister's Fellowship wishes to make known its stand with reference to our position as it relates to interracial tensions and inequities.

We are aware of the smoldering unrest among our people throughout the country and in Rockford in our efforts to achieve full and unfettered rights as American citizens. We recognize the barriers imposed that are designed to prevent us from sharing equitably in every facet of life. We, the Negroes, have fought to preserve democracy and job opportunities made possible by the economy of our dollars, labor, and devotion to the country which we have helped to build.

We are also aware of the difficulties imposed upon us in renting adequate housing, buying homes, or building of our own choice and according to our means. Housing is pivotal in that it governs the education of children and sets social and cultural patterns. We are aware of other areas where the conscience of our community needs stirring, and this we intend to do.

Realizing that the Negro community bears responsibilities in the achievement of full rights and opportunities, we propose to approach the tasks ahead with determined discretion and Christian dignity. We shall relentlessly pursue our goals with grim determination through all proper channels with every desire to negotiate without rencor or unfair demands. As in our conference with Mayor Ben Schleicher, July 16, we've agreed to pursue this course of action.

We seek to spell out in definite terms our areas of concentration now, that has been and is under study for a factual report. We elicit the aid of any and all loyal Americans to join us in this action. Words and promises will not do. We are setting up machinery for an organizational structure which will include any and all persons within our community, but particularly through the churches. Our areas of concentration are: Housing, education, economic action, political action, employment, and social action.

There shall be committees for each area and shall reach down to the grass roots, including all wishing to work democratically and without violence.

Our course of action should and must not be construed as opposition to protest marches in other parts of the Nation, or one of necessity in Rockford. We shall choose the course we deem best for our situation and community at this time. We further submit that the position we take is not intended to mean that we would not promote or take part in a protest march in Rockford except as a last resort. A protest march at this time in our opinion is ill-timed and ill-advised. We deplore and oppose any person or group who would use the aspirations of our people for personal gain or empty notoriety.

We decry and will oppose those who might seek to sell the dignity and aspirations of our people for handouts or a mess of pottage or selfish gains and unwarranted publicity for a chosen few. We have vested interests in Rockford and seek to secure them by further investments adding to the total culture of Rockford of which we are an integral part.

This statement is authorized and approved by the following ministers and their congregations:

Pilgrim Baptist Church, Rev. E. H. E. Gilbert; Providence Baptist Church, Rev. W. Prince Vaughn; Macedonia Baptist Church, Rev. Artie Shaw; Shiloh Baptist Church, Rev. E. Z. Curry; Miles Memorial C. M. E. Church, Rev. J. S. Turner; Mount Olive Baptist Church, Rev. Namen N. Kline; Greater New Hope Baptist Church, Rev. A. G. White; Christian Union Baptist Church, Rev. L. E. Green; and Liberty Baptist Church, Rev. William T. Henderson.

Our Men at the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Mansfield News-Journal had an excellent editorial in its July 30, 1963, edition which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. It points out the growing concern that many of our citizens have for the inept representation we have at the United Nations. American interests seem to be sacrificed to expedient appeasing of the Communist and neutral nations' blocs. I commend it to the attention of the Members of this body.

OUR MEN AT THE U.N.

The incompetence of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations is appalling.

For example, hundreds of thousands of U.S. tax dollars are poured into Cuba disguised as grants from the U.N. for agricultural research.

Cuba is a puppet state. Its people are crushed under the colonial policy of Soviet Russia.

Does our U.N. delegation protest? Ah, no. It approves.

The newly independent nations of Africa are charging that South Africa and the Portuguese colonies are threatening world peace.

Soberly our Security Council delegation listens to this hogwash.

South Africa is threatening nobody. She has grave international problems and her policy of apartheid between white and colored races has been subjected to worldwide criticism. But, according to its charter, the U.N. is not supposed to interfere in a state's internal affairs.

Obviously the African politicians want to get their hands on South Africa so they have trumped up the world threat talk and Americans at the U.N. swallow the phony bait.

The Portuguese colonies, on the other hand, have virtually no internal problems. The races are completely integrated in Angola and Mozambique. Trouble has been

caused in both countries by external raiders, considered Communist inspired.

But the African politicians want to get their hands on the Portuguese possessions as well, so they charge that international peace is threatened. Adlai Stevenson plays along by calling for self-determination.

Our U.N. delegation was a party to the destruction of independence in Katanga.

Our U.N.'ers helped force the Dutch out of Borneo, turning West Irian over to Sukarno who, with Communist help, is really threatening world peace by trying to create an East Indian empire.

If our U.N. delegation is truly trying to represent the best interests of this Nation and of world peace, then it is both naive and incompetent.

The American people deserve better representation.

Individual Ambition: The Key to Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the August 26 issue of the Washington World should serve to remind all Americans that this is still a land of opportunity for those, regardless of color, who are willing to work for it. Individual success will never be measured in demonstrations, marches, and Government aid.

INDIVIDUAL AMBITION: THE KEY TO SUCCESS

S. B. Fuller, at 58, has reached a level of business success attained by few men. In addition to the Fuller Products Co., which produces a nationally known line of cosmetics and allied products, he controls eight other corporations. Among them is a department store in Chicago, a real estate trust in New York, and the Courier chain of newspapers serving Negro readers in Chicago, New York, Detroit, and Pittsburgh.

Born of poor parents in Louisiana, Fuller went to school only as far as the sixth grade. Moving to Chicago as a young man, he started the Fuller Products Co. in 1935 on capital of only $25. Today, the company's gross sales comes to more than $10 million annually.

He has risen to success in the true tradition of the American business entrepreneur. According to the well-worn cliche—he is a self-made man. S. B. Fuller is a Negro.

Fuller describes himself as an integrationist—pointing out that many of his employees are white. In commenting on current affairs, he says he opposes the views and tactics being used by militant Negroes. These tactics stigmatize an entire race, he feels, and accomplish little that is positive. Instead of arousing interest and sympathy, they create antagonisms.

Fuller indicts many of his protesting racial fellows on other grounds as well. He claims they do not participate as fully as they might nor do they take ample advantage of the opportunities available to them in education, employment, housing, recreation, and other avenues open to them in the economy.

Negroes, Fuller notes, who have the same determination and confidence and ambition as their fellow Americans will find far fewer barriers to success. His comments are cogent since he is by no means a lone representative of his race to achieve a large degree of success, nor is he alone among his people in expressing the opinions in which he believes.

As a group, Negroes spend about $23 billion annually in this country; they have about $1.8 billion of its capital. They contribute actively to business affairs. A large number operate small businesses. Many others are successful publishers, outstanding in athletics, prominent in all of the professions—teaching, law, medicine, and they grow steadily in both rank and number as government servants.

Americans, no matter what their race, color, or creed, can achieve unlimited success in this Nation of opportunity by exerting effort as individuals to obtain desired goals.

Physicists in Pittsburgh Area Sign Letter in Response to One Written by Dr. Edward Teller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter which I have received from some constituents of mine. The letter responds to one written by Dr. Edward Teller, and is signed by 14 outstanding physicists in the Pittsburgh area:

JULY 31, 1963.

At the suggestion and with the support of the Federation of American Scientists, we feel compelled to respond to a letter by Dr. Edward Teller concerning the nuclear weapon test ban treaty.

Dr. Teller makes two major points in his letter: First, that cheating is possible on very small atmospheric tests that may be important for the development of a missile defense, and second, that large atmospheric tests are desirable to allow us to catch up to the U.S.S.R. in the development of high-yield weapons. As a partial answer to these comments, we should like to make the following points: First, it does not seem to be a matter of nuclear technology that is holding up the development of an effective antimissile system. The problems are more along the lines of how to tell armed missiles from decoys, how to detect missiles in sufficient time to be able to strike them down in spite of screening devices that may be used, and how to destroy missiles with 100 percent efficiency in view of the fact that a single missile that gets through our defenses may wipe out an entire city. Second, it is by no means clear that the high-yield weapons referred to are very useful military devices, since the lower yield weapons we already possess are capable of destroying virtually any target they reach. We have long possessed the ability to produce high-yield weapons; the decision not to develop them was prompted by considerations of their limited usefulness. Third, if both sides continue unlimited testing, there is little reason to suppose that the Soviet Union is incapable of maintaining any lead it may have developed in certain areas of weapons technology; if further testing is likely to close existing gaps, it is equally likely that the U.S.S.R. can close the gaps in those areas in which we presently maintain a lead.

Let us, however, concede that there are some risks inherent in the treaty, or, for that matter, in any treaty that could be negotiated along similar lines. The most important question is how these risks compare to those we face in the absence of such a treaty. Both countries have stockpiles of nuclear weapons which are far more than sufficient for mutual annihilation, even allowing for a reasonably effective defense against the delivery vehicles. Our urgent concern should be to prevent the use of this awesome power, and ultimately to return the world to a state in which nuclear annihilation is not a constant threat. Although the present treaty by no means accomplishes these aims, it is a step toward preventing a worsening of the situation; it is a step without which further progress away from war may be impossible.

Sincerely yours,

Allen I. Janis, John R. Townsend, Thomas M. Donahue, Ezra T. Newman, John J. Stachel, M. A. Biondi, M. P. Garfunkel, Frederic Keffer (Chairman), Irving J. Lowe, John H. Anderson, Norman Austern, Department of Physics, University of Pittsburgh; Ernest J. Sternglass, Chairman, Pittsburgh Chapter, Federation of American Scientists; Lincoln Wolfenstein, Richard E. Cutkosky, Department of Physics, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Politics Can Ruin the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I included in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial by Mr. Leon Smith, editor of the Free Press, Thomaston, Ga., entitled "The Gesell Report Would Overcorrect the Racial Strife and Damage the Armed Forces." Several days later this same newspaperman wrote another editorial on this same subject, appropriately entitled "Politics Can Ruin the U.S. Armed Forces."

As Editor Smith so ably points out:

This [Gesell report] goes far beyond the matter of racial integration.

It would have the practical effect of deterring the Defense Establishment of the United States from its primary mission of maintaining the security of the country and use the military as a massive force to implement a political decision for purely political purposes.

This editorial, in full, follows:

POLITICS CAN RUIN THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

The greatest wrong with the Russian military organization, so American military men have thought since we have been associated with the Soviet as an ally in World War II, is the fact that each Russian military unit has a political officer.

"You can't have politics in the Armed Forces," we have contended through the years and it has been a theory that has seen us through many tough spots.

A fighting man has been urged to leave politics on the other side of his oath as a fighting man. And, except for the fact that they have done so, we might not have won in many of our wars. If our fighting men had stopped to consider the politics of many actions in which they fought and died they may have never gone.

It is agreed, then, that politics and the fighting forces should be a separate and independent arm of a democracy.

Why, then, does the U.S. Government even consider a political officer for every military installation?

Take this paragraph from the Gesell report—an infamous document prepared by an almost secret committee appointed by President Kennedy to study the equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States:

"An active program for eliminating off-base discrimination demands the creation of a wholly different working relationship between the commander and the local community * * * in the future the installation commander should be required to appoint such a (biracial) committee in order to bring together leaders of both the white and Negro communities * * * care should be taken to include individuals experienced and concerned with problems of racial equality * * *. the services must insure that when reaching the position of base commander are familiar with the requirements of the Constitution and the history of the Negroes' struggle to achieve equality of treatment and opportunity."

"In order to improve the processing of complaints at the base level, procedures must be established which will encourage Negro personnel to present complaints of discrimination while eliminating the risk that they will be subject to criticism or reprisal for so doing. In order to accomplish this, an officer should be designated at each base to receive such complaints. This officer must have free access to the base commander or his deputy for the purpose of communicating and discussing complaints of discrimination. Commanders at bases must, of course, be personally responsible for the effectiveness of the system and for conditions on the base."

A base commander entering into community politics and an officer to implement a purely political matter is what they suggest and we suggest that such an officer could next suggest who to vote for in the presidential elections.

Politics, pure and simple, is what is suggested that be integrated into the Armed Forces.

This goes far beyond the matter of racial integration.

The Gessell report could well be the blueprint for the ruination of the four principal branches of our country's defense and weaken us so that we could fall from the enemy within or without.

And if you are as alarmed about all this as we are, you will dash off a letter of protest to every elected official whose name you can recall in Washington.

Let's Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the recent Civil Aeronautics Board decision to deny Northeast Airlines an extension of its charter to fly south of New York has caused much legitimate concern in New England. The Quincy Patriot Ledger expresses its disapproval in an editorial of August 19, 1963. As the editorial points out, the solvency and economic health of Northeast Airlines is predicated in large measure upon its flights south of New York. Furthermore, as the two dissenting CAB members quite frankly state, it is probable that Northeast service of the New York-Florida market is necessary to insure competition which results in substantial benefits to the traveling public. Considerations such as these prompted many members of the New England delegation to testify before the Senate Commerce Committee which is reviewing the CAB decision. The reasons for the continuation of service by Northeast Airlines south of New York are many and compelling. The following editorial expresses them clearly and convincingly and I urge every Member of Congress to read it:

LET'S FIGHT

The Civil Aeronautic Board's decision to amputate Northeast Airlines' Boston-to-Florida routes and leave the stump of regional service will badly cripple New England.

The health of New England transportation is precarious and this loss will be a further blow.

The arguments the three-man majority of the CAB used to reach their decision seem wide of the mark. They cite the ability of the two other airlines to handle the traffic and note the line's continuing financial difficulties, but fail to take credit for those difficulties. It was the CAB's temporary award of the Florida runs in 1957 which placed unusual financial burdens on the line. Because the certification was temporary, the line could not gain favorable terms for the purchase of planes it needed.

The report filed by the two-member minority seems more cogent to us. Robert T. Murphy and G. Joseph Minetti said "the collapse of Northeast is virtually dictated by cutting off this one trunk route."

They noted that it marked the first time in the CAB's history that a line had been taken away from a carrier. "The liquidation of Northeast will be detrimental to its creditors, its stockholders," to its employees, and "the hard-pressed New England area, which is already suffering from a deteriorating railroad transportation system," the minority wrote.

We believe the minority members see the picture in New England more clearly than the majority. And we believe the CAB ruling is spotted with enough legal questions to warrant a vigorous appeal through the courts of that ruling.

There is the very real question of whether the two other lines flying the Boston-Florida corridor are adequate to carry all the traffic. Physically yes, but travelers recall vividly the kind of service available on the Florida run before Northeast entered the competition. Northeast cared about the comfort of its passengers and forced the same regard on Eastern and National.

Northeast rattled the other lines by putting better planes in the service, getting jets into the race ahead of Eastern and seeking out new markets the other lines had rejected.

The CAB's basic finding that two carriers would be enough invites the next step: one carrier would be enough, technically; but competition is an important friend of travelers. The CAB had supported that idea by awarding the same routes in heavily traveled corridors to several carriers. Here they seem to be rejecting their own policy.

The CAB decision, if allowed to stand, will impose considerable economic hardship on New England through loss of service and loss of the 2,000 jobs it provides, principally in the Boston area. It is a decision we hope will be reversed when the appeal is made.

Northeast has the strong support of the State's congressional delegation and the sympathy of the citizens. We hope the courts will decide to keep competition in the New England air.

Another Reminder of the Danger in Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the barrage of propaganda from the White House too many American people are becoming lulled into a false sense of security regarding Soviet Russian intentions. The smiling, badminton-playing, Khrushchev has evidently won over the President, Secretary of State Rusk, Averell Harriman, and other policymakers, but to what end?

The massive peace offensive is being carried out to the letter of the Lenin doctrine for disarming the capitalist nations and winning world domination for the Communists.

The editorial from the Dallas Morning News reminds us once again we are playing a stupid and dangerous game, ignoring all the facts of history. In the face of all the evidence, is it not proper to ask the President, What is your real purpose in the frantic negotiations you are carrying on with Khrushchev?

The editorial follows:

LOOK, DON'T LEAP

What's behind our Government's repeated maneuverings in Geneva on disarmament? "In the spirit of Moscow," our latest proposal to the Russians is that both countries stop producing the materials for nuclear bombs.

The offer was first made last April. At that time, it included a proposal to divert 50,000 kilograms of uranium 235 from military stockpiles, if the Reds would do likewise. This time our disarmament negotiators offered to sweeten the pot and give up 60,000 kilograms from defense stocks in exchange for only 40,000 kilograms from them.

In effect, we were giving a peace offering. We proposed to reduce our defense stockpiles by an extra 20,000 kilograms, in exchange for a Communist signature which in the past has meant nothing.

Though our spirit was willing, the Russians weren't. Their chief delegate, Semyon Tsarapkin, said the offer was "unacceptable." If past bargaining tactics are any indication, the Reds are probably holding out for more.

Again we seem to be falling for a Red peace offensive. After seeing "the spirit of Geneva" and "the spirit of Camp David" blow up in our faces, we are coming back for more and acting in "the spirit of Moscow."

Dictatorships rarely bother to conceal their objectives. Hitler wrote "Mein Kampf," the West paid no attention to it and he carried out his stated plans for war.

In 1930, at the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Dimitri Manuilsky said:

"The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. Then capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends.

As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

His students apparently learned their lesson well, because they have been using this tactic over and over. After a few jokes, a few toasts and a game of badminton we seem to "leap at another chance to be friends." The Communists are not our friends and never will be.

In this country, everybody wants to live in a world at peace. But laxity and stupidity are the roads to destruction.

Democrats Urge Ties With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star, on August 19, carried the following account of resolutions adopted by Young Democrats from 13 Western States in a convention at Berkeley, Calif.:

DEMOCRATS URGE TIES WITH CUBA

BERKELEY, CALIF., August 19.—Young Democrats from 13 Western States ended their convention in Berkeley yesterday with resolutions concerning Cuba, civil rights, and American military deployment.

A total of 32 resolutions demanded, among other things, that the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba, that the August 28 Negro civil rights parade on Washington be "carried out as planned," that a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations and that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam.

Other points covered included demands for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act, revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, the elimination of compulsory arbitration in strikes and abolition of the death penalty.

The delegates condemned various organizations, the aim of which they said is to limit the civil rights of nonwhites. These included, the Young Democrats said, the John Birch Society, the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Christian Crusade.

I find that I am in personal disagreement with several of the resolutions. While I respect the views of those on opposite sides of most of these issues, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the three resolutions demanding the signing of the nonaggression pact between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations, the resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam are not only unwise but extreme.

I have not hesitated to denounce extremism on the right and point out the folly of withdrawing from the U.N., abolishing the Federal income tax, or impeaching members of the Supreme Court. By the same token I feel I have an obligation to oppose extremism on the left and that is exactly what I consider these three resolutions to be which were reportedly adopted by Western Young Democrats at San Francisco.

When we consider that today the President of the United States with the advice of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Justice Department—including the FBI—is making intelligent decisions on NATO, Cuba, and South Vietnam, I believe that it is not only unwise but extreme for any group of young Americans, be they Democrats or Republicans, to adopt these resolutions that were reportedly adopted at San Francisco.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to completely disassociate myself from these three resolutions. I hope that the various State Young Democrat Committees as well as the National Young Democrats will let the people of America know that they support our President in his decisions on NATO, Cuba, and South Vietnam and disassociate themselves from these three extremist, leftwing resolutions reportedly adopted at San Francisco.

Keene, N.H., Hosts American Legion Little World Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, next week, the eyes of the Nation will center on a small baseball diamond in the city of Keene, N.H., a city in the southwestern corner of my congressional district.

There, beginning August 25, eight teams of young men will take the field to compete for victory in the American Legion's little world's series. The sponsors of this greatest and oldest baseball event for juniors will guarantee the championships have never been held in more scenic surroundings.

As Keene's Congressman, I am proud of her efforts and those of the near-1,000-member American Legion Gordon-Bissell Post No. 4 in reaching the top in Legion baseball. It has been a long climb tough, a dream kept alive and fruitful by hours and hours of plain, dedicated work.

Mr. Speaker, the Gordon-Bissell Post has spearheaded the drive to the top. Special credit go first to the Keene Evening Sentinel, Keene's afternoon daily newspaper and one of New Hampshire's most distinguished journals, who suggested the series idea some 3 years ago. The idea was taken to heart by Karl Underwood, Jr., former Bissell Post commander and now head of Legion baseball in New Hampshire. Through "Gubby" Underwood's efforts, aided by comrades of the Legion too numerous to mention by name has made this dream a reality.

The end result, now only a few short days away, will, obviously, be one of the biggest promotional plums any city could pluck for itself. Keene and New Hampshire and Legion baseball will all prosper in the spotlight of national attention.

Releases from the publicity committee are going regularly to more than 110 television stations, newspapers, and American Legion baseball leaders throughout the United States. Some 30,000 fans are expected to see the actual playoffs in Keene.

But in all the excitement surrounding this great, typically "American" event, some may lose sight of the simple facts behind Legion baseball: the teaching of our youth.

In Keene or Peoria or San Francisco, thousands of young Americans regularly take to the sandlots and green covered diamonds to play baseball. They are helped by hundreds of legionnaires who serve year after year on a volunteer basis receiving no pay for their work. The boys learn invaluable lessons: sportsmanship, humility, the will to win and win well, the dear quality of learning to lose and lose gracefully, the value of competition, teamwork, and physical exercise.

These are things which will benefit New Hampshire just as much, indeed more, than the national publicity which surrounds the event. These things, too, benefit the Nation.

The elimination process among 13,891 teams in the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia—this is the first time the District team has played in the series, I might add—is now pretty well wrapped up. For the eight regional champions, Keene now waits. My Granite State awaits them, too, and will furnish competitors and fans alike with an experience they will not long forget.

Members of teams knocked off early in the competition, and their supporters, will find a host of interesting places to visit relatively close to Keene.

The city proper lies on relatively level terrain, but the area in general is typical of the verdant, rolling country midway up the Connecticut River Valley.

A major attraction in the Greater Keene area is Steamtown at North Walpole, with its magnificent collection of locomotives and cars of yesteryear. Daily excursion runs of nearly a score of miles are available.

The Monadnock region—southwestern corner of New Hampshire, has a couple hundred lakes and ponds, 15 mountains over 1,500 feet, capped by beautiful 3,165-foot Mount Monadnock and a half-dozen State parks.

Within short driving distance is perhaps the most inspiring war memorial in the world, the Cathedral of the Pines, an outdoor place of worship.

For those willing to venture deeper into the Granite State, New Hampshire's celebrated Dartmouth-Lake Sunipee region is just to the north of Keene; it is a trip of just over 100 miles to Hampton Beach on the Atlantic, or into the heartland of the mighty White Mountains in the upper half of the State. Washington, at 6,288 feet, is loftiest of all peaks in northeastern North America, it stands as a sovereign sentinal at the approaches to the fabled north country of New Hampshire.

It boasts the first cog railroad in the world. Other New Hampshire up-mountain rides include a tramway in Franconia Notch, gondolas at Wildcat in

Pinkham Notch, the one-of-a-kind Skimobiles at North Conway, and the more traditional chairlifts.

For those who have never seen an agricultural fair, a couple of good ones will be in progress as the series goes down the wire. They are the State Fair at Plymouth and the Hopkinton Fair at Contoocook, both from August 30 to September 2.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD, a recent editorial from the Keene Evening Sentinel to conclude my remarks.

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT

On a cold day in February of 1960, an editorial in this space said, "Gordon-Bissell Post, American Legion, is to be congratulated for bringing here, for the third consecutive year, the American Legion Regional Baseball Tournament."

The editorial continued that there was at that time strong sentiment in the Legion post to seek the Little World Series, but the post knew that the effort couldn't be made without 100 percent community backing.

We suggested that there was a reason to try to bring the national tourney here which had nothing to do with baseball, per se; that it would give Keene national publicity which the city could never buy; because prior to the series, and during its-playing, the attention of thousands of newspapers, radio stations, television stations would be drawn to Keene.

We concluded that the direct and indirect benefits from such attention would fully justify the effort and expense required to have the championship played here.

That was the beginning.

Two years later we were able to report that Keene had plucked off the biggest promotional plum in the city's history when it was learned that the 1963 American Legion little world's series would be played at Alumni Field.

Thus, Keene had reached the top in American Legion baseball after a long and arduous climb; after a staggering number of hours of dedicated work by key members of Gordon-Bissell Post, most notably Karl (Gubby) Underwood and Warren Barrett.

There's little question that the sponsoring Gordon-Bissell Post 4 is "over the hump," so to speak, so far as promoting the national playoffs is concerned.

Releases from the publicity committee have been going regularly to more than 110 television stations, newspapers, and American Legion baseball leaders throughout the country.

Within 45 days the series will be here, and committee officials are anticipating that more than 30,000 fans will witness the 14 or 15 games. The real work will start on Sunday, August 25, when Ted Williams will usher in the 1963 series by throwing out the first ball in the opening game between the New England and west coast champions.

It will be a well-coordinated group that will handle the actual supervision of the tournament. Knowledge obtained by running six regional and two sectional events here will be put to good use.

Karl Underwood, a vice chairman of the little world's series executive committee, has confidently predicted that the tournament will be the most successful ever held. In view of the fact that the region 1 tournaments here the past 2 years were the most successful in the country, we're inclined to go along with Underwood's thinking.

Meet Goes to Perfection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, our State is proud of the results of the recent coal mining first-aid contest conducted at Ebensburg by the Central Pennsylvania District Safety Association, the North Central District Association, Moshannon District Association, and Allegheny-Kisky Valley Safety and First-Aid Association. In one of the most evenly matched contests in 25 years of competition, a perfect score was recorded by the winning team from Diamond Mine of Imperial Coal Corp. at Boltz.

This outstanding exhibition of expert coordination and teamwork, based on thorough and persistent training, should serve as an inspiration to first-aid teams throughout the country. Further, organizations connected with civil defense activities would be well advised to look into the achievements of our first-aid groups and, where practicable, set their own rescue practice programs accordingly.

We congratulate the Diamond Mine team. The performance of each of its members might be compared to the careful and flawless accomplishment of a pitcher who retires 27 consecutive batters without having a single man reach first.

We salute every team and every individual who took part in the competition at Ebensburg. Their dedication to the cause of mine safety and first-aid merit the commendation and gratitude of us all. For this reason I am listing below the order of finish and team rosters:

First. Diamond Mine Team of Imperial Coal Corp., at Boltz, Capt. John Rensko, John Pabrazinsky, John Simon, James Clement, Maurice W. Troska, Nicholas Busoney, Francis Mort and Cleto Santucci.

Second. Mine 32 of Bethlehem Mines Corp., at Revloc, Capt. Gene Persio, Matthew R. Isaacson, Dino Menie, Fred Parisi, Calvin Prazinko, Steve Zaffuto and John Radebach.

Third. Springfield No. 4 team of Barnes & Tucker Coal Co., Capt. George Kutchman, Robert Stratton, Walter Trybus, Gerald Farabaugh, Tony Kaschack, Peter Trybus, and Gerald Becker.

Fourth. Mine 31, Bethlehem Mines Corp., Nanty Glow, Capt. Earl Soulsby, Anthony Schirato, Illo Bartoletti, Peter Scansaroli, Louis Byich, Walter Hessler, and Ignatius Olsavsky.

Fifth. Harwick Mine, Duquesne Light Co., Capt. Joseph Wilkosz, Joseph Pitlock, Michael Kandziolka, Joseph Sarso, Lois Bott, Maurice Fowler, and John Mudlo.

Sixth. Kelso Mine Team of Bird Coal Co., Capt. Quindo Sicone, Robert Hainsey, Emmanuel Crew, Alex Litko, Andrew Brunnett and Louis Vettori.

Seventh. Harmar Mine of Harmar Coal Co., Capt. Capt. C. J. Callahan, John Krasovsky, Rudolph Stanko, Theodore Mackos, Frank Oswald and George Flynn.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPRING LAKE, N.J.,
July 15, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I am writing you urging quick action on any of the resolutions before the House Rules Committee calling for establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

I am prompted to do this because of my concern that the number of captive nations is increasing. In this morning's news Senator DODD believes this has already occurred in Africa. Among the fears I have of the United Nations, is the meaning of the strange statements calling for freedom(?) of the emerging nations of Africa (except Katanga?) while ignoring the fate of the captive nations of Europe. Somehow I distrust such ambivalent action which is apparently motivated by desires for compromise and peace rather than truth and justice.

Very truly yours,

FRANK PFLUM.

HAVERTOWN, PA.,
July 12, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I am writing you to request fast action on H.R. 14, with the hope that the mention of captive nations in the Congress of the United States will show Russia that we are still interested in the plight of the unhappy people under Soviet control.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Miss RUTH MULLIGAN.

MINEOLA, N.Y.,
July 16, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
U.S. Congressman, Rules Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH AND RULES COMMITTEE: Please give us some quick action on House Resolution 14, a resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

A. GEIS

MINEOLA, N.Y.,
July 16, 1963.

Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DEROUNIAN: Please submit a resolution in Congress to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

A. GEIS.

EAST WILLISTON, N.Y.,
July 14, 1963.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Congratulations for introducing House Resolution 14.

Too long have the people of the captive nations suffered in vain. How disillusioned they must be when the United States, the bulwark of freedom is indifferent or at best mouths empty phrases in their behalf.

When are the leaders of America going to show the moral strength that made our country great and lead the world away from the brutality of atheistic communism.

Yours truly,

MARY DRISCOLL,
Mrs. DANIEL J. DRISCOLL.

JULY 15, 1963.

Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am forwarding herewith four additional sets of petitions praying for the immediate release from the Committee on Rules of either House Resolution 14 or 15, bearing with the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Other petitions will follow, and have been sent from our California office.

Your attention is solicited.

Sincerely,

Dr. JAMES H. TASHJIAN.

Defense Spending Is Not Responsible for Increasing Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is very fond of justifying every irresponsible demand for increased Federal spending by crying it is necessary to keep up our defenses. We all know that defense spending has not been the major cause of our huge budget and our ever increasing debt. A larger percentage of the increase has been in nondefense spending which could be cut without jeopardizing our national security one iota.

The following news story from the Washington World of August 26 points to a study which shows how small a part of the increase in Federal spending has been caused by the need for defense expenditures:

DEFENSE COSTS UP SLIGHTLY AS NONMILITARY SPENDING SOARS, SURVEY DISCLOSES

National defense expenditures have risen only 6 percent in the last decade, while civilian benefits and services of the Federal Government have more than tripled, according to Director W. Glenn Campbell of Stanford University's Hoover Institution.

This sharp rise in nonmilitary spending must be curbed to balance the Federal budget, check inflation, and ease the balance-of-payments crisis, Campbell declares in the concluding chapter of a just-published, 1,000-page volume: "National Security: Political, Military and Economic Strategies in the Decade Ahead" (1034 pp., $10, Praeger).

FORTY AUTHORS

Forty authors contributed to the study, which was sponsored by the Center for Strategic Studies at Georgetown University, headed by Adm. Arleigh Burke, USN., (retired), former Chief of Naval Operations.

"The first and foremost priority for national security rests not on money, but rather on the brains of our top officials—their adequate time for study, for deliberation, and for decision," Campbell writes.

"The scope, knowledge, and insight needed to judge the requirements of national security in the nuclear age are stupendous and overwhelming. * * *

"Part of the problem is that those who make decisions on which hangs the existence of this Nation are placed under constant domestic political pressures, not just in awarding weapons contracts, but in giving precedence to nondefense spending."

Just as the notion that stepped-up Federal spending results mainly from defense needs is a myth, so too, the idea that private affluance has strarved public services "has no basis in fact," Campbell asserts.

Between fiscal years 1953 and 1963, Federal spending rose 52 percent, about as much proportionately as the gross national product—60 percent, disposable personal income—60 percent—and personal consumption—62 percent.

CIVILIAN COSTS SPIRAL

But more than three-fourths of the $40 billion increase in Federal expenditures during this period was allocated to civilian purposes—and only 7 percent to defense.

State and local governments increased spending from their own sources from $28.3 to $64.7 billion during the same decade.

This record makes it difficult to argue that Federal spending had to multiply because State and local outlays lagged, Campbell contends.

Similarly, charges of "conspicuous consumption" leveled against the American public by Kenneth Galbraith and other critics are "completely unfounded." During the 1951–61 decade, personal expenditures for new cars rose 50 percent, for clothes 35 percent, for household operation 54 percent, for housing 89 percent, for recreation 76 percent.

The sharpest gain was for private education, 162 percent, but even this failed to match the growth of nondefense benefits and services financed through the Federal Government, which rose 214 percent.

MORE PUBLIC WORKERS

Excluding the armed services, the number of public employees has grown at an even faster rate in the last 10 years than in the heyday of the New Deal in the 1930's, Campbell notes. "The true beneficiaries of the shift in financing of public services to the National Government are * * * public officials."

Turning to Washington for help is not essential for meeting national needs in education and health, he adds. During the decade of the 1950's, the share of national income devoted to schools and colleges rose almost 50 percent—from 4.1 to over 6 percent of national income.

"About three-fourths of the total health expenditures in America come from private sources. Currently well over $25 billion—or about 5 percent of our gross national product—is spent on health * * *. This share is well above the 4 to 4.5 percent of gross national product spent on health in Great Britain, a country with governmental provision of health care for all.

"Well over half our aged population now has some form of health insurance—more than double the percentage of a decade ago."

An Address by Howard K. Smith on the Wastage of Talent and Ability of Individual Americans, Little Rock, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, every year the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce makes awards to 10 outstanding young men of the Nation.

A few months ago these awards were presented for the year 1962 in ceremonies at Little Rock, Ark. One of the major addresses during the ceremonies was delivered by the distinguished radio and television commentator, Howard K. Smith.

In his address, Mr. Smith was particularly concerned with the wastage of talent and ability of individual Americans and he called upon the people of our country to give far greater support to education than we are now doing.

Although Mr. Smith's address was delivered earlier in the year, I believe that the actions of the House of Representatives on education legislation in the last few weeks are evidence of the response we in Congress are endeavoring to make to the kind of challenge which he so

cogently set forth in his address at Little Rock.

The House of Representatives has already passed bills to help build more medical and dental schools, to modernize the vocational education program, and to provide assistance for the construction of college and university classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

I hope very much that the Senate of the United States will soon act on these three bills. The Nation needs them if we are to help stop the wastage of talent and ability of which Mr. Smith spoke.

The text of Mr. Smith's address, delivered in Little Rock, Ark., in January 1963 follows:

ADDRESS BY HOWARD K. SMITH

I have watched your selections of the 10 outstanding young Americans over the years. And, as Mr. Blankenship said, I was a judge 2 years ago. I have developed an extremely great admiration for the institution that you have thus created and I would like to spend the balance of my time this afternoon explaining why.

Among our many virtues and faults, perhaps our most distinctive American fault is wastfulness.

No people wastes food as we do. We waste our land, because we have so much of it, and unless legislation is passed soon we shall be wasting the beauty and physical freedom that our great country possesses. And that few others in the world do possess. We waste our mineral resources, now more than other countries do.

But our greatest wastage, and one we must stop wasting very soon if we are to escape dire consequences, is our wastage of talent and ability of individual Americans.

Our national economy is at this moment wasting 4 million capable hands and brains in an insufferably high unemployment rate. Fifteen to 20 percent of our industrial plant capacity is idle and being wasted. This constitutes, the experts say, a waste of and a failure to produce, $40 billion of wealth which we deserve a year—a tremendous increment in wealth that could be used for any number of good things. To raise the levels of the one-sixth of Americans who are inadequately provided for, in our country or could be used to help close the vast and very dangerous gap between the high standards of life of the wealthy Western nations and the extremely low standards of two-thirds of humanity—the poor, emerging, newly created nations.

In our schools, last year 200,000 students in the top one-third of their classes in high school—nearly a quarter of a million of our most talented and able young Americans—did not go on to college due to lack of means of paying for a college education.

HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Please forgive me one more set of statistics, but the point is so important I'm anxious to emphasize it. In the next 10 years, 26 million new young workers will be added to the national workforce. One-third of them will not have a high school education, so high is the number of dropouts from high school before students complete high school.

In these unusual times, no nation can go on wasting its human assets in that way and hope to remain in the long run among the great powers of the earth. It is popular in our times and indeed it is relevant also to compare what we do with the Russians. They are doing, I believe, most things far less successfully than we are doing them. But they are in one respect keeping their eye on priority number one: They are making sure that every student is stretched to his utmost by education and they are making sure that everyone who can benefit by further training or by a college education is getting one because they feel they dare not waste those people. We should not be lulled by the fact that the Russians last year had a very bad year. Their agriculture is lagging. We got the better of them in the Cuban crisis. They are having a bitter fight inside their ideological bloc. But we must not take 1 year's failure too seriously. They tend to think in long-range terms, and there are few better long-range indexes to watch—to see how you are going to do in the long run—than the number of graduates from your colleges.

And, in respect to one important field, technology, they are now graduating—they weren't doing this 10 years ago—far more engineers and technicians than we are. And in numbers the gap between us is increasing year by year and if we don't watch out in years to come they will be graduating more of other kinds of needed professions and technologies.

We also waste our public men. The politician in America is ridiculed, and sometimes justly so. But it is my belief that a good politician is one of the most valuable assets that a nation can have. In my peculiar scale of values, the teacher comes up at the top.

THE VALUE OF A TEACHER

The most valuable single individual in all our society to me is a teacher able to inspire students with a fire of curiousity to learn, to do, and to achieve. But just after that comes the good politician. And, I'm afraid after that comes the lawyer, the doctor, the businessman, the engineer, the journalistic, etc.

We do not have so many good politicians that we can afford to waste those that we have. I would ask you to consider the case of Richard Nixon who I was unjustly accused of having been unfair to recently. Something for which there was really no basis. And those who saw the program know there was no basis for it.

Richard Nixon visibly grew with his increasing responsibilities over the years and I was able to watch him. He served in the House of Representatives. He served in the Senate. Then he served 8 years very near to the summit of power as Vice President of the United States. Our public investment in his experience was tremendous. But then he was defeated in an election and is lost to public life. He is condemned to become a very wealthy private lawyer. But frankly wealthy lawyers come pretty far down the list of what a nation needs in our affluent society; first class public servants are very near the top of what we need. Or consider the case of Adlai Stevenson. In all American history there was no election campaign to match Mr. Stevenson's campaign for the Presidency in the year 1952. I was able to follow both campaigns, alternating with Eisenhower and Stevenson. It was an educational experience following Mr. Stevenson. It was conducted by a citizen with a fine mind who had studied his times—never thinking he was going to have an opportunity to run for public office, who understood his times—and decided to speak to the people on a level no politician ever matched in a political contest before. As was inevitable with anybody running against George Washington, Stevenson was defeated. Thereafter he was lost to American public life for 8 years. Possibly they were the 8 most useful years of his life when he could have done the most for us. His conduct of our affairs at the U.N. in the past 2 years—which I consider to have been superb—is possibly only a suggestion of the services he might have rendered us. But by our political system we had no use for him.

BRITISH POLITICIANS NOT LOST

But, I would like to compare what happens in our sister nation, Great Britain. When Winston Churchill's party was thrown out of power abruptly in 1945, just after the elections, Winston Churchill was not lost to the nation. He became the leader of the opposition in Parliament with an office and a special salary and a staff given him by the government to perform that service of opposing the government.

When the Labor Party leader, Clement Attlee, was defeated, I think in the year 1951, after 6 years of really terrific experience, when he decided that he no longer at his advanced age could give the time and energy which the job of being a member of the House of Commons required or being leader of the opposition, nonetheless his wisdom and experience were not wasted. Attlee was, as was the custom, elevated to the House of Lords where his value for advice and in debate, for persuasion, for warning, have been an immeasurable asset to the British legislative process.

I cite Churchill and Attlee only as the most conspicuous illustrative cases. The British and many other nations simply will not waste a good man who had had good experience, in whom they have invested a great deal. The British system simply recognizes the high value of a good public man and will not allow them to be wasted.

In the rest of public life, beyond and outside of politics, the British have devised a system of very high rewards for achievement. Several times a year, the queen or the monarch—whomever the monarch is—issues what is called the Honors List.

All men and women who by their very great exertions, and great ability have made a contribution to the nation are honored, by a title or a medal that carries with it the right to print the initials of the honor after one's name for the rest of a man's or woman's life. Industrialists, physicians, engineers, artists, actors, even jockeys have received this recognition for unusual service.

Now it may sound trivial. But, I do not believe it is. The community punishes people who do it wrong. Why should it not then reward people who perform it outstanding service? We in our country have no way of doing that. When a Hemingway or a Faulkner or a Steinbeck achieves the greatest heights in their art, they have to go to Sweden to get the reward for it. America doesn't really have one for them. We have simply not developed that high regard for the various forms of public service that exist. Our economy is extremely generous in material terms. If you can produce something saleable there is no nation in the world which offers such high rewards as we do. But aside from that we do not encourage service and talent and ability. This I think is of greater importance than it appears on the surface. We have come into a time when excellence is actually a weapon. We have not only been thrown into a time of confusion when the earth has shrunk in a few generations to a mere fraction of its former size, when all men have become next door neighbors, and need to understand one another and need to understand much more difficult problems, when technology saps away our environment and changes it even while we are creating it, when population is rising at an almost frightening rate of speed. We have not only been buried into a confusing time; we have been called upon, suddenly and without warning or preparation, to be the leader of that time.

FREE CIVILIZATION

The special form of rational tolerant manners, of respect for the individual mind and spirit above all other earthly values—that form that has been called Western civilization, which first became a factor in life of man when the little, insignificant Athenians won the Battle of Marathon and thereby made that form of civilization important, 2,500 years ago—that form of civilization has passed in the course of two and a half mil-

lenia from one steward to another. It has passed from Greece to Rome, to Renaissance Italy, and to France, to England. Now suddenly it has been handed to us to lead, much against our national consensus and wish. That special form of civilization, free, tolerant Western civilization, seems normal to us whose viewpoint as with most human beings is that of the very brief span of a human lifetime. But that civilization is not normal to life. Free civilization has existed for only a small fraction of the time that man has existed. And it has, at all times, even today, been a minority civilization, enjoyed so far only by a fraction of the people alive. Now, it faces a very grave test from a determined opponent. The foreign opponent is equipped with a compact ideology or philosophy of conquest. A capacity for concentrating his effort against us at all times. Which we and the free, tolerant, rather loose jointed, pluralistic nation cannot do against him except in time of war. The contest we are engaged in with that opponent appears to be mainly a trial of power or threats of power. Sometimes it seems to be an economic struggle. Sometimes it's called a contest of ideas. But I am going to suggest to you that those are the superficial marks of the contest. I think that basically the winner is going to be the side with the greater number of better equipped human beings with superior trained intelligence and with the strength of morale from an integrated understanding of the times and of oneself. That side is the one that is automatically going to have the better weapons and the better strategy in every case.

Now, let me carry this deviation from the norm of views on the cold war a little further. I do not believe there is going to be a world war III with nuclear weapons. I believe that the monster weapons have brought with them their own checks against their use. I disagree thoroughly with the novel, "Fail Safe," for example. I agree completely with General Eisenhower who said in an interview on one of the minor networks some time ago that accidental nuclear war is most unlikely; you can almost rule it out of consideration.

I think that "Fail Safe", though cleverly contrived and fascinating to read, is totally wrong.

NOT CLOSE TO WAR

You hear almost every commentator speak of how very close to war with Russia we were last fall over Cuba. I do not believe we were at any moment close to war with Russia. I don't believe war was ever slightly probable with Russia over Cuba. In respect to conventional war, the Russians would have had to break our blockade. What that means is, they would have had to go to war with us at sea, where we are much stronger than they are, and deep inside our Western sea defenses.

For them it would be completely the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. In respect to nuclear war, the Russians would have had to be willing to offer up Moscow, and Leningrad and Kiev and 40 or 50 other cities and hundreds of millions of their people—for Cuba. I don't believe it is even realistic that they would take that into consideration.

I think that just as we were unwilling to go into Hungary when there was trouble in Hungary because deep down inside we said that is probably part of their basic defenses. They might fight over that. We did not move in Hungary. It was sad, but was the consideration that dominated our minds. And I believe in the same way, they were not going to dare a war over Cuba which was part of our basic defenses.

For my own part, I was terribly worried about Cuba before the President declared the blockade. But after he declared the blockade, I felt at all times perfectly confident and at ease with the situation. What I think the cold war is really patterned on is a vast global chess game. In it each side is striving to outmaneuver or outflank or outreach the other—or score some scientific breakthrough the opponent cannot rapidly match—then present that opponent with a situation in which he is helpless and dares not resist.

He must surrender or be destroyed unilaterally, so he will surrender. That I think—this maneuvering—is the nature of the cold war that we have reached now. In a single phrase, I expect the winner will be the side that can outthink the other. It will be the side with the people who have studied history and very thoroughly and well and deeply and have learned from it, who can best grasp the problems of the times, know the limitations of the possible solutions and would best understand all the possible solutions to problems that we face. For example, the side with the best students of language, who have really studied and who have made the language part of their personality and their spirit, for if you can express something well, and that is language, you can understand it better and if you can express something extremely well, you can persuade others to act.

It is a fact that Pericles in ancient Athens had no real power except the power of persuasion, the use of words and that proved to be enough. That's what he used to create one of the greatest ages of mankind.

As Churchill, himself, once said about World War II, "The British lion was already there. All I have was the privilege of being the roar for a short while." As Ed Murrow said about the same time in English and modern history, everything was already mobilized before Churchill came to power; all he did was mobilize the English language and that's what it took. Those things, I think, are extremely important.

OUTTHINK THE OPPONENTS

We need scientists and technicians so skilled and trained that they can outthink the opponents, foresee breakthroughs and make the breakthroughs first. We need better physicians and much better managers and much better engineers. Altogether, we need a people in each of whom proper training and motivation have brought out the utmost in achievement that they are capable of. And that is what I think we are wasting today.

The point that I fear I am belaboring is that we can no longer be wasteful of our human resources. We cannot let potentially skillful and capable brains and hands drop out of school for any reason—for lack of money or the wrong motivation. We cannot let them go idle because the economy is billions. We have got to motivate our whole society to the goal of excellence in every field of attainment.

I feel so strongly about this that I probably support the President's plan for Federal aid to education much more than he does. I believe that by means of legislation, monetary aid, by national standards for both teaching and learning, we should try to build a floor for education beneath which no American will be allowed to fall in acquiring the education that is most suited to whatever natural gifts he has. Then another and supplementary way to meet this problem is, up at the top, to reward excellence in some conspicuous way. And that, by this long indirect, incircuitous route, brings me back to what you are doing here this weekend.

Two years ago, when I was a judge in this selection, I happened to receive the dossiers of the young men from whom 10 were to be selected at a peculiarly discouraging moment in world affairs. I forget exactly what it it was. But I just felt we were not going in the right direction fast enough.

As I studied those dossiers and saw what amazingly high stature our best young men achieved, how vigorous, brilliant, dedicated and effective they were, my spirits were revived. You have by this competition set a kind of national standard for excellence.

You have created a kind of premature and small and highly select House of Peers for the United States, something for vigorous young men to aim at. I would like to conclude by congratulating the 10 men who have received this justly honored award.

I would like to congratulate the many more who barely missed being selected simply because only 10 can be selected.

I hope that in future years we will find other ways of honoring the thousand or the ten thousand rather than the 10 who might by proper education, motivation belong in the same class of ability and achievement. I congratulate the Junior Chamber of Commerce on creating and maintaining this institution. And I thank you for all your very kind attention.

Union Curb a Kefauver Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, many praises have been given the late Senator from Tennessee, Estes Kefauver. High among these was recognition of his personal valor. He challenged the mighty and the powerful. As further evidence of his courage, the liberal Tennessee Senator is reported to have been planning to launch his Anti-Trust Subcommittee into an investigation of the monopoly powers of labor unions because he had become convinced that they exerted undue control over the American economy. The fact that he would have been willing to incur the wrath of the labor bosses even though he always had received strong backing from the unions and generally could be counted on as one of their major supporters in the Halls of Congress is characteristic of his courageousness.

What a fitting tribute to Estes Kefauver it would be if the Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee were to complete this last important project planned by its late chairman.

Senator Kefauver's close acquaintance, Journalist Charles Bartlett, recently wrote a column pointing out the Tennessean's feeling regarding the need for more curbs on unions. Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 18, 1963]

UNION CURB A KEFAUVER AIM

(By Charles Bartlett)

A major effort by the Senate Anti-Monopoly Subcommittee to curb the impact of labor unions on the economy had been secretly and carefully planned by Senator Estes Kefauver before his death on August 10.

Senator Kefauver's determination to investigate the labor unions as a monopoly force evolved from a dramatic reversal in the thinking of a man whose political life had

been nurtured by labor support and whose advocacy of liberal causes had been constant.

His plans were known only to a small group of close associates, who say that the Senator reluctantly decided to apply the leverage of his subcommittee against the unions because he became convinced they had achieved a disproportionate power that was exerting an adverse effect upon the economy.

He was motivated by a concern for the public and not by a sympathy for business, whose abuses his subcommittee had probed ruthlessly. "It is time," he is quoted as saying, "to give the public a break."

SLATED FOR SEPTEMBER

The investigation was to begin in mid-September but a considerable amount of groundwork had been laid. Senator Kefauver kept all of the papers at home and had spoken of his plans to only one of his employees on Capitol Hill, as far as can be learned. He had not mentioned them to his subcommittee staff, which is prolabor in outlook.

The Senator's chief associate in the endeavor was Luis Kutner, an old friend and Chicago lawyer who was among those responsible for inducing him to embark on the famous crime investigation in 1949.

The two men had talked for a long time of the monopoly problem in labor power and last October, at Senator Kefauver's suggestion, Mr. Kutner published in the University of Pittsburgh Law Review an article that was in fact to be the blueprint of the investigation.

Congress granted labor unions a number of special privileges and immunities to enable them to survive in their early days, the article asserted, but these preferences can no longer be justified at a time when the unions have achieved disproportionate power, wealth, and economic dominance. Mr. Kutner maintained that the Nation's economy is now controlled by the 10 percent of the population who comprise the labor force.

ANTITRUST IMMUNITY

Senator Kefauver's investigation was to be concerned with labor's exemption from Federal antitrust prosecution, granted in the Clayton Act of 1914 and reaffirmed in the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932. Mr. Kutner proposed a partial elimination of this immunity.

He argued that industrywide negotiations should be made illegal and that collective bargaining units should be limited to the size of individual enterprises.

Noting that Walter P. Reuther, United Auto Workers president, had attempted to form a $500 million general strike fund for labor, Mr. Kutner maintained that the union bargaining units should be prohibited from extending financial assistance to each other and required, like management, to avoid any form of collusion.

Mr. Kutner proposed to draw a line between the unions' legitimate interests in the labor market and their opportunities to control the product market with legislation that would forbid direct attempts to control prices, areas of distribution, the amount of goods produced, or the number of producing and distributing firms.

PROPOSED TAX

Mr. Kutner also maintained there was no valid reason why union income from capital, estimated as high as $3 billion, should enjoy the same immunity from income taxes that was originally accorded their regular income from dues. He proposed to tax their investment income and the portion of their dues income that was not related to their function as a bargaining agent.

These would have been the major points at issue in a hearing that is now unlikely to be held. The ranking Democrat on the Antimonopoly Subcommittee is Senator PHILIP A. HART, who comes from the industrial State of Michigan.

Chairman JAMES EASTLAND of the Judiciary Committee is reported anxious to terminate this subsidiary body which has generated so much controversy.

But the fact that Senator Kefauver, a militant liberal with great courage, became persuaded that it was necessary for Congress to move against union power is significant as a portent of a developing viewpoint.

A Case for a National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Case for a National Lottery," written by a veteran racketbuster, Edwyn Silberling, which appears in the September issue of McCall's magazine.

In this article, Mr. Silberling comes out forthright for a national lottery as the only way to deal with organized crime. I recommend this hard hitting article to every member including those who have stubbornly refused to accept the obvious—that the urge to gamble is a normal, instinctive human trait.

The article follows:

THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL LOTTERY

(By Edwyn Silberling)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This plea for establishment of a national lottery comes from an unusual quarter: a veteran professional crime-fighter of noted reputation. We are aware that past lotteries in the United States led to corruption; that many authorities consider the Federal Government's entry into legal gambling not only immoral but an active encouragement of human weakness. Nevertheless, we feel that Mr. Silberling's view deserves to be considered and discussed.)

I've been investigating and prosecuting racketeers for a dozen years. While I served as an assistant district attorney in New York City, I helped break up rackets on the waterfront and an international ring that sold babies on the black market. Later, as a special New York State prosecutor, I found so much corruption among legal officials in Suffolk County, Long Island, that the voters elected a Democratic administration after half a century of unbroken Republican rule. Then, until I resumed my law practice earlier this year, I headed Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's top-priority project, the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department's Criminal Division. While I was in Washington, I worked hand in hand with the French Sûreté, the Italian Sala di Finanza, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and several U.S. agencies, to smash an international narcotics ring that reached from Marseilles to Los Angeles. In New York City alone, we sent more than a score of dope peddlers to prison.

I mention this, first of all, because I have a proposal to make that I know will outrage millions of Americans and, second, to show my credentials for making this suggestion. It's on the basis of my experience with organized crime that I say: Let's establish a national lottery now, before more States follow the lead of New Hampshire and start State lotteries of their own. I'm convinced that, by doing so, we can deal organized crime a crushing blow.

I can hear the angry protests already. Millions of Americans consider gambling immoral, just as millions of Americans consider drinking immoral. They will ask: "What? Put the Government into the gambling business? How can a man who has spent his entire career until now fighting crime advocate such an immoral thing?" My answer is simple. I'm for a national lottery precisely because I hate criminals.

My experience has taught me this: Just as the profits from bootleg liquor financed organized crime back in the days of prohibition, so the profits from illegal gambling are financing it now. Just as the profits from booze corrupted our police and public officials in those days, so the profits from illegal gambling are corrupting them now.

Exactly how much money Americans gamble each year, I do not know. Nobody knows, because the gangsters who run the gambling racket don't issue financial reports. I once made an estimate for the Attorney General of $7 billion. This is the most conservative estimate ever offered. It was based solely on money and records seized in raids by Treasury Department and State police agents—in other words, it was based only on business that had been done by men who got caught. Other estimates have run as high as $50 billion.

In the Justice Department, we figured that, after paying all expenses, including graft, the gamblers make a profit of 10 percent. At the lowest possible estimate, mine, they make $700 million a year; at the higher estimate, they make $5 billion. It's all in cash. And the Internal Revenue Service gets nothing, because racketeers dislike paying taxes.

My critics may say: "Why don't we crack down on the gamblers?" The answer is: We've tried; we've failed. Even the FBI hasn't been able to make more than a dent in the gambling racket. Evidently, you can't stop people from gambling any more than you can stop them from drinking.

So I ask: Why provide a comfortable living for gangsters by letting them profit from gambling? If people are going to gamble, no matter what, shouldn't the Government collect the profits? How much would a national lottery net the Government? E. F. Hutton, founder of the Wall Street brokerage firm that bears his name, says $5 billion. Representative PAUL A. FINO, the New York Republican, who has introduced a bill to establish a national lottery, says $10 billion. Wilbur Clark, who operates the Desert Inn in Las Vegas, says FINO's estimate is just about right.

I frankly don't know. I do know this: However much it brought the Government, it would reduce the revenue of the gangsters engaged in gambling by precisely that much. For one thing, it would surely cripple a form of gambling that invariably leads to corruption of police, yet is as common in some sections as buying a cup of coffee: the numbers game. This racket, after all, is nothing but a private, illegal lottery, in which the odds against a man's picking the right number are 999 to 1. The payoff is only 600 to 1 or less—when the gangsters do pay off, and they don't always. The numbers are played mostly by lower-income groups, and I should think that these patrons in particular would much prefer to buy tickets in a national lottery than play the numbers game: the lottery would give them more favorable chances, and also they wouldn't have to worry about the Government's running off with the winnings.

I've said it's the profits from illegal gambling that finance organized crime. The international narcotics ring I mentioned

earlier is a good example. We picked up the men who converted the raw opium into heroin; the men who wholesaled the heroin in Paris and Rome; the men who brought the stuff into the United States and Canada; the men who distributed it there; and we picked up the "pushers."

And we discovered this: These men always dealt in cash. In a single year, millions changed hands. If a man left New York for Paris to pay for a shipment of heroin, he went with anywhere from $50,000 to $100,000 in cash strapped to his body.

Where can you find that much cash? Only gangsters in the gambling racket have it. We learned long ago in law enforcement that, much as the insurance business creates pools of capital for legitimate enterprises, profits from gambling finance rackets of all kinds. Some gamblers are in the narcotics busines themselves. Others are bankers for dope smugglers.

Illegal gambling also finances the loan-shark business, another widespread evil. It works this way: A hard-pressed wage earner borrows $5 today and pays back $6 next week. That amounts to 20 percent interest a week, 1,040 percent interest a year. If he doesn't pay up, a muscleman will be around to collect, because loan sharks never sue in the courts; they can't, since they're guilty of usury.

Again, the hoodlums who run illegal gambling enterprises and those who run the loan-shark racket frequently are the same people. While I was in the Justice Department, we raided a floating crap game in Reading, Pa. Standing on the fringe of the game were men with fistfuls of cash. If a customer lost all his money but wanted to continue playing, these crooked financiers were only too happy to lend what was needed. If the patron lost that, too, well, they were so sorry, but they had better have it paid back in a week, $6 dollars for every $5—or else.

I feel so strongly about the need to cut down the flood of money that pours into organized crime from illegal gambling that I'm less concerned about the details of legislation that may be needed to make a national lottery legal or precisely how such a lottery is set up. There are a dozen different ways of running a Government lottery. Most of the nations of the Western World have them—England, Ireland, France, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, Greece, Mexico, Denmark—and the Philippines. All operate efficiently; all bring in a great deal of money to the government. I've heard of their being attacked as "a tax on imbeciles" (in Italy) and as "a plague invented by despots to silence the people" (in France). But this was decades and even centuries ago. Meanwhile, I've yet to hear of a breath of scandal touching any of them.

We could, for example, do what Ireland does. The Irish Sweepstakes are run for the benefit of the nation's hospitals. There are three drawings a year, based on the results of the nation's three big horse races of the year. Tickets are $3 each. If you're lucky enough to buy one with the same number as a horse entered in the race, you receive a small prize. If your horse runs first, you collect $140,000; second, $56,000; third, $28,000. Ticket holders of also-rans divide $84,000.

The Irish lottery has poured more than $100 million into the hospitals. In the process, it has become an eagerly anticipated event in many American families, even though there are estimates that 19 out of every 20 sweepstakes tickets sold in this country are counterfeit.

New Hampshire recently voted to establish a State lottery, modeled on the Irish system, which is expected to provide at least $4 million a year for State aid to public schools. The lottery wil be based on races at Rockingham Park. The trouble with this lottery is that it cannot help but draw customers from other States. The result would be that lottery customers from Massachusetts would help build schools for New Hampshire exclusively. I think lottery profits should be broadly distributed for everybody's benefit, and the Federal Government is our only instrument for accomplishing this distribution.

There are those who opose basing a national lottery on horse races, because, they say, a horse race can be fixed. Perhaps they would prefer to adopt the Puerto Rican system. In Puerto Rico, the numbers of all tickets sold are printed on small balls. When drawing time comes, the balls are poured into a big wire cage. Officials of the government's lottery department do the drawing. Describing the system not long ago, the New York Times declared: "Puerto Ricans are confident the drawing are fair."

A man can win $1,250 on a 25 cent ticket. In a recent drawing, a total of $584,985 was paid out in prizes, and the government collected $195,015.

Percival F. Brundage, Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget from 1956 to 1958, likes the system established in Great Britain by Prime Minister Harold Macmillan when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. This is a system under which nobody can lose. Instead of lottery tickets, the government sells bonds. The bonds do not pay interest. However, the government puts 4 percent of the proceeds from the bond sale into a pool, and a drawing is held. Holders of bonds with winning numbers get prizes ranging from $75 to nearly $15,000.

Clearly, if Congress decided to establish a national lottery, it has a wealth of experience to choose from.

Whatever system it decides on, I believe the sale of tickets should be handled by the Post Office. That would be the least expensive and most efficient way; the Post Office could sell the lottery tickets over the stamp counter.

I'm also in favor of taxing lottery earnings. Many nations make them tax-exempt, as does Puerto Rico; but I don't believe a man who makes money without working for it should escape taxes.

I think we should not go to the extreme of New South Wales, where 350 lotteries are held each year. I would recommend only four drawings annually. No one could then accuse the Government of creating an opportunity for compulsive gambling.

I concede that a Federal lottery might possibly increase the total amount of money going into gambling. But I am certain it would greatly decrease the illegal gambling that benefits gangsters. Surely nobody will deny that Americans would much rather gamble legally than illegally.

Besides, I am convinced that once we created an outlet for the gambling urge, the courts would be willing to deal more harshly with illegal gamblers and discourage some—and perhaps most—of them. Right now, in many areas, courts merely fine gamblers more or less lightly whenever they are caught, thus creating, in effect, a system of licensing illegal gambling.

I can still hear the critics. No matter what arguments are offered for a national lottery, no matter what safeguards are suggested, they come back to one objection: that I am attempting to put the Federal Government into an immoral business.

Well, Harvard, Princeton, Dartmouth, and Columbia all helped finance themselves in Colonial times by holding lotteries. Were they immoral? Benjamin Franklin sponsored a lottery to buy a cannon for Philadelphia. Was he immoral? George Washington ran a lottery to finance the building of a road over the Cumberland Mountains. Was the Father of his Country immoral, too? I don't happen to think so.

Dubinsky Lays It on the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, the noted columnist, almost a year ago, published an article which was so outstanding that it created an indelible impression upon me. This column was based upon the testimony before the ad hoc Subcommittee on Investigation of the Garment Industry of the House Committee on Education and Labor given by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

In a period when certain problems confronting the Congress are fraught with tensions, it is refreshing to bring to the attention of the public the statement made by the distinguished American labor leader at a time of calm. In it he reflects a philosophy which cannot honestly be disputed and which President Kennedy himself endorsed at his press conference this week.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, Aug. 28, 1962]

DUBINSKY LAYS IT ON THE LINE—UNION CHIEF'S PREFERENCE FOR MERIT AS BASIS FOR LEADERSHIP IS LAUDED

(By David Lawrence)

Every now and then in the field of public controversy someone has the temerity to utter a piece of simple wisdom and everybody wonders why it hasn't been said before.

An example is the recent outburst of indignation by David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, who was testifying the other day before a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in answer to what he considered were trumped-up charges of racial discrimination inside his union. He said:

"I'll be damned if I will support the idea of the professional Negro, the professional Jew, the professional Italian that a man should be a union officer because of his race, color, or creed. He should be an officer on his merits, ability, character."

This piece of advice might well be given consideration by those high officials here and Members of Congress who sometimes deal with appointments to officer in ways that they believe will obtain them the votes of minority groups.

David Dubinsky is, morever, a liberal in every sense of the word. He is vice chairman of the Liberal Party in New York State and is known as "the patriarch of a dozen liberal causes."

Mr. Dubinsky unhesitatingly points out that the political motive can be pushed too far. He referred to a 14-page statement submitted to the subcommittee by Hebert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Mr. Hill happens also to be a paid staff member of the subcommittee, and in his statement he charged the garment workers union with being guilty of "de facto discrimination" against Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

Mr. Dubinsky called the statement "untruthful and irresponsible," as he cried out:

"There is no discrimintaion in membership, initiation fees, dues, wages. There is no class A membership, no class B membership. Our members eat together meet together, dance together, celebrate together, and fight together * * *

"Eighty percent of our members are women, but we have only one woman vice president. Can we be charged with discriminating against women? No!"

Mr. Dubinsky explained that most of the women members are married and want to be at home with their families, while men are willing to work long hours in union activity. He said that, in the case of Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the reason they have not yet risen to the top is that they are only slowly acquiring the experience needed for the higher positions in the union. Many have become convention delegates and business managers of the local unions. He added in a loud voice:

"Discrimination? Why, I became president of the union not because I am Jewish, but because my fellow man thought I was capable. Show me a colored or a Puerto Rican or Italian who is capable and I'll make him a business agent or a vice president. And I'll spend half of my time giving him a position or a promotion."

The white-haired veteran of many long years at the head of an influential labor union dared to speak out forthrightly because his record has been one of liberalism, but anyone from the conservative side making such statements would have been roundly denounced as an "extremist" or as defying the Supreme Court's decisions and the phrase in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal."

Mr. Dubinsky had the courage to point out that, in business, efficiency does count for a great deal and that this is a lesson the people in public life tend to ignore.

Thus, when Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy died in 1949, President Truman told friends he didn't see why the vacancy should go to a Catholic when he had somebody else in mind who was capable and didn't happen to be of that faith. When President Eisenhower came into office, his political advisers urged him promptly to appoint a Catholic to the High Court. He appointed William J. Brennan, Jr., of New Jersey, long experienced on that State's highest court. But Justice Brennan subsequently voted against what he deemed an unconstitutional action in the so-called school prayer case notwithstanding the fact that some prominent members of the Catholic hierarchy have condemned that decision vigorously.

The politicians have, however, established the fetish that all religions have to be represented on the Supreme Court. Superficially, it's a logical claim. Actually, this viewpoint impugns the integrity of the members of the Highest Court in the land by assuming that, if cases come up which involve their own respective religious beliefs, they will allow their sense of justice in interpreting the Constitution to be brushed aside as they accept instead pleas from members of their faith.

Maybe someday someone will rise and say in Congress or even at the White House that religious and racial discrimination shouldn't be made the football of politics and that private organizations should feel free to select whomever they please for officer positions without finding themselves investigated by congressional committees at the behest of pressure groups.

Fair Pay for Farmhands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this House several months ago defeated the efforts to extend the Mexican farm labor importation program. This action was lauded by responsible citizens, labor and consumer organizations, and by such eminent newspapers as the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Since that time, there has been a concerted move to revive the legislation to extend the program, and just recently the Senate approved a year's extension for admission of Mexican braceros under the provisions of Public Law 78, which initiated the program over 10 years ago.

This morning's Washington Post contained another editorial against the bill, and I would like to include it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 21, 1963]

FAIR PAY FOR FARMHANDS

It is a misfortune that the Senate decided last week to reopen the bracero controversy. It passed a bill extending for 1 year Public Law 78 which, for more than a decade, has authorized and regulated the employment of Mexican farmworkers on American farms. The need for this program, initiated in 1951 when there was an acute farm labor shortage resulting from the Korean war, has long since ended. The House decided recently—and very wisely in our judgment—to let it come to an end when the law expires on December 31, 1963.

There is, however, one felicitous aspect to the Senate action. Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY succeeded in appending to the bill an amendment which neatly exposes the unlovely purposes behind the bracero program. The law provides that Mexican workers may not recruited for hire on American farms until the Secretary of Labor finds that reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for the available jobs at wages, hours, and working conditions comparable to those offered the Mexicans. Senator MCCARTHY's amendment adopted by a 44 to 43 vote, amplifies this by providing that the working conditions should include "workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing, transportation, and work period guarantees."

We think this will dampen the ardor of the bill's proponents. What they really want is cheap farm labor, and this is what the braceros have been able to supply. Their employment at low wages has worsened the already desperate situation of migrant American farm laborers. We think there will be no shortage of domestic workers next year if decent wages and working conditions are provided, and we hope that the House will stick stanchly by its decision to end the wholly needless importation of farmhands from Mexico.

Portrait of Pittsburgh—Natural, Capital Labor Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive-minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing in southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the fourth of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

PORTRAIT OF PITTSBURGH

NATURAL RESOURCES

The natural resources of the Pittsburgh area combined with modern transportation facilities have helped to create one of the greatest industrial centers in the world. Other than water, the primary natural resources in the area is bituminous coal and it is estimated that more than 13 billion tons of coal reserves are still available. Most of the progress in the area has been made possible by its richness in other mineral products besides coal; products such as natural gas, petroleum, clay, shale, limestone, sandstone, sand and gravel.

WATER RESOURCES

In the field of industrial development, an abundant supply of water is essential for business and industry. In many locations the scarcity of water is a serious problem, but the Pittsburgh area—a region with adequate rainfall and three major rivers—is blessed with a good supply of water to meet the needs for continued growth and expansion.

The use of the three rivers, the Allegheny, Monongahela and Ohio Rivers, for water transportation is one of the greatest natural resources in the area. The area is continually improving these facilities for navigational, recreational and control purposes.

COAL AND OIL RESOURCES

Bituminous coal is a major resource in the Pittsburgh area. For many years, coal production declined chiefly because of reduced use by the railroad industry and the increased use of oil and gas in homes, industry, and upon railroads. In recent years, the demand for coal has increased substantially. The increases were generally brought about by the industrial boom of 1953–60, expanded export shipments and substantial increases in the use of coal by electric utilities.

Petroleum and natural gas continue to be major natural resources of the Pittsburgh marketing area. Oil produced in this area averages about 500,000 barrels annually. Some activity continues in the drilling of both gas and oil wells and the importance of this industry in Pennsylvania is not to be minimized. Pennsylvania was the first State on the Great Lakes to lease offshore acreage for oil and gas exploration.

The Pittsburgh area is considered one of the major sources for many other natural resources including cement, stone, and clays. The area also supplies a substantial amount of forestry products.

CAPITAL RESOURCES

The capital resources of Pittsburgh and its surrounding area number into untold billions. The tremendous change which has taken place in the physical makeup of Pittsburgh the last few years is most indicative of the influence of its wealth.

More specifically, the banking and financial resources of the Pittsburgh area make a substantial contribution to the economic growth and development of the area. In the Pittsburgh area alone during the last few years, area banks have spent over $20 million for new offices, vaults, and modern banking equipment. New branches have been established and bank clearings and depositions have increased substantially. In addition to their own growth, the banks and financial institutions have been most influential in promoting the growth of existing industries and civic improvements. They have aided materially in the expansion and economic growth of the western Pennsylvania region through industrial development programs.

LABOR RESOURCES

The labor supply of the Pittsburgh area varies according to industries. There has been no overall shortage in this area for some time, and in fact, statistics indicate that the Pittsburgh area has a moderate labor surplus most of the time.

The Current Attack on REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century and more has passed since the Congress ordered the lights turned on in rural America.

It was in July of 1935, in an Executive order by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, that the Rural Electrification Administration was born. Congress passed the REA Act in 1936.

I doubt if any agency of the Government in Washington has carried on its mission so well as the REA. It indeed has turned on the lights in rural America. Its benefits are felt by all our people, in terms of conveniences and comforts hitherto unknown on our farms and in the contributions REA has made to the efficiency of our agriculture which has blessed our consumers with the best and cheapest food anywhere in the world.

But, I also doubt if any agency has been the center of greater controversy in all these years. REA today is under heavy criticism and attack, from certain quarters.

Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to a speech delivered last Wednesday by the gentleman from Texas, Hon. W. R. (BOB) POAGE, a great champion of REA. Our colleague spoke before the Tarheel Electric Membership Association, at Durham, N.C.

When the gentleman from Texas, BOB POAGE, speaks he leaves no doubt where he stands. He shaped up the issues around REA, clearly and eloquently. I think that each Member of this body, whether he is for REA or against REA, will want to read what the gentleman from Texas, BOB POAGE, had to say. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House, I am publishing this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CURRENT ATTACK ON REA

(Speech of Congressman W. R. POAGE before Tarheel Electric Membership Association at Durham, N.C.)

It is always a pleasure to appear on the same program with my beloved chairman. HAROLD is probably my closest friend in the Congress. I respect his ability and leadership just as you do, but it is a special honor to appear with him in his home State and to talk with him to rural people, for I can say, in all candor, that I know of no Member of Congress who has done so much for the welfare of the farm people of his home State as has Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, Representative of the Fourth District of North Carolina.

He has worked effectively in all phases of agriculture, but, as I see it, he, and he alone, is responsible for the present and the long continued prosperity of the growers of tobacco. No agricultural commodity today enjoys the stability of income which is assured to North Carolina's great crop—and without HAROLD COOLEY I fear you would be in no better position than the producers of oats, chickens, and castor beans.

But I came here to talk about the current attack on REA.

Thirty years ago there was pretty general understanding as to the need for REA and the need for local cooperatives. About 96.2 percent of the rural homes in North Carolina were then without central power service. Power companies insisted that there was no need to supply further rural service and their then spokesman officially stated before a congressional investigating committee in 1937 that: "There are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm needs that are not now served." Of course, the truth was that there were practically no farms served but the power companies felt that there was no profit to be had in serving them and hence they were not interested.

I have never felt, as some of my friends have, that the power companies were under an obligation to serve these farms. They had a right to decline this business which they considered unprofitable, but I have questioned the validity and the morality of their action in later objecting to others servicing this market which they rejected. But there is no question but that just as soon as farmers began to organize cooperatives, the private power companies came to life. They built their lines down many of the roads and highways. They skimmed the cream of the then existing business and they built spite lines to make it impracticable for local groups of farmers to serve given areas, but farmers kept organizing cooperatives. They kept borrowing money from REA, and repaying it with interest, and they kept building lines until today, instead of 96 percent of your North Carolina farms being in darkness, 98.1 percent of them have central station service. The figures, which are very comparable for the Nation, have been almost exactly reversed in the last quarter of a century. But the job is not done.

It is true that some of our power companies have been prematurely celebrating. "The job is finished," they have cried. "Now, let REA and the rural cooperatives get out of business and let them be quick about it. Now the Congress can quite providing REA loan funds. The great day is here. Let there be dancing in the streets." Friends, I am no less pleased than the power companies are with the magnificent work of providing electric service to our rural areas. The REA, its local borrowers, and in many instances their privately owned competitors, have all done a great job, but the job is not yet finished. This is no time for "singing in the streets" and it is no time to stop REA loans. The need for additional capital to provide service to our rural consumers is probably just as pressing today as it was 30 years ago. The difference is that a generation ago we were thinking only in terms of light. Today we are thinking in terms of power. We were building lines to supply an average demand of about 25 kilowatts per consumer. Today that demand is more than 10 times that great.

We all understand that a ½-inch water pipe that could supply a rural home is utterly inadequate to supply a suburban development, but we do not seem to realize that the old single-phase equipment that brought such a revolution in the family parlor is not adequate to provide the power needed for modern pumps, feed mills, and milking machines. We all understand how a well and water tower can supply a village of 2 dozen homes and that a city of 100,000 must provide itself with a terribly expensive reservoir and with large pipes and pumping stations, but all too many of us seem to be unable to understand, or we are reluctant to recognize, that while the early cooperatives could buy their power from the local company and deliver it over inexpensive lines, the modern farmer-owned distributing system must have a large supply of power, expensive standby, complicated substations, and an adequate distributing system.

These current requirements cost money, and lots of money—far more per mile than the old single-phase equipment of the early days. But in many instances there are no more subscribers than there were right after the co-op was organized. The population of most rural areas simply has not been growing and today the average privately owned power company in the United States enjoys a density of more than 30 connections per mile. The average REA-financed cooperative has less than three connections per mile. Obviously, the power companies enjoy a tremendous advantage, and I think right here is where we should understand the fallacy of one of the basic arguments which the power companies make against the cooperatives.

They say that the 2 percent interest which the Government charges on REA loans is "a subsidy"; that it is unfair to the people of America; and that it should be abolished. Indeed, just before I left Washington I had a member of our committee from California call me telling me that he, as well as a number of other members, had introduced legislation to raise this interest rate, and that he wanted us to give him a hearing on his bill. Of course, we are going to give him a hearing, and of course he is going to show that the Government is today paying more than 2 percent for the money which it borrows, but I don't think he is going to call attention to the fact that when REA was first established the Government was paying a good deal less for the money it borrowed than it was collecting from the cooperatives. I don't think he is going to want to point out that today the Government is advancing hundreds of millions of dollars to foreign countries at 2 percent, and even less. Actually, we are even now negotiating to finance a billion dollar steel mill in India at three-fourths of 1 percent interest. I don't think he is going to want to talk about the subsidies that we are paying on transportation, to airlines, to bargelines, and even to railroads and truck-lines in the form of land grants and highway improvements. And, above all, I don't believe that my colleague from California, or any of the others who would destroy REA, is going to emphasize the fact that the REA law specifically provides for loans to private power companies who will assume the same obligations to provide service in rural areas on the same terms that it offers to farmer-owned cooperatives.

It is very easy for city people to honestly assume that they are having to carry a part of the load of providing electricity in rural areas, and I think that is probably true. But they would certainly not help their situation any by turning this service over to the power companies. Power companies cannot make a profit on it either unless they can get some kind of especially cheap power or low interest. And interesting enough, most of them don't want cheap interest on the terms the cooperatives are getting it. What the power companies can do, and what they really want to do, is to throw these rural areas in with their other service areas and then establish a rate over the entire area. Since utilities are always allowed to charge enough to make a reasonable return, that will give the companies a profit on a larger volume of business. So, if they can take over the rural service, they will of course try first to raise the local rates to

rural customers, and undoubtedly they will succeed to some extent. To the extent they do not succeed, they will simply raise rates in general, making the people in the cities and towns more directly than ever subsidize the rural areas.

No, the co-op members may not get an immediate doubling of their rates if the power companies take over, but electric consumers are going to pay the full bill plus a very substantial profit which they are not now paying to the cooperatives, and service is going to suffer as it always does when it falls in the hands of a monopoly.

I know that power companies say that the distribution of power is a natural monopoly and that there is no competition within given areas, but at the present there is the overall recognition that if the power companies don't provide reasonable service at reasonable rates in rural areas, there is somebody else who could provide it. To me that is worth a great deal—more than any regulation which any Commission can pass.

I went to the Legislature of Texas a good many years ago. I was sold on the idea that we ought to have a utility commission, but I hadn't been around Austin 6 months until I began to realize that utility commissions are always—or at least almost always—exactly what the name says they are—"utility" commissions—controlled by and functioning for the benefit of the utilities. For 35 years I have given thanks that Texas does not have such a commission because I believe we get better service when we have different agencies offering service. It is for this reason that I have often stated at REA meetings that while I certainly would not want the power companies to put the cooperatives out of business, neither do I want the co-ops to put the power companies out of business. I think that both groups give better service because of the existence of the other.

No, my friends, you cannot continue to operate a successful electric cooperative and serve two customers per mile of line if you have to pay 4 percent on your money. Nearly one-third of the cost of the average electric cooperative is accounted for by interest. Power costs about one-third, and labor accounts for about one-third. I don't think that you can increase your costs by one-sixth and still provide service at a competitive price. The only way in which the rural cooperatives of this State could stay in business under such circumstances would be for them to enjoy some of the cream. Are those who want to raise co-op interest rates willing to give them an opportunity to compete with the power companies on equal terms for the profitable city business? Of course not. Indeed, they are doing their very best to prevent them from keeping any profitable territory they may now have. I want to make it plain that I am not asking that the farmer-owned cooperatives should go into the cities and compete with the power companies, but I am suggesting that we should not create a situation which will push them into this field.

Actually, some of these cooperatives are today serving some very profitable business on the outskirts of all of our growing cities. The co-ops went there when this was strictly rural area. They went there when nobody else wanted to serve the area. They built their lines and then the people built their homes. As our cities expand and incorporate in these areas which are served by rural cooperatives, we find the laws and the court decisions of many States taking these territories away from the cooperatives and deliberately giving them to the private power companies.

I am, of course, now speaking of what we know in Texas as the Gilmore case. In this case our supreme court held that even though the Upshur County Electric Cooperative had developed a given rural area, that when that area was annexed by the city of Gilmore, the private power company holding a franchise in that city became the only agency which could legally give service in that area, and although we have repeatedly received adequate preelection pledges the legislature of our State has continued to refuse to correct this injustice.

As a Congressman, I don't want to try to pass judgment upon what the legislature should do, but I have no hesitancy in saying what this policy is bound to do to our rural cooperatives. Within 20 years it must deprive them of a large part of their essential revenue, and during that time it must aggravate their need for lower interest and cheaper power. How can any business succeed if, as fast as it builds up profitable customers, those customers are taken from it and turned over to its competitor? But that is exactly what is happening in Texas and a number of other States today, and, I repeat, our rural electric cooperatives cannot continue to live under such a system. They will be forced into a struggle to serve cities and towns. I think our great power companies would be well advised to let these cooperatives continue to serve all rural areas and to serve all areas which have been rural and leave the big cities to the private companies.

But I would not want you to feel that the only threat to the existence of the REA lies in the State capital. There is a continuing threat in Washington. Twenty-five years ago an overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress were expressing their support of REA, and voting just like they talked. A majority still gives lip service to REA, but are likely to say: "I am for REA—But." Some, as the Member I referred to awhile ago, seek to increase the interest rate the co-ops must pay. Some seek to prohibit the construction of generation and transmission plants. They say that REA was created simply to finance the distribution of power to rural people—that the private power companies will build all of the generation plants that are needed. And I am sure they will—that is, all they think they need. They are certainly not going to build any they don't think are helpful to their own systems.

And right here seems to be to be probably the strongest argument in behalf of REA-financed generation plants. The co-ops must have increasing sources of power, just as the private power companies must, and private distribution companies have been building generation plants at a remarkable rate. If they need these new generation plants, if they need these new transmission lines—and I am sure they do—why don't the rural co-ops need the same kind of new facilities? They are growing too.

The companies say they must have their own sources of power in order to protect their customers and each company tries to build to meet its now need. No first-class power company will rely on a neighboring power company. They distrust each other. Why should the cooperatives be forced to trust them? If it is essential to them to own their own sources of power, why isn't it essential to co-ops to do likewise? Of course, it is obvious that not every REA-financed cooperative is going to build its own plant. There are many cases where it is just not feasible, but the knowledge on the part of the private supplier that the co-op could get a G. & T. loan if he needed it seems to me to be the most valuable barganing lever available to the rural system—and actually it is about the only lever which most of them have.

The authority to make such loans is already in the basic REA Act, and it should remain there. The Congress properly looks to the discretion of the REA Administrator in his use of this bargaining tool, and yet there are many Members of Congress who, in all good faith, would like to so limit the authority of the Administrator to make G. & T. loans that this bargaining power would be completely destroyed. Not only are there bills pending to destroy this lending power, or to make it ineffective, but the Appropriations Committee actually wrote instructions into the report on its recent appropriation bill which in effect required the Administrator to turn over the financial statements of his borrowers to the private companies. I don't believe that the Appropriations Committee actually realizes what they are doing—and I don't believe that that committee had any moral or parliamentary right to, in effect, write new legislation in its appriation bill. I protested this action on the floor but to no avail.

The REA is nothing but a banking institution. The cooperatives are its customers. I don't want my banker to turn my financial statement over to my competitor, and I don't believe any honest banker would do so. I don't believe that it is proper or moral for the REA Administrator to call in the co-op's competitors, tell them what the co-op proposes to do, and ask them if they can't take this information and come up with a more attractive plan—and yet on page 8 of the report of the House Appropriations Committee on June 3, 1963, we find the following wording: "Before public funds are loaned for power, generation, or transmission, a majority of the committee believes the REA Administrator, in connection with any such loan, should make a survey, determine wherein the existing contract for power or the proposed contract is unreasonable, advise the supplier wherein such contract is unreasonable, and get such contract modified to make it reasonable. Loans should be made only when reasonable contracts cannot be obtained." And a little further down they state that such loans "should not be made where local private business can meet the need or where it is determined that the local borrower will provide unnecessary competition."

To me this is a clear requirement that the power companies shall be told what the co-op proposes and shall then be given an opportunity to see if they could not beat the co-op's bid. I think that of course there should be a clearly established need for the service, but the power companies should be required to ignore that need at their own peril.

In other words, it seems to me that the private power company which deliberately refuses to provide adequate service or reasonable rates should not be allowed to continue this policy indefinitely and then when the co-op makes arrangements to finance another source of power to be permitted to come in, make a "death-bed confession" and plead that it is now ready to give that which it would not give until seriously and specifically threatened with a competitive source of power. Obviously, if we are to adopt this policy, and that is exactly what the Appropriations Committee asks us to do, there is going to be no pressure whatever on the private power companies to make any concessions until after the cooperative has gone to the REA seeking a G. & T. loan. This will force every cooperative which needs a power source to apply for a G. & T. loan.

I therefore repeat, private power companies should be required to ignore legitimate needs of the co-ops at their peril. Of course, if a private power company has offered to meet the needs of the co-op, before the co-op takes any steps to get power from another source, I should think that the Administrator should, and must, take that into consideration, and if he found that such an outstanding offer was bona fide and within the power of the company to perform, then he would not approve the loan application.

My quarrel with the Appropriations Committee is not that they want to limit loans to those instances where a reasonable supply

of power at reasonable prices cannot be obtained from private sources, but it is in regard to the time at which they want to allow the company to make such an offer. Having refused to provide needed power at proper prices. I do not believe that the power companies should be privileged to purge themselves of their default by coming in after a cooperative has made other arrangements.

Again, I would point out that I do not contend that any power company, in the absence of a special contract, is under obligation to supply wholesale power to a cooperative, but if it wants this cooperative business it should not be allowed to force the cooperative to expose its needs and its possible opportunities of supplying those needs. The company should be required, if it wants the business, to make an attractive offer before, not after, the cooperative applies for a G. & T. loan.

Of course, the real problem in Congress is to get the Members of Congress to understand the situation. Most of the Members of Congress are from large cities and the percentage from large cities is rapidly increasing. These Members naturally feel that they have no interest in REA. It is the responsibility of associations such as yours to educate these Members. Most of them are fair if they can but understand the facts. We should not, however, expect them to have a very clear understanding when so many Representatives from strictly rural areas do not bother to learn the facts except from power company lobbyists.

Of course, I know that you cannot match the power companies in the funds they expend in lobbying but you can see your Congressman. Each local cooperative can make it a definite project to present your problems to your own Congressman. I know that there is a natural disposition to ask: "How can I influence the Congressman in somebody else's district?" I would suggest that except for the big city Congressmen that you not try to influence the Congressman in somebody else's district. Every one of you should be in a position to talk to your own Congressman, but there is mighty little reason why ROY TAYLOR should be concerned with what the people of Chatham County want, or why HERBERT BONNER should be especially interested in the views of the folks of Cherokee County.

When it comes to the big cities, I realize that we must depend more upon a general basic understanding of the people. Probably it is here that organizations like National Rural Electric Cooperative Association can do its best work, and it is here that you are going to find attitudes vitally influenced by party affiliation, but it is also here in the big cities that you are going to obtain or lose the majority in Congress which REA must have if it is to continue to serve our rural people as it has served them in the past.

Euro-Dollar Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the increasing foreign exchange importance of the Euro-dollar market has been of considerable interest to the United States. Although it is impossible to arrive at a precise estimate of the market's size, the most reliable figure has been published by the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. Oscar Altman of the Fund's research department places the market's total at approximately $5 billion, of which about 85 percent is in U.S. dollars. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit for the RECORD a study of the Euro-dollar market which appeared in a recent issue of the Economist:

ALL ABOUT EURO-DOLLARS

This month's dollar loan raised in London by the Belgian government, which has proved so popular that the $20 million on offer might have been subscribed 10 times over, marks a yet further extension of that increasingly important, but to many people still deeply mystifying, Euro-dollar market. The market is no longer new; it is even beginning to find its way into the textbooks; it was surveyed in these columns just a year ago; but it is constantly evolving and is now attracting increasing attention, and a good measure of concern, from monetary authorities. For them this truly international market is inconveniently outside the range of controls and regulations on financing, in the usual way, in domestic currencies—controls and regulations that have themselves played an important though not an exclusive part in bringing about the market in Euro-dollars, which is paralleled by similar markets in Euro-sterling, Euro-Swiss (francs), indeed Euro-every significant currency in world trade.

The prefix Euro simply describes deposits or loans made in a foreign center in the particular currency involved—such as dollar deposits owned by a London bank and relent to a French bank, or sterling deposits owned by a French bank and re-lent to a German importer, or to a faceless international speculator. Ordinary exchange business, by contrast, comprises simply a straight purchase or sale of foreign currencies, for spot or forward delivery. The distinctive aspect of the Euro-currency markets is that they are markets in lending and borrowing foreign currency balances, which must in the nature of things have originated in another center. Thus the whole market is based on a great pyramiding operation, and for this reason there can be no very meaningful estimate of its size. The closest estimate has been made by Mr. Oscar Altman, who in his strategic place in the research department of the International Monetary Fund has collected and published more information on foreign currency markets than all other analysts put together.

Mr. Altman puts the total in mid-1962 at $4 to $5 billion,[1] allowing for duplications between Canadian and European markets (but presumably not for pyramiding within Europe). U.S. dollars consisted of about 85 percent of the funds in European markets, for a rather lower percentage in Paris and other continental markets where dealings in Euro-sterling are significant, but for a much higher percentage in the Canadian markets. At least two-thirds of the funds in European markets are estimated to have emanated from central banks and monetary authorities, either directly by placings of their own or by channeling dollars and other currencies to commercial banks that are provided with an exchange back (a "swap") into their own currency, so that the central bank remains the beneficial owner of the foreign exchange.

Why do people thus lend and borrow dollars outside the United States, sterling outside Britain? This is no doubt what puzzles the layman most. His instinct is most parts correct: transactions of this genre are inherently anomalous, and if the credit markets of the world were perfectly free, perfectly competitive, and equally efficient, there is no doubt that the great bulk, though still not all, of this dealing in foreign currency deposits would disappear. But because credit markets are not so free as that, or ever likely to be, most people—if not yet Hambros Bank—believe that Euro-dollars and the rest of these expatriated currencies are here to stay and be dealt in.

The frictions and imperfections in credit markets that lie behind the Euro-currencies fall into two broad groups: those imposed by monetary authorities, and those springing from the market itself. Official restrictions are themselves of two kinds. Exchange controls on lending to nonresidents, such as those that are strictly enforced in London, are a sure stimulant to the creation of a market abroad: for, while a London bank is not allowed to lend sterling on straight overdraft to a German, there is nothing to stop a Paris bank using its existing sterling balance in this way—simply by asking the London bank that holds the balance to transfer it to the German's account. At times when people nonresident in Britain particularly want to borrow sterling—and this is one way of speculating against it—they will be willing to pay more than current overnight money rates in the London market (which is closed to them as borrowers); and, as the Paris bank will earn these higher rates, it will also be able to offer higher rates on deposits of nonresidents' (i.e., lendable) sterling. Thus, on both sides, the Euro-sterling market will quote higher rates than in London, and the differential in these rates is a fair enough guide to the current state of speculative feeling about sterling. At present, as can be seen in the enlarged arbitrage tables on page 850, the differential is very small.

Exchange control restriction is at the core of the Euro-sterling market in overseas centers. No such restriction is applied by the United States on activities by its banks, though fear of future restriction was significant in developing the Euro-dollar market for one special set of dollar holders—Communist countries that preferred to hold balances in Europe. Otherwise, the significant official restrictions in America are those in the Federal Reserve Board's Regulation Q, which sets maximum rates that American banks are allowed to pay on deposits. These rates have long been below the rates that international traders are willing to pay for dollar deposits. But this restriction is far from being the only basis of the Euro-dollar market—as the loan to Belgium proves: there are no restrictions on rates on 3-year loans in New York.

In this particular case, it is true, the interest rate on the London loan was a shade above a parallel loan marketed by Morgans in New York, at 4⅞ percent against 5 percent. But, in the great bulk of short-term credit operations, London banks work on lower spreads between rates than American banks, and this in itself helps them to cut into the dollar lending business.

London banks, too, maintain uncompetitive deposit rates, but these are confined to the clearing banks. The merchant banks and others compete for funds in the open market. So the market for Euro-sterling is founded largely on Britain's exchange control, while the market in Euro-dollars is founded mainly in the greater competitiveness and activity of Europe's banking institutions. But foreign currency markets are also based on sheer convenience, as is shown by the existence of markets in currencies on which there are no restrictions at all.

Such is the rationale of the foreign currency markets; what are their effects? The most prominent effect has been to restore a truly international money market, previously disrupted by official restrictions which these "Euro" dealings calculatedly bypass. The degree of integration of the inter-

---

[1] See staff papers of International Monetary Fund, March 1963.

national money market is in some ways remarkable. Thus one effect of the increased Communist vote in the recent Italian elections was a tightening of credit all over Europe and a weakening of spot sterling—because worried Italians withdrew money from their banks, which in turn took international funds off the Euro-dollar market, which in turn temporarily covered the gap by "swaps" out of sterling into dollars.

Second, and most encouragingly, the development of the Euro-dollar market in particular has greatly increased competition in the lending of funds in Europe and has been a jolt to local restrictive arrangements, whether among German banks in their lending rates or among London clearing banks in their cozy deposit rates. Large firms have found that they may be able to borrow foreign currencies more cheaply from foreign banks than from their own banks, even after providing for the cost of forward exchange cover; and this has notably increased their bargaining power. Third, in countries such as Germany and Italy the market has enabled central banks to act on domestic liquidity through what in these restricted bond markets are among the most effective forms of open market operations with their commercial banks.

But, equally, all monetary authorities have at one time or another been worried about the implications of this evolving market in loosening their official grip, by providing a huge source of funds that may flow in response to quite small interest differentials. Thus the existence of the market sets definite limits to independent and uncoordinated changes in national monetary policy—as indeed does any effective loosening of official restrictions on the general flow of funds. In London, the authorities are content to see the market enlarge the opportunities for London's enterprising banking institutions, lacking sufficient resources of their own, to play a larger part in international lending. In the United States, official attitudes have teetered about. The first instinctive attitude was annoyance at the intrusion. Then followed an awareness of the value of this market in making dollars more attractive to hold, and thus checking their conversion into gold. More recently, the American authorities have begun to express some concern about the pull of the market on new American funds, usually via Canada, which thus constitute a net outflow of short-term capital. There is a growing if still ill-defined feeling that in attempts being made to get better order into the world of international finance this awkward but important market cannot be ignored.

New Supersonic Jets Cause Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 8104, which would impose limitations upon the operations of supersonic jet aircraft over the United States.

This legislation is designed to put aircraft manufacturers on notice that the United States will not tolerate operation of supersonic jets which would create sonic booms and cause hardship and damage to the people of the Nation.

Mr. Peter Reich, aviation writer for the Chicago's American, wrote an excellent analysis of the problem confronting our Nation with the advent of supersonic jets. Mr. Reich is recognized in aviation circles as one of the Nation's outstanding aviation writers. His vast knowledge of this subject, coupled with his long experience in the field of aviation, makes him a most qualified observer to comment on the problems ahead.

Mr. Reich's excellent article, which appeared in the August 19 edition of the Chicago's American, follows:

NEW JETS CAUSE CONCERN—FUTURE BOOMTOWN HERE

(By Peter Reich)

The coming supersonic airliners should be a dream come true for travelers in a hurry—but they could be a nightmare for people on the ground.

That's the fear of Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois. He told Chicago's American:

"Just imagine, 10 years or so from now, when the supersonic airliner is developed to the fullest, you could have these planes crisscrossing the country and laying down a sonic boom carpet wherever they went.

"People from coast to coast, in a corridor 70 miles wide, would be bombarded by the sonic boom of but a single supersonic jet liner flying from New York to Los Angeles. Pretty soon, the entire country would be blanketed by the continual thunder of these booms.

SHOWERS OF GLASS

"What would this do to people trying to sleep? To the elderly? To babies?

"And what about those glass-curtain skyscrapers we've been putting up all over the country? Are we going to have pedestrians in the streets showered by shattered glass?

"It boils down to this, as I see it: Are we justified in exposing millions of Americans to tremendous discomfort and annoyance and even possibly bodily harm just to save a couple of hours on coast to coast flights?"

The answer, as the Congressman sees it, is a great big "No." And this is why he has introduced a bill that would bar any airliner from U.S. airspace that produces a sonic boom causing more than 1.5 pounds of pressure per square foot as measured on the ground. PUCINSKI explained his reasoning this way:

"Booms generating less than than 1.5 pounds of pressure per square foot are so mild that they create neither a public reaction nor cause any property damage, scientists have determined. But above 1.5 pounds pressure per square foot you start getting reactions from people, and above 2 pounds per square foot you run into property damage. My bill simply would force the aircraft manufacturers to achieve a reasonable boom limit in their designs."

A spokesman for Sud Aviation, the French company building the airframe for the Concorde, the 1,450 miles per hour plane that should be the world's first supersonic transport, told this writer in Paris a few weeks ago that the Concorde should register a sonic boom of no more than 1.4 pounds pressure per square foot.

ONLY A GUESS

But, the spokesman conceded, this is just an estimate.

No one can for certain, because no one yet has built a really large supersonic aircraft. The largest to date is the U.S. Convair B-58 jet bomber, which is less than half the size of the Concorde.

When a B-58 flashed from Los Angeles to New York and back during a supersonic speed run last year, it left a trail of broken windows and cracked plaster across the country.

Sonic booms are but half the problem, PUCINSKI maintains. The other half is the great volume of noise bound to be produced by the powerful engines of a supersonic jet.

LESS ENGINE NOISE

James E. Colburn, Continental Airlines' director of flight engineering, believes the fact that the Concorde will climb more steeply and rapidly than current subsonic jets actually will mean less engine noise exposure for people living anywhere except right next to an airport, when the Concordes enter service. Continental is the only domestic airline in the United States to order the Concorde up to now.

But PUCINSKI isn't so sure. He quoted a letter written by Belford Brown, manager of the San Francisco International Airport, to Pan American World Airways, which also has ordered Concordes, expressing concern at indications the Concorde's engines will generate a lot more noise than present jets—16 decibels more, to be precise. Said PUCINSKI:

"I checked with a scientist to see what 16 decibels more would mean, and the guy told me it would be like the blast of a cannon compared to the ping of a .22."

BEGIN TESTS IN 1967

The Federal Aviation Agency last week sent "this is what we want, who would like to build it" proposals for a U.S. supersonic airliner to all interested airframe and engine manufacturers. Replies to the request are due by January 15, and an evaluation of the industry proposals will be made by the FAA and the airlines over the next 12 months.

Retaliation Overlooks Basic Causes of Trade Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which its backers claimed would usher a new era of expanding world trade, it is disheartening to see the beginnings of what could be a serious trade war between the United States and the Common Market. I refer to the so-called chicken dispute between the United States and the European Economic Community over the Common Market's tariff increases on U.S. poultry.

An editorial in the Wall Street Journal of August 8, 1963, notes the administration's plans to boost tariffs on a large number of European products if the EEC does not reduce its duties on poultry imports. According to the Journal, the administration claims there have been damages of $46 million to U.S. poultry exporters. While this sum is far from inconsequential, Mr. Speaker, retaliation by the United States might well lead to counterretaliation by the EEC. The resulting damage to United States—Common Market trade surely would amount to well over $46 million. As noted in the Journal, "the scope of the potential trouble is indicated by the total" of U.S. farm exports to the EEC—about $1.2 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot stand idly by in the face of Common

Market discrimination against our exports. Retaliation may be necessary, but we should be fully aware of the dangers it poses and, at the same time, work to remove the basic causes leading to trade discrimination.

The Journal illuminates that much of the basic trouble lies in efforts to manage the domestic economies of the United States as well as of the Common Market countries. It is pointed out that:

Misguided efforts to shelter and control a segment of an internal economy lead to higher external barriers, threatening the industrial as well as the agricultural commerce on which an expanding and prospering Atlantic trade community depends.

For example, in Germany, "subsidies and other forms of protectionism for farmers" are a stumbling block to EEC agricultural integration. In the United States, huge surpluses of wheat and other grains generated by subsidies insure that high EEC levies on those commodities would have a severely adverse impact on the United States.

If an expansion of international trade is our goal, then we must face up to the need to eliminate the economic distortions which are caused by efforts to manage and protect segments of our domestic economy. Besides their harmful domestic consequences, they impede the free flow of world trade. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the editorial from the August 8 Wall Street Journal discussing this problem be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 8, 1963]

CHICKENS ON A MERRY-GO-ROUND

The great chicken war, as its tag suggests, certainly has its ludicrous aspects. But it's all rather sad as well.

To begin with, the export of U.S. poultry to Europe's Common Market is chicken feed in terms of the total trade. The U.S. Government says exporters have been damaged to the tune of $46 million by higher tariffs, principally in West Germany; the Europeans say it is more like $19 million.

Yet U.S. officials are so obsessed with this poultry market that Chancellor Adenauer was reportedly moved to speculate if the President is a chicken farmer. Now the American Government has drawn a retaliation list of 19 European products for which it threatens to select candidates for higher tariffs if the Common Market doesn't soon reduce its poultry tariffs.

The Europeans are naturally infuriated, and it takes little imagination to see a possible spiraling of retaliation and counter-retaliation. Already other U.S. farm exports to the Common Market are in trouble, and the scope of the potential trouble is indicated by the total of such exports; they are worth about $1.2 billion a year to the United States.

And this burgeoning trade war, it is interesting to recall, comes in the wake of impressive talk and high hopes for a new era of trade, peace, and expansion. The hopes were generated by the Common Market itself and by the expanded tariff-cutting powers Congress gave the President last year.

The sad part is that this drastic deterioration is so unnecessary. The roots of the trouble are to be found mainly in domestic protectionist policies, in the United States as well as Europe.

The Common Market, to be sure, is justly renowned for the extent and speed with which it has lowered obstacles to trade among its six members. Increasingly, however, the Market has shown signs of becoming a relatively high-tariff enclave against the outside world.

Even within the six, agriculture continues to be a stumbling block, because the nations are addicted, like the United States, to subsidies and other forms of protectionism for farmers. In particular, West Germany fears that the Market's plan for agricultural integration would expose its farmers to the competitive pressure of lower-priced products from other nations.

The fear is not necessarily well grounded, according to some Germans. The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, for one critical source, says the need for subsidies is exaggerated; it insists that "aid to agriculture must not be a perpetual subsidy."

The European problem has resounding echoes in American policy, of course. The bulk of our farm exports to Europe are not unsubsidized chickens but heavily price-propped commodities like wheat and other grains. The threat to these exports is a matter of such concern because they are in such tremendous surplus, the gluts having been generated by the Government's price supports.

That is how the merry-go-round of the managed economy keeps spinning in ever-widening circles. The lesson could hardly be clearer. Misguided efforts to shelter and control a segment of an internal economy lead to higher external barriers, threatening the industrial as well as agricultural commerce on which an expanding and prospering Atlantic trade community depends.

Chickens are said to come home to roost. Also to be not very bright. And to behave frantically after decapitation. People might be forgiven for wondering about the heads of some of the world's distinguished farm politicians.

The 24th Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a very fine editorial from the celebrated Catholic Free Press of Worcester, Mass., entitled "24th Amendment."

The article is not only brilliantly written, but contains a very impressive analysis of the need for some action in the form of a prayer amendment to the Constitution that would clarify once and for all our precious right to free worship and insure that prayer and reverence to God shall remain a vital part of American life protected under the Constitution.

Having signed the discharge petition for a prayer amendment to the Constitution, I hope that the American people will become aroused to the need for such an amendment and bring their views to the attention of their public servants.

I propose to continue my vigorous efforts in support of the proposed amendment and I will do my utmost to secure favorable results.

The editorial follows:

THE 24TH AMENDMENT

It would seem that the only way to stem the tide which threatens to banish any reference to God from American public life is the passage of an amendment to the Constitution clarifying the first amendment. It would also seem, however, that any amendment designed to state in unequivocal terms our belief in man's reliance upon God, while at the same time safeguarding the individual's right to his own religious belief—or disbelief—must be precisely worded, lest the cure be more disastrous than the disease. Similarly, it would seem that any campaign designed to secure passage of such an amendment must be well coordinated, lest its failure be decisive.

We are not anxious to see the Constitution become a patchwork, amended each time a grievance cannot be resolved to everyone's satisfaction by the Supreme Court of the land. In this instance, however, the implications of the High Court's recent pronouncements on the relationship between church and state are so patently contrary to the intent of the Founding Fathers that a clarification by the people seems in order. For that reason we applaud the activity of the newly formed Citizens for Public Prayer in Rutland and other similar groups across the country whose aim it is to assure that America continues to hold a revered place for God in public life.

We applaud also the gesture of the several Senators and Congressmen who have filed resolutions in the Congress requesting that a prayer amendment be made to the Constitution. Past experience should have revealed, however, that some of those resolutions may have been filed simply as a gesture to placate indignant constituents back home, with the congressional sponsors caring little or not at all whether their proposals ever are acted upon. It should also be obvious that the congressional committee charged with the responsibility of clearing one of the more than two-score resolutions for general debate, could decide—as has happened before—that it would be politically more prudent to sidetrack them all.

We hope, therefore, that the sponsors of prayer amendment resolutions in the House will give serious consideration to the proposal of Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York, that they meet and agree on the language of one resolution and then support a discharge petition to bring it to the floor of the House for debate. Proponents of a prayer amendment are all agreed on one basic principle—that the Founding Fathers never intended to identify the separation of church and state with the separation of God from the state. Fragmentation among these proponents, however, could result in inaction on the floor of Congress and frustration among members of groups like the Citizens for Public Prayer who are ready to work for the protection of our religious heritage back home.

Why Live With Sonic Booms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago's American carried an excellent editorial in support of H.R. 8104, a bill which I introduced last week in an effort to set some minimum standards for civilian supersonic jet operations in the United States.

I should like to take this opportunity to call this excellent editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of newspapers throughout America by placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Chicago's American editorial quite properly calls attention to the fact that supersonic airliners of the near future may zip over the United States leaving a trail of broken glass, cracked plaster, and shattered nervous systems on the ground.

Chicago's American is one of the most highly respected newspapers in America. I am sure I speak for the people of my district, as well as all Americans, in expressing a sense of deep appreciation to Chicago's American for taking an editorial stand in support of this important legislation.

As author of H.R. 8104, I take great personal pride in the knowledge that my proposal has won such enthusiastic support from the editorial staff of the Chicago's American.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago's American editorial follows:

WHY LIVE WITH SONIC BOOMS?

Like Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, we are, dismayed at the prospect of supersonic airliners zipping across the United States, leaving a trail of broken glass, cracked plaster and disorganized nervous systems on the ground. As jetplanes are built now, each one that breaks the sonic sound barirer (flying faster than the speed of sound) produces a sonic boom, a sort of explosion, across a band of earth some 70 miles wide.

The reason for PUCINSKI's concern, and ours, is that several American airlines are now ordering jetplanes that will fly above the speed of sound. Undoubtedly these would save coast to coast passengers a couple of hours but, as PUCINSKI asks, is that an object worth wrecking the nerves of millions of Americans for?

He doesn't think so. Neither do we, so we hope Congress will pass legislation he has introduced to limit the amount of noise an airplane may generate in flight. His bill would exclude planes from the air over the United States that produce a sonic boom causing more than 1.5 pounds' pressure per square foot on the ground. Scientists have assured him that booms below that force don't disturb people seriously or cause any property damage.

Representative PUCINSKI's argument is that, since the supersonic planes are to be engineered from scratch in the next few years, his law would give the producers ample notice to redesign their engines before the airplanes are put into the sky. And that, we have always been convinced, is the only way the noise of jet planes can be reduced. It must be accomplished through improvements in jet engines, and the time to improve the engines is before they are put into service.

Jet engineers are going to be obliged to put their minds on this question of noise sooner or later. It will have to be sooner if Congress passes PUCINSKI's bill, so let us hope Congress will—at the present session.

Republican Governors Endorse Increased Staffing for Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, another progressive step has been taken by Republicans in the direction of a more effective Congress and increased minority staffing. Through Congressman GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, chairman of the House Republican conference, it was arranged for Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, who is chairman of the House Republican conference committee on increased minority staffing, to appear before the Miami Governors conference, July 25–28.

Congressman SCHWENGEL addressed the Republican Governors on the subject of "Minority Staffing and Congressional-State Relations." Not only was his address received enthusiastically, but the Republican Governors thereafter unanimously adopted a resolution which indicated their strong support for efforts being made to increase minority staffing and called for implementation of other suggestions embodied in Congressman SCHWENGEL's speech.

The text of the resolution, signed by all 16 Republican Governors, follows below:

MINORITY STAFFING AND CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS RESOLUTION

We, the Republican Governors assembled together in Miami, for the 1963 Governors' conference, wish to express our sincere appreciation to Congressman GERALD FORD, of Michigan, chairman of the House Republican conference, which contains all House Republicans, for the presentation by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, chairman of the House conference committee on increased minority staffing.

Whereas the lack of staff responsible to the minority in Congress is harmful to the best interests of all the American people, Democratic, Republican, and Independent, and our interest in a strong responsible, and effective Congress; and

Whereas Congressman SCHWENGEL has presented to us on behalf of a number of Congressmen a specific, practical proposal for study and future implementation of better minority staffing and more effective State and Federal legislative relationships: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Republican Governors designate a committee of three Governors to meet with the Representatives of the House conference to consider implementing more effective relationships between the House conference and the Republican Governors, and to assist in obtaining more minority staff; and also, be it

Resolved, That we express to Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Senate-House joint ad hoc increased minority staffing committee, and his colleagues, Senators CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, and WINSTON PROUTY, of Vermont, our appreciation for their efforts in the Senate to increase minority staffing, and request the special Governors committee of three to meet also with the Senators to develop a similar cooperative relationship; and also, be it

Resolved, That our special Governors committee be urged to proceed with all due speed on these projects so that results may be achieved during the current session of Congress.

Signed:

Paul Fannin, Arizona; John A. Love, Colorado; Robert E. Smylie, Idaho; John Anderson, Jr., Kansas; John H. Reed, Maine; George Romney, Michigan; Tim Babcock, Montana; Nelson A. Rockefeller, New York; James A. Rhodes, Ohio; Henry Bellmon, Oklahoma; Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon; John H. Chafee, Rhode Island; Archie Gubbrud, South Dakota; George D. Clyde, Utah; Clifford P. Hansen, Wyoming; William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Peaceful Coexistence Is Good for You, or So They Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, numerous voices are being raised in administration circles these days to the tune of "peaceful coexistence is good for you." The words of this tune are a little ambiguous. Something about "you know what continuing of arms race means" is included. Something about "you know what proliferation of nuclear weapons means" is also part of the lyrics. Every once in a while a background chorus sounds out with "first step, first step." The words never do get around to saying what proliferation means or what continuation of the arms race would mean. They never do explain the "first step" business, but apparently its something about peace. I could never gather whether it involves a first step toward peace as we generally understand it or as the Hungarian freedom fighters savagely were taught it.

In any event, this little tune has brought to mind some research work done recently by an associate of Dr. Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace. I dug around my files and here it is:

POINTERS OF COEXISTENCE

1

"The treaty is the means of gaining strength"—(Lenin. VII Party Congress, Mar. 8, 1919).

2

The treaty is seen by Soviet jurists and political leaders as a legal formula of peaceful coexistence.

3

"The policy of peaceful coexistence meets the basic interests of all people. * * * This policy strengthens the positions of socialism, enhances the prestige and international influence of the socialist countries and promotes the prestige and influence of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries. * * * Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle. * * * The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. In conditions of peaceful coexistence, favorable opportunities are provided for the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries"—(from the 1960 Moscow statement of 81 Communist parties).

4

"Imperialism has entered the period of decline and collapse. * * * The oppression of finance capital keeps growing. * * * State monopoly capitalism stimulates militarism to an unheard of degree. * * * The uneven development of capitalism alters the balance of forces between countries and makes the contradictions between them more acute.

"The economic and with it the political and military center of imperialism has shifted from Europe to the United States. U.S. monopoly capital, gorged on war profits and the arms race has seized the most important sources of raw materials, the markets and the spheres of investment, has built up a covert colonial empire, and become

the biggest international exploiter. Taking cover behind spurious protections of freedom and democracy, U.S. imperialism is in effect performing the function of world gendarme, supporting reactionary dictatorial regimes and decayed monarchies, opposing democratic, revolutionary changes and launching aggressions against peoples fighting for independence. The U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie is the mainstay of international reaction. * * * The world imperialist system is rent by deep-rooted and acute contradictions. * * * Peaceful coexistence serves as a basis for the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism on an international scale and constitutes a specific form of class struggle between them. As they consistently pursue the policy of peaceful coexistence, the socialist countries are steadily strengthening the positions of the world socialist system in the competition with capitalism. Peaceful coexistence affords more favorable opportunities for the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries and facilitates the struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries for their liberation"—(from the 1961 CPSU program).

5

In the countries, where there may be "peaceful roads to revolution and conquest of power without a civil war or an armed rising, * * * it would be necessary that the ruling classes should be deprived of the possibility of taking up arms, of using the police, army, and government machinery to crush the revolutionary movement of the masses. A situation of this kind might develop from a number of causes—the weakening of militarism as the result of a successful disarmament policy; a considerable part of the army and the government machine coming over into the side of the people; the recognition by the ruling circles of the hopelessness of an open fight against the masses."—("Lenin's Theory of the Socialist Revolution," Kommunist No. 13, 1960.)

6

"Peaceful coexistence serves as a basis for the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism on an international scale and constitutes a specific form of class struggle between them"—(G. I. Tunkin, "Voprosy Teorii Meshdunarodnogo Prava," 1962, p. 54).

7

Thus, peaceful coexistence tactics place large capabilities at the disposal of the Communists, including the following capabilities:

1. To extend the network and activity of para-Communist, pro-Communist, subversive, and other groups;
2. To expand legal and illegal Communist ideology;
3. To intensify American demoralization;
4. To spread the Communist espionage system;
5. To allow effective interference in U.S. internal affairs;
6. To intensify domestic conflicts within the United States; and
7. To increase capabilities for economic subversion.

Lasky Points Out Pitfalls of Our Vietnamese Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent article written by the illustrious journalist, Victor Lasky, which points out the inconsistency of our policy toward Vietnam. I commend it to the reading of all of my colleagues:

[From the New York Journal-American, Aug. 17, 1963]

LODGE TO SIFT BUDDHIST REVOLT

(By Victor Lasky)

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge leaves soon for South Vietnam with White House instructions to make an all-out effort to settle differences between the Buddhists and the U.S.-backed government of Ngo Dinh Diem.

He has a tough job. For one thing, the Buddhists will not be satisfied with less than the ouster of President Diem and his alleged "repressive Roman Catholic regime." They do not say, however, who will replace Diem. Nor have they ever listed any specific catalog of faults.

Somehow the Buddhists—or a small section of them—have managed to convince the world that they are victims of religious persecution.

All evidence suggests the charge is without foundation. For example, outgoing U.S. Ambassador Frederick E. Nolting said recently in Saigon: "In visits to all parts of the country during nearly 2½ years, I have never seen any evidence of religious persecution or of bigotry on the part of any religious group."

U.S. officials who deal with Diem don't contend he is without faults. He has many, but religious bigotry is not one of them.

Until the Buddhist flareup last May, things appeared to be going well in what Secretary of State Rusk once described as the "dirty, untidy, disagreeable" war in Vietnam. Washington had grown confident that Diem had finally gained the upper hand over the Communist Viet Cong. The State Department felt the $2 billion in economic and military aid sunk into South Vietnam was paying off.

Then came the Buddhist riots in the ancient city of Hue, 400 miles north of Saigon. Nine persons were killed. The riots were touched off by a government order restricting the flying of religious flags. The same order affected Catholics, too, and probably more keenly, since they were accustomed to flying the Papal flag. The Catholics, however, obeyed the law.

Just what do the Buddhists want?

President Diem has made every effort to meet their demands. On June 16, government and Buddhist representatives signed an agreement covering five alleged grievances. But Buddhist leaders began to make new complaints. Only the fall of the Diem regime will satisfy them.

This was made clear by a Buddhist who said: "I undersand Mr. Lodge is going to get rid of Diem as soon as he arrives. That is why we are keeping trouble alive—so that American opinion will stay aroused."

Not all of South Vietnam's Buddhists are involved in the current protests. For instance, the "traditional" Buddhists, of whom there are at least 800,000, have not followed the lead of the General Buddhist Association, the chief protesting body.

Buddhists, generally, are a passive people, which makes the militancy of some of their self-styled leaders very strange. Who are the rioters? A dispatch from a reporter in Saigon commented on the sudden rise of "young, militant, highly political leaders. They are seen as 20th-century Asians anxious to get in the middle of politics." They have excellent intelligence sources in the government.

Undoubtedly, some of these so-called Buddhists are Communists. The Buddhist priesthood is not too difficult for the Reds to infiltrate. Every young Buddhist spends a year or so as a monk, meditating and begging in a saffron robe. Nothing would prevent a Vietcong from donning such a robe.

Meanwhile, American opinion is being kept aroused by the same self-styled idealists, some of whom did so much to help put Fidel Castro in power.

Their latest manifestation is the protest by 15,000 clergymen, sent to President Kennedy, urging an end to U.S. financial and armed support of the Diem regime.

Need for Civil Rights Legislation Recognized by More Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter relating to the administration's civil rights proposals, which are now being considered by the Congress. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this letter is indicative of the grave concern that weighs upon the American conscience and is reflective of the mood that is now sweeping the Nation.

Thomas Jefferson once stated, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." I consider the shameful circumstance of the American Negro as a tyrannical agent that has and will continue to lurk in the minds of all freedom-loving Americans until it can one day be said that all of our American citizens, regardless of race or color or creed, can enjoy, equally, the rights and privileges for which our forefathers so nobly fought.

The 88th Congress has within its power the opportunity to enact what would be not only an historic piece of legislation but which would represent a bold step forward to bolster the cause of freedom here at home and around the world. I cannot emphasize too much the absolute necessity for moving now against discrimination in public accommodations, for prohibiting Federal assistance to segregated programs and projects, and, most important of all, so that minority groups may be financially able to avail themselves of the foregoing, the necessity for passage of an equal employment opportunity bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to enter this letter into the RECORD. Although I have taken the liberty of withholding the author's name, I want to express my deepest gratitude to her and to many like her who have taken the time to make themselves heard and known as active participants in this moral mission for freedom.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 14, 1963.

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: This is not a letter urging you to vote for our President's civil rights legislation. I am quite confident you will, sir.

I am writing to give you a feeling I have which perhaps you can pass on to other Members of Congress who may be wavering

in their decisions. The feeling is this, sir. This legislation must be passed—not to please the liberals—but to make the American people start feeling like human beings again.

Sir, I have relatives from Kansas with whom I have not been able to communicate since your father was President. They can't go 10 minutes without using the word "nigger" or "Jew." This year I spent 2 very pleasant weeks with these people. The subject of equal rights did come up. They said, "I think they ought to have it." That may be an understatement, Mr. ROOSEVELT, but it is what they said and those seven words are a long, long way from "nigger."

I think you can feel this change in attitude everywhere you go. People seem quite willing to admit that they are not entirely free of prejudice. They also seem to recognize that this is a form of immaturity. They want to start growing in the right direction.

All of us depend so very much on men like you to represent us. Please do everything you can to get this legislation passed.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Connecticut Labor Council Supports Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Executive Board of the Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, advocating equal rights and equal opportunities for all citizens. The council favors the enactment of a comprehensive civil rights bill which would include such rights and opportunities. The resolution was adopted by a unanimous vote of the council at a meeting held under the chairmanship of Mr. John J. Driscoll, president of the Connecticut State Labor Council. I am pleased to endorse the resolution, which reads as follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL CITIZENS

Organized labor has, on balance, been a positive and often a pioneering force in assuring full and free opportunity for every Connecticut citizen to develop and to utilize his talents. Our record in the field of legislation in this State is second to none, running from 1947 and the Fair Employment Act through 1963 and the extension of the ban on discrimination in housing.

We recognize, however, that progress through the general assembly in Hartford does not end our responsibility as union members or as citizens of the United States. We are not free here in Connecticut until every American is assured the full and enforcible protection under the law of his rights as a citizen and as a human being.

We therefore call for speedy and comprehensive legislation at the Federal level to make the promise of America meaningful and available for all her citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Connecticut State Labor Council urges Connecticut's Congressmen and Senators to adopt as a personal responsibility the early enactment of a comprehensive civil rights bill, including the following:

1. Adoption of a national Fair Employment Practices Act, applicable to both management and unions, with initiative for enforcement in the hands of the administering agency.

2. Recognition of the root problem in assuring equal employment opportunity for all citizens: namely, the failure of the American economy to provide new jobs at a rate which will cover both those displaced by technological change and those just entering the labor market.

3. Assurance by Federal statute of the right to vote for all citizens, with reasonable standards for eligibility and with prompt handling of complaints by the Federal courts and court-appointed referees.

4. Provision for uniform access to all public accommodations for all Americans.

5. Fulfillment of equal opportunity for a good education, both through Federal assistance for education and through the elimination of discrimination in housing.

6. Establishment of the Federal Civil Rights Commission on a permanent basis, with adequate staff to perform effective mediation and conciliation services where and as needed.

7. Denial of Federal funds to those States which insist on clinging to undemocratic practices.

Sonic Boom Solution Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, the Chicago Daily News carried an editorial supporting legislation which I introduced to impose limitations on the operation of civilian supersonic jets in the United States.

The Chicago Daily News is one of the world's most highly respected newspapers. During its existence, the Chicago Daily News has won the Pulitzer Prize for outstanding journalism on 12 separate occasions.

It is a source of tremendous pride to me, as the author of H.R. 8104, to merit the editorial support for this very important project from the Chicago Daily News.

I am sure that not only the people of my own congressional district, but the people of the entire United States, join me in thanking the Chicago Daily News for taking a forthright position on a very serious problem which will confront our Nation in the next few years, concurrently with the development of the supersonic jet transports.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that my colleagues in Congress and newspapers and publications throughout America will join the Chicago Daily News in support of this legislation.

In order to give this editorial the widest distribution, I am taking the liberty today of including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News editorial follows:

SONIC BOOM SOLUTION NEEDED

Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat of Illinois, has introduced a bill which would require U.S. aircraft manufacturers to pay close attention to noise control in their design of new supersonic airliners capable of 2,000-mile-an-hour speeds. The bill would also limit the amount of ground pressure jets could create with their sonic booms.

PUCINSKI has zeroed in on a problem as important as that of maintaining U.S. supremacy in the development of bigger and faster commercial airplanes. For sonic booms may become unbearable nuisances within the next decade unless preventive steps are taken.

A sonic boom is created when an aircraft exceeding the speed of sound pushes molecules of air ahead of it. The molecules are compressed and shock waves are formed around the aircraft's fuselage. These waves break off, and hit the ground with a "boom." Airliners of the future are expected to lay down a continuous "carpet" of noise in a path up to 80 miles wide as they whiz across the country.

The Air Force has tried to minimize booms by banning supersonic bomber flights at altitudes of less than 30,000 feet and flatly forbidding fighters from exceeding the speed of sound at any altitude unless they are on a "scramble" mission.

Even so, since 1956 the Air Force has processed more than 3,000 claims for sonic boom damage and paid out $159,234 on 1,539 of them. The booms have shattered countless windows, knocked objects from shelves, blasted open doors, and frightened thousands of citizens.

A Swedish expert on the subject, Dr. Bo Lundberg, has looked to the future and posed this question: "Is it justifiable that millions of people should lose sleep so that 100 passengers in an aircraft might gain a couple of hours flight time from New York to Los Angeles." His answer is "No."

We agree. Aviation progress is important, certainly. But the public is entitled to demand that that progress be matched, step by step, with progress in the means of making supersonic flight compatible with the public welfare and comfort. PUCINSKI's proposal deserves serious consideration.

The Invisible Costs of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in these years of expanding Federal activities and recordbreaking budgets, we often overlook what might be called the hidden costs of government. An article in the August 1963 Monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank of New York calls our attention to an "iceberg of invisible costs" lying beneath the surface of the budget sheet.

Probably the major portion of such costs arises in connection with taxation. Calculating individual and business tax returns runs up a substantial cost in terms of man-hours; private firms, especially in regulated industries, must spend many thousands of dollars on personnel and space to report, file, and store the countless tax and other forms required by all levels of government. Ac-

cording to the Letter, industry efficiency suffers. Further, individual and business initiative is dampened by the growing maze of forms and regulations.

On the Government side, the Internal Revenue Service alone has a staff of 64,000 and a budget of $674 million. But as the Letter points out, "there are thousands of Government offices and agencies with overlapping jurisdictions over business", in other areas of regulation.

Mr. Speaker, the invisible costs of government are steadily multiplying. Studies by the Hoover Commission, the Bureau of the Budget and others, recognizing that these costs involve a real burden, have sought ways to minimize the regulation and reporting requirements which government imposes on its citizens. Because this is an area in which continued study is called for, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the August Monthly Economic Letter be included in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INVISIBLE COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

As everybody knows, government costs a lot of money. Revenues of all our governments—Federal, State and local—are running up past $150 billion a year, equivalent to $1,400 for every adult in the United States. While devoting tens of billions to putting a man on the moon—described by former President Eisenhower as "a mad effort to win a stunt race"—government has taken on dependents all over this earth. Checks go out to more than 40 million persons at home: 12 million to employees and the others to welfare beneficiaries. Abroad, no less than 95 countries and territories are receiving U.S. aid.

The true cost of government runs far beyond $150 billion a year. Many people, after gathering figures and receipts all year long, worked on into the night last Easter on governmentally prescribed arithmetical exercises, filling the forms for Federal (and perhaps also State) income tax returns due the next day, April 15. No one has tried to calculate the man-hours of dismal drudgery going into the preparation of tax returns. The rates of tax rise progressively. And so does the effort demanded. The more a man earns—and the more his time is worth—the greater the obligation imposed to amass detailed records and comprehend the complications of the law.

Form 1040, which 35 million persons find it necessary to use, can require upward of 500 entries (including supplemental schedules) and as many as 200 additions, subtractions, multiplications and divisions. The Superintendent of Documents in Washington has on sale a 144-page volume which elucidates some of the major technicalities. Yet no one can settle back and say he understands the whole of the law. Not only is the law itself in process of repeated change, but the regulations are changed and court decisions alter the interpretation of law and regulations. The Internal Revenue Service itself has a major problem of training qualified agents, numbering some 30,000. Publishing technical books on taxes, and advising people on taxes have become big business. The core of tax experts outside Government is represented in the 71,000 "enrolled practitioners" recognized by the IRS.

The work imposed on individuals is nothing compared to that imposed on employers. Not only are there many more forms but employers must serve as uncompensated tax collectors, taking money out of the pay envelopes of workers according to formula and, often, adding a tax bite assessed on customers. The IRS has a total staff of 64,000 and a budget of $674 million. These are big figures. But there is little doubt that business firms collectively employ even more people and spend even more money gathering in tens of billions of revenues.

And burdens of calculating and assessing taxes are just part of the story. Besides the IRS and State and local tax authorities, there are thousands of government offices and agencies with overlapping jurisdictions over business. Thus, lying beneath the visible costs—set out in the budgets prepared at various levels of government—is an iceberg of invisible costs.

SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

Such costs take an infinite variety of forms, ranging from a simple postcard report for an official agency to interminable procedures required by regulatory authorities and tedious investigations launched by congressional committees or executve departments—all too often simply uncovering facts already known to anyone who has taken the trouble to find them. A major company may be called upon to supply hundreds of thousands of figures in a year's time. Many valuable statistics emerge from official compilations but the truth is that the quantity of data overwhelms the capacity of statisticians to digest them. Some required forms have no more important use than getting bundled up for sale as wastepaper.

The second Hoover Commission gave some idea of the dimensions of the problem at the Federal level. As of 1955 it was estimated that paperwork within the Federal Government cost $4 billion a year, consumed 25 billion sheets of paper, required office space equal to 36 Empire State Buildings and storage space equal to 7 Pentagons. Paper handling is a more popular exercise than 50-mile hikes. It fans out across the country.

Forms go out to business firms and individuals to be completed and returned for regulatory, statistical or tax purposes. Though the Hoover Commission made no overall estimate of the total costs involved, it pointed out that the private cost "is far greater than the Government's cost of totting up the figures."

Since 1955, both costs have grown. By latest count, the Federal Government has some 5,300 forms in use for regular reporting. And this does not include reports to the IRS, certain other agencies of the Treasury Department, and the several layers of banking authorities, which are exempted from the Federal Reports Act.

There are, besides, reports for State and local government units. The Hoover Commission found that State and city governments impose "more than 50 percent of the Nation's burden of paperwork."

As John E. Swearingen, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, describes the situation:

"We have arrived at the unhappy point at which the Cyclopean eye of some almighty regulatory agency is upon us when we buy or sell, ship or receive, hire or fire, grow or manufacture, save or spend, drink or diet, profit or lose, talk or listen."

Amid all the hue and cry about accelerating economic growth—which means cutting out useless effort and getting more production per man-hour—we tend to ignore the multiplication of burdens placed upon people to comply with laws. And while we lament the shortage of employment opportunities, we overlook the endless rules and regulations that discourage people from going into business or invite them to get out.

COSTS OF TAX REPORTING

The most familiar kind of invisible cost to the average American is the paperwork involved in his income tax return. Partly because the tax rates are so high, the Government takes a proprietary interest in the money a man earns. And all the time people are being put to more and more trouble to defend their take-home pay. Even so, there was considerable public support for changes in expense account rules—including the requirement for the keeping of a day-to-day diary—put into the Revenue Act of 1962 as a means of checking abuses. This makes bookkeeping a large part of the job of everyone who has responsibilities to pay out money in connection with business travel.

In response to businessmen's advice, the IRS later loosened up a bit on the rules. But all this paperwork becomes a burden to the employer's tax department. One corporate executive, quoted by Business Week, predicted that "we'll have to rent a separate warehouse for the literally millions of pieces of paper we'd have to keep." No one will ever have a chance to go through them all. Nevertheless the law requires that they be there for years until the related tax returns are audited and approved or the statute of limitations mercifully permits disposal of the waste.

The scope for additional layers of State and local government taxation has been broadened by Supreme Court decisions giving them greater leeway for taxing out-of-State corporations. What this has meant in terms of paperwork burdens was effectively presented before the Special House Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce in June 1962, by Werner N. Davidson, secretary-treasurer of the Caloric Corp.:

"The cost of additional help to file only for State tax purposes, the space required for the storage of such otherwise useless records, the cost of one additional invoice copy for each charge to our customer, will add at least $20,000 annually to our cost of doing business.

"By taking into account machine time, salaries paid to our people who perform the tax reporting function, subscriptions for tax services, endless correspondence with taxing authorities to support our returns, payment of travel and per diem allowances to tax auditors of foreign States, we spend an additional $50,000 per year.

"Our corporation and its subsidiaries file a total of 999 tax returns of all kinds per year and the cost of each tax return amounts to $70."

Just in the year since his testimony, Mr. Davidson reports that the number of tax returns has risen further to 1,140. Larger companies have even more. In 1959, the Union Carbide Corp. was filing 3,600 tax forms a year.

CASE STUDIES FROM BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

Some other cases were presented in a 1959 report of the House Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics. One of the most striking was that of a large midwestern manufacturer, which kept a detailed record for 1 year:

"In the year, the company handled 173 different Federal forms ranging in frequency of filing from daily to annual, and involving the filing of 37,683 reports. The workload amounted to 48,285 hours. In addition, the company received a number of other Federal forms, presumably voluntary, which it did not respond to because it objected to the apparent duplication, felt that the data requested were confidential, or for other reasons. * * * Requests from State agencies which were complied with included 63 different forms, involving the filing of 1,145 reports at a cost of 3,266 hours."

While it is difficult to generalize, reporting requirements arise at the birth of a fledgling enterprise and ever after distract from the work of keeping alive. The requirements tend to be heaviest for the biggest companies, for firms in regulated industries, for corporations holding Government contracts, and for firms dealing in agricultural products.

Regulated industries typically have much more Government-imposed reporting and recordkeeping expense than business generally. After the Hoover Commission study in 1955, some progress was made toward simplifying and thinning out reporting workloads in certain industries. The contrary drift is exemplified in the field of banking where financial institutions this year are being required to file information returns on each account with interest payments of $10 or more. Also, along with other payers of interest or dividends, banks are devoting a good deal of time and money to obtain social security numbers from customers to be put on reports to the IRS.

The classic case, of course, is that of the railroad business, put under the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1887. Over the decades, reports required to meet the needs of the day were enlarged until the industry found itself preoccupied with paperwork. The last time the Association of American Railroads made a listing of the reports required by Federal agencies—in 1954—it took 10 pages to give the titles of 164 separate reports. This list did not include reports connected with the handling of mail.

Some reports are required annually, others semiannually, quarterly, monthly, weekly, daily or as certain events occur. The longest annual report, "form A" of the ICC, runs to 117 pages of detailed schedules.

One monthly report for the Department of Agriculture is labeled:

"Report to USDA, San Francisco, of number of carloads of corn westbound passing Needles, Calif."

Such detailed reports are only one aspect of a general problem of overregulation of the railroads; reporting to the ICC alone is figured as costing more than $5 million a year.

Similar problems are found in other public utility fields. The Hoover Commission reported in 1955 that it cost gas and electric companies more than $14 million a year to prepare requests for rate changes. It cited one example of how expensive rate proceedings can be:

"One company fills its plane with several tons of documents and exhibits for such a case. Company executives are forced to fly to Washington saparately in commercial airlines. Normally one or more Federal Power Commission representatives then visit the utility.

"Some measure of how lengthy a process this is, is the fact that the Government man commonly buys or rents a house in the locality, checks on schools for his children, etc. There he audits the company's books to see if they support the facts in the reports. In practice he seldom agrees with costs claimed by the company. His suggestions, therefore, cause the company to revise the voluminous data originally compiled."

Industry sources say $14 million is still a conservative estimate of rate proceeding costs, and that instances like the case cited above are not unusual.

NIGHTMARES AT HIGH NOON

Even if a manufacturer or distributor is not in a regulated industry, it may still find itself immersed in a similarly expensive procedure. An everpresent danger is the possibility of running afoul of the vague but potent antitrust laws.

In 1959, for example, three salt companies—Morton, International, and Diamond Crystal—were charged with fixing prices of rock salt. Two and a half years later, a Federal jury found them not guilty. In the interim, the work of assembling data and materials to defend themselves, plus lawyers' fees, had cost the three firms $775,000, a sum far greater than the $150,000 maximum in fines they might have been liable to pay if found guilty. But the invisible costs go beyond these figures. As reported by the Wall Street Journal, Morton Salt Co. President Daniel Peterkin described the lingering effects:

"We've been in business more than 100 years, and we think we have a fine reputation. Anytime you're accused of violating the law, particularly the antitrust laws, it's extremely damaging to you. After acquittal, the damage still exists. The mere fact that you're accused is enough to hurt you in many people's minds."

A similar, but much lengthier, case involved Standard Oil of Indiana, which was cited for alleged price discrimination by the Federal Trade Commission in 1940. After extensive litigation involving two trips to the Supreme Court, the company finally won its case in 1958.

President Swearingen, however, found the victory worth the cost:

"In our judgment, the net effect was to preserve a competitive system for American business, but it took 17 costly and trying years of litigation to do it. And, to preserve our right to compete, we had to fight off a Federal agency originally established to insure the continuance of effective competition.

"I submit that this is the kind of thing that can give any responsible businessman nightmares at high noon. In our instance, the continuing threat to our ability to compete also threatened the interests of our thousands of stockholders and employees."

ATTEMPTS TO STEM THE TIDE

While the growing burden of paperwork and other expenses imposed by Government has naturally evoked recurrent protests, attempts to stem the tide have met with only limited success.

In 1942, when World War II had stimulated a vast outpouring of Government regulations and requests for information, Congress passed the Federal Reports Act, authorizing the Bureau of the Budget to coordinate Federal reporting with a view toward eliminating duplications and minimizing burdens. In 1951, during the Korean conflict, this authorization was supplemented by an Executive order.

The Budget Bureau's Office of Statistical Standards, charged with carrying out this function, has been largely responsible for making the Federal statistical system more orderly and appreciative of the needs of the public and of the problems of respondents. Helping to accomplish this has been an Advisory Council on Federal Reports, sponsored by five national business groups.

The work of these groups was given impetus by the Hoover Commission. But, as the Office of Statistical Standards has pointed out, progress is slow and requires continuing, persistent efforts because changes in administrative reports "involve legal or policy problems."

THE NUB OF THE PROBLEM

Therein lies the nub of the problem. The growth of "invisible costs" has accompanied the expansion of Government activities—through the great depression, two major wars and the postwar burgeoning of the welfare state.

As more and more money is disbursed by public agencies and as more private activities are regulated by Government, public officials want at hand more minute information about what's going on. Hence, more paperwork.

It is perhaps no accident that the agency with the largest number of regularly required reports—the Agriculture Department—is the one that encountered outright rebellion last May when wheatgrowers, in a national referendum, rejected high price supports and tighter controls. There comes a time when self-respecting individuals resist encroachments upon their privacies and freedoms.

About the worst thing that can happen to a people is to become servants of the state. It is well to recall the warnings of Alexis de Tocqueville, more than a century ago, describing how despotism might conquer a democratic society:

"About this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild.

"After having thus successfully taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp and fashioned him at will, the supreme power then extends its arm over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting.

"Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the Government is the shepherd."

Burns Creek Dam Will Stimulate Need for Western Coal Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, Gracie Pfost, a distinguished former Member of this body from the Second District of Idaho, appeared before the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee in support of the much-needed Burns Creek project in eastern Idaho. In her testimony before this great committee of the Congress, Gracie Pfost stated:

The private power companies from southern Idaho are using coal miners from throughout the Nation to oppose Burns Creek. Mr. Chairman, I want to say here today that this is exactly what the power companies are doing. They are using the coal miners and the coal people for their particular advantage in opposing multiple-purpose projects containing hydroelectric generation. However, these same power companies will not hesitate to build hydroelectric dams themselves—they will not hesitate to switch from the use of coal to pitch or residual oil or natural gas if they can find a cheap source of power for their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I fully concur with these charges that were made by our former distinguished colleague. I know that the record shows that this is true. One of the power companies in question—the Idaho Power Co.—boasts that it is the only major all hydro private power company remaining in America. In other words they do not use any coal. The other company, the Utah Power & Light Co., has eight large steam electric plants. The fuel used in these plants is a combination of oil, gas, pitch, and coal. How-

ever, only one of the eight plants uses coal alone. Three of the plants use only pitch and gas. One plant uses only pitch. One plant uses oil and coal. Two plants use gas, oil, and coal. In addition this company has a total of 22 all hydroelectric plants and one large internal-combustion plant. However, it is interesting to note that four of its eight steamplants do not use any coal, relying entirely on pitch and gas. At the same time this large power company has been complaining about what Burns Creek would do to the coal miners, it has not hesitated to switch fuels in its steamplants from coal to pitch, gas and oil.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested not only in the construction of Burns Creek and other much needed multiple-purpose projects which produce hydroelectric power in Idaho and throughout the Nation. I am also interested in the welfare of the coal miner. I do not believe that there is any doubt among people who know the facts that hydroelectric power produces a need for fuel-generated power to firm it up. In many cases this can and should be power generated with coal.

As has been pointed out many times by our distinguished colleague from Tennessee, Mr. DAVIS, the largest user of coal in the world today is the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am sure great amounts of coal will be required shortly to firm up the hydroelectric power that is being produced at multiple-purpose projects throughout the West.

In 1956, the Congress authorized the upper Colorado River project. Now we are on the threshhold of the first power coming from this great project and it has created a coal rush in Utah. I would like to ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the following article by Robert W. Bernick, the business editor from the Salt Lake City Tribune of July 14, 1963:

UTAH COAL RUSH ON—POWER PLAN KEY

(By Robert W. Bernick)

Utah is experiencing a coal rush unique in the history of American mining

By Saturday, prospectors had applied for an estimated 300,000 to 500,000 acres of coal permits, most of them within the Kaiparowits Plateau area of eastern Kane County.

No such volume of coal prospect permits had ever been sought in a single area within a relatively short space of time in the history of the U.S. Department of Interior the Tribune was told.

And why anyone would seek to prospect for coal—when the coal industry is generally reported to be sick, sick, sick—is something for the average citizen to puzzle about.

But such contact as can be established with applicants—most of them individuals and firms from Salt Lake City, Phoenix, Ariz., Grand Junction, Colo., Denver, Colo., Los Angeles, and even St. Louis, Mo.—discloses a view that something big may be happening in the western energy picture involving coal.

Here is some of the thinking going on in this line.

The completion of Glen Canyon Dam and consequent creation of Lake Powell provokes a future need for parallel supplies of energy from fossil-fueled, steam-electric plants.

This is the history of hydroelectric generation elsewhere in the United States—including the controversial Johnson steamplant, a part of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For steam generation smooths out the peaks of hydroelectrical energy output.

Glen Canyon Dam may have an installed capacity of up to 1,200,000 kilowatts eventually. But its load factor will be at around 58½ percent, according to some engineers. This means that the differential between peak deliveries and firm generation of energy might be as high as 500,000 kilowatts.

On farther south is Hoover Dam, with an installed capacity of 1,344,500 kilowatts and a firm load factor of around 38 percent. This presents an even greater "peak and valley" relationship in energy deliveries.

Conceive of a new desert-spanning grid of 500,000- to 750,000-volt lines wheeling energy from a hydroelectric and steampower complex involving Glen Canyon Dam, Hoover Dam, and coal from southwestern Utah.

That, it is alleged, is what provokes the gleam in the coal prospector's eye. Most important: This may be one means by which the coal people really can compete with growing potentials of nuclear power on the west coast.

If such a Kane County complex were to include Hoover Dam, too, as a balance wheel to peaking problems, then the figures get even wilder and you start talking about 1-million-kilowatt steamplants, etc., and coal reserves of more than 500 million tons.

Actually, the Kaiparowits Plateau may contain reserves of 3 billion tons—but where it is and the cost of mining are key issues which the prospectors must resolve in the future.

The U.S. Geological Survey has set aside two areas—at Last Chance and Warm Creek—on which it says coal prospectors must take leases, rather than the nominal permits. Such leasing involves competitive bidding. Prospectors are challenging this action. These two areas are relatively near the future water sources to be created by Lake Powell.

One individual is permitted only 10,240 acres in both coal leases or prospect permits in Utah—although an added 5,120 acres may be obtained following a public hearing.

Obviously, no power company could control the necessary reserves for construction of hundreds of millions of dollars in generating capacity if such reserves were limited to 15,360 acres. So some change in the leasing and prospecting laws relative to Federal coal laws should be effected if future problems of developing Kaiparowits coal are to be resolved.

The prospect in the Kaiparowits is a heady one. Some 20 individuals and firms are represented in the search for economically minable coal—among them Arizona Public Service Co. of Phoenix; Richfield Oil Co., Sentry Royalty Co., an affiliate of Peabody Coal Co., St. Louis, Mo., and reportedly Consolidation Coal Co.

Others may be speculating on what may occur in the next few years as others prospect. Richfield has a couple of rigs at work in the Last Chance area and drilling reportedly is planned in the Warm Creek region. New roads have been built into the Warm Creek and Last Chance lease areas from near Glen Canyon City, Utah. Approach also may be made from Escalante.

Mr. Speaker, because of the upper Colorado River project, the Palisades project and, yes, in the future, the Knowles Dam in Montana, and the much-needed Burns Creek project in Idaho, thousands of tons of coal will be mined to be used in steamplants to produce power to firm up the hydropower generated at these projects.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are some who say that if it was not for the hydropower that was generated at these projects, that all of the power needs of this area would be supplied with power from steamplants utilizing coal. This simply is not true. We are finding today many farmers are using natural gas to operate farm irrigation pumps, consumers are using gas furnaces, gas air conditioning and gas appliances because it is cheaper than some of the power rates. On the other hand often a combination of cheap hydropower firmed up with coal-produced steampower produces energy cheaper than gas and is cheaper than power produced with pitch, natural gas, or oil.

Today I have written the following letter to the Secretary of Interior requesting a study on the feasibility of a steam plant to firm up all of the hydroelectric power now being produced in southern Idaho. Such a steamplant would mean work for hundreds of coal miners in Utah and Wyoming.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1963.

The Honorable STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: I would like to request that you consider the possibility of a study of the feasibility of a stream power plant utilizing coal to firm up all of the hydroelectric power presently being produced at Federal projects in southern Idaho.

It has been called to my attention by reputable engineers that the power produced at Burns Creek and Palisades will have a hydro peaking capacity of 77 megawatts which could integrate successfully with a thermo baseload of 171 megawatts providing a firm load of a total of 248 megawatts.

I am sure you are aware of the great deposits of coal in southern Wyoming and northern Utah that could be utilized for a steamplant to firm up the Palisades-Burns Creek power. Such a coal-utilizing steamplant would employ many coal miners in the area.

Please inform me at the earliest possible date your views on such a feasibility study.

Best personal regards,

RALPH HARDING,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Burns Creek will result in increased employment of coal miners and the increase in consumption of coal just as TVA resulted in the increased consumption of coal in the Southeast. Because the combination of cheap hydropower firmed up with steampower produced from coal provides a firm power system that can more than compete with natural gas, pitch, and oil. Therefore, it is my sincere hope that the coal miners of America will realize that the Burns Creek Dam in Idaho and the Knowles Dam in Montana will result in the need for additional coal throughout the West.

Boyd's Board in Blunderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board is in the midst of another blunder. This time the blunder is a multimillion one. This Boyd Board blunder directly involves the livelihood of 2,100 Northeast Airline employees and irrevocably injures the air service presently being enjoyed by the entire Eastern Seaboard.

The Boyd Board decision, a tragic comedy of error in reasoning, is a matter of grave concern to the people of New England. The present availability of air transportation has enhanced the Greater Boston area as one of the foremost educational, cultural, scientific and medical centers of the world. Air transportation by three major carriers has helped to make tourism the third largest industry in Massachusetts and the mainstay of the summer economy of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. All the taxpayers of the United States, along with the traveling public in the Eastern Seaboard, have just cause for alarm over a 3–2 Civil Aeronautics Board decision denying Northeast Airlines all routes south of New York.

With his right hand, Chairman Boyd, together with two other members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has taken away Northeast Airline's only lucrative runs. With his left hand, Boyd has gently patted Northeast Airlines and its 2,100 employees with the false reassurance: "Don't worry, the taxpayers of the United States will now subsidize you as a regional carrier." Chairman Boyd's proposed subsidy represents a cost of at least $3.7 million of the taxpayers money. This figure, while being Mr. Boyd's estimate, could possibly exceed $4.5 million, according to the testimony of record in the Board proceeding. The $3.7–$4.5 million price tag is only one aspect of the multimillion-dollar loss engendered by the Boyd Board decision. Chairman Boyd failed to note that Northeast Airlines had saved the taxpayers of the United States some $15 million as a result of their subsidy-free operation of its New England routes during the past 7 years.

The timing of the Civil Aeronautics Board pronouncements is open to serious question. In 1962, the Civil Aeronautics Board approved the acquisition of Northeast Airlines by the Hughes Tool Co. on the basis that it would improve the airline's financial prospects. On July 22, 1963, the Hughes Tool Co. announced that it had put up $26 million to take care of Northeast's debt. Instead of proceeding to examine the effect of this major refinancing, the Boyd Board issued a press release only 4 days later on July 26, 1963, and announced their intention to deny Northeast of all routes south of New York. To add insult to injury, the Boyd Board delivered its "final" decision on the Northeast Airlines case at 10 minutes of 10 on Thursday morning, August 15, 1963. At 10 o'clock that same day, the Senate Aviation Committee was scheduled to hold a hearing on airline service to the New England States.

After reading and rereading the Boyd majority opinion, I was shocked and dismayed with the shallow and shortsighted reasoning expressed by the Chairman of this quasijudicial agency entrusted with a congressional mandate to safeguard the public interest. The Washington Post, certainly a neutral in this matter, in an editorial of August 17, 1963, entitled "Airline Amputation," stated:

> Issuing what amounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route is a step that should not have been taken without a closely reasoned explanation.

Instead of a "closely reasoned explanation," the Boyd majority opinion is a tremendous display of illogic, inconsistency, and absurdity. The minority opinion correctly concludes:

> The majority decision does not rest upon any major policy grounds. It does not go beyond holding that Northeast shall not be permitted now, and now only, to furnish services in the Boston-New York-Florida markets. It establishes no guidelines, which the industry has a right to expect, as to the degree of competition which the Board will be prepared to consider seriously tomorrow or in the days thereafter.

In order to arrive at its decision, "Boyd's Board in blunderland" opinion is a classic example of circuitous reasoning which undermines past CAB policy and puts a dark cloud on the future of adequate airline service to the people of New England. The CAB's statutory mandate is to apply the test of public convenience and necessity. The Boyd Board's policy in this case does the direct opposite. Instead of carrying out the policy of giving maximum service to the public and assuring a minimum subsidy wherever possible, the Boyd decision drastically minimizes service to the public and greatly maximizes the need for subsidy.

The policy of the President's Interagency Group on Transportation calls for the preservation of competition where the traffic density can support it. The Boyd majority opinion, in complete disregard of the facts presented at the hearing, promotes monopoly in the air routes on the eastern seaboard. The Boyd decision reverses the longstanding policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board of promoting multiline competition on all major routes. Under this policy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has added a third competitive carrier to the 13 routes in recent years, and I point out that all of them are in smaller markets than this one. The two dissenting members of the Board, relying on the facts presented at the hearing, concluded that a third carrier is required as the need for service has greatly increased since Northeast's Florida operation was first approved by a unanimous board.

Chairman Boyd stated that the public benefits anticipated when temporary certification was granted to Northeast have not materialized. The facts presented at the hearing indicate that the direct opposite conclusion is true. The record shows that there are more nonstop flights in Florida operating now than when Northeast received its temporary certification. The record also shows that more cities are being served along the Florida route. The competition engendered by Northeast Airlines has forced National and Eastern to double their schedules. As a result of this competition, the public has been allowed to fly south at convenient times and at prices it can afford to pay. As the dissenting Board members pointed out, the majority opinion now turns the clock back to 1956 with the same stultifying effects on the market which were present that year. The Boyd decision also results in turning over this recently developed and expanding market to just two carriers as a "captive market." Most important, the Boyd decision may strike the death knell for the demise of Northeast Airlines as an operating carrier.

Mr. Boyd also stated that the decision is based on the ground that future prospects for Northeast Airlines are not financially sound. The financial status of Northeast Airlines is not a unique one. It has been shared at various times by one or both of the carriers that are competing with it on the Florida route. Many of Northeast's financial difficulties were caused by the uncertainties brought about by the Board's temporary certification. In handing down the majority decision, Chairman Boyd has failed to take into proper consideration that crucial fact that major refinancing actions had been taken by the Hughes Tool Co.

The Boyd opinion takes away from Northeast the only route over which it can hope to make any profit. The only sentence of the Boyd decision which smacks of reality is the majority opinion's gross understatement that this action "will inevitably have adverse effects on its (Northeast's) employees, the New England communities in which those employees reside, its creditors and its stockholders." The effect on public air service on the East Coast and on the taxpayers of the United States is a staggering one.

I believe that an investigation of the "Boyd Board's blunder" by the Legislative Oversight Committee is in order unless the Board reconsiders this decision. The Legislative Oversight Committee was specifically set up by Congress to oversee the operations of the so-called independent agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board and an investigation of the real reasons behind this erratic decision would certainly be in order.

The Boyd Board decision places an additional burden on the taxpayers of New England on the rest of the United States while at the same time reducing the air carrier service they now enjoy. The Boyd Board decision is a disastrous giant step backward on the promotion of a healthy and competitive public service air system for the people of New England.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 20th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

In yesterday's article I pointed out that the flood of letters I am receiving from southern Idahoans expressing their emphatic opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho came from all walks of life. In view of the increasing number of letters coming in, I shall include several letters, editorials or statements in each of my future articles.

The letterhead of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce classes that county as a beautiful, prosperous land, whose friendly people welcome you. Mr. Lovell, president of the board of directors of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce, informs me in his letter of August 6, 1963, that the board of directors have gone on record in opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. It appears that they have no desire to import areas of substantial and persistent unemployment that now plague the Bonneville area into their area of beautiful prosperous land. I am sure they know full well that each additional extension of the socialistic Federal power empire is but the forerunner of more Federal dictation in this and related fields.

Undoubtedly, most of the members of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce are hardheaded businessmen and farmers that know you cannot sell a product for less than it costs without eventually going out of busines or having someone else pick up the check. When the Federal Government with its tax-free and less-than-true interest cost operation competes with taxpaying private industry, it does so at an unfair and indefensible advantage. Of course, the tax loss, and the unpaid interest cost are subsidized by the Nations' taxpayers. Mr. Lovell's letter follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Emmett, Idaho, August 6, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the Bonneville Power Administration's inclusion of southern Idaho in its marketing area: We of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, have gone on record as opposed to BPA including southern Idaho in its marketing area. Our feeling is that private enterprise is not to be invaded by Government, other than by regulatory laws; that taxpaying private industry can and should furnish this service.

Respectfully,

W. F. LOVELL,
President.

In looking over the pile of editorials, articles and letters expressing opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho, I find another chamber of commerce has gone on record on the matter. An article from the Independent Enterprise of Payette, Idaho, on June 6, 1963, reported the unanimous resolution of the Payette Chamber of Commerce voicing its opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. The article follows:

BONNEVILLE OPPOSITION REGISTERED BY CHAMBER

At last week's regular monthly Payette Chamber of Commerce luncheon meeting held at Maudie Owens Cafe the group passed a unanimous resolution voicing its opposition to the Government's proposed Bonneville Power project for southern Idaho.

In a prepared resolution to be forwarded to each of Idaho's congressional representatives the chamber urges them to make a more thorough investigation into the project. Following is the resolution in its entirety:

"At the regular monthly meeting of the Payette Chamber of Commerce, held May 29, 1963, the following resolution was unanimously passed.

"The Payette Chamber of Commerce very strongly opposes the order of Secretary Udall proclaiming southern Idaho a part of the Bonneville Power marketing area. The order was issued without congressional consideration based on a feasibility study that was not made public. It is a further trend toward Federal bureaucratic domination of water resources, of irrigation, and of agriculture.

"We sincerely urge that you investigate more thoroughly the project to bring Bonneville power into southern Idaho.

"We are aware that it runs counter to President Kennedy's announced policy of not sponsoring projects which private taxpaying industry is able and willing to undertake. Southern Idaho has ample electric power as shown by past and planned future development. The duplication of expensive transmission lines is anything but good business.

"Bureaucratic dictatorship is not needed and certainly is not wanted.

"A. R. MEGORDEN,
"Secretary,
Payette Chamber of Commerce."

Another letter from southern Idaho is Mr. Everett Hustead's letter to me dated July 31, 1963. It is short but to the point. The slogan he quotes indicates that he does not believe Bonneville power would be of any value to southern Idaho or to the seed and grain business with which he is connected. His letter follows:

BUHL, IDAHO,
July 31, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Bonneville. Please include us out.

EVERETT HUSTEAD.

Mr. James H. Shields, a member of the Shields firm that has been engaged in the buying and shipping of seeds and grains for over 50 years, expressed his opposition to Bonneville's invasion of southern Idaho in very forceful language. He brands as a lie any inference that the only people in southern Idaho who oppose Bonneville power are those who were interested in the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. Shields through his connection with a firm that has had a part in the growth of southern Idaho over the past 50 years, unquestionably knows and appreciates the beneficial part that the Idaho Power Co. has taken in promoting such growth. Here is Mr. Shields' letter:

BUHL, IDAHO,
July 31, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: It is the writer's understanding that our Representative from Idaho, Mr. HARDING, recently made a statement in the House to the effect that the only people in Idaho who did not want Bonneville Power were the people who were interested in the Idaho Power Co. This happens to be a lie.

The writer holds no stock in the Idaho Power Co. and has no ax to grind for them, but he is so completely fed up with bureaucratic dictation and the American brand of socialism that even though the Idaho Power Co. were his enemy, he would still be for them in this case.

We are reasonably heavy users of power and we have no objection whatever to the rates that are charged for this power and service. My suggestion is that you look at the commercial and power rates that are charged to people in this territory before trying to bring in a duplicate facility paid for out of tax money.

Isn't there some way that we can stop this continuous encroachment of socialized bureaucracy on a nation that is already staggering under the load of the entrenched bureaucracy.

Very truly yours,

J. H. SHIELDS.

U.S. Students in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of my constituents that raises some very interesting points. In the recent past, the gentlemen from Florida, Congressmen CRAMER and RODGERS and others have raised the question expressing their concern over the effect the U.S. students in Cuba would have on our foreign policy. I submit the contents of this letter in full because I believe it adequately expresses the primary concern many of our citizens have in condoning this type of function.

NOVATO, CALIF.,
July 21, 1963.

Subject: U.S. students in Cuba.

Representative DON CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a teacher and a citizen, I am concerned about the future of our country. I wish I were better informed and really knew what is going on. However, it seems to me that our laissez-faire attitude is about to get us all into something where we shall lose our power to choose individually what is best for ourselves in the future.

The U.S. students who went to Cuba are thinkers who will wield much influence across our Nation when and if they are allowed to return to their campuses. It seems to me that they will be deemed heroes of a cause; in fact, they already are. On the bulletin board at San Francisco State College a couple of weeks ago I saw a dittoed notice put out by the student government that they will support them on

their return, even to taking up a collection to retain legal help to defend their rights to be free to travel anywhere they choose.

These people who are so vocal and aggressive about having freedom and giving freedom do not seem to realize that with rights come responsibilities. All of us cannot be absolutely free to do as we please; for if we are, we take freedom away from others. If we are free, for instance, to have anything we like, we are free to take things that belong to other people. If we are free to speed on the highways, we are free to injure and kill other people.

In giving people freedom to become indoctrinated with the virtues of communism, without exploring the disadvantages, we are taking away the freedom of the free world. The Communists themselves have made no secret of the fact that they plan to rule the whole world; where will individuals have any freedom when and if they take over the world?

When these students went on this trip, did they see and experience any of the hard work which the enslaved people are doing? Did they eat the food the working people eat? Did they sleep and live in the same conditions as the workers do? When I have guests in my home for a short time, we eat better, play more, and work less than usual. Perhaps the best solution to the problem would be to let these students become permanent residents of Cuba, or at least let them stay long enough to see the whole picture. If they wanted to go badly enough to defy the State Department, let them stay long enough to want to come home just as badly as they wanted to go. Then they might give us the right perspective on Cuba.

When these students return to their communities and campuses, they will be spreading the gospel of communism, for as guests they have been shown the glamor of the communistic system. If we as individuals put ourselves out to impress house guests, don't we understand that an enemy government is going to go all out to woo the intellectual group visiting them by showing them the advantages only of their way of living?

This has been an exciting trip for these students. There was little excitement here at home, as these students have grown up in a time when they had no real problems to solve as to the necessities of life or for most of the luxuries, either. They have experienced most of the entertainment that money can buy here. They need new frontiers. They are the pioneers of this generation, and they are pioneering us right out of the way of life that the pioneers lived and fought and died for over the short history of this country.

I hope the people who have the decisions to make will not be soft on these students; for if they are, there are thousands more who will be ready to go next time. They want excitement, too. If these students win this victory, they will win other victories. They will lead their followers back home in doing away with agencies hindering their progress, such as the House Un-American Activities Committee so that they and all their cronies will have complete freedom at our expense.

Really, I am afraid, for I fear for the future of our country and our true freedom. People who have lived under other forms of government and who have become American citizens are really our most devoted citizens; this is proof enough to me that we have the best system.

Will you urge the people in Washington who will deal with these U.S. students when they return from Cuba not to feel sorry for them, but to feel sorry for all the citizens of the United States. Please urge them to do what is best for the future of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

MARGARET BINGGELI.

Dallas Reporter Points Out Kennedy Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as each day passes it is becoming increasingly clear that the Kennedy administration is going to be marked as the most complete failure in national leadership in our history. Our present Chief Executive seems entirely incapable of meeting an issue successfully. His 3 years in office have been a complete contradiction of his campaign promises, and in every area of our national life we are in worsening shape.

Our only hope is that the Nation can survive another year of Kennedy bungling so that the people will have an opportunity to elect an effective leader.

The following article by Robert E. Baskin, head of the Washington bureau of the Dallas Morning News, appeared in the August 18 issue of that newspaper and points out the Kennedy failures to date:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 18, 1963]

PERFORMANCE AS PRESIDENT FAILS TO MATCH PROMISES—1960'S GHOSTS HAUNT J.F.K.

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—The ringing words uttered in the heat of the 1960 presidential campaign are coming back hauntingly over and over to the Kennedy administration these August days.

There are those who have kept a record of the words of candidate John F. Kennedy and the accomplishments of President John F. Kennedy. In 1964, Republicans will lay this record before the people as they try to make Kennedy a one-term President.

In politics, there is frequently a cynicism about party platforms and campaign utterances. There has been a tendency to forget them, and both the public and politicians have accepted this circumstance.

But times are changing. A better read public, more careful recording of campaign statements, and more thorough research by party organizations have made the campaign promise, forged by the requirements of the race, a potentially dangerous thing.

President Kennedy has found out this applies particularly in the field of civil rights.

Look back to the night of September 9, 1960. The place: Los Angeles.

"I have asked Senator (JOSEPH) CLARK of Pennsylvania, and Congressman (EMANUEL) CELLER, of New York, to prepare a (civil rights) bill embodying all the pledges of the Democratic platform, and that bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January."

This was Candidate Kennedy speaking.

But January came, and there was no great pressure for civil rights legislation. The President needed southern votes in Congress to help get his administration underway.

Then came 1962, and it was a trade bill that carried all the priority. This year, up until late spring, the emphasis was on a vote-getting tax-cut measure, designed to help Democratic fortunes in the 1964 Presidential election.

The Negro community, however, had heard the words uttered at Los Angeles. It had read the sweeping civil rights proposals contained in the 1960 Democratic platform. Triggered by Birmingham, demonstrations spread across the Nation, North and South. A mammoth march on Washington was scheduled for this month.

Finally, after 2½ years in office, the administration went to Capitol Hill to beg for a tough civil rights bill which it hoped might put out the fire.

The question of whether there is a need for more civil rights legislation is not pertinent. The important point is that great promises have been dealt out in campaigns to woo minority groups, labor, business and other segments of the voting public. In the case of civil rights, the Negro community took Candidate John F. Kennedy at his word and now it demands fulfillment of his promises.

In the sometimes absurd political world of today, facts stated at one time suddenly evaporate overnight.

There was much said in the heat of the 1960 campaign about the state of our defenses.

"The missile lag looms larger and larger ahead," Kennedy stated dolefully on August 26, 1960.

One month after he took office, however, the missile gap vanished and the administration was saying that "any gap favors the United States, not Russia." A veritable miracle appeared to have occurred overnight—after the election of a Democratic President.

But such statements are not as serious to the voting public as the comparison of campaign promises with accomplishments of an administration.

"Our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the outflow of gold," Kennedy said in New York on October 12, 1960.

Nearly 3 years later the Treasury Department is desperately seeking methods to correct the balance-of-payments situation and the outflow of gold continues.

In the field of labor relations, the President has found that campaign pledges don't exactly fit the harsh circumstances of a genuine labor dispute.

In the campaign he said: "The next administration must work sympathetically and closely with labor and management. Nor is there a place for the kind of ad hoc last-minute intervention which settled the steel strike."

In office, the President named a number of ad hoc committees to take part in labor disputes. One of these, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, was thrown into the maritime industry row, and Republicans claimed the industry was threatened with punitive legislation if it didn't give in to the Government wage proposals.

In fiscal affairs, the President found it expedient in the campaign to talk balanced budgets before certain audiences.

At Seattle, Wash., on September 6, 1960, he said: "Let me say that I think it is extremely important that the United States maintains to the extent possible a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget."

Although there is an escape hatch in the phrase, "to the extent possible," the President has made small effort to keep income and outgo in balance, in a time of national prosperity.

This year the budget is a record 98.8 billion, with a prospective deficit of 10 billion. Next year, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon confided to the House Ways and Means Committee the other day, a budget well over 100 million is contemplated. If the administration's tax cut is passed, no one knows what the deficit may be.

The great tragedy of the Kennedy administration has been Cuba and the Bay of Pigs defeat, which still goes unexplained officially. Yet in the campaign the President had indicated a strong policy toward Cuba.

"We must attempt," he said on October 20, 1960, "to strengthen the non-Batista democratic anti-Castro forces in exile—thus far these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government."

But when the die was cast in early April 1961 and the Cuban invaders went ashore, somewhere in the depths of the White House a decision was made to deny them American air cover.

Today administration men say that the Castro regime is withering on the vine as a result of American economic policies toward it.

But the Cuban policy that has probably been most dismaying to this country was the administration's failure to get onsite inspections of the presumably dismantled Russian missile bases on the island last fall. Although this had been stipulated as a condition in talks with Khrushchev, it was never achieved. Meanwhile, Russian troops remain in Cuba, and there continue to be reports of military buildups there.

In the area of civil rights, the President has had other conflicts between his campaign statements and his performance.

On October 17, 1960, in Springfield, Ohio, he said: "I am not going to promise a Cabinet post or any other post to any race or ethnic group."

Only last year, however, he tried to get Congress to approve a new urban affairs Cabinet post with the promise that a Negro, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, would head it. Congress said "No."

In a campaign speech in New York, Kennedy had this to say: "There is more power in the presidency than to let things drift and then suddenly call out the troops." But he had to exactly that at Oxford, Miss., last fall.

In the campaign Kennedy was well aware of the criticism leveled at General Eisenhower for playing golf and spending long weekends at Augusta, Ga.

"I am not promising action in the first 100 days alone," he said on November 5, 1960, in New York. "I am promising you 1,000 days of exacting Presidential leadership. I want to be a President who believes in working full time."

The record shows that in his first 2 years in office, the President was away from the White House 215 days—one-third of the time—at such places as Hyannis Port, Palm Beach, Newport, and Glen Ora.

Kennedy was asked in 1960 about nepotism. "Nepotism is dangerous to the public interest and to our national morality," he declared.

In addition to brother Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, Kennedy has appointed brother-in-law Sargent Shriver as head of the Peace Corps. Though not holding an office, brother-in-law Steve Smith occupies a position of high trust, particularly on political matters. Brother EDWARD (TED) KENNEDY has been elected Senator from Massachusetts. And the Kennedy sisters are active in a number of semiofficial administration projects.

On specific programs, contained in the Democratic platform, the administration has had a hard time convincing Congress of the need for them.

"Next January," Kennedy said on September 16, 1960, "a Democratic Congress, working with a Democratic administration, will push through a bill providing for adequate—and honorable—medical care for the aged."

The medicare bill remains locked in the House Ways and Means Committee and nothing will be done on it this year—3 years after Kennedy set a schedule for its passage.

Even the press has grounds to quarrel a bit with the President's campaign promises.

"I would think that whoever was President would see the press at least once a week," Kennedy said in Independence, Mo., on October 20, 1960.

The record: 46 press conferences in the first 2 years of office and even fewer this year.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 18, 1963]

AN EFFECTIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL CAN REMOVE HOFFA FROM OFFICE

WASHINGTON.—On October 17, 1960, John F. Kennedy made a statement he may well rue today.

"An effective Attorney General," he declared, "with the present laws on the books, can remove Mr. Hoffa from office."

Robert F. Kennedy has served 2½ years as his brother's Attorney General.

James R. Hoffa, now as in 1960, is still firmly in the driver's seat as president of the Teamsters Union.

Extracts From Citizens' Letters Opposing the Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous letters from many parts of the country remarking unfavorably on the partial test ban treaty. Pertinent extracts from some of these letters follows:

Brownsville, Tex.: "Why should we relinquish decision about our safety to anyone else?"

Carmichael, Calif.: "Wouldn't it be wise to ask for a display of good faith, in the form of an agreement to this treaty, that would ask for Russian troop removal from Cuba?"

Kerrville, Tex.: "Say no to the treaty."

Phoenix, Ariz.: "These are dark and terrifying days when we see our Nation being systematically disarmed."

Lake Jackson, Tex.: "I do not see how we can possibly afford to stop perfection of atomic weapons, since we have many enemies working 24 hours a day to build up atomic weapons. Among these, Red China notably, would never consider such folly."

Kansas City, Mo.: "This test ban treaty is pitiful."

Atherton, Calif.: "What folly to think that the Communists will adhere to the test ban treaty."

Portola Valley, Calif.: "Even though there may be a word-by-word examination of the test ban treaty, we hope you Congressmen will remember that you are dealing with a Khrushchev who has no integrity."

Austin, Tex.: "Would amount to a diplomatic Pearl Harbor for America."

Klamath, Calif.: "The test ban treaty holds grave implications for all Americans and freedom loving peoples."

San Jose, Calif.: "Do not sign that phony test ban."

Phoenix, Ariz.: "Have we lost all our senses? Please, please, advise no to the ratification of this surrender treaty."

New York, N.Y.: "Human beings are supposed to have intellect and be able to think. How many times must Uncle Sam's head be pushed into a Russian trap before people wake up to find it is lethal?"

Indianapolis, Ind.: "It is a sad day for the future of this country. Demand to know some details at least of the contents of the two K's correspondence."

Coudersport, Pa.: "We would not be against such a treaty if it were not against our best national interest and security, however we do believe it is not, in it's present form good for our national welfare and security."

Orcutt, Calif.: "Russia never keeps a treaty (unless it is to her benefit to do so). What she has up her sleeve now, no one can guess * * * but we don't trust our own investigators to keep a close enough eye on her, and we don't trust our leadership to take the proper action if we did find out she was violating the agreement."

Pasadena, Calif.: "I protest the test ban deal with the Russians. Why give them any further power than us?"

South Gate, Calif.: "D. Manuilsky stated 30 years ago that the Communists would make unheard of peace overtures, then when we capitalists were lulled into complacency they would smash us—they tell us what they will do, why can't we believe them after repeated proofs?"

Bradenton, Fla.: "It is indeed a sad day for our country."

Cypress, Calif.: "I do not sleep good nights for fear of the things that are going on in Washington."

Compton, Calif.: "It is an integral part of Communist strategy for its opposition to disarm."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "Protest the signing of the test ban treaty with Russia. How can we trust them now?"

Menlo Park, Calif.: "With Cuba a Soviet stronghold—with millions of people still unwilling captives of Soviet Russia, this is no time to call a halt to testing—or proceed in any way to disarm America."

Pittsburgh, Pa.: "Vote against the test ban treaty."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 2 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Th

ce
sp
ro
pa
di
ev
in

be
ge
I
in
p
n
o
p
n

b
s
d
li
a
t
c
i
r

t
s
c
s
c
c
r
c
c
i

Appendix

The Future Role of Our Navy's Aircraft Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been considerable speculation in the press as to the future role of our Navy's aircraft carriers. Apparently, this subject is also being widely discussed in the Pentagon, where all evaluation of our weapons is being made in terms of their cost effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that no Member of this body would quarrel with genuine efforts to save defense dollars. I am always heartened to learn of meaningful progress in cutting our military procurement costs. But I for one will not hesitate to speak out if our defense officials should downgrade military preparedness in the name of cost effectiveness.

Since World War II I have confidently believed that the aircraft carrier is essential to our own defense and to the defense of the free world. I do not believe confidence can be programed into a computer, but I do believe that if all the significant characteristics of our aircraft carrier could be programed into an infallible machine, the evaluation would ring up a plus in favor of the carrier.

As recently as the Cuban quarantine, the carrier reaffirmed its key role as the spearhead of our naval strength. The Cuba crisis proved again that in our superior sea-based strength we have the critical long-trump suit, and consequently, in any confrontation with Communist expansion across the sea, Navy carriers will lead the way to sea control for the United States.

With this brief introduction, I commend to my colleagues two items for consideration: the first, an article entitled "The Future of the Attack Carrier," appeared in the June issue of Navy magazine. The second item is a New York Times story on the recent British decision to construct a new aircraft carrier next year. This story, Mr. Speaker, is a remarkable vote of confidence in seabased airpower by a country not blessed with the abundant national resources available to this country. This, a significant decision by an ally who, through its long history, has shown an unusual appreciation for seapower in all its varied aspects. This story shows, too, that this decision was made after long and studied deliberations at the highest defense levels. So I offer the suggestion that the reasoning, the facts, the arguments behind this timely decision might be of value to the Pentagon and vital to our Nation's defenses.

The above-mentioned items follow:

[From Navy magazine, June 1963]

THE FUTURE OF THE ATTACK CARRIER

(By Anthony Harrigan)

To arrive at a strategic rationale for the aircraft carrier in the mid-1960's, the Nation has only to consider the objectives of the foes of freedom and the options available to them.

For the two principal centers of Communist power—the Soviet Union and China—the objective remains that of permanent revolution and expansion. Whatever differences exist between these two power centers, as to the tactics or tempo of conquest, they have in common a southward drive for empire and domination.

This is the central feature of Communist aggression in the sixties, the campaign aimed at the Southern Hemisphere. Virtually all the Communist targets, with the exception of West Berlin, lie to the south—in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

MUST USE THE SEAS

This course of empire shapes and determines the options available to the enemy. It means, chiefly, that the "land beast," to use Churchill's phrase, must employ a maritime strategy.

In appraising the future of the attack carrier, it is essential to bear in mind that to expand throughout Afro-Asia and Latin America the Communist powers must shift a large part of their aggressive efforts from landspace to seascape.

This is an epochal change for world communism. Traditionally, Russia and China are land powers. The revolutionary forces in the two countries grew out of a background of partisan conflict on land. But the uncommitted world, the weak, developing nations, generally lie across the seas. If not actually separated from Communist centers by bodies of water, the successful control of these target territories depends on control of adjoining seaspace.

For the Soviet Union to maintain a satellite in the Latin world, it must enjoy secure sea communications. It must have complete freedom to ship arms and other material and to use the seas to put down patriotic rebels and subvert nearby areas.

THE FORCES REDS WOULD NEED

To prevent satellites being attacked by indigenous counter-insurgency forces, the Soviets and/or their satellites must have naval forces—torpedo boats, for example—capable of destroying seaborne raiders. In the higher types of psy-war, rockets may be used to threaten or as a form of international blackmail. But the buildup of satellites and the holding of them depends upon control of the seas in key areas.

If the Communist world is to extend its empire into new regions, it must employ a large merchant marine for supplying satellites and be able to give protection to freighters and tankers across thousands of miles of seaspace.

Therefore, all Russian and Chinese Communist designs for expansion logically require a large commitment to a struggle on the seas. This is why the aircraft carrier is so essential to the free world forces. It is impossible to maintain control of the seas without naval aviation. And the carrier is the only means of joining airpower to seapower in continuous, round-the-clock operations in all weather and in all parts of the world.

For Communist China, the problem of seaspace and its control is especially vexing. China is discovering what prewar Japan recognized, namely that control of the Orient requires control of the islands and surrounding ocean areas. Reduction of the free world power in the Orient, whether on Formosa, Borneo or on the ultimate target—Australia—depends utterly on the control of seaspace. Indeed the Chinese Communists cannot be secure anywhere along the periphery of their empire so long as free world naval forces can range the empire's sea frontiers.

THE GROWING CHALLENGE

It is for this reason that the free world may expect a rising challenge to its supremacy on the seas. The challenge is sure to come in the Southern Hemisphere where Western bases are not numerous, naval forces often are nonexistent (as in the Indian Ocean, and where political complications make shore based activity impossible or impractical. Logically, it is in this Southern Hemisphere that the aircraft carrier will be most needed in the period immediately ahead.

As we observe the development of a new challenge on the seas, it is important to take a close look at the options available to the enemy.

The West is familiar with Communist pressures on land—in Berlin, for example. But there is less understanding of how such pressure could be applied in seaspace. It is important to realize that applications can be found.

Vice Adm. J. S. Thach, U.S. Navy, commander, Antisubmarine Warfare Force, Pacific, in a recent address at the Royal Australian Naval College, cited some of the possible avenues of enemy action. He said:

"I, for one, expect no letup in this Communist campaign to freeze us out of an ever-widening proportion of the world's sea areas. Is it too much to imagine that they may some day seek to exclude free world ships from the Yellow Sea, the Sea of Japan, or, say the Java Sea? I think not."

Admiral Thach's warning is timely. The likelihood is that the Sino-Soviets will attempt to include more and more seaspace behind the Iron Curtain, so to speak. Westerners should expect harassment of shipping and naval forces, efforts to control and block vital straits (possibly by minefields), illegal claims of exclusive right to open seaspace, and perhaps the sinking of free world ships by unidentified vessels. Some forms of undeclared war at sea by volunteers would be in keeping with Communist practices in areas of conflict on the ground.

The West has seen the Communist pressure methods at work on land too often to believe that such pressures will stop at the water's edge. The halting and harassment of motor vehicles on the Berlin autobahn also might be applied to free world shipping in straits under the guns of Communist powers. The shooting of U.S. planes over the Baltic Sea could be paralleled by the sinking of ships on peaceful missions.

To keep the sealanes open, to prevent harassment of free world shipping, and to prevent the seas being used as avenues of Communist aggression, graduated naval force is essential. While small craft are useful in

restricted waters, and while destroyers always are a vital part of naval operations, the only fully effective system dealing with naval threats over a large ocean area is the aircraft carrier.

THE UNIQUE WEAPONS SYSTEM

Only the attack carrier has the mobility, flexibility, and versatility—the varied types of aircraft including helicopters, photoreconnaissance planes, trackers, fighters and heavy attack craft—to appraise a threat and to handle it with discrimination. Only the carrier can bring national power to bear in a region where no U.S. bases exist.

Each day of the year, the United States alone has more than 900 U.S.-flag ships on the trading routes. More than 6,000 free world ships are at sea all the time. Vast numbers of these merchant vessels are in the African, Asian, and Latin American trade. No missile yet devised, no reconnaissance satellite conceived of, can give protection to this shipping—shipping that represents the trade lifeline of the free nations of the globe.

Only the aircraft carrier can operate continuously far from bases and friendly ports, provide an umbrella of protection over hundreds of square miles of seaspace and deal with attackers in whatever form they appear. Thus security at sea and the aircraft carrier are synonymous in our time.

One of the most fundamental needs of the free world—an oceanic federation—is to provide security to the trade lifeline. This lifeline is nothing less than the vital link between the nations of the West. If the Communists were to deny the West secure sea communications and effectively harass Western shipping, closing off new seaspace, the allied forces would be separated and in a state of possibly fatal weakness.

THE COIN ROLE

The role of the carrier in counterinsurgency is well known. Whereas the Sino-Soviets have a giant landmass from which they can operate, the West's strength is on the seas. Without plunging everywhere into mainland conflicts, the West—because of the capabilities of the aircraft carrier—can effectively support free nations and peoples from shipboard. These platforms at sea can make available every graduated instrument of national will—from Marine assault troops to heavy air strikes with cannon, rockets, napalm, or such other conventional or special weapons as may be desired.

What seems inadequately understood at this juncture is the role of the carrier in its heavy attack mission. While missiles from the Nation's chief deterrent weapon, they are hardly adequate as a determinant in certain situations. Even if the disaster of global conflict were to take place, with a missile duel between the two principal world powers, the carrier would have a vital heavy attack mission to perform, especially in Asia.

CANNOT OVERLOOK CHINA

Only one of the two major centers of Communist power has a nuclear capability. Even if the second center were to obtain a limited number of nuclear devices, it would be without the means to deliver them.

In a general nuclear war situation, the United States could not afford to ignore the second center of Communist power. Yet it could not, it is supposed, risk holding back a significant portion of its missile strength from targets in the No. 1 Communist power center. Nevertheless, the second center would have to be dealt with effectively at the opening of hostilities. It would be essential to neutralize the power of center No. 2 so as to prevent it from surging out from behind its borders after the two chief belligerents commenced a missile duel.

The defense of the free world would require that the United States be able to exercise the option of neutralizing the second center of Communist power, without having to expend its intercontinental missiles. Use of missiles against a country with a vast population and a basically agricultural economy would hardly seem to be economic expenditure of armed might.

Furthermore, a postnuclear missile duel situation might provide an opportunity to pry loose the Communist system from the Asian land mass. In this case, it might be that the United States would wish to make a selective aerial attack with conventional weapons. Regardless of whether conventional or special weapons were used, dealing with the No. 2 center of Communist power in a time of global conflict would require a residual force of a high degree of invulnerability and flexibility.

Such a force also would be necessary to deal with the ambitions of third-rate powers that thought to take advantage of battle among the giants in order to make conquests. Here again, the carrier system, secure at sea, would be the essential instrument for accomplishing the national goals of the United States.

UNREST IN THE SOUTH

Even the layman can understand that the threat to the United States and free world security is not confined to difficulties between the United States and the U.S.S.R. The bottom half of the globe is seething with unrest, with aggressive impulses and continuing crises. The Indian Ocean, the South Atlantic between Africa and South America, and the Pacific between South America and the east coast of Australia and the Malay Archipelago—are unstable areas where U.S. power must be projected in visible and effective form to deal with the threat of subversion, missile submarines, and surface raiders.

No substitute exists for the large platform at sea, carrying a specialized arsenal of aircraft, weapons and intelligence-gathering facilities. To deal with explosive situations in the emerging countries or those torn by civil strife, to give the United States and its remote allies security, to protect shipping, and to strike decisively with a select range of weapons—these are the capabilities of the attack carrier in the 1960's. It is the weapons system that is able to contribute to security across the full spectrum of conflict.

On the point of vulnerability, the attack carrier is well able to justify itself. It has a high degree of relative immunity. This is a phrase that should be borne in mind in analyzing its cost and performance. It is absurd to ask that a carrier be invulnerable to attack, for complete invulnerability, as George Fielding Eliot has said, does not exist in any weapons system. The ballistic missile may be vulnerable to the antimissile missile or to the laser beam, when the latter is utilized as a weapon. Attack measures and counter-measures form the history of combat systems.

The issue is whether the system has a reasonable degree of immunity from attack.

CHANCES OF DETECTION

In this connection, it is well to consider the aircraft carrier's chances of being detected and to look at its situation from the standpoint of the utmost degree of peril. In earlier times, ships at sea were concealed by the vastness of the oceans, the weather, and the limits of human vision. Then came radar—electronic vision that enabled seamen and airmen to see at great distances. But electronic countermeasures have been devised to fool watching radar. Already there is widespread public discussion of the possibility of utilizing reconnaissance satellites to spy out ships on the sea and to relay precise locations to missile bases on shore.

The unfounded notion in some quarters is that the carrier—indeed all surface ships—are useless if satellites can be developed to provide tracking information. There are many holes in this theory.

First of all, reconnaissance satellites are highly vulnerable. In the event of war or the danger of conflict, nuclear explosions in space could be used to destroy or cripple the functioning of reconnaissance satellites used by the enemy. Even if such measures were not employed, it has been pointed out (by Capt. R. F. Freitag in the Naval Review, 1962) that "techniques of decoying and 'spoofing' satellite sensors can be evolved to confuse satellite sensors." This is the old, old story of countermeasures.

A MOVING TARGET

But even if such countermeasures failed and reconnaissance satellites were not neutralized by high-level atomic blasts, an aircraft carrier would still enjoy relative immunity from successful attack. The process of locating a carrier by satellite, identifying it as unfriendly shipping, relaying of data to home bases, cranking of data into missile guidance systems, and the actual flight of the missile from launching pad to target areas thousands of miles away—all would be time consuming.

By the time the missile arrived at where the carrier had been spotted, the high-speed vessel would be far away from the area of nuclear danger. The mobility of the carrier remains its ultimate strength. The enemy faces no difficulty in giving directions for attack on hardened missile sites. But a seaborne attack system has the mobility that affords a good margin of safety.

THE NUCLEAR POWER AGE

As to the contention that carriers require too great a supply train and escorts, the same economy arguments can be directed against land-based defense systems. Hardened missile sites and command posts underground require massive expenditures for silos and protective covering. Land-based aircraft require expensive airfields, aerial tankers and other facilities. Submarines require tenders, double crews and missile-loading facilities and installations. Indeed there is no modern weapons system, on land, sea, or in the air—that does not necessitate substantial adjunct facilities.

But the carrier system enjoys a high degree of freedom from auxiliary services in time of danger. Indeed with the advent of the nuclear-powered carrier, the need for ship fuel is at an end. Because of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier's capability of moving continuously at high speed, some naval thinkers are of the opinion that the protective screen can be dispensed with so that the carrier may operate alone in the future.

The more one examines the unique capabilities of the attack carrier—its adaptiveness to the special conditions and dangers of the 1960's, the more one is able to appreciate the statement that the carrier does not need defense; it defends itself.

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1963]

BRITAIN TO BUILD CARRIER

LONDON, July 30.—The British Government announced today that it would build a 50,000-ton aircraft carrier.

Minister of Defense Peter Thorneycroft, after having informed the House of Commons of the decision, said also that the Royal Air Force and the Royal Navy, had decided to have the same fighter plane, one capable of taking off and landing vertically. It will replace the air force's Hunter and the fleet air arm's Sea Vixen.

Any concern capable of building the carrier will be free to submit bids, Mr. Thorneycroft said. It is expected to cost the equivalent of $168 million.

The new carrier will replace the *Victorious* and the *Ark Royal*, the Defense Minister said. Both are expected to have ended their useful lives by the early 1970's.

Two other carriers, the *Eagle* and the *Hermes*, will be refitted to extend their useful

lives until about 1980, Mr. Thorneycroft said.

The new carrier and these two, he added, will insure that the fleet air arm can maintain its role at least until 1980.

Orders for the new carrier will be widely placed, Mr. Thorneycroft said, and will soon begin filtering through to the shipbuilding and engineering industries. In general, both these industries in Britain have been suffering for lack of orders.

The Government has decided on conventional means of propulsion for this ship, Mr. Thorneycroft said, partly because nuclear propulsion would raise the cost substantially.

The new carrier will incorporate a design feature known as the parallel deck, in which landing and takeoff lanes are side by side to give unrestricted landing, takeoff, and parking operations at the same time.

The Defense Minister said he hoped to be able to say something more definite about the planned aircraft when Parliament resumes in the fall.

It will be based on the Hawker P-1154, he said. This is a more elaborate version of the P-1127, a vertical takeoff and landing fighter that Hawker has been flying for about 3 years.

New Anti-Commie Group Promises Rollback Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark, N.J., Sunday Star-Ledger of August 18, 1963:

NEW ANTI-COMMIE GROUP PROMISES ROLLBACK ACTION

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

It is now evident that this Democratic administration is committeed to a policy of seeking peace with the U.S.S.R. on the basis of something like equality.

This means that where the United States has any military superiority based on weapons which the U.S.S.R. might consider provocative, it is giving up these weapons.

This goes for the missile bases in Britain, Italy, and Turkey. It goes for various bombers, existing or like the B-70. It goes for oversea airbases. In short, this administration has committed the United States to gambling on its ability to do what F.D.R. spectacularly failed to do, namely, to convert the Russians to a policy of peaceful coexistence with the West.

This means the renunciation of any use of the superior military and economic resources of the free world which would roll back aggressive communism and liberate its victims. Liberation, of course, the New Frontiersmen insist, by peaceful persuasion in some beautiful though presumably distant future when Communist wasps have lost their stings or their poison.

It is also terribly plain that the Republican Party, as such, has not formulated any alternative policy to that of the Democrats. Individual Republicans snipe at this or that of the administration's measures but never condemn them as phases of a totally unacceptable policy.

After all, the Eisenhower administration came to power with a promise of "liberation." Its first step was to end the Korean war leaving the North Koreans under communism. Then, when East Germans, Poles and Hungarians took candidate Eisenhower at his word, and revolted, President Eisenhower found discretion the better part of valor.

Liberation for Portuguese colonies, for Angola and Guinea, fine. But liberation of Czechoslovaks, Armenians, Soviet Georgians, ah no.

That would be dangerous.

Today, any further confrontation with the Soviet Union is considered too dangerous.

Under these circumstances, it is obvious that those Americans who look on communism as at least as nasty and far more dangerous than nazism must rely only upon themselves.

It is for this reason that as one who would rather be dead than Red, I welcome the start of a new anti-Communist organization, Citizens for Freedom. For this organization intends not only to condemn communism in words, like so many others, but to do something about it.

Furthermore Citizens for Freedom is middle-of-the-road and does not try to link its opposition to appeasement of the U.S.S.R. with cockeyed attacks on the graduated income tax, labor unions, fluoridized drinking water or Chief Justice Earl Warren. These may or may not be domestic issues. They have nothing to do with the main problem of overcoming an insidious form of creeping tyranny centered in Moscow and Peiping.

The reason why I have given my name to Citizens for Freedom is because it promises to be an action group. It plans first of all to coordinate the undertakings of the other existing groups. This means first telling each what the others are doing, second, suggesting "how to assist freedom-loving men and women in other parts of the planet."

Finally, I have every reason to hope, Citizens for Freedom will get into political battles, urging the election of candidates who stand for a policy of genuine "rollback" and the defeat of those who are ready for further compromises and surrenders in the name of peace.

Braceros Save the Day for Union Contractors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent article entitled "Braceros Save the Day for Union Contractors," by Don Taylor, which appeared in the July 20, 1963, edition of the California Farmer:

BRACEROS SAVE THE DAY FOR UNION CONTRACTORS

(By Don Taylor)

The unions cannot supply the seasonal workers needed to harvest California crops.

For several years now, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO, has trumpeted its claims that the only sensible way for a grower to solve his seasonal labor problems is to sign a union contract. Then sit back and watch the union steward shepherd his flock of qualified domestics into the field.

AWOC top man Al Green, predicting the death of Public Law 78 a few months back, told California Farmer, "Braceros will not be allowed to keep on taking jobs away from hungry American workers."

Growers and their spokesmen, however, insist that there just aren't enough domestic workers available, who are willing or able to do the backbreaking, often disagreeable work associated with the harvest of many California crops. The State Department of Employment and the U.S. Department of Labor have consistently backed up grower statements by continuing to certify the existence of labor shortages and approving the use of braceros.

In early July, the union's repeated claims that they can supply an abundance of qualified farm workers were shown to be the empty boasts that growers have long known them to be.

Attempts by union contractors who are signed up with AWOC, to recruit domestic pickers for two bushberry growers in the Ceres-Modesto area drew a complete blank—and the union contractors wound up using braceros to harvest the berries.

The stage was set for this apparent complete contradiction of the AWOC propaganda line when two farm labor contractors who supply labor for the bushberry harvest in the area were involved in labor disputes with AWOC. The union also struck several berry growers at the same time.

A field man for a processor who buys some of the berries in the area advised two of his growers that they had better go to union-approved labor contractors, or they might lose their crops.

The growers decided to go along with this—particularly after the contractors guaranteed them a full crew of domestic workers (all carrying union cards). The AWOC contractors then got busy and attempted to recruit the necessary labor—by any and all means, including radio appeals to workers to take union harvest jobs.

Came the day when the busloads of domestics were supposed to start picking, and nobody showed up. Several pickers came by one of the ranches early in the morning, but when they were told they had to join the union before they could work, the moved on.

Two days later, still no fruit picked, the growers were told that they'd have to get permission to use braceros, because the contractors could'nt get any domestics. The union contractors would still be responsible for housing, transporting, and supervising the Mexican nationals.

The harvest was cleaned up in a couple of days, using more than 100 braceros on one place, 50 on the other. One of the growers did have half a dozen domestics, while the other succeeded in hiring two domestics, who stayed for 1 day. According to the grower, 1 day was too long for one of the domestics—he picked the grand total of one crate of berries in 2 hours.

These are not particularly large growers. One has 7 acres of berries, the other 10. These are the small growers who will be hit, and hit hard, if a source of supplemental farm labor isn't found by the time Public Law 78 ends in December.

One of the growers at Ceres isn't waiting for that. "I'm pulling my berries out after this season. I'll go to walnuts. I've got 7 acres of good 7-year-old vines that I'd like to keep. But I'm not a big operator. I just can't afford to get caught without labor at harvest time."

This ridiculous situation raises a couple of questions we'd like to see the union people answer. Why, when pickets on the one hand are attempting to force berry growers to recognize the union, must two contractors who have already signed with AWOC go to braceros to harvest their crops?

And where are all those domestic workers the AWOC bragged about when it was bitterly denying any need for the bracero program?

The Attack on Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 17, 1963, issue of the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. I believe my colleagues will find this editorial to be of particular interest:

THE ATTACK ON CONGRESS

The pattern by which an upcoming attack on another one of the Nation's traditional governmental freedoms, institutions, or policies by the liberal left is signaled is inevitably the same.

The attack begins most often by some obscure intellectual theory buried in the pages of an equally obscure leftist academic or scholarly journal.

Within weeks, the same point of view is soon being echoed by the most radical of the liberal spokesmen in the House and Senate, and after another brief interval, the new policy begins to be reprinted in news articles throughout the leading leftist papers.

The concentrated attack then finds its way into the featured articles of the leading mass circulation magazines. The magazine articles will either be written by one of the more prominent liberal governmental spokesmen or one of the most widely circulated and read liberal writers.

At the same time the commercial magazines begin to feature the new policy line of the liberal-left camp, the television news programs and special projects commentators then move into the picture and the mass saturation campaign needed to convince the American public of the need for the new policy.

Such a pattern has most recently been put in motion to convince the American public that the Congress of the United States is out of date and should be reorganized.

Where, for a long period of time, the liberals and their various associates of the left merely sought to change certain rules under which Congress operated, i.e., trying to eliminate such traditional practices as the filibuster, unlimited debate of the Senate, or trying to pack certain committees to advance stymied "liberal" legislation.

As a result of the "liberals" lack of success in getting their most radical programs through an unwieldy Congress, the left has decided on a frontal assault to undermine public faith in the Congress itself.

Already, academic circles in colleges are filled with the talk of how "reactionary" Congress really is, how Congress is a "stumbling block" to progressive legislation, and how Congress was organized to meet "the needs of colonial America not a 20th-century America."

About a year ago, such journals as the Nation and the New Republic picked up the theory and gave it further impetus: Congress should be reorganized for more efficient operations. These journals, which are among the chief opinion makers of the intellectual left, soon found their message voiced in another, more popular form, a book by Prof. James Macregor Burns.

Dr. Burns has expanded the initial idea that Congress ought to be reorganized into a plan for a total breakdown of resistance to Presidential programs.

Dr. Burns, because of his expostulation of the theory that Congress is deadlocked, has naturally become the latest darling of the liberal forces seeking to reorganize Congress and change its function into that of a rubber stamp of approval for Presidential programs.

Dr. Burns appeared for instance, last December on the "Meet the Press" programs where the liberal move to undermine Congress with the public received one of its first mass television boosts.

In the interview, Burns began by saying "the basic thing wrong with our political system is that our Government was set up to be a divided government, with internal checks."

Immediately, many Americans will see how Dr. Burns is merely twisting the meanings of words to carry his message: (1) He is implying that our Government is "divided," a word which implies weakness and inefficiency and (2) he is blaming the inefficiency on the "internal checks," that is, the constitutional system of checks and balances.

Dr. Burns' disregard for the constitutional system of checks and balances can be seen in his statement that "Today it is imperative that we have a strong national government, but we still have the old constitutional checks."

Dr. Burns continued: "This is the basic problem, but it is greatly intensified by the fact that Congress, and especially the House of Representatives, has become the least representative agency of the National Government."

Dr. Burns overlooks the fact that the House is still the most representative agency of Government and merely denies the fact that it is. Burns' argument, like that of most members of the liberal left, is that the House is still too conservative; although most Americans recognize the fact that the Members of the House of Representatives are still those men in the Federal Government who are nearest the voters and the voters' sentiments.

Dr. Burns' cure-all? Oh, yes. He would like to see Congress improve so that Congress would, as he sees it, serve "an affirmative role to protect the general interest," a nice way of saying that Congress should be yes-man.

A lot of Americans feel that it is currently doing such a task, that is, protecting American citizens against the radical schemes of professors like Dr. Burns.

But the "doublethink, doubletalk" program against Congress continues; and on March 3, another television sympathizer of liberal left, Howard K. Smith, devoted a portion of his program to indicting Congress for its "increasingly negative mood."

Smith cited Earl Warren as saying that the current Congress would not pass the Bill of Rights if it were introduced today, thus cleverly avoiding the real problem which exists—the attack of the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights by the liberal left.

Smith closed his program by stating that the United States was guilty of "a wastage of human resources that no other nation, free or Communist, is permitting itself."

We hesitate to point out to the clever Mr. Smith that the United States has failed so far to exterminate over 15 million of its citizens in the manner of Soviet Russia and the Chinese Communists, for such a statistic seems to us to be a far greater wastage of human resources.

With Mr. Smith terming congressional representatives "deaf and blind" to the problems which face them, he is merely working in the general framework of the leftist attack on Congress and the plot to make Congress appear weak and ineffectual when the exact opposite is true. Congress remains the sole stumbling block to liberal left ambitions to renovate the governmental and social face of the Nation.

The attacks on the Congress undoubtedly will continue, for other television documentary programs (notably David Susskind's "Open End") have joined in the blast at congressional inefficiency, employing such persons as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., as authorities to back their thesis.

Every citizen should be aware not only of the attacks which are now coming thick and fast but the intent behind the attacks on our representative form of government; for an understanding of these attacks by the left are essential to the freedoms of us all.

Arguments Against Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point two recently published news columns by Fulton Lewis, Jr., in opposition to ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty:

TREATY COULD TIE U.S. HANDS IN EMERGENCY

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

On a bitter cold December night this winter, hordes of Red Chinese and North Korean troops may pour across the 38th parallel.

Soldiers of the South Korean and United States Armies, greatly outnumbered, will retreat down the peninsula, as they did once before, 13 years ago.

In all-night sessions at the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs may decide it is necessary to use tactical nuclear weapons to halt the onrushing marauders. Then the shocker.

From the State Department may come word the military must wait 90 days before nuclear weapons can be used. The reason: A partial test ban ratified earlier by the U.S. Senate.

Preposterous? Not at all, according to legal experts who have studied carefully the treaty brought back from Moscow by Averell Harriman. That document outlaws not only nuclear tests but "any other nuclear explosions," as well. The only exceptions are underground explosions that release no fallout.

The Moscow treaty, now under Senate study, provides any signator must give 3 months advance notice before it can withdraw and test or use nuclear weapons.

There are other loopholes. Suppose the Soviet Union violates the treaty by embarking upon a full-scale test program without giving 3 months advance notice. Legal experts say the United States must still wait 3 months before it can test. Otherwise the United States would be violating the treaty, which remains in effect, and is, the Constitution says, "the supreme law of the land."

The treaty may be abrogated, but this can be a lengthy and arduous task, requiring action by both Houses of Congress. Says Thomas J. Norton, in his definitive work, the "Constitution of the United States: Its Sources and Its Application": "Once a treaty is made, it requires both branches of Congress to abrogate it; that is, the President and the Senate cannot undo their work."

NO BAN FOR RUSSIA

It was December 1961, and Nikita Khrushchev thundered, "We'd be slobbering fools if we did not carry out nuclear tests."

There was no evidence of senility last week as Khrushchev, smiling but not slobbering, gave the green light to his diplomatic lackey, Andrei Gromyko, to initial the partial nuclear test ban approved by repre-

sentatives of Great Britain and the United States.

In little more than 18 months, the ever-cagey Soviet premier had seen the nuclear balance of power tip in his favor and in July 1963, it was time for a test ban.

Not that the ban approved by the Big Three last week is what the name implies. While outlawed by word, tests can still be conducted outside the atmosphere. There is no way, as scientists of the Big Three agreed in July 1959, to detect nuclear tests conducted far above the earth.

THEY MOVE ABOUT

Soviet scientists may find themselves working in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania. Not covered by the ban, the Soviet-dominated countries of Eastern Europe may test—in the atmosphere, in outer space, in the sea, below the ground—to their hearts' content.

Were the Soviets to keep their promise not to test—and past performances make this exceedingly doubtful—the test ban would still be to our disadvantage.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, ranking Republican on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and one of the country's best experts on nuclear strategy, tells why:

1. U.S. progress in development of high-yield, 30- to 100-megaton weapons will be paralyzed at the very time Soviet scientists will have achieved these capabilities. The United States will be unable to cope with Khrushchev's long-range program of hardening his missile sites.

OUR PROGRESS HALTS

The consequent inability to mete out destruction to Soviet weaponry will decrease the capability of our deterrent force in direct ratio to increases in Soviet power. It is equivalent to cutting back our SAC (Strategic Air Command) squadrons, ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missiles) bases, and Polaris submarine patrols.

2. U.S. progress in developing a defense against enemy missiles will come to a halt at the same time Soviet scientists appear to have developed such a capability. As Senator STROM THURMOND, a general in the Army Reserve, told colleagues behind closed doors, the Soviet Union has installed an antimissile complex at Leningrad.

Antimissile defense in the hands of the Soviet Union is another way of saying our deterrent against Soviet attack has weakened. It, too, is the equivalent of cutting back our manned bombers, our Polaris missiles, our Atlas and Minuteman missiles.

If the warheads carried by these delivery systems are to be intercepted by Soviet defenses with any degree of efficiency, then they will not loom as large as deterrents to Soviet buttonpushers.

Conversely, the absence of an antimissile capability by this country permits a Soviet first-strike, surprise attack that would destroy our deterrent forces before they are put in operation.

3. The partial test ban treaty introduces to America the completely new hazard of surprise abrogation. This is the situation where Soviet scientists, working in secrecy, would prepare an extensive series of atmospheric tests.

SURRENDER OR DIE

During this period, which might last for years, U.S. laboratory work would deteriorate in quality and quantity along with our capabilities for atmospheric testing. The net effect would be a quantum jump in Soviet nuclear capabilities which might well gain for them decisive nuclear superiority.

Representative HOSMER concludes: "Under such conditions, the West could expect at worst a nuclear Pearl Harbor and at best a surrender-or-die ultimatum."

A Righteous Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many of those of us who do not live in the South tend to think that all southerners have identical views on the controversial subject of civil rights. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As evidence on this point, I want to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the August 8, 1963, issue of the Clarion Herald, a Catholic newspaper published in New Orleans, La.

This editorial demonstrates that there is an important, and growing, body of public opinion throughout the South—even the Deep South—which demands that the promises of the Declaration of Independence be extended to all Americans.

The editorial follows:

A RIGHTEOUS REVOLUTION

Many persons have failed to grasp the significance of the current civil rights problem in the United States.

It is not simply a series of sporadic demonstrations of discontent by Negroes. These really are symptomatic, the surface indication of a deep current of desire and determination by Negroes to attain fully their rights as American citizens.

The problem is not one that can be fobbed off by the grudging granting of a few privileges here, a few jobs there, in the hope, that the push toward equality will fade away.

Nor can the problem be solved by containment—the jailing of Negro and white demonstrators in individual communities, or legislation and practices that, while permitting some advances, still circumscribe the rights of any group of citizens.

For America is in the throes of a revolution, that is, a total and radical change.

It is a unique revolution. In many countries such a struggle for recognition would have had violence as a necessary factor. Although there has been some violence in connection with incidents in the United States, the intention and program of Negroes in seeking their just rights have been peaceful. For the most part, violence has occurred only on the part of diehards who have fought any change in the Negroes' status or as a result of their intransigent actions.

That the revolution has been peaceful, carried on at length through the courts and more recently in nonviolent assemblies, is a tribute to the Negroes. For the great part they have been amazingly patient and truly American in seeking their goals through orderly, democratic processes.

Their revolution is unique also in that they are not against government as such. Rather, they seek to participate fully in government and in the whole fabric of society.

Theirs is a social revolution, a struggle toward perfecting the social order in the United States. Their goal is simply that of putting the ideals of American democracy fully into effect, of bringing about the social justice that has been called for repeatedly by the popes for the better part of the past century.

The sad part of the whole affair is that there should be any need for such a struggle. National civil rights legislation would not be necessary had basic human rights for everyone been assured in States and communities or, most fundamental of all, in the minds and hearts of all men.

But this has not been the case. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick," the saying goes. Hopes deferred for a full century can be denied no longer. Equitable legislation must be adopted to assure basic rights and social justice. More imperative still is the acceptance of social justice for all as the normal thing in the American way of life.

It is unfortunate that it was felt necessary to use demonstrations, even though nonviolent in intent, in the campaign for ordinary rights. Assemblies of any number of persons always carry a hazard of becoming uncontrolled and resulting in untoward actions. In addition, they may provoke reprisals, even though unjustified, which are likely to be rooted in violence. Since there is such a large number—100,000 persons—expected in the march scheduled in Washington August 28, these dangers may become acute then. From this standpoint the proposed demonstrations seems ill advised.

Religious motivation may be the saving factor. At the recent emergency meeting of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice in Chicago it was pointed out that "the dedication and zeal with which Negroes, young and old, have thrown themselves into the struggle has been as true a religious experience as anything America has ever witnessed."

But the movement may lose its spiritual character unless it is buttressed by a religious awakening overall. Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic religious leaders alike have pleaded for a nationwide stirring of conscience to this question as a crucial moral issue.

Volumes could be written on the urgency for arriving at a just solution to the problem, detailing economic, social, historical, and other reasons. Ultimately, they rest upon one inescapable fact—that God created men equal in human nature and in destiny and, therefore, that it is God's will that men live together truly as brothers on earth as they will in heaven.

Are We Blindfolded?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times carried an editorial concerning revelations made by our colleague from Florida, the Honorable PAUL G. ROGERS. The editorial centers on our problem with Cuba, and I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the Chicago Sun-Times editorial at this point.

ARE WE BLINDFOLDED?

While the bright light of world attention has been focused of late on Moscow and the nuclear test ban treaty talks, it has been easy to overlook the festering sore that is Cuba, 90 miles away from the United States.

Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, brought some needed attention

back to this trouble spot by announcing in the House that Navy and Maritime Administration figures show that more than half of Russia's supply burden to Communist Cuba is being borne by shipping from U.S. allies.

In May, Representative ROGERS said, 44 ships from our allies called at Cuban ports as compared with 38 Russian ships. In June the tally was 39 ships from our allies to 31 Russian ships. July figures are not complete but the same ratio is prevailing.

This supply line to Cuba that is being maintained by countries who are U.S. allies, many of them receiving U.S. funds in the form of foreign or military aid, enables Russia to divert her own shipping to uses in other parts of the world. The requests made by the United States to these countries to restrict such trade have fallen, for the most part, on deaf ears. Yet our State Department recently said that it was "generally satisfied" with the cooperation it has received in this area.

While the focus of attention on Cuba may have lessened considerably, the danger still remains. Yet there are reports in Washington that all high- and low-level aerial reconnaissance of Cuba has been stopped on the ground that no untoward incident must endanger the test ban treaty talks or the Senate ratification of the treaty.

If it was necessary to maintain aerial reconnaissance over Cuba before the test ban talks, why would it be safe to stop this activity during the period of the talks and the Senate debate on ratification of the treaty? It must be remembered that aerial reconnaissance revealed the Russian missiles on Cuba. With aerial reconnaissance suspended the United States would be virtually blind to what is going on in Cuba.

Representative ROGERS has performed a signal service to the country in calling the attention of the Congress to the imbalance of Western shipping serving Cuba—and Russia.

Now it is in order for some Member of Congress to perform an even more important service in demanding to know if it is true that aerial reconnaissance of this danger to the United States has been suspended. And why.

Uninsured Drivers in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a bill, H.R. 6537, to establish a motor vehicle indemnification fund for the District of Columbia. This proposal would require uninsured drivers to pay a fee into a fund which would make it possible for accident victims to be compensated, in some measure, for damages caused by the uninsured driver.

A similar indemnification fund to protect against uninsured drivers is now in operation in Maryland. With Washington being such a busy urban area; full of tourists, Maryland and Virginia commuters, and District residents, the accident risk is great. I am pleased that four recent editorials broadcast by Station WMAL supported the need for this type of legislation in the District of Columbia. The text of the editorials follows:

UNINSURED DRIVERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Several times in recent years Congress has been asked to pass uninsured driver legislation for the District. Nothing has yet happened, though the toll of individual misery continues to mount.

For example, 2 years ago a driver was struck from behind by another car. This accident caused the usual whiplash injuries to his back. There was $240 damage to the innocent driver's car. His attorney estimates that he suffered personal injuries worth $2,000. He can't collect because the other driver was not insured. The uninsured driver has made a settlement—but nowhere near the amount insurance should have provided. But the innocent driver will never recover his full claim.

Congress should enact measures to protect the public from damages caused by uninsured District motorists.

A District man was seriously injured in an accident while driving his cab. He brought suit against the other driver and was awarded $30,000.

The guilty driver, however, had no money and no insurance. So the injured man has been unable to collect.

This situation could have been prevented if the District had a financial responsibility law like those in Maryland and Virginia. Under such a law a car owner has to have insurance or pay a penalty. These payments go into a fund to pay for injuries such as those suffered by the cab driver in this case.

As it is now, this man may be on public welfare for the rest of his life. Funds provided by a financial responsibility law would enable him to secure special training and otherwise help him to be self-supporting.

There are measures before Congress to establish a financial responsibility law for the District. It is time Congress took action.

There is no law in the District to effectively require car owners to buy liability insurance. If an uninsured auto is involved in an accident, the District can only take away the owner's license until liability claims are paid.

That may keep a few dangerous drivers off the streets, but it does not compensate their victims for the damage and injuries they suffer. For example, three people in a car were hit from behind by another car. All three suffered severe back and neck injuries.

Their medical expenses alone came to about $600. In court they would have received these costs plus reimbursement for time lost from work. However, the driver who hit them was not insured, and was not otherwise financially able to pay.

There was an out-of-court settlement. The injured parties collected $150, and then the driver stopped payments. The injured people are out several hundred dollars in actual expenses.

Congress can prevent this sort of injustice by passing pending legislation on uninsured autos. This matter has been allowed to slide for too many years.

Not long ago a car driven by a drunk driver struck and killed a District man. The driver had no money and was not covered by liability insurance. Therefore, the dead man's survivor cannot obtain compensation. The man killed had helped support his aged father.

Such situations could be avoided if the District had effective financial responsibility laws for car owners and drivers. Under such laws, the bereaved father would have sued for the support money he lost when his son died. If the driver couldn't pay, the father would have been compensated from a special fund collected from uninsured car owners.

There are three bills now in Congress to deal with the District's uninsured cars. Previously, similar bills were introduced, but they went nowhere. This time Congress must act.

Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, in voting a few days ago to continue our temporary national debt limit at $309 billion, has continued the trend of a decade in countenancing—in giving its blessing to—a program of deficit spending by our Federal Government. In effect, we have told this administration—as we have told it and other administrations over the past 10 years:

> Go ahead and spend money we don't have. Spend it and we will bail you out, and pass the load onto our great, great-grandchildren, as yet unborn.

Let me trace briefly this last decade in our fiscal responsibility.

In 1946, the year in which World War II—the most costly war in the history of the world—ended, the United States had a permanent debt limit of $275 billion. We lived with that limit until 1954, at which time we were forced to add a temporary debt limit of $281 billion.

In 1956, the temporary limit was reduced to $278 billion, and it was further reduced the following year to the permanent limit of $275 billion. However, in 1958, the temporary limit was raised to $280 billion—and then, in that same year, the permanent limit was raised to $283 billion and the temporary limit to $288 billion.

Just 1 short year later, the permanent limit was raised to $285 billion and the temporary limit to $295 billion. The following year, 1960, was a good year—1 of the just 3 good years in the past 10. The temporary limit was reduced to $293 billion.

However, 1960 was the last good year because, starting in 1961, we had greatly accelerated Federal spending and greatly increased deficits. In 1961, we raised the temporary limit to $298 billion. Last year we had to raise the temporary limit twice—first to $300 billion, and then to $308 billion. Just 2 months ago we voted, by an extremely narrow margin, to raise the temporary limit to $309 billion—and on our recent vote we held the line on that amount.

But make no mistake about it, the end is not in sight. We have already been informed that this fall we will be asked to again raise the temporary debt limit—possibly to as much as $320 billion.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that our present debt is some $25 billion more than the combined debts of all the other countries of the world. May I also point out that the interest on our present debt costs us more than $10

billion annually. And may I also point out that our current interest payments amount to more than the total amount it cost to run the Government as recently as 1940? True. The entire budget for 1940—just 23 years ago—was just $9.1 billion.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out that we had lived with and within a permanent debt limit of $275 billion from the end of World War II until 1954. However, 1 year earlier, in 1953, an increase of $15 billion was sought. It was defeated and, to the surprise of many, the country did not go straight to the dogs. We tightened our belts and lived within our means.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we could have done the same thing this year. Had we reduced the temporary limit to $307 billion we would have served notice that the Congress—and the people it represents—do not intend to live indefinitely with a government where costs rise each year. We would have served notice that the Congress—and the people it represents—are demanding a curtailment of unnecessary Federal expenditures.

Federal spending must be curtailed if the dollar is to retain any semblance of stability. But it is we, in the Congress, who must see that it is curtailed. We cannot rely on the Executive to do it.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, about preserving our natural resources for future generations. I agree. We should not—we cannot—utilize and use up all of our natural resources, without thought to those who come later and must pay for our having used their birthright.

A strong stand on the matter this fall when it comes before the Congress again will serve notice that we intend for this Government to live within its income. Even more important such a stand will reduce the fires of inflation which are everywhere on the horizon today.

Let us reduce expenditures accordingly—and it will not be necessary to raise the debt limit come this October.

Rendered Unto Caesar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there has been much comment recently regarding the activities of certain religious denominations, religious leaders, and religious organizations in the field of social and political activity.

On Saturday, August 17, there appeared a very timely editorial in the Lynchburg News, of Lynchburg, Va., dealing with this subject. Feeling that this is a matter of great interest to many of our people who are actually interested in the separation of church and state, I include with my remarks the editorial, which is as follows:

RENDERED UNTO CAESAR

We are witnessing in Toronto these days the spectacle of one of the world's leading church denominations busily organizing itself into a political action pressure group.

We can only wonder if the Episcopal Church knows what it is doing or whether it is deliberately smashing the barrier which has separated and protected the churches from the state.

There was a time not so long ago when the churches stood up and thundered when the temporal state appeared to be invading their spiritual domain.

Separation of church and state in this country has been observed with religious zeal by both parties. And although many churches rattled their pulpits with denunciations of the Supreme Court's recent decision barring prayer in the public schools, they seemed to realize that the Court was charged with the responsibility of defining the dividing line between church and state.

But now the churches have whipped themselves into an emotional crisis over the Negro demands for amalgamation in a white society and have put aside their traditional hymns for the marching cadences of "I Will Not Be Moved." They are a little late—by some 150 years—in their zeal. It was Negro action which bestirred them, not their consciences.

The Episcopal Church has been more vocal than the other denominations, but no more active. The Episcopalians are standing in the spotlight stuffing themselves with the forbidden fruit; the other denominations are snatching it more or less furtively from the tree. And in so doing, they all face expulsion from their spiritual Eden where the state was forbidden, into the world where the state rules.

The Episcopal House of Bishops has transformed their church in the United States into a political action group by calling for all-out participation in the Negro march on Washington August 28 to bring pressure on Congress to pass the Kennedy administration's civil rights program.

Lest there be any mistake about the church's intention, the presiding bishop, the Right Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, went to lengths to spell it out: The bishop's call for participation in the civil rights struggle "goes beyond endorsement," he said. It is intended to "show solidarity of Episcopalians in support of social justice."

The bishops approved a list of resolutions calling for all-out participation in civil rights struggles. These resolutions were drawn up by a committee of which the Right Reverend William H. Marmion, bishop of the Southwestern Diocese of Virginia, was cochairman. The group, needless to point out, contained many clergymen well known for their integrationist activities. As such, it was a "loaded" committee, appointed to bring in an agreed-upon plan of action.

It is official church policy now to take an active part in a movement which has a purely political objective: the passage of certain legislation.

It is a moot point whether the churches are seeking social justice. We do not question their motives. They are seeking, we believe, to promote the general good as they understand that good. It is not the battle they have chosen, but the tactics and the weapons we condemn. As long as the churches exerted their influence from the pulpit and appealed to individuals from Presidents to plumbers, they were fulfilling their obligations to God and man in their most effective way. They challenged faith and conscience. Now they challenge political power.

But the moment they abandoned their spiritual domain and took upon themselves the role of political action groups, endorsing legislation and demonstrating—often in violation of State law—for its passage, they lowered themselves to a level where their actions are just as suspect as those of any other political organization or group.

Many Lynchburg clergymen are to be commended for their clear thinking in condemning church participation in the Negro march. Their stand against official church interference in no way reflects on their love and tolerance for their fellow man, be he white or black or any other hue. Some of these men are among the most godly men we know. But they realize that the way to social justice is through the heart and not through the streets.

And those streets are streets of no return. Once involved in politics, the churches cannot take themselves out of the battle. And the day will not be long in coming when they will be hedged around, taxed, and made to pay the penalty of choosing political sides. For in politics someone must lose, and the loser is always discredited.

By their actions, the churches have rendered unto Caesar that which does not belong to Caesar. What is left for God?

This Could Happen Here, or Did It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from the Wanderer of August 15, 1963. This thought-provoking article is just as logical as the Supreme Court decision regarding bible reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer:

THIS COULD HAPPEN HERE, OR DID IT?

WASHINGTON, JUNE 4, 1974.—The U.S. Supreme Court today handed down a decision in favor of the Terrestrial Association of Nudists (TAN) in the most recent of the school cases to come before the Court.

The Court ruled that all children of the United States would have to come nude to school henceforward because the wearing of clothes was embarrassing to the children who were members of the Terrestrial Association of Nudists.

The case originated in the Sunnyside School District where the school board ruled against the Nudists in their attempt to enforce nudism on all the children. Parents of Johnny Brown brought suit against the board, charging that the board was infringing on their constitutional rights first in insisting that their children wear clothes to school and secondly in not ordering that all other children come to school nude—also on the grounds that it would be embarrassing to the children, and discriminatory against them, to fail to enforce a uniformity of nudity in the school district.

Justice Green of the Supreme Court in a lengthy majority opinion maintained that, whereas we were a Christian nation, we were not to use the power of the Government to enforce the ideas of the majority that clothes are a part of a civilized Christian culture. He stated that the Government would be infringing upon the wall of separation of church and state if it insisted upon this basis. He stated that many eminent dermatologists hold that the rays of the sun and the wafting of the wind are beneficial to growing bodies.

Justice Glennon in a separate opinion pointed out that to excuse the nudist children from wearing clothes and permit the other children to wear clothes would "subject them to a cruel dilemma * * * because of an understandable reluctance to be stigmatized as nudists." The Justice made clear that the only way in which the rights of this minority could be protected by the laws of our land was to insist that the majority conform to the standard of nudism. The Justice in a bit of whimsicality expressed the hope that no nudist would ever be appointed to the Supreme Court and insist upon the same decision being applied there.

In a strongly worded minority opinion Justice Pottery warned that the protection of the rights of the minority did not in American jurisprudence automatically negate the rights of the majority, and insisted that the removal of the clothes of the children in the majority was as much an invasion of their rights as the putting of clothes upon the minority.

Experts on the subject of Supreme Court decisions had long predicted that this case would be decided in favor of TAN. They had pointed out that the 1963 decision in regard to Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer case had been based upon the fact that the minority not only must be protected from the wishes of the majority, but that the majority cannot be allowed to pray or study the Bible in a school if the minority objects. These experts said that the Court in recent years has consistently ruled against the principle that a consensus of the American people as to the value of a custom cannot establish this custom if there are any who object; and hence that the rather long custom of the American people of dressing their children for school could not, since it was a Christian custom, be maintained in the face of those who objected to it on religious grounds.

Our Domestic Gold Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern in this country over our rapidly dwindling gold reserve which is now under $16 billion. We have lost about $8 billion of gold in the last few years. The outflow of gold continues at a most rapid and alarming rate.

One way to remedy this situation is to produce more gold in this country. Unfortunately, we are doing nothing to assist our gold mining industry. On the contrary we have been following a course which has resulted in the closing of our domestic gold mines, and no relief is in sight.

As part of my remarks, I wish to include a copy of an interim report to the stockholders of the Golden Cycle Corp., a Colorado corporation, with its main office at Colorado Springs, Colo., as submitted by Merrill E. Shoup, president, and Max W. Bowen, executive vice president. Stockholders of this company reside in almost every State in the Union and in several foreign countries. This company owns a number of valuable gold mining properties in the Cripple Creek area in Colorado, and also the Golden Cycle Mill, which refined and processed the gold ore produced in this district.

As a result of the continued indifference of our Federal Government toward the plight of our domestic gold mining industry, all of these mines are now closed, and the Golden Cycle Mill suspended operations last January. The letter to the stockholders indicates why it was necessary to take this action.

Mr. Speaker, this same situation prevails in other gold mining areas in the United States. I am at a complete loss to understand why the Federal Government should permit this important industry to pass out of existence. We need the gold which can be produced in the Cripple Creek district. I have introduced several bills which provide for an incentive payment for newly mined domestic gold. I am anxious to do all I can to open these mines and put the miners back to work.

I commend Mr. Shoup on his efforts to obtain relief, not alone for his companies, but for the entire gold mining industry of our country. He has been most diligent in presenting the critical problems facing industry, but his plea for help has been completely disregarded.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time to revive this industry, but it is obvious we cannot wait much longer, as the report of Mr. Shoup indicates. Gold cannot be produced at the present price of $35 an ounce. Congress can reopen these closed gold mines by passing a bill providing incentive payments for newly mined domestic gold. I hope we can act before it is too late.

The report follows:

THE GOLDEN CYCLE CORP.,
Colorado Springs, Colo., August 10, 1963.
To Stockholders of the Golden Cycle Corp.:

The Golden Cycle Corp. during its long tenure has endeavored to keep stockholders fully informed about its operations. The corporation has kept intact its so-called "Cripple Creek package" since we closed all gold mining and milling operations the end of 1961, and we have continued to pay taxes, insurance, maintenance costs, custodians, watchmen, and overhead expense. The package includes the Ajax Mine, the Carlton Mill, the Anchoria Leland and Index Mines, the Colorado Trading & Transfer Co., and the Carlton Tunnel, all wholly owned by the Golden Cycle Corp.; and, in addition, due to its stock and other interest, standby costs of the United Gold Mines Co., the LeClair Consolidated Mines Co., the Empire Lee Mining Co., the Jerry Johnson Gold Mining Co., the New Gold Dollar Mining Co., the Doctor Jack Pot Mining Co., the Roosevelt Tunnel, the Cripple Creek Drainage & Tunnel Co., the Cresson Consolidated Gold Mining & Milling Co., and the Elkton Co. Holding the package together has been expensive, but your management feels it has been justified in these expenditures for two important reasons:

I. THE GOVERNMENT POLICY TOWARDS THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

The price of gold paid by the U.S. Mint, our only customer, was changed in 1934 from $20.67 per troy ounce to $35 where it has remained. All operating costs since 1934 have greatly increased, but gold producers still receive only $35 per ounce. During the war, Gold Mines Closing Order L-208 was imposed by the Government upon the industry surreptitiously almost without warning, and Cycle was able to continue operating its mines and mill on a very limited basis only by converting a portion of the Golden Cycle Mill to the treatment of base metal ores needed for the war effort. Order L-208 closed practically all gold mines, not only in the Cripple Creek district, but throughout the State of Colorado and the Nation and most have remained idle. We thought after World War II and the Korean war ended gold mining would resume its rightful place, but, due to rapidly rising mining and milling costs, it continued to decline until we were forced to place our operations upon a standby basis. During this postwar period, the United States has suffered and continues to suffer heavy loses in its gold reserves, which to date have amounted to approximately $10 billion.

The management believed this continual flow of gold from the United States would necessitate our Government taking action to stop the outflow and to encourage the gold industry by increasing the price paid for newly mined gold or by an incentive payment independent of the Treasury Department. Numerous bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to grant relief to gold producers. The most recent bills, S. 1273 and S. 100, were considered at a hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, chairmaned by Senator GRUENING, of Alaska. S. 100 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to survey the domestic gold mining industry and provide information which would assist Congress to develop legislation to aid the industry. The measure would prohibit sales of gold by any agency of the Government for industrial purposes. The Office of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury strongly opposed the passage of S. 1273 which, among other matters, provided:

1. That the Secretary of the Interior determine the price up to $105 per troy ounce, to be paid domestic producers in order to stimulate maximum production of gold from mines in the United States.

2. That an agency be established in the Department of the Interior to buy gold at such a price and sell for nonmonetary uses at this price.

3. That the price be redetermined annually.

4. That any excess gold be transferred to the Treasury at $35 an ounce.

This bill was proposed to eliminate objections of the administration, Treasury and State Departments as well as the Federal Reserve Bank, all dominated by the administration. The main objection of all these departments is that any change in the price of gold either through direct payment by the Mint or by an incentive payment was "such a provision would immediately give rise to a two-price system for gold, which the administration believes would be a threat to the value of the dollar in international markets." These same departments also offered additional arguments which to us are unsound, but all are so indoctrinated with the "do nothing on gold" attitude of the administration that it is very doubtful at least for the present that any bill submitted will ever even get out of committee.

So long as there was any hope that a change in the price for gold might be secured, which would aid the gold mining industry, we felt the Golden Cycle Corp. was justified in holding the package together to be ready to resume operations if and when relief were granted to the industry.

Your management for many years has carried the fight to save the domestic gold industry to Congress as well as to other governmental departments. After the publication of many papers, talks throughout the country, and numerous appearances before congressional hearings, your management has concluded that there will be no legislation

passed nor any action taken by this administration, the Treasury Department nor the State Department to grant any relief whatsoever to the gold mining industry in the immediate future.

In mid-July 1963 hearings were concluded by the Senate Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels on bills introduced by Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, Senator DOMINICK, of Colorado, and other Senators to raise the price of gold. As a result of these hearings, the U.S. Treasury and the U.S. Department of the Interior have again come out with recommendations denying any help whatsoever to the gold mining industry, so we are now forced to conclude that the present administration will do nothing to relieve us of those impediments which continue to make production operation financially impossible. The management is convinced that, due to worldwide pressures upon the American dollar, the United States will ultimately be forced to raise the monetary price of gold, but when this will occur we cannot predict. We have, therefore, reluctantly concluded that this reason for holding the package together, i.e., maintaining mines and mill on a standby condition, would be in the immediate future questionable, and hence we must determine what our future policy should be.

II. THE SECOND REASON FOR HOLDING THE "CRIPPLE CREEK PACKAGE" TOGETHER IN A STANDBY CONDITION IS THE POSSIBILITY OF A PROPOSED MILITARY INSTALLATION IN THE CRIPPLE CREEK DISTRICT SPONSORED BY THE AIR FORCE

Golden Cycle stockholders were advised early in December 1961 of the impending termination of mining and milling operations on December 31, 1961, and in March 1962 cleanup of the mill of its gold inventory was completed. We received a call March 20, 1962, from the head of the mining department of a large international consulting and engineering firm selected by the Air Force to conduct preliminary examinations of possible locations for a proposed underground military installation, and an appointment was made for the inspection by this mining engineer, with whom we had had previous contacts, and an electronics specialist who had worked with and for the Air Force on other electronic communications systems elsewhere in the United States. After their inspection of our Cripple Creek mine holdings, including tunnels, shafts and other underground and surface workings, the mining engineer as well as the electronics man apparently were very favorably impressed and believed our underground workings could be readily adapted to the purpose they had in mind at a comparatively lower cost than any sites examined to that date. All was clothed in the greatest secrecy, and we were told nothing of the exact purpose of the proposed installation. These two engineers made a favorable report to the Air Force, resulting in a visit to the district on August 10, 1962, by those charged with the project study. This group was composed of high-ranking military men as well as civilian engineers working for the Air Force. Similar visits were made August 22, 23, 24 and 25, 1962; September 25, 1962; December 14, 1962; January 8, 22, 23, 30 and 31, 1963; February 1, 1963; and March 5, 6 and 7, 1963. The number of men in these inspection trips ranged from 4 to 45, some made several trips, and the total number visiting the district was 150 to 200. Among visitors were top scientists and engineers of the United States employed by the Air Force headquartered from coast to coast.

Inspection parties were handled by our engineers, and they were taken down the Ajax shaft to the mine workings; the Carlton Tunnel and the Cresson and Vindicator laterals through the Portland Mine to Roosevelt Tunnel from Ajax 20th level; through the Roosevelt Tunnel to various mines including the Cresson and Elkton toward the Vindicator, El Paso, etc. The parties were shown all the surface of the Cripple Creek district, taken to the portals of both the Roosevelt and Carlton Tunnels, and to the surrounding area to various mountains. They exhibited great interest in what they saw. All seemed to impress the military and civilian engineers as the most favorable site they had examined. Locations selected for further considerations were narrowed to three: One in South Dakota; one near Omaha, Nebr.; and the Cripple Creek district. By the end of 1962 trips to the Cripple Creek district were receiving newspaper publicity and the secrecy was partially lifted when, in March and April, it became known to the public through news items that the proposed project was to be an alternate base for SAC (Strategic Air Command) and was to be an underground installation for use if and when the SAC base, located at Omaha, might be bombed out of commission. Many news items appeared in Colorado newspapers during March and April which were picked up by various national press services and appeared in papers throughout the United States.

We granted the Government [United States of America] a right of entry for survey and examination for Colorado special facilities project on all of our controlled property in the Cripple Creek district for a period of 6 months, dated February 15, 1963, expiring August 15, 1963, which was obtained by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Engineer District, Real Estate Division, Omaha, Nebr. We have heard nothing further from the Air Force or Corps of Engineers since the visits in March. We have endeavored to obtain definite information from the military as to the status of Colorado special facilities project, but have been unsuccessful except to receive the advice that "the project is still under consideration." We are trying through the civilian route to find out whether this project is alive, dead, or merely dormant. Thus, our policy as to the future of our Cripple Creek properties depends wholly upon the U.S. Government and its agencies.

This information is passed on to our stockholders because we always have believed they are entitled to be advised of the exact status of their corporation whether optimistic or pessimistic and because we earnestly solicit your helpful suggestions, advice, and constructive criticism, as the next year will be an important one. We believe our policies of the last few years have been justified and that we should hold a part, at least, of the package together for the next year. Taxes are the largest item of expense. The management has worked continuously with the assessor, county commissioners and treasurer, the State tax commission and the tax equalization board to reduce assessments on our property and improvements in the district (Teller County) and we have obtained lower valuation, but the county or school district (or both) raise levies, so we are back where we started. We believe we will get a fair percentage reduction in our taxes for 1963 but, to get the taxes sufficiently low to hold the important parts of the package, we must change from a "standby basis" to an "abandoned basis" or "completely obsolete basis." It is for this reason we feel it imperative to hold a status quo basis on the Carlton Mill, Ajax, Portland, Vindicator, Cresson and Elkton Mines, Carlton and Roosevelt Tunnels, until we hear definitely that the Colorado special facilities project has been abandoned. We have cut drastically overhead expenses in Cripple Creek and Colorado Springs. The management believes that, if we hear definitely that this project is still being considered, it will be helpful to have kept the above-mentioned properties in a standby basis. However, if it is definitely ascertained that this project has been abandoned or is dormant, then we must change our policy to provide for the liquidation of mining and milling equipment and some property to stop the drain on our cash reserves.

With drastic curtailment of salaries and other overhead expenses and the payment of taxes on strategic properties in which the Government would be interested, we believe we can carry the Cripple Creek mining district the next year for a total expenditure of about $50,000.

Since 1942 practically all major economic troubles of the Golden Cycle Corp. have resulted from actions taken by various agencies of the U.S. Government.

1. The imposition on the gold mining industry of Order L-208 in October 1942, forced Golden Cycle, in order to continue operations, to convert at a heavy cost its mill in Colorado Springs to the treatment of base metals which curtailed all of our gold mining operations in the Cripple Creek district.

2. We formerly operated the large Pikeview Coal Mine north of Colorado Springs. Agencies of the Government, by converting numerous military installations in our region to natural gas, so curtailed our coal production that we were forced to close down.

3. The AEC refused to extend a uranium lease granted to the Golden Cycle Corp. on Atkinson-Mesa, Montrose County, Colo., and forced us by its failure to extend the lease to shut down the Atkinson-Mesa uranium property which staill contains proven reserves of several millions of dollars of uranium ore.

4. Agencies of the U.S. Government have refused over the years and still refuse to take any action to increase the price paid for gold. During all this period, despite ever-increasing mining and milling costs, we have been forced to sell our gold to our only customer, i.e., the U.S. Treasury Department, at a price which it fixes at $35 per ounce. The Government has refused to let us sell our gold in the open market or for industrial purposes, which would enable us to receive a higher price for it.

5. Final refusal of the Department of the Treasury and the Department of the Interior and other Government agencies, after hearings held in Washington, D.C., on July 15–17, 1963, as hereinabove set out, to give gold mining any relief has led us to the inescapable conclusion that this administration will do nothing to help gold mining and the gold price.

The Golden Cycle Corp. has other valuable assets, including real estate and our ice, cold storage, and dairy operation, which we will continue to operate for the stockholder's best interests.

There are enclosed reprints, as follows: (a) Letter from the U.S. Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary, dated July 12, 1963, setting out its objections to raising the price of gold; (b) letter from the General Counsel of the Treasury, dated July 18, 1963, setting out its objections; and (c) articles from newspapers relative to underground installations in the Cripple Creek mining district.

We wish the management could sit down in an auditorium with each and every one of our more than 1,900 stockholders to discuss the Cripple Creek situation. We have stockholders residing in nearly every State in the Union and several foreign countries. Since this is impossible, we urge you to use the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope and write us your ideas, criticism, and suggestions. We appreciate the support of our fine stockholders.

Respectfully submitted.

MERRILL E. SHOUP,
President.

MAX W. BOWEN,
Executive Vice President.

Alliance for Progress Reaching the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by a letter that was handed to President Kennedy yesterday by a Colombian gentleman from the city of Techo near Bogotá. That gentleman, Mr. Argenil Plazas, is in this country as a member of a small group of people from Alliance for Progress projects in Latin America, people whose very presence is evidence of this noble program at work.

Mr. Plazas' letter is in recognition, on the part of himself and seven other men who never owned a home before, for the role the United States played in building the housing project in which they now live—El Techo, the "Roof City." Mr. Plazas is the very same gentleman whom President Kennedy presented with the deed to the first home in this project when the President and Mrs. Kennedy visited Bogotá in November of 1961. Now Mr. Plazas and some 8,000 other families live in the new, modest but decent homes that have been built there in less than 2 years. And the letter from these seven shows how they feel:

REPUBLIC OF COLOMBIA,
PILOT BLOCK,
TECHO CITY, BOGOTÁ.

To the Most Excellent President, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House,
United States:

We (the undersigned) feel moved, on this second observance of the anniversary of point 4—Alliance for Progress—the mutual aid plan for Latin America—to commemorate this significant date.

It is our fervent wish to do this because the beneficial projects of this redeeming endeavor launched by you in a spirit of humaneness are being felt in the homes of Colombia and especially in the city of Techo. This development work is being carried on here through the Home Loan Institute. At the same time, we wish to express our recognition for you, Most Excellent President Kennedy, and the U.S. institutions which have labored to provide homes and education to so many underprivileged families and who on this second anniversary wish to congratulate you.

Respectfully,

(Signatures of the seven homeowners of the Pilot Block, Techo City, including the visiting Argenil Plazas.)

I think this is dramatic evidence that, while much remains to be done, this program—the Alliance for Progress—is moving ahead, is doing so against great obstacles, and is accomplishing things every single day.

I am also pleased to quote from a superb address made by our Vice President yesterday at a special session of the Council of the Organization of American States, to observe the second anniversary of the Alliance. The Vice President cited these impressive figures on the work of the Alliance so far:

A year ago we had relatively little to show in physical accomplishments of the Alliance. This year there is much: 8,200 classrooms, 700 well and water supply systems, 900 hospitals and health centers, 140,000 homes and 160,000 agricultural credit loans.

This is progress. But the bulk of the job remains to be done. This is why we must not be swayed from our chosen path of seeing this great program through.

SPA, Douglas Wright Celebrate Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this month, on August 31, the Southwestern Power Administration and its able and respected Administrator, Douglas G. Wright, will celebrate SPA's 20th anniversary.

I want to take this opportunity to express my personal congratulations and my appreciation to Douglas Wright and to all of the employees of Southwestern Power Administration for the 20 years of outstanding service they have rendered to the southwest area of the United States.

On August 31, 1943, the Secretary of the Interior, by secretarial order, created the Southwestern Power Administration as an agency of the Department of the Interior. The SPA was given the authority to transmit and dispose of electric energy generated at the Denison and Norfolk multiple-purpose projects in such a manner as to realize the maximum public benefit.

Since that time, the duties and responsibilities of the Southwestern Power Administration have increased many times. However, with this growth, the SPA has never lost sight of its primary mission to provide the maximum public benefit from the transmission and disposition of electric energy. Benefits to the public have certainly increased proportionately.

Now the number of hydroelectric projects whose output is marketed by SPA has increased to nine. Six States—Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Missouri, and Kansas—are the beneficiaries of the work of SPA, at the present time.

It is estimated that by 1969, the number of hydroplants in the Southwestern Power Administration area will have increased to 17, and the total installed capacity to 1,584,500 kilowatts.

SPA markets its electric energy to both public and private consumers. For example, 16 percent of SPA's electric energy goes to preference customers such as rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and defense installations. The remaining 39 percent has been marketed to privately owned utilities.

One estimate indicates that more than 95 percent of the farms within the SPA area are now served with electric power compared to only 3 percent being served in 1935.

This outstanding record of service to the Southwest is due in a large measure to the leadership, vision, and the capable administrative talent of Douglas Wright.

Mr. Wright this year celebrates his 30th year of Government service. He has a wide range of experience in the hydroelectric power field and he is certainly one of the foremost authorities in this area in our Nation.

Mr. Wright was once quoted as saying:

In the grid of Southwestern Power Administration, public power, private power, municipalities, and rural electric cooperatives have found a common ground in which they work together.

This achievement is a great tribute to the administrative ability of Doug Wright, who has headed the agency from its beginning.

The Southwest Power Administration has enjoyed a very successful first 20 years. Thanks to Douglas Wright's foresight and management and to all who have been a part of SPA, a significant contribution has been made toward insuring a bright, prosperous, and industrially expansive future throughout the Southwest.

I know I speak for thousands, who have benefited directly or indirectly, in congratulating SPA and Douglas Wright on their 20th anniversary and in wishing them continued success in the future.

An Editorial on the Bracero Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the June 14, 1963, issue of the Roman Catholic newspaper published in Indianapolis, Ind., the Criterion.

The editorial commends the action which the House of Representatives took on May 28 this year to defeat the bill to extend Public Law 78, or the Mexican farm labor importation program.

In view of the action of the Senate last week in seeking to revive this program, I believe that Members of the House will find this editorial of particular interest.

The editorial follows:

GOOD RIDDANCE

Public Law 78 is dead at last. Men of justice are rejoicing.

The action to defeat the extension of the Mexican farm labor program was taken (May 28) by the House of Representatives over the loud protests of large corporate farm-owners in the Southwest.

Known as the bracero program, the law was initiated during the Korean conflict to correct an alleged farm labor shortage. It allowed thousands of Mexican nationals to work on American farms at substandard wages and living facilities. Public Law 78

was then renewed by Congress, year after year, because of the demands by those who stood to gain from its continuation.

Chiefly affected by Public Law 78 were thousands of American farm laborers in the Southwest, largely Spanish speaking, who were forced to look for employment elsewhere to keep their families fed and clothed. Many hundreds of these families have trekked to Indiana and other Midwest States in recent years to find seasonal farmwork.

Perhaps with the demise of the bracero program at the end of this year, more job opportunities will open near the homes of our migrant workers.

However, a spokesman for the bishops' committee for migrant workers has urged continued vigilance against similar legislation and support for six bills currently before the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee which seek to help our American agricultural workers and their families to live a better life.

These six measures (S. 521 through S. 526) have been introduced by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey. Righteous-minded persons should support them.

Silver: A Luxury Coinage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an article of great interest in the light of our present balance-of-payments problems.

Just this week the Department of Commerce announced that our balance-of-payments deficit was running at an annual rate of $5.2 billion. President Kennedy, in his news conference of August 20, listed three actions intended to ameliorate this imbalance: First, a proposed tax on the marketings of foreign securities here; second, the increase already made in the Federal Reserve rediscount rate; and third, continuing effort to reduce the cost of foreign aid and defense abroad.

In addition, I should like to commend the proposal made by Mr. Herbert Bratter in his article entitled "Silver: A Luxury Coinage," published in the Baltimore Sun, August 12, 1963. In his article, Mr. Bratter suggests an orderly marketing of the Treasury's enormous stockpile of silver at present high world market prices for silver. This resembles a proposal that I have previously made. The United States is on a gold, not a silver, standard, and in the course of time, in order to meet the increasing demand for subsidiary coins, the Treasury will have to change over from silver to a baser metal. Why not seize the opportune moment, when the price of silver is high and the use of silver is greater than world annual production, to effect this changeover and reap a profit for the Treasury which would be applicable to our balance-of-payments deficit.

SILVER: A LUXURY COINAGE

(By Herbert Bratter)

Paul Einzig, well-known British foreign exchange expert, suggests that the U.S. Treasury's big stock of silver be gradually sold to support the dollar against the effects of the American international payments deficit. He advises that silver coins in circulation be replaced and that the silver thus retrieved be sold as well. This policy would make a material contribution to the protection of the U.S. gold reserve.

Endorsing such a plan for balance-of-payments reasons, Congressman CLARENCE D. LONG (Democrat, of Maryland), on leave as a Johns Hopkins University professor of economics, sees an additional advantage. In view of the high price of silver today, he says its sale would produce a profit for the Treasury, reduce the budget deficit and so save the Government interest on the public debt.

To follow the advice of Dr. Einzig and Congressman LONG would require legislation. Under present law, the dime, the quarter, and the half-dollar must be made of silver. Even sale of silver bullion and standard silver dollars by the Treasury is restricted both by administration policy and by the new law recently enacted repealing the old silver purchase statutes. The act of 1963 calls for gradual withdrawal from circulation of all silver certificates and diverts the present silver reserve behind the certificates to the minting of fractional silver coins in the future—10-, 25-, and 50-cent pieces, as needed. Elimination of silver from the U.S. monetary scheme, even to meet a pressing balance-of-payments requirement, would arouse the opposition of the silver State Senators and some others, but that is no reason for not doing it.

People in Washington who are not optimistic about righting the payments deficit under present policies think the United States is now at a point where, like many other countries, it can no longer afford the luxury of silver coins. Circulating gold pieces, after all, disappeared 30 years ago and the country survived. Quite satisfactory coins, very much cheaper to manufacture, may be made of copper and nickel—cupronickel coins. The British mint no silver coins for circulation. The half-crown, florin, shilling, and sixpence pieces are all 75 percent copper and 25 percent nickel. Many other countries use these cupronickel coins, and we have our own nonsilver 1- and 5-cent pieces.

Under present U.S. policy, as mentioned, new subsidiary silver coins are being minted out of silver previously held as reserve against silver certificates. This silver has a market value of close to $1.29 a troy ounce. For technical reasons which need not be recounted here, when the Treasury uses silver previously held in reserve against certificates and mints dimes, quarters, or half dollars with it, it makes a profit of 9 cents for each ounce used.

But suppose, instead of silver dimes, the Treasury made cupronickel dimes. Instead of 9 cents an ounce profit it would make a profit of $61.40. This is because copper and nickel are cheap while silver, a precious metal, is dear. Compared with $1.29 an ounce for silver, the price of copper is 31 cents and that of nickel 79 cents. An ounce of silver which will make only $1.38 worth of silver coins will buy enough copper and nickel to make $62.70 in cupronickel dimes. Making cupronickel quarters and half dollars would be equally profitable. And they would serve the purpose just as well as silver coins.

What about Government policy and the industrial market for silver? While the Treasury today technically does not "sell" silver, actually its policy is to make the metal available to anyone willing to pay $1.29 an ounce for it: the Treasury "redeems silver certificates" with silver bullion. But today the law does not allow the Treasury to sell silver to industry at less than $1.29 an ounce. Since the U.S. mine production is not equal to the American industrial demand, silver for industry has to be imported. And imports add to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. Treasury silver at $1.29 can't compete with foreign silver at $1.28.

In 1962 silver imports totaled 80 million ounces. At this rate and at today's market price for silver, this constitutes an annual drain on the balance of payments of about $103 million. And because the industrial demand is growing, the drain will get bigger.

Admittedly, we are not self-sufficient in copper or nickel, either. Importing these metals would mean some drain on our payments situation. But need we import these metals for coinage when we have big copper and nickel surpluses left over from wartime stockpiles? Apart from the untouchable defense reserve the Defense Production Administration has in its disposable inventory about 107,000 tons of copper and 14,700 tons of nickel, or more than enough to replace all our present subsidiary silver coins with cupronickel. Such replacement would require 33,668 tons of copper and 10,890 of nickel.

The Government's profit on such a switch would be great. At today's market price the silver now in use as subsidiary coinage would be worth $1,703 million. The cupro-nickel needed to replace the subsidiary silver coins in circulation would cost only $37,460,000. The difference or gross profit before refining and minting expenses would be $1,666 million. That is where the Federal budget stands to gain. The payments balance would gain to the extent that silver imports were eliminated. If beyond this, the Government sold silver abroad, there would be an additional payments gain.

Those who want to switch to cupro-nickel coins have more in mind than using silver to ease the balance of payments. The Treasury itself has estimated that the supply of Treasury silver now reserved for minting small change will not last forever. Secretary Dillon testified that it might go only 10 years. With our growing population and economy, what shall we do then for additional coins? Even as our coinage need grows, so too will the industrial demand for the white metal. With or without a balance-of-payments crisis, in the long run we'll be obliged to use less valuable metals.

Subsidiary coins need not have "intrinsic value." They are mere counters used to facilitate commerce—exactly as paper dollars are. And we would be in special trouble if ever the market price of silver climbed above the monetary value of present silver coins. Many other countries in the 1930's and more recently have been put to great inconvenience and expense when their silver coins became more valuable as metal than as money and went to the melting pot. Mexico affords repeated examples. Only last year, and for the second time, Australia had to pass a law prohibiting the exportation of its silver coins, which had become worth more as bullion than as currency.

If we wait until our silver is gone before replacing silver subsidiary coins with cupronickel ones, the job of substitution will be much bigger because the volume of coins in circulation will be greater. Also, some of the silver in the coinage will have been wasted through abrasion, while part of the outstanding coins will be lost entirely.

Both the balance-of-payments situation and the limited supply of silver available make a new coinage policy advisable. For the United States to continue on a luxury coinage basis in the present state of its affairs is like an aristocratic family that starts a cafeteria but insists on using the family sterling even though there won't be enough to go around if the place prospers.

Want To Live Under Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, several Gettysburg (Pa.) College students who visited Russia recently give their impressions and answer the subject question in an unmistakable manner.

Their account of the trip should be "required reading" for all who display the most dainty shade of pink to the deepest red.

[From the Hanover (Pa.) Sun, Aug. 19, 1963]

COLLEGE CHOIR REPORTS IMPRESSIONS OF RUSSIA

While participating in the Lutheran World Assembly in Helsinki, Finland, members of the Gettysburg College Choir had a 2-day bus tour to Leningrad, Russia, where they spent a night in that city. Some of the impressions gained during the visit were given by choir members in letters received.

One student wrote: "I never felt more proud of my American citizenship than when I was in that bleak, poor and scary country. It took 1½ hours for customs and then 4 more hours to Leningrad by bus. Our hotel was 3 years old and looked 30 years old at least. The workmanship all over the city is poor. There are statues of Lenin everywhere, plus hundreds of propaganda posters. None of this is exaggeration. The roads are poor, construction crews work late hours with outdated equipment and many women workers. There are few cars and the main street is very unbusy. There is an aura of depression, of desolation in the city. I was approached by a Russian boy my age who wanted to buy my Banlon shirt and my sweater. This is a very common occurrence. Also, Soviet kids are forever begging American tourists for chewing gum. The headline in Tuesday morning's paper was "Economic Production of U.S.S.R. Four Times Greater Than the United States."

"Clothes on the people are very shabby, really unbelievable. Everyone looks so poor, so strange, so old. We had a radio in our room but it only had one station and couldn't be turned off. I saw the construction projects on apartment houses. They are prefab jobs, poorly built, very inadequate. How good I felt to be an American, to have all we have. I felt sorry for these people on sight. Leningrad looks like the United States during the worst days of depression, like one huge breadline.

"Is this the glorious rise of communism? Is this what Nikita wants all the world to be like? No thanks, comrade. I'll take the billboard, traffic jams, unemployment, race riots, income taxes, etc., all the 'evils' of capitalism before this kind of socialism, this seemingly backward step. How easy it is now to see the advantage of competition, of free enterprise. Just 2 days there was enough to open my eyes, to teach me more than I could ever have learned from a book. And Leningrad is even more prosperous than Moscow. Lord help us if we ever give up believing in our way of life and give in to Russia. I really don't see what chance there is for communism to take over, after what I've seen of how it operates. Please excuse my fervent patriotism, but we have so much and I was so glad to cross the border back into Finland today. I for one will never complain about taxes now. I only wish the Russian people could see New York and have their eyes opened as we did in Leningrad."

Another member of the Gettysburg group wrote: "None of us were prepared for what we saw and what a shock we had. As we drove through the countryside almost everyone waved at us. This was formerly Finnish territory, taken from them in 1945. When given a choice of staying under Russia or moving into Finland every Finn moved. Now after 15 years of Russian rule the area is poverty stricken. The farms small and poor, the villages run down and if possible, even poorer. No machinery, no neat houses, no paved streets, the people almost in rags and dirt everywhere. No cars, a few trucks, all drab green and of course all government owned. A few single horse carts, a few goats and cows. The whole area appeared to be one vast slum.

"We drove into a resort town where good workers are sent for free vacations * * * again drabness and dirt. There is a former Lutheran church there, now a rundown movie theater, and an Orthodox church fallen into complete disrepair and used only as an observation post now if it is used at all.

"As with every part of Russia, our pictures will tell more than our words can hope to do. At a town called Vyborg we stopped for lunch at the railroad station. To find the toilets we simply and literally followed our noses. Here the filth—there is no other word for it—was simply unbelievable. For lunch we had water, the color of weak tea, dried out cold cuts, dried bread with questionable butter, borsch edible but only because we were ravenous, some potatoes and fish floating in grease—all Russian food seems to be half grease—ice cream decent but with particles of dirt in the dishes and coffee made partly—and I'm not kidding—of pepper. We all left the table still hungry and feeling very guilty. There were hundreds of people outside who will probably never see a meal as good as the one we left largely untouched. The rest of the meals in Russia weren't that bad but American stomachs just seem to have trouble with Russian food. It's like their diplomacy—it looks pretty good but you never feel sure you can trust it.

"We wanted to take pictures but didn't dare. Even 10 floors up in our hotel we weren't sure who was watching and listening. None of us doubted very much that our rooms were bugged. Maybe they weren't but the whole atmosphere was enough to convince us that they were. About picture taking * * * we were not allowed to take pictures of railroads or trains, bridges, transportation, gasoline stations (we only saw two), factories, soldiers, people (without their permission), and lines of people outside stores. The people almost never give their permission for pictures because they are afraid the pictures will be turned over to the police. Many of us were approached by the Russians trying to buy our clothing. I had an offer for mine in a museum we visited. We were constantly approached by children begging chewing gum and cigarettes but had to be very careful because if the police caught them, they were pretty hard on the kids.

"The next day we spent the morning seeing Leningrad and the Hermitage Museum. That afternoon we went to the summer Palace of the Czars on the Gulf of Finland.

"We had the feeling that Leningrad could, with care, be one of the most beautiful cities in Europe but it has none. If it is the showplace of the Soviet Union, then the other towns must be real nightmares. In all of our touring we were never shown a church or a mosque and had to ask to be taken by one of the mosques so we could take pictures of the towers. Whenever we noticed a church all boarded up and mentioned it, we were always told 'they are restoring it.' When we asked about going to church in Russia we were told that 'only the old people go to church.'

"Our tourist guide was very charming, spoke excellent English and was the only well dressed clean Russian we saw. She seemed to enjoy our group and said so but was completely sold on Russia as evidenced by her comments. One thing which interested me, we offered to answer her questions about America but she wouldn't ask any. After the return to town in the afternoon we wanted to shop so the bus let us out at the city's biggest department store. What a shock. Picture if you can, a hallway about one city block long and very similar to the halls in old dorm, low ceilings, and little or no point. Then on either side of the hall, imagine booths about the size of a classroom in Brua. Put shelves around the walls and some display cases in the center. Set the temperature at about 80°. Place on the shelves a few bits and pieces of shoddy, poor-quality merchandise and fill the place with smelly, sweaty, dirty, grim-faced people. This is Leningrad's best and biggest department store. I did find in another shop in a hotel a ceramic horse statue, not very good, but somehow symbolic of Russia."

Capitol Will Observe Flag Etiquette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, no greater sacrifice can be made by an American citizen than to lay down his life in the service of his country. During three great conflicts in this century, over 600,000 Americans have died fighting for those ideals of freedom and justice which are a vital part of the American tradition.

For many years now, in tribute to those gallant men and women, we have observed May 30 as Memorial Day. On that day, our flag, the symbol of our Nation, is flown at half-mast throughout the United States in commemoration of our dead. Through an oversight, however, this tradition of flag etiquette has been neglected on Capitol Hill. Now, thanks to the efforts of two citizens of my home State of New Jersey, this oversight will be corrected.

The following editorial, from the August 13 edition of the Hudson Dispatch, explains this matter in greater detail, and I commend it to my colleagues.

U.S. CAPITOL ADOPTS FLAG ETIQUETTE

Flags will fly at half-mast over the U.S. Capitol on Memorial Day from now on, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, reports. Ending of the longstanding practice of keeping Old Glory at full staff over the Capitol on this day of remembrance for those who have died in defense of the Nation stemmed from a visit made last May 30 to Washington by a New Jersey Veterans of Foreign Wars official.

Albert J. Gifford of Gloucester, VFW county service officer for Camden County Council, was surprised and dismayed to note that the flags were flying as usual over the Capitol. He wrote to Senator WILLIAMS soon after his Washington visit to inquire why the halfmast rule of the flag code did not apply to the second-most important building in the Nation's Capital. Mr. WILLIAMS also received a similar letter from Benjamin P. Thomas,

adjutant-quartermaster of New Jersey's VFW.

After looking into the matter, Senator WILLIAMS ascertained that for some inexplicable reason the tradition of flying flags on the Capitol Building at full staff 24 hours a day had been in use for more than 40 years. Feeling as did the VFW officers that it would be appropriate and respectful of the country's war dead to follow the customary nationwide observance of flying the flag at half staff until noon on Memorial Day, the New Jersey Senator wrote to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Speaker of the House JOHN MCCORMACK to ask if they didn't believe the policy should be changed.

The Vice President, who is presiding officer of the upper House, wrote Senator WILLIAMS last Thursday to say: "I have looked into the question of the display of the flag on the Capitol Building on Memorial Day. Speaker MCCORMACK and I, together with the Architect of the Capitol, have determined that the flag will be flown at half staff on that day henceforward from sunrise to noon. Thank you very much for calling this matter to my attention and I am pleased that we were able to work it out."

It is completely beyond our ken that this violation of flag etiquette could have continued unchallenged for four decades. Our compliments are extended to the VFW officials from our State who finally observed the oversight—if we can be that charitable—and did something about it. Also, we commend Senator WILLIAMS for the alacrity he displayed in remedying a condition that never should have been allowed to exist.

Advancement by Step Increases of Certain Field Service Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain field service postal employees.

Public Law 87-793, known as the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962, established the basic principles of (a) equal pay for substantially equal work; and (b) comparability of Federal salary rates with private enterprise salary rates. However, the effective date of Public Law 87-793 as it applied to salary rates, to wit, August 12, 1962, acted as a cutoff point with respect to immediate and future pay increases.

Unfortunately, this cutoff point caused various inequitable situations to develop, affecting particularly postal employees in levels 1 through 6 whose total postal service exceeded 6 years. In some cases, junior employees were advanced further in the salary scale than employees with many more years of service. Unless these inequities are corrected expeditiously, they will be further compounded by future wage adjustments.

The bill I have introduced today proposes to correct the main inequities arising out of the enactment of Public Law 87-793 by granting postal employees in levels 1 through 6 full credit toward their salary grades for all postal service performed by them.

Radical Left Overlooked in Attack by Both Parties Upon Conservative Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News of August 19, 1963.

RADICAL LEFT OVERLOOKED IN ATTACK BY BOTH PARTIES UPON CONSERVATION THOUGHT

To the practiced observer of the American political scene, the developments and maneuvering in current national affairs are unfolding according to normal schedule.

On the Democratic side, the nomination is almost irrevocably locked up for President Kennedy, for that party has no other choice. To fail to renominate J.F.K. is to repudiate the philosophy of the New Frontier and, for that matter, to reject the ideology of the party. The same would be true if a Republican first-termer were in the White House.

Republicans, skirmishing for position for the GOP nomination, have a double problem: On the one side is the question of whether the incumbent President can be defeated, and on the other is what is reality in the political schizophrenia that appears to obsess the party every quadrennium.

The first part of the double question ordinarily has an apparent answer by this date on the political calendar. Only on rare occasions is an incumbent in the White House defeated, so it usually is the case that a sacrificial lamb is chosen as a midway opponent.

However, vacillations in national policy, the obfuscation in the Capital and the miasma that envelops the heretofore healthy American thinking have cast some doubt as to the outcome of the 1964 presidential election.

Under these circumstances, it would appear that Republicans would have little difficulty in choosing a candidate to oppose Mr. Kennedy, figuring (1) the logical nominee should be in the image of opposing everything that the New Frontier stands for, and (2) that a determined party policy of unification would give the GOP a respite from its recurring schizophrenia.

But that is not the case at this time. In fact, the Republicans appear to be obsessed with a suicidal tendency, or, as the sports writers' cliche goes: Determined to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

In so doing, the Republicans intramurally are joining with the Democratic Party in what amounts to a disservice to this Nation. To explain:

Naturally, the logical line of attack for the liberal Democratic wing (there is a conservative side of the party, do not forget) is to brand all opposition as the odious "radical right." Thereby, everybody who is out of step with the New Frontier; everybody who believes in economy in government, in curtailing foreign aid, in oldtime American courage, and in a policy of manifest destiny, is some kind of a nut.

Instead of bulwarking against this line of attack, Republican leaders, including former President Eisenhower, are aiding and abetting it by following the old me-too line of trying to outspend and outpromise the administration.

From our viewpoint, we could not care less what happens to either of these elements, so long as they are cast into a political limbo.

What is disturbing is that both parties—except for a minority of overly maligned and much-concerned group in both ranks—have formed an odd coalition for opposing any form of conservative thought and are engaged in a concerted action to ridicule and vilify it to external exile from the American political scene.

The tragedy of it all is that we once again are at a critical crossroads at which there should be two avenues of thought; one that will take us pellmell along our present course, and the other that will veer off to reality.

And overlooked in this bipartisan assault is the plain fact that an element of extremism is in power and is far more dangerous to the Nation than the "extreme rightists" clamoring for surcease.

After all, is it not the present administration that employs the intractable followers of Keynesian economic theory of spending a nation out of debt? Is it not the present administration that placed members of the far-out Americans for Democratic Action in key posts, including the Supreme Court?

Is it not the present administration that is willing to trample all individual rights in the name of civil rights? Is it not the present administration that has commandeered Federal marshals and U.S. troops to invoke its demands even before final adjudication in the courts?

Is it not the present administration that said communism in this hemisphere is not negotiable, but which has entered into a treaty with the masters of communism without demanding reasonable concessions, such as the removal of all Russian troops and missiles from Cuba?

Anybody who gives the current trend any studied thought must conclude we are following policies that are foreign to our natural inclinations and inimical to our best interests.

And the inevitable conclusion must be that the radical left already in power is more dangerous by far than the so-called radical right, most of whom ask nothing more than a return to reason before it is far, far too late.

WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

Government Research Impedes Private Research and Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the increasingly large number of engineers and scientists required by our rapidly expanding space and defense programs is creating a shortage of professional personnel for research and development in private industry.

An article in the Wall Street Journal of August 9, 1963, reports spokesmen from several industrial firms as saying that one-fourth to one-third of their need for new engineers is currently go-

ing unfulfilled. Commerce Department calculations show that "the space program alone could gobble up nearly all of the 30,000 new professional workers expected to enter research this year.

In some cases, personnel in nondefense and space industries are being drawn away by Government contractors. An example is Borg-Warner which, according to the article, lost 20 percent of its research staff when a space contractor put up a lab next to Borg-Warner's facility.

Besides the shortage of engineers and scientists, there is the additional problem that Government contractors, often able to pay higher salaries, bid up wages and thus raise research costs for private firms. This further depresses private research efforts.

Mr. Speaker, while recognizing the need to meet the requirements of our space and defense programs, it would be wise to reassess the present allocation of scarce scientific personnel between Government contractors and the consumer economy. Traditionally, much of our economic growth has come from innovation in the private sector. The Journal quotes a Department of Commerce estimate that one-third of the Nation's past economic gains can be attributed to technological improvements." In addition, our technological leadership has contributed substantially to our export surplus and thus to the strength of our balance of payments. Unless we maintain our technological lead we may find ourselves losing out to other nations, notably Japan and the countries of Western Europe, where research and development are progressing at a rapid pace.

Mr. Speaker, if the Nation falls behind in the pace of innovation because of a misallocation of scarce scientific personnel or for any other reason, it will be difficult to make up the lag in economic growth which would result. The problem which our space and defense programs create in this regard requires the close attention of the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that this article from the August 9 Wall Street Journal be inserted in the RECORD.

SPACE, MILITARY WORK CUTTING INTO RESEARCH FOR CIVILIAN ECONOMY—INDUSTRY BLAMES GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS FOR BIDDING UP WAGES, PIRATING PERSONNEL—WILL MASHED POTATOES SUFFER?

(By Robert L. Bartley)

"How did we ever get suckered into sinking so much of our national prestige on getting a man to the moon?"

A quote, no doubt, from an economy-minded Senator or a military man anxious to divert funds to other projects? No such thing. The gripe comes from Donald Collier, research vice president of Borg-Warner Corp. And like many other executives, Mr. Collier worries that he moon race creates "a real danger or stagnating the economy."

Top research men in industry reason this way: Frantic bidding, by space and military contractors, for scientists and engineers is creating a big shortage for industry. This scarcity, along with the skyrocketing salaries it is provoking, is bringing almost to a halt the hitherto rapid growth of company-supported research. This development hampers efforts to develop new products and processes for the civilian economy.

And it's not just the moon race they question. In general, they wonder about the wisdom of the Nation's continually increasing concentration of research effort on Government-sponsored projects.

PERSONNEL LIMITS EXPANSION

Samuel Lebner, vice president of Du Pont Co. puts it this way: "Government research programs serve as a brake on research in the private sector." Even if corporations had unlimited money to spend, they could not find the personnel to expand research indefinitely, Mr. Lebner says.

Some Congressmen also are expressing concern with increasing Government-financed research and development. Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, disclosed last month that his panel was considering an investigation encompassing all Federal agencies which finance research and development in an attempt to clarify their overall activity and its effects.

Company spending on private research and development at last count in 1961 came to $4.5 billion, a scant 1 percent above the previous year, according to the National Science Foundation. This increase far from offset a rise in research salary costs in excess of 5 percent and fell far short of the earlier 10-percent-a-year average gain in spending, the foundation reports. Many major companies declare that after allowing for cost increases their non-Government research continues to show little growth.

Meanwhile, Government-supported research under contract with private industry had expanded to $6.4 billion by 1961, nearly four times what it was in 1954. Space research by industry and the Government itself will run over $4 billion in the current fiscal year, dwarfing the $204 million outlay of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

RISE IN GOVERNMENT-PAID RESEACRH

The space program alone could gobble up "nearly all" of the 30,000 new professional workers expected to enter research this year, if Commerce Department calculations are correct. Personnel working on Government research contracts rose 317 percent to 190,000 between 1954 and 1961, while industry increased its private research payrolls only 30 percent to 130,00.

While the need for technical manpower is expanding, the growth in supply is slowing. The demand for new engineers alone now runs close to 60,000 a year, but only about 33,700 will be graduated this year, down from as many as 38,134 in 1959. While accurate figures are not available, the situation appears to be nearly as acute in the physical sciences such as chemistry and physics.

Not surprisingly, many companies report they are falling far short of their goals in their recruiting drives.

Xerox Corp., which is trying to expand its research and development in line with booming sales of its office copiers, fell short of its 1962 goal by about one-third and so far this year is lagging about the same amount. Du Pont says it probably will get only 75 to 80 percent of the 1,100 new technical graduates it is seeking this year. Adds the research manager of a major oil producer: "Like most companies, we haven't met our goals. The growth rate in our department has been up and down with the availability of technical personnel and right now it's down."

HOLDING STAFF IS COSTLY

Many companies also are faced with the problem of holding present staffs against recruiting for Government projects. "A major space contractor put a lab right next to one of ours in Los Angeles and hired away 20 percent of our staff at a 15 percent premium," complains Borg-Warner's Mr. Collier.

Space research often can attract top personnel because of the "exotic nature of the problem," asserts Roland Lex, director of development for Leeds & Northrop Co., Philadelphia instrument and controls producer. Adds Justin Neuhoff, manager of engineering for General Electric Corp.'s Switchgear Division: "All of these people in school want to go into the missile business."

There's solid evidence that the shortage of scientific talent is slowing private research. Minneapolis Honeywell Regulator Co. says unfilled openings for technical specialists have forced delay of its study of the nature of flame, which it considers vital to its basic heat-control business. According to Mr. Lebner of Du Pont, in recent months 3 of the company's 12 industrial departments have said "they can't push as rapidly as they're being urged because they don't have the people." Joseph C. Wilson, president of Xerox, says lack of personnel last year meant "we didn't get to start some projects we wanted to."

Not all companies attribute slower growth in research and development directly to unfilled jobs. Many say big expansions can't be justified at this time by the profit possibilities from research. Part of this concern over profit potential reflects rising research costs, stemming primarily from the bidding up of salaries.

The National Science Foundation reports the median salary for scientists in research and development was $10,000 last year, up $1,000 just since 1960. The Engineering Manpower Commission says starting salaries for engineers in research and development rose 34 percent between 1956 and 1962, to a median of over $6,800.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS BLAMED

Corporate executives are quick to blame Government contractors for big salary boosts. They say Government contractors can justify higher salaries because their projects frequently are of a rush nature and because research cost increases often are covered in the Government contract rather than deducted from profits.

With growth in private research and development lagging, officials in both Government and industry are worried about the possible effects on the general economy. The Commerce Department estimates that one-third of the Nation's past economic gains can be attributed to technological improvements. It adds, however, that space and military research merely diverts talent from the type of effort which creates the new products and improved productivity that fosters growth.

President Kennedy himself has mentioned this diversion as a "price" the Nation pays for the space program. But space officials contend that, in the long run, their program will benefit the economy through development of civilian products which normally would not evolve without space research.

FRUITFUL FOR CONSUMERS?

Some industrialists agree. The space program will create products "we wouldn't have had for years if we'd gone along taking the lumps out of mashed potatoes and making better root beer," declares James M. Gavin, a retired general who is president of Arthur D. Little, Inc., Boston research consultants. In any event, General Gavin adds, space exploration is needed to satisfy man's curiosity and to compete with Russia, and the important thing is to "force-feed" space research back into the consumer economy.

Robert Solo, who studied the problem for the National Planning Association, reports in the Harvard Business Review, however, that "spinoff" benefits are about as likely to make up for lost civilian research as consumer-oriented efforts would be to spin off moon rockets. William Meckling, an economist for Franklin Institute's Center for Naval Analysis, writes in the Bulletin of the

Atomic Scientists that "it seems unlikely" that spinoff benefits will "repay the investment, or even a very large part of it."

While some research executives view the space program as the chief culprit, others complain about other Government agencies as well. Some contend that projects in the Defense Department, the biggest spender for research and development, are even less likely to help the consumer economy.

Some drug manufacturers criticize the concentration of research funds with the National Institute of Health, which has requested $930 million in research funds for next fiscal year, compared with only $71 million in fiscal 1954. While NIH research is directed at civilian needs, executives say its dominance may lead to neglect of useful ideas which would be developed by more diversified research support. Comments Harry M. Weaver, research vice president of Schering Corp.: "I think it's dangerous to get the direction of research into too few hands, even if they are well intentioned.' '

Buy-American Differentials Increase Still Under Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, one of the important laws that has to do with this Nation's foreign trade and gold balance is the Buy-American Act. Last summer, when it was learned that the Navy was buying foreign steel for some of our latest warships, the President ordered the Budget Bureau to study the law and determine if it should be modified.

The Budget Bureau has not yet made any recommendation, so it is assumed that the opinions of the State Department and the Commerce Department against any change may have prevailed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not find fault with this. I would not advocate any action which might encourage retaliatory measures by Japan and Germany. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished West Virginia Senator, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, in his effort to have the State Department urge these two nations to increase purchases of Virginia and West Virginia coking coal as the State Department has been recently doing with iron ore.

However, the Buy-American Act contains a clause that provides that Cabinet officers can withhold any foreign purchase that is not "in the national interest." This national security exemption has often been used by Secretary McNamara but it has only rarely been used by other Departments. In fact, it has been largely ignored by the other Departments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, "Buy American Differential Increases Still Under Study," which appeared recently in the Washington Evening Star. The author, Allen M. Smythe, is a widely known financial writer who has discussed our Nation's economic problems in a number of metropolitan dailies.

BUY-AMERICAN DIFFERENTIALS INCREASE STILL UNDER STUDY

(By Allen M. Smythe)

A report on the need to increase the differentials in the Buy-American Act allowed U.S. bidders over foreign has been withheld by the Budget Bureau because of opposition by other Federal departments. Officials explained it was still "under study."

Disclosure last summer that the Navy had bought some steel from Japan and Germany for new Navy vessels caused an uproar in Congress. Senators SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, demanded that the Pentagon buy only American steel. Many supported them.

Advocates of greater overseas trade in the State Department, North Atlantic Treaty Organization officials, the Treasury and the Commerce Department do not believe that further restrictions should be placed by the Pentagon on buying foreign steel.

"The Buy-American Act," said one high State official, "grants plenty of authority to Defense Secretary McNamara for security reasons. Any further restrictions would invite serious trade retaliations from Germany and Japan."

President Kennedy asked the Budget Bureau to assemble all facts on the operation of the Buy-American Act. Any changes to be made in the 6 and 12 percent differentials allowed U.S. bidders were to be decided before last October.

Pending possible changes, Mr. McNamara has held up all foreign orders that are over one-half of the low American bid. This does not interfere with the purchase of drugs and medical supplies in Europe that range well below one-half of American wholesale prices.

Senator RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, and former professor of public speaking, is directing his oratory at the White House to help his distressed coal mining State.

He is fearful that any tampering with the Buy-American Act would hurt his efforts to increase coal sales to Germany and Japan. Navy orders for foreign steel range in the hundreds of tons. Germany buys 5 million tons of United States coking coal annually. Japan buys 6.4 million tons.

Germany has a quota and a $5 duty over the quota for United States coal. Senator RANDOLPH thinks both should be removed and points out that Navy orders for Japanese and German steel are often smelted with West Virginia coal. Four Navy orders that went to the Hyueten steel mill in the German Ruhr were also rolled on new Pittsburgh steel mill equipment that cost over $1.5 million.

While United States coal exports to Canada and Europe have been sluggish, Japan has been increasing her purchases. However, Japan increased her imports from Australia last year reaching 2.6 million tons. Lower transportation costs give Australia a $2 a ton advantage.

Japanese steel mills in 1962 consumed a total of $155 million worth of steel-making raw materials (coal, ore, and scrap) purchased from the United States. Steel scrap accounted for most of this amount. The export price ranged up to $30 per ton.

Miami Metro Government Wins Light Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of Florida's Fourth District, I am privileged to have many occasions upon which to draw the attention of my colleagues to significant events and outstanding honors which have come to my home community.

Never have I felt more pride than I have in the announcement that Metropolitan Dade County, the first governmental body in the world to adopt a code to aid employment of handicapped people, on July 23 of this year was awarded the Mark A. Light Award for its outstanding work.

Named for a handicapped youth in Perrine, Fla., the Light Award is the highest recognition offered by the World Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, the junior chambers of commerce, and others.

The code of Metropolitan Dade County covers the elimination of architectural barriers to the employment of the handicapped. This code has been implemented by establishment of means for easy access to public buildings and the facilities therein, such as special rails and other equipment.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that many other communities will follow the lead of Metropolitan Dade County in eliminating unnecessary obstructions to full use by the community of the contribution which can be made by our handicapped citizens. For this reason, I am bringing this story of enlightened community action to the attention of my colleagues.

Alliance for Progress Makes Little Advance in 2 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune of August 19, 1963:

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS MAKES LITTLE ADVANCE IN 2 YEARS

The second birthday of the Alliance for Progress Saturday was not a joyful occasion for pointing with pride at all that has been accomplished.

Very little progress has been made, in fact, and there is gloom in both the northern and southern parts of the hemisphere.

On August 1, President Kennedy admitted he was "depressed" by the way the Alliance was working out. But he urged a long view, saying:

"I say, on this second anniversary, we have a long, long way to go, and in some ways the road seems longer than it was when the journey started. But I think we ought to keep at it."

The disappointment and disillusionment is even deeper in Latin America. There, officials complain about U.S. redtape and bureaucracy. Undoubtedly, they have encountered this.

But, in all truth, the Latin countries should face the harsh fact that they, themselves, have contributed to the poor showing of the Alliance by default.

Only 6 of the 19 nations—Cuba was barred—which signed the Charter of Punta

del Este have presented workable 10-year development plans.

The six are Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela.

Self-improvement was the heart of the Alliance. But land and tax reforms have been slow in taking shape, if at all. In most of the recipient countries a powerful oligarchy traditionally and successfully fights equitable taxation and forward-looking land reform.

Mexico is perhaps farthest along in reform, thanks largely to a burgeoning middle class. President Lopez Mateos is continuing to hand out land to peasants, but without Cuban-style confiscation.

A loan agreement totaling $398 million was arranged for Brazil. So far, only $84 million has been made available, and this went to prop up the faltering currency, not for long-range projects.

Argentina has $150 million in credits pledged by the United States. But the government still hasn't completed plans for public works and other projects estimated to cost $81 million.

The Agency for International Development has set aside $20 million for Mexico's small farmers. But Mexican banks, through which the money must be channeled, are not organized so as to make the individual loans.

Guatemala and Paraguay are receiving minimal aid until their governments show a serious effort to initiate long-promised reforms.

A politically stable and economically prosperous Latin America is still a worthwhile goal. But we are learning that this will not be attained simply by wishing for it and pouring out millions of dollars.

If the disappointment with the Alliance in its first 2 years results in a more realistic appraisal of what can be done and over how long a span, it will have been beneficial.

Tax-Cut Dosages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Baltimore Sun praised the good job of the House Ways and Means Committee on the tax legislation, soon to be before this body, and endorsed the "strong tonic" this bill would provide to our economy. The text of the August 17 editorial from the Baltimore Sun follows:

TAX-CUT DOSAGES

The tax bill compounded by the House Ways and Means Committee is like one of those pharmaceutical capsules whose ingredients dissolve at different rates, to the long-term benefit, everybody hopes, of the patient. Thus about two-thirds of the cuts in individual tax rates would take effect in 1964 and the rest in 1965; the present corporate rate of 52 percent would fall to 50 percent the first year, and an additional 2 percent the second; the existing 4-percent dividend credit would be repealed in two annual and equal stages; and so on.

Representative MILLS and his committee have in fact done well in their half year of labor over a piece of legislation complicated in every particular, and controversial through and through. As any tax bill must be, this is a compromise. It embodies some but far from all of the administration's proposals, which in any case were rather a hodgepodge, with a number of bugs. It accedes to some but not all of the special-interest complaints that always flood tax-bill writers. The result, even if approved substantially by the House and—much harder—by the Senate, is not likely to be recorded large in history, for it is not in any grand sense a tax-reform bill; but the job is a good one.

In terms of the general economy its salient features are the reductions in tax rates. A cut in corporate taxes is much needed in stimulating capital investment, a process that would be helped also by the proposed liberalization of the details of last year's law encouraging the purchase of new equipment. A cut in individual taxes, besides being the measure's one salient feature for all households, is another aspect of the same picture: its purpose is to increase consumption. (The argument that local taxing bodies are apt to take up what the Federal Government relinquishes is not much of an argument, since local governments show little disposition to hold the tax line, whatever Washington may do.)

How would all this affect the national economy, the patient? The patient right now is doing modestly well, though most economic medicos last spring had prognosed otherwise. No desperate remedy is demanded. But a strong tonic, in the form of phased dosages of increased capital investment and increased consumer spending, is plainly indicated for the Nation's health and growth.

President's Committee of Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some publicity given the so-called Gesell Committee Report on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Force by some segments of the news media. I must say, however, that many segments of our news media have failed to give any real information to our people regarding the full import of this report. For some reason, there has been a blackout so far as a full disclosure by those we ordinarily expect to carry such information is concerned. As a result, the vast majority of the people in the United States do not understand the full import of this report. As a matter of fact, many of them have never heard of it.

It is the most biased and prejudiced report that I have ever read. If the recommendations of this report are carried out, and apparently the report is following the lines of the present administration, we will see the Armed Forces being use for political expediency and to break down social barriers, upset customs and mores, and generally lower the morale of the defenders of our Nation.

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, who is now retired, has made a painstaking and most revealing analysis of this report. General Almond was born in Luray, Va.; educated at the Virginia Military Institute; served in World War I and World War II with great distinction. He retired from the U.S. Army after 37 years of distinguished and outstanding service to his country and he is now making his home in Alabama.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include General Almond's analysis and comments in the hopes that every Member of the Congress will read and study this document so that they will be informed as to the iniquitous report of the so-called Gesell Committee and can take the necessary action to prevent its implementation.

The analysis is as follows:

ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS ON THE INITIAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN THE ARMED FORCES

(By Edward M. Almond, lieutenant general, U.S. Army, retired)

I. INTRODUCTION

The initial subject report dealing with equality of treatment and opportunity for Negro military personnel stationed within the United States has been carefully reviewed by the undersigned and it is believed that the average objective reader of the report would be struck by the dictatorial recommendations, the vagueness of many charges and the bias whereby the committee making the report to the President clearly shows that it is willing to go to any limit to insure integration in its most complete degree and this without regard to the effects that it may have on the balance of the Armed Forces which constitute between 85 and 90 percent of our military servies.

II. OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REPORT

1. It proposes to deny essential information to promotion boards in the military services (pp. 24, 25, "photographs").

2. It demands in the name of equal opportunity a higher percentage in Negro promotions rather than education, age in service, and the more fundamental consideration of merit (p. 20).

3. It seeks integration "for the amalgamation of the races" and not merely to secure equal opportunity and use of skills. (See pp. 34, 35.)

4. It invokes responsibilities and makes demands on post and area commanders by coercive methods to force integration on civilian communities by "threat and blackmail."

5. It encourages and recommends the establishment of an agency whereby accusation of "discrimination" may be made by secret testimony without the person accused being given the source of the accusation.

6. It quotes injustices repeatedly but at the same time admits that the committee has verified very few and many times none of the facts.

7. It draws many inferences loosely and in general terms, even to the extent of challenging the integrity of responsible military leaders.

8. It does not envisage a real evaluation of the individual Negro based on merit but repeatedly speaks of opportunities and "latent" skills inherent in the Negro.

9. It recommends a "spy system" to be called "monitoring" with an especially sympathetic monitor throughout the range of troop levels in order to report on responsible commanders as to how they carry out their functions.

10. It strongly recommends that those responsible for integrating Negroes among white elements of commands be given to understand that such accomplishments will redound to the credit of the author of such plans for the purposes of furthering his promotion.

11. It emphasizes repeatedly that Negroes should operate without reference to race and that there should be no record of blood or

race on the Negroes record of services. Later on in the report it complains of the inability to determine what cases there are which have been committed against the Negroes, since it has no way of determining from the military record whether the individual is a Negro or not. It goes on further to claim that the absence of such a record has cost untold time and money to accumulate such information for the purposes of the report.

12. It seeks to pervert the Armed Forces' mission from that of maintaining the defense and security of the United States for the sake of one small segment of its personnel. An example of this creation of a festering internal turmoil is the requirement of local military commanders to prevent the practice of Negroes gravitating by choice to one post service club and whites to another. This is intolerable interference with the off-duty rights of any American.

13. Signers of the report are: Nathaniel S. Cooley, Abe Fortas, Gerhard A. Gesell (chairman), Louis J. Hector, Benjamin Muse, John Sengstacke, Whitney M. Young, Jr., and Laurence I. Hewes III, committee counsel.

Three of the members of this committee are Negroes and the other four have a long career as racial agitators working with the ADA, ADL, and the NAACP. Not a single member appears to have a practical and objective approach to the subject of integration. From some of the recommendations made, it is apparent that the committee is willing to go to any length to discredit the commander who does not meet the integration criteria that the committee sets up and to institute a spy system which places the post commander in a thoroughly discredited position.

14. The immaturity of this committee is established by its reference to the several inspector general's departments of the armed services which have been known for careful analyses and unblemished integrity since the beginning of the organization of all of our Armed Forces, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; this report would dispense with the inspector general handling anything that has to do with integration and would set up a monitoring service with a special appointee who would handle such cases. The Communist Soviets have such a system and have had since the beginning of the Russian Revolution in 1917. He is known as a "political commissar," whose business it is to watch all military commanders and to report to another agency on their manner of performance of duty. The effrontery of this committee to propose such a departure from the system of integrity of such long standing in the military services is shocking and revolting.

15. This whole report is reminiscent of the experiences of the undersigned when he was the commander of the 92d Division and had so many problems to confront him in various phases of training and in combat from the period of September 1942 to August 1945. One of the most notable problems was that of promotion. Negro advocates of rapid promotion had no hesitance in recommending that a percentage of Negroes comparable to the Negro population strength of the United States should obtain in all promotions in the 92d Division. They complained bitterly when white officers who had commanded companies in training for as much as a year were promoted to the next grade and Negro lieutenants who had just joined the unit or had had only 3 or 4 months service were not promoted percentagewise.

16. Needless to say, such complaints were taken with the validity that they deserved but this instance is cited to show that nothing has changed in the nature of those who are determined to integrate the Armed Forces and determined to secure what is called equal rights and opportunities for skills and abilities. It seems never to have occurred to the authors of such projects that there may be a slight difference between the average white and the average Negro in his ability to absorb information and to deliver a satisfactory performance. It is a known fact that during World War II it required in training 3½ to 4 times as much ammunition expenditure on the part of Negroes as compared to whites in order to secure a reasonable comparison of weapons performance in firing.

17. The undersigned has interviewed three different post commanders since reading this report and the meddlings and directives and complaints that are foisted upon post commanders are little short of tragic. This report if put into effect will do more to damage the morale of the military services than anything that could be devised.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 21st of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

The pile of letters grows higher. The opposition of the people of southern Idaho to the unwarranted and untenable action of Secretary Udall in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho is being expressed in many different phrases. Yet all voice the same general thought that southern Idaho does not need or want Bonneville in its area.

The following letter from Shirley H. Manser, an automobile dealer of Payette, Idaho, expresses the thought that Idaho wants to grow; therefore they should "keep Bonneville out":

MANSER, INC.,
Payette, Idaho, August 1, 1963.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR: The average American citizen wants to be left alone to stand on his own two feet, work for what he gets and pay for what he gets. He wants free enterprise and prefers not to be forced to accept Federal handouts that are paid for by the taxes he pays.

By a large majority the citizens of Idaho do not want the Secretary of the Interior to extend the Bonneville Power marketing area to Southern Idaho. To do this it will only be a further drain on the taxpayers of our State. Idaho citizens are happy with their present electrical services from a company who pays heavily through taxation to bolster the State's economy. To take away from us, by extending Bonneville Power to Idaho, the taxation money now received by our present taxpaying power company will only mean more taxation against every citizen of our State to keep our State's economy at its present level.

Idaho wants to prosper and grow. Keep Bonneville Power out of Idaho.

Sincerely yours,

MANSER, INC.,
(Signed) SHIRLEY H. MANSER.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. E. Toevs, president of Economy Cash Stores, Inc., of Aberdeen, Idaho, has lived in Idaho for more than 50 years, and says that he has no complaint about the service from Idaho Power Co. and sees no necessity for Bonneville entering southern Idaho. His letter follows:

ECONOMY CASH STORES, INC.,
Aberdeen, Idaho, August 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SAYLOR: We have lived in Idaho for 55 years, and have no complaint about the service we have received from the taxpaying Idaho Power Co.

We do know that if Bonneville Power were permitted to come into our territory we would not receive any preference in power rates, but we would see an increase in taxes.

We believe we are well taken care of by the Idaho Power Co., and we see no necessity of Bonneville Power entering this territory.

Very truly yours,

ECONOMY CASH STORES, INC.,
(Signed) J. E. TOEVS.

Mr. Speaker, Judge J. H. Silbaugh, of the probate court of Jerome County, Idaho, advises me that he was a former Pennsylvanian who came to Jerome over 50 years ago. He compliments me on the stand I have taken against Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. His letter follows:

CHAMBER OF THE PROBATE COURT,
JEROME COUNTY,
Jerome, Idaho, August 1, 1963.

Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to compliment you on the debate you made July 8 on Bonneville Power going into Idaho.

I came to this community from Pittsburgh, Pa., 53 years ago. I consider Idaho Power has served this part of the State very well. I see no need of Government power coming into this country, and I can truthfully say I do not own $1 of Idaho Power stock.

I wish to compliment you on the stand you are taking on this matter. Thank you again for your efforts.

Yours very truly,

J. H. SILBAUGH.

Mr. Speaker, if southern Idahoans need any further proof that subsidized tax-free electric power is not the panacea for economic growth and well-being its promoters would have us believe, their doubt should be dispelled by the following article about Oregon's stagnant economy and the movement of its young people out of the State:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, July 24, 1963]

CANDIDATE SAYS OREGON HAS STAGNANT ECONOMY

"Vast numbers" of Oregon's most productive population, its young adults, are leaving the State because of Oregon's "stagnant economy," Jim Bacaloff, Republican candidate for the Third District congressional seat, declared Tuesday.

Bacaloff cited University of Oregon Bureau of Business Research figures showing that Oregon is losing population in the 20- to 34-year age group at a rate higher than the national average of population change.

"Most of the young adults leaving our State have been educated in our schools and have found it necessary to look for job opportu-

nities in other States," he told the North East Kiwanis Club luncheon at the Sheraton Motor Inn.

Bacaloff also cited business failures and said Dun & Bradstreet figures through 1962 showed Oregon with "the highest business failure rate in the Nation, some 2½ times the national average." He said the rate was considerably higher than California's.

Bacaloff charged that the State is not doing all it can to attract industry and more jobs. He cited the March issue of Dun's Review & Modern Industry, a Dun & Bradstreet publication, which he said showed that "Oregon is one of the 12 States that does not offer any of the 4 major methods used by most States to attract new industry."

He said the Oregon Department of Planning and Development could stimulate growth by encouraging industrial parks near population centers where ample labor is available. He also suggested 2 years of exempt property taxes for new manufacturing plants.

Bacaloff said a new auto-manufacturing plant planned for the west coast found high property and inventory taxes "major obstacles" in locating in Oregon. He said the $50 million plant would employ up to 5,000 persons.

He indicated that officials of the firm would visit Oregon this year and that he had offered to show them possible locations and present the advantages of the State to them.

Happy Birthday, Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr Speaker, a few weeks ago one of the most distinguished Americans, Herbert Hoover, celebrated his 89th birthday.

Typical of the nationwide editorial comment that greeted this occasion was an editorial in the August 15 issue of the Messenger Press, serving communities in southwest Cook County, Ill., which I will insert into the RECORD at this point.

I am sure all of us are pleased with the esteem that the Nation and the world hold for this distinguished former President:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, HERBERT HOOVER

Herbert Hoover will be 89 years old on August 10. It is a ripe age—and one can only hope that the 31st President of the United States will be with us for many years to come.

Few men have seen so much of the world or done so much for the world as Mr. Hoover. He has known triumph and tragedy, victory and defeat, exaltation and despair, all beyond the ken of most mortals. In private life and in public, whatever the destinies of the moment, he has gone resolutely ahead as his conscience and his heart and intellect directed. And he has emerged a wise and mellow man, whose friendships and loyalties are beyond numbering.

It is for his work on behalf of the hungry, the dispossessed and the downtrodden that Herbert Hoover will be best remembered in history—and it is history that, finally, separates wheat from chaff and presents a man whole in the context of his time. Mr. Hoover started from humble origins but knew financial success at an early age. Then he divorced himself from commerce and turned to public life. Through wars and revolutions his was the guiding hand that saved millions from misery, pestilence, starvation, and death.

Happy birthday, Herbert Hoover. The civilized world will echo that fine old greeting.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent newsletter of mine pointing out the dangers involved in cutting taxes when our spending continues to mount, as well as an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News which makes some cogent comments on the same subject.

The editorial follows:

NEWSLETTER, AUGUST 20, 1963

TAXES

Last week, the Ways and Means Committee, after 6 months of hearings and deliberations, substantially approved a tax bill which, if enacted, would reduce taxes by upward of $10 billion a year when fully effective. The bill will probably be considered by the House in early September.

NEED

There is general agreement that sound economic growth requires a leveling-off of the high tax rates which were imposed under wartime conditions and which have never been significantly readjusted to meet long-term needs. Republicans, for example, have long supported an attack on the high rate structure and were pleased when the President recognized those rates as an impediment to sustained growth.

CONDITIONS

But, a tax cut can, in the long run, be harmful—if it ignores the Government's fiscal problems and if it fails to meet the objective of a sound tax program. The bill in the Ways and Means Committee is such a bill.

OBJECTIVES

The President stated that the three major objectives of a sound tax program should be: Simplification of the tax laws, more equitable treatment of taxpayers and the creation of new jobs.

SIMPLIFICATION

Not only does the bill fail to simplify the laws; it is a step backward toward greater complexity. It adds some 300 pages of new complexities to a statute already overburdened with exceptions, exemptions, special rules and complex formulas.

Equity

The bill adds new inequities to the tax system. It gives an unwarranted eventual $1 billion a year subsidy to big business; it increases the double taxation of shareholders, and it increases taxes for those who itemize deductions while reducing taxes for those who do not.

Jobs

Jobs are created when people invest in new enterprises. This bill relies more on increasing consumer spending than on encouraging increased investment. The net effect may well be the creation of inflationary pressures rather than the creation of jobs.

FISCAL

More than any of these defects, however, the grave deficiency in this bill is the fact that it deliberately enacts the greatest tax cut in history when the Nation's spending is at an alltime high, and when the administration in power gives every indication of wanting more and more Federal expenditures.

SIGNIFICANCE

What this means is that the bill's tax cut will be financed by borrowing money (or creating it), not only next year but for years ahead, as far as we can look into the fiscal future. It insures deficits of the magnitude of $10 billion a year for years to come. This prospect has grave implications for the value of your dollar—both at home and abroad. It is a grave risk to take for uncertain benefits.

REQUIREMENT

What is urgently needed before we can safely cut taxes is meaningful action, not words, by the administration to get Federal spending under control, to pull back its numerous requests for new expenditures, and to give the Nation the hope that one day—in the foreseeable future—we can balance the budget.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Aug. 14, 1963]

CUT IN FEDERAL SPENDING SHOULD HAVE TOP PRIORITY TO SPARE NEXT GENERATION

While the House Ways and Means Committee is rapidly completing the long, tedious and highly complicated job of preparing a tax-cut bill that could produce substantial savings for most taxpayers, it is still very problematical that any action will be forthcoming on such a bill this year.

The reasons are obvious enough for those acquainted with the ways of Congress. To begin with, approval of a tax-cutting bill by the powerful House committee still adds up to but one short step in the long route such a bill must take through the Congress. It is an important step, to be sure, but still laying in wait for the bill is open debate on the floor of the House, a study and hearings by a Senate committee, and perhaps a long and bitter debate in the upper Chamber.

The present timetable calls for full lower House consideration of the tax-cut bill next month. Even granting that the House debate is short and winds up with House approval of the bill along the lines proposed by the Ways and Means Committee, it is not likely that any action, whatsoever, will be forthcoming in the Senate until an approved bill comes over from the House.

Then the powerful Senate Finance Committee will schedule its own hearings on the bill and they are apt to take just as long as the hearings held by the House committee. In fact, they might take longer as there are powerful economy advocates on the Senate committee who are strongly opposed to the whole idea of making substantial reductions in current tax rates without making substantial reductions in Government spending to balance the loss of revenue. Granting that this opposition can be overcome, there is still the probability that the Senate committee will change the House bill in many respects, thus enhancing the prospect of a long debate on the floor of the Senate and possible complications if and when a Senate-approved bill goes back to the lower House so differences can be resolved.

All of this precludes any interruptions of regular Senate business by a filibuster on the civil rights issue. Should there be such a filibuster, with Senate committees prohibited from holding hearings and conducting any business sessions during the filibuster, there is virtually no chance that any

tax legislation will clear Congress this session.

Thus, our overburdened taxpayers would be wise to temper their enthusiasm over the prospect of getting a tax break anytime soon. It is true that the administration has put a first priority on the tax-cutting bill, but many Congressmen prefer to hold up such action until an election year and that is another factor which helps to explain why the Congress isn't going to be in any big hurry to push a bill through this year.

One of the surprising things that many Congressmen have already learned is that there are a lot of taxpayers in this country who share the belief that a tax cut should be accompanied by a sharp reduction in Federal expenditures. People who have grown accustomed over the years to tailoring their own spending to their incomes simply cannot understand how a government, which is already head over heels in debt, can improve its fiscal position by reducing its income while further increasing its spending.

Yet, this is exactly what this proposed tax-cutting bill aims to do. It will provide over $10 billion in tax relief at a time when the Federal budget is already unbalanced on the deficit side to the tune of some $7 billion. This is the same as arguing that a man who is already broke and deep in debt can go on and increase his personal spending while his income is going to be much less than he had before. Admittedly, for an individual to follow such a reckless policy would be financial folly in the extreme, yet there are those who argue that a government, which is nothing more than a collection of individuals, can do this without endangering its financial position.

We sharply disagree with this economic theory. A government, because of its vast borrowing powers, can go on spending more than it takes in for a much longer time than applies to individuals. But no government can go on indefinitely in this fashion without eventually reaping the consequences of such folly, and we are rapidly approaching the state in this country where the size of our debt, the taxes required to carry it, and our declining gold supply are certain to bring on extremely serious consequences.

Quite naturally, there are darn few taxpayers in this country who don't relish the idea of being permitted to keep more of their own money to spend on their own needs. That's what makes a tax-cutting bill so popular with Congressmen in an election year.

Yet, commonsense and plain common honesty demand that all of us look at tax-cutting proposals that aren't accompanied by balancing cuts in Government spending with a slightly jaundiced eye. This generation of Americans has already built up a staggering debt load for our children and now it is proposed we add even more to that load by giving ourselves a juicy tax cut without forcing a wasteful government to cut its spending proportionately.

From this viewpoint, that is fiscal irresponsibility of a most tragic sort and, while we recognize the need for a tax cut, we think there's an even greater need for reducing our wild Government spending at one and the same time.

The Cost of Cutting Foreign Aid Too Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, during the current debate on the Foreign Assistance Act, many of the bill's critics have cited the report of the Clay Committee. It is evident, however, that General Clay and his Committee are basically very much in favor of foreign aid. In the following editorial, which appeared August 21, the New York Times rightly notes General Clay's warning against further cuts in the bill:

GENERAL CLAY'S WARNING

Our foreign aid program, as President Kennedy noted yesterday, remains an essential safeguard for this country and the cause of freedom. The cost of cutting it too low is vastly greater than the cost of carrying it.

Much of the impetus for current congressional assaults on foreign aid spending stems from the criticisms of the program made earlier this year by a special Presidential Committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. Since the Committee's views so impressed Congressmen, we hope they will be equally impressed by Genral Clay's present warning against any further cut in the $4 billion ceiling the House Foreign Affairs Committee has proposed. The new ceiling is already nearly $1 billion below the figure originally asked by President Kennedy. Additional reductions, in General Clay's judgment, would put severe strains on our efforts to promote the security and solvency of the free world.

The basis for his concern is underscored in the letter Secretaries Rusk and McNamara have jointly sent to all Members of the House. They point up the perils to our world position inherent in any drastic retreat on the aid front. Nothing could be more "euphoric"—to use the word that crops up so often in the Senate hearings on ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty—than an assumption that international tensions or economic development needs overseas have diminished to an extent that would make a dismantling of our foreign aid commitments either feasible or desirable.

The American Tass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the versatility of the Department of Agriculture is wonderful to behold—and to be deeply concerned about—especially when it branches into new ventures in direct competition with private enterprise. I read with much interest the comments of Eric Ridder, publisher of the New York Journal of Commerce, on the wire service which the Department is now offering. As Mr. Ridder asks, Just where does this kind of thing lead in Government control of news? I include the Journal of Commerce editorial and Mr. Ridder's column in the RECORD:

THE AMERICAN TASS

(By Eric Ridder)

What gets me—now that we're well into the 1970's and I look back ruefully at the past decade—is that it only took 5 years to kill the independent American press and that the execution was carried out with such a minimum of malice.

It really came to a head in 1965 (get the date, 1965) when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and interdepartmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?

They were, and in no time at all a large assemblage of reporters, teletype operators and other personnel was woven into a wire system slightly larger than the combined networks of the Associated Press and United Press-International. There were some growing pains at first, but by 1967 it was plain that the new Federal News Services (FNS) was second to none, its coverage then extending into stock prices, business annual reports and (seemingly for the enlightenment of the Department of Justice) even into homicide and other local police matters.

The Service grew so rapidly that it was virtually inevitable that before 1967 was out a bright and highly influential young Government official should suggest, first to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Congress, that "this service is being provided with the taxpayers' money and should be made available to anyone who is willing to pay for it and will not abuse the use of it."

The proposition was promptly challenged as a move to set up "an American Tass" (a reference to the Soviet Government's news service monopoly). AP and UPI objected strenuously that it constituted an unwarranted interference with free enterprise.

But these objections got nowhere. The stage had already been set back in the summer of 1963 when the Department of Agriculture offered a crop and market reporting service to anyone willing to pay A.T. & T. a rate for the wire service sufficient to return the company a profit. This, too, had been challenged, among others by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, for it was plain that the probable effect of this would be to put a commercial service in the same field (the PAM News Corp.) out of business. USDA had been quite unmoved by this eventuality. So was the Federal Communications Commission. When it saw that another Federal agency had been named respondent in the publishers' petition it backed off at once with the explanation that propriety of USDA's wire service to non-Government individuals was "not cognizable by the Commission."

So the point was made and carried in 1965 that if any fight were to be won on the subject, it should have been won in 1963 when the issue first came out into the open in earnest. Moreover, there had been other precedents in the field of electric power. As in the USDA case earlier, the Government then went ahead and arranged with A. T. & T. to distribute its service to anyone who would pay for it and not "mishandle" the news. Billings and collections would be up to A. T. & T. itself. The Government "sincerely hoped" that private news services would not suffer, but left the plain implication that if they did, it was their own hard luck.

A pause followed and lasted until certain newspaper and broadcasting media, struggling hard for survival, cancelled their regular news service contracts and subscribed to FNS, which offered lower rates.

The effect of this was to reduce the funds available to the private wire services. As the quality and scope of their services began to decline the whole thing began to snowball. By 1969 both AP and UPI were out of business. Though somewhat bewildered at first by the swiftness of these events, FNS found itself a monopoly.

Like BBC in England, FNS tried to be objective. It was, up to a point, but there were times (especially during election years) when it could not quite forget which side of its bread the butter was on. Administration critics got rather short shrift. Scandals involving the administration went largely unreported because they did not

quite qualify as "constructive" news. Some editors learned of them and reacted vigorously, but the facts came hard since few were given much encouragement to dig them out as was demonstrated on June 1, 1970, when lightning suddenly struck.

Angered by discovery of irregularities in Washington that FNS had ignored for months, a well-known newspaper serving a market of over a million readers opened an attack on administration laxity and charged FNS with silent complicity in the matter, simultaneously recalling earlier predictions that it would turn out to be "an American Tass."

The same bright young Government official (older now, and presumably more resourceful) was stung by this into recalling the half-forgotten proviso to the effect that FNS would be withdrawn from anyone "mishandling" the news. He promptly invoked it.

The next day readers of this newspaper found it shorn of all international, national, and even regional news. Having only a few reporters left (FNS was by then even reporting sports and theater news), it could present only a few scraps of local gossip and was obviously not long for this world.

This lesson was not lost on the rest of the press nor on radio and TV stations. After a cautious study of the ruin to which their excontemporary's brashness had brought him, they opted for the safety of conformity.

FNS thus survived unchallenged, except by a rather worrisome unofficial system all too familiar to dictators. Known popularly as the grapevine, this proved an inexhaustible source of the wildest rumors. It upset everybody, perhaps most of all the administration itself, but continued to spread like wildfire despite the most relentless attempts to stamp it out.

TOO TRUE TO BE GOOD

To some readers "The American Tass" (see above) may seem pure fantasy. In actual fact it's far from it.

The Department of Agriculture has already launched a wire service competitive with that of PAM News Corp. Its information is gathered at the taxpayer's expense then offered gratis to anyone who wants it and is willing to pay what it costs A. T. & T. to include them in its circuit and realize a small profit.

Since PAM, a commercial enterprise, must charge not only for the use of wires, operators, and tickers but for newsgathering costs that USDA charges off to the taxpayers, the result is intolerable pressure on the commercial service. Few forms of free enterprise can stand up for long under this type of competition.

How has this come about? And how was it that the Federal Communications Commission, which is usually so discriminating in specifying who should start this service or that and what the kiddies ought to be watching on TV, refused to do anything about it?

Let us get that out of the way first. When the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM took the issue to FCC the Commission took one look at who wanted to offer the news service (USDA) and concluded that since it was a Federal agency the issue was "not cognizable by the Commission."

Well, I'm not going to indulge in the losing litigants time-honored right to "cuss the judge," but there are other aspects of the issue that I think you will find as disturbing as I do.

There follow pertinent paragraphs of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM News Corp. and the decision of the FCC in connection therewith. A beautiful brochure has been printed and is being used by A. T. & T. salesmen to promote this service.

A background statement issued by the Department of Agriculture says in one paragraph: "According to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, the new system will not bring in any revenue to the Federal Government, and will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government."

And another paragraph: "Under this plan, subscribers apply directly to the company that owns the teletype circuits, which handles all the work of contracts, billings, collections, etc., without cost or income to the Federal Government. The plan is designed to increase access to information, particularly to detailed specialized information, detail on local markets, and other information already being collected and summarized."

Two more paragraphs: "The private common carrier that owns the teletype system leased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been obligated to protect the confidentiality of information flowing over that system, until the information was released by the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

"Therefore, it required written authorization to provide this extension of service to private subscribers. The idea was discussed of having the Agricultural Marketing Service approve each application. It was being rejected as being time consuming and unnecessary. Instead, a catch-all reservation of the right of the USDA to cancel service was included in the authorizing letter."

I wonder what a "catch-all" reservation is?

A sentence in the next paragraph: "Since it is impossible to foresee what illegal use or flagrant abuses might be made by individual subscribers, the reservation also includes the right to cancel service to individual subscribers."

I wonder who determines what "flagrant abuses" are?

Another sentence: "In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

Isn't it nice to know that the USDA doesn't expect that it will be necessary to cancel service.

In a letter dated August 9, 1963, addressed to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Mr. G. R. Grange, Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services, says as follows:

"The PAM News Corp. relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports plus supplemental market information which it collects directly. Whether the direct connections to our leased wire circuit will adversely affect its business may depend on the value which its customers place on the supplemental information they receive from the PAM News Corp. Press associations, newspapers, radio and television stations, business firms, and all other interested persons may, if they desire, have access to the market news circuit. We have no basis for making it available to some and denying it to others, as long as there is no false or illegal use of the Federal-State market news reports."

As I remarked earlier, if you will weigh these words against the projections drawn in "The American Tass," I don't think you'll find the latter overly fanciful. Perhaps you'll feel as I feel, recalling the title of one of Shaws plays, "It Is Just Too True To Be Good."

Prayer and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of the Members of the Congress to an outstanding article by a young student at the Canterbury School at New Milford, Conn.

A freshman student, Duane Tucker, rips into the malicious and atheistic ruling against prayer by our Supreme Court in an excellent article in the Carillon, a school publication.

I highly recommend his article to the Congress.

Canterbury, as you may know, is a small preparatory school for boys. And when you take into consideration the fact that this article was prepared by a freshman, I am sure you will agree our Nation's youth is not casually brushing aside the grave questions raised by such actions by our Supreme Court.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his article for the information of the Congress:

PRAYERS AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Duane Tucker, 1966)

The 25th of June 1962 will live in history as the second day of infamy, for on this day the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in a 6-to-1 decision that the recitation of a simple nondenominational 22-word prayer in public schools was unconstitutional. The ruling stemmed from the complaints of five Long Island parents who contended that the prayer was not in accordance with the principle of the separation of church and state and that as it was composed by the New York State Board of Regents, it violated the first amendment. Constitutional amendments were introduced to legalize the saying of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools. Powerful opposition developed rapidly. The Court itself was placed in the midst of the hottest controversy since the school desegregation decision of 1954.

Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, expressed thorough disgust with the decision, "I know of nothing in my lifetime that could give more aid and comfort to Moscow than this bold, malicious, atheistic, and sacrilegious twist of this unpredictable group of uncontrolled despots."

American magazine called it "An unpopular decision * * * literally a stupid decision, a doctrinaire decision, an unrealistic decision, a decision that spits in the face of history, our tradition, and our heritage as a religious people."

Former President Hoover termed it "a disintegration of one of the most sacred of American heritages."

Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, expressed dismay at this decision. "The decision strikes at the very heart of the godly tradition of our Nation."

In an anonymous letter to the editor of the Herald Tribune one protestor said, "Once more our Supreme Court has sided with a small group of frustrated malcontents and the tail still wags the dog in America. * * *

I wonder if schoolchildren of the future, if we are to have one, will sit down to an exam and utter a brief prayer to the Government or if a child who is lost and alone will close his eyes for a moment and gain confidence in the sure knowledge that the nine old men are ever present to guide him."

Bishop James A. Pike submitted that the Court's ruling "deconsecrated the Nation by in effect creating a state religion, that of secularism."

Compliance with President Kennedy's counsel to pray more fervently at home does not restore the freedom of which the parents have been deprived. For they have no further grounds to believe that the schools to which they send their children should in some manner acknowledge the existence of a God whom the same children are taught to worship at home.

ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE

The criterion of this issue lies in that misinterpreted clause of the first amendment, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." In 1898 Thomas M. Cooly, of the University of Michigan, interpreted this clause to mean "the setting up or recognition of a state church, or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others. It was never intended by the Constitution that the Government should be provided for in cases where a proper recognition of divine providence in the working of government might seem to require it, and where it might be done without drawing any invidious distinction between religious beliefs, organizations, or sects."

Surely, this prayer does not further one specific religion but merely acknowledges the presence of a Supreme Being, a belief of every religion, excluding atheism which is an established minority. Yet these atheists were not compelled to recite this prayer and therefore should not have had any grounds for a protest. During the recitation of the prayer any child could stand or sit in respectful attention or he might leave the room.

Even if there had been the slightest coercion involved as was suggested by Justice Black, Erwin Groswold's, dean of Harvard Law School, argument pointed out, "The child of a minority group is to be sure different in his beliefs. That is what it means to be a member of a minority. Is it not desirable and educational for him to observe and learn this in the atmosphere of the school not so much that he is different as that others are different from him? And is it not desirable that, at the same time, he experiences and learns the fact that his difference is tolerated and accepted?" However, just because this member of a minority is tolerated, it should not follow that he can force others to relinquish their Christian heritage merely to suit his personal beliefs.

In interpreting the "establishment of religion" provision, Justice Black and his followers have employed an approach which has been termed the "absolutist" approach. Instead of interpreting the words of the Constitution by studying and treating all sources pertaining to the constitutional system, the Court has interpreted it in a narrow, literal legalistic sense by isolating two words and ignoring their relation to the rest of the document. The Court has put on blinds, focused solely on the words "no law," and taken them to mean just that, no law with no more consideration involved.

PRECEDENT

In addition to the rigidity of the interpretation, there has also been an inconsistency that is ridiculous. In the Everson case in 1946, the Court held that it was not "an establishment of religion" for a New Jersey township to reimburse parents for money spent for bus transportation of their children to parochial schools. It held further that "the first amendment requires the State to be neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the State to be their adversary."

It is extremely difficult to perceive how the same Court could decide just 15 years later, with any regard for precedent, that a single, uncompulsory prayer could violate the Constitution. If the State has not now become an adversary of religion, it must surely have become an advocate of irreligion, and this places United States 40 years behind the Soviet Union in forbidding the mention of God anywhere.

In 1948 the Court ruled 8 to 1 that the use of public school classrooms for religious instruction was unconstitutional. Yet in 1952 in the case of *Zorach* v. *Claudson* it upheld 6 to 3 a New York program of releasing children from public schools to attend religious instruction elsewhere. In this case the Court declared that, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respects there shall be separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. * * *

"When the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities * * * it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. We find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for the Government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influences."

Why if in 1952 the Court could recognize that we have a religious background and culture does it not apply this reasoning to the present? Why if in 1952 the Supreme Court could interpret the Constitution in a correct, balanced fashion, does it now interpret it absolutely? Why if in [the people's] spiritual needs does it not do this now by permitting the regents' prayer in public schools? And why if in 1952 the Court could find "no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for the Government to be hostile to religion" does it now discover one?

In the current prayer decision, in the case of *Engles* v. *Vital*, the Court has stretched its imagination far beyond reality by construing the establishment clause to mean a banishment of God from public schools. Justice Stewart, the sole dissenter, wrote in his opinion, "I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an 'official religion' is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these school children to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

JEFFERSON'S WALL

When the Court speaks of Jefferson's "wall of separation between church and state" as though it were actually a part of the Constitution itself, it is walking on very thin ice. Although the first amendment was never intended to be used as a means of secularizing the United States, the Court in employing this unrelated metaphor has used it for just that purpose. Furthermore, in its interpretation, or should I say misinterpretation, the Court has made literal that which was meant only figuratively.

For this wall of separation cannot possibly be made impenetrable as the Court has attempted to do. Our Nation's long tradition of chaplaincies and churches for the Armed Forces; tax benefits for religious institutions; the prayers in Congress, the Supreme Court itself; the inaugural address taken by the President; the pledge of allegiance to the flag; the third stanza of our national anthem; the words "In God we trust" imprinted on our coinage; the traditional Christmas and Easter plays in public schools; the proclamation of a national day of prayer and thanksgiving by the President; and numerous other incidents demonstrate the fiction and impossibility of an absolute wall between church and state. In short, Jefferson's cliche cannot be interpreted absolutely and is irrelevant to the interpretation of the first amendment.

It was the legislatures of the 13 States which ratified the first amendment. They could only have done so on the basis of a common understanding of the "establishment of religion" clause which was the setting up of an official state religion by the Government. Jefferson's metaphor was not written until 1802, 11 years after the ratification, in polite correspondence with the Danbury Baptist Association.

Ironically, Thomas Jefferson advocated in his annual report of 1822 the building of "religious schools on the confines of the University [of Virginia]," and supported this statement by submitting that, "such an arrangement * * * would fill the chasm now existing on principles which would leave inviolate the constitutional freedom of religion." Yet those resolved to drive religion out of every portion of public life, would rather quote Jefferson's private unofficial metaphor of 1802 and ignore his public statement of 1822.

EFFECTS AND A REMEDIAL MEASURE

This ruling, like stones tossed onto the surface of a pond, has produced results far beyond the point of impact. For it sets up precedent which can be applied to future cases regarding prayers or Bible recitation in public school. Ominous effects of the decision have been manifested in Vermont, where the board of education held that "the intermingling of religious expressions in tax-supported institutions is inconsistent with the Federal Constitution."

In order to right this grievous error and to prevent more like it in the future, I feel that an amendment to the Constitution should be adopted clarifying the "establishment of religion" clause to mean the setting up of a particular sect or religious denomination of the official religion of the state.

In conclusion, I would like to leave you with an excerpt from George Washington's Farewell Address which definitely shows that he would have been among the rigorous objectors to this decision. "In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness these firmest props of the destinies of men and citizens."

Man in the News: Planner of U.S. Supersonic Airliner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, our Federal Aviation Administrator is doing excellent service for his country, and I would be among the first to salute his efforts. Presently, in his thinking on the agenda of America's future and plans for a supersonic airline, I have long been a supporter of the RS–70 program and I hope we do have a supersonic airliner someday. I salute Mr. Halaby for his efforts, and include in my remarks a much-deserved article from the London Times, June 24, 1963, which is as follows:

MAN IN THE NEWS: PLANNER OF U.S. SUPERSONIC AIRLINER

JUNE 24.—Mr. Najeeb Halaby, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, is as much responsible as anyone else for the U.S. decision to produce a supersonic airliner, a venture which he has described as "harnessing the inevitable." Himself an expert pilot, who has flown many of America's fastest aircraft, including the B–58 bomber, Mr. Halaby recently expressed doubts about the design of the Anglo-French Concord supersonic aircraft against which the United States is now to compete.

"I just happen to think," he told a congressional committee last week, "that there will be more pilot-handling problems, and therefore more passenger-confidence prob-

lems than they [the British and French] think." He explained his belief that the Concord would have to come in to land "cocoked up at a pretty high angle" like modern jet fighters. He believes that the United States will be able to produce its aircraft soon after, or even as soon as, the Concord and that it will be able to sell more of them.

It does not often happen that a man who is a jet fighter and test pilot, a lawyer and a corporation executive, finds himself in a Government post in which he can use all his qualifications. Mr. Halaby has done so. The Federal Aviation Agency, in whose creation in 1958 he was involved, is responsible for regulating air commerce, administering Federal aid to aviation, controlling the navigable air space for both civil and military flying, consolidating the research and development of safety devices and planning for emergency operation in case of war.

With the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the FAA has been responsible for the planning and studies which resulted in President Kennedy's recent announcement that a supersonic airliner would be developed in this country. Another of its functions, in which Mr. Halaby has interested himself, is the encouragement of civil aviation abroad. He suggested recently, for example, after visiting Africa, that a sort of Flying Peace Corps made up of experienced aviators might go there to further the cause of flying.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has described the job of administering the Federal Aviation Agency as "probably the most demanding job in Government," but Mr. Halaby, a tall, dark, handsome man, with the easy confidence of the jet pilot, seems to carry the burden easily. One of his first acts after President Kennedy appointed him in 1961 was to decentralize the Agency, delegating more authority to his assistants.

As one who has been interested in aviation since he was a schoolboy, secured a student pilots license at 17, test-flew the first American jetplane, the Bell P-59, and later made the first transcontinental jet-powered flight, his knowledge of flying is unassailable, but he has other valuable achievements behind him. As an official of the Aero Space Corp., he gained much knowledge about missiles and his interest in the oversea aspect of this job probably stems from 5 years in the State and Defense Departments.

LAW TRAINING

Najeeb Elias Halaby was born on November 19, 1915, in Dallas, Tex., the son of a Syrian, who's first name he bears. He was educated as a lawyer at Stanford University, California, the University of Michigan Law School, and the Yale University School of Law, where he obtained an LL.B. degree in 1940. He has been admitted to the bar in California and the District of Columbia, and is qualified to practice before the Supreme Court.

After 2 years in practice he became in quick succession a pilot instructor in the U.S. Army Air Corps, a production test pilot for the Lockheed Corp., and chief instructor at the naval air test center which he had helped to found. It was in 1948 that he joined the State Department as an aviation intelligence officer, and in 1952 he became Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Internal Security Affairs, in charge of placing armaments contracts for NATO under the offshore procurement plan.

SEVERAL JOBS

In 1953 he resigned to join the Rockefeller Bros., Inc., and he subsequently held various posts with companies interested in aero space technology. Being prone to do several jobs at once, he also practiced law in Los Angeles and served the Government in an advisory capacity. Besides being a consultant to the Secretary of Defense, he served on the White House aviation facilities study group which recommended the formation of the Federal Aviation Agency. The Agency, which was created by Congress in 1958, incorporated the old Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Airway Modernization Board, and the safety regulation functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which is now the only other Government agency directly responsible for civil aviation.

Mr. Halaby is married to the former Miss Doris Carlquist, and they have three children, Lisa, Christian, and Alexa.

Housing Project Youngsters Join Domestic Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable interest in the creation of a National Service Corps which would be in effect a Domestic Peace Corps. The Senate passed a bill authorizing such a corps and several similar bills are before the House.

In Jersey City, N.J., the housing authority has instituted what is believed to be the first Domestic Peace Corps in the Nation. The authority approved the organization of a youth program which brought together youngsters ranging in age from 8 to 14 who volunteer to serve the elderly, handicapped and confined residents of several of the city's housing projects. Over 100 boys and girls make up Jersey City's version of the Domestic Peace Corps.

The man who gave the volunteer youth group its start is the housing authority's tenant relations director, Conrad J. Vuocolo.

The aim of our group is to instill in the kids a sense of citizenship and at the same time give them a chance to render a useful service to the community—

Mr. Vuocolo said.

Of course where there is hard work there is usually some fun to follow. The members of Jersey City's Peace Corps are rewarded by an outing after 25 hours of work. The first outing planned was a trip to a big league baseball game. The transportation, food, and tickets were provided by Mayor Thomas Gangemi, Mr. Samuel C. DiFeo, Mr. Joseph E. Connelly, and Mr. Vuocolo.

I sincerely wish Jersey City's Domestic Peace Corps the best of luck and I hope that other cities and towns will catch on to this worthwhile idea. We have a tremendous reserve of manpower who are willing to help others and I think it's a shame to put it to waste.

This worthwhile program has received considerable press coverage which it certainly deserves. The following news story which appeared in the Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N.J., describes this program:

HOUSING PROJECT YOUNGSTERS JOIN DOMESTIC AIDS

Jersey City Housing Authority this week launched what might well be the nucleus of a nationwide Domestic Peace Corps as some 20 project youngsters between 8 and 14 joined the newly formed volunteer youth group.

The youngsters, who live in the city's eight housing projects, have volunteered for such duties as raking leaves, keeping project ground clean, assisting in recreational programs and aiding many of the authority's elderly tenants by going to stores and running errands.

The project was launched by Tenant Relations Director Conrad J. Vuocolo acting on a suggestion made by Hudson Congressman CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, who is pushing for a National Peace Corps in Washington.

CITIZENSHIP AIM

The youngsters, who jointed another 100 project youth volunteers, are provided with uniforms in the form of imprinted "T" shirts and will serve 2 hours a day. After each accumulates 25 hours of duty, they will be treated to outings, major league ball games and other entertainment sponsored by city government, labor officials and local merchants.

The aim of the program is to provide the project youths with an opportunity to serve their neighbors and give them chance to learn good citizenship, housing officials said.

The majority of youngsters joining the Corps are boys but one 13-year-old girl, Ernestine Ross, has been signed up for a hitch as duster and flower waterer in the project manager's office at Hudson Gardens, where swearing-in ceremonies took place.

The American Tass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the control of news at its source within the Federal Government, a policy of this administration known as news management, is a matter of great concern not only to many Members of Congress but to the Nation's news media and all people of this country who believe in the "freedom to know."

Deciding what the people shall be told about the affairs of government and what they shall not be told, is one facet of news management. Now an additional step has been taken; the Government has gone into competition with private enterprise in the business of disseminating news by wire to the Nation's news media.

The implications of what this can lead to in terms of control of the news by the Government and the very existence of private wire services are well stated in articles entitled "The American Tass" and "Too True To Be Good" which appeared in the Journal of Commerce, New York, N.Y., on August 19, both written by the publisher, Mr. Eric Ridder.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the articles at this point:

THE AMERICAN TASS

What gets me—now that we're well into the 1970's and I look back ruefully at the past decade—is that it only took 5 years to kill the independent American press and that the execution was carried out with such a minimum of malice.

It really came to a head in 1965 (get the date, 1965) when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and inter-departmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?

They were, and in no time at all a large assemblage of reporters, teletype operators and other personnel was woven into a wire system slightly larger than the combined networks of the Associated Press and United Press International. There were some growing pains at first, but by 1967 it was plain that the new Federal News Services (FNS) was second to none, its coverage then extending into stock prices, business annual reports and (seemingly for the enlightment of the Department of Justice) even into homicide and other local police matters.

The service grew so rapidly that it was virtually inevitable that before 1967 was out a bright and highly influential young Government official should suggest, first to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Congress, that "this service is being provided with the taxpayer's money and should be made available to anyone who is willing to pay for it and will not abuse the use of it."

The proposition was promptly challenged as a move to set up an American Tass (a reference to the Soviet Government's news service monopoly). AP and UPI objected strenuously that it constituted an unwarranted interference with free enterprise.

But these objections got nowhere. The stage had already been set back in the summer of 1963 when the Department of Agriculture offered a crop and market reporting service to anyone willing to pay A.T. & T. a rate for the wire service sufficient to return the company a profit. This, too, had been challenged, among others by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, for it was plain that the probable effect of this would be to put a commercial service in the same field (the P.A.M. News Corp.) out of business. USDA had been quite unmoved by this eventuality. So was the Federal Communications Commission. When it saw that another Federal agency had been named respondent in the publishers' petition it backed off at once with the explanation that propriety of USDA's wire service to non-Government individuals was "not cognizable by the commission."

So the point was made and carried in 1965 that if any fight were to be won on the subject, it should have been won in 1963 when the issue first came out into the open in earnest. Moreover, there had been other precedents in the field of electric power. As in the USDA case earlier, the Government then went ahead and arranged with A. T. & T. to distribute its service to anyone who would pay for it and not mishandle the news. Billings and collections would be up to A.T. & T. itself. The Government "sincerely hoped" that private news services would not suffer, but left the plain implication that if they did, it was their own hard luck.

A pause followed and lasted until certain newspaper and broadcasting media, struggling hard for survival, canceled their regular news service contracts and subscribed to FNS, which offered lower rates.

The effect of this was to reduce the funds available to the private wire services. As the quality and scope of their services began to decline the whole thing began to snowball. By 1969 both AP and UPI were out of business. Though somewhat bewildered at first by the swiftness of these events, FNS found itself a monopoly.

Like BBC in England, FNS tried to be objective. It was, up to a point, but there were times (especially during election years) when it could not quite forget which side of its bread the butter was on. Administration critics got rather short shrift. Scandals involving the administration went largely unreported because they did not quite qualify as "constructive" news. Some editors learned of them and reacted vigorously, but the facts came hard since few were given much encouragement to dig them out as was demonstrated on June 1, 1970, when lightning suddenly struck.

Angered by discovery of irregularities in Washington that FNS had ignored for months, a well-known newspaper serving a market of over a million readers opened an attack on administration laxity and charged FNS with silent complicity in the matter, simultaneously recalling earlier predictions that it would turn out to be "an American Tass."

The same bright young Government official (older now, and presumably more resourceful) was stung by this into recalling the half-forgotten proviso to the effect that FNS would be withdrawn from anyone "mishandling" the news. He promptly invoked it.

The next day readers of this newspaper found it shorn of all international, national, and even regional news. Having only a few reporters left (FNS was by then even reporting sports and theater news) it could present only a few scraps of local gossip and was obviously not long for this world.

This lesson was not lost on the rest of the press nor on radio and TV stations. After a cautious study of the ruin to which their excontemporary's brashness had brought him, they opted for the safety of conformity.

FNS thus survived unchallenged, except by a rather worrisome unofficial system all-too-familiar to dictators. Known popularly as the grapevine, this proved an inexhaustible source of the wildest rumors. It upset everybody, perhaps most of all the administration itself, but continued to spread like wildfire despite the most relentless attempts to stamp it out.

Too True To Be Good

To some readers "The American Tass" may seem pure fantasy. In actual fact it's far from it.

The Department of Agriculture has already launched a wire service competitive with that of P.A.M. News Corp. Its information is gathered at the taxpayer's expense then offered gratis to anyone who wants it and is willing to pay what it costs A.T. & T. to include them in its circuit and realize a small profit.

Since P.A.M., a commercial enterprise, must charge not only for the use of wires, operators and tickers but for newsgathering costs that USDA charges off to the taxpayers, the result is intolerable pressure on the commercial service. Few forms of free enterprise can stand up for long under this type of competition.

How has this come about? And how was it that the Federal Communications Commission, which is usually so discriminating in specifying who should start this service or that and what the kiddies ought to be watching on TV, refused to do anything about it?

Let us get that out of the way first. When the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and P.A.M. took the issue to FCC the commission took one look at who wanted to offer the news service (USDA) and concluded that since it was a Federal agency the issue was "not cognizable by the commission."

Well, I'm not going to indulge in the losing litigants time-honored right to "cuss the judge," but there are other aspects of the issue that I think you will find as disturbing as I do.

There follow pertinent paragraphs of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and P.A.M. News Corp. and the decisions of the FCC in connection therewith. A beautiful brochure has been printed and is being used by A.T. & T. salesmen to promote this service.

A background statement issued by the Department of Agriculture says in one paragraph:

"According to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, the new system will not bring in any revenue to the Federal Government, and will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government."

And another paragraph:

"Under this plan, subscribers apply directly to the company that owns the teletype circuits, which handles all the work of contracts, billings, collections, etc., without cost or income to the Federal Government. The plan is designed to increase access to information, particularly to detailed specialized information, detail on local markets, and other information already being collected and summarized."

Two more paragraphs:

"The private common carrier that owns the teletype system leased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been obligated to protect the confidentiallity of information flowing over that system, until the information was released by the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

"Therefore, it required written authorization to provide this extension of service to private subscribers. The idea was discussed of having the Agricultural Marketing Service approve each application. It was being rejected as being time-consuming and unnecessary. Instead, a catchall reservation of the right of the USDA to cancel service was included in the authorizing letter."

I wonder what a "catchall" reservation is?

A sentence in the next paragraph:

"Since it is impossible to foresee what illegal use or flagrant abuses might be made by individual subscribers, the reservation also includes the right to cancel service to individual subscribers."

I wonder who determines what "flagrant abuses" are?

Another sentence:

"In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

Isn't it nice to know that the USDA doesn't expect that it will be necessary to cancel service.

In a letter dated August 9, 1963, addressed to Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Mr. G. R. Grange, Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services says as follows:

"The P.A.M. News Corp. relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports plus supplemental market information which it collects directly. Whether the direct connections to our leased wire circuit will adversely affect its business may depend on the value which its customers place on the supplemental information they receive from the P.A.M. News Corp. Press associations, newspapers, radio and television stations, busines firm, and all other interested persons may, if they desire, have access to the market news circuit. We have no basis for making it available to some and denying it to others, as long as there is no false or illegal use of the Federal-State market news reports."

As I remarked earlier, if you will weigh these words against the projections drawn in "The American Tass," I don't think you'll find the latter overly fanciful. Perhaps you'll feel as I feel, recalling the title of one of Shaw's plays, "It Is Just Too True To Be Good."

Justice Harlan Warns Against Trend Toward Judicial Unsurpation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a forceful and timely warning against pressures which work increasingly to effect "a substantial transfer of legislative power to the courts" comes from Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Justice Harlan's views of the dangers inherent in this growing tendency were expressed in a recent address in Chicago at dedication ceremonies of the American Bar Center. A concise summary of the Justice's remarks on that occasion was published in the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent to have this news article reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article follows:

HARLAN CAUTIONS ON ROLE OF COURT—WARNS OF GROWING RELIANCE ON JUDICIARY BY SOCIETY

CHICAGO, August 13.—Justice John Marshall Harlan of the Supreme Court criticized today what he termed a growing tendency to rely on the courts for correction of society's shortcomings.

Such a "cosmic" view of the role of judges, he said, "is not only inconsistent with the principles of democratic society but ultimately threatens the integrity of the judicial system itself."

Justice Harlan spoke at the dedication of the American Bar Center, to which two wings have been added. The center is the home of the American Bar Association, now holding its annual meeting here, and affiliated legal organizations.

The speech was a firm expression of the philosophy to which Justice Harlan has hewed on the Supreme Court. This vie emphasizes deference to the independence of the States and caution in developing new constitutional restraints on the States.

Since the retirement of Justice Felix Frankfurter a year ago, Justice Harlan has been the principal spokesman on the Court for what has been called this philosophy of restraint.

He has found himself more and more frequently in dissent. In the last term, for example, he dissented more often (43 times) and wrote more dissenting opinions (22) than any other Justice.

Justices Harlan and Frankfurter were the only dissenters from the 1962 decision opening the fairness of State legislative apportionments to judicial scrutiny. Last term Justice Harlan alone dissented when the Court struck down the Georgia county unit system of giving extra weight to rural votes.

Today Justice Harlan said that domestic and international tensions "produce temptations and pressures to depart from or temporise with traditional constitutional precepts, or even to short-cut the processes of change which the Constitution establishes."

"One of the current notions that holds subtle capacity for serious mischief," he said, "is a view of the judicial function that seems increasingly coming into vogue. This is that all deficiencies in our society which have failed of correction by other means should find a cure in the courts."

He said, "Some well-meaning people apparently believe that the judicial rather than the political process is more likely to breed better solutions of pressing or thorny problems."

"This is a compliment to the judiciary but untrue to democratic principle," Justice Harlan said.

"For in the end," he declared, "what would eventuate would be a substantial transfer of legislative power to the courts." "A function more ill-suited to judges can hardly be imagined, situated as they are, and should be, aloof from the political arena and beholden to no one for their conscientious conduct."

"Such a course," he said, "would also denigrate the legislative process, since it would tend to relieve legislators from having to account to the electorate."

Justice Harlan warned against looking at a judicial decision as stemming simply from the idea that "something should be done," or as based simply on the "justice or injustice or a particular case. He urged a slower, more careful approach to judging, keeping in mind the long-term development of the law.

In the concluding section of his talk, Justice Harlan welcomed analysis and constructive criticism of judicial decisions. But he said ill-informed or intemperate criticism of the doings of the courts only serves to breed misunderstandings and ultimately disrespect for law.

"Is it claiming too much," he asked, "to say that the judiciary is entitled to count on the bar sternly setting its face against that sort of irresponsibility from any quarter?"

There are four members of the Supreme Court here at the American bar meeting besides Justice Harlan. They are Justices Tom C. Clark, William J. Brennan, Jr., and Arthur J. Goldberg.

A Negro Businessman Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for many months we have read little in the newspapers except civil rights and what has become known as the Negro revolution. The airways have screamed with headlines of demonstrations, sit-ins, lie-ins, sleep-ins, and the failure of America to deal justly with its Negro population. We have been led to believe that all of the 18 million Negroes are parading, shouting, demonstrating. As usual, the professional agitators represent only a small part of the total number they claim.

It remained for a Negro, one faced all the problems faced by all Negroes, indeed by most of our citizens who must start from scratch to make their way in the world, to give us the other side of the coin.

Mr. S. B. Fuller, a successful Negro businessman, has pinpointed the only sure way for Negroes to solve their problems—to work and strive to better themselves, not wait for the whites or the Government to create opportunity for them.

Mr. Fuller's story is a typical American success story and his advice to members of his own race and to the whites, deserves thoughtful consideration. Therefore, I include an interview with Mr. Fuller which appeared in the August 19 issue of U.S. News & World Report, as a part of these remarks.

Will racial demonstrations, now spreading across the Nation, solve the Negro's problems? Is the Negro actually a second-class citizen? If so, who is to blame—the white man? You get unexpected answers to these and other questions from a leading Negro businessman. He is S. B. Fuller, interviewed in Chicago by a member of the staff of U.S. News & World Report. His conclusions: A Negro, like anybody else, can get ahead only by hard work and enterprise.

Question. Mr. Fuller, are the doors of opportunity closed to the Negro in America today?

Answer. No, I don't think so. The Negro has the same rights that other people have in America—

Question. In what way do you mean?

Answer. He has a right to vote, he has a right to start a business for himself, and he has a right to find a job, providing there's anybody that he can sell his service to. But he has to learn to use those rights.

Question. Did you find it possible to get ahead?

Answer. Yes, indeed. I left Louisiana at the age of 15 years with a sixth-grade education. My people moved to Memphis, Tenn., and we lived there for 8 years. Then I hitchhiked my way to Chicago. I got a job here and found out that I could not get ahead working for somebody else.

In 1935 I had $25, and I took the $25 and bought some soap and started selling soap from door to door. And from that $25, it developed into this business today.

Question. Did you find racial barriers difficult?

Answer. No, because I sold my own people my own product.

Question. What is the value of your sales annually, would you say?

Answer. This year, it will run about $10 million.

Question. Do you have markets in the South, too?

Answer. We have markets in the South for the colored only. We don't have any markets in the South where we sell to the whites. But we have white customers in the North.

Question. Has that market grown much in recent years?

Answer. Yes, it has a constant growth. We continue to buy out other companies—if we find a white company having financial problems, we buy it out. Then we keep the white employees and add to the colored payroll.

Question. How many employees do you have altogether?

Answer. We have on our direct payroll about 600 employees.

Question. How many of those are white?

Answer. About 20 percent of them are white. And in our door-to-door selling, we have about 3,000 people selling and about 500 of those are white.

Question. Is there any friction? Do white persons seem to resent working for you?

Answer. No, the white people here are talking integration more than the colored people.

Question. What do you mean by that?

Answer. Here, in our organization, the white people are very sensitive about being treated as inferior in our organization. They are more concerned about discrimination than the Negroes are.

One thing that I find in my organization is this: If I don't watch very closely, the Negro bosses here will discriminate and hire all Negroes and no whites. I'm constantly watching them to see that they hire people on their merit and not on the color of their skin.

Question. Would you say, then, that racial discrimination is found among all races?

Answer. It is a universal human trait—and people use it, if they can do so, at a profit. When it becomes unprofitable, they forget it.

Here in our organization, it pays the white people not to discriminate against the Negro, and they don't. But the Negroes will discriminate against the white people because they are trying to get the white people out of some of these well-paying jobs and put some Negroes in them.

Question. In what way do they try this?

Answer. If a white man applies for a job, and if nobody else knows it, the Negro supervisor will not hire him. He'll hire another Negro.

Question. In general, what do you think is the answer to the race problem in this country?

Answer. Well, the problem is one the Negro has to work out himself. Negroes are not discriminated against because of the color of their skin. They are discriminated against because they have not anything to offer that people want to buy.

The minute that they can develop themselves so they excel in whatever they do—then they are going to find that they don't have any real problems.

An example is baseball. There was discrimination in the big leagues. But when the owners of the big leagues found out that Negroes could play just as well as whites, discrimination in the big leagues ended as far as Negro players are concerned.

Question. Is there any justification, then, for Negro complaints about their lot in life?

Answer. They have some legitimate complaints, but not very many. They will find that you cannot sue a man and make him want to live next door to you. You've got to sell him the idea that you are just as good as he is, by performance. You must perform well in your job. You must train your youngsters. You must keep your community as clean as the white man's community. You must keep up the home as well as he does.

Question. If the Negroes have not done these things, why is that?

Answer. I don't think that the Negroes have been taught enough concerning this. Remember this: The Negroes have been free for 100 years, but, during that time, the white man has not told Negroes the truth. He has always taught the Negroes that they were at a disadvantage. He never told Negroes that they should do business for themselves, that they should clean up their own community, and that they should accept community responsibility.

They have never told him this in plain English. Nor has the white man told Negroes what the white people say about the Negro when the Negro is not present. This is what they should start doing—telling Negroes in their presence what they say about them in their absence.

Question. Do you mean mention the unfavorable comments about Negroes?

Answer. Yes. If it's bad, then tell them.

Question. Are the racial demonstrations doing any good?

Answer. The demonstrations have made the white man know that the Negroes are dissatisfied. But he knew that in the first place. Beyond that, I don't think they have done any good. In fact, they have done harm in the picture they give of Negroes.

Question. Will the demonstrations continue, do you think?

Answer. Oh, they will go on as long as they get publicity from it. When they don't get any publicity, they will die out. I don't think the demonstrations will go on as much as 18 months longer.

Question. Do Martin Luther King and others of his views speak for the Negro people as a whole?

Answer. No, they speak for certain small groups of people. If they were speaking for the Negro people as a whole, you'd find more Negroes demonstrating. As it is, those who are demonstrating and sitting in are a very small minority of the Negroes.

Question. Are the Black Muslims really important in the Negro community?

Answer. No, they are not. The Black Muslims have a very small organization. It is tightly organized and its members are loyal to their cause, but their number is very small.

Question. Why is it that we hear so much about the frustrations of the Negro?

Answer. It's because they have been played up so much on the television, on the radio, and in the newspapers.

Question. Do you ever hear of militant Negroes calling you an "Uncle Tom"?

Answer. No Negro calls me an "Uncle Tom." He can't call me "Uncle Tom" because I employ white people. And "Uncle Tom" never employed any white people.

Question. What about the charge of some militant Negroes that Negro moderates are subservient to whites?

Answer. I think that this is very dangerous—it is an attempt to muzzle free speech. I think that every man should have a right to his own opinion. I may disagree with him, but I defend his right to say it.

There are more moderates than we hear of, but some are afraid to give their opinion. They are being muzzled; they are somewhat fearful of speaking out.

Question. Do you find any other Negro businessmen getting ahead in the same way that you did?

Answer. I find a few, but I don't think that enough Negroes are doing so, because no one has sat down and told them of the possibilities of doing something for themselves.

Question. What about the argument that it is the white man or society that is to blame for the Negro's problems?

Answer. The crimes that you find in Harlem, for instance, are caused by the people of Harlem, and it's nobody's fault but that of the people of Harlem. I came from a very poor family and, in those days, there was not the crime that you have today. When I was a boy, they kept us busy doing something. Today it's hard to find a boy in Harlem to sell newspapers.

Question. Do most Negroes, in your opinion, want integration?

Answer. I think that Negroes want integration—but not as the white man thinks they want it.

Question. In what way do they want it?

Answer. I think Negroes want to know that they have the opportunity to go wherever they want to go and live wherever they want to live. Whether they go there or not, they want the privilege of going there.

Question. Once this is obtained, do you think Negroes then would tend to stay together?

Answer. They would—they would follow their own patterns.

Question. Do Negroes today have the same ambitions in life as white people do?

Answer. They have the same ambition in life that white people have, but they don't know how to go about satisfying that ambition. They think that they can succeed by working for other people. The thing is, if all white people worked for somebody else, then the white people would not be in the position that they are today.

Question. Will Negroes work just as hard as anybody else to get ahead in spite of all obstacles?

Answer. They will, once they have been shown the way. You see, Negro people do not understand that they must own their own businesses. They must give jobs—not just ask for jobs.

They have as much right to employ the white man as the white man has to employ them. They must remember that every one of us is born with a spark of divinity, but it's up to the individual to fan that spark.

REAL "ROAD TO PROGRESS"

Question. Is getting ahead in business and industry, then, an essential part of the Negro's progress?

Answer. It is the really essential part. I think there's no other road that leads to progress.

Let me say this: Negro people spend about $23 billion annually in America. If they controlled 80 percent of this $23 billion that would be about $18 billion. Now, let's say they had 10 percent profit. That would be $1.8 billion as capital that they would have to work with every year. This would be power in their hands. And two things are power in America—the vote and the dollar.

Question. Has there ever been, in your knowledge, any race that has gotten ahead in the world without this ability in business and industry?

Answer. No, I never heard of any racial group in this country or any other country that was able to get ahead without participating in business.

Question. Are there Negroes supplying the Negro market for clothing and for food, that you know of?

Answer. A few.

Question. Are there Negro automobile dealers?

Answer. None that I know of.

Question. Are there Negro construction men—builders?

Answer. Very, very few.

Question. Who are some of the other successful Negro businessmen like yourself?

Answer. Well, John H. Johnson here in Chicago—he's a very successful magazine publisher.

There are a number of Negroes in the insurance business.

Question. Have Negroes done everything they can do to help themselves?

Answer. No, I don't think they have. They have failed to go into business. I'll give you an illustration: In Chicago alone we have millions of dollars invested in church property. I know of one church in Chicago that cost over a million dollars. But we have not had that kind of money invested in business.

Now, if those people could put a million dollars in their church, they could have taken another million dollars and started a business. And this would have helped them employ themselves and others, too.

Question. Do you find Negroes thinking about ways to take advantage of that market?

Answer. No. Too much is being said to them about civil rights and too much has been said about their being second-class citizens. I don't consider myself a second-class citizen.

Question. Can Negroes, do you think, consider themselves first-class citizens?

Answer. Yes—if they work at it. I don't think that you legislate quality in the man. Quality is developed from within. And I don't think that any law you pass can make me second class, because I am what I think I am.

Question. Did white people try to keep you from succeeding?

Answer. No more than they would any other competitor. In America, it's a capitalistic system and it's competitive. Of course, they are going to give you competition. When I started selling among my own people, there were white people out there selling to them too. But there was no barrier because of my race.

Question. Looking at your own success, what is the secret of it?

Answer. First, a man must have determination. He must be ambitious. He must be enthusiastic over doing things for himself. He must have confidence in himself. I have confidence in myself. I have more confidence in myself than I have in anybody else. So I would not trust anybody to set a salary for me, because I realize that I will pay myself more than anybody else would pay.

I have a sixth-grade education. But last year I paid an income tax on over $100,000. How else could a sixth-grade scholar have a job in America that paid him over $100,000 a year unless he was in business for himself?

Question. Why are Negroes reluctant to get into business? Are they afraid to assume responsibility, do you think?

Answer. Yes, I do think so. There have been some failures in Negro business; there are failures in all businesses. But Negroes must learn to risk their capital—not put it in other people's banks and draw 3 or 4 percent on it, when they could use it among themselves and make 10 or 15 percent.

Question. Would you say that today it is still possible for a Negro with a high school diploma to make good?

Answer. Oh, yes. It's still possible for a Negro with a grammar school education to make good. I have a young Negro who sells—he's 24 years old. He came from Lexington, Miss., and I've taught him to sell, and he's averaging now from $10,000 to $12,000 a year selling from door to door.

LAWS DO LITTLE GOOD

Question. Will laws passed in Washington assure the Negroes the things they really want?

Answer. The laws are going to do very little good, because in the North the Negro has every legal right that anyone else has. In the South, there is legal segregation—but in the North we don't have it. So when the white people in the North keep away from the colored people, it is because it's not an economic advantage to get together.

Question. What about the Negroes in the South?

Answer. The only way the Negro in the South can solve his problem is to continue to press for the ballot—not for sit-ins and not for eating at the lunch counter and not for the other rights. First, there must be the right to vote. Once he starts voting, you will find the racial issue in the South will disappear.

Question. Is the racial conflict in this country going to spread? Will it result in bloodshed?

Answer. No. I think the racial conflict in this country is at its height right now. From now on it's going to have a trend downward.

Question. Do Negroes still tend to feel inferior?

Answer. Yes. Negro people are just as good as anybody else. This they must know. But they cannot convince others until they convince themselves.

I have found no barriers to me in business. I am a member of the National Association of Manufacturers, of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, of the National Association of Direct Selling Companies. I serve on committees, I can be elected to any office that I aspire to in these organizations. There is no discrimination that I find in these organizations.

Question. What about the charge that well-to-do Negroes tend to ignore the rest of the Negro community and its problems? Is there any truth to this?

Answer. No, I don't think so. I am working with the churches and all the civic organizations in Chicago. I am a member of the board of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, I'm a member of the local chamber of commerce, I work with the YMCA, I work with the Urban League, I work with all of the civic organizations in the community.

I am trying right now to organize a group to buy a hospital in the Negro community, and I'm also the treasurer of the Midwest Baptist Home for the Aged. I am in civic affairs and I find all the other Negroes here in business are doing the same thing.

Question. What would be your advice today to a young Negro coming out of school?

Answer. My advice today is, first go to school and get a good education. It's not up to the teacher to see that he gets it. It's up to the student. When a Negro child goes to school, he must concentrate on his work.

Then, when he comes out of school, come out with something to offer, a talent that he can sell.

Question. But we hear that the schools available to Negroes often are inferior, that they don't offer a good education—

Answer. Well, I think that the schools that the Negroes attend here in Chicago have about the same facilities as other schools. Anyway, it's not so much the facilities of the school that count as the attitude of the student.

Question. Will demonstrations encourage Negroes to work harder, become more self-reliant?

Answer. No. I find that the Negro today does not have as much ambition as he had 25 years ago.

Question. Why is that?

Answer. I think the trouble is that no one tells the Negro that he's responsible for himself—being unemployed. When I was a boy nobody helped us. You had to help yourself, and you had to learn to "do." You had to have the know-how plus the do-how.

My mother died when I was 17 years old. She left six besides myself. The relief people came and offered us some relief, but we did not accept it, because it was something of a shame for people to receive relief in those days. We were embarrassed just because the relief woman came to talk to us. We did not want the neighbors to know we couldn't make it for ourselves. So we youngsters made it for ourselves.

Question. What kind of work did you do?

Answer. I sold from door to door. I started selling from door to door when I was 9 years old, and have been selling ever since.

Question. Do you feel that some races have more of an aptitude for business than others or more of an ability to sell?

Answer. No. It's all in the desire. Any time that you can create a desire in the Negro to sell, he's just as good a salesman as anybody else.

Question. Do you have Negro salesmen serving white customers?

Answer. Yes, in some places we do.

WHY OUTLOOK IS BRIGHT

Question. Are you generally optimistic on the future of the Negro race in this country?

Answer. Oh, yes.

Question. Is America, do you think, a good place for Negroes?

Answer. America is the best place for the Negro in the world. America is the best place for any man in the world.

Question. Is the Negro basically unhappy, do you think?

Answer. I think the Negro is very unhappy, but it's not from segregation. He's unhappy because he is unemployed.

Some of the leaders will tell him he's unemployed because he's a Negro, and that segregation is the cause of his being unemployed. But that is not true. We have unemployment in America, and the Negro is the last hired and the first fired because he doesn't do any of the hiring or the firing.

Question. What is the answer, then, to the Negro's future?

Answer. Work. And not only that: He must work and he must save his money and he must pool his money. If he wants integration, he must hire white people just as he wants white people to hire him.

Small Business Tax Change Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have been especially interested in President Kennedy's tax recommendations pertaining to small business. An excellent article in the New England Small Business Journal, SBANE of July 1963, concerning the President's tax recommendations affecting small business corporations, has been called to my attention. I feel that this very excellent article should be called to the attention of the Members and I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Small Business Tax Change Urged" be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS TAX CHANGE URGED

The White House Committee on Small Business last month urged the House Ways and Means Committee to approve two of President Kennedy's tax recommendations to enable small business to expand and compete more effectively with larger corporations.

The proposals are: (1) to reduce the normal tax rate on the first $25,000 corporate income from 30 to 22 percent and (2) to prevent large multicorporate groups from taking undue advantage of the lower rate which applies to small corporations. The committee's recommendation was in a statement sent to Chairman Wilbur Mills of the Ways and Means Committee, which is presently considering the President's tax program.

The normal corporate tax rate—the rate on the first $25,000 of corporate income—would be cut by reversing the present normal and surtax rates. The normal rate is now 30 percent; the surtax rate is 22 percent. The reversal of rates would be, by percentage, the most significant cut included in the President's tax proposals for 1963, the statement said.

The two proposals are closely interrelated, the committee said. The reduction in the corporate normal tax rate from 30 to 22 percent would not be of maximum benefit to small corporation's unless the surtax exemption were modified because otherwise the lower rates would give multiple corporations an unwarranted advantage.

Under existing law, each corporate unit in a multiple corporate organization generally is treated as if it were an independently controlled small business. Exemption from the surtax on income above $25,000 applies to each unit of the multicorporate organization. The availability of multiple exemptions to large chains of corporations lessens the ability of small firms to compete with them because it allows large business "to reap the benefit of a provision designed to benefit small business," according to the Committee's statement.

The White House Committee on Small Business made an extensive examination of the problem. The group concluded that:

1. Corporate tax rates now in effect make it difficult for small businesses to retain sufficient earnings after taxes to finance expansion and growth;

2. Reversal of the normal and surtax rates should encourage the birth of new small firms, spur the growth of existing ones, and ease the major problem of small business—lack of adequate capital;

3. Elimination of multiple surtax exemptions would improve the competitive position of small businesses in relation to large multicorporate organizations. It would insure that a provision designed as an aid to small business is not converted into a windfall for large business;

4. The $120 million annual gain in revenue from enactment of the multiple surtax exemption proposal would contribute to the President's goal of tax reduction within a framework of fiscal responsibility.

The Committee added that the President's tax program contains a number of other proposals which would help meet the needs of the small business community.

The White House Committee on Small Business is a group appointed by the President to join the efforts of agencies within the executive branch which are most familiar with the problems of small business.

More From the Test Ban Mailbag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am asking that more extracts from letters I have received from all over the Nation opposing the test ban treaty be reproduced below because considerable interest seems to have been generated by the extracts previously placed in the RECORD:

Philadelphia, Pa.: "This test ban treaty actually speeds the burial of the West. The leopard has not changed its spots. The only alternative to annihilation is strategic nuclear strength. The public is being given only the favorable facts concerning the treaty. It is imperative that the people realize what is going on."

Brooklyn, N.Y.: "Russia as always is seeking to trap us."

Orange, Calif.: "Make certain that the vicious test ban negotiated by Harriman is rejected. Are we going to give the Soviets an agreement that they want in order to take advantage of us again?"

Los Angeles, Calif.: "The bad far outweighs the good."

Beverly Hills, Calif.: "Everyone wants peace and a cessation of tests but are we not perhaps walking into a trap? Our administration seems launched on a policy of coexistence with communism and a naive trust in its motives."

Pacific Palisades, Calif.: "Can we not make the practical assumption that such an agreement could only be concluded if Russia could see a clear-cut advantage for her and a disadvantage for us? If we accept any other premise are we not risking our existence on very shaky wishful thinking?"

Tuscaloosa, Ala.: "Alert the American people."

Santa Ana, Calif.: "Russia has broken 50 out of 52 agreements and would break this one when it helps destroy the United States."

Quartz Hill, Calif.: "There's no such thing as honest coexistence with Khrushchev."

Findlay, Ohio: "The American people are being betrayed into the hands of the international Communist conspiracy."

Santa Monica, Calif.: "It taxes one's imagination to figure out how any one can sincerely believe that the Soviet Union would agree to anything that was not to her advantage."

San Diego, Calif.: "Defeat such an infamous sellout of America. Who, in their right mind, would trust Mr. K. or Russia?"

Homestead, Fla.: "The truth is being suppressed, and Americans are being propagandized and pressured into suicide. Even JFK said, 'We cannot take less (than effective inspection) * * *' and then proceeded to take less and to propagandize and pressure Americans to take less."

Lancaster, Calif.: "The agreement that was put up on the A-test is the bunk, they (the Russians) have stated that they would rule the world and they were not kidding."

Austin, Tex.: "Our security would be tampered with."

Santa Barbara, Calif.: "No on the test ban treaty."

Indianapolis, Ind.: "Save us."

Millburn, N.J.: "Timing is usually perfect with the administration forces: Note the accent on Strontium 90 content in milk just as hearings are getting underway."

North Hollywood, Calif.: "Prevent ratification of the partial test ban by the Senate. This is another Yalta."

McLean, Nebr.: "We sincerely hope the Senate votes against it."

Reality of Emancipation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Harry Daniels, of Washington, D.C.:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *August 15, 1963.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: Would it be asking too much of you to ask for permission to have the two following letters published the the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Published in Washington Post, Aug. 12, 1963]

"REALITY OF EMANCIPATION

"I hope all Negroes realize the fact President Kennedy has killed his chances for reelection because he stood fast for their equal rights. Through all the pressure and measureless responsibility the President stood like a great giant with the strength of God to assure equal rights for Negroes.

"Time forbids Negroes to forget their great, noble friend, John Kennedy, for making the emancipation a reality, for striving with all his might to promote and secure the establishment of inalienable equal rights for Negroes.

"HARRY DANIELS."

The following appeared in the Washington Daily News, August 15, 1963:

"NO NONSENSE

"In asking for his civil rights, the Negro is not asking for the stars, but for his inalienable rights which God in His wisdom endowed upon him. What race on this earth can go in pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness when it is held in chains?

"The fact must be recognized that these rights are eternal and the world can no longer delay their coming by hooking both right and wrong together under the guise of democracy. The Federal Government must see to it that Negroes throughout the Nation are freely allowed to register and vote."

"Sincerely yours,

"HARRY DANIELS."

Can America's Libraries Handle Our Colossal Rate of Accumulating Knowledge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following are excerpts from a speech I delivered to the members of the Reference Service Division at the American Library Association Conference on Monday, July 15, 1963.

There is a serious problem today in America that unfortunately has not come to the forefront of the Nation's attention. We are experiencing a "knowledge explosion," and unfortunately we have neglected to look into the means to harness this explosion and make efficient use of the rapidly accumulating storehouse of knowledge. The following remarks are directed to this serious deficiency and make explicit the problem facing the future of American intellectual pursuit.

Your committee was somewhat surprised when I suggested as my title: "Can America's Libraries Handle Our Colossal Rate of Accumulating Knowledge?"

Let me assure you at the very outset that with all due respect to your efforts, in my judgment, the answer is a categorical "no."

You will undoubtedly, in this conference, hear many prophets warn about the crisis in our library services.

These warnings should not be taken lightly. They are true.

We are experiencing a fantastic knowledge explosion throughout the world but, tragically, our own country appears to be dragging its feet in finding adequate ways to harness the intellectual fallout from this explosion.

In too many instances, we still are using horse and buggy methods in our library services. Even though businessmen are learning that libraries have a real dollars and cents value to them, their interest in their community libraries are miniscule.

In 1961, 18 million persons—16.5 million rural and 1.5 million urban—still had no readily accessible public library service available to them.

U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppell recently told my committee that 110 million Americans—with 60 million of these living in urban areas—in 1961 had access only to libraries which were inadequate according to minimum State standards.

These libraries offer only limited and outdated book collections, and frequently are ill-housed, understaffed, and open for use only a few hours a week.

The Nation is trying to meet the needs of mid-20th-century intellectual pursuits in a virtual straitjacket.

Fantastically primitive is, I believe, a fair way to describe our library efforts in many parts of America.

Ponder, if you will, this reality: With the possible exception of penal institutions, public library buildings are probably the oldest governmental structures in use today. Studies of the age and adequacy of public library buildings in three States—California, Indiana and Wisconsin—provide some insight into the magnitude of this problem. Thirty percent of the public libraries in these three States were built before 1910. Eighty-five percent were erected before 1920. Of all public libraries, only 4 percent were constructed since 1940. The median age of these structures is now 54 years. Reporting libraries in 13 States estimate that they will need 30 percent more space in the next 7 years. The construction now planned by local libraries, 1.6 million square feet, will fall short of estimated needs by more than 2 million square feet.

Statistics, at best, are boring unless we can relate them to actuality.

Why should we be concerned? Because the library today is becoming the storehouse of knowledge in the community. It is the clearinghouse of information for a nation whose intellectual curiosity is being increased daily as the world grows smaller and complexities increase.

The library today is the average American's university—and the demand for service will grow in ever increasing bounds.

By the end of the decade, there will be an increase of at least 37 million local library users. This is a conservative estimate and applies only to the conventional library—the stampede on special library facilities cannot be properly estimated.

A tremendous effort is being exerted to improve this situation, but I'm afraid it will be a very long, long time before we close the gap.

As you know, my committee voted out a bill to provide Federal assistance to help meet the library crisis. You will be happy to know that this bill has been recalled to remove the Powell amendment, which would bar any Federal funds to segregated library facilities.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has ruled in a decision which apparently has completely missed public notice that the definition of "public" means a building available to all. Any library practicing discrimination is not available to all—ergo, it is not public and thus is not qualified to receive Federal aid.

This is a far-reaching decision. But under this definition, the Powell amendment no longer appears necessary in the library bill. I am sure you will agree the chance of passing the legislation is markedly better without the Powell amendment.

I have dealt so far with the broad aspects of the library problem. But my purpose in visiting you today is to discuss the role of the special library.

As chairman of a special committee studying the need for a data processing and information retrieval center, I am particularly pleased to be with you today.

I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that the word "librarian" is today a misnomer. It will be even more so before this decade is over.

As Christopher Stevenson, manager of the Technical Information Quarterly at General Electric recently stated:

"In addition to its social responsibilities, every profession has also the responsibility to continuously build a core of specialized knowledge in its professional field of work. Whatever peripheral skills may be useful to librarians, our basic core of specialized knowledge is concerned with the organization and utilization of information. This phase of library training has been sadly neglected. During this period of neglect, a tremendous literature of specialization has grown up in the United States, and we librarians find ourselves today unequipped with the tools for organizing and utilizing this literature."

The librarian of tomorrow will be more properly called an information scientist—or perhaps a retrievist—one skilled in the art of retrieving information to satisfy the insatiable lust for knowledge among our people.

My committee is now probing the entire problem of special librarians—what relationship they will have to my proposal for the establishment of a national data processing and information retrieval center.

Let there be no mistake. The demand on our special libraries in the next decade will be staggering.

What trends will effect special libraries within the next decade, the doubling of the gross national product; a fantastic increase in research and development; an increase in the ratio of special librarians to research workers and the need for more technical skills in special librarianship.

Our gross national product in 1980 will approximate 1,000 billion 1959 dollars. Our population will increase 37 percent by 1980 to 246 million. It will require higher skills. Demands on our library facilities will be staggering.

But of greatest interest to me are the reports that by 1969—only 6 years from now, 4 percent of our gross national product, or approximately $28 billion will be devoted to research and development.

If these figures are true—and I believe they are—then our demand for the new version of today's librarian will be beyond comprehension. By 1980, the figure for research and development will reach $40 billion annually, and unless we undertake a drastic revision of our present methods of information retrieval, I fear we will be in serious trouble.

This is why I am so anxious to determine—as chairman of a special subcommittee studying the advisability of a National Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center—if there is a better way to harness the vast knowledge explosion for more orderly use by the entire scientific and educational community.

It is significant to me that 9 years ago the Soviet Union established the U.S.S.R. Institute of Scientific and Technological Information in Moscow. Three years after this institute began functioning, the Soviet Union plunged its first Sputnik into orbit. To this day there is considerable speculation on how important a role did the Soviet research retrieval center play in Russia's spectacular "first" into space.

The Soviet Union's center receives research data assembled from 90 countries, published in 68 languages. All of this material is translated into Russion, codified, digested, and turned into the institute's systematized files for use by the entire Soviet scientific community.

The world total of scientific and technical publications has reached astronomical proportions—400,000. It is humanly impossible for any researcher or team of researchers to keep up with this endless flow of new knowledge being developed in universities and scientific laboratories throughout the world. Unless the United States develops a more efficient way of compiling this vast torrent of knowledge, we may find ourselves again racing against the world in the technological explosion.

There are several nations already substantially ahead of us in the establishment of a central information retrieval center. In addition to the Soviet Union, France, England, Italy and The Netherlands already have information retrieval centers in various forms in operation.

It is my firm conviction that before this decade is over, data processing and information retrieval will be one of the biggest industries in America and the world. The tremendous knowledge explosion which is sweeping the world makes it imperative that this civilization develop more efficient ways of grasping the full meaning of man's intellectual discoveries.

I am fully convinced that just as this Nation spent the forties in nuclear development and the fifties to space exploration, the generation of the sixties will see the advent of a tremendous emphasis on data processing and information retrieval.

Since the beginning of recorded history, man's capability to accumulate and retrieve information has paced his progress. Today we are witnessing a grave threat to this progress.

This threat has been eloquently described by the eminent neurologist, Dr. Grey-Walter:

"During the last two generations the rate of accumulation of knowledge has been so colossally accelerated that not even the most noble and most tranquil brain can now store and consider even a thousandth part of it. Humanity is in a critical state compared with which the constitution of the dinosaur and the community of the Tower of Babel were triumphant.

"The root of this evil is that facts accumulate at a far higher rate than does the understanding of them. Rational thought depends literally on ratio on the proportion and relations between things. As facts are collected, the number of possible relations between them increases at an enormous rate."

Dr. Vannevar Bush, the great American scientist, characterized the urgency of the problem with the following grim note: "Science may become bogged down in its own products, inhibited like a colony of bacteria by its own exudations."

The staggering statistics amply testify to this pejorative state of affairs.

During the last 33 years, there has been a 10-fold increase in the number of scientists and engineers; from 50,000 in 1930 to more than a half million today. Indeed, one authority estimates that the number of scientists now living is greater than the number of all scientists who ever lived before.

The prodigious output flowing from this ocean of creative activity is overwhelming. More than 130,000 research and development projects per year are of Government origin, representing two-third of the $15 billion our country now spends on research.

We have more than 120,000 technical journals in the world. Our patent office has more than 7 million patents on file. There are more than 500 specialized science information services.

Indeed we have reached a stage in the accumulation of knowledge where manual searching for information is quickly becoming an impossible and extremely costly task.

We now have bibliographies of bibliographies. The last issue of the "World Bibliography of Bibliographies" contains more than 100,000 separately collated volumns of bibliographies.

And yet, it is painfully apparent that the human capacity to absorb knowledge is almost minuscule in comparison to the fantastic amount of information available.

For example, the average person reading 12 hours a day, for 50 years, can at best read about 16,000 to 18,000 technical books in a lifetime. We have about 30 million books in the world today.

The enormous gap in our capacity to store and retrieve information and at the same time meet the demands and responsibilities of our society has created the most costly and wasteful drain on our resources, which is without parallel in the entire history of mankind.

The appalling figures speak for themselves. One major U.S. company spent more than $250,000 and 5 years of research in an attempt to solve an electronic switching prob-

lem only to learn that the information was available 6 months before the project started.

A cloud seeding experiment has recently been made at a cost of $3 million. Shortly after completion of the experiment, it was learned the same information has been obtained at a cost of $256,000.

We could never exhaust this catalog of waste. It is, however, sufficiently dramatic to make us responsive to meet the greatest challenge of our time, a challenge fraught with power to either suffocate our progress or ennoble the aspiration and welfare of mankind.

Indeed, the harnessing of power from scientific knowledge through data processing and information retrieval will surely surpass the rich rewards derived from harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

It should be a source of concern to all of us that the Soviets appear to be so efficient that Dr. Finley Carter, director of the Stanford Research Institute, was prompted to state:

"In order to better know what American scientists are doing, one must read Soviet journals of abstracts."

John Gunther, the well-known American reporter writes:

"Russian abstracting services are so complete and so well developed that it has come to the point where American scientists learn about new accomplishments by Americans in their field from Russian abstract journals."

The importance of centralizing information has been attested to as one of the key factors in the success the Soviets have had so far. As pointed out by Dr. Michailov, director of the Institute of Scientific Information of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences:

"Nine years of operational service of the Institute of Scientific Information under U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences justify completely the establishment of a centralized documentation agency, since it is only within a centralized documentation service that the world's overall output of scientific publications can be processed and synthesized. Besides, the centralized system of information provides a fair base for effective mechanization and automation development."

The above is supported by Prof. Boris M. Tareev, also from Vinity, who states:

"Experience gained from information work in the U.S.S.R. and in other countries indicates that the complex and important task of providing complete, i.e., 'total' information on all recent scientific and technical developments throughout the world can be accomplished by a central scientific information institute which has at its disposal many highly qualified specialists, suitable technical equipment, and sufficent funds for acquisition of current literature from many different countries. The Institute of Scientific Information is such a center in Russia."

In my bill, H.R. 1946, I proposed the establishment of the National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center to ameliorate some of the abysmal shortcomings and dangers to which facts and figures just stated bear witness. For it is readily apparent that the lack of a central organ, amidst hundreds of abstracting devices and countless specializing information services, lacking efficiency and control over duplication of research projects costing billions of dollars is a deadly danger to the survival of our country.

The timing and need for the center which I have proposed have never been more urgent and necessary. The responsibilities of our Government to our citizens and the scientific community must be met at once with energy, dedication and leadership worthy of our heritage.

"The cries for help from our scientists are desperate and justly demanding. The distinguished vice president of Tulane University, Dr. F. R. Cagle, only a few months ago succinctly captured today's mood of our scientists by saying:

"I speak as a scientist complainant * * * as a biologist frustrated by the difficulties of obtaining articles essential to my research * * * as a bewildered administrator participating in decisionmaking * * * as a frightened observed of the literature problems of my biologist colleagues * * * as an angry critic of our Government for failing to have concern about technical information programs * * *."

It is therefore of little surprise that my proposal has received such gratifying response and support.

The distinguished soldier-scientist, former Chief of Research and Development in the Department of the Army, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Truddeau, recently pointed out:

"I believe you of industry, our academic allies and the agencies of Government need to get together and back what I think is needed here—let's call it SATIC—A Scientific and Technological Information Center—a national clearinghouse for the most complete and comprehensive acquisition, translation, and exchange of information that we can get from all segments of our Nation and from the rest of the free world."

A Washington University editor writes:

"Above all, in this country we need a central agency to coordinate the overall information effort; winnow the total production; and pick up the loose ends like foreign publications, research bulletins, graduate theses, Government reports and papers delivered at conferences. Organizing and operating such an institution would be an effort no bigger than others we have made, no more ponderous than others the Government has shouldered and carried home. It would deserve to be called investment rather than extravagance."

One of the most distinguished foreign critics on information retrieval, whose expert advice and services have been solicited by various Government agencies for many years, including the National Science Foundation, whose record of objective scientific analysis is unassailable, professor of mathematical logic and linguistics, Y. Bar-Hillel, has recently stated:

"There could, for instance, hardly be any doubt that the establishment of the institution corresponding to the Russian All-Union Institute of Scientific and Technological Information could greatly improve the existing situation in the information field in the United States and could be an overall improvement."

Needless to say, there are many others who voice similar views. Clearly, the establishment of a national center is the most urgent need and merits the highest consideration and priority.

The benefits to be derived from the establishment of a national center are too numerous and too obvious to need further elaboration here. However, there is one outstanding bonus which can be had. It is less obvious, and, therefore, I shall detail some of the hidden rich rewards awaiting the realization of a national center.

We are all too familiar with the current shortages of scientists, the costly expense involved in obtaining a technical education and the difficulty of attracting students to pursue degrees in science. And yet, notwithstanding these obstacles, the establishment of a national center could double the number of scientists by cutting wasteful duplication and mountainous literature searches which consume as much as 70 percent of our scientists' time.

Never before in history have we faced such a titantic challenge. The hour is fast approaching when we must act or be left behind, adrift in a fog of technological confusion. The rewards in accepting this great challenge are boundless. The decision is ours.

Beware of Poison in Small Doses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has been most adroit at getting acceptance of its schemes by dishing them out in small, seemingly harmless potions. The end result, however, will be a fatal dose of poison which may see the demise of this Republic.

Most dangerous trifling by the visionaries in the White House is in the area of disarmament. President Kennedy's policies are seriously endangering the security of the United States through what amounts to unilateral disarmament while the enemy, Communist Russia, continues to increase its military strength and aggressive potential.

The following article by Ken Thompson, editorial writer of the Dallas Morning News, reminds us that we are following a detailed blueprint for surrender.

U.S. DISARMAMENT—BLUEPRINT FOR SURRENDER?

(By Ken Thompson)

Politicians have a way of getting what they want, and the Kennedy administration is no exception. Its leaders know—perhaps better than any of their predecessors—that the people will swallow in small doses what they will reject in quantity.

The disarmament program of the Kennedy administration is a perfect example of how a radical scheme cannot be sold to Congress or the public in a single package, but can be put over piecemeal.

On April 18, 1962, the United States offered a draft treaty to the Soviets at Geneva. Based upon a U.N. speech by the President 7 months earlier and a State Department pamphlet entitled "Freedom From War," the proposed treaty would have eliminated the Armed Forces of this Nation over a period of 6 to 10 years and replaced them with an all-powerful United Nations peace force.

There were so many loopholes in that proposed treaty that the Soviets could have marched their armies through them on the road to world conquest. Even if the Reds chose to abide by the principles, the best that could be expected from the outcome would have been an irredeemable loss of American sovereignty and ultimate world government under the U.N.

Millions of Americans were horrified by this radical proposal and there was never a chance that the Senate would have ratified such a treaty. Yet today—16 months after that incredible disarmament plan was laughed out of Geneva—we have traveled a long way down the road toward disarmament which was mapped by its authors. We have already taken many of the steps which they specifically outlined. If anything, we are probably well ahead of schedule on that 6- to 10-year program.

One of the primary requirements of that plan, of course, was a test-ban treaty—which we have just signed with the Soviets. Many people may have forgotten that on November 27, 1961, the Soviets proposed a nearly identical treaty calling for a ban on tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in space without international controls.

That proposal was flatly rejected by the United States and Britain, and was labeled in an official joint report filed by the two Governments as "an extraordinary step back-

ward." Today the same plan is called a "giant step toward peace" or a "victory for mankind."

The Soviets, of course, have insisted time and again that they would never sign a test-ban pact unless it were part of an agreement on general and complete disarmament. The President tells us that there is nothing hidden beneath the test ban treaty. If this is true, the Soviets have departed from a long-standing demand.

It seems possible, however, that a secret agreement leading toward total disarmament could be lurking beneath the surface. That possibility appears more plausible when you consider the whole series of other measures which have been taken in the past year in the area of arms control.

The April 1962 disarmament scheme called for a gradual reduction of nuclear arms and delivery systems. We have already abandoned the RS-70, are phasing out the B-52 and B-58 and have scrapped the Skybolt.

Production, testing, and research were to be halted under the plan. We have killed the Nike-Zeus program, downgraded the Dyna-Soar and nuclear plane projects and discontinued development of multimegaton weapons.

Under the original disarmament scheme, production of fissionable material for military purposes was to have been stopped and outer space reserved for peaceful purposes. Just recently we offered to meet the first of these requirements, and for some time now we have been boosting the NASA civilian space program at the expense of developing nuclear rockets.

A principal requirement of the disarmament scheme was to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and knowhow to nonnuclear nations. This was agreed to in the treaty signed last month in Moscow.

Military bases were to have been dismantled and weapons and men stationed abroad were to have been brought home.

We have already dismantled Jupiter and Titan missile bases in Turkey, planned the withdrawal of B-47's and the elimination of IRBM's in Europe. In their place, the administration's policy is to concentrate almost exclusively on Minuteman and Polaris weapons which are limited to a primarily defensive role.

Measures were to have been taken which would reduce the chance of "accidental" war. The first step—installation of a "hot line" between Washington and Moscow—has already been accomplished.

We have not yet begun severely cutting back the level of manpower, nor have we ceded compulsory jurisdiction to the World Court or begun to build up that U.N. "peace force" which would ultimately be so powerful that no nation or combination of nations could challenge its will—all specifically called for in the April 1962 disarmament draft treaty.

But after all, that scheme was to have been accomplished over a period of 6 to 10 years and the steps we have already taken have been accomplished in only 14 months.

The really frightening aspect of this story is that, of course, the April 1962 disarmament treaty was rejected at Geneva and the Russians are not bound by any treaty to take the same steps we have been taking—nor is there any indication that they are taking them.

We are disarming unilaterally—in the absence of a treaty and without the least guarantee or inspection system to assure that the enemy will follow suit.

Some 14 months ago the State Department came up with a crazy blueprint for surrender. Although it was vetoed, we are today following that blueprint as if it were the law of the land.

Unless the Kennedy administration makes a sharp turn away from the path it is following, we will be disarmed long before the original timetable has run its course.

We Still Can't Understand Policy of Spending in Red

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many erudite and theoretical explanations from the administration why deficit spending is in the best interests of the Nation—why the public debt limit must be periodically increased to authorize greater Government borrowing for administration programs. We have heard the Government must pour billions into the economy to prevent a financial recession; and we have heard that spending beyond the limit of our revenues is not really bad business, but in fact an improvement over the "puritan" habit of balancing the budget. We have heard a great deal, most recently in the passage of an extension for the $309 billion ceiling set last May. However, many people out my way don't seem to understand how the Government can year after year spend more money than it takes in. They think of Government financing in terms of their own financial problems and know that spending must be related to income or financial disaster will result. They know that future generations will have our tremendous deficits as their heritage. Their views, which are clearly reflected in the August 12, 1963, editorial of the Flint Journal, have a sound and urgent ring and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

WE STILL CAN'T UNDERSTAND POLICY OF SPENDING IN RED

The Kennedy administration is seeking an extension through November 30 of a temporary legal ceiling of $309 billion on the U.S. national debt.

Congress raised the limit to $307 billion through June 30 and to $309 billion during July and August. The $307 billion was an increase over the previous temporary limit of $305 billion.

Unless the Senate follows the action of the House and approves the extension, the permanent debt limit of $285 billion will be back in effect on September 1. And, in case it has slipped your mind, that permanent limit is somewhere around $20 billion less than the actual debt.

So it is a good guess that the so-called temporary limit will remain in effect, and eventually even that limit will have to be boosted to keep pace with Government spending.

The disturbing part of this situation is that too few people seem to be disturbed about it.

Even thought the debt has passed the $300 billion mark, there are angry cries of protest from the administration whenever Republican leaders criticize its economic policies.

Whenever the charge is made that President Kennedy is in the clutches of the "big spenders," administration spokesmen counter by trying to trace our economic woes back to the Eisenhower administration. They claim it is necessary for the Government to spend more money to prevent a serious financial recession.

This, of course, is an old argument. And it's one to which the Kennedy administration is wed—that good times are dependent on the freedom with which the Federal Government feeds money into the economy.

This is a notion which always has confused us. Despite its size, the Government has always seemed to us like a family or a business. In trying to make a financial go of either, it is necessary to budget your operations on the basis of the income available. You might stretch your credit now and then if a special situation or emergency calls for such action, but if you live beyond your means continually you're headed for only one situation—the rocks. Sooner or later you—or your children—will experience disaster.

But when the same principle is applied to Government, we're told the only way to keep the economy spinning is to go deeper into debt.

If the Government didn't run up such debts by spending more money, the deficit spenders argue, then millions of people would be out of work, the economy would lag, and things might get to the panic stage.

We still don't get it. Sure, it's possible for the Government to cut taxes, increase its spending, and generally bail the country out of a financial downturn. But the point we don't comprehend is how it is possible to do this year after year after year without somebody getting it in the neck; namely, the taxpayer.

There are those who try to explain such a policy something like this: "When the Government spends, it keeps things going. It steps up the lower level of activity and it generally comes to the rescue. By doing that, more taxes are collected and the money that was a deficit now becomes a surplus."

Sorry, but we still don't understand it. All we know is that for the past many years we have been operating from one deficit to another. No real attempt has been made to live by any other accounting. Oh, there are speeches made about balanced budgets, but no one really puts any stock into them anymore. Government deficit has come to be regarded as something we can't do without. And little attention is paid to its size.

We still are naive—or perhaps old fashioned—enough to feel that, as in the case of a family or a business, this policy of continually spending more money than we have is going to catch up with us. If we won't face the music, either our children or their children will have to.

So with all our current problems why worry about future generations, you ask? Well, maybe we shouldn't. Still, it seems to come under the heading of being dishonest.

But then dishonesty, like deficit spending, seems to be condoned by more and more people today. Perhaps we are a little old fashioned at that.

TVA Now a Global Household Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, TVA, like OK, has become a familiar American known and used around the world, as the Baltimore Sun observes in a recent editorial. And, the editorial adds, everywhere TVA stands for affirmative Government action for the rehabilitation of regions and the economic betterment

of the people, based on the great example of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"OK, TVA," the Baltimore newspaper captions its editorial calling attention to this significant recognition of American enterprise in regional development.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that this editorial from the August 16, 1963, Baltimore Sun be reprinted in the RECORD. It follows:

O.K., T.V.A.

Some American words and combinations of words or initials are known all over the world. One is "O.K." Another is "hotdog." Others close to a state of universality are "chewing-gum," "snackbar" and lately even "drugstore." And then there is "T.V.A."

No regional-development program in our time has so captured the imaginations of countries everywhere as has the Tennessee Valley Authority. To begin with, the concept has grandeur: the rehabilitation of an entire river complex, with all the implications of improved standards of living, faster transportation, pleasurable recreation, higher income and burgeoning industry. The point about the Tennessee valley is that there the concept has worked out, and everybody knows about it. Any similar enterprise elsewhere, whether in dream or in being, whether on the Mekong or the Indus, whether miniature or mighty, is called a "T.V.A."

The Alliance for Progress is now considering sponsorship of an irrigation project in the basin of the Yaque del Sur River in the Dominican Republic. If carried through, it is expected to revive or open to cultivation some 500,000 acres of land, and to affect for the better the lives of some 250,000 people. In this case the Tennessee Valley Authority would be actually involved, to supervise the construction stages. But the Dominicans would call it a "T.V.A." anyway.

The National Student Association and the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, this week the National Student Association is holding its 16th National Student Congress at the University of Indiana. I think it is well at this time to bring to the public attention some claims which have been made concerning NSA and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Apparently some officers of the NSA have publicly said that the committee endorses NSA for its policies, although this is contrary to fact.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the June issue of the New Guard magazine which exposes the falsehood of these NSA claims. I would also like to include a letter from the staff director of the Committee on Un-American Activities which explains the committee position on this matter.

NEWS MANAGEMENT: NSA STYLE—NSA OFFICIAL TRAPPED IN A FIB: THE UNLIKELY CLAIM THAT HUAC PRAISED NSA FOR ANTI-RED WORK

The verbal lie has achieved some measure of tenuous respectability in recent months. The President started the trend early in his administration by denying that any "missile gap" existed—a claim he made often during the campaign. Now, despite a Senate subcommittee report which casts serious doubts on the reliability of intelligence reports from Cuba, Administration officials continue to insist that Cuba is no military threat to the United States.

With such examples set by their elders, what could we have expected from the junior league of the leftist community?

I refer to the National Student Association (which likes to call itself in print, the U.S. National Student Association—another lie, but that is a different matter). NSA has been running into difficulty of late because a great many of its member schools are questioning the organization's right to represent political views of American students.

Whenever an anti-NSA trend on campus gets to the point where some students actually call for disaffiliation, NSA can be counted upon to send out its first string officials to "clear up distortions," etc., about the association.

This "anti" movement has appeared on various campuses since 1961—and a grand total of 34 schools with an enrollment of 230,000 have pulled out. Inevitably, Rutgers University, a New Jersey State institution, felt the impact of this nationwide movement.

PRAISE FROM THE WORKER, AND HUAC

So on to Rutgers went NSA president Dennis Shaul, a Notre Dame graduate who served NSA as a vice president in a prior year. Confronted in public debate by YAF's national chairman, Bob Bauman, Shaul gave a dry, hardly inspiring, defense of the association which he heads. At one point Bauman introduced as evidence of NSA's continued leftward trend, words of high praise from the pages of The Worker, an official Communist publication.

Bauman was careful to preface his remarks with the statement that he did not consider NSA in any way Communist-dominated or infiltrated. However, he pointed out that Communist youth leaders and front organizers had been allowed free run of the last National Student Congress at Ohio State University and had exerted considerable influence on the passage of several important resolutions.

In rebuttal, Shaul made the amazing statement that none other than the House Committee on Un-American Activities had praised NSA for anti-Communist work:

Shaul: "The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a letter written to Phillips University in 1961 said: 'Not only has this group no trace of being a Communist organization, but this group has been the spearhead in the fight against communism at the youth and student level'." (This quote is verbatim from a radio tape recording made of the Bauman-Shaul debate at Rutgers University on April 30, 1963.)

Bauman pressed Shaul to state whether he knew the quote had been used by NSA supporters at Indiana University during the recent NSA referendum, and that House Un-American Activities Committee Staff Director Frank McNamara had denied in a wire to the university that the committee had ever made such a statement about NSA.

Shaul denied knowledge of McNamara's telegram, and stated further that he was sure that the statement was used with McNamara's permission. He then revealed to his audience that he should know what he was talking about since NSA had only recently sent a representative to the House committee asking about its stand on NSA.

M'NAMARA LETTER

What neither Shaul nor Bauman could know at the time of the debate was that Mr. McNamara, staff director of the House committee, had written a letter clarifying the whole point, which was waiting at YAF headquarters in Washington—unopened. The letter, dated April 25, 1963, was in response to an inquiry made by YAF on April 19 concerning an advertisement in the Indiana University newspaper during the NSA dispute there. NSA supporters paid for the full-page ad in the Daily Student for April 4, 1963, urging the students to vote "yes" on the NSA referendum, and printing the alleged House Un-American Activities Committee quote in full.

The McNamara letter should leave no doubt that the use of the quote was fraudulent and purposely deceitful.

McNamara explained that, at the request of a U.S. Senator, the committee prepared a 4-page report on NSA, dated November 14, 1960, which the Senator forwarded to a member of the Student Senate at Phillips University in Enid, Okla. Those familiar with the committee's policies on requests of this type would immediately recognize that the report would not have made conclusive evaluations of NSA—since such characterizations are only made through official reports, issued after hearings and investigations.

McNamara's letter to YAF was accompanied by a copy of the report. In prominent print above the typewritten copy appears the statement:

"This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigations or findings by the Committee."

The quote used by Shaul as an endorsement of NSA by the House Un-American Activities Committee appears on page 4 of the report. It was actually made by the NSA Liaison Committee of the National Association of Deans of Women, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the American College Personnel Association on April 1, 1953—over 10 years ago. The source is clearly stated in the report.

Other material in the report is both favorable and unfavorable, compiled from a variety of sources.

SHAMEFUL HYPOCRISY

Staff Director McNamara's letter to YAF Chairman Bauman states unequivocally that the statement attributed to the committee by NSA, both in the Indiana Daily Student ad, and later by NSA President Shaul at the Rutgers debate, was never made by the committee. He says: "It is difficult for me to understand how the National Student Association could attribute the quotation to the Committee on Un-American Activities, inasmuch as the report specifically stated its source and all committee reports of this type contain the following prominent notation: (which is quoted above)."

If Mr. Shaul had actually seen the committee document before making his statement at Rutgers, then he is guilty of the most shameful hypocrisy. So also are those who falsely used the quotation in the Indiana paper claiming it to be a statement made by the committee.

Fortunately for both Indiana and Rutgers, students at both schools have seen through the sham and repudiated the organization. Yet, what a sad commentary it is on our Nation's college student community that some of its most "respected" leaders cannot always be relied upon to tell the truth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1963.

Mr. ROBERT E. BAUMAN,
National Chairman, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB BAUMAN: Thank you for sending the committee a copy of the ad placed in the

"Indiana Daily Student" of April 4 by the National Student Association.

The quotation in the ad attributed to the House Committee on Un-American Activities was never made by the committee.

On occasions in the past in response to requests from Members of Congress, the committee has prepared for them a typed 4½-page report on the National Student Association. This report contained some basic information about the NSA compiled from a variety of sources. The quotation in the NSA ad you forwarded with your letter is an excerpt from one of the quotations contained in this report. The statement was actually made not by the Committee on Un-American Activities, but by the NSA Liaison Committee of the National Association of Deans of Women, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the American College Personnel Association on April 1, 1953, over 10 years ago.

Committee records indicate that the committee supplied a copy of this report to a U.S. Senator on November 14, 1960, for transmittal to a member of the Student Senate of Phillips University in Enid, Okla.

It is difficult for me to understand how the National Student Association could attribute the quotation to the Committee on Un-American Activities inasmuch as the report specifically stated its source and all committee reports of this type contain the following prominent notation: "This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee."

In order that those concerned may make a proper evaluation of the quotation incorrectly attributed to the committee by the National Student Association in its ad, I am enclosing a copy of the report from which it was excerpted.

A complete check of all published committee documents reveals that there has never been any comment on, or characterization of, the National Student Association in any committee report, the only medium through which the committee makes official statements.

As you requested, I am returning the NSA ad to you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MCNAMARA,
Director.

Obstacles to Regional Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the last 20 years have witnessed an extensive growth in the functions of local government. As a result of the rapid expansion of suburban communities since 1945, many city and county governments have found it difficult to handle the new problems presented by the vast metropolitan complexes. One of the most promising solutions found for matters overlapping the jurisdictions of several local governments has been the formation of regional governmental councils. Examples of this are the Philadelphia Regional Conference of Elected Officials, the San Francisco Association of Bay Area Governments, and Washington's own Metropolitan Council of Governments.

Many of the difficulties faced by these regional organizations were cited in a speech given by Anne A. Wilkins, the chairman of the executive board of the Washington council. She addressed a joint AMA–NACO session on voluntary city-county regional cooperation, in Houston on August 10. Mrs. Wilkins stressed the need for cooperation and made the important point that in the absence of regional groups, area problems may be solved "by organizations over which our own local governments have little or no control." The text of her speech follows:

OBSTACLES TO REGIONAL COOPERATION

The obstacles to regional cooperation are of increasing concern to many of our fledgling regional councils of governments.

As we attempt to be more than pollyanna lodgelike forums for discussing mutual problems, as we attempt to tackle some of our metropolitan needs, we become more aware of the obstacles which must be either hurdled or avoided if we are to meet these needs. A few councils of governments have been made dramatically conscious of the interests opposed to anything more than lip-service cooperation.

As our councils of governments have met through their fledgling years, their members have laid a solid basis of confidence and communication and subsequently a consensus on many of the most pressing metropolitan problems. We are more than ever conscious of the dramatic metropolitan gap which exists between our interjurisdictional needs and the ability to meet these needs.

We must begin a countdown on 10 of the principal and interrelated obstacles facing our various councils of governments.

10. TOO MANY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Robert Wood has pointed out that the New York area has 1,400 local governments. The Philadelphia area has 388 local governments eligible for membership in its Regional Conference of Elected Officials. It is extremely difficult to develop mutual confidence and effective communication, let alone consensuses; among so many local governing bodies, especially when such a large variety of interests are represented. This problem is aggravated when the local governments are spread over an especially large area such as around San Francisco, but is somewhat less difficult when municipalities are represented on county boards as in the Detroit area, or when counties are as powerful vis-a-vis the towns as they are in the Washington area. Cooperation is also more difficult when the local governments lack the power to act or lack an effective structure, council, and chief executive officer to facilitate cooperation with other communities. If local governments are to solve their interjurisdictional problems, they must have sufficient home rule to provide them the power to cooperate.

9. JURISDICTIONAL ISOLATIONISM

Aside from the difficulties of communication, confidence, and consensus among numerous local governments, a few councils of governments have an even more serious problem of jurisdictional isolationism on the part of one or more member governments. There is a suspicion that the unit of government involved will get the short end of the bargain, will not get its money's worth for the expenditure involved and a fear of the loss of sovereignty or home rule. The mild version of this disease is the jurisdiction which belongs but never attends the regional meetings and therefore has to be individually sold on every major item. The more serious manifestation of this disease is the jurisdiction which refuses to join or withdraw from the regional organization. The city of San Francisco; Westchester County, N.Y.; and Montgomery County, Md., are examples of the latter. To listen to some members of these governing bodies one would think that Berlin walls would create no hardship in some of our metro areas.

Jurisdictional isolationism, often in the form of core city: suburban hostility, is intensified whenever a threat of consolidation or annexation is voiced. For this reason consolidation and cooperation are mutually exclusive approaches to metropolitan problems. However, the presence of a clearly-apparent core city and the metropolitan consciousness that often accompanies it can be a helpful factor in overcoming jurisdictional isolationism.

8. FUNCTIONAL ISOLATIONISM

For some councils of governments this is already an even more serious obstacle to regional cooperation than jurisdictional isolationism. It will become even more serious as our regional bodies become more involved in the tougher interjurisdictional issues and attempt to relate the problems and programs in one functional field to those in another.

In particular, as Max Lehman has remarked in discussing the difficulties of New York's Metropolitan Regional Council, there is the "opposition of entrenched bodies, such as authorities, special districts, commissions, boards, and the like which feel a threat to their spheres of influence." Even outside New York, it is well known that the Port of New York Authority, for example, has shown no eagerness to assist the regional council, and in the Washington area the National Capital Regional Planning Council has proved unwilling to permit the councils of governments to have the ultimate responsibility for regional planning.

On the other hand, several of our regional bodies, such as the Detroit Supervisors' Inter-County Committee, Salem's and Washington's Councils of Governments, and the Association of Bay Area Governments around San Francisco, have had success in assisting new special-purpose bodies undertake particular functions; and in these areas we have generally been successful in working cooperatively.

7. POLITICS

By and large all the councils of governments have been successful in keeping partisan politics from hindering regional cooperation and progress. Philadelphia's Regional Conference indicates, however, "the reluctance of active partisan politicians to participate in a nonpartisan organization and effort." New York's Regional Council and Washington's Council of Governments have both experienced attacks which were motivated by partisan considerations—those of one party attacking those of the other by using the regional organization as a political issue.

6. PARANOICISM

Several of our councils of governments have experienced paranoic attacks by extremist groups who are afraid of metro governments, the very thing we are trying to avoid. ABAG experienced this during its founding and Washington's COG is hearing hostile sounds from Montgomery County. New York's MRC has been criticized in its attempt to finalize its interlocal agreement at the recent congressional hearings in New York. Such paranoicism—with its capitalized words and references to the conspiracy directed from Moscow—is similar to the anti-1313 and antifluoridation literature.

5. FINANCES

Jerry Coleman, Detroit SICC's executive director has summed up this problem suc-

cinctly by stating that "everybody's for cooperation until it costs money." As we take our duties more seriously, we will need more money—and this problem will become even more serious. There is a fear of skyrocketing costs or taxes with little or no tangible return. Even worse, they fear another costly level of supergovernment.

4. ADMINISTRATION

All of our organizations are relatively new; our staffs are even newer. Any new governmental organization has an abundance of initial administrative headaches—housing and keeping capable personnel, establishing procedures, determining programs. For organizations such as ours which are plowing new fields where objectives and means of achieving these are constantly in the process of being defined, reexamined, and redefined, this initial phase is a long one; for there is usually nowhere else to look for examples. Natural cautiousness and fear of the unknown hinder the understanding of new programs.

A few of our organizations have even greater administrative handicaps. The staffs of New York's MRC and Washington's COG are administratively part of the corecity's hierarchy. This imposes distinct complications in determining administrative procedures and selecting the most qualified personnel.

3. NEED TO AVOID CONTROVERSY

A basic premise of our regional organizations is the need to develop a broad consensus of agreement—a lack of dissension, even if not complete agreement—on all proposed programs. While supporting the necessity of retaining this principle, we must recognize that this will severely impair our ability to tackle some of our most pressing interjurisdictional problems—and therefore ultimately impair our prestige and status. This problem is even more serious when it is carried to the extreme of avoiding even the discussion of some needs because they are controversial.

2. LACK OF LEADERSHIP

The most vital ingredient in the regional cooperative process is metropolitan leadership. If problems are to be identified, if policies are to be agreed upon, and if programs are to be developed, if eventually we are to have some products of the regional cooperative process, we must depend on adequate elected and staff leadership to provide the inspiration and perspective to develop a metropolitan consciousness and meet our metropolitan needs.

Two factors especially hamper development of this kind of leadership. Among elected officials there is a severe turnover problem. This was an especially important factor in Montgomery County's defection.

A second factor is time: most elected officials have their own jobs, their council jobs, their party responsibilities, their families, and hopefully they can fit regional responsibilities in somewhere.

1. PUBLIC APATHY

No problem is more basic than that of public apathy. To the public, most metropolitan problems appear put-off-able. The others are usually too controversial for us to act on. The public won't appreciate the water supply problem until a turn of the spigot doesn't produce water, and many elected officials feel they can afford to avoid these problems until the public clamors for action. Such apathy is sometimes strengthened by the belief that voluntary metropolitan cooperation does not get at the roots of metropolitan problems, only delays solutions to metropolitan problems by setting up an uneasy truce between members who are in opposition or conflict, and that more direct action is needed.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, many of these 10 problems are closely interrelated, and indeed many reinforce one another. Undoubtedly, they have limited our successes; and it would be idle to pretend that they will become any easier to deal with in the near future. But persevere we must—for three good reasons: First we do have behind us a growing list of limited but useful accomplishments, of which we may be proud, and which we must continue to consolidate. Second, in trying to hurdle some of our obstacles—such as paranoiac attacks by professional "fright peddlers"—we have at least become better known, and our public has become somewhat less apathetic. Finally, there is the most important reason of all for perseverance: If the complex problems of our metropolitan area are not tackled by the growing number of regional councils of governments, either they will not be solved at all, or they will be solved by organizations over which our own local governments have little or no control.

Our duty to the people of our metropolitan communities and to the concept of democratic and efficient local government leaves us no alternative but to accept the challenge.

A Fable—Not Altogether Fantastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how close we are to losing our freedoms in America is made terribly clear in a little fable reprinted from the Journal of Commerce of August 19, 1963. The editorial comment, from the same paper, which follows the fable tells what has already taken place in the direction of complete news control through a project of the Department of Agriculture.

I hope my colleagues will give careful consideration to this matter and join me in demanding an end to Government controlled and financed news agencies.

The editorial follows:

THE AMERICAN TASS

(By Eric Ridder)

What gets me—now that we're well into the 1970's and I look back ruefully at the past decade—is that it only took 5 years to kill the independent American press and that the execution was carried out with such a minimum of malice.

It really came to a head in 1965 (get the date, 1965) when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and interdepartmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?

They were, and in no time at all a large assemblage of reporters, teletype operators, and other personnel was woven into a wire system slightly larger than the combined networks of the Associated Press and United Press International. There were some growing pains at first, but by 1967 it was plain that the new Federal News Services (FNS) was second to none, its coverage then extending into stock prices, business annual reports, and (seemingly for the enlightenment of the Department of Justice) even into homicide and other local police matters.

The Service grew so rapidly that it was virtually inevitable that before 1967 was out a bright and highly influential young Government official should suggest, first to the Bureau of the Budget and then to Congress, that "this service is being provided with the taxpayer's money and should be made available to anyone who is willing to pay for it and will not abuse the use of it."

The proposition was promptly challenged as a move to set up "an American Tass" (a reference to the Soviet Government's news service monopoly). AP and UPI objected strenuously that it constituted an unwarranted interference with free enterprise.

But these objections got nowhere. The stage had been already been set back in the summer of 1963 when the Department of Agriculture offered a crop and market reporting service to anyone willing to pay A.T. & T. a rate for the wire service sufficient to return the company a profit. This, too, had been challenged, among others by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, for it was plain that the probable effect of this would be to put a commercial service in the same field (The PAM News Corp.) out of business. USDA had been quite unmoved by this eventuality. So was the Federal Communications Commission. When it saw that another Federal agency had been named respondent in the publishers' petition it backed off at once with the explanation that propriety of USDA's wire services to non-Government individuals was "not cognizable by the Commission."

So, the point was made and carried in 1965 that if any fight were to be won on the subject, it should have been won in 1963 when the issue first came out into the open in earnest. Moreover, there had been other precedents in the field of electric power. As in the USDA case earlier, the Government then went ahead and arranged with A.T. & T. to distribute its service to anyone who would pay for it and not "mishandle" the news. Billings and collections would be up to A.T. & T. itself. The Government "sincerely hoped" that private news services would not suffer, but left the plain implication that if they did, it was their own hard luck.

A pause followed and lasted until certain newspaper and broadcasting media, struggling hard for survival, canceled their regular news service contracts and subscribed to FNS, which offered lower rates.

The effect of this was to reduce the funds available to the private wire services. As the quality and scope of their services began to decline the whole thing began to snowball. By 1969 both AP and UPI were out of business. Though somewhat bewildered at first by the swiftness of these events, FNS found itself a monopoly.

Like BBC in England, FNS tried to be objective. It was, up to a point, but there were times (especially during election years) when it could not quite forget which side of its bread the butter was on. Administration critics got rather short shrift. Scandals involving the administration went largely unreported because they did not quite qualify as "constructive" news. Some editors learned of them and reacted vigorously, but the facts came hard since few were given much encouragement to dig them out as was demonstrated on June 1, 1970, when lightning suddenly struck.

Angered by discovery of irregularities in Washington that FNS had ignored for months, a well-known newspaper serving a market of over a million readers opened an attack on administration laxity and charged FNS with silent complicity in the matter, simultaneously recalling earlier predictions that it would turn out to be "an American Tass."

The same bright young Government official (older now, and presumably more resourceful) was stung by this into recalling the half-forgotten proviso to the effect that FNS would be withdrawn from anyone "mishandling" the news. He promptly invoked it.

The next day readers of this newspaper found it shorn of all international, national and even regional news. Having only a few reporters left (FNS was by then even reporting sports and theater news) it could present only a few scraps of local gossip and was obviously not long for this world.

This lesson was not lost on the rest of the press nor on radio and TV stations. After a cautious study of the ruin to which their ex-contemporary's brashness had brought him, they opted for the safety of conformity.

FNS thus survived unchallenged, except by a rather worrisome unofficial system all-too familiar to dictators. Known popularly as the grapevine, this proved an inexhaustible source of the wildest rumors. It upset everybody, perhaps most of all the administration itself, but continued to spread like wildfire despite the most relentless attempts to stamp it out.

TOO TRUE TO BE GOOD

To some readers "The American Tass" may seem pure fantasy. In actual fact it's far from it.

The Department of Agriculture has already launched a wire service competitive with that of PAM News Corp. Its information is gathered at the taxpayers' expense then offered gratis to anyone who wants it and is willing to pay what it costs A.T. & T. to include them in its circuit and realize a small profit.

Since PAM, a commercial enterprise, must charge not only for the use of wires, operators and tickers but for newsgathering costs that USDA charges off to the taxpayers, the result it intolerable pressure on the commercial service. Few forms of free enterprise can stand up for long under this type of competition.

How has this come about? And how was it that the Federal Communications Commission, which is usually so discriminating in specifying who should start this service or that and what the kiddies ought to be watching on TV, refused to do anything about it?

Let us get that out of the way first. When the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM took the issue to FCC the Commission took one look at who wanted to offer the news service (USDA) and concluded that since it was a Federal agency the issue was "not cognizable by the Commission."

Well, I'm not going to indulge in the losing litigant's time-honored right to "cuss the judge," but there are other aspects of the issue that I think you will find as disturbing as I do.

There follow pertinent paragraphs of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association and PAM News Corp. and the decision of the FCC in connection therewith. A beautiful brochure has been printed and is being used by A.T. & T. salesmen to promote this service.

A background statement issued by the Department of Agriculture says in one paragraph: "According to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, the new system will not bring in any revenue to the Federal Government, and will not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government."

And another paragraph: "Under this plan, subscribers apply directly to the company that owns the teletype circuits, which handles all the work of contracts, billings, collections, etc., without cost or income to the Federal Government. The plan is designed to increase access to information, particularly to detailed specialized information, detail on local markets, and other information already being collected and summarized."

Two more paragraphs: "The private common carrier that owns the teletype system leased by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been obligated to protect the confidentiality of information flowing over that system, until the information was released by the USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service.

"Therefore, it required written authorization to provide this extension of service to private subscribers. The idea was discussed of having the Agricultural Marketing Service approve each application. It was being rejected as being time consuming and unnecessary. Instead, a catchall reservation of the right of the USDA to cancel service was included in the authorizing letter."

I wonder what a "catchall" reservation is?

A sentence in the next paragraph: "Since it is impossible to foresee what illegal use or flagrant abuses might be made by individual subscribers, the reservation also includes the right to cancel service to individual subscribers."

I wonder who determines what "flagrant abuses" are?

Another sentence: "In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

Isn't it nice to know that the USDA doesn't expect that it will be necessary to cancel service.

In a letter dated August 9, 1963, addressed to Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Mr. G. R. Grange, Deputy Administrator, Marketing Services, says as follows:

"The PAM News Corp. relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports plus supplemental market information which it collects directly. Whether the direct connections to our leased wire circuit will adversely affect its business may depend on the value which its customers place on the supplemental information they receive from the PAM News Corp. Press associations, newspapers, radio and television stations, business firms, and all other interested persons may, if they desire, have access to the market news circuit. We have no basis for making it available to some and denying it to others, as long as there is no false or illegal use of the Federal-State market news reports."

As I remarked earlier, if you will weigh these words against the projections drawn in "The American Tass," I don't think you'll find the latter overly fanciful. Perhaps you'll feel as I feel, recalling the title of one of Shaw's plays, "It Is Just Too True To Be Good."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Beatification of Bishop Neumann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the tragic death of Pope John XXIII postponed the scheduled beatification of the late Bishop John Nepomucene Neumann, C. SS. R. This event would have been of momentous importance to the United States inasmuch as Bishop Neumann would have been the first American male so honored. The late bishop's earthly remains are presently in St. Peter's Church in Philadelphia, Pa.

Fortunately, according to latest reports, His Holiness Pope Paul VI plans to go ahead with the beatification ceremonies, perhaps sometime during the second session of the Vatican Council. On June 25 of this year, a group of 400 Philadelphia pilgrims made the voyage to Rome in order to discuss, among other things, the time and circumstances of the beatification. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this visit, as well as the text of Pope Paul's statement to the visitors, be made a part of the RECORD. The article and statement appeared in the Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times, on June 28, 1963.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISHOP NEUMANN TO BE BEATIFIED SOON, POPE PAUL VI TELLS PHILADELPHIA PILGRIMS

VATICAN CITY.—His Holiness Pope Paul VI spoke in English for 15 minutes on Tuesday, June 25, to more than 400 Philadelphia area pilgrims who had come to Rome for the beatification of Biship Nepomucene Neumann. He told them the beatification, which had been scheduled for June 23 but was postponed by the illness and death of Pope John, will take place soon, perhaps during the second session of the Vatican Council.

Pope Paul told the pilgrims:

"We understand your keen disappointment on learning of the postponement of the beatification ceremony which would have given the world still another example of heroic virtue nurtured on American soil. It will not be long before Bishop Neumann is numbered among the blessed."

Later, while talking to Auxiliary Bishop Francis J. Furey of Philadelphia, Pope Paul was asked: "When will Bishop Neumann be beatified?" He replied: "Perhaps during the next session of the council."

Those at the audience were the first large group of pilgrims from the United States that Pope Paul has addressed since his election to the papacy. Earlier he had received Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, and priests and seminarians of the New York archdiocese, but most of the members of that group are living and studying in Rome.

The audience was also the first time since his election that the pontiff has given an entire address in English. The Pope read the typewritten speech from a throne which was backed by a tapesty of the Assumption. His English was clear and easily understandable. He read slowly and deliberately, with a marked accent.

The audience was scheduled for 11 a.m., but Pope Paul did not arrive until 11:30. A number of cardinals passed through the Vatican's Clementine Hall where the audience was held on their way to see the Pope, causing the 30-minute delay.

WARM RECEPTION

The feeling at the audience was warm on both sides. Pope Paul, seeming very tall in his white cassock, smiled often and the pilgrims cheered him frequently. They applauded when he told them that Bishop Neumann will be beatified soon, and again after he gave them his blessing.

Following his address, the Pope descended the seven scarlet steps from his throne to greet the four Pennsylvania bishops who had been given places of honor at his right. They were Bishop J. Carroll McCormick of Altoona-Johnstown, Auxiliary Bishops Francis J. Furey and Gerald V. McDevitt of Philadelphia, and Bishop Francis E. Hyland, retired ordinary of Atlanta who lives at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook.

Pope Paul chatted with the bishops in English.

To Bishop McCormick, the Pope remarked that he knew his uncle—Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, late archbishop of Philadelphia—well and held him in the highest respect.

The Pontiff asked Bishops Furey, McDevitt and Hyland to convey his "warm greetings" to Archbishop John J. Krol.

POPE PAUL'S ADDRESS TO 400 LOCAL PILGRIMS

Following is the complete text of Pope Paul VI's address delivered in English to 400 Philadelphia areà pilgrims on Tuesday, June 25:

"We are very happy to greet you, our beloved children from the United States of America who have made this long journey to see your venerated Bishop Neumann raised to the honors of the altar. We understand your keen disappointment upon learning of the postponement of the ceremony of beatification which would have given to the world yet another example of heroic virtue nurtured on American soil. It will not be long before Bishop Neumann is numbered among the blessed.

"However, your visit to Rome should be a rich and unforgettable experince. All around you there are numerous monuments, reminders of the glories of the church and her faithful. Here one can sense in a special way the unity and agelessness of the church. And here, at the tomb of St. Peter, we traverse centuries to return to the times of the Apostles Peter and Paul. The lessons that one learns here are precious, and are an encouragement to imitate heroic men and women venerated in the many churches of this holy city.

"We ask you to take back to all citizens of the United States our greetings. We have visited your noble country and we have experienced personally your sincere and warm hospitality and generosity. The industry of your people and the rich blessings of natural resources have made yours a prosperous land. In your abundance you have not forgotten less fortunate peoples, and to them and to new emerging nations you have given valuable assistance. The Catholics of the United States have been outstanding for their devoted loyalty to the successors of St. Peter; they have been singularly generous to the church and its missionary activity. Your young men and women are giving of their talents in every part of the world.

"We are mindful, too, of our non-Catholic brothers, and upon them and their loved ones we invoke rich heavenly grace. To you, venerable brothers and beloved children, to your families and friends, and through you to our brother bishops, clergy, religious and all faithful of the United States, we impart, in pledge of abundant heavenly blessings and assistance, our special paternal apostolic benediction."

Remarks by His Excellency, the Honorable George Laking, New Zealand Ambassador to the United States, During the 376th Anniversary Observance of the Birth of Virginia Dare, at the Lost Colony, in Waterside Theater, at Manteo, N.C., August 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, at the 1,202d performance of "The Lost Colony" drama at Manteo, N.C., there was also celebrated the 376th anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English parents to be born on American soil. Though the small band of these daring early colonists suffered a mysterious fate, their efforts nearly 400 years ago mark the beginnings of the modern American Nation. The birth of the child, Virginia Dare, thus fittingly symbolizes the beginnings of our American civilization.

On this significant occasion the guest speaker was His Excellency, the Honorable George Laking, New Zealand Ambassador to the United States, who, himself, is a descendent of daring English pioneers who made the hazardous journey half way around the world to found new settlements in the lonely islands in the South Pacific which are now called New Zealand.

Mr. Laking's remarks merit your attention, for they emphasize the parallel heritage which we share with other great areas of the free world. His remarks follow:

The birth of a child is the high point in the simple ritual of human existence when past tensions are forgotten and men and women are drawn together in hope and look

to the future with renewed confidence and courage.

It is fitting, therefore, that the beginnings of the modern American Nation should have come to be symbolized in the birth 376 years ago, of Virginia Dare. This child, the first to be born of English parents on American soil, has come to represent the spirit of the American people. Her parents, with an audacity which to us is almost breathtaking, left the comforts of English life and ventured over treacherous seas to make a new life in an unknown and inhospitable land. They brought with them little but their courage, their faith and their determination to make a new and freer life for their children.

The mysterious fate of the entire Roanoke Island Colony only serves to emphasize, if that were necessary, the daring of those early colonists who were willing to risk everything in order to subdue this vast and wild continent. It is through the blood and toil of such people as Virginia Dare's family that the great modern American Nation has been created. The tenacity, courage, and adaptability of countless unrecorded men and women has made America what it is today.

You have greatly honored my wife and myself, and through us my country, by inviting us to join with you in this family commemoration of the birth of the American Nation. We have been deeply moved by the occasion, the more so because a short time ago my wife and I stood on the shores of a small bay in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, from which my great-grandmother sailed as a young girl to New Zealand more than 100 years ago. At that time New Zealand was at the very beginning of its history and to anyone living in this hemisphere it was as remote and unreal as this continent was to Englishmen in the 16th century. The emotions which stirred in us as we reflected on the courage which sustained those 800 Scottish people in their decision to set out for the other side of the world are very much akin to those which move us all as we watch this great pageant. Perhaps we understand more clearly what St. Paul meant when he defined faith as "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

I draw this comparison because it may make our presence here less strange than it perhaps seems to some of you. We New Zealanders share with you many of the same traditions, the same values, the same way of looking at life.

My country shares with yours the same colonial origin. We are coheirs of a great tradition. The same intrepid British peoples who established the first colonies on this land were later to send their small and not always seaworthy ships on the far greater journey to found new settlements in those lonely islands in the South Pacific which we call New Zealand. There, in the mid-19th century, was reenacted the same harsh struggle with bush, river, and mountain which your forebears encountered in this country. Our two peoples learned to wrest from the land, by hard work and skill, a wealth which has given our children opportunities undreamt of by the early colonists. Our two peoples are united, in peacetime, just as much as they were in the two great wars which convulsed the modern world, in the defense of that common Western heritage which we received through those early colonists.

Your country has enriched that early English heritage. From all corners of Europe, and from many other lands as well, have come people whose cultural heritage has been absorbed into that basic English tradition. That rich cultural background, coupled with a history in which revolution, civil war, reconstruction, and startling economic growth have all played their part, has prepared the United States for its present major world role. From an offshoot of a European colonial power, the United States has become the great world power. We other members of the English-speaking world may not always agree with every policy of the United States. But we recognize that the boundless energy and enthusiasm of the American people is committed to the exercise of free choice which is the hallmark of Western civilization.

We, too, in New Zealand are taking that heritage which the first British colonists brought with them and evolving out of it something which is a unique expression of the New Zealand experience. Just as Americans learned to look away from the sea which joined a series of small colonies to a distant European power; just as Americans learned to look inward to the vast continent which was to be the strength of the United States; and just as, eventually, Americans came to accept their position as one of the main centers of world power, so have New Zealanders, in their modest way, begun to find their place in the changed world of today.

For generations, just as the early American colonists looked to the Atlantic seaboard as their main connection with the outside world, so did New Zealanders look to Europe as their main external link. Sheltering behind the power of the British Navy, New Zealanders were left free to develop their country—to build a new society in which increasingly were fused the diverse cultures of Europe and Polynesia. For over a hundred years New Zealand was able to ignore its neighbors on the Asian mainland on the comfortable theory that happenings there could be looked after by the European powers.

It took the great depression of the thirties, the agony of the Second World War, and the dissolution of the old British Empire to open New Zealand eyes. Like the early American revolutionaries we discovered that we were, indeed a new nation and not a mere "lost colony" of the British peoples. These traumatic experiences brought into focus the nationalism which had been slowly developing amongst our people. In discovering our identity, in finding out just what made a New Zealander, we found that we were a Pacific people. We discovered that we lived on the fringe of the vast Asian mainland. We saw a world transformed first by Japanese aggression, then by the rise of a powerful and ill-disposed Communist regime on mainland China, and concurrently by the emergence of independent nation states in Asia.

Part of this awakening of New Zealand nationalism, part of this coming to terms with our geographical circumstances, was reflected in the growing intimacy of our relationship with the American people. We found that not only had we language, literature and values in common. We realized that we shared very real strategic interests with the United States. For at the very time New Zealand was emerging from its long colonial dream the United States was accepting its destiny as the great Pacific power.

In many ways these developments were the culmination of contacts established over a long period between the New Zealand and American people. Throughout the whole of our history and through a large part of yours our peoples have known each other, have got along well together and have learned to understand each other.

I hope, therefore, that in commemorating the anniversary of Virginia Dare's birth you will think not only of the growth of your nation from its first simple but heroic beginnings. I hope you will also think of that wider international community which, too, has its connections with the brave adventures which established the first English colony on these shores. Naturally your thoughts will turn in the first place to Britain, from where came the first settlers who established themselves in this new land. But perhaps, too, you will think with affection of those other members of the English speaking world who drew their first lifeblood from the villages, seaports and industrial cities of the British Isles.

Certainly, it is with sympathy and respect that we New Zealanders join with you in commemorating the birth of the American Nation which has come to be symbolized in the birth of the child, Virginia Dare.

Hon. Jim Egan, Mayor of Muskogee, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, as a native of Muskogee, Okla., it is a genuine pleasure to call attention to the mayor of my hometown, the Honorable Jim Egan.

Mayor Egan is a dedicated public servant. Since taking office in April of 1962, he has worked hard to solve the challenging problems his city faces. He has accomplished a great deal in a very short time.

Mr. President, Mayor Egan's story has been told in an article written by Irene Martin and published in the Tulsa Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW MUSKOGEE OFFICIALS GET RESULTS

(By Irene Martin)

MUSKOGEE.—A current of confidence developing in the citizens of Muskogee is perhaps the most satisfying accomplishment during the first half of Mayor Jim Egan's administration.

When Mayor Egan and a new city council slate took office in April, 1962, on the heels of the arrival of the town's young new city manager, Buford Watson, a feeling of discord existed among the town's people.

An AIM (Action in Muskogee) Committee had been organized, and although the group came up with several good ideas designed to help Muskogee grow, no "action" had been taken by the previous city officials.

But in one year's time, this feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest has disappeared, and Muskogee's image is beginning to improve, not only here but on the outside.

Immediately upon taking office, Mayor Egan and the entire city council gave the city manager full charge of the affairs of the city. This tended to create a better feeling—a sense of security—among the city employees, who in turn are doing a much better job.

An improved training program for city policemen, placing an emphasis upon fair law enforcement regardless of social level, has been installed.

The new administration has also peacefully integrated city parks and swimming pools.

One of the most popular programs put into effect by the present administration is the city recreational program, which draws up to 25,000 persons a week during the summer months.

Summer entertainment designed for the entire family is scheduled daily, and re-

quires two full-time and 40 part-time employes to run the program.

Building permits issued during the fiscal year which ended June 30 increased 50 percent over the previous year.

Major Egan said that since January 1, 1963, the city has issued permits for 23 new business buildings and for remodeling of 17 business houses, totaling more than $2,800,000. And this figure does not include plans of all three Muskogee banks.

With the assistance of Federal loans, a $912,000 street improvement project will be started next month, a $750,000 water and sewer project is underway, and the Muskogee General Hospital is completing the first portion of a three-phase expansion program which will cost $1,200,000.

Two major accomplishments must be attributed to the Egan administration.

First was the creation of the port of Muskogee, making the first port location in the State.

And second, Muskogee was the first city in the State to take advantage of legislation enacted last year giving cities the right to pass revenue bonds to entice new industries. Proof of Muskogee's undertaking is the new Funston Nut Co. plant.

When Mayor Egan, who retired several years ago as president of the Egan Manufacturing Co., was asked for a comparison of being the head of a business and the head of a city, he made these comments:

"Being a mayor and being the head of a corporation is not too different. There is a similar pattern—the city manager form of government which prevails in Muskogee is a great deal like the structure of a corporation. You hear complaints, and have problems in both jobs."

Egan emphasized that one of the most important phases of being mayor is to get information to the people, to let them know what the city is planning to do. "A better public relations job by the city helps to establish confidence and trust," he said.

"The city of Muskogee is gaining this confidence now," Egan continued. "And I believe this proves to some extent that when a group of persons such as our city officials, with unselfish motives and no desires except to do what is best for the people, apply themselves, and when the citizens want to improve their town, a lot can be done with what already exists.

"And I believe the people of Muskogee are ready to 'reinvest' in their city."

Distinguished Berkeley Scientists Support Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, distinguished scientists from the Seventh Congressional District of California, which I am privileged to represent, have overwhelmingly expressed support for the nuclear test ban treaty. This fact was determined in a recent poll conducted by the Berkeley chapter of the Federation of American Scientists.

The significance of this nearly unanimous opinion should not escape us. In the words of Profs. Jack M. Hollander and Samuel S. Markowitz, chairman and vice chairman of the Berkeley chapter of the Federation of American Scientists:

Our motivation in conducting this survey was, in part, to determine the extent to which the Berkeley colleagues of Dr. Edward Teller share his views on the treaty.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that they do not.

Professors Hollander and Markowitz add:

While we do not claim to speak as experts on details of military matters privy to the Government, we are vitally concerned as individuals with seeing a new direction taken in international affairs. As scientists, many of whom work with radioactivity and nuclear materials, we can well appreciate the ultimate horrors of a spiraling arms race.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the full text of the federation's statement to our colleagues' attention:

BERKELEY SCIENTISTS POLL ON TEST BAN TREATY

The Berkeley chapter of the Federation of American Scientists announced today the results of a questionnaire it had distributed to chemists, physicists, and biologists on the campus and at the Radiation Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley.

The poll concerned the partial nuclear test ban treaty now pending ratification in the U.S. Senate. It asked the question, "Do you think the nuclear test ban treaty should be ratified by the Senate?"

Of the questionnaires returned there were 75 "yes" answers and 2 "no" answers, almost 98 percent "yes" replies.

The questionnaire was distributed to chemistry, physics, and biology professors on campus and to the equivalent staff scientists at the Radiation Laboratory on August 16, 1963. A number of the scientists were out of town at this time.

The scientists were also given the opportunity of supporting publicly the following statement previously endorsed by 35 U.S. Nobel laureates:

"We the undersigned wish to make public our approval of the test ban treaty recently negotiated in Moscow by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union. We believe that this treaty marks a significant, if minimal, first step in reducing the tensions of a continued nuclear arms race, thereby enhancing the security of the United States. We hope that this treaty will be approved by the Senate as a concrete expression of our country's desire for peace."

Those wishing to support this statement publicly include both members and nonmembers of the Federation of American Scientists. The following 70 scientists signed the statements: James A. Bassham, Sergio de Benedetti, Raymond T. Birge, Robert W. Birge, Leo Brewer, Joseph Cerny, Owen Chamberlain, Geoffrey F. Chew, William Chinowsky, Paul Concus, H. E. Conzett, Bruce Cork, Frank S. Crawford, Jr., Richard M. Diamond, Vernon J. Ehlers, Robert P. Ely, Jr., Norman K. Freeman, Gerson Goldhaber, Sulamith Goldhaber, Robert A. Harris, John E. Hearst, A. C. Helmholz, Joel H. Hildebrand, Jack M. Hollander, Gilbert G. Hudson, Earl K. Hyde, Carson D. Jeffries, Selig N. Kaplan, Denis Keefe, Arthur F. Kip, Bernard Kirtman, C. Kittel, Richard M. Lemmon, J. V. Lepore, Frank T. Lindgren, Samuel S. Markowitz, Ralph D. McLaughlin, Donald H. Miller, C. Bradley Moore, Gary J. Nelson, William A. Nierenberg, Roderic B. Park, Howard G. Parker, I. Perlman, Wilson M. Powell, Henry Rapoport, John O. Rasmussen, Jr., Frederick Reif, F. L. Reynolds, John H. Reynolds, A. H. Rosenfeld, R. H. Rudy, Thornton Sargent, III, Kenneth Sauer, Charles Schwartz, David S. Schreiber, Emilio Segre, D. A. Shirley, William E. Siri, Herbert L. Strauss, Andrew Streitwieser, Jr., Richard N. Stuart, David H. Templeton, Ignacio Tinoco, Jr., Robert D. Tripp, Donald C. Van Dyke, James C. Wallmann, Clyde E. Wiegand, Stanley M. Williamson, Michael Wortis.

University of California professors who had previously signed the statement include Nobel Laureates, Owen Chamberlain, Donald Glaser, Glenn T. Seaborg, Emilio Segre, and Wendell Stanley.

Little Rock Looks at Mr. David Bell, Administrator of AID

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on July 13, 1963, an editorial was printed in the Arkansas Gazette commenting on the capabilities of the able Administrator of the Agency for International Development, Mr. David Bell, who had just completed a visit to Little Rock where he participated in a program of the Arkansas Economic Education Workshop.

In my opinion, we are fortunate to have the services of a man of David Bell's qualifications in this extremely important job. Though too often a thankless undertaking, David Bell has brought to this position insight and dedication which is commendable, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK LOOKS AT A NEW FRONTIERSMAN

With the voice of the doom-crier being heard in the land—ever louder, it often seems—here is one handy advance test for determining the point when the country will really be in trouble: That point when it becomes impossible to cajole men such as David E. Bell to enter Government service in the first place—and to stay there long enough to get their job done and make their own personal impression felt, once they are brought there.

Mr. Bell, the young, incisive, Administrator of the Agency for International Development (and former Director of the Bureau of the Budget) is a man clearly on top of his job, not only in its broad outlines, but in the nuances, too. Arriving in Little Rock in the small hours Thursday morning, Mr. Bell was up in time for an informal 7:30 breakfast with newsmen as the merest preliminary to a full day's speaking schedule before the Arkansas Economic Education Workshop and the Rotary Club. If he was more bushed than busy-tailed at that hour, he was at least bright eyed, and, as we have said, capable of fielding the little nuances, too, such as how the Agency tries to persuade its overseas personnel to send home as much of their income as possible, as one means of reducing still further AID's comparatively minuscule contribution to the balance-of-payments deficit.

Meanwhile, back on the Hill in Washington, the House Foreign Affairs Committee was busily engaged in chopping anew at the administration's foreign aid authorization bill, even as Mr. Bell was at the grassroots explaining calmly and cogently just why a foreign aid program still is necessary as in-

dispensable corollary of our worldwide defensive alliance system and how it is constantly in the process of shifting emphasis and direction, not only in accordance with the shifting demands of foreign policy, but in accordance with improvements in business practices as well. Mr. Bell is, above all, businesslike, and, again, as we have noted, hard working. The House committee's cuts in the foreign aid bill were not unanticipated; Mr. Bell was simply confronted with the necessity to roll his sleeves up a little higher still, once he got off the plane back in Washington.

If David Bell doesn't sound all that exceptional measured against the whole list of the Kennedy's administration's top-level appointments, it is because there appear there the names of so many other gifted specialists who are on top of every facet of their job for as many hours as the day requires. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, for another example whose managerial talents have been impossible to hide under any sized basket produced thus far by any of the scattering of critics inside the uniformed command structure and in Congress. Mr. McNamara has just been able to report, almost offhandedly, that the Department over the past year has been able to save $1,100 million by giving the Services not what they wanted in every instance, or what somebody wanted to sell them, but what they needed to do the job.

None of this is really a partisan matter—or, at least, it needn't be. Of the two cost-conscious "Frontiersmen" here referred, one, as it happens is a Democrat (Bell) and the other (McNamara) a Republican. Under our system, a great deal of credit has to go to the man who brought together these men and so many others like them. Yet, ideally, such a lineup should be the norm and not the exception, and so long as we maintain these standards even as goal to be worked toward, we shall have much less real cause to fear for the Republic's future.

Area Population of 5 Million Predicted by Year 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, repeated delays have prevented the solution of the problems of the District of Columbia. When the questions vexing the Nation's Capital become too troublesome and time consuming it has become customary to postpone them until another day. This is a bad habit that we of the legislative branch of government share with the executive branch and with local officials in the City of Washington.

If there is any delusion that problems will shrink with the passage of time it should be corrected at once. Persuasive evidence is the article by Jack Eisen which appeared in the Washington Post on August 18, 1963, which is appended:

AREA POPULATION OF 5 MILLION PREDICTED BY YEAR 2000

(By Jack Eisen)

Still another researcher has peered into his crystal ball to view Metropolitan Washington's economic and population future, and the vista for the year 2000 has generally confirmed what others saw:

A metropolis of nearly 5 million persons, with a possible range of 3.7 million and 6.3 million compared with the 1960 census total of 2 million.

A doubling to tripling of today's number of dwelling units, both houses and apartments, with these filling up empty spaces outward to Gaithersburg, Laurel, Upper Marlboro, Lorton, and possibly beyond Fairfax.

An average yearly personal income of $13,000 and household income of $18,755, measured in 1960 values, compared with today's personal average of $6,000 and household average of $10,507, and a quintupling of the aggregate income of $24 billion.

An increase in the number of women in the labor force from 39 percent today to 45 percent at the turn of the century.

An expansion of job opportunities for Negroes, coupled with better education and training, that should increase their proportion in the population from 1 in 4 today to about 1 in 3 by year 2000.

These are among the conclusions of a technical report prepared by the Washington research firm of Economic Associates (Ecasso) for the National Capital Transportation Agency, and used as a basis for planning the region's proposed future rapid transit network. It was released today.

Leonard L. Fischman, Ecasso director, told a press conference the report is the first of its kind to use 1960 census data.

FINDINGS SIMILAR

In general, its findings largely agree with those prepared by CEIR, Inc., as a part of the 1959 Mass Transportation Survey; with work done by the National Capital Planning Commission for its year 2000 plan; with the Potomac River Basin Study of the Army Corps of Engineers, and with other similar reports. Some of the basic figures from these reports were used.

From NCTA's viewpoint, the report underscores one central fact often forgotten in the debate over its projected fast-train and subway network: the community to be served will, 37 years from now, be at least twice as populous as the congested metropolis of today.

FUNCTIONAL UNIT USED

Ecasso actually came up with three sets of figures on most of its projections—a "high" based on a high-velocity economy with great Federal activity; a "low" based on the opposite assumptions, including massive Federal decentralization, and a "medium" that seemed to the researchers as most likely. It was assumed there will be no general war. Except as noted, the figures used in this account are "medium."

The report deals with metropolitan Washington as a functional unit, wiping out political boundaries and assuming the metropolis will expand as its population rises.

Its total population forecast is 4.6 million, just a shade under the 5 million predicted in the year 2000 plan. But the 4.6 million could be here by 1988.

The report found that the "mainstay of the Washington area economy has been, and will continue to be, the Federal Government," whose payrolls will be considerably larger—with a smaller percentage share of the work force—by the turn of the century.

The increases would range from 50 to a more likely 85 percent. Federal civilian employment now is 222,000 and would rise to 421,000.

Personal service and manufacturing employment should increase.

Employment in the central core of Washington—from Capitol Hill west almost to Rock Creek, from the Potomac River north to roughly Florida Avenue NW.—will nearly double by year 2000.

EMPLOYMENT JUMP

Ecasso's predictions: 275,000 today; 345,000 in 1970; 405,000 in 1980; 520,000 by the turn of the century. (High for year 2000, 754,000; low, 427,000.)

Of the year 2000 core-area employees, Ecasso foresees 241,000 working for the Federal and District Governments; 277,000 for private employers. Present figures are 139,000 governmental and 137,000 private.

While the core will not expand in area much beyond its already sprawling girth, the study sees the greatest relative employment growth on Capitol Hill and the greatest actual growth north of the city's traditional downtown—in the area generally flanking Massachusetts Avenue NW.

Ecasso's survey took a close look at the effects of improved transit and highways on downtown retail sales.

Like those in most other big American cities, downtown Washington's cash registers have been ringing up a smaller share of the metropolitan sales. But in Washington, the 1960 share of retail sales—15 percent—actually represents a dollar volume that is holding firm.

SALES DROP SEEN

After weighing the statistical factors, Ecasso came to an "optimistic" conclusion that downtown's share of retail sales will drop to 10 percent by 1980 and to 5 percent by 2000, but conversely that the actual dollar volume in 1960 value money will rise 100 percent by 1980 and 140 percent by 2000.

A "pessimistic" conclusion, based on less attractive travel times and patterns, would drop these figures substantially. Both conclusions assume rapid transit and improved highways.

But, Ecasso concluded, "possible differences in * * * income growth will ultimately have a far greater bearing upon retail sales and employment in the core than the transportation facilities which carry in the customers."

Downtown's economic health, another part of the report indicated, is tied to an ability to bring in customers who come for other reasons—medical service, jobs, and the like—and to the fact that it is the region's biggest single shopping center.

The report was dated April 1962. National Capital Transportation Agency Administrator C. Darwin Stolzenbach said it is being released because of its usefulness to other agencies and to the community generally.

HOW THE AREA DOES GROW

Following are some of the findings of Economic Associates in their study of Metropolitan Washington's prospective growth. All projections are "medium" unless otherwise noted:

Population

[In thousands]

Year	Individuals	Work force	Households
1960	2,002	900	590
1970	2,600	1,100	810
1980	3,200	1,400	1,050
2000	4,600	2,100	1,600

Income by household

[In dollars at 1960 value]

	Average	Lowest 20 percent	Highest 20 percent
1960	$10,507	$1,702	$18,944
1970	12,588	2,090	21,983
1980	14,322	2,406	25,374
2000	18,755	3,357	32,277

Sulphur, Okla., Attracts Tourists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, the State of Oklahoma, although one of the youngest in the Union, is imbued with the spirit of progress and this spirit is found in every municipality and county in my State. We are blessed with an abundance of high caliber pioneers who never give up in their efforts to improve their communities and their State. During my 4 years as Governor of this State, I was in a position to observe these characteristics of the people and it was always my pleasure and honor to assist them in their efforts.

I have noted an article written by Joe Looney, and published in the Ada Evening News of Ada, Okla., of August 15, 1963, featuring the efforts of another town and another county in my State, the city of Sulphur in the county of Murray. The article describes the efforts being made in this area to move ahead in an effort to attract tourists through the improvement of the environment of the Platt National Park and the addition of a well conceived new "Lake of the Arbuckles." I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SULPHUR GOES ALL OUT TO ATTRACT TOURIST TRADE

(By Joe Looney)

SULPHUR.—This once-sleepy city has discovered the tourists.

And not a moment too soon, either, because the tourists are flocking into adjacent Platt National Park by the hundreds of thousands in what is modestly described as a phenomenon.

During the past week, the millionth visitor squeezed his way into the 900-odd acre park. Whoever he was, he arrived on a busy day and found himself elbow-to-elbow with hundreds of other vacationers all eager to troop over the pleasant wooded hills with the eight buffalo and assortment of stinking springs.

Platt, smallest unit of the National Park system, hosts as many visitors as such famous places as Great Smokey Mountains, Bryce Canyon, and Shenandoah.

Authorities on tourism shake their heads in amazement, because there is nowhere within sight of Sulphur anything like the mass of developments it's claimed one needs to attract visitors.

Those million people came to see Platt National Park and nothing else. You can be sure of that, because to a visitor from afar, once you step outside the boundaries of the park there just isn't very much to do in Sulphur.

But Sulphur is doing something about that.

"This city could easily become another Hot Springs," observed one enthused woman. Her car bears a sticker advising she favors Arbuckle Lake. In her glove compartment are brochures extolling the virtues of the proposed Sulphur Springs Spa. And she is an active worker on a committee planning to reconstruct histroic old Fort Arbuckle.

In the years past, Sulphur folks figured the national park was good to increase business in motels—made for better restaurant business and accounted for extra sales in bait stores and now and then in some other local establishments.

But not much else, unless you liked to have a bonafide National Park across the fence from your backyard for an occasional picnic.

That was in the days when only 500,000 or so people a year came to see the park with the sulfur and bromide springs. The camp grounds hosted about 20,000 hardy outdoorsmen a year a decade ago and most of these were Boy Scout troops or something akin.

In 1963? Some 20,000 campers a month flock into the park. They bring full-fledged beds, trailers loaded with kids, dogs and grandma, and stay for days.

They tramp every inch of trail in the park. The eight buffalo in the pasture are photographed from every possible angle. All the springs are dutifully sampled. Every deep spot in Travertine and Rock Creeks hosts swimmers.

Every blossoming wildflower finds an admirer. All of which has suddenly stirred something in Sulphurites' minds.

When the old Artesia Hotel burned, the old era of Platt National Park went out the window. A modern motel is going up in its place—right across the road from the park.

The Lake of the Arbuckles project, which has been kicking around for years, suddenly started moving as committees went toe work. It's hard to find anyone in Sulphur opposed to the lake today.

If there are any, they will make themselves known Tuesday when both Sulphur and Davis vote on whether their communities will take part in the multi-city project.

A news reporter was unable to find anyone in either town against the lake—indeed, everyone seemed passionately in favor of pledging future revenues from lake water to retire those cities' shares of the cost of the reservoir—even to levying millage on advalorem property as a supplemental revenue measure if this should happen to prove necessary.

Ardmore and Wynnewood will vote later on whether they'll take part. If they do, the Federal Government forks over a $1,800,000 appropriation to build its share.

The lake is seen as providing more recreational facilities in the immediate area to keep some of those million-plus visitors to Platt every year in the Arbuckle area a few days longer.

Another project designed with the same purpose is the privately owned Sulphur Springs Spa north of the city. Promoters in Sulphur are hard at work on this project for a deulxe resort similar to those at Hot Springs, Ark., which also capitalize on a pleasant National Park with mineral springs.

Associated with this project is the proposal by the newly organized Arbuckle Historical Reconstruction Society to build a replica of Fort Arbuckle north of Sulphur.

Eskimos Highlight Test Ban Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in noting the divergent views which are currently being presented to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Armed Services, and Senate Members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, I submit that utmost stress should be placed upon the dire consequences which would soon ensue if atmospheric testing is not terminated. On balance, our Nation's security would be in a low state, indeed, if we go ahead with atmospheric testing and permit the air and the earth and the living things thereon to become poisoned and deformed and killed. This gruesome prospect is highlighted by recent discoveries of extraordinarily high exposure to nuclear fallout contamination in northern and northwestern Alaska, as ably reported in the New York Times of August 22, 1963, as follows:

ESKIMOS EXPOSED TO HIGH FALLOUT: SURVEY OF SEVEN VILLAGES FINDS AN EXCESS OF CESIUM 137

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Some Eskimos in Alaska are receiving fallout radiation doses exceeding the permissible exposure levels proposed for general populations, it was reported to Congress today.

Radiation surveys of seven Alaskan villages have shown that the Eskimos have far more cesium 137 in their bodies than the rest of the American population. Preliminary results indicate that the level of the radioactive substance is still rising, and one radiation expert suggested that it might become necessary to take measures to protect the Eskimos.

The report was presented to a Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Subcommittee by Dr. H. M. Parker, Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford Laboratories in Washington.

During the last year, Hanford scientists have gone to Alaska with a portable "whole body counter" to measure the radioactivity in the bodies of Eskimos. The original purpose of the survey was to determine what might happen if atomic explosives were used to excavate a harbor on the Alaska coast—a project that has since been deferred, partly because of the radiation problem.

ARCTIC TESTS BLAMED

The survey discovered that the Eskimos were receiving surprisingly high amounts of fallout radiation from atomic tests. Presumably, much of the fallout resulted from Soviet tests in the Arctic.

Over 700 Eskimos in 7 villages were examined by the portable body counter, which measures the gama radiation being emitted by radioactive materials in the body. In the village of Anaktuvuk Pass, the average adult was found to have 450 nanocuries of cesium 137 in his body and one individual had as much as 790 nanocuries. A nanocurie is a billionth of a curie. A curie in turn is equal to the radiation from 1 gram of radium.

One of the long-lived radioactive substances produced in an atomic explosion, cesium 137, is chemically similar to phosphorus. Once taken into the body, the substance accumulates in the muscles, where in sufficient quantity it can present a genetic hazard.

The Federal Radiation Council has not established guidelines on how much cesium 137 should be permitted in bodies of the general population. But the International Committee on Radiation Protection, an unofficial committee of scientists, has proposed that 300 nanocuries of cesium 137 be the permissible average for groups in the general population and that 1,000 nanocuries be the accepted limit for a single individual.

The reason for the unusually high concentration of cesium 137 in the Eskimos arises from the special food chain in the Arctic region. The lichens, as Dr. Parker put it, act as a blotting paper to pick up the radio-

active fallout. Caribou thrive on the lichen, and the Eskimos in turn depend on the caribou for meat.

WOMEN LESS AFFECTED

That this arctic food chain is responsible is indicated by the fact that the cesium 137 concentrations in individuals in Alaska not consuming meat from Alaskan animals are comparable with those observed elsewhere in the United States. Furthermore, Eskimo women and children, who presumably get less caribou meat than the men, show lower cesium 137 levels.

In the village of Anaktuvuk, the cesium 137 concentrations were 100 times greater than those observed in individuals in the rest of the United States.

Dr. Parker reported that preliminary examinations had shown that cesium 137 levels in the Eskimos were rising above those recorded last year.

It is "very likely," he told the subcommittee, that the levels in some Eskimos will rise this year to 1,000 to 1,200 manocuries.

The prediction prompted Representative MEL PRICE, of Illinois, the subcommittee chairman, to raise the question of whether the radiation was reaching "dangerous levels."

Dr. Parker replied that there was "no real danger in the normal sense of the word." He pointed out that workers in atomic plants are permitted to accumulate 30,000 manocuries of cesium 137 in their bodies.

Dr. Parker said, however, that the possibility of some harmful effects could not be ruled out, and he suggested that consideration be given to possible countermeasures to reduce the amount of fallout in the diet of the Eskimos.

"I believe I would begin to look around to see how reasonable it would be to substitute other kinds of food," he said.

Baseball Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the University of Arizona baseball team came within a couple of runs of winning the college world series early this summer. It was a big disappointment to all of us Wildcat fans that our boys did not quite make it, but such is the way of competitive sports.

On the day following that defeat the Wildcat coach, Frank Sancet, left on a tour which more than made up for that loss in Omaha. Sancet was one of the instructors on an 8-week baseball tour of Central America which scored a clean diplomatic sweep for the United States.

I am proud to say that not only Sancet but three other residents of my hometown of Tucson were on that tour. One was Jimmy Estrada, an outstanding teacher and coach at Pueblo High School. The others were Buzz Acuna and Bob Gauna, members of the University of Arizona team.

Throughout the tour these men, who love the great American pastime, taught the boys and young men on their route the fine art of fielding grounders, throwing curves and smashing line drives. It is to the credit of the State Department, which arranged the tour, that the participants were men who not only know baseball but speak the Spanish language.

The sports editor of the Arizona Daily Star, Mr. Abe Chanin, has written an account of this unusual experiment in diplomacy which I commend to my colleagues who are interested in finding new ways to advance America's relations with Latin America. The article follows:

WANTED: COACHES, NOT AMERICAN POLITICOS

(By Abe Chamin)

When plans were being formed for the State Department sponsored baseball tour of Central America, there was an understandable apprehension over running into Communist-inspired trouble.

"Trouble? We didn't haev any," says Frank Sancet, the University of Arizona baseball coach who was one of the key instructors on the 8-week tour. "Everywhere we went we were received wonderfully. In fact, we were asked to stay, or to come back again next year.

"I don't pretend to know much about politics, but I do know that those Central American countries sure were crazy about our baseball clinics and were mighty cordial to the Notre-Americanos.

"They are baseball hungry in those countries and I think we could do an awful lot for good relations by sending more of these baseball clinic tours down there."

Sancet was one of four Tucsonans selected for the tour that was headed for the State Department by the former major league star and now Florida State University coach, Danny Litwhiler. Jimmy Estrada of Pueblo High and University of Arizona players Buzz Acuna and Bob Gauna were the other Tucsonans.

"A major factor in our success," Sancet explained, "was that all of us could speak their language. There have been other baseball tours to Central America, but never with instructors who could speak Spanish."

PEOPLE FRIENDLY EVERYWHERE

Here are a few notes Sancet made while on tour:

"At San Salvador our work really began. We held clinics in the mornings and afternoons and showed movies at night. The kids and older people are very interested in baseball and are avid to learn. San Salvador has a fine Little League program already and will have a good team in time * * * just lack know-how and are hungry for instruction.

"We are treated very well everywhere. These countries are small and so we have been all over them from north to south and east to west. What strikes everyone is the poverty of most of the people. They say that the average yearly income is around $200.

"We have met some wonderful people both in the U.S. Government service and those handling baseball in these countries. * * * Costa Rica is a beautiful country. We were at San Jose when the volcano erupted and kept us from making a flight to a small town named Golfito. Volcanic dust in the air grounded the planes.

"We were able to make Port Limon where they claim Columbus landed and then a town called Puntarevas. At Puntarevas the men put on a game under the darndest conditions. * * * A futbol field about the size of a Little League field and the grass was so high that you couldn't see the bases and the ball had to be hunted each time it was hit on the ground."

AUDIENCE WITH THE PRESIDENT

"This has been a great experience for me. All of us have had a good chance to practice our Spanish, I think that this has been our biggest asset in the job we have been doing. * * * Gauna and Acuna have been very popular—even with the young Spanish ladies.

"In the Dominican Republic futbol, rather than baseball, is the national sport. But the truth of the matter is they would all play baseball, but they just don't have the equipment. All they need for futbol is a vacant lot and a ball.

"Despite the political trouble in this country we had a 30-minute audience with President Bosch. He is a great baseball fan and expressed great interest and appreciation in our tour.

"Along the tour we have been leaving some equipment in each country. Hope it helps. Just wish we had more. But I'm sure we made a lot of new friends for the United States."

Mexican Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, all Mexican citizens, Americans of Mexican descent, and citizens of the United States whose lives have been touched by the Spanish-Mexican cultural influence, will celebrate the 153d anniversary of Mexican Independence Day.

Mexico was the first of Spain's New World colonies to rise up in a war for independence, and the cost of this independence was high in numbers of patriots and expended treasure. But the commodity sought—freedom and sovereignty—was, and remains, priceless. There are few nations in the world which can match Mexico's boundless pride and reverence for its historic struggle for freedom.

In 1810 Mexico was in a ferment of revolutionary ideas and plans for independence. Among the Mexican leaders of this movement was a simple parish priest, Father Miguel Hidalgo, who administered to the Indians and peasants of Dolores. In September of that year, upon learning that the Spanish Government had learned of a plot that he was involved in, Father Hidalgo boldly chose to strike before the government rounded up the revolutionaries. On Sunday morning, September 16, 1810, he rang the church bells to summon the simple people of his parish—the church and churchyard were soon crowded with humble peasants and Indians. Hidalgo spoke to them from the pulpit:

My children, this day comes to us a new dispensation. Are you ready to receive it? Will you be free? Will you make the effort to recover from the hated Spaniards the lands stolen from your forefathers 300 years ago?

As the crowd roared its approval, Hidalgo cried out what became known as the grito de Dolores, the battle cry of the Mexican War of Independence:

Long live our Lady of Guadelupe, down with bad government, death to the Spaniards.

Although Hidalgo's army of Indians did not gain complete Mexican inde-

pendence—for Hidalgo himself was tricked, captured, and shot—the grito de Dolores electrified and rallied Mexican patriots to the long task of earning their freedom. Thus, this day, September 16, like our Fourth of July, is celebrated as the day of the declaration of independence.

Mr. Speaker, we Californians, of course, have particularly close ties with the history and culture of Spain and Mexico, for we have been deeply affected by the gentle arts and customs which our heritage has bequeathed us from Mexico. There are many Mexican-Americans residing in California—over 30,000 in the San Francisco Bay area alone—and we join with them wholeheartedly in their celebration of this day of independence.

From the people of the United States comes the warmest and most affectionate good wishes to the people of Mexico on this, their national day of independence. You are, of all our good neighbors in Latin America, our closest and best neighbors.

Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleagues, Congressmen DANIEL J. FLOOD and EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, in their plea for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

The Congress of the United States has taken positive recognition of America's concern for the welfare of the peoples of the captive nations by proclaiming July 14–20 as Captive Nations Week. The problem of captive nations, of 100 million people subjugated in captivity by the Communists, is a problem that goes beyond a 1-week ceremonial observance. America must demonstrate its moral and political commitment to the independence and freedom of captive nations 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. The formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is a constructive means of dealing with this vital problem on a year-round basis.

The debate on the various provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 today has made it abundantly clear that the United States is at a critical point as a leader in the great struggle for freedom. The need for a captive nations committee is greater today than ever before in our history. The free world must face squarely the fact that we must deal with the insistent expansionist aims of Communist China, the increasing oppressive and hostile activities of the Kremlin Communists, the continuing crisis in Laos and Vietnam, and the unfinished business in Latin America and in Africa. The formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is both a practical and inspirational approach in our efforts to gain self-determination for the victims of Soviet imperialism.

Report of National Projects Committee to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the national projects committee, which was unanimously adopted by the recent 50th National—"Golden Anniversary"—Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress held in Washington, June 4–7, 1963.

The permanent national projects committee of the congress consists of an oustanding expert on water resource problems from each of the major drainage basins of the United States. They serve without compensation of any kind whatsoever and bear all of their own expenses when coming to Washington and while serving here on this committee.

The committee's purpose is to assist the sponsors of projects in preparing and presenting their data, so that they may be placed in line for approval. The projects recommended by the committee and endorsed by the congress are vigorously pressed for inclusion in the Government's public works program and appropriations or allocation of funds sought therefor.

I was honored to be asked to serve as chairman of this important committee, having previously served as its chairman for a number of years during my former service in the Congress of the United States. At that time I also had the honor of serving as a national vice president of the congress, and presently I am serving as its regional director for the lower Great Lakes region.

We are grateful to the members of this committee for their public-spirited service in an effort to assist the Congress of the United States and the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for these public works, as well as the people in the areas to be served thereby.

The members of the committee who served at its recent session are as follows:

Projects committee: Representative ROBERT T. SECREST of Senecaville, Ohio, chairman.

New England division: William S. Wise, executive secretary, Flood and Water Policy Commission, State of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

North Atlantic division: Brig. Gen. James H. Stratton, U.S. Army (retired), consulting engineer, New York, N.Y.

South Atlantic division: Col. George W. Gillette, U.S. Army (retired), chairman, Wilmington Port and Waterway Development Commission, Wilmington, N.C.

Southwestern division: Dale Miller, executive vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.

Lower Mississippi Valley division: Hu B. Myers, chief engineer, Department of Public Works, State of Louisiana, Baton Rouge, La.

North Central division: Al. Hansen, comptroller, city of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minn., vice chairman.

Missouri River division: John B. Quinn, executive director, Missouri Valley Development Association, Inc., Lincoln, Nebr.

Ohio River division: J. I. Perrey, chief engineer, Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, Indianapolis, Ind.

North Pacific division: Herbert G. West, executive vice president, Inland Empire Waterways Association, Walla Walla, Wash.

South Pacific division: Col. Thomas J. Weed, U.S. Army (retired), vice president, National Defense Transportation Association, Washington, D.C.

Western Inter-Mountain Region: Harold H. Christy, second national vice president, National Reclamation Association, Pueblo, Colo.

The report follows:

REPORT OF THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE TO THE 50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

JUNE 7, 1963.

Mr. HENRY H. BUCKMAN,
President, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In pursuance of the call of the president, your projects committee met on June 5, 1963, to consider the projects submitted since the last session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Hearings were afforded all who made appearance.

The committee at this session has examined 62 proposals embracing all resource improvements with which this congress is concerned, including navigable waterways, harbors, flood control, hurricane protection, soil conservation, reclamation, and water conservation.

Of the proposals examined, this committee is convinced that 22 constitute projects sound in conception, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status to warrant endorsement, involving a total estimated cost of $247,068,000. Fourteen proposals appear to be without sufficiently advanced development to warrant project endorsement at this time, but are believed to be meritorious and entitled to further consideration by this committee, if and when additional information may be adequate to warrant an endorsed status. We find that on 26 proposals, surveys have been authorized but the reports of said surveys have not been completed and we therefore recommend in these cases that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to permit completion of these surveys as soon as practicable in order that action may be taken toward classification by this congress.

Appendix A of this report sets forth in detail a list of all proposals and projects examined and the action taken thereon.

On October 23, 1962, President Kennedy signed the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act. This act authorized the Corps of Engineers to construct, modify, or otherwise participate in the provision of 199 flood control, navigation, water conservation, and other water resources projects, having an estimated Federal cost of $2,260,218,300.

This includes 79 navigation projects at an estimated Federal cost of $378,498,800; 12 beach erosion control projects at an estimated Federal cost of $19,875,000; and 108 flood control (including multiple-purpose) projects at an estimated Federal cost of $1,861,844,500.

The new law also authorizes amendment of existing beach erosion control laws to provide for Federal payment of 50 percent of the cost of works for the protection of non-Federal publicly owned or publicly used,

shores and up to 70 percent of the cost of protection of State and other publicly owned shore parks and conservation areas which meet certain criteria. Previously, it was 33⅓ percent in both cases. Authority is provided to construct small shore protection projects not specifically authorized by the Congress with the Federal share of the cost limited to $400,000, and the law authorizes shore protection investigations at Federal expense in lieu of the present basis under which local interests participate equally in study costs.

In addition, the new law increases the Chief of Engineers' small flood control project authority from $400,000 to $1 million for a single project. The limitation on the overall amount which may be used for this program in any one fiscal year was increased from $10 to $25 million.

Other items of interest in the bill include amendment of the flood control emergency law to provide for repair and restoration of Federal hurricane and shore protection works, and authority for the Chief of Engineers to develop recreational opportunities at all Army water resource projects (previously limited to reservoir projects).

The new omnibus act also authorizes 18 surveys for flood control and allied purposes and 8 surveys in the interest of navigation.

It will be recalled that the Senate version of the 1962 Authorization Act included increases in monetary authorization for 10 river basin plans. However, when the bill went to conference, these increases, along with several projects on which the House committee had not held hearings, were deleted from the bill. The managers on the part of the House made the commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings on those projects as soon as practicable after the next Congress convened.

As a result of the hearings during April 1963, a bill, H.R. 6016, authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, was reported by the House Public Works Committee on May 15, 1963. The bill provides increases in monetary authorization for 10 river basin plans, totaling $684 million. It is understood that monetary authorizations for certain river basins have become so deficient that funds which might be made available cannot be used in the fiscal year 1964. Your projects committee recommends that the Congress of the United States be requested to take early action on this bill.

Your projects committee feels it is fitting at this time, the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, to cite the accomplishments in the field of water resources.

The Corps of Engineers civil works program statistics, as of June 30, 1962, are as follows:

Navigation

Number of improved harbors (commercial)	500
Improved Federal waterways in commercial use (miles)	19,100
Commerce during calendar year 1962 (billion tons)	1.1

Active navigation projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed	2,289	$1,972,400,000
Under construction	110	2,639,200,000
Balance	130	1,611,400,000
Total	2,529	6,223,000,000

Flood control

Number of reservoirs in operation	195

Flood control—Continued

Number of local protection projects in operation	536
Flood-control storage in reservoirs in operation (acre-feet)	65,800,000
Flood damages prevented during fiscal year 1962	$662,637,000
Cumulative flood damages prevented to date	$11,295,187,000

Active flood control projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed	484	$1,604,100,000
Under construction	168	2,993,100,000
Balance	259	2,297,600,000
Total	911	6,894,800,000

Multiple-purpose projects producing hydroelectric power

Number of reservoirs in operation for hydroelectric power	36
Installed capacity of projects producing power (kilowatts)	7,531,400
Generating capacity installed during fiscal year 1962 (kilowatts)	657,000
Generating capacity under construction (kilowatts)	4,030,000
Ultimate capacity of projects completed and under construction (kilowatts)	15,677,400

Active multiple-purpose projects

	Number	Total estimated Federal cost
Completed	29	$1,678,600,000
Under construction	30	3,741,900,000
Balance	17	1,480,000,000
Total	76	6,900,500,000

NOTE.—Net hydroelectric power generation during fiscal year 1962: 29,924,100,000 kilowatt-hours.

IRRIGATION

Irrigation storage was provided by 16 reservoirs, having 796,000 acre-feet exclusively for irrigation, and 4,043,000 acre-feet jointly for that and other purposes, making a total of 4,839,000.

LOW-FLOW REGULATION

There were 35 reservoirs in operation which provided low-flow regulation.

WATER SUPPLY

There were 20 reservoirs in operation which provided approximately 1,500,000 acre-feet of water supply storage for 64 cities, towns, and rural areas.

BEACH EROSION CONTROL

The total estimated Federal cost of the 92 authorized projects, involving partial reimbursement for construction by local interests, is $44,400,000, of which $8,800,000 has been appropriated to date for 48 of these projects, leaving a balance of $35,600,000 to complete.

RECREATION

Outdoor recreational facilities for public use have been provided at more than 300 projects, at a Federal cost of $27,500,000 and a local cost of about $56 million. During calendar year 1962, there were 127 million visits to these facilities.

It is to be noted that great progress has been made in water resource development, but much remains to be done. The problems in water resource and land use developments are ever increasing in an expanding Nation such as ours. The committee is gratified to note that not only is increasing attention being given to the need for comprehensive planning for water resources development but even more important, numerous recent actions are designed to facilitate true comprehensive planning in the water resource field. These actions include section 207 of the 1962 Flood Control Act in the interest of public parks and recreational facilities at water resource development projects; also Senate Document No. 97, 87th Congress, 2d session, prepared under the direction of the President's Water Resources Council, has been issued setting forth policies, standards, and procedures in the formulation, evaluation, and review of plans for use and development of water and related land resources.

The studies and recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has provided the primary stimulus for the currently increasing emphasis on comprehensive basin planning. The requirements placed upon our water and related land resources are many and varied. They must serve domestic, municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other human activities. Senate Document No. 97 states that "The basic objective in the formulation of plans is to provide the best use, or combination of uses, of water and related land resources to meet all foreseeable short- and long-term needs." That document also established the scope of multiple-purpose planning; the needs and possibilities for all significant resource uses and purposes of development. As of June 1962 comprehensive basin planning had reached the stage where the areal extent was considered as an entire river basin or major tributary thereof. As a result of the need for such planning Congress has authorized many comprehensive river basin investigations. The budget for fiscal year 1963 included funds for completion of three comprehensive basin studies, continuation of two and initiation of 19 other studies. The fiscal year 1964 budget request includes funds for initiation of 4 and continuation of 21 comprehensive basin studies.

In closing, your committee desires to direct the attention of the Congress to the urgent need for initiating and completing authorized water resource projects and investigations. It is hoped that the committees of Congress will see fit to include in the annual public works appropriations bills for the various Federal agencies concerned with water resource developments, funds necessary to carry out their assigned responsibilities in this highly important field during the next fiscal year.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT T. SECREST,
Chairman.

NOTE A.—A project which has been placed in class II, III, IV, or V by the committee may be reexamined from time to time upon due application and the submission of material supplementary information, with a view to advancing its classification; but no project will be reported upon by the committee more than once in each calendar year.

NOTE B.—Attention is called to the fact that when a project is once put in class I—endorsed, such status continues and it is unnecessary to follow up at subsequent sessions with new applications. All projects endorsed by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the committee, retain their status until finally constructed, unless such action is rescinded by the Congress, and the Congress stands pledged to do everything possible to assist in reaching that goal.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECEIVED BY THE PROJECTS COMMITTEE

(Letter "R" following the project number indicates revision of a previous application.)

DIVISION I—ENDORSED

Endorsed. This means that it is the judgment of the committee that the project is sound, needful, and sufficiently advanced in status; and that its construction is justified by the public interest it will serve.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
867-R	Kawainui Swamp	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1008-R4	Calcasieu River salt water barrier	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1096-R5	Port San Luis deep draft and small craft harbor development	California	South Pacific.
1102-R	Trinity River and tributaries	Texas	Southwest.
1193A-R2	Savannah Harbor	Georgia	South Atlantic.
1235-R	Campti-Clarence flood control	Louisiana	Lower Mississippi Valley.
1239-R	Green Bay Harbor, deepening of entrance and river channels	Wisconsin	North Central.
1254-R	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	Tennessee	Ohio River.
1266	Hyder Wing Dam	Alaska	North Pacific.
1267	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach and vicinity	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1268	Savery-Pot Hook, reclamation	Colorado and Wyoming	South Pacific.
1269	Bostwick Park, reclamation	Colorado	Do.
1270	Fruitland Mesa, reclamation	do	Do.
1275	Fremont flood control, Sandusky River	Ohio	North Central.
1276	Salt Creek Reservoir	do	Ohio River.
1277	Crab Creek	do	Do.
1280	Laurel River Reservoir	Kentucky	Do.
1281	Cordell Hull Dam	Tennessee	Do.
1285	Key West Harbor modifications, Key West Bight	Florida	South Atlantic.
1286	Key West Harbor, Garrison Bight	do	Do.
1287	Great Lakes harbors study, interim report on Saginaw River	Michigan	North Carolina.
1296	Elkhorn Basin flood control and irrigation project	Nebraska	Missouri River.

DIVISION II

Meritorious

Meritorious. This means that the committee believes that although the project is not sufficiently advanced in status to warrant its present endorsement, it is meritorious and that the committee is willing to consider in due course, its advancement to division I upon presentation by its sponsors of additional evidence justifying such action.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
1092-R3	Passaic River Basin	New Jersey	North Atlantic.
1126-R4	Norfolk Harbor and channel to Newport News	Virginia	Do.
1157-R3	Waikiki Beach improvement	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1165-R	Trenton Channel extension (All American Channel)	Michigan	North Central.
1168-R3	Haleiwa Beach erosion project	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1170-R3	Harbors for light-draft vessels, coast of Hawaiian Islands	do	Do.
1213-R2	Northeast (Cape Fear) River above Hilton Bridge	North Carolina	South Atlantic.
1220-R2	Cape Fear River above Wilmington	do	Do.
1234-R	Salem Church Reservoir	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1256-R	Norfolk & Western Ry. bridge	do	Do.
1271	Animas-LaPlata, Reclamation	Colorado and New Mexico	South Pacific.
1272	Waterloo flood protection project	Iowa	North Central.
1279	Devils Jumps Reservoir	Kentucky and Tennessee	Ohio River.
1295	Central Arizona project	Arizona and New Mexico	South Pacific.

DIVISION III

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested

Expeditious report on authorized survey requested. This means that the committee believes that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress should request the engineering authority to expedite any report on any authorized investigation or survey of the project to the end that appropriate further action may be had thereon in regard to its classification.

Docket No.	Name of project	State or States	Division
776-R	Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Key West	Florida	South Atlantic.
797-R	Perdido Pass	Alabama	Do.
1069-R	Knik Arm Causeway Dam	Alaska	North Pacific.
1138-R2	Mississinewa River channel improvement	Indiana	Ohio River.
1158-R3	Iao Stream	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1162-R3	Kihei District	do	Do.
1163-R2	Palolo and Manoa Streams	do	Do.
1169-R3	Honolulu Harbor, deepening and widening of harbor and survey for a harbor at Barbers Point.	do	Do.
1172-R3	Port Allen Harbor modification	do	Do.
1174-R3	Explosive handling facilities within Hawaii harbors	do	Do.
1219-R2	Kahoma Stream	do	Do.
1251-R	Hanalei River flood control	do	Do.
1257-R	Thimble Shoal Channel, Norfolk Harbor, and channel to Newport News	Virginia	North Atlantic.
1273	Kuliouou Stream	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1274	Potomac River channel improvement project	Virginia and Maryland	North Atlantic.
1278	Heppner Dam and Reservoir	Oregon	North Pacific.
1282	Pupukea-Paumalu flood control	Hawaii	Pacific Ocean.
1283	Kapaakea flood control	do	Do.
1284	Kawela Gulch flood control	do	Do.
1288	Kawaihae Harbor modifications	do	Do.
1289	Hocking River survey	Ohio	Ohio River.
1290	Champlain Waterway	New Jersey, New York, Vermont and Canada.	North Atlantic.
1291	Lafayette River, tributary or estuary of Hampton Roads	Virginia	Do.
1292	Cliff Walk	Rhode Island	Northeast.
1293	Touchet division, Walla Walla project	Washington	North Pacific.
1294	Susquehanna River watershed, comprehensive development	New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland.	North Atlantic.

Nursing Care for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H.R. 8009 favorably, and it is my hope that this bill will soon be considered by the House. This bill resulted from an extensive study conducted by a special subcommittee of which I have had the honor to serve as chairman, and is designed to relieve a very serious problem being encountered in the Veterans' Administration hospital system by providing nursing care for those veterans who have reached maximum hospital benefits but who are unable to care for themselves. Recent action of the President which permits the use of 2,000 hospital beds in the Veterans' Administration hospital system for nursing care treatment also bears on this problem, and the subject is discussed in an editorial appearing in the August 22, 1963 issue of The Stars & Stripes-The National Tribune. The text of this editorial follows:

NURSING CARE

The action by the President in authorizing the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to activate 2,000 hospital beds for nursing-

care treatment is certainly a step in the right direction.

The matter of intermediate care has been the subject of exhaustive hearings before a subcommittee of the House Veterans Affairs Committee over the past 3 months. The net result of those hearings has been the introduction of some seven identical measures to make it mandatory for the VA to supply nursing care for veterans who have already received maximum treatment at the hands of the VA.

Nearly all of the major veterans organizations have mandates calling for the establishment of this type of treatment and most of them seek the setting up of 4,000 beds in VA hospitals for this purpose.

Objections by VA spokesmen to the intermediate nursing-care program were voiced before the House subcommittee but it is understood that Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of the House Veterans Affairs Committee is determined to enact legislation making the 4,000 beds effective if it can be pushed through the Congress.

There have been too many cases of veterans being discharged from VA hospitals and returned to their families when they were utterly incapable of caring for themselves and in addition the families concerned were in no financial position to assume the added burden of the veteran's incapacity.

We believe that despite the President's Executive order the minimum number of beds should be no less than 4,000 and we hope that some legislation of this description can be enacted before the close of the present session.

Resolutions Adopted by the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce Entitled "Under God" and "Tax Rate Reform"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the members of the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce recently held a convention and approved two important resolutions entitled "Under God" and "Tax Rate Reform." I have a high regard, Mr. President, for the Jaycees not only because of this organization's great contributions to community life, but also because this organization has always manifested a deep interest in and concern for valid and enduring American principles.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these resolutions as approved by the South Carolina Jaycees be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER GOD

Whereas we believe that faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life; and

Whereas we strongly believe that this Nation of ours was created under the blessings of God; and

Whereas we further believe that the blessings of God should be publicly acknowledged by the people of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved in a spirit of thankfulness to an Almighty God and worship to Him, the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce in board meetings assembled this 11th day of August, 1963, in Clemson, S.C., firmly resolves, That the Pledge of Allegiance should contain the words "under God" as our public acknowledgment of His blessings and guidance.

We further resolve in a spirit of thankfulness to Almighty God for creation of this great country and firmly resolve that prayer and Bible reading should be allowed in all schools and places of public meetings, as our public acknowledgment of His blessings and guidance.

TAX RATE REFORM, AUGUST 11, 1963

Whereas capital is basic to economic progress and the greater the volume of capital employed, the greater will be the economic progress of any nation; and

Whereas the inadequate rate of national economic growth over recent years provides ample evidence of the restraining effect of tax rates on capital accumulation and use; and

Whereas the steeply graduated individual income tax and the demanding corporate profit tax sharply curtail the rate of personal and corporate savings, the sole source of capital in our free enterprise system; weaken incentive by shrinking the rewards for personal and individual enterprise and initiative; restrict the start and development of commercial establishments by limiting the investment funds available; hold down rises in living standards by severely slowing up the creation of new and more rewarding job opportunities; impair the ability of the economy to meet the challenge of the Soviet economic thrust and the competition of the revitalized economies of the free world nations; and

Whereas comprehensive tax rate reform is required, but only in a constructive manner the benefits of which will be diffused throughout the economy, stimulating its growth and enhancing the well-being of all citizens; and

Whereas such salutary tax rate reform can be achieved without reducing the Government's income below present levels by utilizing the Government's revenue gain rising from economic growth for this purpose, instead of using such gains for increased spending; and

Whereas such a preemption of revenue gain is the essential procedure of the Herlong-Baker bills for thoroughgoing reform of Federal tax rates and methods now pending in Congress; and

Whereas this legislation, while setting up competition against unnecessary Federal spending, would not curtail national defense or other essential programs, or cause a return to deficit finances, because of a postponement feature which would postpone the reduction scheduled in any year in which budgetary unbalance is threatened; and

Whereas the greater and more consistent economic growth to be expected on enactment of this legislation would mean a step-up in the revenue gain to the Federal Government, providing a continuing surplus for regular debt retirement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce in board meetings this 11th day of August, 1963, in Clemson, S.C., strongly endorse the principles, procedures and rate reform objectives of the Herlong-Baker bills, and urges the prompt passage by the Congress, of this or comparable legislation, and to recommend to all local chapters of the organization that they take comparable action to serve the interest of their businesses, their professions, their communities, their States and their nation.

Americans Voice Apprehension Over the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Americans all over the Nation are terribly concerned over the Moscow test ban treaty and are voicing their concern. There follows extracts from some of the letters I have received from them in the past few days:

BUFFALO, N.Y.

Point out the terrible snakepit our country can fall into if the Senate ratifies this suicidal treaty.

PASADENA, CALIF.

Against the test ban treaty.

ASBURY PARK, N.J.

Confirmation of this treaty will be just another step toward one world government under communism.

GREELEY, COLO.

The test ban would indeed be a long step in the direction of our own self-destruction.

EVANS, COLO.

Vote "No" on this phony test ban agreement. If or when the time comes for the Communists to complete their takeover of the world, Russia and Red China will stand shoulder to shoulder against their avowed and common enemy—the United States of America.

CLAREMORE, OKLA.

Could it be that Khrushchev is planning another Pearl Harbor when he thinks the time is right?

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Has everybody forgotten that Khrushchev has promised to bury us?

CHICAGO, ILL.

In full accordance with orthodox Marx Leninism the destruction of free society and the imposition of a worldwide Communist rule remains the ultimate aim of the Soviet Government.

TAMPA, FLA.

Signing of this agreement will put us right into the hands of the Communists.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

What I am afraid of is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the AEC are going to claim that we can keep the laboratories healthy and intact by maintaining a vigorous underground testing program. This claim, if uttered, will only help seal our doom because you and I know that the laboratories are going to fall apart at the seams.

GREENVILLE, S.C.

Open the eyes of some who are blind to this treaty's threat to our security.

GILLESPIE, ILL.

I am a Democrat but I have no faith in this test ban treaty.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Since the Soviets have violated every previous agreement they have made, there is no reason to feel they will not continue to do so. They know when they make agreements that they will keep them only so long as it

is profitable, but they figure that the sucker they entrap will continue to keep his word.

SANTA PAULA, CALIF.

I have been sickened over the test ban treaty. Congressman, why, do our people insist that we can do business with these Communists? Why? Why? When we play right into the hands of the Communist conspiracy do our newspapers hail such stupidity as a victory?

TORRANCE, CALIF.

It should not pass, and I have hopes that it won't.

LORIS, S.C.

Nikita is smart. He said he would take America like picking ripe fruit off a tree.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

There are no adequate safeguards to make sure the Russians would not cheat.

BROOKFIELD, WIS.

Seriously question as to the competence of the President's advisers in this critical area.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

Watch out for the passage of that phony unilateral peace program, which is as phony as a $3 bill.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

I want no part of the agreement.

DALLAS, TEX.

How the executive branch of our Government can be so naive and gullible in dealing with the ever-lying Communists is hard to comprehend.

SOUTH PASADENA, CALIF.

Vote against the limited test ban treaty.

SANTA ANA, CALIF.

The test ban makes war inevitable.

BOHEMIA, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

Why is the Red butcher who vows to bury us so suddenly willing to sign a test ban treaty? I can only suspect that this treaty helps the Communists at this time. They never deviate from their intended course. They change only their tactics.

MERION STATION, PA.

A sly accommodation to Nikita Khrushchev * * * playing with fire on this one—and a fire that conceivably could get out of hand.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

Oppose the Senate's ratification of the test ban treaty.

NORTH GEORGETOWN, OHIO.

Why even consider signing a test ban treaty with Russia if they can't show their good faith by first getting out of Cuba?

ARCATA, CALIF.

Against this "head-in-the-sand" test ban treaty. We have unfortunately acted like open-faced yokels.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

There motto is: "Agreements are like pie crusts, made to be broken."

SAN MARINO, CALIF.

Detrimental to the safety of the United States.

HESPERIA, CALIF.

It can do us no good, as we will keep our part of the treaty, but who will know about the others?

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.

We are looking to levelheaded people to prevent our making a mistake we might never recover from.

PORTLAND, OREG.

In our preamble and Constitution, article 1, section 8, is mentioned for defense but not a word about disarmament.

HOUSTON, TEX.

So many people don't know the dangerous risk we would be taking if it is ratified.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF.

Acceptance of the treaty by the United States will put us suddenly a great distance down the road toward eventual surrender to the Communist conspiracy.

CONNEAUT, OHIO.

Skulduggery.

Statement Commemorating the First National Bank of Gallipolis, Ohio, on Its 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the 100th anniversary of a bank whose constant goal has been dedication and service, the First National Bank of Gallipolis, Ohio.

On September 11 ceremonies commemorating a century of service by this bank to both the citizens of Gallipolis and the Ohio Valley will be observed in Gallipolis.

From its very inception in 1863 the bank under the guidance and through the administration of capable and dedicated men and women has served its customers in the highest tradition of banking. It has grown from a small rural institution to a landmark of the Ohio Valley. It is a landmark not because of unusual financial prowess in the banking world, but because of dependability, integrity, and an awareness of how it could meet the financial needs of its customers and the community. In this space-age world we sometimes have a tendency to forget some of our smaller, but enduring and dedicated business firms and institutions. We overlook institutions that serve the many needs of our smaller communities and outlying areas—better than our larger and better known banks that sometimes tend to be insufficiently aware of the needs of smaller cities.

But, it is difficult to overlook a bank that has accepted the challenge of adversity and overcome it to grow in the finest American tradition. Nor can one overlook a man who has dedicated over 50 of his 82 years to the banking world. Mr. Joe Moch is in his golden year as its president. Thus not only do we have a banking institution of note in Gallipolis, but one of the grand old gentlemen of banking.

A half century ago when Mr. Moch became president of the bank deposits totaled just over $200,000, but since have reached new heights of over $5 million. This in itself is a tribute to his devotion, service, and obviously untiring leadership. Many other statistics could be cited, such as the growth of the bank's surplus from $31,000 in 1913 to $600,000 in 1963 but statistics could never tell the story of the First National Bank nor of its president, Mr. Moch.

There are many First National Banks in this country. But few, if any, are as worthy of the name of First National Bank as is this First National Bank of Gallipolis. It has the distinction of being one of the very first banks to be chartered under the National Banking Act of 1863. For 100 years it has been faithful to the trust that was accorded to it by the granting of this charter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I consider it entirely fitting for the Congress of the United States to salute the Fist National Bank of Gallipolis on its centenary and to extend our heartiest congratulations to its distinguished president, Mr. Joe Moch, who has guided its destinies for exactly half of its first hundred years. We are confident that the First National Bank will continue to contribute to its community and to the Nation in the same spirit of dedication and service that have characterized its first century.

Come, Come to the Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, all over our great Nation, harvesttime is at hand. And the farmers of our country who have made America affluent in food, and meat, and drink, through their skilled and intensive farming, are now gathering in the great State fairs to show their prize stock, their blue ribbon vegetables, and their handiworks of all kinds. The Maryland State Fair takes place this year at Timonium, Md., from August 26 to September 4. I am delighted to extend to everyone the invitation printed in the Jeffersonian for Friday, August 23, 1963:

COME, COME TO THE FAIR

Try to please everybody and you wind up pleasing no one—that is, unless you are the gentlemen who produce the Maryland State Fair. The sponsors of this annual event, staged at Timonium Fair Grounds, intend the gala affair to satisfy all: boys and girls men and women, city people and country folk. And they succeed.

Interested in flower arranging? Witness an expert demonstrate that craft. Want to see what prize-winning livestock look like? Examine the top-grade steers, swine and sheep. Admire pretty girls? Enjoy the parade of 23 beauties, one from each of the State's counties, as they vie for the crown worn by the Maryland Farm Queen. The State fair is an oldtime custom with modern-day trimmings. So you will find virtually anything and everything, from A for ap-

ple to Z for Zoysia, at Timonium from August 26 through September 4.

It sounds trite to say so, but each year the traditional Timonium Fair is bigger and better—and you will be denying yourself much pleasure if you fail to attend this year's.

Tulsa Tribune Defends Arkansas Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the vicious attack printed in the August 16 issue of Life magazine concerning the Arkansas River multiple-purpose water development project and other equally meritorious public works and space agency programs has provoked the justified anger of many citizens in both public and private life.

We in Oklahoma are proud of the Arkansas River project and we are proud of one of its chief architects, the late Senator Robert S. Kerr. We deeply resent the way Life maligned both in its article.

One of the Southwest's outstanding newspapers—the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune—on August 13 carried a penetrating editorial exposing many of the fallacies of the Life article.

I think those who would rebuke such projects as the development of the Arkansas River Basin should read the Tribune's editorial. The editorial follows:

LIFE MAGAZINE'S EXPOSÉ

Life magazine has had a team of five researchers and writers peering into what it calls the national pork barrel and in the current issue comes up with a smear of the Arkansas River navigation project. We've read the story before.

It is one that crops up every few years from the part of the country that has been built with Federal largess. If you already have your harbor deepened by Uncle Sam and regularly maintained, you don't want a competing city to have a harbor. If you have a new post office, you can yell loudly when it is proposed to build one in a neighboring city.

The real reason for the birth of the Arkansas project and the earnest pursuit of it that finally resulted in the go-ahead order to the Army Engineers was that the pattern of railroad freight rates fixed upon Oklahoma was grossly unfair. Life magazine's researchers did such a shallow job that they never discovered that.

It has been cheaper to ship steel for oil country goods from the Chicago-Calumet mills to Houston than to Tulsa, though the distance was double. Similarly, Oklahoma was discriminated against from the Pittsburgh area. This was because the railroads met the water rates Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Houston enjoyed sitting on federally maintained rivers.

If this bloodied our nose, and it did, we lost red corpuscles from still another action permitted by the Federal Government. There was a freight rate penalty on every bushel of wheat, barrel of oil, or hundredweight of corn or grain sorghum shipped out of Oklahoma to make up for the railroads what they said they lost meeting water freight rate competition in other parts of the country.

Whatever makes a Member of Congress or a Life magazine editor believe that an American will be content to accept these handicaps forever? There never was a moment in the early stages of the evolution of the Arkansas River project when its most ardent backers would not have settled for a square deal in railroad freight rates. And this was something one Federal bureau or another might have won for them. But neither Life magazine nor its counterpart of those days, or Senator DOUGLAS of the river freight rate favored State of Illinois or Senator PROXMIRE or his predecessors of Wisconsin which has Lake Michigan at its front door, were even slightly interested in that fairplay. The stage was thus set perfectly for Senator Kerr to come along and champion the underdog successfully.

The Arkansas River project will be completed despite Life magazine or other exposés. For what started out simply to earn fair freight rates for the growing middle of the country and did at times appear to be an expensive way to get that, has blossomed into something much greater. The absolute necessity of flood control has become apparent to the burgeoning country. The economy of firming up steam-made electric power with cheap waterpower, and it is cheap when it is incidental to flood control and navigation, has become important. The mounting need for domestic water supplies alone underwrites most of the new giant reservoirs. The creation of the wonderful recreational areas in a country long buffeted about by some of nature's most unpleasant whims is well warranted.

"Billions thrown away" screams Life magazine, and the echoes come from the fat cats who represent the States long favored by Federal grants. We are not worried. In such high and selfish places regard for others is seldom to be found.

Special House Committee on the Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House and with the proponents of freedom everywhere in supporting the desire for freedom and liberty which continues to burn in the hearts of the peoples of the captive nations.

We, in the United States are fortunate to be living in a country founded upon principles of human dignity and representative government. There are, regrettably, those who are not so blessed. The friends and relatives of hundreds of my Pittsburgh constituents still live under the militarily supported rule of Soviet imperialism. It is a rule that denies the existence of fundamental human concepts of freedom and dignity.

Emancipation of these captive peoples is our ultimate goal. Our weapons in this effort are many: ideological, psychological, political, economic, and diplomatic—a flexibility calculated to meet every subtle change in the Communist power structure. It is imperative that, in our desire to achieve eventual liberation of these Soviet colonies, we leave no avenue of approach unexplored.

Encouraging successes in this area have already been noted but complacency is by no means indicated. The erosion of the ideological wall of solidarity, coupled with internal economic pressures, has brought about a gradual relaxation of autocracy. This, however, represents an expedient concession by the Communists rather than recognition of inherent individual rights.

It is therefore singularly appropriate that, acting through their freely elected representatives, the people of the United States continue to expose Soviet colonialism to freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Rights: Cover for Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the San Gabriel Valley Sunday Tribune of August 18, 1963. The article is entitled "Rights: Cover for Power Grab."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTS: COVER FOR POWER GRAB

Civil rights are those guaranteed American citizens by the Constitution—the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right of peaceful assembly and free speech, and the right to own private property. They should apply for all, regardless of color or creed, and in our opinion should not be twisted to the advantage of any individual or group.

We are now being told that the civil rights bill of 1963 will eradicate racial discrimination and let Negro citizens have the same civil rights as white citizens. However, it seems to us that sections of this bill go far beyond civil rights. In fact, if enacted, certain sections would deprive citizens of their civil rights.

Although this program is traveling under the cover of civil rights, and to speak against it is akin to being for sin, it seems that the measure primarily is an extension of Federal power.

Under the civil rights program the President is seeking power to control every home, school, business, farm, and bank. Under the program the Federal Government would have the power to call, foreclose, or refuse loans, to exclude individuals and businesses from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits without notice. It would give the Federal Government the power to tell businessmen who they may hire, fire, promote or demote. The Government could blacklist banks, contractors, schools, businesses, and individuals.

These are vast powers. They are far more sweeping and arbitrary than any President has ever sought—even in time of war. If Congress accepts this civil rights program in its entirety, it will have curtailed the traditional rights of trial by jury and appeal, it will have virtually erased State lines and State's rights.

Such an influx of centralized Federal control of the lives of men is frightening. And it bodes to be just a step in the continuing grab for power by the Federal Government. As the President has said, "the enactment of the legislation I suggest will not solve all our problems." To us, this indicates plans are already afoot to seek greater centralization of power.

A confederation of States did not work because it provided no central authority to give unity to our new country. For good historical reasons our Founding Fathers shied away from a centralized government with an all powerful monarch. The answer was a federation of States into a country known as the United States of America. It provided balance of power. We don't want to see that balance destroyed by further power grabs by Washington under the guise of civil rights legislation.

Area Redevelopment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the position of the Chamber of Commerce of Ironton, Ohio, and set forth its stand on expenditures by the Area Redevelopment Administration, I wish to include in the RECORD the following letter from D. Bruce Evans:

IRONTON, OHIO,
August 20, 1963.

Hon. HOMER E. ABELE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Some time ago, a group of local businessmen were invited to attend an orientation session being held at Rio Grande College by the district officer of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Some six persons attended this session. During their visit to Rio Grande, they were asked to sign an attendance roster and did, not realizing the consequences. Since that time, the ARA has issued a list of persons and/or organizations in support of their program. These businessmen appeared on this list. I have had an opportunity to discuss this with each person involved and they inform me that they attended this session as a matter of information and to learn just what ARA is about. They in no way meant for their names to be used in support of the ARA program and are disgruntled to find that this is being done.

This past month, I have addressed two service clubs in direct opposition to ARA with the full knowledge and consent of the board of directors of the Ironton Chamber of Commerce. Ironton has been included in the distressed area category, and we don't like it. This organization will do everything in its power to oppose any increased spending in the ARA program because (1) the United States of America cannot afford it; (2) it places the Federal Government in the banking business in direct competition to free enterprise organizations in this field; (3) we feel that the employment of our people is our problem and that if this program is discontinued, local persons can and will take the initiative to solve the problem; and (4) that ARA funds do not help in any way to eliminate the problem, but merely to transplant it from one area to another.

The Ironton Chamber of Commerce would like to take this opportunity to thank you for voicing your opposition and ours to any increased spending on the part of the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Sincerely,

IRONTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
D. BRUCE EVANS.

Senator Monroney Delivers Oologah Dedication Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last month on July 20, members of Oklahoma's congressional delegation, leading business and political figures in Oklahoma, and hundreds of Oklahoma citizens joined together in dedicating the Oologah Dam and Reservoir.

This was a memorable event in Oklahoma and it culminated the hopes and dreams of many who have followed the progress of the Oologah project for a quarter of a century since it was first authorized in 1938.

The Oologah Dam and Reservoir is the first major unit to be completed on the Arkansas-Verdigris River navigation project.

One of the highlights at the Oologah dedication ceremonies was the speech delivered by Oklahoma's able senior Senator, the Honorable MIKE MONRONEY. Senator MONRONEY has been a champion of water conservation and development throughout his illustrious career in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate.

Senator MONRONEY's remarks point out in graphic terms the benefits to be derived from the Arkansas River development program and the necessity of continuing to develop and conserve our water resources. The complete text of his remarks follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY AT THE DEDICATION OF OOLOGAH DAM, JULY 20, 1963

Today we dedicate the first of three great projects that make possible the first man-made navigation channel in Oklahoma.

Mark Twain once sad that the Army Engineers had started out to make the Mississippi over again—a task which he claimed was exceeded only by the original job. We are in the same posture as we envision the massive job undertaken on the unruly Arkansas.

But here we are—at a dedication service for the Oologah Dam and Reservoir, which was first authorized 25 years ago. Next year we will dedicate the Eufaula project (dam to be completed June 1964), which will control the Canadian River system, and the Keystone project (dam to be completed December 1964), which will control the upper Arkansas and all its major tributaries above the confluence of the Verdigris, which is controlled by this great project.

Oologah, Eufaula, and Keystone—three great mountains of earth, rock, steel, and concrete erected across three unruly rivers. These had to be completed before we could direct our attention to the construction of the navigation canal.

The tons and tons of silt carried by the Canadian, the Arkansas, and the Verdigris had to be trapped—the torrents of flood waters had to be impounded—before we could begin the locks and dams, the revetments, and the channel straightening which will form our waterway to the sea.

The Corps of Engineers has adopted a unique way of putting all the pieces together in the right way at the right time. They call it the "Critical Path Method." This system is one devised by the armed services for programing construction of complex missile base systems. It was also used successfully in the Navy's Polaris program. I am told that by following the recommendations of the "mechanical brain" the construction schedule can be maintained with the reliable assurance of navigation to Pine Bluff in 1968, to Fort Smith in 1969, and to Catoosa in 1970, provided, of course, that Congress furnishes the money. I assure you that it is the objective of the Oklahoma delegation to see to that.

The Arkansas project is expected to exceed the benefits of the already developed Tennessee, which is used as the "showcase" of America to foreign visitors interested in the field of conservation, and where private investment in job-creating industries along what was once a useless, dangerous river has already surpassed the total public investment required to control its waters.

We have no reason to believe that our Arkansas will not develop as profitably as the great Ohio, which is returning $11 on each $1 invested. The former chief of Engineers, Emerson Itschner, said at Tulsa that we had all the resources that made the industrial complex of the Ohio grow at the rate of $1 billion per year, plus a great abundance of fuel resources and bauxite. Who here wishes to dispute the chief?

The Columbia River development is returning $5 to $1, the lower Mississippi $6 to $1, and the lower Colorado almost $3 to $1.

Where else can we invest to secure such a handsome return? I favor economy in Government. I favor, when possible a balanced budget. But I also favor accelerating the investments that we as a Government make in our soil and water programs.

Each project we create is the equivalent of a new industry. It creates jobs, which means payrolls. It creates new opportunity for industries and for recreation. Each visitor to this project will spend an average of $3 per day. He will create a demand for capital investments of $10 to supply him with goods and services.

Our good friend and colleague Senator FULBRIGHT, testifying before the Appropriations Committee, pointed out that since 1900 the United States had spent $21.5 billion on Army Engineer, Bureau of Reclamation, and Tennessee Valley programs. He pointed out that this is less than one-third of the amount budgeted for defense purposes for the coming year. The Corps of Engineers has advised us that this project will create in excess of $1 billion in new business each year for Oklahoma and Arkansas, and the direct benefits from its operation will amount to $64.5 million a year, which is $6 million more in annual benefits than is required to amortize the project in 50 years.

We are running out of time. We need to realize that our demands for conservation are growing much more rapidly than our development program.

The Russians are determined to overtake the United States in hydroelectric power and water development by 1975.

Congressional committees that have visited Russia report the Russians consider their mighty river systems their greatest inexhaustible resource. They are sparing no effort and no expense to have the greatest harnessed and utilized river system in the world (spending $2 to our $1).

The priority of river development is hydroelectric power, navigation, irrigation, flood

control, fish, wildlife, and recreation, water supply.

The U.S.S.R. is catching up with the United States in electric power production, the basic field in which supremacy counts heavily in peaceful and economic competition or in event of war (10 percent of river investment going into power).

Although the United States is still far ahead, with 142 million installed kilowatts at the beginning of 1959, compared with 53 million in the U.S.S.R., the Russians could overtake us in 1975—in 12 years—unless we speed up or they slow down.

The U.S.S.R. allocates almost four-fifths of its power to industry. The United States uses a far smaller share of its power in goods-producing industry. This means that the U.S.S.R. could surpass the United States in the amount of power allocated to industry in 1973—in 10 years.

The U.S.S.R., vigorously pursuing its oft-stated goal of overtaking the United States in economic production, has undertaken literally hundreds of new starts on water developments within the past 5 years.

Ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in bringing you the following greetings from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 13, 1963.

The completion of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir is an event of considerable satisfaction to me. Its relief of the misery and loss from floods, its needed water supply, and its enhancement of recreational and wild life opportunities will be important contributions to a better life for the people in the area. As a key reservoir in the multiple-purpose plan for development of the water resources of the Arkansas River Basin, it signals a major milestone in bringing to the people Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Kansas the benefit of an invaluable waterway connection to the Mississippi. This occasion is also a tribute to the late Senator Kerr and to those Members of Congress who are participating today in the dedication exercises.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Sensing the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a number of persons have written to me recommending inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a recent column by Mr. Thurman Sensing. The column is entitled "Commissars in the United States" and is on the subject of the infamous Gesell report. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSARS IN THE UNITED STATES
(By Thurman Sensing)

An attempt to create a commissar system in the American Armed Forces and to make civilian communities in the United States subject to the political orders of military base commanders has been proposed in the infamous Gesell report issued this summer. Every American who is opposed to utilization of the Defense Establishment as instrument of pressure on our free citizenry should read this report.

The full title of the 93-page report is "Equality of Treatment and Opportunity for Negro Military Personnel Stationed Within the United States." This is a mild-sounding title, but the actual document contains a body blow at freedom of thought and action in this country.

Here are some of the recommendations made in the Gesell report:

Base commanders should appoint biracial committees in the communities to break down racial separation.

Civic clubs should not be joined by military personnel if they are not integrated.

Methods are suggested for getting around local segregated housing by leasing homes in the name of the Government and moving Negroes in.

Promotion of officers should be based on their initiative and accomplishments in forcing integration.

Military personnel should be allowed to patronize only those establishments that are integrated.

Girls who believe in segregation are not to be allowed on bases for social functions.

Negro hostesses should be considered at base functions instead of white.

Military promotion boards should not be allowed to view photographs of officers under consideration.

A base snooper should be appointed to whom those with complaints are encouraged to make anonymous charges of discrimination.

Base commanders are to be held personally responsible for promoting integration on and off base.

The recommendations are so outrageous—so much in violation of law and custom in this country—that one can hardly believe they are serious. But they are to be taken seriously. It is the clear aim of the Kennedy administration to use the military bases to force radical social change in this country. As in the Communist armies, political commissars are to ride herd on officers and men alike and to guide nearby civilian communities. The Gesell report makes plain that it is not enough for an officer to be a skilled military professional; he must hold the political opinions of the administration. This isn't American, however; it is the kind of setup one finds in the Red army.

The Gesell report should open the eyes of millions of Americans to the kind of radical reconstruction of the United States that the Kennedy administration seeks. It aims to get its way by a combination of military and economic pressures. If a community adjacent to a base refuses to come to heel, the administration intends to declare the area off limits.

Who are the people who were appoined by President Kennedy to this committee? Gerhard Gesell, whose name the report bears, is a Washington lawyer. Congressman HÉBERT, of Louisiana, has reported that Mr. Gesell in effect only loaned his name to the committee and that the report actually was drafted by N. S. Colley, an official of the NAACP in California. Other members chosen by Mr. Kennedy to make recommendations for U.S. Armed Forces include Abe Fortas, a liberal wheelhorse and former adviser to the U.S. delegation to the U.N. meeting in San Francisco in 1945; Benjamin Muse, ultra liberal writer from Virginia and foe of conservative government in that State; John H. Sengstacke, an official of the Hampton Institute, a Negro college; and Whitney M. Young, director of the Urban League, who went on record this summer as saying that Negroes should receive preferential treatment.

The Gesell report is a national shame. The Armed Forces of the United States exist to defend this country against its foreign enemies, and for no other reason. The Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps certainly do not exist for the purpose of pushing the Kennedys' pet social theories or for helping the Kennedy administration win more Negro votes in the 1964 election.

Congress should make it plain to the White House that a commissar system has no place in the Defense Establishment of the United States.

Remarks by Dr. Frank P. Graham, United Nations Mediator to Pakistan and India, at the 1,200th Performance of Paul Green's Symphonic Drama "The Lost Colony" in Waterside Theater at Manteo, N.C., on Friday Night, August 16, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker on Friday night, August 16, the 1,200th performance of Paul Green's symphonic drama, "The Lost Colony," was played in the Waterside Theater at Manteo, N.C. This is the stirring story of Sir Walter Raleigh's pioneering efforts at colonization at what has come to be the United States of America. This commemorative occasion was highlighed by the remarks of Dr. Frank P. Graham, a distinguished North Carolinian and United Nations mediator to Pakistan and India. In his brief remarks Dr. Graham movingly pointed to the symbolism of the drama wherein the author "has chosen to light candles of heritage and hope rather than to curse the darkness of history and mystery into which the first colonists passed from these historic shores."

I commend Dr. Graham's remarks to your attention:

These lifetime passes to every hundredth purchaser of a ticket tonight are awarded in honor of this the 1,200th performance of "The Lost Colony" given on this commemorative occasion by this able and devoted community cast and staff. Tonight we also salute Chairman Francis Winslow and Gen. John Phillips of the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission; the 200 4-H Club youth and L. R. Harrill, their leader for 37 years; the U.S. Park Service; Roanoke Island Colony Memorial Association; their successor, the Roanoke Island Historical Association; the people of Dare; the Manteo Players; the original incorporators; the financial benefactors and the present president, the dynamic Emma Neal Morrison and especially Paul Green, the eminent author and all those whose faith and generous energies have kept this drama living with the revolutionary meaning of America and challenging with the unceasing adventures of equal freedom unfolding more and more from generation to generation.

In honor of this performance tonight we do not have a fatted calf to kill, but we do have an anniversary cake to cut for the colony that was lost and is found again for the 1,200th time tonight.

In an old classic quotation which I paraphrase in saying that Paul Green in this pioneering beautiful outdoor symphonic drama has chosen to light candles of heritage

and hope rather than to curse the darkness of history and mystery into which the first colonists passed from these historic shores.

These pioneering shores of Roanoke Island on which Sir Walter Raleigh stumbled became the steppingstone of empires. Virginia Dare, conceived in England and born in America, became the prophetic symbol of both the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America. This partnership of free people strengthens and lengthens the links of freedom in an imperiled world.

We live in a darkening world of the precarious peace of deterrent terror in which the panicked press of a button may suddenly end the human race, evolved over countless ages in the physical descent and spiritual ascent of men, and quickly lay in global ruins the civilization patiently accumulated in thousands of years.

May the lighting of these candles amid the darkness of this night bring the glimmer of the morning for the mothers and children of men. May the ratification of the test ban treaty by the U.S. Senate, amid the hazards of a broken and bi-polar world, become prophetic of the steadfast hopes of man's unresting dreams of building on the earth a nobler home of the family of man in the dauntless struggle of the human spirit through the United Nations for equal freedom, justice, and peace under law and human brotherhood under God in these times of mortal peril and immortal hope for all people everywhere.

Columnist John Morley Views Moscow Pact No Help to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on recent days many U.S. and foreign newspapers have carried the concerned views of Columnist John Morley regarding the test ban treaty as follows:

IS THIS PEACEFUL SURRENDER?

(By John Morley)

"It's in the half-fools and the half-wise that the greatest danger lies."—GOETHE.

The radio blared: "People of the world, listen, please, please listen.

"Help us not with advice * * * not with words * * * but with action. We need guns, not speeches in the United Nations. We, our wives and children are right now being slaughtered. Please, we plead with you that communism will not stop here. You may be the next victim. For God's sake, save us."

Those were the last words and the final plea made by the Hungarian Freedom radio, Sunday, November 6, 1956 and given to me a few months later by the underground in Budapest.

What happened next is history. We ignored the plea. We ignored Korea. We ignored the Berlin wall. We ignored Cuba. We ignored the violation of 50 out of 53 Soviet agreements.

We ignored the President's branding Khrushchev as "a liar" on the Cuba rockets. We ignore the facts of history upon the promise now of a proven repeated liar that he will honor a nuclear test ban.

IGNORING CAPTIVE NATIONS

Seven years after the Hungarian massacre, we are still ignoring the pleas of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain, now stretching to Cuba.

We seem to be more concerned with the feelings of Khrushchev than we are with the lives of millions he has enslaved. We dare not cross him. We run like scared animals to Moscow. We eagerly seek to compromise with Communist policies. We are afraid that he will make war if we don't.

WAR WORSE THAN COMMUNISM?

Coming out of Washington is the implication that it is not Communist enslavement we should fear most, but war. Khrushchev got the message and hastened to perfect his 100-megaton bomb * * * then conned us into the test ban.

He now has no competitor in the 100-megaton club. He may never be forced to drop it. But our children and their children will live under this Communist blackmail, unless we perfect other kinds of defense weapons to offset this danger.

SOME FALSE ASSUMPTIONS

Khrushchev and Mao are not split about our burial but how it will be done. Khrushchev appears to prefer slow poison. Mao wants the dagger in the heart. God forbid, but should there ever be a funeral, they'll be there bear-hugging each other from Moscow to Peiping.

There are false assumptions that we can win over Russia by compromise. Compromise to a Communist means weakness.

We are told that a nuclear race leads to war. This is not quite so. World War I, World War II, and Korea are proof. In each case the United States was in no arms race, but unarmed—and war came.

War comes when one side thinks it has military superiority * * * not when armaments are in close balance. While the United States does not possess 100-megaton bombs, it has enough bombs to worry the Kremlin. But if the Reds violate the treaty and test secretly, thus gaining a substantial superiority, then war is inevitable—or surrender.

There are false assumptions that since some 100 nations will eventually sign the treaty, Khrushchev will not dare violate it. This is wishful thinking.

The UN charter was signed by the nations of the world, too, yet Mr. K. violated it in Korea, Hungary, by enslavement of his satellites * * * and by not paying his U.N. assessment. Communists don't give a hoot about world public opinion.

TREATY TO EASE COLD WAR

There are false assumptions that the treaty will lead to easing tensions, like Berlin. If Berlin tensions are eased, it will not be because of the treaty, but because of U.S. U.S. concessions.

President Kennedy said he made no "secret deals" and we believe he didn't. But did he make secret concessions that may lead to open deals later?

White House correspondents say that some 30 secret letters passed between Kennedy and Khrushchev, but none was made public. What's in those letters on Berlin?

There are false assumptions that Kennedy surprised and frightened Khrushchev over the Cuba quarantine last October. The facts are that Mr. K. brought his rockets to Cuba undetected. The facts are that he could have buried them in the Cuban hills, but laid them out on the surface so U-2 photoreconnaissance would find them. When we caught him in the lie, he agreed to remove them.

During that same week we announced our removal of Jupiter rockets from Turkey. It may be a coincidence, but Turkish intelligence says it was not. There was no previous discussion with our ally.

Besides, Mr. K. still has his troops in Cuba, and who knows how many rockets are still there, since we withdrew our previous condition of on-site inspection.

SURRENDER BEGAN IN CUBA

Representative AUGUST JOHANSEN, of Michigan, recently sent the following telegram to President Kennedy:

"We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our immigration and Justice Department authorities."

The curious fact about this telegram is that it was not composed by Representative JOHANSEN.

The words are exactly as spoken by Candidate John F. Kennedy at Johnstown, Pa., on October 15, 1960, in accusing the Eisenhower administration, of all things, of peaceful surrender to communism.

The Need for Highway Reform Legislation as Contained in H.R. 2557, Justified and Discussed by Robert L. May, Minority Counsel, Special Subcommittee, Federal Aid Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the very studied and learned remarks of Mr. Robert L. May, minority counsel, Special Subcommittee, Federal Aid Highway Program, U.S. House of Representatives, on the subject of additional highway reform legislation, discussing in particular the bill which I introduced for this purpose, H.R. 2557, and comparing it to H.R. 5713 and H.R. 6080 as proposed by the administration, provides compelling evidence of the need for enactment of this highway reform legislation.

It is unfortunate that the Judiciary Committee of the House, on which I serve, has still been unwilling to set hearings on the matter or to take action regarding it.

I believe the remarks of Mr. May, who is an authority on the subject, will further evidence this need:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AS A LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEM

(By Robert L. May)

There is no doubt that conflict of interest is now, and has been for some time, one of the most difficult, important, and frustrating problems confronting governmental agencies at all levels. It is an administrative problem because it involves basic questions of policy and practicality, as well as principles of ethics and integrity. It is a legal problem because any effort to regulate it involves questions of the legal authority to regulate, valid means of regulation and enforcement, and the rights of public officials as citizens, as well as technical problems of drafting a clear, unambiguous regulation or statute.

One of the basic problems is that of defining the term "conflict of interest." I suppose that, broadly speaking, the term could

be defined as "any situation in which a public official required to make an official decision finds his personal beliefs, desires, aims, or objectives incompatible with the beliefs, desires, aims, or objectives of his employing agency or the public which the agency was created to serve." Such a definition is obviously too broad to serve as the basis for a regulation or statute prohibiting conflicts of interest. In the first place, the regulation or statute would probably be too vague to be enforceable, and in the second place, it would certainly inhibit, if not prevent, the free expression of ideas, opinions, and disagreements which is so essential to the making of decisions in governmental agencies.

Because of this problem of definition, most efforts to regulate conflicts of interest have consisted of selecting certain specific activities or circumstances (usually involving financial matters) and prohibiting them by regulation or statute, without attempting to define the general term "conflicts of interest." The rest of this paper will be directed toward the problems involved in selecting specific activities and circumstances as the subject for regulation, a description of some of the ways in which the problems have been met, and references to sources of more detailed information. I will discuss several conflict of interest cases in the highway program because this is a gathering of highway lawyers and conflicts of interest problems exist in the highway program as well as other governmental activities and are of particular interest to you. However, most of the recent dicsussion and study of conflicts of interest has been directed toward Government and Government officials generally.

During recent years, much publicity has been given to cases of conflicts of interest on the part of public officials. The latter part of the Truman administration was marred by scandals, investigations, and indictments of Federal officials. In 1958, nationwide attention was focused on the case of Sherman Adams, assistant to the President, who accepted substantial gifts from a manufacturer friend who had several matters pending in Federal agencies. Earlier this month, a Federal court jury in Baltimore returned verdicts of guilty against two former Congressmen charged with conflicts of interest in the use of their congressional position and influence.

In the highway field, the investigations of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal aid highway program have revealed cases of conflict of interest as well as other deplorable incidents. Some of these cases are as follows:

In Oklahoma, a member of the highway commission was a secret partner in a firm doing highway work and shared in its profits while a member of the commission.[1]

In Florida, a number of State employees regularly and frequently accepted money and other things of value from highway contractors and subcontractors.[2] Also in Florida, an intricate arrangement between contractors and public officials with respect to the disposition of improvements from highway rights-of-way resulted in substantial profits to all concerned except the highway department, which had purchased the land and buildings with public funds.[3]

In New Mexico, two highway commissioners had interests in private businesses which sold substantial amounts of material and supplies to contractors constructing Federal aid highway projects for the State.[4]

In Massachusetts, there existed a revolting pattern of conspiracy between certain attorneys, appraisers, and State employees, resulting in the payment of clearly inflated prices for property acquired for highway rights-of-way—with the proceeds of the excessive payments going largely to the conspirators rather than to the property owners.[5]

In West Virginia, a highway department right-of-way supervisor employed his own woefully untrained and unqualified son to appraise property to be acquired for highway rights-of-way. The same right-of-way supervisor negotiated on behalf of the State for the acquisition of property for highway right-of-way, while at the same time conducting negotiations (for a commission) between the owner and a third party relative to the sale of the part not needed for highway purposes.[6]

Incidents such as these are undesirable, to say the very least. Despite these and many other irregularities, few criminal convictions for offenses involving the Federal-aid highway program have been obtained in either State or Federal courts. In fact, out of the highway cases I mentioned, the only criminal convictions of which I am aware concerned the Massachusetts episode. This suggests that either the laws or enforcement efforts or both are inadequate.

It should also be noted that the first hearings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program concerning the practices of a State highway department were held in May of 1960, with respect to Oklahoma and, in November of 1960, the American Association of State Highway Officials published "An Informational Guide on Project Procedures" which emphasized the necessity for personal integrity and eliminating conflicts of interest. Since then, the subcommittee has held six public hearings involving five other States, and all have revealed cases of fraud, irregularities and conflicts of interest.

The latest hearings of the subcommittee, which involved certain highway projects in Arizona,[7] were held in May of 1963—almost exactly 3 years after the Oklahoma hearings and 2½ years after the AASHO publication. Yet, the disclosures of falsification of tests and reports by Arizona highway department employees who were afraid they would lose their jobs if they prepared accurate records were startlingly similar to those in Oklahoma. This is a disturbing indication that administrative action—really effective administrative action—concerning irregularities and conflicts of interest in the highway program is lagging.

It is apparent that conflicts of interest in the highway program create many difficult legal and administrative problems. However, the major problems are not necessarily attributable to the number of conflict-of-interest cases. Considering the number of persons and the amount of money involved in the highway programs, serious conflicts of interest have been comparatively few.

The most bothersome legal and administrative problems arise from a number of factors, including the odd nature of conflicts of interest as a subject for regulation, the fact that not all conflicts of interest can or should be regulated, and the definite effect of public opinion.

Most of the traditional laws and regulations which prohibit certain acts or conduct are directed toward acts or conduct generally recognized as being evil or injurious in themselves. Bribery, theft, fraud and the like may involve certain elements of conflict of interest, but the laws prohibiting such acts are not generally concerned with that aspect—the laws simply prohibit that which is accepted as evil. But the existence of a conflict of interest does not necessarily mean that an evil or unethical act has been committed. There is nothing morally or ethically wrong with a government official having financial and other interests outside his government employment. Even where an official has interests which conflict with those of the government, it does not necessarily follow that the official will resolve the conflict to his own personal advantage rather than that of the government. However, a person in a position of conflicting interests is subject to temptation when he is required to make a decision, regardless of how he resolves the issue.

Thus, regulation of conflicts of interest is unusual in that it is not directed toward specific evil acts but is intended to prevent situations of temptation from arising. It is regulation of evil before the event; it is regulation against potential harm.

It is generally recognized that not all conflicts of interest can or should be regulated. Membership in religious and other organizations, family ties and personal friendships, loyalties to schools, former business associates and the like, may well influence an official, and to a degree constitute conflicts of interest. It is questionable whether regulation of such influences should be attempted, and if the attempt were made it is very doubtful that the regulation could be enforced effectively. For this reason, most efforts to regulate conflicts of interest have been limited to matters involving personal economic and financial interests, and this paper is largely directed toward those efforts.

Even when efforts to regulate conflicts of interest are limited to financial and economic interests, difficult questions remain. In order to function effectively, the Government must be able to obtain qualified and informed persons as employees or as temporary experts or consultants. Conflict-of-interest regulations so stringently drawn and enforced that persons accepting a Government position or assignment would have to divest themselves of a substantial part of their financial interests would certainly discourage many persons with desperately needed talents and knowledge from accepting a governmental assignment. This is particularly true with respect to persons who might serve the Government temporarily or intermittently, such as consulting engineers, property appraisers, special attorneys, and the like.

Thus, the regulation of conflicts of interest involves two basic considerations. First, ethical standards in the Government must be beyond reproach. Second, the Government must be in a position to obtain the personnel and information it needs. Conflict-of-interest regulations must be so drawn as to promote each of these without subordinating either to the other.

Now, as to the effect of public opinion. Most Americans are convinced that motives of personal profit or advantage are strong if not dominant factors in determining human conduct. Many persons are all too willing to assume that public officials are alert to opportunities to make a quick dollar, and are not unduly restrained by the duties and responsibilities of their official position. If a public officer or employee has financial interests which tend to conflict with his official duties or responsibilities, it will be very, very difficult to convince most of the citizens that he will resist temptation and act without regard to his personal interests, even though he may do exactly that. If the public believes that an official is acting to his own advantage, rather than that of the public, support for that official and the governmental agency or program he represents will be lacking. And without public support neither the official, the agency nor the program can long survive. Thus, in considering this subject, attention should be given to those things which have the appearance of being undesirable conflicts of interest as well as those which are so in fact. To preserve public confidence, government officials must avoid the appearance of evil as well as that which is actually evil.

With these basic considerations in mind, we can turn to the more specific subjects of regulatory efforts. I have already noted that

Footnotes at end of speech.

most efforts to regulate conflicts of interest have been limited to matters involving personal financial matters. Five areas of conduct have been the topic of most conflict of interest laws and regulations. These areas are (1) acceptance of gratuities; (2) outside employment; (3) financial interests; (4) use and disclosure of government information; and (5) activities of former employees of an agency. It might be well to discuss these areas very briefly.

Gratuities: Payment to an official for a particular action in connection with his official duties is bribary. Acceptance of gifts or gratuities by an official or employee does not necessarily constitute bribery, but is uniformly agreed to be poor practice. Certainly, the acceptance of gifts or gratuities of substantial value can place a public official in a conflict of interest situation, and most assuredly, most members of the public would assume that such acceptance would affect the judgment of the official in matters involving the donor.

Outside employment: In many agencies, outside employment is permitted so long as the employee performs his official duties satisfactorily and observes regular office hours. However, some kinds of outside employment constitute or create conflicts of interest. A highway department engineer or inspector who accepts part-time employment with a contractor whose work he is supposed to be supervising is certainly in a conflict of interest position.

Personal financial interest: The most simple and obvious conflict of interest situation is that which is created by the financial interests and personal property holdings of a public official or employee which are influenced or affected by the activities of the agency which employs him. Even this aspect of the matter has considerable complications. For example, an attorney for a highway department might own stock in a utility company without encountering a conflict of interest situation. On the other hand, if the highway department and the utility company later became involved in a dispute as to the removal of the company's facilities or acquisition of some of its properties, a conflict of interest may arise. Government employees have the same rights as other citizens and should be as free as possible to own property and conduct their financial activities as they see fit. The problem is to devise controls which will prevent conflicts of interest situations from arising while still allowing the employee substantial economic freedom.

Inside information: Control of the improper use of inside information has two aspects: First, the possible use of information for an employee's own private advantage and, secondly, the premature release of such information to unauthorized persons. Land speculators who obtain advance information as to the location of a porposed highway can realize substantial profits. Contractors who obtain advance information not available to other contractors with respect to cost estimates, etc., have an advantage over their competitors in bidding for contracts. This particular problem can be approached in two ways: By carefully written laws and regulations prohibiting and punishing the premature release of confidential information to unauthorized persons, or by conducting the agency's affairs in such a way that very little confidential information exists, or, in other words, so that all or most of the information concerning the agency activities is available to all members of the public equally. A person cannot gain unfair advantage by using information which is available to the general public.

Postemployment dealings: A former employee of an agency may have a distinct advantage over his adversaries in dealings with that agency because of possession of confidential information, special knowledge as to the practices and procedures of the agency, personal friendship, and the like. This problem may be somewhat beyond the scope of "conflict of interest" as we are discussing the subject here, but this aspect of the overall problem should be considered in drafting any statute or regulation on the subject.

Now, as to recent developments and sources of further information on this subject.

One of the most comprehensive studies of conflicts of interest was undertaken by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and published under the title "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service." [9] This is an entertaining as well as an informative book and, I would recommend it highly to all who are working on or interested in the subject. Although the study deals almost entirely with conflicts of interest in the Federal Service it contains a wealth of background information and is definitely a classic in the field.

A valuable source of information concerning the details of existing State laws and administrative orders on conflicts of interest applicable to State highway employees is a tabulation and summary prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads at the request of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program. This tabulation and summary appears as an appendix to one of the reports of the special subcommittee.[9]

In October 1962, the Congress enacted, and the President approved, an act "to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes." [10] The complexities of this subject are suggested by the fact that the studies which led to enactment of the law began in 1957. In that year, the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary was directed to prepare a detailed study and analysis of existing Federal conflict-of-interest laws to the end that they might be revised, simplified, and coordinated to prevent improper and unethical practices, while at the same time preserving the dignity of Government service and maintaining its attractiveness to competent men and women.[11]

In April of 1961, the President transmitted a special message to Congress on conflicts of interest.[12] With respect to the eight then-existing Federal conflict-of-interest statutes the President noted that five were enacted before 1873, and said:

"The fundamental defect of these statutes as presently written is that: On the one hand, they permit an astonishing range of private interests and activities by public officials which are wholly incompatible with the duties of public office; on the other hand, they create wholly unnecessary obstacles to recruiting qualified people for Government service. This latter deficiency is particularly serious in the case of consultants and other temporary employees, and has been repeatedly recognized by Congress in its enactment of special exemption statutes."

As I mentioned above, the act to revise and strengthen the general Federal conflict-of-interest statutes law became law on October 23, 1962. The act continued with strengthening changes the prohibitions of previous laws, made special provisions applicable to consultants and temporary employees, consolidated and revised the laws prohibiting bribery, and incorporated all of the provisions in a single chapter of the criminal code. The reports of the congressional committees which handled this act contain a detailed summary and analysis of the act, as well as considerable background material.[13] If you are interested in pursuing the matter further, you may want to read the President's memorandum of May 2, 1963, to the executive departments and agencies on "Preventing Conflicts of Interest on the Part of Special Government Employees" [14] and a memorandum of the Attorney General of the United States concerning the revised Federal law.[15]

So far as the Federal-aid highway program is concerned, there are several items of interest. You are no doubt familiar with the Federal statute concerning anti-collusion statements by highway contractors,[16] the so-called "Anti-Kickback Act," [17] the statute prohibiting false statements concerning highway projects [18] and the so-called "Hatch Act" [19] which prohibits certain types of political activities by State employees engaged in Federally financed programs. Strictly speaking, none of these is a conflict of interest statute in the sense we are using that term here, yet all of them concern matters which are at least related to conflicts of interest.

Section 1.33 of the Regulations for Administration of Federal-Aid for Highways [20] specifically concerns conflicts of interest, and prohibits officials and employees of State highway departments from having any financial or other personal interest in highway department contracts or subcontracts. However, the Regulation states that "It shall be the responsibility of the States to enforce the requirements of this section," and the Bureau of Public Roads has not promulgated procedural guidelines to implement this section. The Bureau has issued a "Statement of Policy as to Administrative Action to be Taken by the Federal Highway Administrator in Instances of Irregularities" [21] (27 Federal Register 8448, Aug. 23, 1962). Section 2.4(c) of this statement deals with conflicts of interest, and indicates that State personnel involved in conflict of interest situations described in the regulations may be declared unacceptable on Federal aid highway projects for a period of 6 months to 3 years.

It should also be pointed out that the Department of Commerce has issued an order concerning "Standards of Conduct for Department of Commerce Employees." [22] The order summarizes statutory limitations on employee conduct, and includes a number of other restrictions imposed upon employee conduct by Department regulation. This order is printed in full in an employee handbook, a copy of which is given to each employee. I will not attempt to review the contents of that Department order now, but I would suggest that anyone pursuing this subject familiarize himself with it.

Several bills are now pending in the Congress concerning conflicts of interest and other irregularities in the highway program. These include H.R. 2557, introduced by Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER in January, H.R. 5713 by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER in April, and H.R. 6080 by Congressman JIM WRIGHT in May. The bills introduced by Congressmen CELLER and WRIGHT are identical to a proposed bill drafted cooperatively by the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and submitted to the Congress by the Department of Justice in April 1963.

In many respects, the three bills are substantially the same. All of the bills are directed toward all persons working on Federal-aid highway projects, including State employees and contractors. The bills would prohibit gifts and gratuities from contractors to State employees, and provide criminal penalties for both donor and donee. They all contain provisions prohibiting Government employees and contractors from knowingly performing work other than as permitted under the applicable plans, specifications or contracts, and revise and strengthen the existing law relative to false statements concerning highway projects.

However, there are two very important differences in the bills. Neither H.R. 5713 nor H.R. 6080 contains provisions relative to political contributions by highway contractors. Congressman CRAMER'S bill (H.R. 2557) would prohibit political contributions to any political party, committee or candidate by any person who is at the time negotiating for or performing a contract in connection with a Federal-aid highway project.

Existing Federal law enacted in 1940 contains such prohibitions with respect to Federal contracts, and it is Congressman CRAMER's strong belief that the same provisions should apply to contracts financed with 50 to 90 percent Federal funds.

Up to this point, I have purposely avoided discussion of political activities and political contributions for two reasons: First, it is a subject in itself, leading to discussions of patronage, civil service protection, job tenure, merit systems, etc., and second, because the political situation varies so much from State to State. All of you are far more familiar than I with political problems in your State, and whether anything should or can be done about them. It is clear, however, that political activities and influences can give rise to serious conflict-of-interest situations and should be carefully studied in connection with any effort to regulate this subject.

The second major difference between Congressman CRAMER's bill and the other two bills is in the approach to the financial interests of public employees in State contracts

Congressman CRAMER's bill would prohibit officials, employees, and other persons performing services in connection with a Federal-aid highway project from having any financial or other personal interest in any contract with respect to which they perform such services or have any official duty or responsibility.

The other two bills would not prohibit such interests, but would simply require full disclosure thereof to the employing agency, and provide a criminal penalty for knowingly failing to make such disclosure. Presumably, although it is not stated in the bills, after disclosure the employing agency would have to make a decision in each case as to whether the interest could be retained or not, whether the official should be disqualified from acting, or other appropriate action, depending on the circumstances.

This difference in approach clearly reflects the difficult legal and administrative problems arising from conflict-of-interest situations. It demonstrates the relative weight given to each of the three principles as we discussed earlier: the need for unquestioned ethics in the conduct of governmental offices; the desirability of leaving governmental employees as free as possible to conduct their own financial and economic affairs; and, the need for retaining public confidence and support by avoiding the appearance of evil as well as evil itself.

The approach of Congressman CRAMER's bill seems to be more consistent with the views of the Bureau of Public Roads than the other bills, even though these so-called administration bills were prepared cooperatively by the Departments of Commerce and Justice. As I mentioned earlier, the Regulations for Administration of Federal Aid for Highways contain a section prohibiting financial interests by highway officials and employees somewhat similar to the provisions of Congressman CRAMER's bill. The statement of policy as to administrative action to be taken by the Federal Highway Administrator in instances of irregularities provides for the possible removal from Federal-aid projects of persons violating the regulations. Neither the "regulations" nor the "statement of policy as to administrative action" contain any indication that certain of such financial interests might be permitted if a full disclosure is made or that the possession of prohibited conflicts of interest might be condoned under particular circumstances.

I mentioned earlier the incident of the two highway commissioners in New Mexico who, during their term in office, sold substantial amounts of automotive equipment and supplies to State highway department contractors. Those commissioners were violating no State or Federal law, and had made a full disclosure of their financial interests including their dealings with contractors, to the State senate at the time the senate considered and confirmed their appointment to the commissison. Nevertheless, subsequent to the hearings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program which disclosed serious failure to meet specifications, falsified tests and reports, and possible undue influence on the part of certain contractors in New Mexico, each of the New Mexico highway commissioners agreed in writing not to do business, other than in the course of performance of his office, with persons holding contracts with the highway department. The bureau of public roads urged them to do this, and has recommended that similar action be taken by highway commissioners in other States.

The administrative and legal problems concerning conflicts of interest are many, difficult, and complex. Each of the problems involves a mixture of philosophy, ethics, definition, public opinion, and the right of government employees to the privileges of citizenship. I have not provided you with answers to these problems, because, first, I do not pretend to know all the answers, and second, what might be the right answer in one State might be entirely wrong in another State. I have attempted to explore the subject with you, and to provide you with sources of information from which you might obtain the answers. I hope I have succeeded.

---

[1] Report on construction projects in Oklahoma, H. Rept. 364, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] Report on relationship between road contractors and State personnel in Florida, H. Rept. 1246, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] Report on disposition of right-of-way improvements on highway projects in Florida, H. Rept. 1285, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] Report on highway construction practices in the State of New Mexico, H. Rept. 1819, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[5] Hearings on right-of-way acquisition practices in Massachusetts before the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, February and March 1962.

[6] Hearings on right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia before the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, July 1962.

[7] Hearings on highway construction practices in the State of Arizona before the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, April and May 1963.

[8] "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service" by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Harvard University Press, 1960.

[9] Report on relationship between road contractors and State personnel in Florida, H. Rept. 1246, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[10] Act of Oct. 23, 1962; Public Law 87-849; 76 Stat. 1119; 18 U.S.C., 201-218.

[11] See "Report on Conflict of Interest Legislation," committee print (1958) pts. I and II, House Committee on the Judiciary, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

[12] Message from the President of the United States, H. Doc. No. 145, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[13] H. Rept. 748, 87th Cong., 1st sess. S. Rept. 2213, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[14] F.R. 4539, May 7, 1963.

[15] "Conflict of Interest," Committee print of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

[16] 23 U.S.C. 112(c).

[17] 18 U.S.C. 847.

[18] 18 U.S.C. 1020.

[19] 5 U.S.C. 118k.

[20] 25 F.R. 4162, May 11, 1960.

[21] 27 F.R. 8448, Aug. 23, 1962.

[22] Department of Commerce Order No. 77 (revised), issued Mar. 8, 1963.

Ballot Bribery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are tiring fast of irresponsible spending measures that have slipped through the legislative branch of this Government. More and more my mail reflects a growing distaste for the pork barrel. The people of Dallas and Texas in general are rising in solid resentment to the economic carrot stick approach used by those who want to buy their way back into office.

In an outstanding editorial condemning the despicable process of buying votes and commending the courageous message of Mr. Edwin P. Neilan of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Bill Collyns, editor of the Midland Reporter-Telegram, wrote the following remarks on August 20, 1963:

BALLOT BRIBERY

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, struck a firm, factual, effective blow for good government in addressing the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., recently.

"Our Own Public Scandal—Vote Buying and Selling" was his subject. He subtitled his address "Billions for Ballot Bribery." And he didn't pull any punches.

He said this Nation's public scandal involves the wholesale purchase of votes on an unprecedented scale.

"The opening skirmishes of the 1964 national election campaign provide a clear and present danger that this election may be the biggest auction sale in history—the sale of ballots not solely for promises but for hard cash."

That is putting it on the line in words and phrases which every citizen can understand. He is talking about the spoils system; he is talking about Federal handouts; he is talking about the communities and agencies who seek and accept Federal aid and about those who dole out same. He is talking about political bribery.

Citing a record Federal budget, Neilan said, "The talented politicians who will direct the administration campaign for reelection in 1964 have more of your money and my money to spend than in any previous election in our history—and more ways to buy votes with it. They hold the purse strings on billions of dollars of vote-getting projects; accelerated public works, urban and rural area redevelopment, defense-space contracts, to name just a few."

Perhaps you hadn't thought about this sort of thing. Many persons hadn't. But now this frightening aspect of big government is out in the open. And there are those who don't like the exposure.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, is one of those who didn't appreciate Neilan's speech and who was most critical of it.

Fortunately, however, other Texas Congressmen have spoken out loud and clear for Neilan's address and program.

Congressman ED FOREMAN, of Odessa, lauded Neilan's "frank and factual presentation of a deplorable situation." He said the Neilan story "carries a tremendous message of soul-searching truth and facts for Mem-

bers of Congress and the people of this Nation."

Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Dallas, said "Thank God there are still men who will speak out, who are unafraid of the bureaucratic dictatorial Federal power and politician."

Neilan believes the bad situation best can be handled by curbing the spending authority and extravagance of the bureaucrat big spenders in Washington.

Yes, America today needs more big men like Edwin P. Neilan—men who are unafraid to speak out for good government.

Communist Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, statistics issued by the Soviet Union and its captive satellites are generally distorted to serve propaganda purposes of the international Communist conspiracy. For this reason, an accurate measure of Communist growth or failure is difficult to obtain. However, even if we take their figures at face value, an interesting statistical comparison could be made.

I place into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in the August 20 edition of the Baltimore Sun, discussing this question of Communist economic growth:

COMMUNIST GROWTH

An official journal published in Czechoslovakia reports that the Communist countries as a whole have been falling back in their rates of growth. It is said their total output gained 8.5 percent in 1962 as against 17.1 percent in 1958. The earlier figures coincided with warning by Western economists that Soviet growth was pressing hard against Western achievements. The new rates are still beyond many Western countries—the official target in the United States is a 4-percent annual expansion and too much must not be read into the fall-back reports.

For one thing, the earlier figures reflected a start from minimum beginnings. A man who has a dollar and makes another experiences a 100-percent increase in his resources without really being very much better off at the end of the process. Growth in the West may be slower in various countries, but the percentage is figured on a vastly broader base and represents much more abundance in absolute terms. So, in the Communist countries, growth might slow as the base broadens. With these precautions in mind, however, something is still to be learned from the Czechoslovakia journal's figures.

They show China as the worst laggard, pulling the general average down. Rumania is one of the two countries which actually did better in 1962 than in 1958. Yet China and Rumania stand together in resisting Kremlin efforts to subordinate all the other Communist countries in a bloc-wide production program which would leave them as mostly raw material suppliers to the sophisticated manufacturers of the senior partner, Russia. In the Communist areas as elsewhere it is not mere theory but pragmatic application which counts. Go-it-alone (or almost) has led China into catastrophe but Rumania to a modest leadership in the Communist world.

NATO, After Treaty Is OK'd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1963, the Washington Evening Star published a particularly provocative article by the distinguished columnist Eric Sevareid. Mr. Sevareid directs our attention to one aspect of the consequences of the conclusion of a partial nuclear test ban treaty which has not received very much attention. In one sentence particularly he expresses the hopes of all of us when he says: "one can hope that the tranquilizing effect of the treaty agreement will not put the efforts to reorganize and strengthen NATO, already half paralyzed, into a coma". Mr. Sevareid then goes on to suggest that this may have stimulated Mr. Khrushchev's about-face on the subject of the treaty. Certainly this is a perfectly tenable theory.

I commend the Members of the House to a close and careful reading of Mr. Sevareid's penetrating analysis of possible Soviet motives, both past and future. The article follows:

NATO, AFTER TREATY IS OK'D

(By Eric Sevareid)

The extreme right wing in American politics is not likely to prevail in the debate over the nuclear test ban treaty with Russia, in spite of the respectable doubts of such open-minded men as Senator Jackson, in spite of the clear truth that the treaty by no means implies the end of the worldwide contest with aggressive communism. The long reach of history is accomplished by such short, often unpremeditated steps; and this seems to be one of those times when it is better to move than to stand, however impossible it may be to identify the next move after that. What we are engaged in with Russia is a game of poker, not chess

Before this current argument is over, the United States will have again demonstrated to the world that if there is any basic flaw in the American world stance it is a leaning toward trust rather than distrust, a deep-seated prediliction toward lowering our guard, not toward rigidity and ingrained hostility, in spite of the clamorous, guilt-ridden claims of all those groups which arrogate themselves the desire for and the label of "peace."

No, if from here on we are lead into policy errors by reason of domestic pressures, it will not be the pressure of the overly suspicious rightwing minorities but the pressure of the leftwing minorities who persistently equate American with Communist responsibility for the dangerous condition of the world—those groups which would have us detach from Vietnam because its government happens to be nasty in rightwing fashion and which would have us draw closer to Cuba because its nasty regime happens to be leftwing. Brutality, itself, does not bother these groups; they are concerned only with the words of the torturer's chant as he wields the whip.

One can hope. One can hope, for example, that the tenor and outcome of this debate on the test treaty will demonstrate to these groups and their counterparts in Europe that, while the military-industrial power structure of which General Eisenhower warned is, indeed, worth worrying about, it is not determining the foreign and defense policies of this country. The President and the Secretary of Defense are doing that, as much, if not more, than ever.

One can hope that the tranquilizing effect of the treaty agreement will not put the efforts to reorganize and strengthen NATO, already half-paralyzed, into a coma. It is entirely permissible to believe that this prospect was one of Premier Khrushchev's various purposes in welcoming the agreement.

One can hope, also, that behind Mr. Khrushchev's corollary desire to isolate the nuclear ambitions of the Chinese, there is not something far more immediate and frightening than a doctrinal disagreement about the worth, in Communist terms, of risking big war. With no hard evidence to support it, the nagging thought persists that the Chinese may have been pushing, not merely for doctrinal support from Moscow, but for support of Chinese plans for immediate, overt aggressions, whether against Vietnam or South Korea or Formosa or India. It may not be merely the Chinese ideologues who left Moscow in disgust last month; it may be also representatives of the Chinese general staff.

It is a scary notion. Whether or not aggressions do come on such a dire and drastic scale, what we cannot realistically hope for is an end to small-scale Communist aggressions in the Far East or an end to Communist created alarms and excursions in Latin America, which could easily snowball. The coexistence Mr. Khrushchev has in mind is an intensely competitive coexistence, both political and economic. There is no reason, whatsoever, to think that he, any more than the dogmatic Chinese, has revised his declaration that "socialism is working for history," which is a program of action, as distinguished from the old Marxist slogan that "history is working for socialism," which was an intellectual abstraction.

It is generally and historically true that tyrannies do pass away in time, that doctrines are always diluted by realities, that any church militant tends to become, with prosperity, the established church. And it is also true that these processes, like all social processes, move through their cycles at a faster rate than they did before the modern revolution in communications. But the worst mistake we could make would be to assume, on the evidence of the test ban treaty, that these processes have come to completion, even with the Russians. With the Chinese, of course, the processes have scarcely begun.

The Passing of the Honorable Estes Kefauver

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, with sadness I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in expressing my regret on the sudden passing of our good friend and colleague in the other body, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER.

ESTES and I came to Congress as junior Members of the House of Representatives at the same time—the 76th Congress. ESTES KEFAUVER was one of the hardest working and most industrious Members I have encountered. He was always unequivocal in stating his posi-

tion on legislation, both while he was a Member of this body and after he became a Member of the other body. He had those qualities of mind and character which we admire. His boundless energy was known to all of us. He will be missed in the years to come.

My sincere condolences to his good wife Nancy and his children.

A More Mundane Topic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been my feeling that adequate air service is vital to the economy of Florida and our Nation. In a recent editorial in the Fort Lauderdale News, one of Florida's influential newspapers, the concern of the citizens of south Florida was expressed in regard to the need for Northeast Airlines to continue serving our area. A copy of that editorial is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

A MORE MUNDANE TOPIC

While on the subject of losses we think the people of Broward County should be gravely concerned over the recent ruling by the Civil Aeronautics Board to eliminate Northeast Airlines from the lucrative New York-Miami route and confine that route to the remaining licensees, Eastern and National Airlines.

Broward Countians will recall that it was Northeast Airlines that pioneered in providing air service to New York, Washington and other populous eastern points from Broward International Airport. Without Northeast's cooperation and effort it is doubtful that Broward air travelers would have even a portion of the limited service they have today.

Thus, it comes as a hard blow to see the CAB by a split 3-to-2 vote deciding to revoke Northeast's permit to fly the New York-Florida route. When it is considered that this New York-Florida route serves over 900,000 passengers a year while the Florida-Chicago route serves only 300,000, how the CAB can decide that only two carriers are needed between New York and Florida while three are required on the Chicago-Florida route becomes even more difficult to understand.

Even more pertinent is the possibility that if Northeast loses its license and only Eastern and Northwest are left operating out of Broward International, the time may soon come when we will lose all service out of Broward and our people will once more have to travel all the way to Miami for air service to out-of-State points.

Although accepting the fact that Northeast was encountering financial difficulties, we thing the CAB acted too hastily in arriving at its decision and we believe south Florida's economy can be seriously harmed if the decision is carried through.

Representative PAUL ROGERS has already joined many other Congressmen in protesting the CAB decision which will sound the death knell for Northeast, and he is hopeful the Federal agency can be persuaded to review its decision.

We concur with Representative ROGERS in his belief this unfortunate decision should be reviewed, and since Northeast Airlines has always strived to promote this area's interests we think Broward citizens should now come to the aid of a friend in distress and fire off some letters or telegrams to Chairman Alan Boyd of the CAB requesting he give this entire matter further thought.

"O, You Immoral People"—A Reply to U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Edwin P. Neilan's by George W. Shroyer, Publisher of the Shamokin Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Members of Congress reacted strongly to the unfair attack of U.S. Chamber of Commerce President Edwin P. Neilan on programs of Federal assistance to local communities to help combat problems of unemployment, lost productivity, and economic blight.

Neilan's criticism was not only directed at Members of Congress who supported these programs, it included members of local business communities who joined in cooperative efforts to bring economic progress to their areas.

It has been my experience, as Representative to the Congress from the Sixth District of Pennsylvania, to work with many community leaders for redevelopment programs and other types of Federal assistance to create job opportunities and to help provide facilities for community improvement. It was, therefore, with a great deal of interest that I read an excellent editorial on the Area Redevelopment program by Mr. George W. Schroyer which was published in a recent edition of the Shamokin Citizen.

As a community leader and local businessman in an area that has been helped by the Area Redevelopment program, Mr. Schroyer effectively disproves the unfair allegations made by Neilan. In order to give my colleagues in the Congress an opportunity to acquaint themselves with a true sample of local opinion, I have requested that Mr. Schroyer's excellent article be inserted in the RECORD:

O, YOU IMMORAL PEOPLE

The railroad siding just completed at the industrial park was made possible through the very substantial financial aid of the Area Redevelopment Administration. Besides affording Ritz Craft a more efficient and economical means of receiving supplies for the construction of mobile homes, the siding enhances the value of the remaining sites. This facility is another selling point in attracting new industries.

The Federal financing was sought by the Shamokin Area Industrial Corp. to speed completion of the siding and to make available for further site development other funds on hand or that might be raised. Throughout the anthracite region communities have appreciated the real help that ARA has been to them and the hope that it offers for industrial development.

Harshly critical of the Area Redevelopment Administration is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In a speech before the Press Club in Washington the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Edwin P. Neilan, castigated Congressmen as "political bagmen." The tenor of his remarks is revealed by the title of his address: "What Is Our Public Scandal, Vote Buying and Selling?"

Taking strong exception to his characterization, Congressman BOGGS declared: "Members of Congress agree and disagree on many things, and that is as it should be in our representative form of government. But to question the basic integrity of the Members because they may work for projects, whether they be flood control projects, navigation projects, public works projects, shipyards, and all the other things that go to make up this vast economy of ours, as being politically immoral and compare them to the sex and security scandal going on in Great Britain today I think is unbecoming of the president of a great national organization, and I am sorry to hear him make the speech."

Congressman BOGGS then went on to put in the RECORD a listing of "something like 600 members of chambers of commerce throughout our country who have participated in joint programs beneficial to all of our people."

Among regional chambers of commerce participating in ARA programs the Congressman named Shamokin, Mount Carmel, Scranton, Lewisburg, Middleburg, Milton, Bloomsburg, Berwick, Danville, Williamsport, Pottsville, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton. Obviously the sentiments of the U.S. chamber are not reflected by actions of area chambers of commerce and many other chambers throughout the Nation.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce publishes a legislative bulletin for congressional action committees of chambers of commerce entitled, "Congressional Action." In the issue of August 9 are excerpted some of the statements to which Congresman BOGGS objected.

Mr. Neilan warns of the danger that the 1964 national election "may be the biggest auction sale in history—the sale of ballots not solely for promises but for hard cash. The old-fashioned ward heeler who rounded up and delivered derelicts to the polls at a dollar a vote was an honest man compared to the widespread public immorality that has infected otherwise reputable, respectable American men and women who are willing, even eager, to turn their elected Representatives into 'bagmen.'"

The U.S. chamber president hastened to add that there are some Congressmen "who bravely resist the selfish pressures from back home, and they are outstanding in their service to the country."

Extending his charge of immorality, Mr. Neilan said: "Nor is the immorality confined to either major political party, it involves voters, candidates, and elected officials of both parties, but inevitably the bulk of the spending—or buying—the bribing power if you will—rests with the party in office."

How many area voters in the last election felt that they had been bribed by grants and loans received through the Area Redevelopment Administration? The aid came while Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK was representing this State and while he was a candidate for reelection. The county went Republican.

As a member of a committee seeking Federal aid for the siding at the industrial park, I come under Mr. Neilan's blanket castigation of those who brought selfish pressures to bear on our Representatives in Congress. Whether or not our mission had been accomplished, I would have cast my vote for Senator CLARK. Just as surely others involved in SAIC's efforts to create more local employment voted for James Van Zandt, the Republican nominee.

Mr. Neilan's economic beliefs are indicated in his judgment of the Area Redevelopment assistance program: "Economically depressed areas are created by a variety of factors such as changes in consumer demand, depletion of resources, changes in defense procurement, or in the location of defense facilities, decentralization of production, lack of industrial diversification, and technological change.

"The Area Redevelopment Administration," he asserts, "has done nothing to change any of these conditions which cause depressed areas. It cannot. No Federal program can."

What will annoy many chambers of commerce is the appearance of Mr. Neilan as their spokesman. The separate chambers, while maintaining membership in the national organization, are autonomous. They are not bound by statements of belief or policy of officers of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Objective critics of any Federal program can serve the public by calling attention to abuses and misuses of power. But Mr. Neilan's chant of Government spending is the familiar complaint of those who want a weaker Federal Government so that big business can be more powerful.

Closer to the problems of their communities, the local chambers of commerce have a better sense of the reality of their situations. Few will be deterred from making proper and legitimate representations to Government for aid in solving chronic problems; many will be mindful of the lobbyists that are kept in permanent residence in Washington by the huge corporations for which Mr. Neilan may be an authentic spokesman.

Federal spending can win a war, can rebuild the vanquished countries, can put men into space, can successfully launch communications satellites. But Federal money is immorally and futilely spent when it is directed toward the rehabilitation of people in distressed areas.

Mr. Neilan needs a new writer.

Radio Free Europe Tells Reds How To Put It Out of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of possible public misinterpretation that the partial nuclear test ban treaty produces "sweetness and light" behind the Iron Curtain, and that Communist governments have adopted proper moral standards, we owe it to our national interest to continue close scrutiny of performance of the Communist rulers. The attitude of the Polish Communist Government toward Radio Free Europe is especially enlightening, and I place into the RECORD at this point a recent press release issued by Radio Free Europe, which dramatizes the attitude of the Polish Reds toward freedom of expression:

RADIO FREE EUROPE TELLS REDS HOW TO PUT IT OUT OF BUSINESS

Radio Free Europe's Polish station has told Poland's Communist bosses how they can put the private American network out of business.

The problem of combating the influence of Western radio broadcasts was a top priority item at the recent Polish Communist Party plenum, where four high comrades, including Premier Wladislaw Gomulka, attacked them as dangerous to the "socialist consciousness" of the nation.

Two of the speakers made heated specific references to Radio Free Europe as a major instrument in shaping American "imperialist policies." They appealed to the party's central committee for constructive ideas on how to weaken Radio Free Europe's effectiveness.

Radio Free Europe offered a simple solution to its Polish audience, which includes the party leadership: Permit an opposition press, establish a genuine multiparty system and allow free access to foreign books, newspapers and other sources of information.

In fact, said Radio Free Europe, once these and other moves to restore real freedom in Poland are made, the problem of Radio Free Europe influence will no longer exist and the network will shut down—gladly.

Radio Free Europe broadcasts to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Airline Amputation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a penetrating editorial, entitled "Airline Amputation," which appeared in the Washington Post on August 17, 1963. The Washington Post editorial is quite right in stating that the "Boyd's Board in Blunderland" multimillion-dollar blunder decision was handed down what amounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route."

I was shocked and dismayed with the short-sighted and illogical reasoning expressed by Chairman Boyd's majority opinion in the Civil Aeronautics Board's Northeast-Florida decision. Instead of carrying out the policy of giving maximum service to the public and assuring a minimum subsidy wherever possible, the Boyd decision drastically minimizes services to the public and greatly maximizes the need for subsidy.

The editorial follows:

AIRLINE AMPUTATION

The Civil Aeronautics Board's final decision in the Northeast Airlines case once again underscores the need for a coherent set of policy guidelines if the airline industry is ever to be regulated in a rational manner. Last year the CAB rejected the American-Eastern Airlines merger on the ground that it would have significantly reduced competition. But now the Board argues that there is excessive competition on the heavily traveled east coast-Florida route. And by denying Northeastern certification to service points south of New York City, it is making the east coast route the exclusive province of two carriers, National and Eastern.

There can be little doubt that the airline industry has in recent years been afflicted by excessive competition on a number of routes, largely as a result of unwise decisions by the CAB. But the majority of the Board has not made a strong case for the existence of excessive competition on the east coast-Florida route. Much of its fire was centered on the financial weakness of Northeastern, which is incurring large deficits.

A convincing argument can be made, however, that many of Northeastern's woes stem from the uncertainties engendered by its temporary Florida certification. So long as there was doubt about its right to continue on the lucrative Florida run, cash was hard to come by. The CAB majority asserts that granting Northeastern permission to fly the Florida route has failed in its purpose of strengthening the airline. If this charge is valid, it must be said that the Board bears much of the responsibility for that failure.

Having deprived Northeastern of the only route over which it can hope to make any profits, the Board assumes that the amputated airline can operate successfully as an intraregional carrier, based almost solely upon New England routes. This is a highly dubious assumption in view of the fact that both the Mohawk and Allegheny airlines have been certified to service a number of New England cities. Moreover, it begs the question of what is to become of the large organization created by Northeastern in discharging its responsibilities as an interregional carrier.

Issuing what acounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route is a step that should not have been taken without a closely reasoned explanation. None was offered, and there is much substance to the minority charge that "the majority decision does not rest on any major policy grounds. It does not go beyond holding that Northeast shall not be permitted now, and now only, to furnish services in the Boston-New York-Florida markets. It establishes no guidelines, which the industry has a right to expect, as to the degree of competition which the Board will be prepared to consider seriously tomorrow or in the days thereafter."

Vital Concern to Labor Movement

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the railroad crisis is of deep concern to all people. We must judge this matter deeply. Important issues basic to democracy are involved.

A personal friend of mine, William R. Meyers of Superior, Wis., has written a guest editorial for the largest newspaper in my district, which I urge my colleagues to read and judge:

VITAL CONCERN TO LABOR MOVEMENT

(By William R. Meyers)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—William R. Meyers, 1111 Baxter Avenue, Superior, is now serving his second 4-year term as executive vice president of the more than 20,000-member Switchmen's Union of North America. A native of Superior, he attended local grade and high schools and is a graduate of Superior State College. He was active in basketball and football at both the high school and college levels as a player or coach. He served in the Air Force during World War II. Following the war, he was granted a scholarship to the School of Labor at Oxford University by the British Government, but circumstances forced him to pass up this opportunity. He also was employed as a

teacher. In his railroad work, Meyers held numerous posts both in the Switchmen's Union and the Superior Federation of Labor. Mr. Meyers is presently attending negotiation sessions being held in Washington, D.C.)

The subject of which I speak is of vital concern to the labor movement in general and railroad labor in particular.

Recently, I had occasion to appear before the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with Mr. Neil P. Speirs, international president of the Switchmen's Union of North America. Mr. Speirs spoke before these two bodies in opposition to a joint resolution submitted by President Kennedy to dispose of the current railroad rules dispute. This resolution provides for the disposition of the dispute by means of compulsory arbitration.

While most all persons in high Government position will not admit that the resolution is compulsory arbitration, the fact remains that it gives to a third party, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the right to impose on one of the parties work rules concerning rates of pay, rules or working conditions without the consent of one of the parties. This would destroy free collective bargaining in the railroad industry and may very well open a Pandora's box to all collective bargaining in these United States. While railroad management may look with favor on such an arrangement in this dispute, who can say that Congress will stop there? If railroad employees are forced to perform labor by Government fiat, the next step will be Government ownership of the railroad industry.

In addition to the fact that this joint resolution contains all the elements of compulsory arbitration, there is another provision in the resolution that makes it doubly onerous. This provision provides for a 2-year period in which neither party, no matter how adversely affected by the imposed rule rendered by the ICC, can move for a change. Under voluntary arbitration, if a party feels that they have been unduly treated, they may serve notice for a change in the rule and proceed through the channels of free collective bargaining to arrive at a more satisfactory agreement.

Many people wonder why free collective bargaining has failed so far to affect a settlement in the current railroad rules dispute. The carriers, through their notices to their employees, demanded the right to make, keep, revise, or discontinue virtually every rule covering the working conditions of the operating workers in the entire industry. The carriers replaced collective bargaining with public relations in two respects. First, the myth of railroad poverty was created and heavily promoted. Second, the defamation of the industry's workers. They made the term "featherbedding" a household expression of contempt.

As to the first item above, Emergency Board No. 154 in its report to the President in May of this year after studying the financial condition of the railroads during the railroad rules dispute, said in pertinent part: "We were impressed with the evidence submitted to us that the vitality and earning capacity of the railroads as a whole are improving, that the productivity of its workers is rising at a rapid rate, and that the industry can face the future with confidence and even optimism."

As to the second item above, the productivity of railroad employees is second to none in the entire United States. This was expressed by Emergency Board No. 154 in pertinent part as follows: "Recent years have been years of progress and innovation for the carriers. Technological and organization changes have been many and far-reaching. Forty percent fewer employees than were employed at the beginning of this decade now handle substantially the same volume of traffic. Productivity gains have outstripped those in industry generally by a wide margin."

Since World War II, there are 200,000 less employees in the railroad operating department. This represents a tremendous savings to the railroads in wage cost. All this was accomplished without severance or separation payments or any other protective benefits.

At the time the Presidential Railroad Commission made its report (February 28, 1962), the then Secretary of Labor made the statement that the Government would not countenance a strike in the railroad industry. Statements to the same effect have been repeated by other high governmental officials including the President of the United States. The negotiators for the railroads had every right to believe that their operating employees would, in the end, not be allowed to strike. They insisted that any agreement must be within the framework of the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and that they have the unilateral right to place their interpretation on the recommendations. Management had no incentive to bargain in good faith. The employees would not be allowed to strike. All that remained was to run out the clock and the end result would be compulsory arbitration.

Helen Vaughn Receives International Recognition for Work in Youth Employment Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, Congress and, indeed, the Nation have expressed deep concern over our youth unemployment problems. We have endeavored to cope with these problems through legislation and various national and local work programs. But few individuals have accomplished more in this vital field than Helen Vaughn of Riverside, Calif.

I join Riverside County and the Nation in honoring Mrs. Vaughn who recently won international acclaim for her dedicated efforts. Under unanimous consent I include a tribute to her from the Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise:

HELEN VAUGHN RECEIVES INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION FOR WORK EMPLOYMENT FIELD

Helen Vaughn, youth placement officer of the California Department of Employment in Riverside, has won the 1962–63 International Merit Award for outstanding service, given by the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security (IAPES).

She was selected for the honor over candidates from all 50 States and 28 other countries.

Only one award is presented each year. Mrs. Vaughn will accept hers at the association's international convention July 1–5 in Chicago.

Announcement was made officially last week at a district meeting in Pomona of southern California IAPES members.

Mrs. Vaughn, a department of employment staff member for 8 years, won the California Merit Award last October. This qualified her youth employment work for consideration in the international competition.

"I'm very honored and pleased," Mrs. Vaughn said yesterday. "I didn't dream I had a chance, and I'm still amazed by it all."

Her selection was based on a comprehensive report of Mrs. Vaughn's youth employment projects. It included letters, records, pictures, pamphlets, newspaper clippings and other information on various Riverside area programs which she has organized or helped to promote.

The report was prepared by Mrs. Edna Heath, formerly a supervisor in the Riverside department office, now in Pomona.

Similar reports on the records of more than 70 members, working in all phases of employment service, were considered for the international honor.

"We're all proud of Mrs. Vaughn's award," commented Ray Hibbing, manager of the Riverside office. "This pays tribute to service above and beyond the regular job, and that's certainly what she contributes. Helen lives and breathes this work, 24 hours a day."

A Riversider since 1936, Mrs. Vaughn attended Liberty, Chemawa Junior High and Poly High schools and Riverside City College.

Her father taught for the U.S. Indian Service 32 years, so Helen lived her early years on a reservation at Fort Wingate, N. Mex., then resided at Sherman Institute until 1945.

As an employment security officer with the Department of Employment in Riverside, she took special interest in the employment problems of teenagers and devoted many extra hours, outside her normal duties, to youth projects. About 2 years ago a full-time youth placement position was created and Mrs. Vaughn was assigned to it.

Since then, she has helped to organize special training classes for teenagers seeking jobs, like Clean 'N Green (for yard workers) Teen Aides (housecleaning and pet care jobs) and Cribs (training for babysitters).

With the cooperation of school officials and area employers, she launched last year the "employment clinic," designed to inform high school seniors and potential dropouts about job-seeking problems.

Mrs. Vaughn also serves as chairman of the youth employment committee of the Riverside Planning Council, a coordinating body for various public and private welfare and service agencies. She is a member of planning council's youth council and represents the department of employment on the California Youth Authority's parolee committee.

Mrs. Vaughn's job takes her to every area high school every week, where she works with guidance counselors and job placement personnel. She also helps find jobs for Indian students at Sherman Institute.

In addition, Mrs. Vaughn has served as president of the Riverside Junior Woman's Club; president of the De Anza district of Junior Woman's Clubs; State youth chairman and later State vice president of the California Federation of Woman's Clubs, Junior Membership. Her hobbies include growing roses (she has 150 bushes surrounding her home) and sewing (she makes nearly all her own clothes).

With two daughters—Cathy, 16, a Ramona High School senior, and Cindy, 11, a fifth-grader at Mountain View—Mrs. Vaughn lives at 4925 Central. Her mother, Mrs. L. C. Thomas, teaches second grade at Pacific Avenue School in the Jurupa Unified School District.

The International Association of Personnel in Employment Security, which is giving Mrs. Vaughn the award, consists of persons engaged in job placement and administration of employment insurance benefit payments. Most members work for governmental agencies.

A. Philip Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, this is a time for all good Americans to be on guard and be aware of the elements of destruction that are in our midst. On February 23, 1956, under special order to address the House, I placed in the RECORD a report from the House Committee on Un-American Activities covering affiliations of a large number of the board of directors, officers, and committee members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Among those reports was one giving the record, as contained in the files of such committee, of A. Philip Randolph.

On January 14, 1958, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A218 an article by H. Ralph Burton entitled "Integration and Its Ultimate Effect." Additional information with reference to A. Philip Randolph was incorporated in this article. In addition, the same information on A. Philip Randolph, as was included in the February 23, 1956, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was reproduced.

Again, on July 29, 1963, the House Committee on Un-American Activities report on A. Philip Randolph, and others, was placed in the RECORD by me, starting at page A4785. As of 1961, 59 of the original 70, as contained in the 1956 RECORD, are members of the official family of NAACP.

What did all of this material contain with reference to A. Philip Randolph, and why pull him out of so many others who are officers of the NAACP and focus attention upon him? I have received recently an invitation which was mailed from New York, N.Y., under date of August 20, which reads as follows:

Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins and Mr. Whitney Young cordially request the attendance of E. C. GATHINGS at the mass assembly for "Jobs and Freedom," Wednesday, August 28, 1963, at 2 p.m. at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., to hear the demands of your constituents for "Jobs and Freedom." March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, 170 West 130th Street, New York City.

Yesterday I received a letter dated August 19, 1963, with the letterhead "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, 170 West 130 Street, New York, N.Y." signed by A. Philip Randolph, director. Being the director and one of the spearheads of the movement to assemble in Washington on August 28, it would be well to again bring to the attention of the House of Representatives, and the country, the revelations as contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the three occasions of which reference has just been made.

The Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives has the full and complete report in its files, among which is the photostatic copy of the masthead of a magazine, "The Messenger", which shows its coeditor to be A. Philip Randolph. Two of these mastheads I hold in my hand, one dated March 1919, which reads as follows: "The Negro and the New Social Order—The Messenger—the Only Radical Negro Magazine in America." It states further as follows:

The Messenger—published monthly by the Messenger Publishing Co., main office; 2305 Seventh Avenue, New York City; editors, A. Philip Randolph, and Chandler Owen; A. Philip Randolph, president and business manager; Chandler Owen, secretary-treasurer.

The January 1925 masthead reads as follows: "The Messenger—World's Greatest Negro Monthly." On page 3 we find the following: "Messenger Publishing Co., Inc., 2311 Seventh Avenue, New York; editors, A. Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen." Why refer to these old editions of the Messenger, which go back into 1919 and the early 1920's? Let us take a look at the philosophy which is in articles carried in this magazine. Here are excerpts taken from the Messenger:

EXCERPTS TAKEN FROM THE MESSENGER

(The Messenger is a Negro magazine having quite a wide circulation, and the following excerpts from its pages are quoted as pertinent to this question.)

EXCERPTS RELATING TO BOLSHEVISM

"The march of the Soviet Government."

"Still it continues. The cosmic tread of the Soviet Government with ceaseless step claims another nation. Russia and Germany have yielded to its human touch and now Hungary joins the people's form of rule. Italy is standing upon a solid volcano. France is seething with social unrest. The triple alliance of Great Britain—the railroad, transport, and mineworkers—threatens to overthrow the economic and political Bourvivism of 'Merry Old England.' The red tide of socialism sweeps on in America. South America is in the throes of revolution.

"Soviet Government proceeds apace. It bids fair to sweep over the whole world. The sooner the better, on with the dance." (The Messenger, May–June 1919.)

"We want more Bolshevik patriotism.

"We want a patriotism represented by a flag so red that it symbolizes truly its oneness of blood running through each one's veins. We want more patriotism that surges with turbulent unrest while men—black or white—are lynched in this land. We want no black and white patriotism, which demands separate camps, separate ships, and separate oceans to travel on. What we really need is a patriotism of liberty, justice, and joy. That is Bolshevik patriotism, and we want more of that brand in the United States." (From the Messenger, May–June 1919—included in the U.S. Department of Justice report of "persons advising anarchy, sedition, and the forcible overthrow of the Government.")

"You next take to task the editors of the Messenger, A. Philip Randolph and Chandler Owen, for being Bolshevists. While you are generally adept at distortion of facts and misrepresentation of circumstances, you have not greatly misrepresented us.

"The old order is passing. It is passing in race relations. It is passing in class relations. The old relations are yielding to the magic touch of the new democracy. They struggle to hold their own but are doomed to disappointment.

"We have all to gain; you all to lose. As we watch your frantic alarm and your myopic desperation, we remember that the nearness of a ruling class to the end of its reign can be judged by the rashness of statement and the severity of measures to which it resorts.

"The Sword of Damocles dangles over your so-called white man's domination. Rumblings of revolution are heard in the distance. Nemesis is at hand." (The Messenger, October 1919.)

"The world of color is stirring. In America, China, India, and Africa the hearts of the disinherited sons of color yearn for freedom. * * * Tides of nationalism and racialism rise threateningly in the hands of ebon races to throw off their white capitalist oppressors.

"Negroes in the United States and the West Indies are, at an amazingly accelerated rate, glimpsing the meaning of the new freedom." (The Messenger, February 1927.)

"In the Far Eastern section of world affair, China is by far the most significant question, owing to the vitality with which Canton fights for release from the fell clutches of foreign rule. This may be the beginning of the shifting of world power from the hands of the white to the darker races." (The Messenger, February 1927.)

I have examined Senate Document No. 153 of the 66th Congress, 1st session, which is the "Investigation Activities of the Department of Justice." Letter from the Attorney General transmitting in response to a Senate resolution of October 17, 1919, a report on the activities of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice against persons advising anarchy, sedition, and the forcible overthrow of the Government. This document was dated November 17, 1919. Many excerpts from the Messenger are contained in this Senate document from page 172 up to and including a portion of page 184. At the outset the report reads:

The Messenger, New York; editors, A. Philip Randolph, Chandler Owen, Victor R. Daly,, W. A. Domingo, William N. Colson. The Messenger, the monthly magazine published in New York, is by long odds the most able and most dangerous of all the Negro publications. * * * The March 1919 number was the first to be published. * * * Since then the Messenger has come out regularly and with an increasing crystalization of radical purposes. * * * Indeed, the credo of the Messenger as published in the March issue almost at once became an outworn creed, as this magazine threw all discretion to the winds, and became the exponent of open defiance and sedition.

The windup paragraph on page 184 says this:

No amount of mere quotation could serve as a full estimate of the evil scope attained by the Messenger. Only a reading of the magazine itself in its several issues would suffice to do this.

What has this man Randolph been doing in recent years since the Messenger has discontinued operations? Let us look at two Washington newspaper items:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Times-Herald, June 27, 1948]

JIM CROWISM FIGHT OPENED AGAINST DRAFT—DISOBEDIENCE DRIVE URGED BY AFL LEADER

NEW YORK, June 26.—A rebellion against the draft act was launched today by A. Philip Randolph, Negro AFL leader. Determined to fight Jim Crowism in the armed services, he announced a nationwide drive to urge Negroes and whites to refuse to register or be inducted and, if need be, to resort to such trickery as feigning illness and faking dependents. It was a daring step, but Randolph was prepared to face the consequences.

"It may cost me my liberty," he said, but he added that "every march forward has cost somthing." "The drive," he said, "will get underway throughout the country unless President Truman issues an Executive order against segregation before August 16. It will be conducted, he said, by the League for non-Violent Civil Disobedience Against Military Segregation, whose formation he anounced. The civil disobedience was threatened by Randolph, president of the Sleeping Car Porters Union and treasurer of the National Committee Against Jim Crow in Military Service, at a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee in Washington March 3. Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and Baldwin, of Connecticut, warned that Randolph and his followers would face treason charges if they carried out their threat. Field campaigners of the league will start visiting major cities Monday, Randolph said. Adherents subject to the draft registration after August 16 will be urged he said to take any of four main courses of action: (1) open refusal to register; (2) quiet ignoring of registration; (3) refusal to be inducted and (4) feigning illness, faking dependents, and other subterfuges."

[From the Evening Star, June 23, 1948]

RANDOLPH FORMS LEAGUE TO DISOBEY DRAFT LAW

NEW YORK, June 26.—A. Philip Randolph, Negro union leader, announced today formation of a league to campaign for noncompliance with the draft unless President Truman issues an Executive order against segregation. Mr. Randolph, president of the AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, said the campaign would be waged on a nationwide basis. It will call for a program of nonviolent civil disobedience, he said. The Negro union leader said that even though "It may cost me my liberty," he would urge members of his race and others subject to the draft registration after August 16 to refuse to register or be drafted. Mr. Randolph recently expressed similar views at a congressional hearing.

The documented disclosure of the system used by Russia to train Americans as subversive agents was revealed in the article written by Hon. H. Ralph Burton, "Integration and its Ultimate Effect," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 14, 1958, pages A218 and following. I quote from a portion of Mr. Burton's article:

A plan was developed and put into action to bring to Russia groups of white and colored citizens of the United States who had yielded to the propaganda of the Communists, to train them as leaders of the planned revolution in the South.

Just how this plan operated can best be described by testimony which was given before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 77th Congress, 1st session, by Charles H. White, an extremely intelligent Negro who, at the time he gave his testimony, was employed in the writer's project of the WPA in New York City. (I can personally vouch for the authenticity of this testimony because, at the time it was given, I was in charge of the investigations in the city of New York and State of New York of the Works Progress Administration, which continued for more than a year, and, after taking the affidavit of Charles White substantially corroborated all that he had to say by the affidavits of other Negroes who, like Charles White, had awakened to the real purpose of the Communists to use the Negro of the United States as a tool in the development of their plans.

Quotations from Charles White's testimony follow:

"Question. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party, Mr. White?

"Answer. Yes; I was from 1930 to 1936 inclusive.

"Question. Did you ever take a trip to Russia at the expense of the Communist Party?

"Answer. Yes; in 1930 and 1931, including a part of 1932.

"Question. Who paid your expenses for this trip?

"Answer. I was sent abroad by the Communist Party of the United States, district No. 6, of which Herbert Benjamin was then party secretary.

"Question. What did you do while you were in Russia on this trip?

"Answer. Well, I studied at the College of Professional Communists.

"Question. What did they teach you at that time?

"Answer. The course covered a number of topics, some of them dealing with labor problems and some other problems. The labor problems topics included such things as Marxism, Stalinism, and Leninism, a history of the Communist Party, of the Soviet Union, a history of the American labor movement, a book by Foster on Soviet America. * * *

"Question. Were you taught how to ride a horse while you were in Russia?

"Answer. Yes, there was a course in military strategy and tactics.

"Question. What was the type of instruction given you and what was explained as the purpose of the instruction?

"Answer. Practically the whole time I was there, for about 18 months, I was with about 100 other Americans who were there for the same purpose, and we were instructed in sharpshooting classes, and taught the handling and manipulation of rapid-fire machineguns, how to construct the various barricades in street fighting, defending public squares, taking public buildings, and how to destroy the tank, that is, the military tank, and horseback riding, and secret coding.

"Question. Getting back to Russia again, what was explained to you as the program of the Communist Party insofar as colored people were concerned, and the Black Belt in the United States?

"Answer. The program of the Communist Party for the Negroes was said to be self-determination in the Black Belt.

"Generally speaking, that means the Cotton Belt where most of the Negro slaves lived when they were brought to the States and where they are concentrated heavily.

"This belt was supposed to be separated from the United States in time as an independent black republic under the domination of the Communist commissars, who, in theory, were supposed to have power over them.

"Question. Did you receive pay for the entire period from the Communist Party for the work that you did?

"Answer. There was no real salary to speak of. All of my expenses were paid, and with the exception of the trip abroad, the investment was modest. The trip abroad must have cost somewhere in the neighborhood of $5,000 because I traveled throughout the country in Russia.

"Question. You say there were about 100 in the party that proceeded to Russia?

"Answer. Yes, sir; that went with me.

"Question. Were you given instructions about the secrecy that should be maintained concerning this trip to Russia?

"Answer. Yes, sir; we were told that we were to have our names changed and that we were to keep away from Americans or foreigners generally in the capital, Moscow; that no one was to know our destination or purpose for leaving the United States.

* * * * *

"Question (page 1099). Mr. White what activated you originally in becoming a member of the Communist Party?

"Answer. The stated purposes in the form of popular propaganda about better conditions, and for equal opportunities for Negroes, for unemployment relief, etc. All of those things played their role.

"Question. Did you have some difficulties which caused you, perhaps, to view things in a bad light?

"Answer. My mother was a widow. The propaganda was made to order, as far as I was concerned, because it appealed to my ambitions to get social security and opportunities; therefore, I was a fit subject for this propaganda. It is designed for all people commonly affected in the way I was.

"Question. What caused you to sever your connections with the Communist Party?

"Answer. The contradictions between the stated purposes and the actual acts of the Communist Party. I learned in time that the party really intended to exploit these conditions to get state power and that outside of that there was nothing else that they were interested in.

Let us look at the information revealed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and I will refer to only a portion of the report on the director of the August 28 Washington assembly or march. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress of the organization held in Washington, January 6–8, 1939. Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy, dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, named him as a sponsor of the council. A photostatic copy of the letterhead for that organization, dated April 6, 1939, lists A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization. The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board dated December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The name of the organization, American League Against War and Fascism was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy, and according to the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, "It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before." The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters dated June 1 and September 21, 1948. A letterhead of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the national advisory committee. The special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944. The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter dated April 27, 1949. New Masses for October 26, 1937, reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress and was shown to be president of the organization by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938. The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of January 3, 1939,

cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

A. Philip Randolph was a consultant on the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization dated April 19–21, 1942. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front. A. Philip Randoph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy, which was cited as subversive by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 1, 1948. The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937, announced that A. Philip Randolph was to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., on February 12–14. The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

For several decades this revolutionary pattern has been taking form. The inherent dangers of Communist infiltration in the freedom march set for August 28 is depicted in an article from the Cleveland Press of August 17, 1963, and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, under date of August 22, 1963. It is entitled "Freedom March Must Keep an Eye on Reds":

[From the Cleveland Press, Aug. 17, 1963]

FREEDOM MARCH MUST KEEP AN EYE ON REDS

Disclosure that Eric Reinthaler, admittedly a former Communist, hired a couple of buses for the Negro march on Washington is something of a shock. But perhaps it shouldn't be a surprise.

It's ancient history that the Communist Party and its adherents love to infiltrate legitimate groups and purposes to twist them to Marxist ends. There was no reason to doubt the Reds would regard the August 28 freedom march as another opportunity to stir trouble and win America some bad headlines around the world.

The Nation, from President Kennedy on down, has pretty much accepted the civil rights march as a nonviolent demonstration for decent purposes.

A Communist flavor is something else again. With known Reds gathering themselves into the demonstration, danger of violent incidents becomes an even greater possibility than previously. Leaders of the march have a truly formidable job in keeping it within its controlled, peaceful plan.

Portrait of Pittsburgh—A Growing City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive-minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing on southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the fifth of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

PORTAIT OF PITTSBURGH—A GROWING CITY

Pittsburgh today is fast becoming a city of tomorrow. Since 1945, one-fourth of the city's business district has been redeveloped. In place of old commercial buildings stand the new gleaming skyscrapers that house such industrial giants as H. K. Porter, United States Steel Corp., Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Aluminum Co. of America, Westinghouse Electric Corp., and other smaller firms.

At the historically rich point in Pittsburgh is impressive Gateway Center which challenges the imagination. Included are three stainless steel office buildings, the western Pennsylvania headquarters of the Bell Telephone Co. of America, the blue aluminum-clad State Office Building, a fourth glass-curtained Gateway Building, the gold aluminum 22-story Hilton Hotel, and an underground parking garage for 750 autos decked by a beautiful tree and stone park.

Altogether 27 major new buildings have joined the Pittsburgh skyline since 1945. And five more, in the construction stage now, will be completed by 1963. These include a Blue Cross Building, Commercial Bank and Trust Co., IBM Building, New Federal Building, and YWCA Building. Scores of others are in the planning stages.

Pittsburgh has surged ahead in massive highway projects. Nearly $400 million has already been spent for new and improved highways since 1946 * * * and another $500 million will be spent in Allegheny County roads in the next 10 years.

PITTSBURGH FIRSTS

Newest in the Pittsburgh field of firsts is the world's largest underground zoo in Highland Park. Three times as large as the only other one in the United States at Tucson, Ariz., the new zoo was opened in June 1962.

Dedicated in September 1961, was the unique Civic Auditorium with the world's largest retractable dome.

The Pittsburgh area is also the home of the world's largest manufacturer of aluminum, steel, steel rolls, rolling mill machinery, air brakes, plate and window glass, refractories, safety equipment, and oilfield supply equipment.

It is the location of the world's largest tinplate producing unit, byproduct coke plant, wire manufacturing plant, food products plant of its type, the world's first full-scale commercial nuclear powerplant, the world's first industry-owned nuclear testing reactor, as well as the home of the world's second largest manufacturer of electrical equipment.

Pittsburgh also is America's largest producer of bolts, nuts, and rivets, wrought iron pipe, and bituminous coal.

DID YOU KNOW?

Pittsburgh is exceeded as a corporation headquarters only by New York and Chicago and is second only to New York in the percentage of new office space constructed in the postwar period. Pittsburgh is working to expand its role as an office center both for national company headquarters and as a regional office center.

COMMUNICATIONS

On all fronts, Pittsburgh is a city on the move. The area has every type of communication necessary to the growth of a community. In the Pittsburgh area are two daily newspapers, 48 weeklies and 16 foreign language newspapers.

Since Pittsburgh pioneered the first radio station in 1920, more than a dozen radio stations, one educational television and three commercial stations now operate in Allegheny County with a total income exceeding $21 million.

EDUCATION

One of the most valuable assets of any community is its educational institutions, and Pittsburgh can rank with the best of them in quantity and quality. In the metropolitan area are more than a dozen major institutions, including Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Pittsburgh, Duquesne University, Mt. Mercy College, Chatham College, and Point Park Junior College. These staff well over 1,200 and have a combined enrollment of over 26,000. In addition, there are over 600 elementary and high schools in Allegheny County with a total enrollment of over 379,000.

HEALTH FACILITIES

In Oakland is found one of the most complete health centers in the Nation. In the shadow of the Cathedral of Learning of the University of Pittsburgh, more than a thousand men and women are helping to create a world free of disease and suffering. These are the aspirations of doctors and nurses, researchers and scientists at the burgeoning Pitt Health Center, where seldom-equalled community philanthropy has dedicated in the last 10 years nearly $60 million worth of new structures devoted to patient care, research and education.

COAL AND OIL RESOURCES

Bituminous coal is a major resource in the Pittsburgh area. For many years, coal production declined chiefly because of reduced use by the railroad industry and the increased use of oil and gas in homes, industry and upon railroads. In recent years, the demand for coal has increased substantially. The increases were generally brought about by the industrial boom of 1953–60, expanded export shipments and substantial increases in the use of coal by electric utilities.

Petroleum and natural gas continue to be major natural resources of the Pittsburgh marketing area. Oil produced in this area averages about 500,000 barrels annually. Some activity continues in the drilling of both gas and oil wells and the importance of this industry in Pennsylvania is not to be minimized. Pennsylvania was the first State on the Great Lakes to lease offshore acreage for oil and gas exploration.

The Pittsburgh area is considered one of the major sources for many other natural resources including cement, stone and clays. The area also supplies a substantial amount of forestry products.

Senator Estes Kefauver—A Giant Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation individuals and organizations continue in expressing tribute to the late Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee.

I include, Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, the following editorials, and resolution:

[From the Democrat]

A GIANT AMONG MEN

A giant among men is dead.

Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, the Democratic Party's vice-presidential nominee in 1956, died of a heart attack at 3:40 a.m., Sunday, August 11, in Washington.

The tall, angular Tennessean had served four terms in the House of Representatives and was elected Senator three times. He built a legend with his homey style of campaigning and his tenacious commitment to crusades that conflicted with powerful interests.

John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, summed up the Kefauver story this way:

"Estes Kefauver was a symbol of democracy, a fighter for the people, a champion of the underdog.

"It was Estes Kefauver who exposed the framework of organized crime, who fought so successfully to protect the people from the unscrupulous in the marketplace, who exposed a conspiracy to undermine the Tennessee Valley Authority, and who laid bare fraud and deceit wherever he found it.

"He was a constant fighter. He never rested. He never gave up.

"Because of Estes Kefauver, America is a better place in which to live today. He brought great honor to his beloved State of Tennessee, to the U.S. Senate and to America. He will always live in the hearts of Americans because he was their protector and defender."

[From the Machinist]

KEFAUVER

Estes Kefauver will be sorely missed. The lanky, slow-spoken Senator from Tennessee died a few days ago of a heart attack. In his life he had been a special friend of labor and a favorite of IAM members.

In 1956, Senator Kefauver appeared at the IAM Grand Lodge Convention at San Francisco with Adlai Stevenson. Stevenson was the Democratic nominee for President that year. Kefauver was his running mate—coonskin cap and all. Together they won the enthusiastic endorsement of the delegates.

It wasn't in the cards for Kefauver ever to be President. He was too much of a maverick for the men who dominated the Democratic Party in those years. But it was because he was independent that so many union members supported him. Kefauver was a mild-mannered man with few pretenses, but he was never afraid. He wasn't afraid of the mobsters when his investigating committee gave most Americans their first glimpse of how organized crime operated in the United States.

He showed he wasn't afraid of the private utilities when in a later investigation he uncovered the Dixon-Yates scandal that rocked the Eisenhower administration.

More recently he took on the powerful drug industry, exposing its cozy relationship with the medical profession and its profiteering on the sick and suffering.

This kind of courage in a national political figure is all too rare. Too often the courageous young men grow cagy and cautious with success.

Not so Kefauver. He wasn't afraid of the overlords or the underworld. More important, Kefauver wasn't afraid of the people who supported him. He enjoyed campaigning among people, standing outside factory gates early in the morning talking to men and women on their way to work, shaking hands as he drawled in his gentle voice, "I'm Estes Kefauver. Will you help me?"

Some politicians were afraid of Kefauver. But not working people whose causes he championed. His overwhelming reelection to the Senate in 1960 demonstrated that.

John T. O'Brien, national coordinator of the Machinists Nonpartisan Political League, worked with Kefauver in his campaign for the presidential nomination in 1952. O'Brien says:

"Estes Kefauver taught the people that government influences and directs the course of history and that their wishes and their viewpoint can be reflected in government policies if they care enough to influence government. This was his greatest contribution."

We wish there were more Senators like Kefauver. Perhaps we could get Congress moving again. Without him, the job will be harder than ever.

[From the Boyertown Times]

SENATOR KEFAUVER

The death of Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, leaves a void in the U.S. Senate which will be difficult to fill. The tall, folksy southerner earned the respect of his colleagues in the Congress, the fear and hatred of many criminal elements and the love of his constituents in his native State.

Senator Kefauver made the coonskin cap of Davy Crockett and Tennessee a national political symbol when he ran for the vice presidency in 1956—a year in which he, incidentally, handed John F. Kennedy one of the few political setbacks our present President has experienced by besting him for the Democratic nomination.

A man of humility, Kefauver amiably and without heat or rancor, conducted his political campaigns in Tennessee and was sent to the Congress each time he asked by great majorities of the people who regarded him with a brotherly affection accorded only those who have proved that they truly represent the people.

His congressional campaigns against crime in the Nation brought forcibly to the people the true nature and seriousness of organized criminality in the country and resulted in the first truly concerted moves to control it. Likewise, his investigations of business monopolies served to protect the people from many unfair monopolistic practices.

Senator Kefauver, although he never gained higher position than that of Senator, nevertheless gained in his lifetime the love of his fellow Tennesseeans and the respect of every American.

Not all of us can gain that much and Senator Kefauver in his years of service as a Representative and as a Senator brought to himself and to his State nothing but the highest honor and the utmost respect.

The Senate of the United States is the poorer without him.

RESOLUTION BY THE RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION ESTABLISHES LIBRARY FUND IN MEMORY OF SENATOR KEFAUVER

In the sudden, untimely death of Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, on Saturday, August 10, 1963, railroad workers lost one of their staunchest friends in public life.

The tall, Lincolnesque statesman, stricken by a sudden heart attack at the peak of his career in the Senate, will be greatly missed by all the working men and women of the Nation, because he was a public servant of uncompromising courage and integrity who worked until the very end to protect the interests of all of the people. No legislator of the 20th century has been more the friend of the average citizen or a stronger foe of the forces of greed and corruption.

From the day he left his home on Lookout Mountain in Tennessee to take his seat in the 76th Congress, Estes Kefauver remained dedicated to service of American ideals and the common people. He was the champion of the weak against the powerful, of the truth against falsehood, of the democratic principles of government by law against the forces of crime and lawlessness. Of him it can truly be said that he was big enough to make the right kind of enemies.

Estes Kefauver's courage in working for the public interest won him many, many loyal and devoted friends, and railroad workers, without exception, were always proud to be among those who valued and respected his friendship and benefitted from his help. In recent months, for example, he had done more than any other Member of the Congress to focus public attention upon the evils of the present railroad merger movement, and he was completing plans for a new series of hearings on this subject by his Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee at the time of his death. His death is a major loss to railroad workers everywhere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the chief executives of the 24 standard railroad labor organizations, assembled August 15, 1963, at a meeting of the Railway Labor Executives' Organization in Washington, do hereby express deep and sincere sorrow at the untimely death of Senator Estes Kefauver, our friend and the friend of all the men and women who toil. We have already honored his memory by standing for a moment of silence in the midst of our deliberations. We now resolve to honor his memory in the future by pledging to carry on the good fight he led so ably against the forces of greed and corruption in American society; be it further

Resolved, That this association hereby contributes $5,000 from the RLEA emergency relief fund to help establish a Kefauver Memorial Library Fund for the purpose of starting a library in his honor in his native State of Tennessee.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

KEFAUVER: A MEMORABLE LONER—TENNESSEE SENATOR FOUND IN FOREFRONT ON RIGHTS AND AS AN INTERNATIONALIST

(By Doris Fleeson)

Estes Kefauver had a sure instinct for the family troubles of Americans. He seemed always to be sitting down at table with people to talk about the bad influences which might affect their children, the high cost of drugs, their utility and grocery bills.

The stuff of daily life for most people was his speciality. His native capacities, joined with a law degree from Yale, helped him to use the political jungle most hostile to reform in Washington, the Senate Judiciary Committee, as a forum for these issues.

He was often ahead of Tennessee opinion, as in civil rights. He refused to sign the southern manifesto against school desegregation and took no part in southern filibusters or caucuses. At the same time, he was an ardent internationalist and sowed much seed in fields where the more sophisticated who scorned him as naive now reap.

Against such a man the Senate establishment is helpless, but he will always have a following among Americans. It is rarely big enough, as it was not in the case of Senator Kefauver. But the gangling soft-spoken Tennesseean plugged away, a consistent source of frustration to the predominantly southern leadership which could not interest him in its niggling concerns and often took petty revenge.

Most Senate loners merely criticize and then go off to Burning Tree. Senator Kefauver worked hard on what interested him and got attention. The great constitutionalists of the Senate will hardly be missed by so many of the folks.

Reporters who slog around the chicken-and-mashed-potato circuit with aspirants for the Presidency see few well-managed campaigns, but they are unanimous that "Kefe" was anchor man of the whole class. In a Kefauver campaign, nobody was ever on time, clean, comfortable or well fed, and deadlines seemed to have no real existence.

But somehow it was fun, more fun than with the better organized driving types. Kefauver veterans still rather look down on those who did not serve with them on their special St. Crispin's Day. It was the more remarkable because few really shared what they could make of his often cloudily ex-

pressed political philosophy. One reluctant admirer finally worked it out that one couldn't rebuff a big, friendly dog, even if his paws were muddy.

The Senate has always had to rely on its individualists for its press. This stale and stalled one will be much poorer for the loss of Estes Kefauver.

He has no permanent legislative monument; the Senate Establishment saw to that. But while they dismissed him as superficial and a tilter at windmills, a great many powerful interests will find their lobbying tasks less hard.

It does not immediately appear that his like will now emerge from Tennessee. Gov. Frank Clement is not fulfilling his early promise and is increasingly criticized at home. Senator Kefauver's former opponents seem old hat, and his old enemies have faded from the scene.

[From Trainman News, Aug. 19, 1963]

A TRUE FRIEND

Members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and all others who toil for a living will miss Senator Estes Kefauver. He was on their side all the way.

Whenever issues of vital importance to their well-being were up for decision and a friend was needed to defend their interests, it was practically a certainty that the Tennessee Democrat would line up on the side of working people—ready to do battle with those who represented the special interest groups.

He did it time and again. Possessing great tenacity with a determination that could not be overcome despite great odds against him, Senator Kefauver fought on to see justice win out.

BRT'ers and other railroad workers will never forget his dedicated efforts to slow up the onrush of rail mergers facing the Nation until the proposed consolidations and all their ramifications could be investigated by Congress and recommendations made for a rail merger policy.

Shortly before his untimely death, Senator Kefauver stepped forward again to perform an important role for railroad workers in defense of democracy on the collective bargaining front. He joined with nine other Senators in cosponsorship of the rail labor-backed Engle substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 102, in opposition to the compulsory arbitration measure proposed by President John F. Kennedy in the work rules dispute on the Nation's railroads. The Engle substitute would have collective bargaining resumed under the eyes of a special congressional "watchdog" committee.

"In the passing of Estes Kefauver, the Nation has lost a great leader. He was a champion of good government, the common man's friend. His efforts in behalf of the wage earner will long be remembered. His passing leaves a gap in the annals of time that will be difficult to fill. May he rest in peace," declared Joe T. Steadham (1044), retired BRT Texas State representative, in paying tribute to Senator Kefauver.

Those words will be echoed for many a day wherever "rails" congregate.

Senator Kefauver was a true friend.

Only Way To Find Out Is To Try It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Florida Times-Union of August 5. It deals impressively with the important subject of U.S. military strength and Exercise Swift Strike, which recently was successfully completed.

The editorial follows:

ONLY WAY TO FIND OUT IS TO TRY IT

Can the United States move a large number of troops by air to meet a sudden Communist offensive?

Many American citizens will be surprised to learn that the answer to that question is a simple: No one knows. Civilian and military leaders think and hope this country possesses such a capability. Yet it has never been done in division strength.

However, a test of the abilities of the Air Force and Army to cooperate in such a mission has been planned for later this year. Only a severe cut in the military budget, now threatened by the House, could cause the largest airlift of all time to be canceled. Surely the military leaders need to know exactly what the services can accomplish in the high-speed transfer of fighting men.

A related exercise by the U.S. Strike Command, which also would handle the proposed airlift of a division to Europe, now is in progress over the Carolinas and Georgia. With an aerial duel for supremacy of the skies already completed, invasions by large opposing armies are due early this month. Although this war game is the largest such exercise ever held in the South, the plan to fly an entire division of soldiers across the Atlantic within 3 or 4 days is even more ambitious.

It is becoming clearer almost every day that mobility of force is this Nation's most effective concept in carrying out its commitments to meet the threat of conventional aggression by Communist military forces on many fronts scattered all over the world. With fast transportation, well-trained soldiers based in this country can be on immediate call to fight wherever needed. Such a force would be a strategic reserve for military units already stationed in troubled areas. Should American might be needed in places where there are no soldiers, the Strike Command with the demonstrated ability to get there fast could arrive within hours. But first, that capability to move quickly and in division numbers must be proved.

Such proof can be had in only one way. Try it and see. The proposed airlift to Europe would be expensive. It would involve a certain danger. There would be a risk the purpose of the exercise might be misinterpreted in some quarters. Nevertheless, the benefits far outweigh any liabilities.

If America is to avoid another Korea, or strength-sapping brushfire wars, it must possess the conventional power to meet Red aggressions quickly and forcefully. The mobility of such a force must be actual and not merely a theoretical assumption.

Reply to Saturday Evening Post Article "The GOP: For White Men Only?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter which was sent to the editor of the Saturday Evening Post in answer to the article "The GOP: For White Men Only?", published in the August 10–17, 1963, issue of that magazine. I was particularly interested in the copy of the letter which I received, since it was sent to the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Edward Banks, an outstanding Negro citizen of Phoenix, Ariz. Mr. Banks is the publisher-editor of the Arizona Tribune, a leader of his people, and a man of responsibility and wisdom who is concerned over the current racial situation and the political overtones which have been brought into it. He is also a Republican, disturbed by the attack of Mr. Robinson on Senator GOLDWATER, a man whom he knows, respects, and has worked with. In light of Mr. Banks' background, I believe his letter to the editor of the Saturday Evening Post presents a viewpoint important to the problems of these days and which should be known by the people of America.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 13, 1963.

Mr. CLAY BLAIR, JR.,
Editor in Chief, the Saturday Evening Post, New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It was with deep concern indeed that I read the article by Mr. Jackie Robinson entitled "The GOP: For White Men Only?" in your magazine for August 10–17. As a Negro I am especially shocked that you would allow your magazine columns to become the instrument of ambitious men who do not hesitate to fish in the disturbed and dangerous waters of the Negro problem, for their personal political advantage.

Racism is not a conservative versus liberal issue. The fact is that the people who have done most to improve the conditions of the Negro in the South have been the literate, middle-class people living in and near the largest cities in the South and they vote in most areas 2 to 1 and more Republican. The white riff-raff of the South which is violently anti-Negro is almost 100 percent Democrat and it lives generally in the rural and smalltown regions. This element is led exclusively by Democrat demagogs of the South.

Now the Northern liberals have tried to hide this from the Negro. They don't like us to know that a man like Senator Bilbo who became almost the symbol of extreme racism during the height of the New Deal era was also one of the most consistent of the so-called liberals when he voted on economic issues. He was no exceptional case.

I believe one of the things Negroes have to learn, and learn soon, is that the so-called liberals have made a great deal of political hay out of their very verbal support of Negroes and nothing else. If we look back at what was actually accomplished under Roosevelt and Truman, as far as concrete achievement is concerned, it is amazing to see how little really happened in the midst of all this talk. For example, nothing really happened in the armed services until Eisenhower came into office. The so-called liberals for 20 years used nothing but promises to gain a strong hold on the Negro vote; the Republicans really began the first serious action in this area. The thing that I fear most is that the Negro will continue to be exploited by the so-called liberals who want to use the Negro to gain political power, but who have shown little desire to deliver anything important. You will recall the emotional promises made by Mr. Kennedy during his campaign; he promised immediate and far-reaching action when elected.

You will recall also that 2 years passed after his election without a single piece of civil rights legislation. The Negro, burning with a sense of frustration at these unfulfilled promises, deeply disturbed by the wide discrepancy between words and actions by this so-called liberal, finally developed the reaction which we have been witnessing across the country during the last few months.

I say that the Negro cannot trust these so-called "liberals," and I say again that I fear that too many Negroes have allowed themselves to become tools for these men whose real aim is simply to gain political power. Mr. Robinson is no exception.

Now I live in Phoenix, Ariz., and I think I know something about Arizona politics and politicians. I know that Mr. Robinson's comments about Senator GOLDWATER were grossly unfair, and I am surprised and disturbed that he, as a greatly respected figure among our people, would have been willing to sign such an article without checking the statements. I have the impression that the article is actually libelous. I don't like to see a man of Mr. Robinson's stature involved in a political "ploy" which is so clearly exploiting the dangerous and complicated problems of our people in a way which will, once again, serve the political power objectives of some Northern big-city liberals. The Negro aims and aspirations must not become a political football.

Mr. Robinson opened his article by comparing the aims of the Black Muslims and of Senator GOLDWATER's followers as both being racist. I won't take his article, item by item, and discuss the amazing misstatements I find all through it. I will only say that I know the history of Senator GOLDWATER on the problem of the Negroes. He has a sincerity I have never been able to find among the loose-talking, so-called "liberals" and I trust him on this matter. He may not go as far and as fast as some of us might wish, but he has a strong, true history here in Arizona on problems related to the Negro and I believe in him as one who knows him well.

I am sorry that Mr. Robinson, whom all of us regard highly, has allowed himself to become the instrument of a political faction which is intent on smearing an honest and upright man who knows and understands the Negro problem and whose achievements here in Arizona were solid. I deeply believe that we can expect the same sincerity should he become a candidate for a greater office.

Sincerely,

EDWARD BANKS.

This Thing About Frank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I find things that I think friends of father might enjoy. The following article from the August 10, 1963, issue of the New Yorker, entitled "This Thing About Frank," is a piece of Americana which I thought would be of interest not only to my colleagues, but to others as well who may have known him.

The article follows:

THIS THING ABOUT FRANK

At the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, in Hyde Park, the late President is shown as baseball manager in his sixth-form year at Groton School. Dressed in a dark suit and identified as "the one in the hat," he stands next to the coach in an enlargement of part of the 1900 squad picture. The uniformed players around him are nameless, and for this my father, who is among them, would be grateful. He wouldn't be any happier over ending up in such a place than over having the 1900 team remembered for its manager, and mention of that hat, a boater, wouldn't help. It is worn with a baseball hatband, and since father didn't accept managers as real members of a team, he considered it in poor taste for them to wear its colors.

As a boy, when I looked at our print of the squad picture, I used to wonder if having to be photographed with Roosevelt was why father had turned away from the camera. That smile of his, father said, made it just that much worse, but in the picture Roosevelt is looking as serious and determined as the others. It was taken before the annual big game against St. Mark's, which Groton won for the first time in 5 years. The victory was due partly to father's work on second base; also, in spite of his being only a fifth-former and the smallest player on the team, he shone as a batter. Each time he came up to the plate that day, he reminded himself how important winning the game was to the rector. This was the Reverend Endicott Peabody, Groton's founder and headmaster.

Anybody who upset the rector had father to deal with, and one of his complaints against Roosevelt was that he had put the rector in an embarrassing position by going into Democratic politics. They were not for Groton boys. Father claimed that Tammany Hall had put Roosevelt in the Governor's mansion, but Tammany didn't control the national convention, and there he would be cut down to size. The news of Roosevelt's nomination hit father hard. He and a form mate went for a walk, and took me with them. Neither of them spoke during the entire walk. When we arrived at the front door of the other man's house, he took out his keys and father said abruptly, "I can't understand this thing about Frank. He never amounted to much at school."

Father's friends, some of whom, like him, had gone direct from school to Wall Street, thought the idea of Roosevelt's running for President a joke. The odds the smart money was laying on him worried them, but they said that the people would never elect a man who was a traitor to his class. They felt their judgment was confirmed when the rector announced that he wouldn't vote for Roosevelt, and was seconded by the other Roosevelts—the real ones, father called them.

When the results of the election were in, father and his friends were staggered, and they went around in a daze, shaking their heads. It was a catastrophe almost as serious as the 1929 crash, they said. Roosevelt would fix them now, and all good Groton men like them. Father's friends used to drop by our apartment in the east fifties with the latest libels about him from downtown, which they would enlarge on over cocktails. By the time the second dividend was poured from our big silver shaker, they were excited enough to sound as if they really believed what they were saying. As the inauguration drew close, they were increasingly gloomy, and would sit over their drinks in the dusk with large sighs.

Two days after the inauguration, father came uptown early from his office, and, having forgotten his key, rang the bell. I let him in and he brushed by me without a word. Wondering why he looked so pale, I followed him down the hall to his dressing room and watched while he counted aloud a pocketful of coins and stacked them in neat piles on the shelf with his athletic trophies. Then he looked a long time at the squad picture hanging next to it, the only one of his Groton collection which showed Roosevelt. Finally, he said that that man had closed the banks, every one, and that was all the money we'd see for a while, maybe forever.

He opened a bureau drawer and took out his Army .45 automatic to clean it, as he often did. Together with a large blackjack, the gun had been issued to him during the First World War, when he was serving in military intelligence. First as a captain and later as a major, he commanded a unit of the Corps of Intelligence Police, known as the bomb squad, at New York City Police Headquarters. During this service he lived at home and was in frequent contact with his brokerage firm. According to a yellowed clipping from the New York Herald of November 30, 1918, father's unit "broke up many anarchist groups and pro-German bomb plotters in the metropolitan district and sent their leaders to prison." I grew up thinking that he was assigned to investigate the Wall Street bombing, in which 39 people were killed and 400 more were injured, on September 16, 1920, and that father worked on the case each day after the exchange closed. Apparently, this is not true, but he loved to talk about the Wall Street bombing, which he was convinced had been perpetrated by the Bolsheviks, and which he did have some connection with. His head was banged against another's, and hard. He was having lunch at the Stock Exchange Lunch Club, and it was under the table that he met the other man's head. The other man was not a member.

I held the oilcan for father now as he worked on the gun. Closing the banks, he said, was part of a Bolshevik plot to destroy the economy. And while he still hoped Roosevelt wasn't one of them, there was no question about some of those people he was always listening to. Absolutely none. When the gun was finished, he aimed at the squad picture and said, "He better not show up at the school's 50th anniversary, that's all." Then he looked at me, laughed, and said not to worry; after what Roosevelt had done, he would never dare show his face at school even if the rector invited him, which he wouldn't think of doing.

As a student the next year at Groton, I didn't hear much about Roosevelt, but there was a lot of excitement over the anniversary. It was to be a time we would never forget. In spite of what father had said, the President did get an invitation, and it was accepted. Father stood up for the rector, saying that the anniversary was so important the President of the United States had to be asked, no matter who he was. When the word came that they—meaning Roosevelt sympathizers—had got to the rector, it was a bad time. The rector couldn't be wrong, Roosevelt couldn't be right, and father's friends said now they were really done for. One of them casually mentioned the possibility of assassination, but father said he wouldn't have such talk in his house. They weren't going down to that man's level, at least not that far down, and besides, you don't assassinate Groton boys. "There are other ways of handling the problem," father said, "and if he insists on coming for the anniversary, well, it will be handled. You know how hard I have always played, and I'll take care of it in my own way." His friends could count on him, he said.

I don't know if they believed him, though they said they were behind him 100 percent, but I believed him. On my return to school, I wrote what I hoped was a tactful letter suggesting that father not come for the anniversary. The weekend was bound to be a mess, and I was sure he knew how hot it could get in June at Groton. In reply came a stock exchange sell-order form with the message that he was bullish about the market but not about me. He didn't know what was going on up there, but he hadn't thought he would ever have to wonder if Groton was the right school for a son of his. He closed by saying it certainly was going to be a hot weekend and we were going to have a long talk during it.

The instructions that were passed out to the boys were specific: We were hosts—Groton hosts—and we were expected to behave accordingly. Since we would be far outnumbered by the guests, we had our work cut out for us. The graduates, regardless

of their present calling in life, were to be considered as equal in importance. This meant all graduates. The school cheer would be given for them at times thought appropriate by the prefects, but, as with all other demonstrations of approval, only at the prefects' direction. There was no mention of expression of disapproval, and there didn't need to be. The threat of what would happen to any boy—or graduate, for that matter—who forgot what the rector saw as the Groton code hung over the place all weekend.

The guiding principle of keeping us busy was exactly what I had in mind for father, but since I didn't see how I could regulate his activities, I had to rely on distracting him. To do this I had to be with him. I couldn't be in two places at the same time—where duty to the school required me to be and where responsibility for father said I had to be—and I could see a crop of blackmarks coming. I decided I would settle for as many as they might add up to by the time the weekend was over if I could keep him out of the way.

Instead of assembling with my form on that Friday morning, I waited for father at the gate. He was to have spent the night in Boston with a fellow-veteran from the bomb-squad days. I knew what that meant. Long drinks and long thoughts about the Bolsheviks they should have stood up against the wall and shot, as a matter of principle, Father and the President were both late.

At last I heard distant sirens. They belonged to the President's escort, composed of Massachusetts State police, on motorcycles, and as they coasted through the gate, they looked well armed and businesslike. They were followed by a sedan full of what I assumed were secret service men. It stopped just inside the gate, and a large Packard touring car, its top down and the seal of the President of the United States on the rear doors, drew up behind it. The President was sitting in back. I watched him remove a cigarette from a long holder. He wore a gray suit, a dark tie, and a panama hat. He looked bigger than I had expected—almost as big as the rector, which made him a lot bigger than father. As the Packard moved on, he was laughing, with his head thrown back.

Presently, I heard "the Star-Spangled Banner" in the distance. Father still hadn't come, and I decided he wasn't going to make it. I was about to try to rejoin my form inconspicuously when there was a squealing of brakes and a tired Boston taxi stopped short of the gate. Father got out carefully, gave me a tense nod, and winced as he paid the driver. Breathing rather heavily, he frowned at the driveway and said that, naturally, he was already here. Just like him to be early. No taste at all. I explained that they were both late, and he gave me a long look, and then said that we certainly would have a talk, but right now he was going to pay his respects to the rector.

The student body had lunch in the baseball cage, there being not enough room in the dining hall, and in the middle of the afternoon I saw father waving at me from across the lawn and went to him. "They're about to line up to meet the President, on the steps of the rector's house," father said. "The rector wants it. But it is overdoing things." The line was forming already, and as we went to the end, father barely nodded at the men he knew. Several of them winked conspiratorially, wished him luck, or told him to go to it. I felt as if only I didn't know what was coming. Looking down the driveway where the Packard was surrounded by police and Secret Service men taking it easy, I saw they were in just the wrong place—too far away to stop him but near enough to catch him.

The President was on the landing, between one of his sons and the rector, and as he shook hands with one person after another, clearly enjoying himself, I noticed that he wasn't wearing the baseball hatband, and mentioned this to father. His back was rigid, and though I knew he heard me, he didn't answer. Somebody in the line called to him, "Don't let us down," and he didn't pay any attention to this remark, either, but kept advancing stiffly as the line moved slowly forward. The nearer we got to the steps, the more worried I became. Finally, I decided to try prayer. I worked hard at it, shuffling along behind father with my eyes closed. The schoolhouse bell rang, and it coincided with the President's shouting father's name—and his first name at that. I opened my eyes and saw that father had stepped to one side and was staring up at the President. His face was white and his fists were clenched. There was laughter from behind us. The President waved at father and called to him to come up there and give him the hand that won the St. Mark's game. Father ran to the head of the line and up the steps, and I heard him say, "Frank, you look great."

I shut my eyes tight, and this time really prayed. Then I heard my name being boomed out in the rector's great voice. I looked up at the landing. Father was between the rector and the President, looking very small but smiling, and each of them had an arm around him. In a dream, I went up the steps and found myself sticking a hand out at the President. He asked me if I was going out for baseball, and father said, "You bet, Frank."

I went out on the lawn to recover, and shortly father joined me. Taking my arm to steer me to his friends under some trees across the lawn, he told me not to worry about having been shy with the President. At first, he said, he had been shy, too, but nobody could be shy with him for long. Father's friends were laughing as we came up to them, and somebody asked him if that was what he had meant by handling things in his own way. He stood very straight, and said to cut it out. He and the rector agreed, he said, that even if Frank had made a mess of things, he was still a Groton boy and should be given another chance.

Braceros and Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from B. H. Luebke, professor of sociology, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, Tenn., to the Christian Science Monitor, and appearing in that publication under date of Tuesday, August 20, 1963. The letter follows:

BRACEROS AND FARMWORKERS

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Why all this outcry in Congress by liberals over 200,000 Mexican bracero farm laborers competing with domestic labor on a temporary basis when according to a recent article in U.S. News & World Report 2½ million people came into this country last year under the regular immigration laws to compete with American labor on a permanent basis?

The chief bone of contention by union labor is that the bracero is repatriated each year, and is not subject to union organization. According to the liberals, benefits and good features of the bracero program are at the expense of the poor domestic migrant families. These also come from Mexico, but they come under the general immigration laws without provision for repatriation. This makes them subject to organization which union leaders claim will solve the problems of poverty in farm labor.

Has union organization solved the problems of distressed mining areas in the Appalachian area, of the great slums of our big cities, of the people across the tracks everywhere in the United States, of technological unemployment (mechanization in agriculture) and of physical and mental inadequacy associated with poverty and the marginal worker?

B. H. LUEBKE,
Professor of Sociology,
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute.
COOKEVILLE, TENN.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 22d of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

No one has challenged the statement that Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho. Certainly no one would be foolish enough to make such a challenge.

The widespread opposition to Bonneville's invasion of southern Idaho is manifest in editorial after editorial, in resolution by chamber of commerce after chamber of commerce, in letters to the editor and in scores and scores of letters from individuals in southern Idaho. In addition, the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation representing nearly 12,000 farm families went on record against it, as did the State reclamation association, and a majority of both houses of the Idaho Legislature, who petitioned Secretary Udall not to extend the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho.

It is difficult to believe that Secretary Udall realized the extent of the opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. On the other hand, perhaps his zeal for the expansion of his Federal power empire is so great as to outweigh all opposition no matter how great and the lack of economic justification.

On August 8, 1963, the Idaho Farm Journal, of Caldwell, Idaho, expressed its opinion on the spreading of the Federal power empire, in these words:

SPREADING AN EMPIRE

More and more taxpayers are beginning to wonder why the Federal Government should build tax-exempt power systems to serve "preference" customers—that is, those who are served by publicaly owned facilities—at cut rates because of tax freedom, when publically regulated, taxpaying electric service is already available in the "preference" area.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, recently voiced his belief that the territorial limitations of Freedom power projects should be determined by Congress rather than by interested bureaus, otherwise Congress could be bypassed on vital issues.

This opinion followed the order of the Interior Department making southern Idaho a part of the Bonneville public power complex. Mr. SAYLOR said this move would cost taxpayers $5.5 million a year to save $600,000 a year for some 19 "preference" power distributors in the area while Bonneville is already losing some $15 to $17 million a year. He pointed out that such extension of the Bonneville power marketing area can only be regarded as a spreading of the "Federal power empire." He said it was accomplished by administrative fiat.

Various Federal agencies have for years opposed construction of many investor owned, publicaly regulated, taxpaying power projects which local companies seek to build.

The Federal, and local governments are deprived of tens of millions of tax dollars annually in order that "preference" customers of Government-owned powerplants may have tax-exempt cut rates. Thus is the tax load increased for all taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Evening Statesman, of Boise, Idaho, on August 2, 1963, noted in an editorial that an Oregon customer of Bonneville was protesting a BPA rate increase. The editorial follows:

MORE ON THE BPA

Volleys of opposition from reclamation interests, among others, were aroused a few weeks ago when the Federal Department of the Interior shifted control of public power sales in southern Idaho from the Reclamation Bureau to the Bonneville Power Administration, which is running in the red yearly. The Idaho Power Co., fearful of new heavy public power costs at the taxpayers' expense in extending BPA into southern Idaho, has also campaigned against the spreading of BPA territory and authority.

Since Senator CHURCH and Congressman HARDING, Idaho Democrats, preach that the southern Idaho public power users will now be enabled to get cheaper power, it may be instructive to hear what an existing BPA customer has to say about BPA's tactics in setting rates.

This customer is the Eugene Water and Electric Board, of Eugene, Oreg., which generates part of its own power needs but buys the rest from BPA. This week the board members exploded in anger when BPA announced new rates for Eugene. Its power costs, the board charged, would be increased by about $127,000 a year. L. C. Peterman, the Eugene board's consulting engineer, denounced the new BPA rate formula as "outright discrimination."

What BPA is doing, it was charged, is to set a cheap rate for those utilities which produce no power for themselves, but to put a higher price tag on the power for utilities which produce a part of their own power needs. Hence Eugene would be penalized. It takes about 3 percent of BPA's power output.

Mr. Peterman admits that BPA is entitled to get a higher rate for power, since it ought not to keep running a deficit on mortgage payments, but he assails the new BPA price formula with the scathing words:

"No public utilities commission in the country would permit this sort of formula."

Mr. Speaker, the president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Twin Falls, Idaho, says that he is at a loss to understand how the Idaho Representatives formed the opinion that the people in southern Idaho are for the extension of Bonneville power into that area. He says it seems that everyone he has discussed it with is opposed to this further extension of Federal power. His letter follows:

FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION OF TWIN FALLS,
Twin Falls, Idaho, August 14, 1963.

The HONORABLE JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I note that you have taken issue with the Congressman from Idaho when they have tried to make it appear that the people in southern Idaho are in favor of the extension of Bonneville power to this area.

I am at a loss to understand how our representative formed this opinion. It seems that everyone I have discussed it with are opposed to this further extension of Federal power.

I do not own any shares in the Idaho Power Co. My opinion of their performance in this area is based solely on the fact that I have been a customer of theirs both individually and with this association for more than 30 years. I would be pleased if all the money I spent for goods and services brought me the same return as the money I pay the Idaho Power Co. It seems to me that if the Federal Government installs transmission lines in southern Idaho, it will be just another case of "something for nothing" that the tax payers can ill afford.

Very truly,

LEO ANDERSON,
President.

Mr. Speaker, a housewife of Boise, Idaho, says "Let's keep Government governing, and out of private enterprise," in her letter thanking me for my efforts. "Fantastic" is the word she uses in thinking about the nearly $100 million cost for facilities to transmit Bonneville power to southern Idaho. Her letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: Congratulations on your stand regarding Bonneville power to southern Idaho.

To think that Bonneville will have to seek nearly a hundred million dollars for facilities to transmit power to eastern Idaho is fantastic, to say the least.

As a taxpayer, I fully realize that Government can give me nothing that it hasn't already taken from me, I shudder to think of this unnecessary tax burden.

Let's keep Government governing and out of private enterprise.

Only a housewife but an interested citizen, I add my thanks for your efforts.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. J. H. HUNT.

BOISE, IDAHO.

In Recognition of God in Our Public Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, printed below is a resolution passed by the recent Quadrennial General Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America. The resolution is very appropriate, and to my way of thinking, is a very sensible expression of the need to resolve the questions which have arisen concerning the relationship of religion and the state because of recent Supreme Court decisions. I include the resolution for the benefit of all who care to read it:

ON THE RECOGNITION OF GOD IN OUR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Whereas the historic attitude of the U.S. Government toward the worship of God has been one of friendliness, as may be substantiated by any number of evidences; and

Whereas the American citizenry today, of whatever creed, is overwhelmingly characterized by faith in God and a recognition of our national and personal dependence upon Him; and

Whereas the intent of our Founding Fathers in forbidding the establishment of religion in the 1st and 14th amendments of our Constitution was manifestly not to remove all vestiges of our theistic faith from Government sponsored premises and activities; and

Whereas in recent years there has been a determined effort by an atheistic minority, having every personal privilege of disbelief, to secure judicial decisions purportedly based upon the Constitution to shield themselves from remainder of their minority status by the banishment of all theistic traces from publicly sponsored activities and premises, notably from our public schools which, because of compulsory attendance requirements, affect the lives of the vast majority of our children, thus undermining the historic foundation of our moral and ethical value system; and

Whereas successive actions of the Supreme Court, occasioned by the persistent appeals of atheists and agnostics, seem to indicate a growing inclination to ban from public life all worship of God, in however broad terms, and all recognition of Him: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Wesleyan Methodist Church of America, assembled in its 31st quadrennial General Conference in Fairmont, Ind., respectfully petitions our legislative leaders to discover for us and for the great God-fearing majority of our people some adequate lawful redress from the above-described disability. We presume that such may require a constitutional amendment recognizing the sovereignty of Almighty God for our Nation (while granting freedom of conviction and propagation to those who choose not to recognize Him), reaffirming the doctrine that units of the Government are to avoid acts and policies involving the support or establishment of organized religion, but declaring the principle that it is not deemed a contravention of this doctrine that the name of God be honored in state and civic life and that men be encouraged to read the Bible in its various versions and to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience, not excluding the incidental occurrence of such activities even from premises built or financed in whole or in part by public moneys, that this Nation may indeed be a nation under God.

Resolution offered by Dr. S. W. Paine and heartily endorsed by a unanimous vote of the general conference.

Catholic Bishops' Statement on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to in-

sert into the RECORD the statement of the Catholic bishops of the United States on civil rights and the current racial crisis in the country. This pastoral letter, which will be read in many Catholic churches on Sunday, stresses the need for Catholics to become personally interested in attaining an amicable solution to the problem. I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. It reads as follows:

TEXT OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS' LETTER ON RACE

Nearly 5 years ago, we the Catholic bishops of the United States proclaimed with one voice our moral judgment on racial discrimination and segregation. This judgment of November 1958, simply reaffirmed the Catholic position already made explicit in a much earlier statement in 1943. In the present crisis, we wish to repeat those moral principles and to offer some pastoral suggestions for a Catholic approach to racial harmony.

We insist that "the heart of the race question is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. * * * Discrimination based on the accidental fact of race or color, and as such injurious to human rights, regardless of personal qualities or achievements, cannot be reconciled with the truth that God has created all men with equal rights and equal dignity."

We reaffirm that segregation implies that people of one race are not fit to associate with another "by sole fact of race and regardless of individual qualities. * * * We cannot reconcile such a judgment with the Christian view of man's nature and rights." These principles apply to all forms of discrimination and segregation based on prejudice. In our immediate and urgent concern for the rights of Negroes, we do not overlook the disabilities visited upon other racial and national groups.

It is our strict duty in conscience to respect the basic human rights of every person. Our beloved pontiff of blessed memory, Pope John XXIII, stated this fact in his encyclical "Peace on Earth." He proclaimed that, "in human society, to one man's right there corresponds a duty in other persons: the duty, namely, of acknowledging and respecting the right in question." He not only condemned racial discrimination but asserted that "he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim these rights as marks of his dignity."

Respect for personal rights is not only a matter of individual moral duty; it is also a matter for civic action. Pope John stated: "The chief concern of civil authorities must * * * be to insure that these rights are acknowledged, respected, coordinated with other rights, defended and promoted, so that in this way each one may more easily carry out his duties."

We know that public authority is obliged to help correct the evils of unjust discrimination practiced against any group or class. We also recognize that every minority group in America seeking its lawful rights has the obligation of respecting the lawful rights of others. On this point, Pope John wrote:

"Since men are social by nature they are meant to live with others and to work for one another's welfare. A well-ordered human society requires that men recognize and observe their mutual rights and duties. It also demands that each contribute generously to the establishment of a civic order in which rights and duties are evermore sincerely and effectively acknowledged and fulfilled."

These truths being understood, no Catholic with a good Christian conscience can fail to recognize the rights of all citizens to vote. Moreover, we must provide for all equal opportunity for employment, full participation in our public and private educational facilities, proper housing, and adequate welfare assistance when needed.

But more than justice is involved. There is also the divine command: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Our present holy father, Pope Paul VI, at the beginning of his pontificate, reminds us that "Revelation teaches us to love all men, whatever their condition, for they have all been redeemed by the same Savior; and it obliges us to offer to those who have least the means of arriving in dignity at a more human life."

It is clear that the racial question confronts the consciences of every man, no matter what his degree of direct or indirect involvement. Indeed, the conscience of the Nation is on trial. The most crucial test of love of God is love of neighbor. In the words of the beloved apostle: "If anyone says I love God and hates his brother, he is a liar. For how can he who does not love his brother, whom he sees, love God whom he does not see?"

We can show our Christian charity by a quiet and courageous determination to make the quest for racial harmony a matter of personal involvement. We must go beyond slogans and generalizations about color, and realize that all of us are human beings, men, women, and children, all sharing the same human nature and dignity, with the same desires, hopes, and feelings. We should try to know and understand one another.

To do this we must meet and talk openly and sincerely and calmly about our natural problems and concerns. There are many ways in which such meetings can come about peacefully and naturally and fruitfully. For example those in the same type of work can readily discuss the problems caused by racial barriers. Physicians of one race can talk with those of another. So can businessmen, teachers, lawyers, secretaries, farmers, clerks, and other workers. Parish and diocesan societies, political gatherings, and civic and neighborhood associations can be common meeting grounds.

Our important task is to break down the barriers that have caused such grievous misunderstandings in the past. Where barriers have existed for many decades deep misunderstandings have all too often arisen. These should be faced, not in a spirit of debate, but with a desire to open doors of understanding.

It is only by open and free exchange of ideas that we can understand the rights and obligations that prevail on both sides. Such knowledge is the prelude to action that will remove the artificial barriers of race. We must act to remove obstacles that impede the rights and opportunities of our Negro brethren. We should do our part to see that voting, jobs, housing, education, and public facilities are freely available to every American.

We can do this in our own area of work, in our neighborhood, in our community. We may act through various lay organizations of the church, as well as with civic groups of every type. In many parts of the Nation there are interracial committees representing the major religious faiths as well as the important aspects of civic life. We bless and endorse such efforts to secure interracial harmony and to implement it in everyday affairs.

But civic action will be more fruitful, and its results more lasting, if all our citizens openly and explicitly proclaim the religious basis of racial justice and love. Accordingly, we repeat simply: Love one another, for this is the law of God. Revere in every man his human dignity, for this is a gift of God.

United, as men and women of every faith and race, we can heal the ancient wounds of division. Thus our Nation will reflect its true greatness, a greatness founded on the moral principle that all men are free and equal under God.

In all these endeavors, we must remember that they labor in vain, who seek to work without Almighty God. Our daily prayer for guidance will give us that confidence and courage we need to seek racial justice and harmony in our land. Above all, it is our prayer that the love of God may infuse our thoughts and actions, so that we may revere in every man the image of the eternal God.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Black Bear Trees Athlete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, black bears, abundant in many sections of Alaska, and generally considered harmless or relatively so, are on a rampage this year. Only the other day William Strandberg, member of a pioneer Alaska mining family, was killed by a black bear while alone at his mining camp.

Previously blacks had made two separate attacks on Fairbanks fishermen. In both cases these attacks were without provocation while the men were sleeping.

Now there has been a fourth incident. Larry J. Bidlake, University of Alaska hockey star, sighted a bear while paddling a canoe on the Porcupine River within the Arctic Circle. The bear sighted Bidlake. The bear took to the water after the University of Alaska athlete. The beast drove him ashore and treed him. The university man was bitten on both feet and it was only hours later that his tormenter left.

Some experts ascribe the ferocity of the black bears this year to the shortage of the blueberry crop. Whatever may be the cause, black bears for the first time in Alaska's recorded history are found to be extremely dangerous to man.

Kent Brandley, Fairbanks, Alaska News-Miner staff writer wrote the thrilling account of the attack on Bidlake in the August 22 News-Miner. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENRAGED BLACK BEAR ATTACKS FOURTH VICTIM AT FORT YUKON—UNIVERSITY HOCKEY STAR BITTEN ON FEET

(By Kent Brandley)

Another attack by an enraged black bear was reported this morning.

The victim was Larry J. Bidlake, 22, a University of Alaska hockey star who has been well known to local sports fans.

He was bitten on both feet as he tried to kick the bear out of a tree.

The report of the attack reached Fairbanks this morning. Bidlake, employed during the summer months by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, was attacked while on the Porcupine River about 25 miles from Fort Yukon.

He was coming down river in a canoe Monday when he saw a bear drinking from the river.

The bear crossed the river and started to come after him, running along the river bank.

Bidlake turned his canoe around and started to paddle away from the bear. He had proceeded only a few yards when the bear jumped in the water and started swimming after him.

BEACHES CANOE

He outpaddled the bear for a short distance until he encountered a log which caused him to beach his canoe.

The fleet-footed athlete, who is majoring in wildlife at the university, ran through the woods and climbed a tree. He had climed not more than 10 feet when the bear started up after him.

"I tried to shoo him down," Bidlake said. "The tree was small and I kept slipping. I kept slipping down. I kicked his nose trying to get him down, and he bit me on the right foot."

Larry then managed to pull away. He kicked the bear again and it went down to the ground.

Larry then tried to climb higher, but instead he slid down toward the bear. He was only 5 feet away from the furious bruin and, thinking quickly, he took off his knapsack and threw to the side of the bear.

The animal carried it about 50 feet. Meanwhile Bidlake ran to a sturdier tree.

"I went up it as far as I could go," he said.

EATS LUNCH

The bear ate Larry's lunch, rested for a while and then began to look for Larry.

He started up the second tree after his victim. During the next hour he made three attempts to get him. After each attempt he wandered off to eat berries and to attack Bidlake's knapsack. He also tore up the decking of the canoe, Bidlake said.

At 11:30 a.m. the bear again returned. This time Larry threw down tobacco and dried apples to detract his aggressor.

The bear again came up the tree growling and snorting. He made four more climbs, each time growing closer. Bidlake shouted and kicked and shook the tree in hopes of getting rid of him.

"When he was coming up he would snap off the limbs with his teeth," Larry said. He finally bit the student on his left foot, but during the excitement, Larry hardly noticed it.

Bidlake, in desperation, threw down his lifejacket. The bear went down to see if it was palatable. While the bear was sniffing it, John Trent, a coworker, entered the area.

Bidlake said when he heard Trent holler he told him to make a lot of noise but to be ready to run or climb a tree.

Apparently, the entrance of a second human was too much for the bear, and he made a hasty retreat.

An hour later, Jay Eisenhart, another friend of Larry's, went by the same spot and reports the bear was still there.

He said the bear did not attempt to go after him.

This Nation, Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Nation, Under God," written by Stuart P. Garver, editor, and published in the September 1963 issue of Christian Heritage. In my opinion, all clear-thinking Americans, especially those having school-age children, should have an opportunity to read this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS NATION, UNDER GOD

The shock that ran through the Nation on June 17 is hardly more than a memory to most people today. The Supreme Court decision banning compulsory use of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in public school classrooms has been accepted generally as the law of the land, despite the fact that both practices date from before the birth of the public school system itself. It appears that an unqualified application of the separation of church and state—or absolute government neutrality in religious affairs—can take us down a treacherous road toward legalized secularism.

There is something tragic behind both the Court's decision and all the debate it has stirred up in the country. The tragic element lies in the fact that the decision is hailed as the ultimate in democratic procedure. There can be no preferential treatment, so the argument runs, of any group, no use of the power of government to propagate any faith. Democracy is "of the people, for the people, and by the people" only. Where the Government acts without the full consent of the people, it must retreat to a position of absolute neutrality until such time as the people provide legislation for it to do otherwise.

But this democratic process, if it is not "to perish from the earth," cannot be divorced from the democratic principle—"this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom." It is impossible to hold on to our democratic idealism without implanting in the life of all our countrymen, if not reverence, at least respect for God as the source of all law and of justice itself.

Nor can the Government shirk responsibility for inculcating such regard for the "Author of Liberty" since it has a vital stake in the ever-emerging character of its people. Let all men in high office recognize that their Communist counterparts never shrug off their responsibility to teach atheism to their youth and turn all such teaching into fierce patriotism to boot.

The fact of the matter is that the practice of prayer and Bible reading banned by the Court is not at all sectarian in nature. Rather it is the chief cornerstone of American democracy and older than the Constitution itself. Our Declaration of Independence insists it is "self-evident that all men are created equal, and endowed by their Creator." The sense attached to such self-evident truths by the framers of this Declaration is inescapable. Apart from a grateful acknowledgment of indebtedness to the Creator's gifts to all members of the human race, we can never be sure "whether this Nation, or any nation so conceived, can long endure."

The Supreme Court decision is doubtless legally correct, but let us be reminded that "the letter of the law killeth"—even nations. It is "the spirit that giveth life," and happy

is the people whose children are imbued with the grand design of "this Nation, under God"—always. Hitler robbed a generation of German youth of such a national spirit, and the whole stream of history runs red with the blood of men whose rulers dodged their obligation to insure that children at least "retain God in their knowledge."

In our country the minimum insurance provided for this purpose was a daily devotional period in public school classrooms. Certainly no churchman felt that this period was a faithful presentation of his sectarian doctrine or that the exercises would fill his church pews Sunday mornings with bright-eyed youngsters. Most agreed that the recitation of a prayer and the not-so-good reading of a few verses from the Bible were hardly more than a formal recognition of the Declaration's basic premise that since the Creator has endowed us with certain inalienable rights the Nation is this very day "under God."

The practice developed not from any sense of religious duty, but grew out of the pedagogical necessity of impressing upon young American minds that our political life and structure, our civil rights, rest upon an open acknowledgement of the Creator and His endowments. This question, therefore, revolves not around the rights of minority or majority groups, neither is it a matter confined to the separation of church and state—the Court's brief notwithstanding. The crux of the problem is whether or not we impart to future Americans both the courage and convictions of our founding fathers who publicly declared that they pledged allegiance to a form of government which openly affirmed its indebtedness to their Creator—God, whether in the home, the church, the school, the court, the congress, or the White House.

Surely this is not sectarianism.

This is our American heritage.

Clergymen and others, who greeted with approval the Court's decision and then criticized the effectiveness of the public school teacher who tried to create at least a token classroom reverence, have some very sobering questions to ask about their own success. If they advocate that our children's instruction in praying and Bible reading be confined to the home and church, then let them soberly tabulate their answers.

How many of the total school-age population of our land do they actually reach through their Sunday Schools or classes of instruction? Or how many homes in their community can they confidently point to as good training centers in the things of God? Let them honestly seek to determine what percentage of their own congregation read the Bible "nearly every day." (Detroit's record was less than 10 percent per congregation, according to one survey.) Perhaps it will be more difficult to get an answer to the question as to how many pray daily or at least can recite the Lord's Prayer without any prompting. Not until they know this percentage, however, will the magnitude of their (and our) task to preserve the faith that first gave rise to our cherished freedom be fully known.

Forbidding public school devotional exercises means that multitudes of our children will be denied the opportunity of entering into the spirit of reverence which must forever characterize the life of any nation founded upon the democratic principle of equal opportunity for all men. Will those who hailed the Court's decision shoulder their share of responsibility for the instruction and spiritual inspiration of these children? Will they greet the opening of this school year with a prepared program and adequate staff to reach our total school-age population for God and country? The very questions are terrifying.

Baby Death Rate Here Leads United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider H.R. 7544, the Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963. An article in Sunday's Washington Post forcefully illustrates the need for enactment of this legislation. The text of the article follows:

BABY DEATH RATE HERE LEADS UNITED STATES

Washington has lowered its infant mortality rate slightly but still has more baby deaths than any other leading U.S. city, the Federal Children's Bureau reported yesterday.

The Nation's Capital had an infant death rate of 35.6 for each 1,000 live births in 1961, highest of the 10 most populous cities in the country.

In 1960, Washington's infant death rate was 36.4, which was also the highest of the 10 major cities, said Katherine B. Oettinger, Chief of the Children's Bureau.

The white infant death rate of 27.2 in 1961 and 29.4 the year before was also highest for each year.

The nonwhite baby death rate in the District in 1961 was 39.2, fifth highest of the 10 cities.

In 1960, the nonwhite infant death rate here was higher, 39.6, but at the same time, it ranked better in comparison with the other cities. Washington was sixth highest that year rather than fifth.

FIGURES BLEAK

Nowhere in the Nation, Mrs. Oettinger indicated, are the infant death rates encouraging.

"Premature birth and inadequate prenatal care are major factors in our failure to reduce infant mortality more rapidly," she said.

"Women who receive no prenatal care," she added "have a high incidence of premature delivery, and many of these babies die or suffer damage of an avoidable nature."

Calling for expanded maternity care programs and more prenatal clinics, Mrs. Oettinger also noted that in large metropolitan areas, "many expectant mothers are reluctant to go to prenatal clinics unless they are located nearby, in their own neighborhoods."

The Children's Bureau did not have any more recent statistics on infant mortality here, but the District Health Department, which makes its own compilations, reports a continuing drop in the rate through 1962.

LATER REPORTS

Last year, Washington had an overall baby death rate of 34.6, reported John Vinyard, chief of the Health Department's biostatistics division.

The white infant death rate, he said, was 23.5 and the nonwhite rate, 38.2.

Of the 10 cities on the Children's Bureau list, Los Angeles came out best in 1961 with an overall infant death rate of 23.9.

Los Angeles also had the lowest nonwhite death rate, 29.2 per 1,000, but New York City had the lowest white death rate, 21.4.

Highest nonwhite death rate was in St. Louis which had 42.3 per 1,000.

On a statewide level, Mrs. Oettinger reported, the lowest rate was reported by Utah with 20.3 deaths per 1,000 in 1961. Only two States, Mississippi with 37.8, and Alaska with 37, had higher death rates than the District of Columbia that year.

Mrs. Oettinger also reported that the United States as a Nation slipped behind 10 others in last year lowering infant mortality.

Using the latest available figures for each of 15 countries, she noted that Ireland now ranks 10th while the United States has dropped to 11th place.

The U.S. baby death rate last year, Mrs. Oettinger estimated, was 25.3, a full 10 deaths more for every 1,000 live births than the leading nations, Sweden and the Netherlands.

Provisions Protecting Braceros Cited as Rights Bill Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the New York Times has pointed out the curious fact that some Members of the Congress who are fighting President Kennedy's civil rights program appear to be vigorous supporters of much stronger antidiscrimination provisions of law to protect Mexican nationals which are contained in the braceros bill. Following Senate action on the bill to extend the Mexican worker program on August 15, Senator NEUBERGER called attention in the Senate to this strange circumstance, and the New York Times yesterday, in an article by C. P. Trussell, discussed this matter.

It may be hoping too much, but perhaps the experience these Members of Congress have had with the braceros program's strict antidiscrimination provisions has convinced them that the milder general civil rights proposals of the adminstration should be adopted. In any event, why should we not extend to Americans of the Negro race the same rights which we now prescribe for Mexicans who work temporarily in this country? I ask unanimous consent that this New York Times article of August 25 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVISIONS PROTECTING BRACEROS CITED AS RIGHTS BILL PRECEDENT

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—Congressional liberals fighting for the civil rights program are trying to kill a 12-year-old project operating under antidiscrimination provisions that have been called stiffer than those requested by President Kennedy.

At the same time some Southerners who are battling the President's civil rights proposals are supporting this program. Some of them have lived with its antidiscrimination prescriptions since 1951.

The program is the annual importation, under contract, of hundreds of thousands of Mexican workers to cultivate and harvest

American fruit and vegetable crops. They are called braceros.

The Senate voted, 63 to 24, last week to continue the importations for another year, although the program was started as a temporary emergency measure during the Korean conflict. Fourteen Southerners voted "aye."

HOUSE MAY RECONSIDER

The House, which rejected an extension in May, is expected to reconsider before the current session ends.

Meanwhile, the program is being cited as probably the strongest precedent that can be presented for the administration's civil rights bill.

Such a citation was made in the Senate by Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon. She did this shortly after the Senate had approved the 1-year extension, which she had voted against.

She put into the record the antidiscrimination terms of the United States-Mexican agreement under which the program has operated since its inception.

SOME AREAS BARRED

The terms are as follows:

Mexican workers will not be assigned to work or permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

The Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations provides the U.S. Secretary of Labor with a listing of communities in which it considers discrimination exists.

If the Secretary does not concur, the appropriate Mexican consul may request an antidiscrimination pledge from the chief executive or enforcement officers of the community.

If the Mexican consul reports discrimination despite the pledge, the complaint is investigated promptly and action taken against proved violations.

In instances of continuing discrimination the Mexican consul may ask a representative of the Labor Secretary to join in further investigation.

The Secretary of Labor thus could not authorize the employment of Mexican workers held to be discriminated against, or would be required to withdraw the employment authority.

MAY DEMAND PLEDGES

Also the Mexican Government may bypass a disagreeing Secretary of Labor and take a case of alleged discrimination directly to the officials of a community and demand nondiscrimination pledges.

The prohibition against discrimination covers all instances, whether by a local government or local custom or by an individual. It applies regardless of whether a situation is interstate or wholly local in character, Senator NEUBERGER emphasized. So, she held, the Bracero antidiscrimination provisions are more far reaching than the pending civil rights program.

Mrs. NEUBERGER has received from the Labor Department a report showing that as of Sept. 14, 1962, the Mexican Government continued to hold 10 Texas communities ineligible for the contracting of Mexican workers.

The report cited several instances of discrimination at various points in Texas, in cases of restaurants, bowling alleys a swimming pool and a movie theater. These cases and many others, the report stated, were resolved satisfactorily.

The program has been shrinking in recent years. Arkansas, for instance, contracted for 12,410 braceros last year, against 44,780 in 1959. During this period the Texas importation dropped from 225,498 to 36,298. Tennessee, which had 1,228 in 1959, reduced its number to 165, and Georgia, which imported 1,094 in 1959, called in none last year.

Administration Economic Policies Disputed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the administration's economic programs are often accused of being old fashioned because of their insistence on balanced budgets over the business cycle and a limited public debt. A recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal takes a contrasting view. It points out that in the area of economic theory there is actually little support for the brand of economies that is currently being practiced by the Kennedy administration. This conclusion is based on the observation that even those economists who are biased toward increased spending and economic controls have traditionally espoused certain restraints which are thought to be missing in present administration programs.

The Journal points out that not only do the lessons of the past and the ordinary man's commonsense weigh against the Kennedy brand of economics, but that there is also a substantial body of professional economic opinion that opposes the administration position. This school objects to continued budget deficits, increased Government spending, and continued easy money because they distort the economy and impede real economic growth.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the August 2, 1963, Wall Street Journal in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW DOGMATISTS

"Somewhat wryly, the President has frequently asked his exprofessional advisers where the several million college students who have taken Ec 1 in the past 20 years have gone."

That little insight was provided earlier this year by a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. It is an interesting thought: Despite all the indoctrination in the new economics in many of the Nation's schools, millions of Americans today are incurably old fashioned in their views about Federal budgets and public debt. For a Government dedicated to economic sophistication, it must be quite vexing.

But we suspect there are some sound reasons for the difficulty of winning wide popular acceptance of the new economics. One is that it is not just a case of sophisticated Federal economists versus the allegedly unsophisticated masses. Whether the Government believes it or not, there are considerable numbers of eminent professional economists throughout the world who also disagree with the teachings of the new economics.

Specifically, they question the miracle-working powers of perpetual planned deficits, constantly rising Government spending, ever-growing public debt, all accompanied by easy money and a confusing and often internally contradictory assortment of economic regulations and controls. On the contrary, such economists view this melange as very bad business, because it distorts the economy, impedes economic growth, aggravates the balance-of-payments problem, leads to inflation and hence risks a serious slump.

Such views, we submit, reflect not economic illiteracy, but knowledge fortified by the teachings of experience. It is tempting to speculate what some of the Federal economists think did cause the world's great inflations and subsequent depressions, or whether they ever heard of history's bleak experiments with the managed or semimanaged economy. Perhaps they do not believe in historical analogy; if so, the more pity for the Nation.

In point of fact, even the realm of economic theory offers little or no support for the new economics as practiced by this Government. The earlier prophets of the new economics, for all their bias toward Government spending and control, nonetheless insisted on certain restraints.

For example, the so-called compensatory theory of budgeting holds that deficits can be a stimulus in slumps but that budgets must be balanced in prosperous years. Those older new economists would not have subscribed to deficits as a way of life in all economic conditions. Nor would they have failed to note, as our Washington friends seem to, the connection between these persistent domestic deficits and the persistent deficits in our balance of payments.

Now, no reasonable people, including today's orthodox economists, are proposing anything particularly extreme as an alternative to the new economics. The need is not to dismantle Government but to limit it in the way it was supposed to be. A Government which presumes to take on all individual responsibilities is less a guardian of the national interest than a potential threat to it.

In such a calmer climate, much would be possible. The conditions would exist for safe tax reduction and the increased economic activity the Government professes to want so much. Maximum individual and economic freedom consistent with order is, at any rate, the historical path to economic and politically well-being.

While we naturally don't expect the Federal economists to change their views, we could wish they were a little less dogmatic in their assumption that theirs is the only valid economic position. We wouldn't be all that cocksure if we found arrayed against us a respectable body of professional opinion, the teachings of the past and the ordinary man's commonsense.

Jordan Enterprises Weekly Newspapers Receives Coveted Quill Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, my constituent, DuPree Jordan, Jr., publisher of Jordan enterprises weekly newspapers, visited this city, where he had the opportunity to observe the Congress, to meet with leaders of both Houses, and to discuss issues with top-level leaders of the administration.

The result of his visit was a special section included in his newspapers, the

North DeKalb Record, the Weekly Star, and the Tri-County Graphic, entitled "A Week in Washington, D.C."

This excellent feature was widely distributed to Members of Congress. From comments I have received, I know that my colleagues share with me a deep appreciation for the fair and objective manner in which Mr. Jordan compiled his most interesting observations. I am, therefore, pleased to advise my colleagues that Mr. Jordan's perspective has not gone unnoticed by his fellow journalists. The Atlanta Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalism fraternity, recently conferred upon Jordan Enterprises its coveted Quill Award, for outstanding contribution to journalism. I congratulate Mr. Jordan on this signal honor.

Tribute to Federal Bureau of Investigation—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have received from the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police the following resolution commending the Federal Bureau of Investigation and especially Special Agent Ralph W. Bachman. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED JUNE 20, 1963, AT THE 51ST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE HELD AT SPRING LAKE, N.J.

Whereas the members of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police and their respective departments continually receive excellent cooperation and assistance from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and its various Divisions; and

Whereas Director Hoover and Special Agent in Charge of New Jersey, Ralph Bachman, have diligently supported the aims, objectives, and ideals of this association and assisted tremendously in police training in New Jersey; and

Whereas the members of this association sincerely appreciate a most inspiring and timely address presented by Special Agent in Charge Ralph W. Bachman during our 51st annual conference: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this conference and a copy transmitted to Director Hoover with our greetings and best wishes and heartfelt appreciation for the splendid cooperation and assistance continually received, and our confidence and trust in Director Hoover and his associates affiliated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of said resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and to Special Agent in Charge Ralph W. Bachman, as well as the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, and the U.S. Senators and Congressmen in the State of New Jersey.

JOHN W. BUDD,
President.

Young Democrats and the Radical Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that the national president of the Young Democrats, Allen T. Howe, has repudiated the actions of the Western States Young Democratic Conference held recently in Berkeley, Calif.

There can be no doubt that resolutions urging the resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba; the signing of a nonaggression pact with the Eastern European slave states; and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Far East are clearly following the Kremlin line and are repugnant to all responsible members of the Democratic Party.

It is right that the conference should be condemned, and the so-called Young Democrats participating in it exposed.

However, I cannot agree with Mr. Howe when he calls the conference "an isolated instance." Those resolutions are typical of many that have been spewed forth in recent years at meetings of the California Young Democrats.

It seems clear to those that study the situation that there has been a determined attempt by radicals of the far left to gain control of the Young Democratic movement in the Western States. It will not do for Mr. Howe to simply point his finger at the Young Republicans. The outrageous happenings within the California Young Republicans and the violence and rightwing fanaticism displayed at their meetings does not provide us with an excuse for extremism within our own party.

Mr. Howe says, "The Young Democrats allow—even welcome—dissent." For my part, I think this is commendable. Our party is neither totalitarian in origin nor monolithic in structure. However, there is something to be said for party responsibility and political maturity as well. Both these two qualities have been conspicuously absent in the proceedings of the Young Democrats in the Western States.

Resolutions calling for unilateral disarmament by the United States have been introduced time and time again at meetings of Young Democrats in California. Sometimes these resolutions have been brazenly worded, at other times their true meaning has been slightly veiled. On a number of occasions resolutions of this type have been passed at regional and State meetings.

Anyone reading the convention platforms and resolutions of the California Young Democrats can only assume that the organization is firmly in the grasp of a highly vocal group of emotional radicals, peace-at-any-pricers, and other assorted lunatic leftists.

It is a disgrace that the honorable name of the Democratic Party should be associated with such resolutions and policy positions. I know that there have been many sincere members of the Young Democrats battling against this tide of radicalism, but they have been left to stand alone. Little, if any, interest or aid has been forthcoming from the national leadership.

I suggest to Mr. Howe that he refrain from pointing the finger of scorn at the Young Republicans until such time as his own house is in order. The old expression—people in glass houses should not throw stones—is entirely appropriate in this case.

It may be of further interest to Mr. Howe to know that radicalism is not confined to those parts of his organization located in the Western States. The District of Columbia Young Democrats could stand his close inspection. Recently that group passed a resolution calling for the District of Columbia to be placed under control of the United Nations. If this is meant as a joke it is in pathetically poor taste, and if it is meant to be serious I shudder to think what else they may advocate.

Mr. Howe is proud of the liberty displayed by his organization. I think that his organization has confused liberty with license. I think they also confuse political freedom with anarchy. I suggest that Mr. Howe and the National Committee of the Democratic Party launch a full-scale inquiry into the activities of the Young Democrats, and attempt to bring order into this ever-present chaos. If this organization is to have the privilege of using the name of our party—they must prove they have the necessary maturity to earn it.

Tools for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the August 12 edition of the U.S. Department of Commerce's publication International Commerce contained an article entitled "Toolup Aid Goes Overseas," highlighting the work of Tools for Freedom Corp.

Inaugurated in Rhode Island in 1960, Tools for Freedom is a nonprofit, charitable, scientific, and educational corporation organized, sponsored, and administered by the U.S. business community.

Its program aids self-help development overseas by the distribution of donated machinery, equipment, and inventory to qualified technical vocational schools in the developing countries.

Tools for Freedom helps to move old machine tools and equipment across our borders, increasing the potentials for domestic sales of new and improved machinery; enables young people abroad to receive training equipping them to lead their countries out of the underdeveloped category; and, provides an example to foreign populations of U.S. free enterprise acting to meet the aspirations and needs of people everywhere. The items contributed by more than 400 participating companies have

been designed to meet almost every conceivable training need of thousands of students in 51 countries.

Mr. President, the work of this organization, Tools for Freedom, is an outstanding example of the important role private enterprise can and has played in the economic development of developing countries.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOOLUP AID GOES OVERSEAS

Icebreakers are not listed among the $1.9 million worth of tools and machinery shipped by Tools for Freedom to Africa, Asia, and Latin America during the past 3 years, but one effect of the program has been to "break the ice" for increased sales in those areas of U.S.-made equipment.

Tools for Freedom's President Mansfield D. Sprague, vice president of the American Machine & Foundry Co., describes the organization's work in these terms:

"It is a double-barreled business program helping both self-help development overseas and the U.S. business community here and abroad. It is the contribution by American industry both of new, used, or outdated machinery, equipment, and inventory to qualified technical and vocational schools in the developing countries.

"* * * Sixty-eight schools have received major shipments enabling them to double and even triple enrollments and to train effectively large numbers of students where only limited numbers could be accommodated before."

FIVEFOLD AIM

In addition to laying the groundwork for more exports to countries familiarized with U.S. products through the program, Tools for Freedom helps to move old machine tools and equipment across our borders, increasing the potentials for domestic sales of new and improved machinery; enables young people abroad to receive training equipping them to lead their countries out of the "underdeveloped" category; enhances the corporate public relations programs of contributing companies; and provides an example to foreign populations of U.S. free enterprise acting to meet the aspirations and needs of people everywhere.

"The simple truth is, you can't sell typewriters or machine tools where people don't know how to run them," Mr. Sprague observes. "On the other hand, every 100 students trained on U.S. equipments represents 100 possible future buyers of U.S. equipment.

"Something often overlooked in many of these countries is that the majority of the people do not like to buy goods that they have not actually touched or manipulated before. The technical schools provide the widest opportunities to introduce American equipment."

HACKSAWS TO LAB EQUIPMENT

From files and hacksaw blades to lathes, generators, electronic testing machines, printing presses, and laboratory equipment, the items contributed by more than 400 participating companies have been designed to meet almost every conceivable training need of thousands of students in 51 countries. This summer, on the occasion of Tools for Freedom's 70th shipment, President John F. Kennedy observed:

"The United States has the greatest backlog of tools of any place in the world. There is a great need for them in the newly developing countries. If we could put young students together with these tools it would give them an opportunity to understand how industrialization can improve the lives of their people. This is the only way that their lives can be substantially advanced.

"I want to commend the companies involved * * * for taking the leadership in this regard."

OFFICERS

Among the 30 members of Tools for Freedom's board of trustees is the Honorable Christian A. Herter, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiation. Executive committee members, in addition to Mr. Sprague, are: executive vice president, Robert Morrow; vice president, F. Taylor Ostrander, assistant to the chairman, American Metal Climax, Inc.; secretary, Robert M. Pennoyer, Patterson, Belknap & Webb; treasurer, Paul E. Wallendorf, manager (Banking & Corporate Finance), General Electric Co.; Sylvan Barnet, partner, Barnet & Reef Associates, Inc.; Rowland Burnstan, Industrial Relations Counselors Service, Inc.; Karl G. Harr, president, Aerospace Industries Association; Townsend Hoopes, partner, Cresap, McCormick & Paget; William H. Lang, administrative vice president and treasurer, United States Steel Corp.; Waldemar Nielsen, president, African-American Institute; Herbert P. Patterson, senior vice president, Chase Manhattan Bank; and Robert H. Strange, senior financial adviser, Rockefeller Bros., Inc.

Industry associations backing the program include Associated Industries of Massachusetts, National Machine Tool Builders' Association, Woodworking Machinery Manufacturers' Association, and the American Machine Tool Distributors' Association. Headquarters are at 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y., 10017.

Inaugurated in Rhode Island in 1960, Tools for Freedom is a nonprofit, charitable, scientific and educational corporation organized, sponsored, and administered by the U.S. business community.

RECOMMENDED

Oversea training schools benefiting from the program are investigated and recommended by cooperating organizations such as the Pan American Union, African-American Institute, and the Asia Foundation, together with American businessmen or business organiztaions, U.S. Government agencies, and U.S. voluntary aid agencies such as CARE, American Friends Service Committee, Catholic Relief Services, and Church World Service.

Immediate goal of the program is to give 300,000 students annually a chance to acquire useful skills at schools provided with needed training equipment. Students in Pakistan, the Philippines, Nigeria, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Tunisia are among those attending 53 schools in 17 countries receiving equipment from Tools for Freedom. Initial shipments have led to requests from an additional 340 schools in 56 countries.

RESOURCES

To show that the United States is preeminently qualified to meet the need, Tools for Freedom cites the American Machinist's finding ("8th Inventory of Metal Working Equipment") that there are about 1,750,000 obsolete metal-cutting and metal-forming machine tools in this country (mostly of 1939 design or earlier), and Steel magazine's statement that "experts estimate * * * no other country has as much obsolete plant and equipment as the United States—$95 billion worth."

STOCKPILE

This great stockpile of equipment which is obsolete only in a relative sense—from the standpoint of U.S. technology—supplies a vital ingredient for technical training programs in the countries served by Tools for Freedom. Where the price of a micrometer represents a school's equipment budget for 1 month, the value of the contributed tools and machinery is unmistakable. With such aid, industrially developing countries can begin to supply themselves with critically needed middle-level skilled manpower. As Mr. Sprague points out, the worst shortage is not "of graduate engineers but of the technicians who can maintain power stations or electrify a village, run a sawmill, operate a machine shop, or heattreat metal."

PRIORITY

Tools for Freedom's list of most-needed equipment is led by machine tools, welding, and woodworking equipment, electronic and science apparatus, and printing equipment.

The organization's administrative overhead is described as "modest" and is met by company and foundation contributions. Contributing firms are also asked to make a cash donation of 5 to 10 percent of the equipment's fair market value, with both equipment and funds contributions tax deductible. This is described as offering "one important added incentive to the American manufacturer to update his equipment because it offers him a favorable tax writeoff as well as an immediate use for his outdated equipment."

SHIPPING

Oversea transportation of the materials is arranged at no cost to participating companies through the cooperation of CARE, various private and U.S. Government agencies, and private shipping lines. Donor companies crate and deliver equipment to the port of embarkation. Trucking firms frequently provide free service.

Tools for Freedom has enlisted major representatives of American free enterprise—acting on the basis of enlightened self-interest—in a significant international good will program. One index of the contributing companies' enthusiasm is the fact that 30 percent of them have included new equipment in their shipments.

In the Literary Vineyards of Gettysburg an Author Labors On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the weight of public attention has lessened, but its responsibilities still remain for Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. In his office and at home in Gettysburg, there is much activity in researching and writing about his Presidential years of service. The New York Times book review section of July 7, 1963, reports how "In the Literary Vineyards of Gettysburg an Author Labors On." General Eisenhower accepts this project with the same good nature and determination that is indicative of all his work. Many of us in Congress and throughout the country who admire President Eisenhower so much look forward to reading his thoughtful observations. The article follows below:

IN THE LITERARY VINEYARDS OF GETTYSBURG AN AUTHOR LABORS ON

(By Lewis Nichols)

GETTYSBURG.—In an office near the center of this small Pennsylvania town, now breathing quietly again after the centennial of the battle that made it famous, one of the more harassed authors of the day sits working on a book. The title—there are to be two

volumes—is "The White House Years," the author, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He agreed to see a couple of callers the other day—what's one more interruption, when there have been so many?—in the compact building which once was part of Gettysburg College. This being a bit before the July 1–3 centennial, people were walking around with odd-looking beards and costumes in the center of town a quarter mile away. Within the building, marked with no sign of identification beyond the stern "by appointment" notice by the bell, the author, researchers, and editors were going over the final galley proofs of the first volume, "Mandate for Change," which is to be published in October.

The building is quiet, cool, soundproofing on the ceiling smothering whatever alien noise may have escaped the wall-to-wall thick carpeting on the floor. During the writing of the book, each of the two floors has its separate aind defined function. The first, or ground floor, is for the book. There is a conference room there, and the office of the former President's son, John Eisenhower, now a Doubleday editor since his recent resignation from the Army. In bookcases along the walls are materials used in research, and also on this floor are some safes with formidable looking locks, containing material that still is classified. For tracking down the odds and ends of material not found in Gettysburg, there has been a Washington researcher, William Ewald, whose primary beat has been the Library of Congress.

The second floor of the office is given over to what may be called other business. Brig. Gen. Robert L. Schulz, retired, the former President's aide, who has been with him since 1946, is in charge up there. On an average day, 100 letters come in, must be dealt with, and after a speech they arrive fivefold. It is up there that the demands are made on the former President's time, thus leading to the harassment of an author.

The former President's study is a corner room, his desk at an angle near the window, three leather-covered chairs for visitors. Behind the desk chair is a flag, and as he sits, casually leaning back, he faces the entrance door of clear glass, on which have been painted the five stars of a general of the Army. This is a photographer's dream—a picture of the subject taken through the stars—but the former President regards the whole thing as a little "too corny" for his tastes. The stars were put there because a number of visitors, mistaking clear glass for an open door, banged their noses against it.

For almost an hour in the morning, the former President talked amiably and easily, if a little ruefully, about the toll taken of an author's time by sundry interruptions. He offered perhaps the best reason of all for writing a book—duty. Although it doesn't appear in the Presidential oath, he feels that any President owes to the future a complete, factual memoir of his years in office.

"Very few of my predecessors have left definitive volumes," he said. "What wouldn't you give now to have a definitive memoir by Johnson, who succeeded Lincoln—reconstruction, and all the rest?

"Some parts of it have been fun—it's good to look back and test memory. Other times, when you try to describe the budget or something—how complicated that can get, and if you're not careful, how dull to the reader.

"It has been nice to relive some of the events. I never made a decision which at the time I didn't believe in, and I try to explain the decisions. For example, for the first 2 years, there was a precarious majority in the House, even stephen in the Senate. The opposition took over for the second 2 years. People wondered why I didn't lambast them, but you can't offer ice cream and rough-on-rats at the same time, and it was necessary to use persuasion. In 1956, we lost both Houses. I don't know how this happened. I probably won't even try to explain it.

"In writing this, I make a statement, the publishers say, 'How the hell do you know that?' Then I have to prove it. Most of the papers are here. Some files are secret, of course. They can be used for checking but not quoted from. That's my son's job. He has been cleared. There are other files in Arlington and Abilene, but by and large our records here are in pretty good shape."

Had he ever taken offense at things done and said, and would he now, with pen in hand fight back? The answers, yes and no, in that order.

"Of course I've taken offense, but I've trained myself all my life not to get into disputes based on personalities. Sometimes as I've been writing, I've found myself going too far and have had to stop. I'm anxious never to ascribe motives to people, and this may make the book less exciting. Of some, I simply relate the facts, let people draw their own conclusions. The big thing is to lay out the reasons behind the decisions."

As to how close a President can come to properly evaluating his own Presidency, there are no illusions these days in Gettysburg. "It can't be done by anyone for perhaps 20 years. Maybe as far away as Mr. Hoover—maybe he can."

As a writer, President Eisenhower follows two systems—dictation, and by hand on ruled paper. The one full-time and two part-time secretaries who have been working on the book are very fond of him, but they wish all were by dictation. Instead of reaching for another piece of paper when he reaches the bottom of one, he simply turns the first on its side and goes on writing along the margins.

Some of the events he has set down from raw research supplied by his son and Mr. Ewald, things, for example, that can be recalled from such tomes in Gettysburg as the bound Public Papers of the Presidents, and the daily appointment book down the 8 White House years, in itself a fascinating bit of reading. Others he has written from memory, using the researchers as checkers, when Doubleday asks how the hell did he know that. While traveling, he has used odd moments of free time to write 10 or 12 pages, which have been mailed back for transcription. One bit of raw material, while at hand, won't appear in the book. Former Prime Minister Winston Churchill has refused permission for the use of his letters to the President. While there is no factual explanation of this given in Gettysburg, the assumption is that the Prime Minister's son, Randolph Churchill, may wish, himself, to use them.

Downstairs in the afternoon, it was informal and casual. The final bit of going over proofs took place in the conference room, its long table littered with galley proofs, scraps of paper, pads, pencils. At the table, two sides were lined up like opposing armies—two Eisenhowers on one, which would be the defense; Doubleday on the other, in the persons of Samuel Vaughan and Kenneth McCormick, editors, and Douglas M. Black, chairman of the board, and a friend of the former President.

The former President wore loafers, a sports jacket, a sports shirt—although not quite a Truman sports shirt. At the start, he was addressed with careful solemnity as "Mr. President." As the conversation became a sort of amiable seminar on history—political, military, presidential—along with side discussions, the "Mr. President" was dropped in favor of a "You." Items:

Vaughan (chief devil's advocate): "Mr. President, you say that right after your nomination, you went to Taft's headquarters. What did you say?"

Author: "He asked if it were all right if his sons were present. I said certainly. Then I said, 'I just came over to assure you that I want to be friends.'"

Vaughan: "Now here, this is where you were president of Columbia."

Author: "I was against that. At the end of the war I wanted to go to some rural undergraduate college. I wanted no part of New York. I don't like vertical living. Besides the president's house, nothing had been done to it, you pushed down hard and your hand would go through the window sills."

Black (hurt): "I was chairman of the buildings and greens committee then."

Author (firmly): "Your hand would go right through the window sills."

Vaughan: "Here's this insert you gave us yesterday."

Author (reading): "I suppose I'm going to have to go along with these split infinitives."

Vaughan: "They're your split infinitives."

Author (using pencil): "Let's get some of them out of here."

With the first volume of the memoir now wrapped up, the former President has done the first draft of 13 chapters of the second, with 12 to go. He has sworn that whatever political or itching foot sirens may call, he will devote this month and next to knocking off the dozen. When finished with his accounting of his Presidency, will he then keep on writing?

"God forbid." And then a pause, and this being an honest man, "Well, perhaps essays on the Presidency. Or articles on the passing scene, as I see it."

The Militants Have Gone Too Far in Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, earlier editorials from the Peoria Journal Star which I inserted into the RECORD indicated that the mood of the Peoria, Ill., community was favorable to Negro demonstrations. Now we see by the following editorial that the actions of the NAACP are hindering the Negro cause in that area. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial of August 21, 1963:

PICKETING, MILITANCY, AND FAIRNESS

Well, the militants can be proud of themselves.

They have succeeded in destroying a mood and a broad move to widen Negro employment across the board in this community.

The appeal of the speaker who protested against cautionary editorials because they came from caucasian editors seems to have had its response.

It was followed by renewed demonstrations which were then stepped up to the point of transgressing the law.

And now we are busily painting ourselves into a corner in this community bickering over whether picketing violates the earlier agreement.

Picketing? It isn't just picketing anymore when it crosses the line to putting kids under truck wheels, and other acts of physical obstruction.

Let's not talk double talk.

All this does is get everybody involved in side issues. Already, the militants overlooked the fact that there was also a white awakening blooming in this community and a widespread mood and movement among

the major employers to make an extra-special effort not merely to correct any past discriminatory effects of hiring procedures but to broaden Negro employment opportunities, specifically.

That is easier said than done, when one has a functioning organization that must keep functioning efficiently to support the effort. It is always easier to obstruct and disrupt and destroy than to build solidly—be it jobs or anything else. It was definitely underway.

Behind it were two powerful forces: (1) A white awakening to the reality that some longstanding practices resulted in actual discrimination, and (2) the desire to remedy the situation in time and avoid trouble in this community.

Rightly or wrongly, that second incentive has largely gone down the drain, now.

There is confusion over what the NAACP and its leadership really want. To many, many people there is not a question whether they want fair employment, jobs, or more than those the honor of taking part in a physical way in the revolt—and in some cases wanting above all the badge of that honor, a trip to jail.

In this kind of confusion, there is a serious doubt in the minds of many whether any amount of employment in any number of companies will make any real difference in the end result so far as the NAACP insisting on finding something, someplace to demonstrate about, and stepping up such demonstrations beyond the rights of free speech to a self-satisfying defiance of law.

Thus, the militants, in seeking to put on the pressure have succeeded in taking off the pressure. They had it on. Now, this confusion makes the special effort that was underway seem useless.

The steam has gone out of it, at the very least.

Some say the NAACP leadership doesn't want any progress unless it can come directly in the presence of NAACP action—one step at a time.

We do have something of that sort of spirit demonstrated in that militant protest against a Caucasian having any right to even express himself independently on race relations. It seems to be a segregated subject to that speaker, except for any Caucasian who just wants to cheer anything the NAACP does.

That was only one man speaking, but if that attitude spreads, and is taken seriously there will be a vast silence from 96 percent of this metropolitan population on the subject of race relations.

That wouldn't do much for real Negro progress.

Indeed, it is exactly what must not happen. Caucasians must express themselves independently, not only in words but in actions—independent actions to clean up questionable hiring practices and eliminate all forms of discrimination against individuals on the basis of color.

Nothing that has happened, nor none of the interpretations of what to expect justifies for one moment a single act of discrimination on the part of any employer.

That central, basic, moral fact must not be lost in all the dust that has been kicked up by zealous people who can't tell the difference between thunder and lightning, and apparently think the thunder creates the lightning instead of vice versa.

This obligation exists whether there are demonstrations or not, whether there are agreements or not, indeed, whether there is a militant NAACP or no NAACP at all.

Any person determined not to be pressured into hiring Negroes by the NAACP ought to be equally determined not to let that pressure cause him to discriminate against individual Negro job applicants.

Whether you are sympathetic or have become unsympathetic with some tactics, the first order of business is to remember that a grievance does exist and to hire on a fair, nondiscriminatory basis whether you get credit for it or not from the NAACP.

The actions of the NAACP in the past have helped the Negro cause. They have contributed to a Negro awakening and to a white awakening. Present actions by them seem to be backfiring, and it is a mistake to prejudge the future. Future actions by the NAACP may help or hinder.

But whether they help or hinder, the white awakening should guarantee progress independently of anything they do, for the fair hiring of capable Negro job applicants, and in other areas of past discrimination.

It can, on its own, do this.

We must not get the dust of these discriminations in our eyes, but must proceed to do what is right, regardless of any feelings about one or two Negro leaders and their followers' actions.

The Economic Rainbow and the Pot of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when President Kennedy was a candidate for the office of the presidency in 1960, he made a speech in Cadillac Square, Detroit Mich., on September 5. After praising the then Gov. G. Mennen Williams, and Governor-Candidate Swainson—he stated, among many things, and I quote:

> And finally, if we are going to grow the way we should grow, we must adopt fiscal policies that will stimulate growth and not discourage it. Every American who financed a home, who bought a refrigerator, who bought an automobile, bought a television set, has suffered from this high-interest rate policy. Those of you who bought a home for $10,000 with a 30-year mortgage, are going to pay out $3,300 more for that house than you would have paid in the Truman administration. This kind of growth that I am talking about is not antibusiness. It is probusiness. It is not antiprivate enterprise. It is proprivate enterprise, and it is pro the American people.

And so on, ad nauseum, for his political campaign to become President.

This is one of the examples in which sheer demagoguery paid off. Somehow many in the public were convinced that America would get moving again if only this charming, vigorous, aggressive young man, who seemed to have such brilliant and far-reaching ideas and plans on how to run this country, were elected.

So now we are in 1963. The President took office in 1961. We have experienced, since 1961, a Kennedy deficit which totals more than $20 billion.

The short-term interest rates have been raised. Instead of encouraging loans and investments, the Federal Reserve Board has forced banks to borrow at the discount window. They now pay 4 percent to borrow from the Federal Reserve banks. U.S. commercial banks, who used to pay the cheapest price to borrow from the central bank, now pay more than banks in Switzerland—2 percent—Holland—3.5 percent—France—3.5 percent—and Germany—3 percent.

When President Kennedy took office, the Government spent $81.5 billion. Estimated Government spending last January was to have been $98.8 billion, and the President proudly announced a short time ago that it instead was $97.8 billion. But on August 13 of this year, Treasury Secretary Dillon, in testimony before the House ways and Means Committee, stated that spending may be as much as $101 billion next year. With this he gave us a couple of aspirins, by assuring that the official spending program would not go over the $102 billion mark.

Astronomical jumps have been taken, since 1961, in our national budget, in our Federal payrolls, in our national debt.

Our balance-of-payments deficit has reached an annual rate of $5.2 billion. According to the President's own Commerce Department reports, the balance-of-payments deficit in the second quarter of the year was about $1.3 billion—a $500 million increase over the first 3 months of the year. Balance of payments—in simpler language—means the widening difference between the amount of money leaving the country and the lesser amount coming in.

Now we find our gold supply has fallen from a high of $24,771 million in August 1949—to $15,583 million.

Home foreclosures are at an alltime high. The foreclosure rate is now above four per thousand—but 3 years ago it was less than three per thousand.

Do we—or do we not have inflation?

The plain truth today is that the Federal Government is not in a wholesome financial position. Yet we still hear the "vote getting" attempts to sell the American public tax cuts without a cut in Federal expenditures.

When we Republicans—with previous encouragement from the President's own factfinding committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay—and many, many "partisans" from the President's own Democrat Party—helped bring about a tremendous cut in foreign aid spending authorizations, we were called "irresponsible and partisan" by the President.

Many of us are beginning to feel we cannot afford much more of the President's brand of "moving ahead"—not to a balanced budget and sane balance-of-payments policy, but to increasingly unbalanced budgets, and increasing balance-of-payments deficits. Many of us are beginning to wish the President would stop "making like a candidate" and start "making like a President."

It is time for him to live up to the bright promises of his election campaign. The fabled pot of gold at the end of that rainbow—so vividly pictured by then Senator Kennedy—seems to be located overseas now. And it seems to be filling up rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I received an outline of the personal opinion of a senior analyst of the Dempsey-Tegeier & Co., Inc., financial news service, titled "In Re: Gold." It sounds interesting.

While I am not an economist, nor an owner—nor even contemplating the purchase of gold stocks—I feel it is worth being brought to the attention of the House membership, and the public. I therefore insert this article with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

IN RE: GOLD

I have been asked whether I think gold stocks are attractive for purchase at this time, and my answer is "No."

I cannot see any sense in devaluing the dollar. More than one can play at this game, and if we devalue today England, France, Japan, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Sweden, et al. would devalue within 48 hours in the same proportion, and what will have been gained?

This whole balance-of-payments problem is ridiculous, and demonstrates a complete lack of self-discipline. Presently our exports are $21½ billion—and our imports are $16½ billion—so gold should be flowing to the United States at the rate of $5 billion a year. Instead it is flowing out at about a $3 billion rate. It didn't make any difference in the profligate years—the years when we defeated half a world and bankrolled those who stood beside us. Then came the years when we lifted the fallen to their feet—friends and foes alike. Why not—we were and are a good people and we are very rich, so we paid out more dollars than we took in. Of course these dollars we've spent keep turning up, turned in by an increasing number of idiots who do not think the dollar is as good as gold.

We have been told for a generation that gold is valueless except for jewelry, and we have believed it, but the idiots keep multiplying, each with a handful of dollars demanding idiot money—gold. And now, we are beginning to face up to the ugly fact that internationally we are on the way to going broke, but why? First, we do not have the guts to cut at least $1 billion per year out of the foreign aid program. Every Congressman will assure you privately that this can safely be done. Second, we do not have the guts to cut $1 billion out of our military spending abroad. This can be done easily by cutting the tour of duty and refusing to allow dependents of the military to join them abroad. Eisenhower tried to do this, but soon gave in before the political pressures. Third, we should sharply limit spending by American tourists abroad. They spend $2.9 billion while foreigners only spend $1 billion here, so almost $2 billion goes down the drain. From the foregoing you can see how you can stop the gold drain real quickly and make it unnecessary to devalue the dollar. However, we will not do so because we are political cowards.

I have a better solution than devaluing the dollar. Just a few short weeks ago we demonetized silver, passing a bill which provided that we did not have to buy or sell silver anymore. The silver certificates are redeemable only in paper money, and as fast as they go through the banks they are being retired from circulation. What if we just pass another bill to demonetize gold? Just refuse to buy it or sell it an any price. The dollar would then fluctuate in the foreign exchange market up or down the same way as the pound, franc, mark, Swiss franc and yen. If the dollar declines in the foreign exchange market it will make our goods cheaper and our exports will increase, turning the balance of payments in our favor. After all, no other country in the world has a fixed price for gold or a specific amount of gold backing for its currency. Why should we?

GEORGE W. PELUS FELDER.

No. 1, Maryland: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, I have brought to the attention of Congress the scores of nations throughout the world that have utilized Government-operated lotteries not only as a compromise with the gambling problem but as a revenue-raising device as well.

I have shown how 77 foreign countries have recognized and accepted the human urge to gamble as a normal, instinctive trait which should be regulated and controlled by the Government for the people's benefit.

Mr. Speaker, today, and in the coming weeks, I intend to discuss the vast gambling activities here in the United States which have grown into a $50 billion a year business. I also intend to discuss the panorama of gambling and crime in America—in different States, cities, and towns.

Because of our stubborn refusal to open our eyes to the bold print of commonsense, we have turned this country into a gamblers' paradise. We have, thanks to the hypocrites and bluenoses, helped the underworld crime syndicates to fatten themselves from gambling revenues.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Members of the Maryland congressional delegation are aware of the illegal gambling that goes on in that State?

While part of the gambling is strictly legal, most of it is illegal. Maryland ranked fifth in the Nation, last year, in parimutuel turnover. More than $160 million was wagered at Maryland tracks in 1962 which brought into the coffers of the State treasury over $9 million.

However, according to the McClellan Committee on Gambling and Organized Crime, off-track betting far exceeds legal betting on the horses. Maryland's share of the estimated national off-track yearly turnover is $860 million and this figure only represents less than half of the total illicit gambling in that State. Therefore, the extent of gambling in Maryland may well approach the sum of $2 billion a year—all but a small part of it being illegal.

Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that gambling syndicates skim about 10 percent of the take—this would amount to a haul of $200 million in Maryland. These moneys constitute the treasury of the underworld. So long as gambling is illegal and clandestine, the crime syndicates will wax fat. Of course, not all of this profit stays in criminal hands. The biggest expense faced by the syndicates involves the corruption of the process of government.

I do not know whether the Maryland congressional delegation realizes it but their State is heavily subsidizing the forces of organized crime with each moment that gambling is chastised rather than controlled by officialdom.

Society, Mr. Speaker, is the greatest victim of the failure and refusal to regulate and control gambling through the most obvious means—a Government-run Federal lottery. We know that the crime syndicates have a good cause to oppose a national lottery but, it seems to me, those reasons which are good cause for their opposition are also good causes for our action.

Pork?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, unrefuted in the recent speechmaking on the floor of the House in which Members rebutted the smear-like tactics of Life magazine in its issue of August 16 on the subject of so-called pork was that portion of the story pertaining to the U.S. Employment Service under the heading of "The Steaming Pork Casserole—Tasty Items in the Dish." After speaking of the scope and cost of the U.S. Employment Service, the article says:

> Here is where the pork gets mixed into the dish. To attract professional people, some State agencies build elaborate offices with free parking lots in downtown districts. * * * Last year only 40 percent of the people USES placed were unemployed.

Judging from the reaction to this article of Mr. Gil Johnson, Commissioner of Labor of Alaska, who is also head of the Alaska State Employment Service, the subject statement about the employment service is far afield indeed, as evidenced by the telegram which I have received from him, as follows:

> Following wire sent to editor of Life magazine: "I must take exception to your statement in August 16 issue that only 40 percent of the people placed by the U.S. Employment Service were unemployed. Alaska State employment is affiliated with Public Employment Service. Our records show that of the nearly 10,000 persons placed in jobs during the 12-month period ending July 30, 1963, 87 percent were unemployed. Unfortunately your writers apparently ignored the job-finding services provided by the employment service network to the physically handicapped and unemployed veterans. The job-counseling service given applicants and the activities of the service in combating automation and obsolescence of skills through retraining programs. You have apparently been misled by the current campaign being conducted across the Nation by the fee-charging employment agencies. I would appreciate it if you would give your readers a complete report on the activities of the U.S. Employment Service."

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I say that although Life magazine went far out of its way to broaden

its attack to include worthwhile programs based upon public policy and the general welfare, it said nothing about the highly preferential and deficit-producing second-class mail rate under which it mails its magazine each week to its subscribers. Honest reporting should include a fair evaluation and balanced presentation.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BALDWIN, N.Y.,
July 13, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Just a few words to express to you that I am in full accord with you in your endeavor to set up a Committee on Captive Nations. Accomplishment of this will certainly help counteract constant administration attempts to forget, ignore, and brush under the table the ordinary U.S. citizen's desire to keep the problems and memories of the captive nations alive and to help them out and perhaps (I sincerely hope) eventually assist them in getting out from under Communist domination.

We face in the United States today the massive job of reeducating our people—counteract the liberal and one-world "do-gooders" and bleeding hearts and dupes, make the people aware that this is the United States of America, the best, kindest, and strongest (under God) country in the world and we can—we must—we will remain free and assist any honest group who have similar desires.

Very truly yours,

W. S. BOERCKEL, Jr.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Hon. Congressman FLOOD,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Armenian Youth Federation of America at its 30th annual and national convention unanimously expresses its appreciation for your concern regarding freedom of captive Armenians.

THIRTIETH NATIONAL CONVENTION
ARMENIAN YOUTH FEDERATION OF AMERICA.

ELMONT, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.
July 12, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The enclosed newspaper clipping appeared in the Long Island Daily Press of July 11 and it was like a breath of spring to read of it. The special committee of which you speak would be a vital force in our everlasting battle with atheistic communism.

In these days of appeasement and events designed to "Not anger or upset Mr. K. or Mao Tse-tung." It is a revelation.

Just now there are many people in this country who are rejoicing over the so-called split in the Communist world. There is a split, to be sure, but as I see it the only split is in the method of "How best to bury us" the coexistent way or the hard way, sponsored by Communist China. The murderers of the Kremlin have quite well succeeded in their method, considering the number of nations which are now lost.

We should do all we can, and there is a good deal we could do, to needle both opponents, to keep the fight going and to exacerbate it to a maximum. The worst disaster for the West would be the restoration of fully united policy within world communism, no matter which faction came out on top. We must never lose sight of the fact that communism has made its great glacial advances under the soft, not the hard, strategy. Only at times of open revolutionary crisis, and not always then, does the hard line become serious. The riproaring slogans of the hard line are often a compensating expression of the weak position of the super revolutionaries, as in the present dispute.

Respectfully,

EDWIN R. MURPHY.

HOW ONE CAN OBSERVE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

President Kennedy has invited all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed, to observe Captive Nations Week, July 14–20, with "appropriate ceremonies and activities."

The tragedy of the people held captive behind the Iron Curtain, bamboo curtain, and Berlin wall is graphically demonstrated by the one-way flow of human traffic to the free world.

Just one example from the report of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, states: "Another refugee torrent was almost dried up at its source when East Germany, on August 19, 1961, erected the Berlin wall. In a 12-month period before the wall, more than 200,000 Germans had crossed to freedom. The wall proved a most effective dam although—by digging tunnels, leaping barriers, swimming rivers and canals—an additional 21,000 have made good their escape. More than 100 died trying. There are now upward of 4 million refugees from the East in the Federal Republic of Germany."

What can one person do to try to help in any small way the people in such Communist colonies as Albania, Armenia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet and the Ukraine?

Write a letter to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD who has introduced a measure (H. Res. 14) to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Mr. FLOOD says: "The popular response * * * to H. Res. 14 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write men on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself."

Address: House Office Bulding, Washington, D.C.

RUTH HERMSTED.

BROOKVILLE.

JULY 13, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: I am writing this letter to urge quick action on House Resolution 14 which provides support for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Our very able Congressman from this district, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD is among those working in favor of this measure.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. MCNAMARA.

JULY 11, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: This letter is written in support of House Resolution 14 which you introduced to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

My wife and I heartily endorse your proposal not only because we believe the establishment of such a committee would strengthen the security of the United States by alerting more of our citizens to the sufferings of the captured peoples but because we believe the United States is honorbound to do everything in its power to secure the freedom of these people or be untrue to its God-given heritage of liberty and justice for all.

I am going to follow this letter with one to my Congressman [JOHN WYDLER] urging him to support your resolution in every way possible.

Good luck anyway.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HEALY, JR.

Clean Air Without Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing editorial from the August 20, 1963, issue of the Greensburg Daily News:

CLEAN AIR WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROL

Clean air in all sections of the Nation is desirable.

Some areas have experienced difficulty, in large measure from smog in certain types of weather.

This has applied in particular to Los Angeles, Calif., where fog, climate, and widespread use of motor vehicles have combined to bring about an annoying and unhealthful condition. The remedy appears to be reduction of exhaust fumes. One of the leaders in the manufacture of anti-smog equipment is Arvin Industries, of Columbus.

Where there is a concentration of industry, some air pollution is certain to develop. At least, city air is not as pure as that breathed by rural residents.

Within the past 2 decades, the problem of air pollution has not been eliminated but conditions have improved. In part, this is due to efforts of local and State units of Government. Industry, too, has made a contribution in this field.

H.R. 6518, entitled the "Clean Air Act" has been passed by the lower House of Congress.

Under this act the Attorney General of the Nation would be empowered to go into any area, with or without a request from local and State officials. He could bring suit, even though local efforts were being made to combat the problem.

If a State deemed that air pollution came from industries in an adjoining State, the Attorney General could file a suit.

The amount of spending over a 3- to 4-year period is estimated at $90 million.

Some of this sum would be used for research. However, local communities would be willing to engage in research, if less available funds were not channeled to the Federal Government in the form of taxation.

Everyone desires pure air. The problem of air pollution, it would seem, can be solved best on a local level with possible State cooperation.

Herb Clark, of the Tipton, Iowa, Conservative, Wins Best Editorial Award at Annual Meeting of the National Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of calling attention to the fact that Mr. Herb Clark, of the Tipton, Iowa, conservative, had been granted the Best Editorial Award by the National Editorial Association for his editorial, "We Honor a Dream," a tribute to former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, written the day of the dedication of the Herbert Hoover Library in West Branch, Iowa.

This is the second editorial citation received by the Tipton Conservative in the last 2 years. In 1962, Herb Clark was awarded a citation for "editorial page excellence," the highest editorial writing award given to weekly papers in Iowa.

In addition, he has twice been honored by the National Editorial Association for news stories. In 1953 while news editor of the Marengo Pioneer Republican, he received a third-place award for the story of the Marengo bank fire. In 1960 a story about the "Bennett Bank Robbery" also received a third-place award in newswriting.

These awards are in addition to State honors to the Tipton Conservative for general excellence, use of photographs, typographical excellence and highest honors in the coverage.

We are proud of Herb Clark for his constant deduction to highest journalistic principles which is reflected in the honors which have come to him and the papers for which he has written.

He is an Iowan by birth and training. He was born in Tama, Iowa, May 19, 1918. He attended the University of Iowa and received a bachelor of arts degree in journalism in 1940. Since his graduation he has done graduate work at the State University of Iowa and the University of Washington.

Herb Clark started his career in journalism while he was still in college. He was a sports writer for the Iowa City Press Citizen during his undergraduate days. After graduation he went to work for the Tama (Iowa) News Herald. He then became part owner and publisher of the Toledo (Iowa) Chronicle and served in this capacity from 1948 to 1952. In 1953 and 1954 he was news editor for the Marengo (Iowa) Pioneer Republican. In 1954 he became a stockholder in and the editor for the Tipton (Iowa) Conservative, at which paper he is still winning honors.

He has some teaching experience on his side. He taught English and journalism during the 1947–48 school year at the Burlington (Iowa) High School and during the school year 1952–53, he was an instructor in the school of journalism at the State University of Iowa.

Typical of the leaders of his generation he has a fine military record. He enlisted January 7, 1941 and served overseas for 3 years in the European Theater of Operations with the 9th Infantry Division and the 7th Corps. He was separated from the service with the rank of captain. He is now a lieutenant colonel assigned to Army Intelligence and Security. He just completed 2 weeks of active duty at summer camp at Camp McCoy, Wis., attending Reserve command and general staff school.

Herb Clark is married and has five children. He married the former Ruth Hinkhouse. Their children are Arthur, 13; Krista, 11; Brian, 9; Stuart, 7 and Maeve, 6. Mrs. Clark still finds time to teach at the Bennett (Iowa) School.

The citizens of Cedar County, Iowa, will continue to be exposed to faithful reporting and thoughtful editorial opinion as long as we have people in the editor's chair with the background, training and sincere dedication which Herb Clark brings to his weekly task of turning out a highly readable, interesting and factual newspaper, the Tipton Conservative. And Herb Clark will continue to receive citations for the excellence of his work as long as the people who judge these efforts look for originality, clarity of thought and purity of prose.

Interest Equalization Proposal Ignores Underlying Causes of Balance-of-Payments Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is currently holding hearings on H.R. 8000, the so-called interest equalization tax. I have stated several times that such a tax attempts an unwarranted control over investment market. This is a proposal unprecedented in the postwar period. The bill, if passed, would severely restrict the free flow of capital, despite the bland statements by the administration that they do not advocate capital control.

Further, the proposal as originally presented, and even more so now due to the exemption that has been granted in the case of Canada for the issue of new securities, and the reservation of power in the President to suspend its operation if he deems it necessary, is nothing more than an attempt at an interim solution to the problem, that does not take cognizance of the real causes behind our balance-of-payments deficit. We must improve the investment climate at home by balancing our domestic budget in order to present an investment market that will be competitive with foreign markets. Only in this way can we diminish the outflow of capital, and reach a long-term solution to our deficit in international payments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have read in the RECORD at this time an editorial from the July 27 issue of Business Week magazine that points up the failings of the administration's proposal and argues cogently for a long-range solution to the problem:

THE WRONG WAY TO PROTECT THE DOLLAR

It has been evident for some time that the U.S. balance-of-payments situation was becoming so serious that the measures required to deal with it would have to be drastic, disagreeable, and, in all probability, unpopular. The program announced by President Kennedy last week certainly fits these specifications. Whether it will do the job is another matter.

The starting point for any discussion of the balance of payments should be the simple fact that the fundamental position of the U.S. dollar is strong. Year in and year out, the United States runs a favorable balance of something like $4.3 billion in its ordinary commercial accounts. The only reason there is a payments problem is that we dissipate this balance each year through—

Military expenditures overseas to defend the free world and to check the expansion of communism into such areas as Laos.

Foreign aid to strengthen our allies and to help the underdeveloped countries.

Oversea investments by U.S. business which buys plants and by U.S. investors who acquire the securities of foreign borrowers.

The President's program for dealing with this situation is a package, consisting of a modest rise in short-term interest rates to attract foreign capital, a small cut in military spending, a promotional program to in-

crease exports, and a punitive tax on the purchase of new foreign securities. Each element of the program is well-intentioned. But taken all together the various components simply do not add up to an effective, coherent whole.

The rise in the discount rate—intended to make U.S. short-term investments more attractive to foreigners—is very late. It probably is too small to make a material difference in international capital movements.

The cut in military spending is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough. The United States remains committed to the proposition that it will pay for the defense of allies who are well able to defend themselves, allies who, in fact, are the principal beneficiaries of the flow of funds that our adverse balance of payments produces.

This means that if President Kennedy's program is to provide a satisfactory answer to the balance-of-payments problem, the special tax on investment in foreign securities will have to be so effective that it makes up for the deficiencies of the other measures in the package. And this is the essential weakness of the program.

In the last analysis, the securities tax is a gimmick, an ingenious subterfuge dreamed up by some bright adviser in a backroom who wanted to get the effect of regulating capital issues without risking the political repercussions that a direct and overt control would have set off. Like most subterfuges, it promises to do the job badly if it does it all. The penalty tax will not shut off borrowing in the American market. It simply will drive away the high-rated borrowers who can get money elsewhere, leaving the market to the sort of borrowing who is willing to pay anything for his money just so he can get it.

AN OVERDOSE OF INGENUITY

From the moment it was announced, the proposed tax started running into trouble. First, the New York Stock Exchange issued a warning: Either the effective date would be postponed or trading would have to be suspended in foreign securities. Then, Canada made urgent representations that the penalty would shut off the flow of capital on which its industry depends. To take care of this hardship, the President was compelled to ask for discretionary authority to suspend the tax. Thus, the administration winds up asking, in effect, for discretionary control over capital issues, but without the flexibility—or the frank assumption of responsibility—that outright regulation of new issues would involve.

In an effort to get the best of two worlds, the administration, as it might have expected, has got the worst of both.

With the main feature of its program—the "equalization tax"—already cut to shreds, the wisest thing the administration can do is back up and start over.

To handle the immediate problem—the movement of capital abroad—the Treasury, acting through the 12 Federal Reserve banks, can call in the leaders of the financial community throughout the country and explain to them in simple direct fashion the necessity for drastically curtailing the floating of foreign securities in this market. Approached on this basis, the leading investment men and commercial bankers of the country unquestionably would join with the administration in voluntarily policing the flow of dollar loans.

Such a voluntary restraint could not last indefinitely. But it could last long enough to permit the administration to draw up a real long-term program for eliminating the balance-of-payments deficit.

Such a program will have to avoid all gimmicks and come to grips with the fundamental problem of cutting U.S. spending to the point where we are living within our means. The question is whether we have the self-discipline to take the steps that we must take to prevent the collapse of the dollar. This question cannot be evaded by clever devices. It must be faced headon.

Peace Corps Experience Valuable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star indicates that the Government, private industry and universities now realize that the experience one can obtain through Peace Corps activities opens new dimensions of knowledge for the individual. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial of August 20, 1963:

PEACE CORPS BOON: BROADENED YOUTH

There is one absolutely sure benefit to be gained from the Peace Corps and it is a great benefit—although never mentioned in the original pitch for such an organization.

We are getting the first signs of it now with the first 400 volunteers completing their 2-year term, and these already confirm one of the safest predictions we ever made in these columns.

These folks are in great demand already by the Government, by private industry, and by universities.

They should be.

In spite of the total variety, the overwhelming majority of Peace Corps volunteers are eager, talented, well-educated young people, and when they finish their tour they have spent the better part of 2 years living in some obscure foreign country.

They have lived there not in an American compound, but with the native people of the place. They have worked there not in the seclusion of an embassy, but with the native people dealing with grassroots problems.

Above all, they have grappled with the earthy problems of the common people in these lands not at committee table, but in the fields, side by side * * * and not with an instruction manual from headquarters, but out of their own initiative and ingenuity.

We just haven't had anybody doing this, privately or publicly, heretofore, and these young people have a monopoly on the kind of experience and the kind of information about many, many countries that is invaluable.

We're all familiar with the complaints about ambassadors who "don't speak the language." In fact, it has been worse than that. Too many diplomatic experts have had neither the formal language nor a real comprehension or feel for the realities of the countries in which they serve. They spend their whole career in the synthetic, unreal facade atmosphere, isolated in the social and political climate of the top few. Their understanding of the country is limited to a few statistical studies, and other bloodless sources.

No wonder, as we expected, the Foreign Service eager to hire the returning Peace Corps people.

Private industry, already active in underdeveloped countries, is being urged by our Government to invest in them, and this promises to offer the newest expanding markets and the only tax-break areas left, so these talents and this background experience is of great value and demand in industry as well. So, indeed, is the Peace Corps tradition of people in far-off and obscure sites where they have to think for themselves.

Finally, this kind of information, of course, opens up a whole new dimension of knowledge and experience to the colleges, and they seek Peace Corps people, too.

Only 400 will be available this year, but next year there'll be 2,500 more, and in 10 years 40,000 such "grads" will be a very important part of the leadership in American Government, industry, and education.

Whatever else the Peace Corps accomplishes, this will fill a tremendous gap in the kind of skills and know-how available to our country.

From our experience with them, we believe it will be 40,000 people who have learned the importance of grassroots leadership and the weaknesses of centralization.

Foreign Aid Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid editorial which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of August 25, 1963. This editorial lifts the camouflage from President Kennedy's unwarranted outburst about the slash in foreign aid authorizations by the House of Representatives. The President should have learned by now that he should not go on television and radio when he is angry. Furthermore, he should also realize that under the Constitution, the President only proposes legislation and the Congress disposes. In cutting the foreign aid authorizations, the House of Representatives was clearly ahead of the President in appraising the sentiments of the American people. In fact, the House of Representatives was simply reflecting the views of the American people who are becoming fed up with the endless program of foreign aid:

FOREIGN AID REVOLT

President Kennedy will not find many buyers for his thesis that the deep slash made by the House in the foreign aid authorization was the result of "a shortsighted, irresponsible and dangerously partisan action" by the Republicans.

The basic trouble with this convenient explanation is that 66 Democrats joined 156 Republicans to make up the 222-vote majority in favor of the $585-million cut. It is true, of course, that Republican leaders advocated the slash and that it was supported by more Republicans than Democrats. But the President is misreading the signs if he really thinks that this sharp rebuff to his administration can be explained away solely on grounds of political partisanship.

Mr. Kennedy spoke wistfully of bipartisan support for foreign aid in the fifties, when he was in Congress. But we are living now in the sixties, and there are many indications that the American people are becoming fed up with the seemingly endless program of foreign aid. Not the least of these indications is the House vote itself. If one wishes to attribute that vote to partisanship, all well

and good. In this context, however, it must be conceded that the Republicans at least think they are responding to the popular will. Certainly they would not take such a partisan position if they thought it would alienate the voters.

The President says he now looks to the Senate to restore the full amount of the authorization request so the House, in conference, will have an opportunity "to reconsider its ill-advised action." The Senate should give careful consideration to the points which have been raised in opposition to the cut, although some of these objections are of highly dubious validity. From Mr. Kennedy's point of view, however, the outlook is not hopeful. Minority Leader Dirksen has said the Senate may sustain the House cut. And even if it is restored in whole or in part, two hurdles will remain—the conference with the House and the rugged annual battle with the Appropriations Committees.

Mid-Continent Area Power Planners Offer a Money-Saving Plan for the Generation, Transmission, and Exchange of Electric Power in the Mid-Continent Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, I had the privilege of participating in a dinner meeting in Washington at which several Members of Congress from the Midwest were briefed on the plans and purposes of a new organization of power suppliers in the North Central States who have formed Mid-Continent Area Power Planners—MAPP. The purpose of this organization is to coordinate the planning, construction and operation of the power supply facilities in the area. Membership is available to any supplier in the area who subscribes to the principles and objectives of the program. The following is a list of the companies who have formed the organization:

MEMBERS OF THE MID-CONTINENT AREA POWER PLANNERS

Black Hills Power & Light Co., Rapid City, S. Dak.

Central Power Electric Cooperative, Minot, N. Dak.

Cooperative Power Association, Owatonna, Minn.

Dairyland Power Cooperative, LaCrosse, Wis.

Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative, Wilton Junction, Iowa.

Interstate Power Co., Dubuque, Iowa.

Iowa Electric Light & Power Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., Davenport, Iowa.

Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.

Iowa Public Service Co., Sioux City, Iowa.

Iowa Southern Utilities Co., Centerville, Iowa.

Lake Superior District Power Co., Ashland, Wis.

Minnesota Power & Light Co., Duluth, Minn.

Minnkota, Power Cooperative, Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

Northern Minn. Power Association, Virginia, Minn.

Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

Northwestern Public Service Co., Huron, S. Dak.

Omaha Public Power District, Omaha, Neb.

Otter Tail Power Co., Fergus Falls, Minn.

Rural Cooperative Power Association, Elk River, Minn.

Union Electric Co., St. Louis, Miss.

You will note the list includes 7 generation and transmission cooperatives; 14 investor-owned companies and the Omaha public power district. The service territory of these suppliers is included in the States of Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, Missouri, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Wyoming.

I am pleased that out of the seven Iowa firms which are members of the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners, two are from the district I represent: the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative of Wilton Junction, Iowa; and the Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co. of Davenport, Iowa.

The program of these power planners is consistent with the objectives outlined recently by the Federal Power Commission and is directed toward the development of integrated regional planning among members to form the basis of a large regional power pool utilizing the latest technological advances in extra high voltage transmission, generation, and fuel sources.

This is an important step forward in bringing together electric cooperatives and investor-owned utilities so that they can concentrate on bringing consumers the best possible electric service at the lowest possible cost. I find the statement of policy worthy of note and commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress:

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF THE MIDCONTINENT AREA POWER PLANNERS

Membership in the Midcontinent Area Power Planners is open to all local electric power suppliers who are dedicated to furnishing the best possible electric service at the lowest reasonable cost to all consumers thereof in the midcontinent area and who subscribe to the following objectives:

1. To support the principle of local control and operation of electric power facilities.

2. To promote integrated regional planning among MAPP members toward the establishment of a regional power pool.

3. To recognize the right and obligation of each MAPP member, regardless of size or type of corporate organization, to own or otherwise provide for the facilities required to supply the present and long-range electric power requirements of its consumers.

4. To recognize the right of existing municipal generating systems to share in the benefits of integrated regional planning.

5. To provide an organization for coordinating the activities of MAPP members in planning, constructing and operating an integrated electric power system utilizing the latest technological developments in high-voltage transmission, generation facilities and fuel sources.

6. To provide an organization for developing co-ordination with adjacent electric power suppliers, including the Federal agencies, insofar as such coordination does not interfere with each MAPP member individuality, local initiative and corporate freedom.

To get an idea of why the regional big power operations planned by Mid-Continent Area Power Planners are feasible today, first look back half a century to the early days of the electric power business. The electric power business of 50 years ago can be compared with the automobile transportation industry of that day. Not too many people owned cars and those who did were not able to go very fast or very far. There was no need for big automobile factories and superhighways then, and building them would have been a waste of time, effort, and money. The cars and the roads of 50 years ago, therefore, served their purposes pretty well. Similarly, the electric power systems and facilities of the day did the job well, although they were small by today's standards.

Just as our modern automobile manufacturing industry and our modern highway systems have been developed, electric generation and transmission systems have been greatly expanded and modernized to keep pace with the tremendous increase in use of electric power. The average home electric consumer today uses more than five times as much electricity as he did only 25 years ago. Rapid population growth is continuing, along with study increases in per capita use of electricity. It is estimated that by 1980 the total peak demand for electricity by Mid-Continent Area Power Planners member consumers will be 23 million kilowatts, more than three times the present total demand. These growing needs call for the integrated operations planned by the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners.

Appearing on the program which explained the nature of the organization and spelled out its objectives were Mr. Earl Ewald, Mid-Continent Area Power Planners chairman and executive vice president of the Northern States Power Co., who presided; Mr. Kenneth S. Vig, the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners coordinator, of the Lignite Electric Power Cooperative in North Dakota, who outlined the power plans for Mid-Continent Area Power Planners; Mr. Edward E. Wolter, general manager of the Rural Cooperative Power Association, who spoke for the rural electric cooperatives; Mr. C. F. Moulton, General Manager of the Omaha Public Power District, who spoke for the district; and Mr. Charles H. Whitmore, president of Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., Davenport, Iowa, who spoke for the investor-owned utilities.

The other Members of Congress and I who participated in the meeting found Mr. Whitmore's remarks especially significant and I am privileged to include his address as a part of this extension today. Mr. Whitmore is one of the fine citizens of my community who has been very sensitive to the needs of the community and is keenly aware of the obligation a utility has toward the community it serves. I am glad that he was present and had the opportunity to present his own remarks which follow:

SERVICE TO OUR CUSTOMERS

GENTLEMEN: Service to our customers is the primary goal of each of us in MAPP. We aim to supply electricity in quantities and at prices which will permit our customers to enjoy ever-increasing benefits and

pleasures from the work that electricty will do for them.

The record of past performance is interesting and enviable, we believe. With only 6 percent of the world's population, the United States continues to outstrip by far any other country in the production of kilowatt-hours of electricity. The latest figures show that we produced 37.1 percent of the total world production. This is more than the combined production of the next six countries—Russia, United Kingdom, Japan, West Germany, Canada, and France.

Russia's production is a distant second—13 percent, barely one-third that of the United States. On a per capita basis our lead over Russia is nearly three and one-half times. We produced about 4,800 kilowatt-hours of electricity per person in 1961 compared with about 1,420 kilowatt-hours per person in Russia. We estimate that this margin of nearly 3,400 kilowatt-hours will grow to over 4,400 kilowatt-hours by 1970 when our annual production per capita is expected to be about 7,555 kilowatt-hours.

This tremendous power wealth in production and productive capacity is available to meet whatever the needs or desires of our customers today and will be available in ample time and quantity to meet their needs and desires of the future.

In the course of providing this bountiful power supply, the average cost per kilowatt-hour has declined almost constantly. The most recent figure is 2.45 cents per kilowatt-hour—less than one-tenth as much as Thomas Edison's first customers paid and about half of what it was 25 years ago. In terms of the family budget, Americans spent only 1.4 percent of their disposable personal income for electricity in 1961. Meanwhile, by comparison, they were spending 19.5 percent for food, 9.5 percent for clothing and 2 percent for tobacco products.

How has this record been achieved? We believe that a significant factor has been the preponderance of local control and operation of electric power facilities. This principle of local control and operation is one of the primary principles which binds all of us in MAPP together. From this association will come the financial rewards of cooperative long-range planning and pooling of our facilities. Meanwhile, maintenance of local control and operation will be assurance to our customers that their best interests are of utmost importance to us. Service to our customers is our prime objective.

CHARLES H. WHITMORE.

Special Committee on Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and many of my colleagues who have spoken on this decision, in urging the prompt creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I hope and pray that this session will not adjourn until the special committee for which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania so long has worked has been authorized.

I venture the prediction that if the resolution creating this special committee is brought to the floor of the House, it will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

This is the time in the long struggle of the free world against the evil forces of communism that we should give strong and positive reassurance to the millions of men, women, and children in the captive nations that they are now, and shall continue to be, in the subject of our interest and our determination to strive for this liberation with no faltering in our effort.

Labor Department Study Expected To Show Apprentice Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 the Republican Policy Committee study, "Operation Employment," called attention to the fact that the heart of the Nation's unemployment problem primarily is the lack of skilled workers to fill job vacancies rather than a shortage of jobs in the economy. Recently, increasing attention—including congressional attention in the form of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962—has been paid to this important aspect of the problem.

On June 10, 1963, the Lawyer's Weekly Report, prepared by Prentice-Hall, Inc., called attention to a study by the Department of Labor of the Nation's private on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs. The reason for the proposed study is a growing awareness that greater efforts must be devoted to training if the Nation is to meet its future needs for skilled manpower.

I am encouraged by the increasing recognition of the needs in this area and, under unanimous consent, insert at this point in the RECORD the Lawyer's Weekly Report which brought the Labor Department's proposed study to my attention.

I also insert in the RECORD a letter to me of August 8, 1963, from Seymour L. Wolfbein, Director of the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, Department of Labor, commenting upon the Department's study.

A SHORTAGE OF WORKERS—UNLESS

Worried Government labor planners sense that the shortage of skilled workers is getting serious, yet they don't know that for sure, and they need to know before they can do something about it. If a survey they will soon take confirms their fears, they plan to redouble efforts to arouse more business interest in on-the-job training, and use some new tricks to stimulate enthusiasm for apprenticeship programs.

A recent Presidential report on the Nation's manpower situation noted that apprenticeship programs aren't supplying enough skilled workers to replace those who die, retire, or change occupations. About 320,000 workers receive formal training annually, but only a fourth of those become journeymen each year—far too few to make up for attrition in the 8-million man skilled work force.

Soon, the Government will make a nationwide survey to find out how many workers are actually getting on-the-job training, as apprentices or otherwise. The result could be a somewhat higher figure than that given in the President's report, but officials don't think it will lessen fears that too few workers are being trained.

If the study proves them right, officials say they'll try harder to convince industry that it needs to train more apprentices. One thing they can do, they say, is to renew an old suggestion that apprentices be made journeymen when they can do a journeyman's work—instead of waiting a specific number of years to "graduate." They also want business to be less particular about who can become an apprentice.

To get these points across, officials say they will begin taking their campaign higher in the business hierarchy—to company presidents and other officers—instead of to plant managers, personnel directors, and the like.

AUGUST 8, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The article cited in Lawyer's Weekly Report which was included in your letter of July 31 refers to the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training's survey of employee training by private industry in the United States. This report is expected to be available by October or November and should provide basic information on manpower development which can be of assistance to the Department in carrying out its responsibilities under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The "Manpower Report of the President and a Report of Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization and Training by the U.S. Department of Labor" which was transmitted to Congress in March 1963 contains a discussion (p. 107) on the training of skilled workers. The report indicates that "despite the fact that this Nation's economic development and well-being depend upon an increasing number of well-trained craftsmen, limited progress has been made in recent years in significantly expanding apprenticeship programs and enrollments." The report concludes that "unless apprenticeship training is increased, it will provide only a small percentage of the journeymen needed by 1970."

Title I of the Manpower Act directs the Secretary of Labor to examine in depth the training, resources, utilization, and requirements related to the Nation's manpower. The Office of Manpower Development and Training is engaged in doing research in these manpower areas and it is also sponsoring contractual research designed to assist us in securing additional information on the Nation's manpower effort.

Your interest in our program is most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
SEYMOUR L. WOLFBEIN,
Director.

Almost Time for School Bells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial.

For the much younger generation, the end of summer has a special note. Sum-

mer's end means school's beginning. All of us cherish our recollections of those summers long ago and the gathering of the new class at the schoolhouse in the first warm week of September.

A short editorial published in the Community News and Baltimore Countian, on Friday, August 23, 1963, recaptures for us, young and old, those pleasant memories of the past:

ALMOST TIME FOR SCHOOL BELLS

Everyone's view of summer is different, depending on his responsibilities, opportunities and role in life. Many mothers very probably feel it has been long, noisy, busy, and hot. But a good many million children and dogs probably find it hard to believe that 3 months could have sped so quickly and that the school doors are about to open once again.

The sounds and smells and experiences of summer vacation are still an important part of growing up. But there have been changes. The old swimming hole may have become a concrete-lined, chlorinated pool. The automobile and airplane have vastly extended the scope of things that can be seen on a vacation trip. School has changed, too, as the frontiers of man's knowledge have been been pushed back so rapidly in recent years. The amount of knowledge that must be packed into the heads of children in grade school and high school has vastly increased.

As school bells prepare to ring again, let's salute our young people and those who guide them through ever more complicated fields of learning. In the great affairs of nations, in science, and in the complicated business of leading a good and worthwhile life, our need has never been greater for concerned, intelligent, educated men and women.

Alabama Paper Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, this month one of the South's leading pulp and paper pioneers announced his retirement.

Erling Riis came to this country from Norway in 1911 with a new engineering degree in his pocket and a dream of a career in the paper industry. His outstanding success in this field is a tribute not only to the great ability of Erling Riis but also to the wonderful opportunities for advancement that exist here in the United States.

In tribute to his many achievements in this industry, the new International Paper Co. research laboratory in Mobile, Ala., was named for him. A 7,000-acre International Paper Co. reservoir in Louisiana was named Lake Erling in 1958 in honor of this Mobilian by adoption.

We from Alabama pay tribute this month not only to the mammoth contributions Mr. Riis has made to the papermaking industry in our State, but for his equally noteworthy contribution to community life.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following tribute to this retiring Alabama businessman and civil leader from the August 4 edition of the Mobile Press Register.

RETIREMENT TOLD FOR ERLING RIIS

Erling Riis of Mobile, a pioneer in the South's pulp and paper industry, has retired from International Paper Co., it was announced this weekend.

Riis retired as general manager of the company's Southern Kraft Division in 1961; however, he remained active with International Paper as a vice president and member of the board of directors. In 1962, he retired from the board, but remained a vice president in charge of manufacturing of byproducts, which position he held until his retirement from all duties which was actually effective last May 8.

In addition to his position of leadership in the paper industry, Riis has been very active in community life. He is a past president of the Mobile Rotarians, past president of the local YMCA, and a former member of the board of directors for both the Mobile United Fund and the Mobile Chamber of Commerce.

LAB HONORS HIM

As a tribute to his vast knowledge of papermaking and engineering that resulted in many developments that were International Paper firsts in new products and new methods, the company's modern new research laboratory in Mobile was named the Erling Riis Research Laboratory in his honor in 1961. Also, the company's 7,000-acre fresh water reservoir near Springhill, La., was named Lake Erling in 1958 and made available for public recreational use.

Born in Oslo, Norway, in 1889, Riis was educated in Norwegian schools and in 1909 graduated with a degree in mechanical engineering.

After 2 years in the Norwegian paper industry he immigrated to the United States and settled in Kaukauna, Wis.

He worked in papermills there and in 1915 came to Bogalusa, La., as chief engineer in charge of construction of the Louisiana Fibre Board Co. mill. Upon completion of the mill he was named pulpmill superintendent.

INTERNATIONAL PAPER IN 1927

In 1924, he became chief engineer in charge of construction of the Louisiana mill for the Louisiana Pulp & Paper Co. at Bastrop. When this company was purchased by International Paper in 1927, he joined the International Paper family.

In the years that followed, he designed and supervised the building of International Paper mills at Mobile, Camden, Ark., Panama City, Fla., Georgetown, S.C., Springhill, La., and the conversion of the Moss Point mill from brown paper to bleached paper. More recently under his leadership, mills were built at Natchez, Miss., and Pine Bluff, Ark.

In 1938, Riis was made vice president in charge of manufacturing for the Southern Kraft Corp., then a subsidiary of International Paper. This was when he moved to Mobile.

When Southern Kraft Corp. became Southern Kraft Division of International Paper in 1942, Riis was made a director of the company.

The Work of the Delaware River Basin Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1961 the Delaware River Basin Commission was established. The commission's value to the citizens of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware is now an undisputed fact.

The commission has as members the Governors of the four previously mentioned States and the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall. The purpose of the commission is to develop means by which the value of the river may be best taken advantage of by the four States through which it runs. One such project is the Tocks Island Dam and reservoir proposal. Not only will the dam supply power for the surrounding area, but it will also provide a means for controlling the level of the river, the need for which was made poignant by the 1955 flood. The resulting reservoir will prove to be an excellent source of water supply as well as provide a magnificent recreation area for the residents of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

I think the Delaware River Basin Commission is a fine example of what States with mutual interest can achieve with cooperation.

Mr. President, Mr. James F. Wright, the executive director of the commission, gave a speech concerning the work of the commission to the delegates attending the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress here in Washington on June 7, of this year. I ask unanimous consent to place the extent of that speech in the RECORD as a reminder of what can be done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES F. WRIGHT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION, AT THE 50TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 7, 1963

When our office up in Trenton was in touch with officials of this congress recently to discuss what my topic might be here, we found their interest typical of that which we are encountering everywhere.

We are asked to tell how the four States got together, how the Federal Government was brought in as an equal partner, and how we feel this partnership will work.

I suppose most of you know many of the problems which go to make up the background for the compact in which the Federal Government and four great eastern seaboard States legally recognize as a single geographic area the Delaware River Basin.

While diminutive in size, the Delaware Basin is dynamic and potent. It is among the most densely populated of river basins and its population is growing rapidly. It is the home of Philadelphia, one of the world's great cities and seaports. Its service area includes not only most of New Jersey, which is the Nation's most urbanized State, but also New York City, which now draws more than a third and soon will be drawing about half of its water supply from the upper reaches of the 12,000-square-mile Delaware Basin.

The background for the compact was clouded by decades of controversy over water rights between New York City on one hand and the downstream States on the other. The increase of the Delaware Valley's industrial might, when added to the compounded domestic population situation, has made it more and more difficult to maintain high levels of water quality. It seems that droughts, with their accompanying fish kills and threats of rationing of water for do-

mestic use, are a regular occurrence along the Delaware.

Despite repeated drought conditions, of which this year has been typical, some of the Delaware's rich water resources run uselessly to sea, resulting not only in great waste but in depriving so many citizens of attainable improved recreation facilities.

Flooding is also a regular occurrence. Fortunately, Delaware floods as bad as those which took more than 100 lives and caused more than $125 million in property damage following the back-to-back hurricanes in August 1955 are uncommon. However, even the annual average flood damages on the Delaware and its tributaries are listed by the Corps of Engineers at nearly $8 million.

Events have demonstrated that river systems which cross State boundaries, particularly those of several States like the Delaware does, fail to undergo true comprehensive development where there is a splintering of responsibility. Not only must the responsibility be centralized, but this central authority must be provided the tools to work with. Consider that the Delaware at one point separates Pennsylvania from New York, at another New Jersey from Pennsylvania, and at still another stretch Delaware from New Jersey. Then imagine the long history of hodgepodge jurisdiction within the basin over the various phases of its development within each of the four States. On top of this picture, superimpose the various Federal natural resource agencies. For the first time, there is now a basinwide center for coordinated effort.

It so often takes a disaster to force the people into action. However, to their great credit, the basin States of New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey, as well as the cities of New York and Philadelphia, agreed during the year 1955 in a period of no particular crisis—other than a routine drought—that action must be taken to harness the Delaware. They launched what was known as the Delaware River Basin Advisory Committee and assigned it the ever so difficult task of determining how the Delaware development should be pursued. It was only by coincidence that tragedy struck soon afterward in the form of the 1955 flood.

The advisory committee then intensified its work, and the Congress put the Corps of Engineers to work immediately to prepare a plan for the Delaware development. The corps received $2 million to make that study.

I feel certain that even the most energetic and hard working among those who worked on the preparations of the Delaware Basin Compact would acknowledge that their efforts receive a great boost from the public clamor for action which followed the August 1955 floods.

In the early 1960's both the diligent work of the advisory committee and the study of the Corps of Engineers began to bear fruit.

The advisory committee came forth with a recommendation for adoption of a compact between the Federal Government and the four basin States, a unique arrangement under which a group of States and Washington would for the first time become equal partners in an operating venture.

The corp's study produced a report in which nearly $600 million in water resource development facilities was recommended, with natural emphasis on flood control and water supply. The corp's multipurpose report also urged that provisions be made for hydroelectric power development, recreation facilities, and other conservation measures.

Many persons felt that it would be easier to achieve some of the ends seen in the corp's report than to get the four States and the Federal Government to go along with creating a new type of multipurpose, comprehensive, long-range river planning, development, and management agency.

Instead, the legislatures of the four States and their Governors seemed to jump at the proposal. Actually, the Governors jumped first, perhaps adding the extra weight needed to push through the proposals which were, at the time, about to be placed before the legislatures.

At any rate, whether as a result of the early gubernatorial endorsements, whether due to an unusually high degree of interstate cooperation which may have prevailed at the time, or perhaps due to the ingenious decision to make the Governors themselves the members of the commission, the compact was sped through eight houses of State legislatures in record time.

Then came the Congress and the National Government. Objections and reservations were freely expressed in both the legislative and executive branches. At the time, I am certain that anyone working for the compact's adoption would have lamented the tough row they were hoeing in Washington.

But in retrospect, could they complain now that the going was so rough after the enactment of a compact which was first seen by the Governors in the early months of 1961 and 8 months later had cleared four legislatures, four Governors, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the President?

In December 1961 the Governors and U.S. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, President Kennedy's appointee on the Commission, organized the Agency.

The Commission's first Chairman was former Governor David Lawrence of Pennsylvania. Secretary Udall was elected 1963 Chairman of the Commission's first reorganization meeting last February in Wilmington, which also marked the first participation by Pennsylvania's new Governor, William Scranton, as a member of our Commission.

Rather than impose the day-to-day burdens of the new Commission on the Secretary and the four Governors, all busy men of course, it was decided that each should have a voting alternate member. The five alternates conduct the policymaking affairs of the Commission at its monthly meetings in Philadelphia.

I am sure that you can imagine that it has been a busy year and a half since that first organization meeting. Naturally, there are no great reservoirs, hydroelectric generators or immaculate streams as yet to show for our endeavors. We have had the normal problems which go with setting up housekeeping. Commission headquarters, in line with an early decision by the Commission, had to be located at Trenton. We had to learn to live with the varying procedures and policies of the four State capitals in such matters as budget preparations and project clearance. We had to arrange all the logistic support needed in establishing a typical Government office.

We may have no great new dams to show you yet, but we can show you more than 30 hard-working employees, most of them engineers and technicians in the planning division. Three branches—program planning, water quality, and project review—comprise that division, and they are made up of experts in economics, water supply, water and land use, recreation, fish and wildlife planning, hydroelectric power, flood control, various phases of antiwater pollution, and the other fields of river management. Navigation has been left to the Corps of Engineers, and this is about the only phase of river development and management in which our Commission is not directly involved from an operating viewpoint.

Since it is unlikely that we shall become an actual construction agency, at least in the immediate future, the commission staff can be expected to remain at about the same size for several years. Those employees of the commission who are not part of the technological crew make up my own directorate of six persons and the seven-member administrative division which handles the everyday problems of personnel, payroll, finance, purchasing and the like.

All this is not to say that the commission has not been working toward its real purpose—the planning and development of a great river basin. At one of its first meetings, the commission adopted a phase 1 comprehensive plan for the basin's development. This plan's principal components are 12 multipurpose reservoir projects and 8 local watershed developments. Naturally, the work of the Corps of Engineers was of great value to the commission in drawing the plan, and this was demonstrated by the selection of eight multipurpose projects from the corps' recommendations.

No doubt most of you delegates have heard of the project in our plan which is fast becoming its dramatic showpiece. It is the 12,000-acre Tocks Island Reservoir, which will be created by construction of a 160-foot-high dam across the main stem of the river just 5 miles north of the Delaware Water Gap.

Congress already has authorized this and seven other big multipurpose dams in our plan that were recommended in the Army Engineers' report.

If the lawmakers here in Washington approve legislation now before them to establish the East's first big national recreation area around the 37-mile-long Tocks Island Reservoir, this project will cover a total area of 72,000 acres. It will also cost $122 million, not including an associated pumped-back storage hydroelectric operation.

In addition to big multipurpose reservoirs, the commission's first phase comprehensive plan includes a number of important small watershed development programs, many of them nearing completion, in which local authorities are involved in an effective partnership with the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies.

In one of its important early decisions, the commission also exercised for the first time its historic jurisdiction for allowing out-of-basin water diversions by granting a small but significant diversion into the Wilkes-Barre area, which lies in the Susquehanna River Basin. This most significant authority shifts the burden of deciding water right disputes to an instrument of the rivals themselves. Let's call it settling out of court.

The commission, in addition, granted the first approvals under the powers bestowed upon it by the compact to review all projects by others which have a substantial effect on the water resources of the basin, or which may be in conflict with the commission's comprehensive plan. The first of these approvals under the review function involved a Philadelphia sewage treatment plant. Another granted a group of utilities the right to construct a big pumped storage hydroelectric facility in New Jersey.

Our Wilmington reorganization meeting was a most encouraging event. The four governors indicated in no uncertain terms that they are anxious that their States should shoulder their project cost responsibilities and share other burdens. Also, the new chairman, Secretary Udall, issued a bold statement of future commission policy which could well help shape the overall goals of this growing metropolitan region and the decisions on how they should be achieved.

It was marked by a maximum of harmony and cooperation and a minimum of partisanship and regional rivalry.

The first year of the commission's existence was also marked by a rather happy period of activity in Washington. I mentioned earlier that the Congress has authorized construction of the first eight priority projects in the commission's comprehensive plan with a total pricetag of about $220 million.

In addition, the 1962 Congress appropriated $100,000 for actual design and engineering work at Beltzville, a Pennsylvania project that is one of the eight projects authorized by Congress.

In his budget message to the Congress, President Kennedy requested a half-million dollars for engineering and design work on Tocks Island and further moneys for Beltzville Reservoir.

We also receive favorable reports for the chances for enactment this year of the Tocks Island recreation area plan.

At the same time as many of these advances seem to be underway, the commission is busy studying a whole range of policies and problems.

One of these will be to determine the policies under which hydroelectric power should be generated at the Tocks Island Dam and possibly at other locations in the basin.

Our hope is to devise policies under which the commission will harvest enough revenues to establish a significant credit base in order to embark on some of the other important developments needed within the basin. We shall examine the possible uses of such revenues to help in meeting such non-Federal responsibilities as water supply and recreation. As now planned, recreation will be a Federal feature only at Tocks Island.

An equally complex problem will be that of devising policies and procedures and administrative structure under which the beneficiaries of such non-Federal features, as recreation and water supply can contribute their fair share of the costs.

At the moment, our staff is also formulating procedures under which the commission can exercise its compact-directed duty of reviewing water-connected projects proposed by others. You can imagine the complexities involved in establishing a policy in this area. No problem better highlights the interstate complexities of our makeup more than this.

At the same time that we are working with these difficult policy issues, our staff is shaping programs for commission consideration in the fields of water quality, water supply, flood control, water and land use and fish and wildlife and recreation.

All these must be integrated into the comprehensive plan. The dimensions of this are under steady development by staff and in turn pose numerous unanswered questions for the present. We view a mature comprehensive plan as much more than a general statement of needs and a list of projects to meet them. We feel that the economic and social policies to be recognized and advanced must be a foundation of such a plan.

We think also that a plan should explain methods and principles governing the allocation of benefits and costs, that it should designate to the maximum extent possible the various responsibilities for project development and operation and financing, that it should provide for orderly and progressive amendment and modernization as changing conditions are recognized, and that it must insure the harmonious correlation of projects yet unforeseen with the objectives and structures of the plan. Necessary quantitative and qualitative standards are, of course, an essential segment.

Finally, we believe such a plan must not only be comprehensive but comprehensible. You can therefore appreciate why we need to conceive of this as a dynamic and evolutionary scheme rather than a one-time blueprint.

At this time we are also working on the development of the commission's water resources program, an annual document which must be prepared under the provisions of the compact. The water resources program is a detailed plan within our long-range comprehensive plan. It enumerates those portions of the long-range comprehensive plan which are to be undertaken in the ensuing 6-year period. The water resources program now in the mill, our first, will be unveiled early in the summer.

I hope that I have given you a general picture of the events that led up to the enactment of our Federal-interstate compact, what we have been doing in our first 18 months of existence, and some of our aspirations.

At a recent meeting, New York State's conservation commissioner, Harold Wilm, compared our commission's present status to that of the mountain climber that has just conquered the foothills only to be faced by great peaks ahead. Commissioner Wilm should know, for he is Governor Rockefeller's alternate member on our agency's governing body.

It shows that we are on our way, however, and that we have our sights set high. I might add that we intend to get to the summit.

Thank you very much.

Pesticides and Congress—Threat Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Detroit News by Will Muller entitled "Pesticides and Congress—Threat Ignored":

PESTICIDES AND CONGRESS—THREAT IGNORED

(By Will Muller)

If a U.S. Senator were told the bloater he ate in the Senate restaurant was contaminated by Aunt Nellie's bluing water, he would race for the stomach pump at Naval Hospital.

Bluing, useful in whitening linen or cotton cloth after laundering is a known quantity and relatively harmless. It can be made up of the proper proportions of indigo-carmine, water and gum arabic. Pesticides, much more dangerous, leave Congress indifferent.

A report submitted to Congress by Interior Secretary Udall says that "25 of 26 specimens of bald eagle analyzed by his Department's scientists contained DDT, a pesticide which has caused considerable alarm, warranted or not."

The bald eagle is vanishing. If a bald eagle, with insecticide inside it, can vanish, so, presumably, can a U.S. Senator. Here is food for senatorial thought.

THE 14-CENT PEOPLE

At present, Congress has set a ceiling of less than 14 cents a person on research to determine the eventual effect of the mushrooming use of pesticides on the human race. Our 14-cent Congressmen would do well to study Udall's report.

Scientists had reported earlier that pesticide residues can be found in an impressive number of the 180 million bodies of human beings in the United States. They are found in the water we drink and the food we eat and the air we breathe.

Udall's report, based on the effects of pesticide on wildlife, is a shocker. It says that analyses of bird eggs and the young of birds disclosed pesticide contamination more than 500 miles from the borders of pesticide use.

"Even in remote areas of the world animals have residues," the report said. "Water fowl and their eggs in the far North, and resident fish in streams in Alaska, were collected in areas far from any known pesticide application, and they contained residues of insecticides, as did the surrounding vegetation."

Whether DDT and other pesticides which refuse to disintegrate and are only spread by dilution are harmful to humans has never been determined to the satisfaction of the human race, which reminds us of an old song of World War I days which went: "I don't know what this war's about, but I'll be darned if I don't find out."

Fourteen cents a person hardly is enough to determine what the worldwide controversy over the use of pesticides is about—or settle it either. The spectacle of a U.S. Senate, engorged with pesticides, debating whether a test ban treaty will insure the safety and longevity of us all is a trifle baffling.

ACTION LACKING

There has been a crash program in the production and use of pesticides since before World War II. There has been no corresponding crash program on the part of Congress to determine its safety.

Scientists now assume that adult ducks pass along their accumulation of pesticide residues in a yet unexplained manner that apparently concentrates them in their young. For a Congress fond of despairing over the debt that this generation is leaving to the next, this may be some solace.

We may be leaving that next generation something solid after all—the residue of pesticides in more concentrated form than any this generation has been able to accumulate.

All who cry alarm do not necessarily believe in ghosts. They just don't want to be one.

Teeners Baseball Team of Gaston County, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, 1963, the teener baseball team, sponsored by the Absher-Flowers VFW Post 9337, of Gastonia, N.C., won the world championship of teener baseball in a tournament at Hershey, Pa. In their victory the Gaston County boys accomplished a feat which will probably never again be equaled in that this represented the third time that the Gaston County team had won the championship out of 4 years of competition. In 1962 the Teeners of Gaston County did not win the championship but were runners-up in the tournament.

The coaches and players on this championship baseball team were worthy representatives of their community and State. As champions of the world they will be outstanding examples to all youth.

As a member of the sponsoring post, I have a personal sense of pride and appreciation of the outstanding athletic ability of the champions. I have an even greater sense of pride in the character and conduct of these fine young fellows.

Since the attainments of these representatives of my home county are so outstanding, I would like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congratulations to the Teeners," which ap-

peared in the Gastonia Gazette August 17, 1963, a news story entitled "Welcome Champs," which appeared in the same newspaper on August 18, 1963, a column by Harold Pearson, "Memories Are Made of This," which appeared in the Gastonia Gazette, August 19, 1963, and a roster of the team and its officials.

Gastonia, N.C., VFW Teener Baseball Team, 1963

Name	Age	School	Parents
Bill Grant	15	Ashley High School, Gastonia, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Grant.
Larry Hartsell	15	Mount Holly High School, Mount Holly, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. Warren Hartsell.
Danny Suggs	14	Belmont High School, Belmont, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Suggs.
Chuckie Steele	14	Bessemer City High School, Bessemer City, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Steele.
Dennis Wofford	15	Belmont High School, Belmont, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Wofford.
Jerry Barker	15	Hunter-Huss High School, Gastonia, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Barker.
Terry Stroupe	14	Cramerton High School, Cramerton, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Stroupe.
Cleve Rayfield	15	Stanley High School, Stanley, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. T. C. Rayfield.
Ed Thompson	14	do	Mr. and Mrs. R. M. Thompson.
Ronnie Cocheroft	15	Bessemer City High School, Bessemer City, N.C.	Dr. and Mrs. R. L. Cocheroft.
Dickie Giles	15	Ashley High School, Gastonia, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. H. T. Giles.
Steve Barkley	15	Belmont High School, Belmont, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. J. M. Barkley.
Barry Farmer	14	do	Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Farmer.
John Rudisill	14	Stanley High School, Stanley, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Rudisill.
Doug Owen	14	Grier Junior High School, Gastonia, N.C.	Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Owen.

Coaches: J. V. McGinnis, mail carrier, U.S. Post Office, Gastonia, N.C., and Russ Bergmann, personnel director, A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C.
Adult manager: Ott Pittman, Gastonia, N.C.
Scorekeeper: Miss Linda Bergmann, student, Ashley High School, Gastonia, N.C.

[From the Gastonia Gazette, Aug. 19, 1963]

MEMORIES ARE MADE OF THIS

(By Harold Pearson)

August 11–16, 1963, will always remain as a memorable week for this writer, as well as for a select group of Gaston County citizens.

Not only will it be known as the week Gaston County won its third World Series of Teener baseball, but also as a week remembered for the way in which the championship was won and the attitudes, character and feelings of the boys as well as those who journeyed to Chocolate Town, U.S.A. to cheer the boys.

It will be remembered as a week of experiences outside the actual game play.

A day-by-day account of the week would best show the people not fortunate enough to make the trip just what they missed and why the 15 boys and their coaches will forever have etched in their memory, August 11–16, 1963. But space would never hold it.

How can they ever forget the reception they received upon arrival? They were accorded their choice of accommodations in the Park Golf Club. This is the huge club that is a part of the Hershey Estates and serves as headquarters for the team during their stay.

At their disposal was a championship golf course just outside the headquarters and on the other side was a swimming pool for their use.

Just down the way was the huge amusement park where many nights the boys, and those traveling with the team, enjoyed exhilarating rides on roller coasters, ferris wheels, etc. This was like having a county fair come to their doorsteps.

Also available for the group's enjoyment along the sporting line was the daily workouts of the Philadelphia Eagles of the NFL. These behemoths were just beyond leftfield and provided everyone with an extra thrill.

Larry Hartsell possibly summed up the week and its effect on everyone, when he accepted his outstanding player trophy Friday.

With a smile that ran from ear to ear he told everyone "* * * this is something I will never forget."

His immediate meaning was the trophy, but it is certain that his memory will also forever hold a spot for his week in "Chocolate Town."

If you were not there, you can never realize the extent of this week. Not having experienced some of the incidents, you cannot comprehend the acceptance of the Gaston representative. Neither can you realize the amazement, awe, and respect of the other visiting teams for the Gastons.

Talking Wednesday night with Bill Fenton, one of the coaches of the Gloucester City, N.J., team which lost to Absher-Flowers boys in the finals, it took some time to try and explain why the Gastons are always there and always get such great support from the folks in Hershey, as well as the people back home.

Delegations from Wisconsin, Ohio, Arizona, and elsewhere were also amazed.

People of "Chocolate Town" adopt the Gastons as soon as they arrive. It is the "home team." In restaurants and on the streets they are recognized as the gentlemen of the tourney.

As it is they are thinking of giving it a new designation for this 1 week of August each year. If the Gastons get up next year, they may find that they are visiting "North Gastonia."

Jack Mathieson, national youth activities director for the VFW and tournament director, said Friday that "If Gastonia comes up one more time, we will probably have to designate a special section as the permanent summer home of Gastonia.

"No other team has done so much, nor enjoyed such success in the teener program as the team from Gastonia."

All week long you hear these remarks.

People in Gaston County, especially the parents of the players, can well be proud of the boys this year.

J. V. McGinnis, who directed the team to the title called them the greatest bunch of boys I have ever seen in my life.

Parents and friends of the boys can also be proud of the boys for the respect that they command in Hershey each year. Not only are they respected and feared on the field, but they are also thought of as the cream of the crop among the teams.

Even the opposition has nothing but kind words for the Gaston boys.

When they were playing the game Thursday against West Allis, Wis., for another shot at the championship, they had the vocal and moral support of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

One Jerseyite called himself a rebel and cheered loudly and enthusiastically for the Gastons. "We want them to win, because we (New Jersey) feel that they are the best boys here. They were every one gentlemen."

This same person suffered a slight heart tremor Thursday night and was told by a doctor to stay away from Friday's games. However, he was there for both games Friday and was one of the first to congratulate the winners.

Feeling like this toward a team that you are part of, if only in a reportorial capacity, makes you proud. You find a place for them that you will always remember.

Never will this writer forget August 11–16, 1963, and the Absher-Flowers Teener Baseball Team.

And never will he see a chocolate bar without remembering how Chocolate Town, U.S.A., took one team and its representatives to heart.

[From the Gastonia Gazette, Aug. 18, 1963]

WELCOME CHAMPS

(By Harold Pearson)

Late Saturday afternoon Gaston County welcomed home its heroes, the new world champions of teener baseball.

Meeting the team on its return at the Catawba River Bridge, a giant motorcade, bedecked with streamers, took them on a trip through the county, because this was the county's team.

Starting at the meeting point, the victorious teeners were first carried through Belmont, into McAdenville, up through Lowell and Ranlo, up Airline Avenue in and through Gastonia, where they came to stop at the post home of Absher-Flowers VFW Post 9337, the organization that sponsored the team.

Leading this parade through the county was Ralph Ross, North Carolina VFW department chief of staff, representing the department commander. His car was followed by a bedecked convertible carrying Gastonia Mayor Vic Phillips, Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, and National VFW Councilman James Wallace.

Met at the post home by a huge delegation of parents and friends, tribute was paid to the new champs by officials and friends for a job well done.

Mayor Phillips probably best expressed the feelings of the city and county with the words, "It is a proud and honorable moment when I can welcome you back to your beautiful home."

Russ Bergmann, who had made the trip with the previous champions in 1960–61 and assisted J. V. McGinnis with the team this year, also had nothing but praise for the team that "really battled back."

Closing out his tribute, Bergmann thanked the parents for the "loan of these great boys for the past month and a half."

J. V. McGinnis, who directed the team to the championship this year, told the group Saturday that he was indeed proud of them, of their ability and, most of all, their character as gentlemen.

Others paying tribute to the team were members of the group that made the trip to Hershey with the team, including Ebb Gantt, who broadcast the games back to the home folks.

Post 9337 Commander Ern Hubbard, who was also with the team in Hershey, served as master of ceremonies and introduced the guests.

A formal tribute will be paid the team Tuesday, August 27, when the sponsoring VFW post honors the team with a dinner at the post hall.

[From the Gastonia Gazette, Aug. 17, 1963]

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE TEENERS

A certain amount of nostalgia hovered over the diamond like dust in Hershey, Pa., yesterday when the Gaston Teeners took the measure of Gloucester City, N.J., 1 to 0.

It was in 1956 that Gloucester City turned back the Gaston team in like performance and left all of us here with aching hearts.

No, there is no gloating here in the victory of our Teeners—just admiration and a headful of pride.

It was the first time since 1954 that a team in the loser's bracket came back to win the series, and that's exactly what the Gaston boys did. They lost one game and then had

to win three straight. And, boy, did they do it.

This Gaston team was one of the youngest teams ever to play in Hershey. Seven of the lads will be back next year.

J. V. McGinnis, the fine Gaston coach, led the way. And there, right beside him—wouldn't you know it?—was the old warhorse himself, Russ Bergmann. He couldn't stay away.

So, hats off once again to the Gaston Teeners. They bring home the World Series for the third time.

In the words of Mel Allen, "How about that?"

Billions to Tito for What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, each time we have been asked to give millions of the peoples' money to Yugoslavia's Tito we were told it was to win him away from Soviet Russia. The current lovefest now going on between Khrushchev and Tito proves what many of us warned that Communists do not stop being Communists without giving up communism. In spite of the billions we have given to Tito he is still a working ally of the Communist conspiracy which is dedicated to the destruction of the free world and particularly the United States.

Now we are gambling with our security by entering into unilateral disarmament and a test ban treaty with Russia because we believe there is a split between the Russians and the Chinese. Has not history taught us enough to at least proceed with caution?

To refresh our memories, I am including, as a part of these remarks, a column by Dr. Robert Morris of Dallas, an authority on the Communist conspiracy. Dr. Morris' column, "Those Convenient Splits," follows:

THOSE CONVENIENT SPLITS

(By Robert Morris)

Although everybody in the diplomatic world seems to be hugging Khrushchev these days, the particularly affectionate embraces exchanged between the Soviet dictator and President Tito should have a sobering effect on our leaders who are predicating great changes on the cleavage between the Russians and the Red Chinese.

In 1947 there was evidence of a real split between Tito and Stalin. That split, incidentally, came about at a time when there was genuine hostility between the United States and the Yugoslav dictator who had just shot down our flyers and ignited a storm of indignation here in this country. While public opinion was forcing our State Department to bear down on Tito, for reasons of their own, the two dictators broke off relations. Neither, it will be recalled, renounced communism.

That cleavage in the Communist empire came, not while we were kowtowing to Tito—that came later—but while we were properly severe with him. Since 1947 we have been courting Tito to the tune of almost $3 billion. The result today is all over the newspapers—Khrushchev and Tito are in fond embrace and exchanging missiles and military hardware.

Instead of acknowledging the failure of that expensive gamble (it was always represented as an effort to splinter world communism) this reconciliation is being hailed as a welcome development because, it is now said, the embraces between these two dictators are driving a new and different wedge between Moscow and Peiping.

Meanwhile Tito's assistance since 1947 to the growth of the Soviet influence has been enormous. He has carried on a Yugoslav foreign aid program, with our money, that was calculated to draw the genuinely neutral nations over to the Communist side. This is a role that Khrushchev himself could not perform and it obviated the patently indefensible act of our giving direct aid to Khrushchev himself.

The Belgrade Conference in the fall of 1960 where Tito acted as host to the neutral leaders of the world, proved to be a great success as far as Khrushchev's program in the General Assembly of the U.N. and elsewhere was concerned.

While the Russian-Yugoslav split was in force, there were real organizational cleavages between Titoists and adherents of Stalin. The American Communist Party was purged then of Titoists and Titoist sympathizers. John Lautner, for instance, who has since rendered such great service to the United States, was expelled from the American Communist Party because one of his earlier party bosses turned out to be a Titoist.

In other words, the cleavages were real then. The Chinese cleavages have not yet reached that stage. Yet for all our billions Tito and Khrushchev are back in each others arms.

While there is pretty good evidence that Khrushchev is putting strong pressure on Mao Tse Tung, suspected Maoists are not being rubberhosed in Cleveland basements as was John Lautner. In fact, the recent record of Yemen, of Cuba, of Africa, and of South America show that Khrushchev's advance guard has worked very closely with Mao's in leveling bourgeois ramparts.

Since the current differences stem from a power struggle for Soviet supremacy, within the family, they could be solved tomorrow by a pro-Khrushchev man superceding Mao.

Meanwhile the Red Chinese are convenient baying hounds for Khrushchev on the test ban issue. As Mr. Harriman has said, Mr. K. really wants this test ban treaty. When Charles de Gaulle, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, and other independent leaders express dissent from the treaty for plausible reasons, they are conveniently balked by our policy planners and by the Russians with the nasty Red Chinese, who are very conspicuously opposing the treaty. The role of these Chinese is thus conveniently and ideally suited to the Harriman-Khrushchev posture.

In fact when you analyze it, the role of the Chinese is even more convenient. Over and over we are being told that one of the real advantages to this dubious treaty, which is showing more flaws every day, is that it is driving a wedge between Moscow and Peiping.

Meanwhile, on the practicable side of things we are restraining President Chiang Kai-shek of Free China from returning to this rightful place on the homeland. If someone asks why, Mr. Harriman has the answer—such a return would drive the Russians and the Red Chinese together again. Thus we allow the Red Chinese to be preserved until they become a nuclear power and for the first time a threat to us.

These off-again-on-again splits are being dextrously wielded—not so much by Khrushchev but by our policy planners—with the effect of preserving Soviet power in its illegal lairs.

The Chicago Sun-Times Offers First Significant Clue to Sino-Soviet Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, the Chicago Sun-Times carried an editorial entitled, "Mao Tze-Tung Moves," which, in my opinion, constitutes the first significant suggestion as to the basic reason underlying the mounting tension between the Soviet Union and Communist China.

I should like to call this very significant editorial to the attention of my colleagues because if, indeed, the findings of the Chicago Sun-Times are correct—and I believe they are correct—then perhaps the time has come when the free world should view the present Sino-Soviet break from an entirely new perspective.

The Chicago Sun-Times suggests that Mao Tze-Tung has decided to base his entire foreign policy on a determined effort to become the leader of the world's non-white population. This hypothesis might very well explain why Mao wants to diminish his relationship with the white leaders of the Soviet Union.

When considering long-range goals, it is entirely possible that Mao may feel he has much more to gain as the self-styled leader of the world's nonwhite population by dumping the Soviet Union as his ally, than by continuing to be closely identified with the white leaders of the Kremlin.

Mao Tze-Tung may well feel he must renounce all contacts with the world's white Communists, including the Soviet Union. It would appear to me that the free world must expose this cynical ambition of Mao Tze-Tung's.

I believe Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, has made a good start in blocking any hopes that the Communist boss of Red China may have for gaining sympathizers among the nonwhites of America. In completely repudiating a telegram from a Communist Chinese organization in Peiping wishing the NAACP success in its freedom rally here in the Capital this Wednesday, Mr. Wilkins boldly replied:

> We await the opportunity to send our felicitations to Chinese citizens gathered in a huge demonstration in your nation's capital to protest living conditions under your government and welcomed there by your heads of state.

Mr. Speaker, it should be perfectly apparent that Mr. Wilkins has seen through the thinly veiled ambitions of Mao Tse-tung to establish a beachhead for his world ambition here in the United States among our nonwhite population.

Mr. Wilkins is to be congratulated for his acumen and foresight.

I cite Mr. Wilkins' forthright repudiation of any greeting from the Chinese Peoples Committee for World Peace in Peiping only because the original message

from Peiping would tend to support the thesis advanced in the Chicago Sun-Times editorial which I shall include at the conclusion of these remarks.

I believe the editors of the Chicago Sun-Times deserve the highest commendation for calling this new twist of Red China's aspirations to the attention of the American people. Through its alertness, the Sun-Times has performed a most significant public service and I am confident the nonwhite people not only of the United States but the entire free world will denounce Mao for his arrogant ambitions.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

MAO TSE-TUNG MOVES

Chairman Mao Tse-tung, head of the Chinese Communist Party, is noted for silence. Usually his subordinates make the public statements of policy. Mao seldom speaks out for the record; when he does, it carries unusual significance.

Last week Mao made what is believed to be the first foreign policy statement ever issued over his signature. His statement was a formal bid for the leadership of the colored races of the world against the white.

Speaking to a small group of African leaders in Peiping, Mao called for the Chinese Communist Party to back the struggle of the American Negro for equality with the white race. It was an obvious attempt by Mao to capture the backing of the African and Asian populations in Mao's quarrel with Moscow and a warning to Russia that the Red Chinese would pursue their own course in world communism.

The appeal by Mao to the colored races of the world is not a new tack. The real monolithic unity of the Communist parties has been based for decades on the blind acceptance of the thesis that the interests of the world Communist movement are absolutely identical with the interests of Russia.

Mao's propagandists have been subtly torpedoing this thesis for some time by repeatedly pointing out that Khrushchev's campaign of peaceful coexistence was based on fear of the damage a nuclear war could do to highly industrialized Russia. Following the 22d Communist Congress the Red Chinese declared that Russia had everything to lose in a nuclear war but that such a war would open a "beautiful future" for the nonwhite Communists of the world.

The schism between Russia and Red China has been growing for years. It is now a bitter and vengeful breach; following Mao's statement Red Chinese trade union leaders denounced the Kennedy administration for "Fascist atrocities" against the American Negro and then attacked Khrushchev for allying Russia with the United States in the nuclear treaty. The Red Chinese unionists warned Khrushchev that the alliance with the United States was foolish, that the American Negro would be the "real master" of the United States.

The offer by Mao to back the struggle of the American Negro for equality is a bitter insult to every American, no matter what his color. It should be renounced and spurned by every Negro in the United States.

Mao's efforts to assume the leadership of the colored peoples of the world must, however, be taken seriously. Mao has always believed himself to be the real leader of world communism; his record of ignoring the dictates of Russia is long and consistent. Now he clearly indicates his course to achieve his leadership, the division of the world on the basis of skin color; a division that Russia fears deeply and the peoples of the world of all races should guard against.

National Purpose on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include an editorial, entitled "National Purpose on the March," which appeared in yesterday's Long Island Sunday Press.

I am completely and wholeheartedly in accord with the intent and purpose of the march, and shall continue to support insofar as possible the strongest and broadest civil rights legislation.

The Press has delved into our national conscience, and has eloquently and forcefully explained the reasons for the demonstration which will take place here in Washington next Wednesday, August 28.

The editorial follows:

NATIONAL PURPOSE ON THE MARCH

The march on Washington strides toward us.

It is unlikely that any mature American is unaware of its approach next Wednesday.

Some may have qualms about the possibility of touching off an explosion. Disclaiming omniscence, we'd comfort them.

One hundred thousand—maybe 250,000 or more—fellow Americans from all quarters of our Nation are going to Washington to participate without qualms. For many it will be a hardship they readily accept because of its larger meaning.

Crowds of 100,000 are not unusual for Washington. The July 4 fireworks show draws as many as 250,000. Official estimates for the 1952 and 1956 inaugural parades ran as high as 750,000.

Granted, Wednesday's inpouring will be different. The marchers will be participants instead of spectators. But responsible public safety authorities and the organizers of the march are taking massive precautions. They are confident it will be peaceful.

Some may have doubts about the strategy. "What will it accomplish?" We claim no omniscience here, either.

But we'd point out that the Nation's conscience has been stirred—deeply stirred to the implied promises of the Emancipation Proclamation of 100 years ago and yet unfilled.

America is searching its conscience, openly and frankly these days. It is well that it does, for our own sake and for the sake of the moral leadership that we've accepted in raising the standards of living of people around the world, whose freedoms we are committed to preserve.

The march is for Negroes' rights—a shameful admission, when you come right down to it, for a country where all are supposed to be born equal, have equal opportunity, and contribute equally of their talents in the growth of their country.

President Kennedy put the matter in proper perspective the other day in answering a reporter's question about Wednesday's demonstration's effect on the country and on the Congress:

"I think the purpose, of course," he said, "is to attempt to bring to the attention of the Congress and the country the strong feeling of a good many thousands of citizens. I don't know, of course, how many are going to come. What we're really talking about is a problem which involves 180 million people. * * * It must, in the final analysis, be settled by the Congress and by the executive branch working with 180 million people."

Our country will meet this responsibility.

The march is not going to solve everything at once. But it can, as a conscience issue, create the moral atmosphere that will insist on the quickening of rights progress and lift the country toward the factual heights that equal the idealism inherent in our system of self-government.

This is neither a will-o'-the-wisp pursuit nor a 1-day show.

It is the pursuit of an attainable objective. It comes right down to the understanding that each of us is personally a part of this cry for justice. It demands of us the determination to live the kind of life that we'd like to think we live—with compassion for others, the courage to stand up for their rights as well as our own, to do unto others as we would that they do unto us.

"The March" is so close it would be presumptious of any of us to try to put it in historical perspective. It can be said, however, that except for the exigencies of wartime—when our collective security has been at stake—we have not seen so spontaneous and dramatic a manifestation of national purpose.

Gesell Analysis Confirms Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have previously pointed out on several occasions how the Times-Picayune of New Orleans has made great efforts to expose the Gesell report to public scrutiny.

In line with this, it is a pleasure to include into the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the August 23 edition of the Times-Picayune, entitled "Gesell Analysis Confirms Charges":

GESELL ANALYSIS CONFIRMS CHARGES

As stated by Senator P. A. HART, Michigan, articles in Congressional Quarterly are typically inclusive, readable, informative. Its recent article on the Gesell report and directives falls, we think, in that category. In stating that the Quarterly is one of the periodicals most carefully read by Congressmen, and in recommending reading of this article, Senator HART serves the cause of opposition to this radical militarization maneuver.

Senator HART thinks himself that all Americans should hail the Gesell report and directives. But the Quarterly article, merely by summarizing in detail the points involved, the charges and rebuttals, should convince any close, alert reader that the charges made are indeed valid, and that the rebuttals comprise lame excuses, quibbles, and contradictions.

In reply to a description of the Gesell maneuver as a "club to force integration in communities near military bases," the response of "defense officials" is that "it will be far less sweeping in its effect than initial reports and interpretations indicated."

No justification is discernible for this denial of the sweep of the Gesellistic takeover. Toward the end the Pentagon is quoted as saying: "It * * * is prepared to order its

men not to patronize those (restaurants, etc.) which are segregated." Nor has the door been shut, as the article notes, on closing down military bases, as another knob of the club.

Description of the administration plan as one to "use the military as an instrument for social change" brings only the weak rejoinder that "We are not trying to change the life of a town, but the way they treat servicemen." (This generalization of terms, "servicemen," appears in another quote, from one official: "We have the power to restrain our troops from engaging in activities which are deleterious to their morale.")

Defense officials claim ther was a misconception about the McNamara directives which was primary, to the effect that whole communities might be declared out of bounds for servicemen. The reply: "We hope never to have to use the off-limits sanction." Omitted: "Provided communities see the club and act accordingly."

These are just starters in the game of equivocation and soft-soap apparently now being played at Washington in this matter. The article speaks for itself up to this point. But what Gesellism is leading to, in precedent and principle, is left to other reviewers, or to later times.

The Slash in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of President Kennedy and many others over the action taken by the House last week on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

The following lead editorial on the subject appeared in the Philadephia Inquirer of August 25, 1963:

THE SLASH IN FOREIGN AID

President Kennedy is justified, to a considerable degree, in angrily denouncing as unwarranted and unwise and dangerously partisan the deep cuts in the foreign aid bill engineered by Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Republican leadership in both Houses of Congress has been obsessed by a spirit of negativism that is frustrating to those who are anxious to do something about fulfilling this Nation's tremendous responsibilities abroad and at home. Republican Minority Leaders HALLECK of the House and DIRKSEN of the Senate, a pair of standpatters whose concepts of progress are contemporary with the era of the flat strawhat and striped flannel trousers, have been making a vaudevillian farce of the legislative process far too long.

We don't mean that foreign aid funds are sacrosanct and should be granted some kind of special immunity from the budget trimmers' shears. But there is a difference between intelligent, careful cutting of wasteful or unnecessary foreign aid items and reckless, wholesale axing of projects important to free world security. The $585 million slash rammed through the House of Representatives bears no earmarks of wisely selective action.

It is strange, indeed, that such a hasty and far-reaching move to weaken anti-Communist forces in strategic areas of the world comes at a time when Republicans are expressing grave concern over the continuing Communist menace and are counseling against quick action on the nuclear test ban pact.

There are, however, some aspects of the House cut in foreign aid funds that President Kennedy chose not to discuss but need to be brought out in the open.

For one thing, the cut was not the work of Republicans alone. It could not have been done without Democratic support. The vote was 222 to 188. Democrats supplied the decisive margin—66 of the 222 votes for the cut. Most of these Democratic votes were cast by southern reactionaries but they were, nevertheless, Democratic votes.

Moreover, many votes in favor of the cut in foreign aid funds came from responsible Congressmen who are genuinely alarmed at the Kennedy administration's dedication to deficit financing and big spending. A more cooperative administration attitude toward efforts by Congress to hold spending down, so that a tax cut can be enacted without unbalancing the budget too badly, might have forestalled the decision by the House Republicans to take matters in their own hands.

Additionally, there is no doubt that the House action reflects in some measure a widespread disgust, felt not only on Capitol Hill but throughout the country, over the continuing inability of foreign aid administrators to eliminate wasteful and unjustified foreign aid spending in some countries.

Nonetheless, all factors considered, the Republican leadership stands guilty as charged by the President. The Dirksen-Halleck medieval outlook and stall-stall tactics are hurting a host of measures—including the tax cut, the rail strike prevention bill and the test ban treaty.

Insofar as the disfigurement of the foreign aid bill is concerned, it is our earnest hope that the Senate will repair the damage.

Caverns of Sonora: A Veritable Symphony in Color

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, only recently there was opened to public view, near Sonora, Tex., one of the world's most fabulous natural spectacles. I am referring to the Caverns of Sonora, which has been described as "Nature's art gallery." It is believed by many experts that these caverns are more spectacular in many respects than any underground discovery that has yet taken place in America.

Indeed, a visit to the caverns by Bill Stephenson, past president of the National Speleological Society, prompted him to say: "It's the most beautiful known in the world."

An estimated 60 million years of slow uninterrupted growth has gone into the formation of the caverns, where nature has fashioned scenes of beauty ranging from the dinosaurs to minature patterns of frothy lace.

The formation found there are translucent and phosphorescent and range in color from pure white through shades of gray, faint greens and blues, pale rose and bright oranges to deep browns. So profuse are these formations that in portions of the cave, walls, ceiling and floors are completely covered.

Exploration of the caverns began in 1955. Already many miles of passages have been explored, and an undeterminded number of passages are yet to be explored. Cave experts from all over the United States and several foreign countries have made trips through the caverns, and all describe it as the most beautiful known in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of exploring these caverns. They are located in the district I represent. I felt it appropriate to call attention to this discovery, and to urge everyone who possibly can to visit the caves. It is an experience one can never forget.

Portrait of Pittsburgh: America's Midway Location

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing in southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the sixth of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

Pittsburgh's three rivers—the Allegheny, Monongahela and Ohio—have been this area's great benefactors for two centuries. In early days, they provided the easiest routes for frontiersmen bent on exploration of the heartland of America.

Today the three waterways serve as a primary means of bulk transportation of the raw materials required by industry.

Pittsburgh has become America's largest inland water port, handling more than 41 million tons in 1960. Three major barge lines serve Greater Pittsburgh. In addition, many of the local industries maintain their own fleets for water transportation.

Buyers and sellers who deal through Pittsburgh are also assured excellent rail facilities. In terms of employment, for example, there are more persons employed by railroads in the Pittsburgh area than in any county in the United States except Cook County, Ill. No less than 22 railroads operate within Allegheny County, handling everything from cans of tomato soup to hot slag from the steel mills. In addition, 89 other railroad firms, with operations covering every State in the Nation, maintain local offices.

Pittsburgh is also the home of the world's largest and most up-to-date freight classification yard in the Nation.

The motor freight industry is recognized as one of the youngest in the transportation field. With the improvement of highways, motor freight has become an important industry in Pittsburgh. More than 240 com-

mon and contract motor transport firms service the immediate Pittsburgh area. In addition, there are many private carriers who provide freight carrier service to every point in the United States.

In air transportation, Pittsburgh ranks among the best in facilities and service. Eight airlines provide scheduled service from Greater Pittsburgh airport—second largest air facility in the world. Twelve international airlines maintain local offices.

Approximately 2,300,000 persons annually use the Greater Pittsburgh Airport facilities. In 1962 the airlines transported nearly 21,881 tons of cargo. This included 4,544 tons of air mail and 17,337 tons of express and freight cargo.

Also available is Allegheny County Airport—used for freight as well as a homebase for corporate-owned aircraft and hangars. This airport has more activity than many commercial airports throughout the country.

Plans are underway to turn Greater Pittsburgh Airport into an international air terminal making the Pittsburgh area a jet-age gateway to the world.

Thirty-four bus companies serve the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. Biggest mass transit supplier is Pittsburgh Railways Co. Greyhound Corp., the Nation's largest bus carriers, has completed a new $3 million terminal in downtown Pittsburgh.

The Pittsburgh area's importance in the field of international trade is also shown by the large number of steamship companies maintaining offices for passengers and freight. More than 44 companies maintain offices here. In addition, there are special freight and passenger agents representing other companies locally.

Pittsburgh's location and facilities have given it a high status as a major transportation center. Not only is the city a great producer, it is also a city which can transport goods quickly and economically.

A New Kind of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the disenchantment of many Members of Congress with various aspects of our foreign aid program—a feeling which was made unmistakably manifest here last Friday—it is particularly timely to call the attention of the House to legislation which would authorize a new and potentially highly effective and beneficial private form of foreign aid, the proposed International Home Loan Bank.

The Bank would function with private funds exclusively. It would not cost the taxpayers a thing. But because it gives promise of bringing home ownership within the means of millions of families of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa, it could be a major force for social stability and economic progress in these nations—an avowed goal of our present foreign aid program.

As a constructive alternative to parts of our present foreign aid program, I suggest to our colleagues that the legislation deserves sympathetic consideration in light of the hostility which has just been shown to the old form of foreign aid.

As the sponsor of one of the bills—H.R. 6715—to create the International Home Loan Bank, I prepared the following statement in support of the bill for the Committee on Banking and Currency which has just concluded hearings on the legislation.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, REPUBLICAN, SIXTH DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, IN SUPPORT OF HER BILL, H.R. 6715, AND SIMILAR BILLS TO ESTABLISH AN INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, it seems especially appropriate that our committee should begin hearings on the several bills, including my own (H.R. 6715) to establish an International Home Loan Bank at the very time the House was considering this year's foreign aid authorization bill. The approach to the problem of helping the people of the less-developed areas which is embodied in this housing legislation would be more realistic, more effective, and more beneficial—not to say, much less costly—than are many aspects of our present foreign aid program.

This is a large claim, I realize, but it is a claim which I believe can be substantiated. The International Home Loan Bank idea is based on several premises: that housing, next to food itself, is the most directly important commodity in the lives of most human beings; that the ownership of private housing gives a person a considerable stake in the community and thus is a source of social stability; that a growing middle class, provided with the opportunity to save some money and finance the purchase of residential housing, can be a bulwark against social unrest and a vigorous force for sound economic and social development in the newer nations of Africa and Latin America.

Housing, therefore, occupies a crucial position in the overall problem with which our entire foreign aid program is concerned: the strengthening of independent, self-governing nations by bolstering their capacity to meet the needs of their people for economic opportunity and social progress. To a limited extent, our foreign aid program has recognized the importance of housing and through the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank some funds have been used to assist directly in the construction of housing in Latin America. These efforts have been sporadic and relatively minor, however, and of a fiscal year 1962 total of $2.4 billion of nonmilitary foreign aid less than $200 million was devoted to housing programs.

Yet, even this restricted attention to housing has produced very encouraging results. Individual projects have been remarkably successful and U.S.-assisted housing is frequently pointed to as among the most fruitful effects of our aid programs. In addition, AID and other Government programs have cooperated in conducting surveys in Latin America and Africa which have documented the urgent need for private housing—a need, for example, which is estimated to total 14 million units in Latin America alone. A growing awareness has developed that successful housing programs provide not only significant social and political benefits but also stimulate the growth of such important areas of the economy as the construction, finance, and supply industries and have a wholesome impact on the economy generally.

My own interest in this field has been greatly heightened by the experience of one of my most prominent constituents, Mr. Everett C. Sherbourne, president of the City Federal Savings and Loan Association of Elizabeth, N.J. Mr. Sherbourne was the industry representative on a three-man team which studied the housing situation in Libya in 1961. His report is an immensely persuasive document. His group found an urgent need for considerable private housing for low- and middle-income families—a need which, nearly 3 years later, is still unmet and which is intensifying the unrest and resentment which the three members noted in 1961.

As Mr. Sherbourne and his associates pointed out, adequate private housing can be constructed at costs within reach of low- and middle-income wage earners who can afford modest down payments and the subsequent long-term mortgage charges. In the total absence of such long-term mortgage facilities, however, prospective homeowners have no alternative but to pay exorbitant rents for housing, rents so high that the owner's total investment is recouped often within 5 or 6 years.

Mr. Sherbourne's experience has been duplicated widely in other parts of Africa and Latin America. The resulting data and information document the pressing need for encouraging the accumulation of sufficient capital in the underdeveloped countries to service this market, for developing the thrift and home financing institutions needed to put this capital to work, and for creating a central source of technical know-how and seed capital which, as the term suggests, would reproduce itself many times over in the fertile areas of unfilled needs.

This would be the purpose of the proposed International Home Loan Bank. It is designed to meet such a worthy objective in such a practical way that I find it difficult to account for the lengthy delay in establishing this program. No public funds would be required for the Bank. Its capital would be raised from the investment of up to one percent of the assets of individual savings and loan associations and other mutual savings institutions. The one percent limitation should eliminate any risk at all to depositors in such institutions, while the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the State Department should assure the soundness of its banking operations and harmony with the objectives of American foreign policy. The Bank would invest in or lend to those thrift and home-financing institutions in the developing countries, which, in turn, make loans and advances to individual institutions resembling our own savings and loan associations in their thrift and home-financing functions. A few such institutions already exist in some of the developing countries, but here and elsewhere they need the experience and resources of the Bank to help them multipy and flourish.

As a sponsor this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I am particularly impressed that the Bank would be a striking example of free, private enterprise in this "capitalistic" system of ours investing private funds and talents, with no hope of big profits, into an activity of the most direct consequence to individual people of modest means in many of the less powerful or influential countries of the world. The meaning of this situation will, I feel sure, communicate itself more effectively than many a more ambitious Government project.

No more significant indication could be found of the success of the savings and loan and mutual savings industry during the last fabulous 30 years than this proposal to share its wealth with less fortunate areas of the world in a practical effort to show that the American way holds out hope for the millions everywhere.

The bills we have introduced and are considering today, Mr. Chairman, can themselves be thought of as "seed" bills—legislation designed not as a finished product but as a way of stimulating further thought about some of the real problems associated with this undertaking. Even the most worthwhile objectives pose difficult questions of organization, administration, degrees of legislative authority, financing, and the like.

I have every confidence, however, that our committee, after considering all these questions and possible weaknesses or objections to the plan, can devise a workable and effective method of inspiring and facilitating one of the most constructively revolutionary social movements in the world—the effort to spread the benefits of homeownership among the peoples of the developing world who yearn for stability, opportunity, and the hope of better things in the future.

The Farming Industry in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very proud of my State of New Jersey and I am honored to serve the citizens of the State here in Washington. There are very few States that are as diverse as the Garden State, and this diversification gives the State a rare character.

The State of New Jersey has one of the greatest population densities of any of the States, yet the State also supplies a great percentage of the food for the Middle Atlantic States, hence the name "Garden State." While New Jersey's industry to the north is well known to all, the thriving farm industry in the southern part of the State is known to few. New Jersey every year turns out bountiful crops of vegetables and a great variety of fruits. Our dairy and poultry farms are some of the most productive in the country. The famous rotolactor at the Walker-Gorden Farm in Plainfield, N.J. is just one example of how the farmers of the State make the most of their resources.

Mr. President, the State of New Jersey is rapidly approaching the tercentenary celebration of her founding. For 300 years farmers have continued to find prosperity in the rich soil and warm climate of the State. I would like unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article concerning the farming industry in New Jersey. It appeared in the August 3 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GARDEN STATE GROWS

(By Helen Henley)

NEW JERSEY.—"It's like a tiny shop on a very crowded corner. People are always passing, looking, stopping—and buying."

This description of New Jersey, which appears in a brochure of the Public Service Electric & Gas Co. of New Jersey, sums up concisely the many-faceted activities of this corner of the United States known as the Garden State.

Although usually thought of as urban and industrial, New Jersey has gained renown also for its thriving agriculture. Under the State's Secretary of Agriculture, Phillip Alampi, this area promises to keep vigorously ahead of the food demands of a growing population.

This State, which ranks 46th in size and about 7th in value of manufactured products, is considered the most urban State in the Union in terms of percentage of population living in urban areas, yet here you find that almost a third of the land is producing food—and bountifully.

From these meticulously and intensively cultivated fields comes some of the tastiest foodstuffs on the whole eastern seaboard: eggs, poultry, vegetables, fruits, and dairy products. The nursery business is growing, too.

CASH RECEIPTS TOPS

New Jersey farms average the highest gross cash receipts per acre in the United States, amounting in 1962 to $205, compared with the national average of $32. In cash receipts per farm, it runs third, averaging in 1962, $19,831—exceeded only by California and Arizona, two States which, like New Jersey, depend heavily on irrigation.

Farmers here are holding their own, in spite of concentrated urban and industrial pressures. They can do this partly because of a peculiarly favorable combination of climate, soil, resources, and a tremendous market waiting practically at the farm door; and partly because of agricultural know-how and good management. In southern New Jersey, farmers have practically a 10-month season.

Yet, even here where farmers are prospering, the cost-price squeeze is troubling those who look ahead.

"I cann't say we are working for nothing," J. E. Rudderow told us between trips of his truck to the cornfield to bring back loads of sweet corn which Puerto Ricans were packing in a nearby shed, to be whisked to retail markets with the freshness of the field still on it.

"But we're not getting anything on our investment. Aside from the land, we have roughly about $100,000 investment in our equipment and machinery here. We should get some return on this investment but all we are getting actually is wages."

FAMILY TASK

Mr. Rudderow and his two sons do most of the work on his 200 acres of cropland here in Burlington County, except for seasonal labor hired for harvest.

"I think—I hope—there is a future in farming," he told us. "I have encouraged my two boys to say here, and each has his own home here on the farm. But I think farmers need better organization among themselves to stabilize quality and to get better prices."

En route to the Rudderow farm near Moorestown, Robert A. Jones, division manager of agriculture for Campbell Soup Co., Inc., at the Camden plant, had explained that Mr. Rudderow, in a sense, enjoys the best of two worlds.

He is growing crops under contract—tomatoes, carrots, and a test plot of onions—for Campbell to process, and he is also growing sweet corn for the fresh market.

Farmers supplying vegetables direct to market always have to gamble on the price, explained Mr. Jones. When retail prices run high, it is a good year for farmers selling on the fresh market. But on crops grown under contract for processing, price is guaranteed. No one knows ahead of time which will bring the better price. Contracts are based on acreage but the price is paid on tonage, so farmers on contract who increase their yield per acre stand to earn a little extra.

Fifteen years ago Mr. Rudderow had six mules and a couple of tractors "just to plow with." Now he owns seven tractors with the necessary cultivators, sprayers, etc., required by modern farming methods. He also has laid about 2 miles of 8-inch pipe for irrigating. Water, fortunately, is plentiful throughout New Jersey farmlands and few today try to farm without irrigating during the State's typically dry-hot summer.

"Some of these crops have been watered seven times this year," said Mr. Rudderow.

HARVEST UNDERWAY

On the previous day, Fred W. Jackson, Director of Information for the New Jersey Department of Agriculture, had shown us some of the fields in Cumberland County where a bumper crop of green beans was being mechanically harvested for Seabrook Farms, Inc.

Four big yellow harvesters, valued at perhaps $13,000 each, were chewing their careful way through as prosperous a field of green beans as we had ever seen. When their bins were filled, these were dumped into a huge waiting truck, to be rushed to the freezing plant at Seabrook.

This field is part of Seabrook's own 20,000 acres—and in addition, this company contracts with farmers for produce from 18,000 additional acres in this area.

Vegetables often can be processed within 2 hours of picking. "That's why we can say that frozen foods are fresher than fresh," explained C. E. Darwent of Seabrook Farms.

Firms like Campbell Soup Co. and Seabrook Farms have done much to help farmers stabilize quality and farm income, too.

Formers who produce for processing plants like these must meet the standards set. They are assisted in this by specifications set forth in the contract which may indicate even the kind of seed to be used and the practices to be followed in bringing the crop to harvest.

To a great extent, in Mr. Jones' words, the processor "recommends and supervises" the crop he has contracted to buy. Under this regime farmers hereabouts, as elsewhere, are steadily increasing their yields per acre. The average tomato production here for the years through 1940 to 1952 averaged 7.8 tons per acre, said Mr. Jones, while the average for the 5 years from 1958 through 1962 was boosted to 17.8 tons per acre by Campbell's growers.

THE BLUEBERRY PATCH

Over in Atlantic County, sometimes called "the berry patch" because of its acreages of blueberries, blackberries, and cranberries, harvesting of blueberries was in full swing. Here County Agent John E. Brockett was almost lyrical about local farmers, proudly pointing out that "this is a county in which, unlike most of the Nation, agriculture is growing."

In peaty, sandy ground and swamplands, the berry business is thriving. Here farmers do not hesitate to take their sons into business with them and to add their increasing families to those who must draw their living from the family farm business.

The Galletta Bros., of Hammonton, represent a business founded by the father and now carried on by four brothers with the help of their wives and the widow of a fifth brother. Several small grandchildren are already happily helping in the packing plant.

PRODUCTION THE CHALLENGE

Heading up the business as general manager is genial Arthur (Duke) Galletta who welcomed us to the plant one hot summer day, when a score of girls with practiced skill were sorting berries into boxes.

Out in the blueberry patch, pickers intent on earning a good day's pay kept busy pulling off berries even as they obligingly shifted position to pose for pictures. The best pickers might earn $25 a day, said Mr. Brockett, but the average skilled picker runs around $12 to $15.

With so many Gallettas buzzing cheerfully around the plant, it was easy to understand Mr. Brockett's assertion about the farmers of his county: "Some of these people are terrific operators. Like some of the good farmers elsewhere, they are more concerned with production of bigger or better crops or cultivation of more acres than with the

amount of money they earn. A lot of them do know how to make money—but their chief satisfaction comes from seeing their crops grow or being harvested.

"It's easy to interest them in new practices for better farming but I have spent 35 years trying to instill in them some idea of improving their marketing approach. That isn't easy."

Yet marketing methods are being steadily improved throughout the State. That's one of the developments which New Jersey's Secretary of Agriculture Alampi was eager to explain.

QUALITY INDICATION

"The biggest push in my department during the past 7 years has been to promote emphasis on marketing," said Mr. Alampi during a breakfast interview at Princeton. "In the past we have spent millions for production research and only pennies for marketing research. It's a crime not to do more about marketing."

Now, in New Jersey, four separate commodity councils are promoting the State's agricultural products: the apple industry council, the asparagus industry council, poultry products council, and the white potato industry council. Grower-members tax themselves voluntarily to raise thousands of dollars annually to promote their products. Similar promotion efforts are expected to develop for other commodities.

"This does not interfere at all with the brand name," explained Mr. Alampi. "It's like the Good Housekeeping seal of approval, which assures the consumer of quality. New Jersey eggs with the State seal of quality sell for 1½ to 2 cents more than those without it."

In New Jersey the secretary of agriculture enjoys an unusual distinction. He is not politically appointed. He is chosen for an indefinite term by the State board of agriculture, made up of eight farmers. Since the department was established in 1916, the State has had only four secretaries. Mr. Alampi, who for a number of years conducted farm radio and television programs and who has a farm of his own, has served since July 1, 1956. All of his staff members are civil service employees.

BUSINESS COSTLY

The need for mechanization and irrigation, added to a high tax rate, makes farming in New Jersey costly, the secretary pointed out.

"A farmer has to have a high production per unit to stay in business," he said. "Without a sales tax or income tax, New Jersey depends for revenue on its real estate tax, which in 1961 averaged $10.16 per acre for farmers."

This is said to be the highest per acre farm real estate tax in the Nation and is due in large part to the intensive urban and industrial development of the area which pushes land values upward. The national average for farm taxes per acre is reported as around $1.29.

A concerted effort is being made to reduce the tax pressure on New Jersey farmers. A referendum will be presented to New Jersey citizens in the next election which would make land use, rather than land value, the basis for real estate taxes on agricultural land.

With a 16-percent rate of growth, Mr. Alampi described his State as "the fastest growing State in the Nation," and he leaves no doubts as to his own conviction that New Jersey will continue to grow and progress, with agriculture one of its strongest assets.

Voice of Reason on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful discussion by the very able columnist, David Lawrence, entitled "Voice of Reason on Civil Rights." This article appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 22, 1963:

VOICE OF REASON ON CIVIL RIGHTS—NEGRO BUSINESSMAN'S VIEWS ON ISSUE CALLED SOMETHING FOR ALL TO CONSIDER

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe the voice of reason is at last coming through on the racial problem of today. President Kennedy deserves praise for the frankness and bluntness of the statement he made at his latest press conference telling some of the Negro agitators that they had gone too far in their demands and that a quota system in employment is not practicable. He said:

"I don't think quotas are a good idea. I think it's a mistake to begin to assign quotas on the basis of religion, or race, color, nationality. I think we get into a good deal of trouble.

"Our whole view of ourselves is a sort of one society. Now that hasn't been true, but at least that's where we're trying to go. And I think that we ought not to begin the quota system.

"On the other hand, I do think we ought to make an effort to give a fair chance to everyone who is qualified—not through a quota, but just look over our employment rolls, look over our areas where we are hiring people, and at least make sure that we're giving everyone a fair chance. But not hard and fast quotas. We're too mixed, this society of ours, to begin to divide ourselves on the basis of race or color."

Another voice of reason has just been raised by S. B. Fuller, one of the most successful Negroes in business in America today. He had only a sixth-grade education, but last year paid an income tax on over $100,000. He hitch-hiked from Memphis to Chicago at the age of 23, got a job and saved up $25. He took the $25, bought soap and started selling it from door to door. From that $25, he developed a business which produces a nationally known line of cosmetics and allied products and whose sales last year totaled more than $10 million. Mr. Fuller also controls eight other corporations, among them a department store and a chain of newspapers serving Negro readers in Chicago, New York, Detroit, and Pittsburgh.

Mr. Fuller expressed himself last week in an interview in the U.S. News & World Report, in which he told the story of his own career and urged Negroes to own their own businesses so as "to give jobs—not just ask for jobs."

"How else," said Mr. Fuller, "could a sixth-grade scholar have a job in America that paid him over $100,000 a year unless he was in business for himself?"

When asked whether Negroes have "done everything they can do to help themselves," Mr. Fuller replied:

"No, I don't thing they have. They have failed to go into business. I'll give you an illustration: In Chicago alone, we have millions of dollars invested in church property. I know of one church in Chicago that cost over a million dollars, but we have not had that kind of money invested in business.

"Now, if those people could put a million dollars in their church, they could have taken another million dollars and started a business. And this would have helped them employ themselves and others, too."

Here are some excerpts from the interview in which Mr. Fuller explained his views:

"Question. Is the racial conflict in this country going to spread? Will it result in bloodshed?

"Answer. No. I think the racial conflict in this country is at its height right now. From now on, it's going to have a trend downward.

"Question. Do Negroes still tend to feel inferior?

"Answer. Yes. Negro people are just as good as anybody else. This they must know. But they cannot convince others until they convince themselves.

"I have found no barriers to me in business. I am a member of the National Association of Manufacturers, of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, of the National Association of Direct Selling Companies. I serve on committees, I can be elected to any office that I aspire to in these organizations. There is no discrimination that I find in these organizations. * * *

"Question. In general, what do you think is the answer to the race problem in this country?

"Answer. Well, the problem is one the Negro has to work out himself. Negroes are not discriminated against because of the color of their skin. They are discriminated against because they have not anything to offer that people want to buy. The minute that they can be develop themselves so they excel in whatever they do—then they are going to find that they don't have any real problems. * * *

"Question. What would be your advice today to a young Negro coming out of school?

"Answer. My advice today is first, go to school and get a good education. It's not up to the teacher to see that he gets it. It's up to the student. When a Negro child goes to school, he must concentrate on his work.

"Then, when he comes out of school, come out with something to offer, a talent that he can sell.

"Question. But we hear that the schools available to Negroes often are inferior, that they don't offer a good education.

"Answer. Well, I think that the schools that the Negroes attend here in Chicago have about the same facilities as other schools. Anyway, it's not so much the facilities of the school that count as the attitude of the student. * * *

"Question. Are the racial demonstrations doing any good?

"Answer. The demonstrations have made the white man know that the Negroes are dissatisfied. But he knew that in the first place. Beyond that, I don't think they have done any good. In fact, they have done harm in the picture they give of Negroes.

"Question. Will the demonstrations continue, do you think?

"A. Oh, they will go on as long as they get publicity from it. When they don't get any publicity, they will die out. I don't think the demonstrations will go on as much as 18 months longer. * * *

"Question. Is there any justification, then, for Negro complaints about their lot in life?

"Answer. They have some legitimate complaints, but not very many. They will find that you cannot sue a man and make him want to live next door to you. You've got to sell him the idea that you are just as good as he is, by performance. You must perform well in your job. You must train your youngsters. You must keep your community as clean as the white man's community. You must keep up the home as well as he does. * * *

"Question. Are you generally optimistic on the future of the Negro race in this country?

"Answer. Oh, yes.

"Question. Is America, do you think, a good place for Negroes?

"Answer. America is the best place for the Negro in the world. America is the best place for any man in the world."

Maybe Mr. Fuller's story ought to be told through the Voice of America to the peoples of other lands who are wondering about the Negro problem in America and who have heard about it only in the terms of events in Little Rock or Birmingham or "demonstrations" in other areas.

Pacific Northwest Lumber Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the August 17, 1963, issue of the Marine Digest—a well-known west coast weekly periodical—has pointed up the Pacific Northwest lumber situation in an editorial which I urge Members of Congress to read.

Therefore, under permission previously granted, I include in the RECORD that editorial:

THE LUMBER PROBLEM

The steady loss to Canadians of Washington-Oregon-California cargo lumber markets on the U.S. Atlantic coast is shown dramatically in Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau figures for the first 6 months of 1963.

The U.S. Northwest, in the first half of 1960, shipped 510 million board feet of cargo lumber, as against the British Columbia total of 408 million.

In 1963, the half-year totals are 252 million for Oregon-Washington-California, and 558 million for British Columbia.

Reason for the alarming decline is that U.S. producers must use high-cost American-flag vessels for intercoastal shipments, while Canadians are free to charter more modern, efficient foreign carriers at a saving of some $12 per thousand board feet, according to Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president of the Western Forest Industries Association.

British Columbia has water-shipped more lumber into the U.S. Atlantic market during the past 6 months than its combined shipments to the rest of the world, McCracken said.

If action is not taken soon by Congress, McCracken added, the cargo lumber industry in Oregon and Washington will be lost. "It is a problem of critical importance to our lumbering and port communities," he said.

The first half totals since 1960 (millions of board feet):

In 1960, British Columbia, 408; Oregon, Washington, and California, 510; 1961, British Columbia, 429; Oregon, Washington, and California, 315; 1962, British Columbia, 517; Oregon, Washington, and California, 273; and 1963, British Columbia, 558; Oregon, Washington, and California, 252.

June 1963 shipments to the U.S. Atlantic coast market were as follows: British Columbia, 91 million board feet; Washington, 33 million board feet; Oregon, 2.4 million board feet; and California, 000.

This problem is not all one-sided, but a solution is long overdue.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 23d of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

It is fully apparent that many southern Idahoans are fearful that when Bonneville invades southern Idaho it will bring with it some of the unemployment that characterizes some of the areas wherein Bonneville has served for many years. The Hailey Times, of Hailey, Idaho, in its editorial of June 13, 1963, points up why Bonneville power would bring unemployment to southern Idaho.

The editorial follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER WOULD BRING UNEMPLOYMENT

The wild-eyed claim that bringing Bonneville power into southern Idaho would "add 3,000 new jobs to Idaho's phosphate industry and 6,000 new jobs to supporting industries and services with an aggregate payroll of some $75 million," has been shot down like a dead duck by a person who speaks from long experience in the phosphate fertilizer business. He is W. Grant Kilbourne, vice president and general manager of the J. R. Simplot Co. Minerals and Chemical Division of Pocatello.

Mr. Kilbourne says in a letter addressed to Senator FRANK CHURCH that Bonneville power "poses a disastrous threat to the $20 million investment that J. R. Simplot Co. now has in the phosphate fertilizer business and the $10 million expansion program we are now engaged in. I do not believe either the proponents or opponents of cheap Bonneville power are aware of this" and points to some important facts.

"First of all," he says, "There are two methods of making phosphate fertilizer. One is called the 'wet' process which this company uses and the other is known as the 'electric furnace' process such as used by Central Farmers, FMC, and Monsanto. The wet process uses phosphate rock and sulfuric acid as its primary raw materials. The electric furnace process uses phosphate rock and electric energy as its primary raw materials. In the wet process, sulfuric acid is used to induce through a series of acidulation and filtering steps the extraction of phosphate from the rock in the form of phosphoric acid, whereas the electric furnace process uses electric energy to induce the extraction of the phosphate from the rock by melting it and driving the phosphate off as a gas which in a series of steps is converted to phosphoric acid.

"The electric furnace producers of phosphates are already in such keen competition with this company and the other wet process producers in the agricultural fertilizer field that margins have seriously deteriorated over the past few years to the point that it is very difficult for any of us to maintain a profit position. In fact, many wet producers are now operating at substantial losses.

"Now the cost of electric energy to the electric furnace producer is the same to his basic production costs as the cost of sulfuric acid is to the wet method producer, and if the Bonneville Power Administration comes into the area to sell electric energy at a third of the present cost, it would have the same disastrous effect to our business as it would to the electric furnace producer if some Government agency should sell us sulfuric acid at one-third of our present cost."

The general manager of the Simplot operations at Pocatello says, "In either case, the injured party would be driven out of the fertilizer business by his subsidized competition and many millions of dollars that are now invested in good faith in plants and facilities would go down the drain."

Instead of 3,000 new jobs there would be a "substantial net loss of jobs," Mr. Kilbourne explains because electric furnace producers of phosphates, using cheap Bonneville power, and with the Simplot plant closed down, could expand existing operations to fill the market vacuum by putting more furnaces in operation "which would add very few employees, instead of the rather fantastic 9,000 claimed by BPA," he said.

In a letter dated June 4 addressed to Senator FRANK CHURCH, the J. R. Simplot Co. official asks, "My question to you then is how can it be true that the phosphate industry in Idaho will best be served and the economy strengthened by unfairly subsidizing the costs of one competitor against another to the extent that the one employing the larger number of people will be driven out of business?"

It appears that some very misleading misinformation has been given Idaho's senior Senator and when a man of Mr. Kilbourne's stature says, "The wet process producers drawing from Idaho mines now account for more jobs than the electric furnace producer," and then points out in clear and logical fashion that Bonneville power would destroy a $20 million investment, and result in less jobs, it's time everyone became concerned.

The prospect that Bonneville power would result in the creation of a highly artificial, unfair, and disastrous competitive situation in a business now competitively in balance is too serious to be brushed aside lightly. It would indeed be a black day for Idaho in general and Pocatello in particular if the J. R. Simplot plant had to be shut down. But that's exactly what could, and will happen * * * and under such terms, who wants Bonneville power?

Mr. Speaker, the Recorder-Herald, of Salmon, Idaho, in its editorial on June 27, 1963, reminds its readers that substitution of tax-free Bonneville power for the power now being supplied by the Idaho Power Co. would put the school districts and other taxing units farther behind the eight ball and in a worse financial condition than they are now.

The editorial follows:

POWER AND TAXES

By the stroke of a pen recently the Bonneville Power took over all public power distribution in south Idaho and it remains to be seen what will come of this move.

In Lemhi County as is perhaps true of other counties in the State, what is needed is no more public utilities but more private in-

dustry and business. The largest taxpayer in this county is Idaho Power Co. which paid in 1962 taxes $49,461.19. Approximately 62 percent of the $3,890,000 paid by Idaho Power Co. in 27 counties of the State of Idaho goes to school districts.

If, for example, Bonneville Power took over the supply of electrical power to this area, through a cooperative institution of some sort, Lemhi County would not have the tax money now being paid by Idaho Power Co. and the school districts and other taxing units would be even further behind the eight ball and in a worse financal condition than they are now.

Since Lemhi County has no major sources of tax revenue such as railroads, gaslines, and industrial factories, it behooves the area to keep the few large taxpayers now on the rolls and work for the development of other such businesses. If through some turn of events Idaho Power Co. service in this area were supplanted by Bonneville Power, Lemhi County would suffer a backset which could hardly be tolerated at this time.

As a recent release from Idaho Power Co. stated: "As a consumer and taxpayer, you and your pocketbook are directly affected. Your voice, directed toward your congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., and toward Members of the Senate and House of Representatives' appropriation committees, is your recourse."

Mr. Speaker, the Times News of Twin Falls, Idaho, expresses concern about the tax-free angle of Bonneville power in its effect on the tax atmosphere in southern Idaho. In its editorial of May 22, 1963, it says the invasion by Bonneville "is contrary to the expressed wishes of the area's residents, who time and again have voted against public power whenever it was a clear-cut election issue." It also points out that the move is "in complete accord with the philosophy of the bureaucrat and power-grabbing, socialist-minded politicians who are convinced that they know what's good for the people, regardless of what the people think."

The editorial follows:

ONLY STARTING

Extension of the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area to include all of Idaho cannot be written off as having no meaning now. True, for the present there will be no significant change in southern Idaho. But so far as the long-range picture is concerned, the present move can be regarded only as a toe-in-the-door sort of maneuver. What happens over the next decade or two should be of immediate concern to every resident of the area.

Anyone who thinks industry will come rushing to southern Idaho is bound to be disappointed. There are too many other factors involved and some are much more important than availability of public power, such as the tax atmosphere.

Some resident, such as those supplied electricity through the Raft River REA, can expect early benefits. The have been paying roughly one-third more for irrigation pumping power than those purchasing electricity from the Idaho Power Co.

Those who imagine there will be no further change in the regional status of Bonneville Power Administration don't reckon with Federal bureaus and their history. With its toe in the door, Bonneville will keep right on working for more and more power and authority. The bureaucrats will not be content until they control the entire region. The eventual possibilities raise the question of replacement of the tax money paid now by the Idaho Power Co. Public power pays no taxes.

Only time will show the eventual consequences of a move that is completely political from conception to accomplishment. It is contrary to the expressed wishes of the area's residents, who time and again have voted against public power whenever it was a clear-cut election issue.

That makes the move in complete accord with the philosophy of the bureaucrat and power-grabbing, socialist-minded politicians who are convinced they know what's good for the people, regardless of what the people think.

Restricting Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as with most major bills in Congress, the motives, circumstances, and meaning behind last Friday's action by the House in restricting the financing and administration of our Government's foreign aid program were more complex than many of those who see all such action in partisan and black-and-white terms are willing to concede.

An editorial in the Newark Sunday News of August 25 will, I believe, provide better perspective than we have seen in many reports, and I recommend it to our colleagues:

MORE THAN PARTISAN

During House debate on the foreign aid bill, President Kennedy urged Congress to approve his proposals "however tired we may get of the program." After the House got through with the bill, there was little doubt most of its Members had grown impatient with the program and were in no mood to be dissuaded from showing it.

The $585 million reduction by the House, on top of a $400 million slash in committee, was unprecedented. And unexpected, in view of the Democratic leadership's ability to head off earlier Republican assaults on the bill. But Speaker McCORMACK failed to muster Democratic strength on the crucial vote.

As passed, the bill provides $3.5 billion for the current fiscal year instead of the $4.9 billion Mr. Kennedy requested in January.

To make matters worse for the administration, the authorization bill sets up new restrictions on foreign aid allocation and administration. Thus, assistance could be denied nations continuing to trade with Communist Cuba and a new restraint on funds for special projects precludes a large loan to India for a steel mill which critics say would compete with private industry.

For all this damage to his program, Mr. Kennedy blamed only the Republicans—156 of whom teamed up with 66 Democrats, mostly from the South. Only 16 Republicans joined 172 Democrats in opposition to the slash in funds.

The President denounced the Republicans for "short-sighted, irresponsible and dangerously partisan" action. But Mr. Kennedy himself displayed regrettable partisanship. He made no criticism of the 66 Democrats who voted against his program. They could have turned the result in his favor.

Apart from embittered southerners, it is apparent the vote was not so much against the President as against big foreign aid spending and its careless administration. The growing unpopularity of the program was reflected in last April's Clay Committee's report which called for "substantial tightening up and sharpened objectives." Even Mr. Kennedy responded to this view by taking the unusual step of cutting $420 million from his January request.

Moreover, the President has repeatedly expressed concern over the deficit in the Nation's balance of payments, for which various correctives have been suggested. A reduction in foreign aid offers a far more substantial means of correcting the imbalance.

Imperial Russia, China, and the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 11, 1963, the 61st annual observance of Hungarian Day was held in Cleveland, Ohio. It was my pleasure to address this annual meeting. As is known, some people believe the Hungarian freedom revolution of 1956 was a failure because the Russians put down by armed aggression that effort of the Hungarian people to regain their freedom and national independence. Events of the recent past have demonstrated that victory of the Hungarian revolution was not lost, it was only delayed. Those events as well as events yet to unfold were the theme of my address, the text of which follows:

IMPERIAL RUSSIA, CHINA, AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The Hungarian Nation has enjoyed its epics of greatness and glory just as it has endured its moments of sadness and suffering. Standing as the rampart of Western civilization on the frontiers of Christian culture, it has experienced the burdens of an endless struggle with the forces of the barbarian. In good weather and in bad weather the Hungarian Nation has clung to its heritage with a Christian conviction, and that conviction has preserved the nation for 1,000 years.

In this century alone the Hungarian Nation has enjoyed the blessings of national independence, after a long period of foreign domination, only to have that independence snuffed out by a new and completely alien domination. Those extremes of national status occurred in the brief period of 26 years—between the terminus periods of two World Wars. But 12 years of alien occupation, between 1944 and 1956, by the new barbarians of the East, drove the Hungarian people to a popular revolt, the power of which shook the empire of Muscovy to its foundations and unleashed a powerful tide of new hope and old purposes throughout that empire. Time has proven that the Russians did not defeat the Hungarian freedom revolution. At best the Russian blood bath in Hungary following the historic revolt of 1956 did no more than postpone total victory for Hungarian freedom and national independence.

The past 7 years have provided the world with abundant evidence of the far-reaching consequences of the Hungarian freedom revolution. Those voices on the American scene which predicted there was a finality to the settlements by force following World War II have been thoroughly discredited. Those voices of surrender have taken cover in the musty halls of American diplomacy where they now work covertly for the preser-

vation of the Russian Empire. But the powerful tide of new hope and old purposes which runs in all the captive nations will inundate those voices alien to freedom's cause as surely as that tide will inundate the Russian despots. No power on earth can contain or divert the course of that rushing tide.

There is no denying the fact that the peoples of the captive nations now under the domination of imperial Russia have striven for centuries to break their chains and to win their national sovereignty. I refer, of course, to the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union as well as the central European satellite nations. All of these nations declared and held their national independence during and in the aftermath of World War I. All of them lost their independence between the great wars or immediately following World War II. All the captive nations have in common two powerful motivations. The first is a common oppressor—imperial Russia. The second is a common purpose to regain their national independence. That is what I mean by the "powerful tide of old purposes."

The Hungarian freedom revolution added an explosive dynamic to that powerful tide of old purposes. That explosive dynamic is new hope—born of the proof that multinational Red army is vulnerable to large-scale popular revolutions, as demonstrated by the Hungarian people in 1956. Providing that proof was costly to the Hungarian Nation but that proof is now bearing a rich harvest in the vast area between the Baltic and Caspian Seas wherein lie no less than 15 captive non-Russian nations. The new hope provided by the Hungarian Freedom Revolution has given a unique dynamic to the spirit of nationalism; that is, the national independence movements behind the Russian Iron Curtain. The new dynamic of which I speak takes logical recognition of the fact that 90 million Russians cannot keep in chains over 200 million non-Russian peoples in the captive nations, if the captives undertake a unity of revolt against tyranny.

The Russian leaders from Khrushchev down recognize the realities of the powerful tide of new hopes and old purposes which engulfs their empire. That is why the Russians are now engaging in the diplomacy of smiles and cocktail toasts with the West. That is the rockbottom reason which impels Khrushchev to call out for a nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact. That explains the Russian haste to enter into a limited nuclear test ban with the United States—through which they expect to extract their price of a nonaggression pact.

There are those who maintain that the deepening dispute between Moscow and Peiping, actual or alleged, impels the Russians to seek a temporary truce with the West. These same people argue that now is the time to take advantage of Russian overtures for peace because Moscow is worried about Red Chinese behavior within the Communist international and along the far eastern borders between the Soviet Union and China. These arguments are the products of political myopia and political immaturity. They ignore the full political realities which a genuine deep-rooted dispute between Moscow and Peiping would produce. If it is true that Peiping is the prisoner of Chinese nationalism, that the Russians fear impatient Chinese action to recover their territories in the Far East annexed by the Czars, the conclusion must be taken that imperial Russian communism is surrounded by the hostile forces of imprisoned nationalism. It is now a generally accepted fact that the European part of the Russian empire is seething with the growing pressures of nationalism. It follows naturally that if the Red Chinese are forced to respond to the pressures of Chinese nationalism, then Muscovy, the heartland of the Russian empire, is in a state of siege by the forces of nationalism. That is the reality of geopolitics which must govern with an iron discipline all our future relations with Moscow.

A partial test ban treaty was signed in Moscow a few days ago and will soon come before the Senate of the United States for ratification. Advocates of that treaty admit publicly it will not prevent war, that it does not ban the use of nuclear weapons in the event of conflict—including a sneak attack against the United States—and that it does not bring a total halt to nuclear weapons tests. It does place a moratorium on tests in outer space, the atmosphere and the waters of the sea, while permitting a continuation of underground nuclear weapons tests. But its advocates do claim this partial test ban opens the way for a reduction of global tensions and for the settlement of major differences between imperial Russia and the nations of the free West, including the United States. This means another round of summitry is a certainty. Khrushchev has announced that his objective is a nonaggression pact between NATO and the so-called Warsaw Pact. Secretary Rusk has announced that discussions on that proposed nonaggression pact will soon begin among the member nations of NATO. There now can be no doubt that a major shift in U.S. foreign policy is in the works, strongly reminiscent of the Hitler-Stalin pact of nonaggression and mutual assistance, and the strange alliance of the West with imperial Russia during the course of World War II.

Secretary Rusk, in connection with the signing of the limited nuclear test ban treaty in Moscow last week, stated that history would judge the importance of the treaty. It has been said that we are living in the age of the historians, that is, a time when momentous decisions are taken from the lessons of the past with an eye to the future. If this is true, and I hope it is, the truth of Russian history is unparalleled as a constant, unchanging source of dependable guidance. The truth of Russian history under the imperial commissars is an open record for all to see—and it is a record filled with deceit, broken treaties and militant conspiracy against peace and human freedom. The truth of Russian history under a long line of imperial czars is very much the same as the record of the commissars. What we are dealing with here, if history is to help guide our decisions for the future, is a record of consistent Russian motives and behavior in international affairs reaching back for centuries.

In 1898, Czar Nicholas II issued an invitation to all the powers of the world to assemble and discuss a treaty for the limitation of armaments—a World Peace Conference. In his invitation the Czar made these observations:

"The present moment would be very favorable for * * * insuring to all peoples the benefits of a real and durable peace, and above all for putting an end to the progressive development of the present armaments. The maintenance of general peace, and possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations is * * * the ideal towards which * * * all governments should be directed."

This sounds like Khrushchev in 1963 but it was a predecessor, Czar Nicholas II, 65 years ago.

Time has exposed the realities which motivated Czar Nicholas to call out for a limitation of armaments and a world peace conference. Looking at the political climate of 1898 we find that was a time when the imperial Russian Government was in trouble with its people who wanted no part in supporting an arbitrary monarch in a long weapons race. That was a time when imperial Russia was in trouble with most of the Western powers. That was also a time when imperial Russia was in trouble with Japan because of her land grabbing tactics in the Far East, which eventually led to the Russo-Japanese war 6 years later. Russian belligerence and aggression over a protracted period of time had forced the Czar to the wall, and developed hostile powers on all flanks of his vast empire. Those were the practical reasons which drove Czar Nicholas to call out for disarmament and for peace in 1898.

The situation now facing imperial Russia under the Commissars is a striking parallel to that which faced Czar Nicholas. The major difference is the hostility of the peoples in the captive non-Russia nations of Europe and Chinese nationalism in the Far East which has forced Czar Khrushchev to the wall.

It is interesting to note that during the same month Czar Nicholas issued his call for world peace he undertook an inspection of his troops and his fleet. Along the way his military commanders began to inquire about the meaning of his call for peace and disarmament. The czar remarked, with a sly wink while inspecting his troops, "I think I could contrive to get along with a platoon or two less of them." Khrushchev is less sly than the czar about his motives for at the very time the test ban treaty was being negotiated in Moscow, he made the following announcement in reply to Peiping:

"We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism, but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

By this statement Khrushchev obviously means he is working overtime to destroy all non-Communist nations, including the United States.

There are countless parallels such as this to be found in the truth of Russian history. The Russians have not changed and will not change. Their goal for centuries has been world domination. We in our time are faced with the challenge of what to do about this centuries-long menace to peace and freedom.

As I have observed, another round of summity is a certainty. The question is now pertinent—how shall the United States take advantage of the imperial Russian crisis to win a genuine peace with universal freedom.

Should we repeat the errors of World War II by rushing to the defense of imperial Russia in order to preserve the Russian empire against the efforts of the Chinese to regain their lost territories?

Should we desert our proven allies, the peoples of the captive non-Russian nations behind the Iron Curtain, by supporting a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact?

The answer to both these questions should be an emphatic and articulate no from the electorate of our Nation.

What then should we do in the internal crisis which now confronts imperial Russia.

I have proposed that President Kennedy extend the good offices of our country to negotiate nonaggression pacts between the peoples of the captive European nations and Moscow. The tidal wave of new hope and old purposes which is rising up in the captive nations is Mr. Khrushchev's only real problem. It is true that Chinese nationalism is a threat to the Russian empire, but Mr. Khrushchev cannot deal effectively with that problem until he settles accounts with the peoples of the captive European nations. Unless he settles those accounts to the satisfaction of the captive peoples he will soon be faced with a symphony of popular revolutions from the Baltic to the Caspian Seas. Red China is now stimulating that movement and can bring it to a point of climax at any time by using its manpower to recover her lost territories in the Far East. The Chinese people need those vast virgin lands for its expanding population and it is only a matter of time before necessity moves Peiping to action.

Our good offices proposal to Khrushchev should include exercise of the principle of self-determination under international supervision through which the captive nations can make a free choice as to their status. The choises offered the people of every captive nation should include the right to be allied with imperial Russia, the right to independent governments of their free choice either as allies of imperial Russia or as neutrals. In all cases, however, a nonaggression pact with the Russian nation would be a certainty for every other nation involved in the plebecites.

This proposal corresponds with the realities of life behind the Iron Curtain. It supports the cause of peace with freedom. It would save the Russians from impending disaster. It could prevent a war which will surely come if the present course of international developments is allowed to continue.

So we may conclude that the Hungarian Freedom Revolution of 1956 was not defeated in its purposes. Victory was delayed by the aggression of imperial Russia. But the seeds of new hope planted by that revolution have brought forth a rebirth of those old purposes which have moved the peoples of all central-east Europe for centuries. For that contribution the world owes a great debt to the Hungarian people. The sacrifice of the Hungarian nation to the cause of peace and freedom will be rewarded in the order of world justice which will follow the crisis of this moment. All of you gathered here today, can take satisfaction from the knowledge that the land of your forefathers has remained ever true to its historic commitments. Fidelity to that commitment will liberate Hungary and return freedom and national independence to its people.

Rogers Commends Automobile Companies for Installing Seat Belts in New 1964 Models

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that five leading automobile manufacturers have decided to install seat belts as standard equipment in the front seats of their new models. It is commendable that the manufacturers have the responsibility and foresight to see the added safety that can be given to drivers and riders in automobiles by the use of seat belts, and that they have taken the initiative by installing these seat belts in their future models.

In the past 5 years, 192,081 persons have died in auto accidents, and on an average that is some 38,500 lives per year. In 1962 alone, 41,000 lost their lives in traffic accidents, and this year we seem to be continuing the upward trend toward a new record of human self-destruction.

I feel that a ready solution to this problem of automobile fatalities due to accidents can be lessened considerably if the automobile owner will use these seat belts provided for them in these new model cars. Having the seat belts is only the first step to safe motoring, the other and most important step is the use of these belts.

I am sure that the whole Congress joins with me in commending these automobile companies for their efforts towards automobile safety.

Quality Stabilization Bill Provides Missing Link of Protection in Chain of Production and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently one of our distinguished Members, the gentleman from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD, made an outstanding contribution toward a better understanding of the basic principles behind the drive for quality stabilization in the retail trade.

I would like every Member to read and evaluate his remarks.

I am sure that like myself, they must be impressed with the logic, the commonsense of his analysis of this phase of our economy.

Too many of us fail to realize that in an industrial complex such as ours, every phase of activity from raw material to ultimate consumption or use of a finished product must carry its weight in our economy or the results will be disastrous.

Every time we shortcut between production and use we lose potential customers for both our farm and mill products and our professional and nonproductive services.

I have heard it said by some amongst us that the basic ingredient in a successful economy is production. That is hogwash and the repeated blabbering of a long list of overrated, overpaid, unqualified present-day economists. Incidentally, many of them are so unqualified that they clamor at the door of Government service for jobs so that they can get the necessary background to sell their pamphlets and books—many of them written on Government time.

You can have all the production you want and unless you have the distribution that leads to consumption, you will stake up surplus just as we have in many lines already.

The answer to prosperity is complex. It is a combination of investment, production, employment, consumption, and profit.

These are the five pillars of prosperity that I have dwelled on from my earliest days in Congress.

Within the framework of these five main pillars there are many sustaining and strengthening lesser pillars and props such as distribution, taxes, services, and so forth. However, in the main, if one of the main pillars loses its strength you can be sure that its sustaining pillars have been destroyed or injured by false economic concepts.

That is why quality stabilization is indeed the link between production and consumption because it is the key to distribution.

Congressman HOLIFIELD points this out in language we can all understand. I am convinced that most of the opposition to the quality stabilization bill comes from the group amongst us that misunderstands, misinterprets, or deliberately and for various reasons always appear as the protectors of the poor and underprivileged, but somehow always help the exploiters.

Quality stabilization will not solve all our problems but it will help American workmen to compete both internally and externally on the sound economic principle of product value, decent wages, reasonable profits, and quality for the purchaser.

This is sound legislation and CHET HOLIFIELD is doing a lot to prove it.

His fine presentation follows:

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL PROVIDES MISSING LINK OF PROTECTION IN CHAIN OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Labor is the greatest consumer of goods it produces and should lead in the demand for orderly marketing of quality brand name goods as essential to a stable economy. Therefore, labor should be leading the fight for enactment of the quality stabilization bill, a bill currently sponsored by many of labor's strongest supporters, including Senator HUMPHREY, Representative RAY MADDEN, Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Representative JOHN DENT, and many others, including the writer. It is bipartisan legislation.

The quality stabilization bill has this strong support in Congress because it will strengthen independent retailing, it will help consumers have a true standard of value combining both quality and a fair price, it will discourage monopoly, it will promote competition, and it will help the national economy.

Many of the sponsors of this bill are themselves small businessmen who have personally experienced the unfair competition that threatens the small businessman's existence. This small businessman, just as the man of labor, should have the right to earn a profit for his endeavors. The small businessman should have a fair profit on his investment and for his long hours of work. Let's look further at the analogy between quality stabilization and labor.

Fair union wages are set by eliminating "scab" labor, thereby modifying the factor of competition in the lab or cost area, not creating a monopoly, but modifying pure competition; union labor calls scab labor unfair and Congress has legislated procedures to protect decent levels for wage earners. In so doing, Congress has recognized that unrestrained competition in the wage area is unwholesome for our society.

Retailing is the final step in the chain of production and distribution. It is just as necessary as any other step. It is entitled to some protection just the same as are the people engaged in all other activities. The proponents of the quality stabilization bill are not asking for complete protection; we are asking for a fair amount of protection. We do not think this legislation will completely protect the small businessman. He has many factors against him in this struggle to stay alive.

Let me describe the chain of production and distribution of a national branded item of merchandise. I use an Arrow shirt, for example, as I am now, and have been a retailer of ARROW shirts and other national

brand items of union-made men's wear for more than 25 years.

JUNGLE WARFARE PROMOTED BY PURE COMPETITION

Link No. 1: Production of cotton: Competition modified by legislation (crop control and price support).

The Congress has enacted price support bills for 30 years in the field of agriculture. Each of these acts has modified competition—for the purpose of the beneficial, all-over impact on society as a whole.

Link No. 2: Transportation costs from raw cotton to the retailer's store. Here competition again has been modified by legislation of Congress. For example—legislative authority to set interstate commerce rates based on the cost incurred by the transportation companies, including the component union-wage level of all employees.

Link No. 3: The production of textile cloth and manufacture of the same into final garment; this is indeed two links. Every link of production is based on fixed costs, including union wages.

Link No. 4: Distribution of the final garment to the consumer. Now, it is in this field that no legislative protection exists for the independent businessman, who serves in this final link in the chain of production and distribution. Here we have complete competition; unmodified by any type of legislative protection. As a result, "scab" practices run wild.

The decent merchant who wishes to retail good merchandise made in union-wage factories finds himself at the mercy of the "price gimmick," "deceptive advertiser," the mass handler of nonunion-made merchandise.

These practices are threatening this last link in the distributive chain. The independent operator cannot last if he is forced to operate in a cost-of-operation area where his costs are rigid until it reaches the point of delivery to the consumer. There it is suddenly faced with ruthless competition. I would assume that everyone would agree with me that the small businessman is a desirable factor in our society, that he does perform a service and that he is worthy of his hire—and his hire is reasonable profits.

Now, let me further explain the independent businessman's present dilemma as a result of the other links in the chain. The sponsors of the quality stabilization fixed costs of operation and unmodified competitive conditions in selling.

1. The article he sells in a national brand item is a nonmonopoly item. Similar articles are made by dozens of competitors. Again let me refer to Arrow shirts. I cite Manhatten, Van Heusen, Jayson, Hathaway, plus hundreds of less well-known shirt manufacturers.

So there is no doubt that in selling this national brand item, he is selling a nonmonopoly item.

BILL APPLIES ONLY TO COMPETITIVE PRODUCTS

An important point to remember is that the quality stabilization bill cannot be applied to a monopoly item. There must in every instance be similar items available to the consumer.

2. The independent retailers cost area contains many noncompetive areas. I cite a few:

(a) Wages, in most areas unionized. They are fixed.

(b) Rents: Percentage of sales based on a retail scale related to different kinds of businesses plus traffic count of people who would pass in front of his door.

(c) Insurance: All old line insurance companies charge almost identical rates.

(d) Interest rates on commercial loans. Usually the smaller merchant pays an identical rate to all banks in a trade area.

(e) Transportation costs on goods; as noted before, these costs are noncompetitive, fixed by interstate commerce rates.

(f) Utilities: All fixed noncompetitive rates set up by public utilities commissions which, incidentally, include a floor of guaranteed profits to the utilities above their investment and costs. And in most instances, a guaranteed wage to their employees. A fixed wage to their employees, fixed by negotiation.

(g) Last, but not least, the manufacturer must supply the retailer any specific item at a nondiscriminatory price. I refer, of course, to the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The nondiscriminatory price for an identical item gives the retailer some protection as between himself and a competitor retailer, but it also establishes a fixed noncompetitive price for the wholesale cost of the item.

As a result f all these areas of fixed or semi-fixed costs, the retailer does not have the benefit of competition in the components of his cost of doing business. His investment in inventory is a cost which deserves a fair profit return. His time and skill deserve a fair recompense.

If we demand that he face unmodified competition at the point of distribution, we deny him the right to a fair profit and say that the law of the jungle must control and apply to this area only in our distributive system.

I say that a principle of equity is involved which is identical to the basic principle involved in securing a fair wage for the wage earner. If we do not permit by legislative approval the extension of reasonable and fair protection to the independent retailer, as we have to the wage earner, we are neither just nor consistent.

THEORISTS IGNORE REALITIES OF MARKETPLACE

Now I've heard the theorists get up and expound that the quality stabilization bill is no good because it will raise prices to the consumer. This is hogwash. The Nation's small independent retailers who so desperately plead for the enactment of this bill do not want it as a means to gouge their neighbors and lifelong friends who helped them build their business.

In the first place, the quality stabilization bill is specific on this point. The law cannot be used unless (par. 8 of the bill): "Goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the owner of such brand name, or trademark, and are in free and open competition therewith."

The idea that because you have a right to sell an item made in a nonmonopoly industry gives the manufacturer or the retailer a chance to gouge the market is completely erroneous. It may be justified by theories, but in the practical application of it, this is just simply a factor that doesn't obtain.

Yes; this bill is a modification of pure competition. When we talk about competition being the life of trade and competition being necessary in the marketplace we do not necessarily mean the ruthless type of competition which cannibalizes itself and destroys itself by its excesses and abuses. We are talking about competition under orderly rules of society to protect all of the component factors of society to an equitable extent.

This is what the quality stabilization bill will do. It will bring about equity in one area where equity does not now obtain. It will not force any manufacturer to use it; it will not give any manufacturer a chance to use it as a monopoly item area. It will not create an obligation on the part of any consumer to buy that item. He can obtain various similar items and buy them if he does not want the stabilized item. It is an orderly adjustment of what I consider to be an inequitable condition in our pattern of production and distribution which threatens to eliminate that final link of independent retailing.

Now, if independent retailing is worthy of a place in the market, if it is something that we want to preserve to give opportunity to the little man to start into business and grow big, it has a justifiable position in the marketplace. I say that it has such a position, and millions of small retailers throughout the country would certainly also say that it is justified. They are putting in 10, 16, 16 hours a day. They are putting in their life savings into little drug stores, into little retail hardware and clothing and jewelry stores. They are struggling against many odds in the competitive area.

Can't we give them a little bit of the protection that we give to every other facet in the chain of production and distribution by enactment of the quality stabilization bill?

The Game of Life Is Taught on Diamond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today when many people seem concerned to the point of frustration with the problems that face our country and themselves, occasionally somebody takes a more constructive look and brings things back in perspective. Such a man was the writer of the editorial which I bring to your attention from the Florida Times-Union of August 25 as follows:

THE GAME OF LIFE IS TAUGHT ON DIAMOND

Baseball great Ted Williams will throw out the first ball today at Keene, N.H., in what is known as the "Little World Series." More formally, it is the American Legion Junior Baseball World Championship tournament and its importance as a part of the American summer scene is measured in terms of the effect upon millions of youngsters who eat, sleep and play baseball.

These boys are able to identify themselves closely with the players in this tournament because they are average American youngster. But do not underestimate the skills displayed by players on the field. Some of them are only 3 or 4 years away from the professional major leagues. Many will make that jump to follow in the footsteps of former American Legion players Hank Bauer, Yogi Berra, Ed Matthews, and many others.

Baseball at this level, in which so many youngsters can participate, seems to teach the lessons of fair play better than some other games. The subtle distinction between the need for outstanding individual effort and close teamwork is carried home to youngsters in baseball. Other sports may teach one or the other better, but for combining the two fundamentals for victory both on the diamond and in life, baseball seems best.

This may be one reason Americans have taken this game so completely into their lives and made it the national pastime. Whatever the reasons, the fact is there is a little bit of America in every game of baseball. No youngster can play the game for long without sensing this nationalistic pride associated with the game. In these days when patriotism draws scorn from some quarters and love of country is condemned as "flag waving," a need exists for the kind of uplift that baseball provides.

The Little World Series and other events like it are good for America.

Records Prove Eastern Consumer Dependent on Western Grown Lettuce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a million railroad carloads of lettuce—or anything else, of course—would extend more than 7,500 miles, 2½ times across the United States from San Francisco to Washington, D.C. Think of the men, equipment, machines, directly and indirectly, involved, not even including the millions of consumers.

I insert the following editorial to permit my colleagues to better understand how directly each person in America is affected everyday by only one of many products grown in a very small area of my congressional district.

A clear appreciation of our production and our problems is necessary to vote wisely and fairly on the proposed extension of the bracero bill.

Many other agricultural areas, of course, share the same problems and deserve your thoughtful and educated judgment.

The editorial follows:

[From the Salinas (Calif.) Californian, August 21, 1963]

THANKS A MILLION—CARLOADS

In our space age rush, Californians sometimes fail to recognize that agriculture still is the Golden State's No. 1 industry. California's farms, producing a variety of 200 specialty crops, bring the greatest amount of wealth to California and provide the most employment—on the land and in the many activities allied to agriculture—packaging, fertilizing, transportation, canneries, and so forth.

Yesterday's ceremonies at the Southern Pacific depot marking the one millionth carload of lettuce to roll out of the Salinas Valley brought the importance of agriculture to Salinas into sharp focus. Monterey County growers produce about 50 different crops, with lettuce No. 1 on the list. The lettuce shipments from the Salinas-Watsonville-King City district, along with many other vegetables, account for 40 percent of the fresh produce marketed in the United States. Truly, Salinas is the salad bowl of the world, and that "salad" is the "meat and potatoes" of the economic life of the Salinas Valley.

The first shipment of iced lettuce was made in the Salinas Valley in 1921, and by 1937 the carload shipments from here totaled 26,000, increasing to 40,000 cars a year in the early 1950's. Many new growing areas in other States started to come into the lettuce picture and the Salinas Valley's agriculture became more diversified—but lettuce still is the king crop.

Last year this district shipped 33,429 carlots (18,959 by rail and 14,470 by truck). That is an average of 180 carloads of lettuce per day, 6 days a week from April through October. Shipments to date are running ahead of a year ago—24,653 to August 19 as against 22,641 on that date in 1962. This year's daily average is 205 carloads of lettuce. To newcomers, that figure is almost unbelievable. Highest daily shipments this year were 328 on May 9 and 325 on June 29. It is difficult to visualize the trainload after trainload of lettuce that goes out of the valley to eastern terminals. Due to the lettuce shipments, Salinas is the largest shipping point originating new business for the Southern Pacific Railroad, one of the country's largest systems.

And every carload is a lot of lettuce. That "millionth car" yesterday contained 1,100 cartons, each with two dozen heads of lettuce. That's more than 26,000 heads. The 89 members of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association of Central California packed the lettuce in the special "One Millionth Carload" foil-wrapped cartons to be auctioned in New York for the benefit of the Salinas and Watsonville chapters of the Red Cross.

Operating without a dime of Government subsidy, the produce industry is a big gamble on weather, market, and labor conditions. When lettuce is ready to harvest, it must go or else. Unlike fruit, it can't be left "on the tree," so to speak. The threatened end of the bracero farm labor program is the present danger facing the industry; a continued adequate supply of water is another.

Concerted efforts have been made this summer to increase the farm youth employment program in various vegetable row crop activities. Some 1,300 youths, ages 12 to 20, have enrolled—but there never are anywhere near that number in the field on any given day. The turnover in crews is very high—due to baseball games, family vacations, Bible school and summer school. One solid crew of under 16-year-olds has been used for hoeing and thinning as an experimental labor force by one grower. Special crew leaders were provided for effective training and supervision. The conclusion reached is that the work certainly did not do the youngsters any harm but this program is not the answer to the farm labor shortage.

The industry has never had it easy. There was the big strike in 1936 to overcome. There was need to develop better strains of lettuce for meeting the competition across the country and to come up with lettuce resistant to mosaic. Other growing areas, closer to the eastern markets, have come in—Colorado, Arizona, Michigan, New York, New Jersey. New marketing methods made a big change in the switch from ice-packed crates to today's dry-packed vacuum cartons. Mechanical harvesting might well have to be the answer to the future.

Unlike the manufacturer who totes up his cost and tacks on a profit, the grower-shipper is at the mercy of the vagaries of the weather and a supply-and-demand market. The current lettuce market, $1.00 to $1.10, is little more than the growing cost. The average price per carton last week was $1.05. The 2 weeks before $1.09 and $1.11. In only 3 weeks this summer has there been a $3 market.

The economic life of thousands of Monterey County residents is linked to the dollars put into circulation here by the produce industry. All of us have a stake in agriculture's problems of an adequate supply of suitable farm labor as well as an adequate supply of water. Increased industrial use, but especially the greater demands for domestic water for the rapid population growth, are adding to the present overdraft on our underground water basin.

The "Millionth Lettuce Carload" milestone certainly is an occasion for all of us to salute the produce industry. For four decades, through the good and not-so-good seasons alike, it has made the Salinas Valley the bright spot it is today * * * and will be in the tomorrows.

A Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House I would like to include with my remarks an article by newspaper columnist Mr. Richard Wilson.

It is an excellent presentation which pays a deserving tribute to President John F. Kennedy and his family. It also states the importance of high moral character and conduct to good government.

The article follows:

PERSONAL CONDUCT IN HIGH OFFICE

The world is much concerned, as it ought to be, with standards of human conduct. Moral, ethical and spiritual questions are sharply presented in many different ways. They arise in the private and public lives of officials here and abroad, in the revolution of religious theology and dogma, in the morality of nuclear policy, in the relationships between the races, and, most of all, in the ordinary complexities of modern life.

In this vortex of changing standards and values, when the individual finds himself troubled so much of the time, the conduct of the President of the United States provides a temporal precept and example.

President Kennedy, in his public and family life, has set the very highest standard of American conduct. One need not agree with all, or any, of his policies to recognize that in his behavior, attitude and demeanor he provides the needed example that the troubled or misguided may turn to with respect and admiration.

He is a man of intellectual attainment and with wide and varied interests not confined to public affairs but ranging into the areas of mind and spirit which define the ultimate values of life. We have seen lately his deep concern with his family, not for its advancement or preference but for its form and substance as the treasured and indispensable nucleus of a balanced life, and so little honored by the troubled and misguided.

His qualities of mind and spirit carry over into smaller but more tangible matters of style, and we see a cultivated modern man of vigorous spirit and wit and pleasing habits, manners and appearance.

The essential ingredient is, perhaps, his sense of responsibility for his own official acts, what he says, and how he behaves in his exalted office publicly and privately, partly for the effect this will have in setting a national tone of responsibility.

One would wish that such conduct were universal. Precept and example have not been so greatly honored by an associate justice of the U.S. Supreme Court whose divorces and remarriages, the latest to a girl 40 years his junior, have humanized the high tribunal somewhat beyond its deserts.

Nor has the Governor of a leading State contributed to the stability of national customs by divorcing a wife of 30 years to marry a woman who herself broke up an established family with four children to marry the Governor.

These are not examples which a stable society would wish to follow. They have

offended public sensibilities. They reveal instabilities of behavior which scholars have found to be historically characteristic of advanced societies on their way down, and thus out of tune with American society.

High officials must surely recognize, as President Kennedy recognizes, that the probity of their lives should at least match the level of their positions and responsibilities. As in England, there is no room for the unstable in public positions. Once such instability is condoned in prominent persons it is likely to become more general among the unprominent where it is already general enough. The concept that a public official's private life is his own does not bear close examination in a welfare state society wherein this official may be directly affecting the lives of others.

Mr. Kennedy's contribution to American standards of behavior is not confined to his family and personal life. His levels of taste, his manner of dress, his way of speaking and articulating his thoughts extemporaneously as well as the breadth of his education and experience, set a high standard.

He is, in all these respects, the finest the United States has to show to itself and to the world—a cultured, rational, calm, perceptive and well-spoken American.

In other respects it may be permissible to argue with Mr. Kennedy from time to time, and with vigor.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the Armed Services Committee will shortly report to the House a bill which authorizes expenditures for civil defense. In anticipation of the debate on this measure I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an interesting editorial which appeared on August 24, 1963, in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The editorial follows:

AN UNSOUND SHELTER PROGRAM

It is noteworthy that Representative CARL VINSON (Democrat of Georgia), who a year ago wrote President Kennedy that he opposed a Government-financed fallout shelter plan, has now urged his House Armed Services Committee to support a $190 million fallout program.

Mr. VINSON explains his change of mind by saying that one of his subcommittees has convinced him of the wisdom of such a building program at Government cost. This of course, in spite of the historic move by the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union in agreeing to a test-ban treaty.

It is true that the veteran Georgia legislator softened his support of this dubious project slightly by saying that if, after a year, the plan did not appear sound he would recommend killing it.

As the shelter proposition now stands, $15 million would be spent to create shelter space in Federal buildings. Another $175 million would be set up for shelters in nonprofit buildings such as schools, churches and buildings owned by local governments.

There is no question about the perils of nuclear fallout; but spending hundreds of millions or billions of dollars on shelters would be a shocking and needless waste. It is inconceivable that such shelters would be of any use whatever except in the unlikely event of an all-out atomic attack. They would be no protection against slow, gradual poisoning of the atmosphere.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond suggested on this page a few days ago that growing support for this civil defense proposal may be because it is Congress' own measure, not handed to it by the administration. But it seems to us that if a Government shelter-building program was unwise last year it is even more so this year. The surest safeguard against atomic fallout is to strive unceasingly for the outlawing of nuclear weapons.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 24, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District of Texas)

TAX ON FOREIGN SECURITIES

H.R. 8000 would impose a tax on U.S. citizens' future purchases of outstanding and new foreign securities. The tax would range from 2.75 percent for 3-year maturity to 15 percent if over 26½ years. The administration seeks to correct the present imbalance of payments, whereby American dollars are flowing out of the United States and American dollars can be redeemed by foreigners in our gold. We now have only $15.5 billion left of which $11.5 billion, approximately, undergirds the value of our currency. The world holds $24 billion callable in our gold. The imbalance continues and so the administration, seeking to take action, proposes the so-called "Tax Equalization Act of 1963," H.R. 8000; arguments against which have been almost universal, include: (1) Private investment abroad improves our balance of payment, because interest, dividends, and capital return to United States; (2) H.R. 8000 will, on the contrary, worsen our balance of payment; (3) the new tax is a discriminatory protective tariff; (4) H.R. 8000 does not treat the basic causes of our imbalance of payments, which are: (a) Our heavy military expenditures abroad, (b) foreign aid, averaging $8½ billion per year, (c) interest rates in the United States which, when lower than in other nations fail to keep our capital at home. Artificially-low Government influenced rates augment this problem. (d) Government intervention which shackles our industrial productiveness through restrictive regulation and burdensome taxation.

What we need to do is to free-up our industries' competitive position in the world by removal of Government bureaucracy and taxation, rather than this New Frontier tax and control on the free flow of money. It is my hope that we do this, acompanied necessarily by reduced Federal spending, a balanced budget replacing deficit spending, and lower taxes. However, if we follow the administration's suggestion, we will destroy confidence in the dollar, devalue our money, drastically hurt U.S. industry and world money markets impose additional controls on U.S. capital flow, retire as the world banker, and see the world capital market center shift from New York to overseas. These spell financial ruin for the United States. The President and his inadequate advisors must not be permitted to sabotage U.S. present and future financial fortunes.

FOREIGN AID

(Excerpts from Alger remarks in the House of Representatives during debate on foreign aid.)

"Foreign aid must be substantially changed and drastically cut. Since World War II we have given away over $100 billion to approximately 110 countries. There is $6.8 billion in the economic and military assistance pipeline, that is unexpended money, earmarked for foreign aid. Now we are being asked to authorize $4.1 billion more to 95 countries. Are American taxpayers considered to be a bottomless barrel of money? How easy it is to give away someone else's money, is the way it seems. Indeed, we do not have the money to give away. We are borrowing money, borrowing from future generations of children and grandchildren to give it away. How fiscally foolish, how reckless, how careless, how immoral we are.

"Our national debt is $305 billion and skyrocketing up. Our gold reserves are dwindling. And here we are, being asked to give away some more. Our debt, our taxes are the highest in the world. Yet, we must borrow more and either tax or inflate our currency more.

"All evidence and information garnered from our past giveaways now tells us that we have failed to accomplish our objectives. The Communists, of the international conspiracy, are firmly entrenched 90 miles from our land. The Monroe Doctrine is discarded. We have not only failed to prevent the spread of communism, we have been subsidizing it. Our foreign aid to Communist satellites has been transshipped to help the Communists in Cuba, in Laos, in Vietnam, and elsewhere. The United Nations has aided in this effort. We have footed the bill. Now it is British Guiana the Communists are preparing for takeover. There are other areas, too. Our foreign aid has not only failed to stop the spread of communism, it has accelerated it. The shotgun techniques of scattering money promiscuously in grants, soft loans, Public Law 480, and gifts of every sort have helped the Communist enemy spread the teachings of socialism, educationally aided the unfriendly neutrals, and alienated our friends. We bewilder everyone.

"You cannot buy friendship but we give the appearance of trying. We pledge no strings attached, and as a result, unfriendly neutrals and enemies benefit. We talk moral and spiritual virtue, and practice materialism. We declare our belief in do-it-yourself and self-determination and then expect foreign nations to act, to develop, to want to be, like us. Then we waste goods, we duplicate orders, we plan the wrong projects, and generally discredit careful planning and sensible goals until it is no wonder foreign nations think we are fiscally irresponsible. Couple with this free and easy careless giveaway the liberals belief in easy money and you can readily understand what has brought us to crisis in our balance of payments.

We are told by Secretary Dillon and foreign aid exponents that giving our dollars away does not affect the balance of payments. What nonsense. Even the material bought in the United States with some of this money does not obscure this fact. The 42,500 employees in Federal aid are too many. We should cut back the personnel. We should streamline the administration. All money expended must be carefully scrutinized yearly by Congress, no back-door spending. No money should go to Yugoslavia, Poland, or any other Communist country nor to the U.N. for transshipment to a Communist country. In this connection we should not even trade with Communists and build up their economies. Otherwise, "Trade not aid," while a forgotten slogan should be remembered and practiced. Section 231 of the

1963 Trade Expansion Act must be observed, not violated, by this administration. Even the Clay Committee report stresses too much has been spent on too many. Strong as we may be, we cannot throw our money around. Nor should we invest without our own interests at heart. I suspect that members of this administration in the White House would devalue our money before cutting foreign aid or big Federal deficit spending. This fact must be faced and the American people must choose either fiscal responsibility, the balanced budget or the "spend ourselves into bankruptcy" so confidently expected by Khrushchev and the Communists.

"The rest of the world must help bear the financial burden of foreign aid. United States great contribution can and must be, the demonstration of capitalism; of free enterprise at work. We should export our business know-how in American business moneymaking activities—not loans and grants, unless the cause of capitalism can be advanced. Free enterprise, a free money market, new American factories at home and abroad, that hire employees and help the local economies, standards of living and governments, through taxes on profits—these are our legitimate forms of foreign aid. By precept and example we demonstrate capitalism at work. Others can follow our examples and we help them as we benefit simultaneously from profits on our industry. Competition is the key. "Trade, Not Aid" the slogan, inventiveness and initiative the origin, and capital the fuel."

NOTE.—The illogic of our aid can be seen in the many amendments which failed; example, an amendment to deny our aid to those aiding Cuba failed (by a tie vote 162–162). The bill passed the House 224 to 186. ALGER against. Five hundred eighty-five million dollars was cut off the bill.

Potomac River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave accorded, I take pleasure in herewith including as a part of my remarks, the poem now set forth, from the pen of Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, a distinguished predecessor of mine in this body, and formerly Governor of the Canal Zone.

The tribute he pays to the great river which has figured so prominently in the Nation's history, is excellent; and the inscription to the patriotic and efficient group of American women that reclaimed, and through the years has splendidly preserved and maintained, the historic home of the Father of his Country, is commendable:

THE POTOMAC

(Inscribed to the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union)

Seaward the great Potomac flows,
Its troubled waves finding repose
Anear the Dome whose luster glows—
O'er freedom's seat.

And thence the river widely spreads,
As with the ocean's tide it weds
To form a gulf, 'twixt hills and heads—
Of majesty.

The current courses past the site
Where lived and died there, on the right,
And lies entombed upon the height—
Great Washington.

O Stream eternal, thou wert cast,
Witness to bear, of events vast,
The tool of fate in ears past—
To serve the land.

We pray that in the years to be
Thou shalt remain unvexed, and free
To aid the cause of liberty—
With all thy might.

The Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing unrest amongst the fast diminishing ranks of World War I veterans over the delay in the passage of much needed pension legislation.

It appears to many of the veterans whom I talk to that Congress is shunting their grievance aside while expending much time, effort, and tax money on many projects both here and abroad that—in their opinions—are not as demanding at this moment.

With our grave job situation, especially in my district, the veteran is completely at a loss for job opportunities in this day of electronic and automated production.

It is simple justice to remember the seriousness of the veteran's position when one considers his age, his training, and his inability to compete in today's job market.

The veteran is not asking for handouts or as it has been called by some, payola. All the American soldier wants is a chance to bow out in dignity and with self-respect.

We all know the rate of decline in the veterans ranks, truly they are "just fading away." Perhaps there are those amongst us who believe the continuing stall will solve the problem through the simple process of the dying race.

For one, I believe that time is running out for the veteran of World War I. I believe I have a responsibility that goes beyond the statistics of economic growth, dollar diplomacy, or even balanced budgets.

I have voted for billions of dollars for all kinds of programs, foreign and domestic. I have no doubt that many U.S. tax dollars have found their way into the pockets of veterans, both enemy and ally, through our foreign aid programs.

I do not quarrel with what we are doing for our lesser brothers, except when we assume that all of our own peoples are so well endowed that they can be overlooked, their plight ignored and their problems swept under the rug while, at the same time, we are pounding our chests with pride for our great humanitarian deeds al over the world.

If ever the power play of political issues has buried worthwhile causes, this is it. Today our attention, with the help of a negative press coverage, is focused on tax cuts, civil rights, the refusal of the Common Market traders to follow our unsound tariff proposals and the hot war spots in Vietnam, Cuba, and so forth, while legislation for our veterans, the unemployed and aid to education languish and rot in committees.

All of the major political issues are worthy of consideration and attention, but this can be done without closing our eyes, our minds and our hearts—the ever-increasing problem of the World War I veteran who is truly becoming the forgotten soldier rotting away in the thrushes of crowding old age, unemployment, despair and in some cases abject need with all of its miseries, worry, and personal degradation of spirit, pride, and will.

Recently, my friend, Julian R. Drake, penned a masterful appeal for the veterans. I respectfully urge all by colleagues to read it and ponder its contents:

THE CRISIS—THE WORLD WAR I VETERAN: HIS INTEREST, WELFARE, AND PENSION

(By Julian R. Drake)

Has the World War I veteran been ignored, sidetracked, mistreated, just left to die on the vine? Was it bacause he was just too old and uable to accomplish much that he has been so sadly forgotten and left to root hog or die as the old saying goes?

Has the younger generation forgotten that these boys won World War I and that had they lost, there would be no one- or two-car garages, no motorboats and no easy sailing such as exists today? Yet, the prospects of even a filling or service station in each block is about to be realized. Times are so good except for the poor neglected World War I veteran who was the root of all such prosperity.

Have you also stopped to consider the sufferings and inconveniences that existed during the time of World War I and especially the comparison of such with that of the present, which presents so much better workmanship and conveniences in planes, tanks, guns, artillery and even gunpowder? Almost everything was crude compared with the equipment and even transportation of today. Yet, why has this World War I veteran been so vitally neglected?

The World War I veteran even played a major part in the organization of the American Legion and the establishment of American Legion posts in almost every town and hamlet in the United States and after World War II, these posts, many of which were debt free, were assigned to the World War II veteran to operate.

Did the World War I veteran act too hastily in turning the responsibility over to the World War II veterans to assume? Was it just taken for granted that the old warhorse could go on forever, that he had enough money, that he had reached his goal and it was now time to help the World War II and Korean veterans make their nest egg?

Are these World War I boys a liability of the U.S. Government in the way of having a decent living and enjoying at least some of the fruits of life?

It is a consensus that a majority of the people of the United States favor a pension of such an amount that will not cause the World War I veteran to be a liability on the public because of insufficient income. However, let's put it this way. The World War I veteran felt proud of himself. He not only felt but knew he had accomplished an unprecedented task in winning World War I

and he just simply felt it was unnecessary in later years to push for help from the U.S. Government in the way of a pension feeling all along the Congress would grant an appropriate pension and in their later years, could sit back, take a long breath and with pride say we did our part, now surely Uncle Sam will do his part for us. That was a long Rip Van Winkle dream that came to almost naught because the present Congress has done almost nothing in the way of getting a pension passed that would give the World War I veteran a pension to offset also any pauperism or become subjects of charity.

Why has the Congress appeared so negligent or unconcerned? Why has even the President of the United States appeared too so unconcerned? Do the Congressmen feel these World War I boys have about played their last tune, that they now have one foot in the grave and are no longer an asset and the sooner they fade away, the better for all concerned? Or do they feel they can never now muster enough votes to carry any weight? So, why worry, the easiest is always the best way out. Some conclusion must be drawn. So it would seem that the chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee intends to do nothing on the pension H.R. 2332, just let it die on the shelf. Why does he display that attitude? The Chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee must feel that the bill H.R. 2332 is too high and out of reason. If so, he surely has the right to recommend. He must also feel the President and the Veterans' Administration are not in harmony or sympathy with the bill. Also, I understand this same Chairman has stated that he knows all about this H.R. 2332 bill and that there was no necessary for holding further hearings.

If that is the case, why does not this chairman put the bill on the House floor for voting or modify for House voting present laws for veterans over 65 by increasing income limitations just $1,800 and deleting incomes in $3,000 brackets and other few changes? There is only one conclusion that I can offer and that is, he appears not in sympathy with the Veterans of World War I and I do not see how any man would want to hold an important post as this is and not be in accord or sympathy with the World War I veterans' purpose and achievements. Also, I cannot understand why other members of that committee could accomplish much with the head of the committee acting like that especially the members in harmony with the World War I program. It is not right and it is not fair to Congress, the Public, and the World War I veterans to have some one unfair to the Veterans of World War I. I have tried to find the reason why a change is not made in cases like that and learned that seniority played an important role and that policy played also a contributing factor meaning, in cases like this pension bill, there is policy but little or no procedure. In other words, as I interpret it, one man can hold up the works and do almost anything he pleases and let the whole Nation suffer and go to the dogs because of too much policy and little or no procedure except maybe one procedure, namely the filing of a discharge petition. Many of the House of Representatives will not sign such a petition to force this bill out of the committee onto the House floor for voting because also of policy fearing some of the Representatives who signed the petition might later want favors from other Representatives who failed to sign the petition and the favors might not be granted. In other words, the whole set up appears wrong and inadequate and appears a prime factor to the satisfaction of the Members of the House of Representatives and an unfair procedure to the public and those who present bills for congressional passage. It has never dawned on me until now that the several hundred Members of the House of Representatives must have almost 100 percent exclusive power in the operations of a big Nation like the United States of America. They can tie up most anything, it seems.

Over on the Senate side, I understand it is almost as bad. A Senate bill (S. 1918) was introduced on the floor several weeks ago and I understand it landed into the lap of the Senate Finance Committee. Surely Senator HARRY BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, will not handle this bill like the chairman of the House of Veterans Affairs Committee has on H.R. 2332. We believe he, Senator DICK RUSSELL, and many other Senators I have heard from, will stick and fight for these sadly neglected World War I veterans and that the House Members will do the same if only they had the chance to vote on H.R. 2332. There is one thing for sure and that is, more people should become politicians who should either improve the laws and congressional policy or turn the country back to the Indians where at least we would have a little fun and hunt and fish and take it easier.

Now the poor forgotten World War I veteran must wake up and fight for existence. Even though the average age is now 70 of these veterans, there is still a fighting spirit left. The World War I veteran also has a bright future hope in obtaining the pension and that is, 12 million votes can be mustered and controlled. So you see, they are far from dying on the vine.

Also the Congress should act on the pension this year because of the over 2 million World War I veterans now living but in 10 years, at least 90 percent of these will be dead. The Congress can clearly see that because of the average age now of 70 years that the heaviest cost is the first year and less each year so the final cost after 10 years is almost negligible.

The Congress should also consider that veterans of all wars from the inception to World War I have received fair pensions and while it should be like that with veterans of World War I still, bill H.R. 2332 is considered a fair income limitation. This pension would also greatly enhance better times, create more jobs, and all in all, do more good than any reduction in taxes. Little of the pension money would be saved. Most of it would go into circulation.

There are over 60 bills in the 88th Congress. Some have income limitations; some do not. That appears to be no disturbing element to the present Congress.

Thousands of World War I veterans had to turn to charity because they are unable to make ends meet on their meager incomes. Relief organizations have paid out millions of dollars to help provide their veterans and their dependents with such needs as food, shelter, and clothing. Many of these veterans, as old as they are, have had to take jobs in bowling alleys, filling stations, stores, and other industries to add to their income. Their wives, too, as old as they are, often have to work to supplement the income. Also, the World War I veteran has received nothing like the benefits that the World War II and Korean veterans received in the way of education, loans, homes, etc.

I read in 1963 issue of Stars and Stripes where President Kennedy was not receptive in helping the World War I veteran on a major scale this year because of a tight budget. However, subsequent contacts with the President would indicate his willingness to go along with World War I veterans in signing any reasonable pension bill Congress might pass this year provided also the national commander and his staff would favor such a pension plan.

How much pension with income limitation is needed for a World War I veteran and his dependents? Because some veterans happen to have good incomes should they receive no pension just because they happened to make more money than the ones who might be subject to a pension with low incomes? If the answer for these so-called well-to-do World War I veterans is "no" pension should be received, then that is what might be termed a penalty for having good incomes. That way of life is not good politics, good practices, or the American way of life yet, it is felt to get the ball rolling, H.R. 2332 would be fair.

If it was not for the fact that billions were loaned for foreign aid and a big portion never repaid or even the interest; if it was not for the fact that the World War II and Korean veterans received a fat compensation; if it was not for the fact that billions have been paid into retirement and social security funds by the United States; and last but not least, if it was not for the fact that we are the greatest and richest nation on earth, then, and then only, would I contend that a pension with income limitations is in order. However, to try and cope with the Congress on savings and adhere to a pension with income limitations, I feel that pension bill H.R. 2332 is fair and will keep a World War I veteran and his wife on a decent standard of living and enable them from being more or less dependent on public society for a decent livelihood. Medical and doctors' bills are very high for many of these veterans. Also, it is better for these veterans to have their own homes if they are mentally and physically competent. I truly feel that a World War I veteran and his wife should have an income limitation of at least $3,600 yearly and be exempt of any social security or retirement annuity such as railroad, civil service, and other retirement benefits up to an amount of at least $1,200 yearly because the Federal income tax exempts up to $1,524 and also because retirement dues were paid to obtain such benefits upon retirement after age 65. These World War I veterans are an obligation of the U.S. Government and it is wholly unfit and unfair to cause these World War veterans to suffer meager incomes when they should draw a fair pension.

In my canvass with many people, 95 percent clearly stated the World War I veteran should have a pension with no income limitations—just give him a decent pension with no strings attached as was done in the Spanish War. The above people canvassed even included World War II and Korean veterans who really felt that the World War I veteran had a dirty deal. These World War I boys cannot live much longer. Everyone now living is physically handicapped more or less and if Congress does not feel the public is in sympathy with these World War I boys, well just make a few tests and I am sure they will find a majority of the public in sympathy for a decent pension and that the Congress has also not played fair with them.

I want to ask everybody to call on his Congressman to put H.R. 2332 on the House floor and S. 1918 on the Senate floor for voting so the World War I veteran will at least know how he stands on the pension by the Congress. Please be fair to yourself, be fair to the Congress and also be fair to the World War I veteran in whatever action you take.

We all have to live and try and practice the Golden Rule. So in making your determination for or against the World War I veteran, just remember this—he won World War I and do you feel you have gained enough in love and wealth and health to realize that had the World War I veterans lost, we would probably have nothing and be carrying the heavy yoke of some other country maybe as servants, who knows?

This article is the picture as I see and understand it and is meant to cast no reflection on the Congress or anyone else. Just give these World War I boys justice.

Price Fixing by Any Other Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, August 21, 1963. That editorial, entitled "Price Fixing by Any Other Name," makes it plain that H.R. 3669 and other similar bills pending before the Congress are not in the public interest and that they are price fixing pure and simple.

The article follows:

PRICE FIXING BY ANY OTHER NAME

A "quality stabilization bill," a citizen might suppose, would be a bill having something to do with quality stabilization. But that's where said citizen would betray his innocence of legislative namesmanship.

There is indeed a "quality stabilization bill" now before Congress, on which a Senate Commerce Subcommittee is holding hearings. It already has the blessing of the House Commerce Committee, as well as a lot of powerful support both in and out of Congress.

What it is, though, is a plain old-fashioned price-fixing bill dressed up in a new name—what used to be called "fair trade" until the silly sham of that monicker got across to the public, then masqueraded in the last Congress as a "fair competitive practices bill."

Whatever the name, the intent is the same: to allow manufacturers to dictate the retail prices of their products, and to get court injunctions against anyone who sells them for less. It's a bill wanted by some manufacturers, and dear to the hearts of small retailers who don't like to face price competition. But it shouldn't be too welcome to consumers, since its whole purpose is to force them to pay more for a product that somebody wants to sell them for less.

When corporate executives get together in a smoky hotel room and agree not to undercut one another's prices, that's called a conspiracy and the executives are sent to jail. When they attempt to do the same thing by law—and require everybody to go along—that's called fair trade. When Congressmen seek to disguise "fair trade" as "quality stabilization," that's called politics. Though consumers—and that includes all the voters—might be excused for using earthier terms.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Foreign Securities Tax Fails To Attack Basic Cause of Capital Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, of all the comments which have been made upon the administration's proposal to tax American purchases of foreign securities, none, in my judgment, has been more lucid and to the point than a portion of an article entitled, "The Hot One," which appeared in the August 1963 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey.

While the article agrees—as we all do—that something must be done to improve our balance-of-payments position, it points out that there are other alternatives to the securities tax. Calling the tax proposal "negative and narrow," the article points out that "the objective of curbing the outflow must be pursued in the total context of capital incentive."

As is pointed out, a well-conceived program of tax reduction and reform could serve to make the United States more appealing to domestic and foreign capital and thus help curb the outflow. The article goes on to say that no step would have as much effect in speeding legislation on a tax cut as an announcement by the administration specifically calling for a substantial cutback of Federal spending planned for the current year. The article then makes the valid observation that a tax reduction program further simplifying the reform aspects and including a meaningful cut in Federal outlays could provide the major thrust of this country's attack on the balance-of-payments problem and would command wide support.

If the administration had taken such a course of action instead of proposing the so-called interest equalization tax on foreign securities, it would have been possible to avoid the tangle of administrative complications, the sticky discrimination among foreign countries, the hint of exchange controls, and the psychological risk involved in the foreign securities tax proposal.

I include the Morgan Guaranty Survey's analysis in the RECORD at this point:

THE HOT ONE

The quiet acceptance accorded the administration's IMF move must be explained in part by the concentration of noise on another measure announced at the same time—the proposed "interest equalization" tax on certain foreign securities bought by U.S. residents from nonresidents. The stated purpose of the levy is to raise by about a percentage point the borrowing costs of foreigners getting funds for periods over 3 years from U.S. sources, and to increase by 15 percent the cost to U.S. residents of foreign equity shares purchased from nonresidents. Loans made by a commercial bank "in the ordinary course of its commercial banking business" would be exempt from the tax. So would credit granted as part of an export transaction. Issues of governments or corporations of countries officially termed "underdeveloped" also would be excluded. Criticism has ranged from certainty that the tax "wouldn't work" to fears (mostly abroad) that it might work too well and deprive outsiders of needed financing they couldn't get elsewhere than in the United States. The latter anxiety took violent form in Canada, where the July 18 announcement of the tax proposal produced instant panic in financial markets.

The events that followed suggest how squirmy a nest of eels the tax could be in practice. The Dominion lost $191 million in gold and foreign-exchange reserves during July, $80 million of the total in a month-end repayment on its IMF drawing but most of the rest in the flurry of the 18th and 19th. After a quick conference of officials from that country and the United States, an understanding was announced to the effect that new issues of Canadian securities would be exempted from the tax, provided Canada did not attempt to build up Foreign-exchange reserves at the expense of the United States.

In complaining to the United States about "interest equalization," the delegation from Ottawa held a high card—the big surplus the United States enjoys in trade with Canada. The Dominion holds that it needs comfortable access to U.S. credit to finance its trade deficit. If pushed—the inference goes—Canada might have to discourage imports, perhaps with tariff surcharges.

In the Treasury's draft of legislation to implement the tax proposal, the Canadian escape clause is couched as a discretionary authority for the President to exempt specific new foreign issues if application of the tax would imperil international monetary stability. The draft text does not mention Canada by name, and it may be assumed that other countries would on occasion apply for exemption and use such pressures of persuasion as might be available to them. Each exception granted, of course, would lessen the efficacy of the tax. Additionally, vesting the exemptive power in the President would mean surrender by Congress of a segment of its taxing prerogative—a concession contrary to political tradition.

Support for interest equalization has chiefly taken the form of recognition that something has to be done, combined with an assumption that the tax, or something like it, is the only alternative to outright exchange control.

Obviously something does have to be done about the payments problem. Almost as obviously, there are other alternatives. To decide which of them may be better and which worse requires a basic analysis of what interest equalization is intended to accomplish. It is aimed, of course, at the sharp rise which has occurred over the past year in foreign offerings of new securities in this country. Compared with an average annual total of less than $600 million in the 1959–61 period, sales of new foreign issues to Americans topped $1 billion in 1962 and rose sharply further to an annual rate of $1.7 billion in first-half 1963. The step-up has negated much of the progress registered in such other components of the U.S. balance of payments as trade in goods and services and income on foreign investments.

But the increase in purchases of foreign issues by Americans is not the whole payments problem, nor even the whole problem of capital outflow. Direct investment abroad by U.S. parties, as distinct from portfolio investment, also has risen steeply. Preliminary indications are that in the first half of 1963 it hit an annual rate of about $2 billion. That pace, if maintained, would put the full year some $450 million over the 1962 total. The rise in foreign new issue sales here comes to more than that if the first-half rate is applied for the full year, but allowance should be made for unusuual and presumably nonrecurring debt issues that inflated the first-half total, such as the Canadian Governments loan to rebuild exchange reserves and the Province of Quebec's loan to take over public utilities.

While the movement of U.S. capital to other parts of the world has been quickening, foreign long-term investment in this country—both direct and portfolio—has slowed. In 1959, with a lively economy and attractive inteerst rates in the United States, $709 million came in from abroad. In 1961 the figure was $466 million. Last year it was down to $271 million, and all indications are that it is running markedly lower in 1963.

THE REAL ALTERNATIVE

Net capital outflow, to repeat, is a broader question than just the sale here of foreign securities. It is the whole question of the relative attraction this country holds for funds. In this respect, the American economy has been suffering by comparison with a number of other places that offer more promising opportunities for the profitable employment of capital. Unless all channels of capital movement are to be blocked—an extreme course that the administration has repeatedly, and rightly, foresworn—the objective of curbing the outflow must be pursued in the total context of capital incentive.

In that context, the "interest equalization" tax is negative and narrow, especially when contrasted with the positive and broad approach offered by income tax reduction designed to invigorate the economy and encourage investment. Not only would relief from the high rates of income levy make the United States more appealing to both domestic and foreign capital; it also would permit aggressive use of monetary policy as a deterrent to capital outflows.

The moment of high drama reached in the President's special message to Congress provided a unique opportunity to show the relationship between tax reduction and the balance of payments, and thereby to spur legislative action on a tax cut. The administration subsequently made major changes in its original tax program in order to overcome congressional opposition to certain reform provisions. The golden chance of timing, however, had been missed.

When revision of the earlier tax-cut package came, it left two major sources of congressional reluctance intact. It retained the especially controversial recommendation that the 4 percent dividend credit be repealed. And it did not allay the deeply rooted concern in Congress and the Nation about the upward trend of Federal spending. Prob-

ably no other single step would have as much effect in speeding legislative action on a tax cut as an announcement by the administration specifying a substantial cutback—say $2 billion or so—in Federal spending planned for this fiscal year. A tax-reduction program further simplifying the reform aspects and including a meaningful cut in Federal outlays, if put forward as the main thrust of this country's attack on the balance-of-payments problem, could be expected to command broad support in Congress, among the electorate, and in the world financial community where confidence in the dollar must be maintained as well as at home.

Had such a course—rather than interest equalization—been taken in the July 18 setting, it would have avoided the tangle of administrative complications woven around the proposed tax on securities—a tangle that grew denser almost day by day even before the draft of the implementing bill was put before Congress. It would have steered clear of all sticky discriminations among foreign countries—and also among individuals and institutions in the United States—that are implicit in the evolving format of the tax. It would have kept the dollar clean of the slightest tinge of exchange control. And it would have removed the psychological risk, consciously incurred in launching the equalization proposal, that taking a first nibble out of a traditionally complete capital freedom might arouse fears that bigger bites could come later on.

Jet Engines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the president of Pan American Airways, Mr. Juan Trippe, concerning the purchase of jet aircraft from the Dassault Sud Co. of France.

I ask this be included because it represents an $85 million jet engine order for General Electric in Lynn, Mass., one of the largest industrial installations in the State I represent.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JUAN T. TRIPPE

Commenting on the contract just closed between Pan American's Business Jets Division and Dassault, Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American, stated: "The 10-passenger baby jet aircraft being built under this U.S.-French program will provide fast, convenient travel for business officials between offices and plants in the United States. More important, however, the baby jets will permit faster business travel overseas between distant company offices and plants in many countries."

Mr. Trippe pointed out that "Pan American also will benefit directly from the program. Fees for use of company airport facilities and for services of company ground personnel will be charged when business aircraft transit Pan American stations overseas. With few exceptions, Pan American's stations abroad, in addition to company transports, now handle only military aircraft of friendly nations."

Mr. Trippe emphasized that "the new Dassault baby jets would be fitted with U.S.-built General Electric fan-jet engines; also, with U.S.-built flight instruments and radio, electronic navigation equipment, and with U.S. wheels, brakes, and tires.

"Baby jets, of course, will be marketed not only in France and the United States, but also, throughout the world. The value of the U.S.-built engines and components being sold abroad offset the French-built airframes to be sold in the United States. The United States, therefore, as well as France over the years will be a net exporter. The cooperative baby jet program as a result, should make a significant contribution to the balance of payments of both the United States and France," Mr. Trippe said.

The several contracts which Pan Am has closed with Dassault Sud, General Electric, and other Baby Jet program contractors are expected to provide foreign exchange earnings over the years for the United States, as well as France.

Dassault has announced a production line for 500 airplane units beginning February 1965. The Pan Am Business Jet Division contract provides for sales in the United States and in Canada. Dassault and other foreign contract distributors will sell in France, Western Europe, and other countries, but excluding the United States and Canada.

American manufacturers, including General Electric, will produce and export equipment in the amount of $125 million under the program. United States-built parts exported in bond to France for installation in the French-built airframes would be reimported to the United States in the amount of $35 million. The net value of U.S.-built exports for Baby Jet installation is therefore $90 million to offset Dassault airframe imports in the amount of $73,500,000.

Foreign currency fees earned by Pan American as exclusive distributor in Canada and co-distributor in other foreign countries are conservatively estimated at the equivalent of $3 million. Net U.S. foreign exchange earnings under this cooperative United States-French program total $19,500,000.

Old European Dog Newcomer Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to an important segment of people who are lovers and trainers of selective breeds of dogs.

Unfortunately, the diminishing band of dog fanciers and connoisseurs in the United States is sad to behold. Fortunately, the district which I have the pleasure to represent contains some of the truly great and distinguished dog breeders in the Nation.

I am immensely gratified that the great Barrington Kennel Club this week held an important obedience trial, and that other areas in the beautiful Berkshire section of Massachusetts are continuing their excellent efforts in behalf of excellence in the care and breeding of dogs.

An excellent survey of this activity recently appeared in the Sunday New York Times sports pages. The article notes many of the dog enthusiasts in western Massachusetts and elsewhere. I am also proud that the proceeds of the great Barrington, Mass., show will be shared by two worthy groups; namely, the great Barrington Visiting Nurse Association and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

The article, Mr. Speaker, was written by Walter R. Fletcher, and appeared in the Times of August 25:

OLD EUROPEAN DOG NEWCOMER HERE—PULI IS A RARE BREED IN THIS COUNTRY EVEN TODAY

(By Walter R. Fletcher)

It wasn't until 1936 that a puli was approved by the American Kennel Club. Although a small group of dedicated aficionados have worked hard, progress for the dog show has been slow. Of the 111 breeds registered with the American Kennel Club last year, the puli stood No. 71—with only 175 recorded. The breed, though a comparative newcomer in this country, is ancient in Europe, where it was brought more than a 1,000 years ago by invaders from Asia. For centuries the puli has been known as the Hungarian sheepdog. Because of his dense coat, he looks larger than he really is. The male averages 19 inches at the shoulder and weighs 45 pounds.

The puli's coat is of long, fine hair which often mats—giving it a somewhat corded appearance. The coat is particularly dense on the head and face. The colors are black shades of gray and white.

Dog show enthusiasts don't have many opportunities to see the breed. For example, last weekend, none was exhibited at either the Finger Lakes or Elmira shows. Greater Lowell had one and Annapolis three.

Today, 10 will compete at the Great Barrington K. C. fixture on the grounds of the Barn Club in Great Barrington, Mass. This is the largest entry of pulik that has been assembled in the East in weeks.

The noted champion, Cedwoods Anthony Gray, owned by Mrs. Elianor Anderson of Bristol, Conn., heads the entry. The first puli to win a working group, he has been best of breed 92 times and has placed in groups 21 times. At four Westminster shows, he was best puli.

It is largely through the efforts of three of club's members—Mrs. Marion Finke and Elizabeth Ryder, the coowners of the Marlise Kennels, of Sheffield, Mass., and Mrs. Charles R. Whipple, of Lenox, Mass.—that this has been accomplished. All three have been in touch with puli owners, urging them to bring their dogs to the show in the Berkshires.

Great Barrington, which prides itself as "the friendly club," has drawn 569 dogs for its 21st show and 89 for its obedience trial. The proceeds of the fixture will be shared by the Great Barrington Visiting Nurse Association and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

German shepherds top the entry, with 61. Bassets have a surprisingly large 18, German shorthaired pointers 17, and otterhounds, so rarely seen, 9.

Among the well-known members of the club is Dorothy S. Williams, its vice president, coowner with her mother, Mrs. Gertrude D. Williams, of the Dorem Kennels. For more than 20 years Dorem miniature schnauzers have been winning ribbons. Ch. Dorem Display will be remembered for having won the terrior group at Westminster.

Joseph G. Kulper, of Woronoco, Mass., a member of the board of directors, owns the Forest Bay Kennels of basset hounds. His Forest Bay's Lonesome George has won some top laurels. The club's president, George J. Helmrich, has been breeding and showing beagles for a dozen years and miniature schnauzers for 5. He owns the Konkapot Kennels in Monterey, Mass. Mr. and Mrs. John I. Carlson also are prominent fanciers. He is the president of the American Miniature Schnauzer Club and his wife is the chairman of Great Barrington's trophy committee.

Unwarranted National Labor Relations Board Actions in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 24, 1963, I made an address in the Senate on the subject of the National Labor Relations Board and its efforts to upset practically every decision in South Carolina in which the union failed to attain the necessary vote to organize at a particular industrial location. At that time I particularly cited two recommendations by the NLRB's Winston-Salem office to set aside elections in Orangeburg, S.C., and Greenville, S.C., where the unions lost. Since that time I have called several editorial comments to the attention of my colleagues, to give an indication of the strong feeling against the unwarranted NLRB actions in the State of South Carolina. On August 15, 1963, radio station WDIX, in Orangeburg, S.C., editorialized on this subject. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the broadcast editorial of WDIX entitled "Reign of Terror" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REIGN OF TERROR

The National Labor Relations Board is a creature of the Congress. The NLRB's duty is to represent the public. Instead, it becomes more blatantly obvious that the NLRB has become a creature of the unions. Employees of Utica Drop Forge & Tool Co., a subsidiary of Kelsey-Hayes, moved from Utica, N.Y., to Orangeburg, S.C. The new plant had been in operation less than a year when the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO, called for an election and lost. The employees rejected the IAM. The IAM hollered, "foul," and the National Labor Relations Board sustained the union's claim of foul—not against the Utica Drop Forge & Tool Co.—but, against the community of Orangeburg, S.C. The NLRB claimed that citizens of the community by their statements on radio and in the newspapers and by radio editorials and newspaper editorials created a reign of terror. Therefore, the NLRB ruled that the election was not valid and that the employees would have to vote again.

From Tampa, Fla., the Associated Press reports the telephone workers strike. The Associated Press reporting from Tampa says: "It seems quite peaceful during the daylight hours as electrical union workers picket in front of General Telephone Co. facilities in a six-county area of the Florida west coast. But the picture changes during the dark hours. It is then that charges of dynamite are set; flaming gasoline bombs thrown through windows; relay units pulled out and destroyed or burned; telephone poles cut down by the score with power saws; cables cut with axes; nonstrikers intimidated; and emergency repairmen assaulted. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has denied any participation in acts of sabotage."

The NLRB called Orangeburg citizens' words a reign of terror and decided an election contest in favor of the union. The NLRB requires workers at Utica Drop Forge to twice reject a unionism reign of terror. What is needed next is that Congress should create a reign of terror in the National Labor Relations Board. The public interest will be served only when the public demands it—through their Congressmen.

Danger in the Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, history, or more so a miracle, was recorded the morning of August 27, in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania.

Two of three coal miners who had been trapped for 2 weeks 330 feet below the surface of the earth were brought out alive and every effort is being made to rescue the third miner.

This mine where the three miners were working is one of those that are classified under the Coal Mine Safety Act as a title I (or small mine) and as such is exempt from the coverage of the law simply because they employ 14 or less men.

In this Congress, as in the past Congresses, bills have been introduced by various Members of Congress to eliminate this exemption thus making all mines that employ coal miners subject to inspection and regulation. Had this exemption been deleted from the act this accident might have been avoided.

In the 87th Congress the House Education and Labor Committee, of which I am chairman, reported out a bill but it was stymied in the Rules Committee.

Opponents of this legislation have based their argument against the bill on what it would cost to make their mine safe, yet I have seen where it was estimated that the cost of this rescue operation is going to run somewhere in the vicinity of $500,000 to $1 million. That amount of money certainly would go a long way in making these mines safe.

Following is an editorial from the New York Times of August 23, 1963:

DANGER IN THE MINES

Coal miners trapped underground—anxious faces of relatives outside the pits—rescue efforts and a race against death.

There is a somber unreality about the midnight faces—a spectral quality of which we are freshly reminded by the present search for miners trapped hundreds of feet below the earth in Pennsylvania. Mine disasters and rescues are happenings—or should be—from earlier decades in this century, not ours. Such stories are not a proper subject for news in 1963.

And yet, tragically, they are. Before the Federal mine safety law of 1952, as many as 1,500 men lost their lives in the mines every year. Last year 287 miners were killed—a great improvement, but only by comparison. The latest mine fatality figures show matters are somewhat worse this year. Through June 30, the deaths already are 158—an increase of 39 over the same 6-month period last year.

Can something be done about this immediately? The Federal Bureau of Mines, the United Mine Workers of America, and the major coal operators all think so. There is a loophole in the present law which prevents Federal mine inspectors from closing down small mines where hazardous conditions are found. Arbitrarily, a "small mine" is defined as one with 14 or fewer men. (The mine where the men are now trapped is one.) These "doghole" operations, as they are known, seldom have rigid standards of safety. They exist primarily because technological displacement has made many miners so desperate they are willing to work even under extreme hazards. Only about 10 percent of the country's underground mine production results from such small mines, yet their contribution to the death rate is out of proportion; it usually runs to one-third of the annual mine toll.

Mining is a dangerous activity, and some fatalities are perhaps inescapable. But explosions, which have caused most deaths, are much less frequent now. The same tough standards of Federal inspection should apply to every mine in this country, big or small. A mine with 14 men should be as safe as a mine with 140 or 1,400. (Do we say that the brakes on a taxicab carrying 5 people should not be inspected while those on a bus carrying 50 people should be?) Only by closing loopholes in the Federal mine safety law can we make faster headway toward eliminating preventable mine disasters.

Long-Term Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the House of Representatives will soon have another opportunity to authorize additional funds for the Area Redevelopment Administration.

The following editorial from the August 17 edition of the Baltimore Evening Sun takes a realistic view of the economic development possibilities inherent in the ARA program. It will be of interest to everyone concerned with the problem of chronic unemployment.

LONG-TERM PROJECT

There being more than one way to skin a cat, or to get a proposal through Congress, House Democratic leaders are going to try again to win approval for a bill to provide additional funds for the Area Redevelopment Administration. In mid-June the original bill was defeated in the House by 209 to 204. A similar bill passed the Senate easily, however, and is now in the hands of House leaders. They will try again—with more vigor this time, presumably, especially since an unhappy President Kennedy labeled the first defeat "tragic."

ARA officials say they need the new money because the $389 million originally authorized for them to pass out in grants and loans will soon be exhausted. Critics charge this is evidence that the money has been squandered on unworthy projects. But actually, the surprisingly heavy response to the program provides the basis for some hope. In order to qualify for ARA help, a community must work out development plans which in the eyes of the administrators are promising. There are provisions for the employment of local funds and initiative. There are safeguards against the simple pirating of industry. The heavy response so far is an indication that many communi-

ties in almost all the States have been looking for solutions to their problems of unemployment.

Most of ARA's money is used for loans rather than grants. Most of the programs are designed to help establish new industries which, with time, could in turn attract other industries. And finally, the areas in which ARA programs are now in effect are by and large those parts of the Nation in which unemployment has been most severe and most persistent.

As Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out, ARA money is "seed money"; and seeds can't grow overnight into giant economic trees. In some cases the unemployment problems with which ARA has been charged to do battle developed over a period of years or even decades. ARA was established as a new agency with limited funds just 2 years ago. It is too soon to say that the program has failed.

Silly Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether we are really as dumb as some of our actions make us appear to the outside world. The "silly boys" get sillier every day.

On a trip to Hong Kong and Tokyo last year I was impressed with the great industrial growth of both areas. I noted that there seemed to be little need for further assistance from the United States since both areas were doing quite well.

Particularly, I resented the many U.S. industries associated with, or in total ownership of, factories producing goods for the U.S. market. The wages paid made competition entirely out of reach for domestic U.S. producers.

I remember the Marx toy plant in Hong Kong with workers paid 6 cents an hour, 10 hours a day and a lunch of rice and greens costing them 13 cents. I saw the very efficient automated textile plants in both areas with workers earning 15 to 25 cents an hour. The electronic plants were a revelation in planning and production with young girls earning $50 a month doing work which we say our people need expensive training and retraining programs so that they may qualify.

I watched the plywood production with the cutting logs all imported and the plywood for export, especially to the U.S. market. I knew then as I had known before that we were wrong in our trade approach and policy planning.

Today I am more than ever concerned. I learned in Hong Kong that no American could buy Red China goods for shipment home or for personal use. It appears that this Nation kids itself into believing that by stopping Red China goods from coming through the Hong Kong port we are slowing up the Red Chinese international endeavor.

Let us not kid ourselves any longer. The story of Canada's trade with China is an open book. Few, if any, of our friends join us in this so-called moral boycott of Red China. The English trade to the extent of Chinese ability to pay.

A worse situation, however, is the trading between Japan and China. The other nations in the main use the goods for their own market, but the Japanese trade is mostly for raw materials and it does not take a high-priced sophomoric economist to tell us where the products end up—you are right, here in the good old U.S. market basket.

The story of the Japanese-Chinese trade is just another facet of the worldwide profiteering at the expense of the U.S. worker, U.S. industry and the total U.S. economy.

You can bet your last dime that out of the $100 million worth of raw materials from Red China we can find most of these materials in our Japanese imports. The "silly boys" who try to equate today's world trader with economic stability and U.S. prosperity are so far away from reality that one wonders how they can justify their titles in Government—certainly not their salaries.

The following story tells the tale of three countries—Japan, China, and the United States:

JAPANESE TRADE WITH RED CHINA

TOKYO.—Freighters flying the Rising Sun flag glide daily out of Japan's harbors into the blue Pacific—headed for Communist China.

Stowed in their holds are economic vitamins that China, big but industrially flabby, needs to harden her bones and strengthen her muscles.

At ports like Shanghai and Tsingtao, the Japanese ships unload fertilizer for Red China's communal farms and steel for her tractors. There are insecticides to protect the crops that the Chinese Communists desperately need to feed their people.

Returning to Japan, the freighters carry Red Chinese coal, pig iron and soybeans. All of these Japan could buy—albeit at higher prices—in the non-Communist world.

The United States doesn't like it. U.S. policy is that anybody who trades with China is strengthening a menacing international bully.

"Americans feel that it is incongruous to trade with a country of such unstable behavior as Communist China," says a State Department career man whose duties in the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo keep him in close touch with Far Eastern trade.

He adds that there are no signs that the American viewpoint is going to change.

A questioner asks him how China, industrially backward and still in the infancy of atomic research, can be regarded as a threat to the United States.

"Great powers don't get powerful overnight," is the answer. "It's a slow process of accretion, of adding little increments of power here and there. If you're going to get tough with them, the time to do it is in the beginning."

American diplomats in Tokyo have not hesitated to make the U.S. view on Red China trade known to the Japanese public. But so far the United States has made no move to apply the economic pressure that it obviously could put on Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda's government.

One reason is that when the Japanese freighters dock in China, they have a lot of company. A cargo ship from Yokohama may well be found sharing a Shanghai pier with a merchantman from Norway, Britain, France, or West Germany.

The fact is that the United States has encountered a great deal of difficulty in selling its allies on boycotting Red China.

Last year Japan's two-way trade with Red China reached $80 million, with Japan selling about $36 million worth of goods and buying about $40 million worth.

This year the two-way flow is expected to be worth about $150 million.

Exchange of Correspondence With Secretary Dillon Commenting Upon Interest Equalization Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on July 23 I wrote to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon commenting upon the administration's so-called interest equalization tax on U.S. purchases of foreign securities. On July 24 I inserted a copy of my letter to the Secretary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have now received a response from Secretary Dillon, dated August 6, 1963, and, under unanimous consent, I insert a copy of his reply in the RECORD at this time, along with a copy of my letter to him.

The Ways and Means Committee is now holding hearings upon the administration's proposal, and it is my hope that the record of these hearings will shed further light on the many points of disagreement now existing on the soundness of the principle behind the tax proposal as well as on its balance-of-payments effects.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1963.

Hon. C. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary, U.S. Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing in regard to the administration's plan to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit by stemming foreign security sales in the United States through an interest equalization tax. It is claimed that such a tax would, in effect, increase by approximately 1 percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country and would thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad.

The significant nature of this proposal was demonstrated by the unsettling reaction which its announcement caused in major financial centers around the world. Because of the serious effects that it might have on domestic and international money markets and because it is a clear departure from U.S. policy of maintaining freedom of capital movements, the benefits to be derived from such a program must be carefully weighed against the costs. It seems clear that the costs of such a program, particularly when employed by a key currency country, would be so onerous as not to justify the meager balance-of-payments savings which might be expected to result from it.

In his July 18 balance-of-payments message to the Congress, the President said that the balance-of-payments savings which would result from an interest equalization tax combined with the increase in short-term interest rates should over the next 18

months equal or probably exceed $900 million. As you pointed out in your testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on July 8, a reasonable increase in short-term interest rates would be likely to improve our annual balance of payments by $500 million or more. Over an 18-month period, therefore, we might expect an improvement arising from the increase in the discount rate of about $750 million. It would follow that the balance-of-payments savings over 18 months which the administration believes would flow from the foreign security tax program would be in the area of $150 million—or $100 million on an annual basis. I would appreciate knowing if my understanding is correct.

Furthermore, I presume that this estimate was arrived at prior to the exemption of new Canadian issues, which the administration reportedly has granted. Since new Canadian issues for the past 3 years have comprised an average of 33 percent of American purchases of all new issues of foreign securities plus all transactions in outstanding foreign securities, it appears that exempting them would very largely wipe out the balance-of-payments savings which the administration has estimated. What is the administration's estimate of the total balance-of-payments savings which would be realized by the program on an annual basis if Canadian new issues are totally exempted?

If new Canadian issues and issues of the less developed countries are exempted, as is apparently planned, my estimates indicate that the total amount which might be affected by the tax would have been only $189 million in 1960, $478 million in 1961, $379 million in 1962 and $131 million in the first quarter of 1963. Admittedly, one cannot predict the size of future outflows of this nature solely on the basis of past experience. It does appear to me, however, that the magnitudes covered by the tax would be so small as not to warrant taking such a potentially harmful and unsettling step.

Aside from the fact that the balance-of-payments savings which might be realized would be relatively insignificant compared to the size of the overall deficit, there is a possibility that there will be offsets to such savings. First, some exports of U.S. capital goods which are financed from foreign borrowings in the U.S. market probably would be reduced. Second, there is a likelihood that some foreign investment in the United States, which the President seeks to attract, would be discouraged by the fear that further restrictions might be imposed on the use of the dollar. Has the Treasury Department made any estimate of the size of these possible offsets to balance-of-payments savings arising from the proposed tax?

In addition, the tax proposal is inconsistent with the administration's objective, which was clearly spelled out in the President's message, of selling more U.S. securities abroad. The erection of an artifical wall to foreign flotations in this country can only serve to negate any beneficial effects which might flow from the administration's efforts to sell more U.S. securities overseas. Has the Treasury estimated the size of this offset?

Furthermore, there is considerable doubt about whether a 1-percent increase in long-term interest rates would discourage much foreign borrowing in the U.S. market. For example, an article by Prof. Peter B. Kenen in the June 1963 issue of Lloyd's Bank Review points out that the costs to the borrower of floating new issues is considerably higher in other financial centers than in the United States. Even after a 1-percent increase in effective interest rates, the U.S. market would still remain considerably more attractive than nearly every other major financial center. Furthermore, as you yourself have pointed out, there are numerous important influences other than interest rates which attract borrowers to the New York market and which would remain largely unaffected by the tax.

If my conclusions are correct, the tax plan at the rates proposed is likely to have no appreciable effect on the balance of payments. If the tax were to be passed by Congress, however, I fear that once its ineffectiveness became apparent the administration would insist that the approach was right but that the rates were not high enough and needed to be increased.

I do not wish to leave you with the impression that my comment on the effectiveness of the proposal implies any agreement with the principle behind it. Instead of erecting barriers to private capital movements, the administration should grapple with the basic cause of the outflow of funds. This outflow results from an unfavorable investment climate in this country arising from a weakness in business confidence based upon the continuing profits squeeze, chronic Federal budget deficits and the slow but steady erosion of the value of the dollar. Confidence and the healthier investment climate which accompanies it will not be restored until the administration imposes discipline upon itself in the conduct of its fiscal affairs.

In sum, Mr. Secretary, aside from rejecting the principle underlying the administration's proposal, I have the distinct impression that the gains which might be realized from it are likely to be so small as not to justify the heavy costs involved. Because of my deep concern over our payments problem and my desire to seek solutions consistent with the U.S. role as world banker, I should appreciate hearing any comments you may have on my understanding of this proposal.

With very best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Your letter dated July 23 raises a number of very interesting points with regard to the potential benefit for our balance of payments of the proposed interest equalization tax. I shall deal with these points in the order in which they appear in your letter. Let me emphasize at the outset, however, that we do not regard this tax as "a clear departure from U.S. policy of maintaining freedom of capital movements." The tax will exert its impact on the market by raising the costs to foreign borrowers. It will neither arbitrarily shut off foreign security sales by other advanced countries in our markets nor make them subject to Government screening or direct control.

Paragraph 3 of your letter involves a misinterpretation of the estimated balance-of-payments improvement which the President referred to in the penultimate paragraph of his July 18 message to the Congress. The "approximately $2 billion" estimated gain is the decline in the rate of payments of Government expenditures abroad and of short- and long-term capital outflows over the next 18 months. Sometime within that period we expect Government expenditures abroad to fall to and continue at a level which, on an annual basis, will be $900 million lower than the 1962 level. As much, or more, of a decline in the rate of outflow of short- and long-term portfolio capital, considered together, is expected to result from the rise in short-term interest rates and the effects of the interest equalization tax. The balance-of-payments savings from declines in the rate of Government expenditures, and short- and long-term portfolio capital outflows will obviously be larger the sooner the lower levels for these payments are reached within the 18-month period.

It is our belief that the amount of new foreign security issues sold to U.S. residents will return in the next 18 months to the average level of the years 1959, 1960, and 1961—something just under $600 million—as compared with $1.1 billion last year and an annual rate of about $1.8 billion in the first half of this year. The balance-of-payments saving from the interest equalization tax, when it is fully effective, would therefore amount to some $500 million annually from the 1962 level. Measured from the level indicated by the recent upward trend in new foreign security issues, the savings resulting from the tax would appear substantially larger. I think you will agree that a continuation of that trend would have been serious.

Our estimate of the potential decline in portfolio capital outflow attributable to the IET is not affected by the exemption for Canada. Canadian authorities have assured us that they would not borrow in the United States to increase their reserves or to relend the proceeds of their borrowing to other borrowers who are not exempt from the IET; also that we could expect a decline in the recent level of Canadian borrowing here.

In view of these considerations, we agreed that a properly safeguarded exemption for new Canadian issues would be consistent with their domestic goals. If we should find that the exemption given to Canada is not operating satisfactorily, we would reconsider the situation in light of the facts at that time. An interdepartmental committee will carefully analyze overall developments on a continuing basis and call attention to such measures as may become appropriate.

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of your letter, you give estimates of the total amount of transactions which might have been affected by the proposed tax in recent years in the assumption that new Canadian issues and issues of the less developed countries are exempt. While it is correct that new Canadian issues would be exempt from the tax under our proposal, it does not follow that the volume of new Canadian issues in the U.S. market would, therefore, remain unaffected. As indicated above, we have assurance from the Canadian authorities that we can expect a decline in recent levels of Canadian borrowing in the United States. We are thus achieving our objective in the case of Canada by a somewhat different procedure than application of the tax to new Canadian issues. I would also point out that the tax applies to purchases by Americans from foreigners of outstanding foreign securities of developed countries.

You mention the possibility of some offsets to the balance-of-payments savings resulting from the proposed tax. For example, you suggest that some exports of U.S. capital goods which are financed from foreign borrowings in the U.S. market probably would be reduced. In this connection I want to make several points. All financing up to 3 years would be exempt from the tax. Commercial bank lending in the ordinary course of business would be exempt from the tax. In general, we expect to ask for an exemption which will relieve from the tax any financing arising out of the export of U.S. goods. Direct U.S. investment abroad would be exempt from the tax (assuming that acquisition of securities is not made for the purpose of resale in the United States). Securities issued or guaranteed by the governments of less developed countries would be exempt from the tax as would securities issued by a corporation which meets the definition of a "less developed country corporation" in section 955(c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

You also mention a likelihood that some foreign investment in the United States would be discouraged by the fear that further restrictions might be imposed on the use of the dollar. The proposed tax is not a re-

striction on the use of the dollar, and we do not believe that it will be so interpreted by foreigners. What could have generated concern about the dollar on the part of foreigners is a continuation of or increase in the recent large outflow of private portfolio capital abroad and its impact on our balance of payments. New foreign issues sold to U.S. residents jumped sharply from $523 million in 1961 to $1.1 billion last year, and to an estimated $1.8 billion annual rate in the first half of this year. The reaction of official financial circles in Western Europe is that we have taken a step beneficial to our balance of payments, and that the program which the President announced on July 18, including the IET, will increase rather than reduce confidence in the dollar.

I cannot agree with you that the tax "can only serve to negate any beneficial effects which might flow from the administration's efforts to sell more U.S. securities overseas." Failure to react to the excessive outflow of portfolio investment, with its adverse impact on our balance of payments, would have been far more damaging to foreign confidence than any of the consequences you attribute to the proposed tax. The amount of foreign investment in U.S. private securities was less than $150 million last year. Any possible indirect effect which you fear the tax may have in reducing the inflow of foreign capital would seem to me negligible compared to the effect of the tax in discouraging the outflow of U.S. capital into foreign securities.

You question whether a 1 percent increase in the effective borrowing rate, as a result of the tax, would discourage much foreign borrowing in the U.S. market in view of the fact that costs of borrowing in some financial centers may still be considerably higher than in the United States and that other factors besides the level of rates attract borrowers to the U.S. market. As I indicated on page 2, we believe that the level of foreign portfolio borrowing here will return to the approximate level of the period 1959–61, but it is not possible to be precise in such an estimate. You should note that the tax will deter not only sales of new security issues of advanced countries but also sales of their outstanding issues to American investors who will now have to pay the tax.

With regard to setting the tax at a level that would increase the effective cost of foreign borrowing here by 1 percent, that increase seemed about right in the sense that it seemed large enough to reduce U.S. private capital outflow without preventing foreign borrowing in our market for the more pressing needs or disrupting rate structures abroad.

With regard to your concluding remarks on our balance-of-payments problem, I believe that the President's program, including the emphasis on maintaining price stability as business activity accelerates and on achieving more productive investment through tax reduction, is fully consistent with our common objectives of maintaining a sound dollar at home and abroad without the imposition of controls or other forms of regimentation.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Civil Rights Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed by the large number of communications I have been receiving from outside the South in opposition to the President's proposed civil rights program. In addition to this large volume of correspondence that has been coming into my office, I have also had my attention called to a number of editorials expressing opposition to the President's proposed civil rights program. The August 23, 1963, issue of the Portsmouth Times, of Portsmouth, Ohio, carried such an editorial, entitled "Power Grab in Disguise."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Aug. 23, 1963]

POWER GRAB IN DISGUISE

The Kennedy administration's proposed civil rights legislation raises one basic and disturbing question: Is it a sincere attempt to wipe out racial discrimination or is it being used to camouflage a Federal power grab?

While we'd like to think it's the former, sections of this bill go far beyond the realm of civil rights. In fact, if enacted, they could deprive citizens of their civil rights.

In our book, civil rights are those guaranteed American citizens by the Constitution—the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right of peaceful assembly and free speech and the right to own private property.

These are rights that should apply to all citizens, regardless of color or creed, and should not be twisted to the advantage of any individual or group.

Although the Kennedy program is traveling under the cover of civil rights, and to speak against it is akin to being for sin, it seems that the measure primarily is an extension of Federal power.

Under this program, the President is seeking power to control every home, school, business, farm, and bank. It would give the Federal Government the power to call, foreclose or refuse loans and to exclude individuals and businesses from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits without notice.

It would give the Government the power to tell businessmen whom they may hire, fire, promote, or demote. In effect, it would give the Government the power to blacklist banks, contractors, schools, businesses, and individuals.

These powers are far more sweeping and arbitrary than any President has ever sought—even in time of war.

If Congress accepts this civil rights package in its entirety, it will have curtailed the traditional rights of trial by jury and appeal and will have virtually erased State lines and States rights.

Such an influx of centralized Federal control of the lives of men is frightening. And it may be just one step in a continuing grab for power by the Federal Government.

President Kennedy has said, "The enactment of the legislation I suggest will not solve all our problems." Taking a look at what he suggested, it would indicate centralization of power.

Our Founding Fathers, for good historical reasons, shied away from a centralized government with an all-powerful monarch. They found that a federation of States provided a balance of power.

We don't want to see that balance destroyed by further power grabs by Washington under the guise of civil rights legislation.

Provisions Protecting Braceros Cited as Rights Bill Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, many of those who have long supported the extension of Public Law 78—the bracero program—also are opponents of the civil rights program. Yet, the provisions of Public Law 78 call for stringent antidiscrimination measures to protect the braceros.

One cannot escape the conclusion that those who would extend Public Law 78, but oppose the civil rights bill are guilty of advocating rights for some people, but denying the same rights to others. This article from yesterday's New York Times is an apt illustration of my point:

PROVISIONS PROTECTING BRACEROS CITED AS RIGHTS BILL PRECEDENT

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—Congressional liberals fighting for the civil rights program are trying to kill a 12-year-old project operating under antidiscrimination provisions that have been called stiffer than those requested by President Kennedy.

At the same time, some southerners who are battling the President's civil rights proposals are supporting this program. Some of them have lived with its antidiscrimination prescriptions since 1951.

The program is the annual importation, under contract, of hundreds of thousands of Mexican workers to cultivate and harvest American fruit and vegetable crops. They are called braceros.

The Senate voted, 63 to 24, last week to continue the importations for another year, although the program was started as a temporary emergency measure during the Korean conflict. Fourteen southerners voted "aye."

HOUSE MAY RECONSIDER

The House, which rejected an extension in May, is expected to reconsider before the current session ends.

Meanwhile, the program is being cited as probably the strongest precedent that can be presented for the administration's civil rights bill.

Such a citation was made in the Senate by Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon. She did this shortly after the Senate had approved the 1-year extension, which she had voted against.

She put into the record the antidiscrimination terms of the United States-Mexican agreement under which the program has operated since its inception.

SOME AREAS BARRED

The terms are as follows:

Mexican workers will not be assigned to work or permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

The Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations provides the U.S. Secretary of Labor with a listing of communities in which it considers discrimination exists.

If the Secretary does not concur, the appropriate Mexican consul may request an antidiscrimination pledge from the chief executive or enforcement officers of the community.

If the Mexican consul reports discrimination despite the pledge, the complaint is investigated promptly and action taken against proved violations.

In instances of continuing discrimination the Mexican consul may ask a representative of the Labor Secretary to join in further investigation.

The Secretary of Labor thus could not authorize the employment of Mexican workers held to be discriminated against, or would be required to withdraw the employment authority.

MAY DEMAND PLEDGES

Also, the Mexican Government may bypass a disagreeing Secretary of Labor and take a case of alleged discrimination directly to the officials of a community and demand nondiscrimination pledges.

The prohibition against discrimination covers all instances, whether by a local government or local custom or by an individual. It applies regardless of whether a situation is interstate or wholly local in character, Senator NEUBERGER emphasized. So, she held, the bracero antidiscrimination provisions are more far reaching than the pending civil rights program.

Mrs. NEUBERGER has received from the Labor Department a report showing that, as of September 14, 1962, the Mexican Government continued to hold 10 Texas communities ineligible for the contracting of Mexican workers.

The report cited several instances of discrimination at various points in Texas, in cases of restaurants, bowling alleys, a swimming pool, and a movie theater. These cases and many others, the report stated, were resolved satisfactorily.

The program has been shrinking in recent years. Arkansas, for instance, contracted for 12,410 braceros last year, against 44,780 in 1959. During this period the Texas importation dropped from 225,498 to 36,298. Tennessee, which had 1,228 in 1959, reduced its number to 165, and Georgia, which reported 1,094 in 1959, called in 1 last year.

Aquarium Interest Sets Records in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion in this body during the past year of the project to provide the District of Columbia with a new aquarium.

It is interesting to note that a new aquarium in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park is attracting thousands of daily visitors and demonstrating conclusively the tremendous public interest which exists all over the country in such educational tourist attractions.

An article on the subject, which appeared during the past week in the Oakland Tribune, follows:

CROWDS JAM AQUARIUM LIKE SARDINES

They're jamming Steinhart Aquarium like sardines.

Not the sardines, the people.

Since the finely festooned fish palace in San Francisco's Golden Gate Park reopened its doors June 28 after a $1.5 million refurbishing job, the crowds just won't quit.

The police department had to increase its weekend crew. Said one officer after witnessing, and trying to control, the traffic and the crowds in Sundays' turnout of 28,000: "The crowds are so tremendous, they're almost getting out of hand. You have to elbow you way through.

"They're not unruly or anything. Just a crowded crowd."

J. Byron Warner, business manager at Steinhart, said daily crowds are running about 11,500 above last year and weekend crowds some 15,000 higher.

Which doesn't leave much room for sardines.

Life Magazine's Disservice to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter, dated August 14, 1963, to Mr. George P. Hunt, managing editor of Life magazine, from Mr. William Morgan Cain, president, Water Development Foundation of Oklahoma, Inc.

AUGUST 14, 1963.

Mr. GEORGE P. HUNT,
Managing Editor Life Magazine, Time-Life Building, Rockefeller Center, New York City, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HUNT: Your pork barrel exposé published August 16 which ripped into Government spending for water development projects was undoubtedly the greatest disservice you could have possibly done to the United States.

Water resources development is the country's greatest single challenge, as your publication pointed out in a lengthy article in 1961.

Life has glorified such Federal spending as the space race, the foreign aid and Peace Corps efforts and our buildup for national defense.

But each time you speak of projects aimed at making capital improvements for the Nation—projects which will help build the economy and diversify our industrial base—you berate them. It costs an average $24,000 to create just one job for a single industrial employee. This is far too large a job for Government to undertake with the quantity of unemployment now existing. But if Government aids projects which will create new climates that stimulate industrial investment, the private economy may well be able to give our unworking labor forces new opportunities.

The efforts of individual States to modernize their highways and increase their waterways are vital segments in industrial growth. Without economic transportation facilities, the less populous States of the Nation will never be developed to handle exploding conditions of overpopulation now occurring along both coasts.

To fill the interior of the country with opportunity, and avoid a predicted decline in the Nation's standard of living due to overcrowding, we must build up the areas which don't have all the natural endowments of more fortunate regions.

Oklahomans are doing what they can on their own to build the State. This year, Oklahoma City completed a $62 million project moving water 100 miles into its metropolitan area. Thousands of Sooner farmers annually match Federal aid dollar for dollar to dam up water for agricultural use. But the job is too great for a small population. We admittedly need help.

America desperately needs the new horizons being created in Oklahoma with "Kerr's Lakes" and the economic transportation to be available along the Arkansas River.

This is a region of low-cost energy fuels such as coal, gas, and oil. Economic studies show the new canal will move these fuels and other vital minerals out of five States—goods and minerals now sitting untapped. To question that this region shouldn't be developed is tantamount to questioning man's development of the atom or his efforts to conquer space.

If our Nation can push costly exploration along the frontiers of science why shouldn't it use its know-how in ways to develop every section of the country to its fullest capacity.

We submit that every State in the United States will be amply repaid for their collective investments in Oklahoma. The vast resources tapped here and the development of a thriving economy on the plains will increase the gross national product and furnish great volumes of new taxes for the U.S. Treasury.

Our foundation represents and is financed by over 300 businessmen in the Oklahoma City area. We know the Arkansas Navigation project isn't just a channel to tiny Catoosa, Okla. We have studies by economists which prove the Arkansas will be a gateway for goods coming to and from Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Wichita, Kans., Amarillo, Tex., and even Trinidad, Colo.

Thanks to a coming population of 230 million, Americans will be untolerably thirsty within 15 years if we don't continue to build reservoirs to stay ahead of industrial, domestic and agricultural demand. And if we are to continue growing economically, we must provide for expanded transportation networks.

Although you successfully beat the August slump in news with a sensational article colored with half truths and blown past proportions, what price is America to pay for the misinformation about water projects you disseminated to millions of your readers?

Yours very truly,

WM. MORGAN CAIN,
President.

Free Enterprise Can Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. McLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session I warned the Congress that the Department of the Interior, under the guidance of Secretary Udall, planned to create a Government monopoly in setting up long-distance transmission powerlines.

In my opinion this dreamy socialistic scheme of Secretary Udall's is just another example of the spreading of pork barrel projects by the Federal Government under the fallacious argument that private enterprise cannot do the job.

It is a peculiar commentary on our way of life that we are now reaching the place where the Federal Government is fearful of having private industry compete against it. Are the socialistic planners afraid to have private industry prove it can do a better job at a lower cost to the consumer than can the Federal Government?

I am very pleased to learn that a group of locally controlled power companies in

the Midwest are willing to meet the challenge.

Last week, in company with a number of other Congressmen and Senators, it was my privilege to attend a dinner meeting at which time we were briefed on the plans and purposes of a new organization of power suppliers in the North Central States who have joined together to coordinate the planning, construction, and operation of the power supply facilities in their area.

To me this is a proper approach to the problem. It is a worthy objective when investor-owned companies, cooperatives, and public power districts are willing to pool their respective talents and investments to work in complete harmony with each other. It is a most important step in the right direction when these three groups combine their resources in bringing to consumers the greatest possible electric service at the lowest possible cost.

To my way of thinking this is the proper approach to protect the American taxpayer against subsidized Federal projects. My congratulations to this joint effort to prove the free enterprise system is both feasible and workable. I wish every success to the Mid-Continent Area Power Planners.

The Attorney General and the Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an editorial by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., of Charlotte, N.C., entitled "The Attorney General's Reply." It is dated August 21, 1963. This broadcast editorial points up, Mr. President, just how hard key members of the Justice Department are working to try to sell the President's so-called civil rights proposals to the public, and particularly to the various news media. The editorial also points up just how unsuccessful any salesman can be when he does not have a quality product to sell.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPLY

We have received a communication from the Department of Justice questioning our position taken in a previous editorial on the use of the interstate commerce clause as a means of forcing integration in public accommodations business.

After a careful study of the Attorney General's legal memorandum, and with all due respect for his position, we find it impossible to modify the opinion that we previously expressed.

Let us emphasize again that this station is not opposed to full civil rights for Negroes. On the contrary, we favor it. Our argument was that the use of the interstate commerce clause as a weapon to force compliance in matters not affecting interstate commerce would set a precedent dangerous to all American liberties.

The issue seems to be this: Does segregation in public accommodations have an effect on interstate commerce justifying the use of the clause to protect trade across State lines?

We still believe it does not.

The Attorney General uses several illustrations to prove his point. He says that a segregated restaurant will not serve as many customers as an integrated restaurant and will therefore not buy as much out-of-State food; hence to that extent segregation interferes with the movement of interstate commerce.

We doubt that he can establish that thesis. In the first place, it is not at all certain that a restaurant will have more customers after integration than before. In the second place, all those people must eat, whether in an integrated or a segregated restaurant, or at home. The same amount of food will be consumed in any case, and interstate commerce will not be affected.

As another illustration the Attorney General cites the report that in six Southern States that practice segregation, new construction contracts for the first quarter of 1961 were 11 percent below those of the first quarter of 1960, though the national average was up two-tenths of 1 percent. Therefore fewer building materials moved in interstate commerce, and segregation was to blame.

That is only a post hoc argument, because no connection has been shown between segregation and the drop in building contracts for that quarter. And why did he go back to a particular 3-month period in 1961 to get his figures. Why about the other three quarters of 1961?—or all four quarters of any year?

We submit, therefore, that the Attorney General has not made a case for invoking the interstate commerce clause as a means of forcing private business to integrate.

We hold to our opinion that this use of the clause makes it a dangerous weapon which in unscrupulous hands could undermine the very civil liberties that the proposed bill is intended to safeguard.

A Living Dream for Pine Ridge Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the first Indian housing project in the country was inaugurated by President Kennedy in 1961 on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in South Dakota.

Recognizing the need to improve shameful housing conditions on the reservation, the President met with Pine Ridge leaders at the White House; and then, under the direction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, 50 homes were constructed for Indian families.

The fact that this low-rent housing program has been a source of new strength and hope for our Indian citizens is clearly demonstrated in a recent article published in the Belle Fourche, S.D., Post of August 17, 1963. The heartwarming story of Mrs. Athelia Yellow Boy and her children is one which I hope will be repeated again and again as this worthwhile program for our Indian citizens continues. They deserve a better opportunity for happiness and good health.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIVING DREAM FOR PINE RIDGE INDIANS

(By Ron Ross)

Athelia Yellow Boy was living a dream.

With confidence and interest she poured coffee in her sparkling white kitchen, while she discussed her weekly meal plan and budget with Mrs. Bessie Cornelius, home demonstration agent. On her new electric range, Athelia's 10-year old daughter Barbara was watching a low-cost nutritional hot dish.

The time was February 1963. The place: a public housing authority low-rent housing project on the outskirts of Pine Ridge, the largest town on a southeastern South Dakota Indian reservation of the same name. Athelia, a Sioux Indian widow, and her 6 children were among the first 10 families to move into the 50 new 2, 3, and 4 bedroom homes.

Only a few months ago Athelia had lived in a two-room log dwelling belonging to her parents. Altogether it housed 16 persons. She at times slept on the floor, carried water and wood for heating and cooking, froze in winter, and suffered through the heat of summer. To add to her woes, she had lost her husband and all of her own home furnishings when fire destroyed their own inadequate home early in 1962.

Then Mrs. Bessie Cornelius saw the Yellow Boy's plights, and urged Athelia to apply for one of the new homes; she did and was accepted.

The low-rent project works like this: The public housing authority, a branch of the Federal Government's Housing and Home Finance Agency loans money obtained through investment bonds to a local housing authority. Houses are built by the authority and rented to needy families, with the rent scaled to income and size of family. All planning, building, and administration are locally done.

Along with the other families, Athelia had misgivings about the move. They wanted the new homes, but they were uncertain if they could cope with the many new problems they knew they would run into.

Yet they were ahead of many of the reservation Indian families. They all had an income—the average was between $2,500 and $3,000—and they wanted to improve their living conditions. They were faced with making a jump in standards that has taken most families two or three generations.

They were not used to living in a confined area, with neighbors, and community codes. Nor were they used to having a rent payment due the first of every month. The old shacks may not have been modern, but, for the most part, they were owned by their occupants.

With only 6 months until moving day, extension agents didn't have time to relax. Mrs. Cornelius and C. D. Allen, the agricultural agents at Pine Ridge, visited with the families and observed the existing conditions. They came up with a list of major needs: family living, home management, meal planning and electrical cooking, and obtaining furniture. Most of what the Indians had was not suitable for the new homes.

Before individual work began, a meeting was held for all interested persons to explain the responsibility of each agency of the Federal Government, and the tribal council, regarding the development. Rumors had

started about the Indians "losing their freedoms" if they moved into the housing, and these had to be stifled.

Workshops on family relations and home management came first. Both the women and the men were prompted on the responsibilities of living in a crowded neighborhood. The days of car body and tin can littered yards was over. Also, fullbloods and mixbloods would be living side by side for the first time on the reservation. Recordkeeping, budgeting, meal planning, time and money management, and routine housekeeping operations were gone over in detail. Mimeographed booklets outlining daily, weekly, and monthly cleaning chores were distributed.

Because the homes were equipped with electric stoves, an electrical cooking workshop was held. The women had a chance to try out new techniques under supervision. A variety of nutritious economical foods was studied.

Next came the problem of furniture. The tribal council came to the rescue, with a loan of $500. Mrs. Cornelius with some of the other leaders went to Chadron, Nebr., and bought a vanload of "junk" furniture for $335. With the rest they bought paint, fabrics, and tools.

Several sessions were held on upholstering and refinishing furniture. Six of the ten families attacked the broken-down items with more vigor than they had exhibited toward any other project in their entire lifetimes.

Results so far have far exceeded expectations. Mrs. Cornelius cites Athelia as an example. Athelia was doubly afraid of changing living standards, because she had to be both mother and father to her children, and changing homes would mean losing the help from relatives.

She now takes it all in stride. She talks confidently of the future as she makes new rugs and curtains for her new home. Her children are near school, and attend regularly.

Athelia's income is $252 per month. She pays $53 rent, $5 back to the tribal council's furniture fund, and $5 to a department store charge account. She plans meals well in advance, watches for grocery bargains, and budgets the remaining money carefully.

Furniture she got was worth about $20 then. She upholstered a davenport, chair, kitchen chairs, painted all the wood furniture, and according to Mrs. Cornelius, "It is now worth a whole lot more, and would be a welcome addition to any home."

Mrs. Cornelius and the others look forward to more problems in the future. For one thing they will have at least 40 more families to "train." And in a few years, Pine Ridge will be brimming with teenagers. But they aren't worried. "After the personal initiative these people exhibited, they proved they were willing to use every basic talent they have to get what they want. And what better basis for sound planning could you have than that."

Potomac Fever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, hark to the following:

Thanks to the glories of foreign aid, we don't have to wear ourselves out fighting the Communists. We can always take time out—and fight the Buddhists.—Fletcher Knebel in Potomac Fever.

Well Deserved Award for Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the Peace Corps volunteers in Asia have collectively been named to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding. The Peace Corps volunteers are the first nonresident Westerners to receive this distinction.

An editorial from the Philippine Herald of August 10, 1963 which follows describes the work of the Peace Corps volunteers who have received this prize.

[From the Philippines Herald, Aug. 10, 1963]

WELL-DESERVED AWARD FOR PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

U.S. Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian countries including the Philippines have been singled out collectively to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award for "international understanding"—a signal honor, for the award, normally for Asians, is being conferred this time on persons who, while not of the region, have contributed in a unique manner to the cause of peace and understanding in this area. That the honor is most deserved, everyone will heartily agree.

SIGNAL HONOR

In deciding to cite the Peace Corps volunteers, the RM Award Foundation noted: "The problem of achieving peace amidst the tensions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet a few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

The award is made more significant by the fact that the first Asian contingent of Peace Corpsmen were detailed to the Philippines. That was in October of 1961. By the middle of this year, they have spread out all over Asia, including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaya, North Borneo, Nepal, Afghanistan, Ceylon and Sarawak. What they have done and are doing in the Philippines is most eloquently indicated by the many favorable and highly complimentary reports about their services in various parts of the country, sharing their energy and technical skills with the people, as teachers, athletic coaches, nurses, doctors, laboratory aides, mechanics, engineers, etc., and, in the process, promoting friendship, understanding and the cause of peace.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS

The award, established to give recognition to those in Asia who exemplify the late Magsaysay's "greatness of spirit, integrity and devotion to liberty," carries a $10,000 prize which the Peace Corps has indicated would be put to "appropriate" use. But it's not the cash award, of course, for the Peace Corps volunteers have embraced their work in a spirit of service and self-denial—as much as the honor that deservedly goes with it and the gratefulness of the people who have been the beneficiaries of their services. One might say that the conferment partakes of the nature of an expression of thanks to these volunteers for the splendid thing they are doing for the cause of peace and understanding in our part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to state that in another editorial, the Manila Evening News commented on the award in the following way:

In 22 months of quiet and sometimes painful, often discouraging labor, Peace Corps volunteers who came to this part of the world have secured a verdict not before vouchsafed to any other foreign group. With few tools to work with besides dedication, Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian nations lived in backward communities, sharing the people's woes, offering counsel to combat the age-old problems of want and illiteracy, and through it all providing an example of that simple human comradeship that strikes down prejudices and brings people together. Peace Corps workers have achieved in less than 2 years an understanding with Asian people that promises to pass all tests.

All Hail to Southwestern Power Administration's 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, all Americans can today proudly celebrate the 20th anniversary of creation of the Southwestern Power Administration by the Secretary of the Interior on August 31, 1943. SPA was conceived to market power and energy from the Norfork Dam in Arkansas and Denison Dam in Texas, both built by the Army Engineers, and the Grand River Dam—Pensacola, Okla.—projects, and to market additional power and energy from later projects. After World War II, Grand River Dam was returned to control of the State of Oklahoma.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 spelled out the general purposes of SPA, as follows: "who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

Shortly after this law was passed this section 5 was inscribed on the head of a straight pin and carried around the Senate by a page boy to show the Senators—Douglas G. Wright, "The Southwestern Power Administration; Past, Present, Future," speech at New Orleans, La., January 21, 1960.

In spite of violent propaganda in the early days to the contrary, and its later spectacular history of growth, the Southwestern Power Administration has not tried to build a monopolistic, grasping power empire which would duplicate facilities already in operation. Instead, its policy, from the beginning, has been to use existing equipment, and build new facilities where practicable, and where needed, particularly in the rural areas. One of its most important objectives has

been to promote tie-ins or coordination with, and use of, facilities of private companies and cooperatives. Proof of this is that, in 1950, SPA requested Congress to cut its appropriation by $6 million because the need was eliminated by a contract with two Oklahoma utility companies to supply power.

The SPA program has not been one of grant or of subsidy. It has marketed ample, dependable, low-cost power, recovering the annual cost of the Government's power operations, and repaying the investment costs to the Treasury, plus interest.

Revenue from its projects has ranged from $8,510 in fiscal year 1944, to $17,600,000 in fiscal year 1963.

By 1950, the SPA had cut the average wholesale power rates in half in its operating area, from 1.03 cents per kilowatt-hour in Texas and 1.16 cents in Oklahoma in 1941, to 5.6 and 5.8 mills, respectively, 9 years later. Today SPA's power is 20th from the lowest in the United States, and 9 of the 10 companies with lowest rates in the country are associated with SPA.

SPA's growth and present goodwill among private companies and cooperatives have not been easy to build. These assets have been nurtured and fought for by its Administrator from the start, Douglas G. Wright, and other employees. In the early days, private utilities were strongly opposed to public power and, naturally, to SPA. For example, one company extensively exhibited a model to show that successful incorporation of flood control, and generation of power in the same dam or reservoir was impossible. However, in 1952 the president of that company publicly asked support for the immediate beginning of a multiple-purpose dam in the company's home State. In the same year the president of another utility company which had previously fought SPA told Mr. Wright that:

> If I appear before the congressional Committees on Appropriations for fiscal year 1953, it will be to support your entire program.—"A History of SPA," by U.S. Southwestern Power Administration, Tulsa, Okla., 1952.

The Southwestern Power Administration now buys, markets, and exchanges electric power and energy in a drought-ridden area in six States, in Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. The uncertainty of rainfall and vagaries of waterflow in these areas made apparent to SPA from the beginning the necessity and importance of coordination or tie-in of transmission and power facilities among SPA, private companies and cooperatives. In that way deficiencies from drought in one area could be made up by power brought over other systems' lines from normal storage or rainfall areas, and from fuel-powered electricity plants. It also provides an alternative source of power when local equipment fails or blows up, such as happened at Jonesboro, Ark. The local powerline's interconnection with SPA, however, restored the community power service until repairs could be made. SPA now has about $30 million invested in about 1,100 miles of transmission facilities, and SPA has the use of other interconnected facilities worth over $2 billion. Of the approximately $350 million worth of dams in its expected payout future schedules, about $250 million will be allocated to power development.

SPA's installed capacity of hydroelectric power now is over 791,000 kilowatts. Over half—52 percent—of its power sales go to REA cooperatives, about 20 percent goes to the aluminum industry in Arkansas, about 8½ percent goes to municipalities and 2.7 percent goes to Federal agencies. In 1961 the Southwestern Power Administration bought 127 million kilowatt-hours of power from private power companies and it sold 125 million kilowatt-hours to them.

Mr. Douglas G. Wright, who has been administrator of Southwestern Power Administration from its beginning, is a strong advocate of building up and using pumped storage power. This helps increase peak power availability, and it supplies a reactive which works at night to enable high-voltage transmission grid lines to benefit and work from power unused at night that might otherwise be lost.

The great achievements of the Southwestern Power Administration in working with private power companies, municipalities and cooperatives are those of enlightened diplomacy and statesmanship. Together these forces and the SPA have brought ample, dependable, low-cost power for thousands of families, businesses and individual consumers in parts of six States.

This 20th anniversary of the founding of the Southwestern Power Administration is highly worthy of our recognition, admiration, and tribute.

March on the Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article—from the August 18, 1963, issue of the Atlanta Journal—entitled "Negro Major Rips Leaders' 'Frauds'." I think it is also appropriate, Mr. President, to print at the conclusion of this article one by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., entitled "On the Right: It's Time To Protest Against That March on Nation's Capital. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this article, too, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO MAJOR RIPS LEADERS' "FRAUDS"

An official of Fort Valley State College, a Negro unit of the University System of Georgia, has sharply criticized civil rights leaders who he says have "perpetrated the greatest fraud upon the American people within the past 100 years."

Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, commandant of ROTC cadets at the college for the past 6 years, also has commended the 1,100-member student body of the college "for having avoided association with those who devote their time and energy in creating disturbances of the type that involve conflict with constitutional authorities."

Major Robinson, an Army Reserve officer who says he does not belong to nor support any civil rights organizations, said he has made a survey of the results of antisegregation demonstrations led by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (headed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.) and others.

The results, he said, "thus far clearly indicate that Negroes have suffered greatly economically because of the demonstrations, and the only persons who have benefited are the leaders who exploit the ignorance of the Negro people for their own good."

The demonstrations, he added, "have put the Negroes back 75 years, economically, and the Negro people would be better off if the Reverend Martin Luther King and others would desist in their efforts."

Major Robinson said "thousands of jobs are lost, and in turn thousands of homes are reclaimed by lending agencies because of the evil influences of the demonstrations."

In a letter of commendation to his ROTC students, the major said that "mob rule is alien in its very character and nature" to this country and "is destructive of all that is desired by lawabiding citizens and peaceful inhabitants."

He said that "without effective enforcement of local laws, anarchy would prevail and there would then be no supreme authority to protect life and property."

"Those of our citizens who are interested in our Nation's future and desire to contribute to its future growth and further development," he said, "will not permit themselves to be associated with those who disregard constitutional authorities in Georgia and elsewhere."

Major Robinson urged the students to turn to the courts for any grievances they may have. "The rights and privileges of citizens in a free society may be determined by legal and constitutional processes," he said.

"What may appear, on the surface, to be your rights and privileges, may, if obtained by force, deprive others of their inalienable rights and privileges," he declared.

Major Robinson said the students should "be concerned with values and accepted standards upon which our civilization is based" and urged them "to prepare for better citizenship" and maintain "an abiding faith in our constitutional processes and a respect for the rights and privileges of others."

ON THE RIGHT: IT'S TIME TO PROTEST AGAINST THAT MARCH ON NATION'S CAPITAL

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Are you going to march on Washington, on August 28?

I am not, and to tell the truth I am beginning to resent the implicit suggestion that it can therefore be assumed that my concern for the Negro race is underdeveloped. Yet that is the outline that slowly emerges from the moral scaffolding of our lords spiritual.

The idea of the march caught on and was boisterously prompted by the more radical of the Negro civil-rights groups. In due course the more moderate groups took it up. Then one or two Jewish groups went along. Then a few Protestant groups. Then the President of the United States, at his press conference, put his benediction on it.

And last week the Catholic archbishop of New York said he, too, thought it a sound idea, a good and respectable way to express the general dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs.

It is time to venture a caveat or two.

The demonstration in Washington is for ontological reasons an unruly affair. That is to say, the demonstration was not originally conceived as having a concrete purpose—the pending civil-rights bill had not yet been written. If that bill were passed into law next week, the march would not be called off; and therefore there is no way to satisfy the marchers.

REFLECTION IS URGED

And if it can be maintained that the passage of that bill is the sole purpose of the demonstration, it follows that one should participate in the demonstration or not, sympathize with the demonstration or not, depending on one's views about the prudence of that particular measure as a means of encouraging interracial harmony.

Now there happen to be two points of view on the wisdom of that measure, for the reason I touched upon in this column 2 weeks ago.

Whether or not the reasoning is correct of those who—like Senator DIRKSEN, for instance—have expressed their misgivings about Mr. Kennedy's proposed bill, surely that reasoning should be penetrated.

One ought to meditate upon the arguments against the passage of a measure of dubious constitutional genealogy and sociological effect as the means of improving the vexed racial situation. And nothing is clearer than that the way to induce a philosophical discussion on the bill is not to encourage a stampede of several hundred thousand people into Washington who lust after a piece of legislation, and damn the arguments against it.

There are those thousands, and even millions, who feel very strongly about any number of issues, who nevertheless do not go about counseling mobocratic pressures to insure the ratification of their desires.

There are those, for instance, who believe that a very basic concern for human rights, and for strategic sanity, requires the liberation of Cuba: and yet we do not hear a call for a march on Washington to restore the Monroe Doctrine.

There are those who believe that the workingman's right to be free from coercive unionism is a very essential right—who nevertheless do not say that a march on Washington is the appropriate way to communicate one's desires to the Congress.

JUSTIFICATION IS RARE

There are to be sure times when the emotional impulses of an outraged people should indeed crystalize in massive demonstrations. But such situations are very rare indeed. And precisely the question to ask now is whether the current controversy over the Negro question is one that clearly calls for direct mobilization of the demos: for that, clearly, is what the march on Washington proposes.

It seems to me that the reflective conscience of the reflective Congressman is not stimulated by the shock drug the marchers have prescribed.

Mass demonstrations, in a free society, should be reserved for situations about which there is simply no doubting the correct moral course.

If it is true that the Senate and the House of Representatives cannot be trusted to write a law which is manifestly just and imperatively moral, then and only then is the pressure of the mob in order. But mob deployment in circumstances that call for thought and discussion and meditation is a dangerous resort. What society, at any time in history, was free, and just, and civilized, and ruled by the mob?

Milton Hershey's Trust Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, James Welsh, of the Harrisburg, Pa., Patriot-Evening News, wrote an extremely interesting story on the Milton Hershey Trust Fund immediately after the announcement of the gift of $50 million for the creation and maintenance of a medical school and medical center in Derry Township, Pa.

In my judgment, Mr. Welsh has caught the spirit of both Mr. Hershey and the Hershey management since Mr. Hershey's death. He, also, gives some competent suggestions of what the future may hold in store for the 16th Congressional District as a result of this magnificent bequest.

I would particularly like to call attention to Mr. Welsh's statement about the present work of the Milton Hershey School. From 1962 to 1966, $21 million in new construction and improvements on old construction will have been completed for the Milton Hershey School.

Thirty new homes for the boys are being constructed. All the old homes are being brought completely up to date. Each home comprises 12 boys, plus a married couple who act as house parents for the 12 boys in the home. The school now has close to 1,200 students with about 145 graduating each year. The new facilities will increase the capacity to 1,600. Clearly, the tremendously successful Milton Hershey School which has done so much for so many young men will not suffer from the diversion of funds from the school to the Medical Center.

Some of the many other Hershey philanthropies are:

First. 1909 establishment of the Milton Hershey School with four boys.

Second. Building of the Hershey Consolidated School of Derry Township.

Third. In 1925 donation of the Derry Township Junior and Senior High School to the township.

Fourth. 1935 establishment of the Milton S. Hershey Foundation with 5,000 shares of Hershey Chocolate Co. stock to assist in public education in Derry Township.

Fifth. 1938 organization of the Hershey Junior College with a guarantee to underwrite the first 2 years of operation and financial assistance ever since.

The last four of these gifts were for the direct benefit of the citizens of Derry Township and are entirely separate from the Milton Hershey School.

Graduates of both Milton Hershey High School and Derry Township High School are eligible to go to Hershey Junior College as are children of employees of the Hershey Chocolate Corp.

In 1935, Mr. Hershey donated $20,000 to each of the five churches then in existence in Derry Township.

Mr. Welsh's article follows:

MILTON HERSHEY'S TRUST FUND

(By James Welsh)

He personified the American legend of the benevolent millionaire.

He acquired wealth with the diligence of the early Rockefellers and gave it away with the eagerness of the later Rockefellers.

He created a towering industrial empire, built what someone has called "the supreme mill town" and for more than 35 years lavished his fortune on his favorite cause, the school for poor orphan boys.

But in a sense Milton S. Hershey's benevolence misfired. He provided far too well for the school he founded.

Hershey died October 13, 1945, at the age of 88. The war had ended, and the new era just beginning was to be far different, and far more swiftly changing, than anything that had gone before.

One development was the steady, sometimes sharp upward surge of the Hershey fortune. The chocolate corporation has prospered. Its stock, which feeds the Hershey Trust Co., which finances the school, has galloped beyond even normally optimistic forecasts.

A second development in the postwar era has been a swift decline in the number of orphans and a lessening of the need to take care of orphans in large institutions. Parents live longer. Social security exists for widows. Foster parents are available. The big needs of society are in other directions—medical education, for instance.

And so an embarrassment of riches has occurred in Hershey. In the last few years the evidence became overwhelming that, within the limits of operating the Milton Hershey School, the people running the trust fund simply don't know what to do with all the money available.

This is what generated the idea to use some of the income from the trust to build and endow a first-class medical school in Pennsylvania. The idea reached the stage of reality Friday with the electrifying announcement that Dauphin County Orphans Court Judge Lee F. Swope had signed a decree for that purpose. The medical school, to enroll between 200 and 300 students, will be affiliated with Pennsylvania State University.

How much money is involved here?

The principal of the Hershey Trust Co., which is trustee for the school, now is $298 million. In addition, the accumulation of unspent income, which has been reinvested, is worth $96 million. The total is nearly $400 million.

There aren't many chunks of money in America that are that large and earmarked for charity and education.

For purposes of comparison, the United States has about 12,000 foundations, and only 4 of them can claim assets topping those of the Hershey Trust Co. The colossal Ford Foundation is worth $2.5 billion, the Rockefeller Foundation $615 million and the Hartford and Duke Foundations each more than $400 million. The next largest is the Carnegie Foundation with about $285 million.

Among American colleges and universities only two have endowments that can match the fund for the Hershey School. Harvard's endowment was listed earlier this year at $393 million, and that of the University of Texas (it discovered oil on its land) at $394 million. One other university, Yale, has an endowment of more than $200 million, and only seven others have more than $100 million.

The Hershey Trust Co., its directors readily concede, is the keystone of the Hershey complex. One of its investments, for instance, is Hershey Estates, which runs so much of the nonchocolate business of the town, from the hotel to the arena to the department store. More important, its assets include 67 percent of the outstanding stock of the Hershey Chocolate Corp.

Since the end of the war the value of the stock has about quadrupled. Twice it split, three-for-one in 1947 and five-for-one last year, and it now sells for about $34 per share.

Progress at Hershey picked up noticeably after Samuel F. Hinkle took over as president of the corporation in 1956. With the nickel chocolate bar still working its magic, net sales went from $148.7 million that year to $183 million last year. The value of the stock rose in that period, too, and really took off flying in the middle of 1960.

With the trust fund having grown to such an enormous amount, it became impossible to use all the income to operate the school. Enrollment now runs between 1,100 and 1,200 boys, and there is enough income from the fund to spend well over $10,000 per boy every year.

Short of giving the kids cash, what do you do with that kind of money? As the court decree eventually was to say, the accumulated income is "in excess of the amount which can be reasonably or prudently spent."

The law governing charitable trusts in Pennsylvania, as in most other States, is complex and demanding. What a man says in his will cannot be thrust aside lightly. There have been sharply contested actions in the State involving big trust funds. In one, the city of Philadelphia unsuccessfully tried to reverse a feature of a trust limiting enrollment in the Girard College to white males. In another case the State justice department forced the Barnes Foundation to open its art gallery near Philadelphia to the public.

As for Hershey, the trustees, not an outside force, sought change. Still, they had to go to great lengths to prove their case in court. They had to prove:

They had done everything that money could do to improve the Milton Hershey School.

The need for orphan care and education won't grow to meet the supply of income from the trust.

The need for the new purpose, a medical school, is real and pressing.

This new purpose is in line with charitable pattern of Hershey's life.

In discussing the improvements to the orphans' school the other day, a Hershey spokesman said simply:

"We believe we will have the finest school of its type in the world."

In 1959, to mark the 50th anniversary of its foundation, the trustees brought in experts from all over the country to advise them on what to do for the school. Three separate surveys were taken.

As a result the Milton Hershey School now is undergoing a mammoth program of capital improvement and modernization. By 1966 projects worth $21 million will be completed. That's just about as much as it will take to put up the entire new medical center.

The orphans' institution is getting new school buildings for children in the intermediate grades. It will get a whole science complex, including observatory and nature study center, for the high school. It already has 30 new residential homes that have become a trademark of the school. It is getting technical and vocational education equipment of the finest caliber. It is, in short, going first-class with a vengeance.

In providing evidence on future care of orphans, the Hershey people turned to statistics compiled by Uncle Sam. The form a picture that would amaze Milton Hershey. From 1920 to 1961, the number of children with one parent dead has dropped from 6.4 million to 2.9 million. The number of full orphans has been cut by more than nine-tenths, from 750,000 to 55,000.

Then, too, since the heyday of Hershey's paternalism, the welfare state has come on strong. In 1920, a widow with small children might take in washing, fail to make it and turn to Hershey. Today's widow more often than not gets social security payments and manages to get along. Some orphans receive income as children of deceased veterans or as survivors of railroad and government workers. About 270,000 orphans receive publice assistance under the aid to dependent children program. Social workers steer children to foster homes and tend to bypass large institutions.

With all this in mind, the Hershey School has set an ultimate capacity of 1,600 boys. Most people doubt if enrollment will ever get there.

The trustees had little trouble proving the need for medical schools. Every serious study on the subject strikes a note of urgency. The American population threatens to outrun the supply of doctors. Just to keep even, medical schools will have to increase their supply of graduates from about 7,500 to 11,000 in 1975.

The Derry Township location, it could readily be pointed out, is a natural. It is near Harrisburg's medical complex of hospitals and specialists. And the Harrisburg area is the most logical place for Penn State, the only big university in Pennsylvania without a medical school, to have one.

Would Milton Hershey have approved?

Said Arthur R. Whiteman, president of the trust company, "The medical school idea came from looking around for what Mr. Hershey would have wanted."

The court petition pointed out the two themes that dominated the Hershey charities: education and Derry Township. The medical school idea is consistent with this, said the petition.

Judge Swope agreed, as everyone knows by now. Part of the immense Hershey fortune now can go to work in a new and exciting cause.

A big question remains. Since the $50 million represents about half the accumulated income and none of the principal, it might be asked if this is only the first move, with other new charitable bequests for education to follow eventually.

The Hershey people have cautious answers to that one. But it's a good bet.

Now Is the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein an editorial.

In Havre de Grace, in Harford County, Md., the day on which the citizens of that town are asked to support their volunteer fire department, is tag day, September 14. In honor of the fire department of Havre de Grace, and of all volunteer fire departments in Maryland and in the other 49 States, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial in the Democratic Ledger of Havre de Grace, asking support for the firemen, and reminding all citizens how much they do for us, and how well they do it:

NOW IS THE TIME

For all good citizens to come to the aid of the firemen. These words are trite and slightly changed from the familiar line that any typist ever banged out on a keyboard—but a reminder to all that tag day is less than a month away—on September 14—and you'll never miss that extra change saved until that date or placed in containers in many shopping places through town. It can mean the addition of several hundred dollars saved by every family toward the funds that protect your life and property. Give a little more than the usual donation in this year's drive. There's a volunteer fireman in every neighborhood—might be your next door neighbor, too. Funds go toward supplying modern equipment and the upkeep of the present facilities.

Next time you are wakened by a fire siren on a stormy night or the wee hours of the a.m. remember the man who jumps out of his bed into nearby clothes—he might be on the way to your house.

Comments on Anthracite Drama Near Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many prayers were answered early this morning with the miraculous rescue of David Fellin and Henry Throne who had been trapped some 330 feet underground in a mine at Sheppton, near Hazleton, Pa. It is fervently hoped that Louis Bova, the third man who has been separated from Mr. Fellin and Mr. Throne by debris, will be found alive. In line with this national and international story, I would like to include two editorials which were published in last Friday's edition, August 23, of the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News—one from the Philadelphia Inquirer and the other from the New York Times.

Editorials follow:

COMMENTS ON ANTHRACITE DRAMA

COURAGE IN MINE TRAP

The courage, good humor, and physical endurance of the Pennsylvania coal miners directing their own rescue operations from their tiny prison 300 feet underground should give all Americans cause for wonder and pride.

Heroism in the coal country is nothing new, we know. These remarkable men would be the first to deny that there is anything unusual about their conduct, and they could do it without false modesty. The truth is that the strength of character they are demonstrating in such abundant measure is just as typical among the inhabitants of the coal regions in these times as before the years of debilitating mass unemployment, brought on by the decline in coal production.

The wife of one of the trapped men says, "He's always had the spirit. Coal, coal, coal. He really loves coal. He's always walking around looking for coal, talking about it. He's a very hard worker."

This is something we all need to remember about our people in the coal country. The small jokes being cracked by those men whose lives so obviously hang in the balance

in many ways reveal a kind of courage which they and their neighbors have been demonstrating on a daily basis for many years in the face of a less obvious kind of hardship.

"If you don't believe in God," one victim told America over a microphone lowered into his air hole, "go through a thing like this. Then you'll know there is a God."

Such men are worth saving. This Nation should bend every effort to rescue these victims of a physical disaster and not stop there but devote a proportionate share of its resources to rescuing their friends and neighbors from the economic adversity that has plagued their lives for so long.

If there were any Americans who thought this was not worth doing let them observe the courage of these brave men. It is the stuff that has made this country great and kept it strong. We should treasure it and encourage it wherever it is found.—Philadelphia Inquirer.

DANGER IN THE MINES

Coal miners trapped underground * * * anxious faces of relatives outside the pits * * * rescue efforts and a race against death.

There is a somber unreality about the midnight faces—a special quality of which we are freshly reminded by the present search for miners trapped hundreds of feet below the earth in Pennsylvania. Mine disasters and rescues are happenings—or should be—from earlier decades in this century, not ours. Such stories are not a proper subject for news in 1963.

And yet, tragically, they are. Before the Federal mine safety law of 1952, as many as 1,500 men lost their lives in the mines every year. Last year 287 miners were killed—a great improvement, but only by comparison. The latest mine fatality figures show matters are somewhat worse this year. Through June 30, the deaths already are 158—an increase of 39 over the same 6-month period last year.

Can something be done about this immediately? The Federal Bureau of Mines, the United Mine Workers of America and the major coal operators all think so. There is a loophole in the present law which prevents Federal mine inspectors from closing down small mines where hazardous conditions are found. Arbitrarily, a "small mine" is denfined as one with 14 or fewer men. (The mine where the men are now trapped is one.) These "doghole" operations, as they are known, seldom have rigid standards of safety. They exist primarily because technological displacement has made many miners so desperate they are willing to work even under extreme hazards. Only about 10 percent of the country's underground mine production results from such small mines, yet their contribution to the death rate is out of proportion; it usually runs to one-third of the annual mine toll.

Mining is a dangerous activity, and some fatalities are perhaps inescapable. But explosions, which have caused most deaths, are much less frequent now. The same tough standards of Federal inspection should apply to every mine in this country, big or small.

—The New York Times.

Nuclear Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the test ban treaty currently is being discussed here in Washington, D.C., and across the land. During the past couple of weeks, I have had many letters from constituents concerning this issue. Because of their interest in the matter, I have made the nuclear test ban the subject of my August newsletter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include my newsletter, as well as the paragraphs entitled "As I See It" in the RECORD:

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

The test ban treaty has been signed, and probably will be ratified by the Senate in a month or so. Whether or not this "first step" is in the best interests of our country remains to be seen. However, it wouldn't hurt to ask a few why and wherefores.

Why did Khrushchev suddenly agree to a treaty which he had refused in the Eisenhower administration and again until recently during the Kennedy administration?

Was it because of his serious problems with the Red Chinese? Did he need a detente with the West? We have been told repeatedly that the break between Moscow and Peiping is real and that a full struggle for power exists between Mao and Khrushchev. Will the signing of this treaty pose him before much of the world as "the man of peace"?

Or is he in trouble politically in Russia itself and needed to demonstrate his ability to call the tune with the West? There have been indications that all is not quiet and peaceful in Russia and that Khrushchev is having personal political problems.

Did he sign this treaty because of military considerations? It is generally conceded that the weakest part of Russia's nuclear arsenal lies in its lack of tactical nuclear weapons and that these weapons can be developed through underground testing, which the treaty permits. On the other hand, our knowledge of large weapons effects is limited and that knowledge can only be implemented by tests conducted in space. If these assumptions are true, then it is quite possible that the Soviets can obtain a weapons superiority by continued underground testing.

Perhaps it was because of the tremendous costs of the arms race and the strained Soviet economy. We have been told by Secretary of Defense McNamara that the signing of this treaty will not reduce our defense budget of $50 odd billion, so we will not gain from a dollars-and-cents point of view.

Then we ask, Why did we agree to this treaty? Was it because it "eased tensions?"

President Kennedy, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Rusk have all said that this treaty does not lessen the threat of nuclear war, it will not prevent the addition of new weapons to the stockpile, it will not reduce in any way the present stockpile. There is certainly no guarantee that Mr. K won't make a move in some other direction. Remember this, it was on July 14, 1963, that the Soviets stated in an open letter:

"We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism, but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

I would write a great deal more on this subject, but space won't permit. Let me conclude by asking: Is Mr. K a man of peace?

If he is, he could demonstrate it by withdrawing Red Army troops and equipment from Cuba. What do you think?

Sincerely,

JACK WESTLAND,
U.S. Congressman.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Recently I listened to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the floor of the Senate, discussing the nuclear test ban treaty. Senator GOLDWATER was asking questions in the field where he thinks there is some doubt. Senator HUMPHREY was trying to reassure the people of the United States that there is little, if any field of doubt. Down in the basement of the Senate, and simultaneously on the House side, ceremonies were going on announcing civil defense supplies were, for the first time, being unloaded and placed in shelters on Capitol Hill. This struck me as a field of doubt, in the broad picture. I would like to know if the Russians are laying in civil defense supplies as they sign a treaty with the United States, supposedly to release tensions on the possible nuclear war front.

Meanwhile, "Anyone for quilting?" In the extracurricular activity department, I am now involved in being chairman of a political quilt. In every national campaign, projects of this nature come to light. You might call them attention catchers. I am collecting signatures of Congressmen and Senators which in turn will be embroidered on an 88th Congress quilt. This is literally "history in the making," and it is lots of fun.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to

House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DIVISION,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 9, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL F. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Thank you very much for your letter of June 1, 1963, and the very valuable booklet on Lithuania.

Your action in introducing House Concurrent Resolution 14 is greatly appreciated by all Lithuanians. Enclosed herewith is a copy of the resolution adopted at a mass meeting recently. It refers also to House Resolution 14 on page 2.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. MOTIEJŪNAS,
President.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted at the mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent, sponsored by the Lithuanian-American Council, southern California division, held on Sunday, June 23, 1963, 12 noon, at 2704 St. George Street, Los Angeles, Calif., commemorating the events of June, which include the occupation of Lithuania in June 1940, the deportation to Siberia of about 40,000 Lithuanians in June 1941, and the rebellion against the Soviet regime at the beginning of the German-Russian war in June 1941:

"Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania by legal or democratic process because the Soviet Union took over Lithuania on the 15th of June 1940, by force of arms, and since that time Lithuanians have fought and died for their national independence; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America condemned on July 23, 1940, this Russian aggression and consistently has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Soviet Union; and still maintains diplomatic relations with the free Republic of Lithuania; and

"Whereas so many countries under colonial domination of the Western nations have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, Lithuania, on the other hand, having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for many centuries, is now subjected to the most brutal colonial Russian oppression; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we urge the U.S. Congress to pass six Senate concurrent resolutions (S. Con Res. 4, 15, 17, 18, 20, 33) and 26 House concurrent resolutions (H. Con Res. 15, 38, 43, 54, 55, 59, 62, 63, 66, 80, 96, 97, 103, 106, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 135, 138, 139, 140, 151, 153), requesting the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and to ask that the United Nations request the Soviets to (1) withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; (2) Return all Baltic exiles from Siberia prisons and slave labor camps; and (3) Conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the United Nations' direct supervision; and be it further

"*Resolved,* To urge the U.S. Congress to pass House Concurrent Resolution 14 and other similar legislation requesting to establish the Special Committee on Captive Nations; and be it further

"*Resolved,* To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1963 as Captive Nations Week; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the Secretary of State; the Speaker of the House; the Chairman and all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; the Chairman and all members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; the chairman on Rules; Senator Thomas H. Kuchel; Senator Clair Engle, and all members of the Congress from California."

GARDEN CITY PARK, N.Y.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I read notice of the new committee on captive nations proposed by you. Please record my vote in favor of such a permanent committee.

Very truly yours,

J. A. MCNAMEE.

JULY 12, 1963.

DEAR SIR: In regards to your introduction of a measure to establish a special committee on captive nations, I would like to say that I, as an American citizen, am highly pleased. This committee would serve to show the world that, for once and for all, we are truly kindred to the captive peoples, because we were once dominated by a tyrant also. Aside from emphasizing our close relationship with these peoples, a committee would be invaluable in aiding the refugees themselves, which is the clearly dominant aim. I, therefore, commend you, as a patriot and a humanist, and I sincerely hope that the establishment of such a committee is in the very near future.

Yours truly,

CAROL NANGEL.

HICKSVILLE, N.Y.

VINELAND, N.J.
July 13, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Would request that the House Rules Committee of which you are chairman, act now on recommendation of several Congressmen for the passage of House Resolution 14 for the establishment of Special Committee on Captive Nations.

If we can show the Reds that we in this country have not forgotten these beleagured people behind the Iron Curtain it will be a great feather in our caps and give Mr. Khrushchev something to think about.

Thanking you, I remain

Sincerely yours,

EDW. NEW.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.
July 14, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish you, sir, to support the passage of House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives of the United States.

If passed it would be an act of charity to those in capitivity to know that the Congress of our Nation knows of their horrors.

This will not ring well in Mr. K and his American Liberal's ears.

Wishing you the best of everything,

MR. & MRS. CHARLES P. SAHMIT.

P.S. We urge our Congressman, EUGENE J. KEOUGH of the Ninth, to support House Resolution 14.

The Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the fastest growing industry in my State of Montana is recreation. Last week I spoke about the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, which would be established in Montana and Wyoming by the legislation which the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and I have cosponsored. This 63,287-acre area, back of Yellowtail Dam, which now is under construction, would include the spectacularly beautiful canyon and a large water area and would provide wonderful wildlands for sightseeing, camping, boating, hiking, horseback riding, swimming, fishing, and possibly winter sports.

About 100 miles north of the Big Horn area, astride the Missouri River and Fort Peck Reservoir, lies another, larger Montana playground. I refer to the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Range, "a paradise of hunting and fishing," in the words of Joe Linduska, whose article on the area entitled "Pronghorns for Profit," appears in the August issue of Field and Stream magazine.

What impressed Mr. Linduska, during his trip through the area, were the possibilities which the recreation business in eastern Montana afford local ranchers, who spend part of their time as guides. He quotes Glen Childers, of Brusett, as follows:

I don't expect to make a killing in the guiding business. But I like people; I love to hunt; and if I can show some dudes a good hunting trip and make a few dollars in the process—well, it'll soften the blow, especially in the lean years.

Continues Linduska:

Here, it seemed to me, is where land use should be given a long look. Here, perhaps, is where the national embarrassment of too much agriculture might yield a little to the national dilemma of too little vacation land. For follows like Glen Childers, entry into the vacation business is piecemeal and part time. But it's a start and a sensible way to go about it. It will be surprising if such modest beginnings don't lead to new livelihoods, new uses of the land, and a partial solution of a vexing problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Field and Stream article to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRONGHORNS FOR PROFIT

(By Joe Linduska)

Fame at last. Show me another blue-eyed male with a red beard who's wing-shot an antelope as it sailed overhead, and I'll show you the coincidence of all time," said Bob Kuhn. Allowing for the usual hunter exaggeration, he was about right. Here's what happened.

Several bands of spooky antelope had outguessed and outmaneuvered us all morning. No luck. After several college tries we held a council. The plan evolved: hunt them where they were going, instead of where they'd been.

It was Glen Childers' idea—Glen being a rancher, guide and outfitter, and hell-for-leather horseman from Brusett, Mont. He posted Bob in a deep gully paralleling a woven-wire fence. I took a position 200 yards back in a clump of sage. Then Glen and his mount coursed the range in the manner of a smart pointer. Instantly the drive was on. Antelope streaked across the

prairie, and the fence lines funneled them by us.

That's about it. As the unsuspecting herd sped along the fence, Bob simply waited for a respectable pair of horns to appear practically overhead, then quick-squeezed a shot from his 7-milimeter Magnum. It was all over but the big talk and the picture taking.

This was Montana. The area in and around the half-million-acre Fort Peck Game Range, recently renamed the Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Range, is a paradise of hunting and fishing.

Last fall I traveled the area by foot, horseback, and Jeep with Bob Kuhn, nationally known wildlife artist. Bob was doubly inspired by the ghost of Charley Russell and by a land sliced deep to show the primordial beginnings of the West. But I was impressed by the tremendous untapped recreation potential in this big blue-sky region. Here, it seemed to me, is where land use should be given a long look. Here, perhaps, is where the national embarrassment of too much agriculture might yield a little to the national dilemma of too little vacation land.

The first glimmer of understanding came as I chatted with Glen Childers. We sat high on a chalk butte looking out on an endless prairie. Strips of winter wheat were lush and green. Gully bottoms that held pools of water and grazing land rank with choice forbs and grasses told of a wet season.

"Water. That's all it takes—water," said Glen. "This year there's feed for a herd twice the size of mine. But a few years back this same land wouldn't have fed a colony of gophers. In the lean years—and they come regularly—it takes some scratching just to hang on."

The lean years had prompted Glen Childers, and others like him, to explore the recreational values on some of these marginal lands. Hunting, in particular, is a supplement that dovetails: the seasons cover a relatively slack period for ranching; most operators have a sizable investment in horses and trucks that otherwise stand idle at this time of the year; and what better guides for hunters than longtime, year-round residents who know every foot of the terrain?

As Glen put it: "I don't expect to make a killing in the guiding business. But I like people; I love to hunt; and if I can show some dudes a good hunting trip and make a few dollars in the process—well, it'll soften the blow, especially in the lean years."

For fellows like Glen Childers, entry into the vacation business is piecemeal and part-time. But it's a start and a sensible way to go about it. It will be surprising if such modest beginnings don't lead to new livelihoods, new uses of the land, and a partial solution of a vexing problem.

Over some of the West, ranchers just get by, partly as a result of a built-in subsidy in the form of low cost grazing on public lands. Any suggestion that livestock use of such areas will be deemphasized in favor of wildlife and other recreational values stirs the pot. Such is the case with the Charles Russell range.

Plans have been announced for a major acceleration of wildlife programs and the development of other leisure-time values. Nothing has been said of a reduction in livestock allotments or other changes in agricultural use. Nevertheless there is concern, and howls are going up of a "Federal land grab." More than a few people would like to see the project knocked in the head.

Aside from cows, sheep, and private interests, plans for better public use of this and similar areas are in keeping with the public interest and present day needs. The problem in its full dimension was aired last year at a White House Conference on Conservation called by President John F. Kennedy. This session was attended by topflight Federal and State administrators whose job is to satisfy demands for more recreation for more people on less and less land. They heard Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, say: "We have the unique opportunity to bring together two problems of great concern to this Nation—an abundance of food and a shortage of recreation—and to find that in solving one we also can solve the other."

That statement by the Secretary contains a lot of commonsense, particularly if considered in the light of his following remarks: "American cropland is producing more than we can consume, export for dollars, or use effectively in food-for-peace programs." And by 1980, "If agricultural technology and farm efficiency continue to advance as in the past decade, we can meet all the needs for crop products with 50 million fewer acres than we presently have available for cropping."

This means only one thing: the problems of too much to eat and too few places to play are going to get worse before they get better. Who can argue with the Secretary's proposal that "in solving one we also can solve the other"?

A good place to start, it seems, would be on land marginal for agriculture, such as the Charles Russell Range. Around the country there are millions of such acres—private and public. Converting these, wholly or in part, from touch-and-go agriculture to recreation would better the lot of the landowner and the Nation.

Criteria for Economic Assistance for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of Buffalo, N.Y., is an active group which has aided many civic endeavors and expressed a genuine interest in the affairs of local and national government. On occasion it has conducted seminars or studies on topics pertaining to community interests, as well as national interests.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following criteria for economic assistance for underdeveloped countries, recommended by the National League of Women Voters and endorsed by the Buffalo league:

First. Stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries.

Second. Efforts to reduce and ultimately eliminate our aid by enabling nations to stand on their own feet as rapidly as possible.

Third. Securing increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of aid to developing countries.

Fourth. Development programs should be long-term because development programs cannot be solved overnight.

Fifth. The programs should be adequately financed so that they have a real chance of success.

Sixth. The programs should be "effectively" administered so that our tax money will get full value.

A Miss in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in all of my travels in foreign countries, I believe Mr. Joseph S. Farland, Ambassador to Panama, is the most capable Ambassador I have met.

It came as a real shock to me to learn that he recently submitted his resignation.

The following article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, which appeared in the Post on August 26, expresses my concern and feelings with respect to this unfortunate loss of Mr. Farland's activities on behalf of our Government:

A MESS IN PANAMA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The bumbling and officious handling of an obscure foreign aid project in Panama partially answers the mystery of why this country is losing one of its most dynamic diplomats.

As a rule, U.S. Ambassadors to Latin America aren't much to brag about. Joseph S. Farland, Ambassador to Panama since late 1959, is an exception. Although anti-Americansim was raging there when Farland arrived, he has achieved popularity unprecedented for a foreigner.

That's all over now. Farland suddenly resigned a month ago, talking cryptically of policy differences with AID, the foreign aid agency.

The story of just one conflict between the Ambassador and AID can now be told. It also helps explain why President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress isn't winning many friends or influencing many people south of the border.

Actually, direct foreign aid is not at stake here. Uncle Sam merely would guarantee private investment in middle-income housing.

Six separate proposals for Panamanian housing were submitted, but AID evaluated only one: the Keel-Gilbane plan. The builder is the Gilbane Building Co., Providence, R.I., with financing by two labor unions (the bakers and the lithographers). AID has not even looked at the other plans.

Why? Simply because Keel-Gilbane happened to be the first plan submitted. But AID had never announced that a project worth more than $3 million in profits would be awarded on the arbitrary basis of first-come-first-served.

Moreover, Ambassador Farland was kept in the dark about the Keel-Gilbane project. Communications between minor Panamanian officials and AID bypassed Farland. In a secret report to Washington, the Ambassador refused to approve the project.

Nor is the Panamanian Government's attitude toward Keel-Gilbane any warmer.

"The Government," President Roberto Chiari informed the United States 3 months ago, "has not taken to this date any decision on the matter."

The fact is that the Chiari government would like to see the other five plans. None contains Keel-Gilbane's requirements that Panama issue $10 million in Government bonds to help insure the builder against loss.

But AID made clear to Panama that it's Keel-Gilbane or nothing—take it or leave it.

If the other proposals also were studied, AID warned in one coded cablegram, "we could not predict when affirmative action * * * could be completed."

AID has been simultaneously feuding with Panama over whether Panamanian approval is needed at all. But AID officials blandly informed this column that it was the Panamanians who had picked Keel-Gilbane.

There is absolutely no evidence of corruption. AID just seems tangled up in its own redtape. But Panamanians, accustomed to the intrigues of Latin politics, are suspicious.

For instance, they wonder why influential Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, is taking such an interest in the Keel-Gilbane plan.

Eugene McGrath, fast-talking Panama City insurance man and friend of SMATHERS, is promoting Keel-Gilbane. What's more, Panamanians who talk to McGrath get the impression that SMATHERS is solidly behind him. SMATHERS himself has inquired about Keel-Gilbane's progress with top AID officials and, on two occasions, with Farland.

As SMATHERS tells it, the inquiries were perfectly innocent. SMATHERS, legislative father of the housing guarantee program, has been burned up about its leisurely pace. He says he wants a housing project—any project—underway in Panama and wasn't aware that more than one plan was submitted.

What's remarkable is that AID, after months of intransigence, quietly capitulated last Friday by agreeing to look at competing proposals. AID director David Bell also promised to consider the Panamanian Government's recommendations. The reason: Bartlett Collins Co., a Sapulpa, Okla., manufacturer sponsoring one of the plans, has been pestering Oklahoma Congressmen. Their intervention finally got results.

The change of heart comes a little late. It can't uproot the seeds of distrust sown by Panamanians. Nor can it undo the part played by the incident in driving Joseph Farland out of diplomatic service.

Democrats or Republicans, Maybe?—Conservatives, Definitely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it may be difficult to determine whether west Texans are Democrats or Republicans, but it is not hard to see that they are definitely conservative in their thinking. Recently, with the help of hundreds of volunteer citizens, I mailed out approximately 100,000 questionnaires to the folks of west Texas inviting them to advise me of their feelings concerning some of the major issues facing the Congress. Also, most of the newspapers published my questionnaire, and several clubs reproduced and distributed it. I fully realized that the simplicity of the questions hardly befitted the complexity of the issues, and therefore, I invited the people, if they wished, to attach a letter setting forth their reasoning on any of their answers and discussing any other issues not mentioned in the questionnaire.

The response was tremendous; 21,651 questionnaires were returned and over 5,000 of them had additional comments and suggestions attached. The answers pointed up the people's vital concern and dissatisfaction with our national situation and their overwhelming desire for responsible, conservative government. The questions submitted, and the answers returned, are as follows:

Questions	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe that taxes should be cut without a cut in Federal spending?	6.3	93.7
2. Do you believe deficit financing is good for our national economy?	4.4	95.6
3. Do you favor the proposal to provide Federal aid for urban mass transportation?	6.0	94.0
4. Do you favor the proposals to give Federal aid to education at all grade levels?	13.0	87.0
5. Do you favor the administration's Federal aid for medicare proposal?	12.3	87.7
6. Are you satisfied with the way the administration is handling the problem of Cuba?	9.2	90.8
7. Do you believe there should be large reductions in our foreign aid expenditures?	91.1	8.9
8. Do you favor continued Federal control and regulations of agriculture?	11.3	88.7
9. Should the Guadalupe Peak area be removed as a source of State tax income and made a national park?	24.6	75.4
10. Should the Federal Government be responsible for removing the salt cedars along the Pecos River?	8.8	91.2

Of the 100 people answering, "Yes," to a final question, "Do you own property along the Pecos Ricer?" 74 opposed Federal Government eradication of the salt cedar bushes, even though it was on their own land, and 26 favored the Federal aid program.

It is a pleasure, indeed, for a conservative Republican to have an opportunity of representing this kind of folks in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Results of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker last week we voted to reduce the foreign aid program by a considerable amount. I believe that the action taken in that vote was ill advised and unfortunate. Our aid programs have done a great deal of good. No aid program is much more important than the Alliance for Progress. The good that has been done by the Alliance holds forth great promise for the future. We would be unwise to stand by the decision to reduce funds for the Alliance. This speech by Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance, gives us compelling reason to reconsider our vote, and restore funds taken from the Alliance for Progress.

The speech follows:

RESULTS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IN LATIN AMERICA

(Address by the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, before the Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, Calif., Aug. 23, 1963)

It is no longer necessary today to give a reason for discussing the problems of Latin America. Events there in the past 3 or 4 years have had a powerful impact on the American public. The area has moved from virtual oblivion to the front pages of our newspapers. The image of the sleepy Latino, of the tourist paradise, of the fiesta that yields good pictures for home movies, has radically and rudely changed. Now we think of Latin America as a hotbed of Castro—communism, of feudal rule and unreasonable reluctance to go along with us in policies that we believe are good for the region. The trouble is that these current notions are just as oversimplified as the superficial romanticism that colored our thinking about Latin America in the past. The one thing that is unquestionably true is the simple but immensely meaningful statement President Kennedy made a few months ago: "I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today."

I hope today to trace some of the reasons why this is so, to analyze what we are doing about it, and what more we can do.

I

The Latin America with which we deal today in 19 different countries, with 19 different sets of problems and opportunities. Most of the people speak Spanish. The single largest nation—with a third of Latin America's population—Brazil, uses Portuguese. But millions of people in these countries don't speak either of these languages. Guarani is the Indian language of Paraguay, Quechua and Aymara are the major languages of the Andean countries, and many other dialects are spoken by smaller groups of indigenous people, most of whom do not figure in the money economy and hardly are aware that they are citizens of the countries in which they live.

Some of the Republics have long traditions of constitutional democracy, while others are only now emerging from a succession of strongman dictatorships. Some have firmly rooted private and public institutions, which need reshaping under the impact of social ferment and economic pressures. Others have as yet no firm institutional base. Some are industrially developed, thanks in large measure to immigrants from Europe—from the same countries who sent us millions of people that helped build our Nation—Italy, Germany, England, Spain, and Portugal. Most are essentially agricultural—with too many people working too hard to produce too little. A few Latin American countries boast highly developed educational systems, with literacy rates comparing favorably to our own. Most are struggling to reduce the waste resulting from mass illiteracy and to give their people the skills so vitally needed for modern development work. Some have gone through deep political and social revolutions. Most are now at a prerevolutionary stage, bent on massive change, and challenging their own leaders and us to help them do the job in freedom and with a minimum of violence. But changes they want and they will get—either with us, or without and, in that case, possibly against us. The man with the hoe will make his voice heard.

II

Since the early years of our Republic, the United States has had a deep and unique commitment to the struggle of our fellow Americans to the south for political independence, economic growth, and social justice. This commitment has been embodied in the Monroe Doctrine, the Pan American Regional Organization and the good neighbor policy. It symbolizes the brotherhood of the Western Hemisphere—the common interest of the American peoples for building societies capable of providing solutions to popular demands.

But since World War II, none of these policies have been adequate to deal with the rapidly growing problems of Latin America. An industrial ferment which began in the postwar years—a ferment induced in part by the near stagnation of rural economies—brought new millions of unskilled workers to the burgeoning cities. Since the end of the war, Sao Paulo's population has doubled. Mexico City's population increased by 58 percent between 1950 and 1960. City after city has grown and in the cities, the process of the "revolution of rising expectations" has accelerated. The back windows of some plush apartment houses in Rio de Janeiro open out on a hillside of huts—the favelas, homes without water, lights or sewers. The favela dwellers as well as more fortunate citizens with a social conscience, began to ask "Why?" The answer: Because this has always been so—no longer is good enough.

III

Political and economic thinkers in Latin America have understood the seriousness of the problem for a good many years. The United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, under Dr. Raul Prebisch, proposed comprehensive approaches to the problems of social and economic development in the hemisphere early in the fifties. In 1954, the Latin American countries proposed to the United States the establishment of an Inter-American Development Bank—a regional equivalent of the World Bank—to concentrate on planning and financing the modernization of Latin America. We said "No." It took the disastrous events of the Nixon trip 4 years later to change our attitude. The Bank became a reality in 1960 and has done a fine job ever since.

But the Bank was only a partial answer. In 1958, President Kubitschek of Brazil proposed a comprehensive program of social and economic development under the title "Operation Panamerica." Again, we failed to pick up a plan of action that a Latin American leader who knew the urgency of the situation offered us. Another 2 years later, reacting to the incidents involving the then Vice President Nixon, we moved ahead another step, with the Act of Bogotá, in which we committed ourselves to a major attack on Latin America's social ills. But it was not until 1961, when John F. Kennedy became President, that we faced up to the problem in all its complex and deep-rooted aspects.

On March 13, 1961, in an address to the Latin American ambassadors in the White House, the President proposed "that the American Republics begin on a vast new 10-year plan for the Americas, a plan to transform the 1960's into a historic decade of democratic progress." He called it the Alliance for Progress. August 17, 2 years and a week ago, 19 Latin American republics and the United States signed the Charter of Punta del Este to give birth to the Alliance.

The Alliance represents a totally new approach to U.S. cooperation with our Latin American neighbors. It is not a projection of the bilateral technical assistance programs which were initiated during World War II under the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and continued under point IV. These former activities were programs designed to transmit technical know-how through demonstration projects and training of Latin-American technicians.

The Alliance calls for major development efforts by all the Latin American countries in which national and international financial, technical, and moral resources are committeed to attack the causes of economic underdevelopment, social injustice, and political instability. It is an attempt to change the status quo, and to make change itself the hallmark of a new way of life.

Under the Charter of Punta del Este, the primary responsibility for such basic development is placed on the Latin American countries themselves. Each country has agreed to improve and strengthen democratic institutions through the principles of self-determination of its people, to carry out social and economic reform programs and to accelerate the integration of Latin America, and to provide the bulk—an estimated four-fifths of the total resources required.

IV

The progress achieved during the 2 years since the charter was signed shows more action by the Latin Americans in the enactment of basic reforms than in the preceding half-century. The picture of tax, agrarian, administrative, and other reforms is encouraging. But it is also uneven. Some countries have made giant strides while others have only made superficial efforts. In many cases reform laws have been adopted in good faith, but the countries do not have the trained administrators and specialists to implement them and make them effective.

To help the Latin American governments do this job, we assist them in such areas as national planning, improved revenues collection, and better public administration. To this technical assistance we add development loans under terms which they can afford. But we cannot do the job for them. Only the governments of Latin America can bring about the basic reforms which, soundly conceived and implemented, will ultimately help to make democratic government secure.

Unfortunately, the history of Latin America is full of unhappy experiences with corrupt and irresponsible government, which have bred disillusionment and cynicism among the people, and especially the youth. Lack of confidence in their government has made it doubly difficult for Latin Americans to modernize. In less than 2 years, the Alliance could not possibly reverse the trend which has such deep historical roots. But a beginning has been made.

In the 2 years since Punta del Este planning for development has got underway in every member country of the Alliance. Seven countries have submitted blueprints for marshaling their internal resources and effectively utilizing external assistance.

In 11 Latin American countries, tax reforms are underway. In many cases, income and property taxes are being applied for the first time in a country's history. We have made it a policy to work with Latin American governments in generating internal sources of financing for government programs rather than seek from us nonproductive budget support.

In this context an agreement between our Agency for International Development and the Internal Revenue Service warrants special mention. The IRS is undertaking not only to train Latin American officials here but also to provide technical assistance on the spot in improving tax administration. Cooperation between AID and IRS has already achieved some notable results. Tax administrators from Chile who were trained by the IRS were instrumental in increasing that country's revenues under existing laws and in bringing two tax evaders to justice—the first such cases in Chile's history.

In the last 2 years, landholding problems have received more attention than at any time since the wars of independence of Latin America. Prior to the signing of the Alliance Charter, only Mexico, Bolivia, and Venezuela had basic agrarian reform legislation. Since its signing, five more countries have adopted laws and started on land redistribution schemes. Five other countries are now studying the most effective and appropriate method to raise both productivity and living standards on the land. We do not look on land reform as the splitting up of large estates and the distribution of the land to peasants per se. We see it as a complex problem. Aside from changes in landholding patterns—and these need not necessarily be changed in every case—adequate and supervised credit, marketing facilities, technical assistance and many other elements go into the development of a healthy agricultural economy which can produce abundant food for fast growing populations.

Perhaps the most fundamental series of reforms carried out in Latin America during the past 2 years has been in education. The Latin American countries have substantially increased their budget allocations to education and have taken other significant stages to develop their most valuable resource: people.

All of the hemisphere's resources could be poured into primary education without coming to grips with its need for qualified engineers, economists, professionals, and technicians needed to staff government and industry, to draft and execute national plans and to develop a productive agriculture. Latin America has an estimated 50,000 engineers and technicians in a population larger than our own, while we have over a million and feel we suffer from a shortage.

In husbanding national and inter-American resources for education under the Alliance, we are seeking a balance between primary and higher education. In the first 2 years of the Alliance, more than 8,000 new classrooms have been built—and teachers trained to use them. Nearly 4 million textbooks have been distributed—often the first books of their kind ever received by the children. We are supporting technical training programs for workers in a score of countries, ranging from apprenticeship in El Salvador and industrial training in Chile to vocational education in Brazil and Ecuador. Some 40 major U.S. universities are working with 60 institutions in Latin America to help prepare the future professional, technical, administrative, academic and political leadership of Latin America.

V

Basic reforms and sound public administration of those reforms are essential building blocks of the Alliance. But the success of the Alliance will depend not only on governmental action but also on involving the people of Latin America directly and intimately in the development process.

Within the AID program, special efforts are being made to this end. Individual projects in community development are underway in many countries to make the people themselves protagonists in social, economic, and political development. In Central America and Panama, the rural mobile health project combines minimum medical care for 600 villages with community development efforts. The health teams, made up of local personnel, traveling by jeep, boat, and muleback, collect a nominal and voluntary fee of 25 to 50 cents for treatment and cost of medicine; the fees collected are turned over to committees in each community which invests these fees in community projects of the villagers' choice. The possibilities for involving the people in their own development under such a project is unlimited, and the response of the people so far has been most encouraging.

On a hemispherewide basis, AID has also set in motion programs which harness the resources of U.S. private enterprise, the

leading U.S. unions, cooperatives and voluntary agencies to work on a people-to-people basis.

The Alliance cannot succeed without a healthy and vigorous private sector in Latin America. This is so, not for reasons of verbal convention, but because our economies prove the point pragmatically. An effective market economy must be created, and preserved, and the forces of individual initiative allowed to play their creative role in Latin America as they have in Europe, North America and Japan. Thus, Latin American business must feel that it has a stake in the Alliance.

U.S. investment has not moved into Latin America of late at the rate at which it is needed. But things are not as bad as some have recently suggested. U.S. firms and investments are already playing a role in the development programs of the Alliance, especially in the key area of manufacturing. But we are not satisfied. AID has developed a number of programs to assist the private sector to play its due role in the development effort. These include direct loans; loans to intermediate, credit institutions; investment guarantees and proposed tax credits on investments in developing countries. Particularly promising are joint ventures of U.S. companies with local businessmen.

Such joint ventures can be mutually advantageous to the business partners themselves, as well as helpful in knitting closer ties among the individuals working together in such firms.

On the labor side, the AFL-CIO has lent its support through the Labor Advisory Committee for the Alliance for Progress. Under its guidance, AID has contracted with the American Institute for Free Labor Development to carry out a hemispherwide effort to combine United States and Latin American union resources in training democratic union leaders and in developing social projects needed by workers to raise their living standards. In little more than a year of operations, the Institute has helped establish labor leader training centers in four countries as well as a regional training center in Washington; it is now setting up centers in seven other countries. In the social projects area, the Institute is working with unions in a score of countries on housing, cooperative, and other activities.

Another area of people-to-people action is in the field of cooperatives. In collaboration with the Credit Union National Association, a center for training credit union technicians is being set up in Peru and will be working with groups in 16 countries to develop credit unions which will provide the common people of Latin America with the means to save and to borrow at reasonable rates. In cooperation with the National Farmers Union, a people-to-people exchange of 75 farm leaders from 6 Latin American countries has been started to provide agricultural and cooperative leadership training.

One program that has given us particular satisfaction and that has opened up a whole new field for people-to-people participation in the Alliance is the association formed between this State and Chile. As you know, your State government and leaders in key sectors of California's economic life—especially in agriculture—are doing pioneering work today. They are exploring the possibility of making the accumulated experience and the research and development resources of California available to Chile, which is confronted with problems and opportunities of geography, soil, and climate similar to those that California faced long ago and has solved so successfully. There are also some special historical ties between these two west coast frontier regions—going back all the way to California gold rush days when Chileans came north to this State to work as miners and settle here.

Success in these California-Chile ventures would undoubtedly lead to other such associations between States or regions of the United States and our Latin American sister republics under the Alliance. It would be another large field for people-to-people action—for the involvement of individuals in this country and in the Latin American countries in a program that must be rooted in understanding and cooperation among our peoples and not just in agreements of governments if it is to have lasting effects.

VI

Today, 2 years after the signing of the Alliance Charter, it is safe to say that the Alliance has grown roots. Throughout Latin America, the housing projects, hospitals, water systems, and schools that have been built under its banner are tangible evidence that it has got underway. More importantly, the Alliance has made its impact on political, economic, and social discussion and conduct in the hemisphere.

Elections have been held where, without the influence of Alliance objectives and charter principles, they might not have been held. Constitutional governments are more secure from coups d'etat today—though far from inviolate as yet—because the subtle pressure of the Alliance Charter and of the policies it imposes on all its signers is making would-be strongmen think twice before they roll their tanks up to the presidential palace. And even where unconstitutional changes have occurred, the new rulers are likely to pledge new elections and support for economic and social reform when in the not-distant past they could not have cared less.

Gentlemen, this represents the real progress that the Alliance has made. Men and women in Latin America today are arguing about policies and programs when in the past they dismissed such subjects as political responsibility, economic growth, and social reform as ivory tower debates.

Our free system of life and government precludes the imposition of social and economic change from above. We have to act within the framework of consent, of change through acceptance rather than fiat. This is a long-term process. But not as long as to be endless. I believe that by 1970 much of Latin America will be sustaining its own growth, equipped with the institutions and human resources to transform itself into a modern society.

But the job will by no means be finished by 1970. The political, economic, and social transformation of a continent is not accomplished overnight. What we must seek to provide rapidly is evidence of progress which can sustain the hopes of the people and thus provide the opportunity to complete the long-term task.

The impatience with which some of us view the realization of this program is sometimes inspired by an excessive sense of panic, or by unrealistic expectations of what is possible even in the best circumstances. On the other hand, impatience designed to keep up the pressure is healthy and welcome. Working with the dedication that people connected with this program have displayed in the first 2 years, I am confident that we shall accomplish what we set out to do.

Thank you.

Dr. Gershon Rosenstock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 7, 1963, the Congregation Beth Jacob of Scottsdale, Ill., will officially welcome its new spiritual leader, Dr. Gershon Rosenstock, and his wife.

Dr. Rosenstock comes to Scottsdale with humility, with love in his heart for mankind, and with the utmost devotion to the tasks he has set for himself.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I consider it entirely fitting to submit for the RECORD, a review of Dr. Rosenstock's experiences and background, as follows:

DR. ROSENSTOCK'S ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL CAREER

Dr. Rosenstock graduated with magna cum laude from Yeshiva University in 1941.

He was recipient of the Manischewitz Philosophy Award. In 1945 Dr. Rosenstock graduated from the Jewish Theological Seminary and received its highest honor, the Talmud Award.

On graduation, Dr. Rosenstock was elected to the largest conservative pulpit in the United States, Shaare Zedek, in Detroit, Mich. He served briefly with the Hilel Foundation at Ann Arbor, Mich., at the University of Michigan. In 1948 he took a leave of absence to study at Columbia for a doctorate in philosophy. From 1951 to 1957, Dr. Rosenstock was rabbi of the oldest conservative synagogue in Buffalo, N.Y., Temple Beth El. While in Buffalo he served as president of the Buffalo Board of Rabbis, as chairman of the Zionist Council, as chairman of the Faith of Israel TV program. From 1958 to 1959 he again took a leave of absence to receive the doctorate in philosophy at Columbia University.

Dr. Rosenstock came to Chicago in 1959 and reorganized Congregation Shomrehadas, where he served at rabbi part time and also taught philosophy at Indiana University.

Dr. Rosenstock has completed a book entitled "Constructive Mind," soon to be published by the Southern Illinois University Press.

Portrait of Pittsburgh—A Good Place To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh area enjoys the advantage of having progressive-minded citizens intent upon fostering the continued commercial expansion of the region. The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh has prepared an interesting, up-to-date brochure describing the basic facts about the economy, trade, and resources of the Pittsburgh area. In order that my colleagues may know more about the wonderful commercial opportunities existing in southwestern Pennsylvania, I wish to include, as the seventh of a series, the following portion of the "Portrait of Pittsburgh":

PORTRAIT OF PITTSBURGH—A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE

In its 205-year lifetime, Pittsburgh has developed rich cultural centers and top-notch entertainment facilities.

Newest symbol of the Renaissance City is the $22 million Civic Auditorium in the Lower Hill area. Under the world's largest retractable dome are facilities for hockey, basketball, boxing, wrestling, civic light opera presentations, circuses, rodeos, conventions, and trade shows. Already the arena

has drawn record crowds to see such headliners as Judy Garland, Carole Burnette, Jerry Lewis, Harry Belafonte, and a score of others.

Other plans for the Lower Hill redevelopment call for a new symphony hall, museum, motor hotel and high rise apartments.

CULTURE

Pittsburgh offers residents and visitors one of the finest libraries in the Nation; a world famous symphony orchestra, opera, legitimate, community, and summer stock theaters.

Carnegie Museum, Music Hall, and Art Institute in Oakland represent a matchless cultural triumvirate. The Carnegie Museum has many fascinating collections including the most famous single dinosaur skeleton in the world. Carnegie Music Hall features organ recitals, travel lectures, classical ballet, and other musical productions. The art institute, draws nearly 1 million visitors a year to view its outstanding paintings, prints, sculpture and other collectors items.

In addition, Pittsburgh is the home of the American Wind Symphony Orchestra which performs from a barge moored at the Point. The wind symphony has regular concerts in June and July before making its annual tour down to New Orleans.

SCIENCE AND NATURE

Also unique to Pittsburgh is the largest underground zoo in the world. Located in Highland Park between the main zoo and the children's zoo, this newest addition features a variety of animals noted for their nocturnal or burrowing habits. They include a pangolin, aardvark, kinkajou, porcupine, blind fish cave, beaver lodge, and mushroom display. There are 16 exhibits in all. Featuring many innovations in zoo design, the subterranean cavern has brought zoo officials from zoos all around the Nation.

For science and nature lovers, there is Phipps Conservatory, a tropical garden and outstanding orchid collection; the Aviary Conservatory, a tropical forest under glass with exotic birds; the Allegheny Observatory, a must for telescope peerers; and Buhl Planetarium featuring sky shows and scientific exhibits.

SPORTS

Ever since Pittsburgh hosted the first world series in 1903, the city has earned the distinction of one of the Nation's greatest sports centers. For hometown and visitor enjoyment alike, Pittsburgh offers professional baseball, football, and hockey; and topnotch intercollegiate competition in baseball, basketball, football, track, and gymnastics.

In the area of participating sports, Pittsburgh has much to offer. Allegheny County, of which Pittsburgh is the seat, has the second largest number of golf courses of any county in the Nation. Hunting and fishing are available in nearby lakes and forests. Winter sports enthusiasts have four well-equipped skiing centers within a half-hour drive of the city.

Federal Communications Commission Increasing Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the editors of the Wall Street Journal have penned an appropriate editorial admonition to the Federal Communications Commission in an editorial entitled "Regulation by Fear," as printed in the August 19, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal. In recent months, Mr. President, more and more broadcasters have been expressing to me concern about increased regulation and control which is being exerted on them, both directly and indirectly, by the Federal Communications Commission. In view of the important responsibilities which Congress has in overseeing the functions and activities of the Federal Communications Commission, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so it will be made available to all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 19, 1963]

REGULATION BY FEAR

A lot of Americans would perhaps agree with the Federal Communications Commission when it criticizes television networks for not devoting more time to important domestic issues. Certainly the camera's eye only fleetingly focuses on such questions as big government, big business and big labor.

Ironically, however, the FCC's own power is one of the factors inhibiting creativity and controversy on TV. And the same kind of inhibition is found in other industries regulated by other Government bureaus.

Like all such agencies, the FCC is limited by law in its authority to control. But when a regulatory body is told by Congress to operate on a standard so vague as "the public interest," then the arbitrary power placed in its hands is bound to be enormous. The fear it induces is as effective in controlling an industry as the specific rules and laws which the agency administers.

Apprehension about this state of affairs is increasingly voiced by some of the men closest to the control problem. As TV Guide quotes Chairman HARRIS of the House Commerce Committee, which oversees the FCC: The broadcasters "know that the people who control them can hurt them and hurt them badly. * * * When anybody is in a position to cut your jugular vein * * * well, naturally, it causes concern." Even the FCC's Chairman Henry concedes: "The broadcasters are afraid of Government and economic sanction. They're afraid of reprisals and loss of profits."

It's easy to find the same forces at work throughout Washington. A striking example, in an industry which theoretically is not regulated, was the President's explicit use of fear in forcing the steelmakers to revoke their price increases last year.

Then there are the innumerable management decisions which are heavily influenced by the very existence of a Government regulatory agency. Aware that merger applications in the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board take as long as 2 years before they are acted upon, many railroad and airline managements fail to apply for merger permission even when economic sense dictates such a course.

Again, how many companies have signed labor agreements which they believed were not in their best interest or that of their employees because of pressure from the Government and the sometimes not too subtle threat of legislation which might result in a still worse contract?

The listing could go on and on. All in all, it smacks of a mode of governance not unusual in some other parts of the world. We would have thought Congress would make sure that, in this country, no one need fear regulation by fear.

Peace Corps Volunteers in Asia With Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the Peace Corps Volunteers in Asia have collectively been named to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding.

The Peace Corps Volunteers are the first nonresident Westerners to receive this honor. The award was given them "for their contribution to work among people and service to the cause of peace and humanity in a direct and personal way."

Commenting editorially on the award, the Manila Evening News said:

With few tools to work with besides dedication, Peace Corps Volunteers in 11 Asian nations lived in backward communities, sharing the people's woes, offering counsel, to combat the age-old problems of want and illiteracy, and through it all providing an example of that simple human comradeship that strikes down prejudices and brings people together.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud, as all Americans should be, of this recognition of the good work being done by our Peace Corps Volunteers. The Magsaysay Award joins the growing number of tributes being accorded Peace Corps activities around the world. Barely 2 years old, the program has already proved itself one of our Nation's best contributions to world development and understanding.

Its future is as bright as the faces of the young men and women volunteers.

I include a Peace Corps press release on the Ramon Magsaysay Award and a background information sheet on Peace Corps activities in Asia:

Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver has accepted an invitation to go to Manila August 31 to receive the Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding on behalf of Peace Corps Volunteers in 11 Asian nations.

President Macapagal, of the Philippines Republic, will present the award to Mr. Shriver in ceremonies to be held in Manila, Saturday evening, August 31.

"The Magsaysay Award is the finest tribute Peace Corps Volunteers have received," Shriver said. "They are the first group of Americans to receive the award. We are deeply gratified and very pleased."

Established in 1958 to honor the late President of the Philippines, the Magsaysay Award recognizes persons in Asia who "exemplify his greatness in spirit, integrity, and devotion to liberty." It has been termed Asia's equivalent to the Nobel Prize.

The 1963 award was given to the volunteers "for their contribution to work among people and service to the cause of peace and humanity in a direct and personal way."

In commenting editorially on the awards, the Manila Evening News said: "In 22 months of quiet and sometimes painful, often discouraging labor, Peace Corps Volunteers who came to this part of the world

have secured a verdict not before vouchsafed to any other foreign group. * * * What millions of dollars in machinery and foodstuff and other material gifts had failed to accomplish, the Peace Corps workers achieved in less than 2 years—an understanding with Asian peoples that promises to pass all tests."

The Philippines Herald termed the award "a signal honor, for the award, normally for Asians, is being conferred this time on persons who, while not of the region, have contributed to the cause of peace and understanding in this area. That the honor is most deserved, everyone will heartily agree."

Volunteers serving in Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Nepal, Ceylon, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaya, North Borneo, Sarawak, and the Philippines were cited by the award foundation. The foundation also commended the work of volunteers serving in the Near East, Africa, and Latin America.

Presently there are about 2,000 Peace Corps volunteers serving or in training to serve in Asia. Worldwide, there are 6,657 volunteers currently overseas or in training. They are serving in 47 different nations, all over the world.

In its award citation the Magsaysay Foundation said of the volunteers: "The problem of achieving peace amidst the tentions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

The award carries with it a cash prize of $10,000. Like the Nobel Prize, there are several categories of the Magsaysay Award: International understanding, government service, public service, community leadership, literature and journalism.

Past award winners have included the Dalai Lama, Malayan Prime Minister Abdul Rahman, Thai civic leader Nilawan Pintong, Indonesian public health physician Raden Kodijat, Burmese social worker Daw Tee Luce, British missionary doctor Sir Henry Tristram Holland, Indonesian labor leader Koesna Poeradiredja and Mother Teresa, founder of the Missionaries of Charity in India.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE PEACE CORPS IN ASIA

The Peace Corps presently has 1,262 volunteers at work in Asia, with another 604 candidates in training for service there.

Volunteers are working in five southeast Asian countries. They range from the Philippines, where there are more than 450 volunteers in the organiaztion's single largest program, to Indonesia, where 17 regional physical education instructors are working in one of the smallest and newest projects. They include also Malaya, Thailand, North Borneo, and Sarawak.

Teaching is the major activity among the more than 900 volunteers assigned to this sweeping area. Some volunteers teach at important universities and colleges. But most work in secondary and elementary schools in rural regions. A small number are in physical education. And a growing number are in community development, 4-H, agriculture, and health programs.

In the Near East and South Asia, volunteers, cited by the Magsaysay Foundation are working in Afghanistan, Ceylon, Nepal, Pakistan, and India.

The Peace Corps' activity in this region increased six fold during the agency's second year of existence. As one example: on June 30, 1962, there were 83 volunteers at work in India and Pakistan. Today 287 volunteers are serving in those two countries.

Again, one major field of endeavor is education. Nearly half of the volunteers here are involved in it, in one way or another. Other work includes community development, public works, health, and agricultural extension.

Here is a country-to-country rundown of Peace Corps work in the 11 Asian nations cited by the Magsaysay Foundation:

Afghanistan: The first nine volunteers arrived here in September 1962, making up the smallest Peace Corps group overseas. They included five English teachers, three nurses, and an automobile mechanic. Since then they have been joined by 26 more volunteers, 19 of them secondary school teachers and 7 printers.

Ceylon: Thirty-six volunteers have been at work here since September, 1962 in 20 teachers colleges and secondary schools, where they are participating in Ceylon's campaign to improve its educational system and extend the curriculum into scientific and technological fields. They are teaching science, health, physical education, and home economics.

Indonesia: When 17 Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Indonesia last May they were greeted by a Communist Yankee-go-home demonstration, but also by some reassuring words of welcome from top national leaders.

Known there as "Sukarelawan Pembangunan" (Volunteers for Development) the group of 15 men and 2 women are working as athletic instructors in the islands of Java, Sumatra and Sulawesi.

Malaya: Of the 169 volunteers here, 90 are teachers at all levels from elementary to university, 53 are health workers and others serve as architects in charge of school construction, heavy equipment operators and surveyors engaged in road construction, foresters and soil analysts.

The health workers include two doctors as well as nurses and laboratory technicians who work in district hospitals, rural health centers, in leprosaria, in yaws and tuberculosis control programs and in maternal and infant care. Peace Corps nurses treat as many as 1,200 patients and have given inoculations to many thousands more.

North Borneo/Sarawak: After almost a year of operation in these last two British colonies on the vast island of Borneo, the Peace Corps has 91 volunteers spread out across the two regions which stretch along almost 800 miles of the island. About half are secondary and primary school teachers. Others are nurses, lab technicians, social workers, malaria control specialists, 4-H organizers, specialists in truck farming, pig raising, and veterinary work. Peace Corps surveyors are leading work parties plotting roads that will open up trackless jungle areas.

Inlia: India's size and complexity present the 115 volunteers there with a formidable challenge. The population of 440 million is more than four times that of any other country served by the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps' first project there was in the Punjab in the fields of agricultural extension, rural housing, town planning, farm machinery production, small business improvement and youth work. Since then, additional volunteers have become university teachers. Volunteers now work in five different Indian states.

Nepal: The majority of the volunteers here—51 out of 65—are teachers in secondary schools and colleges. Twelve others are in agricultural extension work. These volunteers are teaching about 3,000 Nepalese. The agricultural extension workers have vastly increased egg production at experimental farms and have launched chicken raising projects.

Pakistan: The Peace Corps in Pakistan has expanded in the past year from 57 volunteers to 117 now working there. Fighting such natural hazards as drought, typhoon, and flood, they have made considerable progress throughout the country. They are working in such diverse fields as gardening, education, and flood control and irrigation, in many cases with the local villages themselves. In the Ganges-Kobadak region, PCV's work hand in hand with the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization.

Philippines: A Peace Corps program rich in people-to-people contacts has evolved in this nation. There are 474 volunteers currently serving in the Philippines in a program designed to improve the quality of Philippine education. Most are serving in rural elementary schools. Others are in high schools, normal schools, and colleges. They are helping teach English, science, math, and community education.

Thailand: In mid-1963 about three-quarters of the Peace Corps' 227 volunteers in Thailand were in education. A small group was teaching advanced subjects at universities in Bangkok. Some were instructing at trade and agriculture schools. A dozen physical education instructors were spread around the country. The bulk of the volunteers were teaching English in secondary schools and teacher colleges far out in the remotest provinces.

Handouts Lead to Moral Decay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest crime of the social planners and the welfare state advocates is the moral decay they foist upon the people. People once too proud to beg, now think nothing of accepting Government charity at the expense of their neighbors. The initiative created by the struggle for reward has been killed because man need not work to eat, he can loaf and the Government will pay him to do it. There is a sickness in the land and the sickness, fostered by socialist thinking, may be fatal to free men.

The following column by Paul Harvey in the August 24 issue of Human Events points out what is happening and why:

CAUTION: MEN NOT WORKING

(By Paul Harvey)

Most people are not natural-born moochers. Most people have too much pride to stand on a street corner and beg something for nothing from the passersby.

Yet these same proud Americans are perfectly willing to take money from their neighbors if a Government agent picks the pockets of the passersby. They'll even allow the Government agent to keep a commission for himself.

What Khrushchev now decries as parasitism, Americans have adopted as a way of life. life.

Our welfare state continues to penalize the industrious in order to prosper the indigent. Pay without work is altogether as unfair as work without pay, and even more demoralizing.

Rarely have the help-wanted ads been more numerous. In our big city dailies there are pages and pages of jobs looking for people.

Service industries find it increasingly difficult to get and keep capable employees. Many are insubordinate, even rude. "Fire me," they say. "Then I can collect unemployment pay."

In this most prosperous peacetime in our Nation's history, when more workers are working than ever before and more indus-

tries are crying for capable personnel * * * there are still 4.8 million unemployed.

Who are these persons getting paid for doing nothing when jobs are going begging?

Some are doubtless displaced by automation. But of the 4.8 million out of work, 2 million are teenagers. Another third of a million have less than 5 years of schooling.

Labor Secretary Wirtz says, "You can't teach these job skills until you teach them to read."

Secretary Wirtz' answer to this dilemma is a bigger Government aid program. He says the manpower development and training program which Congress launched last year is not enough. It is "not reaching the least educated group."

So he wants Government to teach "basic education and work skills" to those who are presently unemployable. Now it'll be unemployment pay plus free tuition.

What ever happened to the old bootstrap concept which made our Nation the powerhouse of this planet?

Nuclear Test Ban Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article and an editorial having to do with the proposed Moscow test ban treaty. The article is an AP article from Moscow, which was published in the San Diego Union of San Diego, Calif., on August 22, 1963. It is entitled "Russia Says A-Pact Helps Communism." The editorial is from the Midweek edition of the Worker, the official publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A. It is entitled "How To Win the Test Ban."

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 22, 1963]

RUSSIA SAYS A-PACT HELPS COMMUNISM

MOSCOW.—Russia told Communist China yesterday the limited nuclear test ban is a gain for communism because it would perpetuate the liquidation of the one-time American nuclear monopoly, and freeze each side's atomic power.

A 20,000-word official government statement derided Red Chinese charges that signing of the treaty marked a Soviet "capitulation" to the United States as the words of "simpletons." It told the Chinese they would do well to improve their economic situation and forget about nuclear weapons.

PACT VICTORY

It asserted the treaty was "a victory of the peace loving forces"—that is, the Soviet Union.

For the first time, the Kremlin admitted that it had followed a zig-zag policy—the statement called it "nonfossilized, flexible and realistic"—on banning tests according to particular Soviet nuclear needs at any given moment.

The statement, in reply to last Thursday's attack on Russian policy by Peiping said that for years it would have been against Soviet interests to have a test ban unless the United States agreed to destroy all its nuclear weapons. This, of course, the United States refused to do.

CHANGE NOTED

But now, it added, "with the new balance of strength, the nuclear test ban would perpetuate not the American nuclear monopoly, but the fact of its liquidation; not the unilatteral advantage of the imperialist camp but the new balance of strength in the area of nuclear weapons."

[From the Worker, Aug. 20, 1963]

HOW TO WIN THE TEST BAN

There is just one way to answer the sabotage of the test ban treaty by the ultras, like Senators STROM THURMOND and BARRY GOLDWATER, and the more subtle adventurers like Senator HENRY JACKSON. That is, to resist every attempt on their part to stall ratification.

In a struggle against the ultras the administration can have the passionate support of the overwhelming majority of the American people who are interested in preserving their own lives and the rest of the human race. The Thurmonds and Goldwaters represent only a fanatical minority which has lost contact with the human condition, and clutches to its bosom the crusade of anticommunism and world domination that led so many millions of Germans and their nation to disaster.

Administration spokesmen, however, have made it appear as though their main job is to prove to the ultras that we are not really committed to the road of peace, that the Nation must meet them halfway in their opposition to the treaty. This is a fatal course.

The New York Times put it plainly in an editorial on Sunday. Obviously referring to the testimony of Robert McNamara, Defense Secretary, and of Pentagon spokesmen, the Times cautioned the administration that the test ban objective, peace, "should not be obscured by all the stress administration witnesses are putting on the vastness of our atomic arsenal and on how much more progress in weaponry we expect to make through legal underground tests."

The Times correctly calls on the administration to pursue the course of easing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union which the President expressed in his American University speech.

The carping of the Thurmonds and the Goldwaters and the Jacksons, the Times suggests, is a concern for "unattainable perfection." Nothing could be further from the truth. These men want no treaty, perfect or otherwise, they want no easing of tensions, they fear the treaty as the beginning of the end of the cold war. They would destroy the Socialist way of life that other nations have chosen and, to these evil ends, they are ready to sacrifice our Nation and our people.

What purpose did the U.S. commandant in Berlin think he was serving when he participated on Saturday in laying a wreath on the Berlin wall for a youth who had been shot a year ago at the wall. Did Maj. Gen. Jame H. Polk have America and its people in mind or was he abetting the neo-Nazis who had enticed the youth to attempt to get into West Berlin?

And when will Congress force the CIA to tell what it is doing in the Caribbean? The CIA considers itself a power above the Congress, above the administration of which it is a part. The CIA believes it can carry on warfare without accounting to anyone.

How, other than insane, can one describe an institution that encourages, arms, trains for murder, Cuban refugees, and sends them to the island?

How should one estimate the granting of nuclear warheads to Canada, and the renewal of underground nuclear tests in Nevada?

Will our nuclear warheads in Canada make it easier to destroy the Soviet Union, or will they insure the destruction of Canada also, in the case of an atomic war? What great contribution shall the underground tests add to our overkill potential which is sufficient to destroy all life on earth several times over?

Bringing the threat of nuclear devastation to Canada may encourage the manufacturers of nuclear weapons, and the Nevada tests may bring a thrill to the Thurmonds and Goldwaters, but it is not the road to peace.

The first step to easing tension, everyone agrees, has been taken in the test ban treaty. The task now is for the Senate to ratify the treaty, and for the administration and the people to prepare our proposals for the next steps along that road.

But such an outlook requires unremitting struggle against the ultras, in the Senate and in the Pentagon, and against any other demented war lovers.

Crime in Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the August 24 issue of the Dallas Morning News, depicting one of the most shameful episodes in the history of the United States.

Under the policies of President Kennedy which protect a bloody-handed dictator, American forces stood by and watched Castro troops seize Cuban refugees seeking freedom. Only through a change in our national leadership can we erase this stain upon our national honor and make America once again the champion of freedom instead of the protector of Communist dictators:

CRIME IN SILENCE

Britain finally has protested one of the strangest international incidents on record—the Cuban invasion of its waters and territory in the Bahamas August 13. On that day, two Russian-built Cuban PT boats and a helicopter landed troops on the British islet of Anguila Cay and captured 19 anti-Castro refugees.

It is no surprise that the British have protested the incident and demanded release of these prisoners; it was a clear violation of international law. What is strange is that it took more than a week for the protest to come.

Perhaps the explanation is that the British themselves were not witnesses to the invasion and capture. And, for some strange reason, they were not notified about it until several hours after the raid was over and Castro's bullies had carted their prisoners away.

Witnessing the entire episode were several U.S. war planes which photographed the raid and capture for 2 full hours. These photos may prove useful in documenting the aggression, but why did our forces fail to intervene?

They had every right to do so. There was no question that Castro's forces had violated British waters. President Kennedy had said time and again that Cuba would not be permitted to commit aggression outside of its own tight little island.

Yet our forces stood by watching the slaughter, taking photographs and not even notifying the British of what was going on in their territory. One exile leader in Miami, commenting on the incident, had this to say: "Castro's ships received more air cover

(from the United States) than the Cuban freedom fighters did at the Bay of Pigs."

This incident becomes stranger when you consider the attitude which the Preesident and the State Department have taken toward anti-Castro forces in the past.

Several months ago it was decreed in Washington that we could not allow these groups to operate in the Caribbean. Their sneak attacks on Cuba and their sabotage of Cuban and Russian ships were declared to be violations of international law. The United States asked Britain, at the time, to help sweep Cuban freedom fighters out of the Bahama keys.

Britain complied with this request and managed to round up a handful of raiders. In fact, the British recently decorated an officer and an enlisted man for their roles in capturing nine armed freedom fighters on Andros Island April 16.

How ironic. It has become a matter of policy to hinder in every way possible the activities of the only group of people doing something tangible to undermine the Cuban Communist regime. But when Castro's forces invade an island and capture a group of anti-Communists, the only shots fired on our side come from a battery of cameras.

Before the turn of the century, one of Cuba's leading patriots in its war for independence from Spain, Jose Julian Marti, remarked: "To witness a crime in silence is to commit it."

Syria's Harrassment of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the foreign aid bill, we heard a most interesting analysis of America's present position in the Near East. It was prepared by the Department of State. I quote from it:

> The United States has become the most influential outside power in the Near East, now able to exert a more useful although still limited degree of influence on a wide variety of issues important to the free world than at any time heretofore.

Now this is a very reassuring statement. It is meant to placate the worriers among us and quiet the critics among us. It is meant to soothe those of us who protest when our allies in Israel and other Arab States are threatened by aggressive neighbors.

For instance, defenders of continued massive aid to Egypt will say that by exercising influence over Nasser's economy, we exercise control over his ambitions.

It will be claimed that American wheat—millions of tons of it—cushions the diplomatic channels between our Embassy in Cairo and the Egyptian Government. It will be contended that our aid was a major factor in bringing Egyptian troops home from the long and bloody little war in Yemen.

Well, I contend that our aid contributed to Nasser's ability to stay in that war for so long. It has indirectly helped him to amass an arsenal of more and more sophisticated weapons, by freeing part of his economy for the purchase of Russian arms. Just last month, we saw a day-long parade of that arsenal through the streets of Cairo. The crowds cheered; the bands played; the Migs thundered overhead. The Egyptians took that parade very seriously; I do not see why we should not.

And let us take a closer look at that triumphant return of Nasser's troops from Yemen. Thousands of Egyptian soldiers, having fought long and hard against Royalist guerrillas, sail into Alexandria. Does their leader promise them rest, peace, security? No. With one hand he signs the nuclear test ban treaty and with the other, he directs his battle-weary army to the cherished goal of—and I quote—"liberating Palestine." And to me, that means annihilating Israel.

I was glad to see that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in its report on the foreign aid bill, was not too much soothed by the State Department's confidence. The committee stated:

> Consideration should be given to the withholding of economic assistance from those countries which persist in policies of belligerence and in preparations for their execution, and to entering into security guarantees with those nations that would be willing to make appropriate commitments for promoting peace and stability in the area.

If Nasser's speech to his Yemen veterans is not just another myth manufactured by Cairo radio, then I define Egypt as a nation which has "persisted in policies of belligerence."

At this very moment, the Security Council is deliberating Israel's complaint that her borders have been repeatedly violated by Syrian soldiers and aircraft since last December. Two of Israel's young pioneers have been killed at their work.

Why does this Syria choose this moment to inflame her borders with Israel? Because she is in trouble with Arab public opinion. She is under attack by Cairo's propaganda machine, one of the most destructive weapons in the Near East. Syria, like other Arab nations, has come to believe that she can use the Israel conflict to cover her sins at home and to protect herself from Arab enmity, without fear of action by Israel's Western allies.

We should keep in mind that Baathist Syria is quite different from the Syria we have known in recent years. It used to be the case that rebellious soldiers and opposing politicians were exiled to pleasant diplomatic posts abroad. Now, they are shot.

In Morocco, dissident voices are being systematically choked by the Government. Many of these voices are directed by Cairo. They attempt to subvert, infiltrate, undermine. They have their counterparts throughout the Near East—in Jordan, where they exploit the Palestinians; in Iran, where some months ago they exploited a national religious observance to instigate bloody riots.

Nasser does not limit totalitarianism to Egypt. He encourages it in other countries by forcing governments to protect themselves against Nasser with Nasser's own methods.

Algeria's leader—and I use the singular, Mr. Speaker, because now Ben Bella stands alone—shrouds his purge of old revolutionary friends by blaming Israel for a plot against his régimé. He too feels free to beat the whipping-boy of the Arab East. As his imitation of Nasser grows more and more unmistakable, this recipient of enormous American aid declares his "policy of belligerence" toward Israel.

I have heard reports recently that France will turn over some atomic testing facilities to Algeria, who will in turn lend them to Egypt. Egypt does not plan to test firecrackers, Mr. Speaker. Nasser plans to do exactly what he says he will do—liberate Palestine—and unless we stop him, he may give it a try and thus catapult the entire world into a disastrous conflict.

Supposedly, we seek to acquire influence in these countries in order to protect the interests of democracy and freedom, and to resist the pressures of the Soviet bloc. I have some doubts about this definition when applied to American Near East policy. It seems to me that the influence we have must be very meager—if it does nothing more than protect blossoming dictatorships from Soviet influence.

I will tell you where I think we have influence. We have influence in Israel. In Israel, men are free to petition their Government, to argue with it as we do in this country. Israel's citizens have the protection of their courts and their laws. What they need now is the protection against Arab aggression which could be afforded by security guarantees from the United States and her Western allies.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced two resolutions on this matter. One calls upon our United Nations delegation to introduce and support a movement calling for direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. The other urges that we undertake a collective defense agreement with Israel. These are the ways to convince Arab leaders that threats of war against Israel must stop, that border harrassment must stop, that war in fact is out of the question.

These are the ways to use our hard-won influence. And if we don't use it, we might as well not brag about it. Because we might as well not have it.

Take the Russian's Word for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram editorially made this sound observation about taking Russia's word:

TAKE THEIR WORD FOR IT

Administration witnesses have stated that American nuclear superiority over the Rus-

sians actually will improve if the proposed test ban treaty is approved.

If this is true, the Russians have deceived themselves—something of a reversal in view of the fact that they normally confine themselves to deceiving the West..

Since these witnesses are willing to accept Russia's signature on a crucial document, perhaps they also will be willing to accept as sincere the Russian belief, just expressed to Peiping, that the test treaty represents a gain for communism because it will help liquidate nuclear advantages once held by the United States.

Teenage Unemployment Linked to Choosiness, Union Regulations, and Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent special report in the August 19, 1963, edition of U.S. News & World Report suggests three reasons for the paradoxical situation that now exists in regard to our teenage unemployment problem. While Government labor statistics indicate extensive unemployment among teenagers, there are still many thousands of jobs appropriate for teenagers that cannot be filled.

First, the report contends that many jobless youths could find work if they were not so choosy about the type of employment they will accept. Despite the high rate of teenage joblessness, openings for unskilled workers are going begging. The article says that teenagers are particularly wary of time-consuming and menial positions, and that they are interested only in jobs with high pay, convenience, and considerable status value.

Second, the article points out that even if a youngster is willing and able to work, union regulations often bar him from getting a job.

Third, labor laws of Federal, State, and local governments often make it difficult for teenagers to fill jobs that are available.

Mr. Speaker, these three obstacles to teenage employment explain a great deal about the paradox of high unemployment among teenagers alongside many unfilled jobs. Because of the importance of this issue to our domestic economic debate under unanimous consent I include this article from the U.S. News & World Report in the RECORD:

SPECIAL REPORT: YOUNG PEOPLE WITHOUT JOBS—HOW REAL IS THE PROBLEM?

(NOTE.—Hordes of idle teenagers unable to find work. Such is the situation portrayed by official statistics. Dig into the trouble, however, and you get a different picture. Many jobs are available. Idleness often is preferred to work considered menial. Unions bar many young workers. So do child labor laws. Here is the story—in actual cases.)

Reported from New York, Washington, Detroit, and San Francisco.

Nearly a million teenagers—about one out of six of those in the Nation's labor force—are looking for work and unable to find it.

That's one out of seven white teenagers; one out of three Negroes.

Yet jobs for the unskilled are going unclaimed from one end of the country to the other. Restaurants and hotels complain of chronic shortages of help. Farmers do, too, in harvest season. Homeowners constantly are forced to do jobs that they would like to hire someone to do. Streets of almost every city are a mess.

Talk to Government officials handling employment problems, to employment agencies, job counselors, businessmen, and others and you quickly find a wide range of explanations for what appears to be a paradox.

In some cases, union rules prevent teenagers from getting jobs. In others, Federal, State, and local laws against child labor are a factor. Minimum wage laws put pressure on employers to hold down on use of unskilled labor. Laws in many communities bar youths from working in excavations or from using power tools—including power lawn mowers.

Parents are singled out for blame by many in the employment field. Says an official of a New York agency:

"Today there is no such thing as telling a youth to get a job this week or else. Instead, parents often tell their children there is no rush to get a job—especially during hot weather. During a hot spell our traffic falls off 75 percent.

"Many teenagers would prefer to 'bum off the old man' rather than take jobs that are considered menial or that require hard physical work."

Another in the job-placement field said: "Today's teenagers are functional illiterates. Even those who complete school lack real training or skills."

CASE HISTORIES

Examples abound to illustrate what is going on.

Recently, several jobs opened up in Washington, D.C., for grounds keepers—cutting grass, weeding, tending bushes and shrubs. Difficulties in filling the jobs are cited by a U.S. Employment Service official:

"A half dozen youths, out of work for months, turned down the job. They told me: 'That's field work. My folks did that down South and I'm not going to do it here.' Instead, they prefer to hang around street corners."

From a job-placement official in New York: "Newspaper ads show the great demand for kitchen and dish-washing help. Many white and Negro youth won't take the jobs. They feel that such work is only fit for Puerto Ricans."

A company in Detroit advertised for 50 salesmen to peddle ice cream from bicycle carts. Up to now, only half the jobs have been filled.

Says an official of the Michigan employment service: "We've got commission jobs—door-to-door selling-running out of our ears. You can't find people to take them."

From the owner of a Washington, D.C., shoe repair shop: "I can't get any help. Nobody wants to be a cobbler. Kids today just want glamour jobs."

A Maryland lumber executive relates his experience in getting two workers to spread gravel in his driveway. "When I went over to pick up the workers, their mother said they weren't around. I asked why, since they had promised to do the job, and she answered: 'The relief check's just come in. Until they drink that up, you won't find them.'"

From the head of an employment agency in New York: "I recently got a job for a young girl as a file clerk at $60 a week. After 3 days she stopped showing up for work. She told me that she had gotten bored with the job."

This example of teenage job attitudes comes from a Los Angeles job agency:

"Not long ago we got a job for a girl as a clerk-typist at $75 a week—$15 a week more than she was making in her previous job. She quit after 3 weeks. The reason she gave us was: "They kept me going from 9 until 5.'"

Says a job expert in New York: "Kids today all want fun jobs—like receptionist—and often turn down jobs that require effort."

TOO FAR TO WALK

This "choosy" attitude about jobs shows up in city after city. One case is cited of the teenager in Chicago who turned down a job because the location required a six-block walk from the subway.

Jobs lacking in "status" often are rejected. A clerk-typist's job, for example, might be passed up. If that same job had the title of "administrative assistant," however, it would be snapped up—even at lower pay.

"Plenty of girls would rather not work than take a routine job," says one job authority, adding: "The trouble is that this attitude doesn't show up in the unemployment statistics that get all the headlines."

MUSIC, MAESTRO, PLEASE

Just the other day a girl walked into a New York employment agency and asked for "a creative job, one with scope." What did she have in mind? Her answer: "I'd like a job suggesting to Leonard Bernstein what music he should play."

A number of employers report difficulty in hiring office help.

"We have trouble employing young girls unless we can show them that there are other young girls on the staff," says one businessman.

In some places, officeworkers specify exactly where they want to work. Says an official in New York: "Young workers used to state a preference for an area—say downtown Manhattan. Now they specify the street and sometimes even the building. Just the other day we were asked to find jobs for two girls in the Pan Am Building. They weren't interested in anything else."

Employers report that many younger workers have definite ideas about how much they should be paid.

For example, take the comment of a job-placement director in New York: "If you offer some girls jobs as typists for $65 a week, they will refuse and say that their friends are making $80. They won't settle for $65, even if it means no job."

Says the head of a west coast job agency: "We get dozens of jobseekers who absolutely refuse to go below a certain salary figure."

Parents often are blamed for teenagers' job attitudes.

A job counselor in San Francisco says: "Parents are overprotective. At the parents' urging, and amazing number of girls who have been working less than a year will quit their jobs to take a 3-month vacation in the summer. And these kids are from middle-class homes, not wealthy families."

Says a specialist in job problems of young workers:

"How can you expect today's youngsters to go out and dig for a job? They have been coddled and sheltered all their life."

Another source of job trouble: Insistence by parents that their children take college-prepartory work rather than business or vocational courses.

"Most parents won't let their children go to a trade school or take a commercial course," says one youth counselor. "But when their children don't make the grade and are not college material, they have no salable skills and training. Even so, these youngsters equate a high school diploma with a white-collar job that pays well. They won't take anything else."

WHEN RULES BAR EMPLOYMENT

As for those youngsters who are willing to work, many are finding out that unions bar them from getting a job.

This experience of a west coast teenager illustrates the problem: "I applied for a job the other day at a warehouse, only to find that you have to belong to the Teamsters Union. No union card, no work. It's a lot of redtape to get a card; you have to know someone who knows someone."

Says a New York job placement official: "Trade union restrictions are a definite bar. Some craft unions confine their apprentice openings to sons, relatives or close friends of members."

A number of businessmen report that "teenagers don't have a chance" when contracts contain union clauses—requiring all hiring to be done through union channels. Others blame unions for pricing young workers out of jobs.

An example of the latter is cited by a Los Angeles businessman: "The meatcutter apprenticeship requires 2 years—at a starting pay of $90 to $100 a week. This is big pay for a boy who doesn't know very much. Employers are forced to hire experienced workers because they can get more output per dollar out of them."

LAWS VERSUS EMPLOYMENT

Work rules set by law—at Federal, State, and local levels—are cited as another obstacle.

Youths under 18 are prohibited from using power tools in most places. Night work is strictly regulated. So are jobs considered to be hazardous—such as working in excavations.

Says an official in the U.S. Employment Service, "These rules keep kids out of jobs. For many school dropouts, all they can do is dig ditches. Laws should be reviewed."

From the head of a Macon, Ga., hardware and farm-equipment-supply firm:

"Before the restrictive Federal laws on child labor, and before the wage-hour law, we had at all times a group of young men who were learning the business. Many were high school boys who worked Saturdays and in summer; others were school dropouts or newly graduated.

"All were paid on the basis of what they were worth, which usually ran 50 percent of regular wages. Now we cannot do this." The head of this firm goes on to say that there is a "great shortage of trained men in the hardware field at all levels."

An so go the reports—throwing new light on the teenage job problem.

Many jobless youths, it turns out, could find work if they were not so choosy about the type of job or the pay. Many others, who really want to work, are bumping into bars set by unions or by labor laws.

That's what the experts say is behind the seeming paradox of heavy unemployment with jobs going begging.

The Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in the current test ban debate on Capitol Hill and in the various news media, too much attention has been given to the so-called political considerations which supposedly make it mandatory that the Senate accede to ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty. It would seem, however, that the crucial factor to be considered is how the treaty will affect our national defense posture. Because, after all, this is and has been the primary deterrent to war.

On August 24, 1963, one of the outstanding newspapers in my district, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., published a column by Messrs. Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, of the Hall Syndicate, giving the disadvantages which the Joint Chiefs of Staff say the Moscow test ban treaty would pose to our defense posture.

The article also presents the advantages which would supposedly accrue to our Military Establishment by ratification of the proposed treaty.

However, Mr. Speaker, the score, as reported by the Allen-Scott column, stands seven to four against our national security and in favor of the military might of the Soviet Union. I notice that the final point given as being favorable to the United States revolves around the fact that we have more nuclear reactors and a greater stockpile of nuclear material than the Soviet Union. There have been recent reports in the news, however, indicating that the United States is willing to close many of our nuclear reactors and to transfer some of our stockpile of nuclear material to some international agency for peaceful purposes. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the recent proposal advanced at Geneva by our negotiators, we offered to make much more of the material available than the Soviet Union in an effort to induce Soviet agreement. So it seems, Mr. Speaker, that the fourth advantage may not turn out to be much of an advantage at all if we proceed with our present plans.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the Allen-Scott column of August 24, 1963, in the RECORD:

DISADVANTAGES ARE DISTURBING

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The military disadvantages of the nuclear test ban treaty to the United States outnumber the advantages seven to four.

That's the disturbing comparison in a terse summation of a position paper of the Joint Chiefs of Staff prepared especially for the Senate committees considering the pact.

This still-unpublished analysis is the basis on which the four top military leaders reached their admittedy tepid approval of this agreement.

Already this study is the core of the struggle over Senate ratification.

It is on the key issues raised by the Joint Chiefs that treaty opponents are insistently demanding specific and unequivocal safeguards and guarantees from President Kennedy.

These demands, rather than the pact itself, have become the real battleground.

Presumably, this highly significant comparison will eventually be made known to the American people. In the meanwhile, this column can authoritatively report the following publishable highlights:

ADVANTAGES TO THE UNITED STATES FROM THE LIMITED NUCLEAR TEST BAN

1. United States has a larger number of nuclear weapons.

2. United States has a wider variety of delivery systems.

3. United States leads in low yield (tactical) weapons technology. However, the United States has virtually no information on the extent of Russian underground testing of such armaments.

4. United States has more nuclear plants and a greater stockpile of nuclear material.

DISADVANTAGES

1. The Soviet has a definite superiority in "high yield (5 to 100 megaton)" weapons.

2. Soviet knows more about the effects of "high yield" weapons.

3. Soviet is further advanced in "high yield" weapons technology.

4. Soviet is considerably ahead of United States in antiballistic missiles.

5. The treaty would enable the Soviet to attain parity with the United States in tactical nuclear weapons.

6. There are strong reasons to believe the Soviet knows more about radar blackout effects that are crucial to the development of antimissile missiles.

7. The treaty bars the testing of nuclear weapons to determine their performance under operational conditions. This is a particularly critical handicap to the United States.

There is a striking similarity between the unpublished position paper of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the main points made by Dr. Edward Teller, "father" of the H-bomb, in his opposition testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

Like the military leaders, the noted scientist stressed that the disadvantages of the pact outnumber the advantages to the United States.

Also like them, he asserted that: Russia is definitely ahead of the United States in the development of antimissile missiles; has a big lead in "high yield" nuclear weapons and technology.

Other important points made by Teller which have not yet been disclosed are:

Tests of low yield (several kilotons) so-called clean nuclear weapons cannot be readily detected.

Little is known about Soviet methods of producing clean nuclear weapons.

Similarly, the United States has little information about Russian underground testing.

Small underground tests cost around $500,000 each. A 10-kiloton (equivalent of 10,000 tons of TNT) test costs around $1 million.

A 100-megaton (equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT) nuclear explosive can weigh as little as 10,000 pounds (5 tons).

Scientists at Kirtland Air Force Base, N. Mex., are working on a "capacitor"—a device that would be used to simulate atmospheric nuclear tests. This extraordinary project is highly experimental and its chances of success very conjectural. However, the scientists expect to gain much valuable information in the process of building the capacitor * * *. The Russian air force is now making daily flights between Cairo and the capital of Yemen. The planes have Egyptian markings, but belong to Russia and are operated by Russian crews. The Soviet also has set up a military academy in Yemen to train officers and noncoms * * *. According to a Peking broadcast, Robert Friend, described as a "professor from the United States," is visiting Red China as guest of the Chinese Peoples Association for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. He was met at the railroad depot by a number of Communist officials and given red-carpet treatment.

Castro Ended Freedom in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, apologists for Communists Castro would like us to

believe that whatever he is he is better than Batista, but they ignore the facts. Without making a brief for the former dictator, there is no doubt that Castro is much worse. Now the people have lost all their freedoms, their country is poverty stricken, they work under conditions akin to slavery, and they are a people without hope.

Those who would perpetuate Castro in power would like us to believe the choice is between this bandit dictator and a return to Batista. This is not true. Batista has no following in Cuba and when the Cubans rid themselves of Castro they will be able to have a government of their own choosing.

The following article written by Ken Thompson in the Dallas Morning News shows the many ways that Castro is worse than Batista:

CUBA: CASTRO WORSE THAN BATISTA

(By Ken Thompson)

Johnny-come-lately liberals who once regarded Fidel Castro as the George Washington of the Caribbean—an emancipator, an agrarian reformer—are now admitting that perhaps they were mistaken. All but the most hardened eggheads are forced to concede today that Castro is a Communist.

It took public boasting by Castro himself to the effect that he always has been and always will be a Marxist-Leninist, to bring his defenders in the United States around to the same conclusion. But in a face-saving move, most of these people still insist that Castro is wrong when he says he always has been a Red. Apparently they know him better than he knows himself. The popular line with these people is that Fidel betrayed the revolution he led; that he started out all right but went astray.

To bolster their position they remind us of the evils of Castro's predecessor, Batista. For some time, the propaganda barrage against the Batista regime—even after it was long gone from Cuba—was so extensive that Castro had to look good by comparison.

Let's take a look at what Cuba was like before Castro came to power.

For more than a decade, from 1940 to 1952, Cuba was governed by the rule of law under the constitution of 1940. Under that constitution, the Cuban people were guaranteed a freely elected, representative government. In 1952, Batista began to tear down this guarantee—but it was not until 1959, when Castro came to power, that it was finally and completely destroyed.

Even under Batista, however, there was substantial freedom of speech, religion and press. There was a recognizable degree of justice—with the right of habeas corpus guaranteed to most, if not all Cubans.

The Cuban people lived better under Bat-Batista. Before 1959 Cuba had the highest standard of living in Latin America. Its literacy rate was the third-highest. It had more miles of railroads and highways than any country of comparable size. There were more doctors per capita than all but two other Latin-American countries and more telephones than all but one other country.

Cuban currency was on a par with the dollar. Industry and trade were abundant. Social legislation was amazingly progressive. Workers were guaranteed a month paid vacation every year. They could not be dismissed from their jobs without court action. They were given 48 hours of pay for 40 hours of work, plus retirement, hospitalization and numerous other fringe benefits. Salaries in Cuba before Castro were the highest in Latin America and the fourth-highest in the world.

Return to Batista? It might look pretty good. But it isn't going to happen. Batista has few if any exile supporters. Only the tiniest fraction of the exiles would advocate his return. Cuban-exile groups have had enough of dictators, and they don't want another simply because he would be better than the one they now have.

The lingering hue and cry about the evils of Batista, the hand-wringing by those who say today that, sure, they want to get rid of Castro but fear Batista will return, is as phony as it can be. There is no danger that Cuba will be handed over to him if Castro is overthrown. The only purpose served by such talk is the delaying of that overthrow and a return to the better days before the revolution—without Batista.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the first Peace Corps volunteers are completing their initial tour of duty, and are returning to the United States. We have received much information, both good and bad, concerning the effectiveness of this new cold war weapon.

Miss Dianne Bridges, a constituent of mine, was Atlanta's first Peace Corps volunteer, and has now returned from duty in Oslob, Philippines. Miss Bridges has written an excellent article for the Emory Alumnus, the Emory University alumni magazine, July 1963 issue. In this article Miss Bridges gives a vivid description of life in the tiny village of Oslob, on the island of Cebu in the Philippines. Though too long to include in its entirety, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the last paragraphs of the article. These are of particular interest to me in judging the success of the Peace Corps to date.

The excerpt follows:

ASSIGNMENT IN OSLOB

(By Miss Dianne Bridges)

And so life in the Philippines goes on—interesting and different. I have learned a fantastic amount about the life, beliefs and customs of Filipinos. At the same time, of course, they have learned firsthand about Americans. If nothing else, they now know that Americans eat rice, they do not feed all their corn to the hogs, they wear Bermuda shorts and bathing suits to the beach, and they come in all different sizes and colors. Just from the point of understanding between nations, the Peace Corps has greatly succeeded. At long last, these people are learning that the "ugly American" need not be typical of all those from the great United States. Also we are gathering a wealth of knowledge about these people of a small group of tropical islands out in the Pacific.

Yes, there have been plenty of times when I have been lonely and homesick. Sometimes the differences ceases to be interesting and educational and tend to get me down—the daily, hungry, high-pitched scream of hogs, the ever-present filth in public places, the pungent, disagreeable odors, the absolute poverty, the dirt, and all the bugs are enough to make life unpleasant if you dwell on them.

However I know now that I can erase all these disturbing things by merely watching the sky turn rosy from the sunset, feeling the gentle breeze of the majestic palm trees, hearing the sound of the waves rolling in lazily on the white beach, or seeing absolute joy in a child's face.

One of the main lessons I've learned here is to appreciate my own country. I know when I get home, I'm going to be extremely grateful for all those little things I used to take so much for granted. A soft bed, the change of seasons, ice cubes, paved roads, children's toys, a warm bath, apple pie, freely demonstrated affection—all these have taken on a new, wonderful meaning for me.

All in all, this Peace Corps experience is an enriching one. It will certainly do much to shape my life.

Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is an oversimplification to discuss and weigh the test-ban treaty solely on the basis of the relationships between the United States and Russia. As important as that relationship is to American interest, we are also an inseparable part of the larger community of nations and our total interest is deeply involved in the improvement of stability and progress in the many parts of the world which lay outside the scope of Russian-United States affairs.

In the introduction to the annual United Nations report Secretary General U Thant puts, I think, the considerations for affirmative action on the treaty appropriately in this larger context. Below is an extract from the report:

The test-ban treaty, although limited to three environments and marginal to the central problem of disarmament, is an important objective in itself. It will directly serve the humanitarian aim of ending the danger of ever-increasing radioactive fallout resulting from nuclear explosions. But it will also help restrict the spread of nuclear weapons and impose limitations on the development of new weapons of mass destruction, and thus be a factor in slowing down the arms race. This treaty could also point the way to the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty including a ban on underground tests.

Equally, if not more important are the political implications of the test-ban treaty. If this treaty is followed by agreement on other measures aimed at lessening international tension and establishing confidence among States, it may be the beginning of a new era of better understanding between nations and create a more favorable international climate that would facilitate progress toward general and complete disarmament and the goal of stable international peace and security, which remains the primary purpose of the United Nations. It would seem, therefore, all the more urgent that the partial test-ban treaty now concluded by the main parties be made universal by the accession of all states.

I believe that the opportunity so eagerly awaited by mankind will not be missed because of considerations of national interest, and that the enduring cause of world peace will prevail over short-range political considerations. I am strengthened in this belief by the improved relations between the

Soviet Union and the United States, which have come about in spite of the difficulties of these two great world powers in reconciling new developments and requirements in the fields of defense with their diverse interests and those of their respective allies.

Let's Keep Chicken War From Spreading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, trade is a two-way proposition. The European Common Market's erection of high tariff chicken fences will keep our birds out of Europe. This action is an unnecessary injury from a group of nations that we have helped with billions of dollars of aid.

"What the Chicken War Means" is an editorial from the September issue of Farm Journal and is given below.

But rather than retaliation, the United States should take energetic action to insist upon the two-way lowering of agricultural tariffs in Europe and around the world. In economic, as in military, wars, both sides suffer:

WHAT THE CHICKEN WAR MEANS

These days the things that affect your income most may not happen on your farm at all. They may not happen in your neighborhood, in your county, or in your State. Or even in your country.

Suddenly we've got a chicken war looming between the United States and the six countries of the European Economic Community (Common Market). The EEC had pledged a stable tariff of 5 cents a pound on our poultry. Overnight they broke their promise, turn on us, hiked poultry duties to 13½ cents (up 170 percent), and cut American farmers out of $46 million of sales.

Some city newspapers are laughing this off as some kind of comical chicken war of small proportions. It is nothing of the kind. The Common Market, all through its formative years, has assured us that tariffs on our other goods would be reasonable. But in the last year, when they got down to deciding the issue, they hiked tariffs on our fruit by 36 percent, on our wheat and flour by more than 100 percent, on our tobacco by nearly 50 percent. And all this may be but a forerunner of more to come.

We've given European farmers a very great deal of help, both with money and know-how. In return, they are clamoring for higher tariffs against more American farm products. "We can raise a lot more of our food here—why let the Americans do it?" they say. And given high enough support prices, protected by sufficiently high tariffs, they can do it.

They have some juicy targets to shoot at. The EEC countries now buy 52 percent of our dollar exports of feed grains, 31 percent of our wheat and flour exports; 31 percent of our tobacco exports, 20 percent of our fruit and vegetable shipments—a total of $1.2 billion worth of our farmstuff a year. Moreover, they pay us in U.S. dollars.

When you consider that in this country one acre of cropland out of every five is devoted to raising something for export—and that our export crops are the ones in surplus trouble here—you can see the enormity of U.S. farmers' stake in what's going on. Not only crops farmers but livestock men are affected.

For that matter the whole country has reason for tremendous concern. Partly due to an already unfavorable balance of trade we're losing gold to the rest of the world at a frightening rate. In view of this the Nation can't afford to let anything serious happen to its farm exports—not when they comprise one-fourth of all U.S. sales abroad.

The one encouraging thing that's happening is that our Government is at last beginning to talk in the only terms anybody over there seems to be able to undesrtand—possible increase of some tariffs here. Some may call this retaliation. It might better be called self-defense—defense not only of our farmers but our gold supply.

Conversation, reasoning, pleading, cajoling have gotten us nowhere. We've sent two Secretaries of Agriculture over there—Benson and Freeman. The President wrote Mr. Adenauer of Germany a note. It's been largely a waste of time. Now, late in the day, we're starting to act. It would seem about time.

We may lose some of our markets over there anyway. European farmers are fast gaining some of the efficiencies we've achieved in this country. If they can outdo us in a fair race, power to them. But if they're going to do it by walling us out we'll have to consider our own walls. Trade can't be a one-way street.

It would be too bad to get into a tariff-raising contest with the EEC. Both sides would lose. But if one wants to play the game this way the other will be forced to. That ought to be made clear, right now and with no pussyfooting around.

The Establishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the New York Journal American of August 22, 1963, published a very interesting article, by Mr. John Chamberlain, entitled "Yes, Folks, There's An Establishment." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal American, Aug. 22, 1963]

YES, FOLKS, THERE'S AN ESTABLISHMENT

(By John Chamberlain)

Anyone who writes a column gets letters from peopel who are convinced that the Government of the United States—and the world, for that matter—is in the hands of conspirators. The litany is familiar: there is, supposedly, a group of one worlders, bent on subjugating the United States to a UN that will be subservient, in its turn, to the Communist nations.

The one worlders are pictured as dominating the centers of power in both major U.S. political parties. They don't care who wins an election if it is a Roosevelt versus a Wilkie, or an Eisenhower versus a Stevenson. But if an independent man like the late Robert Taft looms as a likely Presidential nominee, the forces of the "conspiracy" move into action at once to circumvent his success.

In its bald outlines, the "conspiracy theory" won't wash: things don't happen because there is a mysterious high command that pulls the strings to get a foreordained result. However, there is a more sophisticated theory that the American political system is dominated, not by a crude conspiracy, but by something called the establishment, a sort of high level, honorable Mafia that reacts in knee-jerk fashion to keep things as they are for the benefit of those who have held positions of power and influence for a long time.

The establishment, according to this theory, doesn't want to hand the world over to the UN or to the Communists—but it believes in accommodation with the Communists through the UN. It just doesn't want to push issues, whether they affect the domestic economy or international politics, to showdowns. And it maintains itself, not by conspiratorial subversion, but by appealing to the Milquetoast that is in every contented or semicontented family.

Well, what about this establishment? Is it a reality? When a "liberal" commentator, Richard Rovere, in a semiserious, semimocking article, identified the members of the establishment, he was careful to cover his flank by indicating that he might be spoofing.

William F. Buckley, the eidtor of the conservative fortnightly National Review, who can identify the members of the establishment for anyone who will send him a self-addressed postcard with a stamp, thinks Rovere was spoofing when he implied that he was spoofing.

The establishment, according to Buckley and/or Rovere, includes eastern bankers, the presidents of great universities, the editors of the Washington Post and the New York Times, most economists on the Harvard faculty, and three out of five big figures in Wall Street. Their influence supposedly moves, by the mysterious ways of money, into both of the big political organizations to make all important candidates "safe." And the "liberal" hierarchy among the writers is depicted as spreading incense as the establishment's charades are acted out.

Discounting Rovere, however, no establishment man has ever clearly admitted that there is any such thing as the establishment. Or, rather, nobody ever admitted it before this month of August in 1963. The first clean-cut 14-karat, Cadillac-powered admission by a presumed establishment journalist that there is such a thing as an establishment appears, rather coyly, in an article in the Saturday Evening Post. The man who makes the admission is Stewart Alsop, and he does it in a column of commentary that is appended to his article on BARRY GOLDWATER's presidential chances for 1964.

Stewart Alsop thinks GOLDWATER has a chance of getting the Republican nomination if the public opinion polls, come next June, show that Kennedy will be a clear winner in November, anyway. In other words, certain people in the Republican Party who have a veto power will not exercise it to head off GOLDWATER in a losing year. But if it ever should appear to be certain that GOLDWATER might actually beat Kennedy, the possessors of the Republican veto would not be so complacent.

Who possesses the power of veto in Republican ranks? Why, says Stewart Alsop, it is the establishment. What is this establishment? It is "the moderate-internationalist, old-money wing of the party." If it appears that GOLDWATER might take Kennedy, "the establishment will marshal all its power to block his nomination. In the past, that would have been enough. * * * But there is no visible candidate to fit the miracle-man role of Wilkie in 1940 and Eisenhower in 1952."

This isn't Robert Welch of the Birch Society speaking of mysterious "liberal" manipulation of all the centers of American

political action. It isn't even that voice of nonconspiratorial conservative moderation, Bill Buckley. It is Stewart Alsop, a "liberal" of "liberals."

So it appears, Virginia, that there is an establishment after all.

Runaway Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I revise and extend my remarks in connection with further proof of the desirability of in some definite way of letting the American public know where the motion pictures they are asked to support by their patronage are actually filmed. Those of us from southern California know only too well what the runaway film production has done to the tempo of the motion picture industry in Hollywood; it has brought it to practically a standstill.

We are all aware of the many inroads that have been made into the motion picture presentation of films that are not truly fitted for younger viewers to attend. These films openly project scenes and scripts that deal in sensationalism and have as their main theme murder, adultery, and all around promiscuous behavior. Quoting from the August 22, 1963, issue of the Hollywood Reporter it has the following to state:

> Approximately 95 percent of the motion pictures given a class C (condemned) rating by the National Legion of Decency are foreign productions, according to a breakdown of the legion's latest tabulation of film classifications. In the cumulative list of pictures in active release, totaling 407, there are 63 condemned films, of which 59 are foreign made.

The biggest category in the Legion's list is the top-rating class A–I, films "Morally unobjectionable for general patronage," with a total of 91 films under this heading and the big majority of them American. Two other categories—class A–II, "Morally unobjectionable for adults and adolescents," and class A–III, "Morally unobjectionable for adults"—list 86 and 76 films, respectively. There are 32 class A–IV, "Morally unobjectionable for adults, with reservations," and 59 films in class B, "Morally objectionable in part for all," with the latter category also heavily foreign.

Due to this overwhelming report that shows the desirability of American-made films I feel it is most important that Congressman KING's H.R. 7670 and my companion H.R. 7672 be enacted in this Congress to let the American motion picture viewing public know where the pictures they are asked to patronize are actually filmed. A fact that is hidden from them in today's exhibition of motion pictures.

Equal Federal Aid to All School Children Growing in Favor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, few issues have been so hotly debated in this country during the past few years as the controversy over Federal aid to private and parochial schools.

Some new trends in this debate were pointed out in an article written by the Reverend Virgil Blum, S.J., which appeared in the August 25 issue of the weekly Our Sunday Visitor. Father Blum is the chairman of the Department of Political Science, Marquette University, Milwaukee, and a member of the board of trustees of the Citizens for Educational Freedom.

A recognized authority on Federal aid to education, Father Blum has authored a book and many articles on the subject. In his latest article, Father Blum points to four recent developments in favor of Federal aid to private and parochial education.

They are, in his opinion, first, a change in public opinion, second, cracks in liberal opposition, third, growing support from those of the Jewish faith and, fourth, growing awareness among Catholics of the problem.

Father Blum makes some telling points, and I commend the attention of my colleagues to his article, "Federal Aid Debate: Some New Trends":

FEDERAL AID DEBATE: SOME NEW TRENDS

(By Rev. Virgil C. Blum, S.J.)

In the past 2 years American public opinion has shifted sharply in favor of freedom in education. An increasing proportion of people favor equal federal aid to all children regardless of the school they attend. This trend in public opinion again demonstrates that once the American people know the facts they are inclined to be fair to their fellow citizens.

In this context, I would like to point to four important developments favoring freedom in education: (1) changes in public opinion, (2) cracks in the liberal opposition, (3) increasing Jewish support, and (4) growing Catholic awareness of the meaning of citizenship in a democracy.

The change in public opinion in favor of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in education was clearly indicated in a recent Gallup poll. While in March of 1961 only 36 percent of Americans polled favored equal treatment by the Federal Government of children who attended church-related schools, by February of 1963 that segment had grown, significantly, to 49 percent, with 7 percent having no opinion.

Once the American people came to realize that the federal aid issue involved basic questions of fredeom, many of them were ready to jettison their biases and to support the civil right of the individual child to freedom of conscience in education.

Debate of the federal aid issue has, indeed, clarified the constitutional question. As a result, many citizens now know that not a single leading constitutional authority maintains that federal aid to church-related school children for the study of secular (nonreligious) subjects is unconstitutional. They realize, moreover, that there is involved here a question of freedom of mind and freedom of religion. Hence, these citizens feel that they cannot, in conscience, oppose equal federal aid to children whose parents choose to have them educated in the Judeo-Christian tradition.

NINE BILLS INTRODUCED

The growing popular support of freedom in education is reflected in the number of bills introduced in Congress which provide for equal education benefits for all children regardless of religious beliefs. The first Federal aid bill which assured a measure of freedom in education to all children was introduced a year ago by Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY of Brooklyn. But since then, no less than eight other Congressmen have introduced identical bills.

The Delaney bill, H.R. 320, provides for a Federal education subsidy of $20 for every American child. Children whose parents exercise their religion in the choice of a church-related Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish school, would, under the Delaney bill, receive a direct tuition grant of $20 a year. Because of this direct grant provision, the Delaney bill has popularly come to be known as the junior GI bill of rights.

It is interesting to note that of the nine Congressmen who have introduced the freedom-in-education bill, two are Negroes and two are Jews. It is not surprising that these Congressmen, since they belong to minority groups which frequently suffer discrimination, should so actively support the current drive for freedom and equality in education.

The second important development is a cracking in the wall of liberal opposition to freedom in education. Most liberals consider freedom in education undemocratic, un-American, divisive and even subversive. They seem to look upon the economic strangulation of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in education as one of the blessings of a free people.

These "liberals" are of course not liberals at all; they are absolutists in their cold, inflexible opposition to freedom in education. This betrayal of their own basic liberal principles is perhaps best explained by Peter Viereck's observation that anti-Catholicism is the anti-Semitism of the "liberals." Vassar History Prof. Carl N. Degler observed that these anti-Catholic "liberals" would not think of being anti-Semitics or anti-Negro. From a moral and civil rights point of view, they are, nevertheless, to be bracketed with anti-Semites and anti-Negroes.

Several months ago the New Republic decided that it could no longer prostitute its integrity as a liberal journal by opposing freedom of mind and religion in education. Figuratively speaking, it took a long-delayed look at its profile in the mirror and was shocked to discover a big absolutist wart on its liberal nose, the wart being its commitment to an absolutism in church-state relations that demanded the suppression of freedom in education. The New Republic is to be commended for cauterizing the wart, though it knew full well that what thousands of its devotees liked most about its profile was the wart upon its nose.

On March 2 the New Republic said editorially that, since the state has an "interest" in the education of church-related school children in secular subjects, "the state can and should pursue this interest by subsidizing instruction in these subjects." The state, said the New Republic, is interested in student mastery of secular subjects, not in who teaches them or where they are taught. Hence, it said, "it makes no difference to the state whether his instructors are Jesuits or agnostics, whether his classroom is owned by the Lutherans or the local school board."

In advocating state subsidies for the study of secular subjects in church-related schools, the New Republic is, of course, merely applying legal principles repeatedly expressed by the U.S. Supreme Court, most recently in the Bible-reading case. It said that "the state should legislate for purely secular ends, but that it should not worry if this incidentally helps a church."

ONLY A POLITICAL ISSUE

Perhaps the most notable among those liberals who have publicly dissociated themselves from the liberal-absolutists and asserted their commitment to liberty is Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic.

In his recent article in the Saturday Evening Post (June 8) President Hutchins declared that "Federal aid to pupils in parochial schools is not a constitutional issue. It is a political issue, a real and important one." And, quoting the Supreme Court's Everson doctrine of freedom and equality, he declared, "the children in schools supported by religious denominations should not be excluded 'because of their faith' from the benefits of a national program of education."

Dr. Hutchins, a competent constitutional lawyer, answered four stock objections to freedom in education in his January address at the University of Chicago where he said: "The fact that a school is owned by a church, or that it gives some religious instruction, or that its teaching is permeated by religion, or that aid to it is incidentally of some benefit to the church is immaterial." The aid to religion, he said, "is incidental to an overriding public benefit that cannot be obtained without including institutions under religious auspices."

Discussing the Delaney bill, Hutchins wrote in the Post, "this is a GI bill of rights for children in elementary and secondary schools. Legislation of this sort," he pointed out, "would quiet the fears of those who are alarmed at the prospect of Federal control." And in support of equal treatment of all children regardless of religious beliefs, he said at Chicago, "since the object of the religion clauses of the first amendment is to guarantee and promote religious freedom, incidental benefits, which do not limit religious freedom, do not invalidate the legislation."

Mr. Walter Lippmann also joined the liberal dissenters. On CBS Reports, Mr. Lippmann said that Federal aid to church-related education was necessary in the national interest. In answer to the question how this might be done, the columnist replied: "It is not beyond the wit of man, if he means it, for us to find a way of aiding education, whether it is in public schools or parochial schools, without getting involved in the question of the teaching of religion."

A solution to the Federal-aid question is certainly not beyond the wit of man; the question is rather whether it is beyond the good will of man.

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF has also, in principle, rejected the liberal-absolutist position on Federal aid to church-related schoolchildren. He now publicly advocates at least a small measure of freedom in education for all children. Although the Senator's bill provides only crumbs to the Nation's 7 million independent schoolchildren in the form of a very small tax deduction, and is for this reason unacceptable to their parents, it does, nevertheless, recognize the right of these children to share in a Federal aid program.

By his forthright proposal, Senator RIBICOFF has repudiated the political posture—irreconcilable with freedom in education—which he was compelled to assume as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

GROWING JEWISH SUPPORT

The third development of real importance is the growing public support given to the cause of freedom in education by the Jewish community, particularly by the Orthodox Jews. One of the most highly esteemed Jewish rabbis in America, Menschen M. Schneerson, wrote in The Jewish Forum (May 1962) that "it is the moral duty of every Jew to do his utmost to make Federal aid to the secular departments of parochial schools a reality." And Rabbi Dr. Immanuel Jakobovits, a scholar of international repute, wrote in the Forum, "the claim of parochial schools, whether Jewish or Catholic, to Federal aid should be strongly supported by the Jewish community as a matter of principle, of national interest, of justice and of expediency."

Jewish leaders and groups are becoming more vocal in their demand for Federal aid for the education of children in Jewish day schools. Recently Rabbi Abraham N. Av Rutick, president of the Rabbinical Council of America, the largest Jewish orthodox rabbinic body in the country, called for legislation to grant income tax credit to parents who pay tuition for the education of their children in church-related and other private schools. Such an income tax credit would help parents pay tuition in the independent school of their choice.

Testifying before the House Committee on Education and Labor, Rabbi Morris Sherer said: "We seek equal Government support only for the general studies program of our schools, which meet all the educational requirements of each State. Why should Jewish parents be penalized with the heavy yoke of double taxation, as they struggle to meet the skyrocketing costs of independently maintaining dual programs?"

The keen and active interest of the Orthodox Jewish community in freedom in education is further indicated by the fact that Rabbi Alexander Mittelmann is vice president of the New York State Federation of Citizens for Educational Freedom, a civic group dedicated to the cause of freedom of conscience in education.

Principals and directors of Jewish schools throughout the country also favor freedom in education. When these school officials were polled recently, 94 of the 105 who expressed an opinion (90 percent) favored Federal aid for secular subjects in church-related schools.

In announcing the results of the poll, Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky, executive director of the Jewish day school movement, declared: "It is unfair to place the entire burden of the educational costs of Hebrew day schools entirely upon the parents of the day school students, who also contribute their share of the taxes which finance our public school system. These schools serve the entire community."

The development of greatest significance, however, is found among Catholics who send their children to church-related schools. A new phenomenon is taking place. More and more Catholics are beginning to awaken to their rights and duties as citizens in a democracy. They are beginning to understand the clearcut distinction between their role as members of the Catholic Church and their role as citizens of a democratic society. They are beginning to understand, moreover, that as citizens they have rights and duties which they cannot, in conscience, abrogate or neglect.

CATHOLICS WANT JUST SHARE

Before the publication of "Pacem in Terris," these Catholics were already carrying out Pope John's injunction: "For, if a man becomes conscious of his rights, he must become equally aware of his duties. Thus he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim those rights as marks of his dignity, while all others have the obligation to acknowledge those rights and respect them." They accept as fundamental the doctrine repeated by Pope John: "Parents have a prior right in the support and education of their children." Hence, these parents have come to realize that since they have civil rights in the education of their children, they have the civic and political duty to claim those rights.

It is, of course, true that many Catholics still think of themselves exclusively as children of the church, whose every need, in both sacred and secular society, will be taken care of by the bishops and clergy. To their false way of thinking, membership in the church incapacitates them for active participation in the democratic processes; that is, for the scores of civic and political activities that are essential to the making and shaping of public policy. They do not think of themselves as American Catholics who, through an active participation in democracy, can and should have a positive and effective influence on public policy and the development of our culture. They have not, in fact, accepted democracy in any meaningful sense. The consequences of this failure of involvement are, of course, inevitable—a positive Catholic influence on American thought and action is virtually nonexistent.

This failure to think in terms of personal involvement in our democratic society is undoubtedly the reason Catholics in general are so reluctant to work cooperatively with Protestants and Jews to resolve civil problems through the democratic processes. It is this all-too-common "I don't want to be involved" attitude that, for example, Christian Reformed parents have found so frustrating when they try to interest Catholics in joining Citizens for Educational Freedom (CEF). In this connection, a Christian Reformed CEF chapter leader wrote to the group's executive director: "We now have more than 350 CEF members and are working hard to interest our Roman Catholic brethren in the movement." Recruiting Catholics for active membership in a civic group, even when their own most vital interests are involved, is a most difficult task.

BUT DEMAND IS GROWING

The number of Catholics who are actively working with Protestants and Jews for the preservation of church-related education in America is, in terms of the importance of the values involved, infinitesimal. In fact, in proportion to the number of children in church-related schools, Protestants are considerably more active in CEF, the only national civic group dedicated to freedom in education, than are Catholics. And, interestingly, many of the Catholics who are most actively involved in the effort to secure freedom of conscience in education are converts.

The reluctance of many American Catholics, particularly the educated, to become involved in the democratic processes is perhaps due to the fact that the instinct of social conformity, to use Christopher Dawson's phrase, is stronger than the instinct of civic and moral duty to society.

On the other hand, many thousands of Catholics are actively engaged in the democratic processes in a lofty effort to preserve God-centered education for our children, church, and country. They want their children to learn about God, and about man's relations to God. They want them to learn moral and spiritual values. They want them to learn the difference between right and wrong. They want them to learn principles of life that will, in later years, give meaning, purpose, and direction to their lives. They want them to learn the moral values necessary for the conduct of the social, professional, business, and political activities of our Nation. They want also to help preserve in our society the Judeo-Christian principles upon which our democracy was founded, and upon which alone it can be maintained.

In terms of their rights as parents, they refuse to accept the proposition that they must surrender these civil rights in the education of their children as a condition for sharing in education-tax funds. And, moreover, they refuse to accept the proposition

that their children must conform to the moral and religious (including secularist) values of State schools as a condition for sharing in the tax funds to which they have themselves contributed. In other words, these Catholic parents, cooperating with Protestants and Jews, are committed to securing freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the education of their children.

These Catholics, moreover, are keenly aware of the progressive secularization of American society. They observe the effectiveness with which certain interest groups are working toward this end. Knowing the nature of our pressure-group democracy, they do not take exception to the pressure activities of secularist groups. They do, however, reproach their coreligionists for their failure to work with interest groups that can effectively counterbalance the social, legal, and political influence of these secularist groups. In this connection, they recall that Christopher Dawson, the great English cultural historian, blamed, not the clergy, but "the failure and passivity of the Catholic laity" for the secularization of Western culture.

WORK FOR ALL

If these four trends continue to develop, American parents will yet enjoy freedom in education, as parents throughout Europe enjoy it. Whether they will in fact come to enjoy it depends in great part on the willingness and readiness of American Catholics, working with their fellow citizens, to claim their rights in the education of their children. Public opinion in large measure, and liberal opinion to some degree, will grow more favorable only if Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, through active participation in the democratic processes, make a persuasive and convincing case for freedom in education.

Such participation in policymaking by parents in European democracies won for them a share in their tax dollars for the education of their children in the schools of their choice. Whether American democracy can achieve the same measure of freedom of mind and freedom of religion, depends to a considerable degree upon the parents of the Nation's 7 million independent school children.

The lessons of history teach us that the members of minority groups never enjoy freedom and equality unless they claim their rights, and, moreover, unless they use the effective means to give substance to their claim.

Planning Promotes Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we every day become more and more dependent upon truck and auto transportation, our highway system takes on new importance and the problem of highway safety multiplies.

Mr. Rex M. Whitton, the very able Administrator of the Federal highway program discusses the relationship of planning to highway safety in an article in the August edition of the International Operating Engineer. I am sure my colleagues will find the article worthwhile and ask that it be included at this point in my remarks.

The article follows:

PLANNING PROMOTES HIGHWAY SAFETY

(By Rex M. Whitton)

(NOTE.—Rex M. Whitton is Federal Highway Administrator and heads the big program of building 41,000 miles of interstate highways. He served as Missouri State Highway Commission's chief engineer before being named to the top roads job in the United States. He had been with the Missouri roads body for 40 years. He has received numerous honors including the George S. Bartlett Award in 1958 for outstanding service to highway progress; was one of the "Top 10 Public Works Men of the Year;" received the 1960 Thomas H. McDonald Award for highway engineering service and the 1961 Roy W. Crum Award for distinguished highway research service.)

The world's safest network of heavy-traffic highways is the safest because it is the best planned.

This network, of course, is the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, whose heavy construction schedule began in 1956 and is planned for completion in 1972. The $41 billion job is a cooperative State-Federal undertaking. The States have selected the system routes; and they choose the projects for annual construction programs, design them, and manage their construction, all subject to the approval and control of the Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, which administers the Federal-aid highway program.

The Federal share of the cost is 90 percent, and the Federal-aid funds come wholly from Federal excise taxes on highway use—chiefly the motor fuel tax.

Over 14,800 miles of the Interstate System are now open to traffic and 5,300 miles are under construction.

How safe is the Interstate System? Last year alone, it is estimated, 2,000 people who would otherwise have died in traffic accidents, lived because of the safety features of the Interstate mileage then in use.

After 1972, when the system is fully completed, more than 5,000 lives will be saved every year. And there will be $9 billion in savings to users every year—in time saving, lower vehicle operating costs, lesser accident costs—plus reduction of the strains and discomforts of stop-and-go driving.

The key to the safety of the Interstate System is planning. These superhighways are being designed not just for today, but for 20 years from now. Every modern principle of design is being used. And it is a unique and fortunate circumstance that both safety and efficiency of traffic movement are well served by these modern design features.

Perhaps the most significant feature is access control. Entrance and exit to the freeway is permitted only at skillfully designed interchanges, placed at reasonably frequent and carefully chosen locations. No driveways or service roads can cut into the Interstate. Minor roads, and railroads, are carried over or under, so there will be no cross traffic.

Most of the system will have four or six lanes, with separate roadways for travel in opposite directions. The median separator will be broad enough to reduce the problems of headlight glare at night, and to reduce or eliminate chance of cross-over accidents. In cities, where broad medians would be impossibly expensive, a raised safety barrier will be provided.

Many other planned features, including long acceleration and deceleration lanes, big and uniform signs, and safety rest areas, are helping to make the Interstate System the safest and most efficient highway network in the world.

The Interstate System will carry 20 percent of all motor-vehicle travel, but will constitute only 1 percent of the Nation's 3.6 million miles of roads and streets.

What about the other 99 percent of the mileage? Of course, a good deal of it consists of purely local roads and residential streets whose sole purpose is to serve the adjacent land and whose traffic is very limited.

Between the extremes of these and the Interstate lie the 840,000 miles of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, encompassing practically all of the main roads and streets in the Nation. They constitute less than one-fourth of our total mileage but carry almost one-half of all traffic. The Federal-aid program for their continuing improvement, begun in 1916, is also a Federal-State cooperative enterprise, with equal sharing of costs on Federal-aid projects.

On these roads and streets, as on the Interstate System planning is essential for the wise use of public funds, and planning features benefit both safety and efficiency of traffic operation.

One current joint planning effort of the States and the Bureau of Public Roads is to put into widespread practice the "Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices." Nobody knows how many accidents have occurred because a driver was confused by an unfamiliar pavement marking, or was impatient because he lost his way due to a confusing sign.

The manual, adopted by Public Roads and the national organizations of the State highway departments, the cities, and the counties, prescribes standards for color, shape, size, and placement of traffic signals, signs, and pavement markings.

Nationwide efforts are now being made, with Bureau of Public Roads leadership and Federal-aid financing, to survey the existing traffic control device situation on our roads and streets, to detail their inadequacies, and to plan and put in place proper signs, signals, and markings. The target date for completion of this undertaking is the end of 1966.

STATES ASSISTED

Public Roads is also giving leadership and assistance to the States and cities in planning the application of effective traffic engineering techniques to ordinary arterial city streets. Much can be done, at modest cost, to improve the orderliness of traffic flow on them—such things as control of turns, parking, and pedestrians, synchronization of traffic lights, or improvement at specific bottlenecks.

A pilot study by Public Roads has demonstrated how to undertake such planning, and how beneficial it can be. In essence, traffic engineering techniques seek to smooth and accelerate traffic flow, for with this comes increased traffic capacity—and safety as well.

In a number of cities, such studies are going to be a part of a much broader planning study. In the Federal-aid highway legislation of 1962 Congress provided that, beginning July 1, 1965, Federal-aid highway projects cannot be approved in cities of over 50,000 population unless they are based on a comprehensive, cooperative, continuing transportation planning process.

The provision for these broad urban planning studies is the outcome of President Kennedy's Transportation Message of 1962 to Congress, in which he said: "Highways are an instrumental part of any coordinated urban transportation program, and must be an integral part of any comprehensive community development plan."

More than 200 cities are directly affected by this planning requirement. In some, such comprehensive studies have long been underway and are already being translated into modern transportation systems. In others, Federal, State, county, and city officials are getting started or are well on their way toward that goal.

In this tremendously important planning effort, the basic objectives are for the movement of people and goods: quickly, conveniently, economically, and—by no means least—safely.

These same objectives hold as well for research; and it is research, of course, that provides the principles and techniques for planning. A considerable proportion of the highway research conducted or sponsored by the Bureau of Public Roads and the States is directly or indirectly safety oriented.

In addition, the Bureau's concern with carnage on the highway is manifested in its Office of Highway Safety, whose efforts are aimed directly, through diverse means and media, at reducing the Nation's highway death and accident toll.

One thing must be remembered in considering the horrible statistic of almost 41,000 highway deaths in 1962: this is at a rate of 5.3 deaths per 100 million miles of travel. The previous record of highway deaths, 39,900, was in 1941—but in that year the rate was 12 deaths per 100 million miles of travel. At that rate, 1962 highway travel would have killed 92,000 people, more than twice as many as actually died.

It is evident that the highway planning and research of the past are paying off—and in the most priceless commodity, human lives. But highway administrators and engineers are not satisfied. They continue to seek improvement in highway safety and service.

Aid Our Friends, Then Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since House action to recommit the foreign aid bill, reducing the authorization $585 million has become the source of considerable discussion, I feel that an editorial which appeared in the August 22 issue of the Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill., expresses with great clarity the views of millions of Americans, and I insert it into the RECORD at this point.

The editorial was written prior to House action. However, it is certainly indicative of the view which prevailed in the House last Friday:

AID OUR FRIENDS, THEN STOP

Looking back to the beginning of foreign aid, and to the idealistic yet practical principles on which it was then postulated, gives one something of an Alice-in-Wonderland feeling.

The start is found in the Marshall Plan. The idea was to use American resources to help rebuild war-shattered nations, and to bring about a peaceful, cooperative world based upon free institutions—including free popular elections.

The tragedy is that many billions of our foreign aid have been used for very different ends. It has gone to dictatorships, in which the people have no voice at all in affairs. Worst of all, it has gone, in instance after instance, to members of or sympathizers with the Communist bloc. Thus, our dollars have been used to strengthen our enemies—and even to buy them advanced weapons of war.

One can understand that foreign aid distributions of billions of dollars are often wasteful and misdirected. That is inevitable in so vast an undertaking. But there can be no excuse for employing it to our own disadvantage and danger. A drastic change in policy has long been in order. Let us aid our friends, and stop right there.

A Washington Film Festival: Peace Through Communication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the world has just witnessed the signing of a historic treaty to limit the testing of nuclear weapons; the United States has established and operated successfully for 2 years an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; our citizens have heard Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev reaffirm their mutual belief that nuclear war would be disastrous; and, while cold war tensions still run high, all nations have renewed their commitments to the cause of lasting peace.

These developments are opening new vistas in the field of international relations, and are raising new challenges to the West.

If we are thinking seriously about the elimination of violence as a means of settling political disputes, we must realize that the institution of war, which is as old as mankind and is deeply rooted in our governments, our societies, and our thought processes, cannot be expected simply to dissolve with no new institutions to take its place. In fact, war can be expected to recede into the background only as the forces for understanding and peaceful competition advance to the foreground.

That is why I and several of my colleagues have introduced a joint resolution to establish a Commission for a World Festival of Films to be held in Washington, D.C., in 1965.

Of all the channels of information through which the United States becomes known to the rest of the world, the film industry is by far the most prolific and the most popular. American film makers have participated in international competitions supported by the governments of the Soviet Union, France, Italy, Spain, and Germany, to name just a few. But the United States, moviemaking capital of the world, has never hosted other nations in a similar event.

The power of communication which can be generated by such a cultural exchange was illustrated in the recent Moscow film festival, where the showing of seven American films had a tremendous impact on the image that Russian audiences had of this country. Film director Stanley Kramer, the American juror at the Moscow festival, was deeply impressed by the cross currents of opinion which he saw and helped to stir in Moscow. In an article prepared for the Los Angeles Times, Mr. Kramer described the avenues of communication which he saw open wide in the course of the festival, and implied the unlimited possibilities to be explored in the realm of cultural exchange.

Certainly this article gives clear testimony that a world film festival in Washington, jointly sponsored by the public and private sectors, could be an outstanding American contribution to the cause of peace through communication:

SOVIETS REACT TO U.S. CANDOR

(By Stanley Kramer)

I don't think an 18-day visit to Moscow entitles anyone to write a book—nor even to pontificate. A little knowledge is still dangerous—if only because it is so little.

Perhaps the justification for this piece is in its limitation to a discussion of the impact of American films at the Moscow film festival. Yet, I am aware that even in this limitation there is a potential danger—because film is a primary force in mass communication and it spills over into the political arena, like it or not.

Last month's Moscow festival was the scene of the greatest American film invasion ever undertaken. And it was highly experimental besides.

Instead of indulging in an exchange of cliches and giving lipservice to the ideas of peace and understanding, we were able to screen films "out of competition" which were controversial and provocative. The Soviet reaction to these films was worth more than one could imagine in understanding their aims, prejudices and sensitivities.

First, the official American entry was "The Great Escape." It was an entertainment not topped by any other film in the festival. Unfortunately, it could not be considered seriously for the Grand Prix since the jurors from all European countries, as a result of their own national experiences, are unable to consider the theme of a prison camp in a light vein; it is something to be shown in terms of serious drama only.

The films shown out of competition, however, covered a broad spectrum. They included "West Side Story," "Judgment at Nuremberg," "The Defiant Ones," "Some Like It Hot," "David and Lisa," and "Ben Hur." It should be noted that the phrase "out of competition" indicates a limitation only insofar as festival prizes are concerned. The six selected films were in fact widely shown.

SOMETHING TO HIDE?

Since there was no control, "West Side Story" was screened three times at a deluxe theater before the American delegation heard about it. It was shown in English, with a Russian translation blaring out over loudspeakers. The Soviets are accustomed to this kind of translation and dial down the sound to accommodate the translator. We suggested that the sound be turned up during the musical numbers so that the audience might enjoy the song and dance routining. Izvestia promptly ran a front page story asking "What have the Americans to hide?"

The following night, I was asked to introduce the picture before its screening at the Kremlin Palace. To set the record straight I read aloud the lyrics to the song "America" and commented that the picture deals with a problem in America and showed that we were quite able to criticize ourselves—even better than Izvestia might do it. The audience reaction exceeded our expectations. They literally cheered at this reference to Izvestia—and 2 days later, that newspaper published a retraction.

AMERICAN FAULTS

In introducing "The Defiant Ones" and "Judgment at Nuremberg" on successive nights, we mentioned that we did not come flying any flags of virtue.

"The Defiant Ones," we pointed out, had to do with what we thought were flaws in

the American social structure, as commented upon by American filmmakers. "We do have some faults," it was added, "and we presume you have a few." Again, there was a tremendous, and favorable, reaction to an American suggesting that the Soviet system had its own faults.

The reaction to these films lead to a remarkable conclusion; the Soviet people, bathed in daily newspaper and radio propaganda, actually believe that most Americans subscribe to racial inequality. Suddenly, they witness films, made by Americans in America which make comment on the situation. So—after all—they come to realize we are aware and desire to change the injustices.

One simply cannot underestimate the impact of this fact upon a people who know that their creators are simply not free to make any comment of this nature in the first place.

How truly mistaken we have been to insist upon only the innocuous being shown in the Eastern orbit. Our power—our one great power—is in the full demonstration of real freedom in filmmaking. The argument about endangering the American image is ridiculous—the image has already been endangered in press, radio, and television coverage of the American scene. It needs to be answered by such films.

I discover that an American filmmaker who visits Russia must expect to be asked about all phases of American life. At one press conference I was asked, "What about Cuba?"

SOLUTION TO CUBA

Naturally, I emphasized that I was not an expert on world affairs, and could speak only for myself. But, I added, "We Americans aren't good at this sort of thing. We are either there with too little or we come too late or we don't make adequate preparations. As an individual, it seems to me that perhaps—only perhaps on moral grounds—we should have handled it the way you handled Hungary—send the whole army in and get the job over with."

The comment brought appreciative if not enthusiastic laughter from the assembled Communist newspapermen.

Similarly, they responded, and quoted fairly, the answer to a question regarding the Negro "revolution" (as they phrased it) in the United States. I pointed out that the current situation is the result of 30 years of progress toward a clear, just, and constitutional status for the Negro.

They listened attentively to the theory that violence only comes at the end of a long struggle such as this and is caused by the last-ditch struggle of the dwindling number of diehards who would preserve the status quo. They have not regarded the American scene in this light before.

Test Ban Treaty Risks Placed in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 20 the editorial pages of the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram rather accurately and sensibly had the following to say relative to balancing the risks with and without the test ban treaty:

ALARMISTS ARE ALARMED ABOUT THE WRONG THING

A cartoon designed as part of the massive propaganda campaign in behalf of the test ban treaty shows two skeletons amid the debris of a nuclear war. One skeleton is saying: "As I was saying, a test ban agreement might have resulted in a fatal gap."

This rather hysterical dismissal of an important argument against the treaty overlooks the fact that any significant gap between the United States and Soviet Russia in the development of nuclear weapons can result in the same ghastly destruction as depicted in the cartoon.

Naturally, every American wants this country to take the course which assures honorable peace at the smallest possible risk. If the Russians gain a significant advantage in strength, including the ability to defend against a retaliatory blow, there can be one or another of two consequences: One, they will destroy this country. Two, they will conquer this country by threat of destruction.

These alternatives warn against the signing of any treaty which offers the Russians the opportunity of catching up in some areas and going ahead, through possible secret developments, in other areas of nuclear research.

The treaty backers are now bringing in the old bugaboo of nuclear fallout. Yet, when President Kennedy decided to resume atmospheric testing last year, he leaned heavily on a report by the Federal Radiation Council. The Council told him that radiation from fallout was substantially less than from natural radioactivity, and that there was but one chance in a million that an individual of the next generation would suffer gross physical or mental defects as a result of the tests conducted thus far.

Likewise, a 6-year study conducted by the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory indicates that the dangers from nuclear fallout have been greatly exaggerated. The American College of Radiologists, composed of 6,000 physicians who are experts in the use of radiation, recently deplored "paper studies" predicting the genetic destruction of the race. According to Dr. Gerald M. McDonnel, former medical officer for atomic tests, the doubling of the present rate of birth abnormalities would require that everybody in earth get dosages of 80 roentgens, which "on the basis of practical analysis" would be impossible.

Assuming, though, that there is a certain amount of danger from nuclear testing, why should that danger be considered more terrible than the potentially greater harm that would come from letting the Russians get ahead?

That the Russians do expect to gain some advantage is axiomatic. They certainly are not signing any treaty for the good of mankind. The nuclear test alarmists are alarmed about the wrong thing.

A Great Victory for American Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I had the pleasure of meeting and visiting with some of the good folks in Vermont. I was presented the opportunity of addressing a group at a meeting at Jeffersonville near the famous resort city of Stowe, Vt. Incidentally, I did not find it necessary to hit any news reporters or grab any cameras while I was there. While in this fine and beautiful State, I was pleased to meet many very concerned citizens, people who are concerned about high Federal spending programs such as the foreign aid authorization bill passed by this House last Friday.

One such person was Mr. Franklin Benjamin Smith, editorial writer of the Burlington Free Press, Burlington, Vt. Mr. Smith expresses the feelings of a good many Vermonters, I believe, and many other American taxpayers in his editorial, "A Great Victory for American Taxpayers." This is an excellent editorial and I am pleased to submit it for the review of my colleagues:

A GREAT VICTORY FOR AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

American taxpayers were accorded one of their greatest victories in recent years Friday when the U.S. House of Representatives slashed more than $1 billion ($1,000 millions) from the foreign aid authorization bill.

The Kennedy administration fought desperately Thursday night and Friday morning to keep the authorization figure at $4.1 billion ($4,100 million). The White House even enlisted the support of former President Eisenhower, General Clay, and several other prominent Republicans.

But it was all to no avail, as the House gave President Kennedy the worst legislative defeat he has ever suffered.

The total amount cut from the bill came to $1,025 million. However, part of that amount had not been requested by Kennedy. The real cut came to $585 million of the $4.1 billion ($4,100 millions) bill.

Now foreign aid spending faces another tough hurdle in the House when the actual appropriations are made. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON, voted for the authorization cut Friday, and so did OTTO PASSMAN, chairman of a subcommittee which will write the appropriations measure.

The Senate, of course, has yet to pass judgment on the authorization bill. No doubt the Kennedy administration will put great pressure on the Senate to restore at least a portion of the House's reduction.

The crucial vote on this year's foreign aid spending will come when the Senate acts on the appropriations measure. The Senate is usually more generous than the House on foreign aid appropriations, but there won't be much room for generosity if the House's authorization figure is made to stick.

There are two basic reasons why Friday's action by the House represented a great victory for American taxpayers:

1. It dramatized the public's feeling that U.S. Federal expenditures must be reduced, so that this country can look toward a balanced budget, a tax cut, and a solution to the balance-of-payments problem.

2. It served notice on the administration that the whole foreign aid undertaking, country by country and program by program, should be reexamined.

Finally, after all these years of wasteful and self-defeating giveaway programs, some commonsense is exerting itself.

School Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to two outstanding editorials which have

been written by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers. Both of these outstanding editorials are concerned with the Supreme Court's decisions against prayers in our schools. The first is entitled "Must the Schools Bootleg Prayers?" The second is entitled "Bring God Back." They were printed in the Hearst newspapers on August 11 and on August 18, 1963, respectively.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST THE SCHOOLS BOOTLEG PRAYERS?

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN SIMEON.—The results of two national surveys, showing the extent of the shocked opposition of the American people to Supreme Court decisions banning prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, came as no surprise to me this week. The volume and tone of letters from readers to me at our Hearst newspapers had forecast the overwhelming sentiment.

The surveys were made by the two great news services, United Press International and Associated Press, and they both reported widespread refusal to go along with the Court.

UPI reported that "The Court's June 17 decision is being openly defied in some areas and circumvented elsewhere by 'interpretations' which seem to ignore the plain language of the ruling."

AP reported that "One way or another many of the Nation's schools plan to preserve a classroom religious note despite the Court decision banning prescribed devotional exercises."

In case you didn't read those stories, it was pointed out many States have announced their intention of circumventing the Supreme Court's rulings, otherwise known as "the law of the land," and where States have gone along, localities are defying the ban on their own.

To call the ruling unpopular, therefore, would be one of the great understatements of our time. The heritage of religious faith is the heart and core of America. Most of us are the descendents of people who came to this country to get away from coercion and persecution of some sort—more often than not to worship as and when they felt inclined.

It just couldn't be expected that a people—whose motto "In God we trust" has been accepted by Americans of all faiths as embodying their common ground—would sit still for the court's kowtowing to a handful of atheists and their "liberal" but misled civil liberty worriers.

It is positively tragic, then, that our children's prayers must be contraband—that reading of the Bible must be in defiance of the law or in bootlegged circumvention of it.

The 18th amendment, prohibiting liquor in the twenties and thirties, certainly was not a law which hit at our highest aspirations—merely at our pleasures. But it suppressed what most of us believed was a personal freedom. It was a tyranny of a zealot minority imposed on a live-and-let-live majority. It was a negation of the very idea of democracy.

So the American people defied it on such a scale that we became a country of "scofflaws." Remember?

What on earth ever made anyone think that our people who would defy a law which merely interferred with a pleasurable liberty would react in a less outraged way to Supreme Court "law" which interferes with our deepest convictions?

I make that point of calling the prayer ban Supreme Court law because it is an interpretation of the Constitution by this current set of black-robed justices which goes against the interpretations by previous courts and absolutely negates the intent of the Founding Fathers who wrote our basic law.

In fact practically all the historic documents which marked the birth of our Nation—from the Declaration of Independence onward—made a point of invoking God. It thus becomes a savage irony indeed that this Court should outlaw prayer to Him.

YEARS OF BELIEF OVERTHROWN

Lest we forget, the current Court has in 2 short years overthrown more than 4½ centuries on this continent of unashamed acknowledgement of dependence on the Deity.

This was accomplished by three decisions—all directly involving public schools but claimed by at least one member of the Supreme Court to apply to all public life.

This has conceded the objective sought by nonbelievers for decades—to impose their will on the rest of us.

The narrow ground on which the Court rests its first decision—that the New York State regents' prayer for schools (although it was nonsectarian and noncompulsory) was written by a government agency and therefore was "establishment of religion"—had some legal force even if it defiled commonsense and public sentiment.

We of the great majority of believers in God, outraged as we were, could still see it as typical of lawyers' love for the hair-splitting quibbles. Recalling the line in a John Galsworthy play of some years back that said: "Public opinion's always in advance of the law," we could hope the Court might catch up.

That hope went out the window a couple of months ago.

The rulings did it—one declaring the Lord's Prayer was taboo and the other making the reading of the Bible in schools illicit.

It became clear then that the philosophy of the present majority of the Court considered all reference to God in the public schools as violating the first amendment to the Constitution, more usually referred to as the first article of the Bill of Rights.

To refresh your memory about the wording of that amendment, here is its reference to freedom of religion:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *"

More than a century and a half has passed since the architects of the Constitution carefully selected those words. But until this Court advanced its peculiar interpretation, an establishment of religion had always been held to mean giving privilege to one sect over others.

FOR RELIGION, PRAYER TO GOD

That's the way the writers of the first amendment meant it (and I'll tell you more about that next week), because their philosophies, no matter how much they differed on other matters, were unanimous in being for religion and prayer to God and against establishment of any church. To them establishment meant official support (and inevitably some degree of control) of any one church.

How then has the Supreme Court arrived at treating prayer to God as shameful or dangerous, not to be allowed to sully the tender ears of schoolchildren?

How has it arrived at what it is only fair to call an establishment, the establishment of atheism as a favored "church," if you'll pardon the expression?

More thoughts on how this happened, and what we may do about it, in this column next week.

BRING GOD BACK

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN SIMEON.—In this space last Sunday I took the position that the Supreme Court decisions banning prayer and Bible reading in our public schools affront our religious heritage and mangle the meaning of the first amendment.

Before getting on with our own conclusions here as to what we might do about it, I would like to cover a point or two that has been made in some mail I have received in just the last few days.

1. The Hearst Newspapers do not advocate coercive worship—never have, and never will. In our country "coercive worship" is a phrase in which one word cancels out the other. To worship God, or not to worship at all, is a matter of free choice.

It follows that children of parents who are antagonistic to religious exercises in the schools—for reasons af atheism, agnosticism or whatever—should not be forced to take part in them. To the best of my knowledge, no such compulsion exists anywhere.

Conversely, since those parents who oppose the exercises are a tiny minority, it also follows that the court decisions favor the very few over the very many.

2. It was pointed out last week that the rulings have aroused defiance in some States, communities or schools.

The reaction was cited to indicate the extent and vehemence of public antipathy, not to encourage overt or clandestine defiance. The right way—and granted, a laborious one—is to abrogate an offensive law by constitutional amendment, of which more later.

And that brings us to history. There were two opposing political philosophies when the Constitution was written at the Philadelphia Convention.

Thomas Jefferson, the greatest apostle of human rights and liberties among the founders of our country, was serving as Ambassador to France at the time, but his views were more than ably represented by his close associate, James Madison. The other main view, the need for strong protection of society as a whole, was equally well represented by Alexander Hamilton. Each, of course, had his group of followers.

Two more different men than Madison and Hamilton, major architects and proponents of the Constitution, would be hard to find in the nonextreme climate of their day.

Madison, son of a wealthy Virginia planter family, was nevertheless an ardent "liberal" in the true sense of the word rather than its current strange adaptation by big-government advocates. The young man of 36 who was to become the fourth President was prematurely wrinkled, of slight stature physically, but affable and tireless in negotiation. He was strong for individual liberties and moderately for State's rights.

Hamilton, arch-exponent of a strong Federal Government, was a far cry from the modest Madison. Child of a romantic love on the Island of Nevis in the British West Indies, Hamilton was so poor that he was put to work as an apprentice in a bank at St. Croix at the age of 11 and needed help to pay for schooling. But he did manage to get to King's College in New York (now Columbia University) and he became a star of the New York bar. The first U.S. Secretary of the Treasury was so trusted a confidant of George Washington that he is credited with having helped the first President write his shining Farewell Address.

Handsome and brilliant, Hamilton was also intellectually arrogant and so impolitic that it was a wonder he got far in politics. His scorn of popularity was matched by his scorn of danger, and it probably cost him his life. Hamilton was killed in a duel provoked by his slurs on shady politician Aaron Burr.

Hamilton's studies of history had taught him that all previous attempts at democracy

had foundered on the immoderation of crowds, and he sought strong safeguards for the American republic. He so distrusted the judgment of the large public that he once said in debate: "Your people, sir, are a great beast."

These then were the two main representatives of the two divergent views that found their consensus in the Constitution.

But once the two diverse views had been driven into the Constitution under the wise chairmanship of Washington and the flexible guidance of elder statesmen like Benjamin Franklin, it was characteristic of the nonextremism of Hamilton and Madison that they joined together to campaign for ratification by the States.

This was not easy everywhere. To sway reluctant and once-Tory New York, Hamilton, Madison, and John Jay (later to become first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court) wrote the Federalist Papers, a series of 85 articles appearing in various New York City newspapers. They wrote under the joint nom de plume of "Publius" and their labor has been hailed worldwide as America's great contribution to political philosophy.

Since these one-time opponents had become collaborators in interpreting the Constitution, it is surely not irrelevant to compare their frequent tribute to God with the present Supreme Court's interpretation of constitutional rights.

Madison, the man who specifically is credited with the fathership of the first amendment, surely showed what he meant by religious liberty in his proposed 1776 amendment to the Virginia State Constitution. It said, "All men are equally entitled to the full and free exercise of religion." He lost but persisted until with Jefferson's help he put it over 9 years later.

It is interesting that Madison's words in the Virginia proposal reappear in the first amendment which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

And what Madison and Jefferson meant by "establishment of religion" was also shown in Virginia. Patrick Henry ("Give me liberty or give me death") sought to put State support of churches into that constitution. Jefferson, Madison and their followers killed Henry's proposal.

The architects of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, therefore, were clearly against establishment of any church and equally clearly in favor of homage to God. It takes a really far-out interpretation to say they intended the first amendment to protect atheists against public prayer.

As of a recent count, seven bills to amend the Constitution so as to spell out the legality of prayer and Bible reading in public schools are before the Senate Judiciary Committee. About 50 bills are before the House Judiciary Committee. All these bills are slumbering quietly with no indication of when they will move—if ever.

There are many pieces of legislation meriting the support of all Americans, and some of them can be helped by pressure from the voting public upon their representatives in Washington.

But I can't think of anything that cries for rectification more than the ban on school prayer. It goes against the grain of all our deepest convictions and traditions. Here surely is an instance where the people should make their voices heard in the Halls of Congress.

We aren't going to get the outlawing of prayer corrected without constitutional amendment. Both Houses of Congress must pass it before the States can act on ratification.

I think it can help a lot if we don't all just complain, but instead write our Senators and Congressmen and keep the heat on them until they act on laws to get God back into the schools.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, by what might be termed popular demand, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD four more columns by Art Hoppe. I hope they will be enjoyed by the readers of the RECORD equally as much as those in the past:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 6, 1963]

TO BE FIRST LADY, GET FORGOTTEN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in television-land. It's time one again for another romantic episode of "The Rocky Road to Happiness," the heart-tugging story of Rocky Nelson and his search for the answer to that burning question which concerns us all: Can a young man of 54 find love? And still be President?

As we join Rocky today he is all alone in his romantic New York penthouse with his romantic new bride, Hysterical O'Brien. Plus 17 aids, assorted wall charts, a slide projector, several IBM computers, and the Nation's precinct lists.

AID. It's no good, chief. It just isn't blowing over the way we figured. We keep feeding the data into Ramac, Univac, and Dr. Joyce Brothers, but it always comes out the same: Every lady in the country still wants you. Drawn and quartered.

ROCKY (gloomily). Thanks a thou, fella. If only we could repeal the 19th amendment.

HYSTERICAL (pirouetting across the room and plopping into Rocky's lap). Oh, darling, tell me our undying love has not ruined your career.

ROCKY. Fella, you're unforgettable.

HYSTERICAL. Oh, what a beautiful thing to say.

ROCKY. But we're working on it.

HYSTERICAL. Oh, what can I do to help salvage your shattered life as your new soulmate?

ROCKY. Well, first of all you could put on your shoes. And roll down the cuffs of your jeans. And——

AIDE. The hairdresser's here, Chief.

HYSTERICAL (excitedly). Oh, a new coiffure. Shall I be an exotic brunette? Or a sensual platinum blonde? Or——

ROCKY. No, actually we've worked up a brandnew shade for you. It's called "Mousey."

HYSTERICAL. Mousey?

ROCKY. Don't worry, fella. Only our hairdresser will know. And here's the new wardrobe we've designed for you. How do you like this stunning mouse-gray bombazine?

AID (critically). The neckline's a bit low, Chief. I'm afraid her Adam's apple may show.

ROCKY. We'll add a lace ruffle. (To Hysterical) Now run off, fella, and come back an all-new woman. Oh, and here's a keepsake we bought you at Tiffany's: gold-rimmed spectacles.

HYSTERICAL. Oh, dearest, I only hope the all-new me will make you happy. For all I wish to do in life is stand forever by your side.

ROCKY. Thanks a thou, fella. And speaking of standing by my side, henceforth when you see the photographers coming, would you kind of edge back in the crowd? And maybe duck down as though you'd dropped something?

(Hysterical vanishes with the hairdresser and modiste while Rocky packs for his 50-State nonpolitical speaking and bumper-strip distribution tour. At last, Hysterical returns, a drastically changed woman.)

ROCKY (absently). Can we help you there, fella?

HYSTERICAL. Rocky, it is I. Hysterical.

ROCKY. Hysterical who? Now look, fella, let go of my coattails and stop sobbing. (To his aids) Toss her out gently fellas. She may be somebody's grandmother.

Will the public forget Rocky's new bride? In time for the New Hampshire primaries? Tune in to our very next episode, folks. Meantime, as you go down the byways of life, friends, remember: In back of every great man in public life stands a woman who loves him. And usually the farther back the better.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 7, 1963]

LET'S FACE REALITY (IN SMALL DOSES)

(By Arthur Hoppe)

If you haven't taken your vacation yet, may I offer a word of advice?

Don't.

The vacation part is fine. You go off to a mountain lake or somewhere and talk to squirrels and pine trees. But when you come back you have to catch up with what's been going on in the world of reality. All in one lump. And it's awfully hard to swallow.

Take me. I've spent the last 2 days poring through back issues of the paper trying to figure out what's been going on in the real world. I think I've finally got the gist:

Mr. Mao is now mad at Mr. Khrushchev forever and ever, which is good; but Nero has captured Romulus of Rome, which is bad.

On the other hand, we may stop exploding bombs because they are bad for us, but the treaty's meeting stiff opposition from Red China, General de Gaulle and Dr. Edward Teller. And Mr. Dick Tracy is hot on the trail of an avant garde chimpanzee suspected of pushing dope.

On the local scene our State legislature finally adjourned, which is good, after a bitter fight over the budget, which nobody much cares about one way or the other.

The fight ended in the State senate when the Republican leader, Senator Jack McCarthy, released his GOP colleagues to "vote their consciences." Instead of what they'd been voting.

But in the assembly the Republicans held firm and Governor Brown got so furious he flew off to Washington and said he'd stay there until they caved in. Which he would have, too, if he hadn't gone on to Europe the next day. That was about the same time Gordo shaved off his beard.

So Mr. Jesse (Big Daddy) Unruh locked up all the Republicans in the assembly until they agreed to vote his conscience, too. What a fracas. As Dondi said gloomily that morning: "How'm I ever going to get everybody glad again?"

On the racial front, the Atlanta Chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous integrated its membership, an act hailed as a blow against immoderates on both sides. The CIA opened a campaign in Congress stressing the need for better retirement benefits for our spies.

Mr. Nixon went to East Berlin to insult the Communists again, which he did by saying their city reminded him of "a beautiful woman with dirty underclothes." This statement required no explanation. Except, perhaps, to Mrs. Nixon. And Mr. Steve Roper began searching for "a man who rode a bicycle, wore red knickers and looked like Santa Claus."

On the romantic front, Miss Magee in Apartment 3-G fell in love with a "rat" named Bart Westlake, and our scientists isolated the pure sex attractant of the gypsy moth which they plan to duplicate under the

commercial name of "Gyplure." Meanwhile, in Hyannis Port.

So you see what I mean about the world of reality: You take it in regular doses day by day and it's perfectly digestible. But woe to you if you get a couple of weeks behind, and try to catch up.

Indeed, after a thoughtful analysis of the world of reality, the only character whose actions I find understandable is that one I mentioned at the beginning. Not Dr. Teller. I mean the chimpanzee who's pushing dope.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 9, 1963]

THE GIRL WHO SAVED THE WORLD

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Let us pause today in our busy rounds to salute the most diligent peace worker of our time.

As a hundred nations rush to sign the nuclear test ban treaty, as mankind basks in a new era of good feeling between East and West, as we rejoice in renewed hope for peace in our time, let us not fail to pay tribute to the unsung toiler-behind-the-scenes primarily responsible for this breakthrough at last in the long, grim cold war.

I am speaking, of course, of Miss Christine Keeler. May she win the Nobel Peace Prize.

I know that others would see the prize go elsewhere. The Americans would give credit for the test ban treaty to Mr. Kennedy; the British would hail Mr. Macmillan; the Russians, Mr. Khrushchev. But this is no time for crass nationalism.

Oh, I confess that at first I felt the same way. When the treaty was signed I was filled with gratitude toward our leaders. It made you realize, I said, how ordinary human beings like Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Khrushchev could set aside domestic political squabbles and rise above petty personal ambitions in order to achieve universal good for all mankind.

And personally, my heart overflowed most in Mr. Macmillan's direction. For of all three leaders, it was he who pressed hardest for the treaty. It was he, obviously, who selflessly thought most of humanity, who stood ready to give his all for the happiness of men everywhere. And it was he, I said, who should be awarded the Nobel Prize.

At least that's what I said before I read what the experts are saying. But do you know what the experts say? They say the reason Mr. Macmillan pushed so hard and successfully for the treaty was to take the British voter's mind off the Profumo scandals. So that he could get reelected. Which makes sense.

And thus, if there be any justice, the prize should go not to Mr. Macmillan, but to the little lady responsible for his dedication to peace: Miss Keeler.

Who can deny that night and day she, too, devoted herself to the happiness of men everywhere? Who can deny that she, too, gave her all? And who can view newsreels of her striding into Old Bailey without paying silent tribute to her movement? It may save the human race yet.

So it is due to her dedication and devotion to her work that all of us are a little safer from war today. If it were not for Miss Keeler, the British Empire might not have thrown its prestige behind the cause of peace. So I say that when it comes to peace work among our leaders she takes the prize.

Oh, I know some cynics will argue that while Miss Keeler may indeed have saved the world, it wasn't precisely the first thing on her mind at the time. And they're going to contend that it was all personal vanity and status building.

But I say if we're going to start getting into the motives of the candidates, we're never going to pick a winner.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 14, 1963]

CAN COMMUNISTS LIVE COMMUNALLY?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

We ace kremlinologists, as you know, are always looking for little tidbits which will reveal the constant behind-the-scenes machinations of the mysterious Russian leaders. Let Pravda mention a new method of mending trousers and six kremlinologists will rush into print with articles entitled: "Is There a Split in the Soviet Presidium?"

So thank goodness Mr. Khrushchev took five Western newsmen on a tour of his summer retreat. We've now got enough tidbits for a hundred cocktail parties.

I leave to my colleagues the tidbit that Mr. Khrushchev plays badminton on an oriental (or, in some dispatches, Persian) rug. This obviously shows his intentions to tread on Red China. (Or, as the case may be, Iran.) And we obviously must plan for this (or that) move.

What boggles my mind is Mr. Khrushchev's casual disclosure that he keeps the temperature at 78.8° "because Mikoyan likes it that way."

This means he often shares the place with Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan. Plus who knows how many other Communist leaders? Talk about tidbits which explain the constant machinations of Soviet politics. Well, anybody who has ever shared a summer cabin with anybody will see at once what I mean.

(Scene: The door of Mr. K's summer place. Mr. and Mrs. K are greeting Mr. and Mrs. Mikoyan, who are travel-weary and arm-laden.)

Mr. MIKOYAN. Nice place you got here. If a little chilly. We brought you this small gift.

Mr. KHRUSHCHEV. Imagine. A hand-carved nutcracker. Just what I needed. I'll put it here with the other seven nutcrackers our guests have given us. Chilly?

Mrs. KHRUSHCHEV (to Mrs. Mikoyan). You must want a nice, hot bath. We shouldn't have used up all the hot water. But let me show you around: This is your half of the icebox. And this is your very own dish towel. And your very own mop. We all do our share, ha, ha. Just like one big happy family.

Mrs. MIKOYAN. I'll bet, ha, ha. Where do we sleep?

Mr. KHRUSHCHEV. You got the whole loft to yourselves. Over here's the ladder. Watch out for the bats. In the country you know, you got to rough it. Ho, ho, ho.

Mr. MIKOYAN (unenthusiastically). Ho, ho, ho. But, pardon my asking, is the heat on?

Mrs. KHRUSHCHEV. Oh, yes. It's 62. That's the way my Nikita likes it. But if it's too cold for you * * *.

Mrs. MIKOYAN. Well, my Anastas does prefer it about 85. Not that we'd dream * * *.

Mrs. KHRUSHCHEV (gritting her teeth). Why don't we compromise at 78.8? Like one big happy family.

(Mr. Khrushchev, perspiring already, whispers to Mrs. Khrushchev that "this hothead's got to go." Mr. Mikoyan, meanwhile, is shiveringly confiding to Mr. Mikoyan that when he gets home he's going to ask Mr. Molotov for cocktails. And the two ladies, who are glaring politely at each other.)

But why go on? The whole thing clearly explains the constant purges in Communist history. And as soon as I confirm a report that Mr. and Mrs. Chou En-lai were guests at the Khrushchev dacha last summer, we'll have the key to the entire Sino-Soviet rift.

For, if you ask me, the failure of communism lies in the theory that many families can all live together, communally, as one big happy family. Nonsense. I say living together as one big happy family is tough enough even when you're related.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Watchdog of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress must determine how he can best utilize the precious minutes and hours of each day. The backgrounds and capabilities of each Member differ widely with the result that their interests lead them into different fields of study and concentration.

Fortunately for the Congress, for the country as a whole, and for each individual taxpayer in the 50 States, one man has conducted an unrelenting campaign to halt wasteful defense spending. Despite the countless frustrations, the roadblocks at every turn, he has diligently and courageously preceded along his chosen course, with the result that literally millions of taxpayers' dollars have been saved.

It is a pleasure to insert the following article from Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill of August 28, 1963, praising Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana, as a watchdog of defense.

The article follows:

[From Roll Call, Aug. 28, 1963]

WATCHDOG OF DEFENSE: HOOSIER REPRESENTATIVE EARL WILSON KEEPS HIS EYE ON PENTAGON SPENDING

(By Oscar Johnson)

EARL WILSON, who calls himself the bane of the Pentagon, reports meaningful gains in his one-man quest to halt wasteful defense spending.

WILSON is one Member of Congress who doesn't subscribe to the belief that the Defense Department is being efficiently run under Secretary Robert McNamara.

In his view, medium-level bureaucrats are practically shoveling dollars from the windows of the Pentagon into the waiting arms of favored contract winners. WILSON feels the rampant waste—due largely to noncompetitive sole-source procurement—accounts each year for a sizable portion of the Nation's huge defense budget.

The Hoosier Republican has been locked in a battle with the army of civilian and military bureaucrats to halt the inefficient practices. Now, he says, "The tortoise is catching the hare."

WILSON, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, has always been a plugger for economy in Government. When he came to Washington as a freshman Congressman 20 years ago, he says, "to say that I was appalled is putting it mildly."

Roaming through Federal agencies, the former high school principal found Government employees sitting around doing nothing, everywhere he went.

"Large rooms, filled with chairs, were populated by scores and scores of secretaries," WILSON recalls. "They sat on these chairs all day, polishing their nails, reading, talking, waiting for someone to find work for them to do.

"While they sat and waited, they were being paid by the taxpayers in my district who had to work hard to earn the tax money they contributed to the Government. It made my blood boil."

Although WILSON has been fighting creeping bureaucracy ever since, it wasn't until about 2 years ago that he moved into a new field—defense spending.

What touched him off this time was the "freezing out" of an Indiana manufacturer on a military contract. When it was awarded, apparently capriciously, to a company in another State, WILSON started peppering the Pentagon with inquiries.

The Pentagon's response was not altogether satisfactory, so the stubborn Hoosier broadened his probe. Since then WILSON has been demonstrating the amount of applecart-upsetting a single Congressman can accomplish when he really gets going.

It's safe to say that the military procurement officials regret the day WILSON got into their lives.

One of WILSON's first steps was to get on the public mailing list of all defense procurement agencies. Sifting through the voluminous mass of material, he soon began pinpointing cases of apparent extravagance and waste in noncompetitive contracting.

Bombarding the departments with pointed, hard-to-answer questions on specific contracts, WILSON and his congressional staff set up sort of an economy clearinghouse on military procurement. They began getting tips by patriotic civil servants on what was going on within the bureaucracies.

"The procurement picture is as tangled a can of fishing worms as you have ever seen," WILSON found. "It's been wrapped in a shell of directives, policies, regulations, restrictions, excetpions, amendments and procedures that protects it like the shell protects the armadillo.

"To understand how wasteful the purchasing policies of our defense people are, you must strip away the shell piece by piece. There is no shortcut." What is amazing is that there is apparently nobody in the Defense Establishment trying to do this.

As WILSON's office acquired proficiency in the field, their efforts began to produce too much heat for Secretary McNamara's comfort. Accordingly, he cut the Congressman off the revealing mailing list in 1962.

Other Congressmen, however, came to WILSON's assistance. Due largely to two Democrats—Chairman JOHN MOSS, of California, of the House Freedom of Information Subcommittee and Chairman GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, of the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee—McNamara grudgingly restored WILSON's access this May.

Each day now, from 40 to 74 procurement documents arrive at WILSON's office on Capitol Hill. They range in size from 1 to more than 100 pages, and are immediately examined.

WILSON estimates that of the material that comes in, perhaps a third merits further immediate study. Later, even this number is culled down to get at the documents which present the most provocative questions.

"In this process many good cases are lost," says WILSON. "I only wish time and staff were available to study more of them."

Inquiries are made in several ways. The military agencies frequently bar bidding by more than one company on contracts because specification drawings "are not available." On some such cases, WILSON has written directly to the agency buying the equipment and forced them to admit that drawings were available—thereby opening the bidding to companies other than a sole development source.

In other instances, Congressional liaison officers of the various service branches are asked for more documents to fully explain the history of the equipment being bought.

In still others, the General Accounting Office or private industry is asked to supply accounting or technical answers to questions.

Answers come back in a time span that ranges from several hours to several days, WILSON reports. "Most times the answers trigger more questions and the file on individual cases grows accordingly."

Eventually, a case is complete and (1) a questionable procurement has been stopped or turned into a competitive purchase, (2) the waste in the noncompetitive procurement has been exposed to the public by press statements or a House speech, or (3) a formal approach to the Secretary of Defense or other agency is necessary.

During the 18 months from June, 1961, to December, 1962, a total of 1,014 military procurements were studied. During the first 5 months of this year several hundred cases have been taken up, and WILSON has detailed 18 of them in House speeches.

In one recent speech, WILSON brought out that his probe has forced the Army to cancel a proposed $338,000 procurement because the equipment sought was already in storehouses of other agencies. The Army wanted to pay a sole-source company $800 for 421 instruments which indicate visually the flight attitude of an aircraft.

Attempting to head off the purchase on a noncompetitive basis, WILSON discovered there were already on hand a stockpile of more than 12,000 of the devices left over from the Korean war.

Thus, said WILSON, this single investigation resoulted in a saving to the taxpayers of $338,000.

Many of the errors and giveaways turned up by the Congressman show taxpayer losses in the millions of dollars. Another recent case brought out how the Army demonstrably wasted $17 million by not opening a radio to bidding until after a sole-source company had cleared an immense profit.

One of the main obstacles confronting WILSON is the fact that the information he develops is simply unbelievable. Few persons are willing to accept that the military is throwing away so much money in its procurement, about 80 percent of which is without full competition.

However, the facts and statistics he has brought out are too convincing. Many people are beginning to sit up and take notice.

On hearing of the waste, some citizens ask why the tax dollars are treated with such contempt. WILSON has disclosed as one example that a record-high $65 million radio contract was let to a company (sole-source) with 5 months after the former Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics had left the service and joined the firm.

Apparently, wonders can be worked among medium-level Pentagon procurement officers with a few dollars' worth of lavish entertainment. "The sharp operators in industry buy lunches and dinners, arrange for various

forms of social entertainment, buy gifts and manifestations of good will for the Government bureaucrats who accept them as favors to set the stage for Government contracts," charges WILSON.

He says that "influence, politics, and other pressures are being used to channel defense contracts to favored manufacturers at all levels." Even when this is disclosed, the offenders are never punished, he says.

WILSON says he does not directly criticize McNamara, the admirals and generals, the secretaries of the services, the line and fleet commanders, the second-echelon officers, and the enlisted men of the services. "I speak of the middle-grade civil and military experts who are wined and dined and much more to set the stage for contracts to favored companies."

The long, hard fight has taken much effort, WILSON says. "Progress has at times been slow and there has been some discouragement.

"Now, however, it is abundantly clear that savings are being effected. Procurement regulations are being changed in the direction of truly open and competitive bidding for defense supplies."

It has been a tough battle for the stubborn Hoosier, but WILSON, 57, is still going strong. That's the way they make 'em, down in Indiana.

Dr. Teller's Impressive Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Knoxville Journal on August 22 discussing the test ban testimony of Dr. Edward Teller:

TELLER POSITION IMPRESSIVE

Dr. Edward Teller, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week, characterized the Khrushchev nuclear test ban treaty "not a step for peace but rather a step away from safety, possibly a step toward war." Dr. Teller is especially concerned about the treaty's preventing perfection by this country of a missile killer, a weapon with which he asserts the Russians have made more progress than we.

This testimony is not too comforting to the American people who have come to know the name of Dr. Teller as "father of the H-bomb." He was so designated because while a group of other scientists were contending some years ago that our weaponry was adequate so long as we had the atomic bomb, Dr. Teller insisted upon development of the H-bomb. The fact that the Russians now also possess it has confirmed the soundness of Dr. Teller's judgment. Thus, when he expresses the opinion that Khrushchev wants this treaty to prevent the United States from getting the knowledge achieved by Russian scientists when they last broke off negotiations at Geneva in order to conduct a series of new tests, a good many Americans will suspect the University of California physicist may be right again.

Of course there are other scientists who will testify in behalf of the President's proposal. There were scientists who insisted, even before Russia signed to a word of honor agreement, that this country unilaterally ban atmospheric testing. There is an element in this country which would support complete disarmament of the United States, as proposed by the Kennedy administration in a document filed with the United Nations, leaving to this ragtag aggregation the whole problem of preserving our freedom.

If what the Senate is considering were a matter of politics only, we would be impressed by the judgment of the President. If it were a matter of operating a mass production industry such as Ford, we would want no better judgment than that of McNamara. If it were an academic point to be passed upon, then we would gladly accept the judgment of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

We believe any of these gentleman, however, might concede that in the light of scientific history, the judgment of Dr. Edward Teller should probably be given more weight than theirs.

If the American people are jittery about this treaty, and if some of us are in doubt about accepting the President's judgment as the last word on a scientific matter, he must take personal responsibility for sowing the seed of doubt. Most Americans remember that when he was Candidate Kennedy, much was heard during the 1960 campaign about a missile gap. The President had scarcely gotten the seat of his rocking chair warm before, lo and behold, it was discovered that no such gap existed, or ever had. The gap that Mr. Kennedy was so concerned about, allegedly through negligence on the part of former President Eisenhower, turned out to be only a discovery of the candidate's speech writers. Now we are told that this country, so far as missiles are concerned, outguns the Russians many times over. In fact we are being told now of our capacity for overkill.

It is no wonder that the people of this country are desperately confused.

Sham Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following article, "Sham Tax Cut" written by Henry Hazlitt in the September 2 issue of Newsweek:

SHAM TAX CUT

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Neither the Treasury nor the House Ways and Means Committee that adopted its proposed tax cuts has any reason to feel proud of what it did.

Let us recall some elementary principles that everyone seems to want to forget. Taxes are imposed, not out of pure cussedness, but to raise revenues. Their function is to raise enough revenues to pay for the Government's expenditures. Taxes, in other words, are a purely derivative problem. The real problem is to cut expenditures. But nobody wants to face this. So everybody can be a cheap Santa Claus by voting for tax cuts while voting for more expenditures.

When taxes fall short of meeting expenditures, the tax cut is not real. Either visible taxes must be correspondingly increased in subsequent years (if there is any honest intention of ever having even a "cyclically" balanced budget or ever paying off any of the national debt), or the deficit must be paid for by the hidden tax inflation, i.e., of higher prices and cheaper dollars. If inflation worked out evenly, it would be a proportional income tax and capital levy on rich and poor alike. It never works out evenly, but falls most heavily on those least able to protect themselves. In brief, any tax cut that leaves a deficit is a deception and a sham.

HUGE DEFICITS

On August 13, Secretary Dillon predicted a deficit of $9.1 billion for the current fiscal year 1964, compared with his estimate in January of $11.9 billion. But he also forecast still another deficit of $9.4 billion for fiscal 1965. The day after the Secretary announced these tremendous deficits, the Ways and Means Committe adopted tax cuts, starting in the election year that begins next January, that will amount when fully effective, according to Treasury estimates, to $11.9 billion annually. How much of this cut was allowed for in Secretary Dillon's estimates of the day before was not clear. In any case the Treasury, this far ahead, has persistently underestimated the deficit. For the fiscal year ended June 30 last, it originally estimated a surplus. There was actually a deficit of $6.2 billion. The same thing happened in the preceding fiscal year, which ended with a deficit of $6.3 billion.

If a tax cut were justified at all with present spending programs, it would not be the kind of tax cut that the Treasury has recommended and the Ways and Means Committee adopted. There would be an argument for a tax cut that ended confiscatory rates, that made the scale of progression less steep, that mitigated the taxes that do most to discourage effort, production, and growth. Such reforms would make possible greater revenues in spite of lower rates.

MASSIVE REVENUE LOSS

But the new tax bill does the opposite. For the present personal income tax scale ranging from 20 to 91 percent, it substitutes a scale ranging from 14 to 70 percent. The result is that the tax cut at the bottom of the scale amounts to 30 percent and at the upper end of the scale varies from about 15 to 23 percent. Moreover, owing to a new "minimum standard deduction" gimmick, 1.5 million taxpayers would be taken off the tax rolls entirely.

The result is that 1.5 million fewer people will give a hoot how high Government spending goes. The loss of revenue will be massive. It will be politically almost impossible to put these people back on the rolls or to restore the 20 percent basic rate. If, as Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, proposed, there had been simply a flat tax cut of 20 percent all down the line, the political problem of restoration would not be so serious. If the top rates had been slashed to a maximum of 50 percent, there would have been a maximum revenue loss of $1 billion in the first year and probably increased revenues in succeeding years because of the incentives that would have been restored. Instead, the penalization of investment was made even steeper by the proposed termination of the 4 percent dividend credit.

True, the new tax bill has a few good features. But in the context of planned deficits of more than $9 billion a year, its tax reductions are a fraud that will deceive only the shortsighted.

Extremism on West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently called to the attention of the House the extreme leftwing pronouncements which were made at a 13-State

meeting of the Young Democrats, held August 17–18 at Berkeley, Calif. It is not surprising that the People's World, West coast cousin of the Communist Daily Worker has praised the Young Democrats as being in advance of the party on these issues. The article appeared in the August 24, 1963, edition of the People's World:

YOUNG DEMOS SET FAST PACE ON ISSUES

BERKELEY.—Young Democrats, who move traditionally in advance of the main body of the party on issues, ran true to form at a Western States conference at the Claremont Hotel here last weekend (August 17–18).

Among the resolutions adopted at the gathering were:

A call upon President Kennedy to resume diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba. (The resolution pointed out last October's brink-of-war crisis "might have been avoided if there had been contact between the Cuban Government and the United States.")

A demand for reforms in Vietnam and a withdrawal of U.S. troops from that nation.

A condemnation of any Federal program for civil defense or fallout shelters.

A call for abolition of the House Un-American Committee, repeal of the McCarran "internal security" Act, and a complete revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

A plea for lifting of travel restrictions to Cuba and China.

A call upon the Democratic Party to sponsor a national conference on peace, freedom, and jobs.

A proposal for a conference of young political leaders from the Afro-Asian Pacific rim.

Endorsement of the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom this coming Wednesday.

A demand for a massive Federal voter registration drive in the South.

In the same vein the Young Democrats opposed compulsory arbitration in labor disputes, endorsed ratification of the test ban treaty, urged abolition of capital punishment, opposed the "tyrannical" seniority system in Congress, and criticized attacks on the U.S. Supreme Court from the ultra right.

The actions placed the Young Democrats ahead of even such advanced Democratic Party organizations as the California Democratic Council on issues.

And the Young Democrats were far in advance of the California State Democratic Central Committee, which only a week ago refused to take a stand on the controversial Pacific Gas & Electric Co. atomic power plant on Bodega Head.

The Young Demos opposed the plant.

The Young Democrats also—

Supported a pending bill by U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, limiting the giving of advance information to the press on certain investigations.

Urged creation of a Federal Fair Employment Commission with powers to enforce voting rights and to revoke Federal licenses in cases of discrimination.

Opposed continuation of the bracero labor program.

Urged Federal construction and operation of high voltage interconnection lines between Pacific Northwest power sources and States of the Pacific Southwest.

Condemned the John Birch Society, Americans for Constitutional Action, the Christian Crusade, the National Education Program of Harding College "and those other organizations of the radical right."

Deplored the "capture" of the National Young Republicans "by the extreme right wing of the political spectrum."

Howard Schumann of Los Angeles, Young Democrat national committeeman, said the resolutions will be submitted to the Young Democrat national convention in Las Vegas in December.

The delegates from the Western States adjourned in memory of the late Senator Estes Kefauver.

Results of a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently I circulated a public opinion questionnaire in more than 85,000 households in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, comprising Lake, McHenry and Boone Counties. I am particularly pleased to report that almost 15,000 questionnaires were returned with answers, comments, and—in some instances—an accompanying letter expressing individul views.

Reviewing these questionnaires and reading the many opinions has been one of the stimulating experiences of my service as a new Member of Congress. I am proud of and grateful for the overwhelming interest in good government and good citizenship which led to these responses from my constituents. And, I include the compiled opinions of the 12th Congressional District of Illinois in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

1963 questionnaire—Final results

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a Federal income tax cut this year:—		
A. Without a reduction in Federal spending?	14.9	--------
B. Only if Federal spending is reduced?	85.1	--------
2. In relation to Cuba—		
A. Do you think the Cuban situation has been handled wisely?	21.5	78.5
B. Do you favor a naval quarantine of Cuba to eliminate the Castro-Soviet threat through economic pressure?	78.8	21.3
C. Do you believe the Government should manage the news as was done in the Cuban situation?	36.8	63.2
3. Do you favor the creation of a joint committee of Congress to examine the President's budget and recommend sound fiscal policies?	86.3	13.7
4. Do you favor adoption of one of the following farm programs (check 1):		
A. Rigid controls and quotas on individual production, mandatory land retirement—a strictly regulated farm economy?	3.6	--------
B. No controls, no supports, no protection—a completely free farm market?	27.4	--------
C. Moderate and flexible price supports, voluntary large-scale land retirement—a gradual withdrawal of Government from the farm economy?	69.0	--------
5. Does our Nation need a youth program under Federal control, such as—		
A. The Domestic Peace Corps?	33.9	66.1
B. The Youth Conservation camps?	48.2	51.8
6. Do you favor Federal aid to education such as—		
A. Aid to public grammar and high schools?	36.7	63.3
B. Aid to private and parochial grammar and high schools?	17.1	82.9
C. College construction grants?	46.4	53.6
D. Federal scholarships for higher education?	55.5	44.5
E. Federal income tax credits for parents paying tuition?	73.6	26.4
7. Do you favor Federal subsidies to assist urban mass transportation?	26.8	73.2
8. Do you favor Federal civil rights legislation—		
A. To guarantee the right to vote?	88.3	11.7
B. To enforce school integration?	43.3	56.7
C. To grant equal opportunity for employment on Federal work?	83.2	16.8
9. On foreign aid, do you favor—		
A. A sharp reduction in foreign aid spending?	86.3	13.7
B. Any foreign aid to nonalined nations?	22.2	77.8
10. Do you favor hospital and nursing home care for people over 65 financed by increased social security taxes and increased Federal income taxes for those not under social security?	28.2	71.8
11. Do you favor the creation of a Federal Crime Commission to investigate and intensify the war against organized crime?	83.2	16.8

Truth Rings Out in Lamoille County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Texans can take pride in compliments paid a Texan in Vermont. More than this, all citizens of our county can take heed to the sensible, commonsense and views expressed by the gentleman from Texas [ED FOREMAN], as reported in the Burling ton Free Press of Burlington, Vt.

Commonsense, statesmanship, Constitutionalism, limited government, respect for the individual and his freedoms are views worthy of the Halls of Congress. Yet, such expressions are heard too seldom, and legislated even less by your Federal Government.

Congress and our Nation are strengthened by the presence and frank statements of the gentleman from Texas [ED FOREMAN]. Yes, we need more men in Congress who think about the future of this country and not just about the next election. ED FOREMAN is one of those men. I offer the following editorial for today's students of government:

TRUTH RINGS OUT IN LAMOILLE COUNTY

(By Franklin Benjamin Smith)

The voice of commonsense rang loud and clear in Jeffersonville Saturday night at a hugely successful rally sponsored by the Lamoille County Republican Committee and the Lamoille County Republican Club.

U.S. Representative ED FOREMAN, of Texas, the Nation's youngest Congressman, vigorously and eloquently laid the facts of life on the line to an overflow audience of 146 citizens. Here are some of the commonsense facts which FOREMAN stressed:

1. The United States of America was made great by individual citizens working under the free enterprise system. These individuals had a strong and firm belief in God, and they understood the necessity of business profits.

2. Only so long as business can make profits "will you and I be free." Anyone who is antibusiness is also antilabor, for the two go hand in hand.

The opposite of capitalism is socialism—the collective ownership of production for need and use rather than profit.

"It is this thing called profit that made people move on." Socialism reduces people to a blur in the mass. This can kill the very spirit that makes men and nations go.

3. The Government has no money—no income—that it doesn't get from the people. It is impossible to get something for nothing: "When you give up freedom for security, you get neither." The government which is big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you've got.

4. Socialism moves us to only one step away from the greatest enemy in the world today—communism. The way to defeat communism is to defeat socialism, and the way to defeat socialism is to defeat the Socialists in government today.

5. There are too many Republican Congressmen and too many Democratic Congressmen, but not enough U.S. Congressmen. "We need men in Congress who think about the future of this country and not just about the next election."

6. Our foreign aid program borders on treason, because it gives our money to our enemies. "How absurd, how silly, how ignorant can you get when you throw away your money to your enemies?" There are 64,508 people on the foreign aid payroll who give away our money to other countries. We had better start looking at home to take care of our people's own needs first.

What can Americans do to prevent the Socialists from selling this country down the drain? FOREMAN urged that Americans do the following:

1. Know and understand your governments and your laws. Exercise your right and obligation to vote.

2. Get active in politics. A citizen who is not interested in politics is like a drowning man who is not interested in a life preserver.

3. Teach our young people about the things that made America great—profits, the free enterprise system, etc.

We congratulate Lamoille County Republicans for bringing ED FOREMAN to Vermont. He fearlessly spoke the truth as we have not heard it spoken in a long time, and our State and Nation will be the better for it.

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this brings up the problem of when, if ever, does the Congress of the United States start to think about terminating this whole business of preference.

It does so by saying that the privileges and the priorities established by this bill will apply only to those who now are receiving the benefit of presently existing Federal facilities in the Pacific Northwest. This is a matter that we are going to have to look into in a very broad sense, but the amendment applies specifically to this particular bill.

When Congress Listens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the country and the taxpayers were heartened last week by action of the House of Representatives in making a very substantial reduction in the foreign aid bill. I was among the 222 Members who voted for the cuts. I am proud of this vote.

The national press quoted the President as being very unhappy over the action taken by the House.

What the President and many others at the executive level do not seem to understand is that the taxpayers are tiring and their backs are getting sore under the heavy burden of foreign aid.

It is time we were getting out of the foreign aid business. There is a spark of hope in the action taken by the House.

As part of my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, a large daily published in Memphis, Tenn.

The editorial follows:

WHEN CONGRESS LISTENS

The American voter is often frustrated by incapacity to influence the decisions made in Washington. He should be encouraged, then, by House action on the foreign aid authorization bill for fiscal 1964.

President Kennedy called the action "irresponsible." He used other words like "shocking," "dangerously partisan" and "thoughtless."

But members of both the House and the Senate have noted that a grassroots revolt against the perennially high cost of our foreign aid program is underway. The word from home has gotten to the lawmakers in both parties.

Actually, the House cuts are not so tremendous as they might appear. The President followed custom by requesting more than he expected to receive, and then trimmed his own request as a response to a report on waste in aid made by a special committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. The House Foreign Affairs Committee cut it again, sending to the floor a bill authorizing an outlay of $4.1 billion.

And then, with the sentiments of the voters echoing in their minds, House Members dug another $585 million out of the measure.

With that, the foreign aid bill was passed by a 224 to 186 vote and sent to the Senate. The $3.5 billion program approved is only $400 million less than the sum voted last year.

Let it be clearly understood that this one milestone action does not guarantee reductions in the final aid bill. The Senate can, if it wishes, restore the cut items, weaken restrictions applied by the House, and leave the differences to be ironed out by a conference committee. But many Senators have welcomed the House squeeze on a big cost item in the American budget. A number of Senators also are miffed enough with the President's civil rights bill, his handling of the railroad work rules crisis, and the pushing of tax cuts without reforms to ignore his foreign aid importunity.

The bright hope is that on the second round—when the House and Senate vote actual appropriations of funds instead of mere authorizations—the grassroots voice will be even stronger.

It should be, for the voters have been shown that on occasion their wishes can be translated into actuality by a listening Congress.

That's Your Dough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Abilene, Kans., Reflector-Chronicle, which appropriately calls to our attention the efforts of Charles E. Holmes, executive secretary of Kansas Petroleum Industries Committee, to do away with such expressions as "paid for by Federal funds."

The editorial follows:

THAT'S YOUR DOUGH

The editor of the Kansas Petroleum Industries News says that of all the lost causes he has pushed, he thinks none is recalled more often than the unsuccessful attempt to do away with the expressions "at Government expense" or "paid for by Federal funds" and similar phrases.

"Federal funds? Nuts. That's our dough," says Charlie Holmes, executive secretary of the Petroleum Industries Committee.

He continues:

"Scarcely a day passes but what the newspapers report on some project which the 'Government will pay for.' Quite often a politician will explain gleefully to his constituents how he has saved them money. The new bridge or highway or municipal building or what-have-you will not, says the politician, cost his beloved taxpayers anything but a simple fee.

" 'The big expense,' he tells the audience, 'will be taken care of by Federal funds.'

"Now, except for their own contribution through personal tax, politicians don't spend their own money. When the President or the Congress approves a gift or a loan of millions or billions of dollars, inside the country or outside, the money being spent doesn't belong to them.

"This money is taxpayers' money. The implication is when there is a joint financing of some project, any part contributed by the Federal Government is 'found' money. As long as 'Federal funds' are used, nobody has to pay.

"It seems to me it is about time somebody put to use the known facts of financial life, the most prominent being that there are no such things as Federal funds in the sense the Government owns money. The Government doesn't earn a dime.

"Because of this, I have suggested more than once that the phrase 'Federal funds' be changed to 'taxpayers' money.'

"Instead of telling how the Federal Government is paying for some new buildings in Catchall, Kans., through generous loans at

low rates, the item ought to read 'the taxpaying citizens of 50 States today chipped in $43 million so that the people in Catchall could have a new downtown development.' "

In the first place, I think the people who come up with the scratch, not the gents who spend it, should get proper credit. At least, it might get recognition abroad for the hard working folks who make it possible for our agents to play Santa Claus.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JULY 22, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Captive Nations Conference of Hungarian, Polish, and Ukrainian Collegians at State University of New York at Buffalo on July 19, 1963, unanimously endorses and calls for the enactment of House Resolution 14 for establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations Affairs.

OLGA SHEPELAVEY,
Conference Chairman.
ANN-MARIE SLOBODIAN,
Moderator.

JULY 12, 1963.

DEAR HON. DAN FLOOD: I support your House Resolution 14, to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations and urge its passage without delay.

BARBARA SUTHERLAND.

West Islip, L.I., N.Y.

JULY 22, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to urge quick action on House Resolution 14, for the purpose of establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Just the reaction of Moscow and her puppets to any mention of captive nations in the Congress of the United States shows that she fears our exposing the Soviet imperialist colonial system and the plight of the unhappy people under it.

As a person of Czechoslovak and Hungarian extraction, you can see why I am most anxious to see something permanent done in this regard.

Very truly yours,

CLARA T. BENNETT.

JULY 11, 1963.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I fully endorse your House Resolution 14 (to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations).

Let us establish this special committee as soon as possible—and do something.

Sincerely,

ROBERT CORRE.

The Foreign Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the recent action by the House to cut the 1964 foreign aid bill. As the Congress proceeds through the remainder of the legislative process and begins work on the appropriation for the Foreign Assistance Act, it is valuable I believe, to consider some of the charges and counter charges which have been made. In this connection I call to the attention of the Members the following two editorials from the Chicago Sun-Times and Chicago Tribune of August 28, 1963:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Aug. 28, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT'S ANGER

Mr. Kennedy exhibited more anger than wisdom when he rushed before the microphones to denounce House Republicans for lopping another $585 million from his already deflated foreign aid bill. The final House bill gives the President $3.5 billion instead of the $4.5 billion he is asking.

In attacking the Republicans as "shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan," Mr. Kennedy lobbed his expletives neatly over the heads of 66 members of his own party who, by voting with the Republicans, insured the latest cuts. Of 106 Democratic Congressmen from 13 Southern States, only 36 opposed the cuts. Seventeen more would have defeated the reduction. It isn't particularly persuasive for the President to condemn the opposition for opposing him when he couldn't even keep his own party in line.

The President accused the Republicans of perpetrating this "unprecedented, unwarranted, and unwise" deed just when "the forces of freedom are moving around the world." Once again he is suggesting that success is just around the corner—if only he has his way this one more time. The foreign aid lobbyists have been crooning this lullaby for years, yet their requests have been growing ever larger, more insistent, and more burdensome.

Maybe things are looking up and maybe not. Mr. Kennedy doesn't seem to agree with himself. He excoriates the Republicans for voting against a program which "both parties have consistently supported" when there has been "no change in the world situation" to justify them; yet he justifies a test ban treaty on the ground that the situation is changing. It remained for Senator GOLDWATER and Representative GROSS to remind Mr. Kennedy that he, as a Senator, had voted on at least four occasions to cut Mr. Eisenhower's foreign aid bill. As viewed from the White House, apparently, the world situation and history adjust themselves to suit Mr. Kennedy's political needs.

As the French proverb says, the more things change, the more they remain the same. So it is with the world situation. Vague references to world conditions can't in themselves justify any program, espeically one which has cost us upward of $100 billion. The program must justify itself, and this foreign aid has failed to do. Even former enthusiastic supporters such as Senators FULBRIGHT and MORSE have turned cautious and critical as the evidences of waste and futility have mounted. Mr. Kennedy apparently expects Congress to continue wholehearted support of a program simply because it was once talked into supporting it.

He painted a dire picture of the devestation that would remain if the House cuts are accepted by the Senate. "Social and economic progress in Latin America will be stalled." The development loan fund will be crippled. The effectiveness of allied forces abroad will be "jeopardized."

If a cut of $585 million will leave the rest of the program in this helpless condition, then perhaps Congress would be wiser to restore the essential $585 million and eliminate, instead, the remaining $3.5 billion which Mr. Kennedy assured us, in his anger, would be so useless.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Aug. 28, 1963]

FOREIGN POLICY NO STATIC AFFAIR

(By Milburn P. Akers)

The slash in President Kennedy's foreign aid proposals from $4 billion to $3.5 billion voted by the House of Representatives doesn't necessarily imply that Congress has thrown overboard the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy. But it could mean that Congress—at least the conservative House—intends to have more of a hand in the determination of what that bipartisan policy consists and in the method of its implementation.

The term "bipartisan foreign policy" is a vague one. For foreign policy is not a static affair, especially in its implementation. Circumstances vary almost from day to day. And the implementation of basic policies varies with them. For example, the implementation of our policy in South Vietnam this week varies somewhat from 2 weeks ago. And it is likely to vary considerably more before that mess is over. Basically, however, our policy in South Vietnam—an effort to keep that distressed nation out of the Communist orbit—hasn't changed.

American security and along with it the defense of the free world remain the basic tenets of our bipartisan foreign policy. Congress and the administration may differ, as do others, on the details (if half a billion dollars may be called a detail) of the manner in which we can best assure our security and in which we can best defend the free world.

Administration efforts to restore the cut will no doubt be made in the Senate, far less conservative than is the House. Nonetheless, the House has reflected a growing body of public opinion regarding foreign air. More than $100 billion has been spent on it since World War II. Some of it has been misspent. Some of it has yielded large returns, however.

President Kennedy's description of the House action as "shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan"—if intended as a political thrust at his Republican opposition—was hardly justified.

Sixty-six Democrats voted with 156 Republicans to record the 222 votes by which the slash in foreign aid was decreed. Sixteen Republicans voted with 162 Democrats to support the President's proposal. It was Mr. Kennedy's failure to get the support of the Southern Democratic Members which caused his defeat, if it was, as he apparently interprets the vote, a partisan defeat. If the vote reflected a "dangerously partisan" attitude it is one in which 66 Democrats bear the same responsibility as do 156 Republicans.

If it was a dangerously partisan vote, as the President asserted, so were a number of votes Mr. Kennedy cast as a Member of Congress. For he voted on a number of occasions to decrease presidential requests for foreign aid. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona has recited that record: A 1953 vote for a $50 million cut; a 1955 vote for a $500 million slash; a 1956 vote for a $90 million cut; a 1958 vote to decrease the presidential request by $200 million.

Mr. Kennedy's views on unlimited spending abroad seem to vary. For Representatives H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa has read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Boston Globe story of November 19, 1951, in which Mr. Kennedy was quoted as stating:

"The vision of a bottle of milk for every Hottentot is a nice one, but it is far beyond our reach. There is just not enough money in the world to relieve the poverty of all the millions of this world who may be threatened by communism."

The need for foreign aid was far more pressing in 1951 than it is today. If not, much of the billions which have been spent in the interval has been misspent.

The President's inability to corral the votes of southern Democrats in support of his entire program is no doubt disconcerting. It is probably true that some of the southern Democrats who voted to trim his foreign aid request did so as the consequence of bitter opposition to his civil rights program. It is likewise probable that some northern Democrats who voted to sustain his request did so solely out of partisan consideration.

One of Mr. Kennedy's less astute and more obvious political maneuvers is that of charging his congressional failures up to his Republican opposition; an opposition which would be futile if the President had the undivided support of his own party in Congress.

Our basic foreign policy—those policies we pursue in what should be our enlightened self-interest—haven't become mired in bipartisan bickering. They shouldn't be. But they are, especially in the area of implementation, subject to continuous reappraisal. Questioning the effectiveness of multiple billion-dollar aid programs—an effectiveness in many nations some are beginning to doubt—is in order. And it isn't dangerously partisan to do so or to change one's mind, as Mr. Kennedy did, as to their effectiveness.

Whose Side Are They On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Mr. Bill Beckham, editor of the Wink Bulletin, Wink, Tex., is an outstanding proponent of responsible, conservative government. He is a fine young man who stands for principle. He has the courage of his convictions and he does not hesitate to speak out for America and the principles of free enterprise and individual freedom that made our country great.

The Wink Bulletin, published by Mr. Beckham and his partner, another fine young business leader, Mr. Howard Wall, is an independent, conservative newspaper dedicated to the principles of Americanism as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. They subscribe to the belief that freedom is a gift of God and not a grant from any government. They believe that the primary role of government is the preservation and protection of that freedom.

West Texas has many fine young people like Bill Beckham and Howard Wall. We are proud of them and commend them for the job they are doing. There is no doubt whose side they are on. I am pleased to submit an editorial, "Whose Side Are They On?" by Mr. Beckham which typifies his thinking and the fine job he is doing by informing his readers of some of the things that are taking place today.

WHOSE SIDE ARE THEY ON?

Congressman ED FOREMAN has made public some information concerning the closing of long-range radar stations in west Texas that should wake-up even the most loyal supporters of the Kennedy administration. Congressman FOREMAN charged that part of the equipment being idled by the closing of the 17 long-range radar stations and 6 Sage Centers across the United States, some of them in west Texas, is being shipped to India as a part of our foreign aid program to that country.

The west Texas congressman undoubtedly expressed the sentiment of the majority of the people of his district when he said: "It is a deplorable and almost unbelievable situation indeed when our Government is willing to close down our own military centers and ship our equipment to any country, much less a socialist country such as India, that has continually played footsie with the Communists.

"Apparently, it wasn't enough for us to try to outdo Russia in aid to India by building them a steelmill with U.S. taxpayers dollars, we now must give India our radar equipment to try to compete with Russian military gifts."

We heartily concur with Congressman FOREMAN's remarks. Manipulations such as the sending of our radar installations to Communist-loving Mr. Nehru's homeland makes one wonder whose side the American State Department is on. This fiasco calls to mind a remark made recently by Tom Anderson, editor in chief for Farm and Ranch magazine, who pointed out that in the last 30 years, "Our State Department hasn't made a single mistake * * * in our favor."

It is high time that the American people rise up in righteous indignation over the incredible acts now being committed by the State Department. The double-dealing bureacrats in Washington are giving away our weapons and our money faster than the New Frontier can tax the American people to raise funds to give away.

This tremendous throw (it has passed the stage where it could be classified as a giveaway) is continuing every hour of every day in domestic affairs as well as in foreign affairs. Shortly before Congressman FOREMAN revealed the transfer of our radar installations to the pro-Communist Government of India, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, touring the world at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation, pledged $50 million in American dollars to Communist Dictator Tito's Yugoslavia.

Other instances of absolute throwing-away of American tax dollars were revealed recently by Representative HOMER F. ABELE of Ohio. These idiotic schemes include the following:

$17,500 for modification of alcohol preference in rats.

$15,200 for a study of society and demography in ancient Babylonia.

$36,800 for social behavior of ants.

$2,100 for behavior patterns of the barrenground caribou.

$16,800 for social behavior of termites.

$20,600 for communications signals in birds.

$16,900 for revision of the classification of earthworms.

$13,700 for social structure in Madagascar.

$29,300 for mammal fauna of the highlands of Ethiopia.

$65,400 for behavior and ecology of the wandering albatross.

Included on this ridiculous list should be several million dollars for a psychiatric examination of every employee of the U.S. Department of State. This would be money well spent: It might reveal whose side they are really on.

Thinking Members of Congress in both political parties are constantly pointing out extravaganzas such as these in Government spending. Surely the American people will wake up and vote out of office every politician who lets Government bureaucrats get away with this fantastic waste which is bankrupting the American economy.

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a series of six amendments that are all very simple; I promise you I will not take but a minute on any one of them. This one merely takes the terms of this bill

and, instead of applying it to all the power in the future, says that the Pacific Northwest is going to have only the monopoly they now have on all of the power that they are now using and an extra 10 percent. We give them that and all the rest of it is up for grabs for anybody that can put lines in to get it.

Labor's Contribution to the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to celebrate Labor Day 1963 this September 2, the opportunity arises to recognize the contribution of the leadership and members of the U.S. labor movement to the free world. I am happy to take advantage of this opportunity to voice my regard and commendation for this group of patriotic American citizens.

The growth of the labor movement in the United States is a tribute to the high standards of good citizenship of its members and the outstanding examples of cooperation for mutual benefit between labor unions and management. Nowhere in the world can be found a more outstanding group of fellow craftsmen. United in pride of occupation, they are constantly alert to discoveries of new methods and techniques for improved standards of workmanship which contribute to the national good.

During the past 100 years, many of the landmarks of our national progress have been initiated and given impetus by the labor movement. Public school education came into being in our country as a result of the demands of labor leaders. School lunches, safety measures in shop and factory to cut down accidents among workers and public, these and many more have had the support of the labor movement. The U.S. labor movement has always been found in the forefront of all movements for the betterment of our fellow man. The flourishing state of members of labor in our country stands as a monument to the democratic process at work, arousing the admiration—and sometimes envy—of workers the world over.

One of the most vital contributions of the labor movement has been its activities in the International Labor Organization at Geneva, where both labor and management are part of the policymaking force. In addition to planning and implementing aid to workers all over the world, including the newly developed nations, such as Nigeria, representatives of U.S. labor unions have drawn world attention to the fact that in the Soviet Union and Soviet-dominated countries, there is no free labor movement.

I join my colleagues and all our citizens in a tribute to and deep desire for a continued happy and progressive relationship between labor and management to the end that our Nation may maintain its security and fulfill its role as leader of the free world.

Fair Play for Farmhands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican Farm Labor program, was defeated by the House earlier this session. Since that time the Senate has attempted to resurrect this legislation and we, in the House, are again being asked to support this inhumanitarian legislation.

It is my hope that the House will resist this new drive to extend Public Law 78 and nowhere have I seen better argument for opposition than was printed in a letter to the editor in this last Sunday's Washington Post. The letter's author is Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen—AFL-CIO.

Pat Gorman is a fellow Chicagoan and long has been associated with humanitarian and liberal causes in behalf of the rank and file worker both in and out of the labor movement. He is a conscientious and strongly motivated person seeking betterment of the downtrodden and less fortunate. I believe his reasoning against extension of Public Law 78 is compelling and I highly commend his letter which follows to my colleagues and the readership of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FAIR PAY FOR FARMHANDS

As the secretary-treasurer of one of the organizations leading the fight against Public Law 78, or the Mexican farm labor importation program, I want to thank you for your editorial of August 21 and the two earlier this year in which you opposed this vicious statute. Public Law 78 should be terminated this year and we believe it will be.

Your August 21 edition also carried a letter by Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, who represents one of the main bracero-using congressional districts. Mr. TALCOTT's arguments beg an answer.

The claim that Public Law 78 was not considered "wartime emergency legislation" is contrary to the legislative history of the congressional debate of 1951 when the legislation was first passed. The supporters of Public Law 78 claimed then that the law was necessary because of the emergency conditions caused by the Korean war. It is understandable that they would like to rewrite history now.

There is sufficient U.S. farm labor willing and able to harvest crops for Mr. TALCOTT's growers and all the other bracero-using growers, who make up less than 1 percent of the farmers of the United States. Unemployment among U.S. farmworkers is higher than among urban workers—7.3 percent in 1962. An additional 9.5 percent of farmworkers were underemployed. Sharply increasing farm mechanization is making more farmworkers jobless each day. These men and women need jobs.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS has proposed and is holding hearings on legislation to recruit and transport U.S. farmworkers to areas of labor need at the time of the need. But every single grower witness who has testified—and many have—has strongly opposed the bill. The growers do not want domestic workers. They want cheap, docile, easily exploitable labor.

An example of the desire for cheap labor is Mr. TALCOTT's expressed concern that added housing and schools would be needed in his area if U.S. farmworkers cultivated and harvested the crops instead of braceros. Mr. TALCOTT indicates that his growers want workers to work on the crops, to help produce wealth for them, but the growers do not want to meet any of their responsibilities toward these workers—not even to educate their children. "Do our work and then get out," seems to be the sentiment.

Mr. TALCOTT claims that braceros are not imported if domestic workers are available. The fact is that domestic workers often are not available in the area because of the low wages paid them and because fewer benefits are offered to U.S. farmworkers than to braceros.

The Senate, although continuing Public Law 78 for another year, ordered for the first time that U.S. farmworkers would have to be offered free housing, free transportation to the job, workmen's compensation and a work guarantee before braceros could be imported. This would give farmworkers a few of the very benefits which the imported braceros have enjoyed for 12 years. Needless to say, the growers are violently fighting this attempt at equalization and are atttempting to knock this amendment out of the bill.

Even with the amendment, the importation of hundreds of thousands of additional workers would depress the wages and would limit the job opportunities of U.S. farmworkers. Wages cannot rise as long as a limitless supply of labor is available and importable.

Finally, Mr. TALCOTT contends that migrant farmworkers lead a terrible life and should not be encouraged in this type of work. He is right. But what are these farmworkers to do? Unemployment is widespread in the United States. The farmworkers are not only unskilled in industrial labor, but do not even have the experience of industrial discipline. They would be among the last to be hired by factories. The alternative to farmwork for them is to starve.

Self-serving arguments about the frightfulness of migrant life in order to gain extension of Public Law 78 are ironical, for Public Law 78 is a major reason why the life of U.S. migrants is terrible. One way of making the life of these poverty-stricken and exploited U.S. citizens better is to kill the bills which would continue Public Law 78.

PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL-CIO).

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region

and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, here we have the last of those most serious questions that we as a responsible legislative body should consider with respect to federally owned electric kilowatts that are marketed to consumers throughout the Nation, that is, what is the fair price at which they should be sold.

As the gentleman from Texas indicated a moment ago, the fixing of rates for electricity is a difficult matter. This amendment would provide that the most expert body in the country be given the job of fixing those rates; namely, the Federal Power Commission, which has the applicable formulas for determining the value of power. The amendment says Bonneville power shall not be marketed at less than value. Again I would say with respect to this particular principle, if applied to the Bonneville power project, as I believe it properly should be, that legislation could easily be enacted to apply it to all other Federal marketing bodies. I certainly recommend most highly that it be done.

Principles and Heresies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a very excellent article which appeared in the August 13, 1963, National Review. It is written by my good friend, Frank S. Meyer, and contains a powerful indictment on our current state of foreign affairs vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. I commend it to the reading of the Members:

PRINCIPLES AND HERESIES—THE KHRUSHCHEV-KENNEDY TREATY

(By Frank S. Meyer)

Averell Harriman, the hero of Laos, has negotiated and initialed the nuclear test ban treaty. John F. Kennedy, the hero of the Bay of Pigs, in a nationwide television speech, has opened the barrage designed to smother sober consideration and criticism of the treaty in a welter of emotion. Nothing now stands in the way of establishing it, substantively and symbolically, as the settled policy of the United States, except to secure the advice and consent of the Senate. Rarely has the utmost deliberate consideration been more demanded of the Senate, yet every device available to the administration is being pressed into service to bring about a precipitate, unconsidered and emotional ratification.

Kennedy's appearance on television was the climax of the first phase of this campaign—a phase in which the press was filled with inspired stories of every sort and description. Henry Cabot Lodge was dragged from his grave as a portentous warning to the enemies of Presidential wisdom, and the Chinese bogeyman was paraded across the stage to terrify those who doubted Khrushchev's sincerity and peaceloving nature.

In the second phase of this campaign, beginning now, the pressure on the Senate will mount to further heights. That pressure the Senate must resist—not only because it is its constitutional duty to consider treaties in calm deliberative process; not only because the treaty is highly questionable in itself; but primarily because this is the first opportunity the Senate has had to pass upon a consistent administration program (previously implemented by executive actions alone), the effect of which has been steadily to weaken our military stance vis-a-vis the Soviet Union (apparently in implementation of the Rostow doctrine of appeasement of communism by military technological retreat).

Consider the record: abandonment of the RS-70 (reputedly the first fruits of Rostow's visit to Moscow in late 1960); phased withdrawal of the B-47's from Europe and elimination of European-based IRBM's; planned obsolescence of the B-52's and B-58's, intensified by the scrapping of Skybolt; the decision not to develop nuclear weapons in the 50-plus megaton range; downgrading of the nuclear plane project and Dyna-Soar; grotesquely distorted emphasis on space exploration and NASA civilian-centered projects at the expense of military rocketry; the administration's official Maginot-line policy of concentrating all our strategic force in Minuteman and Polaris, weapons whose warheads are ineffective against enemy offensive nuclear power and are therefore limited to a purely deterrent, a statically defensive role. It is true, of course, that any one of the decisions to relinquish this or that weapons system might be justified on specific military-technological grounds; but the series of decisions taken together adds up to a policy of appeasement, retreat, and inherent weakening of the military stance of the United States.

That this is the policy of the administration is confirmed both by its actions in the face of Soviet aggression (the loosening of the embargo on trade in strategic items with the Communist empire; the Hungarian negotiations; the farcical Laos agreement; the shameful and perilous retreat in Cuba) and by its words. Blindly ignoring the character of communism, to say nothing of the revolution of envy sweeping the colonial sector of the world, the administration projects as the goal of our policy a disarmed United States subservient to an international authority, an authority which, things being as they are, would inevitably be controlled by the Communists in manipulative alliance with the envious.

Kennedy expounded this policy in his American University speech (which I have analyzed in these pages) [National Review, July 16] and the State Department has solemnly introduced proposals to implement such a policy in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Now Kennedy has, in his television address, reiterated it, proclaiming his "ultimate hope for general and complete disarmament." The preamble of the test-ban treaty, which the Senate is called on to ratify, declares that the signatories "[proclaim] as their principal aim the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control in accordance with the objectives of the U.N."

There are strong enough arguments against the substantive terms of the treaty, of course. In the first place, outer-space testing is, in the view of scientists, almost as difficult to detect as underground testing, and this may well become in a few years the most important kind of testing. More immediately, atmospheric testing is of the utmost importance if we are to surpass the Soviets, not only in very high yield weapons and in acquiring the necessary knowledge of the effect of major nuclear explosions on communications vital to the effectiveness of our strategic striking force, but most decisively in achieving a breakthrough at the key frontier of military technology, the antimissile missile.

These arguments alone indicate the danger of the Khrushchev-Kennedy treaty. But, in the light of the consistent military and diplomatic policy of this administration, it presents to the Senate a manifest opportunity, by rejecting it, to call a halt to appeasement and retreat. Those Senators of both parties and many persuasions who have understood the disastrous consequences of this policy—Goldwater, Tower, Russell, Thurmond, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, and many others—have the strength, standing together, to rally the Senate against a willful President and bar the road to continued retreat.

Well-Deserved Award for Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philippines Herald of August 10, 1963:

WELL-DESERVED AWARD FOR PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

U.S. Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian countries, including the Philippines, have been singled out collectively to receive this year's Ramon Magsaysay Award for "international understanding"—a signal honor, for the award, normally for Asians, is being conferred this time on persons who, while not of the region, have contributed in a unique manner to the cause of peace and understanding in this area. That the honor is most deserved, everyone will heartily agree.

SIGNAL HONOR

In deciding to cite the Peace Corps volunteers, the RM Award Foundation noted: "The problem of achieving peace amidst the tensions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet a few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

The award is made more significant by the fact that the first Asian contingent of Peace Corpsmen were detailed to the Philippines. That was in October of 1961. By the middle of this year, they have spread out all over Asia, including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaya, North Borneo, Nepal, Afghanistan, Ceylon, and Sarawak. What they have done and are doing in the Philippines is most eloquently indicated by the many favorable and highly complimentary reports about their services in various parts of the country, sharing their energy and technical skills with the people, as teachers, athletic coaches, nurses, doctors, laboratory aids, mechanics, engineers, etc., and, in the process, promoting friendship, understanding, and the cause of peace.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS

The award, established to give recognition to those in Asia who exemplify the late Magsaysay's "greatness of spirit, integrity, and devotion to liberty," carries a $10,000

prize which the Peace Corps has indicated would be put to "appropriate" use. But it's not the cash award, of course—for the Peace Corps volunteers have embraced their work in a spirit of service and self-denial—as much as the honor that deservedly goes with it and the gratefulness of the people who have been the beneficiaries of their services. One might say that the conferment partakes of the nature of an expression of thanks to these volunteers for the splendid thing they are doing for the cause of peace and understanding in our part of the world.

THE RAMON MAGSAYSAY AWARD

The Ramon Magsaysay Award, established in 1958 and given annually, is one of Asia's highest honors. Established to honor the late President of the Philippines, the award gives recognition to persons in Asia who "exemplify his greatness of spirit, integrity and devotion to liberty."

The award is given in five fields each year:

Government service: Outstanding service in the public interest in any branch of government or the military.

Public service: Outstanding service for the public good by a private citizen.

International understanding: Advancement of international amity, building of friendship between peoples of different countries.

Community leadership: Action that would help the man on the land to have fuller opportunities and a better life.

Journalism and literature: Effective writing and publishing as a power for public good.

Each of the five awards carries a cash prize of $10,000. The Board of the Magsaysay Foundation may omit awards in one or more categories in a given year if they do not find an appropriate candidate.

The awards are presented each year in Manila on August 31, the anniversary of the birth of Ramon Magsaysay.

Some distinguished past winners of the award are:

Dalai Lama: Tibet, winner Community Leadership Award, 1959.

Chintamon Deshmukh: joint winner Government Service Award in 1959. A former Finance Minister of India, currently president of the Indian International Center in New Delhi.

Jose Vasquez Aguilar: Philippines, joint winner Government Service Award, 1959.

Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Alhai: winner Community Leadership Award, 1960, Prime Minister of Malaya.

H. Koesna Poeradiredja, Indoesnia; and Palayil Narayanan, Malaya: joint winners Community Leadership Award, 1962.

Mochtar Lubis: Indonesia, winner Journalism and Literature Award, 1958.

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFOR.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRE. ENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, again I bring up something that the Congress is going to have to face up to and that is this mounting national debt and how to get some revenue to pay it. We have billions of dollars of Federal money invested in power lines and in power generating facilities throughout the country. I think it is up to us to take a responsible look at every possibility for adding a small sum to the charges made to the users of this power, since it comes and has been coming at cost for a long time, and to applying that revenue toward the solution of a problem which nags every single responsible citizen of the country whether he serves in public office or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Foreign Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct an erroneous impression which has caused some to criticize the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the assumption that this year it failed to devote sufficient time and study to the foreign-aid bill. The exact opposite is true.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am proud of the conscientious manner in which the committee has fulfilled its legislative responsibilities. Last year the committee held 24 days of hearings on foreign-aid legislation and spent 12 days in markup sessions to complete its drafting, and during the period heard 43 official and 22 public witnesses.

This year the committee devoted even more time and energy to this important foreign policy legislation, beginning its hearings on April 5 and ordering the bill reported on August 6, after spending 4 months in intensive study, consideration, and hard work. During those 4 months the committee received testimony in 38 sessions from 63 official and 42 public witnesses, following with 19 sessions for amending the bill.

During the markup sessions 100 amendments were proposed and considered. Forty-six of them were approved, more than doubling the size of the bill. Each and every member had as much time as he needed for presentation of his views and the offering of amendments. I want to stress that many of the most significant and important amendments originated with minority members, all receiving bipartisan support, and some of them were adopted unanimously.

Some of the testimony received by the committee was classified by the executive branch and could not be published for security reasons, but the printed hearings number over 1,700 pages. The committee also received from the executive nearly 2,000 pages of presentation data which required careful study and analysis. I think all this adds up to pretty good evidence that the committee regarded and discharged its responsibilities.

Our attendance record was excellent. For this I believe a large share of credit is due our distinguished chairman, Dr. MORGAN. We have come to hold him in affectionate esteem for his unfailing good humor and his absolute fairness in presiding. Under such a chairman, committee work becomes a pleasurable duty, and it is easy to understand why Members participate with enthusiasm in the committee sessions. Because of the scope and complexity of the foreign aid program, every staff member receives specific assignments to help committee members. This is done on a nonpartisan basis. As a member of the minority, I can state that this has worked out well and efficiently, for under the committee rules any of us is entitled to the services of any staff member on committee work. In referring to the long hours devoted by the committee members to the foreign aid legislation, I also want to express my appreciation for the loyal and efficient dedication to our assistance displayed by all the members of the committee staff.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have said all this, I believe my colleagues will understand my taking the floor to correct the charge, even though it has been made by only a few that the committee has been remiss in the time and study it gave the foreign aid bill. No major legislation has received better examination, study, and careful effort to produce improvement.

Taxpayer Objects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, now and then we all receive letters from our constituents which are so good that we feel we should share them with the other Members of the House. Financial institutions have been required by the Federal Government to secure social security numbers from their depositors and stockholders. This request from one bank in my district prompted the following reply:

DEAR SIRS: In regard to your letter asking for my son's social security number, he has none. The main reason for this is he is only 10 years old and in trying to be a good provider for my family, I have refrained from sending him out for a job. Being that I have been transferred here in Canada for business reasons I find it a little difficult to get him to the Social Security Board for his number. This being the case and with all the redtape we will upon our next trip home, bring the deposit book and withdraw his account until such time as the Government can keep its damn nose out of a 10-year-old boy's business. Understand that I'm not condeming your bank, as I can undertsand regulations and redtape that is connected with your business. This transfer up here is temporary so I have continued my own accounts with your bank but it burns me why

the Government is so insistent on sticking its nose in everybody's business when it does such a poor job of running its own.

Yours truly,

Shipyard Aids Hospital in Distress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in an emergency which would have been a tragedy, were it not for the quick thinking and hard work of several members of the New York Naval Shipyard, one of my constituents, Richard Wanner, a long-time resident of Williston Park, played a major role.

This is a thrilling report of outstanding cooperation and I am pleased to place it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SHIPYARD AIDS HOSPITAL IN DISTRESS—15-TON BOILER RELIEVES EMERGENCY

When a severe thunderstorm on the evening of July 21 damaged the power system of the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital in Brooklyn the shipyard came to the rescue to turn possible tragedy into a story with happy ending.

Act 1 of the drama began at 10:30 p.m., Saturday, July 21, when the storm struck suddenly and furiously. The hospital's power system, which provides steam, hot water and essential services, was seriously damaged. Pressure in the sewers caused a 6-inch plug to blow out in the main sewer of the hospital's boilerroom.

EXPLOSION PREVENTED

The pressure was so great that the institution's engineers could not stop the flow of water which rose to a height of 3 feet. The boiler was immediately shut down to prevent an explosion.

Hurried calls were made to the City Fire Department for equipment to pump out the water. The pressure was too great, however, and the water finally submerged the electric motors and the controls in the boiler room. SOS calls were put out to other city agencies, none of which were able to supply either pumping equipment or a portable boiler. Eventually, the water was pumped out of the boiler room and the elevator shafts by the hospital's staff, but a problem remained—no steam.

CALL FOR HELP

Act 2 unfolded with a call to the shipyard answered by Lt. (jg.) R. A. Beckford of Public Works and duty officer at the time. After determining the hospital's needs, arrangements were made to dispatch a yard crew to its aid.

At 5:15 a.m. Sunday, the crew consisting of Lt. Beckford, Shop 12 Master Vincent Mount, and Quarterman Vincent Mazza and Leadingman Richard Wanner of Shop 12 arrived at the hospital to examine the damage and to arrange for the installation of a temporary boiler to furnish steam. Five hours later, a trailer from the yard carrying a 15-ton boiler arrived on the scene. Within 3½ hours the shipyard group, in cooperation with the hospital's engineering staff, made the necessary connections and steam was being pushed through the hospital's system.

Thus with the shipyard's cooperation the hospital was able to maintain essential services for its more than 800 patients. Without the yard's help, the patients would have had to be evacuated, an almost impossible task.

PERFORMANCE PRAISED

Solomon L. Siegel, the hospital's executive director, expressed his extreme gratification in a letter to the shipyard commander. "Your men," he reports, "handled the situation with the utmost understanding, courtesy and cooperation. The speed and efficiency of the operation was all the more admirable in view of the fact that the incident occurred over a weekend and during the night when you had only a skeleton force on duty."

Mr. Siegel concluded by "conveying the sincere appreciation of the patients, our officers and members of the board of directors for your capable assistance in overcoming this extreme emergency."

A Negro American Thanks God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the civil rights demonstration being conducted here in Washington today, I think it is interesting to note the thoughts of one Negro who recently saw fit to express his thanks to God for permitting him to be born an American. Mr. Zeak Crumpton, of Hampton, Va., expressed these thoughts forcefully in a letter to the Christian Science Monitor which was reprinted August 20, 1963, by the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch in my congressional district. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Crumpton's letter in the RECORD and follow it with pertinent editorial comment by the Times-Dispatch:

A NEGRO AMERICAN THANKS GOD

I am glad that my ancestors were Negro slaves. The first shipload of slaves reached our shores in the year 1619 some 344 years ago. In the year 1828, Congress passed a law prohibiting the importation of slaves. So those members of my race whose ancestors reached America on the slave ships have been exposed to the civilization of the white man for 135 years.

My race has made tremendous progress since they came to live in this country. I own my home which is neatly furnished and is fitted out with all modern electrical appliances. My three children graduated from college, have good jobs, and live in homes of their own.

After years of steady employment and hard work as a section hand, I shall retire next year on a good pension from the railroad. I enjoy good health and have no grievances. My family have always had plenty to eat. For Sunday dinner we can afford such foods as: black-eyed peas, grits, cabbage, corn muffins and fried chicken.

Had my ancestors not been slaves, life for me would be different. I would be living in the jungles of tropical Africa, exposed to the diseases and insects found in that region. I would walk around in my bare feet with a metal ring in my nose, and around my waist I would wear a loin cloth—if I could afford one. At night I would try to sleep on a dirt floor of a one-room mud hut. Then on holidays we would feast on elephant stew, roasted grasshoppers, and the milk of a coconut.

I get on my knees each night and thank God for permitting my ancestors to come to America as slaves. That was the great blessing to our race, and I am thankful for it. Since members of my race have traveled from the status of headhunters and cannibals to that of Members of Congress in Washington, in less than 344 years time, there should be no question about the abundance of opportunity for the Negro in America. It is my hope that the time is not far distant when we will have a Negro as President of the these United States.

ZEAK CRUMPTON.

HAMPTON, VA.

MAY HIS TRIBE INCREASE

In the welter of emotional demands by Negroes for freedom now, and for jobs in proportion to population—irrespective of the availability of the jobs or the qualifications of those who are demanding them—it is refreshing to publish a letter such as the one which appears on this page today from the Christian Science Monitor.

Written by a Negro citizen of Hampton, who actually thanks God that his ancestors came to this country as slaves, it strikes a new and different note.

Instead of bewailing the lot of himself and his race in the United States, Mr. Crumpton is grateful for the fact that Negroes in this country "have traveled from the status of headhunters and cannibals to that of Members of Congress in less than 344 years." He hopes that there will be a Negro President of the United States in the not far distant future.

Mr. Crumpton feels that this country has afforded him and his wife and children a great opportunity. Not only so, but he has shown his appreciation by putting all three of his children through college, and seeing them established in good jobs with homes of their own.

Here is a man who is a credit to his race and who would be a credit to any race. Instead of lying down in the street, in violation of law, and going limp when ordered to move; denouncing most white people as phonies and exploiters and the U.S. Constitution as a bogus document, Zeak Crumpton counts his blessings as an American.

We salute him as the sort of man who has made this country great. Would that there were more like him.

REA on Skis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial entitled "REA on Skis," which appeard in the August 26, 1963, edition of the Washington Daily News:

REA ON SKIS

It will be mighty nice, we should think, for those who are interested to have some new ski areas in western Pennsylvania. And if thousands of ski fans use this area it is likely to provide some employment not otherwise available.

And since the Government is lending taxpayer money right and left to almost anyone who thinks he could use it, we see no objections to lending to a ski resort.

But the Rural Electrification Administration has just lent a Pennsylvania cooperative $110,000 of taxpayer money which the co-op in turn will lend to the ski resort for electrical equipment. The REA claims this is within its original purpose because the ski resort will make business for the co-op, reduce the cost of electricity to other customers of the co-op, and make jobs.

REA will lend the money for 2 percent—a little more than half of what the taxpayers fork over to borrow it. What the co-op will charge the ski resort wasn't mentioned.

The original purpose of the REA—and still the legal purpose—was to help get electricity to the farms of the country.

Unbalanced Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, 1963, Dr. Harley L. Lutz, professor emeritus of public finance, Princeton University, inserted an article in the Wall Street Journal which gives some very sound advice to all of us in the Federal Government.

His article follows:

UNBALANCED GOVERNMENT: IT'S HIGH TIME THAT THE NATION GAVE MORE WEIGHT TO THE STATES

(By Harley L. Lutz)

The United States is a federation of States under a Constitution which established a balance of powers between Federal and State Governments. The concept of balance is essential. If the States should have too much power the Union would disintegrate. If the Central Government should acquire too much power the States would lose their authority, and eventually their identity, as the central monolithic state developed.

The federation form does not require completely static balance. Historically, the trend was toward the Federal Government from 1789 to 1800, then toward the States to 1860. Over the past 100 years the pendulum of governmental power has swung again toward Washington, and at an accelerated rate during the past three decades.

In consequence, the Federal Government is now too big to be managed efficiently and economically by any man or group of men, however competent they may be. Its size and power threaten the fundamental nature of the Republic by undermining the sovereignty of the States; its cost impedes economic growth by imposing an excessive burden on the economic resources that must support both the people and the Government; and its enforcement of policies, at times by methods suggestive of the police state, violates both the spirit and the practical realization of personal freedom. The constitutional design of a balance of power between Federal and State Governments should be restored by bringing closer to home many governmental functions and services that have been swept into the Federal orbit.

A POSITIVE GUIDE

This monumental task cannot be accomplished by throwing brickbats at the lunatic fringe of either right or left. It will require a positive guide to action on which reasonable persons can agree, and also an understanding of the forces and influences to be combated. First, let us consider the major influences that have promoted the excessive growth of Federal power.

To begin with, the States have not been as jealous of their constitutional prerogatives nor as aggressive in asserting them as they were more than a century ago. Civil War and Reconstruction severely damaged for a time the States' rights concept. The centralizing trend, which had proceeded at a very moderate pace after 1865, was stepped up by the expansion of the Federal administrative and fiscal structure in two world wars. Even so, the States could have achieved some degree of better balance in their favor had it not been for two other developments, one practical and the other ideological.

The practical development was the steady expansion after about 1930 of Federal grants-in-aid, whereby the Federal Government has assumed full or partial responsibility for various services and activities, the performance and financing of which were, and are, within State and local administrative and fiscal capacity. There is continued pressure, within and without the Federal Government, to extend the area of these grants and to increase existing grants. This device is appealing to those who believe that someone else is providing the money, and to State and local officials who are thereby enabled to take credit for improvements and benefits without the disagreeable necessity of increasing taxes or debt.

The Federal Government has bought its way into the sphere of State and local functions. Its acts of purchase have seldom been questioned by the Supreme Court which has construed the term general welfare so broadly that there is almost no area of government function into which the Federal Government is not legally free to enter, there to spend money and exercise control. All disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding, Federal aid means Federal control.

The ideological development has been the rise of the current concept of liberalism, which is a distortion of the 19th century definition akin to the upside-down connotations of democracy behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. The 19th century liberal advocated liberating individuals from the restrictions and controls of government. The present-day liberal advocates more, not less government; more, not less control and regimentation of persons and businesses; more, not less support of the people by government through the modern counterpart of the Roman bread and circuses.

COMBATING THE TREND

The Constitution provides a guide to positive action to combat the centralist trend and to restore a reasonable working balance between Federal and State powers and responsibilities. The constitutional allocation reserves to the Central Government.

First, those truly national tasks which can be performed only by and at this level of Government. National defense and foreign affairs are the two major national tasks.

Second, certain other functions which, though capable of performance by the States, would be adverse to the interests of citizens generally if so performed.

For example, each State would be competent to determine its own system of weights and measures; its own currency system; its own postal system; its own rules regulating commerce with other States and foreign nations; and its own procedures relating to bankruptcy, naturalization and immigration. These matters were reserved to Congress, not because they could be dealt with only at the Federal level, but because the resulting "balkanization" of the country, if they were left to the States, would have been disastrous.

The Constitution further provides for reserving to the States or to the people all powers not delegated to the Congress nor prohibited to the States. This pattern is even more sensible and necessary today than it was in 1787.

A LIST OF CONSEQUENCES

Some of the consequences of permitting the Federal Government to assume jurisdiction over, and responsibility for, the many functions and activities that belong elsewhere and that were, in effect, reserved by the Constitution to the States, or to the people, are considered herewith.

1. An excessive diversion of attention and effort from the truly national tasks: This is obvious in view of the time and energy that the President and the Congress devote to relatively small matters, each involving political dickering, and sometimes bickering. These local and sectional issues include such diverse matters as wheat planting, juvenile delinquency, waste treatment, urban renewal and transport, depressed areas, and many others.

The price we pay for administrative and congressional application to the thousand and one matters that should be dealt with elsewhere is an excessive cost of national defense, loss of prestige before the world, and riding suspicion among nations that we want, and need, as friends. After spending upward of $100 billion to combat and contain communism around the world, we have allowed the Communists to take over Cuba. We have had worsening relations with Canada, France, England, Latin America, and as a world leader we have been plagued by unhealed sore spots of which Korea, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, and Indonesia, are examples.

Defense costs are admitted to be excessive but progress in their reduction is at snail's pace. Moreover, there is sharp difference over the best defense as the debate continues over missiles, manned bombers and other matters.

The truly national tasks cannot be competently managed as a part-time job. They are so large and important as to require the full attention and energy of the Congress and the Federal administration. The decisions made and actions taken in the areas of defense and foreign affairs are vital to the stability, prosperity, and security of the free world. The talents and capacities for competent national leadership are available but they must be conserved for that purpose, not wasted on matters that are not genuine Federal business.

2. Excessive cost: Over the past decade the major factor in the rising Federal budget has not been the Military Establishment, as such, but the domestic civilian services. Each year additional services and programs are introduced. Every new Federal activity means another administrative unit, more employees, and an appropriation of funds. There is much overlap and duplication and the ramification of Federal operations has led to a host of big and little bureaucratic empires which compete for funds and authority while contributing to diffusion of responsibility and tangled redtape. The ultimate cost of Federal projects is often concealed by the practice of small annual appropriations which get the undertaking launched, thereby establishing a commitment to carry it through to completion.

WAGES AND HOURS

Federal regulations relating to wages and hours have led to cases of local rejection of public improvement grants because of the added cost. There are heavy costs of compliance with other regulations which fall on taxpayers, not on the budget. Recent examples are the rules relating to expense accounts and those promulgated under the Drug Control Act of 1962.

A reallocation of functions and services would transfer both costs and revenue resources to the States and their local units.

These governmental divisions would have more to do and more to do it with. Savings could be effected through lower expenses of operation and in some cases by deciding not to continue programs deemed locally to be unessential in the given circumstances. When the bill is to be paid locally, a harder look is to be expected at the relation between costs and benefits.

3. Retention or punitive tax rates: The doctrine that government must support the people requires that an ever-widening array of benefits be provided. The people pay the cost of these benefits in one way or another, but it is politically advantageous to foster the illusion that someone else is paying. Hence, to support this illusion there is stubborn insistence on retention of punitive tax rates despite general recognition that they produce comparatively little revenue while sapping away funds that otherwise might go for capital formation and economic growth. The inconsistency of seeking a higher rate of growth while burdening the Nation's productive resources with destructive taxation suggests that there still lingers the notion that wealth can be multiplied by dividing it.

4. Government by crisis: The technique of promoting centralism by asserting the imminence of crises which require Federal intervention was developed to a high pitch of efficiency during the 1930's and it has continued to be a useful tool in the centralist kit. The crisis need not be real, for a fictional one will serve as well to support the double argument, first, that the Federal Governnent knows just what to do and is ready, willing, and able to act in the alleged emergency; and second, that the States are unwilling or financially unable to act.

State or local inaction is likely to be due to hard-headed realization that no emergency impends. It is seldom, if ever, due to financial incapacity, though a plea of poverty has served, for reasons noted above, as an excuse to let Uncle Sam do it. The fact is that the wealth and income of the citizens of the several States is the same aggregate as the wealth and income of the citizens of the United States. There are no constitutional restrictions on State and local taxation, other than those of their own devising, except the prohibition of duties on imports and exports.

CONFLICTING STATISTICS

The alleged crisis in education is a good example. Conflicting, and to a considerable extent, questionable statistics purporting to show classroom and teacher shortages have been used to support the demand for large Federal spending on school construction and salaries. The scare effect has been compounded by projecting the alleged deficiencies as far ahead as 1970 with the implication that the projected results are with us today. The steady progress being made by State and local action toward closing any real classroom gap that may exist is disregarded. The rising proportion of college graduates preparing to teach refutes the case for Federal stimulus of teacher supply. The centralists realize that if they are to get control of education, it must be done before State and local action eliminate the excuse for Federal aid.

5. Competition with taxpaying citizens: The centralized trend has extended the area of Federal Government operations beyond the scope of public functions into the field of private business. Here the Government competes on very unequal terms with its taxpaying citizens while compelling them to provide the capital and sustain the losses of its ventures. In addition to the objective of Federal control and domination, the purpose is to provide further benefits to individuals, groups, and sections. The Treasury supplies loan funds in some cases at interest rates below its own cost of borrowing. Electric power is sold to favored customers at rates below those that private, taxpaying companies can afford to charge. This is called the "yardstick" method of comparing public and private operation. Risks are assumed with public funds that no private investor would dare take with his own money. The lack of a profit motive in Government business operations is paralleled by absence of concern to conserve capital. Losses can always be made up by another appropriation, as is customary in various Government corporations.

There are other consequences of centralism which must be passed over here. The fatal contradiction of current liberalism, however, cannot be too much emphasized. It is the conflict between governmental power and liberty. The authority of government is absolute and the individual never has a choice between obeying its rules or not. The larger the scope of government operations, the greater the area of absolutism and the smaller the area within which the individual is free of government restraint or compulsion.

There must be enough government to assure an orderly community life at home and security against foreign aggression, on one hand, but not so much government as to imperil personal liberties and destroy the economic basis of individual self-support through excesses of spending, taxing, and regulating, on the other. The balance between these extremes can be achieved only by arresting the centralist trend and bringing more of the functions and services back home.

Some Gambles Pay Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newton Kansan, which reflects an important point of view relative to this Nation's investment of its resources in space research and exploration.

The editorial follows:

SOME GAMBLES PAY OFF

There's a lot of chatter today about the so-called "race to the moon."

Many Americans are beginning to seriously question whether or not the project isn't too costly and should be abandoned.

One English expert who visited in Russia recently came away with the impression that the Russian's aren't nearly as anxious to get the moon as we think they are. He seems to think that Americans are racing themselves to the moon.

His statement, of course, can't be taken as gospel.

The Russians have been known to deceive foreigners in many fields and this could be another of those deceptions.

We must remember, too, that the same kind of an economic problem faced a man named Christopher Columbus almost five centuries ago. He hunted for money to finance a trip to the East Indies, only he would sail westward to get to the Indies.

He finally found a royal couple that agreed to furnish the necessary money for him to make the trip. He didn't get to the East Indies, although he didn't know this, but he did find a new world.

The modern day space explorers have an advantage over Columbus—they know where they are going if they can just get the money and the technical know-how to make the trip a success.

And what will they find when they get to the moon? No one is really certain, but they could open up an era of exploration that would make the discoveries of the 15th and 16th century adventurers look like peanuts.

It's a gamble, but exploration always has been a gamble. Most of it has paid off, however.

REA: The Future of Rural Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, July 22, 1963, I addressed the annual meeting of the members of the Bartlett, Tex., Rural Electric Cooperative at Bartlett, Tex. Because of a number of requests that this speech be printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at that meeting be printed today in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA: THE FUTURE OF RURAL TEXAS

Chairman H. M. Keith, members of the Bartlett Electric Cooperative, fellow Texans, the State of Texas can be called the heartland of the REA. One of our proudest Texas accomplishments is that we have strung over 156,000 miles of REA-financed lines along the Rio Grande, through the Panhandle, across the west Texas plains, on the central Texas blacklands, and among the east Texas piney woods. Our 79 active borrower rural electric co-ops serve 384,000 consumers over these lines. This is more consumers served on more miles of line than in any other State in the Union.

A great Texan, the beloved late Sam Rayburn, sponsored the Rural Electrification Act in the U.S. House of Representatives. It has often been said that, had the service of Mr. Sam to his country been limited to his part in passing this act alone, it would have been sufficient to give governmental immortality to his name.

The members of this cooperative can feel especially proud because it was here that the first REA loan in this State, and one of the first in the Nation, was approved in September 1935, and the Bartlett Electric Cooperative, Inc., placed the first REA-financed line in operation on March 9, 1936.

In February 1935, I was appointed by the late beloved Gov. James V. Allred as a member of the original board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Authority of Texas, which built the series of six fine dams on the Colorado River above Austin. You grew up together. Actually, the Lower Colorado River Authority was set up by Texas a few months before the national REA was passed by Congress.

Over our entire State, at the time REA was created in 1935, only 11,466 farms, or 2.3 percent of the total, were receiving central station electric service. Today, 28 years later, an estimated 223,000 farms, or 96.2 percent of all farms recorded in the State by the 1959 census of agriculture, are being served. What is more, approximately 70 percent of these electrified farms in Texas are being served by REA borrowers.

Nationally, farm electrification advanced very slowly during the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central generating system went into service, to 1935, when REA was created. Less than 11 percent of all farms in the United States had electric service in 1935. Today REA estimates that 97.6 percent of our 3.7 million farms recorded in the 1959 census are now electrified. Slightly more than half of these electrified farms are served by REA financed electric systems.

Opponents of REA are quick to say that the original purpose of REA has already been accomplished, that virtually all the Nation's farms have electric service, and that all the additional powerplants and transmission lines rural America needs can be financed in the free market. I doubt seriously if Mr. and Mrs. John McGuffin of New Mexico would agree with this. The McGuffins lived on their ranch for 21 years without such 20th century conveniences as electric lights, refrigerator, television or washing macine. They would still be without these modern "necessities" if a rural electric cooperative had not last year extended 3.5 miles of line to their ranchhouse to make them the 5-millionth consumer to receive electricity through REA loans.

Despite the fact that some of their areas have grown in population, rural electric cooperatives continue to serve the most difficult and the sparsely settled areas of the Nation. Nationally the co-ops average little more than three consumers per mile of line. All but the smallest commercial utility systems have, on the average, 33 consumers to each mile of their line.

The comparison from the standpoint of revenue is even more dramatic. In 1960, REA-financed systems averaged $414 revenue per mile of line, compared to $6,580 per mile for the commercial companies. No other source of power will accept the risk and challenges of serving the typical REA co-op territory. The fact that some of the original territory of REA borrowers has prospered does not abolish the responsibility or the right of the cooperatives to continue serving these areas.

The rural electric program is good for all Americans. It is making tremendous contributions to our national strength and progress. However, numerical progress in rural electrification has obscured the fact the rural areas still have far to go before parity is achieved. Seldom mentioned is the fact that the consumer on the lines of an average REA borrower system still has to pay almost 20 percent more for 250 kilowatt-hours used in a month than the average city consumer.

Why does this rural disadvantage exist? The truth is that it costs more to provide quality electric service to rural areas. In addition to low revenues and low density of consumers—your cooperative averages less than 1.7 consumers per mile—power requirements in rural areas tend to be high during certain periods of the day, and often negligible during the rest of the day. Rural electric cooperatives, then, with relatively few commercial or large powerloads to even out power requirements, must make proportionately greater investments in facilities used only for a few hours a day.

That the rural electrification program has succeeded so well in the face of such severe obstacles is ample reason for pride on the part of all those with even a slight connection with REA. The fact is that REA has succeeded far beyond the dreams of its founders.

When REA was organized, its opponents argued that farmers would never use enough electricity to pay for building the lines. Contrary to these pessimistic views, rural consumers are using electric energy in much greater amounts than REA supporters expected when the original lines were built.

On the farm alone more than 400 uses of electricity are known, at least 250 of which increase production or make farming more profitable. Use of electricity from REA-financed lines by farm and nonfarm consumers has more than doubled in the past 10 years. Average monthly consumption of electricity per consumer has increased from 182 kilowatt-hours in 1952 to 400 kilowatt-hours in 1962.

Rural electric cooperatives have created a new market for power that did not exist before the task of rural electrification was undertaken. Cooperative systems purchased $97 million worth of power from the private power industry last year.

The rural electrification program has brought increased business into rural communities. The rural market for electrical appliances and equipment is estimated at $1 billion a year. In addition, the availability of electric power in rural areas encourages the establishment of industry and general economic development. And of course, each co-op is directly responsible for some employment in its area and injection of currency into local economies.

Rural electric cooperatives have made an outstanding record in repaying their loans. From its beginning REA had advanced more than $5 billion to its electrification and telephone borrowers. Adding its commitments, the total would be over $6 billion. Repayments to the Treasury have totaled more than $1.8 billion principal and interest. Loans outstanding total approximately $3.7 billion. The $1.2 billion paid on the principal is about 25 percent of the principal borrowed. This has been repaid, plus $640 million of interest money paid to the U.S. Government over and above the principal. This interest was paid for the right to use Government funds to get started. In the long history of REA only two loans have ever been foreclosed, at a net loss of only $44,478. No bank, no Government agency, nor any other group of borrowers have ever before compiled such a record.

On January 1, 1963, REA borrowers in Texas had repaid almost $100 million on the principal of their $354 million in loans and had paid $46 million in interest. No borrower in Texas was overdue in payments on its REA loan, nor has any Texas borrower ever been foreclosed.

It is well that our hearts should swell with pride at the glorious history of REA, but we should never lose sight of our role in the years ahead.

Demands of tomorrow—in a dynamic, expanding economy—will dwarf the electric power requirements of yesterday. Anyone familiar with the electric industry knows that the demand for electricity in the Nation is doubling every 10 years, and on the rural systems about every 7 years. Meeting this increased demand will require continued large capital outlays. Failure to meet it is to fail to meet the needs of rural people for adequate and reliable electric power.

Rural electrification has increasingly become more than a matter of mechanical technology. REA and REA-financed electric systems have for 28 years been among the leaders in the battle to raise living standards in rural areas. This period has established the rural electric co-op as a powerful social and economic force in the development of rural life.

Rural cooperative systems have been termed "private enterprise with a built-in public conscience." This public conscience has already worked to change the face of rural America. Your actions have furnished an example to the whole world of ordinary citizens taking the initiative and shaping their future. This banding together for a common cause in a spirit of cooperation is a unique trademark of the rural electrification movement.

The success of the REA program in raising rural living standards has made it a logical choice as a leader in the rural areas development of the Department of Agriculture. The achievements of the past can be a beacon of light to lead the way for improved conditions in all rural areas.

Presently our rural economy is not progressing as rapidly as it should be. REA and REA-borrowers can contribute toward breaking this economic roadblock.

The stake of rural electric co-ops in rural areas development is obvious. Cooperatives serve rural areas. If the economic base of rural areas becomes stagnant, people move away. This has already happened in large degrees. Testimony to this is offered by 500,000 idle services on the lines of rural electric cooperatives today. If the economic base of the area served shrinks, so does the business base of the co-op.

However, if new economic opportunities are provided to hold people in the area, it means growth for the cooperative and the area as well as greater benefits to consumer-members in terms of better service at lower rates, since the electric business is a volume business.

Cooperatives have recognized this mutual interdependency and have taken steps to stimulate local economies. Many rural electric systems are making remarkable progress in developing small rural industries for which the economic potential to themselves and their communities far exceeds the investment required to attract the industry.

These development projects are scattered throughout the country. They include a lumber project in Idaho, a furniture factory in Kentucky, a commercial recreation enterprise in Illinois, a meatpacking plant in Nebraska, and a wood chipping plant in Mississippi. In addition to these local industries, 600 REA-financed systems report they have assisted their communities in launching a number of public facilities including hospitals, water systems, and sewerage systems.

Remarkable progress has been made but the need for further development is great in rural America.

The role of the REA is far from finished. Rural electric cooperatives, on the basis of their performance, have earned a permanent place in rural America. REA can look back upon a distinguished record of achievement, but the biggest challenge lies now in the future. We know that REA and rural electric cooperatives will continue to be a social and economic force for progress in rural America.

Now that is the record of the REA for the past 28 years. But where does the REA stand in Congress today?

The House Appropriations Committee has approved $425 million for REA under the agriculture budget. The amount is enough to meet the needs for loans to local cooperatives. But provisions have been included that will hamstring the REA and delay the loans by practically giving private power suppliers a veto over the loans. It demands that a final last chance must be offered to the private supplier to offer an acceptable contract. The effect of this language would be delay and more delay. It is to be hoped that this private power veto over REA loans can be eliminated in the Senate.

There are some six anti-REA bills pending in Congress, all but one of them sponsored by Republicans, that would raise the interest rate on REA. This is a longtime goal of the private power companies in the continuing effort to bury REA. I intended to oppose these bills to raise the interest rate on REA loans. I am against all these recent increases in high interest rates on money. To raise the interest rates on REA loans would set off a chain reaction of high interest rates for everybody.

I am also a strong supporter and a coauthor of the act creating the area redevelopment program, to bring new industry to areas of weak economy. Area redevelopment is

important to the REA. The Senate passed a bill for extension of the ARA program after it was knocked down by a few votes in the House. I am hopeful that the Senate ARA extension bill will be brought forward again and will be passed by the House.

ARA and REA, together can build a new prosperity for rural Texas. That is the hope of the future for the rural counties in Texas.

Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years we have tried the New Deal-Fair Deal-New Frontier approach in solving the problems of a vigorous and growing society. The attempt to solve all the problems through a paternalistic government, welfare state programs and restrictions on a free economy have failed.

In spite of all its proud promises the New Deal never did lick unemployment and the great period of depression ended only because of World War II. The Fair Deal was still fighting unemployment by further restricting the economy to enlarge the welfare state and only the Korean war saved the Truman administration from an economic setback.

The failures of the Kennedy administration are legion, especially in the economic field. These planned economy panaceas, these attempts to establish a Socialist system just will not work in the United States. Our strength has been founded upon a free economy where the reward of profit and opportunity furnish the incentive which expands the economy and creates jobs for all the people. Just once, can we not try a return to the policies which made the United States the most productive, the most powerful, the finest nation in the world?

The following editorial from the August 26 issue of the Dallas Morning News is well worth reading in this connection:

WRONG APPROACH

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon is urging Congress to tax investment of U.S. capital abroad to curb the flow of gold and ease the balance-of-payments problem. This approach attacks the symptoms of our ecomonic ills rather than the causes. The long-range answer is not to build a wall around American capital to keep it inside our borders, but to make investment in U.S. industry more attractive.

Shortsighted people—politicians included—too often make a habit of fighting symptoms instead of causes. The so-called civil rights crisis is a better example.

When you think hard about this problem, the principal cause of Negro unrest today seems to be unemployment. The jobless rate is twice as high among colored as it is among whites, and the differential is even greater for young unemployed. Why?

Extremists have charged that it is pure job discrimination. But it is not, basically, except that employers naturally discriminate against job applicants with the least degree of skill. With American industry becoming more and more automated, those with the fewest skills and the least education have the poorest chance of finding work. This hits the Negro hardest.

Actually, there are more job openings for Negroes today than there are qualified Negroes to fill them. The solution, then, is in raising the Negroes' level of education and skills—which is being done gradually—and/or providing a greater number of jobs.

For several decades the broad problem of unemployment and related economic ills has been attacked from the wrong angle. The welfare state has arisen to provide immediate relief for the symptoms of our plight, but there has been little attention paid to dealing with the causes of it.

In fact, the welfare state remedies have added to the causes and made the ultimate solution more difficult. Byproducts of the welfare state are a fantastic rise in the cost of living, higher prices, inflation, and stifling of capital investment needed to create new jobs. All of these have hit the lower economic groups—particularly the Negroes—hardest.

During the last century and early in this one, America was able to cope with the influx of a large number of immigrants—most of whom had fewer skills and a lower level of education than the present-day Negro. Yet we were able to provide jobs for these people and to move them gradually up the scale toward a higher standard of living. Why? Because the American economy was not heavily restricted and taxed by a Government bent upon treating the symptoms of a sick economy.

Instead, it was free to deal with long-range needs by accumulating capital, providing a high rate of job expansion and producing a wide variety of consumer goods better and cheaper.

The answer to our problems today is not another healthy round of welfare state legislation—a domestic Marshall plan, FEPC, bigger and better unemployment insurance programs, medicare, Federal aid to education, depressed area bills, etc.—which the politicians are proposing.

The answer is to free the American economy from the shackles which have already been placed upon it.

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this brings directly to the attention of the Members this matter of the Secretary of the Interior requiring, wherever a line goes across Federal land—and it could be in the New England States or any other part of the country, because we have plenty of Federal land all over—that private transmission facilities be made available for his purposes of establishing a national grid.

This question, whether it is decided yes or no today, should be brought up and decided by the Congress in its broad sense in the very near future. We are always told these things are not in order in connection with a specific piece of legislation. However, we cannot get a piece of general legislation heard and brought out for a decision.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Negroes Traveling the Wrong Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karl O. Spiess, Sr., 1 North Fenwick Street, Arlington, Va., has forwarded to me a copy of an editorial appearing in the Progressive Farmer September issue.

Mr. Spiess has asked that I read this editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all my colleagues as well as those who read this RECORD can have the benefit of the views presented therein.

The editorial follows in full:

NEGROES TRAVELING THE WRONG ROAD

Radical Negro leaders need to learn the facts of economic life. Not all Negro troubles are the result of discrimination. Some are of his own making. They are due to his own shortcomings in training and dependability. Negroes hold few top jobs. They would hold many more, if they were qualified.

This isn't to say that U.S. Negroes aren't making progress. They have a far better standard of living than Negroes in other parts of the world. And, as U.S. News & World Report showed recently, the per capita income of U.S. Negroes is higher than that of modern, up-to-date Western Germany.

With as many Negroes as we have in the South and with as many of them well to do, it is a mystery why they don't do more for themselves. The other day, Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy told a Senate committee that in Montgomery, Ala., and Danville, Va., a Negro can find overnight accommodations in only one listed place, but a white man's dog is welcomed in nine.

No doubt, Mr. Kennedy intended his testimony to be an indictment of the South. But to us his statement is even more an indictment of Negroes—for failure to help themselves. It is indeed deplorable that when Negroes travel, they have such poor accommodations. But why in the world don't Negroes themselves do something about it? Why don't they establish needed hotels, cafes, and theaters for their own race? There is no law against it.

Now this is a situation that civil rights has nothing to do with. New Jersey has more civil rights legislation than any other State in the Union. Yet, according to a Negro editor in New Jersey, there are more businesses owned and operated by Negroes in Atlanta, Ga., than in the entire State of New Jersey. Indeed, there is abundant evidence to show that Negroes are getting ahead in business much faster in the South than in other parts of the Nation. Dallas, Tex., is said to have three or four Negro millionaires. And many Dallas Negroes are in the half-million bracket.

Negro progress toward first-class citizenship will be exasperatingly slow if it depends

solely on force applied through civil rights legislation. In the excitement of the hour, Negroes are forgetting they have great problems to solve for themselves. Negro leaders as a group are doing little to improve the deplorable crime record of the race and too little in telling Negroes that getting a good job is one thing, being qualified to hold it is another. Self-improvement and cooperation with well meaning white people of the South in working out race relations is the real solution. Sit-down strikes and demonstrations are not only silly, but futile.

The Problem of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable publicity on the action of the House last week on the foreign aid authorization bill. I am sure that all of us are deeply interested in the feeling of the people back home on this program. For that reason, I, therefore, include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on August 25 in the Sunday Call-Chronicle, Allentown, Pa., a very large newspaper in my district, and which said editorial very definitely expresses certain views on this program:

HOUSE CUT IN FOREIGN AID POPULAR BUT $3½ BILLION STILL LOT OF MONEY

Just about the time few citizens were expecting anything constructive from the 88th Congress, the House somewhat redeemed itself last week by lopping more than a half a billion dollars from President Kennedy's foreign aid bill.

One would have to go far to find any action more popular with the average citizen who has long since become sick and tired of the worn and tired arguments put forward in favor of squandering their money on boondoggles in foreign lands which have neither bought us friendship nor materially lessened the tensions of the cold war.

For a long time, including the years of Dwight Eisenhower in the White House, the argument was that unless we poured our billions—more than 100 of them to date—into the hands of governments abroad these countries would swing into the Communist orbit. This has always been a fake and a delusion.

With the exception of some of the countries of Western Europe much of this so-called aid never went for the purposes for which it was intended. Dictators and other heads of government used it for whatever they pleased. Too much of it never filtered down to the people it was supposed to help. This was notably the case in the Far East, Africa and South America.

When repeated exposure of the real situation created a healthy skepticism among Americans and roused no little bitterness because of the high taxes they had to pay to support the program, the tune of the foreign aiders changed. More recently the plea has been one of self-interest. Eighty percent of the money given for foreign aid, the argument now goes, is earmarked for expenditure for products made in the United States. To cut it off now would be to seriously affect our economy and make heavier the outward flow of our gold reserves, say the proponents of aid on a vast scale. This trip around, there were not enough legislators to buy the idea.

Quite likely one of the reasons for the current legislative revolt was the proposal to lend almost $1 billion to India so the Government can build a Government-operated steel mill at a place called Bokarto. The House knocked this plan out of the running last week, but the very fact that it was proposed with a straight face and fervent pleas shows how tough it is to discourage the entrenched bureaucracy of the foreign aid program.

If it hadn't just happened, it would be difficult to conceive of responsible persons in Government who would propose putting out this kind of money at negligible rates of interest to an impoverished government to create an industry operated under a strictly socialistic plan completely contrary to all our ideas of free enterprise. None of these same advocates would have dared for a minute to suggest using Federal tax funds to bail out the railroads, for instance, in their currently serious difficulties.

And if this isn't bad enough, then perhaps worse is that Washington's giveaway artists wanted to make the handout to an unfriendly government.

Unfriendly is precisely what India has been in all the postwar years, despite Prime Minister Nehru's purported neutrality. During most of this time he had been led around by one Krishna Menon, a bitter hater of Great Britain and the United States and avowedly a pro-Communist. Not until the Red Chinese moved to the Indian border and criticism at home mounted did Nehru put Menon under wraps. Late reports indicate he is only under wraps and still throwing substantial weight in India's decisions.

Having ostensibly removed this source of irritation, Prime Minister Nehru, who has always been noted for carrying water on both shoulders, found it quite natural to call unashamedly on the United States and Great Britain for military supplies of all kinds, money, and other aid. All were forthcoming. But there is no reason to believe Nehru or his government have changed attitude.

The answer of the foreign aiders to all this is that while Nehru may have his faults, we should keep in mind the millions of Indians who might turn out to be friends. Nothing could be more ridiculous. The fact is a vast number of India's millions, if not most of them, can neither read nor write. They are too busy trying to scrape together a meal every other day to even be aware of the existence of the United States. And even if we provided $1 billion for a new steel mill it is a cinch no one in the Indian Government would make it a point to tell them where the money came from. So our $1 billion would not be buying any friendship. It would merely be bailing out—perhaps—a man who has done a poor job as head of the government and is in our camp for the time being simply because he has no other place to turn.

In one way or another this sort of thing can be duplicated all over the world as a sound and persuasive argument against squandering more billions on ill-advised foreign aid projects. The American public has been aware of these things for a long time. The House at long last appears to have become aware of them, too.

Friday's vote in the House has been termed a stunning defeat for President Kennedy. It should be more properly called a victory for commonsense. As Congressman ADAIR of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said succinctly: "I think the program has too much money and that it has induced careless administration and sloppy programing."

Whether the Senate will restore, as has happened before, some or all of the cuts in the light of Mr. Kennedy's embittered criticism is, of course, the biggest question now. Certainly, the administration will exert every possible pressure to salvage what it can, for it is a good bet that our giveaway artists abroad have already promised more than they can deliver, if the bill stands as the House passed it.

Let the Senate remember, however, the reductions have by no means eliminated foreign aid. They have simply brought it into a little better balance. No matter how it is used, $3.5 billion is still a lot of money.

The Government in the News Wire Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has entered the news wire business in bold, flagrant competition with established private ownership. To bring this unwarranted venture to a halt and to prevent its spread throughout the Government bureaucracy, I have introduced H.R. 8214. Wide interest has been expressed by the Nation's press in this bill to prohibit the Government from engaging in the dissemination of news by wire in competition with private enterprise. The Associated Press and United Press International have formally protested to the Government the entry of the Department of Agriculture into their wire service domain.

I have been asked in a letter from the American Newspaper Publishers Association what I think are the prospects of getting the Department of Agriculture out of the news wire business. My reply is that this is a matter on which I hope for speedy action by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which H.R. 8214 was referred—an action which I have formally requested of the committee.

The grounds on which the AP and UPI based their protest to the Government are included in an editorial entitled "The Heart of the Matter," which appeared in the August 22 issue of the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram. I include the editorial at this point in my remarks:

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is back in Washington after a month-long visit to places and people in Soviet Russia and putting his somewhat battered shoulder—battered by the American farmers who blocked his program for putting complete control of wheat production in his Department's hand—to a movement that has particular interest to the American way of gathering and distributing the news by newspapers. It is the setting up of a news wire service, using Government teletypewriter circuits provided by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. for which rates are scheduled to be reduced when other news-gathering agencies, notably the Associated Press and United Press International, have been increased as of August 1, the date on which the new Government venture went into operation.

Naturally the AP and UPI have recognized the significance of the move and went exploring. They found plenty to work on, and as a result of their discoveries sent a

protest against the Government going into the news wire field on the following grounds:

(1) Under our concept of freedom, it is improper for the Government to engage in the business of news gathering and dissemination. It can too easily become a propaganda agency. The longstanding policy of the Small Business Administration (and its predecessor agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corp.) has been not to make loans to newspapers or broadcast stations because it does not wish to create any implications of Government influence on editorial content. The same policy should apply to the Department of Agriculture.

(2) Government should not engage in any enterprise in competition with existing private ownership which is able to provide satisfactory service, as the U.S. Department of Agriculture will be doing in this case.

(3) The announcement sets up a system of censorship by giving the Department of Agriculture authority to cancel the service of anyone who allegedly abuses the services by "misrepresentation of reports, or by any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable."

(4) Further expansion of this service—as is indicated in a Department of Agriculture background memorandum—could easily lead to a complete national news wire in direct competition with Associated Press and United Press International.

(5) The announced plan has monopolistic implications in that only A.T. & T. wires can be used although the present privately owned news service in this field uses wires leased from Western Union. FCC policies and actions have been aimed at preserving competition in the leased wire field between A.T. & T. and Western Union.

(6) The American taxpayers should not be expected to pay for news wire services to anyone.

Those six basic arguments go to the heart of a matter which is solidly written into the American Constitution and the operation of that document through close to two centuries. They, the arguments, should be read over and over again by people, regardless of party or other more or less natural bonds. The easiest understood of the arguments is the least verbal and last. Certainly American taxpayers should not be expected to pay for news wire services to anyone.

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this strikes directly at the historic question of preference. It would eliminate preference in the purchase of power from public utilities 10 years after the passage of this act insofar as the Pacific Northwest is concerned. If it were made a part of this bill I would anticipate that other legislation would be introduced eliminating the preference insofar as all other publicly generated power is concerned. All of the Members of this body who have preference customers in their districts, who want to continue to buy public power at rates less than it costs to produce, should certainly vote against my amendment. The others I think should logically vote for it.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing House Joint Resolution 676, authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the first week in March of each year to be Save Your Vision Week.

It has been said that most of man's knowledge of the world about him comes through his eyesight. For complete participation in the joy of living as well as in our ordinary day-to-day activities the means by which we see—our eyes—unquestionably one of man's most cherished possessions.

Save Your Vision Week was first observed in 1927 and has been sponsored annually since then by the American Optometric Association, working with other organizations to educate our cit- and enhancement of their vision.

Save Your Vision Week in my State of Kansas has alerted our citizens to specialized vision needs. In 1957 Kansas initiated a campaign entitled "Reading Takes Seeing" to emphasize that all schoolchildren should have their vision screened and those detected with vision problems referred to specialists for care. In 1959 the importance of vision in driving was emphasized. Thousands of citizens learned their seeing ability was not up to par when behind the wheels of their automobiles.

The theme in 1961 was "Enjoy Golden Years," the purpose, to assist the elderly person in continuing as a functioning individual. "Getting Rid of Vision Delinquents" was the basis for the 1962 campaign aimed at the estimated 50 million individuals who fail to take proper care of their eyesight.

The efficiency and productivity of industry in Kansas is dependent upon the vision of its workers. Breakage, spoilage and accidents have been reduced by calling management's attention to the visual requirements of their plants through Save Your Vision Week programs.

A close personal friend, Dr. Arthur D. Glenn from my hometown, Russell, Kans., is first vice president of the Kansas Optometric Association. He knows the potential importance of observing this special week devoted to informational messages and activities concerning a priceless possession—our vision.

The officers of the Kansas Optometric Association, in addition to Dr. Glenn, are: Harold E. Ripple, Jr., Hiawatha, president; Eugene C. Jeffery, Kansas City, Kans., past president; Eugene D. Nelson, Topeka, president-elect; L. I. Powers, Hutchinson, second vice president; Lewis E. Mock, Jr., Dodge City, secretary; Wendell D. Waldie, Wichita, treasurer. Officers of the Women's Auxiliary are: Mrs. Howard Sharpe, Atwood, president; Mrs. Franklin Reinhardt, Great Bend, first vice president; Mrs. Marvin E. Woolen, Olathe, second vice president; Mrs. L. I. Powers, Hutchinson, third vice president; Mrs. Harold E. Ripple, Hiawatha, secretary; Mrs. Harold A. Snider, Emporia, treasurer.

Some 83 million persons—more than half of the total population, six and over—are overdue for vision examinations. It is known that some 51 million of them—nearly one-third the total—are in immediate need of vision care, ranging from a simple correction of their lenses to surgical attention.

The visual welfare of our Nation is a matter which should concern us all. If a few may be saved from blindness, a few more from highway accidents, and others from failure in their jobs, through "Save Your Vision Week," this resolution will have served its purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join in support of this most important resolution, as set forth below:

Whereas vision is of the utmost importance to every individual and to the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas many Governors and mayors have, over the past 36 years, issued proclamations calling upon their citizens to give special attention to vision care during the first week in March of each year; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has supported significant research to protect man's priceless gift of vision; and

Whereas the U.S. Post Office Department has authorized the use of special cancellation stamps during that week and the preceding week for the purpose of reminding our citizens that their vision demands constant care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week," and inviting the Governors and mayors of State and local governments of the United States to issue similar proclamations. The President is further requested to consider including in such proclamation an invitation calling upon the press, radio, television, and other communications media, the health care professions, and all other agencies and individuals concerned with programs for the improvement of vision, to unite during such week in public activities to impress upon the people of the United States the importance of vision to their own welfare and that of our country, and to urge their support of programs to improve and protect the vision of Americans.

Look Who's Imitating Portugal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continued saber rattling by

Indonesian President Sukarno, and his clear attempt to disrupt the legitimate development of neighboring lands, an editorial which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune is of special significance. I place it into the RECORD at this point and also point out that it touches very effectively upon issues and subjects beyond the immediate Far-Eastern complications so consistently created by Mr. Sukarno:

LOOK WHO'S IMITATING PORTUGAL

The Indonesian puppet assembly in the former Dutch territory of West New Guinea has rubber-stamped a resolution declaring the country an integral part of Indonesia.

Thus a people who have resisted Malay and Moslem conquerors for nearly 1,000 years have been quietly swallowed up by an alien government which is predominantly Malay by race and Moslem by religion. And thus President Sukarno of Indonesia, no doubt, hopes to avoid the referendum which he promised when the United Nations handed him control of West New Guinea. He fears it would result in a vote for independence or affiliation with Australian New Guinea.

Mr. Sukarno has done precisely what he denounces Portugal for doing, and he has done it in utter disregard of human rights and his own promises. West New Guinea is almost as different in ethnology and culture from Indonesia as Angola and Mozambique are from Portugal. Portugal spent centuries developing the colonies which it now considers integral parts of Portugal, and for the most part the natives of its territories have benefited. Indonesia has never lifted a finger to help the aborigines of West New Guinea, and it has neither the money nor the inclination to do so now.

Mr. Sukarno's attacks on Portugal have been joined in by a large and vociferous chorus of Afro-Asian politicians. But we needn't expect them now to rise to the defense of the poor people of New Guinea. Sukarno is their pal. Portugal isn't. Nothing else matters.

All Philosophy Is Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Worthington, editor of the Aegis, Bel Air, Md., has ably summarized the outlook of the average citizen on the subject of Government spending. I am pleased to include his editorial, because it deserves a nationwide audience:

ALL PHILOSOPHY IS SPENDING

One of the pleasures of vacationing at the same resort year after year is the friendships made and the interest on derives from the progress of individuals and families as time passes on.

A number of years ago we met a young gentleman, who at the time, was the struggling campaign manager of his close friend, George Leader, Democratic candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Leader became Governor of that Commonwealth and ever since the stock of our new found friend, Otis Morse, has risen until he is now chairman of the powerful Pennsylvania Democratic State Central Committee. As such, it was interesting to hear his comments on the Democratic Party's philosophy as we lulled lazily in the sun on the beach.

He feels that taxes will continue to rise as the public demands increased services from Government, but on the other hand the Pennsylvanian expressed the opinion that most Government spending should be considered an investment.

How does one know what the citizens demand in services? In our opinion each agency of various Government functions attempts to become bigger and spend more, with department officials themselves dreaming up new ways to be of service to the people.

Within the past several months national publications have pointed out almost scandalous spending of public funds, but it seems only a few persons in political positions want to curtail expenditures.

Is this country to follow in the footsteps of the Roman Empire, as is so often mentioned today? Easy living, physical deterioration and overspending by its government brought on the Romans' final downfall as they became easy prey to enemies.

We hope not, but sometime in the future political leaders of the United States will find they have spent more than the people can pay for, and the hero of the hour will be the man who will rise to the occasion and say so, regardless of party.

Everyone Has a Part in Recreation Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Everyone Has a Part in Recreation Plan," which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, August 26, 1953. This article speaks impressively of the present resources and future development of Florida's rich recreational assets:

EVERYONE HAS A PART IN RECREATION PLAN

Approach of the fall hunting season focuses attention once more on the growing importance of Florida's rich resources for every form of wholesome outdoor recreational activity, and the responsibilities shared by State and local governments and every Floridian individually to insure their fullest proper enjoyment while protecting them for future generations.

Florida is bountifully blessed with the terrain, waterways, climate, game, and fish which make it a sportsman's paradise. The importance of their contribution to the State's total economy is incalculable, and perhaps proportionately greater than that of any other State in the Union.

Such an asset, valuable in both financial and human terms, can and must be protected against any diminution incident to other and equally vital elements in the State's total growth. The steady increase in population, spurring the expansion of urban areas and new residential developments, the welcome addition of new industries and construction of new highways all have a bearing on the matter.

Happily, however, it is not a question of either-or. Florida's blessings include ample space to accommodate every foreseeable demand in its destined growth, without endangering its recreational resources. The need is to take full advantage of the time remaining, which fortunately is still adequate, for the planning necessary to prevent any avoidable conflict.

A variety of plans and programs are underway to protect and improve the State's recreational resources, including the proposed constitutional amendment to be voted on November 5, authorizing an outdoor recreation and resources conservation bond issue, and joint Federal-State projects for improvement of fish and wildlife area.

The individual's responsibility extends, in addition to exercising his obligations of citizenship, to his personal conduct in sharing the use of the State's natural bounties. He is responsible for learning and abiding by the game laws, acting in the spirit of true sportsmanship, and performing responsibly in the exercise of all rules of safety for himself, his companions, and all others he may encounter in the field or on the waterways. In addition to polishing, oiling, and checking their guns in preparation for the approaching season, hunters new and old could profitably attend one of the series of firearm safety clinics now being held throughout the State.

National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to share with my congressional colleagues and all who read this RECORD, the thoughtful remarks printed by Harvey P. Griffin, editor of the Gallatin County Tribune, in Bozeman, Mont., concerning our current racial problems throughout the Nation.

I should like to quote, in part, from a letter sent to me by a former Bozeman resident who has been a constituent of mine for a number of years:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In today's mail, I received my copy of my onetime hometown (Bozeman, Mont.) weekly paper—the Gallatin County Tribune—to which I have continued subscription for a number of years.

Enclosed is an editorial of the last issue received (August 15, 1963) which I think will interest you as a reflection of some very forthright thinking on a problem on which too many people are too timid to speak out.

I hope you can give it some consideration for extension of remarks for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There are some thoughtful statements in the editorial which I think can drive home some inescapable facts, distasteful as they may be to some few much-admired Negro friends.

The editorial forwarded by my constituents follows in full:

NATIONAL PROBLEM

Here in the Gallatin, where we have virtually no Negroes, where other troublesome minority groups are conspicuous by their absence, we have rather prided ourselves that the current racial troubles which beset so much of the country are not our direct concern.

Two recent statements by Negro leaders, however, have so altered the entire picture of racial tensions as to remove it from being a local problem confined to areas with a heavy black population and put it squarely in the laps of white America.

In a telegram to Governor Harrison, Rev. L. Francis Griffin of Farmville, president of

the Virginia NAACP, and Lester Banks, executive secretary, declare:

"There is every intent to make 1963—the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation—the year of full emancipation. This (is) to be accomplished nonviolently, but violently if necessary."

The incredible message to the Governor of Virginia puts the entire controversy over race matters in a new light. So does a statement made by Rev. Archie Hargraves, a New York Negro minister on June 23 at Clark College in Atlanta, Ga. The Atlanta Constitution, on Monday, June 24, 1963, quoted this Negro as saying:

"The acid test is whether we in America can accept the proposition that a Negro may marry whomever he loves and loves him. The Christian church will either prove itself or destroy itself on the basis of its response to this proposition."

There you have it. The Negro problem isn't a sectional problem any more. It is a national problem and it ranges from one side of the Nation to the other.

Throughout all this emotional but thoughtless turmoil not one word is published in our press about the Negro's qualifications to live in social equality with whites. No one mentions his criminal record, his primitive living habits, his illiteracy, his backwardness after 100 years of freedom while living in a civilized white environment.

Emboldened by their widespread but unrealistic support—some sincere but shortsighted, some cynical and vote baiting—Negroes are demanding something they have not earned and are incapable of practicing. It took the white Caucasian race 6,000 years to earn that something we call Western civilization. It may take the Negro 6,000 years. He is only just starting.

The test questions of a white man's sincerity on these issues are plain:

1. Will you send your children to school with Negroes?
2. Will you live next door to Negroes?
3. Will you associate with Negroes socially, in your home, in your club?
4. Will you approve of your children marrying Negroes?

We have yet to find a politican, even among the "liberals", who will answer publicly those four questions. They are afraid to tell the truth.

On Sunday night, July 21, 1963, over station KTTV in Los Angeles, four Negro leaders, each representing a different black organization, were given a full two hours to state their demands.

Three of these Negroes agreed completely that the Negro demand is for "compensatory preference." This was their exact term.

These words are a demand that Negroes in the United States be given at once, with no delay at all for any reason, special privileges, by law, over all other citizens of our country, and at the expense of citizens other than Negroes.

It was stated by Wyatt Walker, assistant to Martin Luther King, and agreed by the others, that in order for their demands to be met, American legislatures, courts and law had to be bypassed, the Constitution must be replaced, and our entire economic system, educational procedures, free enterprise structures and profit system had to be abolished and that America had to move rapidly to a Socialist system.

It was stated that the whites of America were in great debt to the Negroes and that "mere equality" for Negroes was insufficient and inadequate, and that "massive preferential treatment" by coercive force, if necessary, must be imposed on white Americans to force payment of this debt now.

One incredible aspect of this so-called civil rights development is the assumption that the 90 percent white population are going to surrender to the 10 percent Negro population their heritage of decency, law and order, freedom and genuine civil rights. That in the name of equality, white America give up its liberty.

In considering this racial problem one recalls the realistic words of Lincoln spoken August 14, 1862, to a delegation of some 500 free Negroes in Washington. Lincoln said:

"Even when you cease to be slaves you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you. I cannot alter it if I would."

One cannot conceive the Negroes will obtain what they demand. There is too much pride of race among white people to ever let them submit to the mongrelization that always follows miscegenation.

What Lesson Does History Teach?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the road to dictatorship has not changed since Caesar destroyed the Republic of Rome. He destroyed the free forums of the people, he squandered the substance of the nation, and he rode roughshod over the rights of all who opposed his schemes.

Raymond Moley, in the September issue of Newsweek, has written an interesting article on "Caesar the Destroyer." I include as a part of my remarks. Members of Congress and the American people may decide if there is an analogy somewhere in this story.

CAESAR THE DESTROYER

(By Raymond Moley)

Royalty, said Walter Bagehot nearly a century ago, is one person doing interesting things. A republic is many people doing uninteresting things. The British could understand obedience to a queen. They had only hazy notions about law without a queen. The explanation is that human feelings are strong and human reason is weak.

This explains not only the durability of the British Crown but why Americans have always been intrigued by activist statesmen like T.R. and F.D.R. but have been left cold by the sober lawfulness of the two Tafts.

It is also, in part, the reason why Julius Caesar has been exalted over Cicero. From Theodor Mommsen's scholarly but slanted history of Rome to the present gaudy production of "Cleopatra," Caesar's virtues have been exaggerated. Mommsen's history, upon which most academic blessings have been bestowed, was written in the 1850's when the author was eagerly anticipating the coming of a German Empire.

A week ago I commented upon a quite different interpretation of the dissolution of the Roman Republic by John Dickinson, an immensely talented American lawyer, professor, and scholar. An excerpt from Dickinson's 3,000 manuscript pages has been edited by George Lee Haskins, a colleague of Dickinson ("Death of a Republic," Macmillan). The book mainly concerns the period from Caesar's first consulship to his assassination in 44 B.C. In Dickinson's account Caesar is the enemy and Cicero the conscience of republicanism. At issue were the laws and constitutional institutions of the dying Roman Republic. Involved in the revolution were the patricians, the constitutionalists, conspirators, and politicians, and the urban masses in the city of Rome.

DECAY OF CHARACTER

The once-sturdy fiber of the Roman people as well as their protective institutions had been undergoing a decline for a long time. Dickinson makes special mention of the Gracchus brothers in the second century B.C. Contrary to the stories we read in our schoolbooks, these individuals were demagogs who corrupted the populace and undermined the constitution. Caesar built his power through this weakness.

In his earlier years Caesar employed the tactics of machine politics with which Americans are so well acquainted. His machine operated through bribery, daring usurpations, and public benefactions with money provided by callous and ambitious rich Romans. His henchmen won support by public handouts when expedient and occasionally by planned violence and disorder. As he rose to supreme power, Caesar secured for himself election to one republican office after another, even attaining the sacred office of pontiff to clothe himself with religious authority. Later his well-advertised military expeditions yielded personal glamour and spoils for the Roman mobs. In the aftermath of the Cleopatra affair he beguiled Romans with the absurd image of himself as a peer of the gods.

CICERO'S OPPOSITION

Dickinson says Caesar substituted "a new mystical basis of authority for the traditional sanctions of the old republic. At the moment of his death he had built nothing, founded nothing * * * [except] a psychological acceptance for his rule." Into this vacuum moved the emperors and the Praetorian Guard.

Cicero struggled against this institutional corruption. The principles embodied in his speeches and writings were the supremacy of law which rested upon long-term concepts of justice, the exercise of official power under the limitations of republican institutions, checks and balances to prevent the abuse of authority, respect for organic growth represented in traditions of proven worth. Finally, he held that the character of government is determined by the integrity of the people who live under it. Cicero saw government as an agency under law and above the caprice of classes or even of majorities.

He labored for these ideas to his death. But he failed in the context of a greatly enfeebled and corrupted Roman character.

His warnings embody wisdom which our generation will ignore at deadly peril to human liberty.

Alliance for Progress Program Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the House last week cut the authorization for the Alliance for Progress from $600 million to $450 million. This was a 25-percent reduction which was included in the motion to recommit the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. I opposed the motion, because I believed it was not in the interest of our country, and it did not help the security of our country. This cut in the

authorization also hurt the program for South America, which certainly needs all the help we can give the Latin American countries.

I am including below an item from the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 26, 1963, relating to Dr. Martin J. Forman, who lives in my community and whom I know very well. Dr. Forman has been commended for the help he has given to Latin American countries under the Alliance for Progress program. This involved the feeding of hungry children who needed help. The motion to recommit did not consider the needs of these children.

I hope the Members will read this news item. I am glad that I have a constituent who is doing such wonderful work, and I join in commending him for his fine efforts.

The article follows:

FORMAN HAILED FOR WORK IN LATIN AMERICA

A Philadelphia sociologist has been hailed as the "moving spirit" behind a program which has fed more than 5 million children in Latin America in the last year.

Dr. Martin J. Forman, of 1986 Renovo Road, West Oak Lane, was paid tribute by Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, as the man who is "doing the real work" in Operation Ninos. In Spanish, "ninos" means children.

The operation was organized when President Kennedy expressed concern about hunger in Latin America. Dr. Forman was named program coordinator.

In Bolivia, 270,000 children are receiving food under the program as compared to only 9,500 receiving food under all other U.S. programs a year ago. In Brazil, Operation Ninos has reached 3 million children and is expected to feed 4 million next year.

A graduate of South Philadelphia High School, Temple University and the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Forman served as sociologist on Penn's faculty from 1952 to 1956.

In January of 1957 he became director of International House in Taipei, Taiwan. He later joined the Foreign Service and served in the Far East until the spring of 1962. He was then appointed head of the social and economic development section of Food for Peace, Operation Ninos' parent.

Dr. Forman's program has been so successful in Peru that Peace Corpsmen report many there refer to the Alliance for Progress as the "Alianza para los Ninos"—Alliance for Children.

Marketing Area, Bonneville Power Administration

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill and I am not equivocating about being opposed to it. In my opinion, if somebody had taken the Ten Commandments and written them out upside down and backwards, it just about would amount to this bill. I say that after a long, serious, hard study of it. The reason why we have the bill before us has been explained. They have this new transmission line technology which allows the transmission of electricity over greater distances than before. To the people up in the Pacific Northwest this simply means somebody else is now going to have a shot at their cheap Government power. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] explained to you, the chamber of commerce and almost everybody else in the Pacific Northwest is for this legislation. Of course. They are not going to go out and shoot Santa Claus. They are going to try to build a wall around the Pacific Northwest and keep other people from coming in and getting this power out.

So, in essence, in the beginning of this battle, when it started out a couple of legislative years ago, the forces of greed were fighting the forces of greed. The public power people outside of the Pacific Northwest were screaming against this legislation and the people in the Pacific Northwest were screaming for it. Under those circumstances, of course, public power forces were in considerable disarray and it was necessary for the people down in the Interior Department, who are interested in having all power of the Nation controlled from Washington, to do something to put them back together so that they can get a united front to get more appropriations out of this Congress for more public power generating facilities and for more public power transmission facilities. They did a pretty slick job of it here. They accomplished the maneuver by promising the people of the Pacific Northwest this bill, denying regional power preference to all others, then placating the nonpreferred they will get theirs in the form of new Federal generating plants and transmission lines financed out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Will the gentleman inform me, if this bill were not to become law, what is the reason why an intertie between the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest could not be built and the benefits which have been explained made available?

Mr. HOSMER. I will tell the gentleman the exact reason; because private power facilities would have to construct it in order to insulate the Pacific Northwest against preference customers outside the area. The Department of the Interior does not want private people to build these lines because, if they do, the private people are going to get a leg in the national power grid that is coming up and the bureaucrats in Washington will not be able to control it so easily. That is why we have this legislation before us.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, let us see how this scheme works. People in the Pacific Northwest say they want to have all the Bonneville power they can get, at one basic prime rate that has been in effect since 1939—since 1939—without one increase in power rates. In order to do that, they have put the gimmick in section 1 of this bill. Section 1 of this bill contains a bunch of definitions and if you are persistent enough you can get all the way through them. And this is what you find out. You find out that by law this Congress is defining Bonneville firm power as any power that anybody in the Pacific Northwest at any time, for the next 1,000 years, if it lasts that long, wants. The bill goes further to say something else—namely, anything else is dump power. It could be power as firm as the rock of Gibralter—but the law says it is dump power. Only that can be exported, and in exporting it, it must be sold at dump rates.

Mr. Chairman, they tell you that we are going to pick up $10 to $12 million annually for the Federal Government through this magnificent piece of legislation. Let me tell you this, if it were not for this piece of legislation, if we got them to do what they ought to do there, firm up the power the way it ought to be firmed up, we would be getting $100 million a year for the Federal Government. When you are voting "Yes" on this bill you are voting to keep that money out of the Federal Treasury; you are voting a legislative fiction as to what firm power and what dump power is. You are voting against all sanity in utility economics when you vote for this bill. That is the reason I make no bones about being against it.

The purpose of the bill, namely, keeping the mouths of the people of the Pacific Northwest, up to the Treasury, sucking out cheap kilowatts, could have been accomplished in other ways. The Federal Power Commissioners in the report on the bill quarreled with this legislation. They do not like it. They said that without all these inane consequences it involves, we could have given these people what they want merely by giving the Bonneville Administrator the power administratively to define some reasonable kind of a marketing area. Instead of that we have before us a gimmick that takes care of the cheap power users in the Pacific Northwest at the expense of everybody else, keeps everybody else from ever getting a shot at this power they help pay for since it is paid for by all the people of the United States. You give any industry, for all future time, that wants to go out to the Pacific Northwest and put in a big, costly, power-consuming plant—private industry, mind you now, say another paper company—the guarantee of access to this cheap public power over and above some public power user who happens to be just outside the borders of the Pacific Northwest.

You gentlemen who live in the Southern part of the country and who have your paper mills just realize that somebody is going to go out to the Pacific Northwest and take advantage of this cheap power that is legislated into law by Congress to make paper. Then that

company is going to go, say, to Chicago and bid on a paper contract cheaper than your plant in the South can bid. It will get the contract. Your people are not going to get it because Congress today passed this bill.

We started out many, many years ago with this preference business—and perhaps then it was a good thing. Perhaps preference to public power bodies and cheap public power when the Pacific Northwest was in its swaddling clothes and you had to chop down a few trees to get from one small community to another, was good. Maybe it helped build up what is now a very modern, a very progressive part of the country. But let me tell you such a sure-win gimmick of decades ago may be the sure-lose gimmick in modern America, which interferes with, impedes and makes more costly the economic progress of this country. It is going to make necessary—because it defies modern day economics—untold billions of dollars of investment in added generating facilities so the American people can have the power they need as consumption of power increases. Confining these kilowatts up in the Pacific Northwest prevents proper pooling of power, which in turn imposes requirements for construction of facilities not otherwise needed. It is uneconomic in other ways, too.. Oh, we can have some tie lines and we can transfer some dump power that can be cut off on a few days' notice. But we cannot now with this piece of legislation ever have a power pool for all the Pacific States and throw all of the generating facilities of all of these States of the West together, both hydro and through thermal and achieve the efficiences permitted by modern technology. As the decade of the sixties progresses into the decade of the seventies and then on into the decade of the eighties—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, as we go into these periods ahead where the power requirements of this country double, my friends, double every decade, we are going to have this and probably other similar legislative obstructions based on this as a precedent, in the road of developing the power that the United States of America needs for its economy and, if you will, needs for its race for survival in a hostile world. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is in my opinion only one redeeming feature of this entire piece of legislation and that is the feature that was introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. I mentioned this national power grid that will surely come into being, even though it may, to an extent, be Balkanized by legislation such as this. I mentioned the desire and the greed of Federal bureaucrats to be the ones that build this grid, or at least control it, and become the force that hereby control the combined power resources of the Nation. They want to get their greedy hands on the Nation's kilowatts and in that way exercise a dictatorial control over the entire economy of the country. I have mentioned those.

Now, the present Secretary of the Interior wants to be able to get away with building a national power grid, these very costly transmission lines, to lace together the Nation without coming to the authorizing committees of Congress to do so. He just wants to be able to go down and some afternoon at a crowded Appropriations Committee hearing and get $100 million, $200 million, or $500 million, or whatever amount of millions of dollars he needs for this purpose. He does not want to stand the careful scrutiny of an authorizing committee to determine whether or not his lines are those lines that are going to be best for the country. The Westland amendment prevents this and we should retain it at all costs.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the inconsistency of the Department of the Interior on this subject is truly amazing. The Secretary wants to come only to the Appropriations Committee, get money, and build a vast tieline between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, to be followed by another, vaster, second tieline on the basis that these interconnect generation centers and load centers.

At one and the same time he also is planning to come to Congress with a multibillion-dollar program of dual-purpose atomic reactors for the production of both power and fresh water. The thing about these dual-purpose reactors is this: Although they may be needed, although they may be good, although they may be the finest way there is to satisfy requirements for both water and power—although I do not necessarily admit it—these dual-purpose reactors are going to have to be confined to certain locations in this country. The amount of polluted material that will come out of these plants, the polluted water, means you cannot put them inland; you have to put them on a seacoast somewhere where you can get rid of this polluted water. These dual-purpose reactors are planned at 5 million kilowatts capacity. They will be restricted in their location. They have to be near a salt water source and an ocean to dump pollutants in. They will entirely relocate the centers of power production in this country to new and different locations. Yet the Secretary of the Interior in his plans has not even mentioned this feature. He might ask Congress to build these expensive interties, up to a quarter billion dollars at a crack, in areas where within a decade the power consumption and power production centers would be so drastically altered that these lines would no longer serve a purpose. This could come about long before the lines were ever paid for by the power users.

Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to be able to beat this bill. In my opinion it is in all respects a bad bill. I have six amendments I am going to offer to this bill, and I do not expect them to be adopted because many will think they are too radical. One of them, for instance, would require that 10 percent be added on to these Bonneville rates and the money to be used to help the Treasury reduce the national debt. That is really a radical idea nowadays. These people who have not had a boost in their power bills since 1939 are not going to take kindly to asking them to pay 10 percent more even though others, since 1939 have accepted very much greater increases. That would be just too old frontierish to contemplate. I do not expect them to be adopted, but I hope offering them will at least prick the consciences of some.

Buddhists in Hawaii Call for Restoration of Religious Freedom in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the whole world has been shocked by the actions of the Government of South Vietnam in its brutal repression of a right held sacred in America—the right to freedom of religion.

The 51st Annual Legislative Assembly of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawaii, representing a membership of some 50,000 persons in Hawaii, passed a resolution at its convention held in Hilo, Hawaii, August 13 to 15, 1963, asking that the freedom-loving peoples of all countries join in a call upon the Government of South Vietnam to desist from further persecutions and make amends in a humanitarian way for its inexcusable actions and restore the fundamental rights of men to the people of that country.

I have been informed by Bishop Chitoku Morikawa of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawaii and by Susumu Yoshikami, the assembly chairman, that this action arose from a genuine concern for the lives and well-being of not only the Buddhists but also of the non-Buddhists of South Vietnam. They also fear the disruption of harmony between peoples of various religious and racial backgrounds, not only in South Vietnam, but also in all other countries in which multireligious and multiracial peoples live side by side.

The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION, 51ST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, HONPA HONGWANJI MISSION OF HAWAII, AUGUST 13 TO 15, 1963

Whereas disturbing news of religious persecution against Buddhists in South Vietnam, with that country's government as the instigator of this great unrest, is being heard around the world reaching even this far-flung corner of the globe; and

Whereas the unrest has now reached proportions almost beyond human understanding in its viciousness, as evidenced by the cruel and inhumane atrocities inflicted upon the freedom-loving Buddhists of that country, to wit: the massacre of the followers of Lord Buddha gathered for the observation of his birth on May 8, 1963, in the Tu Dam Pagoda, in Hue, arising out of the issuance of a discriminatory government edict prohibiting the hoisting of the Buddhist flags; and

Whereas Dictator-President Ngo Dim Diem, his elder brother, Archbishop of Hue, Ngo

Dim Thuc, his younger brother, and Political Adviser, Ngo Dim Nhu, hold unlimited control over the policies of South Vietnam, bringing about the elimination of the separation of state and church so necessary in the well-being of any freedom-loving country; and

Whereas protests and appeals from the Buddhist leaders and organizations, including the Cambodian Government, have met nothing but deaf ears, while the suppression, oppression, and persecution of Buddhists are being intensified; and

Whereas Buddhism has been the religion of Vietnam from time immemorial, and 80 percent of the total population of about 15 million are Buddhists even to this day, and thus entitled to worship and to propagate their religion freely, without fear of harrassment and without fear of prosecution; and

Whereas Buddhists of the world should join in a united effort to bring this matter to the attention of the freedom-loving peoples of all countries, so that the peoples of all religions may be made aware of the existence of such a dastardly situation in Vietnam, and request their support and cooperation in the eradication of this great shame: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this the 51st Annual Legislative Assembly of the Honpa Hongwanji Mission of Hawaii decry and protest the intolerable situation existing in Vietnam, call upon the Government to desist from further persecutions and make amends in a humanitarian way for what has gone on, and restore the fundamental rights of men to the people of that country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. U Chan Htoon, President, the World Fellowship of Buddhists; Hon. U Thant, Secretary-General, United Nations; President John F. Kennedy, United States of America; Hon. Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senator, Hawaii; Hon. Hiram L. Fong, U.S. Senator, Hawaii; Hon. Spark M. Matsunaga, Congressman, Hawaii; Hon. Thomas P. Gill, Congressman, Hawaii; Lord Abbot Kosho Ohtani, Nishi Hongwanji, Kyoto, Japan; President, Japan Buddhist Association; Pope Paul VI, Vatican City, Rome, Italy; Hon. Harold Macmillan, Prime Minister, United Kingdom; President Charles de Gaulle, Paris, France; and Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Ambasador, Saigon, South Vietnam.

What Happened to the Vigor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor Daily News, of August 20, 1963:

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE VIGOR?

Looking back over the accomplishments of the Kennedy administration, we find ourselves wondering what is new about the New Frontier. And where is the vigor we heard so much about?

Lack of vigorous action led to the calamitous failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion aimed at the ousting of the Castro regime in Cuba. The President did employ vigor—and the Nation applauded him—when he demanded last October that the Soviets get their military forces out of Cuba. But then the vigor wilted. There was no follow-through. As a result, Soviet weapons and some 13,000 troops and technicians remain on the island.

The administration has done no better on the international economic front. Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act on the strength of glowing assurances by the White House of what could be accomplished. But when it came to using the act's authority to negotiate trade agreements with the Common Market, the administration found it was up against a sharp set of horse traders who were willing to take but not give.

A disillusioned administration is now planning tariff retaliations against the Common Market countries. What this may accomplish remains to be seen. Certainly, it is belated.

The unfavorable balance of payments continues to harass the Government. The administration recently moved to ease the situation by imposing a tax on American purchases of foreign securities. But this proved to be an act of haste rather than of vigor. Canada and Japan, two of the Nation's staunchest allies, immediately protested. Such a tax would discourage American investment, which both countries depend upon for industrial development. And so the administration is making an agonizing reappraisal.

Certainly, the administration has not employed much vigor in pressing its domestic programs. The White House has an abundance of supporters in the Democratic Congress but little is being done. The much-publicized tax cut plan remains a plan and nothing more.

Whatever may come of the railroad featherbedding dispute, the administration has been letting this critical issue dangle for want of decision. The White House has been handling this with long-handled tongs—fearful of a crippling strike and fearful, politically, of the railroad unions.

Less would be expected of the Democratic administration if so much had not been promised. There was to be a new day and a New Frontier. But what is new and what is better? "Vigor" has become a White House byword but, so far, only a word.

Bad Cut for the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, August 27, 1963:

BAD CUT FOR THE AMERICAS

Although the inter-American Alliance for Progress has been disappointing in many ways—and even moribund in some places—it still has promise and vitality in it as it begins its third year of operations. That is why the House, in making other cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill, should have supported the administration's request for $600 million for the Alliance in the next fiscal year.

The House has reduced that figure by $150 million, and President Kennedy has responded with these words: "Under the terms of this bill, hopeful social and economic progress in Latin America will be stalled and our shield against Communist aggression in this hemisphere will be weakened. It will mean that the Soviet Union will be giving almost as much to the small island of Cuba, as the United States is to the whole of Latin America. This is no way to defeat communism."

These are strong words, and perhaps a bit on the exaggerated and oversimplified side. But there can be no doubt that the House cut threatens to have a demoralizing effect on all our friends to the south who believe that there is something much more than mere rhetorical possibilities in the Alliance for Progress. And this is particularly true because of the fact—as just emphasized by Dr. Milton Eisenhower (who strongly favors the Alliance)—that the whole enterprise is under heavy attack from the extremists. These include, at one end, the Communists, who regard chaos as their best handmaiden. And at the other end, according to Dr. Eisenhower, are the oligarchists, the privileged, who stand for nothing but the most glacial sort of social change."

It is against these opposing oppressive and retrogressive or standstill forces that the Alliance for Progress has been designed to operate and bring about a better word south of the Rio Grande. Of course, not even the most optimistic New Frontiersman now feels that such a world can be brought into being in a hurry. But good advances are in sight, or at least possible. Thus, by way of example, Peru, Argentina, and the countries of Central America are committed to programs that should lead to genuine economic, political, and social betterment.

As for Brazil, the biggest and potentially the richest of all our neighbors in the Americas, it has done a poor job trying to curb its inflation and take care of its other woes. That is one of the reasons why the House has voted as it has. We submit, however, that there continues to be a lot of hope for the Brazilians and that the Alliance for Progress, given time and our country's help, will have a chance of attaining its goals.

Meanwhile, the Senate will do a good day's work if it will undo what the House has done in this matter. Meanwhile, too, what should be kept in mind is that the United States withholds funds from countries like Brazil when the fail to abide by the Alliance's rules. This is a fact that should reassure those who have suspected that our Government has been just throwing money away in the Americas, wantonly, without any political or other sense.

If It Doesn't Help the Communists, It's No Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Soviet Russia has never made any secret of its strategy in seeking to rule the world. The code of communism demands that the end they seek justifies the means. They proudly boast that they do not honor agreements, that lying is a national policy when it serves their purpose; the world has seen how little value they set upon human life. With no belief in God and devoted to dialectic materialism, human beings are merely animals to be used or eliminated as their use or elimination benefits the Communist conspiracy.

Khrushchev is the current high priest of the cult of communism. He has risen

to his post of power over the bodies of thousands of helpless and innocent men and women. The blood is still fresh on his hands from the freedom fighters in Hungary. Now we are asked to believe that suddenly his past means nothing, that he has changed into a benevolent and lovable grandfather who is deeply concerned with the lives of our children.

Before we are too carried away with the naive optimism of President Kennedy, his Secretary of State, and his special envoy to the Soviet Union, let us remember what Khrushchev and other Communist leaders have done in the past. What is "Back of Russia's Sudden 'Soft' Line" is all too clearly outlined in an article from the September 2 issue of U.S. News & World Report. Is it not just commonsense to review this history before tying our hands with the test ban treaty or entering into other agreements with a government that knows no honor?

The article follows:

BACK OF RUSSIA'S SUDDEN "SOFT" LINE

[Reported from London, Vienna, Paris, and Washington]

Less than a year ago, Nikita Khrushchev was rushing his missiles into Cuba, getting set to blow the United States to kingdom come.

Today, the Soviet dictator is all smiles and good will. Visiting Yugoslavia he hugged and kissed his host, President Tito, the Communist who has succeeded in getting billions of dollars in U.S. aid.

There is a blooming private correspondence between Khrushchev and President Kennedy. There is a private, closed-circuit, teletypewriter "hot line" being set up between the Kremlin and the White House.

There is a new treaty which bans nuclear testing in the atmosphere and underwater. There are plans for cooperation in space experiments. There is talk of other agreements bewteen Russians and Americans.

Why? What has changed in these 11 months? Looking at the contact points of cold war, it is hard to find real change.

Khrushchev's own Russian troops still occupy their Cuban bases. East German Reds on Khrushchev's orders still are shooting down unarmed Germans trying to escape over, under, or through the Red-built Wall into West Berlin.

In Latin America, in Africa too, Soviet agents appear to be as active as ever before, if not more so. Communist aid still goes to guerrilla fighters who are killing American soldiers in South Vietnam's war.

Khrushchev no longer boasts of the rockets which may still be in Castro's Cuba. Otherwise the cold war is clearly still on. Yet Khrushchev has made "deals" with the United States and hopes for more. Why?

Western experts on Soviet policy are in agreement that Communists do not make deals with non-Communists merely for appearance's sake. Russia's leaders must see gains for Moscow or there is no deal.

What does Khrushchev feel he is gaining with the test ban? Answering this and other questions, experts on Soviet policy in the United States and abroad provide at least one common answer: Out of deals with the United States, Khrushchev hopes to make not just one gain, but many.

NIKITA'S BOAST

In a message to Red Chinese leaders who attacked the Russia-United States test-ban deal, Khrushchev, on August 21, boasted of "our victory."

As Khrushchev described the deal with the United States, it will "perpetuate not the American nuclear monopoly, but the fact of its liquidation." Khrushchev told the Chinese that Russian policy on the test-ban issue was "nonfossilized, flexible, and realistic."

The Soviet statement to Peiping's Communists was saying, in effect, just what many U.S. military leaders were saying in Washington—that the limited ban on nuclear testing was a military gain for Russia, a military setback for the United States.

Reasons given by U.S. military men who opposed the treaty included these:

1. Russia is ahead in the development of big nuclear bombs which can only be tested in the atmosphere, so that the United States is hindered in its plans to catch up with Russia in this area by the ban on atmospheric testing.

2. Russia lags in the development of smaller nuclear weapons which can be tested underground, so that Russia is being permitted to catch up under a test-ban agreement which does not ban underground testing.

There was every expectation among Western experts on Soviet affairs that Khrushchev will now press quickly ahead with underground testing of small nuclear weapons.

ROLE OF CHINA

Khrushchev's decision to make a deal with the United States banning tests is seen as directly related to Khrushchev's quarrel with Mao Tse-tung of Red China.

As long as there was some hope of repairing the break with Red China, said Soviet experts in London, Khrushchev had to go slow in negotiations with the United States. Mao is opposed to all such negotiations with non-Communists. Now the split between Russia's Reds and Chinese Reds is so wide that Khrushchev appears to be no longer concerned about what Mao says or thinks of his policies.

Split between Russia and Red China is growing fast—so fast that there already is talk in the Far East of Russia's territorial ambitions involving Red China's Provinces of Sinkiang and Manchuria. Both these areas have been penetrated by Russia in the past. Both lie far from China's population center and close to the Soviet Union's main Eurasian lines of communication.

By billing Russian Communists as Reds willing to "coexist" with the United States and the West, by denouncing Chinese Communists as Reds who want nuclear war, Khrushchev appears to be wooing U.S. support against Red China. But a former British ambassador to Moscow, Sir William Hayter, has warned the West against counting too much on the Russia-China break.

"The things that separate Russia from China are still infinitely less than the things which separate us from either of them," said the British diplomat.

"The quarrel of itself does not change the world balance as much as some people seem to think. Though Russian policy has become infinitely militarily menacing, her relative strength has, if anything, increased, and her general attitude to the world, to all of us, remains fundamentally unaltered."

MEANING OF A VISIT

It was a tanned, gay and apparently happy and relaxed Khrushchev who turned up in Belgrade as August ended for a 15-day work-and-rest visit to Tito's Yugoslavia.

By choosing to visit Tito, the "independent Communist" who has obtained $2½ billion worth of aid from the United States since his 1948 break with Stalin's Russia, Khrushchev appeared to be delivering a mesage to the satellite leaders of Eastern Europe.

This message, as the experts on Soviet policy read it, followed these lines:

The Soviet Union is making deals with the United States, is getting closer than ever to an overall deal with the United States. And the more Moscow's Communists can cozy up to the U.S. Government the less likelihood there is that the United States and its allies will provide any support at all for any attempt by Eastern Europeans to break away from Moscow's orders. Things now are so good between Moscow and Washington that both are on intimate terms with the same Communist, Tito of Yugoslavia.

The United States, so far, has shied away from any deal formally recognizing Khrushchev's East German puppet regime as an independent government. Now, however, the East German Reds are to sign the test ban treaty.

United States and British officials say that the East Germans can do what they like, that their signing of the treaty in the presence of the Russians and other Reds does not alter the Western attitude. But Communists clearly are taking this move as tacit recognition by the West of the East German Government.

In addition, after the test ban treaty, United States relations with the satellite governments of Hungary and Bulgaria were described, even in Washington, as "greatly improved."

In Yugoslavia, Khrushchev appeared to be saying to one aand all that not only the United States, but even "independent Communist" Tito, now recognizes the Soviet dictator as head of Russia's empire in Eastern Europe. This idea represents a net gain for Khrushchev.

LOAN FROM UNITED STATES?

There are hints that Khrushchev is beginning to think in terms of a large line of credit from the United States.

Khrushchev's visit to Tito set off again speculation about a big United States loan to Russia. If Tito, a declared Communist, could "coexist" with the United States, and the West while following the Moscow line and still get billions in U.S. aid, then why couldn't Khrushchev with his new policy of making deals with the United States do the same? This was the trend of the speculation.

In addition, there is a historical background for the current talk of United States credits to Russia.

At the end of World War II, before the Marshall plan took form, the Roosevelt administration in Washington gave serious consideration to a loan to Russia. Amount the Russians originally discussed was $6 billion. Stalin balked at supplying economic information needed for such a loan, and the idea fell through as Stalin adopted a cold war policy.

A loan of comparable size in today's dollars would be one approaching 10 billion dollars.

Compared with Red China, Soviet Russia is a "fat cat," a "have" country whose people are relatively well off. Compared with Western Europe and the United States, however, Russia still looks poor in terms of living standards, the housing, food and consumer goods available to its people. Among the things the Russians want are better food, better apartments, cheap automobiles.

United States loan to Russia, now believed by many experts to be part of Khrushchev's thinking, would provide the Soviet Government with the dollar exchange needed to obtain U.S. fertilizer to boost food production, U.S. structural steel for housing, even U.S. consumer goods.

HOPES OF MORE TRADE

Through a lessening of tensions, by the test ban treaty and similar moves, Khrushchev also hopes to increase Soviet trade with the West.

Businessmen all through Western Europe are showing increased interest in opportunities to do business with both Russia and her

satellites. Trade deals are growing rapidly. Rumania particularly has been active in developing its own deals with the West.

A "soft" line, placing the emphasis on peace and coexistence, encourages a lowering of bars to trade in goods of all kinds, including those goods classed as strategic.

West Germans are leading the way in trade deals with Russia and the satellites, setting up permanent trade missions in satellite capitals. On their side, satellite governments are doing what they can to attract Western trade and, where possible, Western capital investment. Some Western European businessmen turning up in Vienna from Communist capitals in Eastern Europe report discussions of profit-sharing concessions offered to them by Communists.

Russians are reported to be particularly anxious to get Western fertilizer and chemical plant machinery, are said to be in the market for whole factories. Once again, as in Lenin's day, the Russians are considering the idea of contracting with Western engineers and industrial specialists for the setting up of complete industries. Now, however, the industries wanted are described as "only the most advanced types," including automated plants for the production of machine tools.

All of this, including trade items now banned by the United States as strategic, is viewed as a possible gain for Khrushchev in the new atmosphere growing between United States and Russia.

GOAL: SPLIT THE WEST

When peace talk is in the air, history indicates that military allies tend to pull apart.

By taking a "soft" line toward the United States, Khrushchev is encouraging squabbles already visible within the Western Alliance. Britain and France are at odds; Britain and West Germany have been cool. President De Gaulle of France and President Kennedy of the United States have been distant. De Gaulle disapproves of any deal with Khrushchev at this time, won't go along with the test ban.

Russia's long-term goal has been to get the United States with its troops, out of Western Europe, to divide the Western European allies from each other and from the United States. Reaction to the test ban deal clearly has intensified Allied quarreling—another gain for Khrushchev if quarreling lasts.

There is a widely held conviction among Western officials whose business it is to analyze Soviet policy that Khrushchev is particularly anxious for a breathing spell, that he wants some relief from the cold war with the West, at this time.

There is, for one thing, a host of economic problems eating away at the Soviet structure. Industry is lumbering, inefficient. Farm production is a year-to-year gamble. Consumer goods are short.

A respite in the cold war is essential to Khrushchev in order to avoid a cutback in the standard of living of Russians, a cutback which would be unavoidable if defense costs go spiraling upward. Such a respite at this time may well be Khrushchev's greatest gain from deals with the United States as the experts appraise these gains.

In Khrushchev's philosophy as in Lenin's: "The treaty is the means of gaining strength." Otherwise, in Communist ideology, there is no point in treaties.

Present test ban treaty is seen by Khrushchev as a part of "peaceful coexistence," with the understanding that it is only "a necessary phase" prior to the eventual "triumph of communism."

Subversive Character of NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 29, 1963, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable E. C. GATHINGS, did this Congress and the Nation a great service by inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a very detailed and exhaustive account of the subversive character of the NAACP.

This report by Representative GATHINGS required approximately 30 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and no doubt its length, although necessary for such a documented study, discouraged many from reading it. One of my most outstanding constituents and one well versed in and knowledgeable about communism, Mr. Emert S. Rice, of Columbia, S.C., has made an in-depth study of my colleague's report and reduced its factual information into a most concise and understandable form.

As every conceivable pressure is being used by the leaders of the NAACP against Congress for the passage of the most vicious and unconstitutional civil rights bill in the history of this Nation, I am inserting the compilation of my esteemed friend, Mr. Rice, in the RECORD so that everyone will have a concise record of the background and activities of the people directing that organization. The report, as compiled by Mr. Rice from Representative GATHINGS earlier speech to this House, follows:

Number of subversive organizations with which affiliated or sponsor of such an organization's project, as reported by Representative Gathings and appearing in the Congressional Record

OFFICERS AND BOARD MEMBERS OF THE NAACP

1. Roy Wilkins, national administrator and executive secretary 7
2. Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, founder, Atlantic University, 1909 96
3. Arthur B. Springorn, national president, member board of directors, 1961 4
4. Grace B. Fenderson, national vice president, 1961 1
5. A. Phillip Randolph, national vice president, 1961 20
6. L. Pearl Mitchell, national vice president, 1961 2
7. Bishop W. J. Walls, national vice president, 1961, A.M.E. Zion Church, Chicago 8
8. John Haynes Holmes, national vice president, 1954–61 30
9. William Lloyd Imes, national vice president, 1961, pastor, St. James Presbyterian Church, president, Knoxville College 31
10. Dr. W. Montague Cobb, chairman, national health committee, 1954, professor, Howard University 4
11. Dr. J. M. Tinsley, national board of directors, national health committee, 1954 (Virginia) 2

Number of subversive organizations with which affiliated or sponsor of such an organization's project, as reported by Representative Gathings and appearing in the Congressional Record—Continued

12. Dr. Harry J. Greene, national board of directors, national health committee, Philadelphia 2
13. Roscoe Dunjee, national vice president, 1961, attorney, Oklahoma City 14
14. Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, national board of directors, 1961, Department of Religion, Smith College 10
15. Robert C. Weaver, national board of directors, 1961, Economic Adviser Secretary of the Interior 5
16. Lewis Gannett, national board of directors, national vice president, 1961, book review columnist, New York Herald Tribune 14
17. Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, national board of directors, 1961, president, Talladega College, 1936 2
18. Judge Hubert T. Delany, national board of directors, 1954, New York City 9
19. Norman Cousins, national vice president, 1954 (editor, Saturday Review of Literature) 1
20. Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, 1961, New York City 24
21. Dr. Ralph Bunche, national board of directors, 1961, Washington, D.C. 3
22. Dr. H. Claude Hudson, national board of directors, 1961, Los Angeles, Calif. 1
23. Alfred Baker Lewis, national board of directors, 1961 3
24. Dr. James J. McClendon, national board of directors, national health committee, 1961, Detroit 3
25. James Hinton, national board of directors, 1954 (president, State conference, South Carolina) 1
26. Theodore M. Berry, national board of directors, national legal committee, 1961, Cincinnati 1
27. Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, 1961, Illinois 30
28. Benjamin E. Mays, national board of directors, 1954 (president, Morehouse College) 5
29. A. T. Walden, national legal committee, 1961, Georgia 2
30. Arthur D. Shores, national legal committee, 1961 3
31. Lloyd Garrison, chairman, national legal committee, 1961 (Former chairman, NLRB, Madison, Wis.) 5
32. Sidney A. Jones, national legal committee, 1954, Chicago 8
33. W. Robert Ming, Jr., national legal committee, 1954, Washington, D.C. 2
34. Arthur J. Mandel, national legal committee, 1954, Houston, Tex. 4
35. Robert W. Kenny, national legal committee, 1961 (Attorney General of California, 1943–47) 16
36. Milton R. Konvitz, national legal committee, 1961, Newark, N.J. 1
37. Loren Miller, national vice president, national legal committee, 1961, Los Angeles 16
38. Morris L. Ernest, national legal committee, 1961, New York City 9
39. Z. Alexander Looby, national board of directors, national legal committee, 1961 2
40. Karl N. Llewellyn, national legal committee, 1954 (Colorado Law School) 3
41. Shad (Isador) Polier, national legal committee, 1961 (Rabbi Stephen Wise' son-in-law) 6

Number of subversive organizations with which affiliated or sponsor of such an organization's project, as reported by Representative Gathings and appearing in the Congressional Record—Continued

42. Jawn Sandifer, national legal committee, 1961, New York City	1
43. Sidney R. Redmond, national legal committee, 1961, St. Louis, Mo	2
44. George M. Johnson, national legal committee, 1961, Washington, D.C.	1
45. Edward P. Lovett, national legal committee, 1954, Washington, D.C.	1
46. Louis J. Redding, national legal committee, 1961, Wilmington, Del	3
47. Joseph B. Robinson, national health committee, 1961	1
48. Dr. Edward L. Young, national health committee, 1961 (Harvard University Medical School)	11
49. Viola Bernard, national health committee, 1954	1
50. Dr. Russell L. Cecil, national health committee, 1961	1
51. Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, national health committee, 1961, Washington, D.C	4
52. Gloster Current, director of branch department, 1961, Detroit	3
53. Ruby Hurley, Southeast regional secretary, Birmingham, Ala., 1961	2
54. Thurgood Marshall, director counsel, legal defense fund and education fund, 1961 (New York)	3
55. Clarence M. Mitchell, director Washington bureau, 1961	2
56. Henry Lee Moon, director, public relations department, 1961, Washington, D.C	4
57. Clarence A. Laws, regional director, New Orleans, 1961, La	1
58. Robert L. Carter, assistant special council, 1961	2
59. Torea H. Pittman, assistant field secretary, 1961, California	1

Minnesotans Join 200,000 in Washington March for Jobs and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a large delegation of Minnesotans is here in Washington today, joining with 200,000 people from all 50 States in the March for jobs and freedom. The group includes the Honorable Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis, and James Rice, secretary to Gov. Karl Rolvaag. There are religious leaders, civic leaders, and just plain citizens.

This morning these men and women met with the Senators and Congressmen from Minnesota and conducted a challenging discussion on civil rights legislation pending in this session of Congress. They strongly support President Kennedy's proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963.

The petition which they are presenting to Congress deserves the attention of all Members of both the House and the Senate. I have unanimous consent to place their petition in the RECORD:

PETITION

Know all men by these presents, that the Minnesota march on Washington delegation, a voluntary ad hoc delegation of residents of the State of Minnesota, assembled for the purpose of presenting a petition to the Congress of the United States of America, witnesseth:

Whereas it is the intent of this delegation to petition, in particular, that the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY and the Honorable EUGENE MCCARTHY, Senators from the State of Minnesota; and the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, the Honorable DONALD FRASER, the Honorable JOSEPH KARTH, the Honorable ODIN LANGEN, the Honorable CLARK MACGREGOR, the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN, the Honorable ALEC OLSEN, and the Honorable ALBERT QUIE, Congressmen from the State of Minnesota, should work to achieve the passage of Senate bill 1731 and House bill 7152, the so-called President's Civil Rights Act, and should also consider with their colleagues and with civil rights leaders further legislation to guarantee freedom and equal opportunity to all residents of the United States. In general, we petition that the Congress of the United States express and implement its concern that the fundamental civil rights of residents of the United States of America shall not be abridged in violation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this delegation, hereby and by these presents, petitions the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY and the Honorable EUGENE MCCARTHY, Senators from the State of Minnesota; and the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK, the Honorable DONALD FRASER, the Honorable JOSEPH KARTH, the Honorable ODIN LANGEN, the Honorable CLARK MACGREGOR, the Honorable ANCHER NELSEN, the Honorable ALEC OLSON, and the Honorable ALBERT QUIE, Congressmen from the State of Minnesota, to work to achieve the passage of Senate bill 1731 and House bill 7152, the so-called President's Civil Right Act, and to the end that the Congress of the United States express and implement its concern that the fundamental civil rights of residents of the United States of America shall not be abridged in violation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

In witness whereof, we the undersigned, have set our hands in the city of Minneapolis and State of Minnesota this 25th day of August in the year 1963:

Rev. Webster Barnett, pastor, St. David Episcopal Church of Minnetonka Mills, Hopkins; Robert Baum, student, Excelsior; Jesse Bell, reporter, Minneapolis spokesman-recorder, Minneapolis; William Budd, executive director, Jewish Center, Minneapolis; Father Denzil Carty, rector, St. Philips Episcopal Church, St. Paul; Christopher Durand, Catholic Interracial Council, St. Paul; Rev. Mark Fallonsbee, United Church of Christ, Northfield; Father Flavin, faculty, Nazareth Hall, St. Paul; Mrs. June Hanson, Minnesota Humanist Society, Minneapolis; Eugene Hill, president, Minnesota National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, youth group, St. Paul; Margaret Benton, secretary, Minnesota Council of Civil and Human Rights; Joe E. Byrne, St. Paul; Mrs. Lois Doty, Friend's Meeting (Quaker), Minneapolis; Max E. Fallek, representing Temple Israel, Minneapolis; Zetta Feder, executive committee, Minnesota Council of Civil and Human Rights; S. F. Hammond, Jr., International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, Minneapolis; William Heryla, president, local 1139, United Electric-Radio and Machine Workers of America, UE, Minneapolis; Rev. Louis Holm, reporter, Augsberg Publishing House, Minneapolis.

Reverend Hunter, pastor, Mt. Olivet Baptist Church, St. Paul; Mrs. Josie Johnson, Mayor's Commission on Civil Rights, Minneapolis; Rev. Stanley King, pastor, Sabathani Baptist Church, Minneapolis; Rev. George Lemoine, director, Christian-Social Relation, Minneapolis; Robert Lippert, Catholic Interracial Committee, St. Paul; Jim Luger, board of directors, National Catholic Interracial Council; Paul Muller, teacher, Vocational High School, Minneapolis; Rev. Jerome Nilssen, pastor, Danebod Lutheran Church, Tyler; Mrs. Marty Nordstrom, housewife, Minneapolis; Mrs. Dorothy J. Huseby, speech pathologist, Minneapolis School Board, Minneapolis; Mrs. Mary Ann Jones, interfaith fair housing program, Minneapolis; Mrs. Mary J. Kyle, Twin City Observer and Sun, Minneapolis; Rabbi Jerome Lipnick, Adath Jeshurun Congregation, Minneapolis; Matthew Little, vice president, Minnesota Council of Civil and Human Rights; Rev. Richard Mathison, pastor, Endion Community Methodist Church, Duluth; Cecil Newman, publisher and editor, Minneapolis Spokesman and Recorder, Minneapolis; Marty Nordstrom, photographer, Minneapolis; Father Otani, director, Japanese-American Community Center, Minneapolis.

Mrs. Dorothy Parker, housewife, Minneapolis; Mrs. Connie Price; Urban League Guild, St. Paul; James Rice, secretary to Governor of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Mrs. Shirley Ricketts, housewife, Minneapolis; Rabbi Moses B. Sachs, B'nai Abraham Synagogue, Minneapolis; Floyd Scott, social worker, Minneapolis; Gerald Sheehey, director, Minnesota Indian Employment and Guidance Center, St. Paul; Father T. R. Taylor, Minnesota Commission on Race and Religion, St. Paul; Mrs. Hertha Pflanze, housewife, Minneapolis; Mrs. Ralph Prim, nurse, Minneapolis; Sam Richardson, board of directors, Minneapolis Chapter, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Minneapolis; Rev. Roland Robinson, assistant pastor, Lake Harriet Methodist Church, Minneapolis; Robert Samples, Catholic Interracial Council, Minneapolis; Chester Simmons, assistant director, Urban League, Minneapolis; O. Donald Smith, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Minneapolis; Dr. D. B. Terrell, chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; James Thomas, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Minneapolis; Rev. Kneely Williams, pastor, New Hope Baptist Church, St. Paul; Rev. Mordeau Williams, pastor, St. James AME Church, St. Paul; Mrs. Marjorie Wynn, housewife, Minneapolis; Rev. Peter Thompsen, pastor, St. Peders Danish Lutheran Church, Minneapolis; James White, Ph. D., president, Congress of Racial Equality, Minneapolis; Mrs. Olive E. Willis, housewife, Minneapolis; Robert Wynn, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Minneapolis.

The Challenge of Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, there are challenges to be met by every individual and every nation. Often, these chal-

lenges are recognized vaguely and belatedly.

In this connection, I was privileged recently to read a perceptive and inspiring address by Dr. Davis Y. Paschall, president of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, delivered on July 27, 1963, to the convention of the Department of Virginia, the American Legion, held at Roanoke, Va. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Dr. Paschall's message, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF OUR TIMES

The American dream is a glorious epic of man's struggle for freedom. Because its recorded struggle has so often reflected hope or disillusionment, glory or despair, statesmanship or demagogery, the sunshine of a republican form of government or the dark shadow of authoritarianism, America has always been at the crossroads. "Times that try men's souls" have not been exclusively confined to any one period of our history.

It is not the trial of the times, but the failure of men to comprehend the contemporary scene with an eye to the past as well as to the future that has strewn history's pages with the wrecks of dying civilizations which refused to meet the challenge of their day.

As the late President Lowell of Harvard said, "A civilization is seldom murdered; it commits suicide." The unmet internal responsibility has ever cancered the "Roman" wall of defense long before the enemy scaled its summit, and reduced men and nations to the tragedy of unrealized potential.

Surely, it behooves us, therefore, to reflect on the import of our times if we are to fulfill our rendezvous with American destiny.

OUR TIMES

We are in a new type of war amid an uneasy peace. This paradox, unusual in our history, is admitted by those who witness the intense battle of ideologies in the struggle for the minds of men.

The major determinants for something more valued than mere survival in this conflict will be found in the realm of the intellect and spirit rather than in the power of brawn.

The Damocles sword is suspended in this nuclear Olympic in one awesome challenge of our times: In ruthless competition with an atheistic enemy, can we retain the spiritual values, and basic individual freedoms that have nourished and sustained us as a nation in order that a possible "win" will not, in the long run, become a hollow victory? Put in another way, can we avoid emulation of the tactics and ideologies of a formidable enemy so that we not become betrayal victims in our own actions, beliefs, and successes?

In meeting this challenge of our times, we need to answer the question: What has made America great, and what are the forces that would dilute and destroy this greatness?

A full and satisfying answer in the minds and hearts of our young people, as well as ourselves, will, above all else, determine the future defense of western civilization and the destiny of the American dream. In the objective pursuit of this answer lies our supreme hope for the allegiance of the future citizen to those principles that safeguard this country, and must be protected at all costs if freedom is to endure.

KEYS TO AMERICA'S GREATNESS

Whereas the answer to America's greatness cannot be prescribed categorically, yet there are three guidelines and salient truths that experience has proved to be worthy of consideration. However dimmed by changing years and circumstance, they persist as bedrock values in charting the course of our ship of state.

First. The freedom of the individual: From the long, arduous, and agonizing struggle of man in his search for freedom, the Founding Fathers gleaned the ideals to which this Republic would dedicate its full measure of devotion.

Beginning with the experiments of ancient Athenian democracy and the fundamental Hebraic-Christian concepts to the wresting of the Magna Charta by the English barons at Runnymede in 1215, to the inauguration of the first representative assembly at Jamestown in 1619, to the assertion of the right of free men to govern themselves set forth in the Mayflower Compact of 1620, to the English Bill of Rights of 1688, to the immortal principles of freedom enumerated in the Declaration of Independence—the attritional and sacrificial successes were documented.

From these basic ideals, the Constitution of the United States, incorporating the first 10 amendments as the Bill of Rights, was born. Here, at last, the spiritual, political, and economic rights as the very essence of individual freedom were set forth.

We cannot attain the level of informed intelligence for effective citizenship today without a deep and abiding knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of these great milestones in the history of human freedom, together with the accompanying responsibilities for their preservation and extension to posterity.

Second. Representative Government: The principle that the rights and responsibilities of the individual, the limitations upon his freedom of action with respect to the rights of others, are to be determined by representatives elected by the people, and subject to their being called to account by the electorate, is a basic jewel set by the Founding Fathers in our system of government. Forever, did they intend that our governments—Federal and State—derive their powers from the consent and deliberate delegation of the governed and, hence, possess limited powers.

Today, as in 1776, the true revolutionary doctrine is not the Communist manifesto, but the history-shaking pronouncement, "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Third. Due process aand the rule of law: The reliance upon government by law and not by men, upon orderly steps in law enforcement—rather than the violence of revolution—which validates each step according as it protects the rights of the individual involved became another jewel in the course of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This principle recognizes that laws are made by men, but that men are not laws unto themselves.

Here, in what Blackstone described as "the golden passage" of Magna Charta, is the test of whether the freedom of the individual is more than hollow mockery, and whether the government really rests upon the consent of the governed.

It would be difficult to find stronger propositions supporting the source of America's greatness outside these pillars of documented liberty, and they constitute an eternal distinction between the American and the totalitarian ideologies, whether of the 18th or the 20th centuries.

THREATS TO AMERICA'S GREATNESS

To constitute a framework for liberty and human freedom is not enough to assure it. Only eternal, enlightened and aroused vigilance by each succeeding generation can do this. What then are the contemporary threats to America's greatness for which such vigilance must be exercised? Here, again, a categorical answer cannot be given, but some of the "signs of the times" can be identified.

1. The accelerated erosion of the principle of federalism since the 1930's is becoming a cancerous sore in the body politic. In the process of redefining the functions and powers of the Federal and State governments, the race has been between the general welfare clause in the preamble and the following two amendments in the Bill of Rights:

Ninth amendment: The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Tenth amendment: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The record shows that under the guise of one emergency or another during the past 30 years field after field of State activity has been preempted by the Federal Government. The attritional annihilation of these two amendments, if not checked, will whittle away the Federal system, the very essence of our republic.

Closely akin to this threat is the increasing danger to the separation of powers at the Federal level, and the corresponding unbalancing of time-honored checks and balances. Blood relations, and the appalling increase in bureaucratic agency-made law further contribute to this threat. Also closely akin is the maddening emphasis on rights and a corresponding lack of emphasis in responsibilities.

2. The trend of the judiciary process in recent years to evolve as the "keeper of the national conscience" can, as Jefferson feared and predicted, make putty of the Constitution itself.

When the approach to fundamental legal issues ceases to be a scholarly evaluation of statutory precedent and historical foundations of constitutional intent, then the inevitable consequence portends a rule of men instead of a rule of law.

Such practice in effect amends rather than interprets the Constitution and tends to make it a flexible, unstable document subject to the political exigencies of the contemporary scene. The net consequence is the gradual undermining of time-honored faith in the integrity of the judicial process as a guardian of liberty.

The tragedy of the moment lies in the overwhelming pressures on Congress to enact laws, and the courts to adjudicate, in areas so fundamental and delicate as rights without having time, or disposition, to bring to bear the weight of historical and truly constitutional intent. Such stampeded action, taken today on the part of some in a sincere advocacy of the cause of liberty, may in the light of tomorrow's retrospect be revealed as a new tyranny.

3. The tendency to disassociate the freedom of America from its economic solvency is a growing fallacy of the first magnitude. The two are inseparably entwined, and danger to a sound, free enterprise system is a threat to the fundamental fabric of our way of life.

Our economic system was built on two pillars of strength: that labor should be worthy of its hire, and that capital should be worthy of at least a reasonable return on its investment. We have observed these two principles—both good—emerge in conflict and be engulfed in a legal labyrinth under excessive governmental guidance and control.

The result is the threatening specter of Government becoming the master rather than the servant of the people; an acceptance of the national debt, however big, as a state of normalcy; a view of the Federal budget as a social rather than an economic instrument; and a belief that security is the goal rather than initiative and incentive.

4. The tendency for one to restrain expression of deep conviction on public issues for fear of being labeled liberal or conservative is one of the insidious dangers to the exercise of effective citizenship on the contemporary scene. The sound and fury that now casts these labels across the land is an ominous threat to leadership.

Whereas the informed citizen recognizes that it is not an either/or process on any major issue; that the Federal Government

must undertake certain activities peculiar to a space age; that any problem of the moment must invite objective analysis on both sides of the question; that the modern evolution of 20th century America often requires a new concept of thought and procedure—yet he is disposed to remain aloof for fear that having acquired a label he must then live up to it, or exert frustrating effort in trying to get out from under it. In either case, the real cause suffers in the aftermath.

The point is that the Nation cannot afford to lose the voice of effective leadership for fear of crucifixion on the altar of a label, nor permit this leadership to relegate itself to the safe bosom of neutrality on public issues—which in reality is but a haven of retreat and often a cowardly camouflage for compromising expediency and appeasement.

5. In a world that shrinks daily in terms of distance and time, the absence of a strongly advocated ideology of America, historically rooted, but with 20th-century application, leaves us as a ship without a rudder.

Such a void finds us frantically devising defensive procedures with which to combat communism—the enemy whose ends and goals are clearly defined, but who is content for now to have us deal with the means.

In dealing with the means we are kept busy putting out the fires, meeting a threat that is a retreat, and a retreat that is in essence a revolution, until we dissipate our resources and frustrate our objectives. The result is an ever-increasing encirclement by communism, and a corresponding weakness in a sense of conviction and destiny on the part of the Western nations.

In proclaiming such an ideology we need to clarify for the world that judges so much by materialistic achievements that Americanism is far more than materialism. Indeed, let us emblazon the fact that our roots of greatness are deeper than the economic or political system—they lie in the ethical and spiritual foundations whose gleanings from the long struggle of mankind for freedom constitute the bedrock of liberty on which this country was founded and stands today.

In meeting these challenges of our times, I would suggest four guiding principles enunciated by a wise philosopher whose name I do not now recall:

1. Conserve the experience of the old pioneers for the sake of our new experiments—we need a perspective like that given by the chauffeur's mirror which enables the driver to see what is behind him without turning his eyes from the road ahead. We need this historical perspective for the purpose of watching our "left turns."

2. We must, somehow, preserve the spirit of independence amid the necessities of interdependence. Otherwise, we may have movements start as a desire for liberty and then develop into a new tyranny.

3. We must constantly strive to preserve our local loyalties in the midst of our larger outlooks. Without this principle, we may beget a chainstore mentality that mistakes movement and size for progress and happiness.

4. We must maintain the old virtues of our Founding Fathers but with new frontiers of application.

The Outlook for Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today Dr. R. B. Robins, a prominent and outstanding surgeon and general practitioner of Camden, Ark., addressed the El Dorado Kiwanis Club of El Dorado, Ark., on the subject "The Outlook for Mankind."

Dr. Robins is not only a fine surgeon and physician, he is an outstanding citizen, immediate past president of the Camden Chamber of Commerce and active in civic affairs of the community and our State. He is former president of the American College of Surgery and presently a member of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association.

In view of his experience and knowledge in this field and the importance of the subject, under unanimous consent I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend to our colleagues for their attention:

THE OUTLOOK FOR MANKIND

(By Dr. R. B. Robins)

A few months ago I had the opportunity of making a trip around the world and spent the major part of my time in the Far East visiting Pakistan, India, Hong Kong, and Japan. I developed some unforgettable impressions on this trip regarding the outlook for mankind on this earth, and this is what I plan to discuss with you today.

I feel that I am talking to you about a greater menace to mankind than the atomic bomb when I discuss with you the population explosion which is occurring over the world. Yet, you don't hear people discuss this subject very much. I can tell you, however, that many thoughtful people, especially in the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations, such as the World Health Organization, are becoming very much concerned with the problem. People are concerned with the kind of world our children will inherit from us.

There are over 3 billion people on this earth now and at the rapid increase which prevails we will have more than double this number by the end of this century (less than 40 years from now). When we consider that it has taken man about a million years to achieve a world population of 3 billion people and then realize that in the next 40 years this number will double, it amazes one. So I tell you that the population problem is now recognized as the greatest challenge to humanity.

Two hundred births every minute on the earth: United States, 8; Canada, 1; British, 2; German, 2; Japanese, 3; Soviet Union, 10; Latin America, 17; India, 34; and Chinese, 50.

World population growth: 1963, 3 billion; 2000, 6 billion; 2035, 12 billion; and 2070, 25 billion. Estimate 600 years from now each person will have only 1 square-yard to live on.

STANDING ROOM ONLY

Every minute I speak to you here today there will be 200 new babies born on earth and if I talk to you 20 minutes there will be 4,000 new humans born on this earth. We are adding human numbers every year on earth equal to the size of the nation of Great Britain. Just 10 years ago the population of the world was about 2½ billion and there have been added about a billion in these 10 years.

One terrifying estimate shows that within the next 600 years, if the present rate continues, the number of human beings on earth will be such that every person will have only 1 square yard to live on. Standing room only.

Presently two-thirds of the world's population goes to bed hungry every night. Do you ever think of this: For every meal you eat, two other people eat nothing, or hardly anything. And one of these two people is a child. For this reason there is something inside me that makes me feel bad when I see food wasted. There are people on earth who would be so happy to receive the food that we waste.

I do not think that the ambition of man is to live on an earth where just bare existence is the goal of life. Nobody wants mass starvation, which is the only thing that can happen if the present trend in world population continues as it is today. There are only five nations on earth today that are capable of producing more food than their own people need (United States, Canada, Argentina, New Zealand, and Australia). If we continue to disregard this challenge which I am discussing with you, we, as the human race, can only face a future of a desperate and impoverished humanity as our destiny. This can destroy civilization as we know it. So, I repeat, the problem of uncontrolled population growth emerges as one of the most critical issues of our times.

It is the ambition of all nations to achieve a higher standard of living for their people—this means adequate food, good health, education, and gainful employment. The barrier to all of this is the rapid rate of population growth.

Automation is shaking up the industrial world and the employment picture. It was once thought that automation would create in the end more jobs, but this is not true. Automation is displacing people from work. It is throwing hundreds of thousands of people out of work and will throw out many more. We all recognize this as the basis for many labor union troubles at the moment.

We now have in this country 68 million people working and around 4 million out of work, but in 5 years, at the present trend, we will have 64 million people working and 14½ million crying for work. Automation is eliminating jobs extremely rapidly. We have the problem of saving man from his own creation.

Everyone knows that automation was behind the newspaper stoppages in New York and Cleveland. It is behind the propsective railroad strike which involves thousands of firemen who are trying to hang on somehow. Labor unions are demanding a shorter workweek—demanding ever more for doing ever less. This is the real problem for labor unions whose strength has been waning for the past 10 years, especially rapidly in the last 5 years. Total union membership in the United States today is about 18 million—almost exactly where it was in 1955 when, of course, the population was smaller. The grand total of union members today is only one-fourth of the civilian work force of 72 million plus.

The most unfortunate victims of automation are the unskilled people, especially the young looking for a first job and school drop-outs who possess neither training, experience or seniority. Without a skill, there isn't much of a place for a man in the future economy. Every year there will be fewer and fewer opportunities for unskilled work. Right now we have 700,000 kids out of school and out of work and they can't find work. Even skilled people must look forward to automation developing to such an extent that many of them will have to change their trade or livelihood once or twice during a lifetime.

Yes, automation is here and is increasing. We are all becoming accustomed to automatic elevators, cigarette machines, beverage and sandwich machines, candy vendors, laundromats, machines that collect tolls, dialing a long distance call from Chicago to Los Angeles direct without the aid of a human operator and there are many other examples that could be cited.

So we come to a big question in the minds of some of us with old-fashioned human minds: The question is: What do we do with people? We are fast running out of use for people, yet we are producing people faster than ever.

We, as a Nation in the United States, consume roughly half of the world's annual

production of nonrenewable resources. We Americans never seem to think about our vanishing resources. The average American family throws away about 1,000 metal cans a year. I found out in India that a family lucky enough to gain possession of a metal can treasures it and puts it to work in some way, if only as a flower pot.

It is said that each individual person in the United States uses up an average of 18 tons of materials a year. Some estimates suggest that the average American requires, for his style of life, 10 times as much raw materials—not including food—as the average citizen of the rest of the free world. Only in America would a housewife hop into a 2-ton vehicle and drive downtown to buy a small box of tacks.

We Americans are chronic optimists that seem to feel that our rich resources will last forever and that, somehow, there will be more when these are exhausted. I guess there must be something to the old saying "You never miss the water until the well runs dry."

The Materials Policy Commission in its survey reveals that Americans are consuming considerably more materials than they produce and the United States must now depend more and more upon other lands for most of the strategic and critical materials essential to the Nation's defense. I'll admit that the United States is in the economic saddle today, but it may be that our continued supremacy may be limited. I'll also admit that my profession—in other words, the benefits of modern medicine have vastly increased life expectancy all over the world and thus has created a problem for our time.

It is time for thinking people to begin to think of the long haul—begin to think about the future. I would like to quote from our President. These remarks were made when he was Senator from Massachusetts several years ago before the Economics Club of Chicago: "Strange as it may seem, there is more poverty than at any time in the history of this planet * * *. While the United States and to some extent industrial Europe grow fat, in large part with the raw materials sucked in from the rest of the world, that some 'rest of the world' suffers a slow economic decline that can only end in tragedy for us as well as them (he refers to the unprecedented population explosion) and the world cannot permanently remain half-slave and half-free, as it is today, but neither can the economy of the free world remain half rich and half poor."

Population pressure is a great factor in political instability. The problem of rapidly increasing numbers in relation to natural resources, which are dwindling, is now the central problem of mankind. Overpopulation leads to economic insecurity and social unrest. Unrest and insecurity lead to more control by central governments and an increase in their power over people. It obviously follows that more and more power of the central government over people leads to more and more loss of freedom for the individual. In this manner dictatorships take over.

I have tried to stress the point with you that there are more and more people to share less and less of the world's resources. To me it appears that the time has come for every country to have a population policy as well as an economic policy and a foreign policy.

Mr. Eugene Black, in his capacity as President of the World Bank, not long ago said: "Clearly, the urgent, indisputable need today is for intensified action to decelerate world population growth. Population trends must become a central consideration in all national and international plans for health, economic development and world peace * * *. And we should strongly urge that the United Nations take a lead in worldwide programs to cope with overpopulation * * *. The actions we suggest require that the timidities and conflicts of the past be cast aside."

The question is: How can impending social suicide be stopped? Cut the birth rate, of course. But how?

This is a subject for another speech. May I close by recommending to you for reading a recent book by one of the country's leading Catholic physicians, Dr. John Rock, emeritus professor of gynecology of Harvard Medical College. The title is "The Time Has Come."

The Book, "Nuclear Ambush," Reviewed by Wall Street Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, recommending that no lawmaker should miss reading the new book "Nuclear Ambush" by Earl Voss, the Wall Street Journal reviewed the work on August 27 as follows:

TEST BAN PROPOSALS: A TIMELY ANALYSIS

An extremely timely book, at a moment when the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain have just finished hammering out a limited ban on nuclear testing, is Earl H. Voss's "Nuclear Ambush."

Despite the vital importance of the subject, few Americans possess the time, patience and technical knowledge necessary to follow closely and intelligently the past course of negotiations on nuclear arms limitation, the details of the negotiating positions of the two sides and the voluminous Senate hearings on the ramifications of the treaty.

Mr. Voss packs an enormous amount of homework into a volume that may well be the most comprehensive and thoroughly documented study of the implications of agreed nuclear disarmament available. Some of his supporting material will be understandable only to readers with at least an elementary knowledge of nuclear weaponry. But his conclusions are clearcut and somewhat startling.

The author believes that the 5-year quest for a ban on nuclear testing, initiated by the Eisenhower administration in October 1958 and continued by the Kennedy administration until the recent ceremonial signing in Moscow, has at times seemed to be a tragically futile pursuit of a will-of-the-wisp. During part of this period the United States abstained from testing of all kinds. How much undetectable underground testing the Soviet Union may have carried out isn't known.

SLEEPING SICKNESS

But the Soviet Union, which resumed all-out testing early in September 1961, in disregard of Khrushchev's pledge that his country would never be the first to resume testing, may well have made considerable gains during this period when, in spite of realistic warnings, American high officials responsible for the negotiations seem to have indulged in a bad case of self-induced sleeping sickness. Gifted with a hard-hitting polemical style, Mr. Voss mercilessly exposes one contradiction after another in the soft, vacillating official policy on how much trust can be placed in Soviet cooperation for nuclear disarmament. His case is perhaps best presented in his own language:

"America as a nation has a $50 billion a year suspicion of the Soviet Union's intentions toward the United States.

"Below this level of mass suspicion, however, there flows a contradictory eagerness to trust. * * *

"Those who favor a test ban believe the Soviet-American arms race is getting so dangerous that we must trust the Russians. Opponents of the test ban believe it would be more dangerous to trust the Russians and stop racing.

"Between these two 'hard core' opinions there ranges a great mass of people, leaders and followers alike, who think part of the time the Soviet Union can or must be trusted and part of the time that she cannot be."

The American position on a nuclear test ban has repeatedly shifted, always in the direction of making greater concessions to the Soviet position of opposing any effective inspection as "espionage," and is riddled with inconsistencies. So it is often argued that a test ban will stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, although no one has ever presented a reasonable argument for the likelihood that General de Gaulle would heed remonstrances from America about his own nuclear striking force or that Red China would pay any attention to similar remonstrances from Moscow.

One factor in the wobbling course of American policy has been excessive concern for "world public opinion," represented by the off-the-cuff "ban the bomb" sentiment of spokesmen for member states of the U.N. which possess neither nuclear power nor nuclear responsibility. In the opinion of Mr. Voss, "humoring the fainthearted, when confronted with a ruthless adversary like Soviet communism, has proved to be a dangerous game."

Mr. Voss has written an important book, a formidable book, a challenging book, a severe indictment of the vacillators and wishful thinkers. He has put in accessible form the general viewpoint shared by such former heads of the Atomic Energy Commission as Lewis Strauss and John A. McCone and nuclear scientist Edward Teller.

Members of Congress are busy men. But no lawmaker should omit Mr. Voss' work, especially part V, the Appraisal, from his list of required reading, especially now that a test ban treaty awaits the verdict of the Senate.—WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN.

Youth Conservation Corps, Like CCC of the Thirties, Will Put Youth to Work Serving Nation's Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Youth Conservation Corps has been subject to sporadic and ill-conceived attacks since its introduction in this House. It has been charged that it would be a waste of the taxpayer's money and the energies of our youth. The same voices and the same arguments were raised in criticism of the Peace Corps whose success speaks far more eloquently in its behalf than this Member could hope to do.

And, in fuzzy retrospect, critics of the Conservation Corps have indulged themselves in distorted references to the CCC, apparently in the benign hope that the

lapse of two decades will obscure the inaccuracies in their charges.

Neither the CCC nor the proposed Conservation Corps were conceived as a wholesale panacea. The successes of the CCC amply justify its updated revival; the lessons learned from the inevitable mistakes accompanying the innovation of novel concepts should stand us in good stead in the execution of this sorely-needed program.

An article in the August 18, 1963, New York Times magazine offers an accurate and well-balanced account of our experiences with the CCC:

BACK TO THE WOODS—THE NEW YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS FOLLOWS A 30-YEAR-OLD TRAIL BLAZED BY THE CCC

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON.—"Around home if you want to take a bath you have to go and get a bucket of water and go through all that stuff. Taking a shower in camp was a lot different. In camp it was a pleasure to take a bath."

"It bolstered my courage. I've got more ambition now."

"Back home there were seven of us—five boys and two girls. In camp I got more room to sleep and it was quieter."

Those were the comments at the time of just three of the more than 2,500,000 graduates of what was probably the least controversial experiment of the New Deal—the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. It was a smashing success. So much so, in fact, that President Kennedy plans a modern-day version of the old CCC—the YCC for Youth Conservation Corps—designed to provide employment for young men by putting them to work serving the Nation's resources. The Senate has passed the bill and it is now in the House.

The record of the new corps, of course, is yet to be written. When it is, it undoubtedly will fill fewer pages than its illustrious predecessor. As the Senate approved it, the YCC would have a first-year limit of some 15,000 youths, with 60,000 the top the next year. At its peak, in August, 1935, the CCC had some 500,000 boys in more than 2,000 camps.

It was 30 years ago this year that President Roosevelt sent his famous message to Congress asking authority to begin the experiment. "I propose to creat a Civilian Conservation Corps, to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, but confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control and similar projects." The project, he added, would give the unemployed work and give posterity important dividends by protecting and improving public lands.

On March 31, 1933—John F. Kennedy was then 15 years old—Congress passed the bill, just 10 days after the Roosevelt message. Five days after that, on April 5, the President established the CCC by executive order. "Roosevelt's tree army," as the skeptics called it, was in business.

It grew rapidly. The first man enrolled on April 7. On April 17, the first 200-man camp was set up in the George Washington National Forest near Luray, Va., and by June 17, some 255,000 youths had signed up.

They came from all over the country. One study of the typical volunteer—published by the American Council on Education—said he was between 17 and 18, weighed about 145, stood 5 feet 8 inches tall, was a little underweight because he probably was not eating too well at home, had been living in a house or flat of six rooms with his father, mother and five brothers or sisters.

His home had no telephone, automatic refrigerator or running water. In the living room, there were perhaps a maximum of six books. No piano, probably a radio. His parents both went through the seventh grade at school and his father worked in agriculture or manufacturing as an unskilled worker. The family was on relief at the time.

The boy himself probably had more education than his parents. He completed almost nine grades of school, although it probably took him 11 years. "He hopes the CCC is going to teach him how to work hard and like it," the study reported.

When the boys got to the camps, hard work was easy to come by. They planted trees; helped control insect pests; built telephone lines, dams, truck trails, reservoirs, bridges, docks, piers and fish ponds; restored historic buildings; killed mosquitoes; improved beaches, and built nesting islands for the protection of waterfowl and shore birds.

After it was all over—the program ended formally 6 months after Pearl Harbor—the figures for the 9 years were totaled. Among other things, the boys had planted nearly 3 billion trees, built 1 million miles of roads and trails, constructed 85,000 miles of telephone lines, erected 4,000 fire towers, and 100,000 bridges and buildings, and improved more than 4 million acres of forest land.

The Government spent some $3.1 billion on the program, but most observers felt afterward it was worth it. The value of the work on public lands alone, for example, has been put by forestry and park officials at $1.5 billion.

What was life like in the camps? The camp itself was found either among tall pines and spruces or on the edge of town on flat open ground. Locations ranged from the Natahala National Forest in Georgia and the Carolinas to sites outside small cities in the State of Washington. The buildings, which the volunteer helped erect himself, were mostly low oblongs, about 100 feet long by 20 feet wide. They could sleep 200, and they usually formed a rough U in the center of the camp.

The wooden structures, painted brown or green, included quarters for the Army officers who helped run the camp, for the technical staff and civilians, an infirmary, a mess, several garages and a couple of tool sheds, and administration building with an American flag waving from a tall pole in front of it. And there was a recreation hall and a schoolhouse where boys were taught reading and writing or cooking and photography.

Not all the camps, of course, were so endowed. The boys at some lived for months in tents, particularly in the early days. At Manitou Springs, Colo., the entire camp was quartered in an old dancehall.

It was a 5-day, 40-hour week. The boys were up at 6, and doing calisthenics for 15 minutes before breakfast at 6:45. Dressed in denim work clothes, the boys lined up for the usual fare—stewed prunes, cereal, ham and eggs, coffee or milk. Some of the camps displayed a touch of class by giving the boys dishes and so-called silver; others used Army mess kits.

The boys then made their beds, cleaned the barracks and grounds, and went to work, usually about 7:45. They piled into a dozen trucks and headed for the projects where they swung picks, shovels, sledges, spades, or hammers, or perhaps drove a tractor.

About noon, the lunch wagon pulled up—sandwiches, pie, hot coffee. Half an hour later, it was back to work until around 3:30 when the boys started back to camp. The flag was lowered at 5 with the boys standing at attention, their denim work clothes now replaced by neat spruce-green uniforms. Dinner followed—meat and vegetables and dessert—not always too tasty but always plentiful.

Behavior at mealtime did not always resemble that of a high-class prep school. In fact, camp authorities often found it a good idea to put special stress on good table manners. They did not meet with complete success.

"A blast of the mess sergeant's whistle was the signal for universal grabbing, followed by a scooping up of food and gulping down of beverages which could only be described as primitive," the Education Council report recalled. "Leaders and assistant leaders were often among the fastest and noisiest eaters. On several occasions, by actual timing, enrollees began to leave the mess hall exactly four minutes after the whistle sounded."

In the evening, the boys attended classes, did some shop work, went into the recreation hall, or hopped the truck to town for a movie if they could afford it. The volunteer was paid $30 a month, but he got only $8 of it. (YCC will pay $60.) The remainder of the CCC pay was either sent to dependents or deposited to the volunteer's credit until his discharge, which could come anywhere from 6 months to 2 years after he enrolled, depending on whether he reenrolled. Until 1941, a volunteer had to have some depression-hit dependents back home who needed the extra income or he would not be accepted.

At night, shoes of new boys might be nailed to the barracks floor or the newcomers carried, still sleeping in their beds, to the center of the camp. The boys who for some reason had an aversion to water were forced into the showers and scrubbed. Camp officials tried to keep all the horseplay under control, although they weren't too concerned about mild hazing. Boy volunteers, after all, will be boy volunteers. When discipline was required for more serious infractions, the camp commander either sent the volunteer back home, reprimanded him, suspended some of his privileges, assigned him extra kitchen work on his day off, or made him forfeit his cash allowance of up to 3 days' pay a month.

While the whole program has since been hailed as a huge success, it nevertheless had it errors. There were serious questions about the camps. Some feared the CCC might evolve into a private army or at least represent the beginning of a militia that would turn the United States toward fascism.

Organized labor, for example, was unhappy over the role of the War Department.

To help ease labor's worries, President Roosevelt selected, as the first CCC director, a labor veteran, Robert Fechner, vice president of the International Association of Machinists. And officials repeatedly emphasized that many Government agencies had a hand in running the CCC.

The Army was responsible for constructing the camps and for their administration, including the food, clothing, medical care, and control of the volunteers while they were physically in the camp. It was not until just before World War II that military drills began.

The Labor Department, however, helped to supervise the selection of the men. Interior and Agriculture took charge of planning and administering the work projects, providing foremen at the project sites. Other agencies, including the Office of Education, were also involved.

Moreover, there was an initial lack of uniform selection standards. Some boys were pressured into joining by police or parents. Little effort went into telling a boy in the early days just what he might expect. Some recruiting agents, for example, told some volunteers they would learn to fly and maybe earn high school diplomas, glossing over the pick-and-shovel aspects of the job. Disillusioned or homesick, hundreds of thousands of boys deserted the camps within a few hours or a few weeks.

The education programs also created problems. Some formal classes resembled

the schools the boys had no taste for back home. However, estimates are that the CCC did manage to teach 80,000 illiterates to read. And it taught volunteers key skills in the use of tools and machinery.

There were administrative tangles galore because of all the agencies involved; waste in some projects because too many boys were thrown into the job, and a lack of effective counseling to ease the path of the boys back into their home communities.

Despite its faults, the CCC accomplished much and would probably have had a longer life if not for World War II. In the early days of the war, Army Engineers took over most of the CCC equipment and real estate. Some barracks were sold to communities intact for wartime housing. Later, many of the camp facilities were either torn down, turned over to forestry and national park officials, or given to colleges for summer classes.

The boys went back home or into the military. One estimate was that 70 percent of those who returned to their homes during the 9 years of the program readily found jobs. Some went to work for Government agencies such as the Forest Service.

They went home for the most part with greater maturity and increased self-confidence. But they went home with something else, too. The statisticians say that, during his service, the average CCC boy gained at least 12 pounds.

Profit Is an Honorable Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Socialists, the Communists, the advocates of a planned and controlled society have done their best to make profit a dirty word, but they have not been able to con the American people. Most Americans believe that honest reward for honest effort is an honorable goal. Most Americans believe that it is right and proper to be ambitious, to be able to dream and willing to work to make their dreams come true. Most Americans know that jobs are not created by government, but by business and industry, and that they cannot be created without reasonable profit. Most Americans realize the danger in the present policies advocated by the Kennedy administration, the threat these policies pose to private enterprise, the threat they pose to the freedoms of all of us.

The American people are alert, but the word has not yet penetrated to President Kennedy and his advisers. In the hope, perhaps, that some small germ of logic may yet get through to them in order to reverse our journey down the road to socialism, it is my purpose to continue to present comments and ideas in support of the profit system, capitalism as against the evils of socialism and communism.

In this effort I include, as a part of these remarks, a recent statement made by Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., chairman of the board of the Aluminum Co. of America. Mr. Litchfield's remarks were broadcast on the Manion Forum:

IS PROFIT WITHOUT HONOR?

DEAN MANION. For the first year in its history our Federal Government has just collected over $100 billion in taxes. Where did this incomprehensible sum of money come from? Not from the Tennessee Valley Authority, or from the Department of Agriculture, or from Public Housing or the Post Office Department. These institutions spend the taxes, they do not pay them.

How much do we know about the source of billions of dollars that the Government collects to spend at home and abroad?

The source of this tremendous tax take is the American private enterprise system which now picks up the check for all of the public activities that we read and hear so much about.

In view of all of the propaganda that pours out of Washington now, it is difficult but nevertheless important to remember that it is not public works but private works and private work for private profit that generates our prosperity and pays government bills.

I firmly believe that the public interest suffers when private enterprise fails to get its important message across to the American people. Nevertheless, for some reason, many leaders of American industrial enterprises are reluctant to speak up about what they are doing for the freedom and prosperity of our country.

With me here now, however, is one such leader who is both able and willing to do so. As chairman of the board of the Aluminum Co. of America, Mr. Lawrence Litchfield, Jr., of Pittsburgh, is responsible for the management of one of the largest industrial operations in the United States.

He knows his important business, of course, but he also understands the free enterprise system in which his business functions I have persuaded him to talk to you about it. Mr. Litchfield, welcome to the Manion Forum.

Mr. LITCHFIELD. Thank you, Dean Manion. I appreciate the honor of being heard on the Manion Forum. I would like to talk with you about a subject which I believe needs to be better understood by all Americans, and particularly by the younger generation on whom the responsibility will rest to make private enterprise a continuing reality in the years to come.

What I want to point out to you tonight is the vital importance of providing a business climate in which corporations and all private enterprises are able to earn a profit, if indeed the concept of private enterprise is to be translated into a continuing reality.

There must be a widespread understanding and acceptance of the proposition that business to be permanent and healthy must live in an environment where there is long-term tax stability, where labor-management relations are characterized by prudence and good judgment, where the economic needs of one segment of the community are not allowed to overshadow the life and vigor of the community as a whole.

Companies look for such an environment as an important factor in the choice of location for their enterprises. There should be general recognition and understanding of these propositions; namely, that the basic all-important function, of a business is to turn a profit; that a business cannot fulfill its community and social obligations without earnings; that without a profit any business must die; that business is not a social institution or a charity—worthy though these activities may be—but is an organization through dollars and cents profits. Though some people understand these facts, it is becoming painfully clear that growing numbers of our fellow Americans do not.

I believe that there is a tremendous task ahead for all of us who understand the material and moral consequences of doing business in a free enterprise economy. I believe that all of us who do understand have an obligation—which is part patriotism and part just plain commonsense—to make the profit motive clear to those who do not understand it.

And that is the role I have chosen for myself tonight. I come to you as a missionary, or salesman if you wish, of the profit motive.

What about profits? Are they something good or something bad? Are they seeds of growth—or are they just something left over when the accountant's books are balanced? And how much is left over in these days? Do profits divide us, plutocrats on the one hand and slaves on the other—or do they make growth and freedom possible?

Certainly there is evidence to an alarming degree that all too many of us look upon profits as something hidden, probably exorbitant and possibly evil.

In a recent national survey of students from seventh grade through college, more than 63 percent of the seventh graders tested believed the Government should control large company profits; 57 percent of the high school seniors and 47 percent of the college freshmen agreed. In a later survey of adults—a whopping 42 percent agreed.

Among students preparing to be teachers, only half understood that a business cannot function very long without profit—only 27 percent believed that the most practical way for workers to earn more was to produce more.

There were two statistics which particularly frightened me. The first was this: Of college students majoring in education, only 20 percent got any exposure to economics. The second was: When asked, "Why do people work?" only 6 percent of the young people interviewed answered, "Because they like to work."

These are Americans, mind you—not children brought up as the heirs of socialism.

I suggest you ask your own children what they understand about profits. Ask them if the really understand and endorse these facts of life: that the reason, directly or indirectly, that they can go to school or college, the reason there are schools and colleges with teachers and physical facilities, the reason there are churches, hospitals, YMCA's, Boy Scout camps and all the other advantages they take for granted, is because someone—a lot of someones in fact—were able to earn a profit.

A public attitude indicated by the statistics mentioned above cannot help but inhibit the ability of our free enterprise economy to continue to give life and vigor to our national environment.

The current profit picture indicates that the kind of unrealistic thinking exemplified by those statistics is gradually being translated into action adversely affecting our economy.

Statistics published by President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers show how corporate profits after taxes have failed to grow in proportion to the overall economy, as measured by gross national product or GNP. In the 1947–51 period, net profits equaled 7.2 percent of GNP. This same ratio fell to 5.2 percent in the 1952–56 period, and to 4.6 percent in the 1957–62 period.

What happens when profits do not keep pace with the growth of our economy? Plants and equipment are not modernized and expanded to meet world competition—less money is available for research and development—fewer dollars are spent on advertising and sales promotion—less tax money is paid to government—less money is available for schools, churches, and charities.

PROFIT LAG MEANS LESS INVESTMENT INCENTIVE AND FEWER JOBS

Outdated plants mean loss of orders and fewer jobs. Less money for research and development means less emphasis on new products and new markets. Reductions in

advertising and sales promotion budgets lead to reductions in sales and the number of new customers. All of these things add up to fewer jobs—a smaller tax dollar—even smaller profits in the future—and, hence, a slowdown in economic growth.

I might add here that in 1962 a number of our finest corporations paid their stockholders—their owners—no more than they would have received had they left their money safe and sound in the bank. They got nothing in compensation for risking their capital, a risk always present in business. When a corporation has to do this, it places itself in a poor position to ask the public—or present owners—to provide more funds for future growth.

The profits problem can be viewed still another way. Profits in total dollars have risen only 8 percent since 1950. Wages paid to employees have risen over 100 percent—the tax bite has increased 79 percent. If it had been possible for profits to keep pace with the rest of the economy, profits would have reached $45 billion in 1962, instead of the $24.6 billion actually realized.

What's wrong with profits of $24.6 billion? What's wrong is this: it illustrates an alarming trend—a trend due largely to lack of understanding of the function of profits. Profit is a motor which powers growth. The bigger our economy grows, the bigger motor it takes to keep it growing. This formula also works in reverse. Economists have noted that a decline in profits is followed quickly by a decline in employment. America needs between 1.25 and 2 million new jobs each year to keep up with our growing population. If we are to have more jobs, we must have more profits to invest in more productive facilities.

It seems to me that somewhere along the line we have lost the basic American formula for achievement. Perhaps we have lost touch with reality. Perhaps it will be useful to turn briefly to the historical origin of our Nation to see where we have strayed from our Founding Fathers' original intent.

If you turn to the pages of the Constitution of the United States—as adopted July 2, 1788—you will be hard put to find the basis for our present business-government-labor-management relationships.

Article 1, section 8, of our Constitution provides a basis for Congress to collect taxes and to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. As we have all known since early childhood, the intent of the provision to regulate commerce among the several States was to make sure that free trade would be maintained—that no State would raise a tariff against its neighbor.

Why is the subject of economic participation and manipulation by Government so conspicuous by its absence in the Constitution? The answer is crystal clear to me, as I hope it is to you. The founders of our Nation understood one basic, profound truth. That truth is that private enterprise with the profit motive and a minimum of Government regulation provides the only practical alternative to a Government-owned or a Government-controlled economy.

Why didn't our Founding Fathers want a Government-owned or a Government-controlled economy?

Because they understood what too few people understand today. That for the Government to control or manipulate the flow of food, clothing and shelter is to provide an environment in which the initiative of the freeman is gradually extinguished until, indeed, Government is absolute. They were properly wary of Central Government control.

The colonists had learned this lesson from firsthand experience. For George III, King of England, had his own version of the Council of Economic Advisers. This Council had a big plan for the colonies. The plan was this: The colonies would provide England with an endless flow of raw materials, at prices deemed fair by the Council of Economic Advisers. After all, the Council, in its wisdom, understood the needs of England and the colonies alike. And since it wasn't involved in making a profit, it could render a fair and impartial decision.

English industry, in turn, would convert the raw materials into finished products which would be sold back to the colonists at prices deemed fair by the council.

This kind of old English Government planning taught the colonists the virtues of free trade. It also taught them the kind of economic slavery that comes as the product of government participation and manipulation.

The colonists as individuals and as groups were searching for freedom, and it was through free trade—motivated by the delicate instrument of free enterprise and the profit motive—that they hoped to open the doors of their homes to the fresh air of freedom. For without profit, a free enterprise can neither remain free nor even remain an enterprise.

And thus it was that the profit motive became an important weapon in defense of freedom—as much a part of our national heritage as the Bill of Rights or the Constitution.

Did this radical philosophical idea prove to be sound and workable in practice?

Though it may not be perfect, the free enterprise, profit-motive philosophy has given birth to a miraculous horn of plenty. From this original and idealistic concept has grown the most vigorous, the most dynamic, the most prosperous nation in the history of the world. And by it and because of it, free men—by their own hands and their own wits—have come to build the great wealth of commerce and industry on which all Americans and a large part of the free world depend in varying degree.

Today, the United States of America, with about 6 percent of the world's population, is producing more automobiles, more electrical appliances, more TV sets, more telephones than all the rest of the world put together.

OUR PROFIT SYSTEM HAS MEANT FREEDOM

Free enterprise is providing the highest standard of living ever known—a standard of living in which Americans spend $26 billion annually for education; $4 billion just for new schools—$87 billion for food, beverages, and tobacco—$34 billion for clothing—$42 billion for housing—$19.4 billion on recreation—$4.6 billion on churches and charities.

Meanwhile, back in the Soviet Union, that great fatherland of all government planning, things aren't going so well. After 40 years of complete and total control of the farmer, it still takes 50 percent of the Russian work force to produce what we consider a "poor-pickings" diet. America produces far more food than it needs with less than 10 percent of the work force.

And from this free enterprise horn of plenty continues to flow more jobs, more wages, more private property, more wealth than has ever been known in the world's history.

But most important of all—the profit-seeking philosophy has been the principal guardian of the most sacred of all human values—the value for which it was originally created. That value is man's right to free choice. That value is freedom.

If these things are so—and I hope most of us believe they are so—can profit be without honor? Can profit be something bad? Can profit be just something left over when the accountant's books are balanced? Do profits make slaves of us, or do they make our growth in freedom possible?

You and I know the answer. How can there be others who do not?

Perhaps the time has come to check our bearings—to note our course and our future direction. Perhaps the time has come—having listened too long to the virtues of the planned economy—to turn our ears to the voices of Jefferson and Hamilton and Franklin. They spoke more of freedom.

Perhaps the time has come when we should plot a graph—with freedom as one axis and statism as the other—and look carefully to see in which direction the black line is leaning.

What can we do about it?

The first thing we must do is to make a firm resolution to provide our children—at home and at school—with a proper free enterprise education in economics. Our children are the heirs to freedom. Let them learn carefully how their forefathers came by it.

Next, we must put a stop to the consider-me-first attitude which sometimes dominates business-government-labor-management relations. We all want the same things. Corporation ownership and management want to grow and expand—to build for the future—to make improved products at reduced costs. The solution can be found in increased profits.

Labor wants an increase in the number of jobs—increases in wages—increases in buying power—increases in job security. The solution can be found in increased profits.

Government wants an increased tax take—to do the things we must do as a nation. The solution can be found in increased profits. Since we are all after the same thing, let's work toward it together.

The next thing we must do is to take a greater interest in the affairs of our Government. Before we elect a representative to office, let's make sure he, too, has learned his lessons in free entrprise economics. And once we have placed him in office, let's watch to make sure he practices what he has learned.

A good place to start would be by urging adoption of appropriate tax reductions and budget reforms by government bodies. We need to put some commonsense back into taxes. Just as important, we need to put some commonsense back into Government spending. Write your elected representatives—and write them often. And here are some other things you can do:

When your next-door neighbor tells you of the need for a new super highway, point out that only free enterprise profits can make it possible. And when your visiting Aunt Martha remarks on the fine quality of your church organ, point out that free enterprise profits made it possible. And when Sister Sue brings home a new book from the library, point out that free enterprise profits made it possible.

Point out again and again that only profitable companies grow—only profitable companies can hire additional people—only profitable companies can raise our standard of living—only profitable companies can make nonprofit activities possible. These are the things that all of us—the missionaries of the profit motive—must do to keep this country moving ahead. We must do these things at the national level—and we must do them right here in our own community, too, right at the grassroots.

Every company wants to grow. Every company should pay fair and honest wages, but wages that reflect increases in production, not increases in coercion. Each company must pay fair and honest taxes, but taxes it can honestly afford to pay. And every company must have profits to invest wisely in new plants and equipment, to create new jobs and to pay the shareholders who are the owners of the business a fair and equitable return on their investment, and each company must have profits to grow.

Profits will continue to be the key to our success in meeting the challenges facing the

free enterprise system today. And as we all work together to better understand and strengthen the profit incentive in our society, let us also bear in mind the material and moral consequences of what we do. For profits are not without honor. They are the life-giving seeds of our personal freedom.

Thank you, Dean Manion, for this opportunity to participate in one of your radio forums. I have enjoyed being your guest.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Mr. Litchfield, for this important explanation of the relationship between business profits and human freedom.

My friends, this speech is a good place to begin your child's education about the American profit system. Tell him to read it and discuss it with his schoolteacher.

Chambers of Commerce and the ARA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Edwin P. Neilan, to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges. Certainly it is unfortunate that many individuals were listed as participants of the ARA program when, in fact, they had merely seen fit to inform themselves concerning the program. One individual so listed has personally advised me that his acceptance of membership on a county economic development committee was to know the inside of the program and to sit on the committee and keep it from becoming active.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 20, 1963.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce, Commerce Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 6, 1 day prior to my appearance before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, issued a press release regarding cooperation of "chamber officials" with ARA. I am convinced this press release was timed to create embarrassment to the national chamber. I am afraid, however, that Mr. Batt in his effort to discredit this organization has surpassed his capabilities.

The ARA press release expressed Mr. Batt's "deep appreciation" for the "participation" of local chamber officials in ARA programs. Mr. Batt claimed that "558 * * * officials and representatives of local chambers of commerce * * * have helped promote the ARA."

Mr. Secretary, you yourself have used this ARA list as a basis for an attack both on me and the national chamber. Congressman HALE BOGGS seemed to think the list important enough to reproduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is time you were told that you and others have been given out-of-date, inaccurate information. Knowing your personal interest in doing things—and having things done—properly, I do not understand how this ARA list ever was permitted to reach the press or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, much less serve as the basis for an attack on the national chamber.

Although the ARA claims this list to have been compiled on April 20, 1963, if you and your assistants had carefully checked Mr. Batt's list of "participating chamber officials," you would have found:

Of the chamber presidents listed, 5 have not been in office since 1961; 25 have not been in office since 1962; 16 were not in office on April 20, 1963, when the ARA list was prepared; 7 we have no record of ever being president.

Of the chamber executives listed, one has not been in office since 1961; seven have not been in office since 1962; One was not in office when the ARA list was prepared; two we have no record of ever being in office.

This is a total of 64 names just from local chamber members of the national chamber that have been listed in error, plus the following: In 1 instance, the list shows 19 members of the local chamber board as participating, but no names are given; in at least 5 other instances, titles are listed, but no names; in 3 instances, names are listed twice; there are over a dozen instances where the names of the local chambers are incorrect: in 1 instance, a county rural areas development committee is listed as being the chamber for the area, an incorrect statement. The community has its own official chamber of commerce; in one instance, the executive was listed as a vice president of the chamber; in another instance, the opposite occurs—a local president was listed as a manager of the chamber.

The number of names misspelled may not deserve mention here, but it is just another indication of the inaccuracies we encountered in this ARA list.

In addition to inaccuracies of this type, we learned that there are individuals listed as "participants," but who actually only attended meetings to see what ARA was about, and either officially protested or took no further action. One chamber—Brookhaven-Lincoln County Chamber of Commerce, Brookhaven, Miss.—upon learning the ARA claimed them as supporters, passed a resolution urging the congressional delegation to "vigorously oppose any additional appropriations to the Area Development Administration."

Mr. Batt lists 558 names of chamber officials, saying that these represent 230 of the 1,074 areas which are eligible for ARA funds. In checking this ARA list further, we found that in these 230 areas, Mr. Batt lists 337 communities represented by local chambers. The national chamber depends on local chambers for establishment of its policies. Of the 337 local chambers, 174, more than 50 percent, are not members of ours. I bring this up only to show that we do not, indeed cannot, speak for these chambers. This is something the ARA would not know, but which I think you might wish to know.

Throughout the United States, there are 2,900 local and State chambers of commerce that we are proud to claim as members. Since Mr. Batt's list includes only 5.6 percent of our total chamber membership, I think he has a much smaller target to try to hit in any future press releases.

The compilation and release of such inaccurate information only reflects some of the problems the Department of Commerce is having in handling such an uneconomic program as the Area Redevelopment Act. Most of the Members of Congress have already come to realize this, and have voted against an increase in this seduction by subsidy once this year. I am sure they will again.

Sincerely,

EDWIN P. NEILAN.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

National Student Federal Aid to Education Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there is continued evidence of support of Federal aid to education by that segment of our population which is most concerned with education—the students themselves. The National Student Federal Aid to Education Conference is a confederation of 22 national student organizations that are working toward educational improvement in the United States. The conference's sponsoring organizations are the American Podiatry Students Association, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, B'nai B'rith Young Adults, Campus Americans for Democratic Action, College Young Democratic Clubs of America, Congress of Racial Equality, Methodist Student Movement, National American Indian Youth Committee of Arrow, Inc., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Youth and College Division, National Federation of Catholic College Students, National Newman Club Federation, National Student Christian Federation, National Student Young Women's Christian Association, North American Student Cooperative League, Student National Education Association, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Student Religious Liberals, Students for a Democratic Society, United States National Student Association, United States Student Press Association, Young Adult Council, and Young Christian Students, National Staff.

The two elected cochairmen of the conference are Tim Ryles, of Alabama, a graduate students at the University of Georgia, and Patrick Clary, of Nevada, who is studying at the American University.

The conference held its first national meetings in Washington, D.C., on April 25–26 with student delegates in attendance representing 34 States, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands. Dr. Hurst F. Anderson, president of the American University and president of the Association of American Colleges, Dr. Frances Keppel, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and I addressed this group of alert young citizens.

As the conference now is stepping up its efforts of asserting its position, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the resolution on Federal aid to education of the National Student Federal Aid to Education Conference, adopted in April, which I include in the appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BY NATIONAL STUDENT FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION CONFERENCE

I. PURPOSE

Recognizing the traditions and rights of State sponsored and controlled education and the great efforts made by many States to improve their educational systems, we feel that some States are financially unable to support adequate programs without Federal aid. Consequently, we recognize the need for the participation of the Federal Government in a supplementary manner to the established State expenditures in certain specific areas of education in the United States. We feel Federal aid must not be used to reduce either State or local efforts. It should be a welcome addition to a State's program.

We propose the following policies in which we feel Federal expansion will not interfere with the traditional rights and responsibilities of the State and locally sponsored educational system.

II. EQUALITY OF EDUCATION

Federal aid to education should benefit all Americans regardless of race, creed, religion, or national origin. Therefore, we support the inclusion of an antidiscriminatory clause to provide Federal funds only to school districts, colleges, and universities which have taken positive steps toward desegregation and/or uphold a nondiscriminatory policy with regard to race, religion, creed, or national origin. Furthermore, we urge the Federal Government to see that all Federal aid to education is administered in a manner consistent with and leading to the realization of this principle.

We feel that Federal funds should be distributed on the basis of need and not because of political considerations.

III. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Because a significant number of students are deprived of higher education for lack of sufficient means to finance their education, we support title I of the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963 with the following provisions: (1) An increase in the National Defense Education Act loan ceiling for individual undergraduates from $1,000 to $1,500 per year and a cumulative ceiling of $6,000 in a 4-year period; (2) an extension of National Defense Education Act loan forgiveness to include Peace Corps volunteers; (3) an endorsement of the Student Loan Insurance Act of the National Defense Education Act as a corollary to student loans but not as a substitute for them; (4) the addition of a national scholarship program administered through the States of a total of 200,000 4-year scholarships at a maximum per year of $1,000 to be distributed on the basis of need and ability; (5) an extension of the GI education benefits to post-Korean veterans; and (6) the Federal minimum wage standard to apply to student work covered in the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

IV. HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES

The present rate of increase in the school population is placing, and will continue to place, a great strain on existing school facilities. Institutions of higher learning are unable to draw sufficient financial aid from their present resources and may not be able to obtain the necessary matching funds to qualify for sufficient Federal assistance.

Therefore this conference believes that title II, parts A and B, of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (Expansion and improvement of higher education; Higher education facilities, Public community college academic facilities) represent only a beginning in this field, that there is a definite need for more funds, and that these funds should be available as grants rather than loans.

V. TECHNICAL EDUCATION, LIBRARIES, GRADUATE TRAINING AND LANGUAGES

We recognize that the proposals outlined in title II, sections C–F of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (Expansion and improvement of higher education: College level technical education, college and university libraries, graduate schools, modern foreign language training and research) deal in a positive way with important problems facing this Nation. We feel that these proposals represent only a first approach to these problems and much larger expenditures will be necessary in the future. We support the President's proposal as a first minimal effort.

VI. QUALITY OF EDUCATION

The bettering of educational facilities and the increase of educational opportunities is a prerequisite to improving educational quality in America.

We urge (1) the passage of legislation to broaden the scope of the Cooperative Research Act and (2) that the National Defense Education Act Teacher Training Institutes be expanded to meet the rising need of student-age population.

VII. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

We endorse the provisions of title IV of the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (strengthening elementary and secondary education) which will aid in improving facilities for instruction in the areas of science, languages, and mathematics because of the value of these subjects as areas for scholarships. We note, however, that these subject areas seem to receive special emphasis because of their relationship to national defense rather than as a part of a general attempt to improve school curricula. While recognizing the problems of national security confronting the Nation we think that the primary function of aid to education should be improvement of general educational quality.

VIII. GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

A great need currently exists in American education for increased and improved programs in the areas of guidance, counseling, and testing. Such programs will assist in alleviating the current severe unemployment problem and will help to remedy the extant lack of personnel trained for the suited occupations of the nuclear age. Many local areas of this country do not have the financial resources available to support such programs.

We urge the passage of part C, title IV, of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (strengthening elementary and secondary education: guidance, counseling, and testing).

IX. STATES' ECONOMIC NEEDS

We approve the program specified in title IV, part A, of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, providing aid to public elementary and secondary schools, and endorse the principle of this section, which calls for relating the amount of aid to the State's economic need. However, we feel the provisions of the States' relations with the U.S. Office of Education are not sufficiently clear on the issue of Federal control. We urge that the language of this section make explicit the criteria which the Federal Government will use in deciding whether or not to approve a State's request for aid.

X. VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

In the past the funds appropriated for vocational education have been distributed among the various vocational areas by a set ratio. This present formula for distribution was established when agriculture was still a significant source of employment. Today the economic situation has changed, while the formula has not.

In spite of the obvious dominance of manufacture and service, only 5 percent of public high schools offer distributive education courses; and less than 10 percent have trade and industrial courses. At the same time nearly one-half offer home economics and agricultural courses.

The laudable aspect of title V, part A, of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (vocational and special education: vocational education) lies in its endeavor to replace this rigid allocation of funds. This will give the States more latitude in vocational training to meet the increasing demands for trained manpower.

Although the proposed increase in Federal support is 50 percent higher than last year, it will not solve the problems faced by vocational education in this country. We believe there must be increased Federal support in this area to increase the quality of existing programs to extend this training to schools and areas where it is not now offered.

There is a present need for education of approximately 6 million handicapped children. These children need services which are not now available in most all of our schools. Part B (education of handicapped children) provides an initial 3-year program to train teachers to support research and demonstration projection in this area.

The $15 million authorized for fiscal year 1964 can be considered only an initial effort. There must be a considerable increase to insure that children with special problems will receive a quality education.

Twenty-two million Americans over 25 years of age today have less than an eighth grade education. With the advancing complexity of our society, an eighth grade education cannot be considered adequate for a significant role in the community and the economy.

XI. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Title VI of the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (expansion of continuing education) would establish an initial 3-year appropriation for local adult basic education projects. Research is aimed at determining which methods would best raise the educational level of these functional illiterates. After the methods are identified there will be a strong need for significant Federal support for comprehensive educational programs, and we recommend additional legislation that will provide and insure such support.

In conclusion, we reiterate our position of support in principle of the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963 and urge its adoption in this session of Congress.

PATRICK C. CLARY,
Conference Cochairman.
TIM RYLES,
Conference Cochairman.
JOSEPH FALLON,
Presiding Officer.
ERIN M. CLARY,
Secretary.

Freeman Notes Relationship of Agriculture and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has recently returned from his trip to the Soviet Union and other East European nations. Upon returning, the Secretary made some pertinent and timely observations on agricultural practices in the countries he visited.

Mr. Freeman's statements are given in a press release of the Department of Agriculture dated August 21. It deserves the attention of all Members of Congress, especially those of us who are particularly interested in foreign affairs and in agriculture. By unanimous consent, I hereby include this press release in the RECORD:

JUDGE COMMUNISM BY AGRICULTURAL INTENTIONS

Agriculture provides a little used, but effective window through which Americans can more clearly judge the capabilities and intentions of Communist nations, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today.

"Agriculture, both in the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations, is closely meshed with national policy and the overall potential of each country. Through agriculture, we can better understand their problems and the measures being taken to solve them. And, in doing so, we will be better equipped to formulate policies that promote our own national interests and the cause of world peace.

"In this respect, no point struck me more forcefully during my recent trip through Russia and Eastern Europe than the realization that food and agriculture are among the finest instruments we have for building a world based on the achievement of peaceful goals."

The Secretary summarized his observations at a press conference held after his return from a survey trip of agricultral policies and programs in the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. He made these points:

The prestige of the United States and of U.S. agriculture is high, as evidenced by the warm welcome and generous hospitality the American group received in each country, and by the lack of incidents or signs of hostility.

While all five countries have governments that are solidly Communist they are not identical and cannot be treated as a unit. Each of the five peoples have their own history and tradition, and a real spirit of nationalism.

Trade has kept a door open to the West, and to close it now by removing Poland and Yugoslavia from the most-favored-nation status would only force greater Communist solidarity, and would deprive the United States of potential markets.

The Communist system of agriculture does not stand well in comparison to U.S. agriculture. The family farm system is far superior in making much more efficient use of resources.

Americans should not be misled, however, into overlooking the progress which Soviet agriculture is making and will continue to make.

Russia is shifting agricultural priorities from the new lands to more intensive cultivation of available cropland.

The people of the five countries are anxious to learn from the United States, and this country also has much to gain from reciprocal exchanges and broader people-to-people contacts.

The Secretary returned August 13 from his factfinding study of Eastern Europe where he had discussions with the political heads of five countries. They were Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, President Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, of Rumania, Prime Minister Todor Zhivkov, of Bulgaria, and President Tito, of Yugoslavia. In Poland, the President and Prime Minister were out of the country, and Secretary Freeman talked with Vice Chairman Edward Ochab, of the Council of State, and Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki.

"In each country, the people were without exception very friendly. Wherever our party went, we were given a most cordial welcome. There was not a single instance of hostility or criticism," the Secretary said.

"Wherever I had an opportunity I talked to people on the farms, in factories and in the markets. Particularly in areas away from large cities it was evident that most of the people had seen few Americans—and never an American official. When I brought these people the greetings of the President and the American people, and expressed our hopes for a peaceful world, the reaction invariably was an expression of friendship and a desire for peace.

"In the U.S.S.R. and the other Communist nations, American prestige is high. Perhaps no other event in recent years has impressed the peoples of these countries of our dedication to the cause of peace than the agreement to ban nuclear testing above ground and in the atmosphere," the Secretary said.

"There is no doubt that, for these people, personal memories of the horrors and destruction of war intensify the hope for peace. This hope dominated the expressions of people everywhere we traveled.

"In all the countries we visited, the governments are firmly and solidly in the hands of dedicated Communists. Government policy is in accord with the current party line, and dictated and carried out in accord with party principles.

"For agriculture, this means that if the officials in power decide on a certain agricultural policy, the whole bureaucratic mechanism is thrown into gear to implement that policy—whether it relates to which field crops to plant or how much fertilizer to use.

"We found evidence in each country, however, that officials have learned that too much uniformity and rigidity limits agricultural progress because it fails to allow for local differences and the variations of nature. As a result, more flexibility—especially with regard to adaptation to climatic conditions—is being permitted. But the planning on farms and in regions still must conform to the overall plans and require-

ments of the State, which determines all priorities.

"This means that if Chairman Khrushchev carries out his determination—as he indicated to me he would—to sizably increase his capital inputs in agriculture, there will be an increase in production, particularly grain and row crops. The Chairman indicated he would give strong emphasis during the next 5 years to mixed feed, fertilizer, and chemical production. It is apparent that he is shifting agricultural priorities from the new lands, where the Russians have placed substantial amounts of virgin land into grain production in recent years, to more intensive cultivation of historic cropland.

"The five governments are solidly Communist, but the five nations cannot be viewed as a unit, or single bloc. Each of the five peoples has its own history and tradition—and there is a noticeable spirit of nationalism in each country.

"Even within the bloc, Poland has never been able to carry out the Communist principle of collectivization of agriculture. Between 80 and 90 percent of the land is owned and worked by the stubbornly independent peasants. The official goal is to change this situation, but Communist officials are realistic enough not to push the transition too far or too fast.

"Yugoslavia, which is outside the bloc, and has far more significant relationships with the West, likewise has retained the ownership and operation of most of the farmland (88 percent) in the hands of the peasants—and the right to own a limited amount of land is written into the Yugoslavian constitution. Yugoslav officials said their goal is social (state) ownership of the land.

"They emphasize they will not seek this goal by force or coercion, but by evolution and education—which, they say, may take 10, 20, or 50 years. It is significant, with all their penchant for 5-year plans and timetables, that they refuse to set a timetable for this.

"These facts are very significant for the American people. It is clear that American exports to these two countries (Poland and Yugoslavia) under Public Law 480 have been a significant factor in preventing the forced socialization of the land, and thus in keeping alive a spirit of individual ownership and enterprise. Trade has kept a door open to the West, and the door is opened widest in Yugoslavia.

"In my judgment it would be a serious mistake to close this door by ending the most-favored-nation status that up to now has been accorded Poland and Yugoslavia. To close this door would both force greater Communist solidarity and deprive ourselves of potential markets. On the other hand, by continuing the most-favored-nation treatment we can promote trade that is of mutual benefit, and move toward developing valuable commercial markets for American products.

"I have returned with a number of strong convictions, but none more firmly reinforced than the demonstrated superiority of the family farm system of agriculture based on private ownership of the land.

"United States and Soviet agriculture are scarcely comparable. In my conversation with Chairman Khrushchev, he said his goal is to surpass the United States as the No. 1 agricultural producer. I accepted his challenge with confidence and told him the incentive built into the family farm system will insure that it will continue as the most powerful engine for efficient agricultural production.

"My observations convince me that the socialist system is bureaucratic and unwieldy, and by its very nature inefficient and wasteful. There is a lack of balance, and many extremes. For example, while the Soviet Union has made definite progress in production of grain and row crops, it lags far behind in the yields and production of animal products and fruits and vegetables, which require more skill at individual levels.

"In comparison, the U.S. farmer has a training and background much broader than those we met in the Communist countries. We observed few farmers in the five countries who could match the American farmer with his working knowledge of agronomy, mechanics, veterinary, business management and other agricultural skills.

"We should not be misled, however, into overlooking the progress which the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations are making. It is significant progress by their own standards, and all indications are that it will continue and be accelerated in the years ahead.

"The agricultural practices we saw were, of course, their best, and many of them were impressive. Near Orenburg, we found a 22-percent protein spring wheat. In the Krasnodar region, we found sunflowers with a 46-percent oil content. In Bulgaria, we saw hybrid tomatoes which were equal or superior in quality and yield to our own. We found very good research being carried on at several research institutions.

"There also are several important institutional improvements underway in the Soviet Union. They are getting technical and scientific know-how into practice more effectively by encouraging more local discretion and adaptation to local conditions. There are, in addition, increasing numbers of trained people, as well as more and improved machinery.

"One of the more significant weaknesses in Communist agriculture is in the storage, marketing, processing, and distribution of food commodities. Focusing on production, they are overlooking an aspect of the farm-to-dinner-table process which most Americans take for granted. This, I predict, will prove to be a serious oversight in the years ahead.

"I left the United States feeling that reciprocal people-to-people contacts and the exchange of information on agricultural subjects is of mutual benefit. I now feel this even more strongly. We found in Eastern Europe that the talk of exchanges met with immediate and favorable responses. We had an opportunity to see some of the effects of exchange programs, and to push for reciprocity in exchanges. And, while U.S. agriculture is far advanced in comparison to these five countries, there are advantages we can gain by such exchanges.

"We can expect to get germ plasm to breed into our plants—our apples, pears, plums, alfalfas, and many forage grasses and legumes came originally from Russia—to obtain more disease and insect resistance, winter hardiness, drought resistance, and other desirable qualities. We would like to explore Siberia for cold-resistant plants and send entomologists to seek more effective biological controls for plant and insect pests, either in the form of natural enemies or insect diseases.

"Few people realize that the United States, through past exchange programs, already has obtained over 2,260 different plant specimens from the Plant Breeding Institute of Leningrad.

"I strongly recommend expanding our exchange programs involving reciprocity to the end that both parties to the exchange benefit. In addition to the material gains resulting from such exchanges, there is the increased understanding and good will which follow when people come to know each other as human beings.

"Finally, the clear evidence of increased attention to the agricultural sector in the countries we visited is a sign and a trend we should welcome and encourage. Investments in raising the standard of living are investments in the peaceful capabilities of these nations."

National Gallery of Art Program for September

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program of the National Gallery of Art for the month of September:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART,
SEPTEMBER 1963

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.; Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New exhibition: Watercolors by J. M. W. Turner from the collection of the British Museum, central gallery, September 15 through October 13.

New publication: Turner watercolors, exhibition catalog, 54 pages, 7½ by 10 inches with introduction by Edward Croft-Murray, 1 color plate and 37 illustrations; $1.50 postpaid.

Continuing exhibition: Modern prints and illustrated books from the Rosenwald collection, central gallery, through September 2.

New reproductions: 11- by 14-inch color reproductions, Botticelli, "Portrait of a Youth"; Hals, "Portrait of an Officer"; Giotto, "Madonna and Child"; Rubens, "The Meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek"; Turner, "The Dogma and Santa Maria della Salute, Venice"; 25 cents each, postpaid.

Sunday lectures: On Sunday, September 1, there will be a showing of a film in the auditorium at 4 p.m. The Sunday lectures will resume on September 8.

Concerts: The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation Concerts resume on September 29, at 8 p.m., in the east garden court.

Lec-Tour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these Lec-Tour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays, 4 to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

Painting of the week:[1] Veronese, "The Finding of Moses" (Mellon collection) gallery 30, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Modern prints and illustrated books from the Rosenwald collection, central gallery, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday film: "Lust for Life"; Vincent van Gogh, produced by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, lecture hall, 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 8

Painting of the week:[1] Henri, "New York Street in Winter" (Chester Dale collection),

Footnote atend of speech.

gallery 66, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: English portraiture, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Monday, 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Hostility to Modern Art in the 19th Century"; guest speaker, Francis Haskell, lecturer, Kings College, Cambridge, England, lecture hall, 4.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 15

Painting of the week [1]: Stubbs, "Colonel Pocklington With His Sisters" (gift of Mrs. Charles S. Carstairs), gallery 59, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Early landscape paintings, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Decorative Painting in England"; guest speaker, Edward Croft-Murray, keeper, Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum, London, lecture hall, 4.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 22

Painting of the week [1]: Toulouse-Lautrec, "Quadrille at the Moulin Rouge" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Turner and English landscape painting, rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "New England Painting Before Copley"; guest speaker, Stuart P. Feld, assistant curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 29

Painting of the week [1]: Manet, "The Old Musician" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 88, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Exhibition of Turner water colors, central gallery, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Earliest American Landscape Painting"; guest speaker, Sterling A. Callisen, president, Parsons School of Design, New York, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra; Richard Bales, conductor, Joan Weiner, pianist, east garden court, 8.

[1] An 11- by 14-inch reproduction with text for sale, 15 cents, postpaid (special price this week only, regularly, 25 cents).

Iron Ore Imports Should Be Curtailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, U.S. production of iron ore decreased almost 30 percent while iron ore imports more than tripled in the period from 1952 through 1962. The same 11 years saw a complete reversal of our position in the world steel market. In 1952 we sold abroad 3½ times as much steel as we imported. In 1962 we imported twice as much steel as we exported.

It is against this background, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced a bill to establish a reasonable quota on the importation of iron ore into the United States. I have sponsored such legislation for the last several years in the firm belief that it offers the best hope of reviving a basic industry that has been on the decline since shortly after World War II.

In limiting the quantity of foreign ore that could be fed into our blast and steel furnaces we would be forcing the big steel companies to reopen some of their ore mines and draw more heavily from their domestic supplies. This, in my opinion, would be a good thing for this country, the iron ore miners of Michigan, and for the people in the iron mining communities who depend on this industry.

As I have done in the past I again want to emphasize that my purpose in sponsoring this legislation is not to penalize in any way the steel companies which own and operate our domestic iron ore mines and also own a major part of the reserves in Canada and Venezuela. Some of these companies also are participating in development of Africa's vast iron ore reserves. What I propose is that we regulate the flow of iron ore from abroad on a reasonable annual basis to save our domestic ore industry from destruction or substantial injury.

The table below, prepared from statistics compiled by the Bureau of Census, reflects the sharp increase in foreign iron ore imports from 1952 through 1962 with the corresponding decrease in domestic production:

Iron ore imports, 1952–62 [1]

[In thousands of long tons]

	1952	1953	1954	1955
Canada	1,822	1,841	3,537	10,077
Venezuela	1,846	1,950	5,210	7,160
Others [2]	6,093	7,283	7,045	6,235
Total	9,761	11,074	15,792	23,472

	1956	1957	1958	1959
Canada	13,723	12,537	8,289	13,458
Venezuela	9,254	12,291	12,180	13,542
Others [2]	7,434	8,823	7,075	8,617
Total	30,411	33,651	27,544	35,617

	1960	1961	1962
Canada	10,595	9,683	16,844
Venezuela	14,555	10,478	10,313
Others [2]	9,428	5,644	6,274
Total	34,578	25,805	33,431

[1] During the same period, domestic production has decreased from an annual average of 98,984,000 long tons in 1952–56 to an estimated 71,000,000 long tons in 1962.

[2] Other countries exporting iron ore to the United States include Brazil, Chile, Denmark, India, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Peru, Philippines, and Sweden.

It has been contended that research, and not legislation to limit imports, is the key to the iron ore problem. This opinion is rooted in the progress that has been made in developing economic ways of concentrating or beneficiating lower grade ores, especially the taconites of the Lake Superior ranges. Research offers much hope for the future. However, the development of these new processes is costly and the construction of plants to put them to practical use requires tremendous investments. Full commercial utilization of our lower grade ores is a decade or more away and meantime our miners and their families are suffering deprivations because of this unfair competition from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, our increasing reliance on foreign sources of iron ore could be disastrous in time of war. If we permit the destruction of our domestic industry, how could we replace foreign supplies cut off from us in time of war? Abandoned iron mines cannot brought back into production overnight. The skills of miners who have had to leave their home communities to seek other ways to make a living would be difficult to replace in time of emergency. The present situation is a threat to our national security.

By following a shortsighted policy of ever-increasing dependence on foreign ore supplies the steel companies have helped promote a free trade policy which, in the face of growing protectionism abroad, can only have an adverse effect on American industry and American working men and women.

For many years the iron ore producing areas of our country have been trying to digest the bitter fruits of the steel companies' policy of developing foreign ore sources at the expense of the domestic iron ore industry. Due in large measure to that policy all of the western half of Michigan's Upper Peninsula is a depressed area, and has been so designated by agencies of the Federal Government. Not only do we have heavy unemployment in the iron ore mining areas of this country, but we also have serious underemployment resulting from the part-time operation of those mines which have not shut down.

Now the steel companies themselves are tasting the same bitter fruits of their buy-foreign policy. The U.S. share of world steel production declined from 46 percent in 1950 to 25 percent in 1961. Our participation in world steel trade dropped from about 17 percent of the total in the early 1950's to an average of less than 6 percent during the last 3 years.

In the past, despite inadequate tariff protection, our steel industry was able to compete with foreign producers because of our more efficient plants and labor force. While steelworkers received higher wages in this country, their per capita output also was greater. The situation has changed and our steel producers no longer have these balancing advantages. Through our foreign aid program, we subsidized construction of steel plants in foreign countries that are more modern and efficient than many plants in this country. Western Europe and Japan have found a ready market in the United States for the product of their new plants. For the first time in more

than a half century this country became a net importer of steel in 1959, a situation that continues down to this day. The following table reflects this change for the worse in the world steel trade picture:

Imports and exports of steel mills products, 1952–62

[In net tons]

Year	Imports	Exports
1952	1,201,435	4,005,248
1953	1,702,991	2,990,751
1954	770,822	2,791,886
1955	973,155	4,060,998
1956	1,340,746	4,347,903
1957	1,154,831	5,347,678
1958	1,707,130	2,822,910
1959	4,396,354	1,676,652
1960	3,358,752	2,977,278
1961	3,164,256	1,989,179
1962	4,100,448	2,013,102

Source: American Iron and Steel Institute.

Steel management and labor have been slow to see the handwriting on the wall. They now are beginning to realize how badly they are being hurt by imports of finished steel products, as evidenced by the recent visit to the White House of Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., and David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers Union.

According to the press reports, they asked President Kennedy for help in halting the unfair competition from foreign steel mills. Mr. Blough pointed out that foreign steel imports last year totaled more than 4 million tons, representing a loss of 70 million man-hours of work, or the equivalent of 37,700 full-time jobs in the American steel industry. Even more jobs will be lost this year because foreign finished steel products now are pouring into this country at an annual rate of 5 million tons.

Mr. Blough should realize that iron ore imports have a similar impact on our American iron miners. They buy-foreign policy which his company, and other major producers, have pursued for several years are costing the jobs of increasing numbers of iron miners in this country. Iron ore imports jumped to 33 million tons last year. Production of this ore in the United States would have provided a year's employment for 10,000 iron miners who could have had almost 43½ million man-hours of work. Since the iron ore miners currently earns an average of $3.03 an hour, these foreign imports represent a loss of wages totaling $131,805,000. Our now unemployed, or underemployed, iron miners would be paying substantial income taxes instead of having to rely for their sustenance on unemployment compensation and job-creating public works projects, beneficial as the latter might be to our depressed iron mining communities.

I believe that the steel industry, as well as the iron ore industry, should have tariff or quota protection. But it is somewhat ironic that the steel companies should be asking for protection against imports of finished steel at a time when they are increasing their imports of iron ore at the expense of the domestic iron ore industry, which is virtually being destroyed.

The steel companies cannot have their cake and eat it. If they want protection against imports of finished steel, they should be willing to go along with a quota on the importation of the raw material.

Unless both the steel and iron ore industries receive tariff or quota protection, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can expect to keep the foreign mills from making even greater inroads into the American market. A steelworker in the United States in 1962 earned an average of $4.16 an hour. In comparison, a Japanese steelworker earned 63 cents, an Italian steelworker 98 cents, a French steelworker $1.27, a Belgian steelworker $1.33, a British steelworker $1.38, a German steelworker $1.45, and a Canadian steelworker $3.46. In each case these hourly earnings include supplemental benefits which in many countries represent a substantial portion of the worker's wage. There is a similar variance between the earnings of American iron ore miners and those in foreign mines.

I do not wonder then that the steel industry and the steelworkers' union have become concerned about unfair foreign competition. My only wonder is that their concern has been voiced so late. Had it been expressed during last year's debate on the reciprocal trade program it might have had a greater impact.

It was just a little over a year ago that the House passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As I predicted when I voted against this misnamed act, we have seen a steady deterioration in our world trade position since it became law last October. Our foreign trade is contracting rather than expanding. Even stanch supporters of the Trade Act have suggested that the United States be armed with retaliatory tariffs in the event we are not able to work out a mutual reduction of tariffs with the Common Market countries of Europe.

Recent events have brought a rude awakening to those who were contending a year ago that our Tariff Expansion Act, in combination with the Common Market, would usher in a new free trade era that would spell unparalleled prosperity for all the free world.

Free trade cannot be a one-way street. Our policy of lowering tariffs and eliminating barriers to the importation of foreign goods in the face of the tariff walls being thrown up around the Common Market countries will be the ruination of American industry unless we take counteraction in our own self-interest.

Although trade act proponents last year agreed that tariff concessions would be harmful to some segments of American industry and labor, they hailed the trade adjustment assistance section of the bill as providing special benefits to cushion the injurious effects on companies, workers, and farmers.

As yet, however, no company, no worker, no farmer has received any help under this section. Before such assistance may be extended, the Tariff Commission must find that injury resulted from imports due to tariff concessions. So far the Commission has decided nine cases brought before it by five industries, two companies, and four groups of workers, all seeking relief under section 301 of the Tariff Expansion Act of 1961. The Tariff Commission rejected every one of these cases, justifying the view of many of us last year that the trade adjustment section was merely an empty promise.

We are now told that the White House is attempting to pump some life into this moribund program. By injecting new blood into the Tariff Commission, the administration, according to an article in the August 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal, hopes "to create a more sympathetic agency climate" for claims of injury resulting from imports.

More than a transfusion of personnel on the Tariff Commission is needed to provide genuine relief for the thousands of American workers who have been hurt, and who are continuing to be hurt, by foreign competition. It is time for a thorough reappraisal of our whole free trade policy because that policy works to the advantage of foreign producers and foreign workers and against the best interests of our own industries and our own workers. More and more of our people are losing their jobs as a result of unfair foreign competition. We must protect our own people first. Free trade is like foreign aid. It is a give-away of our resources to foreign countries who neither understand nor appreciate our generosity.

I hope the Congress will repeal the reciprocal trade program in its entirety and rewrite a trade policy based on reality, commonsense and enlightened self-interest. Unless this is done our free trade policy is going to be responsible for one of the greatest depressions this country has ever seen.

Results of Public Opinion Poll of Ohio's 11th District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a poll of many thousands of voters of Ohio's 11th Congressional District has shown interesting results with voters expressing firm opinions on a number of major legislative matters before the Congress.

On multiple questions where respondents were asked to "choose one," many voters put checks on all three of the questions expressing favor for one and opposition to the other two choices.

Since the mailing was general and only one questionnaire went to a single address, I received many requests from other individuals in families saying they also wanted questionnaires to answer. In some cases a wife would write and say her husband filled out the questionnaire and she wanted one, and vice versa. One wife wrote:

> My husband and I don't always agree on political questions, but we do on this, so you can count this for both of us.

Approximately 14,000 questionnaires were returned to my office—opened and sorted there—and then turned over to Tabulating, Inc., Washington, D.C., who transferred the responses to IBM cards and tabulated the results. This firm has certified the results which are shown on the following table:

[Percent]

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose
1. Taxes (choose 1):		
a. The proposed income and corporate tax reduction of approximately $13,500,000,000 spaced over the next 3 years?	21.7	42.1
b. An immediate tax reduction of $10,000,000,000?	12.9	44.2
c. No tax cut unless accompanied by corresponding decrease in Federal spending?	65.4	13.7
2. Education:		
a. Federal assistance for public school construction?	44.5	55.5
b. Federal assistance for teachers' salaries?	24.5	75.5
c. Inclusion of private and parochial schools in any general Federal-aid program?	21.0	79.0
d. An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition and educational expenses of a taxpayer or his dependents?	79.1	20.9
e. Federal grants to colleges and universities for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and research facilities?	57.5	42.5
3. Medical care (choose 1):		
a. Compulsory health care for those over 65 financed through social security system?	36.3	49.5
b. A voluntary private health insurance program for those over 65 with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year toward the cost of the premium to each taxpayer?	39.6	24.3
c. No new Federal program at all?	24.1	26.2
4. Civil rights:		
a. Increased Federal enforcement of voting, educational, and employment rights for all?	70.7	29.3
b. Continued Federal aid to States which practice, encourage, and support discrimination in public facilities?	37.1	62.9
5. Foreign affairs:		
a. Amending Atomic Energy Act so as to permit U.S. sharing of nuclear weapons and secrets with NATO allies?	25.3	74.7
b. Further concessions on number of on-site inspections in attempt to achieve a nuclear test ban with Soviets?	25.5	74.5
c. A more aggressive Cuban policy—including U.S. armed blockade and military intervention—if Soving troops and weapons are not withdrawn?	86.2	13.8
6. Foreign aid (choose 1):		
a. Continued foreign aid at approximate $4,000,000,000 per year level?	8.2	53.8
b. Gradual reduction of foreign aid commitments?	72.5	10.5
c. Discontinuation of entire foreign aid program?	19.3	35.7
7. Mass transit: A Federal program of grant and loan assistance to assist cities in planning, establishing and maintaining mass transit systems?	35.0	65.0
8. Space: Continuation of expenditures at present accelerated levels in the manned-space program?	53.3	46.7

Union Leader Urges Treaty Ratification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America in support of the ratification of the partial test ban treaty brings a number of important facts to light. His remarks, together with the resolution he has included, deserve the attention of all Members of both the House and the Senate. The text of Mr. Carey's remarks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JAMES B. CAREY

Chairman FULBRIGHT, Chairman PASTORE, Chairman RUSSELL, and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Armed Services Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here before you in behalf of ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty.

In behalf of the industrial union department, of which I am secretary-treasury, and the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, of which I am president, I urge the committees to approve the test ban and the Senate to ratify this treaty agreement.

We support this first-step agreement not only because of its implication of the easing of tension and the precedent it might set for the relaxing of tensions more generally, but also because we are truly concerned with the continuing and growing hazard which atmospheric testing presents not only to the present generation but also to future generations. It is a clear and present danger.

I speak as one who participated as a member of the Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy Industry Expansion. I speak as one with some experience in this problem of radiation hazard. I speak as a trade union officer concerned with the impact of world tensions as well as a trade union officer who has sought to assist workers and their families who have been injured by radiation.

Many trade union groups are in support of ratification of this treaty. The executive officers and international vice presidents of the IUE made this explicit in a resolution adopted shortly after the treaty was sent to the Senate in the following terms:

"July 24, 1963, may well mark one of the most crucial turning points in the entire history of humanity.

"On July 24 in Moscow mankind took an unprecedented step backward from the brink of the abyss. For the first time in all the years since the Soviet Union's development of its own atomic weapons, there has been a slight—but extremely auspicious—lifting of the threat of global devastation and the annihilation of mankind.

"Today, because of the test ban agreement reached in Moscow by representatives of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, there is for the first time in our nuclear age the hope and the promise that mankind will not destroy itself and that the vast edifice of civilization, its culture, its arts, scientific progress, and spiritual values will survive.

"Nothing could be truer than President Kennedy's statement, in his address to the Nation on July 26, that 'both sides have come to possess enough nuclear power to destroy the human race several times over.' Nor can we, in judging this treaty, permit ourselves to forget President Kennedy's statement:

" 'If only one thermonuclear bomb were to be dropped on any American, Russian, or other city—whether it was launched by accident or design, by a madman or an enemy, by a large nation or small, from any corner of the world—that one bomb could release more destructive force on the inhabitants of that one helpless city than all the bombs dropped during the Second World War.'

"We agree with President Kennedy that the July 24 test ban treaty has not by any means dispelled the threat of a possible doomsday, but that it does constitute 'a first step' and an 'opening wedge' in mankind's desperate efforts to avoid the ultimate catastrophe: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That this meeting of the executive officers and international vice presidents of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers AFL–CIO-CLC acclaims the test ban treaty as a 'first step,' but a most promising one, in the direction of disarmament and the achievement of an enduring peace; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we warmly congratulate and commend President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk for this initial accomplishment, and with a special note of praise for the superbly successful work of Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, our Nation's chief representative in the Moscow negotiations; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we strongly urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which today begins hearings on the treaty, to give the agreement its full approval and support, and similarly we urge that the Senate as a whole give overwhelming endorsement to the treaty; and be it finally

"*Resolved,* That we heartily urge President Kennedy, the U.S. Disarmament and Control Agency, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee to carry forward, with intensified vigor, the achievement of the 'second step,' an agreement on partial or total disarmament which will open the door toward mankind's age-old dream: peace, the abolition of poverty, and the universal fraternity of man."

More recently, the Atomic Workers Council of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers likewise adopted a resolution urging the U.S. Senate to ratify the treaty. These are the workers whom we call the "atom's peaceful soldiers" because they have been in the forefront of the military application of nuclear science. They have produced the fissionable material. They have operated the laboratories of military exepriement. They have made the parts of the whole family of nuclear weapons. They have powered the submarines and the various military reactors in operation throughout our military establishment. These workers know the potential impact of this agreement of their lives, their jobs and their economic well-being; yet, in adopting this resolution, I note that they "fervently hope that this will be the first step of a long series of steps leading gradually to total disarmament and a world of peace."

Because of the shortness of time, I am not reading their entire resolution but am attaching it for inclusion in the record. I urge you to read it in its entirety.

I am also attaching a statement published by the Industrial Union Department, AFL-

CIO, entitled, "The Atom's Peaceful Soldiers," the story of some of these workers who have been injured by radiation. I ask that it be included in the record following my remarks.

The Atomic Workers Council resolution was referred to the convention of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union in Chicago last week where the convention unanimously adopted the identical resolution. Please note its call for conversion of atomic science to its peaceful potential. For some time, our organization has been urging this transition to the peaceful atom. Many people ask, what has happened to "Atoms for Peace"? Truly here is a science almost totally dedicated to military use which can, with proper safeguards, be converted almost entirely to achieving benefits for mankind.

Ratification of the treaty will not only bring an end to the dispersion of dangerous and harmful radioactivity in the atmosphere, in our food, and in the very milk, and water that we drink; but it will also help bring about the potential of this conversion to peacetime use of this great and wonderful science.

Not long ago, I had the experience of proposing this conversion to the people who have felt the devastation of the bomb at a convention of the Japanese Electrical Workers Union known as Denki Roren. I proposed that a joint effort be made to use this science to electrify the undeveloped world. I proposed that we make power from the splitting of the atom economical by using production line methods for building 1,000 power reactors; that these be placed on barges and floated up the rivers of undeveloped power-hungry areas; and that we thus demonstrate to the world with the same vigor and energy that we used to make the bomb that we can apply this science for the benefit of mankind.

I would urge here, in addition, that we use modern production line techniques to also build 1,000 reactors for the production of potable water from the ocean to meet the water needs of arid areas throughout the undeveloped world.

Maybe with these kinds of proposals which, I am sure, properly administered, would be economical, we can wash away the terrible image of the mushroom cloud which comes to mind whenever the phrase "atomic energy" is mentioned to the overwhelming majority of the population of the world.

Other nations, if they wish, can bear the stigma of only developing atomic energy for military ends. The United States must vigorously restate its policy on atoms for peace.

I would like to close with some quotations. The first is from the encyclical letter of the late Pope John XXIII, in which he addressed himself directly to the problem which is before you when he said:

"Consequently, people live in constant fear lest the storm that every moment threatens should break upon them with dreadful violence. And with good reason, for the arms of war are ready at hand. Even though it is difficult to believe that anyone would dare bring upon himself the appalling destruction and sorrow that war would bring in its train, it cannot be denied that the conflagration can be set off by some unexpected and unpremeditated act. And one must bear in mind that, even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, there is nevertheless reason to fear that the mere continuance of nuclear tests, undertaken with war in mind, can seriously jeopardize various kinds of life on earth."

And then I would like to cite the very encouraging note contained in a portion of Dr. Albert Schweitzer's letter to the President, which was carried in the press last Sunday, when he wrote:

"Finally a ray of light appears in the darkness in which humanity was seeking its way and gives us the hope that the darkness will make way for light."

It is appropriate for me to conclude this statement with a quotation from the man who might be considered the father of the atomic age, Albert Einstein. It was this great physicist who made the immemorable remark: "I do not know with what weapons World War III will be fought, but I do know that World War IV will be fought with rocks."

We can only hope that there will be people left to throw rocks.

Gentlemen, I strongly urge you to vote for ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty both here and in the full Senate.

RESOLUTION ON PEACE AND ATOMIC ENERGY ADOPTED BY ATOMIC WORKERS COUNCIL, OCAW, CHICAGO, ILL.

As workers in the atomic industry, we applaud the fact that negotiators for the three major powers have initialled a treaty which will stop the testing of nuclear bombs except underground.

This is a step toward disarmament which all Americans surely must approve. We urge the U.S. Senate to ratify the treaty, and we fervently hope that this will be the first step of a long series of steps leading gradually to total disarmament and a world of peace.

In candor, however, we must recognize that the very worthwhile process of disarmament creates certain problems as byproducts. Greatest of these problems is economic dislocation, for many of our citizens at all levels are employed in defense work. Planning should begin now toward the creating of peaceful projects which will offset the dislocations which will be caused by disarmament as and when it comes about.

In the area of nuclear energy, we repeat again what we have said, in essence, many times before. That is that the United Staes of America has an obligation to move forward aggressively in the development of peaceful uses for nuclear energy. This energy, which now hangs as a threat over mankind, can, if properly applied, become instead a great boom for mankind. We recognize that many experiments have been conducted in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We are convinced, however, that the Nation has been halfhearted in its extension of these small-scale experiments into actual working size pilot projects. For example, there are approximately 500 nuclear reactors in this country being used for experimental purposes, but there are only a mere handful of substantial size producing power on a commercial scale. After almost 20 years of experimentation, we believe it is past due that commercial uses be expanded.

We cite that there are many peaceful uses of nuclear energy which can be and should be exploited but which are not being exploited. The first and most obvious is electric power generation. In some areas of the country, nuclear-generated power already could be economically competitive with power generated with other fuels. As fossil fuels decline in availability and accessibility, this competitive picture will shift further to the advantage of nuclear power. We need to prepare now for that eventuality.

A second use is in massive earth-moving projects—such as the excavation of canals, harbors, lakes, and mines. This area of practical use has scarcely been touched even on an experimental basis, but holds great possibilities. We should bear in mind that these opportunities are particularly plentiful in the underdeveloped countries which we seek to aid.

A third area of use is in the conversion of sea water to fresh water for the irrigation of desert areas in which food may be produced for the world's growing population. This, too, is an area in which we can be of great assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

Other uses, secondary in volume of nuclear material needed but important to humanity, included the expansion of medical uses of radiation and the irradiation of food for preservation; the use of nuclear energy for propulsion of ships and possibly planes should be further explored.

In summary, we are most sincerely convinced that the United States should move forward with vigor in the development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy, preparing now for the day when eventually the bombs will be disarmed and atomic energy will be used only for the positive welfare of mankind. This should be a matter of the highest priority before Congress; the costs would be negligible compared to our present outlays and the benefits would be great beyond human comprehension.

(Reproduced by Leo Goodman, secretary, Atomic Energy Technical Committee, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.)

International Affairs Platform of the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a significant and worthwhile statement regarding foreign policy has recently been brought to my attention. This is the international affairs section of the 1963–64 platform of the American Veterans Committee. By unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, I hereby place this statement in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, 1963–64

We, the members of the American Veterans Committee, believe that the goals of U.S. foreign policy should be to avert world devastation by nuclear warfare, to strengthen the United Nations as an agency for the preservation of peace and the betterment of human welfare, to promote the extension of government based upon the consent of the governed and the respect of minority rights, to secure in underdeveloped areas both economic growth and equitable distribution of wealth, to foster the growth of sentiment in Communist nations for coexistence, and finally to prevent imposition of Communist or other dictatorial regimes on unwilling peoples. To secure these goals we advocate the policies which we now set forth.

I. THE UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

Only the progressive subordination of national sovereignty to a democratic world government operating under and implementing world law can ultimately and permanently eliminate the heavy burdens of national armaments and the scourge of international warfare, and permit the full development of human freedom. Because of its successful experience with federalism, its worldwide position of material and moral strength, and its desire for peace, the United States, by precept and example, should take the lead in promoting the ultimate subordination of national authority to that of the United Nations on a progressive basis that will enhance our freedoms and well-being. Recognition of the rule of law in international relations where such law presently ex-

ists, by prompt repeal of the Connally reservation would be one such step.

The United Nations continues to be man's best hope for peace, and support of the United Nations must be an essential part of our foreign policy. We favor encouragement and aid to the formation of supranational authorities of a regional nature and of treaty agreements which limit the sovereignty of the participating nations in order to secure mutual advantage, such as the European Common Market, Euratom, and others.

We regard the integrity and independence of the Secretary General's office as expressed in the charter crucial to the existence and growth of the United Nations. We shall oppose any attempt which seeks to weaken the powers of this office.

We fully support a United Nations police force as one of the important contributions to peacekeeping in the world. The peacekeeping forces of the United Nations must be supported financially by all members of the U.N. and this support must be obligatory.

II. NUCLEAR TESTING AND DISARMAMENT

Nuclear testing and disarmament are the two pressing questions that have imperatively forced themselves as first items on the world agenda. The arms race and renewed nuclear testing continue to pose a mortal danger to mankind. The world is further threatened by the possible growing spread of nuclear weapons. This possibility would make control more complex and difficult and the threat of war would be heightened. Despite the difficulties and the slow pace of disarmament negotiations, the United States should continue forcefully and imaginatively to negotiate for both general and complete disarmament with proper safeguards and control and for an effective nuclear test ban treaty. The American Veterans Committee continues to support staged disarmament proposals such as that set forth by the U.S. Government at Geneva.

The American Veterans Committee states its firm belief that American leadership can help rescue us from the threat of war and lead all nations to a peaceful world protected by institutions of law and justice. We see the challenge to the United States to lie ultimately in the search of men everywhere for reliable systems of international security which make armed aggression impossible, for methods of economic organization and international cooperation to bring freedom from hunger and rising living standards to all continents and all people, and for political systems of government which protect the rights of each man and give to each a voice in his own government and his own destiny.

Achievement of disarmament will bring peace to the world and enable us to get on with the real business of our century—freedom, security, and human betterment for all the world.

III. DEFENSE COMMITMENTS

Until enforcible disarmament agreements are achieved, the United States must maintain effective power to deter aggression and possess the clear capacity to meet even a surprise nuclear attack. Obviously, our allies and others must keep in sight the somber fact that there is no defense against allout total nuclear war. The United States must, of course, develop and maintain conventional military forces of sufficient mobility and striking power to extinguish "brushfire" wars.

Military aid to neutral and allied powers should be surrounded with safeguards against corruption, incompetence, and especially against use to sustain antidemocratic regimes.

IV. UNCOMMITTED AND UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

The United States should aid and encourage uncommitted nations to maintain control of their own policies and avoid satellite status. The United States must act decisively to spur the desired economic growth and to promote more equitable allocation of national income in such nations while fostering insofar as possible development of representative government and respect for minority rights. To these ends, economic aid, preferably in long term, low interest loans, technical assistance (especially in education), and subsidized cultural exchanges must be increased and given priority over military assistance. United Nations agencies should administer such aid programs, and when it is not possible to do so, then we should seek joint action with other countries. Only if these efforts fail, should the United States resort to bilateral programs. Private investment abroad should be encouraged only if it promises to promote sound economic development in the interest of the areas concerned, and if it is welcomed by the nations themselves.

The primary aim of aid to underdeveloped countries should be to aid them to develop politically, economically, and culturally for the welfare of their peoples. Our Government should undertake to negotiate agreements covering the allocation of aid funds to specific projects or kinds of projects serving such aim.

We congratulate enthusiastically the work of the Peace Corps. Our Peace Corps has overcome many obstacles and is an inspiring example of unselfish full giving service to the underdeveloped countries and the peoples of the world. In addition, we call for a greatly expanded program to afford more highly trained and experienced technical, managerial, professional, and other personnel in the many varied fields to aid the underdeveloped areas.

V. THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES

The United States must spare no effort to keep its allies confident that the alliance of which each is a member can and will provide effective protection against military aggression of any kind from any source. Because of this mutual defense commitment, the United States must formulate its military and diplomatic policies in consultation with its allies to a greater extent than it has in the past. Underdeveloped nations among our allies should, of course, share in economic and technical aid as well as the uncommitted nations. Allies who have the capacity should be persuaded to contribute to foreign aid programs to the extent of their ability to do so. Colonial powers should prepare their colonies for independence. The United States should exert every effort to improve the record of certain of its allies in providing governments based on the consent of the governed, in guaranteeing individual and minority rights, and in advancing both economic progress and the welfare of the underprivileged.

We believe that the recent NATO meetings in Ottawa indicated that the allies are beginning to recognize the importance of establishing a multilateral nuclear force within the framework of NATO for the defense of the free world. We continue to support the U.S. position, which opposes separate national nuclear forces on the ground that the spread and proliferation of nuclear weapons must be halted.

VI. LATIN AMERICA

The social, economic, and political problems of Latin America demand special attention; political, economic and technical aid must be increased. Cooperative action must be sought through the Organization of American States to bring pressure on regimes of whatever political persuasion to introduce representative constitutional governments, together with taxation, fiscal and land reforms. Too often the United States and its official and unofficial representatives in Latin America have identified and allied themselves with the native and foreign exploiters, aristocrats and dictators. Instead we must strongly support those systems which are democratically oriented and which are actually effecting social and economic reforms.

The Alliance for Progress, a program for economic development, better living standards and basic reforms in the hemisphere, is recognition on our part of the needs of our friends and neighbors of the Americas. Economic development, social reforms and political freedom are the only guarantees that democracy can flourish on the American Continent. Latin America will be doomed and lost to the free world unless its nations can end forever government by the military. The Alliance correctly envisages that the countries of Latin America must in conjunction with massive U.S. public and private aid, help themselves on the road to progress.

VII. COMMUNIST POWERS

U.S. policy should include a firm commitment to the achievement of reliable disarmament agreements and peaceful relationship with the Soviet bloc. This does not alter our determination to insure that Communists or others do not impose by force their form of government on unwilling people. We should, by taking the initiative, challenge the Soviet Union to increase the authority of the United Nations, to utilize it in aiding underdeveloped areas, to increase the exchange of persons and to expand trade between Communist and non-Communist nations, to cooperate in scientific research and development for peaceful purposes, to bargain in good faith through conventional diplomacy and to compete without a sense of desperation for the minds of men in uncommitted areas.

The United States should withdraw its opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations because we believe that all nations willing to subscribe to the Charter of the U.N. should be members of the United Nations. The United States should foster rather than prohibit commercial exchanges with the Chinese. We should also proffer assistance in meeting the threat of famine through the U.N. At the same time, no doubt should be permitted to exist as to the power and determination of the United States and her allies to prevent aggressive military action by Communist China against any of her neighbors. Further, we hope for a cessation of Chinese Communist military aggression and for her eventual participation in negotiations for disarmament.

We favor increased trade and cultural relations with the Communist satellite nations because we believe it will strengthen their chances of achieving independence and freedom.

VIII. FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

The principal economic problems of today's world are the struggle against poverty and for effective, equitable economic progress. The United States must accept a decisive role in this struggle.

The need for accompanying capital investment abroad with corersponding investment in technical and management education aimed at building human skills in industrial and agricultural developments and, where the investment is made in the public sector, in social engineering, has been greatly ignored. Much of what little has been done we owe to the work of the United Nations technical agencies and to the effort of private organizations, notably the Ford Foundation. Regardless of the nature of the investment—whether grants, loans, Public Law 480 or other funds—a carefully studied and planned but dynamic program of education and technical training is needed to enable underdeveloped nations to help themselves.

It is tremendously important that technical assistance and related educational efforts are carried forward by highly qualified people who not only excel in their work but

who can convey to the people abroad with whom they are working the spirit of the American heritage to help them light their futures of accomplishments in a free society. Their service will be in the noblest cause of all—winning a peace that stays won.

The purpose of foreign aid should contribute to the optimum security of the United States and the economic and political stability of the world.

IX. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

We support the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and concomitant actions taken under the act to date. We reassert that the strength of the free world lies not only along political and military lines but also along economic lines. We hope to see Great Britain a member of the Common Market and we view with confidence the continued growth and development of the free world's economy as expressed through the Common Market.

A strong economic community of the free world represents real opportunity and challenge to help the people of the world and the underdeveloped nations of the world.

X. THE EXAMPLE OF AMERICA

If the United States is to influence positively the building of a better world, it must create within its borders a society which will appeal to people everywhere. Policies to achieve this end are set forth in AVC's platforms and resolutions on national and veterans affairs.

A Lady in the Balcony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, discrimination by man evidences itself in diverse ways—subtle and not so subtle. And as Columnist Art Buchwald, in his own inimitable way, points out in a recent column that discrimination comes in varying sizes and shapes. Under unanimous consent I place in the Appendix of the RECORD a Buchwald column printed in the August 29, 1963, editions of the Washington Post. Once again Mr. Buchwald, by humor rather than by the frenzied blaring of trumpets, causes the wall of rationalization for discrimination to topple:

A LADY IN THE BALCONY

(By Art Buchwald)

One of the things that came out of the march on Washington was a protest by women reporters that they were discriminated against by their male counterparts at Washington's National Press Club.

Miss Elsie Carper, president of the Women's National Press Club, protested last Monday to A. Philip Randolph, chairman of the march on Washington, who was scheduled to be guest speaker at the men's National Press Club, that women would have to sit in the balcony during his talk.

She asked that Mr. Randolph change the site of his speech so that the men and women reporters would be allowed to sit together.

The embarrassed Mr. Randolph turned down Miss Carper's request, though he did come out for equality for women and said he was against discrimination of any kind. He went ahead and gave the talk to an all-male audience with a few women sitting in the balcony.

The question of discriminating against women has always been a ticklish one in the Nation's Capital. Although the majority of members of the National Press Club consider that some of their best friends are women, the feeling is that women aren't ready to take their places as men's equals, and no amount of legislation will change the attitude toward the female reporter by male members of the Press Club.

EN"ER AGITATORS

One correspondent spoke for several members at the bar when he said, "Our women were very happy to sit in the balcony until outside agitators from the North came down here and started causing trouble. Women prefer to be together. That's why they have women's colleges and women's magazines. We've always treated our women good, but they wouldn't know what to do with equal rights if we gave it to them."

Another newspaperman agreed. "You said it. You start mixing the sexes and you know what you'll wind up with? Babies. I've seen it happen during the war."

"I don't mind women asking for equal pay and wanting their children to go to school with our children," said a third reporter. "But what I'm worried about is that if we let them eat with us, pretty soon they'll want to dance with us, and neck with us, and before you know it all the barriers will be down, and they'll be wanting to play poker with us."

"We don't ask to go to their beauty parlors," a columnist said. "Why should they ask to come to our club?"

Everyone at the bar nodded their heads.

SCANDALOUS CHICAGO

A young reporter said, "I was in Chicago recently at the Playboy Club and you know what was going on there because women are permitted to sit downstairs? The women were kissing the men, right in public. I saw it with my own eyes."

"I hope you walked out," the others said.

"You bet your life I did," the reporter replied. "I told them we don't do things like this in Washington and they accused me of being a bigot."

"Damn Yankees," someone muttered.

"I said," the reporter continued, "that our women know their place and if a woman in Washington attempted to kiss a man in public she'd be tarred and feathered and rode out of town on a rail."

"Good for you," the others said.

A public relations man said, "I heard that the agitation at the Press Club for women to sit with men is Communist-inspired."

"It's got to be," a fellow drinker said. "They would never have thought of it themselves."

"I sure would like to know who is behind it."

"The Communists have the most to gain," a Hearst man said. "You desegregate the sexes and you have chaos—marriages, divorces, fights, riots, and crime, everything the Communists are working for."

BASIC ERROR

"Our mistake was letting them sit in the balcony in the first place," a TV commentator said. "We opened the door an inch and now that they've got their foot in they want to squeeze in the rest of their anatomy."

"You can say all you want about women," a man from a wire service said. "You can talk about equal rights, equal job opportunities, equal schooling, and equal public accommodations, but it still boils down to one question. Would you want your brother to marry one?"

Everyone at the bar, including the bartender, shouted "No."

USDA News Agency Threatens Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been concerned about the spread of Federal controls into all areas of our economy. Along with this fear we have also become quite disturbed over the manner in which propaganda is being disseminated to the American people in an effort to control public opinion. Not only have there been many instances of controlled news management, but there have been indications that unless certain news media print biased information which would be favorable to the administration, that information from various agencies might be withheld.

I now note that Mr. Freeman is contemplating a nationwide system of a Federal wire service. I am not sure whether he got his advice from Mr. Khrushchev after his last visit to Russia or not. In any event it would seem the contemplated type of service he is now advocating is one which follows very closely with Soviet news agency TASS, and is nothing but a propaganda machine serving as a mouthpiece of the government. We might well ask ourselves is this the type of news agency he is contemplating setting up?

I should like at this time to direct the attention of the members to a front page editorial which appeared in one of the daily newspapers in my congressional district.

The following story was taken from the Canton Daily Ledger, Canton, Ill., August 26, 1963:

USDA NEWS AGENCY THREATENS FREE PRESS

The Federal Government is now in the wire news service business in competition with privately owned news agencies. The U.S. Agriculture Department on August 1 started its market news service over a nationwide leased-wire teletype network to commercial subscribers.

Realizing the serious potential threat to freedom of the press, the American Newspaper Publisher's Association filed a petition with the FCC asking for suspension of the market news service.

This petition pointed out that the Government can exercise censorship since the USDA can deny the service to a subscriber at any time if it feels such cancellation is desirable. The FCC denied ANPA's petition.

This action opens the way for the major departments of our Government to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. And since this would be done at the expense of the taxpayer, why shouldn't this Federal news service be offered to anyone who is willing to pay a low rate for it and will not abuse its use?

It would not be long before competing news gathering agencies would be forced out of business by low rates of Government competition and the lack of information gathered by the FNS.

Our Government would then have the same type news service as the Soviet News

Agency Tass, which is nothing but a propaganda machine serving as the mouthpiece of the Government. Any newspaper that would argue against the party line could be subject to cancellation of service—which would mean its eventual death.

The subtle overtones of our Government's entry into a wire news service are serious indeed. We believe that unless it is stopped, another of our democratic heritages—the checking power of a free press—is in great danger.

Alice Nibbles Away U.S. Economic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following very clever parody on Lewis Carroll's "Alice in Wonderland" seems to describe our fiscal situation as well as anything I have seen to date.

The article appeared in the Washington Post of August 28, and is written by the eminent financial columnist, J. A. Livingston, as follows:

ALICE NIBBLES AWAY U.S. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

(By J. A. Livingston)

The Mad Hatter offered Alice a wafer the size of a half dollar.

"Nibble it," instructed the Hatter. "Nibble from left to right."

"How can I tell which is the left side of a circle"? asked Alice.

"Stop arguing," said the Hatter. "We're using Dodgson's Discovery. The Red Queen wants to reduce unemployment. So you nibble on the left side. If she wants to increase production, then you nibble on the right side."

The Red Queen said to Alice sternly, "Unemployment is my gravest problem. Do as you're told."

Alice nibbled. Soon lights flashed at the top of the palace tower. "It's working, it's working," announced the Mock Turtle. "There's news."

As he spoke, the March Hare dashed in with the Court Bulletin and handed it to the White Queen, who read aloud: "Her Majesty's Secretary of Labor is pleased to announce that unemployment has declined from 4,500,000 to 2 million."

The Red Queen beamed. "You did it, you did it," she shouted to Alice. "It proves what nibbling at a problem will do. Now let's nibble away at the budget."

Alice nibbled again.

"Faster, faster," directed the Red Queen.

Soon a voice over the Court Radio announced: "Her Majesty's Chancellor of the Exchequer today noted that expenditures in the fiscal year have been lowered 30 percent and that the budget will show a surplus. An error in—."

The Red Queen didn't wait. She turned to Alice with unqueenly impatience and said: "The League of Consumer Voters is petitioning against the high cost of living. Let's reduce prices."

About three-quarters of the wafer remained, as Alice nibbled again. Soon the Commissioner of Labor Statistics announced that the Index of Consumer Prices had been revised down to the level of 1955.

By now, nibbling had become an accepted instrument of Government policy. The Red Queen again turned to Alice:

"And now, my dear," she said, "let us reduce the national debt." One nibble, and the Court Circular brought the cheerful news that the Senate Finance Committee had suspended hearings on raising the debt ceiling because the debt had fallen from $305 billion to $200 billion.

"Continue, continue," the Red Queen directed, "we might as well get rid of the debt altogether. Have you enough nibbling room?"

Alice answered, "Yes, Your Majesty." She held up half a wafer.

Suddenly, the lights flashed, bells pealed, and the March Hare brought in this disturbing communique:

"A meeting of the Finance Committee, on the point of adjournment, was thrown into confusion when the national debt, which had dropped to $200 billion, suddenly rose to $320 billion, an alltime high."

The Red Queen shouted, "Off with her head."

"Who, me?" said Alice.

"Whom, dear," corrected the White Queen. "How often have I told you to say whom when you're the object of a sentence."

"And a very severe sentence it is for an obedient subject to lose her head," protested Alice.

"I'll give you another chance," declared the Red Queen. "Nibble." Soon a courtier handed the Red Queen a message that the drop in the cost of living was the result of miscalculation. And what did the queen intend to do about it?

"I'd better stop," suggested Alice. The wafer was a quarter of its original size.

But when the Treasury sent word that the budget hadn't decreased at all, the Red Queen bellowed: "Stop, stop," but momentum carried Alice's teeth rightward. Unemployment was back to 4,500,000.

The Red Queen burst into tears.

"What could have gone wrong," she asked, "when everything was going so nicely? I was just about to have Alice nibble away at the balance-of-payments deficit. Then all our problems would have been solved."

"I've got it, I've got it," said Alice. "We misused Dodgson's Discovery. While I nibbled on the left side, things got smaller, but when I nibbled on the right side—"

"Who told you to nibble on the right side?" demanded the Red Queen.

"My teeth crossed over, from left to right," said Alice sadly.

The Mock Turtle pushed his head out of his shell and declared pompously, "You're not very bright. Once you had eaten past the middle you were nibbling what was left. And that should have been right."

The Red Queen continued weeping. "Can't we ever solve anything?" she asked the White Queen. "Do all our troubles stay with us?"

"Maybe," suggested Alice helpfully, "I could go to the pharmacy and purchase another wafer."

"Off with her head," shouted the Red Queen. "This time I will not wafer."

Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received from a friend, Attorney D. H. Perkins, of Shreveport, La., a copy of a poem by Josiah Gilbert Holland entitled "Wanted," which I believe these trying days warrant insertion in the RECORD for all Members to read at their leisure:

WANTED

(By Josiah Gilbert Holland)

God give us men. A time like this demands
strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before the demagog
and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
in public duty and in private thinking;
God give us these kinds of men.

Straws in the Wind—From Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Federation of Independent Business sent me a statistical chart, showing results of their semiannual survey of independent businessmen in every State in the Union, with respect to certain legislative proposals.

I would like to share these findings on various issues with Members of the House of Representatives because it shows the attitude in my State of North Dakota among independent businessmen, as compared to national attitudes in the same group.

Nationally, 30,238 responded. Of this, 127 ballots were received from North Dakota—meaning that my State had a percentage of 0.0042 percent of the national vote. Since North Dakota is considered one of the lesser States, populationwise and incomewise as well, I decided it would be good to compare our percentage of votes on the various issues with those responding from larger, more populous, and more prosperous States, such as New York, California, and for purposes of comparison on labor issues, Michigan. Michigan, as we all know, has been known for some time as a State in financial chaos. However, since Gov. George Romney has had his hand at the helm of state, there has been a 73-percent reduction in its whopping deficit. This stood at $85.6 million on June 30, 1962—and has been cut to $23 million as of June 30 this year.

California showed a response of 2,527 votes. New York responded with 2,450, and Michigan with 1,303. While California and New York were the only 2 States who responded over the 2,000 mark, Michigan was joined by Illinois, 1,204; Indiana, 1,231; Ohio, 1,335; Pennsylvania, 1,648; Texas, 1,695; Virginia, 1,072; and the State of Washington, 1,109, as States returning ballots over the 1,000 mark.

Tax cuts were naturally an item of great interest to the businessmen. They

voted separately on individual income taxes and corporation income taxes. The first category gave a choice between having the same percentage of cuts regardless of income—to which the national vote came to 68 percent yes and 32 percent no. North Dakota's percentage showed 70 percent yes and 30 percent no. California showed 77 percent yes, and 23 percent no; New York showed 63 percent yes and 37 percent no; and Michigan answered yes 68 percent and no 32 percent.

The second choice on the first category asked if they preferred bigger cuts in lower income brackets. To this, the national vote responded 74 percent yes and 26 percent no. North Dakota responded 79 percent yes to 21 percent no; California responded with 61 percent yes to 39 percent no; New York, with 82 percent yes to 18 percent no; and Michigan with 73 percent yes to 27 percent no.

On corporation income taxes, businessmen were asked if they preferred the Senate small business committee plan. Briefly, this plan means the proposed reversal of the normal tax and surtax rates would result in a reduction of approximately 27 percent in the tax liabilities of small corporations earning $25,000 or less per year. To this, the national vote responded 85 percent yes and 15 percent no. North Dakota voted 78 percent yes and 22 percent no. California voted 77 percent yes to 23 percent no; New York voted 88 percent yes, and 12 percent no. Michigan voted 87 percent yes and 13 percent no.

On the same category of corporation income taxes, the businessmen were asked if they felt taxes should be reduced regardles of size. Nationally, the average showed 45 percent yes to 54 percent no. North Dakota showed a 45 percent yes vote to a 55 percent no vote. California responded with a 59 percent yes vote and a 41 percent no vote. New York voted 42 percent yes and 58 percent no, while Michigan voted 47 percent yes to 53 percent no.

To the 64 dollar question should Congress cut taxes in 1963? The national vote was 60 percent yes and 40 percent no. This I thought was rather illuminating, and should be viewed in the context of a comparison with some later questions asked on tax reform and Government spending, which appear later in my remarks.

On this important issue North Dakota responded with an exact twin percentage, 60 percent yes to 40 percent no. California voted 74 percent yes to 26 percent no; New York responded with a 73 percent yes vote to a 27 percent no vote; and Michigan, 82 percent yes to 18 percent no.

Unfair price competition was the next large category of questions. The survey chart showed four categories of action needed to curb unfair competition. The first category asked if the businessmen approved of stronger use of present antitrust laws. Nationally, they responded 86 percent yes to 14 percent no. North Dakota's response was 76 percent yes and 24 percent no. California answered with 84 percent yes to 16 percent no; New York, with 86 percent yes to 14 percent no, and Michigan with 83 percent yes to 17 percent no.

The second category asked whether the businessmen felt they needed firm retail price proposals. The nationwide vote was 53 percent yes to 47 percent no. North Dakota answered 65 percent yes to 35 percent no. California answered 57 percent yes to 43 percent no. New York answered 58 percent yes to 42 percent no, and Michigan responded with a 56 percent yes vote to its 44 percent no vote.

The third category question was whether they preferred a firm manufacturer price proposal. Nationally, the businessmen replied 74 percent yes to 26 percent no. North Dakota voted 82 percent yes to 18 percent no. California voted 65 percent yes to 35 percent no; New York with 77 percent yes to 23 percent no; and Michigan, 74 percent yes to 26 percent no.

The fourth category asked if the businessmen favored a proposal to curb "loss-leaders." Nationally, the vote was 84 percent yes to 16 percent no. North Dakota responded 87 percent yes and 13 percent no; California, 76 percent yes to 24 percent no; New York, 85 percent yes to 15 percent no; and Michigan, with 86 percent yes to 14 percent no.

The survey now entered the always vital field of labor legislation, or labor regulation. Here there were two categories offered for vote. The first category asked if the businessmen favored proposals for the 35-hour week, an issue very much on the minds of the labor leaders today. Nationally, the vote showed 3 percent yes and 97 percent no. North Dakota, a right-to-work State, voted 3 percent yes and 97 percent no—identical to the national average. California, which is not a right-to-work State, voted 4 percent yes to 96 percent no; New York, also not a right-to-work State, voted 3 percent no to 97 percent yes, and Michigan, again not a right-to-work State, voted 2 percent yes to 98 percent no.

The second category for labor regulation asked if the businessmen felt antitrust law should be applied to labor unions the same as to business. This issue, much in the minds of business as well as labor these days when we are threatened with a nationwide railroad strike, or a form of compulsory arbitration between railroad unions and railroad management on certain issues—reflected a national response of 99 percent yes to 1 percent no. North Dakota voted 96 percent yes to 4 percent no; California, 98 percent yes to 2 percent no; New York, 99 percent yes to 1 percent no; and Michigan, a trifle more than 99 percent yes and a trifle less than 1 percent no.

The large questions of tax reform and Government spending were linked together in the survey, under a subheading of How To Secure Funds for Tax Cuts, by: Under this was suggested six methods. The first one was by closing so-called tax loopholes. To this the national response was 63 percent yes to 37 percent no. North Dakota voted 69 percent yes to 31 percent no. California responded with a 59-percent yes to a 41-percent no. New York, with 64 percent yes to 36 percent no, and Michigan voted 68 percent yes to 32 percent no.

The second method was by a reduction in Government spending. The nationwide businessmen's response was 97 percent yes to 3 percent no. North Dakota, 96 percent yes to 4 percent no. California voted 97 percent yes to 3 percent no; New York, 93 percent yes to 7 percent no; and Michigan, 96 percent yes to 4 percent no.

The third method suggested a cut in foreign aid. To this, the businessmen nationally voted 94 percent yes to 6 percent no. North Dakota's vote was 94 percent yes to 6 percent no, again a twin to the national vote. California voted 94 percent yes to 6 percent no—triplets. New York voted 88 percent yes to 12 percent no, and Michigan, 93 percent yes to 7 percent no—almost making it a quadruplet vote. This, along with a check of the other States, should be a convincer to the administration—as least as far as independent businessmen are concerned—that foreign aid is a highly unpopular subject.

The fourth method suggested was whether or not Federal payrolls and employment should be cut. To this, the national vote was 92 percent yes to 8 percent no. North Dakota almost twinned with a 93 percent yes to 7 percent no. California responded with a twin to the North Dakota vote, 93 percent yes to 7 percent no. New York voted 89 percent yes to 11 percent no, and Michigan, with 92 percent yes to 8 percent no.

The fifth method was whether funds for the tax cut could be secured by reducing public works. Nationally, the vote was 32 percent yes to 68 percent no. North Dakota voted 27 percent yes to 73 percent no. California, 37 percent yes to 63 percent no. New York responded by 28 percent yes to 72 percent no. Michigan voted 39 percent yes to 61 percent no.

The sixth and last method suggested was to secure funds for a tax cut by a cut in "social welfare" programs. To this, the independent businesmen voted nationally, 78 percent yes to 22 percent no. North Dakota responded with a 73 percent yes to 27 percent no. California, with 83 percent yes to 17 percent no, and New York by 94 percent yes to 6 percent no. Michigan voted 73 percent yes to 27 percent no, thereby joining North Dakota in this vote.

In this semiannual survey, the last category was imports-exports. Under this were two categories asking whether the 1962 trade law had helped your business operations, or harmed your business operations.

Under the "helped" column, the national vote was 9 percent yes and 91 percent no. Under the "harmed" category, the national vote was 36 percent yes to 64 percent no.

North Dakota voted 6 percent yes and 94 percent no as far as "helped" was

concerned, and 40 percent yes and 60 percent no to "harmed."

California voted that the trade law "helped," 12 percent yes and 88 percent no; and that it had "harmed," 30 percent yes and 70 percent no.

New York felt the trade law had "helped" 9 percent yes to 91 percent no; that it had "harmed," 24 percent yes to 76 percent no.

Michigan voted 7 percent yes and 93 percent no, that the trade law had "helped," and then voted 21 percent yes to 79 percent no that it had "harmed."

I considered this to be quite an eye-opener, in that the highly industrialized States, which should be reflected in small business operations, were not too enthused over the benefits of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, so thoroughly endorsed by the Kennedy administration. On the other hand, there were not too many who wanted to declare definitely it had harmed their business. This leads to the somewhat general conclusion that perhaps it has not had any particular impact one way or the other.

The last—but by no means least important issue voted on in the survey asked this question: As an importer or exporter, have you used SBA—Small Business Administration—Commerce, or State Department aids?

Nationally, the vote showed 7 percent yes to 93 percent no; North Dakota voted 18 percent yes to 82 percent no; California voted 14 percent yes to 86 percent no; New York voted 11 percent yes to 89 percent no; and Michigan voted 1 percent yes to 99 percent no.

From all the above, I felt it was small wonder that the independent businessmen seemed to feel it would be helpful if there was a reduction in Government spending, and a cut in Federal payrolls and employment. Apparently the Government aids did not quite live up to their reputation. This, in essence, compares to the well-known situation of the small farmers under Government agriculture controls and supports. After many years of operation, it has become increasingly apparent that the ones who actually benefit from the Federal Government subsides or aids are the large, or commercial farmers, rather than the small farmer, running the so-called "family farms." Yet the whole philosophy behind such Federal aids is supposedly to "help the little man."

That is why it seemed to this this semi-annual nationwide survey of the National Federation of Independent Business—the little man in the business field—can be looked upon as straws in the wind. The fallacy of helping the little man reflects in small business in almost the same ratio as it does in agriculture.

Small business, as well as the small farmer, obviously would appreciate simple fairness, and an opportunity to conduct their business with more freedom and less Government control or interference.

To put it in slang phraseology—"with friends like this—referring to Federal Government activity—who needs enemies?"

AVC Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans Committee in its recent convention adopted a comprehensive platform.

The platform is deserving of attention by all of us and I wish to call particular attention to the National Affairs Statement of Principle and the following sections on Government and liberty, and economic security:

AVC PLATFORM

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Statement of principles

AVC stands for the Bill of Rights as a living force animating the political life of our Nation and as a firm limitation on the arbitrariness of Government.

AVC stands for the Bill of Rights as a guarantee of our freedom to speak, to assemble, to believe, and to dissent without fear from the conformities of the day.

AVC stands for the constitutional guarantees of equality for all regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, and religion.

AVC stands for responsible, efficient and honest government and for the merit system in government employment.

AVC stands for a government possessing and willing to exercise all powers necessary to bring about a solution of our national problems.

AVC stands for the just representation of the people in their legislatures within the framework of our National Constitution.

AVC supports the basic economic policy of the Employment Act of 1946 which holds out the promise of economic security for all.

AVC supports the active intervention of government, primarily of the Federal Government, in the economy and general welfare of our country to stimulate and provide employment, to improve the physical conditions of our cities and towns, of our housing and our schools, to bring all the greatest benefits from the development and conservation of our natural and industrial resources and to provide for the general welfare and health of our people.

AVC supports a tax policy based on ability to pay and opposes regressive sales and excise taxes.

AVC stands for the recognition of equal rights for labor and management and for improved social benefits of employees.

AVC supports an educational system and a public health system which will give the American people, and America's youth in particular, the knowledge, skills, and training, and the physical and mental health and stamina, to continue their forward march toward America's democratic fulfillment.

GOVERNMENT AND LIBERTY

I. The Nation's freedom—The Bill of Rights

1. We affirm the basic right of all Americans to due process of law, the right to counsel and to freedom from unlawful search and seizure. We oppose all efforts to suppress freedom to believe, speak, write, assemble, criticize, and dissent.

2. A. We urge the passage and enforcement of Federal legislation and regulations which will insure to the citizens of the United States and of the several States the full measure of their privileges and immunities of due process of law and the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to them by the Constitution, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, or sex.

B. In furtherance of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court calling upon the States to integrate their school systems "with all deliberate speed," we urge the passage of Federal legislation which will:

(1) Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to give technical assistance to communities engaged in integration—as well as draw up plans for any community which has failed to initiate such integration plans of its own.

(2) Give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the further duty of seeking assistance from the Attorney General to enforce the above through all legal means at hand.

(3) Provide Federal funds to help support school systems deprived of State financing because of State or local laws designed to hinder or evade integration.

(4) Empower the Attorney General to seek injunctions or proceed under law on behalf of persons claiming deprivation of civil rights or liberties.

C. We urge the enactment of Federal, State, and local legislation to prevent discrimination, whether through segregation or otherwise, because of race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, or old age and also the denial of equal opportunity in:

(1) Voting: (a) By abolition of poll tax and any other undue restriction of voting rights; (b) by legislation which makes it mandatory for all State voting registrars to maintain their records; (c) by legislation empowering the Justice Department to obtain such records under orders from any Federal district court.

(2) Housing: By legislation aimed at cutting off Government aid at all levels to builders practicing racial or religious discrimination.

(3) Employment: By creation of a Federal commission on equal job opportunity under Government contracts; and other legislation at all levels aimed against segregation in employment.

D. We urge inclusion in all Federal legislation making loans or grants to States, municipalities, or private institutions, of a provision requiring these loans or grants to be used without discrimination on the basis of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, or sex (recognizing, however, the right of any institution to limit its religious service to the members of a particular religious denomination or to limit its services to the members of one sex).

E. We urge protection by Federal law of all members of the Armed Forces from physical violence because of race, color, ancestry, national origin, or religion.

F. We urge making lynching a Federal crime, as well as making provisions for compensation to the families of lynching victims.

G. We favor Federal legislation making it a crime to bomb or to conspire to bomb school, church, and other public and quasi-public property.

H. We believe in the principle of the separation of church and state. We, therefore, oppose the use of pulbic funds, whether State, local, or Federal, in support of church administered or controlled elementary and secondary schools, regardless of whether such funds are to be made available as grants or loans. We also oppose religious instruction in the public schools as well as the display of religious symbols in public schools and on other public property.

I. We favor freedom from censorship of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, motion pictures, and other media by the Post Office, Customs Bureau, police departments and other units of government as well as by private pressure groups.

J. We oppose wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping whether by private individuals or government officials, elected or appointed.

3. A. The right against self-incrimination. A personal right to refuse to testify on any matter which he fears may tend to incriminate him is a fundamental constitutional right which should not be diluted or impaired. No inference of guilt in any legal proceeding should be drawn in regards to any person solely because such person exercises this rgiht.

B. The right to travel. The right of an American citizen to travel abroad should not be arbitrarily abridged by the Federal Government. A citizen should be free to leave this country without an exit permit which the passport has in recent years in large part become.

C. Immigration and naturalization. We urge revision of the immigration and nationalization laws to eliminate racial and religious discrimination, to eliminate the outdated national origins quota system and to do away with distinction in the treatment of native born and naturalized citizens.

We urge that all hearings on immigration and naturalization matters be subject to the safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act.

We urge revision of our nationality laws to remove from them the provision on loss of citizenship except for loss of citizenship through voluntary expatriation.

We urge a revision of the statutes and practices governing deportation.

(a) To provide a reasonable statute of limitations precluding deportation of any person on the basis of any act or event which occurred prior to the limitation period.

(b) To preclude deportation of those charged with activities which were legal when undertaken.

(c) To preclude deportation of those who arrived in the United States as children and who have spent the major portion of their lives in the United States.

II. The Nation's Government

1. Freedom of information: The right of the people to full knowledge of governmental affairs must not be abridged, except where disclosure would imperil the national security or where disclosure would, without substantial public benefit, encroach on the right of the individual to personal liberty or freedom.

2. Congress: We urge proper changes in the rules of the Congress of the United States which will make it possible for the majority of the Members to vote cloture or close debate on legislation after a reasonable period, and which will make merit, not tenure alone the standard to be used in the selection of committee chairmen.

3. State and Federal relations: Federal payments to the States for aid to schools in federally impacted areas, for assistance to the blind, disabled, dependent children, and the aged, for slum clearance, waste treatment facilities, vocational education, and hospital construction must be continued. We favor Federal supervision which assures minimum standards in the performance of these cooperative programs.

4. State and local government: We urge reapportionment within the States to provide for equitable representation based on current population distribution.

5. The Federal civil service:

A. Apart from discharges based on reorganization of Government activities or reduction in force, Government employees should be discharged only for cause and through due process of law. The employee should be presented with a written statement of charges, have the right to a hearing before an impartial board. He shall have the right to present evidence, be confronted with adverse witnesses, cross examine witnesses, and receive a transcript of the hearing free of charge. Action toward his separation from the Government service should be taken only on the basis thus made.

B. The rights granted to veterans in the Veterans Preference Act in regard to discharge procedures and appeals should be extended to all Government employees except those in probationary status.

6. District of Columbia: We urge that the District of Columbia receive:

A. The right to full local self-government.

B. The right to representation in the electoral college in proportion to its population.

C. The right to elect Senators and Representatives in Congress in the same manner as the States.

D. A fixed annual contribution in lieu of real and personal property taxes on federally owned property within the District of Columbia.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

III. Basic economic policy

1. We continue to support the Employment Act of 1946 which states it is the policy of the Government to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

2. To insure the interest of the consumer, we urge Congress to establish a Department of the Consumer, to be headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

5. We know from our national experience that maximum prosperity, without inflation, can only be attained and maintained so long as the national economy continues to expand its consumption and investment with increased leisure at a rate equal to our population growth, plus rising productivity per man-hour. National policies and programs to insure this rate of national economic growth should be established.

IV. Monetary and tax policy

1. Monetary policy:

A. We urge the increase of and additional appropriations for much needed social, welfare, and economic measures as sound investments in the well-being of our Nation.

B. We urge easier credit for small business, homebuilding, and the family farm.

C. We urge the establishment of a Federal capital budget for reimbursable public works projects with a life in excess of 5 years, in order to rationalize public works appropriations and to improve the accounting and budgetary operations of the Government.

2. Tax policy:

Increased economic activity together with stricter enforcement of our tax laws should produce much of the income needed to finance the Government programs which we support.

We urge the elimination of special provisions in the internal revenue laws which are discriminatory in nature. As blatant examples, we point to the favored tax treatment of the extractive industries, the restricted stock options for corporate executives, the retirement income credit, the preferred tax treatment of profits on stock market transactions, and the dividend exclusion and credit provisions.

We also call for an end to the abuse or the deductibility of business expenses to finance luxurious travel, vacations, and entertainment for business management, professional men, and sales executives.

V. Housing and urban affairs

AVC is vitally aware of how closely the country's economy and well-being are dependent upon the building and housing industries and of the continued need for additional housing at reasonable rents. With this in mind we offer the following housing program:

1. That the FHA and VA insure mortgages for a term up to 40 years with low down payments and that the Federal Government make said mortgages attractive investments to lending institutions.

2. An enlarged and vigorous middle income housing program, both publicly owned and Government stimulated, as well as privately sponsored, as the best method of meeting the needs of an ever-growing middle class.

3. That the Government (municipal, State, Federal) pursue a vigorous program of urban renewal planning and make provisions for the smaller builder-owner and individual owner to participate actively.

4. Eliminate all racial discrimination in the building, sale, and rental of all housng units.

5. Continued and expanded publicly owned housing for low income groups, together with a Government stimulated, privately sponsored program to provide housing for said groups with a view toward giving grants-in-aid, mortgage guarantee, site clearance, and relocation aid, and real estate tax abatement.

6. That the Government (Federal, State, and municipal) make allowance in the form of additional mortgage guarantees and real estate tax abatement to builders and owners who make special provisions for the disabled and the aged.

We urge the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs with jurisdiction over housing, urban renewal, mass transit, city planning and other problems of urban and metropolitan areas.

Address of Roger C. Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, one of our greatest newspaper editors and publishers, Mr. Roger C. Peace, of Greenville, S.C., recently made a fine speech outlining the great value of newspapers in our rapidly changing world. I believe his remarks before the Newspaper Advertising Executive Association in Asheville, N.C., will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

ADDRESS OF ROGER C. PEACE, PUBLISHER OF THE GREENVILLE (S.C.) NEWS AND PIEDMONT, BEFORE THE NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION IN ASHEVILLE, N.C., JULY 8, 1963

All of us in the Carolinas are delighted and flattered that you have chosen Asheville as the place to hold your annual summer convention.

We think this is a great part of the country. You see it at its best in the summertime, but it is good all the year round.

The Carolina mountain country not only has special scenery, but it has special people. Most of them lived here a long time, as have their parents and grandparents before them. They are conservative and hard-working and learned a long time ago to depend on themselves and not on some New Frontier.

In fact, you might call us the Old Frontier, for we—and I count myself one of them—believe we can paddle our own canoe a whole lot better—and, of course, a whole lot cheaper—than a bunch of bureaucrats in Washington can paddle it for us.

As one who has spent—and is still spending—a rather full life in the great and interesting world of news, editorials, and advertising, I appreciate your invitation to appear before you today.

I shall not bore you, I hope, with the breaking out too much of the disease of reminiscence.

Perhaps, though, you may be interested in how a young editor switched from the glamour of news and editorials to business and advertising, which he then regarded as dull and uninspiring.

It was an advertising manager who did the selling. He came to me with the suggestion that I desert the sanctum sanctorum and come downstairs to be business manager, and, as such, his boss.

He was much my elder.

I thought he was kidding but he was not.

"I love the editorial side of the newspaper and want to work at it the rest of my life," I told him.

"Yes," he said, "but you have a wife and children. I have looked up your salary and you are making $25 a week. Don't you need more money? Wouldn't you make the move if your salary were increased to $50 a week?"

My reply was short. "I'll move down tomorrow," I said.

And so began my experience with the business side of the newspaper, which I have never regretted. At the same time, for more years than I care to enumerate, I have kept one foot in the news and one in the business department, relating one to the other, and tried to help produce good newspapers that were both readable and salable.

One observation that lingers with me is that the national advertising dollar, like the gamblers' dollar, has no home. I emphasize the national, not the local, advertising dollar.

Like the man on the flying trapeze, "it floats through the air with the greatest of ease." It is here this minute, gone the next.

In North Carolina a half century ago there were Bull Durham signs on thousands of barns, and they spread to barns all over the country. Traveling in buggies and wagons, you had plenty of time to read the signs and fill up your corncob pipe.

Came the automobile and paved highways and you sped along wondering what the next Burma Shave ditty would be like.

America on wheels was truly a reality long before General Motors epitomized it at the World's Fair in New York.

But America—the always changing America—was being affected by other inventions than the automobile. And of course it was inevitable that the march of progress would have something to do with the flight schedule of the advertising dollar.

Only incidental in the life of the flying trapeze were the Zeppelins of a Carolinian, Douglas Leigh, who took to the air with illuminated balloons over some of our major cities. The big bags didn't last long and Douglas Leigh came back to his Broadway spectaculars, where he still puffs tobacco smoke from Camels to the enjoyment of the passing throng.

What was important then and important now was the development of little boxes that could pick up radio waves from the air and transport news and entertainment right into the living room or bedroom of everyone in the United States for just a few dollars.

Radio—that was it.

For the first time in its life, print media—as we have sophistically come to call it—had a competitor that could communicate. Communicate—in a different way—you had to be there to get it or it was gone—but if you were there it came to you quicker than the newspapers could deliver. Out went the election crowds in front of newspapers throughout the land; out went the world series matinees; out went the extras.

But even those who heard the news about Pearl Harbor first over radio could hardly wait to read the next issues of newspapers to get all the facts and those facts in perspective.

And so it has gone, continues to go, and will go on forever apparently, changes and improvements in communications that affect every segment of the industry.

The full impact of evolution did not come, of course, until television fell upon the American scene just a few years ago. It was a new star that changed the habits of people, the ways of doing business for millions, the structure of many industries and—even—the way of electing Presidents. I wonder, still, how Abe Lincoln would have done if TV had been in existence when he ran for President?

With TV came, too, the greatest upheaval in the advertising world since Edison invented the incandescent light and made way for electric signs and later the neon lights.

Television has its critics, of which I am not one, for I get a good part of my living from it, as well as radio.

I am for advertising, first, last and always, for no matter where the client spends his money, we all have a chance at it.

I had rather see Procter & Gamble spend over $100 million in TV and relatively little in newspapers and magazines, than see Hershey's chocolates spend almost nothing at all in anything.

The irony, if not the tyranny, of these extremes is that both do well. One is on the advertising "flying trapeze" in a big way, while the other just makes good chocolate bars at a cheap price and watches the dollars roll in.

What is apparent to all of us in the advertising business is that there are all kinds of ways to advertise and no conclusive evidence that any one kind is the best for all. Otherwise you would not have the terrific turnover in advertising clients in the agencies from year to year, nor from medium to medium.

I liked the statement of John Wannamaker, one of the original believers in advertising, who said: "Half of my investment in advertising is wasted. The trouble is I don't know which half."

And to that I add, who does?

Certainly, the retailers of the United States who ought to know what they are doing, believe newspaper advertising brings them better results than any other medium.

They live off the home dollars, just as newspapers have learned to live mainly off the home dollars.

I think we newspaper people and a lot of other people, too, should take a look now and then at the structure of the newspapers of our country.

Ours is a great big, broad Nation of immense acreage and all kinds of people, diverse in habits and tastes, yet bound by common instincts and impulses that somehow fit into a national pattern.

That is the basic reason, of course, why we have over 1,800 daily newspapers and 9,000 weeklies.

In this day of rapid transportation, we might get along with 200 or 300 dailies, or less, were it not for the fact that people like to read the news about themselves and their neighbors, as well as the news of the world.

Lord Northcliffe is reported to have said that the people of London were more interested in the news of a runaway horse in London that injured a pedestrian than in a monsoon in China that killed millions.

General Taylor, of the Boston Globe, made an effort to get the names of his thousands of readers in his news columns at least once in a year, in a favorable way if possible.

We have repeated the good slogan, all advertising is local, so long, that it has become trite to us and boresome to our competitors.

But the fact remains, the only time you get something said about your birth, your marriage, and your death is in the local newspaper. Unless you are a celebrity, a crook, or an accident victim, the magazines, radio, and TV stations just can't record your vital statistics.

Even Chet Huntley said as recently as a few weeks ago that TV simply can't do the thorough and detailed job that newspapers do.

All of us knew that, but it was good to have praise from Sir Hubert, which was, to complete the quotation, "praise indeed."

I don't go so far as Charlie Lipscomb and the Bureau of Advertising that "next to food, a newspaper is the most sought after object in the world." I can't help but think that the population explosion we read so much about should be taken into that consideration.

However, it is impressive that over 86 percent of our people read at least one newspaper every day. They must like us pretty well, or they would not spend millions to buy us.

One thing that impresses me as a publisher and at heart an editor—is that there are just as many different ways to publish newspapers as there are newspapers. There is no one success formula.

Except for the wire services, pictures and features, there is a wonderful lack of similarity between the New York Times and the New York Daily News, between the Chicago Tribune and the Kansas City Star, between the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Boston Herald-Traveler, between the Wall Street Journal and the Daily Worker.

The Balitmore Sun papers print their local news on the back pages and carry the runovers forward in the paper. So what? If you are a patient at Johns Hopkins and read those papers for the first time, you think their editors should be sent over to the psychiatric unit at Phipps. But you reflect it must be true that the people of Baltimore like it that way. And the publishers give them what they want, or at least what they have been used to a long time and wouldn't like a change.

Down here in the Carolinas we publish four newspapers and we think they are as individual as four children are likely to be. We want them that way. We could easily make them look alike and behave alike, but we want our newspapers to do "what comes nachully" to each of them.

We and all of us are able to do this because the long arm of the Supreme Court has not yet emasculated the first amendment and made us subject to whims of a czar or czars to tell us whether or not we are publishing the kind of newspapers he or they think are "in the public interest."

I can't help but wonder our plight if we had a young lawyer czar, without a day's experience in the newspaper business, who would say that we too are a "vast wasteland."

Let's be optimistic and say he would call us a "vast wonderland" where we do a vast amount of good for our readers, where we render unparalleled public service—often at great cost and without monetary gain—and where we are unafraid to attack whatever we regard as hostile to the welfare of our people, even to cussing the Supreme Court.

In all this operation of the vast wonderland of newspaper publishing—which I like to call it—no group is more important than you men and women who "sell the precious commodity." Without the advertising dollar the American press would be either venal and corrupt or weak and ineffectual.

Only solvent newspapers can be good and strong newspapers.

You are always alert to the "flying trapeze" and I predict with all the sincerity of my soul that the national advertising dollar will come back to you and us with just a few more movements of the bar.

There has been and will be, I believe, a close bond of affinity between the American people and the American newspapers. The half that is wasted on advertising, as John Wannamaker said, will not in the long run prove to be that which is invested in newspaper advertising.

"Send me the man who reads" is the fine slogan of the International Paper Co.

The man who reads—reads the daily newspapers now and will continue to do so in increasing numbers.

Emphasis throughout the country is on education—and education means reading.

There will be more and more newspaper readers and more and more newspaper advertising.

National advertisers will come back to us in increasing volume and I predict that within 5 years we will again be the top medium with them.

As the old saying goes, "you can't keep a good man—nor a good thing—down."

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring the first week in March of each year to be Save Your Vision Week. In so doing, I am cognizant of the fact that various and sundry organizations have, for promotional purposes, designated days, weeks, months, and years as reminders of various good causes.

The idea of Save Your Vision Week goes back as far as 1927. Since then the Governors of practically every one of the 50 States have on one or more occasions issued such a proclamation, and the mayors of our larger municipalities as well as some of the smaller ones have done likewise. However, we are prone to take some of the best things in life for granted, and therefore, to neglect them. God's gift of eyesight is one of these.

We are concerned with juvenile delinquency and school dropouts, and well we should be. Where surveys have been made, the results have uniformly shown that the dropout or the delinquent had an uncorrected visual problem. How much this contributed to the final result it is difficult to say, but certainly it is a factor which can and should be corrected, and the importance of which should be brought home to the American people.

We are all appalled by the colossal amounts of damage suffered in highway accidents and the loss of life. Again, there are no accurate statistics to show what part faulty vision played in the tragic result. We do know that from 80 to 90 percent of the decisions made by the driver of an automobile or truck are dependent upon vision. The optometric profession has carried on exhaustive studies on the subject of visual problems in highway safety. Save Your Vision Week will call attention to this important factor in the operation of motor vehicles.

During the past few years we have been fascinated with the idea of the exploration of space and the realms beyond. Aeronautics and space exploration present their peculiar vision problems.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is in the interest of our national welfare that a Presidential proclamation should be issued each year calling upon the American people in the interest of their own well-being, our national economy and defense, to not only save their vision but to make certain that it is functioning at the highest possible level.

Independence of Malaya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 21 the Federation of Malaya celebrates the sixth anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Majesty Yang di-Pertuan Agong, Tuanku Syed Putra ibni Al-Marhum Syed Hassan Jamalullail; and His Excellency the Malayan Ambassador to the United States, Dato Ong Yoke Lin.

For most nations of the world, the Second World War ended with the ceremony of surrender enacted on board the battleship *Missouri* in 1945. Some, however, were faced with continued fighting, an internal conflict of communism against democracy. For the people of Malaya, the war was not to end until July 1960.

For 15 years the Government in Malaya battled the Communist guerrilla forces, some 11,000 well-trained and heavily armed terrorists, who wreaked havoc and destruction in the name of freedom. A British colony until 1957, the independent Malayan regime continued British practices in their struggle for democracy and existence, using effective propaganda methods and crack jungle-trained military units. The Prime Minister, the father of Malayan independence, the Tunku Abdul Rahman has declared:

> We believe that we cannot coexist with the Communists. We are non-Communist and will remain so.

To this day his policies and actions have fulfilled this statement.

The Federation of Malaya, constituting 11 states, 9 of which are constitutionally governed by hereditary sultans and 2 by appointed governors, gained its independence from British sovereignty on August 31, 1957. The transition was cordial and without incident, showing the willingness and good intentions of both the colonial power and the independence forces to carry out the spirit of the United Nations.

Although the Communist war was in progress, from the very first, the new Malayan Government gained world recognition and admiration by its stability, harmony, and progressive outlook. Because of these attributes, Malaya today has the highest per capita income and the most vigorous and prosperous economy in southeast Asia. The nation produces 40 percent of the world's natural rubber supply. Furthermore, the nation is the world's first producer of tin. Since 1957, the total industrial production has doubled, the annual agricultural crop has tripled, and the output of iron ore has doubled. To attract additional investment capital, the Government, instead of nationalizing foreign companies, has enticed foreign concerns by passing legislation which grants tax concessions to new industries. The results of these astute policies is an enviable economic record.

The attentions of the Malayan Government are focused today upon a new political scheme which would federate the British colonies of Singapore, North Borneo, and Sarawak with Malaya under one federal government. Scheduled to come into being later this year, the states concerned are waiting word from a United Nations factfinding commission. It is the concern of this United Nations group to determine whether or not the people of Borneo want to federate into the new Malaysian Federation. Politically, economically, and ethnically speaking, all states would benefit from this undertaking. The danger of communism, specially in the colony of Singapore, demands that such action be taken.

To overcome suspicion and possible hostility from neighboring countries, Malaya has actively participated in regional agreements. The recent Maphilindo pact, concluded among the Philippines, Malaya, and Indonesia, is an attempt at regional security. The Association of southeast Asia—Thailand, the Philippines, and Malaya—is actively engaged in cultural and economic cooperation. It is the hope of this association to be the forerunner of an Asian common market.

Relations with the United States have been friendly and cooperative. During their fight against communism, our Government sent 10,000 carbines and 10 helicopters to the Federal forces. Our economic assistance has produced roads, bridges, and a dam. At the present time a $10 million loan is helping to develop the facilities of Port Swettenham, in order to handle the increased trading activities of the country.

As the Malayan people celebrate their 6th anniversary of independence on August 31, we in the United States must honor these people, too. Their courage, progressiveness, and stanch stand against communism demand our admiration and assure continued close and amicable relations between our Government and the Government of the Federation of Malaya.

Another Effort To Disarm Honest Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express raised some important points

relative to the enactment of restrictive firearms legislation which I feel should be brought to the attention of the House.

Hunters and sportsmen skilled in the use of powerful weapons should not be deprived of healthy outdoor exercise and recreation by legislation intended only to make firearms less accessible to amateurs and to criminals. Any legislation drafted in this field should preserve the rights of responsible citizens; they should not be made to suffer for the carelessness and crimes of others.

The August 28 editorial follows:

ANOTHER EFFORT TO DISARM HONEST CITIZENS

Article II of the Bill of Rights, as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution are known, reads as follows: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

"Infringe," according to the dictionary, means among other things "to impair; weaken." So a move has been started in the District of Columbia to impair and weaken the right of citizens in the Nation's Capital to keep and bear arms. It has taken the form of a House bill aimed at making it virtually impossible for honest citizens to own handguns while having no effect upon the criminal population. The section of the bill dealing with machine guns would even rule out many semiautomatic rifles, even including the Garand M-1 rifle, the M-1 carbine and the M-14 rifle, all of which are otherwise authorized for civilian use in the development of marksmanship.

An article in the September issue of Field & Stream calls notice to the fact that knowledge that an intended victim does not legally possess a handgun only serves to encourage a criminal. And the article records Washington's Police Chief Robert V. Murray in opposition to the proposed bill. Said Chief Murray:

"Legislation imposing further restrictions on the ownership and possession of handguns is not the answer to our law-enforcement problem. Attention should be focused on the criminal, not the gun."

And Field & Stream contends that disarming the people of Washington would be a giant step toward a national firearms act serving only to make victims of people who want to protect themselves.

We hope there are enough Members of Congress who know the score on restrictive firearms legislation to knock down such a proposal whenever it makes an appearance.

Only $6.2 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lloyd Morey, former president of the University of Illinois and a former auditor for the State of Illinois, has asked some pertinent questions. Mr. Morey's questions are comparable to those many of us have been asking on the House floor.

We have been told our gross national production and income are at an alltime high. If our Federal budget cannot be balanced in such a period of prosperity then I ask in all candor when can it ever be balanced.

Within a short time we shall be asked to take action on a tax bill which, from all indications, would substantially reduce the Federal income. I merely call these facts to your attention and ask once again should not the present administration make every effort to reduce expenditures before we further increase our Federal deficit.

At this time I wish to place in the RECORD some comments which were made by Mr. Morey concerning our fiscal policy:

ONLY 6.2 BILLION

(By Lloyd Morey)

URBANA, August 23.—The President has just announced that the deficit, or excess of Federal expenditures over revenues for the fiscal year ended June 30, will be only $6.2 billion instead of the $6.8 billion predicted last January. When the budget for that year was presented in January 1962, it indicated a surplus of half a billion dollars. So the result is off by $6.7 billion from the original budget, and not merely $6.2 billion.

The important point is that it is still a big deficit of 6 percent over total revenues, excluding trust funds, a deficit nearly twice as large as the biennial budget of the State of Illinois, a deficit added to an accumulated debt from previous deficits of over $300 billion, 1 more year added to 26 previous years of deficits since 1930. This is certainly not a picture of which anyone can be proud.

All this is in the face of peak gross national production and income, and the highest personal income, consumer spending, savings, and tax revenue in history. If a budget cannot be balanced in such a period, when can it ever be balanced? And in the face of this situation there is still talk of reducing taxes.

It is obvious that if left to the administration and Congress, there will be no improvement in the foreseeable future. Only the voters can bring about a change and restore fiscal sanity and responsibility to Federal management. They can do so only if they speak up, by writing to the President and their representatives in Congress. Such letters have an effect.

The voice of the taxpayer is rarely heard in the committee rooms of Congress. The voices heard are mainly those of representatives of groups who want more money spent for some particular purpose in which they are interested. They are not concerned as to how or by whom or when the bill will be paid. Only the individual taxpayer has that concern, and his route for expressing it is by direct communication to members and administrators.

Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the San Diego (Calif.) Union on August 20, 1963.

This editorial points up the terrific power grab of the present administration. The American Bar Association at its recent convention in Chicago issued a stinging rebuke against the present administration for extending its jurisdiction beyond the power granted, either by Congress or the Constitution.

My colleague the gentleman from California, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, has been urging that a congressional committee be constituted to examine the constitutionality of the President's Executive orders. It is his belief that these orders constitute Executive legislation, not delegated to the Executive. The boards, bureaus, and the commissions in the executive department rule, and regulate the lives of the individual, and there is apparently no recourse until Congress recaptures its legislative rights.

There are five times more administrative laws than there are congressional laws. This was never contemplated by the Founding Fathers, who placed all legislative power in the Congress, and limited the jurisdiction of the courts as well as the executive department.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT—POWER GRAB HURTS ECONOMY

The expansion not only of Presidential but of Federal administrative and bureaucratic powers is proceeding at an alarming pace.

The president of the American Bar Association last week warned Congress that this grab for power was slowing down the Nation's economy.

"There is every indication that the Federal administrative agencies are again reaching out for power, extending their jurisdiction beyond the intended delegation granted by Congress," Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., told the bar's convention in Chicago.

It is an insidious extension, as it moves in so many directions and in so many ways, that, as Smith pointed out, few in Congress are aware of what is happening. Only the people who are affected are feeling the slow strangling of initiative and energy imposed by more and more control.

Congressional delegation of authority empowers Government agencies to write rules and issue orders tantamount to law. As they carry the full weight of Federal power, there are few who dare to oppose them. For the individual it would be like a woodpecker attacking a giant redwood tree.

The expansion of Presidential power by which Executive orders also have the form and effect of law has led Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, to suggest that a congressional watchdog committee be set up to determine the constitutionality of Presidential Executive orders.

Representative LIPSCOMB has raised the question of whether Presidential Executive orders, such as the one establishing the Peace Corps, actually constitute lawmaking outside the legislative process as defined in the Constitution.

In other words, is Congress surrendering lawmaking to executive agencies?

There can be no doubt but that tendencies have been in that direction, and now with a President and administration firmly committed to increasing the authority of the White House, and to the downgrading of the legislative processes, the Nation is beginning to feel the cold breath of sheer power.

As Mr. Smith warned, these tendencies "can be carried so far that the Federal agencies may in the future control every phase of an individual's activities."

Congress in the past has been able to overthrow both Executive orders and Supreme Court decisions by recourse to legislation. Representatives LIPSCOMB says that

what is needed now are guidelines on executive authority by which bureaucratic power can be measured, so Congress can act if the President and Government agencies step over the line.

If things continue the way they are going, nobody will ever be able to find the line—and the Constitution will be abrogated without a vote.

Library Services and Construction Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at the present time we are witnessing the extensive use of existing public library facilities both as research centers and to supplement overburdened school libraries. The increase in school enrollment in this decade and the demands of our complex society will place our libraries under heavy strains in the future.

In Baltimore alone, for example, school enrollments will double during the next 8 years. If these students are to be given the opportunity to fully develop themselves present adequate library facilities must be both replaced and expanded. In a recent letter, Mr. Edwin Castagna, director of the famous Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, strongly urged enactment of Library Services and Construction Act to deal with this problem.

I am pleased to insert his letter in the RECORD:

ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY,
Baltimore, Md., August 15, 1963.

Hon. CARLTON R. SICKLES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SICKLES: I wish to urge you to support the Library Services and Construction Act (H.R. 4879) which is now before the House Committee on Rules.

This expansion of the Library Services Act (Public Law 84-597) will be of solid benefit to Maryland and the city of Baltimore. In our State many city and county libraries, hampered by inadequate or antiquated facilities, are struggling to meet the increasing demand by their citizens for service. Students in overwhelming numbers and at all levels are using the public libraries to further their education. (The enclosed Deiches study amply documents this.) Many workers, hoping to better their chances of employment in our highly technical society, expect libraries to provide some of the materials needed to retrain themselves. The steadily rising educational and reading level of our country means that more people will be using libraries for information and recreation in their ever-increasing leisure time. Also, a free people must be a well-informed people and good libraries and a free press are bulwarks of our open society.

Additional Federal funds, wisely spent on constructing new libraries and improving old, and on extending services, will enable Maryland to give its citizens the library service they need and deserve.

When this bill comes before the House, I know you will have given it your serious consideration and I hope it will receive your vote.

Sincerely,

EDWIN CASTAGNA,
Director.

Independence of Trinidad and Tobago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, the nation of Trinidad and Tobago celebrates the first anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Governor General, Sir Solomon Hochoy; and His Excellency the Ambassador of Trinidad and Tobago to the United States, Elias E. I. Clarke.

Trinidad and Tobago is one of the world's new nations and is a fairly close neighbor of the United States. I would like to take this opportunity to extend to the people of Trinidad and Tobago the warm good wishes of the American people on this day of joy, their Independence Day.

Trinidad and Tobago are the most southerly of the islands of the West Indies, lying just off the coast of South America. Trinidad, discovered by Columbus on his third voyage in 1498, came under British control in 1802, with the signing of the Treaty of Amiens. Tobago, originally discovered in 1596 by the English Captain Keymis, came under British Crown control in 1814. Earlier dominated by sugar, coffee, and cocoa, the island's economy benefited from the development of petroleum resources, which today account for four-fifths of the nation's exports.

Ruled separately as Crown Colonies until 1888, Trinidad and Tobago amalgamated in that year, and have grown closely together since then, sharing common administration and budget control. Crown colony government lasted until 1924, when under the urging of the outstanding political leader of Trinidad, Capt. Arthur Andrew Cipriani, the constitution was amended to provide for a legislative council.

Full adult suffrage was introduced in 1945, and led to a series of elections and proposals resulting in a new constitution in 1950, which increased the number of elected representatives in the legislative council, and created an executive council designed to ready the island's political leaders for full self-government. This constitution remained in force until 1956, when a further change provided for a Chief Minister and an elected Finance Minister, and by 1958 this had become a full cabinet government, under the premiership of Dr. Eric Williams, who had been earlier elected the islands' first Chief Minister in 1956. Dr. Williams brought his government to full internal self-government in 1961, and negotiated the achievement of full independence for Trinidad and Tobago as of August 31, 1962.

We here in Washington are especially proud of Eric Williams, the Premier of Trinidad and Tobago, since before entering politics he graduated from Oxford University and held a teaching post here at Howard University. Dr. Williams' People's National Movement Party won 13 of the 24 elected seats in the 1956 elections, and increased its majority to 20 of the 30 elected seats in the 1961 elections. The remainder of the seats in the 1961 election went to the Democratic Labor Party. Out of an electorate of 365,000, 88 percent voted in the elections, a good indicator that the citizens of Trinidad and Tobago value their votes highly, and can be expected to maintain continuing civic interest and responsible participation in their Government.

Thus, on this first anniversary of their day of independence, the future prospects are bright for the people of the island nation. The American people will continue to support and encourage the development of our newest neighbor, Trinidad and Tobago.

What Is Wrong With Investing American Money To Make This Country a Better Place To Live?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CHARLO, MONT., *August 15, 1963.*

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS, LIFE,
Rockefeller Center,
New York, N.Y.

SIRS: Not a single taxpayer objected, I am sure, when his money was used to fly an army field hospital to Skopje to relieve suffering. But when the Army Engineers propose to build flood control dams to prevent suffering, loss of life, and property, you call the projects pork barrel.

My comments, on the article in your issue of August 16, about taxpayers' money being thrown away, are confined to multipurpose dams.

In 1948 the entire town of Vanport, Oreg., was destroyed. Thirty-one people were drowned in that one city, in that one flood. The corps says levees will solve only part of the problem; there must also be upstream storage dams to control spring runoff from snowmelt in the Rockies, and they have proposed storage dams rationally distributed among the tributaries which cause the floods. But from 1952 to 1962, when Bruces Eddy was finally authorized to provide 1.4 million acre-feet of active storage, they were unable to get a single flood control project authorized on the Columbia, even though the projects are self-liquidating, paying back the cost, with interest.

Why the delay, when it is known that flood damage will increase as the river's flood plain is more extensively occupied and that, though no one can predict where or when the next flood will occur, it will come? Becaus in 1903 President Theodore Roosevelt said:

"It seems clear that justice to the taxpayers of the country demands that when the Government is or may be called upon to improve a stream the improvement should be made to pay for itself, so far as practicable."

Ever since then, when practicable, the corps and the Bureau of Reclamation have

included power generation facilities in flood control dams, so that "so far as practicable" the users of electricity who reap the immediate benefits, pay for the dams, not the taxpayers of the whole country.

All public power is anathema to private power companies. Their monumental campaign to eliminate public power is best known through the Investor-Owned Electric Light & Power Co.'s advertising programs which has gone to such lengths that even President Kennedy was constrained to characterize some of its ads as "particularly ugly." Less well-known, and for good reason, are other ways of molding opinion. Senator GRUENING in a privately published book, "The Public Pays," which disappears from library shelves, details ways in which the utilities used schools, colleges, newspapers, magazines, textbooks, even womens' clubs, to put over their propaganda that public ownership of electric facilities is bad and leads to socialism and eventually communism. What they fear is not socialism but competition. Has anyone ever seen expensive advertising aimed at public ownership of water or sewer systems? Even so careful and scholarly an institution as the Smithsonian published a book which it later withdrew when it discovered the author had been paid by a utility to write it. All this is carefully documented from the records of a 3-year investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

That such undercover molding of public opinion is still going on is shown by the Washington Post of March 5, 1961, which quoted a General Electric task force report on public relations:

"Business might subsidize a brain trust of competent writers (novelists, playwrights, etc.) to begin an active campaign of turning public attention away from the left through the source of popular-attitude formation (television, movies, stage, radio, novels, magazine articles, etc.)."

That your article betrays an anti-Federal bias in evident from the fact that you mention the benefits which stem from a State-built dam, Toledo Bend, "the communities along both sides of the river learned that the most enticing lure they could offer (to new industry) was plenty of water and power."

Yet in describing the Federal projects you did not mention that the same benefits would accrue. You harped only on costs.

If your polemic against Federal development of the Nation's natural resources had been broadcast over the air, people with opposing views could have demanded equal time to answer it. Would it not be in the public interest, even though not required by law, for a magazine of nationwide circulation like Life to present the other side—what people receive when the Nation's credit is used to develop its resources? Ask someone of comparable journalistic skill and reputation, someone guaranteed not to be a member of business' "brain trust of competent writers," to look into the positive side.

TVA would furnish a good example. How much has it saved in flood damage? How much have property values increased in the area? What new industries have sprung up? How much has the proportion of income taxes paid by residents of the TVA area increased, thereby lessening the burden on other taxpayers? How much has the market for electric appliances increased in the TVA area because electricity has been brought to all the people and rates have been low enough to encourage its use? And finally, what did Oak Ridge Laboratory, which uses a vast amount of power from TVA, contribute to winning World War II? What part is it now playing in development of peaceful uses of the atom?

In the floor debate preceding Senate passage of a bill authorizing nine new projects, which you characterized as "ominous," both Montana Senators, MIKE MANSFIELD and LEE METCALF, came out strongly for private development of single purpose sites, for power only. They stated they would be for private construction of multipurpose sites if the private developers would provide the same benefits, flood control, reclamation, recreation, etc. But in none of these nine cases had private companies proposed to do so, and some plans would have precluded forever adequate flood control, and guaranteed perpetual waste. Senator MANSFIELD concluded his speech by saying:

"They [the public projects] are all fully repayable. They represent an investment in our own country, for the benefit of our own people. * * *

"What is wrong with investing American money to make this country a better place to live?"

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES D. LOGAN,
Chairman, Natural Resources Committee, Western States Democratic Conference.

The Hershey Gift in a Word: It's "Fabulous"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Sunday, August 25, 1963, Harrisburg, Patriot-Evening News.

This fine editorial expresses the reaction throughout our entire central Pennsylvania area in respect to this magnificent gift.

The editorial follows:

THE HERSHEY GIFT IN A WORD: IT'S "FABULOUS"

The people who run the show at Hershey don't generate much news. But on Friday they did. And what they had to announce is, to use an overused word, "fabulous."

It can safely be said that to lay out $50 million at one swoop for a medical school is something that can occur only very rarely in this very rich country of ours. Except for the Federal Government, there just isn't that kind of money very many places. But the decision of the Hershey people goes beyond the dimension of money to touch on one of the most critical situations this country faces—an impending shortage of doctors. The diversion of the $50 million from the Hershey trust for the medical school is being made with that situation squarely in view.

And so, as many people already have pointed out, this is wonderful news for Harrisburg and its surrounding area, for Pennsylvania, for the Nation, and for humanity.

To appreciate the full drama of this development requires a look at the past and at the famous man who built the biggest candy industry in the world. In matters of charity, Milton Hershey knew what he liked. He liked orphan boys, he liked education, and he liked Derry Township. When he founded his boys' school in 1909 with 500,000 shares of stock in the chocolate corporation, he had no idea of how this trust would grow. Even in his last years he couldn't have known that the trust would grow too large for his original purpose.

Fortunately, Pennsylvania law makes provision for directing a proven surplus in a charitable trust fund to some other purpose that the courts are convinced is in line with the intent of the benefactor. This is what the Hershey interests asked the court to approve.

In doing so, and in formulating the idea of a medical school, they proceeded in a commendable way. In particular, they followed the recommendations of authorities in medical education on the best way to establish a first-class center.

One recommendation is to couple the school with a teaching hospital. That will be done. Another is to make the school a part of a good university. And that will be done. Everything fits nicely here. Penn State is the one large university in the State without a medical school, and Harrisburg is the logical site for it to have one. The reason is that a medical school should be in an area with established hospitals, sufficient medical specialists, and a large population. The location of the new school is a natural.

The benefits, of course, are mutual, both for Penn State and the Harrisburg area.

Creation of the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center will certainly quicken the tempo and raise the caliber of the field of medicine in this community. It will bolster the economy. It will hasten the day when Harrisburg will be fully active in all phases of higher education.

Penn State President Walker hit it right: "It's a great day for Penn State and for Harrisburg."

Message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, September 1, marks the 24th anniversary of the outbreak of World War II, which began with the invasion of Poland by the Nazis on September 1, 1939.

History has well established that the outbreak of war in Europe was in part motivated by the Hitler-Stalin agreements of that era. It is especially important that we keep in mind the history of Soviet diplomacy as we continue negotiations with them at this time.

I place into the RECORD at this point a message from the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish nation, commemorating the 24th anniversary of the German invasion of Poland. H. E. August Zaleski, President of the Republic of Poland, has issued a statement to Poles all over the world. Its timely and practical theme is certainly evident. As the legitimate spokesman for free-world Poles and Polish citizens silenced by the yoke of communism, the message has special significance:

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION

The 1st of September 1939 was for the Polish nation not only a day of horror but also one of hope. Horror, since on that day Germany, despite solemn declarations of nonaggression, began to carry out her agreement with Russia for a new partition of Poland. Hope, because Poland was entering the war in alliance with France and Great Britain, the two leading powers of Western

Europe, with which our country has been linked by her civilization for close on a thousand years.

Unfortunately, these hopes failed to materialize. Our allies did not come to our help during the invasion of our country nor later when we were waging a prolonged, fully unremitting struggle against both the occupation powers at the cost of millions of human lives.

It was only when these powers clashed with each other that our allies, now joined by the United States, supported Russia and encouraged her to continue the fight by making concessions at the cost of Poland. We all know the nature of these concessions, finally formulated during the Yalta Conference.

An effort was made later to present them to public opinion as "the most hopeful agreement possible for a free, independent and prosperous Polish state * * * as the beginning of a permanent structure of peace upon which we can begin to build, under God, that better world."

But these hopes likewise failed to materialize.

This time, they disappointed not only Poland but also the whole world. One hundred million free people in Europe were transformed into slaves of Moscow. But even this did not satisfy the imperialistic aims of Russia. She reached out for new conquests.

Again, the world faces fresh negotiations with Russia. Again, hopes arise that the negotiations will this time yield better results than hithertofore. But the world is also faced by the menace of new concessions in favor of Moscow's imperialism.

We Poles in the free world should do all in our power to inform the public opinion of those nations who have not lost their independence that no concessions in favor of Russian imperialism will alter the convictions of the exponents of Marxism-Leninism that their mission is to impose their outlook on life upon all mankind.

We trust that with God's help our task will be accomplished.

Meat Cutters & Butchers Union Develop Vital Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to address the annual conference of Butchers District Council of New York at the Concord Hotel at Kiamesha Lake, N.Y. I was particularly impressed by the fine representation of the national, State, and local leaders of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butchers Workers of North America who participated at the conference. These included the union's international president, Jack Lloyd, and Leon Schechter, international vice president, and Joseph Belsky, international vice president of the New York and New England area.

The conference was chaired by Irving Kaplan and, from what I understand, a most intelligent and foresighted plan for action, not only for the betterment of conditions of the workingman, but for a better America through an enlightened program to strengthen our democratic processes.

I especially want to pay tribute to Morris Horn, a dear friend and constituent of mine, who serves with such distinction as chairman of the legislative committee of the district council which covers the New York-New Jersey area. Mr. Horn, working with the international, and with the leadership of the AFL-CIO, has helped formulate a broad and comprehensive legislative program which commendably encompasses important national issues that affect not only the members of the union but every citizen of our country. In brief, the program covers such vital matters as civil rights, tax law revision, job opportunities, and medicare.

With these subjects as guidelines for my presentation to the gathering, I was pleased to forthrightedly express my own views. In view of the pertinence of this program to the Members of Congress, it is a privilege to include these in the RECORD:

WHERE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IS NEEDED TODAY

It is truly a pleasure and privilege for me to be with you today and to share with you some of my thoughts on a few of the major issues which we in Congress are facing today. I am sure all of you have been reading news stories about the slow progress of Congress this year; you have read columnists and heard commentators on the air severely critical of this so-called do-nothing Congress. Let me assure you that I, too, am far from satisfied. But, let me add that there are many reasons for this situation. If we examine them, we may be in a better position to do something about it and still, even at this late hour, to make a legislative record of which the Congress and the Nation can be proud.

The weaknesses of the congressional machinery and the extraordinary power or influence of key persons in the Congress, notably the chairmen of major committees, are well known. Most of the chairmanships, you will recall, are in the hands of southern Democrats. Nevertheless, if we can judge at all from past experience, these faults, serious though they be, will not prevent important legislation vital to the Nation from being passed if enough pressure is brought to bear for its passage.

The Congress has been presented this year with truly mammoth legislative proposals dealing with taxation and with civil rights that, in the best of circumstances, would be time consuming, considering the complexity of the issues and the range of emotions involved. This of course is on top of many other vital issues, such as medical care for the aged, programs for jobs, the vote on the railroad strike, and the nuclear test ban treaty.

Because of the importance of these issues—issues that could mean our very survival, we should do our utmost to marshal our most effective weapon. That is the American people.

Now I don't pretend to set myself up as an expert on public opinion even though I do hear a great deal from my constituents and try always to be alert as to the true feelings and beliefs of those I have the honor to represent in the Congress. Personally I have grave doubts that Americans are complacent.

Is it creditable to believe that the American people are not concerned when 1 in 10 is handicapped in the exercise of his ordinary civil rights, just because of the color of his skin? Are we as a Nation content when we have 5 million of the men and women in our labor force unemployed, when 1 out of every 16 workers cannot find a job? And this is a nagging persistent long-term unemployment problem in most cases. Can we Americans be satisfied when the most elemental kind of medical care is beyond the reach of millions of our people, especially those over 65 among us? Can we rest easy when our economy remains sluggish, when we know that Government action in terms of tax reduction, tax reform, and soundly selected Government public works programs, would do much to speed up our rate of economic growth?

It is on some of these issues that I want to say a few words today. And I am particularly glad to have you as an audience. You are representatives of the largest and one of the most influential economic groups in the Nation. You are some of the 14 million members of the AFL-CIO. It is your voices, individually and collectively that must be heard. It is you who must prove that we as a Nation are not just fat, dumb, and happy."

Let me start out a few comments on the civil rights legislation before the Congress. I have introduced numerous bills designed to guarantee full civil rights and equal opportunities for all Americans. I was pleased to introduce a companion bill, H.R. 7338, to the administration civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, now being considered by the House Judiciary Committee. This is a bill which should be passed without any weakening or softening amendments. If anything it should be strengthened. Let me review the chief provisions of the bill for you.

In the crucial area of voting rights, the bill would guarantee equal voting rights in Federal elections, abolish discriminatory literacy tests, permit court-appointing voting referees, and speed voting rights suits in Federal courts. Surely, there is nothing more basic in the American way of life than the free and equal right of franchise, and anything that prevents any responsible adult American from exercising that right cannot be tolerated.

In order to expedite school desegregation, the bill would provide technical and financial aid to local school authorities engaged in such school desegregation, and would authorize court action by the Attorney General to speed up this desegregation.

A Community Relations Service would be set up under this bill to help local communities solve racial disputes and ease racial tensions. In view of the various kinds of racial frictions and clashes, actual, and potential, that can be found almost everywhere in these United States, North and South, this service could be most helpful. Certainly the successful experience gained in handling race or color related problems in one area should be utilized wherever applicable in other parts of the country.

The bill would prohibit racial discrimination by all Federal contractors and subcontractors. The U.S. Government would be empowered to withhold Federal grants when it finds the funds are being used in a discriminatory way. I would like to see this mandatory and am doing my utmost to strengthen the bill.

And finally, there is the public accommodations provision. This is, of course, the provision that has aroused the most intense publicity in the press and has been argued up and down the land. The bill, as you probably are aware, would guarantee equal access for all to public accommodations, such as hotels, motels, restaurants, stores, and places of public entertainment. It is with real alarm that I learn of one concession after another being made in this section of the bill, providing for exempting a considerable variety of businesses from its provisions. I think this is a tactical mistake. Far worse, it is a moral mistake. As I said in testifying before the Judiciary Committee of the House, which is considering this bill, "Our actions must be bold and must brook no compromise of principle."

How on earth can you justify one place being allowed to discriminate and another not to. That is why I advocate, and so many others do, a strengthening, not weakening, of the bill, to apply the 14th amendment principle to cover all.

I am grateful that the president of the AFL–CIO, Mr. George Meany, has likewise come out strongly for the bill. I can but applaud his statement in his June 13 message to President Kennedy: There is no public issue of greater importance to America than equal rights and equal opportunities for all citizens. . . . We can no longer expect Negro Americans to be content with a little liberty. They are entitled to full liberty, full citizenship, full standing in the community, not next year but now. . . . I pledge the unstinting assistance of the AFL–CIO to the prompt achievement of a full, enforceable civil rights program on every front." Mr. Meany was candid enough to say, I would like to add, that the problem of discrimination is not absent in organized labor. But he welcomed most of the provisions of this bill which would help organized labor in its effort to achieve greater equality of opportunity and civil rights.

I want to make it quite clear that I agree with Mr. Meany that discrimination in employment is by no means primarily a matter of union responsibility. Time and time again unions have taken the lead in bringing a company around to establishing a fair employment and promotion policy. Again and again, the labor movement has asked for equal employment opportunities laws, applicable to unions and management alike, while all too often businessmen and their associations have held back.

Now I should like to turn to our national tax policy. As you know, the President last winter proposed an extensive tax program designed in the first instance to stimulate the economy, and, second, to take some initial steps to put the tax burden on a fairer base. There has been a growing awareness in Washington that our entire tax structure has been acting as a drag on the economy; that taxes are discouraging both consumption and investment; that therefore tax reduction and tax reform would have to be a matter of top legislative priority. The President proposed a bundle of tax changes in January of this year which are far too numerous for me to detail here. But I do want to point out a few of the highlights. For individuals the administration proposed a reduction of rates from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent, in a three-step sequence with the final range effective in 1965 and subsequent years.

There would also be reductions in corporate taxes. After 1965 corporations would be taxed at a rate of 22 percent on their first $25,000 of income and at a rate of 47 percent of income above $25,000, compared to a rate now of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of income and 52 percent on incomes above $25,000. Some of the tax reforms would, for certain income recipients, reduce the amount of the tax cut. The repeal of the dividends tax credit would have its greatest impact on high income groups. Much wider in its application would be the proposal to limit itemized deductions (for such expenses as interest, State and local taxes and charitable contributions) to those in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. The administration estimates the net effect of its tax package would be a reduction of more than $10 billion when the reductions and reforms have become fully effective in 1965.

But I contend that the President has failed to go nearly far enough in terms of tax cuts for low- and middle-income families. It is these families who most need the boost in purchasing power that a substantial, prompt tax cut would give; it is their purchasing power that would do most to get our factories and workshops operating full blast again instead of, as at present, limping along at 15 percent less than capacity. So rather than give major tax reductions to corporations and upper-income families, I would much prefer increasing the personal exemption of each taxpayer and his dependents by at least $300 a person. And I would not delay. The sooner we can get the economy moving again, operating at the potential our human and natural resources make readily possible, the easier it will be to solve the Nation's social and economic problems, such as unemployment, job discrimination, school dropouts and juvenile deliquency. We should have a $10 billion tax cut this year, not spread over 3 years.

The tax reforms proposed by the President, like his tax cuts, have merit, but again do not go far enough, and do not provide adequately for closing loopholes enjoyed by the wealthy. Curtailing capital gains treatment of lump-sum pension and profit distribution, and tightening the tax law on capital gains income by extending the holding period from 6 to 12 months to become eligible for capital gains rates are all to the good. We should know by now that the tax cuts requested by the President, even if he gets all that he asked for, will be too little and to late to totally solve the intolerable unemployment situation, one that becomes worse with each business cycle. Tax cuts will help considerably, but much more is needed. We must expand our programs at all governmental levels—Federal, State, and local—for badly needed public facilities: schools, hospitals, highways, water supply and sewage disposal works, parks. The needs of the American people for public works such as these are urgent. The employment that filling these needs would create is substantial.

We should rapidly expand our programs to provide useful training to young people about to enter the labor market and retraining for those whose jobs have become obsolete. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 have barely been able to operate on a pilot project basis. They must grow to reach more areas and more individuals that need help.

Federal aid to education, at college and graduate school levels, as well as in elementary schools and for vocational training, will not only create jobs in construction and for teachers directly, but will prepare workers and their children for more skilled and higher paid jobs in the future.

It is quite clear to me that we are going to have to meet the problems created by automation head on. The programs of education, retraining, and area redevelopment are part of the answer, but only part. Automation and related technological advances are unquestionably going to bring enormous benefit to our society, by raising levels of productivity and making possible production in quantities and of uniform quality hitherto undreamed of. But it also is bringing unemployment and underemployment in its wake. The adjustment will not be easy or automatic.

What is needed above all is more job opportunities. This will require resourcefulness and ingenuity. It may even become desirable to explore the feasibility of shortening the workweek from 40 to 36 to 35 hours a week, at least in certain industries, as a means of opening up more jobs.

There is one final issue that has been before the last Congress and which must be resolutely faced this year. It is an issue in which I am intensely interested. I refer to adequate medical care for the aged. I have long advocated medicare under social security. I was privileged to cosponsor the original Forand bill, 5 years ago and to be identified as a sponsor of its succeeding legislation, the King-Anderson program. The facts in favor of this legislation are plain, and, no doubt, well known to many of you through your own personal experience. Few elements in the cost of living have risen more rapidly than hospitalization and other kinds of medical care. And for those over 65 this care is needed at least three times as often as for those under 65. Further, today's older people generally are least able to bear these high hospital and medical expenses, both because they have lower incomes, on the average, and less insurance than younger persons. Let me cite just one figure for you. Half the aged couples, where one or the other is hospitalized, have total medical bills of over $800 in a single year. Yet statistics show that more than 50 percent of those over 65 have incomes of less than $1,000. This situation is a source of untold anxiety for the aged and their children.

We know, of course, that there have been many proposals to deal with this acute problem. But all methods thus far do not, and perhaps cannot, get to the crux of the problem. Basically, experience has shown that the health insurance now available to older individuals which provides reasonable protection is too costly for most of the aged to afford, and such health insurance that is now available to older individuals at moderate cost provides only severely limited protection. Let's not kid ourselves into believing the problem can be met by private plans. It just can't. Let's face it.

The situation is intolerable. And with every passing month it is getting worse. Hospital and other medical costs continue to soar. The proportion of the elderly in our population is increasing; the need for a sound medical insurance program is undeniable. It's vital.

(In 1946, only 17 years ago, an average hospital room cost $9.70. Last year, an average hospital room cost $34.50.)

The sensible answer, the only answer, it seems to me, lies in a Federal health insurance program, financed by social security. It fits the original concept of social security, the whole philosophy of which is based on providing at least minimum economic security to a person when he gets older and his earning capacity decreases or ends. Well, that is only part of an older person's security. Equally important is his health. This is what is proposed by the Anderson-King bill (H.R. 3920 and S. 880). Under this bill, 18 million persons over 65—and that includes those not under social security—would be protected beginning in January 1965, and all present workers and their wives (or widows) would be covered when they reach 65. The health insurance under this bill would include hospital care, nursing facility care, hospital outpatient diagnostic services, and home health services, all up to certain specified amounts each year. This insurance program would be financed by certain modest increases in social security. Basically social security and railroad retirement contribution rates would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent each for employees and employers, and four-tenths of 1 percent for self-employed persons, and the taxable earnings base would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200. Thus under the proposed law a worker earning $5,200 or more would in 1965 be paying in social security $201.50 of which $17.68 would be for hospital insurance. This total of $201.50 would be $27.50 above the amount payable by the same worker in 1965 under present law without hospital insurance.

The present Kerr-Mills medical assistance program for the aged is certainly unsatisfactory. As a matter of fact, it's a disgrace; it

means test provisions are degrading and an insult to human dignity; it's onerous. I might add as of February of this year, less than 7 out of every 1,000 aged persons in the United States were receiving any assistance under this program. All but the poorest, who have no choice, are neglected by it. Benefits are often meager and uncertain. In fact, in nearly half of the States, no benefits have been paid at all.

Let's not permit certain bugaboos to blind us to the merits of medical insurance under social security. It is not, as some would claim, an opening wedge to socialized medicine. It is no more socialized medicine than are Blue Cross or other private insurance plans that pay hospital or medical bills. It would not interfere with the patient's free choice of a doctor—or hospital—or control medical fees. The Government would in no way provide care, offer services, or suggest any physician or facility. Under this program, its sole role would be to set up the means for paying for an aged person's hospital and related care by a small tax levied on him and his employer during his working years. Neither would it interfere wth private insurance. In fact, it would probably increase the demand for a variety of private insurance plans. With basic protection assured under social security financed hospital insurance, older persons could use what funds they have to buy supplemental coverage, such as surgery, drugs, physician visits and dental care, which would not be covered by social security hospital insurance. Further, without the burden of insuring the high-cost aged, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and other commercial health insurance firms could hold down their rates and sell insurance more effectively.

While it is too early to make a prognosis of the fate of the King-Anderson proposal, you may be certain that I shall use whatever power and persuasion I have to get it enacted into law It is a measure that should receive the warmest endorsement of all who want to see that our senior citizens are able to live out their lives without the threat of costly medical care ever corroding their minds and hearts.

Let me conclude by describing to you a cartoon I saw in a Washington paper earlier this week (Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1963). It shows a lifeboat, entitled U.S. Economic Progress, apparently adrift in a stormy sea. In the boat huddled together are men designated by the labels, "education opportunities," "employment situation," "civil rights," "business," and "unions." The caption to the cartoon reads, "In This Boat We're All Integrated." How true; I could not agree more wholeheartedly. It is our economic progress that makes solutions to the problems I have been discussing with you here possible. Our future as a free people and as a leader in the world depends on our ability to make economic progress constructively and without undue delay.

My only quarrel with the cartoonist (Herblock) who created this picture of the diversity of America and its problems "integrated" in a lifeboat, is that he failed to show a helmsman or even any oars that would suggest that we have a destination and a determination to reach it. Let us make sure that our ship of state has a noble and worthy goal. Let us see that the boat is fully manned. Let us make sure that a helmsman will fearlessly steer a true and steady course. That is where you as individuals, your unions, your neighbors; yes, all the American people, come in. They have the power in their hands—through their work, dedication, alertness—and through the power of the ballot.

Chairman Cooley Acts Promptly on REA Loan to Ski Resort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have today written to the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, concerning an REA section 5 loan for $110,000 to a ski resort in Pennsylvania. I complimented the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, for his prompt and efficient action in calling a hearing to confront the REA Administrator for authorizing this 2-percent loan to the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative which will be reloaned at 4 percent to the Blue Knob Development Corp., of Altoona. I feel it is most important to call this to the attention of my colleagues and urge them to extend proper commendation to the committee chairman for his authoritative and direct action. I would also hope that a large number of my colleagues would indicate a desire to attend those hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the REA Administrator's action was in direct defiance to the instructions of the committee chairman at the hearings in February of 1962 in addition to the committee language contained in House Report No. 1691 of the 87th Congress, 2d session. In addition, other congressional leaders have become concerned with the outside business activities of REA borrowers, not related to the well-being of the American farmer, and I know this subject was discussed during the hearings on the Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1964.

During those hearings, I pointed out to REA Administrator, Norman Clapp, that considerable publicity had been given to several 4-percent loans made out in a number of Iowa communities to managers of co-ops to finance the purchase of their own homes. Under unanimous consent I include at this point the colloquy that followed between our very able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and Mr. Clapp:

Mr. WHITTEN. May I interrupt here. I am like Mr. MICHEL. Let us not endanger a good program by having Federal funds used far beyond the intent of the act. We have the Farmers Home Administration, which make rural housing loans. We have set up new programs to finance homes for the elderly. The Farmers Home Administration is actively engaged in these things, and to have the REA associations do the same things is not intended.

Mr. CLAPP. I understand, Mr. Chairman. My first statement to Mr. MICHEL was that we do not approve of a co-op lending money to the manager to build a home.

Mr. WHITTEN. You disapprove, but what are you doing about it?

Mr. CLAPP. We are investigating this particular case.

Mr. WHITTEN. When you investigate it, what are you going to do?

Mr. CLAPP. As soon as we find out what the facts are, we will cross that bridge.

Mr. Speaker, I will be anxious to find out if Mr. Clapp has crossed the bridge. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Missouri, PAUL JONES, chairman of the special Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations, to which this instant case has been referred, will check all the bridges. Understandably, the tentative date of September 5 had to be postponed, but I am sure that a large number of my colleagues will be watching the committee calendar at the end of September for a definite date.

Freedom Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the magnificent and stirring march for jobs and freedom on August 28 was indeed a living petition. Its monumental success is testimony to the dedication of the leaders and organizations which sponsored and cooperated with it. Among the organizations which strongly suported the march was the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. On August 14, 1963, Dressmakers Union, Local 22, ILGWU, at a general membership meeting unanimously adopted a ringing resolution calling for the immediate enactment of President Kennedy's civil rights program. The following resolution expresses local 22's deep commitment to the civil rights movement:

AUGUST 14, 1963.

CIVIL RIGHTS RESOLUTION OF DRESSMAKERS UNION, LOCAL 22, ILGWU

Whereas millions of our fellow Americans daily suffer the denial of their constitutional and moral rights as citizens of a democracy because of their color; and

Whereas 9 years after the Supreme Court decision desegregating the public schools of this country, the majority of Negro children are still compelled to attend segregated schools; and

Whereas racial discrimination has barred large numbers of Negroes from employment opportunities, thereby creating severe economic and social problems for them and their families; and

Whereas in many areas Negro citizens are still being denied the most basic right to be had in a democracy—the right to vote; and

Whereas in addition to all of these intolerable injustices, they are also compelled to endure the humiliation of being denied access to public accommodations and facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Dressmakers Union, Local 22, ILGWU, representing 18,000 workers in the New York City area, call upon our

Senators and Representatives to do everything in their power to end these abuses and infringements of democratic rights which undermine the strength and morale of our country and tarnish our reputation before the world. We believe that, in this centennial year of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, the issue can no longer be evaded or postponed, and that Congress can do no less than enact the civil rights program submitted to it by President Kennedy. We ask for justice, for equality, now.

McNamara Attacks a Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Henry J. Taylor, staff writer for the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers, is a brilliant columnist who just recently finished a series of articles on the concept of "overkill." This was followed up by an editorial in which he states:

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara now announces he will negotiate cutbacks in the overkill nuclear materials stockpiling program.

If vested interests do not defeat that purpose, resulting directly from the exposure of the costly, irrational, hideous absurdity, our Nation can most certainly save a quarter-billion dollars a year.

I hope that Congress will help him maintain our Nation's solvency and security through the means of attacking waste and divided responsibility.

The articles follow:

MCNAMARA ATTACKS A WASTE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara now announces he will negotiate cutbacks in the overkill nuclear materials stockpiling program. And if Congress doesn't help him do it, there must be ether coming out of the ceiling.

If vested interests do not defeat that purpose, resulting directly from the exposure of this costly, irrational, hideous absurdity, our Nation can most certainly save a quarter billion dollars a year.

First, taxpayers are entitled to that. Moreover, our Nation's solvency and security are indivisible. Gigantic waste like this damages the security of the United States.

This billions-on-billions buying spree is the product of pork-barrel profits, bureaucratic habits, divided responsibility, and its own momentum. All these influences have grown steadily for years on end, until the whole hush-hush thing has gone completely off its rocker.

So, day and night, around the clock and at steadily increasing maximum production, the taxpayers' five incredibly vast nuclear mountains at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Paducah, Ky.; Portsmouth, Ohio, and Savannah River, Ga., are still piling up more nuclear materials on top of what? The equivalent of 22 billion tons—tons—of TNT already manufactured and stored.

There are only about 2,000 cities in the world (including the United States) with 100,000 or more population. Allowing 30 percent failure to deliver to target, our overkill stockpile represents enough to deliver the equivalent of 2.5 million tons of TNT per 100,000 of population in all 2,000 cities throughout the entire world.

Still allowing 30 percent failure, this means we could return and knock into atomic rubble all such cities (370) in the Sino-Soviet bloc about 500 times, and all in the U.S.S.R. alone (140) about 1,250 times.

Apologists claim we must have plenty of nuclear material left over after initial losses to the enemy. Well, if we lost 90 percent of the nuclear material we have, which is too nonsensical for anyone to claim, we've still manufactured and stored enough to blow up all those targets in the entire world 11 times.

Our atomic weapons are peace insurance. They are, of course, indispensable. General Eisenhower once stated, "With the H-bomb in Soviet hands, if we had not developed it, the Russians already would have marched everywhere in the world they wanted to go."

Nor is the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, Polaris submarines, planes or other carriers involved. The absurdity involved concerns the nuclear materials—the gunpowder—overkill stockpiling itself. For nuclear explosives alone are costing us more than $2 billion a year. We must have enough. But when is enough?

I can give you the answer of the Atomic Energy Commission—now the largest single buyer of electricity in the United States, the buyer of 30,000 tons a year of very profitable uranium, of 1,000 carloads of coal a day, and the user of more machine tools than General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler combined. The AEC answers that its output is not its responsibility. It says it simply produces as much as the Joint Chiefs of Staff want.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff? They'll tell you the overkill stockpiling isn't their responsibility, either. Oh, no, they state, it's the responsibility of the National Security Council. But, of course, that's a secret body, which won't even give you the time of day. So, where are you?

Mr. McNamara has a chance here to make any waste cut he may have made look like peanuts compared to this. Vested interests die hard, but they will aways cave in under the light of public exposure.

THE OVERKILL FOLLY: TIME TO HALT U.S. H-BOMB BUYING SPREE—PEACE INSURANCE COSTING BILLIONS FAR MORE THAN NATION CAN USE

(By Henry J. Taylor)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of three articles by Henry J. Taylor on U.S. nuclear stockpiling, the concept of overkill that has gripped the Nation's military planners since that unforgettable, blinding flash wiped out 100,000 persons at Hiroshima to knock Japan out of World War II.)

Expressed in the horrible, horrible word "overkill"—our country's ability to kill more people than required—our nuclear stockpiling program has gone completely off its rocker.

Partly due to pork-barrel profits, partly due to bureaucratic habits, but mostly because Congress and the public alike are uninformed, we are in a billions-on-billions buying spree without any time limit or cost limit whatever.

The overkill spree, like Topsy, "just growed." Today the secrecy, anxiety for national defense, divided responsibility, and its own momentum create a result so colossal as to nearly defy understanding.

But it can be understood. And it must be understood, for only an informed public can blow the whistle on this gigantic folly.

In this series you will learn hideous truths—documented. You will find analysis based on official U.S. Government figures, freely available if sought. But the enemy will gain no military secrets. In fact, in that sense, these revelations greatly aid the United States.

FIVE STOCKPILES

There are five enormous nuclear fountains feeding our overkill stockpile: Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Paducah, Ky.; Portsmouth, Ohio; and Savannah River, S. C. Taxpayers have invested $5,500 million on these alone.

Largest is the supersecret H-bomb plant at Savannah River. It is also the largest construction undertaking in the history of the world. The project covers 315 square miles.

So much is underground that the excavated dirt would form a wall 10 feet high by 6 feet wide, stretching from the site to Seattle, 3,000 miles away.

This plant alone cost $1,500 million, nearly four times the cost of the Panama Canal. It uses enough water daily to serve Philadelphia's 2 million people and more electricity than the entire State of Delaware. In fact, the total electricity bill for the five nuclear fountains is a quarter of a billion dollars a year. And they burn a thousand carloads of coal every day.

OUTSPENDS NATION

The overkill stockpile is now not only the Nation's largest single consumer of electricity, coal, and water, but also chews on more machine tools than General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler combined.

Nuclear stockpiling began when Oak Ridge began production January 27, 1944—19 years ago. And from the date each plant started all five plants have been running day and night. There has been no tapering off any place at any time. Instead, each plant has been enormously expanded all along the line.

Their uranium conversion has ballooned from 2,000 tons to more than 30,000 tons a year. As a result, our taxpayers now pay about $2 billion annually for nuclear explosives. Some 900 uranium mines in our country alone annually deliver around 17,400 tons (oxide) of this quantity—an important new industry with a mighty, mighty effective lobby which pitches its bivouac beside Congressmen's desks.

The stockpile's product is peace insurance. But how much peace insurance?

The lone, primitive A-bomb dropped on Hiroshima was equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT. Throughout World War II—everywhere, land, sea, and air—407,828 Americans were killed. A quarter that many Japanese were killed instantly by that lethal Hiroshima thunderclap. It exploded at only 1 percent potential efficiency, yet 780 feet from the bomb center the blast burned—printed—onto the stone steps of the Sumitomo Bank the human-shaped shadow of a man sitting there.

A-BOMBS ARE OBSOLETE

Large A-bombs are obsolete. Our great U.S. Strategic Air Force flies 1,300 bombers. Each now carries only H-bombs 5,000 times more powerful than that Hiroshima blast. So do our 200 intercontinental ballistic missiles and 16 Polaris submarines. Many are so immense, however, they can only be carried by ship. A-bomb miniatures, however, range down from artillery sizes to bazooka shells small enough to carry by hand or be thrown.

Now, 1 pound of H-bomb stockpile material, the size of a golf ball, packs more explosive power than enough TNT to fill Yankee Stadium. As long ago as 1960, the then Senator John F. Kennedy stated: "The world's nuclear stockpile contains an estimated equivalent of 30 billion tons of TNT, about 10 tons for every human being on earth."

Today our overkill stockpile exceeds a TNT equivalent that would cover five New York City blocks square and be higher than the Empire State Building. Quite a stockpile. For what?

How many times can our overkill stockpile exterminate America's foes and friends alike

everywhere on earth? What is ahead in this incredibly costly program—except profit?

THE OVERKILL FOLLY: H-STOCKPILE COULD BLOW UP 125 EARTHS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of three articles by Henry J. Taylor, on U.S. nuclear stockpiling, the concept of overkill that has gripped the Nation's military planners since that unforgettable, blinding flash wiped out 100,000 persons at Hiroshima to knock Japan out of World War II.)

(By Henry J. Taylor)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—H-bombs are not bombs—bigger-than-ever bombs. Each one is a catastrophe. Moreover, each is a catastrophe so colossal that never enough or every shot didn't kill a man but continual shooting won the war, becomes a costly irrational, hideous absurdity.

Yet, along with porkbarrel profits, bureaucratic habits, divided responsibility, and its own momentum, this accounts for the undisclosed billions-on-billions buying spree in our overkill nuclear stockpiling program.

EVERYTHING HAS H-BOMBS

With even the horrible, horrible A-bomb obsolete, all our 1,300 Strategic Air Force bombers, our intercontinental ballistic missiles, and the Polaris submarines are now equipped with H-bombs. These are 5,000 times more powerful than the primitive Hiroshima device, even though that was equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT and killed instantly 100,000 people.

The overkill stockpile to support this is peace insurance. But how much peace insurance?

Excluding barren oceans, which cover most of the earth, 80 percent of the world contains less than 17 percent of its population. More than half (57 percent) of the earth's people live on less than 5 percent of the earth's surface.

There are only some 2,000 cities in the entire world with 100,000 or more population, including those in the United States. Of these only 370 are in the Sino-Soviet bloc, 140 in the U.S.S.R., and 230 in Red China. Their total population is roughly 600 million.

The top-secret document which records our ever-growing nuclear materials stockpile does not express this inventory by weight in pounds or tons or by megatons of explosive power. This top secret is, of course, and should be, sacrosanct. But its full revelation is not needed, and—please remember—no secret is here revealed to our enemies. The Russians presumably know all this.

Official testimony to Congress, available from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, fairly simple calculations and the agreed estimates of physicist authorities show that our nuclear inventory now works out as equivalent to about 22 billion tons of TNT.

WHAT IT MEANS

Assuming we intended to blow up friends and foes alike, as well as ourselves in the United States, and allowing 30-percent failure to deliver to target, reach for the aspirin and read what our everygrowing overkill stockpile really means:

We have already manufactured and stored enough to deliver the equivalent of 2,500,000 tons of TNT per 100,000 of population in all 2,000 cities through the entire world. Each 2,500,000 tons is 125 times the Hiroshima quantity, and notice, please, that this amount is not for each city. It is per 100,000 inhabitants in each city everywhere.

In short, having delivered a Hiroshima catastrophe everywhere on earth, the overkill stockpile takes us back to do this all over again, not twice, but 125 times. It returns us to all Sino-Soviet cities 500 times or just to the Soviet 1,250 times.

How repeatedly do we propose to kill the same millions of people, including ourselves, by burning them all over again? After performing this horror 125 times who would be left for our 126th knocking of the world into atomic rubble? Indeed, who among us would be left to do the knocking?

Macabre as this query is, there is no other way to point out to our public the colossal folly of the largely undisclosed overkill buying spree.

PEARL HARBOR IMPOSSIBLE

The further inventory building, begun 19 years ago and still fed from the five gigantic production centers at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Paducah, Ky.; Portsmouth, Ohio, and Savannah River, S.C., is largely in the hands of men wisely determined to possess a supply that makes a "nuclear Pearl Harbor" attack on the United States clearly unworkable. But the added stockpiling is costing taxpayers more than $2 billion a year for nuclear explosives.

The failure to at least taper off the overkill stockpiling is deeply buried behind bad reasons. The ancient principles of war—the principles of the objective, the offensive, economy of force, mobility, surprise, simplicity of plan—have not changed. But their application undergoes a vast transformation that must somehow free us completely from the past bombing conceptions. It has not.

Why this program got, and remains, completely off its rocker and why it is vital for the Congress and the public alike to blow the whistle on it, and on the profits from it, is the subject of the third and final article in this series.

THE OVERKILL FOLLY: HUGE STOCKPILE COSTS SNOWBALL

(By Henry J. Taylor)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of three articles by Henry J. Taylor on U.S. nuclear stockpiling, the concept of overkill that has gripped the Nation's military planners since that unforgettable, blinding flash wiped out 100,000 persons at Hiroshima to knock Japan out of World War II.)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—Sixty thousand American airmen, all told, flew in the repeated raids against the single Rumanian oil target of Ploesti. The Nazi refineries were crippled but never killed.

On Sunday, May 10, 1941, Hitler sent 1,200 bombers over London. Luftwaffe radios announced the city ceased to exist. The German Air Force was wrong.

Memories of such kill-failures account for much of the folly represented by our incredible overkill nuclear stockpiling program.

It is a famous fact military people usually prepare for a next war the way they won the last one. Battleship building before—and after—Pearl Harbor confirms the historic phenomenon. This, plus the "we never have enough" complex, plus pork-barrel profits, bureaucratic habits, divided responsibility and the overkill program's own momentum have the taxpayers trapped in that billions-on-billions buying spree.

The ancient principles of war—the principles of the objective, the offensive, economy of forces, mobility, surprise, simplicity of plan—have not changed. But their application now undegoes a vast transformation that must somehow free us completely from the past bombing conceptions. It has not. Ploesti? London? We can hardly permit such experiences and memories to justify no tapering off from spending $2 billion for more nuclear materials. Even as early as 5 years ago our tests alone delivered 100 times the total World War II Allied explosive power hurled on Germany and Japan.

Why, in a mere test at Bikini more than 9 years ago, 10 million tons of water were raised to a height of 2 miles. This was the entire tonnage of the U.S. World War II Navy—lifted by a single bomb.

For how long has it been obvious that all previous need to "put a bomb down the chimney," which airmen learned has vanished forever?

The one primitive Hiroshima A-bomb was equivalent to 20,000 tons of TNT and killed 100,000 people. H-bombs that our Strategic Air Force carries today are each 5,000 times as powerful. Ten miles away the flash is so bright it can turn your eye fluids to steam and blind you. And, of course, the horrible, horrible radiation and fall-out effects expand the entire catastrophe in well-known ways.

But, even beyond this, Soviet tests of 58 megatons allowed us to detect that the yield from our own bombs in U.S. heavy bombers could easily be boosted to 100 megatons by encasing the awful device in uranium instead of lead. This drastically affects the already incredible killing power in our "overkill" stockpile.

Few people know that atomic bombs deteriorate in storage. They must be freshened, topped off, replenished, recharged. This draws on the materials inventory, but the amount is minute. Testing likewise demands its share. But most defenders of the stockpiling are ignorant of the facts. Defenders in the military, Congress, etc., to say nothing of the powerful uranium mines lobby, will tell you we must not taper off because:

1. War shows it's always better to be on the safe side with too much than not have enough. Safe? We must have overwhelming nuclear capability. This is our only peace insurance. But, as described earlier in this series, we have already stored enough nuclear materials to deliver, God forbid, the equivalent of Hiroshima on each 100,000 people in all 2,000 cities of that size throughout the world, and then come back and do so 125 times.

2. Much inventory is spread widely—strategic disbursements. But, of course, it exists—which is all that matters.

3. The number of targets is increasing. Even without reference to our overkill stockpile size, mere mention of the targets increasing betrays the obsolete down-the-chimney thinking that underlies much of the colossal buying spree.

4. We must have plenty of material left over after initial losses to the enemy. If we lost 90 percent of what we have, which is too nonsensical for anyone to claim, we've still manufactured and stored enough to blow up the entire world (including America) 11 times.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, Democrat, investigated excessive stockpiling of many materials. Some explanations received for the immense overbuying were good, others were not. With the public's help and an alerted Congress, no such exposures compare with the service to be performed by throwing the book at the buying spree geared to the folly-run-riot in the incredible, condemnable overkill stockpiling program.

America Has Lost a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing outpouring of expressions of sorrow that I share so deeply with my colleagues and with people everywhere in all walks of life is its own testimony of the depth of feeling held for that outstanding statesman, the late Senator Estes Kefauver. He was a man who per-

sonified the personal characteristics with which we associate the term "statesman."

Throughout his long years of service to the people of this Nation, he demonstrated an unshakable tenacity of purpose and an unflagging concern for the rights of the indivdual. He would not be deterred in his fight against organized crime or against those who would attempt to circumvent laws designed to protect the public against those who would profiteer at the expense of the consumer.

It has been my privilege and my pleasure to have been associated with Estes Kefauver in a number of endeavors during the years I have been in this House. Throughout his tenure, his honesty, and integrity permitted no course other than that which principle directed. He feared no odds and would not be turned aside by threats of adverse consequence, when he entered into battle for what he knew to be right.

The Senate and the Nation has lost an indefatigable leader and champion of the people. It is incumbent upon us that the memory and deeds of this great man continue to be an inspiration to our future endeavors to the end that the work he strove so mightily to complete for the good of the Nation may be carried forward as he would wish.

Along with his other countless friends and admirers, I extend to Mrs. Kefauver, and to the children my heartfelt sympathy in their great loss.

School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which was aired by radio station KLEO in Wichita, Kans., relative to a problem in which we are all interested. This radio station has been conducting an on-the-air campaign urging students to stay in school.

KLEO broadcasts six times daily a 1-minute feature entitled, "Drop Out City, U.S.A." A mythical city has been created that is populated by school dropouts only. These features emphasize that the people of "Drop Out City" are there because they lack the education to qualify for positions in competitive American communities.

We are all aware of the importance of urging high school boys and girls to remain in school. Such efforts as those of radio station KLEO contribute to the success of this essential goal.

Following is the editorial broadcast by KLEO:

During the past 200 years, our standards of living in the United States have gone steadily upward. Every once in a while, something like the great depression of the thirties slows down the climb, but the overall trend is up. Basically a person's standard of living is determined by how many minutes of labor he must expend to get the money he needs for a given purchase. The amount of labor needed drops, the individual works the same amount of time, and he can afford to buy something else with his labor. This improvement in living standards has come about because of engineering. Machines are doing the work formerly done by men, and that work is done cheaper and faster. But built into this system is a basic drawback. Without going into involved economics, it means that eventually, there will be many more men available to work than there will be labor available for them to do. As in any other instance, competition sets in: you get the best man available out of, let's say three men, when you have something to be done. And for a job requiring a certain amount of brainpower, who would you hire? One man has an 8th grade education, another went through 10th grade; the third graduated from high school. That's all you know about them. Who would you hire?

We address these remarks to young men and women who are still in high school. But who may be planning to drop out. It's your life, of course, to do with as you choose. But believe us when we say, along with the President of the United States and every other national and local leader, that without an education, it's not going to be much of a life. If you think it's tough for a young person to get started now, just think how tough it's going to be for a young person with no education to make a living 10 years from now. All we ask you young people to do—is think.

Hurts Us Much, Helps Them None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. E. L. Johnson, of Winnebago, Minn., has provided me with a copy of an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Toronto Financial Post, commenting on the President's proposal to tax the sale of foreign securities.

Since the President's proposal has been the subject of hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The comments of a Canadian financial editor are worthy of consideration in view of our close economic and financial ties with our good neighbors to the north.

I insert the editorial from the Toronto Financial Post in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

HURTS US MUCH, HELPS THEM NONE

What the Americans do about taxing themselves is obviously their business.

But when they stagger on a course that does nothing worthwhile for them and hurts Canada a great deal, we have a right to raise a loud cry of pain.

All Financial Post readers know about the Americans' balance-of-payments problem, and the fact they very much need to do something about it.

If they had played less politics and more good government they would have started work on this problem long ago and before it got so serious. However—the present scheme includes a spectacular wallop at very large financial dealings between our two countries.

Canada is by all odds America's best customer. Thousands of U.S. communities and tens of thousands of U.S. workers thrive because Canada buys their merchandise and services.

One of the ways we Canadians have for paying for this gigantic flow of goods and services is through the sale of Canadian securities in the United States. The Kennedy scheme to penalize Americans who buy Canadian stocks (other than new issues) throws several big monkey wrenches into the delicate machinery of our balance of payments.

If the scheme is OK'd by Congress, a lot of Canadian stocks will go down and stay down. It could also cause a run on our dollar, a painful cutback in our purchases of general merchandise in the United States and a major economic upheaval extending far beyond the owners of securities.

The absurd fact is that the Americans won't get any significant improvement in their payments problem, though they will have created an administrative nightmare for themselves and have seriously hurt us.

Kennedy is the man who has talked wisely and well about an international program for getting greater commonsense into business relationships between nations. Now Kennedy and cohorts are leading the assault on the very principles of international conduct Kennedy has espoused.

If Canada is to be forced to make basic alterations in the method of meeting its U.S. obligations, what does Kennedy want us to do? Do we stop pleasing the Americans by buying so much oil from U.S.-owned producers? We could buy Russian oil. Do we stop buying all sorts of U.S. products, much to the discomfiture of U.S. exporters?

There are all sorts of things Kennedy could do to fix his problem which wouldn't hurt his best customer and which would be much more effective in serving his own purposes.

The Ottawa folk have made a couple of pilgrimages to Washington on this matter. They didn't achieve much. The "concession" exempting new securities from the proposed tax means little because over recent history, except during the exchange crisis and its aftermath, Canadians managed to raise most of their debt capital at home. It is the dynamite blast at the other securities which does so very little for Kennedy but which can be so extremely damaging to Canada, not just to stocks but to trade, import, and tax policies.

Kennedy has goofed on his security tax plan. It does very little for his domestic problem and it creates horrible prospects for his best customer.

It's Bad Medicine in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, many influential Members of Congress have risen in the last few days to protest the recent biased and ill-advised Life magazine article on public works spending. Some reporters in Washington have tried to use this as added evidence, justifying criticisms of pork-barrel spending, with little regard for the facts concerning the need for resource development in this country. One of Oregon's leading editors puts this whole matter in clearer per-

spective in the August 22 edition of the Pendleton (Oreg.), East Oregonian. I insert it at this point in my remarks:

IT'S BAD MEDICINE IN THE WEST

When the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce accused Members of the Congress of wooing votes by obtaining Federal projects for their districts and States and said it was wrong for them to do it he undoubtedly was expecting the results that were soon coming.

Many Congressmen were indignant. Some demanded an apology from the man. And in the days immediately after his address to the National Press Club the U.S. chamber's headquarters in Washington reported many favorable letters in the form of newspaper editorials and letters and telegrams from plain citizens. Some Congressmen commended the speech.

All of this is par for the course. Any newspaper editor worth his salt can on any day at any hour become righteously indignant in a long winded editorial on pork barrel spending. He can be sure many of his readers will commend him for it and urge him to hit 'em harder.

Congressmen who come from States in the populous East have learned that a tirade against pork barrel spending is always good for votes and letters of commendation that can be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (at taxpayer expense).

The reasons for all of this were well defined a long time ago. The editor who attacks pork barrel spending never is speaking of such spending in the area in which his newspaper is circulated. The projects he and the readers of his newspaper want and press their Congressman for are not of the pork barrel variety. Never. They are "sound investments." It is similar projects in other parts of the country that the editor is opposing because "they cannot be justified."

The citizens who praised chamber President Edwin P. Neilan's speech were thinking, of course, of all of the pork barrel spending that goes on in other parts of the country. They don't have any of it where they live.

The Congressmen from the big cities of the East pound their chests and angrily denounce all such spending, because they invariably identify pork barrel spending with those projects which are associated with water resource development. Almost all of the water resource development projects are in the West. If the eastern Congressman's constituents don't know that, he reminds them of it. Spending for urban renewal, housing for the aged, and other projects for which millions are spent in the big cities is not, of course, identified as pork barrel spending.

This is sure-fire stuff in the big cities where there is little sympathy for or understanding of the importance of water in the West.

Congressmen who get water resource development projects for their districts and States are rewarded at the ballot box. They should be. They are doing what their constituents expect them to do. If they are not successful in getting appropriations for flood control and reclamation projects, they are punished for their lack of influence.

Any westerner who thinks that full development of the water resources of the West is not a good investment for all the citizens of the United States has a shocking misunderstanding of the nature of the economy of the West and its importance to the economy of the Nation.

Furthermore, any westerner who recognizes that a water resources development project in his district is good for the Nation but calls a similar project in another district "pork barrel" is the worst type of hypocrite.

This editor has never indulged in the pastime of denouncing pork barrel spending. He has not, because he knows that in the minds of most of its critics pork barrel spending is identified with water resource development.

If this Nation does not find the best possible use for every drop of water available to it, Lord help generations to come. There has not been enough spending for this. There must be much more.

The president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce probably has been encouraged to make some more speeches about pork barrel spending. We trust he will have the good judgment to confine his orations to those places and audiences where the importance to the Nation of Federal spending for water resource development is not understood.

The People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have been highly impressed with work which is being done by the People to People Council of Pensacola, Fla., in my district. H. B. Grow, a retired Navy captain, is executive chairman of this fine group. For the people-to-people effort, the Pensacola group visited Peru and selected the city of Chimbote as one of those areas most deserving of help. I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by Captain Grow to Mr. Mark Bortman, chairman of the civic committee of the people-to-people movement, which outlines what has been done:

PENSACOLA, FLA.,
August 23, 1963.

Mr. MARK BORTMAN,
Chairman, Civil Committee, People to People, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MARK: I thought it might be helpful if I set down in writing a sort of chronological summary of our program today and where we are headed.

First, the thinking behind our venture. We feel that the place to counter the communistic effort against America is where it is most actively being exercised and where exists the greatest threat to our way of life. In other words, move in next door and offset by deeds their words.

We feel our target should be the people upon whom the enemy is working—those now in need and now in revolt or ready for it, rather than primarily the very well to do.

We feel that we should leave visible, tangible, permanent evidence of our good will and of such a nature that their way of living has been improved at least in some of its aspects.

We feel that where possible we should seek a situation where our Government through U.S. AID and Peace Corps are now working and there select an area of endeavor not being covered or handled by them or the local government and finally, we feel that such a program, if initiated by a large number of other American cities, could very well and in a short time have a visible and lasting beneficial result and that we shall have made a definite and valuable contribution to our country's relations in the foreign field.

With those thoughts in mind we visited Peru to seek a sister city that offered the above-mentioned combination of circumstance and opportunities. We selected Chimbote as a city confronted by almost insurmountable probelms and where we could complete an integrated team of chuch, our Government, and Peace Corps by adding a peoples effort.

Chimbote accepted our invitation to form such an association and, after a council meeting, advised us that the best thing we could do at this time would be a facility for youth activity; to which we agreed.

While in Peru, Miraflores, a wealthy suburb of Lima also accepted an invitation for sister city relationship based on a cultural relationship.

RESULTS

1. The ladies of Chimbote, before the year (1962) was over abandoned a custom of giving useless toys to the poor children and instead collected funds and built five small children playgrounds in the slum areas.

2. The mayor's wife, subsequently, this year, formed a charitable organization of 200 members with $20 a month dues to seek out and care for emergency distress cases of need and illness. They use the priests of the American Catholic Mission to locate, investigate, and bring such cases to them.

3. The Peace Corps nurses organized a "Posta Medica" (outpatient clinic) in one slum area. The Alliance and Peace Corps built a small building and asked us if we could equip it. It is a nonprofit co-op, run by the people of the slum—supervised by the nurses and attended by a volunteer local doctor in cases where needed.

We accepted the challenge and have already sent them a refrigerator (new), autoclave, instrument case, fluoroscope (new), desk, chair, adding machine, typewriter, bandages, gauze, and about $4,000 in medicines, enough for a 6 months' operation; after which time it will be self supporting. We are now preparing to do a second one. Total value on supplies sent was approximately $10,000.

4. The mayor of Chimbote and his wife have visited Pensacola and presented the city with a silver plaque.

5. We have presented the city of Chimbote with a "pergamino" (illuminated scroll) of friendship and good will.

6. The press in Peru has given large and full and very favorable coverage of our project.

7. The city of Miraflores has dedicated a new binational cultural center calling it the city fathers of Pensacola center.

8. On October 11, seven Peruvian labor leaders are visiting Pensacola on a good will visit expressly to thank Pensacola for what we are doing for Peru.

9. We have managed to have sent to Chimbote a Pensacola boy in the Peace Corps who is now on our building committee there.

FUNDRAISING

10. We got started late on our fund drive having waited for a name speaker (Mr. Morrison) but should have started without him, since we lost some of the enthusiasm resulting from Mr. Bortman's visit and Mr. Chambers.

11. The students of five high schools and the Pensocalo Junior College teamed up in the last 2 weeks of the school year and by numerous devices, car washes, walk-a-thon, talk-a-thon, collecting bottles, etc., collected some funds, but due to exams, proms, graduation, etc., the results were disappointing. Civic clubs have made numerous contributions. We have imported 5,000 Peruvian dollars which we swap for American dollars with considerable success.

We are now soliciting from special groups, doctors, lawyers, dentists, pharmacists. We have a list of 450 special names and are now organizing to go after them in about a week—they are classified as "$50 minimum."

The students are now reorganizing for a new drive as soon after school starts as

possible and we expect 5,000 to 10,000 from them.

We have set up a thrift shop run by some six or seven volunteer ladies and this will be open for business on September 1.

12. We have presented Miraflores with a pergamino also.

13. The city of Chimbote has awarded Pensacola a certificate of merit and achievement accepted for us on their 4th of July (the 28th) by our Peace Corps representative, Lon Roberts.

14. The City Council of Pensacola today by resolution is unanimously endorsing the people-to-people program and urging all citizens to support it.

15. The mayor and common council are giving a luncheon on the 6th of September to some 100 civic leaders to ask their support.

16. We have established a scholarship for two girl student nurses to come here and train for 1 year at Baptist Hospital, all expenses paid.

17. The enthusiasm and support has not flagged and we shall get the job done.

18. Finally, we are not behind since a change in the building site in Chimbote was made and they have just recently started grading and leveling down there.

I shall be glad to answer any questions or amplify any part of this summary if you desire.

Our very best to you and Llora.

Sincerely,

H. B. GROW,
Executive Chairman, People-to-People Council.

Stark County Historical Society To Dedicate New Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day this year it will be my pleasure and honor to participate in the dedication of the Stark County Historical Society's new historical center adjacent to the McKinley Monument in Canton, Ohio.

This magnificent building has been erected by the citizens of Canton at a cost of more than one-half million dollars, all of which has been donated so that the center is debt free.

A primary purpose will be to house a collection of historical documents and items relating to William McKinley, whose illustrious career is cherished by all of us in Canton and Stark County.

The purpose of the historical society in this regard is more fully set forth in the following resolution adopted by the board of directors:

Whereas it has been thought that William McKinley our most highly esteemed citizen of the United States should be more adequately honored, especially by the people of Stark County; and, whereas the beautiful monument which stands in this city, erected to the memory of him by the people of the Nation in 1907 is an ideal to that inspiration, it was thought reasonable to ask the Congress of the United States to join with us in this tribute to our 25th President.

It would, therefore, seem fitting and proper that additional recognition might well be given to this great man and that the memory of him be more deeply impressed.

He served with honorable distinction in the War Between the States from 1861 to 1865, entering it as a private and emerging therefrom as a major. For more than 30 years thereafter he continued as a leader and community worker in civil life, and as Governor of the State of Ohio and in the Congress of the United States.

A deeply religious man in all of his endeavors, he was one of the truly great, and was active in promoting world peace and good will. In his homelife and his daily attention and ministrations to his good wife he was an example of love and devotion that was inspiring to the world.

As President of the United States during a critical period in history, the Spanish-American War in 1898, he exercised sober judgment, fair dealings and wise decisions in all of his accomplishments.

Encircled within the dome of his tomb are these words, "Let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict, and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war."

He never failed to promote the welfare and happiness of his country, without injustice to others or the different nations of the world.

He came to the rescue of Cuba in its dire extremities and rescued it from the clutches of tyranny. He promoted welfare and prosperity for all.

His life was sacrificed on the alter of freedom, by an assasin's bullet and the world lost one of its greatest statesmen.

Recognizing the innumerable things that he had done and what he had always stood for and pioneered, it would seem that more complete remembrances of him should be kept.

Consequently, these will be in the form of tributes, tokens, mementos, extracts from his speeches, and stories of his achievements which will be preserved, not only for ourselves, but for our posterity.

In Canton, Ohio, where he lived and served so well, there are different remembrances of him, one of which is the beautiful McKinley High School. The home he owned and occupied was removed for humanitarian reasons to provide for a much needed expansion of a large hospital and he is not forgotten there.

Since June of 1946, a vast program of historical collections and writings have accumulated and have been published in book form regarding Stark County history, and many of these facts tell the story of William McKinley anew.

Recently completed at a cost of more than one-half million dollars is a beautiful historical center, free of debt, near the base of the McKinley Monument provided by the citizens of Stark County. The location of it was authorized through approval of the Ohio Historical Society and by a special act of the Ohio Legislature. It will be a compliment to the monument in its place.

Within its walls there will be contained the largest collection of McKinleyana in the United States. There will also be a place where the Spanish-American War, of which he was Commander in Chief, will be memorialized.

Therefore, this project will constitute a more extensive and well deserved remembrance of William McKinley. We, therefore, in paying tribute to him who was an example of true citizenship, and real greatness, pay tribute to ourselves: Be it therefore

Resolved, That a statement of these principles inscribed herein be enshrined on the records of the House of Representatives at Washington, D.C., as a testimony of honor and memory to William McKinley, and an inspiration to his fellow countrymen.

Every Federal-Aid Dollar Costs Michigan $1.20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, for years notions that Federal aid to States in the form of cure-all programs is a kind of free handout from an inexhaustible benefactor have been spread among American citizens by clever talk. The fact is that many States pay much more than a dollar in taxes for every dollar of aid received.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial of the Flint Journal, Flint, Mich., published August 19, 1963:

EVERY FEDERAL-AID DOLLAR COSTS MICHIGAN $1.20

"It won't cost us much. Most of it will be paid for with Federal funds." How often have you heard that misleading line? Chances are it has been too often.

Today's big spenders in government bandy this contention around as freely as they run up debts against future taxes that they haven't even dreamed up yet.

The regrettable thing about their irresponsible mouthing is that through repetition they have planted the dangerous idea into the heads of many taxpayers that Federal aid to States and local communities is a kind of a free handout that doesn't cost them anything.

It seems to be a difficult theory to explode. Because Washington is far removed from most of us and because those who would woo national support at the polls cleverly imply that Federal grants mean something for nothing, the thought persists that the Government possesses a bountiful money tree that has merely to be plucked whenever a State or local community applies for more funds.

The only one being plucked is the U.S. taxpayer—you and me. And it's beginning to hurt.

The Government's sole source of money is taxes. The more it spends the more it costs us.

Rather than being a free handout, funds received from Washington for State and local use actually cost Michigan taxpayers more than they receive.

That's right. For every $1 of Federal aid for projects in this State, Michigan taxpayers have to put up $1.20.

We have tried to emphasize this fact many times. But it was again brought to mind recently when the Internal Revenue Service announcement that Michigan residents had pumped an alltime high of $8.1 billion into the U.S. tax kitty in the fiscal year ended June 30 was followed by a Tax Foundation, Inc., report. It helped to debunk this something-for-nothing idea.

The report shows that Michigan is 1 of 17 States that pay more into the Federal Treasury than they receive.

Delaware taxpayers are paying the largest bite. They have to turn over $2.12 for every $1 of Federal aid. Here is the cost to each of the other 15 States for every $1 of Federal aid: New Jersey, $1.80; Connecticut, $1.64; New York, $1.52; Indiana, $1.44; Illinois, $1.34; Pennsylvania, $1.31; Florida, $1.30; Wisconsin, $1.26; Maryland, $1.23; Massachusetts, $1.20; Ohio, $1.15; California, $1.14;

Iowa, $1.04; Rhode Island, $1.03; Texas, $1.03.

Among the other States, the cost of a Federal aid dollar varies from 98 cents in Nebraska to 19 cents in Alaska.

Federal aid boosters use such figures to point out how resources between rich and poor States are equalized by such programs. However, a New Jersey Taxpayers Association report last year debunked such a contention. It called attention to the fact that only about one-sixth of the overall Federal aid spending actually transfers resources from the aiding States to the aided States.

"Nationally," the report stated, "84 percent of the Federal aid dollars made the trip to Washington and ultimately returned to the 50 States of origin under accompanying Federal programs. Only the remaining 16 percent was switched from the aiding to the aided States."

The sum of Federal aid to State and local governments is growing each year. In 1950 it totaled $2.2 billion. The projected figure for 1963 is $9.9 billion.

This should come as no surprise, as costs are going up everywhere, and the New Frontiersmen are determined to cure all our economic ills by unprecedented spending.

Let's never lose sight of the fact, however, that it's our money they're spending. And when they provide some of it for State and local projects we're paying $1.20 for every $1 received. It's not a free handout from a benevolent administration.

The Pomona Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, another major step in the community revitalization program of Pomona, Calif., which is located in the congressional district I represent, took place on August 15, 1963, when Pomona in impressive ceremonies dedicated a newly completed railroad underpass designed to relieve longstanding bottlenecks in the flow of traffic. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Herbert W. Klotz was the featured guest at the dedication.

This underpass, the last of three constructed to eliminate grade crossings of mainline Union Pacific and Southern Pacific tracks in downtown Pomona, is the Garey Avenue underpass in the heart of the famous Pomona Mall, Pomona's unique nine-block-long shopping area which has won national recognition. The underpass was dedicated to Mr. Homer L. Duffy, a famed Pomona civic leader.

Besides the Pomona Mall and the railroad underpasses, Pomona's revitalization program will include a modern civic center complex. A vital part of that complex is the public safety building combining all communications of a modern city, including the police, fire, public works, and water departments, the city hall switchboard and civil defense into a single intelligence and command department. The public safety building was dedicated in April of this year. Under its master plan Pomona has also developed a series of businessmen-operated municipal parking lots and a transportation terminal.

A factor that makes the Pomona story all the more impressive is that its projects have been accomplished without Federal aid, but instead are the product of private initiative and local and State resourecs. The mall, for example, was privately financed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the address presented at the Garey Avenue underpass dedication by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Klotz:

FREEING COMMERCE LIFELINES

I was more than delighted when your Congressman GLEN LIPSCOMB suggested to me that the Department of Commerce should be represented at the dedication ceremonies of the Homer Duffy Underpass at Garey Avenue here in Pomona.

Mr. LIPSCOMB, as you may know, is a member of the powerful House Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I sit across the table from him annually when we go up to ask for funds to run the Department of Commerce for another year. You will understand that we don't like to turn down a man who, with his committee chairman and colleagues, sits in stern judgment over every penny that we may be permitted to spend—especially not when it means traveling a few thousand miles to a beautiful place like California. I was glad to accept this assignment personally.

But, I became really intrigued when the Congressman, who is known to be economy minded, informed me that I would see, at first hand, a project that cost the Federal Government not one cent. This is something that happens to us just once in a great while.

And now that I have seen the impressive job you have done in revitalizing your central city, I am deeply honored by the privilege of taking part in these ceremonies.

Because of our great concern for healthy urban growth and for effective transportation to support this growth, we at Commerce are delighted when a city like Pomona sets out on its own to tackle its problems.

While Pomona is nearly 2,800 road miles from Washington, D.C., its accomplishments are felt and appreciated in the Capital. We are acuately aware that the downtown areas of our cities must maintain a vigorous growth if they are to contribute to the overall expansion necessary to the economic health of the United States.

Pomona's accomplishment in planning and building its beautiful shopping mall and streamlining its traffic approaches—as exemplified by the underpass dedicated today—is made more impressive when you consider that in city after city across the country downtown areas have deteriorated seriously and their contribution to the economic development has declined.

Explanations are not hard to find. The center of most cities were laid out 100 to 200 years ago and meant to serve much smaller populations and the leisurely pace of the horse and buggy.

A soaring population and the automobile have created problems that have too often outstripped community planning. In Pomona, for example, the population has increased fantastically from 35,000 in 1950 to around 75,000 today and is expected to hit 135,000 by 1980. You certainly are aware of the problems this growth has created.

The continuing impact of the automobile on our cities can be gathered from the fact that the number of automobiles in use in the United States has risen from 40 million in 1950 to more than 79 million in 1962 or 22 cars to every mile of road.

Here in California, mobility is a very important factor in the economic and social life of your citizens. They not only accept this, they apparently thrive on it.

Many California workers drive more miles between their jobs and homes in 1 week than the residents of some eastern cities travel for both business and pleasure in a month.

These facts of California living show up in some very interesting ways.

This is a highway, automobile oriented State. The citizens of California own more cars than the citizens of any other State—in fact, motor vehicle registration last year reached about 8.5 million units—more than 3 million higher than New York, your closest rival. Californians also drive more miles annually as witnessed by the fact that their motor vehicles will consume some 6.2 billion gallons of fuel, about 2 billion gallons more than in any other State.

Obviously, the mobility implied by these statistics requires a superior transportation system. California and its communities have been among the Nation's leaders in this field for many years—in fact, second to none.

All across the Nation, the increase in the use of automobiles has not only taxed downtown parking facilities and created sales-wrecking traffic congestion, but has been a factor in the flight to the suburbs, which have grown in population by 48 percent in a decade, compared with a growth rate of only 10.7 percent in central cities.

Indeed, the population rise and its shift from farms to cities to suburbs along with the growing demand for an expanding economy and new technical developments have created an urgent demand for solutions to increasing complex transportation problems.

In less than 20 years, more than half of our expanded population will be living in 40 great urban complexes. One of them is here in Los Angeles County. At the same time our urban areas are growing in population, they are undergoing fundamental changes due to the results of science and technology. The patterns of commerce are more diverse and complex. The transportation requirements of individual citizens have changed radically in recent years—partially as the result of higher income and more leisure time.

These were among the factors which President Kennedy cited last year when he sent a special message to Congress on transportation, in which he devoted a substantial portion to meeting the future requirements for transportation in our urban areas.

The President said: "The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare therefore requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth."

In recommending long-range Federal financial aid and technical assistance to help plan this vitally needed comprehensive and balanced transportation system, the President made it clear that his purpose was not only to benefit local communities, but to assure a more effective use of Federal funds for other than urban development and renewal programs.

Our planning is therefore aimed, in the President's words, "at the widely varying transit problems of our Nation's cities, ranging from the clogged arteries of our most populous metropolitan areas to those smaller cities which have only recently known the frustrations of congested streets."

One important aspect of our national transportation program is the construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate System. This is a glamour program because of the big $41 billion investment and because it challenges the imagination to think of that many miles of highway without a traffic light, railroad

crossing, or other features which impede the flow of traffic.

The Federal and State Governments in partnership are spending about $3 billion a year on this program and its importance cannot be understated. When the Interstate System is completed, it will represent only about 2 percent of the highway mileage in the Nation, but it will carry about 20 percent of the traffic.

The construction of the Interstate System, however, is only one part of the total transportation program. The Federal Government also allocates nearly $1 billion a year to other Federal-aid highways, both urban and rural.

Despite this tremendous investment in highways by the Federal Government, in the final anlysis, it is up to the State and local governments to fit all the various parts of a highway program together into a system which provides efficient and effective local service. This is one of the reasons Pomona can take such pride in this facility we have dedicated today. This project is yours. You, the citizens of Pomona, and the State made it possible.

No matter how much the Federal Government contributes to our intercity highways, our transportation system can be no better than that of the cities it serves. With this in mind a concept of total transportation planning was written into the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, in which Congress required that urban areas with populations of more than 50,000 have a cooperative, comprehensive, continuing transportation program, in order to be eligible for Federal-aid highway funds after June 30, 1965.

This concept has been fully accepted by the national organizations of the State highway departments, the cities, and the counties, who are working harmoniously and vigorously together, with assistance from the Bureau of Public Roads at the Department of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, to promote this total transportation planning.

It wasn't many years ago that highway planning consisted primarily of counting the cars on any given route and then deciding whether to build a new highway on the basis of total traffic.

This administration has made a determined effort to make transportation planning more comprehensive and blend it effectively with all other types of public and private urban activity and to take into full account the social requirements of a community as well as the need to move people and goods.

We now plan highways on the basis of the uses which will be made of available land. We closely coordinate highway development with urban renewal and other community development programs. The Federal Government also will pay its share of the costs of relocating both families and businesses required to move by Federal-aid highway projects.

In short, our transportation program reflects the principle that the effective and efficient use of public funds, whether Federal, State, or local, requires comprehensive consideration of a community's own development plans and program.

This total planning concept has been made necessary by the change in transportation patterns. In addition to what used to be a simple movement of people from the fringe of the city to its core, there has been added a complex crisscrossing of the whole area. Many people making crosstown trips are forced to go through the already congested central business district. Travel studies have shown that only a small percentage of the people—and vehicles—in the downtown area want to be there. They are just passing through because that's the way the existing street pattern channels them. And with so many, they are likely to be just creeping through.

Studies, which were pioneered here in California, have also indicated that in many cities circumferential highways have actually increased traffic in downtown areas—meaningful traffic of shoppers, not frustrated through drivers.

Furthermore, a nonintegrated transportation policy has long ignored the apparent conflicting needs of different modes of transportation. Thus, the railroad right-of-way and city traffic needs have long seemed at odds.

Back in 1887, a local newspaper here in Pomona reported, "The railroad crossing at Garey Avenue was blocked last Monday forenoon for a considerable length of time by a freight train, causing no little annoyance and delay to passing to and fro of teams. This is an annoyance that should be abated at once."

As is so often true in human affairs, "at once" took 67 years. But Pomona has faced its problem. Other areas have not.

In 1961, the latest year for which we have figures, more than 3,000 accidents occurred at grade crossings, with nearly 1,300 people killed and almost 3,300 persons injured. This is a terrible price to pay for accidents that could have been avoided with planning and action such as you have carried out here.

Your city has been a pioneer in the development of a statewide policy with respect to railroad grade separations. In 5 short years since you floated substantial bond issues to pay for your share of the program, you have built three underpasses, one at Towne Avenue, a second one at White Avenue and now the Homer L. Duffey underpass at Garey Avenue.

Through your remarkable achievement in eliminating the bottlenecks at these major traffic arteries, you have made an important contribution to the vital need of freeing the economic lifelines of the Nation.

You have every right to be proud that by taking the initiative and by your willingness to pay a fair share of the cost, you have been able to thwart the slow decay and strangulation that is typical of too many other American cities.

You have demonstrated that a city can enhance its opportunities to grow if it is led by responsible planners with foresight and drive. But the solution of this phase of your urban renewal program could not have been possible without the cooperation of all who were involved in the project and who accepted their responsibilities in a truly remarkable team spirit:

The Southern Pacific and Union Pacific Railroads which contributed their financial share to the undertaking, the county of Los Angeles which has shown its faith in the future of your community in many ways, the State division of highways which was in control of the project and bore the major portion of the cost, and other officials of the State of California who, under the progressive leadership of Governor Brown, encouraged and pushed the project to completion.

The revitalization of your central business district provides a fascinating record of achievement: From 1 parking lot district in 1950 with 110 spaces, Pomona has moved to 4 districts with assets over $1.5 million, more than 2,000 spaces in 20 core-area lots, and plans for some 3,000 spaces by 1965.

Perhaps even more impressive is the cooperation of merchants to share the cost of your beautiful shopping mall at a cost of over $680,000.

Coupled with the three underpasses that have made the downtown shopping area readily accessible, these developments are bringing dividends to Pomona. This $4 million department store where we are meeting today is just one of those dividends. Another, I understand, is that during the first 3 months of the mall's operation, city sales showed a 20 percent jump over the same period in 1961. These are results you can really measure.

And yet, this is only a beginning. You and I know that your city is merely on the threshold of a development which is bound to make it into one of the most important business, cultural, industrial, and research centers in the State.

Many problems of growth are still ahead of you, but from what I have seen and heard, I am confident that you will solve them as effectively as you have those that are now history.

This has been a proud day for Pomona and all of its citizens.

"What is the city but the people?" Shakespeare once asked. What Pomona has accomplished certainly reflects the spirit of its people and its leaders.

I am privileged to have met today some of your leaders who have contributed so much to Pomona's progress:

Mayor Harry A. Faull, under whose leadership Pomona's renewal program is being carried forward; former Mayors Baker, Cox, and Osborn who all played important roles in the development of the city; the members of your city council and all of the city officials, past, and present, who initiated and implemented this city's vigorous and imaginative program for growth; Fred Sharp, whose administrative ability has contributed so much to turning your plans and thoughts into reality; A. T. Richardson, that grand old citizen who 60 years ago founded the Progress-Bulletin which from humble beginnings has grown into a mighty newspaper; and last, but not least, "Mr. Pomona" himself, Homer L. Duffy, whose name the underpass bears—a man who never in his long life has lost faith in the future of your city.

And most important, the citizens of Pomona themselves.

Visiting your city has been a richly rewarding experience. For it is a city which is built not only of steel and concrete, but on the solidarity and the faith of its citizens.

Yours is a city which has demonstrated in a heartwarming manner that a great project for the benefit of all the people can be successfully completed in a truly bipartisan spirit.

You have shown that the forces uniting our Nation are greater than those dividing it, and that by working together in constructive, peaceful pursuit of our goals we can, as a local community or as a Nation, meet the challenges of our time.

On behalf of the Federal Government, I salute you and wish you well as you move forward on the road to further progress.

Farm Youth Employment Helpful but Not Substitute for Bracero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently some opponents of the bracero program, for supplying supplemental farm labor at harvesttime, have said, "Why don't you get the unemployed youth to do the work?"

This is not a new idea in the Salinas Valley. Our farmers, the Salinas farm labor office, schools and students have been doing this for many years. There

is good potential—for the farmer and student—in this idea.

Thirteen- and fifteen-year-old boys can average $1.50 per hour during the summer and save $250 in 4 weeks.

The following article from the California Farmer shows two important points: First, we have tried every idea proposed to obtain the necessary supplemental farm labor—and we still need the help of the bracero—and second, the labor is not cheap. Where else in the United States can a 13-year-old boy average $1.50 per hour working outside in the fresh air during his summer school vacation?

The article follows:

GOOD SUPERVISION KEY TO SUCCESS WITH YOUNG LABOR

(By Don Razee)

The Salinas Farm Labor Office has been promoting a farm youth employment program for the past 10 years. Each year the program has grown a little. This summer 1,300 students, ages 12 to 20, have found employment during the summer.

Activities to which young people have been referred are: Lettuce harvest, celery, broccoli, garlic topping, carrots, strawberry harvest, miscellaneous vegetables and thinning and hoeing of vegetable row crops.

We recently spent a day in the field with these young farmworkers, accompanied by B. C. Rucker, assistant chief, farm placement service, and Louis Braun, manager, Salinas Farm Labor Office. We found a happy group of fellows for the most part having a good time while earning welcome spending money.

We chatted at random with fellows such as Randy Goldman, 15, of Salinas. He had been harvesting crews we visited. Ron Lucas, 13, talked to him. He had saved $250 toward the purchase of a car. He told us he had averaged $1.50 per hour.

This was about the story all day in the harvesting crews we visited.. Ron Lucas, 13, Salinas, was also in a lettuce crew, and was averaging $1.50 per hour.

Lettuce is harvested at a crew rate of 24 cents per carton. The day's take is divided equally among the crew. We visited several ranches in the area and the pattern was about the same. There would be 20 to 25 youths in a crew of 70 to 75 workers. The young people held up their end. They have to in a situation such as this or the adult members of the crew would object to having them included.

Braun starts this youth work program before school is out. All area schools are contacted and the student body is informed that the more ambitious and physically able are wanted to do farmwork. Students are asked to come to the farm labor office to file their application for work.

Work application forms are left in the school offices, and notices of available farm jobs are published and posted on school bulletin boards. On Saturday, May 25, the farm labor office remained open and held a special Farm Youth Registration Day. Three years ago 750 students were placed in jobs. This summer the figure should top the 1,500 mark.

Every worker must be registered with the farm labor office, and have a social security number when reporting for work. Minors under 18 must have a work permit from the school office, valid during the vacation period. Minors over 16 are not restricted as to working hours in farmwork, but cannot work before 5 a.m. or after 10 p.m. Minors under 16 are restricted to 8 hours per day.

This program is in no way designed to replace either the bracero or the regular domestic workforce in Monterey County. There were 9,000 braceros working in the fields of Monterey at the same time the 1,300 students were picking up extra cash in the fields.

It is important to note that the 1,300 or 1,500 figure is a gross number and there are never that many in the field on any given day. This is the total number of young people who will have worked on a farm at some time during the summer. There is always turnover among these groups. Families leave for vacations and others return. Bible school and summer school start and finish, and with each such change there is a shift in the young workforce.

Farms using these crews successfully understand the nature of the workforce they are dealing with. They allow a fellow to work a short day to go play baseball or to take off for a few weeks' vacation and to return to his job when he is ready.

Not every ranch is set up to handle a youth program effectively. It takes a special kind of supervision to get a job accomplished with this kind of crew. The successful ones hire crew leaders to stay right with the youths. This youth crew leader can't expect to use the same methods employed to get the most out of a crew of braceros or adult domestics or he is finished before he starts.

Bruce Church, Inc., has a crew of 35 youths from 13 to 15 hoeing vegetable row crops. Richard Cotta, a college student, has been hired for the summer as the youth crew foreman. The crew is transported to and from the field in the employer's bus. At $1 per hour for 21 days, this crew has per worker earnings of $168 and crew earnings of $5,880 for the first month of work.

According to accurate figures for June and estimates for half of July, there were 900 in the age group of 16 to 20, and about 300 in the 13- to 15-year-old group referred to farm jobs. Total county earnings for this crew for a 21-day period amounted to $201,600.

Braun and his staff feel it is better for the youth of his area to earn a quarter of a million dollars per month than to roam the streets looking for something to do.

Adequate supervision is the key to making such a program work. Growers who have provided competent youth crew foremen have had a successful program and are encouraged with their results. Others who just turn the kids loose and expect to get something done have been disappointed.

This is no answer to the farm labor shortage, but it sure doesn't do the youngsters involved any harm.

Government Control: Citizens Must Stop This Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a very fine editorial which appeared in the Elks Bulletin, of the Pensacola Lodge No. 497. I was most impressed by this editorial, and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

E. R.'S CORNER

The Order of Elks is distinctively American. There are no Elk lodges in any foreign country. You must be an American citizen to belong to the BPOE. Since we are all American citizens, one of the primary objectives of our order is to promote Americanism. To bring to the members of our order, and to the general public, an awareness of the benefits of being lucky enough to be a citizen of this great country of ours.

The American way of life as we know it, and as it was visioned by the men who created it, is in a danger of which there is no parallel in history. There have been many trials of our system in the past, such as the War Between the States and the great depression, but we have survived most of them because of our basic concept of the rights of the individual. These very rights, which kept men going in the past are the things which are being slowly removed day by day in our time. In Europe, where most of our ancestors came from, there was very little or no chance to better one's self in society. If you were born to a carpenter then you would also be a carpenter and your children would be carpenters. In the new world of America you could advance according to your abilities and your desires. This was the incentive that drove men on to overcome all other obstacles and permitted our system to survive.

Through Government control, these basic rights which kept our country going, are being slowly whittled away. The farmer is being paid for not growing his crops. The businessman is being penalized for expanding his business by way of the graduated income tax. In all phases of our life Government control is taking a larger and larger part. Khrushchev said that he would bury us and he quickly explained that what he meant was that it was our system of individual freedom, he calls it capitalism, which would be buried of its own volition.

We American citizens can and must stop this trend. We cannot do it, however, by being indifferent and letting someone else do it. We must keep ourselves informed on the actions of our Government and let our representatives know what we think. Everyone values his freedom, but everyone does not know what to do to help preserve this freedom. The thing to do is to let yourself be heard. Nothing can influence a representative so much as a few letters from home letting him know that his voters are aware of what is going on.

RON.

Forecast for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, throughout this session of the Congress I have taken time to point out to my colleagues here in the House of Representatives the devastating effect that will result if the present monetary policies propounded by the Treasury Department were carried out. Only last Monday, here in this Chamber, I gave adequate warning for the need of constant and careful study and vigil on proposed monetary legislation if we are to avoid a complete dilution of our currency. I wholeheartedly feel that through bad judgment within the Treasury and greed on the part of others in wanting to speed up the withdrawal of silver certificates to such an unfortunate extent, justifies my alarm and warning.

Next, I expect to hear a request for legislation to debase our coins and it, too,

will be urgent because there will not be any silver left to mint due to the silver sales, at a subsidized price, to speculators and makers of silver products.

Fortunately, I am not the only one who is aware of the possible consequences. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a news story published in the Wallace Miner, Wallace, Idaho, on August 22, 1963, concerning an interim report made by Robert M. Hardy, Jr., to stockholders of the Sunshine Mining Co., of Spokane:

PRESIDENT OF SUNSHINE LOOKS AHEAD AT POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENTS IN SILVER SITUATION OF THE UNITED STATES

"The market price of silver being near the monetary value of the U.S. silver dollar, it is interesting to look ahead a bit and see what will transpire," says Robert M. Hardy, Jr., Spokane, president of the Sunshine Mining Co., in an interim report mailed to stockholders last weekend from Spokane.

He said the next market plateau will be around $1.298 per ounce, a figure that is derived by adding a half cent to the silver dollar monetary value of $1.2929.

"The market will stay at that level while the silver reserve of the Treasury is being eroded by coinage and the demands of industry," Hardy wrote.

In not very many years the reserve will be lost and the following plateaus will be the monetary value of the halves, quarters, and dimes, $1.3824 or slightly higher, he commented.

"The attainment of this plateau will be accompanied by a disappearance of coins to the extent that the ordinary transaction of business in this country will be seriously impeded," Hardy added, continuing:

"There are only two steps which may be taken by the Government to avoid this pitfall. One is the elimination of silver in coinage and the substitution of base metal tokens. It is interesting to speculate upon the consequences of such an action in this day of automation. The other step would be to raise the monetary value by reducing the silver content of the subsidiary coinage, that is the halves, quarters, and dimes, to a point beyond any expected rise in the price of silver.

"Either step requires a debasement of the coinage which should not be taken lightly. History is replete with examples of nations which have followed this course and have had either extreme economic difficulties or have lost their freedoms and disappeared as entities. It will be interesting to observe which course our Government, in its wisdom, will choose.

"Meanwhile, the general trend of the market price of silver will continue to be upward and, once it has leaped over the two plateaus, will level off only when there is sufficient supply coming out of the ground to meet a demand which may be lessened by higher prices."

Deeds Rather Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully wish to call attention to a project which has just recently been completed in one of our Connecticut communities. I believe this project has meritorious possibilities in the cause of developing our friendship with the newly formed States on the African Continent. For that reason, I would hope that it could be emulated by other communities across our country and, for that reason, mention it here.

The project, officially dubbed "Books for Africa," was sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of New Britain, Conn. The operation was organized by a local citizen, Daniel J. Kulak. They were joined in this good work by the American Hardware Corp., the New Britain School Department and the Peace Corps. The idea was to collect outdated textbooks, no longer in use by the local school system, pack and ship them to Africa, for distribution by the Peace Corps there. The value of the books to the community at the time was only nominal—as dust collectors in the storage rooms of the city's schools. Overseas, however, they would be given a new lease on life, and service again to humanity.

Starting at 9:30 in the morning one day, the local jaycees went to work rounding up the books. The American Hardware Co. contributed the space in their plant for storing, and the materials for packing. By 5 o'clock that evening 10,000 books had been collected. Then, another 10,000 has been added. From New Britain, the books came to Peace Corps headquarters here in Washington for reshipment to Africa where Peace Corpsmen and Corpswomen will use them in classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, deeds such as these; examples of human understanding and helpfulness; I believe, bespeak more eloquently the fair and unselfish spirit of the American people than many thousands of splendid words, carefully put together. For such are deeds that speak for themselves the simple love and compassion of their doers. Most of us who have traveled overseas have witnessed the grudging destitution which surrounds the lives of old and young alike. But our deepest sympathies lie with the innocent children whose tender lives will be blighted, perhaps forever, by circumstances far beyond their control.

In these children, however, also lie the best hopes for the future stability and development of these areas. Young and eager to live, their spirits have not yet been broken by the brutalizing forces of poverty. A textbook in the hands of one such child is a tangible symbol of that hope; another material proof that we in America want to see them attain the full realization of their worthy aspirations. It is not possible, I think, to assay the true value of such deeds by our private citizens, but I do sincerely believe that the benefits that flow from them are many and very long lived. So I would urge my colleagues here and citizens everywhere to consider the merits in such acts. The simple deeds of the kindhearted people back home often speak as forcefully and more directly than some of the best planned and well-intentioned projects of our Government.

A Tribute to Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Senator Estes Kefauver has left a void in American politics which may never be filled. Senator Kefauver was loved and revered not only by his constituents in Tennessee but by millions of Americans who looked to him to protect the public interest. Many editorials all over the Nation have been written memorializing the great crusader from Tennessee. Few, however, capture the essence of the man more accurately than one which was published in the August 31 issue of the New Republic magazine. I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to this tribute to one of the Nation's greatest Senators:

ESTES KEFAUVER

Ours is an age of transition from localism to nationalism, and nowhere is the difficulty of this change clearer than in the U.S. Congress. Senator Estes Kefauver was elected by the people of Tennessee to serve as their Senator. Yet he was called, both by his own conscience and by the requirements of the time in which he lived, to be not merely the Senator from Tennessee but a U.S. Senator. Few of his colleagues met the challenge so successfully.

Estes Kefauver was a great campaigner, a master of the handshake and the slap on the back. But unlike most of his colleagues he used these skills not only to retain office but to serve the public interest as he saw it. His dependence on Southern voters did not prevent him from advocating Atlantic Union or refusing to sign the Southern Manifesto, nor from opposing the filibusters and the poll tax.

Nor did the power of local businessmen or national lobbyist blunt his Populist faith that the function of Government is to protest "the people" from "the interests." He opposed A.T. & T. in space, the drug houses in medicine, and the steel companies in industry. The opposition was instinctive, but it was backed by impressive expertise: When the drug safety bill was signed last year, the trade press said Kefauver had won because he and his staff knew more about the drug industry than the industry knew about itself.

There are probably no more than 30 Senators who habitually place the public interest ahead of local interests. Kefauver was one of them. He had a rare willingness to struggle, both politically and intellectually, with problems far removed from the immediate affairs of his constituents. Sometimes, as when he investigated crime, drugs, or the Dixon-Yates affair, he earned headlines for his troubles. Occasionally he even won votes. But often his efforts were visible only to a few colleagues and to the lobbyists who opposed him. When he died on August 8 he was in the midst of such an unsung fight, against a "quality maintenance" bill which would in effect legalize price fixing on trademarked goods. There are no legislative monuments to the men who lead such defensive actions in Congress, but without them the country cannot long survive.

Estes Kefauver had neither the intellectual style nor the restrained manner valued on the New Frontier or elsewhere in an increasingly technocratic society. He was a legacy

from the past—from the muckrakers and progressivism—when it was still fashionable to believe that the people were the ultimate respository of wisdom and virtue. His faith is today largely discredited. But the new age which is dawning has yet to discover a new faith to replace it. Until it does, Estes Kefauver should not be forgotten.

If Peace Does Come, What Happens to Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, U.S. News & World Report magazine recently published an excellent article analyzing the effects of peace to our economy. Their consensus: Disarmament, if it came, would be limited and gradual. The country should be able to take what it brings in stride. As Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York stated, "we still have the solar system, the inside of the atom and the amelioration of man's condition on earth to take up the slack."

The article follows:

IF PEACE DOES COME, WHAT HAPPENS TO BUSINESS?

This question once again is being raised: If peace does come, what happens to business? Will the bottom drop out if defense spending is cut?

There is a lull in the cold war. Before the U.S. Senate is a treaty calling for an end to testing of nuclear weapons in the air or underwater. A nonaggression agreement is being proposed by Russia's Khrushchev.

DANGER SPOTS

Talk of peace is catching on. Before shouting, however, it is important to bear some other things in mind.

Cuba, just off Florida, remains a Russian base, occupied by Russian troops.

Truce in Korea is a very uneasy one.

The guerrilla war in South Vietnam, where Americans in uniform are being killed, is still being sustained by Chinese Communists. The Red Chinese, in an ugly mood, are capable of starting a big war in Asia at any time.

Berlin, in Europe, is only on the back burner. Crisis there can be heated up in a twinkling.

Russia at this point, too, holds an edge in military power of many kinds—including nuclear weapons of supersize. Nobody is proposing seriously that all these weapons be destroyed.

In other words, it is hardly a world in which to go about unarmed, or even with a smaller arsenal of weapons.

But just suppose peace did come and disarmament was agreed upon. What then? Would a depression follow?

This whole question has been the object of Government studies. It has been explored by economists for private industry and other groups.

All studies appear to be in agreement on these points:

1. Disarmament that might occur would be partial and spaced over a period of years, not sudden and drastic. Defense costs now total about $55 billion a year, or about 10 percent of overall spending in the country, public and private. It has been suggested that those costs might be cut by 25 billion, at a rate of about 5 billion a year. Such a cut would be less than 5 percent of total spending when completed in 5 years, and barely 1 percent a year while occurring.

2. A tax cut of comparable size would accompany an arms cut. If defense spending were cut at a rate of $5 billion a year for 5 years, the expectation is that taxes would be reduced by at least that amount, and probably more. This would be aimed at cushioning the shock. It is expected, too, that spending in fields other than defense would be expanded—for roads, schools, slum clearance, mass transit, other programs.

3. Business, in total, need not be upset for any prolonged period. It is true that States in which defense contracts are centered would face a severe adjustment. Some industries dependent upon defense business would be hurt. The additional purchasing power resulting from a reduction in taxes, however, would help many lines of civilian business.

The country could expect to go through a period of uncertainty, in which the stock market might experience an upset. Thus, the effects would be spotty, and few think a general depression would necesarily follow unless the arms cutback should happen to coincide with the working of other forces of a deflationary type.

AFTER WORLD WAR II

Two adjustments from heavy spending on arms have occurred during the past 18 years and in each case with only a minor shock.

Arms spending reach a high of $81.3 billion in the Government's accounting year that began July 1, 1944. Over 3 years, that spending was cut to $11.8 billion, a reduction of $69.5 billion.

Business at the time took this reduction in its stride. The reason was that war had created a vast pent-up demand for everything from household gadgets to new cars and new houses. Business was moving up strongly by mid-1946.

AFTER KOREA

Arms spending during the Korean War rose to $50.4 billion at the peak. Within a year after the war ended in 1953, arms outlays were reduced to $40.7 billion, a cut of $9.7 billion. Again the shock was minor—eased, to a great extent, by a cut in business and individual income taxes. By 1955, the country was again moving into a boom, with record demand for new cars, high and rising demand for new homes, and record spending by business.

THE NEXT TIME

There would be differences, however, if today's cold war should end. Pent-up demands of consumers have been met. Individuals are heavily in debt already for purchases of cars and other items. Competition from foreign producers is fierce in world markets. The American dollar, after years of carrying the bulk of the free world's defense and aid burdens, now is in some trouble.

Yet out of all the studies comes the conclusion that the United States could take peace without too serious an upset.

The main reason for this optimism is that peace would not just break out overnight.

No nation would be expected to destroy its weapons and disband its armies as the United States did after two world wars. The theory of those who have made studies is that, so long as Russia and China remain closed societies, the free world could never be sure that the Communist nations were not cheating.

The upshot: Disarmament, if it comes at all, is expected to be limited and gradual, spaced over a number of years.

One official study made by experts in Government, industry and universities provides an illustration of how this works.

This study, released in January 1962, by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, assumed a continuing buildup in arms until 1965, followed by a gradual scaling down over a period of 12 years.

Cuts in arms spending were seen being offset, in part, by increased spending by the Atomic Energy Commission for civilian purposes and by a growing space-exploration program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Also expected: increased spending for policing of any disarmament agreement.

Allowing for these offsets, the study estimated a net reduction in U.S. security and associated outlays of about $22 billion in the first 6 years after a disarmament agreement.

The study's conclusion: "Disarmament * * * should create small danger of provoking immediate depression in our economy * * *."

That confidence now is widely shared by economists in and out of the Government.

Depression proof? Neil Jacoby, dean of the business school at the University of California at Los Angeles, told U.S. News & World Report:

"Peace would not trigger a drastic slump in business. Disarmament would have to come in stages, allowing the economy time to make adjustments. I think the United States is truly depressionproof."

From Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York:

"I can't see the cold war ending so suddenly as to face us with a sharp cessation of military expenditures. If the cessation is gradual—if and when it comes—we still have the solar system, the inside of the atom, and the amelioration of man's condition on earth to take up the slack."

Other leading economists also are reassuring. These authorities recognize, however, that some difficult adjustments affecting many businesses, individuals, and areas of the country, would be necessary.

MIXED RESULTS

The charts on these pages show you the industries and parts of the country that would be most vulnerable to an arms cutback.

California would be hit hard. That State handles nearly one-fourth of all the Nation's prime military contracts. It ranks as the biggest "war producer"—in missiles, planes, ships, electronic gear, other items.

New York, Ohio, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Texas, all deep in the defense business, would feel the impact.

A slash in defense payrolls, military and civilian, would be felt widely. In Alaska, for example, defense payrolls account for more than one quarter of total personal income in the State. In Hawaii, more than 18 percent of personal income is drawn from Defense Department paychecks.

Washington, D.C., home of the Defense Department's Pentagon, would be hurt. There, defense payrolls account for more than $1 out of every $10 of personal income. The same is true of nearby areas of Virginia.

Some communities would feel a severe wrench. San Diego, Calif., where aircraft and missile production accounts for more than 80 percent of factory employment in the city, is a prime example. Another is Wichita, Kans., where defense manufacturing of missiles and planes provides jobs for 72 percent of all factory workers. In Seattle, Wash., more than half of all factory workers are employed in making missiles and aircraft.

These are extreme examples. Most areas of the country would be affected much more moderately, and some places would feel little direct impact from a cutback in defense.

The Midwest, in general, would not suffer the worst of the blow. That area has faced up to sharp cutbacks in defense spending.

Five of the Great Lakes States—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin—now get only about 12 percent of the prime military contracts, compared with 32 percent

during World War II and 27 percent during the Korean war.

The expectation is that, in this and other areas similarly situated, a defense cutback could be phased out over a period of years without any great dislocations in the economy.

TAKING UP THE SLACK

But what of the States and communities that today are heavily dependent on defense contracts and payrolls? Would disarmament mean economic collapse in these places?

The experts who have explored the question think not, assuming careful planning for an orderly transition. These experts emphasize two points:

First, that defense spending, even if reduced under a disarmament program, will remain substantial for as long as anyobdy can now foresee.

Second, that any cutback will be phased out over a period of years, allowing time for adjustment to a new era.

Nobody expects California or New York or any other major State in defense production to lose out completely in military business. These States would simply have to adjust to a smaller volume of military production. Troops in large numbers would still be stationed in Alaska, Hawaii, and many other places.

The official idea is for the Government, during the transition period, to move in with many means to head off business trouble.

Tax cutting is one. A tax holiday has been proposed by some. Easier tax rules to help business switch into new fields are under study. Money, under these plans, would be made cheap and easy to borrow—again aimed at helping business over the hump.

Public works of many kinds are proposed. There are plans to rebuild the cities, clean up and develop the Nation's rivers and harbors, build roads and dams, build schools, construct systems of mass transit in urban areas.

Such plans also include vast civilian uses of the atom—to make electricity, dig tunnels, possibly provide a cheap source of power for desalting ocean water for irrigation.

All these measures and others, to be financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, are counted on to ease the difficult years of adjustment. Contracts, so far as possible, would be channeled into areas that are hurt by disarmament.

A CIVILIAN ECONOMY

At the same time, the idea is to stimulate development of new civilian products to catch the public fancy.

The thinking is that the public appetite for better living, new conveniences is insatiable—assuming people have the money to buy.

Peace planners talk of switching research away from military purposes and into peacetime purposes, aimed at developing new civilian markets.

In short, it means an effort by direct public and private investment into building a new civilian economy.

Workers by the thousands, so the thinking goes, would have to be retrained in new skills. The Government has plans for that.

Industry would have to be given the urge and the means to reach out into new fields. Tax incentives, easy money, possibly even direct loans from the Government, are among the ideas that are being advanced here.

Nobody expects all this to come off like a rehearsed performance. The transition to peace undoubtedly would be painful for many, at least in the early stages. Still, nearly all authorities on the subject believe a general depression can be prevented.

PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT

How severe the initial shock might be is related to the condition of the economy at the time the news of peace develops.

If business is in a downward cycle at that time, peace news could produce a psychological reaction affecting the whole economy. If business is strong at the time, peace news probably will be easier for the economy to take.

Warns Mr. Sproul: "We do not know exactly what makes human beings act and react as they do." He notes that investors did not panic after the sharp break in the stock market on May 28, 1962, but adds, "Another May 28 might bring a different response."

The first reaction to peace news is one of the real imponderables.

EVERYBODY HAS A STAKE

Whatever the initial impact, the effects of disarmament would reach every American.

Tax relief, almost surely, would be voted right away.

U.S. forces, many of them, would come home from abroad. The Armed Forces, a little at a time, would be cut.

The draft soon would end. Young people would be able to plan their lives again.

All this would occur gradually, not all at once. Sudden, upsetting changes probably would be avoided.

The country could hope that, in time, Government spending might be cut, permitting a reduction in the public debt. The plan, in the beginning, is to hold spending high through pump-priming programs.

Foreign aid probably would be cut.

The dollar problem would be eased—assuming a reduction in aid and military spending abroad.

Space programs at the outset, probably would be pushed by the White House as one way to take up the slack left by a cut in military outlays. In time, however, a public reaction might set in against huge spending to run a race with the Russians in space. Peace would destroy some of the incentive to outdo the Russians in space.

Planners expect the public to be impatient, once disarmament starts, to get the transition pump priming over with and settle down to normal conditions again.

The expectation is that high-level spending, for peace if not for war, will go on for a good many years yet.

The outlook. Any real peace, permitting substantial disarmament, still looks a long way off. Yet planning for peace is a continuing project.

If it comes, the experts agree, the country should be able to take what it brings in stride, without a collapse of the economy.

March on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all across the Nation, the press has been proclaiming the success of the march on Washington for jobs and freedom. All have lauded the manner in which it was run and have paid tribute to those who were the leaders in this event.

The Springfield Daily News in an editorial of August 29, 1963, reflects the feeling of the newspaper world. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SUCCESS IN WASHINGTON

Congress is not likely to be stampeded into adoption of President John F. Kennedy's civil rights program intact by yesterday's historic rally in Washington.

In fact, various key figures in Congress have said that the impact of the march on the National Capital will change few votes in either branch. The thinking of the present Congress on civil rights issue had long since been crystallized.

Nevertheless, if national opinion does have its eventual reflection in the attitudes of legislators, yesterday's great gathering was not a wasted effort.

On the contrary, between sunrise yesterday and sunset, the cause of civil rights made a remarkable advance.

Partly this was due to the fact fears for the worst were not realized. There were no examples of the violence—and indeed no hints of it—which it had been feared enemies of the cause might instigate in the hope of embarrassing the movement.

But perhaps the tremendous success of the event was due principally to the aura of moral sureness created by the sight of so many marchers, both white and Negro, dedicated to a common hope. No one participated, in short, who did not know he was right—right in the conviction that racial discrimination and intolerance are indefensible on any grounds whatsoever, and right in the conviction that the American promise is freedom.

And that this sense of certainty was communicated there can be no doubt.

This cannot but have a major effect on the country as a whole as it braces for new chapters in the forward moving civil rights struggle, even though the immediate register of yesterday's triumph may not be in Congress itself.

The results nationwide should be greater sympathy and greater understanding and perhaps a greater willingness on the part of those who have watched the movement from the sidelines up to now to change to the role of active participation. That this can be done with enthusiasm and yet with dignity was demonstrated yesterday in Washington.

International Air Cadet Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 6, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to note that on August 2, 1963, foreign cadets participating in the 16th Annual International Air Cadet Exchange program of the Civil Air Patrol and their escort officers representing 22 countries, arrived in Washington, D.C., for a 4-day visit. The following countries took part in this most commendable program: Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey.

It was indeed heartening to have had this fine international group of young people and interested adult participants meeting here in our Nation's Capital to compare programs and discuss the worldwide operation of the Civil Air Patrol. The Civil Air Patrol has long been in the forefront of a worthwhile and constructive program of public service and admirably inspires a large voluntary service of its members and wide

non-Government participation in its functions.

This recent International Air Cadet Exchange received invaluable assistance from the U.S. Air Force, of which the Civil Air Patrol is an auxiliary unit. While the Air Force assists in the Exchange, it is still essentially self-reliant and requires active support from American citizens and private corporations.

Men like Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., of Pan American World Airways, and L. A. Fleener, of the Mercedes-Benz Co., can be singled out as citizens who have taken such an active and spirited interest in the CAP International Exchange program. Their tireless efforts, as well as the work of numerous others, have guaranteed the success of this most commendable and constructive international meeting of mind.

Again, I congratulate the CAP and its members, both from the United States and abroad, who participtaed in the recent Exchange visit to Washington and who, I am sure, have carried back to their homelands a new devotion and interest in the work of the Civil Air Patrol.

New York Job Development Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from the New York Job Development Authority which I bring to the attention of the House. This report covers the first full year of operations of the authority. It reflects the fact that the loaning activities are now underway and have already been of material effects in creating job opportunities throughout the State.

Worthy of particular mention is the fact that new jobs are being created at the rate of approximately $1,000 loans. This is an indication of what can be done by a tight, well-run program and is an example for the Area Redevelopment Administration to take to heart.

OPERATIONS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NEW YORK JOB DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

During the fiscal year ended March 31, 1963, the first full year of the authority's operation, the authority's loaning procedure got underway and 20 loans aggregating $2,724,069 were approved. These loans affect widely scattered communities throughout the State in both rural and metropolitan areas and cover a wide range of manufacturing including steel, metal products, clothing, scientific equipment, building materials, housewares, paper, furniture, and various food products.

It is interesting to note that of the total loans, 16 for $1,715,030, provide funds for the construction of new manufacturing plants or the expansion of existing plants, while the remaining 4, amounting to $1,009,-039, make possible the acquisition, renovation, and resumption of manufacturing in plants heretofore idle.

It is estimated that the total new job opportunities created by these loans will amount to 2,212.

It will be recalled that the authority's loans are made in conjunction with other lending agencies. These agencies include commercial banks, savings banks, the New York Business Development Corp. and the Federal Area Redevelopment Administration.

While ultimately the authority will offer bonds for public sale, loanable funds up to this time have been obtained from the sale of short-term notes to a commercial bank. It is planned to retire these notes with bonds at such time as the total of mortgage loans makes this practicable.

Some 16 of the 20 loans affect labor areas of relatively high unemployment.

There is evidence of continually increasing interest throughout the State in the work of the authority. At the present time the total number of local development corporations which have been organized exceeds 100. The authority's staff maintains continual and close contact with these organizations. In addition, the staff members have frequently met with chambers of commerce, city councils, professional associations and various similar groups throughout the State to explain to leading citizens the financial procedures by which the authority can assist in the creation of new jobs.

Freedom and Jobs Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital this week was privileged to be host to 210,000 Americans of many races, creeds, and colors who participated in a freedom and jobs demonstration. I am certain that millions of Americans were impressed with the orderliness and purposeful manner with which the marchers conducted themselves. There has been no end to editorial comment on the march, its consequences, and its impact upon the American people.

About 3 dozen persons from my congressional district made an 88-hour chartered bus ride to Washington to participate. They arrived in Washington at midmorning on the day of the march and left at 5:30 a.m. the following day. I had the pleasure of talking to many of them after the march. I was impressed with their deep, religious faith that in America injustice and social evils will not long be tolerated and ultimately will be remedied. They conveyed an impressive sense of belief that the American democratic ideas will ultimately be squared with practice and that American men and women of all races, creeds, and colors will ultimately be secured against racial, religious, and economic discrimination. These aroused Americans, whose conscience and workaday world rebels against discrimination, inspiringly remind us, in a paraphrase of the late poet, Robert Frost, that in America we have promises to keep and miles to go before we sleep—in good conscience.

Under unanimous consent I place in the Appendix of the RECORD five articles—one by Richard Starnes in the August 30, 1963, Washington Daily News; one by Marquis Childs and an editorial, both in the Washington Post of August 30; a column by James Reston printed in the August 30 editions of the New York Times; and a column by the widely read columnist of the Oregon Journal, Doug Baker, that appeard August 29.

The articles follow:

NOT AN ENDING BUT A BEGINNING

(By Richard Starnes)

It was a day to remember. It was a day when a multitude of sorely tried Americans conducted themselves in a manner that someday will be hailed as a milestone in mankind's long and weary climb toward human dignity and brotherhood.

It was a day of revolution, a day when finally the most purblind among us must have realized that we were witnessing a momentous social change taking place before our eyes.

It was, above all, a day for laying to rest hoary, tarnished cliches.

These were no outside agitators from the dreadful Gomorrah of New York, bent on destroying a gentle folkway. There were pros there, to be sure, and skillful, impassioned ones at that. But the cry that swelled from 200,000 throats had no taint of press agentry, and the good will and self-restraint of people whose patience has been hammered thin by generations of oppression was no mummer's mask.

The pros and the artful technicians were there, but no one who witnessed it will ever forget the dramatic moment when the leaders suddenly became followers, when the plain people moved from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial as if on common impulse, and the leaders fell in step and followed.

There was an authenticity about this rally that could not be mistaken.

There was a subtle but very real distinction between the patient good humor that was seen on every hand, and the docile resignation that so often has been the rule in the past.

For all its impressive precision, its lack of incidents and its quasi-religiosity, the rally contained a clear warning for all who could see it:

The word is "now."

Now, while the essential decency of America's Negro minority remains uncurdled by the bitter wine of defeat and disappointment.

Now, while there is still time.

Now, when it still can be done peacefully by the workings of our democratic process.

Now, before default permits the George Lincoln Rockwells and the Malcolm X's of this world to rip our mending social fabric into shreds.

It was a day that must have been wormwood and gall to the chinless know-nothings of both races.

Where, in the clockwork precision, were the feckless black men who know neither time nor schedules? At what point in the sunny, smiling day did the dismal old bromide about lack of discipline and near savagery perish?

And in the gentle kindness with which the city of Washington made these people welcome, where was the cruel image of the white oppressor?

If it was a day to remember for white Americans, it was no less memorable for Negroes.

Old wounds heal slowly, but many an ancient hurt must have been eased yesterday in the comfort and understanding with which the Capital of our Nation held out its hand to the freedom marchers.

It took the bloody horror of the Warsaw ghetto battle to convince the doubters that Jews would fight and die for freedom.

If yesterday's awesome spectacle does nothing else, it should forever still the smug voices that endlessly repeat the dogeared litany that Negroes are happy in their segregated warrens, in their benighted schools, in their menial jobs.

For all its power and grace, none who witnessed the appeal to the conscience of America in Washington yesterday could doubt that he was seeing not an ending but a beginning.

It was a beginning, a beginning tragically overdue, and one that may have been perilously close to being too late.

It was only a beginning, but, great day in the morning, what a beginning it was.

[From The Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1963]

TRIUMPHAL MARCH SILENCES SCOFFERS

(By Marquis Childs)

It was part camp meeting, part joyful picnic, and part a determined, almost fierce political rally uniting people of so many kinds and conditions.

Above all, it was an answer to the scoffers hoping for the worst. Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, had sneered at what he called an organized civil war, a rabble looking for trouble.

No one watching that vast crowd sweeping away from the Lincoln Memorial could help being impressed by the quiet and the patience with which they stood as the hours wore on, listening to a program that was inevitably too long. They had come from all over the country, schooled in the need for dignity and restraint. All the dire forebodings about what might happen with such an influx of people were put to naught.

At times it seemed they were almost too restrained. Only when the chant, "Pass that bill," now and then swept over the assemblage, starting just under the speakers' platform and sweeping out to the farthest reaches under the elms along the Mall, did the crowd seem to take life.

But the depth of feeling was there just beneath the surface. In the response to the fiery words of John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, calling for the marches and the demonstrations to continue until equality should be won, you could be sure that this was not just a glorious outing that was an end in itself. The Negro leaders who spoke were all veterans of a war still going on, and the march was merely a pause in which to recite battles won and warn of the long and difficult campaign still ahead.

How much that great demonstration—the greatest test in the history of the Capital—will mean for civil rights leigslation is hard to say. In the cold light of the morning after, as the weary marchers return home, it may seem small indeed. Attitudes are hardening on both sides of the integration line.

In the House, members of the liberal bloc feel that the Kennedy administration has made a characteristic tactical error in asking for less than a full measure of civil rights and expecting to take less than that. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT and others have been pressing the White House to include a fair employment practices provision. The crowd held up an impressive number of signs calling for a Federal FEPC.

Administration supporters are saying that it will be enough to get the basic structure of civil rights legislation, then expand upon it in the years ahead. A lot of hard work and a lot of luck will be necessary for even the first fundamental step. But if the legislation is watered down—the public accommodation section amended to cover only establishments with 50 or more employees for example—the deep and dangerous frustration for which the march was a temporary outlet will build up again.

The crux of the whole matter is jobs. The most forthright expression of this came from Walter Reuther of the United Auto Workers. Without jobs for both whites and Negroes in an expanding economy, civil rights tend to seem a theoretical privilege for the affluent of both races.

Regardless of how much it finally means in the civil rights score, this great orderly mass outpouring will go down in the history of the Capital as a triumph. The setting and the day were perfect. As the hours wore on, the shaft of the Washington Monument threw a deepening shadow on the Reflecting Pool, framed by the crowd stretching almost its entire length.

They had sat through to the end with little movement, with people coming and going only at the extremities as the oratory wore on. They were rewarded by the closing speech of Martin Luther King, Jr., which rose above mere oratory to a moving peroration of what the future can mean for an American that has wiped out the hatred of race prejudice.

King and the other leaders had shown not only that they could organize such a gathering but that in this critical juncture they could hold the support of the mass of the Negro people. The extremists were pushed to the remote sidelines. And that is perhaps the greatest measure of the success of a day that has had few if any parallels in the life of this city.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S DAY

The Capital belongs to all Americans, of course; but the people who call it home are entitled to a special measure of pride for the part it played in Wednesday's triumphal march for jobs and freedom. The marchers, who came from all parts of the United States, were admirable visitors; but we think it no more than simple justice to say that the people of Washington proved to be superb hosts.

There was not an untoward incident all day. The 200,000 Americans crowded into the area between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial were full of such resolute good will and good humor that it was impossible even to hear an irritable word, let alone see any indication of hostility. Courtesy, patience, kindness were the rule. And, indeed, all through the city order and sobriety prevailed. The only crime reported all day long was a single instance of pocketpicking downtown.

Men being less than angels, all this harmony and lawfulness did not come about by sheer chance. It was planned that way—planned by local authorities in close advance collaboration with leaders of the demonstration. The most imaginative and foresighted precautions were taken to minister to the needs and comfort of the marchers, to protect merchants and householders against any camp followers who might try to take advantage of the city's preoccupation, and to minimize friction, confusion, and provocation of any sort. We salute—and with warm gratitude—the good spirit and the good sense with which the District Commissioners and their aids handles the whole affair in the name of the people of Washington.

Special praise and thanks are due Chief Robert Murray's police force and the small army of National Guardsmen, Reservists, and special officers who helped in the splendid job of maintaining order. They did it with such style, dignity, calm, and gentleness, that there was not a legitimate complaint to be heard concerning them the whole day through. They were even meticulously correct and considerate in their treatment of the little handful of Nazi troublemakers. And to all the men and women of good will who thronged the Capital, they were, as they should always be, stalwart protectors and friends.

The Americans who came here will feel more than ever, we hope, that this is their city. The Americans who live here can feel renewed and redoubled pride in their own hometown.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1963]

WASHINGTON: THE FIRST SIGNIFICANT TEST OF THE FREEDOM MARCH

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 29.—The first significant test of the Negro march on Washington will come in the churches and synagogues of the country this weekend.

It is no good waiting for a political reaction in Congress, for if there is no effective moral reaction out in the country, there will be no effective political reaction here.

This whole movement for equality in American life will have to return to first principles before it will overcome anything. And as moral principles preceded and inspired political principles in this country, as the church preceded the Congress, so there will have to be a moral revulsion to the humiliation of the Negro before there can be significant political relief.

THE TV MENTALITY

The preachers at the Lincoln Memorial here this week understood this better than anybody else, but they were not able to speak for the whole religious community of the Nation.

"If," said the executive head of the United Presbyterian Church, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, "all the members and all the ministers of the constituency I represent here today were ready to stand and march with you for jobs and freedom for the Negro people, together with all the Roman Catholic Church and all of the synagogues in America, the battle for full civil rights and dignity would be won."

The president of the American Jewish Congress, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, put the point another way. "When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned many things. The most important thing I learned * * * under those tragic circumstances is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most shameful, and the most tragic problem is silence.

"A great people, which had created a great civilization, had become a nation of silent onlookers. . . . America must not remain silent. It must speak up and act . . . and not for the sake of the Negro, but for the sake of the image, the idea and the aspiration of America itself. . . ."

Few people would question the validity of these points, but two misfortunes have debased the power of the church and of church opinion. Too many preachers, like too many Congressmen, are not leading but following their flock, perpetuating rather than destroying illusion and prejudice. They are "passing by on the other side." And their parishioners, even when they want to be participants instead of spectators, have lost faith in their power to influence great events.

Nothing, however, is more fallacious in American political life than the popular idea that Congressmen pay no attention to letters from their constituents. Some of them are impervious to reason and others either won't or can't read, but all of them want to be reelected, and all of them know the political power of the church, even if they never go there except for votes.

If the preachers said what they really thought about this racial crisis and even half of those who heard and believed them wrote their honest convictions for or against racial equality to Capitol Hill, the political balance on racial equality might easily be transformed.

If, however, the churches do not react and the march on Washington is regarded by the

religious community as just another TV show, the political battle for civil rights could easily be worse off than before.

For while the politicians here are not saying much about the march, they are listening. And if such a mammoth demonstration, dramatizing the basic religious concept of equality, does not get an impressive response even from the churches, Congress could easily conclude that the Nation was indifferent or worse.

WE NEED ALLIES

The Negro leaders were less exuberant here today than during the big demonstration yesterday. After the spree comes the hangover, and President Kennedy warned them before they left that only with strong bipartisan support could his civil rights bill be passed.

Asa Philip Randolph, who organized the march, admitted the obvious fact. "We need allies," he said. "People who are victims must take the leadership. No one but a Jew could lead the fight against anti-Semitism. No one but a man from the ranks of labor could lead the labor movement."

"But the Negro cannot win the fight alone, no more than the Jew or labor leader could win his fight alone. We need allies."

And if he cannot find them first in the churches, he's not likely to find them among the politicians.

[From the Oregon Journal column of Aug. 29, 1963]

GREAT HISTORIC EVENT

(By Doug Baker)

Television, for all its faults, lends an immediacy to major new events which more than makes up for all the hideous commercials and comedy programs designed for the Jukes family.

The roving eye of the cameras takes us to the political conventions, to sporting events and to the edge of a coal mine where two men are wrested from the bowels of the earth to cheer a watching nation.

I still recall the thrill of the first TV coverage of the globe-girdling American astronauts.

And then, Wednesday, millions of us were afforded a glimpse of one of the truly great historic events of the 20th century—the march on Washington, D.C.

When I was a boy in Aberdeen, S. Dak.—a community imbedded in the Nation's heartland—there were only two Negro families in our town of "18,000 friendly people."

One of these Negroes was a giant named Eli Roberts. I recall how Eli, a refrigeration mechanic, would throw a hundredweight of flour over his shoulder and walk the 3 miles to his house on the outskirts as though he were carrying a feather. Eli's daughter grew up to attend the University of California and became one of the first Negro women ever to be licensed in California as a physician. Her marks on her medical exams were exceptionally high.

I don't remember much about the other family except that they lived along the railroad tracks and kept a small herd of goats. They sold goat milk to the hospital, but they were poor people.

Maybe it was because we had so few Negroes that I knew nothing of race prejudice until I was at least 11 or 12 years old. Eli came walking down the street and I heard a neighborhood child shout, "Run for your life. Here comes a nigger." Until that moment I suppose I either thought Negroes were just people of a different color. Or, more likely, I never thought much about it at all.

I first learned a lot about prejudice in the Army. I saw the still Jim Crow regiments with white officers. I met southerners in bulk for the first time and came to realize the nature of real bigotry. And I talked to educated Negroes such as Enoch P. Waters, war correspondent for the Chicago Defender. Much of what I know about the Negro I learned from Waters.

After the war, at college, I studied anthropology and learned something of the different races of man, their differences and their similarities. And I learned, of course, that many widely held ideas about the American Negro are a lot of bunk.

Wednesday I thrilled to the spectacle of those massed thousands asking for nothing but what is their birthright. And of all the thousands of words or oratory before the Lincoln Memorial, I can recall verbatim only one line. It came from Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, who said, "I have a dream that one day my four little children will not be judged by the color of their skins, but by the content of their character."

And that is what all men of good will want. There are so many of us who believe in a class system, an aristocracy if you will. But the aristocracy in which we believe is not one based on bank balance, family, race, or religion. It is one of mind and character.

I no longer have any great concern for the views of the Talmadges and Barnetts and even small-fry racists such as Portland's Dale Benjamin. What worries me is the nice guy in the suburbs who, for God knows what reason, thinks he is somehow better than those with darker skins. This is the guy who loves his wife and children, votes like a good citizen, works for better schools, attends church, bowls with his buddies, and is always a good sport, and yet goes through life a wretched bigot.

These are the guys who write me letters about being a "nigger lover" and tell me that if you "give those blacks an inch they'll take a mile." I have letters in which these people seriously propose that all Negroes be emasculated so that they cannot produce children. Such letters no longer make me angry. They make me sad, and they make me worry about what kind of creature this is that God cast in His own image.

However, we have come a long way since the Emancipation Proclamation. It is no longer a matter of taking the first step. It is a mater of taking those last few long steps on the hard road to human brotherhood.

The Eli Roberts of my hometown was a good man, a Bible-reading man. He is long dead and he didn't outlive the taunts of the white children whose parents taught them no better than to jeer.

I have no illusions about my generation living to see the end of race prejudice in this still far from perfect democracy. But, like Dr. King, I have a dream that my children and their children will live in a world where men will be judged by yardsticks that make sense.

Hate is a human emotion. One of my Dutch friends once said that as long as two boys fight over a piece of cake there will always be hate in the world. But if we have to hate, let us use our glandular reactions for hating the things worth hating—war and greed and poverty and disease and inhumanity.

When we learn to hate the evil that is in men instead of men themselves, we shall have come a long way. It won't happen tomorrow, but it could happen one day.

Cosmosophy and World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in my service as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations in 1959, and in my work as adviser to the U.S. mission to the United Nations in reference to the Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, I have come to know well the excellent contributions of Dr. Franco Fiorio, Italian delegate to the Committee for Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and counsel general of the Republic of San Marino. I respect highly his professional competence and forward looking viewpoint on the effects of space research and development on world affairs. Dr. Fiorio has many new concepts and is one of the leaders for international cooperation on the program of research and development in space and scientific research.

I am calling to the attention of the U.S. Congress, and the American people, an outstanding and startling new concept presented in an address by Dr. Fiorio November 13–18, 1962, at the 17th annual meeting and Space Flight Exposition of the American Rocket Society in Los Angeles:

COSMOSOPHY AND WORLD AFFAIRS

Cosmosophy is the new philosophy, which will have to be used in the approach to world affairs, in view of the changes in our ways of living that will be brought about by the space age.

The significance of the conquest of space on the evolution of the traditional concepts in human relations, both collective and individual, is analyzed here. Global cooperation in peaceful space activities is presented as an effective alternative to disarmament in the search for peace.

EFFECTS OF THE SPACE AGE ON OUR WAY OF LIVING

Broadly speaking, the effects of the space age on our way of living can be assessed generally in the following areas:

A. Environmental conditions

Geographic and physical environment: Geodetic satellites will be able to determine land boundaries with much greater accuracy than in the past, with an indirect effect on local life near the borders. Radiation control for nuclear industrial powerplants will have to take into account the effects on wide areas, covering neighboring countries, and similar problems are foreseen in the use of nuclear rockets powering the spaceships of the future.

One of the major effects of space activities on environmental conditions, will be that of improved meteorological forecasts and, later on, of weather control. This latter will require a new approach to the cooperation amongst States, because it will touch upon some of the most vital national prerogatives of each State.

Other environmental effects include the artificial hazards of falling space objects to the natural hazards of meteorites and other natural phenomena; the possibility of beneficial modification of natural hardships through the application of space technology such as the redemption of arid zones by means of water production using solar energy, etc.

In each one of these new situations on earth, brought about by the space age, new principles of individual and international behavior will have to be followed, because most of the old rules do not apply to them any more than the rules in 1900 for automobiles apply to the traffic situation of today.

Educational environment: The educational environment has to be adjusted to scientific, technological and engineering progress, which is providing us with new knowledge, new processes, and new materials at an unprecedented rate. For the young students of today, the geometric progression of change, of accomplishment in scientific research and

technology will be the dominant feature of their lives. It is, therefore, very important that the education of the new generation be organized with such a cosmosophic approach.

Transportation and communications: These services are part of our environment and will be both deeply affected by the progress in space. The first will benefit in speed and capacity, as well as in a relative reduction in costs. This will be due to technological improvements and wider use of safer, more comfortable and faster vehicles, which will be produced

Communications through satellites will really need global understanding and a unified approach to the problems of network operation, distribution and programing, all of which require a true cosmosophic handling of the matter by all nations concerned.

The combination of improved space transportation and communications services will also have a great effect on individual environmental habits. This will be true especially in the underdeveloped nations, which will skip several phases of development to adjust more rapidly to the pace and needs of the space age.

B. Economical evolution

Some of these patterns are easily recognizable, such as:

The concentration of Government space contracts in the hands of few gigantic concerns because they are the only ones with the technical capability and the financial resources to be held responsible for them. This, in turn, catalizes a trend toward the merger of many smaller companies so that they can better compete with the larger ones.

The decline of large production runs and the reversal of the ratio between shop and engineering personnel. The space industry will spend much more in engineering than in production. This brings about a hunt for engineering and scientific manpower, which will be felt in the overall economic picture.

The creation of new breeds of specialists, never before employed by the industry, such as computer programers, physiologists, mathematicians, astrophysicists, etc.

A tremendous effort in the area of product reliability, which will seriously challenge every element of the productive structure of each country.

Many other trends will emerge with the consolidation and the enlargement of space activities. But, at this moment, the importance of the ones I mentioned cannot be ignored in the cosmosophic evaluation of the space age economy.

If these trends create problems, there are, on the other hand, beneficial effects, which will be felt from the space programs on the overall economies, such as:

New techniques will bring about higher productivity for both labor and capital. The real income of workers will rise and so will corporate profit margins, freeing more money for expansion; national output will be increased with the availability of new resources, or the finding of new uses for old ones; spending of both Government and private money will vastly increase research and development activities; the space program will become a key factor in profits and the growth rate of the whole economy; appearance of new products as a byproduct of space research will stimulate demand, create new markets, and create a need for more capital to increase production.

It is already evident that all sorts of new products, new ideas, new techniques of production will flow out of the space effort to benefit business in general.

Merchant shipping will profit from navigational satellites. Meteorological satellites should become a boon to agriculture, and communications satellites will revolutionize the communications industry with a cost forecast of only $7,550–$8,500 per transatlantic voice channel transmitted by satellite, compared with a cost of $24,000 per voice channel transmitted by cable.

Probably the broadest area of economical and industrial development originating from space activities will grow out of the new, self-contained, sources of power, needed by satellite and spacecraft to operate their equipment and to maintain men and their environment independently in space. They are already well along on the development path and include:

Solar cells, which convert sunlight directly into electricity, are being used to power disparate things such as portable radios, railways crossing lights, telephones, and community radios in rural areas.

Thermoelectric materials, which can convert heat into electricity and vice versa.

Thermojonic tubes, which also convert heat into electricity and vice versa, will be the heart of the silent air-conditioners of the future.

Fuel cells, converting chemical reactions, directly into electricity.

Highly compact powerpacks, which produce electricity directly, through a thermoelectric or thermojonic converter.

Magnetogasdynamic generators, which convert the movement of a very hot ionized gas stream into electricity, by passing it through a magnetic field. These generators will make possible power stations 40 percent more efficient than the most modern stations existing today.

Compact power package will probably develop to a point where they can generate electricity on the spot for domestic uses as well as industrial processes, thus bringing the impact of the space age and its cosmosophic implications, in all aspects of the economical life of each nation.

POLITICAL EVOLUTION

Even the most conservative experts on political sciences have to admit that space has become an issue of the foremost importance in the conduct of national and international political affairs. We have already had a brief review of the importance of space in internal affairs through its impact on economics and environment.

The United Nations, with unanimous decision of its 16th General Assembly, has even declared to the people of the world that "Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind and to the benefit of states, irrespective of the stage of their economic or scientific development, (1) commends to the states for their guidance in the exploration and use of outer space the following principles: (a) international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, applies to outer space and celestial bodies; (b) outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states in conformity with international law and are not subject to national appropriation."

This is all very nice, but general principles, expressed in good faith and by unanimous consent, cannot change the realities of a world which is divided sharply in two groups of powers with contrasting ideologies.

It shouldn't come as a surprise to anybody, therefore, if, in the wake of the emphatic declarations about the need for keeping the peaceful intent of any space activity, there have been subsequent statements by prominent personalities on both sides of the world to the effect that "space has to be exploited also by the military, in order to retain the (his side's) superiority which will insure the peaceful uses of it."

However, and very few people realize it, the most important point is not to determine whether space should be kept peaceful or militarized, but whether the advent of the space age has brought closer to us the old dream of an everlasting peace on earth.

I shall now try to demonstrate with very little modesty, (a) that space is the only hope we have left for peace, and (b) how peace can be brought about, in the long run, by cosmosophic space policies.

THE HOPE OF PEACE FROM SPACE

In a paper I presented at the ARS annual meeting in 1959 entitled "Peace From Space," I wrote: "For the first time in the history of the earth, a new, nonproductive (at least, for now, in the economical sense) activity will be created, parallel and in competition with the defense activity, which will require an increasing share of the national budgets of the states and force them, in due time, to face this dilemma: Be prepared for war or be prepared for space."

I believe that this statement is valid today and thus the first element of our hope for peace lies in the amount of money spent in scientific and peaceful space projects. Both in this country and in the U.S.S.R. the funds invested in scientific space exploration represent, I am sure, a substantial amount which can only have been diverted from the military budget at the expense of some weapons systems. In a very indirect way, this is, practically, a unilateral disarmament step.

In almost every case colonial exploration and expansion took place during periods of peace in Europe when the nations involved didn't have to sustain, at the same time, heavy military expenditures.

By analogy, if we reverse this statement and apply it to the exploration of space, it can be said that we have to have peace, to carry it out successfully and, in turn, that if we do carry space exploration out successfully, we will insure peace.

The second element of hope is mainly of an historical nature and goes back to the fundamental reasons why nations in the past waged war against one another.

Greed is the ingredient responsible for all wars since the beginning of mankind. Our hope for peace is here arising from the fact that, for the first time since the birth of our world, the same ingredient, which has launched nations against each other in a fury of destruction, can be redirected toward the conquest of space.

Indeed, the longing for the discovery and exploration of new worlds; the desire for freedom from home rules; the national, and perhaps, in the future, planetary pride; the taste for adventure and the daring gamble, are all present in the space venture in such ways as to appeal to human nature just as they appealed to in wars. And wars, as space activities, are enterprises of human beings.

A third element of hope, of a negative nature, is represented by the fact that, through some ingenious electronic computation, several scientists have demonstrated that, if there is no hope for peace in space, there will be no hope at all to save our planet from complete destruction in a flaming global war before the end of the century.

The only hope to survive is, therefore, a change of human behavior in respect to war, between now and the year 2000. Only space can supply a logical reason for such a change. In the words of Dr. Wernher von Braun: "Man's attempt to conquer space could become civilization's equivalent of wars."

The last element in our quest for peace from space is of a negative nature too and is represented by the development of increasingly effective weapons systems. Each new weapon has generated a comment that its effectiveness would end war, while, in fact, it has only served to increase the magnitude of wars.

Peace might be secured by maintaining full recognition of the weapon's increased lethality, and perhaps reducing the dangers of accidental conflicts, which are not com-

pletely excluded in today's uneasy balance of forces in the world.

HOW PEACE WILL BE BORN FROM SPACE

The approach which has been followed, so far, by the Western Powers, is that of preventing the military uses of space by a special agreement, including measures of inspection and verification, within or without the general disarmament framework.

The argument in favor of this approach is that such measures may be more promising, because the task of keeping disarmed even such a vast area as outer space, may be easier than bringing about disarmament in an area that is presently armed.

Furthermore such measures are considered very urgent because, according to a special study performed by the Institute of Defense Analysis for the U.S. Disarmament Agency: "the anarchy of the arms race will before long be transferred to outer space, and technical problems of arms control in this new military environment are likely to dwarf those that now confront us on earth and in the atmosphere."

While space would, therefore, be barred from becoming a military battlefield, Western official planners hope to reach general and complete disarmament on earth and thus insure an everlasting peace.

It is my personal opinion that these policies, which had some value 4 or 5 years ago, have to be replaced today by a cosmosophic approach to the problem, in view of two fundamental facts, which have made themselves very clear in the last few years of negotiations with the Soviets: First, the U.S.S.R. will never accept inspections and verifications in her own zone of influence; second, space is already, potentially a military environment, whether we like it or not, if we consider the exploits of both the American and Soviet cosmonauts and their military implications.

Thus we have already in space a military potential, which is limited only by the intentions of its users and we are, consequently, right now, faced with "problems of arms control which are dwarfing the ones we have on earth."

If we will be able to push forward, with a reasonable amount of good will and avoiding military implications, a real international peaceful cooperation in space, from small initial steps, such as the ones devised last summer in Geneva by the Technical Subcommittee of the U.N. for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, to larger and larger joint projects, such as joint expeditions to the planets and to the stars, the investment by all nations will reach such proportions as to overshadow entirely any national military activity in space.

Armaments in space would then simply "dry out" of existence for lack of motivation and, by the same token, the same will happen to armaments on earth, while most of the former military personnel would be absorbed into the great peaceful space ventures. This will be the real peace, in space as well as on earth, brought about by joint aims and mutual work, and by the need of mutual help in reaching those space goals, which would be unattainable even by the largest and most powerful nations alone.

D. Juridical and religious implications

The juridical issue: Even before the beginning of the space age, which we may consider as started in 1957 with the launching of sputnik I, lawyers from all nations of the world have been discussing the problems of space law and, as lawyers do, have not spared words nor publications on this subject.

The very latest failure in reaching some positive suggestion in the field of space law has been experienced in the meetings of the U.N. Legal Subcommittee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space in Geneva last June, which has only agreed to disagree on most matters. This agreement to disagree has been passed along to the main committee in New York, which, in turn, has passed the problem to the XVII General Assembly of the U.N. now in session.

Not being a lawyer, I probably have a tendency to oversimplify the problem. But I believe that the reason for the failure to reach universally agreed proposals lies in the effort by the legal representatives of all nations, to project into a body of space laws, concepts, principles and provisions, which reflect not only legal needs traditionally existing on earth but, even worse in some cases, legal-political views of individual nations.

Such a narrow-minded approach shall never work and here, too, a cosmosophic approach is required: To talk about space law in itself doesn't make much sense, unless by it, we envisage the new law which will determine the relations between people of the human race for the next generations when the ecosphere of man will have been extended far out in the cosmos.

The new legal principles born out of this evolution will not only apply to the activities in space, but will probably bring about fundamental changes on international law as conceived today, as well as on national and municipal laws.

It is therefore perfectly legitimate now to try to determine particular rules for special pressing problems, such as the liability for falling space objects and the assistance to astronauts in distress, as well as other specific items which might arise during the development of space exploration. But the great framework of the future universal law has to grow out of a slow and careful cosmosophic evaluation of generalized rules of conduct chosen from the municipal and international laws within the realm of the anthropocentric law, harmonized with the principles of natural law and, perhaps in the future, extended to include those which my good friend Andrew Haley calls the principles of metalaw in dealing with human beings from other planets.

For this evaluation, the use of a morphologic method such as proposed by Dr. Fritz Zwicky appears to be a very promising and positive approach.

The religious issue: It is a strange fact that from the very first forms of religion, the concept of divinity has always been associated with something high in the sky (or heaven); that is, in space. This has, perhaps, led to the comment of dubious humor by atheist cosmonaut Titov that he "didn't see any God up there."

The evidence points to the contrary, and even the Soviet cosmonaut, being an intelligent human being, realizes probably that his small step out in space has only emphasized the immensity of the universe and has increased, not the knowledge of it, but rather the awareness of new mysteries of which we have ignored the existence before. Furthermore, as in the case of the economy, by stepping out into space, man has hitched his chariot to infinity.

And the more mysteries our scientists are faced with, the farther away we proceed on the way to infinity, the stronger the presence of God is felt. And our faith in Him is called to explain what our mind with its human limitation is not able and might never be able to grasp.

In a recent interview, Sir Bernard Lovell, the celebrated British astronomer of Jodrell Bank, was asked whether, in the light of scientific discoveries, we must now revise our religious and philosophical thinking on the creation of life, especially since our space progress is posing the question whether the universe was created at one time or it is in a state of continuous creation.

I wish to quote Sir Lovell's answer, which represents a truly cosmosophic interpretation of this problem:

"The question of the origin of the universe and of the uniqueness of life, is obviously a twin problem in religion and philosophy.

"I do not think that the answer to these questions is in conflict with the theological doctrine.

"Growth in scientific knowledge need bring no lessening of religious belief. In fact, it may well serve to strengthen existing beliefs. Through man's history, scientific thought has gradually, and sometimes painfully, been absorbed into existing religious belief, and has often served to illuminate, rather than obscure, the mysteries with which man is continually faced."

CONCLUSION

Summarizing, a cosmosophic evaluation of the space activities related to world affairs, offers us the following suggestions:

1. Space activities are "hitched" to the infinite and thus are here to stay and will exert a growing and determining influence on our environment and ways of life;

2. National and global economies will feel, sooner or later, the full impact of the space programs and techniques and will have to adjust, accordingly, their ways and means;

3. The natural evolution of the space activities will unavoidably extend to space the policy of balanced military forces between the opposing groups of nations; this will not worsen appreciably the arms race, but perhaps improve the stabilization of the deterrent and reduce the risk of accidental wars;

4. The real hope for peace does not lie in the application of disarmament measures or policies to space, but in pursuing, in the mutual interest, a massive effort of joint international peaceful space projects of growing importance, thus minimizing military requirements by building up mutual trust and confidence through these peaceful joint enterprises;

5. A universal law has to grow out of a cosmosophic and perhaps morphological approach to the legal needs of mankind in its newly acquired cosmic environment; and

6. The belief in God is strengthened rather than weakened by space discoveries and exploration.

A chart drawn up by Dr. Fiorio indicates the percentage of probability of a war capable of killing the total population of the world is now 37 percent. This figure is determined from extrapolation of past conflicts and patterns of human behavior before the space age.

The Wilderness Is for Everyone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of July 29, 1963, and call my colleagues' attention to its contents. It is my earnest wish that a wilderness bill be enacted into law this year:

THE WILDERNESS IS FOR EVERYONE

The wilderness bill has passed the Senate by the handsome majority of 73 to 12. It is now in the Interior Committee of the House.

Nearly every nationwide conservation organization and most newspapers and magazines, urge that it be brought out to the floor, where no doubt it would be approved decisively as it was in the Senate.

Why? Because its passage would assure that—

Two percent of the lands of the United States would always remain as all of it was before the white man came—a place of green forests, clear streams, blue lakes, and pure air.

Where plants and animals could reproduce themselves through the ages and no species would ever be lost, as was the passenger pigeon.

Unmarred by auto roads, and the civilization and litter that auto traffic inevitably bring, but open to all to explore by foot trail and horseback.

For hunters of big and small game, for those who would fish in white water or calm lake, for birdwatchers, for the myriads of amateurs with still and movie cameras.

As the indispensable laboratory for scientists, who must always have primitive nature to study if they are to understand how to bring health to overcivilized men of our teeming cities.

Do you say, "I am not adventurous. What would it mean to me?"

It would mean that if you are a camper, you could camp in lands provided in the wilderness foreground; if a motorist, travel roads and stay in hotels and motels, having its wide, unbroken landscape as the inspiring backdrop of your vacation.

But another may say: "I am a stay-at-home; I cannot afford to travel," or "I am too ill to take a journey," or "I do not care to."

To you, it may mean most of all.

After you have come home through the traffic rush, the fumes and the neon glare of the city, to open your newspaper and magazine and see pictures and stories of this wilderness; to go out to a movie and see it in magnificent color in nature and sports films and as the scenes in which human drama is enacted; or to turn on your television set at home and see these things there.

Even without these pleasures, would it not mean much to everyone just to know that primitive nature is still there—that man the despoiler, the destroyer, the greedy exploiter, the waster, had spared a little of original creation, which God saw after He had made it, and "behold, it was very good." (Genesis 1-31).

If you think as we do, then write to your Representative in Congress, to Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the Interior Committee, to any member of that committee—indeed, to any other Congressman, and tell him that you want the wilderness bill passed.

Do not underestimate the power of an American citizen who will write to his Congressmen.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

No. 2—Louisiana: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, last week, I brought to the attention of this House the vast amounts that are gambled every year in the State of Maryland. I pointed out how most of these moneys support every filthy ramification of underworld activity. Today, I would like to discuss the extent of gambling in the State of Louisiana and the tremendous revenue that is made available to the crime syndicates in that State.

In 1962, the State of Louisiana had a parimutuel turnover of over $45½ million from which the State received about $2½ million. However, according to the McClellan committee, this is far from being the whole story of gambling in that State. Indeed, the mathematics of the situation would be intriguing were it not so shocking.

From the testimony taken by the McClellan committee, Mr. Speaker, it appears that 16 times as much money is wagered off the tracks as is bet on the tracks. Simple multiplication leads to the conclusion that over three-fourths of a billion dollars is wagered every year illegally on the horses alone. This figure represents less than half of the total illicit gambling in that State. Therefore, it can be well estimated that gambling in the State of Louisiana reaches the $2 billion a year mark. I wonder whether the members of the Louisiana congressional delegation are aware of this tremendous gambling activity in their State?

The director of the New Orleans Crime Commission somewhat contradicts my estimates of the amount of money gambled annually in Louisiana. His testimony before the McClellan committee indicated that only $1 billion is involved in gambling. Whether it is $1 or $2 billion, we do know that this money goes into the hands of the crime syndicates and a good portion is used to corrupt the governmental process in that State.

Mr. Speaker, all of the 77 foreign countries that operate government lotteries have found that control and regulation has not only helped solve their gambling problems but has produced much needed revenue for their treasuries. A national lottery in the United States would not only be the most effective method of undercutting illegal gambling in this country but would pump into our own Treasury $10 billion a year in additional needed revenue. Just what are we waiting for, anyway?

Imports of Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on imports of residual oil. The statement was made by Gov. William W. Barron, of West Virginia, and Gov. Bert T. Combs, of Kentucky, at the Governors' conference in Miami on July 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY W. W. BARRON, GOVERNOR OF WEST VIRGINIA, AND BERT COMBS, GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY, IN CONNECTION WITH PANEL DISCUSSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., JULY 22, 1963

Our States rank Nos. 1 and 2 in the production of bituminous coal, but during the last decade coal markets have declined or have been stabilized at a level entirely too low causing a high level of unemployment in coal-producing areas.

Coal has a vital stake in policies affecting both imports and exports of our goods and commodities. Coal markets along the east coast are seriously threatened by increasing imports of residual fuel oil. At the present time imports amount to the equivalent of some 50 million tons of coal annually.

The amount is less serious than the manner in which this oil is sold.

Being a waste product and without a measurable inherent value, it can be and is sold for whatever price is necessary to move it into trade channels.

Contracts are said to have been signed by some large users of residual oil guaranteeing them the price will always be under that of coal.

Our trade policies were never intended to encourage piratical pricing such as this to the detriment of domestic products.

For coal the net effect has been to reserve for imported oil the market created by the growth of the economy.

Domestically produced residual oil is being driven out of the east coast market by oil produced abroad and sold considerably under which it can be produced for in this country.

There is an urgent need to stabilize imports of crude and residual oil.

This can be done without disrupting our international trade policies and commitments or the Nation's friendships abroad.

The coal industry is asking for a stabilization of imports at or near the present levels with some assurance that the line will be held.

Coal thus could share in the future growth of the market along with imported oil. The coal mines of West Virginia and Kentucky would have a chance to increase production and put people back to work.

As for exports it appears to us that coal offers a golden opportunity for the United States to increase sales abroad and make a major contribution to solving the problem of unfavorable balance of payments, which so concerns the President.

Coal is one of the few commodities which this Nation produces that can be sold competitively throughout the world. That it does not enjoy larger markets stems from the fact that almost all nations impose quotas, high tariffs, and other measures to keep out U.S. coal.

We are encouraged by what seems to be a growing recognition on the part of our Government that the highly industrialized nations offer a market of great potential for U.S. coal.

From this growing realization of coal's potential we hope will emerge a determination to press during trade negotiations next year for a relaxation of restrictions against coal.

Two highly significant results would occur:

1. It would earn dollars for the United States in oversea markets.

2. It could create jobs in areas of the Nation which need them desperately.

Those coal mines currently working in the Appalachian area are operating at or near capacity. Any increased demand, therefore, could only be met by putting more men to work.

Every additional million tons of coal production, either through exports or a careful limitation of residual fuel oil imports, sold under marketing practices which disrupt the entire domestic fuels market, would require 350 more jobs in our coal mines and another 200 on the Nation's railroads, which transport the bulk of the coal to market.

Some foreign trade experts foresee a potential increase of up to 100 million tons annually in export markets. This could mean 55,000 new jobs in areas where a solution to unemployment problems is imperative.

Therefore, we urge our colleagues at this conference meeting to join in supporting a program to insure the maintenance of an expanding domestic fuels industry by urging upon the Federal Government realistic and reasonable restrictions upon imports of both crude and residual oil.

Further, we urge that our colleagues join in advocating that the persons vested with the responsibility of developing international trade policies recognize that coal can play a significant role in solving our present trade and payments imbalance.

The national interests will be served by such actions.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a captive nations resolution by the Americans for Congressional Action To Free the Baltic States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION, AMERICANS FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO FREE THE BALTIC STATES

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanias, Latvians, and Estonians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians desire, fight, and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives created by House Resolution 346 of the 83d Congress, to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States' question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets: (1) To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; (2) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States.

No. 3—Massachusetts: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to point out to the Members of this House, more particularly to the members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, the vigor of gambling in that State and the extent to which crime syndicates have taken over a lucrative industry.

Of necessity, this can only be a cursory glance at Bay State betting—it would require more than a lifetime to write a biography of each bookie joint in the President's home State.

However, Mr. Speaker, the American public got a pretty good idea of illicit gambling when it was privileged, last year, to watch the filmed exposé of gambling in Boston.

Legal gambling in Massachusetts, as evidenced by the parimutuel turnover, last year, amounted to about $110 million with almost $8 million going into the State treasury. However, this represents only a small part of the story. The real big story lies in the tremendous illicit gambling that goes on in that State.

Thanks to the bluenoses and the moralist contingent, Massachusetts' share of the figure for national off-track betting, last year, came to more than $1.4 billion. This is the action that fills the horse parlors and makes the professional gamblers happy.

Still, off-track betting, as revealed by the McClellan committee, is generally figured to constitute only a little less than half of the total illegal gambling in the United States.

On the basis of these estimates, I wonder whether the Massachusetts congressional delegation realizes that gambling in their State may amount to nearly $3 billion a year. Because of Massachusetts' refusal to control and regulate gambling, it has aided and assisted the forces of organized crime to flourish in a tax free industry—all to the detriment of the State and its people.

The gambling syndicates usually profit to the extent of about 10 percent of the take which would come to almost $300 million a year. But part of it is eaten up by political overhead expenditures—such as the corruption of the processes of law enforcement and general government. This is the biggest and most important expense of the gambling rings.

The remaining gambling profits, which are the chief source of revenue for the underworld, help bankroll every form of crime known to man. This I am afraid, will continue to be true so long as gambling remains illegal and unchained. This will persist so long as government harbors illegal gambling.

Mr. Speaker, a national lottery is one potent weapon that can strike a lethal blow at organized crime in the United States and, at the same time, pump into our Government treasury over $10 billion a year in additional revenue. Is it not time that we withdrew our head from the sand?

Voss, Teller, and Possony Views on Test Ban Quoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an article by Russell Kirk in the August 29 edition of the Los Angeles Times gives timely quotaton to the views of three very respected opponents of the test ban treaty. They are, Earl Voss, Dr. Edward Teller, and Dr. Stefan Possony.

The article follows:

KREMLIN MAY HAVE SET ANOTHER TRAP WITH THE TEST BAN TREATY

(By Russell Kirk)

Will the projected treaty with Russia, prohibiting atomic tests in the atmosphere, really increase the security of these United States? Some people able to speak with authority entertain grave doubts.

Certain State Department consultants tell this writer that they are badly worried. The present public enthusiasm, engineered by the Kennedy administration, at the prospect of a diminishing of tensions, actually may result—so these experts fear—in a naive concession to the Soviets of everything Nikita S. Khrushchev wants with no real guarantees to America in return.

There has just been published, too, a 600-page study written by Earl H. Voss, a diplomatic correspondent in Washington. His book is called "Nuclear Ambush: the Test-Ban Trap."

In this sober and elaborately documented examination, Voss points out that probably Russia will repeat her performance of 2 years ago, in which she resumed testing in defiance of the Geneva negotiations.

Khrushchev probably has set a second trap to catch gullible and optimistic Americans.

"History may yet look back on the nuclear test ban idea," Voss writes, "as one grand delusion of the 20th century, grander by far, for instance that the Soviet ruse that it was building a big fleet of long-range bombers, or that the Russians had invented everything important since the wheel.

"It should be taken as a sobering warning that the Soviet Union was able, by a clever combination of propaganda manipulation and diabolical statesmanship, to have tied up the U.S. testing program with so shabbily camouflaged a technique."

In Moscow, Khrushchev remarked to Lord Home that the 17 American representatives there to consider the testban treaty seemed to be divided among themselves. Well might they be.

Our chief authority on the atmoic bomb, Dr. Edward Teller, thinks we may be hoodwinked in our present pacifist mood. Dr. Stefan Possony for the Hoover Institution's international political studies program), one of our leading authorities on the struggle for power, testified before the House defense appropriations subcommittee that the proposed test ban would give the Soviets an advantage in big bombs, and may prevent America from carrying on tests of anti-missile missiles.

So the Kennedy administration may be counting its test ban chickens before the Senate hatches them.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, with his accustomed forthrightness, opposes the treaty—and his influence grows daily. Many Republicans in the Senate will follow where he leads.

They may be joined by such Northern and Western Democratic Senators as JACKSON, DODD, and LAUSCHE. The Southern Senators, suspicious of the treaty anyway, are angry with Mr. Kennedy because of the civil rights fight in the Senate.

President Kennedy's recent suggestion that the test ban might be followed by a nonaggression pact between the Soviet bloc and the NATO countries will alarm the serious anti-Communists still further. This arrangement would resign to Russia permanent mastery of her present satellites—including, presumably, Cuba.

But it is most improbable that Soviet subversion actually would be terminated in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Everyone would like to get rid, somehow, of the menace of big bombs. But buying a Russian pig in a poke might accomplish no more than to permit the Soviets to prepare for grander tests, while America dozes complacently.

It happened to us at Geneva—remember?

Morrison To Be Honored by International House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues in the Congress the fact that Ambassador deLesseps S. Morrison, the U.S. representative on the Council of the Organization of American States, will be honored next month in New Orleans, La., for his many years of outstanding service for the betterment of inter-American hemisphere relations.

On September 12 in New Orleans, Ambassador Morrison will be presented with the Thomas F. Cunningham Award for 1962 for his distinguished efforts to improve relations between our country and the nations of Latin America. In his 15½ years as mayor of New Orleans, and his 2 years as U.S. Ambassador to the Council of the Organization of American States, Chep Morrison has done as much as any single official in our country to advance the cause of unity among nations in the Western Hemisphere. He is most deserving of this signal honor, and I am proud that International House in New Orleans, which I helped to organize 20 years ago and which Ambassador Morrison worked to expand as mayor of New Orleans, has chosen Chep Morrison to receive the Thomas F. Cunningham Award.

I also had the honor to receive this same award several years ago, and I am proud that Chep Morrison is to be recognized in a similar way for his contributions toward the betterment of the lives of the people of the Western Hemisphere. For these reasons, I would like to insert into the RECORD a news story from the Times-Picayune of New Orleans which announces that Chep Morrison will receive this fine award on September 12:

MORRISON TO BE HONORED BY INTERNATIONAL HOUSE: WILL RECEIVE AWARD FOR HEMISPHERE WORK

Ambassador deLesseps S. Morrison, U.S. representative on the Council of the Organization of American States, will receive the Thomas F. Cunningham Award for 1962 for outstanding service to betterment of inter-American relations.

The announcement was made Wednesday by Lawrence A. Molony, president of International House. It will be presented to Morrison September 12 here.

"We are honoring a man who has long been keenly interested in Latin American affairs," said Molony. "Under his administration as New Orleans mayor, he aided in the expansion of International House with the aim of making New Orleans the U.S. gateway to trade and cultural exchanges with Latin America.

Molony added that Morrison "took to the important position with the OAS great energy and interest in the welfare of this hemisphere."

SWORN IN JULY 1961

Morrison was sworn in as ambassador in July 1961, after serving as mayor from 1946 to that time.

Among decorations presented him have been the Presidential Medal of Nicaragua, the Order of Duarte from the Dominion Republic, the Order of San Martin from Argentina and the Order of Eloy Alfaro of Panama.

Morrison participated in the conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, which resulted in the signing of the agreement which started the Alliance for Progress.

He has instituted a program for taking Latin American ambassadors to the United States to introduce them to people of this country and to introduce this country to them.

OTHER RECIPIENTS

In 1950 Morrison was president of the Inter-American Municipal Organization.

The selection committee was composed of Capt. Neville Levy, Richard L. Hindermann, and C. C. "Bud" Walther.

The award was established in 1945 by heirs of Thomas F. Cunningham.

Recipients have been William G. Zetzmann, Sr., James S. Kemper, Theodore Brent, Rudolf S. Hecht, Gen. Robert E. Wood, Adolfo E. Hegewisch, Crawford Ellis, Lloyd J. Cobb, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Samuel Zemurray, Dr. Wilson Popenoe, Henry B. Sargent, U.S. Representative Hale Boggs, Dr. Larimer Mellon, J. Peter Grace, Thomas Jefferson Williams, and Juan Trippe.

Visit United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, international travel is an important part of our larger foreign policy. It is also an important factor in our balance-of-payments imbalance, and last year was responsible for a $1.4 billion deficit. There is continued need, therefore, for stronger efforts on our part to attract more visitors to our shores, in order to aid our foreign policy and to help correct the unfavorable balance of payments.

For many years I have advocated that measures be taken to extend every courtesy to visitors from foreign lands during their stay in the United States. Multilingual guides should be provided at points of interest; transportation should be made readily available at reasonable cost; and information which is of interest to tourists should be dispersed as readily as is feasible. Much good work along these lines is now being done by the U.S. Travel Service, legislative authority for which I helped to sponsor.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Travel a New World," which describes what New York has done in the field of services for foreign visitors. It appears in the July 1963 issue of the magazine Via Port of New York, published by the Port of New York Authority.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAVEL: PORT OF NEW YORK FOCAL POINT FOR GROWING NUMBERS OF OVERSEA VISITORS

Early this month more than 200 German business people and tourists walked down the gangplank after the *Provence* docked at the port of New York. The same week almost 700 British university students arrived at New York International Airport in 5 charter flights. Their arrival was extraordinary only in the size of their units, for groups and individuals from abroad enter the port of New York every day.

Some come for business, some for pleasure; their numbers are registering annual gains. Last year more than a half-million oversea visitors arrived at the port by sea and air, more than twice the number that came 5 years ago.

For the business traveler, the Port of New York is a center of trade and finance. For the tourist, New York's skyline and Statue of Liberty are symbols of America itself. Most visitors from abroad spend at least a few days of their visit to the United States on Manhattan Island; more than three-fourths of them arrive and depart via the port's air and marine terminals.

Swelling the tide of travel to the United States from abroad has been the job of the 2-year-old U.S. Travel Service, a division of the Department of Commerce. In conjunction with travel agencies and carriers, it has launched an extensive program to attract tourists. Since its birth, nine Travel Service offices have been opened abroad. In the new and attractive London office, smartly uniformed American girls courteously answer questions about the United States. In the non-English-speaking areas in which seven of the other offices are located, personnel offer travel advice and information in the native language.

Many a European has said, "I would love to go to America, but I could not begin to afford it." To offset this misconception, much has been done by USTS to emphasize economical methods of travel available in the United States. When an Englishman walks into the USTS office near Picadilly Circus he is given material describing the attractions of cities and States he might visit. These information sheets emphasize inexpensive, moderately priced accommodations and eating places.

Oversea advertising programs supplement the personalized efforts to offer suggestions for an economical trip through the United States. Ads are based on themes such as "See the U.S.A. on a Student's Budget," and "Here Are 50 Places Americans Themselves Most Want To See in the U.S.A."

Transportation companies based at New York have led the way in offering travel bargains to foreign visitors. Both Continental Trailways and Greyhound offer 99 days (or less) of unlimited bus travel for $99. A number of regional airlines offer travelers from overseas similar arrangements (air fares are already about 40 percent lower than in Europe); railroads offer 15 percent reductions.

As a focal point for visitors to the United States and as a world business center, the port of New York has taken big strides to welcome the growing number of tourists attracted by the USTS program and the even greater number anticipated for next year's World's Fair. Problems of providing currency exchange facilities for the port city's visitors and information and assistance for its non-English-speaking guests are being met. Banks have extended exchange services. Every branch of the First National City Bank will now accept and exchange foreign currencies without charge. The bank also operates an exchange desk at International Airport that is open 24 hours a day. More than 50 hotels in the city as well as a number of department stores will also accept foreign currencies.

Bloomingdale's, Bonwit Teller, Saks Fifth Avenue, Lord & Taylor, Macy's, and Stern's—major department stores in Manhattan—have interpreting services, shopping escorts, and reference services. Macy's offers

oversea visitors a "Traveler's Guide." This passport-size booklet translates European sizes, distances, measurements, and money and is available free at the personal shopping desk at the Herald Square store in Manhattan. Macy's like many stores, hotels, and restaurants that have become conscious of the increasing number of non-English-speaking visitors to the city, has taken a language inventory of its employees. The survey revealed that a total of 42 languages could be spoken by the store's 900 employees.

Hotels and restaurants have become conscious of their abilities to handle oversea guests and have considered language abilities in their hiring programs. To aid their guests, the American Hotel & Motel Association has published "A Guide for Guests from Abroad in American Hotels, Motels, and Inns." This booklet is available at USTS offices in English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish editions and contains much useful information concerning accommodations, services, and customs in American hotels, as well as other useful information on tipping, etc.

Other units at the port of New York are also helping to give the oversea visitor a happy welcome. Multilingual information booths are available at International Airport, the visitor center across from Grand Central Station on 42d Street and at Rockefeller Center. Visitors receive information concerning the sightseeing "musts," how the subways operate, how to make a phone call, how much to tip, where to get lists of hotels, and the answers to many other questions. Even the tourist wtih a toothache may have his pain relieved by a dentist speaking the patient's language. This is arranged conveniently by phoning a special telephone number.

At the information centers a guide to the attractions of the city is available in eight languages: English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, Italian, Japanese, and Russian. "The New York City Guide and Calendar of Events" gives information about all the tourist musts as well as many things that might be of special interest.

For the non-English-speaking visitor, Gray Line offers special multilingual tours of the city in French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. It takes in all the major sights—Times Square, the Empire State Building, Wall Street, the Statue of Liberty, the United Nations, and Rockefeller Center. It adds a few not covered by the usual Gray Line schedule—a supermarket, for instance. This trip lasts 3½ hours in a bus electronically equipped to handle the simultaneous playing of tape-recorded dialog in the four languages.

The Port of New York Authority, working with USTS and other arms of the Government, has been actively cooperating in making the visitor's arrival a pleasant one. At New York International Airport the passenger arriving from abroad will be hailed by signs greeting him in 17 languages and a special welcome message from the President of the United States in English. At the entrance to the terminal building, pocket-size cards printed in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish give information concerning the various means of ground transportation available when leaving the airport.

The International Arrival Building has been designed to facilitate the flow of incoming passengers and to make their arrival a pleasant one. Entering the building into the Public Health sector, they are greeted by a pleasant blend of pastel shades and glass that creates a sense of light and space. Passing from the Public Health rooms into the Immigration area, they are met by multilingual port receptionists who help visitors with necessary forms while they are seated in a comfortable lounge area.

From Immigration, passengers proceed to the customs hall, a long, well-lighted area equipped to facilitate rapid clearance. Green-uniformed porters are available to help with baggage at no charge within the area. Many passengers prefer to claim their own baggage from the self-serve baggage claim racks and wheel it in lightweight baggage carts to the supermarket-type customs checkout counters only a few feet away.

Ground transportation is available immediately outside the International Arrival Building and an entire range of necessary consumer services is available in the lobby where passengers may also confirm outbound flights at airline counters. Multilingual New York Telephone Co. personnel staff telephone service in the lobby and uniformed employees of the same company circulate in the terminal to help in making calls, providing change and locating correct telephone numbers.

Currency exchange and a multilingual information counter are available in the lobby around the clock to aid newly-arrived visitors. The information booth is staffed by specially trained port authority personnel capable of providing aid in seven languages. An American Express Co. representative at the same counter assists in the operation of the information center.

Similar facilities for shipborne arrivals are in the offing, too. The city of New York plans to complete the first of three consolidated passenger ship terminals in 1966. A large customs hall, modern baggage-handling facilities and numerous tourist facilities will be incorporated in the design. Holland-America Line and Grace Line have recently opened new passenger terminals; other lines have planned improvements.

Many of the hundreds of thousands of oversea visitors to the port of New York arrive for business. Of course, business travelers often take advantage of their trip to bring along the family. Much is done to help the businessman in his contacts. The U.S. Department of Commerce is of prime assistance and advises commercial travelers to consult the U.S. commercial representative at the nearest U.S. Foreign Service post well in advance of their trips. The department will then publish the itinerary and purpose of the trip in its weekly publication, International Commerce, to aid in prearranging business appointments. Business visitors to the port of New York are also invited to call upon the New York field office of the U.S. Department of Commerce in the Empire State Building for further assistance in locating suppliers and buyers.

The port of New York looks forward to being the host to ever-growing numbers of commercial travelers in the future. The World Trade Center, to be built on a 15-acre site in lower Manhattan, is destined to become the hub to which international businessmen will gravitate as a matter of course in the years ahead. At this one location the overseas commercial traveler will transact all his business. There he will find displays of products from every part of the globe, essential trade information, and he will be able to meet with fellow businessmen from virtually every nation.

The port of New York is a tourist center; it is a business center. It is also the center for departures for nationwide business and tourist trips across the Nation. Travelers taking advantage of bargain $99 bus travel will embark at the modern port authority bus terminal for points across the Nation. Others will depart from the port authority's air terminals. Those traveling on the combined routes of Allegheny and Piedmont Airline for 30 days for $99 will leave from Newark Airport. The magnitude of bargain fares from New York may be appreciated when one realizes that the bus trip from New York to Los Angeles approximates four such trips from Rome to Paris; or that the combined air systems of Allegheny and Piedmont approximate a service from London to Rome and from Paris to Berlin.

That the work of the USTS has paid off is evident in the recent increase of tourism. Twenty-six percent more tourists arrived in the United States from abroad in the first 6 months of 1963 than in a smiliar period in 1962. Their number was almost 50 percent more than in the first half of 1961, before USTS began operations.

The Government has had much help in its program. International air carriers spent more than $6 million in 12 international markets abroad last year advertising travel to the United States. Pan American World Airways has published a 36-page booklet in four languages called "The Pan American Planning Guide to Travel in the U.S.A." An American Airlines' Royal Coachman jet has toured Europe and Japan to promote Visit the United States of America. Continental Trailways and Greyhound have had their buses on overseas tours to promote their services. American Express Co. has introduced in London special Visit U.S.A. package tours from $14 a day and expects the program to be instrumental in inducing about 200,000 Britons to travel to the United States in its first full year of operation.

The Visit U.S.A. program, like the National Export Expansion program, is a positive program, as contrasted to a restrictive approach, to help offset the flow of dollars going out of the United States. The U.S. deficit from travel and tourist expenditures in 1962 was over $1.3 billion—the difference between $1.1 billion in receipts and $2.4 billion credited to other nations. Rising incomes and increased leisure time abroad, combined with an effort to interest foreigners in visiting the United States of America and a hearty welcome from the American people, should do much to eliminate this imbalance. The port of New York, standing at the front door of the United States, welcomes one and all to travel a new world via the port of New York—one of the most fascinating tourist attractions on the globe as well as an efficient freight terminal for the world's products.

Beware the Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Senate is considering the test ban treaty with Russia, it is highly important that all views be given ample consideration because those of us who would like to see a lessening of the tensions in the cold war do not want to accomplish this by signing a treaty which would limit the United States to World War II defensive weapons.

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER's thought-provoking article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 3 follows:

BEWARE THE TEST BAN

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California)

The limited nuclear test ban is a Russian bear trap. It will help the Soviet Union and hurt the United States. It will allow the Russians to catch up in nuclear-weapons development, in which they are behind, and prevent us from catching up in areas in which they are ahead. This topsy-turvey treaty raises the ominous possibility that, in time, the Soviet Union could gain the clear-cut nuclear supermacy it needs to achieve

communism's unalterable goal of world domination.

Despite serious ideological differences between Moscow and Peiping, neither has abandoned the idea that the West shall be buried. Their dispute is over how, when and how deep.

For a decade and a half America's overall nuclear superiority has deterred the Kremlin from seeking its goal quickly and explosively with nuclear weapons. Our ability to retaliate with fearsome damage to the Soviet Union has made that method too costly. Our deterrent also has curbed Russia's cold-war activities. Fears that limited wars might get out of hand and escalate to nuclear war have tempered Soviet adventurism.

America's superior nuclear arsenal has been maintained by American scientists in unrestricted competition with Russian scientists. Now the rules of competition are to be changed. All testing is to go underground. President Kennedy has said this will be a first step toward reducing world tensions, freeing us from the fear and danger of fallout, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and limiting the arms race in ways that will strengthen our security more than unrestricted testing. He has argued that it is a step toward peace well worth taking, because the terms of the treaty will allow the United States to retain its present nuclear superiority.

But will it allow us to retain superiority? Is it a step toward peace as we understand it—or as the Hungarian freedom fighters savagely were taught it?

Here is the nub of the matter and here there is room for discussion—and dissent. Power, not good intentions, rules the world. No one knows this better than the Russians. Why, after all these truculent years, have they suddenly decided there shall be a test ban agreement? What is behind Khrushchev's quick change from the frowning Russian rocket rattler of last October's Cuban crisis to the smiling Russian treaty peddler of today? Has the wolf jumped out of his skin and a lamb jumped in? Hardly. He obviously believes the pact is giving him something at the expense of the United States. Khrushchev thinks he is getting a bargain. He is.

While allowing underground testing, the treaty bans explosions in the atmosphere, underwater, or in space. For the Soviets, nothing could be better. With underground tests they can develop the kinds of small, tactical weapons that the United States has been building successfully for years. They will have the unrestricted opportunity to equal or surpass us. In the atmosphere the Russians already have made tremendous advances with strategic weapons far more powerful than any that the United States has. In 1961, when Khrushchev coolly broke the testing moratorium, Russian scientists detonated one weapon with a force of 58 megatons. It can be scaled up to a yield of 100 megatons and safely placed in Soviet arsenals without further testing. The exact yield of the biggest American weapon is a military secret, but a good bet is that the Red army calculates it at not over 30 megatons.

During the 1961 series of 31 atmospheric shots and continuing with last year's series of 49, the U.S.S.R. also made some startling advances in the development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons. Caught flat-footed by the sudden Soviet test resumption in September 1961, we could not get our own atmospheric series under way until April 1962. With nearly 90 tests, we made some significant advances on our own, but technical difficulties cut our high altitude experiments severely. On balance, we need to continue testing far more than the Russians. These are the reasons why:

First, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has testified that the Russians, like ourselves, are rapidly hiding their missile bases and other military installations far underground in protective cocoons of concrete. Without atmospheric testing we cannot increase the yield of our warheads. Knowing the limitation on those yields, the Russians easily can pour enough concrete to protect against them. When that is done, our retaliatory strikeback forces will be left threatening empty launching pads and invulnerable fortresses. That kind of threat against the Soviet homeland is hardly sufficient to deter the Kremlin. Nuclear war will be become more likely, not less.

Second, our nuclear deterrent will be weakened in yet another way by a ban on atmospheric testing. To pose a credible retaliatory threat, we must be strong enough to absorb a suprise Sunday punch and then rally to devastate the attacker. The enemy's nuclear attack will create weird disturbances in all unprotected electrical circuitry. Yet to strike back convincingly, millions of electrical circuits at SAC bases, in our bombers, missiles, and Polaris submarines all must work in unison and function perfectly—beginning with transmission of the command to retaliate through every step of the massive strikeback operation, right down to triggering our warheads over enemy targets. We know a good deal about nullifying these electromagnetic disturbances, but we need to know very much more. That knowledge can be learned only from atmospheric testing.

Third, the United States starts with the sobering knowledge that, if war comes, we will be on the defensive. This means we will be using defensive nuclear weapons over our own territory and that of our allies. Dr. Edward Teller, the "father of the H-bomb," has pointed out time and again that these weapons must create little or no fallout. Otherwise we will severely hurt ourselves in our own defense. We have made a good start toward developing cleaner nuclear explosives. But we need to learn much more and, again, we need to test in the atmosphere to do the job.

Fourth, we need to test in the atmosphere to perfect the antimissile missile, the weapon that we may need desperately to preserve our nuclear deterrent. The technical problems of creating a defense against a warhead hurtling down on the United States are great. Secretary McNamara has expressed doubts that it can be done at all. However, Khrushchev, in fact, insists that the Russians have already turned the trick. "We can hit a fly in the sky," he says.

If Khrushchev's claim that his scientists have solved the technical problems is correct, then as soon as the Russian missile defense system is put into operation our nuclear deterrent will be largely nullified. Our only course of action is to develop an antimissile missile of our own. To do this, we have to test in the environment in which the weapons will be used—the atmosphere.

Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has forcefully pointed out how vital it is to test new weapons under realistic conditions. "At our peril," he has said, "we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads, and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode."

Fifth, because the treaty will be unpoliced, the Russians could make a quantum jump militarily by the trick of surprise abrogation—clandestine preparation leading up to the sudden start of tests. Last year President Kennedy himself said that an atmospheric test ban treaty would be "extremely vulnerable" without provision for "adequate inspection" guarding against secret preparation for a surprise abrogation. Although President Kennedy has promised to keep in readiness our own plans to resume testing quickly, our program is bound to sag unless it is kept alive by at least some limited atmospheric testing. This was explained by the President in 1962 before the resumption of our own tests when he said, "we cannot keep topflight scientists from concentrating on preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly and found it impossible of execution.

Sixth, there is need for the United States to continue testing, because the treaty fails to rule out Soviet cheat tests either in the air or in space. Secretary of State Dean Rusk has asserted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the pact places no faith and trust in the Kremlin, and that it is self-enforcing, since the United States could easily detect any atmospheric tests by the Russians. His assertions do not square with the Atomic Energy Commission's inability to classify three sets of manifestations from the Soviet Union early in June as nonnuclear. There is no assurance they were not very low-yield or very clean air shots that released only small amounts of fission products. As to space cheating, series after series of very profitable Soviet tests in outer space could be carried on entirely without suspicion on our part.

For all these reasons, the test ban treaty helps Russia militarily. It also helps Russia psychologically and politically.

The negotiation and signing of the treaty in Moscow, together with Premier Khrushchev's role as the only participating head of state, gives Russia a credible claim to the peacemaker image. In addition, the treaty helps Khrushchev in his struggle with the Chinese. The negotiation tells both East and West that Khrushchev's book on "How To Succeed in Aggression Without Really Bombing" is still a best seller.

An ineffective treaty removes the pressure of world opinion for an effective one that would stop Russian progress as well as our own. Furthermore, an unpoliced treaty ratifies the Soviet closed-society principle and forestalls future attempts to open it up.

This treaty also hints our extreme reluctance to use nuclear weapons at all, except in a final showdown with the Soviet Union. Communist and other aggressors seem to be left free to intensify conventional attacks without fear of our calculated use of nuclear arms to block them. Stepped-up Red Korean action along the Korean armistice line already has cost U.S. casualties.

In addition, the treaty could be interpreted as preventing us from giving needed nuclear weapons to our allies. This comes at a time when our NATO allies seriously resent their inability to deter the Soviets independently should we refuse or become too weak to do so. Without the freedom to share our weapons, this estrangement will deepen. The dissolution of NATO could well result. This, for years, has been one of Khrushchev's priority objectives. The nuclear test ban, also, comes at a time when our allies in the Far East are increasingly worried that the Red Chinese will soon get nuclear weapons.

APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS

Perhaps the most dangerous aspect of the test ban proposal, however, and the most difficult to argue against, is its emotional appeal. As Khrushchev knows all too well, the treaty seems to assure the worried peoples of the world that after the long years of fear everything is going to be all right. Surely the treaty must be the beginning of a thaw in the cold war. Surely, the Russians must now be ready to work for a real peace.

For Americans this line of wishful thinking could be disastrous. We could rapidly develop a false sense of security that would lead us to drop our guard. We could be emotionally pressured into more comprehensive disarmament agreements without adequate controls.

All the "first steps" sought by President Kennedy with his partial treaty could be gained through much wiser means—a simple treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union stipulating that atmospheric testing be stopped whenever certain reasonable, agreed-upon levels of fallout had been reached. These "first steps" would be substantially free from the military, psychological, and political disadvantages of the treaty at hand—which solves none of the basic conflicts between Russia and the United States. The problem of Berlin would still exist. So would Laos. So would Cuba. And there is not a shred of evidence to indicate that Americans would not continue to be killed in Korea and South Vietnam.

In such a world, the United States must keep up its nuclear guard. And the only safe way we can maintain the nuclear deterrent is by refusing to accept a Communist scheme to force us to stop testing in the atmosphere.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of August 31, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, August 31, 1963)

REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE—DO FEDERAL LAWS AFFECT YOU?

Each year thousands of legislative bills are introduced, many controversial. Some are passed, some not. Do these, can these affect you? Let's see.

A FEW OF THE ISSUES

(NOTE.—Each law (1) requires yielding some freedom, (2) costs. (Remember, figure $1 billion equals $5.30 per capita or $21.20 per family of 4).)

1. Foreign aid: $100 billion given away since World War II, including aid to Communists dedicated to enslaving you and your children. (Cost, $2,120 per family of 4.) (Yours?)

2. A Communist Cuba, with missiles that can hit Dallas. (Cost to you?)

3. Military protection: $55 billion, approximately. (Your cost?)

4. Government business operations: 700 Government corporations spending $40 billion yearly—power development, housing, construction, insurance, banking, real estate, transportation—competing with Dallas business. (Your cost?)

5. Government loans, favoritism for selected people. (What does this cost you?)

6. Trade agreements hurt Dallas competitively—other nations won't match our tariff cuts. Also, Communist labor undercuts us—costs Dallas jobs. (Cost to you?)

7. Government wage setting increases costs of doing business without regard to production increase. (Your cost?)

8. Farm subsidies increase costs of both groceries and taxes at the same time. (Cost to you?)

9. Tax changes affecting every taxpayer, concerning deductions, exemptions, rates—individuals work 2 months or more per year to pay taxes. (Your bill?)

There are many other issues.

Should your Congressman study and judiciously resolve each issue with each Dallas resident in mind, or abandon independence of judgment, "go along to get along" in hopes of not alienating congressional administration leaders, thereby attempting to bring home a larger share of "Federal bacon"?

Legislative issues are all important as Congressmen themselves see it, by the careful assignment of Members to committees and the expectation they will give committee work first priority. Pressure groups—AFL-CIO, Teamsters, farm groups, veterans, Federal workers, educational societies, professional societies, and all the others, each consider their legislative bills most important and rate a Congressman on how he votes on their particular measures. Patriotic and good government groups display the importance of issues by publishing the voting records of Congressmen and urging their reelection or defeat on the basis of those records.

Who pays the cost? The wealth? Not on your life. You do. Eighty-four percent of individual income tax comes from the brackets below $10,000 tax liability. If we took all the money from the very wealthy, we could run the Government for less than a month, so it is the great bulk of the low and middle income people who support the Government. It is up to you, then, to decide if my work on the Ways and Means Committee, the tax committee, and my struggle to hold down spending is important to you.

Most Dallas people believe the issues are the important part of a Congressman's job. Some even realize they are footing the bill, not someone else. It seems the only persons who think otherwise are those (1) who have a special interest in a particular program or project; (2) who are under political pressure because of some real or fancied indebtedness to the party in power or a key individual in government; (3) who have decided since they pay taxes, they'll try to get back all they can; (4) who never have thought about it.

WHERE DO YOU STAND?

Today's questions must be answered. They will be, with or without you. Make your presence felt. Everyone is needed. It's our problem, our country, our future. How about it?

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

James D. Shouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared recently in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star relative to James D. Shouse, chairman of the board of the Crosley Broadcasting Corp., who is well and widely known throughout the Middle West:

SCHOOL BELL TOUCHES HEART OF CROSLEY CHIEF

(By Mary Wood)

When James D. Shouse, Crosley's board chairman, celebrated his 60th birthday a few weeks ago, his associates presented him with an old-fashioned school bell bearing the inscription "To James D. Shouse * * * a symbol of your life * * * a teacher wherever you are."

This couldn't have pleased Jim Shouse more, since he taught high school in Belfast, Ohio, and Southgate, Ky., long before he became involved in the broadcasting business. He dearly loved teaching.

"I have always believed radio and TV to be a tremendous educational medium and a wealth of educational material is available on television each day. It is simply a matter of using judgment in what you watch," said Mr. Shouse.

"For example, I accidentally stumbled on a great summer show at 6:30 a.m. from the University of Michigan, which is replacing 'Continental Classroom'," he continued. "Now I get up early each morning so I can watch it. The show just finished a series of 10 programs on the development of music and the presentation was superb."

Week in and week out, Mr. Shouse feels, Cincinnati has the best TV service in America.

"The competition between the three stations is rough, but it is the spur that makes for better television," he said.

It was in 1940 that Mr. Shouse launched a new department at WLW called Special Service, which was a forerunner of the FCC's thinking that a station has an obligation to help people tell their story. It became the job of Special Service to take the informational material, offered by various organizations which wanted broadcast time, and whip it into programs which would interest, not bore, the audience.

"So far, we have done no editorializing on the Crosley stations, but in the future we will present documentaries which will take sides on matters affecting the public," Mr. Shouse said. "I think a documentary approach on five or six issues a year, with adequate research, will do much more good than coming out each day for the home and against sin.

"The people trying to run TV have a problem in how much responsibility they can assume in editorializing," he continued. "In order to feed information and research to editorial writers, a big staff of researchers is needed and we don't have it. That's why I waver, no matter what the FCC says."

Jim came to Crosley in 1937 as vice president of Crosley Broadcasting and general manager of WLW and WSAI. Under his guidance, Crosley Broadcasting has become one of the country's most successful operations with four TV stations—Cincinnati, Dayton, Columbus, and Indianpolis—and the 50,000-watt, clear channel WLW.

"But I daresay the best known acquisition Jim contributed to Crosley was hiring Ruth Lyons away from WKRC over 20 years ago.

"I was driving along one day and heard her doing a show called 'Hello, Teachers,' a spelling bee, as I recall," he said. "I remember thinking, now there is a woman with personality. Why isn't she working for us?"

A Worried Citizen Views the Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Saturday's edition of the Washington Star newspaper carried the following well-

reasoned letter to the editor from Benjamin Ginzburg:

SOME NAGGING DOUBTS ABOUT TEST BAN TREATY

Several disturbing facts have come out of the debate on the nuclear test ban treaty.

The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Glenn Seaborg, testified he would like to see the treaty amended so as to permit nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. This recommendation indicates that on the basis of scientific information available to the AEC, Chairman Seaborg does not believe that nuclear test fallout constitutes a serious health hazard to the world's population. Thus a high official of the Kennedy administration, and the one whom the American public counts on possessing the best scientific information on the fallout problem, has knocked the props out from under the panic argument for the test ban treaty—to wit, that we have to have a treaty in order to stop the frightful poisoning of the earth's atmosphere.

Witnesses at the Senate hearings have called attention to a phrase in the treaty banning any nuclear explosion (in the air, under water or in outer space) and have voiced the fear that this phrase would bar the use of nuclear weapons by the United States in repelling aggression by China or some other country, or for that matter by Russia herself when using conventional forces and not nuclear weapons in perpetrating her aggression. In reply to this fear, the State Department has explained that the phrase in question was inserted in the treaty to ban nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, since such explosions, if permitted, could serve as an indirect means for evading the prohibition on tests of a military character. The Department insists that the phrase was not meant to ban the use of nuclear weapons in actual war. Unfortunately its own stated theory of banning indirect evasions of the prohibition on the testing of nuclear weapons could also be held to apply to the use of nuclear weapons to repel aggression by conventional arms.

One of the classic ways of testing any weapons is to test them in actual battle. (Hitler used this method when he intervened in the Spanish civil war and obtained valuable information on the performance of his new weapons under combat conditions.) Thus if we should want to use nuclear weapons in order to repel aggression by conventional arms, Russia could claim (on the State Department's own theory) that we were violating the treaty by indulging in an indirect form of nuclear weapons testing.

In a heated reply to Dr. Edward Teller's claim that the treaty endangers American security, President Kennedy reiterated the statement he made in his speech on the test-ban treaty, to wit, that "what we now have on hand, without any further testing, will kill 300 million people in 1 hour." And he added: "I suppose they could even improve on that if it's necessary." These statements are couched in language used by the members of the Women Strike for Peace and other pacifist organizations. If they really express the President's convictions on the subject of nuclear weapons, then he should recommend that we stop spending hundreds of millions in an effort to keep ahead or even abreast in the nuclear technology race.

On the other hand, if it is important to seek and to maintain a lead in the nuclear technology race, then President Kennedy's statements must be regarded as a sentimental distraction from the serious business in hand, and as betraying the pacifist sentimentality which inspired the negotiation of the treaty. I use the term, pacifist sentimentality, to characterize the attitude of mind which assumes that our will to peace will be met with an answering will to peace on the part of the Russian and Chinese Communists when in fact they have never renounced their intention to bury us and are simply quarreling among themselves as to the best and speediest method of accomplishing this end.

Since so many of our military officials have stated that the treaty carries military risks for the United States but that they are endorsing the treaty because of its political advantages—in other words, because it is felt to be a first step toward peace and the end of the nuclear arms race—it behooves us to ask ourselves whether the hope for genuine peace between ourselves and Russia coming about as a result of the treaty rests on anything more than our sentimental aspiration for peace.

To counter the fears of Senators that the treaty may endanger American nuclear superiority, the Pentagon has announced a vast new nuclear readiness program which will whip our weapons testing apparatus into instant readiness for the eventuality that Russia should breach the treaty. Included in the program is a broadening of current underground testing "to include as many tests as are feasible to replace atmospheric testing." The announcement of this program, and particularly of the broadening of underground testing, serves to demolish the second basic argument for the treaty, namely, that it will lead to a slowing down and ultimate cessation of the nuclear arms race.

For if we are going to whip our weapons testing apparatus into instant readiness (by preparing the preliminary research that has to take place prior to actual tests) and if we are going to increase underground testing to the maximum feasible, we can be sure that Russia is going to do the same things. It is difficult to see how the nuclear arms race can slow down under such a procedure. It is instead likely to accelerate as each side seeks to protect itself against cheating by the other side, and as each side seeks to take maximum advantage of the practices permitted by the treaty.

President Kennedy has quoted a Chinese proverb in support of the treaty—to wit, that in order to undertake a journey of a thousand miles one must take the first step. But in view of the disturbing implications of the cited facts it seems more relevant to quote an old Italian proverb, which says, "God protect me from my friends—from my enemies I can protect myself." I can imagine the Angel of Peace in Heaven reciting this proverb as she listens to the debates on the nuclear test ban treaty.

BENJAMIN GINZBERG.

Bellingham, Wash., Has Big Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, much of the future of the Pacific Northwest and Washington State depends upon the growth of communities such as Bellingham, Wash., which is situated on Puget Sound in my district.

The growth, however, depends in turn on the foresight and planning of these communities. Many are small today, but have big plans and room for expansion. Moreover, the communities are doing something about their future. An example is Bellingham, the subject of an article in the July–August 1963 issue of the Compass.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in the RECORD:

The Strait of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, the Strait of Georgia, and the coastline north to Skagway, Alaska, is North America's fjord country. Capt. George Vancouver (1758–98) explored it during 1792 with orders from George III's admiralty to ascertain its desirability for subsequent colonization. One of the places he dropped anchor was a small sheltered bay that he named Bellingham Bay in honor of Sir William Bellingham, who had assisted him in victualing for his voyages of discovery.

Sheltered areas such as this were important to Captain Vancouver from a safety standpoint. For though the country in fair weather in magnificant, in foul weather or in fog it can boobytrap an unwary mariner. A few days before he'd had an experience in Juan de Fuca that made him doubly cautious. Finding what he thought was a satisfactory lee and unable to anchor because of deep water, he maneuvered close inshore and tied up to a tree. Imagine his surprise some 6 hours later to find his ship high and dry. Unknowingly, he had encountered one of those occasional tides that have a 14-foot or more range.

Ashore, a magnificent wilderness beckoned him. Tall stands of superb Douglas-fir trees stretched as far as his eyes could see. From his tops he had a splendid view of snow-capped mountains to the west, to the east a glimpse of Mount Baker's snowy crown that reaches over 10,000 feet toward the sky. And the native Lumni Indians were friendly. Little did he realize at the time that he was on the future site of the mainland United States most northerly first-class city, Bellingham, Wash. (population about 35,000 as of this writing).

According to a short history of the city by Mr. William C. Carver, of the Bellingham Herald, 60 years were to pass before white men permanantly settled in the area. The first were Capt. Henry Roeder and Russell V. Peabody who came north from San Francisco in search of a site for a water-powered sawmill. With it, they could help supply, at a good profit, the Golden Gate's skyrocketing lumber demands. Meeting Lummi Indian Chief Cha-wit-zit at Olympia, now the capital of Washington, they asked him whether he knew of "any falling water all the time from a high hill."

Cha-wit-zit did and replied, "Yes, at Whatcom, noise all the time."

Aided by the friendly Lummis, Roeder and Peabody built their mill at the foot of lower Whatcom Falls that finally empties into the bay at Whatcom Creek. From 1853 when it started cutting until it burned 20 years later, the Roeder-Peabody mill shared with the Sehome coal mine, a mile to the south, the industrial capacity of the fir-clad settlements fringing the shoreline.

William H. Pattle, who came to the area some 2 months before Roeder and Peabody, was the man interested in coal. He carefully examined outcroppings reported to him by the Indians and decided they could be worked. For a number of years he operated a marginal coal mine that probably went out of business or was absorbed into the Sehome mining operations. Though coal is no longer mined, Bellingham still prides itself in "resting and sleeping on a bed of soft coal."

Shortly after the turn of the century, the three major bay communities of Fairhaven, Sehome, and Whatcom voted to consolidate as Bellingham. Economically, the new city's life was intimately tied to farming and timber. Eight major sawmills and shingle mills were busy working to meet demands of a rapidly expanding population south to the Mexican border.

The timber-cutting mills of half a century ago have been replaced, for the most part, by wood-processing plants. Wood pulp,

specialized paper fabrication, and plywood manufacturing plants are now much in evidence, supported by ample stands of publicly and privately owned stands of timber. During fairly recent years, fish processing has also entered the picture. But more about this fascinating business later.

Just to the north of Bellingham is an area that adds to the growing strength of the rich northwest country. This is Ferndale, a lush agricultural spot. More important, though, to Mobil's operation, it is the locale of our large oil refinery, the first such in the great and growing Pacific Northwest.

The port of Bellingham as a corporate entity did not come into existence until 1920. Even then it did so in the face of severe opposition from certain interests bent on keeping the city quiet and more villagelike. During the 1920's and 1930's it grew apiece, but nothing like it might have. World events, though, were cutting a pattern, setting in motion forces that were to jam the harbor with vessels waiting for cargo. This was World War II when immense quantities of lend-lease materials were shipped out to Russia, materials that have never been paid for to this day.

Traffic resumed its peacetime patterns once hostilities ended. There were, however, some marked changes. Logs, lumber, newsprint, paper and farm produce, though still economically important, were being crowded by the booming demand for plywood and by a postwar newcomer, the frozen-food industry. The latter, though not involved in oversea shipping, added much to the financial well-being of the city and to the port's arrival figures.

Largest freezing plant in the area is 15-year-old Bellingham Cold Storage Co. Demands for its services were so great that it built and opened, during the summer of 1960, what is probably the largest fish freezing, cold storage and processing plant in the Pacific Northwest. The location is excellent. The port is readily accessible to the North Pacific fishing grounds, and facilities are available for the fishing fleets to take Mobil fuels, Mobil lubricants, stores and fresh water before returning to sea.

The company operates on a strictly custom basis, has no brand of its own. And it maintains a skilled crew to handle the wide variety of its customer services. Its main business comprises: storing, packing and shipping of whole fish received in bulk from Alaska; storage of packaged frozen foods; freezing and storing, packaging and shipping of whole fish; and specialized custom processing of customers' property. A good part of the latter entails readying the delectable king crab for an avid U.S. frozen food market.

A specially reclaimed area called the Squalicum Industrial Block houses the Bellingham Cold Storage Co., Stokeley-Van Camp's preparation plant and the facilities of the Columbia River Packers Association. To keep everything close aboard, just abaft the cold storage plant is a small yard and slipway that can both build and repair fishing vessels and small craft. The seaward side is enclosed by a seawall that provides sheltered anchorage for the fishing fleet as well as room for a small-craft haven.

Though the present port of Bellingham is relatively small, it has excellent well-maintained facilities and ample room for future expansion. The facilities include a 60-ton water crane and barge, logger-hauler, lumber carrier, motor crane and lift trucks of various capacities. The main pier called port dock will be enlarged and improved shortly. At present, though, it can berth three deep-sea ships along its 900-foot face and 400-foot triangle dock. There is ample water—depths alongside averaging 30 feet. Ashore, about 57,600 square feet of the storage space is covered with some 83,000 square feet plus leased acreage open. Three railroads, the Great Northern, Northern Pacific and the Milwaukee Road serve the dock; the latter also serves the grain elevator nearby. The elevator is presently under lease to Fisher Flouring Mills for the storage and shipment of grain to the Orient. Since lumber is a key industry, timber basins abound.

The port of Bellingham's directors have long-range plans afoot for expanding present facilities and building new ones. Included among the improvements are a greatly enlarged shipping terminal and development of industrial sites to attract new business to the area. Actually, the city's fathers are dedicated toward providing incentives that will increase the overall business tempo of Whatcom County—make more jobs for more people, more wealth for the community as a whole. There's plenty of space along Bellingham Bay to do just that. And when it is done—and done it will be since Bellingham is in the heart of an area that has much to recommend it as a commercial center—the port will be ready to ship its products to the rest of the world. Acknowledgement and thanks to Mr. William C. Carver of the Bellingham Herald and to the Pacific Fisherman for their assistance in preparing the story.

Inside the USIA With Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Information Agency has a very important mission—that of providing information about our country, its policies and ideals, to citizens of other nations around the world.

Mr. Edward R. Murrow, the Director of USIA, recently has written a very informative and interesting article on USIA and its policies, entitled "Inside the USIA With Edward R. Murrow."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article which appeared in the September issue of American Girl—the official publication of the Girl Scouts of America—in the RECORD.

The article follows:

INSIDE THE USIA WITH EDWARD R. MURROW

(By Edward R. Murrow)

Once a man jumped on a horse at midnight and rode through the cobbled streets of New England into American history. He had a simple message: "The British are coming. The British are coming." So Paul Revere raced to rouse the slumbering patriots from Lexington to Concord. And they rose from their beds to meet the common danger.

Like the historic horseman, the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) carries an important message. But today it cannot be as simple as a single shout.

Three things make our country's story a difficult one to tell: There are many parts to America's story. There are many ways to tell each part. There are many different people in different lands to whom the story must be told. The USIA is faced with the unique task of providing information about the United States and its policies and ideals, as well as explanations of events that take place here.

Given the barriers of different languages, customs, interests, ways of living and working, kinds of governments, the USIA has to interest people enough to get them to listen—and so want to understand what kind of people we are and why we do what we do.

To reach the eyes, ears, minds, and the hearts of people everywhere, USIA uses many different means of communication: press, radio, movies, TV, books, and other printed materials, exhibits, the arts—and most important of all—people-to-people contact. At 239 posts in 106 countries about 1,300 foreign service officers try to meet others and learn how they live and think, and, in turn, act as spokesmen for the United States of America.

Overseas, the USIA is known as the U.S. Information Service (USIS) to emphasize the offer of service to the people of other lands.

Let me take you on a quick tour of oversea posts to show some of the ways USIA works. A good starting place is the information center or library—the main attraction of many USIA posts abroad. On the main thoroughfares of many big cities in the free world today, you can see a sign with letters spelling out either "U.S. Information Service" or "American Library." Outside the building, there are usually window displays of books and eye-catching photographs on a subject of special interest to the people in that area, or exhibits on major international developments such as an American astronaut in orbit. Sometimes bulletins are posted so passersby can learn the day's major news events at a glance. Inside, the reading room is a busy place. In one corner, an old gentleman sits next to a student, both eagerly reading current periodicals. In another area, school children are drawing on construction paper. One young man is questioning the USIS librarian. He wants his answers directly from a person, not a book.

In some places, people have never before been allowed to remove books from library shelves and handle them as they please. There are countries where we have started a revolution of the mind by having the first and sometimes the only free public library. Imagine the impact on a school teacher from a small Burmese village who walked many miles one day to visit the USIS library in Rangoon. She had heard of its facilities. She hoped to get information on a subject of particular interest to her class. Seeing an entire row of books on the subject, she was amazed. "Ah," she sighed to the librarian. "If I only had known how many books you had, I would have planned to spend a few days here to make notes." Told she could take the books with her, the teacher stared blankly. Only when they were placed in her hands, did she seem to realize something very new had happened to her.

That same library was visited not too long ago by members of an official Communist trade delegation. One East German member approached the librarian cagily. "You may not wish me to be a member of the library," he said, "but only you have the books I like to read." She issued him a library card on the spot.

In Morocco, so many people swarmed through the USIS library that the librarian had to issue cards of seven different colors, one color for each day of the week. Every card holder was then asked to use the library the day his color came up.

These libraries contain 3 million books, one-third of them in the local language. The demand for information is especially great in newly sovereign nations. The information centers also act as a public forum for discussions on community projects. They are an invaluable tool in combatting ignorance, misunderstanding, and suspicion, because they are so widely used by journalists, teachers, students, researchers, and government leaders.

Where people are far from the world of books, a sampling from that world sometimes turns up on the USIS bookmobile. Or it comes by bus or jeep, by elephant or oxcart,

or even on foot. These mobile units climb over nearly impassable roads in remote regions, ford muddy streams, scale mountain passes and plunge through deep jungle to receive a ceremonious welcome everywhere. In one mountain village in Pakistan, arrival of the bookmobile is always heralded by the beat of heavy drums.

The world moves fast today, and information must keep in pace. USIA provides an unending flow of material to all our oversea posts, where it is translated and adapted for local use. Daily, we furnish stories in several languages to newspapers in foreign countries to help explain America's position.

Here at home, the USIA also produces major magazines in Russian, Polish, English, Spanish, and Arabic. Overseas, USIS posts produce 62 other magazines in 25 languages, 20 newspapers, and other periodicals. These are read by millions who otherwise would either receive no knowledge of America or only such knowledge as local conditions permit. In Vietnam, a ferryboat operator accepts as fare, instead of money, one copy of "Free World" (printed in Manila in 10 languages).

MAGIC WINDOW ON THE WORLD

You can imagine what a source of wonder and excitement movies are to the millions of people who cannot read or who are unfamiliar with the world outside their villages. A reporter for a local newspaper in the remote hill country of Baluchistan, assigned to cover a USIS film showing the inauguration of John F. Kennedy tells this story:

"A very old man was sitting next to me during the showing of the film. 'Who is this man to whom so many people are giving respect?' he whispered. 'He is the new President of the United States,' I whispered back.

"Evidently he had never seen a motion picture before because he then asked: 'But how is it that so great a man has come so far to our town and we can see and hear him speak as through an open window?' "

Last year, one of our mobile film teams left La Paz, Bolivia's capital city, to present a movie program in a small village. On the scene they found that word of their coming had preceded them. Some 80 families had walked through dense jungles to join the audience. Many had never before seen a movie.

Our films cover many topics, among them: the importance of self-help to the peoples of developing countries; the fortitude of the West Berliners who must live with the wall that divides their city; the warm reception received by foreign leaders during visits to the United States; African students' own views of their experiences at college here; biographies of well-known personalities from different fields—such as tennis champ Althea Gibson and singer Marian Anderson; American educational, scientific, and cultural achievements. The newsreels, shorts, and documentaries USIA produces are seen by about 600 million people every month.

A USIA film crewman in Pakistan sent this account to our headquarters in Washington:

"I contacted the commanding officer of the frontier post at Mughal Kot, and offered to put on a show. The offer was gratefully accepted. We showed three films—'Hamara Pakistan,' 'In Search of Lincoln,' and 'Chicken Little.' As they were being shown, the audience shouted and talked back to the people on the screen. When a certain dance scene came on in the Pakistan film, everyone clapped. Some got up and danced to the music. During the Lincoln film, the audience shouted loudly whenever Lincoln appeared. 'Hurrah,' they said, 'for the tall man who sacrificed his life that all men may be free.' "

In Nigeria, the USIS projectionist had to rerun a film three times. It was a movie of a local festival which he had photographed and was showing on command to the Oba (king) of Ilobu and his court. "Mah tun se, mah tun se!" the Nigerians shouted. "Do it again, do it again!" Each time his picture flashed across the screen, the Obu beamed graciously, and the villagers waved as they saw themselves, friends, and relatives on film.

For similar audiences in Africa, the USIA has filmed newsreels that are proud documents for many peoples of the emerging nations of that continent. The agency recorded the seating of 17 new African states at the United Nations. Film sequences show the raising of each new flag at U.N. headquarters and the delineation of each new country on the map of Africa. As far as we know, this is the only film record of these events. And many African firms are using it as part of the history and geography of their countries.

Television is another means we use to help others learn about themselves—and us. We assist with local shows, as well as offer our programs to most of the 74 countries where TV has been introduced.

Within hours after President Kennedy's exposure of the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba, USIA air-expressed a special documentary, "Focus: Cuba," to posts where it would be shown in many languages. By far our most popular television series is an English-teaching course called "Let's Learn English," which also illustrates life in the United States. Filmed partly in our Washington studios and partly in the local studio, it features an American teacher by the name of Don Richards, and then a local counterpart. A TV columnist in Vienna reported that everyone in Austria knows at least one English sentence—"My name is Don Richards."

Many stories come back to us in connection with USIS efforts to teach English. In an African city, a group of tribal chieftains, enrolled to study English, were requested not to come to school on opening day since the school furniture had not yet arrived. They came anyway. Each brought his own chair.

A secretary with USIS was asked to give English lessons at the city market in Bangkok. After several weeks, she protested to her overgenerous students, for she discovered she had already put on 15 unwanted pounds. (It is the local custom to bring a teacher presents of rich pastries.)

Then there was the young Latin American lad who asked permission to attend classes barefoot. His teacher soon discovered that he sold his shoes to pay the small sum involved in his getting lessons.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

The worldwide radio branch of USIA—in operation around the clock—reaches some 20 million people, many living in Communist-dominated countries. Over short-, long-, or medium-wave transmissions, from Washington headquarters or from studios in foreign countries, the Voice of America broadcasts daily in 36 languages news, analysis of events, and a wide range of cultural programs.

A young man from Czechoslovakia wrote to tell us: "Communists have built this curtain around us but they were unable to build it without a crack. They left it with a couple of keyholes through which we, the golden youth of communism peep out and obtain our own views of the outside. The Voice of America is one such keyhole * * * Thank you for your information, true, direct * * * I am 22 years old and have enjoyed the broadcasting of VOA since my 14th year."

Listeners sometimes criticize us, or compare us with Radio Moscow, or ask us to do more than we are able to do. For example, this appeal arrived on a postcard from a citizen of Calcutta: "You should set up spacious halls with air conditioning, restaurants, other facilities to show American theater, dances, music * * * film shows, exhibitions of American art, culture, industries, history, scientific and technological discoveries, and sports. The shows should be open to the public and should be held at least three times a day."

There are other ways we bring home to the world the meaning of democracy. When the *Friendship 7* capsule, in which Colonel Glenn orbited the earth, made a worldwide tour a year ago, crowds lined the streets for hours to see and touch it. The sight of the capsule was evidence of what USIA had been saying in various ways all along: That the United States is open and candid about its space explorations and that through a free exchange of knowledge, the United States makes it possible for many nations to participate in the adventure of space research. Incidentally, this exhibit was our most popular one.

In Laos and in northern Thailand we use a different technique to get our message across. Popular strolling minstrels called Mohlam singers function as the town criers, the TV's and the newspapers in parts of those countries. Working with the local governments, we weave into the Mohlam singers' tales the contemporary story of communism and its threat to the people and cultures of southeast Asia. To extend the audience, we film the Mohlam dramas, then show them wherever our mobile teams can navigate a river or trail, or drop them in by helicopter if need be. We also tape the singers for broadcast over local radio.

A NEVER-ENDING JOB

The USIS works closely with U.S. diplomats assigned to a given country, and we operate the U.S. cultural exchange program overseas. Each year, our officers help select thousands of leaders and students who travel to the United States on Government grants for a first-hand experience of the American way of life.

One of our most important tasks is to advise U.S. Government officials on oversea attitudes. To do this, USIS representatives study the attitudes of the people in the countries where they work, and the ways in which such attitudes are formed. This on-the-scene research helps USIA in preparing materials in ways that will be both useful and acceptable to the people for whom they are intended.

Interpreting the United States and its policies is a never-ending job. But no matter what we say or where we say it, we operate on the basis of truth. When the USIA covers the news, it covers all the news, even when it hurts. In addition to reporting events factually, we try to show how the facts fit within the framework of U.S. goals and ideals.

In the struggle to keep the minds of free people free, we know that truth is the best weapon, and lies the worst. We know that to be persuasive, we must be believed, and to be believed, we must be truthful. To this end we direct all the resources the U.S. Information Agency commands—so that understanding of our country is strengthened throughout the world.

Don't Drop Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the statistical evidence is abundant to show that those who drop out of school without the benefit of at least a high school

education simply cannot effectively compete in today's labor market. This is a problem which should not be of concern only to educators or to those in Government. This is a problem which deserves the attention and concern of all segments of our society.

Therefore, I certainly found it most encouraging to read the newsletter which is published periodically by Northwestern Steel & Wire Co., of Sterling, Ill., and distributed among its employees and note its attention to the problem of school dropouts. I think that this company deserves a special commendation for its initiative in this regard, and I hope the example which they have set in calling attention to the school dropout problem will be followed by business and industry all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, the article I refer to follows:

DON'T DROP OUT

Within the next couple of weeks hundreds of thousands of American teenagers will make one of the most important decisions of their lives. They'll decide whether to return to the classrooms or become dropouts.

This message is aimed at every young man or woman who is considering not returning to school. Don't drop out now. You'll regret it as long as you live.

The odds of a dropout becoming a productive member of society are rapidly changing. Today's dropout is more apt to become an unemployment statistic. The Labor Department estimates that the demand for skilled workers will increase by 150 percent by 1975. The demand for unskilled workers will decline by some 80 percent in the same period. You can't buck such odds.

Labor Department officials continue to estimate that dropouts will number 7.5 million by the end of the present decade. New dropouts will be throwing themselves without skills or training into a work force already unable to absorb the unskilled. At least a partial solution to the problem of unemployed youth, as well as the problem of employers looking for skilled help, exists within the educational system. No solution exists for the unprepared dropout.

Even if today's dropout is fortunate enough to find work immediately, his future earning power is limited. Recent Census Bureau statistics show that the average high school graduate makes $1,500 more per year than the person who failed to finish high school. The worker who failed to finish elementary school averaged $3,000 less than the high school graduate. It all boils down to one answer. Don't be a dope. Don't be a dropout.

Direct Passenger Service Between New York and Moscow Via Air Is Dangerous to Free World Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, negotiations are being conducted between the United States and the U.S.S.R relative to establishment of direct air service between New York and Moscow There is little if any economic justification for such a route insofar as U.S. airlines are concerned. The vast potential for mischief, insofar as the Soviets are concerned, however, is set forth in a letter I have received from an employee of the U.N. in New York. For understandable reasons I have deleted the employee's name from the letter, which follows:

NEW YORK, *August 31, 1963.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: As an employee at the U.N., I come in contact with the Russians. From conversations with them one can understand that they consider it extremely important to them to establish direct passenger service between Moscow and New York so that they can fly their Aeroflot planes from Moscow to New York and back. They know that it will make their task of carrying classified material out of this country a simple one. Their planes will afford them protection.

Their Embassy and U.N. staffs numbers several hundred people. If they could shuttle between New York and Moscow twice a week in their own planes, think of how much secret material, military secrets, scientific and technical data, blue prints and other valuable information gathered for them by their friends and operatives in this country they could tuck away without detection. They will be able to carry away tons of so-called "diplomatic mail." Detection will be practically impossible. They are unscrupulous thieves and they are our mortal enemies.

It will make it possible for them to flood this country with their so-called "diplomats and tourists" (spies) without having to spend critical foreign currency for transportation. It will help them get a firmer grip on South America.

I have just learned that their present target is Venezuela, and to establish more "Cubas" in Central and South America.

The above are only a few of the reasons why the establishment of Aeroflot flights is so vital to them, there are many more. Our Government intends to agree to such flights; if it does, it will be a tragedy and prove most disastrous for our country. I beg you to do everything in your power to prevent it.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————

The Price Fixers: They Are Trying To Take the Food Off Your Table, the Shoes Off Your Children's Feet, and the Money Out of Your Pocket—A Study of the Quality Brand Stabilization Bill, H.R. 3669 and S. 774

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, each year in slightly changed form, but equally destructive content, there appears before the Congress that hardy perennial, the fair trade bill, to raise consumer prices, to destroy price competition, to pro tanto repeal the antitrust laws, and to inflict upon the free competitive American economy the unbelievable evils of the European cartel system. I have always opposed this legislation as being against the interest of the American consumer and intend to continue to do so.

This bill would place the manufacturer in a position to control the small businessman's conduct of his daily affairs. It would authorize the manufacturer to fix prices at all levels of competition.

Today, however, I wish to deal with perhaps the worst feature of this legislation, and that is the rise in prices which would afflict the consumer as a result of enactment of legislation of this kind.

The Department of Justice found by extensive economic surveys that consumers in States with price maintenance, or so-called fair trade laws, paid 19 to 27 percent higher prices on a long list of items of all kinds than consumers in States without such laws. A projection of the average price increase of 20 percent for all sales that would be covered under H.R. 3669 indicates that the federalized fair trade or price fixing as proposed under the Quality Brand Stabilization Act would have a powerful inflationary effect, raising prices by between $1.4 and $13 billion for the consumers of this Nation.

One witness who testified before my committee estimated that the Quality Stabilization Act, if passed, would cost consumers $100 to $250 a year or more, and that it would raise consumer prices in non-fair-trade States by 20 to 30 percent.

Three ads were recently run in the Washington Post by Webb's City, Inc., a responsible mass merchandiser in St. Petersburg, Fla. The first appearing in the July 24, 1963, issue of the Washington (D.C.) Post sums up generally a businessman's view of the legislation:

J. E. "DOC" WEBB, OWNER OF WEBB'S CITY, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.—ATTENTION SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN

H.R. 3669, the so-called quality stabilization bill, has been reported out by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and may soon become law.

If this bill is passed, consumers will be paying higher prices for brand names—drugs, toiletries, appliances, hardware, sporting goods, paints, jewelry, watches, books, furniture, bedding, shoes, silverware, and many other items.

Thousands of retail store owners throughout America (over 100,000 strong) along with hundreds of manufacturers of nationally known products of every description, merchandise you buy every day, have banded together to intimidate and force your Congress in Washington to pass the biggest price fixing bill the world has ever known. This bill makes it legal for manufacturers to fix prices on brand name merchandise. The law if passed will allow manufacturers to set wholesale and retail prices on products sold under their trade mark or brand name. Their products cannot be sold by any store below their fixed price. If a store does cut the price of a manufacturer's product, he will no longer be able to sell that product and will be subject to being sued by that manufacturer. This quality stabilization bill, if passed, will cost American consumers billions of dollars yearly and can double or triple the price you are now paying for everyday items.

We urge you to familiarize yourself with this price-raising bill which will cost consumers in your State or district more money than any single piece of legislation in history.

WEBB'S CITY, INC.,
J. E. "DOC" WEBB.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

The second appearing on Thursday, August 8, 1963, in the Washington Post contained the following quote and the

table which follows indicating the evils that would follow enactment of legislation forcing upon our free American enterprise system a pattern of artificially high fixed prices on almost all commodities which would be inflicted upon the consumer thereby. The prices in the ad are illustrative of the adverse price changes on all items large and small which would affect the consumer.

Listed below are just a few comparisons of manufacturer's suggested prices (which under the Quality Stabilization Act you will be forced to pay) and prices currently charged at Webb's:

Item	Manufacturers suggested retail price	Webb's price
Bottle of 100 Bayer Aspirin	$0.73	$0.59
12-ounce size Maalox	1.50	1.08
Polident denture cleanser	.69	.54
Package 15 Gillette Super Blue Blades	1.00	.69
Bottle of 25 Alka Seltzer	.59	.39
Economy size Crest toothpaste	.69	.47
Bottle of 100 Anacin tablets	1.29	.95
14-ounce bottle Listerine	.89	.67
Bottle of 100 All Bee with "C"	7.45	5.77
Pint size Isopropyl alcohol	.59	.17
General Electric F-70 iron	17.95	12.88
Westinghouse RM-17 roll-a-bout fan	39.95	26.66
Udico C-73 electric can opener	19.95	12.76
Universal No. 4580 percolator	19.95	16.76
Kelvinator 2-horsepower air conditioner	449.00	329.95
Admiral M-623AC7 air conditioner	199.95	134.00
Presto PC-34 pressure cooker	22.95	16.88
Toastmaster toaster, S-131	21.00	14.88
Revere Ware, 9-inch covered skillet	10.25	7.96
General Electric hair dryer, HD-2	29.95	21.99
Giant Palmolive shave bomb	.98	.77
Phillips milk of magnesia tablets, 200's	1.19	.93
Bottle of 100 Bisodol mints	.79	.63
Bottle of 100 Bufferin tablets	.98	.79

Any legislation fixing prices not only destroys free enterprise but also paves the way for Government price fixing.

The third includes the following poignant statement and a list of prices showing how consumer prices will have to be raised if this legislation becomes law:

As introduced this Quality Stabilization Act will allow every manufacturer to fix the retail price of everything the American public wears, eats, or uses, which is sold as brand name merchandise. Some prices of everyday necessities will just about double.

Let's not promote the interests of retail merchants at the expense of 185 million other Americans.

Listed below, for typical prescription drugs, are the prices which consumers will probably have to pay if this bill becomes law, compared with the prices now charged at Webb's City.

Item	Size container	Suggested retail price	Webb's price
Sigmagen	100	$6.00	$4.15
Furadantin (50 mg.)	50	10.40	8.40
Orinase	50	6.25	4.50
Diamox	100	10.80	7.95
Miltown (400 mg.)	50	5.25	3.55
Raudixin (100 mg.)	100	8.33	6.00
Serpasil (0.25 mg.)	100	7.50	4.90
Diabinese (250 mg.)	100	15.00	9.80
Decadron (0.75 mg.)	100	24.16	16.85
Peritrate (10 mg.)	100	4.17	2.75
Peritrate (20 mg.)	100	6.25	4.15
Delenar	100	7.90	5.50
Librium (5 mg.)	100	9.00	5.95
Librium (10 mg.)	100	10.50	7.70
Quinidine (Parke-Davis, 3 gr.)	100	4.50	2.60
Serpasil-Apresoline (No. 1)	100	6.65	4.75
Duotrate (30 mg.)	100	$10.00	$6.60
Duotrate (45 mg.)	100	12.50	8.25
Diuril (500 mg.)	100	9.00	6.60
Diuril (250 mg.)	100	5.70	4.20
Singoserp	100	7.50	4.95
Equanil (400 mg.)	50	5.25	3.45
Gantrisin	100	4.90	2.95
Hydrodiuril (25 mg.)	100	5.70	4.10
Hydrodiuril (50 mg.)	100	9.00	6.50

Webb's City in St. Petersburg, Fla., originated 39 years ago and is independently owned. Webb's City, its stockholders and St. Petersburg have prospered under free enterprise.

It is remarkable that a group of well-financed lobbyists could achieve the threatened enactment of a piece of consumer-gouging legislation of this magnitude when we see arrayed against the enactment of this legislation the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Council of Economic Advisers, the President's Consumer Advisory Council, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of State, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the AFL-CIO, the National Council of Senior Citizens, and the American Farmers Union.

Yet the danger of enactment of this legislation is both real and at hand.

At this point I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a series of editorials appearing in the major newspapers across the country showing uniform and unanimous editorial opposition to this consumer-gouging legislation. The first is an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, August 21, 1963, entitled "Price Fixing by Any Other Name." It might be pointed out in connection with this excellent editorial that the only place in the whole of this iniquitous legislation that the term "quality" or "quality stabilization" appears is in the title of the bill.

PRICE FIXING BY ANY OTHER NAME

A quality stabilization bill, a citizen might suppose, would be a bill having something to do with quality stabilization. But that's where said citizen would betray his innocence of legislative namesmanship.

There is indeed a quality stabilization bill now before Congress, on which a Senate Commerce subcommittee is holding hearings. It already has the blessing of the House Commerce Committee, as well as a lot of powerful support both in and out of Congress.

What it is, though, is a plain old-fashioned price-fixing bill dressed up in a new name—what used to be called "fair trade" until the silly sham of that monicker got across to the public, then masqueraded in the last Congress as a "fair competitive practices bill."

Whatever the name, the intent is the same: to allow manufacturers to dictate the retail prices of their products, and to get court injunctions against any one who sells them for less. It's a bill wanted by some manufacturers, and dear to the hearts of small retailers who don't like to face price competition. But it shouldn't be too welcome to consumers since its whole purpose is to force them to pay more for a product that somebody wants to sell them for less.

When corporate executives get together in a smoky hotel room and agree not to undercut one another's prices, that's called a conspiracy and the executives are sent to jail. When they attempt to do the same thing by law—and require everybody to go along—that's called fair trade. When Congressmen seek to disguise "fair trade" as "quality stabilization," that's called politics. Though consumers—and that includes all the voters—might be excused for using earthier terms.

The second editorial appeared in the Providence (R.I.) Journal of July 8, 1963, entitled, "Another Attempt at Fair Trade":

ANOTHER ATTEMPT AT FAIR TRADE

The perennial drive for a Federal fair trade law is underway again. Backers of the drive scored a point the other day when the House Commerce Committee approved a fair trade measure masquerading as a bill to promote quality stabilization. The change in the name does not change in the slightest the obnoxious qualities of the bill.

There is nothing fair about fair trade. What is is, in brief, is a scheme to permit price fixing. Under so-called fair trade, the manufacturer of a product is permitted to fix the retail price of his product, and any retailer who dares knock so much as a penny off the price can be penalized.

Dozens of States have experimented with fair trade laws. Experience has demonstrated that such laws cause higher prices for consumers, impose a restriction on one of the vital competitive features of the free enterprise system, and lay a deadening blanket of price-fixed regulation on the economy. A Justice Department study in 1954 disclosed that drug and appliance prices were 28 percent higher in fair trade States than they were in States with no such restrictive laws. The Commerce and Agriculture Departments and the Federal Trade Commission repeatedly have testified against fair trade.

Yet, despite this opposition, the backers of fair trade—or as they now choose to call it, quality stabilization—continue to press for a Federal law. Year after year, their proposals are pressed in Congress.

An unusual feature of the newest bill is a proviso that gives the States veto authority. The bill, if passed, would be effective in all 50 States, but any State could exempt itself by a simple act of its legislature.

This is a strange proviso, perhaps even an unconstitutional proviso, because it gives each State authority to negate an affirmative Federal action. But even with this built-in sweetener the bill is still a bad bill. Price fixing by whatever name, is bad for the economy and bad for the consumer public.

The third is an excellent editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on August 28, 1963, entitled, "Competence and Competition":

COMPETENCE AND COMPETITION

There are few surer things in life than the periodic complaint of merchants about the pricing tactics of other merchants—especially the small against the big and the conventional dealers against the discounters. The complaints usually add up to a plea for more fair trade laws to fix everybody's prices.

But a small businessman in our community is doing very well even though he must buck a big-volume competitor on the same street. He carries a nationally known line of appliances and because his volume is comparatively small, he must pay the top price for them.

The manufacturer, for instance, offers any dealer a $5 discount on every order of six refrigerators that wholesale at $200 each, down to a minimum of $170 per unit. The small dealer cannot afford to buy in lots larger than six, so he pays $195 for each unit.

The bigger store down the street buys the same refrigerators by the carload and thus gets the $170 price.

But while the small businessman must charge his customers more than his competitor does, he still attracts buyers by offering extraordinarily good service. The customer is invited to look about at leisure, skim through appliance brochures; later on, when an appliance needs servicing, a repairman responds immediately to a call, even if it's after hours. In other ways, too, this merchant makes doing business with him easier and more pleasant.

All of this is quite different from buying an appliance in many of the big-volume outlets which are not set up to offer much more than a lower price—and, indeed, a lower price is all many buyers are interested in. But again, because buyers look for different things when they shop, and because price is only one factor in competition, our small merchant has capitalized on the advantages of smallness.

So when a legislator is being pressured by a group of businessmen to pass a stultifying fair trade law, he might show how well he knows his business by asking his visitors how well they know theirs.

And lastly, an excellent editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, August 26, 1963:

ASK HIM TWO QUESTIONS

Every voter who has heard his Congressman praise the virtues of free competition ought to ask his Congressman two questions in the next week. One is whether he is going to vote for H.R. 3669, which is a devious scheme to legalize retail price fixing although the sponsors are trying to camouflage this fact by calling it the quality stabilization bill. It's the same old fair trade fraud with a fresh mask on it.

If the Congressman says he will vote for this sneaky anticonsumer legislation, he should be asked a pointed second question: Why?

It becomes plain that if the price fixers succeed in enacting H.R. 3669 and S. 774 they will succeed in diminishing the purchasing power of the consumer in the United States to such degree that they will be indeed taking the food off the table, shoes off the children's feet and the money from the pocket of the American consumer without giving him either an adequate or a fair return on his expenditure.

The Railroad Crisis: A Salute to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a national disaster was averted on August 28 when the Congress acted to prevent the impending rail strike.

Major critics of the 88th Congress have joined together with one voice to sing our praises. The Washington Post in an article on Sunday last said:

Acting in the unusual role of strike arbiter, the so-called standstill Congress has just given a surprising demonstration that it hasn't forgotten how to move fast when a national emergency threatens * * * for 3 happy days, Congress had been in business again.

Mr. Speaker, critics of this Congress may yet discover that the 88th Congress has been in business all along, and intends to perform other amazing deeds before this session is over.

However, there is one point concerning the settlement of the railroad crisis that I wish to deal with in particular. Some sources have claimed that the rules of procedure we established on August 28 tend to favor management and restrict labor. I cannot imagine how this claim can be truthfully made. It is my belief that our action was in the best interests of the entire Nation, and as such is worthy of recognition.

As proof of my contention I cite the vote cast in the other body on Senate Joint Resolution 102. Only two votes were recorded against the measure. One was cast by a Member strongly prolabor, and the other was cast by a Member known to be strongly antilabor. I believe this vote alone should silence those individuals that are attempting to confuse the public on the real questions at issue.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been a strong champion of organized labor for many years. Let us note again his remarks on the floor of the U.S. Senate on August 27.

Senator MORSE said in part:

I repeat again what I said last night: Congress has always, as a matter of course, tended to treat railway labor differently, legislatively, than the rest of labor. Thus, we have the National Mediation Board, the Washington agreement, the boards that are established to handle the retirement funds of the railroad brotherhoods, the Chicago board that considers grievances that arise with respect to the expenditures of funds. There is a set of separate legislation for railway labor, including the Interstate Commerce Act and the Railway Labor Act of 1926.

I agree with Senator MORSE. The operation and performance of the Nation's railroads is a matter of concern to the entire country. Of necessity, railroad labor is in a separate catagory from other branches of the labor movement.

I believe that the Congress has acted in the best interests of both management and labor in this present dispute. For 4 years this issue has been rankling and festering within the railroad industry. Time and time again negotiations have broken down until the final impasse was reached.

I believe the railroad brotherhoods have been mainly responsible for the failure to reach agreement. They have acted irresponsibly, and with little regard for the welfare of the public.

Senator MORSE also believes the brotherhoods have been at fault. On August 27 during the same Senate debate he said:

I received a call this morning from Oregon from a brotherhood man * * * he had been listening to the radio and listening to news reports in regard to the speech I made on the floor of the Senate last night, which to him added up to my refusal to follow the brotherhoods because of their failure in leadership for many months, and because of the great disservice that they have performed for the rank and file of the railroad workers of this country, by the adamant position they have held and their refusal to cooperate with their Government, and their refusal to adopt every proposal that the Government had made for a peaceful solution of the problem so that it would never get to the floor of the Senate.

Senator MORSE continued in stronger terms:

The chiefs of the five operating brotherhoods must take full responsibility * * * for the adoption of the first compulsory arbitration law in the history of Congress. The rank and file of the American labor movement will understand the disservice of these political chiefs—and that is the best description I can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Senator MORSE in one respect—we did not enact a compulsory arbitration law—we enacted some rules of procedure, but in every other aspect I do agree with the Senator.

The railroads are not just the business of the carriers and the employees. The railroads are part and parcel of the entire economy. Manufacturers, growers, farmers, and others—all across the country—were helplessly facing bankruptcy because of this dispute.

The Congress had to act, and the Congress did act. I am convinced we acted wisely and well. We acted not only for the parties involved but for the entire Nation. I salute my colleagues in both Houses—when this urgent call came the people found us ready. Full honor is due the leadership of both political parties. This was truely a bipartisan action in the best American tradition.

I Have a Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, the Reverend Martin Luther King addressed the more than 200,000 people gathered at the Lincoln Memorial to demonstrate their concern for civil rights. Reverend King's address is one of the great speeches in American history. I believe that future generations will read this speech for inspiration. On September 1, the New York Post reprinted excerpts from the address. I hope that all my colleagues will read Rev. Martin Luther King's speech which follows:

I HAVE A DREAM

(By Rev. Martin Luther King)

I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our Nation.

Five score years ago a great American in whose symbolic shadow we stand today signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree is a great beacon light of hope to millions of Negro slaves who had been seared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as a joyous daybreak to end the long

night of their captivity. But 100 years later the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later the life of the Negro is still badly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself in exile in his own land. So we've come here today to dramatize a shameful condition.

In a sense we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men—yes, black men as well as white men—would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds."

But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this Nation. So we've come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom and the security of justice.

We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.

Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children. It would be fatal for the Nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality—1963 is not an end but a beginning. Those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the Nation returns to business as usual.

There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is granted his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our Nation until the bright days of justice emerge. And that is something that I must say to my people who stand on the worn threshold which leads into the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred.

We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protests to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force. The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to distrust all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny.

They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone. And as we walk we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights, "When will you be satisfied?" We can never be satisfied as long as the Negro is the victim of the unspeakable horrors of police brutality.

We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities.

We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their adulthood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating "For Whites Only."

We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote.

No, no, we are not satisfied, and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulation. Some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells. Some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering.

Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive. Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, though, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow. I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up, live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood. I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a State sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream * * * I have a dream that one day in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification, one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today. I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low. The rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together. This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our Nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning, "My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrim's pride, from every mountainside, let freedom ring." And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.

But not only that. Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia. Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee. Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi, from every mountainside. Let freedom ring.

When we allow freedom to ring—when we let it ring from every city and every hamlet, from every State and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "Free at last, Free at last, Great God a-mighty, We are free at last."

Maybe a March To Save the Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, where are the citizens who will plead for the civil rights that are not a matter of color and race? Who will demand fiscal integrity as a basic right so citizens will not have their money watered by the inflation of Federal deficit financing?

An interesting slant might be a demonstration to protect the dollar, to demand congressional and Presidential financial and self-discipline.

Maybe a march to save the dollar? David Lawrence says it in his column:

MAYBE A MARCH TO SAVE THE DOLLAR?

(By David Lawrence)

The march on Washington seems to have been given some unprecedented publicity over television and radio and in the press. President Kennedy called it a "contribution to all mankind." The leaders of the demonstration said it was the one way to get national attention and impress Congress and the Executive.

If such a thesis is accepted and if a "march on Washington" is the only way to get legislative action, there's something which needs national attention and is far more vital to the cause of full employment than the civil rights crusade. It is the plight of the dollar.

Without a sound currency, the savings of citizens can be depreciated in value. Also, the purchasing power of wages can be cut down and the country can be forced into an era of inflation which can hurt citizens of all races, old people and young people, including women and children. It can produce further unemployment and bring more bankruptcies.

The fiscal facts of today are unpleasant to record:

The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents in 1939 to 45.2 cents in July 1963.

The decline in June and July of this year has been as big as the total drop during the preceding 11 months.

Consumer prices have been steadily mounting.

The gold stock of the Nation has dropped from $24.5 billion at the end of 1949 to $15.7 billion today.

Foreign claims in gold against the dollar have risen from $6.4 billion in 1949 to $23.5 billion at present.

Foreign financial experts are betting that the United States inevitably will have to devalue the dollar, notwithstanding President Kennedy's emphatic pronouncements to the contrary not long ago.

Yet, in the face of these unfavorable trends, the Nation's budget remains considerably unbalanced.

Spending by the Federal Government continues to rise. It is officially estimated at $98 billion for the current fiscal year—up from $76.5 billion in 1960. In the fiscal year starting next July, it will exceed $100 billion.

Budget deficits have been reported by the Treasury for the last 6 years.

There have been budget surpluses in only 4 years since 1930. These came in 1948, 1949, 1956, and 1957.

Deficits were reported in the remaining 29 years of this 33-year period.

A still bigger deficit than the $6.2 billion of 1963 is officially estimated for fiscal year 1964.

Even if there is no tax cut, next year's deficit, will exceed the 1963 figure. If there is a tax cut effective next January, the deficit for fiscal 1964, which ends next June, is estimated at $9 billion. Large deficits are also indicated for 1965 and 1966.

Government spending, of course, goes on and on. The theory that this brings prosperity and good business was disproved in the thirties. For, fundamentally, it doesn't make fiscal sense to spend billions more than is being collected in taxes. Nor is it sensible to cut taxes when the deficits are growing in size.

Inequitable as many of the tax rates are—and they should be revised sometime—the fact remains that this isn't the real barrier to business progress.

A business that makes a profit of $1 million a year and pays the Government $514,500 in taxes would gladly continue to pay that 52-percent rate if it could make $2 million in gross profit. For it's better to pay the Government $1,034,500 in taxes and be able to retain $965,500 than it is to continue to pay $514,500 in taxes and retain only $485,000. Even under the proposed reduction in the corporate tax rate from 52 to 48 percent, only $41,000 would be saved. Who wouldn't prefer the $480,000 increase in net profit while the tax rates stayed the same?

The big challenge, therefore, lies not in revising tax rates but in finding a way to make business expand. An expanding volume reduces unemployment. It also means more tax receipts and could bring a balanced budget.

But loose spending must end. The Democratic Party has been in control of Congress from 1932 to the present day with the exception of two 2-year intervals. The time has come for a revision of spending policies and a removal of the impediments to the growth of employment. The Government, moreover, must abandon its hostility toward business and deal firmly with the restraint of trade practiced by the labor-union monopoly.

For the danger today is in relying on temporary measures, like tax cuts, to cure the fundamental illness from which the national economy suffers. This is the biggest issue before the country today, and it ought not to be necessary for the citizens to organize a "March on Washington" to secure a most important civil right—the protection of America's fiscal position before the world and the maintenance of a sound dollar at home.

Labor Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, September 2 was Labor Day. As in the past, we took particular note of this day and that which it represents. In 1882, the first celebration of Labor Day took place, as a holiday in honor of the American workingman and American industry. The advances since then, by free American labor, through the union movement, collective bargaining, and remedial legislation, are known to and enjoyed by all.

Labor, over the years, has helped to make the United States a great Republic. All of this under the free enterprise system established by our Founding Fathers. This great free enterprise system necessarily had to be fostered and maintained by those involved in its operation—labor and management. Both of these groups had successes and failures, but each continued to respect and recognize their interdependent rights and responsibilities. I believe that each kept in mind the importance of the free enterprise system to the United States.

In all of the disputes between labor and management, the parties endeavored to maintain a balance between them through the great system of collective bargaining. As a result of the settling of their differences, the outside force—the public—often suffered. But Mr. Joe Public realized the problems and knew that fairness would prevail.

The great industrial system of our Republic expanded in proportion to the growth of our Republic and, in parallel fashion, the responsibilities placed upon the system expanded. Presently, Mr. Speaker, the Nation is faced with a possible breakdown of this system by the dispute in the railroad industry. The dispute involved has been under collective bargaining negotiation for 4 long years and a nationwide railroad strike is still on the horizon.

However, due to the inability of the parties to settle their dispute and the absence of legal machinery to compel such settlement, the Congress of the United States was forced to take action. On August 28, 1963, Congress passed a resolution, which resolution follows the negotiation agreements, the tentative agreements and near agreements of the parties involved. It also follows a pattern that has been agreed to by labor and management in other instances under our labor-management procedure. This resolution will prevent the strike which threatened to rock the very foundations of our Republic. It gives ample time and procedures to management and labor to settle the item in dispute—a dispute arising from the advances of science in our age of automation.

This action by Congress was reluctantly accepted, but the responsibility was forced upon us. We now hope that management and labor will pick up the tools, apply them to the instruments furnished by Government, and continue to strengthen the free enterprise system in the new age of space.

We who have faith in America want to pass on to future generations the reasons for celebrating the great day for labor—Labor Day.

Why Physicians Support Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement signed by a group of distinguished physicians and surgeons on "Why Physicians Support Hospital Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security."

This statement is a clear and convincing argument of why we should have hospitalization for the aged within the framework of social security at the earliest possible moment, notwithstanding the machinations of the American Medical Association to the contrary:

WHY PHYSICIANS SUPPORT HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

HEALTH CARE PROBLEMS: FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES LIMIT HEALTH SERVICES FOR AGED

Physicians have long been concerned because the elderly of our Nation live in fear of the catastrophic costs of hospitalization. A single long illness can wipe out slender savings and force the aged to seek either public assistance or help from already overburdened children.

Physicians know that because of this fear, many older people who need hospital care do not get it at all or get it too late.

Few Americans reach retirement age with savings or incomes sufficient to pay the cost of a prolonged stay in the hospital. And, as might be expected, the need for hospital care increases with age.

Statistics show that—

Half of aged couples have total incomes of less than $2,600 annually.

Half of aged persons living alone have incomes of less than $1,100 annually.

About half of aged family units have liquid assets of less than $1,000; many have none.

One in six of the aged is hospitalized each year.

Nine out of ten older persons are hospitalized at least once after age 65.

About half the aged have no hospital insurance. Available coverage is either woefully inadequate or costs more than the older person can afford to pay.

In short, difficult and often desperate financial problems confront aged persons in paying for badly needed medical care.

INADEQUATE REMEDIES: PRIVATE PLANS AND KERR-MILLS FAIL TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS ADEQUATELY

Hospitalization is the costliest part of old-age medical care. Therefore an insurance

program that will bring medical care within reach of the aged by covering most in-hospital and related costs is urgently needed.

Nonprofit hospitalization plans and commercial insurance plans have not been able to meet the problem. About half of the aged have some form of health insurance. But because of their low incomes and high medical expenses, very few of the aged can afford the premiums charged by plans which provide reasonable protection through realistic service benefits. Those plans which are cheap enough for any substantial number of the aged to afford can provide only severely limited benefits.

For example, Blue Cross estimated that for the $200 million received from policyholders over 65, it paid out $375 million in benefits. It has tried to meet this problem by shifting part of the burden of old age hospital costs to younger groups. This has caused difficulties for Blue Cross because its premiums for younger, low-risk groups became non-competitive with those of commercial insurers.

To stay in business, Blue Cross has had to increase substantially the premiums its older subscribers pay—or cut the benefits for the same premiums.

A plan for indigent aged

Nor has the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged (MAA) program provided the answer. It authorizes Federal matching funds to States for health care to those of the aged who can prove their need for assistance. In nearly 3 years of operation, the Kerr-Mills Act has clearly failed to meet the needs of any but a very few of the very neediest aged.

By the spring of 1963, only half of the 50 States were operating Kerr-Mills (MAA) programs for the medically indigent aged. Less than 7 out of every 1,000 aged people in the Nation were receiving any assistance under MAA. Kerr-Mills funds have increased old age medical care to only a negligible degree. They are used in large part to subsidize existing State relief programs.

Benefits are generally meager, spotty, and often uncertain. In many instances, limited State tax resources and high cost of good care have resulted in the use of facilities that endanger health and safety. Administrative costs are extremely high. They have run as high as 124 percent of the benefits provided in one State (Kentucky).

People with more than minimum incomes or savings get no assistance under MAA at all. The relief that is available is given only after resources are used up and incomes are permanently reduced. In many States an aged person's relatives have their incomes and resources investigated before help will be given. Relatives with modest incomes may even be taken to court and forced to give aid.

The Kerr-Mills program can function effectively only as a supplement to a program of health insurance for the aged through social security. With a substantial part of the burden of health costs met through social insurance, it would become much less costly for the States to establish good medical assistance programs under Kerr-Mills to meet any remaining needs.

PRACTICAL SOLUTION: SOCIAL SECURITY INSURANCE PLAN AN EFFECTIVE ANSWER

The most economical and practical answer to the problem of financing the health needs of the aged is a hospitalization insurance program which involves virtually the entire population. It enables people to pay for their protection during the time they can best afford to contribute—while they are working.

This approach avoids the necessity of a means test because benefits are made available as a matter of earned right. It helps prevent poverty and destitution, instead of trying to deal with them only after they occur, as is the case with public assistance.

The social security system is tailor made to operate such a program. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and Representative CECIL KING, of California, have introduced a bill to provide hospital insurance for the aged through the social security system (S. 880 and H.R. 3920).

Nearly all persons over age 65, including persons not now covered by social security or railroad retirement, would be eligible for specified hospital and related benefits. The only exceptions of significance are persons covered by the Federal employees health benefits program. The cost of hospital benefits for those who are not eligible under the social security or railroad retirement system would be paid out of general tax revenues.

Three options

The social security hospital insurance bill would permit the choice of any of these three hospital benefit options: 90 days of hospital benefits for each period of illness, less a deductible amount—to be paid by the patient—equal to $10 a day ($20 minimum) for each of the first 9 days in the hospital; 45 days of hospital benefits for each period of illness, without a deductible; 180 days of hospital benefits less a deductible amount equal to 2½ times the average cost of a day of hospitalization (the amount will be about $92.50 when the bill goes into effect).

The social security hospital insurance measure would also provide:

Skilled nursing facility benefits for up to 180 days of care following hospitalization.

Outpatient hospital diagnostic benefits less a deductible amount of $20, paid by the patient, for all covered diagnostic services furnished during a 30-day period.

Home health benefits for up to 240 visits during a calendar year. These benefits would cover the cost of such items as visiting nurse care and physical therapy.

Modest cost

This program would be financed on the same sound insurance basis as social security retirement benefits. Employees would contribute during their working years to a special trust fund and their employers would pay an equal amount. The contributions would be quite small. The social security contribution rate for employees would be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent; this new contribution rate would be applied to a new annual earnings base of $5,200. The social security contribution rate for the self-employed would be increased by four-tenths of 1 percent.

In other words, the average employee, earning $4,800 a year, would make an additional social security contribution of $1 a month, or $12 a year. His employer would contribute an additional $12 a year. The maximum that an employee would pay for the hospital and related benefits described above, available to himself and his wife in old age, is $17.68 a year.

The new Anderson-King bill overcomes major objections raised in previous years:

It would include virtually all persons over age 65.

It would permit voluntary organizations, such as Blue Cross plans, to perform certain administrative functions.

It would utilize State agencies in planning, in determination of eligibility of providers of services, and in consultation to the providers.

QUALITY OF HEALTH CARE; MEDICAL SERVICES WILL IMPROVE OVERUTILIZATION OF SERVICES PREVENTED

Many physicians are convinced that enactment of the King-Anderson bill will significantly improve the quality of health care available to the aged. It will help physicians to fulfill their commitment to provide high quality medical care while preserving their independence of professional judgment.

With hospital and related services covered by insurance, physicians will be in a better position to prescribe the treatment which is best for the patient. Doctors will be able to advise hospitalization, posthospital convalescence in a skilled nursing facility, home health services or diagnostic services. They need no longer fear what the payment for this needed health care will do to the economic security, family relationships or dignity and independence of an elderly patient.

Benefits to hospitals

Hospitals also will be able to provide better service—not only to aged patients but to the entire community. These institutions, now often financially hard pressed, will know that they will be paid for services rendered to aged patients instead of having to absorb such costs as charity. More balanced hospital budgets and improved administration can be expected to result.

Improvements in the quality of nursing home care will be stimulated. Low rates of payment and other factors have caused serious deficiencies in some nursing homes. About 40 percent of nursing home beds have been classified by State Hill-Burton agencies as unacceptable because of fire and health hazards. Many nursing homes provide seriously inadequate health care.

Because the proposed program will be open only to skilled nursing facilities which meet professionally accepted criteria, participating facilities would serve as much-needed models for the improvement of other nursing facilities.

Three safeguards against overutilization

When the program is enacted, an increase in the number of aged entering hospitals can be expected because they will be able to get needed treatment which they had been putting off. This is not overutilization; this is proper utilization. The aged should obtain the hospitalization they need.

The King-Anderson bill contains specific provisions to prevent unnecessary utilization. Three basic safeguards are provided:

1. The patient's physician must certify that the services are required before any payment can be made under the hospital insurance plan.

2. A self-governing utilization committee composed of the physicians on the hospital staff would review admissions, duration of stay, and services rendered.

3. No financial incentive will exist to use higher cost services when lower cost alternative services will suffice, since the insurance program will cover outpatient hospital diagnostic services, skilled nursing facilities, and home health services.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE: MEDICAL RELATIONSHIPS PRESERVED, NO GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE ALLOWED BY BILL

The legislation to provide hospital insurance for the aged under social security maintains the existing doctor-patient relationship. Patients would choose their doctors. The physician and the patient would choose the appropriate participating hospital, nursing facility or other service without outside interference.

The legislation specifically guarantees the free choice by the patient of physicians, other health personnel and facilities.

Under the King-Anderson bill, the Government would not provide any direct health care or any direct health services. The legislation would provide only the means of paying for hospital care and for certain other specified services in much the same manner as Blue Cross does for younger citizens.

The hospital insurance program is clearly not socialized medicine.

Self-help program

Actually, the King-Anderson bill is a self-help program. Men and women pay into an insurance fund during their working years in order to have hospital coverage during their retired years as a matter of right. There is no means test because they have

insured themselves to obtain the benefits when needed.

Many older persons could afford to supplement this basic coverage by purchasing private insurance to cover physicians' care, prescribed drugs, and other medical needs. Blue Cross—relieved of the burden of insuring the high-cost aged—could hold down its rates and sell insurance to the working population more successfully.

Private health insurance can thrive with the enactment of social security hospital insurance, just as private life insurance was stimulated in its growth by the passage of the original Social Security Act 28 years ago.

No matter how you look at it, legislation to provide hospital insurance for the aged is an effective, practical, and commonsense way of meeting the high cost of hospitalization of the aged. It fills a great human need. It will improve the quality of health care. It protects the patient and the physician.

This legislation is unquestionably in the national interest and it is urgent that Congress enact it promptly.

PHYSICIANS' COMMITTEE: "SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM PROVIDES BEST METHOD FOR FINANCING BENEFITS"

"We believe the social security system is the most practical and sound method of financing health benefits for the great majority of the aged.

"As a group of physicians, representing general practitioners, scientists, health administrators, educators, and specialists in many fields, and including members of both political parties, we welcome the opportunity to meet on this occasion and convey to the American people our belief that with such a method of financing health benefits for the aged, the physicians of America will be better able to maintain their commitment to provide high quality medical care and excellence of standards while preserving independence of professional judgment, and that the aged will be better able to enjoy with dignity the best of modern medical care."[1]

LIST OF PHYSICIANS WHO SIGNED THE STATEMENT

Robert H. Alway, M.D., Palo Alto, Calif.

George Baehr, M.D., New York, N.Y. Chairman, Public Health Council of New York State; president, director, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, 1950–57

David P. Barr, M.D., New York, N.Y. President and medical director, Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York; physician in chief, New York Hospital, 1941–57; past president, American College of Physicians.

Walter Bauer, M.D., Boston, Mass. Chief of medical service, Massachusetts General Hospital; professor of clinical medicine, Harvard Medical School.

Leona Baumgartner, M.D., New York, N.Y. Commissioner of Health, New York City Department of Health; former president, American Public Health Association, 1959.

E. Michael Bluestone, M.D., New York, N.Y. Hospital consultant; recipient of American Hospital Association's 1961 Distinguished Service Award.

Thomas Brem, M.D., Los Angeles, Calif. Head of Department of Medicine, University of Southern California School of Medicine.

Dewitt T. Burton, M.D., Detroit, Mich. Medical director, Burton Hospital.

Martin Cherkasky, M.D., New York, N.Y. Director, Montefiore Hospital; editorial board, "Journal of Chronic Diseases."

Robert E. Cooke, M.D., Baltimore, Md. Pediatrician in chief, Johns Hopkins Hospital; professor of pediatrics, Johns Hopkins University, School of Medicine.

Edward P. Crump, M.D., Nashville, Tenn. Chairman, Department of Pediatrics, Meharry Medical College.

Michael E. Debakey, M.D., Houston, Tex. Professor of sugery and chairman, Department of Surgery, Baylor University, College of Medicine; holder of American Medical Association's Hektoen Gold Medal (1954) and Distinguished Service Award (1959).

James P. Dixon, Jr., M.D., Yellow Springs, Ohio. President, Antioch College; Health Commissioner of Philadelphia, Pa., 1952–59.

Warren F. Draper, M.D., Washington, D.C. Executive medical officer, United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund; past chairman, Section on Preventive and Industrial Medicine, AMA; member, AMA House of Delegates, 1924–46.

Benedict Duffy, M.D., Jersey City, N.J. Professor and chairman, Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry.

Robert H. Ebert, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio. Professor of medicine, Western Reserve University; medical director, University Hospitals of Cleveland.

Caldwell B. Esselstyn, M.D., Claverack, N.Y. President, Group Health Association of America; founder and medical director, Rip Van Winkle Clinic, Hudson, N.Y.; attending surgeon, Columbia Memorial Hospital, Hudson, N.Y.

Alfred Gellhorn, M.D., New York, N.Y. Professor of internal medicine, Columbia University; Associate physician, Presbyterian Hospital.

Morton Goodman, M.D., Portland Oreg. Assistant professor clinical medicine, University of Oregon; visiting staff, Good Samaritan Hospital and Multnomah Hospital.

James H. Graves, M.D., Detroit, Mich. Clinical director, psychiatric division, Detroit Receiving Hospital.

Sven Gunderson, M.D., Hanover, N.H. Associate professor of medicine, Dartmouth Medical College; trustee, American College of Physicians.

Thomas Hunter, M.D., Charlottesville, Va. Dean and professor of medicine, University of Virginia, School of Medicine.

R. Francis Jones, M.D., Washington, D.C. Medical director, Freedman's Hospital; Clinical professor of urology, Howard University College of Medicine.

Arthur Kornberg, M.D., San Francisco, Calif. Nobel laureate in medicine (1959); Professor and executive head, department of biochemistry, Stanford University School of Medicine.

Lawrence S. Kubie, M.D., Towson, Md. Director of training, Sheppard and Enoch Pratt Hospital, Baltimore, Md.

Philip R. Lee, M.D., Palo Alto, Calif., member, department of internal medicine, Palo Alto Medical Clinic; assistant clinical professor, Stanford University School of Medicine.

Irving M. London, M.D., New York, N.Y. Professor and chairman, department of medicine, Albert Einstein College of Medicine; director of medical service, Bronx Municipal Hospital Center; holder of Theobald Smith Award in Medical Sciences, American Association for the Advancement of Science (1953).

J. Howard Means, M.D., Dorchester, Mass. Emeritus professor of clinical medicine, Harvard Medical School; president, American College of Physicians, 1937–38; president, Association of American Physicians 1941–42.

Daniel R. Mishell, M.D., Beverly Hills, Calif. Chief gynecologist, Beverly Hills Doctors Hospital.

Frederick D. Mott, M.D., Detroit, Mich. Executive director, Community Health Association; medical administrator, Miners Memorial Hospital Association, 1952–57.

Goerge G. Reader, M.D., New York, N.Y. Professor of medicine, Cornell University Medical College; associate attending physician, New York Hospital.

Dickinson W. Richards, M.D., New York City. Nobel laureate in medicine and physiology (1956); Lambert Professor of Medicine, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.

David E. Rogers, M.D., Nashville, Tenn. Professor of medicine, chairman of department, Vanderbilt University, School of Medicine.

David Rutstein, M.D., Boston, Mass. Professor of Preventive Medicine, and head of department, Harvard Medical School.

Ernest Saward, M.D., Portland, Oreg. Physician in chief, Bess Kaiser Hospital Foundation.

William A. Sawyer, M.D., Rochester, N.Y. Past chairman, AMA Committee on Medical Care for Industrial Workers; past president, American Association of Industrial Physicians and Surgeons; medical director, Eastman Kodak, 1919–51; winner of William S. Knudsen Award 1942–43; Albert Lasker Award, 1955; and American Academy of Occupational Medicine Award, 1958.

Benjamin Spock, M.D., Cleveland, Ohio. Professor of Child Development, Western Reserve University School of Medicine; author, "Pocket Book of Baby and Child Care."

Helen Taussig, M.D., Baltimore, Md. Physician in charge, Harriet Lane Home Cardiac Clinic, Johns Hopkins Hospital; holder of Albert Lasker Award, 1959; Elizabeth Blackwell Citation; and Eleanor Roosevelt Achievement Award, 1957; codeveloper of the blue-baby operation.

Ray E. Trussell, M.D., New York, N.Y. New York City Commissioner of Hospitals; professor and executive officer, Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine, 1955–61.

Alonzo Yerby, M.D., New York, N.Y. Executive director of medical care, New York City Health Department; medical welfare administrator, New York City Welfare Department.

[1] From a statement presented to President John F. Kennedy by a group of leading physicians at the White House, Washington, D.C., Mar. 27, 1962.

Alarm Over U.S. Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is justifiable concern across the country with the growing deterioration of our foreign policy position. We especially observe the deliberate manner in which the present administration has alienated stanch and true allies.

The trip of Undersecretary of State George Ball to Pakistan and Portugal has tremendous significance and has very accurately and effectively been analyzed in a column by William S. White which appeared in the Monday, August 26 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

In view of the tremendous significance of our relations with Pakistan and Portugal, I submit the article for the RECORD at this point.

ALARM OVER FOREIGN POLICIES

(By William S. White)

The Kennedy administration very late in the day is showing alarm over the damaging effects of some of its policies—its long enchantment with the Afro-Asians in the United Nations and its close association with neutralist India—on the unity of the Western Alliance.

The President is sending Under Secretary of State George Ball to Pakistan and to Portugal to seek better relationships with President Ayub Khan in the one and Premier Antonio Oliveira Salazar in the other. Portugal is an old ally in the North Atlantic Treaty

Organization. Pakistan, which borders giant India and feels incessantly menaced thereby, has until lately been by all odds our best military associate in Asia.

FEAR IN PAKISTAN

If one could suppose that this trip really indicates some change in our fundamental policies, there would be cause for rejoicing. For these policies have put both Pakistan and Portugal on a very thing diet. The Indians have used military assaults by their Chinese Communist neighbors as levers with which to pry from us a great deal of military aid which may or may not ever be used in any effective way against the people we would like to stop in Asia, the Red Chinese.

Past Indian resistance to Chinese incursions has been absurdly, almost ignobly, poor. For illustration, at the very height of the last major Chinese attack upon India, the bulk of Indian troops were never employed against the Chinese. They were held, rather, in reserve along the borders of Pakistan. Moreover, the very possession by India of increased U.S.-supplied arms has steadily raised Pakistan's fears of India and has steadily diminished Pakistan's confidence in the value of American friendship for her.

As to Portugal, our United Nations delegation has consistently taken a position of basic hostility to her colonial interests in Africa—if a hostility never carried to the point of totally joining Portugal's outright enemies, the Afro-Asians, and Russians. It is the old story: We have been so hotly determined to maintain the friendship of the newly emerging ex-colonial lands that we have been able to find no good at all in Portugal.

But Portugal, whatever her grave faults, is, after all, a Western power and has for 20 years permitted us to use her Azores Islands as military bases. The agreement for use of those bases expired at the end of December, and Premier Salazar quite understandably has not seemed so eager to renew the lease as he used to be.

It is against all this background that Ball undertakes his mission to Portugal and Pakistan. To repeat, if one could think this mission means some real change in American policies, the news would be good, indeed. It is not easily possible, however, to see Mr. Ball as the eager herald for such a change. He is very close to Adlai Stevenson, our chief United Nations delegate, and nothing in his record indicates that anybody is more pro-Afro-Asian or more respectful of the self-righteous neutralism of Premier Nehru's India.

THE WRONG MAN?

It rather looks that in sending Ball to placate Ayub Khan and Salazar, the President has not picked the most sympathetic possible emissary. The melancholy odds are that American policy will simply be the mixture as before.

Still, there may be just the slightest chance for some alteration, at least as concerns Southeast Asia, where American-backed military resistance to Communist guerillas in South Vietnam is now menaced by disorder within the local government—and by increasingly threatening attitudes among the Red Chinese.

Pakistan remains the sole major power of reliable pro-Western military capacity in all that area. Maybe now we will realize that it is more important to get the Pakistanis truly back on our side than to continue to arm—supposedly to fight the Chinese—a neutralist India whose main interest thus far has been to keep Pakistan under constant threat.

Dr. Hugh R. Leavell, Outstanding Public Health Statesman, To Head Public Health Service in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it behooves us to note with admiration and respect the departure from the immediate national scene of a great public health statesman. I refer to Dr. Hugh R. Leavell, who has chosen to climax his distinguished career by undertaking a long-term assignment in India. As consultant and adviser to the director of the Indian Government's new Institute of Public Health, Administration, and Education, he is plunging into a demanding task that would give pause to most men half his age. He is 60 years old but, instead of tapering off the intensive labors that have engaged his energies and talents for nearly four decades, he faces confidently the tremendous challenges of improving the health and well-being of the people of India.

Dr. Leavell has many friends in this body. Many of us knew him as an able spokesman for the American Public Health Association, the National Health Council, and the Association of Schools of Public Health during and after his presidency of each of these organizations. He served on two medical task forces of the Hoover Commission and with many public and voluntary organizations in the health field. A native Kentuckian, he studied medicine at the University of Virginia and at Harvard, did graduate work at Johns Hopkins, Columbia, and Yale and practiced medicine in Louisville before becoming health commissioner there. Since 1946 he has been professor of public health practice at Harvard from which he has just retired to emeritus rank.

Acknowledged in the health professions as a foremost leader, Dr. Leavell has been recognized by men in Government—both administrative and legislative—as a trusted adviser concerning the Nation's paramount health needs and the appropriate role of the Federal Government in helping to meet these needs. His grasp of the realities of public affairs, together with his professional competence in the health field and his devoted concern for fellow human beings enabled him to contribute immeasurably to understanding and progress in the conservation of our Nation's most precious element—its human resources. I know that my colleagues join me in saluting Dr. Leavell for all that he has done for this country and in wishing him success in his important work abroad.

The August issue of the Harvard Public Health Alumni Bulletin contains an excellent review of Dr. Leavell's career. With permission of the House I ask that the article be inserted in the RECORD following my remarks.

The article follows:

A PERENNIALLY YOUNG MAN IN A NEW JOB, DR. LEAVELL, 1963

(By Harold Coe Stuart, Litt. B., M.D., A.M., emeritus professor of maternal and child welfare)

On August 31, 1963, Dr. Hugh Leavell will leave his Harvard post and begin a new and challenging assignment in India. It is always exciting to talk with people starting off on new careers. In this instance it is both exciting and astonishing, because he has already gone off on a series of new careers and has performed with distinction in all of them.

In talking with Dr. Leavell of his plans one cannot escape the infectious enthusiasm. The calendar and the history tell you that this is a man who could be getting ready to close shop and settle down, writing memoirs and reminiscing. The man himself tells you that nothing is further from his thoughts. He has seen a job to be done, he thinks he's the man for the job, and now he's off to prove to the world he can handle it. As consultant and adviser to the director of the Indian Government's Institute of Public Health, Administration, and Education he will be plunging into some of the world's most formidable health problems. When we hear him talk, we know he will be equal to them.

Dr. Leavell's past accomplishments have been recorded in several earlier issues of the Harvard Public Health Alumni Bulletin. The class of 1956 dedicated its yearbook to him under the title "Public Health in a World Community." The dedication described Dr. Leavell as a "graphic interpreter of preventive medicine as the joint responsibility of private physicians and of voluntary and official agencies * * *" and "an outstanding leader in the fields of national and international health, * * * a true citizen of the world community." Clearly his new post is in keeping with this description.

Dr. Leavell's medical career began in 1924 with his graduation from the University of Virginia (S.B.) and his admission to the Harvard Medical School. He completed the course at the medical school with honors in 1926 and began a postgraduate training which took him to the Massachusetts General Hospital, the Columbia Presbyterian Hospital, and the Johns Hopkins during the years 1926–30.

The first assignment that Dr. Leavell tackled after completion of this training was in Louisville, Ky. Here he quickly demonstrated that his interests involved the whole of medicine and its relations with the community. He practiced clinical medicine, and he was involved in academic medicine at the University of Louisville Medical School, and all the while he was puzzling out the broader pattern of how these pieces of medicine could be fitted together. These interests led him to the post of director of health for the city of Louisville in 1934.

One of the problems facing a health officer in Louisville in those days was the annual flooding of the Ohio River. At the end of each winter the thaw made torrents of the small mountain streams and larger tributaries feeding the Ohio, and each year the river overflowed in Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville and other river cities. The population living along the riverfront in Louisville had to be evacuated, and when the waters receded they returned to shovel out

the debris and recover their property. These were depression years, and there was no place else to live. The health department regularly worked with other departments of the city and with churchworkers and other community groups. The whole procedure of dealing with the flood was as routine in Louisville as starting the furnaces in winter and shutting them off in summer.

But in 1937 the problem was different. The thaw was early and the rains were persistent. By early February the river flowed over the riverfront property, but it had only begun to rise. When the crest came, days later, all of downtown Louisville and all of the residential west end were inundated.

Dr. Leavell was responsible for finding solutions to the health problems associated with this emergency. This was the sort of challenge for which his concept of the public health integrated with the whole community life had prepared him. He handled the job with distinction and with courage. On one occasion he misjudged the ferocity of the waters and was carried into a manhole, narrowly escaping drowning. The junior board of trade voted him its distinguished Service Award for his work on this occasion.

Soon other people were calling him to other jobs that needed to be done. In the early days of the United Nations he joined the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association (UNRRA) in Europe, and in 1945 he took a post with the Rockefeller Foundation in its division of medical sciences.

In late 1946 Dr. Leavell began the second major phase of his career. Earlier in 1946 the Harvard School of Public Health had become a separate administrative unit of Harvard University, with a full-time dean and a faculty of its own, independent of the medical school. At the same time, in July, 1946, Dr. Edward G. Huber, of the Department of Public Health Practice, died suddenly. Dr. Leavell was asked to take this post, and it is in this work that nearly all readers of the Bulletin will know him. From 1946 to the present time Dr. Leavell has held this position, serving also as assistant dean during much of this time.

During his 17 years on the faculty, Dr. Leavell has been a vigorous and constructive department head and an untiring assistant dean. He has never seen his work limited to any narrow confinements, but rather he has traveled widely, gaining a firsthand acquaintance with people and problems of the whole world. This broad view has always been reflected in his teaching and in his direction of his Department. Most readers of the Bulletin will recall Dr. Leavell's concept of precentive medicine, which does not set sharp boundaries and limit perspectives, but which sees all of medicine in a purposeful pattern, where every physician shares responsibility in the whole pattern.

Dr. Leavell served actively as consultant for India to the Ford Foundation during the years 1955 and 1956. His new post as consultant and advisor to the Director of the Indian Government's Institute of Public Health Administration continues a long practice of serving as consultant to governments which have been struggling to establish sound public health practices. In many of these areas it is his former students, now themselves health officers, who seek his services.

Dr. and Mrs. Leavell will be greatly missed by those of us remaining in Boston, but the many alumni in India will be delighted to renew an old acquaintance. We will all feel great satisfaction in knowing that Dr. Leavell is continuing his leadership in the global improvement of Public Health.

U.N. Fails United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, any success in foreign affairs cannot be attributed to the U.N. if facts are the criteria. The world has ample proof of the failures—few, if any, successes—of U.N. policy. Always the United States takes a licking—the cost is ours, the loss of sovereignty is ours. The U.N. decisions are not in the best interest of the United States, the leader of the free world, and those who would be free.

The Wall Street Journal reminds us of this in a recent editorial, as follows:

A SENSE OF SELF-SATISFACTION

It is only natural, we suppose, for the Secretary General of the United Nations to try to put the best possible face on the organization's work. All the same, the introduction to U Thant's report on the year ended June 15 contains some rather remarkable assertions which should not be left without comment.

Mr. Thant concedes, to begin with, that the U.N. was not directly involved in last fall's Cuban missile crisis. But a number of member states, also not directly involved, consulted with him; as a result he was encouraged to make certain proposals toward easing the situation.

Those proposals, it may be recalled, were in effect for the United States to appease the Soviet Union. Instead, the United States took a strong line which was successful at the time, even though it was not followed through to the point of ridding Cuba of Soviet troops. The U.N.'s notion of resolving the crisis is hardly anything to boast about.

It is more than a bit galling, too, to read the report's description of the ending of the immediate Cuban crisis. Mr. Thant refers to the "high sense of responsibility and statesmanship demonstrated by the leaders of the powers directly concerned."

In other words, a robber brandishes a club at you but backs down when you produce a gun. This is responsibility and statesmanship on the part of the Soviets? Not for the first time, the U.N. seems to be carrying evenhandedness a trifle far.

The U.N. also finds some other strange sources of self-satisfaction. The report notes that the territorial integrity of the Congo has now been assured—that is, as a result of the U.N.'s war against secessionist-minded Katanga province. Somehow, though, the country is scarcely less chaotic than it has ever been since independence 3 years ago. Yet to Mr. Thant the Congo has seen a sudden change for the better.

The report expresses pleasure, moreover, at the successful conclusion of the U.N. temporary authority in West New Guinea; it praises the cooperation of Indonesia as well as the Netherlands. This whole exercise, in which the United States unfortunately played a part, was a disgraceful endorsement of the Indonesian dictator's power grab.

And the Secretary General devotes considerable space to the agreement on the nuclear test ban treaty. Though he doesn't quite call it a U.N. accomplishment, the impression is conveyed that the world body was a big help. Actually, two things only made the agreement possible: U.S. concessions and a decision in the Kremlin that the treaty was in the Soviet interest at this time.

Such are the developments Mr. Thant cites for thinking that the international outlook has brightened and the U.N. has gained strength. The truth is that the significant and decisive movements of world affairs are almost entirely apart from the deliberations at U.N. headquarters; that is especially so of what is just about the main question before the world—whether the Soviets are turning, for their own purposes, to a more peaceful line.

Where the U.N. does interfere, it demonstrates almost a genius for mischiefmaking. That is one reason for suggesting that the U.N. is growing weaker, not stronger, at least as a salutary influence on the world. Another reason is that it is now so top-heavy with newly independent nations, not to mention Communist ones, that its voice is bound to be confused.

Not the least reason for its weakness is this unedifying habit of embarking on questionable ventures with questionable results and then presenting them as victories. It is small wonder if the U.N. is losing the world's respect both for its realism and the quality of its moral standards.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

The Fundamental Objective of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some excerpts from an excellent address which the able and distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] delivered at the Hager reunion at Ramage Park in Boone County, W. Va., on Sunday, August 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT HAGER REUNION, RAMAGE PARK, BOONE COUNTY, W. VA., SUNDAY, AUGUST 25, 1963

There is no doubt in my mind concerning the fundamental objective of the Soviet Union. It continues to strive for world domination—for defeat of democracy and capitalism by the methods of communism.

I believe this to be the Russian aim and I am dedicated to those policies and actions which will thwart the communistic achievement of such a goal. Ours is a commitment to the preservation of the democratic way of life within the free enterprise system—competitive capitalism.

There is not, in my judgment, any incompatibility between such dedication and being in favor of ratification of the limited test ban treaty negotiated by the United States with Soviet Russia and Great Britain.

Admittedly, in such a treaty the Kremlin visualizes certain advantages. We believe there are definite benefits for our country in a ban on nuclear testing in the atmosphere. Great Britain obviously views the agreement as one which is in its self-interest, too. On balance, then, the treaty is an instrument with a potential for improving the individual and combined positions of all three of the great powers. But, with approximately 60 other governments having also become signators to the limited test ban pact, there is an even broader potential for improving the well-being of the citizens and governments of the world as we search for a peace based on justice.

There is no unanimity among scientists on the meaning and thev alues of the limited test ban treaty, just as there is no absolute consensus concerning the degree of effects of radiation fallout from nuclear tests conducted in the atmosphere. This makes political decisions concerning these issues more difficult to arrive at and longer to develop.

For my part, I prefer to stand on the side of ratification of the treaty as a hopeful instrument to aid the cause of peace. I must agree that it is a hopeful instrument rather than an absolute. But why should we disregard hope and possibility for peace while searching for the absolute means to that desirable status for mankind? Why should we continue contaminating the atmosphere and why continue adding fallout to the problems of life on this planet when there is hope and possibility that it is unnecessary to take these risks?

It is equally appropriate to inquire if we should be continuing to add, at costs of millions on millions of dollars, to our nuclear stockpiles. There is a mounting doubt—a growing degree of it in official circles—about this country paying the costs of increasing its so-called overkill capacity. The term "overkill" is applied especially to the nuclear materials being stockpiled above the 22 billion tons of TNT equivalent already manufactured and stored.

One expert has called attention to the fact that there are about 2,000 cities in the world (including those of the United States) with 100,000 or more population. And he says that allowing 30 percent failure to deliver nuclear warheads to such urban targets, the U.S. nuclear stockpile already represents enough to deliver the equivalent of 2.5 million tons of TNT per 100,000 of population in all 2,000 cities throughout the entire world. Still allowing 30 percent failure, this means that the nuclear attack delivery systems of our country could return and knock into atomic rubble all such cities—370 of them—in the whole Sino-Soviet block approximately 500 times, and all cities in the U.S.S.R. alone—140 of them—about 1,250 times. That is overkill capacity as some experts believe it to exist in our country's nuclear stockpiles at tremendous expense to the taxpayers.

Those who champion the validity of the stockpile as it exists and who contend that we should continue adding to it, declare that we must have ample nuclear material left over after our country suffers initial losses to the enemy.

But those persons who point to the overkill capacity present in the stockpile, and who protest the expenditures for additions to it, declare that if the United States should lose 90 percent of the nuclear materials already stored—which is an absurd percentage to anticipate—there still would be left in nuclear stores enough to blow up all targets in the entire world 11 times.

Certainly our atomic weapons have been and continue to be our so-called peace insurance. Although some of us urge working toward disarmament, certainly no one with the real interest of the country before him would destroy this insurance already manufactured and stored unless and until there would be evolved a worldwide disarmament agreement in absolute and totally reliable terms.

But in decrying the additions to and wasteful expenditures for overkill capacity, we are not questioning the validity of the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles, the number of Polaris submarines, or the planes and other carriers of nuclear warheads involved. Our concern is with what we believe to be the excess of nuclear materials—for nuclear explosives alone are costing our Government more than $2 billion a year. We must have enough—but we should not stockpile too much.

There have been indications that the Secretary of Defense might be willing to negotiate cutbacks in the overkill nuclear materials stockpiling program. I hope Congress will help him do it. There are interests at work to defeat such developments. However, the Defense Department has a chance to make any waste cuts previously accomplished or in the process of being accomplished look insignificant by comparison if there is a recognition of the savings that can be made in not adding to the overkill capacity already present in the nuclear stores.

We must not be emotional on this issue. Adjustments in the stockpiling of nuclear materials must be negotiated carefully. National security is involved, but this does not imply sanction of wasteful and unnecessary additions to stores of warheads.

I share the conviction that America should have a defense force and arsenal which is second to none. But I also feel positive that the time has come to question the assumption that we are adding to defense and security by increasing more and more the nuclear stockpile.

It is also my conviction that the security of our country rests on economic and political, as well as military competence. While we are building up a probable excess of nuclear stores we are simultaneously permitting a wasting of human capabilities. This represents a depletion of the basic resource of our Nation. It spells insecurity at home and an unacceptable society for emulation abroad.

We cannot afford or tolerate the policy and the expense of overstocking an overkill capacity of nuclear materials.

We cannot either tolerate or afford it from the economic, political, or moral standpoints.

The self-defeating nature of the nuclear arms race is that each side reacts to the other's moves in a constantly rising scale of armaments.

Is it not reasonable to assume that just as we attempt to counter arms moves but the Soviets, so do they try to gear their efforts to counter ours? Could we not then well afford to make a serious effort to move the arms race into reverse by carefully calculated actions designed to shift the competition with Russia away from arms spending into more peaceful pursuits?

Let us hope that the test ban treaty negotiated and initialed in Moscow by representatives of the Governments of Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and the United States, may be a start along a course of shifting the competition into an area of more peaceful endeavors. We must not only exploit every international breakthrough on the cold war front which has a more peaceful potential—we must also take the steps in our own affairs which will set exemplary patterns for our adversaries to emulate if they are to demonstrate good faith in international bargaining.

News Management by Revelation of Secrets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, ordinary citizens and ordinary officeholders can

get a long expense paid vacation in a Federal prison for disclosing military secrets. But the administration seems to be able to draw on the Nation's stockpile of secrets at will for the purpose of managing the news favorably to its pet projects. The matter is discussed by newsman Howard Simons in the following article from the Washington Post for September 1, as follows:

EXAMPLES: A-PACT HEARINGS, CUBA CRISIS—SECRETS DECLASSIFIED ON EXPEDIENCY BASIS

(By Howard Simons)

When is a secret not a secret?

This question seems to haunt the administration every time its posture or its policy toward the Soviet Union is questioned by Congress.

One consequence of the recent public debate on the test ban treaty, for example, was the disclosure of a great many hitherto secret or classified facts.

Take the matter of how many underground nuclear tests there have been at the Nevada nuclear test site since mid-September 1961, when testing was resumed there. Before the test ban debate the Atomic Energy Commission would announce most of these tests, but not all. The rule was: Keep the Soviets guessing.

A query to the AEC on August 19 on how many tests had been conducted in Nevada would have brought the answer: "We have announced 70 tests."

But at his August 20 news conference President Kennedy volunteered the information that "We have already in the last 2 years conducted 97 tests underground."

Consequently, a query to the AEC on August 20 about the number of Nevada tests would have brought the response: "There have been 97 nuclear events in Nevada."

AEC RESUMES SECRECY

The fact that the President's figure included a few surface bursts and excluded one nonmilitary nuclear explosion was inconsequential. What the President had revealed was the total number of Nevada tests since 1961, a figure which until August 20 was a tightly held AEC secret.

Now, it appears, the AEC has again decided that it will announce only a certain number of underground blasts in the future.

When Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he volunteered a number of hitherto secret facts and figures.

Never before, for example, had an administration official noted that "a 35-megaton warhead for our Titan II" could be developed and stockpiled.

Nor could an official discuss the fact that weapons scientists "can develop a warhead with a yield of 50 to 60 megatons for B-52 delivery."

Those who know suggest that before the test ban debate it was all right to discuss these concepts in broad and obscure terms. But specific yields for specific weapons carriers was classified information.

McNamara's chief scientist, Harold Brown, also added to the instant declassification process when, under committee questioning, he disclosed a number of things that the United States had learned about the Soviet nuclear test series of 1962.

PREVIOUS POLICY

Hitherto, Brown, along with everyone else in the administration, was not at liberty to say publicly, as he did during his testimony, that only a few of the Soviet tests were at an altitude where the fireball could affect the radar of an antimissile system. Or that the Soviet superweapon tests were not tests to determine the effects of a massive detonation on radar and communications.

The test ban debate was not the first time that the administration has felt compelled to declassify certain information to answer congressional critics. In February, McNamara put on an extraordinary 2-hour television display of intelligence data and aerial photography to support administration statements that no offensive Soviet weapons had remained in Cuba.

And, up until November 8, 1962, administration officials would not discuss details of Soviet space failures. But several Congressmen were concerned that a series of U.S. space failures and no reports of Soviet failures was presenting an improper picture of the space race. So the Congressmen queried the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

What NASA's Administrator, James E. Webb, disclosed were the fine details and dates of six Soviet planetary probes. This seemed to satisfy the Congressmen.

However, it is generally known that there have been more Soviet planetary probe failures. But neither these failures, nor indeed Soviet satellite failures in general, can be discussed. Now, as was the case before November 1962, Soviet space problems, though well known to administration officials, are a state secret.

This is a reason, of course, why the administration, from time to time, tells not quite all but some of its secrets. Essentially, this is to win congressional support for, or to muffle congressional criticism of, administration policies.

But every time the administration makes a judgment to drop the classification label on one of its secrets, shudders are sent up the spines of the Nation's intelligence chiefs. This is so because a cardinal rule of intelligence gathering is not to tell anything to anyone.

On the other hand, the majority of scientists testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee in recent weeks, including test ban critic Edward Teller, insisted that there was too much secrecy today.

When is a secret not a secret? The answer seems to be when political necessity dictates.

Regimentation Doesn't Feed Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the August 20 edition of the Moultrie, Ga., Observer an excellent editorial which poses some questions of vital importance to the preservation of our individual liberties and constitutional government.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGIMENTATION DOESN'T FEED FREEDOM

The mass march of Negroes on Washington is ended and the fires have been banked while the Nation slowly assesses the results. Reason and not emotion is assuming a more dominant role in the evaluation of the march.

The civil rights leaders who planned and carried out the massive display of pressure on the Government, and the marchers themselves, are to be congratulated on having conducted it without violence and unnecessary tirades which could have fomented a lasting bitterness.

Certain questions, however, have not been answered—basic questions which may determine the futures of all races and creeds:

Should any mass group, whether of race, religion, or economic status, seek to coerce, intimidate or pressure a Congress and an administration into adopting legislation which will further regiment all peoples and extend Federal control over areas and business?

Should emotion take precedence over reason in making national decisions?

Should one group be advanced at the expense of another?

And, above all, should any true American regardless of his station, race or creed, be so intent on gaining certain objectives that he is willing to risk the downfall of that which has made this Nation great from the very beginning—his freedom from direct governmental control in order that he may pursue those things which he cherishes most?

All may, up to this moment, talk, work, and strive to improve his own lot and that of his people. Such is a worthy cause. But we can only hope and pray that no one has become so blinded that he is willing to pressure Government into further regimentation of people, property, and business. Regimentation does not feed freedom, and both socialism and communism are proof of what can occur if all races and creeds in a nation do not safeguard those basic constitutional principles.

Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons for a native of Canton, Ohio, to be proud of his home town, and one of them is our outstanding school system.

I wish to place in the RECORD today a copy of a letter addressed to the U.S. Commissioner of Education by Gordon G. Humbert, Canton's superintendent of schools, in which he discusses how Canton has faced the school dropout and other problems, and I call your attention to these significant sentences from the Humbert letter:

Our school district has always operated on the assumption that the education of the citizens of our school district is a responsibility of this school district and, to some extent, the State of Ohio.

And:

Communities can take care of their own educational ills if they have the desire and the dedication, or they can become fully dependent upon some remote branch of Government.

I am proud to say that Canton does have the desire and dedication to take care of its own educational problems, and it is living up to its responsibilities.

The complete letter follows:

CANTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Canton, Ohio, August 22, 1963.

Dr. KEPPEL,
Commissioner of Education,
U.S. Office of Education,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. KEPPEL: In reply to your letter of July 12 expressing concern about the dropout problem in the public schools, I assure

you this has been a matter of concern to our school system for many years.

Believing it to be necessary to understand the individual problem before a solution can be effected, we have developed a staff of school psychologists and counselors. At present the Canton public school system has 1 counselor for each 400 students on the secondary level and 4 full-time counselors on the elementary level. These specialists devote full time to counseling, and their activities are coordinated by a director of pupil services.

Our board of education does not need any urging to help to solve the civil rights problem insofar as public education in our community is involved. It subscribes to a philosophy of education which precludes discrimination for any reason and on any basis. Its statement of philosophy reads as follows: "The American way of life is based on the recognition of the worth and dignity of each individual. Each person is entitled to the development of his abilities and talents to the fullest. It is the primary objective of the Canton public schools to develop programs which will provide for the maximum growth and development of each child."

In order to effect this point of view, detailed studies of the dropout problem have been made. A copy of a mimeographed pamphlet on "A Study of Dropout Students in the Canton Public Schools" is enclosed.

In the light of findings, there has been a serious attempt to adjust educational programs to the needs and intellectual levels of our students. Perchance this is why our system has had the lowest dropout rate among large cities in Ohio the past 2 years.

A rather extensive educational program has been set up in our community to meet the social and individual needs of our youth. In our total organization, there are 27 elementary schools, 3 comprehensive senior high schools, 1 vocational high school, a technical institute for 13th and 14th graders, and extensive adult evening school with a State accredited high school division, and an extensive summer school program. Something of the philosophy and program of these divisions of our school program is included in pamphlets attached to this letter.

Our vocational high school meets innumerable needs, vocational and general, of both adults and youth of high school age. It, of course, is basically a terminal institution. It aims to educate young people for living in our American democratic society, and at the same time, to train them for the highly skilled jobs in local industry and business.

Timken Vocational offers four types of programs to students of high school age—distributive education, business education, trade and industrial education, and home economics education. A section of the policies of the Canton City Board of Education explains trade and industrial education more fully. A copy of this section is attached.

Three of our high schools offer what is termed comprehensive programs. In these high schools you will find programs for the college bound, slow learners, the blind, the hard of hearing, the crippled, the average and below average, and among all of these groups the potential dropout about which you write. Programs have been and are being established for all of these students. Individualized scheduling has supplanted the traditional mass scheduling in terms of inflexible curriculums.

This next year a further step will be taken to adjust the school program to the vocational and social needs of the potential dropout. This next step will be in accord with a contention we have held for some time, that there should be an orderly transition from school to the world of work for all students. School programs in far too many cases have been isolated from the work-a-day world in which the student will find himself after graduation. In our system we shall not only attempt to identify the potential dropout, but we shall then attempt to do something about his problem. We have established, effective with the opening of school in September, a diversified work experience program for selected low academic students and for selected high school special education students. Counselor-coordinators have been employed in two of our high schools to initiate this program. A detailed description of the plan is enclosed.

A community school, a cooperative venture of the Canton Welfare Federation and the Canton Board of Education, has been created to meet the needs of the citizens in a culturally deprived section of the city.

Obviously not all of the unemployed can be trained or retrained for jobs in American industry. They simply do not have the native endowment. The main source of employment for these youngsters in the years ahead must necessarily be in the extensive area of service occupations. By service occupations, I mean such jobs as laundry worker, chef, waiter, bellboy, custodian, street maintenance, barber, and the like. There are thousands of these service occupations.

Schools must take the initiative in creating an attitude of respect for and interest in these service occupations. Through job definitions, on-the-job experience and other techniques, these potential dropouts can be convinced that service occupations are essential to America's welfare. As a corollary to this, these youngsters must develop respect for themselves. In the program of instruction for these youngsters, manners, dress, and health should receive a great deal of attention.

Training for jobs that do not exist will not solve the dilemma of the unemployed. If our economy is given the opportunity to grow and expand, there will be additional employers in many essential services, resulting in thousands of additional jobs. It seems to me that our first concern on the national level would be to create this kind of situation or climate rather than to view industry and business, from the angle exclusively, as sources of money with which to take care of the social and economic ills of all of the countries of the world.

It isn't the exclusive job of American industry to take care of the unemployed. The first task for American industry is to maintain a sound economy for our own country, without which America would be unable to do anything substantial for any foreign country.

Our school district has always operated on the assumption that the education of the citizens of our school district is a responsibility of this school district and, to some extent, the State of Ohio. There is wholehearted agreement on our part with your statement that, "It is the American tradition, which we all wish to preserve, that the responsibility for education remain at the State and local level—in the hands of duly authorized citizens closely associated with particular schools, colleges, and universities."

Communities can take care of their own educational ills if they have the desire and the dedication, or they can become fully dependent on some remote branch of Government. I should like to take this opportunity to tell you that for the past 10 years, due to the interest of the citizens of this city in their schools, a pay-as-you-go building program, which permits us to maintain a building schedule as the need arises, has been in operation, and our school district is now practically debt free.

The members of our board of education, who receive no salary, believe that the handling of the public's money is a sacred trust, and that the citizen is entitled to receive a full dollar's worth of education for his tax dollar. We believe that our citizens will get more for their tax dollar if it is collected on the local level. We are still convinced that control goes largely with financial support and responsibility.

We recognize fully the severity of the problem about which you write, and trust that we have given you some insight into what we are doing in the Canton City School District to effect a solution.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON G. HUMBERT,
Superintendent of Schools.

Plight of the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the U.S. merchant marine has problems a-plenty these days. However, not all of them are beyond the possibility of solution without the assistance of Government, as a recent article which appeared in the proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute make plain.

Writing in the June 1963 issue, C. R. Wilhide, commander, U.S. Navy, rightly emphasizes the importance of maintaining at adequate strength this invaluable arm of our country's commerce and of its defense capability. He also, and quite pertinently, points a finger at a number of omissions and commissions in the everyday operations of our shipping which deserve the attention of management and labor alike.

I ask unannimous consent that portions of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, portions of the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MERCHANT MARINE IS DYING AND NOBODY SEEMS TO CARE

(By C. R. Wilhide, Commander, U.S. Navy; foreword by Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired)

Unless there is a reversal in the decline of the American merchant marine in the immediate future, one of the greatest assets of the American economic structure will die a death of neglect. It is important that the possibility of this demise be recognized by American businessmen, by the Government, and by the operators themselves.

A shipping industry cannot be built overnight, as the Soviet Union has discovered. But they have found that a strong shipping industry is a tremendous national asset.

The situation lends itself to a clearer presentation than do most things these days. An essential part of the power of a nation is contained in a strong maritime industry. The maritime industry of the United States is dwindling—and rapidly. The Soviet maritime industry is growing—and rapidly. The result?

As Commander Wilhide has pointed out in his cogent article, almost everybody can take part of the blame for the condition in which our merchant marine now finds itself. There is no all-purpose elixir capable of curing the many illnesses which beset the maritime industry. But there are some steps that can be taken now to begin the rehabilitation process. Chief among these is recognition by the American people of the importance of the industry to our national economic and industrial life.

Within this generalization are some built-in facts that can be exploited, among them the maritime industry's contribution to the balance-of-payments problem, the necessity for having a merchant marine, and what will happen if this vital factor in our national existence is weakened to the point of ineffectiveness.

Nobody is going to tell the American people this story except the maritime industry itself. Nobody else can tell it.

The United States had better do something about its merchant marine—not just the Government, not just the industry, not just the shippers, but all of us. If we do not do something soon, we will not have a merchant marine. And someday when it is too late to take corrective action, we may fervently wish we had.

In the middle of the 19th century, the sharp prows of the clipper ships sliced through the oceans bordering all the continents as the infant American merchant marine spread the products of a burgeoning industrial colossus to all corners of the globe.

These fine-hulled ships with their billowing canvas represented the resolve of a new nation to become a first-class maritime power.

By the end of World War II, America reigned supreme in the maritime world and competed on better than even terms with her nearest maritime rivals. Owners, captains, crews, and shippers were proud of the records established and a hefty backlog of cargo contracts kept the ships moving with what seemed at that time to be an inexhaustible supply of goods and machinery.

Just over 17 years later, the United States finds itself slipping rapidly down the ladder as a maritime power, with an industry beset by years of labor-management conflicts, falling cargo contracts, an aging fleet and, most significant of all, dwindling confidence by American shippers.

The picture is not one to inspire much cheering by those who make even the most cursory study of this industry.

Since 1945 there has been an almost precipitous decline in the fortunes of the American merchant marine. A certain amount of slackening could have been expected as the demands of a peacetime economy replaced the forced expansion of wartime necessity. Yet, nothing like that experienced by the maritime industry in the years since the end of World War II was foreseen.

In 1946, American ships carried 67.6 percent of our foreign trade. In 1960, the figure had plummeted to 10.5 percent. Today it is even less. If the downward trend continues, the American merchant marine could well disappear as a positive national force within the foreseeable future.

This is not an idle observation, as innumerable studies of the industry can testify. Few scholars can remember when an industry has been examined in such minute detail as has the U.S. merchant marine in the past few years.

A few years ago, Ralph Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, said that shipping was the most investigated and researched industry in the United States. At the same time, Mr. Casey, along with other experts, agreed that the merchant marine outlook was at an alltime low.

Such a condition would be cause for concern in any age, but today the health of the merchant marine is particularly important. For we are struggling with a force that threatens the complete subjugation of the free world, and a vital part of the program is the domination of ocean commerce.

Communism has expressed its intention to destroy freedom with every means at its command. It is making its greatest inroads in the economic penetration of markets which up to a few years ago were considered an almost inviolate fief of capitalistic enterprise.

The threat of economic warfare, however, has become not only a reality, but one which is not easily discernible to large numbers of our people, because it is difficult to see its effects in day-to-day affairs. And this obscurity is what makes this kind of economic warfare so dangerous.

In the maritime field, Communist penetration is growing daily. A rash of newspaper accounts of an expanding Russian merchant fleet has appeared during the past year. All reports indicate that the Soviet Union has embarked on a program to become the greatest maritime power in the world.

One report pictured a 10-year growth in the Soviet merchant fleet leading to some 2,600 ships of over 1,000 tons by 1970. This estimate contrasts with a fleet of less than 900 in 1960.

Thus, the Russian merchant fleet will surpass that of the United States by 1966—unless there is a dramatic reversal of the U.S. maritime skid.

Responsibility for the decline in fortune of the American merchant marine has been ascribed to almost everyone who has had anything to do with the industry. The decline has been blamed on lack of Government decision, on the demands of labor, and on a lack of patriotism by shippers—in fact, the condition has been attributed to almost everything except the industry itself.

It is not the purpose of this article to judge the degree of blame to be assessed on anyone, but from even a limited amount of research, it is obvious that the industry itself is not blameless for the relatively low esteem in which the maritime business is held by our own people.

This view can be substantiated by spokesmen from both Government and the industry. Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges in an address a year ago said: "In general the maritime picture is disappointing. Certain sectors show strength * * * but others reflect lack of direction and planning and display the characteristics of a dying enterprise."

Wilfred J. McNeil, president of Grace Line has touched the nerve end of what must be a major reason for the condition of our maritime industry. In a major address to the American Society of Naval Engineers in May 1962, he said: "The answer (to the poor showing of the merchant marine) in large part at least, is the general apathy in the United States toward a merchant marine."

It is in this area of public attitude that the maritime industry can make the greatest contribution to the revival of American merchant sea power. The industry would be well advised to consider a well-planned public relations program which it has never enjoyed.

At the outset, let me say that public relations by itself obviously cannot supply the complete answer to the lagging maritime progress of the Nation. But the lack of a planned public relations approach is certainly a factor which must be considered in viewing the low public esteem in which the industry finds itself today.

There are 120 shipping operators in the United States today of varying size and influence. They employ about 150,000 seamen. This is big business.

But in the public relations field, there is only one line which has a vice president in charge of public relations.

Three other lines are considered to be among those that give any more than passing attention to the public relations activity of their organizations.

In discussing the lack of public support for the American merchant marine, Grace Line's President Wilfred McNeil said: "The Japanese and the British—just to pick two at random—feel that it is patriotic to use their national flag lines, and as a result, 60 to 70 percent or more of their trade is carried in their own bottoms. So far, in this country, we have not been able to secure the same degree of public support."

As far back as March 1960, the same thought was expressed by Mr. Tom Killefer, at that time executive director of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, when he said "American businessmen have no compulsion or suggestion of Government pressure placed on them to designate a vessel of American registry."

In a nation which is looked upon as the outstanding exponent of public relations, the lack of a public relations program for the merchant marine is almost inconceivable. Yet, such appears to be the case. Here is an industry which has a readymade stage that has had an unending appeal to millions of Americans—the sea itself. The fascination, glamour, and mystery of the sea has always held an attraction for Americans. This national characteristic is something on which American shipping lines could very well capitalize with a minimum of expense and a maximum of return.

Some of the most elementary fundamentals of a public relations attitude have been ignored by the industry. An example of this in the passenger ship category is the lamentable condition existing on the New York docks. The drafty, dirty buildings and the arrogant attitude of some officials who greet passengers on their arrival from overseas have been the subject of various editorial comments, none of them flattering. The steamship lines themselves are probably not solely at fault. Yet, it seems that a concerted effort to bring the conditions to the attention of responsible city, State, and National officials could result in some immediate remedies followed by more permanent improvements.

The reasons why such a condition exists in the first place are many. But, the improvement at these docks must have priority and must be given proper attention in the public relations program so that passengers will become aware of the effort that is being expended on correcting what has become a major passenger irritant.

It is difficult for an experienced public relations practitioner to comprehend the total lack of action in some obvious fields by the shipping industry.

For example, it would be expected that the maritime industry would be deep in the business of encouraging the interest of sea-minded organizations—particularly those with a large and enthusiastic body of young men like the Sea Explorer Scouts. Yet, an inquiry to the National Council of Boy Scouts of America revealed the fact that only three such units are sponsored by the shipping industry or organizations allied with the industry. One is sponsored by the Canal Zone Pilots Association, one is sponsored by the United States Steel Corp., and the third is sponsored by the Pacific American Steamship Association in San Francisco.

In a business which, by its own admission, does not enjoy the support of the public, this gap reveals a strange lack of interest in improving that support.

But the maritime industry has had quite enough critical examination in the past decade. The main challenges to be met now lie in the areas of improvement and revitalization, and the gaining of confidence that comes from increased public support.

There is, however, some silver in the apparently unending cloud of gloom that currently casts its shadow over the merchant marine outlook.

Of chief significance is the recognition of the problem by top-level management. New and energetic executives have been placed at the helms of several companies, men who have had extensive experience not only with overall management, but also with the part a sound public relations program plays in the scheme of things. Their interest is expressed in a decided improvement

in the form and distribution of institutional advertising. Until recently, the only shipping advertisements in most major metropolitan papers consisted of those placed by foreign companies. Now at least three American steamship companies are advertising quite consistently.

In this field, the companies themselves should take a look at their advertising budgets, which are among the lowest in the American business community. This is not to say that they should jump headlong into a massive expenditure which would deplete the amount of capital they must have for improving material facilities. What should be done, is to survey potential passenger and cargo areas and pay much more advertising attention to those important areas.

In the passenger trade, for example, more and more U.S. citizens living in the interior are becoming financially able to tour abroad, and, in some ways, it is also in this region where the sea enjoys its largest appeal. For years the U.S. Navy has gained its greatest success in recruiting from the vast areas of the landlocked Midwestern States.

The amount of advertising by shipping companies in this region is almost nil. With the potential return so apparent, these companies might well afford to place some sponsored programs among the communications media of this area. An additional bonus is the relatively low cost of such advertising, particularly among the smaller radio and television stations and the hundreds of local, well-read newspapers.

One of the most vital targets of a planned public relations campaign is the potential shipper. A considerable amount has already been done to attract him, in particular the practices by some 30 or more shipping executives of holding meetings in various communities far removed from cities on the seacoast.

One of the most surprising items noted in researching this article was the apathetic attitude of the American businessman regarding the importance of shipping in American owned ships. Donald W. Alexander, Maritime Administrator, has said that "There are no problems that we have today that would not be eased or even possibly resolved if all of our ships were sailing full and down on every voyage."

Yet, from the data available, it seems that most American shippers not only allow the foreign buyer to designate the shipping line to transport the material he buys in the United States, but also give him the prerogative of designating the line carrying the material he ships into this country.

It is obvious that there is a major breakdown between the American shipping lines and the American exporter and importer. It is most important that this breech be patched up at the earliest possible date.

The potential for a sound public relations program for the shipping industry is great. Here are a few items that could and should be widely publicized. In this day of increasing concern about the balance of payments, it is interesting to note that as far back as 1959, American flag vessels either earned or avoided disbursement in foreign exchange balances that year of $1 billion. Therefore, if there had been no merchant marine in 1959, the deficite in the balance of payments would have been $5 billion instead of $4 billion. A substained effort on the part of the American businessman to ship American could have an even greater effect on the balance of payments and thus contribute significantly to our international economic position.

The cost of shipping by sea has always been understressed. It costs something over $40 to send a ton of cargo to England by sea. The air rate runs over $1,700 per ton. It takes 30 pounds of black oil to haul a ton of freight across the Atlantic. It takes over 2 tons of aircraft fuel to do the same thing. These facts should be drummed into the ears of all potential shippers with unceasing vigor. There are many more examples, but these obvious ones should be enough to spur the imagination.

There have been some notable efforts at improving the public relations aspects of the maritime industry, among them the ship adoption program, the essay contest, and Maritime Day poster contest sponsored by the Propeller Club, the international trade weeks, news letters, foreign trade counseling services, and the mobile trade fair exhibits abroad. Some of the building yards, particularly those of Bethlehem and Newport News, have also chipped in with significant assistance in the public relations field.

In the final analysis, however, the initiative must come from the individual shipping companies before they can hope to get the support of the American people for a revitalized merchant marine. While there have been several efforts at group public relations by the industry—the Committee of American Steamship Lines has done some excellent work—it appears that individual lines might have been placing too much reliance on a series of group efforts without really focusing attention on their own program. The strength of any group plan or program must come from a strong and varied program by the individual companies. The experience gained by company practitioners can then reflect itself in a greater return from group efforts.

The point to be stressed here is that a gigantic and challenging public relations task is confronting the maritime industry—both management and labor—and attention to its solution is long overdue. Mere preparation to carry out such a task will require Herculean effort, but if it is to be successful, the project must be approached realistically, and it must combine the best elements of sound public relations planning, financing, and excution. The responsibility for initiating such a program lies with the industry itself and with no one else.

A successful public relations effort coupled with self-improvement in a multitude of other fields, should bring about a revived, healthy, and proud maritime industry capable of serving the American businessman and the U.S. Government. The American merchant marine must respond vigorously—and soon—to the challenge that has been hurled at the free world economy by communism.

SBA Definitions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those of us Members who opposed the Small Business Administration initially have ample room still to do so; namely, the unwarranted intrusion of the Federal Government into business operations, by making loans. In addition to criticism of such Government business endeavors being clearly unconstitutional we pointed out that any such loanmaking function would be like the camel getting his nose under the tent.

Here is an interesting sidelight on this matter recently published in the Wall Street Journal.

The editorial follows:

STRETCHABLE SMALLNESS

Just how small is "small" is a question that seems to be giving the Small Business Administration a little trouble lately.

Until last July 1, a "small" business eligible to bid on certain Government research and development contracts—those set aside for bidding only by small firms—was defined as one with fewer than 500 employees.

But in application that definition apparently didn't work out very well, for the SBA changed it. After July 1, it defined a small business eligible to bid on such Federal work as one independently owned and operated, not dominant in its field, with an average revenue over 3 previous fiscal years not in excess of $1 million a year.

That definition didn't work out very well either. Businesses, noting that research and development contracts for the Government often were highly complex and required extensive facilities, complained that the $1 million ceiling was unrealistically low.

Obligingly, the SBA now has removed the $1 million ceiling. It also rejiggered its definition of "small" so that under one set of circumstances a firm bidding on these Government contracts will be considered small if it has no more than 1,000 employees. But under another set of circumstances a firm will be defined as small if its employees do not number more than 500.

Such are some of the small problems that arise when the Government tries to favor a particular, and particularly amorphous, group. We suppose coping with these metaphysical questions of definition helps explain why the once-temporary SBA, which in its early days had 14 field offices and 600 employees, today boasts 60 offices and more than 3,000 employees.

In any event, "small" turns out to be a pretty stretchable word, whether for measuring small business or its appointed shepherd.

Hon. Sam M. Gibbons, of the New 10th Congressional District of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have noted with much interest a fine article in the St. Petersburg Times of August 25 on my colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM M. GIBBONS, who represents Florida's newly created 10th Congressional District which embraces Hillsborough County.

The Times—one of Florida's outstanding newspapers—makes clear that this new member of Florida's congressional delegation is proceeding aggressively in the finest traditions of public service as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. Although a "freshman" Representative SAM GIBBONS is a seasoned legislator, having served 10 years in the Florida Legislature before coming to Washington, 6 years in the house and 4 years in the senate. In addition, he brings to the House a fine military record, with heavy combat experience as a paratrooper in Europe during World War II—parachuting behind enemy lines with the initial assault forces just prior to D-day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached article entitled "A New Congressman's Way," which was published in the St. Petersburg Times magazine section, Sunday, August 25, written by Jerry Blizin of the Times' staff.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE SAM GIBBONS: A NEW CONGRESSMAN'S WAY

(By Jerry Blizin)

Though he didn't shout "Geronimo," an ex-paratrooper named SAM M. GIBBONS has jumped into a political battlefield called the U.S. House of Representatives, landed on target and bounced back on his feet without any visible loss of aplomb.

This is no simple task. For GIBBONS is a freshman Congressman—from a newly created district embracing his native Tampa. It has been said by no less an authority than Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, that, "A freshman Congressman is a lost soul. He cannot find his way * * * he doesn't know the rules and nobody bothers explaining them."

Tain't so in SAM GIBBONS' case. First, the 43-year-old Tampan has already had 10 years of experience in the Florida Legislature—6 years in the house and 4 in the senate.

Florida's legislative rules are quite similar to those of the House of Representatives and are based on Thomas Jefferson's Manual of Rules. As a State senator generally classed with the urban minority, GIBBONS had to know the rules to offset the controlling "pork chop gang." It was GIBBONS who proposed and drafted Tampa's special urban renewal act.

Of course, many freshmen in Congress have had similar backgrounds: training in law and State legislative experience. But many of them repose in obscurity, part of a 435-Member House which acts as if it can get along just fine without freshmen. Some of these may be following the Sam Rayburn dictum: "Don't try to go too fast * * * if you want to get along, go along."

GIBBONS, though, has a cool confidence. Without being brash, he has been forward. But he's acted within the rules of the game, done his homework and, as a result, feels he enjoys the respect of his committee chairmen and fellow Members.

He explains his attitude as the same approach one takes to parachute jumping: "The whole thing is training * * * I believe strongly in preparation, so when the time comes, you're ready."

GIBBONS has followed his philosophy. When he first arrived, he prepared flash cards so he could memorize the names and faces of his House colleagues; he carries home a briefcase full of committee reports at night.

In the first few weeks of the 88th Congress, GIBBONS wearied of bickering among the members of the Education and Labor Committee. When the hour rolled around for the House to go into session, he raised a point of order that the committee could no longer meet and stalked out on what he called "filibustering that was beneath the dignity of the committee."

He's had his moments of chagrin, though. Dashing from an Agriculture subcommittee hearing in which he and Tampa witnesses won approval for the Upper Tampa Bay Watershed project, GIBBONS tried to get recognized by Appropriations Chairman CLARENCE CANNON to testify in behalf of other public works projects. CANNON cut him off.

"I guess he thought I was trying to debate with a witness," GIBBONS says with a shrug. "But there were no hard feelings. Mr. CANNON drinks a lot of orange juice in the cloakroom, and we talk quite a bit. He knows a lot about Florida."

GIBBONS landed what he thinks are pretty good committee assignments for a frosh—Education and Labor, and House Administration. It's a bit unusual to obtain two assignments right off the bat.

He and Georgia's PHIL LANDRUM are the only southerners on Education and Labor, a hard-working committee generally regarded as "stacked" in favor of the Kennedy administration, in sharp contrast to other major committees, which are dominated by conservatives. GIBBONS is the first Floridian on the committee.

On the House Administration Committee, GIBBONS says he gets a tremendous opportunity to learn the internal workings of the House. This is a so-called legislative "oversight" committee, before which other committee chairmen bring their annual budgets. The committee also gets regular reports on the activities of each committee and settles disputed elections. All members are lawyers.

Thus, GIBBONS thinks he's getting valuable indoctrination in a major legislative committee, as well as on a key internal committee of the House.

He concedes that the way to advance in the House is to specialize. Appropriations is his first choice. This, of course, is one of the three most powerful House committees. Hence it is open only to the most senior Members of their anointed.

GIBBONS is not sure what specialty he will ultimately pursue, but he knows the importance of carrying out his current assignments at peak efficiency.

SAM GIBBONS has bucked the administration on several bills—he voted against the Area Redevelopment Act, moved to strike out several appropriations items. At the same time, he's supported the President on key legislation such as the opening vote to permanently enlarge the Rules Committee to crack its conservative stranglehold.

But there's been no kickback on any of his votes. In fact, GIBBONS says, "There is less pushing leadership at the national level than there is at the State. We had more contact with the Governor in Tallahassee than you get with the administration here."

In the House, the administration checks its vote support through calls made by the whip and 18 regional assistants.

GIBBONS has been to the White House to plead for the Four Rivers Basin (Green Swamp) flood control project and has been assured the President will budget this next year. He was amazed by the grasp J.F.K. had of this relatively minor project.

GIBBONS is no one-man-show Congressman. He delegates authority to a capable administrative assistant, Hector Alcalde. Jim McGurk, press aid, helps keep GIBBONS abreast of the Florida news.

There is general camaraderie with all members of the State delegation and GIBBONS says he's received good cooperation from Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, whose district used to include Tampa.

Rangy, crewcut SAM GIBBONS finds it hardest to get used to the sheer size of the House. When he was in Tallahasse, he knew every legislator. "Here, it's so large and so much is going on at the same time, that if you spent all day, you couldn't get a grasp of it."

GIBBONS has had three inside-the-United States "indoctrination" trips that the military services customarily give new House Members. He concedes there may be latent lobbying involved, but says all three trips were educational. On one jaunt, he and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER were trapped briefly in a small elevator aboard the carrier *Enterprise*.

There have been the usual relocation problems. GIBBONS tried to rent his Tampa house furnished, finally had to store the furniture. He found a house to rent in McLean, Va., after 10 days of pounding the pavement.

GIBBONS rises at 6 a.m., tries to get to the office before 9, and returns home by 7 p.m.

Does the Senate loom in his ambitions? "I might take a crack at it someday," GIBBONS says, adding he would never run against Senators SPESSARD HOLLAND and GEORGE SMATHERS.

SAM GIBBONS thinks there are many ways in which congressional action could be speeded up—going into session earlier in the day (Congress convenes at noon); using electric voting machines; more modern procedures. He finds that in some ways the House is more archaic than the State legislature—noisy behavior on the floor (GIBBONS sits in the front row so he can hear); an equal volume of noise from the galleries. He'd like to see galleries glassed off, and television cameras brought in to cover regular House sessions.

"The hams in Congress would soon be exposed," GIBBONS thinks, adding that sessions in the House would improve in quality and brevity.

He is also miffed by closed committee sessions. And he says he strongly opposes any executive sessions which lead to news by "leak or stooge." He would also do away with proxy vote in committee hearings.

So far, his biggest shock has been the fact he is not besieged by the press as legislators are in Tallahassee. Despite a huge national press corps, most correspondents are spread thinly over a vast field of newsbreaks.

GIBBONS attends House sessions diligently. He would have had a 100-percent attendance record on quorum calls, if some sinus trouble hadn't laid him low.

In all, the man from Florida's 10th Congressional District shows very little freshman itch. A guy who jumped behind enemy lines just prior to D-day, SAM GIBBONS has simply traded his combat boots for legislative shoes.

Sheboygan Press Backs Home Rule for the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Sheboygan Press has added its editorial voice to the many that have been calling for self-government for the District of Columbia. I include this editorial to reemphasize that fair play toward the citizens of our Capital City is a matter of concern to the home folks:

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin's Fifth Congressional District, is concerned because the so-called home rule bill is bottled up in one of the congressional committees, dominated as are most congressional committees by members from the South. He insists that a great injustice is being done to the citizens who live within the District of Columbia; we agree with him.

When our Nation was established, there was no permanent seat of government. In 1790, by congressional action, a commission was established of which George Washington was a member. This commission selected a tract of land along the Potomac River—10 miles square, partly in Maryland and partly in Virginia; the land was ceded to the Federal Government by the two States. In 1846, the land south of the river was re-ceded to

Virginia, leaving the District of Columbia at about 70 square miles.

Various forms of government have been tried in the District of Columbia. In 1878, Congress destroyed the last vestige of representative government in the Nation's Capital. It established a commission consisting of two members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate and an Army officer assigned by the Secretary of War. But Congress itself acts as a city council, determines the final District budget, passes on the myriad of little things on which the typical city council passes. Half of the approved expenditures come from Congress, the other half from real estate taxes on nongovernmental property in the District. But no elections are held in the District, the residents retaining their legal residence in the States from which they come. All civic and educational functions are subject to commission approval. All observers agree that the District schools, in which Negro children are now in the majority, need massive improvement and support. Slum clearance programs could be justified within a short distance of the Capitol but Congress says "No" and the residents have no vote in the matter.

We agree with Congressman REUSS and wish him success in getting the home rule bill out of committee. The District of Columbia government is, in our opinion, out of harmony with the Nation whose Government is therein located.

Telstar and "Town Meeting of the World"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in July 1962, Telstar, the first communications satellite capable of transmitting a television signal, was put into orbit. It was suggested then, as it had been shortly after the Atlantic cable was laid, that these two physically separated worlds would have little to say to each other. This shortsighted notion was again disproved this summer when the Columbia Broadcasting System celebrated the first anniversary of the new era of intercontinental television with "Town Meeting of the World," on which General Eisenhower, former Prime Minister Anthony Eden of England, Jean Monnet of France, and Heinrich von Brentano of Germany discussed some of the most critical issues of our time.

The "Town Meeting of the World" was first proposed last October by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, who noted the opportunity for the creation of a new form of journalism with a world dimension. His initiative and perserverance, and the resourcefulness and imagination of the executive producer, Fred W. Friendly, contributed enormously to this historic landmark in global communications. The broadcast, all concerned frankly admitted, was an experiment. But so was Joseph Henry's laboratory telegraph in 1831; Morse's famous Washington-to-Baltimore transmission—"What hath God wrought"—of 1843; and Guglielmo Marconi's first transatlantic wireless transmission in 1896. And as with these experiments it established the precedent for, and the promise of, the future.

The problems faced in presenting this electronic town meeting were political as well as technical. It is rather ironic to recall that in 1938, even on the day Anschluss was proclaimed, CBS broadcast a World News Roundup from Berlin and Vienna as well as London, Paris, Rome, and Washington; and yet, because of the French refusal to make their transmitting and receiving facilities available, the "Town Meeting of the World" was seen, live, only in the United States. A broadcast designed to promote understanding between peoples and nations was unfortunately blacked out in Europe.

This kind of setback is a transitory phenomenon. It in no way dims the CBS achievement, nor will it hold back the future of worldwide television communications. I congratulate those pioneers here and in Europe who made this broadcast possible, and because of the historic nature of this event ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD samples of critical acclaim which come from newspapers and magazines across the country.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWN MEETING OF THE WORLD

(Excerpts from comment in the press)

United Press International, Rick Du Brow: "CBS is to be highly congratulated for not merely utiliznig Telstar on matters like new transmissions, but for leading in creative satellite broadcasting."

Syndicated, New York World Telegram and other newspapers, Inez Robb: "When time ran out on the first 'Town Meeting of the World' the other night my impulse was to stamp my feet, beat my hands together and cry, 'More! More!'

"Columbia Broadcasting System, with an assist from Telstar II (and despite a desist from Gen. Charles de Gaulle), has given the world an extraordinary sample of the illuminating dialog that flows from a town meeting of four international figures."

Time: "As a suggestion of what might be—future international colloquies drawing continents together—CBS's program could not have been more impressive. CBS swiftly announced plans to stage similar meetings four times a year."

Washington Post, lead editorial: "The first use of Telstar for a 'Town Meeting of the World,' with Dwight D. Eisenhower, Anthony Eden, Jean Monnet, and Heinrich Von Brentano participating, disclosed the exciting possibilities of this device for the formation of world opinion * * * possessed other virtues that recommend its frequent repetition in a world that needs to hear dispassionate and friendly discussion of the problems of greater Western unity."

Washington Star, Bernie Harrison: "A terribly impressive show."

Los Angeles Times, Aleene MacMinn: "Television, which often records history, made history Wednesday morning when CBS presented a 'Town Meeting of the World,' the first instantaneous hookup between nations utilizing the Telstar communications satellite."

Hollywood Citizen-News, Arlene Garber: "It was a wonderful example of network television operating in the public interest on a global scale."

Chicago Daily News, Terry Turner: "As far as the American television audience was concerned, the CBS-TV 'Town Meeting of the World' Wednesday was an overwhelming success, filled with the magic of excitment at television history being made * * * a superb hour of television."

Chicago's American, Bill Irvin: "The telecast was a milestone in world communications, foreshadowing the day when world leaders may hold high-level diplomatic conferences via transatlantic TV and when the man on the street anywhere can question directly leading statesmen on international problems."

Cleveland Press, Bill Barrett: "The implications are breathtaking."

Detroit Free Press, Bettelou Peterson: "CBS, which originated the idea and put the program together, as a salute to the anniversary of the first Telstar broadcast, can be proud of the program."

Boston Traveler, Eleanor Roberts: " 'Town Meeting' was a landmark in television progress. It's gratifying to learn that CBS-TV plans another program of the same type in the near future."

Albany Times-Union, Chan L. Turner: "This show represents a real communications breakthrough. Congratulations to CBS for bringing it off and we can all hope that, as Mr. Cronkite predicted, such a format will be used in the future for settlement rather than just for discussion, of worldwide problems."

Philadelphia Inquirer, Harry Harris: "An impressive milestone in the history of transatlantic television was achieved on Telstar's first anniversary by CBS 'Town Meeting of the World,' aired live—as scheduled and without a hitch—at 12:20 p.m. Wednesday and repeated on tape at 7:30 p.m."

Baltimore Sun, Donald Kirkley: " 'Town Meeting of the World' was a smashing success despite the churlish obstruction placed in the way by the French Government. To begin with, it was a thrilling experience for those who watched the live spacecast via Telstar II on CBS-TV in midday; here was history in the making, regardless of what was said by the distinguished participants in the five-way discussion. This was a project long planned by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, but he would be the first to point out that credit is shared by a small army of people, in and outside television, who made it possible."

Montreal Star, Pat Pearce: "Whatever the content, the program itself was historic. CBS deserves every kudos for doing it, for doing it live, and for repeating it in the evening."

New York Times, Jack Gould: "Amply confirmed the hopes of Dr. Frank Stanton, CBS president, that a two-way hookup of continents would dramatize the potential of international TV in helping unite peoples and countries."

New York Journal-American, Atra Baer: "Telstar's tremendous potential—and the fear of that potential harbored in some quarters—was proven beyond question yesterday as CBS beamed its first 'Town Meeting of the World.' "

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial, entitled "The Cross-Florida Barge Canal," which ap-

peared in the Monthly Reporter of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

THE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL: A STITCH IN TIME

The President's message to Congress requesting an appropriation of $1 million, in the current fiscal year to begin the construction of the long-authorized waterway which is to connect the barge channel systems of the Mississippi Valley and gulf areas with those of the Atlantic seaboard, largely because, as he states, of its value in the national defense, is destined to be an historic document.

It is a fixed policy of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to refrain from suggesting to Congress or the Executive any priority for any one of its endorsed projects over any other such. However, once such an endorsed project has been duly authorized by Congress, and funds for its construction have been requested by the Executive, it becomes appropriate to call to the attention of our readers certain pertinent facts.

This project has been examined and studied by the projects committee of this nationwide organization and has been endorsed by them and (among others) urged upon the Federal Government for decades, not only because of its evident economic value to the Nation, but because it is an essential reserve in our defense potential. A glance at this aspect of its history is in order.

Before De Soto discovered the Mississippi, he discovered something else on his long march up from Florida—the mountain barrier of the Appalachians which, as both French and Spanish were soon to learn, effectively separated the midcontinent from the Atlantic area. In less than 25 years after the discovery of the Mississippi, the Spanish realized that the political integrity of any sovereignty which might be established over this part of the New World would ultimately depend upon an easy and unfailing means for transport and communication around this barrier. The rail- and roadways which have pierced it today have reduced it only in degree. It continues to impose the economic necessity for ocean transport of bulk cargoes through the narrow strait between Florida and Cuba, a recourse which an enemy has once before and may yet again deny us. This necessity constantly increases with the growth of our population.

The year 1567 saw Philip II of Spain directing his Governor at St. Augustine to search for a water route across Florida to tie together the Spanish dominions on the gulf with those on the Atlantic.

Considerably later, during British dominance, it is the commander of the English fleet in the gulf who is urging the Admiralty to cause this waterway to be constructed.

Later still, President Andrew Jackson was to send a message to Congress stressing the need for this inland water route to strengthen our Union and to promote its economy. The project thus became the first waterway to be surveyed by the Corps of Engineers.

But it was a little over a hundred years thereafter before, in 1942, it was authorized by a special act of Congress "to promote the national defense." However, the exigencies of World War II, then in progress, prevented its construction at that time. As a result there followed the bitter lesson of the destruction of our coastal merchant fleet by enemy submarines, the death of more than a thousand of our merchant seamen, and the menace of a critically weakening transport capability; a lesson which, according to a later report by the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of Defense, would have been unnecessary had this inland trunk route for cargo been available.

The national character of the project is evident. There can be no doubt that in time it will transit annually in times of peace a tonnage rivaling if not exceeding any such artery in the world.

But the impressive economic aspect of this connection of the midcontinent and Atlantic barge channels is overshadowed by its essentiality as an element in our defense transportation.

The current military policy of the United States is soundly based on the assumption that the continuing threat of war which hangs over America may not be withdrawn within the foreseeable future, if ever. Also that we must be prepared with preponderant strength to wage either conventional or nuclear war. Cuba may well remain a permanent outpost of one or another of the great communistic powers. The political climate south of us affords ground for apprehension. Under these circumstances, prudence requires that we cure now this weakness in our capability for internal emergency transport.

Recognition of Red Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in order that Members of the Congress and others may have an opportunity to read and evaluate the contents of a release recently issued by the Committee Against the Recognition of Red Hungary, I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ETHNIC-EXILE ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSE CHANGE IN HUNGARIAN RELATIONS

WASHINGTON, August 24, 1963.—In a meeting at Washington today representatives of major American ethnic and exile organizations expressed their strong opposition to any change in diplomatic relations between the United States and the Communist Government of Hungary and stated that in spite of repeated denials by the Department of State evidence has consistently developed over the past 2 years to indicate that the United States and Communist Hungary plan to resume full diplomatic relations in the near future.

Spokesmen for the national ethnic-exile groups were Bela Bachkai, national secretary, American-Hungarian Federation; Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Monsignor Bela Varga, chairman, Hungarian Committee; Stefan Korbonski, Assembly of Captive European Nations; Monsignor John Balkunas, chairman, Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent; Paul Deac, executive secretary, National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups; and Horace E. Henderson, chairman, Committee Against the Recognition of Red Hungary. Claiming to represent the vast majority of some 24 million citizens and their families of European origin, as well as the exile organizations from the 9 captive nations of East Europe, a vigorous protest has been lodged with the Department of State, the executive branch of the Government and with Members of Congress in opposition to the proposed "normalization" of diplomatic relations with Red Hungary.

The Washington meeting outlined the assembled organizations' beliefs that negotiations were continuing between the United States and Hungary toward full diplomatic relations based on the following developments:

1. In May 1962, the London Economist reported that a "deal" was in the making between the United States and Hungary which would involve the abandonment of the U.S. position in opposition to the seating of the Hungarian delegation in the U.N. in exchange for Soviet acquiescence in the election of U Thant as U.N. Secretary General. And it reported that in December 1961 the Hungarian Government let it be known that it was willing to permit Cardinal Mindszenty to leave Hungary in exchange for (a) full American diplomatic recognition, (b) the definitive acceptance of Hungarian credentials in the U.N., and (c) the elimination of the Hungarian issue from the U.N. agenda. The Department of State said the Economist report was not true and denied that negotiations were taking place toward the restoration of full diplomatic relations with Communist Hungary and stated there was no change in U.S. policy on Hungary.

2. In February 1963, Members of Congress were assured by the Department of State that "there had been no change in our policy on Hungary" (Senator DODD, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 20, 1963).

3. Yet in May 1963, the Department of State circulated among Members of Congress an undated memorandum entitled a "Report on the Changing Situation in Hungary" obviously for the purpose of preparing the way for a change in national policy without stating what, how, or why. The report goes to some length outlining the background of relations between the United States and Hungary and in detail cites a "General Amnesty of March 22, 1963" and "Other Measures of Moderation" with the following conclusion: "The foregoing developments and policy shifts in Hungary should be viewed objectively and in proper perspective. Assessed by Western democratic standards, the changes may appear as limited concessions to the rights and interests of the Hungarian people since Hungary continues to be a Communist state within the Soviet bloc. But present conditions are a decided improvement over those that prevailed during the Rakosi era or in the early aftermath of the 1956 revolution. It is also clear that the present situation of the Hungarian people is relatively better than that of the peoples in other Soviet bloc countries except Poland."

4. Then in June 1963, without advising the Congress or the public of its intentions, the United States dropped its 7-year-old campaign to keep the U.N. General Assembly from accepting the credentials of the Hungarian delegation and the Credentials Committee of the United States did not make its usual motion that the General Assembly take no action on the Hungarian credentials. The Government of the United States abstained.

5. In reply to strong objections from Members of Congress to this change in national policy and the proposed normalization of relations, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton replied on June 18, 1963: "Recent developments in Hungarian affairs do not, in fact, involve any question of recognition or resumption of diplomatic relations. * * * It is the Department's view that the reduction of bilateral relations to minimal levels after the events of 1956 and the pressures brought to bear on the Hungarian Government in the U.N. over the same extended period have served a useful purpose. * * * The future course of U.S. bilateral relations with Hungary will depend on many factors and developments, and we do not anticipate any dramatic or sudden changes in this record. * * * The Department has no plan to send a Minister to Budapest at this time."

6. Yet a similar letter was written by Acting Assistant Secretary Richard H. Davis on July 26, 1963, using the same words yet eliminating all reference to the appointment of a Minister and adding that "the amnesty as

well as a number of other measures taken by the Hungarian Government over the past 2 years reflect a significant amelioration of conditions in Hungary * * * it is a basic U.S. concern * * * to utilize all appropriate opportunities for maintaining and broadening U.S. contacts with these peoples, for manifesting continuing interest in their welfare, and for making the U.S. presence and influence felt in that area in as many effective ways as possible."

7. On August 9, 1963, the New York Times reported from Washington that the "United States and Hungary prepare to renew normal ties soon." It reported that "plans were underway to send a new Minister to head the American mission in Budapest" and that "cautious explorations have been initiated by the State Department in the belief that Eastern European countries are genuinely eager to adopt a friendlier attitude toward the West."

8. Also on August 9, 1963, the Washington Evening Star reported that "despite State Department denials, a firm belief prevailed in diplomatic circles that the United States and Communist Hungary will resume full relations, probably by the end of this summer." It also reported that the State Department although repeatedly denying reports from various European capitals "has confirmed through its official spokesmen that contacts with the government of Premier Janos Kadar were established some time ago. This was done through the U.S. Legation in Budapest aimed at what the diplomatic language calls 'normalization' of relations." And that "there were private hints that Washington is preparing some kind of a package deal which would go beyond the lifting of restrictions and would also include sending a full-fledged Minister to head the U.S. mission in Budapest." With reference to the removal of Cardinal Mindszenty from the American Legation in Budapest to Rome, the report said Cardinal Mindszenty "refused and said that he believes his place is with his flock."

9. Radio Budapest has recently reported that Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman conferred three times with Communist Boss Janos Kadar in Moscow.

The ethnic-exile organizations in session in Washington strongly assert that the positions taken by the Department of State as a basis for examination of relations between the United States and Communist Hungary are questionable and debatable. Their sources of information and contacts with persons in Hungary does not confirm the assumptions taken in the official positions of the Department. As recently as 1960, the official position of the Department was that there had been no convincing confirmation of announced amnesties by the Communist regime and that all protestations to the contrary, the Hungarian people continued to live under a repressive regime installed and maintained by the armed forces of the Soviet Union. Yet today it is asserted that announced amnesties and "measures of moderation" by the same Kadar who was the "Butcher of Budapest" is a reliable basis for full American recognition of the Communist Hungarian government. These American and exile leaders from Hungary, with friends and relatives still in Hungary, and who continue to fight for the freedom of their homeland, strongry contest any assumption of conditions warranting the accord of respectable status and international prestige to the Communist government of Hungary. They collectively deny that there has been any substantial change in the totalitarian Communist dictatorship over the Hungarian people and they strongly oppose the restoration of full diplomatic recognition to Red Hungary. It is their belief that the Hungarian people oppose any such action by the U.S. Government. They believe that should normal diplomatic relations with Hungary be restored that the 100 million people still in Communist captivity in Europe will feel that the United States has violated its self-proclaimed devotion to the principle of self-determination. It will be interpreted that sheer expediency and not dedication to principle determines the policies of the United States. It will stand as an indication that the status quo in East Europe has been recognized by the United States and the Western Powers. It will demoralize the captive peoples and thus weaken an essential deterrent aggressiveness in Europe.

The respective representatives thus assembled in Washington on August 24, 1963, strongly protest the proposed normalization of diplomatic relations between the United States and Communist Hungary. They petition the Government of the United States, and its representatives, to resolutely maintain the principle of self-determination and freedom for all peoples. They humbly request the Government of the United States to continue to withhold the establishment of full normal diplomatic relations with the Communist government of Hungary until it complies with the resolutions of the United Nations and restores to the Hungarian people their right to self-determination and freedom as an inviolate principle which the United States will never compromise.

Practice or Just Preach Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fiscal self-discipline, like dieting, takes willpower and effort. Good intentions must be backed up by performance.

Almost everyone in and out of Government knows that we must balance the budget, cut the debt, and reduce the taxes. All of this assumes reduced Federal spending. For political reasons the President and his congressional leaders will not practice what they preach. Instead, spending is increased while tight budgets and fiscal integrity are preached. Performance does not match the talk and the promises.

The following Wall Street Journal editorial puts this matter in interesting prespective:

RESTRICTIVE DIETS AND HEALTHY GROWTH

Anyone who's ever been faced with the problem of unhealthy overweight discovers that the doctors are all agreed on the cure. What the patient needs to do is go on a restrictive diet.

The trouble is that a restrictive diet quite often brings pangs in the stomach, moments of dizziness and days of seeming weakness. So it's easy to understand why people put off the cure hoping for some magic remedy that will restore good health without restricting the pleasures of the table.

By the same token, we find it possible to understand why successive administrations have tried just about every measure imaginable to deal with this country's dollar problem except to adopt the regimen which all the experts—be they liberal or conservative economists—agree would be the real cure.

For example, President Kennedy agrees that one way to help the balance-of-payments problem would be to cut down on the Government's own huge outpayments of dollars. But while he is willing to trim this slightly, he is unwilling to make any substantial cuts which would restrict his desired foreign aid program.

Again, the President's economic advisers will agree that restrictive monetary and budget policies—allowing interest rates to rise and halting the creation of new dollars to finance budget deficits—could make a radical improvement in our international accounts. Such measures would work in many ways: They would increase foreign confidence in the dollar, decrease the flow of capital abroad, increase the flow of foreign capital from abroad, and so on.

But here too the curative measures, which almost everyone agrees on as a matter of economic therapy, are resisted out of fear that they will cause pangs in the domestic economy. They would, so it is thought, curtail the economic growth by which the administration sets such store. Or at least they might take some of the bloom off the boom, and that at a time when an election is approaching.

Now it is possible that some of these things might happen. Allowing a general rise in interest rates (short-term rates have been nudged up somewhat) to attract foreign capital, or keep domestic capital home, does also mean a rise in interest rates within the U.S. economy. This could have the effect of postponing some projects presently planned on the basis of lower interest rates, especially those of a speculative character.

A reduction in the Government's deficit would also not pass unfelt. Obviously some of its spending projects too would have to be postponed until another day, and this would mean that some segments of the economy, especially those highly dependent on the Government, might not find things as happy as otherwise.

But it doesn't follow that these effects would be as painful as the fearful think. They never have been for the nations which have followed these so-called restrictive policies in order to restore the necessary health to their currencies.

The reason for this, it seems to us, is not obscure. A sound regimen, whether in economics or any other of the affairs of men, is the surest provider of economic health and continued growth. When a nation has a currency which its own people, and people beyond its borders, will trust and depend upon then it has the best basis for a prosperous country.

And the converse of this is certainly plain. Whatever passing discomfort this country might feel from a restrictive diet is nothing compared to the danger to its growth and prosperity from an indulgence that threatens the health of the dollar.

Untrammeled Power Embodied in the Civil Rights Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. George Todt, in writing for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, has prepared an excellent article on an important address which recently was delivered by the Honorable John C. Satterfield, who was president of the American Bar Association in 1961–62. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Todt's article, dated August 28, 1963, and entitled "Trojan

Horse of 1963," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: TROJAN HORSE OF 1963

"Never in the history of nations governed by elected officials has the head of any state demanded naked untrammeled power as is embodied in this (Civil Rights) Act, except when such state was upon the verge of becoming a dictatorship."—John C. Satterfield, president, American Bar Association in 1961–62.

Today a cheering, emotional mob is marching on Congress in the Nation's Capital and it threatens the very foundations of our limited constitutional Republic.

There is considerably more to the shadowy, almost invisible forces behind the so-called Civil Rights Act than outwardly meets the eye. It is time to speak out frankly on this subject. What is the real score here?

"When future generations look back through the eyes of history at this legislation," said former ABA president, John A. Satterfield, at the Army and Navy Club in Washington recently, "they will recognize 10 percent civil rights and 90 percent extension of raw Federal power. It is 'The Trojan Horse of 1963'."

TOTAL CONTROL?

A careful analysis of the proposed legislation clearly demonstrates the fact that this bill is designed to establish unlimited Federal control over the States, business and—in many instances—private individuals.

It seems apparent that the American people are being deliberately misled on this controversial matter. Under the guise of civil rights, this piece of legislation (S. 1731) is being presented as merely seeking to give the Negroes the rights to which they may hitherto have been denied. But this is only the gimmick to take our eye off the ball.

What then, is the basic underlying purpose of the administration-backed legislation?

"The proposed extension of Federal executive and administrative control over business, industry, individual citizens, and the States by the package of legislation called the Civil Rights Act of 1963," Satterfield pointed out in his hard-hitting address, "exceeds the sum total of all such extensions by all decisions of the Supreme Court and all acts of Congress from 1787 to June 19, 1963."

The eminent lawyer indicated that if the bill becomes enacted into law, the checks and balances set up by the Constitution of the United States will have been destroyed.

CONTROLLED LIFE

The 50 various States, themselves, will become little more than local government agencies, existing as appendages of the central government—and largely subject to its control.

In reality, this legislation assumes a totally powerful National Government with unending authority to intervene in all private affairs among men—and to control and adjust property relationships in accordance with the judgment of Government personnel.

Under such circumstances, it is manifestly impossible to prevent Federal intervention from becoming an institutionalization of special privilege for political pressure groups. Is this to become our future concept of American democracy?

Those of my readers who desire a free copy of Satterfield's brilliant address may obtain it by request at the following address: Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Suite 520, 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.

No good American questions the right of all other citizens to hear both sides of any controversial story. Or as many sides as may be pertinent concerning informed controversy to which we are a component part. Let's read this revealing booklet.

Few of us are against civil rights or freedoms within correct bounds for any of our fellow men. But thinking people do not set fire to the barn to roast a pig for dinner. The end does not always justify the means.

In this case of the intended civil rights bill of 1963, many persons applaud the ultimate aims—but not the present methods proposed by the administration to obtain them. Shall we destroy our vaunted American free enterprise system?

A DICTATORSHIP

The strong-arm methods and means advocated by proponents of the legislation, their camouflaged desire to turn the Federal Government into something akin to dictatorship, is all too reminiscent of the Fabian ideology of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action. George Orwell, here we come.

One of the more painfully obvious manifestations of the bill is that most of its chief proponents have been adept practitioners and followers of the ADA line—the so-called braintrust of the liberal establishment today.

Let's hear from typical American Joe Doakes on this controversy.

Resolution by the Association of Retired Railroad Employees, Roanoke, Va., July 22, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to report that the Association of Retired Railroad Employees of Roanoke, Va., has adopted a resolution endorsing H.R. 21, the Bow bill for medical care for the aged, and I include a copy of the resolution with my remarks:

RESOLUTION BY THE ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED RAILROAD EMPLOYEES, ROANOKE, VA., JULY 22, 1963

Whereas we are of the opinion that health care for the aged among our own people is a recognized problem that should be solved by providing such medical health care; and

Whereas we have given careful consideration to a bill introduced by Congressman KING of California, being H.R. 3920 and cited as a bill to provide, under the social security program, for payment of hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; and

1. We are of the opinion that the provisions of H.R. 3920 can be obtained only at the price of certain freedom; and

2. That we are not prepared to pay the price nor to saddle future generations with the denial of such freedom; and

3. That while we speak of the freedom of others in the world we should constantly resist surrendering our own freedom; and

4. That we believe H.R. 3920 is a discrimination against social security workers; and

5. We feel that H.R. 3920 would establish a form of dictatorship in matters pertaining to health insurance, hospital and medical care, the operation of hospitals, and the practice of medicine; and

Whereas we have given careful consideration to the provisions of a bill introduced by the Honorable FRANK T. BOW, being H.R. 21 and cited as Health Insurance Benefits Act of 1963; and

6. We find that H.R. 21 does not contain any of the serious objections found in H.R. 3920; and

7. That H.R. 21 will distribute the cost equally among those best able to pay, while at the same time it will benefit those least able to pay; and

8. That H.R. 21 is more comprehensive, with greater coverage, both as to beneficiaries and medical services; and

Whereas H.R. 21 will benefit retired railroad workers as well as others, and will in effect be equivalent to an increase in railroad retirement annuities, while at the same time it will not cause the railroad retirement fund to suffer, but on the other hand will help to solve a problem brought about by drastic reduction in the total number of active railroad workers throughout the Nation; and

Whereas H.R. 21 was unanimously endorsed by the Association of Retired Railroad Employees, Roanoke District, at a meeting on Thursday, July 18, 1963, and the policy committee directed to draw up the resolutions contained herein: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the bill introduced by the Honorable FRANK T. BOW, being H.R. 21, and cited as the Health Insurance Benefit Act of 1963 is hereby strongly endorsed by the Association of Retired Railroad Employees, Roanoke District, and we strongly urge that the Congress of the United States enact it into law; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, chairman, Ways and Means Committee; Hon. Frank T. Bow, Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Harry F. Byrd, U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.; Hon. A. Willis Robertson, U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Richard H. Poff, Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Geo. Finnigan, president, National Railroad Pension Forum, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Robert W. Fry, president, American Association of Retired Persons, Roanoke chapter, Roanoke, Va.; Dr. Earl R. Glendy, president, Roanoke Academy of Medicine, Roanoke, Va.

V. M. HEAZEL,
Chairman.

A. A. AKERS,
Cochairman, Policy Committee.

Stewart Udall Is the Administration's Leader of Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the exceptional executive guidance of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has assisted the administration of President Kennedy in becoming foremost in the history of the United States in seashore conservation programs.

His record of achievement, with the support of an administration and a Congress attuned to the growing importance of conservation of all of our natural resources, is recognized in the September-October edition of the magazine Listen, which featured his photograph on the cover, and an article captioned "Secretary of the Interior Udall—Builder of Monuments."

As author of the bill passed by the 87th Congress establishing a national sea-

shore recreation area on 81½ miles of Padre Island, off the Texas gulf coast, I am personally familiar with Secretary Udall's strong and able advocacy of worthwhile conservation legislation.

In fact, with his leadership, the 87th Congress exceeded all others in the Nation's history in preserving three magnificent national seashore recreational areas, one on Padre Island on the Gulf of Mexico coast, one on Cape Cod on the Atlantic coast, and at Point Reyes on the Pacific coast. Many other national park and national monument bills are under consideration at this time. The future generations of this country are fortunate in having Secretary Udall to protect their interests.

Such achievement is made possible by all-out support by President Kennedy, who this month will visit several Western States to inspect and advance our national parks, seashores, wilderness areas, dams and power and redevelopment projects.

Texans are especially aware that without the support of President Kennedy and Secretary Udall, the public would soon have found the beaches and dunes of Padre Island under fence, with wall-to-wall development. We are appreciative also of the fine support given to establishment of Old Fort Davis, high in the rugged Davis Mountains, as a national historic site. Old Fort Davis is a pre-Civil War and post-Civil War frontier fort midway on the route from Carlsbad Cavern National Park on the north to Big Bend National Park on the south, and is already attracting many visitors. It is the fort of the camel experiments of the 1850's and one of the forts of the Apache wars.

Also in Texas, we are working for preservation of a national monument at the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo culture sites, near Amarillo. The quarries, mined for flint to make weapons thousands of years ago, when mastodons roamed the Southwest, are near Amarillo, Tex., an area visited last year by Secretary Udall when he attended ground-breaking ceremonies for the Canadian River project, a Reclamation project, where his leadership has also been of great assistance to my State.

I ask unanimous consent that the article on Secretary Udall from Listen magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today by way of underscoring the great strides being made by this administration in preserving our natural resources.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UDALL—BUILDER OF MONUMENTS

(By Francis A. Soper)

Three centuries ago Sir Christopher Wren designed a new St. Paul's Cathedral in London following the great fire of 1666. Over the north door of this cathedral appears this famous inscription regarding his work: "If you would see his monument, look around."

In various parts of the United States a person will one of these days be able to look around and see monuments to another builder, one of a different sort, indeed, but a dedicated builder nonetheless.

This modern builder is Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, whose personal passion is to preserve nature unspoiled. In what he terms the "quiet crisis" of our day he sees the beautiful open spaces of nature being swallowed up by the grinding wheels and massive progress of our mechanical age, leaving a shortage of "open and green space."

Since assuming his office early in 1961, this vigorous son of the outdoors has developed a multipronged program to conserve the resources of woodlands, mountains, seas, and deserts and to develop scenic areas for the enjoyment of all the people.

He is convinced that "we are learning that the search of modern, urban man is not for new ways to conquer nature—but for ways to save the beauty of the out-of-doors so that, to use Robert Frost's words, man can gain new insight from 'country things.'"

Nothing pleases Secretary Udall more than to find time to climb mountains himself, shoot rapids, and relax around an open campfire away from the rush of crowded concrete jungles. He believes in using and enjoying America's natural resources, and at the same time preserving them.

His is the conviction expressed by that frontiersman, Robert W. Service, in "The Spell of the Yukon":

"The strong life that never knows harness;
The wilds where the caribou call;
The freshness, the freedom, the farness—
O God! How I'm stuck on it all."

"We stand today at the open door of a new—and possibly final—opportunity," the Secretary says. "Our land-use patterns will soon be fixed. What we save now will be all that is saved. By our action, or inaction, we will determine whether our children will know the green and pleasant land which was our legacy."

And he goes on, "What we need now is a truly national program which affirms the worth of our vast land resources and prescribes solutions to prevent continued despoilment and promote the highest kinds of preservation."

To implement such a national program, this farsighted guardian of natural resources has developed and advocated the wilderness bill, now under consideration by Congress. The intent of this bill is to preserve free from commercial exploitation about 2 percent of our land and "leave it the way God made it."

One chief interest of Secretary Udall is the national park system. Under his prodding Congress has created three national seashores—Cape Cod on the east coast, Padre Island on the gulf coast of Texas, and Point Reyes on the Pacific coast. These constitute the first major additions to the park system in some 16 years. A host of other plans, both for expansion of national parks and for encouraging the States to expand their public recreation facilities, is underway. A dozen or 15 new national park proposals are being studied.

And he is a man in a hurry. "We lose a million acres of open space annually to commercial and highway development, with the resultant diminishing of the qualities which formed our national character," he declares. "We are working against the relentless ticking of the clock—time is against us in our efforts to preserve open space."

Furthermore, this effort is not all along traditional conservationist lines. Mr. Udall sees great natural value in our swamplands as preservers of wildlife and centers for nature study. He envisions, too, great strides in researching the untapped resources of our seas. Our knowledge in this area is very limited, he says.

So, in his concept, conservation is defined broadly in the following way: "The wise use of our natural environment; it is, in the final analysis, the highest form of national thrift—the prevention of waste and despoilment while preserving, improving, and renewing the quality and usefulness of all our resources."

Nor do his wide-ranging convictions stop here. Though his official duties have to do with water, forests, minerals, parks, and wildlife, he is also deeply concerned with the physical fitness of the people who are to use and enjoy these natural resources.

"One of the reasons I think America has emerged as a strong country is that we have had to be strong. We have had a big country to conquer, and have had to be physically fit to conquer it. I think people are happiest when they are fit physically."

In advocating an adequate program of recreation and exercise, especially in the outdoors, this national leader echoes Theodore Roosevelt, who declared, "I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life."

And such a life is not exclusively for adults, in the opinion of Secretary Udall. Youth today need to learn how best to utilize the outdoors in their own program of keeping physically fit, and to cultivate positive living habits in the face of a general tendency to "take things easy," for of what use will well-kept resources of nature be if the people are not in a position to enjoy them firsthand?

In the early days of our Nation, he comments, men had to be more rugged physically. Today we have machines to do our work and to carry us around, so we have greater need for outdoor exercise.

And as he speaks he looks up wistfully from the chair in which he is seated in his spacious Washington, D.C., office and fixes his gaze on the large colored pictures on his wall showing the rugged Tetons of Wyoming and Rainbow Bridge in Utah. Obviously, he would feel more at home climbing the mountainous heights or tramping the trails in the open. His lean, muscular build shows that he is advocating that which he knows best.

True fitness results from a balanced approach, according to the Secretary, having to do with the body, the mind, and the soul. Also there is a negative aspect about it—the leaving behind of those things which are harmful or destructive in order to gain the better overall positive purposes in life. "We are much better off with clean habits," he observes. And his serious concern for the welfare of youth shows up clearly as he goes on, "If young people start off right, they will have every chance of living a long and happy life."

The importance of personal living habits and right mental attitudes, with spiritual undergirding, comes out again as Secretary of the Interior Udall concludes, "The future greatness of our country rests ultimately on what kind of individuals we are and whether each person achieves his own standard of excellence."

Indeed, if the Secretary's ideals are fully developed, his "monuments" will be not only in the form of new national parks, preserved wilderness areas, and conserved natural resources, but also in the better health of our citizenry, the balanced growth of our young people, and a greater strength of our Nation as a whole.

Federal Educational Efforts Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the comedy of errors in Federal aid to education and federally forced integration may be

found in the impacted area schools situation.

The Government, to force integration at and near military bases, is duplicating existing school facilities so that there are discriminatory advantages on the one hand and too many classrooms for children involved on the other.

The following study by Jonathan Spivak in the Wall Street Journal is full of lessons to be learned but which probably will pass unnoticed by many Government administrators and legislators. These include: First, Federal aid is inequitable; second, forced integration does not solve the problems underlying integration; third, local control and operation of schools is preferable to Federal control; fourth, school needs are correctly assessed by local residents, incorrectly assessed by Federal authorities; and fifth, Federal aid is more costly.

These are but some of the legitimate criticisms disclosed in this article which follows:

IMPACTED AREA SCHOOLS: THEIR INTEGRATION IS PROVING COSTLY, WASTEFUL, AND VEXING

(By Jonathan Spivak)

FORT RUCKER, ALA.—When school bells ring this morning, some 1,200 white and Negro children will file into a spanking new $1,038,000 schoolhouse built on the base here by Uncle Sam this summer for the sake of integration.

Meanwhile, a few hundred yards from the camp gates, a segregated public school, also costing $1 million and financed with Federal funds, will remain two-thirds empty. Most of its white students have been transferred to the Army school, in company with a handful of Negro military dependents that previously attended a local all-colored school. At most, it's estimated only 30 Negro pupils at Fort Rucker will be enrolled in the new integrated school on post.

"As a taxpayer, every time I think of the waste and expense it makes my blood boil," exclaims one local resident. Such sentiments, of course, are tinged with segregationist sympathies. But, surprisingly enough, similar opinions are expressed by many Washington officials involved in this Kennedy administration civil rights effort to provide integrated schools for military dependents in the South.

Besides Fort Rucker, new Government elementary schools are opening today at Fort McClellan and Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., Fort Stewart and Robins Air Force Base, Ga., Fort Jackson and Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, S.C., and England Air Force Base, La. The total construction costs: $4,298,100.

LIBERAL COMPLAINTS

The undertaking was launched by former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary RIBICOFF under the so-called impacted areas program that provides Federal aid for construction and operation of public schools in districts burdened with a large proportion of Federal employees, civilian or military. Even before the present integration crisis, liberal Congressmen and civil rights had been complaining that the 13-year-old impacted program was funneling funds into segregated schools in the South.

In response, last March Mr. RIBICOFF decreed that federally aided schools near military installations must accept service dependents without discrimination by the fall of 1963 or the Department would build its own facilities on base. In addition, the Justice Department has filed five suits seeking to achieve broader desegregation of the impacted areas program; the Government has won one and lost two decisions in lower courts.

At the time, Federal officials had no precise idea of what impact the Ribicoff ruling might have, though they felt it would be substantial. But a subsequent Government survey revealed that partial desegregation had already occurred or suits were pending at local schools near 33 of 76 major southern bases. In addition, 13 bases had no Negro children in residence, and others were either too small to make school operations practicable or had no space available for a building, such as the Charleston, S.C., Naval Base.

This left, at the outside, a potential of 32,000 military dependents who were attending segregated off-base public schools. HEW planners hoped all of these schools could be persuaded to desegregate voluntarily. Those enrolling only 12,000 pupils complied, and the Department reluctantly concluded it would have to make good on its school construction threat.

A SHORT SCHEDULE

But present plans provide only a partial solution. Barring further integration gains, at least six more elementary schools and several high schools will be needed next year. Other problems are already being encountered.

More significantly, it won't be clear until all attendance figures are in how accurately HEW has calculated the military's school needs. The enrollment estimates of 4,620 had to be made early in the spring for construction purposes before there was any firm knowledge of what effect summertime transfers would have on the number of school age dependents at individual bases. Officials are crossing their fingers that overcrowding or excess capacity won't become troublesome at some of the new schools.

It's likely, however, that whatever the final figures, the actual amount of integration achieved will be token. Last year, out of a total of 3,673 military pupils, only 112 were colored. For example, Maxwell Air Force Base, which has received a new $514,000 school, had only three Negro school-age dependents in 1962.

Other drawbacks to the program have become apparent. Some officials thought it would serve, at least in part, to punish segregation-minded southern schools by depriving them of much needed Federal payments. But it has turned out that as long as military dependents are taught on base, local public school authorities can make sufficient cutbacks in their expenses to compensate for the loss of revenue.

The cost to the Government is also substantially increased. Outlays for operating the eight military schools are estimated at $1,528,277 in the coming school year, compared to $650,000 which would otherwise have been paid to local school districts for educating these same students.

But perhaps the greatest irony, Government experts admit, is that there's no way to require military parents to send their offspring to the integrated on-base schools. In fact, military commanders have been cautioned that it's illegal to exert any compulsion. While no major defections are anticipated, if military parents do enroll their children in segregated public schools, impacted fund payments would have to be made as in the past.

And, of course, since only elementary schools have been built at these bases, an estimated 2,000 or more high school students will continue to attend segregated off-base public schools. To make matters even more complicated, because of the technical basis of the Ribicoff ruling, the military schools will be open only to children living on post. Elementary school-age dependents residing off base must remain in all-white, or all-Negro public schools, even though there might be space available for them in the integrated on-base schools.

Because of such complications, Federal officials would privately be overjoyed to chuck the whole school-building effort, if a way out could be found.

"It's sort of like opening a can of eels," comments one HEW expert.

The most attractive avenue would be a clear-cut victory in the Government's impacted area suits. These would offer a far more effective and less costly remedy by forcing local public schools receiving impacted aid to desegregate—without the stratagem of building duplicate Government facilities.

The administration long has tried to cut back the entire impacted areas aid program. Though Congress has allowed some portions to expire as of June 30, it's anticipated the lawmakers will extend the program for at least another year before the session ends.

In the 13 years the program already has been on the books, military authorities have gained considerable experience in school administration. More than 100 schools have already been built by the Government on Federal property. The military runs about 20 although wherever possible the services usually have turned responsibility over to local public school authorities on the theory the civilians can do a better job.

FEDERAL REASONING

HEW, in fact, at first intended to enlist the aid of local segregated school districts in running the eight new military schools. Its reasoning was that if local authorities could be persuaded to take on this responsibility it would be a healthy gradual step toward more thorough desegregation in the area. Experience in operating the on-base schools would show the local folk that integration was no great devil, it was hoped.

But a first-class ruckus ensued when the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other prointegration groups learned of these plans. HEW was accused of giving added aid and comfort to segregated school districts rather than depriving them of such Federal funds. And for a time it appeared that the school-building effort might ironically become a major political liability.

The Department, however, quickly executed an about-face and argued it had never really been serious about letting the public school districts handle the job in the first place. Nonetheless, the bureaucrats who run the impacted area program still contend it would have made far more sense, both for civil rights and educational reasons, if the assignment had not been given to the military.

A visit to the new Fort Rucker school leaves no doubt that it's already the envy of local school folk. "They've got better facilities and equipment, but is it right to do that for a small group of Federal employees and no one else?" complains Thomas M. Alexander, superintendent of schools in nearby Ozark.

Army officials say the Rucker School is the largest single unit elementary school in the State. Its principal, W. M. Lewis, who formerly headed the public school which Rucker children had attended until this year, will receive a salary of $9,000 annually, high by State standards. Teachers' pay scales will start at $3,700 a year, $100 to $200 more than salaries in surrounding schools. The advantage of Federal civil service retirement benefits is also appealing. As a result, the Army has hired a number of teachers away from local schools.

But the real educational problems created by the Rucker School devolve on the nearby Daleview Public Elementary School which has lost most of its pupils, as well as its principal and eight teachers to the Army facility. Daleview will no longer have a full-time librarian or manual or fine arts teachers. Nor is it certain that the school will be able to provide special education classes for the retarded and severely handicapped. To economize on operating costs,

two of its three classroom wings will probably be closed down but even so the remaining space may not be fully used.

"I think it's a waste of money when we could take care of all the pupils," says a Daleview teacher, and this comment seems to summarize the judgment of many others here and in Washington on this desegregation operation.

Civil Rights—A Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, every news media in existence today is cluttered with articles pertaining to civil rights. In the midst of this mass hysteria to write anything and everything on civil rights, I have come across an article which, in my opinion, presents one of the most intelligent and logical discussions of the racial problem that I have read in the past months. I refer to an article entitled "Civil Rights—A Challenge." It was written by Robert Bork, and was reprinted in the New Republic magazine on August 31, 1963.

Mr. Bork approaches sensibly and rationally the racial dispute and its manifestations. This approach has been a rarity throughout the entire existence of the racial problem.

I urge every Senator to read this worthwhile article, for I believe the only solution to the rights problem is to deal with it rationally and intelligently, as Mr. Bork does in his article. It is never the path to a wise decision to throw all rationale and logic to the wind, in order to gain a given objective. This is just the situation we face today when we consider the demands of the civil rights leaders and proponents. They would willingly throw away democracy and the freedom that we in America have fought for for decades, to build in order to gain what they consider equality for a few, at the expense of all. As Mr. Bork states in his article—

> If, every time an intensely felt moral principle is involved, we spend freedom, we will run short of it.

Mr. President, I ask that this outstanding article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS—A CHALLENGE

(By Robert Bork)

Passions are running so high over racial discrimination that the various proposals to legislate its manifestations out of existence seem likely to become textbook examples of the maxim that great and urgent issues are rarely discussed in terms of the principles they necessarily involve. In this case, the danger is that justifiable abhorrence of racial discrimination will result in legislation by which the morals of the majority are self-righteously imposed upon a minority. That has happened before in the United States—prohibition being the most notorious instance—but whenever it happens it is likely to be subversive of free institutions.

Instead of a discussion of the merits of legislation, of which the proposed Interstate Public Accommodations Act outlawing discrimination in business facilities serving the public may be taken as the prototype, we are treated to debate whether it is more or less cynical to pass the law under the commerce power or the 14th amendment, and whether the Supreme Court is more likely to hold it constitutional one way or the other. Heretical though it may sound to the constitutional sages, neither the Constitution nor the Supreme Court qualifies as a first principle. The discussion we ought to hear is of the cost in freedom that must be paid for such legislation, the morality of enforcing morals through law, and the likely consequences for law enforcement of trying to do so.

Few proponents of legislation such as the Interstate Public Accommodations Act seem willing to discuss either the cost in freedom which must accompany it or why this particular departure from freedom of the individual to choose with whom he will deal is justified. Attorney General Kennedy appears to recognize but to wish to avoid these questions, for, in speaking on behalf of the bill before a congressional committee, he went so far as to state that the law would create no precedent. That of course is nothing less than an admission that he does not care to defend the bill on general principles.

There seems to be a strong disposition on the part of proponents of the legislation simply to ignore the fact that it means a loss in a vital area of personal liberty. That it does is apparent. The legislature would inform a substantial body of the citizenry that in order to continue to carry on the trades in which they are established they must deal with and serve persons with whom they do not wish to associate. In part the willingness to overlook that loss of freedom arises from the feeling that it is irrational to choose associates on the basis of racial characteristics. Behind that judgment, however, lies an unexpressed natural-law view that some personal preferences are rational, that others are irrational, and that a majority may impose upon a minority its scale of preferences. The fact that the coerced scale of preferences is said to be rooted in a moral order does not alter the impact upon freedom. In a society that purports to value freedom as an end in itself, the simple argument from morality to law can be a dangerous non sequitur. Prof. Mark DeWolf Howe, in supporting the proposed legislation, describes southern opposition to "the Nation's objective" as an effort "to preserve ugly customs of a stubborn people." So it is. Of the ugliness of racial discrimination there need be no argument (though there may be some presumption in identifying one's own hotly controverted aims with the objective of the Nation). But it is one thing when stubborn people express their racial antipathies in laws which prevent individuals, whether white or Negro, from dealing with those who are willing to deal with them, and quite another to tell them that even as individuals they may not act on their racial preferences in particular areas of life. The principle of such legislation is that if I find your behavior ugly by my standards, moral or aesthetic, and if you prove stubborn about adopting my view of the situation, I am justified in having the state coerce you into more righteous paths. That is itself a principle of unsurpassed ugliness.

Freedom is a value of very high priority and the occasions upon which it is sacrificed ought to be kept to a minimum. It is necessary that the police protect a man from assault or theft but it is a long leap from that to protection from the insult implied by the refusal of another individual to associate or deal with him. The latter involves a principle whose logical reach is difficult to limit. If it is permissible to tell a barber or a rooming house owner that he must deal with all who come to him regardless of race or religion, then it is impossible to see why a doctor, lawyer, accountant, or any other professional or businessman should have the right to discriminate. Indeed, it would be unfair discrimination to leave anybody engaged in any commercial activity with that right. Nor does it seem fair or rational, given the basic premise, to confine the principle to equal treatment of Negroes as customers. Why should the law not require not merely fair hiring of Negroes in subordinate positions but the choice of partners or associates in a variety of business and professional endeavors without regard to race or creed? Though such a law might presently be unenforcible, there is no distinction in principle between it and what is proposed. It is difficult to see an end to the principle of enforcing fair treatment by private individuals. It certainly need not be confined to racial or commercial matters. The best way to demonstrate the expansiveness of the principle behind the proposed legislation is to examine the arguments which are used to justify it.

Perhaps the most common popular justification of such a law is based on a crude notion of waivers: insistence that barbers, lunch counter operators, and similar businessmen serve all comers does not infringe their freedom because they "hold themselves out to serve the public." The statement is so obviously a fiction that it scarcely survives articulation. The very reason for the proposed legislation is precisely that some individuals have made it as clear as they can that they do not hold themselves out to serve the public.

A second popular argument, usually heard in connection with laws proposed to be laid under the 14th amendment, is that the rationale which required the voiding of laws enforcing segregation also requires the prohibition of racial discrimination by business licensed by any governmental unit because State action is involved. The only legitimate thrust of the State action characterization, however, is to enable courts to see through governmental use of private organizations to enforce an official policy of segregation. There is a fundamental difference between saying that the State cannot turn over its primary election process, which is actually the only election that matters, to the private and all-white Democratic Party and saying that a chiropodist cannot refuse a Negro patient because a State board has examined him and certified his competence. The State-action concept must be confined to discerning State enforcement of policy through a nominally private agency or else it becomes possible to discern the hand of the State in every private action.

One of the shabbiest forms of argument is that endorsed by James Reston when he described the contest over the public accommodations bill as one between human rights and property rights. Presumably no one of liberal views has any difficulty deciding the question when so concisely put. One wishes nonetheless, that Mr. Reston would explain just who has rights with respect to property other than humans. If A demands to deal with B and B insists that for reasons sufficient to himself he wants nothing to do with A, I suppose even Reston would agree that both are claiming human rights and that this is in no way changed if one of the humans is colored and the other white. How does the situation change if we stipulate that they are standing on opposite sides of a barber chair and that B owns it?

A number of people seem to draw a distinction between commercial relationships

and all others. They feel justified, somehow, in compelling a roominghouse owner or the proprietor of a lunch counter to deal with all comers without regard to race but would not legislate acceptance of Negroes into private clubs or homes. The rationale appears to be that one relationship is highly personal and the other is just business. Under any system which allows the individual to determine his own values that distinction is unsound. It is, moreover, patently fallacious as a description of reality. The very bitterness of the resistance to the demand for enforced integration arises because owners of many places of business do in fact care a great deal about whom they serve. The real meaning of the distinction is simply that some people do not think others ought to care that much about that particular aspect of their freedom.

One of the Kennedy administration's arguments for the bill is that it is necessary to provide legal redress in order to get the demonstrators out of the streets. That cannot be taken seriously as an independent argument. If southern white racists—or northern ones, for that matter—were thronging the streets, demanding complete segregation of commercial facilities, it is to be hoped that no responsible politician would suggest passing a law to enable them to enforce their demands in court. In this connection, it is possible to be somewhat less than enthusiastic about the part played by moral leaders in participating in demonstrations against private persons who discriminate in choice of their patrons. It feeds the danger of the violence which they are the first to deplore. That might nevertheless be tolerable if they were demonstrating against a law that coerced discrimination. They are actually part of a mob coercing and disturbing other private individuals in the exercise of their freedom. Their moral position is about the same as Carrie Nation's when she and her followers invaded saloons.

Though the basic objection is to the law's impact upon individual liberty, it is also appropriate to question the practicality of enforcing a law which runs contrary to the customs, indeed the moral beliefs, of a large portion of the country. Of what value is a law which compels service to Negroes without close surveillance to make sure the service is on the same terms given to whites? It is not difficult to imagine many ways in which barbers, landlords, lunch counter operators, and the like can nominally comply with the law but effectively discourage Negro patrons. Must Federal law enforcement agencies become in effect public utility commissions charged with the supervision of the Nation's business establishment or will the law become an unenforceable symbol of hypocritical righteousness?

It is sad to have to defend the principle of freedom in this context, but the task ought not to be left to those southern politicians who only a short while ago were defending laws that enforced racial segregation. There seem to be few who favor racial equality who also perceive or are willing to give primacy to the value of freedom in this struggle. A short while back the majority of the Nation's moral and intellectual leaders opposed all the manifestations of McCarthyism and quite correctly assured the Nation that the issue was not whether communism was good or evil but whether men ought to be free to think and talk as they pleased. Those same leaders seem to be running with the other pack this time. Yet the issue is the same. It is not whether racial prejudice or preference is a good thing but whether individual men ought to be free to deal and associate with whom they please for whatever reasons appeal to them. This time stubborn people with ugly customs are under attack rather than intellectuals and academicians; but that sort of personal comparison surely ought not to make the difference.

The trouble with freedom is that it will be used in ways we abhor. It then takes great self restraint to avoid sacrificing it, just this once, to another end. One may agree that it is immoral to treat a man according to his race or religion and yet question whether that moral preference deserves elevation to the level of the principle of individual freedom and self-determination. If, every time an intensely felt moral principle is involved, we spend freedom, we will run short of it.

Attempts To Bring About Off-Base Integration of the Races

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial—from the Marion Star, of Marion, S.C. entitled "Our White Corpuscles Boil." The editorial expresses the feelings of the people of my State on the McNamara order which would inject our military-base commanders into local political affairs, by trying to bring about off-base integration of the races.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WHITE CORPUSCLES BOIL

Not too long ago Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker, a soldier of honor who distinguished himself in World War II and was awarded the highest medal his Government could bestow, was relieved from his command because of his participation in politics. He was instructing his troops against the dangers of communism. The President and the military considered this unbecoming to an officer of the U.S. Army and contrary to the agelong policy of nonpolitical activity by military personnel.

But recently the Government dispatched a directive to Air Force base commanders across the Nation to allow military personnel to participate in racial demonstrations. As the Washington Star expressed it "it puts military men in politics up to their brass hats."

The Columbia Record spent much of last week contacting the Pentagon and trying to get the full text of the directive. As yet, no success. The guide, according to the powers in Washington, is classified and "for official use only."

This is just another example of the means the Kennedys will resort to to pass their civil rights program now before the Congress. First it was economic boycott—cutting off all Federal aid to education in impacted military areas. Now authorization for the military to don their civies and march down the streets, jam segregated eating establishments, carry placards, and otherwise disregard State laws and take part in civil strife that could precipitate civil war in vast areas of the Nation.

When we think that we are bleeding ourselves white to pay high taxes to maintain a large standing military so that they can demonstrate for (or against) integration, this makes our white corpuscles boil.

The Danger of Government by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an important article, written by Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt, entitled "By Executive Order." This article, which was printed in the August 25, 1963, issue of the Shreveport Journal, points out the danger of Government by Executive order. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is waking up to the gradual usurpation of its lawmaking powers by the White House.

Use of executive orders to reduce the powers of Congress and increase the powers of the White House and the administration generally has shown itself to be a calculated procedure. The notorious Fulbright memorandum which was enforced as if it were law has, in effect, resulted in the liquidation of the anti-Communist seminars that were alerting the American people and the military to Communist tactics. Another example was the action taken by the President shortly after he took power abolishing by Executive order all restrictions against Communist propaganda mailed to this country.

The only word which properly applies to this type of government by Executive order is dictatorship. Congressmen have gone along under threat of losing Federal grants and projects in the areas they represent and under pressure from the biggest White House lobby ever known.

The New Frontier holds Congress in such slight regard that the Peace Corps was initially set up by Executive order on March 1, 1961. Here, the issue is not the pros and cons of these measures but the principles involved.

In February of this year a number of Executive orders were issued assigning sweeping powers to Federal agencies for emergencies which can be declared at the will of the President. Plans so far even include private property by Government, and billeting, that is, quartering strangers in citizens' homes. Earlier, on November 20, 1962, the President by Executive order ordered equal opportunity in housing, which is tantamount to legislation by the executive branch of the Government.

The latest attempt to bypass congressional procedures, which has created a storm in Congress, is the administration's move to implement by Executive order the recommendation in the report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, known as the Gesell report.

After a letter from President Kennedy to Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara commending this report the Defense Department issued a directive saying that military commanders have the duty to oppose discrimination in offbase areas and nearby communities. Here again, the issue is not one of whether segregation should exist in America.

Rather, it is that this Executive order uses the military as a political instrument to carry out the social programs of the White House. The directive even goes so far as to set up an informer system. It says:

"The military department shall institute in each service a system for regularly reporting, monitoring, and measuring progress in achieving equal opportunities on and off base."

Already Defense Department officials have compiled "little black books" on leading businessmen in the South. Some of these dossiers, containing about 40 names of prominent Mississippi businessmen, were produced on the floor of the House by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana. These Pentagon files contain, HÉBERT said, material about the relatives of these men, their contacts, their philosophy of government—in other words, "how to get to them." Other dossiers produced by Representative HÉBERT contain reports on the economies in segregated communities near bases. Obviously, the purpose is the use of economic boycott as recommended in the Gesell report.

Some of these Pentagon dossiers are marked "for official use only" to stop Congress and the American people from learning about these gestapo-like methods.

Significantly, the man who authored the Defense Department Directive 5120.27 implementing the Gesell report is none other than Adam Yarmolinsky. Under the usual "liberal" double standard, this same Yarmolinsky who is now Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, opposed the Federal security program's use of secret investigators in his report "Case Studies in Personnel Security," August 1955.

Tactics which are immediately denounced when used against the Communists are considered legitimate when used by the administration in its power grab.

Indications that Yarmolinsky's thinking is influenced by those who use the tactic of social reform to alter our form of government is suggested by information produced by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin. In 1961, according to LAIRD, Yarmolinsky recommended to the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel that special examinations be given to afford preferential treatment to Negroes wishing admittance to service academies. Obviously, such a directive would not create genuine equality of opportunity for all but an equalitarian system calculated to cause racial discord and to impair the quality of our military training.

No wonder that the continuing campaign to transform not only the military but every agency of Government into political puppets with strings pulled by the Executive is causing concern to Members of Congress. Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, has introduced a House resolution calling for a Joint Committee on Executive Orders to advise Congress on whether these orders conform to our Constitution.

Others in Congress recall that they have not only the right but the responsibility to withhold funds and to reorganize and even abolish Government offices when deemed necessary. But only we the people can encourage and force our legislators to assume the powers lawfully theirs. The precedent used by all dictators for suppressive laws is always carefully selected popular programs.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

What Business Can Do for America—By President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Nations Business, the publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, President Kennedy has written a concise and lucid article on what American business can do for America.

The President not only discusses what business can do for our country but what government and business can do together in order to achieve certain aims and goals under our free enterprise system.

I believe that this article is of such importance and of wide general interest to the American business community and others that the President's statement should be read and restudied and given meaningful consideration and attention.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the President's article in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT BUSINESS CAN DO FOR AMERICA

(By President John F. Kennedy)

Members of the business community play a vital role in maintaining and building the strength of the American economy—in converting its great potential into higher standards of living and free world leadership.

It is to this community—guided by the free play of market forces but responsive to the national interest—that I address these thoughts on what business can do, and what government and business can do together, to achieve these common aims: Getting our economy back to maximum operation, speeding our rate of growth, improving our competitive position in world markets, avoiding inflation, and equalizing opportunity for all.

These are the aims all of us share. Each group in our economy has a responsibility to take actions to help achieve them—and in so doing to help America and help themselves.

TAXES

Although the present expansion, now in its 30th month, has reversed the postwar trend of ever-shorter expansions and more frequent recessions, and has generated solid gains—a 13-percent growth in real output, a 21-percent rise in industrial production, a 13-percent rise in personal income, a 30-percent rise in corporate profits—both unemployment and idle capacity remain far too high.

Too many of our plants stand idle, too much of our work force is unemployed, too many of our potential sales are not made and, thus, part of the country's economic strength lies fallow.

This administration has proposed tax action that would advance our economy, that would turn potential into actual sales, that would move workers from employment agencies to their jobs, that would keep machines humming full time, that would lead to new and larger orders for raw materials and equipment.

The drag of inadequate markets has slowed our economic growth in recent years. This drag will not fall away simply because we wish it so. In part this drag consists of what you and I know is a burdensome tax system born of war and inflation. The tax program I have recommended can lighten the drag on growth: Through its impact on consumer markets and sales and through its stimulus to after-tax profits, it would set the stage for the more vigorous investment response that is crucial to the future growth of business and the country.

This action—tax reduction and reform—would spur output and investment. It reflects a conscious decision to stimulate the economy chiefly through private rather than public channels, to give American business the opportunity, and the responsibility, of meeting the needs of the American economy and all its citizens.

Government is not interested in making a larger share of the decisions on where to spend, but it is interested in creating the climate through tax reduction and reform for more investment spending by business and for more buying by consumers. When tax revision is enacted, it can be made more effective as you revise your investment and other plans upward, in accordance with the improved profit and demand picture.

But tax revision has not yet been enacted. You can help even today in creating a stronger America by supporting that tax revision program. There exists no magic tax policy that will fully satisfy everyone and every interest—yet prompt action on tax relief and reform will benefit us all. If we quarrel over every sentence, the book will never be written. The full support of the business community for prompt and appropriate tax action is urgently needed. The common interest in an overall program of tax reduction and reform must transcend the particular interest of individual groups.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Our balance-of-payments position has been a source of continuing concern. Here, too, we have made progress. But the times demand even greater progress and even greater effort. Government can do much to defend and strengthen the dollar and to promote the interests of U.S. business around the world.

In our tax and monetary policies, in our international monetary arrangements, in our rigorous dollar-conserving measures in aid and defense, and in our export credit and expansion programs—buttressed by the strong new measures announced in July—we are making a major effort to bring the U.S. balance of payments into equilibrium. But again, there is a role that only you can play.

The Trade Expansion Act and the forthcoming tariff negotiations with the European Economic Community and other nations are opening a new era of world trade and international business opportunity. The time has come to seize these opportunities, to seek out the potentials that lie in foreign markets.

Although many producers have responded quickly and successfully to the growing challenges of foreign competition, we are far from being a nation of exporters. U.S. firms can meet the test of the world market successfully if they search out their opportunities aggressively.

I urge you—and the prospect for new profits urges you—to redouble your own export efforts. Your active personal support for the White House Conference on Export Expansion to be held September 17 and 18 can also contribute to a successful national export effort.

This Nation's efforts to increase production and profits comprise another key element in the improvement of our balance-of-payments position. As we expand our home market, and increase rates of return by cutting costs and making full use of our productive capacity, investment funds that now go abroad will stay at home. And as they stay at home, they will help to build the base for faster growth of our own economy.

PRICES

Our remarkable wholesale price stability in the past 5 years while prices in most other industrial countries were rising substantially has given us a solid base for an improved international competitive position.

Investment to reduce costs and improve products and measures to advance the skill and productivity of our workers will further strengthen our competitive position—but only if the productivity gains are not dissipated in fruitless spirals of rapidly rising wages chasing higher prices, and vice versa. That is why we have called upon labor and business to exercise responsible restraint, basing wage and profit increases on fair shares of rising productivity. The continued need for a vigilant national effort to avoid a resumption of the inflation of past periods will become even more urgent as we move closer to full employment and full-capacity operation. Relative price stability can be continued if all of us—labor, business, and government—work at it. If the overall level of prices is not to rise, price increases on some products and services must be matched by price decreases in others. Such increases and decreases are a necessary and desirable part of a free market economy.

But what is unnecessary and undesirable is a general rise in prices. Current prices cannot be looked upon as a floor—let alone as a springboard for higher prices in the future. American business pioneered in exploiting the possibilities of mass markets—of seeking higher profit levels through lower prices and expanding sales, not through increased profit rates on limited output. This basic philosophy is as relevant today as it was 50 years ago and time has proved its worth.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The achievement of full employment and of a faster rate of economic growth will be of prime importance in giving substance to "equal opportunity." But beyond this, you, as businessmen, can play a leading role in giving all Americans a direct chance to share in the creation of a stronger economy and in the fruits of that economy. In communities all across the Nation, businessmen hire workers and serve customers and thus have an opportunity in their everyday business conduct to make a decisive contribution to the practice of American democracy. I ask of all of us that we judge each other not as white or nonwhite but as Americans and in so doing expand our markets, increase our productivity, and strengthen our Nation.

THE JOINT TASK AHEAD

Business can help on all these fronts—on tax revisions, on investments, on exports, on prices, on equality of opportunity. But business cannot achieve our common goals alone. This is too much to ask of any group. Nor, and let me make this clear, can government do it alone.

Business, labor, and government are partners and no one partner can complete the task if the other partners are not doing their shares. That is why, in much of what I have said, I have spoken of what we can do together.

For business decisions not only influence current and prospective economic conditions, they also reflect these conditions. It is government's task to create a climate in which your decisions to expand and invest, to export, and to assist in defending the stable dollar, are sensible and meaningful.

The present economic expansion is an example of the interaction of government policies and business performance. Part of the rise in economic activity is the result of business decisions made in response to last year's investment tax credit and depreciation guideline revision. The latter were government policies; but you made them effective.

A recent private survey indicated that over $1 billion of the business expenditures on new plant and equipment planned for this year are directly related to last year's tax credit and revised depreciation guidelines—measures the Executive and the Congress took to encourage new investments. Without this $1-billion margin, business investment plans for 1963 would have shown much less change from 1962.

I have no reason to doubt that the future will tell the same story: That government can pursue policies to encourage expansion, and we will do that; that businessmen can make these policies effective by playing the dynamic role the free market assigns to them, and you will do that.

Our aims are the same. If you fail, all America fails. But, in fact, we will succeed. The results will demonstrate to men everywhere the power and thrust of the American free enterprise system—the mightiest engine of economic progress the world has known.

Address of Senator Cannon at 45th Annual Convention of Nevada Department of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, my distinguished junior colleague, Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, recently was privileged to address the 45th annual convention of the Nevada Department of the American Legion in the city off Ely, in our home State.

His remarks to legionnaires and their ladies were warmly received and his thought-provoking speech is worthy of the attention of this body. Senator CANNON, as most of you know, has an outstanding war record. He has a vital and keen interest in all our veterans and in the administration of legislation affecting their interests. He follows closely all legislation of this nature and his speech is a fine summation of the workings of the Veterans' Administration, as well as veterans legislation currently before the Congress. Just a few short weeks ago Senator CANNON performed a splendid job in managing the military pay raise bill before ths body.

I ask unanimous consent to have his speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR CANNON AT 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Fellow legionnaires, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to be with you today and an honor to speak to you about certain matters that are of current concern to veterans and their elected representatives in the Congress. Such matters as the creation of a standing committee of the Senate which I have sponsored and supported since going to the Senate, proposals for GI benefits for our cold war veterans, and the reopening of national service life insurance are serious matters indeed, and I shall get to them in a few moments.

First, I should like to express my thanks to Johnny Lougaris and others who invited me to be with you today, thereby gaining for me a long weekend away from Washington and into the friendlier and far more enjoyable environment of Nevada to share your company.

The present session in Congress is still very much in progress. And while no new records have been set for accomplishment, I can tell you that I have been assured we will be in Washington this year until we get the job done.

So, while I intend to enjoy my few days in Nevada on this trip, it is a little too early to celebrate the closing of business in the Senate which usually takes place about this time each year.

Few matters before the Congress are as important or are of the magnitude of the programs undertaken by the Veterans' Administration. There are, as you know, over 30,000 veterans in Nevada alone, and some experts have estimated that one-half of the adult male population of this country has experienced military service on at least one occasion of their lifetime. So it is not surprising that the affairs of the veterans affect virtually every segment of the Nation's population and are inextricably linked to the economy and welfare of the United States.

Only the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department have more employees than the Veterans' Administration's 175,000. The Agency is responsible for administering over 300 statutes through its 279 field offices. Its recent budgets have been exceeded only by those of the Department of Defense, Agriculture, and the Treasury. It is larger than any of the 32 independent agencies in the executive branch. Its chain of 170 hospitals is the largest in the world, and through the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery it operates the largest single medical program in the United States. In addition, the Veterans' Administration administers the largest guardianship program in the country, having charge of the estates of nearly 400,000 children and other beneficiaries. Its present life insurance program represents about one-fifth of all ordinary life insurance in force in the United States—life insurance policies with a face value of $41 billion are handled by the Agency.

The outstanding indebtedness on GI home loans equals about 25 percent of the total outstanding residential mortgage debt and Veterans' Administration payments of disability and death compensation to more than 4 million veterans and their dependents exceeds the total budgets for 7 out of the 10 departments now represented in the Cabinet. It is therefore easy to see why I have championed the establishment of a standing committee on veterans' affairs in the Senate and will continue to do so.

Some of our national legislators have even demanded Cabinet status for this aspect of our national life. In the Senate at present the Finance Committee handles compensation, pensions, and insurance matters; and the subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee handles veterans' education and training, vocational rehabilitation, GI loan matters, and bills relating to veterans' hospitals and medical care.

I have consistently maintained, as my predecessors have since the Reorganization Act of 1946, that a Committee on Veterans Affairs is certainly long overdue. I was chairman of a committee in 1959 which probably came closest to a successful resolution of this matter. We unanimously recommended the creation of this standing committee but were unsuccessful in gaining approval of the full Committee on Rules.

I believe that support for such a committee is growing and that an increasing number of Senators have come to realize that such a new standing committee is necessary if we are to fully and adequately discharge our responsibility to the Nation's 22 million veterans.

Another major piece of legislative business which continues to be of interest to the Legion is the cold war GI bill which was reported out favorably by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on July 2. This bill will provide readjustment assistance to cold war veterans; that is, for those who have served on active duty in the Armed Forces from Janury 31, 1955, to June 1, 1963. The readjustment assistance authorized is similar to that awarded to veterans of the Korean conflict. But unlike the aid granted Korean veterans, there is no mustering out pay and no provision for business loans. The minimum service required for eligibility for educational benefits is 180 days of active duty, whereas only 90 days were required as a minimum for World War II and Korean veterans. I believe the Senate record on this bill is fairly consistent. We passed this bill in 1959, but it did not reach a vote in the House. It was favorably reported in 1961 (as it was this year), but was not reported in time to be considered by the Senate.

Each year many thousands of cold war veterans return to civilian life. The vast majority of these entered the Armed Forces without any higher education or vocational training, and very few were provided with technical skills suitable for civilian life during their service in the Armed Forces. Consider their plight: They serve their Nation during a time of international tension and return to a situation of high unemployment where the unskilled person faces decreasing opportunities. The purpose of this bill is to provide readjustment assistance to these cold war veterans to continue their education and to obtain vocational skills, as well as to provide for direct and guaranteed home and farm loans. It is not a give-away. Rather, it will provide this country with hundreds of thousands of vitally needed men and women in the fields of education, science, and medicine and will pay for itself in the increased taxes which these veterans will pay on their higher earnings.

No, this is not a giveaway. In my opinion, the alternative is to give away much of the future for these patriotic young people and to give away the economic growth which is dependent upon skill and educated men. And perhaps we would even be giving away the confidence which most Americans have that the Congress does not forget the devo-

tion of the men who protect this country around the globe.

As you know, bills have become law during this session of Congress which will be of great benefit to many veterans. I can only cite them without speaking of the details of their provisions. An increase of dependency and indemnity compensation for dependent parents and children was approved on May 15, as were statutory awards, as distinguished from disability compensation, for veterans with a service-connected loss of the powers of speech and of hearing. On April 2 the provisions governing burial allowances broadened eligibility (Public Law 883).

The question of further reopening of the national service life insurance program is still undergoing legislative study and consideration. In the last Congress a measure was passed reopening the program only to veterans with service-connected disabilities. A bill introduced in the present Congress provides for the reopening of the program to all veterans of World War II and Korea, with no requirement concerning service-connected disability. It provides that those veterans who did not exercise their right to apply for national service life insurance during their initial period of eligibility now shall be given a 1-year period in which to apply for insurance coverage.

Granting a period of grace to World War II and Korean war veterans would assure equality of treatment with World War I veterans who had 33 years in which to apply for life insurance funded by the Federal Government. As the matter now stands, those who served in the second war had only the 4½ years after the war within which to apply. The cutoff date was April 25, 1951.

It is the belief of the supporters of this bill that there were many reasons beyond the control of eligible veterans which prevented their application for insurance during this period of readjustment to the difficulties of civilian life. That the opportunity to apply for such insurance is a valuable one, is shown by the following figures: The cost of national service life insurance is far lower than similar commercial policies; the average net annual premium charged by four leading commercial insurance firms for 5-year term insurance at age 35 is $6.64 per $1,000 of coverage, compared with only $1.20 for national service life insurance.

The bill does not create a new Federal program, and does not make any new group of veterans eligible. It restores eligibility previously earned by veterans because of their active service in time of war. No addition to the cost of Government is proposed since additional costs of administering the national service life insurance program will be charged in the premiums paid by those using the grace period provision of eligibility. If the bill is enacted, it is estimated that from 14 to 16 million veterans insurance purchase rights will be restored.

I am also pleased to report to you the successful passage by the Senate of the military pay bill, which represents the first increase in salary given to our men in uniform since 1958. Among the most significant elements of the bill, which I had the pleasure of managing on the floor of the Senate only 2 days ago and of being chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee which heard testimony, was to provide a cost-of-living increase of approximately 5 percent for retired persons. Above that, significant increases were recommended and approved ranging from 11 to 25 percent dependent upon length of service and proficiency. I believe this bill will go a long way toward improving the attraction and retention of service members for career military service, correct certain inequities in the military compensation system and establish a more equitable basis for the adjustment of military pay for service members after retirement.

As veterans, we cannot fail to be interested and, I hope, impressed by steps that have been taken in the past 3 years to strengthen the military establishment in several important ways. Congress has approved legislation which authorized additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces and to broaden the power of the Secretary of Defense.

This country today is stronger militarily than it has been in many years, and we in Congress intend to keep it that way.

Great attention today is drawn to the other side of the coin of our military capacity—that of the difficult problem of disarmament and a lessening of world tensions. The Senate at this moment is engaged in an exhaustive and penetrating study of the proposed nuclear test ban treaty. Certainly, everyone in our country would favor a nuclear test ban treaty if we could be assured that it would not endanger our security and the position of the free world which was dearly bought in terms of American blood and treasure. I personally am taking the position that I will not vote for a treaty of this kind until I have reasonable assurances that proper safeguards are available to prevent cheating by the Russians.

Second, such a treaty would be foolhardy if it represented an attempt at appeasement in the form of permitting the Russians to equal or surpass our present nuclear superiority. The lessons of the past are all too vivid in regard to this crucial subject.

Third, I want to be sure that this country has sufficient policy planning for the development of our strategy in the event that China, France, or other countries begin a massive testing program in the atmosphere.

The Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee will ask questions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to determine if the treaty will adversely affect our military position. Scientists of the Atomic Energy Commission will be called upon to tell us how rapidly we could resume testing if the treaty is violated by the Russians—a risk that certainly lies at the heart of this proposal. The Senate will also be anxious to know whether we can accomplish our defense goals through underground testing alone.

I would like to get away from my text here to tell you something more about the treaty. It provides that we would volunteer to discontinue to test nuclear weapons in space. Russia broke the moratorium in the past in atmospheric testing and some of our scientists believe that the Russians are well ahead of us in this area. Underground testing the treaty does not prohibit, and in this area we are well ahead of the Russians. Russia may be able to test underground to improve their capabilities, but we cannot test in the atmosphere, an area where we believe the Russians are ahead.

There are provisions in the treaty wherein either party may give a 90-day advance notice of withdrawal to resume atmospheric testing. The Russians may make all their preparations over a long period of time and then give us the 90-day notice of withdrawal.

One of the things that we are going to assure ourselves of is that our country is constantly prepared to resume atmospheric testing at least on a 90-day notice. We will not approve the treaty unless we are assured on this particular point by the President of the United States and our leading scientists.

I want to assure you that this is going to be subjected to long and intensive study by people we consider outstanding in the field.

The people who have already said they are for the treaty and will vote for it do not happen to be members of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, and without the approval of this committee, the treaty probably would not be approved. It must be ratified by and with the consent of the Senate of the United States.

And finally, I would like to know upon what firm intelligence we can now believe that the Russians genuinely believe in an easing of tensions and the cooperation between East and West which is certainly indicated in the treaty.

Our overall security should be the foremost consideration. This is part and parcel with the obligation. The country owes to those who served in prior conflicts.

Our veterans did not ask what they could do for their country when what had to be done in its defense was clear for all to see. They went ahead and did it and did it well. And they continue to work for the good of the country in the manifold patriotic and community activities of a great organization such as the one assembled here today. I believe that the Congress can do no less than keep your faith.

It is always a pleasure to meet with Nevada Legionnaires and it has been an honor to have your attention this morning.

Thank you.

A Tough Policy Is Hard To Swallow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the news from Vietnam is not very encouraging it might be well to give some thought to the operation of the State Department as referred to by Art Hoppe in the San Francisco Chronicle on September 3, 1963, remembering that even in his humor he makes a very important observation:

A TOUGH POLICY IS HARD TO SWALLOW

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Our State Department has come under fire lately for the way the Vietnam situation has been handled. If that's what you call it. But in all fairness and in hopes of reassuring a nervous American public, I feel we should pause today to salute the unsung heroes of our State Department. Like the dedicated litttle cadre of policy toughener.

You obviously have read repeated casual statements by high State Department officials about how they plan to "toughen our policy" in this or that part of the world. But have you ever given a moment's thought to those who must do the actual work? Of course not.

On reflection, however, it will come as no surprise to learn that in the bowels of the Department's vast beehive sit 73 caldrons of brine in which each of our policies is soaked for from 1 to 6 days by the busy men and women of the policy toughening section—the length of time in the vat dependent, of course, on delicate calculations as to just how tough we wish the policy to be.

From there, the dripping policy is carried to the sightsetters, those highly trained specialists who must set our sights neither too high, for the benefit of the Department officials who feel we must not set our sights too high, nor too low, for the benefit of the other extreme.

Each sightsetter, of course, sets the sights (neither too high nor too low) on a rifle, rather than a shotgun, as it is traditional

Department procedure, as you know, to shoot with a rifle rather than a shotgun.

The policy, now riddled with rifle bullets, is rushed to the effort department, where the effort focusers, each with a graduate degree in optics, skillfully focus our efforts as spelled out in the policy. Once the efforts are focused they are immediately bent by the hard-working effort benders, diligent men who have been known in a crisis to bend every effort in the Department in 47 minutes flat.

There has been some justifiable criticism of this procedure on the grounds that bending an effort puts it out of focus. But the Department's administrative tighteners (those knowledgeable mechanics on whom we rely to tighten administrative procedures) assure us that any effort which is bent in the Department usually gets straightened out in hardly any time at all.

Depending on its toughness, the policy is then stuffed in one of several pipelines, which are kept constantly free-flowing by the pipeline uncloggers (Local 695, Amalgamated Plumbers Union, AFL–CIO). A soft policy, for example, would be dispatched to a tie mender, whose drudgery it is to mend ties, but only international ones. A tough policy, on the other hand, requires "an accelerated policy line." And is thus forwarded to one of the Department's brilliant, but explosive, linear accelerators.

Space forbids saluting the hundreds of other behind-the-scenes departmental workers, such as the course charters, bottleneck breakers, fat trimmers and scope expanders, to name but a few.

But I feel sure every American would sleep sounder if he knew that these thousands upon thousands of unsung heroes stand ever ready to toughen, riddle, focus, bend, tighten, straighten, mend and accelerate our State Department's policy on Vietnam.

As soon as we get one.

Lincoln County, W. Va., Named After President Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on April 20, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed a bill providing for the establishment of a new State—West Virginia. Four years later, shortly after Lincoln's death, the West Virginia Legislature created a new county and named it in his honor.

A brief history of Lincoln County, W. Va., is told in a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S NAME GIVEN NEW COUNTY IN 1867

On an April day in 1863, the 16th President of the United States signed a bill providing for the establishment of a new State—West Virginia.

On a February day in 1867, the West Virginia Legislature passed an act creating a county from sections of Cabell, Putnam, Kanawha, an Boone Counties. It was named Lincoln, after the President who signed that bill 4 years earlier.

Having a county named for a President wasn't enough for the residents. They named the county seat Hamlin—after Hannibal Hamlin, Vice President during Lincoln's first term. Another story though, has it named for Bishop Leonidas L. Hamline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a postmaster later dropping the final letter.

Like many other West Virginia counties, Lincoln had coal. The northern half of the county years ago developed oil and gas extensively. Lumber and tobacco were other important resources, but a splendid stand of timber was depleted as the land was cleared for agriculture.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad later became an important asset.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the Washington Star of August 30.

It is written by a former friend and colleague of many Members of this House, the Honorable Charles S. Dewey, of Illinois.

Mr. Dewey's account of his talk with President Coolidge in 1926 is interesting in view of recent events. It is well to be reminded that since President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, all Republican Presidents have fought and upheld the principle of civil rights.

CALVIN COOLIDGE AND AMERICA'S WARDS

On Saturday afternoon in the early days of July 1926, I was informed that President Coolidge wished to see me at once.

There were only one or two clerks on duty, and I imagine the President had forgotten that this was the first of the half holidays that the Government had put into effect on Saturdays. I found the President sitting alone in his office, apparently cogitating, for he had no papers on his desk and apparently was in deep thought.

As soon as I entered, the President said, "Sit down, Dewey. I have been wanting to have a long talk with you, and that is the reason I asked you to come to the office at a time when we might not be interrupted."

The President had the reputation of being a rather silent man and not given to many words. In talking to a Member of the Congress, he once said, "You never have to deny saying things that you have never said."

But, on this occasion, Mr. Coolidge waxed voluble, and for the next hour expounded the following ideas. He said, "Dewey, I understand that in the various divisions of the Treasury Department which come under your direct supervision (as Under Secretary), there are several thousand Negroes employed, and it is in regard to them that I wish to have you understand my policy in regard to their treatment."

The President then went on to say that the Negroes had not come to the United States as immigrants or of their own volition but had been brought here by slave traders and sold as slaves in which capacity they had served for a number of decades until President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation had liberated them and given them the status of citizenship.

"Therefore," said the President, "they have become sort of the wards of the United States, and like wards, they should be given special consideration and considerate treatment. I am not recommending to you that Negro employees should be unduly favored, but in the matter of employment and promotion, I wish them to have fair and equal opportunity within their abilities with any white employee working in the same divisions of Government and that there be no thought of segregation."

Just at that time, a matter had come to my notice in the office of the Registrar of the Treasury. During the First World War, a number of the employees had served in the Armed Forces, both white and Negro, and some of them had lost their lives in the service, and it was intended to place their names on marble plaques to be erected in the office of the Registrar, one bearing the names of the white employees, and the other, the names of the colored employees. This idea had caused some disturbance among the employees of the Registrar's office, and upon hearing about it, I gave orders that only one plaque should be located, and the names of the deceased employees placed thereon in alphabetical order without reference to their color. I think the President must have heard of this for during our conversation, he made indirect reference to a certain decision on my part of which he heartily approved, and he wound up our conversation by saying, "I have no criticism of the way you have been handling your departments, but I want you to know how I feel on this matter, and I consider it of great importance to the best interests of the country and of efficient operation of the Treasury that our Negro wards be treated with great fairness."

As I write this in August 1963, with the march on Washington fresh in memory, I cannot help feeling that Mr. Coolidge recommended fair and equal treatment for the Negro minority of the country whom he considered as wards but emphasized fair and equal treatment without thinking about the political effect; whereas, at the present time, there is an attempt to listen to the demands of this minority and to give them special privileges under duress.

CHARLES S. DEWEY.

Skiing With REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, although some of my colleagues are alleged to state their mail has dropped off alarmingly, I must remark that the voters in the 12th Illinois District continue to remind me that they are out there—watching. Over and over, they remind me that Federal spending must be brought into balance with Federal income. Extravagances and "boondoggling" should be eliminated, they say firmly and repeatedly. Clippings from current newspapers and periodicals are sent to me—with underscored passages—all pointing to an evaluation of congressional action on appropriation bills.

For this reason, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, under date of September 4, 1963. Entitled: "Skiing With

REA," this article points up the travesty which allows a loan to a ski resort from the taxpayers' money. That this agency REA has outlived its usefulness or the purpose for which it was created needs hardly be highlighted by the editorial. That the time has come to stop this wasting of public funds must be said again and again until Congress has heeded the warning and has stopped the leak in the dike—by eliminating this superfluous and costly governmental drain.

SKIING WITH REA

Every time somebody suggests that it's time to disolve the Rural Electrification Administration, as Senator GOLDWATER did a few months ago, the REA gadflies scream they are being persecuted. One of their standard defenses is that they are administering a nonprofit program which is vital to the national welfare because it is "bringing light and power to the remotest reaches of rural America."

Bankrolling a ski resort in western Pennsylvania is hardly bringing light or power to a remote area, but that is what the REA is doing with $110,000 of the taxpayers' money. A loan of this sum has been approved by the REA for one of its electric cooperatives. The co-op will relend the funds to the Blue Knob Development Corp. of Altoona, which plans to develop a ski resort.

The loan is authorized under section 5 of the REA act. The section was revised after the Kennedy administration took office to permit electric cooperatives to borrow funds at 2 percent interest to finance the purchase and installation of eletrical machinery and equipment for commercial, industrial, and agriculture enterprises. The interest rate is only about half that which the Treasury has to pay for the money it borrows. This means that over the 35-year period of such loans the taxpayers are paying a subsidy amounting to about three-quarters of the loan itself.

Justification for a loan to a ski resort is offered by the REA on grounds it will help the electric co-op develop additional power loads as a means of bringing down the cost of electricity to its members and also help create more employment in the area. This is one more bit of evidence to indicate why the REA program continues to expand when, in fact, it should be diminishing. More evidence may be found in the aggressive efforts of the public power proponents to build their own generating plants and transmission lines.

All this is reflected in President Kennedy's request for $425 million for the electrification program in 1964, an increase of 73 percent above funds appropriated in 1962 and nearly three times the amount recommended for that year by former President Eisenhower before he left office.

As originally conceived, the REA program was designed to bring electric energy to persons in rural areas who were not receiving central station service. Now 98 percent of all farms have electric service, four of every five new customers being added to the REA system are nonfarmers, and more than half of the total power sales of the systems are being made to nonfarm users.

Surely the time has come to stop pouring public money into a project that serves no other purpose than to strengthen and expand the public power bureaucracy at the expense of taxpayers and to the detriment of private enterprise.

Address Delivered by Adm. George W. Anderson Before the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Adm. George Anderson, retired, yesterday voiced some thoughts before the National Press Club which he described as an epilog to his military career, before assuming his new duties as Ambassador to Portugal.

On behalf of my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Admiral Anderson's forthright and constructive address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. GEORGE ANDERSON

It is my pleasure to be with the members of the National Press Club today, and to accept a long-standing invitation to address you.

On August 1, I closed the book, as it were, on 40 very rewarding years of naval service. The final chapter covered my 2 most instructive years as Chief of Naval Operations and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Today I would like to voice to you some thoughts as an epilog to my military career, prior to assuming the duties of a new life—that of Ambassador to Portugal.

I know your first question: Why did I so quickly accept the appointment as Ambassador to Portugal? For two reasons:

First, it is my belief that career military personnel should always respond to the expressed wish of their President that they serve their Government in any capacity in which they believe they can be useful unless adverse personal considerations preclude their acceptance.

Second, the post of U.S. Ambassador to Portugal at this time is extremely important to both nations, both members of NATO, both maritime nations. To me it is certainly challenging. I have enduring affection for the Portuguese people, respect for their traditions, growing understanding of their problems, and personal friendship for many of their officials. I assume my duties with a sense of responsibility, humility, and confidence. Our Navy and our diplomatic service have worked closely together in advancing our Nation's prestige since the early years of our national life.

Those of us who fought in World War II and have observed its aftermath know that the basic problems which beset the world cannot be solved by military conflict. These problems are rooted in complex economic, political, and social issues and systems, and in the nature of man himself, with his capacity for both good and evil. At the same time, we must recall that in those two great eras of peace—the Pax Romana, in which Christendom was born, and the Pax Britannia, in which unparalleled advances in the arts and sciences were achieved—progress was possible through superior power being selectively used in the interest of law, order, and legitimate government. Peace and progress can be secured by other means, as it was during the moral consensus that constituted the so-called truce of God, lasting over 350 years in the early Middle Ages. Until an equivalent moral consensus under God is again achieved, our concept of peace among nations is ultimately dependent upon our Nation, the leader of the free world, having superior moral and physical strength with which to confront and restrain any disturber of that peace, to provide for our defense, to preserve our way of life, to uphold our honor.

Our great Nation fails in its duty to mankind if we tempt any other power into new forms of aggression, new Koreas or Cubas, because of our own weakness, complacency, or failure to maintain superior weapons systems. This is especially important in the period immediately ahead, when, as we hopefully seek signs of real progress toward peace, we must allow for a specific Communist strategy that could be designed to lull us into complacency. The Soviets, having failed in their Cuban attempt to upset the nuclear balance of power, may now be seeking a detente with the West in a tactic of popular fronts and economic penetration. Meanwhile, relieved of conflicting current priorities, they can concentrate on other activities and future weapons breakthroughs, gaining political as well as military advantage. Totalitarian powers are expert in translating both actual and deceptive weapons progress into great psychological leverage, in international blackmail and in a race for prestige with neutral nations. This was the story of Nazi Germany. It has been past practice of the Soviet Union.

True arms control can only follow a conclusion of the Communist states that it is impossible for them to achieve arms superiority over the free world or that it is unwise to attempt to do so. True chances of peace can come only when the Communists begin to argue among themselves, not over what method is best to destroy us, but over whether that objective of destruction is achievable, and worthwhile. Whether arms control or peace is attainable thus basically depends upon us—the way we make decisions and the moral and strategic posture we maintain. It is therefore essential that our military strength, our sound strategy, our able leadership and our courage provide sure support for the true men of peace—the educators, the economists, the statesmen and the clergy—who are willing to meet the challenges of our age.

With this philosophy as background, I should like to express my views on certain aspects of the Department of Defense at this time. These views, if given due consideration, might be a factor in insuring that our country indeed will have the necessary military strength, the best strategy, and the finest military leadership.

There are some tendencies which give me great concern, a concern shared by many in uniform today and by many who have previously served their country in military and civilian positions. At this critical period of history and formative period of the Defense Department, it is prudent for all to check the set of the sails, the trim of the ship, the mark of the course in light of the seas ahead. If certain tendencies are checked and redirected now, the Defense Department will move forward to a better position than ever in its history.

I express my position with due and high regard for many improvements which have been made in the last several years. It is

over 15 years since Congress enacted the National Security Act which established the Department of Defense. The wisdom of the Congress in doing so has been reflected under the administrations of both of our political parties and under a succession of dedicated and capable secretaries beginning with James Forrestal; during a series of international crises from the Berlin blockade through the Korean war to the Cuban quarantine; from the infancy of nuclear weaponry through the development of missiles to the recent achievements in outer space. I question neither motivation, patriotism, dedication, or ability of anyone, but rather the trend of the organization in being.

Today, interservice cooperation is at an alltime high. This is primarily attributable to a deep sense of responsibility to the Nation on the part of both civilian officials and military officers. It is also due to joint educational programs in effect for many years, to emphasis on joint planning, training, and operations, and to the conscientious attendance of Secretary of Defense McNamara and former Secretary Tom Gates at weekly meetings with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with service Secretaries and military chiefs, and to the keen interest of the President in military activities. The genuine unity and cooperation among the services were particularly evident during the Cuban crisis. Of this we are proud.

Our Army has been brought to a high state of readiness for any type of combat. Our Air Force is capable of furnishing greatly increased airlift, of maintaining higher percentages of strategic and tactical aircraft in alert status, and of providing more conventional weapons support to the ground forces. Polaris submarines are joining fleet in expanding quantity with longer range, more reliable and more devastating missiles. The Marines have more "ferry" available for their always superb fighting force. Independent agencies for intelligence and common supply have been added to those previously established.

The list of real achievements is long and impressive. However, we will continue to progress only if we correct those tendencies which could jeopardize our national security. Great defeats and military catastrophies do not result from what a nation is doing well, but from what it is failing to do. The stakes are high. There can be no room for complacency, no hesitancy to criticize when that criticism is constructive and motivated only by consideration of the best interests of the United States.

My first concern is over the prospective naval and maritime position of the United States versus the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that the Soviets are moving forward rapidly on the high seas, both economically and militarily. The actions which they have taken to facilitate the availability of potential naval bases in key strategic areas; their extensive programs of shipbuilding, both naval and merchant marine; their increasing activity on, over, and under the seas; the adaption of aviation, nuclear power and nuclear weapons and missiles to their navy—all of these foreshadow the future strength of Soviet maritime forces.

On the other hand, much of our own Navy is growing old. Ships are not being replaced as rapidly as they should be. The status of American commercial shipping also is declining, while that of the Russians is increasing. New capital investment for modernization of U.S. shipbuilding and repair facilities is low.

This country must not be dependent upon someone else for its essential sea communication; it must not be cut off from its sources of raw materials, from its allies, from its forces overseas. If we are weak at sea, we invite aggression at sea as well as on land.

Positive action is necessary to reverse existing trends, and the first requirement is for a greater appreciation of the importance of the U.S. naval and maritime position at the higher levels of the Department of Defense.

Second, I am gravely concerned that within the Department of Defense there is not the degree of confidence and trust between the civilian and military echelons that the importance of their common objective requires. This two-way responsibility requires wisdom, respect, and understanding from both sides.

Uniformed personnel know that they must be continually responsive to national security requirements. They must also be responsive to any particular form of administrative civilian authority prevailing in the Department at any particular time and to the statutory responsibilities of their service Secretaries. Civilian officials and staff assistants should recognize that forceful expression of contrary views in proper channels or frank response to congressional inquiry do not represent a challenge to the valid concept of civilian control. There is no such challenge. Our civilian officials should appreciate that the standard of service integrity equals that of religious communities, and must be kept that way. Mutual confidence and trust are built the hard way and can be broken down quickly by one or two impulsive actions or intemperate judgments.

Third, I am concerned also regarding a trend in the major procurement policies within the Department of Defense to the ultimate detriment of our military services. One proposal has been advanced which would in effect eliminate the requirement for specific recommendations by military personnel on matters such as design competitions or source selection procedures. I view any diminution of military recommendations on weapons procurement with grave alarm. Certainly the abrupt reversal of military recommendations without interim consultation, as was the case of the TFX and VSTOL contracts, is fraught at a minimum with unpleasant developments, and potentially with grave dangers. The civilian authorities exercising control, and the military, have two common objectives: First, to obtain the best weapons or weapons system possible; second, to prevent the use of defense appropriations for anything except best performance for least cost.

Ground rules for competitive procurement must therefore be clear, consistent, and impartial. They must be understood alike and in advance in the Department of Defense, the responsible services, industry, and the Congress. The system itself must have integrity to protect people of integrity—both civilian and military.

I have spoken of the danger of making abrupt reversals in regard to procurement. The same reasoning applies to formulating defense policies with our allies. Specifically, a principal trouble in the Skybolt affair sprang from our encouraging our ally confidently to look forward to the timely availability of a superior weapon when, apparently, we were not justified in giving them so much encouragement. This illustrates the need for continuous consultation between civilian and military experts and for avoiding abrupt actions timed to our own budget cycle.

At all important conferences involving our national security it would be of great benefit for any Secretary of Defense to have with him a senior military representative from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As a result of many years of intimate association with the military services of our allies, our senior officers constitute a distinct national asset of communications and influence which should consistently be used to knit together the alliance.

Fourth, I am concerned that, in the selection of weapons, aircraft, or ships, there may not be a full appreciation of the decisiveness of a narrow edge in superior performance, both to achieve maximum safety and to succeed in combat. I am concerned that service experience tends to be subordinated to evaluation by operations analysts on the staff of the Secretary of Defense or involved in contract research activities.

Military experience builds an appreciation of the truth that slight margins make big differences when the chips are down. Those who fought in the Pacific know what the narrow margin of operational superiority in the Japanese Zero fighter cost in American lives. Our Navy pilots landing on carriers in a stormy sea at night know what a small increment in aircraft or engine performance means to their safety. I have had two nephews—both Navy pilots—who have been lost in peacetime in naval aircraft. Air Force and Navy senior officers have had the personal experience of searching for aircraft or ships that have failed to return from their missions with fine young Americans aboard. Therefore, we feel emotionally aroused as well as dispassionately concerned if the recommendations of the uniformed chiefs of our services, each backed up by competent military and civilian professional staffs, are altered or overruled without interim consultation, explanation, and discussion.

Both the experienced military man and the operations analysts are important contributors to the decisionmaking process. However, I am disturbed because now, in the Department of Defense, the operations analyst—properly concerned with "cost effectiveness"—seems to be working at the wrong echelon—above the professional military level rather than in an advisory capacity to the military who should thoroughly appreciate his assistance. Specialists cannot, without danger, extrapolate their judgments into fields in which they do not have expert knowledge. Unfortunately, today in the Pentagon an unhealthy imbalance has resulted because at times specialists are used as experts in areas outside their fields. This has resulted in a tendency to draw conclusions before all the evidence has been examined.

As a justification for this imbalance, there is a myth to the effect that historically the generals and admirals, the colonels and the captains, are villains opposed to progress and refugees from new ideas. On the contrary, history shows that daring ideas from the military often have been ignored: Col. Charles De Gaulle in his ignored warning of the dangers of the Maginot Line type of defense; Adm. James O. Richardson in his caution against leaving the fleet exposed at Pearl Harbor. William S. Sims, as a young lieutenant before World War I took his daring case for gunnery reform directly to the President. Admirals Moffett and Towers pressed forward with the development of U.S. naval aviation to the enchancement of our naval power. Generals MacArthur, Billy Mitchell and "Hap" Arnold, and Admiral Mahan were daring, original, and creative as were Admirals Rickover and Rayborn in engineering Polaris breakthroughs. All belie this myth that the military are not progressive.

True enough, this creativity of the military can be stifled. Military services of nations often have fallen into a stagnation and self-satisfaction, as was the case in Europe at the onset of World War I. This must not happen in the United States. It is curious that those who criticize the military as being backward tend to be the very ones who are proponents of procedures and policies which would discourage a creative corps of military professionals. Today, by making too many detailed decisions at high level, by attempting to stamp officers of all services into a common mold, we may kill incentive, imagination, and independent thought. Also, career military personnel must receive sufficient pay and benefits to

attract high caliber men into the services, and keep them once we get them. Far too many men, particularly those with large families, are forsaking the services for industry. This can only harm our national security.

There is another alarming peril to obscuring the role of the military, found in a modern fallacy that theories or computers or economics or numbers of weapons win wars. Alone, they do not. Good leadership unfailingly recognizes that man is the key to success or failure.

Go back through history. Some of the greatest victories, from Hannibal at Cannae to Nelson at Trafalgar to MacArthur at New Guinea, have come at the hands of forces inferior in numbers but superior in human ability, courage, and determination to win. Our Nation will defy every lesson of history if we think that stockpiles of weapons or the decisions of computers win wars. Man, his wits, and his will are still the key to war and peace, victory and defeat.

The military man has spent a career in observing human nature in the different environments of operations, in danger and under fire. He has seen how personal reactions are affected by discipline, by want of confidence or overconfidence, by trust or distrust, by patriotism, by fear, or by the will to succeed. He is exposed to the narrow margin between success and failure, not only in weapons, but in leadership and in understanding of the enemy. Without powerful morale, esprit de corps, incentive, and inspiration, combat effectiveness is unattainable. Civilian officials and staff assistants should appreciate fully that where lives are at stake, morale is vital.

The key to leadership is understanding human nature—your opponents, allies, and subordinates. To do anything to downgrade the role of the men who may have to fight our country's battles is to violate the first principle of leadership. Morale is the business of every leader in our Defense Establishment. Do all else right, and do this wrong—the product in a crisis is disaster. In this area, it is better to have less of a connotation of management and more of leadership.

Military men have no crystal ball that can guarantee infallible decisions; but neither do scientists, analysts, engineers, businessmen, lawyers, or for that matter, computers—which must rely on human assumptions for inputs. All of us must shun reasoning based on unquestioned assumptions that become self-deceptions. Napoleon, the classic case, in his earlier years so precise and discerning, gradually became intolerant of criticism and so killed the well meant and much needed criticism in his own command. Finally, he lost his battle, his campaign, his France.

Time and again, such self-deceptions are a preamble to defeat. Allegedly impregnable Port Arthur in 1904, Singapore in 1942, the so-called infallible systematic defense of the maginot line, all these looked good in office blueprints, but in practice were based upon untested and unquestioned assumptions. Then there was Pearl Harbor, when it was anticipated that the Japanese, in the event of war, would strike elsewhere, and those who dissented were not heard.

Mortal mistakes for our Nation could be assumptions that we cannot make mistakes, that we justify honest errors as correct decisions, and that we discredit the voices of dissent—especially the dissent of high-ranking military men speaking on subjects they know.

Fifth, I am concerned that the system of checks and balances so wisely provided for in our Constitution and further translated into legislative code may unconsciously be in process of growing unbalanced with respect to the Department of Defense. A sometimes forgotten partner in civilian control, the Congress, is a part of our checks and balances. On occasions, committees of Congress have been right, we in the executive departments wrong. Members of these committees have made wise decisions with regard to military equipment and other matters which have had beneficial effects. The Congress must be a check on the use of either civilian or military power in the Pentagon and must not default, even in part, its constitutional responsibility and authority to provide for our Armed Forces. The continuing interest of Congress must not be resisted or resented. The chiefs of our military services appreciate this role of the Congress—so does the Commander in Chief, who has served in both of its bodies.

Overcentralized structures are conducive to the abuse of power and compounding of mistakes. Monolithic-structured organizations can kill imagination, stultify initiative, completely eliminate the effectiveness of those in the officer corps who have gained wisdom and experience. Overcentralization at the top, and discouragement of initiative at lower echelons, can critically increase reaction time in crisis. Such a system can topple in disaster. Witness the experiences of the Second and Third Reich.

Thankfully, built-in checks and balances are provided in the National Security Act. One of them is the separate services, for they often take differing viewpoints and thus afford higher authority clear options and greater flexibility in decisionmaking.

Within the Department, another check is the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Never should this body become a political one, or merely a rubber-stamp to the Secretary of Defense in implementing decisions or carrying out orders. As a collective body, the Chiefs must represent military requirements from differing viewpoints, so that we do not ignore the value of mixed, balanced, diversified forces. The Joint Chiefs should not be swamped with matters that should be processed in service channels, nor should their functions be taken over by segments of the office of the Secretary. Before committees of Congress the service chiefs must always be allowed and encouraged to give their full opinions, not subject to any retaliation against them or their service. I strongly support the bill of the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to insure that the service chiefs who are members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff serve 4 years. Stability in the office of the Commandant has served well the Marine Corps and the country.

Since my retirement, my concern about some of the trends I have outlined has grown even greater. The test ban treaty, with its attendant uncertainties, will more than ever demand a high order of vigilance, energy in promoting our own research programs, and discernment in monitoring the military balance of power. We must allow for the unexpected, technologically and politically, and must scrupulously guard against what Roberta Wohlstetter in her study of Pearl Harbor called, the tendency to select whatever is in accord with one's expectations.

Above all, the Joint Chiefs of Staff must maintain an independent view and thorough grasp of the continuing security requirements and risks of this treaty, and of the effectiveness of the proposed safeguards. National policy must not be based solely upon military considerations, but it must be formulated after full consideration of all military implications. It should embarrass neither the Secretary of Defense nor the Chiefs when they disagree, or when the Chiefs themselves differ over future aspects of this treaty, or other high-ranking military officers, active or retired, disagree with the Chiefs. It is of utmost importance to avoid unanimity for unanimity's sake, and we should encourage reasoned expressions of differences. The full force of Joint Chiefs of Staff recommendations must not be compromised or dulled in any way in transmission to the President or to the Congress, each of whom has such awesome constitutional responsibilities. The willingness to consider dissenting and conflicting analyses in the military and in the intelligence community may very well be the determinant as to whether history will judge this treaty good or bad for our Nation.

Experience teaches that there are no infallible judgments with respect to national security in these times of the unknown, the changing and the unexpected. The best hope of surviving the pitfalls is found in a precept which I commend to those who lead the Department of Defense, now and in the future. It was stated by our President in his first state of the Union message, when he said:

"Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of dissent and daring, that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change."

In the spirit of these wonderful lines, I have given you the valedictory to my military career. The philosophy of these words of the President is the best guarantee of security and indeed of political progress in uncertain times, grave with risk but bright with hope, as we seek peace for the world and freedom for its peoples.

A School Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written and broadcast by Paul Benzaquin on station WEEI's program, "Listen."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Sept. 3, 1963]

Now I sit me down in school
Where praying is against the rule.
For this great Nation, under God
Finds public mention of Him odd.

Any prayer a class recites
Now violates the Bill of Rights.
Any time my head I bow
Becomes a Federal matter now.

Teach us of stars or pole and Equator
But make no mention of their Creator.
Tell of exports in Denmark and Sweden
But not one word on what Eve did Eden.

The law is specific, the law is precise
Praying out loud is no longer nice.
Praying aloud in a public hall
Upsets believers in nothing at all.

In silence alone can we meditate
And if God should get the credit, great.
This rule, however, has a gimmick in it;
You've got to be finished in less than a minute.

So all I ask is a minute of quiet
If I feel like praying, then maybe I'll try it.
It not, O Lord, this plea I make;
Should I die in school, my soul you'll take.

The Late Honorable Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many warm tributes have been paid our late colleague, Estes Kefauver, the senior Senator from Tennessee. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Press-Scimitar published in Memphis, Tenn., enjoyed a warm and intimate friendship with the Senator. On many, many occasions Estes sought the counsel and advice of this good and intelligent man. He has paid him a beautiful tribute, and I include that expression of his affection and esteem for the Senator:

KEFAUVER'S HEART BEAT SINCERELY FOR THE WORLD AND ITS PEOPLE

(By Edward J. Meeman)

A great heart has snapped because it tried to do too much. Though he seemed to do it all easily, there must have been a strain which did not show on the surface.

I was one of many whom he took inside that big heart, and I feel that I learned to know it well.

I first met Estes Kefauver when he was Representative in Congress from Chattanooga. What he talked about, and earnestly, was the need of reforming the procedures in Congress, ideas which he expressed in his book, "Twentieth Century Congress." Right then and there I decided he was a statesman, for there were few votes to be gained by reforming the rules of Congress.

So when, a little later, he told me that he was going to run for the Senate, and asked me to get some Memphis people together to meet him, I was glad to do so.

He said he would fight Ed Crump, the political boss and dictator of Memphis. "Don't do that," I advised. "One candidate after another has made Crump the issue and that negative policy has failed. Just come to Shelby County and present yourself and your program, appeal to the people for their votes as you have a right to do. Don't fight Crump, but if Crump fights you, as I think he will, fight back."

CRUMP VERSUS KEFAUVER

Crump did blast Kefauver, and Kefauver fought back. Crump likened Kefauver to a pet coon, that goes rummaging in the bureau drawer when you are not looking. "I may be a pet coon," Estes rejoined, "but I am not Mr. Crump's pet coon." The battle was on.

I learned that Estes was about to put on a coonskin cap. "Don't do that," I pleaded. Such showmanship was distasteful to me. He ignored my advice, and the whole world know how effective the stunt was.

Kefauver won. The Crump dictatorship which had ruled Memphis with an iron hand, and the State with handpicked Governors and Senators, was smashed though Crump continued to be a political leader of prestige until his death.

A statesman, they say, must first prove himself to be politician who can get elected. But once elected, Kefauver proved that he was at heart a statesman. In order to get the indispensable support of Edmund Orgill, Memphis wholesale hardware merchant, Kefauver had to convince Orgill that he was for Atlantic Union, for it was only to advance this cause that Orgill was willing to enter politics.

Kefauver did pledge himself to advocate Atlantic Union. But, if he had been merely a politician, how easy it would have been for him to make one speech, introduce a resolution for it, say, "I'm sorry, but you see the time is not ripe," and abandon the effort. But Estes had become convinced that organic union of the free, democratic nations of North America and Western Europe was necessary to overcome communism. He worked for it, fought for it. When, in campaigns, demagogs attacked him for it, he stood his ground. He was a speaker in demand throughout the country, and he could choose his own subjects, and often he chose to speak in behalf of Atlantic Union. He was the principal architect and the leading American figure in organizing the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, which has been meeting every year since 1955, the Atlantic Congress of 1959 and the Paris Conference of 1961.

FRUITS OF HIS WORK

There is an Atlantic Council at work today, with all three living ex-Presidents, Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, as its honorary chairmen, Gen. Lauris Norstadt as its chairman, and Kefauver's own former administrative assistant, Memphian Richard J. Wallace as its director general, and to Kefauver goes the credit for this. The "parliament of man" he achieved before his death; the federation of the free should come soon from causes he set in motion, and be his monument.

Kefauver's exposure of gangsters and his fight on monopoly were spectacular. That he was probably personally acquainted with more people than any other American who ever lived is a distinction.

But I will wager that he will have a great place in history as the statesman, who, more than any other, pioneered in behalf of the federation of the free.

Braxton County, W. Va., Retains Legend of Monster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, long before there was any talk about "unidentified flying objects" or "men from Mars," the people of Braxton County, W. Va., had their legendary monster who was said to haunt their woods. According to a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, the Braxton County monster was 10 feet tall, with a blood-red face and green eyes, and wore a green mantle.

The Gazette-Mail's article gives an interesting account of the history of this central West Virginia county, which was first settled 170 years ago by a pioneer named Adam O'Brien. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

BRAXTON COUNTY, W. VA., RETAINS LEGEND OF MONSTER

One hundred and seventy years have passed since Adam O'Brien built his cabin on O'Brien, Fork of Salt Lick Creek and became the first settler in what is now Braxton County. It was not long before he was followed by other pioneers in increasing numbers, until today their descendants have blessed and made fruitful the land on which they were born.

Braxton County, comprising a land area of 517 square miles and a population of 15,152, occupies a position as close to the center of West Virginia as the irregular shape of our State permits. High Knob, the highest point in Braxton, offers the most extensive view in the State.

Braxton, which was formed from parts of Kanawha, Lewis, and Nicholas Counties in January 1836, was named for Carter Braxton, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. At that time the county was quite large, but due to the formation of Webster and Clay Counties, its area was reduced considerably.

Among the first settlers to come to Braxton was the Carpenter family. The following years witnessed the coming of several families to this region; and in 1863 the vicinity was incorporated as Sutton in honor of John D. Sutton, the largest landholder of the section.

Some years after the first settlers had come to the Sutton area, Peyton Byrne established his home at the mouth of Salt Lick Creek. Other families followed and the settlement became known as Lumberport. In 1866 its name was changed to Burnsville in honor of Captain John M. Burns. While Sutton and Burnsville were establishing themselves, the vicinity of Gassaway, named for Henry Gassaway Davis, was coming into existence.

The pioneer fathers of Braxton County were great believers in education as well as religion. Their chief motive in life seemed to be the fostering of these two elements. There are three high schools with a county enrollment of approximately 4,000 elementary and high school students. There are more than 60 churches in Braxton County. The fact that the pioneer fathers were quite energetic in their efforts is evidenced by the statistics which show that Braxton has a much higher percentage of church attendance than the National or State average.

There are many places of interest to see as well as abundant legends to be told. The story of Strange Creek is strange indeed. Many years ago a surveyor became hopelessly lost. Some time during his wanderings, he carved these words on a tree: "Strange is my name, and strange is this ground, and strange it is that I cannot be found." No doubt the best known legend is the Braxton County monster. From all descriptions, he was 10 feet tall, with a blood-red face, green eyes, and wearing a green mantle. No one is certain what, if anything, landed near Flatwoods, but something frightened the seven witnesses.

Perhaps the most scenic spot in Braxton is the Sutton Dam. It is very important, not only to Braxton County, but to West Virginia. The dam is located about 1 mile above Sutton, rises 200 feet above the riverbed, and holds a summer pool about 20 miles long, which offers many opportunities for water recreation. The National Guard Armory, located between Gassaway and Sutton on West Virginia 4, has a dual purpose for the community: recreation, and training and equipping a National Guard unit.

Motivated by pride in the past and present, and by hope in the future, the county has taken full advantage of its 20th century developments, welding them into a place of better business and industrial opportunity.

As early as 1908, plants were erected in Braxton County for the manufacture of wood alcohol and other chemicals. At present, Williams Wood Products, Inc., furnishes steady employment for approximately 105 people and their products are known and used throughout the United States.

The West Virginia Forest Products Co., Inc., to be located between Sutton and Gassaway, will manufacture particle board, plywood, and veneer. The German-made machines will take about 10 months to build

and install, and in the meantime the construction of the plant and an access bridge across Elk River will be underway.

There are two county newspapers, the Braxton Democrat and the Braxton Central, both published at Sutton. Five watersheds, which will be constructed on the Tom Hughes Fork, the Salt Lick, Berry Fork, and Corley, are for the prevention of floods and the conservation of water.

Braxton has abundant natural resources, There are several small producing coal mines, and in the past year, producing gas wells were drilled near Exchange and Bowling Green. The surface of Braxton County ranges from 760 to 2,160 feet above sea level. Five rivers have their courses through the county: the Elk, the Little Kanawha, the Big Birch, the Little Birch, and the Holly. Some 100 species of fish are found in these rivers, among them are some of the finest game and food fishes in the State. The large game has all been exterminated except for deer and a few native black bear.

Braxton County is friendly. Its people are naturally hospitable, intelligent, industrious, and skilled in many trades. Forward looking, yet eager to preserve its atmosphere of rural peace, Braxton County has combined the old and the new in a delightful blend of easy living and progressive building.—Prepared by senior English class, Sutton High School, Leah Fox, teacher.

Gary Boldwater, Boy American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I always take pleasure in inserting Art Hoppe's columns in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope the readers of the RECORD will enjoy the following:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 19, 1963]

GARY BOLDWATER, BOY AMERICAN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Hi there, boys and girls out there in front of your TV set. Comfy? Well, hold on to your hats 'cause here we go—off on a brand-new thrilling adventure series with a brand-new thrilling adventure hero—Gary Boldwater, boy American.

(Theme: "The Stars and Stripes Forever.")

Faster than the speed of sound, stronger than the Chase National Bank, able to bound over tall issues in a single leap—Gary Boldwater, boy American.

Who will save us from the Communists? Who will save us from the Keynsians? Who will save us from ourselves? Gary Boldwater, boy American.

So c'mon, kids, let's join Gary today for "The Thrilling Adventure of the Phony Treaty." There he is in his disguise as a stuffy old Senator with his stuffy old horn-rimmed glasses and stuffy old double-breasted suit. That's his pretty secretary, Lotus Lane (who doesn't know who he really is either), handing him a document.

LOTUS. Here's a copy of that nuclear test ban treaty, Senator Boldwater. Shall I read it to you?

GARY (who always pretends he can't read). Well, now, Miss Lane, I don't see much sense in that. The way I hear, it's just another simple old treaty. Nothing to get het up about.

LOTUS (vexed). But, Senator. Look, it's written in two languages.

GARY. Now, now, Miss Lane. Heaps of things are written in two languages, Like, well, like heaps of things.

LOTUS (angrily). Oh, Senator, you're just like so many Americans. You're sweet, but you're so naive.

(She stomps out and Gary whips off his glasses and suit to reveal the uniform of a general in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. The uniform of Gary Boldwater, boy American. Leaping into the cockpit of his very own jet plane, he zooms into the sky and circles over the Washington monument.)

GARY (musing as he flies in circles): There. Now I am able to think more clearly with my 100 I.Q. brain. Could Lotus be correct? Wait. I shall scan this document with my 20–20 vision. "The governments of * * *" Hmmm. "* * * discontinuance of all test explosions * * *." Hmmmmmm. "In witness whereof the undersigned * * *" Leaping lizards. Lotus was right. Our Nation is in peril. Oh, that I shall but be in time to save the day.

(We shift to the Capitol where our beaming Senators are about to ratify the treaty. Suddenly, through the skylight, crashes a parachutist. Could it be? Yes, it is. Gary Boldwater, boy American.)

GARY. Gentlemen, before voting you should know that one of the signatures on this pact is that of an "Andrei Gromyko," who is a proven card-carrying member of the Communist Party.

(There are shocked cries of "Oh, no" and "Egad, sir, he's right." The treaty is torn up. The Senators give Gary a big six before he can modestly slip away. Later, once again in disguise, Gary greets a breathless Lotus Lane in his office.)

LOTUS (glowingly). Oh, Senator, I wish you'd been there to see him. If only you could be more like that.

GARY (winking at the camera). Well, Lotus, I guess we can't all be Gary Boldwater, boy American (turning serious). But it sure would be a great country if we could.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 20, 1963]

A BOY'S BEST FRIEND IS HIS M–1

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Our annual Building Little Minds Award goes today to the Crockett Playground over in Contra Costa County for proving to scores of tiny Crockett tykes that war can, too, be fun.

Allow me to quote from the local paper: "Crockett—a high point of the week comes Tuesday afternoons, beginning at 1 p.m., for a large number of little boys in this community. That is the day they muster at the Crockett Playground for the weekly war games."

The story goes on to tell how the dedicated playground staff teaches the little fellows to make their very own toy rifles in the playground workshop. And how to dig their very own foxholes. And how to stage their very own infantry attacks. And how to kill each other.

Of course, the children don't really kill each other. They just pretend to kill each other. No sane adult would condone children really killing each other. But otherwise, it's as realistic as possible. And "all boys of the community between the ages of 6 to 10 years are invited to come down and join the fun." Which is the end of the story.

We will all agree, I'm sure, that this is a wholesome, outdoor, funtime activity, typical of the war games children have been playing for hundreds of generations. But I do feel that the playground staff in general is open to some constructive criticism.

Their basic error, I think, is that like most general staffs, they are training our boys for the last war. Foxholes? Rifles? Infantry charges? Nonsense. In a more forward-looking community, the playground director will line up his little charges and announce:

"All right, men. You fellows dig your shelters over there and you other boys dig yours over here. Remember now, at least 6 feet of earth on top, 2 weeks' supply of water and food, chemical toilets, and an efficient airfilter system. Let's get cracking."

This would occupy the small fry with outdoor exercise for a good 6 months. And then, at last, would come the glorious day.

"OK, men this is it," says the director grimly. "We're finally ready to play our fun-filled world war III game. Everybody in their shelters. Hop to it. That's the good soldiers. Everybody in? Hatches dogged? Don't forget to crouch down and bury your heads in your arms. Five, four, three, two, one."

The director then pushes a big red wooden button and shouts, "boom." And all the little children immediately assume the grotesque postures of death which are the delight of little children everywhere. Best of all, there will be no bitter arguments over which side won. Because neither side will.

I'm sure you'll concede this is a far more realistic war game these days and will prepare our children far better for the future. But I suppose some will complain that it isn't nearly as much fun. And it's true that the only one who has any real pleasure is the man who gets to push the button.

But after all, war itself isn't nearly as much fun as it used to be. And while that's a crying shame, our children do have to learn to face reality if they want to grow up. And so, if you ask me, do we parents. If we want them to grow up.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 22, 1963]

WHY THE DOGS ARE GOING TO OUR YOUTH

(By Arthur Hoppe)

EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON.—Oh, I know what you're saying. You are saying, "What's that fool Hoppe going to Washington for this time?" I don't blame you. People certainly go to Washington for unbelievable reasons these days. For example, the man across the aisle says he's going there to sell carrot juice to the Pentagon. Who'd believe that?

But with me it's different. I am going to Washington to demand the answer to a key question of grave concern to our Nation's youth:

How come I didn't get one of those dogs Mr. Kennedy's passing out free?

You will recall that when Miss Caroline's Russian dog, Pushinka, produced pups in a gesture symbolic of Soviet-American friendship, 5,000 of us wrote in asking for one of the litter. And, sure enough, two of the puppies have now been issued to kids. Along with releases to the press.

Miss Karen House, 10, won one in the big contest by writing the White House that the puppies were pretty and having one would make her so happy. Which is very nice, I'm sure. And Mr. Mark Bruce, 9, was awarded the other for explaining that he accidentally hit his last dog on the head with a baseball bat. So he needed a new one. And only a dog lover could quarrel with that.

But neither letter, in all due modesty, could hold a candle to mine. After all, I've devoted years to studying the letters our youngsters constantly write the President. And I feel I know the kind most likely to get action. Allow me to quote my entry:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I know you are the greatest, kindest man in the whole wide world and you would never have time to think of a typical little freckle-faced, barefoot, very photogenic American boy like me. Even if I do live in California, which may swing the 1964 election.

"But, whillikers, I sure would like one of those cuddly little puppies of yours. Ever since I told Dad about stuffing my last puppy down the garbage disposal, because I cannot tell a lie, I've been sad.

"And, golly gee, I guess if you sent me one I'd throw away my crutches and run through our integrated neighborhood to pose for the national photographers in my Boy Scout uniform with my best friends, Tony Giuseppe, Herman Katz, and Sam Cheong, whose dads are all civic leaders but politically independent—as of now.

"But I sure wouldn't want you to give me a puppy just because my dad has $3 million. To be honest he doesn't care about politics. Like he says, 'I never found a candidate I wanted to give my $3 million to. Yet.' So maybe he'll just give it to the SPCA. If that's where I have to go to get my dog.

"P.S. I'm very photogenic."

So what happens? I get a letter back from some underling saying: "Study very hard, for everything you learn in school will help you in your ambition to be President some day." Is that justice? There's a mixup somewhere.

But I'll get to the bottom of it. After all, if a perfect letter like mine doesn't win a lousy puppy, what will our youth think of White House efficiency? It's enough to destroy their faith in the American way.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 23, 1963]

HUMAN BEINGS ARE VERY SUPERIOR

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Mr. Kennedy has asked the Senate for a historic debate on the nuclear test ban treaty. But like most of his proposals to Congress it just isn't panning out.

True, there is a division of opinion among our Senators. One faction is firmly for the treaty, but has reservations. The other just has reservations. But, if you ask me, this doesn't make for much of a debate.

Now there's no question a lot of our Senators would like to be against the treaty. In fact, they'd love to be against the treaty. But the trouble, I think, is that they just haven't come up with any good reasons for everybody to keep on blowing up thermonuclear bombs. It's lucky they've got me.

First of all, what do those who favor the ban say? They say if everybody keeps testing bombs the air is going to get very radioactive. Which is not very good for human beings, not to mention caribou, turtle doves, halibut, and daffodils. And who is man, they say, to louse up this planet?

Well, I feel a little sober reflection will dispose of these specious arguments in short order. Take the fact that radioactivity poisons human beings. Do we have the right to poison human beings? But we're human beings, too. And if human beings don't have the right to poison human beings, who does? That disposes of that.

Now then, about those other living things which crawl, swim, fly, and grow. The issue gets a little touchy here, but I feel we can resolve it. After all, who is the most superior life form on our planet? We human beings. Who is endowed with the wisest wisdom of all? We human beings. Who, then, is the day-to-day custodian of these lower forms which crawl, swim, fly, and grow? We superior human beings.

And, being superior, isn't it up to us to decide whether to poison them or not? Of course it is.

So all we need do is ask ourselves whether it is not our solemn duty to save all the caribou, the turtle doves, the halibut, and the daffodils of the free world from the pitiless yoke of communism. And the Russians can similarly go on saving the Communist caribou, turtle doves, halibut, and daffodils from the menace of capitalism.

This leaves us with the final question: Who is man to louse up this planet? Nonsense. Whose planet, I ask, is it? It's ours by right of our superior wisdom. And if we, in our superior wisdom, want to louse it up, that's our business.

I cite precendent: We human beings in our superior wisdom have already eroded this planet's soil, destroyed its forests, and polluted its waters. And if we now want to poison its air, who's to stop us. Who?

So there you have the argument in favor of our right to go on blowing up bombs. And I trust we'll now have a more spirited historic debate, with Senators leaping to their feet to oppose the treaty forthrightly.

For if there's one concept that appeals most to our leaders, it's the idea that they are endowed with superior wisdom.

Cloak of Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, wrapped up in the civil rights package are broad and sweeping Federal powers. The Osceola Times, of Osceola, Ark., in a recent editorial, "Cloak of Deception," enumerates the scope of the Federal authorities sought in this legislation.

The full text of the editorial follows:

[From the Osceola (Ark.) Times]

CLOAK OF DECEPTION

It would be a grave, perhaps fatal, error for any citizen of the United States, whether he is black or white, red or yellow, to accept the idea that the basic purpose of the so-called civil rights bill of 1963 is to eradicate racial discrimination.

This legislation is 10 percent civil rights and 90 percent extension of Federal control. And it is fair to presume that the administration presents this bill at this time and goes all out in pressing Congress for its adoption in the expectation that the current racial hysteria will provide a cloak to obscure its true significance.

Under this cloak of civil rights, the President is seeking power:

Power to control every home, every school, every business, every farm, every bank, every citizen who owns a share of stock or casts a vote.

Power to call, foreclose, or refuse loans; to exclude individuals and businesses from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, benefits, and without notice of hearing.

Power to tell the owners of every business whom they may hire, fire, promote, or demote.

Power to blacklist banks, contractors, schools, businesses and individuals—all without notice of hearing.

These are vast powers, far more sweeping and arbitrary than any President has ever before sought in our history. If Congress, in the fearsome shadows cast by that cloak of civil rights, grants these powers, it will have curtailed the traditional rights of trial by jury and of appeal. It will have virtually erased State lines, nullified States' rights and placed once-free men in the keeping of a swarm of Federal overseers appointed by Washington. If Congress grants these powers, it will have provided the machinery by which contempt proceedings—the word of a judge from which there is no appeal—replaces trial by jury for all who are charged with civil rights violations. And on this base, this administration or succeeding ones may proceed at leisure to build an all-encompassing control of every aspect of American life.

As the President has said, "the enactment of the legislation I suggest will not solve all our problems." But, certainly, it reveals the master plan for government by gauleiter—for control of every citizen by Federal minions breathing down his neck. If you don't want this, the time to protest is now, today. Write to both of our Senators. Write to our Representative. They need our help as desperately as we need theirs.

No Subsidies?—No Guaranteed Prices for Buffalo Hides?—No Free Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to read, and pass on for the review of my colleagues, many of the good editorials in the Midland Reporter-Telegram by Mr. W. H. "Bill" Collyns. I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Collyns in his editorial, "They Put On Overalls," when he says there were no free lunches 50 years ago, and there are none today.

We need more folks and more newspapers, today, who have the courage and willingness to speak and print the fallacies of the welfare state. I commend this editorial to you for your review:

THEY PUT ON OVERALLS

Half a century doesn't seem very long in some respects, yet the changes which come about in that and much shorter periods of time are tremendous—and even terrifying, in certain instances.

How many stores, for instance, now would close for a day or two so that the personnel could work on the streets and roads? They used to do that very thing.

The Salem, Mo., Post, quoting from a 1913 issue of the Salem Monitor, said, "The first good roads day was fully observed by the majority of the businessmen of Salem, having closed their places of business, put on their overalls, went out and did real road work. They divided into squads and worked at all roads leading into town. It is estimated that at least 300 men worked the roads within a radius of 4 miles of Salem. * * * The second day all business houses have closed again and as many if not more have gone out to work the roads. * * * It is better to do it this way than to bond ourselves for $45,000."

Yes, times really have changed, along with attitudes concerning bonded indebtedness. It's mighty easy today to contract our road-building and other improvements, particularly when a generous Uncle Sammy Claus is ready and willing to pour unlimited numbers of your tax dollars into public works projects of all kinds.

In fact, it isn't even necessary in many cases to ask for financial assistance. The Federal spenders often will pick out a community, designate it as distressed or critical, and then insist that it accept Federal aid.

On the other hand, too many businessmen consider themselves too busy to even give very much of their time for nonlabor community projects, much less closing their places of business. Again, they had rather hire someone to do it.

The recent issue of the Post also reprints an editorial from the King City Tri-County News, which states: "No subsidies? No guaranteed prices for buffalo hides? No free pensions?

"No, all that those American pioneers had to go on was character; all they traveled 2,000 hard miles for was the opportunity for hard work. And that is what conquered deserts and mountains; that is what made America.

"Those real Americans would have been ashamed to ask for something for nothing; they would have scorned those who demand pay for no work."

Changing times, changing conditions, changing attitudes can be good or they can be bad. It seems we are witnessing a lot of the bad in planned deficit spending, public welfare, high taxes, centralized big Government, and a "let George do it" attitude.

But one thing hasn't changed. It still is impossible to get something for nothing in Midland, Tex., Salem, Mo., Las Vegas, Nev., or Washington, D.C. There were no free lunches 50 years ago. There are none today.

It is time that all Americans reawaken to a realization of the facts of life.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Oregon newspapers have also commented on the orderliness, dignity, and impressiveness with which the August 28, 1963 jobs-and-freedom demonstration was conducted here in Washington. These favorable echoes of that memorable day in the life of our American democracy give added endorsements to the civil rights legislation now pending before this Congress.

In this connection, I place in the Appendix a most eloquent statement of views by the well-known and highly respected columnist, Max Freedman; a column by that perceptive observer of the Washington scene, A. Robert Smith, Oregonian correspondent; an editorial from the Portland, Oreg., Journal, and an editorial from the Portland Oregonian:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 4, 1963]

AN EPIC OF DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA: GOOD EFFECTS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH ARE EXPECTED TO LINGER A LONG TIME

(By Max Freedman)

I owe an obligation to my conscience to write about the great Negro march in Washington last week. This event cannot be judged by the ordinary rules of journalism which bid us comment on the immediate news. The afterglow of this demonstration will be with us for a long time to come, and its deeper meaning will be explored by the historians. The wisest man I have been privileged to know, or am ever likely to know, has correctly described the march as an "epic of democracy." That is the proper spirit in which to measure its worth.

Like countless others. I wished the march every success but dreaded the risks which it raised. In such a multitude it would take only a small spark to kindle a flame of hatred and violence. As all the world knows, the march and demonstration were triumphs of democracy in action.

But it is just not good enough to record this fact with a sense of relief or as a form of routine praise. The character of the march is a golden fact that cannot be tarnished by the mean little arts of the critics. Dr. Martin Luther King praised the marchers for their dignity and discipline. In this tribute he fell below the height of the achievement. For their dignity was won through self-discipline. Most of the police officers could have gone on holiday and there still would have been no ugly splash of violence.

This fact is worth remembering, for every suffering minority deserves to be honored for its achievements instead of being censured for its failures. When next we read of fighting in the streets—and there will be many such episodes—let us have the grace, before we condemn the Negro demonstrators, to ask ourselves if it is not possible that some brutal local official goaded them into violence or provoked them into disorder. The Negroes are not always to blame, especially when they are blamed quickly and harshly.

If the march had been a failure, if it had been small in numbers, nasty in temper, and violent in action, would we ever have been allowed to forget this disaster? Why are our memories so tenacious of insult and so forgetful of idealism? Is this really fair to ourselves or to the Negro?

There is another test from which we dare not shrink. Would the segregationists in America, in the North as in the South, like to stage a similar demonstration and place their values against those of the Negro for the impartial judgment of the American people?

Let us be candid and fair. The segregationists could easily organize a march of 200,000 Americans on Washington. Not all these men and women would be bigots or fanatics or extremists. Many of them would be citizens of honor and distinction. But what case could they make in the clear light of day in defense of imposed and compulsory segregation? What arguments could they use to satisfy the reason of the broad mass of the American people? What appeal could they offer to the conscience of America? Until they can answer these questions, they would be wise to avoid any competition with Dr. Martin Luther King.

For Dr. King has the outraged majesty of the American dream on his side and they have only the nightmare of racial discrimination. He speaks with matchless eloquence of the wrongs of Negroes and we wish to give them the rights of Americans. Not a snarling word of bitterness fell from his impassioned lips. Gandhi certainly would have approved. So would Lincoln and Jefferson. His allies are the agonies and exultations of the human spirit, and the invincible mind of man reaching forever forward to freedom and equality. Are there enough jails in this country to break this cause?

Gladstone said eloquence consists in drawing inspiration from the audience as if in a vapor and pouring it back in a flood. Dr. King is that kind of supreme orator, a type so rare as almost to be forgotten in our age. But he is the master of words precisely because he is the servant of his cause. If the South wants to stop Dr. King's eloquence, let it grant justice to the Negro. Until then his voice will fill the land and Americans of all races and creeds will respond. For "the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted; and though great men should apostatize, yet the cause will live; and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet but survive him."

[From the Oregonian, Aug. 30, 1963]

SPIRITUAL QUALITY RULES BIG MARCH

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—So much advance anxiety focused on possible violence in the march on Washington this week, that such standard precautions as closing all the bars and placing troops at the ready just across the Potomac were understandable precautions.

But, as one of the Portland bus riders said in astonishment later, "It was all so orderly, that was what surprised me."

The fact, of course, is that the massive demonstration of Negro and white sympathy for racial equality contained none of the explosive elements of Birmingham or Jackson or Cambridge.

Instead of a display of militancy, the march on Washington was an affirmation of faith that justice will prevail, even for the black man. It was more in the nature of a great religious revival or convocation of a church denomination in which the evangelists move the crowds by proclaiming the sentiments of the true faith, call one another "brother" and evoke shouts of "amen" from the faithful.

If it was dominated by this spiritual quality, it was far and away more stirring than any revivals held here before, including the crusades of Billy Graham from the Capitol steps.

As this reporter marched and mingled, looked, and listened, it was evident that the young bards of this unfinished revolution, strumming their authentic folk music of a suffering people, provided a meaningful outlet—gave the people a way to express what they feel deep down inside. If the Negro spiritual of old helped them articulate a needed faith that life would be better in the great beyond, the new folk music sung by Odetta, Bob Dylan, Peter, Paul, and Mary, or Joan Baez helps them articulate their plea that life should be better now.

Looking back toward the Washington Monument from the Lincoln Memorial, one saw an Old Testament scene with a New Testament spirit. If Moses had led their march, they could not have had a greater sense of emerging from the social wilderness to which they are largely assigned still in the middle of the 20th century.

But there was no eye-for-an-eye militancy here. Instead, there was a sign bearer quoting Christ: "Love your neighbor as yourself;" Roy Wilkins quoting St. Luke: "No man having put his hand to the plow and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God."

And all the while a white lady nearby was holding a sign to shield from the hot sun a black lady who felt faint and was resting on the grass.

The multitudes came in frocks and slacks, beach shirts and white collars, fishing caps and fedoras, spiked heels and sneakers, clerical garb and rumpled suits—but they came and they came and they came.

As they faced the afternoon sun before the brooding Lincoln, their black, brown, beige, and pink faces gleamed. Behind them on the horizon standing against the sky was the gleaming white Capitol dome, symbolic of what Martin Luther King understandably calls "the white power structure."

The decisions that are made or avoided there in this year of social revolution may well hinge upon what Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress, called the pressing problem of "mass silence" by the white majority. America, he warned, must not become a Nation of onlookers, for the sake of its collective soul.

Meanwhile, the multitudes that rested by the still waters of the Reflecting Pool clapped and chanted, mindful perhaps of the saving grace Odetta had sung to them:

"If anyone asks you—who you are—tell him a—child of God." Surely, they shall overcome.

[From the Oregon Journal, Aug. 30, 1963]

THE GAINS OF THE MARCH

A. Philip Randolph probably came as close as anyone can to the truth about the civil rights demonstration in Washington Wednesday.

The veteran Negro labor leader, who had the idea for the march in the first place, said it had achieved its purpose even before the first placard was lifted.

The vast news coverage, he said, the attention given the march by the President and Congress, and the enthusiastic support of many religious organizations "are all evidence that we have already succeeded in reaching the mind and heart and conscience of America on the issue of racial justice."

He could not mean, of course, that the speeches and the hymns and the very physical presence of more than 200,000 marchers had overcome all opposition and guaranteed adoption of the civil rights measures the demonstrators wanted. Far from it. Even the most sympathetic Congressmen still face the job of translating their demands into measures which seem constitutional and possible to execute. And after they have done this, the battle to pass them will be hard.

But despite all that lies ahead, the supporters of racial justice did make some gains in Washington Wednesday. The rioting which many had feared did not occur. The Negro leaders showed themselves to the whole Nation on the one hand as practical men, capable of organizing the difficult venture and keeping it in hand, and on the other as thoughtful men putting their case forcefully and respectably. The marchers, whose role was to endure long bus rides and aching feet to take part, made it evident that it was real people, not just platitudes, about whom those men on the platform were speaking.

To our mind one of the most telling points was made not by one of the Negroes, but by the head of the American Jewish Congress, Rabbi Joachim Prinz. Speaking out of his experience of having been a Jew in Hitler's Berlin, and out of his knowledge of the thousands of years of persecution of the Jews, Rabbi Prinz warned that "the greatest problem of all * * * is indifference."

After Wednesday, fewer Americans can be indifferent. Fewer can close their minds to the awareness that the 19 million Americans who are Negroes face barriers which their fellow white citizens do not have to climb.

The way in which that knowledge works on the hearts and conscience of the American people, which A. Philip Randolph mentioned, will determine how fast those barrier fall.

IMPRESSIVE APPEAL

The interracial but predominantly Negro march on Washington may not have changed a single vote in Congress on the civil rights bill. But it unquestionably advanced the Negro cause with the American people who have the final say on congressional action.

As a Gallup poll made clear a few days ago, a great majority of Americans was unfavorable to the massive demonstration for political and economic equality. Many feared the peacefully intended assembly would result in violence to the lasting detriment of the entire Nation.

The fears were unfounded. The discipline of the 200,000 who marched from Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial and then listened there to the inspirational and almost spiritual program was magnificent. Not a single incident of disorderly conduct among the marchers themselves was reported. Speakers, both Negro and white, stated their views firmly but almost entirely without truculence.

This was an earnest, good-natured and intelligent crowd. Thousands undoubtedly saw Negroes in a new light, as the television cameras and the microphones brought their faces, words, and music to the nationwide audience. It must have been made clear to many Americans that there was no reason to panic if one of these fellow Americans moved in next door, sent his children to the same school, ate at the same restaurant or became a member of the same union as the white viewer.

Some of the Negro demonstrations in recent weeks have hurt the cause of full equality. The march on Washington should overcome the harm done by some of the sit-ins, chain-ins, and pray-ins that increased rather than reduced racial prejudice. There was dignity in Washington, along with the earnest demands for full citizenship and the warnings that Negro patience is wearing thin. Dignity is essential. A majority demands more of it from a minority than it expects of its own members.

No one can expect immediate fulfillment of Negro hopes from the march on Washington. A filibuster and defeat of the civil rights bill or some of its provisions remain probable in Congress. White neighborhoods will not suddenly be opened up to Negroes. Job opportunities will not appear everywhere. The "now" emphasized by the Negro leaders and their supporters of other races in their drive for equality is unrealistic. But progress has been made and such responsibility as was demonstrated in Washington will speed it.

Seat of Morgan County, W. Va., Mapped by Father of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, according to a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, the West Virginia town of Berkeley Springs, county seat of Morgan County, was mapped out over 200 years ago. One of the earliest mapmakers, in 1747, was Peter Jefferson, father of Thomas Jefferson.

Originally designated as "Warm Springs," and later as "Medical Springs," this historic town has been called the first health resort in the American Colonies. Some historians have maintained that Berkeley Springs was the fabulous "Fountain of Youth" about which the Indians told the Spaniards, for the reputation of its healing baths extended for hundreds of miles. The young George Washington mentioned it as "Ye Famed Warm Spring" in his journal, when he visited it with a surveying party in 1748.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article on the history of Berkeley Springs, W. Va., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING THE WATERS AT MEDICAL SPRINGS

On March 1, 1820, law and order moved a little closer to the frontier of two counties, Berkeley and Hampshire, when Morgan County was formed from the eastern part of Hampshire and the western part of Berkeley, with a county seat at Bath, now known as Berkeley Springs.

These portions of both counties had been remote from their respective county seats and had maintained much of the frontier atmosphere. In 1747 Joshua Frye and Peter Jefferson, father of Thomas Jefferson, made a map of Virginia, and the only point in what is now the Eastern Panhandle which is identified with a present day town is the location of "Medical Srings" at what is now the seat of justice of Morgan County. A map of Fairfax land made in the years 1736–37 shows it as Warm Springs.

The people of the tidewater had heard from the Indians about the water of Warm Springs which was good for aches and pains of old age, such as rheumatism and arthritis. These diseases, common among the older Indians, had according to tradition caused the tribes from as far North as the Great Lakes and as far South as Florida to seek relief from pain.

Dr. J. J. Moreman and Dr. William Burke, both early 19th century authorities, have called the Warm Springs (now Berkeley Springs) the first health resort in the American Colonies. At least two late 19th century historians tried to prove these springs to be the Fountain of Youth about which the Indians of Florida and the Carolinas told the Spaniards. The explorers, fearing ambush of the Indians, refused to be led farther North than the Carolinas. There is no proof that this is the place, but there remains the fact that this was the first resort, and then there is the question: If not here, where was the fountain? Relief from aching joints was to the Indians a restoration of youth.

"We this day called at Ye Famed Warm Spring" is from a journal of a 16-year-old youngster, George Washington, made March 18, 1748, while traveling with a Fairfax surveying party. Even at an early date the tidewater folks had begun to seek the cure of the springs, and among them were Henry Lee, Virginia planter, and Lewis Burwell, president of the colony, followed by Laurence Washington; Patsy Custis, stepdaughter of George Washington; George Washington, James Madison, fresh out of Princeton in ailing health.

The Fairfax family and others came. It grew in importance through the years. Not only those seeking restoration of health but the planters followed an old English custom of resorting to springs in the summer season to break the monotony of home environment. Some came to idle and fribble the time away, and soon the place in season became almost as widely known for its social as its medical importance. David Hunter Strother, 19th century writer and artist, said of the period at the centennial celebration of the charter of Bath: "Here, day and night passed in a round of eating, drinking, bathing, fiddling, dancing, and reveling. Gambling was carried on in great excess and horseracing was a daily amusement."

To furnish fresh mutton, beef, pork, poultry, and other farm products to feed the colonists gathered about the springs, there grew up in the area an agricultural economy. At first it was all within Old Frederick County, but in 1752 Hampshire County was formed to come within a few hundred yards of the famous springs; but this still left the town growing around the springs a frontier quite removed from forces of law and order.

When Berkeley County was formed in 1772 the springs were little closer to the seat of justice than when in Frederick. Because the gambling interests had become so important in the economy when Morgan County was formed in 1820 there was little change in the practices at Berkeley Springs. Several fine boardinghouses were built and the farming industry flourished. Many of the farmers were of German descent from Pennsylvania moving in after the Revolution. They, combined with Scotch-Irish and English, made up the early settlers.

Writers, Presidents, Senators, diplomats, sports, gamblers, and infirm people seeking cures made up the assemblage. Here the North and South met until the Civil War. Until about this time the county government had been in the hands of the Democrats, but just before the war there was a defection to the American Party, which after the war combined with the old Whigs to join the new Republican Party and made a majority. A three-man race for assemblyman—one for secession, one against, another who advocated secession only as a last resort—resulted in the latter, Johnson Orrick, being elected. He voted for secession and on a trip home he was ambushed and killed. There was little more than raiding parties in the county and troops to protect the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. The largest was a march by Gen. Stonewall Jackson through the county to shell Hancock, Md., and Sir John's Run, Va., and to tear up some railroad.

After the war the few from the South ventured to the northern resort and business slackened for a time, but again abounded somewhat more sedate. Gambling was continued in the hotels but not in gaming houses. The influence of various churches was felt. When at the turn of the 20th century the two leading hotels burned, the gambling interests, through the churches and the local papers, were told that gambling would not be tolerated, and the planned replacement of the hotels was delayed. As the influence of the church and newspaper prevailed, modest accommodations for those seeking a quiet vacation or cure of the waters were provided by local capital and gambling was discontinued.

Early, the tanning of leather became an important part of the economy with many small tanneries. After the Civil War one company consolidated the smaller operations into a big tannery. This was incompatible with the resort business and there was always a conflict with the town until it closed at the turn of the century.

Tanning also became an important part of the economy of Paw Paw, the second largest town in the county. Paw Paw also developed a large orchard business which still flourishes in that part of the county. For the 1st half of the 20th century the county became known for growing and processing tomatoes. During the last half of the 19th century a local citizen was prospecting and discovered deposits of glass sand that proved to be one of the best in the country. Today the glass sand mining and manufacturing is a leading industry.

For the last three decades the county has been rebounding as a resort. The State has built a large recreation park of about 5,000 acres with a modern lodge, private capital has built good hotels and motels. The small farms are being purchased as homes by city people and the unpolluted Cacapon River and Sleepy Creek provide ideal sites for new summer homes springing up along their banks. Sleepy Creek State Forest partly in this county and in Berkeley County provides 30,000 acres of hunting reserve. The bathing facilities and curative baths have been modernized and are better than ever.

Throughout the years there have been many influences on the economy but always at the base of it has been the resort business. Even though a 19th century writer said the accounts of the early times were "calculated to excite both the mirth and envy of the present day," few who read the accounts of the past of Morgan County would trade the experience of today. It has good schools, roads, hospital and accommodations for the vacationist. Today it offers a dignified vacation for resort guests and a fine place to raise a family. Here, the influence of the churches has changed the whole social order of the county. Industry and labor have never had any great differences. There is no organized crime in the county and it maintains a rural atmosphere without the presence of provincialism.

FRED T. NEWBRAUGH.

Reversal of Administration Policies Need To Curb Payments Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after 3 years of attempts to deal successfully with the Nation's balance-of-payments problem, it is becoming clear that President Kennedy and his advisers are avoiding a confrontation with the problem's basic cause—the administration's own fiscal and monetary policies.

As the Wall Street Journal pointed out in an editorial on August 26, the tendency has been to pick on some "culprit" by placing primary responsibility for the deficit on it. First, dependents of soldiers abroad were pointed to as a major cause of our deficits. Then, it was American tourists who were spending too many dollars abroad. Next, we were told American businessmen were not exporting enough. Now, American private investment abroad is pointed to as the chief malefactor, and the administration proposes to solve the whole problem with its so-called interest equalization tax.

Although these factors have certainly contributed to the problem, the administration's tendency to pick a specific offender only serves to obscure the basic cause. It is the Government's own policies of running large budget deficits and maintaining artifically low interest rates that are at the core of the problem. As the Journal points out, the effects of these inflationary policies have dissipated themselves, without worse effects at home, by spreading abroad and contributing to the dollar problem.

The editorial makes it clear that, because of the importance and size of Government operations, a solution of our payments problem depends on a reevaluation of current administration policies. For instance, the editorial points out that the Government's own payments abroad have annually exceeded the total deficit in our balance of payments. In view of the size of these Federal payments and the failure of other policies to restore balance, it is becoming apparent that some reformulation of Government policies is necessary in order to reverse our payments drain.

Because of the importance of the approach suggested in this Wall Street Journal editorial to the solution of our balance-of-payments problem I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

DIVORCE: ITALIAN STYLE

In the current movie of this title the husband, finding his wife an encumbrance, goes to considerable lengths to encourage her to misbehave. Having thus put her in the wrong, he feels free to shoot her and turn in due course to happier affairs of his own.

The plot is funnier in the movie than in the bare telling because it is a sardonic reflection on a very human feeling. Encumbered by troubles, it is always tempting to rid ourselves of them by blaming anyone but ourselves. It is a temptation not unknown among those troubled by affairs of state.

One such trouble today is the heavy pressure on the dollar, the plaguing drain on our gold supply. The roots of this lie in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, the amount by which the money poured abroad exceeds the payments we receive. For the second quarter of this year, this deficit was at an annual rate of $5.2 billion, the highest ever.

The problem, however, is not new, only newly grown more acute. Since 1958 the cumulative deficit in our balance of payments has exceeded $15 billion, and in consequence we have lost nearly $7 billion of the gold supply which supports the value of the dollar in the world. What the latest figures show is that the problem is getting worse, not better. It is evident that if this continues, then at some point the U.S. dollar risks a worldwide collapse, with unimaginable consequences.

Now it would be grossly unfair to suggest that those in charge of our fiscal affairs are unmindful of this danger. First in the Eisenhower administration, and now in the Kennedy administration, worried officials have taken the situation very seriously indeed. President Kennedy has twice made it a subject of special statements, the latest being a grave message to Congress last month.

But we think it is fair to note that in all the official discussion thus far, and in all the remedies proposed, the ever-present temptation has been to find culprits upon whom to blame the troubles. Each proposed remedy in its turn has been aimed at putting somebody—anybody but the Government itself—in the wrong.

First it was the family—dependents of soldiers stationed abroad. They spent too many dollars. Then it was other foreign governments, who were not paying their fair share of NATO costs or foreign aid or whatever.

Next it was the American tourist, whose customs allowance had to be cut to stop him from buying so much lace in Brussels, or American business which wasn't exporting enough, though exporting more than importing. At other times it was those foreign bankers, who not only asked for gold in payment of their dollar accounts but let foreign interest rates rise to lure more money from United States to foreign markets.

The current culprit is American private investment abroad. When the figures on the latest recordbreaking deficit were announced last week it was explained that "unusually large" private capital outflows were the cause of it all.

This statement is intended to bolster the case for the latest remedy, a tax upon the purchase by Americans of foreign securities, and to lay the groundwork for the next measure in the offing, restrictions on all forms of American private investment abroad.

What this assignment of blame leaves out is, first of all, the fact that the Government's own payments abroad have annually exceeded the total deficit in our balance of payments. It also obscures the fact that the Government's own policies have promoted the very affairs it now complains of.

Year after year the United States has run huge budget deficits, made money "easy" with artificially low interest rates. One way in which the resulting inflation has dissipated itself, without worse effects at home, has been by its spreading abroad and causing this dollar problem.

The self-imposed low interest rates, for example, have encouraged the outward flow of money, discouraged foreign funds from coming here. If American firms have built foreign plants, it is because rising costs at home make it harder for them otherwise to stay in the competitive race. And if, as some people say, the easy money policies have contributed to prosperity at home, they have also contributed to the boom in Americans abroad. Nothing encourages easy spending like easy money in the pocket.

It's true enough, we suppose, that these successive "culprits" have contributed their mites to the total deficit in our balance of payments. But however appealing the thought, the Government is not going to divorce itself of this encumbrance by ignoring its own behavior and shooting at everybody else.

Knowles Dam Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to have reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial, "Knowles Dam Needed," from the Sunday Oregonian, printed in Portland, Oreg. I think it points up the feeling of the people of the State of Oregon, and I have read similar articles in a number of newspapers of the whole Northwest, that would profit from the construction of Knowles Dam.

KNOWLES DAM NEEDED

This newspaper has warned repeatedly that the U.S. Government should proceed with orderly construction of its own upper basin storage area in the Columbia River system without putting so much dependence upon proposed Canadian storage.

The Court decision invalidating British Columbia Premier Bennett's high-handed seizure 2 years ago of British Columbia Electric Co. now makes almost certain long additional delay in implementation of the United States-Canada Columbia River Treaty. The ruling also invalidated the provincial power agency's negotiating for sale of downstream power in the United States and designated to build dams in Canada. The Canadian Federal Government is not likely to attempt to supersede the provincial government in dam building. The treaty remains unratified in Canada.

Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Montana has been authorized by Congress but it, like the three proposed Canadian dams, cannot be built until the treaty is ratified. Members of the U.S. Senate, however, have voted this session to authorize Knowles Dam on the Flathead River in Montana which would provide usable storage for flood control and downstream power benefits of more than 3 million acre-feet. Initial generation at Knowles would be 256,000 kilowatts, with provision for addition of a fifth 64,000-kilowatt generator. But the importance of the upstream storage is shown by the report that downstream dams could produce 953,000 kilowatts more as a benefit of Knowles storage.

Without upstream storage, the Columbia River Federal system will remain only half-effective, subject to seasonal fluctuations in river flows, producing large quantities of nonprime power or allowing it to waste to the sea, and unable to guarantee long-term firm-power contracts to industries seeking to locate in the area. In view of the Canadian foul-up, Congress should go ahead with Knowles as the next and most important step in Columbia Basin multiple-purpose development.

Underdeveloped Nations Must Provide a Climate for Scientific Creativity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of underdeveloped and newly independent nations to achieve progress in the scientific and engineering fields are impressive. Nevertheless these countries face some formidable obstacles in their efforts to create an environment in which this can take place.

Recently published is the report of the CENTO Science Survey Mission which undertook a study of science and engineering development in the three CENTO countries of Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey.

One of the members of the CENTO Science Survey Mission is Dr. Richard C. Jordan, professor and head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at the University of Minnesota. In a recent letter to me, Dr. Jordan outlined some of his impressions about the problems which face the underdeveloped nations. Some affirmative recommendations to these problems are set out in the CENTO Science Survey Mission Report, but I felt that my colleagues would be interested in the observations set forth in Dr. Jordan's letter to me.

In part, the letter reads as follows:

UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS MUST PROVIDE A CLIMATE FOR SCIENTIFIC CREATIVITY

As background, may I suggest that the world is currently faced, uniquely in history, with three explosions, one scientific, one population, and one political. Ninety percent of all the scientists and engineers who have ever lived are alive today, and by several measures it can be shown that scientific and engineering achievement is, currently, virtually doubling each decade. Both the population and political explosions are too well known to need much comment. Eight-hundred million people in 22 of the 100 countries and territories which average considerably less than $700 a year per capita income have received their political independence in the past 20 years. All three CENTO countries have less than $100 per capita per year income.

The explosion of science and technology has been dramatic as you well know. The powerful nations of the world, particularly the United States and the U.S.S.R., have been caught in a struggle virtually for survival. The somewhat less powerful nations such as France have insisted that their science programs be as strong and colorful as possible. The underdeveloped countries or the "developing" countries, such as the new African nations, the Central and South American countries and the CENTO nations, are suddenly faced with a world in which communication is virtually instantaneous, and transportation is little more than a day between the major world centers. They recognize that the activity through which they can gain the greatest power, the greatest self esteem, and the greatest economic help revolves around the rapid evolution of science and technology within the country. They are, therefore, developing a national regalia of science and technology. Too often it is gaudy and superficial and third or fourth rate in most respects. Moneys are spent on nuclear centers, rocket programs and scientific equipment, but the research itself is repetitious, often attempting only to redo what others have already accomplished in the hope that the training gained through repetition may be valuable. Science and technology now place a true premium on creativity, and no amount of expenditure on buildings and equipment or on the hiring of second-rate scientists and engineers can, by shear mass, possibly result in new scientific and engineering developments. It is much the same as attempting to produce one Rembrandt by hiring a hundred third-rate artists and putting them frantically to work.

This is in no way to say that any single country or group of countries has a monopoly on creative brain power. Many distinguished scientists originate from underdeveloped countries, and many more could develop if the training facilities and the climate for their development were available. The problem is that the "have" science nations are able to provide a climate for the nurturing of scientific creativity which the "have not" science nations cannot do, and this attracts and drains away any competence existing in the have-not science nations. In many respects the scientific community has become international except in the rare cases of extremely strong nationalistic bonds. Frustrated scientific competence appears to find reasons to emigrate to those parts of the world where a stimulating scientific climate exists. One need but look at the staffs of many of our major universities in this country or at Huntsville, Ala., or at many of our scientifically oriented industrial companies to recognize this. One interesting exception of a new nation which has created a scientific environment and has been able to attract into it a sufficient number of competent scientists to exceed the critical number necessary for the development of engineering and science within a country is Israel.

The principal obstacle to the development of science and technology in the developing countries concerns the ability of the country to provide a climate which will nurture, attract and retain creative engineers and scientists. What are the important characteristics of such a climate? Certainly, of secondary importance are the buildings constructed and the equipment purchased. Such physical needs are sterile unless manned by creative, soundly trained scientists, and engineers with freedom of activity, in critical numbers with similar interests, and within easy communication range. In most of the developing countries the very few creative scientists who do remain are isolated from the strong science centers of the world by distance and by customs barriers. Too often the governments do not recognize the nature of the support which must be given to education and to science, and there is an impatience to see that returns are achieved within a short period of time. There must be recognition that the strongest concern must be for the scientist and his living and working conditions. Scientific and engineering achievement cannot be legislated nor purchased but must be nurtured.

There must be recognition that science and engineering achievement has its heart in the universities and not in the other science organizations. For if the universities are deprived of their ability to produce scientists there is no possible way for science to flourish within the country. The research of the scientists must be freed from hampering

restrictions, and custom regulations must permit free importation of needed equipment and repairs. In some well documented cases procurement of repair parts now takes not months but actually years.

In many of the countries science is looked upon as something personal for the scientist by the masses of the people, and it is not recognized that the fruits of science will affect all, including the nonscientists. Even in our own country the language of the scientist is a foreign tongue to the majority of the people, and a communication gap exists between peoples at all levels and the scientists. This gap is much broader in the developing countries where education is much more limited. As you well know, in the majority of the developing countries, malnutrition is rampant. Worldwide there are some 300 to 500 million people who have never had enough to eat. Further, in many of the developing countries where the population growth is rapid, the population distribution is predominantly youthful. In some of the Middle East countries over 40 percent of the population is under 15 years of age, and the work life starts at 9 or 10. Under these circumstances it is difficult to obtain support from the general population of the country for science and science education when the immediate sacrifice must be shared. It is also understandable why their governments are impatient for results and are often attempting to provide a scientific facade, weak in foundation but spectacular from the viewpoint of the people. Thus the competent scientist finds relatively little outlet for his own creative abilities and tends to migrate to a country with a more understanding environment.

Profit: Lifeblood of Capitalism and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, know the secret of success in the private enterprise society of a free land. Here is a good example of their knowledge—and their ability to portray the too well kept secret of capitalism's strength. Obviously, they are reminding Americans not to take our precious heritage for granted, even though do-gooders would save society with the other fellow's money through Federal spending.

PROFIT IS NOT WHAT'S LEFT OVER—IT IS WHAT MAKES THE WHOLE TRANSACTION POSSIBLE

Unions and Government both seem to think profit is what is left, after a business transaction has been completed. (So both try to get most of it, even though neither owns it.)

Profit actually is what makes everything else possible—jobs, wages, taxes, our Government itself.

A company's profit:

1. Helps support the Government (52 percent of that profit is paid out in tax);

2. Creates jobs by financing research and development; and

3. Improves jobs by supplying money for new machinery, which makes wages, increases, security possible.

When a company does not make a profit: It pays no taxes, does not help support Government; it provides fewer and fewer jobs because it cannot afford money for new products and markets; and it cannot increase wages and if forced to do so, provides no taxes, soon no jobs at all.

Therefore profit benefits everyone, and any government or union which hampers it is cutting its own throat—and yours.

"Man Probe" Lack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, at the summer commencement of Boston University, its president, Harold C. Case, discussed the need for our civilization to develop outstanding individuals. With eloquence and perception he pointed out the crucial role of education in this process—not only formal education at the school and university level, but continuing education based on personal interest and motivation. Yet as he points out, we are less clear about our personal goals than about our space probes. His message that constant awareness of our purposes, as a Nation and as individuals, is an important one for us all.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser on August 25 describing President Case's address:

BOSTON UNIVERSITY'S CASE SCORES "MAN PROBE" LACK

Space probes are being pushed by dedicated men with clear objectives while the "man probe" has no clear design, Boston University President Harold C. Case declared Saturday in his summer commencement address at Symphony Hall.

To the 850 students including a 66-year-old grandmother and four Catholic nuns receiving degrees, Dr. Case said, "Every American must come to terms with civil rights. We have clear objectives, excellent techniques and practical schedules for space probes, and whether they are wasteful of national resources or productive of national security, they are being advanced by dedicated probers.

"But at the street level, at the point of a school board and concerned citizens, or prejudice and contradictory pressure, of penal policy and a breeding ground of crime, we have no remotely comparable objective, budget or goal.

"The fogs which shroud Venus from the Earth are no less deep than the fogs which shroud man from man. For the "man probe" we have no clear design, national program, or dateline. So time has moved ahead and we have been overtaken."

The grandmother who won a master's degree in special education is Mrs. Eva Symmes Darling, of Millis, a full-time teacher at the Wrentham State School. She was a part-time Boston University student for 5 years.

The four nuns all received degrees in music. They are Sisters Jane Elizabeth O'Connell, of Braintree, Mary Cabrini Abbatiello, of Trenton, N.J., Anne Robert Flood, of Albany, N.Y., and Estelle Marie Holt, of Cambridge. Degree recipients came from 35 States and 19 foreign countries.

Some Impressions of Germany—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part I of several vignettes—personal impressions which my assistant, Mr. William Emerson, wrote for me by way of a report on a recent trip which he took to Germany:

From the roof garden of the Berlin-Hilton one has a splendid view of the capital of Germany. The Federal Government, of course, does not sit in Berlin these days, but every German will tell you that Berlin is the capital of the Republic. A splendid view. But, depressing in a certain respect.

When you look to the east at night it is rather like looking toward the ocean—a light here and there on the horizon, but nothing like the glare of the western city that burns in the sky. The wall is there, most certainly, marking the line between East and West. It marks a great deal more.

I walked for an afternoon into East Berlin, just for an afternoon. I had read about it many times, and heard about it just as often. I had to see and experience it to believe it.

Checkpoint Charlie on Friederickstrasse could just as easily, from physical appearances, be a vegetable stand along a midwestern road. The enlisted man on duty was a fellow midwesterner. We had a pleasant exchange as he had me read an admonition from the American Government about travel in East Berlin. I registered and left a time at which I would be returning. "So long," I said, and walked toward the wall.

At the wall came my first meeting with Eastern police. They were polite enough, and took enough time to look at my passport. I was directed to the customhouse, which stood just beyond a second barricade at which I went through the same routine as at the wall. Finally, the customhouse.

I entered, and went directly to a "teller's window" to show my passport. The officer took it and gave me a number. "Have a seat," he said in broken English. I sat down. In a few short minutes the officer walked to a rostrum in the center of the room and called my number, though I was the only person in the waiting section. "Your passport is in order. You may now exchange whatever money you have."

Ten West German deutsche marks, I had been told, would be ample for the afternoon, so that was all I'd taken. Although East German currency has one-fourth the value of the West German deutsche mark, the exchange was on a mark-for-mark basis. I left the customhouse walking east, through another barricade, the same passport routine as before, and on to the sidewalk.

The first person I encountered was a young man, leaning against the wall of a small shop. He looked up, smiled, and acted like he wanted to speak. I didn't speak, but passed by him with that feeling one has in a strange place, not knowing really what to do. I noticed a bus queue about a hundred feet up the sidewalk and heard footsteps behind me. I maintained my pace, but the footsteps beat faster on the pavement. Just as I arrived at the queue, the last passenger was climbing aboard a dilapidated two-decker bus, and around me dashed the young man, leaping onto the bus as it pulled away. On the rear platform he twirled quickly, to face me. He hollered nothing, but raised his thumb in the Roman sign of approval and

grinned broadly. A friend. That act conveyed more, I think, than any conversation could have, and I didn't hesitate to speak the rest of the afternoon.

My tour in the East was routine, except that I was seeing everything for the first time. I walked to the site of the former Hitler bunker, for miles along the former Stalinallee, down many side streets, talking with whomever I could, seeing the facade that is East Berlin. Behind the neo-Moscow style apartment buildings that line the former Stalinallee stands the unreconstructed Berlin, to be sure—just one of the many monuments communism is continually erecting to itself.

There are some attractive displays in store windows. I commented on this to several East Berliners. "Try to buy it," was their scornful reply.

Though I had seen the Iron Curtain from a distance on several previous occasions, I had never before gone beyond it. When you are over there you tend to think, to put yourself in the shoes of those—such as the East Berliners—who have no escape. It makes you rather uncomfortable. You feel closed in. You want to help, but immediately about all you can do is offer a few West German cigarettes.

I had signed to be back at Checkpoint Charlie by 6 o'clock, and had roamed too far to make it on foot. There wasn't a cab in sight, so I enlisted the aid of a young German who said he could get me a cab. I waited a few minutes, and saw the headlights of a car driving toward me—it was the only car on that street. It stopped. I got in the cab.

Trying to make the driver understand in my poor German that I wanted to go to the Friederichstrasse entrance to West Berlin was too much, and we arrive at the wrong checkpoint. I tried again, this time we made it. The smallest denomination I had with me was a 5-mark piece. The cab fare was only 2 marks, and the driver didn't have any change. I was late, so I made him understand that he could have the 5 marks, providing I got a receipt for that amount. The regime is very touchy, I'd been told, if receipts and cash on hand don't add up when you return through customs. People have been charged with bribery and other economic crimes for the equivalent of a few cents, and I didn't want to be next on the list. I gave the driver a few cigarettes, and got out of the car about a hundred feet from the first barricade.

It was dark now, and as I walked toward the barricade I looked at a large apartment building. There were lights in only two windows of that huge building, and I wondered about all of the people who occupied it. The afternoon had been a totally different experience than I had ever had, and I felt ill at ease from the experience. In a few minutes I would be in the West, and on the way to the opera. In a few days, I would return to the United States, where the plight of East Berliners is, for the most part, well, a question to be viewed with utter "objectivity." When you are on the spot in East Berlin it is difficult to be objective.

The first team at the first barricade gave me a warm greeting, as though they were glad to see me. They were glad that I had had the opportunity to view the wonderful works of the regime for which they worked. I walked into the customhouse.

There were five or six men in uniform behind the cage this time. One of them took my passport. I thought he'd look at it, give it right back, I'd exchange my money and be on my way—particularly because, except for the men in uniform and a little lady at the money exchange, I was the only person in the building. He gave me a number and told me to have a seat, as he pulled the drape over the window of the cage.

I sat down. For 10 or 12 minutes I sat looking at a large photograph of Herr Ulbricht, hanging in the center of the wall across the room. The East German version of the day's news was coming over the amplification system in English.

Fifteen minutes. The drape was still drawn. I walked to the cage and rapped on the glass window. The drape parted and a man in uniform said, "Yes." "Is anything wrong," I inquired. "Have a seat, and we'll let you know." It was too quiet. I thought, "Surely some others will be returning soon. Someone to make small talk with." I was edgy.

"My God. That cab driver. I gave him 3 marks too much. What a stupid thought. He's probably glad to have the extra money. He gave me a receipt for 5 marks. Oh well."

The door opened. The person to whom I had given my passport strutted pompously to the podium, and called my number. As if he had to. I was still the only person in the room. "Please exchange whatever money you have and bring the receipt to me."

I was glad to. I only had 5 marks left plus the receipt from the cab driver. The little lady took my receipt and made the exchange. The commission was rather heavy on the 5 marks. I took the receipt to the window, where the man in uniform took it and told me once again to have a seat.

"What is all this nonsense?" I was irritated. "Who was I? What had I done, except to walk around, take a few pictures, share a few cigarettes and pay a cab driver 3 marks too much."

The door from the east opened. Several people walked into the customs house and stepped up to the cage. The drape opened, and the men in uniform took their passports.

My friend entered the waiting room section and walked once again to the podium, calling my number. "Your passport is in order. You may leave." I didn't waste any time.

Past the second barricade and a cordial farewell from the police there, through the Wall again, and an invitation to return to the Democratic Peoples Republic. I was at Checkpoint Charlie..

Back in West Berlin I learned that my experience, passing from East to West, was the standard policy of harassment employed against many ordinary visitors. They had succeeded in making me uncomfortable in those minutes.

The prelude to this experience had developed over a Washington luncheon table several months before. A friend, a member of the staff of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, and I were having one of our periodic get-togethers to discuss politics, the cold war, Berlin, and Germany.

My questions to him were usually prefaced with "Do you Germans think * * *?" or "How is something like this done in Germany?" or "Since the Wall, can East Berliners * * *?" My friend said, "You should go to see for yourself. In fact, I extend an invitation on behalf of the German Press and Information Office for you to visit Germany. You can go, do and see what you want. We'll offer whatever assistance you need in making plans." I was ready to go.

THE BUNDESTAG

As a member of a congressional staff I was naturally interested in comparing our parliamentary operations with those of the Bundestag. As a consequence, an exciting 3 days were arranged for me in Bonn, where I visited with numerous officials and staff of the Bundestag.

It was curious to note what a scant staff arrangement they have compared with ours, yet individual Germans often think the members are providing themselves with far too many luxuries. A member has, for instance, to be rather senior before he can have his own secretary. The junior members have to take their chances with a secretarial pool.

While there is much to be said for the economy of having a limited staff, I thought it had its definite drawbacks, the most apparent being the inability of a member to communicate directly and often in a meaningful way with his constituency. A junior member, though junior, still has people to represent. Many, I learned, have resorted to replying in longhand to the folks at home. On the other hand, members of the Bundestag do not hear from their constituencies in the volume American Congressmen do, and their districts contain measurably fewer people.

The formal organizational aspects of the Bundestag parallel the House of Commons more than they do the House of Representatives, but that is something most good comparative government textbooks explore in depth, so I will not belabor the point here.

What did count in Bonn was the opportunity to talk with members and staff about some of their issues, in addition to the shop talk about procedures.

Curiously, there was a strong similarity between their issues and ours. Health insurance, the budget, education, and news management seem as alive in Bonn as it does in Washington. And, of course always, the problems relating to war and peace.

WAR AND PEACE

On the subject of war and peace I found an interesting concensus. It is not based on what I heard in Bonn alone, but includes the opinions of people in all walks of life from Hamburg to Berlin to Munich.

The concensus is that war is a more genuinely remote probability than peace. They sincerely believe this. Germans are heartily convinced that there is a broad-scale balance in military power between the East and the West with the scale tipped, if tipped at all, in favor of the West. As long as there is this balance, and unless it is tipped hopelessly to the East, the Soviets will not risk war because they know they would receive a mortal blow.

This, in itself, does not sound unusual. We hear it at home, hope that it is true, and bank on it. But their thinking goes a little farther than ours on this point, in everyday circumstances. We don't normally consider that, as a creditor nation, at least a theoretically creditor nation, the Soviet Union could only lose the benefits of hard-won gains. This is a risk most Germans think the Soviets will not take, particularly considered with the German attitude that Soviet Communist ideals are something that is strictly for public consumption; that when it comes to the probability of having a devastated motherland in return for a foolish act of aggression, the Soviets will forgo the aggression. They—the Germans—didn't seem to doubt that the West could be pushed only so far, and that the Soviets were acutely aware of this reality. They were only puzzled, in fact, that the Soviets had risked pushing as far as they have, attributing Soviet aggressiveness primarily to a lack of resolution on the part of the West, several instances of which happened to involve Germany.

West Virginia's "Vertical Vacationland"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article by Charles Harper in the Ford Times describes West Virginia as a "vertical vacationland"

which has many natural wonders to offer vacationers from the middle Atlantic States.

West Virginia mountains rise as high as 4,860 feet, at Spruce Knob, and our speluncean wonders, such as the Sinks of Gandy, go down over 400 feet below sea level. In between are natural rock sculptures, such as Senaca Rock, and many well-known waterfalls. In the vicinity of Blackwater Falls, in Tucker County, skiers can find the best skiing south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Mr. President, I understand that the U.S. Tourist Office, under the Department of Commerce, is seeking to attract tourists to our shores and to promote tourism within our Nation. In the interests of American tourism, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Harper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA'S VERTICAL VACATIONLAND

(By Charles Harper)

West Virginia's Allegheny Mountain region can best be described as some patches of horizontal surrounded by a lot of vertical. The State with the roller coaster profile and the jigsaw border is crowned by the Alleghenies, where farmers in folklore plant corn by loading it into their rifles and shooting it from one mountainside to another, harvest potatoes by holding a sack at the bottom end of the furrow and count their sheep by looking up the chimney.

A million and a half of these inclined acres are covered by Monongahela National Forest and included in its borders are year-round recreational opportunities galore, within easy driving distance of the eastern seaboard. Blackwater Falls State Park (on State 32 south of Thomas), with its handsome 55-room alpine lodge, excellent dining room, 25 secluded cabins, and well-equipped campground, is a good place to unpack the suitcases for a sampler of this vacationland.

Outside the lodge you find a half-mile-wide slice of earth has dropped from sight. This is Blackwater Canyon, and it stretches 525 feet from your shoe soles down to a wrinkled ribbon of river called Blackwater that tosses scraps of broken sky back to you. The canyon is 10 miles long, and in that distance it drops 1,350 feet.

If you collect waterfalls, you'll cherish Blackwater, which stands at the head of this boulder-strewn gorge. There are higher ones, and wider, but none lovelier. Here the amber water, darkened by the peaty soil of hemlock and spruce forest along its path, spills over a 63-foot ledge, churns noisily in a deep pool, and starts its erratic journey down the canyon. If you like your waterfalls tall and skinny, look for Pendleton and Elakala Falls, just below the lodge, where they follow hop-skip-jump courses from top to bottom of opposite sides of the canyon.

In scenic drives from the park you'll find several of West Virginia's vertical wonders: Seneca Rock, for example, a 1,000-foot slab of sandstone eroded to resemble a crumbled castle. If you are moved to scale it, there's an easy path up the back side now.

SUBTERRANEAN VERTICAL

Some of the area's most dramatic vertical is to be found underground. Spelunkers have called Schoolhouse Cave "the toughest cave in America" and regard a crawl through it as a postgraduate course in subterranean exploring. It's only for experienced cavers, though, as are Hellhole, a series of pits going down to 424 feet, and Sinks of Gandy, where you can follow a creek through a cave under a mountain. If you don't spelunk, better stick to the two outstanding commercial caves in the area, Seneca Caverns and Smoke Hole Caverns.

Blackwater Lodge and the nearby town of Davis host winter sports enthusiasts who find excellent skiing on Cabin Mountain and Weiss Knob, overlooking an impressive patch of horizontal called Canaan Valley. The lodge is headquarters for the yearly alpine festival and winter carnival, skiing events held at Weiss Knob.

At Cathedral State Park (east of Aurora on U.S. 50), the State's largest remaining tract of virgin timber, you'll find a 600-year-old hemlock. The Dolly Sods area, a mountain ridge in the windswept high country, is a special treat for wildflower fans, particularly in June (try for the second weekend) when it is carpeted with pink azaleas, wild bleeding heart, pink ladyslipper, painted trillium, and bunchberry, to name a few. Later you'll find miles of cranberries and huckleberries. You can camp here, as well as in many other places in the national forest.

The forest has 1,900 miles of sparkling trout-stocked streams; Seneca Creek, Blackwater River, Gandy Creek, and Spruce Lake are favorites with fishermen headquartering at Blackwater Lodge. The South Branch of the Potomac is excellent bass water, particularly in the rugged Smoke Hole section. Hunters find an abundance of deer and bear, and exceptionally good shooting for turkey and grouse.

On 4,860-foot Spruce Knob, where you're as vertical as you can get in the Mountain State, you see turquoise peaks fading away to far horizons and grasp at last the scale of man to the Alleghenies. Across this wild expanse a new 160-mile scenic national highway is scheduled to be built, extending from Gormania southwestward to Richwood and adding a new dimension to West Virginia's vertical vacationland.

Economists To Study Service Industry Productivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a factor often not considered by those who urge an increase in aggregate demand in order to stimulate our economic growth rate is that an increasingly large part of our economic output is devoted to the service sector. Many economists believe that increases in productivity are more difficult to achieve in services than in the goods sector. It is because of this important shift in our economy that a recent announcement by the National Bureau of Economic Research takes on such major significance. The Bureau has announced its plans to make a detailed study of the service industries, and specifically "what has been happening to service productivity, and why."

The results of this study should prove valuable in helping to provide a more accurate measurement of the real growth of our economy as well as to suggest appropriate policies to encourage a high level of growth.

I include in the Appendix, under unanimous consent, the announcement of the study which appeared in the New York Times of August 12, 1963:

SURVEY PLANNED BY ECONOMIC UNIT—EMPLOYEE OUTPUT IN SERVICE SECTOR TO BE STUDIED

Plans for a study for productivity in the various service industries were announced over the weekend by the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The impetus for the study came from a preliminary finding that according to measures now available real output and employee output has grown much more rapidly in the goods sector of the economy than in the service industries.

The service sector will be defined in the study as including wholesale and retail trade, finance, insurance and real estate, professional, personal, business and repair services, and government.

COMMITTEES PLANNED

Some of the industries will be studied in detail, and the bureau expects to organize industry-advisory committees to draw upon the experience and knowledge of those in various service enterprises.

Salomon Fabricant, director of research for the bureau, made this comment in announcing the plan:

"The service industries now account for more than half the total economy, measured by either employment or dollar income, and employment has been growing far more rapidly in this sector than in the goods-producing industries." He continued:

"We urgently need to know more about what has been happening to service productivity, and why. This knowledge would contribute greatly to better understanding of the Nation's past economic growth and would be of value in developing sound policies to stimulate the Nation's future economic growth."

FORD GRANT GIVEN

Mr. Fabricant, who has overall responsibility for the project, said Victor R. Fuchs of the bureau's staff had assumed immediate direction of the work. Financing is assured by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

"The service sector has many distinctive characteristics, which deserve analysis," Mr. Fabricant said. "More than half the employees in service industries are women, compared with only one-fifth in the goods sector. Self-employment and part-time employment are much more important in the services and there is much less unemployment.

"Firms in the service industries are typically small, owner-managed and nonincorporated, although there are some notable exceptions. Further, the nonprofit form of organization is much more prevalent in services. Also, technological change apparently has been slow in the production of services."

In addition to increasing our understanding of the service sector, Mr. Fabricant said, the study should have important implications for policy regarding economic growth. Among these he mentioned the possibility of new insights into the relation between education and economic growth, the role of capital formation, the significance of changes in the number of hours worked a week, and the importance of expenditures on research and development.

Parental and Civic Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a resident of Oakland, Calif.,

Mrs. Edith Dolan Riley, recently prepared an article entitled "Breakdown of Parental Authority Leads to Breakdown of Civic Authority."

I am pleased to offer these remarks for the RECORD because, from my longstanding friendship with Mrs. Riley, I know she speaks with a great deal of experience and knowledge concerning her subject matter, having been a teacher, mother, and now a grandmother, as well as a great public-spirited citizen. In her lifetime Mrs. Riley has had a close association with young people and with the many facets of our society that influence the development of children into adults. Both Mrs. Riley and her late husband gave unselfishly of their time and energies to make our country a better place in which to live.

In this article, which I include with my remarks, there are many thought-provoking comments, which I hope will stimulate the thinking of parents, teachers, and others closely connected with the growth and development of children today:

BREAKDOWN OF PARENTAL AUTHORITY LEADS TO BREAKDOWN OF CIVIC AUTHORITY

(By Edith Dolan Riley)

At the turn of the century I was admitted to the school system of the city of Chicago. Shortly thereafter Ella Flagg Young became superintendent. My assignment was first grade in the Bohemian district, where the parents were all immigrants and spoke little, if any, English. Fifty to sixty children were taken in and informally sorted into "bright," "ordinary," and "dull" and taught the rudiments of conformity to group action, accepting directions, speaking and understanding simple commands and requests that enabled them to melt into a group inconspicuously. Here they were placed in class A, B, or C. "A" sometimes were ready for promotion by midyear. "B" must be ready for promotion by yearend, or the ability of the teacher was watched carefully. "C" might have some who needed to repeat, in which case the repetition was under another teacher. Thus automatically without the children being very conscious of the distinction, since there were many subjects jointly participated, the children advanced according to their ability without the bright ones being discriminated against as they have been under the system of the late years of working to capacity, or advancement regardless of ability.

One day on picking up my room keys I found a note in my box from the superintendent. Being a new teacher, I was plain scared, and slipped across the hall to another first-grade teacher of many years' experience. She, too, had received a summons. So with a sigh of relief I went back to work, knowing that if Miss Gimbel was called in, it couldn't be anything of serious criticism. After school the next day (in those days conferences were not held during school hours) we four first graders hurried downtown to Mrs. Young's office. We found several other teachers of first grade from many schools all in the foreign districts, so we surmised it must be some national discrimination that had cropped up.

Mrs. Young greeted us with her usual smile and said:

"I hope I haven't caused you undue worry, but I'm going to present a matter to the board tomorrow which might be played up in the papers as a criticism of your work and I wanted you to know you are in no way to blame, as it is a matter of policy that has been established through the years and which I feel must be changed.

"Since taking the superintendency I have been watching the trouble spots that have been developing in the foreign districts of the city and have become convinced that our method of teaching Americanism in these districts is a major contributing factor. In your earnestness to have these children learn to speak English and to become Americanized you unintentionally have made them feel that not to speak English, and live according to our American habits of frequent bathing, dental cleanliness, and other American health habits, is something to be ashamed of, and, with a child's directness, these children have become ashamed of their parents, who show little or no interest in adopting these things we have taught them to feel are important. Another thing, when a child gets into trouble and we send for his parent to come to school, we ask the bright child in the room, who understands English easily, to act as translator for us, if the problem is too slight to be referred to the office. This makes the bright child feel far superior to the adult and the child feels that his parent is one to be ashamed of. In other words, the system we have been using is breaking down the respect for the authority of the parent who isn't as smart as the child who speaks English. Every time you say to a child, 'Tell your mother—' or 'Tell your father what I mean—' you are placing the child, because of his superior knowledge, above the parent, who thereby loses his position of superiority in regard to other actions, and parental authority is fast becoming a thing to be flouted in these districts. And you cannot destroy respect for parental authority but what respect for civic authority will soon follow it into the discard and Chicago will see the worst bunch of gangsters that have ever been known.

"Now, I am going to suggest to the board tomorrow that instead of the German language being offered in all the seventh and eighth grades, we will teach the language of the neighborhood so that children will feel that speaking Bohemian, Polish, Italian, is not a disgrace, since it is something they will be learning in the higher grades, and so, they will keep up their own speaking to their parents in their native language instead of thinking of it as a sign of disgrace."

How wise she was. But before she could bring the board around to her way of thinking, World War I broke out. German was thrown out of Chicago classrooms, and with it all thought of any other foreign language.

I married and went to New York. Mrs. Young, I suppose, became discouraged as she transferred to the west coast and in just the span that the children she had hoped to save had reached young manhood, Chicago had its Al Capone gang, made up of these foreign elements that she had tried to save from disrespect for civic authority by saving their respect for parental authority.

Everyone blamed it on their foreign nationality. Even today in New York, the reason for the gangster, mostly so far Puerto Ricans, is looked upon as being their nationality. The other day I saw where someone advanced the idea that it was caused because Americanism had robbed these young people of all respect for all their ideals, because they thought it a badge of their being Puerto Rican, just as the Chicagoan a generation ago by robbing the Chicago foreign children of all respect for the ideas of their parents had created a disregard for civic authority by destroying parental authority.

One thing it would be well for the band of welfare workers, who have been assigned to study 50 Chinese youths, in order to find out why there is little or no juvenile delinquency among Chinese, would be to realize that they need go no further than the Chinese school where Chinese is spoken, and which all Chinese children have to attend at least 2 hours a day after their regular school day is done. This preserves their respect for their parents, and parental authority is upheld and civic authority is obeyed.

But what of gains in other cities where the culprits are our own American youth? What has taught our American youth to defy civic authority? What about the disrespect for parental authority?

On every hand the children hear "the parents are to blame"; a few years ago it was almost a national slogan: "There are no bad boys; it is the parents that are delinquent."

Just the other day an Oakland Tribune headline proclaimed to the youth of America, "Don't Blame Junior for His Bad Habits—You Can't Blame a Child When His Parents Allow Him To Develop One Bad Habit After Another." But, who was it that has pounded it into parents of the past two generations, "You mustn't say 'no' to Junior. You must not restrain him from developing his personality. You will have a frustrated youth if he is not allowed to express his feelings without restraint." The writer goes on to say, "We consulted a baby specialist and he said to 'stop wheeling her. Put her to bed and shut the door.'" What heresy that would have been even a dozen years ago. Back to the dark ages, it would have been said.

Required reading for specialists of today should be the books written by the specialists in their own field—whether education or psychology—written as far back as at least 10 years. Then it would be known who is to blame for the conditions of today.

When the child goes to school today, what happens? He carts home drawing and shoddy handwork, et cetera, but when mother or father asks him to bring home his reader so they can see how well he is learning to read, the answer is, "Oh, no. Teacher says you don't know how we teach reading today. You would tell me the wrong way."

If parents don't know, whose fault is it? There are classes on almost every subject under the sun, from teaching the parent "How To Play Bridge" to "How To Train the Dog," but I have never heard of a class on "How To Teach Your Child to Read." If some of the departments of education should put on such a class, they would find themselves overwhelmed with enrollees. (See note at end of this article.)

If a child gets into trouble, what is the procedure? Is the parent called in and counseled as to how to handle the situation? Oh, no. The parents would not understand him properly. He is sent to the counselor. A stranger who can judge his case without prejudice, which takes precedence over judging it with knowledge gained by experience.

If a child, from the time he enters school until he is 13 or 14 years old, hears: "Your parents don't know how to help you with your lessons; your parents don't know how to help you with your behavior problems." Is it any wonder the youth thinks his parents don't know how to handle his social problems when they arise.

Parents are not to blame. They haven't had a fair chance to learn how to deal with their children. The parents of today have had more abnormal psychology when they were in college than they have had child psychology, which would have helped them to handle their children. Only those who took education studied child psychology. The smart crowd studied abnormal psychology in the university my children attended.

Judge Kohler, in analyzing the results of her European visit, says: "I sense that Americans are more hostile toward adolescents than are Europeans. One result is that we do not plan for the problems of youth."

This hostility between parents and children and the lack of preparation for their coming problems are caused by the breakdown of communion between child and parent by the schools shutting off the parent from the child's development by forbidding homework, and the turning of the solution

of school problems to the professional counselor. This removes the parent from the solving of the child's small problems in their beginning, causing the breakdown of the child's respect for his parents' ability to deal with his problems in childhood. As with the Chicago mistake, this leads to disrespect for all authority, civic as well as parental.

(NOTE.—Since this was written, the Denver Board of Education financed by the Carnegie Foundation, has conducted a TV program to teach parents how to teach their children to read before they start to school.)

Columbia Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Christian Science Monitor carried a front page story on the John Day Dam which is now being moved toward completion on the Columbia River.

As Representative of the district adjacent to John Day, I join with both Oregonians and Americans in the great feeling of pride over the accomplishment this dam and for that matter the whole development of the Columbia River represents. However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring special attention to the second paragraph of the Monitor's story, where it is pointed out virtually just in passing, that while John Day will have an ultimate rated power capacity of 2,700,000 kilowatts, that the Soviet Union has a dam already under construction which will produce 4½ million kilowatts; or, in other words, exactly two-thirds larger than John Day.

I point this out because we are often urged to neglect the responsibility of the Federal Government toward full development of our hydroelectric resources potential.

Before the end of this session of Congress, this House will have an opportunity to vote on vitally important programs which will help facilitate full development of our water power; I hope at that time every Member will be aware of the need to compete in this peaceful way with the Soviet Union, as well as in defense spending which already takes up so much of our budget.

I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks:

LAST LINK IN COLUMBIA PROJECT RISES

(By Malcolm Bauer)

THE DALLES, OREG.—The biggest concentration of heavy construction equipment since the building of the St. Lawrence Seaway is in action on the Columbia River's banks just east of here.

Central project is the John Day Dam, last major link in the mainline chain of hydroelectric dams spanning the Columbia River and due to be the second largest hydroelectric producer in the world. Upon its completion in 1968, the John Day Dam will begin to turn generators with an ultimate rated capacity of 2,700,000 kilowatts, second only to the Soviet Union's 4,500,000-kilowatt project under construction on the Angara River at Bratsk.

Just the other day, the U.S. Engineers awarded a prime contract for the completion of the John Day Dam, which has already been under construction for many months within sight of the thousands of motorists who travel Interstate Route 80N (formerly the Columbia River Highway) on the Oregon side of the river.

BIGGEST CONTRACT

The contract, which went to the California combine of Vinnell, Mannix, McNamara Corp. and George A. Fuller Co., was won on a bid of $70,496,832. It was the biggest civil contract ever let by the U.S. Army Engineers.

But this is a small part of the massive project, which will require the relocation of towns along the Columbia and of major highway and railway lines. U.S. Army Engineers estimate that the total cost of all operations related to the John Day project will be almost $500 million. By contrast, Bonneville, the first of the Federal dams in the Columbia system, cost $85 million in "depression dollars."

The biggest job of relocation will be on the Oregon side of the Columbia River upstream from the site of the dam, which is 25 miles east of The Dalles. The dam will raise the height of the Columbia as much as 100 feet above its present normal flow.

A 76-MILE RESERVOIR

The reservoir will extend for 76 miles up the Columbia, beyond the towns of Blalock, Arlington, Boardman, Irrigon, and Umatilla on the Oregon side of the river, and Roosevelt, Alderdale, Paterson, and Plymouth on the Washington shore. Arlington and Umatilla, in particular, are engaged in extensive arrangements to move to new locations.

The Federal Government will pay the greater part of the cost of such relocations as well as the cost of moving mainline railways and major highways.

All along the 76-mile reservoir on both sides of the river the landscape will be transformed. As in the case of earlier Columbia River hydroelectric projects, the displacement of established settlements will be compensated for, in part, by enhanced opportunities for commerce and recreation on the newly tamed segment of the river.

YACHT CLUBS SPROUT

Arlington, for example, which for decades has occupied a rocky cleft on the south shore of a river often in rampage, will have a new man-made harbor extending almost into the center of its brandnew business district.

When the John Day Dam gates are closed in 1968, there will be a slackwater lake extending from the Pacific (tides reach downstream Bonneville Dam) to Pasco, Wash., 325 miles inland. The Columbia's major tributary, the Snake, will eventually extend this water highway another 140 miles to Lewiston, Idaho.

It is not surprising now to find yacht clubs where a few decades ago the Columbia rushed through desertlands. As the river has been progressively controlled by the big dams, water commerce has boomed between Portland and the inland empire of eastern Oregon, eastern Washington, and Idaho.

John Day Dam will be the biggest hydroelectric producer in the Columbia system, its 2,700,000 kilowatts being more than 700,000 kilowatts in excess of that produced at Grand Coulee Dam, once rated as the largest manmade structure in the world.

Giving Orange County the Double "Oh"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Orange County, Calif., in which the district I have the honor to represent lies, certainly should be given a "Double Oh," as the title of a recent Pacific Telephone Co. magazine's featured article suggests.

Orange County is one of the fastest growing counties in the United States. Not only is it growing in population, but in industrial development, and as one of our Nation's most famous recreational areas.

Beautiful sunny beaches, Disneyland, Newport Harbor—where more pleasure craft are moored than any other in the world—and, of course, a perfect year-round climate, just to mention a few, all make their contribution to Orange County's ever growing fame.

There can be no question that Orange County is a county to watch. One of the best descriptions of our county that I have seen is contained in the Pacific Telephone Co.'s, magazine article I referred to earlier. I include this article for the interest of my colleagues:

GIVING ORANGE COUNTY THE DOUBLE "OH"

Orange County used to be a 782-square-mile weakling. It has miles of sandy beaches that huskier neighbors to the north used to kick in its face.

But now the county has taken on some industrial muscle and an aggressive outlook. It wants to stand up and be noticed, a task for which it's now admirably equipped.

Before World War II, Orange County was a bucolic place. Rows of orange trees marched out of sight. Large and juicy strawberries and other farm crops, nursed on deep well water, were the big items in the economy. Spacious dairy farms dotted the hills and coastal plains.

There isn't much of that now. In its place you'll find neat and bustling industries in a sprawling urban center. There's a young and well-educated populace that earns far above the national average. There's a big bundle of confidence and a spirit that promises even more growth and vitality ahead.

The county would be the 12th largest population center in the Nation—even larger than Cleveland or Baltimore—if it weren't tied to the Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area for the census and other data. It's small wonder that the tale of Orange County's phenomenal growth wants to shake the cog that is Los Angeles.

Orange County claims it's the fastest growing area in the Nation: Gaining 226 percent in population during the 1950's, expecting to have a million by this autumn, and shooting for over 2 million within 10 years.

Orange County considers itself a unit with numerous political subdivisions, or cities. The cities have joined forces through the Orange County Associated Chambers of Commerce to secure industries, plan development, and, generally, promote the area.

The cities themselves suddenly have swelled to magnificent and colorful proportions. Garden Grove once was a hamlet set down in strawberry fields and orange groves. Its population of less than 4,000 swiftly boomed 2,139.2 percent in the bustling 1950's. Garden Grove now is a substantial city of more than 100,000.

Anaheim, in the same period, gained nearly 616 percent in population. Other impressive records: 33 percent gain for Cypress; 746 percent for Buena Park; 302.5 percent at Fullerton; 406.7 percent at La Habra; 119.2 percent at Newport Beach; 163.7 percent at Orange; 324.7 percent for San Clemente; 120.4 percent in Santa Ana, and 722.4 percent at Westminster.

These changes well from a rich historical past. The county once was a part of Los Angeles County. Much of the land still belongs to large holdings, such as the Irvine Ranch's 93,000 acres, and the more than 52,000 acres of Mission Viejo ranch. The grants for these lands were made long ago by Mexican Governors Pio Pico, Juan Alvarado, and Jose Figueroa.

Country life started to change in earnest after World War II, when the great migration to Los Angeles from everywhere reached full flower. At first, Orange County simply provided a "community of bedrooms" for workers in L.A. But the migration couldn't be contained solely by Los Angeles, big as it is. Orange County began to feel a residual effect. Then it decided to do something about the boom. The cities sought and landed new industry. New tourist meccas brought a myriad of visitors. Many liked what they saw. Orange County reached maturity.

Now the county acts with unity to feed the boom and plan carefully to maintain pleasant surroundings.

What has happened in the past 15 years seems like magic. The future is equally eye-popping. Nearly 300 people move into the county every day. Construction booms and bangs to new records by the month. Last year, building totaled $560 million, a gain of $448 million over 1961. This year should be even bigger.

The town of Fountain Valley is a good illustration of what's in store. Building permits last January were well over $3 million; only $500,000 short of entire 1962. The population in March was about 3,000. By the end of this year it should reach 11,000.

The boom has been accompanied by a favorable tax situation. Victor Heim, county auditor, says the tax rate increased only 20 cents in 73 years. Assessed valuation, maintaining the balance, rose from $8.6 million to $1.6 billion in the same period.

A big factor in the county's boom is location. It is the only area in the country central to three adjoining metropolitan census areas: Los Angeles-Long Beach, San Diego, and San Bernardino-Riverside—a market of more than 10 million people within a radius of 100 miles.

The county has attracted many "smokeless" industries that require a skilled force. It is now one of three or four top electronic manufacturing centers in the Nation. The median family income is well above the national average and the best in southern California.

Lucien D. Truhill, general manager of the Orange County Associated Chambers of Commerce, points to a new diversification, citing a growing number of food processing, research, transportation, and service industries.

More than 100 new plants came to the county last year. Many older industries are expanding rapidly. Aerojet at Fullerton, for example, increased its payroll from 600 to 1,500 in 1 week and now has 2,500 employees. Fullerton alone added 3,500 new jobs last year.

The county must add about 25,000 new jobs a year. In 1962, it gained 40,000, 40 percent manufacturing jobs.

The inward and outward movement of people reflects in the telephone business. The company has approximately 450,000 telephones in the county and adds some 45,000 every year. More than 385,000 installer visits were required last year for all purposes, according to A. V. (Bud) Jones, division plant manager. The county has more telephones in service than some States.

This rapid growth requires a vigorous program of central office construction, and additions to outside plant. Four new central offices will be completed this year: at El Toro, Orange-Olive, Costa Mesa, and Yorba Linda-Placentia.

One problem common to all departments is an urgent need for competent help. R. H. Smith, Jr., division traffic manager, points out that the volume of operator-handled calls increased 18 percent last year.

R. W. (Dick) Taylor, division commercial manager, says planning the telephone system in the county is similar to "running a railroad train while you're planning the track ahead."

Other contributions to the county's economy can be traced directly to Pacific Telephone operations. The company has well over 3,000 employees and an estimated annual payroll of nearly $20 million. Company taxes paid within major incorporated cities last year exceeded $4.5 million.

While industries such as ours make important contributions, Orange County still has a healthy agriculture. Although farm acreage is only half of what it was in 1951, the cash crops reached a record peak last year; over $110 million.

The county also is the leading tourist attraction in the Nation. Receipts from tourism last year totaled $158 million.

All this gain has had its headaches. Costs of services and improvements mount up. Nearly every community in the county considers a major bond issue at least once every 2 to 3 years. There's need for public transportation and more freeways. Water, wisely conserved in the underground table for years, may be less plentiful in the future, with more people and industries dipping.

There's no denying that the county is building from a solid base. The transition from citrus, bean, and strawberry land to a countywide metropolis commands superlatives. The county is earning recognition and respect. Its people believe the future is unlimited. It's a place full of gee whiz, and when you admire what's going on, it's only natural to say, "Oh, Orange."

It's Not So Much Your Dollars, but Your Prayers That Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a very excellent letter from Josephine Brown Mathews, who has been in Honduras for a number of years, in which she very appropriately describes the needs of the people in Honduras, and in which she also very ably and sincerely points out many of the fallacies and shortcomings of our generous monetary foreign aid program. Many folks across the country are concerned about the failures of our foreign aid policy; perhaps Josephine sheds some light on a plausible solution. I commend her letter to you for your review.

The letter follows:

TEGUCIGALPA D.C. HONDURAS,
March 28, 1963.

DEAR FRIENDS: Many of you have asked me my opinion of foreign aid, including your taxpayers' money spent on the Peace Corps. After long consideration and deliberation, I am giving you, which you may accept exactly in accordance to your evaluation of my judgment. I beg your patience in my necessarily long explanation.

In dealing with what is termed as backward nations—though many of them are hardly nations in your conception of the idea—you must remember that a nation reflects the personality of its people. Your foreign aid has tried to counteract technical backwardness, low material standards of living, sanitation deficiencies, illiteracy, poor agricultural returns through teaching technical farm practices. I'm sure you have attacked your enemy, Communism, through assuming that the true disease lies in materialism. That is why, even with the tremendous expenditures of dollars, you have received no return. The foundation of the disease lies in the moral, ethical, spiritual area.

You must gather all your strength in imagining that the backward peoples are primarily savages from a jungle who have a veneer of modern European dress, American shod, who are aping the manners and culture of a Christian-based culture. But there remains in the base of their psychology the savage code of self preservation in the jungle: Kill or be killed, two eyes for one, two teeth for one, treachery, duplicity, amorality spell his self-preservation. Having lived 7 years here, I am in a position to assure you that even the most traveled, best educated Honduran returned to that savagery. Four hundred years of intensive Catholic missionary activities have only given him a whitewash of Christianity. If he is under pressure he steals a religious symbol and hies himself to the nearest church for 30 minutes—not for breast beating, though that may be his physical manifestation—but to demand that God come to the aid of his physical danger—to preserve him through the phobia symbol he carries. Even the beginnings of charity fail him: His son or daughter are entertaining playthings, who have lost the entertainment value, in that awkward age preceding puberty are cast out of the parent's life and his affection. The Honduran is an amoral barbarian whose salvation lies not in material advancement, but rather, in ethical education. And that, fundamentally, is why foreign aid is failing.

You may help a man who comes to you in dire need, but you must judge the man. If he is hungry and he steals bread from you, he has not sinned. With the motive of controlling the stealing, you begin giving that man a daily portion of bread and continue that habit, he becomes dependent upon you—then he begins hating you for that dependency. Because it is human nature to assert one's anomosity against a personality rather than a situation, you have placed yourself in the position of becoming the scapegoat for all his incompetence, his failures, his ineptitudes. You become a symbol of the cause of his failure. If you remove the daily gift of bread, to his mind, you have stolen from him his right to maintenance. You become accused of grave injustice toward him. If you give him the bakery, he is placed in the position of a responsibility for which he is not prepared to assume. The inferiority asserts itself in a show of superiority and you have committed the most unfair act in the world; that of

placing an inferior in a position above and beyond his ability. That, worded simply, is the precise reason for the anomosity for the fruit companies and their late land distribution reforms. The fruit companies are hated for the very fact that the best schools, the best hospitals, the best housing, the only chlorinated water, and the only intraining while working and learning are provided by them—for free, gratis. In the same theme, if you help a worthy man, with a strong morality, with an ethical order, a smattering of philosophic understanding, a man who is responsible to others for his conduct, he will expend all energies in returning your act of generosity through whatever means of return that is at his disposal. If there are any Honduran of that stature, I have yet to meet one.

The disease of communism lies not, in reality, in the promise of material acquisition and achievement, but rather in the pandering to the sensual satisfactions, the utilization of the amoral to achieve its end, which philosophically is atheism. And any of you who argue that with me have not lived in a country which is basically communistic and has been for the past 3 years. As previously introduced, there can be no more fertile ground for the seeding of communism than the individual Honduran. May I remind you that archeologically he is the slave who remained behind in the gentle Mayan's exodus to the north with a smattering of the blood of Africans who escaped the slave markets of Cuba. We have lost the pearl of the Antilles; must we then, through our own ineptitude, lose Honduras and all of Central America?

Of all babies born here, 70 percent are illegitimate, which physically matters not to any great extent because infant mortality is very nearly that too. In the majority of male babies active sexual experience begins at the age of five years. Of the female I have no statistics, but should imagine it to be around 10 years of age. If the States imagines it has an abortion problem, ha! ha!, the Honduranean perpetrates a self-abortion and considers it no problem at all. These are only stated to give you a reflectual idea of the general moral tone of the country. The percentage of alcoholism is even beyond that of San Francisco's. Worse, the locally brewed hooch contains a percentage of fenal fermal oil, which is a poison that physically damages the brain and leads to eventual incurable insanity.

In the time that I have been here, the chipping away of what ethical whitewash the barbarian does have has become intensive, particularly since the Cuban reality of communism.

If you are a doctor you do not give aspirin to lower the fevers of tuberculosis. You diagnose the disease and treat it properly. If you are wise, you do not spend dollars uselessly to counteract communism. You diagnose the disease at its base: its base is atheism. The proper medicine for curing it is faith. We must properly administer and propagate that remedy if we are to save this continent.

So you are not being asked for donations of money. I'm not even asking that you discontinue your taxes that are being spent so uselessly in foreign aid. I am asking that you pray fervently and hard for more priests, more vocations and lastly for my intention; the time of one priest to say one mass weekly, and perhaps a bit of extra time to hear confessions. You imagine that to be simple?

All parish priests here in Tegucigalpa have around 48,000 souls in their care. With the help of one brother and two nuns they run bookstores, soup kitchens, and emergency medical dispensaries. They work 14, 15, 16, 17 hours a day, besides weekly trips out into the boondocks to perform mass baptisms, marriages, etc. This country alone has the lack of 2,000 priests. That is why I am asking you to pray for the time of one priest to say one Sunday Mass weekly. We have the building for the chapel, we have the house for the teaching of cathecism, crafts, A. A. sessions, and simple recreation. We are working, please help us with your prayers.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHINE BROWN MATHEWS.

Can Men Plan for the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the terrible encroachments of Federal Government are depriving every American of his heritage to earn, keep, and bequeath. Federal taxing, spending, regulation and control are taking away our time-honored rights and privileges.

The following Wall Street Journal editorial ably depicts the problem of any citizen today who dreams of the future of his loved ones and who wants to help in that future:

REFLECTIONS ON A GREAT-GRANDFATHER

The picture on our living room wall is a bit formal for these times. The old gentleman wears a high-wing collar, a soft white beard and steel-rimmed spectacles over eyes watery with age. Although we remember him as a warm and kindly man, he seems now strange and distant to his great-grandchildren.

That is a pity, we think, for this fall one of those great-grandchildren goes off to college, and that journey will be a gift from this man of Puritan ethics who, in a way no longer fashionable, gave thought to those unborn who would come after him.

Nor was that thoughtfulness all there was to mark him as a man of a different time. He came to manhood in the aftermath of a great war which had cost him a father, a brother, a home and the education which is today thought every man's due. He could not take himself a wife until he neared his fortieth birthday since it never occurred to him that the responsibility for a family lay upon anyone's shoulders but his own.

In due time, laboring with his hands by day and his mind by night, he became a merchant, a musician, something of an artist and enough of a scholar to discuss Latin subjunctives with his more learned sons. Before it was over he had built a house with tall columns, dreaming that someday his grandchildren would dwell therein with their own children in turn.

The dream is gone, of course, just as the house is, where now dwells a filling station. Times have scattered the family, and new ideas about society and the role of a family have dispersed the legacy he so carefully husbanded. Taxed and taxed again, it cannot much longer pay a child's education. Hereafter each generation begins anew.

There are many, we know, who think this is the way it ought to be. With the welfare state we seek to make outmoded this self-reliance of a bygone time. And with our laws we make it difficult for any man to dream in such a fashion of his great-grandchildren.

At first the aim of heavy death taxes was only to break up the concentrations of great wealth, such things being thought bad for society. But really great wealth has its own defenses; the fortunes of the Rockefellers, Fords and Kennedys survive. Today the true penalties fall upon those who, like the old man in the picture, accumulate a little in hopes for the next generation but not enough to build bulwarks against the erosion of taxes.

And this is by design. No one pretends these taxes are for revenue, for they bring in little. By intent they put a levy upon the savings of every family that gives thought to its own tomorrow.

If the Government had its way, these penalties would be even higher. The President wants Congress to tax every estate twice; to charge first for any alleged "capital gain"—real or imaginary, realized or not—that may have accrued in dollars on a lifetime's property, and then to pile the estate tax upon top of that.

Thus a house bought 30 years ago and made worth more in paper money cheapened by 30 years of inflation could be a taxable capital gain just because a father died. Then the heirs could pay another tax for the privilege of living in it still. The same principle would apply to all other family savings.

Fortunately a House committee has, for the time being, rejected this vicious injustice. Yet curiously hardly anyone seems to have looked beyond that plain injustice and asked about the injury this philosophy also does to society itself.

For beneath all the spoken arguments for this kind of taxation, however phrased, is in fact a hostility to the very concept of family as a continuing institution, progressing from generation to generation and handing on a better heritage to each succeeding one.

It is true, of course, that not everyone has a father, or great-grandfathers, able to accumulate material things or willing to do so by sacrificing for what may be when they are dead. Nor is it only a question of material things. Some men are at home with books, and they pass this familiarity on to their children, which may give them an advantage in a world where education is capital. Indeed, in almost every aspect of life there are some who begin with better fortunes than their fellows, if in nothing more than that some fathers bestow good health and others a sickly life.

All this, so it is said, is unfair. It is wrong that the child of one family should begin with more than those of another; that some, for example, should go to school on the earnings of the past while others must earn their own way. So society, by its laws, must eliminate all such advantages.

Perhaps so. But why, then, should any man deprive himself of present pleasure to save something for those who come after? He need only spend what he has while he lives and there will be nothing left for the taxgatherer. Why, indeed, should a father trouble himself at all with his young, if none should have the patrimony gained by generations?

Yet if this had been the view of the man on our living room wall, who should be the loser but society itself? For laws can only level downward, not upward. They can take from one child the birthright of a great-grandfather; they cannot give to all what one has lost, and the sum of this must be a subtraction from the whole.

But it's hard to explain all this, these days, to a great-grandchild. Even older, and supposedly wiser, men seem to have forgotten that society itself is nothing but a large family which has also built its present on the accumulations of yesterday.

March on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Oregonians who marched in that magnificent August 28 jobs-and-freedom demonstration in Washington, D.C., have written of their experience in the hometown daily press.

One article, appearing in the September 2, 1963, issue of the Portland Reporter, was written by Nancy Jane Duncan, 18-year-old daughter of a most able House colleague, Representative ROBERT B. DUNCAN, of Medford, representing the Fourth Oregon Congressional District.

The second article, likewise appearing in the Reporter, appeared August 31, 1963, under the byline of the Reverend R. M. Moore, pastor of Highland Congregational Church of Portland, Oreg.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include these two pieces in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Reporter, Aug. 31, 1963]

PASTOR CLAIMS MARCH FORCEFUL TESTIMONY

(By the Reverend R. M. Moore)

(Reverend Moore inspired and organized the freedom bus from Portland. Here are his views on the possible results of the march on Washington.)

Some note has been made that the march on Washington for jobs and freedom is the beginning of a movement. I would rather say that this demonstration was a forceful testimony to the powerful movement that has been in motion for many decades.

A friend of mine, who has angrily denounced the direct action methods used in the South by protest groups called Thursday specifically to react to the Washington march. "I want you to know that this was really a moving event," he said. "If only such dignity and respectability can be maintained from now on, much will be gained and I'll be all for it. It was lawful, peaceful and made its point without being extreme. More power to it."

My friend still disbelieves that the more than 500 sit-ins, marches, and other direct action demonstrations of nonviolent nature that have taken place in the recent few years were essential. He cannot see that they got out of hand and became disrespectful only after the white power structure reacted with troops, weapons and violence. He also disregards how the tyranny in most southern communities makes it impossible for one to obey the law while working for political change.

Nonetheless, I am confident that his reaction represents that of many citizens who have been unsympathetic up to now about what has been going on. To many of us the words that were spoken, the faces that appeared and the electricity of the atmosphere was not new. But this was a wonderfully new kind of victory, because we have broken through into new territory. The validity of the message, the undeniable truth of the basic search for human dignity, has been broadcast with overwhelming sincerity and power from shore to shore. I believe that we have challenged and won over many so-called moderates who have heretofore remained aloof and uninvolved in the press for full freedom for all—now.

Will the demonstration aid the President's civil rights legislation in Congress? The popular comment on this is that it will not. I am not so inclined. I believe that citizens in local communities who have been affected by this event will begin to do what citizens usually do not do—make their feelings known to their congressional representatives. This may be meager at first. I believe, however, that pressure has been brought to bear. Some Senators and Representatives who waver and fear to be different may now feel supported enough by local and national pulses to change their vote.

The respectable Senator from Florida who characterized the 200,000 marchers as representing a "minority point of view" is unbelievably foolish. I judge that he will soon realize that a significant portion of the white citizenry of America can be as impatient and radical in making demands as the Negro community. I do not see how this brilliant show of strength with love can fail to permeate the walls of Congress, hover over the lawmakers and prick the consciences of some of those whose good will will finally crack through. The march committee is emphatic, however, on our writing the men in power—again and again.

Another result of the march will take place in Portland. The biracial busload of youth and adults organized by the Portland Friends of SNCC has tied the Northwest into the national struggle for human rights. Their going and return will act as a catalyst here. Our local unfinished business will be pointed up more vividly than ever before, for we will be forced to see how much a part of the rest of the country we really are. Northwesterners seem to be intent upon shunning reality. There is horror when facts demonstrate that they live in an urbanized culture beset by 20th century problems. The marchers will not allow us to avoid this any longer.

I speak of the march in first-person terms. It belongs to me. The march is the product of dedicated Negro leadership. It is a peak in a historical phenomenon. It advances on behalf of all who desire freedom from the closed society in which we all live at present. But everyone is invited to be a part of it, and when you do, it becomes yours, expresses you, and carries you on with your brothers. It has a long way to go, indeed, in Portland. But it will succeed—without a doubt.

[From the Portland Reporter, Sept. 2, 1963]

OREGON TEENAGER TELLS OF CIVIL RIGHTS DAY

(By Nancy Jane Duncan)

(Nancy Jane Duncan, 18, daughter of Congressman and Mrs. Robert B. Duncan, of Oregon's Fourth District, participated in last Wednesday's civil rights march in Washington, D.C. She presents herewith, in a story written exclusively in this area for the Portland Reporter, the reactions of a teenager to the demonstration. Miss Duncan is a former student at Willamette University.)

Wednesday was the day of decision of this summer of decision. It was what the hopeful call the last and the greatest of civil rights demonstrations—the August 28 march on Washington.

And I was there. I was a part of the jostling, hot crowd that lined the main streets of the city. I was a part of the 200,000 believers in equality and dignity of man. I helped to express this belief by adding my own dignity as a human being to the dignity of others, who have long been striving to have this dignity recognized. The pride which I knew was bursting inside of me, I saw reflected in the solemn eyes of every glistening black face, every flushed white face.

The morning of the 28th started differently from most mornings. The sun was not its ordinary misty yellow; instead, it was a huge round flaming disc. Even the heavens had lighted the torch of liberty and set it aglow above the city—the city which is our last hope for justice—the city which was beautiful in its anticipation, thrilling in its pulsing throb of something big to come.

I joined my group at the Bible Way Church, a Negro church several blocks from the monument area and surrounded by the tall sadness of slums. The crowd was predominantly Negro—for once, the tables had turned and I was in the minority. It was a strange feeling.

But here, the comparison ends. For I was treated always with kindness and hospitality. For example, I had wanted to buy a civil rights button, but was told the supply was exhausted.

Hearing this, a Negro man who stood near me reached into his own pocket and handed me his button. He refused to take any money for it—instead he began to talk about this cause which has been the instigator of so much heartache.

He spoke of the time he returned from serving in the Second World War. He had fought courageously, as was evidenced by the metal plate in his skull and the stub of a finger on one hand. He was hungry when he stepped off the train into Union Station, as all servicemen are hungry.

Yet, that day, this man who shed his blood as nobly as any white man for America, was refused a sandwich in the station restaurant. But no one cared, that day. No one saw the dark-skinned man crying, that day. But they will see—they will see.

And I thought to myself, this is why we are marching today. That we might prevent another soldier from the humiliation of tears, that we might stop another mother from explaining to her child, that we might stop the wall which is growing between white and black—a wall more terrible than any wall in Berlin.

The march began. Quietly, orderly, but proudly, the march began. People watched from the sidewalks, from the barbershops, from the bus depots. Small Negro children with big serious eyes peered from dark doorways. There was a strange bond, a feeling of kinship, between every marcher.

Such a feeling is unparalleled—for it is kinship between Negro and white man which is a rare thing today, yet very precious. There was no color barrier in this march—there was no real black and white, but one tremendous blending, with injustice as its source. For I had reached the point I can say, in all honesty, where I could not have seen color anymore.

The famous were there, of course. But this march was not a tribute to the famous. It was, as one of the speakers said, a tribute to the thousands who had come, the thousands who could not be named, but who clapped and prayed and shook hands and smiled at one another and cried softly and stood proudly.

To you who stand in the shadow of the Great Emancipator is this march dedicated. To you, old man leaning against that tree; to you, white minister with that banner in your hand; to you, dark-skinned student with your head bowed to your lap—to you all, who are now only a sea of faces stretching from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Monument, do we pledge this day.

The day was not perfect. It was not without its share of trouble and irritated words. People fainted, people got sick and the sound of ambulances wailed through the cheering voices. It was hot, it was crowded. People stepped on toes, on fingers. It was hard to see, it was hard to hear.

But I shall never forget the feeling which rose and grew in me as I stopped to stare out across the reflecting pool. Behind me were the columns of the Lincoln monument and the statue of Lincoln with his benediction of the Emancipation Proclamation. In front of me as far as I could see, on all sides of the pool, were the people, listening quietly

to the voices of the leaders they could not see, maybe had never seen. It took my breath away to see so many people—I felt like I was looking at a Bible picture of Christ at the Sea of Galilee, surrounded by the crowds. How can I communicate what I felt? I was standing with a thousand friends, all of us looking into the pool which reflected to us the towering white monument backed by blue sky, and framed by a people whose song reverberated through the air—and across the world.

I cried only once—during the last speech, by Rev. Martin Luther King. When he was announced, the sitting thousands rose, as a single man, to pay their tribute to this beloved leader. His voice rose on the wind, saying all the unsaid things in the heart of every man, every woman, every child who stood there.

He assured his people that this march was not the end, that the Negro would not be content, hereafter, to sit silently.

"I have a dream," he shouted. The dream—true and full equality, but not given grudgingly, but given through love. He beseeched the crowd to feel no bitterness toward the white race for "We cannot walk alone." A mighty swell of applause shook the city, as the downtrodden, persecuted, and tormented black man saluted his white brothers. Then I felt my tears.

I shall never measure the pride I felt as I heard the voice of Marion Anderson singing the theme song, "We Shall Overcome." I shall never measure the pride I felt as the grounds cleared instantly following the concluding of the program—as I saw crowds of policemen sitting on the grass lawn because there was nothing for them to do, no trouble to avert, no need for fire hoses or police dogs or paddy wagons.

I shall never measure the pride I felt as I walked back to the House Office Building. My aching feet, my pounding head, my parched throat were forgotten—burned away by the glory of wearing a button which read, "I was a civil rights marcher—August 28."

The Wonders of Wheeling, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the city of Wheeling, W. Va., is well-known as an industrial center, but not sufficiently known as a mecca for recreation seekers. One of the recreational wonders of Wheeling is Oglebay Park, a 1,000-acre municipally owned recreation ground which is described in a recent article by Bob Terry in the Ford Times.

The article tells how what was once a vast farmland was transformed into a marvelous recreation park where modern pleasures are enjoyed in a traditional colonial atmosphere. The unique glass collection in the Mansion House at Oglebay Park alone merits a visit to Wheeling. The outstanding item is a giant cutglass punchbowl, 4 feet 10 inches tall, and weighing 225 pounds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Bob Terry on Oglebay Park be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WHEELING'S 1,000 ACRES OF FUN

In the Mountain State it is always inspiring to pick a high hill, leave the shadows and go into the sun, to see the beauty that is West Virginia.

Earl W. Oglebay probably had this in mind when he bequeathed his Waddington Farms to the people of Wheeling in 1926. This 1,000-acre municipally owned park, bearing his name, retains its natural setting of a country estate of the early 1900's.

The refinements of an 18-hole golf course, vacation cabins, archery range, lakes and 106 picnic sites, appear to spring from the rolling hills to complement the Greek Revival architecture of the mansion house and the formal gardens and forest trails.

The year-round activities are planned for all groups and all ages, from baton twirlers to opera lovers. There are hay rides and sleigh rides, horses to ride and boats to paddle, ice skating and skiing, swimming and tennis, horse shows and flower shows, waltz nights and folk dance festivals.

A full-time naturalist conducts the Nature Center program which includes hiking, movies, lectures and bird study. Youngsters enjoy the Children's Center with its playground and zoo. Gardeners can visit the greenhouses, where a gladiolus show is held in August and a chrysanthemum show in November.

The angler can try the park's lakes—Schenk and Flycatcher—for rainbow trout up to 24 inches, large channel catfish and scrappy smallmouth bass. Schenk has fishing and boating, while Flycatcher is restricted to artificial lures. No license is required but a small fee is charged for the fish kept. There's ice skating in the winter on Schenk Lake, the larger of the two. Observation walks circle each lake.

One of Oglebay Park's most popular features is its Caddy Camp, begun in 1939, a supervised program for 30 to 40 boys at no cost to their parents. The camp's unusual financial arrangement allows the boys to earn half their board by caddying and the rest from small chores about the park.

Guiding the cultural program is Oglebay Institute, founded in 1930 to implement the use of the park by special groups and to secure volunteer leadership to aid the park's own staff members. Each year the institute enrolls people from all States at its folk dance camp, junior nature camp, and the drum major camp.

In the estate's old red brick carriage house, the institute has a Frontier Travel gallery with exhibits of pioneer travel on the national road—U.S. 40—and a display of early navigation on the Ohio River.

Nothing catches the nostalgic union with the past like an evening of music or opera in the natural amphitheater under a summer sky. You can enjoy a sumptuous buffet supper on the amphitheater's terrace, then remain at your table while the music rises from the stage, framed by ivy-colored walls and canopied by tall moonlit trees.

A trip through the mansion house is a must for the whole family. It was built in 1835 and houses an outstanding collection of 19th century glass, including early Wheeling and Midwestern. Its rooms have been authentically refurnished to reflect living of that era.

The glass collection room is dominated by Sweeney's Folly—a giant cutglass punch bowl, 4 feet, 10 inches tall, and weighing 225 pounds. Surrounding it along the walls are examples of early flasks, pressed glass, flint-cut glass and other rare pieces.

The mansion's 20th-century counterpart, Wilson Lodge, is a multimillion-dollar building with accommodations in both motel rooms and Swiss chalets. It has all the features of a modern hotel, yet its fieldstone and wood exterior and the giant stone fireplaces inside catch the spirit of the day when this whole acreage was only a "tomahawk claim."

A Comeuppance for the Totalitarianism of Intellectual Snobbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, although they profess liberalism, some of this country's so-called liberal intellectuals are as intolerant of viewpoints differing from their own as any tyrant. Out of a recent announcement that Dr. Edward Teller would be a speaker at a symposium on "Open Space and Peace" came the recent exchange of letters reproduced below in which such tolerance was displayed and received its deserved chastisement.

The writer of the first letter is a professor of physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the writer of the second is a director of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. The correspondence follows:

AUGUST 22, 1963.

Dr. STEFAN T. POSSONY,
Hoover Institution on War and Peace, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

DEAR DR. POSSONY: I received today in the mail from a Mr. James J. Lanigan of Waltham, Mass., a press release announcing that Dr. Edward Teller will be the future speaker at the forthcoming symposium on "Open Space and Peace." It strikes me as highly ironic that the one scientist who more than others symbolizes the cold war and the desire for its continuation, if not enlargement, should be chosen to keynote a symposium whose title implies the aim of reaching agreements and peaceful accommodations with our potential antagonists. This is all the more unfortunate coming at the same time when Dr. Teller has raised his lone voice in strident opposition to the first small move toward arms control agreement which we have been able to arrive at since the end of the war.

I would hope, as I believe would also the great majority of my colleagues, that the tone and direction of your symposium will not be set by its keynote speaker.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD T. FELD,
Professor of Physics.

AUGUST 31, 1963.

Prof. BERNARD T. FELD,
Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR DR. FELD: Before receiving your letter of August 22, I was under the hopeful impression that physicists side with Galileo rather than with the Inquisition. Thank you for disabusing me of this error.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States outlaws any abridging of the freedom of speech. I consider your letter to be an attempt to curtail Professor Teller's freedom of speech.

Science can flourish only so long as freedom of inquiry remains unimpaired. Any attempt to ostracize a reputable scientist

constitutes a curtailment of the freedom of inquiry. My main personal experience with people who deliberately set out to silence scientists whose ideas they disliked, was 1933 in Nazi Germany. However, since Hitler and Goebbels lacked education, or in any event possessed less education than professors of physics at MIT, perhaps these people may be granted some extenuating circumstances.

You say that Dr. Teller "has raised his lone voice in strident opposition" to the test ban treaty. Dr. Teller testified before a Senate committee. The Senate is the constitutional agency of our Government to ratify, or not ratify, international treaties. The implication of your objection to Dr. Teller's testimony is that he should not have testified; in which case the further implications seem to be that the Senate should receive partial instead of full evidence and should rubber stamp decisions made by the Executive; and any opposition (which ex definitionem is deemed to be strident) must be silenced. If this is your wish, and if you are consistent, you also must desire the end of constitutional and representative government, and of the traditional two-party system.

Another possible implication of your criticism is that Dr. Teller should not have testified in line with his beliefs, i.e., he should have lied to the Senate.

Frankly, I don't believe you examined the implications of your stab at censorship. A genuine believer in freedom of speech is one who takes initiatives to preserve freedom of speech for those with whom he disagrees. You can find the pertinent prose in Voltaire.

From the point of view of scientific methodology, your letter strikes me as unprofessional: Because you dislike Dr. Teller's judgmnt on subject A, you presume that his notions on subject B also will be disliked by you, and furthermore you make this judgment prophetically, before Dr. Teller delivered his speech.

As to Teller raising a lone voice, may I remind you that about 100 years ago, Ignaz Semmelweis also was a lone voice when he discovered the remedy for puerperal fever. Academic orthodoxy then hunted Semmelweis to death, refused to give his views an objective hearing, and thus allowed the slaughter of the childbed to continue. Yet as a result of Semmelweis' temporarily lone voice, the lives of untold millions of mothers were saved ultimately. Semmelweis' opponents are now forgotten.

Furthermore, you seem to be singularly misinformed in implying that Dr. Teller is the only person knowledgeable about matters of nuclear strategy, who is opposing the test ban treaty. Your remark that he desires the "continuation if not enlargement" of the cold war, is irresponsible. Naturally, in a country which guarantees freedom of speech, you are free to make remarks of this sort. I was under the impression that the cold war is of Communist inspiration and making, and that like most other Americans, Dr. Teller is simply interested in defending this country against aggression. Self-defense, you may be interested to learn, is a right confirmed in the Charter of the United Nations.

Let me ask you this: Why are you so worried about lone voices? Are you perhaps, albeit subconsciously, perturbed that Dr. Teller made points you are unable to refute? If you are sure of your cause, why are you afraid of criticism?

In my judgment, you owe Dr. Teller an apology for your attempt to abridge his freedom of speech and to trespass upon his civil rights. You owe me an apology, because you seem to think that you can make of me a party to academic Gleichschaltung. But most important, I think that you owe an apology to yourself, because your letter violated the ethos of science as well as the ethos of democracy.

Sincerely,

STEFAN T. POSSONY.

Major Problems We Face Today: Spending and War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the following editorials entitled "Spending: Public and Private," "War and Peace," I think that the editor of the editorial page of the Mount Morris Index in Mount Morris, Ill., has very perceptively addressed himself to the two major problems that we face today on both the domestic and the international scene.

In the editorial entitled, "Spending: Public and Private," there is a rather telling rebuttal of the inference so glibly indulged in by many so-called liberals today; namely, that public spending is "somehow more virtuous than private spending." My liberal friends seem to forget that there are just as many, if indeed not more, appalling examples of waste, extravagance and conspicuous consumption on a scale that Thorsten Veblen never dreamed of in the public sector as in the private sector of our economy.

In the second of these two editorials entitled, "War and Peace," we are reminded of some things that are so basic and so fundamental that nowadays they threaten to escape us altogether. We are reminded in very vivid language that communism has not forsworn its goals; that any mutation which has taken place is only for the purpose of deceiving the unwary. I commend both of these excellent editorials to the attention of my colleagues:

SPENDING: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

The experts of modern economics such as Walt Heller and John Galbraith are happiest when they are condemning the American people for spending money on shiny automobiles and other status symbols instead of turning it over to the Government for use "in the public sector."

They are sure that the men who run the Government are much better qualified to spend money than the individual. They assure us that the Government can use the money "to carry out the common purposes" whereas the individual just uses it for unnecessary frills.

Personally we have never gotten a guilt complex as we listened to the lectures by the good professors. We must remember that we now are turning over 2 days' pay each week to the Government and in addition we are contributing to the support of churches, charities and other activities in the public sector such as Little League, youth recreation, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls and Blue Birds, Red Cross, and to combat polio, cancer, mental illness, muscular dystrophy, heart disease and cerebral palsy. In addition we manage to spend several hours each year working in the public sector through our service club.

So we have never felt that we were being selfish in using a portion of our income on such status symbols as food, housing, clothing, electricity, water, heat, telephone, insurance, and education for the kids and an occasional vacation.

This hasn't left us much money to squander on such status symbols as tail fins and color television sets although we must admit to the ownership of the 4-year-old automobile and a 7-year-old TV box that brings in a fairly decent picture if the wind is blowing in the right direction.

We agree with the professors that there is a need for slum clearance, more highways, better schools and other improvements in the public sector and we might even agree that public spending is somehow more virtuous than private spending if they would produce a few facts to support their case.

But before handing over a greater portion of our wages we would like a little more proof that the Government spenders will make good use of the money.

It bothers us when we read that a Government agency can lose 24 million bushels of wheat somewhere between here and Austria or spend $70 million of tax money to buy up rancid soybean oil.

We wonder how the public purpose is served when billions are wasted on such foreign aid projects as luxury yachts for the King of Ethiopia, Cadillacs for oil-rich sheiks, private planes for Communist-loving dictators and million-dollar palaces for the self-appointed elite in the emerging nations.

We agree that this country must help in the development of the emerging nations but we don't like the idea of scattering billions of dollars all around the world haphazardly in the hope that some of them will end up serving some public purpose.

Nor do we relish the thought of turning our money over to people who can lose $50 million worth of grain and shrug it off with the casual reply that "no official seems to have been criminally involved."

When Government bureaucracies grow beyond a certain point we have to expect a considerable amount of waste and error but since it is our money involved we believe the taxpayers are entitled at least to explanations, apologies, and the firing of the persistent boneheads.

We're not satisfied or happy when an unnamed department spokesman answers the charge that $70 million was wasted on a soybean oil deal with the statement that, "It's something we investigated a year ago and it's all buttoned up."

WAR AND PEACE

In view of the thaw which is supposed to be taking place between the United States and Russia it is well to remember certain facts.

No matter how much our relations with Russia are improved—and there are hopeful signs that this may happen—it does not mean any relaxation in the ideological war between the free world and the Communist world.

One of the great faults in our thinking has been that we fail to see the difference between Russia as a nation and Russia as a Communist power. So we become confused when Khrushchev or some other high official talks or acts one way as a Russian and another way as a Communist Party spokesman.

The truth of the matter is, however, that Khrushchev can talk in one breath of peaceful coexistence and in the next threaten to bury us. There is little doubt that the United States and Russia could live in reasonable harmony in the same world. We could have peaceful competition in the economic field, reach certain mutually beneficial agreements in disarmament, work together

in the exploration of space and even in a program of aid to the emerging nations.

These things could come about through agreements reached by the Russian and American Governments and this is what seems to be happening at the present time. It is in this direction that our negotiators of the nuclear test ban treaty see it as a first step toward easing tensions in the long and costly cold war.

We would be making a mistake, however, to see any of these things as a sign that communism has retreated a single step from its avowed intention of ruling the world.

It is not inconsistent for Khrushchev, the Russian, to sign a nuclear test ban treaty with us and the British and still proclaim as a Communist: "We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

The very basis of the Communist movement since the days of Karl Marx has been that it could not rest until it enveloped every country of the world. Capitalism in all its forms was marked for destruction and there has not been the slightest deviation from this goal.

The Communist Party line may have veered but there has been no change in the objective of world domination. Khrushchev, the Russian, may talk of cooperation with "capitalist" nations but as head of the Communist Party he "fully stands for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism."

Whatever rift has developed between the Russian and Chinese Communists has not been due to a difference over the final goal but merely over the best way to reach it "as soon as possible."

This is the point to remember in these days of the great thaw. There will be no truce in the war for men's minds and no treaties in the war of the ideologies.

No opportunity will be passed up to foment disorders and bloodshed anywhere in the non-Communist world. There will be no rest in the efforts to undermine the governments of countries in South America, Central America, Africa, and Asia. There will be no end to campaigns to weaken the love for freedom and the belief in the democratic processes of government in the United States.

There are times when we might trust Russia but it is foolish and dangerous to believe that we can ever trust communism.

Alabama Travel Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Alabama Travel Council conducts its highly successful fall "Colortour," a program designed to show leaders from other States in the field of travel and tourism the many points of interest in Alabama.

I want to commend the Alabama Travel Council for conducting this fine program and to welcome these out-of-State friends to our great State later this month.

The September 2 issue of the Birmingham News carried the following article on this upcoming tour, and I submit it herewith.

STATE TO HOST TRAVEL AGENTS

Alabama will host 35 out-of-State travel experts from 15 States, the District of Columbia and Canada in September.

They will be getting a firsthand look at some of the travel attractions in Alabama for use when they direct tuorists on vacation trips through the South.

Guests on the Alabama Travel Council's annual fall "Colortour" will start their Alabama visit in Montgomery, Friday, September 27, and end the trip in Mobile Sunday, October 6, according to William P. Wright of Birmingham, council president.

Representing automobile travel clubs, oil company touring bureaus, and some travel writers and editors; the guests influence literally millions of routings annually.

This year the States represented will be Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin, in addition to Canada and the District of Columbia.

Governor and Mrs. George C. Wallace will entertain the guests at dinner at the mansion in Montgomery the first night in Alabama. Other overnight stops are Birmingham, Huntsville, Gadsden, Decatur, Tuscaloosa, Gulf Shores, Dauphin Island and Mobile.

A Great Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD today an article which recently appeared in the Waterbury Republican, Waterbury, Conn., in tribute to Justice Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut, who has served faithfully and well in many highly distinguished posts on both the National and State scenes. It is a pleasure to join in the tribute to Justice Baldwin, a distinguished leader of Connecticut, of whom our State can be justly proud. His contribution to the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors will not be easily forgotten, and I wish him much happiness in his retirement.

The editorial follows:

JUSTICE BALDWIN RETIRES

Raymond E. Baldwin's retirement from the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors removes from official State life a personality of influence and stature that will not be easily equaled.

Justice Baldwin was the only man since Jonathan Trumbull in the 18th century, who served as U.S. Senator, Governor, and chief justice of Connecticut, and in every post he served with distinction.

The manner of the man is a measure of his accomplishments in a historic career: lawyer, State representative, twice Governor of Connecticut, U.S. Senator from Connecticut, candidate for the Republican vice presidential nomination in 1940, favorite son candidate for the GOP presidential nomination in 1948, justice of the State supreme court, chief justice of the State supreme court.

Retirement to a man who has lived such a full and meaningful life would be richly deserved, but Justice Baldwin believes that happiness consists in being busy and useful and the energies he spent in public life will now be more leisurely shared with his family. We wish him good health and fortune.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention Opposes the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months I have been among those who have repeatedly called attention to the Gesell report and its subsequent implementation by the Secretary of Defense.

Time and again I have attempted to point out to my colleagues that the emergence of the Gesell report poses a danger unassociated with the segregation issue. Under the guise of its formal title, "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces," the Gesell report proposes military sanctions on civilian communities.

Less than a month ago it was difficult to find more than a handful of persons who had even heard of the Gesell report. And like all radical documents, this report thrived on the ignorance of its existence.

It is now most encouraging to note that more and more responsible voices are being raised to challenge this report and its implementation.

In this regard, I believe it is indeed pertinent to point out that delegates to the 64th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, meeting in Seattle last month, adopted a resolution opposing the Gesell report.

I certainly wish to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars delegates for having so wisely looked into the issue behind the issue.

The VFW has scrutinized the Gesell report and sensed dangers which, in its words, "could lead to the establishment of a commissar system of political control within military organizations."

I submit that when a great patriotic organization like the Veterans of Foreign Wars calls national attention to the Gesell report, opposition cannot be called sectional or parochial. Rather, the VFW is alerting us to a national issue and a national danger.

The resolution of the recent VFW convention speaks for itself, and I include the resolution herewith into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING FORCED INTERFERENCE BY THE ARMED FORCES INTO DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Whereas there has been issued by the Secretary of Defense an order implementing the so-called Gesell report, which report proposed measures violating the time-honored principal of our Armed Forces keeping out of domestic controversy; and

Whereas the so-called Gesell report and the implementing directives would undermine the discipline command structure and morale of Armed Forces; and

Whereas in so doing the so-called Gesell report and implementing directives could lead to the establishment of a commissar system of political control within military organizations; and

Whereas the combined effects of the Gesell report and the implementing directives would have disastrous results both to

our military efficiency, and to our form of government; and

Whereas the so-called Gesell report with its implementing directives would cause serious difficulties between personnel of Armed Forces installations and civilians of surrounding communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 64th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we vigorously oppose the Gesell report and protest the implementing directives which would force the military to intrude into local civil affairs and undermine military morale, discipline, and efficiency.

Big Government Is Getting Too Big

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the growth of governmental cost and power under the stimulus of President Kennedy's New-Old Frontier is aptly depicted in this week's U.S. News & World Report article captioned "Is Big Government in the United States Getting Too Big?"

A concise digest of present power and what New Frontiersmen want for the future is found in these tables from the article:

All of this is in addition to existing powers that include, among others:

Power that goes with cash spending of $120 billion each year.

Power to enforce minimum wages, maximum hours of work.

Power to police labor relations.

Power to support farm prices and restrict output.

Power to grant or deny subsidies in a wide range of fields.

Power to grant or deny loans for many purposes.

Power to condemn private property for an increasing range of Federal projects.

Power to police private business practices in many areas.

Power to draft youths into the armed services in peacetime.

Power to regulate transportation and communications.

Also, the White House seeks large new spending powers:

Power to extend or deny aid to local schools under Federal terms and conditions.

Power to aid or deny aid for college construction.

Power to set up a youth corps to work in cities.

Power to set up a conservation corps to work in the countryside.

Power to aid mass-transit plans in cities.

On top of vast present power, Government seeks these new powers:

Power to police all race relations.

Power to investigate and hale into court businessmen whose customers complain of discrimination.

Power to grant or deny billions of dollars annually to projects in communities, depending on how they accept or fail to accept integration rules laid down in Washington.

Power to take away deposit insurance of banks or mortgage guarantees if Federal wishes are not complied with.

Power to police local registration of voters.

Power to use the FBI in policing activities once considered local.

Added power to regulate stock markets.

Mr. Speaker, the time is overdue. We must stem the tide or our persona liberty and income will be swallowed up by the all encompassing Federal Government.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A Visit to the Guthrie Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 6, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the success of the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis has been a source of great encouragement for those who have been emphasizing the need for live theater and the importance of the arts in cities and towns outside of the large metropolitan centers. It has also shown that new undertakings in the theater can be successful when the proper community leadership and support is enlisted. The example which Minneapolis has set should help to stimulate similar action in other large communities where there is a need for such an endeavor.

Robert Moulthrop, a former member of my staff who joined the Peace Corps in Nigeria visited the new Guthrie Theater in June shortly before departing for Africa. His sensitive reaction to the two performances he attended offers striking expression in depth of feeling and emotion of his visit. I ask unanimous consent to have his report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GUTHRIE THEATER

I understand that half of the money for this venture came from the community itself. In the program they tell of pennies coming in from Sunday school classes, as well as large sums from other donors. Perhaps this is what gives this theater its excitement and verve. Probably it is only one factor of many. But the fact is that this is not a theater of Broadway importations. And it has none of that sense of futility which has seemed to characterize the repertory touring productions of Eva La Gallienne. From sitting in the audience, listening to a few conversations, talking with some of the ushers, I got the sense that at this theater neither the actors nor the audience feel patronized—looked down upon. From the two shows I saw, "Hamlet" and "The Miser," I gained the impression that actors and audience were both working at giving of themselves so that the best possible performance could be achieved. This "sense of the theatrical occasion" is a tangible thing, doubly noticeable after attending Broadway productions in which communication between actors and audience is sometimes lacking.

Minneapolis, I think, believes the Guthrie Theater to be its own, feels that they are a part of it, and that it exists for them and for their use. On both nights the audience was made up of a few people like myself who had come to Minneapolis to see the theater—the rest were people in from the suburbs, perhaps farther. People who until this theater came into being had probably never been to a professional performance in their lives.

Both productions were of the highest caliber: fine acting, imaginative directing—beautiful and stunning productions. Neither was treated as a "classic" to have a glass enclosed case around it and only be looked at. Both were produced with the idea that they were good, exciting drama: the true metal of what theater is made.

In the program, Dr. Guthrie makes the statement that as in music, where we are constantly hearing the classics and therefore have solid ground on which to base our judgments of things contemporary, so must it be in drama. This is his main philosophy behind this theatrical venture. And one might well wag one's head and say, "But to be presenting the classics in Minneapolis? Why there?"

That would seem the point. It would appear unlikely that an audience for the classics could be recruited from among a mostly rural population without a habit for theatergoing. Yet the age-old adage seems to hold: Give the people something really good, and they will flock to it, no matter where they are or who they are.

So, regional theater at popular prices seems to have got off to a flying start. And the fact that the community has been a part of the theater since its inception seems to be a factor in its success.

I still can't get over it—an audience of people who haven't looked at "Hamlet" since high school, sitting through an uncut version of the play (4 hours) and hanging on to every word. I probably shouldn't be so amazed, but I am. And also immensely proud that I am in the field myself.

Some Impressions of Germany—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of the "Impressions of Germany," written for me as a report by my assistant, William Emerson, about his recent trip to Germany:

IMPRESSIONS OF GERMANY—PART II

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

I had been to Germany once before, during the 1950's, and had been impressed then with how a nation could, at least for all outward appearances, have recovered so well so fast—just then 10 years up from smoldering ashes. So I wanted to see something of German industry and commerce.

The first good image came on my first day in Germany, at Bonn. From my hotel window there was a magnificent view of the Rhine and the Seven Mountains beyond. Up the mighty river and down, the barges moved in a grand display of commerce. It had no end. Day and night, from the North Sea to Basel, fuel and food and goods made their way along the Rhine.

From Bonn, to Cologne, to Hamburg, to Wolfsburg, West Berlin, Munich, and Frankfurt, thriving industry was apparent. The main complaint I heard from an official at the Volkswagenwerkes in Wolfsburg was about the shortage of labor in Germany. With a severe shortage of native men, many women have factory jobs. In Berlin, now the largest industrial city between Moscow and Paris, during the decade of the fifties over 350,000 new jobs were opened up in industry.

The Berlin economy has filled the pages of many special reports. It is particularly interesting because of the isolated nature of Berlin and the fact that most of her trade is confined to the rest of West Germany. Lacking in almost any ability to produce agricultural products for her sustenance, over 35 percent of her industrial working force is confined to the electrotechnical trade.

Obviously, without her precious links to West Germany, Berlin could not exist. Large subsidies from the Federal Government help to keep Berlin alive. But there is more to it than that. Berliners have a peculiar faith and tenacity. Geographically and politically isolated, trade is Berlin's blood. Many Berliners with whom I talked believe that their future will depend upon their own will to mount the challenge of economic isolation, and that from the experience may come avenues in which political isolation may also be challenged and overcome. Perhaps in the tenacity of the Berliners of 1963 there is a clue to the success of Germany's postwar recovery, and perhaps in their attitude that trade is the only hope and help they can give themselves, there is a clue to how a united Germany in a world with less tension may evolve.

Trade with the East is a subject of mixed emotions in Germany, particularly in Berlin. I won't touch upon the theoretical political arguments of the situation. Most individual Germans and Berliners with whom I talked had more immediate thoughts than where trade with the East might lead. They were concerned about the effect on the prisoners on the other side of the wall.

I asked my guide in Hamburg what he thought about trading with the Eastern sector or with satellite governments period. His answer, like many others, was that he couldn't think of the economic aspects of the situation, or even the long-range benefits that theoretically could result for both sides. "In the East," he said, "I still have some opportunities to communicate. Everytime I get word from over there, particularly this last winter, I am told, 'Don't send packages over here. We are hungry and cold and if the winter lasts a little longer and it gets a little colder, Ulbricht will have to go, and things will have to get better. When you send a package, it only helps Ulbricht.' Now, I ask you, if that helps Ulbricht, how much will trade help?"

REFUGEES

What it is really like in the East I learned a little about in my own brief experience there. A middle-aged mother with her teenaged children spoke more poignantly at an emergency interview which I attended at Marienfelde Refugee Center.

She and her offspring had escaped during the night. With the board whose function

it is to interrogate all escapees—partially for the purpose of determining how genuine their stories happen to be—I listened for an hour to the answers she gave.

She had been a West German Communist before the party was outlawed in 1955. She didn't know why she had been, other than that she was poor and fate had not been kind to her. After the party was outlawed, she maintained her Communist sympathies, dreaming of the area to the East where the workers lived in great comfort and plenty. In October 1962, she fled with her children to the East.

Promised a home, a job, food, and comfort, she was soon confronted with a maze of arbitrary and hostile "public servants" who would help her locate and set her on the path to prosperity.

She and her children were assigned to one room, which had one bed, in which they slept two at a time, alternating as to which one slept on the floor. Their food, except for fat pork on infrequent occasions, which she saved to buy from scant earnings as a streetworker, was necessarily poor quality bread and assortments of soups—depending on what little money there was, and what vegetables were available. For the most part, through the winter, only potatoes could be bought, and then, only in limited quantity.

At first, she thought that as newcomers this was a hardship to be endured briefly until they could be properly situated. Things didn't change. She started making visits to the functionaries, appealing for better conditions and provisions. When they would see her, they were abrupt and discourteous. More often they would not see her at all.

In 8 weeks, she said, she was entirely disillusioned. She had learned her lesson, and fully appreciated the difference in the two systems with which she was familiar.

She began speaking publicly, to acquaintances and fellow workers, about her dissatisfaction. She was warned by officials that she might be prosecuted if she did not soon become more temperate. She said she didn't care. What was there to lose? She began her plot to get back to the West.

Somehow, for some reason, she had kept her West German identification papers concealed when she went to the East. Some West Germans may, with special permission, visit in the East. She devised a scheme, with the use of her papers, to convince the border authorities that she and her children had been on a visit. This, with a confident and knowing attitude, coupled with the determination that it was worth a try, got her through once again to the West.

I wondered if the Marienfelde officials might not be skeptical. Isn't it possible that she could have been a "plant." They were convinced—and they are specially attuned to separating fact from fiction, based on their experiences in thousands of interviews—that hers was a genuine case.

Since the wall, the business at the refugee center has slowed to a trickle. Where once hundreds and sometimes thousands came in a single day, there are now one or two or three, or none. Some make it that we never read about, because an escape is not publicized unless it is certain that the Eastern authorities are aware of the escape, or if there is a possibility of repercussions for others still across the wall.

For those who try, but don't make it, and die a few feet from freedom, sympathetic countrymen erect their monuments. The wall is a virtual bank—on the western side—of flowers and wreaths and crosses.

BORDER AT LUBECK

The wall, of course, divides Berlin. I had asked to see the border at a point other than in Berlin as well.

From Hamburg, one Saturday, I drove to Lubeck, the Hanseatic city near the Baltic Sea. Through the rich and fertile farmland of Schleswig-Holstein, we traveled to the barracks of the border police. A young lieutenant escorted me at first to the point where the only road connects with the East in that section of the border. It is hardly open.

Barricades, guards, police dogs, guard the entrance to the Democratic People's Republic. And you'd better stay on the road if you go through.

Immediately beyond the barbed wire, which is stretched from the top to the bottom of divided Germany, is a mine field, and beyond that, more barbed wire. On the other side of that fence is a 10-foot stretch of plowed ground, finely cultivated to show any footprints. Then another fence, and a broad barren strip to the east. In the midst of all of this stand the guard towers, one always in sight of the next, from the Baltic to the Czech border.

We went to many sites where "to keep undesirables out of East Germany" roads had been ripped up so the minefields could be installed. To creeks and rivers where bridges came to an end in the middle. To farms, straddling the border, where half of the farmer's land was forfeited. The Ulbricht regime has ingenious ways of befriending the world.

DACHAU

At Munich, it was arranged for me to visit a remnant of another day, when a different despot had his day.

My very fine host in Munich had been to the former concentration camp at Dachau with other guests on a number of occasions. His wife had never seen the camp, so it was decided that she would accompany me.

Our guide through Dachau was a former prisoner. He had, I understood, been imprisoned for simply having been an old-line Social Democrat. He stayed alive because he wasn't in the most serious category of "enemies against the state." From 1936 through 1945 he had been a prisoner. A picture taken shortly after he was admitted, and one taken at the liberation, told his story.

The story of Dachau was more horrible. As we stood where firing squads had stood, as we stood where the hangman's noose had hung, as we walked through the gas chambers that were never operational because prison laborers sabotaged their completion, and at the now rusted doors of ovens where thousands went to ashes, it seemed the "Thousand Year Reich" could never have been, and this was a weird and twisted dream. The tears of my hostess could not be controlled.

That night, she, her husband, and I talked about it until the dawn. They remembered those days but can't believe it now.

First they were hungry. They had been little children at first. There was the treaty. There was chaos and weakness. A poorly assembled democracy could not cope with the people's unrest. Elections. Hitler gained. He promised. He became chancellor. More people were employed, and there was more to eat. Slowly, surely, as every benefit came, another freedom disappeared—sometimes quietly, sometimes by deceit. There was the total police state, at last, to do as it pleased. There were no more elections. How, now, do you get rid of them? With your hands? Do you strike? Sure. Then it's a firing squad or a work camp for you. You don't do what they tell you? Maybe you don't do it. But, there are mouths to feed, and children to think about. How did it happen? How did it happen? The police state. They are all rotten.

On the day we went to Dachau to visit the former camp, we visited a school in the town. The young children laid their English books aside, while the headmaster and teacher conversed with them and me about the American political system. Their English was good, their understanding pleasing.

A teacher asked me to remember the town of Dachau for their school, and not for what had happened in previous days. Not that what had happened there can be forgotten, but that what can happen there—with those children and with Germany—can be remembered for better things.

HOME AGAIN

The jet flew high over the glistening ocean. Soon I would be home, helping my little girl celebrate her first birthday.

I had seen some history, current and past. I had seen some of the progress of the western half of Germany and talked with her people. I had a lot of impressions. I had been made both happy and sad by what I had seen and done. For what would I remember Germany in that moment? What made the trip worthwhile?

Optimism. The mood of the people, who, in their divided land, on a hot seat, sometimes the rope in the East-West tug of war—look to the future with hope and confidence for peace, as individuals, much as we do. I believe that Germany's postwar experience has—with all the change and political and industrial progress—put Germany irrevocably in the camp of the West, as a firm and dependable ally. After all, the experiences of the past 18 years, and the progress made in that time, have surpassed all previous experiences. And certainly the political experiences—those of the West and the East in Germany—have shown a vivid contrast between tyranny and freedom.

Truth in Lending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 6, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an excellent editorial in support of the truth-in-lending bill appeared recently in the Elburn Herald, one of Illinois' leading independent newspapers, published in Kane County. There is evidence of increasing support for this legislation throughout the country, and I am particularly pleased to see the interest taken in this matter by the independent press in my own State. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Elburn Herald of August 22 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEANING OUT THE TEMPLE

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS will begin holding public hearings on his truth-in-lending bill in New York, Pittsburgh, and Louisville this month after what has been described as a tough battle within the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Until now a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans has prevented DOUGLAS' subcommittee from holding hearings outside Washington.

Some reporters believe the hearings in major cities will bring forth dramatic testimony about lending practices and will result in greater public pressure for passage of the bill.

Senator DOUGLAS introduced his truth-in-lending bill in January 1960 and it has been lodged in committee ever since. Major lobbying efforts by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers Association, and the American Bar Association have prevented Congress from considering the bill.

Most observers believe the bill would pass if it could be brought to the floor for a vote. Few politicians want to be on record as opposing fair play for consumers.

The bill provides that all lenders and credit sellers fully disclose to the consumer the costs of using credit. A written statement would include the total amount of finance charge in dollars and cents and the relationship of this charge to the total amount financed, expressed as a simple annual interest rate on the unpaid balance.

Many consumers who rely on credit believe they know these costs now. Testimony already given before Senator DOUGLAS' subcommittee shows that they are usually mistaken.

Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance for the Ford Motor Co., said of automobile financing: "It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere."

The low rates quoted to customers by many lenders are actually much higher than normal bank rates, often two or three times higher. For example, the common $6 finance charge for a $100 loan is not 6 percent it is actually almost 12 percent because the borrower, over a period of a year, steadily pays off the principal and actually has the use of only about $50 while he pays interest on the full $100 all year.

Similarly, the simple monthly rate of small loan companies and revolving credit plans is often represented as one or two percent per month. The simple annual rate in these cases is actually 12 to 24 percent.

Costly extra credit charges, for life insurance, or credit investigations or loan processing, are also used to pad the interest rate. Cases are on record in which credit charges actually exceeded the cost of the item or the amount of the loan.

Apparently businessmen as a group have been afraid of truth in lending because so much of today's business rests on credit. Consumer debt is now something over $63 billion and has grown at the rate of $2 billion a year since 1960.

The arguments against honest disclosure of finance charges are that high rates are necessary because many people are bad risks and disclosure would frighten off customers.

Neither argument is really sound. As a group, consumers have a better record of paying off their debts than business and industry, yet commercial borrowers would never tolerate the usury that consumers now endure.

Honest businessmen have nothing to gain by selling goods on credit to people who cannot pay for them. Loan sharks of the crime syndicate prosper under such conditions; they use terror and violence to make collections, but such methods do not produce the stable, steady flow of customers on which honest merchants depend.

It is true that disclosure of outrageous finance charges would drive away customers, but that is in the interest of most businessmen. At present, those who charge fair rates are tarred along with those who cheat their customers. "Truth in lending" would return to good businessmen one of their most precious assets: their good reputations.

Finally, if reliable customers did not have to pay so much of their income to the money lender they would have more to spend on the goods and services the rest of us sell.

It is foolish for business in general to suffer just to allow the relatively small number of money changers to reap their greedy harvest.

You Can Do Anything When You Know You're Not Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend Vice Adm. W. R. Smedberg III, Chief of Naval Personnel, called to my attention a most provocative article in the September issue of McCall's magazine.

Although written in collaboration with an experienced writer, Michael Drury, it is basically a story by Mrs. John Wesley Harvey, the widow of the captain of the lost submarine *Thresher*.

Admiral Smedberg, in sending the article to me, enclosed a few of his own comments, which I would like to quote as a preface to the inclusion of the article:

This article so beautifully expresses the dedication and devotion of regular naval officers and enlisted men, and their wives, that I think as many Americans as possible should have the opportunity to read it.

Too few of our fellow countrymen realize the rigorous kind of life that is accepted by officers and men of the U.S. Navy, and their families, which is completely different from any other profession or any other branch of the Armed Forces.

There is no other profession which requires, so continuously, as much of a man's time and attention when on sea duty as does Navy duty. During the 6 or 7 months' deployments away from homeports and the United States, which are the order of the day in this period of cold war, a Navy man spends most of his time living, eating, and sleeping with his work; rarely more than a few seconds from his battle station and liable to call, day or night, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

On sea duty, his normal weekly workload averages over 80 hours; for many of the technicians, 100 hours a week is not unusual. When one adds to this abnormal workload, for which no extra compensation is ever received, the discomforts of the crowding of many people into small compartments—still 30 to 70 enlisted men in a small steel space—the physical beatings taken in small ships in rough weather, the isolation from all social contacts outside the ship for long periods and the complete separation from loved ones, one begins to understand the degree of dedication of Navy men and their wives to their Navy and the security of our Nation.

Much of this Mrs. Harvey has managed to convey in her splendid article.

Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the eloquence and sincerity of Admiral Smedberg's comments, except to say that I, too, was inspired and gratified by Mrs. Harvey's story.

It is a pleasure to include into the RECORD herewith excepts from this excellent article:

YOU CAN DO ANYTHING WHEN YOU KNOW YOU'RE NOT ALONE

(By Irene Harvey, widow of the captain of the nuclear submarine *Thresher*, as told to Michael Drury)

That piercing cold day last January when I stood in the drill building at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, in Kittery, Maine, and watched my husband, Lt. Comdr. John Wesley Harvey, take command of U.S.S. *Thresher*, I was deeply glad. I saw Wes' face as he saluted and said the solemn ritual words that formally put a nuclear submarine into his hands, and I knew, as much as another person can know, how much it meant to him. I had shared, as much as another person can share, the toil and love and sacrifice that had earned him this, the most coveted command in the naval submarine force. Now there are two sister ships, *Permit* and *Plunger*, in service in the Pacific, but *Thresher* was the first of her class, the newest, the best, the fastest, the latest in weapons system and design of the attack submarines, and, my husband firmly believed, destined to accomplish much for the country and the development of underwater seafaring.

To me, even now, a nuclear submarine is an amazing and beautiful ship. I have been on several of them, and I know. I never had a moment's fear for my husband's personal safety. We never talked about what I was to do in an emergency, because neither of us believed there was any greater danger in his job, in peacetime, than in countless others, military and civilian. I sometimes felt anxiety for his doing well, or concern for his meeting his own or the Navy's terrifically high standards, but not fear. Yet 3 months after I watched that change-of-command ceremony with such pride and delight, *Thresher* went down, about 200 miles off Cape Cod, with all hands and a number of civilian and military observers—129 brave men who died in the service of their country. It was almost impossible, but it happened.

I was at home in the house we rent in New London, Conn., the home port of Submarine Development Group II, of which *Thresher* was a part. It was Wednesday, April 10, and I was getting dressed for an evening of bridge with friends. Our two sons—Wesley, 11, and Bruce, who is 8—were downstairs with a sitter, watching television. *Thresher* had sailed the day before on her test run after her long overhaul in Maine, and I knew Wes was pleased to be at last underway. We had talked by long distance just before he left.

The phone rang, and I took it on the bedroom extension. It was Adm. Alton W. Greenfell, in Norfolk, Va., commander of the entire Atlantic Fleet submarine force. He said they had lost radio contact with the submerged *Thresher* and that everything humanly possible was being done. My first reaction was not one of intense alarm, because it is not entirely uncommon to lose contact. In the next sentence, though, he told me how long it had been, 8 hours, and I replied, meaning it, "Then we had better start praying." He said yes, and that he would keep me informed, and I put the phone back, troubled and somewhat frightened, but not—how shall I say this?—not quite believing it.

I sat on the edge of the bed wondering what, if anything, I should say to the children. Suddenly, Bruce came bounding up the stairs, crying, "Mommy, Mommy, there's a sub lost, but my daddy will find it, because my daddy has the *Thresher*, and it's the best ship in the whole world." Before I could speak, he was off again. So the news was on TV. I knew it was serious.

The quilt on our bed was handmade by the good Mormon women of Idaho, where we had lived in 1954 while Wes trained on the reactor prototype for *Nautilus*, and where Bruce had been born. I studied the quilt's wild-rose pattern and struggled inwardly for calmness. That was one of my husband's dominant qualities—calmness—one of the

things that made him good at his job and a good husband and father. I knew he would expect it in me now.

I called Lt. Comdr. Shepherd Jenks, commander of another nuclear submarine, *Skipjack*, which happened to be in port, and our longtime close friend. He said he'd be there as fast as he could, and when I hung up, both boys were back in my room, solemn, begging me with their small-boy eyes to deny it, saying, "Mommy, it's *Thresher*."

I told them I knew and that probably it was going to be all right. Bruce asked if they were just playing hide-and-seek, and I said it might be something like that; but Wesley was silent. Then Shep came, bless him, with the minister from our church right behind him, and the doctor from the base, Capt. Richard Dobbins, and several other Navy officers and their wives. The phone began to ring incessantly. My father called from Philadelphia to say he was on his way, and my sisters from Minnesota and Pennsylvania. My mother had died about a year before, and Dad said later he was glad she was not here. She and Wes were very close. Wes' parents called, too, and his brother, who said he was en route. Inquiries came from all over.

Finally, in desperation, we had all long-distance calls switched to the base. The reporters came—wire-service men, photographers, local men. They stayed out in front until 2:30 a.m., and they were very courteous. I did not let them inside; I couldn't. I hope they understood; they were only doing their job, I know that. There must have been 50 people in the house that night, military and civilian friends, neighbors; some of them I didn't even know. They slept here, on the sofa, in chairs, on cots they brought in. A few of the cots stayed there, and somebody slept on them, for weeks. I was not left alone—unless I chose to be, but I mean not forsaken—for a moment.

We put the children to bed, still reassuring them, still not knowing officially; but in my heart I prayed for the dignity and courage to get through the next few weeks. I did not sleep much that night, but I rested.

At 9:30 the next morning, Admiral Grenfell and Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth came to my home together, confirming what we already knew. One of the hardest things was being pulled two ways: As long as there was a thin thread of hope, it would be wrong to give up; yet it was equally important to face reality. Bruce went to school that day as usual—it was the last day before Easter recess—but friends took Wesley to their home. Later in the afternoon, while Shep Jenks stood by loyally like a rock in a storm, I took the boys aside in our house and told them *Thresher* was gone, and Daddy would not be coming home. I told them as much as I knew, that the submarine had dived and had not been able to resurface and that if anyone could have brought it back, their father would have done it. They did not cry, nor did I, then. A few days later, I spent some time alone with each of them, and we wept together. They had been brave and steady. After school resumed, Bruce, who is our artist, drew me a colored picture of *Thresher* resting quietly on the bottom of the sea—with her flags flying.

I have cried and I have prayed steadily, sometimes in words, more often not; but I have not panicked or had hysterics. The Lord gives and the Lord takes away. I trust Him. He gave me a very great deal.

Even when you believe in the goodness of people—and I do—you cannot know how wide and deep it goes until you come up against an experience like this. People were superb. Navy wives did all my ironing, cleaning, sewing. A civilian friend turned all the hems on my dresses. Food came by the ton. I did not cook a meal for 3 weeks. And the flowers—they poured in. People came with pastry, fruit, candy, bread, more flowers. Whenever I had to leave the house for any reason, there was someone to chauffeur me, and our car dealer, who is anything but a softie, left a brandnew Chrysler New Yorker in the garage, fearing I might be too upset to drive my husband's car.

Max Shapiro, a civilian attorney friend who has lived all his life in this Navy town, took my boys fishing, and Bruce caught his first fish. Max's 11-year-old son, Andrew, gravely offered the boys his most cherished possession—a baseball autographed by most of the New York Yankees. Another lawyer in Max Shapiro's firm, a retired Navy man, volunteered to handle the legal affairs of all *Thresher* families, entirely free. A third local man who has long been interested in the Navy, Moe Savin, took the boys to a game in Yankee Stadium.

You might think such things don't matter in the face of such loss, but they do matter. They are a real and tangible comfort, present and felt. You can do anything when you know you're not alone, and so many, many people let me know they cared, friends and strangers alike. I don't think I could personally have survived without those people. Letters and telegrams came by the hundreds from all over the world. Half a dozen women worked for weeks helping catalog them and address envelopes. I was sustained and strengthened by this outpouring of love and sympathy.

An elderly Greek couple who have a summer home next door to a house we own in Oswegatchie, not far from here, wired simply: "We pray with you." A Guatemalan Army major wrote from the War College, in Mexico City; a Roman Catholic nun told of an all-night vigil in her convent on behalf of *Thresher's* crew, adding, "Don't even try to answer this"; a Korean student wrote from Seoul: "I would like to burden half of your grief with myself. Dear lady, God will never discard you and your family and your husband, too." I know, Chung See Kwan, but I needed to have you say it.

From the Moselle Valley in France, a woman sent words of solace, explaining: "I am only a little French woman among millions whose thoughts and wishes are, I am sure, the same." The submarine Old Comrades Association of England sent a letter in care of the American base at Holy Loch, Scotland, knowing no other way to reach me. Doctors and clergymen we had known at our various stations; high school classmates and teachers we had not seen in years; executives from manufacturing companies where Wes made speeches (he was a good speaker and somewhat in demand); Bob Pierce, his first nuclear instructor at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory in Pittsburgh—all these people wrote in sorrow and comfort.

Navy officers with whom Wes had served—and their wives—wired and wrote and came. Lt. Comdr. Paul Early, one of Wes' closest friends and his only classmate at Bettis, heard the news on his car radio as he was driving home from Key West to take over the new Polaris submarine *John Adams*. He and his wife Violet had not seen each other for 3 months, but they came directly to our house and stayed here for days. The highest ranking government and Navy officers paid tribute to Wes' abilities and character: the President; Senators and Congressmen; the Governor of our home State of Pennsylvania; Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations; Admiral Grenfell; Capt. K. G. Schacht, in the Department of Defense, who had known Wes at the Academy and first influenced him to go into submarines; Capt. William R. Anderson, skipper of *Nautilus*, with whom Wes served 38 months, on what was then the only nuclear submarine in the world; and many more than I can list here.

Capt. Arch Gordon, of the Atlantic Oceanographic System, was my husband's first commanding officer in submarines, on *Sea Robin*. He summed up all their comments when he wrote of Wes: "Even as an ensign, all the ingredients of an admiral showed through all his undertakings."

You see, my husband died doing something he believed in and was dedicated to, and so did the others on that ship. That's not as commonplace as it might sound. There are so many kinds of people in the world and so many types of jobs, and not everyone is privileged to go on with his hopes and aspirations. Men sometimes become disenchanted with their work or have to settle for just making a living—but submarine service is wholly a volunteer service.

These men love us, but they also love this work. It is so big and so important to them that a wife has to make room in her heart for her husband's other love. It isn't always easy; I don't say that it is. But you have to find and build the courage to accept it honestly, and then it becomes a source of pride and gratitude for you as well as for him. You may not always understand what he does, but in due time you come to be loyal to it, and in that way, you are truly loyal to him. By holding his work in some measure of reverence, you can share it with him, and having shared it is a help—a very great help—when the going gets rough.

You have to learn very early that your husband won't always be home when you want him, or even when you need him. He will seem to break promises. He will say of some big event—a new baby or moving to new quarters or a school graduation—"Don't fret. I will take care of everything." He means it—but orders come, and he is off, leaving you to do it all alone. Wes was never home when the boys had tonsillitis or broke their ankles or took honors at the Cub Scout blue and gold banquets or appeared in school plays. Part of my job was to keep him real and important to them. I would say, "Daddy will be so proud. We'll tell him all about it. Won't he be surprised?" All Navy wives do this. Basically, what you must do is leave his mind free for other, more essential work. This is as necessary for enlisted men as for officers. That submarine could not have functioned without every man on it knowing and doing his job.

And yet, you aren't secondary. I wish I could tell that to some of the young Navy wives. They are so young, and they want so much; but you come to see that the wall-to-wall carpeting and dishwashers and other things you think are important aren't important at all, because they are things. The love and faith you have in your husband are important. His pride and belief in his work are important. As I understand it, we will eventually have 80 of these nuclear submarines, and we need men to operate them so badly. We must realize what this means to our husbands and to us and to the country. My husband worked to improve the lives of his fellow countrymen, and so did all the men on *Thresher*, and so do all submariners.

After the Cuban crisis last fall, Wes wrote to me from Washington: "Everything has its price and good things cost more than bad things. I feel I am at least a small part of the reason why this world was saved from the total destruction of nuclear war. Except for our Polaris submarines on station, I do not doubt for a moment that things would have been much different. * * * Perhaps now there is still hope that Wesley can go on to be a doctor or a farmer or a saxophone player, and Bruce can have time to find himself."

* * * * *

I have had a good life, and to be bitter now would negate that goodness. A little poem I clipped from a magazine many years ago reads in part:

"Darkness could not hide your presence.
Straight to me your love came winging,
And over all the bitter ocean
I heard you singing."

The future is still unsettled. I shall go on with nursing part time, and there is always work to do for Navy relief and in the schools. We will stay in New London; it is our home. I spent most of my married life there. I have a deep religious conviction that God will guide me now, as He has in the past, and help me raise our children.

There is something more—my husband's fellow submariners. On April 15, 5 days after *Thresher* was lost, they paused wherever they were to say goodby to their comrades. They read simple, beautiful services, scattered flowers on the water, and then, went on with their work.

Comdr. Robert Hale, skipper of *Tullibee*, on which Wes was once executive officer, sent this message to all *Thresher* families: "*Tullibee* sails with heavy hearts but renewed dedication and strength of purpose. Be assured that the sacrifice of your men and our fellow submariners will not have been in vain."

On *Skipjack*, 30 miles out in the Atlantic, our friend Shep Jenks read from the 139th Psalm: "If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me." It was dusk, and he laid a floral wreath on the water, from Wesley, Bruce, and me, which we sent to all the officers and enlisted men of *Thresher*. Then *Skipjack* submerged beneath the waves and went on her way. Later, Shep sent us the silk flag she was flying at the time.

Those men were not afraid to go on. I keep remembering that. I was married to one of them. I was—and am—a Navy wife.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the idea to declare 1964 as "See America Year" is already gaining nationwide support. Such a declaration, as embodied in my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, has the joint benefit of helping to improve America's balance-of-payments position, and in encouraging Americans to learn more about their own country. I wish to include in the RECORD at this point a letter I have received from Mr. Charles Parker, director of the Travel Information Division, Department of Conservation and Development, of the State of North Carolina, as an example of the interest being shown in my proposal:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT,
Raleigh, September 5, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: House Joint Resolution 658, introduced by you on August 21 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, has the enthusiastic support of this department, which has the responsibility of developing North Carolina's travel-serving industry—its third largest.

We feel that it would be in the public interest for the President to issue the requested proclamation designating 1964 as "See America Year", and for its vigorous implementation by the Department of Commerce. It should prove to be an important factor in reducing our Nation's balance of payments deficit.

We shall direct our State advertising in national and regional media in 1964 toward support of the President's proclamation by bringing to public attention the prime domestic vacation attractions of this "Variety Vacationland" State.

Sincerely,

CHARLES PARKER,
Director, Travel Information Division.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

International Road Federation Serves as World Stimulus for Improved Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have the pleasure of reporting on the activities of the International Road Federation which, through its world operation to stimulate interest in economic and social advancement through highways and highway transportation, has contributed materially to the advancement of the American image abroad, both from a governmental and private enterprise viewpoint.

Soon after World War II a group of imaginative business and industrial leaders looked into future global needs and took vigorous action to meet one of the most critical of these. The need was for an orderly development of integrated highway systems around the world which would foster postwar international trade and hasten the economic and cultural advancement of the new and emerging nations as well. Inherent in the idea was the formation of a world agency to encourage and facilitate the planning, financing, and construction of national and international highway networks and provide advice and counsel to help insure that a maximum return on road investment is realized.

The idea took shape in the founding of the International Road Federation, a nonprofit, nonpolitical service organization dedicated to the development and improvement of highways and highway transportation throughout the world. IRF offices were established simultaneously in Washington and London in 1948, and in Paris 4 years later.

IRF Washington is governed by a board of directors, composed of prominent businessmen and industrialists, an executive committee, and a small staff headed by a president. Although the activities of all IRF offices and national good roads groups are coordinated, each is autonomous and independently financed.

Fifteen years ago, when IRF emerged from concept to reality, there were eight national good roads associations. Today there are more than 70, with others in the formative stage.

In 1948 there were only guesses as to world highway expenditures, but the best estimates placed them at $6 billion. By 1962 this total had risen to $22.34 billion.

IFR was founded by businessmen in the belief that good roads are essential to social and economic development. Highways give access to untapped natural resources, open to cultivation vast new agricultural areas, provide new jobs, increase purchasing power. They make it feasible to multiply production, distribute surpluses, exchange ideas and services, and to provide a better way of life for the peoples of the world.

The federation promotes the international development and exchange of engineering and technical know-how in the highway field.

It provides a common meeting ground for existing national road associations and spurs the development of new ones.

It maintains active liaison with all organizations having objectives similar to its own.

It serves as highway transportation consultant to the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and as a service arm to governments, national and international lending organizations, and aid agencies.

IRF sponsors world and regional highway meetings and supports advanced training of highway and traffic engineers.

In cooperation with its more than 70 national associates it stimulates road consciousness among the governments and peoples of the world. Its educational efforts are directed toward the grassroots as well as the upper echelons.

IRF collects, publishes, and widely distributes basic information on the benefits of good roads, the need for soundly planned and executed programs of road development, and of road transport, and the techniques through which such programs can be realized.

In its 15 years of existence, IRF has achieved global prestige and recognition in many phases of its farflung operations. In 1958 the federation received the Christopher Columbus International Prize for Communications. IRF was the first winner in the land communications category and the citation mentioned the promotion of the Pan American Highway and the IRF fellowship program.

WORLD MEETING

IRF has sponsored four world highway meetings, the largest of which was held in Madrid in 1962, and was attended by 2,800 representatives from 78 countries and 10 international organizations.

President John F. Kennedy, in a message to the delegates, said:

> The work of the International Road Federation in the advancement of highways and highway transportation is, indeed, an important effort toward social and economic progress. I am sure this forum for the exchange of economic and technical information will be stimulating, not only to the assembled delegates and guests of IRF, but also to those everywhere interested in providing a better way of life for all peoples of the world.

Regional conferences at frequent intervals between world meetings have produced amazing results. A conference in Mexico stimulated renewed interest in the completion of the Pan American Highway. A meeting in Sydney, Australia, provided a common forum to resolve many problems localized in the Far East, while a southern South American conference in Buenos Aires broke down customs barriers which had retarded road programs for a lack of roadbuilding materials. An African gathering gave stimulus to a Pan African Highway.

IRF acts as highway information center for the world. A total of 573 persons from 74 countries visited the Washington offices during 1962. The visitors ranged from student enginers to cabinet ministers and their missions were almost as varied. Study itineraries were arranged for the visitors by IRF, at the request of foreign governments and U.S. Government agencies, as well as by private organizations and individuals.

FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The Federation has trained 330 engineers from 77 countries since 1948. Each of its fellowship grantees has received 1 year of graduate engineering training, followed by extensive tours of road projects, Federal and State highway administrative offices, and various highway-related enterprises.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

IRF tells the highway story in four languages—English, French, Spanish, and German. It publishes the monthly highway news magazine, World Highways, and the quarterly, Road International. It maintains a close working relationship with domestic and foreign news media and assists in the development of highway stories of international significance.

SPECIAL INFORMATION SERVICES

Two of IRF's annual publications are basic source books of the global highway information. They are the "World Directory of Highway Administrators" and "Highway Expenditures, Road and Motor Vehicle Statistics." As a service to governments and businessmen, it publishes a semiannual listing of U.S. contractors and engineers doing work in other countries on roads, bridges, and airports. Periodical publications include billingual tabulations of maximum limits of motor vehicle sizes and weights for various areas of the world. A news bulletin provides sponsors with information on up-to-date highway projects and programs. Special reports and publications have included Spanish-language manuals on soil mechanics, traffic engineering, and highway specifications. In addition, country road studies have been made covering most countries of the free world.

OTHER FUNCTIONS

IRF acts as semiofficial host to foreign delegations attending highway meetings in the United States. It per-

formed this function, for example, for construction equipment expositions in Chicago, the Ninth Pan American Highway Congress and the World Traffic Engineering Conference.

At the request of Central American countries, IRF has developed a plan for an Inter-American Highway Authority to assure that this 1,573-mile section of the Pan American Highway, passing through Central America and Panama, is properly maintained and kept open to traffic year-round.

The federation pioneered in the establishment of operators and mechanics schools and this type of training program is continuing to be developed for additional areas. Meanwhile, plans have been advanced for a worldwide inventory of research and development in the road and road transport field.

IRF is supported financially by various industries—principally automotive, rubber, petroleum, and highway construction. Consulting engineers are also prominently represented among its sponsors.

Membership in IRF is available to associates or private groups interested in the advancement of highways and highway transportation worldwide. A list of sponsoring members, national associations, and fellowship students may be obtained from the IRF offices in Washington.

In the 15 years of IRF's existence there has been a phenomenal growth in road-building and the construction of international highway systems around the world. Some indication of this growth in recent years is shown in the table below:

Highway expenditures in the free world

Year:	*Billions*
1955	$10.90
1956	12.90
1957	15.03
1958	17.13
1959	18.53
1960	18.87
1961	20.75
1962	22.34

The activities and responsibilities of the International Road Federation have kept pace with this increase. In the years ahead IRF proposes to continue its present functions and assume new ones as the developing countries of the world seek the best transportation systems for their particular needs.

Before an area or country can develop adequate roads the public must be made aware of the need for the and benefits of good highways. This knowledge will then be converted into desire and demand. Leaders of governments may defer action on road development or turn to other forms of transportation unless there is a public expression of preference for highways.

Although the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of road networks are necessarily a responsibility of government, business interests can contribute substantially to the development of highways throughout the world, and are doing so today through the International Road Federation.

Founded and supported by businessmen, IRF speaks the language of industry in world highway matters and at the same time creates a friendly climate for business enterprise. We believe that better roads mean better living for everyone—everywhere in the world.

Communist Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the American people are today carrrying the heavy burden of the Negro problem which the Communist world has exploited to gain propaganda advantage.

It was therefore as timely as it was commendable to see a private manufacturing company, the International Latex Corp., buying newspaper space including the New York Times of August 30 in order to reprint in the public interest a most enlightening column by the learned, eminent Mr. C. L. Sulzberger entitled, "Communism's Own Racism."

This article was prefaced with an informative introduction by the founder and chairman of the company, Mr. A. N. Spanel who originated and introduced editorial advertisements for his organization in 1939 and has continued them since, at great cost in time, thought and money.

This topical presentation is of utmost importance because it refutes with truth Russia's and China's endless propaganda lies that racism is exclusively a capitalistic phenomenon.

I am certain that the American people will point, as I do, with pride and grateful approval to International Latex Corp., and its founder for their continued educational, patriotic efforts on behalf of our country, its traditional allies and the whole free world.

Under unanimous consent I include the editorial presentation of International Latex Corp., which appeared in the New York Times on August 30, 1963, in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM'S OWN RACISM

FOREWARD

In a world cursed by race prejudices and race fears, the Communists for 45 years have posed as true internationalists. But while purporting to be the enemies of racism, they have in practice relentlessly appealed to race sentiment and fanned the flames of race hatreds.

The two Red dinosaurs, Russia and China have exploited every episode of racial tension in our world for propaganda purposes. In Africa and Asia, they have agitated against white colonialism, with the accent on white; in Latin America they have agitated against Yankee imperialism, with the emphasis on race elements in the equation.

Only 2 weeks ago Russia's leading newspaper, Pravda, presented its readers with more evidence of its yellow peril in the form of official Chinese newspaper stories that appeared in 1962 when Japanese Kenzo Matsumura visited Peiping. Matsumura was greeted by Chen Yi, the Chinese Deputy Premier with these words: "The East after all remains the East, and the Asians must change world history; we must unite and strengthen the ties between people of the same color of skin."

"The 'friendship' between China and Japan," Pravda continues, "rests not on peaceable aspirations but on racism, an attempt to divide the world into black, yellow, and white, in the spirit of Genghis Khan."

Yes, history has its great ironies. The chickens of Communist racism have come home to roost. Skin pigmentation has now become an issue, perhaps the decisive issue inside the Communist world. In its struggle with Moscow for primacy, Peiping is deliberately appealing to color. Anti-Kremlin polemics out of China now underline that Russians belong to the exploiting race of whites.

It is too soon to judge the consequences of this ironic turn. But it is possible, at least, that color may prove stronger than ideology within the Communist orbit.

In his second press conference in Paris on November 10, 1959, Gen. Charles de Gaulle said, "Nothing can prevent Russia, a white European nation which has conquered part of Asia well endowned with land, mines, factories and wealth—nothing can prevent her from having to reckon with the yellow multitudes which is China."

Rarely has a statesman shown such amazing insight or intuition. But has General de Gaulle also emphasized the necessary moral, which is that, now more than ever, free nations must dedicate themselves to the achievement of unity—true unity above race and color?

A cold war between the races could be even more catastrophic than the ideological cold war.

Some time ago we wrote in these columns: "The attempt of any free world nation to go it alone, to act divisively, can be made only at the peril of freedom for all of them; exclusivity, isolationism and rigid nationalism are divisive and self-destructive. Neither France nor the United States can long survive this folly." When will the leadership of freemen on our threatened planet understand and act on this basic truth?

Against this background, we recommend the careful reading of the following article which appeared in the New York Times on August 21, 1963.—A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.

TEXT OF ARTICLE

A terrifying postwar development has been the spread of politics by pigmentation. Atavistic confusion has long existed in a world unable to reconcile itself to the fact that its inhabitants have differently colored skins. Now comes the frank exploitation of "color" as an excuse for national judgments and alinements. In revolutionary Marxism it has become the principal issue between the Chinese and Russians.

The hue of the human skin comes primarily from melanin, a brown-to-black pigment produced in epidermal cells known as melanocytes. Shade differences among the races are due to differences in the quantity and distribution of melanin in the skin.

Oddly enough, millions of humans have never tranquilly accepted their normal tint or features. Negroes have sometimes employed what are called skin whiteners. Western women try to make their eyes appear oriental. And at this season thousands darken their light skins by roasting in the sun to artificially encourage melanocytes.

One would hope such striving for similarity might produce mutual tolerance. That this does not exist, alas, is advertised daily by racial bigots in our own country alone, favoring white over black or black over white.

Racism became a familiar tenet during World War II when the Japanese spread their slogan of "Asia for the Asiatics" and

the Germans spoke of "Herrenvolk. Now the Chinese are trying to add a racial twist to their interpretation of communism, introducing the principle of geographical discrimination based essentially on color of skin. When the Russians protested about this, the Chinese scornfully replied that Moscow was merely seeking to defend a racial superiority complex founded on the fact that the Soviet majority is of white European Slavs.

The sudden intrusion of racism into the Marxist domain, already riven by ideological disputes, has deeply upset the Russians. They see plainly where this evil can lead if it is allowed to spread unchecked.

PLANTING EVIL SEEDS

Peiping is contentedly aware that the earth's colored population is far greater than its white population. If China can ever plant the idea that it alone is the power leading downtrodden colored peoples against the white masters who once oppressed them, it could achieve a massive psychological advantage.

By linking Communist Russia and the anti-Communist West as imperialists, China hopes to convince simple-minded folk in underdeveloped Asia and Africa that there is only one true champion of anticolonialism and communism: China. Finally, Peiping sees the possibilities of slowly breaking up the vast Soviet empire, spreading racial nationalism among Asian peoples overrun by Russia during the past 2 centuries: Kazakhs, Khirghiz, Uzbeks, and Turkmen.

The Russians, themselves masters of tricky power politics, are enraged by this Chinese skin game. Peiping publicly denounces the United States and privately denounces Russia for the same sin of being white. The obvious next step would be to persuade China's clientele in Asia and Africa that there is little to choose between Moscow and Washington.

The world has frequently been plagued by variations on this curse of policy by pigment as typified by Kaiser Wilhelm's bombast about the "yellow menace" or the curious South African belief that men of different shades may walk together but not sit or pray together. General de Gaulle thinks that some day race rather than ideology will dominate nations and that, in the indeterminate future, Russia will be drawn to white Europe against yellow Asia.

China's special contribution to the racist plague is trying to turn it into an ideological force, to strike simultaneously at the United States and U.S.S.R.

Asian lands like Japan and India or African lands like Nigeria are unlikely to be persuaded that the mere fact China is not governed by white people automatically qualifies its policies or politics as attractive. Nevertheless, this strange new Chinese skin game imposed on Marxism-Leninism—never racist by conception—is bound to add to the unhappiness of an already troubled earth. One may only hope that should time eventually bring closer relationships between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. it will not be simply because Peiping has damned us both for being white—by C. L. Sulzberger.

Our Gold Is in Hock but Spending Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, entitled, "Our Gold Is in Hock but Spending Is a Must."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GOLD IS IN HOCK BUT SPENDING IS A MUST

(By Henry J. Taylor)

While President Kennedy castigates the foreign aid cut, down goes our gold again—down and out.

The President remains in a dream about money. But what happens to the people who have to earn it?

Until 1933 every American had a choice of accepting paper money or gold money from our Government's Treasury. When the Government deprived us of that free choice, few people seem to realize this never happened before. In the entire history of the United States, including the darkest days of the Civil War, it had never before been unlawful for an American to possess his own money in gold.

By its own action, our Government removed any effective check on its own unlimited spending of our money, so far as Americans are concerned, agreeing only to redeem its pledges to us, its citizens, in paper. Foreigners are not affected.

The gold outflow reached troublesome proportions in 1958 when the call from abroad was $3.5 billion. Then in 1959 it was $3.7 billion, in 1960 another $3.9 billion, 1961 another $2.4 billion and 1962 $2.2 billion. In addition, for the past 2 years the true situation has been buried behind temporary gimmicks and monetary deals that gave the deepening crisis a false front.

Never has our Government been in hock to so many for so much, both at home and abroad.

Foreigners now have a call on us for $20.5 billion in gold—central banks abroad can ask for $12 billion, noncitizens of the United States for $8.5 billion.

As one result the U.S. gold stock at Fort Knox has now fallen to another new 24-year-low. We don't own a nickel of what is left. The $20.5 billion that foreigners can demand is nearly $5 billion more than the $15.6 billion left to meet this demand including the entire amount the administration is legally required to keep as our currency reserve. Now that's all gone in hock, too.

The $8.5 billion privately held in foreign claims is the more explosive part of this total. These creditors—some large, some small—live in many countries. All they have to do is turn their dollar holdings into their national central banks in exchange for their own currencies. And if the central banks are unwilling to thus increase their dollar balances they simply demand gold instead.

That's the way it works. And what does Mr. Kennedy expect our foreign creditors to do when he keeps saying, "must," "must," "must" to more and more spending?

The administration collected $102 billion from the Nation's earners last year. More than $65 billion was taken from individuals, of which $49 billion was withheld and never seen by the men and women who worked for this vast sum, in addition, corporations collected $21 billion for Washington.

Still, New Frontiersmen couldn't pay their bills—even this this—and boosted our national debt to a new all-time high. The President's only proposed solution is to urge "planned deficits" through programs to increase general spending and reduce taxes at the same time. Moreover, since January 1 Mr. Kennedy has proposed 12 additional tax-distributing programs for which he asks $200 million merely and entirely to get more bureaus organized and ready for the vast taxes they would distribute later. Like the full amount of foreign aid, all are labeled a "must." The politicians treat—and eat—our wages and earnings like a huge, rich slice of Turkish delight.

The great Senator William Borah once observed that the marvel of all history is the patience with which men and women submit to burdens unnecessarily laid upon them by their governments. We have no direct recourse against our Government's abuse of our funds. But foreign creditors do have a recourse. And they'll continue to call for gold unless Mr. Kennedy does a complete turn-around, stops claiming every spending bill is a "must" bill, supports reductions, and puts priorities on what is spent.

The President can no longer say "must" to handouts everywhere and still save the American dollar.

NATO and the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in order that all sides of the test ban treaty controversy be aired, I think it is wise to consider the on-the-spot observation of Constantine Brown, who writes the following article from Paris:

NATO AND THE TEST BAN TREATY—OBSERVERS FEAR THE FAILURE OF ALLIANCES WITH THIS AND OTHER ACCOMMODATIONS

(By Constantine Brown)

PARIS.—The nuclear test ban treaty and the inevitable subsequent accommodation steps such as inspection teams to prevent surprise attacks and the adoption of a slightly modified Rapacki plan continue to worry political circles in Bonn and Paris.

French sources close to the Elysee Palace intimate that the troubled internal conditions in the United States, coupled with our external difficulties, may have been the main reason which decided President Kennedy to yield to the advice of his advisers. These men firmly believe that coexistence with Russia—even on her own terms—is the only expedient solution for our present-day ills. Hence the signing of the Moscow treaty without any quid pro quo from the Soviets and the likelihood that the next steps toward accommodation will follow suit.

"America is just not in a position to fight under existing conditions," said one of the French Elysee consultants. "As a consequence of your debilitated condition," he continued, "the Russian general staff has already won a spectacular victory which renders the NATO powerless."

He went on to trace the history of the Russian strategy since the end of World War II and the beginning of the cold war: "Even after the Soviets managed to explode the A- and H-bombs; even after they created a formidable nuclear force of their own (which in the opinion of the French specialists still does not match that of the United States), the Russian general staff from Zhukov to Malinovsky have been against a nuclear war."

These capable military men want to fight a war for gains and there can be no gain in a total destruction of the enemy as well as their own countries. The Soviet marshals have helped the Kremlin, and in particular, the shrewd and capable, rough diplomat, Khrushchev, in waging a campaign of terror in the free world. They have especially concentrated on the United States and Britain in the hope that their people would become sufficiently frightened to eventually ac-

cept the banning of all nuclear weapons. Once this is achieved, so the thinking here goes, Russia will become the foremost military power in the world because she will possess the greatest conventional force.

The power of the NATO—the shield of freedom as we like to describe it—has always rested on the American nuclear deterrent, not on its ground and conventional air forces. Its power rests on keeping the Russians guessing whether we shall use our nuclear deterrent in, say, a coup against Berlin. According to French intelligence, the Kremlin has now acquired the positive knowledge that America's ultimate weapon won't be used unless there is a major Soviet nuclear attack against U.S. territory.

Under these conditions, the power of NATO is almost laughable. The watch on the Rhine is composed of six American divisions, nine German, two understrength British, two equally understrength French and a couple of miscellaneous Benelux, Danish and Norwegian divisions. The Italian, Greek, and Turkish Armies which are counted among the NATO forces have specially assigned roles. They will join the battle only if the Mediterranean sector becomes involved.

Against this force between the Elbe and the Rhine the Russians have in East Germany alone 20 divisions with 4,000 tanks. The other satellites have a minimum of 60 divisions. And behind them at close quarters from the Russian border to the Ural Mountains there are 147 battle-ready divisions.

How long, ask the French, could the NATO armies resist that formidable conventional force of the potential enemy even if we assume that the air forces of the two antagonists are about equal in quantity and quality? Granted that the Western forces are splendidly trained and equipped, how long could they resist such an avalanche?

The day has arrived when the Russian general staff knows positively that America's deterrent will not be used to protect Europe and the NATO has become a thin paper shield.

Yet, informed Frenchmen add, it is hard to see how America can move to another path than it has taken since the Cuban affair when it gained a short-lived victory. All the alliances which had been formulated since the end of the war to arrest the onward march of international communism at huge expense to the American taxpayer are now falling by the wayside. And the present accommodation policies of the administration are accelerating their disintegration.

The Arts and Philanthropy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, traditionally the arts have received the greatest part of their support from philanthropic foundations and other private sponsors, but this is no longer adequate today. The visual and performing arts face the greatest difficulties because of rising costs and a number of other economic factors, and the consequences are being felt in their limitation out of all proportion to our resources and to the interest of the American people. The visual and performing arts are tending to concentrate more and more in the large cities while much of the rest of the country is left without opportunity to participate in and to enjoy them adequately. The recent crop of arts festivals and the rush of new cultural centers are welcome signs of an awareness of need, but they are no substitute for long-term cultural development in depth. Much more will have to be done both by private philanthropy and by State and Federal Government programs to meet the rapidly growing artistic and cultural explosion in the country. And in this respect the legislation I have proposed for a U.S. Arts Foundation, and similar proposals by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] should receive the early consideration of Congress.

The expanded role that private philanthropy can take in helping the arts is the theme of one of a series of lectures on "The Fine Arts in Public Life," delivered late last year at Brandeis University. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the lecture delivered by W. McNeil Lowry, director of the Ford Foundation program in humanities and the arts, entitled "The Arts and Philanthropy," at Brandeis University, December 10, 1962.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARTS AND PHILANTHROPY

(By W. McNeil Lowry, director, the Ford Foundation program in humanities and the arts)

(NOTE.—This lecture was delivered at Brandeis University under the auspices of the Poses Institute of Fine Arts, December 10, 1962, by W. McNeil Lowry, director of the program in Humanities and the Arts, the Ford Foundation. It was one of four lectures in a series on the theme of "The Fine Arts in Public Life." August Heckscher, director of the 20th Century Fund, Max Abramovitz, architect, and Alfred M. Frankfurter, editor and president of Art News, were the other Poses lecturers in the 1962 series. The Poses Institute of Fine Arts was established at Brandeis University in 1960 through the generosity of Mr. and Mrs. Jack I. Poses of New York to supplement the university's regular curriculum of instruction in art. The institute supports a continuing program of activities which include the annual Poses lectures, scholarly papers and publications, seminars and symposia, and university gallery exhibitions. In 1961 the institute's lecture series was devoted to the subject, "Aspects of Romanticism," with the following guest speakers: Prof. Lorenz E. A. Eitner, University of Minnesota; Edgar P. Richardson, formerly director of the Detroit Institute of Arts; William C. Seitz, associate curator of the Department of Painting and Sculpture, the Museum of Modern Art, New York; and Prof. Henry-Russell Hitchcock, Smith College.)

Analysis of the current American artistic scene reveals many paradoxical elements. On the scale of history and in comparison with some of the older countries, the arts in the United States are underdeveloped. With conspicuous exceptions, most professional artists lead precarious lives both psychologically and economically. The majority are concentrated geographically in two sections of the country. Their scarcity in the Southeastern, Plains, and Mountain States leaves these areas generally underdeveloped except within academic halls and in a few museum collections from the past. Compared to other elements in the Nation's life, the arts are also neglected financially. Institutions in the performing arts, from the largest to the smallest, regularly meet financial crises threatening their survival. The same influences of rising costs affect fine arts institutions differently; all but the most heavily endowed curtail their activities and their staffs while managing to keep their doors open.

* * * * *

The arts as an ethnic or an esthetic have taken on a new doctrinal urgency in many diverse segments of the society, and the argument is advanced by the most as well as the least affluent of artistic groups. Among many other claims, the arts are said to be:

1. Important to the image of the American society abroad;
2. A means of communication and consequently of understanding between this country and others;
3. An expression of national purpose;
4. An important influence in the liberal education of the individual;
5. An important key to an American's understanding of himself, his times, and his destiny;
6. A purposeful occupation for youth;
7. In their institutional form, vital to the social, moral, and educational resources of an American community;
8. Therefore good for business, especially in new centers of population in the Southwest, West, and other regions;
9. Components for strengthening moral and spiritual bastions in a people whose national security is threatened;
10. An offset to the materialism of a new and (generally) affluent society.

This is not the place to debate the validity of each of these claims. But they reflect a steadily growing interest in the arts in almost every part of the United States, even though that interest ranges all the way from concrete action to mere lipservice. The first translation of this growing interest has come in buildings (or plans for buildings) as symbols of our cultural life. Another has been in the form of arts festivals, workshops, seminars, and conferences at every level—local, State, regional. A third is in the new fashion of clustering the arts together to reach some supposed *n*th factor in creativity. A fourth is the rapid enlargement of academic training programs in the arts. Most recently, and only in a few communities, has come the attempt to give stability to proved artistic groups or institutions which were formed out of individual drive and energy but have not enjoyed financial patronage. And there are many other examples.

* * * * *

As could be supposed, the artists themselves have had mixed reactions to the lay attitudes and lay actions I have noted. Though on an absolute scale there is more financial support being made available for the arts it is not always being channeled into artistic enterprises meeting the criterion of equality. Some of the artists have resigned themselves to the probability that the first new money in the arts may chiefly be reflected in bigger college programs, new activities for schoolchildren, and new halls for performances. Others are bitter that the outlets for professional careers are in many fields woefully inadequate and not as yet being increased. Though there are conflicting judgments among artists as to the satisfaction to be found from teaching, there is universal discouragement over the fact that teaching remains the principal economic base for professionals in the creative (and for some in the performing) arts.

There are important variations from one art field to another in both the resources of American artistic talent and the opportunities for its expression.

The style of painting in the greatest vogue in the United States today has become an

international style for the first time in American history. So dominant has its influence become and so easy is the style to imitate that it threatens to erode the technical equipment necessary to transmit to the next generation of painters. The number of painters accepted as professional exceeds that at any time in the past. Yet only a fraction of these earn their living by their art, and other persons reap more financial reward from it than do the painters themselves. At the same time it is inescapable that, for whatever reasons, large numbers of new collectors are appearing in many parts of the United States, and a significant portion of these are also collecting contemporary works. In a few communities new museums are built to house only contemporary art.

Sculptors benefit somewhat less from the new enthusiasm for abstract art, primarily because of the expensiveness of materials, the cost of showing bronzes, and the fewer opportunities for the individual collector to display them. Both new materials and new techniques for casting are being developed. For a long time to come, however, sculptors will feel the effects of the diminished use being made of their art in the building construction budgets already inflated by other economic costs.

Perhaps no other country in the world equals the United States in its reservoir of talented young voices. But in no country of the Western tradition are there more sharply limited outlets for the truly professional singer. Only one major opera company has a season longer than 13 weeks and only three others have what could in fairness even be called a season. About a dozen civic opera companies have potentialities of growth which, if realized, could make a difference in the careers of young singers, many of whom now must seek their outlets on subsidized European stages. As for the recital stage, commercial managements have the deciding influence, and each limits the number of singers it will keep on its sales roster at one time. At the top, of course, are soloists whose names are internationally known.

The United States also boasts a number of equally famed instrumentalists. It has 42 symphony orchestras which the trade itself terms important. Yet the career of an instrumentalist in the United States is hard; if the average performer sought to live on orchestral employment alone, he would have an annual income of only about $2,000. Customarily the orchestral musician also has at least two other jobs, and often one of these will be completely unrelated to his musical training. His union is currently making sweeping demands upon all major orchestras, which already must find about 40 percent of their income from gifts rather than from the box office. Meantime the failing economic incentive robs the orchestras of new sources for players, presently most noticeably in the string section. U.S. symphonic resources are the subject of national pride in a difficult achievement, but new ways must be found to support them. The answer appears to lie in new community arrangements and not in outright philanthropic subsidies, but philanthropy may have an important role in helping to test the new patterns.

One of the most important problems in the arts affects the legitimate theater in the United States. For a long time the American theater was an actor's theater, then for the past four decades it was a producer's theater, and now even the producer is losing much of his artistic control to the booker of theater parties looking for the lightest or most sensational fare. There has been a decrease in the opportunities for those actors, directors, designers who regard the theater as a serious art rather than as commerce. Yet most theater people prefer to see the institution supported by what the people will pay for at the box office. At the very moment that the Broadway theater is placed on a perilous and unsound economic base, the resident repertory theater concept has won the allegiance of artists and critics alike. To date the resident theater is represented only by a few small institutions scattered here and there about the country. With the help of organized philanthropy, some of these are now able to be strengthened, provided they can reasonably foresee a financial breakeven point within the next decade. The influence of the resident ensemble is also needed in New York, particularly if new American playwrights are to be developed for the good of the whole scene, including Broadway. Meantime the ratio of legitimate acting parts to the reservoir of professional actors remains ridiculously low, despite the fact that recent experiments show that Hollywood and television have not blunted the appetites of the public for live dramatic performances. For directors, the picture is a little different and more confused. Directors whose talent has been thoroughly tested are in short supply, but the conditions of the theater prevent many, many others from getting an adequate test.

The positions of the poet and the novelist in the United States are not basically more difficult than they have been in the past, despite the increased costs of publishing. But these positions are different from what they were. The creative writer may suffer more than he realizes from his economic base on the college campus, but not financially more than his historical antecedents. The public, in a different way, also suffers, for the poem or novel offered as "literature" is often academically inbred and pointed toward a paperback existence for a chiefly academic audience. Even the self-professed rebels in San Francisco, New York, or other nonconformist environments indirectly feed on their academic connections. If creative writing is to be a profession, its most professional practitioners are finally going to have to leave the academy and have other exposures. The same can be said about those other creative artists, such as composers, who see themselves in the advanced guard. But for the separation to be made, book and music publication may have to find new avenues, new principles of marketing.

As already noted one of the most surprising developments in the postwar artistic scene is the interest in the dance, particularly the ballet, around the country. It is even more paradoxical because no field in the arts in the United States offers a grimmer picture. Only one professional company of artistic merit, the New York City Ballet, has an important season, and this company is in urgent need of new funds for new productions, new decor, and general operations. The San Francisco Ballet Co., with a much shorter season, is in the same situation, and the American Ballet Theater fails for many reasons to have an adequate season at all. The 80-odd civic ballet enterprises generally mount only one performance a year, but here and in hundreds of schools young girls (and recently a few young boys) are studying ballet with the hope of a career. A recent inquiry we have supported suggests that only a few of the teachers in these schools have even minimum qualifications for handling the young students without spoiling forever their potentialities for reaching professional stature. The leading ballet companies need strengthening, but even more urgently there needs to be a national center for ballet instruction open to talented children throughout the country. The Soviets have no choreographer who can match George Balanchine, but every Soviet choreographer has available dancers trainer at a professional level since the age of 9. To create an American ballet academy just to outdo the Bolshoi and Kirov schools would not be justified; to give the proper training to hundreds of young people already struggling against odds to find it would make sense.

Interpretive dance presents both a more confused and a less urgent picture. This art form is now chiefly based upon the colleges; until it finds its own aesthetic and a more stringent professional ethos, perhaps it is safer to keep it where it is. It is often argued, nevertheless, that more needs to be done to open the modern dance to a wider public than college and other subsidized stages can reach. Interpersonal and intercompany jealousies and frictions increase the difficulties of reaching this goal. * * *

It is a paradox that the largest single source of unearned income for the arts is the Federal Government but this happens through two provisions of the Internal Revenue Code one affecting exemptions from personal income taxation and the other affecting inheritance taxes. Now as in the 19th century individual men and women are the chief sources of artistic patronage. We no longer have the monuments to single patrons left in the early part of this century in the form of heavily endowed orchestras and museums in Cleveland, Boston and elsewhere. But both personal income and inheritance taxes have retained incentives for individual patronage and the arts divide it with religion education and medicine.

Foundations, according to their own research center, have up to now given only about 4 percent of their grants to the humanities, which in this analysis include the creative and performing arts, and if this be true they have not generally recognized that their activities in other fields are being assimilated by government and industry. A little less than 6 years ago the first truly comprehensive foundation program in the arts was established on an exploratory basis in the Ford Foundation. In September the arts became 1 of 10 major Ford programs; even in its more limited phase it was the largest single national source of patronage in the arts. So on a relative scale there is yet much to be done about the arts in organized philanthropy.

The tax codes governing them permit corporations to give up to 5 percent of their profiets to education—which by the code's definition may include the arts—but on the average, corporations are not by any means taking advantage of the provision. Even since I began doing staffwork in the arts, however, I have noted real changes in the interest of corporate donors. In the areas of the United States toward which the population is moving—southern California, east Texas, south Florida—corporate support of the arts is developing rapidly; it is not, of course, confined to the new centers.

Compared to other elements in the Nation's life, in short, the arts have been neglected financially. There are variations in degree when one looks at each art separately. Music and the visual arts have had a large share of what has been available; theater and the dance scarcely any. Fortunately the importance of outside support of the arts has not been strictly equivalent with the amounts involved; often the effect of a single action has been crucial in the career of an artist or of an institution important to his development.

As I said at the outset, I think a more meaningful way by which to assess the role of philanthropy in the arts is through an analysis of the motives provoking the philanthropic act itself. I am sure each observer of the artistic scene might find a varying number of motives and label them differently. From my own experience in the field in every part of the country over the past 6 years, I have selected five categories about which to group the argument. I am not completely satisfied with my own labels, but for want of better ones I shall speak of the status motive, the social motive, the educational motive, the economic motive, and the professional motive.

The motive of status might almost be called the temple complex. In dozens of communities around the country, there are plans, drawings, or actual skeletons of so-called cultural centers. Somehow in our country, public, business, and other lay leaders appear to believe that art begins with real estate, as if art is engendered by the four walls, if they be imposing enough. At the risk of appearing ungrateful for all the artistic activities breaking out in American communities, I believe we must guard against a failing which is characteristically American—the tendency to mistake the symbol for the thing, the intent for the doing, the name for the act. Is this just another example of our materialism, even as we become more active in the nonmaterial realms of the arts? I do not know, but it appears we are to have the audience before we are to know who will perform before it. The rash of cultural centers is one sign of the status motive. The rash of arts festivals is another. Exposure to the arts is a good; no one could be against it, particularly in a democratic society. But surely the artistic status of a community or region cannot be measured merely in terms of the facilities it can offer to imported artists and artistic creations. As a motive for philanthropy, the status motive is at the least imperfect, and if it prevailed over other motives, it would be quite simply disastrous. None of us can afford to be complacent about this phenomenon in our society. It is being fanned by every wind that blows, particularly those from the banks of the Potomac, and it will not ultimately make for the public happiness.

The social motive for artistic patronage is merely an older variant of the status motive. It persists from a time when few of us could afford status but those who could were willing to pay for it. It surrounds the openings of operatic and symphonic seasons, particularly the former, but it is not altogether missing from the openings of museum exhibitions and other ceremonial occasions of the artistic season. The director of one of our large opera companies told me that he could open his season with a 30-minute concert from the orchestra in the pit, raise and lower the curtain, and get by without singers on the stage, so intent would be the first-nighters on the dinner parties they had just attended and their studies of the ladies' dresses in the hall. Perhaps he exaggerated, but I can vouch for the fact that the description of the dresses worn at one of his opening performances occupied five complete pages, barring advertisements, in the local press.

* * * * *

But like the motive of status, the social motive is bad when it is dominant. When it takes control of an artistic institution or company, art evaporates. The whole enterprise becomes something that is not about art, but about society, about power, because what society is ultimately about is power.

The educational motive for philanthropic activity in the arts is more difficult to characterize. It operates in two ways. In the first, artistic enterprises are accepted as important to the community because they are somehow supposed to be good for the schoolchildren. The stock example is the businessman who supports a symphony orchestra provided he is not expected himself to appear at symphony hall. He likes the idea that the schoolchildren possess an advantage he does not want to exercise for himself. For some time orchestras and museums have partially supported themselves on the backs of schoolchildren; theater and opera companies are now making strenuous efforts to do the same. The donor's motive is single, the beneficiary's triple; the beneficiary hopes not only to extend his sources of support and help to educate young people in the arts but also to train his adult audiences of the future. All three objectives are laudable. Whenever they distort the artistic enterprise, it is because art, when used for nonartistic ends, always risks distortion.

The second way in which the educational motive operates is through the use of an educational institution as a philanthropic base for the arts * * * I am now speaking of the role universities, particularly the State institutions, have often assumed, to serve a community or a region as an artistic entrepreneur. Some of our State universities have even conceived their role in the tradition of the German stadt, which in turn took its own role from that of the German princeling. Particularly in areas where professional institutions in the arts were scarce, such universities have provided music, theater, opera, painting and sculpture both on the campus and in other communities within the State. Meantime, on their own campuses they have, like many other universities and colleges, provided through faculty appointments an economic base for writers, composers, painters and sculptors, were concert performers. This trend shows the adaptability of democratic institutions, and it gives no sign of abatement. Since the universities, particularly those with tax support, have a much easier time raising funds than do professional institutions in the arts, we confront here an important new development in artistic patronage. Recognizing it, even welcoming it, we should nevertheless not lose sight of its hazards. We are living in an age of a general speeding up of communications throughout every fabric of our society. But some of us worry lest every vehicle of communication, including even our educational system, may tend, if we are not vigilant, toward a steady popularization and amateurization of those intangibles we call the arts.

A fourth philanthropic motive, and the newest, is the economic. The arts are now not only good for people but good for business. This development is an offshoot of the educational motive for artistic patronage. The mobility of our economy, spurred by science, industry, and the need for national security, is intruding upon settled and somewhat provincial communities new concepts about their proper community resources. We must have not only good schools but other—and more specialized—cultural resources. A few months ago an important industrial corporation in a southwestern metropolis lost out in competition with another city for the talents of a trained biochemist. Later investigation disclosed that the biochemist had taken a position in the second city because of its supposed greater cultural resources for himself and his family. In the southwestern metropolis that had come out second best, a new vigor was felt in the cultural renaissance. Backed by the local press, the businessmen undertook an inventory of the city's cultural resources. The arts, which had been thought of as good for the schoolchildren or of interest to the ladies, were now good for business too. Given the nature of our democratic and laissez faire economic society, this evolution within it is undoubtedly a necessary step in the development of our cultural resources. But it antedates (by how long a period we can only guess) any realization that it is the highly talented and professionally trained artist on whom all depends; it lacks as yet, in short, discrimination as to what the arts are really about.

In the identification of motives for artistic patronage I have chosen as the argument for my discussion, the fifth, and last is the professional, a feeble name, I am afraid, for the motive I desire to convey. Basically it means accepting the artist and the arts on their own terms. This does not apepar to be a very unorthodox requirement when we consider how easily (in the main) philanthropy accepts, say, scientists, or educators on their own terms. But individual patrons, corporations, public officials, and until recently foundations have too frequently chosen to concern themselves with the educational or social uses of the arts, if they have indeed devoted their resources to the arts at all. Some of us have long hoped that the sources of money in the United States, private, or public, individual or corporate, would find a greater share for the professional arts. A greater share for the arts is actually becoming visible, though by no means as yet proportionate to the importance of the arts in any society. But a paradoxical development is also emerging. We are beginning to see an enlargement in the funds available to the arts without too much prospect of channeling the new resources into the places where they are the most imperatively needed, places which traditionally have been subsidized by the artist himself through his Spartan determination. And in many quarters, public-spirited persons of good will are performing good works in the exposure of the public to art without too much thought as to what is being exposed or the results to be anticipated.

* * * * *

Philanthropy, in the arts at least, is professionally motivated only when it accepts the artist and the arts on their own terms, and learns from the artist himself at least to recognize the atmosphere in which the artistic process is carried out.

What is that atmosphere? None of us can describe it to the complete satisfaction of anyone else, but as I have said on another occasion, it derives importantly from "the drive or fanaticism or whatever of the person who has made his choice, and will often have to eschew anything else—money, the elite identification of a university degree, even health—to develop the latent talent he hopes he has. It comes also from the pride of doing for oneself, of making ends meet, of giving society what it will pay for even if what it pays is inadequate to sustain a normal life, of working in the midst of a fraternity that will show the same fanaticisms and abnegations. It comes from the endless time, time, time spent on doing one thing, only one thing, and then starting all over again. It comes, finally, from the acceptance of such distortion as a way of life, a way of life, you will note, that is in some ways completely antithetical to the ideal objective of a liberal and humane education. Some of the most professional, the most talented, and the most mature artists I have met lack either the time or the capacity to sort out a decent personal life from the endless hours of their artistic concentration. Only a rare heredity or early environment and not, I am afraid, a very good education, has given some of these artists a humanity that separates them from the talented bums in their midst."

It is no accident that so many talented artists (you will have guessed by now that I use this word to apply to creators or performers in all artistic fields) who are 35 years of age or older speak of "the depression psychology." Strictly speaking, however, this is a timeless phenomenon in the artist and not peculiar to an era when the entire social community is in severe economic straits. Many persons believe that the artist became socially motivated in the depression era because the Government itself accepted him as just as rightfully unemployed as a bricklayer or a mechanic. I am not, of course, merely repeating the romantic picture of the artist as a starveling or saying, with Matisse, that hunger will bring out the artist's creativity if he has any. The Spartan fanaticism of the driving, talented force is not purely a factor of the annual income of the artist or artistic director in whom the force is lodged. It is certainly not saintly, nor is sainthood the goal. It is neither moral nor immoral.

It does mean, however, that the artist has chosen what he must do without the promise of security, not merely financial, but even emotional or social. If the concentration is great enough to develop the existing talent, it is great to the point of distortion. And distortion, as I said earlier, may itself have to become the way of life.

If any of this be true, then what the artist is about is not what society or education or business or physical magnificence is about. And if philanthropy—public or private, individual or organized—is to relate to the arts in any realistic and therefore meaningful way, it can learn how to do so only from the artists and artistic directors themselves. It is they who must, in short, become the chief participants in the whole philanthropic process.

It has been my privilege for 5½ years to help carry out this sort of exploration for the Ford Foundation. Whether it is theater, music, painting, ballet, or opera with which we are concerned, we attempt to talk to many artists and artistic directors in the field and to gain a realistic insight into the problems with which the art is confronted. Through our extensive fieldwork in every part of the country, through conferences and panels we call in New York, through interviews with individual men and women in our offices, we listen. Anything we know about the arts we do not read from books nor attempt to view from our own vantage point on Madison Avenue. We are catalysts rather than reformers, participants rather than backers, communicants rather than critics. And when we announce a specific program for individual artists, both the nominating and the selecting processes are in the hands of the artists and artistic directors themselves.

I wish I had time to tell you about the results of this activity, now beginning its 6th year, and the way it is reflected in so many parts of the country. That is not my subject tonight. Even though the Ford Foundation Program in Humanities and the Arts is expanding, I can tell you that all the sums the Ford Foundation may expend in the arts will not enable us to attack even the most urgent problems we have identified with the help of the artists themselves. I say this lest you think I am not the appropriate person to speak of the artist in his Spartan aspects. Our investments in the arts are not so much subsidies as they are levers. We are content not to change history if we can help to shorten it, even infinitesimally, in the career of the artist and his most rudimentary institutions. There are ways, I feel sure, to weaken artistic drive through subsidy, but if this happens one is either subsidizing the wrong thing or mistaking for an artist a person who has only a talent for visibility. And we are not very much moved by those who tell us that the public will not respect the artist until he commands an imposing financial position. Most of those who support this argument talk better about art than they either practice it or recognize it.

As the scale of the Ford Foundation's activities increases, important actions we shall take will appear to serve all five philanthropic motives I have defined—status, social, educational, economic, and professional—as did, for example the $6 million, in grants to strengthen the resident theater concept announced in October. Every important philanthropic action has both an organic and a nuclear relationship to its society, and it is always an action taken in concert. But only the professional motive can justify what we do, our acceptance of the artist and the arts on their own terms. This is the key to channeling new interests and new financial resources in the arts into effective development for the future. Other motives are important, but they are finally irrelevant.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 24th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's Multimillion-Dollar Annual Losses and Areas of Substantial and Persistent Unemployment Are Not Wanted in Southern Idaho."

The proponents of Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho would have us believe that the opposition of southern Idahoans to his action was very limited. The mounting pile of letters, articles, resolutions, and editorials expressing southern Idaho's opposition to Bonneville is ample testimony that such is not the case.

In past articles I have presented numerous examples of southern Idahoans' objection to the Bonneville invasion. The group included expressions of opposition by chamber of commerce after chamber of commerce, the Idaho Farm Bureau representing 12,000 farm families, a majority of the Idaho State representatives and senators, State reclamation officials, businessmen, farmers, bankers, lawyers, housewives, et cetera.

Today, I am presenting a resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Boise, urging revocation of Secretary Udall's edict. This was sent to me in a covering letter signed by the president and secretary of the club. Kiwanis International, of which the Boise club is a part, consists of more than a quarter-million members, all dedicated to the principles of free enterprise that have made this the greatest Nation on earth.

The letter and resolution are as follows:

KIWANIS CLUB OF BOISE,
August 21, 1963.

Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: JOHN, please find enclosed a copy of a resolution approved by the Boise Kiwanis Club on August 20, 1963.

This resolution reflects the principles and policies for which Kiwanis members are dedicated.

Yours truly,

LEON FAIRBANKS,
President.

A. B. WHEELER,
Secretary.

"Whereas the Kiwanis Club of Boise, Inc., is composed of 130 members, freely associated business and professional men, who are dedicated to the objects and programs of Kiwanis International, including, but not limited to, the following:

"A. To develop by precept and example a more intelligent, aggressive and serviceable citizenship;

"B. To promote understanding by both youth and adults of the principles of free enterprise as an indispensable part of the life and strength of our countries;

"C. To oppose participation by Government in, or favor to, programs which compete with private enterprise;

"D. To recognize and support responsible public officials; demand sound business procedure; and oppose excessive expansion of Government; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, by edict, did extend Bonneville power into southern Idaho without full consultation or adequate opportunity for public discussion or consideration, so vital to our common welfare upon the issue between a paralyzing dictatorship and true democracy of the ethical, American and traditional due process, 'reserved to the states respectively or to the people' under the 10th and 14th amendments to our Federal Constitution, also guaranteed by our Idaho State constitution: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That business and industry be permitted to function in a free, competitive market making full use of its efficiency and ability to operate and produce at a profit, which has been demonstrated to be a major factor in our free enterprise system that has made our Nation prosperous and strong; that our Federal Government should be conducted only upon sound business, economic and financial lines in order to preserve our capitalistic system, which we believe was not done in this instance; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we do respectfully urge revocation of the said edict and, failing revocation, that we do advocate the complete elimination of any appropriation of taxpayers' money which would implement a marketing policy of Bonneville power for the benefit of a few preference customers in southern Idaho."

The Business and Public Affairs Committee of the Kiwanis Club of Boise, Inc., hereby approves and recommends the adoption of the attached resolution by the board of directors at its meeting to be held August 16, 1963.

Approved: August 13, 1963.

CLARENCE W. HETTINGER,
Chairman, Business & Public Affairs Committee.

Kiwanis Club of Boise, Inc., board of directors meeting, August 16, 1963, Elks Club, Boise, Idaho: The Board of Directors of the Kiwanis Club of Boise, Inc. having received and duly considered the attached resolution hereby adopts the said resolution and recommends the same for approval by the membership at its regular meeting to be held August 20, 1963.

Approved: August 16, 1963.

LEON FAIRBANKS,
President.

The attached resolution was approved by the members of the Kiwanis Club of Boise, Inc., at the regular club meeting held August 20, 1963.

LEON FAIRBANKS,
President.

Mr. Speaker, not to be outdone by the action of groups like the Kiwanis Club and chamber of commerce and others, the individual southern Idahoans continue to express their opposition to the Bonneville invasion. Mr. Tate of the Safway Scaffold & Power Tool Co. of Boise, Idaho, expresses his appreciation for my stand, and fears that Udall's action is part of the plan of the public power group that want to see our country change from a representative type of government to a Socialist type. His letter follows:

SAFWAY SCAFFOLD & POWER TOOL CO.,
Boise, Idaho, August 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated Monday, July 8, 1963, containing

your remarks concerning "Udall Ukase and Addled Economics" has been brought to our attention.

As president of Safway Scaffold & Power Tool Co., a corporation, wholly owned by Idaho citizens, I wish to congratulate you on your clear thinking, and on your taking a firm stand against the encroachment of the Federal Government in the business world of these United States.

It is almost asking the impossible to get the people of Idaho to object to having money given them by such people as Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, and yet we can see that it is just another wedge in the program of the public power group (and, I fear, those who want to see our country change from a representative type of government to a Socialist type) to gain their ends.

Again, let me express the opinion of our group, that we appreciate your stand and want to do what we can to prevent this "Udall Ukase."

Sincerely yours,

W. PAUL TATE,
President.

Mr. Donald C. Roberts, of Meridian, Idaho, believes a canvas of the State would find a majority of the people against bringing in Federal power. His letter follows:

MERIDIAN, IDAHO,
August 2, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am happy to hear that someone in Washington is opposed to bringing Bonneville power into Idaho.

There is ample power for firms in southern Idaho without bringing in Federal power. There is no need for the Government to spend millions of dollars to bring Federal power to Idaho.

If our Idaho Senators and Representatives would take the time to canvas their State I think they would find the majority of people against bringing in Federal power.

Yours very truly,

DONALD C. ROBERTS.

Mary B. Elliott, of Caldwell, Idaho, expresses her opposition to Bonneville power and commends me for my stand in these words:

CALDWELL, IDAHO,
July 29, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: Would like to commend you on your stand on Bonneville Power Administration. It is too bad that more of us can't see that Government money means Government control.

Very truly,

MARY B. ELLIOTT.

Mr. Val Child, of Caldwell, Idaho, says he speaks for 26 good U.S. citizens in his letter of August 2, 1963, opposing Bonneville's entry into their area of Idaho. He says it makes their blood boil.

His letter follows:

BLACKER APPLIANCE & FURNITURE,
Caldwell, Idaho, August 2, 1963.

Hon. Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are greatly concerned over the needless entry into our area of the Bonneville Power Administration. We have been well served by private industry for many years, and are more than happy with the relationship which we have enjoyed with Idaho Power.

Now to see the Bonneville power coming into the area, to waste our tax dollars on useless duplication of services which are already being provided by a taxpaying institution (Idaho Power), frankly, makes our blood warm excessively.

It seems absurd to any thinking individual to believe that it makes sense to cut revenues from a taxpaying industry (Idaho Power) by taking their customers for a Government-operated company (Bonneville Power) to use for the perpetuation of tax loss bureaucracy makes about as much sense as it would to starve your own children so that you could feed the fat children of the guy down the street.

If there is anything which you can do in your position, or by virtue of your office, to save our tax dollars by returning industry to private business, and leave big Government to muddy up other waters, we would most vigorously recommend it to you for action.

Sincerely,

VAL CHILD
(For 26 good U.S. citizens).

How To Keep the Budget Up With the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by Mr. James Reston and appearing in the New York Times of September 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO KEEP THE BUDGET UP WITH THE TIMES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, September 7.—Like every thoughtful citizen of the United States, the Federal Government has trouble with its money. The problem with money, both places, is the same: there isn't enough of it; the demands are unlimited, the supply limited. And this raises the hard question of priorities: What comes first? What's essential, what's not absolutely essential, and how do you tell the difference between the two?

This is the time of the year when Washington has to think about these questions. The budget for the coming fiscal year is now being formed, and again the reflex action of the Government is very much like the individual's reaction. It wants to avoid trouble. The easy thing to do is to dish it out as before, and the hard thing is to cut it up to meet the changing demands.

No sensible man who has trouble with his own budget would venture to be dogmatic about the Government's. Yet there is a sense of uneasiness here about the Federal budget—a feeling that it is not changing fast enough to keep up with the changing times.

THE BASIC QUESTION

Several things have increased the feeling here that a fundamental reexamination of the budget, not only by the Bureau of the Budget but by the President himself, is in order.

First, the problems of the homefront now seem larger and more urgent than they did last year. The cry of the Negro for equality now may divide the country, but the demand of the Negro and the poor whites for jobs and decent housing gets a more sympathetic hearing, even among the segregationists.

Does the budget give a high enough priority to these things? Is it more of a "vital interest" of the United States to spend over $1 million a day in South Vietnam than to spend it, or at least part of it, on jobs and houses at home?

Second, the cost of defense is leveling off. The President has assured the country that we already have the power, even on the assumption of a major war, to withstand an atomic attack and still wipe out our enemies.

If this is true, is it really essential to go on spending $50 billion a year on defense? Is over $5 billion a year for space exploration really a serious scientific calculation, or is at least part of it aimed at politics and propaganda? Third, Europe is no longer poor and unable to provide most of its own defense. It is prosperous and increasingly competitive with the United States, whose balance-of-payments problem is getting worse under the present one-sided sharing of the burden.

Under these circumstances, is the cost of maintaining a quarter of a million men in Europe a generation after the war still necessary? Or could it be reduced without jeopardizing the security of the free world?

Fourth, the situation in the underdeveloped countries and particularly in the poor countries on the periphery of the Communist world is changing. The United States is spending billions on the assumption that, if it reduced its aid to South Korea, Nationalist China, South Vietnam, Pakistan, and Iran, the monolithic Communists would overrun these areas.

But is this true since the split between Moscow and Peiping? Would Moscow really welcome a Chinese Communist conquest of Korea and South Vietnam, or would it cooperate to block Peiping's expansion, as it is now cooperating to oppose China's aims against India?

THE FALSE ALTERNATIVES

The official reflex action to such questions here is that the questioner is proposing rewith the increasingly urgent problems on the treat and isolation, but this is not the intent. So much money is involved in all this, that the question is merely whether two or three billions could not be pruned out of the defense and oversea budgets to help out with the increasingly urgent problems on the homefront.

Nobody is saying the question of priorities is easy. In the last few days Uncle Sam has been vilified because he dared to suggest that he did not want to be identified with suppressing the political opposition in South Korea or using American equipment to raid temples in South Vietnam or be a party to Pakistan's alliance with Communist China.

Everybody, including the soldiers and sailors in the Pentagon, want more from the budget and will fight against taking less, so the battle is hard all around. But will it be faced? That is the question raised by the new budget.

Student Bums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the group of students who recently returned to the United States after an extended visit in Castro's Cuba,

the following editorial from the Detroit News is of interest:

STUDENT BUMS

A bevy of unbirched beatniks, who have been passing themselves off on the international circuit as the image of the U.S. college intellectual while freeloading on Cuba's Castro, have now returned to thumb noses at the State Department.

The State Department has banned Cuban travel. All of the time the juvenile recalcitrants were on their defiant pilgrimage to the Communist mecca, the Department trumpeted warnings about their being liable to $5,000 fines and jail sentences.

About the time the young travelers turned home and started whining about delayed air transport, which might make them late for capitalist colleges, the Department began helping them and talking only of "picking up" their passports. Well, the traditionally indecisive State Department got itself slapped down again by the students when back on home soil.

When customs officials attempted to pick up those passports, about the mildest face-saving device the ineffectual State Department could think up, they were defied. The students did what has probably come naturally to them most of their lives. They sat down. Officials let them take their passports and go.

By their actions this impudent group made a State Department, which poses as the champion of righteousness and order in the adult councils of the world, look like an incompetent oaf. Most of us would have preferred to see them sit it out at Idlewild Airport.

They spent the summer mouthing Commie jingoism. Now they want to go back to roost in capitalist-supported colleges and universities to freeload on the American system they find so repressive. And all that without a trip to the woodshed.

Someone once said the "law is an ass." Apparently any tramp student can prove it against the State and Justice Departments.

Twelve Days Under Montana's Big Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'I Rode Into the Wilderness'—12 Days Under Montana's Big Sky," written by John Osier and published in the Washington Daily News of September 9, 1963, being an account of a horseback trip of 12 days into a wilderness area in Montana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I RODE INTO THE WILDERNESS"—12 DAYS UNDER MONTANA'S BIG SKY

(NOTE.—The word "wilderness" has been much in the newspapers lately while conservationists have been fighting for passage of the wilderness bill in the House after a 73-to-12 victory in the Senate. What is the wilderness like? Why are men fighting to save it? John Osier, Scripps-Howard staff writer, has just returned from such an area in Montana. Here's his account of what he found.

(By John Osier)

I rode horseback into a Montana wilderness for 12 days.

I ate, slept, lived in a land where men are alien, where the grizzly bear roams alone. There are no roads. Supplies are packed in by mule train.

This back country lies some 50 miles northeast of Missoula, Mont. It is known as the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, is a memorial to a forester, author and naturalist who awakened the Nation to the need for such areas, and did much to get them established.

The Continental Divide stretches like a snake's spine through it. The Lewis and Clark expedition explored the area on the way to the Pacific in 1805. Long before, the Flathead and Blackfeet Indians were ambushing each other in its canyons and passes.

It is bordered by the Lewis and Clark National Forest on the east, the Flathead on the west, and the Lolo on the south. It comprises nearly a million acres of mountains and virgin timber.

It is part of some 35 million acres of primitive grandeur that the wilderness bill, now before Congress, is designed to preserve for unborn generations of Americans.

THOSE WHO WENT

I entered the area on August 5 with a group headed by Howard Zahniser, executive director of the Wilderness Society and a leading backer of the bill.

"Zahnie" recently had a heart attack. But a veteran of many wilderness trips he was determined to go on this one. In his pack he carried an emergency oxygen supply.

Members of the party came from all walks of life, from coast to coast.

There were 10 women and 20 men, including 8 wranglers in charge of the livestock. We were all bound together by a need for mountains and sky.

The dentist, R. W. McCluskey, of Sacramento, Calif., oldest man on the trip, was tossed from his horse on a steep mountain trail the second day out. His face was badly cut, but he bounced off the ground and remounted immediately. He celebrated his 71st birthday a few days later, the same day that James Johnston of Denver, a retired oil driller and production man, observed his 70th.

Head wrangler was Jack Hooker, a retired rodeo rider. Trail guide and outfitter for the trip was Tom Edwards, of Ovando, Mont., a small grizzled man whose nimble fingers and battered mandolin sparked many campfire songs. Tom's wife, Helen, rode along as cook.

Soon it became apparent she would be the busiest person on the trip. The mountain air increases appetites to enormous proportions.

A nonrider before, I soon became accustomed to my horse, a big rawboned mare named Topsy. Surefooted, she ambled through rocky valleys and over windy ridges. We rolled up nearly 200 miles together.

The creaking saddle became music to me. The smell of horse, leather, sweat, and pines replaced the motor fumes of city streets.

The rush of wind and mountain streams, a red sunset changing a river to blood, the misty meadows in the morning—these turned my heart from the city, to the hills.

TAKING A BATH

One evening, after a hard ride, I left my tent for a cold bath. Approaching the stream, a female voice hailed me.

"Ladies first—you'll have to wait."

I was reminded of crowded bathrooms at home. Faced with walking upstream a half mile, I collapsed into pine needles and waited out the ladies.

You don't have to wait long. Baths are short in the icy mountain waters. No matter how dirty you got, you always approached one of the streams with mixed emotions. But on the hottest days, the water provided the coolest, freshest drink imaginable.

It also provided several suppers and breakfasts. Cutthroat trout were there for the casting. We could have lived on the fish we caught.

VANISHING BEAR

Game abounded. We sighted deer and mountain goats. Cougars, elk, and bear, as well as smaller game, are hunted in season here.

Often we glimpsed fresh grizzly tracks. But we never sighted one. The grizzly's a loner, fighting a desperate battle for survival against encroaching civilization. Montana is one of his last strongholds in the United States. Possessed of almost human cunning, tremendous strength and speed, he is equal to anything but a high-powered rifle. Sometimes weighing half a ton, he can run down a man on horse.

Passage of the wilderness bill in the House would almost certainly save the grizzly from extinction, forest rangers told me. By preserving wild areas for him to roam in, the bill would prevent roads and machines from entering the wilderness. Otherwise he is doomed.

HOW IT FEELS

Most of our days were spent in the saddle, exploring the wilderness area. Often we had to dismount to lead our horses over crumbling trails rimming yawning canyons.

One night I crawled into my sleeping bag, stared at the stars. Around me the mountains loomed darkly. Millions of years they had stood almost untouched by man. Only the grinding forces of rain and erosion had made any mark on them. But man could de-timber them, burrow into them, scar them, blast them apart in a few short years.

At that moment I began to feel the wilderness, to understand why men will fight to save it.

Wilderness is the frost in the Alpine Meadow. It is the taste and smell of hot coffee outdoors. It is the frail chain of humans shutting out darkness around a campfire. It is the realization, amid stars and mountains, of the grandeur of nature and man's place in it.

CONCERN

The next morning one of the party summed it up in a different way.

"I've never felt hotter, colder, hungrier, thirstier, wearier, or greater in my life," said Art Wright, of Alexandria, Va., an air transportation official for civil service.

That night members expressed concern that their children or grandchildren might not see what we were seeing, never get the chance to experience America as it was before modern civilization settled over it.

THE BILL

The wilderness bill, passed by the Senate and now before the House Interior Committee headed by Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, would preserve 8 million acres of virgin national forest land for posterity. It would allow an additional 6 million acres to be studied in detail and reclassified as true wilderness areas or eliminated.

Some 20 million acres of other unspoiled wilderness found in the back country of our national park system, and also another possibly 25 million acres in wildlife refuges including Alaska, would be studied for preservation under the bill.

The wilderness bill would put the areas to be preserved under congressional protection. Only Congress could abolish them.

THE LAST DAWN

The last dawn of our trip broke sparkling cold.

We ate a big breakfast, warmed ourselves at the fire. Gear was packed, loaded on

mules. We mounted up and started what would be our final ride in the Bob Marshall, some 25 miles to the Monture Ranger Station, beyond the south boundary.

Few words were spoken. During nearly 2 weeks of living together the outdoors had broken down barriers, created deep comradeship. It was hard to break this bond, to trade peace for noisy rush of cities.

We all had become a little tougher outside, had done a little more contemplating inside. Zahniser, who came in with a heart condition, announced he felt more fit than ever. His doctor, who had a similar trip, had recommended that he go.

Evening was on us as we parted at the ranger station to scatter across the Nation. Bidding goodby to friends and 2 weeks in the wilderness, I stood a moment at dusk, feeling emptier than Montana's big sky.

Congress Is Confusing Motion With Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in in the Detroit Free Press of Thursday, August 22, 1963:

CONGRESS IS CONFUSING MOTION WITH PROGRESS

Since everybody else was doing it, we got worrying the other day about the state of the Nation, and particularly the state of Congress.

James Reston started it, with his column suggesting two platoons, so that everybody could get his work done in a reasonable amount of time. From his column, our eyes dropped to the congressional boxscore, showing that in almost 8 months, Congress has passed four major bills, of which three were utterly routine. Yet it's working harder than ever.

Then back to Reston, with his observation that Government officials seldom have time to think, and confuse motion with progress. A great truth in that line.

The question is: "What kind of progress, and by whose terms?" Why should Congress act if it sees no need? Why should it worry that the White House has seized the initiative, and Congress is called upon to be a rubber stamp?

The old classic that the President proposes and Congress disposes could still hold true if Congress wanted. Congress could, if it chose, cut its work week and work year in half, and the country would not suffer as a result.

Somehow, it seems to us, the Nation has become enraptured with the idea that the Government always has to be doing something, that "progress" can be measured precisely by the number of laws enacted.

Somehow, we have come to believe the inspiring but unsupportable message of President Kennedy, that being an American in the sixties is not an easy job.

It's a great deal easier to be an American than to be anything else, and a great deal easier to be an American today than it was in the thirties or early forties.

So on we go, the President proposing bill after bill, and Congress holding hearing after hearing, agonizing endlessly over whether vigor is an end in itself. Though a majority may not like the bill, Congress seems afraid to reject it. So the bill stays in committee, and new hearings are called. Sometimes bills get passed that way.

The result is that we continue to get new laws which don't serve the best interests of the people, which perhaps a majority of the people would not even want if they had a direct vote, and which continue to restrict the freedom of the people to live their own lives and make their own decisions.

The farmers rejected wheat controls in a referendum, so there is a hue and cry for a bill to establish new controls. Secretary Udall dashes around the country trying to buy up developed land to turn into future wildernesses. The Senate passes a bill to create a domestic Peace Corps, despite the fact that private agencies abound in every field, and more is not done only because of a lack of money.

Meanwhile, Congress is conned into thinking that a $9 billion deficit isn't a bad thing.

Since the President isn't about to change his style of doing business, the job is up to Congress. It should not allow itself to confuse motion with progress, or change with improvement.

Saying "No" when it's necessary is just as vital as being able to say "Yes."

Hospital Insurance a Legislative Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, regarding the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, the King-Anderson bill, shortly to have hearings before the Ways and Means Committee.

This article appeared in the August-September issue of the Senior Citizens News published by the National Council of Senior Citizens.

I heartily commend this excellent editorial to the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress and to all right-thinking men everywhere:

HOSPITAL INSURANCE A LEGISLATIVE MUST

(By Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

The most disturbing problem confronting millions of older people today is how to pay for the expensive hospital and related health services they will almost certainly need during their remaining years. The problem is not limited to people of very small incomes or savings. It is of constant concern to millions of elderly people of modest means who know that a costly illness could wipe out their life savings and force them into poverty or near poverty. And it is of concern to their sons and daughters and grandchildren.

The irony is that this worry, this feeling of insecurity, this dread over the economic consequences of serious illness in old age could be ended for most people by one legislative action—passage of the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 as advocated so vigorously by President Kennedy.

Adoption of this legislation would be a great forward step in America's social and economic progress. It would mean greater peace of mind not only for millions of people 65 and over but for Americans of all ages. It is a practical step for dealing with a problem of major and growing proportions. It should be taken without further delay.

In less than two decades hospital charges have nearly quadrupled, and the costs of other health services have also risen sharply. The problem this presents for older people—and for those who feel a sense of responsibility for their welfare—is that the time in life when hospital and related health care is most likely to be needed is the very time in life when income is likely to be permanently reduced. The inevitable result is that millions of older people are confronted with the cruel choice of going without the health care they need, of accepting help from sons and daughters with their own families to support, or of seeking public charity.

This should not be. It need not be. More than a quarter of a century ago, our society faced up to the fact that in a rapidly growing, rapidly changing industrial economy a system of social insurance was a necessary foundation on which to build financial independence in old age. As a result of this farsighted action, almost 15 million older people now receive about $1 billion every month as a matter of earned right. For the majority of older people, their social security checks are their greatest source of income; for millions, these checks represent their only income.

It is unthinkable that the same society which developed the social security system will continue to tolerate much longer the progressive—and acknowledged—erosion of the financial independence of retired workers that the system was designed to foster. In about half the States, elderly people can get various kinds of help with their medical problems under the Kerr-Mills program—but to get such help they must prove that they are not only sick but also medically indigent. And what if they move to a State that has no Kerr-Mills program?

Medical care under public assistance would still be needed for older people with special problems even after the President's program of hospital insurance goes into effect. But charity health care for otherwise financially independent older people is hardly a satisfactory answer in a society that prides itself on individual freedom and dignity.

Opponents of the President's proposal seem to imply that there are only two kinds of older people—the rich and the poor. The rich can take care of themselves. The rest can go on relief. The fact is, of course, that the great majority of older people are neither rich nor poor. Most can get along reasonably well—until serious illness strikes. This is when the bad times set in. This is when the retirement years, which should be filled with peace of mind, become filled with dread and suffering and a sense of frustration and failure.

Social security hospital insurance would go far toward making the retirement years the good years we all anticipate—years to be spent in enjoyment without the shadow of poverty always present.

Nor is social security hospital insurance a new or radical departure from the way we do things in this country. It would simply provide older people with paid-up insurance against the high cost of the hospitalization they so frequently need.

The fact that social security would pay hospital bills would in no way affect the practice of medicine. In fact the services of private physicians would not be covered in any way. The patient would select the doctor of his choice, just as now. The patient and his doctor would select the hospital of their choice, just as now. The plan would simply be a means of paying the bills for hospital care, nursing home care, the services of visiting nurses, therapists and other health workers in the patient's own home, and hospital diagnostic services.

This is the practical, sensible, financially sound solution to the high and still rising cost of illness in old age. This is the way to provide the health services that older people need and at the same time preserve their basic financial independence. Both the logic and the humanitarianism of the President's proposal are unassailable.

Customs Night in the Port of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the first Congress of the United States assembled in the city of New York in the spring of 1789, one of the most urgent problems facing the lawmakers was to provide funds to operate the new government. The resources of the country had been depleted by the long War of Independence and little progress toward financial stability had been acquired during the brief experience under the Articles of Confederation.

It was natural that the legislators should turn to a practice founded in ancient times for raising revenue for governments—the levying of tariffs or duties—taxes—on importations of merchandise from foreign countries. The word "customs" as we know it today is said to have originated during the many disputes between the King and the House of Commons over the disposition of taxes in the early days of English history. The ruler's counsel claimed that by "ancient customs" these taxes were rightfully the King's and the Parliament had no jurisdiction over them. Ever since, the name "customs" has applied to those taxes on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into a country.

The idea of levies or tariffs on imports was not a novel one to the pioneers in the Original Thirteen States because customs duties had been collected by them for many years and forwarded to the English King.

America declared its independence on July 4, 1776. After almost 5 years of war, Lord Cornwallis surrendered in 1781. From then until 1789 this country was not a nation, but a set of small, independent States. The Continental Congress made calls upon the States for levies in proportion to the State's assessed land valuation. Usually the States ignored the requests and there were times when the U.S. Treasury did not have funds enough to pay even the most reasonable Government expenses. Every State had a different tariff law and its own collector of customs, whose duty it was to collect tariffs against neighboring States.

New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut placed heavy duties on the most humble of products. Chicken peddlers from New Jersey queued up at the New York customhouse to have eggs counted, chickens weighed, duties paid, and clearance papers issued. Connecticut firewood was measured; cabbages and turnips were appraised. Duties had to be paid on everything.

It was the hope of ending this confusion that responsible men of the 13 young nations called the Constitutional Convention of 1787. On March 4, 1789, the new Constitution put an end to the existing strife and organized the Government for more orderly procedures, providing that:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The second statute passed by the new legislators was a law known as the Tariff Act of July 4, 1789. Four weeks later, July 31, the Fifth Act of Congress, signed by President George Washington and Vice President John Adams, was passed establishing customs districts and ports of entry, and providing for customs officers as well as for methods to be employed in the collection of tariffs or duties. This was hailed by the press of the day as the "Second Declaration of Independence."

Thus, the U.S. Customs, a part of the Treasury Department, was one of the first administrative Government agencies to be created under the Constitution—as a matter of fact antedating the establishment of the Treasury Department itself.

For a long time the customs revenues were sufficient to pay the costs of our Federal Government. Even as late as 1910 almost 60 percent of the cost of Government was paid for by this form of income. After this date the internal taxes levied on corporation and individual incomes by the Federal Internal Revenue Service exceeded the revenue collected by customs.

Customs laws are broadly divisible into two parts: First, the tariff or schedule of the rates of duty on commodities; and second, the administrative provisions. The rates of duty are either specific—based on weight, measure, or a count of the merchandise; ad valorem—based on the value of the goods; or compound—based on a mixture of the two, quantity and value. The administrative part of the Tariff Act provides the machinery for the collection of the revenue and the functions of the Bureau of Customs. Customs receipts for the first year under the new Constitution amounted to approximately $2½ million. During the first 10-year period of the new Union, the expense of collecting this revenue amounted to 4½ cents on every dollar collected.

Today, over 173 years later, with the many complexities added to administering the tariff; the quadrupling of the number of customs districts requiring more employees; and the more than 560-fold rise in customs collections—over $1.4 billion for fiscal year 1961; Customs has been able to reduce the early low operating cost to 4⅕ cents for each dollar collected.

Today, the Bureau of Customs must cope with an increasing amount of foreign trade and travel. In fiscal year 1962 there was an estimated $16 billion worth of merchandise importations, and 160 million people and 46 million vehicles crossed our borders. This flow of goods and persons must be checked not only for violations of health, agriculture, and immigration laws; Customs, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, must guard against the noxious plant, the insect pest, the disease carrier, the unlawful immigrant.

A big job has been assigned to our customs service in guarding our farflung borders. Judging from its past history, however, its future duties will be carried out with efficiency and dedication.

New York made a big comeback in handling general cargo foreign trade last year when a total of 13,901,942 long tons of oceanborne exports and imports moved through the port. New York's general cargo foreign trade in 1962 was 7 percent above the 1961 level and 1.2 percent above 1960. The gain reversed a downward trend, at least temporarily, in which New York has slipped from handling 32.6 percent of the Nation's general cargo foreign trade in 1953 to a low of 21.4 percent in 1961. Last year's share was 22.6 percent of the national total of 61,588,350 tons.

General cargo exports and imports are the items of cargo that determine the true activity of a port. This package cargo brings in the most revenue and provides the most labor for a port compared with bulk cargo which usually is of low value and is unloaded or loaded by mechanical means with little labor.

The New York-New Jersey port is the Nation's leading general cargo port. It is comparatively low in the national list in handling bulk cargoes. Such ports as Philadelphia and Baltimore which handle millions of tons of iron ore rank high in this respect. New York handles virtually no ore imports. Nevertheless, it handled a respectable 27,988,500 tons of bulk cargo, mostly petroleum, in 1962, a gain of 8.7 percent over the 25,739,145 tons of bulk commodities handled in 1961.

Thus, the total movement of general and bulk cargo foreign trade through New York came to 41,890,442 tons last year, an 8.2 increase over the 38,733,257 tons of 1961. The combined movement of general cargo and bulk for the entire United States for last year was 289,722,-525 tons, a gain of 7.8 percent over the 268,637,149 tons handled in 1961.

Consequently, the Port of New York handled 14.5 percent of the total national foreign trade tonnage last year compared with 14.4 percent in 1961.

On August 1, 1964, the Bureau of Customs will be celebrating the 175th anniversary of the creation of the customs service by the First Continental Congress. The month of August 1964 will mark the culmination of 1¾ centuries of unbroken dedication to the advancement and protection of the American people by the Bureau of Customs.

I want to particularly praise the inspectors of customs who as enforcement officers are our first line of defense against the illicit introduction of contraband into our country. These inspectors of customs act as the protectors of our

revenue, protectors of our security, and do a most commendable job under very trying circumstances. The record of these inspectors of customs reveal complete and wholehearted cooperation with many of our other law enforcement groups.

I would also like to commend the U.S. Customs Inspectors' Association of the Port of New York, an independent organization, founded in 1893. This association is the second oldest Federal employee organization and is an organization comprised of members of the inspection personnel in the port of New York. The association will celebrate the 70th anniversary of its founding on November 16, 1963, and in conjunction with the Retired U.S. Customs Inspectors' Association have declared this evening as the customs night in the port of New York. A dinner-dance to celebrate the occasion will be held in the grand ballroom of the Statler Hilton Hotel in New York and in attendance at this affair will be active members of the association, retired members of the association and friends of the U.S. Customs Service.

Report on Mongolian People's Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

REPORT ON MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

(By Dr. Norman P. Auburn, president, the University of Akron)

With Sino-Soviet tension reaching a boiling point, the United States is missing a key listening post in Outer Mongolia.

Failure to recognize this strategically located buffer state entirely surrounded by the U.S.S.R. and Red China may be depriving the State Department of important information.

There certainly are compelling reasons why the State Department has not recommended diplomatic recognition of the Mongolian People's Republic. However, judging from what I learned on a recent trip to Mongolia, I hope our policy will be reviewed.

Following up our previous visits to the U.S.S.R. in 1956, 1959, 1960, and 1962, my wife and I sought admission to Outer Mongolia in June to observe what we could of life in the homeland of Genghis Khan. We hoped to learn at firsthand what the Russians and Chinese are doing to woo this sparsely populated land of 600,000 square miles and 1,015,000 people.

With China casting covetous eyes on southeast Asia as an outlet for its exploding population, Mongolia must appear to Mao as a prize package, since it is so close at hand and has less than two persons per square mile. And with Russia worrying about China's encroachment into Siberia, Mongolia surely is a critical area for the U.S.S.R.

Russia needs a satellite in the east to match its buffer satellites in Central Europe. This justifies the large foreign aid Moscow pours into Mongolia—the greatest aid per capita any country now receives.

Meanwhile, China tries to match Russian aid by furnishing skilled labor battalions to help Mongolia transform itself from a land of nomad herders to an agricultural-industrial state.

My wife and I joined 12 other countrymen in June as members of the first American tourist group ever admitted to Mongolia.

We were received by Juulchin, the official government tourist agency, when we touched down June 18 in a Russian-built but Mongol-operated Ilyushin-14 at the airport serving the capital city of Ulan Bator. During our 11-day stay we traveled thousands of miles by plane, bus, jeep, horse, and camel. We visited, in addition to the capital, the cities of Khujiirt and Arbay Kheer; dairy and stock farms; a large irrigated collective farm at Karakorum, the ancient headquarters of Genghis Khan; camel and sheep stations at Bogdo Suma at the edge of the Gobi. Our deepest penetration was by jeep into the Gobi itself, close to the Red China border at Inner Mongolia.

What outward evidence does the American tourist see of Sino-Soviet tension? Frankly, very little. The Russian technicians who are aiding the Mongols don't mix with the Chinese skilled laborers—the so-called Blue Ants.

In June, the Blue Ants were hard to find. We noticed them building four- and five-story apartments in Ulan Bator and stringing telegraph wires along the gravel road to a machine tractor station 60 kilometers northeast of Ulan Bator. We met a few in the capital's new department store and at the cinema.

But the Mongolian officials played down their presence. Whenever we asked if a group which looked like Blue Ants were Chinese, the reply was: "No, they are Mongols."

Yet we saw and photographed the Chinese school in Ulan Bator and glimpsed several high-fenced compounds filled with wooden huts on the outskirts of the city. These probably were Chinese living quarters because Mongols prefer to live in their dome-shaped, felt-covered tents, known as yurts.

Our hosts were eager to cite evidence of the help they received from the Soviet Union and its European satellites. They pointed out Russian-designed powerplants, Russian-made buses, cars and jeeps; Russian machine tools; their highly prized Czech-built and Czech-furnished hotel; the Russian caviar, vodka, and candy on our dinner table; the Estonian shortwave radios in our rooms.

But we discovered Chinese-built machinery at the new irrigation station in Karakorum; Chinese canned fruit and bottled mineral water in the state stores; Chinese thermos jugs, table linen and pencils in the department stores; Chinese tires on cars and jeeps.

Mongolia leans toward Russian and away from China today, judging from these observations:

1. The school and university system is closely patterned after the Russian.

2. The collective and state farms are very similar to Russia's. Mongolia apparently has rejected the Chinese commune system.

3. The machine tractor station northeast of Ulan Bator is a ringer for several we visited in Russia and the tractors, machine tools and equipment there are Russian made.

4. Merchandising methods and procedures in the new department store in Ulan Bator ape the Russian.

5. The Sukhe Bator Square in Ulan Bator, with its tomb holding the casketed remains of the Mongolian heroes—Sukhe Bator and Choibalsan—is practically a replica of Moscow's Red Square.

6. Juulchin itself is similar to the Russian Intourist organization. Our treatment as visitors reminded us of the heavyhanded restrictions imposed by the Russians in 1956 when Khrushchev allowed American visitors to penetrate Joe Stalin's Iron Curtain. Juulchin was very concerned about pictures—we must not take "bad" photographs, but only "good" ones which depict the material progress of Mongolia. How reminiscent of the U.S.S.R. some years ago.

7. Modern apartment buildings in Ulan Bator are quite similar to the new ones in Moscow, Kiev, Irkutsk and Khabarovsk, except that the Mongolian structures rise only four or five stories.

8. Mongolia's treatment of its Buddhist lamas is similar to the Kremlin's policy about religion. Premier Tsedenbal's government has eased its pressure on Chief Lama Gombojab and his 100-member monastery at Gandan in Ulan Bator and at Erdeni-Dzuu in Karakorum. While the people are urged to disregard religious ceremonies, they are not forbidden to attend such services and to worship at the temples.

9. Juulchin authorities eagerly pointed out to us a large sign in the hills above Ulan Bator which read: "Long live the friendship between the people of Mongolia and Russia."

10. The Mongolian armed forces use Russian equipment, including Russian airplanes.

The present cordiality with the Soviet Union may have been forced upon the Mongols as a lesser of two evils. Our hosts constantly reminded us of the ruthless manner in which the Manchus had ruled Mongolia for several centuries after they conquered Genghis Khan's successors. They may now fear Mao more than Khrushchev.

Moreover, the Mongols still distrust the Chinese, remembering that before Mongolia's independence in 1924 Chinese merchants and traders practically owned the country, lock, stock, and herds. Chinese entrepreneurs had enacted heavy mortgages on the country's sole economic assets—its horses, cattle, sheep, and camels—as payment for Chinese consumer goods.

But we got the feeling that Premier Y. Tsedenbal would like eventually to copy Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia and act with greater independence toward Russia. Here are straws in the wind:

Item: Rector N. Sodnom, of the Mongolian State University, readily admitted to me that his institution was staffed by Russian professors when it was started in 1942. But now, Professor Sodnom told me, he has only 15 Russians on his faculty of 190. Although this distinguished physicist got his postgraduate education at Moscow State University, his policy is to replace every Russian professor with a Mongol as soon as the Mongol is qualified. Significantly, he now has no Chinese professors on his teaching staff. He is eager to visit America and establish some exchange professorships.

Item: Desperate as it is for skilled manpower, Mongolia will not allow Russians or Chinese to become Mongol citizens. The Blue Ants are required to return to Red China at the end of their labor tour of duty, even if they would prefer to stay in Mongolia.

Item: The Mongolian Foreign Office seems to run its own show. An episode, with international implications, which occurred during our visit, was handled expeditiously by the Foreign Office which did not seek counsel from Moscow.

Item: The Mongols are proud of their membership in the United Nations and hopeful of early diplomatic recognition by the United States.

Item: Mongolia is striving to build up a balanced economy so as to be less dependent upon Sino-Soviet aid. It is attempting to leapfrog from a land of nomadic herdsmen to a modern state based upon agriculture, stock raising, and light industry.

To do them justice, we must report that the Mongols have made considerable progress in a relatively short time. Until recently these ruddy-skinned, black-haired, stocky people lived exactly as their forefathers had in the days of Genghis Khan, moving about

with their herds and flocks to new grazing areas.

Now more herders are tending fields of grain and hay as well as cattle and sheep. Now many nomads are leaving their portable yurts behind and settling in such cities as Ulan Bator, Choibalsan, and Tsetserlig, learning new arts and crafts. Now all children are getting at least 8 years of schooling.

As this process continues Mongolia will be able to sustain a much larger population. Irrigated fields will feed many more people and livestock.

China will continue to look covetously at the vast, still underdeveloped land. Russia will want to protect its Siberian hinterland from Chinese encroachment.

In the 13th century, the Mongolians under Genghis Khan conquered most of the then known world, from the Danube to Peiping. After their short-lived triumph, they existed as vassals of the Manchus for several hundred years. Now, once again, their star is rising.

The Mongols of today pose no threat to world peace. They won't again overrun China and Asia on the backs of their sturdy horses.

But their geographical position puts them at a very sensitive and strategic spot—an area where Russia and China may one day come to blows.

Mongolia bears watching.

Safety of Atomic Power Reactors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the development of electrical generating plants through the fission of the atom promises to be the greatest peacetime application of this great new scientific discovery.

The meaning of this new source of energy to mankind cannot be estimated. The degree of a nation's progress and its standard of living rests upon its access to—and its capacity to use—energy.

Today our standard of living rests upon billions of kilowatts of electricity derived from the use of gas, oil, and coal. The time will come when oil and gas deposits will fail and even the immense deposits of coal may diminish in size and quality. Long before that time a supplemental source of energy will be needed to serve the teeming millions of the earth's people. That source has been discovered in the energy released through the splitting of the atom.

It has been one of the primary objectives of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to bring atomic electric energy into a position of feasibility from a technological standpoint and competitiveness from an economic standpoint.

Today we have proven technological feasibility and we are on the verge of our goal of economic competitiveness.

Three great reactors will be started soon. One will be built in the New England area by a consortium of electric utilities and two in southern California. One of the California reactors will be built by the Los Angeles Light & Power Co., a publicly owned utility, and the other California reactor will be built by the privately owned Southern California Edison Co., and the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

One of the problems in the advent of atomic produced electricity is the fear which has been inspired in people's minds by the explosions of atomic weapons. It is difficult to overcome this fear because it is based on an instinctive fear caused by the great destructiveness of these fearful weapons. People associate in their minds an atomic reactor with an atomic weapon. Although both devices use atomic fission, they are completely different in design and function. One might as well compare a raging fire in a high octane gasoline refinery with the controlled use of gasoline in our family automobile.

In order to dispel the fears of people who live near the site of an atomic reactor, it is necessary for the Federal Government to carefully evaluate each reactor design before approving its safety. The geographical site must also meet drastic requirements for safety. The atomic energy law specifically provides for an independent committee of scientists and technicians who are skilled in all facets of atomic technology. This advisory committee on reactor safety functions on each proposed reactor. Their independent approval must be on record before an atomic reactor can be constructed and operated. Public hearings must be held in each reactor site area and public and private citizens must be allowed to protest if they so choose. In the opinion of the Congress, such precautions and procedures adequately protect the public safety.

Notwithstanding the protecting provisions of the Atomic Energy Act and their procedures, it is also necessary for each utility that proposes to construct and operate an atomic reactor to realize that they have a public obligation to inform and educate the citizens of the nearby area. It is their responsibility to bring the facts to the attention of the citizens of each reactor area through the use of all public means of communication. When this informative and educational responsibility is discharged properly, opposition based on ignorance or misinformation usually disappears.

The Southern California Edison Co. and the San Diego Gas & Electric Co. have recognized their informative and educational responsibilities in the Camp Pendleton area where they plan to construct a great atomic reactor to supply electricity for the people of southern California. In the ensuing months they will bring to the citizens in the nearby areas the thrilling story of the peacetime use of the atom. Through lectures, printed material and demonstration models and devices, they will establish the facts in relation to their atomic powerplant. They will demonstrate the safety of their project and they will explain the miracle of this new great source of energy which will serve the people of southern California in the years to come safely and dependably and without contribution to the smog pollutants usually dispelled into the air by fossil fuel fired plants.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I append to my remarks an article entitled "Safety of Nuclear Plants." This article comes from the offices of the Southern California Edison Co. and is informative, educational, and factual:

SAFETY OF NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

Since nuclear power was first introduced to the world in the form of a devastating bomb, it is not surprising that this mental association has been carried over to the peacetime uses of atomic energy in the minds of those who are either uninformed or misinformed.

These people are highly susceptible to the scare propaganda currently being spread by a small but highly vocal group of people who, for unknown reasons, are seeking to block installation of nuclear powerplants throughout the country. In this area, both Edison and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power are now the target of their attacks.

Much of the opposition has centered around the issue of safety. Here, then, are the facts:

Commercial nuclear powerplants have a perfect safety record. In fact, some 250 nuclear reactors of all kinds have been built in the last 20 years, and there has never been a single accident resulting in injury to the public.

The only fatalities resulting from a nuclear reactor accident in this country occurred in the case of workers at a research facility in Idaho, which was not equipped with the shielding and other automatic safeguards provided in a commercial powerplant—and even here, there was no injury to the public.

Considering accidents of all types ranging from sprained ankles to radiation exposure, the accident record for the nuclear industry has been less than half of the general industrial averages.

The pressurized water reactor—the type to be used at Edison's San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station—is particularly safe because it has an inherent tendency to shut itself down when there is an abnormal temperature condition. Three major nuclear powerplants of this type already are in operation—one 24 miles from New York City, another 26 miles from Pittsburgh. Also, 28 U.S. Navy submarines and 4 surface vessels are operating successfully with pressurized water systems.

There is, of course, absolutely no possibility of a nuclear explosion at the San Onofre plant because the fuel would contain only 3.5 percent of U^{235} atoms—as compared with approximately 90 percent required for simultaneous fission.

As for radioactive emissions from the plant, they would add so little to the radioactivity already in our atmosphere as to be inconsequential. Specifically, air discharged from the plant would contain less than one-twentieth of the radioactive content permitted by stringent safety regulations of the AEC and State department of public health. Water discharged from the plant would contain less than one one-hundreths of the allowable level of radioactive materials.

A person living near the plant site would inhale less radioactivity from the plant in an entire year than he would receive by having a single chest X-ray. Air emitted from the stack would be monitored continuously, with instruments so sensitive that the radioactivity from a luminous dial watch would be sufficient to close the valves and prevent further release.

The San Onofre containment system would include four barriers, one inside the other, to prevent any possible accidental escape of radioactive fission products—the final barrier being the huge steel sphere, 140 feet in diameter, designed to contain the entire vol-

ume of steam and water within the system if it were suddenly released.

We know this proposed plant is perfectly safe—safer, in fact, than many other kinds of industrial plants.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, "No Nhus Is Ghood Nhus," says Art Hoppe from Washington and from New York "A Crisis Is Missing."

I hope the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will read the following articles and note in particular Mr. Hoppe's description of the annual strange sacrifice:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 27, 1963]

THE STRANGE RELIGION OF THE SOLONS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—I have compiled another chapter in my work, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." But I hesitate to publish it for fear my fellow anthropologists will hoot me down as a charlatan. Nor could I blame them. The conclusion is unbelievable.

For I had the extreme good fortune to observe with my own civilized eyes the Weird Annual Foreign Aid Sacrifice of the Solons, one of the many indigenous native tribes of Washington and one of the most primitive.

This strange sacrifice is held each summer, concurrent with the hop harvest, in the Solons' well-guarded compound atop the strategic heights of Capitol Hill. The rites last many days. They begin when the Kennedys, a numerous tribe dwelling in the flatlands, offer the Solons the victim, which is always called "Foreign Aid."

What happens next is perhaps more reminiscent of "death of a thousand cuts" as practiced by the Blackfoot, the Sioux and the Hottentots of West Madagascar. But more bloodcurdling.

Foreign aid is first sent to one end of the compound where the Representatives or lower class natives dance furiously around it for days, waiving mystic papers and shouting unintelligible imprecations. Then at last, when the tribe has worked itself into a savage rage, comes the bloody climax. Each native makes a cut in the victim, the size of the cut depending upon the native's stature among his fellows.

While this occurs, the Kennedys and their allies in State, AID, and other minor tribes, dance around the base of the Hill. And as each cut is made, they moan or scream aloud in simulated agony. This continues until all the natives are exhausted and the victim near expiration.

But, unlike among the Hottentots, the victim is never killed. Instead, its limp form is carried to the other end of the compound where the Senators, who are apparently chosen for their advanced age, quietly restore it until it is almost as good as new. They then give it back in solemn ceremonies to the Kennedys, who invariably express their gratitude to all solons in general. The compound then remains quiet for another year.

Now, any anthropologist familiar with stone age cultures will agree there are few surprises in the rites themselves. What staggers the imagination is the reason for the rites.

For the liturgy is invariably the same. The cuts are made to appease the native deity, who is called the voter, and who dwells in a nirvana called the grassroots and whom the solons believe to be unalterably opposed to foreign aid.

But, the anthropologist will ask, if the voter in the grassroots does oppose foreign aid, would he be appeased by the same meaningless rites year after year, if he had a grain of sense? Which means the entire rite is merely a demonstration of the solon's faith in the stupidity of the voter. And whoever heard of a tribe that worshipped stupidity?

Oh, I'll be laughed out of the Explorers' Club.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 28, 1963]

ONE OF OUR CRISES IS MISSING

(By Arthur Hoppe)

NEW YORK.—I hurried breathlessly up here, of course, to bring you an up-to-the-minute report from the United Nations on efforts to avert the impending war between Syria and Israel. And while I certainly don't want to make you any more nervous than you already are, duty compels me to report objectively my findings on this crisis.

And my main finding is that I can't find it.

I know it was around here somewhere last Friday. It was page 1 in all the press. Syria was shooting at Israel. Israel was shooting at Syria. Troops were massing. The Security Council was called into emergency session. And war was undoubtedly imminent.

So it was unarguably a very large crisis. And I'm sure it couldn't have gotten lost. I think probably it's just been misplaced.

I do hope Mr. U Thant will remember to check the downstairs broom closest. That's where things always seem to wind up at our house.

Actually, the first inkling I had that it was missing was Monday morning when I arrived at the gates of the U.N., pencil and notebook in hand, and asked the policeman what he, as an average American, thought of the crisis.

"Which crisis?" he said.

"The Syria-Israel crisis," I said.

"So what else is new?" he said.

Trying to conceal my concern, I hurried to the delegate's lounge. But it wasn't there.

The crisis there, if I've got it straight, was how close to the garage ramp in the basement one's assigned parking stall should be if one is higher on the protocol list than one's colleague, not to mention a more minor crisis on how many rocks one should receive if one is having a martini on the rocks.

But one gentleman did say he thought the crisis I was looking for would turn up the next afternoon because the Security Council had called an emergency meeting to discuss it. "Or, maybe," he said, pausing, "that's the Jordan-Israel crisis. Frankly, I tend to get the two confused a bit lately."

I checked the corridors on the U.N. office building.

But it wasn't there either. The U.N. staff workers hurrying by did, it is true, look worried. But no more worried than they usually look. And over at the U.S. mission, our State Department Foreign Service officers looked unworried. But no more unworried than they usually look.

I did find one fellow who definitely recalled seeing the crisis in the Security Council on Friday. He said the Council was told that Israel and Syria had negotiated a temporary cease-fire agreement to observe their permanent cease-fire agreement and the Council had issued "an urgent message" to both sides saying this was a good idea pending a full report from the head of the U.N. truce mission, Gen. Odd Bull.

I think this is a red herring.

So I never did find the crisis, and I think it just proves the world is getting more and more nonchalant crisiswise every day. And that, if you ask me, is a real crisis.

But, anyway, don't worry about the Syria-Israel crisis itself. I'm sure it'll turn up again.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 29, 1963]

NO NHUS IS GHOOD NHUS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—After days of agonizing appraisal, our State Department appears to have at last come up with a clear-cut moral policy for dealing with the Vietnam crisis: We're going to try to overthrow that discredited civilian dictatorship in order to install a forceful military dictatorship so that we can get on with the business of saving the South Vietnamese from dictatorship.

I think that's a great moral policy we've got there, all right. But so far we've been having a little trouble stirring up a military coup. I guess it's part of the basic problem we've faced in South Vietnam for years: We just can't get the Vietnamese Army to fight.

But I'm confident the policy will succeed eventually. After all, it worked admirably in nearby West Vhtnnng, the nation on which I'm the leading expert because I made it up.

It was in the ninth year of President Ngo Mahn Ngo's lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Vietharians. At first the war had gone poorly because the Vhtnnngians were uncivilized heathens, who didn't realize it was good for them to die for West Vhtnnng.

But through a herculean effort involving billions of dollars and thousands of U.S. troops we slowly, over the years, managed to drag these backward people up to a decent, civilized condition. You could tell because they were all fighting with each other. The Buddhists, the students, the secret police. It seemed every group in Vhtnnng was fighting.

Every group, of course, but the Loyal Royal Army.

The Loyal Royal troops, as they had for years, went on lying in their trenches, strumming their hookahs, and composing sad love songs. And while the army sat in its trenches, the Vietnarians sat in the jungle and the people sat in concentration camps.

Indeed, civilization got so widespread that our CIA approached Gen. Sher Mahn. "Mac," said the CIA, "if you'd care to seek the Presidency, we could promise you the support of democratic-loving peoples everywhere, plus 52 tanks and 2 infantry divisions."

"U.S. troops?" inquired Gen. Sher Mahn. "No," said the CIA, shocked. "You know we cannot interfere in the domestic affairs of a sovereign nation. Loyal Royal Army troops." "What are you, some kind of nut?" said Gen. Sher Mahn. For it's a wise general who knows his own troops.

But civilization kept spreading and finally seven people were hurt. The Loyal Royal Army, which never could stand the sight of blood, was so unnerved that it rose from its trenches to the man, overthew President Ngo Mahn Ngo, and installed Gen. Sher Mahn, who, through a "Great Leap Backward," managed to uncivilize everybody in 11 weeks and restore order. And the war effort continued. For another 72 years.

So I've got confidence in our State Department's policy. If Mr. Diem's regime gets any more violent, I'm sure the army will overthrow him. As anybody who's observed the army's fighting spirit will tell you, it's the greatest force for nonviolence in the world today.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Aug. 30, 1963]

THE SPIRIT OF PROTEST—1963

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—The civil rights leaders are so very proud and happy about their march on Washington. It was, they say, so huge, so moving, so orderly, so disciplined. And, truly, it was. But let me try to tell you how it was with me.

On the day of the march, there was a sense of newness in the air. The heart of the city had been closed to traffic and it seemed like a Sunday morning. Thousands of people were coming from far away solely because of an issue. And it was exciting to think that there were still that many in our modern society who cared that much.

So I walked in the freshness down past the White House to the Washington Monument, where we were all to assemble, feeling good.

And there, to show that I cared too, I bought from a sidewalk vendor one of the large lapel pins everyone was wearing. On its enameled front was a drawing of a black hand clasping a white one. And on its shiny back was the legend: "New—oderless-non-toxic."

So we stood on the grass in the warm sun, I and the people who had come so far, while over the loudspeakers the singers sang at us and the leaders spoke at us. And one of us talked to each other.

From the headquarters tent, they began passing out the placards. There must have been 10,000 of them, all neatly lithographed, each bearing one of 15 officially approved slogans, such as: "We march for jobs for all."

"If you want a sign, please step up," urged a young man. And the people who had come so far stepped up and were handed their officially approved signs.

"Do you all have programs?" said a busy lady in white. And she made sure the people who had come so far each had a printed mimeographed program with a map showing them which way to march and instructions on how to behave properly.

Then, promptly on schedule at 11:30, the people who had come so far began walking down Constitution Avenue as the map directed, not toward the Capitol where their Congressmen were in session, but in the opposite direction to the Lincoln Memorial. For their leaders had decided not to jeopardize the civil rights bill by angering the Congressmen.

So I and the people who had come so far walked down the street, our backs to the Capitol, a few singing the old songs like "We Shall Not Be Moved," but most of us silent. There was no one on the curbs to cheer. And afterward, through the long, hot afternoon we stood in front of the stolid memorial while they sang at us and spoke at us—of "equality" and "justice" all, it seemed, in officially approved words.

Then, in the evening, thousands upon thousands of people who had come so far went home.

So the civil rights leaders are understandably proud and happy. They issued their call and the people came by the thousands upon thousands. Yet through diligent organization and scruplous planning they managed to stage this mass protest against injustice without offending anyone.

I suppose this is necessary, but I am sad, I had such high hopes and I came away so sad. I find it sad to live in a society where a man demanding individual freedom must march into battle under a lithographed banner, carrying a mimeographed map and shouting an officially approved slogan.

And I feel deeply that in some way I don't quite understand, the people who came so far were betrayed.

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I sent out some 23,500 questionnaires into the 18 counties of my congressional district in order to gather thev iews of my constituents on several important issues. Every 10th name was taken from the telephone directories of the larger cities and towns, and every 5th name was taken from the directories of the smaller towns and rural communities. The questionnaires, therefore, reached Republicans and Democrats alike. There was about a 20 percent return of the questionnaires sent, which is considered to be a good response. Many were returned with additional comments and letters.

The questions presented were simple, direct, and to the point, even though in some cases it was difficult to answer by a straight yes or no. The responses I received was most gratifying.

This questionnaire poll clearly indicates that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Iowa are rather conservative in their thinking. In this connection, it is interesting to note that only 28 percent of those answering the questionnaires approved of the way in which President Kennedy handled the Cuban situation; only 21 percent appraised the Kennedy administration as good in handling domestic affairs; and only 19 percent appraised the administration's record as being good in foreign affairs.

The following questions were presented, and the answers tabulated in percentages, as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Reducing Federal income taxes only with a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures?	89	4	7
2. Placing medicare for the aged under social security and increasing social security taxes to cover the cost?	21	77	2
3. Federal aid to education?	33	62	5
4. Continuing our foreign aid program?	22	71	7
5. A Domestic Peace Corps to work on local community projects?	31	59	10
6. The present feed grain program for agriculture?	40	44	16
7. The gradual elimination of Federal controls and subsidies in the agricultural programs?	69	25	6
8. Do you approve of the way President Kennedy has handled the Cuban situation?	28	64	8

	Percent			
	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion
9. How would you appraise the Kennedy administration thus far?				
(a) In domestic affairs?	21	47	31	1
(b) In foreign affairs?	19	39	40	2

Worrisome Flaws in Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the San Diego (Calif.) Union on August 29, entitled "Pact for National Suicide?" This editorial points up some of the flaws in the proposed test ban treaty that are causing many thinking Americans to take a second look at the so-called first step. The proposed treaty is more of a blueprint for a world government under the United Nations, with an international army under the United Nations to enforce the edicts and injunctive processes of the International Court of Justice, which will be charged with the interpretation of the treaty, than it is a test ban treaty.

The editorial follows:

WORRISOME FLAWS IN TREATY

The limited nuclear test ban treaty has been discussed for several weeks. The hearings in the Senate have developed that it is an imprecise document and that military and scientific experts are in disagreement as to the acceptability of the risks to our security, which all admit it does contain.

The testimony, or at least that which has been made public, has developed the following significant points and questions:

1. The treaty was hurriedly and badly written. Though the United States had discussed a nuclear treaty at Geneva for years, we evidently were unprepared for the sudden Soviet Union acceptance of a limited ban which provides no means of control or inspection regarding secret developments and preparations.

2. The degree of differences in the military and scientific evaluations of its effect on our security have shaken Congress. No

military enthusiasm for the treaty has been expressed; only reluctant acceptance in some cases and outspoken opposition in others.

3. The insistence by military leaders on additional safeguards, beyond the pledges of the treaty, that this country will not diminish its nuclear power or restrict development, at least under the handicaps or limitations imposed by the treaty, reflect a lack of confidence in our national leadership.

4. No believable or satisfying argument has been advanced in the hearings as to why the Communists desired the treaty at this time, and that they have changed and are not merely engaged in a deceit based on our gullibility.

5. The United States may have tied its hands in case of war, by agreeing to prohibit nuclear explosions in the atmosphere unless the treaty is abrogated after 3 months' notice. Could a quick conventional war upon our allies be waged without this country's being able to exert its nuclear power, upon which its major defense rests?

6. Experts seemed to agree that the Soviet Union has an advantage in large nuclear bombs, and that by underground testing permitted by the treaty, they can catch up with us in small and medium yield weapons.

7. The Soviet Union, by agreeing to a test ban treaty while holding an advantage in large nuclear weapons, has the means secretly to convert space to military purposes by orbiting huge military space stations that could bring every inch of this country under direct threat.

8. The Senate virtually was subjected to legislative blackmail by the administration in having other nations sign the treaty before it ever became a valid document by ratification. The United States now is in a position that no matter how ill-conceived or ill-advised the treaty might be, its rejection would be damaging to our prestige and could lead to serious consequences with the Soviet Union.

However, Adm. Arleigh Burke, former Chief of Naval Operations, after giving secret testimony, publicly said the treaty represented a step backward in our defenses and insisted that the Senate should reject it.

No real meaning in relation to our security can be imparted by such a treaty, he said, without the dismantling of nuclear test facilities, confirmed by unlimited inspection, and to that the Russians will never agree.

The treaty seems to be an article of faith more than one of certainty. The intentions of the Communists must be read into the wording—and how you read them determines the worth of the treaty.

Subsequent to signing the treaty, the Soviet Government, in answering accusations of Red China, insisted that the treaty "perpetuated the liquidation" of America's nuclear advantage.

Summarizing recorded opposition to the test ban treaty would seem to present the conclusion that—

If a desire for military advantage or for the neutralization of our nuclear power, more than a sincere desire for peace, motivated the Soviet Union, and given the Communist practice of intrigue and duplicity, the treaty, if accepted on its face, could become a document of committing suicide—by us.

No. 4—"Michigan: The Gamblers' Paradise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to set before the members of this House, more particularly the Michigan congressional delegation, some interesting information about gambling in that State and how Michigan has permitted and allowed crime syndicates to take over a big tax-free business.

Last year, Michigan's pari-mutuel turnover came to $120 million from which the State legally received about $9 million in revenue. However, this small amount represents only a portion of the real story of gambling in that State.

Using the figures presented to the McClellan Committee, some $2.2 billion can be allocated as Michigan's share of the total national off-track betting turnover last year. Organized crime has been strong and healthy in that State since Prohibition, and gambling offers an even better source of funds to bankroll syndicate operations than did bootlegging.

This, Mr. Speaker, might come as a shocking surprise to the Michigan congressional delegation but it is estimated that illegal gambling in that State could be as high as $4½ billion a year. The crime syndicates in Michigan are making more out of bluenosed government attitudes about gambling than they ever made out of the Canadian whisky trade during the bootleg era. Michigan has truly become a gamblers' paradise—a haven for the crime syndicates.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the above figures, the gross profits to the gambling syndicates—10 percent of the total take—may amount to nearly $500 million a year in Michigan. Even after footing the necessary bills for law enforcement corruption, there is plenty of money left to finance every criminal scheme in the book.

The State of Michigan is paying a steep price for the foolishness and blindness of those who refuse to recognize and control the natural human urge to gamble. Only when we wake up to the need for government control and regulation of gambling will the great majority of the people of Michigan cease to be the unwilling consorts of crime. Only when we enact a national lottery will we bring to an end the filthy ramifications of underworld activities and pump into our Government Treasury over $10 billion a year which now is siphoned off by the crime syndicates. When are we going to wipe out hypocrisy and become realistic about this entire gambling problem?

No Tass Wanted Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, almost every day one learns of another activity undertaken by the Federal Government which is controlling more and more the lives of all its citizens. I suppose, therefore, it should come as no surprise that an agency of our Government is now starting a market news service over a nationwide leased-wire teletype network, selling its output to commercial subscribers. While the type of information to be disseminated by the Department of Agriculture may be innocuous—although even this is difficult to believe in view of the activities of the Department earlier this year in trying to force the wheat referendum vote—I share the apprehension which has been expressed that such action will establish a dangerous precedent. I was much impressed with the following editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on August 31 covering this subject and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NO TASS WANTED HERE

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican of California, recently introduced in Congress a bill to prohibit departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news and other information.

A great many Americans doubtless were surprised to learn that a Member of Congress felt there was a need for such a law.

The fact is, however, that one department of the Federal Government already has entered the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news services.

On August 1, the Department of Agriculture started selling its market news service over a nationwide leased-wire teletype circuit to commercial subscribers.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association properly filed a petition with the Federal Communications Commission July 22 seeking to forestall the Federal Government's entry into the news wire business. A petition also was filed by a privately-owned market news service with which the Agriculture Department news service is in direct competition with all the advantages of the Department's taxpayer-financed resources.

The FCC on July 30 denied the ANPA's petition, stating that "the principal allegation contained in the petitions go to the propriety of the furnishing of market news information by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and as such are not cognizable by the Commission."

The ANPA protested against Government going into the news wire field on the grounds that under our concept of freedom it is improper for the Government to engage in the business of news gathering and dissemination and noted that such a government op-

eration can too easily become a propaganda agency.

It was further argued that Government should not engage in any enterprise in competition with existing private ownership which is able to provide satisfactory service and that future expansion of the Agriculture Department market news service could easily lead to a complete national news wire in direct competition with the Associated Press and United Press International.

The ANPA also pointed out that American taxpayers should not be expected to pay for news wire services to anyone.

Some Americans may see no ominous significance in the Agriculture Department's market news service but governmental practices, like Government itself, have a tendency to expand with amazing rapidity.

Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has defended his Department's market news service as an aid to the "free flow" of agriculture information.

Who knows when the heads of the many other departments and agencies in the sprawling Federal bureaucracy will decide there is a need to speed the "free flow" of information about their activities as well as the flow of propaganda favorable to governmental policies and programs.

Under such conditions, the flow of information would not be free as far as the taxpayers are concerned. Moreover, there would be the obvious danger that Government news services would present only versions of news tailored to suit the personal and political purposes of Government bureaucrats.

Stanford Smith, ANPA general manager, has warned that an expansion of the Agriculture Department's market news service concept "would result in a government-controlled news service" such as the Tass agency in the Soviet Union which is owned and operated by the Government.

The Federal Government can make a real contribution to the free flow of information to which the American people are entitled by refraining from efforts to manage the news. But gathering and disseminating the news is and should continue to be the proper function of the privately operated news services, not that of Government.

The bill introduced by Representative HOSMER would not only prohibit future Government ventures into news dissemination in competition with privately operated news services but also would nullify any such arrangements now in effect.

The Agriculture Department's entry into the news wire business is a foot-in-the-door operation that could ultimately lead to the establishment of an American counterpart of Tass.

Congress should shut that door quickly and lock it securely by enacting Representative HOSMER's bill into law.

CAB Investigation Merits Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board recently conducted a lengthy hearing into the probable cause of a crash of Mohawk Airlines Inc., plane at Rochester, N.Y., on July 2, 1963. Five persons along with the pilot and copilot died in the crash of a Martin 404 plane.

Newsmen attending the week-long session at the Sheraton Hotel in Rochester were high in their praise of CAB member G. Joseph Minetti, who was presiding officer of the hearings, and Mr. Leon H. Tanguay, Director of the CAB's Bureau of Safety, and Attorney Donald W. Madole, hearing officer. I am told their efficient handling of the hearing left nothing to be desired.

The Board's safety investigators served as the technical panel and from the questions asked, newsmen reported, these probers did an outstanding job of bringing forth facts of the accident. Some 35 witnesses, including passengers who survived the crash, eyewitnesses, and Federal Aviation Agency inspectors testified.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to show the Congress how effective these hearing investigations are, I insert into the RECORD an editorial praising the CAB's investigation:

[From Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, Aug. 19, 1963]

CAB INVESTIGATION MERITS RECOGNITION

For days after the tragic Mohawk airliner crash here July 2, a 12-man team of Civil Aeronautics Board investigators sifted evidence to find the cause of the crash.

They were up early and worked late, including the July 4 holiday. The team talked to witnesses, examined the plane's wreckage, checked all kinds of airport data, and took photographs.

Now the CAB has scheduled a public hearing beginning tomorrow to gather more facts. After the hearing, the evidence will be resifted and checked. It's expected to take 3 months before the CAB makes public its findings.

Such thoroughness is the CAB's job in crash investigations. But it deserves recognition all the same.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor a resolution which would designate the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week." Good vision is a precious and irreplaceable tool, both for the attainment of knowledge and in everyday life. It is important to focus our attention on the necessity for proper care of the eyes; with a national effort much could be done to improve or to save the sight of Americans.

Often the eyes are neglected until it is too late and medical science can do little to prevent loss of sight. There are over one-third of a million blind in the United States today, and 40 percent of these cases result from glaucoma and cataract. Much of this could have been avoided by early detection of disease through physical and laboratory examination. It is estimated that a million Americans over 40 have glaucoma unknowingly. If neglected, glaucoma leads to permanent blindness.

Proper care of the eyes, including the use of prescribed glasses, is important not only to prevent blindness but to improve general health. Bad eyesight causes 50 percent of headaches and can mean general deterioration of health. Ninety-eight percent of factory injuries to the eyes could be prevented by adherence to safety rules and proper use of corrective lenses on the job. Improved vision of drivers and pedestrians would mean at least 23 percent less accidents.

Better vision would not only improve safety records by a significant amount, but it could save industry more than $50 million per year in increased efficiency. Experiments with schoolchildren have shown that better vision reduces school failures by 21 percent. Often undiscovered defective eyesight in children results in unnecessary complications.

The gift of vision is precious. Save Your Vision Week would focus national attention on the necessity for improved eye care.

Resolution Adopted by the AFL–CIO Executive Committee in Tribute to the Late Senator Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., September 4, 1963.

THE SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The AFL–CIO Executive Council recently adopted a resolution of tribute to the late Senator and former Congressman Estes Kefauver.

In this resolution, the Executive Council resolved that a copy of this tribute should be transmitted to the Congress of the United States. A copy of the resolution is attached. I would appreciate it if you would have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Resolutions adopted August 12, 1963, Unity House, Pa., by the AFL–CIO executive council.

Whereas death has taken from our midst Senator Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, a man who served his country with unusual dedication, tremendous devotion and unequalled partiotism; and

Whereas Estes Kefauver was a true humanitarian, a firm disciple of democracy, a defender of consumer interests, and a warm and abiding friend of labor; and

Whereas all of America and all of the organized labor movement of this country is both the richer because of his lifetime service to the United States and the poorer because of his sad and untimely death; Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO executive council, which last February unanimously chose Estes Kefauver to receive the Murray-

Green Award of the AFL–CIO for his great services to the cause of humanity, joins its fellow Americans in mourning the passing of this great Senator; and be it further

Resolved, That the AFL–CIO executive council hereby determines that its Murray-Green Award will be given to the Senator posthumously; and be it further

Resolved, That these resolutions testifying to our great admiration, our deep sense of gratitude and our overwhelming sorrow be spread upon the records of the AFL–CIO executive council and that true copies be transmitted to the family of the late and great Senator whom we join in mourning his death, and to the Congress of the United States.

George Meany, President; Wm. F. Schnitzler, Secretary Treasurer; Walter P. Reuther, Wm. C. Birthright, David J. McDonald, Joseph Curran, Joseph D. Keenan, Richard F. Walsh, James A. Suffridge, Paul L. Phillips, Paul Hall, George M. Harrison, James B. Carey, Emil Rieve, Maurice A. Hutcheson, Jacob S. Potofsky, Lee W. Minton, O. A. Knight, Peter T. Schoemann, Herman D. Kenin, Harry C. Bates, David Dubinsky, Wm. L. McFetridge, A. J. Hayes, A. Philip Randolph, Joseph A. Beirne, Karl F. Feller, L. M. Raftery, Executive Council.

Flood Control Costs Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many of us on the committees having to do with the authorization of flood control projects on many occasions have had to defend the Corps of Engineers and our own efforts when we brought to the floor of the House meritorious flood control and river and harbor projects. It is comforting occasionally to find a kind word. The Memphis Press-Scimitar carried an editorial entitled "Flood Control Costs Money." It is short but challenging, and all of us on the House Committee on Public Works are grateful to the expressions it contained.

That my colleagues may have the opportunity to judge this writing, I am making it a part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

At this season every year, delegations from Memphis and vicinity show up in Washington. They present earnest arguments supporting large budget requests for flood control. This year, for example, they are supporting $88,650,000 of suggested appropriation.

There are always Congressmen around, usually new ones from distant hilly States, who think it's all a big boondoggle. They give valley folks a hard way to go.

But it is not all a big boondoggle.

Right now, to illustrate, the dredge *Burgess* is anchored practically in the middle of the Mississippi River, several miles below Memphis, chewing away at an invisible sandbar 24 hours a day. It costs real dough to build and maintain machinery that can work under water moving one of nature's most erosive materials, sand.

What will this work do for Pennsylvania or West Virginia? It will keep open to the prescribed depth of 9 feet a towboat channel which was failing completely. On the way up the river are barges loaded with oil, sulfur, and many other products destined for Pennsylvania and West Virginia. On the way down are steel and other products of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, destined for distant buyers.

No money for the *Burgess*, no channel. No channel, no river transport. No river transport, much higher shipping rates. Some things could not be shipped at all—Saturn boosters, for example.

A photo, made a few days ago at Dismal Point near Memphis, shows a river bank which was sloped, smoothed, and paved only last year. This was done to save a levee, among other things. The levee protects from annual overflow about 900 square miles of heavily populated, richly productive farmland with several towns. But the paving and even the bank have failed, a victim of this year's ferocious currents when the river rose as much as 6 feet a day.

Yes, it will be paved again—with the money yet to be voted. Yes, the Engineers could do it once and for all with concrete, but experience shows that sand, asphalt, and patience usually will get the job done in time, for less money.

But it does cost some money. That asphalt, if we may be spared one more example, is 5 inches thick.

The mid-South should give a vote of thanks to the dedicated men of many committees who fight this annual battle in Washington, for should they fail the levee system would in time fail and the delta lands would revert to what they once were.

Q.E.D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1963, Dr. W. Paul Ludwig, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, delivered a sermon on civil rights which to me seems very sound and offers the proper approach.

Since this subject is uppermost in our minds at the present time, I think it is well to consider Dr. Ludwig's appraisal of this issue:

Q.E.D.

Ephesians 4: 1—"I beg of you to live a life worthy of your calling."

Most of us in our schooldays developed a warm, fraternal feeling for three mystical letters—Q.E.D. How convenient to splice them onto a mathematical statement. There was satisfaction in knowing that one stage, at least, in a complex solution had already been proved and need not be proved again. It was a happy maneuver to append the abbreviation, Q.E.D., to a mess of mathematical symbols and to say: "Of this much I am sure—now where do I go from here?"

Looking at the Latin behind the letters, we were reminded that the phrase "quod erat demonstrandum" meant "that which was to be demonstrated." Occasionally, in friendly conversation with our professors, we learned that we had demonstrated something which wasn't true.

For the mathematician, the consequences of proving the wrong proposition or of demonstrating the right theorem in the wrong way are very grave. In a science which calls itself exact, anything less than accuracy is not good enough.

But in matters of faith we appear to live in a different kind of world. Truth is, of course, the avowed objective of religion, and men have oft preferred to relinquish life rather than truth; yet the common experience of the rolling years has been that new truth has repeatedly displaced old truth.

We cannot be contented with familiar Biblical versions when new and better manuscripts have been discovered. We cannot ignore the reconstruction of ancient sites and cities when such discoveries provide fresh understanding of Scriptural references and ultimately a nobler concept of the relationship between God and man. We cannot continue in the name of Christianity to defend social institutions which do not match the requirements of an enlightened conscience or fit the servant-shape of the God who was revealed in Jesus Christ.

If we insist on clutching our religious faith in both hands, we are going to be dragged through the valley of perpetual discontent. The quest for God is a discouraging business when we awaken to realize that the shadow on the wall bears a frightening likeness to us—that somehow the image before which we bow may be but an elongated form of ourselves.

In mathematics we dare not rely on personal inventions. But in religion, because it is perpetually inviting us to private exploration, we are in danger of creating a formless monster, or of producing an ecclesiastical monument that suits our own vanity.

In the midst of the contemporary social revolution, this paradox of religious faith becomes sharper than any two-edged sword. No man remains aloof. So long as the struggle for independence was concentrated in the emergence of new nations on the continent of Africa, most of us could be politely concerned while remaining comfortably separate. Emotionally we tended to sympathize with majority peoples whose destinies had for generations been controlled by the minority representatives of foreign nations. We could afford remote support of enslaved majorities. At the moment we could not foresee any transgression of our private domain—any alteration of our way of life.

But now the fast-surging tide of world revolution engulfs our own shore—confronting us with a quite different perspective. Now a minority people who live and work among us—and for us—stand begging for freedom and equality. And we whose fathers on this continent but a few years ago were the minority representatives of foreign nations are now asked to share more equitably the fruits of this great land. The picture is the same: Africa—America; and yet terribly and intimately different.

For you and me, met in a Christian church this morning, the issue is not alone the social emergence of a race; it is the meaning of our religious faith. It is not the church meeting a crisis; it is the church confronting herself. It is not the mere making of important decisions; it is again the discovery of truth. For it is truth—not decision—that makes men free.

A few days ago in this city a great proposition was written across the face of America. And in the eyes of many—though not all—three familiar letters were written at the end—Q.E.D. "It has been demonstrated."

Clearly certain things were demonstrated: the desire and determination of a race of God's children to rise above their present level of life; the support of many people of other races and creeds in that crusade; and the official blessing of a democracy, recognizing and encouraging the right of any people to express their hunger and their hope.

It would be a temptation to write "Q.E.D." and, for the moment, at least, to assume that in our language, as in mathematical language, to demonstrate means to prove. We cannot make any such assumption.

For the proof lies in what happens in the years A.D.—"after the demonstration"; in

what happens in the official boards of every congregation in American Christendom—in what happens in every community—in every home—in every heart.

It is not surprising that although multitudes came to Washington last week, multitudes stayed away. Some could not support what in their opinion was meaningless and unnecessary. Some could not support what in their opinion would be an act of intimidation. Some just could not support it for a variety of personal reasons known only to themselves and God. It would be just as un-Christian of us to misjudge those who stayed away as to condemn those who came.

But if there appears to be any weakness in the demonstration technique it would be in the temptation to debate the demonstration rather than the issue or to be intolerant at the very moment our lips are speaking tolerance. If there is any weakness, it would be in the careless use of three simple letters—Q.E.D.—"that which was to be demonstrated"—and in the confused conclusion that they can always be translated: "that which has been proved."

The proof lies not in waving placards but in raising the Christian flag on the masthead of our own heart. The proof lies in our performance as Christians in the neighborhood, in the schools, in the churches, on the streets, in the restaurants, in the home, in person to person encounter. The proof lies in doing the truth. Then, and only then, Q.E.D. is appropriate.

What I say now is not an intermission. It is part of my plot this morning. It may be a little like people gathering in the corridors between acts, only to discover that the play is still going on. This is my interlude which is not an interlude:

Beginning next Sunday for 4 weeks, I will be doing sermon-lecturing from this pulpit on Sunday mornings. At all times the Christian church is an educational institution. We hope to make it more so during September. The themes will not be new, they will be as old as Bethlehem, as primeval as the Garden of Eden.

We will talk together about the meaning of Christ; His visit to this earth; His baptism and temptations; His crucifixion and His resurrection. We will be anticipating the year's curriculum in the church school on "The Lord of Faith and Life."

I suggested that this would be conversation. A morning worship service and town meeting seem to be mutually contradictory. We propose to extend the worship service to Monday evening so that dialog can take place and questions can be explored, and—most of all—Christian intention can be asserted.

If this experiment is successful, I am hopeful that there may be an opportunity each week for pulpit and pew to become one; for the pastor and people to go deeper and further together where the Lord of Life leads us in thought and action.

You see, this is not intermission. This is act I in a drama which can never go by any other title than the "Story of Salvation." The ancient record of what God did for us must become the modern declaration of what we, by His strength and wisdom, are doing for each other and for the world.

St. Martin of Tours, bent over a crude bench in his cell, was startled one night, so legend has it, when a knock came at his door and an awe-inspiring figure entered.

"Who are you?" stammered the saint.

The answer came, "I am the Saviour." But the saint was not so sure. There are times even with the godly when suspicion must be a part of sainthood.

St. Martin asked: "Where, then, are the prints of the nails?"

And the Devil vanished.

It is not uncommon for the Devil to appear in the guise of a savior. History is lush with examples of demagog and charlatans who posed as humanity's benefactors. Too frequently this has been possible because the Christian world has timidly refused to demand credentials. The hallmark of saviorhood is the nail-print, the symbol of suffering, the emblem of self-forgetfulness, the label of a man's willingness to be different.

If you ask me for the first test of a Christian, I think I would have to say: It is a man's readiness to be recognized in the crowd—even in the evening when the fire is flicking shadows across our face. If the Christian church has lost some of her influence in human society—and I am not ready to say that it is irretrievable—it is because she has camouflaged herself to blend with the colors of her environment.

A certain prominent churchman from Germany visiting in this country, tells of meeting an American layman who modestly remarked that he frequently spent as many as six evenings a week in a variety of church functions and organizations.

The German made discreet inquiry and discovered that this lay champion of his church was married, had three children; that he was a businessman and a Republican. Then he said to the American: "I hope that from now on you will find the time to spend five evenings out of the six with your family, your hobbies, your business colleagues and your political party, all of which need your Christian convictions and influence much more badly than any church organization."

If a Christian dares to change the environment in which he lives, he had better first be different from his environment. If his Christian commitment convinces him that he is called to be one of the saviors of human society, he had better forsake casual and comfortable Christianity.

Either he can walk the streets and watch while other men suffer—or he can suffer with them, remembering that a savior has the nailprints; recalling, as one heroic Scotsman has so vividly put it: "That Jesus was not crucified in a cathedral between two candles, but on a cross between two thieves; on the town's garbage heap; at a crossroad—at the kind of place where cynics talk smut and thieves curse and soldiers gamble; and that is what He died about."

Q.E.D.—The world is waiting, not for a parade—as moving it may be—but for proof that we are different—we who love Christ and our fellowmen mor than we love the church and ourselves.

Test for Congress—Action or Reform?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has again spoken out clearly and forthrightly for the need of Congress to take stock of its own position as one of the three coequal branches of our Federal Government.

Mr. Drummond observes:

Every student of government who looks upon the functioning of Congress with any detachment is convinced that its machinery must be modernized if it is to recover its eroded authority and have any chance of transacting the public business efficiently and responsibly.

He points out bluntly what many Members conceded privately, that "Congress has been continuously losing power to the President for more than a quarter century," that "we no longer have a system of three coordinate branches" and that "through its own fault and inefficiency Congress is no longer coequal with the Executive and judiciary."

Mr. Speaker, those of us here in the Congress who have a duty to legislate for the good of our Nation and its people must face up to this ever-increasing erosion of power of the legislative branch and take prompt action to reverse this dangerous trend. I commend to my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle the full text of Mr. Drummond's article from the Washington Post for August 3, 1963, and under unanimous consent, I extend it at this point:

TEST FOR CONGRESS—ACTION OR REFORM?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

This summer and fall will be a good time for the American people—and the Congressmen themselves—to watch and decide whether Congress can go on much longer with its present archaic machinery.

Every student of government who looks upon the functioning of Congress with any detachment is convinced that its machinery must be modernized if it is to recover its eroded authority and have any chance of transacting the public business efficiently and responsibly.

What we are going to learn this summer and fall is not only whether Congress can transact the public business at all.

During the many years I have been in Washington there has always been urgent business before the Congress. At this session there is transcendently urgent business before the Congress. There is the problem of rising racial tension, unrelieved unemployment despite substantial prosperity, a sluggish economy, the matter of tax reduction, and the overhanging threat of a rail strike.

Legislation dealing with all of these matters will be before Congress. The issues are being clearly drawn. The President has done his part by decisively committing his leadership, by alerting the Nation to the problems, and by offering Congress concrete proposals for action.

The initiative is now wholly with Congress. The responsibility for action—or inaction—is with Congress, plus responsibility for the consequences. Congress has the ball.

After 6 months of frittering, no wonder everybody is uncertain about what is going to be done—if anything. From January to July Congress has accomplished little that is visible to the naked eye and nothing significant. And now Washington is filled with talk that Congress can hardly be expected to do two big things the same year—that is, deal with civil rights legislation and tax reduction over a 12-month span. The talk is that if Congress can handle one major problem a year, like civil rights, that would be transacting the public business pretty well.

It wouldn't. It would be a sorry record and one that Congressmen who want to see Congress recover its initiative, authority, and prestige cannot and should not condone as an acceptable standard of government.

The truth is that Congress has been continuously losing power to the President for more than a quarter century. We no longer have a system of three coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. Through its own fault and inefficiency Congress is no longer coequal with the executive and the judiciary. It can retrieve its position only by modernizing its methods of discharging its responsibilities. It has lost control of the budget. It is not an adequate monitor of the administration. It is so burdened with trivia that it is rarely able to give priority to crucial legislation. At most points

it is so understaffed with its own experts that, more often than not, it cannot give independent study to Presidential proposals.

How responsibly Congress conducts itself from now to adjournment—what it does and what it fails to do—will disclose the congressional reforms most needed.

Congress now has the ball. What the country is anxiously waiting to see is whether Congress is going to sit on it, throw it into the stands—or run with it.

Coal Production at New High in Field—31-Million-Ton Output in 1962 Sets New Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Coal Production at New High in Field" which appeared in the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky., on August 26, 1963.

The article is as follows:

COAL PRODUCTION AT NEW HIGH IN FIELD—31-MILLION-TON OUTPUT IN 1962 SETS NEW RECORD

The western Kentucky coal field set another production record in 1962, with a 3-percent increase over 1961, and is headed toward an even greater increase in the current year.

The 24th annual production report of Kentucky Coal Agency, Madisonville, released today by William Shanks, executive officer of the agency, shows 1962 coal production of 30,981,025 tons of coal in the western field.

Mining operations in Hopkins and Muhlenberg Counties accounted for better than three-fourths of the field's output for the year. For the second straight year. Muhlenberg—with its huge river-based strip mines—nosed out Hopkins in total production.

Total output in Muhlenberg last year was 13,157,997 tons, compared with 11,163,196 tons for the previous year.

TEN MILLION IN HOPKINS

Hopkins County, with the bulk of its coal produced by large underground mines that are among the most modern operations in the world, had production of 10,112,404 tons in 1962, a slight drop from 1961 tonnage of 10,857,111.

River transportation of coal also increased about 10 percent in this field, while rail-carried tonnage and truck-mine output showed slight decreases.

Rail connected mines in the field produced 17,197,091 tons in 1962, compared with 17,627,464 tons the previous 12 months.

River-connected mines—which put their coal directly into barges without the use of rail lines—produced 12,040,877 tons in the past year. The previous year, river-connected mining operations had an output of 10,933,230.

Truck mines in the western field accounted for 1,653,057 tons in 1962, slightly less than the 1961 output of 1,852,487.

OHIO COUNTY THIRD

Hopkins County rail mines produced 9,521,967 tons and truck mines in Hopkins produced 590,437 last year.

Muhlenberg rail mines produced 6,280,617 tons and its river mines had an output of 6,754,827. Truck mine output in Muhlenberg accounted for 122,553 tons.

Ohio County remained the third producer with the bulk of its 3,003,914 tons divided about equally between river and rail mines and 243,187 tons produced in truck mines.

Union County's tonnage was wholly from river-connected mines on the Ohio, totaling 2,561,722.

Daviess County production was 1,029,398 tons during the year—almost all of it barge transported.

Webster County's tonnage was 490,498 and the remaining 2 percent of the western field's production came from small operations in Henderson, Butler, McLean, Grayson, and Hancock Counties. Christian County had no production during 1962.

BIGGEST MINES

The three largest producing mines in the field are in Muhlenberg. They are Peabody's River Queen (3,280,146 tons); Peabody's Vogue mine (2,431,578); Gibralter Coal Corp. (2,221,622).

Peabody's Ken mine in Ohio County ranked fourth (2,152,317).

Next in order of production came West Kentucky Coal Co.'s Pleasant View mine (1,725,553) in Hopkins; Pittsburg & Midway's Paradise mine in Muhlenberg (1,645,179); Nashville Coal's Fies mine (1,458,254); Peabody's White City mine (1,378,090); Nashville Coal's Uniontown mine (1,353,981); DeKoven Coal Co. (1,207,741); Green Coal Co. (970,000); Nashville's Crescent mine (948,868); Coltown Mining Co. (922,914); Bell & Zoller Oriole mine (863,147) and P. & M.'s Colonial mine (832,200) round out the top 15 producers in the field.

John and Richard Contiguglia, Twin Concert Pianists, Return From Successful European Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the consistent need to create an atmosphere of greater understanding between ourselves and the peoples of Europe, I was deeply pleased the other day to learn that two distinguished young citizens of my congressional district, John and Richard Contiguglia of Auburn, twin brothers, and both accomplished concert pianists, have just returned from a most successful concert tour of Europe.

The reception which the Contiguglia brothers received certainly makes it clear that the people of Europe have a warm feeling for Americans, particularly those who are as talented as these two young men.

I know that the people of Auburn are proud of what John and Richard Contiguglia have done and am sure that their parents are also proud of them. What they have done and what they plan to continue to do will represent not only a major accomplishment in the field of music but will contribute toward greater international understanding and cooperation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles from the August 14 issue of the Citizen-Advertiser of Auburn, N.Y.:

CONCERT PIANISTS ASTOUNDED BY RECEPTION

John and Richard Contiguglia, Auburn's twin concert pianists, returned from Europe yesterday after 2 years of study and concert tours, astounded and pleased by their reception.

The twins were studying under a fellowship, and consequently did not attend formal classes.

"All our family was encouraged to take piano lessons while we were young," Richard Contiguglia said today. "We became interested."

The twins started their musical career on the family upright.

They plan a return to London next January to gain more experience. A concert in Auburn is planned to help raise funds for the trip, but no date has been set.

"We aren't making any money," the twins said. Their debut and concerts were financed out of their own pockets.

"Competition and costs are both fierce," Richard said. "But we were extremely gratified by the fact that we were so well received by European critics."

The twins said that the cost of European living had skyrocketed and that particularly in England, restrictions on performers were such that it was "impossible for young people like ourselves to make any money at all."

Both said they had a marvelous time and toured Berlin, Holland, England, Switzerland and other countries during their stay.

They were taken under the wing of English pianist Dame Myra Hess while they were in London.

She is a friend of Prof. Bruce Simonds, the twins' instructor at Yale University.

"We used to turn her pages for her while she performed at a concert," John said. "She is a wonderful woman, and is perhaps one of the few remaining pianists who study a composition from scratch before performing it.

"She has really transformed our playing by teaching us to follow the composer's intent as written on the score," he said.

While preparing for a concert, the twins practice between 6 and 8 hours a day.

"It seems strange to think that when we were young we thought we could prepare a composition in 2 weeks and present it," Richard said. "But now, it takes at least a year of study to get a composition ready for the public."

Their repertoire consists of enough material to present "probably four concerts," John said.

Insofar as future plans are concerned, the twins are not sure.

They said the problem is getting a New York City managing firm interested in their experience and credentials so that they could be sponsored for an American tour.

"It's a strange fact that young musicians must do well in their performances because they are so far and few between," Richard said.

The twins estimated that it would take 2 to 3 three years if they were lucky to become established.

"We do have to make a living at this," they said.

They are hopeful that an Auburn concert will enable them to raise funds to continue their studies.

MAYOR WELCOMES CONTIGUGLIA TWINS ON RETURN FROM PIANO CONCERT TOUR

"I am pleased and delighted to welcome Auburn's famous piano twins home from their most successful European tour," Mayor Maurice I. Schwartz said today.

The mayor also sent a telegram of welcome to John and Richard Contiguglia on their arrival in New York City yesterday.

"We can be proud of the record these two fine young men have made for themselves," Mayor Schwartz said.

"We are proud of their success and the way they have represented Auburn," he said, "and glad to have them home with us again."

Declarations for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the principles of spot-announcement, commercial radio have been harnessed by the six Sonderling radio stations—four AM, two FM—for a yearlong educational campaign teaching the full concept of American democracy.

The spots, 80 to 95 seconds in length, were prepared and are being voiced by Prof. Robert A. Scalapino, chairman of the Political Science Department, University of California at Berkeley. Each is specially written and edited by Dr. Scalapino to fit the umbrella pattern of "Declarations for Democracy," title under which the saturation-type series is being presented. But each is also engineered to provide the answer to a question on American democratic principles or rebut a Communist or Fascist anti-American thrust.

Egmont Sonderling, president of all six stations now airing the "Declarations," said he created the idea as a direct result of his own extensive travels throughout Europe and Asia. He added:

During my travels abroad, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, I became aware of the fact we Americans do not have ready answers to specific questions asked of Americans, nor do we have answers to many claims made by Communists for their system of government.

As a result, he noted, he conceived the idea for a spot-announcement campaign to provide answers in simple, straightforward manner to the most important questions asked and statements made by Communists and the ultrarightists or Fascists.

Mr. Sonderling continued:

It is our plan to broadcast each one many times daily. In this way, broadcast techniques which have proved practical through the years in commercial advertising are being applied to an educational campaign. We believe it will leave lasting, memorable impressions on our listeners.

The "Declarations" are being aired on an average of between five to seven times daily over each of the six Sonderling stations on a continuous 52-week basis. Stations involved are WOPA, AM and FM, Oak Park-Chicago, Ill.; 50-kilowatt WDIA, Memphis, Tenn., and KDIA, Oakland-San Francisco, Calif., both Negro-oriented; and KFOX, AM and FM, Long Beach-Los Angeles, Calif.

We believe this saturation technique—

Mr. Sonderling said—

is an entirely new approach to education by radio, to making the American public aware of the values as well as the problems created by our democracy.

This is the first time, to our knowledge, that the proved impact techniques of commercial radio—simple, direct, straightforward, pinpointed and pyramided announcements—have been used in protracted, saturation-type schedules to treat the major political problems of our times.

The first 26 of these Sonderling educational programs have already been scheduled for broadcast over the next several weeks. An additional 95 are being prepared by Dr. Scalapino to carry the series for an entire year. This series will deal with "the Positive Aspects of American Democracy" plus the "problems of the American Negro Today."

The initial "Declaration" bears the subtitle "The Right To Vote." The first group also contains commentaries with such subtitles as "On People's Democracy," "The Wall"—a symbol replacing the hammer and sickle—"Ten Little Bolsheviks," "Communism—The Highest Stage?" "Which Side Owns Democracy?" and "Freedom From Fear."

Mr. Sonderling said he plans to make the scripts and/or tapes available to any other station that would like to present them to its audiences.

He commented:

It is our impression, that "Declarations for Democracy" constitutes a public service in the truest sense of the word and provides programing of ultimate value to the general public welfare.

German-born Egmont Sonderling is a 35-year veteran in the broadcasting field. He settled in the Chicago area when he emigrated to this country as a youth. His first broadcasting ventures were with the old "Germania Broadcast," a feature heard in the Chicago area for nearly four decades.

Originally he was an announcer for "Germania," then doubled as sales manager. It was in this latter capacity that Mr. Sonderling began spreading his broadcast wings. He was first, for example, to induce Procter & Gamble and Pet Milk Co. to use foreign language radio and actually produced Procter & Gamble's first Polish-language soap opera.

In 1950, with the birth of WOPA, Chicago, he began to build the Sonderling stations group. In 1957 he acquired WDIA, 50 kilowatt Memphis outlet and first fulltime Negro-oriented station in the United States. Two years later he obtained KDIA, Oakland-San Francisco, transforming this station into a Negro community station, too. He acquired KFOX, AM and FM, Los Angeles, in 1961. These stations, programed to country and western music throughout their 24-hour daily schedules, are considered national leaders in this field.

Mr. Speaker, the first seven "Declarations for Democracy" follow. I believe we can all agree, Mr. Sonderling has performed a most worthwhile service in the best interest of our Republic by bringing these declarations to the attention of his listeners.

Here is radio at its finest.

The declarations follow:

DECLARATIONS FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Robert A. Scalapino)

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

What is the most important political right possessed by an American citizen? Some would say "freedom of speech." Others would argue "freedom of assemblage or of the press." In my opinion, the single most important political right of our citizens is the right to vote. American democracy is based upon a system of political competition. We choose our political leaders at the polls. It is their method of free, competitive, and secret elections that distinguishes modern democracy from communism and fascism. Under those systems, the citizen either cannot vote or he can only ratify the official government candidates.

Nearly 100 years ago, we added the 14th and 15th amendments to our Constitution. These amendments declared that no citizen could have his rights denied—either by the Federal Government of by any State—because of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The time has come for all of us, white and black alike, to insist that the Constitution of the United States be upheld and enforced throughout the land. If a citizen cannot vote, he cannot protect his most elemental rights. If he cannot vote, he is not really living in a democracy.

There is another side to this coin, of course. Those who have the right to vote and do not exercise it are not being good citizens. They are throwing away their democratic heritage. Voting is not only a right. It is also a duty, if we wish to preserve freedom. Let us practice what we preach. Let us insist upon the right of every citizen to vote, and then let every citizen fulfill his responsibilities on election day.

ON PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

The Communists insist that they possess a new and superior form of people's democracy. They argue that the Communist Party, the only party allowed to hold power under communism, represents all of the working people.

In fact, only a small minority of the working people are permitted to become members of the Communist Party. Let us look at the Soviet Union. The present population of Soviet Russia is 220 million, but there are less than 9 million Communist Party members. This is not even 5 percent of the total population. Yet it is this 5 percent and their families who hold the real power in Russia today. It is they who get the best jobs. It is they who control politics and are given the most important political offices. It is they who get the best housing. This 5 percent represents a new privileged class.

Moreover, the most important Communist Party members are generally not from the working class. They are officials, factory managers, or intellectuals. The great majority of the Russian workers are not party members. They have no special privileges and no political power, for authority rests with the Communist Party alone.

Communism is not people's democracy. It is one-party dictatorship in which a small privileged elite hold absolute power for life.

THE WALL

Since its founding, the Communist Party has used the hammer and sickle as its emblem or symbol. The hammer stands for the working class, the sickle represents the peasant. And in their global propaganda, the Communists loudly proclaim that only they have the interests of the workers and peasants at heart, that only theirs is truly a government of workers and peasants.

Today, there is a new symbol that seems some appropriate for the Communist Party—the wall. And this symbol is real. It exists in the form of the wall that runs through the vast, sprawling metropolis of Berlin. The Berlin wall was built by the Communists in August 1961 in a frantic attempt to stop people from leaving Communist Germany and going into free Berlin. The purpose of this wall is not to keep people out, but to keep them in.

When World War II ended and Germany was divided, Communist East Germany had a population of 19 million people. By 1961, when the Communists were forced to build the Berlin Wall, over 3 million of those 19 million East Germans had fled to the West. Those 3 million people voted in the only way

it was possible to vote meaningfully in a Communist society. They voted with their feet. They walked out on communism and voted for freedom.

A majority of these refugees, moreover, were workers and peasants, the very classes the Communsts claim to represent. Thus there are several important questions to ask the Communists: If communism represents salvation for the working class, why do so many workers risk so much to escape? And what free government has ever had to build a wall to keep its people from leaving?

TEN LITTLE BOLSHEVIKS

Many of us Americans as children recited a verse called "Ten Little Indians." It generally started thus: "Ten little Indians standing in a line; one ran away and then there were nine." And so it went until there was only one, and then none.

There is a grimmer version of that verse that could be applied to Communist leaders. It is shocking to realize that all of the top Communist leaders who originally engineered the Russian Revolution were eventually killed by Stalin's orders, except those who died before he could get to them. One by one, Stalin's rivals were shot on a variety of charges, most of them fake. Since communism has come to Russia, it has been very dangerous to be a top Communist unless you are the leader himself.

In some respects, the situation has changed since Stalin's death. The main opponents of Premier Khrushchev are still alive. But men like Molotov, Malenkov, Kagonovitch, Bulganin, and Zhukov have all been publicly criticized in the sharpest possible fashion and forced to retire from public life. No doubt their every move will be watched as long as they are alive. Once again, the men who were top leaders in the Soviet Union 10 years ago are all gone except the boss, Nikita Khrushchev.

Communism proclaims itself as democracy, but the facts show clearly that it has always ended up as one-man rule. And sometimes that one-man rule has been very bloody. It is wise to remember that a free society never yields all power to any one party or man.

COMMUNISM—THE HIGHEST STAGE?

The Communists often claim that their system represents the highest stage of political and economic development. The father of communism, Karl Marx, was certain that communism would come first to countries like Germany, Great Britain, and the United States because these countries were so advanced. Marx believed that the working class would turn to communism as the final stage of democracy after freedom and prosperity had been established.

In fact, however, modern communism has been associated with failure, not success—with backwardness, not progress. Up to date, not a single country that has enjoyed true freedom and prosperity has chosen communism, or even accepted it. The Communists do not stand a chance in such countries as the United States, Great Britain, West Germany, or Japan. These are all countries where political freedom and economic development have gone hand in hand. Revolution and dictatorship are not necessary and not desired.

Where has communism triumphed? It has come to power mainly in countries that had never experienced democracy or social progress, countries like Russia, China, and the nations of Eastern Europe. Most of these countries had a background of poverty, illiteracy, and stagnation. In many cases, they were ruled by tyrants opposed to any basic reforms.

Communism is not the highest stage of political development. Rather, it is the result of a low stage of development. No progressive state or people have ever turned to communism. The Communists have triumphed only in the midst of proverty and hopelessness, political, and economic chaos. Whenever they have a chance, the people prefer freedom.

WHICH SIDE OWNS DEMOCRACY?

The official title of most Communist states is "People's Democracy." For propaganda purposes, the Communists take two words that are popular throughout the world, people and democracy, and by uniting them, hope to win mass support. We Americans and other peoples of the free world argue that communism is false democracy, that the so-called people's democracies are in fact one-man or small-group dictatorships.

In the great political struggle taking place in the world today, the truly interesting thing is that we and the Russians fight over the right to use the same word. For that word—democracy—does have an appeal to 20th century man everywhere.

Who has a better claim on democracy? To me, a democratic society must have two qualities:

First, the basic purpose of the government must be to advance the dignity of each citizen, not to promote the glory or the power of the state. In democracy, it is man that is of central importance.

Second, a democratic society must allow political competition. The people must have the right freely to choose between political alternatives by means of secret elections. And if these elections are to be meaningful, there must be maximum freedom of speech, press, and assemblage so that all alternatives can be understood.

No state, including our own, is a perfect democracy. But under communism, state power, not individual dignity, remains the primary goal; and one-party dictatorship, not political competition, remains the method of seeking that goal. As long as these things are true communism and democracy cannot go together.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

To appreciate freedom fully, sometimes, one has to lose it. A people who have known freedom and then lost it suddenly realize that one momentous change has taken place in their lives: under the new conditions, they must live with fear.

Today, when we hear a knock on the door at night, we assume that it is a neighbor, friend, or relative. But what if our first thought was the secret police. Can you imagine what that thought would mean, in terms of your personality and your way of life?

When communism or fascism takes over a society, the citizens must guard their words and thoughts even from their own children. They must not do or say anything that would appear "suspicious" to party authorities. Thus, people become silent. The shades are drawn, and the doors are closed. When man is afraid, he tries to hide. He retreats and ceases to communicate freely and openly with his friends. He closes off a portion of his personality and intellect, fearful of probing too deeply even within himself.

Among the many benefits of democracy to man, perhaps its greatest contribution, is a simple, yet terribly important one: the freedom from fear.

Neat Little Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorial.

The Pilot of Union Bridge, Md., recently carried a short but pointed editorial on the effects of total Government ownership. For those of us who live in a free society, this brief editorial is a welcome reminder of our great blessings:

NEAT LITTLE TRICK

A short time ago, reports the Associated Press, the Cuban Government raised the price of gasoline from 34 cents to 60 cents a gallon (not far from a 100-percent jump) "in the interest of the national economy." The dispatch continues: "Premier Fidel Castro had suggested the increase as a means of forcing a greater contribution from the people to Cuba's progress."

This is one of those neat little tricks that are only possible in a totalitarian economy, where the Government either owns everything or runs everything, and competition is nonexistent. You might keep this in mind next time you hear private enterprise raked over the coals, and Government ownership of industry lauded as a public blessing.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of September 7, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS, HUMAN RIGHTS, PROPERTY RIGHTS—IS THERE A CONFLICT?

Capitalism: "An economic system in which capital and capitalists play the principal part; specifically, one in which the ownership of land and natural wealth, the production, distribution, and exchange of goods, and the operation of the system itself, are affected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions."

Socialism: "A political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods."

The Constitution embodies the limited form of government that makes possible a free society. Freedom from government domination enables capitalism to flourish. Specific grants of authority are given the Federal Government in its overall capacity over States and all subdivisions. A list or bill of specific rights is enumerated prohibiting Federal Government from transgressing beyond its specified areas, culminating in

Ninth rights retained by the people: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Tenth rights reserved to the States or to the people: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

NOW CONSIDER THE NEGRO LEADERS' DEMANDS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

1. Comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation from the present Congress—without compromise or filibuster—to

guarantee all Americans access to all public accommodations, decent housing, adequate and integrated education, the right to vote.

2. Withholding of Federal funds from all programs in which discrimination exists.

3. Desegregation of all school districts in 1963.

4. Enforcement of the 14th amendment—reducing congressional representation of States where citizens are disfranchised.

5. A new Executive order banning discrimination in all housing supported by Federal funds.

6. Authority for the Attorney General to institute injunctive suits when any constitutional right is violated.

7. A massive Federal program to train and place all unemployed workers—Negro and white—on meaningful and dignified jobs at decent wages.

8. A national minimum wage act that will give all Americans a decent standard of living. Government surveys show that anything less than $2 an hour fails to do this.

9. A broadened Fair Labor Standards Act to include all areas of employment which are presently excluded.

10. A Federal fair employment practices law barring discrimination by Federal, State, and municipal governments, and by employers, contractors, employment agencies, and trade unions.

NOT CONSTITUTIONAL NOR CAPITALISTIC

These are outside the role of Federal Government. Would these be more appropriate and associated with socialism, as a governmental obligation? Yes. Should or can our form of government provide housing, education, jobs that are meaningful and dignified, wage levels, etc. No. If not, then should we change our form of government to see to it that Federal Government provides all these controls, regulations, and services? No. Finally, can Federal Government do these things without constitutional amendment? Unfortunately, yes.

OTHER CIVIL RIGHTS ARE TRAMPLED

This is the result of pressure groups demanding more, and Government promising performance outside traditional constitutional limitations.

1. Personal safety—the test ban treaty approval prevents developing our antimissile defense, jeopardizing our civil right of personal safety, our very lives. Cuban missiles presence also shows breakdown of Federal role in our common defense.

2. Freedom from enslavement—Communist gains in Asia, Africa, South America, and the Caribbean brings closer Communist goal of enslavement, if not, outright burial.

3. Right to expect constitutional use of tax money. Citizens cannot prevent Federal gifts of money to U.S. enemies, the Communists.

4. Freedom to pray—partially denied already by Court.

5. Right to home ownership. Federal programs seriously jeopardize all such ownership.

6. Right to hire and fire. Employers gradually losing all such traditional rights.

7. Right to work. Not without joining a union, abiding by leaders' dictates, and contributing the dues required.

8. Right to earn and keep. Tax laws still cutting into take-home pay. Social security taxes going up again. New tax controls to be imposed.

9. Right to serve whom you please in business. Federal Government being asked to remove persent such privilege.

10. Right to access to public streets and sidewalks. Demonstrators now have superior right, sometimes even to protection by police and military, even to blocking traffic by lying down.

INCONSISTENT

Where are the liberals, the patriots, the Negroes, and the other pressure groups—who, in dedicated defense of civil rights, will protest these violations? Government must protect, not encroach upon our civil rights. Also, citizens must think through the matter of civil rights.

NEXT WEEK

Second installment. Civil rights, human rights, and property rights are identical, not in conflict. See you then.

The National Defense Education Act 5 Years Old on September 2, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Members of Congress will agree that one of the most valuable laws ever enacted by Congress is the National Defense Education Act.

This bill, which was passed with bipartisan support, was signed into law 5 years ago last week, on September 2, 1958.

I believe that Members of Congress will find useful a summary of the programs under the National Defense Education Act during the last 5 years.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement on the NDEA, prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The statement follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT 5 YEARS OLD

The National Defense Education Act was signed into law 5 years ago—on September 2, 1958. Since that time, some $800 million have been paid out under the act to strengthen American education at all levels and to augment the Nation's supply of highly trained manpower, particular in fields directly related to national security.

The act authorizes Federal assistance for student loans and graduate fellowships, for technical education, for the expansion of guidance, counseling, and testing of students, for the strengthening of education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, for the improvement of communications media for educational purposes, and for strengthening educational statistical services.

Enacted originally for a 4-year period, the NDEA was extended by the Congress last year for an additional 2 years. As the programs under the act go into their 6th year of operation, the Office of Education reported these achievements:

STUDENT LOANS

About 490,000 students in 1,534 colleges and universities borrowed approximately $330 million under the student loan program. Ninety percent of the student borrowers reported that they could not have begun or continued their college studies without this assistance. Seventy percent of the loans have been made to students with superior academic background who intend to teach in elementary or secondary schools and to those with superior ability or preparation in science, mathematics, or a modern foreign language.

The Federal capital contribution to the student loan fund represents almost 90 percent of the total. The remainder is contributed from colleges and universities.

The average loan has been about $478, or less than half the maximum permissible to an individual in any 1 year. Approximately one-fourth of those now repaying loans have become public school teachers and have received a partial writeoff of their loans, as provided in the act.

The law allows students 11 years in which to pay. They are paying back so much faster than this that the amount redeemed to date is almost twice the sum due.

The program has stimulated non-Federal loan activity and encouraged a change in the approach to student financial assistance. Approximately 50 percent of the institutions participating in the program had never included long-term loans in their student financial aid programs prior to NDEA.

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Awards were made to 7,000 graduate students for study in 170 institutions of higher education. About one-half of the $80 million so far expended or obligated under this program has gone to the fellows for stipends and allowances; the remainder to participating graduate schools, to help cover the costs of the programs in which these scholars are studying.

During the 1963 fiscal year, 1,500 students received awards for study beginning in 1963–64. These fellows will be enrolled in 621 new or expanded graduate programs at 155 institutions.

Approval of fellowships at the University of Alaska extends the graduate fellowship program for the first time to all 50 States and the District of Columbia. Cost of the program for the year is about $20.7 million.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Approximately 30,500 new technicians have completed training under the area vocational program of NDEA. This program is designed to help meet the demand for highly skilled manpower in electronics, drafting and design, instrumentation, industrial chemistry, and other technical fields.

About 168,000 youths and adults were enrolled during the school year 1962–63, of whom approximately 65,000 were students in 2- or 3-year preparatory programs, and 103,000 were working adults in upgrading and refresher courses. These estimated numbers represent an increase of 20,000 over enrollments for the previous school year.

The number of participating institutions has increased from 262 in 1959 to 630 in 1963.

The Federal Government has contributed about $42.7 million to this program for salaries and equipment. States and communities have overmatched Federal dollars by about 2 to 1.

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

Federal grants totaling approximately $65 million for local guidance programs made possible a significant increase in the national total of full-time school counselors. The number has risen from 12,000 (1 for approximately 900 students) in 1958, to 27,000 (1 for approximately 540 students) in 1963. During this same period, from 1959 to 1962, 67.2 million scholastic aptitude and achievement tests were given, with the help of Federal funds, to public secondary school students and 1.9 million nonpublic secondary school students.

By the end of the 1963–64 academic year, more than 13,800 secondary school counselors and teachers preparing to be counselors will have attended 416 special institutes to

improve their capabilities in counseling and guidance at a cost of nearly $50 million.

The Office of Education has made approximately $65 million available to the States and territories for guidance, counseling, and testing programs. The needs and interests of students, revealed through testing and counseling services, have led to curriculum changes in schools in many parts of the Nation.

During the summer of 1963 and the 1963–64 academic year, 76 NDEA counseling and guidance training institutes will have about 2,280 enrolled for a total cost of $7.25 million. Stipends and allowances account for about 60 percent of the institutes' expenditures; the remainder represents finance operating costs.

SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

During the 5-year period, about $181 million in Federal funds has been paid to the States and territories on a 50–50 matching basis for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in public elementary and high schools. In addition, loans totaling approximately $3 million have been made to private elementary and secondary schools.

Language laboratories in public high schools have increased from 46 in 1958 to almost 6,000 at the end of the 1963 fiscal year. During the same period, more than 180,000 local public school projects have been approved for the acquisition or remodeling of equipment and materials for instruction in these subjects.

States now employ 222 specialists supervisors in these subjects at the State agency level as contrasted with only 33 before the act was passed.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Nearly 14,000 elementary and secondary school language teachers will have attended 301 modern foreign language institutes by the end of the 1963–64 academic year. About $25.5 million has been obligated during the 5 years for this activity, including $7.25 million for 83 institutes to be conducted during the summer of 1963 and academic year 1963–64, enrolling over 4,300. The institutes have provided training for nearly one-fourth of the Nation's elementary and secondary school teachers of foreign languages.

LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS

During the first 5 years of the program a total of 55 centers—including 2 which will receive Federal support for the first time in 1963–64—have been established at 34 colleges and universities. These centers offer instruction in some 70 languages which, until now, had been rarely taught in the United States. A total of about $8.4 million has been obligated for this program, of which $2.6 million is for 1963–64 activity.

Some 2,000 students have received fellowships for the study of over 60 languages of critical importance. Obligations for this program total about $12.3 million over the 5 years, including $3.5 million for 1,035 awards for study in 1963–64. A 1963 innovation has been the awarding of 96 fellowships to qualified undergraduate students for intensive summer study in critical languages.

LANGUAGE RESEARCH AND STUDIES

Approximately $12.2 million has been obligated for 224 language research projects to determine the greatest needs in foreign language instruction, to study the best methods of foreign language teaching, and to develop specialized instructional materials such as textbooks, dictionaries, and recordings.

COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Over $19 million has been obligated to support the purposes of this program which are (a) learning the most effective way of using television, radio, motion pictures, teaching machines, tape recordings, and similar communications media for educational purposes; and (b) disseminating information to assist schools and colleges to make wider and better use of communications media.

Awards have been made for 227 research projects (219 by grants and 8 by contracts) to 114 institutions and agencies in 40 States and the District of Columbia. At the present time, 128 of these projects are in progress, with 98 completed.

A total of 159 contracts for disseminating information have been awarded to 77 institutions, agencies, and individuals in 22 States and territories and 2 foreign countries.

IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES

Forty-eight State education agencies requested and received a total of $1,684,184 in 1963 to improve and expand their statistical services, thus bringing the overall total expenditures for this program to $5,305,083.

Bogus Preachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I knew the Federal Government was making every effort at tremendous expense to insure a peaceful, political rally here on August 28; however, I did not know that bogus and fake preachers descended upon Washington in such large numbers.

The following article from the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger will be of interest to the Congress, to law enforcement officials and particularly to the dedicated true ministers of the Christian religion who are laboring so faithfully to prepare America for an all out struggle with atheist communism.

The article follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, Sept. 5, 1963]

FAKE PASTORS IN "FREEDOM MARCH"?

(By Tom Ethridge)

Some of the "clergymen" who participated in the civil rights march on Washington last week were phonies and imposters, according to Congressman WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio Republican who is the son of a Methodist minister.

In a letter to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Representative AYRES noted that it has been an age-old technique for the Communists Party to misuse the clergy whenever possible. "Such misuse," he added, "has demeaned the noble purpose of this march."

The Ohioan said one unidentified person who visited his office before the march admitted he was a civilian in minister's clothing. Representative AYRES then checked with a friend in New York City who rents clerical garb and was told that there had been a brisk demand for such rental costumes before the march.

Representative AYRES, as quoted by the Chicago Tribune in a Washington dispatch, said the rental price on ministerial garb jumped from $10 to $50 when rental firms learned the cloth of churches would be used in the mass civil rights demonstration.

The Ohio Congressman said that as a minister's son, he thought he could tell a clergyman when he saw one, and he had spotted a number of apparent imposters in the crowd of 200,000 gathered in Washington on August 28 to agitate for civil rights legislation pending before Congress.

More than one newspaper outside the South has attributed the lack of violence in the March on Washington largely to the 1-day ban on liquor sales and the presence of thousands of police officers and Federal troops, ready to deal firmly with any manifestation of lawlessness.

The influential Cincinnati Enquirer, which editorially condemned the big march even before it occurred, disputed President Kennedy's claim that such tactics are "in the great tradition of America."

"What tradition?" the Enquirer demanded. "Certainly not of representative democracy. It tends more to the principle of mobocracy. There would be no great march on Washington unless there was an intent to intimidate Congress by personal presence or sheer weight of numbers."

Poll Shows Overwhelming Public Support for Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as the Senate approaches the debate on ratification of the test ban treaty it is reassuring to know that there is wide public support for the treaty.

A recent poll in my own State of Minnesota shows overwhelming support.

The poll indicates that 78 percent of those questioned believe that the treaty will strengthen world peace. Perhaps even more significant, 84 percent believe that the Senate should approve the treaty and only 7 percent believe that the Senate should reject it.

Thus, if the Senate in its wisdom determines that the treaty should be ratified, it will find that its action has wide acceptance among the people of Minnesota.

The full statement on the result of the poll is as follows:

EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT OF MINNESOTA ADULTS FAVOR SENATE BAN APPROVAL

Five out of six Minnesotans (84 percent) think the U.S. Senate should approve the nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and other countries, a just-completed statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll indicates.

Seventy-eight percent of the State's adults think the agreement to prohibit nuclear weapons tests in the air, underwater, or in outer space, will help to strengthen world peace.

But many Minnesotans do have one reservation about the test ban. Forty-three percent dislike the provision that permits a country to withdraw from the agreement on 3 months' notice.

Another 43 percent, though, approve of that clause.

The opinion of a St. Paul housewife that "Russia is sneaky and has some ulterior motive for signing the treaty" is shared by many Minnesotans in the survey.

During home interviews by the Minnesota poll, voting-age men and women living in all parts of the State were asked:

"The United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union have signed a treaty in which each country agrees not to test nuclear weapons in the air, under water, or in outer space. Do you think the test ban treaty will or will not strengthen world peace?"

The replies:

[Percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Treaty will strengthen world peace	78	77	78
Will not	14	17	12
Other answers	2	3	1
No opinion	6	3	9
Total	100	100	100

(The treaty permits continued underground testing of nuclear devices.)

Eighty-three percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites look for improvements in world peace prospects because of the treaty. So do 77 percent of the independent voters, and 70 percent of the Republicans.

People also were asked:

"In past years, Russia wouldn't accept the terms to stop nuclear testing that she does now. Why do you think Russia was willing to sign such a treaty at this time?"

The responses fall into these main groups:

	Percent
Russia is afraid of Red China, wants West on her side	28
Russia has ulterior motives, will use treaty to her own advantage in some way, can't be trusted	18
Russia thinks United States is ahead of her, is afraid United States has more weapons	15
Russia doesn't want war	12
Russia has done all the testing she needs to do	9
Other answers	11
Don't know	17
Total	110

The column adds to more than 100 percent because some people offered more than one explanation.

Another question was:

"Any of the countries signing the treaty—including the United States—can drop out of the treaty by giving 3 months' notice to the other signers. Do you like or dislike that provision?"

The answers:

[Percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Like 3-month clause	43	43	44
Dislike it	43	47	39
Other answers	1	1	(1)
No opinion	13	9	17
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

The final question was: "As far as the United States is concerned, the treaty must be approved by the U.S. Senate before it becomes formally effective. Do you think the Senate should approve the treaty, or reject it?"

The replies:

[Percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Think Senate—			
Should approve treaty	84	86	82
Should reject it	7	8	5
Other answers	(1)	(1)	1
No opinion	9	6	12
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

The treaty was recommended for adoption by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, and is expected to come up for Senate vote in early September.

The President and the National Democratic Party Have an Opportunity To Refute Young Democrat Radical-Left Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the criticism leveled at the platform adopted by the Young Republicans at their June 26–29 convention in San Francisco, I feel compelled to bring to the attention of this body the platform adopted yesterday by the California Federation of Young Democrats at their convention in San Diego.

Had I read the Young Democrat platform without knowing its sponsor, I would have believed it to be the work of the Communist Party, U.S.A. And with good reason. The Young Democrat platform calls for diplomatic recognition of Red China, conditional recognition of Communist East Germany, and normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with Communist Cuba.

The platform calls for withdrawal of our troops in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this platform is a blueprint for surrender to the Communists. The concessions and accommodations it proposes bring to mind the proposals made by President Kennedy in his speech at American University in which the President called for accommodations with the Soviets and more understanding of the Communists.

It is obvious that this platform is a result of a lack of understanding of the Communist movement and of the Communist's continual war against capitalism. It reflects the thinking of the lunatic left such as the ADA, of the liberal papers, and many leftist individuals in positions of power in our Government today.

The platform is a clear outgrowth of the ultraleftwing of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, the Young Democrat platform should be refuted by the President and the National Democratic Committee as not representative of the views of the National Democratic Party. Refusal of the National Democratic Party and the President to become disassociated with the Young Democrat platform will show the American people, clearly and undisputably, the vital issues that separate the two major parties in America today.

At this point, I am inserting in the RECORD a news report of the Young Democrat meeting which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post:

YOUNG DEMOCRATS FAVOR RECOGNIZING RED CHINA

(By Richard Bergholz)

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., September 8.—The California Federation of Young Democrats voted a far-reaching platform at its convention here this weekend which puts the party volunteers on record as favoring diplomatic recognition of Red China, conditional recognition of Communist East Germany, and normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with Fidel Castro's Cuba.

And they called for gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops in South Vietnam and a cutoff of financial aid to the Diem regime.

"This is a liberal, independent organization," said the federation's president, Josiah Beeman, of San Francisco, 27-year-old director of education for the Northern California-Nevada Council of Churches.

Shortly before the convention—an extension of an earlier session held in San Francisco last May—ended here today, Beeman led a fight to defeat a proposal that the Young Democrats consider sending a delegation of members to visit Cuba next summer, despite Kennedy administration opposition.

Principal purpose of the session was to enact a platform, a function which the May session failed to accomplish.

On Red China, the platform said: "To ignore and refuse to have meaningful relations with one-fourth of the human race is proving more harmful to us than to China. More than that, it blocks the solutions of many other problems facing the world, particularly in the Far East."

On Communist East Germany, the policy statement read: "In exchange for firm and unequivocal guarantees of free access routes from West Germany to Berlin—guarantees which we don't have now—we agree to recognize the existing status quo of two German states and the Oder-Neisse frontier."

Heated debate centered on a statement of policy regarding South Vietnam. As finally adopted—on a 1,527-to-1,460 rollcall vote—delegates approved a statement saying that presence of U.S. troops there "has been a deterrent" to needed reforms in the Diem government and should be withdrawn on a staged basis. And it adds that no more money should be provided Diem.

On Cuba, the platform says that the Castro revolution is "symptomatic of the unrest and impatience sweeping Latin America. * * * We must come to terms with this revolution of rising expectations."

"We call upon the United States to open talks with the Cuban Government directed toward a resumption of normal diplomatic and trade relations between the two countries and full payment for American property expropriated," the platform read.

Louisiana Department, the American Legion, Opposes the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have long been proud of the excellent work carried out by the Louisiana Department of the American Legion in its efforts to promote Americanism and constitutional government.

It is not surprising, therefore, that this great organization was among the first

to announce its position with regards to the Gesell report.

The Louisiana Department Executive Committee meeting of the American Legion, held in New Orleans on August 10, 1963, adopted a reoslution opposing the Gesell report and its implementation.

In line with the growing national awakening to the radical dangers of the Gesell report, I submit for the RECORD the resolution of the Louisiana Department, the American Legion:

RESOLUTION BY LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Whereas the President of the United States, through the Secretary of Defense has issued an order implementing the so-called Gesell report, which order is designed to compel the military forces of this country to force integration upon the citizens of this country and does inject the military forces into politics in the Government and on the local community level; and

Whereas the aforesaid order of the President through the Secretary of Defense commands every military commander within the United States to implement a program designed to compel private citizens of the United States to accept integration of the races; and

Whereas the aforesaid order implements a first step in the so-called Gesell report, which report, among other things, encourages Negroes to complain of alleged racial injustices and protects any such complainant with the cloak of secrecy; directs the appointment of Negro officers to promotion boards, the commendation and promotion of officers who aid and assist in compelling a forced integration; and encourages the military to expend taxpayer's money for the purpose of providing facilities and services to Negroes where any military commander feels that the local facilities and services are not sufficiently integrated; and

Whereas the aforesaid Gesell report recommends that military commanders impose economic sanctions upon private citizens and local communities in order to enforce integration in said local communities; and

Whereas the imposition of economic sanctions is a device used against the enemies of this country, and is here being imposed by the military upon the citizens of this country; and

Whereas the American Legion has historically supported the role of the military as the defender of the country against its enemies, but has always insisted that it be the protector of the citizens of the United States and not the oppressor of said citizens; and

Whereas the American Legion is dedicated to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses and to make right the master of might; and

Whereas the aforesaid order of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, together with the so-called Gesell report injects the military forces of this country into politics and casts it in the role of the oppressor of the rights of the private citizens of this country; and

Whereas the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Louisiana, finds that the order of the President through the Secretary of Defense and the so-called Gesell report is contrary to the basic concepts of American liberty and freedom, imposes military oppression upon the citizens of this country and constitutes an unconstitutional, illegal, and un-American exercise of Executive authority by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department Executive Committee of the Louisiana Department, the American Legion, go on record as urging the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense to cancel and withdraw the orders heretofore issued and made in compliance with the so-called Gesell report; and be it further

Resolved, That the so-called Gesell report be branded as un-American, violative of the rights of citizens of this country, and against the peace and dignity of the individual citizens of this Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Defense; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Louisiana Congressional Delegation and they be urged to take every step and action at their command to cause the withdrawal of the aforesaid orders and to vitiate the effect of the so-called Gesell report; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the National Commander of the American Legion and to each member of the national executive committee and to the national organization for action.

Now the Truth Is Finally Out: Red-Blooded American Fighting Men Prefer Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in this body of a district which contains more dairy farmers than any other New York State district and, according to some calculations at any rate, more dairy farmers than any other congressional district in the Nation, I am always pleased and proud to be able to report good news for the dairy industry and for our dairy farmers.

There has just come to my attention a report which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 2, which indicates the extent to which milk has become the favorite beverage of American fighting men.

At a time when those of us who are concerned with the future of the dairy industry are doing everything we can to increase the consumption of milk, rather than focusing our attention exclusively on restricting its production, this report comes as very welcome news, indeed, and I am most pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the report from the Washington Star:

NEW ARMY BATTLE CRY: "PLEASE PASS THE MILK"

American soldiers are a bunch of milksops, the Army proudly announced yesterday.

A national survey of soldiers' food preferences this year shows milk topping the list, according to a Pentagon announcement.

To be fair, though, it should be noted that beer was not on the list of 265 foods and drinks the GI's were asked to grade for preference.

Closely following milk were grilled steak, fresh fruit, apple pie, veal steak, eggs to order, fresh sliced tomatoes, southern fried chicken, roast beef, and hot roast beef sandwiches with gravy.

In the old days, Army cooks used to tell the men's feelings about the food by what was left on the trays after each meal. A mess sergeant could figure out, with one glance at the leftovers, what the unpopular foods were.

Now the Army is more scientific. It makes surveys, on what it chooses to call the "hedonic method."

"The word 'hedonic' emphasizes the pleasure aspects of eating," the Pentagon explains. "To insure that what is purchased is consumed—and consumed with pleasure—menus are tailored to the men's preferences within the limits imposed by cost, nutrition, and logistics."

The system, devised by a research psychologist, uses a 9-point rating scale for each food, ranging from "like extremely" to "dislike extremely."

Using the method, the Pentagon also reported the top 10 dislikes of Army chowhounds.

Leading the unpopularity poll was iced coffee, followed by spinach with cheese sauce. Next came the gourmet's delight, sour cream.

Instant coffee was next on the dislike list, followed by buttermilk, sweet and sour cabbage, cauliflower vegetable salad, baked liver, cabbage and cottage cheese, and, finally, buttered turnips.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to call the attention of the House to my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, authorizing the President to declare 1964 as See America Year. Mr. Robert Warren, director of the Department of Economic Development of the State of Nevada, has written expressing wholehearted support of such a year, both as a means of lessening of balance-of-payments deficit, and of encouraging Americans to learn of their country. Mr. Warren's letter is included at this point in my remarks:

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Carson City, Nev., September 6, 1963.

Representative AL ULLMAN,
Second District, Oregon, U.S. House of Depresentatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have long publicly advocated and vigorously supported all programs which would encourage travel of Americans within the United States. I believe all Americans would gain a much greater appreciation of and affection for our Nation if they could but see more of it.

I feel that your bill, if successful, would tend to focus attention on the desirability of touring within the confines of our own borders. And it may also help lessen some of the outflow of capital that annually follows the exodus of tourists from America to foreign lands.

I am sending copies of this letter to our Senators, ALAN BIBLE and HOWARD CANNON, and our Representative in Congress, WALTER BARING, so that they may be aware of this department's support of your joint resolution (H.J. Res. 658).

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT WARREN,
Director.

Labor Day 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Labor Day 1963, was observed in hundreds of cities and towns throughout the United States.

The younger members of organized labor are gradually taking over labor locals and fighting to retain and expand the progress and advance won through great setbacks and sacrifice by pioneer labor leaders.

The following is a Labor Day editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune:

THE MEANING OF LABOR DAY

Labor Day is such a familiar fixture on the national calendar that it is somewhat surprising to realize it is one of our most recently acquired holidays.

True, the first Labor Day was observed in New York as far back as 1882, and by 1894 Congress had legalized the holiday, in the Territories and the District of Columbia. Yet only for the last 40 years have all States officially observed it.

Four decades is a short time in the life of a Nation, even one so young as the United States. But Labor Day is firmly established as a national habit.

Undoubtedly this is because the holiday has come to mark the end of summer in our minds, with schools starting up immediately afterward and families split up into their various pursuits.

It is the last holiday until Thanksgiving. It is always a long 3-day weekend just made for short trips or outings, or perhaps an opportunity to finish those chores around the house that have waited to be done all summer.

This is so much the case that many of us never think of the original reason for the day—that it was established as a recognition of and tribute to the American laboring man. But though we will call it Labor Day, it is no longer labor's day.

All considered, relatively few of us will be at labor's picnic and rally at the county fairgrounds Monday. Few cities have holiday parades any more. Yet at one time, Labor Day was a magnet drawing folks downtown to the park to listen to the band and speeches, and to shoot off the fireworks left over from July Fourth.

On one hand, it is regrettable that the American scene has changed so much, that we tend nowadays to retreat from each other into our immediate families, that Labor Day has become a private public holiday.

On the other hand, this change in Labor Day is a part of the penalty of success for the labor movement—and for America. With recognition of labor has come the loss of a certain militancy, a certain separateness from "other" Americans.

Labor Day is no longer labor's day alone. It belongs to all of us in America, for we all are laborers in the sense that the work we do contributes to the country's strength.

Perhaps the name Labor Day is, in 1963, almost a misnomer. The word "labor" is not quite broad enough to encompass the meaning the holiday has acquired.

It should have a name that tells the world just what free American has accomplished for the working man, what we have achieved in the way of the good things of life—not just material comforts but the basic freedoms so much of the world has never known.

The name for this day should show the world how we honor the working, doing, accomplishing man by casually taking a day from the routine, not by massing ranks of uniformed workers or high school cadets and parading them in front of our "maximum leaders."

Still, maybe we do not really need a new name for the holiday. We all know what Labor Day means.

Mrs. Ella T. Grasso, Secretary of State of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, we in Connecticut are extremely proud of our very able secretary of state, Mrs. Ella T. Grasso. A native of Connecticut and a graduate magna cum laude in economics and sociology from Mt. Holyoke College, Mrs. Grasso has developed a great career in politics. She has served in the Connecticut House of Representatives, was chairman of the Democratic State Platform Committee, Democratic National Committeewoman for several years, and since 1959 secretary of state.

In the Christian Science Monitor of September 3, 1963, there appeared a very fine article by the woman's editor of that newspaper, Jessie Ash Arndt, about Mrs. Grasso. I am very pleased to insert this article into the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article reads as follows:

POLITICS HER BUSINESS

(By Jessie Ash Arndt)

The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan organization, but there's nothing that says a league member who goes into politics and is elected can't continue to work for policies she supported in the league and which the league supports because it believes they are for the good of community, State, or Nation.

When Mrs. Ellen Tambussi Grasso, now serving her second 4-year term as secretary of state in Connecticut, was elected to the House of Representatives of the Connecticut General Assembly in 1953, she was "a minority member of a minority party." There had been an exodus of prominent Democrats, she said, but she went to the legislature with the Democratic platform under her arm and in possession of some good solid convictions in line with those of the League of Women Voters of which she was a member.

INTRODUCES BILLS

"What do we do now?" she asked, with the Democratic platform in mind. "You can introduce bills if you want to," a veteran in politics told her with a keen glint in his eye.

"I do want to," she said, "in fulfillment of my responsibility to carry through the platform on which I ran."

"What seems impossible in one session becomes a reality in the next as public opinion is aroused and communicates itself, she observed, during our interview.

One of her bills was designed to eliminate the county government, an old structure which had existed since colonial days. Another provided for reorganization of the municipal court system into a district court system. Both had League of Women Voters support. A third provided for an office of mental retardation to study and act on the problem through local and regional programs rather than place people in institutions and leave them there.

When these goals had been accomplished it seemed there might be no new worlds to conquer, but she found she was mistaken. Plenty more appeared.

SERVES IN ASSEMBLY

She served in the 1953 and 1955 sessions of the general assembly and in 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1962, served as chairman of the Democratic State Platform Committee—the first woman to hold such a post in Connecticut. At the Democratic National Convention in 1960 in Los Angeles, she was also a member of the platform drafting committee which prepared the platform for consideration of the resolutions committee.

Mrs. Grasso and her husband, Dr. Thomas A. Grasso, principal of the Center School in East Hartford, Conn., have both been active in the affairs of their community and State for many years. Doctor Grasso in addition to his work as an educator has served for some time on the State prison board.

Mrs. Grasso majored in economics and sociology at Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., and graduated magna cum laude in 1940. While working for her M.A. in these subjects, she served as a departmental assistant and laboratory instructor in statistics.

It was her active participation in the League of Women Voters that really led her into politics because she had been preaching good government and when it was proposed to her that she run for office, she decided she'd better practice what she preached. And she's intent on keeping voters aware of what's going on in the State government.

"It must be my League of Women Voters training," she said, "but if the voters and candidates of Connecticut aren't fully informed and constantly cognizant of dates and facts to remember it isn't for the lack of trying. We have slides and brochures (in English as contrasted with the legalese of the law), flyers, schools for moderators, for registrars, and town clerks, and so forth, in preparation for the important occasions involved.

"I am pleased we made some progress in improving our election laws. Of course, the mandatory party lever is still with us—it dies hard."

The Grassos have two children. Susane is a sophomore at the Chaffee School, and trying to decide between Brandeis and Barnard. She has just finished an exciting summer studying painting with Robert Brackman at Madison.

IN JUNIOR HIGH

"Jimmy, who was 1 year old when I went into my first primary," says his mother, "is pushing 13 as he remands me constantly. He is in junior high and gives top priority to tanks, the Civil War, and pushups.

"There is always time for important things," is the Connecticut secretary of state's answer to the question, How do you manage? But she admits the hours sometimes seem to run out mysteriously. "The advantages of a tolerant husband and indulgent children help put order into our chaos," she asserted.

"That they respect the myriad activities essential to political participation and even join in the fun makes light work of formidable tasks. It is nice to have young Jimmy pilot me through a picnic grove, go to a tea with Susane, and indulge in an evening of driving to an assignment with my husband.

"A zest for living makes possible a multitude of activities. Sometimes I look wistfully at the tangled garden and unread

books—but tomorrow always brings new challenges, new opportunities, and new adventures for all of us."

More Opposition to the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the best and most active chapters of the Navy League of the United States is the Greater New Orleans Council of that organization.

In the city of New Orleans, the Navy League, like the Navy itself, is a time-honored tradition.

Recently the Greater New Orleans Council of the Navy League addressed itself to one of the most serious issues currently facing the Armed Forces: the Gesell Report.

The New Orleans unit adopted a resolution strongly opposing the Gesell Report and the subsequent directive issued by the Secretary of Defense. Moreover, the council has sent its resolution to the national officers of the Navy League of the United States, urging that similar expressions of opposition be advanced.

I urge my colleagues to consider the following resolution:

RESOLUTION BY GREATER NEW ORLEANS COUNCIL OF THE NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas a document entitled "Equal Opportnuity in the Armed Forces" also referred to as the Gesell report has through the publication of several articles in the New Orleans press, come to the attention of members of the Greater New Orleans Council of the Navy League of the United States, and

Whereas the Greater New Orleans Council of the Navy League of the United States feels that the recommendations contained therein, if implemented, would prove detrimental to the armed services and desires to express this disapproval through its executive committee on the following points:

1. Such implementations would involve the Armed Forces in certain questions of civilian social mores;

2. It would involve the Armed Forces in the heretofore utterly foreign field of political issues;

3. It would, if certain provisions of the report were implemented, place promotional consideration on a basis completely apart from military combat training and combat efficiency;

4. At a time when there is a great deal of effort being expended to make the armed services sufficiently attractive to interest personnel in service careers, the implementation of this report would tend to alienate good feelings between the Armed Forces and the civilian population; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Greater New Orleans Council of the Navy League of the United States desires to bring the aforementioned sentiments against any implementation of the so-called Gesell report to the attention of the national executive committee of the Navy League of the United States in the hope that a major effort will be made to discourage any implementation of the recommendation of the Gesell report and to keep the Armed Forces in their rightful and prideful role in the defense of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Navy League of the United States is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the national officers, directors, and council presidents of the Navy League of the United States in the hope that similar expressions may be advanced to indicate the seriousness in which this situation is regarded.

What Citizens Are Saying About the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, reproduced below are more extracts from letters I have received from concerned Americans on the subject of the test ban treaty:

Mobile, Ala.: "If the test ban is agreed on—behind it in rapid succession will come a nonagression pact with Russia, disarmament, then comes the takeover by U.N. troops."

Providence, R.I.: "I do devoutly pray that the Senate will not ratify the treaty."

Orangebury, S.C.: "The passage of such a treaty can only bring us to disaster in the very near future."

Alton, Ill.: "I suggest we wait until Khrushchev abdicates Cuba, respects international law, and earns a little trust before we sign any peace pact on his terms."

Arcata, Calif.: "The idea of our once proud Nation crawling to the butcher of Budapest and begging for a treaty—which they know he will keep just as long as it serves him."

Missouri City, Tex.: "That treaty can only mean suicide for this country."

Rockford Ill.: "My whole family is against the test ban treaty. President Kennedy should make his letters to Khrushchev available to Congress."

Altadena, Calif.: "Khrushchev would have never wanted it, the treaty, if the advantage had not been to him."

Greenwood, Ind.: "The approval of the ban treaty with the Reds will be another sellout to the Russians. Another Potsdam and another Yalta."

Olympia, Wash.: "Repudiate this infamous document."

Pasadena, Calif.: "It is not in the best interest of our national defense. * * * We should have a supremacy of military power. * * * The Russians would not have agreed to the signing of the treaty had it not been to their advantage."

Seaton, Ill.: "The treaty, cleverly framed, is to Russia's advantage and aimed at destruction for the United States. A voter's protest is needed if for no other selfish reason than that of self-preservation."

Berkeley, Calif.: "That test ban treaty must be defeated."

Glendale, Calif.: "May God help guide our honorable Senators in a decision to reject this treaty. This will bear witness to the world that the free people of our beloved United States are still the voice of America."

Louisville, Ky.: "Our leaders seem determined to close their minds and their eyes to the disastrous mistakes of the past in dealing with the Red Hitlers."

Manhattan Beach, Calif.: "If the United States were getting something out of it, troops and missiles removed from Cuba; Berlin wall torn down, and it might show some good faith on Khrushchev's part. As it is we will only get deeper in the quicksands. It is all a great big farce. I can only pray that Congress will protect us from this snare."

Tacoma, Wash.: "I cannot understand the attitude of our administration and State Department, who are willing to do business with Khrushchev, and even the devil himself."

Torrance, Calif.: "The Communists are liars and murderers making agreements with them is the same as trying to coexist with the Mafia. The whole idea is worse than silly its traitorous."

Lynwood, Calif.: "The folks back home are thinking, in fact quite a few are angry, others claim a sellout and it sure begins to look funny when you try to assemble the pieces."

West Englewood, N.J.: "There is nothing in the test ban treaty which would protect the United States against secret preparations for sudden atmospheric tests by the Soviets in violation of the agreement. This is exactly what happened on the previous moratorium with Russia. * * * It is the opinion of the grassroots that this proposed test ban agreement is a method of neatly hamstringing the United States for political purposes."

Santa Rosa, Calif.: "I don't think that we should hamper our defense by a test ban treaty that we can only expect the Russians to honor as long as it is to their advantage."

Dallas, Tex.: "I pray to God you people won't let them throw away our arms."

Fair Oaks, Calif.: "The test ban treaty must be defeated."

Saugerties, N.Y.: "Why is the red butcher who vows to bury us so suddenly willing to sign a test ban treaty?"

Phoenix, Ariz.: "Sounds to me like Dictator Khrushchev wrote the whole treaty himself."

Exercises Commemorating 155th Birthday of Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech by the Hon. William M. Beard, judge advocate-in-chief, Sons of Confederate Veterans. The address was delivered on June 1, 1963, in Statuary Hall, the Capitol, Washington, D.C., in exercises commemorating the 155th birthday anniversary of Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America.

The entire program was sponsored by the District of Columbia Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy.

For inclusion following the address of Mr. Beard, I submit a biographical sketch of William M. Beard who, among other accomplishments, has served as a member of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission since 1961.

I also submit for inclusion a copy of the entire program held in Statuary Hall on June 1, 1963.

The material follows:

JEFFERSON DAVIS, AMERICAN PATRIOT AND PRESIDENT OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA (1861–65)

Jefferson Davis, American patriot and President of the Confederate States of America,

was born June 3, 1808, in a log cabin in Todd County, Ky. When he was 3 years old his family moved to Wilkinson County, Miss. He was educated in the Dominican School of St. Thomas Aquinas, Washington County, Ky., Transylvania University, Lexington, Ky., and at the U.S. Military Academy, from which he graduated in 1828.

Jefferson Davis served as a lieutenant of infantry in the U.S. Army in the wilds of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa. He participated in the Black Hawk War.

In 1845 he was elected to Congress, resigning however, at the outbreak of the Mexican War. He became colonel of the Mississippi Rifles and distinguished himself at the Battle of Buena Vista where he was severely wounded in the foot. He served as U.S. Senator from Mississippi from 1847 to 1851 and during the administration of President Franklin Pierce, 1853 to 1857, he was Secretary of War. He strengthened the Army, made reforms and introduced new weapons. He also had surveys made of the Far West for future railroad routes. In 1857 he was returned to the U.S. Senate from which he resigned in 1861, when his own State of Mississippi seceded from the Union, January 9, 1861.

In 1860 these United States constituted a Republic of Sovereign States. They did not constitute one state. Sovereign States could not rebel against each other, therefore secession was not rebellion, nor was the War Between the States a civil war.

Secession was an open question in 1861. No statute had ever defined, no executive had ever proclaimed, and no court had ever held it to be unconstitutional. The States had declared themselves to be free and independent.

In 1781 the Original Thirteen States entered into a "Confederation," one article of which read, "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States."

When the Revolutionary War ended, England and the United States signed a peace treaty, which opened with these words:

"His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia to be free, sovereign and independent States."

England made peace, not with the Confederation, but with 13 "independent" States.

Each State had its own statute defining and punishing treason against itself. No man could acquire American citizenship except by virtue of his citizenship of one of the States. The eminent domain of the soil remained in the State, and to it escheated the property of the intestate and heirless dead.

Was not this the sovereign that "had the right to command in the last resort?" Tucker had so taught in his commentaries on Blackstone—so had Francis Rawle, the eminent lawyer whom Washington had asked to be Attorney General of the United States.

When Thomas Jefferson was annexing Louisiana, the Massachusetts legislators were declaring against it as "forming a new Confederacy to which the States united by the former compact were not bound to adhere."

While new States were being admitted into the Union out of its territory, and the War of 1812 was being conducted, Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, was maintaining the right of secession in Congress; the Eastern States were threatening to exercise that right, and the Hartford Convention was promulgating the doctrine.

When Texas was annexed, and Jefferson Davis was in Congress advocating it, Massachusetts was declaring it unconstitutional and that any such "act or admission would have no binding obligation on its people."

Henry Cabot Lodge, in his life of Daniel Webster, writes:

"When the Constitution was adopted by the votes of States at Philadelphia and accepted by votes of States in popular conventions, it was safe to say there was not a man in the country, from Washington and Hamilton on the one side, to George Clinton and George Mason, on the other, who regarded the new system as anything but an experiment entered upon by the States, and from which each and every State had the right to peaceably withdraw—a right which was very likely to be exercised."

On November 9, 1860, Horace Greeley, the editor of the New York Tribune, then the leading Republican newspaper, said:

"If the cotton States shall decide that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a revolutionary one, but it exists nevertheless. We must ever resist the asserted right of any State to remain in the Union and nullify or defy the laws thereof; to withdraw from the Union is quite another matter."

This was precisely the creed of Jefferson Davis.

Again, on the 17th day of December, after the secession of South Carolina, the New York Tribune said:

"If the Declaration of Independence justified the secession from the British Empire of three millions of colonists in 1776, we do not see why it would not justify the secession of five millions of Southerners from the Federal Union in 1861. If we are mistaken on the point, why does not someone attempt to show wherein and why?"

And yet again, on the 23d of February, after Mr. Davis had been inaugurated as President at Montgomery, it said:

"We have repeatedly said, and we once more insist, that the great principle embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of American Independence, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, is sound and just, and that if the slave States, the cotton States, or the gulf States only choose to form an independent nation they have a clear moral right to do so."

The South remembering that on June 16, 1858, Lincoln had declared in Springfield, Ill., "I believe this Government cannot endure half slave and half free," realized that his election as President in 1860 meant the dissolution of the old Union.

On the 20th day of December 1860, the State convention called by the South Carolina Legislature, passed and ordinance which repealed the action taken in State consembly ratifying amendments to that Constitution of the United States had been ratified, together with all subsequent acts of assembly ratifying amendments to the Constitution, and formally pronounced the dissolution of the Union "subsisting between South Carolina and other States under the name of the United States of America."

The secession of South Carolina was followed by the secession of Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas.

At the Exchange Hotel in Montgomery, Ala., on February 18, 1861, William L. Yancy welcomed Jefferson Davis, who on February 9, 1861, had been unanimously elected President of the Confederate States of America, in these eloquent words: "The man and the hour have met. We may now hope that prosperity, honor, and victory await his admistration."

Three days before Jefferson Davis was inaugurated, the Confederate Congress had sent to Washington a peace commission consisting of Martin J. Crawford of Georgia, A. B. Roman of Louisiana, and John Forsyth of Alabama. W. H. Seward, Secretary of State for the United States, refused official recognition to the southern emissaries. However, through John A. Campbell, of Alabama, and Samuel Y. Nelson, of New York, Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, he had official intercourse with the Confederates and he constantly promised that Fort Sumter would be evacuated on April 10, 1861. While the Confederate Commissioners were being deceived by Seward, President Lincoln signed the order for sending a naval expedition consisting of the warships, *Powhatan, Pawnee, Pocohontas,* and *Harriet Lane,* the steam tugs, *Uncle Ben, Yankee,* and *Freeborn,* and the merchant steamer, *Baltic,* with 300 men and the necessary supplies to reinforce Fort Sumter.

On April 7, 1861, Judge Campbell asked Seward the meaning of Mr. Lincoln's action in sending the fleet to Fort Sumter. Seward replied, "Faith as to Sumter fully kept—wait and see."

At 3 a.m. Friday, April 12, 1861, two vessels of Capt. Gustavus Fox's expedition appeared in Charleston Harbor.

Gen. Pierre G. T. Beauregard in command of the Confederate military forces at Charleston was ordered by Confederate Secretary of the Navy, Walker, to make demand for the evacuation of Fort Sumter.

Major Anderson in command of the fort refused, and at 4:30 a.m., April 12, 1861, the Confederates opened fire on Fort Sumter. Major Anderson surrendered on April 13 and on April 14 he evacuated Fort Sumter.

On Monday April 15, President Lincoln issued a call for 75,000 volunteers "to cause the laws to be executed in the seven seceded States," where it was declared the laws were being "opposed and the execution thereof obstructed by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the power invested in the marshals." In these words, Abraham Lincoln gave the cause of the sovereign American States of the South, the aspect of rebellion before the world, and proclaimed the soldier of the Confederacy is a rebel.

The firing on Fort Sumter enabled Lincoln to put the responsibility of starting the war upon the South. Sumter enabled Seward to tell England that the South had brought on the war. The day after the fall of Sumter the war party in the North clamored for action. Where there had been 1 man in 10 willing to coerce the seceded States, there were thousands "eager to defend the flag."

When Lincoln on April 15 called for 75,000 men to deal with "combinations too powerful" to be suppressed by the courts, they flocked to their colors. The firing on Fort Sumter had not caused the secession of the upper Southern States. Lincoln's call for troops added Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee to the Confederacy.

When Maj. Thomas J. Jackson, then a professor at the VMI, learned of Lincoln's call for 75,000 troops to coerce the Southern States, he said, "I have longed to preserve the Union and would have been willing to sacrifice to that end. But now the North has chosen to inaugurate war against us, I am in favor of meeting her, by drawing the sword and throwing away the scabbard."

Gen. Robert E. Lee, in declining command of the Northern army, said "though opposed to secession and deprecating war" he could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States. In 1869, 4 years after the war, he said to Gen. Wade Hampton, "I could have taken no other course without dishonor, and if it were all to be gone over again I should act in precisely the same manner."

The real act of aggression was not the firing on Fort Sumter, but the assault made by the Lincoln Government in sending a hostile fleet to relieve it, after assurances had been given, that Fort Sumter would be evacuated. Lincoln had outwitted the statesmen of the South; He had made it appear that the South was the aggressor. John Nicolay, Lincoln's private secretary, describes

Lincoln's part as Mr. Lincoln's "carefully matured purpose to force rebellion to put itself flagrantly and fatally in the wrong by attacking Sumter." Again Nicolay, writing in 1861, repeated that Mr. Seward believed and argued, that the revolution through the South had spent its force and was on the wane; and that the evacuation of Fort Sumter, and manifestation of kindness and confidence to the Rebel and Border States, would restore * * * "allegiance and healthy political action without resort to war."

In a letter to Capt. Gustavus V. Fox, his emissary to Sumter, Mr. Lincoln said, "You and I both anticipated that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result."

President Jefferson Davis said, "That the war was, on the part of the U.S. Government, one of aggression and usurpation, and on the part of the South was for the defense of an inherent, unalienable right."

There was nothing unconstitutional or wrong in secession, and in the attempt of the Confederate States to establish their independence. The fall of the Confederacy was an example of might making right.

That Jefferson Davis, as President of the Confederate States of America made mistakes, no one will deny, but his achievements transcended all proportions of means and opportunities, that history will never cease to wonder at the magnitude and splendor of his accomplishments; 20 million people on one side, 9 million (and half of them slaves) on the other; a great Navy, arsenals, Armies, factories, railroads, boundless wealth and science, and an open world to draw upon, on the one side and a little more than a thin grey line of poorly armed, half-fed soldiery upon the other, tell the story of the unequal contest from 1861 to 1865. Blame Jefferson Davis for this or that, discount all that his critics say and then behold the mighty feat which created and for 4 years maintained a nation. When he assumed office, there was not a powder mill, not a ship, not a shipyard. Behold how armies were marshaled and armed, how a Navy, small indeed, but one that revolutionized the naval warfare of all nations and became the terror of the seas, was fashioned out of old hulks or picked up in foreign lands. See how a world in arms was held at bay by a devoted people and an incomparable soldiery, whom he held together with an iron will and hurled like a thunderbolt against their foes.

In his cabinet, he gathered the foremost civilians of the South, Toombs, Hunter, Benjamin, Bragg, Watts, Davis, Menninger, Trenholm, Walker, Randolph, Sedden, Breckenridge, Mallory and Reagan. These were good men and true regardful of every duty.

History can assemble no greater or nobler knighthood than the peerless leaders Jefferson Davis called upon to lead to the armies of the Confederacy. Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnston, Joseph E. Johnston, Stonewall Jackson, Nathan Bedford Forrest, Pierre G. T. Beauregard, Cooper, Braxton Bragg, Polk, Hardee, Ewell, D. H. Hill, A. P. Hill, Richard Taylor, Holmes, R. H. Alexander, Pemberton, Early, Kirby Smith, Longstreet, Hampton, S. D. Lee, A. R. Stewart, Buckner, Wheeler and Gordon.

On May 8, 1866, Jefferson Davis was indicted for treason and one of the counts in the indictment was cruelty to prisoners. No baser charge was ever made.

By act of the Confederate Congress and by general orders the same rations served to the Confederate soldiers were issued to the prisoners, though taken from a starving army and people. Brutal and base was the effort to stigmatize Jefferson Davis as a conspirator to maltreat prisoners.

With 50,000 more Federal prisoners in the South than there were Confederate prisoners in the North, 4,000 more Confederates than Federals died in prison. This is what Jefferson Davis tried to do for prisoners. First, he tried to get the prisoners exchanged by the cartel agreed on, but as soon as an excess of prisoners was in Federal hands, this was refused. Second, a delegation of the prisoners themselves was sent to Washington to represent the situation and the plea of humanity for exchange. Third, Vice President Stephens was sent to see President Lincoln, by President Davis, and to urge exchange in order "to restrict the calamities of war," but he was denied audience. Fourth, twice in January 1864 and in January 1865, President Davis proposed, through Commissioner Ould, that each side should send surgeons and allow money, food, clothing, and medicine to be sent to prisoners, but no answer came. Fifth, unable to get medicines in the Confederacy, offer was made to buy them from the United States for the sole use of Federal prisoners. No answer was made. Sixth, then offer was made to deliver the sick and wounded without any equivalent in exchange. There was no reply for months. Seventh, finally, and as soon as the United States would receive them, thousands of both sick and well were delivered without exchange.

The record leaves no doubt as to the responsibility for refusal to exchange. General Grant assumed it, saying in his letter of August 18, 1864, "It is hard on our men in southern prisons, not to exchange them, but it is humanity to those left in the ranks to fight our battles. If we commence a system of exchanges, which liberates all prisoners taken, we will have to fight on until the whole South is exterminated. If we hold those caught, they amount to no more than dead men. At this particular time, to release all rebel prisoners, North, would insure Sherman's defeat and would compromise our own safety here.

Capt. R. B. Winder and the priest confessor of Henry Wirz, keeper of Andersonville Prison, told of a visit of a secret emissary from a high Cabinet officer to offer to reprieve Henry Wirz if he would make a confession which would convict President Jefferson Davis of conspiring to murder prisoners. Wirz indignantly denied contact with President Davis.

Alexander H. Stephens declared that the effort to fix odium on President Davis, constituted "one of the boldest and baldest attempted outrages upon the truth of history, which has ever been essayed."

When General Lee congratulated his army on the victories of Richmond he said to them: "Your humanity to the wounded and the prisoners was the fit and crowning glory of your valor."

Every possible effort was made to implicate Jefferson Davis in the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.

May 2, 1865, President Andrew Johnson issued a proclamation which asserted that it appears from evidence in the Bureau of Military Justice that the atrocious murder of Abraham Lincoln and the attempted assassination of William H. Seward * * * were incited, concerted and procured by and between Jefferson Davis, late of Richmond, and Jacob Thompson, Clement C. Clay and others of the so-called Canadian Cabinet.

The charge against the persons accused in connection with the assassination of Abraham Lincoln read, "had maliciously, unlawfully and traitorously conspired with John H. Surratt, John Wilkes Booth, Jefferson Davis and other Confederate leaders to kill and murder President Lincoln, Vice President Johnson, Secretary of State Seward and Gen. U.S. Grant."

No evidence was ever adduced to prove this atrocious and dastardly allegation.

On May 14, 1867, Jefferson Davis was released on bond, of Horace Greeley, after having been confined as a political prisoner at Fortress Monroe, Old Point Comfort, Va., from May 22, 1865, until May 14, 1867. He was shackled with irons from May 23 until May 28, 1865. The conditions under which Jefferson Davis was imprisoned were unnecessarily harsh and unreasonable and reflected the hatred, the vindictiveness and the animosity of the Federal leaders for the President of the Confederate States of America.

In December of 1868, the U.S. Government entered a nolle prosequi after they realized that they could not convict Jefferson Davis of treason.

From 1878 to 1889, Jefferson Davis lived at Beauvoir and during these years he wrote, "Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government."

Jefferson Davis accepted the Presidency only because the South demanded a man of vision and force whom it could trust—would have no one else.

President Davis worked 15 hours a day throughout his term of office. With the exception of 3 days' recuperation at a farm near Richmond in the summer of 1861, he took no other vacation during the war. There was no cessation of the stupendous problems he had to face, he could walk in and out of crushing discords and maintain his spiritual integrity as President, torn between military and political needs.

It was impossible to concentrate the armies as much as he desired because each State was intent on protecting itself.

While he lacked ruthlessness, Davis possessed real military ability and had a remarkable insight into problems of strategy.

General Lee said, "Jefferson Davis was the best military adviser he ever had consulted."

Another misconception about Davis was his alleged coldness.

Many prominent men "loved him as they never loved another man on earth."

L. Q. C. Lamar declared, "I love and honor our Chief above all men."

Jefferson Davis was the kind of artistocrat the common man intuitively likes and trusts.

The North admitted his "power to stimulate a mood for high deeds."

He could never be swerved from the theme that conscience and moral law should govern all his political decisions.

A northerner declared in 1884, "his energy, sagacity, and indomitable will were all that kept the Confederacy going, without him the rebellion would crumble in pieces in a day."

"What my heart tells me is right, nothing can prevail upon me not to do," said President Davis.

Good sense was one of his outstanding characteristics and this evidenced itself in his judgment, his taste, and in rare acumen in political affairs.

Horace Greely wrote that "Davis' occasional arrogance revealed great commanding power."

The accusation that he meddled with his generals could not be sustained by the official records.

Davis was the victim of vituperative falsehoods by hostile editors and a few disappointed generals.

Prof. Kenneth Stampp, University of California, declared in 1955, "Those who contend that the South made a mistake by electing Jefferson Davis to the Presidency of the Confederacy have not yet come up with a man who would have done a better job in that difficult position."

In 1930 North Carolina's Robert Winston wrote, "undoubtedly Davis was fitted for the job—no one better—Rhett, Yancey, Cobb, Toombs—these were of small caliber; they could not have stood up against the world for 4 devastating years and taken the punishment.

Charles Francis Adams said, "No fatal mistakes either of administration or strategy

were made which can be fairly laid to his account. He did the best possible with the means at his command.

"To give up the struggle while there was a possibility of success would not only have been treasonous but would have ended the struggle without honor.

"It has seemed at times as if a gigantic conspiracy had been informed for the purpose of misrepresenting Davis so as to hide his true nature."

In 1924 Union veteran Gen. Morris Schaff stated before the Massachusetts Historical Society, "How Davis met this helpless, chaotic state of affairs is a matter of history and the wonder of the world."

"The armies he put in the field, the great odds they had to meet and the victories they won, the 4 years he held the South loyal to its cause amid the sorest trials, tell the story of his sagacity, energy, and inspiring indomitable will."

The War Between the States was not a rich man's war and a poor man's fight.

In 1863 Lieutenant Colonel Fremantle declared that "the natives [the poor farmers] were red hot in favor of fighting for their independence to the last."

When a Federal officer asked a ragged Confederate prisoner why he was fighting he answered with devastating simplicity, "Because y'all are down here."

John Warwick Daniel of Virginia said in 1890: "Had a man less sober minded and less strong than Davis been in his place, the Confederacy would not only have gone down in material ruin it would have been buried in disgrace."

When a southern soldier was wounded he was not given his discharge but was employed in small work he was competent to perform. The women cared for the slightly wounded.

Colonel Fremantle said of Jefferson Davis, "Nothing can exceed the charm of his manner, which is simple, easy and fascinating. His services as a statesman pointed him out as the only man who by his unselfish determination and administrative talent was able to control the popular will."

Jefferson Davis was great and noble as a statesman, as a man and as a patriot. He swayed Senators and led soldiers of the Union and he stood accused of treason in a court of justice. He saw victory sweep illustrious battlefields, and he became a captive. He ruled millions and he was put in chains. He created a nation; he followed its bier; he wrote its epitaph; and he died a disfranchised citizen; he conquered himself and he forgave his enemies, but he bent to none but God.

His career as Confederate President confirmed the opinion of Yancey. "The man and the hour have met.

"History, when the case is fully understood, will do justice to the men who have most suffered from hasty judgment and unjust censure."

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MR. BEARD

William M. Beard, a lawyer by profession and judge advocate in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans was born at Williamsport, Md. He was educated in Dickinson College, Ph. B, Pennsylvania State Unisity, M.A., and Rutgers University Law School L.L.B. He taught history in the high schools of Westfield and Newark, N.J., for 6 years. He has served Westfield, N.J., as recorder and mayor, and has been magistrate of the municipal court since 1949. From 1928 to 1940 he was president of the Westfield Trust Co., Westfield, N.J., and is presently a director of and counsel for the Suburban Trust Co. of Westfield. He is a director of and counsel for Middlesex Water Co. He has been attorney for the Borough of Fanwood since 1940 and attorney for Scotch Plains Board of Education since 1938.

Since his admission to the bar of New Jersey in 1921, Mr. Beard has practiced law continuously in Westfield.

He is a member of the American, New Jersey State, and Union County Bar Associations; the Princeton Club of New York City; The Maryland Society of New York, and New York Southern Society. He is a past president of the New Jersey Society, Sons of the American Revolution and a past president of the Maryland Society of New York. He is a member of the Phi Beta Kappa and Beta Theta Pi fraternities.

Mr. Beard is the judge advocate in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans and an honorary commander of the United Confederate Veterans. He is a past national commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans.

In July of 1961, Hon. Robert B. Meyner, then Governor of New Jersey, appointed Mr. Beard a member of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission. He is a member of the Maryland and Virginia Historical Societies.

Mr. Beard has delivered addresses in various cities in 20 States of the United States and Canada. He has resided continuously in Westfield, N.J., since 1913. In 1954 he served as parliamentarian at the 61st Annual Convention of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in Roanoke, Va., and also at their 62d Annual Convention in San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Beard's ancestors, direct and collateral, served in Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Alabama, and Mississippi regimentts C.S.A. Three died prisoners of war in Camp Douglas, Chicago.

PROGRAM: EXERCISES COMMEMORATING THE 155TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JEFFERSON DAVIS, PRESIDENT OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA

Invocation, Rev. Paul H. Groseclose, minister, Francis Asbury Methodist Church.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, led by Mrs. Benjamin Y. Martin, past president, District of Columbia division.

Salute to the Confederate flag, led by Mrs. Lena E. McDonald, past president, District of Columbia division.

Welcome, Division President Miss Rudd.

Greetings, by Mrs. Robert Bachman, ex president general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Presentation of distinguished guests.

Introduction of speaker by Mr. Edmund C. Gass, Assistant Executive Director, Civil War Centennial Commission.

Address, Judge Wiliam M. Beard, judge advocate in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans.

Placing of wreaths at the statue of Jefferson Davis.

United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Robert Hamilton Smith, president general, by Miss Alice Böhmer Rudd, president, District of Columbia division.

District of Columbia Division, by Miss Rosa Lee Busby, historian, District of Columbia division.

Jefferson Davis Chapter No. 1650, Mrs. George M. Stackhouse, chapter president, by Mrs. Frank A. Hornaday, president, Stonewall Jackson Chapter, and Mrs. L. C. Cassidy, registrar, District of Columbia division.

Children of the Confederacy, by Mr. Morgan Morgan and Miss Cora Colbert.

Benediction, Reverend Groseclose.

Pages: Miss Cora Colbert and Mr. Morgan Morgan.

On What Basis Can President Kennedy Trust the Soviet Representative, Gromkyo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the White House has announced that President Kennedy will meet with Andrei Gromyko to discuss the easing of tensions. Remembering that this is the same Gromyko who calmly lied to the President about the presence of Russian troops in Cuba, a lie which the President himself exposed within a week, on what basis can he now be trusted?

Is it not about time President Kennedy and the advisers who seem so anxious to please the Soviet Union put the self-interest of the United States first and demand some deeds rather than more words from the Communists before entering into any new agreements? The American people should be made aware of how dangerous the President's flirtation with the Red leaders is to the security of the United States and the peace of the world. Most everyone except the President and the policymakers in the White House and State Department are concerned about our frantic efforts to make some kind of deal with Khrushchev, but the fears of the American people seem to be of no consequence to the Chief Executive as he plunges recklessly ahead in helping Khrushchev save face, finance Communist-controlled nations such as Yugoslavia, protect Red dictators such as Castro, and pushes his programs by which the United States is unilaterally disarming while the Russians increase their military strength and power in the world.

We may not have too much time left as a free nation if we do not soon demand a responsible foreign policy from the Kennedy administration.

Dr. Robert Morris, in his column "Around the World" reminds us of Gromyko's duplicity, and Communist advances which President Kennedy chooses to ignore. Dr. Morris' column follows:

WILL A NONAGGRESSION PACT BE NEXT?

(By Robert Morris)

While the Senate will be debating the test ban treaty, the diplomatic scene will be shifting toward the President's talk with Andrei Gromyko on the easing of tensions between East and West. It will be recalled that it was Gromyko who lied directly to the President on the presence of offensive missiles in Cuba last year.

What will be involved in these talks will be the Soviet demand for a nonaggression pact following the test ban treaty. We have said that we will not enter such a pact but let us see what is involved.

A nonaggression pact between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would unilaterally and formally call off the cold war as far as the United States is concerned. (It would be

unilateral because the Soviets never acknowledge, as their own, Communist parties outside their borders.)

Such a pact would require all NATO countries to recognize the status quo of the Soviet conquest of the Iron Curtain countries involved. It would thus fly directly in the face of the Atlantic Charter and even the U.N. Charter which call for the self-determination of all peoples.

It would do much more. It would commit the United States and all NATO powers not to oppose communism within the Warsaw Pact countries.

The Warsaw Pact countries seem far off to many shortsighted people. But tomorrow they could very well include Castro's Cuba, Goulart's Brazil, Cheddi Jagan's Guiana, or Bosch's Dominican Republic. All the nation would have to do would be to join the pact.

Thereupon the present de facto detente with communism in the hemisphere would become de jure, at least in such countries as would join the Warsaw Pact. A new administration could not take a stand against established communism.

Castro then will have been formally and completely victorious. The Soviet conquest of Cuba, flying as it does in the face of the Monroe Doctrine and the long series of OAS treaties would be formally recognized.

That is what is involved in the Soviet demand. We are told that the United States opposes this. But we have been told other things before about these same issues, including Cuba.

The President said on September 13, 1962: "If Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force, or the threat of force against any nation of this Hemisphere * * * then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security, or that of its allies."

Cuba is, as a matter of fact, exporting communism all over the hemisphere, with complete impunity. Communist terrorists are destroying oil installations and kidnapping people in their beds in Venezuela. The Red Cubans are constructing 200 electronically equipped "fishing" trawlers that will be plying the Caribbean, the Florida straits, the Windward Passage, carrying saboteurs and agents wherever they wish.

Last month Castro's forces invaded Anguila Key in the Bahamas and forcibly seized 19 Cuban refugees. Not only did the British do nothing to stop the seizures but U.S. forces actually stood by and overheard and watched—for hours—this invasion and kidnapping. To make the point even more shameful, according to Carlos Todd's Cuban Information Service the British subsequently arrested, on the very same key five Cuban freedom fighters who have been sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined $140.

At the beginning of last year, the American people were told that the Russians would be out of Cuba by March 15 last. All reports tell of their presence in greater number there today.

These are just some of the reasons why many people cannot be sure that the talks between the President and Foreign Minister Gromyko will not lead to a nonaggression pact.

Some Are Willingly Seduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of September 6, points out the reason why big government and big spending continues to menace our freedoms—too many local leaders are ready and willing to accept Federal handouts:

SUBSIDY SEDUCTION

President Edwin P. Neilan of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States again attacked "seduction by subsidy." Federal employees are busy selling the idea of using governmental funds, he said. "In community after community pressure to provide Federal handouts is destroying initiative and raising the cost of local projects."

Texans can testify to occasional pressure from Federal employees. With their jobs dependent upon spending programs, some well-meaning workers fail to make the distinction between providing information about legitimate cooperation with real local needs and high-powered salesmanship leading to wasteful spending.

Equally to blame, however, are local leaders or individuals who reason: "Someone is going to get the money; we might as well get ours." As long as the seduced succumb, subsidy seducers will be busy.

Declaration Adopted by the Mass Rally in Commemoration of the Eighth Anniversary of Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, DAN FLOOD, participated in the ninth annual Freedom Day rally sponsored by the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League in Taiwan, China.

This outstanding anti-Communist organization has emerged as a leader of the efforts of the Asian people to hold back the pressures of communism and to restore decent government to those areas of Asia now dominated by Communist regimes.

At the eighth anniversary of Freedom Day, a declaration was adopted which I feel has added significance now in the light of recent developments, and is truly reflective of the views of the Asian leaders who realize the evil nature of communism. I insert this declaration into the RECORD at this point:

DECLARATION ADOPTED BY THE MASS RALLY IN COMMEMORATION OF THE EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM DAY

Largely due to the enthusiastic support given by the Chinese people at home and abroad and warm response on the part of the foreign countries in the past 8 years, what was once an occasion in commemoration of the regaining of freedom by over 22,000 anti-Communist Chinese and Korean POW's has now become a Freedom Day movement which has as its primary objective the worldwide struggle for freedom of the enslaved peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain. This coordinate action by peoples the world over explains a simple fact: love of freedom is an innate urge of mankind. It also provides a surest guarantee for the ultimate triumph of freedom over slavery.

This axiom is supported by concrete facts. During the past 8 years, peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and Asia have followed one after another in succession in their anti-Communist struggle for freedom. So violent has it become that it has shaken the Communist regimes. In the case of the Chinese mainland, this tendency has been more obvious. Failure in implementation by the puppet regime in Peiping of the so-called Three Red Flags has caused economic dislocation and social unrest, and acute food shortages have stirred up widespread resistance on the part of the people under its domination, with the result that the very security of the Communist regime is in the balance. Besides, thousands upon thousands of peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and Asia who are not willing to be enslaved have risked their lives through thick and thin and fled for freedom. This fact further proves that Communist tyranny has aroused deep resentment and indignation of the peoples under its yoke and that its total collapse is just a matter of time.

Taking stock of the whole world situation, we cannot but feel highly regretful that the free world has not yet taken a firm and positive stand against aggression by the Communist bloc of nations. Instead of extending effective and practical support to the anti-Communist struggle by the enslaved peoples shut behind the Iron Curtain, it has adopted some measures which are likely to dampen the ardor of peoples in captive nations in their struggle against communism largely because of a sense of complacency and appeasement prevailing among some of its members. On the other hand, the Communist bloc, apart from the adoption of the so-called new program of the CPSU at the 22d Congress last November for the intensification of its overall aggression against the free world, has created a tense situation at Berlin, stepped up its program to Sovietize Cuba and thwarted every effort for the Congo unification on the one hand and on the other, spared no effort in carrying out its united front tactics and armed subversive activities both in Laos and Vietnam of Asia, thereby further aggravating the situation in southeast Asia which has already been very critical.

As we see it, the only effective tactics to arrest and fight back the all-out Communist aggression is to counter infiltration with infiltration and subversion with subversion. Only by giving full support to the anti-Communist revolutions by the enslaved peoples can the control of the Communist regimes be shaken from within, thus disintegrating the rule which they impose upon the peoples under their domination. Based on this recognition, we take the liberty to make the following four suggestions for the reference of our compatriots both at home and abroad as well as all freedom-loving peoples the world over.

First, we have to mobilize the people of the whole country to give positive support to the anti-Communist revolution by our compatriots under the tyranny clutches of the Peiping regime, to unfold the struggle against the Communists for the return of food grains, land, homes, and freedom which they have deprived of the people under their control, to thoroughly carry out the "six freedoms" and "three assurances" enunciated by President Chiang Kai-shek and also his call for timely action in his New Year Day's message of this year, so as to deliver our compatriots on the mainland from the abyss of cold and hunger at an early date.

Secondly, we must promote solidarity of all free nations in Asia in their fight against communism and set up as soon as possible an Asian collective security organization both for self-salvation and in their common struggle to level down the Iron Curtain in that continent. As staunchly anti-Communist countries, the Republic of China, the

Republic of Korea, the Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of the Philippines should close ranks and take up the full responsibility of resisting aggression in Asia.

Thirdly, we have to call upon all democratic nations of the free world to step up their cooperation, to stand firm in the defense of Berlin; to tear down without further delay the wall that prevents the people of Eastern Europe from going to Berlin; to ensure independence, freedom and unification of Laos and the Congo; to give all-out support to South Vietnam in her resistance against Communist aggression and not to let a single inch of free territory be seized by the Communists.

Fourthly, we must unite the forces of the whole world; expand the scope of support to the movement by the enslaved peoples in their struggle for freedom; urge the United States and all democratic nations to put into effect the policy of liberation and to bring the anti-Communist struggle into the Iron Curtain Communist occupied area so as to destroy the Iron Curtains in Asia and Europe with the combined efforts of the anti-Communist forces on both sides of them.

Finally, we wish to point out that the bell of freedom has tolled; the flame of freedom has spread to every nook and corner behind the Iron Curtain. So long as the free peoples outside of the Iron Curtain can consolidate and struggle hard in the crusade to support the enslaved peoples in their fight for freedom, we are confident that the surging tide of freedom will in time break down the Iron Curtain and thereby deliver the peoples in captive nations from the tyrannical rule of communism.

St. Joseph Project Spurs Area Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial, entitled "St. Joseph Project Spurs Area Boom," which appeared in the Florida Times-Union, September 5:

ST. JOSEPH PROJECT SPURS AREA BOOM

Florida's planned program for expanding State-owned areas reserved and dedicated to recreational purposes is given major impetus by the cabinet's action in releasing a $450,000 fund to begin work on five suggested sites throughout the State.

The allocation will make possible acquisition of acreage on St. Joseph Peninsula in northwest Florida, in the Estero Bay region of southwest Forida, at the Reedy Creek Wildlife Management Area in central Florida, on the east coast, and in Dade County in south Florida.

The St. Joseph Peninsula project involves acquisition of 20 miles of beach front property now owned by the Federal Government. Addition of this site on the northern gulf coast to the State's outdoor recreational facilities once again focuses attention on that area of the State which in recent years has become the brightest spot in the whole bright picture of Florida's continuing development as the Nation's playground.

St. Joseph Peninsula lies only a short distance from the eastern terminus, at Panama City, of the 100-mile strip extending westward to Pensacola which has been aptly dubbed "the Miracle Strip."

A survey by the Florida Development Commission a year ago showed that more than 10 percent of the visitors entering the State during the preceding year were headed for resort centers along the Miracle Strip, including, in addition to the two large "anchor cities," the rapidly growing centers at Destin, Fort Walton Beach, and Pensacola Beach.

Because of its nearness and ready accessibility, the area has become a favored recreation center for visitors from the mid-south, particularly Alabama, which ranks first mong the States in number of residents visiting Florida.

The Miracle Strip's growth, spurred by bridges which opened the coastal highway route to through traffic, has been further stimulated by industrial development and major military installations in the area.

In its rapid development, that area of Florida has already reached a stage comparable to that of east and west coast resort centers of only a few years ago. It is not surprising that some Alabama legislators want to annex the area to their State, but it would be more surprising if Florida should countenance such a move. The St. Joseph peninsula project will be another significant contribution to the balanced development of an area of the State now well advanced on an industrial, commercial and recreational boom.

The Architect of the Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have been reading a good bit lately about the Architect of the Capitol. This is not surprising when considered in light of the responsibilities of the office and the recent expansion of the buildings at the Capitol. There does seem to be some misunderstanding, however, about the position of Architect, and about the Capitol itself. To set the record straight on some of these points, a brief explanation is in order.

The Architect of the Capitol is the official title given to the position created by law to oversee the Capitol Building. The title is not a job description any more than that of Secretary of State, who does not necessarily have to be a secretary. The law does not require that the Architect be an architect, and the present holder of the position happens to be an engineer. It would seem that this background better qualifies him for his duties than any other. The original design for the Capitol was not done by an architect or engineer, but by a doctor, Dr. William Thornton.

The Architect of the Capitol is appointed by the President, not the Congress, and the present Architect received his appointment from President Eisenhower.

The Architect of the Capitol has charge of the U.S. Capitol Building and its 135 acres of grounds. In addition, under the direction of the appropriate committees of the House and Senate, he is charged with the care of the three House Office Buildings, the two Senate Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court Building, the U.S. Court of Claims Building, the U.S. Botanic Garden, and the Capitol Power Plant. The latter supplies heat and air conditioning to all of the others, plus the Washington City Post Office and the Government Printing Office.

In addition to these duties, the Architect of the Capitol is charged with overseeing the planning and construction of additional buildings committed to him by the Congress from time to time. During the last few years these have included the new office buildings for the Senate and the House, and the East Extension to the Capitol.

The Architect of the Capitol also serves as a member of the Capital Police Board and the District of Columbia Zoning Commission.

The Architect of the Capitol, then, serves for the legislative and judicial branches of Government much the same function as does the General Services Administrator for the executive branch. By act of Congress in 1876 the title of Architect of the Capitol was created and permanent authority for the care of the Capitol established.

The Architect acts as administrator and overseer for the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the House Office Building Commission, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Speaker of the House, and the Vice President. In addition, of course, his activities are further controlled by the Appropriations Committees of both the Senate and the House.

We often hear about the high costs of construction or improvements at the Capitol. Unfortunately generalizations are often given, and the true picture of the problems never realized.

The Capitol itself, and the buildings surrounding it, must conform to the general architectual pattern long established. They must be built to endure centuries.

We need a proper perspective of the nature of the buildings and their setting on Capitol Hill. We are talking about the Capitol of the United States of America, the legislative hall of the greatest republic this earth has ever seen. The Capitol, with its additions and surroundings, serves the same Government which witnessed its beginning in 1793—but the Nation has changed. The Capitol was planned for a country with a population of some 3,929,214 people. Today it serves more than 189,712,000. The problems facing the Congress today are infinitely more complex than those at the birth of the Republic.

While the number of citizens has increased, so has the number of States, cities, counties, and also the number of Senators and Representatives. The Capitol has expanded to meet the needs of more space for committees, staff, and Members of Congress. The number of Senators has increased from 26 to 100, and the number of Representatives has increased from 65 to 435. The number of people per Member has greatly increased, since the Constitution invisioned approximately 30,000 people per

Member. Today my own Sixth District of Florida comprises some 800,000 people.

All of this means more facilities, more services, more machinery, to permit the Congress to operate. It is amazing to me that we have been able to adapt the old buildings so well. Except for the new East Extension, the newest part of the Capitol is over 100 years old, and still in use. The office building where my office is located is some 60 years old.

Electricity and the telephone and many other things were not known when the Capitol was being built. Yet all of the latest equipment has been added in the old building without defacing it in any way. New buildings have been added to meet the expanded needs of the Congress, but of course have not kept pace with that need.

The Capitol is the center of Government in Washington, and every tourist and visitor going through the Capitol has every reason to be proud of their building. It is the symbol of their Nation and their Republic. They want it preserved, not as a museum, but as a living example of democracy in action.

The Architect of the Capitol is responsible for the care and the improvement of these buildings, and it is easy to blame him for the expense. But improvements are necessary for the Congress to function.

I wonder how many people visiting the building realize the responsibilities of the Architect, and the faithful devotion to the duty of preserving the Capitol and its setting exhibited by the present Architect, George Stewart.

You have only to walk through the Capitol at any time to see what kind of job he is doing. The building is clean and efficiently maintained. Improvements are constantly being made. They go on day and sometimes even at night so as not to disturb the sitting Houses of Congress. Thousands of visitors troop through the building every day, additional hundreds work within its walls, two great deliberative assemblies carry out their legislative duties, and yet the building maintains its calm and proper decor.

Economy and efficiency are just as important in the U.S. Capitol as in any other office or branch of Government. Where costs can be cut, they should be cut. If something is unnecessary, it should be eliminated. But the Capitol and its grounds should be looked upon for what they really are—a monument to our form of Government and a symbol of our past and our hopes for the future. The measure of the success of George Stewart should be in his achievements in improving the Capitol and maintaining its traditions while bringing it into the mid-twentieth century, not in the question of whether or not the Architect should be an architect. I believe he has met the challenge set down by a long line of predecessors and that the Nation has benefited from his dedicated service to us all.

The $2 Billion Rathole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of this body in slicing over $500 million from the foreign aid authorization bill was met with a charge of irresponsibility by the President.

It is abundantly clear, however, that those Members who voted for the cut, both Democrats and Republicans alike, are far more aware of what is happening to our freedom dollars than is the President who, over my serious and vocal objections, concluded a $640 million loan to Brazil for the express purpose of aiding Brazil's trade with the Soviets. Brazil, incidentally, is one of only five Latin American nations still recognizing the Castro regime.

The U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, Lincoln, Gordon, in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Relations, made the unequivocal statement that Brazil's Government, student groups, and labor groups are heavily infiltrated with Communists.

That Marxists sit on President Goulart's Cabinet was admitted to me personally by the Brazilian Ambassador, Senor Campos. Goulart's press secretary is an admitted Communist.

The economic instability and chaos resulting from our foreign aid giveaways to Brazil is on the other side of this two-headed coin. For a discussion of this aspect of our foreign aid to Brazil, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an editorial that appeared in the September 7, 1963 issue of the Tampa Tribune, entitled "The $2 Billion Rathole":

THE $2 BILLION RATHOLE

Worshipers at the shrine of foreign aid who consider any hint of a cut in a Presidential request for funds sheer sacrilege might do well to consider the case of Brazil.

From all appearances, if anyone's desecrating the good intentions of the Alliance for Progress, it's not the Congressmen who propose to cut funds where they're being wasted but governments like Brazil's.

One of the current big political issues in Brazilian financial circles today is "rescheduling" of the nation's foreign debts. Cleanto de Paiva, Brazil's Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, cries the nation should take a tough attitude, which means that Brazil should demand another moratorium on its $2 billion debts to the United States, such as those granted in November 1960, and in May 1961. One of the major items involved is the wheat accord, through which Brazil buys U.S. surplus wheat at low cost. To U.S. debtors the terms seem almost too good to be true: Brazil pays for the wheat in its own cruzeiros, not dollars, and most of the cruzeiros are then lent back to Brazilian Government agencies at low interest, 40-year loans to finance development.

The purpose of foreign aid in general and the Alliance for Progress in particular is to help underdeveloped nations stabilize their economies. In Brazil, it seems to be having the opposite effect; every time Uncle Sam sends down a new handout, it sets off a new wave of inflation.

Take 1961, for example. Three weeks after President Kennedy announced the Alliance's first $100 million grant to Brazil, the cruzeiro was devalued from 100 to the dollar to 200.

Came 1962. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon announced a $270 million Brazilian aid program. The Brazilian Government promptly raised all civilian and military pay by 40 percent. The cruzeiro just as promptly fell to 400 to the dollar.

Came 1963. Foreign Aid Director David E. Bell in March agreed to send Brazil $400 million, most of it to help solve the nation's foreign exchange problem. President Joao Goulart promptly raised government and military pay another 70 percent. The cruzeiro was then officially pegged at 670 to the dollar—but the unofficial exchange rate slid to more than 1,000 per dollar.

And what has Brazil's Government done in accord with the Alliance for Progress premise that it will take its own measures for stabilization and to equalize the vast disparity between rich and poor?

Well, in some recent years the Government budget has been double its tax revenues. This year a primary goal was to hold the increase in cost of living, a prime concern to the poor, to only 25 percent. The latest report indicates it's already up 39 percent in Rio de Janeiro. The Government also announced salary increases for the year would be limited to 40 percent. As noted above, it's already increased its own pay levels 70 percent. And it agreed to limit its issuance of inflation-fraught new currency to 110 billion cruzeiros in 1963, but has already raised the ceiling to 145 billion, and apparently will keep on cranking the printing presses even after that figure is reached.

Were any private citizen of the United States so improvident while a debter, he would be hustled into court in involuntary bankruptcy proceedings and his affairs, including all his expenditures, put under the direct control of an officer of the court.

National sovereignty does not permit such treatment of debtor nations. Indeed, even those so profligate as Brazil are offended by even a suggestion that they be more prudent. Recent hints from the United States that Goulart's government might better manage its own affairs have been met by the shopworn threat that if the United States clamps down on aid, Brazil can always get it from the Communists.

All foreign aid is not, despite the contention of some unrelenting critics of the program, pouring money down a rathole. But those who deny that any ratholes exist at all had better take another look at Brazil. If that's not a $2 billion rathole, there's not a coffee bean in Sao Paulo.

Oceanography: Another Soviet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that there is no field of

endeavor more worthy of our national effort than is research and development of knowledge of the oceans. Since approximately three-quarters of the earth lies beneath the waters of our seas and, since a substantial part of plant life, animal life, and mineral resources lie within and below the ocean waters, it constitutes for man the remaining single great frontier. As important psychologically as the penetration of space is, I submit that it will not add one whit to the foodstuffs nor to the store of basic industrial or chemical materials that we will need for tomorrow's world.

There has been, it is to be admitted, a gradual awareness of the importance of oceanography and its related sciences. However, to this observer there is a greater sense of urgency than is at present exhibited. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this fundamental technological race we are not apt to receive the stimulus and warning that came with the Russian sputnik. The careful and gradually developed superiority of the Russians in the knowledge and control factors relative to the ocean, its storehouse of goods, its temperatures, currents, its topography, its effects upon weather and a thousand and one other aspects not yet imagined but of likely and equal importance will be a fact and a factor irreducible by any effort of ours if we delay increased effort overlong. The leadership in the world of the future could very well hinge much more upon the control and use of the resources of the oceans than in the accomplishments in space.

I bring this subject to the attention of our body, Mr. Speaker, because I am disturbed at the disparity between the effort of the United States and the efforts of the Soviets in this important field. May I review briefly for my colleagues some details of the U.S.S.R. program.

Soviet effort in oceanography is guided by the Oceonographic Commission and the Institute of Oceanology both under the Academy of Sciences in the U.S.S.R. Independent work is being done by several agencies under the auspices of Maritime Fishing and Oceanography. This latter includes not only special studies n the Arctic and Antarctic but also allows for coordination of scientific and research work on the vessels of the vast fishing fleet of the Soviets. Also the merchant marine fleet of the U.S.S.R. is now fully equipped for weather reports and collection of other data useful in the data gathering center.

In 1959 an important economic conference was held in Russia and a new 7-year program for economic development was launched. It is interesting to note that oceanography held a prominent part in the conference. In the past 4 years several of the programs recommended by the conference have been inaugurated and are operative. From the little that we know of Russia's operations these facts about her equipment and capabilities are interesting. During the period of the International Geophysical Year there were 70 ships flying 17 different flags engaged in this cooperative effort to obtain information useful to all. Fourteen of these vessels were from the Soviet and according to available reports these ships covered 270,000 miles of ocean and made observations at more than 2,500 stations on water surfaces of the world. This effort was approximately twice that reported for the United States, the second most active power in the joint undertaking.

Russia is now using many converted trawlers like the *Persey–2* refitted in 1949 and known to be equipped with laboratories to handle analysis concerned with hydrology, hydrochemistry, hydrobiology, physiology, ichthyology and photography. This ship carries a 15-man scientific team. There are numerous converted W-class submarines like the *Severyanka*. She is equipped with underwater television, photographic equipment, exit and entrance for skindivers, and facilities for storing and preserving specimen. Several industrial survey ships have been completely renovated for scientific use such as the *Mikhail Lomonosov* which accommodates 35–40 scientists and has 16 complete separate laboratories. There are at least four of these ranging up in size to the *Vityaz*, a converted cargo vessel with a capability of covering 18,600 miles in 66 days. This ship carries a crew of 137 including 73 scientists.

All of these latter are the older ships involved in this important study. Joining them in the dynamic and increasing effort for Russia are the new "floating laboratories" like the *Sergey Vavilov* and the *Petr Lebedev*, two of seven new mobile research centers launched in the last quarter of 1960 alone. Another of the newest known additions to the oceanographic fleet is the *Voyeykov*, displacing 3,600 gross tons and equipped with 38 separate laboratories.

The Soviet tanker fleet is also being pressed into service to augment the data collection process. These ships are required to collect weather data, take soundings over their routes, and make other reports of diverse nature along their assigned routes.

The amount and type of information obtainable from an operation the size of that now in action for the Soviets is obviously considerable. One could with some expectation of accuracy conclude that every Soviet ship in some way or other is required to further their concerted oceanographic effort. The Soviet Government has demonstrated its belief in this work by providing the manpower and the funds for the ships, the equipment and its operation. It has done one other important and essential thing. It has encouraged and supported the institutions of higher learning to develop men of talent and interest in this important field and although the output of qualified graduates is not known in the Western World, what we know about our own efforts in this field indicates an appalling gap.

The best conclusion regarding the U.S.S.R. effort to gain dominance over the technology of the seas is contained in this quote from a recent report of Senator MAGNUSON's Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Since 1955, the U.S.S.R. has displayed a large, modern research fleet second to none, has announced the construction of new research facilities, has operated its research fleet throughout the oceans of the world, and has organized a sizable manpower force to conduct oceanopgraphic research.

I suggest it is already late for America in this important matter. Remember when Britain ruled the waves, Britain led the world. Today one needs to rule not the waves but the other manifestations of the ocean, its wealth, its behavior, and its very nature. The nation which is first in this field will be first in the world of tomorrow regardless of who puts the first flag on the moon.

Mr. Speaker, I intend at a very early date to place in the RECORD some evidence of the effort we are making here in the United States. I hope the Members will find it interesting and instructive to compare this article on Russian performance with the indirectness of American activity.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the unfairness and the fallaciousness of the President's verbal lashing aimed at Republican House Members who supported reductions in the foreign aid authorization bill last month are being widely recognized throughout our country. It was quite interesting to note that both daily newspapers in Michigan's sixth district, the Lansing State Journal and the Flint Journal, included editorials criticising the President's bitter protest and hailing the reduction of foreign aid as in the best interest of our Nation. I include these editorials, dated August 27 and August 29 respectively, in the RECORD as an indication of the reaction on the part of many Americans to the foreign aid controversy, as follows:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Aug. 27, 1963]

THE FOREIGN AID CUT

Since 1947 when the Marshall plan set the pattern for the U.S. vast postwar foreign aid program, Democratic and Republican Presidents have insisted that substantial reductions in their requests for funds would have grave consequences for this country and the defense of freedom.

An obviously bitter President Kennedy responded in a similar vein last week to the action of the House of Representatives in approving a Republican-sponsored cut of $585 million in his foreign aid program.

Using some of his bluntest language ever on a congressional issue, Kennedy said the cut represented "a shocking and thoughtless attack" by Republicans on a crucial program.

The President also denounced as "irresponsible and dangerously partisan", the action in which 66 Members of Kennedy's own party joined 156 Republicans in approving the slashes by a vote of 222 to 188.

Kennedy had voluntarily trimmed his original $4.9 billion request to $4.5 billion after a commission headed by former Gen. Lucius D. Clay suggested reductions. In

committee action, the House had reduced it to $4.1 billion.

The cut approved by the House Friday in the authorization bill left the finally approved total at slightly more than $3.5 billion for the current year, as compared with $3.9 billion currently available.

Kennedy said the reduction represented an attack on the foreign policies the Government has been pursuing for years and that it plays into the hands of the Communists.

The House action doubtless was an attack on the lavish foreign aid spending policies the Government has been pursuing for years but it would seem unlikely that the difference between the $3.5 billion approved by the House and the $3.9 billion current program would produce any advantage for the Communists.

While the President has attacked the reduction as thoughtless action, those who voted for it doubtless were doing some serious thinking about the interests of the taxpayers who have to provide the billions that the Government distributes to other countries each year.

Many of the Congressmen also may have been thinking of the foreign aid reduction in the light of Kennedy's proposal for a $10.8 billion net tax reduction and may have been acting in line with the principle that mounting deficits and increases in the national debt are not in the best interests of the Nation.

After all, $3.5 billion is an impressive sum from the standpoint of the taxpayers, however it may appear to foreign aid enthusiasts. If limited to proper purposes under a carefully administered program it should be adequate.

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Aug. 29, 1963]

"POLITICAL" LABEL INACCURATE ON FOREIGN AID SQUABBLE

It was inevitable that foreign aid would be a bone of contention during this session of Congress.

Assaults on foreign aid spending have become annual occurrences on Capitol Hill. But foes of the program went into the battle with their hands strengthened this year. That their opposition would be more strenuous was apparent as early as March when a special Presidential advisory committee headed by retired Gen. Lucius D. Clay expressed the opinion that tighter administration of the program could have at least a half billion dollars a year.

In an attempt to take some of the steam out of the opposition, President Kennedy quickly cut his own foreign aid budget request from $4.9 billion to $4.5 billion.

This didn't satisfy the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Early this month it whittled the amount to about $4.1 billion.

That brought cries of protest from the administration. Such a cut would endanger the security of the free world, it insisted.

But last week the House made a further cut, this time to around $3.5 billion, slightly under the amount appropriated by Congress last year for foreign aid.

Such a cut was justified, House spokesmen said, because the program included items which were extraneous to free world security.

The President didn't agree. In fact, he protested rather vigorously.

His angry retort was aimed specifically at what he called "thoughtless partisanship by the Republican leadership." He accused the GOP of turning its back to the needs of our national security.

Now we don't pretent to pose as experts in foreign aid. We aren't qualified to argue the relative merits of a $4.5 billion, a $4.1 billion, or a $3.5 billion program.

We do believe foreign aid is a key weapon in the defense of freedom. We don't agree with those who point to hard-to-eradicate evidences of waste, mismanagement and confusion in the program as reasons for junking the foreign aid effort. We always have contended that the overall accomplishments of the program have far outweighed its shortcomings.

Beyond that we would hesitate to argue the issue. For as the National Observer stated this week: "Foreign aid has been so vast, so sprawling, and so interminable that almost anything said about it is both true and untrue."

But we don't believe one has to be an authority on foreign aid to recognize the fallacy in the President's labeling of House action a reckless, irresponsible Republican attack.

Opposition to foreign aid has been growing in both parties. Even some Congressmen who favor the program have been questioning its continued expansion. They have expressed the sound theory that foreign aid should be considered in the light of our overall economic stability, that fiscal responsibility also is important in waging the war of ideologies.

Last year when the Senate passed the foreign aid authorization bill by a 56–27 vote, there were more Democrats (18) than Republicans voting against it. And last week in the House, 66 Democrats voted for the proposed cut to $3.5 billion.

We don't recall the President's chastising those members of his own party who oppose foreign aid in its entirety or those who pushed for a reduction in program funds. Does he not find them irresponsible and oblivious of our national security, too?

Perhaps what really rankles Mr. Kennedy is the realization that there is a sufficient Democratic majority in the House to pass any legislation he might request and that the lack of unanimity in his party's ranks is a reflection on his leadership.

Anyway, he is employing a double standard in his criticism of the House. To him, a Republican vote is partisan, an identical Democratic vote is not.

Columnist David Lawrence relates a pertinent point made by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, following the President's tongue lashing.

CUNNINGHAM called attention to the fact that former Representative Walter Judd, Republican, of Minnesota, was for years the most articulate and persuasive spokesman for foreign aid in the House and had won over to his side many of his fellow Republicans.

"Then last year," CUNNINGHAM recalled, "Kennedy went up and purged him. On the very day we were debating the foreign aid bill and Judd was there arguing for it, Kennedy was in his district speaking against him. Judd wasn't here today, either. That was the nub of Kennedy's defeat."

Lawrence added: "The President's trouble is that sometimes he himself is too partisan—or, to put it another way, he isn't nonpartisan enough."

Words To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, entitled "Words to Remember," which appeared in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register, September 7, 1963.

WORDS TO REMEMBER

A distinguished citizen, who served his Nation heroically as a Navy pilot in World War I, when he won the Navy Cross and Distinguished Service Medal, and who later was Under Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, once warned: "Don't take off your overcoats every time the sun shines in Moscow."

These calculated words of caution from Robert A. Lovett were recalled during recent congressional testimony by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric. Mindful of new efforts that will be made in the wake of the nuclear test ban treaty to slash defense programs, Mr. Gilpatric took an immediate opportunity to warn, as have President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara, that the fundamental objectives of communism for world domination remain unchanged.

It is U.S. strength, ready for instant action in event of aggression, which has convinced the Soviet Union that a test ban treaty is in their interests. Free world determination to remain strong and ready will be essential also to thwart Communist designs in the years immediately ahead.

What the Soviet Union and Communist China want most is for the United States and our allies to be lulled into a false sense of security as a result of the test ban accord. Then, biding their time, one or the other of these determined powers would strike.

Peace and freedom will be safeguarded only if, as Mr. Lovett and Mr. Gilpatric put it, we keep fully prepared in days of apparent sunshine for sudden storms that could be devestating.

Commencement Address by Dr. L. Quincy Mumford at Belmont Abbey College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1963, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, made the commencement address at the 85th Commencement Exercises of Belmont Abbey College at Belmont, N.C.

Dr. Mumford is a distinguished native of North Carolina and is a graduate of Duke University, where he held his first library position.

Belmont Abbey College is located in my congressional district and is one of the finest senior institutions of higher education in North Carolina. We were honored when Dr. Mumford accepted the invitation to deliver the commencement address at Belmont Abbey.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading his inspiring remarks, and I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS DELIVERED BY L. QUINCY MUMFORD, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, AT BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE, BELMONT, N.C., JUNE 4, 1963

To say that I am pleased to be here is to commit the kind of commonplace that annually lulls thousands of commencement audiences into indifference and inattention. Yet I am pleased to be here, because when I am in North Carolina I am home again. I was born in the eastern part of the State and grew up there. I attended school in Grafton

and was graduated from Duke University; it was there that I held my first library position. It is therefore with a combination of State and campus nostalgia that I greet you upon this occasion.

To remark that it is singularly appropriate for the Librarian of Congress to address you and to participate in the commencement exercises of a Benedictine college is to begin with a statement which may not be self-evident, unless it is quickly elaborated. Yet it is especially appropriate that the Librarian of Congress should discuss with Benedictine teachers and their students such things as books, learning, and civilization. These are very large subjects; but they are, nevertheless, among the many and absorbing labors which we have in common. No librarian can reflect, as I have been doing in recent days, upon the 1,400 years of Benedictine life and labor without feeling inspiration and pride in what librarians and scholars have inherited from countless Benedictine monks, who, through many centuries, have devoted their lives not only to learning and teaching, but to acquiring, copying, and preserving—at times amid great calamities—the surviving but essential written records of antiquity and Christianity. Literate men everywhere have heard of the medieval librarian and scribe—more often than not a Benedictine monk—who, in Europe's darkest ages, kept what he could of learning and literacy from complete extinction at the hands of the Barbarians who were overrunning the ruins of Rome's once-great empire. These very Barbarians, of course, eventually became Christian Europeans (in large measure through the efforts of Benedictines). But until these invaders were ready to appreciate their classical and Christian legacy, it was in serious danger of being lost amid ignorance, anarchy, and violence. In that perilous interval between the fall of Rome and the creation of the Carolingian Empire with its new schools, Benedictine monasteries were the sanctuaries of many of the scholars and libraries that were to be found in western Europe. Moreover, we can here recall that when the Carolingian renaissance finally occurred and produced new schools and new learning, Benedictines were among the leaders and the teachers. No scholar or librarian can ever forget these facts or repay fully his debt to those early Benedictines. Perhaps the appreciation I express here today will in some small measure repay the debt of librarians to those who preserved so much of what has been passed on to the leading universities and libraries of our time.

Librarians like to remind each other and their fellow men that a great library is actually a kind of great university. And, conversely, a great university is to a considerable degree a great library. No one will deny that the two usually go together. The necessity of this alliance has certainly been understood by Benedictines. In fact, the history of Benedictine libraries illustrates in a striking way this complementary alliance between libraries and education. The early monasteries had both teachers and libraries and were renowned for both. Their libraries could be and were multiplied and enriched by monastic scribes who copied over and over again the great surviving writings, both sacred and secular, until manuscript copies of most of these essential works were at one time to be found in many parts of Europe. It has often been rightly said that the monastic scriptoria were the publishing houses of the Middle Ages.

In the history of libraries the place of the Benedictines is eminent, because of the outstanding collections they hold, or once held, in monasteries like Monte Cassino, and Bobbio in Italy; Canterbury, Durham, and Whitby in England; Fleury, Corbie, and Cluny in France; Montserrat, Valladolid, and Salamanca in Spain; Fulda, Melk, and Salzburg in the German-speaking lands. Today I, as a librarian, can note with interest that the present librarian of the great Vatican Library in Rome is Anselmo Maria Cardinal Albareda, a Benedictine well known to librarians and scholars as an author and bibliographer. But this is, of course, only the latest of many contributions which Benedictines have made to the Vatican Library.

What may be less familiar is the Benedictine contribution to some of the other great libraries of the world. Several of them have at one time or another received some of their present treasures from Benedictine monasteries. If my memory serves me correctly, a number of the great treasures of the Bibliothèque Nationale, the national library of France, came at one time from a Benedictine collection. I suspect that the same could be said of the British Museum of Great Britain and of a number of other great national and university libraries in the Western World. It is a well-known fact among bookmen that Yale University's copy of the Gutenberg Bible came to America in 1926 from the Benectine monastery of Melk in Austria.

But those of us concerned with the written record of the past must acknowledge that medieval monks did a great deal more than copy, collect, and preserve the writings of others; we know that they also wrote original works. They were the chroniclers of much of the history of medieval Europe. No one can study the early history of our language or the origins of Anglo-Saxon society and government without encountering Benedictines like the Venerable Bede and Matthew Paris.

I have reviewed what to some of you are familiar facts simply in order to recall and emphasize the value of the Benedictine legacy to a long succession of scholars and librarians in many lands. Those of the present are but the most recent heirs of an illustrious ancient tradition. So great is our debt that it is disquieting, indeed, to consider what knowledge and beauty we might have lost and never replaced had the Benedictines not carried out the several roles for which they are now celebrated. Had the Benedictines not served in certain periods as the transmitters of Christianity and learning, we might now be without a large and critical part of our inheritance as citizens of Western civilization. The many great libraries, archives, and museums of the world—especially of the West—would not have much of what they now cherish and regard as their greatest treasures. These institutions are quite obviously beneficiaries of the dedication, the discipline, the care and the labors of countless Benedictines through many centuries.

The Library of Congress, the national library of the United States, is every clearly among the beneficiaries of the general legacy which I have been describing. In addition, however, the Library of Congress has received an extraordinary treasure from the Order of St. Benedict. It is, the liber librorum, the first edition of the Book of Books, the "42 line Bible" of Johann Gutenberg. What is more, ours is very likely the finest surviving copy of the greatest book in the world. Such a statement requires some explanation. Gutenberg is believed to have printed about 200 copies of this edition of the Bible between the years 1450 and 1455. It is thought that about 165 copies were printed on paper and about 35 on vellum. Only something like 46 copies in all are known to have survived the last 500 years. Only 12 of these remaining 46 are on precious vellum. The Library of Congress copy is one of these 12 vellum copies, and probably the most perfect of all of them. We believe, therefore, that we have the finest copy of the greatest book of all time. This copy is proudly displayed by the Library of Congress and the Government of the United States on permanent exhibition in the Library's great hall for everyone to behold and admire. Some of you may have already seen it. If you have not you have a special obligation to yourselves to make the short pilgrimage from here to Washington to see this treasure.

No librarian having custody of a Gutenberg Bible can resist talking about his copy. I am no exception—especially here, in a Benedictine college, where we can all take pride in this particular book, because the Library of Congress copy came comparatively recently from a Benedictine monastery.

Our copy is called the St. Paul copy, because it came to us from St. Paul's Abbey in Austria. As far as anyone knows the story, this Bible, in the middle of the 18th century, was in the monastery of St. Blasius in Germany's Black Forest. When the French revolutionary armies came east of the Rhine in the 1790's, the monks at St. Blasius fled to safer lands and took their library and their precious Bible with them to the famous monastery of Einsiedeln in Switzerland. Later, because of the same conflict, they fled again with their Bible to the cloister of Mount Pyhrn in Upper Austria. In 1809 they moved again, this time to the Abbey of St. Paul in Carinthia, where they remained in peace throughout the 19th century. Early in this century their country fought and lost the First World War. Along with their country, their abbey was impoverished. Soon after the war, in the 1920's, the monks were forced to sell their precious Bible in order to survive and to begin anew their community. Later it was resold to the Library of Congress. When surrendering the Abbey's famous Bible on August 16, 1930, Dr. Herman Peissel, O.S.B., speaking for his monastery, explained quite eloquently, if sadly, that:

"In this memorable moment, we are thankfully looking back upon our dear ancestors and brethren, who were the true wardens of this treasure for centuries and centuries.

"In this moment we state in the face of all the world, that the alienation of the famous work was a need sale, brought about by the downfall of the financial state of our monastery after and in consequence of the great war.

"After this war the saying: 'All things must be changed into means of existence,' was the motto of the day in all Austrian families and religious fraternities."

He continued by expressing a special gratitude that the sacred treasure would not be an object of commerce but that it would instead be placed in the Library of Congress of the United States, where it would remain forever and be much more accessible to the public than it could be in his abbey. This fact, he confessed, relieved his sadness at parting with the treasure which his order had safeguarded for so many generations. He called attention to the larger significance of the transfer. He saw it as another act which "gloriously continues the mission which the mother Continent, Europe, has to fulfill toward the daughter continent America," as an act which enriches America's "European dowry" with a splendid supplement." He congratulated the United States with what he called a benediction: Ad multa saecula and God keep you. Dr. Herbert Putnam, then Librarian of Congress, received the book in Europe and brought it to this country on the ship *Leviathan*. The Congress of the United States had earlier appropriated the money for the purchase of the Bible and other valuable 15th century books, and President Hoover had signed the Appropriation Act. Thus, from a Benedictine Abbey to America in 1930 came this splendid symbol of Western culture.

But much as the Library of Congress has its extraordinary bequest from the Order of St. Benedict, so also have you graduates of Belmont Abbey College a legacy. Yours is

certainly no less real or valued because it is intangible and personal. Yours is intellectual, moral, and spiritual; in a real sense, it exists only in you, for it may not be seen by men except in your actions and in your character. You will leave here with the advantage of an education which is matured and enriched by 1,400 years of experience with life and learning. You should also leave here with some awareness that the lives of many Benedictines stand as a challenge to your courage, your charity, and your endurance in good works. Many men know the history of the Benedictines, and many will come to know that you are a product of that tradition. They will expect to see in you some evidence of this tradition. What will you show them? When I, for one, recall the adventures of men like St. Augustine and St. Boniface, I cannot but wonder how many of us in this century have the kind of moral and physical courage which led St. Augustine into the wilderness of England in A.D. 597 or St. Boniface into the forests of Germany in 716 to convert the northern tribes who were at that time the scourge of Europe. Can you honestly say that there is in our time no need for equal dedication and comparable works in behalf of humanity and civilization?

I am clearly not the one to dwell on the details of your Benedictine inheritance or on the obligations which it entails. There are others around me today who can and who have surely instructed you in such things. But it is apparent to me, as to many others outside the tradition, that you, as graduates of this abbey, begin your adult lives with an extraordinary endowment bequeathed to you by your teachers and their many predecessors.

Simply to complete more nearly an account of your inheritance, I must remind you that you are also heirs to two other and much newer traditions. One is the tradition of your country and its form of government. You have been told about this ever since you began your education in elementary school. Life, experience, and perhaps travel to other lands, may yet teach you something more about your country and its many blessings. Actually, there is little or nothing that I can profitably add today to what you have already heard on such an extensive subject.

But as a native of this State, I can appropriately say something about the second of these newer traditions, the southern tradition. This college—and most of you—are a part of this region and its tradition. Many of you will make your homes and careers in the South. You will certainly be required to know and to hold tightly to the best that the history of this region has to offer and to adapt it to the future, for you will see in your lifetime a new technology, economy, and a society very different from anything you or I can now imagine. The South may even lose its traditional identity, as most of our other regions have. It requires no special gifts on my part in order to foresee great changes; they are apparent to many observers more qualified than I, and many of the changes are already well advanced. If the inevitable changes do not make the South indistinguishable from the rest of the Nation, they will certainly bring about another "New South." I say another "New South," because historians and other observers of long-term developments have been speaking of a "New South" for at least 70 years. The term has become so overused that it cannot be said without definition. As I have used the term, I obviously do not mean what was meant two or three generations ago. I do not mean the South that I am likely to see, but the South that you and your children make. (Do not ever forget that when you are my age a new century will have opened before you; it is but a very few years away.) In speaking of the future of this region, I refer not only to southern industry and trade, in the traditional seats of such activity, namely, cities like Birmingham and New Orleans, but rather to the numerous centers of the new technology, the cities of "research and development" organizations or think factories. These are already a part of American and especially of southern life. Cities like Norfolk, Va.; Huntsville, Ala.; Houston, Tex.; Cape Canaveral, Fla.; and, in this State, the complex around Durham, Chapel Hill, and Raleigh are making the "New South" in which a large number of you, as college graduates, will work and live. This will mean that many of you, like young people all over this land, will leave the homes and small communities of your youth in order to go into the cities of the "New South"; some others of you will leave the South. Many of you will never again live where you grew up, whether it be in the North or the South. Some of these prospects may not be pleasant, but truth and pleasantness are often at cross purposes in the life of man. This is a painful lesson that you have learned or certainly will learn. Whatever else you may find in this new life, which I have been discussing, you will surely find excitement in all of the growth and change that will go on around you wherever you are.

But excitement is a questionable asset. A little on occasion may be good for us, but like most other stimulants, a little goes a long way. Very much of it is, on the contrary, a distraction from and an obstacle to the thought, reflection, and study that you, as liberally educated men, are supposed to enjoy for the rest of your lives. Your education is not now completed; it is scarcely begun; it is to persist for life. It will be continued informally, whether you wish it or not, by the press, radio, television, travel, friends, acquaintances, work, and especially by your own mistakes by adversity and even tragedy. These latter three or four teachers each can educate a man to maturity more effectively and quickly than any others. But you, by virtue of the formal education you have had here, are obliged to continue deliberately to educate yourselves by learning from the experience, knowledge, and ideas of other men, past as well as present. This is still best done by intelligent and extensive reading. You can always turn to the nearest library for reading matter of all kinds. If your local library does not have what you need, you may ask that it be borrowed for you, on an interlibrary loan, from another library. The libraries of this land are nearly all part of a great network which permits one library to borrow for its readers books available in other libraries, including—when necessary—the Library of Congress. (It is surprising how few people know of this network. I assure you, for the Library of Congress and for librarians everywhere, that we are eager to assist you in this continuing education. You will have little or no real excuse to keep you from learning by reading. From now on, however, you will not have the coercion of class assignments and grades, and you will not have the shared enthusiasm with fellow students to encourage you to read. Yet, if you do not read—even though you are soon to be graduates—you will inevitably retrogress intellectually, thus cheating your college, your community, and your country of their rightful expectations.

When I speak of reading, I do not mean the reading required by such professional careers as medicine, law, and business, but the reading you do outside these concerns. It is particularly reading in the great area of the humanities that will extend, deepen, enlarge, and fortify your own humanity. Literature, fine arts, history, religion, philosophy—these are the studies which, although they always can be debased to the agencies of enslavement, have, as human inquiry is now divided, the largest liberalizing potentiality. Literature and the fine arts place no restriction on ideas, save that they shall be so expressed that they shall be enjoyed in contemplation. Within their wide boundaries they encourage taste, that is, free preference of the best. History frees the mind from bondage to the present and unfolds the wide panorama of civilizations and man's experience in all ages. If you read in this manner, you will be better men and richer in some of the highest values man can enjoy on this earth. If you do not, you will be squandering the formal education which you have received here.

While speaking of books, reading, and libraries, may I point out that some of you might follow a venerable and renowned Benedictine example and consider as a career such fields as teaching, librarianship, and related occupations? The need of schools and libraries for bright young people, intent on service to their neighbors in all parts of the world, is never satisfied. Thank God that young people of every generation set out to make the world a better place. I sincerely hope that you have such intentions, for youth without a cause is a great disappointment. There is a familiar expression which says:

"A man who is not a radical before he is 25 has no heart; a man who is a radical after 25 has no brain."

There is some wisdom in that judgment, insofar as it recognized that youth must at least attempt to make some improvement in human life. The late E. E. Cummings, in a more serious context, has said:

"Better worlds are born, not made, and their birthdays are the birthdays of individuals. The significant birthday of an individual is not the day he is born. The significant birthday is the day he realizes he is responsible for the kind of person he will be and assumes conscious and planned direction of the process."

You graduates are now at just about that significant birthday. Those of you with this desire to serve your fellow men and to improve the conditions in which they live will, of course, think of the better known careers of law, medicine, ministry and, perhaps now, science. You are, to be sure, needed in these fields. But may I, as one concerned with books and libraries and the accumulated knowledge they contain, remind you of the equally ancient but now less familiar opportunity for service that you have as keeper of the human inheritance, when serving as a librarian or archivist. What would we now know of ourselves, had not many librarians, archivists, and conservators of various other descriptions not faithfully served us by preserving a record of our past and our heritage?

I have, in the course of my remarks, spoken a great deal about tradition, inheritance, legacy, and the like. Such things are the business of educators like this faculty and of librarians like myself. These subjects seemed to be suited to this occasion in a number of ways which I hope I have already made clear.

I am impressed, as I indicated earlier, by the Benedictine bequest which you students share, in a way, with the Library of Congress. But I must, when speaking of legacies, caution you that life will not permit you to live on your inheritance, that you must regard it as a capital endowment to be husbanded, invested, to be developed and expanded, to be turned to your intellectual and spiritual profit and—what is much the greater obligation—to use it to the advantage of your fellow men. You have been taught that great wealth brings great responsibilities. You are now, because of the education and inheritance acquired here, much richer in things of the mind and spirit than the great mass of mankind. For that reason you also have greater responsibilities to this school, to your community, State, region, and country, and to this shrinking and crowded old world of which

you are an important new part. Use well your inheritance to meet your obligations, and you will leave the world a better place than you found it.

Small Cloud on the Horizon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, some of us have been pointing out that we are moving very fast on the road to dictatorship in the United States. To remind America that it is possible to lose our freedoms is not popular and some of us have been charged with being extremists, or alarmists. However, the small cloud on the horizon, which grows darker and more menacing each day is now becoming apparent to many who are concerned with our free system of society.

The following editorial, "Thought Control," from the Dallas Morning News of September 5, reminds us of what is happening in just one area and how far Federal controls may go.

THOUGHT CONTROL

To a man, the heads of Washington's Government bureaus declare with fidelity that they believe in free enterprise—then come directives, orders, and regulations that make free enterprise impossible.

Consider the broadcasting industry. Radio and television find it hard to plan for the future, much less proceed with efficiency for the present.

The Federal Communications Commission's latest plan is to control and regulate the time which radio and TV stations devote to commercials.

The industry has its own code of good practice. Seventy percent of the TV stations in this country now follow that code, and an amazing gain of 43 percent in 2 years in radio stations subscribing is reported.

As a starting point, FCC is considering the idea of taking the commercial time standards set up voluntarily by broadcasters in their code and making them official regulations by the Government.

This, of course, is tantamount to a bureau in Washington telling a radio and TV station in Texas or Nebraska what is to be broadcast—and when. It is also tantamount to controlling the income those stations can make.

If the quantity, length and quality of commercials are to be directed and supervised out of Washington, the management of broadcasting stations has no way to plan for the future and no way to improve programing.

But most important to the listener: This is a long, long step toward governmental control of what is heard and seen on radio and TV.

Warns LeRoy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters:

"Federal control of broadcast advertising would destroy free enterprise in broadcasting and open a back door to future control of programing by the Government. And Government control is only a step away from thought control."

Broadcasting is not a public utility. Its advertising rates are not supervised by any governmental agency—and should never be, due to the free-press clause in the Constitution.

But if FCC tells broadcasters how many commercials they can put on the air, in effect that bureau will be setting rates because it will be regulating the income of stations.

FCC should stick to the original purposes of its establishment: regulation of the technical end of the business so as to provide an orderly system of broadcast signals throughout the country.

Are newspapers next?

If the American people are to be told—by official Government regulation—what advertising they can hear or see, won't they be told next what advertising they can read in newspapers, and how much?

If they can be told that, can't they be told what they are to read in the news columns and on the editorial pages?

Is this free enterprise? Is it even America?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

New York City Bar Association and Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, frequently Congress is petitioned by organizations claiming to speak for multitudes of persons who in fact do not know what is being said for them. The exchange of correspondence I will include in the RECORD is an excellent case in point.

Many Members of the House are properly concerned with the transmission of obscene mail to children. We want to stop it. We believe constitutional ways to do this can be found. We need the help of the lawyers of the country.

It is my hope that the following exchange is not typical of lawyers throughout the country, and for reasons I will discuss, I do not believe it represents the true opinion of the bar of the city of New York.

The Postal Operations Subcommittee addressed some questions in writing to a witness for the New York Bar Association. Note one of our questions and the reply:

Question. For the information of the committee, how many members comprise the Association of the Bar of the City of New York?

Answer. As of April 30, 1962, the association numbered 7,703 members.

There are 7,703 members of the Association of the Bar of New York City. Do you know how many worked originally on a report submitted to Congress in July, which presumed to speak for all 7,703 New York lawyers? Exactly two. Later this was enlarged to 6, and finally 15 members approved the committee's position against the efforts of Congress to enact effective legislation to prevent the flow of obscenity to the children of your constituents and mine.

And when we asked the Association of the Bar of the City of New York for their suggestions as to how we might stop this vile material, what do they reply? "Sorry, we are here to oppose, not to propose." I cannot imagine the bar of my State of Nebraska ever taking so uncooperative, unhelpful, and ridiculous position.

Now, what are we trying to do with H.R. 319? We are trying to let the individual decide whether or not he wants to receive obscene mail from a sender. Under amendments I intend to propose, and about which I asked the Association of the Bar of New York, the permits of the offending mailer will not be revoked. But if an obscene mailer sends mail once, and is then instructed by a sender through the post office to take the objecting recipient off his list, and nevertheless sends obscene mail material to the same recipient, my amendments will provide for a criminal penalty.

In the final analysis, what is prurient to one individual may not be prurient to another. What is obscene to one is not to another. This is the difficulty: The courts properly protect freedom of speech. But it is not protection of freedom of speech to simultaneously destroy a man's privacy, and if I do not want a certain mailer to send me material because experience has shown it to be obscene, I ought to be able to prevent it.

There are 7,703 members of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York. I hope some of them will speak up and help us eliminate a terrible scourge, rather than permit a handful of lawyers to cloak obscenity with respectability.

The following are questions proposed to the Association of the Bar of New York City and the answers to the questions:

1. Question. For the information of the committee, how many members comprise the Association of the Bar of the City of New York?

Answer. As of April 30, 1962, the association numbered 7,703 members.

2. Question. How many members of the association are on the committee on the Bill of Rights?

Answer. As prescribed by paragraph 30 of article XIII of the bylaws of the association, the committee on the Bill of Rights consists of 18 members and a chairman. "On behalf of the association, it may oppose any measure pending * * * in the Congress of the United States * * * which in its judgment would violate or adversely affect rights guaranteed by the Bill of Rights."

3. Question. How many members of the committee on Bill of Rights worked on and approved the statement you are good enough to present to us?

Answer. At its March 1963 meeting a subcommittee of two (the undersigned) was appointed to study H.R. 319. The subcommittee submitted its draft report to the full committee at its May 23, 1963, meeting. On June 18, 1963, an enlarged subcommittee of six members revised the report. At its June 25, 1963, meeting the report was considered by the full committee, and approved with two dissents.

Thus 6 persons worked on the report; 15 members approved it (2 being opposed, 1 being absent, the chairman abstaining).

4. Question. Do you have any suggestions as to how the bill might be improved so that obscenity can be kept away from people who do not want their children to see it?

Answer. The committee has no suggestions for the improvement of the bill. As our report's conclusion indicated, we regard the measure as dangerous experimentation, regardless of its constitutionality. The committee appreciates and respects the desires of most decent persons to avoid contact with obscene matter, for themselves or their children, regardless of whether or not any significant impact on morals or on conduct may result.

But we firmly believe that it would be far more dangerous to our institutions, and to our civil liberties, to implement that concern and that desire with any measure so restrictive of freedom of expression as H.R. 319. The heart of H.R. 319, as we evaluate it, is its threat to publishers that they may lose their mailing privileges—vital to their operations—if individual recipients view their product with disgust or distaste. The intended effect is to breed in publishers a sense of caution born of that threat. The committee is opposed to such objectives. The threat of the criminal sanctions which may be imposed under existing local and Federal laws for distributing matter judicially determined to be obscene is, in our judgment, threat enough.

5. Question. You cite the dissent in the Milwaukee Social Democratic Publishing Co. case wherein the Supreme Court affirmed the right of the Postmaster General to revoke a second class permit where the publisher was stated to be involved in espionage activities. Am I correct that the majority opinion in the Milwaukee case is still the law of the land and was recently reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Manual Enterprises* v. *Day* as demonstrative of the Postmaster General's power under certain circumstances to deny use of the mails?

Answer. With regard to *U.S. ex rel Milwaukee Social Democratic Pub. Co.* v. *Burleson*, 255 U.S. 407, the committee believes that you are incorrect. As we analyze the more recent opinions and decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the present Court is predominantly of the view that the majority opinion in that case is no longer sustainable. Nor do we read in *Manual Enterprises* v. *Day*, 370 U.S. 478, any support for the holding of Burleson.

In Burleson, the Court held that, following an administrative determination in a hearing held on due notice to (and after participation by) the publisher, an order might constitutionally be made by the Postmaster General revoking the publisher's second-class mailing permit. (In contrast, H.R. 319 explicitly precludes a hearing.) The case involved alleged activities inimical to national interests in time of war. In Manual, however, the concurring opinions of both Mr. Justice Harlan (joined in by Mr. Justice Stewart) and Mr. Justice Brennan (joined in by Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Douglas) cast sharp doubt on the present validity of the Burleson holding. In footnote 2 of his opinion, Mr. Justice Harlan declined to consider the question, inviting its fuller briefing and argument. Mr. Justice Brennan, however, stated that "the Post Office order raises insistent questions about the validity of the whole procedure which gave rise to it. Among them [is] * * * whether Congress can close the mails to obscenity by any means other than prosecution of its sender." The opinion is alive with the sense that administrative censorship of obscenity is probably unconstitutional.

6. Question. We have recently enacted legislation pertaining to Communist propaganda. Suppose that we separated Communist propaganda and dealt only with obscenity in this legislation. How would you and your association feel about that?

Answer. Our answers to questions 4 and 5 indicate that this committee would oppose this bill with equal conviction even if it were limited to obscenity.

7. Question. Suppose in lieu of giving the Postmaster General the right to revoke a mail

permit when a mailer refused to abide by notice from a recipient that the recipient does not want the mail that he considers obscene, that we inserted a criminal penalty for repetition on the part of the mailer, what would you think of that?

Answer. The imposition of criminal penalties for violation of an order not to mail matter to an individual which that individual considers obscene would, in our judgment, be an unconstitutional infringement on freedom of speech and of the press, and would constitute a deprivation of liberty or property without due process of law.

Freedom of the press and of speech entitle one to express himself, and to communicate his expressions. The use of the mails as a means of communicating is surely a constitutionally protected form of expression, unless the mailed matter itself be previously judicially determined to be expression not protected by the first amendment. The personal determination of an individual, we believe, cannot constitutionally be substituted for the determination of a court.

The individual's obvious remedy, we suggest, is simply that he tear up and throw away the offensive matter; or that he report it to the appropriate authorities so that a criminal proceeding may be had to determine the obscenity vel non of the matter.

8. Question. Such a criminal penalty would afford a judicial hearing to any individual, would it not?

Answer. See our answer to question 7, above.

9. Question. How private do you feel a man's home is?

Answer. The committee believes in the privacy of the home. It also believes in freedom of speech and of the press. It believes that the mailing of offensive matter to a man's home does not sufficiently constitute an invasion of that privacy to permit an infringement of those freedoms.

10. Question. Isn't the right of privacy a constitutional right?

Answer. The right of privacy is not a right enumerated by the U.S. Constitution. Many of the rights specified in the Bill of Rights, however, appear to be aspects of individual privacy.

11. Question. We have laws against unlawful search and seizure. These protect the privacy of the individual. If a mailer of obscene matter continued to purvey his product and mails material determined to be obscene by the recipient, isn't this an unlawful intrusion upon the recipient's home, an invasion of privacy, akin to an unlawful search or seizure, a trespass?

Answer. Repeated expression of distasteful points of view, and their transmission by mail to an individual, no more constitute unlawful entry of that individual's home than does the repeated radio broadcast of those viewpoints. If the matter be offensive, the individual can tear up the mail, or shut off the radio. If the matter be obscene, present laws provide for criminal process to determine that fact and punish the offender. The home is of course protected against unlawful entry; but the mailbox is not, and should not be, closed against materials that may be objectionable to one recipient but not to others.

12. Question. Assuming that the bill contains penalties for repetitive mailing of obscene material rather than revocation of the mail permit, would we not then be letting each individual determine what is obscene or not as he sees it, and thus be protecting his privacy?

Answer. To permit each individual to determine for himself what ideas are not to be protected by the freedoms of speech and press would be to destroy utterly those freedoms. Freedom of speech implies a liability of the community to listen. That liability to listen is accompanied by a right to reject offensive ideas, but not a power to suppress them.

13. Question. Do you think that any different conditions apply to third-class mail than to second?

Answer. As far as its view of H.R. 319 is concerned, the committee sees no distinction between second- and third-class mail.

14. Question. I am also concerned about first-class mail which I think should be included because no one will be opening the mail except the recipient and there is no violation of any constitutional guarantee. In the last analysis as to second-class mail the publication has to have paid subscribers, and a subscriber to an obscene publication has a remedy; he can cancel his subscription. I think our legislation ought to have a provision that if the publication challenged as obscene by a subscriber is continued to be mailed to that subscriber nevertheless, that we should provide for it in the legislation perhaps by revocation of permit or some other means.

Answer. In the view which the committee takes (see answers Nos. 4, 7, and 11 above), the committee would be opposed to the legislation (a) if it dealt with first-class mail, and (b) if it dealt with subscribed mail matter.

15. Question. I am sure you agree that obscenity is a problem, and the committee would welcome any suggestions you may have to help us solve the problem which is before us. We would appreciate affirmative suggestions from the Association of the Bar of the City of New York rather than opposition without suggestion for remedy.

Answer. The committee recognizes the moral, social and psychological issues which can be posed by "appeals to prurient interest." The committee also recognizes the legal and constitutional problems raised by efforts to suppress such appeals. Under such circumstances, and mindful that the bylaws of the association do not authorize it to initiate legislative proposals, the committee has no affirmative suggestions for limiting or suppressing such appeals. The committee is of the opinion that H.R. 319, in almost any conceivable form, is unwise and unconstitutional legislation.

16. Question. Recently Supreme Court cases have said that the Government had the right to bar "prurient" material. In the last analysis if an individual determines something to be prurient so far as he is concerned, and so long as this affects no one but the recipient and the mailer, would not we be applying a reasonable test if the recipient had the right to tell the mailer not to mail anything to him except under penalty?

Answer. The test described in your question would not be reasonable, in our judgment, and would be unconstitutional if enforcible by Government action, for the reasons set forth in our report on H.R. 319. Any individual presently possesses the absolute right and privilege to destroy any offensive mailed matter. He further has the right and privilege to seek criminal prosecution of the sender if the matter is in fact obscene. He cannot constitutionally be empowered, we believe, to require Government action against the sender where the expression is protected by the first amendment.

Respectfully yours,

SHIRLEY FINGERHOOD,
ROBERT M. BLUM
(For the Committee on the Bill of Rights).

The Hall of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been pleased to read the news that the American Economic Foundation is going forward with its plans to build the Hall of Free Enterprise at the New York World's Fair. Costing $2.1 million, the Hall of Free Enterprise is supported entirely by voluntary contributions received from individuals and corporations throughout America. The foundation has its headquarters at 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

The Hall of Free Enterprise will be the first exhibit ever constructed which will dramatize the workings, benefits and blessings of the free enterprise system. Designed to tell the truth to all the world concerning the abundance produced in a free market economy, it challenges the nations of the world to provide another system which can compete with the free enterprise system in producing "The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number."

The Hall of Free Enterprise, sponsored by the American Economic Foundation with the support and cooperation of the National Small Business Association, has the following national organizations cooperating with it: Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Junior Achievement, Inc., National 4-H Clubs, Foundation for Economic Education, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, Christian Freedom Foundation, Wilkie Brothers Foundation, Canadian Economic Foundation, American Federation of Stockholders, Invest-in-America National Council, Inc., Independent Bar Association.

Mr. President, so that the Members of the Senate and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might know more about this great project being promoted by the American Economic Foundation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following news and editorial articles:

An article from the Bucyrus, Ohio, Telegraph-Forum of July 9, 1963, entitled "Three Former Presidents Back Free Enterprise Hall."

An editorial from the Marion, Ind., Chronicle of June 9, 1963, and entitled "World's Fair Building Will Promote Free Enterprise."

An editorial from the Quakertown, Pa., Free Press of July 30, 1963, and entitled "Pillars of Economic Wisdom."

An editorial from the New York Daily News of June 24, 1963, entitled "Make a Note of This."

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum, July 9, 1963]

THREE FORMER PRESIDENTS BACK FREE ENTERPRISE HALL

NEW YORK.—The Hall of Free Enterprise which will dramatize the benefits of the free enterprise system for the 70 million persons expected to visit the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, today won the moral support of the three living former Presidents of the United States.

In a rare endorsement, reaffirming their faith in the free market economy, the three former Chief Executives put their collective stamp of approval on this educational project of the American Economic Foundation.

In separate letters to Charles S. Payson, chairman of the Steering Committee of the Hall of Free Enterprise, Presidents Hoover, Truman and Eisenhower accepted honorary chairmanships of the project's International Advisory Council.

"This action by our three living former Presidents provides great impetus to an educational effort which will reach around the world," said Fred G. Clark, chairman, The American Economic Foundation, sponsor of the Hall of Free Enterprise.

[From the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle, June 9, 1963]

WORLD'S FAIR BUILDING WILL PROMOTE FREE ENTERPRISE

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Last month ground was broken on the site of next year's New York World's Fair for a unique building frankly designed to sell free enterprise.

It is a new idea—using a building at a major exposition for the purpose of going over to the offensive in the debate with creeping socialism. The estimated $2.1 million which it will cost to lease the land, erect the building, fill it with exhibits and staff it during the fair's 2-year life is being solicited frankly and openly from individuals and corporations who are sold on the advantage of a free market economy.

The building will stand in rebuttal to the expensive pavilions of socialist nations which can use their taxing power to create monuments to themselves.

Although the American Economic Foundation gave birth to the idea, persons from 40 States and 31 foreign countries will serve on its advisory council.

Among the 70 million persons who are expected to visit the fair during its 2 years it is estimated that 3.5 million will be foreigners. Some of these, it is hoped, will come away from the Hall of Free Enterprise with the realization that "people's capitalism" is different by a long shot from the grasping 19th-century system of exploitation and cartels that Marxists like to pretend all modern free enterprise resembles.

The theme of the exhibit will be the Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom. Here they are:

1. Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere, nor can it be free. Everything in our economic life has a source, a destination, and a cost that must be paid.

2. Government is never a source of goods. Everything produced is produced by the people, and everything that government gives to the people it must first take from the people.

3. The only valuable money that government has to spend is that money taxed or borrowed out of the people's earnings. When government decides to spend more money than it has thus received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air, through the banks, and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all money, savings, and insurance.

4. In our modern exchange economy, all payroll and employment come from customers, and the only worthwhile job security is customer security. If there are no customers there can be no payroll and no jobs.

5. Customer security can be achieved by the worker only when the "boss" is allowed by the workers to do the things that win and hold customers. Job security, therefore, is a partnership problem that can be solved only by a spirit of understanding and cooperation.

6. Because wages are the principal cost of everything, widespread wage increases, without corresponding increases in production, simply increase the cost of everybodys living.

7. The greatest good for the greatest number means, in its material sense, the greatest goods for the greatest number which, in turn, means the greatest productivity per worker.

8. All productivity is based on three factors: (1) natural resources, whose form, place, and condition are changed by the expenditure of (2) human energy (both muscular and mental), with the aid of (3) tools.

9. Tools are the only one of these three factors that man can increase, and tools come into being in a free society only when there is a reward for the temporary self-denial that people must practice in order to channel part of their earnings away from purchases that produce immediate comfort and pleasure, and into new tools of production. Proper payment for the use of tools is essential to their creation.

10. The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—is highest in a competitive society in which economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than in a State-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere and intelligent those people may be.

The basic truth that people cannot divide more than they produce unless they steal or extort from someone else needs to be repeated in this age of pie-in-the-sky government promises.

Further, people need to be reminded that the human animal labors not for love of it but only if enticed by the carrot or goaded by the stick. Where the carrot of profit is removed, then the stick of punishment for failure to produce must be applied or general starvation is swift.

Primitive communism, such as that which prevails in China, has resorted to the stick in the most inhuman degree since the feudal tax gatherers of the Middle Ages went forth to flay the peasants.

More mature forms of communism, such as that of Russia, while continuing to whip recalcitrant workers with the stick of compulsion, have tried to reintroduce the carrot by reserving special bonuses and benefits for the better producers. This is a complete retreat from the Marxist theory of "Form each according to his ability to each according to his need."

But even this halfway return to a system of individual rewards can't overcome the deadening snafu of centralized government planning.

In the face of these manifold failures of the Left it's time the forces of free enterprise stood up and crowed a little.

[From the Quakertown (Pa.) Free Press, July 30, 1963]

PILLARS OF ECONOMIC WISDOM

The great New York World's Fair of 1964–65 is expected to attract some 70 million visitors, with 3.5 million of them coming from foreign lands. And, certainly, one of the most unusual and significant of the exhibitions will be the Hall of Free Enterprise.

Its cost, about $2.1 million, is being financed by thousands of contributions from individuals and corporations. It is purely noncommercial and education. Its goal is to dramatically demonstrate the simple economic facts of life to millions of people who have either had instruction in basic economic principles or are victims of false propaganda.

The foundation is built upon "Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom." Perhaps the last of these will give a picture of what it stands for: "The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—is highest in a competitive society in which the economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than in a state-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere, and intelligent those people may be."

Freedom is the most precious of all possessions. That is the principle this great hall is to stand for.

[From the New York Daily News, June 24, 1963]

MAKE A NOTE OF THIS

The New York World's Fair 1964–65 opens April 22 of next year; and we would like to tip off all who plan to visit the fair on what promises to be one of the most interesting and valuable of all the exhibits.

It is the Hall of Free Enterprise. You will find it on the Avenue of Europe, opposite the Belgian and Vatican City exhibits, and it will be the largest building on International Plaza.

The purpose of the Hall of Free Enterprise will be to show the workings and philosophy of the U.S. profit-and-loss system in pictures and charts and by other visual means.

"The net result of a trip through the Hall of Free Enterprise," say its sponsors, "can be a clearer, better coordinated 'total' conception of economic life than is gained from a 4-year college course. And the 'take home' material provides permanent reinforcement."

The sponsors, incidentally, are a highly responsible group: American Economic Foundation, National Small Business Association, Freedoms Foundation, Junior Achievement, Foundation for Economic Education, Christian Freedom Foundation, Willkie Brothers Foundation, and Canadian Economic Foundation.

Better make a note now to visit the Hall of Free Enterprise, no matter what else you may have to pass up among the fair's numerous exhibits. It sounds like a must, with a capital M.

The CIA Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill H.J. Res. 211, that would establish a Joint Congressional Committee to serve as a "watchdog" over the activities of the CIA. Several Members of the House and Senate have offered similar legislation in regard to the need of this "watchdog" committee. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of the September 10, 1963, editorial from the Washington Post, that draws attention also to the need of new measures to be taken in regard to coordinating the efforts of the CIA:

THE CIA AGAIN

The United States has been understandably embarrassed by the disclosure that the CIA has been secretly aiding the South Viet-

nam Special Forces that conducted the raids on Buddhist pagodas. Yet this is, unfortunately, not the first time the Government has been made to look foolish by the misnamed Central Intelligence Agency. And the trouble is precisely that the CIA does not confine itself to gathering intelligence but has been given operational responsibility for tasks for which it has debatable competence.

One might have supposed that the Bay of Pigs debacle would have alerted the White House to the risks of allowing an intelligence agency to sit in judgment on its own operational missions. The temptation is strong to tailor intelligence to support preconceived opinion. Moreover, when the CIA invests its prestige in supporting a given course, there is an all-too-human tendency to seek vindication for a commitment of money and judgment.

This seems to lie behind the present muddle over CIA misadventures in Saigon. The agency's mission chief in that country had established close and cordial relations with Ngo Dinh Nhu, President Diem's brother and sponror of the Special Forces. Some $3 million a year was earmarked for helping the Special Forces. But reportedly the CIA had no advance warning that the Forces would invade the pagodas and the initial intelligence reaction was confused—contributing to the confusion in Washington over what transpired that fateful day.

Nevertheless, the payments evidently continued in the face of Government policy to the contrary, and the administration has been reduced to a stutter in trying to explain what has happened. Ironically, notwithstanding the CIA subsidy, the pro-Diem press in Saigon has been bitterly attacking the American agency for allegedly taking part in an attempted coup against the regime.

Let it be said that the CIA contains men of undoubted skill and patriotism. Let it also be said that much of the American problem in Saigon springs out of circumstances that not even the wisest of men could easily meet. But some self-inflicted wounds form part of the heartbreaking calamity. In the past, there has been a distressing tendency to subordinate political to military considerations and to avert the eyes from unpleasant realities. The CIA, while not alone in this failing, was unable to provide a detached intelligence corrective because its own agents were enmeshed in the operations of the regime.

There are many rueful lessons in the South Vietnamese tragedy, and not the least of them is that it makes sense in every respect to divorce intelligence from operations that belong in the military sphere. It would be heartening if the present embarrassment were turned to useful purpose by effecting a real reorganization of the CIA. The opportunity should have been grasped after the Cuban invasion; if nothing is done now, both the country and the agency may be needlessly humiliated again.

Need for Governors on Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently a former native of South Dakota wrote a letter to the editor which was printed in the Sunday, August 18, issue of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus Leader. The author, Dr. Adrian H. Scolten, presents some interesting viewpoints and I ask unanimous consent that his letter be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR GOVERNORS ON CARS

To the EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

America has not even begun to solve the problem of our unnecessary injuries and deaths caused by cars and trucks. Nobody need be injured or killed in traffic, but it happens on our roads and streets every hour of the day. Something more drastic must be done to stop this.

No adults, children or teenagers need be killed by cars, but nobody seems to care until it is his son or daughter, or other members of his own family.

Why do we license boys and girls not old enough to vote, and think their judgment is good enough to be trusted with the most deadly machine in the world—the automobile? Their records as drivers leave a long list of violent deaths and unnecessary permanent injuries, but we still praise them for their quick reaction times, and give them licenses to drive and kill. Parents could keep their children from becoming potential killers, but today's children are too uncontrolled.

Over 25 years ago, because my mother and several other members of my family had been injured in serious automobile traffic accidents, I gave up my private medical practice and became a full-time "life-saving expert." I then began preaching putting governors on cars, and saying daily the life-saving word "slow down and live," "slower driving means a lower death and injury rate," and "death begins at 40."

Today, though it is entirely unreasonable, speed has become the king of the highway, and editors and drivers seem to listen only to the National Safety Council. How the National Safety Council is financed, I do not know; but what it says and does so far has proven to be quite inadequate as far as saving lives and preventing injuries on our highways and streets is concerned.

We now should bring back the old slower and safer driving habit, and put governors on all cars and trucks if we really wish to save lives and prevent the injuries that are daily causing so much despair, misery, and distress in so many American homes. We are brainwashed by comparing one holiday's death toll with another, and led to believe the last year's total was necessary.

Today, I am still advocating that governors be put on all cars, and I still believe that 50 miles an hour is the upper speed limit of safety for all rubbertired automobiles; and that it is not possible to slow down all driving speeds to 50 without using governors. It is the only quick, safe, and foolproof way of doing that.

Because Americans do not now drive at safer and slower speeds, each year around 40,000 persons lose their lives, and many more than that number are crippled for life. Why don't we who drive slow down to 50 in the country and to 25 in all the settled areas? Where there is no vision the people perish.

ADRIAN H. SCOLTEN, M.D.

PORTLAND, MAINE.

Why the Far East Is Vitally Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Far East is one of our most troublesome and important spots at the present time.

Recently, Mr. Robert R. Gros, vice president of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., of San Francisco, traveled throughout that part of the world and made a report on the new Orient.

Mr. Gros is a very careful and authentic observer, since he has spent much of his mature life in touring the world and making reports on the various countries viewed from the standpoint of a businessman.

I think the following address entitled "Why the Far East Is Vitally Important" delivered to the Commonwealth Club of California on August 16, 1963, is of concern to all of us.

The address follows:

WHY THE FAR EAST IS VITALLY IMPORTANT

In today's world of complexity and perplexity it is increasingly hard to decide which of many crisis ridden spots would be the most productive to visit. Our world is full of fascinating faces and places. It's a problem to choose just where to invest one's vacation most profitably in terms of interesting personal experiences plus substantive opportunities for learning. But most Americans tend to look at the world as a vast aerial photograph, invariably focused most sharply on Europe.

The Far East is there in the picture, to be sure, but generally as a hazy secondary sort of romantic blur. I contend that the time is long since past for us to put on a telephoto lens and zoom in for a closeup on the Far East sector of our fascinating and troubled world. At least four logical reasons occur to me why we should do this.

First, that closeup would make us frighteningly aware that in the Far East they are fighting real wars, not just fending off cold wars. The wars being fought in the jungle paddies of Vietnam and in rough, landlocked Laos are desperately hot. In the Taiwan Straits where the ChiComs and the Nationalists are in direct confrontation the war is always alertly warm at the minimum. Occasionally it's hot, and always it is potentially explosive.

In Singapore and Sarawak it's a cold war, but is showing signs of warming because of the internal communistic threat. There and in Malaya and North Borneo, the components of the soon-to-be-born new nation of Malaysia, we get a good look at heady nationalism.

Third, make no mistake about it, the Orient is coming of age, politically and economically. The Far East holds immense potential for progress or catastrophe. Leading the economic race is viable, prosperous Japan which has gone Western with a vengeance. Both Tokyo's traffic and dazzling supply of consumer goods leave one dizzy. Western ways in this ancient Eastern land have gone so far in even dress for example that street crowds turn around to gawk at a kimono-clad girl. Tokyo has the bounciest and wildest night life in the world, boasting sort of an ersatz Las Vegas, featuring stage-show extravanganzas in varying stages of undress. More basic and more troublesome in the new Japan are the growing pains they are experiencing as they try to adapt to democracy, Japanese style.

Fourth, even from the standpoint of just pleasant tourism the exotic Far East is the place in my book. It's more foreign, if I may use the term, and certainly it eternally fascinates with its bazaars, its sounds, its smells, its color, its scenery, its hard working, philosophic, and kindly people. Apropos tourism, let me unabashedly plug right now about "my new discovery"—new to me that is, although many of you beat me to this pleasure years ago. That is the notion of traveling abroad one way by ship. I have flown nearly a million miles around this world of ours but this time decided for the first time to travel like a gentleman—by

sea, in order to unlax, ease the transition, and have opportunity to do the homework to prepare me to ask less stupid questions in the countries I visited. My 2 weeks aboard the American President Lines' *President Roosevelt* did all that and sold me on the worth whileness of an old concept to which I'm now a devotee—travel just as much by ship as your time will permit.

Still more basic importance

Now I suggest there are even more basic reasons why we had better face up to the impact and the tremendous potential of the Far East. In the first place, 60 percent of the world's population lives in the Far East. Even without India and the Asian portion of the U.S.S.R. that's three times the population of Europe.

Second, two-thirds of the world's 3 billion people have nonwhite skin and more than half those people live in Asia.

Third, the development potential of the Far East is tremendous. Japan has the world's fastest growing economy. And even the so-called backward nations are beginning to stir. And remember, they have immense riches and trade potential.

No. 4, the old adage that "the road to Paris leads through Peiping" could well prove true. The Far East is an area of turmoil, a fertile breeding ground for communism because of poverty and illiteracy in which improvement only recently has managed to get underway. And again I remind you that in the Far East they are already fighting hot wars of the type that thus far, thank God, have been successfully contained in Europe.

Number five, the Sino-Soviet split and rivalry inevitably will intensify the brashness of the ChiComs who are reckless enough to begin with.

For all these reasons and more, now let's highlight three areas which illustrate the cold was in its verying degrees—that is, warm, cold, and intensely hot. Each of these areas is worthy of a full speech unto itself—so of course this can be only a quick run through.

TAIWAN

First, let's close in on the warm war situation where the Nationalist Chinese face the ChiComs within spitting distance, there in the Taiwan Straits. Taiwan is a vital link in the free world's defensive arc which extends from the Aleutians down through Japan and Taiwan to Australia.

Taiwan is no desolate coral atoll as most Americans seem to think. Rather, it is a huge island 225 miles long by an average of 90 miles wide, with high mountain peaks and eternally green valleys of great fertility. For instance, their land yields two rice crops a year instead of the customary one crop elsewhere in most of the Orient. The population of 11½ million people makes Taiwan the second most densely populated country in the world.

Taiwan is extremely close to vast mainland China—only 90 miles in fact. Actually, at Ma-Shan, the farthest tip of Quemoy, I looked across only a mile of water at ChiCom fortifications. So it's not surprising that life on Taiwan presents something of a wartime posture. There is nothing hysterical about it—it is just a state of constant readiness.

The Nationalist Chinese have made amazing strides on Taiwan since my last visit 11 years ago—in terms of public works, health improvement, education, highways, and railroads. Theirs is a truly viable economy and Taiwan has become a showcase in the Orient. Finance Minister C. K. Yen told me that their gross national product had grown 100 percent in 10 years and was now gaining at the rate of 6 to 8 percent a year. Above all, on Taiwan the Nationalists are giving good government and have effected abundant land reform. What a pity that they did not—or perhaps could not—accomplish this on the mainland. The Nationalists run a frugal administration because 70 percent of the national budget goes for defense.

The Chinese Nationalists have 600,000 well-trained, well-equipped troops, including 15 crack combat divisions—constituting the strongest anti-Communist force in all of Asia. The charge is often made that Chiang's has become an old army. This is based on the fallacy that it is the same army that the Commies drove from the mainland way back in 1949 and has simply grown old in the ranks. This is a myth, however, because I found that the average age of the entire army is 30½ years and the average age of enlisted men is 20. More than 200,000 men, a third of the original army, have been retired and their ranks filled by promotions from within. The air force is startlingly superb and a number of American officers told me that man for man these Chinese pilots are as good as ours. They were American trained of course and fly American made jet fighters. The air force is vastly superior to that of the ChiComs as they proved the last time they really tangled and the Nationalists won out 16 to 1.

Admittedly, a large amount of the credit for both economic development and military readiness belongs to the United States because our aid has been immense—in fact some $4 billion in all over a period of years, counting military hardware, but also a number of loans that are repayable. No matter how much aid we give a nation, however, it takes work and will on the part of the people to make that aid effective. I have never seen more discernible dividends from American aid in any of the many countries I have visited than is the case in Taiwan. They are reconciled to the gradual phasing out of that aid which is already underway in terms of both dollars and cutback in our military advisory personnel on Taiwan.

Return to the mainland

"Return to the mainland" is the rallying cry and unifying credo of the Nationalist Chinese. There is no fanaticism about this veritable national slogan—just quietly, firmly expressed determination. But whether that goal is getting closer to reality, as Chiang insists, or is wishful thinking, it clearly is the glue which holds the Nationalists together. That slogan is the credo of those at the top and it comes into every conversation. It is occasionally but less frequently mentioned at the lower echelons but very seldom talked about among the masses. Critics and scoffers openly ridicule the notion, terming it "a necessary fiction" or a "mythocracy."

But the will to return and the conviction that ultimately they will do so is a dominant theme in any conversation with President Chiang Kai-shek, members of his Cabinet and senior Nationalist generals and admirals.

Will they return? Admittedly the odds are against them and the obstacles are immense. They cannot win alone because 600 million ChiComs vastly outnumber the 11½ million population of Taiwan. So they are betting their chips on a mainland revolt to trigger and make feasible an invasion of their cherished homeland. Ta Wei Yu, the Nationalist Defense Minister, and other officials told me that the strategy for return depends upon an uprising among the mainland populous and defections from the ChiCom armies.

During our long interview Chiang Kai-shek reiterated his oft-expressed theorem that "return to the mainland is 70 percent political and 30 percent military." I had asked several members of the Cabinet, generals, and admirals how long their landing troops would have to hold on to achieve a rallying of the populous. Most answered, "a week or two." To the same question the realistic President of Nationalist China responded "2 or 3 months."

It is easy to develop debate among American military persons on the pros and cons of whether the Nationalists could establish a substantial beachhead on their own. Opinion is much more emphatic that they could not possibly do the whole job unassisted; that is, land, supply themselves, beat off the enemy, and hang on for the needed length of time. Success would require that the revolt on the mainland be extremely widespread and ChiCom army defections huge.

Awareness of the obstacles does not lessen the apparent sincerity of Chiang and his keymen that they can and must return to the mainland. With quiet determination Chiang reiterated to me his conviction that they would return. He was cagey about the when, answering only, "The time gets ever closer." I asked bluntly whether he felt sure the mainland Chinese really want the return of his regime. He generalized affirmatively, adding doggedly, "It is our duty to our people on the mainland to return."

Chiang, the undisputed leader of China, echoed the constant theme I had heard from the government hierarchy, "We don't need American doughboys. We can do it ourselves—if we have the moral support of the United States." There is occasional speculation in the United States that the Gimo might decide that time was running out and so might be tempted to a rash military venture, ignoring his commitment to the United States and seeking to go it alone in attacking the mainland.

I asked senior American diplomats and military officers if they feared this possibility. To a man they spoke highly of Chiang's integrity and reminded me that he had never violated a treaty. Maj. Gen. Kenneth Sanborn, who commands the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group on Taiwan, told me bluntly, "I would stake my reputation, and more important the lives I'm responsible for here, on assurance that the Gimo would not do that." At Pearl Harbor Admiral H. D. Felt, commander in chief of the Pacific, deprecated the possibility with the observation that, "The generalissimo has a 100 percent pure record of keeping his commitments to the United States."

A VISIT TO QUEMOY

The closest Nationalists outpost to the Communist held mainland is at Quemoy where the Nationalists and the Reds are almost within spitting distance. A visit to Quemoy is an eye opener and an exciting inspiring experience.

We flew to Quemoy on a Nationalist Air Force DC-3. We traveled down the west coast of Taiwan to the Pescadores Islands, which are startling in the immensity of their land area. There we veered northwest for the last half hour's flight to Quemoy. From the Pescadores the plane skims the water by only 500 feet in order to stay out of range of ChiCom radar as passengers perspire in Mae West life jackets. Suddenly the Kinmen complex heaves into view and soon you see the airstrip on the eastward lee of the island between the sea and low mountains. As you land, island fortifications dominate the scene, the beaches spiked with antilanding defenses and barbed wire and airplane and ammunition revetments lining the airstrip. Soldiers are on the alert, manning antiaircraft defense and machine gun posts.

Met by jeep, we were whisked away to the opposite side of the island, over a remarkably good complex of paved or macadamized roads. At every main intersection armed sentries control the sparse traffic and wave a go ahead only in response to the jeep driver's blinking coded signals. Road maintenance is impeccable, but every few hundred yards were neat piles of stone and rock for fast emergency road repairs in case of bombing.

The most exciting spot on Quemoy is at Ma-shan where the hated Chicoms are so

close by on their nearest island that you don't need glasses to see their fortifications and even occasional movements. At the farthest tip of this outpost, reached through a labyrinth of narrow tunnels and trenches, you are only a mile from the closest Commie-held island. Peering through gun slits you get a real closeup of Chicoms' defenses. These days most of the firing is propaganda and the loudspeaker barrage alternates between insult and cajolery broadcasted by both sides. En route to the farthest tip we passed through a small cave containing a radio room. A girl wearing a khaki army uniform was cooing dulcetly into the mike while a male noncom ran the turntable for background music. Even the heavily sandbagged trenches between posts are immaculately groomed.

Many Americans have the notion that Quemoy is a tiny coral atoll outcropping. Actually, it is a complex of small islands, several of which are fortified. The principal island, which they call "Big Kinmen," is 12 miles long by an average of 5 miles wide. Shaped like a butterfly, it narrows to 2 miles in its slender waist. Quemoy, roughly four times the size of Corregidor, rises from sandy and rocky coastline to rolling hills, topped by Taiwu Mountain at the island's center.

Quemoy is no indefensible pile of rock, as some have sought to write it off. Rather, it is an impregnable fortress, perhaps the most heavily armed area in the world. From deeply dug-in positions, often hewn out of solid rock the Nationalists 155-millimeter artillery sweeps the shore and the sea. The island is honeycombed with underground caves and tunnels which are utilized for barracks and storage depots as well as defensive positions. The Nationalists' pride is a newly completed immense cave blasted from solid rock in the very heart of the island. This huge amphitheater is now used as a theater that seats 1,500, but is planned for use as a hospital should the need arise.

Quemoy's importance is both strategic and symbolic. It effectively bottles the vital mainland harbor of Amoy. Its control by the Nationalists ties down an estimated 350,000 Communist soldiers on the mainland, while simultaneously denying it as a staging area for an attack on Formosa. Thus, Quemoy is inexorably bound to the defense of Formosa itself. Nationalist Defense Minister Ta Wei Yu described Quemoy to me as "The ham in the sandwich between the mainland and Taiwan."

The Reds have not been able to take the island by invasion or crumble it by bombardment. Symbolically, Quemoy stands as a stalwart symbol of freedom in the warm and often hot war that has prevailed in the Taiwan Straits for 13 years. It keeps the defense perimeter of Taiwan in the straits, not on the beaches of Taiwan itself. Quemoy personifies the Nationalists' will to resist. As Ta Wei Yu told me, "Maintaining the will to fight is the No. 1 priority, military hardware is No. 10."

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek called the fortress island "our West Berlin" when I talked with him in Taipei. Abandonment of Quemoy would be a tremendous moral blow to the free world and an immense boon to the ChiComs in their constant wooing of neutrals. The loyalties of the oversea Chinese, some 11 million of whom live in southeast Asia alone, is fickle. They are more concerned with their own economic status in their new homelands than in abiding affection to either of the Chinese factions.

Quemoy impresses a visitor with its tidiness. The heavy shelling that has blasted the island has left no discernible marks. The Nationalists have a fetish for repairing damage fast. For several years there has been no significant artillery bombardment and the superbly trained Nationalist Air Force clearly dominates the Taiwan Straits and blocks aerial bombing.

Quemoy absorbed unbelievably heavy artillery bombardment before the ChiComs decided it was ineffective and way too expensive. The Nationalists have fought off seaborne invasion attempts with fierce tenacity. The Ku-ning-tou campaign in late 1949, with an invading force of 20,000 ChiComs, ended after 2 days of bloody fighting with 7,500 captured and all the remainder lying dead on the beach. Another small landing attempt the next year was equally disastrous for the Commies.

In 1958, at the height of the Taiwan Straits crisis, ChiCom artillery poured an average of 10,000 rounds a day on Quemoy for 44 days. The Nationalists gained on balance because they were dug in too deeply to be hurt badly and between bombardments raked up the metal from the Commie shells and reaped a rich harvest from this salvage.

After repeated heavy losses in the air and the failure of their artillery siege and sea blockade, Peiping suddenly announced a cease-fire, but broke it a week later with a heavy 1-day shelling for propaganda purposes during Secretary Dulles' visit to Taiwan. The last big shelling occurred in June 1960 when the ChiComs poured 175,000 rounds on the Kinmen complex during President Eisenhower's Taiwan visit.

Nationalist officers who arranged our visit assured us in confidential tones that they were taking me over on a "nonbombardment alternate day." The implication is that their forces dig in for heavy bombardment every other day. The truth is that the only shells that have been dropped during the last couple of years have been stuffed with propaganda pamphlets. Admittedly, if such a shell's casing hits you, you're just as dead as though it were the real stuff. But the "alternate day bombardment" notion is a useful myth. Nonetheless, Quemoy is kept in a constant state of readiness against the assault that may step up any day.

We visited a score of gun emplacements, communication centers and command posts, in heavily sandbagged trenches or deep in caves or tunnels hewn from clay or solid rock. Soldiers were immaculately uniformed and snapped to attention with real discipline. A few yards before entering gun chambers, we passed smaller caves where the men sleep on wooden bunks close to their guns.

A young American colonel stationed on Quemoy as an adviser was enthusiastic about the Chinese soldiers with whom he worked. He told me that they are well trained and their morale is extraordinarily high.

A high spot of any VIP guest's visit is lunch with the island commander, much beribboned Lt. Gen. Wang To-nein. Young for his rank and responsibility, General Wang is a handsomely tough-looking soldier who radiates such charm and personality that the language barrier is transcended. Luncheon is served in a rough walled granite cave which is at least 25 feet high and 150 feet long.

Toasts to his forces are drunk in the most potent liquor I've ever tried, a 150-proof wine called kaoliang, made from sorghum grown on the island. The rugged general kept insisting that I drink "gombay" with him, which means "down the hatch." I demurred that the kaoliang was too potent for a mere reporter, but he insisted. I came up from the experience shaking my head and told him, "Now I feel that I could lick any ChiCom." General Wang jestingly offered to commission me on the spot and there upon presented me with a clay jug of the potent portion.

I asked the rugged garrison commander whether he thought he could hold Quemoy if the ChiComs made an all-out try. Exuding confidence but not cockiness, he replied, "Let them come, we're ready for them. I asked your General Sanborn if he thought the ChiComs could take Quemoy. He worried me for a minute by saying, 'No place is completely indefensbile if the enemy wants to pay enough price.' Then the general smiled and reassured me, 'To take Quemoy would cost the ChiComs so many casualties that they wouldn't have enough forces left to defend the mainland.' "

Despite the fortress nature of Quemoy, life goes on for 45,000 civilians in 51 villages. They go about their farming and daily chores as though they were far removed from the frontlines of a festering, often erupting war. The Government attaches so much importance to morale on Quemoy that if local civilians remain on the island they are freed from both military draft and taxes.

We strolled leisurely through the streets of the main village where the whole feeling parallels a similar town on Taiwan. There was no dirth of consumer goods, and shops had many that were relatively luxury items by Chinese standards. Six thousand students attend 27 elementary schools as though there were no war and another 800 attend the high school.

Both in their Taipei capital and on Quemoy, the Nationalists express confidence that they are dug in and expect to hang onto their fortress island. They tell you earnestly that they can't give it up either strategically or psychologically.

AN INTERVIEW WITH THE CHIANG KAI-SHEKS

Now back to Chiang again. It is popular in certain American circles to ridicule and deprecate Chiang Kai-shek personally and the Nationalist Chinese in general. I don't think they should be sold short and believe it's high time for Americans to take a fresh look at the other side of the Chiang coin. The Generalissimo has been fighting communism longer than any other free world leader. He stood fast with his allies in fighting tough campaigns in World War II, despite constant Japanese overtures for a separate peace.

We had a fascinating interview with Generalissimo and Madame Chiang Kai-shek at the President's summer residence at Yang Ming Shan, popularly known as Grass Mountain, high above sprawling, bustling Taipei. There for more than an hour we talked informally and animatedly over steaming Chinese tea and cakes.

"The struggle here is not just our fight. We are a major frontline in the free world's fight against communism." The President of Free China voiced this appeal with undramatic calm but great earnestness early in that hour-long private interview. Throughout the next hour the Gimo, as his title is popularly abbreviated, talked to me within the framework of that theme.

He makes no bones about depending on and appreciating the considerable American aid which has helped sustain his Government-in-exile since the Nationalists were driven from the mainland in 1949. Chiang reiterated his willingness to "stand on an evaluation of the effective use we have made of that aid." With obvious pride he added, "I am confident that we've proved deserving."

On Taiwan, any mere reference to "Madame" automatically is understood to mean Madame Chiang Kai-shek. She is thoroughly feminine in her attractiveness, but possesses a keen mind and strong personality which give her considerable influence as her husband's confidante and helpmate. By any criteria she is acknowledged to be one of China's real leaders, albiet sans formal Government portfolio. Madame spoke in her usual impeccable English, reflecting her Wellesley education.

Conversation with the Gimo is more strained because of the delays and indirectness of talking through an interpreter. Chiang speaks no English whatsoever and gives no appearance of recognizing English words. In our interviews over a 16-year period, dating back to Nanking in 1947, I've

always had some suspicion that Chiang understands a bit more than he admits. But the wily Gimo thus gains the advantage of the added time of translation to think about his answers.

Chiang is slightly built and lean, although Madame commented happily that he had gained 5 pounds since his short illness last year. Despite his 76 years, the leader of Nationalist China is spry of step and vigorous in gesture. Over the years of our several talks he has never appeared really jaunty in appearance or manner, but neither has he reflected any measure of discouragement whatsoever. He has mellowed but in appearance has aged little through the years.

The demeanor of the President Generalissimo is that of quiet dignity, radiating a degree of charm through his pleasant but never extroverted smile. Occasionally he expresses a mild sense of humor. When he learned that our next stop was to be Hong Kong, with uncharacteristic small talk he smilingly assured me, "You are fortunate that Hong Kong's water shortage will shorten your stay and keep your wife from spending too much money."

The evening of our talk the Generalissimo wore his customary plain beige tunic with military collar, devoid of any medals or insignia. Madam Chiang, who characteristically wore a Chinese style dress with high collar, stays attractive despite her years. She told us that she is extremely sensitive to Taiwan's hot, humid summers adding, "On days like this I wish I were an Eskimo living in an igloo." Possibly because of her more facile handling of English, she frequently interjected herself into the Gimo's and my conversation, occasionally querying or challenging my statements and questions. Doggedly interested but not offensive, she was a great deal blunter than was her husband whose questions invariably were couched more diplomatically. Both manifested great knowledgeability about the United States and considerable curiosity about American public and official reaction to all things bearing on Free China.

I commented that my visit to Quemoy had convinced me that this impressively armed offshore island was so bound to the defense of Formosa that I felt confident that any attack on Quemoy would cause the U.S. President to come to their defense. Madam cut into the conversation and pressed me vigorously, "What leads you to this conclusion?" Similarly, she led the questioning regarding my appraisal of the impact of principal American magazines, newspapers and news services, as the Gimo listened attentively.

I turned the conversation to the Sino-Soviet split and asked the Gimo if this development were highly beneficial to his cause. He nodded affirmatively and added, "Yes, it intensifies Mao's strains and problems. Soviet withdrawal of technicians and severe material cutoffs hurt the Red Chinese militarily and industrially." I then asked the Generalissimo's appraisal of the depth of the split. Chiang replied, "It is real and it is deep—but it is a split, not a final break. It is mostly personal, a clash of personalities between Mao and Khrushchev. It does not represent a real cleavage between the parties and therefore should not be regarded as permanent."

To the next question as to whether the split and the just signed test ban treaty might intensify ChiCom brashness, the Commie-hating President of Free China answered, "Quite probably. They need to show off their strength as part of their claim to leadership of the Communist bloc. Moreover, Mao desperately needs diversions to draw the people's attention away from their own hardships and Communist repression."

An interview with Chiang frankly is not a completely relaxing experience, but it is pleasant, impressive, and full of substance. As we awaited the appearance of the Chiang Kai-sheks, an air of expectancy is created by the almost hushed deference to obeisance of the aides who received us. Finally the President and first lady enter the room as an uniformed general aide solemnly intones, "The President and Madam Chiang Kai-shek." Here the strict formalities end, although the entire conversation is kept on a dignified plane and you never forget that you are talking with a chief of state.

Chiang is pleasant enough with the amenities, but is not given to small talk and gets quickly to issues. Madam Chiang sat at the opposite end of a huge monkeypod table on which tea was served, constantly smoking American cigarettes as she chatted quietly with my wife. She appeared fascinated by my wife's description of Khrushchev the man, based on our close-up evening with him in the Kremlin in 1961. The Gimo directed most of his conversation to me at our end of the table. Late in the interview he graciously turned to my wife and commented on having given permission for her to accompany me on the Quemoy visit. He then interrogated her about her impressions of this impregnable offshore fortress island.

Following the interview, an aide commented that the Gimo had manifested special interest in our conversation and had prolonged the interview longer than expected. The aide confided that "We can tell when the President is getting impatient or bored by his habit of stroking his forehead. You can be congratulated that this didn't happen to you."

Fortunately, I had taken the initiative in concluding the interview by starting to say our goodbys and presenting the Chiangs with two redwood seedlings from California. I started to explain that the redwood was the oldest living thing on earth and grew only on the Chinese Mainland and in California. Madam Chiang interposed that she fondly remembered her visit to the giant redwoods of Muir Woods near San Francisco. Both the Chiangs were keenly interested as I unwrapped the tiny trees and they chatted animatedly back and forth about where to plant them on Grass Mountain.

The interview ended with good natured bantering about the Gimo's transplanting the trees to the mainland upon his cherished return and our agreeing to meet and look them over when they reached their maturity 2,000 years hence.

In my book, neither Nationalist China nor Chiang Kai-shek should be written off. Certainly they have remained stanch allies of the United States of America. Of course, it is beyond argument that they could not have survived in their exodus from the mainland without American backing, moral and material. The chorus against them has been so loud in recent years that I deliberately try both to refute canards and stress that they are far from being sans virtue.

Chiang is personally incorruptible, although corruption admittedly was rampant in his government before they were driven from the mainland. Corruption too often is a loose cliche, a term with many degrees and standards. Throughout the Orient some graft or squeeze is commonly assumed among government employees. That doesn't make it right, but a degree of it is as customary in the Orient as it is reprehensible by Western standards.

Perhaps even we Americans should be careful when throwing stones. I recall that in my 1952 interview with Chiang in Taipei I pressed him regarding alleged corruption in his government on the mainland. He smiled querulously, "Corruption? Oh, you mean like mink coats and deepfreeze." Painfully remembering the then recent repercussions from our own Washington scene, I dropped that line of questioning fast.

Don't sell the Nationalists short. They may or may not achieve their goal of retaking the mainland. But in the meantime, in 13 years of exile on Taiwan they have developed efficient government and a viable economy which make them a true showcase in the Far East. Their American trained, American equipped armed forces number 600,000 strong, including a superb air force. The Nationalist Chinese constitute the largest anti-Communist force in the Far East. Holding on to Taiwan is important to American self-interest because it is a vital link in the defense arc which starts in the Aleutians and runs through the Pacific to Australia. On Taiwan and their offshore islands they are fighting freedom's fight.

MALAYSIA—BIRTH PAINS OF A NEW NATION

Now let's turn to a cold war situation with ominous overtones of warmer war potential, if all does not go well—Malaysia. There in North Borneo, Sarawak, Singapore, and Malaya, the components of the new nation-to-be, we had the rare experience of watching a nation being born, witnessing the final birth pangs of the baby which was wildly heralded for delivery August 31. We were in the new nation's prospective capital, Kuala Lumpur, during the Summit Conference at Manila, where Sukarno, of Indonesia, was petulantly trying to postpone the new nation's birthdate. Gen. Sir Rodney Moore, the Britisher who commands the Malayan armed forces, told me at lunch, "The knitting is all done—now we just have to wait for the delivery."

It may not be that simple, or fast, but it is pretty definite that Malaysia will be born only a few weeks past the scheduled delivery day. This is a fascinating study in a new type of nationalism. Malaysia evidences all the problems and challenges of former colonies turned loose to swim on their own. British North Borneo, Sarawak, the city-state of Singapore, and Malaya together are welding themselves into a brand-new nation. For the time being, at least, the oil-rich, vain Sultan of Brunei has counted himself out, but probably will come along later.

Who is the father of this union? Clearly, the father is the Malayan Prime Minister Abdul Rahman, generally known as "the Tunku". The mother? Well, I don't know—perhaps it is Singapore's dynamic prime minister, the moderate Socialist Lee Kwan Yew—but I shan't pursue this metaphor any further. Malaysia has experienced one of the fastest gestation periods on record—2 years from the Tunku's first suggestion of establishing the new nation for security and economic reasons, made in a speech before the press, to the birth of the baby.

The Tunku is an amazing character. Admittedly, nonintellectual, he is warm and lovable with an uncanny intuition for gaging the people's reaction. His Malayans are unquestionably the happiest people and enjoy one of the most prosperous and calmest nations in the entire Far East. The genesis of Malaysia stems from the Tunku's shrewd recognition of the portents for good or bad of the commercially teeming city-state of Singapore. There leftwing influence is extremely strong and could spill over into Malaya. So the Tunku decided that a merger between Malaya and Singapore would be a natural. But realistically he feared that the dominant Chinese cells in the new national bloodstream could present problems because three-fourths of the population of Singapore is Chinese, and Communist pressures are terrific. So to offset this potential Chinese predominance the shrewd Tunku invited in the three Borneo states. British North Borneo and Sarawak were receptive because they recognized the mixed blessings that would come along with their impending freedom from Britain. They feared that they could not go it alone either securitywise or economically—so they agreed to come in.

Malaya is not a natural nation because of its many diversities, chief of which is its multiracialism. At the very top there is strong Malayan and Chinese dominance—the Malayans in politics, the Chinese in business. There is an insignificantly small middle class. Then at the bottom is a tremendous population of both Malays and Chinese. The Borneo tribes really are just emerging into the 20th century.

All recognize that the principal external threat comes from volatile, unstable Sukarno of Indonesia who has been on-again, off-again in his ranting and raving about Malaysia. A major problem is that although Indonesia is the sixth most populous nation on the globe, she is in a state of economic chaos and envies Malaya's stable prosperity. One prominent diplomat in the area, whose name I shall not identify for diplomatic reasons, summarized Sukarno rather well by telling me that "he is more magnetic than William Jennings Bryan, but rahts, raves, and lives like Mussolini."

The Manila "Summit Conference" started out with little hopefulness but wound up with the big surprise of Sukarno's suddenly modifying his opposition to Malaysia. The one remaining "if" is the determination of the Borneo peoples' desires, which was insisted on by Sukarno and left by the Conference to the Secretary General of the United Nations to determine. I have no doubt of the outcome of that determination—that is if an honest appraisal is made with regard to fact and not compromised through fear of offending Sukarno. The British government's High Commission, headed by Lord Cobbald, last year found majority sentiment among the Borneo peoples was for Malaysia. Moreover, the many local elections within the past year always featured Malaysia as an issue and invariably it has won out.

Can the Malaysian baby survive its infancy and move into maturity without adolescence? The answer is hopefully, probably yes. And I am betting and preditcing it will do so.

If this is accomplished much of the credit must go to the British who saw the freedom handwriting on the wall and sensibly accelerated the process among their colonials. They moved realistically with the tide of nationalism even when they knew in their own hearts that the natives were not quite ready to take over and run their own governments.

While it is popular to malign colonialism, I should like to remind you and myself that there are two sides to this colonial coin. Particularly in British areas I have seen the good side—in Honk Kong and Singapore, and also in Nigeria and Ghana in Africa where characteristically the British gave stable, efficient government, with natives in a high percentage of upper level civil service.

The British legacy to the newly freed areas is tremendous. Many of the native leaders were educated in Britain; numerous of their civil servants and even those in the third and fourth echelons have been trained in commonwealth countries. In Jesselton, capital of British North Borneo, I was pursuing this question with Commissioner of Customs, Robert Knowles, a veteran British civil servant. To illustrate the point he summoned his six senior native customs officials, introduced me and left the room. I talked frankly with these clean-cut, intelligent natives whose posts were at the very top of the efficient Customs Service. Each had been sent by the British to Canada, Australia or to Britain herself for customs training, and each reflected pride in his accomplishment.

In the British turnover there is no animosity and little friction, as I learned from talking with both Britishers and native leaders who are about to take over their own countries. A large number of British civil servants, called "expats", have been invited to stay on under contract to the new governments. Commissioner Knowles was typical in his reactions when he smilingly philosophized to me, "The only difference now is that we will no longer sit under the protective umbrella of Whitehall. Now we shall be out in the hot sun. We'll get along with the natives. We know these fellows well—for years we've been working and drinking together. Many is the time we have gone snagging down Nathan Road with these guys."

Donald Stephens, erstwhile newspaper editor and Chief Minister Designate of British North Borneo, put it more elegantly when he told me "With independence inevitable it was best that we do it in a friendly way. We have worked hand in hand with the British. Probably we shall require 5 to 10 years of training and upgrading our people before we can run the government ourselves. Admittedly we have our problems, but we can meet them."

I'm betting on Malaysia to make the grade if the Tunku can lick internal Communist subversion. Then he can calmly but firmly lead his happy people to such economic strength and stability that even Sukarno finally gives up his bellows and bluster.

VIETNAM—THE WORLD'S SHOOTINGEST WAR

And now to a nation in really hot war turmoil, Vietnam, key to control of southeast Asia. Theirs is no cold war but the world's shootingest war—a nasty, bloody hot war that has been raging at varying degrees for 20 years. Communist raids still occur occasionally within 10 miles of Saigon, capital city of the country; and indeed, a few grenades were tossed within Saigon the night before we arrived. Vietnam is the spot where the grand antagonisms of our times have met and clashed—colonialism, nationalism, and communism, all interacting with vicious violence.

America's stakes are immense there in Vietnam where we have recognized our own self-interest in helping stem the Communist tide at a dollar cost currently running more than a million dollar a day. More significant and more risky, but with no alternate in my judgment, our military assistance and advisory forces in South Vietnam number 14,000 men.

Why is Vietnam important and what does it matter whether southeast Asia goes down the drain? Over the years I have visited southeast Asia three times—Vietnam, both North and South, before the partition; South Vietnam twice since; Cambodia, Thailand, the Philippines, Laos; and most recently Malaya, Singapore, and Bornea. I learned long ago that southeast Asia is not a collection of individual countries but a strategic entity. It is a major target of Chinese Communist expansion.

Immediately following World War II the French fought a bloody, losing war trying to hold onto their erstwhile colony of Indochina. For 8 years they valiantly fought a war which draied their lifeblood and their francs and demoralized the French Government back in Paris. After the tragic climax at Dienbienphu, the French pulled out in disrepute—and all semblance of governmental authority disappeared with them.

The Geneva Accord of 1954 divided the nation at the 17th parallel. The Viet Minh up north were headed by Ho Chi Minh, a slight, wispy, goat-bearded, tubercular character who is spooky in appearance and demeanor. Ho is shrewd and simple, yet sophisticated, a 30-year Communist veteran. Diem took over the South Vietnam Government in the south and the odds against its survival were astronomical—half a country, half an economy, with more than a million refugees from the north aggravating the economic chaos.

The Vietcong, as the Communists came to be called, expected to take over the southern government within 5 years. By 1960 it became obvious to Hanoi that they could not subvert South Vietnam with minor guerrilla warfare and propaganda alone. So they turned on the military heat, hundreds of pockets of their sympathizers and guerrillas already abounding south of the parallel. Arms were no problem because the French had abandoned huge caches of relatively modern arms and plenty flowed in from Communist China and the U.S.S.R. The Vietcong further supplied themselves with small arms from tiny jungle factories, not much larger than a garage, where they turn out crude but effective weapons. In Saigon I saw a shotgun captured from the Vietcong, the barrel of which literally was made from an old pipe.

The technique was guerrilla warfare at its worst—the Commie guerrillas terrorizing peasants and confiscating their food and conscripting their labor. The choice for the villager was clear—death or collaboration. And he knew that beheading on the spot was a favorite sport of the Commies. It was a tough war because it's hard to find and defeat an enemy who is a peaceful farmer by day and a ruthless bloodthirsty guerrilla at night.

The "strategic hamlets"

After heartbreaking estbacks, Washington decided that half an effort was worse than none so stepped up American aid, both in terms of military hardware and our so-called advisers who through sheer necessity of self-survival are far more active than that word would imply. A real turning point however, came with the U.S. inspired, Diem government administered "strategic hamlet program." The essence of the program is that the hamlet becomes a defensive town giving the villagers security and breaking their contact with the Vietcong. Simultaneously the regular army forces were thus freed from garrison duty to pursue the enemy.

One of the most interesting experiences I've ever had abroad was my visit to a strategic hamlet. It took a lot of arranging, but I finally I was escorted from Saigon by two American Army officers and the Vietnamese district administrator of the program. Driving way into the countryside by jeep, we stopped at the compound of the village chief, a snappily uniformed, alert young officer whose headquarters was a small-scale fortress. Half a dozen soldiers with tommyguns clamored into a truck which preceded us farther into the country to the hamlet. This was a tiny village of 99 families and 508 people, with barbed wire protecting its huts and its fields. Old men with pathetically primitive spears guarded the fence, but they were backed by younger militiamen of the hamlet, armed and wearing blue fatigue uniforms.

The oldsters of the hamlet, typical Asiatic people—thin, wiry and pleasantly simple, lined up to greet us. Proudly they shook my hand, then led me to the hamlet hall, a tiny one room, thatch-roofed hut with open sides. The walls were posted with modern style charts showing progress in health, schooling, defense and whatnot.

The strategic hamlet program is succeeding with nearly 8,000 of the scheduled 11,000 hamlets already completed, embracing 65 percent of the population. It is a dynamic concept and an inspiring example of democracy from the ground up as the villagers have their first exposure to community life, electing their own leaders.

It is popular to say of the controversial Vietnamese war that this is the war we are not winning. The fact is that we are winning, slowly but surely. The obstacles are immense but not insurmountable. The generals of the American Military Assistance Command are very optimistic. Major General Weede, Chief of Staff, a soft-spoken but tough Marine, told me that the Vietnamese are proving to be wiry, brave soldiers and the war has made considerable progress by comparison with a year ago. At Pearl Harbor I asked Adm. H. D. Felt, commander

in chief of the Pacific, whether he stuck by his prediction that the war would be cleaned up to a routine police action within 3 years and he reaffirmed that optimism.

Nonetheless, it is a frustrating war. Guerrilla warfare is not a war of position as in World War I, nor a war of movement as in World War II. There are no front lines, fixed objectives or salients in the classic sense. These are no clear-cut major victories. The nature of guerrilla warfare is slow. In Malaya it took the British 8 years to mop up 3,000 guerrillas. In South Vietnam at least 30,000 Commie guerrillas are loose. Their leader, Ho Chi Minh, is counting on American impatience and is confident he can wear us down. To win the war will require infinite patience and tenacity.

THE TRAGIC BUDDHIST WAR WITHIN A WAR

Just as the corner in the war was turning for the better, along has come the Buddhist crisis to muddy the waters and divert attention and effort from the big war.

The Buddhist revolt and its consequences are a tragedy in trilogy. First—because the present desperately critical situation need never have flared beyond mild protests and sensible compromise. Second—neither the Buddhists nor the Diem government handled themselves intelligently or practically, even for their own respective self-interests. Third, and most tragic in its potentials—this fratricidal struggle within South Vietnam well may disastrously impede the desperate civil war against the Vietcong Communists in which the corner toward victory had just been turned.

What started as a mild, nonextremist religious protest by the usually docile and philosophic Buddhist monks finally has degenerated into extremist political agitation. Politically motivated younger bucks among the monks have fanned emotionalism into a flame of fanaticism which by now has overshown the original religious demands.

Conversely, the utter ineptness of the Diem government in handling the protests has now made a roaring conflagration out of what should have been confined to a small wastebasket fire, easily extinguishable.

While there long has been friction among the country's numerous religious sects, there has been no real religious persecution in Vietnam. It is sheer nonsense to swallow the notion that Vietnam is 80 percent Buddhist. In fact, Buddhism's being as much a philosophy as a religion, it is not at all uncommon for those professing Buddhism also to embrace another religion. In terms of really devout, practicing religionists, the figures probably are closer to 25 percent Buddhist, 14 percent Catholic, with nearly two-thirds of the people divided among reasonably strong elements of Confucianists, Taoists, and Animists. Even so, probably the largest percentage of the people couldn't really be said to have any religion at all within our general understanding of the term.

Background of the presently intensified controversy dates from the tragic incident May 2 at Hue, South Vietnam's 2d largest city way up north near the 17th parallel which divides the country. To celebrate Buddha's 2,507th birthday, the Buddhists at Hue defied a standing Government edict prohibiting the flying of any but national flags. That order had recently been reaffirmed by President Diem in anger over his own Catholics flying their pennants at an earlier church celebration. When the Buddhists at Hue protested, nine of their demonstrators were shot down in cold blood by Government soldiers. The Government claims, not too persuasively, to have evidence that the deaths were caused by a Communist-thrown bomb.

Not surprisingly, these killings fanned up Buddhist protest meetings throughout the country and stepped up Buddhist demands on the Government. The original demands included grievances that were more fanciful or minor than unreasonable pressures. For instance, the Buddhists complained that despite the preponderance of Buddhism among the people, all army chaplains are Catholic. Few of the demands appeared irreconcilable.

Diem appointed a joint commission to discuss and compromise the demands. Thus far the Buddhists have refused to meet with the joint commission at all. In the meantime, the monks have been egged on by their more fanatic brethren and certainly encouraged by the Communists. However, there is little to support the Government charge that revolts were Commie inspired or overtly supported.

Diem and his Government must be indicted for their resort to brute force and extreme, reprehensible measures against unarmed basically peaceful Buddhist monks and nuns. The riots could have been handled by normal police nightstick techniques and a little tear gas. The use of tough, helmeted, bayonet-carrying soldiers to beat monks and nuns senseless was indefensible.

Diem himself reputedly has favored trying more conciliatory measures toward the Buddhists with confidence that the differences could be worked out. But the continual stirrer of trouble and stinker in the woodpile has been Diem's sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, who aggravates an already tense situation by continually screeching her usual bitter invective. These tactics inevitably incite violent rejoinder. Mme. Nhu has been variously termed "The Dragon Lady," "Lucretia Borgia," and other similarly unflattering appellations—not undeservingly either. She is an attractive female with a domineering personality, but possesses an insatiable penchant for meddling in affairs of state. Totally undiplomatic and even inhumane in her blasts, she throws salt in the wounds by referring to the incidents when Buddhist monks and nuns have burned themselves alive as "monk barbecue shows."

Mme. Nhu is unquestionably the President's major liability and most hated person in Vietnam. Through her "Women's Solidarity Movement" and its million and a quarter members who are sort of "do-gooders" as well as political reformers, she wields considerable power. But her principal power is sheer peronality dominance over her weaker but generally well-intentioned brother-in-law. Shutting her up or even locking her up would be the better part of wisdom by Diem. In fact, Diem would gain great public support and become a stronger, more efficient President if he shipped his whole, oversized family of brothers and in-laws out of the country.

The Buddhist position unfortunately for even their own cause has become a somewhat phony issue, with political overtones far transcending their original mild and justifiable religious grievances. Command post of the Buddhist Association is the Xa Loi Pagoda, located next to U.S. Aid Mission Headquarters in the heart of Saigon. I visited the pagoda on one of its peaceful afternoons. The entire atmosphere reminded me less of a holy temple than a teeming Madison Avenue public relations and advertising factory.

Even sacred religious symbols and decorations are blocked out by the myriad slogan banners draped in vantage spots across the front and sides of the pagoda. The banners sizzled with political slogans alleging religious persecution. The catch was that even this American reporter could read them because they included English translations in letters larger than the Vietnamese characters. Probably fewer than one-half of one percent of the Vietnamese can read English. But the wily Buddhist leaders unabashedly play to the sizable gallery of American and other foreign newsmen and cameramen to get their message to the broader world.

One of the younger and more militant monks carries out duties as a public information officer in the best Madison Avenue tradition. He conducts a press conference each morning, complete with mimeographed handouts. Most of the monks seemed to be enjoying the furor they have created. During my visit to the pagoda, knots of them were gathered around avidly reading their own press notices, mimeographed Vietnamese translations of what American and European newspapers had printed about them that week. On similar visits to such famed Buddhist temples as the Schwe Dagon Pagoda in Burma or the myriad temples at Kamakura in Japan, I had grown accustomed to buying souvenirs and mementos with religious motif. At Xa Loi Pagoda I was shocked to find hawkers peddling postal cards showing grisly highlight stages in the tragic death by self-cremation of the Buddhist High Priest Thich Quang Duc.

A conversation with various groups of monks of the second echelon invariably started out with their piously protesting their religious complaints. As the interviewer gained their confidence, the chat usually ended with frank admission that their crusade against the Government had now become a political issue.

The Buddhist hierarchy's intransigence about meeting with the joint commission was publicly rationalized while I was in Saigon by frank admission of their machiavellian determination to hold further protests in abeyance pending the arrival of Henry Cabot Lodge as U.S. Ambassador. As characteristically happens when stirred emotions conquer reason, the kettle has now boiled over. Diem's pagoda raids and the arrest and hauling away of scores of monks were accomplished so brutally that the U.S. Government took the rare step of publicly deploring repressive actions of this nature. Diem's rationale, of course, was a claim that he had to move with force to block an imminet coup against the Government. Even if true, it hardly justifies using brutal extremes against unarmed temple people and students, indiscriminately whether they are toughies or gentle girls.

The overthrow of the Diem government would be tragic to the war effort, although admittedly the Diem regime leaves much to be desired. Diem is a dedicated, esthetic bachelor, who is stubborn and prideful. Often he is less amenable to American advice because of his hypersensitivity over the Communist taunt that he is an American puppet. He is utterly lacking in charm, strong leadership or personal magnetism, much less any sense of public relations.

The fact remains, however, that Diem's 9-year regime has accomplished near miracles when you consider the odds against survival of the partial nation, chaotic economy which resulted from the Geneva accord which divided the country in 1954. Diem has not won over the intellectuals of his country, a minority but a powerful group whose Western education makes them abhor Diem's totalitarianism which he rationalizes as necessary because of the war tension. However, the charge that Diem does not get out among the people is unfair because he is constantly touring the villages and hamlets.

If Diem's government were overthrown, I fear the result would be close to anarchy. There is a veritable leadership vacuum in South Vietnam which has been war-torn for two decades. There are some who believe that the only logical successor would be Diem's own brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, who is his principal adviser and head of the secret police. That package unhappily would include Madame Nhu. Another alternate could well be one of the generals, in which

case sterner repression of the Buddhists would be inevitable.

Totally aside from the tragedy of an unnecessary fratricidal war among those who were fighting shoulder to shoulder against the real common enemy, communism, the dangerously hurtful impact will be felt in the desperate civil war against the Communists. Nobody is gaining in what is happening in Vietnam now except the Vietcong. The shrewd Commie leader in the north, tough, vicious Ho Chi Minh must be chuckling and stroking his wispy beard up there in Hanoi. Just as the tide had started to turn against him, thanks largely to the success of the strategic hamlet program and the stepped up aid of the 14,000 American advisers in South Vietnam, along came this unexpected ally.

Vietnam poses probably the toughest dilemma for the United States in all our foreign policy. The Buddhist mess makes it easy for critics and leftwing rallies to sloganize against our supporting the Diem government. It makes a pretty demagogic case to call for cessation of aid to Vietnam, particularly in view of their stupid handling of the admittedly not 100 percent pure Buddhist agitation. Certainly our State Department has tripped itself up with contradictory statements about the late August developments in Vietnam.

But, on balance, if we cut off our military assistance we'd be slicing off our own nose. That would assure the fall of the government and quite probably create chaos which would assure victory for the Communists in South Vietnam, hence probably in all of southeast Asia.

In his new role as American Ambassador in Saigon, Henry Cabot Lodge has nothing but a tough road to hoe in solving these dilemmas. I don't envy him, but on the basis of knowing him rather well over a period of more than a decade, I am confident that if any diplomat can do the job, this brilliant, charming but basically pragmatic and tough New Englander is that man.

THE CHICOMS—HELL BENT TO COMMUNIZE THE WORLD

The powerhouse of the Far East turmoil, of course, is the Chinese Communist dragon which belches revolutionary smoke and vicious flame. Red China's objective is not "Asia for the Asiatics" but "Red Asia for the Asiatic Reds." She is less nationalistic than hell bent on communizing the world.

Soviet influence in the Far East is on the wane, as shown in Laos. The ChiComs are pouring in money for subversion throughout southeast Asia. It is easy to accomplish this through normal trade channels—that is why they suffer Hong Kong to survive, for trade and foreign exchange. And they see to it that hardware, hordes of advisers and saboteurs are sent wherever the situation is ripe—and it is ripe in most of the Orient.

Both sides constantly woo Ho Chi Minh, whose heart may be in Moscow but his belly is in Peiping. I recall that on the occasion of my 1961 Kremlin visit, Khrushchev himself was showing immense deference to Ho, who had lingered on in Moscow for the 44th anniversary celebration of the Russian revolution after attending the Communist Party Congress. In recent weeks Hanoi was visited by Chairman Lieu of Red China. The resulting joint communique blasted the United States with the usual propaganda charges of imperialism and warlike design, and clearly alined North Vietnam with Peiping rather than with Moscow.

Frankly, I fear the ChiComs more than I do Russia. They are trigger happy, they are obsessed with intense color hatred and they are far less sophisticated in dealing in international affairs. They have built less, hence they have far less to lose. They have no regard for human life. Mao has boasted that they could lose 50,000 men a day and at the end of the year the nation would be still more populous than at the beginning. Two years ago I widely predicted that the major foreign affairs issue of our times might well be whether the red bear of Moscow or the red dragon of Peiping emerges triumphant in the Communist world. I believe that recent international events point up that premise.

The Sino-Soviet differences finally have aggravated to the point of a real split. That split stems from ideological differences and creates material headaches for both sides. Russia has crippled Red China by cutting off most material supply and pulling out her technicians. But it should not yet be regarded as a complete break. The signal of when that happens will be the day China ceases to get oil from the U.S.S.R.

It was the consensus of most knowledgeable persons with whom I talked that the Sino-Soviet split would intensify the ChiCom's brashness. China doubtless will flex her muscles and show her strength as she vies for leadership in the Communist world, with utter contempt for her erstwhile partner. She must stay dynamic to influence the neutrals who are fence straddlers trying to pick the ultimate winner. More important, she must distract her own population from the colossal failure of her "great leap forward." The split is hopeful and helpful to our side, but we are still mortal enemy No. 1 of all Communists. We should capitalize on the split, yet not get smug when we overhear two bandits arguing only about how best to annihilate us.

PRESCRIPTION FOR SURVIVAL: STRENGTH AND PATIENCE

The only course for the West in the Far East, as elsewhere in the world, is to remain strong. Strength is the only language a Communist understands. The American guarantee of Formosa and overt military support of Vietnam, plus the constant presence of the 7th U.S. Fleet have been the main deterrents to even worse Commie aggression in the Pacific.

As a taxpayer, I regret the necessity of spending American dollars for aid abroad. I believe that cutbacks are essential; indeed ultimate phasing out is the only proof that the aid has succeeded, as in the case in Formosa. As the giver of aid we have every right to demand and enforce standards for its use. There should be only one criterion for America's foreign aid—and that is the self interest of the United States of America.

The problems in the Orient transcend even the urgent military challenges. The Far East is dynamic and awakening, with tremendous potential for good or bad, depending on whether certain countries go Communist. America's stake in the Orient is great in terms of our own self-interest. The Far East is a defense outpost of the free world against the barbarous Chinese Communists who really are less nationalistic than they are burning with genuine Communistic zeal to conquer the world.

Let no Khrushchev nor Mao bellow and scare us into deprecating the strength of our United States. We are strong—immensely strong, in terms of both military missile and civilian muscle.

To win out in the Orient will require strength against our enemy, firmness with our allies, infinite patience—and above all, faith and conviction in our cause. Let us not become intimidated with doubts about our country and our countrymen and ourselves.

Let us go forth not just mouthing pious platitudes about an America worth dying for—but rather dedicatedly believing in an America eminently worth living for.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is presently pending before both Houses of Congress a measure which is erroneously entitled the "Quality Stabilization Bill." This is no more than old fair trade legislation dressed up in new garb. The American consumer would be hard hit by the enactment of this legislation. In September 1963 edition of Exchange & Commissary News appears an article entitled "Price Laws Will Hit Military, Says DOD." This article outlines the serious economic impact which will be felt by our Military Establishment should this measure be enacted. In the same issue of Exchange & Commissary News, there appears an editorial entitled "'Quality Stabilization' Expensive for Everyone," and a column on this subject written by John A. Kuett entitled "Brand Names Bill Tries To Stop Clock."

These three items are very revealing as to certain aspects of the effect of the so-called quality stabilization bill should it be enacted. I have requested that an appropriate official in the Department of Defense be called to testify on this measure before the Senate Commerce Committee. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE LAWS WILL HIT MILITARY, SAYS DOD

(By John Neubauer)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department is seriously concerned with inflationary and anticompetitive aspects of the Quality Stabilization Act (H.R. 3669) now pending before Congress, Exchange & Commissary News has learned.

DOD believes passage of the bill would add billions to the country's defense budget for fiscal year 1964, and that it would largely wipe out the benefits of pay raises recently approved for civilian employees and increases being considered for military personnel.

The bill, which has broad implications for the country's entire economic structure, including the military retail market, is quietly being hustled through the Congress by Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc., a powerful lobbying group representing manufacturers, independent retailers and chainstore interests.

It would allow manufacturers backed up by Federal courts to dictate the wholesale and retail prices of all national brand merchandise, including food and grocery items, on a countrywide basis.

Quality Brands Associates say this is necessary to protect national brand manufacturers from "cannibalistic retail monopolists," and to protect small businessmen, particularly retailers, against loss leader selling. The lobbying group also claims that the bill would have little effect on consumer pocketbooks.

DOD OBJECTIONS

The Defense Department is known to feel otherwise. And so does the Justice Department.

Both fear passage of the bill would gut antitrust laws, cut the heart out of price competition, cause a disastrous upheaval among shall businessmen, and send consumer costs spiraling upward by a estimated 20 percent.

Even though the bill exempts the Federal Government from its provisions, the Defense Department feels it would get caught up in a maze of legalistic gray area since it is the country's largest consumer and its activities take in every phase of daily life.

Pentagon officials further feel that the exemption is meaningless since the bill does not say how the exemption would work.

WHY IT OBJECTS

They cite these other major reasons for their strong opposition to the bill:

Subcontractors and vendors to Government prime contractors are not exempt from the bill. Thus any increased prices they would have to pay would eventually be passed on to the Government.

Manufacturers would be able to control distributors at all levels of operation under threat of losing their franchise. This could be a wedge, the Pentagon feels, to force distributors to sell to the Defense Department at prices dictated by the manufacturers.

By letting manufacturers fix prices at all wholesaling and retailing levels the bill destroys price competition and puts the Department in a disadvantageous bargaining position.

The Pentagon also sees the bill as an oblique attempt to chip away at fringe benefits now enjoyed by military personnel and their dependents, because of the strong national brand policy followed by exchanges and commissaries in the items they stock.

An exchange official said anybody whose pay depends on legislation—military personnel and Federal and State employees—"would be hurt" by the bill, since they would have to wait for new pay legislation to be written to compensate for any further inflation of the cost of living. He noted that the armed services have been 5 years between pay increases.

BRAND STOCKING

He said exchanges could increase the use of private brands if the bill passes, but only if customers demanded them. Exchanges won't stop stocking brand name items as long as they are in demand.

He didn't think the exchange service would have to make cuts in personnel or services or the number of stores it has, if the bill should pass. "As far as our operations are concerned," he said, "we'll go on our merry way. It's the customer who will get hurt."

As one example, he said welfare funds, which are supplied by exchange profits, won't go as far since money won't buy as much if the bill goes through because of its inflationary aspects.

The Justice Department said that rights and privileges created by the bill are "reserved exclusively" for national manufacturers and distributors. It said prices fixed by manufacturers would "serve the interests of chainstores rather than those of small retailers."

NO INDUCEMENT

Since prices of branded items would be the same all over, there would be no inducement for customers to shop around, the Justice Department said. "The result is that the chainstores and the big business retailers increase their share of both branded and unbranded merchandise."

The Department said it was statistically proven that there is a "consistently higher" rate of business failures in States which have resale price maintenance laws than in States which allow price competition.

It said consumers pay 19 to 27 percent more for items in States that have price maintenance laws than they do in States which do not. "Projecting an average price increase of 20 percent for all sales that may be covered by the operation of a national price maintenance law," the Department said, "shows that it would cost the American consumer billions of dollars and have a powerfully inflationary effect."

Representative JOHN DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, said the price-fixing aspects of the bill "constitute a substantial weakening of a large part of the antitrust laws to the grave injury of small businessmen everywhere."

SENATE HEARINGS

The bill—H.R. 3669—has already cleared the House Intermediate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Hearings on the Senate version, S. 774, began in late August. It is identical to the House bill except that is does not exempt drugs and medicines sold by prescription.

No final action on the bill is expected until after the nuclear test ban treaty is ratified and the foreign aid authorization and appropriations bills are worked out. This could take as much as 3 months.

Indications now are that the bill will pass the House, but that it will face rougher sledding in the Senate. Unless there is a massive public protest against the bill, it could pass both chambers. One Capitol Hill insider felt that President Kennedy would veto the bill if it should pass, but said there is strong enough majority in the House to override the veto on a two-thirds vote.

QUALITY STABILIZATION EXPENSIVE FOR EVERYONE

We are going to take a small bow this month. It was Exchange & Commissary News which brought the so-called quality stabilization bill to the attention of the Defense Department.

Although it may be late in the game to be gathering forces in an attempt to counter this reprehensible piece of pending legislation; let us hope that money will talk.

The Defense Department plans to voice its opposition to the bill during hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee. When the Department starts waving the red flag of increased defense costs which are assured by the bill's passage, we think it likely that the Senate will be less favorable toward quality stabilization.

The immediate effect of the law would be to add billions to the fiscal year 1964 defense budget, DOD estimates. It would also largely nullify the proposed military pay raises.

Supporters of the bill deny this. They say that the Federal Government and its agencies—which includes exchanges—are exempt under the bill. Federal legal experts disagree on the grounds that the bill fails to spell out how this exemption applies.

The Defense Department sees costs going up for three reasons.

Subcontractors and vendors who are not exempted by the bill, would eventually pass along to the Government and exchanges the increased prices they must pay at the source for brand-name products.

The Defense Department and exchanges will be forced to pay these increased prices since the vendor will be controlled by the manufacturer. If the vendor does not bow to the manufacturer's price he could lose his franchise.

Thirdly, with the Federal courts allowing manufacturers to set prices at all wholesale and retail levels, competition is eliminated and so is the DOD and exchange bargaining position.

While more than half of all Government buying is standardized and controlled by price agreements such as in the Federal stores catalog, price agreement notices and supply bulletins, officials are concerned over the bill's impact on the large amount of purchasing done on the open market for what are known as unlisted items.

These are bought at market price in a supply and demand situation. Price control legislation would greatly increase costs here.

Relating these factors to the day-to-day operation of exchanges and commissaries can only lead to one grim conclusion. Passage of the bill would seriously injure the pricing structure that has been inherent with these facilities, making them so valuable in the economic life of the military service family.

BRAND NAMES BILL TRIES STOP CLOCK

(By John A. Kuett)

The proposed quality stabilization law is a bold but futile attempt to hold back the tide, stem the flow, stop the clock.

It is also a refusal on the part of some retailers to face themselves and admit that management concepts become outdated along with merchandise.

There are management lessons to be learned by military retail stores in this fight to force artificial price levels on brand name merchandise.

The bill's supporters argue that the majority of retailers need a guaranteed price on a brand name in order to remain in business. Everyone who doesn't agree with this is an "unscrupulous merchant."

This throws a lot of people into the pot including all discount operators, many department stores, supermarkets, mail order houses, ad infinitum. Never mind that these retailers, ranging from the smallest to the largest, might just be more aggressive, harder working, more alert to today's demand for mass merchandising. Some of them sell national brands for less than list prices, and this is unfair, say the quality stabilization boys.

Quality stabilization backers want us to believe that there's a stigma attached to retailing brand names at less than manufacturer's suggested prices.

The purpose is supposedly to save the small guy, the brick of Smalltown, U.S.A., the little merchant from going bust. Because, according to the statistics, he's a vanishing American. He's being done in by the "smart money" boys.

NEW BREED

At this point we would like to spotlight a new breed of small merchant who not only sells brand names at suggested manufacturer's prices but even adds a little. He's doing a booming business and expanding all over the place. He's turning out to be one of the most profitable retailers going.

This fellow is the proprietor of the so-called "ma and pa" store. This is the 1963 version of the corner grocery except with drive-in and self-service. This fellow knows that customers like to get in and out in a hurry. And they are willing to pay more for the privilege of doing so.

His layout is small, compact; variety is limited but first rate and so are the prices. He's never more than a few steps from the customer in case he needs some personal service. In addition, he knows his customers—many of them by their first name.

Today, the customer is in control. He's not interested in whether the operator is an independent, a franchise, a chain, a partnership or what have you. He's only interested in getting what he came for. If he came for cutrate merchandise, that's what he wants. If he came for quick, convenient service, that's what he wants. But when he finds that he's been legislated or regulated out of what he has considered a free marketplace he's going to find out who and why. When he does, all the legislation in Congress won't keep the doors open for those merchants and manufacturers who dipped into the customers pocket in a futile effort to turn back the mass merchandising evolution.

The lesson is simple—this is a buyer's market. The customer is right. He pays for what he wants. Study him and his wants. Don't tell him. Let him tell you. Listen and profit.

J.F.K.'s Credibility, Judgment Questioned in Treaty Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of August 27, 1963:

J.F.K.'S CREDIBILITY, JUDGMENT QUESTIONED IN TREATY ISSUE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's nuclear test ban treaty now threatens to fail him in two fields where, unhappily, he has failed before—his credibility and his judgment.

He has led us to believe that the suspension of above-ground testing could be militarily and scientifically justified at no additional peril to the national safety. He has sent his administration spokesmen to Capitol Hill with slickly prepared testimony that bore the evidence of collaboration and ghost-written unanimity.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg, and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Maxwell D. Taylor, each in turn, swore up and down that the risks were minimal and the advantages manifest.

But I do not think anyone could listen, as I have done, to Gen. Curtis LeMay, the Air Force Chief of Staff, and to Dr. Edward Teller, the Nation's foremost nuclear physicist, without feeling that the President's case for the treaty is little else than a political appeal to Russia and to "world opinion." As a proposition for military and scientific sufficiency, the treaty has reached the brink of unbelievability.

The treaty asks us to accept nuclear parity, when what we need is superiority—and preferably supremacy. It asks us to swallow the theory, voiced by McNamara and blasted by Teller, that we can go underground and successfully test the components of the unimaginably complex antimissile defensive system without ever trying the system in the atmosphere as a whole.

It asks us to believe that the President—after making himself the author and advocate of this partial disarmament pact, and the hawker of all the horrors of nuclear weapons—could, after so doing, creditably use nuclear threats and nuclear arms in a short-of-war action to deter, for example, a Red Chinese invasion of India.

It asks us to believe, as Teller pointed out, that we can deny atmospheric, antimissile weapons to European allies who are faced with Russia's nuclear arsenal, and yet not expect the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance to be blackmailed by fear.

Mr. Kennedy's plausibility as a wise treaty-maker lay in a near-shambles before the LeMay-Teller testimony. And his judgment did not look much better. In the promotion of the treaty he seems to show himself more as the political campaigner whose fluffs and mistakes will be forgotten tomorrow, rather than as the leader who is making decisions that must stand the unrelenting proof of time.

Then his form of presentation has left many Senators and observers with the impression that he demands a Cabinet and military staff who will sing for their suppers. His political approach has given credence to Teller's accusation that our atmospheric tests of 1962 were stopped short of the need to surpass Russia's advantages—stopped at a point where public and world opinion might go against the administration.

The President has denied this serious charge, as he might be expected to do, and his administration witnesses have backed him up.

But the tests were feeble compared with Russia's. They are said in military circles to have been "psyhcological" rather than scientific. They were not satisfactory to LeMay, among others, whose job is to win our wars.

In these circumstances, as in the question of what side deals may have been discussed with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy stands in need of a credibility rating which was not high when the treaty was broached, and has not been recently improved.

Finally, taking the promotional ballyhoo as a whole—the American University address with the Munich-music of appeasement, the Harriman mission, the Moscow spectacular of the signing ceremonies—it is evident that the President is very close to making the one big, conspicuous blunder that his knowledge of history must have warned him to avoid. He has encircled the Senate with choices not unlike those which President Woodrow Wilson laid down on the League of Nations.

The present Senate, faced with this overpublicized test ban treaty, can do three things—all of them very bad.

To ratify the treaty would be to compound what many Senators regard as a dreadful mistake in Presidential judgment.

To reject the treaty outright would leave the American image, like Venus de Milo, maimed though still symmetrical and valid.

To revise the treaty with reservations that Russia would probably refuse to accept seems the least of the evils at hand—yet even that would precipitate a far worse crisis than the one we had before Mr. Kennedy undertook this radical and ill-conceived remedy.

No Raise for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial in the El Dorado (Kans.) Times written by the editor, Rolla A. Clymer:

NO RAISE FOR CONGRESS

Two efforts to fatten the take for Members of Congress are in the works.

If the general public has anything to say about the matter, neither suggestion is likely to arouse whoops of acclaim.

One move would increase congressional pay from $22,500 to $30,000 a year. The second would add another assistant, at a price of over $10,000 a year, to the staff of each Member of the House.

Congressmen have treated themselves in kindly fashion in the matter of pay. In 1955, each Member received a whopping increase of $10,000 annually. This meant that each Congressman now receives $40,000 a year, or over, to pay himself and the members of his staff. A $10,000 hike would push that sum over $50,000—which any competent judge will say is unnecessary.

The Kennedy spenders in Congress regard the budget as a sacred object. It can't be cut in any item, they say—either for military or domestic purposes—without heading the country on the road to the dogs. But, at least, the esteemed gentlemen who stand so loyally by their budget guns can keep from spending more.

They can manfully resist any temptation to increase their own pay, or emoluments.

Congressmen, whose actions continually plunge the country deeper into unpayable debt, don't deserve any more pay. That's what the much-beset rank and file thinks, we believe.

Immigration Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the AFL–CIO Executive Council, meeting at Unity House, Pennsylvania, on August 15 issued a statement in support of the legislation proposed by President Kennedy to eliminate from our immigration laws the national origins quota concept. This proposal is incorporated in S. 1932, a bill which I was privileged to introduce.

Orangized labor has for many years been a stalwart supporter of fair immigration laws. This most recent statement of policy reaffirms and advances their support of long overdue reform of our basic immigration laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the AFL–CIO statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON IMMIGRATION REFORM, UNITY HOUSE, PENNSYLVANIA, AUGUST 15, 1963

President Kennedy has done a signal service to the Nation in focusing attention on our backward immigration policies.

For too many years, the United States has used the national origins quota system to regulate immigration into this country. This quota system is discriminatory. It gives undue preference to immigrants from the countries of northern Europe, and, in effect, views much of the rest of the world's peoples as second-class citizens.

It ill behooves a Nation with our traditions of democracy and our adherence to the principle of equality to treat potential immigrants differently solely on the basis of their country of origin.

The labor movement has long been among the foremost opponents of our discriminatory immigration policies. Before the merger of the AFL and the CIO, both organizations urged elimination of the national origins quota system, and at the merger convention in 1955 the AFL–CIO urged revision and liberalization of the McCarran-Walter Act "to reflect the democratic and humanitarian traditions of our country and to provide an immigration policy attuned to the present requirements of our Nation and of the entire free world."

The legislation which President Kennedy has proposed to the Congress is moderate and fair. It would increase slightly the number of immigrants who could be admitted

each year, and would substitute for the national origins system a formula which takes into account "the skills of the immigrants and their relationship to our needs," family relationships, and the priority of application. The bill would also provide a 5-year period during which the national origins system would be gradually eliminated, thus preserving the rights of those who are now depending on it for admission to this country.

The time is long past when the United States can afford to apply unequal standards to potential immigrants while it professes to be a free and democratic Nation. Our only moral course is to apply to them the same practices of equality which we use to govern ourselves.

We urge the Congress, therefore, to enact promptly the bills introduced by Senator HART of Michigan (S. 1932) and Congressman CELLER of New York (H.R. 7700) embodying the President's proposals. Our heritage of freedom and equality would be thus well served.

"Must" Spending Goes on as Gold Supply Vanishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of August 30, 1963:

"MUST" SPENDING GOES ON AS GOLD SUPPLY VANISHES

(By Henry J. Taylor)

While President Kennedy castigates the foreign aid cut, down goes our gold again—down and out.

The President remains in a dream about money. But what happens to the people who have to earn it?

Until 1933 every American had a choice of accepting paper money or gold money from our Government's treasury. When the Government deprived us of that free choice, few people seem to realize this never happened before. In the entire history of the United States, including the darkest days of the Civil War, it had never before been unlawful for an American to possess his own money in gold.

By its own action, our Government removed any effective check on its own unlimited spending of our money, so far as Americans are concerned, agreeing only to redeem its pledges to us, its citizens, in paper. Foreigners are not affected.

The gold outflow reached troublesome proportions in 1958 when the call from abroad was $3.6 billion. Then in 1959 it was $3.7 billion, in 1960 another $3.9 billion, 1961 another $2.4 billion, and 1962 $2.2 billion. In addition, for the last 2 years the true situation has been buried behind temporary gimmicks and monetary deals that gave the deepening crisis a false front.

Never has our Government been in hock to so many for so much, both at home and abroad.

Foreigners now have a call on us for $20.5 billion in gold—central banks abroad can ask us for $12 billion, noncitizens of the United States for $8.5 billion.

As one result the U.S. gold stock at Fort Knox has now fallen to another new 24-year low. We don't own a nickel of what is left. The $20.5 billion that foreigners can demand is nearly $5 billion more than the $15.6 billion left to meet this demand, including the entire amount the administration is legally required to keep as our currency reserve. Now that's all gone in hock, too.

The $8.5 billion privately held in foreign claims is the more explosive part of this total. These creditors—some large, some small—live in many countries. All they have to do is turn their dollar holdings into their national central banks in exchange for their own currencies. And if the central banks are unwilling to thus increase their dollar balances they simply demand gold instead.

That's the way it works. And what does Mr. Kennedy expect our foreign creditors to do when he keeps saying, "must," "must," "must" to more and more spending?

The administration collected $102 billion from the Nation's earners last year. More than $65 billion was taken from individuals of which $49 billion was withheld and never even seen by the men and women who worked for this vast sum. In addition, corporations collected $21 billion for Washington.

Still, New Frontiersmen couldn't pay their bills—even with this—and boosted our national debt to a new all-time high. The President's only proposed solution is to urge planned deficits through programs to increase general spending and reduce taxes at the same time. Moreover, since January 1, Mr. Kennedy has proposed 12 additional tax-distributing programs for which he asks $200 million merely and entirely to get more bureaus organized.

Harbor and Channel Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to Mr. Edward K. Thompson, editor, Life magazine, by Mr. Harry O. Locher, secretary and treasurer of the National Association of River and Harbor Contractors:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RIVER AND HARBOR CONTRACTORS,
New York, N.Y., August 29, 1963.

Mr. EDWARD K. THOMPSON,
Editor, Life Magazine, Rockefeller Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The article "Now See the Innards of a Fat Pig" in your August 16 issue has come to our attention. We note the derision directed at waterway improvements. Here are some facts which we believe will be interesting to your readers.

At the outset, the improvement of the Tennessee River under the Tennessee Valley Authority was ridiculed. The tremendous success of that undertaking has long since been established. Today, while some are ridiculing the development of the Arkansas River Basin, there are others who believe that ultimately it will surpass what was accomplished in the Tennessee River Valley. Local interests worked long and hard to get the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel and made substantial cash and other contributions toward its cost. Once termed "the damnednest fake out of doors" the Port of Houston more than once in recent years has been the second largest port in the Nation; has helped to make Houston the greatest city in the Southwest, all due to the 50-mile dredged channel to the gulf.

There is probably no legislation enacted in Washington that is less understood by the public than that for waterway improvements; no other Federal expenditure is subjected to closer scrutiny. Disagreement in some situations, yes. But labeling waterway legislation "pork barrel" implies that it provides, through political trades and maneuvers, for ill conceived and unworthy projects. It impugns the integrity of the Corps of Engineers and its Chief, committee members, and other Members of the House and Senate. The derisive term is a moldy cliche, used largely through habit; it misleads the people.

Approved projects are those that have been certified economically sound after public hearings and long study by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, made first by the district officer, reviewed by his superior, the division engineer, then by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and finally by the Chief of Engineers. No part of the study is perfunctory. Having passed that test, they go to the Public Works Committee of the House. If approved there, and later by the Senate Public Works Committee, they are incorporated in a river and harbor authorization bill which carries no money. After the bill becomes law, funds for those selected for prosecution are eventually made available by Congress.

With over one-half of the projects investigated down through the years, the decisions by Army Engineers have been "the principal grounds upon which the adverse conclusions are based are that the benefits to be anticipated * * * are insufficient to warrant the expenditure of Federal funds for the purpose."

It is rarely mentioned that piers, wharves, elevators, warehouses, trackage, and other necessary facilities are wholly the work of local authorities or private interests; the Federal Government improves only the waterways. The two are inseparable; one utterly useless without the other. The waterway might have been derided as a pork barrel project; the land structures it serves commended as civic advances. Civic interests also often contribute to the cost of harbor and channel improvements in cash, rights-of-way and spoil areas for dredged material.

The great strength of America today owes largely to harbor and channel development done in the past. Greater strength of the future will come largely from continuing development. Money spent for this purpose is an investment in the building of the Nation.

Picture the plight of America if all of its harbors and navigable channels vanished overnight.

Our industry is proud of the vital part it is playing in the development of our country; improving harbors and channels through dredging, creating navigation, vital to industry and commerce, where it did not exist before.

Sincerely,

HARRY O. LOCHER.

Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have supported our aid programs because I

believe that these programs are effective and invaluable tools of policy.

The Alliance for Progress is a remarkable example of what our aid program can do. The Alliance has been in existence for only 2 years, but it nevertheless can show some remarkable examples of progress. The Alliance is responsible for moving many countries off dead center, and vast changes have been initiated under its leadership. Inertia is not easy to overcome, and now that we can point out visible examples of progress we should more than ever be willing to support the Alliance.

This editorial from the August 2 edition of a Santiago newspaper will show what I am talking about, and I hope that my colleagues will reflect upon it carefully.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Almost 3 years have now elapsed since the Alliance was contemplated, and its progress has been in a direct line: there are plans for economic development, there are laws for implanting tax and land reforms, and the change in the mentality of Latin American political circles is general, with even the most traditional circles accepting the need for profound transformation in economic and social organization in order to preserve democracy or its true effectiveness. Chile is a typical example of what we say.

As far as the United States goes, great efforts have been made to assure the financing of the Alliance, the existence of directive organizations, and, above all, an increase in the Latin American participation in these phases. It is notorious that President Kennedy has not been able to achieve support from the Congress of his country for the contributions offered at Punta del Este, a fact that gives rise to criticisms in Latin America.

In the time which has passed since the new hemispheric program was put into action, there have been many occasions to appreciate the political repercussions of the Alliance for Progress. It constitutes an element of controversy in the presidential campaign now underway in the United States, neither uniting nor dividing entirely either the Republicans or the Democrats, since there are members of both parties which fight it or defend it.

The political repercussion is sharper in Latin America, since there the political groups appear entirely favorable or entirely against the Alliance. In our recently begun presidential campaign, we see the Democratic Front and the Christian Democrats favoring the Alliance and the Marxist coalition against it. The two positions correspond, respectively, to the idea of carrying out structural change with liberty, and that of achieving such change under a dictatorship.

The deep political reach of the Alliance cannot be avoided and it must be recognized that its spirit and the impulses it has awakened in Latin America are equivalent to a basic transformation.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose herewith an excellent editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., September 2, 1963, which salutes our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman BASIL WHITENER's fine presentation of the existing textile problem:

THE ONE-WAY STREET

Last week the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan reached cozy agreement in their negotiations concerning imports of cotton textiles this country would accept from Japan in the next 2 years. These imports were fixed at 287,500,000 square yards for the calendar year 1963.

Next year this figure will be increased by 3 percent and by 5 percent for 1965. This arrangement is in line with the so-called long-term agreements reached between the United States and Japan in 1962.

In calling the attention of Congress to the completed agreement, the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative BASIL WHITENER, point out that the Kennedy administration had made certain promises to the U.S. textile industry that accompanied passage of the Trade Expansion Act providing compensation for damage to be suffered by domestic textile manufacturers.

"This," said Representative WHITENER ,"was an unabashed admission that American industry was to serve, at the expense of possible lethal injury, the interests of diplomacy as interpreted by the State Department and the President."

This compensation was to take the form of various kinds of assistance to companies and workers injured by the increased imports in shifting to other production, retraining and relocation of workers and, in some instances, financial help.

"But the language of the act," said Representative WHITENER, "was so stringently drawn that in the 10 months since the passage of the Trade Act not 1 cent of compensation has been awarded for technical, financial, or tax assistance to firms or for retraining, relocating, and otherwise supporting the victimized workers.

"To date no less than 11 cases have been processed by the Tariff Commission under the provisions of the new Trade Act. All 11 have been rejected by the Commission by unanimous vote.

"This is the record under the Trade Expansion Act * * *. Yet the facts are that industries are being hurt as a result of past tariff reductions and face a yet more inhospitable outlook in the future when further cuts are to be made."

Promises, it would seem, are things used to secure passage of a bill or the election of a President.

Opposition to So-Called Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Conway Field, of Conway, S.C., has published in its August 28, 1963, issue an eloquent editorial plea against passage of the President's so-called civil rights program. The editorial is entitled "What Are You Doing About It?" I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE YOU DOING ABOUT IT?

We are wondering if 1 out of 100 know that we are ready to take our big step toward communism?

Some of you complain over a cup of coffee about the forthcoming legislation but that is about as far as it goes but as individuals what are you doing about it?

How many of you realize that if bill S. 1731 is passed that the Federal eye will be looking down your throat and control your home, your business, your farm, your bank, and you, if you are a veteran, draw social security, own stock, or have a child in school?

For the first time in the peacetime history of the United States, it is proposed in legislation now pending before the Congress to deny the right of trial by jury.

This is one of the more important (and least publicized) aspects of S. 1731 and H.R. 7152—that legislative "Trojan horse" named the Civil Rights Act of 1963—in which dictatorial Federal control of business, industry, individual citizens, and the "sovereign" States is disguised as protection of racial and religious minorities.

Under this insidious bill, the judgment of Federal inspectors, appointed to bring about social reforms, would supersede our traditional and constitutional judicial processes. Through the sly device of eliminating criminal penalties, those who drew the bill have made it so a violator of the "public accommodations" section (title II), would be haled without hearing before a judge and placed under Federal injunction to cease and desist whatever act of discrimination the Federal overseer may have charged him with. And the penalty would be fine or imprisonment for contempt of court—from which there is no appeal.

Given this cloak of civil rights, the President would thus have raw, unchallenged power. Similarly, under other provisions of the bill, Federal control would be extended to every home, every school, every business, every bank, and to every citizen who owns property or casts a vote. The President—or his political appointees—would have the power to tell the owners of every business whom they may hire, fire, promote, or demote; to call, foreclose, or refuse loans; to exclude individuals and businesses from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits; to blacklist banks, contractors, schools, businesses, and individuals. Think of that.

As one critic has said: "The administration's bill proposes, in effect, that the Congress abdicate, and turn its legislative powers over to the White House. The powers here demanded are not the powers rightfully to be exericsed by a President in a free country. These are the powers of a despot."

No citizen, whatever his color, race, or religion—for this bill extends to all races and creeds—should need further urging to demand of his Senators (both of them) and his Representative that they vote down S. 1731 and H.R. 7152—kill it all.

Serving the Cause of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Palmer Becker of Marion, S. Dak., who has just returned from 4 years of relief and educational work in Taiwan. This letter presents in a most

eloquent manner the story of how one person can serve the cause of world peace. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARION, S. DAK.,
August 8, 1963.

Mr. KARL MUNDT,
Senator from South Dakota, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: While scanning through my great-great-grandfather's diary recently, I noticed that 90 years ago today he had an appointment with President Grant. My great-great-grandfather had come from Europe to find out what this country was like and before returning to Europe to bring his family to this country, he wanted to make sure that this country would guarantee freedom of conscience to his descendants. President Grant assured my great-great-grandfather that the Constitution of the United States would always uphold the rights of conscience and the freedom of worship.

For the past 4½ years I have been in Taiwan because we still have those rights and freedoms. My country, our United States of America, gave me the opportunity of serving it by doing relief and educational work in that land rather than sending me to the Army against the dictates of my conscience. You can't imagine how much I appreciate this. The work was so rewarding that I overstayed the required term by 2½ years.

While in Taiwan, I was able to administer a milk feeding program for 10,000 undernourished children, conduct a daily English radio program over 6 stations and oversee the publication of 40 tons of literature. All of this gave me a tremendous opportunity to interpret our democratic, moral, and religious principles for the people of Taiwan. I felt that this was a wonderful and constructive way of serving my country which I love.

I am a Mennonite. As a people we are not negative to helping our Nation gain peace in this world. In fact, we are convinced that we can help our Nation, the people of the world, and our God more through alternative programs than through the military program.

Thanks again for letting me serve my country in this way.

Sincerely yours,

PALMER BECKER.

Discriminatory Aspects of Present Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HART. Mr. President, recently the Order of Ahepa, the largest fraternal organization of Greek-Americans, held their 41st Supreme Convention in San Diego, Calif.

One of the significant actions taken at the meeting was the adoption of a resolution supporting S. 1932, the bill I introduced to carry out President Kennedy's proposal to eliminate the national origins quota system from our immigration laws. The magnificent contributions made to the United States by citizens of Greek birth and by their descendants are evident in all corners of our land. No voice could speak more eloquently of the need and the value of the proposed changes in our immigration laws than the Order of Ahepa.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Supreme Convention of the Order of Ahepa be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SUPREME CONVENTION OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA ON AUGUST 16, 1963

Whereas the Order of Ahepa has for many years fought for the enactment of immigration legislation which would truly serve the national interest and reflect in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity to which our Nation subscribes; and

Whereas the Order of Ahepa has been in the forefront of efforts to put a just and reasonable immigration law on our statute books and to alert public opinion to the imminent need for immigration reform; and

Whereas President John F. Kennedy, on July 23, 1963, forwarded to Congress legislation designed to revise and liberalize our existing immigration law; and

Whereas the President has proposed a bill which would eliminate altogether the national origins system for allocating quotas and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present laws; and

Whereas the administration's proposal for immigration reform has since been introduced in the Senate by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, as S. 1932, and in the House by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER as H.R. 7700; and

Whereas the proposed legislation would establish a series of priorities for admission: first, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons related to U.S. citizens and aliens legally admitted to the United States, and third, all other immigrants on a first come first served basis; and

Since the enactment of this legislation would reflect America's ideal of the equality of all men without regard to race, color, creed or national origin, and would enhance America's image as leaders of the free world in according equal dignity and respect to all peoples of the world; and

Whereas these basic changes in American immigration policy are long overdue; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Order of Ahepa in national convention assembled in San Diego, Calif., does hereby unanimously commend and congratulate the President of the United States for his vigorous and courageous message to Congress requesting the aforesaid changes in our immigration law, that we further congratulate the Senator PHILIP A. HART and all the Senators who have formed in cosponsoring S. 1932; that we congratulate Congressman EMANUEL CELLER and all Members of the House of Representatives who have joined in cosponsoring H.R. 7700; and that we do hereby go on record as enthusiastically endorsing and supporting these proposed immigration changes; Be it further

Resolved, That certified copy of this resolution be promptly transmitted to the President of the United States, to Senator PHILIP A. HART, to Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, to all the U.S. Senators and Congressmen who have joined in cosponsoring this gravely needed legislation, and that copies be transmitted to all members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees as well.

LeMay's Secret Testimony Adds Bite to Treaty Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of August 29, 1963:

LEMAY'S SECRET TESTIMONY ADDS BITE TO TREATY DOUBT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Secrecy in Washington is never leakproof, but a reporter must satisfy his conscience that in revealing hush-hush testimony he is not giving information to the enemy. With that restriction in mind, I think it enlightening to report the tenor of Gen. Curtis LeMay's dialog in his closed-door session with the Preparedness Subcommittee.

LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, and the other Joint Chiefs of Staff were called individually to the White House, a day or so after the Moscow signing of the nuclear test-ban treaty. They were told that their opinions on the treaty must be based upon both military and political considerations. The legal basis for asking military men to make political judgments lies in chapter 5, paragraph D(8), of the fundamental Defense Department statute and it reads:

"The Joint Chiefs shall * * * perform such other duties as the President or Secretary of Defense may prescribe."

On this broad authority, LeMay was instructed to think politically, but he was then turned over to State Department briefers to be told what to think. He was told that among the major political results expected to flow from the treaty were (a) widening the Sino-Soviet rift and (b) achieving a worldwide detente, or relaxation of tensions, between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

LeMay told the Preparedness Subcommittee that he didn't believe either of these results would follow the treaty ratification. That is, he remained unconvinced by whatever proof the State Department offered him. The Air Force Chief of Staff later told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in open hearing that, had the treaty not been already signed, he would have opposed it wholeheartedly rather than accept it, as he did, with misgivings.

What misgivings? LeMay disbelieves, as does Dr. Edward Teller, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's stated optimism that the United States has nuclear superiority and can maintain it under the treaty.

The McNamara opinion is not based on technical knowledge of Russian nuclear power. It is based on intelligence estimates.

This means we take the little that is known about Russian discoveries and then extrapolate this material to reach some conclusions. When asked what if these conclusions were faulty in the wrong direction, the burly LeMay, with his expressive voice and manner said: "School's out."

Well, what are the chances that the intelligence estimates are reliable enough to sustain the risk that Russia may soon come up with a missile defense system which will make the U.S.S.R. relatively impregnable to an American retaliatory attack? This same Stennis Preparedness Subcommittee on May 9, 1963, published a document entitled "Investigation of the Preparedness Program." While directed specifically at the Russian

sneak occupation and fortification of Cuba, the Stennis report does assess our intelligence estimating capacity as follows:

"The deficiency in the performance of the intelligence community appears to have been in the evaluation and assessment of accumulated data. Moreover there seems to have been a disinclination on the part of the intelligence community to accept and believe the ominous portent of the information which had been gathered.

"In addition, the intelligence people apparently invariably adopted the most optimistic estimate possible with respect to the information available. This is in sharp contrast to the customary military practice of emphasizing the worst situation which might be established by the accumulation of the evidence."

There, in brief, is why LeMay and others are skeptical of a treaty which proposes a limited disarmament on the basis of intelligence estimates. Our policymakers, on whom President Kennedy relies, are not good at evaluation and assessment. They have a "disinclination * * * to believe * * * the ominous portent."

Underestimating the enemy is the cardinal sin in military strategy. When we did it last year, the Russians moved into Cuba in such force that we dare not try to dislodge them. If we underestimate this year on the matter of Russia's nuclear potential, "School's out."

That's the opinion, not of a newsman, but of our foremost military airman, Gen. Curtis LeMay, and of other military men who are less outspoken.

Tax Whacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial in the Iola (Kans.) Register written by Angelo Scott, the editor and publisher:

TAX WHACKS

Any tax student will agree that in theory, double taxation is altogether wrong. There is no logic behind taxing the same source of income twice, once when it is earned, again when it happens to change hands.

Yet that's what we've been doing for years with corporation profits. First they are taxed at a whopping 52 percent when earned. Then when what's left is passed on to the owners in dividends, it is taxed again as personal income.

Thus it was hailed as a reform in 1954 when Congress passed a law permitting stockholders to exclude from taxable income $50 of dividends received each year and to take a 4 percent tax credit on the rest.

It was a small enough move; peanuts compared to the billions of dollars in corporate profits still being double taxed. Nevertheless, it was a move, however small, in the direction of correcting a longstanding injustice.

So yesterday the House Ways and Means Committee voted to eliminate the 4 percent double taxation relief in the new tax bill coming up. And this is called reform by the administration experts who proposed it.

It is a reform because it will close a loophole which is preventing all corporate profits from being taxed twice instead of only 96 percent of them.

Which only shows that you might just about as well be utterly cynical about taxes from beginning to end.

It is not a question of justice or logic or fairness. It is a question of grabbing where the grabbing is good, particularly among the well to do and where the political kickback will be the least.

Of course there is actually another side to the double taxation argument. By now, corporate income taxes have been worked into the price of goods so thoroughly that most corporations make about the same net profit after today's 52-percent tax that they used to after half that much or none at all.

So it really isn't a true 100-percent profit of which the Government takes half. It is just a modern way of adjusting big business to Government income needs. It is a sort of Federal manufacturers' tax. The actual profit is what's left, and there is no reason why all of it shouldn't be taxed as income to those who received it.

At least you could make that argument.

For that matter, you could argue that all sales taxes are double taxation—once when you earn the money, again when you spend it.

And what about property taxation? Here you pay income tax when you earn the money, sales tax when you buy the building materials, then still a third tax for just owning the house after it is built.

I repeat—it's a pretty cynical business, mainly consisting of taking a whack at whatever kind of wealth can be found anywhere in an easily taxable form.

About all you can do as you watch the committee votes on shaping a new tax bill such as the present one is hope that you won't get whacked too many more times than the other fellow.

A Latin American Tribute to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the Star and Herald, of Panama, on July 4, 1963, entitled "A Great Nation's Birthday." It is a splendid tribute to our Nation and its people, and I believe that it should receive wide circulation.

The Star and Herald was founded more than 100 years ago, and has been, ever since, in continuous publication. Throughout its history it has effectively served the cause of progress on the Isthmus of Panama and other Latin American lands, and the solidarity of the American states. It has been the consistent friend of the United States.

The editorial closes on a note of faith and optimism with respect to our country in its dealing with the many grave problems now confronting it. Let us hope that our policies and deeds, may be such as to justify the faith, and to verify the prediction, thus so kindly expressed.

Under leave which has been granted I herewith include as a part of these remarks the indicated editorial:

A GREAT NATION'S BIRTHDAY

"Government of the people, by the people, and for the people," is the cornerstone on which the national structure of the United States is based. It is another way of expressing the doctrine consigned in the Declaration of Independence, of July 4, 1776, that the powers of government rest on the consent of the governed.

That phrase that has justly contributed to the immortality of Abraham Lincoln, and is quoted by people of every language as the most apt expression of the essence of democracy, continues to be the guide of the people of the United States, and because it has been cherished and defended by all the people, as an inalienable right and has been respected, it has become a part of the national conscience and under its beneficent influence the country has grown and has prospered.

Government by the consent of the governed, implies government that shall exercise its powers only as a trustee of the people, acting in such a way that the benefit it produces shall be enjoyed by all the people and not only by a privileged minority; and it shall impose duties and obligations equally upon all, even upon those of its components who have been chosen by the governed to govern. Observance of this principle has contributed to make the United States the great world power that it is on this 187th, anniversary of its independence; it is a principle that many nations could well afford to adopt and to follow the pattern of its effects in the United States as closely as the limitations of human frailities permit.

The United States is a great power today. There is no question of its preeminent leadership in our modern world after only 187 years of independent life, representative of early youth, as the age of nations is measured. And this greatness is, without doubt, the result of the combined effort of that Nation's united people, and this unity can be attributed to the fact that the concept of the phrase, "the people" has never been permitted to mean anything else than all the people, without distinctions of class or creed; without even the suspicion of a claim that there could exist a special class that was born to rule, and that from such a class, only, could men fit to govern emerge. This unity, with the passage of years, has been translated into strength, firm and abiding, physical and moral strength.

Other elements, of course, have contributed their share to form the substance of the power of this new Nation. It sought always to grow within the ample confines of its territorial limits after the early and definite conditioning of these limits, legally and fairly. Other contributing factors include the effort always to absorb all worthy elements that came to its shores seeking freedom and liberty, whatever their origin. Of these, hundreds of thousands, nay millions, were welcomed. And that new Nation that continued free because it wanted to be free, cherished the worthy stranger within its gates and strove wisely, encouraging him to participate, on a footing of equality, to make him, in due course of time, an asset of the Nation, in all the benefits created for the children of that land, native born or adopted.

With rare exceptions, these newcomers effectively contributed in the measure of their strength, with their brain and their brawn toward the greatness of the Nation that generously received them into a full enjoyment of the blessings of liberty and freedom, and helped them to forget the harshness of the oppressor from whom they fled. Naturally and as a matter of course, because they were human beings and thus exposed to error, some of these newcomers proved unassimilable and noxious and so were expelled or eliminated. But these exceptions never were allowed to become the

standard according to which the others were judged.

The United States is a great power, because she was born with the germ of greatness in her vitals, because she was constituted on the principle of the equality of all men. Those men who founded the Nation, despite their initiative and the fact that they ran grave risks, did not regard this circumstance as entitling them or their descendants to any special privileges or prerogatives that would raise them above the level of the people without whose concourse they could have done nothing but fret and fume. These men frankly and sincerely saw an equal in every man united with them, directly or indirectly, importantly or in the most humble posts, in the great adventure of founding a nation. Among those early leaders were men who, themselves or their fathers before them, had fled from oppression and sought liberty and freedom in the wilds of a newly discovered land, preferring the frank acknowledgment of the brotherhood of man in God, to those artificially created concepts of life under the constricting and enervating patronage of a so-called privileged or ruling caste.

The greatness of the United States also has one of its roots in the conviction of her people that every man in the land is the peer of his neighbor; that every man carries within him, in his blood, in his flesh, in his muscle, in his intellect, in his soul, the germ of greatness and that it is his privilege to aspire, to delve and to strive to give it expression, in the prior assurance of full freedom to profit from his findings.

The United States has prospered and grown strong, because she has eschewed those noxious practice that tend to culturally advance one sector or class of the community, while obstructing or denying the enjoyment of the right of equal opportunities to the other. She advanced rapidly along the road of material and spiritual progress, because she created an all-prevading sense of security that induced the honest and industrious man to put forth his best effort all the time, confident that he would not be denied the enjoyment of the fruits of his labor. She grew strong and increased in power, because she stimulated initiative and rewarded enterprise and strove to suppress those elements which made a daily practice of cheating and preying on the simple, straightforward man who lived by the sweat of his brow.

This 187th anniversary of independence finds the United States in the forefront of world leadership, because across the years she has been the chosen haven of the world's lovers of freedom, and thus invariably has received the best spirits of the world, men who have preferred the hardships of a new beginning in a faraway land where they were assured liberty and freedom as an inalienable right; where they could live and think according to the dictates of their conscience, uprightly and righteously, and not as the mere instruments of the power to crush and destroy. The respect for the rights of man has contributed immensely to make the United States the great Nation that she is.

Today that great Republic heads into another year, into another 12-month period pregnant with possibilities, into another 365-day cycle which will be epochal in history. Judging from the marvels of its past, cognizant of its power in the present, we do not hesitate to predict that the pages of history that will have been written by the time the 188th anniversary of independence rolls around in 1964, will be glorious pages, immortal pages, replete with accomplishments that will bring new hope not only for the children of that great country, but for all humanity, everywhere.

"God Bless America."

Massachusetts Participation in Civil Rights Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a letter sent to various Massachusetts newspapers which vividly describes the recent civil rights demonstration in Washington.

I was certainly proud of the excellent showing made by residents of the Commonwealth on that historic August 28 freedom march.

This article, then, by Leo E. Anderson—a former native of Massachusetts who now lives in the District of Columbia—is a stirring tribute to the role played by the delegation from the Commonwealth.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to enclose the full text of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It appeared in the Pittsfield, Mass., Berkshire Eagle of Saturday, September 7:

The August 28 freedom march for the redress of long-standing grievances was national in character and had Washington as its focal point. With my home State Massachusetts in mind, I should like to consider the historic gathering from the triple aspect of: (1) The motto of Massachusetts, (2) the Massachusetts representation, (3) the name of Massachusetts on the Lincoln Memorial.

As every loyal Bay Stater should know the motto of Massachusetts is "Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem," the English version being "By the sword we seek peace but peace under liberty." This slogan is most appropriate, epitomizing the determined effort of the Negro to seek liberty. Just as the sword has been superseded by more sophisticated weapons, so the sword of violence on the 28th was replaced by an orderly demonstration that was, however, no less insistent upon liberty.

When I left the Washington Monument grounds for the mile walk to the Lincoln Memorial with some 200,000 people, who formed a human river flowing down Constitution Avenue, which at one time had been the watercourse of the Chesapeaks and Ohio Canal, I fortuitously came upon the Massachusetts contingent, some 1,500 strong, as it wended its dignified way toward the Great Emancipator's shrine. I suddenly experienced a knitting of souls in a common cause. Speechless awe overwhelmed me, coupled with a paradoxical mixture of happiness and sadness. I was proudly happy to be a part of this unified cry, with a northern motif, yet sad to think circumstances necessitated it. It was a religious, festive, patriotic occasion, evoking a spine-tingling sensation.

With the masses gathering about the brooding figure of Lincoln. Massachusetts assumed a position of even more striking importance. As the capstone of the Memorial, fittingly hovering over the speaker's stand, between six huge columns to the right and six huge columns to the left, with the majestic and pensive seated statue of the martyr as a backdrop, loomed in clear, incisively chiselled letters the name of Massachusetts. It silently gave testimony that it was, and I pray still is, the cradle of independence and liberty.

As a postscript, two deaths surrounding the great petition were in some way connected with Massachusetts. William DuBois, the founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who died in Ghana on the eve of the march, was born in Great Barrington, Mass. And the only casualty of the demonstration was Charles Schreiber, a New Yorker, who was stricken during the ceremonies. He also was born in Massachusetts.

May President Kennedy, who likewise hails from Massachusetts be instrumental in seeing that proper civil rights legislation is enacted forthwith.

Sincerely,

LEO E. ANDERSON.

No Place To Hide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the text of a speech delivered in August by the Honorable John Davis Lodge, president of Junior Achievement, Inc., at the 20th Annual Junior Achievers Conference in Bloomington, Ind. Junior Achievement organizes, encourages and trains young people in the finest traditions of the free enterprise system. Across the country, young people who participate in it are thoroughly prepared both to enjoy the benefits of our free society and to make the maximum contribution to it. This group is further privileged by having John Lodge for its national president.

Mr. Lodge, a predecessor of mine in this seat, later Governor of Connecticut and then a most distinguished Ambassador to Spain, is a keen and experienced observer of world affairs. I know his words will be of interest to Members of Congress:

NO PLACE TO HIDE

(By Hon. John Davis Lodge, president of Junior Achievement, Inc.)

We have gathered to celebrate the moral values which cluster around the free enterprise system. We meet to rededicate ourselves to the initiative, the competition, the incentives which are implicit in our private property economy. We assemble here, in these attractive surroundings, to enjoy the comforting warmth of a beautiful Indiana summer and of Hoosier hospitality and to strengthen ourselves for the battle which must constantly be fought if the future of our young people is to remain, in fact, unlimited.

That future is threatened; but it is also pregnant with opportunity. Our Nation and the entire non-Communist world are menaced by Russian, Communist, imperialist aggression. The test ban treaty has done nothing to halt the relentless Communist onslaught. The 1 billion people enslaved by communism since the end of World War II, have been conquered not by nuclear warfare nor by the contagion of the Communist ideology, but by economic penetration, by guerrilla warfare, by the infiltration of infant democracies, by bribery and blackmail, by corruption and by every manner of deceit, by internal pressure and external force. Let us

hope that the test ban treaty, to which neither France nor Communist China have adhered, will in fact produce a relaxation of tension and constitute a first step toward a more dependable peace. In the meantime, however, Khrushchev's cold war activities remain unchanged. As former Vice President Nixon said a few days ago in commenting on the test ban treaty: "Subversion, espionage, and support of Communist fronts * * * are still his main goals." Nixon continued: "I think Khrushchev is doing what he is doing because he wants to get some recognition of the Soviet Union's control of Eastern Europe."

By weakening ourselves in the area of nuclear power in which we have been predominant, we may reduce whatever danger there has been of a Russian nuclear attack, but we have not weakened Russian and Red Chinese capacity and determination to press forward in that twilight zone of action where all their advances have been made. Indeed our Communist self-styled enemies have been so successful by cold war methods that it is unthinkable that they would risk the unacceptable damage of nuclear retaliation by using Cuba as a base for nuclear attack. In fact, Cuba is now a stronghold for spreading the Communist poison in South America by nonnuclear means.

It may be that we shall now have the spirit of Moscow just as we had the spirit of Geneva and the spirit of Camp David. Yet people are still being killed along the Berlin wall, in South Vietnam, in Korea and here and there in Africa and in South America. British Guiana is on the verge of becoming a Communist satellite and the French and Belgian Congos seethe with unrest. In spite of their reported quarrels, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung still move forward on a concurrent front. Their basic disagreement is on the question of how—not whether—to bury us.

I fear that while we cheer over the test ban treaty and jeer at anyone who expresses reservations, the facts prove beyond peradventure of doubt that the Communist determination to destroy us remains, that peaceful coexistence is still surrender on an installment plan, and that setting up a kind of shadow shield against Russian nuclear attack does not protect us from Communist aggression. We cannot take even cold comfort from our ability to fight the cold war. While we rejoice in the test ban treaty, the Russians tighten their hold in Hungary, in Poland and in East Germany; while we proclaim that the Moscow meeting is a historic step in the cause of peace, Castro is spreading his tenacles in Haiti, in Venezuela, in Peru and in Brazil; while we comfort ourselves with the struggle between Russia and Red China, the Red Chinese and their satellites attack in Laos, in Korea, in South Vietnam and Quemoy; they have launched a new attack in India and they are pressing forward in Tibet.

Although, as Walter Lippmann says, the test ban treaty will not necessarily lead to growing East-West confidence and reduced tensions, it is very likely to lead us to let down our guard as we hope for the best in a jungle world.

Former President Eisenhower understands the Communist threat. He said: "But what makes the Soviet threat unique in history is its all inclusiveness. Every human activity is pressed into service as a weapon of expansion. Trade, economic development, military power, arts, science, education, the whole world of ideas—all are harnessed to the same chariot of expansion. The Soviets are, in short, waging total cold war."

The Communist threat is economic. As long ago as 1956 Allen Dulles, then Director of CIA, stated that Russian production of machine tools probably was greater than that of the United States. As Frank R. Barnett, vice president and director of research, Richardson Foundation, Inc., said: "Machine tools, rather than consumer goods, are the index to growth rate and national power."

The Russian oil surplus is 500,000 barrels a day. They are planning to cripple British, Dutch, and American oil companies by underselling them in the Common Market. The Russian export drive may create great friction inside the Western alliance which is a bulwark against the expansionist aims of the Russian Communist dictatorship.

The Communist threat is economic in another way. Khrushchev's promise to "bury" us means not only economic warfare of the kind I have just mentioned, it means attempts to destroy the American private property, profit and loss economic system. For our enemies know that this is our greatest source of strength. They know that our productiveness is an indispensable element in our national power. They realize that our industries provided the sinews of our military might during World Wars I and II.

Although many Americans, some of them in high places, seem to have lost confidence in the American business system, our enemies know that American business has produced 3 times the railroads of the Soviet Union, 18 times the highways, 50 times the cars, and 4 times the consumer goods of every kind. The affluence of our society is what our friends and our enemies would like to achieve. Our progress, especially since the beginning of the century, has been staggering. Thus, as the year 1900 rolled around, pay averaged 19 cents an hour, the work week was 72 hours not 40 hours and one family in five owned its own house. Today, three families out of five do.

The campaign against business in America is moving subtly and steadily. Its victory would be a victory for our Communist enemies. The survival of business, the survival of freedom, our survival as an independent nation are at stake.

This is where Junior Achievement comes in. The advantages of our American free enterprise system have been demonstrated over and over again both in peace and in war. You Junior Achievers have had occasion to appreciate the values of a free economy. You have had the exciting experience of running a private business, of taking risks. You know what the profit and loss system means. You know that, while loss is regrettable, profit is not evil as some people depict it. It is not an adventitious windfall. Profit is payment for the use of money, of tools of production. You have experienced the wonderful sense of fulfillment which comes from business success. You know, because you have been through the process of learning by doing, that freedoms and responsibilities are indeed inseparable and that as the State assumes the responsibility of controlling your business, you lose the freedom to run it yourselves. You know that our other freedoms such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom from search and seizure will be threatened if we should no longer have the freedom to own and to manage businesses. Human rights depend on property rights.

What is the principal reason why we Americans, with only 6 percent of the world's population produce and consume 40 percent of the world's goods? Natural resources, climate, skilled workers—good leaders? Certainly. Yet the main reason is the desire and ability of our people to assume responsibility. Unless our citizens—you—retain your sense of responsibility, our future will not be unlimited. Indeed it will be limited by the responsibilities which Government assumes.

It is important for you delegates to the National Junior Achievers Conference to realize that you, more than any other group, have, at this trembling hour of destiny, a responsibility of leadership. During the past few years, the clamor for protection and security has been rising. As Smythe Gambrell, of Atlanta, Ga., former president of the American Bar Association, said in a remarkable address, "Afraid they may be found wanting, some would choose not to be tried at all. If our people lack confidence in their power to cope with the problems which face them said Smythe Gambrell, what reason have we to suppose that they will somehow find the infinitely greater wisdom required to choose a leadership who will do the job and that we are still free so long as we elect our keepers * * * These voices of despair tell us that * * * our opportunities and aspirations will all be realized without the pain of effort or the risk of failure if we will only submit our lives and our destinies to the ministrations of some all-wise paternalism."

You young people know from recent experiences as Junior Achievers that this is not so. It is a tired threadbare canard launched by those who do not understand the genius of America. It is propagated by people of perverted intellect and insufficient vitality who mistake their own frustrations and failures for the failures and frustrations of the American economy. It is a doctrine advanced by people of little faith in America, by those who have a lust for power and by those who seek to compensate for their own inadequacies by penalizing others. This sort of paternalism is at the heart of socialism. By diminishing American military might, by reducing American industrial power, by crushing the natural dynamism of the American people, it plays into the hands of our Communist enemies.

You, who are involved in the work of Junior Achievement, know that protecting people from the risk of failure inevitably deprives them of the opportunity to succeed. As Smythe Gambrell says, "To be freed from anxiety, mischance or error is equally to be freed from all possibility of growth and achievement." Achievement then is the crucial word. "Through the rhetoric of security, the meaning of freedom is being shifted in subtle ways from freedom to do as we choose to freedom from the necessities of choice." You Junior Achievers have experienced the exhilarating challenge of choice. I am confident that you will not barter it for a security in which the Government is the master rather than the servant of the people. Alexander Hamilton said, "Power over a man's subsistence is power over his will."

You delegates have a great responsibility toward the younger people in your generation. Democracy means leadership. You must set an example and impose the disciplines of freedom on yourselves in order that disciplines should not be imposed on you by others at the expense of freedom. Youth can help youth. Those who are younger than you achievers will look to you for guidance and example. My wife comes from a family of eight. She tells of how the older ones brought up the younger ones by discipline and example. These disciplines develop character and provide you with the strength to do things which you may well regard as boring and unimportant, but which help to prepare you for the difficulties and dangers of life. Both good and bad habits take time to produce their fruit. The habits you develop now will govern your actions when you are older.

My wife and I told our daughters when they were in their teens, "If we give you a new car, the one you dream of having, surely you will want to keep it in good condition and have it last as long as possible. Therefore, you should follow certain rules: Do not speed for the first 100 miles; check the car every thousand miles; and so forth; then you will keep the car running well and looking new for a long time. But if you race the motor and generally neglect the proper care of the car, you will have it in the repair shop

most of the time. This will cost time and money."

So it is with your personal habits. If you impose disciplines on yourself you will develop sturdy bodies and well-trained minds. You will have the self-control which goes with success. You will be laying the foundation for a healthy, successful, and happy life. You will be able to discharge the responsibilities of freedom. You will help to defeat the enemies of freedom.

A recent survey of high school seniors revealed that 60 percent of them did not believe that profits were needed for the survival of the free enterprise system; that 76 percent believe that most gains from new machinery go to the owners of the business; that 82 percent believe that there is really no competition in business, and that 53 percent, or more than half of those seniors, favor Government ownership or control of steel, coal, and the utilities. This is truly alarming. Something is happening to our moral fiber.

Another poll reveals that in the seventh grade of a junior high school, 92 percent think that the Federal Government should get into the business of guaranteeing jobs for everyone. Incidentally, the more conservative adult answer is only 67 percent. Sixty-three percent of the seventh graders thought that the Federal Government should get into the business of controlling company profits and 63 percent thought that the "owners get too much of the money that companies make compared with the employees."

A group of high school seniors estimated that the average company profit is 50 percent, that the average company investment per worker is $81, and that the average return to stockholders is 24 percent. Such ignorance is dangerous. It constitutes a significant part of the challenge.

You Junior Achievers and thousands of others are producing, merchandising, and financing your own products. You know that the American free enterprise system has produced the most widely distributed and the highest standard of living of any country in all recorded history.

Your obligation as citizens is not simply to go through the motions of how to operate a business. You have an obligation to understand the deeper significance of what you have been doing. What does it all mean in terms of your personal future and for the future of our country, the future of freedom on which your future depends? You must talk it up at school, at college, tell your friends and classmates about our American economic system, explain to them what the word "profit" really means, what capital equipment is, how we in America have produced the tools of production without which we would not now enjoy a predominant position in the world.

Let us then give a dramatic demonstration, for all the world to see, that America is still "the land of the free and the home of the brave." Let us sound a clarion call for the opportunities and the responsibilities of freedom. Let us refresh our patriotism. Let us renew our love of America. Let us meet the challenge of our time and generation.

While retaining "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind," we must not be afraid of controversy. We must not try to avoid the struggle. There is no safe place to hide either at home or abroad. Trading power for popularity will lose us both. The foreign policy of a great nation should be measured not by our fears but our enlightened self-interest. When freedom is extinguished in Budapest it is threatened in Bloomington, Ind. When American strength is reduced, when American purpose falters, our Communist enemies rejoice and our friends and allies are disheartened.

We should not adjust our national objectives to the random winds of pressure and opinion. Broadmindedness does not mean tolerance of corruption, vulgarity, and of the obscene brutalities of our Communist enemies. We must match their implacable drive to destroy us with an unflagging determination to preserve for future generations the right of each individual to seek his own salvation. The concept of man's individual destiny lies at the heart of the world's great religions and provides the basis of our political beliefs. It is the essence of the free enterprise system.

Let us then, in the words of George Washington, the founder of our country, "Raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair. There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the tide; it is well past the flood; the rest, with God's help, is up to us.

Members of Congress Who Oppose Bracero Extension Should Take a Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial entitled "Those Members of Congress Who Oppose Bracero Extension Should Take A Look," which appeared in a recent edition of the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin:

THOSE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO OPPOSE BRACERO EXTENSION SHOULD TAKE A LOOK

The U.S. Congress has had under consideration, in various legal forms, the question of whether or not to extend the bracero program, started during World War II and an important source of farm labor in certain crops ever since. Extension of the program, by which farm laborers are imported from Mexico during crop seasons, has become a matter of considerable controversy. American labor organizations, and various church and welfare groups, opposed its extension. It generally is favored by residents and members of Congress from Western and Southwestern farm areas. Among opponents of the extension is Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER of Oregon, as reported by the Bulletin's Washington bureau.

Opponents generally fall back on several well-defined arguments. The only one which has made much of an impression upon the citizen not involved in the controversy goes something like this: This Nation has a lot of unemployment. Farm jobs should go first to unemployed citizens. There are plenty of these to handle the job. Therefore the bracero program is not necessary.

Over the weekend the editor of the Bulletin spent some time with a medium-scale California farmer who has hired both citizen and bracero laborers in the harvesting of perishable crops for about 50 years. The question of the extension was one of several under discussion. The results of that discussion have more firmly fixed the opinion that the extension is a good thing for everyone concerned.

The braceros, Mexican nationals all, need the work. Most of them come from areas in Mexico in which technological agricultural unemployment is high. Their short time in this country, at wages considerably higher than they can earn at home, provides a financial shot in the arm for them and their families, as well as their country.

The wage structure is the same for both braceros and citizen labor. The braceros do not work for slave wages, as some would have us believe, at least in the California areas, or those in Oregon where they are used. They are paid the same wages as any other employee on the same job. Much of the work is paid on a piecework basis, and earnings of over $25 per day are not uncommon among able workers.

Our farmer friend, feeling the bracero program was on the way out, used citizen labor during the 1962 season. This year he went back to Mexican nationals. Citizen labor, unfamiliar with the work, earned too little to make the jobs attractive. Their income was down, and his costs were up.

Farm labor, in the harvesting of perishable crops, is a young man's game. It requires energy, and skill. Those Americans who used to follow the crops, working their way north from California's Imperial Valley until they reached local area potato harvests in the fall, have about disappeared from the scene. Over the years their personal and economic situations have improved. Someone just off the streets, or fresh from a factory job, is not an adequate replacement.

Those Members of Congress who oppose the extension of the bracero program could do themseves and their country a favor if they would take a long look at the program, as it works in the field. It would give them a fresh insight of the problems, on both sides, if they could pick up a bucket and a ladder during peach, or pear, or apple season. One suspects they would find the braceros are not mistreated. They would almost certainly find that unemployed urban-dwelling Americans cannot provide satisfactory replacements for the braceros.

Reacting To Please Reds: Liberals Seek Arms Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Aug. 31, 1963]

REACTING TO PLEASE REDS—LIBERALS SEEK ARMS CUTS

A campaign to reduce military expenditures, now that the Communists have signed a partial nuclear test ban treaty, is underway among liberals.

The favorite attack is on our alleged "overkill" capacity in nuclear weapons. According to liberal argument, the United States has enough nuclear weapons to destroy the Soviet Union many times over. Some even say 1,000 times. They demand a halt in production.

This capacity is measured against the number of cities conceived by them as targets, and against population. But these are not the true measures of nuclear capacity. The United States must have enough nuclear power, not primarily to destroy cities, but to take out every opposing nuclear weapon, every missile, no matter where it might be hidden or how deep it might be buried or protected, and every airfield and every bomber.

The United States must be able to do this even after receiving a devastating surprise blow from the enemy on our own missile sites and nuclear capacity. We must always have enough left to assure our survival and eventual victory.

The number of bombs must be measured against what has to be done, not against the number of megatons needed to snuff out a certain number of lives in a Russian city.

Testimony given at the Senate hearings on the treaty indicate the United States does not intend to halt development of nuclear weapons. But, as a matter of fact, there have been no real developments in the last several years—or of any new weapons systems.

The freezing of our military and nuclear position, if it is done, would be extremely dangerous. Wars always are fought with weapons in being—and most certainly a nuclear exchange would be done with bombs on hand, no matter how inferior they might be.

The changing military policies of the United States is convincing Europe, and particularly France and West Germany, that this country is retreating to a concept of a "Fortress America."

We are phasing out our strategic bombing force, closing air bases in Europe and elsewhere, removing missiles from Turkey, Italy, and even England, and pulling our nuclear power back toward the American Continent.

This, combined with the administration's eagerness to accept a partial test ban treaty, has given rise to a fear that we would use nuclear power only in the case of a direct attack on the United States.

Thus, while the treaty technically might not interfere with further development of nuclear weapons, and even in this the experts disagree, our actions are being interpreted as one of military disengagement.

We declare our purpose in defending Europe but erode European confidence in our real willingness to do so, at the moment of trial.

Thus the Western military alliance is being weakened. Communist Russia seems more pleased than ever with the way things are going.

Immigration and Naturalization Program of Order Sons of Italy in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last month the Order Sons of Italy in America held their 28th biennial convention in Cleveland, Ohio. During the course of the proceedings, the convention adopted an immigration program and report. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution and the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, the Order Sons of Italy in America has for years been active in presenting comprehensive and constructive proposals with respect to our immigration program. The program set forth by the 28th biennial convention deserves the consideration of every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I am also pleased to announce that the order chose Baltimore, Md., for its 29th biennial convention to be held in August of 1965. I extend my best wishes to the Grand Lodge of Maryland and the Maryland officials who were instrumental in bringing this convention to our State.

There being no objection, the resolution and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(Resolution by the 28th biennial convention, Supreme Lodge of the Order Sons of Italy in America, Aug. 23, 1963, Cleveland, Ohio)

1. Amendment of the National Origins Quota System and in its place to submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

2. To adopt the 1960 in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.

3. To abolish mortgages on quotas and to reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.

4. To grant more favorable preferences to relatives of U.S. citizens.

5. To equalize citizenship between native-born and naturalized citizens.

6. To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration law relative to admission, exclusion and deportation of aliens.

7. To revise and extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to provide for the admission of a fair share of the world's refugees.

Convention Immigration Committee: Samuel A. Culotta, chairman, Maryland; Ernest L. Biagi, Pennsylvania; Renzo Abbondandolo, Florida; Antonio Salerno, California; Andrew Torregrossa, Ohio; Edith L. D'Orazio, Massachusetts; Cav. Luigi Scala, Rhode Island; Frank Teodosio, Ohio; Josephine Battaglini, New Jersey.

REPORT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION COMMITTEE OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL, ORDER SONS OF ITALY IN AMERICA, AUGUST 19, 1963

On October 2, 1961, our supreme venerable, John Ottaviano, Jr., appointed the following members to this committee: Samuel A. Culotta, Maryland, chairman; Ernest Biagi, Pennsylvania; Ubaldo Marino, New York; Paul D'Agostino, Massachusetts; Anthony DeLallo, Connecticut.

We were charged with seeking improvements in the immigration laws as stated in a resolution adopted at the 27th biennial convention on August 17, 1961, at Washington, D.C., as follows:

Amendment of the national origins system and in its place to submit a more fair and humanitarian immigration policy based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

To adopt the 1960 in lieu of the 1920 census to establish quotas.

To abolish mortgages on quotas and to reallocate unused quotas to countries having oversubscribed quotas.

To grant more favorable preferences to relatives of U.S. citizens.

To equalize citizenship between native-born and naturalized citizens.

To humanize the harsh provisions of the present immigration laws relative to admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens.

To revise and extend the Refugee Act of 1953 and the Alien Orphans Act of 1957.

Our seven-point program in essence was adopted with the founding of the order in 1905; we have been working to implement this program ever since. With each Congress and each President we have made some progress, although at times in various positions of the immigration laws the forces of reaction and isolationism have had a measure of success.

Since our supreme convention of August 1961 two immigration bills have passed Congress and signed into law by the President, namely, Public Law 87-301, and Public Law 87-885.

Public Law 87-301, approved on September 26, 1961, provided for the following changes:

The issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain eligible orphans adopted or to be adopted by U.S. citizens, in addition, this provision was made a permanent law.

Laws governing the exclusion and deportation of aliens and naturalized citizens were strengthened to meet the need for expedition, orderly venue, and avoidance of repetitious court proceedings.

Removal from visa applications of any reference to the designation of the race and ethnic classification of the applicant.

Adjustment of certain immigration quotas which will be necessitated upon the emergence of new independent nations from the Western Hempishere and Asia.

Strengthen provisions with respect to exclusion from entry of aliens who have entered into fraudulent marriages for the purpose of evading the law.

Modifying the provisions of existing law relating to the exclusion of aliens who are afflicted with tuberculosis, leprosy, and other contagious disease.

Made permanent the granting of waivers of the tubercular ground of exclusion in cases of certain relatives of citizens and resident aliens.

Made permanent provisions relating to the waiver of grounds of admissibility and deportability in the cases of certain close relatives of citizens and lawfully resident aliens involving convictions for minor criminal offenses and fraudulent misrepresentations in connection with visa or admission applications.

Restored to the immigration law that illegality in the procurement of naturalization is a ground for revocation of citizenship.

Extends to the spouse or child of a citizen spouse or parent the benefits of the law to citizens that go abroad for retirement, under certain conditions, so as not to lose their nationality by residence in a foreign state.

Grants nonquota status to certain relatives of citizens and lawful residents who were beneficiaries of approved petitions filed in their behalf with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1961. This provision will allow approximately 18,000 immigrants to be reunited with their families in the United States. It appears that about 9,000 immigrants of this number will come from Italy.

Public Law 87—885, approved October 24, 1962, made the following changes in the immigration law:

Provided nonquota status for fourth preference quota immigrants registered on a consular waiting list under a priority date earlier than March 31, 1954. (Brothers, sisters, married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens, and their accompanying spouses and children.)

Provide nonquota status for certain first preference quota immigrants who are chargeable to oversubscribed quotas and in whose behalf first preference petitions were filed with the Attorney General prior to April 1, 1962. (Skilled specialists and their spouses and children.)

Provide for the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. (Prior hereto the date was June 28, 1940.)

On June 28, 1962, the President approved Public Law 87-510 titled Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962. This bill provided for continuing U.S. membership in and contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and for contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The bill also gave general authorization for programs to assist refugees, escapees, and other persons who the President may feel should be helped

in the best interest of this country. Primarily, this law was designed to help Cuban refugees and to continue our participation in international migration and refugee programs. It was not a broad program, such as the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, which we advocate in our seven-point program. Presently, the United States can only act, through the President, under the emergency powers of the 1952 immigration act, to allow refugees to come to our shores. Under this power, refugees are admitted on "parole" outside of the quotas, however, they cannot become citizens unless Congress passes a law. A recent report estimated that there are approximately 13 million refugees throughout the free world. Certain congressional leaders have sponsored bills calling for admission of 50,000 refugees to this country.

During 1963, congressional leadership in the field of immigration was sparked by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, PHILIP A. HART, who introduced S. 747, with 36 cosponsors; and, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, New York, introducing H.R. 3926. The pro and con of both of these progressive bills were published in OSIA News. We commend these two gentlemen for their interest and initiative.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, scheduled hearings on S. 747 for June 26, 1963. However, these hearings were subsequently postponed because of the major hearings on civil rights. This committee submitted our seven-point program to Senator EASTLAND for the record. Moreover, we stated our support for S. 747 and closed our statement with the following paragraph:

"The order consists of over 100,000 members and is organized in 40 States. Since the founding of the order in 1905, we have consistently championed the principles of fairness, merit, nondiscrimination and morality in our immigration laws. All of which we further believe is consistent with strengthening the United States. Senator HART's bill leads in this direction, the reforms he advocates are long overdue."

On July 23, 1963, the President released his long-awaited message on immigration. A few of the highlights follow:

"The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. * * * It discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth."

"While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 quota numbers are wasted each year. * * * I recommend that this deficiency in the law be corrected."

"The measures I have recommended will help eliminate discrimination between peoples and nations on a basis that is unrelated to any contribution that immigrants can have and is inconsistent with our traditions of welcome. Our investment in new citizens has always been a valuable source of our strength."

We of course support the President and urge approval of his recommendations that are contained in new bills introduced by Senator HART and Representative CELLER. However, there are responsible leaders in the immigration field who feel that an all or nothing attack against the national origins system will result in no immigration legislation for a long time into the future. Hence, working against many worthy proposals calling for the re-unification of families separated through no fault of their own. Others feel more immediate fairness in apportionment of quotas can be accomplished by working within the national origins system by amending the immigration law to submit the 1960 census instead of the 1920 census to determine national origins of our population. Senator JAVITS introduced a bill on July 2, 1963 calling for a program identical with our 7 Point Program, except for outright elimination of the national origins system. However, he long has been in the forefront of urging elimination of this infamous system. This would indicate that his long years of service in the Senate, as well as his colleagues who joined with him, told him his bill would encounter the hostility of a large block of Senators who are for the system.

Representative REID of New York on August 8, 1963 introduced a bill in the House with these comments:

"Mr. Speaker, there is a clear and pressing need for an immigration bill representing a carefully thought-out approach of thorough and workable reform to our discriminatory immigration law * * * pending the development of such a bipartisan bill there is an urgency to make uniting of families a present reality.

"The current cutoff date for nonquota status in preferences 2 and 3 is July 1, 1961, while in preference 4 it is March 31, 1954. Thus the parents and unmarried children of U.S. citizens, if registered prior to July 1, 1961, are being admitted, while brothers and sisters of the same family are denied entry if registered any time after March 31, 1954.

"I propose to extend the cutoff date for nonquotas status in preference 4 from March 31, 1954 to January 1, 1958.

"Mr. Speaker, there is clearly a compelling need to reunite these families. I can see no reason for these unfortunate people to await the lengthly deliberations accompanying a complete overhaul of our immigration law."

Senator HART, who introduced S. 747 and the President's administration bill, made the following statement:

"The President's proposal today moves us many strides toward our goals, and its approach represents the most advanced proposal on this subject placed before the Congress by any Chief Executive. It will have my support and I hope all who previously had joined with me in sponsoring S. 747 will support it. With these two sound bills before the Congress, we move to the stage where the decision now belongs to the Congress. Let us get on with this job."

(Committee note: The Senator makes reference to "two sound bills" indicating the emphasis on the National Origins Quota System by the President and the otherwise broader and more comprehensive bill S. 747. The same can be said for Senator JAVITS' bill introduced on July 2, 1963.)

Judge Juvenal Marchisio, national chairman of the American Committee on Italian Migration, was quoted by the New York Times, as follows:

"'All Americans should support President Kennedy's immigration bill. * * * While these changes will not solve the problem of most of the thousands of close relatives of U.S. citizens now waiting in Italy and other countries to rejoin their families in America they will bring American principles of justice and equality to our immigration laws.'

"Judge Marchisio, noted that special legislation will be required to permit the reunification of all these families."

The chairman of this committee was requested by the Supreme Venerable, John Ottaviano, Jr., to attend as an observer the Third National Symposium of the American Committee on Italian Migration (ACIM) held on June 10 and 11, 1963, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. The chairman, Samuel A. Culotta, was very much impressed with the organization and presentation of this unusual symposium conducted by ACIM, which is associated with the National Catholic Resettlement Council. Delegates from 27 States came to Washington to make a case and manifest support in immigration. These interested Italian-Americans in the cause of immigration reform are to be commended for their zeal and devotion. It was interesting to note the unusual number of the Catholic clergy who attended, lead by Most Rev. Edward E. Swanstrom, Auxiliary Bishop of New York, and Most Rev. Philip M. Hannan, Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, D.C., Leaders of Congress, such as Senators JAVITS, HART, and KEATING, addressed the symposium. Moreover, many others were in attendance during the discussions and dinners. High Government officials from the State Department, Immigration Service, and the Department of Labor addressed the meetings and dinners on the subject of immigration. The climax of the symposium took place on the morning of June 11 when we met with President John F. Kennedy, on which occasion, he chose to announce his plans to send to Congress his immigration proposals within a few weeks. As is well known, prior to this moment the President had remained silent on the subject of immigration. Hence, this acknowledgement of ACIM as the forum for his statement on immigration marked the symposium with success and national recognition. A deserved tribute to the energetic leadership of Judge Marchisio and the zeal for immigration reform of Rev. Caesar Donanzan, P.S.S.C., executive secretary of ACIM. That same evening we were received and entertained at a buffet dinner by the Italian Ambassador and Mrs. Sergio Fenoaltea. The Ambassador expressed appreciation for the work of ACIM and praised Judge Marchisio and Father Donanzan for leadership in ACIM, and, especially the delegates for their support and interest in furthering American-Italian friendship. One comment that the Ambassador made took me by surprise, namely, that because of Common Market demands, Italy is no longer in the position of encouraging the migration of skilled and semi-skilled workers, however, based on humanitarian motives, Italy does support migration for the reunification of families.

The symposium was a great success and served its purpose, that is to shake up the apathy and stimulate action by the Congress and the President for immigration reform.

The 28th Biennial Convention commencing on August 21, 1963, at Cleveland, Ohio, will have the opportunity to reevaluate the scope and participation of the Order in Immigration reform. Indeed the consideration of the Convention is timely, since the Congress and the executive branch are about to embark into a period, during the next 6 years, when we as a nation will not have to be ashamed of our discriminatory unhumanitarian immigration laws. The future appears promising; America is maturing and becoming a confident leader of the free world.

SAMUEL A. CULOTTA,
Chairman, Immigration and Naturalization, Order Sons of Italy in America, Baltimore, Md.

Alliance for Progress in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent vote in the House on the Foreign Assistance Act authorization has dealt a severe blow to the momentum built up over the last 2 years in the Alliance for Progress against communism in Latin America.

As you are aware, the House Foreign Affairs Committee cut $50 million from

the administration's $650 million request for the Alliance. Then, the House itself deleted an additional $150 million for an overall reduction in excess of 30 percent.

These actions have come as a major disappointment to supporters of this forward-looking hemispheric self-help program. This is particularly true since in the past few months we have seen increasing evidence of a willingness on the part of many nations in Latin America to assume the responsibility of instituting the necessary internal reforms to make the Alliance for Progress a workable and effective program.

In this regard, I might mention such countries as Venezuela, Costa Rica, Peru, Ecuador, and Argentina. These nations, as well as several others, appear to be on the verge of a major breakthrough toward success in their self-help economic development programs. It would certainly be disastrous to withdraw or radically reduce U.S. support for these efforts at this extremely critical time.

Our strongest ally in the free world today is the community of nations of Western Europe. But, if it had not been for the assistance we rendered them in their hour of need after World War II, there is little doubt that many of these nations would have fallen to the forces of international communism.

With this history in mind, I hope that the House will have an opportunity to reconsider its action in substantially reducing the authorization for the Alliance for Progress.

An opportunity and a danger in Latin America, similar to that facing the United States in Europe in the late 1940's, is before us today. We must grasp that opportunity and support the efforts of these nations of the Western Hemisphere to shake off the shackles of the past and build for themselves a better future in the ranks of the freedom-loving countries of the world.

In line with these thoughts, I have found an article by George Sherman appearing in the Washington Star on September 1, to be quite objective and realistic in its appraisal of the effects of the recent House vote.

I include the pertinent sections of Mr. Sherman's article at this point in the RECORD:

AID-CUT VOTE IMPERILS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By George Sherman)

The Alliance for Progress has been shaken to its very foundation during the past week and for the first time in 2 years Alliance architects here seriously discuss total collapse.

The reason: The unexpected and sudden vote in the House a week ago to slash $150 million from the $600 million annual aid authorization for this joint 10-year program of hemispheric reform.

"They just could not have picked a more historically horrible moment," moaned one U.S. official at the top of Alliance affairs. "If the cut remains, we will miss the rising wave of self-help and reform in Latin America.

WE NEED MORE, NOT LESS

"For 2 years we have worked, warned, and cajoled in order to build a launching pad for economic development down there. The Latins had nothing—no plans, no technicians, no reforms. Today the machinery is built, the reforms are beginning, and we need more—not less—money to support them."

This mixture of fury and fear is fed by gnawing frustration with partisan politics on Capitol Hill. Officials grope for persuasive proof which goes beyond political rhetoric to the impending disaster which they genuinely feel.

Officials who normally deal day-in and day-out with Alliance affairs find themselves caught in crosscurrents of public weariness with all foreign aid and apparent Republican-conservative Democratic determination to use that weariness to embarrass the President politically.

One ally they have found is the reaction throughout Latin America to the cut. Newspapers and congresses all over the southern continent have expressed everything from anger and dismay to I-told-you-so gloating on the extreme left.

"The Alliance has died, may it rest in peace," editorialized the Communist paper, El Siglo (the Century), last week in Santiago, Chile. "Only the naive and servile can continue to believe in the Alliance for Progress," echoed the Communist El Popular newspaper in Montevideo, Uruguay.

In Bogotá, Colombia, the respected moderate journal La Republica (the Republic) commented that President Kennedy has certainly suffered a defeat, but that his enemies in Congress have won only a "Pyrrhic victory." In La Paz, Bolivia, La Nacion—mouthpiece of the crisis-stricken government—appeared with this banner headline: "Mortal Blow to the Democracies of the Americas."

HARD BLOW IN PERU

The arbitrariness of the House action is what seems to have hurt most, both here and in Latin America. The $150 million Alliance cut was included in an overall $585 million reduction without either clarification or debate. In one fell swoop the House seemed to confirm the worse fears of suspicious Latin Americans—constantly fanned by Castroite-Communist charges—that the United States is in fact not capable of sustaining a long-term commitment to costly reform in this hemisphere.

Perhaps the most devastating psychological blow came in Peru, where Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator of Alliance affairs, had just arrived for crucial aid talks with new Peruvian President Fernando Belaunde Terry.

In only 1 month in office, this new constitutional president has astounded even the most optimistic by proposing concrete tax and land reforms—and taking action on tax collections—which could change oligarchical Peru into a model-leader of the Alliance for Progress.

BARRAGE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. Moscoso had rushed to Lima to discuss President Belaunde's urgent request for $25 million in U.S. aid. Shortly after he arrived he received another $30 million plea for U.S. support of half the proposed $60 million land reform.

But after the August 23 vote in the House, Mr. Moscoso had to spend much of his time fielding a barrage of questions challenging U.S. sincerity. Last Tuesday the Peruvian Senate unanimously passed a resolution for transmittal to the U.S. Senate urging that the authorization cuts be rescinded, and noting that they "deeply affect the normal development of national programs of economic and social development in Latin American countries."

Today Mr. Moscoso is in neighboring Ecuador, where a military junta which seized power 2 months ago is also taking steps on basic economic and social reform which frightened the country's civilian predecessor government.

COMMITMENT CITED

But Mr. Moscoso's advisers here point out that the United States will not be able to take advantage of this new reforming zeal—either in Ecuador, or Peru, or Argentina, where a new government also takes power in October—if the aid cut is maintained.

To make matters worse, the prevalent belief throughout Latin America is that the United States committed itself to $1 billion aid per year for 10 years at the founding conference of Punta del Este in August 1961.

The Kennedy administration has had trouble enough meeting that commitment over the past 2 years. For the last fiscal year ending last June 30, they had to scrape together every type of loan and grant from food-for-peace assistance to long-term development loans to reach a grand total of $972.4 million.

But the most important part of these dollars in any year comes under the Latin American appropriation given the Agency for International Development, where Mr. Moscoso resides as head of Alliance operations. AID gives the most flexible grants and loans tied to basic social and economic reforms.

It is this $600 million AID request from which the total $150 million has been cut.

That cut has left AID officials with "two horrible choices," they say. First, they can cut back on the $100 million section of grants. But these grants which cover technical assistance in tax collecting, internal police security, and teacher training are considered essential. Therefore, the second choice is to cut the projected $500 million long-term loan operations the total $150 million, or about 30 percent across the board.

Officials say that the House has also passed an amendment requiring 2 percent interest on all these loans which is in direct violation of the Charter of Punta del Este. The United States specifically pledged to supply loans running up to 50 years "and in general at very low or zero rates of interest."

FUNDS FIGHT AHEAD

More than 50 percent of U.S. Government funds currently being lent to Latin America goes at three-quarters of 1 percent interest.

And the final shattering effect of the House action is to explode the myth that the Alliance for Progress is a popular aid program. After the authorization fight is over in the Congress, the still tougher fight to get the actual appropriations through the House lies ahead.

In the eyes of the top policymakers on Alliance affairs, unless the Senate now holds firm and gets the $150 million restored to the final authorization bill, the United States is in grave danger of losing whatever initiative it has gained in Latin America during the past 2 years.

Young Democrats and the Radical Left—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I continue the examination into the Young Democratic organization that I began last August 26.

Since that time I have received a letter from the State president of the California Young Democrats, and a copy of the resolutions and policy statements from the August 16 Western States Young Democratic Conference.

Mr. Speaker, after reading the complete text of these resolutions I am more disturbed than ever. Let me quote just

one of the resolutions that so far has received little, if any, publicity.

Resolution follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Whereas the 88th Congress to date has had a desultory record of accomplishment, and whereas its performance has been a disgrace to the Nation and a mockery of the democratic process: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western States Conference YDCA supports Senators CLARK and CASE in their efforts to achieve congressional reform by modification of the rules and traditions of the Congress including defeat of the deadening seniority system and the tyranical power of the committee chairmen, and limitations of the filibuster: And therefore, be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the 1964 Democratic Convention to indicate its support for congressional reform by taking an uncompromising stand in the 1964 platform for such needed reforms regardless of the effect this would have on Southern States participation in the convention.

Mr. Speaker, examine the language of the resolution for a moment. This Democratic Party Congress is called a disgrace to the Nation and a mockery of the democratic process. Now we know what the Young Democrats think of us—perhaps our mistake has been in representing the American people and not the lunatic left.

The resolution also urges us to eject the Southern States from the next Democratic National Convention. The States that provided President Kennedy with his margin of victory in 1960 are no longer needed it seems. Any sane person would imagine that this resolution was written by Young Republicans rather than Young Democrats. Yet these people insist on calling themselves liberals. The tolerance and understanding of others that used to be the hallmark of the liberal has been swept away in the radical tide.

Other resolutions that have been overlooked so far include a demand for the lifting of travel restrictions to Cuba; a demand that Congress take no action in the present railroad dispute—this appears to conflict with their protest over congressional inaction; a demand for the repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act on the grounds that it establishes "concentration camps" in times of national emergency—presumably for Communists; and complete opposition to any Federal program for civil defense—presumably the Soviet Union is left free to safeguard its citizens; and last but not least a demand that the United States take no unilateral action on matters of international importance but rather work through the framework of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Soviet Union and Red China would be only too pleased to see us adopt the policy positions of the Western States Young Democrats. Must we sit idly by while the good name of our party is dragged through this political gutter? I do not believe we would be fulfilling our duty as members of the Democratic Party if we were to remain silent.

Therefore, I am today sending letters to John Bailey, national chairman of the Democratic Party, and Eugene Wyman, California State chairman of the Democratic Party, calling upon them to launch a full inquiry into the operation and activities of the Young Democratic organization. It is my belief that these radicals of the left should be deprived of the use of our honorable party name until some sign of maturity and responsibility becomes evident.

I have not yet received the complete text of the resolutions passed this last weekend by the California Young Democrats at their San Diego meeting. When these become available I may wish to address the House again on the subject.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I include for the further information of my colleagues the text of the letter sent to me by Josiah Beeman, State president of the California Young Democrats, and the text of my reply to him:

CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF
YOUNG DEMOCRATS,
San Francisco, Calif., September 5, 1963.

Congressman CHARLES WILSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With regard to your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 26, concerning the "Young Democrats and the radical left," it is quite obvious that you have not read the resolutions which you speak of, and your remarks indeed contain several errors in fact as to the content of these resolutions.

I do not know if it is your custom to make speeches denouncing conferences, the byproducts of these conferences, and Young Democratic leaders without first investigating what the facts involved are. Apparently, you have been misled by someone on your staff who seeks to discredit this organization for purposes of their own.

I specifically refer you to the resolution on South Vietnam, which calls for economic and social reforms by the Diem regime, posing as the possible alternative to these reforms the withdrawal of U.S. troops. It would seem to me that this is fast becoming the policy of our country in the face of the obvious persecution by the Diem regime of the Buddhists of that country. It would seem then that your denunciation is the point of view that is out of step with our Nation's policy rather than the resolution adopted by the Western States conference, which you erroneously referred to as a resolution calling for withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Far East.

May I say on behalf of the California Federation of Young Democrats (the correct title of our organization) that we feel that it is somewhat more of a disgrace to associate the honorable name of the Democratic Party with sordid campaign tactics in the past than it is a disgrace to be associated with resolutions which seek to look to the future. We can well recall the time when we were attacked by people who thought as you do, when we called for a nuclear test ban treaty many years ago. That treaty is today becoming a reality and is the policy of our Government. We can recall the time when we urged stronger action by this administration in the field of civil rights and were told by certain State and national leaders to "go slow." This administration has now wisely and correctly decided that it can do much more in the field of civil rights than it has done in the past 3 years. We trust that you too have reversed your position on these questions.

We do not intend to be intimidated from speaking the truth as we see it, and we will continue to urge the Democratic Party to present the American people with progressive and forward looking stands on the great issues of the day.

Sincerely,

JOE BEEMAN,
State President.

P.S.—I have enclosed a copy of the conference resolutions for your edification.

SEPTEMBER 9, 1963.

MR. JOSIAH BEEMAN,
President, California Federation of Young Democrats, San Francisco, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. BEEMAN: I have received your letter of September 5 dealing with my August 26 remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of "Young Democrats and the radical left."

I find your letter both arrogant and offensive in tone. My record in the California State Assembly and in the U.S. Congress is progressive and follows the best traditions of the Democratic Party. Your insolent attempt to brand me as a foe of civil rights legislation is not in acocrdance with the facts, and will only further demonstrate the desire of all radicals to smear and libel any criticism. For your information, I was a member of the small group of Congressmen that participated in the recent march on Washington activities, and I have authored a number of civil rights bills myself.

It is clear to me that my worst fears have been confirmed. Your organization serves no useful function to the Democratic Party, and in fact is a liability to the majority political party of this country. After 8 years of public service in California I am thoroughly acquainted with the role played by Young Democrats, and I can assure you that the platforms and policy positions of your organization have discredited you with all responsible elements of the party.

I readily admit that I did not study the complete text of the resolutions passed by the Western States Young Democratic Conference until you made a copy available to me. I find now that the extensive newspaper reports I previously based my remarks on did not do the conference justice. The resolutions are far more radical than I suspected, and your blistering attack upon this Democratic Party Congress lends weight to my call for a full scale inquiry into your organization.

Your resolution on South Vietnam presents us with a study in contrasts. You say, in effect, either they must cease to be neo-Fascist or they must be allowed to become Communist. The certainty of a Communist takeover after the withdrawal of U.S. troops and assistance seems to bother you little, and I am sure you can understand that our entire position in the Far East may be determined by developments in South Vietnam.

Your resolution on Cuba defies description. The President's policy of isolating this island has resulted in the Soviet Union incurring a liability instead of an asset. Over a million dollars a day is being spent by the Soviets to keep this ramshackle Red nation afloat. As the economic screws are further tightened the Soviet Union will be required to pour out even larger sums in aid and assistance. Your call for reopening of trade with Cuba will undo all that has so far been done to weaken the Communist stranglehold on the island.

I regret that space does not permit a discussion of other disgraceful resolutions from this so-called Young Democratic Conference. However, in answer to your comment on the nuclear test ban treaty I well recall that you demanded a nuclear test ban for the United States years ago. After the Soviet Union had broken its pledge and had resumed testing—exploding the largest bomb in history—your organization was in the forefront of the crusade waged by peace groups to prevent us from also resuming testing and perhaps keep-

ing abreast of the Communists in nuclear development. The present test ban treaty bears no resemblance to your previous positions and you can take no credit for it.

Your assumption that the high school and lower division college students of the California Young Democrats are qualified to advise the Democratic Party or the Nation on domestic and foreign affairs is ridiculous and I will not attempt to answer it. However, I do intend to consult with the appropriate officials of the Democratic National Committee on the damage your use of our party name is causing. I repeat my words of August 26—I call for the national committee to launch a full-scale inquiry into the activities of the Young Democrats. If this organization is to have the privilege of using the name of our party, they must begin to show they have the necessary maturity to earn that privilege.

I have today seen the first press reports from your September 8 meeting in San Diego. It seems that your organization has surpassed itself in the field of resolutions. I trust you will supply me with a complete text of these latest resolutions and policy positions as soon as they become available.

It has always been a mystery to many of us in the party how an organization as vocal as yours can be so totally ineffective during campaign time. If the California Young Democrats would only work a quarter as much as they talk, we might be able to find some redeeming quality for your organization.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES H. WILSON.

Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial in the Iola (Kans.) Register written by Angelo Scott, the editor and publisher:

WRONG APPROACH

The Veterans' Administration, which among other things insures GI housing mortgages, stopped doing business with a Chicago real estate broker recently because he allegedly refused to sell a house to a Negro family.

The Federal Housing Administration has quit guaranteeing loans to a Florida builder on the accusation of discrimination.

Officials are planning a cutoff of Federal funds this fall to eight schools because they have not admitted Negro children.

National Science Foundation money is being withdrawn from two State universities on similar grounds.

The object of these maneuvers—the widening of civil rights for Negroes—the Register heartily supports. The maneuvers, themselves, we do not. The reason is simple; they constitute a usurpation of authority which clearly lies with Congress alone.

Actually, Congress has been asked a number of times to tie segregation strings to money bills in one way or another, Congress has consistently refused, correctly in our opinion.

Civil rights are one thing. Housing construction, mortgage financing, research grants, and school building construction are entirely separate things. Each should be handled directly and on its own merits.

Certainly there is no basis for an administrative officer to deny Federal funds on the basis of the kind of law he thinks ought to be passed. Yet that is what is being done in these instances.

It is not only illegal. It is altogether the wrong approach to the problem.

Democratic Leftwing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the drift to the left within the Democratic Party is causing increasing concern and dismay as it is reflected in Kennedy administration policies. Little that has occurred in recent months better illustrates the extent of this drift than a statement of objectives adopted by the Young Democrats of some 13 Western States a month ago.

I commend to the reading of all interested citizens of both national political parties, the excellent editorial, "Democratic Leftwing," printed in the Manchester Union-Leader of September 6, 1963. Publisher William Loeb has performed a valuable public service by inviting citizens' attention to this most serious manifestation of sickness within one of our great national political parties. The editorial follows:

DEMOCRATIC LEFTWING

Most Democrats in New Hampshire are conservative, patriotic people. They must therefore be disturbed, as is much of the rest of the Nation, by the constant leftward movement of the national Democratic Party.

Take, for instance, some of the 32 resolutions passed by the Young Democrats at the 13 Western States conference held in Berkeley, Calif., recently. Here are some of the resolutions these Democrats approved at their meeting:

1. Resumption of United States diplomatic relations with Cuba.
2. Withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam.
3. A nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact countries.
4. Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
5. Repeal the McCarran Internal Security Act.

A meeting of the Communist Party could not have disagreed with a single one of these resolutions but would have supported them all.

It would seem that the Democratic Party has a very serious problem insomuch as extreme leftwing groups seem to be taking more and more power in the national party.

Some of the rightwing groups, which the Democrats sometimes accuse the Republicans of harboring, are silly, but they are at least patriotic and you don't see any of them passing resolutions such as passed by this group of Young Democrats at Berkeley.

If Democratic national committee chairman John Bailey and President Kennedy do not repudiate this type of membership in the Democratic Party and this type of ideas, then we must assume that the extreme leftwing and the pro-Communist wing of the Democratic Party have become dominant.

Civil Rights and the Leftwing Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the American Flag Committee, a voluntary association of American patriots, located at 2834 Almond Street, Philadelphia, Pa., recently published its summer of 1963 newsletter. It gives an insight into many important factors contributing to the present chaotic situation. The astute analysis of the political implications is most timely. Specifically, it points out the built-in police powers of the present "civil rights" proposed legislation which could lead to "a bayonet-supported Federal dictatorship."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the American Flag Committee newsletter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE LEFTWING EXTREMISTS

(NOTE.—Foreign intrigue and domestic rebellion expose the citizens of the United States of America to grave physical peril as international-liberal establishment prepares to battle for total control in 1964.)

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: This Nation, this Republic, is entering a period of trial and crisis whose gravity should sober every citizen with eyes to see and ears to hear. At stake is not only individual freedom, but the property, the personal and family safety—the very lives themselves—of all who choose to take a public stand in its defense.

This crisis has been precipitated by the developing tide of conservatism and reawakened national feeling which threatens to sweep away the crumbling edifice of a 30-year bipartisan political structure of extreme liberal-internationalist rule. Faced by the prospect of losing its control of the Republican Party and being weakened by widening schism in the other, the leftist establishment finds that its old slogans, its shopworn promises, and even its fulminations and threats, so effective in deceiving a naive public and cowering a timid opposition in years past, no longer exert their desired influence. The vocabulary of smear, so potent in the 1930's and 1940's, less so in the 1950's, now stirs only a few to dutiful rage. The "economic royalist," the "reactionary," the "fascist"—all these are now recognized as borrowings from the Communist polemic and have lost their sting.

In one area, and in one alone, however, the old deceit, the old trickery, still moves a gullible public and benumbs an otherwise energetic opposition. Still as effective as ever in the armamentarium of the character assassin, labels like "prejudice," "bigotry," "race hatred" and others of the same genre continue to silence those who fear their stigma, and to isolate and often economically and socially destroy those who do not. This has given the establishment a broad legislative area—civil rights—in which to operate with relative impunity.

This situation is responsible for a very curious anomaly which finds northern conservatives, who oppose the extension of Federal power in all other areas, fearfully acquiescing to almost any Federal demand which bears a civil rights label, while the battle for

States rights and Federal restraint is left to a handful of southern conservatives and a larger body of southern lawmakers who support almost every other Federal power grab, subsidy and domestic and foreign boondoggle which the New Frontiersmen place in the House or Senate hopper.

Even more serious is the almost impenetrable facade which civil rights has provided for the movement and intrigues of domestic agents of the world Communist conspiracy. As members of the NAACP, CORE, the Urban League and other minority racial organizations, these agents enjoy a virtually unlimited freedom to carry out their Kremlin assignments, safe in the knowledge that any effort to expose their operations will bring down upon their opposition the lethal charge of "hate mongering."

Since the heydey of New Deal-Communist collaboration in the 1930's and early 1940's, one of Moscow's several training centers for subversion, sabotage, and violent revolution in the United States was the Highlander Folk School in Monteagle, Tenn. The school was abolished several years ago by act of the Tennessee Legislature, which found it to be a focus of Red activities and an integral part of the Kremlin's apparatus for world subjugation.

On the Labor Day weekend in 1957, "classes" were conducted at the Highlander Folk School in connection with the training of leaders to take command of an expanded nationwide "activist" movement in the field of civil rights. Attending this session, in the company of Abner W. Berry, key member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., was Rev. Martin Luther King, whose agitation over the past 3 years has been almost solely responsible for bringing our country to its present brink of mass civil rebellion. Karl Prussian, FBI counterspy for 22 years, has charged King with belonging to 60 Red-front organizations. This excels the record of any other Communist-fronter in the United States, including all known card-carrying members of the Communist Party itself.

During the Cuban crisis of October 1962 King conferred with Dictator Ben Bella of Algeria, who is an active ally of Fidel Castro and a trusted cohort of the radical, Moscow-infiltrated pan-African movement which, through the United Nations, motivated the mass murder of both white and black supporters of Katangan independence 18 months ago.

Last November, the evolving ties between domestic civil rights organizations and the increasingly anti-American, anti-Western, pan-African movement were drawn closer when 100 Negro leaders assembled at Harriman, N.Y., to review their special role in relation to official U.S. policy on Africa. Included in the conference were Roy Wilkins of NAACP, James Farmer of CORE, and Martin Luther King. Also represented was the American Committee on Africa, supporter of such Dark Continent leaders as Jomo Kenyatta, convicted mass murderer and mastermind of the terrorist Mau Mau. Out of the meeting came resolutions hostile to America's anti-Communist allies in Europe and Africa, and urging U.S. support for the newly established neutralist governments of Africa which take the Kremlin line on almost every question vital to the security of the Americas and the free world.

The gathering was significant in being held at Arden House, a 50-room French Renaissance-style mansion donated, in 1951, to Columbia University by the negotiator of the current test ban treaty with the Soviet Union and her European satellites, W. Averill Harriman. The mansion has since been used as a center for various conclaves and "briefing" sessions bearing on political policymaking and legislation which the Liberal-Internationalists have sponsored during both Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, and its influence in this regard has been considerable. Arden House "graduates" are often called back for special purposes, as when, in July 1954 the U.S. House of Representatives killed an $18 million appropriation for United Nations technical aid. A 4-day conference of businessmen, labor leaders, educators and diplomats who had undergone previous Arden House "training" was called. Known as the "American Assembly," the conference adopted a series of resolutions, including one declaring the UN, essential to our way of life and insisting on continued U.N. technical assistance. These went to President Eisenhower (who, as President of Columbia University, directed Arden House's organization) and Members of Congress. The following day, $10 million in U.N. technical aid was appropriated by the previously reluctant House.

It is known that the mass march on Washington was informally discussed at the Arden House conference of Negro leaders held last November, and that it is but one project in a master plan for altering the fundamental orientation and form of government within the United States of America. For the out-and-out Communist agents who are partially directing this overall operation, the objective is national demoralization by the progressive destruction of respect for law and order, incitement of civil strife, recruitment, and the conduct of tactical exercises in the organization of mass marches, strikes, "sit-ins" (a euphemism for forcible occupation of private and public property), and other devices of disruption calculated to produce a classical Leninist-type "revolutionary situation" in this country. For the extreme Liberal-Internationalists, the aim is to bring about a condition sufficiently grave to serve as a pretext for the total federalization of every vital area of judicial, executive, legislative, social and personal action still remaining within the legal scope of the State, county, municipal and township governments, or which the U.S. Constitution reserves to the individual citizen, whether alone or in association with his fellows.

It will be seen that the objectives of the Communists and the extreme Liberal-Internationalists overlap in the intermediate result which they seek to produce. The first are working to create civil turmoil as a prerequisite to a domestic Red takeover in concert, perhaps, with Soviet armed assault from abroad. The extreme Liberal-Internationalists encourage similar turmoil (if of a less violent order) as the means whereby they may extend and consolidate their already considerably augmented Federal power, possibly in preparation for subsequent moves in the direction of another of their declared goals—the political federation of the United States and Europe.

A third force operating to create a climate favorable to the aims of both Communists and extreme Liberal-Internationalists is composed of well-intentioned humanitarians who believe they are helping to correct grave social evils, and a fourth force, not so purely motivated, comes from the practical big city politicians of both major parties, whose sole interest in civil rights is the bloc vote which they hope to garner by its support.

It should be underscored here, to the honor of this Nation's Negro citizenry, that it has contributed fewer—far fewer—adherents to the World Communist conspiracy than is true of any other minority of even nearly comparable number. The crime being worked upon our country by the organized agitation for radical social upheaval is especially reprehensible for the violence which it does to the cause of true Negro advancement. No one, white or colored, enflames the passions of his fellows to surrender their individuality to the mob with their benefit in mind, and yet it is certain that there are literally thousands of individually good, moral and law-abiding Americans who have been caught up in the sound and fury of demagogues, convinced that the changes which those demagogues would herald represent the only way to a better future. Their fate under communism need not be elaborated upon here. Their destiny as subjects of a wholly Federalized United States, subject to the tyranny of a power clique less and less restrained by the limitations of established constitutional authority, must be one with the total body of Americans—white and black—who fall ouside the coterie of the chosen few who rule from the top.

Returning to the present situation, it must be pointed out that the rapidity with which it has developed over the past year (commencing with the initial judicial moves which led to the events of Oxford, Miss., last fall) is to be understood in terms of the special political needs of the extreme Liberal-Internationlists, rather than indicating any quickening of the timetable of the Communists, who are nontheless reaping many of the benefits. The sand of time for the extreme Liberal-Internationalists in both major parties is sufficient only to carry them to the small hours of post—general election day morning, 1964. Whether by the nomination of a conservative Republican for the Presidency, the creation of a new political party of the right, the challenge of independent electors, or a combination of the three, the re-election of John F. Kennedy is now in serious jeopardy. Even more disturbing to the New Frontiersmen and their psuedo-Republican cohorts is the complete loss of Congress to a greatly increased conservative Republican membership and a growing roster of frankly anti-administration Democrats which, functioning as a coalition, could wholy neutralize and abort the Kennedy program (should he remain in office) in 1965 and 1966.

It was these considerations which prompted President Kennedy and the extreme liberal-internationalist establishment to gamble his (and its) political future on the single issue of civil rights. The administration's brain trusters were certainly aware of the actual loss of support which its extreme measures in this area would cause among all segments of the population not specifically committed to the program of the agitators. Obviously, they were willing to suffer such disaffection (and all public opinion polls show that it is increasing) only because of expected gains which would not merely balance the losses suffered, but actually far outmeasure them and assure Kennedy's reelection next year. Such an expectation lies only partially in the increased support which the President is certain to garner from the organized minorities of the big cities (which may well be offset by shrinking majority group backing in these same areas). The really significant gain which made the gamble worthwhile is the increment of Federal power inherent in the pending civil rights legislation and a Democratic sweep of every Southern State in the 1964 election.

This massive "recapture" of the defecting South is to be accomplished by a rapid series of moves involving the employment of military force to carry out the wholesale registration of tens of thousands of presently unqualified voters in each of the dissident States in question. Moreover, we foresee the 1964 general election being carried out with units of the U.S. Armed Forces in virtual control of the polling places in every precinct of the deep South. The justification for this return to the Reconstruction days of 1866–76 will be the argument that only by Federal supervision of the election, buttressed by the bayonets of an army of occupation, can a fair election be guaranteed. By such tactics, it is hoped, John F. Kennedy will be assured of another 4 years in the White House.

This flagrant misuse of U.S. Armed Forces is not forecast on the basis of idle speculation, from an attempt to be sensational, nor even as an extrapolation of past applications of military intervention in the area of civil rights. Rather, it proceeds from a logical study of a very alarming initial report of the little-publicized President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. Known as the Gesell report, this is a 93-page blueprint for not merely the total integration of the armed services, but for giving base commanders dictatorial control over the social behavior of their troops, and, by economic boycott and a system of military "licensing" of civilian business establishments within their base areas, to virtually destroy whole towns and communities refusing to accept their decrees.

Certainly, we cannot reproduce or even adequately review this lengthy document. It is suggested that every reader of this newsletter write, today, to his or her Senators, requesting a copy of the report. One example of its content may be quoted here, in order that the reader may know that we have not exaggerated its menace to our basic liberties:

"Commanders should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval. Qualifying establishments might be issued a display placard or decal."

The report also proposes to base the promotion and career advancement of base commanders on the "initiative and achievement" which they display in forcing the Kennedy civil rights program on enlisted personnel and the civilian populations within their orbit of influence.

We are in very real danger of a bayonet-supported Federal dictatorship being imposed upon us within the coming 12 months, and only a nationwide and articulate opposition to Kennedy's civil rights bill can arouse Congress to halt its imposition. Those who dismiss our warning today, may find they are powerless to protest a few short months from now.

Yours in the cause of the Republic,
W. HENRY MACFARLAND,
Chairman.

Businessmen Endorse Tax Reduction in 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, with other Members of Congress, I today attended a luncheon in Washington sponsored by the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963.

Many of the leading businessmen in the United States were present to hear addresses by President Kennedy as well as the cochairman of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co., and the vice chairman of the committee, Mr. Frazar B. Wilde, chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

I call to the attention of Members of Congress the fact that the President's address on this occasion was inserted in the RECORD of September 10, 1963, by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Henry Ford II, in introducing the President of the United States:

REMARKS BY HENRY FORD II, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF FORD MOTOR CO., IN INTRODUCING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE PRINCIPAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON TAX REDUCTION, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. President, Members of Congress, other honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, on April 25 of this year, here in Washington, a group of 34 businessmen, most of whom are present today, launched the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. To date, 2,417 business, financial and professional leaders from coast to coast, as well as in Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico, have joined the committee. By so doing, they have indicated their support for the premise that a prompt tax reduction, coupled with economies in and prudent control of Federal expenditures, is essential in order to encourage long-term economic growth and reduce the present high level of unemployment.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has substantially completed its work on a tax measure. The executive committee of the business committee has evaluated the long-term impact of this measure.

While many members of the business committee may not approve all of its provisions, we endorse the tax reduction features of the bill as it has been framed by the House committee. We do this, of course, in the anticipation that the administration and the Congress will be vigorous in fulfilling their commitments to exercise firm control over Government expenditures.

Mr. President, the businessmen here today have come to this conference to help focus public attention on and gain public understanding of the need for tax reduction in 1963. Some may have already visited with the Congressmen on the issue, others will do so later in the day. Mr. President, we share with you the conviction that the long-term economic growth of the Nation depends importantly on prompt reduction of excessive and burdensome taxes.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the text of Mr. Wilde's remarks on this occasion:

SOME COMMENTS ON THE HISTORY AND POSITION OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION IN 1963 BY FRAZAR B. WILDE, SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

We are meeting today as citizens who share concern for the growth of our economy and the well-being of our country. Specifically, we are focusing our attention on tax reduction and its impact on that growth.

The Business Committee for Tax Reduction is an informal organization unique in many ways. The idea was endorsed by Treasury and by the President. But the organization itself and its program were developed by a bipartisan group of businessmen who wrote their own ticket.

Contrary to some reports, the committee is not the servant of the administration. The administration has in no way tried to direct it. The policies, the statements, and the judgments guiding the activities of the business committee were written and carried out by its executive committee.

Why have we on the committee directed our energies to this task? We have two major objectives:

1. To seek and support a tax bill based on broad economic considerations.

2. To promote the successful enactment of such a bill at an early date.

In addition to these major objectives, we recognize in this effort the opportunity to emphasize the need for restraint in Federal expenditures.

Historically, tax bills were enacted in order to produce the current revenue required for current governmental expenditures. Political orientation was normal. The formula was derived from the old French dictum that the best tax bill "so plucked the goose as to obtain the largest amount of feathers with the least possible amount of hissing."

As long as government activities represented a relatively small portion of the national product, it was not too serious to have tax laws which were largely political and unsound economically. In the free societies of modern times the influence of taxes upon the success or failure of the economy has become increasingly important. Not only the large amounts of money required but particularly the manner of raising such vast amounts has a major impact on the problems of growth and employment. Excessive direct taxes impede the initiative of individuals and businesses and are serious handicaps to expansion and forward action.

In fact, the present high rates of tax on individual and corporate income are carried over from those imposed in World War II and the Korean emergency. They were designed at that time to finance war, to constrain consumer purchasing power, and to hold back so-called less essential investment. It should be no surprise that these excessive rates have restrained growth in the last half decade.

This relation between taxation and economic growth has not been understood by the majority of voters. As a result, we have burdened ourselves with undoubtedly the worst tax structure in the entire free world. Students of taxation have realized this for quite some years, but their's has been a voice crying in the wilderness.

The first organized attempt to bring this to the attention of our Congress resulted from the CED piece published in 1947. The first legislative recognition of the handicap of taxation was the change in the tax law in 1954. In 1958 serious consideration was given to legislation wihch would have permitted a quick tax cut across the board. The present administration recognized the need for a tax change in the winter of 1961. President Kennedy emphasized the matter in the summer of 1962 and again in December of that year. Throughout these efforts, the public's lack of understanding of the economic issues at stake has made it politically difficult to alter our tax structure.

In addition to this failure to recognize the damaging effects of our tax programs, a very serious collateral complication has entered in; namely, the problem of Federal expenditures and a balanced budget. Most of us believe that our country should have a balanced budget over time. Many citizens feel that the administration and Congress should review the present budget priorities and should be very slow to make any net additions to its commitments and hence income requirements.

In this regard, the general public frequently considers the problem of a balanced Federal budget in the same context as the budget problems of an individual household. This analogy fails to recognize that there is a vital distinction between the two, based on different concepts of bookkeeping. The average family generally maintains a double budget. One portion is for current expenses, which are usually paid for directly, such as for food, clothing, recreation. On the other hand, those items which are felt to be important to normal standards of living, particularly housing, automobiles, and expensive domestic goods, are relegated to what might be called a capital budget, with payments on

time, whether it be 1 year or 25 years. Current living expenses and installment payments are then adjusted to balance with family income.

The governmental budget, as it is normally referred to, is based mainly on allocations for specific expenditures within a given time period. Many of the items contained in this budget might properly be capitalized, but that is a long and involved story which we have no time to expand at this point. If the general public were to use the same bookkeeping concept as that required by the Federal Government, only a small number of our families would operate on a balanced budget. The same principle applies to most business concerns.

Our committee emphatically believes that over time a free society should require not only a balanced administrative budget but a surplus from time to time. However, the general public must realize that this objective cannot be accomplished as readily or in the same manner as a balanced budget for a family or a business concern.

The problem of achieving balance between Federal expenditures and Federal income cannot be solved in the course of a year. It is impossible to determine with any certainty what the Government's receipts will be on a 1-year basis. In addition, it is difficult to determine the Government's future expenditures.

The basic situation, therefore, comes down to this. If we want to succeed in our efforts to reach a balanced budget, we must establish a tax structure which will promote growth in our economy in addition to restraining an increase in expenditures. In a reasonable period of time that economic growth will not only produce sufficient revenue to balance the expenditure side of the budget but produce, as well, a surplus which could reduce the public debt. If we can gain this understanding of our problem, we will have made a great contribution to public thinking and future public operations.

This committee on August 19 endorsed the tax program which the House Ways and Means Committee would recommend to Congress, after detailed drafting had been accomplished. This bill in substance clearly met the test of the principles established by the committee soon after its formation.

The proposed tax bill does rest upon sound economic principles. It provides increased stimulus for consumption and it also recognizes the need for stimulus to business. There are features in the tax bill which many of us individually might deplore. However, the basic fact remains that the proposed tax bill on net balance is very much in the public interest and would help the economy.

There is evidence that the administration and Congress are mindful of the public's concern over expenditures. It is probable that important cuts will be made both currently and in the future. However, until the end of the fiscal year, which does not occur until June 30, 1964, there will be no conclusive evidence upon which to judge the outcome. We know that fiscal 1963 improved over its original pattern. Expenditures were reduced and income rose. There is real evidence that this can happen in fiscal 1964. As far as fiscal 1965 and 1966 are concerned, obviously only the future can tell the story.

In this connection one element of Government finance must be emphasized. Current expenditures reflect almost entirely decisions made by the Congress and enacted into law at a previous date. It is very rare and very difficult to get the Congress to alter commitments it has already made. Consequently, Federal expenditures in a current space of time cannot be readily reduced in large amounts.

As the committee sees the situation today, we urge three things upon all citizens:

1. Support wholeheartedly enactment of the tax bill now before the Congress.

2. Continue the present effort to find ways in which Government expenditures can be restrained and prevented from rapid growth in the future. Emphasis on the committee's statement of principles and particularly the executive committee's additional statement made on May 28, 1963, should be especially noted.

3. In order to maximize the beneficial effect of a new tax bill, urge that this legislation be enacted this fall and made effective January 1, 1964, in the form recommended by the House Ways and Means Committee. The country expects the passage of a constructive tax bill. There are still too many unemployed despite the progress that our economy has made. The present upturn has exceeded the normal pattern. There is a grave risk if the Congress fails to take action this fall.

The proposed tax bill represents a major step toward the achievement of our objectives for growth in the economy. Its enactment by Congress now will stimulate employment and increase the chances of achieving a balanced budget at an earlier date. On the other hand, if we do not take these steps, it is probable that we will be further away from a balanced budget and will have larger deficits as well. The future of our economic well-being as a Nation is at stake. We cannot afford to let this opportunity pass to accomplish so much public good.

Pay Adjustment for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the necessity for taking action on pay legislation before we adjourn this year. While we are not close to adjournment, we are confronted with many grave problems that have to be solved before we can adjourn.

I am sure that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives feel as I do—that we have a very serious responsibility that we must live up to—and that is to consider the adjustment in salary for our Federal workers that has been recommended by President Kennedy.

As you know, last year we passed legislation that provided for pay increases for those under the Classification Act and the Postal Field Service Schedules—but that bill did a little more than that.

It provided for a modern way of considering pay adjustments. It required the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make an annual analysis of the comparability of Federal pay with pay in outside industry, submit its findings to the President, and the President was required by the law to make a recommendation to the Congress.

The President has made such a recommendation. Together with other Members of the House of Representatives, I have introduced legislation that would put the President's recommendations into effect. My bill is H.R. 7659, introduced on July 18, 1963.

I feel that we have a moral obligation to live up to the commitment carried in Public Law 87–793. It was passed by the House with only 20 opposing, and by the Senate with only 3 negative votes.

I think we should also give consideration to the fact that the figures on which the Bureau of Labor Statistics study was made were based upon a study of salaries in outside industry made in late 1961 and early 1962. The comparability that has been proposed is 2 years old. We should give some consideration to adjustment of this lag.

Some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives have introduced legislation that would make such an adjustment. I want to urge the Members to bend their efforts to see that this legislation will be given favorable consideration in ample time before the Congress adjourns at the end of the year.

New Jersey Is Proud of Its Outstanding Professional and Business Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the August issue of New Jersey Business features 10 of New Jersey's outstanding professional and business women. New Jersey is proud of these ladies, each of whom has had a distinguished career and has earned a unique place in the community.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of this special section.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTSTANDING WOMEN IN NEW JERSEY

BERNICE ALEXANDER—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF HACKENSACK-RIDGEWOOD

How many boards of freeholders can boast of a former lieutenant colonel, a recipient of a citation by Queen Mary of Great Britain, and a holder of the American Legion of Merit? Well, the Bergen County Board of Freeholders can in Bernice Alexander of Park Ridge.

Mrs. Alexander served in the Army Nurses Corps during World War II at Allied Forces Headquarters in the Mediterranean Theatre of Operations, in charge of 4,500 nurses in the North Africa-Italy-Southern France area. She was one of six nurses decorated by Queen Mary for work in combating a typhoid epidemic in Bristol during bombings suffered by that city, and her American citations include the Legion of Merit for service above and beyond the call of duty.

Elected to the Bergen County Board of Freeholders in 1960, she presently serves as chairman of the Public Health, Public Welfare and Legislative Committees. Among numerous public services was an appointment in 1953 by John Foster Dulles as a delegate-at-large to the United Nations Education, Social and Cultural Organization. Last October she was named by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to serve on a 15-member advisory Committee to review Federal aid to dependent children.

Obviously smitten with the medical profession, Mrs. Alexander is married to Stewart

F. Alexander, M.D. They have two daughters.

LILLIAN M. GILBRETH—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF SOMERSET

"Someone should write a book about Dr. Lillian M. Gilbreth." Of course, someone has, and a successful bestseller at that, "Cheaper by the Dozen," written by two of her children, Frank, Jr., and Ernestine.

This ageless dynamo, not being content with merely raising 12 children, has also managed to earn a doctorate in psychology, cofound the motion-study firm of Gilbreth, Inc., with her late husband, Frank, and still remains one of the happier additions to the teaching profession.

An indefatigable traveler, Dr. Gilbreth has directed the activities of her firm, lectures, serves as honorary counselor to the International Committee of Scientific Management, and still finds time to enjoy 28 grandchildren and 10 great-grandchildren, each of whom is her special favorite. Her home base is Upper Montclair.

Dr. Gilbreth once observed that, "Happy human beings are at the root of every relationship." At the ripe young age of 85 she can look back at a happy combination of marriage, motherhood, and business. She can, that is, if Lillian Moller Gilbreth spends any of her valuable time looking backward.

DR. DOROTHY K. KLUGHAUPT—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF PASSAIC-CLIFTON

That old saw about the dedicated, warm-hearted physician being a creature of the past should certainly be laid to rest after learning about Dr. Dorothy Kethley Klughaupt.

Her professional activities have centered in general medicine and pediatrics, and most particularly a great interest in improving the health of children. The doctor's affiliation at Passaic General Hospital resulted in an appointment to the board of governors of the medical staff and recently her election to the presidency of the medical staff of Passaic General, the first woman to serve in this capacity.

In her spare time, Dr. Klughaupt has served as a director of the Tuberculosis and Health Association, director of the Passaic County Heart Association, director of the Girl Scouts, Passaic Council, and chairman of the Child Health Center of the Passaic County Medical Society.

In private life she is Mrs. Martin Klughaupt and resides in Passaic.

As a closing note, it must be mentioned that Dr. Klughaupt probably learned her patience and fortitude as an undoubtedly overworked intern at New York City's turbulent Bellevue Hospital.

ETHEL L. NOYES—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF ATLANTIC CITY

Is it possible to combine graciousness with boundless energy? Take a look at Ethel Lingelbach Noyes in action at Historic Smithville Inn at Absecon for a rousing affirmative.

By 1949 the Inn was an uncared for property; the two-story, one-room-deep structure was over-grown, battered and seemingly useless. With just 42 seats, Ethel and her husband, Fred W. Noyes, Jr., a renowned artist and critic, embarked on a project to preserve the beauty and excitement of an early staging inn. Today, Historic Smithville Inn is a New Jersey industry employing over 300 people. What started as merely a small counter in the reception room has grown into a complete Early American village with general stores and gourmet, candle, tobacconist, garden and Christmas shops. Thanks to Mrs. Noyes' tasteful and discriminating eye, guests also enjoy visiting the restored dwellings, a grist mill, bootmakers shop, a small working farm, Sugar Hill Chapel, and Quail Hill.

Mrs. Noyes' interests are extensive. Among other activities she serves on the board of directors of the New Jersey Restaurant Association, the Atlantic County Historical Society, Audubon Society, the New Jersey Resort Association, and the Hotel Sales Management Association.

As a matter of sentiment, Mrs. Noyes is tremendously proud of the fact that her great, great, great grandmother, a full-blooded Indian, tended to her log cabin located close to the present site of the Inn.

MARY G. ROEBLING—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF TRENTON

Banking executive—cultural leader— philanthropist. This triple combine just about describes one of the State's most electric personalities, Mary G. Roebling.

The remarkable president and board chairman of the Trenton Trust Co. has a string of accomplishments to her credit that would stagger any five females. She was the first and still only woman member of the New Jersey Investment Council. Cutting across party lines, Mrs. Roebling was appointed by Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll and reappointed for a second term by Gov. Robert B. Meyner.

Just skimming her countless public activities, associations and recognitions; trustee, U.S. Council, International Chamber of Commerce; Committee for National Trade Policy; National Council, Metropolitan Opera Association; Founders, Salk Institute for Biological Studies; vice president and life member, National Defense Transportation, and member, New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp.

Mrs. Roebling gives generously of her time and talents in numerous community endeavors, particularly in the cultural activities of the Trenton area.

The widow of Siegfried Roebling, she is the mother of Paul, the well-known actor, and Mrs. Elizabeth H. Dutch, whose four youngsters make Mrs. Roebling one of New Jersey's most glamorous grandmothers.

JUDGE LIBBY E. SACHAR—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF SOMERSET

Enter a plea of guilty against Her Honor Libby E. Sachar of Plainfield. Guilty, that is, of giving exceptional service to her profession, her community, and her family.

Judge Sachar was admitted to practice law in New Jersey in 1925, as counselor at law in 1928, and before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1948. She has the distinction of being New Jersey's first woman appointee as an upper court judge, in Union County, and is now a member of the firm of Sachar, Sachar & Bernstein, consisting of her husband, brother, son, and herself.

Juvenile matters form a great part of her concern and Judge Sachar has served on the committee of the New Jersey State Bar Association to study the problem of delinquency and on the committee appointed by the State supreme court for the revision of laws affecting juvenile and domestic relations courts. The author of several magazine and newspaper articles on the problem of delinquency, she is in great demand as a speaker on this subject.

Not incidentally, the women of New Jersey owe Judge Sachar a large "Thank you." She has testified before the Constitutional Committee of New Jersey and was instrumental in having the constitution improved regarding the wording which gives equality to women. She has also testified before congressional committees with reference to the status of women and before the American Civil Liberties Union on the same question.

LILLIAN M. SCHWARTZ—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF NEW BRUNSWICK

The new belief that it's a woman's world seems to have some validity as far as the New Jersey Turnpike Authority is concerned. Mrs. Lillian M. Schwartz, as an example, is not only the secretary to the authority, she was also its first employee. In addition, she was the first person hired by the Passaic Valley Water Commission in 1927, serving as assistant secretary-treasurer until 1949.

Mrs. Schwartz racked up another "first" in March of that year when Governor Driscoll appointed her a member of the water policy and supply council of the department of conservation and economic development, being the first woman named to this agency.

In April 1949 nearly 3 years before the turnpike was completed, Mrs. Schwartz became secretary-assistant treasurer of the turnpike authority under the chairmanship of Paul L. Troast.

This bundle of energy is a most enthusiastic traveler. A few years ago this hobby took her to Russia with a party of eight Governors. Her proficiency as a certified shorthand reporter paid off in that she returned with a 30,000-word transcript of the Governors' meeting with Nikita Khrushchev.

Mrs. Schwartz and her husband, Bolton, who is Trenton bureau chief of the Passaic Herald-News, reside in Highland Park. Her only son, Wilbur J. Maynell, by virtue of his children, Jay and Lynn, has made Mrs. Schwartz a most satisfied grandmother.

DR. MARION EMORY SHEA—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF PATERSON

Since there are only two women presidents of State colleges in this country it would be nice to be able to say that one of them is here in New Jersey. We can—Dr. Marion Emory Shea of Paterson State College.

The path leading to the presidency of Paterson State included: teaching principal, Fort Hancock Public School; head of the English Department at Glassboro State Normal School (Dr. Shea's alma mater); instructor in English at the famed Miss Spence's Finishing School for Girls in New York City, and professor of English and supervisor of Student Teaching at Newark State Teachers College.

The effervescent Dr. Shea has managed to combine her official duties with a busy schedule of lecturing and membership in such organizations as the American Association of School Administrators, board of directors of the United Community Chest, Paterson, board of directors of the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, both the National and the New Jersey Education Associations, New Jersey Congress of Parents and Teachers (life member), and an appointment in 1959 by Gov. Robert B. Meyner to the State scholarship commission.

We are also happy to report that Dr. Shea is not the proverbial "prophet without honor." In 1958 she was the recipient of Glassboro State College's Outstanding Alumnus Award.

In private life Dr. Shea is the wife of Joseph Shea and lives in Montville.

JANE A. STRETCH—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF GREATER CAMDEN

To Jane A. Stretch the word "challenge" seems to be synonymous with the word "exhilarating."

Until April of this year Miss Stretch was editor of Camden's Courier-Post. In the fall she plans to launch a new career in the study and practice of newspaper law. Combined with this is her post as vice president of the Cherry Hill National Bank, and for those with a touch of wanderlust, there's the Jane Stretch Travel Agency.

A product of a newspaper family, Miss Stretch's father, the late Harold A. Stretch, Sr., was president of the Courier-Post and her brother, William, has been publisher since 1962. It was in her own right, however, that she established a national reputation as an editor and newspaper executive.

At the forefront of citizen battles for a better Camden, she is proudest of citations received for successful Courier-Post crusades to reform and rebuild the city. Miss Stretch practices what she editorializes by her serv-

ice as a commissioner on the Camden Housing Authority, vice president of the Camden County Mental Health Association, member of the executive committee of the Greater Camden Movement, a director of both the Camden County Chamber of Commerce and the Family Counselling Service, and an executive committee member of the Camden County United Fund.

A resident of Cinnaminson, her domicile is called "The Home Stretch." However, it should be quite obvious that Jane A. Stretch is far from reaching that point in her distinguished career.

KATHERINE ELKUS WHITE—NOMINATED BY ZONTA CLUB OF NEW BRUNSWICK

It might be hoped that the daughter of a U.S. Ambassador to Turkey during the administration of President Woodrow Wilson would follow her father's path of public service. Surely Mrs. Katharine Elkus White has lived up to these expectations.

Our Mrs. White is, of course, chairman of the New Jersey Highway Authority, operator of the acclaimed Garden State Parkway, thereby being the first woman head of a public roadbuilding agency in the Nation. Perhaps only a woman would have the humor and warmth to see that a Garden State Parkway Stork Club was organized to honor the babies delivered on the parkway. Eighteen youngsters are members—so far. Under Mrs. White's direction, the parkway has established a free coffee and tea treat for motorists on New Year's Day and a program of emergency naps along the parkway so that tired drivers can sleep with police protection along the road.

Long active in civic, social, and cultural affairs, Mrs. White served three terms as mayor of Red Bank. Obviously enjoying the political arena, she is vice chairman of the Democratic State Committee and has been a delegate at large to several of her party's national conventions—including the one that nominated an attractive young U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

Politics being the fickle art that it is, the lucky Mrs. White can always count on her favorite "constituents," husband Arthur, two children, and six grandchildren.

United States-Soviet Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently a most interesting document appeared in the Trinity College Alumnae Journal, entitled "The Source of All Mischief." It was written by Dr. Edna R. Fluegel, professor and chairman, department of political science. This paper contains thoughts and ideas which should be of interest to everyone, and I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOURCE OF ALL MISCHIEF [1]—THE SEPARATION OF UTILITY FROM JUSTICE IN THE AMERICAN HANDLING OF THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMINTERN

(By Edna R. Fluegel, Ph. D.)

At a recent conference the question raised was: "How can anyone possibly believe that the United States with its commitment to freedom and the Soviet Union with its commitment to world domination can move closer together and coexist, possibly by forming a new synthesis that will end the cold war and bring peace?" The question is not unusual. It startled me mainly because of the date, May 22, 1963, the 20th anniversary of the dissolution of the Comintern and of the debate in the Department of State over its real significance and over how it should be publicly viewed. History does not inevitably repeat. It is possible, however, that some light will be shed on the current question by reexamining that incident.

In 1943, some officials thought the great dilemma posed by Soviet world objectives had been resolved with the announced dissolution of the Comintern. Some actually believed, some ardently wanted to believe, some who may have been parties to the conspiracy pretended to believe, and some warned that it was a temporary deviation designed to disarm and deceive. In the end, the debate was carried by advocates of expediency and utility who maintained, since Russia was powerful, we must, regardless of the facts, make a pragmatic effort and hope for the best. This was not the first (and certainly not the last) such discussion and decision. It did mark a turning point, however, a fatal commitment to real politik, since the American people were thereafter deliberately misled, alleged utility was separated from justice, and expediency and pragmatism were enshrined as policy.

Here is a summary account of that development as I observed it.

Wars have two objectives: to win the war itself and to insure the peace. The first objective is short range but pressing, and one of the weapons by which it is achieved is propaganda directed to the maintenace of morale within a nation and between allies, and to the destruction of the morale of the enemy. This requires the resolution of, or the concealment of, differences between allies and the exploitation of differences in the enemy alliance. The long-range objective, to insure the peace, requires shrewd analysis and full understanding of the objectives of allies to forestall the danger that the ally of today, strengthened by the alliance, will become the enemy in the postwar. The short- and long-range objectives frequently are incompatible.

In World War II, American propaganda achieved the short-range objective with considerable difficulty and only after the dissolution of the Comintern. The obstacles were substantial. The American public was slow to "warm up" to the Soviet Union as an ally. The objective of the Third International (Comintern) was well known, and communism was viewed as possibly more reprehenisble than nazism. This popular attitude toward communism and Russia was deeply rooted. The United States had had direct contact both with the antecedents of the Comintern and with the Comintern itself. Remants of the First International had been transferred to the United States in 1872 (New York) and had been dissolved here in 1876 (Philadelphia). Elements of the Second International had subsequently functioned here, while Trotsky himself had worked in New York before his departure for Russia and the task of building the Red Army. Many American groups which supported the Russian Revolution had been alienated by the Communist takeover from Kerensky. The objective of the Third International established in Moscow in 1919 to effect a worldwide revolution, Lenin's assertion that it was the duty of all members of the Comintern to support the Soviet Union,[2] the formation of an American Communist Party in the 1920's and subsequent exposure of its activities, together with the operations of Comintern agents—all these and more had engendered popular hostility. This had constituted a barrier to recogniton of the Soviet Union.

Not until 1933, and only after the Soviet Union agreed to end subversive activity in the United States, was recognition politically possible. The agreement was promptly violated by Russia. The attempt by the Soviet Union to change its image in 1935, when the Seventh Congress of the Comintern announced that it was suspending agitation for world revolution in favor of achieving a united front with the West against fascism,[3] was more than offset by the great discussion in the United States of the Encyclical on Atheistic Communism,[4] to say nothing of the disillusionment following the Nazi-Soviet pact and the slavish acceptance of the switch in Russian policy by the Comintern.

These were the reasons why the American statement of support, when Germany attacked Russia, was so restrained:

"This Government has often stated, and in many of his public statements the President has declared, that the United States maintains that freedom to worship God as their consciences dictate is the great and fundamental right of all peoples. This right has been denied to their peoples by both the Nazi and the Soviet Governments. To the people of the United States this and other principles and doctrines of communistic dictatorship are as intolerable and as alien to their own beliefs as are the principles and doctrines of Nazi dictatorship. Neither kind of imposed overlordship can have or will have any support or any sway in the mode of life or in the system of government of the American people." [5]

The statement added "the present issue which faces a realistic America" is that "Hitler's armies are today the chief dangers of the Americas." Adequate ground for emergency assistance in the name of realism, but not for the acceptance of Russia as a free, peace-loving nation.

After Pearl Harbor a heavy propaganda barrage attempted to popularize the "gallant Russian ally," but this was somewhat offset by popular resentment over supplies going to Russia instead of to American forces in the Philippines. In 1942, Russia utilized the Comintern to counterattack by demanding a second front and by accusing Britain and the United States of wanting the destruction of Russia. All this as the allied retreat was nearing its end and the need for concerting the offensive arrived. The United States and Britain feared another Soviet deal with Germany, to say nothing of a rampantly victorious postwar Russia. Russia badly wanted Great Britain and the United States fully committed to and physically involved in ground war in Europe. Nineteen hundred and forty-three was a year of pressure and counterpressure, concessions and deals, with the issue of postwar peace or war dwarfing, for the negotiators, the real war then entering its offensive stage.

As far as the American public knew, the aims and objectives of the war were encompassed in the Four Freedoms, the Atlantic Charter, and the Declaration by the United Nations.[6] The Soviet Union was still hard-pressed on all fronts; the long drive up the Pacific had begun; victory had been secured in North Africa. Roosevelt and Churchill met at Casablanca in January, 1943, but Stalin was unable to attend, he said, because of the war situation. The Casablanca communique [7] produced the unconditional surrender doctrine. Designed to assure Russia of allied determination, to destroy possible German designs to split the alliance, and, when adopted by Russia, to provide assurance that she would not enter separate negotiations—the doctrine was catastrophic. It did bind Great Britain and the United States, probably prolonged the war, but it never provided any real assurance. To this day the origin of the doctrine is obscure—it definitely was not a State Department proposal.[8] It did not satisfy Russia—she was pressuring for more in a matter of days. While the Nazi armies

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

surrendered at Stalingrad, January 31–February 3, the see-saw battles that followed on the Eastern Front did not turn decisively in favor of Russia until late in July. This is important since it encompasses the period of great Russian dependence, when she was still weak, in fact, and should have been pressured in negotiations. The Russians initiated a great diplomatic offensive directly after Stalingrad, however, by establishing in Moscow the League of Polish Patriots and the Free German Committee. Both these committees were under the auspices of "national" Communists who were Comintern men and who subsequently were heads of Soviet-sponsored Communist regimes. Relations between the Polish Government-in-exile in London and the Soviet Union deteriorated to the point where diplomatic relations were suspended in April. The Free German Committee was still more omninous as far as the West was concerned. American and British diplomats worked feverishly to assess developments and to devise some mechanism to "harness" the Russians.

Public opinion had weighed heavily in diplomatic exchanges for some time. The Russian people were not informed about allied fighting in other theaters; they had received no information about the substantial material assistance that had enabled the Russians to resist the German attack; they were being told that Russia alone was defending the United Nations. The dangerous impact on Russian opinion was obvious. In March, 1943, the American Ambassador, Admiral Standley, went beyond his instructions to obtain the first admission, in the Soviet press, that aid had been supplied. American officials had also been stressing the problem the existence of the Comintern imposed on efforts to develop American friendship for the Soviet Union. It was pointed out that, if we were to fight together as allies in Europe, the American people must be assured that Russia was no longer intent on world dictatorship. The continued existence of the Comintern was viewed as a contradiction. The same point was made in regard to close relations between Roosevelt and Stalin—such relations were desired but would be difficult to initiate as long as the American people believed that Russia's objective was world communism.

Then the Russians abolished the Comintern and we had a paper victory which was immediately used in the great drive to sell the American people the idea that Russia was just a different type of democracy, one with the same postwar dreams of a peaceful world. The drive succeeded in goodly measure since the doubts and findings of our officials were not published. What was the internal reaction? A memorandum circulated at the time gave the results of a round-robin from our diplomatic posts abroad as well as the comments of State Department officers. All but one reported total cynicism and many pointed out the danger of an oversell. A month later a similar study developed no signs of any change in Soviet operations and no indication of the disbanding of the Soviet apparatus.[9] Public opinion was disarmed sufficiently to sustain the pragmatic policy subsequently adopted, but at no time in later negotiations did the President and other officials disclose any firm conviction that Russia had in fact renounced her world objectives or terminated the activities of her agents. As the official State Department account of the preparation of postwar foreign policy notes:

"The dissolution of the Comintern was announced in Moscow on May 22, an action which from the standpoint of the preparation did not remove existing and potential difficulties or basic uncertainties but which was officially welcomed for its promotion of "a greater degree of trust" and its contribution to cooperation "for the winning of the war and for successful postwar undertaking." [10]

We accepted a gesture and failed to follow through from an existing position of strength to insure that the objectives were reannounced and the apparatus as well as the superstructure was dissolved. The victory became a defeat.

At the time, of course, it seemed to many that this was the expedient thing to do, even though it involevd deception of the American people. Once done, it could not be undone.[11] At each subsequent stage a new pragmatic expedient seemed useful. One result is that the deceivers gradually deceived themselves as well as the people. Over a period, new policymakers came along who believed what had been published. Russia later worked hard and with considerable success to sell the idea that utopia was upcoming until Roosevelt was repudiated by the cold war warriors. There is a bewildering tendency to believe what has been said by governments. As Thucydides observed over 23 centuries ago: "Men do not discriminate, and are too ready to receive ancient traditions about their own as well as about other countries. * * * So little trouble do men take in the search after truth; so readily do they accept whatever comes first to hand." [12] It is interesting to note that Socrates reached his conclusion that the separation of utility from justice is the source of all mischief at the same time Thucydides was writing.

The latest statement on the subject, still more emphatic and complete, is Pope John's encyclical, "Pacem in Terris," which affirms that "peace will be but an empty-sounding word" unless established on "an order founded on truth, built according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity, and put into practice in freedom." [13]

---

[1] Cicero, De Re Publica: "Consequently Socrates was right when he cursed, as he often did, the man who first separated utility from justice; for this separation, he complained, is the source of all mischief."

[2] Lenin, "Conditions of Affiliation to Communist International," 1920. "Selected Works," International Publishers, N.Y. 1943, vol. X, pp. 204–205.

[3] Resolutions, Seventh Congress, Workers Library Publishers, N.Y. 1935.

[4] Pius XI, March 19, 1937. The Popes had consistently and repeatedly attacked communism, but this encyclical had a special and extraordinary impact.

[5] Acting Secretary of State Wells, June 23, 1941. Text in "Peace and War," Department of State, 1943, pp. 683–684. The statement was drafted at the White House and had been prepared in advance in ancipation of an attack.

[6] Jan. 6, 1941; Aug. 14, 1941; Jan. 1, 1942.

[7] Jan. 26, 1943.

[8] With the Secretary's authorization, I made a full check of the Department's files in 1947. Nothing but opinion and impression has appeared in subsequent accounts.

[9] Prepared and circulated by the writer, then a State Department officer.

[10] "Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation," Department of State, 1950, p. 163. The quotes within the quote are from the public comment of the Secretary of State on the Comintern's dissolution, Department of State Bulletin, VIII, p. 473, 1943.

[11] This acceptance of shadow for substance has marked much subsequent negotiation. The temptation to a democratic leader is very great. Cf. Spirit of Geneva, of Camp David, the Kennedy "victory" in the Cuban negotiations.

[12] History of the Peloponnesian War," introduction.

[13] April 11, 1963. Concluding section, NCWC Press copy.

Warwick, Mass., Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CONTE. On Labor Day, Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of delivering the principal address for the bicentennial of Warwick, Mass. This distinguished community has had a great and noble history throughout the past two centuries, and is very much alive to the changing patterns of American life. At the same time, the leaders and citizens of this community are deeply imbued in the traditions which have made this country great. A fine editorial, entitled "Warwick's Wealth," by Harold LeVanway of the Greenfield Recorder Gazette, accurately grasps the significance of this community. It is an excellent piece of editorial writing and I am proud to make it a part of the official RECORD. The article appeared on Monday, August 26, 1963:

WARWICK'S WEALTH

Of such modesty and retirement has this community remained for 200 years that even one who has resided in the vicinity for a lifetime might be moved to ask: Where is it?

The place? Warwick—a mountaintop township in the northeast corner of Franklin County, now approaching its bicentennial in a spirit traditional with its history.

Warwick today is not far removed from the Warwick of 50, 100, or even 150 years ago. Except for the growth and development of highways, the addition of a few houses, and a clearing here and there, Warwick differs not much from what it must have been like when it was first set apart as a township.

There are reasons for this situation in a world beset with change. Warwick geographically is a community which defies alteration. It could be enlarged and expanded along industrial lines, but that time has not yet come.

This town, instead, has clung to the features which have distinguished many Franklin County communities. Among these are Health, Wendell, Hawley, and, until recently, we might add Shutesbury and Leverett. The two latter, however, have felt the inroads of civilization and by mere population alone have undergone sharp changes.

One rarely thinks of Warwick without calling to mind the grandeur of its hills and vales. There's Mount Grace of more than 1,000 feet elevation. There's a forest at its feet to cool and refresh the traveler. There are brooks and streams wandering in and out of the hills. And there are several ponds to delight nature and the naturalist.

Warwick, too, has in addition to a collection of pleasant homes, an inn of some historical interest, well disciplined schools, and a history of service in all of the country's wars. There also have been saw mills, a grist mill, and other manufacturing interests related to agriculture, once its major industry. There is not much farming there today, but there are summer residents and there are visitations at all seasons from men and women in search of recreation and relaxation.

Birthdays represent significant milestones to every community and Warwick's 200th which will be duly observed this week represents another step in the long road down

the valley of American history. And even if another century should pass without great change Warwick still will uphold an important corner of Franklin County. And there will be men, women, and children who call it home.

The Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the discussion on the proposed test ban treaty has been occupying much of our attention these last few weeks. It is always very helpful to know how the persons back home feel about any subject, and this is particularly true on a subject as important as this treaty. An editorial appeared in a paper in my district which is a very good résumé of such feeling. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the aforesaid editorial which appeared on September 4, 1963, in the Daily Intelligencer, a leading newspaper of my district, published in Doylestown, Bucks County, Pa.

The editorial is as follows:

RATIFICATION GO-AHEAD ON TEST BAN TREATY GOOD

No one now expects that the U.S. Senate will give anything but overwhelming approval to the partial nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's nearly unanimous endorsement of the treaty, there is a clear assessment that whatever risk is involved is one this Nation can take without grave danger to its freedom and security.

It is a judgment which says in effect that if we are not willing to take some risk in order to test Russia's purposes at this stage, we are saying that negotiation is now and perhaps forever a futile device of diplomacy in the cold war.

Obviously we are not prepared to take so adamant and seemingly final a stance.

Soviet motives, in the nature of things, can seldom if ever be entirely clear to us. But we are not measuring motive. We do not have to know all that goes on between the Kremlin and Red China in order to take this test ban chance.

We will be watching Soviet action. There is a strong conviction that if Russia breaks the treaty we will speedily know it and be able to act on our own to prevent Moscow from gaining a critical nuclear military advantage.

It is we who have the great advantage today, and we do not propose to yield it. We will have our guard up, prepared to test in the atmosphere again should the Russians resume.

And beyond doubt, we shall be constantly alert to assure that our massive stockpile of nuclear weapons—called by President Kennedy sufficient to kill 300 million people in 1 hour—remains an effective shield for us and the free world.

This means, of course, keeping the weapons in usable condition—and deliverable over targets.

Military men disagree on ways of assuring this effectiveness. But there would seem to be ample support for the idea that it can be done, notwithstanding the test ban treaty.

Not all our military and nuclear specialists like the treaty. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a sober and responsible body. It listened to the doubts and reservations and yet decided to approve the document. At worst, the committee might in time be proved wrong. At best, this group, the full Senate and all associated with the treaty must recognize that it is not a guarantee of peace, but only a small beginning step down that road.

Up to now there has been almost no traffic on that road. We are simply making ready to try it. We may have to turn back. But, with the stakes so high, the try is one our sanest Senate leaders think we ought to make.

The $2 Billion Rathole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to place in Appendix of the RECORD a very pertinent editorial which appeared in the September 7, 1963, issue of the Tampa Tribune, one of the outstanding daily newspapers of the Nation.

Many of us have questioned the effectiveness of the foreign aid program. The editor of the Tribune points out what the proponents of foreign aid have always maintained, and that is that "the purpose of foreign aid in general and the Alliance for Progress in particular is to help underdeveloped nations stabilize their economies." This has not been the case in Brazil and in many other countries. Our aid has often had the opposite effect.

I commend to all of the readers of the RECORD, the editorial, "The $2 Billion Rathole," in which the case of Brazil is presented.

The editorial follows:

THE $2 BILLION RATHOLE

Worshipers at the shrine of foreign aid who consider any hint of a cut in a presidential request for funds sheer sacrilege might do well to consider the case of Brazil.

From all appearances, if anyone's desecrating the good intentions of the Alliance for Progress, it's not the Congressmen who propose to cut funds where they're being wasted but governments like Brazil's.

One of the current big political issues in Brazilian financial circles today is rescheduling of the nation's foreign debts. Cleanto de Paiva, Brazil's director of the Inter-American Development Bank, cries the nation should take a "tough attitude," which means that Brazil should demand another moratorium on its $2 billion debts to the United States, such as those granted in November 1960, and in May 1961. One of the major items involved is the "wheat accord," through which Brazil buys U.S. surplus wheat at low cost. To U.S. debtors the terms seem almost too good to be true: Brazil pays for the wheat in its own cruzeiros, not dollars, and most of the cruzeiros are then lent back to Brazilian Government agencies at low interest, 40-year loans to finance development.

The purpose of foreign aid in general and the Alliance for Progress in particular is to help underdeveloped nations stabilize their economies. In Brazil, it seems to be having the opposite effect; every time Uncle Sam sends down a new handout, it sets off a new wave of inflation.

Take 1961, for example. Three weeks after President Kennedy announced the Alliance's first $100 million grant to Brazil, the cruzeiro was devalued from 100 to the dollar to 200.

Came 1962. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon announced a $270 million Brazilian aid program. The Brazilian Government promptly raised all civilian and military pay by 40 percent. The cruzeiro just as promptly fell to 400 to the dollar.

Came 1963. Foreign Aid Director David E. Bell in March agreed to send Brazil $400 million, most of it to help solve the Nation's foreign exchange problem. President Joao Goulart promptly raised Government and military pay another 70 percent. The cruzeiro was then officially pegged at 670 to the dollar—but the unofficial exchange rate slid to more than 1,000 per dollar.

And what has Brazil's Government done in accord with the Alliance for Progress premise that it will take its own measures for stabilization and to equalize the vast disparity between rich and poor?

Well, in some recent years the Government budget has been double its tax revenues. This year a primary goal was to hold the increase in cost of living, a prime concern to the poor, to only 25 percent. The latest report indicates it's already up 39 percent in Rio de Janeiro. The Government also announced salary increases for the year would be limited to 40 percent. As noted above, it's already increased its own pay levels 70 percent. And it agreed to limit its issuance of inflation-fraught new currency to 110 billion cruzeiros in 1963, but has already raised the ceiling to 145 billion, and apparently will keep on cranking the printing presses even after that figure is reached.

Were any private citizen of the United States so improvident while a debtor, he would be hustled into court in involuntary bankruptcy proceedings and his affairs, including all his expenditures, put under the direct control of an officer of the court.

National sovereignty does not permit such treatment of debtor nations. Indeed, even those so profligate as Brazil are offended by even a suggestion that they be more prudent. Recent hints from the United States that Goulart's government might better manage its own affairs have been met by the shopworn threat that if the United States clamps down on aid, Brazil can always get it from the Communists.

All foreign aid is not, despite the contention of some unrelenting critics of the program, pouring money down a rathole. But those who deny that any ratholes exist at all had better take another look at Brazil. If that's not a $2 billion rathole, there's not a coffee bean in Sao Paulo.

Statement of Glenn R. Simcox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement by Mr. Glenn R. Simcox, president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees before the Senate Committee on Commerce, Special Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization, in opposition to S. 774.

This statement, in opposition to one of the most iniquitous price fixing bills ever to be presented to the Congress, deserves careful consideration by every Member of Congress and shows clearly why the quality brand stabilization legislation should be rejected by the Congress as being violently against the public interest.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF GLENN R. SIMCOX, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES, TO THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON QUALITY STABILIZATION, ON BILL S. 774.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Glenn R. Simcox. I am president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, an organization with over 106,000 paid-up members who are either retired Federal employees or the survivors or beneficiaries of former Federal employees. Our association has 865 chapters scattered throughout the United States, and has 35 State Federations. We represent over 600,000 Federal retirees and survivors. Vice president George L. Nichols joins me in this statement.

Previously, I have written to all Members of the 88th Congress opposing H.R. 3669 and your S. 774. The contents of my letter follow:

"We, representing 600,000 Federal retirees and survivors are greatly alarmed to learn that H.R. 3669, the so-called quality stabilization bill, has been reported out by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and may soon become a law.

"We want you to know that we are greatly opposed to this or any other legislation relating to price fixing.

"The Federal retiree for the most part is receiving a very meager annuity. The cost of living through inflation has melted this income in buying power.

"This bill will make it legal for manufacturers and others to fix prices on all brand, name, or trademarked goods, wares, and merchandise. If H.R. 3669 is enacted these prices could be set so high as to work a grave hardship on all our members and on their families as well. It will also work a hardship on all of the elderly in these United States.

"You as a Member of the 88th Congress are certainly concerned about the common man and his problems. Please do not allow any injustice to come to those with such meager incomes.

"We are counting on you to look after our interests."

Our members and their families, along with all the elderly, would be more adversely affected by the enactment of these proposals than any other group. Our folks buy essentially the same consumption items as most other consumers. They are on fixed low incomes.

Quality stabilization is just another name for price control and fair trade. It is a name intended to fool the public and allow those who wish price control to gain their point.

Our association is just as much interested in holding the advantages we have as we are in gaining correction to the retirement laws.

We base our judgment on the detrimental effect of price fixing in that it allows producers and resellers price making without restraint if their products or goods are identified by distinguishing brands, names or trademarks.

Twenty-six states here repudiated price-fixing laws similar to quality stabilization. The Quality Stabilization Act empowers manufacturers to fix wholesale and retail prices against the decision of State supreme courts and the wishes of the people in the 26 States that have repudiated price fixing.

A survey was presented on June 25, 1958, by the Department of Justice to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business. This survey concerned a comparison of fair trade and nonfair trade prices. This survey probably provides a more accurate indication of the impact of resale price maintenance programs than might be indicated by a later survey because of the extent to which such price maintenance programs have been abandoned in recent years.

The following excerpts from the survey indicate the differences between consumer prices in fair trade and nonfair trade cities:

Total consumer prices of 119 selected items

In fair trade cities	$2,829.46
In nonfair trade cities	2,280.34
Savings to consumers in nonfair trade cities	549.12
Percentage savings to consumers in nonfair trade cities	19.41

In the above summary, even in nonfair trade cities, many items sold at fair trade prices. The Department therefore made a separate comparison of only those items that were sold below fair trade prices, as follows:

Total consumer prices of selected items

In fair trade cities	$2,033.20
In nonfair trade cities	1,481.73
Savings to consumers in nonfair trade cities	551.47
Percentage savings to consumers in nonfair trade cities	27.12

The size of the increases in prices in fair trade cities above those in other cities indicates there is little comfort for consumers in this bill. If the bill were enacted it could clearly accelerate the relentless upward trend in the consumer price index.

The magnitude of the increased margins reported by the Justice Department's study indicates that the enactment of Federal resale price maintenance legislation would have a significant effect and impact with respect to our national economy, (a) increasing consumer prices, (b) reducing aggregate demand, (c) reducing total production and employment, and (d) deterring economic growth.

Many economists agree that the purchasing power is a key element in promoting growth and high levels of employment.

We feel that the 88th Congress should certainly be concerned about the "common man" and his problems.

NARCE urges you as our Senators to support us in our fight to hold ground on price fixing. We cannot afford to allow further injustices to come to those with meager fixed incomes.

The concept of resale price maintenance is not, in our view, in accord with the principles of a free competitive enterprise system.

We believe resale maintenance denies the consumer the right and an opportunity to share in any savings made possible by lower cost merchandising.

Many consumers are content to shop in less commodious stores with poorer service and less convenient location if by such means they are able to buy cheaper. The consumer who wishes to save money in this manner should not be denied the right and opportunity to do so.

The argument that the consumer should have protection against loss-leader sales is not in our opinion relevant to consideration of this bill. This is not loss-leader legislation: It is legislation to prohibit any price reduction by a retailer. All price reductions are not loss leaders.

We believe that the disciplines of the competitive system are essential guarantees to consumers' interests. Competition should be applicable to distribution margins as well as manufacturers' prices. The competitive principle contributes to the vitality of our economic system by providing a premium for developing new and more efficient ways of doing business.

Now in conclusion, we again ask that you as members of the subcommittee support us in opposition to S. 774 the so-called quality stabilization bill.

Our association appreciates the opportunity to file this "opposition statement" and thanks you for your consideration.

Red War Power Ominous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union:

RED WAR POWER OMINOUS

The first step in sound military planning is to make what is known as an estimate of the situation. The value of this estimate to the commander depends primarily upon one key factor—the accuracy with which enemy capabilities are ascertained and appraised.

One expects an astute enemy to fool us if he can. But if we are prepared to cope with any actions of which the enemy is capable, a wrong guess by us as to his intentions may prove embarrassing but is unlikely to be fatal.

If, on the other hand, we overlook a capability, or worse than that, commit the grave error of gambling that he does not intend to exercise one which we know he has, we are asking for trouble. This appears to be precisely what we are doing in the field of military applications of space.

Because we have pressed for agreements which will reserve space for peaceful purposes, and have ourselves made no move to put weapons or military launching platforms into space, it does not follow that the Soviets will exercise comparable restraint.

Quite the contrary; for by voluntarily refraining ourselves, we not only give them a clear field for their own endeavors but remove any incentive for them to agree not to extend the arms race to this new environment. This is particularly reprehensible because, due primarily to the 5-year lag imposed upon our space program by the Truman administration, we know that the U.S.S.R. has a clear superiority in many aspects of space work.

The only sound assumption that we can make is that the U.S.S.R. military capability in this new field substantially exceeds our own. This being accepted, it is necessary to conclude that they will exploit this advantage to the maximum. To do otherwise would be criminal folly.

We know definitely some of the Soviet capabilities; and with due regard for their proclivities for talking big and running a bluff, we can infer others. We know that they can place in orbit payloads which in comparison with our capabilities are enormous—from 10,000 to 14,000 pounds, or three to five times bigger than we can launch. They do not appear to be restricted to polar or equatorial orbits, but can—and have—launched objects into orbits which provided extensive coverage of the United States. They have very nearly effected a rendezvous between two cosmonauts. They have launched space-probing rockets from orbiting satellites. These things we know they have done.

Very little extension of technique would be required to replace the men in these "space

train" Vostok satellites with nuclear bombs which could be deorbited on radio command, or for that matter to convert the entire satellite to a single multimegaton warhead which could be exploded in orbit at the proper instant to wipe out half the world. Despite the cost and the relative inefficiency of such systems, the Soviets are not blind to the enormous psychological advantages which could accrue to them from the presence in orbit of devices of this nature.

With respect to antisatellite defense, the "near miss" of Vostoks III and IV last summer (on the order of 3 miles) indicates that the Soviets have the capability to intercept and destroy orbiting objects whose presence over the U.S.S.R. annoys them—including our weather, navigational, communication, reconnaissance, and early warning satellites.

So much for their capabilities. Currently we are not able to equal them nor to counter them. Nothing in history indicates that we can rely upon the Soviets not to exercise them. The basic considerations of self-preservation dictate that we inaugurate an urgent program to redress this intolerable situation before it is everlastingly too late.

Wanted: Problem Solvers, Not Dramatists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, Ronald Reagan delivered a lecture in my district entitled, "What Price Freedom." I inserted the lecture in the Appendix of the RECORD and the request for reprints has been astounding.

The entertainment world needs more minds like Ronald Reagan. On that very point, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of August 30, 1963:

METHOD ACTORS ON NEW STAGE

Never since John Wilkes Booth transferred his activities from the stage to the balcony corridor of Ford Theater have "show biz" personalities been so involved in public issues and public affairs.

Playwright Gore Vidal brags publicly about having written campaign speeches for the President, and armies of actors were lined up by both parties and various contenders in the last several presidential elections.

Presidential aspirants are busy now trying to line up Hollywood support.

Meanwhile, wherever there is a crowd assembled on a public issue a "method actor" is likely to pop up, too. They are welcome, of course, because the nature of their activities is such that their names and faces are well known and they can help get out a crowd.

Yet, it is well for us to remember as we observe this trend, that from Mr. Booth's day to this, the special talent that generally makes an actor, fiction writer, or playwright successful is a creative ability, an exceptional imagination, and as "the method" school emphasizes, a special ability to make pretense seem real—even to the actor himself.

Hence, today, we have in many instances the public being exhorted and various political pitches being suported by people with great talent, the appealing and captivating qualities of imagination and creativity, but people who also have to hire somebody to "manage" their own lives and moneys, whose private lives are marked by a trail of failures and broken marriages, and who often come to the public platform more or less directly from the psychiatrist's couch.

People with imagination and creativity delight us, but are seldom the best judges of hard, sober issues and facts.

You don't find them at the bottom of mine shafts very often, nor in sunken submarines, and what really happens in those instances has been very sharply made known to us recently. Hence, we have a chance to see how different is fiction and drama from fact.

Have you ever seen a movie, play or book fictionalizing that situation in which the participants didn't carry on something awful?

The conversations at the mine shaft of this past week showed us the difference between human reality, and the products of imagination, a tightly tuned nervous system, and a creative talent.

Did you know, by the way, that never in the history of the West did attacking Indians ever ride around a circle of wagons?

There is a wonderful place for these special qualities in our society—but it doesn't include taking their advice, or their estimations of facts or presentations of real problems seriously.

A dramatist is one thing. A problem solver is another.

It is a difference this democracy had better learn to recognize.

We need some solutions a lot more than we need more drama.

C. L. DANCEY.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have never failed to rise to meet the challenges of leadership, whatever they have been. One of the great problems presently facing us is the serious deficit in our balance of payments; we are all becoming increasingly concerned about the stubborn resistance of this deficit in the face of growing efforts to end it. Again I call the attention of the House to my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, to declare 1964 as "See America Year," calling upon the patriotism of Americans to do their tourist traveling in the United States next year. Tourist spending overseas is contributing to our balance-of-payments deficit to the tune of $1.4 billion yearly, and my bill seems a reasonable, noncoercive way to ease this dollar drain. I have just received a letter from Mr. Harry C. Thoma, supervisor of recreational advertising and publicity for the Conservation Department of the State of Wisconsin, supporting House Joint Resolution 658, which I include at this point in my remarks:

STATE OF WISCONSIN
CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT,
Madison, Wis., September 4, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Thanks very much for your interesting letter, copy of the House Joint Resolution 658 and the interesting facts sheet behind it.

You may be certain that we will call this matter to the attention of our representatives and do whatever is within our power to further this program. We have been actively interested in Visit U.S.A. program and I serve as a liaison officer on the U.S. Travel Service so we are quite cognizant of the need for a furtherance of this program.

Every good luck in your adventure.

Very truly yours,

INFORMATION AND EDUCATION DIVISION,
HARRY C. THOMA,
Supervisor, Recreational Advertising.

VFW Resolution Opposes Allied Shipping to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars in its 64th national convention August 25 to 30 has formally adopted a resolution opposing U.S. foreign aid to any country whose ships are doing business with Cuba.

As one who has long been working to eliminate allied shipping to Cuba I am delighted at the support of this national veterans organization. It is further proof that the American people are tired of excuses from our allies and tired of paying out our tax dollars to countries who aid our enemies. It is time that our allies realize that there are two sides to the Atlantic, and that if they wish our help in keeping their side free from communism, they must be willing and able to assist us on this side. We are not asking for a commitment of troops, arms, or even money. We are only asking for cooperation between friends. We do not seem to be able to get it in a friendly manner. It is time we demand it.

I include this resolution at this point in the RECORD, and commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their support of our activities:

RESOLUTION 159 OPPOSING AID TO COUNTRIES WHOSE SHIPS ARE DOING BUSINESS WITH CUBA

Whereas we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States feel that certain European and Asiatic countries are abusing the citizens of the United States and their generosity by accepting financial aid being offered them and then using it to do business with Communist Cuba; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America over the past several years has given to many European and Asiatic countries many billions of dollars to aid them in their fight for economy recovery and also to combat the advance of communism within these countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 64th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the Government of the United States of America and its agencies stop immediately any and all aid, financial or otherwise, to any country, having ships registered under its flag, doing business with Communist Cuba.

West Virginia's Wilderness: Only a Few Hours From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is only a short drive from the Nation's Capital. The glories of canoeing along a wilderness river only a few hours away are described in an article in this morning's Washington Post, written by David Burnham, of Newsweek magazine, an able and accurate reporter.

I admire the efforts of those who would confine the Appendix of the RECORD to matters which relate to our congressional duties, and I suggest that legislators who canoe and camp along the Cacapon River of West Virginia will return to their congressional tasks refreshed and with a deeper appreciation of God's handiwork:

CACAPON PADDLERS TASTE WILDERNESS

(By David Burnham)

Ahead was the soft steady roar of falling water.

Below, the river was so clear the rocky bottom looked only inches away from the keels of the three aluminum canoes. Above, the soaring cliffs appeared to support the bright blue, cloudless sky.

A film writer, a lawyer, a lobbyist, a newsman, and two congressional staff men were far removed from the crush of the Nation's Capital.

But they had not driven 500 miles to the Alagash in Maine nor flown 2,000 miles to the Rocky Mountains.

Instead, they were paddling down West Virginia's Cacapon River, a comfortable 3 hour drive from their own backyards.

They were "city boys" on one of the last wilderness rivers left next door to the Boston-to-Washington megalopolis. They were middle-aged neophytes at white water canoeing.

The party left Washington early one Saturday and drove to Seneca on the Potomac River where the canoes, rented in advance, were loaded on two station wagons. Two and a half hours of driving brought them to Cacapon Bridge, which takes U.S. 50 across the river.

The canoes were lugged down the steep bank where the luggage—carefully wrapped in waterproof bags—was divided and tied securely into center thwarts.

Soon they were ghosting quietly downstream. The first white water swept under the tough aluminum canoes without incident. But, in the second series of riffles, one hooked on a rock, turned its flank toward the current and shipped water.

A huge doe crashed out of the brush and swam downstream for a minute or two, unconcerned by the quiet canoe a few dozen feet behind her. Later, the lead canoe frightened a wounded duck.

The duck shot out from the riverside brush and began honking plaintively as she limped along just ahead of the canoe. As the canoeists paddled faster, the duck moved faster and seemed to get healthier and healthier until she took off in swooping flight.

The "city boys" had been fooled by one of the oldest tricks of wildlife—and womanhood—by a mother duck who pretended she was weak, in order to lead potential predators away from her young ones.

By 4 p.m., tired from the unaccustomed work, the paddlers began looking for a camping site. Near a towering rock pinnacle, they found a small grassy meadow, backed by a grove of pines. Two of the three canoes were dragged ashore, emptied and turned over for worktables. Dampened sleeping bags were hung over nearby trees to dry.

Gathering driftwood, the men soon had a hot fire to dry their wet socks and shoes.

The cook—chosen because of his long experience and bad luck at drawing straws for the job—began working on a dinner of fried pork chops and potatoes with apple sauce. It all came out of aluminum foil envelopes, preserved by the new freeze-dry method used to preserve specimens at the Smithsonian Institution.

The pork chops, which looked and felt like heavy pieces of blotting paper, soon swelled up into partly cooked, boneless pork chops. After 15 minutes over the fire, the chops and the rest of the food was as attractive and tasty as a similar meal in a low-cost restaurant.

The advantage of freeze-dry foods is their compact lightness, for 3 days food for six men fitted easily into a pack no bigger than a supermarket shopping bag.

Sleep came easily, although the night was chilly. Two of the party were up before the sun, to start breakfast fire. By 6 a.m., the thick morning mist started rising off the river. The party's two fishermen disappeared downstream, returning an hour later with tales of large bass lurking in the deep, rocky pools—but with no bass.

The second day the river wound through even wilder country. Much of the time the canoeists were surrounded left and right by high cliffs.

Only two members of the party had ever canoed before, and their dictum—"head for the quiet black V in the white water rushing downstream"—was tested. Another canoe was overturned but was righted without serious trouble.

The second night's campsite was in a thin forest of tall poplars. This time the fishermen returned to the river after dinner, reporting they hooked a few large bass which they released "in the interests of conservation."

Small Business Administration Local Development Company Loans Create 20,000 New Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the local development loan program as established by Congress in the Small Business Act is showing much progress. It is now showing some of the promises expected of it when the program was initiated. This program not only aids small business firms, but is instrumental in creating new jobs.

A press release issued recently by the new Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley points out that nearly 20,200 new jobs have been created throughout the country as a result of the local development company loan program. This announcement by Administrator Foley specifically advises of 9 new local development company loans which have just been approved involving 700 jobs.

The press release gives the location and more specific details concerning these new loans.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this press release by Administrator Foley in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The release follows:

More than 700 jobs are involved in nine local development company loans announced today by Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley. The small firms to be assisted plan to add over 435 new workers to the 267 they already employ, Mr. Foley said.

Approximately half of the new jobs will be in areas of substantial unemployment in Florida, Nebraska, and the Appalachian area of Pennsylvania.

Nearly 20,200 new jobs have been created throughout the country as the result of 313 local development company loans made by SBA since the program started 5 years ago. The loans have totaled about $42 million.

The loans announced today amounted to more than $1.5 million and went to the following development companies:

Mount Carmel District Industrial Fund, Inc., Mount Carmel, Pa. A $446,200 loan, the proceeds of which will be used to construct a new plant for Mount Carmel Container Corp., makers of corrugated boxes and sheets. The new firm expects to employ 100 persons. A local bank is taking a 22-percent share in the loan which will run for 20 years. Since the firm is located in an area of substantial unemployment, SBA has lowered the interest rate on its share of the loan to 4 percent. The development company is contributing $89,240 toward the total project cost of $892,400. The Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority is contributing $356,960 toward the project.

Kearney Improvement Corp., Kearney, Nebr. A $254,214 loan to acquire land and construct a factory of J. A. Baldwin Manufacturing Co., makers of oil and air filters for internal combustion engines. The company now employs 183 persons and expects to add 90 more.

The loan will run for 15 years at 4-percent interest since the firm is in an area of substantial unemployment. The development company is contributing $64,000 toward the total project cost of $318,214.

Greater Rochester Development Corp., Rochester, N.H. A $50,000 loan to build a plant for I. M. C. Magnetic Corp., manufacturers of electrical machinery. The firm will employ 80 persons. A local bank is taking a 10-percent share in the loan which will run for 25 years at 5-percent interest. The development company is contributing $12,500 toward the total project cost of $62,500.

Tri-County Development Corp., Hatton, N. Dak. A $369,000 loan to acquire land, and construct and equip a 60-bed nursing home where 28 persons will be employed. A local bank is taking a 10-percent share in the 25-year, 5-percent interest loan. The local development company is contributing $93,134 toward the total project cost of $462,134.

Suwanee Industrial Development Corp., Live Oak, Fla. A $42,000 loan to expand the facilities of Palm Telephone Service, Inc., engaged in repairing and installing telephone equipment. The company expects to add 26 people to the 24 now employed. A local bank is taking a 10-percent share in the loan which will run for 15 years. Since the firm is in an area of substantial unemployment, the interest rate on SBA's share of the loan will be 4 percent. The development company is contributing $10,500 toward the total project of $52,500.

Industrial Development Corp. of St. Charles, Mo. A $52,000 loan to build a fac-

tory for St. Charles Plastic Drainboard Co., Inc., makers of plastic cabinets and drainboards for sinks. The firm plans to add 10 new jobs to its current staff of 10. The loan will run for 20 years at 5½-percent interest. The development company is contributing $13,000 toward the total project cost of $65,000.

Hutchinson Industrial Development Corp., Inc., Hutchinson, Kans. A $57,500 loan to enlarge the facilities of Shawnee Planing Mills, Inc. The firm now employs 20 persons and plans to add five more as a result of the added facilities. The 5½-percent interest loan will run for 15 years. The development company is contributing $2,500 toward the total project cost of $60,000.

Tarboro-Edgecombe Development Corp., Tarboro, N.C. A $280,000 loan to purchase land and build a new branch plant for Phoenix Trimming Co., Inc., which will engage in weaving, dyeing, and finishing narrow fabrics. The company expects to employ 100 persons. A local bank is taking a 10-percent share in the loan which runs for 20 years. The interest rate on SBA's share of the loan is 5½ percent. The development agency is contributing $70,000 toward the total project cost of $350,000.

Phillips Development Corp., Phillips, Maine. A $24,000 loan to purchase land and an existing factory for General Wood Products Co., makers of wooden shanks used in the manufacture of shoes. The firm employs 30 persons. An area bank is taking a 10-percent share in the loan which will run for 15 years. The interest rate on SBA's share of the loan is 5½ percent. The development company is contributing $6,000 toward the total project cost of $30,000.

Sam J. Ervin, Jr.: Outstanding Senator and a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has been noted for the distinguished men who have represented the State in the U.S. Senate. The history of our State has been enriched by the outstanding and devoted service of great Senators.

North Carolina's present Senators, SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., and B. EVERETT JORDAN, exemplify through their dedicated service the tradition of our great State in sending our most able sons to the Senate. We North Carolinians are proud of our Senators and the untiring efforts they are making to preserve constitutional government.

No one has been more diligent in the support of constitutional principles than has been North Carolina's distinguished senior Senator, SAM J. ERVIN, Jr. Senator ERVIN is an able and astute attorney, a profound student of history, and a recognized authority on the Constitution of the United States.

Everyone is familiar with his record as private citizen, jurist, former Member of the House of Representatives, and as U.S. Senator. His service as a soldier is equally impressive.

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.'s World War I record reflected courageous service over and beyond the call of duty. It gained for him the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Silver Star, and the Nation's second highest award for valor, the Distinguished Service Cross.

The Observer-News-Enterprise, published at Newton, N.C., carried a column by Sylvia Kidd in its September 4, 1963, edition which very ably describes the inspiring story of Senator ERVIN's magnificent war record.

I know my colleagues will be pleased to read this account of an outstanding Senator and a great American. I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JUST KIDDING

(Column by Sylvia Kidd)

We have spent many pleasant minutes every day or so for the past few weeks reading colorful newspaper accounts of the running verbal clashes between North Carolina's matchless, unique, irrepressible Senator SAM ERVIN of Morganton and Attorney General Robert Kennedy. The debates, before a congressional committee looking into the newest civil rights bill, have stirred heated and vehement reactions all over Tar Heelia by folks both applauding Senator SAM's stand and opposing it as out-dated.

But most everybody declares or admits he's a brilliant Constitutional scholar. And they all agree he has a marvelous sense of humor, that has its perfect counterpart in the dry humor of the Attorney General. The sessions, in which Senator SAM says he is "teaching constitutional law" to the young and even younger looking Kennedy, have certainly made for interesting eavesdropping via newspaper.

A few days ago we encountered a newspaper account of Senator ERVIN's World War I bravery on the France battlefields that left us impressed. It's always hard for a younger generation to picture graying statesmen as ever having been hot-blooded young men. We picture them in the current sometimes—dull round of banquets type of life, forgetting that once they were daring young heroes.

The story of the Senator's war record was written by Fred Hardesty. We don't know if he is a personal friend, a historian, or a newspaperman who did some digging into the old records. But the story is so dramatic it sounds like a good movie script:

The Second Battle of the Marne, the turning point of World War I, hung in the balance when 22-year-old Private SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR., of Morganton led a half dozen men against a German machine gun that blocked an American advance in the Soissons sector. He had organized a little group of volunteers after casualties had all but wiped out officer and non-com leadership of the platoons in his immediate area.

Private ERVIN belonged to Company I of the 28th Infantry of the 1st Division, which Gen. John J. Pershing had placed at the hinge of the massive door movement he employed in the second Battle of the Marne. Company I entered the action there with 180 men and emerged 5 days later with only 38 who had not been killed or wounded.

It was during the first day's fight near Soissons that part of the 28th Infantry was halted by machinegun fire about 100 yards ahead of its position. That was the situation when the future Tar Heel Senator asked for volunteers to help him silence the enemy gun.

He got four or five. One of them, Private Dewey Price, of Georgia, would later provide the War Department with an affidavit that resulted in the awarding of the Distinguished Service Cross to Private ERVIN for leadership and bravery over and beyond the call of duty.

LED ATTACK

Private Price's statement, unsolicited by ERVIN, declared that "near Soissons on July 18, 1918, Company I, 28th Infantry, suffered heavy casualties, two platoons being thereby deprived of their leaders; that Private ERVIN materially assisted his platoon commander, Lt. Paul G. Venable (of Wilson and Durham) in reorganizing portions of these platoons and led some 85 men through heavy gunfire to the objective; that affiant was serving with this portion of a platoon under the charge of Pvt. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr.;

"That upon arriving at the objective the 28th Infantry was subjected to terrific fire from an enemy machinegun located approximately 100 yards in advance and this machinegun was taking casualties in the company and other adjacent parts of the regiment; that affiant and a few others volunteered upon request of Private ERVIN to go with Private ERVIN and capture this German machinegun:

"That among these soldiers were Cpl. Arlie C. Oppenheim, Bugler Keough, a young soldier from Wisconsin, possibly one or two others, and this affiant; that they rushed forward through intense fire and that the survivors of the party found the machinegun about 100 yards in front of their starting point; that Bugler Keough was mortally wounded, the young soldier from Wisconsin was killed, and Oppenheimer, ERVIN, and this affiant continued forward;

"That said ERVIN was hit by a shell fragment a short distance in front of the machinegun pit and was knocked down; that Oppenheimer and this affiant reached the machinegun killed the crew, and seized the gun; that Oppenheimer and this affiant then went back to ERVIN and bandaged up his wound in order to stop the flow of blood and wanted to carry ERVIN back to a place of safety, but ERVIN refused to be assisted and told them to go back with the other soldiers if they could:

GALLANTRY CITED

"That it was only due to the initiative and gallantry of said SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr., in calling for volunteers and in leading them in the attack on said machinegun that the same was captured; that throughout this engagement, he directed the fire upon the machine gun and after being wounded urged the affiant and Oppenheimer to capture the gun, and showed himself absolutely unmindful to his own safety; though the said ERVIN was wounded so severely as to be unable to walk he refused to go to the rear, but crawled back to where some other soldiers were and organized an advanced automatic rifle post where he remained on duty until all danger of a hostile counterattack was over."

The capture of the machine gun had been observed by 2d Lt. Samuel Parker of the 28th Infantry from his position beside a rock quarry where he had just helped to capture another German gun emplacement. He too submitted sworn testimony of the action. He stated that he saw three or four American soldiers rush the machinegun and silence it. Speaking of himself in the third person, Lieutenant Parker testified as follows:

"Then when organizing the position surrounding the rock quarry against a possible enemy counterattack, he signaled for the members of the recently established automatic rifle post to come over and join his forces. That when they arrived he discovered that these soldiers were members of Company I, 28th U.S. Infantry, and that Pvt. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr., had been seriously wounded in the hip by being hit by a fragment of shell. That he, Lieutenant Parker, offered to have Private ERVIN evacuated, but Private ERVIN repeatedly insisted that he be allowed to remain until after the counterattack had been repelled.

REFUSED ASSISTANCE

"Private ERVIN rendered valuable service in organizing and commanding a section of the position and remained in command of that section of the trenches until the immediate danger of the counterattack had passed, and Lieutenant Parker noticed that ERVIN was growing paler and weaker from the loss of blood and ordered him to the rear. Private ERVIN refused to be carried because two rifles could not be spared from the firing line. He crawled down through the trench and over the hill, dragging his wounded leg.

"Private SAMUEL J. ERVIN's conduct in this engagement was an inspiration to the other men in this advanced position; he was courageous and loyal and showed absolute disregard for his own personal safety and comfort and performed extraordinary service above and beyond the line of duty."

Private ERVIN had been wounded 2 months previously at the Battle of Cantagy, the first engagement fought by American troops in World War One. The 28th Infantry was selected to make the actual attack there and was thus the first American regiment to "go over the top." After a spectacular fight it took the village of Cantagy, Private ERVIN's part in the action was described in the battle's General Order No. 28 as follows:

"Pvt. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, with exceptional courage and perseverance, led a carrying party through heavy fire; he made several trips from the rear to the front until wounded."

Of the 1st Division, of which Private ERVIN's company was a part, General Pershing was to say: "The Commander in Chief has noted in this division a special pride of service and a high state of morale never broken by hardship nor battle."

Angry at Foreign Aid Cut, Jerseyite Donates $100

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the following article from the Sunday Star Ledger, Newark, N.J., of September 8, concerning the direct action taken by Mr. and Mrs. Peter Eilbott, of East Orange, in support of the foreign aid program. I am proud to be the Representative of citizens of the caliber of Mr. and Mrs. Eilbott whose views, I am confident, are shared by the majority of the American people.

A number of freshman Members wrote our colleagues on August 19, urging their support of the vital programs of mutual defense and economic assistance provided under H.R. 7885, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. We stated in our letter:

During our campaigns for election we found strong support for the U.S. foreign aid program. Most Americans understand the practical reasons and the moral reasons for continued military and economic aid to the developing nations.

As Mr. and Mrs. Eilbott recognized, the bill reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee was a practical, sound bill. I hope that their fellow citizens who share their sense of concern and urgency about this vital program will follow their example, at least to the extent of letting their representatives in Washington know that like Mr. Eilbott, they are "steamed up" about the unreasonable slashes made by the House.

The article in the Sunday Star Ledger follows:

ANGRY AT FOREIGN AID CUT, JERSEYITE DONATES $100

Peter Eilbott, a mild-mannered economist of East Orange, is a citizen who sometimes gets his dander up about the goings-on in Washington. And when he does, he likes to express himself.

He felt strongly about the recent drastic cut by the House of Representatives in President Kennedy's request for a foreign aid appropriation.

So he wrote a letter—and a check for $100—and send it to the President.

TEXT RELEASED

The text of the letter, dated August 24, came out of the White House yesterday. Eilbott wrote:

"Dear President Kennedy: Enclosed are $100 for use in our foreign aid program, including, if desired, the proposed steel mill in India. If my elected Representatives will not vote sufficient funds for the program, I will have to go over their heads and contribute the money directly.

"I see no point in being taxed for all kinds of programs of which I do not approve (including pork barrel projects which are voted by the same Representatives who rail against foreign aid), and having those programs which I do support emasculated."

A BIT ABASHED

The check for $100 was signed by Eilbott and his wife, Joan, and was drawn on a New York bank.

The reference to a steel mill in India concerned a project which would be eliminated by the House bill.

At his home, 79-B Parkway Drive, West, East Orange, Eilbott seemed a bit abashed that his letter to the President had been made public.

However, he explained: "I just felt very annoyed and steamed up when the House cut the appropriation. I thought it was a very bad thing to do and I wanted to express my annoyance. So I did it in this way."

He added: "At the time I did not think about whether it would attract attention or not, but if it does that it is all to the good."

He said he wholeheartedly agreed with Kennedy that the House's action was "irresponsible."

Eilbott is 30 and is employed as an economist in the research department of the New York Stock Exchange. He attended Columbia University and his chief interest has always been economics.

SHARES HUSBAND'S VIEW

His wife, Joan, is a mathematician employed by the Bell Laboratories at Murray Hill. She shares her husband's distaste of the House's action, but Eilbott said: "She does not feel quite so strongly as I do about it."

They have lived in East Orange for 2 years and have no children. Eilbott added: "As yet."

He said he has received no reply from the White House and did not expect to. He said the whole thing in a nutshell was that he was "steamed up" at the time, wanted to express himself, did so, and that was that.

In Washington, an official for the Agency for International Development said it legally can accept private contributions, and the Eilbott check has been deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the foreign aid account.

The official added, understating the case quite thoroughly:

"This doesn't happen very often."

Samuel F. Pryor's Discourse on Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a short address delivered recently by Mr. Samuel F. Pryor, of Greenwich, Conn. Mr. Pryor, who is vice president of Pan American World Airways, is an outstanding citizen and a prominent communal leader. He is highly regarded and well thought of in business, government and civic circles.

The subject of his talk is the age-old problem of time, but he presents his views on this subject in a most interesting and thought-provoking fashion. In fact, many of the thoughts expressed in his address are of a philosophic nature and contain a very timely lesson to humanity, and to our Nation in particular. I urge all my colleagues to read this brief address. They will be richer and wiser by it. It is truly a modern-day discourse on time and its implications for us.

The address is as follows:

TIME

(By Samuel F. Pryor)

In the minutes' time I have to talk with you, may I talk about time—time past—time present—time future—the concept of time in relation to what is happening around us in the world today and the responsibility you and I have for the use of that time.

Time does not stand still. As Shakespeare had one of his characters say, "I waste time and now doth time waste me." Time recognizes neither the clock nor the calendar. The fateful words of the Bible concerning the arrival of the time of death, "You know not the day nor the hour" have suddenly come to have as much meaning to us a nation as they always have had for us as individuals.

Time past: The only importance of talking about it besides wonderful memories is what it might contribute to guide us constructively in the present or in the future.

I have had the privilege of visiting many of the ancient cities which are now either in ruins or buried underneath desert sands—among them the ancient pre-Christian kingdoms of Qataban, Timna, the Hadhramut, and Saba the home of the Queen of Sheba, the great lost city of Shabwa, the ancient frankinsense city of Sumhuram, and on our own continent, ancient Chichen Itza.

Some of these civilizations have been buried now over 2,000 years. Each of these cities, in its proper time, stood at the peak of achievement and accomplishments. Each asserted its influence throughout the then-known world. Each was the leader of its time.

Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves. Now how much time do we have and how wisely are we using it? These are questions to which we must provide answers.

As Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas—were not destroyed from without. In each and every case the conqueror found a civilization which had begun its self-destruction from within. When the final test came, these great, cultural, once-healthy systems found themselves spiritually sick and help-

less. They could not defend themselves, because they had already lost faith in themselves.

Time present: As a matter of fact, we have so little time to do something about the present and the future. I shall bring no prophesies of a third world war. If I did, I am morally certain that what I would have to prophesy would be the end of civilization. The next war will have no bands—no parades—no flags, and no romance. Humanity is now at the crossroads.

We can look back through the long, long vista of human history and we can see that now—today—the whole cause of human freedom is in the greatest danger mankind has ever known. We are face to face with the cruelest, most deceitful enemy we have ever faced—an enemy who is dedicated to burying us as well as our way of life. However, we can have hope, for again as Toynbee has so graphically described the Soviet Union, "It is a skeleton in armor, a civilization which looks dangerous to the extreme but is actually dying inside its armor, grasping for life behind an Iron Curtain it has rung down to hide its own fatal impotence." But we must maintain our material strength which, unfortunately, is the only kind of strength our adversary respects. We also have hope in that we are blessed with a spiritual strength not possessed by our adversary for he has no God nor Christ. This is a period in the life of an individual, in the life of a nation, and, for that matter, in the life of a whole civilization when things are happening with incredible speed. Events are piling upon events with such rapidity that time itself has become foreshortened. Predictions about the future are almost meaningless.

Guided missiles can be sent 5,000 miles and their targets pinpointed. The Soviet Union has a 100-megaton bomb; so have we. This is a destructive power equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT. If it exploded in New York it could obliterate all of New York City, all of New Jersey, all of Westchester County, and all of lower Connecticut. How far beyond this no one knows.

The present tensions over Cuba, Berlin, India, Laos, and the dozens of other potential trouble spots all over the globe cannot be exaggerated. These trouble spots are no longer a great distance from the United States as far as time is concerned. Today the flying time from coast to coast is 5 hours and across the Atlantic less than 7 hours, compared with 6 days 24 years ago. Flying time New York to Rio nonstop is 9 hours. No place in the world is more than 24 hours flying time from Greenwich. But this will be obsolete in 10 years' time.

Future time: American air carriers will be flying jets or ramjets that move at speeds of up to mach 3—over 2,000 miles an hour. It will take only about 90 minutes to fly from New York to Los Angeles and 2½ hours to fly from New York to London or Paris. Even more dramatic not long after that—flights to the Moon and to Mars and Venus will be available. Flights to the Moon at speeds of 20,000 miles an hour will take 11 hours and 56 minutes, for the Moon is only 238,857 miles away. Venus is about 26 million miles away, or about 43 days at 20,000 miles an hour speed. Remember, it took our ancestors longer than this to come from London to Boston.

These pilgrimages into space will come. The rocket engines to make voyages of this sort possible are already under construction. The same is true of space capsules which will be the forerunners of large space planes.

Mrs. Pryor and I have had the privilege of seeing almost every nook and corner of this world. On one of our trips we decided to close our eyes to everything to do with economics, politics, war threats and the like, but to see only the beauty of the world. In fact, many times we said to each other, "We have heaven on earth here except for one thing—people." People are responsible for confusion, for trouble, for unhappiness. We people living here in the United States have a great blessing over the way of living under any other form of government. For in our Declaration of Independence we have one privilege not mentioned in the declaration of any new country obtaining independence around the world—the pursuit of happiness. You hear much about freedom and equality, but what greater privilege in life is there than to pursue happiness—happiness—not just for yourself but for other people, because by doing this you will bring happiness to your own self and to those all about you.

Now time to stop. Paradoxically, while realizing that we must constantly be alert to an enemy who knows no god, we must at the same time continue to follow the dangerous path of peace. We must then ask ourselves whether our minds and hearts have the ability to match the speed of sound with understanding and love for our fellow man—not just in our own town, not just in our county or State—but around the world. This is the kind of program the Sovietized nations fear most. It is fraught with danger, but being able to meet danger is what has made our country great. In facing danger we in our country have another great blessing that our adversary has not—faith. During the war in England a stone was unearthed after a bombing. It had on it this inscription: "Fear knocked on the door—faith answered—and there was nobody there."

It is our solemn obligation to walk this dangerous path of peace in faith and friendship in fulfillment of our mission on earth because then, and only then, can all of us join together and truthfully say, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in Heaven."

Compulsory Arbitration a Dangerous Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 102 by the House on August 28 has established for the first time in our Nation's history the dangerous precedent of compulsory arbitration as a means of settling labor disputes. I must concur with the railroad brotherhoods in finding this action "a regrettable and backward step," a violation of a hard-won and vital economic principle of our free society—the right to bargain collectively.

Although this resolution was aimed at one particular management-labor dispute—the work rules controversy over firemen on diesel locomotives and the manning of traincrews—the precedent of compulsory arbitration thereby established contains grave threats to the future of free collective bargaining in America.

We have tried to relieve the burden of the awful responsibility we have assumed by assuring ourselves that this measure does not, in fact, set any sort of precedent. Let us not deceive ourselves. The next time we are called upon to step in and arbitrate a dispute between labor and management, we shall most assuredly find the second step to be less painful and seem more legitimate than the first.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], clearly perceived the latent dangers of our action when he stated that "we are today constituting the Congress as the final board of arbitration for all major disputes in the country."

We should heed the warnings and the lessons of history. The first step taken by the fascist dictatorships of the 1930's in consolidating their power was the destruction of the economic freedom of workers and managers. The corporate state—the politico-economic system under fascism—called upon the government to settle all management-labor differences in the "overriding interest of the public and the state." Corporatism and compulsory arbitration were interdependent.

Considering the great responsibility we bear to keep the government from interfering with the free bargaining between employers and employees, there are at least two alternatives to compulsory arbitration which we should have seriously explored before even considering Senate Joint Resolution 102.

First, we should have waited until we were sure that the possibilities of collective bargaining in good faith had truly been exhausted. After several years of negotiations—first between the two parties themselves, then under the guidance of the Executive, it appeared that collective bargaining had completely broken down, that an impasse had been reached. However, throughout this period, each side had accused the other of dealing in bad faith. The Congress, then, should have taken time to observe the negotiations, and see whether or not the bargaining was, in fact, being conducted in an atmosphere of good faith. If one or both of the parties was dealing in bad faith, then there would be no way of assessing the capability of collective bargaining to deal with the problem.

However, the Congress reached its decision after several short weeks without ascertaining the validity of the charges and countercharges of the carriers and the brotherhoods. The Congress could, therefore, have established a joint overseeing committee to sit at the bargaining tables and determine whether an impasse truly existed, or whether there was evidence of bad faith, in which case collective bargaining could have continued, under congressional supervision and in good faith, toward a possible satisfactory compromise.

Secondly, we could have allowed the system of collective bargaining to take its course. A report from the Committee for Economic Develpoment recently noted that—

> Partial operation of a struck industry or facility may be all that is necessary to protect the public interest in continued availability of the goods or the services involved—

If, of course, there was union participation in such partial operation. The right to strike and the preservation of

the public interest are not mutually exclusive.

The railroad brotherhoods had announced that, in the case of a strike, they would continue to operate commuter trains, move perishable freight, and handle all defense transportation. It seems very probable that a strike under these conditions would not have imperiled the public interest, and yet would have still allowed effective recourse for the brotherhoods in the form of economic pressure. This recourse is at the very heart of the rights guaranteed both labor and management in a free, democratic society.

Neither of the alternatives cited above was seriously considered by the Congress, and yet they are, in my opinion, highly preferable to a program of involuntary compulsory arbitration.

I believe we have instituted a dangerous precedent in this case. We must, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the democratic tradition of free, collective bargaining in a free society if we are to avert the grave dangers of reaffirming that precedent at some time in the future.

Preservation of Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over the years the Indian River News has come to be known throughout Florida as a friendly area weekly deserving the warm support of people from near and far who have read the fine editorials by its founder, the late Dale Wimbrow, and his wife and successor, Dorothy Wimbrow. Dale and now Dorothy have written about things commonplace to most of us—life around us at work, home, and play. But through their humor, insight and penetrating prose we see life in a more meaningful light. They can gently prod us, warmly beseech us or ask us to stop, look, and listen in a manner unknown or untried by many journalists. And I might add, most effectively.

In a July 4 editorial in the Indian River News on the meaning of Americanism, Mrs. Wimbrow discusses our problems and what we can do as individuals to better understand our own system and its future. Because its message will be of interest and importance to all, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

PRESERVATION OF OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Dorothy L. Wimbrow)

What does "preservation of our American heritage" actually mean?

Preservation means "to keep"—heritage, generally speaking, means that which comes or belongs to one by reason of birth. Then, American heritage must mean "That which comes or belongs to all people born in the United States of America and their descendants," and it should be shared by them with all aliens living within the Nation's boundaries in order to preserve it.

From its birth in 1776, our Nation has grown, and it has become strong with the free interchange of ideas, cultures, languages, religious and economic beliefs of people from throughout the entire world. It has been melded into one great nation with freedom of choice and dignity of man as our national objectives.

Throughout our history, we have faced, and will continue to face, difficulties through differences of opinion with other nations and even within our own nation but freedom and the dignity of man has and will be sustained.

Internationally—the greatest challenge is facing us. The people of the world must decide which is the better way of life—the capitalistic system or the communistic system.

Under our capitalistic system production, distribution and exchange are in a large measure privately owned and operated. Each individual can rise or fall economically and socially by his own bootstraps. And we can continue as men and women of free will and maintain our dignity as human beings.

Under the communistic system, as carried out by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Red China, all economic activity is conducted by totalitarian states dominated by a single and self-perpetuating political party. Individual freedom of choice becomes part of a political machine and individual dignity is lost.

While the communistic system is operated by officials of a self-perpetuating political party, our capitalistic system is operated by officials personally elected by each and every one of us—if we care to exercise our voting privileges as free men and women under our form of government.

As a result of this difference of opinion, the whole world at this time is involved in a cold war between these two ideologies: the American way of life and the communistic way of life.

In order to preserve our American heritage we must become informed about these two ideologies and what is being done to preserve our American heritage against the onslaught of communism.

Our American heritage has been preserved for us by over a half million men who died in our eight major wars during the past 187 years. It is being preserved for us now by our participation in the "hostile action" of the Vietnam war. While we are not an official belligerent, we have been in this action for the past two and a half years and 36 Americans have died through service with the South Vietnam forces in engagements against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas. The guerrilla type war is called a cold war. This is the term used to describe guerrilla engagements all over the world. There are many locations of unrest because of this international conflict of opinion: freedom versus communism.

We do know that major gains are being made by Communists as the years go on. With their communistic battle-of-the minds fed through propaganda, the Communists have slowly engulfed the minds of free men and women of 19 nations.

We do know that the Communists have taken over the conquest of Cuba from within Cuba. We do know that strife and discord are being sown all over the world and within our nation. We do know whoever conquers space will conquer the world. We do know that the Soviets put the first man and first woman into space.

We do know that the Communists have moved into South America. We do know that Dr. Manuel de Varona, speaking before a U.S. House of Representatives Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee investigating Cuban subversion in Latin America, stated tnat the Soviets have established two secret military bases: One in northwest Brazil and one in the mountains of Paraguay.

We do know that Cuba has set up sabotage and guerrilla warfare schools throughout Latin America directed by a council of high Communist officials in Havana. We do know that Khrushchev has stated, according to the New York Times, that the Soviet Union and Communist China would join in the final act of burying capitalism.

And we do know that around the world, as freemen, we provide money, food, clothing, medical aid, implements of business and industry, and cold war equipment and men to nations we hope and pray can help keep our world free.

But we do not know what our future as a nation will be.

Through our foreign aid program we have spent a total of $97 billion from 1945 to 1962—in all but eight nations in the world—in an attempt to prevent the spread of communism.

With the hope that peace can ultimately be gained for our world, we joined the United Nations organization. To date, we have paid 32 percent of the United Nations budget. The United Nations is heavily in debt because many countries, including the Communist bloc and France, have failed to pay their share of the costs of the United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Congo and Gaza Strip. We have made up part of the deficit over the years with millions of dollars in voluntary contributions. In addition, Congress reluctantly approved a $100 million bond issue last year to provide additional money to meet the crisis.

In order to preserve our American heritage, we must continue to raise money with which to finance our worldwide projects and programs with which we hope to win the cold war and remain free. We must continue to provide funds for our defense program—even though our modern bombers and surface ships are now being considered outdated for missile wars, as being too vulnerable to air and missile attacks.

And the only way we can raise money is through taxation or voluntary contributions of funds.

Our national debt is around $300 billion. Our gold reserve is now under $15.8 billion, lowest since 1939. A hard economic fact we must face today is: The gold reserve held today by our United States is not sufficient to do the two tasks assigned to it: (1) to support our currency and (2) to fulfill the obligations against it in the form of dollars held by foreign nations and foreign organizations and individuals. If all the potential demands against our gold reserve were made in one concerted effort, we would not be able to meet those demands and ours would be a bankrupt Nation.

We must realize that along with our own problems as a nation international problems affect us adversely. With France and England at odds over the Common Market alliance—with England politically torn apart—with German split in half between freedom and communism—the whole NATO organization is in danger of floundering and becoming more shadow than substance.

Lenin stated more than 36 years ago, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States which will be the last bastion of capitalism. It will fall like overripe fruit into our hands." This communistic plan to conquer the world has never changed.

Remember, while the Russian Communists believe that peaceful coexistence is necessary in the nuclear age, the Chinese Communists believe that communism must be spread even at the risk of nuclear warfare. Russia and China may quarrel all they like; but it should also be remembered that this is a quarrel within a family. When and if the time comes, they will be bound together in a common cause, which to both countries is the ultimate subjugation of the free world by one means or another.

And, remember that these differences of opinions held by the Soviet and Chinese Communists are over tactics and timing—not

over the ultimate goal. The Soviet thinks China is trying to move too fast, and is economically and militarily unable to sustain her plan.

What will happen when China attains nuclear capability, which may come within a few years, poses a grim question.

What can we do to preserve our American heritage? It behooves us to learn all we can about our present form of government. It behooves us to see that officials elected to represent us on all levels of government are the best we can get. We must, through example, prove to our neighbors, friends, and business contacts that we want freedom and intend to remain free. We must share our freedom with others so that they, in turn, can learn how to become and remain free. We must become informed and aware of the dangers confronting us as a free nation and meet these challenges with dignity and maturity. We must become aware of the fact that the trend in our Nation is toward that of a welfare state; and that, as such, our tax system may become confiscatory.

Basically, we must remember that the battle of the minds which the Communists are waging through the worldwide cold wars is for public ownership as against private ownership. The Communists lean all the way toward public ownership. We lean toward private ownership with some government ownership, directed through our free choice of leaders to keep us free.

Most of us are independent business men and women. That means that we work endless hours and expend endless effort to remain independent. It isn't easy—and it isn't exactly profitable; but it is commendable that we operate as free and dignified human beings. We are masters of our destiny and custodians of our security. It is our personal choice whether we succeed or fail.

To preserve our American heritage is a personal obligation and responsibility that each of us must accept.

Freedom is never easily won. Freedom is never easily held. Is freedom easily lost?

Yes.

Will we lose or preserve our American heritage?

The answer to this question lies in the ability of each one of us to resist brainwashing by the Communists' propaganda in a worldwide battle of the minds. The odds are on our side—but only as long as we can successfully meet those challenging our freedoms with calm, deliberate consideration; unbiased judgment; and the determined will to pay the price of freedom, even though it be by accepting backbreaking taxation—great personal sacrifice—or bloodshed.

Today we honor our patriotic emblem: The flag of the United States of America. It's up to you each individual, to preserve our American heritage; so that the time will never come again when, with fear and hopelessness, we shall have to ask that fateful question:

"Oh, say does that star-spangled banner yet wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?"

Resolution by Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted at the recent convention of the Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs, held at Hartford, Conn. This resolution is an expression of appreciation of President Kennedy and the Connecticut delegation in both Houses of Congress for their efforts in behalf of the American people. It reads as follows:

Whereas President John F. Kennedy serves in the higest office in our land; and

Whereas that land and others far and near have drawn new hope and inspiration for the fulfillment of America's destiny; and

Whereas our great President, with courage and clarity has met headon the crucial issues that try men's minds and souls; and

Whereas Senators THOMAS DODD and ABRAHAM RIBICOFF have proven to be invaluable allies in the pursuit of human welfare to which this Executive dedicates his highest effort; and

Whereas Congressmen DADDARIO, ST. ONGE, GIAIMO, MONAGAN, and GRABOWSKI have demonstrated a faith and wisdom that redounds to the good of our people, and to the success of the President's program; Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to this convention express gratitude and respect to President Kennedy and to the aforementioned Connecticut delegation.

The above resolution was passed at the June 8 Convention of the Connecticut Federation of Democratic Women's Clubs.

Students Victims of Political Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, education in the United States will play a decisive role in the cold war. The cold war might well be won or lost in the field of education. Our entire education system is threatened as never before by sociological experiments and fantastic brainwashing schemes. It is tragic when little children are herded into buses in the early hours of the dawn and hauled many miles through crowded city streets to fulfill the fiendish desire of some political vote peddler.

Henry T. Hillson of New York City deserves the commendation of parents all over the United States for his courage and dedication to the improvement of education. I commend the following article in the Washington Star of August 7 to the Congress and to the country:

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION SEEN HARMING STUDENTS

STANFORD, CALIF., August 7.—More harm than good can come from desegregating schools attended by students of predominantly one race, a New York educator says.

Henry T. Hillson, principal of the New York City's George Washington High School, spoke yesterday at a conference on big city schools at Stanford University. The 62 delegates are trying to determine what should be done to improve secondary education for the underprivileged.

Mr. Hillson cited a New York City proposal to send children by bus from one school to another to break segregation as political, not educational.

"It would do nothing but destroy the schools they moved from," he declared. "The ones who'd leave would be the better students. When they've gone, what have you?"

Mr. Hillson insisted that breaking up a segregated school does more harm than good.

He also told of an even more severe and harmful proposition. They call it reverse open enrollment, in which students are sent into Negro schools.

If this issue is forced, it will cause a parents' revolution. You can't bus white children 5 to 6 miles outside of their community and put them in a Negro school.

He said the political problem is forcing the Negroes into an assertive position that they don't want. The educators are too frightened to take positions on this. They are afraid of being called either Uncle Toms or reactionaries.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 25th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

Southern Idahoans continue to express their opposition to Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. Mr. Richard L. Snow, an insurance man of Buhl, Idaho, says the slogan, "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out," aptly portrays the feeling of many in southern Idaho. His letter follows:

FARMERS INSURANCE GROUP,
Buhl, Idaho, August 6, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read with interest your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1963, concerning the extension of Bonneville power into southern Idaho. Congratulations on the soundness of your thinking and thoughts in our behalf. The slogan, "Bonneville—Please Include Us Out," aptly portrays the feelings of many of us in this area.

I regret that those who "railroaded" this through are not possessed with the same commonsense.

Again, many thanks.

RICHARD L. SNOW,
Agent.

Mr. Thomas P. Mahan, a certified public accountant, uses his knowledge of financial affairs to brand subsidized Federal power as a fraud in these words:

JEROME, IDAHO,
August 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Just a note to let you know that your efforts to prevent the spread of BPA and the philosophy back of BPA and all other Government operations in the traditional area of private enterprise, are appreciated. Idaho Power Co. is a good citi-

zen and any thinking person realizes that so-called "cheap power" is a fraud when Federal subsidy enables "Government" power to be sold at a price considerably less than an efficient private utility can afford to sell it.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. MAHAN.

Mr. Morgan W. Tovey, Jr., an architect of Pocatello, Idaho, opposes the extension of Bonneville Power into southern Idaho. He says it can offer nothing constructive and that the intended expansion of Federal power promises a stultifying atmosphere in an area that is now healthy and prosperous. His two-page letter follows:

POCATELLO, IDAHO,
July 29, 1963.

Hon. J. P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: We in this area are threatened with a development which promises the gravest and far reaching of consequences. As you know, Bonneville Power plans to bring subsidized power into this locale. Apparently, its only reason is to prove that it is able to do so. It can offer nothing constructive, and the costs will be astronomical. The loss of free and fair competition will be detrimental to our economic and moral strength.

We have been told that our power rates are too high, the service poor, the supply limited, and the source of power is questioned. Although Bonneville Power will only be involved in wholesale distribution of electricity, it has the usual promises of a panacea attached.

From the practice of this office the following has been observed: Power rates are not too high. The advent of electric heating has given opportunity to compare closely the cost of electric heat with that of other fuels. It is very competitive (witness the growing number of electric heating installations, both residential and commercial). Recent price reductions by the local power company will offer even more determined competition than before.

The service to customers is prompt, courteous, and efficient. This is a credit to the local utility, of course, but the real impetus for it is directly the result of the quick and convincing actions of its competitors. Natural gas electric generating plants are now engineered to accommodate individual buildings, and they are being installed without any hookup to the power company. Service based on competition would be curtailed with the advent of public, noncompetitive, power. The supply of electric power in this area is unquestionably more than adequate. The powerline extending from this area to supply power to neighboring utilities provides evidence of this fact. We have never experienced a "brownout" or "blackout," because of insufficient electrical capacity.

Future dams on the Snake River will surpass the generation needs of this area for years to come. When necesary, private atomic generation plants could be installed to supplement water-generated power.

The use of river water to generate electricity is questioned as an infringement of the public domain by private companies. Improvements which include beautification, recreation, and naturalist equipment and studies are among the direct benefits to we the people.

Is it necessary to smother a strong spirit of competition and enterprise? The intended expansion of Federal power promises a stultifying atmosphere in an area that is now healthy and prosperous.

Please don't let it happen.

Yours very truly,

MORGAN W. TOVEY, Jr.,
Architect.

Revenue Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States delivered a major address today before the National Conference of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. The President referred to the Revenue Act of 1963, H.R. 8363 which was introduced this afternoon as "the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in the past 15 years."

In his speech, the President not only outlined the provisions of the bill: he also pointed out the dangers of amendments which would tie tax reduction to extraneous contingencies. He emphasized the very great importance to the health and growth of our economy of enacting a tax reduction bill during this calendar year.

A tax reduction is a most important part of a balanced total program submitted by the President to the Congress. This program does not contemplate tax cuts at the expense of national defense, or of the space effort, or of programs designed to improve the health, education, and job opportunities of our people. To be of maximum benefit the reduction must be accompanied by the enactment of other major recommendations of the President. H.R. 8363 is, however, an indispensable part and indeed the most important single factor in the President's program to move our economy forward.

The President's address manifests responsible leadership of the highest order, designed unselfishly for the good of our country. He has charted a course which all Americans, and certainly all Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation, should in the national interest follow.

The President's address follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR TAX REDUCTION IN 1963, STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Congress, members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction, participants in the National Conference on Tax Reduction, ladies and gentlemen, I admire your concern for our Nation's business as well as your own. The bill you are here to support is the most important domestic economic measure to come before the Congress in the past 15 years. Its passage is essential to the health and growth of our economy during the past 15 years. Its benefits are not limited to any one segment of society. If it is defeated, diluted or unduly delayed, the adverse consequences would be felt by every family and business in the country. It is not a partisan measure—and this is not a partisan gathering. It is a bill which, if it is to be fully effective, must be passed this year, without restrictive amendments; and I believe, with your help, that it will.

There is no need before this audience to describe in detail the tax reduction features you already know so well. The essential figures to bear in mind are these:

The bill provides for a total net tax reduction of $11 billion a year, of which $8.7 billion would go to individuals and $2.3 billion to corporations. This is in addition to the $2¼ billion reduction in corporate tax liabilities brought about last year through depreciation reform and the investment tax credit. These proposed reductions would be effective in two stages. Two-thirds of the individual reduction (or $5.6 billion) and more than one-half of the corporate reduction (or $1.4 billion) or a total of $7 billion, would go into effect on January 1, 1964, less than 4 months from today. The balance would be effective a year later.

There is also no need to convince this group of the importance of this bill as a boost to the economy. Your presence here, the leadership provided by the Business Committee for Tax Reduction and the Statement of Principles adopted by its members, bear witness to your conviction that our present high tax rates hobble the economy, and that a prompt, substantial and broadly based cut in individual and corporate tax rates is necessary to give the private sector of our economy the extra strength our present tax structure now drains away.

Even after 2½ years of steady advance, manufacturing in this country today is still operating at only 87 percent of capacity—business fixed investment is still below 10 percent of our total output—and unemployment, for the 70th straight month, is still above 5 percent. You know as well as I what that has done to your market for goods and services. You know as well as I that this Nation must create new jobs—jobs for workers replaced by automation, jobs for those displaced from the farm, jobs for young people leaving school, jobs to ease the problems of race relations and youth delinquency and labor unrest. And this bill reflects a conscious decision to give a major responsibility and opportunity to American business to meet those needs through private means.

This bill is only a part—but an essential part—of an overall economic program. We are simultaneously taking steps designed ultimately to balance our international payments, to balance our budget and, above all, to balance our economy at levels of full employment and production.

Tax reduction is essential to the achievement of all of these goals. By increasing our productivity and competitive ability, and by increasing the attractiveness of investing at home instead of abroad, it will help us improve our balance of payments. By expanding consumption and investment, it will help us create more jobs. By removing a restrictive brake on national growth and income, it will work against the recurrent forces of recession. And by reducing the costly drain of unemployment and recession while expanding our national income and tax revenues, it will—combined with an ever stricter control of expenditures—reduce and eventually end the pattern of chronic budgetary deficts.

Despite all of these advantages—despite the fact that our economy today is advancing partly in anticipation of a substantial tax cut—there are those who, for reasons of their own, oppose this bill; and their opposition warrants our attention. If they are unable to defeat the bill openly, or to find enough Members of Congress willing to oppose it directly, their strategy apparently will be twofold:

First, to delay the bill's passage until some time next year; and,

Second, to amend it in such a way as to prevent it from becoming fully effective in the absence of some other fiscal event, such as a reduction in next June's estimated net debt.

Either one of these moves would seriously undermine the gains already made as well as those we hope to make. Either one of

these moves would dilute, if not imperil, the benefits this bill offers the Nation.

The disadvantages of delay are apparent. I have said since last December that this was the year for tax reduction. Inflationary pressures are in check. No major military crisis strains our resources. Our most pressing economic problems are underinvestment, unemployment and our balance-of-payments deficit. The sooner this bill is enacted, the sooner it will begin stimulating investment, enlarging employment and improving our payments balance.

This bill, moreover, is insurance—recession insurance—and the prudent man does not tempt fate by unnecessarily delaying his acquisition of insurance. Excluding war years, this Nation has had a recession on the average every 42 months since the Second World War—or every 44 months since the First World War. By January, it will have been 44 months since the last recession began. I do not say that a recession next year is either inevitable without a tax cut or impossible with one. But I do know that the prompt enactment of this bill, making certain both immediate and prospective tax reductions, will improve business conditions, increase consumer and investment incentives and make the most of the antirecession thrust that this tax cut can provide.

To wait until next year—even though the effective date of January 1 could be retained on a retroactive basis—would be to court uncertainty, inadequacy, and perhaps total failure. For at the beginning of each year, even in a second session, the mills of the Congress grind slowly. Next year there may be new pressures to hold off until some new crisis has passed, or some new economic trend is made clear, or some other political event is behind us. For those opposed to this bill, the time will never be right. "Delay," said the ancient Romans, "is always fatal to those who are prepared"—and this Nation is prepared now for a substantial cut in taxes. The time to enact this bill is now—for the opportunity may not come again.

The second strategy of those opposed to this bill is to make it dependent by law on other fiscal developments—for example, in the form offered in committee, to deny to both individual and corporate taxpayers the $4 billion worth of second-stage tax cuts unless the net public debt on next June 30 is $304 billion or less. To some, this may sound harmless, inasmuch as this figure is only slightly less than that resulting from Treasury Secretary Dillon's own rough estimate of the current budget deficit. But this amendment was rejected in the House Ways and Means Committee, and should be rejected if offered again on the House floor, for four fundamental reasons:

1. The tax bill is needed on its own merits and should not be conditioned by any other event;

2. Should lagging Federal revenues next summer make fulfillment of this condition impossible, that would be a clear sign to proceed with, not prevent, the second stage of tax reduction;

3. Revenue, deficit and debt estimates for the end of this fiscal year are necessarily uncertain at this time, depending as they do upon dozens of unpredictable contingencies to which this bill should not be tied; and

4. This amendment would be self-defeating; for taxpayers, uncertain of receiving the full benefits of the bill, would hold back on their investment and expansion outlays, thus retarding revenues and enlarging the debt.

If tax reduction is essential to the progress of our economy—and I think it is—then it is essential whether Secretary Dillon's estimate turns out to be accurate or not. The need for more private demand—for more funds in the hands of consumers and investors—will exist in 1964 and 1965 regardless of whether the net public debt on next June 30th is $304 billion or $306 billion or $302 billion. History teaches us that the public debt unexpectedly rises when public revenues fall unexpectedly short—and they have been consistently falling short precisely because our tax rates, which were originally designed to meet wartime and post-war conditions, are now imposing a restrictive brake on national growth and income. Thus, this amendment could deny the Nation a tax cut at the very time it needs it most—when revenues are falling short of expectations because of a slowdown in business activity.

Secretary Dillon's rough estimate, moreover, is exactly that—a very rough estimate—made at a time when the Congress has not completed action on legislation and appropriations for the current year. To require, as this amendment requires, that 11 months later his estimate must prove wholly correct is wholly unrealistic. Actually, the Secretary forecast a deficit for this fiscal year of $9.2 billion—which would, on the basis of the existing public debt, mean a net debt on next June 30 of $304.2 billion. This is an estimate both of what the Congress will do and of what the economy will do. If it were exactly correct, the Nation would lose a $4 billion economic boost because of a $200 million difference.

Yet $200 million is not even one-tenth of 1 percent of our national debt—it is not even one-half of the amount we are likely to collect on June 30th alone—and, while I always expect great things of Mr. Dillon, I do not expect the impossible. In the last 11 years, revenue estimates made at this time of year have only three times—in fiscal years 1960, 1962 and 1963—come within a billion dollars of the final actual figure. To allow the fate of a vitally needed tax reduction to be decided by the accuracy or inaccuracy of a necessarily inexact prediction comes very close to resting the national welfare on a game of chance.

Under such circumstances, how can any businessman or investor plan for the future? How can he make even a reasonable guess as to how close this estimate will be, how much Federal revenue will be earned, how much the Congress will spend, whether the weather will bring a bigger farm surplus, whether buyers will be found for Federal mortgages and other assets at reasonable prices, or whether some technological breakthrough or raw material price increase or international crisis will suddenly augment our outlays for national defense? The cost of last fall's Cuban crisis alone, for example, was nearly $200 million.

A businessman attempting to formulate his spending plans in advance will regard that kind of second-stage tax cut promise as no promise at all. It will become a highly speculative matter—and concrete plans cannot be based on speculation. Being less certain of his market and profit, therefore, he will not undertake as much expansion now—and this will not only shortchange the national economy but increase the national debt. As former Treasury Secretaries Humphrey and Anderson pointed out during the last administration, the debt limit does not and cannot control expenditures—for they depend on the appropriations voted by the Congress and not on any arbitrary ceiling.

This is not, let me make clear, an argument over the desirability of expenditure control. This administration has pledged a tighter rein over expenditures, and we are fulfilling that pledge. Last January I submitted a budget for fiscal 1964 which—except for unavoidable defense, space, and interest charges on the national debt—was lower in expenditures than the prior year, despite a steady growth in the Nation's economy and population. Such a reduction had been attempted only three other times in the 12 preceding years—and, to help achieve it, we pared $6 billion from civilian agency budget requests. I have since recommended still further cuts to the Congress, and we now expect to conclude the fiscal year with a total well below that submitted last January.

This administration is not opposed to expenditure control. On the contrary, we take pride in the fact that our budget expenditures for civilian agencies in the fiscal year just ended were $1.7 billion below the January estimates. We take pride in the fact that our debt, in terms of both dollars and percentage, rose last year at a considerably slower pace than the indebtedness of our Nation's consumers, private business, and State and local governments. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the ratio of our Federal civilian expenditures to national output and to the expenditures of State and local government. We take pride in the fact that we have reduced the postal deficit—we have reduced the cost of surplus food grain storage—we have reduced waste, duplication, and obsolescence in the Pentagon—and we have achieved noteworthy economies in every Government agency. And, finally, we take pride in the fact that—in each of the three budgets I have submitted, expenditures other than those required for defense, space, and interest increased less than they did in the last three budgets of my predecessors.

In addition to our efforts to restrict expenditures to those most urgently needed, we have pursued an intensive campaign to identify those existing Federal programs which could be effectively carried out by the private economy—for example, substituting private for public credit wherever feasible. In the last fiscal year over $1 billion of financial assets in Federal portfolios were transferred to private holders. We have also sought to initiate or increase user charges to cover a more equitable share of the costs of services provided by the Federal Government—to introduce modern equipment and management techniques for improving the productivity of all departments—and to control Federal civilian employment as well as expenditures.

Last year, if Federal civilian employment had increased at the same rate as population growth, it would have increased by 42,000 employees. It actually increased by only 5,600 persons—one-eighth the rate of population growth—so that we ended the year with far fewer Federal employees per 1,000 population than we began. To illustrate the significance of this accomplishment, let me point out that, during the same period, State and local government employment grew by about 300,000 persons.

Moreover, this administration's pledges on expenditure and debt control, unlike the amendment under discussion, have not been limited merely to the past and present fiscal years. In a recent letter to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, I repeated my pledge to achieve a balanced Federal budget in a balanced full-employment economy—to exercise an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need—and, consistent with these policies, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, to apply a substantial part of the increased tax revenues toward a reduction in our budgetary deficits.

Assuming enactment of the pending tax bill, I expect—in the absence of any unforeseen slowdown in the economy or any serious international contingency—to be able to submit next January a budget for fiscal 1965 envisioning an estimated deficit below that most recently forecast for fiscal 1964. And any increase in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product—so that the real burden of the Federal debt will be steadily reduced.

This is true expenditure control. It cannot be done automatically by erecting some

arbitrary, artificial figure and declaring that a much-needed tax cut will not go ahead if the debt exceeds that figure. The imposition of such a device can only reduce the effectiveness of the tax bill and invite the higher levels of unemployment which require still greater expenditures and debt.

No one, in short, is calling for a retreat from fiscal responsibility—unless it is the opponents of this bill. For without a quick and assured tax cut, this country can look forward to more unemployment, to more lags in income, to more and larger budget deficits, and to more waste and weakness in the economy—and that course is the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

The Federal budget has been in deficit during 7 of the last 10 years, regardless of which party controlled the executive and legislative branches, regardless of where Congress set the debt ceiling, and regardless of what controls were placed on expenditures. Without a tax cut, there is at present no ascertainable prospect for reaching a balance. But with a tax cut, despite a temporary transitional increase in the deficit, this Nation can move within a very few years to an even higher trend of economic activity capable of sustaining both full employment and a balanced budget.

For all these reasons, the efforts of this organization and conference on behalf of the pending bill are vital to our Nation's future. I do not assume that every businessman here agrees with every provision of that bill. But after 7 months of intensive committee study, a fundamentally sound and strong program has been produced. It must be voted up or down on the floor of the House this month. Every month it is delayed costs this Nation dearly in lost output, jobs, profits and the increased danger of a downturn.

I do not promise that passage of this bill will achieve full employment on the following day or even in the following year. But I do know that we will never get there if we do not start moving—and the time to start is today.

Roses—Give 'em While They Can Smell 'em

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Americans are famous throughout the world for their interest in community affairs, and the amount of time and effort they will expend in order to accomplish worthwhile community goals. In the Carroll County Times for September 5, 1963, Editor Charles Mooshian has bestowed a few well-earned accolades on persons who have contributed their time and effort to make Westminster and Carroll County better places in which to live. I am happy to include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I firmly believe there is no time like the present to hand roses to those who deserve them.

ROSES—GIVE 'EM WHILE THEY CAN SMELL 'EM

Our philosophy has been one of always giving roses to the living rather than to the dead.

We like to commend those who have done things beyond the call of duty without expectations of a "pat on the back" or "thanks for a job well done."

Therefore, we like to give roses while they can smell 'em.

Starting with this editorial we want to make this a regular monthly feature. If you know of an individual or group, who has done some outstanding feat or consistently gives of himself or themselves to the betterment of the community and mankind send us their names.

To Mrs. D. Eugene Walsh for her outstanding devotion and hard work in directing rummage sales for the benefit of the Carroll County General Hospital. The hundreds of hours Mrs. Walsh has put into this work are deserving of our thanks.

To Mayor Joseph L. Mathias and the city council for their sponsorship of the annual municipal playground and swimming program for the benefit of the community's children.

To the county commissioners for their cleanup of "dirt, filth and debris" from the Charles Street area.

To the Loren Simpson family for taking in a Japanese girl and giving her a home for a year while she attends Westminster High School.

To the Lions Club of Westminster for presenting to 15-year-old Tommy Damasiewicz, a braille machine so that Tommy can learn to read and write faster in braille. Tommy is a student at the Maryland Institute for the Blind.

To the Civitan Club of Westminster for their recent donation of $1,000 to the Mentally Retarded Children's Association and for their consistent efforts in behalf of the handicapped.

Gone for Broke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial in the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette written by the editor and publisher, William L. White:

GONE FOR BROKE

We are indebted to an eminent organization aptly styling itself the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee (to aid American taxpayers) for the following soberly factual warning concerning the piteous state of our country's finances:

"The stability of the dollar is threatened. Its stability and that of the free world currency structure totter on flimsy international agreements which could collapse overnight. The arithmetic is simple and unassailable.

"Under existing Federal Reserve legislation, $12.3 billion in gold is required to support our internal currency and credit structure. An additional $500 million is required under recent legislation replacing outstanding silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes. This makes a total reserve requirement of $12.8 billion in gold. The total gold stock is now $15.6 billion, thus leaving free reserves of around $2.8 billion. But these so-called free reserves are not actually free. They are under a special firm of pledge to support the dollar.

"There are heavy demands on this free $2.8 billion. Since 1958 the Treasury has owed $800 million in gold to the International Monetary Fund; recently there was a further gold borrowing of $500 million. In addition, for the first time in history, the Treasury has been compelled to borrow foreign currencies—$654 million to date—repayable not in dollars but in kind. Our reciprocal exchange arrangements, or swap agreements, cover a current commitment in excess of $1 billion. Of this amount, according to the last report, $100 million had been drawn down. Thus, of $2.8 billion so-called free reserves, $2 billion or more is under a special form of hypothecation for foreign obligations.

"All of this the dollar could survive if $25.3 billion in short-term credits redeemable in gold were not in foreign hands. Should foreigners continue to call our gold—we lost $900 million last year—the demand could not be met. Accordingly, the U.S. currency system trembles on the brink of technical bankruptcy and repudiation.

"The only effective solution is drastically to reduce spending, especially foreign economic aid and military assistance. In reducing foreign spending the administration may exercise exclusive control. It need not plead with anyone; it needs no new restrictive legislation to hamstring business; it need not discourage private investment abroad. The termination of deficit spending will restore confidence in the dollar; it will arrest the flight of gold; it will prevent further dollar decay."

So that is how bad it is. We are not just going broke, we have already gone for broke. We have left only $15.8 billion in gold needed to give our currency only a 25-percent backing. But foreigners have claims totaling $25.3 billion against that $15.8 billion, and any time they want to pull the chain they can whisk it out of our Treasury, leaving us $9.5 billion in the hole, and with nothing to support our dollar but the hot air of our elected statesmen. Maybe it could be worse. But just you tell us how.—W. L. W.

The Friendly Undertaker Will Bury Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, "The Rural Electrification Administration seems to have slipped on a ski slope," according to the Washington Post reporter, Julius Duscha, in an interesting story which appeared last Friday, September 6, concerning an REA loan for a ski resort in Pennsylvania. The Washington Post followed up this morning with an excellent editorial entitled "So Far Afield," which pertinently asks:

Why should funds for this purpose [financing snowmaking and ski lift machinery] be coming out of the public till?

This $110,000 REA loan was made despite clear warnings last year by the House Agriculture Committee that a similar ski loan in Illinois went beyond the intent of the REA Act. In addition, according to the Post article, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] told the REA earlier this year—during hearings on the REA appropriations—that the agency should not go so far afield in making these so-called section 5 loans. Nevertheless, the REA, completely disregard-

ing congressional advice, seems to be determined to have its own way.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the REA program is in deep trouble. Day by day it continues to dig itself in deeper and deeper through such actions as the Pennsylvania ski loan, as well as through some of the completely unnecessary loans for generation and transmission facilities. These have had the effect of discrediting REA in the eyes of Congress which, in turn, is resulting in serious repercussions for the entire rural electrification program. The recent actions of this agency leaves one to wonder if career Government employees are still running this program or whether it has been taken over by certain persons outside the Government who are more interested in promoting their own grandiose schemes and philosophies than in rural electrification.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that REA's guiding hand, for the past several years, has been its Deputy Administrator, Richard Dell, a former protegé of Clyde T. Ellis.

Many of my friends in this Chamber will recall that in October 1962, in a statement on this same floor, I quoted a newspaper story from the Oregon Journal saying that Ellis, the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, told a western audience of public power advocates that the only way this country will ever get nationwide public ownership of electric power is gradually. It is this advocate of the gradual achievement of nationwide public ownership of electric power who served for many years as the mentor of Richard Dell.

Mr. Dell's appointment as Deputy Administrator of REA was announced by Ellis from the podium of the 1961 NRECA convention in Dallas. And, ever since Dell has taken over this job, REA has been digging itself deeper and deeper into disrepute. Perhaps he should be referred to as "Digger Dell" for if REA continues to pursue its present policies it will soon be in need of an undertaker. Such policies can only result in the eventual burying of this fine farm program in the black tomb of public power.

The "Digger" learned his lessons well at the feet of Clyde Ellis. For several years, Dell was the chief lobbyist and director of the Legislative Department of NRECA until Ellis was successful in having him placed in a high post inside the Kennedy administration. It becomes more and more apparent that this former Ellis aid—now the aid of the REA Administrator—is the tentacle of control through which outside interests really manipulate the REA program for their own nefarious end of eventual nationwide public power.

This morning's Post editorial says, "We are glad that a subcommittee will be looking into this seeming misuse of funds" to subsidize ski resorts. And, my friends, when the House Agriculture subcommittee has hearings on this Pennsylvania ski loan later this month, as pointed out by Mr. Duscha, I trust the subcommittee will consider carefully the role of "Digger" Dell in this as well as other REA affairs.

In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of reading Mr. Duscha's article of September 6 and the Washington Post editorial of September 9, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert them into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 6, 1963]

SESSIONS ARE PLANNED TO HEAR REA ON LOAN OF $110,000 FOR SKI RESORT

(By Julius Duscha)

The Rural Electrification Administration seems to have slipped on a ski slope.

A House Agriculture subcommittee is planning hearings this month to find out why the REA lent $110,000 to help develop a ski resort in Pennsylvania.

This is the second REA loan for a ski resort within 18 months. The other loan was $30,000 for snowmaking equipment and lighting for ski slopes in northern Illinois.

The latest loan would provide money for the Blue Knob Development Corp., of Altoona, Pa.

The corporation is developing a ski resort at Bedford Springs, Pa., and will use the REA money for electrical machinery to run ski lifts and snowmaking machinery.

The loans are made by the REA at 2-percent interest to local rural electric cooperatives which in turn lend the money at 4-percent interest for 10 years to industries they serve. The higher interest rate is justified to cover the cost of carrying the loan by the local co-op.

The authority for making such loans is based on a new interpretation of the original 1936 REA legislation, which provided for the advancement of money by rural electric co-ops to farmers and other members of the co-op to increase the use of electricity.

The new interpretation was made in 1961 by REA Administrator Norman Clapp and is designed to encourage the development of industry in depressed rural areas.

The ski-resort loans are 2 of 17 business and industrial loans that have been made by the REA in the 2 years that its new policy has been in effect.

The loans total less than $1.5 million and amount to about one-third of the nearly $4.5 million in REA loans made during the last 2 years to help develop rural industries.

Other industrial loans have gone to provide electrical equipment for such businesses as lumber mills, a potato-processing plant, a pulp plant, a knitting mill, and a silica sand plant.

The expansion of the industrial loan program has come under increasing criticism in Congress.

Last winter Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, told Clapp at a hearing on the REA's request for funds: "Let us not endanger a good program by having Federal funds used far beyond the intent of the act."

A year ago Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, said to Clapp when he testified before the committee: "I think you should be very careful not to make loans that are going to go so far afield."

Last week, Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, charged in a House speech that Clapp's approval of the Pennsylvania ski-resort loan was "in direct defiance" of COOLEY's warning.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 9, 1963]

SO FAR AFIELD

Members of Congress may well be asking how the Rural Electrification Administration can justify subsidized loans to ski resorts. No doubt the pleasure to be had on slippery slopes in Illinois and Pennsylvania will be enhanced by these loans for the purchase of snow-making and ski-lift machinery. But just why should funds for this purpose be coming out of the public till?

It is true, of course, that the REA legislation is very broad. Congress has authorized the agency to make loans to rural cooperatives for the benefit of nonfarm rural residents as well as that of farmers. It has also permitted the co-ops financed by the REA to make loans to rural industries to encourage the use of electricity. No question of illegal operations on the part of the REA has been raised, but whether the financing of ski resorts at low interest rates is within the intent of Congress is a question that calls for further inquiry.

Some REA officials feel that Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee was not talking about this type of loan last year when he issued a warning against making loans that "are going to go so far afield." Regardless of how Mr. COOLEY may feel about the ski resorts, we are glad that a subcommittee will be looking into this seeming misuse of funds. Our own feeling is that if Congress wants to subsidize ski resorts it should say so directly and not leave the REA in a position to make such policy under the general terms of an act designed to provide rural areas with electricity.

Resolution Calling Upon Congress To Exercise Some Fiscal Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of Kentucky which relates to the fiscal policy of the United States of America and which calls upon the Congress to exercise some fiscal sanity:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 16

Resolution relating to the fiscal policy of the United States of America

Whereas it now takes 23 of the 50 States to pay the interest on the Federal debt; and

Whereas the United States is the only nation in the world that borrows tremendous sums of money to give away and taxes its people to feed its enemies and gives of its treasure to aid countries espousing the philosophy of godless communism; and

Whereas foreign aids, grants, and giveaways have caused an imbalance of gold shipments to the extent that trainloads of gold have been shipped abroad and alien nations now have credits and claims which could immediately demand all the gold at Fort Knox; and

Whereas the debt of the United States surpasses the combined debts of all other nations of the earth; and

Whereas most officials of the Federal Government have in the past, and do at this time, make great haste to spend the taxpayers' money on a scale unequaled in the history of the world and in excess of the spending sprees of pompous potentates, strutting dictators, and drunken kings in days past; and

Whereas elected officials acquiesce in, condone, and ofttimes promote expenditures to be passed on to generations and generations yet unborn; and

Whereas the Government has no money of its own and the oft quoted words "free from Uncle Sam" is a misnomer and a fallacy, because the Government can only return to its people a part of what it first takes away; and

Whereas the Government, in excess, taxes business and labor, to establish socialistic governmental corporations, tax free and rent free, to compete with the private enterprise system, and loses billions on its operations, and, again taxes the free enterprise system to pay for its deficits; and

Whereas the tax policies of this Nation discourage initiative, stifle ambition, burden the poor, promote socialism, and, little by little, destroy the free enterprise system; and

Whereas the Government officials tax everything and everybody, to the extent that the several States, cities, townships, and communities have not enough revenue left to take care of their own affairs; and

Whereas the Government by gratuities, grants, and sundry assistance programs, with pompous display and feigned humanitarian flair, purports to offer gifts free, and many, having lost dignity and pride, in essence fall down and beg for a parcel of the loaf which was taken from them in the first place; and

Whereas Members of Congress make haste to tax and rush to spend and are the only body since the beginning of time to espouse the philospohy that excessive spending of the taxpayers' money and continued deficits for long periods of time, is in the interest of a sound economy; and

Whereas such fiscal policies adversely affect every person of the Republic, the common good of the Nation, and the prosperity of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky: That opposition be expressed to ever increased spending, taxation, and mounting deficits, and the fiscal policies of the United States in general.

H.R. 7978—Frederick Douglass Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 7978, to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring Frederick Douglass. At the time of its introduction, I pointed out my special interest in such a commemorative stamp related to the 17 years—1847–64—which Mr. Douglass spent in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., as publisher of the North Star, an antislavery newspaper.

I would like to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that encouragement and support for a special postage stamp honoring this famous abolitionist of the last century has come from a Rochesterian, Howard W. Coles, who has continued the Douglass tradition of publishing information for and about the American Negro. Since 1934, Mr. Coles has edited and published the Rochester Voice, a successor to the newspaper founded by Mr. Douglass.

Mr. Coles is a student of the life and works of Frederick Douglass and has conducted years of research on Mr. Douglass' activities. Mr. Coles also lectures on Mr. Douglass and has a collection of Douglass memorabilia which he exhibits in conjunction with his lectures.

Mr. Coles is active in maintaining public interest in the heritage left us by Frederick Douglass. In recent years, he has helped to direct memorial ceremonies at a statute of Mr. Douglass in Rochester's Highland Park. He participated in the christening of a World War II Liberty Ship named in honor of Mr. Douglass and was instrumental in the founding and formation of the Frederick Douglass League in Rochester.

Mr. Coles also is an author. In 1941 the Oxford Press published his history of the Negro in Rochester, western New York, and Canada under the title, "The Cradle of Freedom." A number of its chapters are devoted to Frederick Douglass.

In this volume Mr. Coles details the history of the Douglass publishing efforts and also presents a number of other historical facts about Mr. Douglass that are worthy of note. Among these is a description of Mr. Douglass' underground railroad activity. To further our appreciation of Mr. Douglass, I take pleasure in sharing the following excerpt from Mr. Coles' book:

In addition to the writing and speaking against slavery that Frederick Douglass did in Rochester, there is one important phase which must not be forgotten. As "station master" on the underground, his position gave him the opportunity of hitting his old enemy, slavery, a telling blow in another direction. He was on the southern border of Lake Ontario and the Queen's dominions were right over the way. His own prominence as an abolitionist and editor of an antislavery paper naturally made him the station master and conductor of the underground railroad passing through what he called, the goodly city. During this same period, he attacked the Jim Crow public school system then in existence in the city. He was anxious to educate his children, but they were not allowed to attend the public schools in the district where he lived and owned property. His young daughter, Rosetta, who was the "apple of his eye" was so unkindly treated at Tracy Seminary, a school for girls, that she was forced to leave. Douglass decided to fight this system of discrimination with all the courage and stamina he possessed. On December 14, 1849, he addressed a mass meeting of Rochester citizens in the Monroe County Courthouse, protesting the segregation of colored children in the schools.

He won again a signal victory and soon every barrier was removed. Since that year, children of black parents are freely admitted to all schools of the city.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Howard W. Coles and the Frederick Douglass League. Just as Frederick Douglass a century ago fought for the abolition of slavery, they today are fighting for equal rights for all American citizens.

"Hypocrisy by Landis"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the August 31, 1963, edition of the Gainesville (Tex.) Daily Register carried a timely editorial titled "Hypocrisy by Landis." I feel the thoughts contained in this editorial merit the attention of all of us. We cannot expect Americans to obey the law if they do not see those who break the law punished. There should be no special privilege for offenders, particularly for those who know better. Mr. Speaker, I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

HYPOCRISY BY LANDIS

The 30-day jail term handed James M. Landis Friday in a New York Federal court is only token punishment considering the nature of the charges against the former big wheel in the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the New Frontier.

Landis pleaded guilty August 2 to a five-count indictment charging that he failed to file income tax returns for the years 1955–60.

The defense offered was preposterous and a contemptible reflection on the intelligence of the court and the American people.

His counsel contended that Landis was so engrossed in public affairs and the affairs of his clients—among them Joseph Kennedy, the President's father—he had "neglected his own personal matters, including the tax income returns."

The conviction points up the hypocrisy that exists all too often in the personal lives of those in high places who pontificate for the benefit of the rank and file. It also shows that it helps to have influential friends on your side if your're going to play fast and loose with the law of the land.

Mr. Landis is a former dean of the Harvard Law School, leaving us to wonder if the crimson crowd hasn't heard about the Federal income tax laws. He held high appointive positions in the administrations of three Democratic Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy.

Yes, this ardent welfare stater, has been a real whiz at setting up rules and regulations for the rest of us—and he's preached loudly about the unethical practices by heads of Government agencies. Guess he should be something of an authority on the subject at that.

In 1958 Landis told a congressional committee there would be fewer scandals in Government and less work for congressional committees if Congress would put effort into getting good men into Federal jobs rather than writing new codes of ethics for political hacks.

With his background and experience, we would expect Mr. Landis not only to be tax conscious, but an expert on the subject. He has been head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and Chairman of the Office of Civilian Defense in World War II. Makes you wonder about the caliber of men appointed to Federal Government posts, doesn't it?

Millions of hard-pressed American wage earners aren't permitted to forget that their income tax returns have to be in the mail by April 15 each year. Yet, Mr. Landis—the expert and moralizer on Federal Government

ethics—"forgot" to file a return for 5 years. His income during that period was listed at $360,827.93.

Perhaps he thought his service in helping President Kennedy prepare his book, "Profiles of Courage," and his role as a member of the Kennedy strategy team in 1960 entitled him to some tax privileges.

Mr. Landis needs some indoctrination in the theory of his New Frontier running mates, that it's a privilege to pay taxes.

"The Role of Small Business in Foreign Trade," Television Address of Representative Samuel N. Friedel of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, Representative SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, delivered an address a few days ago on "The Role of Small Business in Foreign Trade," which was broadcast by Baltimore television station WBAL-TV. In that speech he pointed out the importance of foreign trade and commerce to the port of Baltimore and made reference to hearings being held by the Small Business Committee dealing with export trade.

It should be noted, of course, that increasing American trade with foreign countries is not only of great value to our port cities, but is also of equal benefit to every section of our own country, for it helps solve our balance-of-payments problem and stimulates the sale of products manufactured in all parts of the United States to other lands.

I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to the excellent address of the gentleman from Maryland, Representative FRIEDEL, which is as follows:

THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN FOREIGN TRADE

(By Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland)

Ladies and gentlemen, many of you have probably heard me say at one time or another that I believe in trade—not aid. I do not mean that I am against giving aid to less fortunate and underdeveloped nations, but I firmly believe that the more we increase our trade with other nations—the more we can decrease our aid to many of them.

As you all know, one of Baltimore's greatest assets is its port, which is the Atlantic seaboard's gateway to the interior of the United States. Therefore, anything we do to increase business through our port benefits the economy of our entire State.

Foreign trade and commerce through our port has grown by leaps and bounds and now exceeds $1 billion a year, making Baltimore the second largest port in the United States in bulk cargo.

In a normal year, approximately 6,000 oceangoing vessels, loaded with more than 25 million tons of export-import cargo pass through our port. It is obvious that the economic health of the city of Baltimore and the entire State of Maryland is closely linked with foreign trade.

The more exports and imports that flow through our port, the better for all our citizens, and anything that stimulates such commerce, stimulates our economy.

However, I think too many of us tend to think of importing and exporting as something only big business can do but this is not the case. The House Select Committee on Small Business recently held hearings which should be of considerable interest to American businessmen and especially to so-called small business.

My very able colleague, the Honorable JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, is the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee. During the hearings, an imposing array of witnesses from various Government agencies testified for the purpose of ascertaining the plans of the administration under the Foreign Trade Expansion Act, its impact upon American business, how business may be affected, and what may be done to aid such businesses.

This testimony showed that various agencies and departments of our Government are vitally concerned with expanding our foreign trade and with increasing the opportunities for small business to participate in foreign trade.

One of the witnesses, who has the responsibility of coordinating all phases of the export expansion program, pointed out that through Government assistance and encouragement, 1,197 new exporters were introduced to international trade last year. He also stated that 36,000 businessmen attended export seminars in 1962 and he estimates that at least 85 percent of these were small businessmen.

Testimony also indicated that our Government agencies are doing a creditable job in expanding foreign trade, but more must be done. Expanding foreign trade so as to provide a stimulus to our economy and to help in solving our balance-of-payments problem is one of the most important tasks facing us today. Small business is being encouraged and helped to participate in foreign trade to the fullest extent possible.

Last year, the Congress gave the President extensive new trade negotiating power in the Trade Expansion Act. It is important that this authority in negotiations with the European Common Market and members of the European Free Trade Association be utilized to assist American business in securing access to these now prosperous markets. However, foreign trade is necessarily a two-way street. If we expect to sell more to foreign nations, it is only right that we should buy from them. At the same time, it is equally important that American suppliers and manufacturers and American labor be protected. This naturally involves a careful balancing of interests.

Under this same Trade Expansion Act, the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans up to $350,000 to assist firms to adjust to changed economic conditions resulting from increased imports. In order to render the maximum assistance possible, a Foreign Trade Division was established in the Small Business Administration for the purpose of stimulating the interest of small businessmen in international trade and to assure that adequate consideration is given to small business interests in all of the Government programs relating to foreign trade.

We all hope that under the terms of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, a substantial reduction of tariffs will be made by the Common Market countries in order to improve the access of American goods and farm products to European markets. I would urge all businessmen who have a product to sell to give careful consideration to the opportunities open to him through exports. Remember, the more we trade—the less we will have to aid.

This is your Congressman, SAM FRIEDEL, speaking to you from Washington.

Wilderness Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange that a bill that was introduced on the 14th of August 1963, could obtain a favorable report from the Department and be scheduled for immediate hearings while the wilderness bill languishes for over 8 months before the same subcommittee.

Apparently, these views are shared by other people in this country. As examples, I include as a part of my remarks the editorials from two of Washington's leading newspapers—the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News—of Tuesday, the 10th of September:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 10, 1963]

WILDERNESS WAYS

There is a nice contrast between the manner in which Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the House Interior Committee is handling two pieces of legislation. One is a bill he introduced only 3 weeks ago calling for establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to make a 3-year study of public land policy. And the other is a bill first introduced 7 years ago, twice passed by the Senate, the last time by an overwhelming vote in April.

Mr. ASPINALL has been a model of legislative punctuality in dealing with his own bill. Full scale hearings were held yesterday and continue today on a measure that Chairman ASPINALL has just introduced. But the wilderness bill, which enjoys overwhelming support from conservation organizations, remains in limbo though the tailend of the congressional session is drawing near.

Now there is a good deal to be said for Mr. ASPINALL's proposal to study public land policy. The fact is that there is a lack of clear congressional guidelines on what to do with the vast national domain. But ironically the wilderness bill has as its chief merit the purpose of setting guidelines by making it national policy to preserve forever some part of the unspoiled wild for future generations. The two measures complement each other, and one should not be used as a pretext for delaying a vote on the wilderness bill. Since April, the wilderness legislation passed by the Senate has been gathering dust in the House committee files. No hearings have been scheduled.

Isn't it time that Chairman ASPINALL let normal legislative processes take place?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 10, 1963]

WILDERNESS BILL FIRST

Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, ought to put first things first.

The chairman of the House Interior Committee has begun hearings on his bill to set up a new commission to review our century-old mishmash of public land laws.

The committee's opening session was held just 2 years and 3 days after the Senate first passed the wilderness bill and sent it to the House for action. No action has been forthcoming.

In Chicago last month, Representative ASPINALL said there was no reason the wilderness bill, approved again by the Senate last April, had to wait for the Land Law Commission to do its work.

Yet hearings—the first step in legislation—are now being held on the Aspinall commission proposal, while the chairman continues to sit on the wilderness bill. We think the commission proposal has merit: The Nation's public land laws are confused, and the administering agencies often act opposite to the intent of Congress.

But Representative ASPINALL knows the wilderness bill has clear priority over his very recent commission proposal. His failure to call hearings suggests he wants to "bargain" with the Senate, trading his Public Lands Commission for some form of a wilderness bill.

If this is not the chairman's motive—and we hope it isn't, for Representative ASPINALL generally has an excellent record of service—he can prove it by calling hearings promptly on the wilderness bill, whose aim is to preserve some 35 million acres of primeval America.

Fledgling College Bows In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, despite the attention focused on our national education needs, a new 4-year liberal arts college is a rare venture indeed. This week the doors will open for the first time at Franklin Pierce College in Rindge, N.H. I salute those who have made this step possible and share their hope that a quality institution of higher education will come into being to enrich the lives of its students and the neighboring areas of New Hampshire and Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that Robert P. Hey's excellent article from the Christian Science Monitor of September 5, 1963, entitled "Fledgling College Bows In" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLEDGLING COLLEGE BOWS IN

(By Robert P. Hey)

RINDGE, N.H.—On a gentle hill under the shadow of Mount Monadnock, a handful of dedicated educators are attempting to help meet the growing college enrollment challenge in an unusual way—by establishing a new, 4-year college.

Franklin Pierce College, named for New Hampshire's only President of the United States, will open its doors for the first time next Wednesday.

Across the Nation the trend is to meet the exploding enrollment pressures by expanding existing colleges, or setting up 2-year institutions. Few 4-year colleges are being established.

But several months ago five local businessmen decided this area needed—and could support—a good, 4-year liberal arts college and determined to establish it.

FARM COUNTRY

With small towns interspersed with farming areas, the region looks "farmy," as Dr. Daniel M. Forsyth, the thoughtful young college president, puts it.

It also is a center of culture. Within a radius of a dozen miles are a community glee club, a year-round theater group, the Sharon Arts Center, and the MacDowell Colony.

The college with its scenic 216-acre hilltop campus is only 2 hours by plane from New York, where many of its first-year students live, and 90 minutes by car from Boston.

Only one college is within a 20-mile radius, and New England is considered a highly desirable area in which to attend college.

The coeducational institution expects to enroll 120 students this fall in its freshman class and graduate its first class in 3 years. (It will use the "trimester" calendar plan.)

BACKGROUND STRESSED

But why should the college be a small 4-year liberal arts institution?

It is, Dr. Forsyth said, to provide a "sound, high-quality, liberal arts program" with a "broad curriculum background for every student, regardless of his major."

In many instances, he feels, students at liberal arts colleges do not find a sufficiently broad curriculum, and go through 4 years of college without any experience in a major field of human knowledge—history, the sciences, the humanities, or the like.

"We are intent on becoming a quality college," he adds, "and plan to compete with such New England colleges as Middlebury, Dartmouth, Bowdoin, and Colby."

Although there are some 2,000 colleges in the United States today "there is still room for all kinds of colleges," he says.

In particular, there is a "tremendous need" to develop new colleges of equal quality to existing ones, as they are unable to expand sufficiently to meet future needs and still retain educational quality, Dr. Forsyth says—"especially with the college population doubling in 10 years."

Today this fledgling college has nine professors, one classroom building, and two campuses—one a 4-acre downtown site from which it intends to move completely as soon as possible.

Dr. Forsyth expects it to grow eventually to between 1,000 and 1,500 students.

CAMPUS PLANNED

Immediate steps are hiring an architect to plan a campus on the pastoral 216-acre site, which now houses a refurbished manor (most recently a resort), two barns, and a 19th century farmhouse with a slave cellar—once a part of the underground railroad by which many slaves escaped to Canada from the ante bellum South.

Dr. Forsyth expects construction of the first buildings will begin next spring.

As a new college Franklin Pierce is in a position to do a number of things differently, although Dr. Forsyth cautions, "we don't propose to be an avant garde experimental college."

For example, the college will permit students to learn of another culture by taking special courses—given in English—in cultural and political history, instead of courses in a foreign language.

YEAR-ROUND CLASSES

Franklin Pierce is one of an increasing number of colleges adopting the trimester system, whereby students can attend college almost year-round and graduate in 3 years. At this college in Rindge they may also attend for only two semesters annually, earn money during the 4-month third section of the trimester, and graduate in the conventional 4 years.

Perhaps the most heartwarming aspect of the new college is the way local residents have embraced it. The town of Rindge has given use of the townhall and permitted expanded town library service, a restauranteur donated chairs and tables and set up the college kitchen.

Faculty and future students are caught up in the excitement of creating a new college, its atmosphere and traditions.

The college's greatest attraction in enlisting faculty? "Ideas," says Dr. Forsyth, "their ideas—and the fact that they will have a chance to express them here," by building the college.

Secretary Freeman Cites Need for Rural Areas Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the need for a strong conservation program is one of the most pressing problems we face. As population expands, resources must be developed to serve the varied needs of all people, both urban and rural. The challenges of creating an adequate program of land utilization are immense. Plans must be made and individuals convinced that our best interests are served when multiple use is made of private lands.

The Department of Agriculture, through its rural areas development program, is providing the financial assistance enabling individuals and groups to use their own local initiative to develop an expanding rural America. In this way, farming, resource development, and recreational facilities will all be substantially strengthened.

In a recent address to the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman explained the much needed program of rural areas development. This careful and thoughtful statement deserves to be read by all my colleagues.

The address follows:

I welcome this opportunity to join with you at your 53d annual convention—particularly since you are giving special emphasis this year to the growing demands upon the Nation's outdoor recreation resources.

I suspect that when all the reports are tabulated, the summer 1963 will have been a record year in the public's use of both private and public recreation facilities. The preliminary reports on recreation use of the national forests indicate this, and the Sunday Tribune a week ago carried a story reporting the glowing results of a banner year for resorts here in Minnesota. Each of you, I'm sure, could tell of the overwhelming number of visits to State parks and outdoor recreation facilities in your area.

These signs all confirm that the trend which was obvious when I served as Governor here in Minnesota is continuing at an accelerated pace. As Governor I was concerned that the efforts being made to meet this surging demand of the American people were not adequate * * * and I continue to have this same concern as Secretary of Agriculture.

It is gratifying to see in my own State that the programs for resource development—with particular emphasis on recreation—are being pushed vigorously by Governor Rolvaag. The long-range resource program enacted at his urging this year will enable the State park system to better meet the demands being placed on it. In addition, wetland areas for

wildlife will continue to be acquired, the number of public access sites on lakes will continue to grow, and the program for seedling production and reforestation will be strengthened. These are programs which were dear to my heart as Governor, and they remain so today.

Now you may well ask why the Secretary of Agriculture should bother himself with outdoor recreation. Other than his responsibility in connection with national forests, what does he have to do with recreation?

Some people would say—and have said—he should stick to the problems of producing or avoiding production, of food and fiber. They say recreation is none of his business.

I can assure you that I have heard this from some Congressmen. They have snorted at me, "What does the farm have to do with recreation? All this talk about using land for other things than producing crops is crazy. You forget about hunting, fishing, camping, or picknicking and concentrate on corn, wheat, milk, cotton, and peanuts. You straighten out the farmers' problems before you start messing around with recreation."

Happily, I don't hear much comment like this today, for the realization is growing that the long-term solutions to both the agricultural problem and the recreation problem are closely related. In fact, I believe that in resolving the crisis of abundance in agriculture we also will resolve the crisis of scarcity in recreation.

Food and recreation are siamese twins, for the simple truth is that we require the use of land to enjoy both. In the past, as we have attempted to solve the farming problem of too much food we have isolated it from the concept of land use. Some have thought the answer was to idle land. That is wrong, because idling land, or retiring acres, is a waste of valuable and needed resources.

My recent visit to the Soviet Union and the Communist nations of Eastern Europe dramatizes the point I want to make.

In these countries, the government and the people alike are straining every resource to produce more food and fiber. In Russia, for example, an additional 150 million acres of land has been put into agricultural use since 1935. During the same period in the United States, we have taken some 75 million acres of land out of production.

Even with an increase of this size—equal to about a third our total cropland—agriculture still remains a serious problem for the Russians. Food costs in the Soviet Union take about 50 percent of the average family income, as compared to less than 19 percent in the United States. Over half of the work force in the Soviet Union is engaged in agriculture, as compared to about 8 percent here. The average Russian is not going hungry, but he has a monotonous, starchy diet—about 60 percent of his diet is in carbohydrates. Meat, milk, and dairy products, fruits and vegetables—goods we consider commonplace—are scarce in the Soviet Union.

From this standpoint, the production and distribution marvels of our family farm system of agriculture make me very proud—I hope more Americans will realize how fortunate we are to be struggling with the probleb of abundance rather than scarcity. I'm sure that Khrushchev would much prefer our problem than the one with which he now wrestles.

Thus, the contrast between United States and Russian agriculture points up clearly that we use our cropland at an amazing level of efficiency. But we are not as efficient in the use of land we no longer need to produce food and fiber. In the past we have mistakenly assumed that we can solve our problem by idling land. Such a nonuse policy is not the answer for the long pull—it hasn't, and won't work.

Instead we are now beginning to apply another of nature's basic truths—that land serves many purposes, of which food production is only one. This is the natural law of multiple use—and by applying this principle of conservation to the use of private farmland we can begin to see that it is a significant part of the answer to the "twin problems" of overproduction in agriculture and underproduction of outdoor recreation.

With too much land in agricultural production and too little land producing recreation, we need only to convert cropland to meet the new demands of an urban age for outdoor recreation * * * and our twin problems will begin to disappear.

However, as most of you know, nothing happens quite that simply—you know the adage "it is easier said than done." However, I am encouraged by some of the recreation developments now occurring in farming areas, and I am confident that these activities, as they progress, can contribute substantially to the solution of the "twin problems."

One of the major difficulties I see at present is to convey to everyone concerned with the problem of too much food and not enough recreation that the solution to both problems is to be found in the classic definition of conservation—the wise use of land, water, air, wildlife, and forest resources for the fullest benefit of all people.

The application of this concept to our food and recreation problem is of vital importance. But so far it is little understood. Perhaps it is so simple and obvious that no one pays any attention to it. But we aren't going to be able to do much about it until people do understand it. I would like today to ask you as leaders in conservation to join with us in the Department to carry the message of multiple use of private land to the American people. That this is a difficult undertaking can be shown by reviewing the development of conservation in the public mind through three identifiable phases, each more complex than the last.

In the 1930's, the big conservation job was to halt the erosion of our land—to clear our streams and rivers of dirt and clean the air of our topsoil. Conservation then was described as wise use of our resources. What it meant was the protection of our resources from being further despoiled by man.

In retrospect, after 30 years of some success, this task was relatively simple. People can see the effects of erosion on the land, and they know something is wrong. They can see rivers come boiling up at flood stage, and deposit silt in the main street and on the parlor floor. They can see the duststorms blotting out the sun and taste the gritty dirt between their teeth. They know that if they feel the wasteful effects of misusing soil and water resources, then wild animals—fish and game—must have suffered even more.

The public didn't need to be convinced of the value of conservation, they could feel it.

The only limit on progress in this phrase of conservation is how much will the American people invest. We are going ahead with this investment, with the strong leadership of President Kennedy. This administration has nearly doubled the volume of small watershed programs. The River Basin Survey program is now underway as a working interdepartmental action project. For the first time, national recreation areas are being developed in a cooperative program between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

We are aware, however, that the annual outlay of $650 million from public and private sources for resource conservation is not adequate. We are not keeping up with farm planning needs in soil and water conservation districts, and we are far behind in meeting the demand for watershed district planning and conservation. We are proceeding faster today, but it sometimes appears as though we are barely keeping up. We know how to protect our resources from man's misuse—but many of us are not yet willing to make the investment in our future.

The momentum of public support for this stage of conservation technology has carried well into the 1960's, and now overlaps a second dimension which is rapidly forcing its way into the public conscience. If the 1930's were characterized by technology to prevent misuse, then the early 1960's are characterized by technology to end the damage caused by chemicals and wastes we are adding to our environment.

The task at hand is not simple. It is reflected in growing public concern over pollution of water, air, and even the soil itself, by misuse of chemicals in agriculture, in industry, and in the households of the Nation. Here, too, with basic public support and understanding we are beginning to act vigorously.

We are expanding our research into pest controls to develop safer means for combating harmful insects and plants. And we have had notable examples of success. Control of screwworm flies in the Southwest by growing and releasing billions of sterile male flies and use of various selective insect attractants point the way toward practical and safe pest control.

USDA researchers also are developing fat-based detergents which could replace the chemical-based detergents that do not now break down under treatment. Then the housewife will have superior washing compounds and also will be able to get a glass of water without a foaming head on it.

The answers to questions raised by man's contamination of his environment lie not only in careful, controlled use, but increasingly in research to discover alternative materials and ways of using them. Science and technology can provide, I am confident, answers to these perplexing problems. But the price may be high and, once again, we will have to decide if we are willing to pay it.

Thus, we have learned how to protect resources from being despoiled by man, and we are learning how to protect man from himself in his environment.

The third phase of conservation, and the one most difficult because it is the hardest to understand, is the development and use of our resources to serve the needs of all people.

This is the great question facing conservation and conservationists today. How are we to use these resources to serve people in urban America and in rural America? In this decision, every American has a decided stake.

If we drift along as we have since the end of World War II, we could emerge from the decade of the 1960's with an aging rural population, gradually deteriorating natural resources and vigorous and growing urban areas with no room—with sharply inadequate outdoor recreation resources.

The President has proposed to constructively use the resources of soil and water to begin a new era in conservation technology to protect resources in ways that serve people.

We call it rural areas development, and it is an effort—based on the desire of the rural community to progress—to do three things:

Find the answer to overproduction through converting cropland to new uses to produce better incomes for people on the land by filling the unmet needs of people in the cities and urban areas.

Encourage a new alinement of the resources of land and water and people in rural America to expand the rural economy and strengthen income of rural people, both farm and nonfarm.

Infuse new capital into rural America.

We are committing the full resources of the Department to RAD because we believe that rural America—which has contributed hugely to the rise of this Nation to its posi-

tion of world leadership—can be a vigorous expanding sector of our national economy. We seek to move resources back into rural America—to recapitalize the rural economy, if you like. We want to encourage an economic revolution of expansion in rural America. We have several new tools which the Congress provided in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and I would like to list some of them very briefly:

The act authorizes a number of programs to assist farmers and rural groups in developing recreation, wildlife habitat, grazing, forests, water storage or other new uses on land now producing crops or hay, or land currently in Federal diversion programs. These include farm recreation loans—100 of which have been made thus far on a pilot basis; a cropland conversion program now being operated with pilot areas in 138 counties— 2,800 agreements to divert 140,000 acres of cropland have been made; and, an expanded small watershed program to encourage recreation development and to provide for future municipal and industrial water uses in the planning of the watershed.

All of these new land-use programs seek to provide the farmer with a better source of income, to encourage rural communities to make better use of land and water resources and to expand the opportunities for outdoor recreation for city people. They apply to private land the very successful principle of multiple use by which we administer the Nation's forests.

The 1962 act also provided authority to initiate what we call resource conservation and development projects. They will enable farmers, city people, rural communities and private organizations to work together to improve land use patterns and to develop the natural resources of rural areas.

These projects will provide an exceptional opportunity for city and urban people living within easy reach of a conservation and development project to join with local people to create new recreational outlets. As members of a sportsmen's club, a church, a youth group or a neighborhood association, they can work with rural organizations, such as soil conservation districts, to help finance recreational facilities of many different kinds. In this way farmers could develop additional uses and incomes from their lands, and urban residents would have an outdoor recreation area reserved specifically for their use.

The RAD legislation also authorizes rural renewal projects designed to attack the entrenched poverty now found in many rural areas.

We envisage these projects will cover areas large enough to meet deep-seated economic problems, rather than nibble ineffectively on the fringes. Through rural renewal, we propose to work with legally constituted local bodies to make the land more productive, to construct water and sanitation facilities, to encourage the development of new industries and to stimulate the building of both private and public outdoor recreation facilities. This is a bold program similar in its intent and concept to the urban renewal and slum clearance projects which are helping our cities to renovate and rebuild their core areas.

There is more poverty in rural America with only one-third of our population than in all our cities combined and we need to think and act imaginatively and creatively to overcome it.

In addition to these specific programs enacted last year, the overall RAD program involves industrial loans through the Area Redevelopment Administration and through the Rural Electrification Administration; community facility loans and grants through ARA and, to a limited extent, through the Farmers Home Administration; rural housing loans, including a special program for financing housing construction for persons over 65; job training programs which provide rural people with the opportunity to learn new skills which can be used in the new plants being constructed as part of the RAD program.

These programs complement the ongoing programs being carried out by the other agencies of the Department—Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Forest Service, the Federal Extension Service, Farmer Cooperative Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—which are dedicated to building rural resources.

The one essential characteristic of RAD is that while it provides technical and financial assistance * * * the initiative for action must come from local groups * * * from the people who will benefit through better economic opportunity or through improved services, including recreation.

In this respect, I'm sure you will be interested to know that last year over 9,000 farmers in soil and water conservation districts throughout the country converted some or all of their cropland to outdoor recreation facilities.

Let me, in urging your support for this RAD program, make one important point. There is rising in the Nation today an attitude that portrays the Federal Government as an intruder—an outsider.

Yet, in the 1930's when floods along the Ohio made no distinction between communities or State boundaries—or when Kansas dust hung over New York—there was no question but that these disasters were national problems demanding the mobilization of the resources of a nation. And today, when pollution of a single river threatens the common water supply of hundreds of communities, there is no question but that this also is a national problem.

The outdoor recreation needs of an increasingly urban, highly mobile people—needs which can be met only outside their local community—are no different. Thus, as the demand grows for outdoor recreation—and it is rising to the flood stage now—we have the opportunity through RAD to cooperate with local, State, and Federal Governments and private citizens to use soil and water resources to satisfy this new appetite. And it will employ the same resources no longer needed to produce food.

Most of these resources are in private hands, and most hunting and fishing is presently on private land. As the need grows for additional hunting and fishing grounds—and other outdoor areas—those demands will have to be met for the most part on land that is owned and operated by farmers.

Public land just cannot do the job—despite multiple-use management. Neither the geographic distribution nor the characteristics of public land give it the flexibility to satisfy all of the recreational needs of the public. So the landowner really becomes the key in the development of recreation facilities for the future.

Farmers and ranchers have done more to improve conditions for wildlife development in the past 30 years than had ever been done before on the private lands of any country. These activities have increased supplies of some game and fish—to the point where they are more plentiful today than when white men first set foot on this continent.

But we are reaching the point where the farmer, in making his decision on land utilization, should be able to make wildlife as profitable a crop as any farm commodity, and sportsmen should recognize that if wildlife propagation is to be encouraged, it must we worth the price.

We cannot expect farmers and ranchers to invest time, money, and resources in game and fish production other than for their own enjoyment—unless they have some means to recover their investment. Government technical and cost-sharing aids have helped a great deal in this respect, but these are not enough to cover the full costs.

Let me read to you a statement made many years ago by a famous game management authority:

"We recommend that we recognize the landowner as the custodian of public game, protect him from the irresponsible shooter, and compensate him for putting his land in productive condition. Compensate him either publicly or privately, with either cash, service, or protection, for the use of his land and for his labor, on condition that he preserves the game seed and otherwise safeguards the public interest.

"In short, make game management a partnership enterprise to which the landholder, the sportsmen, and the public each contributes appropriate services and from which each derives appropriates rewards."

That quotation is from a speech made by the father of game management in this country * * * Dr. Aldo Leopold. The occasion was the 17th American Game Conference in New York City in March 1930. Those recommendations—made 33 years ago—might well provide, in 1963, a formula for the future.

Farmers are, and must become even more so, the guardians of our soil, water, timber, and wildlife resources. We must find ways to pay them not only for the food they produce—but for other services that we, the public, extract from these resources.

Thus, we approach the time when agricultural policy and conservation policy truly merge into one—giving fair consideration to farm income and farm levels of living and to the broader needs of the rural and urban community.

It is up to all Americans to decide the kind of country we want America to be. It is possible to preserve and develop for all of us the American heritage of rich resources and open spaces—provided we decide now that this is what we want. The land resources are presently great—yet in many instances, especially around cities, the pattern of use is being cast. To commit land to open green spaces—for the benefit of nature-starved city dwellers—calls for quick action before the concrete closes in. Let us vote for grass and water, as well as for concrete and asphalt.

I urge each of you to take a new look at opportunities in your own State. I suggest, specifically, that you investigate the services now beginning to become available under the rural areas development program. If the RAD program isn't operating effectively, pitch in and make it work.

The choice is ours. We can have productive land, clear streams, plentiful wildlife, ample water. We can make this a prosperous and beautiful and spacious America. I urge as our goal that we practice conservation as the art and science of using resources to serve all people.

"You Have To Suffer a Little Bit To Be Beautiful"—News Article Underscores Need for Safe Cosmetics Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Members of the House were surprised, and perhaps shocked, by an article on the front page of the Wash-

ington Post last Thursday [illegible] on a lawsuit in Prince George[illegible] Md., Circuit Court, in which [illegible] was awarded $1,000 damages as a result of scalp injuries from a hair bleaching treatment. The surprise, or shock, would arise from the information contained in the article that women "should expect that sort of thing"—that is, such things as blistered scalps—"if they want to become beautiful."

I think it is generally known by Members of Congress, if not by most consumers, that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains some very glaring loopholes, particularly relating to the safety of cosmetics. Instead of requiring the pretesting for safety of any cosmetic item before it can be sold to the public, as we require in the case of drugs and food products, the law places the burden of proof on the Federal Government to establish that a cosmetic product is unsafe in order to remove it from public sale. This, of course, places the burden of proof on the wrong party. It should be placed on the manufacturer—to make sure no cosmetic item is placed on sale until and unless the manufacturer can prove to the satisfaction of the Food and Drug Administration that harm will not befall the user of such a product.

NEW DRUG LAW COVERED ONLY PART OF PROBLEM

This principle of placing the burden of proof for safety on the manufacturer prior to public sale has been a basic provision of our law covering new drug products since 1938, and was very substantially tightened and strengthened for all prescription drugs in the far-reaching drug control law we passed last year following the thalidomide disclosures. As the original sponsor in the Congress of legislation to close the loopholes in the drug provisions of the 1938 act, I am very proud of the fact that most of the far-reaching provisions of the 1962 drug control law were first proposed in legislative form in my omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, introduced on the opening day of the 87th Congress in January 1961, long before the thalidomide tragedy came to light. There were a great many other things included in that omnibus bill first introduced in the 87th Congress, all intended to close glaring loopholes which still exist in the laws for the protection of consumers purchasing foods, drugs, or cosmetics, therapeutic devices and related products.

I, therefore, reintroduce H.R. 1235 in this Congress—substantially similar to the original bill and with the same number in this Congress as it had in the 87th Congress. The main change in the bill in the two Congresses reflects the fact that most of the prescription drug control provisions of the original bill have subsequently been written into law. But the remaining provisions of the original bill are as urgently needed as ever.

HAIR DYES EXEMPTED FROM REGULATION

One of the major sections of H.R. 1235, deals with the pretesting for safety of all cosmetic products subject to the act. In that connection I would like to point out that the present law—weak as it is in controlling the safety of cosmetics prior to their public sale—is devoid of any protections whatsoever for the consumer in the marketing and sale and use of hair coloring products regardless of how dangerous they may be to the individual consumer. The only thing which the present law requires in connection with hair dyes is that hair coloring products carry a label warning the user that they may be dangerous to her. Whether or not beauty parlor operators in all cases inform the customer of the dangers cited in the required label information varies, I imagine, from operator to operator and from shop to shop. Every woman using these products should certainly know about the hazards.

Mr. Speaker, following is the article which appeared on the front page of last Thursday's Washington Post reporting on the case of the beauty parlor customer who claimed damages for a blistered scalp which, the article states, is the sort of thing women "should expect" if they "want to become beautiful":

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 5, 1963]

"YOU HAVE TO SUFFER A LITTLE"—WOULD-BE BLOND AWARDED $1,000 FOR SCALP INJURY AT BEAUTY PARLOR

(By Donald L. Hymes)

The price of vanity often runs high, but yesterday in Prince Georges circuit court it was the beauty parlor that had to pay it.

Marjorie W. Wrenn, 29, had filed a $15,000 damage suit against a beauty salon charging that a 6-hour hair bleaching treatment left her with a blistered scalp.

The beauty parlor, Vincent et Vincent of 1163 University Boulevard East, Langley Park, claimed that women should expect that sort of thing if they want to become beautiful.

"In order to be a blond," testified partially bleached beautician Aimee Peridaens, 26, "you have to suffer a little bit."

Mrs. Peridaens, a petite Belgian with a streak bouffant hairdo, admitted on the stand, "It happens to me, too."

Dr. Murry M. Robinson, a dermatologist, confirmed the beautician's warning. "It's impossible to insult the scalp with these preparations without expecting some sort of irritation," he testified. "The matter of degree is the thing that varies."

But Mrs. Wrenn, who lives at 36-G Ridge Road, Greenbelt and works at the District Post Office, testified that the blistering was so severe that she had to miss 3 weeks of work. Her physician, Dr. William C. Weintraub, testified that she had suffered "chemical burns with some infection."

The eight men and four women on the jury, none of whom was blond, took only 25 minutes to decide on a verdict of $1,000 for Mrs. Wrenn.

A PROBLEM FOR ALL BEAUTY SHOPS

In placing this news article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair to point out that the particular firm involved in this episode has a very good reputation in the Washington area, and that what happened in the case of this one customer could happen, and I am sure does happen, from time to time throughout the country. We are dealing here with a dangerous situation attributable primarily to a serious gap in the law protecting consumers.

EXEMPTION IN LAW FOR HAIR DYES

Let me pinpoint that deficiency by quoting the act itself. Under present law, in section 601(a) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 1938 as amended, a cosmetic shall be deemed to be adulterated—and therefore illegal for sale in interstate commerce—

If it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to users under the conditions of use described in the labeling thereof, or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the law now states as to most cosmetic items—all cosmetic items with one exception. The exception is spelled out in the following proviso:

Provided, That this provision shall not apply to coal-tar hair dye, the label of which bears the following legend, conspicuously displayed thereon: "Caution—This product contains ingredients which may cause skin irritation on certain individuals and a preliminary test according to accompanying directions should first be made. This product must not be used for dying the eyelashes or eyebrows; to do so may cause blindness," and the labeling of which bears adequate directions for such preliminary testing. For the purpose of this paragraph and paragraph (e), the term "hair dye" shall not include eyelash dyes or eyebrow dyes.

BILL WOULD NOT PUT BEAUTY PARLORS OUT OF BUSINESS

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the 1960 Color Additives Act requiring the pretesting for safety of any coloring material used in or on the foods, drugs, or cosmetics did not affect or eliminate the exemption in the law for hair dyes. That is why hair dyes can be marketed which are not only unproved as to safety but which can actually be harmful, and which may be known to be harmful.

When I introduced H.R. 1235 in January 1961, containing a provision repealing the exemption for hair dyes so that any hair dye would have to be proved safe in the manner used, beauty parlor operators throughout the country were circularized and propagandized by the supply house and manufacturers with alarming predictions that this provision of H.R. 1235 would put them out of business. Of course, it would do no such thing. It would merely require that only safe coloring preparations could be used.

That might not prevent allergic reactions for some women but it would certainly protect a great majority of women using hair coloring preparations. The validity of this provision of H.R. 1235 was subsequently upheld by the Kennedy administration nearly a year and a half later, when an Administration safe cosmetics bill, virtually identical with the cosmetics sections of H.R. 1235, including the repeal of the present exemption for unsafe hair dyes, was submitted to the House by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

When I testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 20, 1962, during hearings on H.R. 1235, I made the following points on the cosmetic section of the bill:

COSMETICS NOT PRETESTED FOR SAFETY

Since 1938, when it first came under Government regulation, the cosmestic industry has had comparatively gentle treatment. Unlike drug manufacturers marketing a new product, or food manufacturers using a new ingredient, the cosmestic industry does not have to prove safety of a new product prior

to marketing. If the product is believed unsafe, furthermore, the Government must furnish legal proof of danger to the consumer in order to force the item off the market. This is the situation which previously existed in connection with the use of food additives, and which we changed in 1958—relieving the Government of the obligation of proving a product dangerous in order to take it off the market. We now require, instead, that the manufacturer prove his additive is safe before putting it on the market.

As a result of our lax cosmestics controls there have been occasional cases of extremely painful injury to cosmetic users, and frequent cases of allergic reaction, because the cosmetic manufacturer is not required to pretest the product for safety or even to identify the ingredients in the product.

Of course, I do not maintain or believe that major cosmetic manufacturers are anxious to poison, or disfigure, or denail, or scalp, or burn, or otherwise injure the American consumer. Certainly, there is no profit in that, and these are firms anxious to make a profit by pleasing, not harming, the customer. But the competitive situation in the cosmetic industry is such, and the ease of entry of new firms into the field of processing cosmetics is such, that new products hit the market accompanied by a wave of high-pressure advertising and promotion, and each firm tries to beat the other to the drugstore or department store counter or supermarket shelf with the latest magic potion for making us attractive.

Cosmetics are as old as history, and the basic ingredients used are well known in the trade. So sales spurts must often depend upon mysterious "gimmick" additives—turtle oil to promote skin rejuvenation or tighten chin muscles (but did you ever see a turtle's skin?); shark oil, queen bee royal jelly; chick embryo extract; horse blood serum, pigskin extract—yes, these are all ingredients which have been introduced in face and skin creams to form the basis for extravagant claims of beauty in a jar.

INGREDIENTS NOT DISCLOSED EVEN TO FDA

They are seldom dangerous—but if they are, we never know about it until a lot of gullible consumers—or consumers who have assumed the product must be safe or it couldn't be sold—have been hurt. That has been the situation in costmetic regulation for 24 years.

Since the 1938 Act does not even require cosmetic manufacturers to identify ingredients in their products, the Food and Drug Administration must analyze new products to determine their content, in case it suspects the presence of a dangerous ingredient. It cannot even go to the firm and legally demand to know what is in the product. Consequently, the consumer never knows—has no way of knowing except by painful trial and error—whether an attractive cosmetic product contains an ingredient to which she knows she is allergic. And, even worse, if a child swallows a cosmetic, the parents and the doctor have no way of knowing for sure what ingredients it contained and what antidote may be necessary.

These loopholes in the law applying to cosmetics should have been closed when we rescued the cosmetic industry from the color crisis in 1960. But we didn't do it then. We just dealt with color additives and nothing else.

It was after that experience—of seeing another blowout patch being placed on the old Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to meet only a limited problem situation, just as we previously passed the factory inspection bill, and the pesticides bill and the food additives bill and the citrus red bill and so on, that I decided late in 1960 to draft a single bill to rewrite all of the obsolete provisions of the basic law. That resolve resulted in the introduction of H.R. 1235 the following January.

MANY OTHER LOOPHOLES IN FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act permitting unsafe cosmetics to be marketed without pretesting for safety, and permitting unsafe coal-tar hair dyes to be marketed without any restraint except as to their labeling, are by no means the only serious deficiencies in our basic consumer protection statute. H.R. 1235 covers many other important areas in the jurisdiction of that law for instance:

First. It requires more informative labeling on all foods and all cosmetics and all drugs (not just the prescription drugs provided for in last year's drug control law) so as to give the consumer the information necessary to make a more intelligent choice among competing products and to eliminate some of the worst features of deceptive packaging, as well as to fortify the purchaser with information on the ingredients contained in any product in case the customer is allergic to or would be harmed by such ingredients.

Second. It would require, for the first time, the pretesting for safety and also efficacy of therapeutic devices which sometimes have been discovered to be harmful or dangerous when placed on the market without adequate pretesting, and which also are frequently useless for the purposes intended.

Third. It provides, for the first time, adequate controls over the distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and stimulant drugs—the so-called "pep" pills;

Fourth. It tightens up on the certification and use of veterinary antibiotics which could find their way into our food supply through meat animals.

Fifth. It permits a more effective crackdown on fake remedies of various kinds victimizing the ill and the aged;

Sixth. It would give the Federal Government sufficient power, which it does not have at the present time, to make complete and comprehensive factory inspections including access to the complaint files.

Seventh. It would repeal the rider agreed to last year in the Drug Control Act permitting manufacturers of animal feed to use cancer-inducing coloring matter in animal feeds merely for the purpose of permitting easier visual identification of one kind of animal feed from another—there is absolutely no reason in the world why any carcinogenic coloring matter has to be used for such a frivolous purpose, and it is a frivolous and indefensible purpose.

Eighth. Also, it authorizes the Federal Government to make factory inspections overseas of products imported into this country in very substantial quantities—we could bar any foreign manufacturer from shipping foods, drugs or cosmetics into this country if he refused to permit inspection or if his plant sanitation and quality controls were not comparable to those we require from American manufacturers engaged in interstate commerce in the same fields.

H.R. 1235 SHOULD BE ENACTED

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the many things contained in H.R. 1235. All of them are important. The need for pretesting for safety of cosmetics has been known to us for many years as consumers have been poisoned or disfigured or denailed or scalped or burned or otherwise injured as a result of the use of unsafe products. I have called a number of such episodes to the attention of the Food and Drug Administration and to the attention of the House since coming to Congress in 1953, and until we change the law and tighten it, I am afraid there will be more such episodes and personal tragedies.

We all know of the frightful toll of lives lost on the highways as the result of the illicit sale of pep pills.

We are familiar with the many instances of victimization of the consumer because of deceptive packaging practices which are aided and abetted by the ineffective labeling requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1235, is substantially similar now to the bill of the same number in the last Congress on which I testified on June 20, 1962. Some of the provisions of H.R. 1235 of the 87th Congress, which should have been stronger, as indicated in my testimony last year, have now been improved in the new bill which I introduced in January of this year. Otherwise, and with the exception of the discussion about prescription drugs and certification of all antibiotics intended for human consumption, all of the arguments I made in behalf of this legislation last year are just as valid now as they were then. I, therefore, submit that testimony as part of my remarks in view of the importance of this legislation to all of the consumers of this country. Anyone reading the testimony which follows should read it with the understanding that the proposals I referred to last year dealing with the safety of drugs are now part of our law insofar as prescription drugs are concerned, but must still be enacted in connection with over-the-counter drug items. Also, the provisions of the original H.R. 1235, dealing with certification of all antibiotics for human use have similarly been enacted as part of last year's drug control law.

The statement referred to above is as follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1962, ON AN OMNIBUS BILL TO REWRITE THE FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

It is certainly no criticism of this committee when I say that this is a moment I have been waiting for—impatiently—for a year and a half, or at least since the opening day of the 87th Congress on January 3, 1961, when I introduced H.R. 1235, an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to bring it up to date in terms of today's needs and problems in protecting the American consumer. It is still the only measure pending in either House which would combine in one bill provisions for closing all of the major loopholes in consumer protections under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Chairman HARRIS and I discussed the importance of having the formal departmental reports from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other Government agencies affected by or interested in the many complex and technical provisions of the bill before hearings could be scheduled.

Unfortunately, except for a "no comment" report from the Federal Trade Commission (subsequently clarified in an exchange of correspondence between me and FTC Chairman Dixon), none of the executive departments or agencies directly or indirectly affected by H.R. 1235 ever did file the requested reports to this committee on the specific provisions of the bill.

PRESIDENT ENDORSES MANY PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN H.R. 1235

On March 15, however, the President sent his comprehensive consumer message to the Congress which contained a formal endorsement on behalf of the administration of many of the changes in the law which are contained in H.R. 1235; and last month, as you know, Chairman HARRIS on behalf of the administration introduced two separate bills directed to those recommendations—H.R. 11581 dealing with drugs, and H.R. 11582, dealing with cosmetics and therapeutic devices. Together, these bills contain many of the features of H.R. 1235, but not all of them, and also contain some provisions not in H.R. 1235.

I suppose I wouldn't have minded the long delay nearly as much if, after all this time, the Administration had reported that the approach in H.R. 1235 was completely wrong and impractical. However, now that most of the provisions of the administration bill are shown to be identical to, or at least very similar to H.R. 1235, I am indeed sorry we couldn't have gotten to this matter a year or more ago, and thus with a better chance of final action in this Congress.

On Monday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a detailed breakdown prepared for me by Mr. Raymond J. Celada of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress showing in comparative tabular form all of the similarities and all of the differences when comparing H.R. 1235 with the two Harris bills, and also as compared with the widely discussed Kefauver-Celler bill. I felt it would be helpful to the committee and to all of your witnesses to have this material available prior to the start of the hearings for a better understanding of the technical points in the various bills. All of the bills share the one common objective of protecting the American consumer; all differ, however, in some significant respects.

The Kefauver-Celler bill is not before this committee, of course, since, as introduced, it is directed primarily at changes in the antitrust laws and the patent laws applying to drugs, and thus comes within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, even though it also contains many provisions amending the drug provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. But I thought it would be useful to have the comparative breakdown of the various bills including this one, too, even though it is not officially before you.

GREAT CHANGES IN FOOD, DRUG, COSMETIC TECHNOLOGY

You are faced here in this committee with an assignment of great magnitude, in an area of supreme importance to the lives and health and safety and well-being of the American people, in connection with the purchase and use of the most personal and intimate of products—all of the foods we eat, all of the drugs and devices we use for health purposes, all of the cosmetics used not only by women but in increasing numbers by men, as well. In many respects, you are facing the same problem which confronted your predecessors on this committee a quarter century ago when it became obvious that the Wiley Act of 1906—a great legislative achievement in its time—was woefully out of date and replete with loopholes permitting practices which visited fraud, deceit, poisoning, blinding, and death upon untold numbers of trusting American consumers.

From 1906 to 1938—a period of 32 years—Congress amended the Wiley law in a number of very important respects to protect consumers but never quite succeeded in making the law as effective as we know it should have been. Congress, in 1912, 1913, 1919, 1923, 1930, and 1934 closed loopholes as they became glaringly evident—just as this committee since 1938 has initiated many, tremendously important improvements in the 1938 act—the factory inspection bill, the pesticides bill, the food additives bill, etc. But the time has come now, just as it did in 1938, for a complete rewriting of outmoded provisions—a modernization and up-dating of the whole statute based on far-reaching changes in food, drug, and cosmetic technology and the dangers created for consumers by omissions in the law, or by court decisions, or by studied evasions and easy violations which are often almost impossible to prevent because of shortcomings in the law.

CATASTROPHE SHOULD NOT BE ONLY SPUR TO ACTION

So it is my hope, as I know it is the hope of every American consumer concerned about the health and safety of our people, that you will now do what was done in 1938—rewrite the statute from beginning to end, keeping what is good but replacing what is obsolete or ineffective. It required a series of horrible episodes to stir the 75th Congress finally to pass the basic statute now on the books, after the 73d and 74th Congresses had extensively discussed and debated similar legislation, but let it die in squabbles over special interest amendments and exemptions. By the time the 75th Congress finally acted, it had before it a sickening parade of horror cases—of young women blinded by eyelash blackeners; of many Americans paralyzed by a poisonous substance in Jamaica ginger—the infamous Ginger Jake scandal; of at least 73 Americans dying from the use of a new prescription drug, Elixer Sulfanilamide, at first considered a great medical breakthrough until horrified doctors watched many of their patients die in prolonged agony from its use.

No such mass poisoning or blinding or paralyzing or killing episodes have occurred, thank God, in recent years. I hope it never again requires such incidents to persuade Congress to act on a broad level to improve the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. However, as we all here know, most of the changes and improvements in the act since 1938 have been on a piecemeal, limited approach basis. I complained of this in 1960 when the color additives bill was being considered. I felt if we were going to "bail out" the lipstick makers on the use of other than "harmless" colors, we should insist on something for something—that is, on a requirement for pretesting for safety of all ingredients used in cosmetics, not just the coloring matter. In fact, I felt so strongly about that aspect of it that even after you agreed to amend the hastily passed Senate bill to include an anticancer clause, I voted against the bill in the House.

COSMETICS NOT PRETESTED FOR SAFETY

Since 1938, when it first came under Government regulation, the cosmetic industry has had comparatively gentle treatment. Unlike drug manufacturers marketing a new product, or food manufacturers using a new ingredient, the cosmetic industry does not have to prove safety of a new product prior to marketing. If the product is believed unsafe, furthermore, the Government must furnish legal proof of danger to the consumer in order to force the item off the market. This is the situation which previously existed in connection with the use of food additives, and which we changed in 1958—relieving the Government of the obligation of proving a product dangerous in order to take it off the market. We now require, instead, that the manufacturer prove his additive is safe before putting it on the market.

As a result of our lax cosmetics controls there have been occasional cases of extremely painful injury to cosmetic users, and frequent cases of allergic reaction, because the cosmetic manufacturer is not required to pretest the product for safety or even to identify the ingredients in the product.

Of course, I do not maintain or believe that major cosmetic manufacturers are anxious to poison, or disfigure, or denail, or scalp, or burn, or otherwise injure the American consumer. Certainly, there is no profit in that, and these are firms anxious to make a profit by pleasing, not harming, the customer. But the competitive situation in the cosmetic industry is such, and the ease of entry of new firms into the field of processing cosmetics is such, that new products hit the market accompanied by a wave of high-pressure advertising and promotion, and each firm tries to beat the other to the drugstore or department store counter or supermarket shelf with the latest magic potion for making us attractive.

Cosmetics are as old as history, and the basic ingredients used are well known in the trade. So sales spurts must often depend upon mysterious gimmick additives—turtle oil to promote skin rejuvenation or tighten chin muscles (but did you ever see a turtle's skin?); shark oil, queen bee royal jelly; chick embryo extract; horse blood serum, pigskin extract—yes, these are all ingredients which have been introduced in face and skin creams to form the basis for extravagant claims of beauty in a jar.

INGREDIENTS NOT DISCLOSED EVEN TO FDA

They are seldom dangerous—but if they are, we never know about it until a lot of gullible consumers—or consumers who have assumed the product must be safe or it couldn't be sold—have been hurt. That has been the situation in cosmetic regulation for 24 years.

Since the 1938 act does not even require cosmetic manufacturers to identify ingredients in their products, the Food and Drug Administration must analyze new products to determine their content, in case it suspects the presence of a dangerous ingredient. It cannot even go to the firm and legally demand to know what is in the product. Consequently, the consumer never knows—has no way of knowing except by painful trial and error—whether an attractive cosmetic product contains an ingredient to which she knows she is allergic. And, even worse, if a child swallows a cosmetic, the parents and doctor have no way of knowing for sure what ingredients it contained and what antidote may be necessary.

These loopholes in the law applying to cosmetics should have been closed when we rescued the cosmetic industry from the color crisis in 1960. But we didn't do it then. We just dealt with color additives and nothing else.

It was after that experience—of seeing another blowout patch being placed on the old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to meet only a limited problem situation, just as we previously passed the factory inspection bill, and the pesticides bill and the food additives bill and the citrus red bill and so on, that I decided late in 1960 to draft a single bill to rewrite all of the obsolete provisions of the basic law. That resolve resulted in the introduction of H.R. 1235 the following January.

WHILE DIFFERING, HARRIS AND SULLIVAN BILLS COVER SIMILAR GROUND

As the Legislative Reference Service report points out, the two administration bills, H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582, and my bill, H.R. 1235, cover substantially similar ground, while differing to some extent in language, approach, or, in a few instances, in content.

For instance, H.R. 1235 and H.R. 11581 both require more adequate controls over drug manufacturing to assure the quality of the product output, thus, for one thing, making it more likely that physicians would feel safe in prescribing by common names instead of the often more expensive trademark names; both require new drugs to be proved efficacious as well as safe for the purposes intended; both permit recall of previously approved drugs in case of substantial doubt of their safety; both require batch-by-batch testing and certification of all of the 30 or more groups of antibiotic drugs rather than just the 5 so-called wonder drugs in existancee a dozen years ago; both call for extensive controls over the manufacture, distribution, sale, and possession of habit-forming barbiturates and stimulant drugs to curb the flagrant bootlegging of these powerful and dangerous and death-dealing drugs; both clarify the existing factory inspection laws as they apply not only to drugs but also to foods and cosmetics.

Similarly, H.R. 1235 and the other Harris bill, H.R. 11582, both require pretesting of cosmetics for safety before marketing, including a Delaney anticancer clause; both require that therapeutic devices be proved safe—closing a serious and dangerous loophole—and also that therapeutic devices be proved effective for the purposes for which they are offered for sale; both bills repeal the provision in the present law which permits the sale of coal tar hair dyes containing poisonous or deleterious ingredients which may be injurious to the user (the present law merely requires a label warning of possible danger).

H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582 have some other provisions in them which are not contained in H.R. 1235 and which are worthwhile. For instance, there is a tighter provision in H.R. 11582 than in H.R. 1235 on the record-keeping requirements for cosmetic manufacturers after a new product has already been approved for sale, and in case consumer complaints or experience should indicate the existence of danger in the use of the product. H.R. 1235 contains such reporting and record-keeping requirements on drugs and should have included cosmetics.

H.R. 11581 has a provision amending the Public Health Service Act requiring tests for efficacy of biological drugs—the provision the President referred to when he said hogs, sheep, and cattle receive somewhat greater protection in this respect than humans.

The same bill also proposes the assignment of standardized names by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in cases where such names do not already exist or there is a dispute over a particular name. Of course, as I said earlier, many doctors will not use generic names in prescriptions unless and until factory inspection authority is so strong that there is no chance of fly-by-night operators turning out inferior drugs for sale in the prescription departments of pharmacies.

However, I have strong doubts, I must admit, over the retreat on the Delaney anticancer clause on feed additives, as contained in H.R. 11582, particularly in view of the Government's experience several years ago with the hormone-treated chickens. It cost us $10 million to remove from the market the fowl treated with a drug considered safe for the purpose—after it was learned that there were residues of the cancer-inducing substance in the skin of the chickens. Too often for complacency, new testing methods disclose the existence of harmful residues which had not shown up in earlier tests, but by then the damage is done.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES OF H.R. 1235

Now, I would like to discuss some of the provisions of H.R. 1235 which are not in either of the administration bills, and which I strongly believe should be made part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

First of all, there are the sections dealing with fake cancer remedies and useless dietary ingredients. If the law were strengthened in all other respects, as has been recommended, perhaps the FDA would then be able to reach the cancer quacks and put them out of business quickly. But I think the provisions of H.R. 1235 would be of invaluable assistance in this respect. As to the special dietary food section of H.R. 1235, it does not aim at legitimate dealers but at the charlatan who evades the law by making oral claims of special benefits to be derived from the inclusion of some exotic or unusual ingredient with no known nutritional value whatsoever.

H.R. 1235 also gets at an exemption in the law for common carriers responsible for causing an article in commerce to become misbranded or adulterated. Carriers should be held accountable, I believe, for violations of the law which they are responsible. Under present law, they are apparently exempt from responsibility for adulterated products in transit, even if the carrier's own neglect caused the violation.

A very important provision of H.R. 1235 which is not included in either administration bill would facilitate oversea inspection by U.S. officials of factories shipping substantial quantities of foods, drugs, or cosmetics into the United States. Importation could be refused any product from a manufacturer who would not permit reasonable inspection of his facilities on request. According to the testimony of Commissioner Larrick on the FDA appropriation bill, we import about $6 billion worth of foods, drugs, and cosmetics a year, of which only a fraction can be inspected on arirval. It is significant that nearly one out of every three sample analyses and wharf examinations uncovered violations of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Mr. Larrick acknowledged that this high rate of violations results from the selective nature of the inspection work—in other words, the inspectors pick out those shipments they suspect of violations, rather than depending upon a random sample. While there is at present no elaborate plans for sending inspectors overseas, yet it seems to me the authority should be there to require those foreign firms which ship substantial amounts of food, drug, or cosmetic items to the United States to give our inspectors the same right of entry on request as an American firm is required to do.

SPECIAL INTEREST LOOPHOLES ADOPTED IN 1938

Another loophole H.R. 1235 alone among the pending bills would close involves the label exemption under the present law for butter, cheese, and ice cream in revealing the presence of artificial color. This was a deliberate special interest provision written into the law in 1938 to quiet protests from the dairy interests, even though some Members of Congress said at the time there was no good reason for it. By law, coloring matter cannot be used unless it is safe, so why not let the consumer have this information if it means anything to him? Some people just don't like to buy artificially colored butter or cheese or ice cream—but at the present time, they have no way of indulging their wishes in this regard. All other food items must acknowledge on the label the existence of artificial coloring. So why not ice cream, butter, and cheese, too?

Another special interest exemption written into the 1938 act, and which H.R. 1235 would repeal, is the provision which declares that soap is not a cosmetic.

It is not a food, of course. Except in the relatively few instances in which certain therapeutic values are manufactured into—or claimed for—a soap product, it is not a drug, either. The law defines cosmetics as, among other things, "articles, including components of any such articles, intended to be rubbed, poured, sprinkled, or sprayed on, introduced into, or otherwise applied to the human body or any part thereof for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness, or altering the appearance * * *."

Soap is certainly intended for cleansing, and it is used by most of us also, if not consciously for beautifying, at least for promoting attractiveness in the removal of dirt from face and hands. Some soaps presumably will do far more for our appearance than that. Nevertheless, by law, soap is not a cosmetic. Under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, then, it is a nothing—it is not subject to the law in any way unless therapeutic values are claimed for it as a drug.

I am not so much concerned over the money spent trustingly and hopefully by women who are led to expect beauty miracles from the soap they buy, although the economic waste may perhaps be significant. What I am concerned about is that a complexion soap can be adulterated with unsafe chemicals or unsafe color additives, and the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act cannot touch it. And regardless of how fradulently it might be packaged, there is not even a requirement that the size or net weight or anything else of an informational nature be printed on the label for the consumer's guidance. Why should soap be above the law?

READ THE LABEL, IF YOU CAN FIND IT

Unlike soap, products subject to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act must carry certain label information, but the language of the law, and the rulings of the courts, are such that this information is often almost impossible to find. Just the other day, the FDA seized 16,000 plastic tubes of a well-known firm's deodorant product because, while the required information was printed somewhere on the product, the printed matter was the same color as the plastic container and was almost impossible to find and read.

H.R. 1235 provides for an effective attack on the labeling problem in foods, drugs, and cosmetics by providing the Government with authority to spell out, in regulations, the degree of prominence required for certain label statements, including statements of the quantity of contents of foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the common or usual names of drugs, and the ingredients in foods and cosmetics.

The present law prohibits labeling which is—

"Not prominently displayed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

But, as the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee hearings brought out last year, you often need a magnifying glass to find the required label information on quantity and contents—before you get out the slide rule to figure the cost-per-ounce. As a nonlawyer, the present law seems very strong, to me, but apparently the courts have held it to be vague. That is why we now need the same authority in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to specify size and location of labeling information as you provided in the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act.

PREFERENCE FOR A SINGLE OMNIBUS BILL

If we are going to change the law on food, drugs, and cosmetics, then let us write a model law and close all of these loopholes.

I believe H.R. 1235, or a similar omnibus bill, would best serve as the vehicle for accomplishing this purpose. I see no valid reason for having two separate bills—one on drugs and the other on cosmetics and devices. They are part of the same overall problem—and under the jurisdiction of one agency. If there are omissions in H.R. 1235 based on the administration's 18-month study of the issue since I introduced that bill, it should be an easy matter to incorpo-

rate them into a single omnibus measure along the lines of H.R. 1235.

For instance, while H.R. 11581 provides for requiring proof of the efficacy as well as the safety of all new drugs, a similar provision dealing with therapeutic devices is contained in the different Harris bill, H.R. 11582. Since the pretesting requirements for both drugs and devices would be similar, and are often intended for the same people, why not cover them in one piece of legislation? If you go through the detailed breakdown of H.R. 11581 and H.R. 11582, you find that substantially similar provisions in those two bills deal separately with drugs and devices. I am not a lawyer, but I suspect lawyers would have a field day over the years finding hidden meanings and significance in the fact that Congress used duplicate wording but in separate bills applying to different products in providing for pretesting for efficacy as well as safety of drugs and therapeutic devices. Obviously, some lawyer, some day, will argue, and perhaps successfully, that Congress didn't really mean to have these products treated alike in their safety requirements, or it would have placed them in the same bill rather than passing separate bills. Do I just imagine this?

Furthermore, while H.R. 11581 applies primarily to drugs—every specific provision applies only to drugs—yet it also would have the effect of amending the factory inspection laws applying to "any articles subject to" the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, including, of course, food and cosmetic products. I think this is to the good—our factory inspection laws need strengthening, for food products and cosmetics as well as drugs. But why put a food inspection provision in what is exclusively a drug law? Why put a cosmetic inspection provision in a drug law, and leave it out of the proposed new cosmetic law? Obviously, there must be some rhyme or reason for dividing up the proposed improvements in the law in separate bills in this fashion, but I do not understand the value of it.

The use of H.R. 11582, primarily a bill dealing with pretesting of cosmetics and therapeutic devices, as a vehicle for amending the Hazardous Products Labeling Act dealing with household products, and also to amend the animal feed additives and food additives laws is, I believe, further evidence that we should have a single omnibus bill and not two separate bills, each covering one major area and a variety of unrelated ones.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate your courtesy in hearing me. The subject matter of these hearings is of paramount importance to me from a legislative standpoint—and has been ever since I came to Congress in 1953 and introduced a safe cosmetic bill to carry out the recommendations of the Delaney investigation. I have introduced safe cosmetics bills in every Congress since then. I have supported this committee in every proposal it has made to strengthen the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and have opposed it in the few instances I thought the legislation would weaken consumer protections.

It would be a relatively simple matter for the committee at this late date in the final months of the life of the 87th Congress to pick out one of the many major areas of inadequacy in the law and recommend another blowout patch to tide us over temporarily. I hope you will not do that—that you will recommend legislation to close all of the major loopholes in the act.

In 1938, after attempts in two previous Congresses to replace the 1906 act had failed, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in a report filed in the House on April 14, 1938, said of the Wiley law of 1906:

"While the old law has been of incalculable benefit to American consumers, it contains serious loopholes and is not sufficiently broad in its scope to meet the requirements of consumer protection under modern conditions."

After two dozen years, the same words are exactly applicable today to the law passed in 1938. I hope this same committee will shortly file a report with the House containing those words, or similar words, in connection with a legislative accomplishment in 1962 as far reaching as that of 1938 in the field of consumer protection.

Boy's Heroism Saves Family in Home Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring attention to another of today's youth that although only 10 years old performed an outstanding act of heroism. Young William Remaker, of Lancaster, Calif., was credited with the heroic rescue of his family from their blazing home a few days ago. William rescued his sister, Peggy, 5, and brother Stanley, 2, by smashing a window and pushing them to safety. He was assisted by two neighbors and county firemen in saving his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Darrell L. Barr, after he had gotten his sister and brother out.

Smoke and heat awakened the boy around midnight, the blaze apparently was started by a cigarette that had fallen behind a cushion in an overstuffed chair in the living room of their home at 45388 Genoa Avenue. He said he shook his sister and brother and got them awake and carried Stanley first to a window in the bedroom and broke the glass, ripped the screen off and pushed him outside and then he was forced to crawl outside because the flames were licking at his heels.

The boy was met by his neighbors, Fred H. Trimble, of 45347 Gadsen Street, and Tom R. Saiz, of 45341 Gadsen Street. William told them his sister and father and mother were still in the house and would they please help him save them. After kicking in the front door the men entered the living room but were driven back to the outside by the scorching flames.

When the two neighbors got back to William they found that he had gotten Peggy out of the bedroom window also. He told them he crawled back in the house through the window and found Peggy lying in the hallway. By this time two county fire units had arrived on the scene and firemen Fred Hahn and Bob Myer, donning special breathing masks and protected from the flames by a fine water spray entered the house, where they found Barr, 42, and his wife Patricia, 31, unconscious on the floor of the living room. Myer and Hahn carried the two victims outside and they were administered oxygen immediately by other firemen before being taken to the Antelope Valley Hospital with the three children. The parents were reported in satisfactory condition and the three children were turned over to their good neighbor, Mr. and Mrs. Saiz.

I wish to take this opportunity of commending William Remaker. Though only 10 years of age, he reacted like a veteran when he was confronted by an emergency that required him to make an instant decision and not panic and then to follow through with the heroic rescue, himself, of his sister and brother which undoubtedly saved both their lives. This is just one example of the stamina and courage that are still inherent in the youth in America today. I am presenting the name of young William Remaker to the proper authorities as an outstanding gesture of heroism and that it be duly considered for a suitable award of achievement for this outstanding, selfless, act of courage and devotion.

I include an article regarding this act of heroism in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BOY'S HEROISM SAVES FAMILY IN HOME FIRE

A 10-year-old boy was credited with the heroic rescue of his family from their blazing Lancaster home early Saturday.

Young William Remaker was aided by two neighbors and county firemen in saving his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Darrell L. Barr, after he rescued his sister, Peggy, 5, and brother, Stanley, 2, by smashing a window and pushing them to safety.

The lad was awakened at midnight by smoke and heat from the blaze which apparently started by a smoldering cigarette in an overstuffed chair in the living room of the home at 45338 Genoa Avenue.

He said he aroused the two children and first carried Stanley to a bedroom window, broke the glass, ripped off the screen and pushed him outside before being forced to crawl outside because of the flames.

The boy was met by the neighbors. Tom R. Saiz, of 45341 Gadsden Street, and Fred H. Trimble, of 45347 Gadsden Street.

"I told them my sister and my father and mother were still in the house and to please help me save them," the boy related.

The men said they entered the living room after kicking in the front door but were driven back outside by the flames.

"When we got back to William, we found that he had gotten Peggy out the bedroom window. He said he crawled back in the house through the window and found her lying in the hallway," Saiz said.

Meanwhile, two county fire units arrived on the scene and firemen Fred Hahn and Bob Myer, wearing special breathing masks and protected from the flames by a shield of fine water spray, entered the house.

The firemen found Barr, 42, and his wife, Patricia, 31, unconscious on the living room floor. Hahn and Myer carried them outside and other firemen administered oxygen before they were taken to Antelope Valley Hospital with the three children.

The parents were reported in satisfactory condition after treatment for smoke inhalation. The children later were released to Mr. and Mrs. Saiz.

There were three other structural fires in Los Angeles County early Saturday.

A 42-year-old El Monte man was fatally burned when fire started in the Fowler Furniture factory, 15300 Arrow Highway, Baldwin Park, where he was employed.

The body of Charles Myrdahl, of 9723 Rio Hondo Parkway, was found in the office where he apparently had fallen asleep while smoking a cigarette.

An estimated $50,000 damage was caused when a two-alarm fire swept through several stores in a Panorama City shopping center in the 8400 block of Van Nuys Boulevard, shortly before 5:30 a.m.

The blaze, of undetermined origin, started inside a rear wall of a jewelry store at 8410 Van Nuys Boulevard and spread through a common attic of a group of five shops before being controlled after a half-hour battle by 12 city fire department units.

Police arson detectives sought the cause of another fire which gutted the Egyptian Gardens nightclub at 5521 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, shortly after 3 a.m.

Eight city fire department units fought the blaze which caused an estimated $25,000 damage to the interior of the nightclub.

Tax Cut Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial in the Humboldt (Kans.) Union writen by Malcolm Higgins, the editor and publisher:

TAX CUT NEEDED

This country needs a tax cut.

But it also needs a balanced budget. It needs to stop spending more money than it takes in.

There's only one way to do both of these two things.

Stop spending so much money on foolishness—on unneeded projects.

That means "Stop giving so much money to persons who would be better off without it."

We need a tax cut because too much of our money is going to the Federal Government—more of it every year—in income and excise taxes, in social security payments—even in postage.

We need a tax cut, too, because the Government is spending this money, or a large share of it, in doing for people what they ought to be doing for themselves.

Even worse, the Government is using some of this money to pay people to regulate our lives and to try to tell us what we can and cannot do. We need laws and law enforcement—but we don't need so much regulations and so many officials enforcing regulations.

Most of us would rather cut out so many regulations and have the tax money to spend.

But we don't need a tax cut like the one that has been proposed—a tax cut without cutting expenditures. This would only leave us "another day older and deeper in debt."

When the present cycle of spending and borrowing started there was a catch phrase "It won't hurt us to go in debt; we owe it to ourselves." That was so silly we forgot all about it. We forgot too much of it. We should have forgotten the last two words of the phrase and remembered only "We owe it."

It's not the Government or someone in Washington who is more than $250 billion in debt. We owe it.

Yes, let's cut taxes—but let's cut spending first—and enough so that we can do three things in this order:

1. Cut spending.
2. Cut the national debt.
3. And cut taxes.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

A Working Alliance Against the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Working Alliance Against the Reds," written by Mary Waters and published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of August 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORKING ALLIANCE AGAINST THE REDS

(By Mary Waters)

It's the Alliance for Progress versus communism in South America. Such was my impression during my recent tour of six major Latin American countries.

The alliance, as set forth in its charter, adopted at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in 1961, envisions a better way of life for the underprivileged of Latin America through peaceful development rather than violent, Marxist revolution. The theme of the alliance is: "Progress, Yes; Tyranny, No."

It proposes to raise the economic and social level of the people—over a 10-year period—through programs in tax and land reform, education, agriculture, housing, and health.

I had the opportunity to meet a great many people dedicated to translating the dream of the alliance into reality: Peace Corps volunteers, health and nutrition experts administering the food-for-peace program, sanitation engineers, housing experts, and more.

Hailing from big cities and small towns across America, these are people associated with U.S. aid programs in Latin America (all of which are now operating within the framework of the Alliance).

I talked to them in our embassies, in primitive, isolated Colombian villages; in "barriadas" (slum areas) on the outskirts of Lima, Peru; in Communist-infiltrated urban sectors near Santiago, Chile. I am filled with admiration and hope.

By attacking hunger, poverty and illiteracy, the human miseries on which communism feeds, they are helping to assure the freedom of the Western Hemisphere.

The movement, I discovered, is bolstered by a proposition of the United States to spend $20 billion in Latin America by 1970; to complement funds contributed by the participating countries, not to finance the Alliance totally.

Each country is required to submit a technical study outlining its needs, realistic plans for solving its problems, and a plan for financing proposed projects. The projects are of a self-help type, financed by at least a 50-percent contribution on the part of the Latin American Government.

In essence, the Alliance proclaims: Gone are the giveaway years; a new era of cooperative effort has begun.

In Colombia, where elaborate programs for the development of the country have been initiated by the Government since the Alliance was formed, I found amazing examples of what cooperative effort can accomplish.

An agrarian-reform law has been approved by the Colombian Congress, a price-stabilization program, a national system of supervised credit, an agricultural extension program, all have been initiated. Community-development programs have gone forward.

By the end of this year, upwards of 43,000 homes will have been constructed, more than 27,000 of them built by the owners themselves. I saw hundreds of houses going up brick upon brick with whole families joining in the effort—even the children.

Within a 4-year period 22,000 classrooms will have been constructed, financed on a 50-50 basis (half Colombian resources, half Alliance money). Roads are being built, again primarily by the people themselves, with technical advice and some grants or loans coming from the United States.

Where this is happening, the Alliance has already proved an effective deterrent to the spread of communism.

The incidence of Communist infiltration, I found, runs the gamut from widespread and potentially explosive in some areas to negligible and ineffective in others.

Here are some of the things I learned:

Castro, backed by Khrushchev, is not only supplying arms and a prodigious amount of money but also Moscow-trained leaders to guerrillas entrenched in Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru. (A man named Hugo Blanco, schooled in Moscow, is one of Peru's chief exponents of communism.) Castro's henchmen are agitating the peasants in northeastern Brazil to an alarming degree. And they are moving in on the slum dwellers of Chile.

In the universities of Peru—and to a certain extent in Argentina—some students think communism is the only way to solve their countries' problems.

Uruguay, where the Communist Party operates legally, is interestingly enough a bright spot. Communist activity there can be likened to a Fourth of July fireworks display, spectacular but hardly capable of setting the world on fire.

An overwhelming number of Latin Americans, Government officials, labor leaders, educators, and just ordinary folk are acutely aware of the danger communism holds for their countries. Now because of the Alliance each day more and more are being added to this list of responsible citizens.

Most of the Latin American countries have been so beset by political disturbances and economic crises that they have not been able to turn their full attention toward formulating the concrete plans necessary to put the Alliance in motion.

It's a vicious circle. The very conditions the Alliance hopes to correct; namely, ignorance and poverty, are in part resonsible for the Governments' difficulties. Add to this harassment by the Communists.

In Argentina, for instance, a $30,500,000 loan for road construction was announced the day of my arrival—the first time such a loan had been granted under the Alliance.

Argentina has had a drawing account of $130 million available for more than a year, but the Government has just got around to presenting some concrete plans.

In Brazil, the Alliance program has scarcely got off the ground. The Brazilian Government, however, has instituted programs to alleviate conditions in the poverty-stricken northeast sector. The U.S. food-for-peace program is in operation. The Peace Corps will soon have another contingent in the country (to work with the slum dwellers). But, in general, Brazil is the laggard (of the countries I visited) within the Alliance family.

Why should we concern ourselves at all with the well-being of Latin Americans? Even a Latin American, a charming Peruvian woman named Chabuca Granda couldn't quite answer this, but her words keep ringing in my ears:

"Some nations are good, but not strong enough. Some nations are strong but they are not good. You have both strength and goodness. We need your help, technically. It is not too late to make a country of my country. Someday—in 50 or 100 years—when there is equal opportunity for all in education, health, and work—such as you have, we will look something like you. I hope so."

Cuba Won't Go Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. WEAVER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the need for firmness in U.S. policy in dealing with the problems of the cold war and in particular our Cuban policy is of grave concern to all thinking peoples. As part of my remarks I include an editorial from the Record-Argus of Greenville, Pa. In my opinion this editorial strikes directly at the problem and pinpoints clearly and concisely the fact that present policy in this area has failed. We must have a strong, forthright policy. Throughout the years the Soviet Union has demonstrated a total lack of sincerity, and will continue to do so unless the United States, before it is too late, makes clear to the world at large that we will not tolerate further communistic inroads in the Western Hemisphere. The editorial follows:

CUBA WON'T GO AWAY

Times, the public is informed repeatedly, have changed in the Caribbean. No longer does the United States exert the influence and authority she once did. Some say it is because the United States overexercised her power in years past that it wanes today—but is that the reason?

It is true, when the Monroe Doctrine was in effect, that no European nation even considered establishing an empire in Latin America. It is also true that no Latin country ventured far outside its own borders in quest of political or territorial opportunism. Respect for Uncle Sam's big stick was the deterrent.

But those, some people say, were the bad old days. Uncle Sam had no business protecting his interests outside his own borders.

Today, the world's largest colonial power—the Soviet Union—has established a foothold

90 miles from the United States which becomes more permanent with each passing month. True, that opening wedge is costing Russia dearly (an estimated $1 million a day), but the price is cheap compared to the rewards to be gained.

Cuba is no longer just a symbol of Russian intervention. Already it has become the passageway to increased subversion and political infiltration throughout the region. Several countries, weakened seriously by internal chaos and domestic Communist agitation, are ripe targets for infiltration from Cuba.

Soviet leaders recently thumbed their noses at U.S. self-imposed impotency by invading British territory and kidnapping 10 anti-Castro refugees while U.S. jets flew routinely above the scene. All the more fantastic was the total lack of any effective action by either London or Washington to gain the release of the kidnapped men or erect barriers to prevent a reoccurrence.

Such petty acts of gangsterism can be expected to continue, and grow in intensity, as long as the United States continues to vacillate on the problem on its front doorstep. Destruction of American oil properties in Venezuela and the confiscation of American investments in Brazil are additional results of a policy which does not include any determined opposition to the cancer festering only a few miles away.

Isaac Don Levine Speaks Up on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on Monday, August 26, John Chamberlain in the New York Journal-American wrote a most interesting and informative column on Isaac Don Levine, author, journalist, and recognized authority on Russia. I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Additionally, Mr. President, I ask that following the Chamberlain statement there be printed in the RECORD an interview which the editors of U.S. News & World Report had with Isaac Don Levine following his recent visit to Russia where Mr. Levine spent about a month visiting the people and the projects of that country.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal-American, Aug. 26, 1963]

A REAL HARBINGER OF SOVIET THAW?

(By John Chamberlain)

Isaac Don Levine, who has written for many years on Russian affairs, returned from the Soviet Union the other day and, though he is a journalist interested in marketing his own product, he submitted to a couple of interviews about his trip. He had much of a newsworthy nature to tell.

But quite aside from the things he had to say, the fact that "they"—meaning the Kremlin and the Soviet Politburo—let Levine, who speaks a fluent Russian, walk for miles through the streets of cities like Kiev and Tiflis without being shadowed is a prime bit of evidence that the post-Stalin "thaw" in Russian life is real.

Letting Levine into Russia and giving him freedom to circulate is almost, but not quite, the equivalent of letting, say, a Whittaker Chambers make the same sort of trip. For it was Don Levine who, often laboring in great disrepute with pro-Soviet American liberals, nursed the spark of opposition to everything connected with Stalin, from the 1920's up to the very recent past.

I first met Don in the early 1930's, when I, as a gullible innocent, was inclined to think the "Russian experiment," as it was then called in "liberal" circles, might prove a practicable alternative to democratic capitalism.

We both lived on Bank Street, in New York's Greenwich Village, in those days. I would run into Don on the street corner, and he would twit me with his amusing sarcasms.

He told me he had turned against the Bolsheviks when they savagely suppressed the rebellion of the Kronstadt sailors at the very outset of the revolution. The Communists, he said, had stolen money from the Sacco-Vanzetti defense fund. As for Stalin, Levine said he was a combination of old-fashioned Tammany Hall boss and Chicago gangster.

In the course of time, Don Levine became a major part of my education. He persisted in making telling blows against the idea of a "popular front" with the Russians in the thirties. It was Don Levine who took Whittaker Chambers to Adolf Berle in the State Department at the outset of World War II. Chambers, then loath to stick the tag of "traitor" on anybody, told Berle about "Marxist study groups" inside the Government which, in view of the existence of a Nazi-Soviet agreement, should be carefully watched. Berle, so the story goes, was pooh-poohed when he submitted the gist of the Chambers interview to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Don Levine was the man who, practically singlehanded, started conservative magazine journalism on its way to a comeback in the United States.

With money put up by Alfred Kohlberg, an importer of goods from China, who had been duped once too often by the believers in Mao Tse-tung as a "Jeffersonian agrarian reformer," Don Levine started a little magazine called Plain Talk. He pulled an important news beat when he exposed the so-called Amerasia case, which indicated that all was not well in the State Department security circles.

Plain Talk kept up a running fire of opposition to the Teheran and Yalta agreements with Stalin. It exposed Communist manipulation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It could have been accused of "McCarthyism"—and this long before the country had heard of Joe McCarthy—save for the fact that no one could question the accuracy of even its smallest detail.

In time, Plain Talk gave way to other conservative magazines, most of which used editors and writers who had worked with Don Levine. Don himself went off into bookwriting.

He exposed the true identity of "Frank Jacson," the Stalinist Spaniard who assassinated Leon Trotsky.

When I first knew Don, he was already the author of a nonadoring biography of Stalin. He brought this up to date not so long ago with another book that gave evidence for believing that Stalin, before the Bolshevik revolution, had been a double agent, working for the czar's secret police as well as for the Bolshevik Party.

This is the man whom Khrushchev recently let into Russia with carte blanche to look about him as he more or less pleased. Whether it is true, as Levine speculates, that the month of June 1963 may mark a real turn for the better in East-West relations, Levine's own visit to Russia can be taken as an indication that Khrushchev's anti-Stalinism is real.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 26, 1963]

Question. Mr. Levine, what's going on in Russia? What is your impression after this latest trip there?

Answer. Looking back on the month of June 1963, I figure this may have marked a real turning point in the history of the cold war—a turn for the better in relations between East and West.

I just can't help feeling that the undercurrents in Russia today promise far more relief to the West than anything that has happened since the death of Stalin.

Question. Why do you say that?

Answer. It isn't just one thing. After 30 days of intensive traveling—seeing, talking with people—it's the total impression that one comes up with.

If you want me to put my finger on a few things: The atmosphere has changed. Although I felt under constant observation in hotels and restaurants, I was never followed during miles and miles of walking the streets of the big cities of Russia. The sense of oppression and terror that was so common in the time of Stalin has faded, to a marked degree.

Question. But how do such things make June a significant turning point in Soviet relations with the West?

Answer. As we all know, things hadn't been going too well for Mr. Khrushchev.

There was the Chinese challenge to Moscow's authority that, somehow, had to be met head on. There was the Berlin ultimatum that had become a dead issue. There was the backdown over the missiles in Cuba.

It may be that there were one or two other things—for instance, the economy. The economy of Russia today is not at all what Khrushchev said it would be 6 years ago.

The Russian agricultural wagon is stuck in the same muddy rut. In the last 5 years, the food situation has not improved an iota. There is still a chronic shortage of meat. There are still frequent shortages of milk, even in the cities.

Khrushchev is supposed to be the great reformer who could bring about a solution to the food problem—but he hasn't.

But, in June, Khrushchev seemed to consolidate his power. Then he could announce that the woman cosmonaut—Valentina Tereshkova—had been in orbit and had returned. This was a tremendous coup for Khrushchev's prestige, worldwide.

So June was Khrushchev's hour of triumph—and also, in my opinion, his hour of opportunity. I think that is one of the reasons he seized upon the atom test ban issue. As a very alert politician, he figured that the timing was right for him to go ahead with this and get credit for a gesture toward world peace. Remember, the Russian people are almost obsessed with a fear of war.

Question. Do you think this test ban treaty is regarded by the Russians as an achievement, rather than a concession, on the part of Khrushchev?

Answer. Oh, an achievement—undoubtedly.

Question. Why?

Answer. Because—well, first of all, the fear of war in Russia is universal and ever present. Anything at all that the head of government can do to make a dent in that fear—to allay it, somewhat—is in itself an act that immediately gives him popularity.

Also, there is the ideological conflict with the Chinese. The fact that Khrushchev could claim to give the masses of the world—in Africa, in Latin America and Asia as well as Russia and the Western World—some relief from the fear of fallout pulled the rug out from under the Chinese Communists.

By rivaling Moscow for Communist leadership, Mao Tse-tung was jockeyed into the position of heading a war party, and Khrushchev was the man of peace. So with whom is Mao left? A bunch of fanatics, crackpots, hairsplitting Marxists. That's about all. To the Communist world, Khrushchev has demonstrated that peace is not only a slogan with him but something that's more substantial—he's willing to take a step, at least, in that direction.

Question. You mean that's the image he managed to create in Russia?

Answer. Yes, Russia—and elsewhere among Communists.

Question. Would you say Khrushchev is in solid? Isn't there opposition to him within the Kremlin?

Answer. No. I arrived in Russia with the preimpression, shall we say, that there was an effective opposition. But I left with the conviction that, if there had been a political opposition to him several months ago, it has since been completely crushed. Khrushchev is riding high.

I talked with a great number of important people on this point and they all come to the same conclusion: There is no effective opposition or political resistance to Khrushchev's leadership now.

Question. Does this extend to the ordinary Russian, too—the so-called man in the street?

Answer. This is a different thing. I think Khrushchev, himself, is not adored or admired by the masses. You see, he's one of them. And the Russians like to treat a leader as if he were inaccessible—far above them.

Question. Don't people like his wisecracks, his earthy humor?

Answer. They don't like his familiarity. The old saying that "familiarity breeds contempt" is particularly apt in the case of the Russian charwoman, or waiter, or chauffeur—in their attitude toward Khrushchev. They don't admire his common touch—the fact that he talks and acts like one of them.

But if you ask such people, "Whom would you prefer?" there is no one. They would vote for Khrushchev at the drop of a hat.

KHRUSHCHEV'S NEW ERA

Question. Why? Because there isn't anyone else?

Answer. The fact that they do not like his mannerisms, the fact that he doesn't live up to the image of a great leader—these things do not mean that the common people don't recognize that Khrushchev has brought them a new era.

Question. In what way? Didn't you say that he had failed to make Russia what he said it would be?

Answer. I mean that, after all, the Stalin period is looked upon by nearly everybody as a kind of a nightmare. They lived through a nightmare. Now I would say that, in the hearts and minds of most of the people, Khrushchev gets credit for ending that nightmare—that terror.

Question. Doesn't he get blamed for having been a part of it?

Answer. Well, he doesn't get blamed publicly—there's no place where such blame could be voiced, you know. Maybe in private conversation some people who know what he did under Stalin will blame him. But mostly there is just relief that it's over, and Khrushchev is the beneficiary of that.

You have to realize that there isn't what you'd call a hot political atmosphere in Russia.

Question. What do you mean?

Answer. The people's concern with the daily food problem really occupies all their spare hours outside of their work.

The political diet that they get constantly through blaring radios, through television, through the press, is so overwhelming that they welcome a chance to escape from it. They don't have the energy, the relaxation, to indulge in political discussions. That goes even for such phenomenal events as the flight of the woman cosmonaut.

Question. Weren't they impressed by that?

Answer. We were in Kiev on the day that the announcement came that the woman, Tereshkova, had joined Cosmonaut [Valery F.] Bykovsky in orbit. We were in this modern hotel. There must have been 150 couples there dining and dancing—enjoying themselves. In the course of the evening we sat and chatted with many people——

Question. Do you speak Russian, Mr. Levine?

Answer. Fluently. People tell me I speak it without an accent. Many times I was taken for a Russian.

Question. Well, you were saying——

Answer. That night we—my wife and I—chatted with many people. And you know, no one talked about Tereshkova. I think my wife and I were far more excited about it than they.

Question. What do you make of that indifference—that disinterest?

Answer. They had heard it on the radio in their offices. They heard it on the way home. The evening newspapers had it. They got it when they got home. They were going to get it tomorrow morning. They were going to get it for the next 5 days. It would be coming out of their ears. It's that Government diet of propaganda that is fed to them constantly, without a letup.

When they got out for an evening—had a chance to have a hotel meal and maybe a good bottle of wine—that was an occasion. They weren't going to let any Government stuff interfere with their private enjoyment.

I asked somebody to explain the lack of excitement over the woman cosmonaut, and do you know what he said? He said, "Well, what do you want us to do?"

They get that sort of thing so much, it's a forced diet. So when they get a chance to escape from it, they escape. That's the only explanation I have.

Question. You were talking earlier about the farm problem in the Soviet Union. Is Khrushchev going to be able to solve that one?

Answer. There is a growing conviction among Communist leaders that something drastic will have to be done about the agricultural program.

I expect Khrushchev, if his foreign policy succeeds in lessening world tension, to face up to the farm problem—maybe by decollectivizing in a limited degree. After all, Poland has decollectivized 85 or 87 percent. So has Yugoslavia. Khrushchev knows that, and they're both Communist countries, as his is.

Question. But isn't collectivized farming almost untouchable dogma in the Soviet Union?

Answer. Yes, it is. It would take an awfully big and brave man to bring up, in the Soviet Union, the subject of decollectivization.

Question. Then how could it be done?

Answer. They just don't talk about it. But there are ways. Perhaps by enlarging certain farming sectors for private enterprise, to give more private acreage to the collective farmers. If a market were set aside in each big city for the peasants to sell part of their produce for themselves, that would be one way.

GERMANY AND A-TEST BAN

Question. Mr. Levine, going back to this test ban treaty for a moment: Do you think it will stick? Are the Russians serious, sincere about it?

Answer. I should say that, if there is no solution of the German problem, the odds are that the Russians will use the escape clause and resume testing.

Question. Is Germany that important to them?

Answer. To them, the nub of the entire international situation is Germany.

I should say that the concession they have made on a test ban treaty—and, in my opinion it is a concession on their part—is in the hope and expectation that the West will be able to solve the German problem to the satisfaction of the Soviet Union.

Question. Solve it how?

Answer. I think Khrushchev is influenced and motivated by the fear of a future Germany—a fear that both the Russian Communists and non-Communists, the hierarchy, and the masses, share. To some extent, they are victims of their own propaganda.

They have sold themselves on the idea that Germany is a potential nuclear power. All the arguments to the contrary are of no avail when you talk with Russians about it.

So I do not think that this test ban agreement is going to stick unless it is followed up by some sort of agreement—not immediately, maybe, but step by step—some sort of agreement that will resolve the question of Germany and Berlin to the satisfaction of the Russians.

I think it can be said without fear of contradiction that the fear of Germany is the overriding complex of the Russians—all Russians.

Scratchpadding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial which appeared in the Times-Press, Hartford, Wis., on September 5, 1963, under the heading of "Scratchpadding."

The editorial truly expresses sound grassroots thinking relative to H.R. 7152, "that legislative Trojan horse known as the Civil Rights Act of 1963," and in my judgment clearly points out that the constitutional rights of all Americans should be protected and that none of those rights should be abridged, as is called for in the pending legislation. I might also add that industry in Wisconsin is sick and tired of being harassed by various departments of the Federal Government calling to ascertain the color of their employees.

The editorial begins by referring to trial by jury in the peacetime history of the United States, and continues:

This is one of the more important (and least publicized) aspects of S. 1731 and H.R. 7152—that legislative "Trojan horse" known as the Civil Rights Act of 1963. In this bill, the dictatorial Federal control of business, industry, individual citizens and the "sovereign" States is disguised as protection of racial and religious minorities.

Under this insidious bill, the judgment of Federal inspectors, appointed to bring about social reforms, would supersede our traditional and constitutional judicial processes. Through the sly device of eliminating criminal penalties, those who drew the bill have set it up so that a violator of the public accommodations section (title II) would be hailed without hearing before a judge and placed under Federal injunction to cease and desist whatever act of discrimination the Federal overseer may have charged him with. And the penalty would be fine and imprison-

ment for contempt of court—from which there is no appeal.

Given this cloak of civil rights, the President would thus have raw, unchallenged power. Similarly, under provisions of the bill, Federal control would be extended to every home, every school, every business, every bank, and to every citizen who owns property or casts a vote. The President—or his political appointees—would have the power to tell the owners of every business whom they may hire, fire, promote or demote; to call, refuse or foreclose loans; to exclude individuals and businesses from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits; to blacklist banks, contractors, schools, businesses, and individuals. Give that a little thought.

As one critic has said, "The administration's bill proposes, in effect, that the Congress abdicate, and turn its legislative powers over to the White House. The powers here demanded are not the powers rightfully the powers to be exercised by a president in a free country. These are the powers of a despot."

No citizen, whatever his color, race or religion—for this extends to all races and creeds—should need further urging to demand of his Senators (both of them) and his Representative that they vote down both of these bills—kill it all.

J. Edward Day Was Great Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, during the 2½ years that Mr. J. Edward Day was Postmaster General, I served on the Senate Postoffice and Civil Service Committee, which considered all postal legislation coming before the Senate during Mr. Day's term of office.

During my 6 years and more of service on the Postoffice and Civil Service Committee, I have made some study of the history of the Post Office Department. Based upon what I have learned and my observations and study, I am of the opinion that this Nation has never had a greater Postmaster General than J. Edward Day. I think he was the greatest in our history. In my opinion he could fill any Cabinet position with ability and success.

J. Edward Day was one of the finest of a number of very fine and able administrators appointed by President John F. Kennedy. His record will long be a challenge to other Postmaster Generals, and, indeed, to all Cabinet officers.

Mr. President, in today's Washington Daily News Mr. John Cramer has ably and succintly enumerated many of Mr. Day's accomplishments, in his brief 2½-year tenure as Postmaster General.

Mr. President, I think this brief enumeration of many of Mr. Day's accomplishments worthy of presentation in the permanent archives of the legislative branch of our Government, as a testimonial to a brilliant and honest administrator who has brought new luster to the Federal service. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cramer's article in today's issue—September 11—of the Washington Daily News, entitled: "Day's Record Will Be Hard To Match," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAY'S RECORD WILL BE HARD TO MATCH

(By John Cramer)

I greet Mr. John A. Gronouski, the Postmaster General-designate with the cheerful word that he'll have to step lively, indeed, to match the shining record of his predecessor, the recently resigned J. Edward Day.

On all-around performance, including notable contributions to postal efficiency, Mr. Day assuredly must rank with the greatest of all Postmasters General. When the final word is in, he may well be at the very top.

And in one particular field—employee relations, human relations, if you please—the word already is in, Beyond any doubt, Mr. Day was the greatest.

DID MORE

In his brief 2½ years in office, he did more to improve the working conditions of the 580,000 postal employees than all his 57 predecessors combined.

Moreover, he made it work in terms which even the most conservative Members of Congress can understand. During his time, postal employee productivity increased faster than ever before.

An early star in Mr. Day's crown was his membership on the task force which drafted President Kennedy's labor-management program for U.S. workers. The program is a milestone, whose full impact, though yet to be measured, is certain to be enormous.

But consider, in addition, these other things Mr. Day did to improve working conditions and fringe benefits for postal employees.

He gave them the first real merit promotion system in the history of the postal service.

Government-supplied tool kits for motor vehicle maintenance employees who previously had to supply their own. (Originally, the cost of these kits was placed at $275. In volume, it has dropped to $145.)

Government-supplied overcoats for mail handlers assigned to outside duty.

A big increase in the number of mail handlers working as group leaders, at level 4, instead of the level 3 nonsupervisory grade.

A drive-out allowance for city letter carriers who must drive their own cars and mail sacks to the beginning points of their routes.

New rules allowing postmasters to take Saturday off (previously not allowed) when auxiliary help is available, plus special provision for auxiliary help on special occasions.

Speeded up programs of modernization, including air conditioning and lighting, in older post offices.

Grade promotions from level 4 to level 5 for 1,700 so-called city carrier technicians who fill in on mail routes while regular carriers are off duty. Eventually, the number of carrier technicians will reach 17,000.

Greatly increased extra allowances for rural carriers assigned to heavy-duty routes.

Saturday off, if auxiliary help is available, for rural carriers on heavy-duty routes.

An open door policy allowing level 3 mail carriers to qualify for level 4 clerical and carrier jobs by passing noncompetitive exams. Previously, their only route to these jobs was through competitive tests.

Government-supplied uniforms for clerks assigned to window duty.

Numerous additions to the list of items Government supplies as part of its uniform allowance for city carriers.

Forward-looking new labor relations agreements negotiated with most of the Department's unions at the national level—plus additional thousands of agreements at the local level.

New adverse action and grievance appeals systems beyond any doubt are the best and fairest in Government. These systems are bona fide Government labor relations landmarks in themselves.

That's the impressive record hung up by Mr. Day.

Our new Mr. Gronouski follows in great footsteps.

News Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr BATES. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a new form of news management has been introduced by Washington. If permitted to go unchecked it could very well spell the beginning of the end of a free press in the United States.

This new method is the establishment of a Government news wire service under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. This wire service will undertake to disseminate news across the Nation. The dangers inherent in this operation are well defined in an editorial which recently appeared in the Salem (Mass.) Evening News.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD.

FREEDOM ENDANGERED

Free speech and freedom of the press are basic to the continuation of traditional American liberty. Let the independence of the press be threatened by open or devious means and we are in trouble—in danger of losing our precious personal freedom which is the envy of countless millions of enslaved peoples around this war-weary world.

Government by decree, secret decisions and hidden pressure to force compliance with bureaucratic whims and to silence the "opposition," are thwarted by an alert and unrestricted press—but they lie dormant nonetheless, ready to spring into action wherever and whenever the people fail to keep vigilant watch over their heritage of free speech, free enterprise, freedom of the press.

The slightest encroachment upon American freedom should be the signal for immediate action. Events of the past half century bear graphic evidence of the truth of this necessity. Freedom has been lost in one conquered land after another—under the heel of Hitler, the cruelty of Stalin, the malignity of Castro, as truth was suppressed and the minds of the people deceived and deluded by a controlled press.

It must not happen here—but wait. The Federal Government is moving in this direction. It has inaugurated a wire news service in direct competition with established privately owned news agencies. The fact that this new enterprise, using a nationwide leased-wire teletype network, disseminates agricultural news should not be permitted to becloud the issue.

Here is a Government operated bureau which competes with the existing PAM News Corp. and does so at great disadvantage to the latter. Taxpayers defray the cost of newsgathering and the information is supplied to customers free of charge. How can free enterprise survive under this form of subsidized competition?

The implied demand that such information be accorded "favorable" treatment by subscribers is seen in the hint that any found using the information in a manner not to the Federal sponsor's liking will have the service canceled.

Says the Department of Agriculture: "In fact, even aside from the news media the USDA does not expect that it will be necessary to cancel service to any individual subscribers."

That phrase, "even aside from the news media," is meaningful in the extreme. Newspapers better watch out or they may be shut off from Agriculture Department news: what else could it mean?

This is a dangerous precedent-setting move on the part of those who would like to control all the news from every Federal department, so that what eventually is promulgated is not "truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" but propaganda, favorable to those in power.

Opposition should be instant and overwhelming.

Military Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "RANDOLPH, FULBRIGHT Eye Military Funds." The article was written by Thomas F. Stafford.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RANDOLPH, FULBRIGHT EYE MILITARY FUNDS

(By Thomas F. Stafford)

WASHINGTON.—For the past generation America has been preoccupied with power. Its maor energies have been dedicated to an enormously costly but eminently successful struggle against foreign aggression.

While this global effort has been necessary, there has been a tendency among the American people to lose sight of the character and quality of the society they had hoped to create as a result of their dedication to power.

A group of Senators—among them JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, has begun to question whether we shouldn't pause and reassess our position.

RANDOLPH wonders about our military policies. Aren't we, he asks, spending entirely too much on fabricating a superior military machine when we already have a nuclear stockpile capable of overkilling the population of the entire world?

Today, he says, Russia and the United States alone have nuclear weapons with an explosive power of 60 billion tons of TNT—enough to put a 10-ton bomb at the head of every human being on earth. Yet, in spite of this capacity, the world continues to spend at the rate of $100 billion annually on military buildup.

FULBRIGHT looks at our plans to put a man on the moon at a cost of $20 billion and observes that since expert opinion agrees the moon has no foreseeable value as a military base we are doing this more as a prestige gesture than for tangible benefits we might derive from the venture.

He then gets to the nub of both his and RANDOLPH's arguments in asking, "Are there not other factors involved in our prestige and self-esteem, such as our capacity to employ and educate, to house and transport our own people?"

The human mind does not readily grasp the significance of expenditures in $100 billion or $20 billion lots. When you take the latter and reduce it to more meaningful terms, you find that it amounts to the spending of $5.5 million a day. This, in figures the West Virginian can comprehend, is a fourth of the cost of the most recent school building program in Kanawha County (largest ever attempted in West Virginia) and almost as much as we spend annually statewide for mental health.

"It is my conviction," says RANDOLPH, "that the security of our country rests on economic and political, as well as on military competence. Unsurpassed military power in combination with areas of grave economic weakness is not a manifestation of sound security policy."

What he says is that we will do as much for national security by finding solutions for our unemployment and educational dilemmas as we will by storing more nuclear bombs in our military arsenal.

The American economy of the 1960's is fueled by scientists, technicians, and highly skilled workers. The unskilled worker is rapidly becoming superfluous as a factor of production, and this untrained, poorly educated person—of whom there are 50,000 in West Virginia and 4 million nationwide—is being committed to a life of agonizing idleness.

Under such conditions, the prospects are bleak for the 42 percent of all American teenagers who fail to complete high school. There is no longer a western frontier for them. They find themselves imprisoned by a system that neither needs their energies nor wants to pay adequately for their reeducation.

The Randolph-Fulbright group has no solution for this tragic problem. But they at least are beginning to look more closely at military spending, which amounts to about 50 percent of the Federal budget. If they have their way, Congress no longer will write a blank check for the generals and admirals.

Sputnik and Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a most important article, "Sputnik and Fish," by Columnist Charles Bartlett, as it appeared in the Boston Globe Monday.

The American commercial fisherman has always prided himself on the most rugged type of individualism and enterprise. His daily lot has always included disproportionate amounts of hard work, tough competition, scant rewards, and great personal hazards. He has faced these problems with little help from anyone. He has seldom asked for anything and seldom received it. And he has seldom been heard to complain.

Now, however, because of a rapid advance of technology, inflated costs, and a series of more unique circumstances, he finds his future and the future of the fishing industry in this country in grave doubt.

The American fishing industry, which in the past few years has dropped from second to fifth ranking among the nations of the world, has reached a point where without some program of governmental assistance it may well cease to exist.

The seriousness of the problem has been dramatized and aggravated in the past few years by the appearance, in force, of giant foreign fleets on fishing grounds that have traditionally been American. The most aggressive of these intruders in American waters has been the Soviet Union, whose oversized trawlers and factory ships have undertaken a program of systematic exploitation of these valuable natural resources.

Through sheer size and weight of numbers they have come to dominate the offshore Atlantic fisheries. The economic impact is already being felt in my district, but this is a problem of national scope and deserves the attention of every Member of Congress concerned with our economic survival.

Several measures are before the Congress that are aimed at improving this situation. I urge every Member to read the following article by Mr. Bartlett, which is a concise but very good outline of the problem, and to support in every way possible the legislative program that would protect our fisheries and bolster our fleets:

SPUTNIK AND FISH—SOVIET POACHING OFF SHORE MAY PROD UNITED STATES INTO ACTION TO SAVE A VITAL INDUSTRY

(By Charles Bartlett)

WASHINGTON.—The reaction to the Soviet fishing armadas off both coasts seems likely to stimulate this country's concern with its fishing industry in somewhat the same way that sputnik brought attention to bear on the space effort.

The intrusion of the fleets within the 3-mile territorial limits has prompted Congress to a move, with a support of the State Department, that would attach stiff penalties to such poaching.

Concurrence on the inadequacy of the present prohibitions is broad enough to portend that the bill will be passed swiftly.

This country will decide soon whether to follow the example of some 40 nations including Canada in extending the fishing restrictions in its territorial waters from the traditional 3 to 12 miles.

In either case the new law will serve to keep these visiting fleets a respectable distance off-shore and lessen the immediate concern.

But the new law will not, as its sponsors concede, answer the basic threat to the American fishing industry that is implicit in these foreign fleets with their great mother ships, advanced trawling equipment, and coordinated efficiency.

The clear implication of these fleets is a present in which the American fishing industry is falling behind and a future in which it will be unable to compete at all.

It is not merely a matter of Russia, although that country's expansion of its fleet has been the most dramatic fact of the new era.

Nations like Japan, Canada, Peru, and even Ghana have also been launching modern fishing vessels during a period of steady decline in new construction in the United States.

Subsequently the fish catch has risen only slightly in the United States while it was doubling in the world as a whole.

This country now relies with increasing emphasis on imports for its fish supply.

Established processing plants are obliged to turn to foreign sources or face the shortages which now afflict processors in traditional centers like Gloucester and New Bedford.

The number of fishermen and fishing boats is decreasing and the industry as a whole is a dwindling operation.

The essential cause of the decline is the inability of the industry to attract the capital necessary to acquire modern boats and equipment. Fishing flourished in this country as a rugged exercise of private initiative but the cost of the new equipment is beyond the reach of the small entrepreneurs and unappealing to the large corporate investors. Uncompetitive labor costs and the high insurance charges on crew members have been factors in this lack of investment appeal.

A major deterrent to new construction has been a law, on the books since 1792, which forbids the landing of fish in American ports from vessels that were not built in American shipyards.

Since modern steel boats can be obtained abroad at savings as high as 50 percent, the fishermen confront a unique handicap.

The U.S. costs of new construction $450,000 for a modern trawler, $740,000 for a tuna clipper, and up to $8 million for a factory processing ship. There are awesome figures.

The impact of the foreign fleets has spurred a congressional move to correct the construction handicap.

The Senate Commerce Committee is preparing to report a bill that would offer $10 million a year in subsidies for new fishing vessels. Payments up to 55 percent of the cost of a boat would be made directly to the shipyard under the supervision of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Another proposal, which has gained less momentum, would enable the government to build two modern stern-ramp trawlers at a probable cost of $7 million each. These vessels would be leased to established fishing companies with the purpose of proving their worth and inducing private investors to contemplate similar construction.

The case for these bills, and for a further proposal to grant $5 million a year to the States for fisheries research, rests upon a proposition that the American fishing industry is worth saving at the price of Government subsidy.

This is a knotty issue because the fisherman's tradition of self-reliance is strong but his prospects have been severely limited by the aggressive fishing policies of other governments.

Textile Pact Held Danger to U.S. Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the recently announced United States-Japan textile arrangement has caused great concern in this Nation because of its further threat to American textile workers. It appears to many of us to be unconscionable that we should have foisted upon us a further increase in the quantity of foreign-made textiles at a time when our own people are so troubled about our past experience in this connection.

In the Charlotte Observer, on September 10, 1963, a news story filed by the Associated Press reported the reaction of the president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of America (AFL-CIO) to the new arrangement. The apprehension expressed by Mr. Jacob S. Petofsky is well founded, in my opinion. This same degree of apprehension is shared by many of us.

Under unanimous consent, I include the news story as a part of the Appendix of the RECORD for today:

TEXTILE PACT HELD DANGER TO U.S. JOBS

NEW YORK.—A union leader said Monday that a recent pact allowing increased Japanese cotton textile imports may mean more unemployment for U.S. clothing workers.

Jacob S. Petofsky said the United States-Japanese agreement foreshadowed "further disruption and unemployment in the United States as low-wage countries drive for an increased share of the U.S. apparel market."

Petofsky is general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of America (AFL-CIO).

The pact allows Japan to export 3 percent more cotton textile products to the United States next year and 5 percent more in 1965. It was signed August 27 in Washington.

"This increase permits substantial increases in categories already suffering from undue concentration of imports," said Petofsky in a statement.

The agreement on 1963 Japanese cotton sets imports at 287.5 million square yards, about the same as Japan's 1962 quota.

The Brooklyn Philharmonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many, the departure for points west of the Brooklyn Dodgers left the borough bereft of any organization in which its citizens could take singular pride. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Indeed, Brooklyn is a community which can boast of numerous cultural and educational organizations which would compare favorably with those in cities of similar size. One of the most distinguished of these is the Brooklyn Philharmonia, the borough's own professional symphony orchestra, which this coming season celebrates its 10th anniversary.

The growth of the Philharmonia over the years has been amazing. From a handful of subscribers in its first year, each concert now draws near capacity houses of 2,200 at the Brooklyn Academy of Music.

This rapid growth can be attributed to the leadership provided by the officers and board members of the Philharmonia and to the excellence of its musical director, Siegfried Landau, and the outstanding artists who comprise this magnificent musical aggregation.

From its very beginnings, those who directed the destinies of the Brooklyn Philharmonia recognized the need to bring symphonic music to our young people, boys and girls who could derive enormous cultural benefits from exposure to virtuoso presentations.

The Philharmonia gives a Saturday matinee Youth Concert series for children of elementary school age and conduct an annual Youth Music Contest for brilliant young instrumentalists in the borough. Both programs are sponsored by the Women's Committee of the Philharmonia.

In 1962, New York City took cognizance of the Philharmonia's efforts in this area by awarding the organization a grant of $40,000 which enabled the orchestra to give a special series of nine free concerts, attended by more than 20,000 junior high and high school students.

These presentations were eminently successful, and again this year, the city has awarded the orchestra a like amount for a second series for young people. As was the case last year, the concert program will be arranged in cooperation with the New York City Board of Education.

The Philharmonia serves the musical needs of the borough on other levels as well. For example, through the Brooklyn Philharmonia Choral Society, it encourages community participation in music-making, and through its Junior Patrons it brings the teenager into direct contact with the cultural life of the borough.

The Philharmonia's 10th anniversary season will be exciting in more ways than one. On December 2, the orchestra has been invited to appear in Philharmonic Hall at Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts to give a concert for the benefit of the Lincoln Center Student Fund.

In furnishing pleasure to tens of thousands of persons—young and old—the Philharmonia has made its mark in the cultural life of Brooklyn, and the support the community has given this great organization has been richly deserved.

I would like to offer my personal tribute to Max L. Koeppel, president of the Brooklyn Philharmonia, and the other officers of the symphony: David Teitelbaum, chairman of the board; Bernard S. Barr, John C. Hilly, the Honorable Leonard P. Moore and Rabbi Eugene J. Sack, all vice presidents; Morris Kirsch, treasurer and Dr. Henry H. Mouradian, secretary; Siegfried Landau, a musician of great stature who conducts the Philharmonia and the many devoted citizens of Brooklyn whose interest and support have made "an orchestra grow in Brooklyn."

As the Brooklyn Philharmonia marks its 10th anniversary year, I am confident that the orchestra will continue to enhance its already notable reputation in the years ahead.

Robert E. Jones, of Alabama, Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]

has been singularly honored by the National Association of Counties.

The association, at its 28th annual conference in Denver, adopted a resolution commending our friend. Since this is one of the very few times the organization has singled out an individual Member of Congress for commendation, the honor to the distinguished gentleman represents high, but deserved, praise.

Those of us who know BOB JONES and his service, however, are not surprised, and I am sure we share with the Nation's county officials their appreciation of his splendid service.

The resolution follows:

The National Association of Counties commends the House of Representatives, Government Operations Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, under the chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, JR., of Alabama, for their continuing and effective leadership in studying and appraising the national water pollution control program.

Remarks of Robert Moses at the Opening of the First Golf Course at Marine Park, Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under consent previously granted, I insert in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Robert Moses at the opening of the first golf course at beautiful Marine Park in Brooklyn, N.Y. In our time, this man, Robert Moses, has contributed more than any other individual to the building of the city of New York. His vision and tenacity have achieved modern miracles ranging from the development of New York's tremendous traffic arteries above and below the land and water to the transformation of swamps and refuse heaps into spacious parks and game refuges. We certainly owe him a debt of gratitude for these accomplishments.

His remarks follow:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES AT THE OPENING OF THE FIRST GOLF COURSE AT MARINE PARK, BROOKLYN, AUGUST 27, 1963

Marine Park will be the largest single park in the city—bigger than Pelham Bay.

Much of my 27 years as city park commissioner went into the establishment of the Jamaica Bay and Rockaway park system which is now more than half completed. The concept was simple enough. It was certainly comprehensive, in the sense that this overworked word is used in planning patter. It encompassed two toll bridges, clearance of a seaside slum back of the Rockaway boardwalk, rebuilding the boardwalk, elevation of the railroad through the Rockaway Peninsula, purchase of the Long Island Railroad trestle and tracks and their conversion to rapid transit, transfer of thousands of acres of islands and water in Jamaica Bay to the park department as a gigantic game refuge unequaled within the boundaries of any big city in the world, filling meadowland north of the bay with sanitation material not otherwise disposable, pumping in sand, manufacturing synthetic topsoil for landscaping, the reclamation of Norton's Basin, and other objectives. All this took support and money, public and private, State and local, from many sources. It was not done by magic or rhetoric. It represented sustained, undeviating effort over a long period.

The story that Jamaica Bay, its shores, islands and waters, including the Atlantic littoral, have been neglected is the invention of invincible ignorance. In any other community what has been done here and is well underway should be a source of immense civic pride and advertised far and wide as an extraordinary achievement in conservation and recreation, something to be envied and imitated.

The indisputable record, which will be accepted when time gives its verdict, is that those who were responsible in the last 30 years for saving Jamaica Bay and its shores and for reclaiming Rockaway, met their obligations, to the extent that they could get support, were ahead of most of their contemporaries and are more deserving of public recognition than the Johnny-Come-Latelies who were never visible when the going was tough, but know just how it ought to have been done.

I may add that the story of progress in preserving ocean and bay parks is almost identical on the Staten Island South Shore and at Coney, Brighton, and Manhattan Beaches.

I found out long ago that only time wounds the sour critics with their sharp tongues and acid stomachs. They screamed for saving the Jamaica Bay islands and marshes from industrial and port development and for inviting and protecting wild birdlife instead, but when the battle was won they shouted that this game refuge was no good for active recreation.

Some time ago my friend Herbert Bayard Swope was asked by an eager beaver, "What is the formula for success?" Herb replied thoughtfully, "I don't know the rule for success but I know the sure recipe for failure—try to please everybody."

Only in New York do we hide and apologize for our achievements and fail constantly to remind the rising generation that ours is indeed no mean city. I urge that this entire Jamaica Bay and Rockaway program to which the city has long been committed, involving lands already publicly owned, including the total elimination of pollution of the bay by raw or half-treated sewage, be carried out without delay, diversion, or controversy. No doubt further extensions and improvements are desirable, but let us finish what we have so ambitiously begun. It will take all the resources we can muster.

People speak of Jones Beach and Western Fire Island as if such parks were built in a day. We began Jones Beach in 1926 and Western Fire Island in 1924. Jones Beach is not finished yet, and Western Fire Island will come into its own when access by bridge opens next June, some 39 years later. No wonder the critics ask if we are talking about time or eternity.

Anyway, this Marine Park golf course is a start, a big start. I congratulate my successor, Newbold Morris, and the many others, including, of course, Mayor Wagner, who have aided in bringing this about.

In 1964 and 1965 we shall show the world visiting us at the World's Fair our Atlantic seaboard, which many of them have never seen, not to confirm their prejudices about New York, but to demonstrate what alert and dedicated officials have done to reconcile conservation and recreation and to prove that you need not go west to find the American frontier.

Should Italian-Americans Demonstrate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in these days of trial and tribulations we find it comforting to know that those of us whose parents were immigrants from across the sea have a profound respect for this Nation, its institutions, its peoples, and above all, its opportunities.

I was impressed by an editorial in the Italian Tribune, La Tribuna Italiana published in Phoenix, Ariz.

Its publisher, Del J. Rogers, has long been a leader in Italo-American groups and has always displayed a commonsense approach to the many problems that must arise in a nation made up of all the peoples of the earth.

There are agitators among the Italo-Americans, the same as among other groups, who would tear down the steady growth of the children of the immigrants of Italian origin by agitating for action not in keeping with the historical judgment of these peoples as a whole.

Without distracting from the cause and the case of the American Negro, Del Rogers speaks out forthright for a continuation of the sane, sober, although at times, exasperating program for the complete and final assimilation of all our races and creeds into the promise that is America.

I commend Del Rogers who with his knowledge of past and even present injustices at the hands of a few misguided persons and groups in America, can still recognize the inherent opportunities in this system of ours, unmatched and envied in most of the civilized world.

He puts his finger on the great differences between the problems of the Negro as against the children of all white immigrants.

First. The whites had no slavery background.

Second. The discriminations were restricted to peoples, not whole States and regions.

Third. The color of his skin was not a barrier to admittance to places of public accommodation.

The editorial as it appeared this August 1963 follows:

SHOULD ITALIAN-AMERICANS DEMONSTRATE?

Today all over America, the colored man is struggling hard for full recognition and rights. A movement started to liberate the colored man in the South has echoed and bounced in all of our major Northern cities. And in many cases, with violence and death to the innocent * * * and costly police payrolls to the taxpayers.

But the effect is rewarding to the colored people. After all, what have they got to lose? Certainly their gains and recognition have already counterbalanced the many arrests.

Not too many years ago, the Italian immigrant was in a similar discriminated position. He, too, was denied housing in "certain areas." He, too, was denied social and civil rights. He, too, was abused by the po-

litical wardhealers and bosses of those halcyon days.

In some eastern schools, children of the immigrants didn't even dare eat their lunches in the school cafeteria, the very cafeteria for which their parents of these discriminated youngsters toiled to pay the taxes to keep these "democratic" institutions alive.

WE HOPE THIS ISN'T TRUE TODAY IN ANY LOCALITY

But the Italian rose to his full stature of citizenship by earning this right. True, he didn't have the slave disadvantage of his colored brother. Neither did he have the stringent barriers of the Southern traditions around his neck.

Today, there is still a definite iota of anti-Italian feeling in some quarters. There is still a definite degree of passing over a qualified person's head to pass a promotion to a more socially desired individual. But it does not exist in such quantity as to merit headlines.

The Italian in America has made and earned his reputation as a good citizen. Education has been a great factor in this battle. Italians have been prone to stay within the letter of the law. The insignificant minority that cast a cloud on the Italo-American was aided and abetted in this guise by yellow journalists of yesteryear. And definitely, the "Untouchables" of the current TV series only helped to revive an era that even we Italians would like to forget.

The Italian-American will go forward in this country, because the Americans who tried to judge him by the unpleasant behavior of the small minority has come to know the Italian for his true, better, and lasting qualities.

This assimilation has been on a tremendous increase since the end of World War II, and additional stimulation came from the thousands of GI's who served General Clark's 5th Army and came to really know the kindness and congeniality that is characteristic of the Italian people.

No, the Italian-American will not demonstrate for his rightful place in the American sun. This generation of Italo-Amaricans will go on to continue the struggle through performance, consistency, determination, and by the law-respecting conduct of their fathers and grandfathers.

The Italian-American has come a long way since that bleak day in the early twenties when Sacco and Venzetti were put to death because of their nationality, their foreign accents, and their natural "greenhornedness" appearances.

Tribute to a Fine American Sailor: Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker. Today I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a great American—Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr. who retired August 31 from the U.S. Navy. I should also like to include in my tribute a heartfelt "well done" and a "thank you" not only from the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma, but from all the American people.

Although I am fully aware that Admiral Raborn has his official residence in the great State of Texas, I am sure my colleagues from that State will not mind my tribute to this fine sailor when I remind them that it was in the Sixth Congressional District that Admiral Raborn attended grade and high school, and it was an Oklahoma Senator, Elmer Thomas, who appointed him to the U.S. Naval Academy 39 years ago, an appointment which launched him on his great naval career. From Ryan and Marlow, Okla., came Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., who after leaving Oklahoma gave 39 distinguished years to his country and to the U.S. Navy. We Oklahomans, like all Americans, have reason to be proud of him, a boy from the land who went down to the sea.

The facts attest to his brilliant and distinguished career as a first-class sailor, officer, aviator, commander, administrator and leader. He was all of these as he built respect for his personal qualities and professional abilities, not only among the thousands of men he has commanded, but among his colleagues and his superior officers.

In the 39 years of serving his country, often at great danger to himself, he has shown that kind of heroism and personal integrity that this country has produced in abundance.

Admiral Raborn has taken a personal part in a great human drama. I speak of the evolution of the U.S. Navy. The role of the Navy was the same 40 years ago, nay 140 years ago, as it is today: To maintain the freedom of the seas and the protection of the American homeland. Over the years freedom of the seas has become synonymous with the freedom of the free world.

But when Ensign Raborn first went to sea the old coal burners still protected America. Today that same Navy, still magnificantly doing its task, has nuclear ships above and below the surface, guided missiles and the most modern aircraft. That the Navy has kept pace with the best in modern technology is a further tribute to the imagination of men like Admiral Raborn.

Ensign William F. Raborn, Jr., was graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy on June 7, 1928. Thirty-two years later, in 1960, he was promoted to his present rank of vice admiral. In those intervening years lies a great American story of dedication, integrity, service, and patriotic fidelity.

In his naval career, Admiral Raborn has served at sea in many types of vessels, most notably battleships, destroyers, and carriers. As an integral part of the development of the air arm of the U.S. Navy, Admiral Raborn flew from carriers in their early years of development, later served as an executive officer—U.S.S. *Hancock*—and later as commanding officer—U.S.S. *Bennington*, CVA-2. He has instructed fliers; served as Chief of Staff of Task Force 38; commanded Carrier Division 2; served with the U.S. Navy Bureau of Ordinance; served at the Naval War College. Admiral Raborn also served in the Office of Chief of Naval Operations as Assistant Director of Guided Missiles; served on the staff of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; and crowned his career as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Development.

Both in time of war as in time of peace, he has distinguished himself. For example, he has earned: the Commendation Ribbon—for work with the U.S. Pacific Fleet; the Navy Unit Citation; the Bronze Star—for operations against the Japanese in 1944–45; the Silver Star Medal—for service in the Pacific in 1945; a Gold Star—in lieu of a second Bronze Star; a second Commendation Ribbon; a Distinguished Service Medal; the American Defense Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign—with one silver and one bronze star; National Defense; Korean Service; World War Two Victory Medal; United Nations Service; Philippine Defense Ribbon.

So today it is with great pride that I say on behalf of the people of my district to Admiral Raborn: Thank you, and well done. May you and Mrs. Raborn enjoy your years of retirement, which you both so richly deserve.

The Story of Czechoslovakia by Peter Zenkl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article written by Mr. Peter Zenkl that has recently appeared in various newspapers, including the Slovensky Sokol, published in Perth Amboy, N.J. The article is entitled "Some Sidelights of the Story of Czechoslovakia," a story Mr. Zenkl is well qualified to write as he is a distinguished statesman of Masaryk's Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Zenkl is a former lord mayor of Prague and Vice Premier of Czechoslovakia. After persecution by both the Nazi and Communist regimes, Mr. Zenkl now lives in the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME SIDELIGHTS OF THE STORY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(By Peter Zenkl)

Whoever wants to judge postwar developments in Czechoslovakia and the attitude and behavior of her inhabitants before and after the Communist takeover must first consider the situation which prevailed in that country prior to 1939.

At a time when democratic parliamentary regimes in neighboring Germany, Austria, Poland, and Hungary had been destroyed and replaced with Facist and Nazi totalitarian dictatorships, Czechoslovakia was ruled by two outstanding scholars as democratic Presidents of the Republic and was continuing successfully to maintain a model parliamentary government. If the Western Powers, especially France and Great Britain, had not sold Czechoslovakia down the river in the summer and fall of 1938 and forced her to sign the shameful Munich agreement,

Czechoslovakia would never have given up her democratic institutions of her own free will.

In the Munich agreement Czechoslovakia was promised that the so-called second republic would be guaranteed its frontiers, but when Hitler decided to destroy the republic, to incorporate the rest of the Czech lands into the Reich and make Slovakia a puppet state, the guarantee was conveniently forgotten by both France and Britain. Six years of Nazi enslavement and terror had to be endured by the Czechs and to some extent by the Slovaks.

During the Slovak uprising against the Nazis in the summer and fall of 1944, assistance given by the Western Allies was negligible because the Soviet Union did not want Slovakia to be liberated by her own efforts with the help of the West; the United States and Britain respected Soviet wishes.

Early in May of 1945, there followed the uprising of the citizens of Prague who desperately called for the help of the American Army, which had liberated a part of Bohemia in the West. Again this call was ignored because Americans respected the wishes of the great ally, so as not to anger the Soviets. Prague citizens were killed in action, and finally the Soviets entered the city as its "liberators."

In November of 1945, the American troops pulled out of Bohemia, the territory they had liberated, in the true sense of the word. The Soviet soldiers also withdrew from Czechoslovakia, but by then the Czech and Slovak Communists had succeeded in securing key positions in the army and a predominant influence in the new police force. Moreover, Americans would never have dreamed of again crossing the Czechoslovak border from West Germany or Austria, but the Soviets remained deployed on the Czechoslovak border in Poland, East Germany, Hungary, and Austria, and there were frequent troop movements over the territory of Czechoslovakia. Thus the threat of Soviet intervention was constantly hanging over the country. Considering these circumstances it comes as no surprise that the Communists finally succeeded in taking over the country completely.

As free elections, scheduled for the spring of 1948, would undoubtedly have resulted in a considerable decrease of votes cast for the Communist Party, President Benes was aware that the Communists might try to prevent such a development by staging a coup. He therefore asked U.S. Ambassador Lawrence Steinhardt in the fall of 1947 what his country's attitude would be in such a case and was told that American sympathies would, of course, be on the side of the Benes government but that an attempt at a coup would have to be considered an internal and domestic matter.

President Benes was thus forewarned, and, when a few months later his apprehension came true, he knew that he could not count on Western assistance. The coup, therefore, proved successful; whatever Benes' national front government had been able to save and preserve of the democratic institutions was again drowned in a sea of totalitarianism, this time of the Communist brand.

Between 1948 and 1953 resistance against the Communist regime was widespread. Some 60,000 citizens showed it by escaping from the country; many immediately organized in the free world the fight for the liberation of their enslaved country. Within Czechoslovakia countless resistance groups sprang up and carried out acts of sabotage. They met, of course, with the furor of Communist persecution: many were killed outright by the Communist police; thousands were tried, sentenced and executed, or incarcerated in concentration camps; hundreds of thousands were placed in forced labor camps, especially in the notorious Jachymov uranium mines.

On June 1, 1953, the citizens of Pilsen, Ostrava, Handlova and other industrial centers of Czechoslovakia rose against the tyrants and thus made the first attempt at a revolt against a Communist regime since the famous uprising of the Soviet sailors at Kronstadt. They wanted to rid themselves of their self-imposed rulers who had not only turned their democratic republic into a cruel police state, but had also succeeded in destroying its prosperous economy. In Pilsen, local police, militia, and army units were not prepared to fight the rebels, and some of them, particularly groups in the armed forces, joined the uprising. The masses stormed the town hall, ejected all symbols of the rated Communist regime, hoisted American flags, hailed General Eisenhower as their liberator and President Masaryk and Benes as their beloved leaders.

Finally Soviet-trained special police formations were called in from Prague. By their overwhelming power they were able to suppress the revolt. A few days later, workers in the East Berlin and other places in East Germany revolted on a larger scale. Under the impact of these developments in the two most industrialized enslaved territories, and because of general unrest in the entire area of its European empire, Moscow had to liberalize its regime somewhat and to introduce what is known as the "New Course."

Goldwater and TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER was recently quoted in a national magazine as saying "we ought to sell TVA."

Even the private power people are quick to admit that the Tennessee Valley Authority operates one of the most efficient electrical systems in the world. In addition, the Authority has been able to control the waters of the Tennessee River and thus avoid costly floods. In the area of recreation they have brought to the people of the immediate area clean and wholesome recreation on the lakes and in other properties under its control. The TVA is paying its own way and is contributing to counties and in the State large sums in taxes. A great number of municipalities are likewise profiting. It has brought cheap power to a wide area and has proved an effective yardstick to users around its boundary.

When the Congress decided not to appropriate additional funds from tax sources to meet the expanding electrical demands, TVA came up with a self-financing bill. Today the Authority goes into the private money markets of the country and borrows money against a $750 million authorization to be used to supplement the waterpower with steam. The property valued at upward of $2 billion stands as security and the purchasers of electricity within the walls established by the act are paying off the bonds, and of course the entire property is now owned and will continue to be owned by all of the people in the 50 States of this Union. Recently, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, a great and conservative newspaper and outstanding in its influence in the Midsouth, carried a very informative and provocative editorial on the subject of "GOLDWATER and TVA." That my colleagues may have the opportunity to appreciate this editorial, I am including it as a part of my remarks. It follows:

GOLDWATER AND TVA

BARRY GOLDWATER, the Republican Senator from Arizona, whom many a conservative in both parties hopes to see nominated for the Presidency, is quoted in a national magazine as saying "we ought to sell TVA."

When the Commercial Appeal asked for verification of this quotation we were given a more cautious wording. It is: "The idea of selling the Tennessee Valley Authority should be explored. Such a thing might be the greatest thing that ever happened to the State of Tennessee. The taxes derived from private ownership of TVA facilities might trigger a real boom in the area."

Our suggestion is that Senator GOLDWATER make that exploration himself—and incorporate a survey of the Federal-power-dam complexes so important to his native West.

Someone should have told him before now that people who know will laugh at his tax ideas. The States and counties are already collecting more taxes from TVA and its distributors than they ever did under investor ownership of the business in electricity.

Increased tax collections would largely go to Washington, and then only if new owners of the electricity business raised prices to collect those taxes from homeowners and businessmen.

Even the much-discussed REA rural lines are putting taxes into county treasuries on a kind of business that was absent in the old days.

It is impossible to repeal the TVA dams. But what could be repealed is the TVA method of getting low prices all the way out the line to the household meter. Forcing TVA to wholesale to private companies instead of city governments and rural cooperatives could do that.

Aside from the financing, this is backing into politics. The GOLDWATER appeal has been high in the South, the very region where TVA is best known and most admired. To attack TVA is to join the forces which are continuously assailing public ownership of power, which puts Senator GOLDWATER on the other side from millions of rural people in many States who never knew modern living until REA allowed them to connect with powerlines.

Another strong GOLDWATER area is in the West, where power from Government-financed dams has been a big election plank even longer than in the TVA region.

We say Senator GOLDWATER should explore the TVA idea immediately and announce what he finds, on the assumption that he would like to be President.

But then there is another possibility, for those with mischievous minds. Perhaps the man from Arizona has found he would rather be Senator and this TVA attitude is a way of turning back from the nomination.

Experts for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials are from the Westport

Town Crier and the Hartford Times, in that order. Both papers express editorial concern over the problem which I have sought to meet by introducing H.R. 6866, a bill to provide Congress with scientific advisory staffs. Both papers, among the most respected journals in Connecticut, endorse my proposal, I am happy to say. I offer them for the RECORD so that all Members may have an opportunity to read them:

[From the Westport Town Crier]

EXPERTS FOR CONGRESS

Anyone who has been inclined to throw up his hands in despair at the scientific complexities that confront him in every day's newspaper will approve of a bill recently introduced in the House of Representatives by Fairfield County's Congressman AB SIBAL.

Apparently, Congressmen are likewise subject to confusion. In their case, it is exceedingly important—because they have to make a variety of decisions, that may have a vital effect on the national welfare or, at the very least, involve billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, on subjects with highly technical backgrounds.

One could hardly expect his legislators, regardless of their general excellence, to be educated in advanced science. How, for instance, can a Congressman or Senator even approach intelligent judgments about such complex matters as missile appropriations, moon races, or even food and drug regulations? It's just too much to expect. And SIBAL is honest enough to admit it.

He proposes the establishment of a permanent scientific staff in both the House and the Senate, headed by three scientists representing the fields of physics, chemistry, and biology.

One of these three would function as director and receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per year; his two associates would be paid $20,000 a year. They would serve for 3-year terms; no appointee could be over 55 years of age, and any given term would terminate at this age.

These experts who would be free to hire specialists on a per diem basis, would be available to answer congressional inquiries on any scientific subject relating to pending legislation or upcoming problems. Congressman SIBAL's idea is to give himself and his colleagues a nonpolitical and disinterested expert source of information with which they could supplement their own knowledge in specialized fields.

Someone once pointed out that "Knowledge is power." We suppose it is—but we know that power without knowledge, in the hands of Congressmen or otherwise, can be exceedingly dangerous. It is to be hoped that Congressman SIBAL's bill gets prompt attention.

[From the Hartford Times]

SCIENTIFIC COUNSEL SOUGHT BY SIBAL

Whenever a problem or program involves scientific evaluation nearly everyone is completely baffled by the variety of conflicting claims that are made about it. And this includes our lawmakers.

Therefor, Congressman ABNER SIBAL, who represents Connecticut's Fourth District, has taken steps to fill what has been called "a serious gap in the legislative process."

The Congressman from Norwalk is sponsoring a bill that would set up a permanent scientific staff in both the Senate and House, headed by three scientists representing chemistry, physics, and biology.

Congressman SIBAL says the lawmakers then could ask for advice in all fields, whether they dealt with atomic energy, cancer research, space, insects, plant viruses, uses of coal or anything else that called for technical knowledge.

As things stand today Senators and Congressmen must pass judgment in situations and upon subjects dealing with matters that lie not only outside their training and experience but also beyond their comprehension.

Now it is impossible for legislators to intelligently question proposals sent to them from the administration and governmental agencies such as, for example, the moon race, for which billions of dollars are sought. Basic information is often lacking.

Scientific publications pour from the Nation's (and the world's) presses in huge volume every month. Even with the best intentions and the most conscientious effort no representative could hope to cope with this floodtide of information.

Thus there is merit in Representative SIBAL's proposal to give Congress better tools to help it fashion legislation with greater understanding than it is possible to do today.

The bill is reported to have attracted a sufficient amount of favorable attention to warrant a hearing which is expected to be held soon.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, in many discussions about congressional action on foreign aid, questions have been raised about the wisdom of continuing aid to areas such as Vietnam. I am sure that all of us are repelled by the civil and religious repressions being practiced in that country today. Many of us are also uncertain that continued support of the Diem regime can do more than destroy much of our country's credibility in Asia. At the same time we are all aware of the practical dangers of striking a moral pose which could result in the collapse of southeast Asia to the Communists.

Foreign policy should not be created by AID; but the AID program can certainly implement that policy once it is established. We can certainly hope and expect that the administration and the State Department will evolve a decent solution to the intolerable domestic situation in South Vietnam. Any such solution should make it clear to the world and to Asia that the moral strength and economic might of this Nation is on the side of religious tolerance, political freedom and the growth of democratic self-determination in the nations of the world.

In a recent ABC radio and television program, Foreign Aid Administrator David E. Bell discussed the question of not only Vietnam but also other areas of the world where problems over foreign aid have risen.

I take this opportunity to include the transcript of the interview on September 8:

"ISSUES AND ANSWERS," SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1963; GUEST, DAVID E. BELL, U.S. AID ADMINISTRATOR; INTERVIEWED BY JOHN SCALI, ABC STATE DEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENT, AND EDWARD P. MORGAN, ABC COMMENTATOR

ANNOUNCER. U.S. Foreign Aid Administrator, David Bell, here are the issues:

Should the United States cut off all aid of Vietnam?

Is there a rebellion against foreign aid in the United States?

Is U.S. money strengthening our enemies in Communist countries?

You have heard the issues. Now for the answers from the head of the U.S. foreign aid program, David E. Bell. Here to interview Mr. Bell is ABC Commentator Edward P. Morgan, and with the first question, ABC State Department correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Bell, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

The biggest issue confronting you, surely, is whether Congress, after appropriating billions for foreign aid during the past 15 years, this year intends to deal an especially heavy cut to the program.

Mr. Bell, what is the outlook for foreign aid? Does the billion dollars that has already been cut or trimmed from the foreign aid program as it was initially presented by the President mean that there is deep disillusionment around the country about the results of foreign aid over so many years?

Mr. BELL. I don't believe that is so, Mr. Scali. I think that the feeling around the country is essentially as it has been since the end of World War II; namely, that a solid, constructive program of economic and military assistance to countries around the world who are striving to defend themselves against Communist aggression in one form or another, that such a program is important to the security of the United States and consequently should be continued.

You will recall earlier this year there was a Gallup poll result which actually indicated that more people favor foreign aid than have in some past years. I am advised that there is a special poll of businessmen coming out next week which will show a very high support for the foreign aid program among that group. I think the action of the Congress is a very serious significant action. If the action of the House were to be sustained in the Senate, I think that there would be a severe reduction in the actions the United States could take around the world to achieve freedom and peace through these means.

The responsibility of the Congress of course is clear. They swear the same oath that the President does, to uphold and defend the security of the United States. They have to make up their own minds on these matters, and I don't know what they are going to do.

Mr. MORGAN. In terms of the "why" of their action, Mr. Bell, a correspondent covering Washington, gets the impression that the foes of aid, rightly or wrongly, feel that one of the reasons they should be against it is that we don't have any control over certain important aspects in various countries. In Vietnam there is a question. South Korea is another point, and so is Pakistan.

My question is this: Assuming the Government's argument that we are not trying to push policy down the throats of aid recipients, what happens when their policies defeat the purposes of our aid? Where are we then?

Mr. BELL. This is a very important question, and one we face in operating—the President faces in operating the foreign aid program quite frequently. The issue is just as you described it. If a government that we are trying to help is embarked on policies

which are self-defeating, which will prevent the development of economic strength or military strength against our common enemies, what do we do? Now our range of freedom of action of course is quite limited. We are not in the business of conducting military coups or trying to establish leaders in those other countries that we pick. It is for the people of those countries to decide their own leadership.

But there is a real question, if their policies are not such as to achieve the results that we are interested in supporting, does it make sense for use to continue an aid program?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, let's pinpoint an example. The President himself has said that the policies of the Government of Vietnam are not those that will help win the war against the Communist guerrillas. Is it logical, as a lot of people, including Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, have concluded, is it logical to conclude that therefore we should cut off or drastically limit our aid to Vietnam?

Mr. BELL. Well it is quite clear that this is an illustration of the policy issue you have just described. In Vietnam there is a serious question which the Members of Congress in particular are asking right now: Are the policies of that Government such that they can be effective in achieving a strong, independent Vietnam, able to defeat the Vietcong, the Communist guerrillas?

Senator CHURCH has raised doubts about this and so have other Senators. We are hoping, as the President indicated a week ago, we are hoping very much that there will be changes in the policies of the Vietnamese Government. It is a very tense, uncertain situation. Ambassador Lodge is in charge for the United States on the spot. He obviously is the principal man on whom we must rely for judgment and guidance in these difficult circumstances, but the attitude of the Congress certainly must be taken into account in a situation of this kind.

Mr. SCALI. Well Mr. Bell, if those changes do not occur, what do we do? Right now the prospect is that President Diem and Mr. Nhu and the present group will continue in power and they don't seem to be broadening the government and making the personnel changes that we think are necessary to win this war.

Mr. BELL. I think that all I can properly say today is that we hope very much that changes will be made. We are desirous, strongly desirous of continuing to assist in the defense of freedom in that part of the world and we want very much to be able to continue to join in an effective program to defeat the Communist guerrillas. I think such a program was underway, has been underway over the last year or two; a good deal of progress has been made in more aggressive military action against the Communist guerrillas, in defending the villages against guerrilla attack and in achieving the beginnings of economic and political progress of a permanent, important, and lasting nature. We would like to be able to continue supporting such a program.

Mr. SCALI. Do I understand correctly or do I gather correctly from what you have said or what you are implying, if necessary you do not exclude the possibility of considering serious cuts in this program?

Mr. BELL. It seems to me that it is necessary to recognize that the attitude of the important Members of Congress and of the people of this country generally, certainly is cause for concern as to whether, in the absence of the kind of changes we would like to see, we could continue the program unchanged. That is an issue that isn't before us today.

Mr. MORGAN. On that point Mr. BELL, has the Diem government been given that—not ultimatum but that clearly a point of the Kennedy administration's thinking?

Mr. BELL. Mr. MORGAN, I think all I can say to that is that Ambassador Lodge is on the spot, he has a very clear appreciation and understanding of these matters, he is a very experienced diplomat. I am sure that he is making plain in the local situation out there the attitudes of all the persons in Washington, in the Congress, and in the executive branch who are concerned with this.

Mr. MORGAN. In a somewhat less serious way perhaps but still very complicated, we've got a situation in Pakistan. I believe Under Secretary of State Ball has just gotten back and I suppose that you have not had a chance to brief yourself in terms of what he has got from Pakistan but as you see it now, where does our aid program go in Pakistan in the light of Pakistan's new agreements with the Communist Chinese?

Mr. BELL. I think there is much less question about the situation in Pakistan. The Pakistan Government and the people of Pakistan is quite clearly committed to the course of independence and freedom. They are desirous—they are taking appropriate policy measures. They are mobilizing their own resources, they are achieving social and political progress in their own country. They have been greatly worried—the people of Pakistan have been greatly worried by the fact that since the Chinese Communist attack on India last fall we have provided some military assistance to India. As you know the people of Pakistan for reasons that we do not consider thoroughly valid but nevertheless they are very serious about it, they are concerned about the possibility of an Indian attempt to dominate Pakistan. And this is why they have—I am sure it is why they have felt it necessary to establish some relations with Communist China. They have not embarked on any major change in their own policy. They still intend to defend their freedom, they are still clearly committed to the free world. They have taken two or three actions in regard to Communist China that worry us and Secretary Ball as you have just said has been out there. He returned this morning. I have not had a chance to talk to him since his return, but there has been no fundamental, certainly no fundamental shift in the attitudes of the Pakistan Government or the people of Pakistan.

Mr. SCALI. Based on what you know then Mr. Bell, you have no reason to doubt that the Pakistani will stand by the pledges they made in the CENTO and SEATO alliances to stand by these nations in the event of attack?

Mr. BELL. There is no question about that at all.

Mr. SCALI. Well, how about the specific issue that seems to be worrying some people, whether or not the United States should grant aid to Pakistan to help them develop an airport which they consider necessary to establish air communication with Communist China?

Mr. BELL. This is an issue which is open. We have not decided it. We will consider it when we have had a chance to talk to Secretary Ball.

The airport in question, which is in East Pakistan, does need expansion, regardless of whether the Pakistanis establish civil air communications with China or not and the plans for expanding that airport—lengthening the runways and strengthening them—those plans have been under preparation by competent engineers for the last couple of years so that the new element of whether they will fly planes from that, a civil air route into China, is something we now have to consider but there is no question of the validity of the need to expand the Dacca Airport, quite apart from the question of a civilian airline into China.

Mr. MORGAN. Hopscotching to another headache, Mr. Bell, that we have mentioned briefly: South Korea. Some of the most intractable foes of foreign aid argue, as well as some of the sympathizers, that foreign aid to South Korea has been somewhat a waste because it has not succeeded in establishing democracy, that there is a threat right now of the present military regime of denying democracy in the coming elections. What is your answer to that argument?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Morgan, I think this is a very important point. We have to start in these countries where they are. We have to start from where they start from. And the situation in Korea has gone through a substantial evolution over the last 10 or 15 years.

You will recall that for a long time Syngman Rhee was a virtual dictator, nevertheless under Syngman Rhee the universities were open for example and many young men received training. It was possible for them to think about what the future of their country should be, how its government should be reorganized. There was in effect a bloodless revolution in Korea 3 or 4 years ago, led by students and then military officers have come in more recently.

There is a military junta now in charge in Korea, but under each of them there has been some favorable evolution of the notions of how to establish and run a modern government in a modern society. So while all of us would have hoped that the situation had moved more rapidly in Korea, I think it would be a mistake to feel that there has been no progress and no change there. There is a whole new generation of young men coming up in the private life of Korea and the public and governmental life, who have a much greater understanding of the political and economic requirements of a modern society and I would think that the chances of a favorable evolution in Korea remain good.

Mr. MORGAN. Could we broaden the focus a bit?

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORGAN. You have said in the past that you think one of the things that foreign aid should do is to look toward getting itself out of business—phasing out projects.

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. At the same time in defense of restoring the cuts you have said that the Chinese and the Soviets are undoubtedly going, in their own way, to increase their respective investment in their Communist foreign aid. Is this an inconsistency here?

Mr. BELL. No, I don't think so, because what we are trying to do through our aid program is put these countries—those that wish to—in a position in which they are economically strong enough, politically strong enough and, where necessary, militarily strong enough to defend themselves against internal Communist subversion and join in the free world defense against any outside attack.

Now in consequence what we have done for example in Greece over the last 15 years or so, which is a very remarkable story—Greece 15 years ago was shattered as a result of World War II and in the midst of a very bitter civil war. Today Greece is a modern, progressive state and coming to the end of the need for outside economic assistance.

Now what I have said about the Russians and Chinese, which I believe is correct, is that following this test ban treaty and following the split, the vigorous conflict between Moscow and Peiping, we expect that the Russians and the Chinese will be seeking to compete for the leadership of the Communist movement in the underdeveloped areas, in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and they will be increasing the vigor with which they are trying to support and stimulate Communist subversion and Communist assault in those areas.

We are therefore facing in some areas certainly a more vigorous thrust by the Communists and at such a time we certainly

should not be drawing back our own efforts. We should be maintaining the strong efforts we have been making to help these countries defend themselves against just such Communist onslaughts.

Latin America is the most immediate, the most clear-cut illustration of this problem. It is, it seems to me, a very serious risk that would follow the House of Representatives' action of 2 weeks ago—if that were sustained by the Senate, we would have less funds available to us to carry out our part of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America than we had a year ago, at the very time when the Latin American countries have done more, as we have been asking them to do. They have undertaken more. They are undertaking tax reforms, undertaking to increase their development efforts, undertaking to conduct land reforms, commit themselves to the kind of progress the Alliance stands for.

At that very time we would be drawing back, and it seems to me this is a very poor way to defeat the prospects for further Cubas in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Bell, part of the opposition from those who oppose foreign aid comes from some who say "Yes, we have built up countries like Greece, and indeed of all of Western Europe through the Marshall plan, but now that they can stand on their own feet economically, why don't they really and truly do more than they have done and why doesn't the U.S. Government put more pressure on them to do that, particularly at a time when the dollar is under attack, and we have a balance-of-payments problem"?

How do you answer that?

Mr. BELL. I think this is a very fair question. My basic answer is we feel the same way, and we are urging the European countries and Japan to do more, to put more of their own resources into foreign aid and in particular to soften the terms, the interest rates, and the maturities of their loans to those countries which need such assistance.

I think it is not widely recognized, not widely realized, that over the last 3 or 4 years the European countries have in fact doubled the amount of assistance that they are making available to the underdeveloped countries. And in the last calendar year, 1962, of the total amount of assistance that went to the underdeveloped countries from all of the advanced countries, the United States, Western Europe, Canada, Japan; about 60 percent went from the United States, and about 40 percent went from all the other countries, and in terms of our gross national product, that is about the right proportion. The U.S. gross national product is about 60 percent of the total of all those advanced countries. So that the thing we have been hammering on hardest in the last year or so has been that the European-Japanese governments in lending funds to the underdeveloped countries should reduce their interest rates and lengthen their maturities and we have been having some success along these lines. The British have cut their interest rates in half. The Germans have begun to make much longer term loans, including as much as 7-year grace periods, but we think more progress along those lines is very much needed and we are to say that to those countries.

Mr. MORGAN. May I just interrupt Scali before he pursues that with a quick question, Mr. Bell. Western Europe has never been more prosperous.

Mr. BELL. Right.

Mr. MORGAN. Why don't we cut off our aid to Western Europe?

Mr. BELL. Oh, we have cut off our economic aid to Western Europe years ago. We did continue military aid during the late fifties at a substantial rate to assist in building up European military forces which is in our interests as well as theirs. Today, the military assistance to Western Europe is coming rapidly to a close. We have a few commitments which remain and which are being honored, but the amount of money, the amount of military assistance going to Western Europe is falling very sharply and rapidly and will soon come to a complete end.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Bell, it has often been said by the administration in advocating foreign aid that foreign aid means jobs here at home. I suppose it would follow that if foreign aid is reduced, it means more unemployment. Do you have any figures on that?

Mr. BELL. Yes. May I answer this question in connection with the question you asked me a minute ago about the balance of payments. It is very important to recognize and it has not been recognized as much as it should have been, I think, in the last 3 or 4 years we have reversed our policies. It used to be we made dollars available for foreign aid. Today we require that virtually all of the foreign aid appropriations made by the Congress be spent in the United States and consequently we are providing aid through U.S. goods and services and therefore when a cut is made, as the House did a week or so ago, they are not affecting the balance-of-payments deficit to any substantial extent at all. Instead they are reducing U.S. exports, U.S. production, and to some extent U.S. jobs. You can roughly translate the jobs, the cut the House made of $600 million was equivalent roughly to 60,000 jobs.

Mr. SCALI. 60,000 jobs in the United States?

Mr. BELL. Yes. Man-years of employment.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Bell, if, as you say, there is increasing support among the American people for foreign aid, why hasn't Congress gotten the message this year? Why have they whacked it perhaps harder than they have at any past time?

Mr. MORGAN. Particularly when you say 80 percent of the money comes back into American industry.

Mr. BELL. I think the Congress has been influenced in some considerable measure by the fact that there is a substantial deficit in the Federal budget this year. They are desirous of cutting expenditures wherever they think they can without damage to the national interest, and many of them have thought that the cut they made would not damage the national interest. As I have indicated earlier, I think that is wrong, and I think that is the proper area for discussion in the remainder of the congressional process in the present fiscal year. We still have, in addition to this authorization bill, we have an appropriation bill coming up in a month or so, so that the argument is going to be going on over the next several weeks and I think it is a very serious question and I hope that we can persuade the Congress that the extent of the cut that has been made is a very risky thing to do at a time when the contest with communism around the world is such a severe one.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the Senate will restore it?

Mr. BELL. We hope very much the Senate will restore it. The Senate, or course, makes its own decisions.

Mr. MORGAN. Doesn't the congressional opposition so far reflect to a considerable degree a belief that no matter how much the Europeans have increased their aid program up until now that they could and should do very much more and that this should be a substitute, not a supplement for American aid?

Mr. BELL. I think undoubtedly many of them feel that way. We would hope that the Europeans will continue to increase the aid. I believe that many of them are expecting to do so. At the last meeting I went to Paris, in July, this is the impression I had. The French, the British, the Germans are all expecting to increase their aid in the coming year.

Mr. SCALI. Well, can we turn on more pressure to get them to give more, or do you think we are doing as much as we can?

Mr. BELL. I have had a good deal of personal experience on this. I think we are putting maximum pressure on this point.

Mr. MORGAN. And now time is pressing us and we thank you, Mr. Bell, for having been with us today on Issues and Answers.

Mr. BELL. It is a pleasure.

The Practical Nurse: An Indispensable Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year I introduced a joint resolution which would have given much needed recognition to this country's licensed practical nurses by designating the second week in September as Licensed Practical Nurses Week. Unfortunately this resolution was tabled. I want to express my appreciation, and that of the country as a whole, for the dedicated service of this group of women. The practical nurse is often underrated and forgotten by the public until they are brought directly into contact with her through the wonderful nursing care some member of their family has received from her. The practical nurse has been called an "indispensable woman" in our hospitals and nursing homes, and this designation is fully justified.

At present there are over 236,000 licensed practical nurses and it is estimated that by 1970 at least 350,000 will be needed. Every year new responsibilities and duties are given to the practical nurse as she becomes more experienced, and she has a permanent, important role to play in the medical team. Perhaps it is only when we become patients that we are fully aware of the practical nurse; she performs a high percentage of bedside nursing and is the one who makes the patient comfortable and shows him that the whole activity of the hospital is essentially built around him.

Hospital doctors and registered nurses have realized the value of practical nurses to them. She makes it possible for the doctor and registered nurse to concentrate on more technical, impersonal duties which are vital for the well-being of patients but are not effective unless the patient is given adequate bed care. The practical nurse is also much in demand for private nursing. During 1961 there were 89,135 calls for practical nurses in the area of private home care alone.

Practical nursing programs were first introduced in 1897, but it is only in quite recent times that the status of the practical nurse has been defined and full use made of her capabilities. Everyone knows of the experienced, kindly neighbor woman who was called to help in emergencies. Over time she became a wise midwife and general nurse who often took full responsibility for the fam-

ily of a sick woman as well as giving competent nursing care. She was not well paid for her services but she was greatly appreciated and loved.

It was during the nursing crises of World War II that the importance of the practical nurse was first recognized, but serious efforts to establish training schools were made during the thirties. Many hospitals were understaffed and it was felt that an educated practical nurse could take some of the burden off the shoulders of the registered nurses. Gradually the vocational program for practical nursing has grown in scope until at present there are 693 approved schools of practical nursing and every State issues licenses which entail examinations. The Federal Government has recognized the importance of this program and done a great deal to encourage it. Under the George-Barden Vocational Education Act as amended in 1956 an expenditure of $5 million per year is authorized to train practical nurses. The Federal Government matches State payments for teaching facilities and instruction under this law.

Today's practical nurse has completed a year's training program in a school which has been inspected and approved by the State board of nursing. She has spent 4 months at classroom and laboratory work, and 8 months doing full-time clinical work in a hospital under careful supervision. After she obtains her license she has further on-the-job training which prepares her for the responsibility of nursing those who are not in a critical condition: new mothers and babies, the chronically ill, the convalescent, and the aged.

The ever increasing demand for medical services has strained our hospitals and training facilities to the utmost and placed a tremendous burden on the doctors and registered nurses. We are all glad that more people are aware of the benefits of medical attention, and that because of pre-paid health plans more people are able to obtain necessary treatment. These are not the only reasons for the need for more medical services. Today people live much longer than they did even 30 years ago, and they naturally require more care as they grow older and develop the various diseases of the aged. The elderly spend two and one-half as much time in our hospitals as any other age group. Other fields where the need for nursing care has increased are psychiatry, rehabilitation programs, and maternity care. The practical nurse is of vital importance in every one of these fields. She can take over a great deal of the general nursing, which is often not of a specialized nature.

It is difficult to supply enough doctors and registered nurses to keep up with the demand, and because of the tremendous increase in scientific knowledge these doctors and nurses have such complex, specialized duties that it is impossible for them to give patients the constant personal attention which they need. The doctor must delegate responsibilities to the registered nurse which force her to spend more time away from the patient. Medical science has shown how important the patient's attitude is in reaching full recovery after a serious illness or operation; the practical nurse, who spends more time with the patient than any other member of the health team, will often notice a change in the patient's attitute or general condition before anyone else does. She can reassure the patient who is worried by personal problems or the nature of his illness, and if something serious is wrong she can often give the doctor the information he needs to improve the situation.

The licensed practical nurse competently fills the gap between the specialists and technicians and the patient himself. She assists the registered nurse in giving nursing care and performs routine functions independently, which relieves the registered nurse for other duties. She is, to the patient, the most important member of the nursing team which enables the hospital to give adequate patient care. The nursing team consists of three units: the registered nurse, the practical nurse, and the nurse's aid. The registered nurse charts the nursing program and attends to the patient's preliminary needs. The practical nurse takes over most of the routine bedside care when the initial emergency situation is controlled. The nurse's aid is a volunteer who assists both nurses. This system, when properly organized, enables the nursing team to care for all their patients efficiently and sympathetically. It is obvious that without the help and technical knowledge of the practicel nurse the system would not work at all.

Once a practical nurse has been licensed her learning does not stop. Many hospitals have post-graduate courses to give these nurses a degree of expertise which enables them to help in the operating theater, and gives them a good knowledge of such fields as obstetrics, medications, recovery room and emergency room techniques, and psychiatric nursing. Hospitals have found that the practical nurse is capable of helping out registered nurses in emergency situations either in the ward or in surgery.

Through the practical nursing program we obtain many excellent nurses who would otherwise be unable to serve the community in such a worthwhile way. Practical nurses run in age from 17 to 50; thus both girls who have been unable to complete high school for one reason or another, and women whose children are grown, are able to fulfill their nursing ambitions. These are women who have a real interest in people and in helping them, and who get a great deal of satisfaction from nursing. Practical nursing is an excellent career for one who wishes to be a nurse but is unable to undertake the more extensive responsibilities and preparations of the registered nurse. I can think of few better ways to serve the community in a personal way.

The registered nurse could not cope with both the greater number of patients and the increasingly technical and scientific nature of nursing treatment without the help of the practical nurse. It has been estimated that there should be at least one practical nurse for every registered nurse in order for the registered nurse to perform her complicated work most efficiently. At present there are 464,138 registered nurses; by 1970 at least 680,000 will be needed. If the current shortage of registered nurses persists it is obvious that more practical nurses will become necessary.

The practical nurse is truly indispensable; not only does she carry out important duties during the day, but the whole hospital relies on her for service at night, weekends and holidays. Her selfless devotion to duty is an example for the whole country. I would like to see the licensed practical nurse given official recognition. She is a dedicated worker in a field which at some time in our lives concerns each one of us deeply; without her help the whole hospital service to each individual would suffer. It is not only in the hospital that her services are needed and appreciated. Nursing homes, mental hospitals, public health facilities and private homes value and use licensed practical nurses. The demand for practical nurses today is greater than the supply. In 1962 one out of every five calls for practical nurses in private homes went unanswered, and 18 percent of the budgeted vacancies for practical nurses in our hospitals went unfilled in 1962. All these figures show that the practical nurse has become an important figure in the whole scheme of medical care. She is a permanent link between the patient and the rest of the health team in most nursing situations today. She deserves our heartfelt thanks.

Senator Morse Is Censured by Veterans Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the appendix of the RECORD a news story and an editorial, both of which speak for themselves:

SENATOR MORSE IS CENSURED BY VETERANS GROUP

LOS ANGELES.—A newly formed veterans group will seek censure of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, for his disclosure of parts of medical reports of Alabama Gov. George Wallace.

Richard F. Carter said Saturday he and 11 other veterans had organized the Committee for Veterans Protection to protest Morse's revelation of details of Veterans' Administration records on Wallace.

MORSE said on the floor of the Senate last week that Wallace is receiving Government disability payments for a psychoneurotic condition dating from World War II.

Carter said his group would ask the help of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars in their protest. The 40-year-old Carter, a veteran of 5 years in the Air Force and the Navy, lives in suburban Inglewood.

LETTERS I MEAN TO MAIL

(By Wilbur Blackmon)

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I see by the papers where you want Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, to have his head examined since you disapprove of his actions in the integration-segregation controversy and because he received a disability allowance for psychoneurosis as a result of World War II service.

That might be a good idea, sir, if he had any plans or wishes for wanting to serve in Congress with such mule-kicked Senators as yourself. But it might surprise you to know that most Alabamians think that it is you who needs a mental exam in order to explain your actions and not Governor Wallace.

Oregon is a long way from the State of Alabama and it could be that you just don't understand the thinking and feelings of people in this section of the Nation—which is just about par for you for it seems you even have trouble understanding just what you think and feel if we use your congressional record as a guide.

Maybe it's the Democratic Party which ought to have its head examined for letting you join the fold after the Republicans wouldn't let you have your way in that party.

Sincerely,

WINK.

A Good Example of Midwest Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I take pride in inserting herewith a letter to me from a highly respected friend, Mr. L. M. Cassat, of Clarinda, Iowa, along with a letter to me signed by 20 of Clarinda's leading citizens expressing their concern regarding the many problems now facing Congress and the people.

The letters follow:

CLARINDA, IOWA, *September 2, 1963.*

Hon. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Here is a communication which I hope you can get into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or anywhere else that you think might do any good. Out here we are really alarmed at the way things are going. Just noticed in the paper today that our dollar today based on the pre-war dollar of 1939 is now worth 45 cents.

Congratulations on the fight you are making to cut down on foreign aid and everywhere else you can. Why should we spend billions trying to go to the moon? Is that effort just for prestige? What good is prestige if we wreck our economy doing it?

Please notice, BEN, this enclosed letter is personally signed by 20 of our solid, responsible citizens. I only hope you can find time to acknowledge each one as having sent you a personal letter.

Cordially yours,

LYLE M. CASSAT.

CLARINDA, IOWA, *August 20, 1963.*

Hon. BEN JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BEN: Here in Clarinda, as you know, we have a legislative affairs committee, composed of members of our chamber of commerce who try to keep up on important trends in government and study legislation proposed in Congress.

It has come to us that protests from citizens across the country at some of the proposals, such as deficit-spending, have not been as vociferous lately and this might lead Congress to believe that we citizens have become reconciled to many of the bills now before you.

Instead of each member of our committee writing you we have talked over various issues and want to give you the benefit of our careful and considered deliberation; each one who approves to sign the letter.

1. We see no justification for deficit-spending. If we cannot control our spending and pay off some of our national debt in these times of great prosperity, when can we do it?

2. We believe that the solving of our international payments problem rests squarely with those who make out our budget and those who adopt it. We have lost much of our gold because we have had to dip into this to balance our overspending all over the world. It is high time that those nations which we have helped back on their feet should now assume a greater share of maintaining the peace burden, to the end that we may keep the most admired and sought-after currency in the world—the dollar—sound. In this country unnecessary spending such as mass transit, youth employment, and public works proposals should all be roundly defeated.

3. We want to protect with all the vigor at our command this idea of a big, paternalistic government (or should we say socialistic government) taking our money from us via taxation and spending it where Washington thinks it should be spent, under such captions as Area Redevelopment programs. This money can well be used by the party in power for political advantage, or it could create more dislocations than it cures. Out here in Iowa, many farmers have found farming unprofitable and have had to seek other employment. In other States coal mining might have affected employment, etc. It is not the province of the Federal Government to try to solve all the problems of various communities. It is the province of the Government to see that the avenues of opportunity are kept open and that fair play is extended and protected for all.

4. We are concerned about the threat to our freedom of an ever growing big government which seeks to assume more and more control over local and State affairs. It seeks to take more and more of our money and spend it for questionable foreign aid projects, unwise social legislation, Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, Federal power projects, etc.

5. We appreciate the stand which the House of Representatives has taken toward back-door spending. It seems to us that the budget of each government department should come before the Congress for spending authority.

6. We cannot understand the refusal of the President to back up his factfinding boards in the rail dispute. After carrying this to the Supreme Court it would seem to us that legislation to put the new work rules into operation should have been adopted. When will the Congress act to curb the monopolistic power of labor unions?

7. Why should the REA be allowed to continue to borrow money at 2 percent and go into competition with investor-owned and fully tax-paying utility companies, after their objective of taking electric power to the farmers of our country has been achieved? In Page County the investor-owned utility companies will pay $181,982.37 in taxes in 1963 while the REA which has many miles of line in the county will pay not one cent.

8. Out here in rural Iowa, an organization called the Farmers Home Administration is loaning some of our money for projects which we consider highly questionable. This money is used to finance houses in towns as well as in the country to those who supposedly can not get financed elsewhere. Why should our money be used for questionable loans? The local loaning agencies who live with our citizens know best who is worthy of credit.

9. After fiscal sanity has been effected down in Washington and the budget brought into balance, we believe a tax cut could be a great stimulus to all business. With less taxes to pay, more money would be spent for the things which every family would like to have. More goods and services would be bought and the economy strengthened. In other words we would like to spend our money for what we want, instead of the Government spending it for questionable projects.

Cordially yours,

L. M. Cassat, Chairman, President, Richardson Lumber Co.; J. D. Graybill, Manager, Iowa Light & Power Co.; John R. Hunter, Farm Director, Page County State Bank; Willard G. Kuehn, M.D.; Paul L. Millhone, Attorney at Law; Wendell Otte, Proprietor, Otte Furniture Store; Q. L. Clinton, Secretary, Page County Savings & Loan Association; Jack R. Swisher, Proprietor, Clarinda Monument Store; Joseph Pfander, Pfander Trading Post; Robert T. Williams, Secretary, Clarinda Chamber of Commerce; Earl N. Bossingham, M.D.; W. W. Grant, CPA; Edwin S. Lisle, Lisle Manufacturing Co.; Robert D. Looft, Superintendent, Clarinda Public Schools; Lawrence J. Sonneman, Dean, Community College; Jerome J. Biggs, Manager, Loranz & Co., Insurance and Loans; M. M. Dryden, Attorney at Law; Frances Sondag, Manager, Sondag & Roscoe, Deere Implements; Carl C. Casewell, Publisher, Clarinda Herald; Rev. C. D. Uetzmann, Pastor, St. John's Lutheran Church; Clarinda, Iowa, Tax Study Committee.

Chaotic Banking Conditions in the New York Metropolitan Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received the following letter from Mr. Frederick Hainfeld, Jr., the president of the Long Island Trust Co. This points out a situation of serious and growing importance in my congressional district. I know we shall be looking forward to receiving the answer of the Comptroller of the Currency to this pressing problem.

The text of the letter follows:

Since the passage of the Omnibus Banking Act by the New York State Legislature in 1960, suburban New York counties have become dangerously overbanked to the point of virtual chaos. The principal impetus has been the desire of the large New York City banks to get first a toehold and then a stranglehold on suburban business.

A contributing factor of crucial importance is the rivalry between Federal and State regulatory authorities. This has resulted in the approval of far more applications for branches than can be justified by either the present economies of Nassau and Westchester Counties, or their growth projections for the next few years.

Long Island and Westchester banks, including Long Island Trust Co., have repeatedly protested continuing approvals given to applications of New York City banks for unneeded branches in the suburbs. Evidence submitted has been ignored by the authorities, and the many written and oral protests have fallen on deaf ears.

Since 1961, First National City Bank alone has been granted approvals for 27 suburban branches, 14 in Nassau County and 13 in Westchester County. This same bank has branches, four in Nassau County, and two in Westchester County. If past experience means anything, it will take a lot of doing to stop this new proposal. If not denied, the chaos will be compounded.

After careful deliberation, we have concluded that the time has come to bring this issue forcefully to public attention. We are pleased to note that other Long Island banks share our deep concern and are also making their views known.

The enclosed letter, sent to the Comptroller of the Currency, has been released to the press. It is our hope the information and views contained therein will encourage your support in bringing a return to the banking industry of sound regulatory philosophy and policies.

"Hon. JAMES J. SAXON,
"*The Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.*

"DEAR MR. SAXON: The Superintendent of Banks for the State of New York has formally notified us that the First National City Bank of New York has applied to you for permission to open 12 more new branches. Six of these are to be located in New York City, four in Nassau County, and two in Westchester County. Our views have been requested relative to these applications, and we present them in this letter.

"Let us say at the outset that we are deeply, and vehemently, opposed to still further deterioration in the presently chaotic banking conditions in the New York metropolitan area. It is time, we believe, that the consequences of the deep, dangerous, and continuing rivalries between Federal and State regulatory agencies are publicly recognized.

"We believe that the battle for supremacy in the suburban areas, now being fought by giant city banks with Federal and State agencies acting as seconds to the respective combatants, gravely affects the public interest. We see wholesale approvals given to applications to establish new branches in communities that already are full up, pressed down, and running over with the most expert and modern banking services. In our own Nassau County, banking offices have increased 47 percent in the last 2 years—a fantastic growth considering that the population has grown only 3.6 percent during this period. First National City Bank, in New York City, now wants four more offices here and this merely will serve to whet the appetites of its rivals. We go, in short, from bad to worse and the end is not yet.

"James R. Hambleton, in the American Banker of February 26, 1963, accurately portrayed the existing situation. In an article headlined 'Conflict Over Expansion Comes to a Boil in New York,' he said in part:

" 'What's really raising hackles in New York is that Mr. Saxon is granting branches to national banks at a far faster clip than is favored by Oren Root, State superintendent. National banks are getting a decisive edge in the population-rich suburban areas, an edge they may retain for years since many communities can't support branches of more than one big bank. Whichever bank gets there first has the field to itself, at least among major institutions.

" 'For big-city banks the situation is critical. Take the case of Chase Manhattan, second largest in the country, and National City, its big competitor and No. 3 nationally. Mr. Root has granted Chase only 8 suburban branches; Mr. Saxon, after rejecting National City's merger bid, has granted it 24 suburban branches—with more on the way. This means, of course, that National City is carving out a big slice of this lucrative market area long before Chase gets off the ground.

" 'The upshot is that Mr. Root is coming under increasing pressure from Chase and other State banks to ease what he considers to be proper standards for granting new branch applications.'

"We deplore abdication of professional standards by the banking authorities, just as we deplore the tendency to judge the excellence and adequacy of a bank by the number of its branches. Banks are not gas stations, and officialdom should disabuse itself of the belief that it is necessary to have one on every street corner or whatever a few houses come to be gathered together.

"Long Island Trust Co. believes that a bank is much more than a building—it is a basic part of the community's life and growth. The public interest demands that limits be placed upon the concept that branch offices are merely chips in a poker game for outside stewardship. Nassau and Westchester Counties are replete with excellent banking services, and do not need more. Already in existence are banks which have lifelong relationships with the communities they serve so well. Already in existence are the finest banking facilities.

"The Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York spoke frankly of the crucial problem of Federal-State relationships in testimony before a congressional committee earlier this year. He said in part:

" 'If there were time, I could go on to discuss further the breakdown in communications between the New York Banking Department and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Although on a personal basis relations are harmonious, on an official basis—and that, after all, is what counts—they are thoroughly inadequate. This is in spite of many efforts on the part of my colleagues and me to develop a mutually satisfactory mode of operations, including several visits to Mr. Saxon and his associates.

" 'If there were time, I would also discuss the 33 branches of national banks which have been approved during the last year and a half in the suburban counties of Nassau and Westchester, 18 of them for a single very large New York City institution. In the opinion of the New York Banking Department this mass introduction into already heavily banked areas has not contributed to the development of a soundly balanced banking structure. Yet under existing supervisory arrangements, the State of New York was not only powerless to prevent these approvals, it lacked even a forum in which its views could be effectively considered.'

"Mr. Root was dismayed then, and one can only guess at his feelings now. If Nassau and Westchester had more banking facilities than they could use at that time, how much further unnecessary chaos is to exist as a result of branch approvals made since then and through the proposed addition of yet another six branches? If the soundness of our bank structure was jeopardized then, how much more is it to be damaged now? When will power struggles and politics end and sanity return?

"Mr. Root is not alone in making protest visits to Washington. We and the presidents of other Long Island banks have made similar trips and written letter after letter citing facts and figures as to why one application after another should be denied. Like Mr. Root, we achieved precisely nothing—and approval continues to be given for more and more branch banks to establish themselves in communities that already possess a surfeit of banking services and facilities. Our protests and appeals for commonsense fall on deaf ears.

"We see, in banking, a Federal office that appears to be dedicated to favoritism as a way of life and to the proposition that some big banks must get bigger. This is little short of astonishing during the tenure of an administration that publicly deplores monopolies and worsened conditions for middle- and small-sized businesses. In other regulated industries, Federal agencies seem to exercise more care to maintain sound and balanced growth of existing institutions. In city after city, across the entire country, regulation of expansion by airlines, public utilities, and radio and television networks is carried out on a reasonably practical basis. Banking has become the exception through the loss of sound regulatory philosophy and policies.

"Hull E. Tuthill, president of the North Fork Bank & Trust Co. in Mattituck, N.Y., gave voice to our common fears for the future in a letter he sent last month to the New York State superintendent of banks:

" 'In our opinion, continuation of this policy can lead only to a suicidal, destructive competition and ultimate chaos. It is quite obvious that overbanking is the sure forerunner of unsound fiscal policies. When the burden of unprofitable branch offices becomes too onerous, the temptation to cut corners and beat the competition by embarking on risky transactions become difficult to ignore. Even without that danger, when there is simply not enough business around to support all the financial institutions in a given community, some of them—possibly all of them—are going to be hurt. We can see no purpose for further sowing the seeds of these inevitable results.'

"Long Island Trust Co. does not intend to stand idly by and see further chaos continue to develop in Long Island banking under a governmental philosophy that anything goes in a financial version of the game of musical chairs. Alone, or in collaboration with others, we intend to seek broader public awareness of this crucial matter.

"Our bank is sound, vigorous, and growing. We do not fear healthy competition because we daily are engaged in competing with the many banks of long standing in our area. Competition from a justified number of rivals in a given market area is a healthy stimulus for a bank rich in the tradition of customer service and possessing demonstrated ability to get things done.

"We think you will agree that the true measure of adequate banking service is community growth and customer satisfaction. The phenomenal growth of Nassau County during the fifties was accomplished without the presence of a single branch of a New York City bank. Existing Nassau County banks were able to meet all requirements of this growth period. Yet, now that the growth curve has flattened out, officialdom says we need more banks. Honestly, does this make sense?

"The application of First National City Bank to add still more branches to these grossly overbanked areas should be denied and, until truly warranted, similar treatment should be given to future applications from other giant financial institutions in New York City. Such petitions are affronts to fairplay and commonsense, and approval of them does grave and continuing damage to sound banking practice.

"Very truly yours,

"FRED HAINFELD, Jr.,
"*President.*"

Retired Watermaster Rips Power Firms for Burns Dam Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, Lynn Crandall, of Idaho Falls, Idaho, for 29 years was watermaster on the Snake River in Idaho in charge of water deliveries to about 100 canals serving 1¼ million acres of irrigated lands.

When Mr. Crandall, an acknowledged expert, speaks about Snake River projects he does so with authority. Recently in a speech to the Idaho Falls Rotary Club, Mr. Crandall spoke of the need of the proposed Burns Creek Dam on the Snake River. Inasmuch as the Burns Creek project has passed the Senate by a large vote and is currently awaiting consideration by the House of Representatives I feel that Mr. Crandall's speech as reported in the Idaho Falls Post-Register on September 5 is most timely.

Therefore, I wish to commend it to my colleagues who are interested in knowing the facts pertaining to the important Burns Creek project in eastern Idaho:

RETIRED WATERMASTER RIPS POWER FIRMS FOR BURNS DAM OPPOSITION

A retired watermaster considered one of the West's top water authorities told Idaho Falls Rotarians Wednesday that "Idaho should not allow private power companies to tell the State it can't have needed water development."

In a talk devoted to need of the proposed Burns Creek Dam on the Snake River given before regular luncheon meeting of the Idaho Falls Rotary Club, Lynn Crandall, area watermaster for some 40 years, described the Utah Power & Light Co. and the Idaho Power Co. as "tough, resourceful and ruthless opponents of the project."

CITES BENEFITS

Under the revised Burns Creek plan, he said, "Flood control storage has been made a more significant benefit. The recreation and wildlife benefits have also been increased. The project is located some 30 miles downstream from the Palisades Dam.

"The present breakdown on Burns Creek Dam costs show 80 percent attributable to power—not 99 percent as the private power companies have contended in their opposition to the dam. Irrigation would have 1.8 percent share in the cost, flood control 6.8 percent, recreation 9 percent and fish and wildlife development 2.4 percent. This is a sound project, has always been a sound project, and enjoys the consistent support of water users of this area who know its benefits," Crandall stressed.

He said, "The dam offers lower power costs than several dams planned or under construction in the lower Snake and Columbia Rivers and yet it is attacked as unsound."

CRITICIZES COLUMNIST

He criticized John Corlett, political columnist of the Idaho Daily Statesman newspaper of Boise, for a recent column in which Corlett stated that the Burns Creek project was unsound and that "the people of east Idaho had better take another look at it."

"For many years now, the water users of east Idaho have endorsed this project and seen its need and I am sure they are more familiar with its soundness and need than Mr. Corlett. * * * Mr. Corlett also objected to the so-called pork barrel legislative approach on behalf of the dam. The Willow Creek Dam and the expansion of the Blackfoot Reservoir were approved in the same legislation which Burns Creek Dam was deleted. Would Mr. Corlett call the Willow Creek Dam and the Blackfoot Reservoir objectionable, too? Worthy dams are approved in this manner regularly," Crandall emphasized.

WYOMING OPPOSITION

Crandall also took Gov. Clifford Hansen of Wyoming to task for his objection to Burns Creek Dam as unfeasible.

"If Burns Creek Dam is unfeasible then Governor Hansen had better take another look himself at projects in Wyoming which cost more than Burns Creek for its power delivery," Crandall said.

"For the power companies to oppose the BPA is one thing but to oppose Burns Creek in the manner in which they have in the past is quite another," he added.

Crandall admitted that the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, because of an earlier incident in New York when power companies opposed a needed water development in that State, made the power companies a personal target of legislation when he became President.

"He had nearly driven the power companies to the wall in the Northwest, for example. * * * But they recovered, and began a campaign based mostly on giving stories to the press which, while untrue, were believed when told often enough," Crandall said.

He said the power companies have done well in this region in past years. He noted that most power companies have to borrow money for their projects at 4 percent and can charge 6 percent on the investment.

Money Gap Refuses To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, concern is growing around the Nation over our balance-of-payments deficit. Before going further, I wish to include at this point an article by Richard L. Strout, which appeared on the front page of the Christian Science Monitor on September 7.

MONEY GAP REFUSES TO GO

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—"If we close our eyes," Washington said, "maybe the balance-of-payments problem will go away."

The problem didn't go away, and all of a sudden everyone is again aware of it, with a new sense of urgency.

The administration has displayed genuine anxiety—less by anything it has said than by what it has done. It has taken drastic and controversial steps: One is the proposed tax on some foreign securities; another is the reluctant increase in the cost of borrowing money on a short-term basis, from 3 percent to 3½ percent.

What is now seen is that supposed improvement in the 1962 foreign trade balance was exaggerated, and that the problem is getting more urgent.

Put statistically, the deficit figure in 1962 was around $2.2 billions (after including some favorable, one-shot transactions) and the annual rate is now around $3.5 billions. If the public could understand this gap it would be quite a shock, as it is to the financial experts already.

INTERNATIONAL VEHICLE

Actually, it is somewhat less alarming than it sounds because the upward leap of the deficit is less than the bare statistics imply. What happened was that the 1962 figure was minimized and the 1963 figure seems big by contrast. The 1962 deficit was reduced, statistically at least, by including some favorable nonrecurring government-to-government transactions.

The embarrassing American balance-of-payments problem wouldn't exist if the modern world were either less closely knit, or if it were more closely knit. The problem arises because internationalism is in the in-between stage; world trade is operating on a supernational basis, but the credit structure is still operating on a modified national basis.

Put in another way, world credit is now creaking along on the panic-prone pattern that U.S. banks used from 1863 to 1913, before Senator Carter Glass put through the Federal Reserve System.

If there were a new Federal Reserve System for the world, U.S. financial problems would mostly cease, American merchandise exports are bigger (i.e., more "favorable") than its imports, and its gold supply is still immense though reduced.

EXPEDIENTS PROPOSED

The U.S. trouble is that its currency the dollar, has been tagged as the international monetary vehicle for the free world (with some help from the pound sterling), and that it must move to keep its dollar firm and fixed to gold at an arbitrary figure because if it didn't it would shake the whole financial structure of the West.

Some of the moves to support the dollar, however, conflict with internal needs of its own economy. This is true of higher interest rates. The domestic economy is sluggish and needs low cheap money to lubricate trade. But if interest rates in the United States are kept low, then capital will go abroad to find more profitable investment, and the United States will lose gold.

Quite reluctantly, the administration and the Federal Reserve Board have finally raised the discount (interest) rate a little (allowing commercial banks to pay higher interest rates on time deposits) but this is being confined to the short-term loans.

Some economists say, "The time has come—let's establish a supernational bank for the world." Most central bankers reject the idea, however, as premature. They propose various other expedients. There are difficulties in nearly all of them.

For example the United States wants to expand exports. There is even talk of subsidizing U.S. exports. The trouble is that Europe and the world want to expand their own exports. The United States is already engaged in the so-called chicken war over tariffs. Other countries might consider subsidized U.S. exports unfair.

QUESTIONS FROM EUROPE

Another paradox is that when and if the United States balances its own international payments it will mean that some other countries' payments will come unbalanced. We will tend to put the deficit monkey on somebody else's back.

Many European central bankers complacently ask why the United States doesn't (a) raise interest rates to keep capital at home, (b) accelerate domestic growth by large-scale Government spending, tax cuts, and deficits?

But raising interest rates, as already explained, tends to brake the domestic U.S. economy, though the Kennedy administration has cautiously moved in that direction.

And deficit financing is popularly denounced in the United States in contrast to the prevailing European view, although here again, President Kennedy has gone part way toward it in his tax-cut program.

Many other remedies are proposed. None of them are simple.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Strout, in his last sentence, refers to "other remedies," saying none of them are simple. As a matter of fact, one reasonably simple proposal has been offered, in my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, to declare 1964 as "See America Year." Mr. Speaker, according to figures supplied by the Treasury Department, last year's published payments deficit was $2.2 billion. That same year, the unfavorable balance of the tourist trade was $1.4 billion. This is then obviously an important area of attack in the offensive to overcome our payments imbalance, and my bill offers a noncompulsory program to encourage Americans to do their touring in America next year. The year 1964 is going to be an extremely crucial year in the whole balance-of-payments situation; House Joint Resolution 658 appeals to the patriotism of the American people to assist their Government in solving this thorny problem.

During this past week, Mr. Speaker, I have placed in the RECORD some of the letters coming in from State travel and recreation agencies around the country. Support has come from as widely separated areas as Wisconsin, North Carolina, and Nevada, and continues to grow. I urge the support of my colleagues in obtaining early passage of my bill, to allow ample time for publicity and development of the "See America" program.

In conclusion I wish to include a letter to me from Mr. T. Ed Pickard, Jr., president of the Travel Council of North Carolina, Inc., as a further example of the growing support of House Joint Resolution 658:

TRAVEL COUNCIL OF
NORTH CAROLINA, INC.,
Charlotte, N.C., September 9, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: On behalf of the travel leaders of North Carolina who operate the State's third largest industry, serving the traveling public, I pledge the full support of the Travel Council of North Carolina of House Joint Resolution 658, introduced by you, August 21, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By all means, we feel that the President should proclaim 1964 as "See America Year" and that the Department of Commerce should promote it to the utmost.

We have never openly complained about the billions Americans are spending abroad, and we never shall, but we have vigorously promoted travel throughout the United States as well as within our own State. The imbalance of the tourist dollar is not likely ever to be corrected, but certainly this country merits a larger portion.

Sincerely,

T. ED PICKARD, JR., *President.*

Improper Federal Expenditures?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ABELE] recently made some pronouncements about expenditures by the Federal Government which got quite a bit of publicity and which the gentleman apparently thought might be improper expenditures of taxpayers' funds.

A recent article in the Poreman's Journal points up the fallacy of the gentleman's thinking that these are not proper expenditures and explains fully to the gentleman from Ohio why the studies he made reference to are most necessary to our American way of life.

For the reading pleasure of the Members of the House, I include the article, as follows:

We don't think Representative HOMER F. ABELE, Republican, of Ohio, is being considerate when he underrates some of the expenditures of our Government. Our Government is made up of thoughtful, honest, and upright elected officials and anything they do is sure to benefit us or our society or their friends Representative ABELE criticized some of the appropriations made by his feller congressments.

One appropriation in Congress provides $17,500 for modification of alcohol preference in rats. Now, them rats should ort to be furnished the type of alcohol they like best. Besides the Government might not have been thinking about them four-legged rats when this appropriation was voted on. These appropriations should be thought out before they are criticized.

Then $35,800 were appropriated for to study the social behavior of ants. Now they certainly ain't nothing wrong with this appropriation and they is plenty wrong with the social behavior of ants. Our kitchen is full of them right now. They're in that high priced sugar what we horded. They get in the butter and the cheeses and everything else. These ants ought to be taught to mind their social ways. You can't picnic for the hateful things and if you wear pants, you are most certainly to get ants in your pants before you know it. This ain't social. The social life of ants is bad and needs improving but you can't improve nothing until you know something about it. Won't be long now until we will have an Ant Social Board and it will be a wonderful asset to any community.

A mere appropriation of $15,200 by our Congressments ain't near enough we do not believe to give justice to the study of demography and society in ancient Babylonia. We just 'low "demography" is the study of Democrats and you can't learn much about Babylonian Democrats with such a little dab of money. Democrats are expensive to study or have anything to do with. Money don't mean much to them if'n it don't belong to them.

The poor barren-ground caribou was practically neglected. Only a pitiful $2,100 was appropriated for the study of his patterns of behavior. The barren-ground caribou must to be pretty well behaved or they would have had to had more money to study with.

Birds should by all means be trained in the use of radar and space communications. Birds are in constant danger of collisions with missiles, rockets, airplanes, etc., etc., which are being sent into space and places. Congressmen appropriated $20,600 for the study of communication signals in birds. All missile experts and rocket experts should be well versed in bird signals so none of them would be collided with on trips to spaces and moons.

The appropriation of $16,900 for the revision of the classification of earthworms will be hailed greatly by fishermen who have troubles deciding which earthworm should be used at a particular time for bait to ketch a particular type of fish. Too, certain earthworms require spitting upon for to ketch fish better and certain earthworms are better for ketching fish if not spit upon. Classification will lessen the guesswork as to whether the worm should be spit upon or not spit upon before casting to the fish. This is a wonderful advancement of progress. The earthworms should appreciate it.

The social structure of Madagascar needs studying pretty bad. We've neglected this study for some time. Now we have an appropriation of $13,700 for this much needed study. This will be just enough to allow two important Peace Corps men to do a little social investigation within the wayward sections of Madagascar. They might run into something there. We would like to suggest that a Britisher be taken along to help direct this study so it will be more successful. They understand social life pretty good.

The poor mammal fauna of the highlands of Ethiopia has been sadly put aside for years and years. But our elected Congressmen sees the needs everywhere. So they appropriated $29,300 for a study of the Ethiopian mammal fauna of the Ethiopian highlands. This will benefit the taxpayers of America to a very great extent. It shouldn't have been put off so long.

The behavior of the wandering albatross has been a puzzle to generations and generations we reckon. It would mean much to the American people if they understood the wandering albatross' wandering behavior and now $65,400 has been set aside for this important study. We hope they find the albatross to be well behaved in all its wanderings. Of course there could be some delinquency in the behavior of the young generation of albatross. Too, part of this money will go to the study of the ecology of the albatross and this will help us Americans plenty. Why have past Congressmen been so idle that they neglected this much needed study?

Congressman ABELE should jump in there and help our American conscious Congressmen get these things all straightened out instead of setting back and criticizing those who do try to do helpful and progressive things for our Nation and world. Of course this small amount of money would have made a small missile to have got shot up into the air for to bust; but these social studies will serve mankind to a much greater extent than will the busting of a small inexpensive missile of some kind. We, as Americans, must always forge ahead and forward—before the Russians do. Support your Congressmen in their straightforward foresight in the above-mentioned appropriations. Maybe they will come up with more important ones if you do. Besides these appropriations will make a good trip for a friend of one of the Congressmen. The Congressmen know who is best fitted to do this studying. They might even sacrifice their time to help on some of the projects. They're good at social study of any kind. We've heard tell.

Judge John W. Hereford—A Great West Virginia Jurist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is proud of Circuit Judge John W. Hereford of Huntington, W. Va. He is one of the truly great jurists of our time. In his decisions, he effectively cuts through the legal underbrush to reach the main issue.

Judge Hereford's decisions ring with the eloquent Americanism of the Founding Fathers. He speaks from the bench with the words of a kindly philosopher who has a deep understanding of the meaning of the law. A devout and dedicated servant of God, his opinions are firmly based on firm spiritual foundations.

Out of court, Judge Hereford is an active lay member of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church in Huntington, W. Va. A firm believer in training the youth of today to be the leaders of tomorrow, he is the single most vigorous force behind the boys' club movement in Huntington.

On September 7, 1963, Judge Hereford was faced with a difficult decision on a case which had stirred many animosities in the city of Huntington. Tempers flared in a racial dispute over whether Negroes should be enjoined from picketing, demonstrating and sitting in the "White Pantry Restaurant" which declined to serve Negroes. In an eloquent decision, printed on page 15709 of the September 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Judge Hereford denied the injunction.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have printed an editorial in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of September 10, 1963, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Sept. 10, 1963]

JUDGE HEREFORD HITS NAIL ON HEAD

After a decade of weary listening to niggling argument based on discredited principles, it is gratifying indeed to hear a legal ruling which cuts through sophistry, bias, and pretense that the law exists solely to secure the right of property, and gets to the heart of the matter.

Such a ruling was issued Saturday in Huntington by Circuit Judge John Hereford, a distinguished jurist who belongs, if anybody does, to that select group of men who understand that American law applies primarily to human beings, and is intended to support their rights, bolster their dignity, insure equal treatment, and remove artificial obstructions to their pursuit of happiness.

Judge Hereford, rejecting a request for a court order to curtail desegregation demonstrations at a Huntington restaurant, delivered his views with Jeffersonian eloquence.

The restaurant owner, Judge Hereford said, "has no right to come into a court of law * * * and ask me to protect him in doing something the Supreme Court of the United States says is improper when done by a governmental body.

"When such a man as the plaintiff gets a license from the State and the city of Huntington * * * and when that business he is operating has to be inspected by the health department or the fire department of that city * * * and when Negroes help pay with their taxes for inspection of a restaurant open only to white * * * it is not good Americanism and contrary, to my way of thinking, to the laws of West Virginia."

The Gazette is pleased by a ruling which puts into focus the difference between Negro contributions and limited Negro rights. It is vastly more pleased to find within the State such an expression of simple, uncluttered justice.

There is right and there is wrong. No lawyer, however learned, and no circumlocution of law, however expressed, can convince a fair and open American mind that citizens of one skin tone may legally be treated differently from citizens of another skin tone. Judge Hereford, unlike some jurists, knows the difference between right and wrong.

A Ceiling on Spending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, now that the Ways and Means Committee, under the most able leadership of Chairman MILLS, has approved the tax bill, some voices are being heard urging that the tax cut be used as an excuse for placing an unrealistic, arbitrary ceiling on Federal spending, regardless of the actual needs of the country. In yesterday's New York Times, there is an excellent editorial in this regard, which is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress. It follows:

A CEILING ON SPENDING?

There is obvious popular appeal in the campaign to link tax cuts with a definite ceiling on Federal spending. Who does not want to see a reduction in the amount of bureaucratic extravagance that accompanies Washington outlays? Who does not favor a measure of control that will keep Federal spending from getting out of hand?

But the beguiling proposal to impose a freeze on spending, which has been put forward by Republicans in Congress and has the backing of former President Eisenhower, is misleading and unrealistic. Most of the rise in Federal spending stems from much higher outlays for defense and space programs, with the amount going into civilian projects rising at a slower rate than the increase in population. Unless there is a reduction in military and space expenditure, a freeze on spending at present levels would mean, because of population increase, an actual decline in the existing services provided by Government.

There is also a touch of political mischief-making in the proposal to limit spending, because it would not cut the nonessential from the Government's outlays. The cost of subsidizing agriculture, for example, may turn out to be well above the administration's original estimates. If this happens to be the case, as it usually is, a spending ceiling would force the Government to renege on other commitments. Similarly, the ceiling by itself would do nothing to prevent Congress from indulging in its annual pork barrel activities, except that its cost would be at the expense if essential programs.

So placing a lid on spending would be a potentially harmful way of controlling the Government's purse strings. Control is necessary, but it can only be effective through cooperation of the White House and Congress. Both sides must reexamine the entire spending process, making clear that no sector of the budget is immune. This goes for farm subsidies, the race to the moon and the grab bag of logrolling appropriations which, under the proposed freeze, would be more firmly embedded than now. If expenditures are to be held down, cuts should be made in the fat, not the bone.

Molly and Jeanie Macnab Express Their Views on the Job for Freedom March in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD two mother-and-daughter articles that appeared recently in the Portland Reporter. One is by Jeanie Macnab, a 15-year-old schoolgirl who, with her mother, Mrs. Gordon Macnab, was a member of the delegation who traveled 3,000 miles from Oregon to Washington by bus to participate in the August 28 jobs and freedom demonstration here in Washington, D.C. Mrs. Gordon (Molly) Macnab is the author of the second piece. Together, I believe that their accounts convey an accurate sense of the dedication, sincerity and mission of the Macnabs and other members of the delegation which included men and women of diverse races, creeds, and color.

I think a reading of the article by young Miss Macnab illustrates a remarkably developed ear and sense in her reportage, a talent she must have inherited from her father, a member of the Portland bureau of the Associated Press.

[From the Pollard (Oreg.) Reporter, Aug. 26, 1963]

OREGON CIVIL RIGHTS MARCHERS SING ALONG ROUTE DESPITE BUS BREAKDOWN

(By Molly Macnab)

"They woke up in the morning with their mi-nn-nnds set on freedom."

Singing that phrase to a syncopated one-two beat, 36 bus-riding Northwesterners took off from Portland in the 5 a.m. darkness Sunday, to say so in the Wednesday civil rights march in Washington, D.C.

Twelve hours later—after a mechanical delay at The Dalles—they were headed for Caldwell, Idaho. Two college coeds would join them there, filling the last two seats on the chartered Greyhound bus.

Driving nonstop—except for other emergencies and meals—the delegates are due in Washington at midnight Tuesday, ready to join the quarter million expected for the mass demonstration.

The Northwest group probably is traveling the farthest distance to participate.

All were high-spirited, laden with suitcases, baskets, pillows, sleeping bags, guitars, and snacks for the 7-day trip.

After the march Wednesday—from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial—they will start the return trip West that night.

The bus is due back in Portland late Saturday.

The group is made up of Friends of SNCC—Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—which has the blessing of many church groups.

Its recent door-to-door drive for travel funds was directed by the Reverend Ralph Moore, pastor of Highland Congregational Church, NE 9th and Going.

They had to raise $3,000.

Trip captains are Richard Celsi, president of the Catholic Council on Human Relations, and John Holley, Portland Urban League executive. The bus carried no banners or identifying markers.

In Arlington, Va., across the Potomac River from Washington, the Northwest group was to be taken under the wing of a Catholic church which would billet it in private homes "for showers and maybe a few hours catnaps," the captains said.

Among Portland women accompanying the group are Mrs. Thelma M. DePass of the Catholic book store, and Mrs. Marie Lesch, teacher and member of the Catholic human relations group.

Also in the party is Tom Albright, staffer of the weekly paper, Portland Catholic Sentinel.

Among other Portlanders joining the group on their arrival in Washington are Mr. and Mrs. Jim Hunt of the Catholic book store, Mr. and Mrs. Bill McCoy of the Catholic Christian Family Movement, and the Reverend Edward Zenner, teacher at Central Catholic High School.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Reporter, Aug. 28, 1963]

TREK TO CAPITOL A BALL FOR TEENAGE MARCHER

(By Jeanie Macnab)

(Wednesday was the day for the civil rights marchers at Washington, D.C. The 15-year-old daughter of Molly Macnab, Portland Reporter staffer, left Portland Sunday on the Freedom bus for the march. Her mailed comments of the trip east follow.)

From 4:55 a.m.: Pulled away from Highland Congregational Church, singing "Michael," "When the Saints Go Marching In," "We Will Overcome." Instrumental section consisted of two guitars, a banjo. Sunrise on Columbia River highway breathtaking, wispy clouds drifting along hills on north bank.

From 6:25 a.m.: Ten-minute rest stop, The Dalles.

From 6:40 a.m.: Bus broke down east of town. Driver walked back to telephone for a mechanic. Guitarists Naeomi Parry, Franklin High School student, Seattle, and Sheila Van Hyning, Portland, tuned up. Bill Corr, Seattle, joined in with his banjo and we sang folk songs.

From 7:30 a.m.: Driver went back to The Dalles to ask for a new bus from Portland.

From 7:40 a.m.: Returned to The Dalles in borrowed bus. Had breakfast in The Dalles depot. Sang, etc.

From 11:45 a.m.: Bus repaired and arrived in town. Loaded onto bus.

From 11:55 a.m.: Left The Dalles for second time.

From 12:05 p.m.: Finally passed The Dalles Dam. Busload of Al Kader band members asked about our group, seemed mildly interested, rather disapproving.

From 12:30 p.m.: Passed John Day Dam.

From 3:30 p.m.: Passed by Wallowas in light sprinkle.

From 6:30 p.m.: Picked up two Idaho girls at Caldwell—Rosalie Bednarek, just returned from 9 weeks study in Mexico, and Faith Cunningham, student at Eastern Oregon College, LaGrande.

From 7:15 p.m.: Dinner, Boise, Idaho.

From 8 p.m.: Left Boise. Had a long hootenanny until about 10:15. Everybody settled down and slept until Salt Lake City, Utah.

MONDAY

From 3:30 a.m.: Salt Lake City, Spires of Mormon temple lit up beautifully. Ten-minute stop.

8 a.m.: Rock Springs, Wyo. Breakfast, girls took down hair, everyone cleaned up. Were told we would be held up for an hour in Cheyenne—credentials, or something.

From 10:30 a.m.: Crossed Continental Divide. Not very impressive. Had expected much more than just a hill.

From 11:00 a.m.: Rawlins, Wyo. Rest stop.

(Took 10-minute rest stop at Lincoln statue at summit of Lincoln Highway, just east of Laramie, Wyo.)

From 2:45 p.m.: Cheyenne. Met by local chapter, NAACP. Ate meal at expense of NAACP.

The Crime of Execution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 22, 1963.

I am happy to say that capital punishment is disappearing; the number of those executed each year in our country grows less and less. Now is the time for the Congress to set the example for the States and pass H.R. 545, the bill I have introduced to abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions.

The editorial follows:

THE CRIME OF EXECUTION

Capital punishment, for whatever crime and regardless of the method of execution, increasingly offends and troubles the conscience of civilized peoples. We urged its abolition in New York at the last session of the State Legislature. A long step in that direction was taken with removal of the death sentence as a mandated penalty for premeditated murder, which New York alone among the 50 States had kept on the books. We hope the time will come, and soon, when this barbaric relic of the Dark Ages of penology has been removed from the criminal codes of all 50 States, including New York. Some methods of execution are more "humane" than others; but all should go.

The Spanish Government is still executing people by garroting. This painful torture, carried out recently against two alleged "terrorists" in Madrid, is inflicted with a metal collar that is gradually tightened until the spinal column is broken. Cruel methods of punishment are all the more deplorable when they are committed in peacetime. Death penalties for political and economic "crimes" especially—whether carried out by garroting or in more "humane" ways, such as firing squads and hanging—are uncivilized acts.

A U.N. Economic and Social Council study earlier this year, based on data from 65 countries, found that when the death penalty was abolished there was no increase in crime. Whether for capital crimes that all men deplore or political crimes that merely offend the party in power, State killings are acts of vengeance that cure nothing. The U.N.'s moral force should be applied to call attention to the primitive means used by various countries to torture people today.

Fairplay for Farmworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, despite the previous carefully considered action of the House in defeating a further 2-year extension of the one-time war-emergency-passed bracero program, the House Agriculture Committee has now reported a bill differing only in the respect that it has been reduced to a 1-year extension.

The proponents of Public Law 78 have frequently used uninformed and misleading arguments to justify their position that this program is essential to American agriculture and has no adverse affect on domestic farmworkers.

Several of these arguments have been exposed and demolished for what they are—unfounded and unwarranted—in an excellent letter to the editor of the Washington Post, by Mr. Patrick Gorman, the very able secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen's Union.

Mr. Gorman has devoted considerable time and effort to the problems of migrant farmworkers; he is knowledgeable in the workings of the bracero program; and his incisive letter should be of interest and importance to all Members of the House.

I take the liberty of including it in the RECORD at this point.

FAIR PAY FOR FARM HANDS

(By Patrick E. Gorman)

As the secretary-treasurer of one of the organizations leading the fight against Public Law 78, or the Mexican farm labor importation program, I want to thank you for your editorial of August 21 and two earlier this year in which you opposed this vicious statute. Public Law 78 should be terminated this year and we believe it will be.

Your August 21 edition also carried a letter by Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, who represents one of the main bracero-using congressional districts. Mr. TALCOTT's arguments beg an answer.

The claim that Public Law 78 was not considered "wartime emergency legislation" is contrary to the legislative history of the congressional debate of 1951 when the legislation was first passed. The supporters of Public Law 78 claimed then that the law was necessary because of the emergency conditions caused by the Korean war. It is understandable that they would like to rewrite history now.

There is sufficient U.S. farm labor willing and able to harvest crops for Mr. TALCOTT's growers and all the other bracero-using growers, who make up less than 1 percent of the farmers of the United States. Unemployment among U.S. farmworkers is higher than among urban workers—7.3 percent in 1962. An additional 9.5 percent of farmworkers were underemployed. Sharply increasing farm mechanization is making more farmworkers jobless each day. These men and women need jobs.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS has proposed and is holding hearings on legislation to recruit and transport U.S. farm workers to areas of labor need at the time of the need. But every single grower witness who has testified—and many have—has strongly opposed

the bill. The growers do not want domestic workers. They want cheap, docile, easily exploitable labor.

An example of the desire for cheap labor is Mr. TALCOTT's expressed concern that added housing and schools would be needed in his area if U.S. farmworkers cultivated and harvested the crops instead of braceros. Mr. TALCOTT indicates that his growers want workers to work on the crops, to help produce wealth for them, but the growers do not want to meet any of their responsibilities toward these workers—not even to educate their children. "Do our work and then get out," seems to be the sentiment.

Mr. TALCOTT claims that braceros are not imported if domestic workers are available. The fact is that domestic workers often are not available in the area because of the low wages paid them and because fewer benefits are offered to U.S. farmworkers than to braceros.

The Senate, although continuing Public Law 78 for another year, ordered for the first time that U.S. farmworkers would have to be offered free housing, free transportation to the job, workmen's compensation and a work guarantee before braceros could be imported. This would give farmworkers a few of the very benefits which the imported braceros have enjoyed for 12 years. Needless to say, the growers are violently fighting this attempt at equalization and are attempting to knock this amendment out of the bill.

Even with the amendment, the importation of hundreds of thousands of additional workers would depress the wages and would limit the job opportunities of U.S. farmworkers. Wages cannot rise as long as a limitless supply of labor is available and importable.

Finally, Mr. TALCOTT contends that migrant farmworkers lead a terrible life and should not be encouraged in this type of work. He is right. But what are these farmworkers to do? Unemployment is widespread in the United States. The farmworkers are not only unskilled in industrial labor, but do not even have the experience of industrial discipline. They would be among the last to be hired by factories. The alternative to farmwork for them is to starve.

Self-serving arguments about the frightfulness of migrant life in order to gain extension of Public Law 78 are ironical, for Public Law 78 is a major reason why the life of U.S. migrants is terrible. One way of making the life of these poverty-stricken and exploited U.S. citizens better is to kill the bills which would continue Public Law 78.

Preserve Peace and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I comment upon a recent, thoughtful editorial in Gist Research by Mr. Frederick Burdick, distinguished editor of that publication.

Mr. Burdick in his statement pointed out that the 1945 model U.N., like automobile models, needs improvement.

The most urgent requirement, he states, is an effective, comprehensive, objective U.N. international communications system to help "preserve international peace and security."

The main aim would be to distinguish between war and peace propaganda, fiction and fact, rumor and reality, treachery and truth. Mr. Burdick believes that the U.N. would be able to forestall crises which invite chances for hastily pushing humanity into modern war fought with diabolical weapons bringing widespread devastation.

I think that all thoughtful persons who are informed concerning the distressing potential of modern weapons are agreed that this Nation and all nations must devote every possible effort to the prevention of war and the maintenance of peace. Aggressive war in this time and age is truly unthinkable and would be consistent only with fanaticism or madness.

Time and time again our Nation has made it clear that its policy is predicated on the desire for peace and that we would never wage an aggressive war.

However, we do not have the same assurances from the Soviet Union and its satellites and for that reason, if the U.N. is to be a really effective instrumentality for maintaining the peace, it must take the initiative in coping with all, not just some, incidents in the world likely to lead to war.

We can have 100 test bans, but there will be no lasting peace in the world until the Soviet stops its conspiracy against free governments and agrees to proper, effective, international control of nuclear energy and weapons, universal disarmament, and realistic judicial institutions for maintaining the peace.

The Great March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, August 28 is a day that will long be remembered in the history of our Nation. It was a day when the people exercised their right peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Justly named the gentle army the participants in the march for jobs and freedom are to be congratulated for their faith in the democratic process.

The New York Journal-American published the following editorial about the march in its August 30, 1963, edition. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

THE GREAT MARCH

They surprised the skeptics, they confounded the racists, they astonished many of their most fervent well-wishers. They held America's greatest demonstration for Negro rights since the Emancipation Proclamation with dignity, with pride, with firm but gentle purpose.

As our reporter Bob Considine wrote:

"They were the best-mannered big crowd I've seen in 30 years of covering massive assemblies. They were saner than the throngs that frequent the World Series, soberer than the mobs at the big fights, discreeter than the yokels who pack convention halls, less hypocritical than those who hit the sawdust trail under a religious spellbinder's spiel."

In short, the men and women, white and Negro, who marched in Washington to register demands for full citizenship for Negroes, did so in a manner in which all Americans can take pride.

The right of the people peaceably to assemble was never upheld in more distinguished fashion. There was emotion there, too, and anyone who heard spiritual singer Mahalia Jackson, either on television or in person, move tens of thousands of people to hand-clapping rhythm can hardly forget it.

A milestone on the long march of American Negroes from slavery to equality has been reached, and there's no turning back now.

Facts on Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an editorial from the Anderson Independent, a prominent and respected daily newspaper published in Anderson, S.C., under the supervision of former Senator Wilton Hall.

This editorial treats the crucial issue of the test ban treaty and presents, I think, the thoughts of the people of America, especially the mothers and children of the future.

I commend this editorial to all who may be interested.

FACTS ON FALLOUT: HOW MUCH DEATH DID YOU EAT OR DRINK YESTERDAY?

Leukemia, bone cancer, cancer of the thyroid, stillbirths, malformations, or deformed infants. These human tragedies represent just a few of the byproducts of the fallout that swirls around the earth, gradually sifting down, in the wake of test explosions of N-bombs in the upper atmosphere.

This fallout is not uniform throughout the world.

Twice as much falls in the North Temperate Zone as elsewhere, infecting what you eat and drink.

And where is the North Temperate Zone? It's where you and you and you live—right here in South Carolina and Georgia and remainder of the United States.

Heaviest fallout has been recorded in what are regarded as the big wheat and dairy States in the Midwest—but it falls, too, in South Carolina and this leading dairy county of Anderson.

What is fallout?

It is tiny particles of radioactive elements created by the explosions.

These elements include Sr^{90}, cesium, iodine, carbon, strontium 89, barium, zirconium, etc.

Of these Sr^{90} causes great concern. It falls on leaves and on the soil. It is then picked up through the roots of plants, eaten by animals and men, and enters the bone structure just as calcium does.

Whether Sr^{90} goes into the bones or into the muscles and tissues, as do cesium 137 and carbon 14, or enters other parts of the body the fact is that these particles act like little X-ray machines. Difference is they are constantly giving off high bombardment of harmful particles.

Carbon 14 can cause genetic damages.

That means today's adults may pass on to their children particles resulting in malformations of numerous kinds; and that the tempo of damage will mount as today's children pass the deadly damage on to their children in the years ahead.

From tests already held as long ago as 1958, the Atomic Energy Commission concluded carbon 14 alone would cause 100,000 gross physical and mental defects, 360,000 cases of stillbirths and childhood deaths, and 900,000 cases of embryonic and neonatal deaths in the future.

There continues running a debate of politico-scientific nature contending effects of fallout are negligible.

That is the angle taken by those opposing approval by the United States of a limited test ban treaty with Russia—a treaty, by the way, that leaves the Nation much less vulnerable to Moscow doublecross than the one Eisenhower negotiated.

Advocates of testing say the millions of Americans and others who are being harmed represent a negligible part of the world population.

What can these advocates be concerned about? Certainly not peace or people.

Pray that commonsense will prevail in the U.S. Senate and that approval of the ban treaty requested by President Kennedy will be enacted swiftly—even if it represents, as he has emphasized, only a first, short, tentative step toward heading off destruction of the world as we have known it.

It is a step in the right direction.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three excellent letters by Mr. Peter L. Bernstein and Robert W. Stevens, discussing foreign aid as a part of our dollar deficit or gold outflow problem.

These fine commentaries deserve careful consideration by every Member of Congress:

SEPTEMBER 5, 1963.

DEAR SIR: We are two businessmen (one an economist for a major industrial company and one an investment counsel) who are concerned about the role of the United States in world affairs. In particular, we have looked into the question of foreign aid. We are convinced that it is vital for the longrun interest of this Nation as well as for the rest of the world.

We are enclosing two reprints of comments on foreign aid that we have had published in the New York Times. We hope that you will read these reprints in the course of your deliberations on this subject, as they contain certain factual material and information that has received too little attention and too much distortion.

Indeed, we believe that the question of foreign aid has stirred up so much opposition and concern precisely because people are told too little about it. Most of us hear about it only through secondhand sources, which for the most part are biased against the very idea of foreign aid. The main thing foreign aid needs today is wider public understanding of its objectives and achievements.

We hope you will agree with us that it is particularly urgent this year for Congress to appropriate at least the amount specified as a minimum in General Clay's report on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. STEVENS.
MANHASSET, N.Y.

PETER L. BERNSTEIN.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1960]

TO CLOSE THE PAYMENTS GAP—SUGGESTION TO ABOLISH FOREIGN AID PROGRAM QUESTIONED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Elgin Groseclose's letter published September 25 blames our foreign aid program for the deficit in our balance of payments and, consequently, for the accelerating outflow of gold from the United States. His argument is deceptive because it oversimplifies the problem and dangerous because his remedy will fail to cure it.

The deficit in the balance of payments is a net figure, the difference between the sum of a wide variety of payments to foreigners and the sum of a wide variety of payments by foreigners to us. A single item is deceptive, because the total of our payments to foreigners exceeds our receipts from them.

As a matter of fact, while the deficit in our balance of payments rose from about $2 billion in 1956 to nearly $6 billion last year, Government transfers of military supplies and services to foreigners shrunk from $2.6 billion to less than $2 billion. Government loans and unilateral transfers for nonmilitary purposes have risen only slightly from $2.9 to $3.2 billion (excluding our contribution to the International Monetary Fund). Clearly, foreign aid is not the villain of the piece; most of the difficulty arises from a gain of almost $4 billion in our imports during this period.

EFFECT OF STEP

As Mr. Groseclose's own data indicate, elimination of $3.2 billion in foreign aid would cut our exports by $2.4 billion (with serious indirect consequences both here and abroad), as 75 cents out of every aid dollar is spent on American goods and services. Thus, while doing irreparable damage to our friends, we would be helping ourselves to only a negligible degree.

Furthermore, he is incorrect in suggesting that the aid recipients save the extra 25 cents and invest it in gold or short-term securities. Most of it is transferred to other countries, primarily Western Europe and Japan, to pay for imports from those areas; Western Europe and Japan are the primary holders of gold and dollars.

The underdeveloped countries are desperately short of gold and dollars to finance their imports. The world outside of Western Europe, Canada, and Japan holds less gold and dollars than was held 2 years ago. Western Europe, Canada, and Japan hold 75 percent of total foreign gold and dollar reserves, leaving only 25 percent ($9 billion) for the sterling area outside the United Kingdom, and all of Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Finally, to the extent that foreign aid accelerates industrialization in the underdeveloped areas of the world, we create growing future markets for our exports. The industrialized countries are by far our largest customers. The United Kingdom, West Germany, Japan, and Canada took 40 percent of our exports last year. Even more dramatic, we sell as much merchandise to France as we sell to India and Pakistan together, even though the latter two countries have 10 times the population of France.

I do not minimize the many problems and the dangers in the deficit in our balance of payments. Yet it would be lunacy, in my opinion, to attack it by cutting out our foreign aid.

PETER L. BERNSTEIN.
NEW YORK, *September 26, 1960.*

[From the New York Times, Dec. 6, 1962]

ECONOMIC AID DEFENDED—EMPHASIS ON HELPING ENTERPRISE IN UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS WELCOMED

(NOTE.—The writer of the following letter was formerly an economist with the Marshall plan.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

An editorial in your November 29 issue observes that today "foreign aid is in * * * (a) perilous condition" and adds that "the program is now in such shape that its future is uncertain." One of the main reasons why foreign aid is in trouble today is that, in the past, the public has not adequately understood either its purposes or possibilities.

Often—as in your editorial—foreign aid is referred to as a program. As a result people go on to appraise aid in terms of whether or not it has improved living conditions in the receiving countries.

For about a decade, however, the term "foreign aid" has been mainly an accounting label attached to a wide variety of U.S. programs and activities in foreign areas. Some of these are related to emergency situations as in Korea and Vietnam, some to strengthening our military posture as in Turkey and Morocco, some to open rivalry in the cold war as in Poland and Yugoslavia. Others are related to long-term economic development as in India and Pakistan, or to humanitarianism as in the campaign to eradicate malaria and in aid to displaced persons, or to the promotion of U.S. exports as with some Export-Import Bank loans and our sales of agricultural surpluses for local currencies.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The military portion of foreign aid—and it has been the larger part—is really an extension of our own national defense program. Since 1953 more than half of foreign aid has been military in character and it can be shown that in most years some two-thirds of the total was military in intent. But the effectiveness of military aid is not to be judged by economic criteria.

Moreover, some cases of successful military aid must remain altogether unsung. This is partly because some of the information upon which to judge it is classified and also because, in the nature of the case, U.S.-supplied military equipment may succeed in forestalling aggression against a country receiving it although the equipment itself is never "used" in combat.

Among the categories of economic aid, much has had to be used in end-of-the-rope emergency situations. These do not usually lend themselves to being displayed as successes. But despite this and the fact that military and defense-related objectives have long been dominant in the foreign-aid field, there have nevertheless been some success stories in terms of economic progress. One may point to Greece, Spain and Taiwan, not to mention the crucial role of U.S. aid in Asia, helping tip the economic balance toward India and Pakistan rather than toward Red China.

PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT

During the past year and a half at the Agency for International Development, the United States has just begun to mount an overall aid program aimed at long-term economic development in the receiving countries. And yet most of the critics of foreign aid assume that we have been trying mainly to do this all along and that we have failed.

It is ironic indeed that foreign aid finds itself "in a perilous condition" today, just after it has started to move in the direction of the public's long-standing image of it:

namely, toward being a single program devoted to improving living conditions in underdeveloped countries.

Foreign aid is still only one tool of our foreign policy, however, and must not be expected—even in its new guise—to "buy friends" or to produce miracles. But if it is used wisely in countries where basic conditions are promising, it can greatly improve the prospects that many independent and self-respecting governments will survive. With luck it might even do more than that.

ROBERT W. STEVENS.

MANHASSET, LONG ISLAND, *December 1, 1962.*

Some Irrelevant Questions on the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, "Trust the Russians? Unthinkable," cry the militant opponents of the treaty, with a radioactive gleam in their eyes.

"A nuclear test ban? The millenium," respond the frustrated utopians, with an ecstatic presentiment of golden days to come.

Amid the hue and cry from both extremes arise the voices of such authorities as the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The testimony of these experts makes it clear that neither faith in the Russians' integrity nor hope for an imminent utopia has much to do with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

True, the record shows that we cannot put much trust in the Communists. But we must be prepared to put some trust in the highest officials of our Government, officials who are sworn to protect the lives and security of the American people. We must trust that America, too, has a sharp eye out for its own interests, and that our President, his Cabinet members, and our top strategists and scientists are pretty smart.

Contrary to the agonized outcries of the treaty's critics, we are not beating our swords into plowshares. We are not appeasing and we are not surrendering.

What, then, are we doing? We are merely curbing the amount of radioactive poison which is floating around in the air and corroding the genes of unborn children. We are letting the deadly isotopes now in the atmosphere disintegrate peacefully, and we are saying that we will not add any more if we can help it. The barrier which we are raising against genetic defects will protect the children of Rangoon as well as Kansas City, and will lower the strontium 90 count undiscriminatingly in Utah, Uganda, and the Ukraine.

Could it be that the Communists, despite their repugnant political philosophy, are also antistillbirth, anticancer and antimonstrous mutations? A point to ponder.

Meanwhile let us try to keep our eyes on the relevant issues in this new cold war development. One journalist who is doing just that is Bob Wells of the Long Beach Independent. In two recent columns on the test ban debate, Mr. Wells got to the heart of the matter when he focused the spotlight on an important aim of the treaty: controlling radioactivity in the atmosphere.

Because cool and lucid analysis is beneficial to any debate, I am inserting these two columns in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TREATY NO LOVE NOTE TO MR. K.

The current debate on the treaty banning atomic tests in the atmosphere, it seems to me, Ralph, misses the point at issue. On one hand, some proponents are hailing it as a step toward peace, and on the other hand, some opponents are battling it because we can't trust Khrushchev.

Nonsense. The test ban treaty has nothing to do with peace. It merely stops atomic testing in the atmosphere; it does nothing about the tensions between us and the Russians which at any time could erupt in nuclear war.

As for the second point—of course, we can't trust Khrushchev. That's why we specifically reserved the right to test underground. We didn't sign the treaty because we wanted to trust Khrushchev, nor did he sign it out of any affection for us. We both signed it because neither of us really need further atmospheric testing and neither of us can trust the prospects of adding further atomic fallout with its radiation hazards to the atmosphere.

That's what the treaty is all about. Because of the fallout from tests already held, we have had and will continue to have for years to come miscarriages, stillbirths, malformed babies, and deaths from leukemia and bone cancer that would not have occurred if we had not tested atomic bombs in the atmosphere.

It does not matter that the average increase in radiation is less than that of the natural background radiation already present. Any increase is dangerous. It is true that the cases of cancer caused by fallout are statistically small—perhaps no more than a thousand a year out of a world population of some 4 billion. If that be your argument, I will let you explain to the mother of a child dead from fallout-induced leukemia that the infant was statistically insignificant.

THOSE WHO KNOW

Listen to the experts:

Dr. Russell H. Morgan of Johns Hopkins, Chairman of the Surgeon General's National Advisory Committee on Radiation: "There is no such thing as a safe level of radiation."

Dr. Charles F. Behrens, of the Atomic Defense Division, Bureau of Medicine, U.S. Navy, said in a textbook, "Atomic Medicine":

"No amount of radiation is completely without harmful potentiality. Even one photon is a potential source of danger."

In 1955, Dr. George W. Beadle, Caltech geneticist and at that time president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in discussing the effects of nuclear testing, said: "Many genetic deaths in later generations will occur early in development and will be expressed as miscarriages. Some will result in stillbirths. Others will reduce the efficiency of individuals only slightly and in ways that will not be obvious."

And Consumers Reports in a follow-up report on "Fallout in Our Milk," said in February 1960: "No one denies that any increase in radiation exacts a genetic price from the human race (in the form of stillbirths and defective children) * * * the only really safe dose of radiation is none."

THE KIDS SUFFER

The peculiar horror of fallout from nuclear testing is that the people most susceptible to it are children. Their bones pick up strontium-90 (a fallout poison) faster than those of adults, and their thyroids receive approximately 18 times more radiation from the same dosage of radioactive iodine (another fallout product) than the thyroids of adults.

Dr. Jack Schubert of Argonne National Laboratory, testifying before congressional hearings on fallout in May 1959, estimated that the then current rate of fallout meant an increase of 1 percent in the total number of children under 10 who die of cancer each year.

These are some of the reasons Russian, American and British negotiators after years of frustrating disagreements finally initialed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

EUPHORIA STILL IS THE BIG RISK

In 1945, when the rosy fiction of United States-Russian wartime cooperation still hazed reality and prominent Americans of both parties were still lending their names to such groups as the American Council of Soviet Friendship, one man spoke out against the prevailing euphoria.

The policies, interests, and goals of the United States and the Soviet Union, said W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador to Moscow were irreconcilable.

Thirteen years later, the same Averell Harriman initiated in Moscow a treaty with the Russians outlawing nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Hardly was the ink dry when again he hastened to warn the American people that Russian intentions had not changed—they were still bent on overcoming and superseding our democratic system and our leadership in the world.

Then last week, Secretary of Defense McNamara, a private enterprise Republican from the automobile industry; Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Secretary of State Rusk; and Dr. Glenn Seaborg, scientist Chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, went up the Hill to Congress to urge the Senate of the United States to ratify the test ban treaty.

All of them agreed there were risks in the treaty—primarily the risk of "euphoria," of letting down our guard in a feeling of well-being—but all of them said the risks were not serious and the prospect of ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere was worth the risk.

Why this concern with nuclear testing? In the week the treaty was initialed the U.S. Geological Survey reported that contamination of rainwater by radioactive tritium from atomic fallout had reached a new high this spring. And a Canadian doctor announced he had found a statistical link between rainwater thus contaminated and the births of malformed children.

And as the Senate debated the treaty, new reports by Harold Knapp, an AEC fallout expert, and University of Utah scientists revealed that persons living within a 409-mile radius of the Nevada test site had been exposed to fallout of far more radioactive iodine than anyone had realized. The amount is at least 4 times and could be 100 times greater than previously reported.

Radioactive iodine—iodine-131—poses a particular threat to children. If an adult and child take the same amount of radioactive iodine into their bodies, the child's thyroid will receive a radiation dose 18 times greater than that of the adult. This radiation may cause cancer of the thyroid.

IKE PROPOSAL IN 1959

This is why governmental leaders, men charged with the defense of this Nation and the overwhelming number of the Nation's scientists want fallout-producing nuclear

tests in the atmosphere ended. President Eisenhower, in 1959, proposed essentially the same treaty, but was then turned down by the Russians.

Yet, there are respected men who oppose treaty ratification as too risky. Chief among them are Atomic Scientist Edward Teller and our own hardworking Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, hard-working member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Their opposition, however, is somewhat weakened since it constitutes a reversal of previous stands. In 1960 Dr. Teller wrote:

"We should renounce nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere. We should challenge the Russians to do likewise. And we should use our influence in the United Nations to prevent atmospheric weapons tests by all nations.

"All developments of nuclear explosives which are really necessary," Teller wrote, "can be carried out by methods which will not contribute to the contamination of the air. We can continue the development of nuclear weapons without causing any further contact of human beings with radioactivity."

The test ban treaty, of course, permits unlimited underground testing. In a press release issued by his office May 13, 1963, HOSMER said:

"The plan calls for a treaty 'about on terms presently discussed by the administration' but would allow each side 'about a dozen fallout-free underground tests annually.' HOSMER feels this 'escape hatch' might go far toward protecting the United States from the consequences of Soviet cheating or surprise treaty abrogation."

The treaty allows an unlimited number of "escape hatch" underground tests. But HOSMER says he didn't really propose the plan at the time, but just threw it out to stir up a little talk.

Man, Monument, and Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "Man, Monument, and Tree," which appeared in the July-August 1963 issue of the Pacific Telephone magazine.

The article concerns Mr. M. H. "Wally" Waldron, 700 Prospect Avenue, South Pasadena, Calif., a resident of the 24th Congressional District which it is my privilege to represent. On April 13, 1963, one of the world's oldest living trees, located in the Angeles National Forest, was named, the Waldron Tree. It was dedicated as a tribute to Mr. Waldron for his untiring efforts in the Boy Scout movement for the youth of America.

MAN, MONUMENT, AND TREE

(By Stewart Hussey)

Few men on this planet carry the distinction of having one of the world's oldest living trees named for them. "Wally" Waldron, 76-year-old retired senior engineer in South Pasadena, is one.

A citation dedicating the tree reads: "The Waldron Tree—dedicated as a tribute to Michael H. "Wally" Waldron for his untiring efforts in the Boy Scout movement for the youth of America. His inspiration and work led toward the establishment of the Lord Baden-Powell Monument on 9,399-foot Mount Baden-Powell in the Angeles National Forest. The Waldron Tree is estimated to be 2,000 years old and is part of the Ancient Limber Pine Forest near the summit of the peak."

Wally weighs less than 100 pounds and stands only 5 feet 1 inch. But he is a giant in the eyes of his Scouting associates. In recognition of his dedicated work for international Boy Scouting since 1929, Wally received both the coveted Silver Beaver and Silver Antelope Awards. His study, where he is busily working on current Scouting projects, is covered with numerous other awards for his devoted efforts to Scouting over the years.

In 1931, a mountain in Angeles National Forest was renamed Mount Baden-Powell, in honor of the founder of the Scouting movement. By 1956, all that remained of the original memorial atop Mount Baden-Powell was a bent and rusty flagstaff. "It's too bad," commented one leader.

Wally agreed—and immediately set out to establish a permanent "landmark and skymark to Scouting—a world monument belonging not just to American Boy Scouts, but to Boy Scouts all over the world."

Funds had to be raised, and a labor force organized. During the 10-week construction period, more than 2,000 Scouts carried 18,400 pounds of construction materials up the arduous 4-mile switchback trail to the summit. Smaller Scouts, some of them barely 11 years old, carried the lunches. As each Scout prepared to make the climb, Wally checked him to make sure the load was not too heavy. "The most gratifying thing to me about the building of the monument was that not once were the standby first aid people needed," he said.

The monumental task was finished in September, 1957. Since then, more than 7,500 Scouts and non-Scouts from all over the world have climbed the mountain and visited their memorial.

The U.S. Forest Service dedicated the Waldron Tree last April 13. Wally's reaction to the tribute? "I am deeply honored. But the monument was built through the combined efforts of many people. It isn't something that could be accomplished by one man. An individual may have an idea, but he must have people to hear it, and cooperate in its execution. So in a joint effort like this, no individual can be isolated and given all the credit."

But the hundreds of Boy Scouts who make the annual climb to the top of their mountain may well pause in gratitude before the majestic tree that now bears his name. They will remember the little giant who made their own world monument a reality.

While They Are at It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee for 5 years I have found myself time and again in the unfortunate position of watching the REA programs slowly degenerate from a fine effort of electrifying the Nation's farms into a politically opportunistic drive to foster Federal ownership and control over the Nation's electric users. Any effort by committee members to take a constructive action with respect to this program is always met by the negative argument that the Appropriations Committee's jurisdiction over REA is limited to making funds available for this agency's operation without any concurrent authority to direct how the money should be used. Such an argument indeed may have had some merit in the early days of the REA program, when the agency was busy financing distribution systems and service drop outlets to serve farmers and others in rural areas. However, recent overt actions by the present Administrator has changed REA from a farm to a Federal power program. REA is, insofar as I know, the only Federal power agency for which the Appropriations Committee must authorize tax dollars without exercising any control or direction over the expenditures of those funds.

For this reason alone the Scripps-Howard editorial appearing in yesterday's—September 9—Washington Daily News entitled "While They Are At It," calling for an "overall review of the whole REA operation," by the House Agriculture Committee makes real sense. If Congress cannot review the REA program annually and mold policy as it does with other power agencies then certainly the legislative committee needs to take a whole new look at this situation. The gist of the editorial is that while the House Agriculture Subcommittee plans to investigate the $110,000 REA loan to a Pennsylvania ski enterprise, it should make an overall review of the whole REA operation to determine "whether REA, as such, any longer is needed."

Although the Pennsylvania ski loan is a disgrace to the good name of REA, it is still only a symptom of a far greater sickness that has befallen this agency since Norman Clapp and Richard Dell began using the good name of REA and the money Congress made available for the American farmers to foster a Federal power program on this Nation against the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to reads as follows:

WHILE THEY ARE AT IT

Use of taxpayer money to help a proposed ski resort finance the electrical equipment it needs has raised enough doubt to start a congressional investigation.

A House agriculture subcommittee plans to call the Rural Electrification Administration about a loan of $110,000 to a Pennsylvania ski enterprise. REA made the loan to a rural cooperative which hopes to supply power for the resort. The co-op then lends to the ski jump promoters, at a profit.

The legality of the loan has been challenged by some Congressmen, and defended by REA, naturally. But there is more to it than this. While the subcommittee is nosing into the whys and wherefores of the ski loan, it ought to do an overall review of the whole REA operation.

It ought to find out whether the REA in many recent loans has gone beyond the intent of the law. It ought to get into the question of the law itself, which requires lending taxpayer money at 2 percent interest when the taxpayers have to pay much more to borrow the money.

REA was created to help provide electric power for farmers. At the time, only about

10 percent of the country's farmers had access to electric power. Now about 98 percent of them are supplied. So the REA program accomplished its purpose. An overwhelming majority of its recent loans don't help farmers at all—but go for facilities for new suburban areas and industry.

While the subcommittee is at it, why not also determine whether REA, as such, any longer is needed?

The New Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the new friendship with Communists being fostered by the administration, it would be practical for us to ponder on the words in an editorial "The New Hungary," which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer of Tuesday, August 27, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

THE NEW HUNGARY

There is a mounting array of evidence that the United States is approaching something amounting to diplomatic recognition of the murderous Hungarian regime of Janos Kadar.

Kadar was installed in power in Budapest by Soviet tanks in the wake of the Hungarian revolt of 1956. With the swiftness and efficiency that are characteristic of Moscow and its puppets, his regime crushed the remnants of the revolt with unspeakable brutality.

Kadar has, in brief, identified himself as an enemy of the Hungarian people, as a slavish servant of Moscow.

But now, a new image of Janos Kadar is emerging—along with a new image of his country.

The word has gone out, for example, that the Hungarians who fled for their very lives at the time of the 1956 uprising will now be welcome to visit their homeland.

Kadar, in addition, has announced a sweeping amnesty for political crimes, including participation in the 1956 revolt. Some 3,000 to 4,000 persons reportedly have been released from prison.

There is also evidence of a relaxation of economic pressures, a loosening of visa and passport restrictions on travel between Hungary and the West, even an increase in the number of Western motion pictures shown in Hungarian theaters.

All of these developments, the U.S. State Department has advised Members of Congress, point to "a decided improvement over those (conditions) that prevailed during the (pre-1956) Rakosi era or in the early aftermath of the 1956 revolution." They are developments, moreover, that should, in the State Department's opinion, "be viewed objectively and in proper perspective."

Janos Kadar, it seems to us, is in the position of an international gangster. His crime is that he has stolen away the freedom of his people. He possesses, by material standards, everything of which he ever dreamed in his conspiratorial days—except one thing. That is prestige—the kind of prestige that underworld figures in our own country always covet but rarely acquire.

This prestige is not simply a matter of salving his own ambitions and aspirations; it is a matter of closing the door on the aspirations of his own people—and other satellite peoples—to be free.

Every American gesture that acknowledges the "reformation" of the Kadar government is a contribution toward this end. It is very much as though the Attorney General of the United States had tipped his hat to Al Capone.

Regulating the Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Herald Tribune begins a series of articles by William Haddad and Martin J. Steadman which deals with the problems encountered by a drug company which has cut the cost of drugs in Colombia, South America.

These two able reporters have revealed shocking practices which should be thoroughly investigated by Congress. The late Senator Estes Kefauver was determined to find the facts. I hope that the appropriate committees of both Houses will not let the matter rest. There must be a full investigation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the article and also a timely New York Herald Tribune editorial in the same edition which urges an inquiry into drug pricing.

HIGH STAKES IN LOW-COST DRUGS REVEALED: SECRET PROBE OF PRICE FEUD

(NOTE.—The cost of life is sometimes the cost of a drug. In Colombia, a land where grinding poverty is a way of life, McKesson & Robbins has cut the prices of some vital drugs to a tenth of what they used to be, bringing modern medicine to ancient poverty. And it makes a profit. But, the company says its drugs competitors are ganging up to stop McKesson & Robbins with a variety of pressures throughout the commercial world. In Congress, at 2 p.m. today, a group of determined men will try to get a full investigation of a whole list of shocking charges. With this story, the Herald Tribune's research reporting team begins a series on a bitter feud involving hitherto secret testimony and the high stakes of an international price structure.)

(By William Haddad and Martin J. Steadman)

McKesson & Robbins is the Nation's largest drug wholesaler. Last year it had drug sales of more than $460 million. And last year, at the request of the President of Colombia, it began marketing drugs there at prices as low as one-tenth the prevailing rates.

This program, according to the State Department, has brought drugs to those who could not pay for them before; for many, it has meant the difference between comfort and suffering; for some, the difference between life and death.

For McKesson, it has meant the wrath of an aroused drug industry and an argument that has extended across four continents and into Congress. The bare details are spelled out in secret testimony Congress may never release.

For everyone involved, the stakes are high: the price structure of drugs in underdeveloped nations, possibly in the United States itself.

So far, McKesson is losing.

"I can understand," Colombian President Lleras Camargo said, "why my people cannot have new cars, television sets, and other luxuries and can only eat meat at infrequent intervals, but I cannot understand why they should be deprived of lifesaving drugs because these are priced out of the reach of more than 80 percent of the Colombian people."

Mr. Lleras Camargo was succeeded as President last year by Guillermo Leon Valencia, also a strong supporter of the low-cost drug program.

When McKesson agreed with him it bought a half interest in a Colombian firm and started cutting drug prices. Here's what followed:

Antibiotic pills costing consumers 29 cents each were cut to 3.6 cents a tablet.

Prednisolone, used in treatment of arthritis, was slashed from 19 cents a capsule to three for a dime.

Isoniazid, helpful in treatment of tuberculosis, was cut from $1.70 for 100 tablets to 80 cents.

Down the line, through 32 vital drugs, McKesson cut the old prices in Colombia. And the company says it is making "an excellent profit."

What plagues U.S. drug manufacturers is the fear that similar reductions may be demanded in this country. In fact, one major firm is now quietly marketing drugs here at prices similar to those charged in Colombia, but the fear of retaliation by the drug industry has prevented the firm from publicizing it.

Earlier this year the late Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, then chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, set out to investigate what he called the "organized and collective efforts of a number of large American drug manufacturing companies" to block such sale of low-cost drugs.

"Evidence," he said, "has come to my attention which suggests that such organized and collective efforts may have been made not only with respect to the program in Colombia, but to prevent the adoption of similar programs in other South American countries.

"When Senator Kefauver died, he was up against a stone wall in his effort to force an investigation on the basis of his evidence."

At 2 p.m. today, Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat, of Michigan, the new chairman of the seven-man Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee (he took over when Senator Kefauver died), will try once again to round up enough votes to get an investigation going.

His prospects are dim. Last Friday he had only his own vote and hopes of one more.

Senator Kefauver tried to get the probe underway with issuance of subpenas for the books and records of seven major drug firms and the industry association. But three times the return date of the subpenas has been postponed. The return date is now September 18, but there is a move underway to kill the subpenas completely. That action will be voted upon today.

If and when Senator HART gets an investigation going, these are some of the things he will be looking at:

A worldwide effort by drug manufacturers (including some in the United States) to deny patented drugs to McKesson for use in its low-cost drug program overseas.

An effort by Colombian drug firms to force McKesson out of their markets.

An effort by American manufacturers to frustrate the sale of low-cost drugs in Central America.

An effort (though unsuccessful) by drug manufacturers to enlist the support of the State Department to kill the low-cost drug program in Colombia.

These and other charges of pressure will be detailed by the Herald Tribune during the next several days.

Already on record before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is the testimony of Herman C. Nolen, the former college professor who is now McKesson's board chairman.

In the testimony, which may never be released, he spells out his fears and frustrations:

"We are alarmed by the growing interference with our ability to carry out this program.

"Fundamentally, we are deeply concerned with the principle at stake—that the efforts of McKesson or any other company to initiate a program to provide low-cost medication should be free from organized interference.

"The drug program is seriously endangered, having been subjected for some months to what is apparently a concerted and malicious campaign * * * to handicap or stop the * * * program and prevent its spread to other sections of the world, including the United States."

Mr. Nolen went on to say:

"It can be said fairly that the price of drugs is a burning social and political issue in Latin American countries.

"In Colombia—and hopefully elsewhere—McKesson has sought to meet this problem through the traditional American approach of free competitive enterprise in coownership arrangements with local firms."

Mr. Nolen than diagramed the low-cost price structure for the Senators, and told them that his company was able to maintain those price levels and still make "a reasonable profit."

He said the program was not affecting tradename drug sales, but that the drugs sold under generic names were reaching new markets in Colombia, mostly the poverty-ridden peasant class.

He told the Senators that the drugs, whose generic names are abbreviations of chemical names internationally used in medical schools and textbooks, required little or no promotion among doctors and pharmacists, thus reducing operating costs considerably.

Then he dropped his depth charge:

"Recently, however, reports came to our attention that members of the pharmaceutical industry in Colombia—who were offering their products under trade names—had started attempts to block or to slow the generic program in Colombia and to interfere with its extension elsewhere.

"At first, we were ready to discount much of this as healthy competition. More and more, however, we grew alarmed at the extent and severity of the concerted attack against the generic program."

Mr. Nolen then made these accusations:

"Concerted activities directed against McKesson and its Columbia affiliate, Droguerias Aliadas, Inc." Retailers were being told by the Colombian manufacturers' association to boycott the generic line. Doctors were advised that it was impossible to produce quality pharmaceuticals at the prices being offered. These doctors received a sizable amount of literature attacking generic drugs. Some of this literature originated in the United States.

"Pressure on medical journals": Colombian medical journals consistently refused McKesson advertising, while at the same time they carried "extensive and distorted articles and editorials critical of generic drugs."

"Refusal to sell activities": The campaign against generics "has even involved the cutting off of supplies necessary for the continuing success of the generic program—that is, the refusal of certain pharmaceutical manufacturers to sell us raw materials useful for the generic program." Mr. Nolen made it clear that some of these firms are U.S. drug manufacturers and licensees.

"Interference with extension of the generic program": There are reports from other South and Central American countries that strong efforts were being made to stop generic drug programs in those countries before they got started.

Serious charges by the respected head of one of the Nation's largest corporations.

Made, June 25, they are still being bounced back and forth between various Government agencies and congressional committees.

The drug industry's counterattack came in Senator Kefauver's own subcommittee. There Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, was successful in having the subcommittee turn for "counsel" to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a move Senator Kefauver bitterly opposed.

Senator DIRKSEN won when three other Senators—ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, and EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri—voted with him. Only Senator HART joined Senator Kefauver in opposition. Senators THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, were absent.

On May 27, the Kefauver subcommittee met with the Foreign Relations Committee and argued the jurisdictional problem. Senator Kefauver lost again.

On June 25, the Foreign Relations Committee held its executive session at which Mr. Nolen testified.

Thomas G. Corcoran (the famous "Tommy the Cork" of Roosevelt days) represented the drug interests and Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin argued State's position. Representatives from the Agency for International Development and the Department of Justice were also present.

Industry argued that:

(1) The disclosure of the matters called for would gravely injure the U.S. pharmaceutical industry in its Latin American operations and would endanger all private foreign investment in the area; (2) industry was working toward solutions of its own problems; (3) the balance of payments would be hurt if oversea drug profits were cut, and (4) industry produced its records for the subcommittee, the information contained in them might be inimical to the foreign policy of the United States.

After the executive session, the Foreign Relations Committee advised Senator Kefauver that the investigation should be conducted either by the Department of Justice or State.

Yet State had already said it couldn't conduct the investigation, and Justice said it could only look into possible violations under existing antitrust laws leaving a wide area unexplored.

There the matter lies.

Unless Senator HART is successful today, the investigation is "for all practical purposes" ended, the Herald Tribune was told.

This spokesman summed it up this way:

"The State Department and AID say they don't have the resources to do an investigation. The Foreign Relations Committee has washed its hands of the matter. The Department of Justice is only interested in pieces of the testimony."

McKesson supporters told the Herald Tribune: "This is exactly what was designed to happen."

LET'S FIND OUT ABOUT DRUG PRICES

The drug industry isn't like the widget or the doodad or the gizmo industry. It deals in lives, and it does so on a vast scale.

In a lot of underdeveloped countries, an abundant supply of relatively low-cost drugs is, quite literally, a matter of life or death. When these are supplied by U.S. pharmaceutical houses, it also becomes inextricably entwined with the foreign relations of the United States. This is so not only because of the sometimes irresponsible use of Yankee drug firms as political whipping boys, but also because a common effort to alleviate human suffering is one to which the United States repeatedly summons its neighbors.

McKesson & Robbins has, in Colombia, pioneered with dramatic success in the distribution of modern drugs at a fraction of the price at which they normally would sell under their regular trade name. As the Herald Tribune series beginning today makes clear, the pressures to block this experiment have been powerful and sustained.

It is true that drug research and development is costly, and that these costs have to be recovered. It is also true that the American drug industry, operating under its system of patents and profits and the hope of profits, has made monumental contributions to medicine.

But if there are ways in which these golden eggs can be made available to millions now mired in primitive misery, without killing the highly productive goose, these ways need at least to be explored. And if—as the evidence suggests—there have been unconscionable efforts to keep drug prices artificially high, these need to be exposed.

At 2 p.m. today Senator HART's Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee will decide, in effect, whether or not to go ahead with its inquiry into drug pricing. If it decides not to, it's going to have a weight of death and despair on its conscience. And if the drug industry's hands are really clean, it should not fear an investigation.

Truth or Fiction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter I received today from Mr. Clyde Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which is self-explanatory:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: We are mailing you the enclosed editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal because you may have missed it when it was reprinted in the Washington Post the other day.

This editorial deals with REA matters now before Congress and will be helpful to you, we are sure, in pointing up what the rural electrification program means to the growth and prosperity of America.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, the enclosure to which Mr. Ellis refers was reprinted as an advertisement in the Washington Post and Mr. Ellis failed to point out that it was a paid ad. The article was entitled "The Truth About Rural Electrification."

Under unanimous consent, I wish to include at this point the following editorial, not a paid ad, from the Washington Post of September 9, 1963:

SO FAR AFIELD

Members of Congress may well be asking how the Rural Electrification Administration can justify subsidized loans to ski resorts. No doubt the pleasure to be had on slippery slopes in Illinois and Pennsylvania will be enhanced by these loans for the purpose of snowmaking and ski-lift machinery. But just why should funds for this purpose be coming out of the public till?

It is true, of course, that the REA legislation is very broad. Congress has authorized the agency to make loans to rural cooperatives for the benefit of nonfarm rural residents as well as that of farmers. It has also permitted the co-ops financed by the REA to make loans to rural industries to encourage the use of electricity. No question of illegal operations on the part of the REA has been raised, but whether the financing of ski resorts at low interest rates is within the intent of Congress is a question that calls for further inquiry.

Some REA officials feel that Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee was not talking about this type of loan last year when he issued a warning against making loans that "are going to go so far afield." Regardless of how Mr. COOLEY may feel about the ski resorts, we are glad that a subcommittee will be looking into this seeming misuse of funds. Our own feeling is that if Congress wants to subsidize ski resorts it should say so directly and not leave the REA in a position to make such policy under the general terms of an act designed to provide rural areas with electricity.

Mr. Speaker, after reading this editorial about REA in the Post, I must assume that Mr. Ellis will arrange for the NRECA to pay for reprints in other papers around the country including the New York Times. If not, I am sure people will begin to wonder whether the substance of his paid ad was really truth or fiction.

U.S. Aid and Trade Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD two recent newspaper editorials commenting critically on U.S. policies of trade and aid concerning Communist nations.

One of the editorials, from the August 28, 1963 Dallas Morning News, discusses the folly of U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia, which has been the recipient of large amounts of U.S. aid and favorable trade policies.

The other, entitled "Aiding the Enemy," appeared in the August 28, 1963, Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram. It points out inconsistencies in U.S. policy which redound to the benefit of the Communists.

The editorials follow:

THE INFERNAL TRIANGLE

For many years aid proponents have been hawking the idea that the United States could woo Tito's Yugoslavia away from world communism with lavish foreign aid.

Our Government has adopted this idea in its policy toward Yugoslavia. The United States has furnished the Communist regime there more than $1.7 billion in economic aid and more than 693 millions in military aid. Over the years the Russian-Yugoslav-American triangle has rocked along, as East and West competed for Tito's favor. Khrushchev has competed with pleas to return to the fold. We have countered by pouring more money, equipment and other material wealth into the hands of the Yugoslav Communists. We have wooed and, as recent news stories show, we have lost.

The history of the strange triangle reads like a formula plot from an old B movie. Yugoslavia has played the part of the coquette. After having a spat with her steady friend, Russia, she has allowed the town's rich boy to court her with expensive gifts. Then, at the last moment, she has left the playboy at the church and gone back to her old flame. Playing the part of the rich boy left holding the bills is Uncle Sam, who is becoming typecast for that role.

The climax of the plot came the other day as Khrushchev arrived in Belgrade. Tito was doing a little wooing of his own and the object of his affection, the Soviet Union, had turned his political complexion from pink to rosy Red. He greeted Khrushchev with a hearty bear hug, which was rather apropos.

At the banquet celebrating the reconciliation, Tito announced that he and K had "mutually arrived at the conclusion that many things which have divided us in the past have been mere trifles and that we are now faced with common interests and tasks."

The common tasks that they are now turning to include, of course, the destruction of capitalism, which continues to be the final goal of Communists everywhere. Among the mere trifles that are not going to stand in the way of this Communist joint effort is the more than $2,393 million in cash and goods given to Tito by the United States.

This was pointed up by the fact that Tito and his guest boarded separate American-made DC-6B aircraft for a visit to Skopje. Upon arrival, they got into a white Cadillac convertible for a drive around the city.

In the spirit of Communist togetherness, Tito suggested to K., "Let us bury the past." Nikita, who is fond of talk about burying things, apparently agreed. And when they did, they probably used an American shovel.

AIDING THE ENEMY

Since it is seeking to isolate the Castro regime through economic pressure, the U.S. Government should be concerned over the fact that 10 non-Communist countries increased their trade with Fidel Castro last year.

Before issuing complaints, however, this country had better take a hard look at its own trading habits and the blindspot in its policy toward allies who aid the enemy.

Last year, Congress amended the Export Control Act to clamp down on the exporting of anything to the Soviet bloc which could contribute significantly to the bloc's military or economic strength.

Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB has just noted that the United States recently authorized the exporting of $10 million worth of mining equipment to Russia.

Mining equipment is used for digging valuable ores from the earth. The director of the Commerce Department's office of export control agrees that the equipment would make a significant contribution "to the economic potential of the Soviet Union."

Meanwhile, the U.S. Government apparently is violating its own foreign aid law by giving aid to countries which carry strategic goods to Cuba.

If the United States itself sells strategic goods to the Communists and refuses to impose penalties, voted by Congress, against others who do so, why should our allies take seriously the occasional injunctions from America against aiding the enemy?

Economic pressure has always been considered a major device for winning wars or altering the conduct of unruly nations.

The free nations have acknowledged the value of this device in principle—but have vacillated in its application. Although they recognize the correct course, they have been unwilling to make the sacrifices required.

Making money is still more important in this world than defeating tyrants.

And so the tyrants forge ahead.

Forecast for Silver and Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the questionable monetary theories presently propounded by the Treasury Department has been brought to the attention of the Congress many times this year. Only 2 weeks ago, I warned my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to remain alert and keep constant vigil over proposed monetary legislation in order to avoid a complete dilution of our currency. Yet, despite our concern the Treasury continues to bathe under sunny skies, seemingly unaware that already their bad judgment in this area has started fiscal storm clouds to brew over the Nation's horizon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Mining Record, published at Denver, Colo., on September 5, 1963, relating to this very important issue. The editorial follows:

NEXT

Some months ago we predicted the abolition of silver certificates such as one dollar bills, and their replacement with Federal Reserve notes, all of which is now in process.

Next on the list of efforts of Washington officials to find a solution to the monetary crisis in keeping with their theories, will be the repeal of the law requiring a 25 percent gold reserve behind all Federal Reserve notes and liabilities. Despite the fact that coming monetary events are as predictable as anything can be in this life, Federal officials still persist in trying to make workable the impossible theories of one John Meynard Keynes. So, within a short time the Congress of the United States will be told by the Treasury Department that there is no necessity for any 25 percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes and liabilities—after all, the American people cannot own gold and, furthermore, these gold reserves should be made available solely to our foreign creditors. These foreign creditors now hold many more short term liabilities payable in gold than we have gold to pay. As usual, foreign creditors are preferred by our Government to the American people. (There are other forms of discrimination besides those having their roots in race or religion.) All of which means that when this 25 percent gold reserve is repealed, there will be no gold behind our $1, $2, $5, or $10 bills, or other Federal Reserve paper money. Then, what next?

At the present time our short term liabilities are increasing at the rate of $3 billion

or more per year. They already total over $25 billion and we have less than $16 billion in gold with which to pay them. There apparently is no end to this situation. The United States alone cannot by currency laws and regulations end the desires of other peoples in other lands to own gold. It cannot remove the value of gold in the eyes of these peoples. In fact, there is an increasing number of Americans who are beginning to realize anew that gold has its value, regardless of what they were taught in school.

The shortage of silver coins cannot be laid entirely to the demands of slot machines, parking meters, coin collectors, and the like. There are many Americans who are now saving silver coins because they fear the day when the unsecured, irredeemable Federal Reserve paper money will not buy the necessities of life. Meantime our gold reserves are being rapidly depleted, our silver reserves are being whittled away unnecessarily. No steps are being taken by the U.S. Government to increase its gold supply or to augment its silver resources. Instead over 90 percent of the gold and silver mines in this country are closed.

So next will be the repeal of the law requiring the 25 percent gold reserve for all Federal Reserve $1, $2, $5, and $10 bills. That may be the final step before the floodgates of inflation are loosed on this country.

Counteracting Red Fishing Fleets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Flordia. Mr. Speaker, we have Russian fishing vessels violating the territorial waters of the United States off the coast of Florida, and we have them engaged in fishing in our historical fishing grounds along the New England and west coasts of our Nation. Our own fishing industry is suffering as a result, and the need for legislation is pointed out in the September 10, 1963, edition of the Evening Star by Columnist Charles Bartlett. I would like to insert a copy of that article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 10, 1963]

COUNTERACTING RED FISHING FLEETS—CONGRESS EXPECTED TO ACT SOON ON BILL, BUT BASIC ILLNESS OF INDUSTRY REMAINS

(By Charles Bartlett)

The reaction to the Soviet fishing armadas off both coasts seems likely to stimulate this country's concern with its fishing industry in somewhat the same way that sputnik brought attention to bear on the space effort.

The intrusion of these fleets within the 3-mile territorial limits has prompted Congress to a move, with the support of the State Department, that would attach stiff penalties to such poaching. Concurrence on the inadequacy of the present prohibitions is broad enough to portend that the bill will be passed swiftly.

This country will decide soon whether to follow the example of some 40 nations, including Canada, in extending the fishing restrictions in its territorial waters from the traditional 3 to 12 miles. In either case, the new law will serve to keep these visiting fleets a respectable distance offshore and lessen the immediate concern.

But the new law will not, as its sponsors concede, answer the basic threat to the American fishing industry that is implicit in these foreign fleets with their great mother ships, advanced trawling equipment, and coordinated efficiency. The clear implication of these fleets is a present in which the American fishing industry is falling behind and a future in which it will be unable to compete at all.

It is not merely a matter of Russia, although that country's expansion of its fleet has been the most dramatic fact of the new era. Nations like Japan, Canada, Peru and even Ghana have also been launching modern fishing vessels during a period of steady decline in new construction in the United States. Subsequently the fish catch has risen only slightly in the United States while it was doubling in the world as a whole.

This country now relies with increasing emphasis on imports for its fish supply. Established processing plants are obliged to turn to foreign sources or face the shortages which now afflict processors in traditional centers like Gloucester and Boston. The number of fishermen and fishing boats is decreasing and the industry as a whole is a dwindling operation.

The essential cause of the decline is the inability of capital necessary to acquire modern boats and equipment. Fishing flourished in this country as a rugged exercise of private initiative, but the cost of the new equipment is beyond the reach of the small entrepreneurs and upappealing to the large corporate investors. Uncompetitive labor costs and the high insurance charges on crewmembers have been factors in this lack of investment appeal.

A major deterrent to new contruction has been a law, on the books since 1792, which forbids the landing of fish in American ports from vessels that were not built in American shipyards. Since modern steel boats can be obtained abroad at savings as high as 50 percent, the fishermen confront a unique handicap.

The United States costs of new construction are $450,000 for a modern trawler, $740,000 for a tuna clipper, and up to $8 million for a factory processing ship. These are awesome figures, and the rate of new construction has declined steadily since the war. When new boats are built, the tendency is to build them along conventional lines without modern improvement.

The impact of the foreign fleets has spurred a congressional move to correct the construction handicap. The Senate Commerce Committee is preparing to report a bill that would offer $10 million a year in subsidies for new fishing vessels. Payments up to 55 percent of the cost of a boat would be made directly to the shipyard under the supervision of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Another proposal, which has gained less momentum, would enable the Government to build two modern stern-ramp trawlers at a probable cost of $7 million each. These vessels would be leased to established fishing companies with the purpose of proving their worth and inducing private investors to contemplate similar construction.

The case for these bills, and for a further proposal to grant $5 million a year to the States for fisheries research, rests upon a proposition that the American fishing industry is worth saving at the price of Government subsidy. This is a knotty issue because the fisherman's tradition of self-reliance is strong, but his prospects have been severely limited by the aggressive fishing policies of other governments.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 26th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

The Twin Falls Times-News of Twin Falls, Idaho, in an editorial on May 30, 1963, indicated that Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho may herald the biggest power grab in the Nation's history.

The editorial follows:

[From the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News, May 30, 1963]

POWER GRAB

The Department of Interior edict arbitrarily extending the marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration may herald the biggest power grab in the Nation's history. Intentionally, the word "power" has a double meaning, one of control or authority and the other of electricity. Where legislative means have failed to enlarge the sphere of public power, there now appears to be a real attempt in the offing to spread the influence of the Federal bureacracy over more of the Nation's electrical energy.

Even before the questionable order to extend the Bonneville marketing area, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was moving to reserve Federal space on privately owned transmission lines crossing the public domain. That move in itself constituted a considerable power grab. In the West, with its wide stretches of public land, such a grab would hurt the public utilities.

Now Secretary Udall has registered objections to construction of a private nuclear powerplant in California on grounds of "earthquake danger." His objection is aimed at blocking AEC licensing of the privately owned plant at Bodega Bay. Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, charges Secretary Udall's contentions are "specious and phony." The Congressman, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said earthquakes do not present any particular hazard to nuclear power reactors.

Representative HOSMER might be quite correct in suspecting Secretary Udall has ulterior motives in attempting to torpedo the Nation's nuclear power program. More to the point, the Congressman should suspect Secretary Udall of attempting to foist off on the Nation the concept of public power as opposed to privately owned power facilities. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co., a private utility, has petitioned the AEC for permission to build the 325-kilowatt nuclear plant.

In trying to block expansion plans of private industry in California, Secretary Udall's motives are open to question. Representative HOSMER might be quite close to the truth when he charges Secretary Udall is trying to grab control of all the Nation's electrical energy. The Secretary's edict extending the Bonneville Power Administration marketing region was a step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Daily Statesman questions how some of the Bonneville promises will be fulfilled. It points out in an editorial of May 26, 1963, that Bonneville with all its so-called cheap power has not brought full prosperity to the area wherein it now serves. It is common knowledge, of course, that a major portion of Bonneville power is sold to the electrometallurgical industry which has extremely high power use with extremely low employment rate.

The editorial follows:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Sunday Statesman, May 26, 1963]

BONNEVILLE POWER ARRANGEMENT SEEMS HIGH GEARED; HOW SOME OF THE PROMISES WILL BE FULFILLED IS PUZZLING

In connection with the announcement that the Bonneville Power Administration will have supervision of the marketing of public power in southern Idaho, Mayor O'Bryant of Idaho Falls makes an interesting statement. He says Bonneville power is scheduled to be available this fall. Senator CHURCH said in Washington that Idaho Falls could save 30 to 40 percent by receiving power from Bonneville.

Our understanding is that before Bonneville power will be available in southern Idaho, Congress will be required to appropriate something like $78 million (we had previously used an estimated figure of $60 million) to build transmission lines. We doubt that congressional approval of the $78 million could be obtained in the immediate future and we know that it would not be possible to construct the transmission lines by fall. So it may be that BPA, with the help of the unlimited authority of the Secretary of Interior, may have ways and means to get these things done. They may have previously unused authority over the transmission lines of Idaho Power and use it to accomplish their evident desire to take over power distribution in this area. They have a club over Idaho Power in that some of the private utilities transmission lines run across Federal land.

But whether Bonneville power comes to Idaho by fall is beside the point. Just how Idaho Falls, already operating with public power except for a fraction of the city's needs which is manufactured in their municipal plant, will receive power at a lower rate than the low rate it already pays for Federal power is not understood. And if Bonneville, already losing its shirt every year, will bring about even lower rates than those of public power presently generated in Idaho, the situation would seem to be compounding itself. Whatever the facts may be, it is plain that Idaho taxpayers are helping foot the bill.

There are many Idahoans who see a great future in the possibility of the State receiving so-called cheap electricity. There is the great argument that public power will bring an influx of industry which is not true, and has not been true along the Columbia River where the full force of the public power program has been operating for many years. Bonneville's heavy operation losses are due to the area's inability to attract new industry. Portland, for instance, has never been really prosperous since the war days when the shipyards operated day and night. A great deal of the use of Bonneville power has gone into industries that were subsidized by the Government. The Harvey aluminum plant at The Dalles is a sample. The Government not only financed the plant but also agreed to buy its output. It was located in Oregon adjacent to the public power lines because aluminum uses a great deal of electricity but few employees. The bauxite from which aluminum is made is imported.

It is doubtful that Idaho would feel any great impetus in industry if power service were free. Generally it is too small a part of industrial costs for it to be a factor in determining industrial location.

The argument that 9,000 persons would be employed in southeastern Idaho by 1980 in the phosphate industry is nothing more than another of the confused statements of public power enthusiasts. So is the claim that the coming of public power to Idaho will bring in millions of acres of new land. The Government has about as much business developing new land, to add to agricultural surpluses which it is forced to buy, as it has in hoping to develop a more extensive fertilizer industry to create even larger surpluses.

But Idaho is about to see what she shall see as far as the power business is concerned. The final story is not being voiced by those who now are baying along the trail. There is so much involved, most of it affecting Idaho's basic economy, that only the distant future will tell the full story. The difficulty will be that when the real damage can be measured it will be too late to do much about it other than boot out of office the intellectuals who want to run the State for personal political benefits rather than practical plans that guard against disruption.

The one cold fact that will remain is that nothing is free even when the Government is the donor. The Government gives nothing except that which it first takes, then returns in minor part from the large slice it continues to collect from the State's taxpayers.

Who Cut Foreign Aid Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial appeared in the Mesa Tribune of September 3. I think the points it makes could well be kept in mind by all Americans, be they Republicans or Democrats.

WHO CUT FOREIGN AID BACK?

[From the Mesa Tribune, Sept. 3, 1963]

President Kennedy was understandably disappointed a few days ago, when the House of Representatives voted a reduction in foreign aid funds. He made a considerable show of effort toward producing a program that would meet with approval, appointing special study committees and the like and accepting at least a portion of their recommendations regarding cutbacks.

The House, however, after further study of the matter, approved a figure of $3.5 billion, which is about a billion dollars under the President's proposal.

At a suddenly called news conference, President Kennedy delivered the following words: "This is a shocking and thoughtless partisan attack by the Republican leadership on a program which both parties have consistently supported as being vital to our national security."

The President was being careless with the facts when he attempted to put all the blame (or the credit, if you're a foe of foreign aid) on the Republicans. Had not some 52 Republicans joined with 172 Democrats in voting for the final version of the bill, the whole effort would have gone down the drain.

Looking a bit closer at the matter, it should be noted that on the so-called key vote which brought about the reduction to the $3.5 billion figure, 66 Democrats voted yes. Is this a partisan attack, too? This group of 66, it should be further noted, included the Democratic chairmen of three committees of the House: Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Rules; in other words, some of the most powerful Democrats in the House.

So it was hardly logical, to say the least, for the President to center his attack on the Republicans and their leaders. There were many rank and file Democrats and many leaders of the President's own party who felt that further reductions in the program were necessary and could be accomplished without imperiling our national security.

The President should realize, by this time, that Congressmen and Senators have minds of the own, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. They are not necessarily rubber stamps, regardless of their political affiliation. When they have a job to do, they'll do it as they see fit, not as a peevish President thinks they should do it.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Creation of New Diocese of Ruthenian Byzantine Rite in Passaic, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I recently learned of the creation of the new diocese of the Ruthenian Byzantine rite in the city of Passaic, N.J. I mention this because I feel that America in general and New Jersey in particular stand to be greatly enriched by this new exarchate.

It is interesting to note that the Passaic Parish of St. Michael is the mother parish for most of the Slavonic churches on the eastern seaboard. The church now has nearly 100,000 members in the Eastern States alone. The new Passaic diocese will encompass all of these States.

Pope Paul has named the Most Reverend Bishop Stephen Kocisko to be the "eparch," or bishop, of the new exarchates. Bishop Kocisko has had a long and distinguished record of service to the church, and I welcome him to the State of New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous concent to have two articles concerning the establishment of the new exarchates printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. They are both from the Passiac, N.J., Herald News. The article entitled "Felicitations to Bishop Kocisko and the New Ruthenian Diocese of Passiac, N.J.," I might add, is written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, a prominent American Slovak journalist.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSAIC TO BECOME THE SEAT OF BYZANTINE RITE DIOCESE

VATICAN CITY.—Pope Paul VI on July 31, 1963, created a new eparchy (diocese) in Passaic, N.J., for Ruthenian Catholics of the Byzantine Rite.

It will cover 94,682 Catholics in all the eastern coast States and the eastern part of Pennsylvania. Until now, all the Ruthenian Catholics in this country were governed by the Byzantine Exarchate (Archdiocese) of Pittsburgh, Pa. The Pittsburgh diocese will now cover all the territory in the Nation outside the Passaic diocese.

The cathedral church for the new Passaic diocese will be St. Michael's on First Street in that city. Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Stim is currently pastor of the church.

Pope Paul also named Most Rev. Stephen Kocisko, who until now was auxiliary eparch (bishop) of Pittsburgh, as eparch of Passaic.

Exarchate and eparchies are the rough equivalent of dioceses, and their heads are known as exarchs and eparchs. An eparch ranks with bishops, an exarch with archbishops.

Most Rev. Nicholas Elko, who has been apostolic exarch of Pittsburgh for the Byzantine Rite, became eparch of Pittsburgh.

The Eastern Church is part of the Catholic Church and has in common with the Roman Church, which is called the Church of the West, all the essentials of Christian belief, morality and worship.

It recognizes the Pope, Patriarch of the West, as the supreme head of the church. It differs from the Roman Church in its liturgy and rites, laws and customs. Its various bodies, called Eastern Catholic or Eastern Rite churches, are principally specified by the jurisdiction to which they are subject, and by the distinctive rites they employ in divine worship.

The Byzantine Rite Exarchate of Pittsburgh was established on May 8, 1924. Until it was divided now it had jurisdiction over 297,000 faithful, 193 parishes, 235 priests, 186 nuns, 31 elementary schools and 2 high schools.

Bishop Kocisko was born in Minneapolis, Minn., on June 11, 1915, the oldest of 9 children born to John Kocisko and Anna Somos. His parents are both American born; his mother a native of Nanticoke, Pa., and his father a native of Minneapolis.

After attending Catholic schools in Minneapolis, he attended Nazareth Hall Preparatory Seminary in St. Paul, Minn. In October 1935 he was sent to Rome where he completed his seminary studies, took advanced courses in theology and earned the degree of licentiate in sacred theology in addition to his baccalaureate in philosophy. Bishop Alexander Evreinoff ordained him to the priesthood March 30, 1941, in Rome.

His first assignment was as pastor of St. Stephen's Church, Detroit, Mich. In March 1947 he became pastor of St. John the Baptist Church in Lyndora, Pa., where he built a new church during his 10-year stay.

In April 1956 he became chancellor of the Pittsburgh archdiocese and on July 20, 1956, was appointed titular bishop of Theveste and auxiliary to the Most Reverend Elko, the apostolic exarch of Pittsburgh.

Bishop Kocisko was chancellor until May 1958 when he was appointed rector of the Byzantine Catholic Seminary in Pittsburgh, Pa., a post he held until April 1963.

In May of 1962 he became the officialis of the diocesan tribunal and in September 1962 the vicar general of the diocese. He has been serving as chancellor of the diocese again since April of this year.

FELICITATIONS TO BISHOP KOCISKO AND THE NEW RUTHENIAN DIOCESE OF PASSIAC, N.J.

(By John C. Sciranka)

The American Slovaks hasten to felicitate our Ruthenian brethren on the establishment of a new Byzantine rite diocese in the city of Passaic, N.J., with Most Rev. Stephen J. Kocisko as its first ordinary. In this historical year of the 11th centenary of the advent of the Slav apostles, SS. Cyril and Methodius, to what is now Slovakia, Pope Paul VI has bestowed a great honor not only upon the Americans of Ruthenian Byzantine rite, but also on those who cling to the Slavonic Christian heritage.

The Passaic parish of St. Michael was predestined for this honor and tribute, for it is the mother church of most of the Slavonic churches in the Eastern States. Considering the fact that it was founded on November 14, 1891, with Rev. Nicefor Chanath as its first pastor, it is a peer among the Slavonic parishes of New York metropolitan area. Its first organizers came in large numbers from what is known as eastern Slovakia.

The Slovak Catholics, who arrived in Passaic on December 19, 1879, established their first Socitey of St. Stephen on November 2, 1884, when 21 of them assembled in the home of John Urban on Bergen and Market Streets, right in the neighborhood, where the newly designated cathedral of St. Michael is established. However, due to shortage of priests, when they met on April 1, 1891, to found a Slovak parish, their plans had to be delayed. Nonetheless, when Byzantine rite Catholics succeeded in obtaining a priest in the person of Father Chanath, the Slovak Catholics gladly joined them and attended their church, acknowledging then the unity, which is stressed now, especially since the pontificate of the immortal Pope John XXIII.

In the fall of 1892 through the cooperation of late Monsignor Sheppard of St. Nicholas Parish, the Passaic Slovak Catholics were given permission by Most Rev. Winand Michael Wigger, D.D., bishop of Newark, N.J., to found their own parish, which was established seven decades ago.

During all those years a real neighborly brotherly love existed between the pastors and people of both parishes. In later years schism became a great factor and often seemed too overwhelming to cope with. Yet St. Michael's stood like a Rock of Gibraltar, loyal to its sacred principles. Its most impressive edifice was predestined to be a cathedral. Writers dealing with immigration and its problems never failed to mention St. Michael's Parish on First Street in the Dundee section of Passaic in their books and often used its picture to show the love and good taste of early Slav immigrants for fine architecture and art, although most of them lived in very humble homes. Yet, they wanted the best for their churches, which is also evidenced from the St. Mary's Assumption Slovak Church on Monroe and Market Streets in the same neighborhood of Passaic. Slovaks and Slavs in general, no doubt, inherited love for beautiful churches from apostles, SS. Cyril and Methodius, who came from Byzantine Empire in the ninth century, when art and architecture flourished and was at its peak.

The Ruthenian language is very close to the Russian and both are descendants of the ancient Slavonic tongue, which is still used in the mass and in the liturgical books. However, in opinion of some linguists, Ruthenian, in the form of its words, is much nearer to the Church Slavonic than the modern Russian or the so-called great Russian language.

Andrew J. Shipman, well-known American Catholic author, gave it much study and found that it bears somewhat the same relation to the latter as the Lowland Scotch does to English or the Plattdeutchs to German.

The beauty of the Slavonic nations is that they can understand each other although each has its own separate language and culture. The Christian tradition of 11 centuries has grown deep roots and every American of Slavonic descent, who understands the meaning of the name Slav, is proud that its origin is from the word Sláva, meaning glory. That is why the old Slavonic greeting is: Sláva Isusu Christu. Which means: Praised be Jesus Christ in Slovak. However, in true

Slavonic translation it means glory be to Jesus Christ. And thus we felicitate the new diocese and its first Ordinary, Most Rev. Stephen Kocisko in his new See of Passaic, N.J.

Labor Day Address of Al Hayes, President of the International Association of Machinists and Vice President of the AFL-CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, organized labor's goal of a shorter workweek is frequently distorted and misrepresented. An excellent exposition of labor's true objective was presented to a nationwide CBS radio audience on Labor Day by Al Hayes, president of the million-member International Association of Machinists and vice president of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Hayes' remarks deserve careful study by the Members of Congress, and I respectfully call the following to their attention:

LABOR DAY ADDRESS OF AL HAYES, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE AFL-CIO

On this Labor Day of 1963, it is appropriate that we pause in the pleasures of this traditional day of picnics and parades—and reflect for a moment on what this day really means—and what it should mean to the people of our country—not just the 17 million people who belong to unions—but to all of the people of America.

Labor Day was created by, of, and for the organized workers of America—at a time, some 70 or 80 years ago—when the dignity and worth of labor—in fact the dignity and worth of man—was threatened by an avalanche of advancing industrialization and mechanization and exploitations.

Labor Day was founded as a reaffirmation of the basic and intrinsic value of man at a time when many of the owners of our industries and businesses were amassing great wealth—while—at the same time workers, husbands, wives, and children, were being forced by economic necessity, to work together as long as 16 hours a day, 6 days a week, for little more than starvation wages.

In our present, relatively prosperous, society it is easy to forget the past trials and tribulations of our working population. There are many, far too many, in our present generation who do not understand that the rights of working men and women, the economic as well as the political rights which we take for granted today, did not come about by the process of automatic evolution.

Every improvement in the economic, social, and cultural lives of our working population was achieved only because of the determination and sacrifices of the men and women who actively opposed oppression, exploitation, injustice, and the tremendous difference between the living standards of the owners of our industries and businesses on the one hand and the workers on the other.

Since an individual worker was and still is utterly helpless to change the status quo, these men and women fought the fight for a higher standard of life and greater justice, and dignity through their labor unions.

Today the purposes—the aims and the objectives of organized labor are widely misinterpreted by the press—and are often misunderstood by the very people who have benefited, directly and indirectly, from the accomplishments of unions.

For example: the opposition to unions argues today that workers may have once needed unions—to combat the greed and exploitation of mercenary corporations—but that today unions are no longer necessary because the managers of industry—have learned the lessons of the past.

It is true, of course, that corporations and businessmen have recognized and accepted labor unions as a vitally necessary institution in our kind of society—a balancing mechanism.

But this does not make the need for unions any less significant today than it was in earlier times.

Despite propaganda and mistaken opinions millions of working men and women—who help to create the wealth of our country—are not yet sharing fairly in America's prosperity.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that a family of four—in an average American city—needs at least $6,000 a year to maintain a living standard of minimum health and decency. Today, at least 77 million Americans are members of families that do not meet this modest standard.

Moreover, despite our seeming abundance and prosperity, we still have in America 15 million families who live in dilapidated slum housing. We still have in America millions of children denied adequate educational opportunities because of a shortage of 140,000 classrooms in our schools.

We still need at least 900,000 hospital beds. We as a Nation still challenge 60 percent of our retired citizens to exist on incomes of $1,000 a year or less.

On this Labor Day 1963, it is sad to report that a majority of these older citizens cannot get adequate medical care only because they cannot afford it.

These are just a few of the unmet needs of the people of our country. In view of these needs—both public and private labor unions are as vital and necessary in our kind of society today as they were at anytime in our history.

Moreover, in addition to all of these omissions, shortcomings, and inequities, there is a new, modern threat to every American who works—with his hands or his brains—for a living.

The onrushing onslaught of a new technological force—called automation—is today transforming not only our factories and offices but our social, economic, political, and cultural institutions as well.

It is ironic that we are celebrating a day dedicated to the concept of the dignity of labor at a time when this new force of automation threatens to render obsolete many of the skills, the muscles, the intelligence—in fact much of the human capacity.

And this is not a remote problem of the future. This is a practical problem of the present.

For some years now, between 4 and 5 million American workers have been unemployed on a full-time basis. At the same time millions of others have been working on a part-time basis.

Because of the high birth rate of the early 1940's, we are today experiencing—what one expert has called "a head-on collision between advancing technology and a tidal wave of manpower."

It has been estimated that to provide job opportunities for our work force of the 1970's our economy will have to create at least 35 million new jobs—or 300,000 a month over the next 10 years. However, instead of creating new jobs, automation will by that time have destroyed 22 million jobs that now exist.

This, then, is an important and overriding problem that confronts organized labor and the working people of America today. How shall we maintain the dignity of labor—and the purchasing power of working families—at a time when the human factor in industry is threatened as it is through automation.

Organized labor is deeply and directly concerned with this problem.

To members of unions, automation is not just a word or a theory but an ever-present fact in everyday life.

Of course, I must make it clear—lest I be misunderstood—that unions are not opposed to technological developments or automation as such. To the contrary, we know that automation, like mechanization, can help us build a more just and equitable economic order.

But we do not believe that workers, or any other single group in our society, should suffer all the adverse byproducts—or bear unaided the full burden—of technology which benefits society as a whole.

Therefore, one of our primary goals on this Labor Day of 1963 is the shorter workweek. Unfortunately, this goal has been sorely distorted and misrepresented.

To refute such distortions and misrepresentations I emphasize that organized labor is not seeking the shorter week because American workers have become lazy and unwilling to work. Quite the contrary, the drive for the 35-hour week is motivated because millions of American workers who want work do not have jobs or job opportunities.

As we all know, antilabor forces have heaped ridicule and condemnation on the idea of a shorter workweek.

However, they offer no answers, no alternatives of their own to the problem of growing technological unemployment.

Many of the arguments now being used against the shorter week were used against unions in the fight against the 72-hour week, the 60-hour week, and the 48-hour week.

But, despite opposition and discouragement, organized labor will continue to fight for the shorter week because this goal—like all of labor's objectives—is rooted in the hopes, the needs and the aspirations of the working people and will benefit society as a whole.

Unfortunately, today the task of organized labor is more difficult than ever before.

While trying to meet the challenge of unmet needs, substandard living conditions and an onrushing technology, organized labor is being handicapped by a broad series of laws and threatened laws designed to reduce its overall influence and effectiveness.

Not only have unions been weakened—by the Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin and right-to-work laws—in the drive for more purchasing power better working conditions and job protections—but today labor is threatened with even more stringent legislation, the kind that coldly equates human labor with the commodities of the marketplace.

Thus—on this Labor Day 1963—unions and the 17 million men and women they represent and their families—are confronted by challenges as severe and far-reaching as any that faced earlier generations of Americans.

But with the help—and the hearts and the hands of the working people—we are confident that we can meet the challenges of our time just as earlier generations of trade unionists met theirs.

I hope that you will take a moment—on this day dedicated to American Labor—and reflect upon—and perhaps even understand and appreciate the struggle that organized workers have made and will continue to make for a more just, equitable and humanitarian society, not only for union members and their families, but for every segment of our society.

United States Should Not Pay for Middle East Hate Propaganda Through Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Senators KEATING, DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and KUCHEL in sponsoring an amendment to the foreign aid bill to halt assistance to countries that disrupt peace around the world.

The foreign aid bill, as recently passed by the House, includes language that would stop U.S. aid to nations that are spending their own meager resources on military efforts against either the United States or other countries receiving aid from our country.

The amendment which I am cosponsoring would stop aid also to countries using propaganda for such purposes.

Egypt provides the most flagrant example of a country using propaganda as a major weapon against its neighbors, but it is not the only country involved here.

Times magazine of March 29, 1963, contained an account of Egypt's Nasser using propaganda to disrupt the already tense situation in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The U.S. Government says that since that time Egypt has increased its propaganda efforts against Israel. It has been estimated by another source that today Nasser is spending about $500 million per year on direct radio broadcasts alone.

Since World War II the United States has poured $629 million into Egypt. I think it is shocking that our money, which should be used to raise the living standards of an impoverished people, is doing little more than freeing funds which Egypt uses to foment trouble and hatred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASSER USES PROPAGANDA TO DISRUPT TENSE SITUATION IN MIDDLE EAST

All the Arab world is influenced by Nasser's genius as a propagandist. Rising to share Cairo's skyline with the huge dome of the Mohammed Ali mosque is a forest of transmitting antennas that carry Radio Cairo's message to all the world. Cairo's voice bears many accents. There is the overt Voice of the Arabs, and a whole concatenation of "Voices" (Voice of the Arab Nation, Free Voice of Iran, Voice of Free Africa, etc.), which bleat incitement to rebellion with no identification of their Egyptian origin. The transmitting complex is elaborate and devilishly clever. Recently, Somali-language transmissions have supported the claims of Somalia to a portion of northeast Kenya, while Swahili broadcasts aimed at Kenya denounce the idea. A U.S. construction firm is building a new transmitter, which will be beamed at Tunisia and aimed at destroying President Habib Bourguiba.

Egyptian TV, the liveliest in the Middle East, manages to keep three channels busy 20 hours a day, while kinescopes subtly loaded with Nasser propaganda are shipped out to Algeria, Kuwait, and Lebanon. Nasser has collected the best entertainers in the Arab world, and uses them superbly. When Um Kalsoum sings "We Revolutionists," the Bedouins in the desert are deeply stirred. One of the most popular songs among Arab kids is "How We Build the High Dam at Aswan." Every transistor radio in the Middle East is a Nasser agent. When Yemen revolted against the Imam, Nasser sent them arms and transistors.

Nebraska: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of the House, more particularly to the members of the Nebraska delegation, the vast amounts that are gambled legally and illegally in that State.

From the size of attendance figures at the Nebraska racetracks—over 800,000 paid admissions—it is apparent that residents of neighboring States have stopped in to place a bet now and then.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the parimutuel turnover in that State hit a level of almost $42 million with close to a million dollars going legally into the State treasury. However, most of the gambling in Nebraska is done illegally. Wide open spaces and long distances make local bookie joints more necessary and convenient than in the East.

Nebraska's share of the national off-track betting figure presented to the McClellan committee came to about $390 million last year. This is only half the story. According to expert testimony, this figure can be doubled in order to arrive at an estimate of all illegal gambling in that State. Simple arithmetic tells us that illegal gambling in Nebraska is an $800 million a year tax free business.

About $80 million a year—10 percent of the total turnover—goes right into the coffers of the gambling syndicates. This represents a healthy bankroll for the underworld.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the Nebraska congressional delegation realizes it but their State is subsidizing the treasury of organized crime with every dollar illegally wagered in that State.

Common sense pleads for an end to this tragic state of affairs. Only proper government control and regulation of gambling can keep out the racketeers. In my opinion, a national lottery in the United States would bring this money into the public treasury rather than into the exchequers of the crime syndicates.

Nontariff Barriers to Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the course of a Senate debate on the U.S. balance-of-payments situation on September 3 I strongly urged that the United States undertake a major effort at the forthcoming GATT negotiations to eliminate those nontariff barriers to U.S. exports abroad which impede the marketing of our goods overseas even though we have succeeded in reducing duties levied on these goods by our trading partners. I submitted detailed evidence to sustain my contention, including a series of articles by Richard Lawrence in the Journal of Commerce and an OECD document on the subject.

To prepare for these negotiations on nontariff barriers the Department of Commerce has held extensive hearings with representatives of over 40 U.S. industries in order to be in a position to know specifically which nontariff barriers cause the biggest problems for our exports. According to an article which appeared in the September 7 issue of Business Week, the U.S. Government on the basis of information gleaned from these hearings, has decided to push for serious negotiations on nontariff barriers during preliminary GATT talks this fall. These talks are to include discussions of nontariff barriers maintained by the United States which are particularly vexatious to our trading partners. This is the way it should be. We cannot enter the coming trade negotiations pretending to be proponents of greater trade liberalization unless we are willing to commit ourselves to meaningful and reciprocal negotiations on all types of obstacles to trade. There is increasing sentiment among leading industrialists that reducing nontariff barriers, such as the ones suggested above could be as rewarding as persuading countries to give further tariff concessions.

A review of the evidence obtained from U.S. industry regarding such barriers is still underway in the Commerce Department. The Business Week article to which I referred earlier, points out however, that most complaints by U.S. exporters center on three types of European restrictions; internal taxes on top of high tariffs, high cost-base methods of calculating ad valorem duties and taxes, and discriminatory regulations against marketing, packing, and advertising.

I believe the United States would make a major contribution to liberalized world trade if, during the forthcoming GATT talks, it was prepared to propose the establishment of a covenant on nontariff barriers under the GATT, should that become necessary to obtain meaningful concessions from the EEC.

There are those who contend that the President has the authority to negotiate

meaningfully with regard to U.S. nontariff barriers, such as the Buy American Act, the Antidumping Act, and those contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act, since it is not the laws themselves that are impeding imports into the United States, but their interpretation and administration. The fact remains that, such U.S. nontariff barriers as the American selling price, quotas, the Antidumping Act, and those provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act involve statutory laws and thus require legislative consent for amendment or repeal. In the absence of an international covenant on nontariff barriers, our negotiators can only pledge executive action proposing changes to the Congress—if it becomes apparent that it is in our interest to otbain changes in these laws.

I hope to be in a position to discuss this highly technical issue further some time soon at which time I will invite the participation of interested Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article which appeared in the September 7 issue of Business Week entitled "Tariffs Aren't the Only Problem," and an article on the same subject in the New York Times dated September 11.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week, Sept. 7, 1963]

TARIFFS AREN'T THE ONLY PROBLEM

Within the next month or so, the United States will introduce a new complication in the already sticky series of talks in Geneva that are preparing for next year's round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT).

At Washington's insistence, one of the preliminary sessions in Geneva will deal seriously, for the first time in GATT history, with what are called nontariff barriers to trade (table). These devices don't show up in a nation's tariff schedule, but they can do more to shut out imports than an outright high tariff can.

In congressional hearings last year on the Trade Expansion Act, they got as much attention as any other trade problem. Industry's spokesmen stressed that the nontariff barriers often cause the greatest export troubles.

MANY OFFENDERS

Most nations sin in maintaining such barriers, but the U.S. negotiators will be drawing a bead mainly on the devices now used by members of the European Economic Community and due to be left intact when EEC's common tariff is finally applied. Many of these barriers were put up in the first decade after World War II.

EEC also has complaints against the United States for giving its domestic producers various kinds of nontariff protection. In the United States, such barriers largely date from the 1920's and 1930's and have withstood the liberalization trend in U.S. trade policy through the postwar years.

In Geneva, the haggling over how to reduce this kind of protectionism promises to be as rough as in the two still more serious issues in dispute between the United States and EEC: how to deal with trade in farm products and what method to use in negotiating industrial tariff cuts (Business Week, Apr. 13, 1963, p. 125).

WASHINGTON HOT, TOO

Meanwhile, in Washington, special hearings are being held regarding the nontariff trade barriers, as provided by the Trade Expansion Act.

Chief trade negotiator Christian A. Herter and his staff were too preoccupied with the other GATT issues to handle the hearings, so they are being held by the Commerce Department's Business and Defense Services Administration, headed by Daniel L. Goldy.

More than 40 industries from automotive vehicles through graphite electrodes and brushes have had their day at the Business and Defense Services Administration hearings, and at least 20 more will be heard before the October talks get started in Geneva.

To winnow the information elicited at the hearings, Herter's office last week announced the appointment of William H. Rodd, vice president of Burson Marsteller Associates of New York, management consultants, as head of the newly formed Trade Information Committee. This is the body that will eventually hear industry complaints about specific cuts in tariffs to be put on the U.S. list, assuming the GATT preliminaries are navigated successfully.

GETTING A LIST

The new committee is getting a long list from Business and Defense Services Administration of nontariff barrier cases that might be bargained. From Brussels, it is also getting a preliminary list of complaints by EEC against U.S. nontariff restrictions.

Most complaints by U.S. exporters center on three types of European restriction: internal taxes on top of tariffs, high cost-base methods of figuring ad valorem duties and taxes, and discriminatory gimmicks against marketing, packing, and advertising.

SUPER TAXES

Auto industry witnesses pointed to taxes in the first category, including an Italian road tax and a French horsepower tax that inhibit any expansion of U.S. auto sales in those countries.

In Italy, the road tax, based on size and weight of car, runs $170 for a U.S. compact car compared with $17 for an Italian Fiat and $44 for a Volkswagen.

In France, there is a surtax of around $60 per 2-gallon container of grain spirits. All U.S. whiskies, gins, and vodkas are made from grain spirits, while most French liquors come from spirits distilled from fruit (brandy).

RIGGING THE RULES

Exporters say the sharpest limitation on volume of U.S. exports, especially to the EEC, comes from the method of determining a product's final cost for ad valorem duties and taxes. France was singled out as a prime offender. It has the biggest value added or turnover tax on steel products, textiles, and appliances, with West Germany not far behind.

These taxes apply also to French manufacturers who sell domestically, but the amount is figured on a higher base for imports. The Institute of Appliance Manufacturers cited an example of how European cost-plus figuring can add to a U.S. product's final sales price.

Take a case of a U.S.-made refrigerator shipped for sale in France. The French customs service starts off by charging duty based on the cost plus all shipping, insurance, and handling charges. To this base of, say, $232.40, it adds 13 percent duty—$30.31. To that total it adds a 2 percent tax stamp charge—another 60 cents. And to that adds a 25 percent value-added tax (charged on all refrigerators, local or foreign-made)—another $65.80.

The United States in contrast, bases its duties on cost plus freight alone. The base itself is lower, and extra taxes and charges are not pyramided on one another. Compared with the French base price, U.S. duty would be figured in this case on a base of $207.25. No tax stamps and no extra taxes are added. And the duty itself, though it varies widely among different types of refrigerators, is almost always lower. Even if the U.S. duty were comparable to the French levy of 13 percent, and if the same percentage stamp tax and value-added tax were applied in the United States, these charges would add a total of $79.29 to the refrigerator's base price—substantially below the $96.61 added by the pyramiding French charges.

RESTRICTIVE GIMMICKS

The category of discriminatory marketing devices affects a lesser volume of trade but includes some of the most bizarre gimmicks.

In France, for example, the Government—to help its wine and brandy makers—prohibits any advertising of distilled spirits made from grain, which means chiefly United States and British whiskies. Canada, to protect its own whisky producers, forces U.S. distillers to use bottles of a different size than Canadians use.

COUNTERCOMPLAINTS

These complaints, and many more like them, add up to a long list of U.S. gripes. But the EEC is countering with its own list, shorter but no less galling to the Europeans.

At the top of EEC's list is the U.S. practice of determining duties for synthetic organic chemicals and a few other products such as rubber footwear according to the American selling price (ASP). This method goes back to the 1920's and has been carefully guarded ever since.

European producers claim that U.S. customs officials more often than not get from U.S. manufacturers an unrealistic list price for these chemicals as the basis for their ad valorem duties. The final effective duty on their chemicals may run as high as 200 percent, they say.

Europeans also protest the U.S. Government's "Buy American" practice, which gives U.S. producers up to a 50-percent price-spread advantage on Defense Department contracts and up to a 12-percent advantage on other Government procurement. Now EEC is concerned about the State of California's decision to put "Buy American" clauses in its purchasing contracts.

In rebuttal, U.S. trade negotiators contend that European power companies—whether State-owned or not—toss almost all contracts for equipment to local manufacturers without even giving Americans a chance to bid, regardless of any price-spread arrangement.

The ECC list also includes complaints against the method of applying quota systems by U.S. executive order on imports of such commodities as lead, zinc, and petroleum. While this practice doesn't hurt EEC directly, it seriously hampers the exports of associated African nations.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1963]

U.S. CHEMICAL INDUSTRY WARNED NOT TO EXPECT TARIFF CONCESSION

(By Philip Shabecoff)

The U.S. chemical industry was warned yesterday not to expect much in special exemptions from reductions in tariffs. The warning was delivered by a key member of the administration's team for next year's negotiations with the Common Market.

William Matson Roth, President Kennedy's deputy special representative for trade negotiations, noted that the Trade Expansion Act gave the President authority to exempt specific items from the tariff reductions. He added, however, "this clause will be used most sparingly."

Mr. Roth spoke at a joint luncheon of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association and the American Chemical Society at the Statler Hilton Hotel. He said the Administration expected other countries to

exercise similar restraint in exempting specific categories.

Segments of the chemical industry that believe they will be hurt by tariff reductions have been numbered among the most vocal opponents of the Trade Expansion Act.

HARD BARGAINING PREDICTED

Mr. Roth, whose appointment as assistant to Christian A. Herter, special representative for trade negotiations, was approved by the Senate, Monday, indicated yesterday that he did not agree with European observers who described the U.S. chemical industry as "a skeleton in the armor of high tariff barriers."

Noting that the U.S. chemical industry enjoyed a 3-to-1 ratio of exports to imports in 1962, Mr. Roth described the industry as "a progressive and powerful force." He asserted that foreign producers were "fearful of the industry's power."

"We do not intend to give anything away," the official said. "We do intend to bargain and bargain hard for the total benefit of the U.S. economy."

Mr. Roth acknowledged that some areas of the industry could be affected by the trade talks. "We can't be consistently strong in every area," he declared.

He said, however, that the tariff reductions would be made over a 5-year period to cushion any impact and that the Trade Act called for special assistance by the Government when the reductions caused serious injury.

Mr. Roth declared that the administration would impartially assess the impact of the reduced tariffs and would carefully study specific industries and segments of industries.

He called on the chemical industry to cooperate with the negotiators in preparing specific information to be used at the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiations next spring.

Mr. Roth said the new Tariff Information Committee and the Tariff Commission would seek testimony from industry when the public list of products subject to negotiation would be published this month.

Earlier in the day, however, the general manager of the international department of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., said, "There has been no announcement of the appointment of representatives of industry to act as advisers to the special representative for trade negotiations."

Speaking at a symposium at the 145th national meeting of the American Chemical Society, W. Sam Carpenter 3d of Du Pont told his audience: "Tariff negotiations are going to be conducted under the new law regardless of what we do. Our major problem is whether we will have an effective voice in these negotiations or not."

Mr. Carpenter asserted that the Trade Expansion Act could have many harmful effects if poorly administered, including damage to the balance of payments by promoting imports without increasing exports.

Commending Helen Delich Bentley of Baltimore Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Baltimore Sun and one of its staff of writers deserves special commendation for an unusual public service. In this week's radio report to the people of Maryland, I tell of this public service, which was the bringing to light of a Navy ship-repair-cost report which had been made unavailable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD that part of my radio broadcast which refers to this public service on the part of the alert reporter and her paper.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM SENATOR BEALL'S RADIO BROADCAST ON 24 MARYLAND STATIONS

An item of national importance which has special interest for Maryland has to do with Navy shipbuilding.

Had it not been for the alertness of the Baltimore Sun's Helen Delich Bentley, a significant ship-repair-cost report would have remained hidden in the files of the U.S. Navy.

You will recall that in the preceding Congress we were able to get through a law requiring the Navy to hand over no less than 35 percent of its repair jobs to private shipyards. We understand that the Navy then hired a consulting firm to analyze ship repair costs—apparently in the hope it would show that Navy costs were lower. The report showed just the opposite; it showed that private shipyard repairs were cheaper.

The Navy then—it appears—made the report unavailable.

It would have remained in hiding had it not been for the alertness of a Baltimore Sun reporter—Helen Delich Bentley. Miss Bentley dug it out of hiding—and only then did the Defense Department make the report public.

The report shows that it costs 16 to 35 percent more to build or repair Navy ships in Navy shipyards than in private shipyards. This should surprise no one. The competitive private enterprise system cannot be beat.

Our shipyards in Baltimore (and the people of Maryland in general) are profiting—and will continue to profit—from the law we got through—requiring the Navy to hand over no less than 35 percent of its repair jobs to private shipyards.

And, Miss Bentley and the Baltimore Sun are to be commended for their service to the public.

Whatever Happened to Uncle Sam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, you remember Uncle Sam, do you not? Quite a man was Sam.

There was a lean, hard look to his face, the kind of look that even whiskers didn't soften much.

And a steely sort of look to his eyes. We used to wonder if the artists who first drew Uncle Sam somehow had the American eagle in mind.

He spoke softly, but he carried a big stick. Other nations very early learned they could not get away with any monkey business when they dealt with Uncle Sam.

He stood squarely for what America was—both feet rooted firmly in the soil and toil of American tradition.

No one ever knew for sure just where Uncle Sam came from. Some think he rode with Paul Revere. His feet bloodied the snow at Valley Forge. He was looking on when they signed the Declaration.

He stood with Lincoln at the crossroads of a nation's destiny. And wept a strong man's tear with Lee and Grant at Appomattox.

He went "over there" with Pershing and the boys. He thirsted and bled and endured with those who made the long march called Bataan. He was there at Bastogne when they wrote another American saga with the single word—"Nuts." He wept again with all of us on the V-days that signaled the end of a terrible threat to our country.

Yes, quite a man, Sam. Our kind of man. The kind we need so desperately now to keep our country strong and alert and tough and independent and honest with itself and with its world. But what has happened to him? Where has he gone? Have you felt him around recently?

No. He for sure was not at the Bay of Pigs. Whatever the reason, Uncle Sam, as we know him, is a little out of focus. Perhaps some of our new-day thinkers have sort of put him out to pasture as something we needed once but find a little old fashioned now. Perhaps they do not feel comfortable with his gaze beating into their consciences.

We believe he is just waiting in the wings thinking and watching, waiting to be called again because he is so deeply needed. We think it is high time Uncle Sam was brought out of retirement.

We Republicans want him back in action. Not because he belongs to us more than to any other good American. But because he needs a place to live and think and speak and work. Because America needs him and our party has a home for him.

"OK, Mike"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, courage and fortitude in crisis are among the finest human qualities. They attract admiration whenever they appear. The recent mine disaster at Hazleton, Pa., culminating in the dramatic rescue of two of the trapped miners, was such an example. A key figure in this rescue was Mike Rank of Bethel, Conn., the operator of the drilling rig, which probed so carefully and delicately through layers of rock to find an escape route for the men whose lives depended on his skill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I reprint the following editorial on Mr. Rank's achievement which appeared in the Danbury News-Times. There is something magnificently American about this story of cool competence and unflagging courage allied in the person of

the drill operator from Bethel who saved his comrades' lives:

"OK, MIKE"

"All it took was a little commonsense," commented LeRoy Mike Rank of Walnut Hill Road, Bethel, as he talked with a News-Times reporter in his home Tuesday evening.

And he indicated that anyone with his experience with drilling rigs could have driven the shaft that resulted in the rescue of two trapped miners earlier this week in Hazleton, Pa.

But Mike Rank was the man at the controls. It was Mike who "felt his way" through the more than 300 feet of earth, rock and coal with an 18-inch bit that was larger than that normally used on the rig he was operating.

"OK, Mike," got to be a byword at the scene, as his employer and others helped to guide the awesome and risky operation. Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, coined it as a new phrase as he paid well-deserved tribute to the Bethel workman in the U.S. Senate on Tuesday.

But Mike is a modest man. And there was no glory-seeking apparent in his manner as he quietly told a newsman he was ready to return to help drill another shaft to a third miner, who may or may not be alive in another section of the collapsed mine.

That the Almighty was with Mike and the miners is unquestionable. And it is praiseworthy that there are men like him with the know-how and the fortitude to carry out such a dramatic task.

To the Bethel hero and all his associates, we offer a hearty "OK, Mike."

The Great Staff Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the problem of staffing the minority on congressional committees has been discussed by many newspapers around the country. Most recently the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune carried a thoughtful commentary on this problem, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT STAFF STEAL

It's in committee that Congress does most of its work, and it is on the committee staffs that individual Congressmen have to place their chief reliance for legislative assistance. If one party hogs the bulk of the committee staffs, that party has a lopsided advantage over the opposition.

This is precisely the condition that prevails in Congress today, and against which a small band of Republicans has been waging a long but largely unsuccessful fight.

Committee staffing may seem a parochial issue, but it cuts to the heart of the legislative process and of the two-party system. When one party controls all the vast staff resources of the executive branch, and also maintains a disproportionate control over the legislative staff, what chance does the opposition have to oppose effectively? Staff assistance, loyal and responsible to the minority members, is essential if the opposition is to find the flaws in majority proposals under committee consideration and to develop responsible alternatives.

Theoretically, most congressional committee staff members are nonpartisan. But they are under the control of the committee chairman, always a member of the majority and usually a skilled political partisan.

It is impossible to divide most of the committee staffs definitely into minority, majority and nonpartisan members; the lines are often blurred. But a study of Senate staffs made last spring by the Legislative Reference Service, at the joint request of Majority Leader MANSFIELD and Minority Leader DIRKSEN, came up with these ratios of majority and minority professional staff—which are typical—on several Senate committees: 2:0, 2:1, 3:2, 4:1, 5:1, 12:1. Is this fair to the minority? Is it fair to the public, which can't have effective two-party government unless both parties have the resources needed to function?

The Democrats, who control both houses, have stubbornly refused to yield up this partisan plum. But if enough of the public cried out for fair play, they might conclude there was some political advantage to playing fair.

Mr. Burger Reports to House Select Committee on Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, appeared on September 10 to testify before the House Select Committee on Small Business during the course of its current hearings regarding small business and foreign trade. A substantial portion of Mr. Burger's testimony was the summarized report of his findings on trips to European countries as a special consultant to the Senate Commerce Committee to look into Federal export-import assistance programs for smaller, independent businesses in Ireland, England, Belgium, Holland, France, and Italy. Mr. Burger made these trips at his own expense in 1961 and 1962, and although his report has been made to the Senate Commerce Committee in full, I am sure that the summary he presented to the House Select Committee on Small Business on September 10 would be of considerable interest and information to all House Members interested in small business. I include this part of Mr. Burger's testimony in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

MR. BURGER REPORTS TO HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

I have twice been appointed by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, to act as special consultant to the committee on trips (paid for out of my own pocket—no Government funds involved) to Europe, to look into Federal export-import assistance programs for smaller, independent businesses in Ireland, England, Belgium, Holland, France, and Italy. I made the first of these trips in 1961, and the second in 1962. Reports on my findings have been made to Senator MAGNUSON and his committee, along with observations made on the operations of these programs right within our own country during my frequent personal contacts and conferences at Small Business Administration regional and branch offices. I am happy to summarize this information for you.

During my 1961 visits—on which public hearings were held by the Senate Commerce Committee in April and May 1962—I conferred with Embassy officials in London, Brussels, and Amsterdam.

During my visit in London I first conferred with Mr. Sam Yates, First Secretary, American Embassy, and during that visit received the exceptional cooperation of Embassy officials in the use of Embassy clerical personnel for preparation of my report to Senator MAGNUSON. This cooperation extended in all other 1961 visits as well as my later visits in 1962 in all Embassies visited. It appeared at that time that in the commercial section of the U.S. Embassy in London they were undermanned and that if they had the necessary personnel their activities would be of considerably more help to small business in increasing its share of the export market, and it is interesting to note that shortly before the Senate Commerce Committee hearings in April and May 1962, I had been advised by Mr. Yates that the employment situation relating to Embassy help had improved considerably.

Also during my visit with Mr. Yates, he gave me a lead as to the Trade Center activities of the Department of Commerce, St. James Street, London, England, and following out the suggestion of Mr. Yates I visited with Mr. Pusey, in charge of the Trade Center activity.

Mr. Pusey was most optimistic about this venture of our Government, with the hopes it will encourage foreign buyers to take on sales lines of American products, and following both of these visits in London it was my opinion greater publicity should be given to the planning of the Federal Government on this important move to increase exports, also utilizing publicity in the foreign press in acquainting them with the action of our Government.

In my conference with Mr. Yates he also brought up that due to their lack of manpower their ability to follow up leads was hampered.

It was my impression from information gathered in the London visits that the Trade Center venture would be helpful if duplicated in various other important Embassy locations. This, in my opinion, would open up the door for small business in the States to gain a greater percentage of exports on the Continent.

In this connection I have now been advised by the Department of Commerce that in addition to the Trade Center in London there is now a Trade Center operating in Frankfurt, Bangkok, Tokyo, and they further advise that an additional Trade Center will be opened in Milan the first of the year.

Immediately following my London visits I visited with Mr. Stephen E. Schneider, Second Secretary of Embassy, Brussels, Belgium, and it is important to note in this visit it was stated that there was lack of publicity as to the Trade Center activity in London, as Mr. Schneider was unaware of this activity.

Following my visit in Brussels I visited with Mr. Frank S. Wile, consul, Amsterdam, Holland, and Mr. Wile made a very important observation as to American producers desirous of increasing their business in that area considering "trial orders" as he stated due to the shrewdness of the Hollander he might be willing to gamble on a trial order of $1,000 which would look small to an American producer but represented 3,000 or more guilders to the Hollander.

During this visit it was also brought out that not enough publicity was given to the London Trade-Center activity to spread into the Holland area.

Shortly after my return to the States I made visits to various regional and branch offices of the Small Business Administration to determine what information or knowledge they had on this trade center movement and these visits also confirmed the fact as to lack of publicity in this country as well as abroad with reference to the trade center activities as a help to increasing exports for American small business.

Also following my return to the States I had a conference in my office with a representative of AID who seemed to be well posted on foreign trade, particularly in the Middle East and the Far East, which gave me an opportunity to check and double-check as to the activities of commercial attachés of our Government, and it was his opinion that the present operation of our commercial attachés are merely "statistical collecting agencies" and he added in very definite terms that we should take a page from the book of Canadian attachés who go out and drum up business, and he also remarked that this line of action is used particularly by German and Italian commercial attachés.

My first Embassy visit in 1962 was with Mr. Edward R. O'Connor, second secretary of the Embassy at Dublin, Ireland, where I again found that the Embassy staff was undermanned, which resulted in the Embassy being handicapped in rendering needed help to trade centers, particularly the one operating in London.

However, I was very much impressed with the service of the Embassy in the way of press publicity as it related to trade operations that took place in Ireland, and if such publicity could be secured in other areas throughout Europe it would result in tremendous expansion of the American economy abroad.

The information gathered here was that if smaller producers in the States desire to increase their export business they should attempt to specialize in the commodity they are manufacturing and as the field is wide open in Ireland for small producers such action could expand their foreign business considerably.

During my visit at the Embassy in Dublin I was more than pleased that the Ambassador came out to meet me personally.

Following my visit in Dublin I again visited with Mr. Yates and Mr. Nathaniel Knowles at the American Embassy in London, and from information supplied to me I gathered that the trade exhibitions procedure was more effective than trade fairs as in the trade exhibitions a particular industry is exhibited and concentration is placed on a particular product, bringing in all producers in that particular industry, both large and small, in which way small producers were able to bring before potential buyers the products the buyers would be interested in, and which to a degree overcomes the difficulty experienced by the smaller producers in financial promotion.

As to the trade center activity, the opinion held was that in its year and a half operation in the London area the operation had been very successful but would be even more successful if small producers would participate in the trade center operations. It was felt that this could be helped by the Department of Commerce in its locations throughout the States making a strong drive in various areas to have small business take more positive action.

My third 1962 visit was with Mr. Alexander J. Davit, assistant commercial attaché at the American Embassy in Paris, where I learned that the Embassy in Paris has used strong pressure to get groups from France to visit trade centers in both London and Frankfurt.

As it relates to the Common Market it was the opinion, insofar as the effect on small business in the States in the production field, smaller producers attempting to be successful in the export market should concentrate on a specialty in their own manufactured commodity.

During my visit in Rome I learned that trade fairs are extensively promoted in Italy by Italian industry. It will be found that some American firms participate in these Italian trade fairs (mostly large American firms), and that the Embassy gives extensive publicity to these trade fairs in Italy.

From the information supplied to me it is my understanding that the Common Market has been very productive to Italian industry, tending to make Italy more in line of a mass production nation.

It was noted from exhibits in the Embassy charts disclose that imports from United States to Italy have shown a considerable increase each year from 1959.

Upon completion of my four 1962 visits it was my recommendation to the Senate Commerce Committee that the Committee itself (or members of the staff) personally visit these Common Market countries as the questions involved are so gigantic it is my belief such visits would be helpful to assist small American producers of all description.

I say this particularly in view of information developed during both my visit in Paris and also during my visit in Rome. During the Embassy visit in Paris I was advised that the procedure used in France as to trade fairs and trade exhibits was; for example, a specialized exhibit of office equipment that would be confined to all segments of that industry. The same procedure would be used on machine tools. The exhibits would not generally be open to the public except on special occasions and holding to these exhibits the trade associations would attempt to bring in all factors that would be interested in the product exhibited. This procedure seems to be very successful in France and in some degree is the recommendation that I received in London.

I was further advised during the Paris visit that as it pertains to the Common Market and its effect on small business in the States in the production field there is a belief here that smaller producers attempting to be successful on export market should concentrate on a specialty in their own manufactured commodity. This also seemed to be the opinion expressed to me in London. Further, it appears that American producers to a degree in this market are attempting to follow the procedure of licensing arrangements, and of course if this procedure was to increase in other foreign markets it could have a very disastrous effect as it would apply to small business in the States.

Also during my Embassy visit in Rome I was advised that American firms have established themselves in Italy in various forms. They are participating with Italian industry through licensing arrangements, through managerial and technical assistance contracts and to a somewhat lesser extent, in a participation in Italian enterprises. In addition, American companies have established wholly owned subsidiaries in Italy in order to produce goods which could not profitably be exported from the United States for sale in Italy through the Common Market. This action is largely concentrated by major American producers and time alone will tell what effect this will have on American small producers.

The Origin of Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, September 12, 1963, marks the second anniversary of the recognition of Troy, N.Y., as the "Home of Uncle Sam." Samuel Wilson, a Troy merchant, is the progenitor of our national symbol, "Uncle Sam."

Uncle Sam today is a reminder to all Americans that to meet the test of survival, we must keep faith with our historical traditions. More than that, however, Uncle Sam has become the symbol of freedom for millions of enslaved peoples.

Under leave to extend my remarks, and as an appropriate tribute to Samuel Wilson on this second aniversary of the recognition of his home in Troy, N.Y., I would like to include a narrative written by Mr. Jay Jay Dunn, of Troy, entitled "The Origin of Uncle Sam."

The article follows:

THE ORIGIN OF UNCLE SAM

A journey back along memory lane takes us to Van Der Hyden-on-the-Hudson during Colonial days when village life was pleasant and men were gracious and kind.

Located 150 miles north of New York, this picturesque village with its white church steeple, trim cottage gardens, and wild flowers in a summer meadow, was an outpost of Netherland culture where the customs and manners of the Land of Tulips prevailed. A fleet of trim, graceful sailing vessels carried the commerce of the river; while the weekly coach-and-four stages to towns along the Hudson provided transportation for those who wished to venture on a journey when the weather was fair.

Civic ambition developed in quaint old Van Der Hyden during 1789, and the village name was changed to the more classical title of Troy. During springtime 1790, Mr. Samuel Wilson and his wife Betsy arrived in this ambitious place and this Samuel Wilson, native of Arlington, Mass., was destined to become our most characteristic American citizen.

Records of deeds entered in the county clerk's office reveal how Mr. Wilson bought land from Peter Van Der Hyden "from one oak tree to another," and in addition to operating the village general store, engaged with his brother, Ebenezer, in the meatpacking business with an advertisement in the weekly Sentinel of 1805.

This public-spirited country merchant with his friendly manner become affectionately known in this Hudson River town as "Uncle Sam" and during the War of 1812 supplied barrels of beef in brine to the American forces. Packages forwarded to the Army and Navy were marked "U.S." to indicated U.S. Government property, but soldiers from a nearby military camp, knowing Mr. Wilson, paraphrased the Government mark "U.S." in a friendly spirit, as "Uncle Sam" and that jovial interpretation continued.

This title became popular in the Army and later general throughout the country, a popularity that has grown with the years. The style of clothing worn by Uncle Sam was typical of the American merchant of 1812,

while the use of red, white and blue bunting for clothes is a later idea to represent the national character of the figure.

Living long, loving his fellow men and rendering unselfish service to his country, Uncle Sam passed away in 1854 at the age of 88 and sleeps beside a hedge of fragrant lilacs in the peaceful silence of Oakwood at Troy, N.Y. while his personality represents the spirit of the American Government over the whole wide world.

JAY JAY DUNN.

Physical Fitness—A National Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, early this year President Kennedy and his administration stimulated the public interest in physical fitness for adults as well as young people. However, it is up to each individual community to take the initiative in formulating programs to carry out the President's recommendations.

In this connection, I am sure my colleagues will be interested to learn that this awareness of the importance to our Nation of building strong and healthy men and women has been implemented in my own State of Maryland by the creation of a State commission on physical fitness. The chairman of this commission is my very good friend, Mr. Harry D. Kaufman, a well-known Baltimore lawyer. Many other prominent citizens of our State are devoting their time and talents to make this physical fitness program a success, and I commend them.

The commission has been conducting a pilot program called 15-man progressive circuit physical fitness program and we are hopeful that the success of this venture will lead to the formation of many other 15-man exercise clubs throughout the country to improve the health of our adult citizens.

Mr. Kaufman has given me a report on this program to date and, because of the interest it has created, I include it at this point in the RECORD. I trust it will serve to encourage leading citizens in other communities to participate in similar programs.

Mr. Kaufman's report follows:

PILOT PROGRAM FOR ADULT PHYSICAL FITNESS NOW BEING CONDUCTED BY THE MARYLAND COMMISSION ON PHYSICAL FITNESS

There was started in Baltimore on August 19, 1963, a pilot program, the purpose of which is to prove that any adult who might be physically out of shape as well as overweight, can reach a peak of maximum physical strength and at the same time have the body attain its proper weight.

The program is known as 15-man physical fitness progressive circuit exercise. It consists of 15 men who meet three times weekly, and who complete this rather novel and unique type of exercise program in 15 minutes. The exercises are not the laborious calisthenic type given by an instructor. The program is novel and unique in that it recognizes the psychological fact that what an individual will not do alone, he will do when he participates as a part of a group, for he then acquires the competitive spirit and urge to follow his fellow teammates. This is one of the two competitive facets in the program. The second is that each individual competes against the clock which is set to run for 15 minutes. During this 15-minute period, the participants, at their own speed and physical strength complete a series of eight different types of exercises, and then return to the beginning point to try to complete as many circuits as possible within the 15-minute period.

Each month the exercises are changed, for as the body increases its strength and the muscles become stronger, the exercises are made tougher so that at the end of the fourth month, the body will have reached the peak of its strength as well as attain its proper weight.

The success of the first 2 weeks of the program has been amazing. The participants at the end of the first 2 weeks have shown a decided increase in stamina, muscle development, breathing control and, for those overweight, a reduction in weight.

We are confident that this program will be successful and will prove our theory that any adult who desires to attain maximum body strength as well as proper weight can do so if he will become a member of a 15-man or woman team that will follow the exercise program that our commission has set up.

Our Maryland commission will gladly cooperate with all States or organizations that might desire additional information as to how the program operates.

HARRY D. KAUFMAN,
Chairman, Maryland Commission on Physical Fitness.

The Loud Voice Gets Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of September 4, 1963, again warning of the evils of the iniquitous quality stabilization bill now pending before Congress enactment of which would gouge the consumer and jeopardize the interests of the small businessman:

THE LOUD VOICE GETS HEARD

Here in Washington, one of the most persistent and wily lobbies is making good progress. It is the fix-prices lobby.

The House Commerce Committee, with only one dissent, has approved the so-called quality equalization bill, once known as the fair trade bill. It is neither. It is price-fixing.

For all the creamy words with which the bill is promoted, its purpose is the same as ever—to permit manufacturers to force retailers to sell their products at the same prices, backed by the Federal Government. Violations would be subject to prosecution.

The promoters of this device call it a small business measure, and anything flossed out in that name has an appeal to most Congressmen.

But the Justice Department, which knows better, says enactment would cost consumers probably 20 percent more for many things—billions of dollars a year. The Department says that in States which have so-called fair trade laws, prices range from 19 to 27 percent higher.

The quality equalization bill has strength because it is being pushed by a loud lobby. The consumers, who will pay the bill, will get short shrift if it passes.

Federal Aid to Education Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education may become the forgotten issue of this session. If it does the Nation will once again be faced with the prospect of a generation of inadequately educated citizens. The consequences of this lack of concern over the schooling of our children are as severe as they are obvious. Mr. Frank Karelsen, vice president of the Public Education Association, has written a letter on this issue which appeared in the August 29, 1963, edition of the New York Times. I hope all of my colleagues will read Mr. Karelsen's cogent letter which shows the desperate need for Federal aid to education.

The letter follows:

MORE FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The present crisis demands that Congress should pass the civil rights and fair employment legislation. This, however, will provide only a legal basis for meeting the problem.

To effectively resolve the existing inequalities it is vital to raise the economic level of the Negro American. His depressed economic status hinders every phase of integration and perpetuates slums. Jobs must be available to the Negro in all fields, including the professions. However, he must be equipped to be employable.

Since automation is here to stay and with the demand for unskilled labor being greatly reduced, educational opportunities become imperative. Good primary and secondary schools with technological and vocational training are imperative. Partly because of slums and segregation, such educational opportunities, with few exceptions, just do not exist for Negroes.

Today throughout the Nation over 2 million children attend school in unhealthful, outmoded, and hazardous buildings. Over 83,000 teachers do not meet the frequently too low State requirements and a large percentage of these poorly qualified teachers are in underprivileged and segregated areas where the most talented teachers are particularly needed.

SPECIAL TIME ARRANGEMENT

Over a million children are in overcrowded classes and over 500,000 are on part-time sessions.

In New York City, the wealthiest city in the world, over 57,000 children are on short-time sessions and upward of 140,000 are on special time arrangements which deprive them of the full benefit of school life.

All of this is conducive to dropouts—children who leave school before completing high school or even junior high school. The dropouts of today become the costly relief clients, delinquents and criminals of tomorrow, thereby increasing the economic drain on the national economy. Within this decade there will be 7½ million dropouts.

An excessively high percentage of these are Negro.

There are 22 million adult Americans, largely Negro, with less than eighth grade schooling. Nationally 23 percent, and in the South 50 percent, of the registrants failed the selective service intelligence test.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that to catch up on the shortage of buildings, teachers and textbooks will require raising the Nation's current expenditures for education from $30 billion annually to $50 billion.

LOCAL AID

Increased school budgets and school bond issues are being defeated in every part of the country. It is evident, therefore, that few communities, even if taxed to the utmost, will make up any appreciable amount of the $20 billion deficit.

In view of this, whether we like Federal aid or not, and since 75 percent of the national tax bill is paid to Washington, it is only here that we can obtain assistance. To help correct this deficiency in our democracy $4 billion is the minimum needed annually for the next 5 years.

Building schools and employing teachers will materially help to solve the unemployment problem, reduce the economic drain and pay big dividends. If it is necessary for the Government to borrow this $4 billion it should issue bonds. Industry and business have shown the way.

Federal aid to education will not only help to solve the Negro American problem but will give to all of our children, white or colored, the educational opportunities necessary for the very survival of our Nation as a democracy in this era of ever-increasing automation and international competition.

President Kennedy stated that "a $4 billion annual appropriation for foreign aid is vital to our national security." Surely an equal appropriation for aid to education here at home is just as vital to the national security.

FRANK E. KARELSEN.

NEW YORK, *August 26, 1963.*

Congressman Broomfield Helps To Redirect Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid program is often criticized as being wasteful and misdirected, and the critics are often correct. However, it has been encouraging in this session to follow the outstanding work of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], who has been providing important leadership in an effort to redirect some aspects of our aid program and to point it toward the target.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] sponsored three major amendments to the foreign aid authorization bill which recently passed the House. Each of the amendments, which were adopted, tightens up the program and tends, in my opinion, to make it more effective.

One amendment requires prior congressional authorization for any foreign aid project exceeding $100 million. Under this provision of the bill, the administration will be precluded, in the absence of specific congressional approval, from committing any funds to construct the proposed Bokaro steel plant in India, a commitment which could eventually cost the U.S. taxpayers more than $900 million.

It is interesting to note that, subsequent to the adoption by the House of the Broomfield amendment, the Government of India has announced withdrawal of its request for U.S. funds for this project. Based upon studies made to date, it was very doubtful that the project as proposed would have represented a sound or a wise investment of our funds.

Another of the amendments to the bill offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD was aimed toward keeping Africa out of the East-West arms race by providing that military assistance grants to African nations should be limited to those arms necessary for internal security or certain civil works projects.

The third amendment offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD, and adopted by the committee, requires a Presidential finding with respect to our national interest before aid to Indonesia can be continued.

I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his outstanding and determined efforts to provide more meaningful guidelines for the foreign aid program. Not only will his amendments save the taxpayers money, but I think they will help to assure that aid dollars are spent with more efficiency and with greater impact.

George A. McLachlan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the recent, most untimely death of George A. McLachlan at the age of 56, has taken from the communities of Danbury and Newtown, Conn., a major force for good and is deeply lamented by all citizens of the area.

Mr. McLachlan was a former hat manufacturer, a banker, a civic worker, a fine amateur golfer and a prominent Catholic layman.

After he returned from World War II, in which he served as a member of the Army Air Force, he was chosen first president of the Danbury War Memorial Association which raised the funds to build the War Memorial Community Center as a living monument to the men and women of Danbury who served their country in the war.

In Newtown, where he lived for the last 15 years of his life, he was chairman of the Newtown High Junior School Building Committee and later chairman of the parish committee which raised funds to establish St. Rose School.

In recognition of his service to his church, he was created a Knight in the Order of St. Gregory the Great. For his contributions to the community at large, his memory is held in honor and gratitude by thousands of his fellow citizens. I am proud to take this means of paying tribute to him and expressing my condolences to his family.

Outstanding Airmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my hometown and district of San Antonio, Tex., has long been known as the "mother-in-law of the Army," and with good reason. San Antonio is also known as the "cradle of the Air Force," for the city has been in the forefront of our military aviation activities from the beginning.

All of my colleagues know that San Antonio's Randolph Field was the "West Point of the Air" during World War II. Now, Lackland Air Force Base, on the opposite side of town, is known as the "Gateway to the Air Force," because all airmen pass through basic training at Lackland. There are other bases, and other activities, all of which go into my contention that San Antonio is still the cradle of the Air Force.

Each year, the various commands of the Air Force select one enlisted man, who is outstanding in his command. No fewer than three of the outstanding airmen of 1963 have close ties to San Antonio. One of them is a hometown product, one stationed there now, and one other has just recently been stationed there. So, Mr. Speaker, I can say without exaggeration that San Antonio has close ties to three of the outstanding airmen of 1963.

M. Sgt. Corliss C. Miller, the outstanding airman of the Air Training Command, was born in San Antonio, joined the Air Force in San Antonio, and is now stationed there, so we can safely say that he is exclusively a local product.

M. Sgt. Samuel C. Akin spent some of his school years in San Antonio, but he was born in Henderson, Ky. Like about everybody in the Air Force, though, he went through basic training at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio. Today he is the outstanding airman of 1963 for the Continental Air Command. It is only natural that he is stationed at Randolph Air Force Base, right in San Antonio.

The outstanding airman of 1963 for the U.S. Air Force Security Service is Chief M. Sgt. Joshua H. Ruderman, and he is stationed at Kelly Air Force Base now—just next door to Lackland. It is inevitable that Sergeant Ruderman came to San Antonio during his career, and sure enough he was stationed at Kelly Air Force Base for the first time in 1955. While at Kelly, he was named as the outstanding NCO of his group and picked up 18 hours of graduate credit at

Trinity University besides. Sergeant Ruderman left San Antonio in 1958 and spent the next 4 years in various places around the world. But now he is safely back in the fold.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that the Air Force select outstanding men to honor each year. I take what I think is justifiable pride in these men and what they have done for their respective commands, for the Air Force, and for the country as a whole. We owe them a debt of gratitude far beyond what we can pay.

These men are the epitome of the millions of men in uniform today, and represent the finest men that this Nation can offer.

I am proud, too, of the contribution my district has made to the military aviation field since the very inception of the Air Force. San Antonio has Kelly Air Force Base, and Kelly is the home of the outstanding airman of the Security Service. It happens, too that the base of the outstanding airman of the Air Training Command is at Lackland—next door to Kelly, and that this man is a native of my city. And, it happens that the outstanding airman of the Continental Air Command is also stationed in San Antonio, at Randolph Air Force Base.

These men are proud, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud of them. I know that all my colleagues will join me in saluting them.

Commodore John Barry: Father of the American Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1803, a magnificent American died in Philadelphia at the age of 58 years. An entire nation mourned his death. He was buried with all the honors his Government could give to him. Today on the 160th anniversary of his death I join with all Americans in paying tribute to this fine and heroic gentleman.

Born in County Wexford, Ireland, in 1745, he spent the major portion of his life at sea, and dedicated his energies and convictions toward American freedom. Seldom in the register of human courage has this man been equaled.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not here deal with the battles and engagements and victories of Commodore Barry, that are legendary wherever sailors gather. But permit me a few words in general about his life and his dedication to the American Revolutionary ideal.

In all of American naval history there is scarcely an officer who can equal the gallantry and achievements of Commodore Barry. In battle he was absolutely fearless, attacking and capturing—usually while outnumbered. Indeed, as we all know, during the Revolutionary War for independence our Navy was seldom equal in strength to the British. America made up for this inequality with men such as Barry. I should also mention that the honor fell to Barry to fight the last engagement of the Revolutionary War when he engaged and whipped three British frigates in the Gulf of Florida on March 10, 1783.

After the war Barry took an active interest and part in seeing that the Constitution of the United States, written in his hometown of Philadelphia in 1789, was ratified by the American colonies. His interest in American democracy went far beyond the U.S. Navy.

In 1794 the commodore was called back to serve his nation by General Washington. Sometime after this the American Congress appropriated the moneys necessary to outfit the beginnings of a new navy to sail to the Mediterranean to overpower the Algerian pirates. At this time Commodore Barry was listed by General Washington as the new country's No. 1 captain. In 1802 he was notified by the Secretary of the Navy that he was the senior officer of the Navy.

He was asked again to return to active duty to help his new struggling nation, but this time he could not answer the clarion call. His health rapidly failing, he died in his country home at Strawberry Hill, Philadelphia.

Because John Barry had so much success in training future naval officers who had served with him at sea, men whose names are an integral part of U.S. naval history, Barry has affectionately and properly been called "Father of Our Navy."

Like so many Irishmen in all of America's wars, Commodore Barry gave devotedly, gallantly, and bravely for the American ideal. He is an example to all of us, whatever our station of life, that to make American democracy work requires dedication, work, courage, love of liberty.

May his example point the way. It is fitting therefore that we pause ever so briefly today to pay tribute to the memory of a fine American.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 27th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho generated a flood of editorials, articles, and letters opposing his action.

Even though there are no facilities for delivery of Bonneville power to former Bureau of Reclamation customers in southern Idaho, the Bonneville Power Administration has been making new contracts with these customers at rates below those charged by the Bureau. The power source will be the same; only the rate is changed.

The Idaho Enterprise of Malad City, Idaho, knows full well that you cannot sell power at less than it costs without somebody paying the bill. Its editorial of July 18, 1963 asks: "Who Pays the Bill?"—in these words:

WHO PAYS THE BILL?

It has been stated that the city of Idaho Falls stands to save more than $100,000 annually on its power bill as the result of getting energy from the Bonneville Power Administration.

But the editor of the Eastern Idaho Farmer reports that in 1961 BPA lost $18 million. "It's true that BPA has a credit payment backlog which was built up years ago when dams and powerplants were cheaper to build and when BPA's rates returned a profit. But $18 million per year loss will whittle that down to nothing in short order—and then the deficits will be shouldered by taxpayers from coast to coast. Either that, or higher Bonneville power rates—which is what we've been told must never, never happen," says the editor of the Eastern Idaho Farmer.

What this all boils down to as far as Idaho Falls is concerned is that other people—such as the taxpayers in Fremont County—will be paying part of Idaho Falls' power bill, in the form of taxes, to help make up the annual BPA loss.

And in the long run as the BPA credit backlog is exhausted the electricity users of Idaho Falls themselves will actually pay—in the form of taxes—more for power than the amount appearing on their bills.—Lincoln County Journal.

The Eastern Idaho Farmer of Idaho Falls, Idaho, questions how Bonneville power can bring prosperity to southern Idaho when it has failed to do so in northern Idaho where it has served for so many years. The heading of its editorial of June 13, 1963, "What's the Difference?"—asks for an explanation of how Federal power that has not brought prosperity to the area wherein it has served for years can bring prosperity to a new area that is already better off. The editorial follows:

WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

We have, from Senator FRANK CHURCH, a detailed and enthusiastic report on the recent inclusion of southern Idaho in the region served by Bonneville Power Administration.

Senator CHURCH apparently believes this is going to be a great economic panacea for southern Idaho. Maybe he's right. But we've never been able to reconcile this rosy promise for the future with the fact that northern Idaho has long since been in the BPA administrative area.

If we have the figures and facts accurately, the Snake River Valley has made substantial economic progress all these years while northern Idaho has been the Idaho laggard.

Is it possible, Senator, that BPA somehow failed in north Idaho but is sure to do a better job in the southern part of the State?

After 50 Golden Years It's Still Love and Knishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening of this week, Elias and Bella Gabay celebrate their golden wedding anniversary in Brooklyn. Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I am enclosing herewith a newspaper article by Ed Edelson published in the New York World Telegram and Sun of Saturday, September 4, 1963, which I believe has great human interest:

AFTER 50 GOLDEN YEARS IT'S STILL LOVE AND KNISHES

(By Ed Edelson)

When Elias and Bella Gabay celebrate their golden wedding anniversary on September 14, each of the 300 guests will get a year's supply of knishes.

This is only natural. For what Henry Ford was to the automobile, what Jake Schubert was to the theater, what John D. Rockefeller was to oil, so is Elias Gabay to the knish.

(For the uninitiated, a knish is a delicacy the size and consistency of a large pincushion. Underneath its light brown crust is a delicious mixture of potatoes and spices. The knish should be eaten hot for maximum enjoyment.)

More than a million knishes a day are produced in a factory behind the Gabay's home, at 120 South Eighth Street, Williamsburg. Half are frozen and rushed to gourmets all over the country. The rest are consumed here, primarily in delicatessens.

Gabay had never seen a knish when he came to this country in 1919. He was a custom shoemaker in Yugoslavia when he decided to emigrate under the pressure of growing anti-Semitism. He had been imprisoned as a suspected spy during World War I, and there was no sign that the situation was improving.

Gabay arrived at Ellis Island with 35 cents in his pocket. He took a job in a shoe factory to raise enough money to bring over Mrs. Gabay and their two children. After two other shoemaking jobs he was out of work for 6 months in the recession of 1921.

He raised enough money to start a restaurant, but the customers didn't come. In desperation, Gabay decided to start producing knishes wholesale.

This was a revolutionary idea. Until then you either made your own knish or did without.

His first sale was to Max's Busy Bee, a restaurant at Ann and Nassau Streets. The idea caught on, and soon business was booming. Gabay decided that the firm needed a name.

His attorney advised him against using his own name. Opening a telephone book, the lawyer picked out the name of a perfume company. And so the world's largest knish maker is known as Gabila & Sons.

Today 15 trucks speed in and out of Williamsburg, bearing knishes to connoisseurs. Most of Gabay's 5 children, 10 grandchildren and 6 great-grandchildren are involved in the business. Gabay is even thinking of selling stock to the public.

Since 1932, the knishes have been made by machine. Gabay designed the machinery himself, to help tide the business over the depression.

Once an exclusively Jewish delicacy, the knish is gaining friends all over the country.

"Every nationality today is eating the knish," Gabay said.

Mr. and Mrs. Gabay, both 74 years old, will hold their golden wedding anniversary celebration September 14 at the Park Manor, on Eastern Parkway. Each guest will be promised a trayful of frozen knishes every week for a year.

Incidentally, the place where they were married on September 14, 1913, was a Yugoslav city named Nish—without the K.

Ambassador Alberto Zuleta Angel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to pay homage today to Ambassador Alberto Zuleta Angel, who since April 8, 1961 has served as Representative of Colombia on the Council of the Organization of American States.

Ambassador Zuleta will be leaving the OAS Council soon—to take up new duties as his country's Ambassador to Belgium. But he leaves behind an enviable record in that extremely important hemispheric organization.

During his 2½ years on the Council, Ambassador Zuleta has rendered distinguished service, not only to Colombia, but to the entire hemisphere as well. For in addition to his duties as Representative of his nation on the Council, he likewise served the Council as its chairman during the period from November 1961 to November 1962—certainly a critical year.

As Council Chairman, Ambassador Zuleta became widely known throughout the hemisphere for his excellent leadership, his devotion to the time-honored traditions of the inter-American system, and his absolute dedication to the enduring principles of freedom and individual liberty upon which our American Republics were founded.

Ambassador Zuleta is a native of Medillin, Colombia, and can look back upon a distinguished career as an educator, jurist, and public servant.

He has served as a professor of law at the Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario in Bogotá, the Universidad Nacional, the Universidad Javeriana, and the Universidad Libre. From 1950 to 1952, he served as dean of the school of Law and Political Science of the Universidad Nacional of Colombia.

He began his career in the public service in 1938 when he held the post of counselor of the Colombian Legation in Venezuela.

From 1954 to 1955—and again in 1957—he served as minister of the advisory committee of his country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

In 1954 and 1955, he also served as magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Colombia, and in 1957 and 1958 as his country's Ambassador to the United Nations.

Before assuming his present post, he served as a minister of government in Colombia.

We regret to see Ambassador Zuleta leave his post with the Organization of American States. But all of us who are privileged to know him can say with assurance that, in his new capacity, he will continue to render distinguished and dedicated service to the great nation of Colombia and to the Western Hemisphere.

We extend to him our thanks for a job well done—and our warmest best wishes to him and Mrs. Zuleta for continued health, happiness, and suecess in their new post.

Goshen (Ind.) News Predicts Senate Ratification of Nuclear Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the Goshen (Ind.) News of August 15, 1963, concerning the nuclear test ban treaty now under consideration in the U.S. Senate.

The editorial concludes:

Our guess is that the Senate and the country will decide the risk is worth taking when you consider the alternative.

The editorial follows:

RUSK ALLAYS FEAR

In the light of public discussion of the nuclear test ban treaty, one fact stands out.

Many Americans now believe there is no longer a basis for abnormal fear that the Russians may have tricked our negotiators into signing something that contains a hidden time bomb.

Analysis of his testimony before the U.S. Senate committees shows that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has given unqualified assurance that the test ban treaty contains no "side arrangements, understandings or conditions of any kind."

Rusk also has declared without reservation that if the United States does detect infractions of the treaty by the Russians, this country has the capability—and the intent—to quickly resume bomb tests.

These statements by a man of Rusk's ability, experience, and integrity should go a long way toward calming any jitters the public may have had.

Everyone knows it's hard to do business with someone you can't trust. But all signs indicate that our representatives have been on constant guard against any fast shuffle during the treaty negotiations.

Why should anyone have been so suspicious of a hidden gimmick in the treaty?

For one reason, because of the managed news in the recent Cuban affair. Many Americans have felt they not only were kept uninformed in that case, but were actually misled as to the facts.

They have been wondering if they might not run into more of the same treatment in the test ban treaty. Secretary Rusk's frankness has dispelled that suspicion.

So now we can concentrate on keeping up our guard and watching like a hawk to make sure the Russians keep their word, as given in the treaty.

Our guess is that the Senate and the country will decide the risk is worth taking when you consider the alternative.

Public Backs CCC-Type Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I note with great disappointment and with even greater concern the unemployment figures released on September 6, by the Department of Labor. The nearly 4 million unemployed are not mere statistics. Behind every man out of work stands a wife, a child, a dependent mother, or father, a grocery bill to be paid, an installment payment that must be deferred.

I do not like to impose repeatedly upon my colleagues, but my concern for the Nation's jobless obliges me to bring this matter once again to the attention of the House. Since 1958 the national rate of unemployment has remained consistently at over 5 percent, and it has ranged from 5.5 to 6 percent during 1963. Among our Nation's teenagers, the rate of unemployment has been averaging 2 to 3 times the national rate, and it currently stands at 14 percent.

The lack of a job is particularly discouraging to a youngster trying to begin his working career. To him it means that the Nation has no place for him, that he is unwanted and unneeded. It means time on his hands and nothing in his pockets. It is a blank intangible he can not fight and so sometimes he rebels against society and sometimes he just gives up and drifts for a lifetime, neither benefiting from an advanced society nor contributing to it.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to waste our Nation's manpower reserves in this extravagant manner. The price is too high. Unless we make a conscious effort to remedy the national unemployment problem, things are going to get worse, and soon. I firmly believe that the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is necessary to alleviate the youth unemployment situation currently existing. Providing motivation and one-the-job experience for our young people—both in youth camps and hometown industries—the youth employment bill will increase the employment qualifications and therefore the employment opportunities of our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the program proposed by the Youth Employment Act has the overwhelming support and approval of the American public. According to an article published in the September 6 edition of the Minneapolis Star, 89 percent of those contacted in a national poll considered the Youth Conservation Corps a good idea. I include the Star article for those who missed seeing it.

In view of the highly favorable public acceptance of the Youth Employment Act of 1963, I feel the Congress has a responsibility to enact the measure swiftly in accord with the wishes of the people.

The article follows:

PUBLIC BACKS CCC-TYPE YOUTH CAMPS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., September 6, 1963.—Few issues in polling history have received such overwhelming support of the American public as has the proposal for modern-day CCC camps—modeled after those established by the Roosevelt administration in the 1930's.

Nearly 9 out of 10 persons interviewed in a nationwide Gallup poll say they think such camps—enabling young men to learn a trade and earn money by outdoor work—would be a good idea.

In the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, young men between the ages of 16 and 22 could earn money through participation in Federal conservation programs.

The "Hometown Corps," which would be open to both young men and women, would provide work experience and increase employability through work in State or local projects.

To get the public's views on the principle of the youth camps, Gallup poll interviewers put the following question to a representative sample of 1,588 adults from coast to coast:

"It is proposed that the Federal Government set up youth camps—such as the CCC camps of the thirties—for young men who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by outdoor work. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

The vote nationwide:

	Percent
Good idea	89
Poor idea	6
No opinion	5

Bugs in Bonneville's Bonnett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my friends from the western part of the Nation sent me a copy of the August issue of Public Service magazine which I found to be quite interesting. The magazine carried an article entitled "Bugs in Bonneville's Bonnett" which I sincerely commend to the reading of my colleagues because of the cogent manner in which it sets forth the implications of the Bonneville Power Administration's recent invasion of southern Idaho.

Just in case some individuals may question the sincerity of the position taken in this magazine, let me quote the publisher's statement contained on the title page of the magazine:

Public Service magazine is independently owned and managed and the owners and management have no affiliation or connection with any other business, groups, organizations or associations. The magazine is free to direct its own editorial policy without direction, contribution or suggestion from any source.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert this article into the RECORD.

This article points out that the Representative from the 22d District of Pennsylvania has introduced House Resolution 430 calling upon the Secretary of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administrator to hold the southern Idaho invasion in abeyance until the Congress can express itself on this important policy question. After discussing the southern Idaho invasion further and the interests of the Federal power advocates in a broader plan to justify a national grid owned and operated by the Federal Government, the article concludes by saying:

The House will be unlikely to do anything about Resolution 430 unless the taxpayer wakes up and gives his Member of Congress some strong supprt.

The article follows:

BUGS IN BONNEVILLE'S BONNETT

On May 21, 1963, Interior Secretary Udall signed an order extending the marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration into all of southern Idaho and small adjoining portions of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

In this area are 17 Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives and municipalities which had been purchasing all or a portion of the electric power from the Bureau of Reclamation at a wholesale cost averaging 5.26 mills per kilowatt-hour. This was the minimum price which the Bureau had to charge in order to comply with the statute.

Under the Secretary's order, the Bonneville Power Administration will now take over the operation of the electric power facilities which the Bureau of Reclamation was operating at five dams in the Upper Columbia Basin and Bonneville will sell wholesale power to the same "preference" consumers at a wholesale rate of 3.10 mills per kilowatt-hour. Bonneville has no transmission lines from its grid connection at Lewiston to Soda Springs. The Idaho Power Co. does have such a line but, of course, Bonneville would be unable to pay Idaho Power a reasonable price for the use of this line and sell at its proposed low rate. The retail buyers served by the distribution lines number about 25,000 customers.

It is obvious that if the Bureau of Reclamation had to get 5.26 mills per kilowatt-hour, that Bonneville cannot sell wholesale power at a 40 percent less rate without incurring a spanking loss.

Using the new criteria for justifying expenditures and losses of this kind and certainly with both eyes shut and tongue in cheek, the Secretary justifies this expanded loss area for the Bonneville Power Administration (which is already losing $17 million annually) on the grounds that the "cheap" power will benefit the phosphate industry in which 25 percent of the cost of producing raw phosphorous is the cost of electric power. A reduction of 2 mills presumably will lower the cost of phosphorous $4.50 per ton. This, the Secretary opines, will create 300 new jobs in the phosphorous industry by 1970 and 6,000 new jobs in supporting industries. Of course, it will put some of the "wet process" phosphorous producers out of business, but the Secretary takes this in stride as he does the cost to the taxpayer.

The Secretary's order provoked at least one Member of Congress, Congressman SAYLOR, who, on July 16, introduced the following House resolution and urged its adoption:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 430

"Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the extension of the Bonneville power marketing area in southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, on May 21, 1963, by unilateral action extended the Bonneville Power Administration power marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada; and

"Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration will take over Bureau of Reclamation hydroelectric generating facilities which were authorized by Congress; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation found it necessary to charge an average of 5.26 mills for wholesale power to meet project repayment obligations established by Congress it is proposed that wholesale power rates be reduced to the Bonneville Power Administration's wholesale rate of 3.10 mills; and

"Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration is now operating at a substantial deficit and has been for the past 5 years; and

"Whereas this extension of Bonneville's power marketing area will require the construction of an $80 million high-voltage transmission line at the taxpayers' expense; and

"Whereas there seems to be substantial opposition among the people of southern Idaho to this unilateral administrative move by the Secretary of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of the Interior and the Bonneville Power Administrator refrain from taking any action to implement the order of May 21, 1963, extending the Bonneville Power Administration marketing area into southern Idaho and parts of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada unless and until the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been supplied with detailed feasibility studies of the proposed extension, a full public hearing has been held by this committee where all interested parties may have the opportunity to submit their views, and positive approval of the policy of extending the Bonneville Power Administration's marketing area has been expressed by a resolution of the committee and the approval of the House of Representatives."

It is estimated that, at a minimum, the cost of providing these 25,000 customers of the "preferential" wholesale buyers will be somewhere in excess of $3,200 per customer and that the annual cost to the Federal Government will be somewhere in excess of $5 million.

This is not stealing, you understand.

Neither is it bootlegging or smuggling.

It is a legal way, if not moral, of letting somebody else pay the tab, and, of course, there is a reason.

Within the last 2 weeks, the U.S. Attorney General has appeared before Congress in support of the new civil rights bill stressing the moral and ethical problem involved and urging that every Member of Congress and every citizen to look into his own heart for the answer to the moral issues involved in civil rights discrimination.

What about the moral and ethical issues which are involved in selling electric power at less than the cost of production to "preferential" customers and charging the difference in cost to the general taxpayer solely for the purpose of gaining political advantage or economic power?

Aside from the sheer intellectual dishonesty of the Secretary's findings in extending the Bonneville marketing area, one cannot help but be appalled at the blind faith which the stanch advocates of public power and some of our Members of Congress place in these goings on.

In order to achieve the objective of the Federal empire in power, the administration will sell electric power at a wholesale rate of 3.10 mills and go to any length to create "excess" power available to "preferential" users.

But what happens after the Government gets control? Well, in some of those countries where nationalized electric power has been an existing fact for some years, the Government approach is quite different and the "yardstick" has a completely different look and feel.

What do these governments now tell the consumer when the service breaks down and power shortages occur?

The consumer is now told that utilization of electric power should and must be controlled by rates; that is, by increasing the rates to the user high enough to reduce the demand for electric power to within the exisitng capabilities. The only thing that presently prevents such agencies as the Department of the Interior and the Rural Electrification Administration from making excess charges is the fact that the investor-owned electric power industry, in addition to paying taxes, is producing electric power at a rate which the Government agencies can't meet.

Because they can't meet it, they give electric power away as in the case of Bonneville, not because of a fondness for southern Idaho and its residents, but because of its broader plan to justify, ultimately, a "national" grid owned and operated by the Federal Government.

It is a step-by-step process involving application of pressures against individual Members of Congress. The House will be unlikely to do anything about House Resolution 430 unless the taxpayer wakes up and gives his Member of Congress some strong support.

Article by Mr. Rubin M. Hanan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 19, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rubin M. Hanan, president of the Alabama League of Aging Citizens, Inc., was recently called on by the Montgomery Advertiser to write a guest column for their publication. Mr. Hanan has long been active in various efforts in behalf of our aged citizens and this has won national recognition for him. I submit herewith his article titled "Rosh Hashanah Retains Its Meaning to Jews in Modern Days." It appeared in the September 9 issue of the Advertiser:

ROSH HASHANA RETAINS ITS MEANING TO JEWS IN MODERN DAYS

(By Rubin M. Hanan)

Autumn has a special signficance, for although the American Jew lives largely by the Gregorian calendar, in his Jewish life he is deeply aware of Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year which begins on the first day of Tishri or September 19.

According to rabbinic tradition, "on this day the world was called into being. On this day Thou caused all the creatures of the world to stand in judgment." This self-explanatory quotation from the Festival liturgy reflects the ancient rabbinical belief that the creation of man took place on Rosh Hashana 5,724 years ago.

The first chapter of Genesis bears this remarkable passage, "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made." The pious orthodox Jew believes that the world was created by expression of Divine Will; that all existence consists of matter and form; and the impression of form upon formless matter is a proof of the existence and creative act of God.

However, the modern Jewish theologian is faced with the problem of reconciling the traditional Jewish concept of creation with the discoveries of science. Instead of the Biblical concept of a world that was created in 6 days and some 5,000 years ago, modern astronomy and ideology extends the life of the universe to billions of years, and modern biology holds that existing forms of life are not static but the result of a continuous process of evolution which is still in action.

Modern physics has strengthened the idea of the eternity of matter by pointing out that as far as it knows, the sum total of material substance in the universe remains the same.

EVIDENCE CLEAR

These conclusions of modern thought are not mere speculations of thinkers that can be brushed aside, but are conclusions of evidence which has been checked by repeated experiments.

The modern Jew believes that it is impossible to maintain the Biblical stories of creation in their literal sense. They were the speculations of great religious men in the past and based upon the knowledge of the past, yet as in the first of Genesis, they bear a remarkable resemblance to the conclusions of geology and biology. But the modern Jew still maintains that God is the Creator, though in a more spiritual and enduring sense.

The idea of creation that took place at a given time and which fixed forever the forms of all living things is replaced by the idea of the constant process of creation, a creative evolution that gives a new meaning to the phrase in the Jewish liturgy. "He reneweth every day the work of creation." The modern concept of God is that of a Being as the prime cause of the universe, without whom there would be no existence. Creation becomes identical with necessity; God is the Creator of the universe in the sense that He is necessary to its existence, that He is constantly making new creation by His will, and that the world is not the product of blind chance and the play of the elements, but the work of a Supreme Rule and Guide.

The modern Jewish concept of God as Creator, like the existence of God himself, rests upon religious belief rather than philosophic proof.

WORLD REBORN

Today, 15 million Jews observe Rosh Hashana as the birthday of the world and therefore worthy of commemoration.

The pious Jew believes that the world is reborn from year to year, from day to day, minute to minute, and the primary message of the festival is that the process of creation is continuous, that the breath of God moves constantly upon the face of the waters, and that the light is continually being brought out of darkness. Nevertheless, if there is a new creation every moment, it is not a creation out of nothing, no moment is self-contained, but it emerges from God's glory.

The most beautiful thing about Rosh Hashana is, the older the Jew becomes with the passing of each year in his life, the festival of the high holidays becomes more poignant and significant to him and it stirs him to seriously contemplate upon basic causes and ultimate effects.

More and more he stands in awe of his fathers who were so wise and realistic in arranging the religious calendar in such a way that the Jewish New Year begins at the fall season of the year, when Mother Nature begins to yield her rich harvest.

Taking the hint from nature, the rabbis of old felt most intensely their own mortality. It is time for prayer, for fasting, and for an agonizing reappraisal of one's own conduct. It is the time for penitence which

forms the central point and most important period of the religious year.

WORLD IN JUDGMENT

The Jew feels that on this day he must know his place in the world and seek the means to attain true perspective. He believes that on this day he stands in judgment before God, our Father, our Creator, our King. Yet not he alone must answer the charge, but the whole world which has reared and nurtured him.

It is a mighty and religious concept which, if carried to its logical conclusion, could turn the tables of fortune and affect the ultimate relations of all men.

It is not the Jew alone, by his own unaided effort who places himself in this position. It is the very atmosphere of the day which does it for him. By slight adjustment of the Hebrew quotation from the prayer book, he may well say, "The day causes all creatures of the world to stand in judgment." It is the day itself with all its mental association which creates a realistic valuation of the world situation that confronted this generation as it has confronted past generations.

SEEK THE TRUTH

Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur are the most important days on the Jewish calendar. Today people look for explanations for holidays and festivals and try to relate ancient events to their own modern ideas and convictions. Because these events took place years ago, they often find it difficult to validate these holidays. But, because Rosh Hashana is not related to an event, but to philosophic concept, Jews accept it more readily than they do the minor holidays and some of the major ones.

Each generation of Jews feel that only that generation has experienced the height and depths of great drama, emotion, and history, and truly, what emotions of any other generation can really be compared with the excruciating tenseness that the Jews of Europe and the Isle of Rhodes have experienced during the present generation.

No other generation can share the remembrance of the cremation of 6 million bodies in Germany. On this Rosh Hashana the 6 million martyr Jews are remembered. Twenty years ago the drama of horror raged in fury, shielded from human understanding by a war that defied description. If children cried at Auschwitz, there was no one to hear. If mothers fled naked into the forests for their lives, they were returned by peasants for a grisly ransom. Children and parents walked to their eternity, naked and ashamed.

Twenty years later, the turmoil of communism and totalitarianism contrast with the perfect order of the universe. The greatest threat to our freedom and civilization is the spread of the totalitarian philosophy. Its best ally is not the devotion of its followers, but the confusion of its enemies, the freedom loving people of the world.

PRIDE IN AMERICA

On this Rosh Hashana we must remember the tragedies of the past and see that they are never again repeated. In this regard, religion and patriotism go together. They strengthen and compliment each other, for without religion and its moral and spiritual strength, patriotism loses strength.

Religion builds in the individual a reverance for those things held to be sacred and it conditions the individual to accept and revere that which is held sacred.

With that conditioning the religious person will more readily accept the responsibilities of a good citizen and will take pride in his country. Just as religion teaches love, obedience, and service to God, so does patriotism teach love, obedience, and service to one's country.

Thus religion gives to patriotism a foundation and permanence which comes from God. These are the ideals of religion and citizenship which must be remembered on Rosh Hashana.

New Generating Plant Is Dedicated Near Ozark, Ark.—Plant Financed by REA Loan Method

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration has been under attack recently from those who would be happy to see the great service performed by REA lost to rural America. Much of the criticism is from the misinformed, some if from those with a private, special interest to represent. An editorial which recently appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal gives a much clearer, and a fair picture of rural electrification, and I wish to include it at this point in my remarks:

Sunday is dedication day for a generating plant near Ozark, Ark. This is in the Fort Smith reaches of the Arkansas River and the plant has been financed by the Rural Electrification Administration loan method, two factors which probably mean the occasion will receive less attention from a distance than it deserves.

It is, we suggest, the epitome of the present contest that once was the Dixon-Yates battle, and before that the Tennessee Valley Authority struggle for life, and the utility holding company uproar, and so on back through decades of page-one headlines. It is, at the very least, typical of numerous other incidents on other parts of the map and of the target at which the investor-financed power companies are shooting in nationwide advertising.

The plant near Ozark is the first to be owned by the rural cooperatives of Arkansas, which are in turn owned by their customers. It has taken a 15-year fight for them to get it. It cost only about $9 million and will have a production of only about 57,400 kilowatts, both of which are small figures compared with standard power company plants, or even with a second plant Arkansas co-ops plan to build at Augusta.

But it is bigger than it seems in an engineering way, since it will be linked with some byproduct power to come from the nearby Dardenelle Dam. The alternative of water power or steam power will give both greater usefulness.

Much bigger than its size is the influence it has on assurance of low-price wholesale electricity for the State's co-ops.

The essential fact of life in the co-op areas is that they are a special kind of organization formed to take electricity to customers who live so far apart the big companies are uninterested in the business. For the most part the electricity they deliver is bought at wholesale from the big privately owned companies. The co-ops are customers of the power companies, the same companies whose advertising is worded to make the co-ops seem to be competitors.

As distributors they have opened the way to modern living along rural roads, where light recently came from coal oil, washing was done on a back porch scrubboard, and the "plumbing" was outdoors for lack of plentiful water from electric pumps. The co-ops have done it on a shoestring of small wires to meters, read by the customer-owners, for lack of money to pay meter readers.

Co-op distribution of electricity means long lines to serve few customers, compared with city loads of the standard companies. It means few of the big customers, such as factories, office buildings, and stores, that pay so much of the costs of a standard company. It means investments to be paid for from partially used equipment, in contrast to the more uniform use of electricity around the clock and around the calendar for the big companies. It means repayment of loans, in place of the common practice of refinancing with new bond issues by the privately owned companies.

In fact, co-op business is so unattractive that the power companies turned away from the 2-percent Government loans they could have had to expand into the same thinly occupied areas.

The power industry advertising reads as though the co-ops were taking business the companies are entitled to have. The fact is the co-ops created an electric service where there was none.

Untold in this anti-co-op campaigning is the fact that co-ops buy more power from these companies than from Government dams, or the fact that more power from Government dams is sold to the private companies than to the co-ops.

While the co-ops were stretching their powerlines out into the country, and buying their power from the big power companies, TVA was the bigger political issue and REA financing got little attention. But when REA loans are used to build generating plants, that is competition and the power spokesmen for free enterprise fight it.

For the co-ops to build some plants is important in assuring future financial health. For the co-ops to be able to threaten to build their own generators is of much greater importance than the actual building, for its results when the power companies threaten massive increases in wholesale prices of electricity.

This is the conflict that is illustrated by Sunday's dedication at Ozark.

Walter P. Reuther, Dynamic Labor Leader, Gives Inspiring Message at West Virginia Centennial Labor Day Event—Wheeling Welcomes Return of Native Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, throughout its history this Nation has been devoted to the well-being of the individual. The American aim is ever to safeguard the rights and privileges of each citizen, and to insure equal opportunity and justice under the law.

The organized labor movement has been a significant force in this tradition, seeking to achieve for its members improved working conditions, satisfactory hours, fair wages, and additional merited employee benefits. By aiding the individual worker, unions have faithfully served this country, and have performed

a meaningful part in the attainment of our present level of prosperity and economic growth.

West Virginians are gratified that our State has had important influence in the strengthening of the labor movement, and the establishment of collective bargaining as a valuable and accepted process. We are likewise happy that men and women of the Mountain State have given leadership to organized labor, and to the workers it represents.

One such native West Virginian who has risen to a position of respect and responsibility in union leadership is Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, and vice president of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

On Labor Day, September 2, 1963, Mr. Reuther delivered the principal address at West Virginia's Centennial Labor Day observances, held in Wheeling.

In speaking to an enthusiastic and responsive holiday audience he emphasized the need for energetic, cooperative effort in meeting the challenges which Americans face on both the national and international scenes.

I have faith in America and its people—

The Wheeling native declared.

Free labor, free management, free government and free people can find the answers. We need as a people and as a nation a greater sense of urgency, a stronger sense of national unity and a deeper sense of moral purpose.

More than 50,000 West Virginians gathered for this important day-long centennial event, which included a thrilling parade, and a special luncheon honoring Mr. Reuther.

The Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable William Wallace Barron took part in the festivities, and awarded Mr. Reuther the Order of the 35th Star—an honor bestowed by the West Virginia Centennial Commission to those whose contributions to our State have truly been outstanding. In making the presentation the Governor said:

As a means of paying tribute to the outstanding persons whose accomplishments have brought chedit to our State, the Order of the 35th Star was designed as a feature of our centenniel year celebration. It is not given lightly, but reserved for those whose work in their chosen professions has helped to move West Virginia forward and to add to the brightness of its new image.

Such a person is our honored guest here tonight, Mr. Walter P. Reuther. It is with a great amount of pride and pleasure that I present to him now the distinguished award of our centennial commission—the Order of the 35th Star.

Instrumental in the organization and execution of the centennial Labor Day program were Miles C. Stanley, president of the West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, and Charles J. Habig, president of the Ohio Valley Trades & Labor Assembly, AFL–CIO. Mr. Habig gave genial welcoming remarks to those in attendance. Mr. Stanley introduced the featured speaker, commenting on Mr. Reuther's service to unionism as follows:

He has devoted a lifetime to ably and articulately representing the workers of this great country. He has been beaten, thrown from bridges and shot, both literally and figuratively, but none of this has dampened his spirit to fight for social and economic justice. Today he stands as a symbol of freedom throughout the world and is accepted as a leader by all peoples who believe in the freedom and dignity of the individual.

Effective master of ceremonies on this occasion was William Diefenbach, president of the Ohio Valley Business and Industrial Development Corp. Also taking part in the program was the mayor of the city of Wheeling, the Honorable Charles Ihlenfeld, who extended the hospitality of that progressive metropolitan area to the honored guest and other visitors.

It was my distinct pleasure to be present on this significant day, and to bring the greetings of the West Virginia congressional delegation: Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and Representatives HARLEY O. STAGGERS, ELIZABETH KEE, ARCH A. MOORE, who was also in attendance, KEN HECHLER, and JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

Mr. President, West Virginia has historically shown deep concern for the welfare of both labor and management—the employee and employer. The Mountain State has traditionally been a cradle of growth for the beneficial union movement, and has seen its sons and daughters earn positions of high responsibility within trade organizations. We laud the dedication and service of Walter P. Reuther, an American who has made lasting contributions to the workers of our land, and who has brought credit to his native State.

I request that the address of Walter P. Reuther, at the centennial Labor Day ceremonies, Wheeling, W. Va., September 2, 1963, be printed in the Appendix. I also ask that the introductory remarks of Miles C. Stanley appear in the Appendix, together with the program of the Labor Day ceremonies, and a list of those persons serving as members of the Organized Labor Committee of the West Virginia Centennial Commission.

There being no objection, the address and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTENNIAL LABOR DAY CELEBRATION
INTRODUCTION OF WALTER P. REUTHER

(By Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO)

It is my great pleasure and privilege to present the featured speaker for this occasion. I say present because he really needs no introduction to the folks in West Virginia, or for that matter in the Nation.

His career in the trade union movement began here in Wheeling, while an apprentice tool and die maker at the Wheeling Steel Corporation. His career since leaving Wheeling is well known to most of you—his brilliance and vision in the field of labor-management relations has established entirely new concepts in national labor policy. He has served the labor movement and America well in a multitude of positions of leadership and trust. He has devoted a lifetime to ably and articulately representing the workers of this great country. He has been beaten, thrown from bridges and shot, both literally and figuratively, but none of this has dampened his spirit to fight for social and economic justice. Today he stands as a symbol of freedom throughout the world and is accepted as a leader by all peoples who believe in the freedom and dignity of the individual.

It is with great pride that I present a great humanitarian, labor leader, statesman, and American, West Virginia's own and Wheeling's own Walter P. Reuther.

ADDRESS AT WHEELING, W. VA., BY WALTER P. REUTHER, PRESIDENT, UAW, SEPTEMBER 2, 1963

Labor Day of 1963 will, hopefully, provide an interlude for many Americans in which they will be able to reflect upon some of the many problems that challenge the social intelligence and democratic conscience of this Nation. It is further to be hoped that this period of contemplation will lead to a call for action directed at the Congress of the United States, and at those in all States and communities across the land who have it, within their power, in large or small degree, to narrow the gap between our democratic ideals and our current behavior in such crucial matters as civil rights, education, health, and the employment and general well-being of our citizens.

Labor Day this year will be, as it has proved to be in recent years, a parade of American affluence, of millions of our citizens pursuing pleasure and renewing family ties, of cars and boats, of farewells and arrivals at airports, of shows and games and sports. Yet millions of our fellow citizens will not be present at the feast. For the affluence of America is highly qualified and greatly marred by the continuing deprivation and poverty of millions of men, women and children within our borders.

Our conscience can find no ease in the claim, numerically correct though it be, that the majority of our people are not thus deprived. For the disadvantaged minority is, for one thing, too numerous to be cast aside or minimized: 50 million Americans live in squalor and poverty by the current standards and capabilities of our society—by the standards that the fortunate among us find normal.

A free society, moreover, lives by the dignity and well-being of all of its members. To the extent that any among us is kept from full and equal access to the freedoms and opportunities of American life, to that extent we are all diminished.

Abraham Lincoln understood that human freedom was essentially inadvisible and that no one freedom could be secure until freedom was made universal. Lincoln in his wisdom said, "I have always thought that all men should be free. * * * Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God, cannot long retain it." We need to understand that we cannot defend freedom in Berlin if we continue to deny freedom in Birmingham.

When Lincoln said that a house divided against itself cannot stand, he uttered a truth as relevant today as when this country was torn by Civil War. We are a rich country—but we are not rich enough to be able to afford a division between an affluent majority and a deprived minority, any more than we can afford to be divided into a white majority and a nonwhite minority. This country is not just a random collection of isolated individuals or groups; we are a people—and we are a people confronted with perhaps the greatest dangers and opportunities in the memory of the human race. We cannot meet those dangers or seize those opportunities unless all of our great potential is realized.

Yet as of this Labor Day of 1963, much of our potential is wasted, and has been wasted for years. We have had three recessions in the past 10 years. We have had rising unemployment, both in periods of recession and in periods of recovery. And we have paid a heavy price for this economic instability and stagnation.

Over the past decade, we have suffered the irrecoverable loss of 25 million man-years of labor. Throughout that same period, be-

cause of unemployment and idle plant, we have lost forever the equivalent of $600 billion in wealth and well-being above and beyond our actual production of those years.

Yet all of us know the needs that presently go unsatisfied on every hand. Each of us could draw up a list of the glaring deficits in the quality of our society in sector after sector, where the labor and skills of men are needed, where our plant and our know-how and our technology could be fully employed in peace and for peace as we have employed them in the past for the prosecution of war.

Surely, the winning of peace and the prospect of survival and a better life for our children are worth the same total effort we expended in wartime.

We should resolve this Labor Day to build more schools and colleges, using the resources that are available to us at every level through the cooperation of all units of government—in order to educate a new generation of Americans for the trials and possibilities of an age infinitely more complex than the era we grew up in.

We should resolve to educate the greater number of teachers that will be needed to staff those schools, and to pay those teachers a salary fully commensurate with their contribution to the future of our children and of the Nation.

We should determine to clear the slums at the heart of our cities; to build more hospitals and bring equality of access to basic medical care to all Americans.

We should expand highway construction and resource development, and do all the other things necessary to get on with the job of improving the quality of American life—for it is the quality of American life, the inner strength and cohesion of the American people, that may well be the determining factor in moving the world away from the abyss of nuclear war and leading the nations and peoples along the path to a durable peace founded on the abundance that science and technology now place within our reach.

Despite the resurgence of Europe, it is still no exaggeration to say that the American economy is world freedom's greatest material asset. And it is equally just to affirm that American democracy—American democracy in action and true to its fundamental principles—can prove to be freedom's trump card in the struggle for the minds of men in which our generation is engaged.

In that struggle, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, of which American labor is a part, has inscribed on its banner the slogan, "Bread, Peace, Freedom" to define the nature of free labor's goal, and to differentiate those goals—which are the basic goals of any free society—from the way of life the Communists would impose if they were to prevail.

Free labor wants—and almost all the people of the world want, if they had the choice and the means—a world in which men can feed, clothe, and shelter themselves and their families without putting their souls in chains. Communism promises economic security, but at the cost of slavery to the total state. There would seem to be no contest, then, between the free way of life and the slave way. Mr. Khrushchev, in fact, believes there is no contrast, not because freedom is bound to win but because, in his view, communism will bury freedom.

Mr. Khrushchev believes he will bury us because we are not living up to our promises to our selves and to the promise that the democratic revolution that began in 1776 holds for the rest of mankind. He knows we are falling short of our potential. He remembers an event that occurred in July 1962, an event that most Americans, if they once knew it, have already forgotten. It was in that month that the Soviet Union, for the first time, surpassed the United States in the production of steel—at a time when our own steel industry was operating at only 43 percent of capacity and hundreds of thousands of American steelworkers were unemployed.

Mr. Khrushchev believes he will bury us because he sees us as a warring feudalism of pressure groups, capable of rising above special interest and achieving national unity and purpose only under the pressures of war.

Mr. Khrushchev knows about the three recessions in 10 years, about the loss of 25 million man-years of labor, about the billions of dollars in wealth and well-being we failed to produce that we could have produced through full production and full employment.

Mr. Khrushchev knows of the poverty and squalor that still mar and mock our affluent society. He knows that we are still a house divided in the matter of equal rights and opportunities 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation. He knows that 187 years after Jefferson lighted the fires of revolution with the proposition that all men are created equal, a Negro still can't buy a cup of coffee or vote or rent a room or send his children to good schools in many parts of the Nation. He knows that the 14th amendment of the American Constitution, which guarantees all citizens the equal protection of the laws, is essentially meaningless to millions of Americans.

Knowing these things—and we cannot deny them—Mr. Khrushchev is betting that we shall fail to generate the unity of purpose and the economic thrust at home which will enable us to launch and maintain a democratic offensive in the global arena where rival systems are contending for the hearts and minds of men.

I am confident we can prove Mr. Khrushchev to be wrong. We can and must prove it not by the propaganda of the word but rather by the propaganda of the democratic deed. We have to prove it by scoring a democratic victory in the only war that mankind can win—the war against poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease in all the desperate regions of the world where men, women, and children go to bed hungry every night.

We have to recognize that history and our own good fortune have thrust this great responsibility upon us. We have to recognize that the scientific and technological revolutions—revolutions that we have led and carried into every region of the planet—have transformed the earth into a neighborhood where we can no longer hope either to enjoy our blessings and comforts or preserve our values in a vacuum, regardless of the state of the world around us. We have to recognize that we are being judged and will continue to be judged not primarily by our wealth and power, but by what we do with our wealth and power. It is only through the full and wise use of our wealth and power—by harnessing them to a renewed sense of democratic unity and purpose—that we can give the lie to the Communist appraisal of freedom's chances. The great challenge we face, in other words, is not to refute communism but to nourish democracy.

Tom Paine, the great American revolutionary, said, "Where liberty is not, there is my country." We happen to be the heirs of the only true and continuing revolution. It is our privilege and our duty to make it prevail, both in its homeland and wherever liberty is not.

That means, most immediately, putting our own house in order. Here in America, we are on trial before our own conscience, and the Congress that represents us is on trial. We have yet to face squarely the fact that our greatest challenge is not in the realm of outer space, but in the regions of inner space—in our own communities and in our own hearts.

It is here that men suffer from intolerably high and prolonged unemployment. It is here that much of our productive plant lies idle, although men need jobs, children need better and less crowded schools and more good teachers, the sick need more and better hospitals, and almost every community in the country could benefit from improvements in housing and public facilities.

It is here in the heartland of democracy that fully one-tenth of our own people have been denied the fundamental rights and opportunities of citizenship because of the color of their skin—in defiance of religious principle, constitutional guarantees, and common-sense.

It is here that unemployment among Negro Americans has been more than double that among white Americans since 1955—and where joblessness among Negro teenagers has been running as high as 30 percent during the past 3 years, about five times the overall rate.

And it is here that some of our loudest and most misguided professional patriots are attempting to block the Negro's determined march toward full and equal participation in American life by casting absurd doubts on the patriotism of the civil rights movement.

The charge of communism is the stalest and most tired charge in the bag of tricks of those who oppose genuine social progress. We in the labor movement have had practical experience and tangible success in fighting communism, years ago in American unions and since then throughout the world. And we long ago learned that the most effective way to fight communism is to foster democracy; not to make speeches against communism but to remove the injustices that communism exploits.

The most blind partisan of things as they are should be able to see that the central drive of the American Negro is to become a more complete American, not to desert or subvert America. The goal of the civil rights movement is to make this Nation truer to itself, stronger and more united through the full acceptance of all our people and the full use of their energies and skills.

The civil rights demonstrations are demonstrations of faith in the fundamental good will of the American people—of faith in the democratic process. Nothing could be more subversive of our free institutions than a failure to remember and abide by the constitutional creed that sustains them. From first to last, the Constitution is concerned with justice. The establishment of justice is set forth in the preamble as a national goal. The first article of the Bill of Rights affirms the "right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The executive branch of our Government has shown its understanding of that sustaining truth about our system. Let the citizens—all of us—now petition the Government to act to redress grievances which hurt not only the Negro minority but every American, whatever his color. And let the Congress act, in order to form, in the words of the Constitution, "a more perfect Union," in which the Negro, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, can come into his full heritage as a loyal American.

Let us petition the Congress, and let the Congress act as well in the matter of achieving full employment, as a logical and essential part of granting the Negro the first-class citizenship so long denied him. For a civil rights victory can be a largely abstract and empty victory without the underlying sustenance of economic well-being. Without a job and a regular paycheck, the right to sit at a restaurant counter is a mocking mirage.

Let us act to establish civil rights and full employment in this country because it is morally right and because it is imperative from the standpoint of enlightened self-interest. Putting hundreds of thousands of Negro Americans in jobs from which they were previously barred—either through discrimination or the lack of training flowing from discrimination—can be of more decisive

meaning in the democratic struggle for the minds of men than landing a regiment of astronauts on the moon. Yet we need not make the choice; we can do both—and much more besides—if we mobilize our will and our resources and sustain the thrust of the American economy at a full employment, full production rate of expansion.

We can take advantage of the breakthrough represented by the limited nuclear test ban agreement to shift the whole emphasis of our quarrel with communism from the self-defeating arms race to a struggle in the economic and social realms. Through an all-out assault on human poverty and hunger around the world, we can call the Communist bluff and stamp a democratic image on the emerging future.

The magnitude of such an assignment is the best argument in behalf of a greater effort. At a time when we are cutting our aid program, we should be increasing it, in order to wage the peace through democratically sponsored world development and to sustain employment and growth at home.

At home and abroad, this Labor Day of 1963, the revolution we started in 1776 is still going on. It is opposed by a false revolution which lacks Jefferson's "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" and which seeks dominion over the bodies and minds of men. Even here at home, we have not completed our revolution, we have not yet made good our promises to ourselves. Our responsibility as freemen, both here and abroad, is to complete the revolution, to redress grievances, to establish justice, to "form a more perfect Union" both here at home and in the wider community of the nations. It is to seize upon the opportunities offered by science and technology to feed, clothe and shelter the human family and nourish its spirit, without putting its soul in chains.

That is a tall order. The tasks of peace are infinitely more complex than the demands of war. Mr. Khrushchev is betting we can't do it—that we don't even want to do it. Yet those of us who have confidence in the capacity and will of freemen will think and act otherwise. Now, as in the founding days of the Republic, we must pledge "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor" in the cause of the democratic revolution.

As an American, I have unlimited faith in the capability of freemen and free institutions. I am confident we are equal to the challenge we face if we will but mobilize our unused economic potential by getting America back to work and harness the creative genius of the free human spirit to the rewarding and promising purpose of peace.

To achieve these purposes, we need as a people and a nation a greater sense of national urgency, a stronger sense of national unity and a deeper sense of national purpose.

LABOR DAY CEREMONY, WHEELING, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 2, 1963

Speakers' platform—corner 12th and Main Streets.

Music by band, Joseph A. Cesario, director.

Welcome, Charles J. Habig, president, Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Assembly, AFL–CIO.

Master of ceremonies, William Diefenbach, president, Ohio Valley Business and Industrial Development Corp.

The national anthem.

Invocation, Right Rev. Joseph H. Hodges, Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Wheeling; Rabbi Martin Siegel, Woodsdale Temple; Rev. Mason Deverreaux, Wayman AME Church.

Introductions, Mr. Diefenbach.

Greetings from city of Wheeling, Hon. Charles Ihlenfeld, mayor.

Readings, Harold O'Leary, "Mr. Dooley on the Closed Shop," "Vanzetti's Last Speech," "Stars and Stripes Forever."

Greetings, West Virginia congressional delegation.

Introduction of the Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Lawrence Barker, commissioner, West Virginia Department of Labor.

Greetings from the State of West Virginia, the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia.

Response, Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO.

Featured address, Walter P. Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers of America and vice president, AFL–CIO.

Presentations.

ORGANIZED LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Miles C. Stanley, president, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO; Charleston, W. Va., chairman.

Members

Franklin Allen, secretary-treasurer, West Virginia Council of Carpenters, St. Albans, W. Va.

Glen Armstrong, State director, AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education, Charleston, W. Va.

Donald Berger, president, district 2, United Glass & Ceramic Workers, Charleston, W. Va.

A. Bruce Campbell, State representative, national AFL–CIO, region IX, Charleston, W. Va.

Eugene A. Carter, president, Local 175 and Joint Council 84, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Charleston, W. Va.

Francis Clark, State representative, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Parkersburg, W. Va.

Oscar L. Davis, State director, Communications Workers of America, Charleston, W. Va.

Maurice Fancher, regional manager, Laborers International Union, Charleston, W. Va.

Joseph L. Handley, business manager, Operating Engineers, Local 132, Charleston, W. Va.

Charles E. Hess, representative, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, Moundsville, W. Va.

Delbert Junkins, representative, American Flint Glass Workers Union, Clarksburg, W. Va.

C. E. Miller, State representative, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Hinton, W. Va.

James T. Nelson, State director, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Bridgeport, W. Va.

Harley Richards, representative, United Steelworkers of America, Parkersburg, W. Va.

Benjamin W. Skeen, secretary-treasurer, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, Charleston, W. Va.

Harry Tulley, State representative, Glass Bottle Blowers Association, Charleston, W. Va.

Cecil J. Urbaniak, president, district 31, United Mine Workers of America, Fairmont, W. Va.

Robert C. Welch, representative, Brotherhood of Painters & Decorators, Huntington, W. Va.

South Bend Tribune Backs Expansion of Manpower Retraining Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a first-class editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune in support of the recent action of the Senate in passing an expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The editorial, entitled, "The Raiders" follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Sept. 1, 1963]

THE RAIDERS

An expanded version of the Manpower Retraining Act has passed the U.S. Senate in spite of attacks by a raiding party of Republicans and Southern Democrats who were either uninformed or blindly obstructionist.

May the measure have equal success in the House, where a similar raiding party awaits it.

To be adequate, the measure must ultimately embrace two major changes from the initial version of the act. One is an extension of the time during which the Federal Government will support the full cost of retraining. The other is clear-cut authorization for classes in basic education skills, so that retraining can put many more citizens back to work.

The Senate raiders included Republicans EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and BARRY GOLDWATER, and Democrat STROM THURMOND. Among their objections were charges that the retraining program has no support from the States and ought to be scrapped; a complaint that Federal money should be provided in the form of loans rather than grants for retraining; and a shotgun attack (from Senator GOLDWATER) on the evils of Federal paternalism.

It is true that 25 State legislatures, Indiana's included, met and adjourned this year without providing matching funds for retraining. It is also true, however, that there was scarcely any proof of the retraining act's value available when these legislatures met.

In Indiana, for example, only one retraining class had graduated when the general assembly convened. That class was in South Bend, where one of the country's first retraining projects was established.

Since then, the benefits of the program have become much clearer (90 percent of those retrained in South Bend, for example, are now working at steady jobs). But the State legislatures can hardly be blamed for not acting until they saw some concrete results.

Those who advocate lending money to support retraining fail to consider that money spent on retraining can ultimately be deducted from money spent to support unemployed families. Moreover, the crisis of unskilled members of the labor market is a national problem that properly calls for the use of Federal tax money.

Two things ought to be kept in mind as the House takes up consideration of the manpower measure. First of all, it has been demonstrated that jobs do exist for properly trained men and women. Secondly, retraining is not another spending measure. It is an investment in the health of the American economy.

It is far better to prepare a man to support himself than to support him indefinitely on relief.

As Big as His Grin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on September 3 a new bridge across the Wabash

River above Vincennes was dedicated. It has been named the Red Skelton Bridge in honor of the famous comedian who was born in Vincennes and spent his early childhood there.

I would suppose that there are few bridges in this world named for comedians, and yet there may be an appropriate analogy. Those who help us laugh at life do a great deal to bridge the happier days with those less happy, pride with humility, and even brother with brother.

In connection with the bridge dedication, "Red" Skelton gave a benefit performance, the proceeds of which were to be used to help needy families in the area. In the course of his very excellent program he offered to match the money raised by the benefit. By means of a subsequent check he did just that.

Some of the impact of Mr. Skelton's visit is reflected in the following editorial from the September 8 issue of the Vincennes Sun-Commercial.

[From the Vincennes (Ind.) Sun-Commercial, Sept. 8, 1963]

AS BIG AS HIS GRIN

"Red" Skelton who gave for us a free show which would cost any other community at least $25,000 has kept his spontaneous promise and has sent in his $10,000 check, matching the fund raised locally, for the benefit of underprivileged children.

Thus we have a fund of $20,000 to invest and to carry out the great commedian's ideas of helping the needy families of this community.

"Red" knew what it was like to be poor, to be hungry. Just as many well-to-do parents who have known difficult times in their youth wish to make life easy for their children, so "Red" wants to spare the youth here of some of the anguish he went through.

His generosity calls for the best thinking of this community in administering this money. It should be beyond political reach. It calls for a trust fund of the highest type.

This fund should be but a starter. Other gifts should be made to it. Even "Red" might be induced to come back again.

Perhaps aid to the youth should go beyond the needs of the moment and look to college education of those who qualify for it. Of course, our own Vincennes University as well as all other schools of advanced learning have many scholarships, yet these scholarships do not and cannot meet all the expenses of education.

"Red" has demonstrated his sincerity by his gift to the community. It should silence the sneers of some of the cynical who thought it but a publicity gesture.

Vincennes should match him in his sincerity and see to it that the money is handled wisely and meets the needs which our hometown boy wants.

"Red" has proved beyond all doubt his heart is as big as his grin. Ours should be big, too.

If the Nation Is To Survive: Admiral Anderson's Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert into the RECORD the following two columns by Ralph de Toledano on Adm. George Anderson's recent speech to Washington correspondents at the National Press Club.

The columns follow:

IF THE NATION IS TO SURVIVE: ADMIRAL ANDERSON'S WARNING

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Adm. George Anderson, the Chief of Naval Operations, was pushed out of his country's military service by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara because he insisted on speaking his piece. Admiral Anderson did not argue that Mr. McNamara should accept the Navy's views. But he demanded the right to give the President and the Pentagon civilians his best thinking on vital military questions.

Secretary McNamara, on the other hand, felt that the military leaders of the Nation should be seen but not heard—that their single duty was to carry out the orders of the proliferating "whiz kids" who now make all Pentagon policy. As a result of his insistence, Admiral Anderson was "retired" and made Ambassador to Portugal. He will serve in this position with distinction, but he belongs at the head of our Navy.

In a valedictory statement, however, Admiral Anderson has been willing to brave the anger of the White House and the Defense Department, to make crystal clear his views on the constitutional rights and duties of the military. He spoke to a group of civilians—most of them newspapermen—at the National Press Club. But what he has to say deserves more than routine coverage. For in outlining "some tendencies" which give him and many others in and out of uniform great concern, Admiral Anderson has sounded a warning to the American people. They cannot, however, respond, unless they know what he said.

"My first concern," says Admiral Anderson, "is over the prospective and maritime position of the United States versus the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that the Soviets are moving forward rapidly on the high seas, both economically and militarily. On the other hand, much of our Navy is growing old. Ships are not being as rapidly replaced as they should be. The status of American commercial shipping is also declining."

Next, Admiral Anderson noted the new policy of ignoring the military in such matters as the evaluation of new weapons systems. "I view any diminution of military recommendations on weapons procurement with grave alarm. Certainly the abrupt reversal of military recommendations without interim consultation, as was the case in the TFX and VSTOL contracts, is fraught with grave dangers."

What Admiral Anderson wants is not an upgrading of military power. He simply asks that before military decisions are made, the generals and the admirals be (at least) consulted. Under Secretary McNamara, the "operations analysts" using computers and fancy sociological studies have completely elbowed out the men who have devoted their lives to military matters.

For the man who must fly the planes and sail the ships, what is simply a small mathematical factor to the "whiz kid" can be the difference between life and death. "Those who fought in the Pacific know what the narrow margin of operational superiority in the Japanese Zero fighter cost in American lives," Admiral Anderson notes.

Objecting to the myth being fostered by the Pentagon civilians and some of their friends in the administration, the former CNO decried the propaganda that military men are opposed to new ideas. "On the contrary," he says, "history shows that daring ideas from the military often have been ignored: Col. Charles de Gaulle in his ignored warning of the maginot line type of defense; Adm. James O. Richardson in his caution against leaving the fleet exposed at Pearl Harbor; William S. Sims, as a young lieutenant before World War I, took his daring case for gunnery reform directly to the President. Generals MacArthur, Billy Mitchell, and Hap Arnold, and Admiral Mahan were daring, original, and creative, as were Admirals Rickover and Raborn in engineering Polaris breakthroughs."

It has been a convenient device to paint the military as foolish, backward, and uninformed. But the convenience has been to the politicians, and the Nation has suffered. It was the civilians after World War II who argued that our generals and admirals didn't know what they were talking about, who maneuvered us into a position of such weakness that when the Korean fighting broke out our forces were unable to cope with the Communist onslaught.

Many Americans died then, because a civilian "knew better" than those trained in war. The military was silenced. Today Secretary McNamara has gagged the uniformed man at the Pentagon in a manner previously unknown to the United States.

IF THE NATION IS TO SURVIVE—PART II

(By Ralph de Toledano)

In his valedictory speech last week to Washington correspondents—and the country at large—at the National Press Club, Adm. George Anderson marshaled in sober and methodical fashion his experience in the Navy and as Chief of Naval Operations. And he pleaded for a Defense Establishment in which decisions that could mean survival or extinction for the United States would not be left entirely in the hands of computer-happy whiz kids who don't know one end of a rifle from the other.

Admiral Anderson didn't put it that way, but his intent was clear. "Those who criticize the military as being backward," he said, "tend to be the very ones who are proponents of procedures and policies which would discourage a creative corps of military professionals. By attempting to stamp officers of all services into a common mold, we may kill incentive, imagination, and independent thought."

That such is the current tendency can be observed by any reporter covering hearings on Capitol Hill. Where in the past the services spoke freely and honestly to committees of House or Senate, now they constantly look back over their shoulders to make sure that Secretary McNamara is not bearing down on them like a superdreadnought.

Perhaps the most significant warning uttered by Admiral Anderson—braving the wrath of the Administration in remarks addressed directly to the American people—was against "a modern fallacy that theories or computers or economics or numbers of weapons win wars. Good leadership unfailingly recognizes that man is the key to success or failure." This is an unfashionable view in a time in which some technicians have reinterpreted the history of mankind.

A materialistic philosophy holds to the new concept. But Admiral Anderson is a better historian than his critics. He says: "Some of the greatest victories, from Hannibal at Cannae and Nelson at Trafalgar to MacArthur at New Guinea, have come at the hands of forces inferior in numbers but superior in human ability, courage, and determination to win. Our Nation will defy every lesson of history if we think that stockpiles of weapons or the decisions of computers win wars. Man, his wits, and his will are still the key to war and peace, victory and defeat."

But where does this lead? Again, Admiral Anderson has proposed a highly unpopular formulation: "The key to leadership is understanding human nature—your opponents, your allies, and your subordinates. To do

anything to downgrade the role of the men who have to fight our country's battles is to violate the first principle of leadership. Morale is the business of every leader in our Defense Establishment. Do all else right, and do this wrong—the product in a crisis is disaster."

Yet this is what we are doing wrong. For morale in the armed services is lower today than it has ever been in my experience—lower than when President Truman's Defense Secretary, Louis Johnson, took the ax to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The civilians brought in by Secretary McNamara have shut off debate—like the Napoleon who became intolerant of criticism, stifled his commanders, and ended his great career in utter defeat.

But Admiral Anderson was not simply making a plea for his military colleagues. Speaking of the American system of checks and balances, he said, "The Congress must be a check on the use of either civilian or military power in the Pentagon and must not default, even in part, its constitutional responsibility and authority to provide for our Armed Forces."

The authority has been brushed aside by the "whiz kids" and the White House. Congress objects to the phasing out of America's manned bomber force and the Strategic Air Command, but it has not taken the necessary measures to compel the Pentagon to desist. The Congress watches in something close to panic as Secretary McNamara goes ahead with plans to eliminate the Navy's vital aircraft carrier force. Overcentralized structures such as the McNamara monolithic structured Pentagon civilian high command are conducive to the abuse of power and the compounding of mistakes.

This is sound judgment. The White House has not been happy with the Anderson statement of principle. But it can do little to stop him. After all, the President has said that he recognizes the value of dissent and daring, that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change. It may be that Admiral Anderson will get his comeuppance for taking the President's words seriously. But if the Nation is to survive, then our military men must act as bravely in Washington as they have always acted under fire.

Statement of Jerome J. Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following statement of Jerome J. Keating, president, National Association of Letter Carriers:

STATEMENT BY JEROME J. KEATING, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS ON PAY LEGISLATION BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, AUGUST 27, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Jerome J. Keating. I am president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, with offices at 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. It is my privilege to represent approximately 165,000 letter carriers located in more than 6,000 local branches spread through all 50 of our States and all our insular possessions.

I am accompanied by Mr. J. Stanly Lewis, secretary-treasurer of the NALC, Mr. Charles N. Coyle, the assistant secretary-treasurer of the NALC, and Mr. J. Don Kerlin, our legislative consultant. Vice President James H. Rademacher is absent from the city on important organization business.

Before beginning my formal testimony, I want to express my thanks and appreciation to this committee. You have always been most fair and understanding in your dealings with us. We appreciate very much the opportunity of coming before you and discussing our problems with you.

I am pleased to testify on the same side of a salary discussion with the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Post Office Department. There is some disagreement as to the amount of money we feel we should have, but there is no disagreement whatsoever among us on the necessity for a comparability pay raise.

As you Mr. Chairman, and the other members of this committee so well know, this has not always been the case. Over the years, the postal workers have been accustomed to fighting for their just dues, alone and unaided, against the assembled forces of the executive branch.

We welcome this new unanimity on behalf of a pay raise for our people.

I don't think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, to argue any further that letter carriers and other postal employees should and must be considered as first-class citizens in the economic community. The whole intent and purpose of the salary reform provisions of Public Law 87-793 was to establish this point once and for all, and to prevent postal workers from falling behind the economic parade as they have done so consistently over the years.

We appreciate very much the efforts of several members of this committee, and of other Members of the House of Representatives, who have introduced legislation to redeem the promise that was inherent in Public Law 87-793 and to give us comparability with our fellow workers in private industry.

As you so well know, one of the principal purposes of the salary reform provisions of the law was to place the adjustment of Federal salaries on an orderly basis. In private industry, as we are prepared to show in our testimony, pay increases in accordance with the rise in living costs improved standards of living and increased productivity are usually granted almost automatically according to the provisions of long-term contracts between labor and management. There is no fanfare about these annual increases and the public has seldom been aware that they have taken place.

Of course, with us in the Federal Establishment, it has been different. We have had to gain our increases in an atmosphere of ultimate publicity and optimum fanfare. Despite the best efforts of everyone concerned, the increases—when granted—have been compromises rather unscientifically arrived at. And, on those occasions when our efforts have failed to achieve a pay raise, our people have fallen woefully behind their fellow workers in the private sector.

This continuing, biennial struggle for a kind of hit-or-miss comparability has been, I know, as difficult for you as it has been for us. Our people have been greatly disturbed by the uncertainty of the issue during each pay campaign. In the past, the Members of the Congress, the executive department, and the employees have struggled without any clear-cut program.

As I have said, the salary reform provisions of Public Law 87-793 were designed to put an end to all this. They represent an historic milestone in the Federal service; the first statement of a policy, by the Congress, that postal and Federal employees were no longer to be treated as unloved stepchildren in the economic family; that they were to be treated just as fairly as they would be treated in private industry.

As you know, the pay legislation was passed by the House of Representatives last year with only 20 negative votes. It was passed in the other body with only three negative votes. It is sincerely to be hoped that this enormously important commitment which the Congress made in 1962 will not be forgotten and disregarded in 1963.

But, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, while the intent of Public Law 87-793 is beyond reproach—the effect falls somewhat short of perfection.

The statistics assembled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of necessity, are from yesterday—even when first garnered. They are a record of what has happened—not what is going to happen. These figures are then studied by the Bureau of the Budget and other administrative agencies. By the time Congress acts, the action is 2 years old. Thus, the administration's recommendations—which follow the provisions of Public Law 87-793 scrupulously—will grant letter carriers and other postal and Federal workers comparatively, not with what their fellow workers in private industry are earning now—but with what they were earning two years ago.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics started compiling its data in the spring of 1962. It completed its compilation in November 1962. Most of these data were, of necessity, based upon conditions existing late in 1961 and early in 1962. The pay legislation before you, if enacted into law, will not take effect until January 1, 1964. Thus the administration's recommendations will give us a rough comparability in income with what workers in similar jobs in private industry were getting late in 1961 and early in 1962. Most of these workers in private industry have received at least two pay raises since that time, so the administration's recommendations—as they stand—would still leave us considerably behind the economic parade.

For this reason we strongly favor the legislation introduced by Congressmen MORRISON, DULSKI, WALLHAUSER and OLSEN, which quite conservatively would add 3 percent per year so as to achieve bona fide comparability with workers in private industry.

It should be inserted here, for the record, Mr. Chairman, that the degree of comparability which Public Law 87-793 was designed to grant was diluted so that it could be achieved only in two steps, or phases. The second phase, which takes effect on January 1, 1964, will merely give letter carriers and other employees comparability with private industry pay scales that will be, by that time, several years old.

We recognize that this two-phase approach was deemed necessary so as not to jar the Federal economy too severely. However, the fact remains that this stop-and-go approach practically guarantees that letter carriers and other employees will lag significantly behind the income norm established for workers with comparable jobs in private industry.

Postal employees have been making a contribution to the stability of the Federal economy by accepting this two-phase pay increase. However, we think it would be eminently unfair to ask them to continue to make this personal contribution indefinitely without ever achieving honest and unassailable comparability.

In our opinion, honest and unassailable comparability can only be achieved by the approval of the legislation which we are supporting today.

I have said that the proposed legislation which would give us an additional 3 percent per year in order to achieve contemporary comparibility with workers in private industry is relatively conservative in its aim.

I would like to discuss that point with you at this time.

As you know, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is the custom of the National Association of Letter Carriers to do considerable research in these matters before appearing before you to testify. It is also our custom to canvass our leaders in the field asking them for specific facts and figures concerning the economic conditions of workers in private industry in their particular areas.

I would like now, if I may, to show you some of the things we have found.

The pattern is almost monotonously repetitive. Everywhere we looked we found a history of yearly pay increases, most of which were 3 percent or more.

First let us look at the picture at the overall, national level.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its Bulletin No. 1356, dated July 1, 1962, and entitled: "Union Wages and Hours; Motortruck Drivers and Helpers," begins with this flat statement: "Hourly wage scales of unionized local motortruck drivers and helpers in cities of 100,000 or more population, rose an average of 11 cents or 3.9 percent in the 12 months ending July 1, 1962. Increases varied from 10 cents to 15 cents an hour for half of the workers. Hourly scales rose 5 to 10 cents for a sixth, and 15 cents or more for a fifth. On July 1, 1962, wage scales for union local motortruck drivers and helpers averaged $2.85 an hour. Negotiated hourly rates of $2.50 to $2.75 were stipulated in labor-management agreements for two-tenths of the workers, of $2.75 to $3 for nearly three-eighths and of $3 or more for three-tenths."

In Bulletin 1357, concering the printing industry, the Bureau of Labor Statistics begins its study with these words: "Hourly wage scales of organized printing trades workers in cities of 100,000 or more rose 10 cents, or 2.9 percent, on the average, during the year ending July 1, 1962. As a result of the widespread rate revisions, union hourly scales on July 1, 1962, averaged $3.41 for all printing trades workers combined."

In Bulletin No. 1354, entitled "Union Wages and Hours: Local Transit Operating Employees," the BLS has this to say: "Wage scales of union local-transit operating employees in cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants advanced an average of 10 cents an hour, or 4.1 percent, during the year ending July 1, 1962."

In Bulletin No. 1355, concerning the building trades, the BLS says: "Wage scales of union building-trades workers in cities of 100,000 or more rose an average of 14 cents an hour, or 3.7 percent during the year ending July 1, 1962. Two out of every three trades surveyed showed an advance of from 12 to 18 cents in their average scale."

Just at random, now, I would like to quote some specific examples: (These figures were also supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in their publication: "Employment and Earning Statistics," issued in 1963).

In Kansas: Transportation equipment workers were averaging $2.59 an hour in 1960, were jumped to $2.68 an hour in 1961 and to $2.78 an hour in 1962. This amounts to 8 per cent in 2 years.

In Detroit, Mich.: Manufacturing workers were being paid $2.92 an hour in 1960. They were paid $2.98 in 1961 and $3.08 in 1962. Total: about 6 percent in 2 years.

In the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, workers in transportation equipment received hourly pay as follows: 1960—$2.71; 1961—$2.77; 1962—$2.89. Percentage of increase in 2 years: 7 percent.

Omaha, Nebr.: meat products workers: 1960—$2.54; 1961—$2.70; 1962—$2.78. Percentage of increase in 2 years: 10 percent.

New York State, transportation equipment: 1960—$2.77; 1961—$2.88; 1962—$2.98. Percentage of increase in 2 years: 8 percent.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the book from which I have been quoting at random has 660 pages. At a guess, I would say that it contains 10,000 examples, citing pay in various industries in every State of the Union. And in 99 percent of those examples, workers have had their hourly pay increased substantially every year for the last decade.

Since these figures come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, they can take us only up to 1962. However, our own members, working with management executives, labor unions, and State and city officials in their localities, can bring us up to date on the picture.

To illustrate, the employees at the Central Illinois Electric & Gas Co. at Rockford, Ill., have received the following increases; compared with the Central Illinois group, the percentage received by letter carriers over the same period is also shown:

	Percent wage increase	
	Central Illinois employees	Letter carriers
1956	6	(1)
1957	5¾	(1)
1958	5½	7.0
1959	5¼	(1)
1960	5	9.0
1961	4¾	(1)
1962	4½	8.2
1963	4	(1)
Total	40¾	24.2

[1] No increase.

In 8 years, the group of employees in private industry had eight increases; letter carriers had three. The group in private industry received increases totaling 40¾ percent; letter carrier increases totaled 42.2 percent.

Policemen in San Diego, Calif., were receiving $483 per month in 1961; $507 in 1962; and $532 in 1963.

Communication workers in Sioux City, Iowa, were receiving $2.87 per hour in 1960; they received a 12-cent increase in 1961; 11 cents in 1962; and 11 cents in 1963, bringing their hourly pay up to $3.21.

The city policemen and firemen in New Haven, Conn., received a package deal this year providing for a $300 increase in 1963; $250 in 1964; and $300 in 1965—and a further increase of $250 in 1966.

In Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the ironworkers who are now receiving $3.98½ per hour in 1963, will have their hourly rate increased to $4.13 on May 1, 1964.

In Milwaukee, Wis., the average hourly pay for motor truck drivers and helpers moved from $2.86 in 1961, through $2.99 in 1962, to $3.12 in 1963. The increase over 2 years is more than 9 percent.

In San Antonio, Tex., brewery workers were averaging $3 an hour in 1961. In 1962, they are getting $3.13 an hour. Today they are getting $3.20 an hour. This amounts to a 15-percent increase in 2 years. Similarly, in San Antonio, carpenters are getting $3.63 an hour today, an increase of 12 percent in 2 years; ironworkers are getting $4.38, an increase of 17 percent in 2 years; electrical workers are getting $4.05, an increase of 8 percent in 2 years.

In Phoenix, Ariz., electricians are receiving $3.36 an hour, an increase of 7 percent in 2 years. Automotive mechanics are now getting $3.11 an hour. They have been raised 14 percent in 2 years. Maintenance machinists have been increased 6 percent in 2 years to $3.38 an hour. Truckdrivers for public utilities are getting $2.79 an hour—or a wage increase of 11 percent in 2 years.

These instances go on and on, and in practically every part of the country the average workingman has been getting annual increases in his pay, and the average has been well over the 3 percent per year which the legislation we are supporting would give us in order to achieve reasonable comparability.

It is for this reason that I say the Morrison bill is a comparatively conservative bill. It would give us a 6-percent increase over 2 years. Most blue-collar workers in the United States have had their wages raised more than that during this same period.

I would like to add that the average hourly pay of a letter carrier today, as estimated by the Post Office Department, is $2.68—significantly lower than any of the wage levels I have cited. In fact, it is significantly lower than the average blue-collar worker's pay in all but a very few metropolitan areas in the country—and, of course, the vast majority of letter carriers work and live in metropolitan areas.

I might also add that the opportunities for letter carriers to earn overtime are far fewer than are the opportunities in private industry.

I would like to cite some further hourly wage levels from various parts of the country to support our testimony.

In Houston, Tex., for instance, carpenters are getting $3.97 an hour, asbestos workers, $4.33 and operating engineers, $4.18.

In Nashville, Tenn., carpenters are getting $3.75 and electrical workers are getting $3.83.

In Altoona, Pa.: glaziers are receiving $3; plasterers, $3.75; truck drivers, $2.99 and tractor drivers, $3.51.

Tulsa, Okla.: carpenters, $3.70 an hour; common laborers, $2.70; operating engineers, $3.85 and truck drivers, $3.85.

I think, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this gives you a pretty fair cross section of what blue-collar workers are getting in almost every section of the country. Letter carriers—at $2.68 an hour—are still far behind the average. The starting wage for regular carriers is only $2.19 per hour. They will not catch up unless legislation is passed which will grant them comparability, not with what their fellow workers in private industry were getting more than 2 years ago—but with what such workers are getting right now.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think you all know that this year marks the centennial of the free city delivery service in this country. This means it also marks the centennial of the letter carrier in America.

To digress for a moment, I would like to say that we are going to mark this centennial with a banquet here on October 26, which we feel will be one of the most notable events of its kind ever to be held in this city. The banquet will also inaugurate our campaign to create a college scholarship fund for the deserving sons and daughters of our members.

The members of this committee, of course, will be invited to this affair as our honored guests—and I sincerely hope you will mark October 26 on your calendars now, so there will be no conflict.

I mention the centennial not only because of its historical and sentimental implications, but also because of the fact that during almost every year that we have had city delivery service there has been a marked improvement in the efficiency and the productivity of postal employees.

It would be easy for us to make our own boasts about this increase in productivity, but we feel it will be more effective if we quote a more objective source, the recent Postmaster General of the United States, Mr. J. Edward Day.

In a speech made here in Washington last February—instituting the new ABCD service—General Day had this to say:

"We handle 68 billion pieces of mail annually—over half the world's total. Our 588,000 full-time employees make us the

largest civilian employer in the country. Even back in 1890 our Department had 150,000 employees. Today we handle 16 times as much mail as we did then, with less than 4 times as many employees. Since 1950 alone, our mail has increased by 44 percent, while total man-years of employment in the Post Office have increased by less than 20 percent. If in 1962 we had operated at our 1952 level of productivity, we would have used 69,000 more man-years than we did with a resulting increase in 1962 cost of $345 million."

In answer to critics who claim that foreign postal services are more efficient than our own, General Day had this to say, in Kansas City, Mo., last July 23: "To handle 70 billion pieces of mail annually, the U.S. postal system has 585,000 employees. Both the United Kingdom and Germany hire about twice as many employees to handle a volume of about one-seventh that of the United States."

And, in Omaha, Nebr., on last July 14, General Day said this: "The Post Office Department ended its fiscal year on June 30 with 24,000 fewer employees than earlier estimated. If we were still operating at the 1952 level of productivity, we would need 70,000 more employees than we actually have today." He went on to say that, despite the volume increase of almost 2½ billion pieces of mail, the Department ended the fiscal year with no increase in employees from the year previous.

Jerry Kluttz, in the Washington Post this morning, pointed out that the Post Office ended the year 1962 with 1,371 fewer employees on its rolls than it had a year earlier despite a more than 2 percent increase in postal volume.

I think, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that these statements speak for themselves and need no additional comment from us. I don't think that any group of employees—in Government or in private industry—can match the record for increased productivity that the postal employees have made over the years.

I have mentioned that this is our centennial year. The past 100 years have been an era of tremendous progress in the postal service. The mail service has improved steadily over those years—the number of services extended to the public has improved and the quality of labor-management relations has improved.

As far as pay is concerned, the greatest of all improvements would be the realization of the promises made last year in Public Law 87-793, which would give postal employees true comparability with their fellow workers in private industry.

Postal employees have always been relatively underpaid.

The pattern of low pay was set almost at the beginning of the postal service. In 1823, as some of you already know, when James Monroe was President, his Postmaster General—a man named James McLean—had this to say in his first annual report. "I have no intention of paying postal employees a sufficient compensation to provide a livelihood without other means of support."

Although no subsequent Postmaster General ever stated his position quite so brutally as that, the majority of them—by their actions and attitudes—made General McLean's philosophy a reality.

There were some brilliant exceptions. As early as 1866—when the free city delivery service was just 3 years old—Postmaster General Alexander W. Randall wrote this in his annual report: "I recommend more liberality. The clerks and employees of the Post Office have not been well paid for the services they have performed. * * * The letter carriers claim peculiar consideration. They travel every day from early in the morning until late at night, in heat and cold and rain and snow, all through the cities, distributing letters and papers without compensation enough to pay house rent. I feel the Government ought to pay all these employees better."

Postmaster General Randall's plea went unheeded.

Public Law 87-793 was designed to end, once and for all, this depressing state of affairs. It was not intended as a one-time thing, it was intended as a permanent and perennial system of not only achieving, but maintaining for postal employees comparability with workers in private industry.

However, because of the timelag I have mentioned, proper and contemporary comparability cannot be achieved unless the Congress approves the Morrison bill and the other bills companion to it which we are supporting.

If the promises implied and, indeed, explicitly stated in Public Law 87-793 are not fulfilled this year, then Mr. chairman and members of the committee, you know as well as I do, that they will never be fulfilled. The whole principle of comparability will be as extinct as the dinosaur or the great auk.

This, in our opinion, would be a mistake of great magnitude.

This year, 1963, the letter carriers' centennial year, is the crucial year. Your actions, and the actions of your colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, will determine whether the principle of comparability will survive permanently, or whether we must go back to the old days of biennial public haggling over postal pay.

Mr. Chairman, the principle of comparability, if it is maintained, will benefit everyone concerned.

It will benefit the service—because good service depends fundamentally on the morale of the employee force.

It will benefit the Government—because the fiscal authorities will be able to anticipate pay raises based on comparability and make budgetary provisions for them.

And it will benefit the postal employees—who will be able to plan their own household budgets with more assurance and who, above all, will at last be able to live in the prideful realization that their Government employer does not intend ever again to treat them as second-class citizens or as unloved stepchildren in the economic family.

Thank you very much.

Regulating the Drug Industry—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Senator PHILIP A. HART's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee decided to continue the investigation of the drug industry which was started by Senator Kefauver. Two leading reporters on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune, William Haddad and Martin Steadman, have written insightful articles concerning the drug industry. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to today's installment on the drug industry. In addition to the article, the New York Herald Tribune of today published an editorial on the subject.

The article and the editorial follow:

DRUG INDUSTRY PRESSURE

(By Martin J. Steadman)

In Venezuela recently, the drug manufacturers' association was advised to "fight the Government" because that was easier than opposing the huge American wholesale drug company, McKesson & Robbins, and its low-priced line of generic drugs.

In Bogota, Colombia, where the McKesson program has its base, the Minister of Health told the Nation's Senate he had evidence that rival drug concerns were tampering with the low-priced drugs.

In Costa Rica, the pharmacists association and the largest drug distributor, which exclusively represents five major American firms, vowed to do "everything in our power to see that, through every Central American association, McKesson does not establish in Central America."

In Washington, D.C., a secret meeting was held between representatives of the Colombian drug industry and this Nation's 140-member Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. The South Americans urged "an appeal from government to government," and asked that the U.S. intervene to arrange that only certain drugs be sold generically in Colombia.

What was developing—and is now the subject of a Senate investigation—is a huge commercial war to stop the sale of low-cost life-saving drugs, some at prices one-tenth the prevailing rates. The prices hinge on the difference between generic and trade names.

Generic names are abbreviations of chemical names and are used internationally in medical schools and textbooks. The generic names are thus well known to doctors and require little or no costly promotion.

The struggle began when Colombia published a decree last year proclaiming a new generic drug program, and invited all major drug firms to participate. The only American concern to join the experiment was McKesson, which bought a 50 percent interest in a Colombian drug manufacturer, Droguerias Aliadas, Inc.

McKesson marketed 322 pain-killing, life-saving drugs at dramatically low prices. An antibiotic used in treatment of respiratory infections and typhoid sold for 3.6 cents per capsule, compared with the trade-name product that sold for 29 cents. An arthritic was able to buy a month's supply of prednisilone for $2 instead of the $16 it had cost before.

The drug industry in Colombia, which includes 15 American firms, fought back. Early this year, McKesson told Senator Estes Kefauver, chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, that it was the victim of a "concerted and malicious campaign" to stop the generic program and prevent its spread to other sections of the world, including the United States.

Senator Kefauver issued subpenas to seven major American drug firms and the industry association, but when he died last month, he was up against opposition in his own committee to an investigation of McKesson's accusations.

The return date of the subpenas was delayed three times, and a motion was pending in the subcommittee to kill the investigation. Senator Kefauver had lost several bitterly debated arguments, and last Friday his successor, Senator PHILIP HART, a Michigan Democrat, feared that he would not receive the authorization of his subcommittee to press the investigation .

But late yesterday, the committee members agreed to extend the return date of the subpenas to December 2 and to proceed with executive session hearings in the meantime.

Herman C. Nolen, McKesson chairman, went to Washington to outline his charges that the drug industry was ganging up on his firm, the Nation's largest wholesale drug house.

He testified in secret session before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 25. Mr. Nolan said his company was meet-

ing "organized interference" which seriously endangered the Colombian generic program.

A team of Herald Tribune reporters looked beyond Mr. Nolen's accusation and found these examples of industry opposition to the cut-rate drug plan:

On June 14, Dr. Jose Felix Patino, respected physician and Minister of Health for Colombia, mounted the rostrum of that South American nation's Senate and startled the lawmakers with a disclosure of the minutes of a secret meeting in Washington, D.C., January 14 between the drug manufacturers of the two nations.

Dr. Patino told the Senate that a representative of the Colombian industry association demanded steps to achieve intervention by the U.S. Government with Colombia to modify the generic drug plan.

American drug manufacturers proposed an alternative plan to contact the State Department and the Alliance for Progress program director "to mobilize official support," he said.

A high official of the PMA, who declined to be identified, admitted that his organization did take its case to State.

"We went to the State Department, not to protest the decision of the Colombian program to order the sale of generic drugs, but to protest that at least 12 of the drugs in the decree were patented products. We asked State for assistance in protecting these rights."

Thus far the State Department has not intervened.

At one point in his speech to the Colombian Senate, Dr. Patino said he had evidence of some tampering with generic drugs.

"We do know of a campaign," he said, "unfortunately very low, that is being carried on, consisting of purposely altering generic drugs. I do wish to state very clearly that the National Health Institute has evidence that there are drug concerns that are purposefully altering generic drugs."

The impact of Colombia's generic drug program is spreading rapidly to other South and Central American countries. McKesson bought a half interest in a Venezuelan firm and is beginning to market low-price drugs there. On February 9, 1963, representatives of Venezuelan drug industry met to hear a Colombian industry spokesman on the subject of generic drugs.

The Herald Tribune is turning over to the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee a confidential memo on the meeting. In attendance were executives of 10 of the largest U.S. manufacturing companies. According to the report, the guest speaker from Colombia, Dr. Anibal Fernandez, warned that if the McKesson program spread throughout Latin America, "our industry will face a very dark future."

He urged "international interdependence" and a "preventive public relations program emphasizing such things as drug industry employment, research contributions, and high quality of trade names."

Dr. Fernandez revealed that "a very, very costly" public relations program was being carried on by the Colombian drug industry in newspapers, on radio and television, on billboards.

"Doctors are also being bombarded with suitable material," he said. "The results are quite uncertain, because it is easy to fight a government but impossible to counter private industry activities such as McKesson's."

He told the Venezuelans that one way to keep McKesson out of their country would be to convince the Government in advance "on the importance of industrial stability, generous employment, importation of capital, etc."

Further north, in the five Central American countries of Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and Costa Rica, McKesson & Robbins attempted to open operations but was rebuffed.

At first very receptive to overtures from the American firm, Jorge Van der Laat, manager of the largest drug distributor in Costa Rica and also president of the pharmacists' association there, suddenly charged neither he nor his organization could participate in a generic drug program.

In a letter to McKesson's Colombian affiliate, dated June 12, 1963, Mr. Van der Laat wrote:

"I do not deny, Don Joaquin, that when the Minister of Health of Costa Rica, with you and the vice president of McKesson, brought this matter to my attention at the Compania Farmaceutica, Ltd., I was impressed. * * *

"I studied the situation; I wrote to foreign countries; I investigated locally, and reached the conclusion, which I still maintain, that McKesson-Aliadas in Central America will damage the Central American pharmaceutical industry. * * *

"This is how we, the Costa Rican pharmacists, see it; and we will do everything in our power to see that, through every Central American association, McKesson does not establish in Central America."

What is behind this violent struggle to prevent the sale of low-price generic drugs?

The late Senator Kefauver may have explained it when he wrote in a letter to the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association on July 24:

"Such information as we have now indicates that the main issue is simply the desire of some major American drug companies to continue to sell drugs in Latin America at these exorbitant markups, a willingness on the part of some other American companies to sell at more modest though still satisfactory markups, and certain alleged concerted efforts on the part of the former to prevent the latter from doing so."

The influential and respected Bogotá newspaper, El Tiempo, quoted Health Minister Patino on sales prices to the Colombian public. Dr. Patino cited as an example vitamin B_{12}, which costs 21 cents to produce and sells under trademark at $12 to $14.

When the generic program began, the price was slashed to $1.20. Dr. Patino said that the raw material prices charged by the manufacturer to other companies producing generically included the cost of research plus profit.

The Health Minister clearly implied that the trade-name manufacturers could also sell at the $1.20 figure and still cover their research and development costs, at the same time making a profit.

Dr. Patino was especially resentful, according to El Tiempo, of the failure of the drug manufacturers to bring down the cost to the consumer of B_{12}.

"There are cases such as that of vitamin B_{12}" he said, "which was quoted in 1961 at $1,600 per gram, and in 1963 at $125 * * * its price (to the distributor) dropped 92.1 percent, but the price of the drug to the public did not go down."

The Health Minister said that tradename and generic drugs were exactly the same, that his Government had no reports of poor quality generic drugs, and that strict supervision was being exercised.

El Tiempo quoted him as saying that the generics were exactly the same, "only the presentation of the trade-name drugs was more luxurious than that of the former, because of which they were more expensive."

THE SUBCOMMITTEE COMES THROUGH

Senator HART's investigation may bring pain to the drug industry, but that pain is little compared with the suffering of millions to whom the price of drugs measures the value of life.

To people in Latin America who simply cannot afford medicines at trade name prices, the chance to buy them as McKesson & Robbins is trying to sell them—by generic name, and at a fraction of their usual price—is the chance to be well instead of sick, or alive instead of dead.

Today's article by our Messrs. Haddad and Steadman details some of McKesson & Robbins' efforts to sell drugs cheaply in Latin America, and the obstacles that have been placed in the way. It's worth reading. And it helps show the importance of yesterday's decision by Senator Hart's subcommittee to keep its investigation alive.

The subcommittee did the right thing. If, as we suspect, the investigation shows that there are in fact better ways of making life-saving drugs available to the people who need them, a lot of people who have never heard of those few Senators will have reason to be grateful. One might even say undyingly grateful.

Tito Not Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was asked today for my reaction to a proposed official visit to the United States by the Communist Dictator Tito. This request was made by station WMAL.

Whether or not Tito should be welcomed in our Nation's Capital is certainly a basic public issue. He has tried to pry, sneak, or embarrass his way into this Nation's Capital for a number of years.

My position on this issue follows:

An official invitation to Tito to visit Washington in connection with his forthcoming foray into Latin America raises a number of public issues.

Among those issues is whether it is compatible with our position as leader of freedom's cause for our Government to play host to one of the most infamous tyrants in history. It may be argued that Tito is head of a state and as such should be received in that capacity. In my judgement that argument is invalid. Tito does not represent the peoples of the Yugoslav Empire. He is, in fact, head of a police state regime. If we are a realistic people, and I hope we are, we would recognize that when our Government plays host to Tito it is in fact playing host to a police state regime.

Another issue is whether the United States should become involved with or take sides in the growing dispute between the Russians and the Red Chinese. As is known, Tito has long been an advance agent of Moscow in the schemes of the Communist conspiracy and was Moscow's agent assigned to subvert France and make it a Communist state in 1947. This Tito front for Moscow cost France $8 billion.

He is now playing an advance role for the Russians in an effort to line up free world support for Moscow against the Red Chinese. The United States should stay out of this feud among the conspirators. If they want to bury each other that is their business, not ours.

An official visit by Tito to Washington would be quickly interpreted in many parts of the world that the United States had lined up with Moscow in its dispute with Red China.

This fall marks the 20th anniversary of Tito's death marches in Yugoslavia. Those death marches involved several hundred thousands of Croatian and Slovenian patriots who opposed the Communist takeover of their homelands. Tito organized those marches which ended up in mass murders and mass burial of the victims. This is one of the black chapters in the Tito rise to total power in the Yugoslav Empire. It would be quite improper for the United States to lose sight of the meaning of this 20th anniversary of Tito's death marches by honoring him as an official guest of our Government.

I hope our Government gives full and careful consideration to the feelers put out by Tito a few days ago for an official invitation from the President. A visit by the Communist Dictator Tito would not be a calming influence in these troubled times.

Is U.S. Intelligence Good Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members calling for a joint committee of Congress to oversee the operations of the CIA, I was interested to see support for more congressional control over U.S. intelligence work in the September 9, 1963, edition of U.S. News & World Report. Americans have good reason to be concerned about the operations of top-secret organizations. Close congressional control, similar to that exercised by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, certainly is needed.

The article to which I referred, follows:

U.S. INTELLIGENCE: IS IT GOOD ENOUGH?

(Spy slip-ups of the past have got Congress worried. Members want to be sure Russia can't secretly cheat on an H-test treaty and pile up a massive arms lead.)

Can U.S. intelligence be counted on to safeguard an atomic test treaty with Soviet Russia?

That question is at the heart of a debate now going on before Congress.

Safeguarding such a treaty with Russia, it is agreed, is closely tied to reliable performance by U.S. intelligence agencies.

Members of Congress want assurance that U.S. defenses will not be endangered by a test ban. They want foolproof detection of violations of any kind, checks on possible secret Red preparations for massive new tests, and an eye kept on development of a new missile killer or any other dramatic weapon by Russia.

Some experts question whether U.S. intelligence is good enough to do the job. The White House has just given fresh assurance that it is. All this has set off a reexamination of U.S. intelligence performance in the past.

SUCCESSES VERSUS FAILURES

That record is marked by both notable success and dismal failure.

Main responsibility for policing the treaty will rest with the Central Intelligence Agency, run by civilians. The CIA was set up largely as a result of a military intelligence disaster at Pearl Harbor. It now operates with 12,000 Americans, untold thousands of foreign agents and a budget close to $1 billion a year.

Credit is given to CIA for a number of victories in the cold war. These are far ranging. For one thing, the Agency disclosed technical skill by pinpointing missile test sites inside Russia as early as 1954. And it has masterminded political coups in Iran and Guatemala. Dozens of other successes are necesarily kept secret.

Failures of CIA also are numerous. The accompanying chart gives an idea of some publicized intelligence errors of the past.

Critics maintain that, on the surface, there is good reason for skepticism over CIA's ability to collect accurate information from Communist countries and over the record of Government officials properly to interpret and act on that information. In some cases—notably the buildup of Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962—intelligence information was available but was felt to be mishandled by policymakers.

On August 24, the administration told the Senate that it plans to police the test ban treaty with improved intelligence and test detection procedures.

This pledge by the White House is based on intelligence tools and techniques now available but not ordinarily associated with old-fashioned cloak and dagger methods.

ATOMIC DETECTIVES

The United States now has perfected a variety of means—at ground stations, aboard planes and ships—to ring Russia with sensitive instruments to detect nuclear blasts under water or in the atmosphere. Equipment includes seismograph stations and special microbarograph instruments. Other equipment also is used.

It now is possible, with this equipment, to pinpoint within hours the exact spot of a Soviet atmospheric explosion and even the ingredients and construction of the bomb.

Detection in space is not so easy. But before the end of the year the United States will launch satellites with electronic sniffers to report on any nuclear explosions in deep space.

SPY SATELLITES

For keeping check on Soviet missile progress—both offensive and defensive—the United States is counting heavily on Samos camera satellites that have taken over the mission of U-2 reconnaissance planes.

Samos is a secret Air Force project but these details have been published: Between six and nine satellites are at work today, in orbits that cover all of Russia. They are sending back photos as good as those returned by U-2 flights.

What concerns a large number of authorities, however, is this: Despite ample information in the past, the United States has still committed blunders. Ability and willingness of policymakers to make best use of all intelligence is still questioned. Inability has contributed to failure in the past and provides a basis for uneasiness in Congress now.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Man and Dog: The Mail Goes Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 13, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is seldom that we pay tribute to the man who carries the mail. Yet, without his faithful and efficient service, our Nation, its society, and its economy would come to a complete and immediate halt.

Delivering the mails is a large, complex, and difficult task, today. In years past, it was all this, and more: it was dangerous and courageous.

The Post Office has provided regular delivery of the mails in my own State of Alaska since the appointment of a Mr. John H. Kinkead as Postmaster of Sitka, on July 23, 1867. Mr. Kinkead later served as the first Governor.

In the winter months, in the northern half of Alaska, the principal method of carrying the mail traditionally has been by dogsled. Only in recent years has the sled been replaced by the airplane. On June 13 of this year, Mr. President, a melancholy ceremony in Fairbanks marked the end of mail delivery by dogsled. Trucks and planes now carry the mails in Alaska.

This is not to say that dog teams are no longer an essential part of Alaskan life. In the dark of winter, they are still the most practical, and often the only available means of transport in the northern part of our State. Man and dog, working together, opened Alaska. Until recent times, dogsled trails linked most northern Alaskan communities.

When I was a boy and was growing up in Fairbanks, there were many dog teams in town. For over 6 months of the year the Yukon River was frozen, and sleds were the common means of travel.

The stories, the tales, and the legends about man and dog against the Alaska winter are a part of our heritage as Alaskans and Americans. They are truly as great and as important to the story of our country as are the cowboy and Indian stories of the lower 48 States.

The occasion of the end of dogsled mail delivery perhaps calls for the recounting of one or two of these stories. Let me first tell of Crag Hart, a great musher of the early nineteen hundreds.

CRAG MUSHES THROUGH

In early May of 1904, the icepack still lay over all of Norton Sound and the Bering Sea. The Yukon River was frozen, but the ice was breaking and heaving. This meant that breakup could come very soon.

Crag Hart had the contract to carry the mail on the Star Route from Ungalik to Nome. In the summer, he would carry it along the coastal trail; in the winter, he would carry it by dogsled straight out across Norton Sound, over the ice.

The trail across the ice was marked by red flags. Blizzards blew up quickly on the icepack; ice haze and fog were common; and the flags helped to keep the dogs on the trail. So long as the trail was broken through the snow and marked by flags across the ice, the dogs would keep on the path without direction from the driver. Without the flags it was easy to get lost and to head out to sea in the sunless winter.

Crag was warned on that day, as he began his trip to Nome, that breakup of the icepack was imminent. This could come in several ways: the ice could split, break apart and drift out to sea, carrying man and dogs; the ice could break apart in such large sections that it might be hours before a man would know that he was helplessly adrift at sea; another possibility was equally bad: the Yukon could blast open, pouring torrents of fresh water into Norton Sound under the sea ice and causing it to buckle up or explode into great chunks.

Crag had confidence in himself and his dogs, especially in his lead dog, the malamute, Brandy. Crag was fortunate Brandy was an excellent leader. He had the strength necessary in emergencies to turn the dog team when it was confronted suddenly by a crevass or a break in the ice. The dog had the intelligence and good sense necessary to keep the team cheerful and hard working. A bad tempered lead dog or one easily diverted is an invitation to disaster when crossing a lonely stretch of ice at a temperature of 40 below.

Crag had confidence in his team and his luck that morning as he set out across the ice. Hour after hour the trip was uneventful although there was the smell of salt water in the air, noticed both by Brandy and by Hart. This was not a good sign. It meant the open sea was near.

As the hours went by, the mist began to darken. A blizzard blew up. The sled and dogs were blown obliquely by the wind across the ice, but they continued on toward Nome.

Suddenly overhead Crag could hear the cry of sea gulls—a very bad sign. The snow was heavier and blowing, all was white: land, sea, and sky. They were no longer able to find the flags. They were lost in the storm.

And then Crag could hear the bark of ugruks, the sea lions, who live only in open water. The dogs could hear it too and they began to whimper; only Brandy's confident example kept them going. Crag was at the point of camping for the night to await the end of the blizzard, hoping to find the trail in the morning. Brandy, however, did not stop. And this saved them all from the breakup which came in the early morning hours.

Without command Brandy turned the sled 180° and Crag, from the sled could not immediately see why. As the sled made the arc turn, through the mists he saw—the open sea. A few feet more and man and dogs would have fallen into the freezing water. Life would have lasted only a very few moments.

Brandy led the way, the only possible way to go, away from the open sea, back to the safety of the shore. They retraced their trail, the snow coming down more heavily. It was wet and turning into slush on the ice, making it harder for the sled to move. As they continued on, Crag noticed they were climing. This meant they were riding over an ice ridge caused by water pressures under the ice, forcing the ice to split and buckle upward. When they got to the top of the rise, there would be a crevasse—which it might or might not be possible to straddle with the dogs and the sled.

As they came to the top of the crest, Brandy left the 3-foot crevasse. The team dogs, leaping in turn, scrambled across. The momentum pulled the sled across and at that point, Crag lost his grip.

He fell into the crevasse.

He was wedged 7 feet or so below the surface and between two great sheets of ice. At any moment it was possible the blocks would shift and crush him. His hands and feet could get no hold on the slick ice walls. He called for Brandy and his voice was lost in the wind. He called and called; and he lost consciousness in the cold.

He regained consciousness from a sudden blow of pain across his face. He opened his eyes to find Brandy hanging in front of him, desperately trying to grab in his teeth Crag's parka. In doing so he had slashed Crag's face. The lead dog, noticing the driver missing from the sled, had turned the sled around, returned to the crevass, and leaped into it, dragging with him all the other dogs on the team and wedging firmly the sled across the top of the ice break. Brandy had come back for his master.

Using the harness as a ladder, Crag Hart climbed out, pulling the dogs out after him. He righted the sled and Brandy led the dogs, the sled and Crag Hart safely to the shore.

The mail got through that day. It always did, one way or another.

CHESTER NOONGWOOK: THE LAST

Crag Hart was but one of many brave men who carried the mail by dog sled across Alaska for over 60 years. Dog sleds provided regularly scheduled service over literally thousands of miles of trails for many years. In the 1920's, fully 75 percent of all mail delivered in Alaska was still carried by dog sled. Sleds were used well into the 1950's and

the last Star route to be served by dog sled was converted to air only this spring.

The last contract carrier to mush the mail across the ice and snow was Chester Noongwook, of Savoonga. Mr. Noongwook is 27 years of age. He has been carrying the mail since he was 20. His route on St. Lawrence Island was a weekly 100-mile round trip from Savoonga to Gambell and return. St. Lawrence Island lies less than 50 miles from Siberia, in the middle of the Bering Sea.

From May through November Mr. Noongwook used a skin boat, a umiak, to carry the mail across the open sea between the two towns. The rest of the year he used his sled, pulled by 8 or 10 dogs. In 1958 his huskies were named Spotty, Brownie, Lassy, Boy, Mil-ko-buk, Frisky, Whitey, Donkey, Blackie, and Camel. I know that this spring Spotty, Brownie, Mil-ko-buk and Donkey were still at work. I am unable to report on the others.

Mr. Noongwook is a resident of the Eskimo village of Savoonga. This is a village of frame houses, a church, a native store, and a Bureau of Indian Affairs school. The driver of the sled made a weekly trip to Gambell, at the tip of the island. The 50-mile trip out usually takes a day, I am told. This must be a long day as most drivers are usually content to make 19 to 25 miles a day. The return trip usually takes 2 days; the mail load is heavier—often up to the maximum 300-pound load.

I am told that in December of 1956, when Mr. Noongwook was but 20 years old, he hauled in over 5,000 pounds of parcel post for the Savoonga Mission. From time to time he has had to stop overnight on the trail because of howling storms or soft, slushy ice. These are the major dangers of the trip because, as Postmaster John Waghiyi, of Savoonga, reports, "No wolves on island."

Mr. Noongwook's devotion to duty in spite of snow or storms or black of night, has been acknowledged by both Postmasters General Arthur J. Summerfield and J. Edward Day.

Mr. Summerfield said it "symbolizes the spirit of dedication to duty in the face of adverse conditions". General Day, on June 13 of this year, authorized the awarding of a special citation to mark the Savoongan's "exceptional service in carrying the U.S. mail under difficult conditions—in the finest traditions of the American postal service."

The mail, once carried by skin boat and sled from Gambell to Savoonga, is carried now by airplane. Ceremonies were held in Fairbanks on the 13th of June so that Assistant Postmaster General Hartigan could personally present the Post Office award to Mr. Noongwook. It is ironic that the airplane carrying Mr. Noongwook was 4 hours late in arriving at Fairbanks. As a result, the ceremonies were postponed. The excuse for the delay was poor weather. Poor weather holds up airplanes; it very seldom holds up dogsleds.

The Savoonga mail contract was but a small thing compared to the dogsled carriers of the past. Depending upon the amount of mail to be carried, the sleds were pulled by as few as 6 or 8 dogs, as many as 19 or 25. Mr. Noongwook's sled could take no more than 300 pounds. Some sleds carried as many as 700 pounds. Often two such sleds would be coupled, one behind the other, to carry even greater loads.

At an exhibit at the Philadelphia Exposition in 1926, a sled was displayed which had traveled 20,000 miles in 6 years of service. At time the cost of transporting the mail by dogsled was $6.30 a ton for each mile traveled. In today's dollars, the cost would be even greater.

I have checked with the Post Office and I am informed that the average cost per ton of mail which is shipped by air within the lower 48 States is now 38 cents a mile. In the most remote areas of Alaska, air service costs do not exceed $2.50 per ton-mile.

There were many hundreds of miles of star route sled trails reaching from Canada all the way across Alaska to Nome, on the Bering Sea. Shelters were spaced along the trail at 25- or 30-mile intervals for protection at night and storage of food.

Once, in 1910, Mike Sullivan and his lead dog Sandy took a team of dogs 1,100 miles from Circle City to Nome without losing a dog. Dogs were fed largely on dried fish and tallow. A good sled dog has always been highly valued. In the 1920's they sold from $80 to $100 each. In 1925, when Leonard Seppala, the greatest musher of them all, lost his lead dog, Togo, the famous Alaska sweepstake winner, he said that he would not have taken $500 for the dog. It was estimated that the average dog can draw 40 pounds of mail 20 miles a day. Dogs are devoted to their master and follow faithfully the lead dog. These leaders are very carefully chosen, extensively trained, and heavily relied on.

The dogs serve 6 or 7 years before they are retired. They are usually loyal, hard working, and cheerful. There are, of course, exceptions. Every sled driver dreads the reports from time to time of the dog pack "framing up" on the driver or the lead dog. Some drivers carried a heavy chain with them at all times for protection in a frameup. Other drivers, such as Seppala, never used so much as a whip.

For many years the Olympics of the dogsled world were held annually in the spring at Nome. The all-Alaska sweepstake race was run from Nome across the Seward Peninsula to Candle City and return. A total of 408 miles, the rules allowed no change of driver or dogs during the race.

In the 1910 race, the famous musher, Iron-Man Johnson, finished first, with a winning time of 74 hours and 14 minutes, an average speed of 5.5 miles per hour. Johnson's lead dog was named Sandy, a dog who ended his life touring the lecture circuit with the musher, Black Luk, in the lower 48. It is interesting to note that the second-place winner, Fox Ramsey, took only 10 minutes to turn around at Candle City. The other drivers took a few hours' rest but Ramsey and his dogs pushed on. The strain began to tell early in the second half, however, and Ramsey fell behind at First Chance. He never regained his nice point lead.

The most famous drive of all took place in February of 1925. The city of Nome was gripped by an epidemic of diphtheria. The local supply of antitoxin serum was exhausted and the city wired for a new supply. The Bering Sea route was frozen and ships could not get in. There was only one airplane in operating condition in Alaska, and it was on the landing strip at Fairbanks. One man, a "mystery man," some thought he was a spy, claimed to be a highly trained pilot with the skill necessary to fly to Nome. Somehow, however, he never got around to actually taking off. The serum must be taken overland—and it was, by dogsled. Over 658 miles from Nenana to Nome, the drive was made in difficult country, the last half of the way through a blizzard, and the average speed at times reaching an amazing 9 to 10 miles per hour.

The news of the successful conclusion of this race cheered the world. Stories were carried in every major paper and on the Senate floor Senator Dill, of Washington, paid tribute to the drivers. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's words may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARRYING ANTITOXIN TO NOME BY RELAY TEAMS

Mr. President, this is a road bill which the Senate is now considering, and I think that without leaving the subject entirely I might discuss for a few moments certain events in that part of the United States which has no roads and to which the bill does not apply. In other words, I want to speak for a few minutes about the means of transportation used in faraway Alaska in the past few days. I want to speak of that classic, heroic dog-team relay that carried antitoxin for the suffering, dying people of the little city of Nome away out there on the coast of the Bering Sea.

It was a week ago last Monday that the news came that there were four deaths and 20 cases of diphtheria in Nome, and that the only antitoxin in the town had been there from 4 to 6 years and therefore was not worth anything in caring for those people. Then there arose the question of how the antitoxin that was needed could be gotten to Nome. Because of the icebound Bering Sea it is impossible to reach the harbor at this time of the year. It was first proposed that the antitoxin be carried by airplane. Nome is a thousand miles from Anchorage down on the southwestern coast of Alaska, from where the antitoxin was to be sent. But it was found that there were only three usable airplanes in Alaska, that they were in winter storage, and the aviators had gone to the States. There was one other airplane in Alaska, but the engine had not been in use for some time and it was believed to be very dangerous to undertake to use it without its being repaired. So it was finally decided that they might take 300,000 units of antitoxin from the railroad hospital at Anchorage and send it overland by dog teams. They could take it about half way by the railroad that runs from Anchorage to Fairbanks. They did not take it all of the distance to Fairbanks, but stopped at Dunbar, about 40 miles this side of Fairbanks. There it was met by one of the dog teams and in relays carried across the country.

RIGORS OF THE TRIP

We who live in a climate such as we have in the States can not possibly realize what that trip meant. It is a trip of 650 miles, which, made regularly by the mail teams, takes from 25 to 30 days. By the use of relay teams they covered the distance in 5½ days. It is an accomplishment that will be talked about in Alaska not only through this winter, but for many years to come. The heroic deeds of those men and dogs have caught the imagination of the entire world and are worthy of a mighty pen and eloquent tongue, and will be celebrated in story and in song long after the participants are dead and gone.

I want to call particular attention to one or two things in connection with this method of transportation. The teams are made up ordinarily of 9 to 11 dogs. They travel from 6 to 7 miles an hour under ordinary conditions. When it was announced that they would take the antitoxin by relay teams, every noted dog driver in the entire country along the routes over the mountains and down the Yukon River to the seacoast, and then along the coast to Nome, volunteered his services, and the very best drivers and teams were chosen. They made some really remarkable records. I shall not attempt to trace the trip, nor to give the details; first, because I am not sufficiently familiar with them, and second, because it would take too much time; but it is interesting to know that between the relays, running from 30 to 40 miles each, there was only 10 to 15 minutes of delay, the driver of every team immediately taking charge of the antitoxin and driving on to the next station.

REMARKABLE RECORD

The Indian natives of the country volunteered their services to make possible the quick relays on the trip, because the people in that section of Alaska have again and again been stricken with this dread disease. So as the drivers and dogs went along on the trip, these Indians helped in every way they could. There are two or three speed records that are really worth mentioning. The relay from Ruby to Whiskey Creek, 28 miles, was made in 3½ hours. The most remarkable relay was from Nulato to Kaltag, where they made 36 miles in 3½ hours, which is a little better than 10 miles an hour. They made the entire distance from Tanana to Kaltag, 280 miles, in 37 hours, by these relay teams. These are truly remarkable records for this time of year.

I want to remind Senators of another thing. The newspapers mentioned the names of the great dog-team drivers who have won the relay races, Seppala, and particularly Kasson, but those records I have just mentioned were made by unknown Indian dog drivers with teams of mongrel dogs. Of course, the last part of the trip was more exciting and the traveling was the more fierce, because of the terrific gales that swept across the Bering Sea and the coast. But we should always remember that the rapid and successful carrying of this antitoxin to Nome was due as much to the unknown drivers and the unknown dogs fighting their way through the blizzards over the lonely, dead ice desert, each doing his part to make the final victory posisble, and that they deserve equal credit with those whose names came through in the news dispatches.

THROUGH DARKNESS, COLD, AND GALES

When the teams which carried the antitoxin over the mountains and down the river to the Bering coast reached that point they struck the most difficult part of the trip. It was 30° below zero, the gales blew 40 miles an hour, and this is the time of the year in Alaska when the country is wrapped in darkness. Their daylight period is from 10 to 2 o'clock and is a period of misty light. They made the trip through the darkness, the drivers most of the time being unable to see anything at all and least of all the trail. They had to trust to the dogs, which seemed to have an almost supernatural power of finding their way along the trail. The trip of Seppala was something like 100 miles, much of it across the country where there is not a single habitation through all the distance. With his dog team of 20 or 21 dogs he made a wonderful record, the crossing of Norton Sound being the most spectacular and the most notable part of the trip. His dogs are the Siberian dogs, smaller than the ordinary malamute dogs used on the first part of the trip. They have the peculiar faculty of starting at an ordinary rate of speed and as they go along they get faster and faster until they attain a speed of 8 or 9 miles an hour. They are said in this case to have speeded up beyond anything known in the travel of Alaskan dog teams. They seem to have had a sort of supernatural knowledge that they must get through to the coast in the face of the storm which was driving against them.

TRIBUTE TO BALTO

When the relay reached Bluff it was taken by Kasson with his team of Siberian dogs. He was to have been relayed at a place called Safety. The storm, however, was terrible, and he did not stop at Safety, but went on through and made the trip of 55 miles. His description of the trip, as written in the newspaper, reads like a romance. I shall not attempt to give it all, but I wish to read just two or three statements from it. According to the United Press, he said:

"I left Bluff, 53 miles east of Nome, at 10 p.m. Sunday. The thermometer stood at 30 below, and a gale was blowing from the northwest. I couldn't see the trail. Many times I couldn't even see my dogs, so blinding was the gale. I gave Balto, my lead dog, his head and trusted to him. He never once faltered. It was Balto who led the way—the credit is his."

This black Siberian dog, through the darkness and storm, crossed this icy desert and kept the trail when no human being could possibly have found his way. I wish to read a commentary on this feat by one of the editors of the Hearst newspapers, because, while many editors have attempted to do justice to this trip, I think he has come nearest to doing so. Speaking of the journey, he said:

"Nothing finer has been done by heroism on any battlefield than this relay race across this wind-swept, ice-locked desert of the Arctic.

"If anything, this heroism of the distant North is better than that of battle, for there was no thrill in the doing of it, no wild intoxication, no mass delirium which makes the hazard seem a holiday.

"All alone these brave drivers and brave dogs accepted the challenge of the tempest and the plague—and won.

"Six hundred and fifty miles they struggled through the storm, blowing 70 miles an hour—650 miles with the thermometer 400 below zero.

"There was not even daylight to relieve the loneliness of it, for at this season that region is wrapped in night. Only between 10 in the morning and 2 in the afternoon a pale gray light filters through—a light so dim that the driver cannot see his leading dog.

"And after this, brief twilight, blackness comes—and with it all the desolation of a dead world.

"Such was the pitiless stage of this great drama of Alaska—this drama of man and dog—or dog and man—for in the fine democracy of nature all are equal if their worth be equal.

"The savage wind cut them, the stinging, flying ice numbed them, the cold cut clear to the bone. They were clad in ice—dogs and drivers—but they kept straight on toward Nome, for children were dying there for want of the medicine they bore—and every minute meant a life.

"They are a dauntless lot—these mushers and their dogs—who find their way where there is neither sign or star—and they are a gallant lot as well.

"For instance Seppala, four-time winner of the all-Alaska sweepstakes, first won the prize from Scotty Allan, till then the peerless driver of the northland, and then Seppala named his leading dog 'Scotty,' in honor of his vanquished rival.

"There are thoroughbreds up yonder in the long, bitter darkness.

"Consider another gallant fellow—

"When, half frozen, Gunmar Kasson, the driver of the final relay into Nome, was given coffee and half thawed out, his first words were words of praise for his leader 'Balto.'"

Then the editor quoted this statement from Kasson:

"I do not believe any dog other than my leader, Balto, could have brought the sled with the antitoxin through such a night of storm as we, my 13 dogs and myself, passed through last night.

"I could not see the trail or any markings myself, and it was only through Balto's leadership that we arrived when we did."

SHOULD NEVER BE NECESSARY AGAIN

Senators, I tell this story because I want it in the RECORD, and because I want to remind the Senate and the bureau that has charge of the Health Service that we should see to it that never again in the future will a great ice-locked northern port be left in the fall with no antitoxin except that which is from 4 to 6 years old.

The 300,000 units of antitoxin that were carried there are only sufficient for 20 or 30 people. It has been decided to send 1,200,000 more units of antitoxin and 200 Shick tests from Seattle. It is hoped to be able to send those by airplane, and probably in the future they will always be able to transport such necessary medical supplies by airplane.

The classic victory of these dogs and men will probably be the last of its kind, and it is certainly a fitting finish to the long history of brilliant achievement made by dog teams in the Far North.

Mr. BARTLETT. This was, in fact, far from the last Alaska race and far from a finish to the records made by heroic men and dogs of the Northland.

These records are still being made, by such heroic men as the postal carrier, Chester Noongwook.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the Post Office, dated June 13, 1963, describing the award to Mr. Noongwook may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Post Office Department will mark officially the end of an era for the U.S. mails today (June 13, 1963) with a special citation for the last of the Alaskan dog sled carriers—replaced by an airplane—Postmaster General J. Edward Day reported Wednesday.

The last of the "star route" contract carriers—whose "mush on" cry for the U.S. mails followed the gold rush and played a major role in the development of the Nation's newer State—is Chester Noongwook of Savoonga. Noongwook is young for retirement—27—but his route on the remote St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea was a hand down from generations before.

Actually, the flying machine began replacing man and dogs in this last American sanctuary of "dog mail" tradition 120 miles off the Alaskan mainland earlier this year. However, nostalgically, postal oldtimers urged the Department to mark the historic passing officially of an era that will take its place in

postal history along with the colonial post rider, the overland mail and the pony express.

Reports on Noongwook's performance over the weekly 100-mile round trip run indicated excellent success in protecting and delivering up-to-300-pound mail loads in the face of hazards ranging from subzero weather and snowstorms to soft trails. An award to Noongwook was found to be justified.

Assistant Postmaster General William J. Hartigan—in charge of transportation between 35,000 post offices ranging from New York to Eskimo villages such as Savoonga—was to be in Alaska this week surveying new transportation routes and officiating at a ground breaking for a new airport facility at Fairbanks.

To complete the picture, Wien Airlines, Noongwook's "rival" and the new star route contractor on St. Lawrence Island, agreed to fly Noongwook to Fairbanks so he can give a first-hand account of his last dog mail runs to the Assistant Postmaster General and receive the award at Fairbanks in a fitting manner in ceremonies set for 2 p.m. today—Alaska time, or 8 p.m. e.d.t.

Unfortunately, Spotty or Brownie or Milko-luk or Donkey—in fact, none of Noongwook's other huskies will be present. But Alaskan postal officials—quick to point out the State hasn't let its great traditions go to the dogs—have assembled a team just like Noongwook's own for the occasion.

The citation Hartigan will give Noongwook commends him for "exceptional service in carrying the U.S. mails, under difficult conditions—in the finest traditions of the American postal service."

Noongwook's report to Hartigan should provide some interesting facts on dogsled operations—facts almost lost in a system that handles neary 70 billion pieces of mail annually, including many millions sent on jet planes. However, some facts still exist in postal records on the now extinct mail by dog.

Noongwook normally used 10 or 12 husky dogs over the contract route from November through May. Although the dog team is scheduled to participate, symbolically, in the Thursday ceremony, Noongwook actually used a skinboat from June to October. The dog route followed the northern coastline of St. Lawrence Island, between Gambell and Savoonga. The skinboat route went directly over open sea between the two points. Noongwook's pay was about $40 a round trip.

The decline of the great dogsled routes, which operated in profusion during the closing decades of the last century and well into the 20's and even beyond in some areas, is due largely to the growth in air transportation in Alaska.

Some of the true stories of the postal dogsled carriers are of near epic proportions. It was commonplace for the "sledges" (as they were called) to carry 700 pounds of mail, and sometimes two sledges were coupled together with up to 25 dogs used.

A typical dogsled route was over the bleak and hazardous trail between Kotzebue and Barrow, 650 miles where temperatures 60 below zero were to be expected.

North of the Artic Circle the U.S. mails often were carried all year over ice by dogsled.

On one "sledge" route the carrier had to use 1,400 moccasins a year for his dogs' feet. The routes were so rough it was standard procedure to rebuild the sledge each year.

The Post Office Department reported in the 1920's that about 75 percent of the offices in the Alaska interior not served by railroad had to be served by man and his dogs.

Postal officials—long use to pointing to the dogsled in their speeches as a symbol of postal versatility—doggedly conceded there can never be a full-scale return for even one dog route.

However, significantly, even in this age of space vehicles, the versatility of man himself is not being put aside. The Department and the contractor are both keeping Noongwook and his dogs on in a "standby" basis so the U.S. mails will go through as always if, for any reason, the planes should fail.

Mr. BARTLETT. I also ask unanimous consent that two stories from the Nome Nugget, dated February 7 and 14, 1925, be made a part of the RECORD at this point. These stories describe the great dash to Nome.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When young Ivanoff of Shatolik met Seppala, the former had hardly begun his relay, in fact he had run but a quarter of a mile and had been bothered by a number of dog fights. At the meeting it was a difficult thing to transfer the package as the dogs were getting a strong scent of reindeer and trying to fight, but it was accomplished and Seppala turned about and made the 42-mile return trip which he had already covered that day, only facing a wind which was blowing stronger all the time. The day's run of 82 miles was made at an average speed of 8.8 miles per hour which is exceptional for dogs on such a distance. That night he stayed at Isaac's Point and started out in the morning for Elim, the blizzard still at full strength, hitting the worst of it at Creek River where it was necessary to rub the dogs on account of the cold.

It was at Elim where Chas. Olson received the parcel from Sappala and started out on his relay which terminated at Bluff. On this run Mr. Olson was forced to stop and blanket his dogs, and froze his fingers, hands and cheeks considerably in accomplishing it. His dogs arrived at Bluff at 8 that evening frozen and stiff in spite of this precaution. It was on this relay that the blizzard had reached almost its height and on account of this, Gunnar Kaasen, who was the next in line, waited 2 hours to see if it would not modify somewhat.

The wind prevailed, however, and at 10 o'clock Kaasen started out deciding that longer delay might be disastrous. This was the decision that has won Kaasen worldwide publicity, made the name of Balto, his lead dog, common on the tongues of people throughout the Nation, and also brought flattering offers for the driver and dog to appear before the grinding cameraman in all parts of the film world.

Mr. Kaasen said that it was the toughest trip he ever made and was unable to see the trail for miles, Balto keeping on the track and going for all the strength in that shabby-coated body of his. The part of the trail crossing Bonanza River was the scene of the worst of the blizzard and the wind had swept the snow from the slough ice and piled it on the trail in other spots, making difficult travel.

When he arrived at Safety, where he was to pass the parcel over to Ed Rohn, the roadhouse was dark, and figuring that it would take time for Rohn to bestir himself and prepare his outfit, and also that it would risk more dogs on account of the cold, he mushed on through and arrived in Nome at 5:30 in the morning, completing a trip of 53 miles in 7½ hours, under the most hellish conditions ever experienced on the trail.

Passing Solomon in the blizzard Kaasen could not make out the settlement and on account of this fact had not been advised that the Board wished to have the run held up until the wind subsided. It was on account of this order that Ed Rohn had retired, believing that his run would be made late the next day.

The driver awakened Dr. Welch from his sleep and delivered the serum which was frozen solid. The doctor placed the parcel where it would have an opportunity to thaw out gradually and by noon a portion of it was ready to use and in a short time it was being administered to the afflicted.

The trip in whole was the most remarkable in the history of Alaska and has caused more excitement than any race that has ever been run.

The deplorable incident of the whole run was the fact that on his homeward run, Togo, the famous sweepstakes leader, broke away on the scent of reindeer and has not been seen since, as did another veteran of his string. Mr. Seppala said that he wouldn't have taken $500 for Togo and is making efforts to recover him, though he fears he has been shot, or has sprung a trap.

[From the Nome Nugget, Feb. 14, 1925]

THE DOG MUSHERS TO GET MEDALS FOR RELAY RACE

After considerable effort on the part of the Nugget and with the cooperation of the U.S. Signal Corps men and Chas. Traeger of Unalakleet, we have obtained finally the names of all the drivers who participated in the Nenana-to-Nome antitoxin race. These are the men to whom Nome owes a world of gratitude and who excited the world with their daring and courage.

From previous telegraphic communications we have the following drivers as taking the serum from Nenana to Hot Springs which leaves an unaccounted gap between Hot Springs and Fish Lake which was probably covered by the latter driver. Information to the contrary has not been received. William Shannon started from Nenana running through to Tolovana, in 12 hours in bitter cold, being relieved by "Tolovana Jim" Kalland who is known to have mushed as far as Hot Springs and probably went on to Fish Lake.

From here on we have more definite information as follows:

Johnny Folger left Fish Lake, drove 26 miles to Tanana, time 2 hours 40 minutes, average about 9 miles per hour.

Niekoli left Tanana for Kollands, 34 miles, time 6 hours, average about 5½ miles per hour.

Dave Corning left Kollands for Nine Mile, 24 miles, time 3 hours, average 8 miles per hour.

Sam Joseph left Nine Mile for Kokrines, 30 miles, time 6 hours, average 5 miles per hour.

Harry Pitka left Kokrines for Ruby, 30 miles, time 3½ hours, average about 9 miles per hour.

Bill McCarthy left Ruby for Whiskey Creek, 28 miles, time 3½ hours, average 8 miles per hour.

Edgar Nollner left Whiskey Creek for Bishop Mountain, 36 miles, time 6 hours, average 6 miles per hour.

Charles Evans left Bishop Mountain for Nulato, 30 miles, time 5 hours, average 6 miles per hour.

Tommy Patsy left Nulato for Kaltag, 36 miles, time 3½ hours, average 10 miles per hour.

Jackscrew left Kaltag at 2 p.m., arrived at Old Woman at 9:15, 40 miles in 7 hours, 15 minutes, average little less than 6 miles an hour.

Victor Annannia left Old Woman 9:30 p.m., and arrived at Unalakleet at 3:30 a.m., distance 34 miles, in 6 hours, average a little less than 6 miles an hour.

Mires Connigan left Unalakleet at 4 a.m. arriving at Shaktolik at 1:35 p.m., distance 38 miles, time 9 hours 15 minutes, average over 4 miles per hour.

Henry Ivanoff left Shaktolik at 2 p.m., meeting Leonard Seppala a quarter of a mile outside of town.

Leonard Seppala left Shaktolik at 2 p.m. (after a drive of 42 miles) and returned another 42 miles without resting making 84

miles in one day, the last 42 mile lap being made in 5 hours 45 minutes, average over 7 miles per hour, in a blizzard, time a little under 7 hours, average 7½ miles per hour.

Charles Olson left Golovin for Bluff, distance 25 miles, time 5 hours, average 5 miles per hour, in a blizzard in which his dogs suffered and in which he also froze his hands.

Gunnar Kaasen left Bluff at 10 p.m., in the height of the storm for Nome, distance 53 miles, time 7½ hours, average 7 miles per hour.

Ed Rohn was at Safety expecting to make the final dash but Mr. Kaasen, on account of the early hour of the morning continued on to Nome with the serum.

SECOND RELAY WELL ON WAY

The second relay, which so far is ahead of the first relay schedule, is well underway, passing Unalakleet yesterday. From this end, Ed Rohn left last Wednesday for down the cost and if no more cases are found to make the situation more serious, he will bring the shipment of serum clear through from his point of meeting. Otherwise more teams will be sent and relays arranged again. Over 100,000 units of the first shipment are still left and no need for the relay on this end is anticipated.

Distances between Nome and Nenana

Station	Miles from Nome	Miles between
Safety	21	21
Solomon	33	12
Topkok	48	15
Bluff	53	5
Cheokuk	66	13
Golovin	78	12
Walla Walla	96	18
Elim	104	8
Moses	115	11
Isaacs Point	131	16
Bonanza	156	25
Shatolik	169	13
Foothills	181	12
Unalakleet	207	26
Whaleback	230	23
Old Woman	241	11
Ten Mile	249	8
Twenty Two Mile	264	15
Kaltag	281	17
Nulato	316	35
Koyukuk	334	18
Galena	359	25
Louden	372	13
Whiskey Creek	382	10
Ruby	410	28
McEndees	425	15
Kokrines	440	15
Big Albert	455	15
Birches	481	26
Kollands	497	16
Tanana	531	34
Fish Lake	557	26
Woodchopper	568	11
Hot Springs	585	17
Dugan Creek	596	11
Tolovana	616	20
Campbells	626	20
Old Minto	638	12
Nenana	658	20

Compiled by Charles D. Jones of the Alaska Road Commission.

[From the Nome Nugget, Feb. 7, 1925]

NOME MUSHERS FIGURE IN RACE AGAINST TIME

With the arrival of Gunnar Kaasen on Monday morning with the package containing 300,000 units of diphtheria antitoxin, a great strain was lift from the minds of many of the population of Nome.

The unprecedented dog relay from Nenana was a thriller from the time the first musher left Nenana until the serum arrived at its destination. At this time we have not available the movements and schedules of the drivers until the last few relays, although we have had some reports of a few incidents wherein drivers are said to have suffered frostbite and other tortures of the trail in their great effort for speed. We have, however, firsthand information on this end of the trail and we will begin with Leonard Seppala, the first musher, who made such connections that it was necessary for him to make the long mush of 82 miles in 1 day.

Mr. Seppala, starting from Nome, had orders to start slowly to condition his dogs for a great effort of speed on the return trip, the first plans being that one team would start from the railroad and another from Nome and meet in the vicinity of Ruby. This plan was sidetracked, however, after Mr. Seppala left here and 24-hour, day-and-night relays were decided upon, too late for communication to be sent to the Nome driver. It was on account of this that the serum met him at Shatolik after he had made a day and a half's run in 1 day.

Civilian Rule All Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the editorial page of the Portland Journal recently carried a lucidly written article in respect to the recent comments of Admiral Anderson who, since his departure as Chief of Naval Operations, has been indirectly critical of the civilian leadership in the Defense Department.

Under unanimous consent, I place the Journal editorial in the RECORD as an effective anecdote to this type of criticism:

CIVILIAN RULE ALL IMPORTANT

Retired Adm. George W. Anderson, who was dropped as Chief of Naval Operations after one 2-year term, has made a slashing attack on Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's policies, reflecting the resentment of some of the Nation's professional military men.

Although there may be other reasons for the attack on policies, the gist of the criticism is contained in two statements:

"I am disturbed because now, in the Department of Defense, the operations analyst—properly concerned with 'cost effectiveness'—seems to be working in the wrong echelon—above the professional military level rather than in an advisory capacity."

"Another alarming peril is a modern fallacy that theories, computers, or economics, or number of weapons, win wars. Good leadership unfailingly recognizes that man is the key to success or failure."

Such criticism is healthy and some may be justified, but there is the tendency among generals and admirals to acquire an "infallibility complex" on all subjects, and, understandably enough, to view all matters in terms of military operations.

History records many bitter disputes between top military men and their civilian chiefs—Lincoln and McClellan and more recently Truman and MacArthur. It is of the utmost importance in our system that the final decision on all matters rest with the civilian authorities.

Certainly the recommendations and advice of the professional military men should be fully respected—even though they often differ—but basic decisions affecting the health, welfare, and safety of the Nation must be made by civilian authorities, or our system of government will suffer serious erosion. Examples of governments where the military has the final say are all too numerous. In most cases, they have caused an unhappy situation and long-range instability.

Used to giving commands and not having them questioned, generals and admirals undoubtedly find it difficult to be checked and vetoed by "unprofessional" civilians.

Anderson asserted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff must never become "merely a rubber-stamp to the Secretary of Defense." Certainly the Chiefs of Staff should not be a rubber stamp. They were appointed on the basis of ability, experience, and training to recommend and advise on defense. If they don't do that they should be replaced.

It is much more important, in fact all-important, that the Secretary of Defense, the personal representative of the President who is Commander in Chief of all military forces, not be a rubber stamp to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, several times during the past 2 weeks I have called the attention of my colleagues to the growing support for my resolution, House Joint Resolution 658, to declare 1964 as See America Year. As I have pointed out repeatedly, no concerted effort to improve our serious balance-of-payments position can be made without attention to the significant imbalance in tourist spending. Last year, American tourism expenditures abroad exceeded foreign travel in this country in the amount of $1.4 billion; the total published payments deficit was $2.2 billion. While any effort to restrict by legal means the right of Americans to travel overseas should be questioned, my bill simply authorizes Presidential proclamation declaring a See America Year, and leaves the decision as to where to travel to the individual American citizen.

The key to the success of this program is the support it received from both public and private sectors of the tourist industry, and from the business community. Perhaps a greater long-term value of a See America program will be the increased appreciation of Americans for the great resources and heritage of our country. For this reason, State recreation and travel departments have a great interest in my bill. I have already placed letters of support from State agencies in Wisconsin, North Carolina, and Nevada. Today I wish to include at this point letters received from Pennsylvania, Kansas, Indiana, Massachusetts, Hawaii, Alabama, West Virginia, Utah, and the Virgin Islands:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Harrisburg, September 12, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ULLMAN: Thank you for your letter of September 3 addressed to Mr. Arthur E. Flynn, which has been referred to me.

We are certainly in favor of House Joint Resolution 658 which asks the President to proclaim 1964 as See America Year. This seems especially timely in a World's Fair year. It seems to me it could be more appropriately called, See the U.S.A.

Our department will certainly join other interested groups in expressing our support to our Representatives, and to the committee. Copies of your letter will be sent to Governor Scranton and Secretary of Commerce Tabor.

Thank you for the enclosed copies of the resolution, your speech and the press release.

Do not hesitate to call on this department for any services we can give you in the field of travel.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT R. SHOEMAKER,
Director, Travel Development Bureau.

KANSAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Topeka, Kans., September 11, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Thank you for your letter of September 3 to John Sticher.

Thank you for sending us this information and be assured of our support for the See America Year program. We will try to find places to publicize this material in our own and other publications.

Mr. Sticher has left the Kansas Department of Economic Development for a position with the Department of the Interior in Washington. I believe his department is with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and he is involved in tourist promotion, so you may wish to get in touch with him there.

Sincerely yours,
BARNEY SLAWSON,
Director, Tourist-Travel Division.

STATE OF INDIANA,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND PUBLIC RELATIONS,
Indianapolis, September 12, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Joint resolution (H.J. Res. 658) you have introduced is heartily endorsed by the Indiana Tourist Council.

Copies of a letter addressed to each Indiana Senator and Congressman are enclosed for you and for the committee.

Sincerely yours,
M. B. HALE,
Administrative Director.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Boston, September 12, 1693.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is a tardy acknowledgment of your letter of August 29 regarding your most excellent resolution (H.J. Res. 658) proclaiming 1964 as See America Year. Reason for the delay is that I was on vacation and did not receive the letter until my return.

We are most enthusiastically for your resolution and Commissioner John T. Burke is so notifying each member of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress.

As one concerned with the vacation/travel phase of our economy I am personally very grateful to you for filing this resolution.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,
GEORGE A. WELLS,
Deputy Commissioner, USTS Liaison Officer for Massachusetts.

HAWAII VISITORS BUREAU,
Honolulu, Hawaii, September 12, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Congressman, Second District, Oregon, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Thank you for your letter of August 29 and the enclosure of your Joint Resolution 658 asking the President to proclaim 1964 as See America Year.

Naturally, the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, as a promotional organization encouraging travel to Hawaii, is interested in getting as many Americans as possible to come to our 50th State. Although we are 2,400 miles offshore, we are an integral part of the United States and a favorite domestic vacation destination with Americans according to the Gallup poll.

We in Hawaii hope that your resolution will result in many more Americans traveling to the 50th State of Hawaii during 1964.

Cordially,
CHARLES G. BEADEN.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
BUREAU OF PUBLICITY AND INFORMATION,
Montgomery, September 12, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: I appreciate the material which you sent this office concerning the project of See America Year.

There is additional information that I would like to receive from you. That is, a sample proclamation which would be appropriate for the Governor of Alabama, the Honorable George C. Wallace, to issue in connection with this program. I am sure the Governor will be happy to assist in this matter.

Let me know if we can be of additional help to you in this program. We certainly feel that it is very worthwhile.

Sincerely,
ED EWING,
Director, Publicity and Information.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Charleston, September 11, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Second District, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Thank you for your letter of August 29 outlining your See America Year program.

We have studied your resolution, your speech introducing the bill and a press release distributed in your district and find that we can endorse and support your idea of encouraging Americans to see America in 1964.

While we agree with you that this might be good for the national economy in bringing our balance of payments closer in line, we feel the greatest asset to such a program is to stimulate Americans in learning more about their Nation. We certainly find it is profitable to our State's tourist business by helping our citizens to learn more about their own State in order that they may be better prepared for visiting citizens from other States and nations.

Again, we would like to acknowledge receipt of your proposed See America Year program for 1964, and do hereby wish to acknowledge that to our way of thinking, this is a highly commendable program which

should and undoubtedly will receive support and endorsement of nearly all agencies concerned directly or indirectly with the travel industry.

Sincerely,

HULETT C. SMITH,
Commissioner.

UTAH TOURIST AND PUBLICITY COUNCIL,
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 9, 1963.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: You are to be congratulated on the introduction of a resolution to make 1964 a See America Year. Our department will certainly cooperate in every way to make this event successful. We believe the timing is excellent because of a renewed vitality in the travel industry in the past 2 years, coupled with the opening of the New York World's Fair in 1964.

My personal opinion is that the argument on the balance-of-payments problem should be confined to Congress, and not be publicized as the main reason for the introduction of your bill. This would have a negative connotation to it here in the United States, and especially abroad. There are plenty of reasons for proclaiming See America Year without introducing this element.

The reason, of course, is sound but I believe it should be internally discussed, rather than proclaimed to the world. Thanks for your letter.

Sincerely,

D. JAMES CANNON,
Director.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
St. Thomas, V.I., September 11, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: We are pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 29, 1963, together with your statement before the House of Representatives on August 21, 1963, and copy of House Joint Resolution 658 which you introduced and which asked the President to proclaim 1964 See America Year.

I have discussed the contents of your letter and the joint resolution with the Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky, Governor of the Virgin Islands, and he has instructed me to advise you that the government of the Virgin Islands offers its complete support to your joint resolution (H.J. Res. 658).

As you are aware, we do not have our own representative in the Congress of the United States, but shall be pleased to acknowledge support to the House Judiciary Committee, copy enclosed.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. KIMELMAN,
Commissioner.

Power Lightens Load in Yaak Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, electric power is finally coming to the Yaak River Valley, in the northwest corner of Montana. This beautiful, isolated valley is one of the last settled areas in this great country of ours without central-station electric power.

An article appearing in the September 8, 1963, issue of the Spokesman-Review points out more adequately than I could describe the benefits of electric power and what it means to these people. The article also brings to mind the great work that REA's and cooperatives have done in bringing electric power to isolated areas all across the Nation—areas which previously were neglected by private power concerns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Power Lightens Load in Yaak Valley," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER LIGHTENS LOAD IN YAAK VALLEY

Electric power is coming to the Yaak River Valley in the northwest corner of Montana.

When construction crews this summer began to build the first 21 miles of line, they went to work with chainsaws and axes to clear the right-of-way. Down came the white birch, the needle-like tamarack, the fir, the leafy cottonwood and the cedar.

Rising in their stead is something which to the valley resident is more beautiful than any tree. It is a brown, blunt-tipped pole with a crossarm—the standard utility pole.

Hard to believe? Perhaps, but not if one has lived without electricity.

The beautiful Yaak Valley close to the Canadian boundary is one of the last settled areas in the Nation without central station electric power. The valley's 150 inhabitants are hungry for power. Electricity will change their way of life.

In expectancy they are shopping for baseboard heating units, electric toasters, deep fryers, freezers, refrigerators, ranges, dishwashers—you name it, and someone on the Yaak is buying it.

The Yaak flows from north to south to join the Kootenai River near Troy, Mont. It drains a forested, mountainous area. Residents in the valley live on a 45-mile stretch of the river. Not all will get power this year. Most, however, will have it by 1965. They have sought power for years, but one thing or another has blocked its coming.

This year the residents appealed for aid to Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN and U.S. Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and LEE METCALF. As a result, the residents, the electric cooperative Northern Lights, Bonneville Power Administration, the U.S. Forest Service, and General Telephone Co. who owned the right-of-way, agreed on a plan to bring power to the valley.

To the people of the Yaak the popping and sputtering of the chainsaws was sweeter music than the symphony which the river sings as it rushes, cool and green, past meadow and rocky run.

What will electricity mean to these people?

"You might say that until now we have lived in grandfather's time. Now we can join the rest of the country in the 20th century."

These are the words of David J. Winn, a rancher. Winn was Adm. Bull Halsey's personal pilot during World War II. Today he has six children for whom he sets high standards. They get mostly A's in school. They earn them by the light of a kerosene lamp.

"We love it in this valley on this ranch," Mrs. Winn said. "But it has meant living without so many conveniences. It's hard to believe we're getting lights. We are very excited."

Mrs. Winn has a list of things to buy—a vacuum cleaner, an electric iron, a freezer, a hot water tank, an electric range, a mixer. Winn plans to double the production of his 193-acre farm with an irrigation sprinkling system.

There are five families and a year-around staff of 17 men at Sylvanite Ranger Station. In winter, darkness begins to fall over the station at 4 p.m. The diesel generator operates only 5 hours a day, from 5 to 10 p.m., because of high fuel costs.

"You miss the lights when the daylight begins to fade," District Ranger William Magnuson said.

The ratio of flashlights to population at the station is at least 3 to 1.

Magnuson confided that were it not for the Government's strict rules about property he would like to celebrate the coming of power by setting off a dynamite charge under the diesel. He feels like a backwoods carpenter who is trading his handtools for power machinery.

Power will put lights in the office, electric tools in the shop, overhead lights in the yard, and dryers in the homes.

The electricity will do more in the valley, however, than just improve living conditions. It will mean jobs.

"With power we can run my sawmill all year 'round," Bruce Leighty said. He employs 25 men. Another 25 work in the woods to supply the mill with logs.

"There were many times in winter when we couldn't operate," Leighty said. "The temperature here frequently drops to 20° below zero. Sometimes it gets down to 40 below."

Leighty's power bill for four diesel generating units averaged between $8,000 and $9,000 a month. He hopes to cut this almost in half. Because of the prospect of power, he already has added a planer to the mill.

Clyde W. Thornton owns the valley's gold mine. Two years ago he shut down the mine and laid off 35 men because of production costs and market conditions. His generating costs averaged $2,200 or more a month. He is taking a new look at costs with the idea of operating again, perhaps on a reduced scale.

Meanwhile, Thornton is installing a few items in his home—baseboard heat, a hot water tank, an electric stove, a television set, and a freezer.

Inside the neat, well-kept little white house of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Grush, valley residents for 53 years, a 30-inch electric range soon will stand beside the wood range. Grush is keeping the wood stove. He likes to sit on the oven door.

"It helps the arthritis in my back," Grush said. "The new ranges don't seem to have strong oven doors, and besides I like the heat from the old wood stove."

He has a small generating unit, which delivers 32 volts, and appliances to match. The appliances once were very dear. Now all will go. Mrs. Grush is busy with her catalogs.

Grush has rented a cabin with a kerosene lamp to a forestry student from Illinois and his bride, Mr. and Mrs. James Sandusky. Sandusky is a summer employee at the ranger station. Mrs. Sandusky is a school teacher. Their cabin is completely nonelectric.

"I've learned one thing this summer," Mrs. Sandusky said. "Electricity means everything. Without it life is hard."

John Glenn and the American Dream

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the high honor to listen

to an address by Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., delivered at the National Conference on Citizenship here in Washington, D.C.

Colonel Glenn personifies the principles of good citizenship in the ideals which he holds and in the life which he leads. His eloquent address articulates what goes to make up the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of Colonel Glenn's address in the Appendix of the RECORD so that Americans and lovers of freedom everywhere may read these thoughtful, penetrating, and inspiring words:

FREEDOM FROM—FREEDOM TO

INTRODUCTION

The challenge of speaking to such a conference as this, on the subject of our citizenship, is indeed of great proportion. Many of you who have been thinking, writing, and doing, in this field should probably be with me on this platform now so we could have a mutual sharing of ideas.

The subject is one in which I have a great interest and strong convictions, difficult as they are to put into words. These areas of conviction and beliefs are always the most difficult to describe, even though they are among the most deeply felt emotions we possess.

But it is wise that we pause for an assessment once in awhile, to see how things are going, and take stock of our situation, for we discuss these matters all too infrequently.

Let us recap for a few moments.

NEW AGE

The progress of man has often been marked in major eras. Thus, the archeologist speaks of the stone age, of the bronze age, and of the iron age, all of which have been great areas, marking the advance of man to a higher civilization. These mileposts of the archeologists are separated by thousands of years. It is interesting that the last 20 years of our history have been marked by two outstanding technological developments which have generally been recognized as meriting the title of "ages"; the atomic age and the space age.

Here are two technological achievements, each worthy of a millennium, and yet lucky to receive a decade in our present day. Thus, time scales in which we meet the mileposts in the development of our civilization have been compressed until today we can literally speak of a technological explosion. Our knowledge is expanding so rapidly that no one can encompass its borders or fully comprehend its extent.

This new era in which we find ourselves has been titled, "The Space Age," and we cannot even begin to delineate the benefits and advantages that may accrue therefrom, for our work of today is but preparations for exploration.

Efforts made by the United States in space have been open, above board, and conducted in a fashion to add to our showcase of freedom. This was brought forcibly home to me this past spring during a trip to Japan in which the Japanese people I met commented freely on their appreciation of the openness of our program for world benefit. Perhaps it was more pointedly stated by a farmer in Panama, who rather shyly approached our dinner table in an open air, country restaurant, and hesitatingly just wanted to let us know that he felt the American way was the best way to live because we do not do everything in secret. He said he did not have much education and could not put in words what was in his heart, but he hoped we understood, and he apologized for bothering us. Bothering us, indeed. I understood all right—enough that I had much more difficulty replying to him.

This openness of our programs has added to the showcase of freedom we present to the world.

The major purposes have been obvious around the world as a serious first step toward the exploration of space, and would be worthwhile even if there was no such place as Russia. The secret intent of the Russian program, of course, we do not know.

It is regrettable, however, that through astute propaganda, the Russians have been able to equate, in the minds of many people, the size of a particular space booster with the merits of our two systems of government and our whole way of life. It has been most incongruous to see opinions of people all over the world so affected by a single item of hardware. We propose, however, to eliminate even that advantage as soon as we possibly can.

No one can foretell with certainty the tremendous import this broad technological revolution may have. But its implication is really much more broad and deep than a single reference to space, for space accomplishments are but one fruit of a greater advancement. There have been matching broad advances in many technical fields that have affected, and will continue to affect every facet of life from our homes, to automobiles, to medicine, to buildings, to roads, and to education. History has shown that such surges of advancement are times of greater opportunity to mold the future.

But how have we arrived at such a situation? Why have not older and more experienced societies been able to make comparable strides? What has been the secret ingredient that set apart our efforts?

To a great extent, it has been the freedom afforded the individual; freedom which has permitted each citizen to utilize his imagination, intelligence, energy, faith, and ability to an unusual degree. The total of these efforts has created a progress never before equaled by any group, tribe, or ism.

From where did this freedom stem?

ROOTS OF FREEDOM

Since time immemorial, men have had freedom as a goal and it has indeed been a long time in arriving. For most of history has shown the greatest numbers of people as slaves, or at least not free to pursue their futures by their own devices. Dostoievski felt that most men preferred tragic freedom to compulsory happiness. This was probably another way of saying that men preferred nearly any government of laws, as opposed to letting their future be determined by the whims of men; that within the bounds of organized society men were prepared to let their futures be decided by their own efforts.

The idea that every citizen should be free probably began among the ancient Greeks, for the citizens of Athens, during certain periods, enjoyed more freedom than most people can hope for today. They were free to give much of their own talents, they were free to share in all decisions of the government, but they could do this chiefly because they were free in large part from the need to perform heavy manual labor.

In Rome slavery also existed, but law and customs made important contributions to personal freedom and Roman principles of order, justice, and private right have become part of the laws of our civilization.

Christianity and Judaism gave importance to the individual and his freedom, for these doctrines hold that each person has an immortal soul and a distinctly separate identity.

They emphasized the existence and salvation of this individual soul, and the infinite worth of every human being. Ever since that time, the history of Western man has been an ever-varying triangle of God, the individual, and the community.

In the Middle Ages, certain rights were called liberties, and these liberties gave some freedom from having things done "to" a person against his will. The liberties were expanded in England with the approval of the Magna Carta and other acts, papers and writings. Government decrees extended the rights of the individual in Europe during this period.

With the establishment of the American Colonies, the liberties and rights that were known in England and Europe were transferred to the New World. Following the American Revolution, the founders of the United States knew what they meant when they used the word "freedom," for they felt that true fredom was obedience to moral laws. Lawful freedom, they said, was the right of decent men, governed by conscience, to make their own principal choices in life. This certainly was a long step in giving individuals control over their future—a centuries-old dream.

In a sense, the attempts to establish freedom had a pattern similar to some of our efforts toward space flight—many holds and "scrubbed" missions, but from each attempt, we learn, improve, and try again.

We try to make safeguards in the event of failure so that all is not lost, but somewhere there must be a time of letting go of the old if we are to grasp the new.

Safeguards can be necessary exasperations when we try to get on with the new as we have discovered in our space attempts.

Many of you will recall with me some of those disappointing mornings when everything seemed ready for launch, at Cape Canaveral, closely followed by a canceled flight. On one such occasion, the decision to cancel was made on the grounds that the wave heights in the recovery area were just at the maximum and cloud cover at the Cape was barely acceptable. I did not want to "scrub the flight" that day, but was overruled. That evening I went to town and made some purchases to be used during preparation for the next attempt. The following day I presented to Operations Director Walt Williams a pair of rose-colored-sun glasses for viewing weather conditions, and a tape measure with each foot relabeled to include 3 normal feet, for measuring wave heights in the recovery area. Lest I be misunderstood, Walt's judgment was good as attested to by the fact that I am here and from this vantage point in time he was absolutely right in what he did.

In pursuit of liberty and freedom, men have never needed rose-colored glasses to make it look better, nor an elongated tape to measure its value.

Today, we say that we have freedom, but freedom can still mean many things to many people.

Complete freedom can be nothing but anarchy. A friend of John Adams once remarked that, "Man is born with a desire for freedom." "Yes," said Adams, "but so is a wolf." He was, of course, indicating the fact that complete freedom with no responsibility is hardly our objective. Democracy, however, as we know it today, might be defined as freedom with a high degree of individual responsibility.

TYPES OF FREEDOM

It would seem to me that there are two basic kinds of responsible freedom in our democracy. One might be described as a legacy of "freedom from." "Freedom from" would imply a freedom guaranteed the individual, from undue outside interference; freedom from suppression of speech, or suppression of worship, and also freedom from want, and fear, to round out the four freedoms elaborated on by President Franklin Roosevelt at one time. These are passive and require little current effort on our part.

The other type of freedom might be a "choice" freedom and can be titled "freedom to do." This in turn implies not a freedom from outside interference but a freedom of action which permits full use

of all the innate talents we choose to employ. This is the basis of great progress, for our only bounds are those of our own imagination, ingenuity, or effort.

There are myriad freedoms that come under the freedom "to do," such as the freedom to vote, to work in callings and localities of our choice, to bargain with employers and employees, to go into business, to buy as we see fit, to contract individually about our affairs, to own private property, to move about freely at home and abroad. All of these are freedoms that might be listed, then, under one all-encompassing title of freedom of choice.

To exercise this freedom of choice is not always as easy as it might seem, for there is the risk of being a nonconformist, of being different and this requires a little motivation.

Just about a year ago I was in California at the tracking station for several weeks in support of Wally Schirra's mission. I try to get a daily workout by running, so one morning I was out early, running along the road when an old dilapidated pickup truck drove past. He continued down the road a distance, turned around, came back, drove alongside as I ran, and yelled, "Hey, buddy, who you fightin'?"

Obviously, people do not always make the proper analysis of your intentions if you exercise this freedom of choice by engaging in a nonstandard activity, but in a more serious nature than my example the history of this country is a testimony to those who have seized some hard-won "choices" and made the most of them.

Indeed, our space program of today is an excellent example of exercise of this freedom of choice. We had the means, but the will to start such a major program of exploration was ours to choose. The "space" choice that was made fits well into the American tradition of research, development, and exploration, for it is such seizing of past initiatives that has given us our present accomplishments and standards.

Our experiment in democracy and self-government is only 187 years old—a mere blink in the eyes of history, but the eyes of history have seen America begin with the idea of giving to every man an equal chance, and relying on the thesis that the majority, properly informed, would be capable of making proper decisions to shape its destinies. That the thesis is correct is obvious.

RECAP

We have discussed the tremendous technological revolution in which we find ourselves; the fact that freedom of the individual is at the center of this progress; briefly traced the growth of freedom; and commented on types of freedom, particularly, the positive freedom of choice.

What do we do with it from now on?

FUTURE

In science, we have two areas called basic science and applied science. Basic science is the primary, laboratory, research type activity, while applied science takes the tools given it from the labs and applies it to problems of the day and the future.

Freedom and liberty in this country are a basic heritage. What we need now from every individual is an applied heritage to continue, strengthen, and expand our concepts of freedom now and into the future.

Basic heritage is a knowledge, appreciation of, and dedication to the fundamental concepts that made this country what it is today.

Applied heritage will be making certain that these principles are applied to the future. But this means we must exercise freedom of choice for every individual, for applied heritage is not a passive thing. It requires action.

Where would we start this application?

One of the most important applications of choice and applied heritage is toward thinking about the future goals, or national purpose of the United States, for here we define the overall framework on which all lesser decisions must build. These are provinces of thought not just for Government officials, or for the President and Congress, but should be the subject of very objective thinking by every citizen. In a democracy such as ours, the lack of individual attention to such matters can only lead to a gloomy future.

There have been discussions in the near past on the national purpose and I have been glad to read some of these. One of our national magazines ran a series of articles a couple of years ago on the subject of the national purpose. Leaders of business, industry, and national thought commented on their feelings for what the national purpose of the United States should be. This was an excellent and thought-provoking series of articles, and one which I was sorry to see end. That there was such a diversity of opinion on what our national goals should be, was probably the most surprising result from the series of articles. It indicated that even to well-read, well-informed people, who have been thinking deeply on this subject, there was still great variance of opinion.

The report of the President's Commission on National Goals entitled, "Goals for Americans," was started several years ago and delved into what the purposes of America should be generally and in a number of different fields. It was an excellent study and one that should be required reading, for it took our next step of "applied heritage" and delineated specific actions in specific fields that would build toward the national purpose.

They are the type of concrete actions that must be followed if we are to make progress.

I would like to see a resurgence of such articles and commissions.

But the major function of such a conference as this, it would seem to me, is not to establish such panels, or committees to dwell on specific national policy matters, but rather to determine how we can encourage individual activity and interest in these matters. Perhaps some of the better techniques of Madison Avenue need be employed, these are important matters.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Throughout all these writings on the national purpose and the goals for Americans, there runs that one similar thought: We must have individual responsibility of every citizen, seriously studying and considering such problems, if America is to go ahead to its full potential, for citizenship, new ideas, and innovations are not the property of a group.

As Whitney Griswold once put it, "Could 'Hamlet' have been written by a committee, or the 'Mona Lisa' painted by a club? Could the New Testament have been composed as a conference report? Creative ideas do not spring from groups. They spring from individuals."

There is a wealth of education and brain power in this country which can be applied most constructively to some of the problem areas that I have just mentioned. If we do not have a widespread application of such citizen responsibility, the alternative can only be one thing, and that is that fewer and fewer people will decide more and more, and in the end, freedom, individual freedom, to pick our future path will be degraded.

It would seem that we are at a dangerous point when only some 60 percent of the voters exercise their franchise. America needs not just more voters, however, but more good voters; informed, understanding, reasoning individuals. The less interest we can generate in individual responsibility the more we are at the mercy of the few well organized planners who advise other people on how they should vote: Businessmen recommending how employees should vote, union bosses trying to dictate membership voting patterns, legislators choosing home interest expediency rather than national interest, blocks voting strictly as a labor vote, or a farm vote. Any special interest groups such as these which vote under control of a few people or for an undeserved special privilege are not operating in the American tradition. The correctness of decision in our democracy will be found as we apply the individual intelligence of our many millions of people to the problems of the future. Freedom to do—applied heritage.

The alternative to this kind of thinking approach to the future could be termed a kind of weightlessness.

In the weightlessness of space flight, an object turned loose in the cabin will drift until it hits something, bounce off and assume another course, react to air currents, and rebound again, reacting to any influence, for it lacks the purpose and stabilizing influence of the force of gravity. We do not want weightless citizenship.

GUIDELINES

Freedom and democracy are a rarity in the stream of human progress, for the history of mankind has within it far more of oppression, of dictatorship, of rule by class, of monarchy, and of suppression of the individual to the state, than it does of freedom. The concept of the supreme worth of the individual and of the purpose of the government to guard that supreme worth is indeed a "come-lately" in the stream of human events. That a minimal minority of one will receive a fair hearing is even today not common outside a few areas of the world.

Our whole society is based on a fundamental belief in God, morality, and respect for our fellow individuals. The very deepest goals for Americans relate to the spiritual health of all the people. The spirit and belief that our forefathers brought to this country assured that no man would ever be an island unto himself. Freemen have always known the necessity of responsibility to their fellow man. Facts, inventiveness, and possession of knowledge are good, but unprincipled and unguided use of the power of knowledge could be ruthless.

There must be guidelines for us to follow. Such things as ideals, religious beliefs, pride, paptriotism, standards, all are intangible principles that have gone a long way toward making this country what it is, and these areas require no new understanding, but only a rededication to their principle, for they are no more old fashioned today than they were in 1776. If we chart the rise and fall of other civilizations, we suddenly find that ideals, far from being impractical, are actually the very heart of survival of our free American way of life. Every great society which came into being and long endured, did so on the basis of convictions and beliefs so strong that they lifted individuals out of themselves and caused them to live and sometimes die for aims or purposes nobler and better than themselves. Arnold Toynbee, the historian, has said that no great civilization ever came into being without a strong impulse of religious, spiritual, or mystic belief. Ours surely had these qualities and conversely, according to Toynbee, out of 21 notable civilizations, 19 died not because of external conquest, but because of evaporation of these beliefs from within. The fabric of this Nation's growth, of its success, its glory, was woven in belief—belief in God, in the individual, in liberty, and the concept of democracy as summed up in the great documents of the early days of this country.

CONCLUSION

Just maintaining a bastion of freedom for ourselves is not enough. This idea of freedom is the dynamic revolution of the future, that men have finally gained, maintained, and can show the way to freedom, to determination of their own affairs.

This is our showpiece of freedom. It must not be a shopworn showpiece, but a living, vital, shining example to which others can aspire.

Carl Schurz was a general in the Civil War, a Senator, and Secretary of the Interior, and a portion of the speech he made in April of 1859 is no less true today than it was then. I am sure we would all agree with his words as he said, "You may tell me that my views are visionary, that the destiny of this country is less exalted, that the American people are less great than I think they are or ought to be. I answer, ideals are like stars: you will not succeed in touching them with your hands. But like the seafaring man on the desert of waters, you choose them as your guides, and following them, you will reach your destiny."

The National Council of Churches in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many people in my State and many throughout the Nation are concerned about the political activities of the National Council of the Church of Christ in the U.S.A. This concern has resulted in a number of communications to my office requesting information on the National Council of Churches. One of the best summaries on this subject that has come to my attention has been printed by Mr. Thurman Sensing in his weekly news column entitled "Sensing the News." The title of this particular column is "The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. in Politics," and it is scheduled for release this week in newspapers across the country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN STATES INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES IN POLITICS

(By Thurman Sensing)

The most sacred thing in the lives of millions of people in this country is their religion. Indeed the ancestors of many of us came to this land in order to enjoy religious liberty. By this, our forefathers meant not merely the right to worship but also the right to have one's religion kept free of politics.

For this reason it is profoundly disturbing to many Protestants that the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (NCC) should have in the 13 years of its existence grown into an ambitious political organization that runs counter to the deepest beliefs of numerous persons in the member denominations.

The most recent cause for dismay among concerned churchmen was the role of the NCC's Commission on Religion and Race in organizing the August 28 march on Washington and in demanding that Congress take specific legislative action. Many members of the denominations that belong to the NCC were shocked to discover that the commission placed newspaper ads in cooperation with the Freedom House organization in New York City. They discovered, many of them for the first time, that members of this NCC Commission included Harry S. Ashmore, formerly of the Fund for the Republic; Ralph McGill, ultraliberal newspaper editor, and Victor G. Reuther, brother of the United Auto Workers chief. They were equally shocked to discover that the NCC had affiliated itself in the advertisements for the Washington rally with such individuals as Roy Wilkins, head of the NAACP, and Paul G. Hoffman, director of the U.N. Special Fund, which is currently aiding Fidel Castro's government with American funds contributed through the United Nations.

Other Protestants were startled to discover that the NCC had gone on record as favoring "a massive Federal public works program." They were amazed to find that the NCC published statements in the language of leftwing radical extremists, repeating baseless charges about police brutality and people working at slave wages.

What has all this to do with religion? asked many concerned churchmen. This is the same question that other citizens asked in 1959 when the World Order Study Conference, sponsored by the NCC, proposed recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations.

Other churchmen bore in mind the fact that the NCC's department of church and economic life had been helped into existence by funds provided by the United Auto Workers Union, of which Walter Reuther is president. In addition, the NCC received funds from the Philip Murray Foundation and the Sidney Hillman Foundation, organizations established in memory of former leaders of the CIO. The NCC's consistent record of favoring the same political objectives as big unionism has to be thought of in connection with these gifts.

There is a strong wave of protest within Protestant churches that is directed against the NCC. Many individual churches have registered a dissent from NCC stands. But local churches often are unable, because of complicated organizational arrangements, to individually remove financial support from the NCC. Within the NCC itself, a small group of leaders holds great power.

The record of NCC officials becoming involved in radical causes is a continuing insult to responsible church members whose churches are, willy-nilly, caught up in membership. Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, for instance—former head of the NCC—has been a signer of innumerable radical petitions. For example, he lent his name in 1961 to the Conference of Greater New York Peace Groups which opposed nuclear defenses for America's allies. Other signers included Cyrus Eaton, the industrialist who boasts of his friendship with Nikita Khrushchev; W. E. DuBois, the late founder of the NAACP, who openly joined the Communist Party a year ago; Owen Lattimore, an advocate of appeasement in Asia; and Norman Thomas, longtime Socialist leader.

The average Protestant churchmen believe that the NCC's role should be restricted to missionary and other related charitable work. Deeply feared and resented is the development of the NCC into an organization that not only calls on Congress to pass radical legislation but that becomes militantly involved in the organization and direction of mass movements that many citizens and churchmen regard destructive of law and order and the intelligent conduct of the public business.

The current partisan role of the NCC is a reminder that church leaders mixing in politics betrays the real character of religion.

Revitalization of Economy of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Wisconsin stands in the center of a three-State area, once abundant in natural resources, later despoiled by shortsighted interests.

The Federal Government, through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has studied the area of the northern parts of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota to recommend ways of revitalizing the economy of that part of the Nation.

It is a valuable natural resource area, lying within 500 miles of 50 million Americans. President Kennedy will visit the area later this month and will address the Great Lakes States Conference at Duluth, Minn.

In order to explain more fully the purposes and aims of the conference, I ask unanimous consent that a news release from my office to Wisconsin news media be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When President Kennedy brings his nationwide conservation tour to northern Wisconsin on September 24, he will learn of "blunders in the past and great hope for the future," Senator GAYLORD NELSON said Monday.

"The destruction over 50 years ago of natural resources in northern Wisconsin—just as in many other places—was a national scandal," Senator NELSON said.

"First we squandered the timber. Then we ruined the soil and some of the waters. And then we exploited our final resource—the people. Every one of these foolish measures ended in failure."

NELSON said that intelligent long-range planning could turn the North into a great recreational asset and a self-sufficient economic unit. However, without such planning at the local State and national level, natural resources and recreational assets could be destroyed anew by a rapidly growing population and fierce economic pressures, he said.

"I hope that the Presidential trip and the Great Lakes States Conference at Duluth on September 24 and 25 will point the way to some solutions for the problems of the North and some wiser conservation policies for the Nation."

President Kennedy will leave Washington on September 24 for a 5-day nationwide tour of conservation needs and outdoor resources. He will land at Duluth, Minn., take a side trip to the Lake Superior shore area of Wisconsin, and make a major speech at the Duluth conference.

"President Kennedy's conservation trip should arouse the national conscience," Senator NELSON said.

"All conservationists and thoughtful citizens will applaud this effort which we hope is a prelude to a comprehensive investment by our State, local and national governments to preserve these assets in the next decade."

"The history of northern Wisconsin tells the old story, repeated all over the world, of men destroying their environment while pursuing a better life," NELSON said.

Northern Wisconsin was once covered with 130 billion board feet of pine trees worth billions of dollars NELSON pointed out. If these forests had been systematically managed and harvested, they could have continued forever as a permanent resource.

A pioneer Wisconsin conservationist, Increase A. Lapham, warned in 1854 that Wisconsin would eventually run out of timber. He called for systematic tree planting, but a State and Nation which considered its timber resources inexhaustible ignored his warning, NELSON said.

Also ignored was an 1867 report by a special State forestry study committee which said:

"Consult the history of Egypt, of Palestine, of Greece, of Italy, and we shall see that the original fertility and productiveness of a country may be destroyed. A country capable of sustaining a dense population of happy, prosperous, and civilized people may be converted into one of comparative sterility. * * * Such may be our future unless we profit by their example."

"This warning was ignored and the land was raped by the lumber barons at the turn of the century," NELSON said. "Forest fires raced through the tangled slash left behind by the loggers. Floods and erosion took their toll. Much of this magnificent land was left in ugly ruins."

"Soil erosion, in turn, caused silting in many streams, the effects of which are still noticed today," NELSON said.

"The exploitation of human resources was probably even more regrettable," NELSON said. "Real estate speculators advertised far and wide that huge tracts of choice land were available to settlers in the north. Train loads of new settlers filled with hope poured in from Chicago, St. Paul, and many other areas. The land was sold to them at a higher price than many of their grandchildren can get for it today after a lifetime of backbreaking cultivation and improvement," NELSON said.

Wisconsin mistakenly believed that "the plow would follow the ax" into northern Wisconsin and that rich productive farms would spring up there as they had elsewhere in the westward development of our country. They were cruelly disappointed because, as scientists had tried to warn them a generation earlier, the destruction of the forests had altered the soil and the very climate of the north.

The inevitable result was heartbreak, financial ruin, and eventually a sad exodus as these people abandoned their farms and filed back to the cities seeking jobs.

"They left behind staggering problems for State and local governments," NELSON noted. Tax delinquency became rampant and villages, towns, and counties throughout the north were thrown into fiscal crisis.

Despite all of these tragic developments, the north has made a remarkable comeback and has a bright future "if we can learn the lessons of the past," NELSON said.

"Once the resources were destroyed, the State enacted enlightened programs of conservation and reforestation. These programs have resulted in the almost complete reforestation of the north, and the population which stayed behind, despite a generation of hardship, has remained vigorous and resourceful," he said.

"The north has tremendous resources," NELSON said, "in its great supplies of land, trees, and clean fresh water. It makes a logical recreation center for many millions of Americans crowded into cities who long for life in the outdoors.

"However, the very factors which create the new opportunity for the north, also threaten it with the second destruction of its resources in a single lifetime," NELSON said.

Population is booming, NELSON pointed out. Highway and air transportation is greatly improved. Americans have more leisure time and more leisure money.

Cottages are filling up the shorelines of the lakes at the same time that there is an unprecedented demand for public access, NELSON pointed out. Some lakes are being polluted by septic tank overflow from poorly planned lake shore subdivisions. High-powered motorboats, many of them trailered from big cities to small lakes, have turned old fishing haunts into waterborne traffic jams. Swamps are being drained for subdivisions, leaving no sanctuary for wildlife. Beautiful landscape vistas are being ruined with a cheap costume jewelry of neon signs, billboards, and hotdog stands.

"Fast buck operators, who have already made millions in Arizona and Florida, are proposing huge cheap subdivisions in northern Wisconsin areas utterly unsuited to intensive residential development," NELSON said.

Some northern residents are easy prey for fast talking promoters who offer an alternative for what has been a long period of near poverty. As a result, NELSON said, "local residents and units of government are tempted to sell tracts of land, which would be ideally suited for public use, to developers who promise swift but short lived profits. Some persons are reluctant to preserve scenic areas for public enjoyment because so much of the North is already publicly owned."

NELSON said that the North desperately needs a responsible long-range plan, setting aside vast areas for public recreational activities for the long-range future, drawing tourists from all over the country." He said the rest of the land should be developed, both publicly and privately, in ways that would provide long-range economic growth without ruining the area as a recreational resources.

What are the principles to be learned from the history of northern Wisconsin? Senator NELSON asked.

He pointed out that the 1867 committee in Wisconsin had applied a principle that was still relevant. The committee noted that those who moved to harvest Wisconsin's timber had no permanent interest in the State.

These men were not builders of farms; they obtained the land, stripped it of its valuable timber and "moved on to depardations upon other lands," the committee said. It suggested that the interests of such men "should be made to yield to the interests of men who are to become the permanent occupants of the land, those who would improve and adorn the land rather than injure and destroy it."

NELSON said, "the public his the paramount interest in our natural resources. No one, even in a free enterprise economy such as ours, has any inherent right to wipe out a great natural resource such as timber, sail, and water."

NELSON said we also need detailed scientific research on natural resources, particularly the dependency of one resource upon another, if we are to make balanced use of all our resources in the public interest.

"As a State legislator, as Governor and as a U.S. Senator, I have seen the same story repeated over and over," NELSON said. "Some person warns that the public interest in a natural resource is being threatened by some private activity. There is a call for some action to protect the public interest. Inevitably someone replies that there is a vital economic interest at stake here and that the State or the community or even the Nation has no right to interfere in private business."

"A classis example is a story in the Milwaukee Sentinel in 1898 warning that the lumber of northern Wisconsin would be gone in 10 or 20 years. In a State caught up in a frenzy of lumber prosperity, with lumbermen occupying positions of influence in government and newspapers, such a warning went unheeded."

"Again in 1912," NELSON said, "when the plunder had occurred and wise men called for replanting, an editorial in the Rhinelander News was headlined, 'Northern Wisconsin Wants Farms and Not Reforestation.'"

"Most important of all," NELSON said, "we must remember that the time to preserve our resources is when they are plentiful, not when they are scarce."

"I hope that the residents of northern Wisconsin, the civic and political leaders of the State and the Nation as a whole will take heed of what may be our last chance," NELSON said. "This visit of President Kennedy to northern Wisconsin can provide a crucial turning point in the preservation of our northland. If we don't respond to this golden opportunity the destruction of our beautiful northland may occur all over again."

NELSON noted that 50 years ago another President, Theodore Roosevelt, had said:

"There is no question now before the Nation of equal gravity with the question of the conservation of our natural resources."

NELSON commented, "President Kennedy is reminding us of this fact half a century later. I hope we will heed this warning. It may never come again."

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, from the many complimentary remarks I receive regarding the articles written by Art Hoppe, who is now well known to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would feel remiss if I did not insert his columns at frequent intervals.

Several of his recent writings follow and I wish especially to call particular attention to the one entitled "Chiselers Had It Right, All Along" in which he, in his inimitable manner, describes his discovery of the underlying philosophy of the tax bill which will be reported to the House shortly by the Committee on Ways and Means:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 1, 1963]

WASHINGTON: THE DAY AFTER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—At 1 o'clock on Thursday morning, the workmen were scrubbing down the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, the center of a nation's attention only 9 hours before. In the darkness their busy, silent figures seemed almost furtive.

Their hoses flicked quickly over the step on which a score of civil rights leaders had stood at the close of the demonstration, arms linked, swaying and triumphantly singing, "We Shall Overcome." Their brooms swept over the spot below where a dozen Negro teenagers in blue-and-gold NAACP caps had clapped and chanted "freedom, freedom, freedom," their eyes glowing, their spirits bold and bright and happy.

The rostrum, the cameras, the cables, the tents, the pushcarts were gone. And so was the fence on which the old lady had leaned as she wept to hear Mahalia Jackson sing. And down Constitution Avenue where 200,000 people had marched only hours before, a single tank truck rumbled through the leafy August night, its sprayers washing down the drain the sandwich wrappers, the paper cups, and the leaflets demanding justice and equality.

All night long they worked. And when day broke, scarcely a trace remained.

On the downtown streets, so hauntingly deserted the day before, traffic was normal. In the department stores, so eerily empty the day before, sales were normal. And in the hundreds of Federal buildings, the thousands of workers who had stayed home the day before returned to their desks and the normal clackings and whirrings of Government resumed.

In the White House, the tough New Frontiersmen talked in 4-letter words about how they had to push the tax bill through first because they didn't want to get it hung upon any Southern filibuster over civil rights. It was the hardheaded, realistic approach.

And on Capitol Hill the liberal Congressman talked about how you were going to need 60 to 70 Republican votes and you might have to toss out the public accommodations section of the bill to get them. It was the hardheaded, realistic approach.

And at the posh bar, the bright young Government aid talked about how President Kennedy couldn't ask for too much more than he could get or he'd look bad. It was the hardheaded, realistic approach.

In the afternoon it rained, restoring the trampled grass, slicking the dusty leaves and washing the whole city. Walking in the col, gray rain it was hard to even bring to mind the image of that hot, sweaty, rousing day before.

And never have the strange, magic qualities of this strange, magic city seemed so overpowering. For the question you asked yourself was not where had all those 200,000 people gone. But rather: Were they ever here at all?

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 2, 1963]

A SALUTE TO LABOR AND OTHER EVILS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Today, as you know, is Labor Day. And I feel we should pause in our pleasures to salute the men and women of the American labor movement and their dedicated stand on the principle of labor.

They are, of course, against it.

Indeed, since its inception, the American labor movement has done little else but fight against labor. It's fought against labor for children, labor for ladies and labor for the elderly. And when it comes to labor for us healthy adult males, the historic stand of our trade unions is unequivocable: The less of it the better.

Look at the record. We used to average 60 hours of labor a week. But thanks to the unbending efforts of our antilabor labor leaders over the years, we now get less than 40. And if this trend continues, if our militant union negotiators continue to win reductions in the workweek at the present rate, I figure that by 1992, with luck, we'll all be unemployed.

"Huzzah!" you say. "Fight for unemployment!" you cry. Maybe so. But at the risk of being thought antiunion, I'd like to speak up in defense of labor. For one thing it saves work.

Take the way it is now. You've put in your 7 hours and 42 minutes at the office, chatting with the fellows, drinking lunch and maybe getting out a letter or two. So you're about to enter the door of your home. You loosen your tie, rumple your hair and affix a finely dramatic haggard look.

Oh, what a sympathetic welcome you receive. "Hush, dears, Daddy looks as though he's had a hard day." And: "I knew you were tired, darling, so I mixed the concrete and poured the new patio myself." And there you are, the hardworking provider, the male dominant, relaxing in the warm bosom of your grateful family.

But what, I ask you, lies in store for man when his workday is reduced, say, to a mere 2 hours and 37 minutes? Oh, rumple your hair all you want. Loosen your tie to the bitter end. Just try to look haggard as you enter the door. There's no question the welcome you'll receive: "What've you been in, a fight?"

Then there'll be dishes to do and diapers to change and toys to mend and * * *. Frankly, I'm physically exhausted just thinking about it.

So I say our great American antilabor labor movement has gone just about far enough. And it's time we men took a vigorous stand against the vicious trend toward shorter hours. Before we all wind up working ourselves to death.

Therefore, let us hasten to agree with the moralists that labor is ennobling. That growing things, building things or fixing things is essential to man's sense of purpose. That it brings him peace. At home, if nowhere else.

And in this spirit, let us all pause on this Labor Day, 1963, to salute the dedicated men and women of the American labor movement in our traditional American way: By taking the day off.

Not only is this the most fitting of our national observances, but it's got full popular support.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 6, 1963]

LOVE IS LOVELY, BUT HATE CONQUERS ALL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Excuse it if I seem to glow this morning. But our Love Everybody (Except Antarticans) Crusade has succeeded beyond our wildest dreams.

Frankly, all we modestly set out to do was save the world from the insidious Penguin conspiracy. We merely wished to warn patriotic Americans that Penguins are an internal threat which must not be stomached. And today, thanks to our work, no more Americans are swallowing either Penguins or their propaganda than there ever were.

But imagine our inner satisfaction to find we have not only saved the world, but we have spread joy and hope and purpose into many a barren life. Through hatred.

Yes, hating Penguins has enriched us all. Oh, I wish you could pore through the deluge of four letters which has come flooding into our Crusade headquarters. How your heart would be warmed by these testimonials. But you can't So I'll pore through them for you myself.

"For years," writes Mrs. J. B. S. of Coalinga, "I hated aimlessly. I hated, at various times, the Dodgers, women who use toothpicks, Alf M. Landon, my aunt's Persian cat and Man Mountain Dean. I had no purpose. No focus. Now I do. God bless you, sir."

The names of the others we have saved are legion. All three of them. There is Mr. P. McC. of San Francisco, who had lost faith in the eternal verities: "I had lost faith in the eternal verities, I felt Gibraltar was sinking. I felt that any day Herbert Hoover would be picked up for possessing an overlimit of trout." But today, needless to say, Mr. McC, equipped with a LE(EA)C badge and a burning hatred of Penguins, looks once again to the future with hope.

And think of all the old military men whose time hangs heavy. Take Assistant Patrol Leader R. A. D., BSA (retired), of Sacramento: "I have in my possession evidence so extensive as to be palpable! We must set up reading rooms across the Republic! We must infiltrate the PTA, the Cub Scout packs and the Little Leagues! We must be heard!" Oh, how good it is to see such born leaders happy and active once again.

But rest assured we answered the above letters right off the bat. "In these times of apathy and confusion," we wrote, our hearts full, "it is good to know that there is still an uncomplicated, genuine, moving human emotion which can stir men into marching forth on a Crusade, an emotion which unites rich and poor, an emotion in human affairs which yet transcends all others: pure hatred."

The fourth letter? Oh, that's from Miss L. C., a young girl in Palo Alto. "You are so very right, you can't save the world for nothing," she says in uncomplainingly enclosing her ten cents for a membership badge. "But," she asks, "are you sure you want to?"

I think I'll answer her letter some other day.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 4, 1963]

GOING NATIVE IN WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I cannot tell you with what deep relief it was that I escaped from Washington and returned to our civilized world. For I fear I was in grave danger of going native.

Yes, I myself almost joined that lost legion of friends who have disappeared into the impenetrable jungles of Washington never to be seen again in the real world. Good, decent men they were, but lured by some overpowering spell, they turned their backs on civilized ways to adopt the weird native customs and practice who-knows-what savage native rites.

What was this lure, I kept asking myself. What was this fascination? Now I know. And, oh, even yet how I shudder at the narrowness of my escape. I only hope my tale will not prove too harrowing for you.

I had been living among the Washingtonians for 10 days, observing their folkways for my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." And I was happily collecting notes for a chapter on The New Frontiersmen, the most savage of the indigenous tribes.

Now the New Frontiersmen wear pants and coats that don't match, have short-clipped hair, talk out of the corners of their mouth and worship "toughness." Their sole function, apparently, is to make the solons mad at the head of the Kennedy tribe. And while they succeed admirably in this, I have never been able to understand why they do it.

So in search of an answer I went to visit a minor young New Frontiersman who works in the White House and, though young and minor, is therefore considered by other natives to be omnipotent. During our conversation he, perhaps mistaking me for someone else, gave me a piece of inside information, to the effect that Subchief X was angry at Subchief Y.

I thought little of it at the time for, as you know, while inside information is the treasure most highly prized by the natives, it is absolutely valueless in the real world.

But that very evening I was at a native rite called "a diplomatic reception." During a lull in the ritual, I casually tossed out my piece of inside information. Immediately I was surrounded by natives. Where had I found this treasure? At the White House, I said. The White House.

There was a new respect in their tone, almost an awe. A native offered me a worthless bit of his inside information in return. Beauteous native maidens surrounded me. I was filled with a sense of power. I could

envision myself achieving the highest rank among the natives—an expert. There I would be, bedecked with pieces of inside information, rewarding my friends, punishing my enemies, revered, feared.

Oh, what a tremendous effort of will it took to break the spell. Oh, with what trembling fingers I packed and with what feverish eyes I fled. Even now, safe once again in the comforts of civilization, I fear to look back in my mind's eye. For I know what is the lure, the fascination, the spell for those thousands of poor lost souls who annually give up all and go native in Washington:

They think it's real.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 5, 1963]

SOUTH VIETNAM—A FIGHTING NATION

(By Arthur Hoppe)

The appointment of Mr. Lodge as Ambassador to South Vietnam has proved, if you ask me, a grave mistake. True, in a few short weeks he has finally united the long-squabbling South Vietnamese leaders. But unfortunately, they seem to have united against us.

President Ngo Dinh Diem, his brother, Mr. Nhu, and the charming Mme. Nhu now appear ready to bury the hatchet—in our head. And even the army, long the greatest force for nonviolence in Asia, at last stands ready to fight. "We," says the head general fiercely, "will crush any plot by international adventurers." Meaning us.

Poor Mr. Lodge. He keeps protesting that all we want is a little peace around there so we can get on with the war. But you know how it is when you step in and try to patch up a family argument. You're lucky to step out alive.

Thus I don't think we should have sent Mr. Lodge to Vietnam. I think we should have sent a domestic relations counselor instead.

Actually, this stroke succeeded admirably in the nearby nation of West Vhtnnng. It was in the 27th year of President Ngo Mahn Ngo's lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Viet-Narians with the loyal help of his brother Mr. Nu and Mr. Nu's lovely wife, the Dragon Lady. None of whom were speaking to each other, except in high-pitched screams.

Realizing that peace was essential to the war effort, our State Department cleverly withdrew our Ambassador, Mr. Frederick E. Nothing. And replaced him with Dr. J. L. Lornlove Pang, past vice president, NUFML.

It was a tense scene when Dr. Pang went to present his credentials (past vice president, National Union for Fruitful Married Love) at the palace. The loyal royal army ringed the grounds, grimly ready to fight against all U.S. interference—to their last Sherman tank.

But once inside, Dr. Pang felt right at home, professionally speaking. After throwing a bucket of water over Mr. Ngo, Mr. Nu, and the Dragon Lady, he tapped his fingertips together and said: "Friends, let us attempt to bring our little problems out into the golden light of love and understanding."

"Doctor," says Mr. Ngo, "You wouldn't believe it. Yesterday was definitely my day to have the army. But my freeloading brother drove off with it before I * * *."

"So sue me," says Mr. Nu. "At least I didn't use it to attack the enemy. You could wreck an army that way. And if there's anything we need around the house these days, it's an army. Right, love?"

"Don't speak to me, you rat," says the Dragon Lady. "You know that for Brotherhood Week you promised me everything—a division of secret police and 16 flamethrowers. And all you gave me was a lousy bottle of Arpege."

"Now, now, friends," says Dr. Pang, heaving another bucket of water. "I am sure we can work out all our little problems like adults. I would recommend a firm schedule so that each of you can have the army 2 days a week. And on Sundays you can all go to church together. Separate vacations are a must. As for the little lady, she should occupy her mind more with social affairs."

It worked fine. The Dragon Lady had all the Buddhist leaders to a mammoth barbecue frolic. The army, not having us to fight, lost its militancy and went back to writing sad love songs. And so blessed peace once again descended on West Vhtnnng, except for the war. But nobody in West Vhtnnng ever did give much of a hang about that.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 14, 1963]

CHISELERS HAD IT RIGHT, ALL ALONG

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Everybody is very much concerned with the poor people. People who cannot get jobs and really have it tough. But at last we people who do have jobs and live reasonably well are going to do something about it.

We're going to cut our taxes.

I know it's a terrible sacrifice, but I'm proud to report most Americans seem willing to make it. And even our Congressmen stand ready to go along. Let the chips fall where they may.

The idea is Mr. Kennedy's. He says that if we well-off Americans gird our loins and cut our taxes $11 billion, we'll all have so much extra money lying around that some of it's bound to wind up in the hands of the poor people.

Now I don't understand economics. But I believe this is what economists call the trickle down on them theory.

Personally, I'm highly in favor of the trickle down on them theory. The whole idea of paying less taxes in order to help the poor people is enough to make a devout humanitarian out of me.

But as a devout humanitarian, I wonder if our Government is going far enough. Do not we humanitarians have a duty as individuals to do our utmost on behalf of this humanitarian program? Say along about next April 15?

There you are, staring happily at your form 1040. Will you include your Basset hound in your list of dependents? Or won't you? Resist temptation, I say. Include him. Do you realize the $600 exemption you'll get for him is enough to supply 11,793 fishhooks to 47 hungry Navajo Indians in the Great Mojave Desert? Let us, at a time like this, think of others.

And, above all, be charitable. Especially when you get to "Charitable deductions" on page 2. Did you slip $20 into the poor box at your neighborhood church this year? Be magnanimous. Make it $200. Remember: It is far better to give on page 2 so as to receive on line 19, page 1 (tax due or refund). After all, the poor people are counting on your charity.

All the charity you can get away with.

Expense accounts? Profits and losses? Capital gains? Try to approach these subjects with a full heart, sympathy for the unfortunate, and two sets of books.

These are but a few of the modest sacrifices any humanitarian should be eager to make for the poor people. It is, after all, the least we can do. And I can only hope that there will be a few saints among us who will be so moved by the plight of our cold and hungry unemployed that they will make the supreme sacrifice, comparable to the self-immolation of the Buddhists: They'll pour gasoline over their form 1040's and set them afire.

So let's all pitch in and cheat like mad so the poor people can get jobs. Because under the trickle down on them theory the more we save on taxes the more things we buy, the more money our businessmen will have to install automation.

Ah, well, I never did understand economics. But I still like the trickle down on them theory. It seems to fit in so well with our whole humanitarian credo these days:

"Let your conscience be your guide. But don't get caught."

A Businessman Looks at the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the chairman of the board of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, addressed the antitrust law section of the American Bar Association in Chicago, Ill., on August 13, 1963, on the subject "A Businessman Looks at the Antitrust Laws." In reading the text of the speech, I was much impressed with the astute presentation of the subject, and I would like to share the pleasure and benefit of the speech with the Members of this body. Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BUSINESSMAN LOOKS AT THE ANTITRUST LAWS

(By Crawford H. Greenewalt)

You have asked me this afternoon to discuss the antitrust laws from the point of view of the businessman, presumably in a few well-chosen and fully informative words. In what I have come to regard as a moment of weakness, even of imbecility, I agreed to do so, being fully aware of the controversal character of the subject and of the emotional overtones frequently attaching to the mere use of the word "antitrust" in the business community. It makes my task no easier to recognize that controversy and emotional overtones appear equally characteristic of the Department of Justice and its attorneys. I think perhaps the reason I was willing to bare my head to blows from both sides is that in my view bias has been overdone and it is high time to search out areas of common accord and to define a sensible future policy. This, it seems to me, is much more constructive than the magnification of differences which identify businessmen and enforcement agencies as natural adversaries.

Perhaps at this point I might also introduce a caveat or two. I must, in the first place, speak as a businessman, hence as a legal layman. I cannot approach these problems in a legal sense since there are many aspects of the law and its administration that are outside the field of my own qualifications. I must also limit my comments to my own experience, which would make me an authority on antitrust law only to the extent that an unforunate pedestrian may be an authority on taxicabs. This is the posture from which I address you, and if my comments appear to be legally naive, I can only beg your indulgence.

First, I should like to make it very clear that I have for many years supported the basic antitrust statutes. I firmly believe that these laws are good laws, essential laws, and that they have been the instruments of preserving within the business community

the competitive environment which is the essence of a free economy.

GENERALITY IS ESSENTIAL

I agree, further, that the very generality of the original Sherman Act is one of its essential features, and I would oppose efforts to have the antitrust laws redrawn to prescribe for every conceivable condition of business conduct. Generality is in fact an absolute necessity if the laws are to perform their historic mission.

The reason is, of course, that the circumstances under which our competitive system operates are in a constant state of change. The law as it applies to most areas of men's affairs reflects the moral code of human experience, with values holding firm throughout the ages—murder is as abominable to us today as it was to the ancients; the dictates of the Ten Commandments are no less pertinent in the 20th century than they were to Moses. The constancy of human frailty requires a legal code which looks primarily at the past, hence justifying the many tomes in your libraries with their dreary tales of human misconduct and its consequences. Antitrust, however, must be more flexible and responsive to dynamic economic changes.

Apart from willful wrongdoing, however, the antitrust laws must, to be effective and just, look not to the past but to the present. They must adjust themselves constantly to the realities of the day.

Human nature may change little from generation to generation, but the conditions under which men buy, sell, and trade among one another differ constantly. And in no era has that change been so conspicuous or so sweeping as in the 75 years or so since the Sherman Act took its place among the laws of the land. The changes are fundamental and exist not only in degree but in kind. They have transformed the whole nature of competition and redefined the boundaries of the marketplace in every area of commerce.

COMPETITION HAS CHANGED

The competitive process in the 19th century was largely one of like versus like. The industries of the day produced the basic necessities and each in its own field was unchallenged: iron was iron, coal was coal, lumber was lumber, railroads were transportation. The function of each was well-known, plainly evident, and innovation was infrequent.

Today new materials and steady technical advances have fostered the growth of a functional competition far more intense than any form of intramural rivalry. There is scarcely a company today which does not face important competitive pressures from sources entirely outside its own field. Interchangeability of materials has created a wide latitude of choice, depending on price, availability, and service. It is a kind of competition in which no monopoly, legal or otherwise, can stand pat. The whole context of the term "monopoly" must be reexamined in the light of these new and revolutionary developments.

With the introduction of nylon, for example, we had a valid patent monopoly which permitted us to remain for a time its sole producer. All well and good, but we still had to persuade our ladies that garments made from nylon were better in price, or wear, or appearance than similar garments made from cotton, rayon, linen, wool, or other synthetics. Today there are more than 20 man-made textile fibers. Our patents permitted us to exclude others from the manufacture of nylon but they gave us no leverage over the consumer. In the marketplace we were on our own.

OUTMODED REVIEW

It is inevitable, in the competitive race as we know it today, that some portion of our industrial establishment will be superseded almost as a matter of yearly routine. Research is now a huge enterprise and every successful breakthrough changes the give and take of the marketplace. Research achievements simply refuse to recognize orthodox industrial boundaries. Last year's judicial view of the relevant market or line of commerce becomes outmoded as quickly as last year's hat.

Not long ago, for example, we brought out a new plastic called Delrin acetal resin. It competes with many other plastics, of course, but before we knew it, we ourselves, were competing vigorously in a new field previously more or less sacred to metals. Many articles previously die cast of zinc or aluminum are now injection molded using Delrin. We have also begun the fabriction of Delrin pipe and at last account we were making our weight felt in an area which at one time had considered pipe to be nothing more than steel in fabricated form.

On the other side of the coin, we recently introduced a new film called Tedlar PVF-polyvinylfluoride, which can be bonded to plywood or metal to form an almost impervious form of siding for frame housing. One of its principal victims, of course, if it finds widespread use will be the house paint business. If anyone here is unaware of the fact that Du Pont is a substantial producer of house paints, let me assure you that we are, and that competition among several branches of our company is nothing new or unusual.

Research is no respecter of persons, and if we can produce something better and demonstrate its merits to the consumer, so be it. In such ways does progress move to create new competitors where one least expects them. This is as it should be, for vigorous, forthright competition, whatever form it may take, is the strongest force in our economy, as has always been the case.

FUNCTIONAL COMPETITION

The full significance of supplantive or functional competition is perfectly clear to those in the business world who must cope with it day by day. It seems not to be well understood by those outside the business scene who appear still to consider competition in terms of identical products made by two or more manufacturers.

In the Du Pont case involving cellophane, for example, the charges levied against us grew out of our position in the field of cellulose film which the Antitrust Division saw as a single market. But to our sales force such a narrow construction of the competitive process was patently an illusion. To the man with the order pad, the rivalry he faced as he made his rounds was by no means confined to the cellulose film offered by other manufacturers but comprised a vast miscellany of all kinds of packaging materials—foil, tin, glass, waxed paper, "Saran", polyethylene, and many others. In this instance we were able to convince the courts of this economic truth, but the prosecution maintained its position throughout the proceedings.

It seems to me that monopoly and competition need redefinition. A monopoly of a chemically identifiable product may not be a monopoly at all in the marketplace. The competitive situation does not depend upon physical or chemical uniqueness; it depends upon functional equivalence. It seems to me that antitrust enforcement which fails to identify and keep pace with this dramatic transformation of the competitive process fails in its mission.

BIT OF FOLKLORE

There is another bit of antitrust folklore which needs reconsideration. This is the notion that small business and large are engaged in a David and Goliah struggle with the weak falling victim to the strong.

Yet the fact is that in today's world the large and small find coexistence not a truce but an alliance, with each mutually dependent upon the other. The larger firms, such as our own, are able to undertake the difficult and expensive development work beyond the capacity of the smaller concern. The small company, on the other hand, provides to the large the essential market for his product, without which it would find little meaning.

Small- and large-business men realize this genuine need for both, and work together closely in performing for the economy the roles best suited to their talents and resources. The public, too, has become well aware of the fact that size and virtue are not necessarily related either directly or inversely. Yet I am afraid that the old ghosts persist, disfiguring the image of truth.

END TRIAL BALLOONS

If I may use nylon once more as an example, the Du Pont Co. did indeed invent it and produce it as a textile fiber, a difficult task requiring many years of intensive research and the expenditure of many millions of dollars. When we faced the problem of marketing this new fiber we had perforce to rely upon the ingenuity, the self-interest, and the aggressiveness of literally hundreds of small concerns, each of whom saw an opportunity to make something new for his customers, and incidentally a profit for himself. Nylon today is used in literally hundreds of textile applications. This is not solely the result of the Du Pont Co.'s efforts but rather of cooperative market development involving us and many hundreds of smaller manufacturers. To be sure nylon has been profitable for the Du Pont Co., but I would suspect that the aggregate profits for the long chain of manufacturers reaching from us to the public would exceed ours many times.

To turn now to other antitrust areas, I would question the practice of burdening the courts with the kind of theoretical trial balloon unrelated to economic reality that we observe so frequently in the antitrust field. In a way it seems to me that this practice parallels the attitude sometimes attributed to the advertising profession of "running it up the flagpole to see who salutes." It seems to me that the process of haling someone into court simply to find out if some practice can be adjudged illegal betokens a very untidy notion of the law's intent. With the thorough press coverage which always appears to attend such excursions no corporation emerges unscathed from such misadventures whether in the final analysis it wins or loses.

Furthermore, the defendant who hears himself stigmatized by irrelevant allegations is comforted but little by the quiet withdrawal of the charges at a later period. I myself have had the sobering experience of hearing my children identified by a prosecutor as conspirators, and this at ages when they could scarcely spell the word.

ANTITRUST SHOULD FOSTER COMPETITION

I think also that the virtues of the Department of Justice can scarcely be properly appraised by reciting the number of cases brought to court. I have seen this gambit used on several occasions, particularly at budget time, but I would be disposed to judge the efficacy of the Department less by the mere recital of numbers than by identifiable accomplishments in fostering competitive enterprise.

It seems to me that everyone should agree that the mission of Government in the antitrust area is to administer the law in a way which will insure a vigorous, highly competitive industrial economy. If that is indeed the mission, it must inevitably embrace not solely the punishment of transgressors but more importantly the responsibility for determining at firsthand what a truly competitive system really comprises—in simple

words, why the battle is being fought and what victory will really produce.

This, clearly, is not solely a task for lawyers, since setting policy in this area requires many skills, much experience, much background in economics, and in the simple facts of the business scene. And such a policy must recognize the continually-changing character of the business arena within which the law is to be enforced.

I doubt that there is any substantial area of disagreement between the business community and the enforcement officers of the Antitrust Division on matters of broad policy. I am convinced that my own strong support of the antitrust statutes is shared by every thoughtful businessman. I think we all recognize the merits of a vigorous competitive system. If I am right, it would seem to me that the posture of the Antitrust Division and the business community should be one of mutual support and understanding, not of adversaries with fists clenched, wary and suspicious of each other's motives.

PRECISELY SIMILAR INTERESTS

Why not, then, recognize that the business community and the Antitrust Division have precisely similar interests in the maintenance of a competitive economy? Why not approach the task with cooperation and understanding? Why should not those charged with law enforcement and those charged with the operation of the business system share their problems to the end that enforcement efforts can be directed effectively, not blindly?

There will, of course, always be cases to be decided on their merits. So long as man is fallible, there will be transgressions in this as in every area of human affairs. To the extent that men transgress clearly established legal prohibitions, they should not of course escape either the penalties or the moral taint of their offense. Such cases, however, represent aberrations of human behavior related only incidentally to the major aims of the antitrust laws.

As to matters of principle lying within the field, there can be no point at issue provided that the ground rules are mutually understood. And it is in this area that I would hope that the enforcement arm and the business community may reach some meeting of minds.

The purpose of the law, I take it, is to referee the competitive scene in such a way as to achieve a meaningful democracy, a high level of economic prosperity and an ethical standard offensive to no man's conscience. We can all agree that these goals may be reached most directly through unimpeded access to the marketplace, through a competitive economy unencumbered by artificial restraints.

Granting these common aims, I see no reason why enlightened businessmen and the antitrust administrators cannot find mutual accord. Calm and realistic appraisals of conditions will accommodate all the economic necessities and at the same time preserve our traditions of equity and concern for human dignity. Through such common understanding it seems to me we may reach, in the words of St. Thomas Aquinas, "a just and artful suiting of means to ends."

Showing the Red Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the disorders here at the Capitol last week caused by so-called students, the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of September 15, 1963, is of interest.

SHOWING THE RED LIGHT

The outrageous rioting which broke up a congressional committee hearing in the Halls of the Nation's Capitol at Washington seemed like an echo of the recent past. It was. The repetition should drive home a few points for Americans concerned with the survival of our land.

The most notorious forerunner of Thursday's riot in Washington was the rioting which went on for parts of 3 days in May 1960 in San Francisco. That resulted in production of the film, "Operation Abolition," which was so revealing of Communist tactics and leftist gullibility that it brought on hysterical reaction from the left.

What happened inside the committee room at Washington followed the San Francisco pattern. Fortunately the rioting did not carry out into the streets, as it did in San Francisco.

There are important things to be learned from these examples about Communist tactics.

One is that the Communists are always ready to move in on any group or any movement which offers them a chance to incite trouble. In the San Francisco and Washington riots they used students—a favorite maneuver. Students are so eager to leap into a cause described as idealism, so volatile, and so plentiful. Their usual method—evident both at San Francisco and in the Cuba student affair which led up to the Washington riot—is to employ relatively youthful organizers who pose as students.

The Communists constantly aim to manipulate other groups. They are always trying to get into the rich field which labor unions and strikes offer for violence, disruption, and sabotage. Racial unrest provides another rich field, and the Communists are always plowing and sowing there. Anyone who thinks that the Communists don't try and sometimes succeed in these endeavors is too naive to be out alone.

Another essential point to be learned from these and other examples is that the aim of these Communist tactics is to disrupt, disorganize, and destroy civil authority and peaceful processes.

Some Americans seem willing to accept, even encourage, the Communists in the belief that the Reds are joining in good causes and will help to win good goals. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Communists do not get into a good cause to make it succeed. They get in to turn it to violence and break it up and try to prevent it from succeeding. At least they will prevent it from succeeding by peaceful means.

The Communists abhor peaceful social reform. Their faith is in a creed of revolution. Their dogma requires violence. It requires the destruction of civil organization, to make way for "the dictatorship of the proletariat." They're in earnest about that. Dictatorship—absolute tyranny—is exactly what they mean.

It is tragic that well-meaning Americans sometimes permit themselves to be used by the Communists in their drive to destroy order and civil organization in our country. Every American should be on guard to prevent himself from becoming their tool.

Whenever someone begins to plant the idea that peaceful methods are not enough, begins to talk about defying authority and disrupting the processes of order—that is the time to stop and begin to take a penetrating look at what is going on. We do not say that such suggestions always betray the presence of a Communist agitator—we did not say that at all and please don't try to read that into what we are saying. What we are saying is that when a movement or project or organization starts steering toward violence or "civil disobedience" or other form of disruption of order, the influence of Communists should be suspected as a possibility.

The Communists aim to fill America with as much disorder as possible. If we help them, we help to dig our own graves.

President Backed on Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a very distinguished observer and commentator on national and international affairs, a man who has served this Nation well and devotedly in a number of important positions, recently expressed his views on the importance of foreign aid in a letter to the editor of the New York Times. I include it in the RECORD, for it is simple in its analysis, cuts directly to the point and is worthy of further reading:

PRESIDENT BACKED ON AID—WARBURG LOOKS TO SENATE TO RESTORE CUT MADE BY HOUSE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I am sure you agree that the President needs and deserves support on the issue of foreign aid. There has never been a time when the maintenance of our foreign aid program has been more important, nor a time when our failure to live up to promises given would so damage our Nation's prestige. With the likelihood of war beginning to recede, economic assistance will become the free nations' best weapon of defense against Communist encroachment.

It is true that other prosperous free nations, notably Germany, should shoulder the great part of the burden, but this is all the more reason for us not to set a bad example at this time. Nor is this the time to allow partisan politics to jeopardize the Nation's security, prestige, and honor.

It is regrettable that the Republican House leadership used the party whip to enforce an almost solid vote to cut down the foreign aid recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee by almost $600 million. To say now that it was the President who injected partisan politics into the issue is, in the face of what happened, preposterous.

As for the 66 Democrats who regrettably joined the Republicans in their ill-advised attack upon this vital program, one can at least say that they voted as individuals and not as robots following a party line.

It is on the Republicans' side of the House that there has been a sudden change this year in the level of support for the foreign aid program. Over the years, on critical votes the program has been defended by about two-thirds of the Democrats and about one-third of the Republicans. This year the Democrats were, if anything, stronger than ever on the critical vote to defend the program, but only less than one-tenth of the Republicans resisted Representative HALLECK's misplaced pressure.

It was only after this demonstration that the President quite understandably expressed his concern and called for a return to bipartisanship on this issue. It is most urgently to be hoped that Republicans will now join with Democrats in the Senate to restore the irresponsible cut made by the House.

JAMES P. WARBURG.

GREENWICH, CONN., *August 31, 1963.*

Foreign Aid: The Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 30 there appeared a statement entitled "Foreign Aid: A Foolish Fantasy," containing a number of specific as well as general criticisms of the foreign aid program. These are the facts about each of the criticisms:

FACTS VERSUS FANTASY

Criticism: That Brazil has received $398 million in U.S. assistance in 1963 after promising "to do better."

Fact: The United States has agreed to provide additional assistance to Brazil only on condition that Brazil make certain specific internal reforms. Because Brazil has not yet taken the necessary first steps to carry out the agreement, the United States is withholding funds.

Criticism: U.S. radar equipment has been made available to India.

Fact: Equipment from deactivated radar sites became excess to U.S. Air Force requirements, and subsequently was made available for use in the military assistance program. Some of this equipment will be supplied to India as well as other countries receiving military assistance. By utilizing such excess equipment wherever practicable, the military assistance program is able to increase more economically total free world defense capabilities.

Criticism: U.S. aid is being provided to 104 countries, including "many Communist countries."

Fact: U.S. economic assistance is highly concentrated in those key countries with the most promising prospects for development. Eighty percent of all U.S. economic aid is going to 20 countries. Forty-five countries receive less than 10 percent of American aid. Nearly all of these are in Africa, where small, limited aid programs can have a very good influence on the development of these new countries. No foreign aid dollars are being spent in Communist countries. This is specifically forbidden by law unless the President finds that such assistance is vital to U.S. security.

PERSONNEL FIGURES

Criticism: AID has 64,508 employees.

Fact: The Agency for International Development has about 13,000 employees under direct hire. Another 8,000 people—including 4,000 foreign nationals paid in local currencies from trust funds to which cooperating countries also contribute, employees of contractors performing under AID contracts, and personnel from other U.S. Government agencies—also are engaged in economic assistance programs.

The 64,000 personnel figure comes from adding people not employed by AID, including about 23,000 students from foreign countries participating in training programs under AID and Defense Department auspices—about two-thirds of these students are receiving training under Defense Department programs—and approximately 21,000 personnel engaged in our military assistance program. This includes about 10,000 military personnel engaged in training and assistance to free world military forces, and approximately 7,000 foreign nationals paid in local currencies.

Criticism: Six hundred technical aid projects in one country, and more ready to be started before completion of the existing ones.

Fact: The total number of active AID projects all over the world is less than 2,200. This figure includes active projects for which 1964 funds are being requested, projects with unobligated balances as of March 31, 1963, for which 1964 funds are not requested, and active Alliance for Progress and development loan projects included in the fiscal year 1964 request.

VIETNAM

Criticism: A highway in Vietnam on which the cost skyrocketed from an original estimate of $18 million to more than $129 million before completion.

Fact: The $18 million figure and the $129 million figure did not relate to the same construction. The $18 million figure apparently refers to a bid submitted by a contractor in 1956 for construction of a limited amount of road and bridge work in Vietnam. Prior to execution of a definitive contract, a substantial change in construction priorities was effected because of overriding military and economic requirements. This resulted in a much larger construction program and ultimate cost figure. However, even the higher cost figure does not approximate the $129 million figure, which presumably includes not only the construction contract, but also a number of other Vietnam highway projects. The $129 million figure also includes both dollars and local currency. Moreover, indications now are that the final costs will be considerably less—$104,641,000 including dollars and Vietnamese funds.

Criticism: A fertilizer plant in Taiwan, started with foreign aid money and estimated to cost $34 million, which was inoperable because equipment did not meet the specifications for the desired operations.

Fact: The fertilizer plant referred to has been completed and is operating at rated capacity. There were considerable delays because of mechanical and design deficiencies. Full production was achieved in July 1961. The final dollar cost was about $31 million, considerably higher than the original estimates. Annual output of fertilizer is saving the Taiwan economy about $8 million a year in foreign exchange and making an important contribution to the country's agricultural productivity.

Criticism: Radio towers installed in Saigon which had not been put in operation because their utility was undetermined and their location in doubt.

Fact: This refers to a complex of seven stations of Radio Vietnam for which U.S. assistance was provided. The criticism grows out of the fact that in 1958 and 1959 there were some delays in completion of the project growing out of United States-Vietnamese differences in interpretation of original agreements as to where certain equipment should be located. These differences were completely resolved by May 4, 1960. For some time the seven stations of Radio Vietnam have been completely operational. Radio Saigon broadcasts news bulletins and reviews, informational programs on handicrafts, business and commerce, civic education, and science and technology. It also includes English language instruction.

Criticism: $3.1 million for an air-conditioned yacht for the Emperor of Ethiopia.

Fact: In 1960, the Department of Defense, under the military assistance program, loaned to the Government of Ethiopia a World War II seaplane tender for use as the flagship of the Ethiopian Navy. As a flagship, it contains quarters for flag officers, or the Emperor as commander in chief. It is air conditioned since air conditioning is considered necessary for that part of the world. One basic use of the ship is as a training vessel for the Ethiopian Navy. A significant part of the $3.1 million cost of refitting the ship was to make possible its use as a training vessel. The Department of Defense maintains important military communications facilities in Ethiopia as part of its worldwide network.

Criticism: $400,000 for battery-powered TV sets in remote jungle villages—merry-go-rounds driven by children would recharge the batteries.

Fact: This contract was terminated before the funds were spent. The purpose of the TV sets was to provide widespread inexpensive communications with outlying villages in order to overcome the immense difficulties of ordinary communication and to provide methods for beginning education of inhabitants of such villages. Consideration was given to a variety of techniques for recharging the batteries. One proposal was the use of primitive merry-go-round systems as a method of generating power for the batteries, somewhat similar in principle to the familiar "merry-go-round" used throughout the world to raise water for wells by hitching oxen to a primitive pump system.

AFRICA

Criticism: Independence Day gifts to African countries from the President's contingency fund.

Fact: During fiscal years 1960 through 1962, the United States presented Independence Day gifts to 18 countries at a total cost of $1.006 million, or an average of $56,000 per country. The practice of independence day gifts is followed by other major countries such as France, Germany, and often the United Kingdom. The usual U.S. gifts were bookmobiles, mobile health units or mobile film units, often accompanied by medicines, books, or films and services of American technicians. The principal reason for use of the contingency fund in these cases is that in most instances independence was formally proposed, sought, and granted within a few months, making it impossible to predict the date of independence far in advance. The goodwill generated and the useful-

ness of these gifts are large in relation to the relatively moderate cost involved in each case.

Criticism: Gifts to Guinea and Mali, because of their changing political attitudes, from the contingency fund.

Fact: U.S. assistance from the contingency fund to Guinea and Mali was designed to take timely advantage of situations—of changing political attitudes—in order to further the U.S. objective of helping these countries to become more independent of the Sino-Soviet bloc and more politically oriented toward the West. These assistance efforts were not merely "gifts"—they were programs carefully designed to meet specific needs in the countries involved.

INDONESIA

Criticism: $5.6 million to Indonesia for completion of a road to an athletic stadium from the President's contingency fund.

Fact: This refers to the so-called Djakarta bypass, which was not a road to an athletic stadium, but rather a road connecting the port of Djakarta with important internal highways linking Djakarta with other parts of the island of Java. The Indonesians requested speedup of completion of the road which comes at one point within 5 miles of the athletic stadium. The United States agreed to speed up completion, thus requiring use of $2.7 million, not $5.6 million, contingency funds in order to finance the work at an increased rate of speed. However, the United States insisted and Indonesia agreed that any cost increase over the previously estimated cost of the highway would be met by the Indonesian Government.

Criticism: The shipping of millions of dollars worth of navigational equipment to countries incapable of using it.

Fact: It is true that countries were incapable of using the equipment when it arrived. What is not made clear is that the equipment was only part of the program—the other main purpose being training of locals in the effective use and maintenance of the equipment. Many of these programs have been very successful, are being satisfactorily operated and maintained by local personnel, and are of great assistance to safer and more efficient air transportation by international as well as local travel, including U.S. airlines.

Criticism: Supplying enough rifles to one country so that each soldier could have, on the average, 1½ rifles and programing enough rifles and carbines in another country to provide an average of two weapons per soldier.

Fact: A quick glance at the MAP congressional presentation books in 1961 would have indicated that these charges were true. However, what the book did not show was that in 1961 country A, 11,000 carbines were furnished under the MAP to arm partially two paramilitary groupings—a rudimentary national guard and civilian militia—for combating Communists guerrillas in outlying areas. Since they are not part of the regular Military Establishment and not normally supported by MAP, these paramilitary groups were not included in the "active military forces" shown in the congressional presentation documents. In this country, weapons furnished under MAP to both the active military forces and to the paramilitary units have not even totaled one per man.

The charge of two rifles per man was based on a typographical error in the MAP congressional presentation document for the country in question. The document showed a total cumulative program of 1,947 rifles and a MAP supported force of only 1,200 men. The latter figure should have been 2,200 men. The information was corrected and supplied to the committe for the hearing on March 29, 1962, but was not reflected in the subcommittee report.

AIRCRAFT

Criticism: Planes to supply additional aircraft to a country with a shortage of trained pilots.

Fact: As in the case of navigational equipment, it is true that there were not enough trained pilots to fly the aircraft planned for delivery to the country in question. Again, the assistance program included transitional training of pilots familiar with other aircraft—the only effective way in which pilots could be trained for the new aircraft. The country now has more than enough trained pilots to man the aircraft provided.

Criticism: Fighter planes and a loan to an African country to buy jet airliners.

Fact: The country referred to is Ethiopia which received jet fighters under the military assistance program in 1959. These fighter planes are being effectively used by the Ethiopian Air Force and saw important and effective duty during the recent Congo crisis. The jet aircraft referred to probably consist of two jet airlines which the Ethiopian Government purchased with the assistance of an Export-Import Bank loan and with collaboration of Ethiopian Airlines and the Boeing Co. The jets were purchased to replace two DC-6B's on European flights and some African routes. An expanded African network and anticipated traffic growth are expected to maintain adequately a load factor for the aircraft. These two jets were not financed with funds under the foreign assistance program.

KOREA

Criticism: Pouring into Korea $200 million a year, which is beyond the capacity of the country's economy to absorb productively or of its Government to administer efficiently, the result of which has been to encourage corruption and hamper development.

Fact: After years of recovery from the war Korea has now begun to move ahead economically. Grant aid to finance Korean imports has been reduced by half, putting pressure on Korea to expand exports and to budget prudently. Financing for capital development projects now is provided almost entirely through loans, Korean tax collections have been improved, and Korean national attention has been focused sharply on planned economic development. United States and European investors are becoming interested in Korea for the first time. The Korean economy is fully able to absorb effectively present and planned levels of U.S. assistance.

Criticism: The transfer of military funds to the contingency fund, and then a further transfer to economic programs.

Fact: This transfer was made at the end of fiscal year 1962 to meet unanticipated urgent economic assistance requirements. Such transfers are specifically authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act. Under section 610 of that act, the President, whenever he determines it "to be necessary for the purposes of this act," may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available for any provision of the act to funds made available for any other provision of this act.

CONTRACTING AND EVALUATION

Criticism: One thousand 23-inch television sets were ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped countries overseas at a cost of $400,000 for areas with no electric power supply.

Fact: This refers to a contract which a congressional committee investigated at great length last year. Criticism by the committee was directed at weaknesses in AID contracting and evaluation techniques on this program, rather than the purpose for which the program was undertaken—that is, to provide relatively inexpensive and far-reaching methods of communication and education in underdeveloped countries. The contract was terminated early in 1963. Negotiations are now proceeding to determine whether there will be any cost to the United States. The agency, with the guidance of the committee, has improved its contracting for research and development procedures to insure that such weaknesses do not recur.

Criticism: Foreign aid funds were used to buy suits for undertakers in Greece.

Fact: This charge was raised in 1957 and 1958. It has no basis in fact. Procurement records in Greece show no AID-financed procurement of clothing of any kind, except footwear for the army. Civilian clothing, as a matter of policy, has always been ineligible for AID financing in Greece.

Criticism: U.S. aid to Kenya was used to buy extra wives for government officials.

Fact: A traders loan program was undertaken by the Kenyan Government in 1953 and 1954 to provide a fund for loans to traders and small manufacturers in a program analogous to the U.S. Small Business Administration. During this period, before any U.S.-owned funds were made available for the program, one trader did borrow approximately $600 and then used the funds to buy a wife. As a result of this incident, extremely tight controls for supervision of the traders loan program were set up. No such incident occurred after U.S.-owned funds were contributed to the program in 1955. The traders loan program has been quite successful, and repayment has been completely satisfactory.

Criticism: A stockbreeding farm was erected in Lebanon with U.S. aid. Nine stalls were built for each bull.

Fact: This apparently refers to an animal husbandry demonstration program during 1953 to 1957 in Lebanon. A barn was built to house a herd of approximately 30 cows and 15 bulls. During a

good part of the year, most of the bulls were transported from village to village to be used in a program to improve the caliber of native livestock. It is therefore possible that at any point in time there might not have been enough bulls in the central barn to fill all the stalls. This program successfully demonstrated the greatly increased productivity possible with better caliber livestock. As a result of this program and a subsequent program using artificial insemination, livestock in many villages was significantly improved. After observation of this program, Lebanese dairy farmers began themselves to import high quality livestock. A thriving dairy industry was developed to provide Lebanese cities with reasonably priced wholesome milk.

Criticism: The Peace Corps sent a man, his wife, and nine children to the Philippines. One-way fare cost $13,190. The Corpsman's salary is $10,190.

Fact: This is substantially correct. The $13,190 includes cost of transportation of effects and household goods as well as one-way fare for the employee and his family. The employee was appointed as executive officer of the Philippines Peace Corps operation. This assignment includes responsibility for coordination of administrative efforts with the AID mission, supervision of the Peace Corps' own administration in Manila, and liaison with the American Embassy. The position of executive officer requires a person with a high degree of leadership quality and the ability to work well with the Philippine people.

MAJORITY SUPPORT FOREIGN AID

The remainder of the statement consists of the individual views and opinions of the speaker in question. Those views must be judged on their merit, as compared with the views of others with knowledge and experience in the subject. To begin with, they must be compared with the view of three Presidents of the United States, three Secretaries of State, and three Secretaries of Defense, all of whom have given stanch support to foreign aid. They must be compared with the views of a majority of the Members of Congress, as reaffirmed year after year for 15 years during which Congress has voted for the aid program. They must be compared, in fact, to the majority views of the American people, who, according to public opinion polls, support foreign aid more strongly today than ever.

Foreign aid is not a perfectly designed and executed program, but there is waste and inefficiency in every large organization, whether it be a Government agency or a private corporation. Look at the tremendous waste and inefficiency in the Ford Motor Co. in the failure of the Edsel. Mistakes are human, and both the foreign aid program and the Ford Motor Co. are operated by human beings.

Great improvements have been made in the design and administration of foreign aid in the past several years. Much remains to be done. But the foreign aid program needs to be strengthened rather than curtailed, and improved rather than restricted. The repetition of old and insignificant criticisms does not contribute toward the kind of constructive criticism of foreign aid which Congress needs to provide in order that the program can be strengthened and improved.

Paddling for Demonstrators and Riotous Beatniks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry S. Truman has a good remedy for demonstrators, student riots, and self-righteous beatnik freedom riders.

The Federal Government must encourage law and order at the local level, or a breakdown of local and State law enforcement by demonstrations will lead to national anarchy.

Pink beatniks and Harlem hepcats who demonstrate in congressional committee rooms and hurl liquor bottles at police today tomorrow may demonstrate against the Armed Forces of the United States.

The following Associated Press story was taken from the September 15 issue of the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C.:

PADDLING FOR YOUNG DEMONSTRATORS URGED

(By Harry Truman)

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—"If northern busybodies would stay at home and clean up their own backyards, the rest of the country will obey its laws," former President Harry S. Truman said Saturday night.

In a speech prepared for 1,200 persons at a $100-a-plate dinner honoring Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, the former Chief Executive spoke out on recent demonstrations.

In his usual blunt style, he said: "These youngsters who are running around the country trying to institute mob rule were raised under the nutty theory of let the child grow like a weed with no home discipline. It is a lazy way to raise a family.

"These young rioters were not spanked enough as they grew up. The police should be furnished with nice old-fashioned butter paddles and be authorized to use them in the place intended for spanking on such demonstrators as interrupted the House Committee on Un-American Activities committee hearing in Washington and the so-called sit-ins in the mayor's office in New York."

Truman said we are living in a very turbulent age in world history.

"The argument on civil rights has been stirred up by Boston and New England demagogs just as the War Between the States was brought about by Harriet Beecher Stowe and William Lloyd Garrison," he asserted.

The dinner was designed to raise $100,000 for Senator YOUNG's reelection campaign if he should run again in 1964.

YOUNG, 73, continued to keep Democrats guessing, but Truman left no doubt the Senator would seek reelection.

"I wouldn't have come all the way if I didn't think so," the 79-year-old former President said.

Dallas Editorial Points Out Failure of Kennedy Tax Bill To Meet Test of Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the September 13 issue of the Dallas Morning News, pointing out the irresponsibility of trying to cut taxes without cutting spending:

POCKET CHANGE?

The public will have a couple of extra dollars in weekly pay envelopes, we are told, if both Houses of Congress act favorably on the tax-cut bill approved by the House Ways and Means Committee. The Treasury estimates that the average American family will receive $2 to $4 of extra take-home pay every week.

Sounds nice, but don't count on it.

The two-stage, $11 billion tax cut approved by the committee may not be as rosy as it has been made to look. Tax reforms written into the measure will nullify some of the gains. Inflation, resulting from the huge built-in deficit which would accompany such a tax cut, is likely to wipe out the rest.

Before this tax-cut bill won approval, GOP members of the committee offered two sensible amendments. They proposed that the second stage of the cut—a $4 billion reduction affecting 1965 incomes—not go into effect if President Kennedy's budget for next year exceeded $98 billion, or if the current year's deficit exceeded $8 billion.

Rejection of these amendments by administration lieutenants on the committee is a tipoff that Mr. Kennedy has no intention of keeping Federal spending down. Mr. Kennedy had promised that he could reduce spending next year and that the tax cut would produce enough revenue to prevent an extraordinary deficit.

These promises apparently were hollow. If they had any substance, there would have been no need to fear the amendments. Their rejection indicates that already the administration intends to boost spending next year and produce a deficit in excess of $8 billion.

In the year before Mr. Kennedy moved into the White House, there was a Federal surplus of $1.2 billion. In the 3 years since, there have been annual deficits averaging $6.5 billion. Before the New Frontiersmen began managing our funds, there was a Federal debt of $286 billion. Today that debt is $305 billion, and it's going up.

Interest on the debt alone has increased by $1 billion in the last 3 years—a phenomenal rise of 9.2 percent.

The theory behind a tax cut without reduced spending is that we, as a nation, can spend ourselves rich. New Frontier advocates of the theory seem to think that this is something new, that in it they have found the economic philosopher's stone. They have not. The theory is an old one which we have been trying over and over again for a number of years.

Experience proves it does not work. Taxes, of course, are too high and should be cut. But there is only one reason for high taxes. And that is high spending.

Once spending is reduced, a tax cut would be automatic. And that would be the honest way to put more dollars into the pay envelopes of Mr. and Mrs. America.

Values in a Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School, in a talk at the University of Utah a short time ago made some very direct observations with respect to recent Supreme Court decisions.

The Wall Street Journal on September 11, 1963, gave a summary of his speech in its article "Review and Outlook," which follows:

VALUES IN A VACUUM

"I have no doubt myself that the (first amendment), as written and adopted, intended that there should be no libel or defamation law in the United States under the U.S. Government, just absolutely none so far as I am concerned."

That is the stated view of Mr. Justice Black, and it reflects a way of thinking which has found no little favor both inside and outside the Supreme Court. Though it has not yet brought an actual ruling that all libel and slander laws are unconstitutional, this "no law means no law" philosophy has affected judicial decisions ranging over a number of other significant issues and promises to influence more.

So it may be useful, as the Supreme Court prepares to start a new session, to recall some remarks of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School, made at the University of Utah early this year; he finds scant merit in the Court's frequently absolutist approach to constitutional questions.

Justice Black's literal-minded approach may sound at first like a commendably strict interpretation of the Constitution, since the amendment explicitly says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." Yet the result of a rigid application of the words "no law" is to leave out most of the considerations needed for a correct interpretation of the Constitution.

That result could hardly be more startlingly clear than in the cases of prayer recitations and Bible readings in the schools. Not surprisingly, the Court decisions have given tremendous impetus to moves to eradicate all traces of religion from the schools and from all manifestations of public life as well—even to such ridiculous extremes as banning a stanza of "America" because it refers to God.

As Dean Griswold observes (and these columns have said), this sort of thing is an affront to the long religious tradition so deeply entwined in our history. "Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchinson, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history?" It is an affront to the religious instincts and concepts of the writers of the Constitution themselves.

Still, the Constitution says "no law." But to focus on those words exclusively is to miss the others and hence the whole context. Who shall make no law? Congress. No law about what? "An establishment of religion." Which means, if history means anything, state religion such as existed in a number of places in America at the time the first amendment was adopted. That is what the Constitution forbids.

Congress has in fact made no law respecting an establishment of religion, and local recommended prayer and Bible readings have nothing to do with the Constitution and no business before the Supreme Court. Ironically, however, a supposedly strict construction of the Constitution turns out to be a profound misreading of it.

In view of the consequences, it's also perhaps worth speculating how such attitudes develop. Obviously much depends on the particular thinking of individual justices, but that thinking is not divorced from the temper of the times.

In recent times, among other things, America's traditional tolerance toward minorities has shown a tendency to get twisted; if a person is a member of a minority his rights are sometimes alleged to be superior to the majority's by virtue of his minority status. Thus it is not enough for a child of atheist parents to remain silent or leave the room during voluntary prayer reading; the religious expression of the majority must be stamped out for his sake.

This is plainly a perversion of any rational concept of equal rights and religious freedom, not to mention good manners. Dean Griswold recalls visiting Tunisia, where the overwhelming majority is Moslem.

"While there, I expected to comply with their laws and customs. They are a tolerant people, and did not seek to compel me to participate in any of their religious observances. But it would have seemed most inappropriate to me to have taken advantage of their tolerance and to have sought to interfere with their customs simply because they were not mine." In this country we seem to be losing a sense of the fitness of things.

Another part of the current climate is the existence of a paradox embedded in the so-called absolutist approach in a period noted for "relativism." When people speak of "relativistic" values prevailing today, they mean that many individuals no longer look for guidance as they once did to the authority of supernatural beliefs or the standards of conduct of the civilized past.

But to cut oneself or one's society off, to say the past has no relevance to the present, the lessons of experience are meaningless to today—surely this is an absolutism of its own. Exactly the kind of absolutism which results in focusing on a couple of striking words to the exclusion of the meaning of the Constitution and the continuity of history and tradition.

To that extent the Supreme Court is reflecting more general attitudes in sociology, economics, and politics. But the prevalence of those attitudes does not make them healthy onces. Not the least of the troubles with such "relativistic absolutism" is that it represents an intellectual emptiness. And political authority no less than nature abhors a vacuum.

The Legion Versus Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in their recent convention at Miami Beach, Fla., the American Legion labeled Castro the Nation's No. 1 concern. It is encouraging to the Congress to know that our veterans feel so strongly about the Communist cancer that continues to grow in Cuba, and threatens to spread its infection through the whole Western Hemisphere. The Legionnaires feel that we have watched developments in Cuba long enough, and they demanded that we proceed boldly to force communism from our doorstep. I echo their plea, and urge tha the Congress take positive steps to exert leadership in bringing an end to Castro and Red tyranny in Cuba.

In the September 14, 1963, edition of the Miami Herald appears an editorial concerning the stand taken by the American Legion in their convention. I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE LEGION VERSUS CASTRO

The American Legion and the President of the United States obviously don't see eye to eye on the Cuban question.

The Legion ended its convention with a demand that we proceed boldly to root out communism at our doorstep. The President replied that we have done all we can—and comunism is still there.

The Legion considers Castro the Nation's No. 1 concern. Our failure to do anything more now than watch developments, their speakers declared, dims our image in a troubled world.

In expressing this opinion so forcefully the Legion lived up to its traditional role of watchdog over the Nation's defenses.

In the same vein the veterans demanded assurance that our security will not be threatened by approval of the test ban treaty.

Most Americans will agree with those stands.

The convention, as always, was a wholesome ventilation of national affairs before the men who fought for their country and are willing, if necessary, to do so again.

Whether we agree with their position wholeheartedly or not, their voice is potent.

It was good to have the veterans here for their annual get-together with all its color and tradition.

Their conventions here over the years have made the Legionnaires good friends, and so we know, as they head for home, that they will come again.

Words, Words, but No Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the San Diego (Calif.) Union on September 13, entitled "Era of Wishful Thinking." This editorial is demanding action instead of words, and calls for a firm foreign policy that cannot be mistaken by the Russians. I commend it to you for your consideration, as follows:

WORDS, WORDS, BUT NO ACTION

We are in an era of wishful thinking.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the American Legion Convention in Miami that the United States is going to employ "appropriate measures" to rid Cuba of Russian troops and to bring about more peaceful conditions in the world.

"Appropriate measures" must be secret weapons, however, as neither Secretary Rusk nor the President has disclosed to the American people how he intends to go about inducing the Soviet Union to withdraw its military forces from Cuba and lift the Red

threat bearing down upon so much of the world.

We plead to sit down with our enemies and criticize those who are fighting against them.

In his talk on foreign policy, Secretary Rusk emphasized the ways in which the United States and the Soviet Union could work closer together, if the Russians were so inclined, but the absence of alternatives leaves us, of course, with no plans in event of Communist refusal to cooperate.

His principal points were that if the Russians would permit inspections, we might be able to reduce armaments, that the points of disagreement over Berlin should be settled, and that if the Soviet Union only realized it, its larger interest would best be served by strengthening the peacemaking powers of the United Nations.

If Communists just wouldn't be Communists, everything would be all right. Thus, the success of our policy for stemming the tide of atheistic communism seems to be based on the degree to which the Russians will grant us concessions. As the old saying goes, that's a heck of a way to run a railroad.

The United States is in the hands of an administration which places great faith in words. It rode to power on words. Words have spilled in endless waves across the land, engulfing principles and choking debate.

It is even difficult, through the haze of confusing and meaningless phrases, to remember we are in a cold war, that the Communists were out to bury us, and still are, and that the Monroe Doctrine pledged us to prevent foreign military intervention in the Western Hemisphere.

We are against trouble over Berlin, but the wall went up; we are against Communist domination of Laos, but that is what we are getting. We are against Communist troops in Cuba, but they are still there. We are happy to accept a nuclear test ban treaty that eases the pressure on our enemies. We presume we also are against sin.

The Copley newspapers believe the time for just talking is long past. These newspapers are concerned with the lack of purpose in our national leadership. They are concerned with the administration's belief that if it can wait things out, everything may turn out good. But for whom?

We are told we must be realistic. That is an excuse for inaction. We are told our goal should be to make the world safe for diversity. That is a new word for coexistence.

As for moving ahead in the fateful struggle between freedom and slavery, nothing is proposed, and nothing happens. Trying to find out the points on which we and the Soviet Union can agree is just a mask for finding the path to appeasement.

That's where we came in three decades ago. Since then, there have been two great wars and communism has seized a third of the world.

Peace in our time is not going to be won or held with bright sayings and high hopes. Or self delusion.

The Copley newspapers and millions of Americans await a leadership that will lead.

The Civil Defense Shelter Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the civil defense shelter development program contained in H.R. 8200 which will come before the House this week.

All the discussions about a nuclear test ban treaty and a hot line between Moscow and Washington should not in any way lessen our interest in protecting American citizens against fallout in the event of an enemy attack. Our past experience indicates just how far we can trust those who would destroy us. Pearl Harbor may be dimming in our memory, but the missile buildup in Cuba certainly is not. Just a year ago Russian arms were deployed in Cuba for a possible attack on the United States. Cuba is still an all-important problem. There are others around the world which indicate that today as ever we must keep our guard up. In this nuclear age we must be ready for action at any time. There will be no second chance to get ready. Preparedness is the only answer to the threat. The survival of the United States demands that we take action to protect our population against nuclear fallout. The shelter program in H.R. 8200 would provide a margin of safety for millions of Americans.

The Steps of a Good Man Are Ordered by the Lord

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. (TIC) FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Georgia is justly proud of the late Honorable Bryant T. Castellow, who was a most distinguished lawyer, prosecuting attorney, and Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have the privilege of representing the congressional district referred to, and I know the pride the people have because of the service of this great man. He had the marked ability to look into the future, and he was one of the first to oppose centralized goverenment unbridled spending and meddling in foreign affairs. His prophecies concerning the changes in our Government are now known to have been wisely inspired.

The Cadle Call, a magazine published at Indianapolis, Ind., carried in its September 1963 issue a splendid editorial entitled "The Steps of a Good Man Are Ordered by the Lord—Psalm 37:23." This good man referred to in the article is the Honorable Bryant T. Castellow. Mr. Castellow was a great American in every respect and his stature increases over the years, following the true pattern of greatness. I am pleased that a responsible Christian magazine in Indiana saw fit to pay tribute to the life of a citizen from my district in such glowing terms.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE STEPS OF A GOOD MAN ARE ORDERED BY THE LORD (PSALM 37:23)

(By Gerald Walker)

He stood before the Members of the House of Representatives, delivering a speech, and spoke with a clear, ringing voice.

"At a time when the world is full of false propaganda, when error parades in the guise of truth, and deception flows with the freedom of the winds, even wisdom itself is subjected to a crucial test," he declared. "Never did a ship need a rudder as human beings need God."

The eloquent speaker was Hon. Bryant Thomas Castellow, Representative of Georgia's Third Congressional District. The year was 1936.

Mr. Castellow had been a Congressman for 4 years. He had been persuaded to run for office in 1932 by citizens of his home State. Feeling that he could be of service to the people, and being a man who moved always in the direction of what he considered to be his duty, Mr. Castellow went to Washington. And he went with one purpose in mind—to help people.

His thoughtfulness and concern for other people had become evident when he was a youngster. He lived in one of the poorer sections of the country. His family was but one of the many struggling against poverty.

When he was only 13, his father died, leaving him and his mother and sister to provide for themselves.

His mother began teaching school to support her children. Although they worked hard, the family had to practice careful economy to get by on their small income.

In spite of the difficulties, Mr. Castellow managed to keep up his studies and continue his education. Part of that education was made up of the truths of the Bible taught by his mother, and the influence of his father's strong faith. When he was a young man, he became a teacher—then principal of a small Georgia school—the same school where his mother and sister taught, where he was admired and respected by all.

He was admitted to the bar in 1897 and began practicing in Fort Gaines, Ga. Mr. Castellow was a great attorney, and soon built a successful, thriving practice. He became noted for his skill in handling difficult cases with integrity and fairness.

In 1900 he became solicitor of Clay County Court—a year later he was judge. In 1913 he became solicitor general of the Pataula judicial circuit—a position he kept for almost 20 years.

Mr. Castellow was elected to Congress in 1932. He was a successful legislator in that he wrought into law the principles in which he believed. Mr. Castellow made no play for public favor. He assisted in all bills he could conscientiously endorse, but jeopardized his political career on several occasions by voting "No" to those he felt were not in the best interests of the people. As he expressed it, "No reputable physicians will prescribe candy for a sick child when he knows the child needs castor oil."

At the end of his second term, fully aware that he was powerless to stop the measures being passed which he felt were serious mistakes, he voluntarily retired to private life.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1962, his successor described him as "one of the great men of this age. He was far ahead of his time. He eloquently warned against many of our foreign entanglements, the danger arising from a centralized government, and particularly he warned against excessive Federal spending. All the predictions made by this learned and dedicated man have certainly come to pass."

After his 5 years in the U.S. House of Representatives, Mr. Castellow became a world traveler and big game hunter. He took two trips around the world, and spent much time hunting in the jungles of Africa. Wherever he traveled, he made friends with missionaries and religious leaders. His fine collection of trophies and mementos from over the world prove him as a man of strength and patience. He was eager to learn from each experience. "I always take plenty of time for everything," he often said.

Mr. Castellow's only child is a lovely daughter named Gertrude. She was greatly devoted to her father. He had the privilege of introducing her to her future husband the Honorable A. L. Ford, Congressman from Mississippi.

Years after his first wife died, he married a college music instructor. Even after her retirement, she taught select students in her home. She and Mr. Castellow loved and understood each other. She shared his deep, unmoving faith, and their life together was serene and happy. "All of my memories are happy ones," she says. "Together we were thankful for everything." Their friends described their marriage as one of togetherness. "He was never thought of apart from you and you were never thought of apart from him," a friend said.

Bryant Thomas Castellow possessed a talent for living. Although he lived quietly, seeking no recognition, he never stopped helping other people whenever and wherever he could. He did much as a philanthropist that no one ever knew about until after his death. He was that kind of man.

His colleagues knew him "as a person of superior character and intellect. The profoundest minds of all the country recognized him as such. Then there are many, many things which the world never knew about, things he did for individuals. These may be counted among the great things he did, when written in the book of God."

Shortly before he died, Mr. Castellow's sister visited him. During her stay, he told her, "God's providence has guided me all of my life, and it will not forsake me at my death. I am not afraid to die."

Six days before he would have been 86, Bryant Thomas Castellow left this life. For, as he expressed it, "Every meeting means a parting, and the longest journey has its end."

His life was a long journey upward. His success was not meteoric—he won his way step by step.

He was a good man—a Godly man—who wanted all men to live together in harmony and love. He was a man who gave his entire life to this end. His biography is written in the lives of all who came under his influence. One person who knew him said, "Mr. Castellow will never be forgotten. He is a living monument—his spirit lives on. He left so much to others."

In the words of Shakespeare, whom Mr. Castellow loved to quote:

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him, that nature might stand up and say to the world, 'This was a man.'"

Mr. Castellow once wrote:

"Let my soul take its flight
With the setting of the sun.
As darkness comes with night,
So comes rest when life is done."

He prepared to live and was prepared to die.

"The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord."—Psalm 37:23.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those reading this editorial will join with the Indiana magazine in its appraisal of the life of a great south Georgian.

The Honorable Fred Landau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, one delights to see anyone of merit honored by his colleagues. My wife and I had the great pleasure the evening of May 8, 1963, to see an old friend and distinguished citizen of New York, Hon. Fred Landau, senior partner in Fred Landau & Co., certified public accountants, receive the 1963 John T. Madden Award presented by New York University's Commerce Alumni Association.

The John T. Madden Awards, inaugurated in 1951 to honor the late Dean Madden, of New York University's School of Commerce, are given to alumni of the college of commerce whose careers exemplified outstanding achievement in business, industry, or professional life.

The following citation was presented to Mr. Landau at the time he received the award:

CITATION ACCOMPANYING THE PRESENTATION OF THE MADDEN MEMORIAL AWARD TO FRED LANDAU, CLASS OF 1920

Accountant, business executive, civic leader and dedicated alumnus, he has carried the ball across many goal lines since his gridiron days at New York University. For 4 decades the head of his own illustrious firm of certified public accountants, he also has brought his zeal, talent, and perspicacity to the directors' table of many and diverse corporations. In the community, his attainments have been myriad, his titles lofty—trustee, chairman, founder, director. The alumni association of the school of commerce is delighted now to extol him and to bestow upon him the Madden Memorial Award.

MAY 8, 1963.

The New York Times of May 7, 1963, announced the award as follows:

ALUMNI GROUP FETES LANDAU

NEW YORK.—Fred Landau, senior partner in Fred Landau & Co., certified public accountants, is one of two prominent businessmen chosen to receive the 1963 John T. Madden Awards presented by New York University's Commerce Alumni Association.

The awards, inaugurated in 1951 to honor the late Dean Madden, are given to commerce alumni whose careers have exemplified outstanding achievement in business, industry, or professional life.

Landau, formerly of Bergen County, N.J., and now a resident of Harrison, N.Y., will receive a medal and a certificate at the annual dinner of the association tomorrow in the Hotel Pierre. The other alumnus being so honored is John F. Mannion, senior vice president of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

A 1920 graduate of New York University's School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, Landau is chairman of the board of General Builders Corp. and of J. B. Hanauer & Co. He also is a director and chairman of the finance committees of Seeman Brothers Inc., and Hazel Bishop Inc.

A former vice president of the Commerce Alumni Association, he is currently a governor of both the New York University Club and the New York University Men in Finance Club, and is chairman of the alumni fund for the school of commerce.

A noted philanthropist, Landau is a founder of the Albert Einstein Medical College at Yeshiva University, executive vice president of the Children's Blood Foundation, and a trustee of the Federation of Jewish Charities Employment and Guidance Service.

The leadership of dedicated and distinguished men like Mr. Landau is most meaningful to America in these critical times. It is encouraging to see that the John T. Madden Awards not only reward patriotic civic leadership but stimulate such dedicated service in others.

Double Taxation on Dividends Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my view strongly opposing the provision of the new revenue bill with regard to taxation of dividend income.

As Members of the House know, presently under the law an individual can exclude the first $50 of dividends from his taxable income—up to $100 in the case of a married couple. In addition, he may claim also a credit against his tax of 4 percent of his dividends.

This modest tax credit provision was enacted in 1954, when the Internal Revenue Code was revised. It was a part of a monumental legislative effort to eliminate inequities in the tax laws.

In 1954 the Republicans controlled the Congress, and in the House, the dividend credit was one of the two issues in controversy with the Democratic minority. The Democrats, in a motion to recommit, tried unsuccessfully to eliminate this partial relief from the double taxation of dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I remember a story which was related during that debate. It was told by the present chairman of the House Committee on Rules, our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. He quoted a former Senator from Virginia, who used to say when in a quandary, "Boys, when you are in doubt, do right."

Maybe this proviso in the bill does not loom sufficiently large to cause doubt. We were told in 1954 that the present dividend exclusion provision would cost the Treasury $240 million. The new bill which would double the exclusion but reduces the credit would only increase the Government income by $300 million. In other words, in terms of effect on the Treasury this is a minor matter. But whether Members are in a quandary or not, there is a right as far as principle is concerned and I think I can show wherein is the right in a very few words.

Before proceeding, I should mention, however, that there are now in excess of 17 million stockholders who are concerned with this discriminatory double taxation. I am told by the Library of Congress that there are 7,965,000 adult male owners of stock in America and 8,291,000 adult female stockholders. Furthermore, I have heard that the number of stockholders was only 6½ million 10 years ago, when the present law was written. So the number of citizens who have been enjoying the modest relief from double taxation of dividend income has increased.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing whether a tax cut with an unbalanced budget and a swollen national debt is justified nor am I discussing the merits or defects of the bill. I am just directing my remarks to the one issue of individual taxation of dividend income.

Going back to 1954, if I may, I want to refer to the position at that time of the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS]. In a colloquy with Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. MILLS said there is only double taxation when a corporate tax is not passed on to the consumer.

All I can say is, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, the corporate tax on income is never passed on to the consumer. It is the one tax that is never passed on. Or if there are exceptions which prove the rule, they are very rare. Other taxes, yes, but income taxes are a slice of the profits—the bigger the profits, the bigger the slice. It is impossible, except perhaps with some isolated transaction, to include corporate income taxes in consumer prices.

Where the facts should be set straight, also, is in connection with the comparison of income taxes from wages as compared with income taxes from dividends. The argument fallaciously has been used that a worker earning $4,000 a year pays $240 tax, whereas a shareholder receiving $4,000 in dividends only pays $120 in taxes on this amount. This is wrong. On the $4,000 of dividends, the earning of the shareholder has been taxed already more than 50 percent, or $2,080, so that in fairness the comparison should be adjusted to add this to the $120. But basically I want to emphasize that a corporation is not able to pass on the corporation income tax on its gross profits and that a tax on dividends does represent double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, let me just add this to what I have said, namely, that business stimulation and prosperity are best secured by incentives to business to expand and thereby create permanent employment. Private enterprise and investment and venture capital represent the key to solving unemployment in this country.

There was no tax on dividend income when the 1918 income tax code was adopted. But for the last 30 years our tax laws have been such as to punish success rather than raise revenue. I hope we can see the folly of attempting to make some people believe that business as such is evil and should be burdened by heavy taxation as the price of existence.

Double taxation of dividends on corporation stock causes many people to place their savings in tax-exempt bonds rather than invest their money as risk capital.

It has caused corporations to use bonded indebtedness to expand their plants. What this country needs now is to encourage business and thereby create prosperity. That is the objective of the President's tax proposal—so why, as in the new tax bill, reduce the partial existing relief from the taxation of dividends? It defeats the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Ways and Means has acted. It was controlled by the Democrats. As a Republican Member of the House, I am rather helpless. The bill will be considered by the House starting September 24 without any Member having the privilege of offering amendments.

But the minority will have one motion available to it and as a member of the Republican policy committee, I am urging that this motion provide for striking out the Democratic provision to eliminate the 4-percent credit which the Republicans were successful in enacting in 1954.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support elimination of double taxation and hope if the House does not do so that the Senate will insist on retaining this incentive to invest in American industry.

Federal Minimum Wage Can Hurt Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of a Federal minimum wage insist they are acting in the best interests of the working men and women of the country, but are they?

As usual, the basic economic facts of life are overlooked; in order to exist private enterprise must make a profit; that only private enterprise, not government, creates jobs; when wage rates are set by law without regard to productivity the inevitable result will be the loss of jobs as industry strives to maintain a proper balance between wages and productivity.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, "The Wage Law Illusion," sums up the case and is well worth serious consideration:

THE WAGE LAW ILLUSION

The Federal minimum wage law has been in effect so long—a quarter of a century—that almost everyone now takes it for granted. And when, as happened the other day, the pay minimum is lifted nearly everyone views that as a good thing for all the workers involved.

On the surface it may seem so. The Labor Department figures that about 2.6 million workers producing or handling goods in interstate commerce have just had their hourly pay rate boosted from a Federal minimum of $1.15 to $1.25. And the department says that the annual incomes of these workers, as a result of the floor-raising operation, will zoom upward by $365 million.

But there is another side of the coin. Any increase in worker's wages is obviously an increase in employers' costs. And a political boost in employers' costs cannot help but raise economic questions.

Will an employer be able to absorb the cost increases? If he can, the pay boosts may indeed be an unalloyed benefit for the workers. But not all employers are so fortunate.

Some employers, in order to stay in business and go on providing any jobs at all, may try to pass the higher costs on to the customers in higher prices. But in these highly competitive times this can lead to reduced sales and profits—and jobs.

Other employers will try to find ways to offset the increased costs, through new methods or machines. It is a fact of economic life that each increase in labor costs makes labor-saving machinery relatively less expensive.

So some employees may benefit from this political venture into the real world of economics. But others may find that a law that raises the floor has pulled the rug out from under them.

Innocent Passage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have called the House's attention to the Russian trawler traffic within our territorial waters off the coast of Florida many times this year, and Congressman PORTER HARDY has had hearings on this subject before his Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee. The evidence of this trawler activity along our coasts is clearly in the affirmative, and these so-called innocent fishing vessels should be closely watched by our Coast Guard to determine whether they are truely innocent. The people of America are concerned over the Government's inaction in this area. They question the "innocence" of these trawlers and their passage so close to our shores.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the September 1, 1963, edition of the Palm Beach Post-Times, that shows the concern of the citizens of Florida over the appropriateness of the term—"innocent passage," in regard to Russian trawlers, who seem to be engaged in more than just fishing:

INNOCENT PASSAGE

A trawler, by definition is a boat from which fishing operations are conducted. The Soviet Union and its Communist puppet ally Cuba have many trawlers engaged in the fishing trade. But they are not fishing for fish.

Not all the time, anyhow. Many of these trawlers are known to be heavily loaded with electronic gear. They could not carry many fish along with this cargo, so they fish for information, which is not so heavy and takes up much less room on board the trawlers.

As a matter of fact, the Russian trawler traffic is getting so heavy in the U.S. coastal waters that a House subcommittee recently made an investigation of the matter and reported its findings, including the observation that the coast-hugging course followed by many of the Red fleet "is neither the shortest nor fastest for ships moving from the North Atlantic fishing banks to Cuba."

This course often takes the trawlers quite close to shore off Palm Beach, within sight of President Kennedy's "Winter White House." Our Navy and Coast Guard permit this familiarity under the doctrine of "innocent passage."

This doctrine holds that "a vessel not prejudicial to the peace, good order or security of the coastal state should be permitted passage through the marginal sea."

The question is: Just how innocent are these trawlers? In view of what is known about the Russians and their modus operandi, wouldn't it be the part of wisdom to make a clear determination?

Like for instance herding one of the trawlers into Port Everglades and taking it apart?

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 28th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho. Last Sunday was September 15, a day that millions of the Nation's taxpayers were called upon to make another quarterly payment on their Federal income taxes. One might ask how much of these taxes will go to make up losses in Bonneville power sales in southern Idaho.

An article in the Idaho Daily Statesman quotes Mr. R. F. Ball, vice president of the Idaho Power Co., as saying the new Bonneville power contracts in southern Idaho "should be accurately identified for what they actually are—the granting of Federal subsidy for a few at the expense of many."

The article is as follows:

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Aug. 13, 1963]

BPA CONTRACT STORIES HIT BY IDAHO POWER OFFICER

An Idaho Power Co. official declared Monday that Bonneville Power Administration's announcements of new power contracts with southern Idaho REA's "should be accurately identified for what they actually are—the granting of Federal subsidies for a few at the expense of the taxpayers."

Company Vice President R. F. Ball made the statement in commenting on BPA's latest announcement, a contract to provide the Lost River REA with wholesale power for 40 percent less than was formerly charged the cooperative by the Bureau of Reclamation.

"The series of preference customer contracts, being stretched out for maximum publicity effect by BPA, add up only to the fact that Federal subsidies are being granted to a favored few by BPA with complete lack of concern for the taxpayers who must ultimately foot the bill," Ball said.

DEFICIT CLAIMED

"BPA's accumulated deficit for the past 5 years is $60 million, and BPA itself forecasts a $40 million loss in the next 3 years alone.

"The REA's and other preference customers now being handed contracts by BPA, to the accompaniment of freehanded claims of great savings at the rate of about one a week, are exactly the same customers which received their power from the Bureau before BPA staged its invasion of this area."

These customers, according to Ball, "will get the exactly same power, produced at the same Bureau plants, manned by the same Bureau employees and delivered to them by the same facilities as before. The actual cost of the power remains unchanged."

CITES MANIPULATION

"Though BPA has demonstrated its ability to manipulate its accounting to masquerade its staggering annual deficits, nothing has changed to permit BPA to break even on deliveries of wholesale power for less than the rates which the Bureau judged from its long and respected operations in this area were necessary to retire its legitimate repayment obligations," Bell said. "So when BPA loudly and repeatedly proclaims that it will sell power to still another preference customer for less, it is going to simply add the difference to its steadily mounting deficits."

"And that means only one thing—the poor, forgotten taxpayer is going to be stuck again."

Most people do not realize that the cost of electric power is a very small fraction of the cost of operating more than 99 percent of the Nation's industry. As a matter of fact, electric power represents less than 1 percent of the cost of the end product from most of the Nation's industry. While it is true that some of the electrochemical industries like aluminum and electroprocess phosphate use large amounts of electric power, they also use very few workers.

An editiorial in the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise, Idaho, points out that "The Deception Is Great" in the arguments that Bonneville power will bring new industry to southern Idaho. The editorial follows:

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Boise, Idaho, Aug. 6, 1963]

THE DECEPTION IS GREAT

Among the many deceptive arguments used by the proponents of Bonneville power for southern Idaho is the one about new industry. To hear the public power boys tell it, once Bonneville power is available in Idaho, smokestacks will follow. Nothing is more in error.

Bonneville power is in surplus. That's one reason the administration seeks new territory. But if public power attracts new industry so readily, what's the reason it is not being used by new industry moving to the Portland area? In addition to cheap power, Portland has another major asset for industry—water transportation, the cheapest method of shipping. So with this combination it would seem that Portland would be a booming industrial metropolis. Yet it is no such thing. Several times in recent years Portland has been listed among U.S. cities hard hit by economic misfortunes.

Fact of the matter, there is very little new industry. But there are hundreds of agencies, representing cities and States, working to woo industries to move to their areas. This has created a national problem in itself, one that has forced unions to demand relocation compensation for its members. But this is beside the point as far as BPA attracting new industry to Idaho.

Idahoans who understand the complication of attracting new industry to this State far outnumber those of our sincere citizens who would like to see new industry locate here. An investigation would quickly prove that even free electrical power would not move new industry into Idaho. Power is a small fraction of the cost of operating 99 percent of the Nation's industry.

It is true that the phosphate industry in southeastern Idaho is one that uses a large amount of power but there isn't much percentage in the Government expanding Federal expenditures to increase the volume of phosphate to further bulge the Federal crop surpluses which now cost a million dollars a day for storage.

The unfairness in this forced invasion of Bonneville power into Idaho is that, eventually, it will cost all Idahoans additional taxes in order to provide lower power rates to relatively few persons. The State's tax income is substantially lower where Federal plants operate. They are not taxed by the State. But the State has to provide the same revenue to operate schools and other State services in these areas and the rest of Idaho has to make up the difference. It will not be until there is a takeover of privately owned utility facilities in any area that this costly step will be measured.

Take the city of Idaho Falls as an example. It operates a municipal power system. That system pays no State taxes, consequently Idaho Falls power rates are lower than those of taxpaying private utilities. Yet the State of Idaho is not able to reduce its obligation to Bonneville County because of this circumstance. Consequently, because Idaho Falls power users receive lower rates, all Idaho taxpayers make a contribution to make those rates possible.

One of our readers have expressed the opinion that the Government should operate all utilities. There may be substance in such a contention in some minds. But the important issue here is not any utility. It is the matter of Government operation. Once the utilities were operated by the Government, some other phase of commerce would follow. Eventually, as Premier Khrushchev insists, our form of Government would cease to exist. We would parallel what communism calls the people's government—the government running everything including the people.

The Statesman doubts that anyone in Idaho ever has been too concerned over the Government's program financing rural electrification projects and other small operations where sparse population service has been barred by concern of State public utility commissions who control private utility rates. But that system was only a foot in the door. Now, along with BPA's desire to run a line in southern Idaho, there is the further plan to extend the public power grid in all directions until it eventually covers the Nation. If and when this is done it will bring more realism to the Communist contention that the capitalistic system of government cannot survive. It is ironical that supposedly good Americans are the prime movers in tearing down our established ways.

Representative SAYLOR, a Pennsylvania Republican who opposes the expansion of public power, says the "actions of the Secretary of Interior (in the Idaho BPA action) is unjustified, unwarranted, and inimical to the best interests of this country as a whole and to the area involved. This extension of Bonneville's socialistic Federal power into southern Idaho by executive fiat is not the American way of doing business."

Not to be ignored is the announced fact that Bonneville Power, operating with losses of approximately $15 million annually, plans to increase rates in December 1964. Overlooking the fact that this higher rate step is not to be effected until after the next congressional election, the inadvisability of the Government operating any business is made plain by BPA. A private utility would have discharged management showing such heavy losses long since. But the public power operation, backed by the Federal Treasury, forms a pool of operating inefficiency. When that arrangement is coupled with hollow promises of new industry, and when it is backed by three Members of the Idaho Congressional Delegation—Senator CHURCH, Representatives HARDING, and WHITE—and when Idahoans join that crusade, there is real cause for concern. Incompetency, irresponsibility and inconsistency are joined to form a great Idaho threat.

Salute to a Great Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

insert into the RECORD, a short article about a very good and true friend of the United States, Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, former Secretary of State of Mexico and one of the great statesmen of the Western Hemisphere. The article is written by Dr. Fred A. Orleans, a well-known authority of United States-Latin American relations, an international attorney and a member of the Mexican Academy of International Law. This is a well-deserved tribute to Dr. Padilla and should help to cement the very cordial and friendly relations existing between our country and Mexico.

The article is as follows:

SALUTE TO A GREAT STATESMAN

(By Fred A. Orleans)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the eighth in a series of articles about Mexico by Dr. Orleans, well-known international attorney, economist, and recognized authority on United States-Latin American relations.)

The dignity of the individual is a powerful concept. Men have fought for it and died for it; men have glorified it and debased it; the struggle to attain it has gone on from the beginning of time. It can never be wholly crushed because there is always the hand to lift the sword or the pistol to fight for it; there is always a voice that cries out above the others to be heard; there is always the pen to stir the imagination.

However, it is a rare thing to find all these attributes in one man, and yet such a man there was and is. Ezequiel Padilla lifted a pistol to fight for human dignity when he fought alongside Zapata in the rebellion against feudalism that had kept the people of Mexico landless and when he rode with Pancho Villa. Ezequiel Padilla raised his voice, that was heard above all the others in January of 1942 at a meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and persuaded all the countries of Latin America to break diplomatic relations with the then enemies of the United States. It was at this meeting that Ezequiel Padilla said:

"Those who have fallen in Wake and the Philippines have not fallen merely to defend the honor and sovereignty of the United States; they have also fallen to defend human liberties and the common destiny of America."

It is little wonder that he became known as "El Hombre Libre de las Americas" (the freeman of the Americas). It was this same man, who feeling that the United States embodied all the hopes of the world stated that the United States was contributing to civilization a profound concept and awareness of individual liberty, as Mexico was contributing a highly developed sense of social justice. It was Ezequiel Padilla who took up his pen to write "One Single Continental Destiny" in 1956 which was reprinted in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and wrote:

"The threats which surround America today are much more serious than in 1942, due to immense Soviet propaganda and the economic anarchy in which our continent lives."

He pointed out that "Soviet propaganda was leading to peaceful conquest through which the Communists would seek to fulfill Lenin's prophesy of America falling like a ripe fruit." He further stated that "the mission of Communist propaganda in America is the same as unfolded in all parts of the world: infiltrate, subvert institutions, open the doors to the enemy in order to surrender the fate of our people to police terror and to a philosophy without God and without liberties."

Yes, this was the man, who, born in a small village in the State of Guerrero, Mexico, sharing the lot of the poor peasants, grew up with the idea that every man must attain human dignity. This idea, no doubt was nurtured by his mother who was a schoolteacher and his father who was a lawyer. There were other worthwhile ideas instilled in this man, which prompted the Honorable Spruille Braden to say of him, when introducing him as the speaker at the Pan American Society of the United States in 1956: "Ezequiel Padilla has always shown his complete dedication to liberty and to the principles of constitutional representative government, has fought for the dignity of the individual and for free, private, and competitive enterprise." Spruille Braden further stated "that the United States had no truer ally during World War II and presently has no friend more loyal than Ezequiel Padilla."

From his humble beginning, Ezequiel Padilla went on to become Congressman three times, twice a Senator, Attorney General, Secretary of Education, Ambassador, and Secretary of State during the difficult period of World War II. Time after time his great voice has rang forth and year after year he has sounded the alarm and striven to arouse the people of the Americas to unite and stand steadfast against the enemy who would destroy us. Every few decades Mexico has produced a man who could stir the imagination of men everywhere—such a man is Ezequiel Padilla.

No. 6—New Mexico: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, more particularly the members of the congressional delegation from the State of New Mexico, some pertinent information about gambling—both legal and illegal—in that State.

In 1962, legal parimutuel betting in New Mexico amounted to $37 million of which the State treasury received about half a million dollars in revenue. However, illegal gambling of all varieties far surpasses legal wagering. According to testimony presented to the McClellan Committee, offtrack betting dwarfs the volume of betting at the track.

Mr. Speaker, New Mexico's portion of the estimated national yearly offtrack turnover came to $265 million last year. Of course, offtrack betting is not the only form of illegal gambling. The figures for bets placed offtrack must be doubled in order to arrive at an estimate of the total gambling volume in that State. This would put the annual illegal gambling turnover in New Mexico at more than $500 million. Some of this money is heading South of the border to the lotteries in Mexico and other similar operations. The rest of it is fattening the purses of criminal elements who hang onto about 10 percent of the total take as gross profit.

Mr. Speaker, if the Spanish-Americans of New Mexico are buying foreign government lottery tickets, it is clearly understandable. The United States is the only nation with a considerable Spanish-speaking population that does not operate a national lottery.

I do not doubt for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that a referendum in New Mexico would establish overwhelming sentiment for a National or State lottery. Perhaps, New Mexico will follow the lead of New Hampshire and make a decision for social and financial reality. Until such time, official hypocrisy will continue to be a silent partner in crime and New Mexico will continue to be a vice-ridden gamblers' fiestaland.

Administration To Take Initiative at IMF Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to me to read recently in the Washington Post and New York Times a report that the United States intends to take the initiative at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund September 30 to urge a formal study of proposals to overhaul and strengthen the world payments system.

Such action by the administration would constitute a sound beginning of the search for a solution to the long-range international liquidity problem which will arise when the United States achieves equilibrium in its balance of payments. At present, additions to world liquidity depend upon additions to the world's gold supply and on U.S. balance-of-payments deficits.

The step that is being taken is clearly in accord with the spirit of House Concurrent Resolution 192, which I introduced in the House on July 5, 1963, urging that the administration take the initiative within the International Monetary Fund to devise new and improved methods of permanently strengthening the international monetary and credit mechanism in order to provide: First, improved means of financing balance-of-payments deficits until basic corrective forces restore equilibrium; and, second, sufficient liquidity to finance increases in world trade and payments once U.S. balance-of-payments equilibrium is achieved. It is also in accord with a similar resolution introduced in the Senate by my colleague on the Joint Economic Committee, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, and Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa.

In urging a formal study of the world payments system, it is important to bear in mind, as I pointed out in my speech on the balance of payments in the House on July 8, that reforms in the international payments system should not be looked upon as an easy way to solve our balance-of-payments deficit. The solution to our payments deficit depends primarily upon those actions which we take ourselves to maintain fiscal and

monetary responsibility at home. The broader international effort has as its purpose the strengthening of the world payments system once the United States achieves balance-of-payments equilibrium.

I include the articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times of September 12 discussing the plans for international monetary reform in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1963]

UNITED STATES TO SEEK STUDY OF PAYMENTS SETUP

The United States shortly will propose to the International Monetary Fund a study of proposals to overhaul and strengthen the international payments system, Government sources said yesterday.

This country will take the initiative before the finance ministers of 93 countries gathering here September 30 for the annual meetings of the IMF and the World Bank, a high official said.

There is every reason to believe, this source added, that the proposal will be adopted and the study launched, even though Western Europe's finance ministries have indicated that they see little immediate need to bolster the world's supply of currency reserves and credit.

Most American officials also see the problem as a future hazard—and one not directly related to this country's current balance-of-payments deficit.

The latter problem can be cured, they hold, by the strong dollar-conserving actions taken by President Kennedy this summer and by the "interest equalization tax" bill now pending in Congress.

But they foresee a progressive scarcity of worldwide gold and dollar reserves to match the rapid expansion of international trade and investment over the next several years.

Chairman Walter W. Heller of the President's Council of Economic Advisers recently told Congress that foreseeable world gold output is insufficient to generate the needed new reserves. Heller testified:

"The development of an improved international monetary system is important to the longrun expansion of the world economy.

"The elimination of the current U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will not mean the end of world balance-of-payments problems. Other countries will have deficits when we get into surplus, and we ourselves can expect the periodic recurrence of deficits."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 12, 1963]

WORLD LIQUIDITY TO BE EXAMINED—GLOBAL MONETARY FUND IS SEEN REACHING ACCORD AT MEETING NEXT MONTH

WASHINGTON, September 11.—An agreement is shaping up on a compromise solution of the hotly debated issue of "international liquidity." The compromise is expected at next month's annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

The compromise would be a decision to conduct a formal study of the problem, possibly by the "Paris club" of the 10 leading industrial countries.

The aim of the study would be to decide whether reforms in the international monetary system might be necessary to keep the world economy growing and trade expanding.

International liquidity is the reserves of gold and foreign exchanges held by countries, plus their automatic or semiautomatic access to credit. The big debate has centered on whether international liquidity will grow sufficiently.

STUDY WOULD BE COMPROMISE

A decision to make a formal study of the problem would be a compromise of the two basic positions that exist among the leading countries and an approach to the middle ground presently held by the United States.

It would meet the British demand to "do something" and not let the problem drop. Britain has been, by far, the most eager advocate of reform.

It would mark a step by the continental countries toward acceptance that a problem might exist, without committing them to any specific reforms. They have been the most cautious about the various proposals for a change in the monetary system.

It would reflect the middle position of the United States. The U.S. view is that improvements in the system will quite likely be needed eventually although there is no hurry and there are flaws in all proposals.

NO FORMULA EXPECTED

Financial officials have said for some time that this year's International Monetary Fund meeting would not settle on any specific reform or formula.

The only concrete proposal is one submitted last year by Reginald Maudling, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, and this has been quietly shelved, even by the British.

There is general agreement that no urgent liquidity problem exists. It could arise, however, when the United States at last ends its deficit in its balance of international payments. U.S. deficits have added to liquidity by adding to other countries' holdings of dollars.

The balance of payments is the relationship between total payments to foreigners and total receipts from foreigners.

UNITED STATES DENIES PAYMENTS LINK

WASHINGTON, September 11 (AP).—Most American officials also see the liquidity problem as a possible hazard not directly related to this country's current balance-of-payments deficit.

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently told Congress that foreseeable world gold production was insufficient to generate the needed new reserves.

"The development of an improved international monetary system is important to the longrun expansion of the world economy," he said.

"The elimination of the current U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will not mean the end of world balance-of-payments problems. Other countries will have deficits when we get into surplus, and we ourselves can expect the periodic recurrence of deficits."

Because it would take years to plan, adopt, and institute a major alteration of world payments machinery, Mr. Heller and others have urged that formal discussions be started promptly.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon argued a year ago that there was no urgency in the matter.

However, he is understood to have come around to the view that preliminary inquiries might well be begun—especially because the Government's forceful balance-of-payments measures have shown the world that the United States would not simply be trying to use international machinery to bail itself out of its payments difficulties.

The question of which international body might conduct the study remains open.

Some officials have suggested the Fund, but there is precedent for having major problems of payments policy conducted, with the Fund's support and sponsorship, by smaller groups representing the industrial creditor countries most directly involved.

The VFW and the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that no other newspaper in the United States has been as active and responsible in exposing the so-called report for "Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services" as the Times-Picayune of New Orleans.

The Times-Picayune, as I have pointed out earlier, was the leader in publicizing the dangers of this document, which is popularly referred to as the Gesell report.

In the September 12, 1963, edition of the Times-Picayune, the paper notes editorially that national opposition is building up against the Gesell report and the subsequent directive by the Secretary of Defense.

The Times-Picayune takes cognizance of the very important resolution recently adopted by the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The editorial, which follows herewith, also gives well-deserved praise to the VFW for opposing the totalitarian tactics inherent in the Gesell report.

HIT GESELLISM

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, in 64th annual convention at Seattle, adopted a resolution "vigorously opposing" the so-called Gesell report, and protesting its implementing directives "which would force the military to intrude upon local civil affairs and undermine military morale, discipline, and efficiency."

The American Legion, in convention at Miami Beach, is expected later this week to consider a resolution condemning the report—though early local reports from that scene conveyed no glimmering it would be among issues taken up.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, considering the difficulty of obtaining and analyzing the bulky Gesell blueprint, on such short notice, did a good job of seeing the flaws in it and in Secretary McNamara's directives, with reference to the overall good of the country.

It found, according to its resolutions, that the report "proposed measures violating the time-honored principle of the Armed Forces' keeping out of domestic controversy"; that the report and the directives in combination "would undermine the discipline, command structure, and morale of the Armed Forces; lead to the establishment of a commissar system of political control within military organizations; have disastrous results to military efficiency and our form of government; cause serious difficulties between personnel of Armed Forces installations and civilians of surrounding communities."

Imbedded in the report and supported already to some extent by ambiguous orders in the McNamara directives (not too ambiguous when the report is taken as guide and master plan) is a project for arbitrary advancement of a single, special race within the Armed Forces, and for favoritism of higher officers who abide by this. This project is to be implemented, according to the report, by a system of secret informers, "spe-

cial branch" officers (or officials), and new standards for appraisals in promotions, etc. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, for one, was able to perceive both the immediate, corrupting effects, and the unlimited possibilities for entrusting such "political police" with the general ruin of democratic institutions.

The Federation of Malaysia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the formation of a new nation, the Federation of Malaysia. This new nation is a consolidation of Malaya with Singapore, Sarawak, and North Borneo.

Born in freedom, Malaysia is dedicated to the principles of democracy and self-determination.

The Tunku Abdul Rahman, Prime Minister of Malaya and one of the principal supporters of this new country, has said:

My ambition is not a mighty Malaysia, but a happy Malaysia.

He has called for "food instead of bullets, clothing instead of uniforms, houses instead of barracks."

He is dedicated to economic growth, to prosperity, to peace, and to freedom for the citizens of this new nation, and with our help and support, Malaysia will achieve these goals.

Geographically, Malaysia occupies one of the most strategic spots in the world. The port of Singapore is the main trading post for all of southeast Asia. The Straits of Malacca are equal to the Suez and Panama Canals in importance.

Malaysia is sandwiched between covetous neighbors who have actively opposed the creation of this sovereign country.

Indonesia has made no secret of its opposition to the Federation. It has attacked Malaysia verbally, diplomatically, and militarily.

Armed bands have crossed the Malaysian border from Indonesia, shooting, killing, creating dissension and turmoil.

Indonesians were directly involved in efforts to stir up revolt and resistance to Malaysia within the country itself, and many of them had to be sent back home.

The Philippines has laid dubious claim to North Borneo and also has attempted to wreck the Federation of Malaysia before it could be created.

In an effort to placate these two neighbors, the United Nations sent a survey team into the area to be encompassed by Malaysia, and the finding was that the population overwhelmingly supported this new nation.

Instead of calling off their opposition, both Indonesia and the Philippines are continuing their resistance and are attempting to force this independent country to its knees.

Indonesia forgets that our Nation supported its efforts for freedom. The Philippines forget that we gave that nation its freedom—which it most certainly earned. Yet, these two countries would deny the right of self-determination to Malaysia and instead strive to make Malaysia their colony.

This effort to wreck Malaysia must be resisted, and it will be resisted at all costs.

Malaysia is rich. Malaysia has solved a great many of its economic problems by itself, by concentrating on peace and prosperity. Let us hope that Malaysia's neighbors will learn from Malaysia, will realize that economic growth can be accomplished much more quickly and much more efficiently under freedom.

The Government of the United States should give the Federation of Malaysia its fullest support, and I am sure that my colleagues concur in these views.

AFL–CIO President George Meany Terms the Tax Bill as "On Balance, Desirable, and Necessary"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a statement made by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, commending the tax bill as "on balance, desirable, and necessary," urging the passage of this legislation to spur the economy and to provide needed tax reductions to low- and moderate-income groups.

The statement is as follows:

The tax bill, which has been reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means, will have a substantial beneficial impact on the American economy. Much of the tax reductions provided by the bill will go to low and moderate-income groups, thereby increasing consumer purchasing power, stimulating business expansion, and creating new jobs.

As such, the bill merits the support of all those who believe prompt action is essential to bring down the Nation's continuing and unconscionably high rate of unemployment.

Unfortunately, in recent weeks, there have been repeated demands that any tax cut at this time be tied to major cuts in the Federal budget. Undoubtedly an effort will be made on the floor of the House of Representatives to make tax cuts contingent upon budget slashing.

Such a move would be deplorable, it would absolutely defeat the purpose of a tax cut. Instead of stimulating the economy, a large reduction in Federal expenditures would merely nullify the beneficial effects of the tax bill and would contract economic activity.

We urge vigorous opposition to any move to combine tax relief with budget cuts. We are for tax relief to spur the economy; we are against every device that will hamstring the economy.

The bill reported by the committee is not perfect in every respect. Many desirable reforms requested by the President are not included.

But, on balance, the bill is desirable and necessary. We support its passage by the House, and hope the Senate will improve it.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 14, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

CIVIL RIGHTS, HUMAN RIGHTS, PROPERTY RIGHTS, ARE IDENTICAL

Man's unalienable right to life, liberty, and property is the basic guarantee of the Constitution. These rights are identical and inseparable. Liberal demagogs, through semantics, now try to confuse the issue and to destroy the faith of the people in certain areas of rights which are identical to others which they promote. The rights of all the people are being trampled upon to give special treatment to minorities, justified by proponents because the minority has suffered past discrimination. This premise is faulty and, if followed through, will destroy the fundamental rights of all, including the minority. Test the following fundamental rights to determine wherein, or if it is possible, to separate civil rights, human rights, or property rights can be separated.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF ALL THE PEOPLE

1. Right to be secure in your own home. Anglo-Saxon law has always maintained that a man's home is his castle and inviolate against government control, unlawful entry, or seizure without due process of law. This includes the right to own a home, a right which is now being taken away through Government-owned housing and in seizure of private property through eminent domain as a part of Federal urban renewal programs. (Applying the test can this be separated as to civil rights, human rights, or property rights?)

2. Right to earn and to keep. Every man has a right to earn according to his ability and talent and to keep the fruits of his labor. (What does your test show here?)

3. Right to sell, dispose of, or bequeath. Every man has the right to dispose of what is his in any manner not harmful to others and which benefits him or his family. (Apply the test.)

4. Right to improve oneself. Each man has the right, according to his individual ambition, desires, and willingness, to improve himself in order to better his lot in life. (Civil right, human right, property right, or all three?)

5. Right to hire or fire. In a system based on private ownership a businessman has the right to hire those who are capable, who meet his requirements, who produce according to the demands of the job, and at wages he has the right to set in order to insure his right to a profit. (Test this right.)

Apply the test, too, to other basic rights such as the right to shop and buy freely; right to own a business and to pick your customers; right to pick your neighbors, companions, and the right to marry; right to eat what you choose; right to personal safety and protection.

Many of these rights are being curtailed or denied by a powerful Federal Government, taxation, bureaucratic regulations, and the power of monopolistic labor unions by wage setting, price fixing, fair trade laws, limited competition, enforced hiring by race, Federal standards for education, nutrition, job performance, and restrictions on firing.

NEW FRONTIER POLICIES RESTRICT RIGHTS OF A FREE PEOPLE

New Frontier policies—politics at any price—threaten these basic rights of all the people. Kennedy policies not compatible with individual rights include a planned economy, democratic socialism, big Federal Government and big Federal spending at the expense of local government and individual freedom; President Kennedy's flirtation with Soviet Russia without proper regard for the defense and security of the United States, weakening our military position and making more probable all-out war or our defeat without a war; his courting of minority groups—Negroes, labor, big-city machines sets the Nation back to the corrupt era of political bossism as epitomized by the worst years of Tammany Hall in New York, the Hague machine in New Jersey, the Crump machine in Tennessee, and the gangster-ridden Pendegrast machine in Missouri.

ONLY THE PEOPLE CAN SAVE THE REPUBLIC

The choice of what kind of government we will have in the future, the preservation of our civil, human, and property rights, is up to the majority. Only the people have the power to halt the complete destruction of rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Our present course will be reversed only if the people, the great majority of the people, become as vocal in contacting their Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the President, as the gangs of demonstrators, the pressure groups now monopolizing the front pages of our newspapers and the newscasts on radio and television. Only an aroused public will force action to protect the rights of all.

Should We Seek Economic Security Even at the Cost of Individual Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 16, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not often put in the RECORD speeches I have made before "captive audiences." I much prefer to subject what I have to say to those who might seek to rebut me. However, I am anxious to get the facts and arguments on the issue of Federal taxes and Federal debt as I see them as widely disseminated as possible.

Accordingly, I am setting out a speech I made on Wednesday, September 11, 1963, before the National Association of Underwriters, as follows:

SHOULD WE SEEK ECONOMIC SECURITY EVEN AT THE COST OF INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM?

(Remarks of Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, Before the National Association of Underwriters, Annual Convention, Americana Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., Wednesday, September 11, 1963)

President Blumberg, Mr. Gatling, gentlemen, I always enjoy having the title of a speech picked for me, particularly when the title contains good affirmative and negative pregnants. In the process of picking out the overtones hidden in the semantics one sometimes can develop a much clearer presentation of the real issues involved. The title I was asked to speak on today, "Should we Seek Economic Security at the Cost of Individual Freedom" is a beauty. It contains just about all the overtones a speaker could ask for.

But before I address myself to this excellent topic, let me express my appreciation to this leading group in the insurance community for inviting me to Miami to address this meeting. Much of what I say this morning will be meaningless unless the people who belong to organizations such as yours take an informed stand on the issue of how much our Government should interfere in the lives of our citizens; how much interference our economy can stand and still be free and enterprising.

You will notice I said "people" must take the stand. An organization undertaking is only as good as the effort by the people who belong to that organization. How much zeal, how much knowledge, how much patriotism, how much conviction, how much principle do the people of an organization bring to their organization objectives and endeavors? When our zeal, our knowledge, our patriotism, our convictions, our principles are too little or too casual, we risk having the words "free" and "enterprising" lost as being descriptive of both our economy and our way of life.

I am not here to preach on patriotism nor to speak partisanly. However, I have strong feelings on the urgency of citizen action and organization responsibility; I have strong basic disagreements with others who have recently used business forums to espouse economic and political views which I believe hold danger for our Nation.

In my view, no other nation in the world has a more inspiring historic origin than the United States in terms of the ideals and principles which guided our forebears in establishing the institutions of our governmental system. These illustrious patriots committed our Nation to a political system that recognized the preeminence of human liberty and opportunity over statism and that recognized the creative superiority of private enterprise over government enterprise. Pursuant to these precepts of government our Nation has grown in strength and stature to a position, unmatched, of respect and honor in world affairs.

But in our lifetime our growth as a nation has found a waning in the intensity of citizen determination to protect liberty and opportunity as we have increased our efforts to achieve economic security through the bounty of government. We have voted to spend the other fellow's money to make us secure without pausing to realize that the other fellow was being just as successful in voting to spend our money to make himself secure. We have pursued government policies designed to create statistical results—many of them bad—without adequate concern for quality of government.

There has been no political revolution in this country nor has there been a major deliberate alteration in our system of government. Yet the past 30 years have produced changes so profound and far reaching that it is my earnest conviction that a penetrating and searching examination of where we are and how we arrived there is in order.

Obviously I am not going to undertake such an exhaustive examination this morning. Suffice it to say that our present affluence is not entirely to our credit because we have resorted too much to expedience and insisted not enough on principle in our drive to be affluent; we have listened too much to sophism and not enough to facts; we have heeded the do-gooder and ignored the realist. We can always cash in principal and use it for current income and make ourselves look and feel better than we are really entitled to look and feel. As a consequence, our freedom from government domination has been lessened; and by a process of fiscal socialism—involving the absolute power of government to tax and spend—we have increased dangerously the role of government in our lives and our society.

Over the past three decades our Federal Government has tried and failed in the effort to spend our Nation rich. With budgetary deficits 80 percent of the time in this period, our economy has grown in fits and spurts. The private sector has produced sustainable economic growth in spite of this tinkering, but the consequences of our thoughtless actions are now in the immediate offing. We have produced a fiscal environment of constantly rising and mounting tax burdens; burdens that consistently proved inadequate to pay the Government bills we incurred. And now, from all points of political and economic thinking, the cry is the Federal tax burden is undermining our economy. I hope that soon there will be unanimity in the cry that the Federal tax and debt burden is undermining our economy. This is not the unanimous cry as yet. The deficit financiers still think they can keep debt separate from taxes, and so they seek to lower the taxes at the expense of increasing the debt and so have their cake and eat it too. This is head-in-the-sand thinking.

We have justified our extravagant and profligate ways by giving recognition to a fiscal tenet that just does not work; this tenet says that it is not necessary to worry about a budget imbalance in any particular year so long as it is balanced over a period of years. It doesn't work because we lack the self-discripline to pay off the deficits incurred in the cyclical trough from the surpluses we should have in the cyclical upturns, such as we have experienced in both 1962 and now 1963. The resort to expediency implicit in this philosophy has led us to what can only be termed "fiscal immorality"—the consequences of which can only be measured in a trillion dollars of debt, in a burgeoning Government bureaucracy, in a serious imbalance in our international payments account, and in a curtailment of human liberty.

The last time we succeeded in even paying our way in a fiscal year was in 1960, and it now seems almost certain, if the cavalier ethic is to depose the puritan ethic, that at least a half a decade will elapse from then before we again have a chance of a budget balance. In those interviewing 5 years we will add a minimum of between $25 and $30 billion to the Federal debt even if we succeed somewhat in stemming the rising tide of annual total spending. In the past three decades we had no program for debt retirement and we have none for the future—as citizens we are content to be prodigals. The administration is busy ladling out the soothing sirup saying the Federal debt is nothing to be alarmed about. Debt is good. Debt with a purpose backed by resources may be better than inaction, but no one should question that expansion based upon savings is much preferable to expansion based upon expectations. And, certainly, inane debt, in which category I place much of our present Federal debt, is bad.

The continuing budget deficits of the last 30 years did not occur in times of depression nor in times of little or no change in Government fiscal affairs. Indeed, relative prosperity has marked the post-World War II period and the Government's fiscal experience has found budget expenditures and tax collections increasing more than twentyfold in the last three decades. We have had the opportunity to do something about paying our way and paying off the debt resulting from World War II, but we have instead chosen a course of Government on credit and creating mode debt—we have chosen to let our children be the fall guys for our fiscal imprudence.

But we need not go back three decades to measure an alarming growth in levels of spending and taxing. I will not belabor you with endless statistics, but the facts are there as conclusive proof that our spending

increases for civil matters exceeded the relative increase in military spending. The administration seeks to hide this fact by coupling interest payment on the debt and spending for the civilian part of the space program with defense spending. Even with this type of figure juggling the fact still remains that nondefense spending rose proportionately higher than defense spending.

If these spending increases had been for Government goods and services that were provided within the framework of a balanced budget, they might have represented expenditures which we were willing to pay for rather than pass on as a charge to succeeding generations. The fact is we did not pay for the cost of those goods and services and, as a consequence, we have a Federal statutory debt in excess of $300 billion. The present annual interest charges on that debt, without providing for any debt retirement, are more than double the total budget expenditures for all purposes by the Federal Government three decades ago.

But this $300 billion figure does not tell the whole story. The truth is that our Federal indebtedness today exceeds $1 trillion, and it means that every American family of four has a share of $22,000 of this debt. This trillion dollar debt includes such items as $250 billion for unfunded obligations of the social security system, $70 billion for unfunded obligations of Government retirement programs, $300 billion of commitments to veterans, $150 billion for unfunded public works and similar charges to the statutory debt. These are currently accruing obligations of our Government for which we are not paying and which will represent demands on the productivity of succeeding generations.

As bad as these fiscal facts are, I feel that future events will pale our past experience to insignificance. Under the present administration we have found that new spending authority had risen from $80 billion in fiscal year 1960 to $100 billion for fiscal year 1963, and actually, spending has risen from $77 billion to $94 billion. It is inevitable that this fact will produce increased spending pressures in future fiscal years. Fiscal year 1964 is still set at $98.9 billion, the highest figure in our history, exceeding the peak in World War II by $200 million. The distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance has predicted that by the year 1965 the Federal budget figures will exceed $135 billion, including $30 billion of trust fund expenditures. I call to your attention the fact that this budget event, if it materializes as predicted, is only 2 years away. Now would seem to be the very latest moment for an allout program to call a halt to this compulsive spending unless we as taxpayers are willing to pay for it and we could afford to increase Federal taxes without creating more than the erosive damage our economy is presently experiencing through the already high tax rates.

In an inaugural speech of not too long ago we were encouraged, if not reassured, by a reiteration of the principle that individuals should concern themselves with what they can do for the State rather than being preoccupied with what the State can do for them. As recently as several months ago we were told, "If Government is to retain the confidence of the people, it must not spend more than can be justified on grounds of national need or spent with maximum efficiency." It seems paradoxical to me that such statements are made by a political leader who, since taking office, has sent to the Congress nearly 300 different spending proposals which, if they had been enacted by the Congress would, in my judgment, have done much to destroy private enterprise and individual liberty.

Regardless of the fact that our Federal Government is the biggest spender, the biggest, employer, the biggest property owner, the biggest tenant, the biggest insurer, the biggest lender, and the biggest borrower in all the world, we find a growing impatience on the part of many holding high office in our land to make Government even bigger. Thus, we are told that it is the Federal Govermnent which must grant aid to schools, compulsory medical care, a permanent system of extending unemployment compensation benefits, an expended food-stamp plan, an expansion of area redevelopment and public works, enlarged public assistance programs, increased public power projects, enlarged housing programs, increased subsidies and other items on a staggering list of so-called Government giveaways—giveaways that inescapably cost the taxpayers of today and tomorrow for programs that involve the massive Federal intervention urged by Government spenders.

Whenever one talks about the threat to individual freedoms inherent in such massive Federal intervention in our economic life, the neo-federalist advocates of these spending programs preach that individual freedom means nothing without economic security as if such security could be achieved through ill-conceived and ill-administered Federal programs. When one mentions the threat of an ever-increasing Federal debt to the future prosperity of our children, the neo-federalists glibly reply, "It really doesn't matter because we owe it to ourselves."

In order to give you greater knowledge concerning the kinds of Federal programs I am talking about, I'd like to discuss the problem of unemployment in some detail. As most of you probably know, for some time the seasonally adjusted percentage of unemployed in our labor force has been hovering between 5.5 and 6 percent.

The Kennedy administration, during the course of this session of Congress, has sent up a number of proposals purportedly designed to meet the unemployment problem. Three of the major ones are the Area Redevelopment Act of 1963, recently defeated in the House, the so-called Blatnik accelerated public works bill, and the youth employment bill. Many Republicans in Congress have long contended that the key to a long-term solution of the unemployment problem lies in education and training programs rather than Federal makework projects. This means not only equipping the unemployed with needed skills, but also encouraging those workers presently holding jobs to upgrade their skills, thus avoiding technological unemployment as well as producing job openings for those further down the ladder. And, above all, to identify the jobs going begging so that, when a man is retrained, he has a job. It was with this objective in mind I helped to initiate and many of us helped to write and then supported the Manpower Training Act passed during the last session of Congress.

In contrast, the Kennedy administration's cure for this disturbing and continuing problem in our economy is to send a Congress a package of legislation providing the discredited solutions of the thirties for the problems of the sixties. To expose fully the economic fallacies underlying all three bills would take more time than we have today, but let me just comment briefly on each of the three. The Area Redevelopment Act, for which the House wisely denied continued authorization in early June, has proven to be an extremely costly boondoggle which has accomplished practically none of its desired results. Rather than creating new jobs, in many cases it has merely used Federal funds to transplant employment, leaving new unemployment in its wake. In other cases it has permitted staggering expenditures to create a miniscule number of jobs. In the depressed area of Minnesota, for example, the redevelopment agency approved loans and grants totaling nearly $19 million to build a convention auditorium near Duluth. In the agency's own words, the purpose of these loans and grants was to "supplement convention, entertainment, recreation, and cultural facilities of the area." The auditorium will ultimately provide the magnificent total of 22 jobs, at a cost to the taxpayers of only $277,272 per job. This sort of bargain will, I am sure, be of substantial comfort to the iron ore miners of Duluth and victims of hard-core unemployment in other depressed areas.

The pork-barrel Public Works Acceleration Act, for which the House recently passed an additional authorization of $450 million, has been a similar success. Ignoring the fact that public works construction has never been effective as an anticyclical measure during an economic recession (unemployment is not concentrated in the constructon field today) the Kennedy administration ballyhooed the additional authorization as a needed short-term shot in the arm while the economy waited for the long-term accomplishments of the Area Redevelopment Act. The past performance of this program gives little hope for future results. The act has been unable to provide immediate employment because of the large leadtime needed for surveys and studies before work can actually begin. Also, in many cases, because of its matching grant features it has diverted community resources from necessary high-priority long-term projects to less-needed short-term projects which will qualify for Federal assistance. Furthermore, a high percentage of the cost of these projects has inevitably gone for the purchase of materials and equipment and for the employment of already-employed skilled and professional people.

One example of how little employment is produced for each dollar spent was provided by one of my Republican colleagues during the debate on the floor of the House several months ago. Among next year's projects is a recreational facility in Hickory County, Mo., costing $347,000, which will employ no people permanently, and which, during the development of the facility, will employ a grand total of about 47 people for a period of a year. Incidentally, Hickory County has a total population of about 4,500 people. Gentlemen, this bill has been presented to America as one answer to the unemployment problem. I say it is rather a pork-barrel slush fund which will undoubtedly be used by the Kennedy brothers to help elect more Kennedy-type Democrats to Congress and return them to the Presidency.

The third part of the administration program to combat unemployment, the so-called youth employment bill, deserves even less comment. Its provision for a Youth Conservation Corps impresses me as an extremely cruel hoax. Under the terms of this bill, young people would be taken off the city streets for periods varying from 6 months to 2 years and trained to plant trees and shrubs, use a pick and shovel, and chop wood. In other words, get them out of sight. However, it is extremely difficult to see how this type of training will equip them to operate complex machines, learn the skills of a profession like a truly skilled life insurance man, or work in the advanced laboratories of the future and so give them real jobs, permanent jobs—not make-shift jobs—and, I might add, provide the skilled manpower we so badly need; the lack of which really puts the crimp in our economic growth. Even the Washington Post and Times-Herald labeled the bill as a mere "patch" on the main problem and criticized it as providing only "make work and stopgap jobs." A sound alternative was presented in the Senate by Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, which would have provided increased funds under the Manpower Training Act to train unemployed young people for the skilled jobs now available. Needless to say, this constructive proposal was rejected

by those who persist in thinking of New Deal solutions for New Frontier problems.

Because of other similar costly and ill-conceived programs, we have failed to control and manage our fiscal affairs within the limits of what the country can afford and to solve the problems that need solution; we have essentially departed from a basic philosophy of our Founding Fathers who believed that it was our citizen duty to support our State and not our country's obligation to support its citizens. To this end, Thomas Jefferson once said: "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt—we must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

In our time we have disregarded the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson. We have also rejected the prophetic admonition of the French philosopher deTocqueville who warned us in the early history of our country that if the time should ever come when people conclude they can vote themselves benefits out of the Public Treasury, self-government by responsible men will be an impossibility.

I need not tell a knowledgeable group such as this that the implications of our failure to do better in handling our fiscal affairs are of concern to any person now living, or to live in the future, who might aspire to be free of political domination. Furthermore, the truth of the matter is that we in world affairs are the world's banker; on the strength and stability of the American dollar rests the economic vitality and monetary security of the non-Communist world and probably the Communist world as well, inasmuch as it is a parasite living off the system of the free world. In the past 12 years we have had 11 deficits in our balance of payments and our gold supply has dwindled to approximately $16 billion. Our commitments against this gold supply included our obligations of $12 billion of legal monetary reserves and obligations of a considerably greater magnitude held by foreign governments and foreign nations.

The simple fact that as the world's banker we borrow short and lend long demonstrates the importance of confidence in our ability to conduct our fiscal and monetary affairs in such a way as to avoid debasing the purchasing power of the dollar.

Against this backdrop of debt, deficits, and declining gold supply, we are now told that the cure for virtually all our problems is to be found in a tax cut. This proposal makes me wonder whether this issue should be decided by the votes of those American citizens who are now of voting age or by the votes of those young people whose age does not now qualify them for voting status. Indeed, it is the latter group that we will be taxing to make up the deficit from the tax reduction that we give to ourselves. Americans have always felt strongly against the idea of taxation without representation; hence if we who have been entrusted with the right of franchise persist in failing to treat this right as also a trusteeship for Americans under age 21 and those not yet born, then we should formally create such a trusteeship so that the voice of the future generations could be heard on the question of a tax cut at this time of high spending and planned deficits.

There is no one who is more concerned than I am over the stifing effect of our present tax structure on economic growth and national strength. Our tax laws represent a peculiar tax policy for a country that relies on individual initiative for progress. Tax receipts of Federal, State, and local governments take almost one-third of our net national product, and most of these receipts are derived from assessments on earned income and on capital accumulation. The more productive and venturesome a person is, the higher tax he pays.

The result is that our present tax system has an impact that is not conducive to economic growth. We have a sharp progressivity of tax rates that is self-defeating. The complexity of our tax structure discourages enterprise and impairs venture taking. In short, I have long been associated with those who say tax reduction and reform are long overdue, and I say "welcome aboard" to the Johnny-come-latelies, in which category I include President Kennedy and his economic mentor, Dr. Walter Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. However, I wholeheartedly disagree with those who are mostly these Johnny-come-latelies who say we can have high deficit spending as usual and still have lower tax burdens across the board. I disagree with those who believe that outlays for even tested and wanted Government programs can be continued without establishing priorities and total ceilings. We cannot tax less to pay more for these programs. In short, I support a major program of tax rate restructuring and reform to remove the impediments to incentive and capital formation, but only if we are not at the same time building up worse impediments to economic growth through larger debt burdens and the monetary imprudence such a course produces.

Tax reduction should not be enacted at this time without a commitment from the administration and a pledge by the Congress, both backed by hardheaded action, to hold spending over the next 2 or 3 years at a level that does not exceed the 1963 figure. Tax reduction should not be enacted unless it is designed to increase productive incentive and to enable the capital accumulation needed to undertake the entrepreneurial risks. Tax reduction should not be enacted if it is designed for a mere short-term stimulant, like dope, that would not result in sustainable economic growth and would end up in hopeless and deleterious addiction to government rather than private allocation of our resources.

Thus, I think it can generally be agreed among this group that our tax reduction objective (1) must be sought under conditions of our regaining control over our spending activities, (2) must be directed toward the attainment of long-term economic progress, and (3) must have as its focal point the easing of tax burdens from those critical rates and substantive provisions that, under present law, make tax saving more important than taxable earnings. In short, we must free our tax structure from its inhibitants against growth and efficiency. How do we do this?

First, we must realize that as long as we are spending for more Government than we are willing to afford, we cannot have tax reduction solely for the sake of making the cost of Government generally less on our citizens. Any tax reduction must be so planned and designed as to achieve maximum incentive benefit at minimum revenue loss. We must not have a tax reduction that seeks to solve our growth and full employment problems merely by increasing the size of the deficit that would have to be financed by added Government borrowing and bank-created funds.

Second, we must recognize that the economic progress from tax reduction at this time finds its key in the vigorous expansion in business investment in new plant and equipment, in inventory and in accounts receivable in the distribution and service areas of our economic endeavor, the area like insurance where we are experiencing the greatest growth and progress, and in the growth of small business. In our last two recessionary periods, profits or incentive for business capital to invest has lagged and, as a consequence, we have had a recovery in each instance that fell short of expectation. This supports the view that our tax reform at this time and under present circumstances must emphasize easing the tax burdens and the governmental debt burdens on savings and investment.

Parenthetically, on this second point, I would observe this fact: Anything we may do in the area of tax reform, revision, and reduction will be to no avail if our people do not have confidence in Government administration and policies. Therefore, we must not repeat the self-defeating mixture of bad and good tax changes that comprised the administration's tax bill of the last Congress. Unfortunately, however, it appears that we are headed down the same road again with this year's tax cut package. We should avoid seeking through tax legislation the accomplishment of nonrevenue objectives such as social reforms and curbs on foreign investment by American free enterprise and private investors. We should strengthen, not weaken, confidence in the integrity of government. We should base our tax reform on the hard realities of sound economics and competitive advancement and let the shortsighted politics be damned.

A third factor that we must take into account as we seek tax reform conducive to growth and efficiency is our present undue reliance on taxes on earned income to produce our Government revenues. The statistic and comparative tax tables on this point are well known, and the details need not detain us here. The effect is that our tax structure with its steeply progressive rate schedule and high corporate rate discourages risk and productive effort and even brings about what I will term the "economic withdrawal" of some of our most promising and able producers.

Tax reduction involving minimum revenue loss and maximum economic benefit will take account of those factors which will encourage utilization of technological innovation and which will sustain in our people a desire to work hard for enlarged incomes and a willingness to accept the risks of entrepreneurial activity. This sort of tax reduction can help us to afford the Government we need; Government whose every expenditure meets the test of absolute essentiality and Government whose every service and good is provided to the people only because the people cannot do it for themselves.

I would come to the close of this discussion by recalling the words of President Eisenhower in his last budget message presented to the Congress in which he said:

"In summary, if we plan wisely and allocate our resources carefully, we can have both public and private advancement. Sound fiscal policies and balanced budgets will sustain good economic growth and eventually will make possible a reduced tax burden. At the same time, we can have necessary improvements in Federal programs to meet the demands of an ever-changing world.

"If, however, we deliberately run the Government by credit cards, improvidently spending today at the expense of tomorrow, we will break faith with the American people and their children, and with those joined with us in freedom throughout the world."

In fact, I happen to believe that the growth and dominance of Government and budgetary deficits in the past three decades have not interfered more detrimentally to our existence as a nation is not a testimonial to the wisdom of Government policy but is instead attributable to the excellence of our free enterprise system and the indomitable industry of our people. These latter have

been tougher and have taken more abuse than anyone had a right to expect.

I speak not as an alarmist when I say that the strength of private enterprise cannot endlessly endure the encroachment of bureaucracy; private initiative cannot flourish in the face of Government confiscation of the risktaker's product. Government must cease profligately using the power to spend as the reason for taxing more and more of our national substance and creating more debt to pass on to our children.

In addition, the private sector of the economy must do its part. It should follow such excellent examples as the insurance industry in the case of health care, particularly for the aged, and devise effective private programs to meet social needs with a minimum of governmental help.

Let me close by commending you as individuals and as a group for resisting the attempts, though well meaning, of those who foolishly think we can achieve economic security through the bounty of Government and this without a regard for whether, even if it were attainable, it would be at the sacrifice of individual freedom. Let me urge you to continue to encourage others to hold fast to the belief that there is only one way to achieve economic benefits for our citizens—through freeing up, not interfering, with the operation of the private enterprise system. An objective review of our brief 200-year history as a society in contrast to the thousands of years of treadmill history of other societies substantiates this belief. The lobby we most need in Washington is a lobby against unnecessary expansion of the Federal Government under the pretext of providing some citizens with economic security. I urge all people to join that lobby as citizens for a better America. If this lobby succeeds in its aim, perhaps the taxes our children pay will be for the cost of their Government, not ours.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Washington County, Ind., Dedicates Elk Creek Watershed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on August 14 the dedication of the Elk Creek small watershed project was held in Washington County, Ind. This was a proud day for all of us. The Elk Creek project was the first watershed project in Indiana to be approved, and now it is the first to be dedicated. In a very real sense the people of Washington County have provided a stimulus for other Hoosiers, for we now have 11 projects approved in Indiana and 54 other applications are awaiting approval. The benefits to our State in flood control, irrigation, better land management, and recreation are just beginning to be realized.

At the dedication of this watershed project those who attended were privileged to hear an address by D. A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service. His address was noteworthy in that it points out the many accomplishments of this watershed. It also recognizes the distinct contributions of those who donated their time, labor, and land rights to obtain this project. I think this statement is worthy of our attention because it shows the significant part a project liks this can play in stimulating local action.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Williams' remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERSHED PROJECTS AND RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

(Address by D. A. Williams)

It is a genuine pleasure and privilege to take part in the dedication of the Elk Creek watershed project. One of the greatest satisfactions in my work as Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service comes from occasions such as this. I appreciate this opportunity to share with you the fulfillment of a goal that was 8 years in the making.

Back in 1955 this project was merely an idea born among a group of you as a means of getting ahead in farming. You recognized the hazards of farming the rolling land here in southern Indiana—the destructive capacity of floods, the costly damages caused by erosion, and the despair of farming faltering soils.

As your idea developed, you pioneered the watershed movement in Indiana. Six years ago, in 1957, the Elk Creek watershed project became the first in the State to be approved for construction. Today it is the first in the State to be dedicated. This is a distinction not to be taken lightly. In the years to come there will be more watershed dedications in Indiana. The spark that will ignite many of those projects will come from the success you have shown here.

This is a proud day for all of us and especially those of you who formed the Elk Creek Watershed Association, the supervisors of the Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District, and the many who donated time, labor, and land rights to see this project through.

You can point to many tangible accomplishments—to the almost 32,000 feet of terraces constructed, to the 58 acres of grass waterways built, to the shift of 550 acres of land from other uses to pasture, and to the many floodwater retarding dams. These are impressive accomplishments on a watershed of only 18,000 acres. Yet I sincerely believe that your real accomplishments are yet to come.

You are already receiving project benefits in flood protection, better land management, irrigation, and recreation. The Indiana State Department of Conservation is developing one of the watershed structures into a 47-acre recreation lake. This will greatly enhance the outdoor recreational opportunities of the community and the area.

The results of your project have played a part in stimulating local action in other sections of southern Indiana. Already approved for construction are the Stucker Fork watershed in Washington, Scott, Jefferson, and Clark Counties; Middle Fork of Anderson River watershed in Perry and Crawford Counties; the French Lick Creek project in Orange County; Dewitt Creek watershed in Lawrence County; Boggs Creek project in Martin County; and the Prairie Creek project in Martin and Davies Counties. In the planning stage is the Muddy Fork of Silver Creek here in Washington County and in Clark County. In addition, five other applications have been made from neighboring counties for assistance in watershed projects.

Indiana presently ranks eighth nationally with 65 applications for watershed project assistance. Of the 11 projects approved for construction, 7 of them are here in southern Indiana.

These projects will go a long way in strengthening the local rural economy. Bringing new vitality to rural America is one of the primary objectives of the Department of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Service. The economic problems of southern Indiana are not different from those in many other sections of the Nation.

There has been a steady outmigration of the area's youth to urban and industrial centers. There has been a decline in farm income and in the number of farms and farmers. There is a definite lack of job opportunities. These are difficult, deep-rooted problems. They cannot be solved overnight, nor can they be solved if the the people in the areas do not actively seek solution.

As you know, the Department of Agriculture has committed itself to a policy of strengthening rural America and is carrying out this objective through the rural areas development approach.

Secretary Freeman has stated that the rural areas development program has two fundamental goals:

First, we must move economic opportunity into rural areas instead of forcing people out of the country. And second, we must use land, not idle it. Resources must be used in ways that conserve and serve the real needs of all people, rural and urban.

You people no doubt understand the objectives and potentials of the rural areas development approach far better than those in many other rural areas.

Secretary Freeman was tremendously impressed during his rural areas development tour of southern Indiana in May. At the invitation of the Lincoln Hills rural areas development committee, he saw agricultural, industrial, and community developments throughout an eight-county area. He saw rural areas development in action.

In Washington County he toured the Elk Creek watershed project which we are dedicating today and the new Bata Shoe Co. Attracting new industry to the rural areas is vital. As important as agriculture is to this community's economy, it cannot offer the employment opportunities so desperately needed by the youth who wish to remain in the country.

If we are to stem outmigration, we must have new jobs in rural areas. The existence of the Bata plant, which will eventually employ 400 local people, is proof this can be accomplished. The Department of Agriculture will continue to encourage industrial expansion in rural America and has included this as one of its rural areas development goals.

At the same time we must move ahead with the development of our natural resources. We have been extremely fortunate in having rich resources of land, water, and forests. The land of America has been good to us. It will remain good only if we make it so.

We have found through bitter and costly experience that our natural resources are not inexhaustable. Once depleted, they take generations to replace—if replacement is at all possible. How you develop and manage your resources in Washington County today will have a great bearing on the economy of this area in the years to come.

This is your challenge. We have the tools available to help you meet it. Since 1935, when the conservation program began, we have repeatedly broadened our aims and developed new programs to meet the growing needs of the people. But local leadership and initiative are indispensable. Secretary Freeman in formally initiating the rural areas development program said: "The Federal Government can provide incentives and technical services, but government cannot and should not do the conservation and development job for local people on privately owned land. The challenge in the use of the new tools provided by Congress is to the leadership of the people of rural America."

You have aptly demonstrated your leadership ability in Washington County, and I commend you for it. You have successfully completed one watershed project and are actively engaged in two others. But much remains to be done. Your ability to meet local problems will be tested time and time again in the years to come.

Rural development is a vast undertaking often calling for talents and knowledge unique to local soil conservation districts. What other local organization has the extensive knowledge of the county's soils and their capabilities, or of the area's resources and their conservation needs? These talents are in demand. They can be put to

good use in making rural America more prosperous.

The rural areas development program is the blending of new programs with going programs in an effort to help local people help themselves. Let me briefly discuss four new approaches in rural areas development—the cropland conversion program, resource conservation and development projects, new small watershed program authorizations, and assistance in establishing income-producing recreational enterprises on private rural land.

First, the Department's cropland conversion program offers farmers transitional payments for converting surplus producing cropland to pasture, trees, and land for recreational uses. This program, now underway with pilot projects in 237 counties, is under the leadership of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Land to be converted will be based on a detailed farm conservation plan developed in cooperation with a soil conservation district and with the assistance of an SCS conservationist.

Second, resource conservation and development projects will enable farmers, city people, rural communities, and other groups to work together to improve land use patterns and develop the natural resources of rural areas.

It was during his rural areas development tour in May that Secretary Freeman announced that the Lincoln Hills project in the neighboring counties of Harrison, Crawford, Perry, and Spencer, will be the first under this new program. Planning for this 1 million acre project will get underway as soon as funds are available.

In a resource conservation and development project area, USDA programs, both new and old, will be concentrated and accelerated in an attempt to provide additional economic opportunities to the people. The success of the project will, again, depend on the effort put forth by the sponsoring and endorsing organizations—the soil conservation districts, special-purpose districts, local and State governments, the RAD committees, and other groups.

The goals will vary from project to project but emphasis will be put on strengthening the family farm through conservation planning, developing both private and public outdoor recreational facilities, encouraging rural industries to make use of the raw materials produced in and near the project area, and promoting community land use adjustments and facilities.

Although the Soil Conservation Service has leadership in the program, many other USDA agencies offering credit, research, cost sharing, technical help, educational assistance, and specialized services have an important role to play.

In addition, the sponsoring groups will be encouraged to draw help and assistance from local, county, and State governments and from Federal departments outside the Department of Agriculture. We feel there is a great potential in this approach to the rural problem, and I am happy to see Indiana kick off the program.

Other new tools in rural areas development include the amendments to the small watershed program.

Hundreds of localities, like yours, have already been able to deal more effectively with their land and water problems through small watershed projects. Year after year Congress has broadened the small watershed program to meet the growing needs for resource development. As you know, rural and urban communities have shown that they can halt soil erosion, stop destructive floods, improve drainage, supply water for growing municipal and industrial needs, improve irrigation, establish outdoor recreational facilities, and boost the economy in other ways.

The latest amendments include cost sharing on public recreational facilities and development of industrial and municipal water facilities for future use.

Project sponsors may now receive in Federal cost shares up to 50 percent of the cost for enlarging the dams, obtaining land, easements, and rights-of-way, and minimum basic facilities such as boat docks and ramps, picnic tables and fireplaces, power and sanitary facilities, roads, and trails in developing public recreational facilities.

Already more than 41 proposals have been received from local organizations to add recreation in watershed projects, and the number continues to grow.

As for water supply, where sponsoring groups feel there is a future need for municipal or industrial water storage, these measures may now be incorporated in the watershed project plan and constructed, with repayment deferred up to 10 years. These two new amendments will contribute much to stimulating watershed project activity and thereby strengthen the overall rural economy.

Let me say a few words about income producing recreational facilities on private rural land. Cooperators in soil conservation districts can receive technical help from the Soil Conservation Service in developing such enterprises as part of their basic conservation plan.

During the past year activity in this phase of the rural areas development program has been tremendous. Nationally almost 40,000 soil conservation district cooperators discussed the possibility of developing recreational facilities on their property with SCS field personnel assigned to soil conservation districts. More than 9,800 established one or more income producing recreational enterprises on their land. For 10 percent of these landowners and operators, recreation became their primary source of income.

In Indiana, 175 district cooperators entered the recreation-for-profit business during the fiscal year. For almost 25 percent of these, recreation became the primary source of income. An additional 260 Indiana district cooperators plan to enter the field in the near future. This activity will grow. The potential is great. For those who have the managerial skills, the interests, and the initiative, there are unlimited opportunities.

The recreational enterprises include vacation farms, fishing and swimming waters, picnic and camping grounds, hunting preserves, and the like. The mushrooming cities have not kept pace with providing recreational sites and open areas for its citizens. Rural areas offer the land, water, and woodlands needed for such developments.

These, then, are some of the new tools to help lift the economy of rural America. We in the Soil Conservation Service believe more strongly then ever that the answers to many of today's problems will be found in the development and wise use of both our natural and human resources. The Department's rural areas development approach will go a long way toward solving these problems.

Castro's Kidnappers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of August 25, 1963:

CASTRO'S KIDNAPPERS

(By Robert G. Spivack)

The U.S. Government looked pathetic when a State Department spokesman announced that a Cuban air and naval force had seized 19 anti-Castro refugees off a British islet in the Caribbean while our jets and a Coast Guard patrol plane helplessly circled overhead.

The description of the incident as one of international "kidnapping" supposedly constituted a severe rebuke to Castro's bad boys. Actually, it made our position look even worse. It is not in keeping with American tradition to stand by and allow refugees, or freedom fighters, to be taken by force of arms to the country from which they have sought to escape.

When such incidents have taken place at the Berlin wall the excuse for our inaction has been that it might touch off a world conflagration, with the Soviet Union and East German armed forces so near at hand.

But if we have become so spineless that such incidents can go unpunished within an area that is not even 100 miles from our shores, how can we expect the rest of the American Republics to take seriously our oft-expressed determination to keep the hemisphere safe from communism?

And why should Castro himself take us seriously when we back down at every confrontation?

The kidnapping incident forces us once again to take a look at our Cuban policy, or "nonpolicy." During July, Castro announced expropriation of the American Embassy in Havana; on July 26 he called for violent revolution throughout Latin America. His adherents have carried on ceaseless guerrilla warfare against the democratic regime of Venezuela's President Betancourt.

We still talk grandiosely about the Alliance for Progress, a laudable but long-range objective. But as far as dealing with day-by-day incidents, it seems clear we have no plan for coping with Castro.

As a result, our prestige in Latin America sinks lower and lower.

I base this not on conjecture, or even on what might be considered logical reaction to our indecisiveness, but on what responsible Latin American leaders have told me. The liberal moderates, the conservatives and the ultraleftists all find American conduct incomprehensible.

"Just imagine," one told me, "how Khrushchev would react if such things were happening within 100 miles of his borders."

Again the question naturally arises: What can we do about Castro's conduct? In the case of the Caribbean "kidnapping," I would think the answer was fairly obvious. Our planes should have fired warning shots at the kidnappers, and if they did not back off then, we should have engaged them in the kind of aerial diversionary activity that would have driven them away, or at least given the refugees sufficient time in which to escape.

The argument is made that we needed British permission to act within their territorial waters. This is not a legal quibble, but in a case so flagrant in its violation of international law our forces should have been able to draw the Castroites into open waters; or if not, then we should have provided a shield for the refugees.

Such action, of course, would be an improvisation, but it might drive home the point which, I hope, our Government intends to make; namely that we do not intend to sit by and allow Castro a free hand in the Caribbean, or in the hemisphere.

Aside from such action, however, Castro is forcing us to do what the Kennedy administration clearly does not want to do: give greater encouragement to the anti-Communist democratic Cubans to engage in guerrilla warfare against the Havana regime.

The longer we delay—and the longer we tolerate the presence of Soviet troops on Cuban soil—the more costly such operations are going to be.

It is regrettable that the administration has allowed itself to become so alienated from the Cuban refugees, after so much big talk about what he hoped to do. But if we do not want to lose all of Latin America, we are going to have to come to grips with the problems Castro poses and that includes working with the refugees.

Tribute to the Late Charles M. Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the West has known many great men, but no man means more to Montanans than Charles M. Russell, the cowboy artist whose statute stands in the Capitol. Truly a man of the West he was able to catch a glance and portray for all time and for generations to come, a bit of the realism of an uncommon era, the Old West.

Charlie was born in 1864, the year that Montana Territory was created. As Montana is now preparing for its territorial centennial it is only fitting that we commemorate further the memory of this great Montanan, a man who even before his death was known as "Mr. Montana."

Ralph Friedman in an article which appeared in the Sunday, September 8, 1963, issue of the New York Times gives a brief outline of the life of this gentleman who he calls the most famous legend in Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Ralph Friedman be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST FAMOUS LEGEND IN MONTANA

(By Ralph Friedman)

GREAT FALLS, MONT.—This State's best-known privately owned building is a shabby saloon at 222 Central Avenue here in Great Falls. Each year, visitors from all parts of the Nation, and from other lands, come on pilgrimage to "The Mint," the saloon so closely associated with the life and art of Charles Marion Russell, painter of the West. The Mint is only a mile from the Russell Gallery and from Russell's log cabin studio, both of which are open to the public. Another Russell Gallery is in the State Capital at Helena.

No man in all Montana history was so adored. The State legislature chose Russell to be honored in the Hall of Fame in Washington, D.C., and almost every place he ever visited has become an unofficial monument.

He is the most famous of Montana legends, for in his paintings he gave the Treasure State its most precise and dramatic image of last frontier days. At the Mint, which Russell knew intimately when Montana was still wild and woolly, people still seek this image.

Charley Russell was born in St. Louis on March 19, 1864. At 16, he journeyed to the high plains country of Montana and worked as a horse wrangler. There, he was promptly nicknamed "Kid" Russell. His first sketches were made simply to amuse other range hands.

THE ROAD TO FAME

Russell started on the road to fame with a simple, stark sketch suggested by the terrible winter of 1886–87, which wiped out many of the State's finest herds. His expressive "Last of Five Thousand," depicting a starving cow faltering in the snow while a coyote waits hungrily by, is still a favorite of cattlemen.

Even after his paintings, both oils and watercolors, and his illustrations began to bring him fame, Russell continued working as a cowpoke. But, although he tried hard at it, he was never a very good one.

In self portraits, however, he often depicts himself astride a horse, at a campfire or near the chuckwagon. A fervent admirer of early range life and a champion of the Indians—he spent a year among the Canadian Bloods in his youth—Russell was the purest romanticist Montana ever had.

In his early years, he planted whatever he could. He first used a henhouse and then a stone barn in Helena. He drifted in from the range late in the fall and stayed until there was sufficient bunch grass in spring to feed his horse. Barns and stables in the plains towns of Malta, Stanford, Utica, Judith Gap and Cascade also served as his studios.

After Russell started on a full-time career as an artist, he built a log cabin studio in Great Falls. But when he was not painting, he could be found at Bill Rance's Silver Dollar Saloon. When it failed, he took his business to the Mint, then owned by Sid Willis, an early day sheriff and former U.S. marshal.

Willis not only purchased the paintings Rance had acquired from Russell, but was soon collecting new work by the warm-hearted, lackadaisical artist. There are numerous tales that Russell gave away drawings and paintings for drinks, but Willis, before his death in 1955, vigorously denied the stories.

"I paid for every one," he said. How much, he declined to say.

At the Mint, the unvarnished, ungrammatical Russell liked to lounge and meet men of his own plain and friendly kind. He regarded the Mint as his second home, and there he played host to luckless cowboys, down-and-out miners, prospectors from the shining mountains and celebrities who had traveled hundreds of miles out of their way to meet the man who, they believed, was the Old West's most faithful biographer.

The few who remember Russell from those days describe him as a short, square man who was always telling stories, and who angered many of his contemporaries because of his defense of the Indians. Indians were not popular among the cowpokes and homesteaders.

They say that Russell was always sketching or modeling clay as he talked or listened. He could pick up an old piece of cardboard from the street and draw on it, the old-timers recall. And he could model an Indian or a horse out of a lump of clay in a few minutes. The walls of the Mint were always covered with his paintings.

In 1906, Russell married Nancy Cooper, whom he had met at dinner at a friend's house. Willis once said, "Up to the time of his marriage, Charley had no idea of the worth of his paintings. Nancy was smart enough to recognize their value and push him forward."

Russell's last creation, unfinished, sold for $30,000.

Shortly after Russell's death in 1926, Willis launched a drive to have the painter's log cabin studio and residence made a memorial, and 6 years ago the Russell Gallery was opened.

AN $80,000 COLLECTION

Willis sold the Mint in 1945 and retired. Russell's paintings—they numbered about 14—his sketches and other works were included in the transaction. The collection, which was sent to Texas, was valued at more than $80,000.

The Mint has changed radically since the days of Charley Russell. Once it had dance-hall girls and a dining room, and was the liveliest place in Great Falls. Today, its atmosphere is that of most saloons found in rundown areas.

But it still holds tight to the memory of Charley Russell. Pictures of him hang on the walls and copies of his sketches and paintings are there and for sale if there are buyers; if not, for atmosphere.

Religion in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (N.C.) Daily News of August 26, 1963:

RELIGION IN SCHOOLS

Recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions seem, bit by bit, to be chipping away at any real religious exercises in public schools.

What is going to happen now about school devotionals? How about Bible reading in schools? Can we constitutionally say the Lord's Prayer in schools?

These are questions which will be answered along the way. Here in North Carolina we have had no court cases over religion in our schools. We hope that we will not have any. There are, however, always certain people who seem bent on carrying a point regardless of what that point is.

We suspect that in the foreseeable future we will see little change in the accepted patterns being exercised in the religious field in our schools. We suspect that we will continue to use the Lord's Prayer, read Bible verses, and in general have a religious atmosphere in our schools until such time as someone comes along to contest such exercises.

When someone objects, what course the activity might then take is a matter open for discussion. But even then religion is so firmly stamped in the minds and hearts of people in North Carolina, that we will continue to have religious devotionals until such time as the U.S. Supreme Court says directly to North Carolina—"You can't do it."

When that time comes, it will be a sad day and a tragic hour. And the one who brings court action here in North Carolina to ban prayers in our public schools will by that very action bring upon himself the scorn, ridicule, and disrespect of the overwhelming majority of our people. It is a matter about which there will be little indifference even among those who seemingly are indifferent now to religion.

Insofar as religion and a religious atmosphere are concerned right now in good old North Carolina, we believe both are safe for the time being.

One Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the splendid letter written by the Reverend Marion Gordon Robertson, associate pastor of the Freemason Street Baptist Church, Norfolk, Va., to the editor of the Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, has come to by attention. In his letter, Mr. Robertson discusses the recent Supreme Court decision banning prayer and Bible reading from the public schools, and presents a forceful argument indeed that our children should be taught at least that we are "one nation under God."

Mr. Robertson, the son of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], has an unsual, if not unique background. He received his B.A. degree from Washington and Lee University, magna cum laude, just after his 20th birthday, and went on to receive his LL.B. degree from Yale Law School, and then his theological degree from one of the outstanding nonsectarian theological seminaries in the Nation.

Mr. Robertson is thus able to discuss and view the recent Court decision from both the legal and theological background, and his splendid letter is worthy of the special reading of every Member of the Congress and the entire Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Robertson, appearing in the September 8 Virginian-Pilot, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Virginian Pilot, Sept. 8, 1963]

UNITED STATES RESTS SQUARELY ON BIBLE

EDITOR, VIRGINIAN-PILOT:

In your editorial of September 2 you took Virginia's Senators to task for criticizing the recent Supreme Court decision banning prayer and Bible reading from the public schools, while at the same time you affirm that these decisions are a true support of our liberties. I must disagree with you on both philosophic and legal grounds.

In the first place, we must recognize that every pragmatic expression of government rests on certain underlying philosophic principles. The Governments of Soviet Russia and Red China rest squarely on a materialistic view of history which is regarded as a religion. The Fascism of Hitler's Germany grew out of a distorted view of racial supremacy, and the wars of aggression came from Hitler's desire for lebensraum for the master race. The monarchies of the 17th century rested on the theory of the divine right of kings. Even today a new nation of Israel is being founded squarely on the principles of the Old Testament.

In the case of the United States of America there is no question that our ideas of government, individual liberty, private property and initiative, education, and personal morality rest squarely in a personal God and the Holy Bible as the revelation of that God. It is in these things, and not in our material prosperity, that we differ from reactionary communism. How utterly absurd it is to tell our children that our country is good, while at the same time denying them the experiential understanding of how it got that way.

Schools in Russia and Red China teach the Marxist-Leninist "religion" day in and day out. In Israel children are indoctrinated in the Old Testament principles. In almost every other nation children are shown the reasons behind their way of life. Yet in the United States, by Supreme Court fiat, some 80 percent of the population is being told that ethical humanism is now replacing theism in our public life. And make no mistake about it, ethical humanism is a religion.

In the second place, the Supreme Court decision does not rest on sound constitutional law. It has always been the prevailing constitutional rule that the task of the Supreme Court was not to write laws but to interpret a document, and the decisions flowing from it. In order to do this the justices were to examine certain historical papers shedding light on the intent of the framers of the Constitution. It is the height of folly to believe that the men who brought forth this document out of a prayer meeting ever intended that there should be no devotional expression in schools. If this was what the framers of the Constitution intended, why has it taken 170 years for this fact to come to light?

Instead the Supreme Court has read into the establishment of religion clause a meaning totally alien to the framers, past history and tradition, as well as the prevailing American folkways. I assure you our liberties have not been safeguarded when the judiciary usurps the role of the legislature in order to take away the things on which our liberty is predicated.

M. G. ROBERTSON,
President,
The Christian Broadcasting Network, Inc.

Outdoor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, following my remarks on April 22, 1963, concerning the contributions to our Nation's stability made by the outdoor advertising industry, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent statement made by Paul C. Hessler, Jr., president of Hessler Outdoor Advertising:

All kinds of assaults are made on outdoor advertising. A few years ago, for instance, the Congress enacted legislation giving a bonus to States which require deep setbacks for billboards as part of the specifications for their highway systems.

The responsible members of the outdoor advertising profession are aware of the beauty of the countryside and go out of their way to cooperate with zoning regulations and with the legitimate desires of local beautification organizations.

In our own defense, for example, we can point out that many years ago, my father, the late Paul C. Hessler, founder of Hessler, Inc., decided against placing billboards on—or along—the Kennett Pike, a main road from Wilmington into Pennsylvania. Zoning regulations permit us to do this today, but we have continued to refuse to erect signs along this road.

Throughout the Nation, there are other concerns that have acted in good faith and with great restraint. We feel that advertising must always be in good taste, and we believe that the use of one medium of advertising to undermine another medium, * * * is unethical and injurious to the best interests of all advertisers.

Miss Indian America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Miss Indian America of 1962, a young Oregon lady, named Ramona Soto, spoke July 18 at the International Convention of the National Secretaries Association in Denver, Colo. Her speech, a mixture of wit, perception, and history, brought the audience to its feet and gave some excellent insights into the thinking of the American Indian.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Soto's speech, "From Wintercount to Telstar," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM WINTERCOUNT TO TELSTAR

(By Ramona Soto)

Ladies and gentlemen, there have been many wonderful things happen to me since I became Miss Indian America. It has been my privilege to meet and get to know people in all walks to life throughout our country.

I had visited, in the past 11 months and 1 week, almost every major area except Denver. Now, in addition to visiting this city and the State of Colorado (which is almost as pretty as Oregon). I am deeply grateful for the privilege to meet and become acquainted with the members of the National Secretaries Association, who are here at this vibrant and exciting convention.

In choosing the theme of my comments today, I was aware that few, if any, would know what I meant by wintercount. That actual wintercount is the tanned hide of a deer, elk, or buffalo (which is rather hard to procure nowadays). On this hide was painted in hieroglyphics, the activities of the tribe during the period of each month (or moen, as I understand we used to call it). This was the only readable history preserved of the Plains tribes in the far past. This was done by the historian, or should we say secretaries, of the tribe. Incidentally, it was done from memory in the wintertime when there was nothing else to do—hence, the wintercount.

I imagine that a similar situation took place in all reaches of the world in recording the development of various civilizations. Unfortunately, if there was a written language in the antiquity of the Indian, it had disappeared from the Americas before the arrival of the white invaders.

There were literally hundreds of different languages among the tribes which existed here. Transportation and communication were extremely limited. This may be good or bad. My tribe the Klamaths, at times, seemed to be in constant conflict with the Shoshone. But we have never had an argument with the Mohawk. The reason probably was that we did not know such a tribe existed.

The storyteller and the recorders of tribal activity had only to document activities

after they had happened. Nothing was set down to do—only what had been done. With no written language there could be no written contract. So, there were no dealings with anyone who was not there to deal in person. Just in the business world in its beginnings. A breach of faith between individuals was subject to immediate and frequently permanent punishment.

Among the Plains Indians imprisonment was unknown. These tribes were essentially nomadic, so it seemed foolish to leave someone in a compound and leave some valuable members of the trible to watch over him. It seemed equally useless to destroy any life wastefully.

In the beliefs of these tribes all things were brother, trees, rocks, birds, and animals. The buffalo, who was the mainstay of the Plains Indian was happy to know that this flesh, hide, bone, and sinew were useful to his brother, the Indian. He knew that the Indian would return to earth to provide greener grass for him to eat. Thereby, completing the cycle.

Because of this, banishment was the order of the day rather than capital punishment.

The life of the American Indian was an individual problem, or at best, the problem shared by a very small group.

When we reached the point of about one hundred years ago it seems to me that we were in somewhat the same position that another group was faced with at about the same time. This other group has gone an unbelievably long way. I am speaking of a segment of our population which can represent, women in business.

In the late 1800's conditions were such that women were neither educated for, nor encouraged in, nor accepted as an integral part of the business world. At that time, the popular idea was "a woman's place was in the home." This had about as much truth as the equally well-known statement, "the only good Indian is a dead one." Being both Indian and a woman, I assure you that I cannot believe either one. We know that the opportunities and rates of pay for women in business have shown a limited degree of equality and opportunity.

One hundred years ago, it was thought that there were only two professions available to women. One was as a teacher. The other profession, though older, was less desirable in society.

It would have been unfair to lump all women into the category of the heroines of the famous ballads, "She's More To Be Pitted Than Censured," and "The Bird in the Gilded Cage." They certainly were not all pitiful sights to see.

Why is it that one segment of the population, the women in business, have progressed in such an important manner, while the other, the American Indian, still remains one of our most serious national problems?

I would say first it has been in the realm of education. If you remember from your history books, written communications used to be in the exclusive hands of little men, sitting on high stools, protected by eye shades and carefully, by hand, noting the details of business transactions. Matters that had, like in the wintercount, already happened.

You here are living proof of the fact that the tempo of business has accelerated in a manner that would have been impossible under the conditions as they existed then. This acceleration would have been impossible without the encouragement by business for women to acquire the necessary education. This education released the talents of women to such an extent that they achieved practically universal acceptance. Those are the three points which both women in business and the American Indian had to have in order to take a significant place in the economy of our Nation. First education, second encouragement, and third acceptance.

I regret to say that the degree of achievement attained by the American Indian in regard to these three points has been woefully small.

What will the next 100 years promise, or even the next 10? I am certain that each of you have a pretty good idea of your future. We have plans, too, we can realize them only if we can follow in your footsteps and achieve progress through the application of the three so successfully used by women in business.

First, there is education. I imagine you might be amazed to know that there are literally thousands of reservation residents who have never been inside of a school. There are those who speak only their tribal language and would find it impossible to get gainful employment outside of the reservation.

There is one reservation in the Dakotas where 45 percent of the male population between the ages of 20 and 40 are unemployed. Not because they won't work, but because there are no jobs on the reservation and they have no training or skills for work on the outside. Of equal importance is encouragement—encouragement to develop the talents and skills that make possible good life in our society. And there must be acceptance of these talents, skills, and the responsibilities, by both Indian and non-Indians.

It is ridiculous to indict an entire people for unsavory actions of a few of its members. But too many people who should know better say the Indian is nothing but an indolent drunkard. You know and I know that this just cannot be true.

Let me remind you—there were no locks on teepees. There are many of my people who have been and are successful in our economy. Others can be and will be in many and varied fields. I look forward to the time when one of my people may be honored in the same manner as you have chosen to honor your candidates for Secretary of the Year here today. Many of you, I'm sure, know of such eminent representatives of my people as the Will Rogers, both senior and junior, Maria Tallchief in the ballet, Jim Thorpe, the greatest athlete of the half century and Keely Smith in the field of popular songs. I'd like to mention in addition a few whom you may not know whose abilities brought honors such as you are awarding today in our Indian of the Year Award made annually at All-American Indian Days in Sheridan, Wyo. Among these so honored are Ralph Weeks Allen, for his work in the theater, W. W. Keeler, of Phillips Petroleum Co. for his outstanding work in the field of business, Judge Johnson, Chief Justice of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, for his achievement in law, and Idaho's Senator Joseph Garry.

I believe it is evident that these Indians much more demonstrate the potential of my people than do those found on the reservation equivalents of skid row.

You know, I think there is another similarity we might consider—that is—humor. How many times can you remember when a chuckle or a tension-breaking smile was worth its weight in gold? But secretaries are not supposed to be facetious or flippant, and did you ever see—on TV or in the movies—a flippant Indian? I doubt it. We are supposed to enter stoically, raise our right hand and say "Ugh"—thus completing all the dialogue written for us in the script. No one can run around all day just saying "Ugh" and no one I know does.

A very good friend of mine—the area vice president of the National Congress of American Indians who is a Crow by the name of Donald Deernose, while driving through Montana last winter with a non-Indian friend happened to comment that this was the pre-white-man country of his tribe. He said, and I quote, "This is very near the spot where my mother was born. Grandmother was one of the wealthier members of the tribe—and at this time horses were the measure of wealth. Well (and I'm still quoting), grandmother had the finest little mare in the tribe—and the mare was about to deliver an offspring—and my mother was about to be born. Food was becoming scarce in the region and the time had come to move the tribal encampment to greener fields. Of course, grandmother and her little mare had to go along. After a day's march it became evident that the colt would arrive any minute. So grandmother decided it was time for mother to be born. After the successful double delivery was made, they, of course, moved on to join the rest of the tribe—and," said Don, "it was almost 3 days before they caught up, grandmother riding the mare and mother riding the colt."

Honestly, most Indians do have a sense of humor—they have to in order to have survived the last hundred years—and I believe secretaries also have a sense of humor—to have survived hundreds of major and minor crises in the office. Without it, we are both dead.

But, in our age of communication a sense of humor, however important, is not enough. We don't have time to wait till the winter comes in order that we may record what has happened.

In business we are almost back to the point where we began—communication is, in point of time—almost as immediate as in the days when business was conducted only on a face-to-face basis. Though now, one face is on one side of the earth, the other side, and the connection is in orbit. The major difference is that the wintercount has to be done the spring before.

It may be that in the past hundred years we have learned—it may be we have not—your progress has been great—ours has been small. You have used to the hilt our three salient points—and have had the freedom to do so—we have not. I hope that you will continue and that we may eventually find the way to provide for all—education, encouragement, and acceptance, wherever we may be.

Thank you very much.

"Daddy" Trail, at 90, Remembers His "Old Boys"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago it ws my privilege to attend Murray State College at Murray, Ky. It was a small college with an enrollment of 700 or 800 and there I made some of the finest friends that any man has ever had.

Our barber there was E. J. "Daddy" Trail. He gave sound advice to us and was really a father to all of us that were in college at that time.

Recently "Daddy" celebrated his 90th birthday and there appeared in the Paducah Sun-Democrat, on Wednesday, August 7, an article by Bill Powell, an outstanding writer and editor of the Nation, about our friend, E. J. Trail.

The article, which follows, speaks for itself:

I should have known better than to ask "Daddy" Trail what I did. Afraid that, at 90, he might be forgetting some of his "boys" of Murray State football. I gingerly asked him if he kept up with the old gang.

Daddy lifted his eyebrows and said, "Just ask me about any of them. Go ahead and ask me about any of the old boys."

He seemed to dare me to do it, so I mentioned the first name that came to my mind. It was "Slim" Kent.

"Slim," said "Daddy" Trail, "is in St. Petersburg, Fla. He was on Corregidor, you know, and was a prisoner of war 3 years. He went blind, you know, but now he can see a little and is doing all right."

I asked about "Bullet Bill" McRaven, "Cobbie" Lee, "Bull" Wells, "Bubba" Mason, Clovis Wallis, "Red" Cochrane, John and Jim Miller, "Butch" Heath, Hugh May, Pedro Simmons, "Pee Wee" Nanney, Bill McMurray, "Baldy" McKenzie, Kent King, Gayle Stinson, Howard Allen, Phil Foster, Vernard Alderson, and some of the others. I asked until I could remember no others, and Daddy rattled off something about each one. He either knew where each one was or where each had recently been.

"Daddy" hasn't forgotten anything important about his boys, and he won't. He is a sentimental bureau of information about the Murray athletes whose names have blazed across the sports pages for 30 years or more.

Murray State College football players never had a better friend or a closer observer. "Daddy" was next to the coach—maybe at times he was closer than the coach—to many of the boys who went to Murray State to play the game of football.

"Daddy" Trail lives at Myrick Nursing Home at 514 South Fifth Street. He has been there about 2 years. I didn't know this until a friend, Mrs. Cue Juett, of Wickliffe, wrote me a letter telling me so.

"Daddy" lives in a nice place; his daughter, Mrs. Fred Lindsey, lives there too. She is only in her sixties but suffered some kind of illness that has made her almost helpless.

She would be very unhappy at the home, I have heard, if her daddy, "Daddy" Trail, were not there.

Jack and Mary Myrick work awfully hard to make the nursing home what they call a haven for the old people.

"We try hard to make them feel as if they had never left home," said Jack.

The old people do seem happy there, but they seem like babies. Some eyes stare vacantly, others show quick recognition. Some of the patients in their beds or chairs squirm, others lie quietly looking at the ceiling.

"Daddy" Trail is in a class by himself. He reads all the papers he can get his hands on, watches television, listens to the radio, argues sports and some questions of the day with most anybody passing by and bristles, all the time, with the interest and understanding of a man 40 years younger than he is.

I met "Daddy" at Murray in 1938; he remembered me when I went to Myrick Nursing Home last Monday.

"You've gained weight," he said, as he looked closely at me.

"Yes, I have," I said. "I haven't seen you in 25 years. I'm 44."

"Daddy" laughed.

"You," he said, "have a long way to go."

"Daddy" Trail wasn't a coach or an administrator at Murray State; he was a barber. His interest in Murray was created on his own and without an official connection, although I have thought for some time he should be at least an honorary member of the board of regents.

He has watched hundreds of Murray football and baseball games and personally counseled hundreds of athletes. They all knew "Daddy"; the hero and the scrub knew him. "Daddy" was a friend to the man who won the game but he always found a way to cheer or advise the sub who let the ball carrier through or dropped a pass or was on the opposite side of the field from his defensive assignment when the torturing play was made.

"Daddy" Trail is Elzie Jefferson Trail. He was named after President Jefferson. He is of Scottish descent, and was born in Livingston County in the year 1873. "Daddy" worked on the farm near Birdsville cutting trees, making rails, and clearing land until he was a pretty big boy. His dad died in 1888 and the family scattered. Young Elzie went to the home of Dave Adams near Smithland to live and, while there, he began to learn the barbering trade.

He cut hair on Sundays at the stable, with the shock-haired boys sitting on a board seat or in a cane-bottomed chair with a piece of domestic around their shoulders. He had shears but no clippers; they hadn't been invented.

Then "Daddy" went into Smithland, on his off hours from work on the Adams place, to really learn barbering in the shop of the Sedberry brothers. He shined shoes, prepared people for shaving, and honed the big, crude razors for the barbers most of the time. Then he went out and talked bushy-haired boys into coming to the shop so he could cut their hair free and maybe learn a little something.

Later "Daddy" went to Golconda and got a job; then he worked in Carrsville, Marion, Evansville, Paducah, Memphis, Chicago, and other places before he settled, in the year 1909 in his beloved Murray.

"I was what they called a tramp barber. I could get a job anywhere, and I didn't stay at some of the places very long. But I never wanted to leave Murray," he said.

"Daddy" was a barber 72 years; he retired in 1952.

"My hands got unsteady," "Daddy" said.

"Daddy" worked at a shop in downtown Murray but he set up his own shop across from the Murray State campus when Murray, established in 1923, was only 6 or 7 years old. "Daddy" has seen all of Murray State's homecoming games, and most of the college's other home football games. He also closely watched hundreds of the college's baseball games. He doesn't like basketball.

"That's a country game; it ought to be played in the country," he told me.

"Daddy" goes to some basketball games but declares it is only to see his friends and "certainly not the game."

"Daddy" lived for some time in Paducah in his "wandering" days; his oldest boy, Fred, was borth at Fifth and Jackson, just across the street from the pleasant nursing home where he lives now.

Fred lives in Memphis; another son, Herbert, lives in Livingston County. "Daddy" has been married twice, and both wives are dead.

"Daddy" saw his first football game here between Paducah and Mayfield in the 1920's—when Carlisle Cutchin was coaching at Mayfield. Paducah won. "Daddy" didn't like the game much at first but did later, and he loves it now.

"Daddy" has studied the game so much he knows it technically; he knows it better than many successful coaches do.

And at 90 he isn't content to let the world go by; he is looking forward to Murray's next homecoming and a possible reunion with the McRavens, the Kents, the Mays, and the McKenzies, and of awakened memories of those, like big old Ham Morris, who went away to war in 1942 and didn't make it home.

Aid Cut Imperils Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent action of the House in cutting the authorized amount for the Alliance for Progress by a full 25 percent is both imprudent and unwise.

In commenting on this pennywise-poundfoolish action, George Sherman, writing in the Washington Star, has pointed out:

In one fell swoop the House seemed to confirm the worst fears of suspicious Latin Americans—constantly fanned by Castroite-Communist charges—that the United States is in fact not capable of sustaining a long-term commitment to costly reform in this hemisphere.

Mr. Sherman's thoughtful article points up a number of the serious, if not disastrous, consequences in store for United States-Latin American help for self-help policies if the drastic $150 million is not restored. As Mr. Sherman has concluded:

Unless the Senate now holds firm and gets the $150 million restored to the final authorization bill, the United States is in grave danger of losing whatever initiative it has gained in Latin America during the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this analysis of a very important problem to our colleagues' attention:

AID CUT VOTE IMPERILS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By George Sherman)

The Alliance for Progress has been shaken to its very foundation during the past week and for the first time in 2 years Alliance architects here seriously discuss total collapse.

The reason: The unexpected and sudden vote in the House a week ago to slash $150 million from the $600 million annual aid authorization for this joint 10-year program of hemispheric reform.

"They just could not have picked a more historically horrible moment," moaned one U.S. official at the top of Alliance affairs. "If the cut remains, we will miss the rising wave of self-help and reform in Latin America.

"WE NEED MORE, NOT LESS"

"For 2 years we have worked, warned and cajoled in order to build a launching pad for economic development down there. The Latins had nothing—no plans, no technicians, no reforms. Today the machinery is built, the reforms are beginning, and we need more—not less—money to support them."

This mixture of fury and fear is fed by knawing frustration with partisan politics on Capitol Hill. Officials grope for persuasive proof which goes beyond political rhetoric to the impending disaster which they genuinely feel.

Officials who normally deal day-in day-out with Alliance affairs find themselves caught in cross currents of public weariness with all foreign aid and apparent Republican-conservative Democratic determination to use that weariness to embarrass the President politically.

One ally they have found is the reaction throughout Latin America to the cut. Newspapers and congresses all over the southern continent have expressed everything from anger and dismay to I-told-you-so golating on the extreme left.

"The Alliance has died, may it rest in peace," editorialized the Communist paper, El Siglo (The Century), last week in Santiago, Chile. Only the naive and servile can continue to believe in the Alliance for Progress," echoed the Communist El Popular newspaper in Montevideo, Uruguay.

In Bogota, Colombia, the respected moderate journal La Republica (The Republic) commented that President Kennedy has certainly suffered a defeat, but that his enemies in Congress have won only a "Pyrrhic victory." In La Paz, Bolivia, La Nacion—mouthpiece of the crisis-stricken government—appeared with this banner headline: "Mortal Blow to the Democracies of the Americas."

HARD BLOW IN PERU

The arbitrariness of the House action is what seems to have hurt most, both here and in Latin America. The $150 million Alliance cut was included in an overall $585 million reduction without either clarification or debate. In one fell swoop the House seemed to confirm the worse fears of suspicious Latin Americans—constantly fanned by Castroite-Communist charges—that the United States is in fact not capable of sustaining a long-term commitment to costly reform in this hemisphere.

Perhaps the most devastating psychological blow came in Peru, where Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator of Alliance affairs, had just arrived for crucial aid talks with new Peruvian President Fernando Belaunde Terry.

In only 1 month in office, this new constitutional president has astounded even the most optimistic by proposing concrete tax and land reforms—and taking action on tax collections—which could change oligarchal Peru into a model-leader of the Alliance for Progress.

BARRAGE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. Moscoso had rushed to Lima to discuss President Belaunde's urgent request for $25 million in U.S. aid. Shortly after he arrived he received another $30 million plea for U.S. support of half the proposed $60 million land reform.

But after the August 23 vote in the House, Mr. Moscoso had to spend much of his time fielding a barrage of questions challenging U.S. sincerity. Last Tuesday the Peruvian Senate unanimously passed a resolution for transmittal to the U.S. Senate urging that the authorization cuts be rescinded, and noting that they "deeply affect the normal development of national programs of economic and social development in Latin American countries."

Today Mr. Moscoso is in neighboring Ecuador, where a military junta which seized power 2 months ago is also taking steps on basic economic and social reform which frightened the country's civilian predecessor government.

COMMITMENT CITED

But Mr. Moscoso's advisers here point out that the United States will not be able to take advantage of this new reforming zeal—either in Ecuador, or Peru, or Argentina where a new government also takes power in October—if the aid cut is maintained.

To make matters worse, the prevalent belief throughout Latin America is that the United States committed itself to $1 billion aid per year for 10 years at the founding conference of Punta del Este in August 1961.

The Kennedy administration has had trouble enough meeting that commitment over the past 2 years. For the last fiscal year ending last June 30, they had to scrape together every type of loan and grant from Food-for-Peace assistance to long-term development loans to reach a grand total of $972.4 million.

But the most important part of these dollars in any year comes under the Latin American appropriation given the Agency for International Development, where Mr. Moscoso resides as head of Alliance operations. AID gives the most flexible grants and loans tied to basic social and economic reforms.

It is this $600 million AID request from which the total $150 million has been cut.

That cut has left AID officials with "two horrible choices," they say. First, they can cut back on the $100 million section of grants. But these grants which cover technical assistance in tax collecting, internal police security, and teacher training are considered essential. Therefore, the second choice is to cut the projected $500 million long-term-loan operations the total $150 million, or about 30 percent across the board.

Officials say that the House has also passed an amendment requiring 2 percent interest on all these loans which is in direct violation of the Charter of Punta del Este. The United States specifically pledged to supply loans running up to 50 years "and in general at very low or zero rates of interest."

FUNDS FIGHT AHEAD

More than 50 percent of U.S. Government funds currently being lent to Latin America goes at three-quarters of 1 percent interest.

And the final shattering effect of the House action is to explode the myth that the Alliance for Progress is a "popular" aid program. After the authorization fight is over in the Congress, the still tougher fight to get the actual appropriations through the House lies ahead.

Alliance officials fear that Representative PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, head of the House Subcommittee on Foreign appropriations and foe of all foreign aid, will take his cue from the early cut in the authorization limit and cut even deeper into the Alliance appropriations.

In the eyes of the top policymakers on Alliance affairs, unless the Senate now holds firm and gets the $150 million restored to the final authorization bill, the United States is in grave danger of losing whatever initiative it has gained in Latin America during the past 2 years.

Lafayette Leader Supports Removal of Social Security Earnings Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Lafayette Leader there was an editorial entitled, "Penalizing the Wrong Person."

The editorial is a commentary on a bill I introduced on July 16 this year to completely remove the social security earnings limitation.

Mr. President, I am happy to see this indication of public support of earnings limitation removal and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENALIZING THE WRONG PERSONS

U.S. Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, has introduced a bill in the Senate with a view to removing all restrictions on the amount of outside income allowed a recipient of social security benefits. Senator HARTKE says the present restrictions on outside income are discriminatory and he is determined they shall be changed or removed.

Under the present law, $1 of social security benefits is withheld for each $2 earned between $1,200 and $1,700. For each dollar earned over $1,700, a dollar in benefits is withheld. These restrictions are responsible for serious financial problems of many senior citizens.

Senator HARTKE calls attention to the fact that the restrictions penalize those least able to pay. People who have reached the retirement age of 62 or 65 but who need extra income and have the desire to work are the ones who suffer.

Ironically, says HARTKE, there is no limit on income from the so-called unearned sources such as dividends, rents, and savings interest—if one is fortunate enough to have stocks, homes and money in the bank. Senior citizens who retire with large investments from which they receive substantial income likewise can receive the full amount of social security every month.

Says HARTKE: "If beneficiaries are allowed to receive unearned income (such as we've just recited) then certainly those who wish to remain active and useful citizens should be allowed to earn additional income without such reductions."

"Our great social security program was enacted to provide some measure of security for our elderly citizens. So long as this earnings limitation remains we are rewarding the rich and penalizing those who really need the protection. This limitation is inequitable and unrealistic," said Senator HARTKE.

It might be well for senior citizens of the Lafayette area and Tippecanoe County to drop a line to Senator HARTKE, care of the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., expressing their pleasure in his action.

Repercussion of the European Common Market on the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, spurred by the success of the European Common Market, the move toward economic cooperation has spread to various parts of the world. Such experiments in economic integration include the South Arabian Common Market which involves 14 countries having no customs barriers and a common tariff against imports from outside the market. Plans are also underway to explore the possibilities of free trade in east and central Africa and in southeast Asia.

Significantly, these movements toward regional economic cooperation have totally confused the Communists who for years now have forecast the decay and fall of capitalism. The success of the Common Market has led the Communist leaders to attack it as an aggressive Western weapon directed primarily against the Soviets.

Mr. President, in connection with the Common Market and its impact on regional trade problems, Miss Mollie Strum, national chairman of the Committee on Customs and Patent Law of the Federal Bar Association, spoke at the Inter-American Bar Association which took place in Panama last April. In her speech, Miss Strum discusses the repercussions of the European Common Market on the Americas. Although Miss Strum effectively points out the momentum the regional free trade movement is gathering throughout the world, her discussion is centered on the problems now facing Latin America in foreign economic policy. She concludes by stating that although the elimination of regional trade barriers may not solve all of the Latin American problems, the increased trade will lead to new accomplishments and greater cooperation between neighbors. Underlying her speech is the recommendation that the United States continue to cooperate with the building of economic unity and friendship throughout the Americas with the aim of peace and prosperity for mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a summary of Miss Strum's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPERCUSSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET ON THE AMERICAS

(By Mollie Strum, National Chairman, Committee on Customs and Patent Law, the Federal Bar Association)

The economic togetherness of Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands, the member nations of the European Economic Community, known as the European Common Market, has jolted the rest of the world out of any complacency which remained after World War II. Nations outside of the Community have been shocked and awed at its phenomenal success. It has stirred new fears, hopes, and plans in the Americas, as well as in other areas.

Established in March 25, 1957, the Common Market is an arrangement under which the national economies of the member nations will be amalgamated into a single economic entity. The present transitional period will end within a few years, at which time there will be a full-fledged customs union. All tariffs and other barriers to trade among the member nations will be eliminated. A single tariff will be maintained around the area against outside countries. It is expected that capital labor and services will be free to move throughout the European Community.

The European Community embraces an area of 449,000 square miles. One hundred and sixty-nine million people live in the six-member countries. In recent years, it has become the fastest growing major economic area of the Western World.

Latin American leaders have given serious thought to the effect of the European Common Market on the economy of their area. It is noteworthy that Latin American trade with the E.E.C. has grown faster than with other major areas. From 1953–61, exports to the E.E.C. increased by 50 percent and accounted for more than half of the 1 billion total export gain.

At stake for Latin America is a market for primary commodities which took almost 19 percent of the area's exports or approximately $1.6 billion in 1961. A substantial range of commodities are involved.

The Treaty of Rome which established the European Common Market provides for a Common External Tariff to be applied to imports from non-member nations. Associated oversea territories of the six-member nations receive preferential import treatment. Many of these products are in direct competition with Latin American exports. If Great Britain does become a member of the E.E.C., the prospect will be extending tariff preferences to the Commonwealth nations. Thus, the tariffs on tropical products from Commonwealth nations may be completely abolished. This would not only expand the area discriminating against Latin American exports but it may tend to aggravate the world surpluses of tropical products.

Statistics published by the International Monetary Fund reveal that 16 Latin American countries derive more than half their exchange earnings from exports of one or two commodities.

The common external tariff of the European Common Market on minerals and other basic raw materials is very low or nonexistent. However, the rates of duty of the common external tariff increase when these commodities are purchased by the EEC in semimanufactured forms. Textiles and wires are dutiable at higher rates than the raw products. The semimanufactured goods of the nations having associate status with the EEC will be duty free. Thus, the European Common Market will tend to discourage development of the Latin American industries which manufacture products for export.

In view of the fact that more than half of Latin American sales to the EEC countries consists of tropical foodstuffs, serious problems must be solved. The common external tariff will be high and the African producers of tropical foodstuffs will have a tremendous advantage of no tariff.

Argentina's trade with the EEC totals $140 million in cereals and $55 million in beef. More than half of the exports of Argentina and Uruguay go to the United Kingdom. If the United Kingdom joins the European Common Market, Britain will doubtless depend more on the protected continental suppliers. Obviously, the loss of this market would seriously affect the economies of Argentina and Uruguay. Thus, the problems posed by the European Common Market are not simple ones for Latin America.

Recently, the New York Herald Tribune reported that the Netherlands Antilles, consisting of six tiny islands off Venezuela, are expected to become the Western Hemisphere's first member of the EEC. The Antilles would be free to set its own external tariffs with nonmembers. It may then make reciprocal concessions with countries which are rich in natural resources, which could be processed in the islands for shipments to the European Common Market free of duty. The interesting observation which was made is that newly independent nations may wonder whether it is wise to completely sever relations with their former European motherlands in view of the opportunities for economic growth through these affiliations.

Experiments in freer regional trade is also being explored by our friends in South America. A treaty establishing a free trade area and instituting the Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) was signed at Montevideo, Uruguay (Montevideo Treaty) and became effective in June of 1961. The nine member nations include Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Colombia, and Ecuador. The treaty remains open to the other Latin American governments. The members are expected to gradually eliminate restrictions on substantially all of their reciprocal trade. The free trade area contemplated by the treaty is to be achieved by June 1, 1973. These countries constitute a market of more than 172 million people, approximately 82 percent of the population of Latin America and 79 percent of the area.

Tariff reductions have been achieved through multilateral conferences, one in Montevideo in 1961 and another in Mexico City in 1962. Concessions have been granted on about 7,000 items involved in intraregional trade for a total tariff reduction of more than 30 percent. Results are already evident. Preliminary estimates show that intraregional trade rose in 1962 by 20 percent over the 1961 volume. Argentina's exports to other LAFTA countries increased by 39 percent; Mexico's exports within the region rose 112 percent and her imports from LAFTA countries rose 48 percent. Peru's exports and imports increased by 60 percent and 53 percent respectively. Latin American business leaders are generally pleased with the progress of LAFTA and are predicting sharp gains for the future.

Thus, the trend toward regionalism throughout the world will undoubtedly accelerate the economic growth of Latin American countries through LAFTA, a new and significant milestone in Western Hemisphere cooperation.

Another recent movement, the Central American program for economic integration, referred to as the Central American Common Market, has been reporting many gains in trading among its members. The first important step toward integration in Central America came in 1951 at a meeting of the Economic Commission for Latin America, an agency of the United Nations. At that time, the Central American Economic Cooperation Committee was set up to study the problems of economic integration. The work of the Committee included preparation of an agreement for free trade within the area, drafting a common external tariff, working out a uniform customs nomenclature, and studies covering other important matters.

Under the General Treaty on Central American Economic Integration (1960) the member nations (Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica) agreed to bring a Central American free trade area into full operation within a period of 5 years and to adopt common tariffs on goods from other countries. It eliminated tariffs and quotas on all but a small number of items produced in the member countries.

The agreement establishing the Central American Bank for Economic Integration came into existence in May of 1961, in order to help finance economic growth on a regional basis. In April 1963, newspapers reported that the Westinghouse Electric International Co. announced that it would participate with the Central American Bank for Economic Integration in a program to develop an electrical industry for the Central American Common Market. The agreement requires an initial $7 million in capital for new plants to manufacture various electrical products for distribution in the Central American Common Market area. As of April, the United States had advanced $10 million to the Central American Development Bank for projects already underway.

The Central American Common Market has many noteworthy achievements to its credit, having brought about the reduction or elimination of tariffs on hundreds of products traded among member nations. The volume of trade within Central America has increased. In 1957 the volume has been $16.6 million; in 1961 it had risen to $37.4 million and estimates for 1962 by Central American Common Market officials were for more than $42 million. It has been reported that trade among the five countries, primarily farm products, amounted to about $50 million during 1962.

Investors are being offered incentives to establish needed industries in Central America. Phelps Dodge Copper Products International Corp., of New York, and the Salvadoran Government are building one of the

largest Central American new plants—a $2 million copper wire and cable plant to supply the future needs of Central America.

The Protocol of San Jose, or Third Protocol to the Central American Agreement on the Equalization of Import Duties is the latest in a series of agreements creating an external tariff surrounding Central America. Among other matters, it deals with unfair competition with respect to commodities imported from outside the region that might harm Central American production.

Thus, as our friends in the European Common Market prosper, our friends throughout the Americas also are making progress. On the other hand, it is reported that the Communist confusion at these developments wavers between denouncing the unique experiments in economic integration of the West to hinting about the possibility of economic collaboration and peaceful economic competition between the European Common Market and the Communist Council for Mutual Economic Assistance know as Comecon.

The Communists are aware of the fact that they will not be able to expand their share of world trade or retain their present position in Western markets unless the economic integration of the Atlantic powers ceases. With the lowering of tariffs on foodstuffs within the European Economic Community, Communists agricultural exports will eventually be priced out of the markets in the West. It would then become difficult for Eastern Europe to pay for the needed machinery imports from the West. At present the East European Communist countries allocate over 25 percent of foreign trade to West European markets because they need specialized equipment for their own industrialization programs.

As anxiety in the East increases about the brilliant success of Western economic integration, the greatest victory of democratic institutions over their enemies may be accomplished by peaceful means. When darkness threatens humanity, we always find that God is merciful.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it, and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WILMETTE, ILL., *August 4, 1963.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your clear and understanding support on questions concerning our domestic and foreign policies particularly on regard to captive nations.

Please continue to do everything in your power so that the question of these suffering nations will be openly discussed on an international forum.

Sincerely yours,

HELENE PARIS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for reintroducing House Resolution 14—Special Committee on Captive Nations. The American people need to understand fully Russian colonialism. Why are we afraid to speak of it when the U.N. daily calls upon the West and our allies to give up territories that have been theirs for hundreds of years. Keep up this fine work.

Sincerely,

D. D. ARD.

BRIGHTWATERS, N.Y., *August 1, 1963.*

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STRATTON: I recently requested that you support Congressman DAN FLOOD's House Resolution 14, re a Captive Nations Committee.

In your letter of July 16, you stated that you have also sponsored such a resolution.

I wish to compliment you on this and urgently request that you get together with the Honorable Mr. FLOOD, since you both propose the same goal.

By carbon of this letter, I am suggesting the same to Mr. FLOOD.

Your cooperation will be forever appreciated, not just by me, but by many millions of people now living under cruel Communist slave masters.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

E. LEE NORTH.

THE PROVIDENCE ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA, BRANCH NO. 202,
New Haven, Conn., July 30, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This letter is to ask you to consider favorably the Flood Resolution (H. Res. 14) for the creation of a Committee on Captive Nations.

It is vital for Congress and the people of the United States to realize, understand, and evaluate the weakness that lies within the Soviet Union in the form of enslaved and captive non-Russian peoples.

Such a special committee would become the center of information and unbiased knowledge concerning these captive nations. This knowledge could be vitally utilized in the shaping and carrying out of our foreign policy.

Therefore, on the behalf of our organization, we urge you strongly, Congressman SMITH, to give your full support to the Flood Resolution now in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARIA DANYLOWYCH,
Secretary.

DOVER, N.J., *July 30, 1963.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD has submitted a resolution (H. Res. 14) to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

As you know, the pathetic plight of the captive nations is a direct result of the disgraceful foreign policy of the United States during the past 20 or so years. Had this Nation's bureaucrats not been so ready to sell out these nations to communism and so reluctant to help these nations throw the yoke of slavery, they would now be stanch, free anti-Communist allies of the United States.

It is obvious that the American people are not sufficiently aware of their responsibility for the dire plight of the captive nations. If they were better informed on the subject, these nations would once again possess a hope of eventual freedom.

I therefore respectfully urge that you act quickly upon H. Res. 14 to see that this committee is established. Let's face up to America's responsibilities and act like men willing to fight to preserve their wonderful heritage and encourage it throughout the world.

Very truly yours,

DAVID T. STAUBLE.

Our Trillion-Dollar Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will probably begin debate on the President's so-called tax bill. In my opinion it is a cruel hoax; not a tax cut, but an example of fiscal irresponsibility. No true tax cut can become effective unless we cut spending, but nowhere in the President's proposal is any serious effort made to reduce spending, balance the budget or pay down the debt.

Instead we are deluged with White House propaganda that we can become rich by increasing our debt, that we can balance the budget through planned deficits. The Kennedy economists have introduced whole new economic theories, most of them sounding almost like an Alice in Wonderland fantasy.

Dr. Robert Morris has written an excellent piece on our trillion-dollar debt and where it may be leading us. Before we are presented with the tax bill, I commend Dr. Morris' column for careful

study and include it herewith for your information, as follows:

THAT TRILLION-DOLLAR DEBT

(By Robert Morris)

The test ban treaty debate has brought out that the safeguards which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have set as a condition of their reconciling the pact to national security, will actually be more expensive and will intensify martial preparations rather than encourage budgetary normalcy and relaxation of tensions. While past experience has demonstrated that such promised safeguards will be frittered away at the first wrinkle of a Khrushchev smile, the experienced admiral who came up with that elemental observation should have known that monetary considerations have little or no effect on State Department thinking unless they are a pretext for stopping some project that does not fit its grand design.

One glance at our fiscal position will show what a harvest we are reaping as a result.

In 1940 our national debt was not yet $43 billion. We were then moving toward war and our budget that year rose to $9 billion.

Today our national debt has broken through the $300 billion ceiling. Our budget is at about $100 billion. Our interest payments exceed $9 billion a year or more than the whole budget of 1940. We are thus moving now in a geometric progression—with no end in sight.

But even these astronomical figures do not tell the whole story. The fact of the matter is we owe more than three times $300 billion.

In 1960 Maurice H. Stans, then our competent and dutiful budget director, undertook to add up all the debts and liabilities of our Government. He included in these compilations our mortgaged indebtedness which would be part of any financial statement. His totals were shocking.

In addition to the $300 billion conventional debt, we owe more than $30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. This is in every sense a debt and must and will be paid. We owe over $40 billion to retired military personnel in accrued pensions. We are committed to pay veterans for future pensions alone—not counting other benefits—more than $300 billion. No other legislation is necessary for these outlays—just the passage of time.

Social security is not on an actuarial basis. We are already committed to make payments on existing schedules that add up to a deficit of $250 to $300 billion. Again only the passage of time will bring Uncle Sam eye to eye with these creditors.

Even this does not tell the story. There are contingent debts such as Government insurance and guarantees of loans to banks and other institutions. These cannot be computed. But Dr. Stans does compute the amounts owed on housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, interstate highway commitments, unfinished public works contracts and unpaid purchases. These total another $150 billion.

Using minimal figures all the way, my total goes over a trillion dollars—a new fiscal concept. Set down on paper the total looks like this—$1,070 billion.

I remember trying to illustrate the concept of a billion dollars. The example I often used involved a suppositious profligate who undertook in the year of Our Lord 1 to spend a billion dollars at the rate of $1,000 a day: If this gentleman had been spending that sum of money all during the intervening 20 centuries, he would still be far short of his goal. He would have more than $300 million left.

But now even this billion-dollar concept is passé. The concept shifts to a trillion. The geometric progression moves on. Infinity seems to be the goal.

But even more distressing than the figure itself is the attitude of the spenders. Some of these actually tell us that spending is a good thing—"It stimulates the economy"—as if there is to be no day of reckoning.

Marshall Tito, the bloody Communist dictator will be coming to the United States next month for more money. We have given him several billion already. But the sky seems to be the limit. We will probably give him more.

We have been writing in this column now for almost 3 years of our race toward what the Government erroneously calls "disarmament." We have shown that it is not disarmament at all but a transfer of our military and judicial power to what is euphemistically called a "strengthened U.N." This is, in essence, a world government.

This race toward fiscal infinity is running apace. Obviously the planners feel that this upcoming state of merger is going to solve all our problems—somehow—at once.

Foreign Aid: Too Much for Too Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the September 1963, issue of the Political Science Quarterly, published by New York's Columbia University, carries an article by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, on the subject of foreign aid.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with foreign aid, no Member of Congress has made a more exhaustive study of this subject and no Member is more qualified to speak on it.

I am pleased, therefore, to offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following views of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], as set forth in the Political Science Quarterly:

VIEWS OF HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

When President Kennedy, late in 1962, announced the appointment of a committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay to study our foreign aid program and submit recommendations for future policy and actions, my reaction was one of mild interest mixed with considerable skepticism. This attitude was the result of my disillusionment based on past experience with similar committees. The work of these committees, in most cases, had been of a superficial nature, and their function, on the whole, had obviously been intended to advocate the point of view and strengthen the hand of the Executive with Congress and the public. Therefore, I looked upon the Clay Committee as one which was cast for the same role, to "bail out" foreign aid.

But, since the Clay report was released by the State Department in March, I have studied its comments carefully, and—although I do not think that any committee within the span of a few months can adequately, and in detail, investigate and evaluate such a vast and complex matter as our worldwide program of foreign aid—I have been both surprised and pleased at the apparent objectivity with which the Committee undertook its assignment, so far as it went. Many of the Clay Committee assessments and conclusions can, and I sincerely hope will, serve effectively in furthering the effort in Congress to curb our indiscriminate foreign aid to a substantial extent.

It has been clearly evident for a long time, however, that we have been "indeed attempting too much for too many," but it is well that the Clay Committee saw fit to give emphasis to this point. It would have been well, too, if the Committee could have gone into a more thorough study and, then, reported in greater detail on how ill-conceived, badly executed, unrealistic, wasteful, and expensive, much, if not most, of our foreign aid really is. In that event, its recommendation for cutting the program's funds would doubtless have been increased considerably beyond the $500 million figure which was announced—assuming, of course, that realistic guidelines continued to prevail in the process of decisionmaking.

Nevertheless, within the limitations imposed by the circumstances, the Clay Committee did note that a good deal of the public and congressional complaints about and criticisms of our aid program and problems were well justified. This is all to the good, even though it is but limited acknowledgment of conditions which I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the House Committee on Appropriations, and the majority of my committee colleagues, who are continuously studying the program, have been pointing out for years.

Since the Clay Committee did not go into these particular weaknesses and faults of our foreign aid program, I think that in the interest of a factual presentation, some of them should be enumerated here. They include overextending ourselves in practically all categories of aid; programs which are too diffuse for specific results; mismanagement of many projects; ineffective bureaucracy in AID headquarters and in the field; ignorance on the part of many planners in AID; little effective liaison between main office in Washington, D.C., and field offices in foreign lands; too many projects started and not brought to fruition; too many sloppily planned projects; projects which are not in the interest of the people to whom aid was offered; too little consideration for our own national interest; completely inadequate and ineffective end-use justification; too much kowtowing to certain political cliques in some countries; graft and greed of some politicians in recipient areas, getting rich at the expense of the masses by means of our aid; speculation in our aid goods; projects initiated far above the ability to repay; aid solely in response to so-called Communist threats; aid in response to pleas from flamboyant politicians; aid for projects in which our prestige has suffered; aid solely to commit funds unexpended at fiscal yearend; aid disbursed by subterfuges, moved from program to program and from the President's emergency fund; and noncooperation on the part of recipients.

The records of our subcommittee are full of documentation for every one of these criticisms, and for many others as well. So, my principal regret is that the Clay Committee did not delve far enough into our foreign aid follies—because it could not go into the program more extensively or, perhaps, for other reasons. However, while covering only a relatively small portion of what is being done and what actually ought to be done, the report is certainly correct in questioning the visible results of our aid.

I concur with General Clay and his committee that "reductions are in order" in present military and economic assistance programs; that Africa is an area where Western European countries "should logically bear most of the * * * aid burden"; that it should be made unmistakably clear that aid recipients must be "serious about self-help"; that aid planning "should be marked by realism"; that aid should not be given to foreign governments for "projects establishing government-owned enterprises which compete with private endeavors"; that careful examination should be made of the argu-

ment that aid should be given for "political" reasons; that there are "serious doubts" as to the wisdom of guaranties on our part against commercial risks (guaranties which should be given, instead, by the recipient countries); that AID employees "whose performance is marginal or whose technical skills are not required" should be separated from the program; that aid should not be given to Indonesia; and that, over all, "a higher quality and reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort * * * could accomplish more."

But, I part company with the Clay Committee in some of its other conclusions, and most especially do I reject General Clay's personal contention that $4 billion is the "rockbottom" sum that should be made available for our foreign aid in fiscal 1964. The evidence simply does not support such a claim as that, any more than it has supported similar "rockbottom" claims advanced by the Executive over the past 8 years. During that period, in which it has been my privilege and responsibility to serve as chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, the Congress appropriated an aggregate of $6,582,937,000 less than the budget estimates for foreign aid—the reductions ranging in amount from $558,650,000 for fiscal 1961 to $1,204,182,000 for fiscal 1960. Even so, the funds made available were, in every year, far in excess of the needs. This was so despite the many grandiose policies and actions which have characterized the program and despite administration assertions that any substantial cuts at all would seriously damage the program. On this score, the facts of the matter are irrefutable.

We are now into, and accelerating, the third major phase of our foreign aid since the end of World War II, assistance to a large number of so-called underdeveloped countries. Yet, in large measure, we are applying in these cases the same economic and military criteria which we used in Western Europe. This basis of action, in my opinion, is completely wrong. A new set of formulas must be devised for this kind of program, if we are to proceed with it, and the elements of commonsense and practicality must be given priority, both in concept and execution. This rules out, so far as I am concerned, such projects as the building of artificial harbors, roads that lead nowhere, giant hydroelectric schemes that cannot possibly be paid for in the forseeable future, and those other large projects which are dear to the hearts of some of the recipients and the superplanners in AID

With regard to many of the other countries, I heartily concur with the Clay report that they do not now really need our assistance and, therefore, we should cut off our aid to them. In this category, the Clay Committee specifically mentioned only four nations, but I think I would have no difficulty in adding to that list a good many others. Those countries should shoulder their own burdens, and there is no way which, in clear conscience, our continued expenditures for their benefit can be justified. And certainly, if there is going to be foreign aid, the other industrialized nations—France, England, and others—should, as the Clay report suggests, help their own former colonial areas. After all, they, not the United States, got most of the benefits from those areas.

The Clay Committee recommendation that the United States should by every means possible get out of governmental aid and make extensive efforts to interest private investors to go into foreign areas is in the best American tradition. Private business know-how and initiative can accomplish more than aid on a government-to-government basis; and if there are foreign socialistic governments who do not wish to allow our private capital to come in, it is my judgment that we should let them alone entirely.

While the Clay report did not go into the matter of Russia's so-called aid to other nations, I think it is well for us to note, in the context of this discussion, that the Soviet dealings have involved "banker" type loans and profitable barter deals. The Soviets, invariably expecting repayment in usable goods and hard cash, assess the capabilities of the various areas according to their ability to pay.

Are our statesmen less able to understand these people and countries than are the Communist leaders?

Higher Cabinet and Congressional Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings now being conducted by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on general salary legislation, considerable evidence was being amassed as to the inadequacy of the present salary levels for Federal executives, judges, and legislators. Existing salary rates simply do not recognize the high degree of responsibility involved in these positions and they do not offer the incentives required for retention of the very best people.

Just as important, however, these low salary rates act as artificial ceilings that prevent us from fully implementing the principle of "comparability" in the pay of postal and other Federal employees that Congress enacted in the Federal Salary Reform Act last year. Most of us who are concerned with this problem feel very strongly that Congress is now obligated to follow through in maintaining salary schedules for Federal employees that adhere to the principle of comparability in relation to business and other employment outside Government.

The National Civil Service League recently conducted a broad survey, embracing some 400 national leaders in business, education, journalism, and the professions, on congressional and executive compensation. In brief, this survey reflects a conviction that present salary levels for Cabinet officers, Senators, and Representatives of the Federal Government are seriously inadequate and should be moved sharply upward. The most striking result of the survey was that more than half—52 percent—of all those participating expressed judgment that Cabinet members should receive annual compensation of $50,000 or higher in contrast to the present statutory limit of $25,000. With respect to legislative compensation, just about half of those responding were in favor of $35,000 or a higher level for Senators and Representatives.

The National Civil Service League is a nonprofit, nonpartisan civic organization representing the public interest in matters affecting the welfare and capacity of the public servants. It is composed of distinguished business and professional leaders, many of whom have at one time served in positions of high responsibility in the Federal Government. The league for over 80 years has sponsored measures designed to make the public service a trust for the competent, the loyal, and the dedicated.

The complete survey conducted by the league, and comments thereon as contained in its bimonthly publication, Good Government, and entitled, "The Influentials Speak Out," is included herewith and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as a most interesting and informative contribution to an understanding of this most serious problem:

THE INFLUENTIALS SPEAK OUT

SUMMARY

The National Civil Service League conducted a major study to learn the views of the "influentials" in our society on the question of Cabinet-level and congressional salaries. The survey solicited the views of over 600 leaders of business, education, and the professions concerning the appropriate level of salaries for key Federal Government executives and legislators. It was carefully and objectively structured to include a valid sampling of the Nation's "decisionmakers" whose respected opinions provide a barometer of public thinking. The returns are in. The survey shows an overwhelming interest in substantially raising salary levels for Cabinet officers, Senators, and Representatives, and a deep concern with the urgency of attracting the ablest men to Government leadership.

The most striking result of the survey was that more than half (52 percent) of all those participating expressed judgment that Cabinet members should receive annual compensation of $50,000 or higher, in contrast to the present statutory limit of $25,000. Over 82 percent favored Cabinet salaries of $40,000 or higher. The average of all recommended salaries for these senior officials was $36,000.

Clear support for congressional pay increases was indicated by the preponderant number (86 percent) of respondents, who stated that Senators and Representatives should receive at least $30,000 annually or higher. Nearly half favored $35,000 or more for Senators and Representatives. Several respondents sugegsted a moderate differential in salary between Senators and Representatives, in favor of the Senate.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

In 1962 historic action was taken by the Congress, based upon the President's recommendation to provide a reasonable and relatively scientific basis for Federal salary policy by approving the concept of comparability between salaries of Federal employees and pursuits in private enterprise. The task was not completed—one reason being that the projections for top career people indicated salary levels equal to, or above, those now being received by Cabinet members and Congressmen.

Under the heading, "Unfinished Reform" the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service stated:

"The committee urges the President to recommend for consideration at the next session of Congress appropriate increases in Federal executive salaries at all levels."

The President then indicated that he would submit recommendations concerning remuneration for top positions in the executive, legislative, and judical branches.

A historical problem: In his annual message to Congress on December 7, 1796, President George Washington said:

"The compensation of the various officers of the United States in various instances, and in none more than in respect to the most

important stations, appears to call for legislative revision. If private wealth is to supply the defect of public retribution, it will greatly contract the sphere within which the selection of characters for office is to be made, and will proportionately diminish the probability of choice of men able as well as upright. Besides that, it would be repugnant to the vital principles of our Government virtually to exclude from public trusts talents and virtues unless accompanied by wealth."

This same view was reflected in 1962 by the panel of distinguished citizens appointed by the President and headed by Clarence Randall which reported:

"In our opinion, a substantial upward adjustment of the salaries for appointive officers would be both economical and in the public interest. No President, in our opinion, in filling these important positions, should be limited to selecting only those who can afford to make substantial sacrifices for the privilege of public service nor should those who are willing to serve be required to make substantial sacrifices for the privilege."

The issues were emphasized by four members of the panel in a concurrent statement. They cited the need to recruit "the ablest men in the country" for Federal executive positions, and decried the fact that pay of Federal officials compares very poorly with top officials in leading private foundations, nonprofit corporations, major universities, and the larger State and local governments.

The National Civil Service League, in its historic role of representing the citizens' interest in the public service field, has recently placed specific attention on the matter of salary policy and provided a communication link between the leaders of private pursuits and officials of our Government on this vital issue. As a guide to its own position, and in the hope of encouraging interest in additional reform steps, the league has sought in its study to capture the strong advances in the positive interest of business, professional, and other leading groups in the prestige and quality of Federal administration. The survey, objectively seeking a cross-section of responsible opinion, included some 677 leaders in the fields of business, education and other professional pursuits, including more than 100 "alumni" of the Eisenhower administration.

EXECUTIVE PAY FOR EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

One of the most significant factors about the survey has been the demonstration of interest and the endorsement of the urgency of this problem as shown by the responses. With no followup approximately 400 have replied, more than one-half of whom included written comments varying from two or three sentences to two or three-page letters. The respondents were impressed with the responsibilities of the Government, especially in the executive posts, and believe that salaries should be substantially increased.

The majority of the respondents believe that $50,000 per year would be an appropriate level for Cabinet pay. The most persistent reason given was the effect of the salary of Cabinet officers on the "second and third echelons." For the most part, the respondents place great importance on the tremendous prestige and public-service challenge of Presidential appointment to serve in a Cabinet post. While there is consistent belief that Cabinet members should be able to maintain reasonable status without personal loss, the greatest concern is with (1) the difficulty of attracting and holding men of superior competence as sub-Cabinet officers, whose positions carry great responsibilities without the prestige of Cabinet rank and lack the security to offset low pay, (2) the need to "fulfill the principle of comparability."

The $50,000 figure should be considered with two other factors:

1. Many respondents believe that salary should not be so high as to reduce the idea of sacrifice for public service. Within this context, $50,000 is considered a reasonable figure.

2. Many of those recommending less than $50,000 indicated concern with what might be politically feasible.

In other words, the leaders in various walks of life in the United States see great prestige in Cabinet posts and believe that the President will generally be able to get competent and responsible people regardless of salary. One highly influential respondent so states and then adds. "But where the Government is hurting is in top-level administrative jobs which require extraordinary competence but can offer neither money nor prestige nor security. The obvious solution, of course, is to pay Cabinet Secretaries a good deal more money. I'd say $50,000." He continues, "In my opinion this will not improve the caliber of Cabinet officers, but it will set off a chain reaction in Washington pay scales that can do much to correct the present impossible problem at the second and third echelons."

The congressional relationship: The thinking of the respondents supports the traditional relationship of Cabinet salaries up to 50 percent higher than congressional pay. One factor is that a Congressman seeks his job whereas the Cabinet member is sought. While many problems of expense, family life, and vocational outlook are recognized, the general idea is that the Cabinet officer gives up more, carries substantially more responsibility, and is subject to a good deal more pressure. The fact that many Congressmen are able to continue active participation in a private business or profession is also weighted significantly, together with the freedom from the strict conflict-of-interest statutes which apply to all executive officers.

Those responding to the questionnaire indicated strong concern that recognition be granted to those Members of Congress who carry great responsibilities. Many suggested a differential either for committee chairmen or between Senators and Representatives. Other comments pointed out the burdens of almost continuing sessions of Congress, the great amount of committee work required, and the increasing complexity of legislating today.

While the application of the "comparability" principle, as adopted by the Salary Reform Act of 1962, is usually considered not feasible for the highest offices of the Nation, two suggestions for a guide to Cabinet salaries did emerge. One suggested using comparisons with career officers; the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet should have a rank system which places them in an established relationship to top career levels. The other suggestion recognized that many executives of nonprofit organizations throughout the country now receive salaries substantially above $25,000 and sometimes above $50,000. These include mayors, foundation officers, and executives of private educational groups, including some university presidents and officials of various career groups and other institutions.

In thanking the respondents for their thoughtful cooperation, league chairman, Bernard L. Gladieux, summed up: "The public generally is coming to an appreciation of the fact that the President, in making appointments to high office, should not be limited preponderantly to those who can afford to make substantial monetary sacrifices for the privilege of public service. It is equally unfair to those who are willing to serve their Government in either legislative or executive capacities to make substantial sacrifices for the privilege."

National Civil Service League survey of proposed salaries for Cabinet and Congress—Recommendations by various groups of business, professional, and educational leaders—Breakdown by groups

1. Business leaders who were not among former Government officials recommended (69 replies):

Cabinet salary:	
$100,000	2
$75,000	3
$70,000	2
$65,000	1
$60,000	2
$50,000	37
$45,000	3
$40,000	9
$35,000	9
$25,000	1
Congressional salary:	
$75,000	1
$70,000	1
$50,000	4
$45,000	1
$40,000	8
$36,000	1
$35,000	21
$32,500	1
$30,000	22
$25,000	2
$22,500	6

2. Business and professional men who have served in Government recommended (136 replies):

Cabinet salary:	
$75,000	4
$70,000	2
$60,000	5
$50,000	46
$45,000	14
$40,000	34
$35,000	27
$30,000	2
$25,000	2
Congressional salary:	
$50,000	8
$45,000	3
$40,000	16
$35,000	30
$32,500	1
$30,000	60
$25,000	9
$24,000	1
$22,500	8

3. Executives of press and radio recommended (17 replies):

Cabinet salary:	
$50,000	8
$45,000	2
$40,000	3
$35,000	4
Congressional salary:	
$50,000	1
$40,000	1
$35,000	6
$30,000	7
$25,000	2

4. Leading educators recommended (92 replies):

Cabinet salary:	
$75,000	1
$60,000	6
$50,000	37
$45,000	7
$40,000	26
$35,000	9
$30,000	2
$27,500	1
$25,000	3
Congressional salary:	
$50,000	2
$45,000	1
$40,000	10
$35,000	34
$30,000	31

National Civil Service League survey of proposed salaries for Cabinet and Congress—Recommendations by various groups of business, professional, and educational leaders—Breakdown by groups—Continued

Congressional salary—Continued

$27,500	1
$25,000	2
$22,500	10

5. Various professional leaders including attorneys and foundation executives recommended (43 replies):

Cabinet salary:

$75,000	1
$60,000	3
$50,000	15
$45,000	4
$40,000	10
$35,000	9
$25,000	1

Congressional salary:

$50,000	2
$45,000	1
$40,000	4
$35,000	11
$30,000	15
$25,000	15
$22,500	7

PROPOSED SALARIES FOR CABINET AND CONGRESS—RECOMMENDATIONS OF BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL, AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS IN THE AGGREGATE

Cabinet officers:

$100,000	2
$75,000	9
$70,000	4
$65,000	4
$60,000	22
$50,000	158
$45,000	33
$40,000	84
$35,000	60
$30,000	4
$27,500	1
$25,000	6
Total	387

Senators and Representatives:

$75,000	1
$70,000	1
$60,000	2
$50,000	19
$45,000	6
$40,000	43
$36,000	3
$35,000	115
$32,500	2
$30,000	142
$27,500	1
$25,000	18
$24,000	1
$22,500	33
Total	387

Korth Explains Why We Must Have the Best Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Fred Korth, given at the commissioning of U.S.S. *William F. Halsey* in San Francisco July 20, 1963:

KORTH EXPLAINS WHY WE MUST HAVE THE BEST NAVY

I am, of course, delighted to be here with this distinguished company and with a naval officer who, along with Admiral Halsey, calls to the mind of every American the very finest image of the U.S. Navy in its greatest hour. In World War I and World War II, and the years between, Admiral Nimitz and Admiral Halsey were instrumental in insuring that our Navy was strong and capable. It seems to me completely fitting that his proud ship—the newest of her type—should bear the name of a great naval officer who has taken his rightful place in our Navy's and our Nation's history.

In the more than 18 months that I have been Secretary of our Navy, a somewhat curious thought has often crossed my mind. It seems to me that many Americans have a somewhat imperfect understanding of sea power. The average American often asks the question, if not directly, then by implication, "Why do we need the world's largest, the most modern, the best Navy?" In a very real sense, persons who ask that question are paying the Navy quite a compliment. They are taking for granted that we will always retain control of the seas.

It would seem that we in the Navy have sometimes experienced difficulty in making the answer plain. One simple answer might be that whenever anything has happened, or has threatened to happen, we have needed the Navy and used it promptly. We did so in Korea in numerous ways—in attack, in support of forces ashore and as a lifeline. The carrier-borne airpower of the 6th Fleet has been used in the Mediterraneon to bolster the southern flank of our NATO defenses. The actions of the 7th Fleet in the western Pacific have become legend.

All this is so obvious that many people are inclined to forget it, or take it for granted. Perhaps we have somehow failed to make vivid to our contemporaries the real value of naval armament in the current world. No doubt it is because the Navy is built around a rather more subtle, less understandable concept than our other arms.

The function of our team is to exploit sea communications, so as to carry wars to our enemies rather than allowing them to bring them to us, so as to endow the national strategy with the power and flexibility throughout the world which it could not otherwise enjoy.

The Navy is not a strategic or a tactical machine. It uses many weapons, many strategies, and many kinds of tactics to perform an overall function. The performance of this function will not alone, of itself, win wars. But it will have a decisive effect on who wins them, how soon, how easily. Naval power, in all its aspects, is a tremendous instrument of national power, useful in countless ways. Surely, that is one reason why Americans so often fail to grasp its significance.

WHY NAVY IMPORTANT

It is a truism of history that seapower was a critical factor in the foundation of our Nation, and that all our wars, without exception, have been amphibious in many important respects. It is also a fact that commerce over the oceans is vital, not only to our own economy, but of equally serious importance to our allies and to our potential enemies as well. Seapower has been our first, and almost an automatically chosen weapon whenever sudden emergencies have appeared on our threshold.

Because of this quiet assumption that all is well because of our Navy, it seems to me that it is worthwhile for us to make a periodic accounting of why our Navy is so vitally important. Some will say we need a navy for one simple reason—to win a war. But as we need naval power in wartime, we need it also in peacetime and in that neither-war, neither-peace area in which we now abide.

A navy is certainly essential in war, both offensively and defensively. On the offensive side of the ledger, we are capable of carrying the fight to the soil of the enemy. We can make his land the battleground. We can use the sea and from it apply force, both direct and indirect, against the enemy.

The highways of the ocean are our routes for retaliation, for invasion, or for attack. In our ships we can transport the personnel of our land forces, their equipment and their supplies. The oceans enhance our capability for massive retaliation.

ITS DEFENSIVE ROLE

In the defensive view of the art of warfare, we see that our Navy is necessary to deny the use of the oceans to our enemies. By confining them to overland resources in time of war, we strangle their industrial warmaking potential. It is easy to recall that during World War II, if we had not retained control of the seas around the great peninsula that is actually Europe, our massive land forces could have been easily outflanked from either the north or the south. Our supply lines across the Atlantic could have been severed much too readily. Our own harbors and our coastal cities would have been prone to attack from the sea. Conversely, our potential enemy today sees this same peninsula as he looks to the West. He knows that further expansion in that direction exposes his flanks to attack from the sea.

It stands to reason that as our Navy is vital in time of war, it is also essential in time of peace. The Navy contributes to our Nation's progress. It protects our interests at home and abroad. It implements national policy, for the Navy is capable of presenting visible evidence to our friends that our support is real, that our determination is firm, and that we are ready to come to their aid if called upon. This particular strength of our Navy has been demonstrated in Lebanon, off the shores of the Dominican Republic, off our own southern shores last fall, and continuously in the waters lapping the shores of southeast Asia. The "show of the flag" gives new hope and adds great fervor to the hearts and minds of those who view it.

The explosion of the world's population has caused an expansion at the rate of about 50 million people per year. Such an increase necessitates a great exchange of raw materials and industrial products between nations, the greater portion of which must be transported by ships across the sealanes of the world. The ability to use the seas for these purposes and for all commerce and for their resources will depend upon freedom of the seas in peace and control of the seas in time of war.

PROVIDES THE OPTIONS

In the third area, the cold war, the Navy is a deterrent to the outbreak of general war. With our carrier forces, our Polaris submarines and guided missile ships and our nuclear surface ships, we demonstrate to the enemy our power to strike, to retaliate, to defend.

Our sea power gives the maximum freedom of choice to the President, and provides the ultimate in economy of force. When it is deemed prudent to apply force, he has a maximum of selectivity as to amount and type. The mobility of our forces on the oceans of the world provides for swift disengagements without leaving costly investments behind.

The Communist bloc must necessarily move in a direction with which they are unfamiliar if they are to do any further expansion. They will be unable to increase their holdings without the use of the seas, which would bring them into direct contact

with our naval power. The example off our southeastern coast, in the Atlantic, last fall proved their unwillingness to do this.

To resist the challenges of the future, we must continue to maintain strong, balanced sea power. We need our mobile islands like *Enterprise, Kitty Hawk,* and our other great carriers with their embarked aircraft. We need submarines to search out and destroy, if necessary, those missile-carrying submersibles of another power. We need underwater craft capable of unleashing tremendous nuclear power should our potential enemies decide upon national suicide. We need our cruiser and destroyer forces with their great flexibility and capability of rapid movement to any potential troubled area. It is essential that they provide air defense, antisubmarine protection, and gunfire support for amphibious operations.

EXPLOIT OUR STRENGTH

And finally, we need our Navy-Marine Corps team—unique in history because of its mobility, its versatility, its readiness, and its ability to engage in all forms of warfare on land, on sea, and in the air. It is an area in which the United States is clearly superior. We must continue to exploit this tremendous advantage in the years to come.

These are the answers to the questions, Why a navy? What is the Navy for?

It is my firm belief that these services (the Navy and the Marine Corps) must be retained in their individual state and by no means allowed to be assimilated into any mixture that could be less efficient.

It is likewise my belief that civilian leadership of all of our military departments must be continued. It is a part of our Nation's welfare that has been handed down as a part of our heritage by those who drafted our Constitution.

In the past 18 months, it has been my experience that those senior naval and marine officers, with whom I come in contact almost daily, would have this relationship in no other manner. They subscribe wholeheartedly to the premise.

SHUN DOWNGRADING

It is also mandatory that our military leaders not be relegated to any role of lesser importance, but must be shown the respect, the loyalty that is their rightful due. They are the operational commanders. They are the professional experts. In my own Department, this has always been the case and will continue to be. I know that the other service Secretaries, as well as the Secretary of Defense, share this feeling.

Let there be no misunderstanding. The roads to be followed by the leaders, both civilian and military, are parallel at all times, and ultimately merge and arrive at the same destination. Neither can guide the destinies of hundreds of thousands of people and disburse billions of dollars annually without the assistance and counsel of the other. Those in mufti have the politico-economic experience and background that is vital in the international scene of today. Those in uniform, whether it be blue, green, or khaki, have the experience and technical skills in matters military and naval, without which our Nation would long ago have lost her stature in the community of the nations of the world.

There is, and must be, a feeling of mutual trust and respect between our military and our civilians which has endured since the birth of our country. This is an extremely healthy situation, of which we can be proud and thankful, for there are few, if any, nations on the face of this earth that can count this spirit of understanding as one of their strengths.

I urge that all of us, military and civilian alike, recall that the basic principle still remains the same. He who controls the sea and the air above, controls the destinies of the world. If we lose that control, we lose all.

Lake Champlain Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose my statement before the public hearing held by the International Commission on the Proposed Enlargement of the Lake Champlain Waterway, Albany, N.Y., September 16, 1963.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the International Joint Commission, my name is EMANUEL CELLER. I am the Representative from the 10th Congressional District of this State and I am Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

I appreciate the opportunity to give you my views on the matter you have under consideration and I am glad that you are holding this series of hearings to get the views of the people most affected by the proposal of the Lake Champlain Waterway.

For years I have been aware of the efforts of certain commercial waterway shipping interests to have a so-called Little Seaway constructed to connect the deeper Hudson River at Albany, N.Y., with the St. Lawrence near Montreal. The route most discussed would utilize the Champlain division of the Barge Canal, Lake Champlain itself, and the Chambly Barge Canal in Canada. The effect of this would be to reduce sailing distances via the present St. Lawrence Seaway from the Great Lakes to the Port of New York by more than 1,000 miles.

When it comes to transportation, I have long advocated that the public should be afforded full usage of the most economical mode or modes available. However, let me stress at this point that when I say most economical—I mean most economical in terms of all costs, including cost to the taxpayer. Moreover, it is essential that the collateral effects of any proposed transportation project be weighed in appropriate plus or minus columns. We must see the picture—whole—not in parts.

Upon doing this, I find that any inclination I might have to support a shorter Lake Champlain water transportation route is completely obliterated by the devastating economic consequences such a Champlain Seaway would have upon the entire economy of the Northeastern United States. Originally I inclined to favor this proposal, but I had only touched the periphery of the subject. When I plumbed its depths and most maturely considered it, I believe now that the United States would not receive benefits from this waterway commensurate with the vast costs with which her citizens would be saddled. Canada may be able to find economic justification for improving the Richelieu River and thus insure a shorter route for traffic in and out of Montreal, but one cannot envisage sufficient advantages to the United States to justify the great costs to her taxpayers. I may be accused of inconsistency. My answer is that sometimes consistency is a stagnant pool. It breeds reptiles on the mind.

It will be my purpose at this hearing to limit my remarks to the effects of the proposed waterway primarily upon the citizens of my own State of New York, with specific reference to those communities which would be most involved.

First, let us consider residents of the Champlain area itself. They have been told by proponents that a Champlain Seaway would benefit them because it would "Make possible the transformation of all locations along its route into seaports."

You might think that the citizens and local officials of these small communities would grasp hold of any sort of scheme which held even remote promise of transforming them into seaports. But, these folks recognize that it is sheer nonsense to expect any or all of the Lake Champlain communities to become seaports due to the mere fact that they are located on a deepwater route. They need only to look at the score of communities located on the deeper Hudson River south of Albany to see that it takes more than deep water to make a seaport. They had better review the chagrin and disappointment of the citizens of many cities along the St. Lawrence Seaway. They too had been persuaded or self-hypnotized into the belief that their cities would become great seaports. Hopes became hoaxes. There were no perceptible changes. The seaport argument is as useless as a 2-foot yardstick. Ogdensburg remained as before. So did all the other cities en route. Business leaders who enthusiastically supported the St. Lawrence Seaway are now convinced that a Champlain Waterway will fail to usher in great marts of international commerce.

Perhaps the best explanation as to why Lake Champlain communities can hold a little hope of having the proposed seaway transform them into seaports comes from the prominent resident of one of these communities. Mr. W. R. Casey, of the customhouse brokerage firm of F. W. Meyers & Co., and a resident of the Champlain area for more than 70 years, stated in a letter published in the June 21 Plattsburgh Press-Republican:

"Cities on Lake Champlain are at a disadvantage by being too far removed from markets. There would be no reason for a vessel entering at Rouses Point to discharge at Burlington goods for * * * consumption in the New York metropolitan area, while for a little more freight charge, discharge could be made in the New York area. Just because there are cities favorably located geographically on Lake Champlain does not prove that they are located favorably economically."

Of further significance is the fact that Mr. Casey's home village of Rouses Point, located in New York on the northern end of Lake Champlain, went on record in opposition to the project in a resolution adopted by the village board in December of last year. According to the Plattsburg Press-Republican of December 6, the village's mayor, Leo Letourneau, said the resolution was adopted because "no community in the northern part of the State would stand to benefit from lake shipping" and that "wastes from ships would only add to water pollution problems already being experienced."

A year ago last August, the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Commerce and Economic Development held a public hearing on this Champlain Seaway proposal. At that hearing, Mr. Peyson E. Hatch, supervisor from Essex County which borders a major portion of Lake Champlain, testified as follows:

"Should the waterway be built, I am sure the (pleasure) boating public would stay away from Lake Champlain, since the southern end is nothing more than a winding and narrow river. It would be dangerous to try to compete with the large commercial ships for the narrow channel.

"Since industry needs a healthy railroad, anything that might harm the railroad should not be undertaken. As a public official, our town needs a healthy railroad to help pay the taxes. In the small town of Willsboro, the Delaware & Hudson pays $40,000 a year in taxes.

"It is my belief that it is only wishful thinking that to open the Champlain Waterway would benefit the Champlain Valley."

I think that it is also of great significance that an organization representing all Champlain are county supervisors, as well as all other supervisors in the State, adopted a

resolution at a meeting held at Utica, N.Y., in January of this year in opposition to the Champlain Seaway. According to the January 23 Buffalo Evening News, the resolution adopted by the Supervisors Association of the State of New York called the proposal "unnecessary, harmful to the economic and other interests of the people, and a project the Federal Government cannot afford to undertake."

This brings us to the subject of costs and the willingness and ability of our Government, through its taxpayers, to pay such costs. Although it will take an extensive engineering survey to determine the exact cost of enlarging the waterway to accommodate seagoing ships, I have seen some reliable estimates which place the cost of constructing a 27-foot channel in excess of $1 billion—and even in these days we should be sure this project is paramountly needed before spending that amount of the taxpayers' money.

When this Champlain Seaway scheme was the subject of a previous extensive study by this Commission in 1937, it was found that the cost for a 27-foot-deep channel (the minimum depth required for oceangoing ships) would equal nearly four times the amount to be saved in transportation costs.

That was in 1937 when the capital cost was estimated at more than $342 million for a 27-foot channel. I am sure that no one will disagree when I say that the costs of material and labor have at least tripled since 1937. Today's cost would advance to over $1 billion. That is a staggering sum and hardly commensurate with gains to our commerce and industry and well-being.

Although we haven't heard much on the subject of tolls to date, I believe that it is to the credit of at least one proponent who declared at the August 28 hearing held in New York State that "this seaway can be built with taxation and on a self-supporting basis if we exercise foresight and leadership."

However, I think it would take more than foresight and leadership to have this happen. On the basis of the money-losing operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway every year since it opened in 1959, I think it would take a small miracle to make the proposed Champlain Seaway self-supporting. Indeed the argument that the Champlain Route could be self-sustaining is about as useless as a scabbard without a sword.

In the 5th year of operation of the $444 million St. Lawrence Seaway, it is steadily developing more cargo, but cargo is far behind the estimates and far behind paying its way. Soon the seaway must either raise tolls or accept a subsidized status. When the seaway began its first year of operation in 1959, it was estimated that it would be handling 37 million tons of cargo annually by 1962. The volume last season was 25,593,000 tons. That is quite a shortage. As Bobbie Burns said, "The plans o' mice and men gang aft a-gley."

The enabling laws of Canada and the United States include an obligation to place the seaway on a self-sustaining basis by July 1, 1964. Under the original planning it was not intended that either the Canadian or United States corporation would be able to pay on capital costs in the first few years. Although traffic is steadily gaining (the April–July volume this year was 2,300,000 tons above the same period in the previous year), the prospect of the seaway becoming self-liquidating and self-supporting is extremely bleak.

According to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp.'s report of 1962, the United States share of tolls for the year up to and including 1962 have fallen $5,415,786 behind the Seaway Tolls Committee's estimates and the U.S. share of the cumulative deficit at the end of 1962 reached almost $11.5 million.

The average toll on the 89,914,808 tons of traffic moved in the first 4 years of operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway was 49 cents a ton. However, to just barely meet its basic financial requirements, the tolls should have averaged $1.03—or more than double the present rate.

Looking at it another way, traffic would have to increase from 1962's 25,593,000 tons to 51 million tons annually if present tolls are to be merely adequate to meet current costs. But, there is not the slightest prospect for such a doubling of traffic. Moreover, even this increase would be insufficient to make up for the deficits of the past 4 years. This is a fine kettle of fish. And the deficits do not point to any successful Champlain Waterway.

The St. Lawrence Seaway, indeed, should stop wishful thinking about possible future traffic levels and raise its tolls enough to become self-sustaining now, and such tolls would be improvidently high.

If the great St. Lawrence Seaway has bred such embarrassments, deficits, red faces, and chagrin, what would the weaker Champlain Waterway yield? Only more deficits, discouragements, and disappointment.

At the beginning of my remarks I noted that it is necessary to weigh the collateral effects of a project such as this Champlain proposal in appropriate plus and minus columns—weigh merits against demerits.

Let us consider who the principal beneficiaries would be in providing a deeper waterway through Lake Champlain. I have no doubt that they would be the same people who are now reaping enormous benefit from the St. Lawrence Seaway—namely, foreign shipping interests.

A year ago this month a story appeared in some newspapers in my State by the late lamented noted Washington columnist Ray Tucker. His story, based on "data submitted to Congress and the Department of Commerce," declared that the St. Lawrence Seaway:

"Instead of providing a waterway to cheaply transport American goods to foreign markets, it has provided entry for foreign commodities manufactured and mined with cheap labor and carried in ships paying far lower wages than American rates."

Although the St. Lawrence Seaway has resulted in substantial diversion of traffic from the East Coast ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, the diversion would have been greater if it were not due to the fact that it is now too costly and too time consuming to move imports and exports to and from lower latitude countries via the northern St. Lawrence route.

Although my own port of New York has been hurt by the St. Lawrence, in 1961 it still handled more than 70 percent of the Nation's exports of the following high value commodities; motor vehicles, tires, and tubes, automotive parts, machine tools, electrical machinery, railway locomotives and cars, and semi-fabricated copper.

In this same year the port of New York handled more than 50 percent of the national imports of the following commodities: crude rubber, edible vegetable oils, wines and liquors, refined copper, crude tin, and crude zinc.

What would happen to this traffic if the proposed Champlain Seaway were put into operation? I don't think you need a crystal ball to see the answer. Quite obviously the bulk of such traffic would completely bypass the port of New York. And without a doubt, the impact would be even greater on other East Coast ports which would not even be able to provide top-loading, servicing, and fueling the ships inbound and outbound to and from the Great Lakes.

Let me also point out that the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, representing more than 3,500 industrial firms, most of whom are shippers, is strongly opposed to the Champlain Seaway. The December 1962 issue of Traffic Management magazine notes that the Association's position was based upon a special study made by the organization's transportation council, comprised of 50 traffic executives of large industrial corporations and 30 top officials of carriers representing most modes of domestic transport.

I quote now from a letter written to me on August 12, 1963 by Mr. Arnold Witte, general manager of that association:

"In view of scheduled hearings regarding the Champlain Waterway proposal, we believe you might wish to be aware of our views.

"Both shipper and carrier members of the New York Transportation Council of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., express serious doubt that the proposed construction of the waterway is urgently needed.

"The cost, according to proponents would range from $375 to $750 million, depending on the desired depth. Some engineers' estimates run as high as $1 billion. This, it was generally felt, is an exorbitant price for a project which might or might not engender trade for New York; but would probably only make the port of New York a gateway for seaway traffic.

"The completed waterway would bring about lower waterborne transport expenses for Canadian mineral interests primarily, but there is question as to benefits to the American taxpayer and industries located here. Its value for shipping would be limited because it would be unnavigable about 5 months of the year. Railroads which are now operating at levels well below their carrying capacity certainly would suffer through lost business diverted to water carriers.

"There is no indication of any potential advantages the undertaking would present to commerce in the port of New York, nor is there any way of ascertaining whether industrial development would materialize here.

"There seems to be no pressing need for building another waterway outlet to the port of New York, especially in view of the surplus of transportation services now available to industry."

Of course, it is no surprise to find that the railroads, for very sound reasons, are strongly opposed to this proposal. I am sure that they will adequately explain their reasons for their position so I will not attempt to go into them at his time except to say this: Here we are supplying another tax-consuming facility to compete with existing taxpaying facilities. The railroads of New York State, for example, in 1961 had about 68,000 employees and a payroll in New York State of about $365 million per year. To those figures must be added the number of employees and the payroll of New York industries supplying the railroads. The common carrier truckers of New York State have a large number of employees and a big payroll.

The railroads of the State are also important taxpayers, so some part of this facility which would compete with the railroads would be paid for by them. My understanding is that their real estate taxes alone in New York State amount to about $13 million per year.

Not only the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, but also the West Side Association of Commerce of New York, is opposed to this project. They are the voice of industry in New York City. They deserve to be heard. They should be listened to.

Also the board of directors of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the project and among other things has said this:

"The proposed waterway would be unnavigable for about 5 months of the year,

the same as the St. Lawrence Seaway which has lost money in its operation every year since it opened. It is estimated that the cost of this project would range from $375 to $750 million, depending on the desired depth. It is felt that the Port of New York would only be used as a gateway for the Seaway traffic, contributing to congestion in the harbor without any revenue derived from this traffic. It is also felt that Albany would siphon off a great deal of upstate cargo which is now shipped through the Port of New York."

Adding further weight to the railroads' position is the fact that, to quote one railroad brotherhood official, railroad employees "completely concur with management with respect to this Champlain Seaway proposal." Mr. F. B. Boardman, New York legislative chairman of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, has testified at New York hearings on the proposal as follows:

"When you are told how many jobs such a seaway would create, please keep in mind the number of railroad jobs which could be lost on the other hand. In the 11 counties along the proposed waterway route, there are more than 5,500 employees working for the 4 principal railroads serving this area. * * * These employees were paid a total of $30,091,088 in 1961.

"We are convinced that most, if not all of these jobs, would be placed in very serious jeopardy if the Champlain Seaway were to result in the abandonment of the rail lines now serving the Champlain and upper Hudson Valleys north of Albany.

"Furthermore, many other railroad employees in other areas of the State could be affected because of resulting losses of traffic in their respective areas."

The railroads and railroad labor are not alone among the modes of transportation in opposition to the enlarged waterway. The February 1963 issue of the Motor Truck News of New York offered the following observations on the proposal:

"We can only see economic harm for the trucking industry of New York State if the seaway is constructed. Tonnage that moves by motor carrier would be lost to water carriers, and there does not appear to be any reason to believe that new tonnage would be generated by the seaway, and if there were that it would move by trucks. As for the local truckman in New York City, who handles waterborne traffic, there appears little likelihood of any increase in tonnage available to him; in fact it would appear entirely possible that there would be a lessening of available tonnage because freight which presently moves to the Port of New York by railroad or over-the-road trucks from the Champlain area would be loaded directly on ships along the seaway route."

It is sheer madness to construct additional avenues of transportation when the present systems are adequate. No one yet claims that transportation by motor truck, air, and rail is inefficient or objectionable in the least. Then why destroy or impair existing facilities and embark upon a water route involving grave uncertainties and harm and unusual financial risk?

The Champlain route should be as unwanted as a wart on your nose.

And who would be the principal beneficiaries of this project? In 1962 more than half of the 6,351 passages through the St. Lawrence were by ships of Canadian registry as compared to a mere 507 of United States registry. Most of the remaining ships which used the St. Lawrence last year were from northern European countries. It can therefore be expected that those shipping lines from southern latitude countries and the Far East would be added to the list of foreign beneficiaries if the Champlain Seaway is constructed. It might well be assumed that many of these ships of southern latitude registry would be the same as those which are now serving the port of New York. Where are they from? Here is the story.

For the first 6 months of 1963 more than one-sixth of the 6,059 ship arrivals at the port of New York were of southern latitude and Far Eastern registry. The following countries were those which had in excess of 90 arrivals over this 6 month period:

Greece, 160; Italy, 92; Japan, 171; Liberia, 300; Panama, 157. Other South and Latin American combined, 179 (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Honduras, Venezuela, Uruguay, Nicaragua).

It is impossible to predict which of the shipping lines from the foregoing countries would take advantage of the shorter water route to the Great Lakes which would be afforded by the Champlain Seaway. However, it could be logically expected that a great number of these would naturally take advantage of the shorter shipping route to Midwestern ports. Although there were only 74 ships from Asian countries which used the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1962, there was more than double that number (171) of Japanese registry which entered the port of New York. Therefore it could be assumed that there would be a substantial increase in the number of ships of Japanese registry which would enter the Great Lakes from a Champlain Seaway because of the round trip saving of more than 2,000 miles.

I am of course in favor of any proposal that would enhance our foreign commerce but such favorable consideration must be correlated to other factors. It cannot be augmentation of foreign commerce at any price. We set side by side the advantages and the disadvantages, the merits and demerits. If we are primarily to feather nests of foreign flag carriers of our transoceanic commerce, we must ask to what degree by way of reciprocity is our own commerce and industry aided. In this respect no data or figures or information has been made manifest justifying our vast outlay for this waterway.

Indeed, with this tremendous outlay and with foreign flag carriers reaping advantages and with no concomitant benefits to us, the United States would be like a fool making a feast for a wise man to eat.

Before one erects or pulls down a fence, one usually determines the actions and intentions of one's neighbor. Our neighbor to our north has ventured into fields not of our liking, to say the least.

The Dominion of Canada is promoting sales of wheat to Red China in return for textiles from that country. I quote from the New York Times of September 8, 1963, as follows:

"Paul Martin, the Dominion's Minister of External Affairs, said in a recent speech that the limited nuclear test ban treaty should be followed up with other contacts with the Communist countries, including China. He emphasized the expansion of trade as an important contact.

"Perhaps most significant was Canada's agreement to admit $7 million worth of competitive goods from China—mostly textiles—as part of the deal in which she will sell 187 million bushels of wheat to the Chinese over the next 3 years. This clause was admitted to the contract despite the angry protests of Canada's textile industry.

"It has been widely conceded that Canada, which consistently maintains a heavy surplus of exports over imports in trade with the Communist nations, could not substantially expand these exports unless it admits more Communist goods. The willingness of the Government to accept Chinese textiles would seem to indicate that Canada would import competitive products to accelerate exports to the Communist nations.

* * * * *

"Over half of Canada's sales to the Communists—some $147 million—went to China, which is blacklisted by the United States."

Most of these wheat and textile shipments may go through the St. Lawrence Seaway. Certainly, we in the United States never intended to help build and support a route that would in the slightest degree give any aid and comfort to Communist China. Frankly, we deplore the action of Canada in its deals with an implacable foe of Western democracies—Red China. We blacklist certain cargoes only to have Canada free list them as far as Red China is concerned. Certainly we would not want any possible Champlain Waterway contaminated with Red China freight. It is enough that we pay part of the charge of conveying Red Chinese advantages, by helping discharge the deficit from the operation of the St. Lawrence Canal. I would not want this nasty situation exacerbated by any Champlain Waterway.

Indeed, Canada has not advanced her cause with these Communist Chinese exchanges. While on that score, neither has has she incurred by a long shot any good will with her deals with Castro. Indeed, opinion in the United States is quite to the contrary.

We also have today a number of communities which expected to benefit from the St. Lawrence Seaway which today, in the light of recent experience with the St. Lawrence, view this Champlain Seaway proposal with strong suspicion. I have had forwarded to me a letter from the president of the St. Lawrence County National Bank, Walter M. Wilmshurst, who identifies himself as a former "enthusiastic backer" of the St. Lawrence project. Mr. Wilmshurst states that although he expects that the financial problems of the St. Lawrence will be corrected in time, he adds:

"I believe that the Lake Champlain Seaway is unjustified, at this time, and do not believe that it will bring industry or any great increase in business to the area affected. In fact, it could be very damaging to the present recreational facilities."

Another letter forwarded to me by Mr. George H. Rand, vice president of the International Paper Co. which operates a mill at Ticonderoga, concludes:

"We see no benefits but feel that serious disadvantages would result to our operations if the seaway were constructed."

Moving further west in New York State, we find many other respected citizens raising serious questions regarding this proposal. On June 21 of this year, the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, in an editorial titled "Doubtful Ditch," stated that with respect to the proposed billion-dollar cost of the project, "Certain better things (can be done) than build a massive ditch to damage a vast recreational region."

A similar editorial appeared 5 days later in the Jamestown Post-Journal which noted:

"Not long ago we saw a statement to the effect that the St. Lawrence Seaway would be unable to meet its financial obligations unless it increased its tolls. Let's not build any more such burdens."

The city which would be hurt the most in the western part of New York State is a city which has already suffered severe economic impact due to the St. Lawrence Seaway. I refer to the city and port of Buffalo.

Between 1957, before the St. Lawrence Seaway was opened, and 1961, cargoes using the port of Buffalo dropped from 23 million to 16 million tons. As of July 30 of this year, general cargo other than flour handled at the port totaled 6,583 tons, compared with 8,381 tons a year ago.

Understandably, the port of Buffalo could expect further losses of traffic if the Champlain route were opened to ocean-going ships. It was for this reason that the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce has expressed the following view regarding this proposal:

"It is the opinion of the chamber that this waterway would further weaken the competitive position of the port of Buffalo in much the same way as did the St. Lawrence Seaway.

"Buffalo, in its present economic state, can ill afford to suffer the adverse effects from expenditures of huge sums for what appears to be an economically unfeasible venture.

"Any localized gains that might accrue from this undertaking would be more than offset by general losses which would be absorbed by other areas and the Nation as a whole."

As noted earlier many citizens of my State are concerned about pollution of Lake Champlain, the second largest fresh water lake in the United States other than the Great Lakes. They are concerned, not only from an esthetic and recreational point of view, but from the point of view of future water supply for our growing population.

I have heard it said that ships don't pump their bilges in or otherwise pollute our inland waterways. I only wish this were true.

I note that my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Representative MILLER, of New York, has sponsored Concurrent Resolution No. 45 for the specific purpose of stopping further pollution of the St. Lawrence by ships now using it.

Dr. Luther L. Terry in the U.S. News & World Report, September 16, 1963, says the fastest growing health problem in this country involves water and air pollution.

Ocean-going ships with their refuse, sludge, oil, and bilge would make the clear, limpid waters of Champlain a filthy stew, a smelly bouillabaisse. The contamination of waters in a river like the St. Lawrence, bad as it is, is far less than in a lake, like Champlain. The defilement usually runs down the river and empties into the sea, but in a lake it is walled in. The filth remains and settles. Dr. Terry, Head of the Public Health Service, thus properly sounds a solemn warning.

I have heard it further argued that any pollution of the St. Lawrence is due to sources other than ships. However, the general manager of the Thousand Islands State Park Commission has stated that bilge pumping does occur in the waterway. On June 11 of this year Associated Press carried a story from Watertown announcing that the park commission general manager, Ralph D. Wallace, was filing a complaint with the St. Lawrence Development Co. because of a ship discharging its bilge along the beach at Grasse Point State Park making the beach unusable for picnickers and campers.

Waterways are unlike highways. We can't have policemen cruising every few miles to enforce antipollution laws and regulations. The only certain means of preventing pollution of Lake Champlain is by preventing the sources of such pollution from entering the lake itself.

One of the most absurd arguments advanced in support of the waterway is that it would "make available a fresh water supply for the States of New Jersey and New York and for Long Island and eliminate all future demands upon the Delaware River watershed for additional fresh water for this same area."

This is sheer nonsense.

Considering the great quantities of water that would be used to operate the essential high locks, where would the additional water come from?

How fresh would Champlain waters remain with great ships contaminating and polluting it with sludge, oil, and bilge. The answer is clearly made by Dr. John H. Bland of the University of Vermont's College of Medicine. He said:

"I do know from the point of view of a biologist that Lake Champlain as a body of fresh water could not continue to maintain its plant and animal life in the presence of oil, sludge, and such pollution as its necessary if deep sea vessels ply the lake."

In the interim report of the International Joint Commission on the Champlain Waterway in 1937, the position of the opposition was summarized:

"1. There had been an increase in domestic trade to and from the Atlantic seaboard of the United States, but it was not of a nature, for the most part, to help the Champlain route; anthacite and petroleum, for instance, represents a large tonnage that would not travel that way in any event.

"2. Transatlantic steamship rates were controlled by conferences and their stability was easily upset. Stability could not be maintained if it became practicable for European tramp steamers to go up into the Great Lakes.

"3. Railways of both the United States and Canada were going through a very difficult time. If competition of waterways should be added to that of highways, the railways would be either forced out of business or at least their efficiency and purchasing power impaired. Reduce their purchasing power and you injured the community.

"4. The proposed water route would, if successful, be disastrous to a large body of railway employees.

"5. Railway facilities were more than adequate to handle all available and prospective tonnage. It was not in the public interest to multiply facilities beyond traffic requirements, and in any event there was already a water route in operation from the Great Lakes to tidewater by way of the New York State Barge Canal.

"6. The project was commercially and economically unsound because it involved the provision by the Government of a free right-of-way, whereas the railways had to spend millions of dollars on theirs. There was no justification for subsidized transportation.

"7. The State of New York already had 8,000 miles of railways and 47,000 miles of highway, as well as 525 miles of barge canal. One of the most efficient and best equipped transportation systems in the world, it represented an enormous investment of capital.

"8. Some witnesses who opposed a deep waterway thought there might be justification for the deepening of the Richelieu River and canals to give a minimum depth of 12 feet between the St. Lawrence and the Hudson.

"9. Opening of a deep waterway from the sea to the Great Lakes would bring into the Middle West the competition of agricultural products grown by cheap labor overseas; also iron ore to compete with the products of American mines, and foreign coal to displace native coal.

"10. The economic picture had radically changed since the International Joint Commission reported in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway in December 1921. At that time the principal factor was shipment of export wheat. Today that was no longer an important consideration. At that time railway equipment and terminal facilities on American railways were admittedly inadequate. That was no longer the case.

"11. Even if the waterway were successful, it would not help Vermont and New York interests along the route because the traffic would be mainly through traffic.

"12. It would seriously damage recreational interests around Lake Champlain.

"13. The waterway would necessarily be out of operation 5 months in the year, and if successful would throw a heavy burden on the railroads during their least profitable season. They would have to provide equipment in winter not needed in the summer.

"14. The cost would fall upon the taxpayers of both countries and could not possibly be justified as a national or international investment.

"15. The very slight existing traffic over the waterway made it highly improbable that it would be profitable to deepen it. The history of the route showed an almost continuous decline in traffic.

"16. Waterways were only justified, in such a region as that under consideration, when rail and water facilities could be coordinated so that neither would cripple or destroy the other. That was not the present case. The proposed waterway would simply duplicate existing efficient rail facilities.

"17. The only types of canals that had proved successful were the artificial straits such as the Suez and the Panama canals, the shallow barge canals such as those of France, Germany and the Netherlands, and ship canals like the St. Lawrence channel and the Manchester ship canal. The present proposal did not fall strictly within any of these classes.

"18. All-water services between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic seaboard had already been tried and had proved a failure. There was no real demand for such a service.

"19. What was needed and desired today was not an additional means of transportation, but rather the most efficient use of the available facilities at the lowest possible cost to the public.

"20. It was not practicable for deep draft ocean vessels to use such restricted channels.

"21. The business interests of New England were strongly opposed to the project.

"22. The principal requirement on the Atlantic seaboard was not such slow freight as waterways might afford, but rather fast service for manufactured products."

In my opinion, this opposition is as firm today as it was when first uttered. Nay more, the difficulties of this waterway have been increased and the opposition is even more cogent today. Furthermore, this interim report on page 16 shows the following cogent opposition to the waterway:

"The Commission has given very careful consideration to the evidence and arguments of those who appeared for or against the proposed waterway, as well as to the report of the engineers, but finds nothing that would justify it, at the present time, in recommending the improvement of the all-water route from Montreal to the Hudson River by way of the St. Lawrence River, the Richelieu River, and Lake Champlain, to 27 feet, to 14 feet, or to 12 feet.

"The Commission is impressed by the contrast between the maximum potential annual saving in transportation costs, as estimated by the engineers, and the annual carrying charges mentioned in (3). For a 27-foot waterway, the maximum potential annual saving in transportation costs is estimated to be $4,710,240, as against estimated annual carrying charges of $17,646,400. For a 14-foot waterway, the figures are $75,600 saving and $2,738,600 carrying charges. For a 12-foot waterway the corresponding figures are $58,800 and $953,000.

"If these figures were even approximately correct, the United States and Canada would be paying each year on account of the Champlain waterway, if it were a 27-foot channel, nearly four times the amount saved in transportation costs; if it were a 14-foot channel, 36 times the saving; and if it were a 12-foot channel, 16 times the saving.

"After careful consideration of the evidence adduced at the hearings, the arguments of those who appeared in support of or in opposition to the proposed improvement, the detailed report of the engineers appointed to assist the Commission, and the briefs and exhibits filed, the Commission begs to report that, with the possible exception of the situation indicated (in the preceding paragraphs) as to a 12-foot waterway, it is neither advisable nor economically practicable to improve a waterway from Montreal by way of the St. Lawrence and Richelieu Rivers through Lake Champlain to connect with the Hudson River, at the present time."

Gentlemen, in addition to all I have thus far said about this project, let me point out one more thing. We have a transportation crisis in the United States today. It is of such serious proportions that on April 5, 1962, President Kennedy sent to Congress an historic message relative to the transportation system of our Nation. In this message he said these things, among others:

"Transportation is thus an industry which serves, and is affected with, the national interest. Federal laws and policies have expressed the national interest in transportation particularly in the last 80 years; through the promotion and development of transportation facilities, such as highways, airways, and waterways; through the regulation of rates and services; and through general governmental policies relating to taxation, procurement, labor, and competition. A comprehensive program for transportation must consider all of these elements of public policy. * * *

"Pressing problems are burdening our national transportation system, jeopardizing the progress and security on which we depend. A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition.

"The regulatory commission are required to make thousands of detailed decisions based on out-of-date standards. The management of the various modes of transportation is subjected to excessive, cumbersome, and time-consuming regulatory supervision that shackles and distorts managerial initiative. Some parts of the transportation industry are restrained unnecessarily; others are promoted or taxed unevenly and inconsistently. * * *

"Some carriers benefit from public facilities provided for their use, while others do not; and of those enjoying the use of public facilities, some bear a large part of the cost, while others bear little or none.

"This administration's study of long-range transportation needs and policies convinces me that current Federal policies must be reshaped in the most fundamental and far-reaching fashion. * * *

"Investment or capacity should be neither substantially above nor substantially below these requirements, for chronic excess capacity involves misuse of resources, and lack of adequate capacity jeopardizes progress. * * *

"This basic objective can and must be achieved primarily by continued reliance on unsubsidized privately owned facilities, operating under the incentive of private profit and the checks of competition to the maximum extent practicable."

Now we are here talking about another subsidized, publicly provided transportation facility to compete with the taxpaying railroads and other segments of our privately owned and operated national transportation system. We already have an excess of transportation facilities, and the common carrier segment of our transportation system, the railroads and the common carrier trucks, are suffering.

In yesterday's New York Times appeared this caption, "Kennedy Orders Spending Curbed in the 1965 Budget." The article indicated the President would prohibit any new programs not previously submitted to Congress. His Champlain proposal has not been submitted to Congress, and I hope it never shall. The President is quite aware of huge expenditures while the budget remains in imbalance. The President's words of caution cannot go unheeded by you.

In conclusion, I am firmly convinced that the proposed Champlain Seaway is not economically feasible, is not in the best interests of the people of the United States and Canada, would only add a further burden upon the taxpayers, would mainly benefit foreign shipping (if, in fact, it would benefit anyone at all), would further accentuate our transportation crisis, and I, therefore, strongly recommend that you reaffirm your 1937 findings and reject the proposal.

General O'Daniel Assails Pearson for Trusting Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk lately from the administration that the Russians will keep the test ban treaty which is now up for ratification by the Senate. Although the Russians have broken, by actual count, 50 of the past 52 agreements which they entered into, many New Frontiersmen have come up with the theory that things are different now—that the Russians can be trusted to keep the test ban treaty.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the views on the test ban treaty of a distinguished military leader who spent 39 years in the service of his Nation—Lt. Gen. John W. O'Daniel, U.S. Army, retired, a resident of San Diego, Calif., who served with distinction in two World Wars. Iron Mike, as he was affectionately called by the men who served under him, was Military Attaché at Moscow from 1948 until August of 1950, and was Chief of the Military Assistance Advisory Group in Vietnam from April 1954 through February 1956. General O'Daniel knows the Communists firsthand and I want to point out to my colleagues the attached letter in the San Diego Evening Tribune from the general reacting to a recent column by Drew Pearson reflecting the New Frontier view that we can trust the Communists.

GENERAL O'DANIEL ASSAILS PEARSON FOR TRUSTING REDS

EDITOR:

The U.S. public is subjected to a lot of crackpot thinking and writing these days, but I have yet to see a more ridiculous and misleading one than that of Drew Pearson that appeared in the August 31 Evening Tribune entitled "Russians' Recent Treaty Record Reviewed."

Pearson goes on and states as follows:

Russia and the United States agreed to take troops out of Austria; agreed to use of the Antarctic for mutual international research; there never was a Berlin agreement; that it was agreed between the United States and Russia that each side may station military observers behind the other's lines (Pearson qualifies this by noninterference of our air flights over East Berlin and Cuba); the Russians withdrew the missiles from Cuba as they agreed to do; Russian troops in Cuba which have AA rockets have not fired a shot on our U-2 planes, that fly over Cuba, since October 1962; the Russians did not violate a test ban treaty in 1961.

Pearson closes his asinine statements by saying, "My own conclusion from careful examination of the record is that the Soviet Union has been a tough negotiator, but keeps its word when given."

I submit that the Soviets are tough negotiators but that they keep their word in all things as inferred by Pearson is pure hogwash.

My own conclusion is, why should Russia break any treaty when the objective she set out to obtain had already been realized?

Pearson has failed to state that the main objective for Russians going into Cuba was to set up a base of operations for subversion and Communist takeover in South America as well as in our own country.

To my mind, the placing of missiles in Cuba by Russia was the bait for the United States and the cover for the real objective, namely, a Communist base for operations. She lost nothing much by removing the uncamouflaged missiles.

She had us rightfully figured, that we would grab at the obvious and, in so doing, lull us into feeling we had heroically averted war and would do nothing aggressive about removal of Russian troops from Cuba. How right she has been.

The fact that Pearson failed to mention the real issue in Cuba pretty well spells out the hollowness of his entire article. Just whose side is he on?

Let's not be taken in by such tommyrot as people such as Pearson hand out to us.

How about our beginning to be "tough negotiators" and concentrate on things that really matter?

For a start, why not demand free elections for all of Germany?

Above all, get the Russians out of Cuba.

Lt. Gen. JOHN W. O'DANIEL,
U.S. Army, Retired.

Civil Aeronautics Board's Decision in the Northeast Airlines Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the recent decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board which cancels the Northeast Airlines temporary certificate to serve points south of New York City to Florida and other eastern seaboard cities including Washington, D.C., is a good example of a governmental regulatory agency being guilty of using bad judgment. This decision has caused me to lose faith and confidence in this Board and their activities. The decision is a good example of placing incompetent people in positions of responsibility. With complete disregard to the economic effect this decision would have on New England and an apparent disregard to the needs of the area this Board has handed down one of the worst decisions in the history of the agency.

The people of New England are appalled at the bold and brazen action of the Board and they are asking many, many questions. If this decision is not reversed and the Northeast Airlines allowed to continue to operate south of New York then I say that a complete reappraisal of the operations of the Civil Aeronautics Board and their activities will be needed.

I have protested this decision and I will continue to fight for equitable treatment for this airline and I serve notice on the CAB that this fight is not over.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress a letter sent to the Chairman of the CAB signed by George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Industrial Organizations protesting the decision.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1963.

Hon. ALLAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and, in particular, in the name of those affiliated organizations whose membership comprises so important an element in the air transportation industry, I wish to note a most serious objection to the Board's decision in the Northeast Airlines case. This decision, which cancels the Northeast Airlines temporary certificate to serve points south of New York City, including the profitable eastern seaboard and Florida routes, is one of the most serious and profound decisions issued by a Board majority.

The decision seems to have been taken with an apparent disregard for its inhuman effect on the livelihood of thousands of skilled and trained employees of the carrier and their families.

The decision also seems to have been taken with an apparent disregard for its damaging effect upon a certified carrier's continued existence, its depressing effect on the economy of a prime region of the United States, and its adverse effect upon the needs of a population group requiring a specific airline's services.

The undesirable monopolistic characteristics which naturally flow from the Board's decision to restrict the number of carriers engaged in the Florida service, is an added element in this matter, which raises serious concern. However, the great loss to the New England area, as well as to the other States involved, together with the Board's apparent complete and utter disregard for the well-being or rights of the carrier's employees, is, in my mind, most regrettable.

This untimely decision by the Board should be the subject of reconsideration so that a more equitable resolution of difficulties of Northeast Airlines can be achieved and the rights and well-being of so many American citizens might be better protected and advanced.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Yankees, Please Stay—Peace Corps Volunteers Honored All Over the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond is a distinguished and objective columnist. I feel that he gives careful consideration to programs he writes about. I found his article on the Peace Corps of interest. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members would also find useful material included in his statements.

YANKEES, PLEASE STAY—PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS HONORED ALL OVER THE WORLD

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—A group of Americans has recently won a distinguished peace award unanimously voted by a committee representing 16 Asian nations, the first time such an award has ever been given by Asians to non-Asians.

Another group of Americans has become so popular in Peru that the Communists have been forced to call off their attacks on them for fear of alienating public opinion.

Still another group of Americans, working in an African country, has in less than 2 years changed the once ominous chant (not limited to Communists) of "Yankee, go home," to "Yankee, please stay."

In recent weeks these groups of Americans have received praise and appreciation from the presidents of five countries on three continents, ranging from two who are stanch friends of the United States to one who is sometimes outspokenly anti-American.

And who do you think these Americans are?

I suspect you need no more than one guess. They are the Peace Corps volunteers who are doing such effective and superb work for underprivileged people in many parts of the world that they are winning special esteem, even affection for the United States.

Here is some recent evidence:

1. The 1963 Ramon Magsaysay Award, to recognize persons in Asia who exemplify "the spirit, integrity, and devotion to liberty" of the late President of the Philippines, went to the U.S. Peace Corps volunteers. They were cited "for their service to the cause of peace and humanity in a direct and personal way." President Diosdada Macapagal personally presented the award to Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver as the representative of the volunteers after a first-hand report of their work had been obtained from the Asian countries.

2. Fernandi Belaunde Terry, new President of Peru, presided over a ceremony in which the city of Arequipa (second largest in Peru) awarded a silver medal to the Peace Corps volunteers working there to improve slum conditions. When the volunteers first arrived in Arequipa, the Communists were screaming, "Death to the Yankees." They have been silenced.

3. Last month President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic singled out the Peace Corps for tribute at the construction of a vocational agricultural school in Santa Domingo, thanking the "young people from the United States for helping us in the task of building a Dominican democracy."

4. President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, who walks a pretty tight rope between East and West and often leans the other way, was host at an official reception for the Peace Corps volunteers leaving the country after 2 years of service. A high-ranking U.S. official, not connected with the Peace Corps, gave the following account: "Nkrumah was obviously impressed by the sincerity, dedication and attractiveness of the volunteers. He became increasingly cordial throughout the reception, helping to arrange pictures with himself." The pictures and news of the event took up a third of an entire page of the Daily Graphic, the paper with the largest circulation in Ghana.

5. President William Tubman personally officiated at the convocation conferring upon the Peace Corps Director an honorary degree from the University of Liberia. President Tubman called the Peace Corps an object lesson for all the world to emulate.

Remember Margery Michelmore? She was the young volunteer who lost her postcard. When it was found on the street, describing the "primitive conditions" in which she was living, it touched off student protests. Now, 2 years later, as the 23 volunteers are preparing to leave, the students at the University of Nigeria are eager for others to take their place.

I count it a tribute to the United States that some foreigners throw bombs at our embassies, but it is significant that these volunteers are getting medals pinned on them rather than bombs thrown at them.

Congress will soon vote on renewing and expanding the Peace Corps. Its case is a good one.

Advise and Consent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Monday's Wall Street Journal carries an editorial on the test ban treaty that I think worthy of the attention of not only Members of Congress, but every American citizen.

As one who has been extremely concerned as to the merit of our entering into any kind of an agreement with a Communist country, I have said I thought all Americans should understand what we are doing in this agreement with the Soviet Union. We are taking what I hope and pray is a small risk in an attempt to eliminate the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union is the one who must deliver by proving her good intentions and certainly these good intentions must be proved and soon. If any question arises from Soviet action, subsequent to our formal approval, that raises the question of motive or good faith, we should immediately announce our intention to withdraw from the agreement. I hope our leaders in Government have had enough experience with broken Communist promises to not again be the victims of our own trust in good faith which does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial from yesterday's Wall Street Journal with my own remarks in the appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

ADVICE AND CONSENT

It seems to us that the national debate on the proposed test ban treaty has been one of the more interesting of recent memory and, on the whole, most impressive.

The various witnesses before the Senate committee—scientists, officials, military men and just plain citizens—have been generally thoughtful and almost always sincere, whether approving or troubled. And in the hands of such men as Senators MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN, GOLDWATER and RUSSELL the debate in the chamber itself has been what it should be, a proving public dialog.

Yet not the least interesting thing about this debate is the simple fact that it is taking place at all.

We are not referring here merely to the fact that there is no such political process in the Soviet Union, although it is well to remember that. Nor even to the fact that in Great Britain there has been no such comparable dialog—arguments in the press, yes; speeches in Parliament, yes; but no deliberation in the sense that the outcome hinges on the result of the debate.

All this is simply a familiar mark of the uniqueness of our own political system. In

the Soviet Union no questions can be asked whatever. In Britain the role of Parliament is limited to supporting or overthrowing the government itself; short of overthrowing the government, it cannot decide the issue. Only in America, as the phrase goes, do a hundred deliberative men have the power to accept or reject an individual treaty which the Executive proposes to the Nation.

What interests us here is that on this particular proposal—a decision to suspend atmospheric atomic testing—the President chose to call this particular political process into play. It has not always been that way. It need not have ben that way this time.

Since the days of President Roosevelt the trend has been to bypass the treatymaking process of the Constitution by the use of executive agreements. None of the momentous agreements among the allies of World War II, by which the world was divide, were ever put to the Senate for ratification. Like the Czar and Napoleon sitting on a raft, Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill just decided what they wanted to do, agreed to it, and that was that.

President Kennedy could have, if he had chosen to do so, bypassed the Senate this time. There is nothing to keep the President from halting atmospheric testing of atomic weapons any time he wants to. He could have done it unilaterally; or he and Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Macmillan could have just agreed among themselves that each country would stop testing. This is, in effect, what President Eisenhower did when he declared the testing moratorium which was ultimately broken by the Soviet Union.

Why Mr. Kennedy chose to use the treaty process rather than another, we do not know. He may, as some say, have been politically motivated, desiring to protect himself from criticism by involving the Republican Party in the decision. He may as it is also charged, have been overpersuaded by the Soviets who hope that a formal treaty may restrict our freedom of action, even with an abrogation clause, more than would either a unilateral moratorium or a less formal executive agreement. Or maybe he just followed sound instincts.

Be that as it may, to those who, like ourselves, have long criticized the habit of substituting executive agreements, privately arranged for the established treaty process, where there must be public ratification, the result of the President's choice is a welcome return to the forms of constitutional government.

The point is that this proposal, be it good or ill, has been put into the public forum. Those who oppose it have the opportunity to bring forth their objections before any final action is taken, instead of being left to question it only afterwards. And the Senate itself has an opportunity to influence the course of events; one-third of the Senators plus one can say the treaty nay.

Whatever the decision, this is the way it should be made. And even the President's severest critics should give him credit for the result, that there is this public dialog before the Senate decides whether to advise and consent.

News Coordination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the following editorial from the Lynchburg Daily Advance of September 12, 1963:

A ROSE BY ANY OTHER NAME

Now the bureaucrats call it "coordination" and not "management" of the news.

The reader will be left free to decide for himself which noun is the more accurate in describing an action taken the other day by the U.S. Department of State.

According to an item in the Washington Post on August 26, the State Department has ordered its desk officers dealing with Latin American affairs not to give any information to reporters when "ticklish" situations arise in the countries for which they are responsible.

Reporters are referred to area directors who, State Department officials say, are "more qualified" to speak with the press. Desk officers for Haiti and British Guiana, for instance, have been ordered not to see certain reporters.

And how is this new policy possibly defended?

Well, the officials argue that it merely represents "coordination" and not "management" of the news.

Do they explain the difference? Certainly not.

Nor do they tell us when a situation in a country is "ticklish" and when it is not.

Seems to us that there are few, if any, situations around this troubled planet nowadays which can't be accurately labeled "ticklish."

So that leaves the gentlemen of the press—and the American public—out in the cold when the State Department decides that it isn't in our interest to know the truth about what is going on in these Latin American nations.

Coordination and not management?

What kind of semantics game are those State fellows trying to play?

Automation Can Be Made To Benefit All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, many Americans fear—and with justification—the growing impact automation is having on our lives. But before anyone abandons the ship, it is worth taking a look at an industry which has already undergone heavy automation, the communications industry, and particularly to the person who represents many workers in that industry, Mr. Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and an AFL-CIO vice president.

In a special Labor Day broadcast, Mr. Beirne pointed out that a danger of automation is that it will eliminate many jobs, leave millions of workers untrained for other work, and provide few positions for unskilled workers entering the work force. This is all too true. But he does point out an encouraging aspect: There would not be enough women in the country today to handle the volume of telephone calls if the equipment had not been automated. And further, without this automation we would not have today's very necessary modern communications system.

By this one illustration alone, Mr. Beirne makes well the point that our problem is to take advantage of automation's benefits while not letting it take advantage of us.

The full text of Mr. Beirne's broadcast is as follows:

On this Labor Day weekend, throughout all the 50 States—from the tropical beaches of southern Florida to the far-off shores of northern Alaska—the citizens of our Democratic Nation are celebrating the last holiday weekend of this eventful summer of 1963.

On this holiday, I bring you labor's greetings from the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations the AFL-CIO. Throughout the entire world, this great American trade union federation of 13 million men and women holds a pre-eminent place. It is admired for its progressive spirit, respected for its sense of responsibility both to its members and to the Nation, hailed in every free country as a major bulwark of democracy.

This Labor Day, of course, is a holiday for all the people. It is not just labor's holiday. It is a day set aside for the purpose of honoring the dignity and spiritual values of human labor in every honorable form.

Yet today, as we enjoy this holiday—in our homes, perhaps, or on the beaches, riding the highways, walking along mountain trails—we Americans tend to take Labor Day for granted. Few of us look upon this holiday weekend as more than a welcome break in the routine of the warm-weather season. Few of us Americans take time to look back today to the world of 1882, when a carpenter named Peter McGuire first proposed that a day be set aside to honor the wage earners of America.

We take Labor Day for granted in the same way we take too many other American institutions and customs for granted. In taking the development and progress of America for granted, I believe we endanger that progress.

Unless we appreciate what we as a people and a Nation have done, we will do less in the years ahead.

Unless we understand how we had to fight hard, and work hard, to accomplish many reforms in the past, we may forget how to fight hard, and work hard, for the forward steps that this Nation will be called upon to take in the future.

For instance:

We in America cannot afford to forget that the system of public education—which we take for granted today—was the product of a determined effort by wage earning men and women to win free schools for their children. The little red schoolhouse—that proud symbol of our systems of democratic education—was built because American working people and their unions insisted on free education, fought for it, won that battle, and went on to build a great educational system.

We in America cannot afford to forget that our system of social security—which we take for granted today—was born only after years of legislative effort and struggle. Men and women of foresight—in unions, in universities, in government—talked and argued and pleaded for a system of pensions for our senior citizens. Thus it was no routine accident when Congress under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt adopted a social security system for America. Hard work and long sustained effort built the economic bulwark that contributes peace of mind to our senior citizens.

So it goes. I could make a long list of things we take for granted which we should not take for granted, because we had to work so hard for them.

The 40-hour week, the vacations with pay, the time off for holidays, did not spring automatically into existence. They came because determined people fought the good fight to build a democratic economy—an economy based on wage earners, not on wage slaves.

When we take for granted any of these American social advances, we have taken the first step to make them weaker or even losing them altogether.

Fortunately for our national sense of progress, people, or events periodically keep reminding us to be conscious of our heritage and the gains we have achieved through the years. For many generations, immigrants fleeing to our shores from nations governed by autocratic dictatorships, caused us to renew our respect for our everyday liberty and freedom. Those of us who were born American have always had many good lessons in democratic citizenship—lessons taught to us by those who chose to be American citizens.

Many of us who have the vote, take it so for granted that sometimes we don't bother to use that precious right to vote on election day. In recent years we have watched members of an often deprived minority sacrifice and strive with dignity and courage to win in fact the right they have in principle—the right to cast a secret ballot in an American election.

As we watch these Negro citizens conduct their campaign for the practical right to vote, we are reminded once again: the American franchise cannot be taken for granted. It is a solemn and precious right.

The right to vote, like other civil and constitutional rights, is vested in all the American people.

The right to vote belongs to all of us; and all of us have an obligation to make certain that all Americans share that right. And, when we have that right to vote, we have further the obligation and the responsibility to cast that vote on election day. The right to vote must be nourished by using it.

A healthy citizenship climate is important to America. Equally important is a healthy economic climate. Yet who would maintain that in America today we have an economy as healthy as it should be?

Millions of Americans—too many millions by far—are out of work, despite their efforts to find jobs. Our rate of economic growth is not enough to provide all the jobs we need. In many sectors of industry; in some manufacturing and service trades, for instance, wages are far below the level needed to provide decent American standards. One whole group of Americans—the migrant workers employed in the Nation's agriculture—are exploited to a degree few Americans would believe.

In the midst of prosperity—the abundant good life of the 1960's—there are many more than 30 million citizens who are close to the borders of poverty.

There is danger, furthermore, real danger that the number of poor in the midst of plenty may be rising. The new technology, the wonderful automatic machines, the whole process of automation, creates new jobs—but it also kills old jobs. If we take for granted the benefits of automation, which are many, and do nothing to ease the many hardships caused by automation, we shall condemn millions of Americans to empty lives of poverty and insecurity.

I have spent my entire life in the telephone industry. It is one of the first industries to have been automated, and I can see the many benefits. If we did not have the dial telephone today, there would not be enough girls in America to serve as switchboard operators to handle all the telephone calls that America makes every day.

That's one way of looking at it. The other view is this: If we had no dial telephone and other related forms of technical progress, would we have the kind of modern communications system we need for today's world? Obviously not.

Our problem in America is to take advantage of automation's benefits, as we have done in the communications industry, while not permitting the automation process to take advantage of us.

Human values must be preserved. It is morally justifiable to resent and resist the havoc caused to a work force by the introduction of automation. It is morally an obligation, from which we cannot turn aside, to plan ahead. In that way, the benefits of automation will be available to the whole society, and we shall be in a position to train people and move them into new jobs, or arrange for their orderly retirement from the work force with proper safeguards.

This job of coping with automation can be done—if we don't take for granted the byproduct of hardships that often results from automation.

For that reason, I hope that President Kennedy will move quickly to activate the Commission of Automation, which he has already said he plans to establish. This proposed commission of experts, functioning with the help and prestige of the President of the United States, would be in an ideal position to "assure both the continued advance of our technology and the continued well-being of our people."

Such a high-level panel of citizens ideally should have representatives from industry, labor, the professions, the academic world, agriculture and the Government. It should be prepared to think hard and work hard. No economic problem looms larger than the question of how we handle the introduction of automation into the world of industry and commerce. It is a problem that extends in many directions.

We will need more education, at higher levels, for our young people to prepare them for living in the age of the new technology. In tomorrow's America, the youngster who is uneducated and unskilled is apt to be unemployed.

Unless we plan and prepare, the age of automation will be an age of discrimination—against those who lack schooling and skills. We must keep on insisting to our younger generation that they get all the education they can absorb.

As a matter of ethics and morality, we must make sure there is freedom of opportunity to get schooling and work skills for every person who wants them, regardless of race, color, sex, or creed. As a matter of intelligent self-interest, we must keep our economy expanding, so there will be jobs and opportunity for everyone who wants to work.

These are desirable goals. They are not easy of achievement. But we will move steadily toward those goals if we are alive to our unlimited opportunities.

In this time of sweeping change throughout the whole wide world, we in America must gear ourselves to change with the times. The challenge extends to every area of American life; to labor, to business, to education, to government.

No person, no group, no industry, no union, can take the past for granted, nor feel it has a special-interest license which permits it to be exempt from the change and the challenge which confronts our Nation on Labor Day 1963.

With God's help, and with our national vigor and spirit, I know we shall continue to build a better America, in a world free from war and chaos.

Foreign Aid Discussed From Defense Standpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter sent to me August 28, 1963, by the Defense Department:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This responds to your letter of August 23, 1963, in which you requested "a brief paragraph or two that relates directly to the opinion of the Secretary of Defense and the opinion of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on foreign aid."

The following has been extracted from the statement of Secretary of Defense McNamara before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on April 8, 1963, in support of the fiscal year 1964 military assistance program:

"With respect to our national welfare at home, there is a very definite relationship between that welfare and allied forces supported by the military assistance program. These forces represent an important and indispensible increment of total free world military strength for common defense. To replace this vital asset for collective security with comparable and similarly deployed American troops would involve a totally unacceptable drain on our manpower and monetary resources. It would send the defense budget soaring and add to the taxpayer's burden an amount many times the cost of the military assistance which makes possible the accomplishment of our own forward strategy with minimum expenditure in men and money. Even more significantly, it would require the drafting of many more young men, interrupting their education, disrupting family life and depriving the economy of the fresh manpower essential to vigorous growth.

The military assistance program thus well serves our national self-interest, not only as a key instrument of U.S. foreign policy and military strategy, but also as a means of conserving our human and financial resources without sacrificing our security."

Later in this same statement Secretary McNamara added: "The fact that I have been stressing the military mission toward which the military assistance program is directed in particular situations and countries does not imply any disregard of the vitally important interrelationship between military assistance and various forms of economic aid as joint instruments of U.S. policy. I am fully aware that neither can most effectively promote that policy apart from the other.

"It is for this reason that, at every stage in the military assistance planning and programing process, State, Defense, and AID jointly evaluate all pertinent factors—military, political, and economic—and decide together upon a course of action designed to promote the predominant interest of the United States in any given situation or country. This careful and continuing coordination serves to insure that military assistance not only conforms to foreign policy, but that

it is so meshed with economic aid that the programs are mutually supporting and not in conflict with each other. Only when they are properly meshed can our total foreign assistance effort make the maximum possible contribution to the attainment of our international security objectives.

"The importance of such meshing is particularly apparent in the complementary relationship between military assistance and supporting assistance in nations which do not have the economic means to support the sizable armed forces we consider essential to their own and the common defense. Because our total objectives with respect to the security and stability of such countries cannot be attained without the judicious and well-balanced application of both military and economic assistance, I am as much concerned with adequate appropriations for one as for the other. We in the executive branch have made every effort in recent years to reduce supporting assistance wherever possible, and to insure that the amounts requested are in fact absolutely essential either for military budget support or for some valid political or economic purpose. I am fully satisfied that the $435 million authorization request for supporting assistance in fiscal year 1964 represents the minimum necessary to insure the protection of our security interests and military assistance investment in the countries which still urgently require this type of aid. As in military assistance, about two-thirds of the supporting assistance funds will go to countries which confront a direct threat of Communist aggression."

The following has been extracted from the statement of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on June 13, 1963, in support of the fiscal year 1964 military assistance program:

"A continuation of military assistance is necessary for the same reason that continued heavy expenditures for national defense are necessary; namely, the threat to the free world remains undiminished. In spite of the problems which we see arising in the Communist camp, the economic difficulties in the Soviet Union, and the ideological division between the Soviet Union and Communist China, the world Communist bloc remains impressively strong in military and subversive resources and continues to pursue a policy of exploitation by aggression, infiltration, and the support of so-called "wars of liberation" in covert attack upon weak governments of the free world. Unfortunately, I see nothing which leads me to believe that this situation is likely to change in the short or the mid term. Indeed, in some areas of the world, new areas of conflict appear likely with which the United States will be obliged to reckon in the future."

Later in this same statement General Taylor added: "In our efforts to create conventional military strength as a counter-poise to the trained Communist military manpower, we are assisting friendly countries who are maintaining ground forces of about 4 million men, some 8,000 operational aircraft, and about 1,900 naval craft. They spend some $23 billion to maintain these forces. Our contribution to the maintenance of these forces is directed primarily toward those countries which are financially weak and which are facing the greatest threat. This contribution during the coming year will amount to about $1.4 billion. This does not appear an unreasonable sum in relation to the military reinforcement of the West represented by these forces."

Your letter of August 23 is being returned as requested. I hope you will find the information above fully responsive to your inquiry. Please advise me if I can be of any further assistance to you on this matter.

Sincerely,

CLYDE M. DILLENDER, Jr.,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Deputy Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

J.F.K. Labor's Pawn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Dispatch:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Dispatch, Aug. 30, 1963]

J.F.K. LABOR'S PAWN?

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy bitterly and angrily has told several national labor chiefs to prevail on some of their colleagues to stop putting him on the spot with a perpetual series of countrywide crises.

In blunt language, he and his top advisers said the time had come for such union officials to cease using the Chief Executive as though he were a pawn.

White House insiders, exasperated by the rail crisis, believe that the office of the Presidency has lost considerable prestige on the domestic front this past year because of a series of personal rebuffs to John Kennedy by strike leaders or those threatening to call crippling strikes.

Latest of the labor chiefs to embitter the President, the White House staff, the Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, and others in the inner circle, is the little-known, guitar-playing almost-unmovable president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

He is Charles Luna, originally of Austin, Tex. His brotherhood represents almost half the operating railroad workers involved in the 4-year rail conflict. He began his national career in the brotherhood back in 1946 when he came on the union's convention scene in Miami Beach dressed in cowboy clothes and strumming a guitar. He serenaded many of the delegates during the 8-week gathering. When it was over he was a vice president.

In 1960 he became the brotherhood's assistant president and succeeded W. P. Kennedy when the latter resigned—but only to fill out the rest of the term. Now Luna must stand for election for a full term at the next convention in Miami Beach in 1964.

It was the unknown Luna who had been the toughest to deal with during the crisis. There was, for example, the moment early in July when President Kennedy, fearing a cataclysmic rail paralysis, had a long talk with Willard Wirtz. They decided something dramatic must be done. Wirtz suggested offering the brotherhoods a chance to have Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg settle the dispute. The Justice is a great advocate of voluntary arbitration.

Mr. Kennedy personally lifted the phone and called Mr. Goldberg in the Virgin Islands. The Justice listened, asked what Willard Wirtz thought, and was assured that the Labor Secretary certainly would not resent Mr. Goldberg's coming into the case. The Justice said he wanted to think about it. Later he agreed and flew back to the U.S. mainland.

The next morning the leaders of the five ontrain unions were in the White House. They were surprised by the news. They had not been consulted.

The man who led the revolt against President Kennedy was Charles Luna—though the President had already made the public announcement. President Kennedy was deeply insulted.

Weeks of new infighting followed.

Finally leaders of the firemen, engineers, and conductors began indicating they were ready for some sort of arbitration to avoid a national strike on some 103 class A railroads.

Then in mid-August came the day when Willard Wirtz was able to put enough on paper to get agreement on arbitration from all sides—or so it seemed that dreadfully wearing hour.

After 4 long years, it would have been over. Both sides were to return to the White House at 11 o'clock the next morning. But at 9 a.m. Willard Wirtz telephoned the railroad company representatives. He told them it was useless.

Charles Luna had again protested. No one had been able to do anything with him. Not even AFL–CIO President George Meany, who also thought the crisis was over.

Wirtz, sleepless, fatigued, and sharply disappointed, had to inform the President of the new upheaval. He also told the rail executives he was so outraged and disgusted by what had happened, he would not even bring the new demands to the table.

All along, Luna's position was that the unions could get more with a strike than from arbitration.

This is the story of other strikes—such as the December $1,000 million east coast dockworkers' stoppage which the President had tried to avert with a personal phone call to the longshoremen's leader—only to be rebuffed.

So the President has sent word he no longer wants to be put on the spot. Congress does not want to be put on the same spot.

The word is that if there is another tough national labor crisis, there will be tougher legislation We'll see.

The Pulp and Paper Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dynamic and progressive industries in the United States today is the paper industry. The following facts will be of interest to the Congress and were furnished to me by American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

THE PAPER INDUSTRY [1] IN THE UNITED STATES

Total number of plants in the United States (1958), 5,271.[2]

States containing plants, 47.

Cities and towns with plants, 1,258.

[1] Paper industry includes: manufacturers of pulp, paper, paperboard, and those who convert these materials into useful products.

[2] Latest published U.S. Census Bureau figures.

Number of employees in paper industry, 602,000.

Wages and salaries paid annually (including fringe benefits), $3,700 million.

Annual sales, $13,700 million.

Federal taxes paid annually, about $600 million.

State and local taxes paid annually, about $250 million.

Capital spent for new plant and equipment between 1947 and 1962, $8,515 million.

Paper and paperboard produced annually, 37,580,000 tons.

Amount of paper used annually by each person in the United States, 453 pounds.

Wood pulp produced annually, 27,831,000 tons.

Pulp produced annually from sources other than wood (straw, rags, cotton fiber, hemp, bagasse, and other grasses), 937,000 tons.

Reused pulp fiber, i.e., waste paper, 9 million tons.

Annual payments for pulpwood, $850 million.

Annual investment in research, approximately $65 million.

Farm Labor Facts—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks before the Congress considers the extension of the farm labor program which provides for administration of the bracero work program, I intend to produce exhaustive materials which should convince the reasonable liberal or conservative of the need for this legislation in the State of California.

This first offering is a reported interview with California Employment Director Al Tieburg, who manages the extremely liberal California unemployment insurance program:

[From the Lodi (Calif.) News-Sentinel, Sept. 6, 1963]

TIEBURG SAYS BRACERO FILLS A GENUINE GAP—SDE DIRECTOR SAYS MANY JOBS HAVE NO DOMESTIC TAKERS

(By Dale Polissar)

The State director of the department of employment, Albert B. Tieburg, predicts grave consequences for California's economy if Congress does not extend the Mexican national program, scheduled to terminate December 31.

In an interview with the News-Sentinel, Tieburg gave his answer to the blistering attack upon the bracero system by Al Green, director of the AFL-CIO Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC), published in the August 27 edition of the News-Sentinel.

Tieburg firmly denied Green's charge that the employment department's farm placement service is allowing Mexican nationals to be used in place of available domestic farmworkers.

Tieburg said that every qualified farmworker who wants to work can easily get a job through the farm placement service. Despite this fact, he asserted, there is a great shortage of domestic farmworkers.

He agreed with Green that the bracero system does keep down the wages of American farmworkers. He also agreed that in most crops, a very slight increase in the retail price of produce—if the increase went to the farmer—could result in a large increase in farm labor wages.

However, he maintained that even if wages are increased, there will still be a serious shortage of domestic workers willing to do stoop labor.

He predicted that if Public Law 78 is terminated this year, there will be a large cutback in acreage next year in bracero-using crops, setting off a chain reaction of unemployment in farm-related industries.

The main conflict between the positions taken by Green and Tieburg lies in the question of whether there is a shortage of domestic workers willing to do the job that braceros are now doing.

Green asserted that the alleged shortage is a manufactured one. He charged that the department of employment's farm placement service is allowing braceros to be used while thousands of American farmworkers are unable to find work.

Green cited an AWOC daily count indicating that from April 24 to August 1—a period including the peak of bracero usage—there were 56,000 men on the street in Stockton trying to get farmwork and unable to do so.

Tieburg challenges the validity of the AWOC count.

He has personally gone down to the 4 a.m. gathering of farmworkers in Stockton on several occasions, Tieburg said, and, in the presence of AWOC representatives, he went from group to group asking the men if they wanted to work and telling them what work was available.

In all these visits, Tieburg said, he had only one taker.

Furthermore, he said, the Stockton office every day broadcasts job opportunities to the men on the street through a loudspeaker, and sends a Spanish-speaking interviewer among them to tell them of job openings.

The mere presence of hundreds of men on the streets in the farm-hiring section does not mean that they are looking for work and can't get it, Tieburg argued. Some of them come down in the morning to socialize with their friends, and others already have jobs and are waiting for labor buses at prearranged pickup points, Tieburg said.

"I wouldn't care if there were 15,000 men out on the street. Because, the place for them to be if they want a job is inside the office," Tieburg concluded.

Green had charged that the farm placement service hiring routine is such that, "No self-respecting worker will go near that place."

Green said a worker who seeks employment through the farm placement service must come down at 3 a.m. or 4 a.m., wait in long lines, go through excessive paperwork and interviewing, then return the next day, when he may or may not get work.

Tieburg answered that the workers know very well that they will not usually be sent out to work on the same day that they are processed. Therefore, he said, there is no reason for them to show up at 4 o'clock in the morning for their initial processing—they could come at 10 a.m. or 11 a.m., when the office is nearly empty.

He explained that the numbers of men that the office is handling makes it impossible in most cases to assign a man to a job the same day that he is interviewed.

He defended the paperwork and interviewing involved in the Farm Placement Service hiring process as a vital part of the department's attempt to employ more domestic workers.

Until 2 years ago, he explained, the department's method of dispatching farmworkers to jobs was a much briefer process. No record was kept of workers' employment histories, and they were dispatched on a "day-haul" basis—they worked for 1 day, were paid off, and had to seek work again the next morning.

Now, says Tieburg, careful records are kept of farmworkers' employment histories. By this method, he stated, unreliable workers are weeded out.

The result, he said, is that growers associations have cooperated with the department in cutting down day-haul hiring and insuring workers of more steady employment. It is now common practice, Tieburg said, for growers associations to keep a worker on for the duration of a harvest—and even transfer him from one harvest to another—so that he does not have to return to the Farm Placement Service every day or every week for referral.

According to Tieburg, this method has greatly increased the number of domestic workers dispatched through the Farm Placement Service—from 10,000 to 12,000 per year before the present dispatching process was adopted, to well over 150,000 per year.

Green had charged that growers associations' labor buses often pull out half full, leaving available workers standing on the street; and that the associations then cry "shortage" and are cleared by the Farm Placement Service for use of braceros.

Tieburg replied that buses may pull out half full if the workers assigned to them have not shown up. However, he added, any time before noon that a sufficient number of worers referred by the Farm Placement Service gather in the Farm Placement Service lot, a bus is immediately dispatched to take them to work. If there are braceros working on that job at the time, they are withdrawn, he said.

Green had charged that the San Joaquin Farm Production Association—the largest local handler of braceros and domestic workers—uses many tricks to replace domestic workers with braceros.

Tieburg replied that any alleged use of braceros in place of available domestic workers is thoroughly investigated by the department of employment.

If the complaint seems to have substance, it is referred to the Department of Labor, the Agency which polices Public Law 78. As proof that there are not many instances of braceros replacing domestic workers, Tieburg asserts that he has had very few complaints of this kind, despite the fact that the AWOC field staff is constantly on the lookout for such instances.

Green had charged that the department of employment is allowing braceros to be used as "strike breakers," and that there are six cases right now in San Joaquin County where braceros are being used behind AWOC picket lines.

Tieburg replied that one must make a distinction between a "strike" and a "labor dispute."

He said, if workers walk off a job in protest against wages or working conditions, and proceed to picket their employer, that is a strike. However, he continued, if AWOC pickets an employer and demands that he negotiate with the union, and if no workers walk off the job as a result of the picket line, that is a labor dispute, not a strike.

Tieburg explained that pursuant to the international agreement with Mexico and the Wagner Peyser Act, the department of employment cannot authorize use of braceros when 50 percent or more of the workers on a job have walked off the job as a result of a labor dispute, and cannot refer any worker to a job when the job is vacant because the former occupant is on strike, unless the new worker signs a slip saying that he is going to a struck job.

Tieburg states that the department of employment has followed these laws to the letter, carefully investigating each labor dispute to determine how many workers have walked off the job.

This reporter asked Tieburg whether, in his opinion, the above-mentioned laws did not, in fact, thwart workers' attempts to negotiate: Since most American workers will not cross a picket line, is not the effect of the law that a picketed employer cannot get domestic workers, and is therefore duly cleared for use of braceros?

Tieburg commented that there have been many cases of farm labor disputes involving no braceros where the employer had no trouble filling his openings with domestic workers willing to cross the picket line.

Tieburg declined to give his personal opinion on the "justice" of the law.

Tieburg, then, rejects Green's contention that the department of employment allows braceros to be used as strikebreakers, and categorically denies Green's assertion that the department is not making an honest effort to use domestic workers whenever possible.

Consequently, Tieburg maintains that the number of braceros authorized in California is a valid indication of the shortage of available domestic workers.

"I don't know of any better way to check on the available domestic labor supply than to offer them jobs," he says.

Propaganda War: The United States and Russian Programs Appraised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a striking article in the New York Times of September 8, which appraises in detail the propaganda methods of the United States and the Soviet Union. Its author is the well-known writer, Ted Szulc.

Each year the Congress appropriates funds for the U.S. Information Agency which operates in this propaganda area where results are nebulous and difficult to appraise; where as Edward R. Murrow has said:

> We cannot gage our success by sales because no cash register rings when a man changes his mind.

This article, which I heartily commend to your attention, points out that there "are yardsticks to measure the American effort and perhaps the best is the violent Soviet campaign against the Information Agency that began earlier this year."

The writer quotes a Moscow radio broadcast of last June which announced that the USIA "provokes sleepless nights in Socialist countries." I shall not attempt to review this fine analysis of the propaganda methods of our country and the U.S.S.R.—rather, I suggest that the Members read the article which follows:

PROPAGANDA WAR: THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIAN PROGRAMS APPRAISED

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, September 7—The Soviet Union has acknowledged deep concern over the current U.S. propaganda effort.

Until recently it was the United States that worried about its own international propaganda and tended to regard Moscow as the sinister and unmatched master in the battle for men's minds. Now it is the Soviets' turn to stay awake nights fretting about what the Americans are doing.

Both countries, and their allies, remain locked in the propaganda war that has been going on for 18 years in almost every language spoken by man. In size and cost, the Soviet effort is 5 to 10 times greater than that of the United States, but lately this battle has entered a new dimension in which quality outruns quantity.

Soviet press and radio statements—as well as the studies by Soviet scholars and specialists—reflect Moscow's concern over the situation. The U.S. Information Agency has been blamed for provoking "sleepless nights" in the Communist world, "brainwashing Africans," attempting to sell "the myth of America—the land of freedom," and engaging in "demoralizing activity" from the East to the West.

What follows is an examination of the propaganda efforts of the two countries and the results of these efforts.

I. THE AMERICAN LINE

The new line for American propaganda was set out last January in this memorandum from President Kennedy to Edward R. Murrow, Director of the USIA.

"Agency activities should (A) encourage constructive public support abroad for the goal of a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others; (B) identify the United States as a strong, democratic, dynamic nation qualified for its leadership of world efforts toward this goal, and (C) unmask and counter hostile attempts to distort or frustrate the objectives and policies of the United States."

"These activities," the President wrote, should emphasize the ways in which U.S. policies harmonize with those of other peoples and governments, and those aspects of American life and culture which facilitate sympathetic understanding of U.S. policies."

Complex effort

Interpreting the Presidential directive in terms of what the United States is telling the world about itself, Mr. Murrow remarked recently that, in operating 104 countries, "the message we convey to them is not a simple one."

"Ours is a land of the multiple ideology," he said. "Democracy is not simple but complex. We allow, even encourage dissent. Variety is our hallmark. We have made it a national credo not to have one belief, one rationale, one guide, one dogma. We have made a veritable dogma of having no dogma."

In practice, then, the U.S. propaganda effort emphasizes plain speaking and straightforward reporting in the 36 languages used by the Voice of America in its 789 weekly hours of broadcasting and in the daily 10,000-word wireless file of news to newspapers in 100 cities throughout the world.

This principle is being widely applied to the U.S. racial problem with the full knowledge of this country's vulnerability on the subject of discrimination in the eyes of Africans and other former colonial peoples.

In its broadcasts and other materials, the Information Agency has been emphasizing the achievements in integration against the background of the unfinished job, including the weekly airing of a "Progress Report" on the racial question. The march on Washington of August 28 was reported live by the Voice in numerous languages, although the Agency planners had no idea what would happen before the end of the day.

Report on the left

On the Soviet-Chinese split and other developments in the Communist world, Mr. Murrow has emphasized objective reporting.

But even this cautious approach could be used to press U.S. interests in widening the Communist feud without involvement in it. Thus, earlier this year—before both Moscow and Peiping began fully to acquaint their respective public with each other's charges—the Voice, its tongue a bit in cheek, made a point of broadcasting the Soviet charges to Communist China in Chinese dialects and the Chinese charges to the Soviet Union in the six main Soviet languages.

If the broadcasts and the press file concentrate daily on political developments, perhaps the most important long-range successes of U.S. propaganda are in the teacher role—an area in which the flexibility of the American society contrasts so sharply with the straitjacket of communism.

Teacher

Here, especially, the emphasis has been greatly changed under the Kennedy-Murrow approach. In the past the United States and the Soviet Union competed in books, periodicals, and movies in depicting each other in the most sinister terms while emphasizing their own achievements at home. Today, Washington prefers to be more sophisticated, universal-minded, and detached.

For one thing, Mr. Murrow believes that Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans, are not interested, in the midst of their own drama of development, in hearing about U.S. affluence and in being fed a steady diet of American pronouncements and activities.

Instead, he thinks, they want to know how they can move toward their own affluence and are eager to be aided in it. With the United States acting as the teacher and adviser, sympathies for America are spreading with better effect than the purely propagandistic and negative approach of the Communists.

Thus, last year the Information Agency published and distributed 5 million copies of books in dozens of languages on everything ranging from political science to art and culture and technical skills. The bulk of the Soviet book production is represented by such a heavy and unattractive diet as the collected works of Engels, Marx, and Lenin and the speeches of Premier Khrushchev.

With a new emphasis on television and movies, the United States has been literally flooding the world with high-quality productions in black-and-white and in color—an endeavor where the Soviet propagandists cannot compete technically and where they find no acceptability for their limited product.

With 700 new television transmitters going into operation every year around the world, TV has become one of the most potent channels of conveying the U.S. message in its direct and indirect form, sometimes explicit, sometimes understated, but always designed to establish a lasting bond between Americans and the people of other nations.

As of this year, more than 500 U.S. TV programs will have been screened in 61 countries by local stations, and without any cost to the United States. Every month, the Agency says, 600 million people see its films produced in 52 languages.

This is, evidently, penetration in depth at a steady pitch that the Communists cannot match. The penetration could be even deeper, Mr. Murrow says, but Congress, which stubbornly goes on regarding propaganda and culture as something un-American and subversive, has kept the Information Agency's budget at $131 million annually. This year, Congress refused to give an additional $15 million that was mainly programed for expanding book publishing and TV activities.

II. THE EFFORT APPRAISED

But what is the actual response to all these efforts and are people abroad regarding the United States more sympathetically?

Mr. Murrow is the first to admit that "we cannot gage our success by sales" because

"no cash register rings when a man changes his mind, no totals are rung up on people impressed with an idea."

"Often," he says, "one's best work may be merely to introduce doubt into minds already firmly committed."

Yet there are yardsticks to measure the American effort, and perhaps the best is the violent Soviet campaign against the Information Agency that began earlier this year. Thus, last June the Moscow radio announced that the USIA "provokes sleepless nights in Socialist countries." Komsomolskaya Pravda wrote indignantly, last March 21, that "USIA is a truly tremendous monster of the cold war, which has no equal in other capitalist countries."

Money question

The same article astonishingly told Mr. Murrow, who finds himself a prophet abroad but not with Congress at home, that "the closefisted American millionaires spare no money" for the "psychological molding" of peoples in other countries.

Interestingly, much of the self-conscious discussion of U.S. propaganda—a matter that Moscow would have hardly touched a few years ago—appears in the highly specialized theoretical journals, like Kommunist, or in Soviet Russia, which is the newspaper of the Central Committee Bureau for the Soviet Council of Ministers.

Last July, this whole question came up for detailed review at a Moscow conference on "ideological struggle and present international relations," which significantly coincided with the Soviet-Chinese confrontation that led to their ultimate split, and with the beginning of the East-West negotiations on the partial nuclear test ban.

With that period looming as a historical crossroads both in terms of the Communist world relations and of the cold war with the West, this Soviet review of its propaganda problems underlined again the entry of the two main power blocks into the phase of full-fledged ideological contest.

Propaganda change

Soviet experts at the conference recognized that the United States had revolutionized its propaganda approach by its new studies into the character of people it is seeking to influence; that it now dealt in obviously dangerous "doctored" truths instead of what they called the "outright lies" of the past; that it promised the new nations to help their revolutions; and that it trained scholars to become an army of active "bourgeois ideologists."

But there are other measurements as well. When the Voice of America announced a write-in contest in broadcasts to Yugoslavia, 18,000 letters were received from that country in one wek. A similar contest in Latin America, where the Voice's short-wave broadcasts are relayed by domestic broadcast-band stations, brought 38,000 letters in a week.

The whole effort, of course, is a long-range one. It cannot be measured in terms of individual political victories or defeats in, say, Vietnam or Cuba. But, American propagandists say, Mr. Khrushchev has asked for an ideological contest to run for generations. And the United States is more than ready to fight him in this area and to demonstrate that democracy has a flexibility that is organically denied to communism.

III. THE RUSSIAN LINE

Communist propaganda no longer speaks with one voice to the world. Where until not too long ago the Soviet, Chinese and Cuban broadcasts complemented each other, today the listener to the Communist radios finds a cacaphony of divergent and often angry sounds.

The Soviet and the Chinese propaganda machines now devote countless hours of air time and millions of words to mutual denunciations in a dozen languages. In addition, each of them has to invest time in propagandizing its own allies and satellites in the correctness of their respective ideological and political positions in the great intra-Communist battle.

Thus last Tuesday the Moscow Radio devoted two lengthy broadcasts to Rumania—in Rumanian—to the visit of Premier Khrushchev in Yugoslavia, accentuating the importance of the unity of Communist countries in "consolidating general peace." These broadcasts were more than the usual bloc propaganda, for Rumania still hovers on the edge of her sympathies for China.

A few days earlier, two Soviet commentators discussed the Chinese-Soviet feud in a Spanish-language broadcast beamed at Cuba, another country in the Communist family that has real ideological loyalties lie. In the heavy-handed manner that remains typical of the Soviet persuasion efforts, one of the commentators remarked that "it is regrettable that the spotlight has fallen on our Chinese comrades."

"All the errors only undermine the unity of the peaceful forces, the unity of all the Communists in the world—this unity to which Cuba is pledged in statements made by its highest leader, Fidel Castro," the commentator added.

The dispute with Peking was aired one day this week in monotonous detail in a radio roundtable for German audiences—the roundtable technique is a favorite of Soviet propagandists—and in lengthy rebroadcasts in two dozen languages of the latest Soviet reply to the latest Chinese blast.

Though Moscow has been extremely careful to avoid attacking the United States too strongly since the signing of the nuclear test ban pact, Soviet broadcasts describe the American opponents of the treaty as "wild men" and unendingly talk of "warmongers" and "imperialists."

The Congo is advised from Moscow that it "will never again be colonialism's private preserve" and Africans in general are told that "the United States has no intention of taking decisive action against South Africa's apartheid."

IV. THE EFFORT APPRAISED

In trying to assess the impact of Communist propaganda in this new age, the first conclusion may well be that if it were considered efficient, Moscow would not be so candid in worrying about it.

But more specific judgments are also possible. Above all, there are powerful technical limitations on the Communist effort in the sense of direct access to the populations to be influenced. In Latin America, for example, not a single local radio station outside of Cuba carries Soviet broadcasts, while Voice of America programs—live or taped—can be heard over more than 100 stations.

Television and movies are the chief mass media of impact, and where the Communists still try for the hard one-two punch with generally obvious messages, U.S. propagandists prefer to think in more sophisticated terms. Therefore, Americans say, Soviet propaganda lags behind as the audiences become more educated.

Varied impact

Propaganda impact is not, of course, a monolithic affair. It varies greatly with the areas of the world and the special interests and emotions of the populations. People in eastern Europe and even in the Soviet Union are overwhelmingly interested in the Western message in all its forms and this interest has been growing along with the recent liberalization of Communist societies.

Latin America, on the other hand, is going through a phase against U.S. authority. There, Communist propaanda has been relatively noticeable in recent years. But even so the United States is not unduly concerned despite the stream of Communist books and periodicals entering through embassies in Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Uruguay.

For Sure, Democrats Can Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Denver Post:

FOR SURE, DEMOCRATS CAN LOSE

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Ominous memories of one of the most tragic periods in our history—the fall of China to communism in the late forties with a resultant embitterment of American politics which nearly two decades have never wholly erased—are crowding in now.

In South Vietnam, the shadows of the past are falling across the present and menacing the future. Again, the area of danger and crisis is Asia—the scene, in the destruction of Nationalist China, of the most terrible setback American policy ever suffered and of the most enduring damage ever done to the Democratic Party.

The loss of China to the Communists more than any other single factor broke 20 years of Democratic rule of the White House amid ceaseless charges that Democratic national leadership had given too little support to the Nationalists and so was responsible for this disaster to the free world.

That these were extreme accusations, often motivated by partisan politics, is undeniable on any fair and full knowledge of the record. But that China did fall, thus turning more than half a billion people over to the Communist empire, is more than simply the most somber fact of all the cold war.

It is a fact of high and sinister relevance to today—to the Nation and to the Kennedy administration.

For American policy in South Vietnam today—where more than 12,000 American troops are committed in support of President Ngo Dinh Diem's armed resistance to Communist guerrillas—has undoubted parallels with American policy in China of nearly 20 years ago. It is well-meaning, but hesitant and confused. And it puts altogether too much stock in the doubts, fears and complaints of liberal experts who always find something wrong in the honest use of military power.

Again, as then, we support a military movement of an ally. But again, as then, we simultaneously denounce that ally as corruptly dictatorial. Again, as then, we demand of an ally more than that he be willing to fight the enmies of freedom and of our cause.

Of Diem we demanded that he cease what we call the persecution of Buddhists protesting his regime—and what he calls repressive measures necessary for the preservation of his government in a time of war with foreign invaders.

All the rights and wrongs of this wretched affair—where the American State Department and the Diem government daily trade insults while American and Vietnamese troops daily fight Communist aggressors side by side—are quite beyond this columnist. But what any reasonable man can surely see is this:

The United States now has only two possible courses open to it, if we intend to see through the militarily brilliant strategy we have adopted to halt creeping Communist assault in Asia:

We must support Diem all the way—notwithstanding all cries of "Buddhist persecution" and of "dictatorship." Or we must get rid of him and candidly take the responsibility for ushering in a successor regime capable of governing in his stead and of carrying on the war—if such a successor can be found.

Would not this latter course be intervention in Vietnamese affairs? Of course it would. But the stakes are high. At stake is the salvation of southeast Asia; or, ultimately, the measureless catastrophe of another China.

Amid these hard realities, liberal qualms will not save world freedom, nor us—nor the administration.

Bonneville Helps Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Salmon River Electric Cooperative, Inc., of Challis, Idaho, recently announced the signing of a 20-year contract with the Bonneville Power Administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD, an article which appeared in the Challis Messenger on August 29, 1963, concerning this signing and the acknowledged savings this service will afford the citizens of southern Idaho.

The article is as follows:

SALMON RIVER ELECTRIC SIGNS WITH BPA

Salmon River Electric has announced signing of a 20-year electric contract with Bonneville Power Administration. The contract was approved August 21 by the board of directors and manager of the Cooperative.

At this meeting Board President Garth Chivers stated, had Salmon River Electric been using Bonneville Power in 1962, when they purchased 8,200,000 kilowatt-hours, there would have been a saving of $20,160 to the Cooperative.

Mr. Chivers remarked that Salmon River Electric does not plan an immediate rate reduction to their members, but will wait a period of time, and review the rate structure after the first of the year.

Boyd Ressel, manager, said regardless of the stories officials of the Idaho Power and Utah Power would have us believe, Bonneville Power coming to Southern Idaho, will not cost the taxpayers an extra cent. All the while the power companies are telling their stories, they are receiving a subsidy from the Government, at the expense of the taxpayers. All private power companies in the United States receive a Federal subsidy amounting to 3 percent of all money spent for construction.

Also, we might mention that Salmon River Electric pays one of the largest tax bills in Custer County. Custer being the principal county in which we operate. We also pay taxes in Lemhi and Blaine Counties.

Federal money used by BPA is repaid to the Government, with interest. It is true that BPA has been operating at a deficit the past few years, but they have millions of dollars in prepayments that are being used to offset the present deficit.

Every 5 years BPA must review their rate schedule and at that time adjust their rates, so they will cover all operating costs, plus meeting their repayment schedule. This will be done in 1964.

Perhaps the most important thing Bonneville Power coming to Southern Idaho has done, is to give the people of the area a yardstick by which they may compare the rates they pay with those the people using BPA power pay.

Birmingham, Ala., Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation was horrified at the deplorable and willful bombing of a church in Birmingham, Ala., which killed four and injured a number of worshipers. Unfortunately, this action led to further rioting and the killing of two additional citizens in that city.

I am requesting the Attorney General for immediate action by all Federal law enforcement agencies to apprehend, arrest, and convict the murderers. This criminal attack upon innocent American citizens in Birmingham last Sunday must be followed through by the Federal authorities, and the case must be kept open and worked upon until the crime is solved and a conviction obtained.

The Gary, Ind., Coordinating Committee made up of 32 civic organizations in that area forwarded to my office yesterday the following telegram. The same speaks for itself:

GARY, IND., *September 16, 1963.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We the Civic Rights Coordinating Committee of Gary, Ind., consisting of 22 civic organizations do demand that you exhort the President to use his complete executive powers to find the perpetrators of the Birmingham atrocities; to speedily and relentlessly prosecute them; to give full and adequate protection to each and every Negro citizen in the city of Birmingham and the State of Alabama; to take every possible step to prevent the continuation of this savage victimization of Negro citizens in the State of Alabama and thus attempt to salvage the badly tattered shreds of the American promise.

NAACT Adult Branch, NAACT Youth Council, NAACT women's Auxiliary, Fair Share Organization, Gary Community Council, Combined Citizens Commission on Open Occupancy, United Council of Baptist Ministers of Gary, Dental and Pharmaceutical Association, the Federated Women's Clubs, Baptist Ministers' Conference, Journeyman Barbers' Union, Indiana Civil Liberties Union Calumet Chapter, Hoosier State Medical Association, Gary Chapter, Semanon Civic and Social Club, Unitarian Action Committee, Gary East Chicago Frontiers Service Club, Urban League of Gary, Interdenominational Ministers Alliance, Northern Indiana Baptist District Association, Kappa Alpha Psi, National Association of Real Estate Brokers.

The Clergy Marched for Jobs and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Frank Conniff which appeared in the August 30, 1963, edition of the New York Journal-American. All of us can be proud that clergymen of the three major faiths in America—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—marched in the great demonstration on August 28.

A reaffirmation of religion's deep commitment to democracy and the spirit of freedom was demonstrated on that day to the rest of the world, including our adversaries who suppress not only political but religious freedom.

The article follows:

CAPITAL CORNER—CLERGY ANSWERED FREEDOM RALLY CALL

(By Frank Conniff)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most striking but little-noted aspects of the historic freedom rally was the presence in depth of clergymen of every faith in the ranks of the marchers.

Ministers, rabbis, and priests were heavily represented, indicating that the moral power imbedded in American churches will be increasingly thrown into the civil rights struggle on the side of the Negroes.

The number of young seminarians was another impressive facet of the finest run of all rallies. They are even now studying theology as contained in the Bible and the Old and New Testaments. The applicability of the teachings of Jesus Christ to the modern crisis must indeed be making an impact on them.

When you think of it, the major American faiths, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, moved rather swiftly into the civil rights arena once the urgency of the situation became apparent in Birmingham and elsewhere last spring. It seems only a few months ago—and that, in fact, is all it was—that Attorney General Kennedy was asking a bit plaintively for more help from the clergy in solving the Nation's moral dilemma.

MORAL SUPPORT

The civil rights showdown had frankly swept ahead of the clergy, except in rare circumstances, just as it had slipped beyond the control of the Kennedy administration. While the Attorney General and his able teammates in the Justice Department were leaping from one flashpoint to another, they sometimes despaired of the moral support they needed from influential sections of the community, including what Bobby Kennedy lumped in as "the clergy."

Wednesday's mammoth gathering at the Lincoln Memorial was startling proof that the clergy of all faiths had drawn the proper conclusions from the brush fires in Birmingham and other Southern cities. There must have been hundreds in the ranks. They seemed eager to participate with all the fervor in the demonstration.

Another astonishing aspect of the demonstration was the total lack of Communist participation. One would have thought this was an ideal chance to penetrate and infiltrate a massive group with at least a few

"Trojan horses." Any agitator worth his paycheck from Moscow should have had little trouble in fomenting a few incidents.

So one would have thought. But if there was any Communist taint to the proceedings, it escaped the prying eyes of some of the Nation's top reporters. On the contrary, the rally beamed a spiritualistic, religious message completely at variance with atheistic Communist ideology.

DILEMMA FOR REDS

One more sidelight of the demonstration tickled this corner. It was the dilemma it posed for the Soviet television network. Up until 5 minutes before showtime, the Soviet TV planned to carry it live via Telstar. The planners probably figured the sight of marching thousands protesting against discrimination would provide fine propaganda material for the Russian viewers.

What happened? Our guess is that somebody bright over there grasped the contradiction inherent in the program. Sure, the marchers were protesting. But what message would this carry to the average Russian onlooker? That a minority group had been permitted to march and protest right in the Capital of their country, a right that simply could not be countenanced in the Communist slave empire. So the program was canceled at the last minute.

It was a great day from every angle, especially from the standpoint of real patriotic Americanism.

Rachel Carson Answers Her Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful and moderate article by Miss Rachel Carson appearing in the September–October 1963 Audubon Society magazine pointing out the continuing hazard of pesticides and the need for wisdom and care in their use:

RACHEL CARSON ANSWERS HER CRITICS

Not often is it given to a generation to be able to change the course of events in ways that may significantly affect the future. Yet this is at once the privilege and the responsibility of us who live today.

We live in a time of challenge, which is also a time of opportunity. We live in a time when it is easy to despair, but which is also a time of great hope. We live in a time when it is necessary to know for what we stand, and to take that stand with courage.

It is, then, a time when we must have a realistic sense of values. We must decide what is worthwhile. We must be able to separate the trivia of today from the enduring realities of the long tomorrow.

"A thing of beauty is a joy forever," said the poet Keats. In modern times that humane and perceptive jurist, Justice William O. Douglas, has said that the right to search out a rare wildflower is just as inalienable as the right of a stockman to search out grass or of a lumberman to claim a tree.

There are scientific reasons as well as those which are esthetic. The world is inhabited by living species that are not only beautiful but full of meaning and significance. The evolution of the plants of today took millions upon millions of years. Who are we to assume the right, in this 20th century—a mere instant in time—who are we to say that those who come after us may never see some of today's rare and endangered species?

What right do we have to destroy the scientific record contained in a living species? How do we know that we may not have great need of what it has to tell us—or of the function it performs?

People who consider themselves practical may sometimes make judgments that are extremely impractical. A Canadian forester recently wrote me of a meeting attended by industrial and research foresters. Everyone present was agreed on a campaign to get rid of a species of alder that invades cutover black spruce lands. Yet, no one knew anything about the life history of the alder, or its ecological relationships.

Apparently it had never occurred to anyone that they should find out. Later it was discovered that this shrub performs a necessary function—a nitrogen-fixing process in the soil—and so is definitely beneficial to the spruce and to the other trees.

In this rather tough and materialistic world, then, how much room is there for concern about our wildflowers? About all of nature? Are we being impractical when we protest the substitution of the "brown-out" for the color and beauty of flowers along our roads? Are we being sentimental when we care whether the robin returns to our dooryard and the veery sings in the twilight woods?

I am confident that the verdict of history will show that we—far from being the heedless sentimentalists—were indeed the tough-minded realists.

A world that is no longer fit for wild plants, that is no longer graced by the flight of birds, a world whose streams and forests are empty and lifeless is not likely to be fit habitat for man himself, for these things are symptoms of an ailing world.

In a recent speech in behalf of the World Wildlife Fund, Britain's Prince Philip put the matter very simply: "Miners," he reminded his hearers, "used canaries to warn them of deadly gases. It mightn't be a bad idea if we took the same warning from the dead birds in our countryside."

So today, as thousands of hapless wild creatures serve as canaries in the mines of our heedless technology, we have graphic reminders that all is not well in the environment of man.

In "Silent Spring" I gave many examples of the destruction of wildlife following the use of insecticides. I am sure I do not need to tell you that a determined effort is now being made to discredit these reports. People are told that the incidents I reported happened years ago, that better methods, better controls now make this sort of thing impossible. We are told that destruction of wildlife occurs only when insecticides are improperly used—"follow the directions and no harm will result."

Even as these reassurances are anxiously being given out, the newspapers carry other reports. These make it clear that incidents linking wildlife and pesticides did not stop with the publication of "Silent Spring."

Let me give you a few examples:

A few weeks ago, Canadian newspapers carried a warning that woodcock being shot during the hunting season in New Brunswick were carrying residues of the insecticide heptachlor and might be dangerous if used as food. These birds had wintered in the Southern United States, where heptachlor was used in the fire ant program. This was a program sponsored and carried out by the State and Federal Governments. It was no unplanned or accidental application.

For a number of years the eagle populations have shown an alarming decline. The Fish and Wildlife Service recently made news by announcing its discovery of lethal quantities of DDT in eagles found dead in the wild. It also discovered DDT in eagle eggs that failed to hatch.

In southern Michigan, State agricultural officials are again using the very poisonous insecticide dieldrin in their campaign against the Japanese beetle. According to a report sent me by a biologist on the scene the destruction of rabbits, squirrels, pheasants, and many songbirds is again great. This time the farmers themselves are protesting against the program presumably intended for their benefit.

Strong protests are also being heard in southern Illinois where a similar program has destroyed several hundred quail and rabbits in two small areas.

And in the Boston area, as a legacy from years of insecticide spraying, fish in the Framingham, Mass., reservoir are carrying DDT in amounts 10 times the legally permissible level. This was discovered by the excellent researches of biologists of the Massachusetts Fish and Game Department.

No, the problem of pesticides is not merely the dream of an avaricious author out to pile up royalties by frightening the public—it is very much with us, here and now.

I was amused recently to read a bit of wishful thinking in one of the trade magazines. Industry "can take heart," it said, "from the fact that the main impact of the book (i.e., 'Silent Spring') will occur in the late fall and winter—seasons when consumers are not normally active buyers of insecticides * * * it is fairly safe to hope that by March or April 'Silent Spring' no longer will be an interesting conversational subject."

If the tone of my mail from readers is any guide, and if the movements that have already been launched gain the expected momentum, this is one prediction that will not come true.

As you know, the threat to wildflowers and other native plants along the highways of America has become a conservation crisis. Blanket spraying of chemical herbicides to control roadside vegetation is turning our roads into barren, unsightly wastes. The wildflowers, the ferns, the shrubs bright with flowers or berries are rapidly being replaced by nearly lifeless strips. Botanists at the Connecticut Arboretum have deplored the elimination of native shrubs and wildflowers by spraying. I have seen it happen along the roads in Maine where I spend the summers. I have heard the bitter complaints of the tourists and summer people—who came expecting beauty and found, instead, desolation.

This is one instance in which the tourists are right. For there is even more than beauty involved. Natural vegetation has its place in the economy of nature. The many millions of acres of roadside borders and highway right-of-ways are—or could be—an excellent wildlife habitat. If maintained as a community of shrubs and wildflowers, they provide food and shelter for birds and many small mammals, and for the bees too—the wild pollinators so important in maintaining many crops and other plants.

Blanket spraying destroys these natural communities. It is expensive. It contains the feature of built-in obsolescence, and has to be repeated year after year. This presumably makes the manufacturers and salesmen of chemicals happy. But it is not good community economics, and it is not good conservation.

There is a good solution for this problem and it is ironical that it has not been widely applied. Selective spraying—aimed at young trees and very tall shrubs—quickly creates a stable plant community—a community of low growing shrubs, ferns, and wildflowers. This community resists the invasion of trees.

Once created—and two or three seasons' work will usually accomplish it—spraying need not be repeated. The community has been stabilized and will remain so for perhaps 25 to 30 years without further treatment. So a minimum use is made of chemicals—the taxpayer's purse is spared, conservation values are preserved.

The chief architect and developer of this plan of ecologically sound, selective spraying is Dr. Frank Egler of Connecticut. Dr. Egler and five other ecologists and botanists have now formed an organization known as Right-of-way Resources of America. This is one of the most gratifying events of the past few months.

All this is not to say we can afford to be complacent about the pesticide situation as a whole. If we are ever to find our way out of the present dilemma—we must remain vigilant, we must continue to challenge and to question, we must insist that the burden of proof lies with those who would use these chemicals to prove the procedures are safe.

Having recognized and defined our values, we must defend them without fear and without apology.

It is not necessary to feel that all who take the opposite view do so out of unworthy motives. There are entomologists who sincerely believe that the temporary advantage of an all-out assault on an insect population is great enough to justify the risk of side effects. There are, no doubt, chemical manufacturers who cannot see beyond the examples of beneficial use.

We take the long view. We do not ask that all chemicals be abandoned. We ask moderation. We ask the use of other methods less harmful to our environment. But we would be naive and unworldly if we did not recognize the fact that this is a large industry, fighting with every device to preserve its profits.

Above all, we must not be deceived by the enormous stream of propaganda that is issuing from the pesticide manufacturers, and from industry-related—although ostensibly independent—organizations.

This is not merely a campaign against an author and a book—it is a campaign against a cause, and that cause is the promotion of sanity and restraint in the application of dangerous materials to our environment.

If you read the trade magazines, you know that the announced strategy of the industry is to concentrate on repairing and building up the somewhat battered image of pesticides. There is already a large volume of handouts openly sponsored by the manufacturers.

There are other packets of material being issued by some of the State agricultural colleges, as well as by certain organizations whose industry connections are concealed behind a scientific front.

Cholesterol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, certain elements of the medical profession have unwittingly contributed to the woes of the dairy farmer in recent years, through dietary recommendations which eliminated the consumption of whole milk.

The market administrator of the New York-New Jersey milkshed reports that during the past 4 years, the use of reconstituted skim milk has increased some 55 percent in that area. Improved processing has made the skim product entirely palatable and acceptable to the cholesterol dieters.

Doctors, however, have never been in complete agreement on this subject and independent research by the National Dairy Association certainly tends to restore this important food item to its rightful place at the head of the list of economical nutrition for the family table.

The following item from the Catskill Daily Mail should prove welcome news to the dairy industry:

HURRAH FOR THE IRISH AND MILK

Did you know that the Irishmen drink more milk, weigh less, have one-half as much high blood pressure and are substantially lower in cholesterol count than their Boston brothers?

According to a recent release from the Dairy Association, researchers found that total milk and dairy products consumed in the United States is less than 700 pounds per capita. Butter consumption is 7½ pounds per capita. In Ireland, total milk and dairy products consumed amount to over 1,500 pounds per person. Forty-five pounds per person of butter is consumed in Ireland.

A study recently made by Harvard University of Irishmen compared with their blood brothers in Boston indicates that the Irish brothers living in Ireland weigh less, have one-half as many cases of high blood pressure, and a substantially lower cholesterol count than do their Boston brothers.

Up and at Adam: A Disappointed Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Amsterdam News, New York City, September 14, 1963:

ANOTHER ANGLE—"UP AND AT ADAM"—A DISAPPOINTED CLUB

(By James L. Hicks)

Pardon me a minute while I present a few facts on political life in Harlem and disappoint quite a few people downtown, including some daily newspapers.

There is, in this town of ours, a dedicated cult of people who could be classified as the "Up and at Adam" cult which longs and lives for the day that ADAM CLAYTON POWELL will only be a memory in the minds of New Yorkers.

Unfortunately for them, and therefore fortunately for ADAM, the vast majority of these people who would like to see ADAM run out of Harlem, don't live in Harlem themselves.

And therein lies the rub.

For even those New Yorkers who wish ADAM POWELL had never been born, are forced to live by a law which says that the people of a congressional district have the right to decide for themselves just who their Congressman will be, and that they can elect a cotton-picking witch doctor if he's qualified—and nobody can throw him out of office without cause until the people themselves decide to do so.

But human nature being what it is, the members of the "Up and at Adam" cult go around hoping so strongly that ADAM will disintegrate into space that they begin to see things in Harlem which simply are not there.

Back at Howard University my professor told me that one of man's greatest faults is that we tend to "see what we are looking for and look for what we see."

That's the way the "Up and at Adam" club saw the primary elections in Harlem last week.

The club was looking for ADAM to be defeated and they thought they saw what they were looking for.

THE SCORE

But we have news for them.

Anyone, including the reporters and editors of the daily papers who saw an ADAM CLAYTON POWELL defeat in last week's primaries simply can't read the score in Harlem.

Some white people actually thought POWELL was running for office against Ray Jones and when they read where Jones had won they just automatically concluded that POWELL had lost. That's how you think when you let your emotions get the best of you.

If anybody lost anything in the Harlem primaries it was the people of Harlem. For we did have the spectacle of our strongest man in Congress engaged in a front page brawl with our strongest man in city hall.

But Ray Jones did by no means kill off POWELL and POWELL certainly did not push Jones out of the picture.

What happened between POWELL and Jones is nothing more than what happens between Lehman and Wagner, Rockefeller and Mahoney or any other two strong leaders in a primary race. They backed their choices but that didn't mean that either man would be through if his man lost any more than it means that Wagner is through because he can't oust a Brooklyn leader, or that Rockefeller is through because his cousin didn't win big.

The big difference is that instead of fighting it out in a smoke-filled backroom like the bigtime politicians they are, Ray and ADAM got into a name calling brawl on the front pages of the delighted daily papers who would just love to see them destroy each other.

That's the thing Harlem regretted. We expect our politicians to fight just like all other politicians do. But we hope they will soon grow up to the point where they do their fighting in the smoke-filled backrooms.

As for Ray Jones' wild suggestion that CORE's Jim Farmer run against POWELL—put that out your mind.

Ray Jones is too smart to think Harlem is stupid enough to use one of its great leaders to kill off one of its other great leaders.

Negro people are simply tired of that kind of foolishness and Ray knows it. But he got a story in the gullible daily press with it.

Now if Ray Jones really wants to run Farmer against some white Congressman, or Senator or State senator or assemblyman—well that's something else.

But not against another Negro.

Low Pay for Top Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is now conducting hearings on general leg-

islation affecting the salaries of Federal employees. One of the most serious problems confronting the Government, in my opinion, is the inadequacy of present salary levels for top Federal executives. This problem and its evil effects on the efficiency of the Federal service was discussed in the September 15, 1963, New York Times magazine by Clarence B. Randall. Mr. Randall is a former president of the Inland Steel Co., and he has served three national administrations in various capacities. I think his article is both timely and valuable and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

U.S. PROBLEMS LOW PAY FOR TOP JOBS

(By Clarence B. Randall)

One of the great new freedoms that come to a man in retirement is the right to stick his neck out. Released from institutional responsibility, he can say exactly what he thinks at all times. Furthermore, when the brickbats are thrown, they bounce off better than they did in earlier years. I know, because plenty of them have been coming my way of late, thrown by both old friends and new enemies, by the business community and the press.

This furor was all triggered when the Bureau of the Budget in Washington recently released to the press the report that I had submitted to the President in behalf of the so-called Pay Panel, the committee which the President had appointed to review salaries in various departments of the Federal Government, and which he had asked me to chair. Our report contained a series of recommendations for pay increases. Among these were proposals to raise the annual pay of Cabinet officers from $25,000 to $50,000, the salary of Congressmen from $22,500 to $35,000 and of Supreme Court Justices, the Vice President and the Speaker of the House from $35,000 to $60,000.

This provoked the storm. One of my favorite newspapers, The Chicago Tribune, honored me with a blistering editorial. "What," asked The Tribune, "have these people ever done for us?"

Two things bothered me about this uproar. First, most of those who were savage in their attacks had quite obviously not read the report. Second, their behavior reminded me unhappily of my own earlier years, when I am afraid I, too, sounded off occasionally in hot anger before I had studied in depth the subject upon which I was expressing positive opinions.

What disturbed me most was the fact that almost without exception the press failed to list in full the names of the other members of the committee. Here they are:

Gen. Omar Bradley; John J. Corson, of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Marion B. Folsom, of the Eastman Kodak Co.; Theodore V. Houser, former chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Robert A. Lovett, of Brown Bros., Harriman; George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Don K. Price, Jr., of the Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University; Robert Ramspeck, former member of Congress from Georgia; Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice (retired), of the U.S. Supreme Court, and Sydney Stein, Jr., of Stein Roe & Farnham.

Every man in that group not only had won distinction in his own walk of life, but had seen at firsthand over many years the intimate operations of our Government. And we were unanimous in our recommendations. I have served from time to time on other such groups, but never before have I seen men of such diverse backgrounds arrive at such solid consensus as was the case here.

Why did we do what we did?

Take the case of the Cabinet officer first. He must move to Washington at his own expense, maintain a home suited to his responsibility, do much entertaining for which he is not reimbursed, accept no outside income whatever, not even for speaking engagements, and stand ready to liquidate whatever investments he may have if he is charged with conflict of interest.

I would be the first to agree that it would be unwholesome in a high degree if compensation in government were set at such levels that men sought appointments as a matter of financial advancement, but it seems equally clear to me that it is wrong to keep the compensation at such a low level that only rich men can be persuaded to accept the responsibilities.

The present administration has put an emphasis on youth, and many able young men were recruited for the public service. Already a disconcerting number have left, returning to private life for "compelling personal reasons." Naturally, I have never talked to a single one of them about it, but I feel very certain that in many cases the financial sacrifice required was beyond their resources.

Nor do I understand why we permit the basic salaries in our Federal Government to be established and maintained at levels below those prevailing in our State and municipal units.

At the present time, a member of the Cabinet who as a Secretary heads one of the departments which are so vital to our national welfare and safety, receives $25,000 a year. Contrast this with the figures given in our report for States and cities.

The State of California has 135 positions which pay more than $25,000 a year; Illinois has 93, Pennsylvania 165 and New York 432.

New York pays its Governor $50,000 plus the use of the executive mansion, and the mayor of New York City receives $50,000. Los Angeles pays the general manager of its water and power departments $40,560; Florida pays the director of its Inter-American Trade Exposition $50,000; and in Boston the general manager of the transit authority receives $40,000. In Chicago the salary of the superintendent of schools is $48,500.

Turning to other fields for comparisons, we found that in the United States there are 81 college presidents who are paid in excess of $25,000. Among the large charitable foundations there were 17 instances in which the principal full-time officer received in excess of $35,000. A member of the Federal Reserve System's Board of Governors receives only $20,000, but in the Federal Reserve banks themselves there are 79 officers who are paid more than that. In private industry on a sampling of 1,157 corporations engaged in manufacturing we found that the median salary figure for the highest paid officer was $91,000.

Naturally, such comparisons must not be controlling in this sensitive and significant problem, but they are nevertheless challenging. As panel members we were fully committed to the philosophy that there can be no money equivalent for the deep inner satisfaction which comes to a man who is privileged to give a period of dedicated service to his country, but we also believe that those who do not serve should share the sacrifice of those who do.

So far I have discussed merely the problem of an appointed officer, using a member of the Cabinet as an illustration. Obviously, however, similar situations exist outside of the executive branch. A Justice of the Supreme Court serves for life yet is paid far less than most of the members of the bar who present their cases before him. A Member of Congress has to maintain two homes and two offices, one of each in his district and in Washington; he is sharply limited in the number of trips which he may make at public expense between the two places. Yet the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" and the public welfare in a democracy clearly require the closest possible relationship between the people and those who represent them in Congress.

The most pressing problem, however, the one which has been largely overlooked so far in discussion of the pay panel's report, and the one which gave us the deepest concern, is the plight of the senior career officer in Government, the man who gives his entire life to the public service.

The compensation of his chief puts a ceiling upon his own salary. Not only that, but there must be several grades in between for the lesser appointive officers just below the top. In the executive branch there must be intermediate pay levels below the rank of Secretary for a Deputy Secretary, an Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries before the point is reached where the appointive positions stop and the career grades begin.

For all practical purposes, therefore, unless a change is made in the salary of the Cabinet Secretaries, no career officer who enters the Government service upon leaving college, and who gives his entire life to it, can ever hope to earn more than $20,000 a year, no matter how great the responsibility which he bears, or how competent his performance. Not only is this unfair to the individuals on the basis of comparison with other vocations which are open to them, but it places a severe limitation upon our Government when it comes to the recruitment of personnel.

That these levels of compensation are presently inadequate is graphically illustrated by the number of occasions on which such career men who are approaching the senior levels are hired away by industry. To businessmen Washington is a happy hunting ground for talent these days, and it takes a dedicated public servant indeed to resist an offer of doubled pay just at the time when his children are ready for college.

Yet sometimes he does just that. I knew personally of a case where a career man who was earning about $14,000 a year was offered the presidency of a corporation with a salary of $50,000 if he would leave the Government. He turned it down. He was occupying a post of great sensitivity at the time and felt that duty to his country had to be the controlling motive in his life. One of the directors of the company had spoken to me about the matter in advance, and I had prophesied that this would be the result. He persisted, and when he was turned down, he found the refusal completely incredible.

During the past 15 years, and under three successive administrations, I have been privileged to observe at first-hand the work of our senior career officers, and to do so not only in Washington, but in many of the remote parts of the world. They are the backbone of our Government, and their quality determines in large measure its effectiveness. Among them are some who are careless in the performance of their duties, and some who are mediocre, as there are in business. But there are many, I am proud to say, who are simply superb, equal in every way to the best whom I have known in industry, in the professions, or in any of the other walks of life. It is the merit of these outstanding men that the Pay Panel seeks to recognize and reward in order that more like them may be persuaded to enter the Government service.

What will all this cost? Not over $20 million a year—even if everything that the Pay Panel has recommended is put into effect.

Large as this sum seems, it would hardly be rated as a good typographical error in computing the cost of sending a man to the moon.

I do not intend by this to criticize the space program, but it does seem to me that

in establishing our priorities in the allocation of our public funds, nothing should have precedence over what may be required to secure and keep in the Government service the best of brains and character that can be found in our country.

Senator Estes Kefauver: Trail Blazer of Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Freedom and Union a high tribute is paid to the memory of Senator Estes Kefauver for the contribution he has made for Atlantic Union.

The article written by Clarence Streit points to the usual courage of the former Senator from Tennessee, and his dedication and untiring efforts for the cause of world peace, for social justice, and good government.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks this splendid article by Clarence Streit in the September issue of Freedom and Union:

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER: TRAIL BLAZER OF ATLANTIC UNION—1903–63

"The answer of the State Department to every proposal for peace, Mr. President, is that it needs time to consider the proposal. My heaven, Mr. President, we need to utilize the brief time that we have to quit drifting and start moving. The State Department evidently does not realize that we cannot kill time; it is time which kills us. And that was never more true than it is at this very moment."

POIGNANT TIMELY REMINDER

Thus spoke Senator Estes Kefauver in his speech, "Atlantic Union: The Way to Peace—Reply to the State Department," in answer to its opposition to the Atlantic Union resolution he had introduced July 28, 1949. He spoke on the Senate floor March 13, 1950—3 months before communism suddenly launched its attack on South Korea.

All that speech repays rereading now, but the paragraph quoted speaks most eloquently just today to all his generation, and most movingly to us Atlantic Unionists who know how priceless was his pioneering for Federation of the Free. No one in the prime of life can be reminded too often or too poignantly that, however much we act as though we had time to kill, all the while time is killing us. Estes speaks to us, and to all, with new authority on this subject now. He did not kill time, he crowded great good into his years, and wisely did he do so, for now time has killed him, when only 60, at the peak of his powers.

The cause of Atlantic Federal Union suffered a truly tragic loss when his heart abruptly gave way on August 10. He had gone from the Senate floor, where he was opposing private monopoly of communication satellites, to the hospital, thinking he had only indigestion. There his heart—until then a kind heart and a stout one in every way—suddenly gave in.

WHAT OTHER SENATOR?

Nature gave Estes great gifts; hard work developed them, and what he had already done with them promised even finer contributions to his fellow man, had he been allowed even the biblical three score and ten. He was not a member of the Senate's famed inner "club" but those who are, and all the 99 Senators, may well ask themselves: "The death of what Senator among us would have the nationwide, Atlanticwide impact Senator Kefauver's has had—measured not only in front page headlines and editorial tributes but in a deep sense of personal loss felt by so many whose devoted loyalty he had won, for so many reasons, in so many places and fields of life?"

Estes was much more than one Senator in a hundred; he was one man in a myriad. He needs a Shakespeare to do him justice—and for him Shakespeare did write a eulogy. It is the tribute to Brutus which Antony paid on the battlefield where he perished. One need but omit—as I do here—its second and third lines to make even its "He * * * made one of them" refer no longer to Brutus and the conspirators, but (like all the rest) to Estes and his work to unite the free:

"This was the noblest Roman of them all."

"He only, in a general honest thought and common good to all, made one of them.

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up

"And say to all the world, "This was a man."

THE GENTLE WARRIOR

Estes Kefauver's life was gentle in the sense that he was a born gentleman, the soul of kindness. He did not learn consideration for others from a course on how to make friends. Consideration for each person he encountered, however humble, was in him second nature—nay, true nature. He carried it to a friendly fault that has made his ready handshake legendary, and over-shadowed for the public better proofs of his thoughtfulness that thousands treasure.

His life was far from gentle, however, in the sense of drifting with the current or following the way of least resistance as so many do, avoiding hard decisions, conflict. Estes was forever paddling his canoe upstream, even up rapids that daunted other explorers. Increasingly through his 10 years in the House and 15 in the Senate, his public life was devoted to heroic conflict. His battles were both negative and positive.

He fought against dragons as powerful as war, democratic disunion or anarchy, race prejudice, organized crime, monopoly, and profiteering in steel, medicine, the high heavens of Telstars. Birth involves conflict, too, and Estes fought for creation of the federation of the free, for a more effective "Twentieth Century Congress"—the title of his first book—for more democratic elections (through abolishing the poll tax, reforming the presidential electoral college, etc.).

In politics as in engineering, there are two kinds of men, the kind that construct and the kind that operate. Estes was of the rarer constructive type. His passion for building better government first showed itself at the county level when he came home from Yale to practice law. Before he died he had contributed to the creation of better government at all the other existing levels, municipal, State and Federal—and above all to the constitution of democratic government where it does not yet exist, in Atlantica. His championship of Federal Government on this international scale contributed to his election to the Senate in 1948 despite Boss Crump in Memphis—and thereby resulted in replacing his machine with an independent government in that city, and freeing the State government from bossism. But this is a story in itself—for a later issue.

A GIANT'S STRENGTH

Estes had a giant's strength, without the fault that Shakespeare found in this:

"O, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant."

I wish Shakespeare had gone on to tell us how excellent it is to use such strength for noble ends—not to exploit the weaknesses of others for one's own profit but to find satisfactions in making the weak stronger, the fearful braver, and in freeing one's fellows from the walls of anarchy, war and moral cowardice that hem man in, and the chains of oppression, prejudice, and ignorance that hold him down. Estes had a giant's strength in at least two senses, physical and moral. He was weak as a speaker—he moved men by his character much more than by his speech. He was not a seminal thinker—but he had an independent mind. He was open to the ideas of others and not too proud to work for those he judged to be sound as if they were his own. And his judgment not only of ideas but even more of political situations and strategy was very good. To return to the two strengths mentioned.

MR. COURAGE

Physically, Estes stood head and broad shoulders above most of us. His stamina carried him through three killing campaigns for his Senate seat, and the multitude of presidential primaries that he won in 1952 and 1956. Morally, his strength was even rarer.

I think of him often as Mr. Courage, for throughout the 15 years I knew him intimately he was the most consistently and outstandingly courageous man in legislative office I have yet known. Nor does my prize for courage go to him only because of the degree of it he showed in the leadership he gave Atlantic Union in Congress, as some may assume.

It has never seeemed to me to take the highest courage for those who laud the commonsense of the common people, as all politicians do, to ask the voters to back the case for Atlantic Union, which is commonsense itself, to me at least. But the record shows that they do think this requires high courage, and so I concede the point—the more readily because such courage is indeed required to continue in this course as long as Estes did. The eulogies and editorials I have read have nearly all stressed his courage, but—with significant exceptions in Tennessee where he was best known—none even mentioned his work for Atlantic Union. This shows at least that there was plenty of other proof of it; this other evidence has most impressed me, too.

THE 83-TO-1 VOTE

The ignorance, prejudice and misguided emotions that Atlantic Union runs counter to and that so many politicians have feared to face do not seem to me so hard to overcome or so explosive as the ignorance, bigotry and misguided emotions roused by other issues, most directly in one's own constituency. Most politicians seem to share this evaluation, judging from their fear of even irking their constituents on matters that touch them to the quick. Yet through these minefields sown with boobytraps Estes marched as calmly as others on a safe highway—even more serenely, if anything, than he did on the Atlantic Union road. For example, on racial issue votes, he stood out among all the southern Senators, conservatives and liberals, often alone until ALBERT GORE joined him as the junior Senator from the State already famed for Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson.

The vote that most impressed me allowed one to test Estes against the whole field. It came when northern Democratic liberals, with whom Estes often voted, sought during the McCarthy fever to outfox those who charged that they were soft on communism, by sponsoring a bill to outlaw the Communist Party. No one was under worse attack then, as a pink, than Estes in Tennessee by those who sought his seat. The Senate approved the bill 83 to 1—and the 1 was Senator Kefauver. The immediate result was

an astonishing victory he won single-handed, which began the next day when two Senators were brave enough to confess on the floor their consciences had kept them awake all night because they should have voted as he did. In a later issue we shall publish an article by his then administrative assistant, Richard Wallace, now executive director of the Atlantic Council of the United States, telling this whole heart warming story. This demonstration of Senator Kefauver's courage and wisdom deserves a much more spacious monument than we can give it now.

NOT RECKLESS COURAGE

The courage that characterized Senator Kefauver was not blind or even reckless or flamboyant. It was no less deliberate than determined, as aware of the dangers as it was quiet, a courage fathered by deeply rooted values and mothered by firm faith in his fellow man.

"His critics in the Senate called him 'Estes the Martyr,' the 'Frontiersman,' and the 'Scourge of Sin.'" The New York Times said: "They accounted him a canny politician bent on building up a personal following." Frontiersman he was indeed in spirit, but there was in him nothing of Jeremiah, still less of the martyr or fanatic. His courage came from no such sources. True, he was a shrewd politician—as I have had much more occasion to welcome than to criticize—but Congress swarms with canny politicians who seek to build up a personal following * * * by anything but the course that Estes took. Two of many examples in my personal knowledge may show that seeking his own advantage was not his major motive.

TWO STEPS BACK FROM FAME

When Estes gained national renown by his crime investigation I was disturbed, because I feared it would divert him too much from Atlantic Union. I expressed to him more than once my anxiety, and my belief that Federation of the Free was more worthy of his mettle. It is now forgotten that at the height of the fame his Crime Investigation Committee had brought him, he resigned as its chairman. He tied this to his responsibility as sponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, in a statement on March 24, 1951. The Korean war was then on, and he explained to his constituents: "Tennessee boys are dying on foreign battlefields and I believe this plan I proposed may provide the answer we pray for. I consider it my bounden duty to turn my efforts and time from local and national crime to international crime."

Freedom & Union featured this on its May 1951 cover, but the mass media gave it scant if any attention. The cause to which he turned has brought Senator Kefauver so little publicity, thus far, that, as has been noted, outside Tennessee his obituaries rarely mentioned his Atlantic Union role. Such was this "canny politician bent on building up a personal following."

The second example I would cite came in 1959. The outlook for congressional approval of the Atlantic Convention proposed—which Foster Dulles had blocked when he became Secretary of State—had improved enough to make its supporters, including Senator Kefauver, believe it might win, and therefore should be reintroduced. Far from seeking to cash in on his early work, he advised the resolution's supporters that, because of hostility he had roused on other issues and the fact that he was not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it would be wiser to get a member of that committee to introduce it.

In the interest of the resolution, he stepped aside for Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who became its chief sponsor, and Senator FRANK CHURCH, who became its floor manager. Estes continued to work as hard for it in the ranks as when he was out in front. Without him it would not have passed the Senate as it did in 1960—and I happen to know that it was his influence behind the scenes that gave it the Republican support it needed to clear the Rules Committee and reach the floor of the House, where its victory was clinched. Such was the character of Estes Kefauver.

WHERE WE DIFFERED

Devotion to principle did not blind him to the values of compromise. In my view he was too ready, after the failure of the first years of head-on onslaught for the Atlantic Union resolution, to follow those who urged that the way to get it through was to water it down. At times I differed strongly with him on strategy. We agreed on the need to accept some compromises to get action while insisting on enough of the essential to make the action worthwhile. We differed only on the degree this involved. I was readier than he to risk losing the battle than to win it in a way I thought risked losing the war.

There was truth in both views: The resolution did win approval, as he hoped, in the weakened form that he found safe—and that in the end I supported, partly from respect for his judgment and partly from necessity. But, as I feared, the resulting Convention held in January 1962 fell woefully short of what we both had sought. Though Estes would go farther than I in such compromising, I know his willingness came from no weakening of his devotion to Atlantic Union.

STARTING KEFAUVER SERIES

The story of Senator Kefauver's work for Atlantic Union is too great to be told now, and too impressive, inspiring, and filled with human interest not to be told later. And so, in succeeding issues, we shall tell more of it. We shall accompany the series with documents, beginning now, on page 21 where we give the text of his first major Senate speech on Atlantic Union. Only 11 days after his death, the New York Times found occasion to note: "The loss of Senator Kefauver seems greater today than it did when death struck him down." As the true story of his work for Atlantic Federation becomes better known, that comment will swell into a chorus, and his stature will loom even greater.

HIS 1948 COMMITMENT

In his hometown, Madisonville, Tenn., named for the "Father of the Federal Constitution," where Estes was buried, he made on June 5, 1948, his first public commitment to Atlantic Union. Announcing his candidacy for the Senate, he said:

"I have studied the matter very closely. I am convinced that the one real way that we can have peace in the world is to join in a kind of federation with the other freedom-loving peoples. * * * I feel that the statesmen of these democracies should work toward this program, just as the statesmen of our Nation worked toward building 13 States into the Federation which grew into the great United States of America. * * * It is going to take work, a lot of prayerful thinking, and moral and religious regeneration. But it is not only possible. It must be done."

FINAL TESTIMONIAL

Fifteen years later, I would testify in the words of Timothy: He fought a good fight, he finished his course, he kept the faith. And I would add these words with which the Associated Press ended its report of the burial of Senator Kefauver on August 13:

"As thunder rolled, the coffin was removed by an Air Force honor guard to the graveside. Lightning flashed as the casket was lowered, and when the family turned from the grave, a heavy downpour began."

In a way that would have seemed fitting to the ancients, the noblest Roman of them all passed, into history.

Tax Cut Needed Despite Upswing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the traps which Congress must carefully avoid is an argument against the tax bill based on the present strength of the economy. In the September 15 edition of the Washington Evening Star, Sylvia Porter points out that the present business boom is one of the strongest arguments for an early tax cut. Under unanimous consent, I include her article at this point in my remarks:

TAX CUT NEEDED DESPITE UPSWING

(By Sylvia Porter)

Where is the U.S. economy right now? At the highest levels in history.

Where is business heading? Up to still higher records.

At what pace is business rising? At a moderate, steady speed.

How broad is the advance? Across-the-board, involving heavy and light industry, hard and soft goods, things and nonthings.

How long will the upturn last? A vital key to its duration will be the timing and magnitude of that tax cut.

What are the odds on its life? The odds are good that this advance, already into its 31st month, will continue well into 1964—thereby making the 1961–? cycle the second longest peacetime upswing in over a century.

AFFECT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Will this expansion reduce our unemployment rate to the so-called tolerable 4-percent level? Not in the forseeable future.

Will rising paychecks and profits produce enough tax money to balance the Federal budget? Not in the foreseeable future.

There's no disputing the evidence that our economy is moving sturdily, steadily upward now and chalking up better than seasonal gains in many areas. Industrial production has continued to reach new peaks this summer in the face of reductions in steel and auto output. Sales of autos remain excitedly strong. Consumers are buying and borrowing freely.

Almost as many new one-family houses were sold in April and May as in the entire first quarter of 1963. New construction spending in August was 4 percent above a year ago and manufacturers' sale of durable goods are 8 percent ahead of last summer. Prices are firming, after-tax corporation profits are increasing, business failures are down.

OUTLOOK FAVORABLE

The evidence also is persuasive that the economy will stay in an uptrend in the months ahead. Personal incomes are rising, are up $21 billion over a year ago and are laying the base for bigger consumer spending. Government spending is rising, adding fuel to the economic machine.

Most significant now, businessmen plan to spend at an annual rate of $41.1 billion on new plants and equipment in the final quarter of this year against a rate of $40 billion in the current quarter and $37 billion in the first quarter. With all three types of spending pointing up, the economy can't move in any other direction except up.

When the statistics are in on the Nation's total output, they'll probably show that our gross national product rose by nearly $8 billion in the July–September period on top

of an $8 billion rise in the April–June months. It's increasingly likely that GNP will be nearing the $595 billion annual rate as the year ends.

But the very fact that our economy is still turning in an impressive performance adds urgency to the need for major tax cuts to give businessmen incentives to invest more in modern plants and individuals cash to spend more on goods and services.

CHANCE FOR SPENDING

Solid and prolonged though this upturn has been, it has not been sufficient to reduce the overall unemployment rate below 5½ percent. Although the rise in industrial production in this upswing is now 22.8 percent, this is still below the percentage rise in the 1958–60 expansion and it is far below the rise of 1949–53.

Even if auto sales in 1964 again hit the 7 million mark—for the third year in a row—this would just be maintaining the very high level of sales and would not accelerate the economy. Even if construction spending smashes all peaks in coming months, this spending already is so huge that it can't rise enough in the near future to give business a significant spur.

Given tax reduction, though, both businessmen and consumers would hike their spending and add new power to this "old" expansion. Then, the 1961–? upswing could live to challenge the 50-month advance of 1933–37 for the record of the longest peacetime business rise in 110 years of U.S. history.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the support being voiced for my "See America Year" resolution (H.J. Res. 658) by State and other public agencies, I am receiving significant encouragement from representatives of the domestic travel and tourist industry. During the last few days several national associations have contacted me to state their concern for our balance of payments deficit, and to inform me of their support of a 1964 "See America" program. For example, I ask that a letter from Mr. Joseph P. Adams, general counsel and executive director of the Association of Local Transport Airlines be included at this point in my remarks:

ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL
TRANSPORT AIRLINES,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I am writing to you on behalf of Mr. T. H. Davis, chairman of our board, and the individual presidents of our 20 members, to congratulate you and express our heartfelt appreciation for your legislative efforts in designating 1964 as "See America Year."

Our association held an official business meeting this past week and it was the specific request of the group that a resolution supporting this program be included on the agenda, and I am pleased to advise you that it met with unanimous consent and approval.

You are assured that our members, which serve the 50 States and Puerto Rico, will be active participants in your program which is not only beneficial to the American traveler, but to the country as a whole in this crucial year regarding the balance of payments situation. Our short-haul transport airlines are particularly well suited for a grass roots tour of the United States as their average flights are approximately 80 miles and they fly at comfortable altitudes permitting an expansive view of our rivers, harbors, farmlands and cities.

It is a pleasure to cooperate with you in this matter and please do not hesitate to call on ALTA if we can be of further assistance.

Best personal regards,

JOSEPH P. ADAMS.

Another association which has contacted me to express their interest is the National Association of Travel Organizations. This organization, which was originally organized by State travel agencies, but has since 1941 expanded to a membership of 600, including all segments of the American travel industry, has been developing a "See the U.S.A." program for some time. Early next year "NATO," as it is known to its members, is sponsoring what may be the biggest convention of travel organizations ever held, to enlist national recognition of their program. That program has already been recognized as potentially helpful in relieving the serious dollar drain caused by the present high level of American tourism overseas.

On September 12, President John F. Kennedy wrote Joseph I. McDonell, president of the National Association of Travel Organizations, expressing his congratulations and appreciation for the "See the U.S.A." drive. A copy of the President's letter to Mr. McDonell follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 12, 1963.

MR. JOSEPH I. MCDONELL,
President, National Association of Travel Organizations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCDONELL: I am pleased to learn that the domestic travel and tourism industry is responding to the request contained in the special message to Congress of July 18, in which I urged that Americans be encouraged to learn more about their own country and the glory of their heritage. I congratulate the National Association of Travel Organizations upon its initiative in agreeing to organize and coordinate this drive.

A successful campaign will have important economic implications to our Nation, and the various Government agencies concerned with this effort stand ready to lend their assistance. I also hope that all segments of industry will cooperate in this worthwhile nationwide project.

It is my understanding that the theme adopted for your campaign will be "See the U.S.A." and that the entire program will be in full operation by spring 1964. It will thus complement the U.S. Travel Service campaign to encourage foreign nationals to come to our shores. Those of our citizens who take advantage of the opportunities offered will benefit from a greater knowledge of their country and a greater appreciation of its resources and history.

I am deeply interested in this program's success.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Courageous Crusader: Margaret Sanger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday one of America's great pioneers—Margaret Sanger—celebrated her 80th birthday.

Without doubt she was cheered by the realization that never before had she had so many well-wishers the world over. After 50 incredible years of crusading, she can at least see signs that an implacable revolution in thinking is underway. In recent months we have heard and read much about population control and fine minds representing many creeds and races are openly and honestly probing the subject.

Mrs. Sanger, I am proud to say, is a constituent of mine. In way of salute to this courageous lady I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to Ralph A. Donham's article, "Margaret Sanger: Her Crusade," in the Christian Science Monitor of September 9, 1963:

MARGARET SANGER: HER CRUSADE

(By Ralph A. Donham)

TUCSON.—The end of this century, competent authorities have predicted, will see the population of the United States near the 300 million mark and that of the world grown to an estimated 5 billion.

The significance of what has come to be called the population explosion is further emphasized in the changing attitude of the nations of the world. For the first time an administration in Washington has announced an affirmative policy relative to birth control.

This shift in viewpoint is attributed in the main to the realization of world leaders that if the present rate of increase in the number of people inhabiting the globe continues unmodified through another century the capacity of the world's resources to sustain humanity—water, fuel, food, and wildlife—could be taxed beyond hope of recuperation.

Watching this changing tide of opinion from her home in Tucson, Ariz., the pioneer of the doctrine of planned parenthood. Margaret Sanger, approaches her 80th birthday on September 14. She can look back on a half century of amazing accomplishment. Fifty years ago she launched both a movement and a tempestuous career. For Americans of 1913 still clung to an abhorrence of birth control to which they had been conditioned throughout their lives. Their opposition brought to Margaret Sanger a martyrdom familiar to many heroic figures of the past.

"We have seen an evolution," she said recently. "Today there are organizations helping mothers and children. Young couples are thinking ahead and planning. Doctors and ministers are helping."

She has been cheered by the news reports this summer telling of swiftly rising interest in the objectives for which she struggled through many bitterly frustrating years. The international as well as the domestic aspects arouse her interest. A sentence, for example, in an address before the American Society of Newspaper Publishers in Washington by former Vice President Richard Nixon pinpointed one phase of the issue:

"The United States," he said "cannot justify spending billions of dollars for economic assistance for the purpose of raising living standards in underdeveloped countries only to discover years later that the population growth outruns the growth of the economy."

Such news marks vast progress since that winter, 46 years ago, when Margaret Sanger spent 30 days in Queen's County Penitentiary in Long Island City. It erases somewhat the sting of bitter memories of years when, despite support from leading intellectuals, she and her coworkers were subjected to vicious persecution all across America.

The ancient taboos have not all vanished, even today. But the tide was turned. The National Academy of Sciences, the National Institute, of Health, and even the United Nations all are engaged in a search for ways to end the tyranny of undisciplined procreation and the attendant tragedy it implies for millions of helpless women and children around the globe.

In her autobiography, published some years ago, Margaret Sanger said: " 'The moving finger writes; and having writ moves on.' In January 1937, in that same town hall where 15 years before I had been forbidden to speak and whence I had been hailed into court, I was honored with a medal. * * * I am glad both my sons are doctors with a background of human interest to which has been added a scientific quality of mind that can continue pushing the heroism of service further into the future.

"I am often asked: 'Aren't you happy now that the struggle is over?' But I cannot agree that it is. Though many disputed barricades have been leaped, you can never sit back, smugly content, believing that victory is forever yours. There is always the threat of it being snatched from you. All freedom must be safeguarded and held."

The year of 1937, when Margaret Sanger penned her autobiography was to witness the first of her succeeding great triumphs. On June 10, the American Medical Association, which for years had been the relentless foe of her crusade, voted at its Atlantic City convention to give birth control its recognition and support.

In January the circuit court of appeals had upheld dismissal of the so-called one package case, in which decision a section of the Anthony Comstock law barring importation of contraceptives was voided. As a result of that ruling Mrs. Sanger was enabled to send her fieldworkers a memorandum advising that birth control information could now be disseminated lawfully. By then 320 birth control centers were functioning in the Nation and Mrs. Sanger predicted that another decade would see 10 times as many.

At about this time, when success began to crown her efforts, Mrs. Sanger, now Mrs. J. Noah Slee, decided to retire to a less hectic environment. In Tucson she and her husband bought a rambling house in the cactus studded foothills of the Catalina Mountains north of the city. Here for a time she enjoyed a period of relaxation interrupted only by social activities, among new friends she made in Arizona. But in 1943, Mr. Slee died and after the lapse of a few more years she returned to her crusade.

In 1948, she organized the Chittenden Congress on World Population and World Resources. She returned briefly to an editor's chair, a role she had known in the hectic days of 1913 when as columnist for the Socialist New York Call she first came in conflict with the law by her advice on "What Every Girl Should Know," which caused the Call to be banned from the mails temporarily at the behest of Anthony Comstock of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice.

In 1949 Smith College awarded her an honorary degree of doctor of laws. Later, on a Japanese tour sponsored by the Mainichi Press, Japan's largest group of newspapers, she was greeted by overflow crowds as she warned against the catastrophe threatening Japan in its swiftly rising population. From Japan she went to India. She was guest of honor at the first conference of the International Planned Parenthood Federation in Bombay. The new Indian Government under Prime Minister Nehru had just come out in support of birth control. Delegates from six nations voted to unite in the federation and elected Margaret Sanger and Lady Rama Rau honorary presidents.

Mrs. Sanger has won the right to live with her memories.

The news today is vastly comforting to her. In line with a policy declaration quietly announced last December by the U.N., the U.S. Government is now circulating in other countries a statement to the effect that we will help in meeting problems of population growth. Among other things this involves giving birth control information on request.

This is a controversial area of activity. Powerful elements still oppose dissemination of birth control data either here or abroad. Objections are based on moral grounds founded on tenets of religious faith which will still hold appeal for many sincere people.

They merit, and unquestionably will receive, all due respect. But the inescapable fact remains that uninhibited population growth has its moral implications. The rising pressures on the institutions of a free society cannot be ignored in a world which a century hence could have, at the present rate of increase, perhaps 25 billion people.

Possibly the most remarkable thing about this semicentennial of the birth control movement is the fact that Margaret Sanger, so long ago, had the vision to pioneer a movement to which, in 1913, scarcely anyone attached any importance. Today all signs indicate she started her crusade none too soon.

Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 14, 1963, two articles appeared in newspapers in different sections of the country, both lauding Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN. One appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, the other in the Peoria Journal Star which is printed in the Senator's former congressional district which I now have the privilege to serve.

The Senator's knowledge on national and foreign affairs is most certainly highly regarded in all quarters. It is obvious that the Star's Chuck Dancey and the writer for the Monitor are aware of his abilities and his responsible judgment. It is with pleasure, under unanimous consent, I include the two editorials concerning the distinguished gentleman from Illinois:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 14, 1963]

THE SENIOR SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

We doff our hat to Senator DIRKSEN. If there were such a thing he should be given the Arthur Vandenberg Award of Merit.

It has been said that Mr. DIRKSEN alone gave a "sense of occasion" to the test ban debate on the Senate floor. Most of the drama and the serious argument had come earlier in committee. Most of the maneuver in lining up votes had taken place backstage. When the actual debate came the Senate was nearly empty.

Yet it remained for the Republican leadership in the Senate to take its public position. Did it have an honest basis for doubt or not? To some the negative arguments of the preparedness subcommittee suggested that the treaty was too dangerous. Others thought the nature of the doubt was directed not at the Russians but at the administration. Could President Kennedy be trusted to take the necessary safeguards on the U.S. side with full vigor?

Senator DIRKSEN did the statesmanlike thing. He is credited with asking the President for formal, written assurance. Mr. Kennedy responded with an even more thoroughgoing and emphatic pledge, it is said, than the Senator expected. This was policy-making at its best all around. The doubts had been honorable. The reassurance of the President was so explicit that it must be believed.

There was an emotional quality to the occasion which the Senator did not overlook. "It is now 18 years since Hiroshima," he said. And asked: "What have we done? What steps have we taken?"

The answer, he said, was to build bombs that made those dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki "look like toys."

If the treaty failed, Mr. DIRKSEN said, the Nation would have forfeited nothing because "the President has given his assurance that the Nation's strength will be maintained." But he went even further, because everyone recognizes that there are some risks to take, and to measure against the larger risks of a continued nuclear arms race.

If there is a risk, this Senator is willing to accept it.

There must have been some in the Chamber who recall the great speech of Senator Vandenberg calling for ratification of the Marshall plan. Senator DIRKSEN does these things in his own way but the result was the same: a spirit of generous bipartisanship in foreign policy just at the moment when it was most needed.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Sept. 14, 1963]

SENATOR DIRKSEN OFTEN MISJUDGED

One wonders if the people of this area truly appreciate Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and the unique position he has attained, largely in the last 3 or 4 years.

The Senator has been part of the Washington scene for a long, long time, and you have to see him in what has become his native habitat to appreciate him.

One of the skills a politician in a responsible position needs is the ability to speak effectively without saying anything. (Politicians who are out, or have no influence, and no real responsibility do not share this problem.)

Consequently, too often, we at home have heard the Senator speak in matters of small moment or mere formality, and while we recognize his verbal agility and impressive tones we miss the real meat of his special skills and impact.

There is no tougher audience than the U.S. Senate. Indeed, there is no other audience on earth with whom it is so difficult to even get their attention.

There have been shocking, headline-making speeches made in the Senate—as in the old McCarthy days—when you could count the Senators who bothered to listen on your fingers. Indeed, some of the flaming McCarthy headline stories were most disappointing in color on the scene, with the Senator literally mumbling his way through although his words constituted violent charges, before an empty chamber.

Senators have their own problems and concerns to pursue without sitting down just to listen to another Senator spout off, usually.

But the whole treaty debate hit its record attendance by Senators when EVERETT DIRKSEN rose to speak on that subject this week—and listened.

Long-time, critical and astute newspaper observers, who usually laugh at the very idea of a Senate speech affecting any votes, have publicly gone on record attesting to DIRKSEN's action in obtaining the letter from President Kennedy and speaking on behalf of the treaty as decisive.

Here you see the tactician at work. There were more than words involved. Obtaining written, specific pledges from President Kennedy was a political strategy of the highest order, and it was the combination of this strategy and the Dirksen speech that stirred the admiration of his colleagues and the press corps.

The Senator is "mellifluous." He does sprinkle his speech with quotations, and sometimes misquotations, from the Bible, Shakespeare, and the classics—extemporaneously. He also, in actual, meaningful debate such as this, has a great talent for hitting the nail on the head. He brings out the strength and weaknesses of each position with an unerring eye gained in long experience with national affairs. And, finally, he thinks and speaks out of a genuine philosophy that is generous, affectionate, and understanding of his more extreme opponents in any given dispute, and often shows itself in a whimsical sense of humor which has become the delight of the press gallery.

It is a combination of qualities that have become rare in American politics, and it was not an exaggeration when those who attended this speech, Senators and newsmen alike, expressed their feeling of having been present at an historic occasion.

There is a great deal of cynicism in politics and in the press with regard to politics—unfortunately, for good reason—but the cynics themselves, showed a kind of nostalgia, immediately, in connection with this last great Dirksen address.

Senator DIRKSEN has been in many a bitter political fray, and he fights with good success and a cutting edge, as he has proven. He is associated with some of the bitterest moments in our political history.

Yet, over a period of more than 30 years, he has clearly demonstrated that he does not, himself, bear a grudge; that while he may differ and differ with heat and strategy and effect, he respects the persons and positions taken by his adversaries; and that while he is an impressive figure who takes the affairs of his country seriously, he does not take himself so terribly seriously as do so many politicians.

This combination has won him a unique place in the hearts of his fellow Senators, of the press gallery of the Senate, and of the succeeding Presidential administrations with whom he has dealt.

It is hard for many here to realize what a towering national figure EVERETT M. DIRKSEN has become in this Nation's affairs, both in deciding, assisting, frustrating, or modifying the actions of our Government and as a personality among the Nation's leaders.

C. L. DANCEY.

Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments is a subject of concern to all those interested in the health and growth of our national economy. It has for some time, and rightly, been occupying the attention of the executive departments concerned as a matter of high priority.

In this connection, I was pleased to read in the July issue of the Department of State Newsletter of the concrete steps being taken by that Department to reduce its expenditures abroad as a contribution to correcting this deficit. I note that these measures are being taken under the supervision of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. William J. Crockett, who has recently been promoted to that position. Prior to his distinguished career as a Foreign Service officer, Mr. Crockett was for 20 years in banking and in business, for part of that time as owner and manager of his own business enterprise; and I am happy to know that a man of his experience as businessman and bank officer is today responsible to Secretary Rusk for the operational administration of our Department of State.

I should like to include in the RECORD at this point the article I have cited from the Department of State Newsletter:

DEPARTMENT REVIEWS STEPS TO CURB OUTFLOW OF GOLD

The Department has made a thorough review of steps already taken and those planned to curb the outflow of U.S. dollars abroad as part of a all-out Government effort to improve this country's balance of payments.

The Department's report was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by Deputy Under Secretary for Administration William J. Crockett.

The Bureau of the Budget plans a series of hearings and conferences to assure that all possible actions are being taken to minimize the balance-of-payments costs of maintaining U.S. offices and missions abroad.

The Department, in its review, called special attention to its plans for closing some posts and reducing in size and status additional ones. Plans to eliminate consular agencies are also being considered. Reductions in dollar costs will be made in addition by plans to relocate regional offices. Other plans to curb the gold outflow include purchases from U.S. firms of machine rentals and supplies for the Regional Finance Center in Paris and limiting the attendance, insofar as it is possible, of U.S. delegates, participants, and support staff at international conferences.

The following steps have already been taken by the Department to help reduce the dollar drain:

Through the establishment of six Consolidated Administrative Management Organizations in Africa, jointly staffed with State, AID, and USIA personnel, it has been possible to reduce costs to the service agencies.

The West African Consolidated Administrative Service Center at Lagos, Nigeria, a joint State, AID, and USIA effort, which services 24 posts and missions in 22 West African countries, has cut costs by bulk procurement and shipping, by reduction of damage and loss, and through improved repair and maintenance and more effective use of personnel.

Through its Joint Administrative Support concept, the Department provides administrative support, on a reimbursable basis, to the oversea representatives of some 43 agencies in over 100 countries, freeing them of the necessity to establish their own administrative units.

Other steps taken last year to relieve the dollar drain included the elimination of 5 American and 13 local positions overseas, the integration of State and AID economic staffs at certain posts, the sale of surplus real property abroad for "hard" currencies or U.S. dollars, as well as the closure of a number of FBO regional offices.

Proposals requiring further study, which may aid in limiting U.S. Government expenditures abroad, were also included in the Department's review.

What I Can Do for My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, recently a Michigan student won honorable mention in the 28th annual National High School Writing Contest sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Her name is Barbara Rozak.

If this essay won honorable mention I am sure that first prize must have been really wonderful because I am very impressed with the knowledge of Barbara, as I am equally impressed and pleased that she lives in my district and attended a school in my district.

Barbara's essay follows:

WHAT I CAN DO FOR MY COUNTRY

(By Barbara Rozak, age 14, Our Lady of Mercy High School, Detroit, Mich.)

The shrill jangle of persistent alarm clocks breaks the quiet serenity of a sleeping nation and America awakens, myself included. Americans, 186 million stumble bleary-eyed from bed and are at once an integral part of the mad pace that is so characteristically Americans, 186 million, stumble bleary eyed rush off to offices, fields, factories, and schools to begin another workday.

I am one of 186 million Americans; a citizen of the land of the free, a citizen of the land of challenge; a necessary link in the chain of freedom, and I may be only one American youth struggling to conjugate doceo, solve equations, and do pushups in gym, but I must be one American youth struggling to keep my country on top; struggling to keep America the land of the free trying to perpetuate American ideals.

It sounds almost ludicrous that one youth can keep the free-world leader on top, but it sounds even more ridiculous to expect the free-world leader to remain on top by simply being American without efforts on anyone's part. President Kennedy realizes this and so he challenged Americans to serve America—willingly and loyally, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Like any other American, I was stirred by the clever turn of a phrase that echoed so clearly across my Nation. Like many other Americans, I am trying to fit this challenge into my daily life.

Family life forms an important part of my daily routine so it seems only logical to discover opportunities for service in my own home first. I didn't have to look very far for a challenge, not a tough challenge to be sure, but nonetheless a challenge. As happens so frequently in any family, the dishes were dirty. Stifling an impulse to complain that we used too many dishes, I gritted my teeth and began scraping the plates. "So, you may be saying what's that got to do with serving your country?" It's got quite a bit to do with serving my country. For that one instance teaches me to think of the

other person first. It teaches me to cooperate with others, to take orders cheerfully now that someday I may be prepared to give them.

This isn't the only opportunity for service in my family. Another common situation arises when my sister's demands persist in irritating me. By answering her calmly I learn how to live harmoniously with others. I learn to compromise now so that I'll be able to negotiate in the future.

These incidents seem insignificant, but these incidents are part of my training course in American leadership. They present me with an opportunity to serve my country now and be prepared to serve it in the future.

Another important part of my day is my school life; a life consisting of books, lectures, tests, and homework; a life that serves as step No. 2 in my American leadership course. Now that I've learned to get along with members of my family I meet a new set of people with whom I must work harmoniously. But this is not the major challenge of school life. The major challenge is summarized in the words: "You are the citizens of tomorrow; the presidents, policymakers, executives, and leaders of the future America. You will either keep America strong or make America weak."

How often these words are cited by teachers and counselors. How true they are. How necessary it is to get a well-rounded education now in order to have a well-balanced personality in the future. How many opportunities there are to develop my personality and potential.

I suppose you're going to ask me if I'm serving America by simplifying complex fractions and conjugating verbs. That's exactly what I'm going to tell you. We live in a space age, an age of missiles and computers. If we intend to be intelligent leaders of tomorrow we must know basic mathematical principles. There is a crying need for skilled mathematicians. There is also a need for people who can think clearly and concisely, people who remember details and take them into consideration if translations are to be sensible. Other skills are stressed in different classes. In history we are trained to evaluate facts and appreciate their import. In English we are taught to write effectively so as to influence others. In religion classes we are taught to "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's"—thus preparing to be good Christian citizens and leaders.

"Sure," you are probably saying, "these classes will be useful in future life when you're old enough to vote and be active in politics, but what about right now? Can you use these skills to put the idealistic thoughts of youth into practice?"

Freedom of expression is a basic right granted to all Americans. It is a privilege which some use, some abuse, and some ignore, but it is a basic principle of representative government. It is a right which can be exercised by all Americans, including minors.

A well-written letter sent to a Representative can and does influence government. Right now, Detroit, my hometown, is a possible site for the 1968 Olympics. By writing convincingly to the Olympics Committee I can increase Detroit's chances for being chosen. By writing to drugstores carrying obscene literature and to theaters showing immoral pictures I'm helping to clean up the moral filth of a big city. By the same token, writing congratulatory letters to networks showing good programs helps to keep the moral caliber of my city at a high level.

These actions may seem insignificant, but a great Nation like America is made of many little things. There must be an equal balance of privileges and responsibilities and it is up to me to help balance the American scales of equality.

Speech by Senator Barry Goldwater in Cleveland, Ohio, on September 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 9, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER made a hard-hitting speech at Cleveland, Ohio, before the Ohio Republican Finance Committee luncheon. Well over 3,000 turned out to hear the Nation's No. 1 conservative deliver a major address which stressed the threat which is coming from the radical left in American politics. I include the speech with these brief remarks:

Chairman Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here today to contribute what little I may to the whole idea of political fund-raising in the State of Ohio. This particular problem, I'm sure you all realize, is not one confined to your fine State alone. We have it in Arizona, too—every year. So I can say—speaking as one who has had considerable contact with this problem over the years—that I sympathize with you and I commend your efforts.

I always like to come to Ohio and particularly to a Republican Party function. Like many others acquainted with political affairs, I believe Ohio has one of the finest, best-organized Republican operations to be found anywhere in this country. And I certainly would be lacking in my appreciation of that fact if I were not to pay tribute at this time to men like your distinguished Governor Rhodes, your nationally-respected State chairman, Ray Bliss, your able county chairmen like Sonny DeMaioribus, your able finance chairman, Ken Smith—and to all the other men and women throughout Ohio who are responsible for this enviable state of Republican affairs.

You certainly do not need anyone from another part of the country to explain and stress the importance of good party organization. And I'm sure that you people in this room, above all others in Ohio, are well aware of the vital importance—the dire necessity—of financial support for the Republican Party.

Looking at what is presently going on in Washington—and I might say that I enjoy a front row seat in the bleachers—I don't believe there ever has been a time when the political stakes were higher. The early development of an efficient, well-financed, carefully organized Republican Party in every part of this country could well be the last best hope for freedom in America as well as throughout the world. No matter who the candidate might be in 1964—and I am not entirely blind to the fact that there is some little argument developing on that score—party organization and party financing will be needed on a scale never before contemplated when we, as a party, confront the New Frontier as it makes its bid for another 4 years in power.

Not only will the party need organization and money, but it will have to present a unified opposition to the grasping, opportunistic, ruinous policies of the Kennedy administration. It will have to stand out strong and clear for the things this country needs, both at home and abroad, to combat the ever-pressing onslaught of international communism. It will have to stand for what is best for America, not just what is good for some particular pressure group. It will have to take hard positions—some of them possibly unpopular—in joining the fight for individual freedom against those who would turn over our lives—lock, stock, and barrel—to the bureaucratic paternalism of a completely centralized Government.

Make no mistake about it, we will need a maximum of all the ingredients necessary for political success. No matter what our personal inclinations and attitudes as we interpret the basic doctrines of the Republican Party, the need for party unity is greater than at any time in our history. We have no choice. The opposition will be formidable, wealthy, entrenched and ruthless. It will take everything we've got to combat an incumbent who can be counted upon to make maximum use of the Presidency and the National Government to further the cause of his reelection and the perpetuation of the New Frontier. Even though President Kennedy has been able to talk himself through 3 years in the White House, the Republicans can't expect to talk themselves to victory in the drive to oust him. What we can do, if we're not careful, is talk ourselves out of any chance of victory by engaging in party feuds and divisive tactics. I've said it many times before and I say it again now, we do nothing but play the Democratic game when we chew on other Republicans. We've got to get used to the idea that we have a common target in the New Frontier. We've got to start emphasizing our many points of agreement, rather than our fewer points of disagreement. We've got to fight the New Frontier with everything the party can muster.

I suggest that we have been so absorbed with what is transpiring in our own party that we haven't been paying enough attention to what the New Frontier is doing. Perhaps the most significant and frightening development of recent date was a conference of those who call themselves Young Democrats of 13 Western States held several weeks ago in Berkeley, Calif. At that conference—believe it or not—resolutions were adopted urging:

1. U.S. resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba.
2. A nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact nations.
3. U.S. withdrawal of its troops in South Vietnam.

Now let me point out to you that these young people are the President's own followers. With the New Frontier's constant preoccupation with youth in Government it is entirely probable that these so-called Young Democrats of 13 Western States constitute one of the major recruiting grounds of the New Frontier for Government workers. This is a fairly dangerous situation. For example, you might ask yourself how many Young Democrats who hold such ridiculous and dangerous views are actually working in policy-making jobs of the Federal Government?

Nor is the concern over the trend of thinking and acting among the Young Democrats confined to myself or the Republican Party. For example, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, Democratic Congressman CHARLES H. WILSON of California had this to say—and I quote.

"There can be no doubt that resolutions urging resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba, the signing of a nonaggression pact with the eastern European slave states, and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Far East are clearly following the Kremlin line and are repugnant to all responsible members of the Democratic Party."

Congressman WILSON said he couldn't agree with the Young Democrats National Chairman Allen T. Howe that the Berkeley action was an "isolated instance." He pointed out that "resolutions calling for unilateral disarmament by the United States have been introduced time and again at meetings of Young Democrats in California."

Now let me quote further from Congressman WILSON. Here is what he said: "Anyone reading the convention platforms and resolutions of the California Young Democrats can only assume that the organization is firmly in the grasp of a highly vocal group of emotional radicals, peace-at-any-pricers, and other assorted lunatic leftists.

"It is a disgrace that the honorable name of the Democratic Party should be associated with such resolutions and policy positions. I know that there have been many sincere members of the Young Democrats fighting against this tide of radicalism, but they have been left to stand alone. Little if any interest or aid has been forthcoming from the national leadership.

"I suggest to Mr. Howe that he refrain from pointing the finger of scorn at the Young Republicans until such time as his own house is in order. The old expression—people in glass houses should not throw stones—is entirely appropriate in this case."

In view of all this, it certainly seems to me that we have been hearing much too much in this country about the far right and not nearly enough about the far left. The far left is in business in a big way and a dangerous way. According to the Democrat I have just quoted, it already has succeeded in capturing the Young Democrats of California. It has made inroads into the Government of the United States via the Americans for Democratic Action. And I would remind you and all other good Americans that the ADA has a basic contempt for our traditions of free enterprise and individual liberty. It would alter the Constitution to fit its peculiar measurements for a socialist welfare state. It would grant full diplomatic recognition to Red China.

Let me ask you this: What is it that causes young people in the Democratic Party to believe for 1 minute that unilateral disarmament is in the best interest of this country? What is there about Cuba that is so noble and respectable that Young Democrats want us to resume diplomatic recognition of a Communist satellite in the Western Hemisphere? What is there about the Far East that makes Young Democrats believe it would help America to withdraw our troops from South Vietnam and pave the way for a Communist takeover of all Southeast Asia?

Always remember that these people are members of the political group that is running this country and, to a large extent, affecting the future of freedom everywhere.

This is the true danger in American political life today. As I have said, many times before, I worry a lot more about extremists who are inside the house breaking up the furniture than I do about those who stand outside and throw rocks at the windows. We've heard a lot of nonsense from the Democrats about the John Birch Society taking over the Republican Party. Yet as GOP National Chairman Bill Miller has pointed out there is not a single member of the John Birch Society serving in a position of influence in the Republican Party. I know of not a single John Bircher among Republicans in Congress, among our Republican Governors, or among our State chairmen and members of the national committee.

But can the Democrats claim as much when we consider the far left? They certainly can't while ADAers hold important policymaking jobs in the Cabinet, in the White House, in the State Department, in the Labor Department, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the Post Office Department.

Let me say that I believe it is one of our most important tasks as Republicans to draw attention to the growing activities of the far left and to point out the dangers involved in getting too close to the radical ideas stemming from those quarters. No matter how mellow the Russians are reportedly becoming—and I for one put no faith at all in this dangerous premise—there can be no excuse for lowering our guard through unilateral disarmament, the withdrawal of troops from the Far East, and the other moves suggested by the lunatic left.

The radical left poses an immediate, serious threat close to the Government of the United States and here is where we must concentrate our attention and our attack. We must examine every move proposed by the administration for its ultimate effect not only on our security but our way of life as a free society. In domestic affairs, we must combat every new attempt to build up the political power structure of the Federal Government. The additions to this coercive force made and sought during the Kennedy administration are frightening in their proportions. They aim at virtually complete control of the U.S. economy by the Federal Government. They propose Government action in almost every sphere of business activity. They would extend the welfare state into every conceivable area of human endeavor.

But the struggle ahead will not be easy. The New Frontier will be playing a tough, hard game of power politics—and they'll be playing for keeps. And to meet this challenge—as I pointed out earlier—the Republican Party will need the best organization it has ever fielded; it will need continuous and ample financing; it will need a unified approach based on traditional Republican principles; it will need hard work in every ward and precinct in the Nation. It must convince the American people that the positive programs offered by Republican officeholders at every level preserve and strengthen liberty, dignity, and our economy. And perhaps the most important requirement of all—the Republicans must have the will to win.

Don't let anyone fool you on this score. The job ahead can't be done with half-hearted effort. Any suggestion of defeatism in the face of formidable, deeply entrenched opponent can end the fight before it starts. Nothing less than an all-out, no-holds-barred campaign can even come close to success.

A Cloak of Many Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the following thought-provoking editorial appeared in the Hanover (Pa.) Evening Sun, Tuesday, August 27, 1963:

POWER GRAB IN DISGUISE

The Kennedy administration's proposed civil rights legislation raises one basic and disturbing question: Is it a sincere attempt to wipe out racial discrimination or is it being used to camouflage a Federal power grab?

While we'd like to think it's the former, sections of this bill go far beyond the realm of civil rights. In fact, if enacted, they could deprive citizens of their civil rights.

In our book, civil rights are those guaranteeing the right to worship as one wishes, the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right of peaceful assembly and free speech and the right to own private property.

These are rights that should apply to all citizens, regardless of color, or creed, and should not be twisted to the advantage of any individual or group.

Although the Kennedy program is traveling under the cover of civil rights, and to speak against it is akin to being for sin, it seems that the measure primarily is an extension of Federal power.

Under this program, the President is seeking power to control every home, school, business, farm, and bank. It would give the Federal Government the power to call, foreclose, or refuse loans and to exclude individuals and businesses from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits without notice.

It would give the Government the power to tell businessmen who they may hire, fire, promote, or demote. In effect, it would give the Government the power to blacklist banks, contractors, schools, businesses, and individuals.

These powers are far more sweeping and arbitrary than any President has ever sought—even in time of war.

If Congress accepts this civil rights package in its entirety, it will have curtailed the traditional rights of trial by jury and appeal and will have virtually erased State lines and States' rights.

Such an influx of centralized Federal control of the lives of men is frightening. And it may be just one step in a continuing grab for power by the Federal Government.

President Kennedy has said, "The enactment of the legislation I suggest will not solve all our problems." Taking a look at what he suggested, it would indicate centralization of power.

Our Founding Fathers, for good historical reasons, shied away from a centralized government with an all-powerful monarch. They found that a federation of states provided a balance of power.

We don't want to see that balance destroyed by further power grabs by Washington under the guise of civil rights legislation.

Domestic Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce, Frankfort, Ky., in regard to the Domestic Peace Corps proposition which has been put forth by the New Frontier. Since this letter contains a resolution adopted unanimously by this group, I am following their suggestion. Under unanimous consent, I include the letter in full at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FRANKFORT JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Frankfort, Ky., September 10, 1963.

Representative M. GENE SNYDER,
House Office Building;
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: It is our understanding that the National Service Corps Act will be brought before the House of Representatives for discussion sometime this month.

We know you always like to know the feelings of your constituents back home before casting your vote.

With this in mind, we made a careful study of the issue and passed the following resolution by unanimous consent at our meeting of September 5, 1963:

Whereas the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce is ever mindful of Federal legislative enactment which affects the economic

and social lives of the people of this great Nation; and

Whereas there is currently pending in the Congress of the United States H.R. 338 proposing the establishment of a National Service Corps, better known as the Domestic Peace Corps; and

Whereas the proposed National Service Corps would be created to help migratory workers, Indians, residents of depressed areas, and rural and urban slums, the elderly, the disabled, the mentally ill and the mentally retarded; and

Whereas there are already Federal agencies within the Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare charged with these responsibilities and a National Service Corps would duplicate work already done by those agencies; and

Whereas there are public agencies on the State and local level which are performing these necessary functions; and

Whereas there are hundreds of private and quasi-public social welfare agencies, as well as many civil organizations, in addition to Junior Chambers of Commerce, which are performing outstanding community development work; and

Whereas this bill, if enacted, would discourage the citizens of the United States from participating in volunteer organizations and would cause the National Service Corps to grow in size beyond all expectations; and

Whereas such expansion would increase the cost of providing help for those in need at a time when fiscal responsibility is sorely needed to combat ever-mounting budget deficits; and

Whereas the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce believes this country has become great through the individual initiative of its citizens and that legislation of this type tends to suppress this initiative: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce hereby opposes the National Service Corps Act (H.R. 338) now pending before the Congress of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

MORRIS E. BURTON,
President.

JOHN J. AVENT,
Governmental Affairs Chairman.

P.S.—If you so desire, you may have the above resolution put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mexican Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK MINOR MARTIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, it was in September of 1810 in Dolores—on a day now observed every September 16 as Mexican Independence Day—that Padre Miguel Hidalgo shouted to his flock el grito de Dolores: "Long live our Lady of Guadelupe. Down with bad government. Death to the Spaniards."

This great exhortation marked the beginning of the Mexicans' long, bloody struggle to overthrow three centuries of oppressive Spanish rule. Mexico was the first Spanish colony to defy Madrid, and her example inspired other uprisings in Latin America in the 19th century.

Padre Hidalgo and his supporters won several victories against the Spanish royalists, but in 1811 they were finally defeated and their leaders executed. The banner of independence was not allowed to fall, however, and the struggle continued for 10 long years until the last viceroy was crushed and Mexico became independent in 1821.

Since then the course of Mexican history has been turbulent. Governmental instability, revolutions, civil wars, and dictatorial regimes hampered political and economic progress for more than a century. It was not until the presidency of Lájaro Cardenas, who was elected in 1934, that some measure of peace and stability came to Mexico. Since then every Mexican President has completed the 6-year term allowed him by the constitution and given way to his lawful successor. This political stability has permitted marked progress in the economic, social, and educational development of the country.

United States-Mexican relations have also steadily improved during the 20th century. Old differences between our two nations have been settled amicably, as the recent settlement of the Chamizal border dispute amply demonstrates. Friendly relations with our southern neighbors have been enhanced over the years by the extensive northward migration of Mexicans, adding a rich and varied tradition to the Southwest. These Mexican-Americans, who number more than 635,000 in California alone, have made great contributions to their new country in both war and peace.

On behalf of these Americans of Mexican descent, as well as all Americans, I salute our southern friends in the Estados Unidos Mexicanos on the occasion of their independence day and wish them continued progress and happiness.

"We the People" Benefit From "Blessings of Liberty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, this is Constitution Week, and today is Citizenship Day. It was on September 17, 1787, that our Constitution was signed in Philadelphia. All too often these days the authority of the Constitution is invoked in an unreflective, emotional way in support of causes reflecting the full spectrum of political coloration. A sober, dispassionate concern for our constitutional liberties and the political order required to sustain them is too seldom in evidence. An editorial in the Flint (Mich.) Journal for Sunday, September 15, 1963, well expresses, I believe, the meaning that this observance can and should have for us all. I consequently, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, wish to share its splendid sentiments with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

"WE THE PEOPLE" BENEFIT FROM "BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY"

Because "we, the people" so ordained, there is none among us whose general welfare has not been enriched by the blessings of liberty.

Certainly not the Hungarian-born immigrant who became a Federal judge here.

Certainly not the Russian-born retired auto worker who became a $25,000 Flint College and Cultural Development sponsor.

Certainly not the son of a shoeblack who became a Flint teacher and civic leader.

Certainly not the Canadian-born young man who arrived with 75 cents in his pocket to take a janitor's job and work his way through school to become a director in Flint's community school program.

Certainly not the Flint Negro attorney who became a Michigan Supreme Court Justice.

Certainly not the son of a Jewish immigrant laborer who became a Journal editor and then vice president of a national manfacturing company.

Certainly not the factory worker who completed his education 10 years after leaving high school, mostly at night classes, to become a community school director.

Certainly not the Lebanon-born immigrant who from a small grocery store built one of our community's largest and most successful businesses.

Certainly not the former Negro factory worker who came from a farm in Arkansas to become a State representative from Genesee County's First District.

Certainly not the numerous persons of almost every nationality, color, and creed in our areas with meager and humble backgrounds who became successful professional men and women and community leaders.

And to the degree that each of these—plus many other thousands—has benefited from the opportunities provided and protected by "we the people," to that degree also has freedom been strengthened and secured for each of us.

For the "blessings of liberty" which were ordained and established in the U.S. Constitution by "we the people" today are ours to enjoy, to utilize, to respect, and if necessary to defend. For each of us, you and I and every other American, is one of "the people of the United States."

It is appropriate that we contemplate the blessings encompassed in our Constitution and benefits inherent to U.S. citizenship. Today marks the beginning of Constitution Week and Tuesday will be observed throughout our land as Citizenship Day.

These events are not innovations. We have seen fit to solemnize September 17 ever since the founding of our country. On that day in 1787 was signed our Constitution, one of the most significant, far-reaching, and meaningful documents extant. A document of national fortitude, for many years it has stood as a blueprint for freedom and an inspiration for peoples of the world.

Its aims are clearly stated in the preamble. It is not possible to imagine any eloquence which could more effectively outline this country's purpose or explain its very existence.

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Constitution Week and Citizenship Day hold special significance for all Americans at this time—a time in which our way of life and the principles for which our country stands are being challenged from without and questioned from within.

Because of abuses and examples of inequality and discrimination which admittedly exist—although in a diminishing de-

gree—in certain areas of our land and are fostered by certain elements in our society, there are those whose faith in our system has been shaken. Seeds of doubt have been planted. Fear of the future has been expressed.

But while considering our shortcomings, let us not lose sight of our strengths and our virtues.

It is well that we examine our faults. Only by open discussion of such errors can we through cooperative effort correct them. And there could be no better time than this week to remind ourselves that because of the type of peoples' government established by our Constitution, meaningful solutions can be resolved. Within the very framework of this historical but up-to-the-minute document can be found the answers we seek—as they have in past crises.

It would be well, too, for each of us to take inventory of what our citizenship means in comparison with that of peoples under the heel of those who seek to take advantage of our inner strife in their attempt to weaken and destroy our way of life.

Freedom as we know and enjoy is something of which those under Communist rule have no comprehension. As long as it remains strong and secure—and it will as long as those who possess it remain strong of heart and fiber as well as in arms—our enemies never will be able to destroy the freedom that is so dear to us.

We often are accused of having lost sight of our founding principles, of no longer being cognizant of what it means to be an American.

We do not agree. Our faith in this country and especially in its people remains strong.

Most Americans are guilty only of not taking time in our whirlwind everyday routine to think about how fortunate we are. We often are negligent in translating the problems of our country and the threat of communism in terms of what they mean to us as individual free citizens. We sometimes are lax in resolving to shoulder our share of the responsibility in meeting the challenges of the hour.

American citizenship is a precious possession. It is a priceless heritage, carrying with it wondrous blessings that have been achieved through decades of hard work, dedication, sacrifice, vision, and no little bloodletting.

Deep within us, most Americans are inbued with an appreciation of our way of life. But a more outward expression of national fortitude, of a willingness to devote more selfless service to the welfare of our country and the sharing with each other the blessing of liberty seldom has been more urgently needed.

We fervently hope that Constitution Week and Citizenship Day serve to instill in each of us an even greater awareness of our opportunities and responsibilities, and a rededication of our efforts toward the preservation and expansion of our freedoms.

A Letter to the Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 22, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a letter written to the editor of the Peru Daily Tribune, Peru, Ind., recently came to my attention. The letter was written by a fine Negro citizen of Peru and expresses very vividly the thoughts of a lady who has lived all her life in a predominantly white community. There are many who will not agree with Mrs. Mayberry. There are many who will. There are none who can disagree with her sincerity and her honest expression. I commend her letter as good reading for all my colleagues:

As a race which has been successful in all lines of endeavor, we should stand on our own feet and not try to force other races to accept us. If we accomplish something of any intrinsic value, we shall be recognized for that regardless of whether or not we have seen the inside of a white school. Where we are educated does not alter the use to which we put our knowledge; if we are capable, we will succeed.

I attended a mixed school through necessity. Although some of the students were nice, I would have preferred to be with my own race because I am proud of my people just as an Englishman or a Japanese or a Jew is proud of his people, their culture, and their accomplishments. As a race, we help each other all we can and we like to share the heritage that is uniquely ours.

The argument has been presented that Negro schools do not measure up to white schools. This does not mean that the Negroes are any less capable as teachers but that they have been less well trained. Closing some of our excellent colleges and universities just to please a few does not help solve this problem. Giving these teachers a comparable educational background would increase their potential as influential teachers and persons.

Some people feel that without any social activities with white people, our lives would be very dull. But as a Negro, I do not feel that I have to depend on such social activities in order to have a good time. It was quite possible for me to find sufficient outlets for my gregarious tendencies within my own race without attending functions with other races.

The friction that exists in schools where segregation has been imposed by law makes all the pupils distraught. Some pupils and some teachers are very understanding—they can recognize and accept an individual on his own merits, regardless of his race, color, or creed. Others feel that they can acquire some degree of status themselves only by making other people feel small. These frequently choose the Negro or any other person who is not exactly like them as the scapegoat. This would not happen in a school where all the teachers and students were Negro.

After the friction has set in, then what has been accomplished? Can pupils attending a school surrounded by guards have their minds on their studies or will they be thinking only of what the guards stand for: to keep down trouble? This is not a healthy climate in which to study or learn how to live with your fellowman. So much attention is thereby drawn to the law enforcement itself that the educational values are relegated to a relatively unimportant role.

Individually and collectively, we are American citizens and should be treated as such. We will be if we accept the responsibilities and obligations as well as the privileges of this citizenship. If, on the other hand, we act like children, then we shall be treated as children. However, if we act as adults, work with certain goals in mind and have perserverence, then we shall command the respect of all who are working toward making the most of the opportunities that exist in America.

I know a number of graduates from mixed schools who have marched down the aisle with the white people and out the back door into the kitchen to stay there. Many Negroes do not want to compete with the whites—they are happier and more content to remain in their own homes. But where is this pride in our own homes to be taught in mixed schools? This is something that must be started within the home itself, then supplemented by the teachings of the school or whatever institution transmits both attitudes and information. Therefore, we Negroes owe it to ourselves and to our race to instill this pride in the home at every opportunity.

Then, if the individual finds that he wants to proceed into some sphere of activity that traditionally belongs to the white people, he does so from a solid basis of a healthy respect for his own home, his own race, his own heritage. When he prospers in business as the manager of a hotel, club, theater; when he finds satisfaction in what he is doing within his church group; when he chooses to teach and does it well—then he can extend the pride that he feels in his home to encompass his activities outside the home. Meanwhile, it is his primary duty to maintain his home as an inviting and livable place where his children can live in happiness and comfort with a feeling of security, not with the browbeaten defeatism that pervades the existence of those who feel they are inferior.

We have many people within the Negro race who have achieved success in many different fields, some in conjunction with others and many who have carved out a niche for themselves by seeing a great need and filling it. Among these famous men and women were Mary McLeod Bethun, president of Bethun-Cookman College at Daytona Beach, Fla., and Booker T. Washington, head of Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala. Dr. Daniel Williamson was the first surgeon to operate successfully on the human heart. His drive and ambition went even further; he also established a training school for Negro nurses at Chicago Providence Hospital. George Washington Carver is world famous for having derived over 300 products from the peanut and more than 100 from the sweet potato.

Nor does this list begin to indicate the extent of the influence American Negroes have had in other areas. Marian Anderson has won friends throughout the world with two qualities uppermost throughout her long career: singing with the magnificent God-given voice she has, which many critics describe as a voice that happens only once every century, and loving people. The tremendous ovation recently accorded her in India, the bond of friendship established between her and Eleanor Roosevelt, the culmination of her interests in her present mission with the United Nations—certainly this bespeaks a woman of stature, regardless of her race.

Langston Hughes is a poet of great renown. Recently one of his plays was presented off Broadway with a completely Negro cast, the first such event in the history of modern theater. The cast of Porgy and Bess which made such a spectacular tour throughout Europe and Russia gave the peoples of the world an opportunity to see the Negro as they had never seen before. Others, who have great talent and have risen above difficulties to exercise it include Ethel Waters and Mahalia Jackson. Another outstanding personality who has brought great recognition to his race is the Negro who has consistently served others in his capacities at the United Nations: Ralph Bunche.

These people did not succeed in spite of their race but with a fundamental courageous pride because of their race. They never lost sight of the fact that they were Negro and never lost faith in their own people.

Rather than have trouble in schools, frightened parents, children who are uncomfortable, ill feeling and bloodshed, our people should just be themselves. If they first think of themselves with respect and live in well-kept homes with the secure feeling that they are worthy, important people, then the questions of segregation will be decided

peacefully. The results will be far more lasting than the present situation where segregation has to be enforced with militia.

Mrs. MARY MAYBERRY,
Peru, Ind.

Federal Spending at Lower Rate Than When Ike Was President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Union Times, Union, S.C., of September 9, 1963:

FEDERAL SPENDING AT LOWER RATE THAN WHEN IKE WAS PRESIDENT

(By Edmond Lebreton and Adren Cooper)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, a Republican, said today Federal spending has grown at a slower rate during the Kennedy administration than during the last 3 years Dwight D. Eisenhower was in the White House.

In an exclusive Associated Press interview, Dillon said "it is hard to put a spending tag on one administration as compared to a previous one with that sort of record unless you are ready to attack defense and space."

Dillion served under Eisenhower as Under Secretary of State and was named to his present post by President Kennedy.

He said he still is optimistic about chances for passage of the tax cut bill, which he said will "do more for our economy and more for curing the balance of payments than any step I know."

Dillon said he is counting on increased public support in the next few weeks to speed congressional action on the tax bill, which would provide for a reduction of about $11 billion in individual and corporate income taxes.

Increased awareness of the problems of dollars and gold flowing abroad—the balance-of-payments deficit—also will help build sentiment for the tax legislation, Dillon said.

"It is not always understood that, by creating a better climate for investment, we will prevent a lot of funds from leaving this country," he said.

Dillon believes that a Brookings Institute report, which forecast that the basic imbalance would be corrected by 1968, was "overly optimistic on the trade side. Consequently, I think we might do better in some of the other areas as diverting more foreign aid buying to the United States."

Asked about the possibility of repealing the requirement which ties down a large percentage of the U.S. gold stockpile to provide backing for domestic money, Dillon said: "We never put that forth as an administration proposal. There was a good deal of talk about it and we would have no objection to its repeal because this would put us in conformity with all the other countries of the world. We are the only one that has this requirement remaining on the books.

"However, we have not pushed it because we have felt that highly emotional debate seemed to be shaping up over this subject. One of the reasons we haven't been too concerned is that the Federal Reserve has authority to suspend that requirement in time of need and keep it suspended."

Regarding the tax bill, he predicted the most important support for it during the crucial Senate consideration "will come from organized groups—the business community for instance, and labor."

Dillon said unless Congress acts on the bill this year, most Americans probably won't enjoy any benefits in terms of bigger take-home pay until April 1964. The reason, he said, is that the withholding rate could not be reduced until Congress said the last word.

He rejected suggestions that the administration might speed the tax cut by formally postponing some of its domestic programs. Dillon denied that the official Kennedy family is divided into economy and pro-spending blocs.

Most of the increased spending under the present administration, Dillon argued, has been for defense, space activities and interest on the public debt. The latter itself, he said, "is uncontrollable."

"All the increases during the 3 years of this administration were less than they were during the last 3 years of the preceding administration," he said.

As for demands that some domestic projects be formally shelved to make it easier for economy-minded legislators to vote tax cuts, Dillon said: "I think a request for a statement like this is political in nature and is not economic."

Assault on the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been concerted and unpublicized attempts to bring about some radical changes in our Constitution, which has served our country well for 175 years.

These three proposals, to amend the Constitution, would, if enacted, bring about an imbalance of our current Federal-State relationship, and would return us to the days prior to the adoption of the Constitution when we were floundering as 13 separate States with no strength or power as a unified nation. They would destroy our cherished democratic processes, and would do away with our guarantees of liberty, justice, and equality.

Mr. Sol Rabkin, who is director of the Anti-Defamation League's national law department, has written an excellent article entitled "Assault on the Constitution," which is contained in this month's ADL bulletin, and I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

It is certainly most worthwhile reading for my colleagues. The article follows:

ASSAULT ON THE CONSTITUTION

(By Sol Rabkin)

Creeping reaction has a long history as a phenomenon of American political life. It thrives when the glare of public attention is not upon it. It usually shrivels under the impact of public awareness.

Reaction will take a mighty leap forward if a program to amend the Constitution of the United States, now creeping through State legislatures, is not halted by public understanding of its purpose. The program is reaction in the most literal sense of the word—a "counterthrust" to the series of basic civil rights decisions handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the past decade.

The Court's rulings in the racial segregation cases might not have been enough to start the program through the State legislatures, but the added push of its ruling in 1962 in *Baker* v. *Carr*, the Tennessee electoral reapportionment case, which struck a blow at the gerrymandering of State legislatures, was. The ruling in *Baker* v. *Carr* hit at the power of rural legislators who dominate State legislative bodies at the expense of city and suburban areas. Since legislators from rural counties are not likely to give up their prerogatives easily, the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision has forged a natural alliance between segregation-minded States and rural-dominated States.

Unhappily, the activities of State legislators and legislatures are not subject to the concentrated public attention which scrutinizes the operations of every facet of Federal Government. Even so important a State as New York does not keep a verbatim record of proceedings in its legislature as the Congress or the courts do. Much State legislation goes unreported by the press and unnoticed by the people. Thus, a meeting last December of a group called the Council of State Governments went almost unnoticed. But out of that meeting came three proposed amendments to the U.S. Constitution, so revolutionary in their impact, that if adopted the Nation would be set back not to pre-1954, the year of the school desegregation decision, but to pre-1789, the year the Constitution replaced the Articles of Confederation as the basic law of the land.

These are the proposals:

A constitutional amendment that would permit State legislatures to amend the Constitution without consideration by any national forum. Twelve States—Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming—approved the proposal. One house in each of seven other States—Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oregon, and Wisconsin—has also approved.

An amendment that would establish a "Court of the Union," composed of the chief justices of the highest court in each of 50 States, with authority to review and reverse decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. The proposal met with immediate approval by Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, South Carolina, and Wyoming and by one house in Mississippi, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

An amendment that would reverse *Baker* v. *Carr* by removing all Federal constitutional restrictions on how States apportion representation in their legislatures. Twelve States acted at once to approve—Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming. Utah's legislature approved the proposal but in different language; approved by Nebraska's Legislature was vetoed by the Governor; one house in the legislatures of Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi and Oregon gave approval.

One house of the New Jersey Legislature approved all three amendments, but then rescinded its action.

Such swift movement of the amendments through State legislatures was made possible only by the lack of public understanding or discussion of the consequences of their enactment. The second thoughts entertained by the New Jersey Legislature is a case in point; someone in New Jersey woke up to the revolutionary impact of the proposed amendments.

What are their consequences?

The adoption of the first proposed amendment would reverse the entire course of American history, would, in fact, turn the United States back to the days when this Nation consisted of a group of 13 squabbling local sovereignties, each primarily concerned with its own narrow, sectional interests.

Giving States the power to change the Constitution smacks of the thinking inherent in the Articles of Confederation:

"Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled."

But this Nation's Founding Fathers tried the Confederation and abandoned it as unworkable. They recognized that even for a United States limited to 13 States on the Atlantic seaboard, such a structure was completely impossible. Each State considered itself an independent sovereignty and decisions of Congress became little more than recommendations. In 1789, the adoption of the present Constitution did away with the State sovereignty provision and replaced it with article VI, which contains a supremacy clause providing that every State be bound by the Constitution and that the laws of the Federal Government be the supreme law of the land.

The second proposal, to establish a "Court of the Union," would make the kind of deliberation and conference which is the essence of the judgment of the U.S. Supreme Court virtually impossible. It would transfer judicial power from a Court whose members are responsible to the entire Nation, are appointed for life and therefore immune from any kind of immediate political pressure, to an unwieldy 50-man court whose members are responsible to individual States, who serve for limited periods and are answerable, in terms of reelection or reappointment, to State officials or the electorate of their own State. Furthermore, their service on the "Court of the Union" would have to be a sideline to their regular jobs as State chief justices.

The third amendment, to remove constitutional restrictions on State apportionment, would not only diminish constitutional guarantees under the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment, but would provide sanction for States to use apportionment as a guise for rank racial discrimination—in contravention of the spirit and purpose of the 15th amendment.

Adoption of this proposal would entrench existing abuses more deeply. Underrepresentation of urban and suburban areas and overrepresentation of rural areas would continue uncorrected, and without any means for correction. In addition, approval of the amendment would constitute the first diminution in American history of any constitutional guarantee of liberty, justice, and equality.

All three proposed amendments are radical in the extreme, an out-and-out assault on the Constitution and democratic progress. The conservative forces backing them are using a device never before invoked—that of petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention on the amendments. For this they need the approval of two-thirds (34) of the State legislatures. For a while they seemed well on their way to success until the campaign began attracting national attention—and opposition.

Last spring, Chief Justice Earl Warren, commented in a speech on the public's unawareness of the amendments. "Any serious effort to amend the Constitution of the United States," he said, "should provide the occasion for a great national debate." Since then, newspapers and other communications media began to note their swift progress in a few short months; various groups have taken a serious and critical interest; President Kennedy, at a press conference, spoke critically of the proposals; the American Bar Association has gone on record against the amendments. The most vociferous spokesman of those advocating the amendments has been Florida Supreme Court Justice Millard Caldwell, president of the Council of State Governments. The U.S. Supreme Court, he cries is "swallowing up" the liberties of the people.

Fortunately, public awareness has not come too late. The amendments still face important tests in additional State legislatures and the campaign to get them passed is no longer unreported and unnoticed.

Diehards may see the amendments as their only salvation, but their scheme to turn history back almost 200 years is doomed to failure—if State legislatures which have not yet tackled the proposals give them the short shrift they deserve.

Statement of Nessie Nides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents appeared recently before the Senate committee and testified in favor of the quality stabilization bill (S. 774). This lady has been engaged in the appliance business for many years. She has outlined the difficulties she has encountered as an independent retailer. Under unanimous consent, I include this statement of Mrs. Nessie Nides in the Appendix of the RECORD, at this point:

STATEMENT OF NESSIE NIDES IN SUPPORT OF THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE OF THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I truly appreciate the invitation given me to testify before your committee, in support of S. 774, the quality stabilization bill. I have never before been in the Halls of Congress; very frankly, I do not know the procedures or expectations of a witness. It is my intention to tell you my own business story in the hope and prayer that it will illustrate the pitiful status of the retailer still in business today, and that it will hasten you in Congress to enactment of this bill so that those still in business can have a chance to continue.

My name is Mrs. Nessie Nides. Until just a month ago, I was owner and president of the Nides Appliances, Inc., in Denver, Colo. This retail business was started 16 years ago by my husband, Mr. Sam Nides. When he passed away in 1950, 13 years ago, I decided to continue the business in order to keep myself occupied. It became a good business and I was always very proud of my association with it. I had been in the business world in Denver since I was a youngster, helping my parents who were in the retail automobile tire business since 1922. Upon the death of my father in 1933, I continued to run our tire business until my marriage to Sam Nides. So I have seen the retail business through many cycles, through good years and bad years (through the normal business cycles). My husband impressed upon me the fact that the basis of the appliance business was good will and service to the consumer; and through the years, I have maintained this policy, always handling nationally advertised quality brand merchandise. To insure the maximum of good service, we maintained our own quick, careful and expert delivery department. We earned a reputation for good installation so essential to proper functioning of a new appliance. We maintained our own TV and appliance service departments so essential to quick and proper maintenance of the merchandise we sold. And we were able to employ a trained "home economist" to instruct our customers on how to get the most use and pleasure out of the appliance they purchased from us. We were able to do all of this up until about 3 years ago, because we could maintain a gross margin on sales which was adequate so that we could afford to give the consumer these benefits he needed and wanted.

Such a meticulously dedicated policy carried my company through the lean years because the reputation we built up for integrity had spread beyond just the local Denver area. Through extensive advertising and word-of-mouth publicity, the public knew our business well, and we were able to build our volume to over a million dollars a year in sales. This volume was attained by charging a fair price with a fair profit to ourselves for retailing and servicing of the finest quality brand name merchandise. This business did not grow through "bait-and-switch advertising," or price cutting.

But in the past several years, the mass merchandisers have been setting an entirely different picture of value buying. The customer still wants—yes, demands—the service and know-how of the independent dealer, but has become enamoured with the "lower-than-cost" lure advertising on name brands by the discounter.

With decreasing margins, Nides Appliance still continued to give the customers the best of products, delivery, and service—until we finally reached the point of no return. We tried to compete with the price cutting to maintain volume, hoping somehow we could develop a profit. In our 16 years in business, Nides Appliance showed a profit every year until the last 2 years.

But last year, I saw the "handwriting on the wall." Either I must become a chiseler and bait-merchandiser with elimination of the important services, or go broke. I had hoped that the Quality Stabilization Act would have passed Congress a year ago, wherein the factories would have been able to set minimum prices and have given me a fighting chance to save my business.

Though the appliance business had been very good to me, although I loved the challenge of the business, the contacts and continual feeling of confidence in helping my customers find a better way of life, I had to face the fact that I couldn't continue in business without making a profit.

I decided to get out of the "rat race" while there was still some investment to salvage.

How to do it? Here was a 16-year-old business with a reputation for integrity known throughout the Rocky Mountain area. Here was a business with thousands of friends and satisfied customers.

I tried to sell it as a going business last fall, when it was apparent that the quality stabilization bill was not going to pass that year, that the help I needed was not forthcoming, and the manufacturers with whom I dealt were still saying that they couldn't set minimum prices on their merchandise, even though they would do it if they could, without running into legal complications too involved and expensive for them to attempt.

First, a young dealer from another city became interested in moving to Denver and buying this established firm. He brought a partner with him, and we worked out a satisfactory purchase arrangement. But by the time my attorneys had drawn up the contract and submitted it to them, they very wisely got "cold feet" and decided there was no chance of success in cities where such a low gross profit margin picture prevailed.

Three months ago, I approached a large volume dealer in Denver (doing over a $2 million volume, but needing a $3 million volume to break even). It was evi-

dent to me that he could use my firm name, location, and reputation to good promotional advantage. His answer was, and I quote, "Nessie, if I could get my investment out of my business, I would get out of it tomorrow. I'm lucky just to be making a living." Think of the gamble he is taking with a very large investment. He is not a mass merchandiser. He has been a legitimate businessman in Denver for 42 years.

Another Denver dealer that I approached said, and again I quote, "Last year I lost money on my retail sales—if it wasn't for the fact that my service department carried me through, I would be out of business today."

Another dealer and my manager wanted to pool resources and buy Nides Appliance, but needing most of their money for working capital, they offered to pay me a small amount down and the balance to be paid in monthly installments out of profit. I couldn't afford to gamble on their potential profit, as no one knew the profit picture in the appliance business under existing circumstances today better than I did.

Now I had no choice. I proceeded to liquidate the assets of my company and I closed the firm on July 15, 1963.

This was just one more store closing, as far as statistics are concerned. But to me, I think you will agree, I have lost a vital part of myself. Thirteen years of running a business in which I took great pride in accomplishment. Now the lost feeling of where to go and what to do. I know what the quality stabilization bill could have done for me, if it had passed even a year ago; but that help was not forthcoming. Statistics reveal that over 1,000 retail firms are closed daily. To many of them, it is a far worse death; for unlike me, they are not able to salvage anything—bankruptcy is their only answer. I didn't sell at a profit—believe me—I salvaged very little.

It is also a little more dying to the manufacturer and distributor each time a retailer closes shop. He desperately needs the independent dealer to promote, sell, and service his products. The small independent retailer, like myself, is the backbone of merchandising in this country.

My understanding of America was drilled into me by my immigrant father, who came to this country with the clothes on his back and became a successful businessman in Denver—because he believed this to be a nation where the individual has a chance to employ his ingenuity and aggressiveness, and where his rewards are making a profit. I learned to believe in the pride of my unusual name and the family to which I belong.

I think if America is to remain American, the individual and the corporation and the product itself have the right to protect their name and the integrity for which they stand. They have the right of protection and the adamant need of protection against misrepresentation and abuse. I have heard the hue and cry that passage of this bill will destroy free enterprise. What is free enterprise in America today—when I had to operate my business, with virtually every service and expense, I had to use price fixed to a profit level except the retail price at which we were selling our merchandise. Our telephones, public utilities, freight rates, insurance rates, advertising rates, rent, etc.—in other words, all the tools the retailer needs to operate a business—have been price fixed and price controlled. Most of these costs have risen under government supervision, while the retailers margin has gone down under pressure of misleading advertising and mass merchandising.

What incentive is there today for an appliance dealer to stay in business when the National Appliance Retail Dealers Association "Cost of Doing Business Survey," a survey made every year since 1949 for NARDA by Mr. Dick Snyder, an economist in Chicago, Ill., tells the sad story of the past 3 years. This report is compiled from actual operating statements of some 2,000 dealers across the country, large and small, who are members of NARDA and send in their operating statements each year. In 1960, the net profit of the appliance dealers was 1.2 percent and 57 percent of the dealers reporting lost money. In 1961, the net operating profit was 0.9 percent. The 1962 report has just been released—I have not seen it as yet, but I understand that it might be just a fraction higher. In other words, gentlemen, an appliance dealer has to do $1 million in volume to net $10,000. The margin for error is too small, as evidenced by the number of retail dealer failures in the past few years.

Passage of the quality stabilization bill would give retail dealers like myself a fair chance to pick and choose his method of operation—chance to preserve the sense of fair play that is inherent in the American people. Don't force us out of business. Let us be honest and reliable. Give us a standard of minimum pricing, so we can devote ourselves to the promotion of our products, to educating the public about the exciting appliances we have to offer them, to have the time to run our businesses in an orderly and profitable manner. But not to have to spend our time chiseling on the floor, conning the customer, having them end up by not buying at all, because by the time they have 5 or 10 differenve prices thrown at them on the same product, they get so suspicious they don't buy at all. Help us to restore the customer's confidence in the retail dealer, who basically should be there to help him, not to have him walk out of the store feeling that he has been played for a sucker. We Americans haven't the time nor inclination to haggle and bargain over a purchase as they do in foreign countries—we want to know that we paid a fair price for our purchase and that our neighbor down the street didn't buy the same item $10 cheaper.

I have loved being in the appliance business. I organized our local NARDA group in Denver. In January, I was elected to the national board of NARDA. I was on the Mart magazine dealer advisory board for a year and a half. My roots in the appliance business are very deep, and I sincerely feel that if we had had the quality stabilization bill a year ago, I would still be in the appliance business. My reason for appearing here today is to plead for the passage of this bill so that other retailers won't be faced with the sad decision I had to make.

Soybean Research in Peoria, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, soybeans have the lowest investment in research per dollar of crop value of all the 10 most valuable cash crops in our country. Testimony this year during the hearings on the Agriculture appropriation bill indicated that there are only 21 scientists in the soybean production research battalion spearheading the effort for the USDA. Each scientist is defending $74 million worth of our $1½ billion soybean crop. The USDA finds it difficult to launch a campaign of offense with the manpower presently on the firing line. Having the responsibility to help the USDA hold its own with a limited task force, is the Northern Regional Research Laboratory at Peoria, Ill. Under unanimous consent I include an article by Director F. R. Senti appearing in the September issue of Soybean Digest. The article follows:

SOYBEAN UTILIZATION RESEARCH AT THE NORTHERN REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORY [1]

(By F. R. Senti, Director, Northern Regional Research Laboratory,[1] Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Peoria, Ill.)

Research has contributed importantly to the rapid growth of the soybean crop and undoubtedly will continue to do so. One aspect of soybean research is the utilization research which has been conducted mainly in the laboratories of industrial processors and the Federal Government. It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to discuss with the American Soybean Association the Government's utilization program on soybeans which is centered at the Peoria Laboratory.

In planning utilization research directed toward increasing the use of soybeans, consideration must be given to trends and demands in present markets as clues for potential outlets and new opportunities. The interchangeability of fats and oils for both food and nonfood uses is affected by developments in technology. Guides for the future lie in analyzing past experiences and in estimating the rates of which social and technological changes and practices are likely to take place. Now let us examine some of these trends and the leads they offer for use research.

UTILIZATION TRENDS—PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The trend in disposition of whole soybeans over the past decade is shown in figure 1 (not printed). The domestic crush has doubled, and we have turned more and more to exporting beans to dispose of the crop. During the current crop year, 25 percent of the beans are being exported. Let us examine these two outlets—domestic crush and exports—in more detail for trends.

Domestic crush

For the current soybean crop and marketing year, extending from October 1, 1962, to September 30, 1963, the estimated domestic crush is 470 million bushels—a new record. This crush will produce an estimated 5 billion pounds of soybean oil and 11 million tons of soybean meal.

Let us now turn to the disposition of 5 billion pounds of soybean oil. What are the trends in utilization? Can research do anything to improve soybean oil for present and potential uses?

The total food fat consumed domestically last year was about 8.8 billion pounds. This total includes butter, lard, shortening, margarine, and cooking and salad oils. This amount averages 45 to 46 pounds per person. With the exception of war years, this average has remained constant for the past 20 to 25 years. Therefore, we have no reason to believe that per capita consumption of food fat will increase. This constancy does not mean that shifts from one type of fat to another may not be expected.

Roughly, a little over a billion pounds of soybean oil are consumed annually in the production of each of the following: (1) shortening, (2) margarine, and (3) cooking or salad oils and related products in which liquid edible oils are used. About 7 percent of the domestic consumption of soybean oil finds its way into industrial products. The remainder of the 5 billion pounds from the crush, which amounts to about 1.5 billion pounds, is exported.

---

[1] Also known as the Northern Utilization Research and Development Division.

The trend for shortening over the past 16 years is shown in figure 2 (not printed). Soybean oil currently accounts for 50 percent as it did in 1946. Per capita consumption has increased from 10.2 to 13.4 pounds over the same period. But changes in the composition of shortening have occurred over this period. For example, more lard and beef fat and less hydrogenated cottonseed oil are now used. However, the proportion of soybean oil used in the manufacture of shortening has been rather constant for about 15 years, and no major research problems are apparent. Because the chemistry of hydrogenating vegetable oils is not well understood, some scientists believe that basic studies are needed to provide better control of plasticity, textures, and functional properties of shortening. The Southern Regional Research Laboratory at New Orleans is conducting such studies on cottonseed oil. The results of these studies are being followed closely by industry for possible utility with either cottonseed or soybean oils.

Withdrawal of restrictions on the sale of colored margarine has been a major factor leading to increased per capita consumption from 3.9 pounds in 1946 to 9.3 in 1962; however, per capita consumption has remained constant over the past 4 years. Figure 3 (not printed) showsthe trends in vegetable oils used for margarine production over the past 16 years. Production has tripled. Soybean oil has dominated the picture for the past 10 years, accounting for about three-fourths of the oil used. Corn oil has replaced some hydrogenated cottonseed oil during the past 3 or 4 years. The use of corn oil in margarine reflects interest generated by advertising the merits of polyunsaturated fats in the diet.

Corn oil is incorporated into margarine by blending liquid oil with solid fat to obtain properties desired for a table spread. This process preserves more of the polyunsaturated fatty acids of the original oils than does the conventional process of partial hydrogenation of the oil to obtain the desired plasticity. If consumer demand for additional polyunsaturates in margarine continues to increase, soybean oil can supply the need. In Europe, a substantial amount of unhydrogenated soybean oil is being used in margarine.

The third major classification of food fats is referred to as cooking and salad oils. These liquid oils are used in the production of prepared foods such as mayonnaise and salad dressings, mellorine, potato chips, and french fries; they are also sold for household use. As is shown in table 1, soybean oil dominates the salad oil field. More than 2 billion pounds of cooking and salad oils were produced in 1961, of which soybean oil accounted for about one-half.

TABLE 1.—*Source of cooking and salad oils, 1961*

[Million pounds]

	Soybean oil	Cottonseed oil	Other oils	Total
Mayonnaise and salad dressings	470	190	10	670
Total cooking and salad oils	1,001	816	[1] 288	2,105

[1] Corn oil, 210; peanut oil, 76; other oils, 2.

Reliable statistics on total production of cooking and salad oils for 1962 are not yet available. However, indications are that an increase of about 4 percent was achieved, which was furnished by soybean oil. Over the past 15 years, per capita consumption of these liquid edible oils has doubled—from 6 to 12 pounds. The trend is for more liquid oil in the diet, both in Europe and in the United States.

Soybean oil has attained a leading position as a salad oil because of diligent research over the past 20 years resulting in improved flavor stability. Intensive research directed toward producing a superior cooking oil from soybean oil is presently underway at the Northern Laboratory and in industrial laboratories.

Industrial uses of soybean oil are shown in table 2. Although increased consumption in this area over the past decade has not kept up with population increase, the volume used in 1960 was 3½ times that used in 1940. The lack of greatly increased industrial use during the past 10 years does not reflect inactivity or want of success in research. Because of research, consumption in end-use products is not static.

TABLE 2.—*Domestic nonfood use of soybean oil*[1] *(million pounds), year ending Sept. 30, 1962*

Paint and varnish	88
Resins and plastics	74
Other industrial use[2]	198
Total	360

[1] Fats and Oils Situation, USDA, January 1963.

[2] Includes chemicals, plasticizers, detergents, methylated foods for feed, dimer and trimer acids, and lubricants.

Traditional outlets have been displaced by synthetics; for example, in the past decade use of oils and fats in soap has been reduced by one-half due to synthetic detergents, and drying oils have lost markets to petrochemical products. Tall oil has displaced appreciable amounts of soybean oil in alkyd resins. On the other hand, 45 million pounds of epoxidized soybean oil are now produced for use as plasticizers, and about 10 million pounds of methylated soybean oil foots now find nonfood outlets; both of these developments stemmed from USDA utilization research. Without such research, soybean oil would undoubtedly be replaced more extensively by petrochemicals, which are the subject of much aggressive research.

The increasing importance of exports for disposing of soybean oil from our domestic crush is apparent from figure 4 (not printed). Total exports have about doubled in the past 5 years; the actual volume going for dollars has tripled, indicating success in developing markets through Public Law 480 operations. During the past 5 years, carryover on October 1 has increased from about 300 to 600 million pounds. Consequently, we are faced with the problem of finding increased outlets for soybean oil if we are to continue to grow more soybeans.

Of the 11 million tons of soybean meal produced by the 1962–63 crush, about 9.4 million tons will be used in feeds; 1.3 million tons will be exported; and about 0.3 million tons will find domestic nonfeed outlets, such as production of isolated soybean protein, soy flour, and plywood glue.

The trend is for soybean meal to become an increasingly important commercial component of the crop. High-protein concentrates are needed by the domestic mixed-feed industry for its current annual production of 44 million tons of feeds. Predictions have been made for this production to reach 70 million tons by 1975 to satisfy domestic livestock and poultry industries. About 60 percent of the mixed feed now goes to poultry, largely for the annual production of 1.8 billion broilers and 100 million turkey poults. Increasing requirements for high-protein feeds to produce meat for our expanding population will probably come largely from soybean meal.

Increasing outlets for soybean meal abroad, especially in Western Europe, are anticipated. Mixed-feed production in Western Europe amounted to 30 million tons in 1962 and is expected to reach 40 million in 1965.

Important to the production of soybean meal of maximum feed value is the development of more complete information on the many still unidentified chemical components of soybean meal. Although present in small amounts, some of these components have important nutritional effects.

Exported soybeans

The American farmer produces more than 60 percent of the world supply of soybeans. By his efficient scientific and mechanized agricultural practices, he has demonstrated his ability to produce soybeans at a price competitive with world markets. Increased consumption of soybeans in the United States is expected to parallel population increase. Any greatly increased production must find markets abroad.

Table 3 indicates the destination of exported soybeans. Increased European imports satisfy the need for more feed protein and edible oil. Imports of 90 million bushels in 1962 are expected to reach 125 million by 1965. Japan is also developing a mixed-feed industry that is expected to take more and more soybeans. Also, additional soybeans are needed in Japan for traditional soybean foods to satisfy needs for dietary proteins.

TABLE 3.—*Destination of exported soybeans*

[Million bushels]

	Year ending Sept. 30— 1958	1963
Canada, Mexico	11	29
Europe	38	92
Asia	[1] 37	[2] 53
Other	0	1
Total	86	175

[1] Japan, 27.

[2] Japan, 42.

Collaborative studies with Japanese scientists working at the Northern Laboratory have defined the varieties and specifications for U.S. soybeans best suited for the production of traditional Japanese foods such as miso, tofu, and shoyl. Our southern varieties, Lee and Jackson, proved to be equivalent to Japanese beans for making tofu. A new process was developed for making miso, which allowed the use of Hawkeye and Harosoy, and possibly other varieties. These findings have been followed up with Public Law 480 projects in Japan on the production of miso, tofu, and shoyu from U.S. soybeans. Recent data from the shoyu project appear to have convinced the Japanese scientists that higher yields of soy sauce are obtained from U.S. soybeans than from Japanese beans. These researches have resulted in increased exports to Japan.

Another opportunity for increasing soybean markets arises from the world shortage of food protein. Research has an important role to play in the introduction of soybeans into these markets by developing soy products suited to the needs and dietary habits of protein-deficient countries. A vital need in many developing countries is protein foods for infants and children.

Cooperative studies between the Northern Laboratory, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and industry have resulted in development of a simple, direct process for converting raw whole soybeans to a nutritious protein-rich food. The process lends itself to the development of a compact truck- or trailer-mounted plant to provide food for children in developing countries where large-scale industry is not yet feasible. Experimental lots involving several tons have been produced. The product has passed laboratory and animal feeding tests in this country, and UNICEF has made shipments to Taiwan and Indonesia for testing in child-feeding programs.

NRRL RESEARCH PROGRAM

Our utilization research program is designed to show the way to wider outlets and more profitable markets for farm products.

The farmer is not organized to carry out modern scientific research to maintain and create new markets for his products. The soybean industry cannot be expected to pick up the tab for the total expense of basic and exploratory research needed to provide a background of knowledge and new concepts for future applied research yielding new products and new processes. It is in this field of basic and exploratory research that our efforts support the farmer in providing necessary information for industrial exploitation of his raw material. We also seek and obtain industry cooperation in evaluating potential new products and processes discovered by our research, and we furnish basic information needed for increased use of commodities produced by the farmer. The importance of these functions is evidenced by the visits of over 1,000 technical people from industry who consult with our scientists at the Northern Laboratory each year. Included are many foreign scientists interested in the use of U.S. soybeans.

The Northern Laboratory has been in operation for 22 years. During this time, our scientists have published over 300 articles in scientific journals, books, and Government bulletins and have been granted 80 public service patents on work directed toward the increased utilization of soybeans. This work has resulted in the development of new uses and new processes adopted by industry. Perhaps the greatest contributions, and the least recognized, are the additions that have been made, to the fundamental knowledge of composition, physical properties, chemical reactions, and the interactions of soybean constituents. This knowledge has been made available and used by workers everywhere—research scientists, manufacturers, and processors. This basic information has been the foundation for achievements in quality maintenance, quality improvements, and the development of new processes and products.

Our current research program is designed to exploit the utilization trends that we have already noted. We seek to discover methods of improving the flavor stability of soybean cooking oil; to develop new industrial products for nonfood uses for both the oil and meal; to find ways and means of improving the quality of soybean meal and flour; to develop new high-protein food products for use in foreign countries; and to supply needed basic information to the industry that will lead to increased use of soybean products. I can only briefly outline the ramifications of this program here.

Edible oil

Soybean oil differs from other edible oils in that it contains about 7 percent of linolenic acid, which is more readily oxidized by exposure to air than the other commonly occurring fatty acids found in soybean oil and other vegetable oils. Previous work at the Northern Laboratory has shown that this linolenic acid component is the major precursor of off-flavors in soybean oil. We have also shown that, by proper processing, a high-grade salad oil can be made from soybean oil. However, difficulty in off-flavors is sometimes encountered when it is used as a cooking oil. A more stable cooking oil is desired for both domestic and export markets. As already noted, the trend is for more liquid oil in the diet.

One accepted method for improving the flavor stability of soybean oil is hydrogenation. Hydrogenated soybean oil gives excellent shortening and margarine. Hydrogenation removes unsaturated or double bonds from the oil to give a more saturated fat. Present catalysts used for adding hydrogen to double bonds are not selective, i.e., hydrogen is added indiscriminately to double bonds throughout the oil—to linoleic and oleic acids as well as to linolenic acid. The problem is to find a catalyst and conditions for selectively hydrogenating one of the three double bonds in the linolenic acid component. Success in this endeavor should provide an economical method of increasing the versatility of soybean oil for food use.

Nonfood uses of soybean oil

Whereas increased food uses of the oil might be expected to parallel population growth, increased industrial use is not so restricted. In 1960 the rapidly growing organic chemicals industry produced 15 billion pounds of products derived from organic-based raw materials. Opportunities for increased use of soybean oil, our most plentiful and most economical vegetable oil, by this industry depends on research to devise nontraditional products that will fulfill needs at competitive prices. That such uses can be created is demonstrated by developments over the past decade.

Current research is concentrated on products obtained by treatment of soybean oil with ozone. We call these products aldehyde oils. One aldehyde oil product shows particular promise as a component of plasticizers and of novel-type resins having unusually strong adhesive strength. Estimates made for us by a research institute are that consumption of this new soybean oil product could reach 50 million pounds in 3 to 5 years.

Other exploratory research is directed toward the reaction of soybean oil and its fatty acids with petrochemicals to produce new organic chemicals. This work involves new chemical reactions discovered by our scientists. The products they obtained are new and have properties that should be of industrial interest.

Meal and protein research

An estimated 300,000 tons of soybean meal and flour, 3 percent of the total domestic use, finds nonfeed outlets in the manufacture of isolated soybean protein, in plywood glues, in asphalt emulsions, and in the production of soy flour. This meal and flour must be processed differently than meal used for feed. For example, less heat treatment is required to give a dispersible product. Engineers at the Northern Laboratory have developed a flash desolventizer especially useful in preparing this type of meal. The flash desolventizer is now being used commercially both here and abroad.

Raw soybean meal is not a good feed. It must be properly heat treated to develop optimal nutritional value. A great deal of research has been done at the Northern Laboratory and elsewhere to isolate and identify the constituents in raw meal that cause the need for heat treatment. The purpose of this work is to define the problem in terms that will allow the processor to control his product more efficiently and to produce meal of optimum feed value at minimum cost. These basic studies are continuing.

The use of full-fat soy flour for the development of foreign-type foods is attractive because of its price and potentially high nutritional value. In addition to the problems involved in heat-treating raw soybean meal to produce livestock and poultry feeds of optimum nutritional value, other problems arise in food applications. Research is needed to develop proper functional properties such as solubilities, viscosities, texture, color, flavor, stability, and appearance for each food. Because of the potential for increasing exports of soybeans for use in needed high-protein foods, we have recently increased our efforts on the development of such foods.

Fiscal year 1963 research expansion

Of the increased funds appropriated for utilization research in fiscal year 1963, $350,000 was assigned to soybeans. Presumably this increase will be maintained for subsequent years. These increased funds have been used to initiate projects on the following problems:

1. Studies on increasing the flavor stability of edible soybean oil were expanded by contracts with two universities and by an in-house project. The two contracts allowed us to enlist the aid of outstanding scientists in our attempts to devise a new catalyst that would remove the unstable component (linolenic acid) from soybean oil by selectively hydrogenating it. The in-house project involves studies aimed at the selective removal of unstable component by processes other than selective hydrogenation. Several processes are being considered.

2. In-house studies on high-protein soy food products to increase the use of soybeans in foreign markets were expanded. The objective in this project is to explore methods for improving the flavor, texture, color, and other edible qualities and the nutritive value of soybeans, soy flour, isolated soy protein, soy protein concentrates, soy milk, soy curd, and other soy products for producing low-cost nutritious foods for use in foreign countries.

3. The fifth project involves contract work with Dr. A. E. Rheineck at North Dakota State University to investigate the preparation and properties of paints from the new aldehydic oils obtained by treating soybean or linseed oil with ozone. Our scientists at the Northern Laboratory have discovered how to make aldehyde oils. We are now seeking uses for this new project.

SUMMARY

Emphasis is placed on basic research directed toward the development of a more stable cooking oil from soybean oil to satisfy anticipated demands for more liquid oil in diets at home and abroad.

Research is conducted on the chemical conversion of soybean oil to industrial products from the viewpoint of meeting competition with synthetics by creating new products and by reducing cost or improving efficiency of traditional products.

Compositional and processing studies are carried out on soybean meal and its products for the purpose of improving nutritional value of feeds as well as its acceptance in foriegn-type foods.

Statement of Railroad Pension Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the railroad pension conference:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1963.

Members of the 88th Congress,
Senate and House Office Buildings,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: You will soon be deliberating on legislation designed to increase the amount of railroad retirement levied on management and their employees.

The Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) claims a tax boost is necessary because the actuaries "figure the retirement system is underfinanced by about $77 million a year." This deficit, the Board declares, "is of a long-range actuarial character." (Labor Aug. 3, 1963.)

The RRB also admits—"There will be sufficient funds available to pay all benefits for the next several decades, even though

this long-range deficit is not removed." (Labor Aug. 3, 1963.)

The railroad pension conference is not opposed to the principle of taxing incomes over $4,800 a year. The cost of retirement benefits for our senior citizens is a burden upon all of us. And, one should carry the burden in proportion to his ability to pay.

In view of the cause of the "long-range" deficit in our retirement account, the question is: Whose taxes should be increased to meet this deficit?

In this particular instance, the railroad pension conference protests the proposal to increase the retirement tax levied on the worker. However, were Congress to enact H.R. 1830, introduced by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the House Labor Committee, which provides optional retirement at age 60, plus increasing the average retirement annuity from $134 monthly to $200 monthly, then, we would not be opposed to the proposed retirement tax boost.

The deficit in question is a management-created-deficit, therefore, in all fairness to the employees, any tax increase needed to offset this management-created-deficit should be paid entirely by the carriers.

As the RRB has said, the deficit is—"due chiefly to the drop in railroad employment," or in other words, from management's policy to reduce the work force for profit.

Rail workers from all crafts feel that the carriers can well afford to pay the entire cost to offset the so-called long-range deficit from the millions of dollars they will be saving in wages from those laid off due to the rules changes.

PRESENT FINANCING OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BASICALLY WRONG

The time has come when Congress should enact legislation that will provide for the refinancing of our social railroad retirement system. The Railroad Pension Conference proposes the following:

1. Finance railroad retirement from the general revenues.

2. Management to pay twice the amount of taxation as paid by the employee.

At present our publicly administered social railroad retirement system is financed as though it were a private insurance which is in business for profit, and which in turn needs high premiums (taxes) and huge reserves.

Railroad retirement is financed on a level cost basis, that is—"If payrolls are taxed at a fixed rate, and the interest accumulated on taxes until benefits are due, our retirement fund will either grow enormously, or become bankrupt, depending on the tax rate and the scale of benefits. If the tax rate is set just right, at a certain time in the future, tax collections and interest income will exactly match benefit payments, and will continue to do so indefinitely."

Our retirement tax dollar is split three ways—to pay for—those who retired prior to 1937, and those who became eligible for retirement in 1937, but paid nothing into the fund; (2) present benefits; (3) to build a reserve fund for investment purposes to help maintain the retirement system for future employees, (those yet to be born).

Level cost financing has become too costly for the employee, and is standing in the way of improved benefits. We now pay the astronomical tax of 7¼ percent on the first $4,800 of our yearly wage. In January 1965 the tax will jump to 8 percent, and in January 1966 to 8½ percent, and in January 1969 to 9 percent. And it will probably continue to rise as management abolishes more jobs.

It is now evident we need to depart from level cost financing and replace it with complete financing from the general revenues.

Financing from the general revenues is socially justified. We are not dealing with private insurance which must proportion benefits to premiums. Private insurance is not concerned with social responsibilities; it cannot without jeopardizing its solvency. Social insurance, however, involves Government policy, operating on the whole of society. Social insurance can adjust policies and benefits as social needs require.

Financing from the general revenues is not to imply we are to cease to pay a retirement tax. As already stated above, the Railroad Pension Conference is "not opposed to taxing incomes over $4,800 a year." But we do say that management should pay twice the amount of taxation as paid by the employee which will lead to a reduction in the amount of tax as paid by the overtaxed employees.

The United States is far behind other nations in financing retirement. Some nations paying part of their retirement systems include: Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Nationalist China, Léopoldville, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador (40 percent), West Germany, Hungary, Iceland (52 percent), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg (50 percent), New Zealand (annual deficit), Norway, Peru, South Africa (all), United Kingdom, Uruguay, Sweden (70 percent) (Social Security Programs Throughout the World, 1961," published by the Social Security Administration). Many of these countries are receiving considerable financial aid from Uncle Sam. While we seem willing to help them in financing retirement, we do not do it for ourselves.

TWO-TO-ONE TAXATION IS JUSTIFIED

Two-to-one taxation (mangement to pay twice the amount of taxation as paid by the employee) was at one time law when Congress enacted the 1934–35 Railroad Retirement Acts. (50–50 taxation was forced on us by management in 1937.)

The authors of the 1934–35 Railroad Retirement Acts, and Congress at that time, clearly forsaw the wisdom, the need, and the justification for 2-to-1 tax payment. Especially so, since our retirement system took over those on the carriers' private pension rolls, without any extra contribution from management. Also, the carriers failed to contribute anything for those who immediately went on pension when the law was enacted. This caused the original debt, known as the unfunded liability. Thus the employee was forced to pay one half of the cost of this management-created liability.

The gross unfairness of the 1937 agreement was thoroughly exposed by the late U.S. Congressman "Bob" Crosser, the father of railroad retirement. And the brotherhoods have also branded this agreement as a "tough bargain."

The late Congressman Crosser said—the carriers—"did not arrange for an extra contribution on their part as was done by all major industries and the Federal Government to its own employees. Since the obligation of these two obligations (mentioned above—Ed.) are those of the railroads only, they should have been borne by the railroads themselves, but railroad employees have paid, and are continuing to pay one-half of these obligations." This has cost the employees millions of dollars which they should not of had to pay.

UNFUNDED LIABILITY

Under the present setup, only the "interest" due yearly is paid on the unfunded liability—on a 50–50 basis between management and the employee. All future employees (even those yet unborn) are obligated to pay the yearly "interest" due on this management-created liability. Theorectically speaking, were there no unfunded liability, the U.S. Treasury would be paying us 3 percent interest on some $8 billion (the reserve fund in the Railroad Retirement Account) instead of some $4 billion.

Two-to-one tax payment will free the employees from the burden of paying 50 percent of management's obligation to their former employees, as it would be possible to reduce the amount of tax paid by the employee.

Equal taxation is not only grossly unfair, as the late Congressman Crosser has noted, but it has no relationship to today's work force. In 1950, some 1.2 million employees were paying toward the cost of our retirement system. Today, about 700,000 are financing benefits for some 900,000 beneficiaries. And within a few short years, beneficiaries will outnumber the taxpayers by 2 to 1.

Industries in many nations pay a higher retirement tax than is paid by the employee—some of these nations are: Argentina, Ceylon, Nationalist China, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guinea, employer pays all, Iran, Iraq, Hungary, Italy, Israel, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, employer pays 75 percent, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, and Uruguay.

REPEAL SECTION 308, PUBLIC LAW 86–28

Rail workers from all crafts urge Congress to prohibit the loaning of funds from our Railroad Retirement Account to pay management's unemployment bill.

Thousands of railroaders through lodges, resolutions, and letters to Congress, have urged the repeal of section 308 since its enactment in May 1959.

The payment of unemployment benefits is the sole responsibility of management, it is in no way an employee obligation.

Management now owes our retirement account over $300 million, and it will take at least 15 years to repay—providing—there is a tax boost, and that unemployment "doesn't increase further during that time" according to the Railroad Retirement Board. (Wall Street Journal, May 1, 1963.)

To alleviate the deficit in the Unemployment Insurance Account, the Railroad Retirement Board has proposed a small tax boost on management, from 4 to 4¼ percent of each employee's monthly wage.

This piddling tax boost is insufficient and will not absorb the deficit in the Unemployment Insurance Account, as more layoffs are coming when the rules changes become effective.

The railroad pension conference urges Congress to increase management's unemployment insurance tax to 6 percent on the first $450 of each employee's monthly compensation.

The deficit in the Unemployment Insurance Account was chiefly due to Congress reducing the tax levied on management from 3 to one-half of 1 percent, in 1948. Mr. A. E. Lyon, labor representative on the retirement board—stated—"The estimates made then were bad estimates." (Wall Street Journal, May 1, 1963.)

In 1948, the Railroad Retirement Board protested reducing the unemployment tax levied on the carriers. They stated—"the 3 percent tax should continue in effect rather than let the excess fund go to the employers in the way of a reward to which they are not entitled, that excess should be used where possible to bring about more substantial benefits." (Mr. Schreiber, to the Senate Labor Committee, May 19, 1948.)

The retirement board also testified—"it would be a serious backward step in the development of railroad social insurance—a step for which there is no justification in view of the needs of railroad employees or the condition of the railroad industry. It would be contrary to modern trends in social security." The railroad pension conference fully supported the testimony of the retirement board in 1948.

CONGRESS SHOULD ENACT H.R. 1830

In view of the above circumstances mentioned, and the plight of those whose jobs will be abolished by the work rules, we urge

Congress to enact the Powell bill, H.R. 1830. Optional retirement at age 60 is needed to improve the job opportunities of the younger employees, as well as an insurance protection to the senior employees who face permanent unemployment from the rules changes.

We also urge the 88th Congress to enact legislation that will finance railroad retirement from the general revenues, as well as 2 to 1 taxation provided by the 1934–35 Railroad Retirement Acts.

Respectfully submitted,

CLARENCE B. CARTER,
National Secretary Railroad Pension Conference.

University of Oklahoma Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that 15 books published by the University of Oklahoma Press will be included in the special section of 1,780 books recently chosen for the White House Library. For Oklahoma's well-known publishing house on the campus at Norman, Okla., this recognition is one of the strongest it has enjoyed since its founding 35 years ago.

All Oklahomans are proud of the remarkable growth and achievements of the University of Oklahoma Press. The press has grown from a 5-book-a-year publishing house in 1928 to a book every 5 days, or 70 editions, new and reprint, each year. The annual offerings from Norman, Okla.—all of them of scholarly but interesting character—range from Xenophon's "Anabasis" in classical Greek to how to drill an oil well, with many stops in between for significant volumes on the American West, Indian history, and early American exploration.

The University of Oklahoma Press is the child of its parent university, which in September celebrated its 71st birthday. The university's fourth president, William Bennett Bizzell, declared in his inaugural address in 1925 that he believed it the duty of a first-class institution of higher learning to publish the results of its research under its own auspices. Three years later he put his convictions to work by hiring Joseph A. Brandt, the young city editor of the Tulsa Tribune, to do something new and significant with the print shop on the Norman campus.

The Press' first book was published in the spring of 1929, a volume of folklore entitled "Folksay," edited by B. A. Botkin, then a member of the English faculty. By 1932, the press had its first big success with the selection of "Wah'-Kon-Tah," an account of the Osage Tribe of Indians, written by John Joseph Mathews of Pawhuska, himself a member of the tribe.

Three years later, Paul B. Sears, then of the botany faculty at Norman, rocked the Nation with his account of man, the land, and dust storms in the book, "Deserts on the March," which went through many printings and is still one of the most active books in the press list, 28 years later.

To a retired county agent of Elyria, Ohio, however, the University of Oklahoma Press owes much of its present stature. He had sent his short manuscript, passed over by many other publishers, to the second and present director of the press, former Rhodes Scholar, Savoie Lottinville, in the spring of 1943. Lottinville published it as "Plowman's Folly" on July 5, 1943, and it has sold more than 350,000 copies in the years since. It is still very much in print. It has literally changed the face of North America by reducing the emphasis on plowing of land and substituting, instead, disk harrowing.

Under Lottinville's leadership, the University of Oklahoma Press has achieved worldwide distinction as a quality publishing house. The Press is now probably as well known in London, Cairo, and Manila as it is in Oklahoma City and San Francisco. Historically or literarily, its books cover almost all regions of the globe, drawing scholarly authors from everywhere. Its distribution machinery includes London and Amsterdam. Through its European distributors, W. S. Hall & Co., its books reach Europe. Through Feffer and Simons, University of Oklahoma Press publications may be found in Asia, Africa, Australia, and South America. It has a New York advertising agency.

The recent range of the Press' interests is reflected in the Centers of Civilization series, which already include 10 volumes and will ultimately extend to 150. Each of these small volumes deals with a great city at a particular point of its flowering. The enthusiastic response of countries as far away as Iran, Morocco, Æire, Greece, Italy, Turkey, Syria, and France, all of which are represented in the series, suggests an international influence from Norman, Okla., which is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that Oklahoma is still comparatively young culturally.

The Civilization of the American Indian series remains perhaps the greatest and most representative of the Press' achievements since its founding. The series now numbers 70 volumes with at least 3 new volumes coming out each year, each one eagerly sought throughout the United States and overseas. Oklahoma's own Cheyennes, Araphoes, Kiowas, Apaches, Comanches, Osages, Cherokees, and many others of its historic 67 tribes figure in this continuing publishing program.

For the whole of the Trans-Mississippi West, the Press' American Exploration and Travel series and Western Frontier Library, the one numbering 40 volumes, the other 23, are of high interest. Hardly a State west of Missouri is not represented in either or both of these series. At least two books are published in each series during the year.

During the last 3 years, the Press' growing publications program in the Greek and Latin classics has won the attention of scholars in many parts of the world. The effort in this direction is dictated by Director Lottinville's aphorism that there is not an audience for books, but scores of audiences for books of particular interest to each. Lottinville is convinced that a healthy development in scholarly publishing dictates the constant reexamination of the extent and tastes of these audiences.

It has been a policy of the University of Oklahoma Press for many years to publish at least one book each season in each of the fields of literary criticism, music, art, and the theater—subjects of high cultural significance, and again all the more significant for coming from Oklahoma, which won its spurs as a State only before Hawaii, Alaska, Arizona, and New Mexico.

History, which has made Americans as much aware of their national past as almost any other people, because of the intensive job that has been done on it in the past quarter of a century, has greatly enlivened not only the story of Oklahoma, to which the Press has contributed no fewer than 80 volumes, but the story of such neighboring States as Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Texas, Arkansas, and Colorado—all of which are represented in the Press list either by full-statured histories in 1 volume or by multivolumed projects on various aspects of State history.

"Oklahoma has a record of being a good neighbor," says Director Lottinville. "But our responsibility extends even further than that: It asks that we develop and share the history of our neighboring States, whose progress is linked indissolubly with out own. Perhaps we can grow together to even greater heights in the years to come."

Mr. Speaker, I salute the University of Oklahoma Press and its distinguished director, Mr. Savoie Lottinville, who is largely responsible for much of its success.

House Foreign Aid Action: Slash With a Meat Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 23, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, since the foreign aid authorization bill was imprudently butchered in the House a number of highly respected and responsible voices have warned that antiaid proponents went too far.

Another warning is sounded in the September 15 issue of Forbes, a national magazine which, I believe, accurately reflects the thinking of a large segment of our business community.

In calling the House action and the expected decimation by the Foreign Aid Appropriations Subcommittee "slashes with a meat ax," Publisher and Editor-in-Chief Malcolm Forbes asks, "What has happened?"

Unfortunately for the national weal—

He points out—

it looks more as though the Republican leadership is determined to exploit the popular temper on a purely partisan basis for the first time since Harding, former Senator Gerald P. Nye, and Pearl Harbor.

A story which appeared in the New York Times shortly after the House vote also echoed the President's charge that the action was "shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan."

It was the Republican leadership's carefully planned attack on the authorization measure—

Observed the Times—

that abruptly ended the bipartisan approach to foreign policy questions begun under the late Republican Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg in the immediate postwar period and continued through Democratic and Republican administrations.

Ever since the beginning of foreign aid it has been called the "keystone" of American foreign policy. And for just as long it has been placed above partisan considerations. In both House and Senate, members of both parties have voted against it. But never has the leadership of a party in either branch led an attack on it.

Gen. Lucius Clay, a Republican and prominent advocate of less foreign aid spending, has cautioned that—

The drastic cut * * * made in the House of Representatives could badly damage the United States position and free world security if allowed to stand.

The foreign aid bill submitted to the House represented a constructive approach to our foreign aid program, was deserving of broad bipartisan support and went as far as practical or desirable at this time. Severe cuts in this program are not in the best interests of the United States.

I am hopeful that as the American people review the foreign aid slash and ponder its dire consequences they will come to the same conclusion reached by the President:

No party or group should call for a dynamic foreign policy and then seek to cripple this program. * * * However tired we may get of this program, our adversaries are not tired. I don't think this country is tired and the cause of freedom should certainly not be fatigued.

And, as does Mr. Forbes, I share the hope that a majority of the Congress will resist the temptation to gut the program by cutting it to the extent Congressman PASSMAN desires. They are to be applauded for reducing but will not be applauded for wrecking.

The full Forbes editorial follows:

CUT OR SLASH FOREIGN AID?

When Gen. Lucius Clay's Kennedy-appointed committee studying foreign-aid recommended reducing this year's appropriations from $4.5 billion to $4.1 billion, it was received with almost unanimous enthusiasm. Traditionally bitter opponents of any aid whatsoever applauded the recommendation of a cut. Those who believe in the soundness of foreign aid applauded this sensible attempt to knock out questionable undertakings which were jeopardizing congressional support for the overall program.

In subsequent hearings, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lopped off $380 million. Amendments from the floor before House passage knocked out $585 million on top of some $430 million cut by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. And it is widely predicted that Congressman OTTO PASSMAN'S House Foreign Aid Subcommittee will knock off $700 million more.

The Clay Committee recommendations were for a cut. The actions of the Senate committee can be considered a further cut. The floor vote and the anticipated Passman action are not cuts. They are really slashes with a meat axe.

What has happened?

It has always taken wisdom, foresight, leadership, hardsell, and political courage to support our huge foreign aid effort. But the program in past years has been sustained by its evidence overall success. The economic recovery and prosperity of Western Europe demonstrated it. The fact that, with one notable exception, communism has not been able to subvert through internal machination other lands friendly to the West or "neutral" in the struggle between freedom and slavery demonstrated it.

But as our Allies have prospered, they have been unwilling to lend much of a hand in the succoring of newly independent, undeveloped lands. Despite growing free world prosperity the amounts asked for foreign aid have not diminished. The recipients have often come to look on dollars from Uncle Sam as their due, and these presumptions have become increasingly irritating to overtaxed Americans.

One irritating example: Algeria's Ben Bella announcing that his support of Castro was "costing" him multiple millions of American aid. He gets "only" $1.8 million in aid and around 300,000 tons of food a year. Another: the Indian cabinet member who declared that if we don't give them their $1.5 billion steel plant, they'll build it themselves. Or Madam Nhu in Vietnam in effect telling us to go jump in the lake despite the shedding of American blood along with the spending of $3 billion in support of Vietnamese independence.

The combination of ever-increasing amounts requested for foreign aid; some inevitable waste and corruption in the spending of it; the presumption and gall on the part of a number of condescending accepters of it; plus our every more dangerous gold imbalance, have all built up to the point where much of the public—hence the Congress—is fed up.

Unfortunately for the national weal, it looks more and more as though the Republican leadership is determined to exploit the popular temper on a purely partisan basis for the first time since Harding, former Senator Gerald P. Nye and Pearl Harbor.

It was indeed high time—past time—to begin cutting down on foreign aid. The Clay Committee cut was sizable. The Senate committee's recommended bill had more enormous reductions. But the action on the floor and the Passman prospects don't constitute reductions. If carried through, they would cut the program virtually in half in one fell swoop. The soundness, the pluses of this oversea investment in our own security still exist. The sudden abandonment of foreign aid support would have catastrophic consequences. I hope a majority of the Congress will resist the temptation to gut the program by cutting it to the extent Congressman Passman desires. They are to be applauded for reducing but will not be applauded for wrecking.

Foreign Aid: A Changed Procedure for a Changed Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Washington, I have met no more honest, dedicated or competent public servant than the Honorable Frank M. Coffin. As a member of this House, he served with distinction. His brillance was in evidence not only on the floor but in his service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. His service to his Nation and to the people of Maine has been inspiring. Many of us have been privileged to work closely with him. Sometime ago Mr. Coffin accepted appointment as Deputy Administrator for Operations for the Agency for International Development. This is by no means a glory post. It is an extremely demanding job, a critical and highly responsible post. There are few men in government, or out who understand the importance of, the need for or the operations of our foreign aid program so well as Mr. Coffin.

It is significant that in a year when this House has seen fit, unwisely, to curtail the funding of foreign aid, Mr. Coffin has elected to speak out in its support so intelligently and so forthrightly.

The Washington Star in its issue of Sunday, September 15, 1963, saw fit to publish excerpts of an address Mr. Coffin made recently at a Regional Foreign Policy Conference in Boston. I feel every Member of the Congress would benefit from reading his remarks and include it in the RECORD.

FOREIGN AID: A CHANGED PROCEDURE FOR A CHANGED WORLD

(NOTE.—Foreign aid is in trouble in Congress. When the bill was passed by the House in August it was cut from $4.1 billion to $3.5 billion, the severest reduction to date. Frank M. Coffin, Deputy Administrator for Operations Agency for the Agency for International Development, outlined the present status of our foreign aid in a speech at a regional foreign policy conference in Boston last Wednesday. This is an excerpt from it.)

How often have we read the sage comment of a columnist that, while he agrees with the basic policy of foreign aid, the basic problem is how it is administered. He predictably concludes that what is needed is a massive reappraisal. The last time I came across the wisdom was last week. As for Congress, it wearily assumes that it is dealing with the same program it has reviewed for 15 years.

The fact is that aid today is not what it was 10 years ago, or even 5 years ago. There is no function of Government which has been so studied and reorganized. It has passed through seven structural changes and no fewer than eight Presidential Committees. These committees, headed by such men as Gordon Gray, Nelson Rockefeller, Clarence Randall, Benjamin Fairless, the late Eric Johnston, William Draper, and—most recently—General Clay, have not essentially differed on the why, what, when, and how of aid. They have laid the basis for a national consensus on aid—one integrated organization with overall responsibility, development based on programs tailored to each country, emphasis on loans over grants, increased procurement of goods and services in the United States, meaningful concentration among countries, aid geared to self help, a broader role for private enterprise, and termination of aid when countries become able to maintain their own momentum.

Here is the record. Aid is now planned and largely administered through the Agency for International Development. The reorganization of 1961 is now completed. Planning is now done on a country rather than a project-by-project basis. Loans have in-

creased from 10 percent to 60 percent of economic aid. Loan terms, now all repayable in dollars, have hardened for a number of countries. U.S. procurement has increased from about 40 percent to over 80 percent, with aid-financed exports tripling from $600 million in 1962 to $2 billion in 1964. Military and supporting assistance have decreased by one-half.

WHERE THE MONEY GOES

As for concentration, 80 percent of economic assistance goes to 20 countries, 80 percent of military assistance goes to 10 countries. Projects and programs are increasingly tied to self-help. Investment guaranty agreements have been signed with almost 20 additional countries in the past 2 years, with guaranties themselves running a 3 times the rate of 2 years ago. A number of missions in the field have been consolidated with embassies. Procedures are being updated and simplified. At least half the missions have had an infusion of new executive leadership. Increasing use is being made of land-grant colleges, cooperatives, savings and loan associations. Instead of helping European countries, these same countries are now furnishing 40 percent of free world aid.

The irony is that at the very time when the planning and execution of aid is better than ever before, the general view is that nothing has changed in 10 years. The historic fact is the U.S. aid has steadily evolved through the past decade and a half, acquiring new tools, finishing the job in many countries, moving to new areas of concern to the United States, and developing new principles. It is now ready, given steady support from the people and the Congress, to play a major foreign policy role in the formative years of the uncommitted one-third of the globe.

EUROPEAN AID

The timing could not have been better. Development assistance will play an even more important part in terms of our leadership, respect, and influence should there be a genuine lessening of world tensions. In this we shall not be alone. The nations of Western Europe, Canada, Japan, and Oceania have also moved into this field, almost equaling our capital aid, and maintaining 14 times as many technicians abroad as we do. Their increasing participation depends on our steady support of what is becoming truly a free world aid movement.

The field will not be uncontested. Already the Sino-Soviet bloc has over 10,000 nationals abroad in aid work in over 30 countries. Even more to the point is the new efforts and incentive of Red China, which has shown its determination to extend its influence not only from Korea westerly to India and Pakistan, but even in Africa and Latin America.

At the same time, we can point to a concrete record of achievement in every part of the world where development assistance has been made available in any substantial amount.

POLITICAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Politically, we can cite two kinds of achievements. Either by generating rapid economic growth from within or by resisting aggression from without, we helped to bring about the rebirth of Europe, the survival of Greece and Turkey, the emergence of a free and prosperous Japan, the rapid building of Taiwan and Israel, and continued, if contested, independence throughout the Far East. There has been a second kind of achievement, less precise but no less real. By offering, through assistance, an alternative to either the extreme right or left, we have exerted a continuing and growing influence on development. In Africa it can be seen in the rejection of reliance on Communist economic ideology by the very nations which have experimented with it. In Latin America, we can point with hope to the dramatic reduction of juntas and dictators which has taken place over the past decade. In view of the worldwide confrontation of ways of life, it is remarkable that of the 46 nations that have won their independence since World War II, not one has elected to become a bloc satellite.

What about economic development? There are some who would say aid should frankly be used only for short-run political purposes, because real development is a hopeless task. Let's look at the record.

Of the 41 major aid receiving countries we have helped since 1945, these are the results:

Fourteen—Western Europe, Japan, Spain, and Lebanon—have not only reached a satisfactory growth rate of at least 1.5 percent for 5 successive years, but are no longer dependent on aid.

Ten more have reached this record of growth, have made progress in limiting dependence on aid, and several, such as Israel, Greece, and Taiwan, will soon be independent of external aid.

Nine more countries have attained a satisfactory growth rate but will continue to depend on substantial aid.

Only eight cannot be said to have reached a satisfactory rate of growth. Seven of these are in Latin America where aid in substantial amounts has only just began.

What about social and political progress in these countries? Does aid help or hinder? In virtually all of the 24 countries in the first two groups, democratic institutions have been strengthened or less democratic regimes have been liberalized.

We should not claim too much. The development of nations with free institutions, with the capacity to manage effectively, is a long and arduous process, with many unpredictable turns in the road. But it is clear that U.S. aid has already built a record of significant achievement.

We can look forward with satisfaction to the graduation to self-sufficiency of at least half a dozen countries. The transition from dependence on aid has started with loan terms being such as to make the element of U.S. subsidy minimal. These same nations are already beginning to assist others.

The international coordination of aid is becoming increasingly effective—through the Development Assistance Committee in Paris, the World Bank, and the International Development Association, and the consortia arrangements for such countries as Pakistan, India, Greece, and Turkey.

This very moment of time, therefore, is characterized on the one hand by the evolving competence of the U.S. aid effort, the increased efforts of our allies, and a record of demonstrable achievement, while on the other hand we see a renewed interest in the economic arena with a release of tensions, a focusing of efforts on development by the Soviet Union and its satellites, and stepped up probings, economic and military, by Red China.

Hold on to Your Hats, Here We Go Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, patriotic, hardworking American taxpayers are about to be taken for another ride. There is no way you can enjoy it, it is too serious for you to relax, but the administration is going to give us another whirl anyway. I refer to the impending visit of the Communist dictator, Tito.

The White House is prepared to give him added respectability in the eyes of the world by having him meet and talk with the President and the result of the talk will be, as usual, giving him more money to help him carry on his anti-American propaganda and support the worldwide Communist conspiracy which calls for our defeat.

It is a dizzy ride, but under the present administration, there is no way we can get off the merry-go-round, so just hold on to your hats, here we go again. This will probably continue until the American people rise up and return the Nation to a leadership with understanding of the world's problems and the courage to meet them.

The following column by Henry J. Taylor, gives some firsthand facts on this Tito, so courted by the Kennedy administration:

OCTOBER VISIT—TITO'S TOPIC—MONEY, AS USUAL

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Fresh from a fortnight kiss-kiss with Khrushchev, Yugoslavia's Tito—our coddled windbag—announces his October visit here "for talks" with President Kennedy. As usual, he will talk about money.

Tito stands somewhere between a dog and a wolf. He's cute on Monday and bites on Tuesday. And if we send this charlatan another nickel we should have our heads examined.

For 15 years Tito has parlayed his hokus-hokey-hokum into a $3.2 billion snatch—a total substantially greater than all conmen in our country might glean by selling the Brooklyn Bridge.

Tito, an avowed Communist from boyhood, and no matter what the mixup between Stalin and himself, has never had any more intention of fighting on our side than any other Communist anywhere, any time.

Are we to learn nothing from the Cuban crisis when the chips were down? Tito chose that crucial moment of October 22 to issue an immediate announcement from Belgrade, siding violently and completely with the Soviet Union.

AFTER A SLAP, MORE FUNDS

In fact, the first two European leaders we heard from were De Gaulle for us, Tito against us. Nevertheless, within a few weeks (December 2) we gave this sybarite Red another $108.3 million and our taxpayers' funds have been flowing to him ever since. Moreover, as early as his Communist career in Spain, the adder of resentment against America had sunk its fangs into Tito's tyrannical heart. I can give personal testimony to that.

Typical of the whole mess, even Tito's disguise as a warrior is an utter fraud, although his hands were as bloody as any in the world, and bloodier than any outside the Communist world. For this arrogant, Moscow-trained braggart has always been a dark-street, knife-in-the-back assassin and wirepuller—not a soldier. "Marshal" Tito, my eye.

I first saw him in Spain many years ago. Red propaganda puffed him up to us as a brave machinegunner in the Communist ranks. When I saw him he was doing his combat exclusively from a paneled office on the 10th floor of Madrid's I.T. & T. Building.

An Englishman who was with me compared him to Captain Hook in "Peter Pan," a man haunted by his doubt that he was not quite brave and, although feared by all, was himself reduced to quivers by the approach of the ticking crocodile.

Later, it was Tito in the Macedonian Mountains during the 1945 Communist attack on Greece. There, again, he was a roundheaded spider manipulating the threads from the center of his safe web while the blood of the people poured through the ancient gutters of Athens.

ON THE ROOF, "LONG LIVE TITO"

Still later, I went to the maneuvers of Tito's army on the Hungarian border, drove 2,000 miles through his Red domain and visited the semi-idle factories he put up with our money, each blaring with a neon sign on the roof: the Red star and "Tivio Tito"—"Long Live Tito." This is a land of magnificent, hard-working people, but the Red regime has made it a prison of suppressed political opponents and a sweating house for the peasants. And, in absolute contradiction to the propaganda we receive, Tito remains, of course, the most hated man in Yugoslavia.

Our continued foreign aid there is militarily ridiculous, economically unsound and morally unprincipled. All that the industrialization has accomplished is to take farmers off the land, thereby creating a perpetual food shortage, and put them in cities where they remain mostly unemployed. Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges would serve our country far better by telling our people that truth than by patting Tito on the back at the current Zagreb Industrial Fair.

Mr. Hodges is praising the wrong man—and at our taxpayers' expense.

While the hard-taxed workers of the United States labor to sustain Tito's lush living and his two-faced fraud, here is a case where U.S. foreign aid cannot only be cut, it should be eliminated entirely. Tito has only one aim: Make a sap out of the United States. When are we going to add up the score?

Chairman Mills Explains Basic Principles Behind H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the RECORD a statement released Monday, September 16, by Chairman MILLS, of the Committee on Ways and Means, explaining the intent and purpose of section 1 of H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963:

CHAIRMAN WILBUR D. MILLS, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, EXPLAINS INTENT AND PURPOSE OF SECTION 1 OF H.R. 8363, THE REVENUE ACT OF 1963

As the author of section 1 of the bill, I would like to explain its intent and purpose.

The purpose of this tax reduction and revision bill is to loosen the constraints which present Federal taxation imposes on the American economy. The results of these tax reductions and revisions will be a higher level of economic activity, fuller use of our manpower, more intensive and profitable use of our plant and equipment; and with the increases in wages, salaries, profits, consumption, and investment, there will be increases in Federal tax revenues. Increases in economic activity, in the use of our resources, in personal and business incomes, and in Federal revenues might be also realized if, instead of reducing taxes, the Congress and the administration increased expenditures of Government. In other words, there are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road. There is a difference—a vitally important difference—between them. The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government—with more labor and capital being used directly by the Government in its activities and with more labor and capital in the private sector of the economy being used to produce goods and services on Government orders. The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity—to a bigger, more prosperous, more efficient economy—with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector of the economy—in the decision of individuals to increase and diversify their private consumption and in the decisions of business concerns to increase their productive capacity—to acquire more plant and machines, to hire more labor, to expand their inventories—and to diversify and increase the efficiency of their production.

Section 1 of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy. When we, as a Nation, choose this road we are at the same time rejecting the other road, and we want it understood that we do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time.

The further meaning of section 1 of the bill is that no Government activity is to depend for its justification on the amount it contributes to the total spending of the economy, because we prefer to reduce taxes and allow individuals and business concerns in their own rights to make that contribution. On the contrary, any and all activities of the Government have to be justified on their importance in serving other essential goals of the Nation. There is no further justification for an indifferent attitude toward wasteful, inefficient Government activities, merely because they incidentally give employment—tax reduction will also create job opportunities and in lines of activity which better satisfy the character and demands of the people for an enriched life. There is no more justification for half-hearted efforts or outright failure to eliminate Government programs that have outlived their usefulness just because they also contribute to the total spending stream of the economy—that contribution will be better realized by increasing the purchasing power of consumers and investors through tax reduction. Finally, there is no further occasion for using the additional revenues which will be generated by the expansion of the economy as a result of tax reduction and revision to finance additional investment expenditures, solely because those additional expenditures might add further to expansion of economic activity. If such additional expansion is desired or needed, tax reduction will achieve it just as surely and through vigorous and progressive forces of the private sectors of the economy.

Let me emphasize the last point. Section 1 of the bill announces very clearly that we are not rejecting a balance in the budget as the guiding criterion for management of the finances of the Federal Government. We are, indeed, emphatically reaffirming that criterion. We are confident that within a relatively short period of time, tax reduction and revision will result in larger Federal revenues than those we could expect without these tax changes. Section 1 of the bill calls upon both the Executive and the Congress to restrain Government expenditures so that this increase in revenues can reduce deficits and bring us sooner to realization of the goal of a balanced budget in a prosperous economy.

I have stressed the contribution this bill will make in achieving a balanced budget and an enlarged economy. These are the principal economic objectives of the bill. If I were called upon to give a definition of the phrase "fiscal responsibility," this is just how I would define it. It means conducting the finances of the Federal Government in such a way that a balanced budget can be and is achieved in an economy which is growing rapidly, providing adequate employment and investment opportunities, making full use of its capital and human resources, and giving the fullest possible play to the initiative and venturesomeness of the private sector. Tax reduction and revision will make it possible for us to achieve these objectives—to be fiscally responsible—with minimum direct intervention by the Government in the decisions of individuals and business concerns.

It has been argued by some that this bill represents an effort by the Federal Government to manage the economy and ignores the precept that taxation should be for revenue purposes only. The argument is completely wrong. This bill reflects an effort by the Federal Government to reduce and remove—not to impose—tax constraints on the economy, to give the private sector of the economy greater wherewithal to do what comes naturally to it and which increases the well being of all of us. Moreover, it affords us the greatest possible assurance that we will before long secure revenues equal to—or even greater than—Government expenditures. Indeed, failure to provide tax reduction and revision at this time would be fiscally irresponsible. It would represent the Federal Government's ignoring the adverse impact of its excessive tax burdens on the economy and on the budget. We must remember that tax policy cannot be made in a vacuum. If we are to be responsible, we must give the closest possible attention to the effects on the economy of what we do—or fail to do—in tax policy.

This bill, therefore, represents a responsible discharge of our duties to sound fiscal management.

Foreign Aid Program Must Be Put in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid program has again come before Congress, and again its opponents have leveled the same shopworn charges against it. We fail to realize that while the controversy itself may be old, the aid programs have been remarkably changed and strengthened.

In a recent speech, the Honorable Frank M. Coffin, Deputy Administrator for Operations of the Agency for International Development, pointed out that foreign aid since 1948 has undergone seven major structural changes and has been reviewed by eight Presidential committees.

The program has been moving steadily toward a higher level of competence and has many demonstrable achievements to

its credit. Early recipients of our aid have now joined with us in aiding the underdeveloped nations.

In the midst of heated criticism relying on familiar and outmoded arguments, our aid program has truly reached its most efficient level. Foreign aid is an essential component of an adequate foreign policy.

At a time when the Communists are increasing their economic offensive we more than ever need a vigorous foreign aid program.

Mr. Coffin admirably provides us with a much-needed perspective on our foreign aid program. His address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. FRANK M. COFFIN, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR OPERATIONS, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AT THE REGIONAL FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE, BOSTON, MASS., SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

In addressing this distinguished Foreign Policy Conference, I shall not try, in 15 minutes, to say everything that should be said on the subject of aid. I recognize that all of you possess more than an ordinary interest in foreign policy, or you would not be here. I therefore view my role as that of adding some perspectives to the current debates on aid.

Perspective is perhaps most difficult to achieve when we are, as at present, in the throes of our annual decision. It is all the more difficult when such issues as the test ban treaty and civil rights claim the interest and passions of the Nation.

But it is precisely because perspective may be squeezed out of major policy determinations that it is important for groups such as this to maintain the ability to look through passing events, moods, and personalities, to some underlying and dominant facts and purposes. After all, the words "look through" are the root words of "perspective."

Let us, therefore, pause to look through some of the realities of the day.

The first—and most obvious—is that aid "is in trouble" in Congress.

To say this does not require such access to inside information as to qualify one as a legislative expert. But there are one or two things which can appropriately be said to such a conference as this about the kind of trouble we face.

First, since most of us obtain most of our knowledge about the aid debates from the newspapers, radio, or TV, it is useful to go to the primary source and look at some of the sentiments one hears expressed. The vigor of these remarks underscores the intensity of feeling about aid.

A scanning of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reveals these opinions from the Senate, which I quote exactly:

"Why should this country, which stood so firmly against the nationalization of industries, now pour out money for the aid of a government which has declared itself bent upon going further into the nationalization of industries?"

"We have no basic international policy, having definitely ignored the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine * * * In its place has been substituted a hodge-podge of executive orders and gifts of large sums of money to foreign nations, founded upon no principle at all."

"It is the road to bankruptcy, and not a very long road at that."

"If I believed the expenditure of this amount of money would stop the spread of communism, I would support it * * * But in the light of history, in the light of facts, how can any Senator rise on this floor and say it will stop communism?"

Even stronger statement have been voiced in the House of Representatives where these statements have been made:

"They are deliberately selling America short * * * Our Uncle (Sam) in his flirtations has become the easy prey of foreign and domestic grafters, vampires, and gold diggers."

"In place of governing ourselves, in place of looking after our own people, we are now trying to bribe and govern the world."

"Congress is lost in the dismal swamps of foreign intrigue."

Yes, one does not have to be a prophet to say there is rough sledding ahead. Now there is one other fact you should know about these remarks I have quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The remarks in the Senate were not made in 1963. They were made in 1948, during the Marshall plan debate, by former Senators Malone and Revercombe. The House quotes were taken from Congressman Lemke's remarks in the 1950 Senate debate on point IV.

The lesson is plain. Aid has always been "in trouble" in the sense that not even the programs which today are acknowledged as overwhelming successes have escaped the hot crucible of prolonged and acrimonious debate.

The fact of controversy is dangerous only if we forget the past and assume that it is a new phenomenon, a sea change of American opinion. It is healthy to remember the arguments of the past. It is reassuring to recall how wrong they were. And it is pertinent, for the same arguments parade the parapets today. No one is a better witness to the lineage of today's arguments than your luncheon speaker, Undersecretary Harriman. For he not only chaired the committee which prepared the case for the Marshall plan, but he was its key official abroad in its critical years.

There is another perspective to add to the current controversy. While we assume that controversy is new, when it is not, we also approach aid today as if it had not changed, when it has.

How often have we read the sage comment of a columnist that, while he agrees with the basic policy of aid, the basic problem is how it is administered. He predictably concludes that what is needed is a massive reappraisal. The last time I came across this wisdom was last week. As for Congress, it wearily assumes that it is dealing with the same program it has reviewed for 15 years.

The fact is that aid today is not what it was 10 years ago, or even 5 years ago. There is no function of Government which has been so studied and reorganized. It has passed through seven structural changes and no fewer than eight Presidential committees. These committees, headed by such men as Gordon Gray, Nelson Rockefeller, Clarence Randall, Benjamin Fairless, the late Eric Johnston, William Draper, and—most recently—General Clay, have not essentially differed on the why, what, when, and how of aid. They have laid the basis for a national consensus on aid—one integrated organization with overall responsibility, development based on programs tailored to each country, emphasis on loans over grants, increased procurement of goods and services in the United States, meaningful concentration among countries, aid geared to self-help, a broader role for private enterprise, and termination of aid when countries become able to maintain their own momentum.

Here is the record. Aid is now planned and largely administered through the Agency for International Development. The reorganization of 1961 is now completed. Planning is now done on a country rather than a project-by-project basis. Loans have increased from 10 to 60 percent of economic aid. Loan terms, now all repayable in dollars, have hardened for a number of countries. U.S. procurement has increased from about 40 to over 80 percent, with aid-financed exports tripling from $600 million in 1962 to $2 billion in 1964. Military and supporting assistance have decreased by one-half.

As for concentration, 80 percent of economic assistance goes to twenty countries; 80 percent of military assistance goes to 10 countries. Projects and programs are increasingly tied to self-help. Investment guaranty agreements have been signed with almost 20 additional countries in the past 2 years, with guarantees themselves running at three times the rate of 2 years ago. A number of missions in the field have been consolidated with embassies. Procedures are being updated and simplified. At least half the missions have had an infusion of new executive leadership. Increasing use is being made of land grant colleges, cooperatives, savings, and loan associations. Instead of helping European countries, these same countries are now furnishing 40 percent of free world aid.

The irony is that at the very time when the planning and execution of aid is better than ever before, the general view is that nothing has changed in 10 years. The historic fact is that U.S. aid has steadily evolved through the past decade and a half, acquiring new tools, finishing the job in many countries, moving to new areas of concern to the United States, and developing new principles. It is now ready, given steady support from the people and the Congress, to play a major foreign policy role in the formative years of the uncommitted one-third of the globe.

The timing could not have been better. Development assistance will play an even more important part in terms of our leadership, respect, and influence should there be a genuine lessening of world tensions. In this we shall not be alone. The nations of Western Europe, Canada, Japan, and Oceania have also moved into this field, almost equaling our capital aid, and maintaining 14 times as many technicians abroad as we do. Their increasing participation depends on our steady support of what is becoming truly a free world aid movement.

The field will not be uncontested. Already the Sino-Soviet Bloc has over 10,000 nationals abroad in aid work in over 30 countries. Even more to the point is the new efforts and incentive of Red China, which has shown its determination to extend its influence not only from Korea westerly to India and Pakistan, but even in Africa and Latin America.

At the same time, we can point to a concrete record of achievement in every part of the world where development assistance has been made available in any substantial amount.

Politically, we can cite two kinds of achievements. Either by generating rapid economic growth from within or by resisting aggression from without, we helped to bring about the rebirth of Europe, the survival of Greece and Turkey, the emergence of a free and prosperous Japan, the rapid building of Taiwan and Israel, and continued, if contested, independence throughout the Far East. There has been a second kind of achievement, less precise but no less real. By offering, through assistance, an alternative to either the extreme right or left, we have exerted a continuing and growing influence on development. In Africa it can be seen in the rejection of reliance on Communist economic ideology by the very nations which have experimented with it. In Latin America, we can point with hope to the dramatic reduction of juntas and dictators which has taken place over the past decade. In view of the worldwide confrontation of ways of life, it is remarkable that of the 46 nations that have won their independence since World War II, not one has elected to become a bloc satellite.

What about economic development? There are some who would say aid should frankly be used only for short-run political purposes,

because real development is a hopeless task. Let's look at the record.

Of the 41 major aid receiving countries we have helped since 1945, these are the results:

Fourteen—Western Europe, Japan, Spain, and Lebanon—have not only reached a satisfactory growth rate of at least 1.5 percent for 5 successive years, but are no longer dependent on aid.

Ten more have reached this record of growth, have made progress in limiting dependence on aid, and several, such as Israel, Greece, and Taiwan, will soon be independent of external aid.

Nine more countries have attained a satisfactory growth rate but will continue to depend on substantial aid.

Only eight cannot be said to have reached a satisfactory rate of growth. Seven of these are in Latin America where aid in substantial amounts has only just begun.

What about social and political progress in these countries? Does aid help or hinder? In virtually all of the 24 countries in the first 2 groups, democratic institutions have been strengthened or less democratic regimes have been liberalized.

We should not claim too much. The development of nations with free institutions, with the capacity to manage effectively, is a long and arduous process, with many unpredictable turns in the road. But it is clear that U.S. aid has already built a record of significant achievement.

We can look forward with satisfaction to the graduation to self-sufficiency of at least half a dozen countries. The transition from dependence on aid has started with loan terms being such as to make the element of U.S. subsidy minimal. These same nations are already beginning to assist others.

The international coordination of aid is becoming increasingly effective through the Development Assistance Committee in Paris, the World Bank and the International Development Association, and the consortia arrangements for such countries as Pakistan, India, Greece and Turkey.

This very moment of time, therefore, is characterized on the one hand by the evolving competence of the U.S. aid effort, the increased efforts of our allies, and a record of demonstrable achievement, while on the other hand we see a renewed interest in the economic arena with a release of tensions, a focusing of efforts on development by the Soviet Union and its satellites, and stepped-up probings, economic and military, by Red China.

This is the backdrop against which to measure the implications of congressional action this year. If not substantially modified, the cuts already made will be tantamount to a policy of withdrawal at the very moment in history when we have so much to gain by a posture of steadiness.

Let me rehearse what has happened in Congress this year. The pattern of other years was varied this year in a significant way. After President Kennedy reviewed the findings of the Clay Committee, he voluntarily reduced his request of Congress by over $400 million. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which for the past 4 years has averaged a cut of only $200 million, made a further cut of $438 million—notwithstanding the President's earlier action. At this point the aid request had been slashed four times as much as at the same stage in an average year.

The House of Representatives then proceeded to debate the bill. On Thursday, August 22, it debated and voted until late at night, having more teller votes than any aid bill has seen in recent history. All cuts were fought off by separate votes after separate debates. On what is already being called black Friday, major policy was made by the simple device of adding up all of the amounts of cuts which had been defeated, except one, and making, in effect, a motion to cut it by that total figure. The motion carried, for a further cut of $585 million. The bill had been pared by almost $1.5 billion, or nearly 30 percent—including the President's reduction—and all this before the Appropriations Committees had acted. When one reflects that the average cut made over the past 4 years by the House Committee on Appropriations has been an additional $1.1 billion, the significance of this surgery becomes apparent.

What was the policy that was made by the catchall motion to cut? Bear in mind that these were cuts that went beyond the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and had been individually turned down by the House of Representatives itself.

The policy implicit in the cuts—whether recognized or not—was just as clear as if the House had said four things:

First. By bringing the authorized level for military assistance down to about 70 percent of the President's request and 75 percent of what was actually appropriated last year, the House was really saying that conventional defensive strength along the Sino-Soviet border from Greece to Korea should be diminished by as much as one-third in a number of key countries.

Second. By bringing the contingency fund down to one-half the request of $300 million, and 60 percent of what was actually appropriated last year—the lowest since it was established as a separate fund in 1959—the House was adopting a policy of much more sharply limited presidential flexibility to deal with the political and economic crises of a fast-changing and unpredictable world.

Third. By cutting Alliance for Progress lending authority 25 percent to a level $75 million below what was actually appropriated a year ago, the House signalled a curtailing of incentive at the very time when many of the Latin American countries had readied themselves to comply with the Alliance requirements of planning and self help and when Peru and Argentina had placed themselves in a position to make dynamic progress.

Fourth. By reducing the authorization of development loans for the rest of the world by 15 percent, to $900 million, the House was saying in effect: fulfill our lending commitments to India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria, and Tunisia, but do little or nothing more. The cut of $160 million is equivalent to all of the loans made last year to all of Africa and the Far East.

Can it be argued that these implicit policy determinations strengthen the forces of freedom or are we to assume that there is such a thaw in the cold war that we can unilaterally lead the way? Is this consistent with the concern being manifested by opponents of the test ban treaty?

Does this improve or hinder our chances of seeing the developing world grow in freedom?

Does anyone think that this will reinforce the will of our allies to enlarge their efforts?

Would anyone contend that this will increase the deterrence to Communist Chinese expansionism?

If we are still concerned about Latin America, can one seriously claim that this increases our chance of success?

Obviously all of these questions are rhetorical. The answer to all is: No. If this is so, what would be achieved by this set of Black Friday policies?

Will it help our balance of payments? Perhaps many voted on the assumption that it would. But new military assistance and development lending—accounting for over 90 percent of the cut—are almost completely tied to U.S. procurement. As AID Administrator David E. Bell has pointed out, the particular cuts made would have almost no effect on the balance of payments.

But U.S. exports would be reduced by almost the total amount of the cut, over half a billion dollars. Where lies the U.S. interest in this kind of action, if it strengthens us neither at home nor abroad?

The answer, I think, lies in an attitude of frustration that the countries we are helping do not do everything we would like to see them do—and immediately. It stems from an exaggerated expectation of the power of aid, which in most cases is between 1 and 3 percent of a country's gross national product. Yet this is the lever which is expected to bring about, overnight, in each developing country, a solution to border disputes, the abandonment of a posture of non-alignment, a full range of sophisticated monetary, fiscal, and social policies, the institution of full-fledged democracy, favorable votes in the United Nations, and a host of other equally desirable objectives.

Just because of our frustrations, perspective is most critically needed to keep our eye on our basic purpose. Aid is a limited but important instrument of our foreign policy. It accounts for 7/10 of 1 percent of our gross product, and 1/12 of our budget for defense and security. It is far less—both absolutely and proportionately—than what we were willing to commit in the days of the Marshall plan when we were less than half as rich as we are today.

But, it is an important instrument of security and freedom. In the world in which we live, there are no guarantees for either. But one thing is sure. So long as we remain in the contest, so long as we are involved, there is the chance of success with which history has rewarded our perseverance in the past. Equally certain is it that when we withdraw from any area of the world, when we furl the banner of freedom and retreat, we have foreclosed the chance for victory. We have made an irreversible decision. We may save some money for the time being, but we will have paid a price.

It is this facing of alternatives that is the hardest task of diplomacy today. One seldom hears it discussed by the ardent foes of aid. But there have been eloquent voices raised. Let us hear them now. They were not partisan voices. One was that of a Democrat, the other a Republican.

One voice said:

"The United States—the richest and most powerful of all peoples, a nation committed to the independence of nations and to a better life for all peoples—can no more stand aside in this climactic age of decision that we can withdraw from the community of free nations."

The other voice said:

"The greatest nation on earth either justifies or surrenders its leadership. We must choose. There are no blueprints to guarantee results. We are entirely surrounded by calculated risks * * * those who disagree * * * have not escaped to safety by rejecting or subverting this plan. They have simply fled to other risks, and I fear far greater ones."

The first voice was that of President Kennedy in April 1963. The second was that of Senator Vandenberg as he closed debate on the Marshall plan in the spring of 1948.

These statements reflect the makings of a consensus. But, they are statements separated by a decade and a half. Can we, in 1963, synchronize the voice of the past with the voice of the present? Can Congress today pursue with steadiness a program which faith initiated, history has vindicated, and the times now so urgently require?

March To Save the Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in these days when marches upon Washington have become popular, David Lawrence, writing in the U.S. News & World Report, suggests that, if such marches are necessary to get legislative action, a march to save the dollar might be in order.

Mr. Lawrence points to the drop in the purchasing power of the dollar and the dangerous trend in our balance of payments which have accompanied the huge Federal deficits of recent years. He maintains that our urgent need is "the protection of America's fiscal position before the world and the maintenance of a sound dollar at home."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Lawrence's editorial:

MAYBE A MARCH TO SAVE THE DOLLAR?

(By David Lawrence)

The march on Washington seems to have been given some unprecedented publicity over television and radio and in the press. President Kennedy called it a "contribution to all mankind." The leaders of the demonstration said it was the one way to get national attention and impress Congress and the Executive.

If such a thesis is accepted and if a march on Washington is the only way to get legislative action, there's something which needs national attention and is far more vital to the cause of full employment than the civil rights crusade. It is the plight of the dollar.

Without a sound currency, the savings of citizens can be depreciated in value. Also, the purchasing power of wages can be cut down and the country can be forced into an era of inflation which can hurt citizens of all races, old people and young people, including women and children. It can produce further unemployment and bring more bankruptcies.

The fiscal facts of today are unpleasant to record:

The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents in 1939 to 45.2 cents in July 1963.

The decline in June and July of this year has been as big as the total drop during the preceding 11 months.

Consumer prices have been steadily mounting.

The gold stock of the Nation has dropped from $24.5 billion at the end of 1949 to $15.7 billion today.

Foreign claims in gold against the dollar have risen from $6.4 billion in 1949 to $23.5 billion at present.

Foreign financial experts are betting that the United States inevitably will have to devalue the dollar, notwithstanding President Kennedy's emphatic pronouncements to the contrary not long ago.

Yet, in the face of these unfavorable trends, the Nation's budget remains considerably unbalanced.

Spending by the Federal Government continues to rise. It is officially estimated at $98 billion for the current fiscal year—up from $76.5 billion in 1960. In the fiscal year starting next July, it will exceed $100 billion.

Budget deficits have been reported by the Treasury for the last 6 years.

There have been budget surpluses in only 4 years since 1930. These came in 1948, 1949, 1956, and 1957.

Deficits were reported in the remaining 29 years of this 33-year period.

A still bigger deficit than the $6.2 billion of 1963 is officially estimated for fiscal year 1964.

Even if there is no tax cut, next year's deficit will exceed the 1963 figure. If there is a tax cut effective next January, the deficit for fiscal year 1964, which ends next June, is estimated at $9 billion. Large deficits are also indicated for 1965 and 1966.

Government spending, of course, goes on and on. The theory that this brings prosperity and good business was disproved in the 1930's. For, fundamentally, it doesn't make fiscal sense to spend billions more than is being collected in taxes. Nor is it sensible to cut taxes when the deficits are growing in size.

Inequitable as many of the tax rates are—and they should be revised sometime—the fact remains that this isn't the real barrier to business progress.

A business that makes a profit of $1 million a year and pays the Government $514,000 in taxes would gladly continue to pay that 52 percent rate if it could make $2 million in gross profit. For it's better to pay the Government $1,034,500 in taxes and be able to retain $965,500 than it is to continue to pay $514,500 in taxes and retain only $485,500. Even under the proposed reduction in the corporate tax rate from 52 to 48 percent, only $41,000 would be saved. Who wouldn't prefer the $480,000 increase in net profit while the taxe rates stayed the same?

The big challenge, therefore, lies not in revising tax rates but in finding a way to make business expand. An expanding volume reduces unemployment. It also means more tax receipts and could bring a balanced budget.

But loose spending must end. The Democratic Party has been in control of Congress from 1932 to the present day with the exception of two 2-year intervals. The time has come for a revision of spending policies and a removal of the impediments to the growth of employment. The Government, moreover, must abandon its hostility toward business and deal firmly with the "restraint of trade" practiced by the labor union monopoly.

For the danger today is in relying on temporary measures, like tax cuts, to cure the fundamental illness from which the national economy suffers. This is the biggest issue before the country today, and it ought not to be necessary for the citizens to organize a "March on Washington" to secure a most important civil right—the protection of America's fiscal position before the world and the maintenance of a sound dollar at home.

Violence Breeds Violence and the Innocent Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, any man with conscience is horrified at the act of a madman who would hurl a bomb into a church, killing innocent children. Such action cannot be excused and the perperator of the crime must be brought to trial and punished.

Now that continued violence has finally erupted, as was predicted by some of us, into acts which bring death and suffering to the innocent, there is a great scramble to place the blame.

Mr. Speaker, many should seek the answer as to who is to blame for the violence in Birmingham in their own consciences and in their own actions. It was impossible to avoid the tragedy in Birmingham when for months we have witnessed growing disregard for law and order. Certainly there have been public officials who have used the racial tensions to their advantage and have thus contributed to the crime. However, the national conscience cannot be eased by merely pinning the blame on southern officials and by further attacks on the South.

Blame for Sunday's horror must also be shared by those Negro leaders who have justified their own defiance of law and order by claiming that "it is right and proper to break laws which are felt to be unjust." The blame must be shared by those who have advocated mob action and rock throwing demonstrations, who have ridiculed and maligned law enforcement officers who balked their illegal entries and who attempted to perform their duties of protecting the civil rights of the entire community. Respect for law and order cannot be destroyed without tragic results. The Martin Luther Kings and others who have urged disobedience of the law, must now share the responsibility for the whirlwind we are now reaping.

Not entirely blameless are those in high office who have exploited racial prejudices for political expediency, carefully maneuvering the Negro to insure his vote. Condoning violence, discrimination against the majority to insure the rights of the minority, the unreasonable demands, the call for blood has now resulted in blood, not for the guilty, not for those who claim to seek martyrdom, but for innnocent children.

Throwing a bomb was the inevitable end to a series of lawbreaking incidents which have been carried on for months and those who encouraged, supported and took part in those incidents cannot now be absolved completely of contributing to the murder of the little girls in Birmingham. Nor can they claim to be motivated solely by nonviolence.

Mr. Speaker, injustice is abhorred by all Americans. Great strides have been made in eliminating injustice, discrimination and unfair treatment where it has existed. There is yet a long way to go, but justice will not be created out of injustice; the rights of all the people cannot be preserved except through orderly procedures, respect for law; and the immature cannot learn responsibility except by the good example of those who should be mature.

There is more than one lesson to be learned from the bombing in Birmingham. It is time each of us search his own soul and his own conscience to determine what actions we may have taken to contribute to this tragedy.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, "The Precepts of Their Elders," although written before Sunday's bombing, is now appropriate as a followup to that story:

THE PRECEPTS OF THEIR ELDERS

The other evening at Southampton on Long Island the debutante's party ended when some hundred young men and their dancing partners went on a rampage that brought on a riot call to the police.

The young men—we can hardly say they were from the better families but they were from upper-income, college-educated families—smashed furniture in a neighboring house, dragged mattresses and chairs onto the beach, broke windows, tore carpets, and ripped down at least one expensive chandelier.

A few days earlier, up in New Hampshire, a police force augmented by firemen, State troopers, and military police needed firehoses, tear gas and six police dogs to quell another riot brought on by youthful spirits just having vacation fun.

In Folcroft, Pa., the violence had a more serious purpose. There the teenaged rioters were expressing their political views over the sale of a house in their all-white neighborhood to a Negro family.

These are but a few examples, plucked at random, of recent youthful exuberance. We are happy to report that in each case the young people promised that the damages would be paid for by their elders. What puzzles us is what these elders, in their turn, will say to their young about this destructively unhibited behavior.

Just a few days before Southampton, New York's city hall was laid siege to by an army of 4,000 adult militant pickets, mostly mothers and housewives, expressing their feelings about a proposal to convert a private residential area into a public recreation park. A number of them brought their children along some of them in perambulators.

The New York City Police handled this mob rather well, having previously learned from an even more vociferous group of grown people who blocked city hall corridors, dumped garbage all over the square, and sat down in the mayor's office, all because of an impatience with his integration program.

Even this crowd was small compared to the 200,000 or so who, for the benefit of Congressmen and home television viewers, lately marched on Washington. There, to be sure, all was orderly, thanks to an operational plan that would have done credit to a small war, marshaling 2,000 firemen, 2,000 National Guardsmen, and a reserve battalion of Marines. It was considered inconsequential that this expression of political sentiment by mature adults closed down shops and offices, disrupted the city, and cost the taxpayers an uncounted amount to clean up afterward.

Nowadays it's considered generally inconsequential for grownup mobs to lie down in the middle of a highway, invade the public streets or sit down anywhere, so long as they feel frustrated in a just cause. A group of distinguished law professors, headed by teachers of jurisprudence from Harvard and Yale, has recently urged that the authorities have a duty to protect any such mob thus disrupting public service from any interference by the police.

And what about the lessons taught today by many of the teachers of children in New York City? Not only do these teachers think nothing of closing down New York's schools to express their disgruntlement with the school board, but they openly preach defiance of law and the courts when law and the courts do not please them. What instruction for young minds groping toward adulthood will be the fruit of this disobedience?

Now all this adult activity, whatever the differences in purpose or provocation, has one thing in common. It expresses the view that those impatient with the law's delay, or frustrated by the ways of society, shouldn't be inhibited in their self-expression. They need not consider the risks of violence in their methods of seeking a redress of grievances. And this is the adult view which is today presented daily to young people in the newspapers, on television, and often by example in their own neighborhood.

To say that there is a difference between a grownup purposeful parade for worthy causes and a youthful snake dance for fun doesn't alter the fact that both are revolts against the ordered ways of society. And if it is all right to disregard personal property, to smash things, or to trample over other people in order to express one frustration, then it is not an easy matter to explain why it is wrong to do these things out of another frustration.

At any rate, we needn't be surprised that it is hard to explain to the young. If youth is the time of rebellion it is no less true that the youths become adults only by the precepts of their elders.

The American Effort in Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on September 9 I had extension of my remarks on the Soviet challenge in oceanographic research and development inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A5678. In those remarks there was emphasized the importance of the knowledge of the oceans of the world in terms of the future of mankind. An attempt was made to partially document the aggressive and impressive program the Soviets have launched recently. Today I should like to address myself to a short and therefore necessarily incomplete assessment of what the United States is doing and to set forth some of what we should do, if we appreciate the grave necessity for an improvement in our effort.

The bulk of the American official effort in oceanography is carried out in conjunction with the military. We have a polyglot fleet of 24 vessels. All are overaged conversions of ships originally designed for other missions. Thirteen of these are Navy survey craft operationally controlled by either Serv-Lant or Serv-Pac. They receive their assignments from the U.S. Naval Oceanographic office. Crews are either Navy or MSTS. These craft range from the three largest which are converted Victory ships 484 feet in length and displacing 13,000 tons to a converted Y.F. displacing 200 tons. The remaining 11 ships are assigned to military research and development and operate for various Navy laboratories interested in weapons, detection, and underwater sound. In this force there are three converted submarines of the *Archerfish* class. They perform the kind of tasks best suited to their operational abilities but all are, besides being quite old, limited in submergence time, too noisy, overcrowded and severely limited in laboratory space. It is interesting to note not one of these ships was specifically constructed for the purpose it now serves and all date back to World War II or earlier. Although our oceanographers have not lacked in resourcefulness and it is true that they have accomplished some rather noteworthy advances, efficiency has certainly not been the hallmark of the U.S. oceanographic effort. Further, serious limitations encompass our efforts because the small number and the character of our committed fleet inherently restrict operations and results.

It is true that some private and semiprivate research organizations have been notably active in the study of the oceans. Among these are Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Scripts Institution of Oceanography, Stanford University, New York University and the Lamont Geological Observatory. Besides these leaders there are a scattering of lesser lights in higher learning institutions and some limited but important research being done by industrial firms like the National Marine Consultants of Anaheim, Calif. All of these groups employ an array of vessels that range from the vintage of the *TeVega*, an old four-master used by Stanford, to the really modern *Atlantis II*. Some of these groups prefer sailing vessels like the *TeVega* for although they are slow, they avoid the noise interference of the heavy marine engines. In the varied conversions of the civilian fleet besides the sailing vessels there are former tugs, catamarans, freighters, trawlers, draggers, and transports.

What we in America need desperately to do in this field is to awaken ourselves to the importance of oceanography in world affairs and the emerging possibility that the control of the resources and powers of the seas may be the largest single determinant in world domination in the future of our planet. Appreciating the urgent need to move we should do so on several fronts. First, our colleges and universities should direct more effort and students to the study of oceanography and its related fields. Our representatives in the State Department and in the U.N. should urge and support resolution of the legal barriers for jurisdiction in the seas of the world and develop legal principles to protect the investments for development of the food and mineral resources to be found there. Funds should be appropriated to establish a data collection center with communication to all resources now existing and to be developed in measuring, mapping, and sampling the variables in the farflung waters of our oceans. A truly up-to-date fleet scientifically and practically built and developed to do the major on-the-spot research and laboratory work should soon be on the boards and in the ways. Some of the recommendations of the National Academy of Science Committee on Oceanography deserve serious consideration and immediate attention. That report requests the construction of 70 vessels specifically designed for this kind of mission to be constructed in the next 10 years at a proposed expenditure of $213 million. In comparison to the Russian effort this is hardly calculated to catch us up in what could be the important unseen gap in technological know-how.

Oceanography, this hydrological synthesis of physics, chemistry, biology, meteorology, geology, and electronics, is

the key to the vast storehouse of the sea. In the years to come the history of mankind may well hinge on the question of how soon this key will be perfected and who will hold it. May we hope that the Members of this body will want the key to be forged soon and to be held firmly in the hands of the leaders of the free world.

Who's to Blame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, mere words fail completely to describe the shock and outrage in the wage of the dynamite bombing of a Negro church in Birmingham, Ala., during Sunday morning service September 15, 1963. One is stunned at the enormity of the crime and at the hypocritical apologies emanating from the governing officials of the State of Alabama.

However, the nearest the written word has come to capturing the sense of this outrageous event appeared in the September 17, 1963, editions of the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star. I refer to the reaction of Charles Morgan, Jr., a white Birmingham attorney, whose article was published by the Post, and Atlanta Constitution Editor Eugene Patterson's view in the Star. I include them, as well as the September 17, 1963, editorials appearing in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1963]

WHO'S TO BLAME?

(By Charles Morgan, Jr.)

(NOTE.—Charles Morgan, Jr., is a white, 33-year-old Birmingham attorney, a graduate with honors from the University of Alabama and a leading advocate in a current legal action seeking reapportionment of the Alabama State Legislature. Yesterday Morgan went to his office in Birmingham's newest skyscraper and wrote these thoughts on the church bombing and deaths that shocked the Nation on Sunday.)

Four little girls were killed in Birmingham Sunday. A mad, remorseful, worried community asks "Who did it? Who threw that bomb? Was it a Negro or a white?"

The answer should be "We all did it." Every last one of us is condemned for that crime and the bombing before it and the ones last month, last year, a decade ago. We all did it.

A short time later, white policemen kill a Negro and wound another. A few hours later two young men on a motor bike shoot and kill a Negro child. Fires break out and, in Montgomery, white youths assault Negroes.

And all across Alabama, an angry, guilty people cry out their mocking shouts of indignity and say they wonder, "Why?" "Who?" Everyone then deplores the dastardly act.

But, you know the "who" of "who did it?" is really rather simple. The "who" is every little individual who talks about the "niggers" and spreads the seeds of his hate to his neighbor and his son.

The jokester, the crude oaf whose racial jokes rock the party with laughter. The "who" is every Governor who ever shouted for lawlessness and became a law violator.

It is every Senator and every Representative who in the halls of Congress stands and with mock humility tells the world that things back home aren't really like they are.

It is courts that move ever so slowly and newspapers that timorously defend the law. It is all the Christians and all the ministers who spoke too late in anguished cries against violence.

It is the coward in each of us who clucks admonitions. We are 10 years of lawless preachments, 10 years of criticism of law, of courts, of our fellowman, a decade of telling schoolchildren the opposite of what the civics books say.

We are a mass of intolerance and bigotry and stand indicted before our young. We are cursed by the failure of each of us to accept responsibility, by our defense of an already-dead institution.

Sunday while Birmingham, which prides itself on the number of its churches, was attending worship service, a bomb went off and an all-white police force moved into action, a police force which has been praised by city officials and others at least once a day for a month or so. A police force which has solved no bombings. A police force which many Negroes feel is perpetrating the very evils we decry. And why would Negroes think this?

There are no Negro policemen; there are no Negro sheriff's deputies. Few Negroes have served on juries. Few have been allowed to vote, few have been allowed to accept responsibility, or granted even a simple part to play in the administration of justice. Do not misunderstand me. It is not that I think that white policemen had anything whatsoever to do with the killing of these children or previous bombings.

It's just that Negroes who see an all-white police force must think in terms of its failure to prevent or solve the bombings and think perhaps Negroes would have worked a little bit harder. They throw rocks and bottles and bullets. And we whites don't seem to know why the Negroes are lawless. So, we lecture them.

Birmingham is the only city in America where police chief and sheriff in the school crisis had to call our local ministers together to tell them to do their duty. The ministers of Birmingham who have done so little for Christianity call for prayer at high noon in a city of lawlessness and, in the same breath, speak of our city's "image." Did those ministers visit the families of the Negroes in their hour of travail? Did any of them go to the homes of their brothers and express their regret in person or pray with the crying relatives? Do they admit Negroes into their ranks at the church?

Who is guilty? A moderate mayor elected to change things in Birmingham and who moves so slowly and looks elsewhere for leadership? A business community which shrugs its shoulders and looks to the police or perhaps somewhere else for leadership?

A newspaper which has tried so hard of late, yet finds it necessary to lecture Negroes every time a Negro home is bombed? A Governor who offers a reward but mentions not his own failure to preserve either segregation or law and order? And what of those lawyers and politicians who counsel people as to what the law is not when they know full well what the law is?

Those four little Negro girls were human beings. They have lived their 14 years in a leaderless city; a city where no one accepts responsibility; where everybody wants to blame somebody else. A city with a reward fund which grew like Topsy as a sort of sacrificial offering, a balm for the conscience of the "good people." The "good people" whose ready answer is for those "rightwing extremists' to shut up. People who absolve themselves of guilt. The liberal lawyer who told me this morning, "me? I'm not guilty." Then proceeded to discuss the guilt of the other lawyers, the ones who told the people that the Supreme Court did not properly interpret the law. And that's the way it is with the southern liberals. They condemn those with whom they disagree for speaking while they sigh in fearful silence.

Birmingham is a city in which the major industry, operated from Pittsburgh, never tried to solve the problem. It is a city where four little Negro girls can be born into a second-class school system, live a segregated life, ghettoed into their own little neighborhoods, restricted to Negro churches, destined to ride in Negro ambulances, to Negro wards of hospitals or to a Negro cemetery. Local papers, on their front and editorial pages, call for order and then exclude their names from obituary columns.

And who is really guilty? Each of us. Each citizen who has not consciously attempted to bring about peaceful compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, each citizen who has ever said "they ought to kill that nigger," every citizen who votes for the candidate with the bloody flag; every citizen and every school board member and schoolteacher and principal and businessman and judge and lawyer who has corrupted the minds of our youth; every person in this community who has in any way contributed during the past several years to the popularity of hatred, is at least as guilty, or more so, than the demented fool who threw that bomb.

What's it like living in Birmingham? No one ever really has and no one will until this city becomes part of the United States.

Birmingham is not a dying city; it is dead.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 17, 1963]

A FLOWER FOR THE GRAVES

NOTE.—The Atlanta Constitution, one of the South's leading newspapers, placed the responsibility for the bombing of the Birmingham church Sunday morning on the entire "white South" in the column printed below, entitled "A Flower for the Graves." It was written by Eugene Patterson, a native Georgian and editor of the Constitution since 1960.

A Negro mother wept in the street Sunday morning in front of a Baptist church in Birmingham. In her hand she held a shoe, one shoe, from the foot of her dead child. We hold that shoe with her.

Every one of us in the white South holds that small shoe in his hand.

It is too late to blame the sick criminals who handled the dynamite. The FBI and the police can deal with that kind. The charge against them is simple. They killed four children.

Only we can trace the truth, Southerner—you and I. We broke those children's bodies.

We watched the stage set without staying it. We listened to the prolog unbestirred. We saw the curtain opening with disinterest. We have heard the play.

We—who go on electing politicians who heat the kettles of hate.

We—who raise no hand to silence the mean and little men who have their nigger jokes.

We—who stand aside in imagined rectitude and let the mad dogs that run in every society slide their leashes from our hand, and spring.

We—the heirs of a proud South, who protest its worth and demand its recognition—are the ones who have ducked the difficult, skirted the uncomfortable, caviled at the challenge, resented the necessary, rationalized the unacceptable, and created the day surely when these children would die.

This is no time to load our anguish onto the murderous scapegoat who set the cap in dynamite of our own manufacture.

He didn't know any better.

Somewhere in the dim and fevered recess of an evil mind he feels right now that he has been a hero. He is only guilty of murder. He thinks he has pleased us.

We of the white South who know better are the ones who must take a harsher judgment.

We, who know better, created a climate for child-killing by those who don't.

We hold that shoe in our hand, Southerner. Let us see it straight, and look at the blood on it. Let us compare it with the unworthy speeches of Southern public men who have traduced the Negro; match it with the spectacle of shrilling children whose parents and teachers turned them free to spit epithets at small huddles of Negro school children for a week before this Sunday in Birmingham; hold up the shoe and look beyond it to the Statehouse in Montgomery, where official attitudes of Alabama have been spoken in heat and anger.

Let us not lay the blame on some brutal fool who didn't know any better.

We know better. We created the day. We bear the judgment. May God have mercy on the poor South that has been so led. May what has happened hasten the day when the good South, which does live and have great being, will rise to this challenge of racial understanding and common humanity, in the full power of its unasserted courage, assert itself.

The Sunday school play at Birmingham is ended. With a weeping Negro mother, we stand in the bitter smoke and hold a shoe. If our South is ever to be what we wish it to be, we will plant a flower of nobler resolve for the South now upon these four small graves that we dug.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 17, 1963]

THE WAGES OF INCITEMENT

In community after community across the South this September, Negro children have gone off to school with their white neighbors. While neither the Negro parents nor the white parents of these children may have been wholly satisfied with the situation, in most of these places there was neither violence nor disturbance.

But not in Birmingham.

For many long months the racial situation in this Alabama city has been a smoldering volcano. Only a few weeks ago the Governor of Alabama tried to use troops to defy Federal court orders, just as earlier he had tried personally to block the entrance of a Negro student into the University of Alabama. There it took the intervention of Federal power to put a few Negroes into the local schools.

Then, this weekend, violence erupted into murder. The bomb thrown on Sunday into the midst of a Negro church, killing four young children, was not the consequence of an inpassioned moment, but a deliberate act in which the intent was, if not to kill, at least to maim, to frighten, and to intimidate. It was lawlessness pure and simple.

Nor was this the first such incident in Birmingham. The trouble began years ago when the city was first chosen, whether by accident or design, as a central battleground of the segregation issue. The first bombing occurred in 1955, and there have been a score of them in the years since, with none of the perpetrators ever having been brought to bar.

Now it is true, as some white southerners have said, that the Negro leaders cannot wholly escape some responsibility for the building up of explosive tension in Birmingham. The very fact that it was chosen by them as a symbolic city meant that all the racial forces, with which the Nation is so unhappily familiar, were there brought into intense focus. Without that, Birmingham might have had no more trouble than any other place.

But all this pales beside the acts of some of the white leaders of the city and of the State. Under the previous city administration both the mayor and the chief of police were openly in sympathy with the most rabid of the segregationists. Brutality to Negroes in the enforcement of police regulations was, if not overtly encouraged, at least covertly condoned.

Finally, when the people of Birmingham changed their city administration and some hope for peace and order was in sight, the Governor of the State took it upon himself, in the good name of constitutional rights, to take the law into his own hands. His actions were taken against the wishes of the local school board and the new city officials and, we feel sure, against the wishes of the good people of Birmingham.

Nor was this all. Across the State, newspapers of good repute had for years been not only denouncing the Supreme Court's decision, which is their right and duty if they feel that way, but also preaching resistance to the courts of the land. They were also joined by a number of political leaders, in office or aspiring thereto. "Massive resistance," talked of in many places, was in Alabama preached as an actice doctrine.

In such circumstance is would have been a miracle if the seeds of this disobedience had not borne tragic fruit. In every city or State, in every group of people—white or Negro—there are some scum, eager in any case to express their frustrations or anger in violence. When such people hear their public officials and spokesmen, even the Governor of the State, tell them that their anger is justified, set before them an example of defiance and show them that others who have acted violently have gone unpunished, then the stage is set.

We are not unmindful, and never have been, of the deep problems involved in the race relations between white and Negro, and we have never joined the chorus of those who think the answer is simply to forcibly integrate the two races regardless of any other consideration. And we have been ever mindful of the risks when the Negro leaders on their part bring out mobs because they too feel frustrated by the law or the ways of society.

It is precisely because the problem is so grievous that those who would lead have a responsibility not to add to the incitement against law and order. Our society provides ways for the adjustment of grievances be they those of Negroes who feel oppressed or white people who feel overwhelmed. Those ways are often slow, and in the best of circumstances there will be some so impatient as to prefer lawlessness to law. There is no magic to make this an easy road.

But it will become a tragic road indeed if the people's leaders, white or Negro, lend their leadership to the lawless. For the sure wages of inciting men's baser instincts is exactly what we have seen in Birmingham—violence and sometimes murder.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]

THE BLAME—AND BEYOND

When an American city is ruled by the police dog, teh high-pressure firehose, the shotgun and the bomb, then it no longer can be considered a city ruled by law. Birmingham's double outrage—the bombing of the four children in Sunday school and the shooting of two teenage boys—were acts of madness.

The blame, as in any conspiracy, falls strongly upon those who incited and encourage and direct as well as upon the actual perpetrators of the crimes. It is the merest hypocrisy for Governor Wallace and his political associates to offer rewards for the capture of the criminals who shamed his State and our country.

The massacre of innocents in a church in the middle of the city and the police shotgun blast in the back of a 16-year-old Negro were bestial acts. They were not committed by mere bigots from the backwoods acting alone; the actual murderers were only the instruments that touched off the fuse. Those public officials and leading citizens who set the standard of violent behavior for the city and State, by words and actions as well as by silence, created a receptive atmosphere for the irrational and horrible crimes that naturally ensued.

This was the 21st bombing of Negroes in their homes and churches in Birmingham in the last 8 years; not 1 of the 50 bombings of Negro property there since World War II has been solved. This is the pattern of a police state, not of a State of the Union. The desecration of the Confederate flag, waved by rabblerousers in Alabama, is a desecration of the American flag everywhere.

White citizens in Alabama and in Congress still have the opportunity to stamp out the evils of the killers and the lawbreakers. The truly brave can help to integrate the schools peacefully, as some have already made an effort to do despite the rabble led by the Governor. And the U.S. Congress can enact the civil rights bill without delay in order to help bring the rule of law back to the Deep South.

A Tribute to Hon. Lewis Deschler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, September 12th, the Ohio Society paid tribute to House Parliamentarian, the Honorable Lewis Deschler, in an evening entitled "A Tribute to Lew."

The Ohio Society was honored by the presence of the distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK; the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT; and the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK, who spoke of the tremendous contributions of Parliamentarian Lew Deschler to the House of Representatives and to the American people.

The program also included stimulating speeches by the Honorable Clarence J. Brown, dean of the Ohio delegation to the House of Representatives; the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Secretary of Labor, Willard W. Wirtz; the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable J. George Stewart; and the Honorable Ralph Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The following statement was made by the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK:

Lew Deschler is the only guy in politics I know of whose return to office in the Congress of the United States is a foregone conclusion.

And Lew—let me say to you that if the time should ever come when I'm Speaker of the House—and you can put up with me—you've got a tenure as long as either one of us lasts.

As far as I'm concerned, Lew is the world's best Parliamentarian—by any standard you want to apply, including pound for pound.

He's one person I'm convinced would rather be right than President. And if he's ever been wrong, nobody has proved it—to my knowledge.

You know, Lew maintains a legal residence out in Chillicothe, which is far enough away from Washington that nobody knows whether he votes Democrat or Republican.

I guess maybe I'm glad I don't.

I've always said an independent is a person who doesn't care what happens to the country, but I'll take that back as far as Lew is concerned.

He's been around for a long, long time—not too long, you understand—and I've known him most of the years he has served in the Congress.

Incidentally, he spent 3 years working his way up from messenger to Parliamentarian and 33 years proving that we were right when we hired him in the first place.

Seriously, for my money nobody could possibly have been more loyal to the people he has served on both sides of the aisle.

And one of the greatest tributes I can pay to him is to say that he has understood and appreciated the role of Parliamentarian, and that through the years he has demonstrated this understanding and appreciation by a complete dedication to his assignment.

He has been fair and impartial to all concerned and—I might add—fiercely jealous of the prerogatives of the House.

I think I speak for everyone here when I say that there has never been the slightest doubt in anyone's mind that Lew's one objective has been to serve the House of Representatives to the full extent of his energy and ability and that—believe me, is considerable.

In the years I have known him, he has been my trusted friend, as I hope I have been his.

You know, we couldn't operate this complicated piece of machinery which is the Congress, with all of the pulling and hauling that is such an integral part of our two-party system, without mutual trust.

And no one has a more delicate role to fill in this operation than Lew.

Let me say for myself, that I have never had the first occasion to question—for an instant—Lew Deschler's good faith—and we have weathered some pretty severe legislative storms.

A lot is said about indispensable people, and I've been around long enough to realize that none of us is.

But Lew comes about as close to that as anybody I know. Let's face it: we wouldn't dare fire him—either side.

And I just hope, as we pay this richly deserved tribute to a wonderful guy and a great American that he proves to be just as indestructible as he is indispensable.

The following inspirational prayer was offered by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Dr. Bernard Braskamp:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that during the fellowship of these evening hours we may have the blessings of Thy grace and favor.

Our hearts rejoice as the Ohio Society bestows its tributes of praise upon our beloved and highly esteemed friend and fellow citizen, whom we affectionately call "Lew" and who for 36 years had rendered significant service in the Congress as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

We acknowledge gratefully that Thou hast endowed him richly with many outstanding talents and gifts for the high vocation of leadership in the business of statecraft, enabling him to contribute worthily to the welfare of our beloved country.

We thank Thee for his sincere and simple faith in God; his integrity of character and lofty idealism; his patriotism and devotion to duty; his wisdom in counsel and his clear mindedness in formulating policies of government that are just and righteous.

May his own heart be filled with joy as he goes up and down the courts of memory and calls to mind those 36 years of faithful service and continues to accept with an indomitable spirit the many arduous tasks and responsibilities which demand and challenge the consecration of his noblest manhood.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace.

Traffic Safety Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, the Safety First Club of Maryland gave a luncheon at the Southern Hotel in Baltimore in tribute to Maryland's Governor, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes. Our Governor was honored on that occasion for his leadership in the adoption of State statutes to improve traffic conditions and safeguard lives on Maryland's streets and highways. The luncheon also highlighted the organization's second annual "Governor's Class" enrollment program, with 100 new members as the goal.

The head table luncheon guests included many distinguished State and city officials as well as many prominent businessmen, as follows: His Excellency, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, Governor; Morris A. Kasoff, president, Safety First Club of Maryland; Hon. Louis L. Goldstein, comptroller, State of Maryland; Hon. Thomas B. Finan, attorney general of Maryland; Bernard J. Schmidt, police commissioner, Baltimore City; John R. Jewell, commissioner, department of motor vehicles; Col. Carey Jarman, superintendent, Maryland State Police; Judge T. Barton Harrington, chief judge, municipal court of Baltimore City; Roger V. Laynor, chief, Alcoholic Beverage Division, State of Maryland; Hon. Edgar P. Silver, chairman, Motor Vehicle Committee, Maryland House of Delegates; Henry Miller, Maryland State commissioner of labor and industry; John B. Funk, chairman-director, state roads commission; Maurice R. Shochatt, executive vice president Safety First Club; J. O. Shuger, past president and chairman of the board, Safety First Club; Paul Huddles, vice president, Safety First Club; Byron Millenson, vice president and general manager, radio station WCAO; and Frank Udoff, U.S. marshal.

Arrangements for this event were handled by William J. Ryan, senior vice president of the Safety First Club; Aaron B. Cohen, vice president, Safety First Club; W. A. Duffy, Patrick J. Roche, Bernard Potts, and David Gordon.

As some of you know, I introduced the first resolution in the House of Repsentatives in 1956 to establish a special Committee on Traffic Safety. I am still vitally interested in the problems of traffic safety and feel that we must work constantly to cut down the slaughter on our Nation's streets and highways. This is exactly what the Safety First Club does.

Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent address delivered by Governor Tawes at this luncheon meeting. In his remarks, the Governor outlined some of the causes which contribute to traffic accidents and some of the measures we can take to insure safety on our Nation's highways.

Under unanimous consent, I include the full text of Governor Tawes' speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY GOV. J. MILLARD TAWES

The officers and members of the Safety First Club of Maryland have been most courteous and most helpful to me since I have been Governor of Maryland, and I should like to begin by expressing my deep gratitude for these favors.

That I was honored to have been invited to come here today goes without saying. I enjoy the comradeship with each of you very much. I appreciate the cooperation you have given to me in my effort to promote traffic safety in our State.

Your executive vice president, Maurice Shochatt, very graciously offered me this time in the luncheon program to give my views on traffic safety problems.

I welcome the opportunity, of course, but I think it is only fair to warn you that there are probably as many different views of this problem, and the means of solving it, as there are people.

In browsing through a newspaper the other day, I found this view, for example, expressed by a member of the legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The only way to protect the lives of the innocent people who travel on the highways, he said, is to remove therefrom the "jackasses, nincompoops, drunks, and fools."

He had a good point, I think. Aside from the drunks perhaps, it is a little bit difficult to determine who fits into his categories. But if they could be identified clearly, and removed from the highways—the jackasses, the nincompoops, the drunks, and the fools—there is little doubt that a great step forward would be made in protecting the innocent who travel on our roads.

The incidence of motor vehicle accidents, with the heavy toll they take in human lives, in maimings and in the destruction of property, undoubtedly is one of the most serious of the domestic problems we face in this country today.

The sad and frustrating part of it is that not only does there appear to be no immediate solution to the problem, but that there is every indication that it is becoming more acute with every day that passes.

We are indeed a nation of rubber-tired wheels—a people which, both through necessity and inclination, spends more and more of its time in automobiles.

The increase in the number of automobiles, and in the number of miles they travel, has been nothing short of phenomenal in this country, especially since the end of World War II.

In Maryland, for example, there were registered 1,290,428 motor vehicles last year. I am told that by a conservative estimate there will be approximately 1,355,000 this year.

To get a fair picture of what is happening, compare these registration figures with the figure of 1,226,427 of 1961 and 794,635 for 10 years ago.

Only a few years ago, it was unusual for an average family to possess more than one automobile. Now it is a very common thing. And it is not an unusual thing, as we all

know very well, for a single family to possess three or four cars.

Incidentally, I noted with a great deal of interest the other day that one Maryland county—Montgomery County—had more three-car families than any other county in the United States.

And of course, these cars are traveling more than ever before. I can remember, and perhaps many of you here can remember, when a 30-mile trip was a human ordeal, with tire blowouts, breakdowns and an almost endless variety of mishaps that tended to discourage motor travel.

Not so today, to be sure. We think nothing of traveling 300 or 400 miles in a day, and in planning the trip we expect it to pass without trouble.

The result of more cars and more miles of travel are well known to us. The increase in exposure means inevitably a corresponding increase in the hazards.

Our problem is to reduce these hazards, which, of course, we are trying to do.

But the appalling statistics which confront us—statistics recounting the untold horrors of killings and injuries—testify only too clearly that we are not doing enough.

Dual highways, medium strips, traffic signals, grade-crossing eliminations, mechanical improvements, seat belts and all the paraphernalia of traffic safety have helped immeasurably, of course.

Heaven only knows what the situation would be like without them.

But they have not done the job satisfactorily as we all know. And we are all aware that these safety devices will have to be improved, and all of our safety efforts increased, unless we wish to be exterminated by the very machine which in our ingenuity we have created for our comfort, enjoyment and general welfare.

I would expect that most of you here, who are as interested in highway safety as I am, are familiar with the statistics of highway accidents.

But let's review them again anyway, because I think they are useful to us in our consideration of the gravity of the problem we face.

Last year in the United States, 40,900 persons were killed in motor vehicle accidents. The continuing upward trend in fatalities will be noted in these figures for the preceding years: 38,091 in 1961, 38,200 in 1960, and 37,800 in 1959.

Besides fatalities, there are many other measurements of the disaster caused by these accidents. More than 1,500,000 persons were disabled beyond the day of the accident.

The National Safety Council estimates that the total economic loss in traffic accidents last year was $7.3 billion.

Some consolation may be gained, and some satisfaction derived, from other figures showing a slight decline in the mileage fatality rate.

For in fact fewer persons are losing their lives in per miles traveled than there were a few years ago. For example, the rate of deaths per 100 million miles of travel last year was 4.5, as compared with 4.65 in 1959.

Which would indicate that, as small as it is, we are reaping some rewards from the efforts we are making to improve the safety of our highways.

The discouraging trend that we have noted in the national figures unfortunately are apparent in the figures for our State.

Last year, there were 588 deaths on the highways of Maryland, as compared with 458 in 1961 and 511 in 1960. In addition to the deaths, 30,480 persons received injuries in 1962, as compared with 26,857 in 1961, and 24,637 in 1960.

And may I say, parenthetically, that I think that we are too easily inclined to ignore these injury statistics in our appraisal of the problem.

To be sure, our major concern is with the deaths. But 30,480 persons were hurt, many of them severely injured and some of them with lifetime handicaps, in motor vehicle mishaps occurring on our Maryland highways.

That, you will observe, is nearly 1 person in 10 of our entire population.

These figures, then, provide us with an accurate inventory of our problem, and should, at least, impress us with the urgent need of finding its solution.

At the National Conference of Governors, which met in Miami Beach, Fla., a few weeks ago, I had the honor to serve on the Conference Committee on Roads and Highway Safety.

Among the points stressed there was that highway safety is not a matter of concern for just one jurisdiction,, one level of government, one agency or one group.

It is, on the contrary, the responsibility of all, from the highest governmental authority down to the individual citizen himself.

"To be of maximum effect," a guide for highway safety, prepared by the Council of State Governments and approved by the conference, said—"to be of maximum effect a traffic safety program must include all levels of government—local, State, and National—with the State playing the leading role."

The same opinion was voiced by a Federal Government official, Mr. James K. Williams, who is director of the new Office of Highway Safety in the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

"Highway safety today," said Mr. Williams, "includes a vast system of interstate travel which can hardly be regarded as the exclusive concern of any single jurisdiction. The traffic accident problem simply does not respect any political or geographic boundary lines."

The Federal Government, through the Office of Highway Safety, has added a new and important dimension to the total national traffic safety effort, showing that its interest in the many miles of interstate highways it is building continues after the ribbon is cut opening up a new section of highway.

The Federal Government, however, recognizes that "official State and local agencies have the primary responsibility for traffic safety measures"—a proposition which was accepted by the Governors at the conference.

At the State and local level, emphasis was placed on an energetic application of the highway safety action program, which was devised by the President's Committee for Traffic Safety a few years ago, and which has been revised periodically since that time.

This program, which we have followed in this State, calls for a continuing expansion and strengthening of laws and ordinances governing the use and handling of motor vehicles.

It stresses the construction of more and better highways, with increased emphasis on good engineering and other safety factors in road construction.

It points up sharply the need for more education in the traffic safety fields. The populace should be kept constantly aware of the great perils involved in highway travel. All persons given permits to drive should know how to handle the powerful machine they operate, and any person giving evidence that he has not this knowledge, or is not using it properly, should be deprived of the privilege to drive.

The action program calls for a tightening of law enforcement, with prompt and severe justice being meted out to all persons who threaten their own lives and the lives of others in the mishandling of motor vehicles.

It advocates plugging any gaps that may exist in proper motor vehicle administration and police traffic supervision.

With all this, to be effective it is essential that any program, State or local, have full support of its citizenry.

Here is where we, in positions of official responsibility for highway safety, call upon the Safety First Club of Maryland, and the many other organizations like it in Maryland, for help, in the heavy task we have to perform.

It is extremely important, let me repeat, that the State or the local government have organized and effective citizen support for their traffic safety program.

And there is no better way—perhaps no other way—for them to receive this support save through organizations such as this.

You, more than any one else, can influence the individual and let me say that it is the individual himself who bears the ultimate responsibility for the safety, or the lack thereof, of motor vehicular travel.

Yes, we need better highways. We need stepped-up law enforcement. We need improved driver education. We need seat belts and we need mechanical improvements for automobiles. There is need for automobile inspection and I sincerely hope we will have a satisfactory program of auto inspection in the near future.

But somehow or other we must find a way to reach the careless driver, to impress upon him the error of his ways and if necessary to remove him from a position in which he can menace all those about him.

This undoubtedly is what the legislator from Virginia had in mind when he spoke of jackasses, nincompoops, drunks, and fools.

We don't have to be drunks, of course, but at one time or another most of us are foolish and may act like jackasses and nincompoops.

The important thing is that we not act—and not be allowed to act—like fools and jackasses and nincompoops while we are behind the wheel of an automobile.

Your State government recognizes that traffic safety is one of its heaviest responsibilities. It is also aware that it offers one of the greater opportunities to the State to contribute to the social and economic well-being of its citizens.

We realize that to do an effective job in traffic safety, the State must bring to bear in a concerted manner all of the available resources.

Our objective, of course, is to reduce traffic losses in Maryland to an absolute minimum, consistent with the efficient and economical use of the street and highway transportation system.

To achieve the maximum effect a traffic safety program must, as I have said, include all levels of government—local, State, and national.

Public officials have the responsibility for developing and executing an effective official traffic safety program. But we cannot do this job alone.

We cannot do the job effectively without citizen understanding and citizen support. We are in a large measure dependent upon the active participation of citizen groups such as this Safety First Club of Maryland.

Many departments and agencies of government are participating in Maryland's effort to reduce the heavy toll in highway accidents—the Maryland Traffic Safety Commission, the Maryland State Police, the State Department of Education, the traffic courts, the Department of Motor Vehicles, the State Roads Commission and others.

I urge you, then, as enlightened citizens with keen sense of public responsibility, to continue your support of these agencies.

Ours is a task that requires the unyielding and untiring effort of every citizen. I know that I can rely upon all of you here to help in this great cause.

America's First Lady of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, women are increasingly finding their rightful places in our society. Aviation is no exception to this encouraging trend. Progress, however, needs pioneers. We all remember with admiration one of the early women pioneers in aviation, Amelia Earhart. Recently, a commemorative airmail stamp has been issued honoring Amelia Earhart. She died at the age of 39, lost in the Pacific striving for further accomplishment in aviation and to establish on an equal basis the position of women in a scientific field previously held exclusively by men. She was the first woman to fly the Atlantic, the first to fly the Pacific and the first woman to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross.

We, in Jamestown, N.Y., also proudly boast an outstanding lady of aviation, Mrs. John H. Wright. I am honored to call the attention of my colleagues and the Nation to two fine articles written by Mrs. Wright for the Jamestown Morning Star. I include the articles in full at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S FIRST LADY OF AVIATION

(By Lucile M. Wright)

Amelia Earhart, pioneer in aviation, first president and cofounder of the Ninety-Nines, first woman to fly the Atlantic, first to fly the Pacific and the first woman to receive the Distinguished Flying Cross. Amelia Earhart during her short lifetime has been honored throughout the world for her contribution to aviation. On July 24, 1963, her feloiw Americans will honor her memory by the issue of a commemorative airmail stamp.

The month of July is important to women who fly, for in this month America's most distinguished woman flyer was born and at the early age of 39 was lost in the Pacific in an attempt to further the progress of aviation and establish on an equal basis, the position of women in a scientific field previously held exclusively by men.

After Amelia Earhart's historic first flight across the Atlantic in 1928, a group of her women friends actively interested in aviation banded together to promote interest in flying among women. The action was spearheaded by Clara Trenckman Studer, public relations executive for Curtiss Flying Service.

Twenty-six of the 117 licensed women pilots in the United States gathered at Curtiss Field Valley Stream, Long Island, on November 2, 1929, to organize into a club. Sipping tea and munching cookies, the girls counted the number of replies received from the 117 eligible candidates to their proposed flying club. Many names for the club were considered but it was Amelia Earhart, the first president who suggested that the club be named in honor of the charter members, the 99 licensed women pilots who had accepted the invitation to form the club.

The aims and purposes of the Ninety-Nine Club were (1) to coordinate the interests and efforts of women in the field of aviation; (2) to assist them in any movement which will be of help to them in aeronautical research, in air racing events and in the acquisition of aerial experience; (3) to assist women pilots in cooperating with men flyers to serve humanity in times of emergency arising from fire, flood, famine or war or any other interest that will be for their benefit or will benefit aviation in general.

The Ninety-Nine have grown and prospered and many who have had to cease active participation in flying have devoted their interests to related areas in the field of aviation.

Only a few years after Amelia Earhart was lost in the Pacific, her friends and dedicated flying enthusiasts, members of her beloved Ninety-Nines, started the ball rolling to have her memory honored by the issuance of a commemorative airmail stamp. Applying the axiom of "constant dripping weareth away stone," the persistence of the charter members of the Ninety-Nine's and other friends the impossible was achieved. The commemorative stamp and memorial first day covers, "Friendship Specials" inaugurated by the Ninety-Nines, will be issued, canceled, and flown from Atchison, Kans., July 20, 1963.

Participating in the Fly-Away are the seven charter members of the Ninety-Nines who have been actively flying since the organization of the club in 1929. Each of the seven members will fly a route in the United States that figured prominently in the flying exploits of their world-famous first president and founder.

First day cachets will have overseas "Friendship Flights" to the European countries that honored Amelia. In London, the Royal Aero Club paid Amelia a special tribute. In Paris, the French Government made her a Knight of the Legion of Honor; in Brussels she was decorated with the Order of Leopold by the Belgians; and in Rome the Italians presented her with the Balbo Medal.

There will be special ceremonies in Northern Ireland to honor the daughter of their kinfolk who landed on the "auld sod" after her solo flight across the Atlantic.

The hotel for Air Force personnel in Weisbaden, Germany, is named for Amelia Earhart. She was commissioned a major in the Air Force a few years before she started her ill-fated last flight.

We Ninety-Nines who will journey to Amelia's hometown to honor her memory and participate in the commemorative stamp celebration go with mixed feelings of emotion. We admire her courage, we respect her forthrightness and we are attuned to the sympathetic understanding she had for her fellow man, and the desire to share with others her experiences in the wild blue yonder.

A few years after her disappearance, Gill Robb Wilson so beautifully expressed for all of us, in the poem "One from Ninety-Nine," our keen sense of loss of our beloved First Lady of the Air.

ONE FROM NINETY-NINE

"Is life more truly ours than yours,
Loved friend we toast tonight?
Are you less present here than we
Who share the candlelight?
Must life be certified in years
And memory by authentic tears,
Or may we hail with valiant cheers
The living—not in sight?

"Bright spirit of the blue frontier
Where silver navies ply,
No place on this rolling sphere
Can claim that there you lie.
Though wind and tide may have your wing
They cannot quench that living thing,
That deathless passion which must sing
Its song against the sky."

ATCHISON WAS FUN BUT HOME IS BEST

(By Lucile M. Wright)

Atchison, Kans., tiny community of 12,000, situated on the banks of the muddy Missouri River, 45 miles north of Kansas City, 28 miles south of St. Joseph, Mo., was the scene of tremendous activity on July 23–24 when more than 2,000 visitors joined the local citizens in honoring Amelia Earhart, native daughter.

The occasion was the celebration of the first day of issue of the 8-cent airmail stamp commemorating the contributions to aviation made by our first lady of the air, Amelia Earhart.

Since I was selected to make the presentation to the library of the memorial plaque and I had opened my big mouth, in praise of our wonderfully skilled craftsmen in Jamestown I was given the job of having the bronze medallions suitably mounted and transported to Atchison in time for the celebration. Time was running short but I had faith in my fellow citizens, knowing that they would meet the deadline and do the finest job that could be done any place in the country. That confidence paid off and I am prouder than ever of their ability.

It was decided that the 2- by 4-foot walnut plaque carrying the two bronze medallions (obverse and reverse of the Amelia Earhart medal) and the inscribed bronze plate would be best transported by private conveyance under personal supervision. This was a facet of my job that I had not counted on. However, the job must be done so using my 1963 station wagon as the modus operandi we took off (on four wheels) for the 1,000-mile flight to Kansas. Using thruways, turnpikes, toll roads, and freeways, practically no stops and continued speeds between 50 and 70 miles per hour we arrived in plenty of time to supervise the installation on the wall of the children's room of the Atchison Library, this precious work of art.

Tuesday, July 23, 500 visitors arrived in Atchison to participate in the opening ceremony of the 2-day celebration. The heat was the most exhausting I have ever experienced, temperature 100 degrees in the shade and no shade. The sun was relentless, burning you to a crisp. Local residents didn't seem to mind the heat but those of us carrying excess blubber were continually dehydrated even though we tried to frequent only air conditioned spots.

Evening program on Tuesday was held in the U.S. Ordnance Supply Depot, a natural cave, perpetually air conditioned, temperature 68 degrees in this largest cave in the world (44 square miles). Here in the auditorium seating 1,000 people, honors were bestowed upon the 7 flying charter members of the Ninety-Nines who would at dawn the next day fly to the 4 corners of the United States carrying first day covers bearing the new Amelia Earhard commemorative stamp.

Col. George W. Von Arb, commander of the 381st Strategic Missile Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, presented the seven flying charter members with honorary membership of the 381st and presented each with the designated embroidered patch.

Felicity Buranelli, founder of Medal of the Month Foundation, awarded Amelia Earhart medals to each of the women flyers.

I represented the American Association of Airport Executives and presented inscribed silver bowls honoring Amelia Earhart to Mayor Mangelsdorf, Postmaster Smith, operator of Ameria Earhart Memorial Airport Thomas Monk; Mrs. Fay Gillis Wells, charter member of the Ninety-Nines, and coordinator of the women's participation in the commemorative stamp celebration; Dr. Wayne Frazer, president, chamber of commerce; Mrs. J. Maria Pierce, international president of Zonta; Mrs. Irene Bird, chairman of Zonta activities during the celebration; Miss Evelyn Reed, president, Atchison Zonta Club; Mrs. Louise Smith, international president of Ninety-Nines and to Mrs. Muriel Earhart Morrissey, sister of our first lady of aviation.

Wednesday, July 24, 1963, anniversary of Amelia Earhart's 65th birthday, featured the dawn fly-away of the seven Ninety-Nine

charter members and 10:30 a.m. dedication ceremony at Amelia Earhart Stadium.

U.S. Air Force Band from Scott Field, Ill., entertained the crowd of more than 2,000 people who braved the 100 degree heat to pay tribute to America's most distinguished woman flyer.

Postmaster General J. Edward Day dedicated the first day issue of the Amelia Earhart stamp, presented commemorative albums to local dignitaries. Pastmaster General Day marveled at the record sale of first day issue stamps and covers stating that it is the largest on record of any first day issue. His address highlighted Miss Earhart's contributions to aviation.

Mrs. J. Maria Pierce, president of Zonta International, paid glowing tribute to the former member of the Zonta Club of Boston (A. E.) and told of scholarships given by Zonta in her honor for study in Aeronautical Engineering to women all over the world.

Mrs. Louise Smith, International President of the 99's, told of the growth of the organization which Amelia Earhart founded, from the 99 charter member to more than 1,700 active members today.

Mrs. Muriel Morrissey, sister of Amelia Earhart, was introduced and accepted the tributes to her sister "with overflowing heart and deepest gratitude." Hundreds of school children swarmed around Mrs. Morrissey asking and receiving autographs.

A luncheon at the country club for participants in the program and guests gave the local citizens the opportunity to visit with their out-of-town friends.

Children's Room of the Atchison Library was the scene of the unveiling of the beautiful commemorative plaque by Postmaster General Day and your correspondent, who is a contemporary of Amelia Earhart, life member of the 99's, honorary member of Jamestown, (N.Y.) Zonta Club, executive member of the American Association of Airport Executives, and presented the plaque to Mrs. John Buehler, president of the library board who accepted it on behalf of the Atchison Library.

Visiting members of Zonta Clubs from East Hidalgo County, Tex., Harlingen, Tex., San Antonio, Tex., West Hidalgo County, Tex., Wichita, Kans., Topeka, Kans., Kansas City and Jamestown were entertained at dinner by the Atchison Zonta Club. International Zonta president, Mrs. J. Maria Pierce told of her recent visit to European Zonta Clubs and of her visit to the Ramallah School for refugee women located in Jordan and to which Zonta International contributes substantially.

Thursday morning, my flight on four wheels took off at 6 a.m., temperature 85 degrees. I set a compass heading of 90 degrees with a straight and unobstructed highway before me and full throttle I was headed for the home port. Touchdowns en route were made at Laclede, home of General Pershing; Hannibal, Mo., birthplace of Mark Twain to also visit the *River Queen*, one of the last of the old stern wheelers to ply the Mississippi; Springfield, Ill., Land of Lincoln before I glimpsed the hills of home.

Never before have the rolling hills of Chautauqua County looked so cool and inviting. Never before have the breezes from Chautauqua Lake felt so fresh and invigorating. Never before have I been so glad to rest my weary bones in my own bed.

I was happy to have been a part of the celebration honoring an outstanding American woman but after all there is no place like home.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Hon. Carl Hatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of the former Senator from New Mexico, Carl Hatch. He is best remembered as an advocate of clean politics and the champion of cleaner elections when he authored the nationally known Hatch Acts of 1939 and 1940. More important however this devoted public servant was one of the most influential and respected figures during his years of service in the U.S. Senate. His contribution to the betterment of this Nation through his defense of reciprocal trade agreements, his demand for bipartisan foreign policy, his championship of irrigation, and reclamation and power projects for the West, his strong interest in labor legislation, and his efforts dealing with the preservation of peace are to be recalled with pride. This great statesman has left his family and the coming generations of Americans a legacy that will continue to guide this country on its path of freedom and world leadership.

Mrs. Morris and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Hatch and other members of his family.

[From the Washington Daily News]

CARL HATCH

Some men are not as well sung as others. And some who are relatively unsung are big men nonetheless.

Carl Hatch, of New Mexico, was not well sung, personally, but everybody in Government knows about the Hatch Act. And the voters of Senator Hatch's day—pre-World War II—know about the motives for it.

The Hatch Act still is on the books, despite numerous and sly efforts by less-principled politicians to amend it, or repeal it.

It was an effort by the Senator to outlaw "pernicious political activity"—like slugging the Federal payrollers, including the depression-day WPA, for campaign contributions. The law also attempted to put a ceiling on campaign expenditures, nominally one of the most wasteful ways to squander money.

By now, they say, the Hatch ceilings ($3 million a year for a national party committee, $5,000 a year in contributions from any one rich man) are unrealistic. But the Senator's purpose was sound.

Carl Hatch was in the Senate from 1933 to 1949. He did not distinguish himself by demagogy. Or play to the galleries. But he did have high principles. He was honest. He was a statesman.

It is 14 years since he was in the Senate. And when he died the other day, many newsmen doubtless had to go to their libraries to learn about him. Even Senators might have been at pains to recall him. But the Senate today would be much better if it had him.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1963]

HATCH SERVED LIBERAL CAUSE

Carl A. Hatch, for whom funeral services will be held in Albuquerque, N. Mex., today, will perhaps be best remembered for the "clean politics" act that bears his name.

But those who knew the New Mexico Democrat during his 15 years in the Senate, where he was one of the most influential and respected figures, also recall that he was a statesman's version of the man of the soil—able to consider both the problems of the grassroots and those on the Nations' horizon.

So it was that Senator Hatch was a champion of irrigation, reclamation and power projects for his State, and also an early fighter for the United Nations, a bipartisan foreign policy, and many liberal causes.

He steered through Congress in 1939 a bill that his colleagues feared might damage them politically.

ACT CURBS PARTY AID

The Hatch Act was aimed at limiting contributions to political parties and taking the civil service out of politics. It was amended in 1940 to cover State officials paid in part with Federal funds.

Senator Hatch died Sunday at the age of 73 in Albuquerque. He had retired because of illness in August 1962 as Federal district judge in New Mexico. President Truman had appointed him to that post after he decided not to seek reelection to the Senate.

Senator Hatch was born in Kirwin, Kans., and there as a child counted eggs and weighed butter in his father's country store. Shortly after the turn of the century the family moved to the booming railroad town of Eldorado, Okla.

After he completed high school, he began to work on the town newspaper as printer's devil. At age 19, he bought an interest in the weekly Courier and became an editor.

TURNS TO LAW

Then he began to study law with borrowed books, sold his share in the paper and entered Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tenn., where he was awarded a law degree.

He returned home to practice law, married Ruth Caviness, a childhood friend, and in 1916 moved to Clovis, N. Mex. There his political career began.

In 1917 he was appointed assistant State attorney general and in 1923 became a State judge. He held a variety of State offices and practiced law for the next decade until he was appointed to an unexpired term in the U.S. Senate in 1933.

BACKED NEW DEAL

Senator Hatch was a supporter of the New Deal but differed at times with the administration, notably on Franklin D. Roosevelt's attempt to enlarge the Supreme Court.

He was part of the "B2-H2," Senate team that led the battle to reverse the Senate's traditional isolation and pave the way for the U.N. The other team members were Senators Joseph H. Ball, Republican of Minnesota, Harold Burton, Republican of Ohio, and Lister Hill, Democrat of Alabama.

Senator Hill, after hearing of Senator Hatch's death, said he was "one of the ablest and most devoted public servants I've ever known."

Defense of the Reclamation Program and the Bureau of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on August 17, Life magazine published and article entitled "Pork Barrel Outrage: Too Much Money Spent Foolishly—Now See the Innards of a Fat Pig." The article was unbelievably inaccurate. It is difficult to understand why a publication such as Life magazine would publish such an article without first checking the facts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Water Users Association at its recent convention held in Minot, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED AT A MEETING OF THE DIRECTORS OF THE NORTH DAKOTA WATER USERS ASSOCIATION IN MINOT ON AUGUST 20 AND ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

Whereas Life magazine on August 17 published an illustrated article entitled "Pork Barrel Outrage: Too Much Money Spent Foolishly—Now See the Innards of a Fat Pig"; and

Whereas said article is critical in the extreme of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation; and

Whereas the authors obviously had instructions or preconceived ideas as to how the article should be written; and

Whereas to accomplish their purposes, they ignored certain facts concerning the need for the continuance of reclamation and the 92 percent reimbursability of the program; and

Whereas they further ignored other community and national benefits which are realized from the successful completion and operation of the reclamation projects; and

Whereas these omissions resulted in a distorted and untrue picture of reclamation; and

Whereas such distortions create a wrong and damaging impression in the public mind; and

Whereas Congressman KIRWAN, of Ohio, made a penetrating analysis of the worth and need of reclamation in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the North Dakota Water Users Association has witnessed the accomplishments of the Federal Reclamation program and recognizes the importance of continuance of this work in North Dakota, the Western States, and all of the Nation; and

Whereas the people representing an area which embraces nearly 60 percent of the assessed valuation of North Dakota, have organized a conservancy district to undertake financial responsibility for the repayment of such Federal funds as may be required in the

construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit project; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Water Users Association go on record condemning the editors of Life magazine for their intemperate, thoughtless, and irresponsible attack on the Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

Resolved, That the said association express its gratitude to Congressman KIRWAN for his fearless and thoughtful defense of reclamation; and be it further

Resolved, That said association call upon the editors of Life magazine to reproduce Congressman KIRWAN's article in its pages as some partial restitution and correction of the damage wrought by their thoughtless action.

[SEAL] R. L. DUSHINSKE,
President.
OSCAR N. BERG,
Executive Vice President.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many American who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressed and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SOUTH BOSTON LITHUANIAN CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
South Boston, Mass., July 16, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens' Association, an organization with a membership of over 1,600 U.S. citizens, I wish to endorse your efforts for the passage of the measure to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The Lithuanian-Americans of the Boston area have, since the occupation of Lithuania by Russia, worked constantly with the Congressmen of our district to keep the problem of this unwarranted and pressing aggression of the Soviets against the Baltic states alive with the hope that some day Lithuania may again be restored to the dignity that she is entitled to among the nations of this world.

We sincerely hope that your committee will take prompt action on House Resolution 14.

Very truly yours,
JOHN G. CRIGALUS,
President.

JULY 30, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I wish to thank you for your most thoughtful statements regarding the commemoration of the Captive Nations Week and for all your determined efforts in behalf of the Communist-subjucated captive peoples.

It is of utmost importance that in this era of "relaxed tension" with the Soviets and the possibility of a nonaggression treaty between the East and the West, the tragic fate of the captive eastern European countries not be forgotten.

Kindly continue to do everything you can to keep this vital issue alive.

With warmest personal wishes.

Yours,
JUHAN SIMONSON.

LAKEWOOD, N.J.

ELM GROVE, WIS.,
July 27, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Appreciate your efforts in behalf of the formation of a sustaining committee on captive nations in the House of Representatives.

Have written to Representative SCHADEBURG and THOMPSON from Wisconsin; also, the chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Your efforts in this area are important to the free world—my thanks.

Respectfully,
Mrs. R. G. RICE.

NATIONAL LITHUANIAN SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.,
July 30, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: In the name of the captive Lithuanian nation, we, American citizens of Lithuanian origin, earnestly urge that you, in your capacity as chairman of the Committee on Rules, do take quick action on House Resolution 14. Right now is definitely the hour in which to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The following excerpt from the vigorous editorial page of the Record American of July 18, 1963 expresses the situation very succintly:

"THE CAPTIVES

"Captive Nations Week * * * serves to remind us that—

"1. While Premier Khurshchev may be forced by expediency into seeking some kind of accommodation with the West, the Soviet Union is an imperialistic and tyrannous power. No nation ever has accepted Communist rule voluntarily.

"2. If, as is possible, he tries to make a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries a condition of a/nuclear test ban agreement he will be seeking to formalize an international crime—that being the enslavement of Eastern European nations.

"A NATO-Warsaw Pact treaty would condone on our side the capitivity of the captive nations, including East Germany.

"We can't do much to free the captive nations. But let's not help Khrushchev make the shackles stronger."

May we count on your support, Mr. SMITH, for the establishment of a congressional committee to study the distressing situation of the enslavement of entire nations to Soviet imperialism and colonialism.

Respectfully yours,
ANTHONY MATIOSKA,
Chairman.

DORCHESTER, MASS.

JULY 24, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I admire your relentless fight against the spread of Russian domination and I am especially grateful for your friendship toward the Lithuanian people and their effort to keep the Lithuanian freedom cause alive.

I hope the House Resolution 14 will be enacted and will become an important factor in turning the Communist tide.

Sincerely,
A. P. MASIKA.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL STAEBLER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, many words have been spoken in debate of the foreign aid bill, and particular emphasis has been put on the long history of bipartisan support for this measure. My Republican colleagues from Michigan have insisted that a bipartisan attitude still prevails. However, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD an editorial in the Detroit News which casts a dubious light on the bipartisanship of the debate.

I am hopeful that in the coming days we will see a truer bipartisanship displayed in consideration of the foreign aid program:

POLITICS, ELEPHANTINE STYLE

The elephant never forgets. But apparently the same cannot be said for the Republican Party, which claims the elephant as its symbol.

In their slashing attack on foreign aid in the House, the Republicans forsook the bipartisan approach that their party has pursued since the days of the late Senator Vandenberg.

Foreign aid is not sacrosanct, nor should it be immune to congressional criticism. But this is the first time in 15 years, according to

experienced observers, that the House GOP leadership has led the fight for such a drastic curtailment of foreign aid funds.

The GOP leadership not only deserted Vandenberg. It deserted former President Eisenhower and Gen. Lucius Clay as well. Both had come to the support of the foreign aid bill when it got into trouble in Congress. Clay, whose special committee had recommended a general tightening up, warned that cuts below $4.1 billion would put "severe strains" on the security and solvency of the free world. Yet the House voted to cut the funds to $3.5 billion, with 156 Republicans and 66 Democrats carrying the day against the 172 Democrats and 16 Republicans who opposed this slash.

But this was not the only time the GOP elephant lost its memory. Earlier, when the development loan fund came up for discussion, the Republicans came out against the revolving fund principle which permits the Agency for International Development to relend, without congressional approval, funds repaid on past loans.

Yet the Republican administration of former President Eisenhower had advocated this principle and recommended its support by Congress, not without some Democratic opposition. Now, however, with a Democratic administration desiring to continue the fund, Republicans came down against it, and failed to repeal it only by a narrow margin.

But if these Republicans were guilty of playing politics on the foreign aid bill, so were the Southern Democrats. For many of them abstained on critical votes, or cast their ballots for crippling amendments, in order to register their opposition to the Kennedy administration's civil rights program.

Nor is the President himself free of criticism on the same score. For he assailed the GOP leadership for a "shocking and thoughtless attack" without conceding that many Democrats had gone along with the Republican amendments. Nor did he admit that the administration itself must bear some of the blame because of its leadership deficiencies and its failure to clean up irregularities in the handling of foreign aid programs in many countries.

Religion in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahassee, Fla., on September 8, 1963, printed an outstanding editorial entitled "The People Want Religion in School." I feel the subject matter of this editorial is indicative of the feeling of the overwhelming majority of Americans and I commend it to the Congress for their reading:

THE PEOPLE WANT RELIGION IN SCHOOL

"If a vote were taken today, it would be found that 90 percent of the American people want their children exposed to prayer and Bible reading in school," Evangelist Billy Graham said.

Graham should know the mind and heart of America. His crusade in Los Angeles drew nearly 30,000 persons in the second of 3 weeks. He sounded the bell for a march on Washington that would dwarf the civil rights march if the U.S. Supreme Court continues its trend toward "throwing God and the Bible out of our national life."

Religious leaders the country over are alarmed that, as Graham said, "secularism is the fastest growing religion in America." The Supreme Court decision banning prayer and the Bible from public schools is helping speed the trend. For school prayer and Bible reading kept alive religious awareness in children, which must now be lost because a very small minority complained that it exposed their children to religion.

A recent Gallup poll showed 24 percent approved the Supreme Court decision on prayer and the Bible, 70 percent disapproved and 6 percent had no opinion. That is not as high as Graham's 90 and 10 percent, but it is still high enough to show the mood of the people.

Whether it is 70 percent or 90, the great majority of Americans want elementary religious exercises in the schools, even while they recognize that the church and the home are the places to give complete instruction according to each family's belief.

For one thing, they fear the utterly confused legal issue will cause such a pointed abstention from any mention of religion in the classroom that their children may carry home a disdain or scorn of religious teaching that will be difficult to overcome when they try to reach their minds through the pulpit and family devotionals.

It is clear that Congress would be doing a very popular thing to move for restoration of nondenominational acceptance of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools by submitting to the States a constitutional amendment clarifying the doctrine of religious freedom and separation of church and state.

ACLU Protests U.S. Chaplains—Cites the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, those who would reduce the United States to a godless society have moved again. As I predicted some time ago, they are now attacking the legality of spending public funds to pay the salaries of chaplains in the Armed Forces.

An attorney for the Civil Liberties Union in New Jersey has written a letter to Secretary of Defense McNamara attacking the status of chaplains. And, in so doing, he has relied on the decisions of the Supreme Court in the prayer and Bible reading cases. This is the same organization, Mr. Speaker, which filed a suit in California attacking the constitutionality of the words "under God" which were inserted by the Congress in 1954 in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Members can stop that kind of godless attack by signing discharge petition No. 3, which has been on the desk of the Clerk since July 9. Again, I urge you to do it now.

I insert at this point a newspaper article recounting details of the attack on chaplains:

ACLU PROTESTS U.S. CHAPLAINS; CITES THE COURT

CAMDEN, N.J., Sept. 14.—An American Civil Liberties Union chapter today challenged the Government's constitutional right to pay chaplains to teach religion to servicemen and their dependents.

It cited the Supreme Court's decision outlawing Bible reading and prayer recitation in public schools.

If public schools may not sanction prayers, "we do not know how the U.S. Army would have any more right to teach religion," said Charles C. Thomas, a Camden lawyer who is chairman of the South Jersey Committee of the New Jersey ACLU.

LETTER TO M'NAMARA

Thomas raised the question in a letter to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. He said the issue had never been dealt with before.

The Defense Department replied that military regulations require that voluntary religious instruction be offered.

"But that completely ignored my basic contention—namely, that the U.S. Government should not employ anyone to teach religion, even if the religious training is taken voluntarily," Thomas said.

Human Rights, Social Justice Vital to Survival of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a news release from the September 13, 1963, edition of the People's Voice, a weekly newspaper published at Helena, Mont. The Voice, as this paper is known to the people of Montana, is one which is independent in thought and expresses the liberal viewpoint.

The news article reports the program of the Montana Labor Week Seminar held at Great Falls, Mont., which was sponsored by farm and labor groups in the State of Montana:

HUMAN RIGHTS, SOCIAL JUSTICE, VITAL TO SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY

"There is nothing in divine destiny that says we will survive if we do not bring intelligence to the problems with which we are faced," Ted Silvey, AFL-CIO Speakers Bureau, Washington, D.C., told the Montana Labor Week Seminar in Great Falls last week. The words of Mr. Silvey carried a theme that was paramount through the 2½ day conclave on the College of Great Falls campus.

The seminar, sponsored by farm-labor groups in the area, brought spiritual, farm, labor and political science leaders before the more than 170 people who attended the meetings.

How to handle the problems of a society faced with automation, population explosions, nuclear weapons, a virulent right-wing movement, a crisis of human rights and the menace of chronic unemployment held the attention of audiences from 9 a.m. till 10 and 11 p.m. Thursday and Friday, September 5 and 6, and until 1:30 p.m. Saturday.

The urgency of time in dealing with vital social problems was stressed by all speakers.

Mr. Silvey spoke of the effect of automation on society and said change is hard for the human being to endure and the cultural lag and our refusal to adapt to the coming of new science is evident everywhere * * * that we all need less and less of drudgery because now the machine does it better, faster, and cheaper.

"Automation should be the servant not the master," he said, "automation is neutral; people are moral or immoral." He said we can advance the world to undreamed of heights with these forces or we can destroy it with the same forces.

Automation can cause unemployment but it can also be a new opportunity, he explained, noting that since 1949 employment has been going up but we have more unemployed, that the world is plagued wtih ignorance at the time when educational facilities are increasing; that with all the slum clearance slums increase.

"We are suffering from the disease of cultural lag because we are unwilling to make social and technological changes necessary to keep up."

The Federal Government has a role to play in our society, Silvey said, because our great potential has to be used for human benefit, not only for private profitmaking. The technology in agriculture is fantastic and we have to ask ourselves whether we produce food for nourishment or profit. "With two-fifths of the families in this country undernourished, with granaries loaded and storage a problem it is a sacrilege to say you can't have it unless I make a profit," he said, adding, "production for use is being forced upon us."

There are things that people need and can be had but which private enterprise can not and will not supply that can come only through public enterprise and public investment for social profit, among them education, health facilities, slum clearance, housing, and natural resource development, he contended.

Rev. L. J. Twomey, S. J., director, Institute of Industrial Relations, Loyola University, New Orleans, hit hard at unbridled profit at the expense of human beings, saying "the little people of this world are going to be served or they are going to bring our civilization to ruin around us as well as themselves." He contended that every human being must be equipped to live a life in accordance with the dignity which is a reflection of the Divine nature of man. Only after every man has the goods and services necessary and sufficient to satisfy the material needs of life is business entitled to a profit or labor entitled to a wage, he said.

The New Orleans priest said the Federal Government can take money away from us because every man is entitled to the minimum, and property must be put to a useful social purpose. "This is not clear to the American people, American management, or American labor," he said.

"The income tax amendment of 1913 helped save capitalism," Twomey said, adding, "read and see how much social conscience they (management) had * * * rugged individualism forced the Government to act."

We are not going to be able to preserve political democracy, he emphasized, unless we have a satisfactory degree of economic democracy and self-government within the economic community with responsible collective bargaining between management and labor.

Pat Greathouse, Detroit, United Auto Workers vice president, speaking at the Thursday evening banquet, spoke of the urgency of time when he asked what we do with the year of time we buy each year with our billions for defense. We can kill every man, woman, and child 250 times over yet we still don't feel safe, he said.

We need to be for peace and have an understanding of something besides the arms race, he said. We can have freedom and bread and show the Communists we are not afraid to compete in the arena of ideas.

He called for a strong liberal voice to counter the voice of reaction in this country and said labor should provide that leadership.

Greathouse noted that some people say we are heading for a world without work and said, "how do we live in a world without work and a world of abundance; maybe this will never be, but we can at least live in a world without want."

There is a great need for people to adapt themselves to the changing times. Programs have to change to adapt themselves to need and someone has to pioneer in ideas, be the conscience of America and take unpopular positions if this country is to progress, he said.

The concept of man and the dignity of the human person was discussed by Rev. Joe Mackin, Department of Economics, Carroll College, Helena, who said the virtue of social justice is just as real as any other type of justice and he contended that private property is subordinate to the common good.

He said that racial discrimination is a sin against justice and charity.

The urgency of time was put in the context of the march for freedom all over the world.

Ted Silvey, who participated in the freedom march on Washington, D.C., August 28, gave a description of how the event looked through his eyes.

Pat Greathouse said the UAW signs carried in the parade read, "Whenever men march for freedom the UAW marches also."

Jim Patton, national president of the Farmers Union, said, "We are going through the greatest revolutionary period since the original war."

Father Twomey said each of us is caught up in what is undoubtedly one of the greatest crises in history and we can't disassociate ourselves, because we are intimately involved. He described the crisis as a very simple thing. "It is the denial of the basic rights of the human person, aggravated by a world force which has capitalized on the uncharitable denial of basic rights of thousands of human beings throughout the world," he said.

He said the Western World is largely responsible for the situation as it prevails today and while we have had similar if not as serious incidents in history the ingredient lacking in the past, that is present today, is the force that can capitalize on our failures.

He described communism as a social protest which without the appeal of our denial of human rights would never have reached the stage of being more than a nuisance.

"Communism is an effect not a cause and there never would have been such a thing as communism if it had not been for our failures," he said.

Our religious, political, and social cultural values have built a society in which an undetermined number of people have been denied their human rights, and added up through the decades we have reached a stage of revitalization of the rights, expectations, and spiraling frustrations of millions of people, according to Father Twomey.

"People will not forever be denied their God-given rights. You may suppress them indefinitely, but sooner or later they will overthrow governments and they will topple thrones in order to strike back at their oppressors," he said.

THE 1963 CIVIL RIGHTS BILL MUST BE ENACTED

He condemned our deplorable domestic record toward our Indian and Negro minorities saying that if the rising expectations of these people are not satisfied, "God help you and God help me," and called for support of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 now before Congress. "If this bill is defeated, or watered down to the point that it is meaningless, it will be one of the greatest tragedies since World War II * * * and only God knows what will follow," he stated.

Freedom from want and oppression were related to freedom to know and discussed by Mr. Silvey and other speakers as basic to democracy.

Silvey said intelligence is the real estate of the future, and we are changing from a people who work with material things to a nation of people who work with knowledge.

"We have to learn to handle a different commodity called knowledge rather than animal energy, and knowledge is the thing that human beings excel in," he said.

Contending that we need information more than we need material things, the AFL–CIO spokesman said we must search for these things in an anti-intellectual society which has been fostered by the power complex which continues to oppose universal knowledge as it always has in every age.

Clay Cochran, legislative consultant, industrial union department, AFL–CIO, said "freedom is man made and must be nourished," in his presentation on the extremists.

He described the extremists as a conglomeration of unhappy people who are always negative, violently neurotic and psychotic and most frightened at home. They do not believe in the discourse of a free society but they believe in the conspiracy theory of history * * * that everybody is about to do them in, he said.

Cochran said the fear and hate of the extremists springs from this period of great and rapid change and the fact we can't do just what we want with the world. They are supported by the power elite and have the blessings of the establishment, he said.

Ted Townsend, public relations director, Montana Farmers Union, said the weapon of the rightwing is oversimplification, motivated by fear and terror, related directly to their private gain.

SUBVERSIVE AGENTS

Father Twomey said the rightwing forces who use the law as an instrument of race prejudice, the basic purpose of which is to deprive human rights are subversive agents.

"We profess Christianity and democracy," he said, "they are the same and we have to take it whole."

Leon Keyserling, economist and attorney and chairman of the Committee for Economic Progress, said the civil rights battle is an aspect of our economic problem, that the greater contest is not between the races though sometimes it looks that way. The racial issue is being used to incite and cover up, he said.

The solution is to have full employment and give the Negro a chance to participate in the solution.

Keyserling, who said he had had dinner with President Kennedy the night before he spoke to the Great Falls group, was sharply critical of the trend the present administration is taking.

He specifically noted for Montanans that no State can transcend the national and international environment in which it operates and that the economy of this State is slower than others. "Everybody does not do the same, but everybody can do well," he said.

"Unemployment of manpower is the most serious indictment of a society because it says you are not wanted * * * you do not have the opportunity to grow in accord with your ability in the society in which you are a part," he said.

PRESENT POLICIES WON'T SOLVE UNEMPLOYMENT

The economic tree should be watered from the roots, he contended, saying that our unemployment problem is serious and will get worse under the policies presently being put forth.

The economy has not grown enough because of the unfair distribution of national income.

He was critical of the present tax bill before Congress and said it was as regressive

as the 1948 and 1954 bills and Democrats would "murder" Republicans if they were proposing this tax bill.

"What counts is not tax rates, but what it does to the people's incomes. Under the present bill the after-tax benefit for the $3,000 family would be 5 percent, the $5,000 family would be 8 percent, and the $200,000 family would be 23 percent," according to Keyserling.

TAX BILL OUR "SECOND CROSS OF GOLD"

"There is no moral or economic reason for this tax bill," he said, "it will put the purchasing power in the hands of the wrong people * * * it is the American people's second cross of gold."

He believed the Nation's economic situation is not just a congressional problem but also one for the administration as well as the Nation's liberal leaders.

Obviously aiming at the present administration he said the greatest progress in history, with one exception, has come under liberal minority Presidents who did not move forward by making speeches but by acting.

He called for strong liberal leadership because we can't wait for the test of time to see which way America will go if things get worse.

The Washington, D.C., economist had "no confidence any constructive legislation will be enacted on any major issue in the present atmosphere."

"We are not holding the executive branch with liberal thinking * * * we are losing our bargaining power * * * grassroots sound objectives have to be listened to and met to a reasonable degree, not just those of the politicians or we will have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage through the pallid acquiescence of those who have the power to do something about it," he said.

Jim Patton called for Montana people to confront political leaders with some of the "promissory notes" they were given in 1960.

Donald Tansley, chairman of Saskatchewan Medical Commission, explained the medical insurance program of his province and this presentation will be printed in full next week.

Most of the speakers referred to the health needs of this Nation and received thunderous applause when they proposed that what we need is a medical insurance plan that will cover all of the people. To get such a plan, Pat Greathouse said in answer to a question, "you first have to be for it." The Kennedy medical care plan was called "milk sop" and at best grossly inadequate by most speakers.

M. A. Ross, a vice president of the Brotherhood of Enginemen and Firemen, talked on the current rules movement and the problems of railroad labor.

Mrs. Kenneth Davies, national vice president of the Ladies Society of the B.L.F. & E., spoke on the "Complacency in Union Membership" and said that much of the reason more women are not active is because their men didn't want them to be. She suggested they look at "the power of the woman."

Leif Erickson, Montana Democratic National Committeeman, spoke on public power and resource development and said that we could have economic progress through public power development and preserve the esthetic values we have through proper pollution control laws such as have been enacted in eastern States.

Others appearing on the program included Dr. Joe Kelly, coordinator of Democratic party activities; Al Root, Montana director, Committee on Political Activities, AFL–CIO; James S. Umber, president, Montana State AFL–CIO; Gretchen Billings, associate editor, People's Voice, and a panel which included lobbyists and legislators present at the seminar.

Action Now or Consequences Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I suppose every Member receives repeated requests from constituents in the course of a session that material forwarded in correspondence be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We all know it is impossible to accede to these requests. On the other hand, even in the absence of such a request when a constituent writes a letter that contains some worthwhile thoughts, much better than the ordinary run of mail, a Member feels he should share these thoughts with his colleagues.

Recently we received a letter from Mr. Kenneth E. Williams, a teacher at William Chrisman High School in the city of Independence, Mo., which contained two major themes but which were blended together in a way that produced one single injunction to the Congress: Do something now to improve the education of our citizens by Federal assistance. Then do something during this present session by means of an immediate crash program against the worst diseases afflicting mankind or face the consequences of both of these deficiencies that will be manifested in the years ahead. Portions of the well-thought-out letter follow:

Representative WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RANDALL: I like to think that in our country the health and education of our citizens are of as vital concern to our Federal Government as our very necessary and very costly national defense program.

I do believe that the time has come when our legislators should begin thinking about the most immediate—and at the same time equally far-reaching needs of the United States:

1. A comprehensive national program to improve public education—and I see no better way at present than by approval of the President's National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

2. An immediate crash program to institute a campaign against every disease afflicting mankind today. Who can deny that pooling the greatest medical brains in a concentrated effort toward one goal is a mathematical certainty to achieve more positive results than a vast number of uncoordinated, poorly financed martyrs working at cross purposes, duplicating effort, and experimenting within commercial limitations often placed upon them. The group of brilliant scientists who worked together to achieve atomic superiority for our country did not do so by working for local or State governments or commercial enterprise but by working under close scrutiny of the Federal Government with all the funds and cooperation of other agencies necessary to accomplish their task.

Thousands of human beings die every year because of complacency on the part of the public, and because brilliant men go into areas other than research for reasons of financial necessity. It is more difficult to measure the effect on the minds and educational progress of American children and adults who, because of inadequate financing of public schools, lose many of their best qualified teachers to the few States paying decent salaries or even more often to better paying jobs outside the teaching field. The consequences of these deficiencies will be manifested in the future but can be lessened by immediate action by Congress.

I am urging Congress to open its eyes to the most immediate needs of all our people and do something about these needs now during the present session.

I urge you, as a representative of not only your fellow Missourians but also 190 million Americans throughout the country to bring these real needs of the everyday citizen to the attention of your fellow legislators in an open session * * * as the two most basic problems of our country as well as the world.

One could initiate the greatest humanitarian movement of our time by proposing a treaty between the free world and Communist nations in which all countries of the world work together with complete cooperation to end any one disease afflicting mankind.

Thank you for your consideration and action on these issues.

Very truly yours,
KENNETH E. WILLIAMS,
Teacher.

Foreign Aid Too High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the concern of the voters of my congressional district about Federal spending for foreign aid is the point of view expressed in an article in the Ironton Tribune, September 13, 1963, by its very talented editor, B. B. Mills. I wish to include this article in the RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

FOREIGN AID TOO HIGH

While we're rightfully concerned about the outflow of gold from this country, that can eventually break us financially, we would do well to consider the foreign aid expenses.

President Kennedy, while talking about tax cuts on the one hand, asked for a whopping $4.9 billion for foreign aid last January. Later he reduced this to $4.5 billion upon the report from a committee headed by Lucius Clay.

The House of Representatives, undoubtedly listening to the rumblings from constituents, wisely cut this to $3.5 billion. The President was reported furious over this action which he considered partisan.

When you consider the billions that you, the taxpayer, have shelled out for foreign aid in the past 19 years, it's high time some sensible action was taken, partisan or not.

We haven't gotten the security or good will that we thought these foreign aid billions would give us. Many of the nations we have helped don't care a hoot about us, and wouldn't come to our defense militarily, and not even on questions debated in the United Nations. Now many countries have come to expect the United States to give them aid regularly, and as a matter of course.

Just think, a billion dollars is one thousand million dollars. We talk of big figures

so often, it becomes almost casual, and the staggering amount sometimes doesn't sink in. When one considers the sacrifice this places on the taxpayer to ante up his share, it seems that 3½ times $1 billion is more than enough to give away in foreign aid.

Avon, Mass., Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress some of the facts related to the town of Avon, Mass., a community that celebrated its 75th anniversary during the past weekend. I include the program and also a news article that appeared in Monday's edition of the Quincy Patriot Ledger written by Mr. James Savage, staff reporter for the newspaper. I would also like to include "Some Historical Facts About Avon" written by Mr. Lewis W. Crane.

Avon is in my congressional district and is a typical small New England town having all the charm and beauty of a small community. Its people are very friendly and a fine civic spirit is evident throughout the entire town. I am very proud to represent Avon and I was most happy to join with all the townspeople in celebrating its 75th anniversary. The articles are as follows:

TEN THOUSAND TURN OUT TO CELEBRATE AVON'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY FETE

(By James Savage)

AVON.—The streets are silent in Avon today but a warm glow from the town's 3-day 75th birthday party still remains.

CAPACITY CROWD

The 4-square-mile town was filled to overflowing yesterday with some 10,000 spectators who came to watch the celebration—and they weren't disappointed.

It was a time of fire engines and Indians for the small fry, pretty girls and blaring trumpets for their parents and, for a woman named Hannah O'Connell, it was a time of memories.

Mrs. O'Connell, 86, the town's oldest resident, sat quietly in a special place of honor on the reviewing stand and watched the years march by.

For pretty, 16-year-old Miss Cheryl Smith it was a very special day. She was chosen Friday night as queen to reign throughout the 3-day anniversary celebration.

Six bands and numerous drum and bugle corps marched in yesterday's 2-mile-long parade. An Army band from Fort Devens, National Guard bands and the championship Redmen's Band of Wakefield highlighted the parade.

More than 1,000 persons, several horses, two patient oxen and countless fire engines moved along the parade route, which moved from the Avon Drive-in Theater to West Main Street, through the center and down East Main Street.

Police chief Carl Miller, parade marshal, on horseback, began the parade shortly after 3 p.m.

The 3-day celebration began Friday night at the high school auditorium with the crowning of Miss Smith, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Smith of 96 Oliver Street.

An all-day field day was held Saturday at Legion Memorial Field for the youngsters. Prizes were awarded for foot races, doll carriage parades and a tug-of-war contest.

A special section of the Sunday afternoon parade was also reserved for the children. Little girls in long dresses and boys in high hats drew smiles from the spectators.

CONCERT AT DRIVE-IN

Following the parade, the Redmen's Band played a concert at the drive-in theater. The Randolph Manufacturing Co., donated two trophies to be awarded to the best musical units. The Redmen were awarded one and the Randolph Brigadiers won the second.

Accompanying the General Committee Chairman Ambrose Pappas, and Cochairman Walter Hallet on the reviewing stand on East Main Street, were Congressman James Burke, Maj. George Romm, executive councillor Margaret Heckler, State senator James Burke, Norfolk County Sheriff Charles Hedges.

Also on the reviewing stand were Chairman Robert C. O'Donnell, of the board of selectmen, Selectman Cornelius Buckley, Selectman Frank Noyes, Mrs. Hannah O'Connell, the oldest resident of the town, and members of the general committee—Frank Nolan, Miss Elizabeth Dolan, George Wood, Joseph Lonergan, town moderator; Roger Tracy, Comdr. Thomas Calter of Avon VFW, Rev. E. Stacy Harrison and James Morrisey.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

Article 16, annual town meeting, March 5, 1963.

Voted to authorize the moderator to appoint a committee of 12 persons to plan appropriate ceremonies to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the town of Avon and raise and appropriate the sum of $2,500 to be used for same.

Committee appointed by Moderator Joseph P. Lonergan, March 28, 1963.

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Ambrose G. Pappas, chairman; Walter A. Hallett, cochairman; Dorothy C. Barker, secretary.

Rev. E. Stacy Harrison, Rev. James O. Eskridge, Rev. James Smith, Rev. Paul Moriarity, Elizabeth F. Dolan (historian), Roger W. Tracy, George H. Wood, Thomas J. Calter, Jr., Charles E. Hartley, Francis H. Nolan, James S. Morrissey, Jr., Joseph A. Collum, Jr.

FIELD DAY COMMITTEE

Thomas Calter, James Morrissey, cochairmen.

Leo Keyes, Carl Lundgren, Philip Geary, Gerald O'Neil, John Curley, Neil Clinton, Herman Kallenberg, Edward Doyle, William Palizzolo, Andrew Rose, Robert Nass, Gilbert Hickman, Wayne Carrel, John Haggerty, Charles Kinch, Jesse Tebbetts, Robert Coveney, James Doherty, Mario Buccella, Calvin Hallsworth, William Burke.

PARADE COMMITTEE

Charles E. Hartley, Thomas Calter, Matthew F. Sullivan, Joseph A. Nangeroni, Leon D. Freeman, John R. Smith, Karl Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. William Couch, Frank Albert.

BOOSTER COMMITTEE

Charles J. McCarthy, chairman.

Gerard P. Antonellis, Dorothy C. Barker, Wayne M. Carrel, Walter A. Hallet, Charles E. Hartley, Eleanor E. Couch, Frank M. Noyes, John J. Lee, Lawrence E. Tilton.

PROGRAM BOOK COMMITTEE—THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Robert C. O'Donnell, chairman; Frank M. Noyes, clerk; Cornelius D. Buckley, associate member.

SUBCOMMITTEE

Pearl G. Kearney, treasurer; Dorothy C. Barker, secretary.

Jacklyn S. Reilly, Charles E. Hartley, William T. Wheeler, Elizabeth E. Dolan, historian, Eleanor A. Couch, Lucy Ryan.

BANQUET COMMITTEE

Mr. and Mrs. Roger W. Tracy, chairman.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles E. Hartley, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Lonergan, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph A. Nangeroni, Mr. Matthew F. Sullivan.

Committee for Miss Avon Diamond Jubilee queen contest.

Secretary, joint committees, Mrs. Geraldine Palizzolo.

Representing VFW Auxiliary: Mrs. Kathryn Calter, Mrs. Grace O'Donnell, Mrs. Marian Rose.

Representing the American Legion Auxiliary: Mrs. Emma West, Mrs. Margaret Gaquin, Mrs. Florence Pulsifer, and Mrs. Stacia Wadgalis.

HONORARY COMMITTEE

Hannah McCarthy O'Connell, William Foster, Harry Holbrook, Guy Butler, Lewis Crane, Edward Young, Alice Doherty, Malley, Letitia A. Feeley, Cora Butler, Gertrude Sheehan Kelleher, Grace M. Lynch, Rose M. Geary, Helen Robbins Kiel, Mabel Oliver Rand, Dorothy A. Goeres, Elsie Whiting Graves, and Jennie Walsh Ganley.

SOME HISTORICAL FACTS ABOUT AVON

(By Lewis W. Crane)

The town of Avon is located in Norfolk County, 17 miles south of Boston.

It was founded in the early seventeen hundreds as a part of Stoughton.

It is bounded on the north by Randolph; on the east by Holbrook; on the south by the city of Brockton and on the west by Stoughton.

It is interesting to note that the boundary line between Avon and Brockton is the old colony line which separated, at one time, the Plymouth Colony and the Massachusetts Bay Colony, thus making this the oldest county line in the United States, as far as can be ascertained.

Avon has been known as East Stoughton and Curtis Corner, with Pond Street once being called Blossom Street, because of the apple orchards being owned by every family along this street, and Page Street once carried the name of Pig-wackett Street.

The present population of Avon at the present time is slightly over 4,000, an increase in density since 1950 of 50 percent. In 1950 the density was 613 per square mile, while today it is 918 per square mile.

The topography shows rolling country and small hills, but also shows Avon as the highest point of land between the Blue Hills and Cape Cod.

The town of Avon has always been blessed with one of the purest water supplies in the State, which has been supplied by springs and artesian wells.

On the historical side, John Elliott had strong followings with the Ponkapog Indians, who once occupied this general area. They were known as Elliotts Praying Indians. There was never any serious difficulty between these Indians and the white men, due to Elliott's influence.

During the Revolutionary period, Joel Briggs, while a student, became a minuteman, after the Battle of Lexington.

Later, as a preacher in a local church, he became so enthusiastic about the freedoms won through the war, that he invited President Manning, of Brown University, and Isaac Bacchus, a noted New England historian, to be his guests in his home in East Stoughton, now Avon. The next day the three men rode to Boston to attend the Constitutional Convention.

At this same time, a famous musical society was organized which is the oldest musical society in the United States, this being the old Stoughton Musical Society. Many people from Avon have participated in the activities of this musical society from the beginning.

In the Civil War period, Thomas Cosgrove is listed as a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, from the records at Washington, D.C. He was the first and only citizen of the town to have won this honor.

During the period 1830–70, Negroes, escaping from the South, found refuge in the swamps of Avon, where they established a colony, which lasted for 40 years.

In the early days, most of the inhabitants were farmers or hunters, until the making of shoes became the livelihood of the families, at sometimes all members of the family working on this project. May's Corner, at South and West Main Streets, and the Littlefield homes on East Main Street near East Spring Street, were the first to make shoes in the home.

The first shoe factories built were the Tucker, Littlefield, Peach, and Foster factories. Also built was a large tannery, later followed by the manufacture of rubber soles, moccasins, welts, shanks, and cutting dies.

There has been little increase in industrial development during the past few years, with the town being, basically a residential community, and a bedroom town for commuters to Boston and other communities. At the present time the town has an active industrial and development commission, making every effort to secure business and industry for the town.

Transportation facilities have always been good in Avon, from the horsecar period, when Avon was the first community to be provided horsecar service from Brockton.

Forty-five trucking firms service Avon, with one-half hours bus service from Avon to Boston. Avon is easily accessible to Logan Airport and other important points, with travel time from Avon to downtown Boston being only 18 minutes by car when the Amvet's Highway (Fall River Expressway) is completed and becomes a part of Route 128 and the Southeast Highway, now under construction. Route 28, from New Hampshire to Cape Cod, runs through Avon.

With the opening of the Amvet's Highway, many fine industrial sites will be made available and will open excellent potential for industrial development that will change the town somewhat, but also will help materially in the broadening of the tax base, and bringing about a better balanced economy for the town.

Avon has been well favored regarding parks, as in the not-to-distant past Highland Park, now a residential area, was considered to be one of the most beautiful street railway parks in New England, with scores of gardeners being employed to keep up the landscape and the property in general. The first electric fountain in New England was constructed at this park. It also included a large zoo, open-air vaudeville shows, and a regulation ball park, where the New England League played for many years, with such ballplayers as Lajoie, Young, Hooper, and Parent all played, as well as Burns, the third-base coach for the Red Sox, made his debut.

Avon also has a considerable part of the beautiful D. W. Field Parkway within its boundaries, with this park being beautifully landscaped and equipped with brooks, streams, and lakes, with picnic facilities being available for all, with hundreds of ducks for children to feed, and ponds stocked with fish for the pleasure of both young and old fishermen. This park is the attraction of thousands from Boston and many other parts of eastern Massachusetts.

When you think of Avon, think of a town where livability is our most precious asset, a community where all newcomers are welcome and rapidly become a most important part of our town.

Let's Not Default on the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, sober second thought has emphasized the irresponsibility of the wholesale, across-the-board slashes which were made in the foreign aid bill through Republican leadership and almost unanimous Republican action.

I made it clear during the discussion of the Foreign Assistance Act that I made no claim that the foreign aid program was perfect in operation and execution. I have always conceded that there were broad areas in which improvement was necessary to maintain the required public and congressional support.

On the other hand, I believe that certain parts of the program are essential to our national security and that we must necessarily bear with some waste and mismanagement in these sections where experimentation and improvisation are necessary, from the very nature of the shifting problems.

One area where the wholesale slash was most regrettable was in the authorization for the Alliance for Progress. No one can maintain that the future of Latin America is not intimately tied with the security of the United States; yet, the reduction in funds for AID for the Alliance amounted to $150 million. This reduction would force a 30 percent across-the-board cutback in the entire Latin program.

While the Alliance program has been slow in starting and was introduced with exaggerated claims, nevertheless, the fact remains that some solid advances are being made and it would be tragic not to give the administrators the benefit of the doubt in this area for a reasonable time to come.

Incidentally, it is a strange commentary that those who are most vigorous in their criticism of Castro and most apprehensive about the danger of his influence spreading in Latin America are in the forefront of those who would deny funds to the Alliance for Progress which seeks to stimulate the private economic growth which would make Castro-like revolutions improbable.

Along the line of these general thoughts, I should like to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Vision letter of August 27, 1963. The Vision letter is a normally temperate and informed commentary on Latin American affairs and the reasonable yet admonitory tone of this editorial is one that should be heeded:

DEFAULTING ON THE ALLIANCE

The annual numbers game over foreign aid is now going on in Washington. The House trims, the Senate reluctantly restores, the President pleads, and a last-minute compromise produces—or has in the past—just about what everyone expected in the first place. This time, however, it is widely recognized that a major departure from this tribal ritual is in the works. For a variety of reasons—concern over the balance of payments deficit, sloppy parliamentary tactics on the part of the administration, and the civil rights struggle prominent among them—the cuts are going unusually deep. The final compromise figure will be probably well below what Presidents of both parties have called in the past the irreducible minimum.

At issue here is not the foreign aid bill or the sweeping arguments for and against it, but a straight question on hemisphere relations: Is the United States about to default on the promises of the Alliance for Progress?

The question is raised because last week's House vote reducing the foreign aid authorization bill to $3.5 billion, included a slash in AID funds for the Alliance—from a requested $500 million to $350 million. At least some of the money, it can be assumed, will be restored. But, whether this will be enough to continue the program even at its present inadequate level is seriously in doubt. And to give a rough idea of what an appropriation of $350 million would mean to the Alliance in simple financial terms, AID sources reveal that it will force a 30 percent across-the-board cutback in its entire program. It is impossible to believe at this critical juncture in Alliance history that this is the Congress aim.

Foreign aid, for good and bad reasons, has a poor reputation with the majority of the American people. From an arm of foreign political and economic policy, it has come to be seen as an international pork barrel. To judge whether or not this is true in the specific case of the Alliance for Progress, a few basic facts need to be reexamined.

The Alliance is intended to be a cooperative venture between the world's richest and most powerful Nation and its struggling, semideveloped neighbors. The demands it makes on the Latin American side are immense. These countries are expected to forge, virtually overnight, a sweeping popular revolution that alters the very fabric of their national societies, while at the same time squeezing out a level of capital investment in the public sector of at least $8 billion a year.

The United States, in hopes of achieving a peaceful and profitable trading partner and to dike its hemisphere walls against predatory communistic incursion, has promised a general level of governmental aid of $1 billion a year with private investment, funds from international agencies, and aid from other developed nations, raising the total to $2 billion a year.

The lion's share of the burden, and properly so, falls upon the Latin American States. As much as their freedom and prosperity is in our interest, it is doubly so in their own. Nonetheless, the fuel that makes the Alliance run is U.S. support.

In the first 2 years Washington either met or came close to meeting its $1 billion obligation, depending on how the figures are juggled. This year, food for peace, the Eximbank, the social progress trust fund, and smaller sources are expected to make up about half the total, with AID providing the other half. Thus, the $500 million asked by AID was not an inflated request designed for later compromise, but close to bedrock needs for meeting our Alliance promises. The $150 million cut, which cannot possibly be made up from other sources, would clearly put us way below the $1 billion mark.

The program does not deserve such treatment. Slow and fumbling in getting off the ground, it is now beginning to show achievements. Almost every Latin American State has already or is in the process of overhauling its tax structure. Land reforms are moving ahead. Roads, schools, hospitals, sewage nets are being built. Small businessmen are receiving Alliance loans for expansion. At the same time, other fortuitous signs of Latin American advancement are appearing—the regional economic integration movements and the slowly rising prices of major commodities.

Of course there is disappointment and grumbling—over the slowness of reform on the one hand, and the slowness of money on the other—but on the balance it is widely accepted that the program is providing a real stimulus to progress. The United States must remember that the $1 billion a year promised by Washington is not the Alliance for Progress, but only a small part of it. Its chief importance is to provide a catalyst which will set off a much larger and purely Latin American reaction. By trimming its commitment, Washington at a very minimum will do irreparable harm to a burgeoning Alliance spirit that only now is beginning to take hold.

The call on Alliance funds will be greater in the coming year than ever before. Peru and Argentina will be back in the program with their return to democratic rule. Major commitments to Chile and Colombia must be continued. If the dust settles in Brazil, new projects will rise again there. After setting rigidly high standards for development aid, Washington is hardly in a position to default once its demands have been met.

The $350 million authorization for AID, which still would face the menace of the appropriations bills to follow, cannot stand. Nor can a simple halving of differences between the Senate and House estimates. At the very least, we submit, $100 million must be restored to the AID request. If this is not achieved, the United States will have reneged on the Alliance for Progress.

More Than Forgiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues to the following sermon "More Than Forgiveness" as delivered by the Reverend Robert G. Eppler, minister of the Second Presbyterian Church in Louisville, Ky.:

"MORE THAN FORGIVENESS"—SERMON DELIVERED JULY 21, 1963, BY REV. ROBERT G. EPPLER

FOREWORD

This sermon, which mounts an all-out attack against liberalism and its handmaiden—the institutional or organized church—requires a foreword of explanation. It is a carefully prepared examination of the fantastic folly that often masquerades, beneath a mantle of respectability, as good government and devout churchmanship in our Nation today.

Because of the frightening events which are unfolding in such bewilderingly swift fashion throughout Europe, Asia, South America, and the United States, the cleavage that has long existed between the left and the right is no longer merely an ideological difference of opinion. The conflict that looms ahead carries with it, for the concerned Christian conservative, the potential dimensions of a struggle to the death, if that be required.

It is our conviction that the Christian faith, as "once and for all delivered to the saints," faces the most grave threat to its long and glorious history. The danger we face is both internal and external and at its core is the unerringly clever work of Satan. In such perilous times we may ill afford an organized or institutional church, that merely pays lipservice to the Biblical guidelines that represent her most solemn responsibility. This, then, is a plea for Christian believers to return to the church of the Scriptures, the church of which Jesus Christ is the head and Saviour. Finally, it is a plea for Christians to return to the basic task and sacred commission of the church: to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ to a weary and sin-sick world.

MORE THAN FORGIVENESS

Text: "God Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Luke 18:18

Yesterday afternoon the sun, which normally shines bright and clear at this time of the day, was in three quarter eclipse. Another object, the moon, had placed itself between earth and our source of life-giving heat, the sun. The result was a gradual blackening of the skies until the land lay in semidarkness.

This is a precise description of what is happening to Christian faith and witness throughout the United States today. Another object, a satanic power, has placed itself between us and our source of life, the sovereign God. The result has been a gradual blackening of our skies, until the land lies in moral and spiriutal darkness. Like the sun yesterday, this Nation is today in partial eclipse. It is our intention to examine issues and reasons that have brought us to this tragic state, and discover what may yet be done to avert complete disaster.

One of the greatest dangers that faces the Christian community today, is the failure of our ministers to realistically preach God's message of eternal life. A ministry that is solely preoccupied with the affairs of this life, that overwhelmingly concerns itself with the welfare and creature comforts of this world, is a direct betrayal of Biblical truth and represents the extreme prostitution of the life and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. We rightly label this apostasy "The Social Gospel," and recognize it as the illegitimate child of that bleak and austere cult known as liberalism.

It is high time that the liberal establishment of this country be called to a stern accounting of its more than 30 years of leadership. It is time for religious, governmental, business, and labor leaders of the left, to tell the truth about their profligate handling of the public trust, which has long been their evident responsibility. It is time for decent, God-fearing people to call a halt to the madness that constitutes much of the spiritual, political, and economic fabric of the liberal left. Nothing less than our continuing existence in this life, and perhaps the life beyond, depends upon such action.

The gospel of Luke tells of a rich ruler who inquired of Jesus, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Note that he asked about life eternal, or more precisely, life beyond this one. In directing this inquiry to Jesus the rich ruler showed an apparent wisdom beyond his years, although there is evidence to suggest the question was posed in disdain. It is interesting to conjecture as to whether he genuinely understood that our Lord could offer him more than forgiveness, important as that surely was.

The rich ruler inquired about eternal life and in response Jesus indicated that he should not commit adultery, kill, steal, or bear false witness. In addition he should honor his father and his mother. The rich ruler's reply was quick and confident; he had kept all these things since his youth. We can visualize Jesus standing before this man and reading his innermost thoughts. With a smile He said, "Sell all that thou hast * * * and follow me." It was at this vital point that the rich ruler faltered and fell by the wayside. The price was too high for him to pay. Luke writes, "And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich."

Christ's lesson is clear. Those who have given up their home and possessions for the kingdom will find greater spiritual riches, both now and in the life to come. The rich ruler inquired about life eternal, when in reality his hopes, plans and ambitions were rooted in the affairs of this world. As such he deluded himself; and characterizes the "liberal" prototype of our age.

Before we examine some examples of the Liberal's retreat from reason within the church, let it be freely acknowledged that the Christian conservative falls under God's judgment, as do all men. He is not exempt. Let it be freely acknowledged that this country also falls under the same judgment. God has it within His power and Biblical authority to subjugate this Nation to his omnipotent will, for Jesus Christ is Sovereign over all nations. To maintain otherwise, is presumptuous.

For illustration we pose a hypothetical situation, but one that is not without truth and irony, however. What would transpire were the rich ruled to appear before today's church leaders and inquire, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" The dialogue, a favorite expression among leftwing intellectuals, might develop something like this:

Rich ruler: "Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?"

The church: "My brother do not fret, unity is close at hand. Soon we shall all be one great ecumenical brotherhood, under the benevolent, omniscient direction of the Lord's handiwork, the National Council of Churches."

Rich ruler: "But how may I inherit eternal life?"

The church: "Rich ruler. The church seeks equal opportunities for all. We are laboring night and day influencing social legislation throughout the Nation. For your information, the National Council of Churches, which speaks 'for 40 million Protestant', consistently concerns itself with the vital 'religious' issues of our day. Among other things:

"We have insisted on drastic change in immigration laws, designed to protect us from undesirable aliens. Is not every man our brother?

"We have sought to repeal the Connally reservation, and opposed the Bricker amendment, both of which were designed to protect the Nation from the blandishments of world government.

"We are engaged in a relentless struggle against right-to-work laws, or any laws that seek to regulate unions."

Rich ruler: "But my soul. What must I do to be——"

The church: "Brother, the church is busy for you. Some of our strongest efforts and much of your money, have been spent in the following Christian enterprises:

"Passing overtures in our denominational assemblies, commending the abolishment of Bible reading and prayer in public schools.

"Circulating petitions by the hundreds of thousands, protesting the imprisonment of convicted spies and traitors.

"Supporting civil liberty for antisocial behavior and political conspiracy.

"Seeking to abolish capital punishment.

"Urging immediate recognition of Red China and admitting her to the United Nations.

"Attacking the House Committee on Un-American Activities and urging its curtailment.

"Actively harassing the real enemies of America, those misguided anti-Communists, who insist that this country is in mortal danger.

"Supporting any collectivist, Socialist enterprise that will hasten the day when the United States will be under the United Nations."

Rich ruler (more than a little subdued by this passionate recital of religious accomplishments): "My, the church is busy. But may I ask a question? What of the message of Jesus Christ? In His day the accomplishments you so proudly boast of, did not constitute the true Biblical work of the church."

Whatever else the rich ruler may have been, he was not the complete fool. He would have recognized the fallacious answers given by the church, in response to his all-important questions. Despite the sacramental robes with which the liberals have so carefully draped the social gospel, its essential dimensions are still evident, its basic premises still false, its ultimate destination a hopeless atheism.

Perhaps the rich ruler did not realize it, but when he stood before Jesus and posed his fateful question, his "hour" had come. Your hour and mine is likewise at hand. The fateful question is: Are we now so far down the road to spiritual degradation, that we no longer recognize the difference between Christian truth and brazen political manipulation? If you do not yet personally know the answer to that all-important question, it behooves you to find out.

The following facts have a direct bearing upon our spiritual and moral dilemma. In this year 1963, the Protestant Christian faith represents but 8 percent of the world's entire population. By the year 1980, or 17 years from now, the figure will be cut in half to an almost unbelievable 4 percent. By the same year, we are told, 50 percent of the world's population will be Asian, professing belief in religions other than Christianity.

Ponder the significance of those figures carefully and we may come to only one conclusion. The brutal fact is that Christianity is a minority religion in today's world, and is fighting against formidable odds. The vital question that concerns us all, is whether or not God will see fit to save an institutional church that has so willfully violated His clearly expressed commandments. The Bible plainly reveals what happens to those who consistently misinterpret and disobey His holy will.

For the past 50 years the Christian faith has been under relentless attack throughout the world. Many people have not yet grasped the full significance of that terrible reality. Advances in scientific knowledge, the results of modern Biblical criticism, open and aggressive atheism, have all combined to bring hatred and contempt upon the Christian faith.

Attacks on Christianity are being launched from every major facet of life. The results are all about us, if we have the courage to take an honest look. The ultimate sin, however, will come to rest upon us, unless we rigorously oppose those who are responsible for these shameful deeds. A recent poll showed that 90 percent of America's most outstanding scientists do not believe in God, or a life hereafter. Obviously these people are entitled to their personal convictions. But think for a moment how much of your financial resources go to support their ideas and beliefs. Recognize how greatly they influence political, social and even religious values that affect us all. This is a sobering contemplation.

Most people are unaware that modern philosophy openly scorns Christian beliefs. The average person obviously has little concern or interest in this sensitive area. But the Christian faith is consistently damaged because of our failure to offer an effective spiritual witness, to the cynical and atheistic philosopher.

A recent editorial in Life magazine praises the 1963 graduating college class, as the best in history. The writer observes, "They know more than their fathers * * * but they possess no less faith in man." It logically follows that he should then conclude, "This is not a notably religious generation."

The New York Times once listed the 100 greatest books of the preceding generation. Not more than eight of the authors could be called Christian, and they were not among the most influential. More than 50 percent were deliberately and vigorously antagonistic to the Christian faith. Is it any wonder that we are in such dire straits today?

These are but a few of the dangers that confort us, a minority religion, in a world that is increasingly hostile to our beliefs and convictions. But even in the face of such apparently overwhelming opposition, we must not despair. The prophet Isaiah predicts the coming doom of the apostates when he writes, "I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people * * * a people that provoked me to anger" (Isaiah 65:2, 3). Jeremiah, writing about the vengeance of God's temple says, "The Lord hath opened his armory, and hath brought forth the weapons of his indignation" (Jeremiah 50:25). Is it surprising then that some of the most devastating attacks against the faith, should come from within the church itself?

The National Council of Churches, a political-power apparatus that deserves to die, represents as grave a threat to true Christian principles, as do any of the abovementioned peoples or agencies. Despite its lofty stated purpose, its imposing social program, its staggering, unlimited budget of Christian funds, it is a calculating, many-faceted power structure, whose thinly veiled goal is complete dictatorial control over a unified super church. This will, of course, be immediately denied, but let us look at but part of the record of an institutional organization, that purports to speak for Christ.

At one time or the other, the council has recommended the following items to the 40 million Protestants it consistently pretends to represent:

The infamous poem by the notorious Langston Hughes, entitled "Good-bye Christ." I shall offer only a few excerpts from this travesty on our Lord's life, but copies may possibly still be procured from the National Council of Churches.

"GOOD-BYE CHRIST

"(By Langston Hughes)

"Listen, Christ,
You did alright in your day, I reckon
But that day's gone now,
They ghosted you up a swell story too,
Called it the Bible—
But it's dead now.

"You ain't no good no more;
Good-bye, Christ Jesus,
Beat it away from here now.

"Make way for a new guy with no religion at all—
A real guy named Marx, Lenin, Stalin.
Go on ahead now,
You're getting in the way of things, Lord."

Reading lists which contain selections promoting sex, with excerpts so suggestive, they cannot be sent through the mail.

Consistent political pressure for Medicare, advocating the increase of Federal power, etc.

Consistent political pressure for policies which would drastically weaken the House Committee on Un-American Activities—a committee designed to protect this country from subversive infiltration. A committee that has repeatedly received the overwhelming support of Congress and the country.

Consistent political pressure, advocating an ever-increasing number of Socialist action programs, programs clearly designed to forfeit the constitutional prerogatives of the citizenry.

Consistent political pressure, advocating phony "peace" movements that would deliver us into the eager hands of the merciless Marxist conspiracy.

Consistent political pressure, through some of its agencies, advocating recognition of atheistic Red China.

Consistent political pressure, advocating expedient compromise and coexistence with Russia, a nation which openly repudiates God, in its constitution.

We could go on and on. The list apparently endless. But as a sort of postscript, we offer this:

The following beatnik-type prayer was recently composed by a Methodist youth group and appeared in literature of the National Council of Methodist Youth. So great is my sense of shame at merely repeating this work, that I record only the first three lines. Unfortunately, that will be enough.

"LORD'S PRAYER—TEENAGE VERSION

"(Composed by a Methodist youth group)

"O, daddy, O
Who are the most,
Hurrah for your support."

I need not remind you that these tragically misdirected children have written a parody on those blessed words of Jesus, "Our Father, who are in heaven, hallowed by Thy name." It seems reasonable to contemplate just what kind of leadership would allow, much less recommend, such blasphemous distortions of sacred Biblical truth.

Rise up and rebel, if you've got the spirit. Dash off an indignant letter to this institution that professes to speak for you, and protest this mockery of Christian truth and decency. Ask the pertinent question, "Why?" Wait weeks for an answer. Then if you are favored with a reply, just try to unravel the gobbledegook, the outright evasions or the counterattack against you, for having the unmitigated nerve to question their infallible leadership.

However, not all the blame for the diminishing power of the Christian community may be attributed to this modern tower of Babel. Other, misguided ecclesiastical zealots play their deadly part. For example, we increasingly witness the phenomenon of what the left wing chooses to call, "guilt by association." Under this strange concept of tolerance, you may associate yourself with dubious enterprises and un-American activities, without having either your conduct or your choice of companions called to account. Interesting? I think so.

When in Knoxville, Tenn., a group of justly disturbed pastors and parents recently protested the leadership of a Presbyterian college student center there, the liberal pack was out in full cry. "Guilt by association," they accused. It seemingly mattered not in the least that the "association" concerned men, whose political affiliations were less than desirable. (This is the kindest comment that may be made about them.) The noisy, but usually articulate left, screamed in outrage. Only this time concerned, knowledgeable Christian people faced up to the issues involved, and fought right back.

Individual ministers are always at hand, eager to do their bit for apostasy. A prominent church official recently explained the reasoning behind the controversial and unconstitutional ban on prayer in the public schools. It was bad enough that his "reasoning" was entirely fallacious, he further insisted that in these "fast moving times," the Christian must learn to exist, on equal terms with the agnostic, atheist, Muslim, Buddhist, and a host of others. Surprise you? In con-

clusion, he labeled this cold-blooded coexistence, tolerance. The Bible rightly labels it apostasy.

The New Testament clearly defines the uniqueness of the Lord Jesus Christ and His gospel message. Jesus himself said, "Without me ye can do nothing." (John 15: 5). Again He said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (John 14: 6). The Bible clearly warns, time without number, that to place the Christian faith on a par with oriental religions, or with no religion at all, is to be anti-Christ, a heresy of monumental proportions. Jesus might well have been addressing these modern day heretics, when He told the Jews, "I honor my Father and ye do dishonor me." (John 8: 49).

In his book, "Testament of Faith" (Boston 1958), the late Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, an outstanding leader in the Methodist Church not only ridicules the idea of the virgin birth, but scoffs at Biblical inspiration as well. He even repudiates the truth of the atoning work of the Lord Jesus Christ. "I have never been able to carry the idea * * * (that) someone else can vicariously pay for what I have done in order to clear the slate," (p. 38). "They argue that God sent his own Son who died upon the cross * * * it simply does not make sense to me. It is rather an offense. It offends my moral sense," (p. 41).

We might inquire as to what the good bishop would do with his sins, but he anticipates us. "I cannot see forgiveness as predicted [sic] upon the act of someone else. It is my sin. I must atone, (p. 144). Such are the inevitable conclusions of a man-centered theology.

More recently, Bishop James A. Pike, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in an article in the Christian Century (Dec. 21, 1960), writes of the virgin birth: "I believe it a myth." On the work of the Holy Spirit, he says: "I no longer regard grace or the work of the Holy Spirit as limited explicitly to the Christian revelation." It would be interesting to speculate as to what other dispensation the bishop might have in mind. Of the Bible, he says: "It came along as a sort of Reader's Digest anthology." Of the Trinity, he writes: "I can't see its permanent value."

In a far-off time, when spiritual giants still walked this earth, these significant words were penned by the Apostle Paul to the people at Ephesus—"Men without Christ, are without hope in this world." (Ephesus 2: 12). That Biblical truth still stands, despite the persistent efforts of some liberal theologians to destroy it.

The emphasis on myth, which has so powerfully affected liberal theologians, has infected their pulpits and has thereby destroyed confidence in New Testament truth. The rebellious sinner of our day is not going to come under a genuine conviction of his need of salvation, through Jesus Christ, if he sees the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the ascension reduced to myth.

This is the lethal result of liberalism—when carried to its ultimate degree—and represents the most damning indictment possible against its theological system. Repudiated by the Bible in word and action, it remains only to be repudiated by God's servants on this earth. That day of accounting is at hand. "Now also the axe is laid unto the root of the tree: every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire" (Luke 3: 9).

One of America's most influential liberal ministers, now retired, has observed, "One of these days we will certainly find the bones of Jesus Christ." Reflect a moment upon the sad implications of such an unfortunate, earth-bound faith. Then recall that Saint Luke observed, "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried into heaven" (Luke 24: 51). Whose word will you accept?

Under the debilitating influence of the liberal rationale, the confused layman is justified in asking, "Where is this Jesus Christ?" Among other places, you could find him recently in the Easter issue of a Presbyterian denominational magazine. An issue incidentally which did not feature on its front cover the cross, swept clean of its precious burden, but a man smoking a pipe. Apparently the only complaints received by the magazine on that, had to do with pipe smoking. In the news section of this Easter issue you could find the liberal's Jesus—portrayed in modern art form, of course. There He was * * * a grotesque, unrecognizable creature, with malformed head and elongated arms * * * hanging on a weird contraption that symbolized * * * symbolized the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. What a tragedy that we must apparently remind our brethren that Jesus Christ did not die in the abstract. His death was real * * * flesh and blood misery; pain, suffering and sorrow. No less a person than Matthew himself tells us that our Lord cried out in anguish from His cross, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me (Matthew 27: 46).

The overwhelming evidence against the beliefs and the convictions of the Protestant liberal movement, has scarcely been touched in this message. However, the secularism of this Nation is made possible because of two highly significant factors.

1. What is happening within our churches throughout the Nation.

2. What is not happening within our churches.

Jesus said to the Pharisees of His day, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God," (Mount 2: 29). This same terrible indictment may be leveled against the liberal leadership in the Christian institutional church of our day.

At a time when Christ's true church stands virtually in the shadows of physical persecution, we need to examine—in the power of the Holy Spirit and with courageous honesty—our Christian conscience.

We need a dynamic, realistic reaffirmation of God's righteous and providential leadership over His people.

We need a renewed recognition that Jesus Christ is Lord of all men and all nations.

We need a renewed recognition that Jesus Christ is the only head of the church. We must become aware that the main purpose of the church, indeed her prime reason for being, is to witness to that supreme miracle of grace: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

We need a heart-searching indictment and genuine rejection of our sinfulness and rebellion against the Creator God.

We need a strong rededication to divine law and order, so that human respect for civil law, might be restored among all the peoples of this land.

Finally, we need an humble awareness that human history is divinely guided to a foreordained goal. The Psalmist tells us, "The earth is the Lord's * * * the world, and they that dwell therein." (Psalm 24: 1).

The British philosopher, C. E. M. Joad, not an overly religious man, has written:

"Here then is an age, which is without beliefs in religion, without standards in morals, without convictions in politics, without values in art. I doubt if there has ever been an age which was so completely without standards * * * or values."

The Bible sternly cautions, "Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord" (2 Corinthians 6:14, 17). This is God's gracious, but solemn invitation to all men to join in fulfilling the true commission of His church. But only the righteous will respond.

The Apostle Paul, in his remarkable letter to the Ephesians, describes the true church—the society which finds its unity and harmony in Jesus Christ (Ephesians 5). He sets forth the Christian conscience and spirit, which constitute the only valid scriptural foundation upon which Christian social order and justice may be established. This letter should be required reading for all Christian people in these days of unrest and civil disobedience. Paul reminds us that there must be mutual respect for the rights and needs of others, but also an awareness of individual responsibility, before the exercise of personal privilege.

There is a most evident need for reconciliation in our world today. However, when the New Testament employs this oft-abused term, it means—God's gracious action through Jesus Christ—to restore sinful men, who by their rebellion have become estranged from their Creator. In this process of reconciliation, man is also restored to a relationship of serenity within himself. The atoning death of Jesus Christ not only demonstrates God's love for us, it is the strongest possible reason for abandoning our hostility, and being genuinely reconciled in Him.

Yet this is not the final goal of the true Christian believer. Even as Paul defines the nature of Christian conduct on this earth, the Revelation describes the new order, the Holy City. "And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem * * * prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." (Revelation 21: 2). As believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, we must realize that we are "in but not of the world."

Next week we shall examine the Christian conservative alternatives to, and the Biblical remedies for, the terrifying spiritual dilemma that confronts this Nation and her people today. Amen.

How To Succeed in Defense Business by Trying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in all of the open and part of the somewhat sub-rosa discussions of distribution of defense contracts there rides a theme that there is present in the pattern of contract awards an unfair preference for certain areas of our country. I would like to ask the House to examine for a few moments the central core of the situation which dictates the wisdom of our present distribution of defense work.

The technology of weaponry is and has recently been moving at a pace that has brought the laboratory into the shop. Conception of ideas for weapon systems are the basis of bids not defined and detailed plans and specifications. Such circumstances call for a high sophistication in research capability coupled with an experienced and updated technical know-how in the shops. Under these conditions a linkage with institutions of higher learning, where the skills of engineering, electronics, physics computers, and the like are on the knife edge fron-

tier of experimentation and development, is required. In the United States, because of the interest, investment, and vision of the people of the area certain centers of leadership in these skills so desperately needed existed and flourished. They had, further, an already healthy and working rapport between the institutions of higher learning and the industrial activities busily engaged in the development of the art in their particular field. These centers were and are Boston, Mass., home for Harvard, MIT, and an array of other fine institutions of higher education; San Francisco Bay area, with the University of California, Stanford University, and several lesser sized but excellent colleges; Los Angeles, home of UCLA, USC, and California Institution of Technology again with a second echelon of other colleges and universities including the State colleges supplementing the efforts of the dominant institutions. Around these great centers of learning which had emphasized those fields so intricately involved in the new technology, that is, physics, chemistry, engineering, and related fields came to be located the research and development laboratories of great foundations and of leading industries.

The accommodation of the one to the other is mutual and to be expected. Then, when the fast-moving breakthrough into thermonuclear power and the emerging space age required the close linkage between research and production, it followed as the day the night that these centers came to be the shop locations of the leading industries wishing to follow up their development with production.

If there is a section or center in this country which seeks to improve its competitive position in the race for excellence and the pressure for superiority, here is the obvious pattern. Invest your people's money, time, and energies in establishing outstanding centers of higher learning. It is an investment which will yield high returns. There will be an undesirable but inescapable time lag for such centers are not created overnight. Such centers are the result of achievements of faculties and graduates; the result of continued support in dollars and concern on the part of governments of the State and local levels; the result of cultivation and maintenance of demand for quality and willingness to pay for it; the result of encouragement and support from local business and industry. It would seem obvious that such a pattern of the past placed those areas now enjoying healthy relations with the present defense effort in whatever privileged position they currently enjoy.

One other matter needs to be stressed. The demands made on industrial firms placed in the complex referred to above have not all been pleasant. A leading executive of one of the larger plants puts it this way:

Our experience of instant expansion to fill the requirements of our contracts gave us no end of trouble. It early became clear that a business could choke to death trying to ingest a flood of new work just as readily as a business could starve to death failing to get enough business—and you would be just as dead. Our approach has been to look for businesses throughout the country that, on a joint effort, could help us handle the demands of the crash program in space.

What that executive was saying is dramatically demonstrated in a recent Wall Street Journal story about a $934.4 million award from NASA to North American. Although the prime work will be done out of the contractor's offices in Downey, Calif., and Fullerton, Calif., take note of this following quote from the article:

It is believed that about 50 percent of the work will be performed by subcontractors and suppliers. North American has already negotiated $127 million of Apollo business with about 1,200 companies.

Obviously, then, the second less costly and more immediate way to succeed in defense business by simply trying is to find out what the problems of the prime contractor are and show him the best way to solve them. Hundreds of subcontractors all over the United States are doing just this. There has come, through such efforts, a quicker, a better solution to the problems and a superior product turned out for our national effort.

Regulating the Drug Industry—Part III and Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, two able reporters on the staff of the New York Herald Tribune, William Haddad and Martin J. Steadman, have rendered the public a service by their series on the drug industry. I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to part III and part IV of this worthwhile series.

PART III: HIGH STAKES IN LOW-COST DRUGS—PRESSURE AT HOME AND AWAY—PROBLEM WITH MANUFACTURERS

(By William Haddad)

As the Nation's largest buyer of drugs, McKesson & Robbins is used to a rapid response from drug manufacturers when it offers to buy their products.

But when McKesson began selling drugs at cutrate prices in Latin America, these companies stopped responding to these purchase orders for drugs to be used in the Latin American program.

At the same time, the manufacturing companies continued to conduct business as usual with McKesson on products not related to the cutrate program. They had to. McKesson sells to 38,000 drugstores (about 70 percent of all such stores in the country) and 6,000 hospitals.

In Latin America, McKesson sells drugs under their generic names as opposed to their trademark names. The generic name is the chemical shorthand name for a product. The trademark name is used by individual companies. The only difference between the two is in their price.

The situation led Herman C. Nolen, McKesson's board chairman—in still secret testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—to conclude:

"This campaign has even involved the cutting off of supplies necessary for the continuing success of the generic program—that is, the refusal of certain pharmaceutical manufacturers to sell us raw materials useful for the generic program. We have encountered a number of refusals by major drug manufacturers to grant us patent licenses or to sell us bulk materials."

Many of the pressures, Mr. Nolen told the Senate committee, were brought to bear against Droguerias Aliadas, a major Colombian drug company in which McKesson bought a half interest when it began its program to reduce the price of drugs there.

In attempting to buy drugs for its Colombian operation, McKesson wrote U.S. drug manufacturers, explaining that the Colombians operate their own company, but McKesson helps them purchase bulk drug materials.

McKesson said it proposed certain "guidelines" for the Colombians to follow:

1. Show preference to American firms in buying drugs.
2. Respect all patent obligations.
3. Buy from responsible sources.
4. Pay responsible prices.
5. Buy only the very highest quality bulk materials.

For all its guidelines, McKesson found that the Colombian company was buying from European sources.

"When we asked why," Mr. Nolen wrote the drug companies, "they informed us the American companies refused to sell them * * * we can hardly believe this is true."

McKesson continued:

"It is to the interests of all of us in the United States to foster the sale of chemicals and pharmaceuticals made in this country, and we feel certain that you are in full sympathy with this policy. For this reason we thought we ought to go directly to you to see if you will sell to Droguerias Aliadas or its affiliate."

So far, very few of the manufacturers have responded to McKesson's request. What is more difficult for McKesson to document is the fact that most of the manufacturers fail to respond to telephone requests, the normal way of ordering in the industry.

Mr. Nolen also told the Senate committee about a case where McKesson requested bulk materials from an English firm's New York office, but was notified of the refusal by a large American drug company which went on to add that it would not provide anything to McKesson for the generic program.

The American company denies that this is its reason for not selling drugs to McKesson.

In another case cited by Nolen to the Senators, two European drug manufacturers, who had indicated they would supply McKesson with an important antibiotic, "inexplicably reversed their position."

Mr. Nolen concluded: "We have found it very difficult to manufacture at our Bridgeport, Conn., laboratories and export to foreign countries."

Two of the drug industry's major complaints against McKesson involve the balance-of-payments problem (the flow of American dollars overseas) and patent rights.

"We definitely plan to pay all royalties on patents and to respect all rights," a McKesson spokesman told the Herald Tribune. "We've said that all along.

"On the balance-of-payments argument, that's pure applesauce. We're trying to get foreign companies to spend dollars here, not the other way around."

In his Senate testimony, Mr. Nolen talked about his greatest fear:

"Aside from our interests in conducting our foreign operations in a businesslike way without such interference, we are greatly concerned about these activities because of

the effect they may possibly have on our domestic business. Since the major share of McKesson's total sales and revenues comes from its activities as a drug wholesaler in the United States, this is the most serious danger."

What the drug manufacturers fear most is a campaign to reduce drug prices in this country. They claim that such a reduction would seriously endanger their research programs.

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, has the job of determining whether McKesson's charges are accurate.

On Wednesday his subcommittee voted to hold closed-door hearings on the matter. A full-scale investigation, including the use of subpenas for drug company records, rests on what Senator HART and his staff can turn up during the executive sessions.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association and the drug manufacturers have bitterly protested the use of subpenas to obtain their records. Despite this opposition, the subpenas remain in force until December 2, making it a criminal offense to alter existing records.

STATE DEPARTMENT SURVEY

(By Martin J. Steadman)

A State Department advisory committee, appointed early this year to make an impartial study of problems faced by businessmen overseas, sent two representatives to Colombia last spring.

One of their functions was listening to complaints from the drug industry there about Colombia's low-cost generic drug plan.

One of the members of the 5-man committee, who did not go on the trip, was and is special counsel to the powerful, 140-member pharmaceutical manufacturers association, which vigorously defends its own special interests.

Lloyd M. Cutler is the counsel. His law firm has seen the U.S. drug industry through 3 years of investigation and hearings by the late Senator Estes Kefauver's antitrust subcommittee.

The Washington attorney will soon be advising drug manufacturers called before the Senate subcommittee. Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat, of Michigan, successor to Senator Kefauver as chairman of the subcommittee, yesterday announced that he would proceed with closed-door hearings into a controversy between giants in the drug business.

In explosive charges made in secret session last June, Herman C. Nolen, chairman of the board of McKesson & Robbins, the Nation's largest drug wholesaler, said that his company was the victim of a "concerted and malicious campaign" by other drug firms to halt the sale of cutrate, lifesaving drugs in South America and the United States.

A team of Herald Tribune reporters, investigating the generic (chemical name) drug controversy, culled this chronology of the State Department story from official records and secret documents:

July 1962: McKesson began selling drugs in Colombia at new low prices.

January 14, 1963: Representatives of the Colombian drug industry, which includes 15 American firms doing business there, traveled to Washington to confer with officials of the U.S. drug manufacturers' association. The South Americans requested pressures for intervention by the U.S. Government to modify the Colombian generic drug program.

Mr. Cutler, acting as attorney for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, offered an alternative plan—to contact the State Department and the Alliance for Progress program director "to mobilize official support."

Yesterday, Mr. Cutler recalled that he had told the State Department before he was appointed to the advisory committee that his business connections and the Government's interests might collide.

He was appointed February 4 and his resignation was accepted June 10, about a month after the South American trip undertaken by another committee member, C. Daggett Harvey, and the executive secretary, Allan Robbins.

Mr. Cutler said he did not know the committee was investigating drug industry problems in South America until the return of the two men. He wrote a letter to Mr. Robbins as soon as he learned of the interviews, requesting that he be disqualified from any matters brought before the advisory committee by the drug industry.

February 4, 1963: Under Secretary of State George Ball announced the formation of a new Advisory Committee on International Business Problems. In a press release, Mr. Ball said the committee would meet regularly "to review the handling, by the State Department and its missions abroad, of specific business complaints submitted by American businessmen in connection with their oversea operations."

Mr. Cutler was one of those appointed to the committee.

April 1963: Advisory Committee Member Harvey and Executive Secretary Robbins left on a month-long trip to every South American country but Paraguay. One stop was Bogotá, Colombia, where, according to Mr. Robbins, drug manufacturers expressed apprehension over that part of the Colombian generic drug program which would affect patent rights.

Mr. Robbins said it was his own idea to make the South American trip and to talk to the Colombian drug association.

"Mr. Cutler certainly did not suggest to us that we talk to them. The visit to Colombia was not the primary reason for the trip, and as a matter of fact, we have never presented the generic drug program complaints to the full advisory committee.

Mr. Cutler emphatically denied that he might have been serving two interests in his capacity as committee member and counsel to the drug industry.

"I was aware," he said, "that a member of the committee and the executive assistant were traveling to South America, but I did not know they would be meeting with representatives of the drug industry in Colombia.

"I learned of the meetings which discussed the generic drug program when they came back. I wrote to Mr. Robbins, and said that if any drug industry matters came before the advisory committee, to please disqualify me."

Mr. Cutler said he had withdrawn from a matter pending before the committee once before, because his law firm had an interest in it, and when the drug question came to his attention in late May, he decided to resign because "I could not be of as much use to the committee as had been expected."

Mr. Cutler pointed out that the meeting between the Colombian drug manufacturers and the PMA in Washington took place before his appointment to the State Department advisory committee. The PMA took the advice he offered at that meeting, and approached representatives of State with requests to intervene in Colombia. This was during the time Mr. Cutler was serving on the committee.

"I never took part in any discussions the PMA people had with the State Department on that subject," Mr. Cutler said.

The PMA attorney said he originally agreed to accept his appointment to the State Department's advisory committee on a "trial basis," because his law firm represented business interests which might bring their problems to the committee.

In accepting his resignation "with regret," Mr. Ball wrote:

"I am sorry that experience has confirmed the concern you initially expressed. * * * I understand the high motives that have led you to submit your resignation."

Price contrasts

Drug and use	Price to retail pharmacy	
	Generic name price	Trade name price
Prednisolone, 1,000's 5 mg. tablets (therapy for arthritis)	$23.95	$170.00
Reserpine, 1,000's 0.25 mg. tablets (therapy for high blood pressure)	2.75	39.50
Meprobamate, 1,000's 400 mg. tablets (tranquilizer)	35.95	65.00
Isoniazid, 1,000's 100 mg. tablets (therapy for tuberculosis)	5.75	11.40

PART IV: HIGH STAKES IN LOW-COST DRUGS—HOW IT STARTED

(By William Haddad and Martin J. Steadman)

On Thursday morning, February 28, 1963, the late Senator Estes Kefauver picked up a copy of a Washington newspaper. He was thumbing through it when a wire service story on the business page caught his attention. The article concerned Colombia's cutrate drug plan.

It was that story, that morning, that started all the trouble the Nation's drug manufacturers are now having with the U.S. Senate.

One paragraph in a general story on drug company reaction to the low-price sale of generic (chemical) name products so enraged the Tennessee Democrat that he went straight to his office, summoned his staff, and started an inquiry.

The paragraph began:

"Industry sources said U.S. Alliance for Progress aid to Colombia could be jeopardized by an extension of the dispute."

The story went on to report:

"Colombian infringement of the patents involved could be legally interpreted as 'expropriation' of American property, the industry sources said. Such a ruling would block Colombia from Alliance aid under present legislation."

INVESTIGATION

The article noted that the State Department had ordered its Bogota Embassy to conduct an on-the-spot investigation of the situation.

Senator Kefauver, an unswerving advocate of lower priced drugs, interpreted this not only as a veiled threat by the pharmaceutical industry against a Latin American neighbor, but also against McKesson & Robbins, the Nation's largest drug wholesaler, and the only American firm participating in the cutrate drug program.

After the staff meeting, Senator Kefauver called Herman C. Nolen, McKesson's dynamic board chairman. The Senator said he wanted to discuss the generic drug program with him; Mr. Nolen was reluctant.

After several weeks of investigation by Senator Kefauver's Antitrust and Monopoly Committee, Mr. Nolen was told to come to Washington voluntarily or be subpenaed.

When the two men finally met—without use of a subpena—this is the story Mr. Nolen told:

Lifesaving drugs can be sold under their official, generic names at prices far below trade name products, mainly because little or no promotion is needed to inform doctors of them.

INVITATION

All the drug companies operating in Colombia were invited to join a generic drug sales program. The invitation came from Colombian President Albert Lleras Camargo. Only McKesson accepted the offer.

President Lleras told Mr. Nolen at a meeting:

"I can understand why my people cannot have new cars, television sets and other lux-

uries and can only eat meat at infrequent intervals, but I cannot understand why they should be deprived of lifesaving drugs because these drugs are priced out of the reach of more than 80 per cent of the Colombian people."

McKesson bought a half interest in a large Colombian manufacturing firm and began selling drugs at very low prices. Antibiotics that sold for 29 cents a capsule plunged to 3.6 cents each. Arthritis sufferers paid $2 for a month's supply of medicine, when once they had paid $16. Through a list of 32 vital drugs, McKesson chopped prices to levels that the poverty-mired millions in Colombia could better afford.

But an aroused drug industry in Colombia, which included 15 U.S. firms operating there, fought back. This is what Mr. Nolen told Senator Kefauver.

"We are alarmed at the growing interference with our ability to carry on this program. Fundamentally we are deeply concerned with the principle at stake—that the efforts of McKesson or any other company to initiate a program to provide low-cost medication should be free from organized interference.

"The generic drug program is seriously endangered, having been subjected for some months to what is apparently a concerted and malicious campaign by some drug firms operating in Colombia who mean to handicap seriously or stop the generic program and prevent its spread to other sections of the world, including the United States."

INDICTMENT

Mr. Nolen then ticked off these serious charges:

Major pharmaceutical manufacturers refused to sell bulk materials for the low-cost drug program.

Doctors were advised that it was impossible to produce quality pharmaceuticals at the low prices.

Retailers were told by the drug industry that generics would bankrupt their business.

Medical journals in South America refused generic drug ads and wrote critical editorials and stories.

Rival drug concerns opened up generic drug packages and contaminated the low-cost drugs.

Potential partners in South American countries were pressured to rebuff McKesson. In one country, a company interested in joining McKesson said it suddenly received a threat that all its insurance would be dropped and its bank credit cut off.

Senator Kefauver ordered subpenas for the books and records of seven major American drug firms and the 140-member Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association. Then he brought Mr. Nolan's charges to the attention of his Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

But Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, Illinois, stymied the investigation with a motion to seek the "counsel" of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator DIRKSEN argued that diplomatic relations between the United States and all of Latin America were intertwined with the drug story.

Over the opposition of Senator KEFAUVER and Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat, of Michigan, the motion carried by a 4–2 vote.

On June 25, at a secret session of the foreign

On June 25, at a secret session of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Nolen repeated his accusations.

The committee listened, but decided that it was not in its jurisdiction to investigate the alleged "concerted and malicious" campaign to stop McKesson's low-cost drug operation. The committee suggested it was more in the domain or the State Department or the Justice Department.

But State said it had no investigative staff capable of doing the job, and Justice said it could only examine possible evasion of the existing antitrust laws.

Senator Kefauver died and his investigation almost died with him.

Until the Herald Tribune disclosed portions of Mr. Nolen's secret testimony last Wednesday, Senator HART, the new committee chairman, had only his own vote to continue the investigation.

IMPETUS

The return date on the subpenas for the drug industry's books and records had been delayed three times, and a motion was pending in the subcommittee to quash them. The Herald Tribune story of the alleged campaign to stop the low-cost drug sales broke Wednesday morning. The subcommittee met that afternoon and voted unanimously to conduct its own closed-door hearings and to continue the subpenas in force until December 2.

It all began with a wire-service story in the business section of the Washington Post. The full story was drawn from a businessman who was at first reluctant to make a complaint, but then became fighting mad. And a tenacious Senator from Michigan may be able to learn more about the intricacies of the drug industry in the next few months.

Managed News in the Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, "Managed News in the Making." President Kennedy is becoming bolder in his attempts to give the Government complete control over the dissemination of the news as he expands Federal publications and Federal wire services in competition with private industry.

The only wonder to me is why every newspaper in the land, every news media is not screaming to high heaven about the inherent danger in Government control of information. There is no surer road to dictatorship than to put an end to the free press of the Nation. Once the right of the people to know has been abridged and we are allowed to read only what the New Frontiersmen decide we should read, private enterprise in America will be finished.

It seems to me every Member of this body would want to go on record as opposed to this invasion of our freedoms by the Kennedy administration. I hope the bills introduced by our colleagues, PAUL FINDLEY and CRAIG HOSMER, will be brought speedily to the floor and passed unanimously so that the unwarranted, unconstitutional, un-American attempt to seize control of the minds of the people of this Nation.

The Tribune editorial follows:

MANAGED NEWS IN THE MAKING

Now that the Department of Agriculture has got its new Market News Wire Service in operation, another Government agency has entered the publishing field. Just off the press is the first edition of a new quarterly banking journal called the National Banking Review ($1 a copy, $5 a year), published by James Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency. Printing costs of the magazine, which Mr. Saxon describes as "a journal of policy and practice," will come from assessments on national banks with which the Comptroller runs his office.

Purpose of the publication, according to Mr. Saxon, is "to afford a medium of expression to those who are concerned with public policies in the field of money and banking, and with the problems and practice of banking institutions." Its pages will be open to those outside as well as within the Government, including the Comptroller's staff, headed by Victor Abramson, chief economist. Legal articles will be edited by the Comptroller's law department.

The inference here is that those who have something worthwhile to say on the subject of money and banking can't find a medium of expression among the many journals and bulletins published regularly by banks and other financial institutions and private publishing firms. This is far from true.

The Department of Agriculture wire service, which offers subscribers teletypewriter hookups with the Government's 19,000-mile leased wire network connecting more than 200 market areas, competes with private news gathering agencies. Likewise, the new Government banking journal, edited and written by Federal employees or handpicked outsiders, competes with private publications in its field. Both offer manifest opportunities to disseminate information favorable to the political objectives of the Kennedy administration.

Another pertinent development is disclosed in a memorandum from President Kennedy, printed in the Federal Register of August 28, ordering establishment of "a unified governmental communications system which will be called the National Communications System." It is to be established and developed "by linking together, improving, and extending on an evolutionary basis the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies." It is to meet the communications needs "of all Government agencies" and to provide communications "under all conditions."

The New Frontier, of course, finds excuses for these activities. Thus the President seeks to provide communications facilities for all the many Government agencies at maximum efficiency and minimum cost. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman contends his wire service enhances the "free flow of news."

Mr. Saxon's excuse is unique. Some time ago he added a number of research economists to his staff. Now he needs the magazine as an outlet for the newly hired economists.

Pretexts for expanding Government intervention in news dissemination have aroused strong objections from the American Newspaper Publishers Association. It contends that when the communications facilities of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and other Government departments become unified, it is then only a short leap to a national news agency of the type that exists in totalitarian countries, such as Russia's Tass.

Both Representative PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois, and Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, have introduced bills to prohibit a Government news service. Congress had better get busy and enact these bills before the service becomes a reality.

Technion and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an address

I made at the dinner sponsored by the New Jersey State chapter of the American Technion Society, in honor of the national president, B. Summer Gruzen, in West Orange, N.J., Thursday evening, September 12, 1963.

The text of my statement follows:

Israel and Technion are indivisible. I do not say that one could not exist without the other, but I would say, without fear of challenge, that neither the State of Israel nor the Technion Institute would be the same. To Israel, Technion spells life and viability. To Technion, Israel—young, lusty but lacking in natural resources, is the spur.

It seems almost unbelievable, does it not, to speak of Technion's beginnings in the time of the Ottoman rule of Palestine. Yet, it was then that a group of German Jews, knowing that very few of the Jewish faith were engaged in any field of technology, hit upon an idea that influenced the very course of history. In 1924 when Technion opened, and by that time the British had assumed the mandate over Palestine, 30 young men entered. With the exodus from Germany, beginning in 1933, thousands of fleeing technologists and scientists sought the opportunities only Technion could give them. When the resources of Technion were stretched to the breaking point, the Government of Israel gave a 300 tract to Technion, and the American Technion Society gave close to $10 million for laboratories, workshops, classrooms, and other facilities for Technion's new campus in Mount Carmel.

Truly it has been said that the engineers of Israel are the builders of Israel. They control the flow of water, oil, gas, chart new industries, modernize existing industries, plan towns, and roads, and reservoirs, and harbors.

Every year, 600 men and women are graduated and, in a sense, their contributions mold the destiny of Israel. They already have reached toward the sun for energy, have found untapped wealth in Israel, have begun the desalinization of water, and harnessed atomic energy for peaceful uses.

The Technion's graduates have gone to the countries of Africa and have helped in their development and have come to the United States, in turn, to receive advanced training. There is no doubt in my mind that were peace to come to the Middle East the engineers, and the chemists, and the architects from Technion would spread learning and light throughout the area and cement, through science, the bonds of friendship. As Gen. Yaacov Dori, President of Technion, has said eloquently: "I hope that one day * * * our neighbors will send us their young men and their teachers, so that together we may pursue knowledge and science in an area of peace and progress."

As the graduates of Technion enter into the stream of life of Israel, they serve not only the people of Israel but the people of the world. For example, when the U.S. Air Force asked Technion to do research a few years ago on the problems of travel at high speeds, the Institute produced a revolutionary new pump known as the centripital pump. When Technion developed a refrigerator which is powered exclusively by the rays of the sun, every country close to the equator knew it must be the beneficiary thereof.

So we are not talking here of parochial achievements, we are talking of man's service to man and the good life that science can bring in its wake to all people.

What Technion is doing is exciting in every sense of the word. It stirs the blood to know that the mind and the heart of men are being put to such uses that even our imaginations, educated as they have been to the miracles of the space age, cannot quite grasp. As the men and women of Technion wrest from the earth, and the air, and the sea the secrets of nature, we, in our own way, must help them as they, in their own way, help us. Only the other day I read somewhere that there had been perfected at the Technion Institute a new technique for aiding the blind. So it is not only a matter of bridges, or pumps, or refrigerators, but it is likewise a matter of the most acutely humane of achievements.

More's the pity then that Israel, ready, willing, and able to serve scientific advance through Technion cannot pursue this course when its immediate range must be first and foremost—peace. Nor, again, is peace in the Middle East parochial. A war in the Middle East is unthinkable for all of the world. Thus the cynical vetoing, by the Soviet Union, of the censure of Syria for the needless slaughter of two Israelis, is a shocking display of immorality. When the United Nations reaches the degree of ethical responsibility to make its decisions on the basis of right and wrong rather than on the basis of the play for political power, then many of the problems which we assume today to be insoluble will be resolved. Another dismal note in the United Nations is the whitewash of the massacre of people in Yemen in the power play between Saudi Arabia and Egypt. What happens in Yemen is of immediate concern not only to the State of Israel but also to the world.

When the debate on the foreign aid bill was on the floor of the House, I felt it imperative to call the attention of the Members on the floor of the House to the following facts; I emphasized the provision of the foreign aid bill which reads as follows:

"(1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

"(1) the United States,

"(2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or

"(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

This is not a recommendation we can afford to dismiss. The testimony is clear that a dangerous condition exists in that area which is the bridge of three continents. Egypt presently is violating the substance of the provision referred to.

A billion dollars of foreign aid has gone to Nasser. While our dollars have been poured into the United Arab Republic, the Nasser regime has been receiving arms from the Soviet Union. President Nasser has weapons including supersonic Mig-21's, antiaircraft missiles, and an arsenal of Egyptian-made weapons.

Egypt is making jet aircraft and rockets with the help of foreign experts. Its regular army numbers from 60,000 to 100,000. To say that the world has nothing to fear from Egypt's military buildup plus Nasser's insatiable ambition to rule over all Arab governments is to turn our backs upon reality. Every dollar we send Egypt releases Nasser from the obligation of developing the economy of that country. He would have you believe that the main Arab enemy is Israel. Yes; Egypt has enemies; and these enemies are poverty, disease, illiteracy, and ambitious politicians. Were our dollars used to the productive end of wiping out disease and poverty and illiteracy of Egypt I would be the very last to suggest that any conditions be set upon aid to Egypt.

Tension in the Middle East, whether it springs from Nasser's desire for an Arab empire or from his hostility to Israel, brooks ill for the Western World. It is a completely resonable request that American dollars be used to promote peace. Offer after offer by the Israeli Government to sit down at the peace table with Nasser has been spurned. When Nasser's ambition to overcome other Arab governments fails, he turns his wrath toward Israel. Only recently, when Egyptian troops returned from Yeman, unable to admit to his discomfort, Nasser spoke to these troops, saying:

"Our armed forces are getting ready to wash out the shame of Palestine and face Israel and those who support her * * *. You must prepare to restore to the Palestinian Arabs their usurped rights. We must put aright the humiliation which the Arabs suffered in 1948 * * *. For us in Egypt, disarmament is impossible unless the rights of the Palestinian Arabs are restored."

Mark his language. I quote specifically the words, "and those who support her."

Our billion-dollar aid has not persuaded Egypt to refrain from getting military hardware from the Soviet Union. Our billion dollars have not persuaded Egypt to turn aside from her practice of vilification and hate aimed directly against Israel. Our billion dollars have not persuaded Nasser to turn his attention to the development of Egypt's economy and leave other Arab governments to work out their own destinies. In the words of the committee report:

"Any government which devotes its energies and its resources to the harassment of neighboring countries and to a military buildup directed against them reduces the effectiveness of its efforts to develop its resources and to improve the condition of its people. Funds provided by the U.S. taxpayer should not be used to make up for the money and effort diverted by the beneficiaries of our aid to such military activities. Furthermore, U.S. financial support to a government engaged in such activities must inevitably be regarded by those nations which are subjected to such harassment and military threats as evidence the United States is willing to tolerate, if not endorse, such action."

In the name of peace, these words merit the endorsement of every Member of the House. Peace in the world and the security of the United States are indivisible. The foreign assistance program recognizes this fact, but at no time shall it be said that the United States is for peace at any price. Thus, I am in wholehearted accord with the statement of the policy of the United States committed in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963:

"To support the principles of increased economic cooperation and trade among countries, freedom of the press, information, and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all private persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion. The Congress further declares that any distinction made by foreign nations between American citizens because of race, color, or religion in the granting of, or the exercise of, personal or other rights available to American citizens, repugnant to our principles."

I have voted, and shall continue to vote, for foreign aid, because I believe that the reduction of world tension and insecurity is our greatest insurance for peace, but wherever there is the possibility that the purposes of our foreign aid may be perverted, we must demand that reasonable conditions be met.

What I have said on the political situation is not irrelevant to the work of Technion. The men and women of Technion work for survival in their area as we in the political arena work in other directions. I have no doubt that peace will come, and I have no doubt that when it does we will receive the full impact of how much the engineer, the chemist, the technologist has prepared the world to live and work in peace together.

Finally, I would emphasize one point which I think is central to all constructive thinking on the world in which we live today. Any educational institution represents an investment in the future and is therefore an expression of faith in the future. If this is

true everywhere, it is particularly true in a small country like Israel which is beset with dangers and is almost surrounded by countries whose leaders continually announce their intention of driving it into the sea. I do not think that this evil intention is feasible. I do not think that the world will ever allow an intention like that to happen. But the basic reason for my conviction that it can never happen is the kind of spirit which exists in the Haifa Technical Institute, which led to its creation some 50 years ago and which has led ever since to its constant expansion and improvement. These are people who are not content to be buffeted by fate. These are people who determine their own future in freedom and who have demonstrated their capacity to do so. These are people who look to the future and live for the future and who are doing their best to teach their children the skills that they will need to create that future and enlarge the horizons of human freedom. People like that are unshakable. They will not be deflected from their course for they possess the greatest resource of strength that can ever belong to man—man's belief in himself and in his right and duty to realize his God-given capacities to the full. This is why I believe that the people of Israel will realize the prophecy which we read in our prayers every Sabbath: "The Lord will give strength to his people; the Lord will bless his people with peace."

Food Fairyland at the Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting and factual report from the World's Fair Corp. speaks for itself, and I insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

The New York 1964–65 World's Fair, opening April 22, 1964, is going to be a gastronomic adventure for the gourmet as well as for the gourmand.

Some 75 restaurants, with a combined seating capacity of approximately 20,900, will be spread throughout the 5 major areas of the fair. The architecture and interior decor of the restaurants at the fair will provide settings of imagination and individuality varying from authentic reproductions of regional and national locales to the most futuristic concepts.

The restaurateurs have projected plans based on a realistic appraisal. Geared primarily for visitors with moderate incomes, the food facilities will cater to the broadest range of appetites and income.

Meals will be priced as modestly as 99 cents for a complete seven-course oriental dinner served in an oriental garden setting of Chinese tea-houses by Chun King Corp.

International sandwiches, prepared from authentic foreign recipes, will be the bill of fare at the Seven-Up Pavilion where patrons can eat at tables set up in canopied shells. Park kiosks will be part of the food service facilities offered in Rheingold's Little Old New York.

For food excitement, even the most commonplace of menu items will be romanticized with "international hamburgers" and footlong hot dogs to be served by Century Grill.

Within the Federal and States Area, New England's pavilion will serve the regional cooking and seafood for which it has become famous.

West Virginia's restaurant, a futuristic mountain lodge surrounded on three sides by water stocked with live fish, will feature golden trout and Virginia ham.

The restaurant in the Maryland pavilion, which will afford a sweeping view of the fair, will serve its famous Eastern Shore dinners and will also offer visitors a raw seafood bar.

In the planning stage but not finalized are restaurants, also moderately priced, for the State pavilions of Missouri, Minnesota, and California.

Texas, in keeping with its "biggest" image, is planning a series of air-conditioned, roofed, pavilion-type restaurants with a 2,000 seat capacity in the fair's lake amusement area.

Louisiana's restaurant will offer the food for which New Orleans has become famous in the re-creation of the city's old French Quarter.

The Hawaiian pavilion, built partially over Meadow Lake, under a transparent plastic covering, will feature the Restaurant of Five Volcanoes. Exotic Hawaiian delicacies—blending the best from each of the ethnic groups of the Islands will be served here. Middle-priced meals will be supplemented by more expensive outdoor luaus where Tahitian and Polynesian dances and rituals will accompany a three-hour, twelve-course meal.

The foods of four continents will be available in the international pavilions where the fair guest will be able to eat his way around the world in either tourist or first class accommodations. Several of the pavilions will have self-service and quick service facilities offering moderately priced snacks, indigenous to the country. Chile will feature its local seafoods and wines. Belgian chalet restaurant, where masters of culinary art will prepare such specialities as cheese fondu and racelette.

Spain's pavilion will house two restaurants—a moderate priced one with entertainment, and a luxury dining room. Most of the restaurants will be moderately priced. However, for the gourmet or for the average fairgoer whose budget allows for a few carefully selected splurges, there will be the opportunity to sample the highest art of the world's greatest chefs.

Patrons will be able to watch chefs at work with huge spits as they prepare Asado, the Argentine version of barbecue. Barbecues will also be featured in the tree-house restaurant proposed as part of an exhibit by the OAMCE, a group of the 13 French-speaking new nations of Africa.

A "Long House" in the Polynesian pavilion will serve Hawaiian foods. Chinese food will be available in the restaurant of the Hong Kong pavilion which will also offer oriental entertainment and a "Bar of Dragons."

Moderately priced restaurant facilities are also being planned for the pavilions of Belgium, Korea, Malaya, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Sudan, Morocco, Pakistan, the United Arab Republic, and International Plaza, a multi-exhibitor pavilion.

Within the industrial and transportation areas of the fair, where exhibits of American business will be featured, quality American food is the rule in restaurants ranging again from the moderate to the high priced.

Schaefer's circular, plastic enclosed structure will contain a "Restaurant of Tomorrow." In a light and airy atmosphere, tables will be grouped around a cascading fountain and gold and silver trees which at night will appear to be illuminated by fireflies. Diners will be served from an impressive buffet.

A Victorian mansion with an attached conservatory, overlooking the lagoon, will house Liebmann Breweries' luxury restaurant. Also within "Little Old New York" will be the more moderately priced Rheingold Tavern which will feature open-faced sandwiches, re-creating the free lunchcounters of old.

Lighting techniques which will make glass enclosures almost invisible, cascading plants on the wall, an ingenious combination of grass, carpeting and terrazzo as a floor covering, and decorative gaslight fixtures will transform the Festival of Gas restaurant into an outdoor garden where moderately expensive gourmet regional American food will be the featured cuisine.

Exhibitors' products will determine the menus in some 16 separate serving facilities planned at the World of Food pavilion. The largest dining area will be allocated to a 500-seat steakhouse. Under consideration are "eating tours" which will enable a visitor to have each course of the meal in a different dining facility within the pavilion.

Greyhound's "Post House," a forecast of tomorrow's Greyhound Terminal restaurant, will offer medium-priced American regional foods in three of four dining rooms centered around a "Main Street, U.S.A."

An unusual dining service will be offered by Mobile Care, Inc. for the feeding of the physically handicapped. Predicated on the theory that the handicapped are at a marked disadvantage in competing with crowds for attention and service, this special restaurant is being planned to insure quicker service in surroundings geared to special needs. Among the features will be menus designed to cope with all sorts of dietary requirements, adjustable chairs and tables, and trained waiters and attendants who will provide not only the physical assistance needed, but the right psychological climate.

Situated 120 feet above ground and commanding a magnificent view of the fair and New York's skyline, will be the 700-seat, glass-enclosed Top-of-the-Fair restaurant, located just below the roof-top heliport of the Port of New York Authority pavilion.

Top-of-the-Fair, open to the public in October 1963, expects to attract a wide range of visitors with prices geared from moderate to high, and fine quality food ranging from hamburgers to deluxe continental cuisine.

Under the supervision of Duke Arturo Pini di San Miniato, who has been engaged as design consultant, the decor will be themed to the many aspects of travel today and will be a blending of the traditional and modern. Three murals on sea, land, and air travel will be installed after their completion in Madrid by Count Louis Quintanilla.

Carrying out this theme is the top of the fair's capsule bar modeled after the *Friendship-7* capsule.

Directly below these facilities will be a 360-seat cocktail lounge featuring drinks from around the world, hot and cold sandwiches, and hors d'oeuvres.

For the fairgoers who desire the extra fillip of a nightclub atmosphere with his dining, Venezuela will offer a moderately high-priced restaurant-nightclub featuring unique gourmet dishes and the country's top entertainment talent. The Texas Pavilion's Frontier Palace, in the Lake Amusement area, will be transformed into a nightclub beginning at 9:30 p.m. and will offer quality American food at moderate prices.

In addition to the mulitude of public dining rooms, more than half a dozen of the industrial pavilions have plans for private clubs and hospitality suites.

The Brass Rail Food Service Organization will operate the largest number of food service facilities at the fair. Twenty-five restaurant unit complexes, strategically located throughout the fairgrounds, with a high-speed system for mass volume feeding, will provide food and beverage in outdoor eating areas. The units will also contain souvenir shops, public telephones, and public comfort stations. Five of them will also house first-aid stations.

Brass Rail will also operate eight moderately priced restaurants with seating ca-

pacities ranging from 300 to 500. Of the two planned for the the Long Island Rail Road overpass, one will be a commuter-type operation featuring hot meat sandwiches and dishes; and the other, Danish smorgasbord meals. Within the fairgrounds, there will be two traditional colonial structures which will serve plantation-type chicken dinners, two modern charcoal steak restaurants and two restaurants which will serve Italian foods in a setting reflecting the Mediterranean influence.

In the words of an old poem—"Pray for peace and grace—for wisdom and guidance—but don't forget the potatoes." The fair won't.

Freedom on the Auction Block

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will freedom be sold for $2-a-bushel wheat? Is trade so important that all human considerations are abandoned? Will Soviet Russia finally rule the world because free nations put money above principle?

These are questions which must be burning in the minds of all those concerned with the freedom of mankind. The latest Canadian deal to sell a half billion dollars worth of wheat to Communist Russia with a large portion of it going to Cuba makes us wonder how interested some of the free world is in remaining free. The most tragic part of this whole deal is that it was consummated without any objection from the United States even though we are spending billions to fight communism around the world.

Once again we see the results of the lack of a strong policy and effective leadership in the United States. Until the world knows where we stand in the fight for freedom, until the world is convinced that they can depend upon the leadership of the United States, we may expect more and expanding deals with the Communists which will continue to strengthen Russia and her satellites and make the world safe for communism.

Some pertinent thoughts on the Canadian wheat deal are included in the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

CANADA'S WHEAT DEALS

Canadians are traditionally reluctant to be bound by foreign policy decisions made in Washington, but Canada's latest wheat deals with the Communists are more than a perfunctory assertion of Canada's right to make its own decisions. They have reached such proportions as to be a decided obstacle to the conduct of the cold war.

Several years of large wheat sales to Red China have now been capped by a $500 million sale to the Soviet Union, of which $33 million worth of wheat and wheat flour will be shipped directly to Castro's Cuba. The rest—all to be delivered by next July 31—will alleviate an acute shortage of wheat in Russia itself and in the East European satellites which Russia normally supplies.

No doubt all of this is welcome news for the Canadian wheat farmer and for the trade and agriculture ministries in Ottawa. In the words of Trade Minister Mitchell Sharp, the Communists have, in effect, guaranteed "a commercial market for every bushel of wheat and bag of wheat flour that physically can be moved through Canadian ports"—and at a price of about $2 a bushel. Russia and China will take the bulk of Canada's wheat exports and roughly twice as much as Canada uses itself.

As a consequence of the agreement with Russia, Mr. Sharp noted that there is no longer any need to give away more wheat to many countries to dispose of Canada's overproduction. Why give away wheat when it can be sold for cash?

But there's another side to the coin which the Canadians, in their mercenary satisfaction, seem to have overlooked. American farmers and Government agencies, stuck with vast surpluses as a result of our misguided policy of price supports, would be only too happy to sell wheat to the Communists except for national policy. The United States has determined that the interests of the Americas and the free world are not served by bailing Communist dictators out of their own mistakes. Trading with Red China or Cuba is considered inimical to the national interest. Canada's eagerness to sell wheat to these countries will therefore cause resentment in this country, for Canada is frustrating our foreign policy.

Canadian wheat will help Messrs. Khrushchev, Castro, and Mao avert political crises over food shortages without having to admit that their own policies are chiefly to blame. The Russian people, for example, haven't been told a word about the purchase of Canadian wheat. Thus Mr. Khrushchev can blame the weather, as usual, for Russia's poor crops and for the rationing of bread in Moscow, knowing that Canadian wheat will arrive to save him in time.

It was for humanitarian reasons that we exempted food and medicines from our embargo on trade with Cuba. But humanitarian purposes will not be served by giving Castro Canadian wheat any more than they were served by giving him medicine in exchange for the Bay of Pigs prisoners. These windfalls are used not to help the average Cuban, but to reward henchmen, enrich corrupt politicians, and entrench the Castro regime. Some of the medical supplies were transshipped behind the Iron Curtain.

There seems to have been little opposition to the Russian wheat deal even from Canadian military men and diplomats, even though they realize that Canada depends for its defense largely on our DEW line and rockets and that cooperation with the United States in the cold war is of paramount importance to Canada. Most surprising of all, the United States was kept informed of the negotiations as they proceeded and raised no objection except to ask if the Cuban part of the deal was necessary. For this, at least, we are entitled to a further explanation.

Herbert Lehman Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the New York Post on September 11. This editorial honors one of the Nation's most honored citizens, Senator Herbert H. Lehman. Senator Lehman continues to be one of the guiding spirits of all who are fighting for the betterment of all our citizens. The editorial follows:

HERBERT LEHMAN DAY

Herbert H. Lehman did not climb on any station wagons in last week's primary. But through letters, telephoned speeches and statements he made his influence dramatically felt on the side of reform.

At 85, this man of generosity, integrity, and principle keeps diligently espousing all the humane causes with which he has been identified ever since an irrepressible conscience impelled him into social service and then into New Deal politics.

Others have spoken more eloquently, but few have made their words count as strongly and the presence of their spirit so deeply meaningful.

Herbert Lehman is modest and incapable of self-dramatization; yet few other public figures have such a firm hold on New York City's heart.

It is fitting that a low-rent housing project in East Harlem should be named after the man who has done so much for public housing and civil rights. New York honors itself in naming that project the Herbert H. Lehman Village.

Garrett Is Adamant About Staying Garrett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 26, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Garrett Corp. is located within my district in the county of Los Angeles. This company is one of the leading members of the areospace industry and has a distinguished record.

I know that a majority of my constituents will join with me in saying—we want Garrett to stay Garrett. It would be a tragedy if this fine organization was disrupted or disorganized due to a stock manipulation.

For the information of my colleagues I cite the following article in today's issue of the New York Times. Mr. Vartanig G. Vartan has explained the present situation and I stand beside the officials of the Garrett Corp. in this dispute.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1963]

GARRETT IS ADAMANT ABOUT STAYING GARRETT

(By Vartanig G. Vartan)

LOS ANGELES, September 17.—"They need us a lot worse than we need them."

With that terse comment, a loyal red-haired receptionist at the headquarters of the Garrett corporation summed up her company's attitude toward an offer by the Curtiss-Wright Corp., of Wood-Ridge, N.J.

Curtiss-Wright is seeking to buy 700,000 of Garrett's 1,493,554 outstanding common shares at $50 a share. This direct offer to all 9,000 Garrett stockholders expires September 27.

Garrett has 10,000 employees at seven plants and many of them also own these stocks. One out of every three Garrett workers is an engineer or a scientist. Nearly everybody on the payroll is talking about the Curtiss-Wright offer.

"We like our company the way it is," says an employee proudly. "We don't want to merge or anything."

MANAGEMENT OPPOSED

What does top management think about the Curtiss-Wright offer?

"We are violently opposed to it," declared Harry H. Wetzell, the 43-year-old president. "We regard this as a raid."

"And how," adds Edward A. Bellande, chairman, for emphasis. He is 65, but has no intention of retiring. The company has no compulsory retirement age.

The two men run Garrett as an effective team. When they talked with a reporter in an interview, both men were in their shirt sleeves. It is abundantly clear that they will roll up these sleeves in the battle against the Curtiss-Wright offer.

To fellow employees, these executives are known as "Eddie" and "Harry." This first-name basis is indicative of the spirit moving the Garrett corporation. It is a company that skips the frills and dedicates itself instead to the business of turning out precision products for the space age.

Airplanes are in the blood of Garrett executives. Eddie Bellande, an early test pilot and later an airline pilot, once copiloted a transport on a transcontinental run with Charles A. Lindbergh. He also flew with the late Wiley Post in the famous *Winnie Mae*. He joined Garrett 20 years ago.

Harry Wetzel, an Air Force pilot during World War II, now logs 150,000 miles a year on business hops and often jets to New York City, a shaving kit tossed inside his briefcase, for a full day's work during a 30-hour round trip. He went to work as a Garrett engineer in 1946.

What makes Garrett such a prize? Why should Curtiss-Wright want to pay $35 million in cold cash for 47 percent of the stock?

The nature of Garrett business renders it anonymous to the public. But airplane passengers can breathe easier and fly in comfort thanks to Garrett. While crushing at an altitude of 35,000 feet at jet speeds, the passenger today literally owes his life to Garrett equipment.

In essence, Garrett ranks as a leading manufacturer of environmental control systems, not only for aircraft, but also for missiles and space vehicles. This means that the company's experts create an artificial environment vital for human survival. Orbiting in the capsule with every American astronaut at speeds reaching almost to 18,000 miles an hour is Garrett equipment.

More than 90 percent of the non-Communist world's aircraft uses Garrett equipment. Moreover, the company is a major contractor for life-support systems for the Gemini two-man space capsule, the Apollo spacecraft, and the Dyna-Soar space glider, as well as such huge missile programs as the Titan, Polaris, Minuteman, and Nike-Zeus.

Garrett also makes money consistently in an industry buffeted by the cutbacks and stretchouts of military production. It has shown earnings and paid stockholders a cash dividend every year since 1937, its first full year of operation.

For the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, one large brokerage house based in New York estimates that Garrett's earnings will climb to between $4 and $4.25 a share. A preliminary report by Garrett for fiscal 1963 put net income at $5,450,000, or $3.65 a share, while sales were expected to have soared to a new record of $225 million.

The best sales year was 1960 with a volume of $223,824,326. That same year, Garrett stock rose to a record market price of $59 a share. In 6 of the last 7 years, the stock has sold above the $50 tender offer by Curtiss-Wright.

REASONS INDICATED

Air industry observers in southern California, where aerospace ranks as the leading industry, think they can spot the answer why Curtiss-Wright is so interested in Garrett stock. They point out that Curtiss-Wright, once dominant in airplane engines, has watched its main market steadily shrink in the transition to a new space-oriented age.

But it is far more than just the hardware where Garrett excels, these observers note. Garrett also has creative brainpower constantly searching out the products for tomorrow. And, finally, Garrett has the reputation as a hard-selling concern—which means ready marketability for its 2,000 products. Among other things, Garrett is one of the world's biggest manufacturers of small turbines used to start jet engines.

Thanks to its cash-rich status, Curtiss-Wright is in an excellent position to make its offer to Garrett shareowners.

The man who created the Garrett Corp. died unexpectedly at the age of 55 on June 22 less than 3 months ago. He was John Clifford Garrett, a far-sighted air pioneer known universally as "Cliff."

In the 1930's, he was one of the first to recognize that if passenger aircraft were ever able to fly higher than the prevailing top altitude of 12,000 feet at speeds greater than 200 miles an hour, the planes would have to carry their own artificial atmosphere and pressure.

His spectacular breakthrough came with the B-29 Superfortress of World War II, the first production aircraft ever pressurized. After the war was won, Cliff Garrett's company turned its talents to civilian transports and, in due time, the space age, while still turning out military aircraft.

The stamp of Cliff Garrett still shows plainly on the company. It has no union, but can boast of never seeing a work stoppage. Even the headquarters building, faced with green ceramic tile, shows the touch of the founder. "Green was Cliff's favorite color," explained an employee. "We call that Garrett Green."

Cliff Garrett, who held the post of both chairman and president, groomed Eddie Bellande and Harry Wetzel carefully for many years before his death.

The 1952 proxy statement shows the late Mr. Garrett as owning 26,520 shares, a block now held in his estate.

Today the Garrett directors and their families own an estimated 10 percent of the company's stock. All of these holdings, company executives declare, are solidly opposed to accepting the Curtiss-Wright offer.

The Garrett Corp. home office is on a boulevard dotted with palm trees just opposite International Airport, the busiest airport west of Chicago. A plane takes off every 90 seconds, and nearly every plane carries Garrett equipment on it. The company wants to keep flying higher on its own in the future.

The Curtiss-Wright Corp. is most familiarly known to the general public for its engines and aircraft. The company has expanded its operations into a wide range of products, some outside the aerospace field.

Incorporated in Delaware in August 1929, the company acquired in exchange for stock substantially all of the capital stocks of Curtiss Aeroplane and Motor Co., the Wright Aeronautical Corp. and their subsidiaries engaged in various branches of the aviation industry.

Mainly through acquisitions, Curtiss-Wright has broadened its interests to include electronics, metals, processing and industrial products.

With more than 15,000 employees, it produces aircraft propellers and controls; flight simulators and duplicators for aircraft and missiles; and forgings, castings, precision-machined parts, precision spring clutches and electronics equipment.

T. Roland Berner, chairman and president, took over the helm at Curtiss-Wright in May 1960, at the age of 49.

Congress Should Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Accuracy of Odometers on Certain Leased Motor Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the automobile rental industry is one which does in excess of a hundred million dollars worth of business in a year. It is conceded that reputable people, on the whole, operate the business. Nevertheless, there have been many complaints that persons renting the cars are being charged by the rental agencies for more miles than they traveled.

Because of the numerous complaints which have reached me on this subject, I contacted the National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce. I was advised that a technical investigation of the accuracy of vehicle odometers was conducted by the Office of Weights and Measures. This was done at the request of the Committee on Specifications and Tolerances of the National Conference on Weights and Measures. I quote from the report dated August 6, 1963:

Test results—odometer accuracy. The average error for all cars driven under city and highway conditions was plus 3.21 percent. The average error for all city runs was plus 3.50 percent.

Conclusions. The test results indicated the average automobile odometer tested provided an overregistration error slightly greater than 3 percent under standard test conditions.

Although this seems a rather low average error, when we multiply it by the many thousands of cars being driven on a rental basis throughout our Nation on any given day, the total figure can run into millions of dollars in a year, and these millions are paid by those who rent the cars. The fact that the bilking of the public is not deliberate or done with fraudulent intent, has no bearing on the subject. In my opinion, the renting public should be protected against such overcharges.

To show the seriousness of the complaints and the interest the problem has aroused, I am including two articles which appeared in the Washington Post on June 6, 1962, and June 7, 1962.

The articles follow:

ACCURATE MILEAGE COUNT IS URGED ON RENTAL MOTOR CARS

(By Dorothy Butler)

A committee of the National Conference on Weights and Measures has urged automobile manufacturers and the Society of Automotive Engineers to do something about the built-in overcharge car renters have to pay.

The committee noted that the mileage measuring device (odometer) is now designed "to provide an average overregistration error of significant proportion," in some cases up to 14 percent. This means many car renters pay for miles they never drive.

At the same time, the committee on specifications and tolerances urged rental car agencies to insist that the manufacturers sell them cars with more accurate odometers.

In a report adopted earlier in the conference and made public yesterday, the committee called on the carmakers and engineers to revamp odometer specifications.

It is not now mechanically possible to build perfectly accurate odometers. They can be built to register more miles, or fewer miles. This is why the weights and measures group in its widely adopted general code has allowed for some error. But conference officials claim odometers now significantly exceed that margin of error.

The weights and measures group, meeting at the Sheraton-Park Motel, is made up of officials from throughout this country and abroad. It is expected to make specific recommendations and possibly propose odometer tolerances after a technical study it is conducting in cooperation with the National Bureau of Standards is completed later this year.

RENTAL CAR MILEAGE FOUND INACCURATE

(By Dorothy Butler)

An irate Canadian visiting Miami complained to the State's division of standards last winter that he was being charged by a car rental agency for more miles than he traveled. Florida officials investigated.

What they found left them more irate than the Canadian. It also stunned delegates to the National Conference of Weights and Measures at the Sheraton-Park Hotel yesterday.

Director Nalls Berryman said inspectors drove 36 rental cars over a 5-mile course. The odometers, or mileage-traveled indicator, overregistered on every car except one. They overregistered as much as 14-percent, he said. Ten of the 36 tested showed an error of 6 percent or more.

"We found it is the policy of automobile manufacturers to gear the odometers in installing them in cars so that they never underregistered. They must always overregister," he told the conference * * *. "We believe this same condition exists over the entire country and not just Florida."

T. J. McCook, chief engineer of the instrument division of Stewart Warner Corp. in Chicago, explained that engineering problems made impossible at this time the accuracy of odometer readings.

"The question of how close we should try to build in additional accuracy will take some pretty good thinking to answer,' he said.

The decision that the odometer should overregister, said an Automobile Manufacturers Association official in a telephone interview from Detroit, was first made with a safety factor in mind.

"Since the odometer is part of the speedometer, it was better at 60 miles an hour to have the speedometer read a little bit high so if the fellow is misled, he is misled on the safe side," said William Sherman, manager of the AMA's engineering and technical division.

He conceded that widespread car rentals have made the overregistration a fact to be reckoned with. The Society of Automotive Engineers currently is studying the problem, Sherman said.

A spokesman for the Washington area Hertz Rental Agency said his company has instituted a new type agreement in view of the mileage-traveled indicator's inaccuracies. Last April 1, the company began computing its charge "on mileage determined by readings on factory-installed odometers," the spokesman said.

The National Bureau of Standards currently is conducting for the National Conference a series of tests on rental cars with help from the District Department of Licenses and Inspection, according to D. R. Mackay, engineer in the NBS Office of Weights and Measures. Preliminary findings are expected to be available next week, he said.

Mr. Speaker, in order to try to correct the current abuses, I have today introduced a resolution which reads in part, as follows:

That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the accuracy of odometers and other measuring devices used to determine, in whole or in part, the rates, fees, or other charges for renting or otherwise leasing motor vehicles used in interstate commerce.

I am hopeful that prompt, favorable action will be taken on my resolution so that present abuses will be eliminated and the unsuspecting public will be protected against overcharges as indicated.

National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the prophets of gloom never stop working. They pose as experts in every field of knowledge and see the worst in each situation. In the area of the national economy they have used terms like "deficit spending," "balance of payments," and "national debt" to scare and confuse. They would have the people believe that the economy is sick, business conditions are bad, and the outlook is grim.

But the truth will out. Bona fide business and economic analysts and publications have been using the facts to demonstrate the basic health and vigor of the economy. I would like to introduce for the record two recent articles of this nature.

One, entitled "Auspices Bright for Continued Kennedy Boom," by J. A. Livingston, appeared in the business section of last Sunday's Washington Post, September 15, 1963. The other is the lead article in the Morgan Guaranty Survey, published monthly by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, in the current issue, September 1963.

Both articles agree that we are in a new phase of expansion beginning with the rise that started in January or February of 1961. Both cite statistics showing significant increases in retail sales, industrial production, and the average real income of families during the current period.

While we all may not concur with everything contained in these two articles, the integrity of the sources is indisputable and they merit the attention and study of each Member of this House:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1963]

AUSPICES BRIGHT FOR CONTINUED KENNEDY BOOM

(By J. A. Livingston)

By time-tested standards, this has been a long recovery. It started 31 months ago, in January 1961, when President Kennedy took office, though at the time he deplored the sorry economic legacy President Eisenhower had handed him.

Now, if he can only keep prosperity rolling another 14 or 15 months, he'll have it made into the 1964 campaign. And the auspices are excellent.

In spite of doggedly high unemployment and a persistent balance-of-payments deficit, total output of goods and services, industrial production, retail sales, and the stock market are at alltime peaks.

On top of that, the House Ways and Means Committee has voted the biggest tax cut—in dollars—in U.S. history. If that reduction materializes, consumers and businessmen will have a major boost in spending power in 1964.

Still, from January 1961 into November 1964 (45 months) is a long, long recovery—50 percent above average. According to studies of National Bureau of Economic Research going back to 1854, the up-phase of an industrial cycle has a 30-month life. So the averages—the probabilities—are against the President.

BREADTH OF DEMAND

But conditions make exceptions. The recovery from the pit of the depression into 1937 lasted more than 4 years. The next expansion lasted throughout World War II for 80 months. And later the Korean war kept the recovery that began in 1949 going for 45 months.

Each of those recoveries had special circumstances to prolong it. So, skeptics can logically ask: What are the special circumstances to keep this one going into November 1964? The answer, as so many times in the postwar years, is the consumer: You and I. We're doing our stuff. We're consuming.

Retail buying has been exceptionally strong all year. In August, department store sales, seasonally adjusted, jumped to an alltime high, and retail sales in general stayed up at their previous alltime peak, as you can see:

	Department store sales index	Annual rate of retail sales
		Billions
January	114	$20.3
February	114	20.4
March	119	20.4
April	115	20.3
May	117	20.2
June	120	20.5
July	120	[1] 20.8
August	[1] 125	20.8

[1] New high.

Such broad demand, if continued, will sustain a high rate of industrial activity and send outlays for plant and equipment to further peaks. Corporate finance committees will revise upward expansion programs as they discover that the excess capacity they thought they had just isn't there.

VERTICAL EXPANSION

Of course, you can argue that this propensity to spend—this boom in retail sales—is temporary. It could peter out. But it seems to me that the tendency is just the other way.

In spite of the persistently high level of unemployment, we're in an era of rising expectations. This country has had, throughout its history, widening frontiers. In the 1900's, it was horizontal space—geography. In the 20th century, we're adding floors to purchasing power. This rise is vertical.

The average "real income" of families rose more than 2 percent last year to a record level of $7,140. This year, real income will be up again. That partly explains the strength in retail sales.

And a multiplier is at work. More families are pushing up into the "middle income" class. Fewer remain in the really low income brackets.

As a result, effective demand for refrigerators, washing machines, driers, dishwashers, freezers, and so on, is widening. You can see why in the following table, which shows real income. (It eliminates inflation.) Note the shrinkage since 1929 in the percentage of families in the below-$2,000-income class from 31 percent to 12 percent—a drop from almost 1 in 3 to 1 in 8.

And note, conversely, the rise in the proportion of families in the $10,000-and-over bracket from 1 in 20 to 1 in almost 5. But the really influential change is the jump in the group earning from $6,000 to $10,000, from 10 percent to 29 percent.

Income	Percent of families		
	1929	1947	1962
Under $2,000	31	16	12
$2,000 to $6,000	54	54	40
$6,000 to $10,000	10	21	29
$10,000 and up	5	9	19

The number of families accustomed to convenience living increases year by year, creating—on top of initial demand—a continuing replacement demand. Of this, the automobile industry, with its record scrappage, is the outstanding consumer goods example.

[From the Morgan Guaranty Survey, September 1963]

BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL CONDITIONS

On the whole, the economy turns out to have performed surprisingly well during the summer period. The letdown widely expected after the elimination of the strike threat in the steel industry did not materialize. Instead—with allowance for seasonal factors—most of the broad indicators continued to advance. Heartened by this showing, business and investor sentiment have taken on more sparkle than they have shown at any time in the past year.

The glow of better feeling was most clearly evident in the stock market, where the general price averages finally broke through the previous alltime highs that had stood since before the sharp selloff in the spring of 1962. A more sanguine attitude also showed in statistics relating to businessmen's plans for the future. These confirmed that weakness in capital goods activity is definitely past and that a new phase of expansion is now under way.

Summer's vigor, added to the strong advance in the first half of this year, calls for a fresh assessment of the underlying character of the cyclical rise that began in February 1961. It has become conventional to regard the expansion as an essentially weak one because of its fitful record of recurring start and pause. That view is now open to serious challenge.

Certainly, when appraised in terms of its probable duration, the current business expansion shapes up creditably. Thirty months old in August of this year, it had already lasted 5 months longer than the advance of 1958–60. With prospects for the immediate future remaining favorable, the chances are good that it will at least equal in length the 35-month expansion of 1954–57 and the 37-month rise of 1945–48. In the whole postwar period, only the 45-month expansion of 1949–53 can boast (as of now) markedly greater endurance, and the long life of that upswing was undoubtedly due in part to the Korean war.

QUANTITY AND QUALITY

Judged by the rate of growth that has been experienced since its inception, the current business expansion also stands up well when compared with its postwar predecessors. Here the sharp gains recorded since the start of 1963 have made a critical difference. In July of this year, industrial production stood 15 percent above its last cyclical high. This represented a significantly better showing than had been registered in either of the latest two expansions. The current rise also gets the best rating when the comparison is made in terms of deflated gross national product.

The present cyclical expansion, moreover, lays claim to some important qualitative achievements. In particular, cost pressures have been much more successfully contained than in earlier advances, partly because of smaller annual percentage increments in wages and partly because of an improved productivity record. Not only has this helped the United States gain competitive strength internationally, but it also means that the outlook for profits is less cloudy now than at the comparable stage in previous upswings. This augurs well for capital spending, typically a key mainstay of the economy as expansions stretch out in length.

The outlook for capital goods activity is, in fact, the brightest part of the present business picture. Consumer buying and homebuilding are running strong, to be sure, but the comparatively long duration of the rise in these two areas cautions that a period of consolidation could lie ahead, especially because of the rather steep rise that has been underway in consumer and real estate credit.

Capital outlays, by contrast, have been relatively laggard and indeed suffered a decline last autumn and winter that persisted for two quarters. Thus they now enjoy an upside leeway, and the various foreshadowing series that are available in the investment sector suggest they may well make use of it.

The Government's latest quarterly survey of businessmen's investment intentions points that way. So does the National Industrial Conference Board's series on capital appropriations in manufacturing. Almost without exception, monthly data which reflect new orders and contracts for plant and equipment have been pushing higher in recent months.

How much growth total business activity will show over the remainder of the year and on into 1964 would seem to depend chiefly on whether strength in capital goods is superimposed on strength elsewhere or whether it merely plays a substitute role as other sectors take a breather. This is essentially a question of guessing at trends in the area of consumer demand for durable goods and housing, always difficult at this stage of cyclical expansion.

THE WHY OF TAX REDUCTION

In this setting, a general reduction of income taxes such as is contemplated in the bill that will shortly go to the floor of the House of Representatives could obviously provide the margin of difference needed to tilt the economy in the direction of accelerated advance. But giving an added fillip to an economy already moving at a healthy pace is not the basic reason for cutting taxes. The surprising strength being shown by the present business expansion, in fact, makes it especially important to stress the more fundamental, long-term arguments for tax reduction as an energizing force in the economy.

Domestically, a quicker pace of business is necessary to cut into the continuing high toll of joblessness and the waste of idle industrial capacity. Internationally, a tax-cut prod to economic activity would yield multiple benefits to the U.S. balance of payments. The lower tax rates themselves could be expected to draw the investment funds of both Americans and foreigners to this country. And a condition of greater prosperity would have the dual value of keeping at home more of the funds at the disposal of American business and of providing more room for any further tightening of monetary policy that may prove necessary to defend the dollar.

On the monetary front, an element of flexibility that earlier this summer seemed to have been lost was recaptured this month. The Treasury, by offering investors two longer term bonds as part of its September advance refunding operation, showed an apparent willingness to let the upward trend in interest rates spread from the short-term end of the money market out through the range of longer maturities. Official statements in July had indicated a resolve to confine the uptrend—important as a deterrent to capital outflows—to short-term paper. An attempt to rigidify such isolation would have seriously limited the ability of monetary policy to help with the balance-of-payments problem.

TROUBLE OVER SPENDING

In the present situation, it is the payments problem that makes the most compelling argument in favor of tax reduction. The urgency of the argument is proclaimed by the unexpectedly large payments deficit reported for the second quarter of 1963—$5.2 billion at an annual rate. Even when allowance is made for the exceptional elements that swelled the figure, and for the more favorable experience that the third quarter reportedly is yielding, the path to payments equilibrium looks long and rocky.

The lift that tax reduction could give over that difficult route looks to be in danger of delay because of the administration's failure to satisfy the broad congressional—and public—demand that a cut in tax rates be accompanied by some trimming of proposed Government expenditures. Unless the loss in revenues is at least partially offset by a retrenchment in Federal spending, many fear, the increase in the budget deficit will threaten a refueling of inflationary fires in the economy.

Concern on this score hangs heavy over Congress as that body gets ready to vote on tax-cut legislation. The administration far from paring back the $98.8 billion of expenditures projected for the current fiscal year, has indicated its spending plans for fiscal 1965 may go over the $100 billion level. Treasury Secretary Dillon forecasts a budget deficit of $9.2 billion for fiscal 1964 with the first stage of the proposed tax cut in effect from next January 1.

Faced with only the narrow choice between "Yes" and "No" on a tax-cut proposal involving so serious a fiscal erosion, legislators and voters alike have a hard decision despite the great economic benefits that tax reduction can reasonably be expected to produce. In an attempt to make the choice somewhat broader, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, proposed an amendment to the tax bill, making the second part of the contemplated two-stage rate reduction contingent on the realization of some spending restraint during fiscal 1964.

The House Ways and Means Committee rejected the amendment. As a roundabout way of trying to check the expenditure uptrend, the approach employed by the measure obviously is not as attractive in principle as direct cuts in appropriations would be. The fact that the committee vote against the amendment at one stage was as narrow as 12–11, however, offers hope that congressional sentiment for fiscal discipline will be strong enough to prompt some judicious pruning of future appropriations.

The Capitol Hill Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article, entitled "The Capitol Hill Lawyer," which appeared in the June issue of the Federal Bar News. This article was written by Erwin G. Krasnow, newly elected president of the Capitol Hill chapter, and Vincent A. Doyle, newly elected vice president. The Capitol Hill chapter, which includes among its members congressional aids, committee counsel, Representatives, Senators, and Library of Congress lawyers, is a very active organization of the Federal Bar Association.

I believe that this article merits special interest as it sets out the significant role played by the legislative lawyer on Capitol Hill. A few statistics tell why the Congress has come to rely on expert committee and staff assistance. The First Congress, which met in 1789, was composed of only 26 Senators and 65 Representatives. The 88th Congress, a group of 100 Senators and 435 Representatives, handles well over 10,000 bills a session as well as acting upon a $98.8 million budget submitted by the President. In contrast to the First Congress, which had few committees and conducted no investigations, the present Congress regards legislative oversight and investigation as an important part of day-to-day committee work. Unlike his 18th century predecessor, today's Federal legislator has a full-time, year-round occupation whose scope and breadth is possible only with the help of a highly qualified administrative and legislative staff.

The above-mentioned article follows:

THE CAPITOL HILL LAWYER

(By Vincent A. Doyle, American Law Division, Library of Congress, and Erwin G. Krasnow, administrative assistant to U.S. Representative TORBERT MACDONALD)

On January 16, 1963, the caucus room of the House of Representatives rang out with toasts to a new baby. After a rather prolonged period of gestation, the Capitol Hill section had finally emerged as a chapter of the Federal Bar Association. Its proud parents thought it was unique, so different from the other chapters of the FBA that it required a different kind of name. And so they called it Congressional, to signify that its lawyers were legislative rather than executive. After some reflection, however, they realized that lawyers were lawyers no matter where they worked and at the very first opportunity they renamed their baby the Capitol Hill chapter. It might be well though to see why the parents, at first, thought their child was unique.

Despite the fact that lawyers are lawyers, the legislative lawyer approaches his problems from a different direction than does the lawyer in the executive branch. The end of the legislative lawyer is to write intelligent and intelligible laws. The end of the executive lawyer is to administer those laws. If the laws are not intelligent, the executive lawyer has a difficult time getting people to obey them. If they are not intelligible, he has a difficult time determining whether people are obeying them. When the legislative lawyer does his job well, life becomes easier for the lawyer in the judicial branch as well as for the lawyer in the executive branch, and incidentally for the people of the United States, too.

Even among legislative lawyers there are differences of approach and divisions of labor. First, of course there are the legislators, the Senators and Representatives. The lawyer, in every Congress, has far outnumbered the legislator in any other occupation. There are 314 lawyers among the Members of the 88th Congress, 67 in the Senate and 247 in the House. The role of the legislator in the legislative process should need no elaboration. Lawyers among the legislators have traditionally been thrust into positions of leadership in congressional and national affairs. This is true also of their leadership in the Capitol Hill bar. Representative TORBERT MACDONALD, of Massachusetts, was the first chairman of the Capitol Hill section and Representative RICHARD LANKFORD, of Maryland, who has been a member of the executive council from its beginning, is now serving as president of the Federal Bar Association.

The legislators, be they lawyers or not, have four kinds of lawyers they can call upon for services. Most close at hand, of course, are the lawyers on their immediate staffs. Though not every Member has such a lawyer, when he does, that lawyer is handpicked, personally responsible only to the Member and likely to share the Member's political philosophy. Despite the fact that he may be molded in the Member's image, he is expected to give the Member sound and objective counsel when the Member has not yet taken a position and to furnish persuasive briefs for the position after it has been taken, no matter what the position may be.

The lines of authority and responsibility, as well as the titles and salaries, vary from office to office. Most frequently, the staff aid who is a lawyer is the assistant charged with the responsibility for the Member's legislative program and committee preparation. He may be characterized as "house counsel," handling problems as varied as advising the Member on conflict-of-interest situations, shepherding a constituent through the executive branch maze, and handling the legal details of the Member's next campaign. Often enough he is the Member's alter ego, testifying in his place before committees considering legislation and appearing for him at other functions in a representative capacity.

Whether a Member has a lawyer on his own staff or not, for his committee business he can call upon a lawyer on the committee staff. The lawyers on committee staffs may be investigators, or specialists in a particular field of law, or they may have the broader duties which are characterized by the title "General Counsel" or "Staff Director." Although in Congress and in the press a great debate is being waged on whether the Members of the minority are being adequately served, no comment need be made here—except to say that there is no reason they should not be.

From recent newspaper accounts we get some notion of the activities of lawyers on committee staffs. They badger Air Force personnel with questions about their contracts from dawn to midnight confident that the *Mallory* rule has no application to them. They investigate gambling at Bowie and Laurel racetracks and sometimes even at Las Vegas. They study things like equal opportunity for women in the entertainment industry at places like the Lido in Paris and the buying habits of women in places like the Giant supermarket in Silver Spring, Md.

There are a lot of other activities of lawyers on committee staffs about which the newspapers never write. How they line up witnesses to testify on the proposed repeal of the jukebox exemption to the copyright law so that the operators and composers will get equal committee time. How they draw up questions for the witnesses to elicit sufficient information for the committee members to make a decision. How they write reports for both the majority and minority which will make each position as persuasive as possible. How they work with Members on the floor during debate on the measure. Multiply this by just the major measures, medicare, civil rights, aid to education, and consider that there are 303 committees and subcommittees, and you have quite a product. These are activities neither as sinister nor as glamorous as the kind the newspapers feature but they are very significant in shaping legislation, valuable to the Congress and the country, and satisfying to the lawyers themselves.

Whenever we speak about shaping legislation we cannot avoid mentioning the third kind of lawyer whose services are available to Members of Congress, the lawyer on the staff of the Legislative Counsel. Perhaps the first think this kind of lawyer will tell you about his work is that it has nothing at all to do with shaping legislation, at least in the sense of shaping legislative policy. Yet, it has everything to do with shaping legislation in the sense of putting legislative policy into statutory language. The Office of Legislative Counsel offers bill drafting services to Representatives, Senators, and committees. These services are available at any stage of the legislative process, from preparing a bill for a Member to drop in the hopper and drafting an amendment to be offered on the floor, to ironing out technical difficulties arising in a House-Senate conference committee. About the only kind of request the Legislative Counsel will not honor is one that comes from a Member who says: "I've got a lot of farmers in my district. Draw me up a farm bill." It is really only a rumor that he gets this kind of request but it is true that he would not begin drafting such a bill until he knew a little more about what the Member wants to accomplish.

Needless to say, the drafting of "public bills and resolutions or amendments thereto" is a highly complex and specialized skill. As practiced in the legislative branch, this art embraces the interests of more than one agency or department. It covers a kaleidoscope of subjects reflecting interests as broad as the ever-expanding scope of modern-day government.

A fourth kind of lawyer whose services are available to Members and committees works in the Legislative Reference Service at the Library of Congress. He may be called a senior specialist in American public law and work in the senior specialists division, or he may be called a social science analyst, even though he is a lawyer. Mostly, though, he is called a legislative attorney and works in the American Law Division. He will write a scholarly paper for a Member on the history of farm legislation, discussing measures which have been tried and failed or succeeded, setting forth criticisms which have been made of existing law and commenting on various proposals which would amend the law to eliminate the criticism. Armed with this information the Member can tell the Legislative Counsel what he wants his bill to do.

After the bill is introduced and referred to a committee, the committee may call upon the legislative attorney in the American Law Division for an opinion on its constitutionality, pro and con arguments with respect to its merits, a study of State legislation in the field, or a report on judicial decisions dealing with the subject. At the hearing stage a Member may ask for materials to be included in a statement, either for or against the proposal, to be delivered before the committee. Although objective reports written

by the Legislative Reference Service are frequently published by committees or inserted by Members in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, papers or statements which develop only one side of a case cannot be attributed to the Service. The Service is charged by law with preparing its own reports without partisan bias in the selection or presentation of the materials incorporated in them.

If this description of the work of the Legislative Reference Service lawyer makes it seem as if he does much of the same kind of work done by the legislative assistants to the individual members as well as that done by the lawyers on committee staffs, the description is a good one. This is not just a duplication of effort; rather, it is designed to complement and frequently implement their efforts. The relationship of Legislative Reference Service lawyers and the others contemplates a division of labor based partly on the notion that the tempo of life in the Library is more conducive to scholarship than the tempo of life in the Capitol and the committee rooms (though this is largely an illusion), but mostly on the notion that lawyers whose desks are adjacent to the best law library in the world need only to stretch out their arms to find the right answer to any legal problem. That this latter notion is largely true is due in no small measure to those lawyers in the law library who are also members of the Capitol Hill chapter.

There is another very capable group of lawyers in the Library of Congress but since they bear a close resemblance to executive lawyers it should not be necessary to describe them in detail. These, of course, are the Copyright Office lawyers.

This may seem like a rather long birth announcement but, as proud parents are prone to do, we consider the vital statistics of the new baby to be quite formidable.

Foolishness of Area Redevelopment Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to read an announcement that the Area Redevelopment Administration had approved a $2,275,000 industrial loan to aid in the construction of a 320-room tourist motor hotel in Carolina, P.R.

I understand that this loan was made to the Howard Johnson Motor Lodges, Inc., which, to my knowledge, is building motels all over the country presumably through private financing.

Having visited Puerto Rico, I find it extremely difficult to classify it as a depressed area. Certainly there are sections of Puerto Rico which are depressed but there is a larger part that is the recipient of millions of dollars of investment in high-rise hotel apartments and gambling casinos.

This is another illustration of the foolishness of ARA. I find it hard to understand why the Area Redevelopment Administration would authorize this loan in view of the findings and admonitions of the House and Senate committees having jurisdiction over this bill. Why new hotels would be considered eligible in view of recent pronouncements by the committees is beyond me.

I flew over Puerto Rico and I saw a great many opportunities for aiding the average Puerto Rican. If any money is to be spent on that island, it certainly should not be spent for the construction of new luxury motels and hotels, since my information convinces me that the banks are more than pleased to advance, particularly to an institution with the financial stability of Howard Johnson, adequate funds for these projects.

The district that I represent, the First Congressional District of New Jersey, has a higher unemployment rate today than it has had in decades and yet it does not qualify for aid under ARA.

It would be interesting to hear an explanation on the Federal aid to Howard Johnson.

Local Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, there are many people in our Nation who feel that the growing centralization of power and control in the Federal Government represents a serious threat to our historic way of life. There is a feeling that the growing paternalism of the Federal Government is undermining the rugged, self-reliant, do-it-yourself spirit of America which has accounted for so much of our progress and success.

Therefore, it is a pleasure to report on a progressive community in the congressional district I represent in New York State—a community which recently completed a major improvement project without calling for Federal or State financial aid, even though such assistance was available under existing programs. I refer to the recent completion of a new waterplant by the village of Albion in Orleans County at a cost of more than $1 million. The village will dedicate its new modern plant next Tuesday, September 24. This improvement should prove a major asset for the people of this community and enable them to provide an adequate water supply for both domestic and industrial use.

Albion is located in a so-called redevelopment area because of a substantial rate of unemployment, and this entitles this community to special Federal assistance under the area redevelopment program and the accelerated public works program, as well as the community facilities program. But Albion preferred to carry this redevelopment project on its own shoulders. In doing so, the people of Albion proved for all to see that they have the initiative and determination to assess their local needs and resolve them locally without surrendering their rights or responsibility for these local services. This initiative and determination deserve the attention and commendation of all of us.

The example of this village on the shores of Lake Ontario has attracted wide attention in our area, and was recently reviewed in a thoughtful radio commentary by Dick Tobias, news director of radio station WHAM in Rochester, N.Y. I include with my remarks this commentary, which reads as follows:

A RADIO COMMENTARY ON AN ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST BY DICK TOBIAS, NEWS DIRECTOR, WHAM, ROCHESTER, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

In the year of our Lord 1828 John Quincy Adams was President of the United States battling a Congress which failed to share his views.

In 1828 the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad opened the young Nation's first rail passenger service and a year earlier, slavery had been abolished in New York State.

Also in 1828, in New York State, the village of Albion in Orleans County was incorporated.

In the ensuing 135 years Albion has had its share of proud moments. None, however, should be more proud than on September 24 of this year.

For on the 24th, Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson will be in Albion to help the village dedicate a new water treatment and supply system.

Not unusual you say? True, Lieutenant Governors are old hands at dedicating bridges, water systems, and post offices.

But there is something unusual about the Albion ceremonies of this month.

The entire water system, all $1,760,000 of it, was constructed without 1 red cent of State or Federal funds.

Not a dime mind you, of Federal moneys was received by this tiny little village tucked away in New York State near the shores of Lake Ontario.

We talked at length today about this remarkable feat with Albion Mayor John D. Robinson, truly a remarkable individual.

He puts it better than we can: "We of Albion simply felt that the outstretched palm brings with it Federal and State control and that in the doing, Americans are too quickly giving away their rights and local control."

We consider this a most important statement from the mayor of a community of slightly more than 5,000 residents.

Mayor Robinson notes that work on his village's new water system started in 1959 on the promise that if Albion were to grow, proper facilities to create new business would be needed.

Three times the residents of Albion rejected the water system bond issue by close margins.

Then Mayor Robinson, acting in the history-steeped tradition of the pioneer spirit which has dominated America, called in the clergy to explain the need.

The Albion clergy inspected the facts, spoke of the need from their various pulpits and helped the bond issue pass on the next ballot by a sweeping 4 to 1 margin.

Mayor Robinson is understandably proud and refreshingly frank and honest.

He admits to a high water rate for the 1,700 Albion water customers; admits that the task would have been much less costly to consumers if Federal funds were grasped.

But, says he, "We have done this thing ourselves * * * proved to any and all interested, that at least one community in America can see a problem and resolve it without the need to go on bended knees to the national and State coffers."

The village of Albion has solved a problem. It has proved a capacity to provide for itself and hopefully provide for new business and new industries to serve its 5,200 residents.

The accomplishments of Albion should, therefore, not go unnoticed.

Certainly in this broad expanse of ours there must exist important businessmen in important industries in search of the very few communities willing to invest in the future.

They could do no better than to select Albion because certainly it would be an investment in a community which has proved its merit.

The news from Albion today is a bit overwhelming. While we big city folks grab another chunk of the Federal pie to build a park or throw up a new building, some country folks with a heritage dating back to the *Mayflower* have established new and commendable standards which put the rest of us to shame.

Double Outrage in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the people of the 22d District of New York, whom I represent, and as a Member of Congress, I wish to express the terrible heartache and grief as well as the outrage we feel as a result of the recent bombing of a church in Birmingham, Ala., which caused the death of four little girls; we deplore the shooting of two teenage boys—these are indeed acts of madness.

Our sympathies go out to the bereaved; the murder of these children will be on our conscience as long as we live; it will remain a blot upon our Nation throughout our history.

Those responsible for the massacre of, and injury to, innocents in a church, committed an act of unbelievable cruelty, lawlessness, and a crime against all humanity. The President has pledged the full resources of our Government in apprehending those responsible for the crimes. We do not know the exact number of persons who perpetrated the heinous acts, but we do know there are many others who are also indirectly responsible; those who have encouraged public defiance of the law, which in turn creates violence and harm to the innocent, are equally guilty with those who threw the bombs and used the guns.

A time of grave crisis is upon us and despair is our lot when we realize that events prove that a police state virtually exists in parts of our Nation. It seems incredible to every right-thinking American that citizens of our Nation, which is dedicated to law, order, and equality of all, are victims of and threatened by irrational and horrible crimes; crimes based upon hatred, bias, bigotry, and distorted thinking.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government and Congress to stamp out these evils; the racial sickness which endangers our Nation must be cured; the killers and lawbreakers must be apprehended and punished; violence must be halted. Every citizen must now make it his deep concern to end the discrimination which exists, based on color, religion, race, or national origin, for when law and order are scorned, no citizen is safe.

We have no more time to lose. Congress must proceed, with all possible speed, to pass the strong, effective, civil rights legislation which will guarantee protection and real equality to all our citizens. Members of Congress, as well as every other citizen of our country, must face up to the duty which is ours.

Let us earnestly pray that there will be no more such murders; let us take every step necessary to prevent such atrocious acts in the future. This is our burden now and our responsibility, which we must all discharge with courage and forthrightness.

Hon. Leon H. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call attention to the Members of Congress and the American people the fine editorial published by the Derrick Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., newspaper, Monday, September 16, 1963, entitled "Hon. Leon H. Gavin."

This excellent editorial has been called to my attention by State Senator Richard C. Frame, of Franklin, Pa., who has been a longtime friend of mine and in whose opinions I have great confidence.

It is a pleasure to place this editorial in the RECORD as it represents an opinion not only of a fine newspaper, but also the opinions of Senator Frame and myself as personal friends and admirers of the fine service which Congressman Gavin has given over the years to our good country and the American people as well as the citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the 23d Congressional District.

The editorial follows:

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

It is with profound regret and a sense of deep personal loss that we record the death of the Honorable Leon H. Gavin, Representative in Congress from the 23d Pennsylvania District and one of Oil City's most distinguished citizens. He died suddenly in his Washington home Saturday night.

Mr. Gavin was in his 21st year in the Congress, having been elected to an 11th consecutive term last November. He was the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress, was the second ranking Republican in point of service on the powerful Armed Services Committee, and was an influential member of several other important committees.

Throughout the years since his first election in 1942, Mr. Gavin had faithfully and efficiently served his district in Congress. He was truly a servant of the people in the legislative halls and the diligence with which he labored for the rights and interests of his constituents won for him their unfaltering faith and confidence, as was so clearly evidenced by the overwhelming majorities with which he was continuously returned to Congress.

While compiling an excellent record of broad achievement for the people of his own district, Mr. Gavin over the years had proved his outstanding capability as a national legislator who was outspoken in his opinions and forthright in his dealings on all matters of national and international importance. He served his district, his State, and the Nation well, and he never faltered in his steadfast support of the American way of life and against any infringements upon individual liberty. He labored without reservation for the maintenance of a military machine under which the Nation's security would be guaranteed.

Mr. Gavin also was noted for his work in behalf of conservation and had been nationally honored for his distinguished service in this field by the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, and other societies and organizations. He worked ardently for flood control and it was largely through his persistent efforts over the years that the Kinzua Dam on the upper Allegheny was approved for construction. He also was chiefly responsible for a number of other flood control projects in this district of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gavin had attained high stature in the halls of Congress and he was highly regarded by his fellow legislators without regard to political affiliation.

Prior to his service in the Congress, Mr. Gavin served as secretary of the Oil City Chamber of Commerce for many years. It was in this work that he organized and carried on many projects for community betterment and progress. He was active in all phases of community life and his achievements for the benefit of the city and the area were many.

A stanch friend, a devoted public servant, an outstanding citizen is gone. But his memory and his deeds will long remain enshrined in the hearts of his fellow citizens.

Job Opportunities Rated Primary Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting study which was conducted recently by Robert T. Bower, head of the Bureau of Social Research. The poll clearly shows the great emphasis which both Negroes and whites place on the achievement of equal employment opportunity as a vitally important goal of the civil rights struggle. H.R. 405, as reported by the House Education and Labor Committee, would enable the Federal Government to meet its responsibilities in this area. As you know, I am firmly convinced that inclusion of a fair employment practices section will add strength and substance to the omnibus civil rights package now under consideration by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee. I believe the Congress would be remiss in its duty if it failed to act in this essential area, and I hope my colleagues will agree as to the importance of enactment of such legislation, and accordingly sup-

port its passage by the Judiciary Committee and subsequently by the House of Representatives.

The article follows:

NEGROES RATE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AS PRIMARY GOAL IN RIGHTS STRUGGLE

Preliminary results of a survey on attitudes toward the August 28 March on Washington indicate that Negroes rate better job opportunities as the most important goal of the civil rights struggle.

The findings were revealed last night by Robert T. Bower, director of the Bureau of Social Research at an open-house program at the Washington Fellowship House, 945 L St. NW.

Bower and a group of volunteer interviewers conducted polls here before, during and after the march and still are tabulating results. But preliminary figures show that 40 percent of the Negroes questioned and 28 percent of the whites believe job discrimination to be the most important single obstacle facing Negroes.

Aims of the march were listed as full voting rights, open occupancy housing, open public accommodations, fully integrated schools, equal job opportunities and social equality. Those interviewed were asked which they felt was most important. The results:

	White percentage	Negro percentage
Voting	30	25
Housing	4	3
Accommodations	1	2
Schools	12	15
Jobs	28	40
Social equality	25	15

The Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, local leader of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said the fact that most of those questioned were from the northeastern part of the country where public accommodations are generally desegregated probably accounts for the lack of emphasis on this goal.

Mr. Fauntroy, Marcellus Goff, of Washington CORE, and Ralph D. Fertig, of Southeast Neighborhood House, participated on the program with Bower. Joan Ohrenstein, of Washington Fellowship House, was moderator.

Bower's survey also showed general anxiety that the march would produce violence and great relief that it did not.

In a poll taken before August 28, a majority said they expected there would be violence. After the march, he said, a number of those who had predicted violence didn't want to be interviewed again.

He attributed much of the fear of violence to news media reports of measures being taken to insure that the march would be orderly.

But Mr. Fauntroy thought the anxiety was attributable to early reports that the march would be a massive demonstration of civil disobedience, with participants prostrating themselves across streets, railroad tracks, and airplane runways.

Answers to questions concerning their familiarity with various civil rights organizations indicate that among low income Negroes, the NAACP is by far the best known and most respected.

Relatively few knew about the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, though nearly all had heard of its leader, Dr. Martin Luther King. The Urban League was practically unheard of. The Black Muslims, on the other hand, were well known but generally not respected, the survey showed.

Fertig, who identified himself with most of the organizations sponsoring the march, said one of its biggest results was to "raise to acceptability a method which had been under question."

He said the Kennedy administration is not being fully fair to the civil rights cause in placing so much emphasis on public accommodations and so little on job opportunities.

Public accommodations can be desegregated through demonstrations, he said, adding that President Kennedy seemed more concerned about ending demonstrations than in solving the Negroes' problems.

Goff, chairman of CORE's action committee, said the march "accomplished a great deal in morale and esprit," but should not be thought of as a beginning in an intensified civil rights struggle.

He said he was very happy that no violence occurred. But, he added, unless enthusiasm generated by the march can be translated into action in local communities, "I'm afraid we've proved only that we can be nonviolent."

Remarks of Superintendent George C. Roy on Some Education Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert therein the excellent statement of Superintendent George C. Roy, able and distinguished head of the school department in Millis, Mass., in my district, as he outlined his views concerning some of the needs of elementary and secondary education.

Dr. Roy is highly qualified and experienced in this field, and his remarks are especially timely, as well as expertly presented, and I am sure that many people will be glad to have the opportunity to read them:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George C. Roy. I am the unpaid legislative chairman of the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents and I also serve as superintendent of schools in the community of Millis, Mass.

In the year 1959–60, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 19 percent of the communities, or a total of 71, had some teachers who were substandard insofar as our State certification requirements were concerned.

In that same school year, about 71 percent of the elementary teachers did not possess a bachelor's degree and 91 percent of the secondary school teachers did not hold a master's degree.

As I see it, the quality, the professional status of the teacher is of utmost importance if we are to stress quality education in the classroom.

In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the past year the minimum salary for teachers was raised from the former statutory requirement of $4,000 to $4,500. I might also add in passing that no additional State aid was provided to help meet school costs increased as a result of this action. While every community must offer a beginning teacher a salary of $4,500, there are several that start their teachers at $5,000. We might ask ourselves if each of us were to seek a position as a beginning teacher, would we go to the community that offered $4,500 or the one where we could get $5,000? As you can see, this means that those individuals who are the best qualified have the opportunity to go to the larger communities and that those communities enjoy a competitive advantage over the smaller ones.

All this takes into account just one phase of a so-called salary scale—the beginning. There are other factors to be considered such as the periodic increments and the maximum.

In my own community, to be specific, a teacher starts at $4,500, the State minimum, and may reach a maximum of $6,900 if he or she holds a bachelor's degree. A master's degree holder begins at $4,700 and goes to $7,100, while 30 hours' study beyond the master's degree means a teacher can start at $4,900 and end at $7,300. But in Brookline, which is not very far from Millis, teachers start at $5,000 and end up with not four but five figures in their salaries.

I believe that the shortage of teachers in specialized areas of education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is due in part to inadequate salaries. I refer to the areas of mental retardation, emotional disturbances, academically talented, and physical handicaps. We are mandated by statute to maintain and to operate classes for these atypical youngsters, but it is difficult to do so with the personnel that is available. I believe additional moneys should be provides to encourage teachers to obtain additional specialized training to enter these areas.

In our State, because of inequality of salaries among the communities, many teachers are constantly on the move. This tendency to be changing positions so frequently means that stability is all but destroyed in our teaching staffs. I do not believe that such a condition helps anyone and that it probably actually hurts everyone. Just as I was leaving to appear before this committee, I received word that a wealthier community was going to hire one of my special class teachers. That means that in turn, I shall have to go looking, which I have already started to do, but where I shall find someone, I don't know.

I also feel that one of the major problems confronting the smaller community is the matter of released time for teachers to use in professional improvement. Not only must we hire professionally competent people for our faculties but we must also help them to maintain such competence. For instance, in many larger communities teachers are released from at least some of their duties to participate in a curriculum study that goes on constantly, year in and year out. In smaller communities, such study must take place after regular hours and in addition to them. This "after hours" work is but one of the many burdens borne by teachers about which most people do not know.

The provisions of the National Defense Education Act have been very helpful in the fields of mathematics, science, languages, and guidance. But many of us feel that the humanities should now receive attention and that the act should be broadened to include at least English and the social studies. The eager response of the teachers who have been afforded the opportunity to attend the institutes provided under the act should be an indication of the need for its expansion, as well as a source of gratification to all those who had a part in framing and enacting that legislation.

My emphasis this morning has been upon the teacher and his or her professional welfare and competence. I have tried to point out that with adequate financial assistance, steps should be taken to see that by means of well-paid topnotch teachers even the smallest community can offer educational opportunities equal to those of the largest. It must be borne in mind that America has a mobile population. Some pupils who are

present in one classroom today may be transferred to another school hundreds of miles away by next week. So we are not educating pupils for community X alone, nor only for State Y—we are educating Americans.

The Business Outlook and the Problem of Preventive Economic Medicine—An Address by John P. Lewis, Member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, University of Notre Dame, September 11, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent address by Dr. John P. Lewis, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which was delivered at the University of Notre Dame, in the congressional district I represent, on September 11, 1963.

Mr. Lewis' address was delivered during a week-long "Partners in Progress" celebration in the South Bend-Mishawaka area.

The fact that Mr. Lewis, before joining the Council of Economic Advisers, was on the faculty of Indiana University, is a source of particular pride to the citizens of our State.

The text of Mr. Lewis' address follows:

It would be an honor in any event to address a business audience of this size and distinction, but this occasion has several special attractions for me. It is the first chance I have had to give a talk in Indiana since I took temporary leave of Bloomington 4 months ago, and for me a return to anywhere in Indiana constitutes a homecoming. I am particularly glad to have come to Notre Dame, with which Indiana University has had such happy and constructive relations over the years and where I personally have some good friends and respected colleagues.

I am honored to be on the same day's program with Gov. Matt Welsh, for whom I've had the dubious and hazardous pleasure for several years of trying to forecast gross income tax revenues. I am especially happy to be here at the request of Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, who already has established himself as one of the most distinguished younger Members of the House of Representatives. And I am pleased to have this association with South Bend's Partners in Progress Week. It is gratifying to see an urban region on its own initiative demonstrate this degree of organization and imagination in its self-help efforts. And needless to say, the administration is enthusiastic about all such efforts as yours to focus upon the particular matter of export promotion.

Most of all, however, I am glad to be here this morning for the opportunity it gives me to revert to a favorite theme; namely, our need for adequate forehandedness in our general economic policymaking.

EMERGENCY EFFORTS

In the United States, we're pretty good at dealing with emergencies once they slap us in the face. Once the problems of the great depression, of World War II, and the Korean war were hard upon us, we acted vigorously. Our policies may not have been fully adequate or even always correct and consistent. But at least they were aggressive and on the whole helpful.

Moreover, during the same period, and partly in the process of these emergency efforts, we accumulated a formidable set of defenses against future economic disasters of anything like the magnitude of the great depression. And, for dealing with limited emergencies like the economic downturns of 1948–49, 1953–54, 1957–58, and 1960–61, we have accumulated some valuable habits, techniques, and institutions that tend, once such declines are well started, to snub and check them, thereby improving our chances of reversing the recessions before they deteriorate into major business collapses.

In short, the quality of our curative economic medicine in the United States has improved very greatly during the past 30 years. But the real question now is: What about our preventive economic medicine? Are we smart enough yet to deal with the nonemergencies?—to see them coming and forestall them before they hit us full force?

This is the question I want to put to you this morning, and I want to do so in the context of the program of tax reduction that is now before the Congress and may be voted on in the House next week. In ordering my remarks around this theme, I shall be talking, as I was asked to do, about the business outlook. But since the pivotal question underlying both our near-term and our longer-run economic outlooks right now does seem to me to be precisely this matter of tax reduction—of whether we will get a program of the type, size, and the timing recommended by the House Ways and Means Committee—this will be my point of focus.

THE RECORD

There are plenty of good things to be said about this economy's performance—both recently and over the span of time, since World War II.

Since World War II, productivity has grown at least as fast as it did over the long run before the war. Real incomes and employment have risen sharply. All four postwar recessions have been notably mild by prewar standards. And despite all of the talk about it, our inflation record really hasn't been too bad—most of it being war-connected, except for the 1955–57 price spurt which may yet prove to have been a freak.

As for the recent past, the expansion that began in early 1961 already is in its 31st month and, if it persists until next spring, will be the longest of our peacetime history—except for the long stretch from 1933–37 when we were emerging from the superdepths of the Great Depression.

During this recovery the gross national product has advanced more than $80 billion; the industrial production index has climbed 22 percent; personal income has increased 13 percent; employment has gained 2½ millions; and the unemployment rate has been squeezed down at least moderately—from a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 7.1 in May 1961 to 5.5 percent of the civilian labor force last month.

Contrary to the usual expansion pattern, in which corporate profits, after surging early in the expansion, quickly taper off, this time profits seem to have held up remarkably well. And in part this seems to reflect an unusually well-sustained productivity performance.

Finally, our recent record of inflation avoidance has been excellent. By most calculations, money wage rates in manufacturing have been rising a bit more slowly than labor productivity for the past 3 years. The Wholesale Price Index is still virtually at its 1958 level, and the Consumer Price Index has edged upward only a little over 1 percent a a year, and this mainly because of the rising costs of consumer services. Indeed, our price stability has been the best of any advanced Western economy, except Canada.

Looking at these plus factors, it is easy to see how a good business journalist like Joe Livingston might suggest—as Livingston did a couple of weeks ago—that perhaps we have moved into a new era of "rolling prosperity." In a textbook a few years ago I myself used the phrase "routine prosperity" to suggest that perhaps good times are becoming almost habitual with us.

PROBLEMS TO BE FACED

As guides to action, at least, I am now convinced that both phrases are all wrong. They invite too much complacency. For there are also some very unsatisfactory things about this past performance of the economy, recent, and otherwise, that pose serious problems for the future.

First, and most obvious, is the fact that our postwar record still has been pockmarked by four recessions. However moderate by prewar standards, these new-style recessions still are painfully costly affairs. The task of avoiding them further—and, more specifically, of forestalling the next one—remains high on our policy agenda.

Second, to talk about rolling or routine prosperity glosses over the fact that we have had little success thus far in stepping up the rate of growth in our productive capacity. We need that stepped-up growth to reinforce our national security, to counter the challenge of Soviet growth, to discharge our other international responsibilities, and to provide a more abundant economic life domestically. And the fact is that during the past decade—despite all of the talk about automation and a new technological era—capacity growth seems to have been chugging along little or no better than at its historical rate of about 3½ percent a year—this compared with rates of 4 to 6 percent in most of Western Europe, 6 or 7 percent in the Soviet Union, and still higher in Japan.

This stickiness in our capacity growth rate has been due, at least in part, to the fact that our investment ratio has gotten very lean. The share of our national output that business decisions allocate to productive private investment, instead of rising, has been significantly lower during the last half of this past decade than it was earlier in the postwar period.

If the first problem aspect of our recent performance has been recurrent recession, and the second, slow growth, the third has been persisting slack in the economy since 1957, and the fourth, the balance of payments difficulties that have beset us since about the same time. For reasons of brevity, I am not going to discuss the balance of payments in this talk, although if we were to add it in, it would require no changes in what I shall be saying about our domestic situation. The third problem on the other hand—our stubborn, lingering failure since 1957, in cyclical upswings as well as downswings, to use our capacity fully—is one upon which I want to dwell at some length.

PERSISTING SLACK

This 6-year-long experience of persisting, unwanted slack poses what, in many ways, is the most disturbing economic problem of all. And in part, of course—despite my reference to preventive medicine, it is with us right now: in the form of the 5½ percent unemployment rate that we still have after 30 months of vigorous cyclical expansion; in the form of an unemployment rate that has never fallen below 5 percent in the last 70 consecutive months; in the form of current operating rates in manufacturing that still average only about 87 percent, instead of the 92 or 93 percent that business prefers; in the form of a $30 billion of shortfall of actual gross national product below potential that still persists after a 2½ year period in which total production has risen more than

$80 billion; and in the form of about $200 billion worth of output (1962 prices) that, as a cumulative matter, we have lost since 1957.

This output is gone for good. It would have been enough to supply us 17 times over with all the public schools, hospitals, and highways that we are building in the United States this year. Gone forever, too, are all of the substantially higher profits that business could have been earning during the past 6 years if the phenomenon of chronic slack had not overtaken us.

All the same, the fact remains that most of us aren't losing sleep over the slack problem right now. Business conditions feel pretty good—especially here in the Great Lakes region, where the automobile and steel industries are having a good year. Nevertheless, we would be highly disturbed by the slack problem if we are doing an adequate job of thinking ahead.

RELATED PROBLEMS

We should be disturbed, first, by the way a continuation of chronic slack in production and high average unemployment will aggravate our first recession problems. It increases our susceptibility to general recession whenever a particular sector of business activity noses downward. Moreover, if employment and output already are in a slack condition before a recession begins, even a moderate downturn can carry us to distressingly low absolute levels of activity. If right now, for example, we got into a downturn of the proportions of 1957–58, it would increase unemployment to something on the order of 8 percent of the labor force and widen the shortfall between actual and potential gross national product to the neighborhood of $60 billion.

Secondly, slack in the economy deters business investment and, therefore, slows the future growth of our productive capacity. There just are no two ways about it. People like yourselves are going to be cautious in pressing capacity expansion when year after year they find a significant margin of their existing capacity redundant.

These, then, are the reasons why an effort to close our underproduction gap, to eliminate chronic excess unemployment, and to end the lingering sluggishness of output, incomes, and profits is our No. 1 domestic economic need at present.

A GOOD BUSINESS YEAR

The administration made this judgment as to priorities in the program it presented last January. At the same time, it saw a better and smoother course for business conditions in calendar year 1963 than did many forecasters at the turn of the year. In its January report, the Council of Economic Advisers predicted a gross national product for 1963 as a whole in the $573–$583 billion range and anticipated a fairly steady pattern of gains during the course of the year.

Looked at in retrospect, this forecast still looks pretty good. This year, as is so often the case, the fashionable consensus among forecasters has undergone much more marked fluctuations than the course of the economy itself. The forecasting consensus began the year somewhat bearishly, took a bullish turn in early spring, had sober second, or rather, third thoughts in early summer, and just lately has begun to sound highly buoyant again.

Meanwhile, the expansion has been plodding along a fairly steady course. The seasonally adjusted annual rate of gross national product rose $7 billion in the first quarter, $8 billion in the second, and—one can now guess—probably something not too far short of this in the third quarter. We at the Council are in the happy position of being pretty well able to live with our beginning-of-the-year forecast. As early as March we did say it now looked as though the gross national product for the year would come out near the upper end of the range we had previously indicated—that is, somewhat above $580 billion—but since then we have been content not to tinker.

My point is not to tout the Council of Economic Advisers' forecasting record—which over a longer span of time has displayed its share of fallibility—but simply to emphasize that when the administration last January recommended a massive tax reduction program it did not do so in the expectation of anything like recession in 1963. On the contrary, it anticipated nearly as good a business year as we are getting and yet it still recommended the tax program—because of the slack problem.

TAX REDUCTION

It chose this as its primary target; it chose major tax reduction as the principal vehicle for reaching that target; and, while I have time only to sketch the bare outlines of the analysis by which it linked these two together, that much is worth doing.

The first proposition in the analysis is that the slack problem is essentially an aggregate-demand problem. We are thoroughly convinced that the cause of persisting underproduction and unemployment is insufficient outlays in the economy as a whole. To put the same point differently, the primary cause is not that our labor force—fairly suddenly, over the space of the last 5 or 6 years—has become too young or too old, or to badly trained, or outmoded by automation, or newly discriminated against on racial or other grounds.

Please do not misunderstand me: These problems of so-called structural unemployment and inflexibility in our use of resources are serious and need the kind of serious attention they are being given under existing or proposed programs. The point is simply this: There is no significant evidence that, standing by themselves, they are any more serious than they were 10 or 15 years ago—and yet the rates of unemployment and underproduction are higher. The cause lies elsewhere—in the area of aggregate demand.

In fact the point can be put more positively than this: The so-called structural problems are themselves highly sensitive to the adequacy of demand. Employers who discriminate against Negroes, who hesitate to train the unskilled, and who pass over the youngsters just entering the labor force do so far less when orders are rolling in, business is booming, and most other job candidates already are employed. Greater total demand will not wipe out all of these stubborn, difficult, particularistic problems, to be sure. But it is the quickest medicine for moderating them radically while other specific programs are being brought to bear.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Last January's analysis went on, secondly, to the proposition that the trouble with demand during the past half dozen years had been the drag created by an imbalance in the Government sector. More specifically, Federal tax rates—which initially were set to fight wartime inflations and which, under a progressive tax system, raise tax collections faster than income in a growing economy—had gotten too high relative to Government expenditures. As the economy begins to approach full employment, these rates, as they now stand, tend to choke off more consumer and business demand than existing rates of Government spending can offset. As a result, total business activity tends to stagnate short of full-production levels.

The solution, obviously, is either to raise Government spending to permanently higher levels, or to effect a permanent cut in tax rates. The administration chose to emphasize the latter for one thing because this leaves up to the private economy the question of what particular goods and services shall be bought with the additional demand fiscal policy unleashes.

This is an aspect of the strategy I am sure most of you approve. But please consider also the corollary point that the needed demand-boosting job cannot be done by matching tax cuts and expenditure cuts. As a very large number of business leaders and business organizations have now come to agree such a policy would take away with one hand about as much demand as it stimulated with the other and would leave total demand roughly unaffected.

So much for the underlying rationale of the program that is just now issuing from committee to the floor of the House of Representatives, and it may, with a considerable measure of good luck and hard work, reach the floor of the Senate for final action before the end of a very long congressional session. My contention is that the outcome of this congressional process is the greatest uncertainty in the economic outlook both for 1964 and beyond. Now it's time for me to substantiate this view by saying something more concrete about the rest of the outlook.

NEAR-TERM OUTLOOK

First, it seems plain that continuing expansion for the balance of this year is secure. As for the various demand sectors, there will be some moderate shifting about among the front runners. Automobile and housing sales both are going to have a hard time topping their recent levels. On the other hand, a pickup in State and local spending is virtually assured, and the latest surveys indicate that business fixed investment will expand about in line with previous expectations. Christmas trade may well be outstanding this year—especially in soft goods which were sluggish last spring and which, the latest savings data suggest, are in a position to make somewhat greater claims on consumer budgets. Overall, the fourth quarter may indeed show the significantly accelerated expansion that the buoyant forecasters are now predicting. It may. But personally, I would not expect the advance in the second half of 1963 to vary markedly from that in the first half of the year. This would suggest an annual rate of gross national product above $590 billion in the final quarter, unemployment still in the neighborhood of 5½ percent of the labor force, and a fairly strong profit showing.

If what therefore seems assured for the balance of 1963 could be straight-line projected on into 1964, there would seem to be very little cause for worry about the near-term outlook—except on the part of those of us who do worry seriously about persisting slack and unemployment as a here-and-now problem. The fact is, however, that—lacking a tax cut—1964 could be a very different story than 1963. The only judicious assumption is that neither housing nor the automobile market will provide a new lift to demand. Under the revised Federal budget for fiscal year 1964 and the tight expenditures control now in prospect for fiscal 1965, Federal purchases of goods and services are expected to climb at much slower rates than recently. There is little reason to expect any rise in net exports or any faster rise in State and local government spending. Inventory investment and—again lacking a tax cut—consumer purchases of soft goods and services both will tend to follow the lead of the other sectors.

FIXED INVESTMENT

This, by process of elimination, identifies what in all probability is going to be the pivotal sector for the 1964 outlook—business fixed investment. If any segment of demand were going to lead a continuing expansion in 1964 in the face of no tax cut, business purchases of plant and equipment it now seems to me, would have to play that role. And I see little ground for confidence that you and others like you would play the role if the tax bill were to fail.

Investors in plant and equipment, well aware of the overhang of existing capacity,

have been following fairly conservative policies throughout this expansion, and the various intentions surveys as yet give no clear sign of a breakthrough. As a distinguished business economist said to my colleagues and me a few weeks ago, plant and equipment spending after this long period of caution could surge in 1964. Personally I believe it will—given the massive stimulus to consumption buying plus the promised reinforcement of corporate cash flow and profits that the administration tax bill would bring on January 1. But lacking that, and lacking the evidence of strong expansion elsewhere in the economy, a downdrift in plant and equipment would be very possible in 1964, especially in the face of the disappointed expectations that defeat or delay of the tax bill would bring. If this were to happen, risk of outright recession before the end of the year would be all too plain.

EFFECTS OF TAX CUT

The same reasoning yields a radically different set of possibilities under the opposite tax-reduction hypothesis. If the bill now being reported passes in substantially its present form, consumer incomes, starting in January, will be augmented at an annual rate of nearly $7 billion. Past experience affords every assurance that the great majority of this will be rather quickly reflected in additional consumer spending, thereby generating further cumulative increases in income and consumption. Meanwhile, investment can be expected to begin a decisive upward move in response to the cut in corporate tax liabilities as well as to the strengthening of consumer markets—proving once again the responsiveness to tax adjustments that business already has demonstrated in its quick and spirited reaction to last years' investment tax credit and revisions of the depreciation guidelines.

Then, under the present bill, there would be assurance of a vital second-phase thrust from cuts that would take effect on January 1, 1965, adding to the first-phase momentum achieved during 1964. There are too many imponderables to permit anyone to estimate precisely what amount of additional demand the total effects will be once the proposed $11 billion tax reduction program has had a chance fully to work its way into the system by a year and a half or 2 years hence. But it is my own view that the round number estimates the administration most often has mentioned—increases in gross national product of $30 to $40 billion and in employment 2 to 3 million jobs—are solidly grounded.

This much I think is unmistakable: For 1964, the tax reduction program is the nearest thing we can get to a guarantee against recession and in favor of accelerated expansion. Beyond 1964, the program is much the best single means at our disposal for lifting the economy back toward its full production, full employment track.

And finally, it holds out this paradoxical promise, so far as the economic outlook is concerned: It offers us the only really feasible course toward a balanced Federal budget. For tax rate reductions that do a good job of boosting incomes can rather quickly turn out to be revenue gatherers rather than losers. And, as the economy moves toward full employment, this expansion in revenues can overtake expenditures.

As you may have detected by now, I'm something of a partisan of this tax program, and now that I'm fairly launched on the subject, there's much more I would like to say—particularly in response to the deficit worries, the public-debt worries, and the inflation worries that some people have about it. All of them, I am convinced, are unnecessary and ill-advised. But you asked me here not as an advocate, but as an analyst of the business outlook.

Reverting to that role, let me say only that, when I do put on my technician's hat, I am almost embarrassed, professionally speaking, at the total harmony between my own outlook analysis and the policy position of the administration to which I belong. But that, unless I also have achieved self-deception, is simply the way the analysis happens to come out.

"QUIET CRISIS"

Finally, let me revert one step further—to the theme with which I began these remarks. A few months ago I published a book called "Quiet Crisis in India." At first the people at the Brookings Institution for whom I did the book didn't like the title. Some of them said that the concept of a "quiet crisis" was a contradiction in terms. But nevertheless they went along with the title, and now they are quite fond of it. The fact is, I think, that in public affairs, many of our more important "crises" are quiet. It is the business of forecasting to spot them while they are still that way, and it is the business of timely policymaking to keep them from becoming really noisy.

I am not claiming, of course, that the debate over tax reduction is going to be particularly muted during the next few weeks, and indeed I hope that it will not be. But the problems the debate primarily concerns still are very muted, compared to what they could become in 1964 and 1965 and 1966 and beyond. The question of whether we will have sufficient forehandedness to act now—now in this session of the Congress, not "early" in the next session, which, before you know it, could mean late next summer, if then—is an issue in which you, as forehanded businessmen, have a very great stake.

Bonneville Administrator Hopeful of Cooperative Dealings With Power Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, since May 21 one of our colleagues has been inserting in the RECORD a series of articles, letters, and editorials critical of the inclusion of southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area. Many of the letters and articles are presenting a false and unfair impression of the results of this extension of BPA by Secretary Udall.

For this reason I was delighted to read in the Idaho Daily Statesman of September 14 a report of a speech of Charles F. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, on this subject which reviews the record of the BPA in the Northwest and clarifies many of the false impressions that the power companies have been attempting to give of BPA.

I commend this report of Mr. Luce's speech to my colleagues:

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Sept. 14, 1963]

BONNEVILLE ADMINISTRATOR HOPEFUL OF COOPERATIVE DEALINGS WITH POWER FIRM

IDAHO FALLS.—Bonneville Power Administrator Charles F. Luce said Thursday he is hopeful of "cordial and cooperative" relations with the Idaho Power Co. despite the firm's anti-Bonneville campaign.

He said that Idaho Power has not replied to a Bonneville request of 2 months ago for terms for a possible contract to wheel BPA power from the Columbia River system to southern Idaho over its lines.

Without such a wheeling agreement, BPA can supply no additional power to southern Idaho. It is presently marketing power from Bureau of Reclamation dams to 20 municipal systems, cooperatives, and REA's served by the Bureau before BPA moved into the area.

PEACE GESTURE

Luce, speaking before representatives of southern Idaho power distributors, described his statements as a gesture of peace to the power company.

It was accompanied by an assertion that Idaho Power's arguments against the benefits of Bonneville's lower rates for southern Idaho are "about 30 years behind the times."

Luce said BPA's relations with other utilities in its service area are cordial and cooperative and he hopes "the same situation eventually will prevail in southern Idaho."

"In talks with the company we already have assured its top executives that Bonneville has no intention of damaging the company," Luce said. "We will, however, provide an alternative source of electricity in southern Idaho, and the company no longer will occupy the strong monopoly position it has held for many years."

INCREASES SEEN

Luce said utilities in the BPA area have increased sales, profits, and stock values since 1938 when the agency first started selling wholesale power.

"They purchase a significant amount of power from BPA," he said. "They wheel BPA power over their lines and BPA wheels their power over its lines."

He said the cooperation has accelerated the industrial growth of the Pacific Northwest and raised the standard of living.

Luce said he wanted to stress these points:

"Bonneville is ahead, not behind, on its mortgage payments to the U.S. Treasury, presently by about $20 million. The Bonneville Act requires it to pay its own way.

"Bonneville Power can strengthen the economy of Idaho, and help create more taxable wealth.

SAME RATES

"The low rates that BPA is putting into effect in southern Idaho are the same rates that BPA has charged for many years throughout Oregon, Washington, northern Idaho and western Montana."

Luce said BPA is able to offer rates lower than those charged by the Bureau of Reclamation in southern Idaho before the shift because Bonneville's rates are designed to cover payout for a larger group of projects with a lower average cost of generating electricity.

"In effect," he said, "the Bureau's five plants in southern Idaho have been merged with 22 dams, either existing or under construction, which are included in BPA's rate base.

"The importance of adding the five projects is slight because of the relative size of the two groups of projects. The total capital investment allocated to commercial power for all 27 projects is $2,043 billion. The total investment in the five southern Idaho projects allocated to commercial power, as of June 30, 1962, was only $20,466,000 or roughly one percent of the system total."

REASONS CITED

Luce said one reason BPA can charge lower rates is that its system includes such projects as Grand Coulee and Bonneville dams, which he described as efficient producers of power built with depression dollars.

Luce said the chain of events which led to inclusion of southern Idaho in BPA's marketing area included the finding of a possible power shortage.

He said the needs of public agencies buying power from the Bureau would have exceeded the Bureau supply in the fall of 1964 or 1965, and that southern Idaho, with its predicted industrial expansion, will experience a summertime power shortage by 1967–

68 and a year around shortage by 1972–73 unless power is supplied or steamplants built.

Water Is Lifeblood of Klamath Basin—New Extension District Fulfills Long Desire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the first explorers entered the regions west of the Continental Divide, they were immediately struck by the great paradox of mighty rivers and full-flowing streams, side by side, with vast arid regions where nothing but sagebrush and cheatgrass would grow. Those with real vision looked forward to the time when man would use the water then being wasted as it flowed to the Pacific Ocean to "make the desert blossom like a rose."

Last month, I had the privilege of participating in the dedication of an extension to the Klamath Irrigation District which is putting water on previously waterless land. I had a chance to meet with farmers of the most self-reliable and independent sort who, despite their basic conservatism, realized that one of the great hopes for America's continued economic leadership is in the development of our land and water resources.

An article in the Klamath Falls Herald & News of August 25 graphically describes the tremendous benefit accruing to both the Klamath Falls region and to their market outlets.

The article is included at this point:

WATER IS LIFE BLOOD OF KLAMATH BASIN—NEW EXTENSION DISTRICT FULFILLS LONG DESIRE

(By Dan Walters)

Throughout the span of history, water has been the primary problem of the farmer.

So it was in the Biblical era when periodic droughts swept over the land, turning the toil of the farmer into dust.

When the rains came, they rushed through the fields, in torrents, not satisfying the crops, but rather washing away the topsoil and leaving ugly, worthless gullies.

And so it was nearly 1,900 years later when the first farmers began breaking the soil in the Klamath Basin.

The problem was still water.

These early settlers found the Basin fertile enough, but the annual rainfall was only 12 or 13 inches and just 25 percent of this fell during the summer growing season.

But the farmer of the late 19th century was not the tiller his ancestors were. He was learning to conquer his environment with machines and science.

And he was ready to conquer the water problem with the same tools.

His answer to the problem was irrigation. There was plenty of water available in the Klamath Basin in streams and lakes. It remained for the farmer to utilize this water in the best fashion.

The first irrigation project in the Klamath Basin probably was an individual farmer diverting a local stream into his fields.

Court records indicate water rights were obtained for irrigation as far back as 1870.

These first few efforts were soon followed by the organization of several water companies, the first of which was the Linkville Ditch Co. in 1878.

This rather small firm was followed by Van Brimmer brothers' ditch in the early 1880's. Soon, the Van Brimmers were irrigating 4,000 acres of farmland.

More and larger enterprises followed as interest in irrigation during the 1890's soared. As more water became available, crops were diversified from the basic rye.

But a movement grew within the farmers themselves for a project that would serve all of the Klamath Basin with adequate water.

Water for such a project, it was realized, would have to come from Upper Klamath Lake.

The Reclamation Act of 1902 provided Federal funds from the sale of public lands for reclamation projects in Western States.

The U.S. Reclamation Service made several surveys of the Klamath Basin and in 1903, the Klamath project was recommended.

At the same time, however, private companies were expanding their services.

The situation came to a head with the organization of the Klamath Water Users Association in March 1905, and the approval of the Klamath project 2 months later by the Federal Government.

The plans called for water to be drawn into the main A canal from Upper Klamath Lake. From there, the canal passes through the city of Klamath Falls and to the southeast.

At a point adjacent to the present headquarters of the Klamath Irrigation District, the canal splits into the B and C canals, the former running to the southeast and the latter to the east.

Smaller canals bring the water to the farmers themselves.

The first water from the project was delivered on May 16, 1907.

The Klamath Irrigation District was organized in 1917 to begin eventual takeover of the system in Klamath County from the Federal Government.

Formed by local farmers, the district took over the responsibility of paying back the Government for the canal system within the main part of the county, along with several other small districts.

In 1928, the system was brought up to date with the construction of drainage canals and in 1950 the Miller Hill and Adams pumping stations were built.

These stations are used for moving water uphill.

By 1955, the Klamath Irrigation District had paid back enough of its debt to the Government to take over actual operation of the system.

The last major expansion of the system began with the organization of the Klamath Basin Improvement District on July 18, 1961.

This was the result of a condition that had been in existence for a number of years. Certain farmers had not had a guaranteed water supply and had been able to buy water from the KID only when it was available.

The KBID entered into a contract with the Federal Government in April 1962, for a loan of $934,000 under the Small Reclamation Projects Act. It was the first such loan under the act in Oregon and the money was used for the expansion of existing canals and pumping stations and the building of three new pumping plants.

This project was completed this year and was dedicated only a few weeks ago. Actual operation of Klamath extension project is under contract to the KID.

And so now the Klamath Basin irrigation system, once only a dream in the minds of a few farmers, has come the full route to maturity.

The Klamath Irrigation District operates 80 miles of main canal, 135 miles of sublaterals, 175 miles of open drains and 8 miles of closed drains.

To maintain and operate this complex system is the full-time job of 30 persons, including Manager Ray Roberts and Secretary John Stewart.

Roberts has been with the district since 1936 and Stewart has been with KID since 1945.

The district operates with an annual budget of about $300,000 and is governed by President J. R. Ratliff and directors John A. Marshall and John A. Short.

The budget includes payments to the Federal Government on the remaining debt and this will be paid off by 1970.

With this modern system, the Klamath Basin farmer is able to order his water by telephone, giving only 24 hours notice.

At the minute he wants the water, it will be gushing into his field ditches.

For this, the farmer pays $5.40 per acre per year, no matter how much water he needs. If he has a 100-acre farm, he pays an annual rate of $540. Users who pump the water from the canals themselves pay just half of that, or $2.70.

The KID now serves more than 1,000 farmers in the basin, irrigating about 61,000 acres of land with 300,000 acre-feet of water per year.

Today, the KID has fulfilled the mission that was begun more than 50 years ago.

Nearly all of the arable land in the area is being farmed with adequate water.

But although there are no plans for major expansion of the KID system, it will, in the future, continue to play the same role as in the past—that of the key to prosperity for the Klamath Basin.

Testimony of Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch Before the House Foreign Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, director of the Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee concerning the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I believe that Rabbi Hirsch's testimony is one of the best statements I have seen concerning this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to read it.

TESTIMONY OF RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH IN BEHALF OF THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1963

I am Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, Director of the Religious Action Center, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I appear in behalf of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism, a joint instrumentality of the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Other national agencies which are members of the Commission on Social Action

are the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, and the National Federation of Temple Youth.

At the most recent biennial convention of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, held in Washington in November 1961, a resolution on world peace was adopted, which contained the following statement: "We commend the United States for intensified efforts to achieve universal, enforceable disarmament and urge that all such efforts be carried forward with the greatest of urgency and imagination. In this regard, we express gratification that the U.S. Congress has established an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to augment and accelerate studies and planning in this field."

In the 2 years since its establishment, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has justified its existence. Despite meager funds and limited staff, the Agency has fulfilled the major functions assigned to it by Public Law 87-297 (Arms Control and Disarmament Act). As the fountainhead for disarmament proposals, the Agency has been responsible for three negotiation instruments of great significance: "An Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World"; "A Draft Treaty Banning Nuclear Tests in all Environments"; and "A Draft Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, Outer Space"; and "Underwater." The latter provided the basis for the test ban treaty which, hopefully, will be overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate within the next few days. The Agency shared with the State Department major responsibility for the successful negotiation of the test ban treaty and was also responsible for the formulation of the so-called "hot-line" agreement between the United States and Russia.

These "first steps", to use the cautious but sanguine language of President Kennedy, must now be bolstered by preparations for additional steps. In these preparations, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency plays an indispensable role.

In this thermonuclear age, men have perverted blessed discoveries capable of enriching life into cursed instruments capable of annihilating life—and have reversed the prophetic vision by turning ploughshares into swords. Yet the massive military power which our own Nation has assembled, has given us no real guarantee of peace and security. We have established a mighty system of defense based on deterrence, but this system is not infallible, because it is based on the following theoretical assumptions which may prove to be inaccurate and misleading:

A. The assumption that there will be no irrationality—that the leader of an opposing nation will recognize that any attack on the United States will lead to retaliation resulting in the destruction of his own country. However, in the light of world history, especially during the last generation, totalitarian systems of government, which do not have the checks on leadership built into our democratic system, have not been renowned for their rational behavior.

B. The assumption that there will be no miscalculation—that both we and potential enemies will always be fully cognizant of each other's intentions. The Cuban crisis was resolved because both Russia and the United States were to a certain extent informed of each other's policies and the ramifications thereof. However, in a future crisis, one of the two parties to an international dispute may not be firmly convinced that the other will use its total nuclear force. This might well lead to a full-scale war, even though neither nation originally intended to go that far.

C. The assumption that there will be no accident—that no mechanical failure or human aberration will occur. It has been generally recognized that there are no foolproof "fail safe" measures which will guarantee against mechanical failure. And what assurance do we have that one day a pilot, either ours or a potential enemy's, motivated by mistaken patriotic impulses, will not take matters into his own hands, as did the French pilot who in 1957 bombed an Algerian village without any orders from his superiors?

An additional factor leading to world instability is the proliferation of nations possessing nuclear weapons. The more fingers grasp the nuclear trigger, the more does our security based on deterrence diminish. The signing of the test ban treaty and its pending ratification by the Senate express the conviction of our Government and of our people that the only secure system of defense lies in the direction of establishing a disarmed world governed by law. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is a vital instrument for implementing that objective.

However, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency can perform its necessary functions only if it is permanently established. To fail to give permanent authorization to the Agency is to hobble it with uncertainty and to limit its continuity of staff and program. A realistic evaluation of international relations requires a recognition that peace will not be attained quickly or effortlessly. The highly complex problems of disarmament and arms control are inextricably related to even more complex political, economic, social, and psychological problems.

The resolution of these problems requires the persistent efforts of experts dedicated to their tasks over a period of many years. Numerous other governmental agencies dealing with areas of less gravity have permanent status. Certainly the objective which the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency pursues merits the permanent status that will reflect our Nation's permanent commitment "to seek peace and pursue it" (Psalms 34: 14).

Proper financing is likewise essential for the fulfillment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's functions as a vital supplement to other governmental efforts. The Nation which can afford to devote more than one-half of its national budget to military defense should be able to devote one-sixtieth of 1 percent of its budget to the ultimate defense—negotiated disarmament. The Nation which can afford to spend more than $6 million an hour every day of the year for its military preparedness should be able to afford more than 2 hours a year worth of those funds to prepare for peace.

I therefore urge this committee as a minimum to restore the original request for authorization of $15 million for 1964 and to give serious consideration to the allocation of such sums as may be necessary and appropriate.

Inadequate funds have prevented the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency from implementing sufficiently one of its assigned functions—the dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament. At the present time, the plethora of misinformation almost suffocates the paucity of valid information. Civic and religious groups such as ours have been attempting to fill the void, but we require on both the national and regional levels the active assistance and guidance which can best be provided by the physical presence of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency personnel and the dissemination of more extensive printed and audio-visual materials.

Our Nation must begin the process of expending much more of our human and financial resources on efforts directed toward disarmament. We have been able to expand our military power, because we have devoted ever larger sums ($7 billion for next year) to scientific research for the development of new and more powerful weapons. Does it not stand to reason that in order to regulate and control these arms, the same scope and degree of scientific research must be developed and applied?

In the last few years, striking new scientific discoveries have been made in the areas of detection and inspection. This type of research must be intensified. It has been especially encouraging to note that the Arms Control and Disarmment Agency envisages the expansion of its research endeavors in the areas of political, economic, and historical ramifications of disarmament.

We have lived with war or the threat of war for so long that our people, our economy, indeed our civilization have become conditioned to it. We must begin now to formulate plans for the reconditioning of our Nation and our world to peace, in confidence that we can meet the radical changes which peace may bring in its wake. Science has taught the world how to wage war. Now science must teach the world how to wage peace.

Even as we endorse a permanent status and maximum budget for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, we would direct the attention of this committee to necessary prerequisites for a lasting peace. Jewish tradition maintains that there is a basic distinction between the Latin word "pax" which is the root of our English word for peace—and "shalom," the Hebrew word. "Pax," which is also the root for "pact," literally means, according to the dictionary, "the absence of a state of war." "Shalom" means much more—"completeness," "wholeness," "perfection," not the absence of something negative but the presence of something positive.

True peace requires more than a balance of power between nations, and more even than a state of disarmament. True peace requires international harmony predicated on the well-being of every nation and the personal well-being of every individual. It is our fervent prayer that disarmament will enable us to devote more of our energies to the elimination of poverty, ignorance, disease, and exploitation—and to the eventual realization of "shalom."

This Calls for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press is rightly alarmed over the establishment of a nationwide news wire service by the Department of Agriculture. In recent weeks, many editorials have appeared in newspapers across the country condemning this intrusion of the Government into the news-dispensing business in competition with private wire services. Some of these have warned that Agriculture's venture could lead to governmentwide control of the dissemination of all news generated within the Government itself.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association and many newspapers have expressed their disapproval of this new Government activity. Their protests are deserving of early and earnest consideration by this body.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point an editorial headed "On Preventing News by

Handout," from the September 4 issue of the Los Angeles Times which comments on the threat this poses to freedom of the press:

ON PREVENTING NEWS BY HANDOUT

Representative CRAIG HOSMER recognizes the public danger inherent in allowing the Federal Government to disseminate its own "news."

The Long Beach Republican has introduced a bill to keep the Federal Government out of the news-dispensing business after the Agriculture Department opened a market news wire service. Now he has more meat for his ax.

HOSMER learned that Lee Loevinger of the Federal Communications Commission had proposed a 24-hour broadcast news wire service because private news services are inadequate. HOSMER says Loevinger implied that "the Federal Government should fill this 'void' by getting into the broadcast business."

HOSMER's fears are valid. Many Government bureaus like to put out information about themselves in what newsmen derisively call handouts—mimeographed statements available to everybody and, of course, making the bureaus look good.

Diligent newsmen like to do their own digging through contacts they have established in the bureaucratic jungle. If they didn't work on their own, much news would never come to light. The Billy Sol Estes case, for instance, was not spelled out in handouts from the Agricuture Department.

HOSMER is right in trying to stop the Federal news service movement before it gains momentum. Federal news services could snow under the legitimate private services, and presently Government news would be only what the Government said it was.

No Labor Day for Jobless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we recently celebrated Labor Day as a day off for those of our citizens who have jobs, but for those who do not now and those who would not in the next 10 years, it was a day for sober thought. At the moment, there are 5 million Americans out of work—a serious problem; but it is now estimated that by the 1970's we will have to create at least 35 million new jobs for our rising generation at a time when automation will have eliminated 22 million jobs that now exist. Every area of our country, every industry, and every family will feel the effect of this coming crisis.

This fact, along with the many other problems it will create was brought strongly to Americans in a Labor Day radio broadcast by Al J. Hayes, vice president of the AFL–CIO and president of the International Association of Machinists.

The following is the text of that broadcast:

On this Labor Day of 1963, it is appropriate that we pause in the pleasures of this traditional day of picnics and parades and reflect for a moment on what this day really means, and what it should mean to the people of our country, not just the 17 million people who belong to unions, but to all of the people of America.

Labor Day was created by, of and for the organized workers of America, at a time, some 70 or 80 years ago, when the dignity and worth of labor, in fact the dignity and worth of man, was threatened by an avalanche of advancing industrialization and mechanization and exploitations.

Labor Day was founded as a reaffirmation of the basic and intrinsic value of man at a time when many of the owners of our industries and businesses were amassing great wealth, while, at the same time workers, husbands, wives, and children, were being forced by economic necessity, to work together, as long as 16 hours a day, 6 days a week, for little more than starvation wages.

In our present, relatively prosperous society, it is easy to forget the past trials and tribulations of our working population. There are many, far too many, in our present generation who do not understand that the rights of workingmen and women, the economic as well as the political rights which we take for granted today, did not come about by the process of automatic evolution.

Every improvement in the economic, social, and cultural lives of our working population was achieved only because of the determination and sacrifices of the men and women who actively opposed oppression, exploitation, injustice, and the tremendous difference between the living standards of the owners of our industries and businesses on the one hand and the workers on the other.

Since an individual worker was and still is utterly helpless to change the status quo, these men and women fought the fight for a higher standard of life and greater justice, and dignity through their labor unions.

Today the purposes, the aims, and the objectives of organized labor are widely misinterpreted by the press and are often misunderstood by the very people who have benefited, directly and indirectly, from the accomplishments of unions.

For example: The opposition to unions argues today that workers may have once needed unions, to combat the greed and exploitation of mercenary corporations, but that today unions are no longer necessary because the managers of industry, have learned the lessons of the past

It is true, of course, that corporations and businessmen have recognized and accepted labor unions as a vitally necessary institution in our kind of society—a balancing mechanism.

But this does not make the need for unions any less significant today than it was in earlier times.

Despite propaganda and mistaken opinions, millions of working men and women, who help to create the wealth of our country, are not yet sharing fairly in America's prosperity.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that a family of four—in an average American city—needs at least $6,000 a year to maintain a living standard of minimum health and decency. Today, at least 77 million Americans are members of families that do not meet this modest standard.

Moreover, despite our seeming abundance and prosperity, we still have in America 15 million families who live in dilapidated slum housing. We still have in America millions of children denied adequate educational opportunities because of a shortage of 140,000 classrooms in our schools.

We still need at least 900,000 hospital beds. We as a Nation still challenge 60 percent of our retired citizens to exist on incomes of $1,000 a year or less.

On this Labor Day 1963, it is sad to report that a majority of these older citizens cannot get adequate medical care only because they cannot afford it.

These are just a few of the unmet needs of the people of our country. In view of these needs—both public and private labor unions are as vital and necessary in our kind of society today as they were at anytime in our history.

Moreover, in addition to all of these omissions, shortcomings, and inequities there is a new, modern threat to every American who works—with his hands or his brains—for a living.

The onrushing onslaught of a new technological force—called automation—is today transforming not only our factories and offices but our social, economic, political, and cultural institutions as well. It is ironic that we are celebrating a day dedicated to the concept of the dignity of labor at a time when this new force of automation threatens to render obsolete many of the skills, the muscles, the intelligence—in fact much of the human capacity.

And this is not a remote problem of the future. This is a practical problem of the present.

For some years now, between 4 and 5 million American workers have been unemployed on a full-time basis. At the same time millions of other have been working on a part-time basis.

Because of the high birth rate of the early 1940's, we are today experiencing—what one expert has called a head-on collision between advancing technology and a tidal wave of manpower.

It has been estimated that to provide job opportunities for our work force of the 1970's our economy will have to create at least 35 million new jobs—or 300,000 a month over the next 10 years. However, instead of creating new jobs, automation will by that time have destroyed 22 million jobs that now exist.

This, then, is an important and overriding problem that confronts organized labor and the working people of America today. How shall we maintain the dignity of labor—and the purchasing power of working families—at a time when the human factor in industry is threatened as it is through automation.

Organized labor is deeply and directly concerned with this problem.

To members of unions, automation is not just a word or a theory but an ever present fact in everyday life.

Of course, I must make it clear—lest I be misunderstood—that unions are not opposed to technological developments or automation as such. To the contrary, we know that automation—like mechanization—can help us build a more just and equitable economic order.

But we do not believe that workers—or any other single group in our society—should suffer all the adverse byproducts—or bear unaided the full burden—of technology which benefits society as a whole.

Therefore, one of our primary goals on this Labor Day of 1963 is the shorter workweek. Unfortunately, this goal has been sorely distorted and misrepresented.

To refute such distortions and misrepresentations I emphasize that organized labor is not seeking the shorter week because American workers have become lazy and unwilling to work. Quite the contrary, the drive for the 35-hour week is motivated because millions of American workers who want work do not have jobs or job opportunities.

As we all know, anti-labor forces have heaped ridicule and condemnation on the idea of a shorter workweek.

However, they offer no answers, no alternatives of their own to the problem of growing technological unemployment.

Many of the arguments now being used against the shorter week were used against unions in the fight against the 72-hour week, the 60-hour week, and the 48-hour week.

But, despite opposition and discouragement, organized labor will continue to fight for the shorter week because this goal—like all of labor's objectives—is rooted in the hopes, the needs, and the aspirations of the

working people and will benefit society as a whole.

Unfortunately, today the task of organized labor is more difficult than ever before.

While trying to meet the challenge of unmet needs, substandard living conditions and an onrushing technology, organized labor is being handicapped by a broad series of laws and threatened laws designed to reduce its overall influence and effectiveness.

Not only have unions been weakened—by the Taft-Hartley, Landrum-Griffin and right-to-work laws—in the drive for more purchasing power, better working conditions, and job protections—but today labor is threatened with even more stringent legislation—the kind that coldly equates human labor with the commodities of the marketplace.

Thus—on this Labor Day 1963—unions and the 17 million men and women they represent and their families—are confronted by challenges as severe and far-reaching as any that faced earlier generations of Americans.

But with the help—and the hearts and the hands of the working people—we are confident that we can meet the challenges of our time just as earlier generations of trade unionists met theirs.

I hope that you will take a moment—on this day dedicated to American labor—and reflect upon—and perhaps even understand and appreciate the struggle that organized workers have made and will continue to make for a more just, equitable, and humanitarian society, not only for union members and their families, but for every segment of our society.

Gen. B. A. Schriever Presented the General "Hap" Arnold Aviation Gold Medal by Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the General Henry H. "Hap" Arnold Aviation Gold Medal Award is presented once a year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to a U.S. citizen, who, in the opinion of the majority of the members of the National Council of Administration, has made the greatest contribution in the field of aviation.

This year, the award was presented to Gen. B. A. "Bennie" Schriever, a personal friend and classmate of mine, at the 64th national convention of the VFW at Seattle, Wash.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include General Schriever's acceptance speech.

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

I am happy to be in Seattle again, and it is a pleasure and privilege to be a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I appreciate the honor you have given me.

There are several reasons why I am honored to receive the General Henry H. "Hap" Arnold Aviation Gold Medal Award. First, because it is presented by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an organization composed of those who have fought to preserve freedom. Second, because of my long association with the Arnold family. When I received my first assignment as a lieutenant to March Field, Calif., at the beginning of my military career, "Hap" Arnold was the commanding officer. His son, Lt. Col. Bruce Arnold, was a member of my staff.

The third reason I am proud to receive this award is that General "Hap" Arnold represented the best tradition of the military service. His vision and sound planning had a large part in creating today's aerospace power. If our Nation is to remain strong and free, we will continue to need the kind of courage and foresight that were his outstanding qualities.

In accepting this award, I want to pay recognition to the many men and women who have worked with me and who share this honor. Very few of them have had their names in the headlines, but the result of their hard work is well known. By their persistent and forward-looking efforts, they have developed the weapon systems employed by the Air Force today.

There is no way to fully reward all of those who have had a part in this effort. Perhaps their truest reward is their knowledge that they have played an important part in preserving peace and freedom.

This brings me to a fact that is sometimes overlooked in this nuclear-rocket age. This is the basic truth that it is people, not machines, who defend freedom. In spite of the revolutionary advances in military technology, human courage and human intelligence remain the vital factors. They cannot be replaced by computers or by any combination of electronic circuits.

Let's take a few minutes this evening to look at this essential element. Just what is the role of the military man in today's environment?

First of all the military man is a professional man, like the doctor, lawyer, or teacher. In common with other professions, the military profession can point to a record of significant accomplishments throughout the history of our country. Like other professions it has demanding standards for entrance and continued practice, and it makes provision for specialized practice by its members. Military men possess a strong sense of cohesion, of joining a common task, and a long tradition of public service. Many of our Nation's leading explorers, engineers, and administrators have been military men. Twelve Presidents were former generals. Four others were field grade officers.

The military profession is like other professions in another way. Until a crisis occurs, its services to the community are largely taken for granted. The man in good health does not fully appreciate his doctor; a man with no legal problems does not fully appreciate his lawyer. In the same way, a nation at peace often may not appreciate its armed services—until a crisis occurs.

The Cuban crisis last fall demonstrated the necessity of having trained and disciplined military forces, equipped with the latest weapons. It was this force, and the will to use it if necessary that compelled Khrushchev to withdraw his offensive weapons. It is clear that we must maintain both our military strength and our strength of will as the necessary foundation for our diplomacy and negotiations. As the President said last month in reporting on the nuclear test ban treatey: "We have been disappointed more than once, and we have no illusions now that there are shortcuts on the road to peace.

"At many points around the globe the Communists are continuing their efforts to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration on nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred."

The task of maintaining our deterrent forces is not an easy one. It takes hard work and long hours. It costs lives as well. You recall that Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., a U.S. Air Force pilot, was killed over Cuba last fall. Just last month two U.S. military men were killed by the Communists south of the demarcation line in Korea. American advisers are still being wounded and killed in the struggle against communism in Vietnam.

As long as we must defend freedom against aggression, our Nation will continue to need dedicated military men to help carry out its policies.

This leads me to mention a term that is often used in the newspapers and magazines today. This is the so-called military mind. I am not always sure just what this means to the people who use it, except that it very rarely seems to be a term of praise. If there really is such a thing as the military mind, then it exists in exactly the same sense as the medical mind, the legal mind, the academic mind, or the political mind. It simply indicates what many people seem to believe—that all members of a given profession tend to think alike. In practice, of course, this is not true.

It is often forgotten that the military profession includes many other professions. For example, on my headquarters staff I have lawyers, doctors, writers, engineers, an artist, and a Ph. D. in philosophy. They all wear the same uniform and have the same ultimate responsibility for our Nation's security, but they certainly do not think alike on all matters. Their opinions are likely to be as varied as their backgrounds.

It should also be obvious that the military profession is undergoing many rapid changes due to the many changes introduced by the advance of science and technology. Today's military man is more likely to carry a slide rule than a swagger stick. He is likely to have—or to be working for—an advanced degree in engineering, mathematics, international relations, nuclear physics, or business administration.

Sometimes it is difficult to realize just how rapidly these changes have taken place. For instance, "Hap" Arnold is naturally remembered as a great leader in airpower. It is often forgotten that when he was studying at West Point, his one desire was to become an officer in the cavalry. He had not even seen a military airplane. In my own career I have seen aircraft speeds multiplied from about 100 miles an hour to over 4,000 miles an hour with the X-15. Ballistic missiles and orbital vehicles, of course, travel at far greater speeds. They are the most spectacular aspect of the new technology that has revolutionized the art of warfare.

This advance of technology has not minimized the role of man. On the contrary, it has placed fresh emphasis on the importance of the individual. As weapons have grown more powerful and sophisticated, the character and training of the men who operate and control them have become increasingly important. That is why the Armed Forces today are placing such great emphasis on character, education, and practical experience for their people. Where the Nation's security is concerned, we must maintain the highest standards.

In the years ahead, the technological explosion may bring even greater changes than we have already seen in the past 10 years. Yet I foresee no change in our basic national objectives. As a nation we will continue to work for a world in which all men may live in freedom and dignity. In order to carry out this task, we must maintain our strength and our strong sense of purpose.

The military man has the responsibility of helping carry out this policy by building and maintaining our military forces. But he has no vested interest in maintaining forces that are not necessary for national security. In fact a great number of military men—and this applies equally to generals and to sergeants—could easily step into industry or other Government agencies to-

morrow and find a job similar to their present one, but with shorter hours and higher pay. In fact, this does happen more often than we would like.

Those who stay do so for many reasons, of course. One of the main reasons is their conviction that as military men they are playing a vitally needed role in maintaining peace and freedom. They know that war would be no solution of the world's problems, and they know that surrender to tyranny likewise would solve no problems. Rather, they know that an effective military deterrent buys the necessary time that may permit the ideas of freedom to prevail.

The task of using this time wisely is a challenge to our entire society. Unless we demonstrate a national way of life that is a realistic alternative to every form of tyranny, we run the grave risk that communism may advance by default.

Stated in simplest terms, our national objective must be to provide that alternative. To a significant degree, this is a military task. In fact we have found in many areas of the world that military training and operations can be fully effective only when they are accompanied by programs of positive civic action. These are programs that aim at answering the age-old problems of hunger, disease, and ignorance.

As part of its responsibility for special air warfare, the Air Force encourages, trains, and assists friendly air forces to undertake nation-building programs. These programs include local development of air facilities, communications networks, weather prediction capabilities, maintenance, repair, and transport aviation. Throughout the world, the Air Force provides airlift of food and supplies to people in need. Just a few weeks ago, 27 Air Force cargo planes airlifted an Army hospital to aid the victims of the earthquake in Skopje, Yugoslavia. In the past few months the Air Force has also airlifted relief to flood victims in Spain and Pakistan, to famine areas in east Africa, and to earthquake areas in Libya and Iran.

These are just a few examples of the civic and humanitarian actions conducted by the Air Force. They provide a magnificent and continuing demonstration of the best values in our way of life. But the task of providing a practical alternative to communism, in the fullest sense, is a job for all of us. As we demonstrate the answers to problems at home, our Nation can speak with authority overseas. As we show the practical value of the democratic way of life, we can expect other peoples to want to apply the ideas of democracy in their nations.

I think one of our greatest needs today is to take the initiative in the contest of ideas, which is the competition for the hearts and minds of men. We are all convinced that the way of freedom is far superior to the way of tyranny, in both theory and practice. Our task is to demonstrate that superiority in compelling terms to all mankind. This is a job for patriots today. It is a challenge and an opportunity to every American.

Thank you.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Senator McIntyre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, two of the most outstanding junior Members of the Senate are the able senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and my good neighbor from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE].

Both these men have devoted their efforts to analyzing the challenges of the future and to developing methods of meeting those challenges. They are not afraid of entrenched opposition; in fact, their past careers demonstrate that they thrive on it.

Last month, New Hampshire's junior Senator spoke at a meeting in Bristol, Ind.. Since I believe his thoughtful observations on the future of our country merit the consideration of the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR TOM MCINTYRE, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, AT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY RALLY, EBY PINES PICNIC GROUNDS, BRISTOL, IND., FRIDAY, AUGUST 16, 1963

I am delighted to be here with all you good Indiana Democrats this evening. I'm told that when delivering a speech, the speaker should start off with a bang, make a ringing declaration that will bring applause and cheers and set the tone of his address. Well, I think I can accomplish all that with just two words—VANCE HARTKE.

I am here tonight to tell you Indiana Democrats some things that a good many of you may already know. But they are things I have wanted to say for some time, and I have wanted to say them in Indiana.

They are about a young man who rose through the party ranks, was a brilliant prosecuting attorney, served ably as mayor of Evansville and at the age of 39 became the first Democratic Senator from Indiana in 20 years. In short, I want to talk about VANCE HARTKE.

As you all know, VANCE was not in the Senate more than 2 years when he became chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, one of the highest positions in the majority leadership. In this important post, VANCE HARTKE'S organizational genius came into play. There is no better way to gage his success than to recite the results of the 1962 off-year elections. A total of 23 Democrats—more than two-thirds of those running—were elected to the Senate. Of the 23, 6 took seats formerly occupied by Republicans. I was one of these, and I can tell you that these victories were in no small measure due to the help of the campaign committee under VANCE HARTKE'S leadership.

In June of 1962, some of my good friends in New Hampshire were urging me to run for the U.S. Senate seat left vacant by the death of Styles Bridges. Naturally, as you might suspect, I was somewhat hesitant to take on again the Republicans in a State that had been so long dominated by Republicanism.

At any rate I promised them I would give it my consideration and I came down to Washington to talk it over with the national committee leaders. While here I met and talked with your distinguished Senator VANCE HARTKE. VANCE was was most encouraging. He told me of his plans to help Democratic candidates all across the country. He assured me of research assistance, he promised to send an experienced staff man to New Hampshire to help out in the heat of the campaign. And all of these promises that he made, he lived up to. Before I left to return to New Hampshire that day, VANCE did a TV script with me for campaign purposes. Then to top it all off, at about 11:30 on election night VANCE called me long distance from Washington at my headquarters in New Hampshire to congratulate me on my great victory. The funny thing was that as I talked to him on the phone, I said, "How do you know, when right now I am running behind some 3,000 votes?" VANCE said, "TOM, believe me, you are in, I know." And he was right.

VANCE'S help to me did not end on election night. When I came down to the Senate, I naturally started seeking a good committee assignment. Here I needed advice and counsel. The first man I went to was your VANCE HARTKE. In typical HARTKE style he said, "Tom, come with me." And off we went directly to the office of Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. VANCE told Senator MANSFIELD of my wishes concerning committee assignments and said to the majority leader: "I want you to do all you can to give TOM MCINTYRE a good committee assignment." And what happened? You guessed it, MIKE did. So that is the kind of Senator you have. Not only an outstanding representative of the great State of Indiana, but a man who is a friend to his fellow Senators and who is respected among them; and today numbers among its members, freshmen like myself who will always be grateful to him for his kindness, his interest, his encouragement, and his wonderful help in the election of 1962.

VANCE and I sit side-by-side in the Senate, and I have had the opportunity to get to know this man better and better. He is a working Senator, fiercely loyal to the tenets of his party and completely dedicated to the principles of this democracy. He is plain-spoken and outspoken. The range of legislation he has sponsored runs the gamut from international affairs to the problems of the man in the street.

I am proud to be a cosponsor with Senator HARTKE of such major legislation as the area redevelopment administration extension, hospital care for the aged, and the civil rights program. But VANCE HARTKE is also interested in the little problems of the men and women of Indiana and the Nation.

A perfect example of this is his bill in the Senate which would exempt from the excise tax musical instruments purchased by parents or children for use in school bands and orchestras. He told his Senate colleagues that there is inequity in a law which exempts musical instruments purchased by schools but taxes instruments which parents purchase for their children to use in schools.

There is a companion to this bill in the House of Representatives, sponsored by the young and very able Congressman from his district, JOHN BRADEMAS. And may I say now, while I am in his district, that when the names of outstanding young Members of the House are mentioned in Washington, always among them is JOHN BRADEMAS.

Tonight I also want to salute you—the Democrats of Indiana. You have done a magnificent job. In a State that hadn't elected a Democratic Senator in two decades, you have by your teamwork in the short space of 4 years, sent to Washington two Democratic Senators—not only VANCE, but the popular, young, aggressive legislator—BIRCH BAYH.

You have also managed, through organization and drive, to help elect a fine Chief Executive—Gov. Matt Welsh.

Your Democratic congressional delegation of the able Congressmen MADDEN, DENTON, ROUSH, and BRADEMAS, have compiled excellent records in the House of Representatives. With this team and with your solid help, I know they will be returned to office next year by greater majorities than ever before.

But make no mistake, the challenge of the election year of 1964 is just as great as ever. That is why you must be busy with the immediate problem at hand—the city elections this fall. I am told that 76 of the 108 mayors currently are Democrats, and this includes 25 of the 26 largest cities. This is a fine record, but one upon which you can still build. Speaking as a former mayor of my home city, Laconia, N.H.—and I know Senator HARTKE will bear me out on this—it's impossible to overestimate the importance of electing Democrats to the key local positions. It's at the local level that the strength of a party organization begins.

This meeting tonight should deepen the dedication of you Democrats to work harder on the problems of today on behalf of the citizens of tomorrow. Our party draws strength from our commitment to the promise of youth, just as our organization draws strength from the lively and vigorous hard work of the Young Democrats. Without them, we cannot succeed, and it is their future upon which success depends for its meaning.

As a nation moving toward maturity, we no longer meet simple problems. These our dynamic our inventive people solve easily for themselves. The problems facing us today are difficult ones and there are no easy answers.

For the first time, we as a nation which has historically suffered from a shortage of labor, have had to face the problem of chronic unemployment. Since 1957, the rate of joblessness has been over 5 percent for every month but one.

For the first time, we as a nation of abundant land and rich resources have had to face problems of congested cities, contaminated water, and polluted air.

Newly independent nations have arisen all over the world with claims which our economic system is not yet well suited to satisfy. New needs demand new responses. But because the programs we propose are new, we are told that they are unneeded. Because they involve the spending of funds, we are told that they are unwise. The prophets of doom and disaster wring their hands and cry of the paternalistic state. They charge that

we are coddling the citizens from cradle to grave. They warn that we would destroy that independence and self-reliance upon which America was founded.

In reply I need only ask—

Who is the more independent—the consumer who is victimized by false packaging and misleading advertising? Or the consumer who can choose from a variety of goods, secure that he will get that for which he pays, and safe from harmful or damaging merchandise?

Who is the more independent—the elderly citizen who must rely upon public charity to pay the costs of hospital care? Or the citizen who has saved through social security for such an emergency and thus can pay with his own earnings?

Who is the more independent—the unemployed, hat in hand who must beg for work where none exists? Or the employed, who through retraining have learned useful skills and secured productive jobs?

I for one, and I think that you as Democrats will agree, feel that these human needs are the proper province for Government concern. And we must make sure that these changes represent blessings rather than burdens. If we are to assure this, we must allow ourselves the freedom, and demand of ourselves the creativity and initiative to deal with social and economic problems as they arise.

Our settled determination is toward progress on public needs even when this invites bitter denunciation from the cave-dwelling rightwing. As Harry Truman used to say, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." But we are in the kitchen and the future's in the stew. Our will must be unbending toward doing the right, as it is given us to see what is right, to meet our needs for social justice, expanded economic opportunities, and a just and secure peace for the world.

It is particularly appropriate to reaffirm before this audience the dedication of the Democratic Party and its leaders to progress. My generation, which has accepted public responsibility in these days, could easily limit its vision to obvious realities, could easily disregard the awesome changes in the world, and could easily balance the books in a mood of bland contentment with things as they are. Many would urge this course upon us. If we were to relax into the mediocrity of complacent satisfaction, we would leave an ugly legacy of insuperable problems to youth and deny to the next generation the resources it will need in leaving its own mark on national affairs.

I am proud to be a Democrat because our party has resolved not to throttle change, but to master it. We have never claimed to have final answers to the problems of the world, and our dogmas are few. We resolve to create opportunity for youth rather than self-righteous certainty for those who have tired of challenge. But it takes capable leadership to meet challenge and to master change. Indiana has been giving such leadership to the Nation, and again and again in the Senate I have been grateful for it. Let me say only that I share in the excitement of this wonderful meeting, which demonstrates how your organization supports the men our party will need if it is to keep faith with the future.

This meeting shows me again how we depend upon you, the party workers, not only for the support and hard work we so often need, but for the sense of purpose which makes the Democratic Party a redeeming element in the affairs of the Nation and in all our lives.

Our assignment is clear. Our task will be difficult. But we have a candidate who came up through the ranks of Congress, who has a sense of history. We have a candidate who has the courage to demand enactment of civil rights legislation, the compassion to seek a hospital care program for our elderly. We have a candidate who is dedicated to the search for peace, vigilant enough to support a strong defense posture and with foresight enough to advance our space program. We have the man who, with the aid and support of each and every one of us Democrats, will be returned to the White House next year by an overwhelming majority of the voters of Indiana and the Nation. We have the man who has built a magnificent record in his first term and who will continue to push forward the New Frontier in his second term—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

And as sure as I'm talking to you tonight—the President will have at his side that hard-working, sincere and able Hoosier and American—U.S. Senator VANCE HARTKE.

Fallout Protection in Federal Structures and Nonprofit Institutions

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8200) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill.

I have often marveled at how ingenious people can be in devising arguments when they are determined to be wrong. Americans are in the same frame of mind now with respect to civil defense as we were back in the thirties with respect to national defense. It took a terrible war to teach us that we had to have a strong national defense in the world in which we lived in the thirties. We have an even worse world now. But we have not yet learned the lesson with respect to civil defense.

Why are some people opposed to civil defense? I think they can be classified into two broad groups. One of these groups opposes civil defense because it thinks civil defense will not work. The other group is opposed to civil defense, even if it would work. Typical of the latter opponents is a lady whom I debated on television on Sunday. I asked her: "If we could have an effective civil defense, would you be in favor of it?" She said, "No."

Why does the one group of opponents to civil defense think it will not work? Basically, because they do not think it will save everybody. Well, it is not intended to save everybody. It is intended to save the lives of millions of people. If a bomb should fall in Washington, we in Washington will all be dead. If it falls on Baltimore, the people there will all be dead. But bombs will not fall on every community and city in this land. Millions of people will be in areas where bombs do not fall.

A civil defense program of this kind is designed to save the lives of people in those latter areas—from fire, blast, panic, and the hurricane of misery that could sweep upon our people at such a time.

With respect to this group, I agree that our cities are almost naked in their civil defense against enemy attack. Our civil defense is scarcely more than a loin cloth. I want to put on more civil defense clothing. These opponents want to take even the loin cloth away.

Now the other group—which is opposed to civil defense even if it were effective—feels that appeasement is the same as peace. They are afraid civil defense will lull the American people into overconfidence, so that they will be less willing to work for peace. They also feel that civil defense will be regarded by the Communists as an act of aggression.

I liken this argument to the proposal to scrap the lifeboats in the hope of better avoiding shipwrecks, by making the navigator more careful and the seas less angry.

The thinking of both these groups is wrong. If you do not want national defense, vote against this bill. If you feel appeasement is the way to peace, vote against this bill. But if you want to save lives, if you accept the testimony of the overwhelming majority of our military and scientific leaders that civil defense is an integral part of national defense, vote for this bill. If you accept the proposition that this prgram will provide some training, some core of leadership until the American people wake up to the realization that clothes can be just as important as arms to the safety of our people, then vote for this bill.

Minority Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Representative FRED SCHWENGEL is chairman of the House Republican conference subcommittee on minority staffing. With his usual energy and eloquence, Representative SCHWENGEL is calling to the attention of the country the importance of increasing minority staffing in the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful letter from Representative SCHWENGEL which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on September 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEGLECTS ITS MINORITY

(By Representative FRED SCHWENGEL)

For all the talk about minorities, a shocking situation exists in the Halls of Congress which is receiving remarkably little atten-

tion. The majority party (Democrats) outnumbers the minority (Republicans) 3 to 2 in the House of Representatives and 2 to 1 in the Senate. Yet professional committee staff members responsible to the majority outumber staff responsible to the minority 10 to 1 in the House and 12 to 1 in the Senate.

Much of the important work of Congress is done in the committees. Their professional staffs do research, draft bills, arrange for witnesses to attend hearings and do other tasks for which Congressmen have neither the time nor, in some cases, the specialized knowledge. Most of them are hired, promoted and assigned work by the chairman—a member of the Democratic majority—of each committee. Naturally their allegiance is to the majority. Minority projects and reports tend to be neglected.

This weakens the two-party system—the basis of our Government. The "loyal opposition" must present clear, constructive alternatives to majority legislation. Without adequate staff it cannot do this and the distinction between the parties blurs in the public mind as the two sides of an issue fail to be presented forcefully to the voters.

This situation makes it impossible for Congress to adequately check the work of the executive branch—its constitutional task. The executive branch today is the Nation's largest pressure group. Each department and agency has a vested interest in acquiring more and larger appropriations. Executive staffs unavoidably reflect this bias, especially when, as now, the Presidency and both Houses of Congress are controlled by the same party.

The present situation is a tremendous waste of the taxpayer's money Without adequate staff the minority cannot pare all the "fat" of the executive budget, nor can it conduct necessary investigations to expose inefficiency or prevent another Billie Sol Estes scandal.

The relatively small cost of more professional staff responsible to the minority would soon be repaid by savings in proposed and existing programs.

Only Republicans in Congress are taking steps to remedy this abuse. We have formed the House Republican conference and Senate-House joint ad hoc committees on increased minority staffing. Also we have proposed measures in both Houses to provide an equitable solution.

Yet minority staffing should not be a partisan issue. Republicans will not always be the minority and Democrats the majority. Regardless of which party is the minority, it is in the public interest that the minority position have sound research behind it and be clearly presented. It is strange that the Democrats, who claim to speak for all minorities, neglect so sadly the cause of the minority in Congress.

We Should Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the gentleman from Michigan, Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, warned the people of our Nation on the floor of this body concerning the aggressive actions of Indonesia. The foreign assistance bill contained the Broomfield amendment which prohibits all U.S. assistance to Indonesia unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States. Some newspapers castigated Representative BROOMFIELD for offering the amendment and the facetious title of "Assistant Secretary for the Far East" was given to the sponsor.

The events that have taken place in Indonesia in the past few days have proven that Representative BROOMFIELD was correct in his analysis of Mr. Sukarno and his government. The outstanding statesmanship displayed by Mr. BROOMFIELD as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is commendable.

The editorial in the Washington Post, September 19, 1963, takes the position the gentleman from Michigan, Representative BROOMFIELD, has been advocating for a long time.

The editorial referred to follows:

INDONESIAN AGGRESSION

In a generation more given to order, the behavior of the Indonesian mob that burned the British Embassy in Djakarta would have been regarded as just occasion for the severance of diplomatic relations if not for a declaration of war.

Disregard of the proprieties and decencies and amenities of international conduct has been repeatedly forgiven and condoned in new countries where the maintenance of order seemed genuinely beyond the power or genius of the government. It can hardly be passed over lightly in a country which has had every opportunity to establish order and which now has has every capacity to enforce order in its own capital.

The British would be right to summon home their Ambassador. They will be justified if they sever diplomatic relations. The government at Djakarta either countenanced this disorder, and is thereby guilty of a calculated offense, or it occurred in spite of it, in which case the government is convicted of a degree of incompetence so great as to make the maintenance of normal relations impracticable.

The Indonesian Government commenced with the high hopes and support of much of the free world. An exceedingly rich economy, an amiable and industrious people, great natural advantages for a maritime power all combined to make it likely that the new country would be viable economically, progressive socially, and stable politically. These hopes and expectations have been increasingly disappointed by a regime that has done its best to sabotage its own interests and to conceal its gross incompetence by external military adventures clothed in clouds of sheer demagoguery.

The outcry against Malaysia puts a powerful case into the hands of those who said at the time of the West Iranian dispute that in Indonesia there was arising an aggressive, expansive, insatiable military power bent on constructing a new colonialism in its own area of the world. That new colonialism now seems likely to have all the evils of the old colonialism plus an inability even to confer order upon the hapless people who fall under its tyranny.

Whatever Great Britain does, the Government of the United States ought to call its own Ambassador home and restudy its own relations with a regime that grows less and less responsible. In the meantime our aid program should be suspended. And while our Ambassador is in this country for consultation, the related agencies of Government ought to lay their plans for other forceful and immediate responses to the present situation and to prepare contingently for military measures which alone seem to hold any prospect of containing Indonesian aggression. We seem to have largely solved the problems of the old colonialism, put in train solutions to the problems of neocolonialism, only to founder on the challenge of a new colonialism as odious as its predecessors.

Picketing of Soviet United Nations Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, strange things are happening in the Nation's largest city and although we have grown used to this through the years, what happened in New York City the other day when a retired restaurateur picketed the Soviet U.N. Mission is the strangest recent happening I have encountered.

Mr. Lawrence Rifkin became upset about the Russians' veto of the United States resolution in the U.N. to condemn Syria, so he picketed the Soviet Mission. His picketing sign said "How come you did not scream when the Syrians murdered a few Jews" He was stopped in his picketing and told that he was not allowed to do this. Is it not strange how we protect our enemies and punish our friends? At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have recent newspaper accounts of this incident printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Sept. 7, 1963]

YES; YOU CAN'T PICKET RED SQUARE, NEW YORK

The curious little arrangement between the East 67th Street police station and the Soviet U.N. mission, which bars any of the U.S. proletariat from picketing the Reds on East 67th between Lexington and Third Avenues, was judicially confirmed yesterday.

Lawrence Rifkin, 67, a retired restauranteur, who had quietly picketed the mission at 136 East 67th Street on Thursday, was hit with a 30-day suspended jail sentence in criminal court.

SOME PARTING ADVICE

"If you go back on that picket line, you'll serve the 30 days," Judge Reuben Levy warned him.

Rifkin, who lives at 905 West End Avenue, arrived at court at 10 a.m. and finally was given criminal court's modest variation of a star chamber proceeding—a trial without spectators in a small hearing room off the main courtroom.

A desk lieutenant and a patrolman testified to the enormity of Rifkin's disorderly conduct—that after being asked in a nice, polite, stationhouse way to go picket a block west, Rifkin had refused, which was contrary to police department regulations.

WHAT WAS BOTHERING HIM

Then Rifkin testified that he'd felt a duty to protest the Russian veto of the U.S. resolution in U.N. condemning Syria for a border incident with Israel.

"What's this all about?" Rifkin exclaimed to Judge Levy when he was hit with the 30-day term.

"They're picketing the residence and the offices of the Governor, the mayor, and they even walk down Pennsylvania Avenue to the President's house. I wasn't violent. Why are these Russians any better than our officials?"

IMMUNITY, YOU KNOW

"These people enjoy diplomatic immunity," said Judge Levy.

At 4:30 p.m., 6 hours after reporting to court, Rifkin walked out a sadder but by no means wiser man.

Ae representative of the Civil Liberties Union assured him that the organization was taking up his case, but Rifkin didn't think he'd test out Levy's warning.

"Besides, the cops kept my signs," he said sadly.

[From the New York Daily News, Sept. 6, 1963]

COPS PICK UP LONE PICKET AT REDS' HEADQUARTERS

(By William Federici)

The cops soothed Soviet sensibilities yesterday by arresting an American who was quietly picketing the U.S.S.R.'s U.N. Mission at 136 East 67th Street.

Lawrence Rifkin, 67, a retired restauranteur, of 905 West End Avenue, became incensed over the Russian veto of the U.S. resolution in the U.N. to condemn Syria for a border incident with Israel.

WARNED BY COP

Rifkin made up shoulder strap signs that carried messages such as "How Come You Didn't Scream When the Syrians Murdered a Few Jews?" and paraded back and forth in front of the Red mission.

From the East 67th Street station, diagonally across the street at 153 East 67th Street, Patrolman John Rooney came over to warn Rifkin. He told him he could continue his picketing a block away, between Park and Lexington Avenues.

Rifkin refused, so Rooney took him into the station. There, Rifkin said, the desk lieutenant a sergeant and some patrolmen tried to talk him out of picketing. Again he refused.

"I'm not an agitator, a rabble rouser, a mean person," the well-dressed Rifkin explained. "I just felt this was my duty."

Then the cops threatened to lock him up. He said, "I guess that's your privilege." So they charged him with disorderly conduct.

"After being requested to desist, refused which was contrary to police department regulations," the arrest record explained.

Rifkin, never in trouble in his life, was taken down to criminal court in the paddy wagon, and the cops suddenly ran into a constitutional snag named Judge Samuel Ohringer.

"Offhand, I don't see how you could arrest this man or hold him on anything," Ohringer said. "This man can picket."

THE 20-MINUTE DELAY

The forces of the law hastily obtained an adjournment and when the case was recalled 20 minutes later, Capt. James P. O'Brien, of East 67th Street, a lieutenant, a sergeant and a member of the department's legal bureau were on hand.

All wanted to stamp out this vicious precedent of picketing the Reds, because if one picket gets away with it, maybe more will and then the Reds will get mad and maybe go home or something. Anyhow, it was against police regulations.

"I guess I've prejudiced myself," Ohringer said, still unimpressed.

"I don't feel I can sit on this case because I think he has a right to picket."

UP AGAIN TODAY

He then adjourned the case until today, advising Rifkin to obtain counsel.

"I don't think I need a lawyer, do I, Your Honor?" Rifkin asked.

"That's your privilege," Ohringer told him.

New Jersey: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the New Jersey congressional delegation, about gambling in that State. New Jersey is one of those 24 States that has had the sense to legalize, control, and profit from parimutuel betting. But, as in most other States so acting, only a half step has been taken. Illegal gambling—the logical result of bluenosed governmental attitudes—is keeping the crime syndicates fat and happy in New Jersey. A covert coalition of hypocrites and mobsters is keeping gambling illegal—and bleeding the State in the process.

In 1962, New Jersey ranked fourth in the Nation in parimutuel betting. Almost $325 million was wagered on the State's racetracks. The public treasury of New Jersey made about a $30-million profit from this turnover.

However, most of the money gambled in New Jersey is doing nothing to swell governmental coffers. Instead, the revenues of illicit gambling are financing the underworld crime syndicates.

New Jersey's share of the estimated figure for national off-track betting presented to the McClellan Committee came to almost $1.7 billion last year. When it is realized that off-track betting constitutes less than one-half of the total illegal gambling, the full and stunning extent of illegal gambling becomes apparent.

In New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, the total amount wagered illegally each year may approach $3½ billion. This figure represents the turnover. The gambling syndicates retain only 10 percent of the turnover as profit. But this is enough to make New Jersey a gangland gravy-train.

The gambling rings contribute much of their take to the financing of syndicated crime. The gross profit which may reach $350 million a year in that State is diminished by expenses such as bribes and payoffs to corrupt law enforcement.

We all know that gambling cannot be eradicated, and so long as it is outlawed, but tacitly allowed to flourish in criminal hands, it will continue to spin a vast web of evil. Only Government control and regulation of gambling—best exemplified by a Government-run lottery—can make it work for the people rather than against society. When are we going to remove our heads from in the sand?

Centralization of Control of Public Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to a column by Mr. Raymond Moley in the September 23, 1963, issue of Newsweek magazine. It is entitled "Uncle Sam, Schoolmaster," and it contains a very sharp warning against permitting the bureaucrats in Washington to centralize and thereby control public education in this counrty. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM, SCHOOLMASTER

(By Raymond Moley)

We are witnessing a desperate, violent struggle over the Nation. Negro leaders and white sympathizers are risking not only imprisonment but physical injury and even death. Their opponents' risks are equally grave. An education—a better education—is a prime objective in this conflict. But when you ask a dozen professional educators to define the objectives of education you are greeted by a confusion of answers.

There is what is known as traditional education. My understanding of this is that three of its elementary components are practical information, mental training or discipline, and an appreciation of esthetic and spiritual values. These relate to the past and the present. So far as the future is concerned, the student learns to live with and make decisions in a world in which the values established by these studies will measurably prevail.

The opposition to traditional education rejects disciplinary studies and rather vaguely suggests, and here I quote some of the educators' gobbledygook: "life adjustment," "the reformation of the goals of our national society," preparation to understand "the world of tomorrow," and something called consensus. In the near past this has been called progressive education.

For simplicity I have somewhat arbitrarily used these terms and definitions. If space permitted, I could show that the difference between the two philosophies is not so clear as this. But the difference is there, and it is vitally important.

THE "MISSION" REPORT

The Federal Government, with which we are concerned here, spends vast sums on education. In fiscal 1962 the total was more than $2.6 billion. Two bills—one for vocational education, the other for "higher education facilities"—have passed the House. If finally enacted, they will add half a billion more to the expenditures per year.

Much of this expenditure is justified. But both Congress and the American people should be aware of the perils involved.

These sums flow through 17 Federal agencies. Very important among them is the U.S. Office of Education.

The related dangers are, first, centralization of control over the content of education and, second, the educational philosophy of those who do the controlling.

While Congress, as well as the Executive, has been careful to deny any intent to control, the danger is necessarily there.

In 1961 the Office of Education issued a report, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future—Report of the Committee on Mission and Organization of the U.S. Office of Education." This stirred up an outcry in Congress, but nevertheless last year there was a reorganization of the office essentially in line with the "mission" report. Eight of the twelve members of the "mission" committee are in strategic positions in the U.S. Office of Education. These individuals will approve or disapprove all State programs of vocational education, of guidance and counseling, as well as many college and university programs of teacher training, language teaching, and student financial aid. They will also develop conferences and give advice at all levels of education.

INDOCTRINATION THE AIM

It behooves all Americans concerned with education to note what these officials with all this power said in their "mission" report about their concept of the content and objective of education:

"In addition to the Federal level of public policy determination, the Office has much concern with policy at the State and local levels and in higher educational institutions. Active leadership by the Office to encourage constructive consensus on particular problems or issues in American education helps to crystallize public policy at all levels."

This, then, is the prescription to establish under an elite, the members of which think alike on public policies, a vast system of indoctrination in our schools, colleges, and universities everywhere. Their pious denial of the word "control" is not relevant. For control by whatever regime is in the White House is real, active, and apparent.

Aviation Council Supports Bill To Eliminate Overtime Customs Fees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, support for my bill, H.R. 4789, to eliminate overtime customs charges for private aircraft which enter the United States on weekends and holidays continues to increase.

Evidence of this growing support is a resolution I received today from the International Northwest Aviation Council. This resolution was adopted by the Council at its 29th annual convention in Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of the resolution for the RECORD.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY INTERNATIONAL NORTHWEST AVIATION COUNCIL

Whereas increased international air travel and air commerce between the United States and Canada by privately owned aircraft is of great importance to both countries in maintenance of good international relations; and

Whereas the U.S. Tariff Act of 1930 exempts the owners and operators of motor vehicles, trolleys, ferries, and commercial trucks from paying Sunday, holiday, and overtime inspection charges to the U.S. customs officials at border crossing points; and

Whereas the elimination of U.S. customs overtime inspection charges is equally important to the owners and operators of aircraft between the United States and Canada; and

Whereas during the 88th U.S. Congress, H.R. 4789 has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means which would correct this inequity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the International Northwest Aviation Council during its 29th annual convention meeting at Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, That the congressional Committee on Ways and Means give H.R. 4789 favorable consideration for passage during the 88th session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the president, by Western Union Telegraph, to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee and to Congressman JACK WESTLAND, Washington, D.C.

HUGH R. KELLEHER,
President.

The Lost Student: Cause and Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently there appeared in Overseas, a magazine devoted to educational exchange, an excellent article by Prof. Nuri Mohsenin. The article is entitled "The Lost Student: Cause and Cure."

I hope the executive branch will study this article and follow its suggestions with regard to assisting education in foreign countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LOST STUDENT: CAUSE AND CURE

(By Nuri Mohsenin)

(NOTE.—Dr. Mohsenin, a native of Teheran, Iran, spent 9 years in this country as an undergraduate and graduate student. He taught for 3 years at the University of Shiraz, Iran, and the University of Beirut, Lebanon, and returned to the United States. He is currently associate professor of agricultural engineering at Pensylvania State University.)

In recent years, American educators and others involved in technical assistance programs in the less developed nations of the world have shown growing concern over the problem of students from these countries who do not return to their native lands after completing their studies in the United States.

No one really knows the extent of this problem nor the percentage of students that stay here, and, to date, no method for obtaining such information easily and accurately has been developed. So far, the number of students who do not return is really not large enough to cause undue alarm. Nevertheless, it is not a negligible problem and steps should be taken to remedy it.

The reasons for denationalization, or alienation of foreign students from their home country, are complex and varied. With a few exceptions, foreign students who remain in this country come from middle-class families. Because of the favorable financial, social, and political status in their home country, the students from the wealthy and powerful upper class families usually return home, where opportunities for their advancement are far more attractive than in the United States. Upper class students rarely would achieve the same class status here, but a student of a middle class background can fit into a correspondingly similar class in the United States because of his educational training and profession.

Insofar as the fields of study are concerned, graduates of engineering and physical sciences seem to stay in greater numbers than those in other fields of studies. The students in other fields (with the exception of medicine) usually find it more difficult to get employment in the United States.

Though each individual who prefers to remain in the United States may give many reasons for his decision, the main factors usually are cultural isolation and alienation, lack of employment or research opportunities in the field of specialization, higher standard of living in the United States, lower pay scale versus higher cost of living and various personal reasons such as religious and political affiliation.

CULTURAL ISOLATION

One of the most important factors influencing the student's decision to live and work in the United States is the problem which sociologists have called "cultural isolation." A young, impressionable and idealistic student who lives in this country for a number of years may change completely in his outlook, attitudes and habits. Most of these changes have come about by simply living in this country rather than by any formal training. They are the outcome of being in another environment which might, in certain cases, be completely different culturally, socially and economically from that of his own. The student begins to react differently to both familiar and unfamiliar situations and adopts a new frame of reference drawn from specific areas of American culture.

When he returns to his home country, he may find himself as much an alien among his own people as he was when he first entered America. Often the political, economic, and social conditions of the country are such that his government, despite the desperate need for trained and technical personnel, cannot take advantage of his training. Such factors as graft and corruption, a high degree of bureaucracy, lack of administrative efficiency and resistance toward change and innovation—basic characteristics in most underdeveloped countries—are additional reasons for the student's discouragement, frustration and disappointment. There are several personal factors contributing to this problem of cultural isolation; the student's age, his previous home life and past experience and the extent of study and education in the United States are, however, of prime importance in determining the degree of his cultural isolation.

LACK OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

It has been argued that American education, particularly in the fields of engineering and physical sciences, is too sophisticated for students from the less developed countries. Engineering education in this country is now placing more emphasis on basic and fundamental sciences. This trend is dictated by the rapid advancement of technology in such fields as nuclear physics and space exploration and the control of such accrediting agencies as the Engineer's Council for Professional Development. We cannot expect American engineering schools to set up special curriculums for the limited number of foreign students without getting

involved in some sort of double standard. Besides, the application of fundamental and basic courses is universal, and it is up to the student to mobilize the best of his ingenuity in applying these fundamentals to many of the diverse and unique problems which he may face in his home country.

Sophistication comes about when the student starts on a graduate program leading toward advanced degrees. Most of the students coming from underdeveloped countries would like to continue their studies through the doctoral degree not only to be able to stay longer in America and thus obtain more practical and academic training, but also to receive the doctoral title which gives them higher social status and better employment opportunities upon returning to their home countries. In some countries, a doctoral degree is essential for university teaching.

This tendency to stay for an advanced degree frequently leads the student into rather exotic fields and areas of specialization which have little or no application at the present time in the country to which the student is expected to return and work. With all the opportunities available in this country for research and teaching in the fields of engineering and physical sciences, we cannot expect very many foreign students with Ph. D. degrees in these fields to go back to their home countries and, after "string pulling" and lobbying, settle for inconsequential desk jobs or, if lucky enough, teaching positions in high schools at substandard salaries.

MORE COMFORTABLE LIFE IN AMERICA

Although the higher standard of living in the United States is one of the factors influencing the decision of some foreign students to remain in America, its relative importance has been overemphasized. Most of these countries are inherently rich, and if the conditions were such that the Western-educated man were given a fair share of his country's wealth, sometimes he could live at a higher material level than in the United States. Despite the numerous mechanical and electrical machines, appliances and gadgets available to the American family, very few of these machines can take the place of the cheap human labor which is plentiful in the less developed countries. With such help, a man can put his time into more constructive work than do-it-yourself projects around the house.

What is most appealing to a serious and sensitive visitor from these underdeveloped countries is not the comforts of life and the high American standard of living in terms of physical and material things, but the atmosphere creating the peace of mind which enables a man to concentrate on his own work and to be more efficient and more productive.

Frequently there are employment opportunities available for the American-educated student upon returning to his home country, but the scale of pay is so low that with a high cost of living it is virtually impossible for him to live and support a family merely on his earned salary. In many cases the parents must continue supporting their Western-educated son after his return home. If he comes from the lower economic class and cannot expect this supplementary living allowance from his family, he will generally try to find a job in another country where he can live the better life that his Western education has shown him to be possible.

PERSONAL REASONS

Students sometimes emigrate because of their political or religous affiliations and the attendant fear of persecution and discrimination by the ruling majority or the government in power. In this category would be the former member of the Communist Party from a country where communism is oulawed, the pro-Western student whose country is now under a Communist regime, the Palestinian Arab and the Middle East Armenian who belongs to a minority group and fears discrimination upon returning to his home country.

In some cases the reason for staying in America, or going home and then returning to the United States, is the inability of the foreign student's American wife to adjust herself to the social and economic conditions of her husband's homeland. This is particularly true when there are children involved, and the parents are concerned about their upbringing and education.

From the reasons mentioned above, it seems clear that the core of the problem is the long residence of the student in a rich and highly complex society, which changes him to such an extent that he cannot readjust himself to the less economically developed society from which he came.

Many of the shortcomings in government, education, and the standard of living which are discouraging to the American-educated foreigner are accepted by his fellow countrymen. These men may also be dissatisfied, frustrated, and unhappy, knowing that a better life is possible, but since they have not had the experience of a Western education and have not earned advanced degrees, there are not many opportunities for them in foreign countries. These men stay home and either conform to the status quo or attempt to fight the situation and hope it will improve.

If the core of the problem is the student's leaving home and studying in a country far more economically advanced than his own, then the obvious solutions are (1) to expand the educational facilities in the home country, (2) to send the student to study in the regional universities close to home and (3) to send to America only graduate students who have already established their roots in the home country.

The primary reason for the large flow of students from the less developed countries to America and to other advanced Western countries during recent years is the lack of educational facilities at home. In one of the Middle Eastern countries where admission to the university is through enterance examinations because of the limited facilities, only 1 out of 50 students who are capable of doing college work is admitted to the school of medicine. In engineering and agriculture, these figures are about 1 out of 30 and 1 out of 20, respectively. Since vocational training in these countires is virtually unknown and the little which is available does not carry the weight and the social status demanded by high school graduates, those who are not admitted to the local universities look for college education elsewhere. Usually, the first choice is America, the second is Europe and the third is one of the neighboring countries.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES CAN DO TO KEEP FOREIGN STUDENTS HOME

Perhaps the most effective way of spending the American dollar in underdeveloped countries is through education—training the people of the country to solve their own problems. The millions of American dollars which have been given to these countries for military purposes, as well as for huge and ambitious projects such as the constructon of dams in remote parts of the country, are intangible aids which may win the friendship of only a few men in the higher government echelons. A fraction of this money spent on education would buy for the United States the more valuable and needed friendship of the common people in these underdeveloped countries.

American aid for education should be concentrated in the three following areas: the introduction of vocational training as it is known in this country, the establishment of land-grant type provincial colleges and the development of graduate programs and research facilities within the large universities to offer advanced degrees.

Limited programs of this type in the past have pointed out many problems which have been discouraging for both the Americans and the foreign faculty members. One of the most common problems is the opposition of European-educated professors, who welcome American aid in terms of equipment, buildings, and libraries but oppose any changes suggested by their American counterparts in their inefficient and antiquated teaching and their outmoded administrative methods. On the other hand, some of the American faculty members recruited for academic work abroad have not been the best available insofar as competence in the field of specialization, understanding of the people and the problems, and interest and dedication to a foreign assignment are concerned. This has created many unpleasant problems jeopardizing American prestige and leadership in these countries, where people are most critical of and sensitive to their relationships with foreign experts.

These problems can be solved partly by paying more attention to the selection of American personnel for oversea assignments, by establishing new institutions which will differ from the traditional European-style universities and by training a new core of young teachers to take up teaching and research responsibilities. The most outstanding graduates in each field would then work as assistants to the American professors for a few years before being sent to the United States for advanced degrees. Such a plan has been tried at the American University of Beirut in the newly established College of Agriculture. Under this plan, the American staff is being gradually replaced by the Lebanese who are working for advanced degrees in this country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES

Recent establishment of new land-grant type universities in India, Turkey, and some other countries under the U.S. university-to-university program is a positive move toward this proposed educational development in the less developed countries.

Some of the problems associated with the establishment of American-style colleges and universities in some of the less developed countries, such as the high cost of the program, difficulties in recruiting a competent yet devoted American faculty, language barrier and problems of cross-cultural communication, bureaucratic redtape and the lack of cooperation from local governments and the local universities, can be overcome by training foreign students in regional universities administered and financed by Americans. In such universities, there are fewer language and other communication problems, increased possibilities to recruit more competent faculty members because of the more favorable location and few readjustment problems for the foreign students upon returning to their home countries.

An example of such a regional university is the American University of Beirut. This is an American institution which, for the past 100 years, has trained many leaders in medicine, education, engineering and other disciplines for the Middle Eastern countries. During the academic year 1957–58 this writer had the opportunity to meet and get to know a number of foreign students coming to this university from the countries of the Middle East and North Africa under an ICA (now AID) program. Except for a few who have come to America for advanced degrees, these students have returned to their homelands, and some are holding highly responsible positions.

If Government and private agency funds are to be used in training foreign students, some carefully selected advanced graduate

students and teachers may be brought to this country for practical training and observation, not only to learn American teaching and research techniques but also to work for advanced degrees. In selecting these trainees, attention should be given to those whose roots are already established in their home countries by means of local undergraduate training, a suitable job and, preferably, a few years of government civil service. In graduate training programs leading to an advanced degree, the student should be encouraged to choose an area related to a situation in his home country and, if possible, even use data gathered under the conditions existing at home. This is a more realistic approach than having the student work on a project which supports a graduate assistantship but has no practical application in the student's home country.

These proposals may help alleviate the problem of the nonreturning foreign student and provide a deeper and more realistic basis for international educational exchange.

Threat to Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the possibilities of an all-exclusive "National Communications System" which could possibly, in the years ahead, completely dominate the public media field may now be considered only a threat. But the danger that such a Federal takeover of news service for newspapers, radio and television exists today through the creation of the new Department of Agriculture's Market News Service. There have been and are "assurances" that such a thing will not take place. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is possible. A recent editorial in the Port Huron Times-Herald, Port Huron, Mich., published in its September 19, 1963, edition, concisely sums up this vital matter. I hope all Members will read it and support all possible efforts to preserve the freedom and independence of all news services:

UNITED STATES MOVES TOWARD THE AMERICAN TASS

A week ago, the Times Herald published on this page an editorial presentation from the New York Journal of Commerce entitled "The American Tass." It pointed to the threats of putting the two present collectors and diseminators of news—the Associated Press and United Press International (AP and UPI)—out of business by launching a Federal News Service.

As the presentation outlined the threat, the vehicle for building up such a Federal News Service already exists—and a precedent for pushing ahead already has been established—in a new Department of Agriculture market wire service in competition with an established private business.

The author of "The American Tass;" Eric Ridder, publisher of the Journal of Commerce, wrote his item from a 1970 viewpoint—looking back on how the Federal News Service might have developed in the 1960's.

Ridder wrote, "It really came to a head in 1965 when the major Federal departments decided at a Washington meeting to establish a single wire service for the rapid collection and interdepartmental dissemination of current information in widely scattered fields. There was, after all, a certain logic to it. Quite a number of agencies had been collecting their own information for years. Why shouldn't all these activities be combined into one giant circuit?"

Ridder, it turns out, is a better prophet than he knew. Or, rather he was more cautious than he needed to be in selecting 1965 as the year in which Federal agencies decided to join together to establish a news service which ultimately pushed AP and UPI out of business—leaving "the American Tass" as the sole collector and distributor of news in the Nation.

For the August 28 Federal Register has a memorandum from President Kennedy to the heads of executive departments and agencies, directing them to cooperate and assist in establishing a unified governmental communications system to be called the National Communications System (NCS). The memorandum states that the new system shall be established and developed "by linking together, improving and extending, on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."

The march of events is following Ridder's prediction to the letter—except that his estimate of a Federal News Service beginning in 1965 must now be changed to 1963.

Ridder consequently asked, in a subsequent Journal of Commerce editorial, if this means his 1970 date for a Federal takeover of news service for newspapers, radio, and TV should be advanced to 1968?

Americans who rightly fear and despise the spoon feeding of information by such government monopolies as Russia's Tass news service are being led down the same road the Russians are treading. The Department of Agriculture's market news wire service was the first step; the proposal for a "National Communications System" is the next. The elimination of all competition—through lower, tax-subsidized rates—and the emergence of "an American Tass" as a reality is dead ahead.

The Honorable Charles N. Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, Montana and the Nation suffered a great loss with the passing of Judge Pray. The following editorial from the Billings Gazette, Billings, Mont., expresses the view of most:

A RECORD OF HUMANE SERVICE

Montanans of all walks of life and Federal jurists throughout the Nation are mourning the loss of Judge Charles N. Pray, dean of U.S. District Court judges.

Judge Pray, as most Montanans of recent years knew him, was respected throughout the Nation for his accomplishments as a Federal judge and the stature that he brought to the bench in 33 years presiding in the Montana district. He retired in 1957 but continued his interest in judicial work after he left the bench at the age of 88.

Judge Pray's service to his adopted State was long, accomplished, and illustrious. As a U.S. Representative for three terms, Judge Pray played active rolls in passage of the Three-Year Homestead Act, establishment of the Bureau of Mines, furthering irrigation projects in the West and establishment of the Postal Savings System.

His continued efforts on the House Committee on Public Lands resulted in establishment of Glacier National Park, one of the Nation's major recreation lands.

When President Coolidge appointed him to the Federal bench in 1924, the selection was not a political reward as much as recognition of a keen legal mind who would be a credit to the court and all who came in contact with him.

The dignity, the warmth, the integrity and intellectual honesty he brought with him to the bench were the qualities that soon caused him to be recognized as a great judge.

Judge Pray was honored and respected in his public life, a reflection of the standards which he had set for himself and as an example to others.

Judge Pray lived a full life. The Creator saw fit to make that life a long and useful one in the service of his fellow man. He is gone from the living but leaves behind him a record of humane accomplishment that will not be forgotten.

Peter Abrams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all of us who knew and admired Peter Abrams were deeply saddened by his death on September 8. Mr. Abrams was a mechanical engineer and civic leader in Philadelphia. He had a distinguished record of service in the First World War. Mr. Abrams also participated in the invention of an important military device, whose patents he contributed to our Government as another contribution to the war effort.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an eloquent eulogy in tribute to Mr. Abrams by Dr. Reuben J. Magil, rabbi of Temple Beth Zion; and also an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on September 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the eulogy and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY IN TRIBUTE TO PETER ABRAMS

(By Dr. Reuben J. Magil, rabbi of Temple Beth Zion, Philadelphia)

Peter Abrams, the man of great heart and keen mind, has returned to God. We who knew him and loved him are the poorer for his passing, even as we accept with grateful resignation the surcease from the dread scourge which struck him down a few months ago, after a lifetime of robust health. The Talmud teaches "When a righteous man comes into the world, the world is benefited."

The Nation certainly was benefited by this patriotic American. He served his country in uniform during the First World War. In the later conflict, he devoted his talents in positions of leadership to the defense of the Nation. In the First World War he was a pioneer, the first in several crucial aspects of the defense effort and military science. He shared with then Maj. Smedley D. Butler in the invention of one vital military device which our Government was ready to pay for

at a high price. Peter Abrams was unique in his patriotism. He would not profit from the defense needs of America. He refused to sell—he gave his patents to the Government.

In the Midrash we read the dictum of Rabbi Azariah, "When a righteous man is in a city he is its lustre, its majesty, its glory. When he departs from it, its lustre, its glory are diminished." The city of Philadelphia is poorer because Peter Abrams, the born leader, whose civic devotion was magnificent, is no longer here. Like Bezalel, the master builder of Israel's first sanctuary, he was endowed by God "with wisdom, understanding, knowledge in all kinds of endeavor." As president of the oldest scientific instrument firm in the land, he devoted his energies to making Chestnut Street one of the great thoroughfares of the world. In his concern with the commerce of Philadelphia, he wisely saw the importance of tourism and conventions for bringing prosperity to our historic and beautiful metropolis.

The firm which he headed for many years is impoverished by his passing. For Peter Abrams, the true American, had the qualities of the true Jew—love of fellow men, democratic regard for high and low. He associated in dignified ease with the highest, in pleasant geniality with the most humble. He was a self-made man. Unlike many self-made men—he never forgot what it felt like to be at the foot of the line. So he did not regard his employees as mere hired hands. They were his fellow workers in a great scientific enterprise. How many of them who sit here today can testify that this man of dignity, of few words which spoke volumes, who was so hard to penetrate at first, proved to be far more than a boss. He was a fatherly friend who had great affection for them.

The greatest sense of impoverishment is that of his family who mourn a beautiful and beloved relative, who was a loving husband, devoted brother, wise and loving father, not only to his son but also to his daughter-in-law whom he loved as his daughter. He was a fond grandfather whose grandchildren will proudly remember all their lives the man of dignity, of genuine refinement, who could unbend all the way with them.

Beautiful was the tireless devotion of his wife and son during the last trying weeks. But it is only right that it should have been so. The romance of Peter and Rose Abrams is a beautiful story which, alas, is more tragic because it cannot continue forever. Theirs was a true marriage. One never went without the other. Their pleasures were complete only when shared. Always Peter came home with a smile—no matter how frustrating and trying the day—to be welcomed by the love of his beloved. He took pride in her energetic efforts on behalf of noble endeavors.

His love for his son was admirable. He taught his only child humility. He ordered him to start at the bottom in the firm. He promoted him steadily and wisely as Robert proved his mettle. This father in the same business with his son was unique in having faith in him and thereby inspiring him to rise in achievement and importance as he will continue to do in the future. Peter Abrams had the wisdom to recognize that even a great father has no right to squeeze his son into his own mold.

Peter Abrams, the true gentleman, the proud Jew, was a charter member of Temple Beth Zion. As he lay on his deathbed, he was concerned that his share in the support of the House of God should not be neglected. His religion taught him many virtues. One was not to bear a grudge. He was too big to be small and picayune in this respect.

So let us remember Peter Abrams "who walked in our common ways with the seal of a king on his brow, who lived as a man among men his days and belongs to the ages now."

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 10, 1963]

PETER ABRAMS DIES, PIONEER DISTRIBUTOR

Peter Abrams, president of Williams, Brown & Earle, Inc., oldest scientific instrument distributors in the United States, died Sunday in Graduate Hospital. He was 74.

Mr. Abrams, who was a mechanical engineer and civic leader, lived at the Touraine Apartments, 1520 Spruce Street. The firm is at 906 Chestnut Street.

He was chairman of the board, past president, and the first "Man of the Year" of the Chestnut Street Association. He was a past vice president of the chamber of commerce and the convention and visitors bureau. He was chairman of the Center City Coordinating Committee.

Mr. Abrams was an authority on urban transportation, serving on various advisory committees for the mayor and city council, as well as the chamber of commerce.

He served in the Signal Corps during the First World War. As a lieutenant, he was the first aeronautical mechanical engineer, and as a captain, the first chief of aerial photography.

During the Second World War, he headed bond drives, and was a member of the Office of the Price Administration and the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. Abrams was a Mason and a member of the American Legion, the Franklin Institute, Scientific Apparatus Makers Association and the Poor Richard Club. He was a charter member of Beth Zion congregation.

Surviving are his wife, Rose; a son, Robert; two sisters and two grandchildren. Services will be at 1 p.m. Tuesday, at Levine's, 1512 North Broad Street.

Hot Line From Military to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the September 23, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an article which merits the attention of all Members of the Congress. It was written by Maj. Gen. Max S. Johnson and is entitled "Needed: A Hot Line From Military to Congress?" I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A HOT LINE FROM MILITARY TO CONGRESS

(By Maj. Gen. Max S. Johnson)

Among this country's senior military planners, the idea of a "hot line" between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Congress is catching on. What they want is a direct line of communications that is always open like the "hot line" between the White House and the U.S. missile center at Omaha.

The reason: A growing fear among military men that Congress is being eased out of its watchdog role over defense policy, with major decisions being made almost solely by civilians in the executive branch. The result, they feel, is the danger of really serious errors ahead.

How can Congress be brought back into the picture, with an informed and responsible voice in the making of key defense decisions?

The clearest answer yet given by a professional military man in public was that of Adm. George W. Anderson, former Chief of Naval Operations, in his uncensored speech of September 4 in Washington, D.C., before the National Press Club.

Said the admiral: "I am concerned that the system of checks and balances so wisely provided for in our Constitution * * * may be in process of growing unbalanced with respect to the Department of Defense. * * * The Congress always must be a check on the use of either civilian or military power in the Pentagon. * * * The continuing interest of Congress must not be resisted or resented."

As a basic requirement, the admiral added, "the full force of Joint Chiefs of Staff recommendations must not be compromised or dulled in any way in transmission to the President or to the Congress."

The principle of civilian control is deeply involved here. But Admiral Anderson draws an important distinction. Civilian control of the military, he points out, involves more than one set of civilians. Control is not uniquely a function of officials in the executive branch; the legislative branch also is charged with a large share.

Military leaders, particularly those in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he suggests, cannot be properly responsive to the congressional side of their control if they are forced into conformity by the executive side.

With control exercised by both Congress and the Executive, he adds, "civilian officials * * * should recognize that forceful expression [by military officers] of contrary views in channels or frank response to congressional inquiry do not represent a challenge to the valid conception of civilian control. There is no such challenge."

Within the Defense Department, the admiral—a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for 2 years—evidently found that dissenting counsel from a top military man sometimes evokes little but annoyance, exasperation, irritation from his civilian chief. For the military man, the easier course would be to bow to the civilian Secretary's views. The harder course, of expressing contrary views, may lead to the officer's relief. Or he may simply be bypassed—his usefulness destroyed.

Admiral Anderson clearly feels that the "system," developing currently in what he refers to as a formative stage in the evolution of the Defense Department, tends dangerously to discourage frank, professional military dissent, even in operational matters.

The role of Congress in civilian control suffers as a result, he says, to the detriment of national security.

In matters like the current debate over the test ban treaty, he argues, Congress should hear the views of top military planners directly—not only once, but on a continuing basis, without the need for going through civilian channels within the executive branch.

HOW HOT LINE WOULD WORK

Specifically, Admiral Anderson proposes that the Senate, if it ratifies the treaty, impose a condition that the Joint Chiefs make frequent and periodic reports to Congress directly, as well as to the Secretary of Defense and the President, on their own assessment of the balance of power and the military risks currently involved.

Further, one particular Senate group, such as the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, should be assigned to monitor these reports and keep open the congressional end of this line from the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Anderson feels.

The argument is not that military considerations should take precedence over political ones. Neither is it that military risks are being disregarded today. It is, instead, that future U.S. security can best be satisfied, if

the treaty is ratified, by the continued assurance that the professional military voice of the Joint Chiefs will be heard in its naked, unadorned, unveiled form—unanimous or not—in the legislative branch of the Government.

All of this adds up to the provision of a hot line of communication, direct from top U.S. military planners—the Joint Chiefs—to a specified group in Congress.

The right of a member of the JCS to go to Congress is not new. The law recognizes that, after just informing the Secretary of Defense, a member of the Joint Chiefs may make recommendations to Congress relating to the policies of the Department of Defense.

What is new about the hot line concept is that, if it is approved, Congress would direct the Joint Chiefs to make reports, routinely, of the military views on related defense issues—before decisions are irrevocably made.

HOT LINE AND DECISIONS

How such a permanent setup might work out can be seen in a few examples of recent defense issues. In the TFX controversy, for instance, Congress was confronted with a fait accompli: A huge, basic contract had been signed and sealed before the contrary views of military analysts were even made known to congressional committees. Had there been a hot line in this case, presumably the decision would have been held up until the intensive investigation later ordered by Congress had been carried out.

Congress also would have had a greater—perhaps a formative—role in decisions like those involving the Skybolt, the B-70, trimming of forces overseas, in which action was taken before Congress was notified in each case.

In addition, if Congress could have been kept abreast in this way of military views on developing risks in Cuba, this might have prevented an intelligence bobble like the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Many of America's top military men, thus, are hoping that the Admiral's suggestion will lead to some basic changes, whereby the voice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be heard loud and clear over what would amount to an authorized hot line—direct from them to Congress.

Sgt. Donald M. Hamblen, a Marine's Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in this week's issue of Newsweek on one individual's personal courage should be of interest to all Members.

I am speaking of an account of Marine Sgt. Donald M. Hamblen of Augusta, Maine, who, through great determination, made his first parachute jump with one leg and thus earned his right to remain in the crack 1st Force Reconnaissance Company of the U.S. Marines.

I am proud of this constituent of mine and I am sure that this man's personal bravery and intestinal fortitude will be a great example to many others with similar handicaps.

The article follows:

MARINE'S MARINE

Now it was time for the ultimate test. Marine Sgt. Donald M. Hamblen had dashed 50 yards, hoisted a fellow leatherneck across his shoulders, and carried the "casualty" back to the starting point—all in 40 seconds. He had proved he could run 3 miles in 36 minutes, clamber up a 20-foot rope, scramble over obstacle courses, dive with scuba gear strapped to his back. Now he had to make his first parachute jump in nearly a year.

Korean veteran Hamblen's last jump—his 215th—had nearly ended in disaster when he snagged a 12,000-volt power cable. The rugged marine, 31, escaped with his life, but his left leg—ripped by shrapnel in Korea—was so badly burned that it had to be amputated just below the knee. His 12-year Marine career seemed over. Crippled in the line of duty, he was eligible for a lifetime monthly pension of $225.

But Hamblen had other ideas: he spent 6 months in the hospital recuperating, had himself fitted with an artificial leg, and talked dubious officials into letting him remain in the corps.

Then, striving to rejoin his old outfit—the crack 1st Force Reconnaissance Company—he faced and passed every trial. Only the parachute jump remained.

Last week, Hamblen strapped on his "tin leg," combat gear, and chute and hurled into the sky from a helicopter 1,250 feet over California's tiny Lake O'Neill. Expertly plucking the shrouds, he guided himself to a perfect landing.

Back at the base, Hamblen explained: "I just want to be a good marine." His commanding officer felt that was an understatement. "He's a Marine's marine," said Capt. Patrick J. Ryan. Welcoming him back to the fold, Hamblen's buddies agreed it was one of the happiest landings in the history of the corps.

A Statement on Law and Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on law and race relations, issued on July 7, 1963, by 130 deans and professors of southern law schools.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT ON LAW AND RACE RELATIONS

As lawyers and law teachers in the South, we wish to call the attention of our fellow citizens to the role of law in dealing with a current and long-lasting problem.

Our country, North and South, now shares in one of the great changes in history. The readjustment of the relations of Negroes and whites here is but a minor phase of a worldwide readjustment of peoples. It is of the utmost importance that we carry forward our part of the change with the ancient virtues of wisdom and justice and moderation. An understanding of the role of law in the change can contribute something to this end.

Law is a means by which a free people advances justice and maintains order. Without it there would be either despotism or anarchy. The first paragraph of the Constitution of the United States states these twin purposes of justice and order, to "establish justice" and "insure domestic tranquillity."

The advancement of justice through law comes about at times through public protests against injustices believed to exist, as our history has often illustrated. The privilege of protest is guaranteed by the first article of the Bill of Rights which protects "the right of the people peaceably to assemble" and "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." The denial of this peaceable right by officers of the law is itself a violation of the law.

The equality of all citizens in the exercise of civil rights is guaranteed by the Constitution and by the principles of a free people on which our Government rests. The denial of equal rights to a part of our people is a violation of our law and our principles.

These matters, basic to our Government and embodied in our national law, have occasionally been obscured by the false idea that our national law may be disregarded and put aside by State officials or private citizens. The men who founded our Government perceived this danger and put into our Constitution a provision to meet it. The words of the Constitution deserve to be repeated now when some would ignore them:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Observe that the Constitution and Federal laws are made "the supreme law of the land," and that the judges in every State are bound by them "anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The idea that our national law may be disregarded has been put forward in different forms. One form is the so-called doctrine of interposition of the State between the Nation and the individual citizen. This doctrine under its old name of nullification was rejected over a hundred years ago by President Andrew Jackson. Its natural consequence, secession, led to the tragedy of the Civil War. Its uses by the 50 States today would pull our country to pieces. It is a backward doctrine that is as out of date as feudalism.

Another form the idea takes is that the 10th amendment to the Constitution reserves to the States and denies to the United States all power over local matters. The 14th amendment, however, requires the States to exercise their powers with full regard to the elements of fairness the later amendment specifies. These elements of fairness demanded by the 14th amendment include "due process of law" and "the equal protection of the laws." Whatever may be the broad powers reserved to the States by the 10th amendment, these powers must be exercised in a manner consistent with due process and equal protection.

A similar false idea recently asserted is that the invalidation of the separate-but-equal doctrine is not binding, because it is not compelled by the express words of the Constitution but only by what the Supreme Court has said the Constitution means. This argument leads on to anarchy for it implies that every person is entitled to interpret the law for himself and to act accordingly. Here again the Founding Fathers, knowing that under a system of law there must be a body with the power of final interpretation, answered the argument for anarchy by placing the power in the Supreme Court. The judicial article of the Constitution begins:

"The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court" (with

such inferior courts as Congress may establish).

It makes plain that the judicial power vested in the courts extends to the interpretation of the Constitution itself:

"The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, and the laws of the United States."

Nearly 150 years ago it was held, through Chief Justice Marshall, that the Supreme Court of the United States, not a State supreme court, is the final interpreter of national law.

Yet another form is an appeal to the terms of the statute of a State, or to a promise by a candidate in a political campaign that he would resist the enforcement of national laws he disliked. The reliance on the terms of a State statute is footless in light of the constitutional provision that the laws of the United States are the supreme law of the land. The appeal to a campaign promise is overridden by a greater oath. For the successful candidate when sworn into office takes an oath with the people as witnesses to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The official who would deny controlling effect to our national law violates his oath of office as well as our fundamental law.

Men who have taken the oath of office are under an even more manifest obligation than the ordinary citizen to observe the law. In violating the law, they inflict a grave injury to our country at home. These men inflict an even graver injury on our country abroad. They discredit it and give aid and comfort to our mortal enemies in these dangerous times. These thoughtless persons, while not in the camp of our enemies, do our enemies' work.

There is the other element of law that must be observed, "to insure domestic tranquillity." Order is no less an essential part of law than justice, and civil duties are as basis as civil rights. Lawlessness breeds lawlessness on both sides. It may quickly get out of the control of those who initiated it in a minor way and turn into uncontrolled mob violence. Those who in their zeal for change would violate the law hamper the means by which their purpose may be achieved. They, too, defeat the ideal inscribed over the building of the Supreme Court of the United States, "Equal Justice Under Law."

A Dangerous Diagnosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of September 19, 1963:

A DANGEROUS DIAGNOSIS

For a good while now the administration's economic doctors have had a simple diagnosis for many of the Nation's ills: We've just lost our old zip. If the economy could only regain its old growth rate, unemployment would dwindle and Federal budgetmakers could go back to using black ink.

Proceeding from this analysis, the Government prescribes and applies such supposed zip producers as ever-easy money and ever-rising Federal spending. Strangely, the ills they talk about refuse to go away.

What's wrong? One of the clearest answers to the question comes, oddly enough, from an economist within the Government itself. Writing in the current Federal Reserve Bulletin, Federal economist Clayton Gehman explains that the original diagnosis is faulty. Not only that; it can be downright dangerous.

In the past half dozen years the economy has been doing a lot better than its critics claim. In fact, says Mr. Gehman, "growth in U.S. economic activity in recent years has been close to long-time rates."

How can this be? Mr. Gehman would seem to be flatly contradicting the recent manpower report of the President, which noted that the annual growth rate of the Nation's goods-producing industries fell from 3.4 percent in the 1947–57 decade to 1.5 percent in the period from 1957 to 1961.

The answer chiefly lies in the way some statisticians use statistics. For one thing, this 1947–57 period reflected some unusual conditions, such as the Korean war buildup, that could not reasonably be expected to continue.

But that's not all; the 1957–61 period is a peculiar choice for economic comparisons, too. A business expansion was reaching its crest in 1957, while 1961 marked the low of a recession. So to say that the economy wasn't making headway during that period is a little like saying that a man who, in crossing the Alps, has moved from one mountain's crest to the bottom of another hasn't made much upward progress. It's quite true, but hardly significant.

For the fact is that the economy, after 1961, moved a long way toward a second crest. Extending economic statistics through 1962 and into 1963 makes the recent period look far better. Our growth rate then comes much closer to matching that of the postwar decade despite the special circumstances present in that earlier period.

If the economy has been doing so well of late, someone is sure to ask, why does it have surpluses of materials, productive capacity and—most painful of all—manpower?

The reason, as Mr. Gehman explains, is that the economy has not only been growing bigger but has been getting more efficient. This stems from more than the introduction of new automated equipment. It also results from such factors as improved control of inventories and more systematic scheduling of production. No longer are unneeded materials and products allowed to pile up so high in warehouses.

In this more efficient economy, some resources are not only unemployed. Old factories, to find a place, may have to be rebuilt; some workers will have to retrained. Easy money and big budget deficits are likely to be of little help. In any circumstances, there's a poor prescription for solid economic growth; its failure in the 1930's should have made that clear.

In the current circumstances, the prescription may only lead to increased trouble. For it is the economy's stock of unemployed resources that the Government is always citing as our protection against sharp inflation. The inflated demand, so the reasoning goes, will be easily absorbed by the unused supply of materials, manpower and factories. But the idle supply of usable, effective resources is simply not as big as it's cracked up to be; sooner then some people think, these resources can be stretched past their limit.

Still, the Government goes on administering its inflationary monetary and fiscal remedies for our ills. And things are never too hopeful for a patient whose doctor starts out with a faulty diagnosis.

Annual Orchard Picnic of Senator Byrd of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the September 17 issue of the Nashville Banner contains an editorial which strongly endorses the recent address of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] at his annual picnic at Berryville, Va. I join, Mr. President, in commending the able chairman of the Finance Committee on his eloquent address on that occasion, and ask unanimous consent that this editorial praising his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT EXTENDS POWER ON DIET OF BIG SPENDING

Every year Senator HARRY F. BYRD invites a few thousand people to a picnic in his apple orchard at his home in Berryville, Va. The 41st such event was held on the last day of last month, and the host sounded—or resounded—a warning which all Americans should heed.

In essence, he said the Federal Government is too big and too powerful, capable of consolidating and extending its controls through a program of big spending.

"The arm of the Federal Government these days," Mr. BYRD said, "has a long reach and no one is escaping the force of its centralized power. In earlier years Federal might was developed more subtly; now it grabs control openly. The Federal Government at the moment is seeking control over voting laws, State legislatures, schools and business.

"Name an area of endeavor and there is probably a Federal subsidy to go with it."

As examples of the present power complex of the administration, the Virginian cited the Presidential crackdown on the steel industry "when the Central Government made unprecedented use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal grand jury, and threats to withdraw and withhold Federal contracts from companies which dared not to conform to administration price control."

Then there was the President's recommendation that he should be authorized to cut taxes by Executive order and spend money on projects for which no appropriations had been made. Both would have been bold seizures of powers belonging only to the Congress. Fortunately, as Mr. BYRD notes, both were rejected, "but they are still being demanded."

The list of Federal encroachments into every area of American life is endless, still the Federal Government keeps pressing for more.

"Power," the Senator said, "feeds on power. And the Warren Court has equaled, if not exceeded, the executive branch in usurping and centralizing power in the Federal Government."

In between these two forces—the executive and judiciary—stands Congress, which may 1 day be freedom's court of last resort. Only a legislative body dedicated to preserving its own constitutional prerogatives can

exercise the necessary checks to curb the power-seeking branches of Government.

For as the Virginia Senator concluded: "Hope for the future—built on confidence—is the stimulating force for sound progress. But confidence is not stimulated by expanding Federal domination and control, or judicial usurpation of power, or excessive Federal spending; and we are feeling the oppression of all three."

John Pickett Displays Selfless Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, every engineering, chemistry, or physics student is familiar with the name "Pickett" in relation to his use of the slide rule. John Pickett has a most admirable history of service in the education of these future scientists in the use of this most rudimentary tool of their trade.

The following sketch will, I am sure, give you a better insight into Mr. Pickett's beliefs. I am proud to have Pickett Industries in the 29th Congressional District of California, and I recommend the reading of Mr. Pickett's story below, to all of my colleagues:

The adjective Communists most often apply to capitalism is "selfish" or one of its synonyms. This appeal is based upon a depiction of capitalists as monomaniacal, self-seeking, in depicting communism as the only political system which encourages civic responsibility and selfless dedication.

There are, of course, marvelous examples of American citizens who disprove this ridiculous charge. However, I feel it worthwhile to bring to this estimable body the example of a constituent of the 29th Congressional District, since his selfless contribution directly effects a good percentage of our college, secondary, and vocational school students and directs them along the lines of scientific and advanced intellectual learning, areas essential to the eventual victory of capitalism over communism in peaceful competition.

This man, in spite of the tremendous extent of his contribution, is only 36 years old. John Pickett began his career as a teacher. He lectured for 5 years at the University of Southern California and in that period found that there was a dangerous educational gap among many students in that they were unfamiliar with one of the rudimentary tools of science—the slide rule. Although an educator by trade he became a manufacturer by necessity.

Six years ago, John Pickett assumed the presidency of Pickett Industries and directed the primary manufacturing and sales orientation toward interesting American students in the use of the slide rule. He pioneered and blazed the trail in supplying our Nation's schools with the most modern and scientific means of teaching the use of this instrument, so symbolic of scientific learning.

Mr. Pickett has donated more than 70,000 slide rule teaching guides to educators throughout the Nation and has placed more than 30,000 wall-demonstrator slide rules on permanent loan in classrooms across the country. It is estimated that more than 2½ million students each day are aided in the learning of slide rule technique through the teaching aids he has donated.

Further, in his pursuit of raising the level and degree of education for American youth, he has inaugurated three yearly college scholarships which are presented to outstanding members of the Junior Engineering Technical Society—JETS—and contributes freely to many local and national competitions designed to encourage interest in science and mathematics.

In this, the age of the electronic computer, the slide rule remains the basic computing tool and the channel through which the eager young minds of our Nation are directed toward the future.

John Pickett has not left his chosen field—education. He has merely expanded the scope of his impact upon our Nation's youth and, in so doing, has demonstrated the strength of democratic capitalism—that individual enterprise and generosity of a free populace is more than a match for the institutionalized "benevolence" of a totalitarian government.

Trend Against Welfarism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial by John Chamberlain entitled "Trend Against Welfarism," which appeared in the Knoxville Journal of September 11. The suggestions it mentions might well be considered in order to avoid the continuing shocks of our "anti-bureaucratic nerve."

The editorial follows:

TREND AGAINST WELFARISM

(By John Chamberlain)

Every day now the evidence accumulates that the Goldwater movement is outpacing the desires of Republican politicians to confine it to the point where it can be headed off. GOLDWATER has manifestly become the beneficiary of some deep-running tides. And when and if the Arizona Senator does finally achieve "mandate" status within his own party, it will be because of a revulsion against the compulsory features of the welfare state that is becoming more and more pronounced all over the western world.

The trend against compulsory welfarism extends far beyond party considerations. When a neo-socialist intellectual such as Irving Kristol writes in Harper's magazine that "I can hardly pick up a newspaper these days without my anti-bureaucratic nerve being given a shock," it has no bearing in itself no possible election day statistics. Kristol would assuredly vote against GOLDWATER anyway. But when the man goes on to say that "after years of experience with New York's subway system, I am not at all averse to seeing it owned and operated by General Motors," it is a sign that the State welfarist faith has been fatally sapped. If the intellectuals will no longer defend compulsory wefarism, it means that the tides of fashion will be soon flowing in an individualist direction. Kristol's defection means that people he has never heard of will be voting for GOLDWATER or another conservative.

The fact that there is an anti-compulsion tide is rather definitely proved by a poll taken recently in England by an organization known as Mass Observation for the Institute of Economic Affairs, Ltd. Using Gallup techniques, the Mass Observation pollsters sought to determine attitudes toward compulsory state welfarism in the three services of education, health, and pension. The questionnaire about preferences was submitted to a board spectrum of conservatives, liberals, and laborites, with results that seemed to cut across both class and party affiliations.

What has surprised the British politicians, both Conservative and Labor, is that the interest in maintaining and increasing the scope of private services is so decidedly general. Assuming that the Mass Observation cross-section constitutes an accurate sample of the population, more than half the people in Britain would like to have a free choice in personal selection of doctors, schools, and pension insurance.

The questionnaire uncovered a deep interest in the old British idea of "contracting out." This would be facilitated by allowing the taxpayer to receive his due portion of education and health vouchers, cashable at choice for services without regard to their public or private origin. The family with a health voucher might elect to continue with the doctors provided by the National Health Service. But if the family preferred a private doctor, or a private bed in a private hospital, the State voucher, paid for out of taxes, would be just as good as money in giving the family its choice.

The idea of educational vouchers has been suggested in the United States by economist Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. It has been taken up by BARRY GOLDWATER as a feasible way of providing Federal aid to education without incurring the risk of Federal interference in local school or college politics. The voucher idea, applied to social security, would enable individuals to choose at will between Federal old-age assistance or private insurance.

Since the voucher idea has been offered in America by rightwingers, it has had little fashionable support among the intellectuals who have set the tone for welfarism for three decades. But if more than half the people in Britain support voucher choice, which would effectively end the State monopoly of health, education, and pension facilities, the idea is to take on more fashionable overtones on this side of the ocean. We like ideas that come to us with a foreign cachet. And an Irving Kirstol, who is ready to turn the New York City subway system over to General Motors on the ground that it would be "a lot easier for the city to regulate GM than it is for me to regulate New York City," could hardly oppose the extension of the free choice voucher idea to health and education fields.

The Western World is not ready to dispense with Government aid to the unfortunate. But a tide is demonstrably setting in against compelling everybody to depend on the Government for welfare services. GOLDWATER is one of the first of our important political figures to realize that the idea of "contracting out" offers a way of maintaining both the independence and the security of society. If he keeps plugging the issue he could be well on his way to the White House.

The Union With a Difference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an article entitled "The Union With a Difference," by the distinguished actor and president of Actors' Equity, Ralph Bellamy. The article appeared in the June issue of the American Federationist following National Actors' Week, May 20–26, 1963, which commemorated the 50th anniversary of the Actors' Equity. The actors' struggle for recognition as a part of society, "not apart from it," and the subsequent accomplishments of the Actors' Equity are worthy of consideration by the House.

It is with a belief in the importance of Ralph Bellamy's enlightening article, that I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE UNION WITH A DIFFERENCE

(By Ralph Bellamy)

The performer shares with his brothers the aspirations common to most men: the desire to get fair recompense for his skills and labor; the wish to live in dignity and the freedom to express his thoughts and feelings. We know, of course, that actors' names make news and because some are attracted to the performing arts by a need to exhibit themselves with no real understanding of the investment of time and toil required, we often find ourselves judged collectively by the widely publicized exploits of a few.

But each profession has its occupational hazards and that is one of ours. There are many more, the greatest of which is unemployment. The Actors' Equity Association often has been called the union with a difference. The reason it has, I think, is because our problems are unique and because we have managed to meet them with a fair amount of success. Nowhere today in the American labor force, excepting perhaps the desperate and deplorable circumstances facing the miners of West Virginia, is there greater supply and less demand than in the American theater.

But while our economic foundations are still shaky, we have at least proven the right to be judged as individuals on the merits of our work, to be part of our society, not apart from it. This wasn't always true. As recently as the beginning of the 18th century, actors were lumped with thieves and prostitutes. Acting actually was illegal in Puritan America; and one man in New York was prohibited from acting in his own theater after being allowed by the authorities to spend every nickel he had building it.

By the time Equity was organized in 1913, the situation was somewhat better. Perhaps the real turning point came with the knighting of Henry Irving by the proper Queen Victoria. But the average American actor could take little comfort in the esteem in which a few of his fellows were held.

When Equity's star began to glimmer on the theatrical horizon on May 26, 1913, the economic fortunes of actors in the American theater were at a low ebb. The preceding 20 years had seen control of the theater pass from their hands into those of a group of producing managers largely recruited from business and dedicated to the proposition that theater meant real estate. Quick profits were the order of the day, with no concern for long-range planning, artistic achievement, or the general welfare of the profession.

Occasional attempts to correct the widespread abuses had not met with success and Equity was formed. Its initial aims were modest, its manners were good, its voice polite and modulated. It asked to be recognized as the bargaining agent of the actors and that a standard contract be negotiated. It took more than 4 years of patient and frustrating bargaining to achieve a contract that included even a limit to free rehearsals, guaranteed payment for work already performed, and notice in case of dismissal.

Almost before the union could savor the full flavor of this victory it went gurgling down the drain. The Nation became involved in the first World War. Not all the fighting was in Europe; the Producing Managers Association, which represented management, took up the cudgels and began battling among themselves. Things in the theater went from bad to worse and Equity's efforts during the domestic crisis had annoyed the managers, who now were determined to set aside the contract and break the fledgling organization before it became too troublesome. The famous strike of 1919 resulted.

Many believed that actors would never stick together, more were certain they would not maintain allegiance to a labor union since performers always prided themselves as artists and have been known for their individuality. Effective group action was considered a remote possibility. The main issue of the 1919 strike was recognition of Equity as the bargaining agent for the actors although there were other issues, too. The strike lasted 30 days, beginning on August 7, 1919, and ending September 6. In that month, theaters in 8 cities were affected, 37 plays closed, 16 others scheduled to open did not. Supported by the International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees and the American Federation of Musicians, Equity found in September that its membership had increased from 2,700 to about 14,000. Its treasury, which had held $13,500 when the strike began, increased to $120,000 despite the expenditure of over $5,000 daily.

All familiar with the labor movement realize its founders have, at one time or another, risked their jobs, their careers, their very livelihoods, because they believed the dignity of the American workingman is indivisible from the welfare of the country as a whole. So it was with us.

As performers, our world and our concepts have expanded since our founding in 1913 and our theater has grown, too; and with it, the actor and his talents and his goals. The spirit of equity is today woven into the broad fabric of the American theater at every level and in every place. While equity is not an international union in the accepted sense, we now have branch offices in Los Angeles, Chicago, Toronto, and San Francisco, in addition to headquarters in New York City.

Every union has its own topography of progress. For us, the peaks perhaps are represented by the impact Equity has made in the field of race relations. We take pride in the fact that every contract which Equity administers clearly stipulates that the union's members may not be required to perform in any place where segregation or discrimination based on race, creed or color exists either on stage or in the audience.

We take pride, too, in being the first American labor union to agree upon impartial arbitration as binding settlement of disputes arising from interpretations of our basic contract. And we are quick to protect not only our own members in their just grievances, but to remind them when necessary that a contractual obligation is a two-way street which we as well as our employers are expected to travel.

Like other American unionists, the actor has learned that the hard-won benefits gained at the bargaining table often can be lost or lessened by actions taken in Washington and in his State capital. He also knows he has not only a right but a duty to speak up and make his voice heard on matters affecting his way of life as a citizen and as a member of the acting profession.

In 1961, now retired Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote in a Supreme Court decision: "The notion that economic and political concerns are separable is pre-Victorian * * *. It is not true in life that political protection is irrelevant to and insulated from economic interest. It is not true for industry or finance. Neither is it true for labor." The Equity member—through his union—participates in the great day-by-day debate that characterizes our democracy. In the State capitals, in city hall, in Washington, we present the case for the American actor and in so doing we hope to insure that future generations will benefit from a vibrant professional theater in America.

First and foremost, Equity has sought to impress our State and National Governments with the fact that as leisure time increases for all Americans, as the cold war continues as a battle for men's minds, as newly developing nations look to the West for cultural as well as scientific leadership, America must look to the needs of our performing artists. While other Western democracies actively encourage and financially support their cultural institutions, our State and National Governments often have discouraged American artists by ignoring their distinctive economic problems.

We hear, for example, a great deal about the high salaries received by some of our most famous stars. We hear very little about the many thousands of professional actors and actresses who average less than $80 per week. Few stop to consider that the high-salaried star usually earns his money in a very short time. The actor has no job security. Between shows he has no income.

Thus the actor's income is typified by drastic fluctuation. And in the year in which he makes a good salary he is taxed to the hilt. Little is left him for the many lean years that typify his profession. He cannot spread his good income over the bad years like a businessman can spread his profits. It makes no difference to the tax collector that the actor was unemployed for a long period before he landed a decent role. Nor does it impress him that the same actor may be unemployed again next year when his current hit has closed.

Thus the actor suffers the consequences of what is known as "bunched income." A few years ago, 10 starring actors, acquaintances of mine, figured out their average incomes over a 5-year period. They found their average annual income from the theater was under $6,000. Less than $6,000 a year earned by 10 major stars. And yet, during their irregular earning periods, they paid taxes applying to incomes considerably in excess of the $6,000.

Actors' Equity has sought to impress Congress with the inequities of this tax situation which hits athletes, farmers, and ranchers just as severely as the actor. In his 1963 tax message to Congress, President Kennedy took note of the unequal tax burden borne by those whose incomes fluctuate greatly and he has recommended long overdue reforms. His proposal in this area has received the endorsement of organized labor and the full support of Actors' Equity.

The special conditions of the acting profession have given rise to another situation that places the actor at a serious disadvantage. Because of the manner in which our unemployment system is constructed, the person who works in many States, who travels from one job to another (as does the actor) often is deprived of unemployment benefits because he does not work long enough in one State's jurisdiction to qualify for such insurance. The performer is

placed at a serious disadvantage because of this and Actor's Equity is working with sympathetic legislators and Governors to correct a deficiency in our Nation's unemployment compensation program that affects not only the actor but all itinerant workers.

I could go on listing the many areas of government activity that have an effect upon the working conditions of the American performer—from immigration laws to copyright. From our cultural exchange program to urban renewal programs that provide for the construction of new theaters and cultural centers, Actors' Equity is making the voice of the American actor heard. In so doing, we are allied with the cause of many millions of American working men and women who will benefit along with the performer from the legislative reforms we seek.

The history of the American labor movement has been one of steady progress in achieving for the American worker more of the fruits of his labor. Many of us have higher wages and more time spent away from the machine to enjoy the better things of life. Properly administered technological advancements and trade union achievements are daily bringing more leisure time to many—more time to spend with families, to be outdoors, to enjoy our favorite sports, to attend the theater and experience the great plays of past and present.

But just as more parks and athletic facilities are needed, so, too, our Nation sorely needs more theaters and more professional acting companies. Unless we provide the means by which leisure time can be used constructively and healthfully, the gains won by the American labor movement will be debased in value. Leisure time, the long-sought goal, will become the mockery warned against by Emerson, a time "to saunter and sit and be inferior and silly."

It is the job of Equity to try to insure that the American worker will have a sufficient number of good theaters to satisfy his leisure time requirements and that he will have quality professional theater in abundance so the time he spends in the theater will be enriching and rewarding. At present, there are more theatergoers in our country than golfers, skiers, boaters, and skindivers combined. The American public increased its spending on cultural activities by 100 percent between 1953 and 1960. This is six times the growth in spending on spectator sports and twice the percentage increase in spending for all recreational activity combined. Equity wants the American people to get their money's worth.

The art of the theater, like a craftsman's work in the machine shop, cannot be produced by unskilled, untrained amateur hobbyists. Training and the experience of many years on the job are the necessary ingredients for a topflight performance on the stage, just as on the assembly line.

Equity seeks to maintain the standards of the acting profession by protecting the professional from substandard working conditions and by seeking to improve his economic position so he may earn his living from his art and devote his full time to his profession. The amateur group, the hobby actors, certainly have their place. The insights one receives from participating in theatrical activity, even on an amateur level, helps one to enjoy more thoroughly the work of the professional and amateur groups are encouraged by Equity. However, the American public must not be misled into being satisfied with less than professional quality.

Equity believes most Americans want the best. We want to maintain the highest quality in our profession and to see that Equity's standards are maintained in the American theater.

As the goal of more leisure time is achieved by the American labor movement, the unions are faced with a new challenge: To insure that the American worker will have the means by which he can employ his leisure hours to enrich his life. We have learned that the production of wealth is a technique which American labor has mastered. But the proper use of wealth is an art which can and should be appreciated by all working men and women. Material goods are not the ultimate goals of human life. The great lesson which the organized labor movement has yet to bring to the American worker is that a people cannot be fully civilized until the economy is the servant of the people's culture and not the master.

Another National Manufacturer Raises Prices Under California Fair Trade Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in Unimart, a trade publication published in Long Beach, Calif., in September 1963.

That article very well points out the loss to consumers from enactment of the quality stabilization bills, H.R. 3669 and S. 774, now pending before the Congress.

ANOTHER NATIONAL MANUFACTURER RAISES PRICES UNDER CALIFORNIA FAIR TRADE LAWS

Unimart has consistently fought California's fair trade laws because price fixing is inconsistent with free enterprise and damages the consumer's paycheck.

Unimart regrets to announce in this issue that Bell & Howell, nationally known photo equipment manufacturer, has elected to fair trade certain items beginning last August 19. In so doing, Bell & Howell products join a limited number of other nationally advertised brands now being fair traded.

As a matter of convenience, Unimart carries a select number of these items. Here is a list of fair-traded merchandise found in Unimart, now sold at full retail:

Clairol, Timex, Corning Ware, Parker pens, Remington (rifles only), Winchester (rifles only), Max Factor, Helena Rubenstein, Coty, Matchabelli, Tussy.

If these companies would decide to compete in a free and open marketplace, then Unimart could legally sell these same lines at this approximate percentage savings:

Clairol, 20 to 30 percent less; Timex, at least 25 percent less; Corning Ware, 25 percent less; Parker pens, 25 percent less; Remington rifles, 10 to 15 percent less; Winchester rifles, 10 to 15 percent less; Max Factor, 20 percent less; Helena Rubinstein, 20 percent less; Coty, 20 percent less; Matchabelli, 20 percent less; Tussy, 20 percent less.

A case in point: Unimart has always carried Gillette at a high fixed fair-trade price for convenience of members. And we have so notified the membership that we opposed being forced to sell 20 blades for $1. Gillette last month dropped fair trade. Unimart now sells the 20 blades for 67 cents.

Unimart has been selling the Bell & Howell movie projector 266-Y at $119.88. Under fair trade the new price is fixed and Unimart should sell at $139.

Unimart regrets the addition of another manufacturer to the ranks of fair trade in California and simply reports Bell & Howell's action as a matter of record. This manufacturer, like the others, has the legal right to fair trade (demand retailers to sell at high fixed prices). Unimart is in complete disagreement with this law and hopes some day that it will be declared unconstitutional, as it has been in approximately 25 other States, during the past 5 years, or some day will be repealed by public referendum.

Whither Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, to win the war and lose the peace may well be an oversimplification of the extremely critical situation confronting us in South Vietnam today. However, the military initiative that our defense and intelligence people feel we had gained before the Buddhist problem erupted could certainly be offset and reversed if the people of South Vietnam continue to be governed by a dynasty totally unresponsive to their will and basic needs; by a government which, in fact, represses the very fundamentals which the Communist guerrillas seek to exploit.

Furthermore, the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from any war waged with revolutionary guerrillas is that it cannot be won on the battlefields alone. To be sure, a monumental military effort might resolve, temporarily at least, the physical conflict. But the final battle must be won in the hearts and minds, not by the weapons of men.

My committee assignment to the Far East, including South Vietnam, in November and December of 1962 alerted me to the serious and delicate problems which face us in this sorely troubled land. It was clear then to those of us who witnessed it, as it is abundantly evident now, that in spite of our valiant military assistance efforts, the key to the solution lies in achieving political stability; a stability which will only become possible when the government becomes more responsive and broadly based.

There is, of course, no easy or ready solution to this monumental task. Each path is frought with serious complications. To cut off, or even substantially reduce our aid could hand the Viet Cong its desired victory, and loss of South Vietnam to the Communists would clearly menace neighboring Thailand and Cambodia. It would send Communist Chinese pressures coursing through Malaya, it would open a backdoor into India, it would threaten the Philippines and even Australia. In brief, Western interests, and indeed freedom in all southeast Asia, would be imperiled.

On the other hand, to continue financial and military support without pressures on the Diem government to at least curtail its repressions, and hopefully to become more responsive to popular will, can only dim the will of a valiant people and violate our own proud ideals.

The distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, has suggested in a recent article that—

The United States cannot renounce unilaterally our commitment. We must hold on and wait until there is a fundamental change in the power politics of southern Asia.

Mr. Lippmann continues thoughtfully:

For if ever North Vietnam becomes, like Yugoslavia, no longer the satellite and agent of a great Communist power, there will be opened up possibilities of a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia.

This frank, realistic appraisal is certainly not the only approach which can be taken or which should be considered. It is, however, logical and thought provoking and deserves our serious attention.

The article follows:

WHITHER VIETNAM?

(By Walter Lippmann)

After a number of false starts and altogether too much talking, the administration seems to have come to the conclusion that in Vietnam the only practical policy is to wait and see. It is a sound conclusion. No dramatic solution is possible. There is no way to make over Diem's government in Saigon or to produce a new government which will be so beloved by the people that they will fight and die for it. There is at the same time no way in which Washington could disentangle itself in South Vietnam without inviting some kind of disastrous landslide in southeast Asia. We have, therefore, no choice but to stay in South Vietnam and continue to subsidize and support Diem's government, exercising such influence as we can.

And so, while I have always thought it was a mistake to become engaged in southeast Asia, while it is evident that we have made many mistakes in dealing with Diem, we must, I believe, stay with him and his family for the indefinite future. The United States cannot renounce unilaterally our commitment. We must hold on and wait—wait, I should imagine, until there is a fundamental change in the power politics of southern Asia.

If I may venture to say more specifically what it is that we must wait for, it would be the opening up of the rift, which already exists, between North Vietnam and Red China, between Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. In other words, just as the security and peace of the Balkan Peninsula in Europe became possible after Tito's break with Stalin, so the pacification of the Indochinese peninsula depends on some similar development in North Vietnam. For if ever North Vietnam becomes, like Yugoslavia, no longer the satellite and agent of a great Communist power, there will be opened up possibilities of a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia.

Quite evidently, there has been no such break between Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But such a break is possible. There is a historic fear in Vietnam of Chinese occupation based on the experience of many centuries. Such ancient national feelings can at times prove to be more potent than the rather recent ideological bonds. It is an important interest of the whole non-Chinese world, not only ourselves but also the Russians, the French, the British, and the Indians, to do what we can—but to do it very discreetly—to induce a change of front in North Vietnam.

Of all forms of prophecy the most foolish that a newspaperman can indulge in is to guess when something is going to happen. As regards the Sino-Soviet break, the pace of events in Asia has been much faster than any of us, even though we have long expected the break, had dared to hope. In these matters it is possible to be too timid.

It may be that the trigger which would release Titoist nationalism in North Vietnam would be a large-scale Chinese aggression against India. For this would precipitate a military adventure which left Peiping with little surplus energy and power to hold Vietnam in line.

It may well be, indeed it is probable, that China, though it is preparing to invade India as Mr. Joseph Alsop has reported so circumstantially, may pause. For it must know that the United States, and possibly the Soviet Union too, would intervene. But as long as Red China is mobilized and poised for a large attack on India, the other border states including North Vietnam have a certain freedom of maneuver.

We must not expect too much too soon, and in the meantime we had better go on holding not only President Diem's hand but also that of Madame Nhu. While this may not be a very satifsying or attractive thing to be doing, we must leave it to the historians to decide how we got there, and whether the trip was necessary.

Fair Trade Rises Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of September 10, 1963, chronicling the evils of the quality stabilization bill so detrimental to the consumer and the American economy alike:

FAIR TRADE RISES AGAIN

A bill to permit price fixing on a national basis appears surprisingly to have a clear track through Congress, for want of opposition.

The old fair-trade proposition is dolled up under a new name—quality stabilization. The new name is just as deceptive as the old. Fair trade is not fair to anyone except the price fixer, and the current measure would not stabilize anything but price fixing.

The bill would authorize manufacturers or suppliers to fix the price of any item bearing a brand name or trademark. No retailer would then be permitted to sell that item at less than the fixed price.

To the extent manufacturers and suppliers chose to apply their price-fixing power, this measure would put an end to the bargain sale, the cutrate store, and the discount house.

The proposal is being promoted in the name of saving small business. Actually it would give big business the power of life or death over small business, for big business would have control over prices. Only a business large enough to produce or obtain goods under its own brand name or trademark would be able to engage in price competition. All others would have to accept the prices set at the top.

Quality stabilization is promoted as something to protect the consumer. It would protect him from price competition and the benefits of having a wide range of goods from which to choose.

What the promoters declare as their objective is a situation in which a person who pays 49 cents for a toothbrush will always get precisely the same quality of toothbrush. They say this will guard the consumer against variations in the quality of a 49-cent toothbrush. It will also guard against the possibility that someone might offer for sale a better toothbrush for the same 49 cents. This is the way in which the measure would stifle price competition.

The consumer is best protected by free and open competition. This gives him the widest choice of goods and prices. It is with the widest choice that the consumer can set the best pattern of the kinds of things he wants for what he is willing and able to pay. Whatever limits his choices, in the name of fair trade or stabilization or something else, forces him toward acceptance of a pattern set by someone else.

It is said that "you get what you pay for." This is partly true, but only partly. Some people want one thing for their money and some want another. Why shouldn't they be allowed to choose according to their tastes? Some are willing to sell at one price and some are willing to sell at another. Why shouldn't they, too, be allowed their choice?

The quality stabilization bill goes against the grain of the American free enterprise system. It should be defeated. To set the matter straight, people should let their representatives in Congress know how they feel about the freedom to shop around for a good bargain.

The Test Ban Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following carefully reasoned editorial, appearing in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram, below:

THE TEST BAN GAMBLE

Reaching the peroration of an impassioned speech supporting the test ban treaty, a Congressman this week asked: Does anybody think the President wants an agreement that will sell the country down the river?

Only a political paranoiac would answer yes to that question. Judgment, not loyalty, is in dispute.

From every indication, the overwhelming majority of the Senate and the public accept the administration's judgment in this matter. But many persons are uneasy, doubtful.

The opposition to the treaty includes scientists, military men, and political figures of intelligence and integrity who are well-informed in the fields of national security and nuclear weapons. Many of the supporters, meanwhile, express misgivings and reservations.

Although nobody, of course, thinks there is a deliberate plot to "sell the country down the river," there is a strong possibility that the test ban treaty could have that effect.

We have been troubled by the ambiguities and contradictions in official statements over the past several months. The same people who say now that the treaty must be signed were telling the public such a short time ago that a treaty such as this was unthinkable.

Last February, for example, we attended a State Department briefing conference at which Secretary Rusk answered questions on the subject of a nuclear treaty. We find it interesting to review our report of that interview, published here on February 15:

"Secretary Rusk, in an on-the-record news conference, was questioned about the progress of test ban negotiations. He stated that the United States cannot engage with Russia in a test ban treaty which depends on trust

and good faith. Under such a treaty Russia would have nothing to fear, but the United States obviously would. (Mr. Rusk's remark.) Said Mr. Rusk: 'We need mechanisms of assurance.' Our impression is that the administration does not intend to accept any treaty which lacks such mechanisms.

"These clarifications are very helpful in evaluating the conduct of foreign policy."

What seemed clear then has become quite confused, for now, only 7 months later, Mr. Rusk is asking the Senate and the Nation to accept a treaty which does depend to a large extent on trust and good faith. The treaty says nothing about inspections; it trusts that Russia would give the 3-month notice in case of withdrawal.

Still unreconciled, meanwhile, are two administration statements regarding the ability of this country to stand ready indefinitely to test on a moment's notice: A few months ago the public was told that in a free society this is impossible; today the public is assured that it is possible.

The test ban treaty will pass the Senate and became an official agreement. But the record shows clearly that it is a calculated risk, a gamble.

If the leadership has made the wrong gamble, the possible consequences are too grave to think about on a bright September day.

The Future of Toll Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call attention to the editorial in the Septembear 15, 1963, issue of the Chicago's American:

THE FUTURE OF TOLL ROADS

We have a good deal of respect for Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio, but we think he and all other Members of Congress should be interested in forming an idea of what to do about toll roads eventually instead of fervently opposing proposals that the Federal Government take over the Chicago Skyway and make it a freeway.

We agree with LAUSCHE that poor judgment was used and overenthusiasm indulged in by city officials in planning and building the skyway. But the fact is that the structure is finished and will have to be turned into a freeway eventually or else shut down and left to weather away. And the idea that the Federal Government would be the logical buyer is sustained by the fact that the 7½ miles of skyway already have been incorporated in the Federal network of highways.

The poor judgment of officials in building the skyway consisted in their optimistic belief that auto drivers would just as soon pay tolls as not. From the first, drivers demonstrated that they would not. The skyway offered them a chance to hurdle over the congested traffic of the southeast side, but it cost, at first, a quarter a trip.

If a man used it to drive to and from work 5 days a week it added $2.50 a week to his fixed expenses. Public officials thought the man wouldn't mind, but naturally he did—or his wife did. In general, he chose to worm his way through surface traffic and save the $2.50. And, instead of lowering charges on the skyway when income fell off, as this newspaper advised them to, officials raised the charges to 30 cents a trip, thus thinning out users still further.

The city now has defaulted on its interest payments and the bondholders are operating the skyway. Their chances of making the motorists like paying tolls on it don't seem any better than the city's were. And the Illinois tollways are also suffering seriously from the public's reluctance to pay for the use of highways if there is an alternative. The opening of the Dan Ryan expressway south from a junction with the Northwest expressway has drained a lot of traffic off of the Tri-State tollway, which was used by cars and trucks from the north to bypass Chicago. Edens expressway, Northwest expressway, and Dan Ryan expressway also provide a fast passage around central Chicago—and they are free. The tollways have lost business in other areas too, and the upshot is that the entire system will raise its rates on October 1.

Passenger cars are now paying 2 cents a mile; they will be raised to 2¼ cents. Truck charges are graduated; they will be raised too. Francis S. Lorenz, State director of public works, says these raises are needed to take care of $41 million of revenue bonds still outstanding. But he predicts that, by 1972, when interstate freeways will be completed, that the freeways will be overcrowded and "passenger and truck traffic will need the turnpikes and will pay for their superior facilities."

One trouble with that argument is the fact that a tollway is in no respect superior to a free four-lane expressway. The expressway is likely to be exactly like the tollway except that it won't have any toll collection booths. So the only way to insure the tollways of enough revenue to enable them to pay off their indebtedness eventually is to refrain from building parallel superhighways—and Congress and the various State governments should start deciding now whether to favor the toll roads by starving the free ones.

Their course will not be popular if they do, as the history of toll roads in America makes clear. Before there were enough railroads in America to handle the available traffic, toll roads were built in various parts of the East.

And the traveling public quickly developed a measure of its own against paying tolls on the turnpikes. People deliberately drove off the toll roads to make new roads paralleling them across open country; and they had a name for these avoidance roads. They called them "shunpikes," as expressive a utility word as the English language has ever produced.

Senator LAUSCHE thinks it would be "immoral" for the United States to pay $63,838,000 for the skyway, which would be the 90 percent of its cost that the Federal Government would have paid had the roadway been built as part of the Interstate System under Federal auspices.

We think the struggle between toll roads and free roads is just beginning and that, sooner or later, chances are most of the toll roads will be taken over, one way or another, as free expressways. And we think Senator LAUSCHE and others in authority should be considering a solution to this conflict that will prevent it from wrecking the fine highway system the Nation had just started to create.

The Late Honorable Leon Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN was elected to the 78th Congress. He and I entered Congress together and I have known him quite well throughout the time he served in this body. For a number of years both of us have been members of the House Armed Services Committee. These associations have given me an opportunity to become well acquainted with him and to understand and appreciate his many outstanding qualities.

LEON GAVIN was an honorable man. He was an uncompromising enemy of graft and corruption in any form and was one of the leaders in the House in opposition to waste and extravagance in the operation of the Federal Government.

LEON was a fighter and a very articulate advocate of principles of good government which he espoused. At the same time, he was very humble and took more than a passing interest in the little things in the lives of the people with whom he was associated. He was indeed a beloved character who fought the good fight and achieved and deserved the plaudits, the admiration and respect of all his colleagues. I extend to the family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Immorality in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the October issue of Farm Journal carries an editorial entitled "Immorality in Washington," which deserves the attention of all Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial is largely an excerpt from a talk given on September 5 in San Francisco by Mr. Edward P. Neilan, the new president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In my opinion, Mr. Neilan strikes at one of the greatest problems and dangers facing our country—not excepting the threat of communism. This is the continually expanding bureaucracy and the spending which accompanies the function of nearly every Federal agency. This not only threatens the financial security of our country, but can only lead to government by bureaucratic decree, rather than government by the people. You say this is impossible? I most sincerely hope this is correct, but it will only be true if the people demand that their representatives approve expenditures of public funds for sound and necessary Federal functions.

We must recognize that there are certain functions of Federal Government that are necessary—that are provided for by our Constitution—and cannot be filled by any other level of government. The first of these, of course, is national defense. While I think there is a lot of fat in defense spending, and a lot of politics in the location of defense establishments, I believe we must maintain our defense capabilty at the highest pos-

sible level. May I say I believe this is critical at this particular time? We are about to approve a nuclear test ban treaty agreement with the Soviet Union. While I think we have little choice about entering into this agreement because I believe we must try to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, we must keep in mind that we are dealing with Communists. They will agree to anything that is to their temporary or permanent advantage and we must be alert to the possibility of this being just another instance where they are playing for time. It also must be remembered that the removal of the threat of war, where at present we do have the advantage, leaves the Communists with a free hand to pursue the expansion of communism by political and economic means.

Members of Congress will generally represent the feeling of their constituents. If they do not, they will soon fail to be reelected. Therefore the responsibility for which way our country goes—fiscal sanity or "Let's get our share—what do we care about the future?" irresponsibility—is up to the people. Let us analyze spending by the Federal Government in our respective States and localities as to whether it is a sound improvement, whether it will increase the opportunities for more jobs and economic expansion, whether this would be a sound expenditure of State or local funds, and in the final analysis—whether it is a proper function and responsibility of Federal Government, and could not be done by the State.

There is no magic about the source of funds in the U.S. Treasury. This money is collected from taxpayers—mostly low and medium-income people. This money is also borrowed, and it is worth remembering that the interest on our national debt is the second highest item of Federal expense. For 1964, the budget estimate is $10,020,000 for interest alone. In asking for the expenditure of Federal funds in our localities, we must realize we are asking for the return of some of our own money. We should be giving more thought to how we could best improve our own capacity to pay from the local and State level for such services we are now receiving from Federal agencies. Is it not obvious that a reduction in Federal taxes would leave more taxpaying potential with local people? It should be obvious, too, that taxes spent by and under the direction of local officials usually go further than Federal funds.

Now we in Congress are faced with the question of approving or rejecting the President's proposal to reduce Federal income taxes. First off, most people are going to say this is just what the country needs. With this I can heartily agree. The President, however, has only given lipservice to a reduction in Federal expenditures. We in Congress are, therefore, faced with the proposition of whether or not to approve the much-needed, but politically inspired tax reduction in the face of announced intention by the administration to continue Federal spending beyond Federal income. This does not make sound fiscal sense and the greatest disservice of all is to low-income people and people living on pensions and annuities, who will be the first to feel the inevitable further inflation of more deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, the decisions Members of Congress make in the next few weeks on tax legislation could be the most important for the future of our country that any Member ever makes during the time he serves in Washington. Personally, I do not intend to vote for Federal tax reduction without a corresponding reduction in Federal spending. I think a majority of Members feel inclined to vote the same way. An indication from the people back home that this is the way they want their Congressman to vote would provide some gratifying and helpful moral support.

The editorial follows:

IMMORALITY IN WASHINGTON

We had some other editorials written for this issue but when we read the speech given September 5 in San Francisco by Edwin P. Neilan, the new president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, we felt it deserved print in Farm Journal. Because we agree so heartily with Mr. Neilan, we give the rest of this page to excerpts from his talk:

"Four weeks ago I made a speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. I said that too many of our Senators and Congressmen have become 'bag men' for their constituents, that the voters either tolerate or insist upon the reckless spending of money for self-serving local projects. I pointed out that we are entering upon a national election campaign in which the party in power has more tax money to spend than at any previous time in history, and more ways to spend it. I suggested that unless there is a great national awakening of the public conscience the 1964 election could well turn into the greatest auction sale of all time. I said then, and I say now, that using taxpayers' money primarily to buy political power is immoral.

"This is not an indictment of any one party. It is a bill of particulars against the voter who puts a price tag on his ballot and the politician who seduces the voter with Federal subsidies.

"The reaction in Washington was violent and prolonged. Some of the politicians said I was too simpleminded to understand how things are done. I was told, in effect, to sit down and shut up. * * *

"Let's take a look at this money the Federal spenders have in their giveaway bag. It represents the hard work of 180 million Americans, many of whom are struggling to feed their families, put their kids through school, and care for themselves in their old age. And yet the spenders throw it away like rich men's sons on a spree, confident that the supply is inexhaustible. * * * Don't turn off the golden spigot, they say. 'The money is there, get rid of it.'

"Thus a Federal agency that finds itself with unspent funds rushes out to find a project, any project, that will empty the till by June 30, so that next year's budget can be increased, not cut back. * * *

"Federal spenders go from town to town hawking their programs. 'Get it while you can.' 'Get it before someone else does.' And sometimes, when they can't find a need, they say 'Take it anyway.' * * *

"Of all the Federal agencies that spend without justification, the Area Redevelopment Administration, with its program of aid to so-called depressed areas, should top anybody's list. That agency operates on the theory that any kind of Federal spending is good spending and its out to get another $455 million from Congress. * * *

"Isn't it time we stopped ignoring political immorality as an incurable disease? Isn't it time we had the same code of ethics for the officeholder as we ask of the voter? The Internal Revenue Service takes a deep interest in the way each of us spends his money. But look what they do with it when they get it. They turn it over to the spenders and from there on it's every polition for himself. Isn't it logical to demand the same strict accountability of the spenders as the tax collectors demands of us?"

"It's time we stopped brushing this scandal under the rug, time we opened our eyes to the corrupting immorality of vote buying. We get the kind of government we deserve. Only you and I hold the power to curb the spenders. In the next election, what are you going to do with your ballot?"

Dr. Possony's Grim Assessment of the Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following current assessment of the partial test ban treaty written by the eminent Dr. Stefan T. Possony, of the Hoover Institution, on war, revolution, and peace has come into my hands. The document referred to in Dr. Possony's last paragraph appears in the RECORD for August 14, at page 14228:

STATEMENT ON PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

(By Dr. Stefan T. Possony)

Whatever the tactical-political motivations may have been that induced Khrushchev to sign the limited test ban treaty, this treaty must be considered to be a move in Soviet strategy, just as it is a move in U.S. strategy.

Through the test ban treaty, and purely unilaterally speaking, the United States hopes to further its strategic interests by slowing down the speed of technological change and to reduce the danger of aggression. But what is the strategic expectation of the Soviet Union?

On the assumption that Mr. Harriman is correct and that, as he explained in his recent interview with Mr. Hearst, Soviet long-range intentions have not changed, Soviet strategy must aim ultimately at defeating, or otherwise neutralizing or eliminating, the United States. If Mr. Harriman's assessment is correct (and I believe firmly that it is correct), it must be deduced that the test ban treaty will not, in the minds of Kremlin leaders, be in contradiction to this objective, let alone prevent its accomplishment.

Yet it is most unlikely that the same treaty can be simultaneously profitable to two different strategies, one of which aims at deterrence of Communist expansion and aggression, the other at the overthrow and neutralization of the United States, presently the strongest military power on earth.

This paradox cannot be resolved by the subterfuge argument that the Soviet Union has forsworn the use of military means for the furtherance of its strategic objectives. There is no evidence that the Communists have abandoned, in any meaningful way, their age-old doctrine on violence and war; nor could they do this without abandoning their creed altogether. By contrast, ample and substantial evidence exists that they are using "peace policy" as a well-planned deception and that they are, as a deliberate tactic, abusing honest pacifists.

Even if they had decided not to use war as an instrument of revolution, they still would rely on military strength sans firepower; and the United States still would have to assess how the Soviet strategists are planning to eliminate American power by mere threat or by political warfare. Actually, it is more than doubtful that the United States can be overcome as an obstacle on the Soviet course of empire, or be captured by the Communists, by any means short of full-fledged nuclear war.

On the basis of our techno-industrial superiority, it is rather self-evident that the Soviet Union never could defeat the United States, provided our country were to make a real effort to stay ahead militarily. Nazi Germany benefited from the fact that during the 1930's, France and England "slept," to borrow a phrase from President Kennedy. The foremost Soviet problem has been that, since Berlin, the seizure of Czechoslovakia, Korea, the initial Soviet atomic and hydrogen bombs, and the Soviet missile and space programs, etc., the United States has remained more or less awake.

Hence to gain that degree of military supremacy which they need in order to accomplish their objectives, the Soviets, as their first order of business, must put the United States to sleep, i.e., they must delay our technical progress and reduce our arms production, while at the same time continuing or even accelerating their military technology and increasing, relatively and perhaps absolutely, their actual strike power.

The main operational task of the Soviet nuclear strategists is to achieve, sometime in future and at a period following Khrushchev's anticipated tenure, a posture allowing the Soviet Union to fight a "quasi-unilateral" war against the United States—a war in which full-scale attack is visited upon this country but full-fledged American retaliation is prevented. Disregarding morale and political factors, such a capability for "unilateral" war depends, in the main, on the technological differential in the armaments of the two superpowers: only technological superiority or supremacy could allow the Kremlin to wage war with relative impunity. In the absence of such impunity, relative though it may be, nuclear war will hardly be risked as a deliberate strategy by the Soviet Union.

The following specific achievements might provide the Soviets with a capability for unilateral war or for forcing surrender:

1. A mature first-strike capability through which, due to adequate numbers, ample yields and accuracy of delivery, U.S. strike bases can be destroyed with a probability of 90 percent or more.

2. An effective antimissile capability forcing the United States to explode the warheads of our residual small second strike force at high altitudes, thus preventing the destruction of Soviet military forces. This capability, inter alia, is an inverse function of the yield of U.S. warheads, that is to say, the less adequate our yields, the greater the Soviet defense-capability.[1]

3. A space capability for the delivery of superyield or gigaton warheads to force surrender after the initial—and unequal—nuclear exchange.

4. A capability to occupy a relatively intact Western Europe.

There are many different strategic combinations through which the Soviets could achieve the nuclear victory at which they are aiming. This particular constellation is cited merely for illustrative purposes.

By keeping U.S. yields relatively low, the test ban would preclude destructive attacks on hardened Soviet missile sites; that is, negate our counter-force strategy. Lack of effective ammunitions for U.S. antimissiles is tantamount to a strengthening of the Soviet missile force, perhaps by a factor of 2 or 3. Lack of a capability to intercept space delivery systems would give the Soviets a perhaps decisive unilateral advantage. Inability to defend Western Europe against superior nuclear attack would allow the Soviets to clinch their victory over the United States by establishing effective control over the entire globe.

In addition, we suffer from uncertainties about the hardness of our missile sites, the vulnerability of warheads and submarines, the usefulness of our electronic devices, and the real effectiveness of our missiles (which never have been tested with their warheads). To the extent that similar uncertainties have been overcome in the Soviet Union through testing, the Soviet capability to plan nuclear blackmail and "first strikes" has been enhanced, and ultimate Soviet aggression must be considered more likely.

The test ban will tend to perpetuate the present lack of defenses of European NATO against the Soviet MRBM and bomber threat and against Soviet ground invasion.

To the extent that, indirectly, the test ban may delay the development in the United States of clean, neutron, and all-fusion weapons, it would preserve the most inhumane characteristics of present nuclear weapons as well as the current superiority of the offense over the defense—factors which benefit would-be aggressors but are inimical to the interests of peaceloving nations.

The crucial questions are these:

1. Do the Soviets aim at military supremacy, at nuclear dominion, and ultimately at clearcut victory? In my judgment, the answer is in the affirmative.

2. To reach these objectives, must the Soviet Union, by means of psychological warfare, attempt to slow down U.S. technology and armaments, and in particular U.S. nuclear technology? Again, the answer is in the affirmative.

3. Does the treaty, as proposed, facilitate or render more difficult Soviet strategy aiming at nuclear dominion? I believe that the treaty would facilitate Soviet strategy, as well as hinder U.S. counter-strategy. It is true that atmospheric tests are only one prerequisite of continued technological advance; yet it is also true that nuclear technology is the key to all other technologies—the explosive is the business end of all weaponry—and that many nuclear problems require atmospheric and underwater tests for their solution, even though a number of these could be conducted with clean devices.

I do agree with the humanitarian purpose of the treaty and support programs designed to avoid tests that would contaminate the atmosphere. This humanitarian purpose can be attained by a simple fallout convention limiting the amount of fallout released by each treaty partner annually.

There was no need in this treaty to outlaw atmospheric ploughshare shots, and thus destroy a significant capability to accelerate economic progress in the free world, in underdeveloped countries, and in the Soviet bloc as well.

On balance, therefore, the treaty appears to be a Soviet deception maneuver, designed to enhance Soviet military capabilities. Therefore, it will tend to weaken our powers of deterrence, and will increase rather than decrease the danger of war. The treaty means that the strategy of deterrence which has stood the United States in good stead for about 15 years, will be abandoned for a different strategy which so far has not been named, analyzed, understood or even been formulated.

If war should unhappily come, the treaty may result in far higher U.S. losses, which otherwise could be prevented; and our European Allies would suffer similarly. Also, if war comes under conditions of Soviet supremacy—and as I said before, it is unlikely that full-fledged nuclear war would eventuate under any other contingency—communism would emerge as uncontested victor from the conflict.

The political advantages of the treaty, whether illusory or real, cannot in any shape, form or manner offset these deadly long-range military dangers.

Therefore, as well for many additional reasons including numerous ambiguities in its stipulations and language, I respectfully urge that the test ban treaty be renegotiated as a fallout convention.

In amplification, I also submit the transcript of a statement made by me on the proposed treaty at an earlier time.

[1] The Senators are respectfully invited to check yield requirements for targets hardened to 300 pounds per square inch or more, with varying heights of burst and accuracies of delivery, as well as desired probabilities of destruction. Also, a calculation is suggested on the numerical size requirements of our missile forces as a function of warhead yields. If the United States wants to stick to relatively low yields, immediate steps should be taken to enlarge our planned missile force.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's Address at the Polish National Alliance Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 34th Quadrennial Convention of the Polish National Alliance, which is now in session in Philadelphia, Pa., on Wednesday of this week gave Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy a tumultuous welcome when he arrived to address the delegates.

Those attending the convention represented Polish National Alliance councils in 38 States of America. The reception given to Mr. Kennedy was one of the most enthusiastic of the entire convention.

The Attorney General reminded his audience that while the U.S. foreign policy is to encourage greater contact with those now living behind the Iron Curtain, "our Nation will never retreat from our conviction that there can be no lasting justice in the world until people everywhere have the right to self-determination."

The Attorney General's inspiring message was interrupted repeatedly with enthusiastic applause. I am happy to include Mr. Kennedy's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, for it spells out a program of hope for the unfortunate victims of communism behind the Iron Curtain.

REMARKS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY AT THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE CONVENTION, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 18, 1963

Poland was an old country when the United States was born, but our two national destinies have been interwoven ever since.

Poles were among the earliest, hardiest, and most democratic settlers of the New World; and no account of the American Revolution would be complete without the names of Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Pulaski gave his life in our war for independence, after serving with gallantry at Brandywine and Valley Forge.

Kosciuszko lived on to work and fight for the cause of freedom, both here and in Poland, for many years.

His close friend, Thomas Jefferson, wrote of him that "he is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known—and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few."

Money and land were settled on Kosciuszko by a grateful Congress after the war—but it was typical of the man that he never used this bounty for himself.

Instead, he placed his will in Jefferson's hands—and in that will, anticipating the Emancipation Proclamation by more than half a century, he directed that the whole of his American fortune be used to buy slaves and set them free.

Today, the herioc statue of Kosciuszko that stands opposite the White House in Washington is a lasting symbol of our friendship with the people of Poland.

And it is appropriate, too, that the monument was built with funds of the Polish National Alliance, for surely there is no organization more truly dedicated to furthering that friendship than yours.

I think we can all agree that it has been a mutually rewarding friendship through the years—though we must acknowledge that America has had the best of the bargain.

The millions of Poles who followed Pulaski and Kosciuszko to this country as immigrants brought a rich and vital strain into our national character: we would be a poorer and weaker nation today without them.

If I set out to read a list of all the Polish-Americans who have earned places of leadership and honor, in war and peace and in all walks of life, it would take all day—so I'll settle for mentioning only one whose name is currently in the news, the distinguished John A. Gronouski, our new Postmaster General.

Within 12 years after the United States won its independence, Poland lost hers; and nearly all of her modern history has been a valorous and continuing struggle to regain it—a struggle with which Americans have always been deeply concerned.

During the First World War, the United States was a leading advocate for reestablishment of the Polish State. And was influential in providing for its formation at the Treaty of Versailles.

And time and again since then, we have been inspired by the courage of the Poles in fighting for freedom in their homeland.

We can never forget how Polish cavalrymen charged their horses against invading Nazi tanks.

Nor can we ever forget General Bor's uprising in occupied Warsaw, which held out for 63 days against the overwhelming forces of the German Army.

Several years ago, I climbed the rocky hillside at Monte Cassino—the scene of a hard-won Allied victory in one of the bloodiest battles of the Second World War—and there, on the monument to the Polish dead, is one of the most moving inscriptions I have ever read:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland."

The fate of Poland after the war, when the Communist regime came into power, opened still another dark chapter in her troubled history.

But the Communists didn't reckon on the stubbornness of the Polish spirit. They soon found out that nobody can make a collectivist out of a Polish farmer—and they still are discovering, more clearly every year, that nobody can stifle a Polish imagination; nobody can bend a Polish will.

Since 1956, the barriers have begun to come down.

The Polish people have won greater freedom to travel abroad, and to receive visitors from other countries. Many Americans, including some of you here today, have been able to welcome Polish friends and relatives to this country.

During 1962, an estimated 10,000 Americans visited Poland, and the figure will undoubtedly be even higher this year.

Under an extensive cultural exchange program, Polish scholars have come here to lecture at our universities, and a lively student exchange program has developed between the two countries.

American athletes now compete with Polish teams, and such renowned Polish performers as the Mazowsze Folk Dance Group and the Posnan Boys' Choir have toured American cities.

American newspapers and magazines are on sale at Polish newsstands, and American broadcasts are received without interference in Polish homes.

In the field of international trade, too, the barriers have been slightly lowered. The United States has sold large quantities of agricultural surplus to Poland, and Polish exports to this country have increased.

We hope to see a steady widening of these economic relations, and for that reason this administration is in favor of retaining authority to grant "most favored nation" treatment to Polish commodities entering our ports.

The United States has made it clear that we will continue to welcome those actions of any country, Communist or otherwise, which respond to the basic needs of the people of that country and which seek to improve relations with us.

Our foreign policy is to encourage such developments, and to show our approval of any progress made along those lines.

But this in no way suggests a weakening in our fundamental position—and the Communists know it.

We as a nation will never retreat from our conviction that there can be no lasting justice in the world until people everywhere have the right to self-determination. And the cause of justice demands equal vigilance here at home.

We will never retreat from the belief of our fathers—the belief for which Pulaski died and Kosciuszco lived; the belief that lives today in every Polish heart, no less than in the hearts of all Americans—the belief that all men were made to be free.

Thank you.

Leisure and the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an article entitled "Leisure and the Arts," which was given as a speech before the Eighth Annual AFL-CIO National Conference last April and later published by the AFL-CIO American Federationist. The author is the eminent Dr. August Heckscher, director of the 20th Century Fund, and former Special Consultant on the Arts to the President.

The use to which man puts leisure time can change a nation's quality. A meritorious avocation, when developed to its utmost, will bring fulfillment and satisfaction to the individual and therefore the society.

Spare time developed for the enjoyment of the arts will be beneficial only if there are genuine artists to guide us. Dr. Heckscher calls on organizations—the foundation, the corporation, the union—to support the arts so that leisure time pursued in this fashion can strengthen society.

This is a helpful and constructive article, Mr. Speaker, and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LEISURE AND THE ARTS

(By August Heckscher)

Free time may be treated, as a kind of raw material, as a basic resource which can be converted into a true leisure, so that it becomes the means whereby individuals find renewal and society finds a new richness and diversity.

As our people have grown more mature, and also more wealthy, the acquisition of material things has come to seem less and less the answer to all the problems and tensions of life.

It is not only this wealth of ours to which the arts are related, but also to the fact that we are today a predominantly and overwhelmingly an urban people. We have preserved for a long time the idea that we were really farmers at heart, that even though we lived in cities we had come from the farms, or our grandfathers had, and perhaps one day we would go back to them. We have kept the feeling that true virtue lay in the farm and that city life was always somewhat unpleasant.

Today we are fated and bound to be an urban people. We are reexamining our philosophies and our myths so as to make them conform to this fact. We are reshaping our cities physically as we are reshaping our ideas to make us aware of the fact that the city is the focus of modern life. If we are going to have a good life anywhere in this country, it will be in the great city or it will be nowhere at all.

Realizing this, we are bringing the arts back into the center of our life, because the arts have always flourished in cities. They have been the child of the urban citizen. They have not grown up in rural isolation. They have not grown up among country folk. Think what cities are if they are not illumined and made habitable by the arts. They become merely great crowds of people and great masses of buildings.

The emphasis of the arts through the government is related to the fact that we are in a society of expanding free time and that the use of this free time will depend upon the kind of civilization which we are. "The soul," said Emerson, "is the color of its leisure thought." A society is what it does in its free time. If we waste that, if we are merely frivolous, if we give ourselves over to boredom and to cheap satisfactions, our civilization and the quality of our people as a whole are bound to decline.

I don't want to say that arts are the only way in which leisure can be effectively spent. At the 20th Century Fund we have made studies in this area and there is, needless to say, a wide option of choice. There are immense possibilities for those who want to make use of them. Sports and games and travel, and the life of nature, these among others are good ways of fulfilling and enriching the time that comes to us as a gift from our technological civilization.

The arts are in some ways the best of all. Here perfection is always unattainable and the pursuit can never bring weariness or boredom.

I am in favor of the most widespread participation by the citizen in all the arts. I believe deeply that such participation can be the joy of individuals and can actually be the saving of a community in an age such as our own, dominated by the machine and given increasing amounts of free time.

There are problems involved in this kind of widespread popular development of the arts. We would be less than wise, less than fair to the cause of civilization, if we were to neglect the deeper issues to which I now turn—assuming that all would be well and fair if only everyone would become an amateur actor, musician, painter or craftsman.

My thesis is that we cannot have a true enjoyment in our own lives as individuals and as citizens, we cannot make our spare time fruitful unless there exist great artists, the genuine gifted individuals who will hold up to all their vision of order and of truth. Through these, the humble craftsman, the amateur and the imitator, the man busy in his spare time, sets his goal. In the light of these great men the rest of us see light and in their immense accomplishments we find the true joy.

The "Sunday painter" would find no assurance in his work if he did not have before him the image of what the masters have done. An amateur theatrical company could not get pleasure in their labors if they did not have the example of great acting and the enduring creations of the playwright.

Today the "Sunday painter" or sculptor does not paint designs as old as his land and the history of his people. He imitates, whether consciously or not, the strokes of a Matissee, the mobile of a Calder, the plane of an abstractionist. He is directly dependent for satisfaction upon models of the highest standards. And, therefore, he is in danger, by his imitation and his unskillfulness, of debasing the great models which he copies.

The problem, as I see it, is how to permit everyone to enjoy the arts in their free time and still to preserve, indeed to nourish and enhance, the standards of high professional attainment and excellence. Only so can we have a civilization of which we can be proud and labor at occupations which bring real beauty to life.

Let me suggest one or two conditions which are necessary to be fulfilled if we are going to meet the two terms of happiness in our free time—if we are to make our leisure constructive and our civilization worthy.

First, it is very important to keep sharp the distinction between the amateur and the professional. I have praised the amateur in the arts, I have encouraged men and women to enter fully into the life of a painter, actor, musician, dancer—the shaper of things in all their varied forms. But we must always remember that between the amateur and the creative genius there is a great gulf. The best of the Sunday painters is still worlds away from the man who gives his life to the development of his genius and to the pursuit of perfection as he knows it.

I am in favor of having the amateur become as skilled as it is in his power to be. Have you noticed how often, when we speak of an amateur in the arts, we have a very different, a much more confused and weak and muddy sense than when we speak of an amateur in sports or athletics? You speak of an amateur tennis player and your image is of a player skilled and hardened, playing for the joy of the game itself.

When you speak, however, about an amateur painter or about amateur theatricals, the picture that comes to your mind is of a bad painter and of a theatrical production in which everybody forgets their lines and the scenery usually falls down before the show is done. Now there is no reason why other works of our leisure should not be as skilled and disciplined as the things that we do in the field of sports.

One of the evils of industrialism is that by focusing everything upon the job, we tend to despise and belittle everything that lay outside the job itself. The job has to be done well because we are being paid for it and everything else can be done badly.

I like to think that we may return to the old concept of work and restore the plural of that fine word. We shall have our work for which we are paid, we shall have our work, perhaps many works—work in the community, work in the arts—for which we are not paid but which still are done as carefully and as competently as we can. I say we must develop our skills and yet I come back to my other point. We must be humble, we must still distinguish between the second best that is ours and the high best of the true artist. Only thus can we avoid confusion of standards and the decline of excellence.

The amateur should regard his own work proudly, but he should also know that the work of the artist cannot be judged without effort and imagination or appreciated without knowledge. "I know what I like and therefore I know what is art"—that may be effective enough and simple enough when we have all grown used to some types of art and when one person's judgment may indeed be as good as the judgment of the informed critics.

In times like these, when the world is changing fairly rapidly, art also is changing and is assuming new forms. The great artist is out at the frontiers of knowledge, of feeling and of experience. He is trying to translate into new forms through new language, through new media, the images which he has created in his own mind. He is a sort of prophet. The great artist, said Pericles in his funeral oration, is "like a ghost seeking to utter more than it can express, always reaching out into realms beyond." If the artist today often may seem difficult to comprehend, may seem difficult to appreciate, that is because he is out on those far realms of knowledge and experience where the scientists also are, where the men are who apprehend new truths in the field of physics and psychology, where all of these are working together.

So the amateur, I would like to think, will not only be the last to confuse his work with that of the professional, he will be the first to discern what the professional is trying to accomplish. He will appreciate what is new even while he follows at a slower pace in forms that have been made familiar by time and use.

That is my first point, that we must keep this distinction between the amateur and the professional, each appreciating the other, yet each realizing that he is bound toward a separate goal.

Then secondly, it seems to me that it is important that all of us sustain the institutions which are being developed wtihin the high arts. There is today in our society a danger that we will overcultivate the amateur sector, while we let the great institutions of the arts wither for lack of funds. We are spending today for example, vast funds in the arts through the educational system. I welcome that, I rejoice in it, but the main point of that expenditure is to turn out people who appreciate and enjoy the arts as amateurs and meanwhile we tend to neglect the professional theater group, the established museum, the symphony with a season long enough to give its members meaningful employment.

We speak today of 1,200 symphonies or 900 opera groups or thousands of acting companies. In these very statistics, we have confused our amateur companies with the institutions which nourish the highest traditions. By using those figures we foster neglect of the core of creative talent upon which everything else ultimately depends.

How many of these 1,200 symphonies are professional? How many are supported to the degree which provides opportunities for the artist to develop his talents in reasonable security, to experiment with new and frequently unpopular works, to attain the skill which comes from being part of a continuing and stable company?

The institutions of the art are in trouble. Their economic difficulties do not spring from the fact that they are being neglected. Their difficulties spring rather from the fact that in our society new demands are being made upon them, new services are being required of them. Meanwhile, old sources of patronage are in many cases drying up.

It is time that new sources be opened generously and imaginatively. The foundation, the corporation, the government at various levels—Federal, State, city—all of these have their role to play. But, not least, and this is the point I want to make in concluding, not least it seems to me labor and the labor unions have a large part in sustaining these great institutions.

Labor has a first task, I would suppose, to train and to educate its own members so that they can enjoy the life of the arts.

Labor has a second job, without which the first would be in vain. That is to uphold a higher standard of beauty and professional competence within the arts. The leader of a great union came to me recently, asking my advice and counsel. He said, "Our union is building a housing development as means of using our funds and giving housing to people who live here in the city. But I don't want this to be an ordinary housing development. In design, in imagination, I want it to represent the finest that the architecture of our time is able to produce."

It seemed to me that that imaginative labor leader was trying to establish by a dramatic and physical symbol the fact that labor in America does care for beauty and the abiding values of civilization and that, unless there is this beauty at the highest level, there cannot be the satisfaction of art in the daily employment of free time.

I would go further. Is there any reason why labor unions should not sponsor and support a good orchestra? Is there any reason why it should not sponsor a traveling theater which would go around the country, bringing to cities and communities the revelations of life which the theater is so supremely able to do, this great dialog dealing with man's fate in all its tragic and humorous aspects? Sponsoring such a company would have advantages for the union. It could be free or at reduced prices to members and their families. Perhaps more important would be proof that labor is capable of enjoying gratefully the gifts of technology, that it is able to accept the challenge of free time. It would be saying to all the world, "We want men and women to develop themselves in the arts and within a civilization which answers to the full needs of the mind and the spirit."

I mentioned earlier those who take a negative and pessimistic view of our capacity to maintain a great civilization and to have our free time filled with pursuit of the arts at the amateur level. Emerson said a hundred years ago, "There are those who say that our civilization has reached its zenith. I tell you that we are yet at the cock crowing and at the morning star." Emerson was an

idealist, but he was no fool. He had seen technology take birth in New England, he had witnessed many of the developments which are familiar today—industrialism, democracy, equality. In the light of all this, he said, we are yet "at the cock crowing."

We cannot not only have that faith of Emerson, but in our own time we can bring the promise which he saw toward fulfillment.

We can make our free time not a burden or a curse, but one of the greatest boons that has ever been offered to mankind.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce: Right-To-Work Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the medicine men of the far right who make up the select committee for the right to work of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have come up with a remarkable new claim for their product:

It not only protects workingmen from their unions but it "skyrockets" the membership of unions as well—they say.

If it were true it would be a neat trick—so-called right to work making the unions stronger and weakening their membership in the same breath.

Obviously both diametrically opposed claims cannot be true, even if the U.S. Chamber of Commerce does say so.

The amazing double claim is made by the chamber of commerce right-to-work committee in a booklet given nationwide distribution. In it, the chamber of commerce makes the claim that union membership in Georgia has grown by 280 percent in that state under a so-called right-to-work law.

The figures of union growth from 1938 to 1953 are true enough. But the period in which a right-to-work law has been in effect in Georgia does not match the dates of the union growth. The fact is the great union growth in Georgia took place in this period during the years of World War II.

What has been done by the medicine men of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is to claim for the right-to-work law all of the growth of union membership during the war years when the right-to-work law did not even exist.

The way it is done is a typical right-to-work misstatement of fact. It is handled this way:

> Union membership has skyrocketed, especially in States that enacted right-to-work laws during this period (1939–53). Georgia's right-to-work law was adopted in 1947 and union membership climbed from 35,000 to 135,000 in 1953, or 280 percent. Other increases are equally impressive: Texas, 239 percent; Arizona, 257 percent; Nebraska, 153 percent; South Dakota, 185 percent; and Arkansas, 171 percent.

The trick is that the union growth took place before 1947, when the right-to-work laws became effective, not afterward.

This bit of statistical chicanery is illustrated by U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards, Directory of Labor Unions Bulletin 937, June 1948. This official chart shows union membership in 1947 at just under 16 million, excluding Canada.

Right-to-work laws generally were enacted in the period after passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. Therefore, the bulk of union growth took place in the years before enactment of right-to-work laws.

The illusion of greater growth is enhanced by the chamber of commerce right-to-work computers who arbitrarily chose a lower base figure for union membership in 1939 than the official Department of Labor figure of approximately 8½ million. Instead the illusionmakers choose unofficial figures of the National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., which estimates union membership in 1939 as approximately 6½ million.

This little maneuver thus adds about 2 million of additional gains in union strength for the 14-year period until 1953, which these happy statisticians claim for the benefit of right-to-work legislation.

Apparently the chamber of commerce mathematicians sifted and selected surveys until they found figures to their liking. They used a survey made by Leo Wolman in 1956 but they ignored his statement that "union membership in the United States in 1948–49 suggests that the large postwar spurt—of union membership—ended in 1947.

This conclusion obviously did not fit the illusion the medicine men sought to create, so it was not used.

It should be stressed that the basic statistics used by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in their remarkable figuring cover the entire 14-year period from 1939 to 1953. In only 6 of these years were right-to-work laws actually in effect—from 1947 to 1953, although Florida had an ineffective right-to-work statute from 1944.

The States that adopted right-to-work laws which were passed or activated in 1947 were Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia.

According to the NBER, Inc., figures, these 12 States gained 949,300 union members in this period. Bulletin No. 937 of the Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics states that in the years 1946–47—before activation of right-to-work laws in the 12 States—three-quarters of a million members were added to the labor movement in the Southern States as a result of an intensive membership drive by the unions.

This accounts for most of the alleged 949,300 growth claimed as a result of right-to-work laws and note, too, that these gains were prior to the existence of these laws.

It should also be noted in this context that the late Mr. Wolman, whose survey the U.S. Chamber uses for their statistical gymnastics, stated that the union membership growth in New York State alone was more than in the entire gain claimed for right-to-work laws. New York is a free labor State.

But let me call attention to some other statements made by Mr. Wolman in his 1956 study which the U.S. Chamber prefers to ignore.

> Within the 14-year interval, total union membership in the continental United States increased by almost 9.7 million or 148.8 percent. Of the total increase more than two-thirds (68.7 percent) accrued to the 10 States with the largest membership in 1953 (New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Indiana, Massachusetts and Missouri.)

None of these States were right-to-work States. Indiana passed a right-to-work law in 1957, 4 years after the period in question.

It becomes apparent that the whole case presented by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is based on a calculated misstatement of figures designed to create the false impression that right-to-work laws had skyrocketed union membership. The source used by these fakirs when examined denies the allegation conclusively.

The U.S. Chamber has sought to claim the labor movement's greatest period of growth, the war years, and the period immediately preceding and following the war, resulted from right-to-work laws when, in fact, the laws did not come into existence until after the Taft-Hartley Act passage in 1947.

They use a nimbly worded statement to create the impression that union growth in Georgia resulted solely from right-to-work. This is a clever statement but the publicity writers employed by the U.S. Chamber were not taken into their statistician's confidence. The publicity release accompanying the pamphlet contains no such subtleties.

The opening paragraph of the release states:

> WASHINGTON, August 25.—Union membership "skyrocketed" in six States after enactment of right-to-work laws, according to a booklet released today by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

No quibbling here. No clever phrasing. Instead a flat claim.

But the figures which disprove the implication of the distorted figures completely disavow this claim.

The U.S. chamber gives the right-to-work law credit for all the growth of unions, yet they never mention losses in union membership in right-to-work States. Roy R. Evans, writing on the

subject of Texas Labor Growth in a study for the Texas State AFL–CIO, pointed out that in the years from June 1954 to June 1962, the membership of the Texas labor movement declined from 375,000 to 350,000 whereas the total labor force had grown in the same period from 3,300,000 to 3,670,000. Mr. Evans concludes:

> Had organized labor had its normal growth, Texas would have 60,000 more union members in the last 8 years rather than 25,000 less.

As part of the same investigation Dr. W. H. Watson, professor of industrial relations at the University of Texas, examined "The Attitude Towards Union Survival in Texas". The conclusion:

> To many of the larger industrial local unions, the "r-t-w" is more like a parasitic growth—always weakening and sometimes deadly. In many areas of the State the so-called right-to-work law has done in the last 15 years what other antilabor forces could not do in three times the length of time before—slowly and surely withering away the life of proud local unions.

It should be noted that this study by the University of Texas and by Mr. Evans covered the period immediately following that allegedly studied by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Thus the facts completely disprove the allegations by the U.S. chamber that right to work helps unions.

Mr. Speaker, what baffles me is what do these hucksters hope to gain by their obviously false claims?

An old aphorism states that "Figures don't lie, but liars can figure." But these people apparently forget that honest men can figure too.

When honest men encounter such blatant misuse of fact they can only conclude that the whole effort of fraud and misrepresentation has been undertaken deliberately in a cynical attempt to sway the judgment and viewpoint of the uninformed.

Farm Labor Facts—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for the second of a series of articles on the need for a farmworker program in California, I think it significant that we keep in mind that California is a specialty crop area.

The California Department of Labor has recently published statistics of the volume and percentages of certain specialty crops grown in the No. 1 State. The amazing statistics show the State grows 50 to 100 percent of a host of crops unsubsidized, thus substantiating special consideration.

The table follows:

TABLE I.—*California agricultural production, 1961 and 1962, selected major crops, including percent of U.S. totals for 1962*

Crop	California as percent of United States (1962)	Unit	1961	1962 (prelim)	1962 compared to 1961 (percent)
Fruit and nuts, all [1]		Ton	6,698,100	6,745,600	+1
Almonds	100	do	66,400	48,000	−28
Apples	8	do	247,200	247,200	
Apricots	92	do	180,000	155,000	−14
Avocados	89	do	35,500	50,000	+41
Cherries, sweet	22	do	27,500	24,000	−13
Dates	100	do	21,400	22,500	+5
Figs	100	Fr. ton	63,200	64,400	+2
Grapes	91	do	2,804,000	2,850,000	+2
Grapefruit	6	Ton	86,580	96,180	+11
Lemons	91	do	524,400	577,600	+10
Oranges	13	do	937,500	776,250	−17
Olives	100	do	44,000	50,000	+14
Peaches	57	do	967,000	1,045,000	+8
Pears	55	do	347,000	382,000	+10
Plums	93	do	87,000	82,000	−6
Prunes, dried	96	Dry ton	139,000	142,000	+2
Strawberries	40	Ton	102,350	103,950	+2
Walnuts, English	96	do	61,200	78,000	+27
Vegetables, all [2]		Ton	6,474,460	7,232,250	+12
Asparagus, all	54	do	99,000	99,900	+1
Carrots, all	37	do	288,100	314,600	+9
Potatoes, Irish	10	do	1,729,950	1,407,400	−19
For processing:					
9 major vegetables [3]	37	do	2,618,690	3,425,420	+31
Green lima beans	45	do	53,300	48,300	−9
Snap beans	7	do	36,800	30,400	−17
Spinach	48	do	64,800	56,300	−13
Tomatoes	59	do	2,319,000	3,154,000	+36
For fresh market:					
21 major vegetables [4]	31	do	3,437,950	3,391,500	−1
Celery	52	do	417,400	367,250	−12
Lettuce	59	do	1,101,500	1,097,500	−0.4
Melons	25	do	577,650	550,950	−5
Field crops, all [5]		do	19,409,800	19,556,000	+1
Dry edible beans	18	do	177,100	171,750	−3
Cotton	12	Bale	1,689,000	1,840,000	+9
Small grain	3	Bushel	88,296,000	88,754,000	+1
Alfalfa	8	Ton	6,140,000	6,011,000	−2
Rice	24	do	696,000	775,200	+10
Sugarbeets	26	do	4,388,000	4,766,000	+9

[1] Excludes strawberries.
[2] Excludes potatoes; includes strawberries.
[3] 10 for U.S. total.
[4] 27 for U.S. total.
[5] Includes potatoes and major field seeds.

Source: California and U.S. Departments of Agriculture.

A Flower for the Graves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, shocked and dismayed over previous happenings in Birmingham and elsewhere in the country in the struggle for human rights, was stunned by the bombing of a Negro church last Sunday which caused the death of four innocent children.

Many voices have been raised in anguish, horror, bitterness, shame, and sorrow.

One that speaks for the conscience of the South is Eugene Patterson, a native Georgian and editor of the Atlanta Constitution. The beauty and poetry of his words serve to heighten the stark lesson of this tragedy—that "those who created the day bear the judgment."

His statement is one of challenge and encouragement to those too timid in the past to speak out, but who no longer find themselves alone.

The article follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., September 17, 1963]

A SOUTHERNER SPEAKS

A FLOWER FOR THE GRAVES

NOTE.—The Atlanta Constitution, one of the South's leading newspapers, placed the responsibility for the bombing of the Birmingham church Sunday morning on the entire "white South" in the column printed below, entitled "A Flower for the Graves." It was written by Eugene Patterson, a native Georgian and editor of the Constitution since 1960.

A Negro mother wept in the street Sunday morning in front of a Baptist church in Birmingham. In her hand she held a shoe, one shoe, from the foot of her dead child. We hold that shoe with her.

Every one of us in the white South holds that small shoe in his hand.

It is too late to blame the sick criminals who handled the dynamite. The FBI and the police can deal with that kind. The charge against them is simple. They killed four children.

Only we can trace the truth, Southerner—you and I. We broke those children's bodies.

We watched the stage set without staying it. We listened to the prologue unbestirred. We saw the curtain opening with disinterest. We have heard the play.

We—who go on electing politicians who heat the kettles of hate.

We—who raise no hand to silence the mean and little men who have their nigger jokes.

We—who stand aside in imagined rectitude and let the mad dogs that run in every society slide their leashes from our hand, and spring.

We—the heirs of a proud South, who protest its worth and demand its recognition—are the ones who have ducked the difficult, skirted the uncomfortable, cavilled at the challenge, resented the necessary, rationalized the unacceptable, and created the day surely when these children would die.

This is no time to load our anguish onto the murderous scapegoat who set the cap in in dynamite of our own manufacture.

He didn't know any better.

Somewhere in the dim and fevered recess of an evil mind he feels right now that he has been a hero. He is only guilty of murder. He thinks he has pleased us.

We of the white South who know better are the ones who must take a harsher judgment.

We, who know better, created a climate for child-killing by those who don't.

We hold that shoe in our hand, Southerner. Let us see it straight, and look at the blood on it. Let us compare it with the unworthy speeches of Southern public men who have traduced the Negro; match it with the spectacle of shrilling children whose parents and teachers turned them free to spit epithets at small huddles of Negro schoolchildren for a week before this Sunday in Birmingham; hold up the shoe and look beyond it to the statehouse in Montgomery, where official attitudes of Alabama have been spoken in heat and anger.

Let us not lay the blame on some brutal fool who didn't know any better.

We know better. We created the day. We bear the judgment. May God have mercy on the poor South that has been so led. May what has happened hasten the day when the good South, which does live and have great being, will rise to this challenge of racial understanding and common humanity, in the full power of its unasserted courage, assert itself.

The Sunday school play at Birmingham is ended. With a weeping Negro mother, we stand in the bitter smoke and hold a shoe. If our South is ever to be what we wish it to be, we will plant a flower of nobler resolve for the South now upon these four small graves that we dug.

Which Road Will We Take?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I applaud our President on his statement made last evening to the American people on the tax bill. I am especially pleased with his recognition that tax reduction is preferred to public expenditures for the purpose of stimulating the American economy. I agree.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [WILBUR MILLS], the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, pointed out on Monday last that the purpose of the bill is to loosen the constraint which the present Federal taxation imposes on the American economy, but that in passing the legislation we are making a choice.

That we are choosing to stimulate the economy by reducing taxes and not by Government expenditures for that purpose. In a free enterprise society such as our own we prefer doing that which will result in greater economic activity—not on the part of Government but rather on the part of the private sector of our economy. By releasing these constraints which a heavy tax burden imposes it will be private enterprise not the Government which will solve our unemployment problem, which will make us more competitive, which will help our balance-of-payments problem, which will produce revenue to run the necessary functions of Federal, State, and local governments and which will produce a bigger, more prosperous, and more efficient economy.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

West Virginia Above National Average in Homeownership—Progress in Other Areas Cited—State Savings & Loan League Holds 46th Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, savings and loan institutions comprise a vital and respected segment of the financial strength of the United States. More than 35 million thrift-conscious Americans take advantage of their convenient facilities which extend credit to 45 percent of all homebuyers, and now record nearly $85 billion in mortgages. In West Virginia the individual ownership of homes is at the rate of 64.2 percent, with the national average being 62.8 percent. Assets of savings and loan organizations have increased 12 times since World War II. During 1962, they financed the purchasing of 757,000 existing homes, and the construction of 429,000 others. In the same year they paid dividends to savers totaling $3 billion, and created 700,000 jobs for American craftsmen.

These figures indicate that savings and loan institutions have become an integral part of the community, and a welcome partner in the acquisition of homes for millions of our citizens.

September 12, 13, and 14, 1963, the West Virginia Savings & Loan League held its 46th annual convention at the Greenbrier, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. It was my privilege to participate in the first general session, on Friday morning, September 13, and was attended by representatives of the 28-member associations in the Mountain State. Presiding was the president of the West Virginia Savings & Loan League, Robert F. Griffith. Also on the program were: Hon. Hulett C. Smith, Commissioner of the West Virginia Department of Commerce; Eugene M. Mortlock, vice president of the U.S. Savings & Loan League; and Hon. Cecil H. Underwood, vice president of the Island Creek Coal Co.

Mr. Mortlock, in addressing the attentive audience, commented on the steadfast service performed in the public interest by savings and loan institutions, and illustrated their widespread acceptance by quoting figures reflecting the expansion noted in West Virginia. He indicated that since 1948, assets of savings and loan institutions in West Virginia have grown from $52 million to near the $300 million mark; the number of savers has increased from 23,000 to approximately 100,000; homeownership has jumped from 43.7 percent in 1940, to 64.3 percent in 1962—this figure comfortably exceeding the national percentage of 62.8.

Mr. Mortlock also pointed out that this undeniable success should not impel us to slacken efforts to bring forth a more rewarding way of life for our citizens.

He continued:

> Surely we cannot afford succes if it must be an anesthetic for initiative or a formula for retreat from the competitive arena. We must reserve an open mind, an ability to see things through the eyes of our opponents, a skill for understanding the motives and the thoughts of those whom we oppose. Yet we must act in the light of the best knowledge and reason available to us at the moment. This is a wildly imaginative, technical world in which we find ourselves * * * a world where managers should not sleep too easily at night unless they accept the fact that there is a better way to do everything. We must be determined to engage in disciplined, effective research to obsolete our own ways and methods.

Mr. Mortlock states here not only a worthy creed for lending organizations, but a worthwhile reminder to West Virginians who have seen the progress achieved in recent years, but who must remain dedicated to the struggle for a more balanced economy and an improved standard of living.

Commissioner Hulett C. Smith, of the West Virginia Department of Commerce, spoke realistically of the challenges which have been met, and those which still demand the attention and energies of responsible individuals. He enumerated advances recorded in the location of new industry, in expansion of existing facilities, in providing additional employment opportunities, and in enhancing the overall commercial climate. Commissioner Smith declared that:

> At the end of the first 8 months of 1963, we had helped to bring 82 new plants to West Virginia. Ninety-three expansions of existing industries had been accomplished. These developments brought a total investment of $145 million—and only manufacturing is included in this count.
>
> Our growth is even more impressive if we consider coal mines and coal preparation plants; electric power installations; transportation and communications; Government expenditures through the accelerated public works program; national investments in flood control projects through the Corps of Engineers; the National Science Foundation's Radio Astronomy Center at Green Bank; and research, warehousing, and retail establishment construction. * * * All of these accomplishments contain the reflection of great efforts and the elements of great challenge.

Mr. President, I concur with Commissioner Smith in the thought that citizens of the Mountain State can be justifiably proud of these fruits of their struggle toward a parity with progress. Yet we cannot relax in this attempt; rather, new approaches and new resources must be called into play if we are to attain our goal.

Concluding participant in the first general session of the convention was Hon. Cecil H. Underwood, former Governor of West Virginia, who spoke effectively of rethinking and restructing—new approaches and solutions to the problems which confront this Nation in the space age.

It seems logical, then—

Said Mr. Underwood—

> that true scientific investigation will thrive best if a proper climate exists—I speak of such things as understanding, appreciation, and support from government, society, and industry.
>
> To remain in a competitive world position, America must advance its research and exploration at a rate far greater than anything we have known. The patterns of these new demands are so different from our familiar past that pioneering will be exceedingly difficult. For this reason, I believe an important share of scientific research leadership must fall to those parts of our country where dynamic change and growth are welcome and possible. Among all States of our country, I think of none more peculiarly fitted to become the center of modern scientific research than West Virginia—a young Mountain State with its rich deposits of natural resources, a compelling desire to grow, a favored geographic position, and a people dedicated to individual freedom and performance.

Featured speaker at the second general session was Mr. George R. Parker, president of the Federal Home Loan Bank, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Instrumental in the success of the 46th annual convention of the West Virginia Savings and Loan League were the purposeful officers of the group, who gave much in time and toil so that the meetings might go forward smoothly. Serving along with President Robert F. Griffith, of Wheeling, were John H. Thomas, of Charleston, first vice president; and R. Deane Blair, Moundsville, second vice president. Special recognition should rightfully go to Executive Vice President Joseph P. Condry, of Charleston, whose efforts in behalf of the West Virginia league were felt not only at the convention, but throughout the entire year. Mr. Condry is a gifted administrator and one whose talents are reflected in the organized flow of convention activity.

The Board of Directors includes Kermit E. McGinnis, Huntington; James D. Wood, Bluefield; W. W. Wagner, Logan; James F. Brown, III, and Ivor F. Boiarsky, both of Charleston, W. Va.

Mr. President, I request that excerpts from the addresses of Hon. Hulett C. Smith, Mr. Eugene M. Mortlock, and Hon. Cecil H. Underwood, at the annual convention of the West Virginia Savings and Loan League be printed in the Appendix, together with my own remarks, and a list of the member institutions in West Virginia.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE WEST VIRGINIA SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

Beckley: Beckley Federal Savings and Loan League.

Bellaire, Ohio: The Buckeye Savings and Loan Co.

Bluefield: First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Charleston: Charleston Federal Savings and Loan Association, Empire Federal Savings and Loan Association, First Federal Savings and Loan Association, West Virginia Building and Loan Association.

Chester: Hancock County Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Clarksburg: First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Fairmont: Fairmont Building and Loan Association, First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Marion County Building and Loan Association, Standard Building and Loan Association.

Fayetteville: Fayetteville Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Huntington: Huntington Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Lewisburg: Blue Grass Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Logan: First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Moundsville: Citizens Savings and Loan Co., First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

New Martinsville: Doolin Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Parkersburg: First Federal Savings and Loan Association, Traders Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Point Pleasant: Point Pleasant Building and Loan Association.

Ravenswood: Farmers Building and Loan Association, First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Sistersville: First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

Wheeling: Peoples Federal Savings and Loan Association, Union Federal Savings and Loan Association.

ADDRESS OF HULETT C. SMITH, COMMISSIONER, WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BEFORE WEST VIRGINIA SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 13, 1963

Thank you for the chance to be with you today. I am happy to share in your program and grateful for the opportunity to speak about progress in West Virginia—the beginning of a dynamic era of growth—and I believe, the awakening of a "sleeping giant" as we West Virginians are becoming more and more aware of the opportunities that lie within our State for economic growth and the general development of ourselves and our resources.

It is a privilege to join with Senator RANDOLPH and former Governor Underwood at this annual meeting of the West Virginia Savings and Loan League.

All of us in West Virginia have important reasons to be proud of the way our State has moved forward in recent years—1962 was a year of progress and our citizens are beginning to recognize the "acres of diamonds" in our own back yard.

Do you realize that as a State, West Virginia had the 25th highest rate of economic growth in the Nation last year? Our growth in manufacturing was greater than that of Michigan, Indiana, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania and Ohio, to mention only a few. Our growth rate exceeded the national average by approximately 5 percent.

Increased employment has helped push personal income to new levels—an annual rate of $3.4 billion in July—and has supported rising retail trade, particularly in the sale of new cars.

At the year's half-way mark, the gross State product—total output of goods and services (as determined by the statisticians of the C. & P. Telephone Co. of West Virginia) had risen to an index of 112 based upon a scale of 100 for 1957–59; and 1957 was the best economic year for West Virginia prior to 1962—this according to the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce records. The index was only 102.3 in January of 1961 when Governor Barron took office.

The average daily output of coal has reached its highest rate in years. Coal tonnage has increased almost 5 percent over year-earlier levels.

Production from our chemical plants has increased 8 percent since December of 1962.

At the end of the first 8 months of 1963, we had helped to bring 82 new plants to West Virginia. Ninety-three expansions of existing industries had been accomplished. These developments brought a total investment of $145 million, providing more than 11,000 new job opportunities with payrolls adding up to $48 million—and, only manufacturing is included in this count.

Our growth is even more impressive if we consider coal mines and coal preparation plants; electric power installations; transportation and communications; Government expenditures through the accelerated public works program; national investments in flood control projects through the Corps of Engineers; the National Science Foundation's Radio Astronomy Center at Green Bank; and research, warehousing, retail establishment construction. Add the programs of the Area Redevelopment Administration, including a new investment in a complex of tourist and recreation facilities amounting to over $24 million; add a stepped-up road construction program (which is now moving into high gear under the able leadership of State Road Commissioner Burl Sawyers). All of these accomplishments contain the reflection of great effort and the elements of a great challenge.

We have only begun—we have only made a start—we realize that the job is by no means finished * * * and we recognize that we in this generation have been given an opportunity to continue this progressive surge.

We recognize that even with the new tools for financing industrial growth that have been provided by the actions of the 1961 and 1963 West Virginia Legislatures in establishing the West Virginia Industrial Development Authority and the Industrial Development Revenue Bond Act and the West Virginia Forest Industry Development Corp.—we have the real challenge to do more—to move faster—to accelerate the pace of progress.

But, we must still think about the other needs of West Virginia—industrial development and tourism are but two of the areas which must be expanded.

What about other major sectors of employment? The task of the West Virginia Department of Commerce is to help provide job opportunities for West Virginians and to foster economic development of the State. We must look to the entire scope of State development, not just isolated segments.

What does it take to gain full employment in West Virginia?

Shouldn't we guide ourselves by looking toward the recommended full employment pattern of the entire United States?

Looking at this pattern of nationwide employment and projected growth, we can easily see that our State once had a higher percentage of employment in mining and agriculture. We are now dropping to near the national average. We were low in manufacturing employment and now are gaining because this has been the focal point of our attack on unemployment in the past few months. Despite the general decline in manufacturing employment throughout the Nation as a percentage of the work force, I'm proud to report that in West Virginia that percentage is increasing. Our State grew in the number employed in manufacturing in the past 2 years—from 21,000 to nearly 25,000 employees. This increase of about 3,000 came in the face of a national decline in those employed in manufacturing—a loss attributed to automation.

But, we are not making the gains in construction, education and research, and resource development classifications needed. It is to these areas that we must turn our attention in planning for the future.

We have long recognized our needs in housing, new homes, new schoolrooms, more teachers to reduce the size of classes * * * meeting these needs will provide the wages to stimulate other sections of the economy and the demand for services and consumer goods will increase.

If we emphasize construction-housing-community facilities, schools, resource development, and education as we look toward the future * * * what can it mean to us?

Nationally, it is estimated that doubling the number of teachers and doubling their salaries would add to the national total outlay for education from around $10 billion a year to $40 billion a year. This would mean for the Nation's economy a direct increase in the demand for food, clothing, housing, automobiles, etc., and the related production facilities estimated to expand the gross national product by some $120 billion. What would it mean to West Virginia? The effects stagger the imagination.

It is stated also that we are spending a much smaller part of our total income on education than our grandfathers did 75 years ago, and we certainly know that a great part of our school facilities are inadequate and unacceptable.

In the Nation today, it is estimated that we are building only one-half the number of new homes needed to replace those becoming obsolete, those required to take care of our expanding population, and those needed to provide proper housing for our less prosperous citizens. It is also said that if we build these homes that are needed, our national employment figure would increase in construction classifications by 1.25 million. This vast expansion would also be felt in West Virginia.

Some of the initiative for industrial financing has been taken by State government to provide for a dynamic industrial expansion in the sixties. Results indicate that this move has encouraged the growth of West Virginia manufacturing.

Should the initiative for encouraging this construction growth in homes and schools come from your State government—or should it come from you as leaders in home financing? What do you think?

In any case, these fields of growth and the solution to the problems of employment in West Virginia continue to be a challenge. It is the great challenge of this generation. We must meet it. We shall meet it. With your cooperation as leaders of the financial industry we shall make available for all West Virginians a richer, more rewarding life.

ONE HUNDRED BILLION DOLLARS STRONG

(Excerpts from an address by E. M. Mortlock)

Ours is truly a success story. A story of big business born and bred out of a very basic need—a "poor" man's bank, grown $100 billion strong in 132 years of service—from $500 to $100 billion—from 1 association to 6,300.

This great American achievement has been made possible by 35½ million thrift conscious citizens, who have saved to have—and to invest—in a better America. This

has been our mission—to spread the gospel of modest savings, performing a great service to our Nation.

As home financing institutions, we have made our most dramatic contribution to national prosperity, by extending credit to 45 percent of all homebuyers, now recording $85 billion in our mortgage portfolios. We have capitalized on an era of favorable financial legislation, post war housing demand. We have pioneered the GI home loan program, and stimulated people's propensity to save. We have wooed the public with appealing advertising campaigns, tailor-made savings programs, investment safety and high dividend rates. We have set the pace in luring and lending funds—until we are now the logical choice for investors at almost every level of sophistication.

Such a history would indeed be far less astounding, had it not been for three great events which altered the nature of our economy and reshaped the role of the savings and loan movement:

1. The depression of the thirties which laid the framework for sweeping legislation designed to strengthen the operations of all financial institutions, and encourage the development of financial intermediaries offering specialized skills, later on, the regional home loan bank system, and the insurance corporation became the foundation of uniform, nationwide standards of sound operation.

2. The World War II economy, with full employment and high earning capacities gave birth to the thrift habit in its fullest force, enabling savings and loans to attain stature and win their contest for savings growth.

3. The postwar real estate boom clinched our role as the nation's mortgage lending specialists. This identification has been virtually unchallenged up until now as other financial factions have begun to recognize the investment appeal of the mortgage instrument.

To sum up a program of progress, facts and figures illuminate our story—a story of the largest and fastest growing savings media in the country:

Assets increased 12 times since World War II from $8.747 to $100 billion.

Gross mortgage loan recordings—current, 12 months, August 1963, $23 billion.

Net savings gains, 12 months, August 1963, $11 billion.

Dividends to savers, 1962, $3 billion.

Financed for purchase, 1962, 757,000 existing homes.

Financed for construction, 1962, 429,000 new homes.

Total, 1,186,000.

We produced 700,000 jobs for American craftsmen.

Since 1945 we have financed 5 million of 21 million new homes built.

Since 1945 we have provided credit for another 9 million families.

WEST VIRGINIA STATISTICS

Assets 1948, $52 million; now, to 1962, $300 million.

Number of savers, 1948, 23,000; now, approximately 100,000.

Percent of homes occupied, 64.3 percent; up from 43.7 in 1940.

This compares with a national average of 62.8 percent.

So much for a proud past. Too often, yesterday's recordbreaker is soon forgotten in tomorrow's world. Now it is our turn to blaze a new trail, to set the pace, to shape the future. Now it is our job to build this business * * * bigger, better, and broader in scope, service, and significance.

But where do we start? Has this $100 billion business been a result of careful planning or an outgrowth of its own accord? Are we the industry leaders who can underwrite a future greater than the past, or are we content with admiring old trophies?

Surely we cannot afford success if it must be an anesthetic for initiative or a formula for retreat from the competitive arena. We must preserve an open mind, an ability to see things through the eyes of our opponents, a skill for understanding the motives and the thoughts of those whom we oppose. Yet we must act in the light of the best knowledge and reason available to us at the moment. This is a wildly imaginative, technical world in which we find ourselves * * * a world where managers should not sleep too easily at night unless they accept the fact that there is a better way to do everything. We must be determined to engage in disciplined, effective research to obsolete our own ways and methods.

Successful enterprise is rarely accidental. Usually it is the result of careful planning, courage, and dogged persistence in making the plan work. The future that we study and plan for begins today. How well we execute these plans is important, but the value of them rests in their usefulness as yardsticks of performance. We must have long-range goals to keep from being frustrated by short-range failures.

We must reaffirm our belief in growth and show our faith by a program of participation, wherein we can continue to make further contributions to the full and exciting life ahead. For this is a new frontier, with new demands and new responsibilities—the time to move into a hardheaded reappraisal of management goals and operating methods. A successful business requires planning to make it that way. The present is always tugging at us, but tomorrow—that is a dreamer's paradise. Everything is possible with tomorrow: No dream too foolish—no goal too high.

It is absolutely necessary that a business justify its existence through economic performance. It must be able to innovate or create change and it must obtain adequate profits to meet the costs of the necessary risks which it generates. The balance sheet is the record of an association's past—not a guide to its future. The earnings statement proves nothing but that the association still has momentum from what has gone before. Our financial statement reflects our past, but how much does it tell of the future—or the men whose actions today determine tomorrow's profits. A good balance sheet is like the foundation of a house. It is important, but nobody lives in it. Everything that counts happens above that level. Our officers must be managers of people, not monitors of work. We must concern ourselves not only with the question of financial solvency, but with that of human solvency as well.

We have grown ourselves into a rugged test of managerial skill, where analysis, foresight, and risk of misjudgment will play leading roles. We must act now for a better future. We cannot afford to keep our eyes closed and fingers crossed, hoping for the best; nor can we afford to ignore the economic evolution taking place under our very nose—giving lipservice to market research while continuing to operate by the seat of the pants. The hour of luck and guesswork is over. The amateur must surrender to the professional in the management of finance.

We are knee deep in an age of acute competition. We must face the hard, cold facts of the earnings squeeze, discretionary consumer spending and inadequate investment outlets. The sleeping giants have been shaken out of their lethargic atmosphere by the arrival of the trojan horse. But if we are to maintain our prominence, it is obvious that we must develop new techniques, methods, and thinking processes.

We must recognize the need for forward planning in order to pinpoint areas of weakness and keep pace with running objectives so that we can adjust policy before it is too late. We must set standards of job performance and measure the effectiveness of managers. We must evaluate the total job being done, and at the same time accomplish a better communication among those concerned with a particular job. Management must create and arrange organization conditions and methds of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best, by directing their efforts toward organization objectives. We must develop men who have the capacity to live in all dimensions, who shift easily from one to another. We must create and develop voluntary cooperation among those people whom we supervise. A manager must concern himself with the new, and with creative initiative. He must devote his principal interest to the different, the rare, the significant. He must have imagination to innovate, capacity for judgment, and an inclination to persevere. He must think, ponder, and frequently reconsider. He must decide and he must act.

Clarity of objective and organized planning through deliberate study of future conditions can prepare us for change and at the same time help us adjust to it. It is so much more important for us to look forward than to look back, in order to insure our survival and progress.

The secret of our continued success is to set high goals, expecting nothing—but to work as though you expected everything.

For we, as industry leaders, are men with a big job—the job of keeping vitally alive more than a century long precedent of serving America. As we raise the banners "100 billion strong," let them be our inspiration, our incentive to forge ahead toward a business twice in size in half the time.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY CECIL H. UNDERWOOD, VICE PRESIDENT, ISLAND CREEK COAL CO., HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

As West Virginia begins its second century, we must accept the fact that welfare demands of our State will remain a heavy drain on Government revenues for yet some time. With about 16 percent of our population receiving welfare payments (excluding social security), the State will be hard pushed to find necessary money to support these programs. Revenues which are needed for schools, roads and other services often will be channeled into the welfare budget. As important as welfare services are, they do not create wealth, generate growth or conserve resources; they merely represent humanitarian holding actions.

In reality, our problem—immediate and long range—is how to adjust the State's vast human resources with the manpower needs of industries based in our mineral resource complex. While moving through this kind of readjustment, planning minds and administrative genius must be based solidly in the long-range future. The State must find a way to lead rather than follow economic cycles.

Long-range planning is complicated by the lingering threat of "cold war." Will our resources be needed for military mobilization? Or, can we use them for peaceful advancement? I believe that West Virginia is uniquely situated to serve the needs of our Nation in the years ahead in either event: to create a new economic base for peacetime prosperity; or to conserve the economic and military strength of America in a cold war.

Any future plan must be based in the rapidly emerging realities of our time. Coal and oil from our region are just beginning to feel the competitive thrust of Russian oil as it moves into the world markets. Unquestionably, this competition will become more serious as the Soviets rely in greater degrees on oil as an instrument of their foreign policy. The Russian oil threat is not so much a market fight as it is a competitive exercise in functional flexibility.

America must constantly evaluate its relative capability to interchange a varied range in the form of energy matter. To meet the Soviet challenge, the coal and other mineral concentrations of our Appalachian heartland must be functionally mobilized to provide a free and flexible flow of energy to all parts of our continent and throughout the free world.

If our region can develop the capability to provide energy in the form and quantity needed to meet constantly shifting combinations of world needs, we will help our Nation to hold all competition for world control in effective balance.

The making of synthetic fuels from coal has been the subject of research in this country since the days of World War I. Its concept has broadened to the interchangeability of energy forms and its tempo increased since World War II.

Since it was first mined, coal has enjoyed a position as one of America's basic fuels. For many years it dominated the energy market; now it supplies only 22 percent of our energy needs.

Greater horizons beckon beyond these limits. Scientific research already has proved that any product manufactured by the chemicals and synthetic industries can be made from coal if it can be converted to usable forms. The only barriers standing between current research findings and these ultimate usages are the economics and techniques of conversion. Once this scientific breakthrough is realized, coal will become a base for manufacturing.

While West Virginia depended on coal to support its single-industry economy, coal has looked to research to stay alive competitively within the limits of the energy market. Now it is moving into a position where it can generate research for new uses, new products, and new scientific techniques. Once it becomes a manufacturing base, coal will lead economic cycles rather than follow them.

If West Virginia is to profit from this new world of scientific economics, it must welcome the new century with new vision. We need to discover or to create new uses for our coal, petroleum, chemicals, sands, timber, and other resources. From new uses will come new industries, new products and new jobs based on the needs of an automated society. Scientific research and economic intelligence will accelerate industrial development.

Leadership for this new life demands concentration of knowledge and dedication of research efforts. The college and university campuses must provide the focal point for this research and generate the brainpower to reach our goals. The colleges cannot fulfill their obligations, unless they can depend on a steady flow of well-trained and curious-minded students from the public school system.

The mountaineer of 1863 found his freedom in a new State. The new mountaineer of 1963 must find his freedom in a new world of research.

Our contemporary scientific advancement was attained only through years of painstaking research. The world today is alive with scientific revolution and daily pronouncements remind us of its extraordinary speed and sweep.

From an obscure amount invested 50 years ago, American industry and Government will spend well in excess of $60 billion in research during this decade. Reviewing the past half century, we can see clearly the practical relationship between the explosive expansion of research in industry, Government, academic and institutional environments, and the equally explosive growth of our material and intellectual civilization. These two form a unit, and we will continue to advance only so long as each feeds upon the other in mutual growth.

Historically, science has been a practical way to get things done. Now, we Americans recognize it as a way of life. It is rapidly becoming the common denominator of modern nations in international affairs. Through the great unities of approach and preparation which bind those dedicated to the scientific way, we may perhaps find that thus far elusive path to peace.

From the ideology expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the American concept of political freedom has been based squarely on the individual citizen. Scientific research extends to the very extreme its demands on individual effort in the search for scientific truth. Think of the intense personal efforts it requires in preparation, dedication, imagination, and originality.

It seems logical, then, that true scientific investigation will thrive best if a proper climate exists—I speak of such things as understanding, appreciation, and support, from Government, society, and industry.

To remain in a competitive world position, America must advance its research and exploration at a rate far greater than anything we have known. The patterns of these new demands are so different from our familiar past, that pioneering will be exceedingly difficult. For this reason, I believe an important share of scientific research leadership must fall to those parts of our country where dynamic change and growth are welcome and possible. Among all the States of our country, I think of none more peculiarly fitted to become the center of modern scientific research than West Virginia—a young mountain State with its rich deposits of natural resources, a compelling desire to grow, a favored geographic position, and a people dedicated to individual freedom and performance.

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Federal Government involvement in savings and loan affairs dates from the depression years of the 1930's when the economy of the United States received a crushing blow. But it is plausible to forecast that Congress will maintain a continuing interest in the welfare of the Nation's savings and loan associations.

The depression in large part was triggered by wholesale failures in the Nation's banking and financial system. Inherent weaknesses were suddenly revealed when the strain and pressure of the business slump was brought to bear on financial institutions. Banks and savings and loan associations were caught up in the chain reaction of failure, and a vital and important segment of our national economy was literally laid low. However, we are aware that the depression reached into every facet of our national life and every phase of commerce.

The Congress realized that the lifeblood of the economy was in the financial resources available to it for expansion, for a ready source of credit, and for the services financial intermediaries could provide. It therefore moved to meet the challenge by enacting two meaningful legislative measures which have become pillars of strength for the entire savings and loan industry. I refer to the creation of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank System. The extension of Federal insurance for participating associations and the guarantee it afforded savers did much to restore confidence in financial institutions.

With the inception of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, savings and loan associations for the first time had available to them a ready source of liquidity for use in emergency situations when short-term demands dictated. They could also avail themselves of long-term credit to meet economic ebb and flow. The Federal Government thus has become an active partner in the destinies of the savings and loan business. A Federal system of savings and loan associations really grew out of the depression, and from acts of Congress to overcome the depression.

But there was an underlying, and in many respects, a more important reason for Congress to take keen interest in savings and loan affairs. It was the realization that the savings and loan business itself was a key part of one of the largest industries in the United States; namely, the homebuilding industry. Without an adequate and proper financing of housing, it was rationalized that the homebuilding industry would fall back and retrench, and would not be able to finance the homes under construction. This, too, was a major element in the decision of the Congress to move ahead with legislation which was to enable the savings and loan business to become stronger and better stabilized.

In intervening years since the depression much legislation has been passed which has broadened and extended the lending authority and financing ability of savings and loan associations. I am speaking here of Federal associations to which only Federal Government legislation could apply. But it is generally recognized that as Federal legislation is enacted and put into use the respective States take parallel action to give parity to State-chartered institutions.

There are some who hold that the Federal Government is more of a drawback than an asset in the fortunes of the savings and loan business and that your organizations would be much better off if the Government would permit associations to operate in a more unrestricted climate. The Federal Government isn't infallible.

Certainly our democracy has made its share of mistakes. On the other hand, I have seen the Central Government act with wisdom in times of stress. As proof, look back to the years of the depression once again and reflect on the two major items of legislation that were passed by the Congress that still serve as a bedrock for your industry.

Your associations are $100 billion strong, or at least are expected to be sometime this month. More than ever, your industry is a giant economic force that finances more than 45 percent of the Nation's homes. It is clear that the Congress is interested in the well-being and future success of the savings and loan business simply because it exerts such far-reaching influence in the economic progress of our country.

What's happening in the 88th Congress? Are savings and loan associations meeting success with their legislative program? To understand the progress made thus far it is useful to note that an unusual volume of complex legislation has been brought before the Congress. The administration's tax bill was introduced early in the session—probably the most difficult measure to come before the House this year. Further complicating the progress of the Congress are several unusually controversial items on the calendar, such as the civil rights bills, the railroad crisis settlement, and, in the Senate, the ratification of the test ban treaty. All of these contribute to delay of hearings on legislation of specific interest to your industry.

In late May of this year, a bill was introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, that would raise the insurance ceiling for both insured banks and savings and loan associations from the present $10,000 figure to $25,000. At the time of introduction, industry leaders tell me that they estimated there was a better than 50–50 chance that this item would be passed by the end of this year. The primary bill had been introduced by Chairman PATMAN and thus carried the endorsement of a committee chairman; identical bills had been

introduced by committee members on both the Democratic and Republican side, indicating bipartisan support; both insuring corporations, the Federal Deposit Insurance Coporation and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation had publicly endorsed this legislation.

During consideration of the measure, the White House Committee on Financial Institutions, known as the Heller Committee, released its long-overdue report. The committee made a number of recommendations concerning the operation of savings and loan associations. Shortly thereafter, a new administration bill was introduced in the House, and was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. This proposal included higher insurance ceilings. Also it provided for more rigid liquidity requirements and authority for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to exercise dividend controls over savings and loan associations at the option of the Board. Although no hearings have been held on the administration proposal, it is a reasonable assumption that the original bill endorsed and supported by the savings and loan business will not be reported until the administration measure has been a subject for further hearings.

Later this month the House Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings to consider proposals to broaden and liberalize lending powers of financial institutions. Commercial banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions will be concerned with these hearings, and all have indicated an interest and a willingness to give testimony. I am informed that the savings and loan industry has forwarded to the committee a legislative package that would increase lending powers of Federal institutions and would grant authority for expansion into new areas of lending that are related to home financing but have heretofore been restricted.

Probably one of the most important of these powers would be authority for Federal institutions to deal in State and municipal securities. Numerous legislators who are expert in this field believe this to be a necessary adjunct to the basic home lending function of the savings and loan association because State and municipal securities finance those elements of the community that are vitally necessary to the environment of the home itself. This means that savings and loan associations for the first time would be able to help finance schools, streets, waterworks, sewage disposal systems and other municipal facilities that help to make the home complete.

Another key provision would give to Federal associations the authority to finance home furnishings and appliances, in addition to the basic mortgage. I understand also that your leaders are urging legislative authority to permit your associations to finance a relatively new type of home or residence that has been spawned since post-war years—the mobile home.

These proposals incorporate a philosophy that is rapidly gaining favor among not only savings and loan organizations, but also among other elements of the financial community, as well as among those in Government charged with supervision. The objective is to provide greater freedom and flexibility to meet new markets as they develop.

We have seen a trend toward freer investment and lending policies, not only for savings and loan firms, but also for national banks and Federal credit unions. The prevailing sentiment seems to be that more adaptable regulation of these institutions can be consistent with protecting the interests of savers and investors.

Stated another way, the central thrust of the new philosophy seems to be the encouragement of a greater range of competition between various Federal financing institutions by permitting banks to invest more heavily in mortgages, and savings and loan associations to make more extensive investments outside the area of single family homes.

The rationale for this new trend of thought is that the public can be better served by increased competition between the various credit extenders and lending institutions.

In light of this trend, I predict that the Congress will be much more receptive to new ideas in legislation relating to finance than it would have been 5 years ago—more willing to accept innovation and pioneering.

And there is reason to believe that this more original thinking is necessary to meet emerging trends in the increasingly urban American society. Here is but one example of change: Apartment construction and apartment living have skyrocketed over the past several years. In 1962, apartment construction accounted for 30 percent of total construction efforts in the country. In large metropolitan areas, over 50 percent of new construction was registered in apartment building. As these figures indicate, apartment living is a vital part of our economy and these units must be financed.

Congress, in the closing days of the last session, passed legislation that accorded recognition of this development and authorized Federal associations to utilize an additional 10 percent of assets for lending on apartment units. This change to permit financing of more apartment buildings will probably have less significance to us in West Virginia than to our counterparts in large metropolitan centers such as Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles. However, we must be responsive to regional needs as well as national ones in meeting the challenge of our growing urbanization.

Congress must be alert to comprehend and to meet the problem of the housing needs of the American people as requirements shift from one form to another. As needs vary, so should the capacity of the savings and loan association expand to meet the demands of the American consumer. I am not suggesting, however, adjustments to accommodate the short-lived trends of housing that emerge from time to time and die overnight. Nor am I implying that you or the Congress should move imprudently in trying to keep pace with all types of living patterns. But, as a solid, unmistakable and long-term living pattern develops, this area probably should be opened to your institutions as well as others.

But, in the quest for and investigation of new markets and additional business, I am confident that savings and loan associations will not overlook their time-honored and essential function—that of promoting homeownership through the financing of the individual home.

Encroachment on U.S. Territorial Waters by Foreign Fishermen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Jack Metcalfe and published in the New York Sunday News of September 15, 1963. It involves the serious problem presented to the fishermen of this Nation and other nations in territorial waters. It is a matter of a very serious nature to the fishing industry. It has caused many incidents with other countries. Many problems are involved in light of what has been occurring off the coasts of other countries, particularly in Central and South America, and also in light of the growth of the Russian and Japanese fishing fleets, which are constantly encroaching upon our own territorial waters, off New England, in the North Pacific, and in other offshore waters of the United States.

Mr. Metcalfe has analyzed the subject very thoroughly. It is a problem which has been before the Commerce Committee, and the committee has recently reported a bill which would define the law in regard to poaching in our territorial waters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By Jack Metcalfe)

WASHINGTON, September 14.—Congress, it is now almost certain, will shortly vote a crackdown on pushy foreign fishermen who invade U.S. territorial waters.

Backers of the bill to accomplish this piece of enlightened American self-interest report that they have rallied support from almost every section of the Nation. They also have succeeded in generating a sense of urgency not always aroused for legislation, no matter how important to the country's well-being.

What got the measure—which would prohibit foreign fishing vessels from operation inside American sea frontiers—moving was the spectacle of fleets of up to 300 Russian trawlers seining off the Atlantic coast this summer.

The Senate Commerce Committee okayed the bill to keep them far from the shore. The unanimous committee vote Thursday was in response in large part to alarm at such brazen threats to the Nation's security voiced by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and others. Legislators in both Houses of Congress are believed ready to follow the committee's lead when the bill, which has the administration's blessing, goes before them within the next few weeks.

It is noteworthy, however, that there are other, solid reasons for quick enactment of this bill than the patent need to guard against sophisticated espionage carried out by the Red trawlers.

These include the damage being done to the important U.S. fisheries industry by large-scale "packing." In this the Soviets are not alone. Some of America's firmer friends, notably Japan, have been just as grabby as the Russians in their invasions of American fishing grounds.

WE'RE NOW NO. 5 AMONG THE FISHING NATIONS

Partly because of this, the United States is gradually losing out in the fierce competition among the nations which have a fisheries industry. While the world's annual catch has more than doubled since 1948 and is nearing 100 billion pounds, the United States has only slightly increased its volume. It has fallen from second place among the fishing nations in 1956 to fifth, behind Japan, Peru, Red China, and Russia.

This sorry state which forces the United States increasingly to import fish to meet rising demand is unlikely to be improved so long as the floating fish factories operated by the Soviets and Japanese compete with the largely antiquated, short-range U.S. fishing fleet on America's own home waters.

The Russians, incidentally, are striving mightily to boost their fish production this year to second place, outstripping their Peiping rivals. Toward this end they have fully mechanized fleets in which the huge factory mother ship processes the catch of its satellite trawlers. Able to stay at sea for months, the fleets deliver fish to the shore ready for the consumer.

EVEN THE MINNOWS CAN'T ESCAPE

American fishermen claim that the needs of these voracious, floating packing plants threaten to sweep U.S. waters clean of fish. Some have accused the Soviet trawlers of using nets with a mesh so fine that even minnows cannot escape.

Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, the moving force with Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska, behind the bill to curb foreign trawlers, has noted that the Japanese fish for salmon on the high seas, a practice banned in this country. Their nets are miles long, MAGNUSON has pointed out, and have trapped whole generations of the highly prized fish.

The Magnuson-Bartlett bill cannot end these and other abuses. But it is designed to give American fishermen a fairer shake. In declaring U.S. territorial waters off-limits to foreign fishermen, it would leave to the President to determine boundaries.

In some cases, the President presumably would stick to the traditional 3-mile limit. In others, he would extend the limit to 12 or 15 miles—which is what MAGNUSON favors. It would also empower the President to bar foreign interlopers from the waters of the Continental Shelf. Those are offshore areas in which the water depth is 600 feet or less. Off the Atlantic coast, the shelf extends as far as 180 miles to seaward—a man-sized happy hunting ground for American fishermen.

For the first time, too, the bill would provide penalties for trespassing foreign fishermen. Instead of merely being escorted to international waters by the Coast Guard, as at present, violators would be subject to a $10,000 fine or a year in prison or both.

BILL HAS AN INTERESTING ANGLE

The bill contains another interesting feature. It provides that the limits can be waived by agreement between the United States and individual nations. This is designed partly to permit fishing in areas which may be overstocked.

More importantly, this clause would give the United States a potent weapon in bargaining with other maritime nations, especially those which rig their rules to the disadvantage of American fishermen.

If, for instance, Ecuador continues to seize and fine American tuna boats operating inside its claimed territorial waters—which extend 200 miles offshore—the United States could threaten to retaliate in kind.

The bill also would help U.S. negotiators in current talks with Canada about its decision to create an exclusive fishing preserve extending 12 miles to seaward. And when the bill is on the books, it is believed likely that Mexico will not feel so free to harass American shrimpers off its shores.

These aspects of the bill plainly are not as dramatic as the curb on Soviet trawlers' activities, although in their way they are considered almost as important to the Nation's foreign policy and economy. Congress, nevertheless, might not have been fired to act on the proposal had there not been scores of electronically equipped Russian fishing vessels off Cape Cod this summer.

Is Conservatism Dynamic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Is Conservatism Dynamic?" delivered by me before the Conservative Club of Montclair, N.J., on August 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS CONSERVATISM DYNAMIC?

(An address by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, to the Conservative Club of Montclair, Montclair, N.J., August 24, 1963)

The conservative movement in America is bristling with controversy, political fireworks, new ideas, splinter groups of all kinds and a crying need for definition of its basic characteristics, roots, ideology, and purpose. In speaking before the Central New Jersey Conference of Conservatives last fall, I attempted to define the 10 marks of the conservative.[1]

In this paper, I plan to outline the 10 marks briefly, then move on to current public controversy in the following areas: the far right reactionaries, liberals and conservatives, conservative desire for war, conservatives and foreign aid, will conservatives compress the Federal Government? a strange shift in public opinion.

These 10 marks of conservative political thought in America are:

1. SELF RESPONSIBILITY

The conservative believes that each individual citizen possesses the total responsibility for his life, his obligations, and the consequences of his actions and beliefs.

2. A BELIEF IN THE MORALITY OF PROFITABLE ENTERPRISE

In the long run, earned profits are the surest sign of responsible behavior by all who make up a legitimate enterprise in a free society. Any person can demonstrate the morality of profits to himself by working hard for a year and achieving the goal of having money left over in his savings, after all his expenses and obligations have been satisfied.

3. VOLUNTARISM

Conservatives believe that if individual rights and the choosing of goals are kept in the people's hands, this Nation has its best guarantee of progress, peace, economic growth, and justice for the individual citizen.

4. EQUALITY UNDER LAW

Conservative thought demands a legal and political structure which insures free competition, redress for injury, fair trial, equal rights of participation, and the right of a citizen to protect his home and his property. We do not believe in any kind of second-class citizenship, nor in restricting people in any way for reasons of race, color, or hereditary characteristics.

5. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOCIETY

Conservatives are keenly aware of their responsibilities to family, community, state and society, and they discharge them. They pay the bills for our society, keep the machinery of civilization in operation, create new growth, build career opportunities for others, and help those who need help. You will find them managing most effective businesses, charities, and constructive associations to advance society.

6. A BELIEF THAT RIGHTS ARE WEDDED TO RESPONSIBILITIES

With the maxim that you can't get something worthwhile for nothing, conservatives affirm that individual freedom, the greatest human right of all, is tied to its twin—our revolutionary responsibility to extend and preserve freedom within and outside our borders.

7. A BELIEF IN THE DISPERSION OF POWER

Our belief in the checks and balances of our republic impel us to regard any concentration of governmental, economic or social power as dangerous to the society. For this reason, conservatives would cut down any monolithic, arbitrary power over the whole of society whether it resides in the Government, the State, the church, in a company, a union or association.

8. A BELIEF THAT LIFE ON EARTH CAN BE IMPROVED

A modern conservative recognizes and welcomes change. He wants to get on with the job of figuring out how to deal intelligently with today and tomorrow. He believes in the perfectibility of human society and works for it in a practical way.

9. INSISTENCE ON BALANCING THE BOOKS

In a free society, conservatives believe that individuals, cities, States, the Federal Government, and every kind of industrial and commercial enterprise cannot survive unless they balance their books realistically. Responsible individuals and organizations pay their debts, live within their incomes and provide reserves for their future needs. Irresponsible people court bankruptcy by "betting on the come," or incurring obligations for future generations to pay off. In the last 30 years, our largely liberal governments have demonstrated this liberal belief that the piper never has to be paid. This cannot work.

10. THE IDEA THAT ACTIONS REFLECT BASIC BELIEFS

If men, organizations, or States oppress or exploit human beings, refuse to behave with honor and integrity, repudiate their debts and commit crimes against their fellows they cannot be treated as equals to those who maintain the constructive values of human civilization. Their actions bespeak their degeneracy. Conservatives would seek to establish social instruments that enable society to deal with spoilers for what they are—the living representatives of the lowest and most destructive human impulses.

These, then, are the 10 marks of the conservative.

I would like to move on in this analysis of conservatism because I feel that many exciting and significant areas remain to be explored. Perhaps the best way to do this would be to take up a number of the expressed fears about the conservative movement and explore their validity. Let us look first at the millstone hanging from the conservative's neck.

THE FAR RIGHT REACTIONARIES

Many Americans squirm when they hear the label "conservative" because they think of pre-World War II isolationism, John Birch Society members, America Firsters, segregationists, Ku Klux Klansmen, and many other little groups who feel that freedom means an extra-legal hunting or hating license rather than a responsible privilege held under law. Let us look honestly at the so-called radical right. First, it is not radical at all. Most of its elements either believe in the ancient rule of force outside the law, or else they merely reflect an ignorant unawareness of their world.

As our society grows more complex and changes before our eyes each day, many citizens—especially those who cannot easily change with the times, or who possess little breadth of human understanding—lose their living courage and succumb to fear. Fear always seeks a scapegoat, and rather than see themselves in the mirror for what they are, these people exonerate themselves by finding something or someone to hate. In the past, this element of fear in our American society has burned witches in Puritan times, held African natives in contempt as

[1] Printed in the Nov. 15, 1962, issue of Vital Speeches.

slaves and sold them as farm animals, shot American Presidents, hated all foreigners, attacked Wall Street barons in the 1930's, screamed Communist at those who sought new ideas; and today it hates the U.N., big business, the Federal Government, and all taxes. These attacks are actually psychotic projections of people who fear that their world is slipping away forever.

This understandable but unforgivable human error is called reactionaryism and it exists on the far right just as much as it does on the far left.

On the far right, you find people striving to turn back the clock of history, rejecting change and new ideas without thinking about whether they might be constructive improvements in society.

On the far left, you find others rejecting all solutions that do not involve the growth of government—especially the Federal Government—without thinking about whether voluntary or private solutions might be more practical in the long run.

The common denominator phrase that describes the actions of these extremist groups, right or left, is "without thinking." Fear unseats their wisdom and installs hate, distrust and malice in their hearts. From that point on they think no more, but spew out venom whenever affairs of the day are mentioned. The far right and left are each notable for their inconsiderate and opinionated attacks as well as their basic lack of love for their fellow man.

In contrast, most Americans of conservative political belief are constructive, responsible and warm-hearted citizens of honor and integrity. They do not deserve to be labeled by the existence of a few noisy reactionaries on the right any more than liberals deserve to be labeled detrimentally by the few wild-eyed socialists and communists on the left. This brings us to consider on common ground that might exist between liberals and conservatives.

As we penetrate to essentials of conservative and liberal thought, we find the two camps drawing closer together. This is really not very surprising. After all, we are human beings first, political beings secondarily. Two sincere, thoughtful Americans of largely opposite political persuasion have far more in common than they have in disagreement. This fact may be one of the hidden success secrets of America's political stability.

Aren't we all getting thoroughly sick of the postures of politicos, the bunco of groupthink behavior and the name-calling that seeks to label the ins and the outs? In the history of this country, many liberals have contributed greatly to our society. Others will in the future, I am sure.

The true liberal sees the conservative as a necessary component of a healthy American society. He really does not want to exterminate you and I suggest we return the favor. For example, Norman Cousins, the liberal editor of the Saturday Review, wrote an editorial entitled "In Defense of the Genuine Conservative," in which he said:

"The term conservative has a specific background and meaning. It stands for stability as opposed to innovation; for restraint as opposed to daring; for the preservation of inherited conditions as opposed to drastic reform. These ideas are not only compatible with a free society; they have an essential place in it, along with genuine liberalism. True conservatism is opposed to liberalism, but not destructive of it. The principal difference between conservatism and liberalism is represented not so much by disagreement over the nature of a free society or its goals as by disagreement over the approaches. Both conservatism and liberalism serve as the twin structural supports of constitutional government."

Mr. Cousins' definition of conservative thought does not quite cover what I see as dynamic, creative, and constructive in the conservative idea. He makes its sound a little stiffish about change or innovation—which he arrogates to the liberal a bit too much. He does not perceive that conservatives are far better managers than liberals; however, his definition is not unkind and it has strong merit in its comprehension of these confluent sources of American greatness.

Having spoken to Mr. Cousins, it is natural to look at an issue which obsesses him—the danger of destroying human civilization by atomic war. Some people have intense fears that conservatives want to go to war.

If we wanted to be snide, we might suggest that the political party which is most closely identified with liberal thinking, led this Nation into two of the worst world wars in history, mismanaged the heartbreaking Korean incident and dropped the first atomic bombs ever used on defenseless citizens. However, this would be too pat and too simple a way to look at the issue. When some Americans think of conservative leadership in connection with American foreign policy, they fear that we are eager to blast Cuba, swap rockets with Russia, and invade the Chinese mainland. Again, this is too pat and too simple minded to be true. A conservative foreign policy for this Nation would find more economic means to maintain our strength, would firmly advance the cause of human freedom everywhere in an ideological offensive, would not foolishly grant governments our trust and aid, and would have long since protected the Cuban people from their Batistas and their Castros when such a defense was easy to accomplish. The dunderheaded, myopic incompetence with which our liberal statesmen have managed our policy with China, at Yalta, or in the Bay of Pigs, and in many other parts of the world, reveals a basic and inherent inability among liberals. They seem unable to handle the commonsense problems of leadership, and vacillate too much to form a wise, constructive foreign policy. Perhaps liberals are more effective as the loyal opposition than as managers of a government. We can do better by a wide margin. Another fear is that conservatives would destroy foreign aid.

New nations are emerging all over the world. In old nations as well as new, the hand is out and Uncle Sam is generous to a fault. I believe in the Constitution and in its limitations on the activities of the Federal Government.

Nowhere in the Constitution do I find the right of Congress to give the $100 billion we have passed out to other nations. Congressman EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky, has offered $1,000 in cash to anyone in our executive branch or in the Congress who can point out to him the section of the Constitution which authorizes our Government to appropriate money for the benefit and use of foreign nations. Apparently, there have been no takers. Yes; conservatives believe in the American people and in their innate generosity which has surpassed that of any other people in history. We believe in our power to stimulate true capitalistic growth in emergent nations. Our many private company managements could create this, if they were permitted the opportunity. We do not believe in giving money to dictators, monarchs, and Socialist states who oppress and exploit their people, yet this is what we have done and continue to do as a nation. It is a blot on our collective honor as human beings and as Americans. Conservatives know their responsibility in this world. Just as no American can truly enjoy the privileges of his citizenship when he knows that others in our midst are denied them; so too, no nation can truly enjoy its freedom when oppressed and enslaved states exist in this world. Conservatives acknowledge the fundamental mission established by the American Revolution; namely, to free all men everywhere so that they might seek their own happiness, their well-being, and their self-respect in a free, lawful society.

WILL CONSERVATIVES COMPRESS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

On the issue of the size of the Federal Government, conservatives believe that most American citizens know something about work—what constitutes a day's honest toil, what wages should buy in performance, and how work must produce something of value to society. I am sure that many competent and sincere Federal executives and civil servants fulfill all these conditions, however, the fact remains that the Federal Government has grown like a giant, uncontrollable cancer to infect every limb and organ of the body politic. This Nation simply does not need 2.5 million people employed in Federal functions. Our Federal Government engages in a reported 700 businesses which compete with companies which employ the rest of us. These 700-odd businesses are run by Federal managers who pay no taxes, no interest on capital loans, no dividends to stockholders, but some analysts of their records have reported that these agencies have lost $81 billion. To accomplish that requires incompetence on a scale so magnificent as to be beyond argument. Our colossal $300 billion Federal debt and this year's $100 billion budget provide screaming testimony of generic incompetence in current Federal management.

One way to meet this problem might be to amend the Constitution to limit the Federal power to tax, another might be for our Congressmen to initiate an organized effort to appraise each Federal business and function as to its importance to the function of Government; its infringement on citizenship rights; the inherent constructive value it contributes; whether it duplicates other activities, public or private; whether the public value received is worth the expense.

An honest and fair evaluation of this kind—not a punitive attack—would probably result in the retention of useful new and old Federal functions, and the chopping down of inconsequential busywork. I am sure that sincere, devoted Federal employees and executives would support this effort to make sense of their world and to cut down the fantastic waste of public funds they witness every day.

We believe this reasonable and fair approach would result in cutting the Federal annual budget one-third to one-half its present cost to the people. When such true savings are effected, then it becomes possible to reduce the national debt by substantial amounts, and eventually, to be in a position to cut down the level of income taxation on our citizens. How many Americans would really be against a conservative policy on Government which would result in better, more efficient Government; a healthier, more dynamic business community which would have the funds to grow and create millions of new jobs; more hard cash in the hands of every American family; a dollar bill which steadily rose in its purchasing power.

There are many more issues which require similar consideration from all of us. For example, State and local government employment has zoomed to almost 7 million persons. How can we justify such exorbitant expense in our own communities?

Conservative thought is new, fresh, and has the opportunity to gain strength from all modern and ancient advances in management organization theory, dynamic economic theory, political theory, the social sciences, and the new techniques of operations research and value analysis. We can, if we will, penetrate to the heart of public functions and create a major advance in the art of government. As long as we continue to think creatively, to consider new ideas, and to reach for a greater future for all Americans, we can combine the social and physical sciences in creating a modern government which can truly advance the freedom and fulfillment of mankind. The Nation is ready

for a leadership which combines wisdom with balanced perspective and concern for the rights of the individual.

A STRANGE SHIFT IN PUBLIC OPINION

In closing, I would like to give you some extraordinary news from the field of attitude research. My organization[2] has measured the U.S. public's attitudes toward Government over the last 17 years. We have trend lines that show the steady drift toward the Socialist concept of assigning all responsibilities to the Federal Government. Every time we measured nationwide over these years, we saw the people of this country drifting left.

However, in August of this year, 1963, we completed our work and were shocked to find that the trend left is stopped, and it may be possible that the Nation is actually changing its attitudes in the direction of conservative ideas. The signal is clear to all politicians and candidates for election in both political parties.

This important shift on the part of American people is too small to constitute a major change but it does look like handwriting on the wall.

CONSERVATIVES MAY NOT BE VOICES CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS

In recent months, we have had farmers turning down Federal handouts and control, a flood of citizen protests telling Congressmen they cannot cut taxes without cutting expenses, and a steadily mounting criticism of union leader arbitrariness in shutting down our economy. These are signs that the average citizen is beginning to understand what we are talking about. This is opportunity. Opportunity to speak out, to think constructively, to plan practical political action and to give this Nation the leadership it needs. I mean an executive branch of the Government run by conservatives, with a Congress in which conservative and liberal thought are each well-represented. This dynamic combination would spark America to fulfill its basic role as the conscience and the economic mainspring of mankind.

[2] Opinion Research Corp.:—"Business Climate Improves," August 1963, the Public Opinion Index for Industry.

A Circus, a Trip, and a Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Circus, a Trip, and a Change," written by Drew Pearson and published in the Washington Post of September 9, 1963. Mr. Pearson has for many years written letters to his grandchildren on various subjects. The letters are phrased in a simple direct manner and deal with many problems faced by our country and by the world. They are almost "must" reading for adults. I am sure my colleagues in the Senate will enjoy reading this entertaining letter to Mr. Pearson's grandson, George L. Arnold, Jr.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CIRCUS, A TRIP, AND A CHANGE

(By Drew Pearson)

(Drew Pearson's column today takes the form of a letter to his second grandson, George L. Arnold, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, *September 17, 1963.*

DEAR GEORGIE: I want to write you about two things—a circus that is showing in Philadelphia and a trip which I have just taken through Europe. In a strange sort of way the two are connected.

The circus is one you would love. If you were not 'way out in California I would take you to it. It has an act in which two bears put on gloves and stage a boxing match. It has some wonderful clowns and some daredevil Cossacks on their horses.

As you know your grandfather is an old circus hand, and I have seen circuses all the way from Singapore to Chanute, Kans. But the reason I am so interested in this circus is because it's the Moscow circus and about 15 years ago I first suggested that it come to the United States in order to show the American people how the Russian people can laugh just as hard as we can, and in order to promote people-to-people friendship.

Well, it took a long time, but the Moscow circus has finally come and it does show that the Russian people are just as human as we are.

The reason I say the Moscow circus is connected, in a way, with my trip to Europe, is that I went through some of the Communist countries and found the people very friendly, very human, and very anxious to know Americans better.

WONDERFUL AGE OF 12

This may not seem strange to you because you are only 12 years old and not old enough to hate.

But the reason it's strange that I was well received in the Communist countries is this: Only a few years ago I would not have been well received. Only a few years ago they were calling me all sorts of names.

For instance, Pravda, the official paper of the Soviet Government, wrote about your grandfather on August 31, 1946: "Pearson steps out as a warmonger * * * will resort to any means to sabotage the cause of peace."

Four years later, on January 22, 1950, the Soviet magazine Ogenek called your grandfather an "unwavering adherent of the maniacal plans for the establishment of world domination by American monopolies," while in June of that year, Universul, the official Communist newspaper of Bucharest, Romania, called your grandfather "the zealous agent of Wall Street monopolies."

Well, last month I went to Bucharest, the same city where they had called me names, and the International Journalists Union gave a dinner in my honor.

I also went to Russia, where I had been called a lot of names, but where this time I was invited to broadcast over the radio to the people of southern Russia.

COMMUNIST CHANGE

The point is that I had not changed, but the outlook and policy of the Communist governments have changed.

During 1946 to 1950, at the time those Russian newspapers were calling me so many names, I was urging people-to-people friendship and the lowering of the Iron Curtain so people could get acquainted. I said that if people got to know each other they wouldn't want war. And in 1950, when some of those critical editorials were written, I was starting a campaign to float messages by balloon over the Iron Curtain to tell the Communist people that Americans wanted to be their friends and wanted people-to-people contacts. I was urging peace at the time the Moscow press was calling me a saboteur of peace.

At one time in 1948 when General Eisenhower was president of Columbia, I had lunch with him and urged him to get behind the people-to-people campaign. He was skeptical.

But I kept hammering away and it was in the summer of 1951 that I finally went to Germany with your Uncle Tyler and began launching those balloons from a rain-soaked wheat field near the Czechoslovak border.

Well a lot has happened since then. Four years later, in 1953, Stalin died and things began to change in Russia. In 1955, I went to the Summit Conference in Geneva, where both Eisenhower and Khrushchev officially adopted the people-to-people program.

At first it worked very slowly, but now it's working pretty well, and the Moscow circus which 15 years ago I suggested should come to the United States is now here; while your grandfather, who was called a "saboteur of peace" and a "zealous agent of Wall Street," was welcomed cordially in Communist countries.

You are 12 years old. That is a wonderful age and a lucky year. And when you grow up you may be able to look back and say that this year—1963—was a lucky year also for the rest of the world. For, with the test ban treaty as a step, it may begin a new period when boys of 18 and 19 and 20 will no longer have to go out as did your father and your grandfather to fight wars.

Lots of love from—

YOUR GRANDFATHER.

CIA Operations in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "CIA Operations in South Vietnam," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, issue of September 16, relating to current political developments in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIA OPERATIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

It will be surprising if current political developments in Vietnam do not increase the sentiment in Congress for a watchdog committee to keep an eye on the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The CIA was established to gather and correlate military intelligence, but that no longer seems to be its principal function. It has become an operational group planning and carrying out secret political and military programs. The Bay of Pigs attempt in Cuba was CIA sponsored, and now it develops that the CIA has been financing Ngo Dinh Nhu's "special forces" which harassed Buddhists in South Vietnam.

While the Kennedy administration has been trying to get President Ngo Dinh Diem to oust his brother Nhu from a position of top influence in the Government, the CIA has apparently been giving Nhu $250,000 a month to maintain his "private army."

The Crisis in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the outrage in Birmingham must be of deep and immediate concern to us all—to those who denounce segregation and discrimination based on race, creed, or nationality; and to those who deplore anarchy and hoodlumism. In this country, with its great tradition and historical beliefs in a society based on law and order and on the equality of man, such a condition can not and must not be allowed to continue.

In his thoughtful column of September 18, the noted writer and political analyst, James Reston, has pointed out that:

> This is what happens when the leaders of a community think law can be unequally applied to protect them and not to protect their fellow citizens. Eventually, others act on their own impulses, and everybody is left with his own fears and suspicions.

Mr. Reston, writing from Birmingham, goes on to make the important point that:

> The Negro leaders feel that even the token compromises of early summer have not been honored. No real improvement has been made, they assert, in the employment of Negroes in the stores and elsewhere, and meanwhile Governor Wallace has been so aggressively segregationist that he has incited the bombers and diverted the municipal government from the task of desegregation.

Mr. Speaker, this article makes an important contribution to our understanding of Birmingham and the Birmingham type of problem. It contributes further to our understanding of the need for prompt action to redress the just grievances of the American Negro.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1963]

BIRMINGHAM

(By James Reston)

BIRMINGHAM, September 17.—The crisis in Birmingham now is not only between white and black, and between State law and Federal law, but between order and anarchy.

Both races are now at the mercy of a few hoodlums. The city is calm today, with the sun shining and the electrical church bells ringing out the old hymns, but nobody knows what may happen in an hour.

In this sense, at least, everybody has something in common because everybody is isolated. The white leaders who put Governor Wallace in office cannot be sure that his authority will protect them. The Negro leaders, who have been preaching patience, cannot be sure after the church bombing of last Sunday that their people will follow them.

This is what happens when the leaders of a community think law can be unequally applied to protect them and not to protect their fellow citizens. Eventually, others act on their own impulses, and everybody is left with his own fears and suspicions.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF FEAR

What was destroyed in the bombing Sunday of the 16th Street Baptist Church here was not only the lives of four Negro children, but the confidence of the whole community in law and order.

The Negroes now feel that they have to protect themselves. On "Dynamite Hill," an area of about 15 square blocks, they have established their own community protective organization, with their own weapons, observation posts and communications system, to watch for potential bombers.

Only a few days ago the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, a leader of the Negro community here, was calling off demonstrations, talking about the progress being made at the Birmingham lunch counters and exhorting his flock to be cool, stay sober, avoid crowds, and don't carry guns or knives.

But today he was saying that the Federal Government must declare an emergency and take over Birmingham. Instead of praising the work of the city's biracial committee, he was denouncing it as a fraud, and instead of opposing demonstrations, he was calling for a massive march on the State capital that would force the Federal Government to come in and protect his people.

NIGHT RIDERS

Even the white community no longer feels quite secure. The two Jewish temples in Birmingham are watched night and day against attack. Employees at the hotels where the Yankee reporters live wonder out loud when the bombers will get around to them, and even the local newspapers, which have recently been critical of the extreme segregationists, are not safe from the night riders.

Without common purposes or confidence in either Governor Wallace or President Kennedy, fear and rumor abound. The Negro leaders here have no confidence in the local police and are openly suspicious of Governor Wallace's State troopers. They even speculate on the possibility that Wallace's men themselves may have been responsible for the bombings.

Some white leaders raise precisely the opposite possibility—namely the Negroes dynamited their own churches in order to put the white community on the spot. Until last weekend, they noted in support of this thesis that "nobody was ever hurt" in these bombings—and argument that seems even less plausible since the casualties of last Sunday.

In this atmosphere of ugly suspicion, the situation here is in some ways worse than it, was during the crisis of last May. Since then admittedly some progress has been made. A few lunch counters and sanitary facilities have been desegregated, the newspapers have urged at least a decent respect for Federal law, there has been some communication between Negro and white leaders, and a more liberal but weaker municipal government has taken over.

BROKEN PROMISES

But the Negro leaders feel that even the token compromises of early summer have not been honored. No real improvement has been made, they assert, in the employment of Negroes in the stores and elsewhere, and meanwhile Governor Wallace has been so aggressively segregationist that he has incited the bombers and diverted the municipal government from the task of segregation.

Paradoxically both white and Negro leaders agree on denouncing the bombings but are far apart on who is responsible. When Justice Department officials arrived here after the death of the four Negro children, they felt that the white leaders of Birmingham were not so concerned about finding the bombers as they were about protecting themselves against the possibility of a counterattack by the Negro community.

In short, both races deplore violence and the tyranny of the lawless minority. They agree in theory with what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said here last night—that if both sides take an eye-for-an-eye philosophy "they will both end up blind." But the tragedy is that they cannot agree on any way of cooperating to protect the community as a whole.

Senator Vance Hartke Advocates Enactment of Quality Stabilization Law as Necessary Aid to Business and the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, quality stabilization legislation pending in both Houses of Congress is designed to provide a necessary curb to a serious malady in our national economic welfare.

Many Americans are being confused by the use of slogans and unresearched decisions in reference to the measure S. 774.

There are over 70 national trade organizations, representing virtually every brand-name retailer and every consumer product of quality name, joined in urging such a law to strengthen their economic status.

There is a malady—that our small independent businessmen are going out of business at an alarming rate, and that our entire commercial system is endangered.

The 11 Senators who sponsor the quality stabilization bill do not contend that its enactment is panacea or cure-all. It can bring some order out of chaos. It cannot hurt, it can help. It will not raise prices. It is elective on the part of the manufacturer, distributor and retailer of a brand name. It removes Government control. It is simple. It is sound. It is needed.

A review of the meaning of a brand name in our economy is important. Recently my esteemed colleague, VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana presented a documented and knowledgeable address on this subject.

I request that the address of Senator HARTKE be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD believing that the many facts should be studied.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR VANCE HARTKE BEFORE MINNESOTA RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, GRAND VIEW LODGE, ECHO LAKE, MINN., AUGUST 27, 1963

It certainly seems there is no group in the United States who less requires a lesson on quality stabilization than the fine members of the Minnesota Retail Hardware Association. Your National Association, whose headquarters are in Indiana, was first to endorse this bill—and has probably done as much as any of the 75 National trade organizations who followed in backing it. The quality stabilization can be won this year—but only because those who need and want it most, have been fighting more for what they want than knocking what they are against.

In this fight, there would be far less chance of victory—perhaps no chance at all—were it not for such as the Minnesota Retail Hardware Association and the Minnesota delegation to Congress, led by Senators HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY.

I said the quality stabilization can be enacted into law. It is well on its way, but it still has very far to go. This is, then, an excellent and necessary time to review what it is, how far it has gone, and what more there is to do.

Now, the problems of small businessmen are not now, have never been, and never will be defined by State lines and boundaries. The problems of small business are largely national problems. What matters far more—the importance of small business is and will always be national, not regional, not merely local.

We may differ among ourselves on many questions of national policy. Whether those differences be political or philosophical, reasonable and responsible Americans recognize that such differences and debates are an essential part of our system. They can be one of its strengths.

We may not always agree on what is best for our American system of free private enterprise. Businessmen will differ with public officeholders—and public officeholders will differ with businessmen—on what should be done or what can be done to support and strengthen our basic economic system.

We can, however, agree that the best economic system for our country is the free competitive system of private and profit-making businesses in which Government is the referee but not the signalcaller.

There is another important point on which we all should agree—that is the point that our system cannot survive and flourish unless it is built upon the strong and solid foundation of small business in every field: manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, and even services.

Small business is what keeps free enterprise free.

Even the most absolute totalitarianisms of the 20th century—including the totalitarian tyranny in Soviet Russia today—has big business in the form of monopolies and cartels, combines and syndicates. But genuine freedom has been missing from those systems at least in part because there was an absence of genuine opportunity for competition by small businessmen who could expect growth to be the reward of their success.

This is a fundamental concept. But it has always been a fragile concept. Over the past 100 years, as the United States has matured as an industrial Nation, we have been faced again and again with the necessity for governmental action to preserve the competitiveness of our economic system—and to preserve the place and influence of small business as the principal source of such competition.

Attacks upon the deadhand of monopolies and trusts and unfair business practices are not—and have never been—something alien to the American philosophy. On the contrary, such efforts are peculiarly American in concept, purpose and results. It was a distinguished Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who recognized that trusts were stifling the growth and development of this country—and he pioneered in doing something about the problem. A great President from my own Democratic Party, Woodrow Wilson, carried forward this work vigorously in his administration. These joint efforts loosened the tight bonds of oppressive monopolies and set off the decades of growth and prosperity, which culminated in the "good times" of the 1920's.

But that prosperity did not endure because it was undermined by the resurgence of speculators and manipulators who did not respect the essential strength of the American enterprise system. We reaped a sad and tragic harvest in 1929—and through the depression years which followed. Again, it was necessary for the national political leadership to intervene to restore the proper perspective and order of our marketplace. Once again it was true that when competition was restored we began another long continued rise upward culminating in the prosperity we have known during recent years

Today—much as I dislike to say it and much as some may dislike to face it—the simple truth is that the basic competitive strength of the American enterprise system is once again being challenged, undermined and eroded.

It has been predicted that within the coming 5 to 10 years, 75 to 90 percent of total retail drug volume will be divided between corporate and independent drug chains; 75 to 90 percent of total retail hardware volume will be divided between corporate and independent hardware chains. The same for the furniture outlet—all major forms of general merchandise retailers.

It will also mean that more and more manufacturers of presold brands will find that tiny handfuls of corporate and independent chains will account for 90 percent of the manufacturer's total volume. In a rapidly growing number of instances, from 50 to 150 giant chains—corporate and independent—will account for 75 to 90 percent of total volume on manufacturers' presold brands of mass-consumed merchandise in practically all categories.

This is exactly what has happened in food.

E. B. Weiss, vice president of Doyle Dane Berbach, Inc., in his study, published in 1963 and entitled "Marketing's Stake in the Low-Margin Retail Revolution," predicted that by 1966 about 50 giant retail organizations will control 50 percent of the Nation's total retail volume in practically all major merchandise classifications.

A United Press International article in the Washington Post of June 7, 1961, quotes discount stores as saying "their movement is going to take over lock, stock, and barrel 80 percent of the retail business of the country before 1970. That would doom not only most smaller neighborhood stores of all kinds, but most of the old line department stores and force the supermarkets to cease devoting themselves exclusively or even primarily to the food and grocery business."

We all know that one of the most basic and essential ingredients of the success of the great common market of America has been that intangible and indefinable ingredient of quality. Since the earliest days of colonial America, proud and self-respecting American craftsmen and American merchants have been known the world over for maintaining a high level of quality of the products manufactured in their plants and sold from their shelves.

Craftsmen's marks are ancient ways of marking quality.

One of the most treasured exhibits at Smithsonian Institution as a piece of lead pipe. Crude, ugly, nothing but a battered piece of lead pipe—except for one thing—an inscription. Reliably translated, that inscription is a brand name and the date is near the time of Christ's birth.

The use of trademarks is very ancient. They were used by the brickmakers of ancient Egypt, the lampmakers of old Athens, and the helmetmakers and armorers of medieval England. There isn't a schoolboy of today or any day who hasn't heard of a Toledo blade as the sword of champions—not by television commercials either. That was community production, I suppose. Were there better swords? We shall not know. But if two were offered for your possession now as relics, one marked "Toledo," the other with no name—both beautiful if ancient, clumsy and slightly ridiculous—which would you choose?

The intended function of a trademark is to distinguish the goods of the proprietor from the goods of others in the marketplace. While a trademark might be just one word, it is an emblem, a symbol, a slogan, or other device. The expressions "trademark," "brand name" or simply "brand" or "mark" are synonymous.

The stamp on a product "Made in U.S.A." has come to be recognized in even the most remote corners of the globe as a guarantee of high quality. I am told there are parts of the world—half a globe away from us—where the ultimate status symbol among young teenagers in so-called underdeveloped nations is to own and possess something bearing that stamp of "Made in U.S.A." Quality is the most universal synonym—the worldwide identification badge—of the American enterprise system and its products.

Far more important, however, than the effect of quality in the world is the effect quality has had among Americans at home. If ever you have traveled in foreign lands, you know how local people will advise you not to shop at this store or that store because, while the prices may be attractively low, the commodities and products sold are merely junk. Here at home, we have been spared this element of doubt and question and suspicion. When an American goes into any retail store anywhere in America—whether in Iowa or Indiana, in New York or New Orleans, in Connecticut or California—he can and does expect to find on the shelves familiar products, bearing familiar labels, which he can buy with absolute confidence and trust in the quality of the product for which he spends his money.

The American consumer, more than any other consumer in the world, is privileged to trust what he is sold. He is privileged by experience to believe that the merchant who opens his doors to the public is a self-respecting businessman, eager and anxious as we all are to make a profit, but equally eager and anxious that each of his customers received dollar for dollar value on each purchase.

As every retailer knows, where other factors are equal, goods identified with brand names or trademarks outsell the "unknowns" 9 times out of 10. And as every buyer knows, bargain shopping is done for the best known brand name at the least cost.

The very fact that a company identifies itself with the goods or services it sells, however, is only the beginning of a story. Especially in this country, the public looks at a trademark as a symbol of high quality, dependability, and full value, although technically and legally the insignia stands only as an identification of the maker.

This basic trust in the quality of the products offered in America's great marketplace has been basic to the growth and expansion of the American economy through all the years. Today, it is this basic fundamental which is most directly under attack by those who would thoughtlessly and shortsightedly sacrifice the element of quality to gain a monopolistic hold over the lifeblood of our competitive system.

Product quality has been and continues to be the indispensable ally of small businessmen. If you will look back through the history of small American manufacturers who have grown large, you will find—virtually without exception—that the basis of their growth was their ability and willingness to produce a product of superior quality. If you look at the growth history of America's greatest retailing businesses—in any field—the same pattern holds true. America's success stories have not been written in the retail field by predatory operators who misled or deceived the American consumer.

If the vitality and prosperity of the American marketplace is to be protected, it is fundamental that we must protect the inte-

grity of the American marketplace. If we are going to have the highest quality life in the world—for businessmen and for laborers, for farmers and for professionals—we cannot afford to be indifferent to the measurement of quality in the operation of our economy.

Price cutting hurts the small hardware dealer as it hurts all established and representative brand name retailers.

The "hurt" to small business by price cutting is not theoretical. It is real.

The crushing effect on the small retailer and the manufacturer, when there is a breakdown in effective price stabilization, is documented in the complaints of *Sunbeam Corporation* v. *R. H. Macy*.

The percentages of "Mixmasters" sold by the largest competitors in New York City during the normal period preceding the price war triggered by the Supreme Court decision on fair trade laws were Macy, 3.3 percent; Gimbel Brothers, 0.5 percent; Bloomingdale Brothers, 0.4 percent; Wanamaker, 0.2 percent. The total of these was 4.4 percent of the entire sale of "Mixmasters" in New York City during the period before the price war. The balance of the business in the area was done by approximately 1,500 other Sunbeam retailers who were located in New York City.

During the 10-week price war these competitors' percentages changed as follows: Macy, 56.2 percent; Gimbel Brothers, 15.3 percent; Bloomingdale Brothers, 2.6 percent; and Wanamaker, which refused to particippate in the price war, zero. Thus, in 10 weeks, these three retailing giants were able to corner 74.1 percent of the market, with Macy's share of the market leaping from 3.3 percent to 56.2 percent.

The small businessmen whose share of the market dropped from 95.6 percent to 25.9 percent were indeed hurt. As to Sunbeam company? Its annual report to stockholders disclosed that "factory sales in the area fell off 17.68 percent for the year while our national business was off 8.79 percent."

In 1952, Argus cameras sold its products nationally under the fair trade acts of various States. Following the Michigan Supreme Court decision that year, invalidating the State Fair Trade Act's nonsigner clause, the retail market in Michigan became chaotic. By January 1954, price cutting of Argus cameras by retailers had become widespread. At the end of July 1954, Argus found that sales in Michigan and the Detroit area declined 37 percent in the period from January through July 1954, as against the same period of 1953. In the same period, national sales showed a 33 percent increase.

The brand name is essential to price cutters.

For the discounter, the ability to advertise national brands at a discount price has long been the most important part of his hard goods operation. The big brand at a low price conveys value and establishes a true "discount" identity.

We have seen that quality of products is a tradition in our competitive private enterprise system as old as our country itself. If we are to protect that system and its strength, we must protect the right of conscientious, self-respecting manufacturers and retailers to maintain that quality which is so unalterably American. This is exactly what the proposed legislation in both Houses of Congress would do—and this is all that it would do.

Quality stabilization is not a price-fixing law.

Quality stabilization is not an anticonsumer law.

Quality stabilization is not a protection for the inefficient or the ineffective. On the contrary, it is just the opposite—it is legislation which would protect the vital incentive necessary to keep quality products flowing to our consumers.

Quality stabilization is not an effort to prevent progress and modernization in American business. Again, I say it is just the opposite—quality stabilization will assure the continuing progress and modernity of American enterprise.

All of us who have worked closely on quality stabilization have heard the opponents speak glibly and freely about the revolution in distribution, the revolution in retailing, the revolution in pricing. But those who know and understand the small business field know that the small businessmen of this country are not suffering from genuine progressive revolutions of invention and innovation. On the contrary, they are being made the victims of a reactionary philosophy of caveat emptor—"let the buyer beware."

There are great tides of invention and innovation running in our economy and our society today. The use of automated techniques, better communication, better transportation—and many such other elements—can and will bring beneficial gains for consumers and producers alike. Quality stabilization in no way interferes with such authentic progress. But the mere cheapening of standards of ethics and morality by the predators of today's marketplace does not constitute a revolution and does not represent progress. Those who willingly and knowingly and deliberately pirate the reputation of a manufacturer or a retailer for quality products in order to lure customers in to their displays of junk merchandise are turning back the clock, rather than turning it ahead.

I do not believe we can afford to be indifferent to this effort to pervert the character of American enterprise by destroying the proud and honorable tradition of universal quality.

Today in the world in which we all live, we recognize that we are presented with clear-cut choices. We, in America, enjoy the highest standards in the world—the highest standards of living, the highest standards of pay for our workers, the highest standards of stable profit for capital investment, the highest standards of medicine and education and opportunity. The adversaries of our system—the totalitarians of the Communist world—are bent and determined to comprise and bring down those standards.

As a result, the choices before us are simple. Either we help the world to come up to our standard or else we shall fall with them to lower standards which will reduce the meaning of our freedom—if indeed we can keep our freedom at all.

Every American from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest has a vital stake in maintaining quality as a symbol and synonym of American enterprise. If we do not maintain the American standard of quality and excellence in our products, the results inevitably will be a flooding of the world with just the kind of junk, low-quality, virtually worthless products that all of us have seen coming into our markets in recent years. This is a direction which we cannot afford to follow in our national life.

Your success has been built on your individual initiative. It is being undermined. It is being destroyed by abuses and misrepresentations of your established brand names. It is leading to a mass merchandising by big business. In many cases, big business is vital and necessary to our economy—but where does big business and monopoly begin? You are today learning that answer. Increasingly, manufacturers are eliminating the wholesaler and retailer by selling directly to the consumer. Grocery stores are selling drugs, clothing, paint, hardware, raido sets. If they desire, they can use these items as leaders since they are merely sidelines of their basic business. As they grow larger, such store or combines can "loss leader" such items to lure customers into the store. By so doing, they are, of course, destroying that brand name and the entire chain of distribution which has laboriously and expensively developed a desired brand names.

I believe, therefore, that it is wise for us to adopt in this country those measures necessary to maintain the standards of quality and preserve the incentive of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers to keep quality on the shelves for our consumers. That is why in both Houses of the Congress there is strong and growing support for the quality stabilization bill which you and many other retail merchants like you in many fields have so long and so steadfastly supported.

You hardware dealers know you have a self-interest—a survival interest—in the success of the quality stabilization bill. Much of the American public does not. And many of my fellow Members in Congress, I believe, must be reminded of its importance to you.

In the House, the bill has cleared subcommittee and been voted out of the full committee. The report has been made and the Rules Committee should any day clear it for vote on the House floor.

We are well underway with Senate hearings. I hope to complete them next month.

Probably most important of all is the team you have working for you. No Senator has ever been more able or dedicated than your great Minnesota leader, HUBERT HUMPHREY, ably assisted by another great Minnesota lead—EUGENE MCCARTHY. His talk before your National Retail Hardware Association in Montreal last month was the most concise and indisputable argument yet for the bill. I'm sure those of you here today who heard Senator MCCARTHY will agree.

As majority whip of the Senate, HUBERT HUMPHREY, has working closely with him on passage of the bill, the minority whip, Senator TOM KUCHEL. A Democrat and Republican, teamed in dedication. Your Congressman, ANCHER NELSEN, is truly an anchor as with 24 other House signers of the bill they have with them the whip over there—HALE BOGGS; and the powerful chairman of the Commerce Committee, OREN HARRIS; the strong Rules Committee member, RAY MADDEN; the close friend of the President, TORBERT MACDONALD; the majority leader, CARL ALBERT.

They can, I believe, bring this bill in this year—if you increase your support * * * if you can increase the flow of factual commonsense about the plight you are suffering, and the need for arrest of the disease now.

And I think, too, by an even greater demonstration of sincerity and commonsense, you will have performed the greatest service to your country—that you must survive if our system is to survive.

Farm Labor Facts—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the real need for a special labor program in California is dictated by the extremely short harvest season on many of its crops. The California Department of Labor recently published the major California crops and their harvest seasons, as follows:

Peak employment and seasons, selected California crops, 1961 and 1962

Crop	Year	Employment [1]	Peak season [2] From—	Peak season [2] To—	Harvesting days
FRUITS AND NUTS					
Almonds	1961	8,500	Aug. 28	Sept. 23	25
	1962	7,650	Aug. 27	Sept. 22	
Apples	1961	3,350	July 31	Oct. 14	19
	1962	4,200	Sept. 24	Oct. 13	
Apricots	1961	25,550	July 3	July 8	12
	1962	19,800	July 9	July 21	
Bushberries	1961	6,900	June 12	July 1	12
	1962	7,200	June 18	June 30	
Cherries	1961	13,500	May 29	June 10	18
	1962	9,750	May 28	June 16	
Figs	1961	2,050	Aug. 21	Sept. 23	32
	1962	2,050	Aug. 20	Sept. 22	
Grapes	1961	65,750	Aug. 28	Sept. 23	25
	1962	64,150	Aug. 27	Sept. 22	
Lemons	1961	6,250	Jan. 16	May 27	140
	1962	7,150	Jan. 8	Apr. 28	
Olives	1961	5,300	Oct. 16	Nov. 4	25
	1962	6,800	Oct. 15	Nov. 10	
Oranges, navel	1961	6,750	Nov. 28	Mar. 4	53
	1962	6,200	Nov. 27	Jan. 20	
Oranges, Valencia	1961	5,300	Apr. 17	Aug. 26	32
	1962	5,450	Apr. 30	June 2	
Peaches	1961	32,350	Aug. 7	Aug. 26	15
	1962	29,250	Aug. 6	Sept. 1	
Pears	1961	9,550	July 31	Aug. 26	12
	1962	12,250	Aug. 6	Aug. 18	
Plums	1961	8,500	June 12	July 15	260
	1962	8,450	June 18	July 14	
Prunes	1961	29,900	Aug. 21	Sept. 9	25
	1962	26,500	Aug. 20	Sept. 15	
Strawberries	1961	17,000	May 1	June 3	16
	1962	16,700	May 7	June 23	
Walnuts	1961	11,250	Oct. 9	Oct. 28	19
	1962	11,550	Oct. 8	Oct. 27	
VEGETABLES					
Asparagus	1961	9,250	Mar. 27	June 10	60
	1962	9,050	Apr. 2	June 2	
Beans, snap	1961	8,900	July 24	Aug. 26	31
	1962	6,500	July 30	Sept. 1	
Carrots	1961	2,500	Dec. 19	Jan. 7	98
	1962	1,500	Nov. 27	Mar. 17	
Celery	1961	2,350	Oct. 31	Dec. 30	40
	1962	2,400	Nov. 5	Dec. 15	
Lettuce	1961	7,600	May 15	Oct. 28	150
	1962	7,600	May 14	Oct. 27	
Melons, cantaloups	1961	9,100	July 10	Aug. 12	32
	1962	8,750	July 9	Aug. 11	
Potatoes	1961	6,200	May 15	May 27	32
	1962	4,750	May 21	June 23	
Tomatoes	1961	43,700	Sept. 11	Oct. 21	40
	1962	53,750	Sept. 3	Oct. 13	
FIELD CROPS					
Cotton (chop)	1961	18,300	May 15	June 17	32
	1962	17,650	May 14	June 16	
Cotton (pick)	1961	26,700	Oct. 9	Nov. 11	39
	1962	19,450	Oct. 8	Nov. 17	
Grain, small	1961	6,100	June 5	July 8	33
	1962	6,100	June 4	July 7	
Hay, alfalfa	1961	12,650	May 22	Sept. 9	120
	1962	10,050	May 7	Sept. 8	
Hay, miscellaneous	1961	4,150	June 12	July 1	33
	1962	3,150	June 4	July 7	
Hops	1961	1,900	Aug. 21	Sept. 2	11
	1962	1,500	Aug. 20	Sept. 1	
Rice	1961	1,850	Oct. 2	Oct. 21	32
	1962	1,900	Oct. 1	Nov. 3	
Sugarbeets (thin)	1961	6,850	Apr. 10	May 27	55
	1962	6,000	Apr. 28	June 23	

[1] Preliminary estimate. The maximum number employed at any time during the peak season.

[2] The period of heavy labor demand, but employment was not necessarily at the maximum throughout the period.

The point is that short growing harvest seasons for crops of fantastic size dictate a precisely manageable labor program. Organized labor says they cannot do the job—neither can the California Department of Employment. The Mexican labor program is the only current solution.

The New Oceanic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Life magazine, in its August 30 issue, published a significant full page editorial titled: "$2.3 Billion Should Go Into the Ocean."

The editors of Life have rendered a timely and conspicuous public service by publishing this concise and convincing editorial pinpointing reasons why this Nation should pursue a broad and extensive long-range oceanographic program. I commend it to my Senate colleagues, a majority of whom I feel have long held similar views.

Expansion of the Nation's oceanographic research is not a new interest on the part of Time-Life publishers. The need also has been indicated in several other of our leading publications. Unfortunately, however, there has only been a partial and piecemeal response on the part of Government and the Congress. Planning has exceeded performance and studies of inner space invariably yield precedence to those of the far reaches of the universe.

Life's editorial, which I will request be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, will, I am convinced, stimulate wide national recognition of the need to explore, scientifically, the 72 percent of earth's surface occupied by the oceans.

This is, as Life magazine so aptly puts it, an "oceanic age," and three-dimensional knowledge of the seas around us, their contents and the dynamic forces within them has become increasingly vital not only to our commerce and economy but also to our national security.

Mr. President, in addition to the editors of Time, Life, and those of several other publications of wide circulation which for several years have indicated support for an expanded oceanographic program—although none perhaps as impressively as Life in its August 30 editorial—it is appropriate that I state at this time that the Senate Committee on Commerce and the Senate as a body have advocated and supported a national long-range program of oceanographic research, surveys and education for almost 5 years.

As early as July 1959, after several months of study, the Senate passed by unanimous consent Senate Resolution 136 endorsing the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Oceanography, forerunner of all plans for a coordinated, long-range program of expanded oceanographic research. This resolution, previously reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce, and which had been introduced by myself earlier in the session, was cosponsored, I am proud to say, by every member of the committee.

That same year, 1959, the Senate passed and sent to the house S. 2482, removing limitations on the Coast and Geodetic Survey and enabling it to conduct oceanographic research and surveys beyond the Continental Shelf, one of the recommendations of the committee on oceanography in presenting its 10-year program.

Later in the 1959 session 14 Members of the Senate, including myself and with strong representation from both parties, cosponsored S. 2692 designed to implement the entire report and recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences' Committee.

Time-Life shared this early interest in oceanography. The fine editorial in Life magazine's August 30 issue is no related inspiration but the culmination of long and thorough study of how this Nation must prepare for the new oceanic age.

S. 2692 passed the Senate on June 23, 1960, by unanimous consent and was referred to the House of Representatives which throughout the remainder of the 86th Congress took no action.

Early in the 87th Congress, on February 3, 1961, to be precise, I introduced, as was necessary in view of the death of S. 2692, a new bill, S. 901, which again proposed to implement the long-range oceanography program recommended by the Committee on Oceanography. This committee, I need not remind my colleagues, is composed of many of our most eminent marine scientists, none of whom are connected with any Government agency and all of whom are completely objective.

Hearings were held, the Committee on Commerce favorably reported the bill, and it was passed by the Senate on July 28 of that year and referred to the House of Representatives.

The bill authorized a coordinated, national oceanographic program and the expenditure over a 10-year period of $651 million for the construction of research ships, laboratories, and other necessary facilities; the design and procurement of new and advanced instruments and equipment, and the education and training of prospective oceanographers and technicians.

The House for more than a year took no action on this Senate-passed measure but in August of last year considered an alternative. The House bill, in lieu of proposing a specific program or a specific time period, endorsed oceanography in principle and proposed that an oceanographic program be developed by the Office of Science and Technology. The House bill also contained a provision and language to which several administrative agencies directly concerned with the proposed legislation objected.

The House, when these measures were brought to the floor, substituted the House version for the Senate bill, retaining only the Senate number. The House version was passed and subsequently vetoed.

This does not mean that Congress made no progress in the 87th Congress in constructive legislation to advance our oceanographic research capabilities. On the contrary several worthwhile bills were enacted.

Early in 1961 Representative GEORGE P. MILLER of California and I introduced similar bills in the House and Senate respectively authorizing the U.S. Coast Guard to conduct oceanwide oceanographic research, the Coast Guard then being limited to such research in connection with its ice patrol.

Each of these bills passed the branch of Congress in which it had been introduced, minor differences were readily resolved in conference, and the legislation was promptly approved by President Kennedy.

This is extremely helpful legislation because it has made possible the wide expansion of marine research on or from existing ships. I wish to credit the Eastern Pacific Oceanic Conference, representing the western coastal States, for initially proposing this utilization of existing facilities by a highly qualified Government agency in broadening our oceanographic program.

In the 87th Congress also my distinguished colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I introduced a bill to enable the geological survey of the Department of the Interior, then limited under its organic act to the national domain, to conduct research into the geological structure and mineral resources wherever such research might be in the national interest which, of course, includes the oceans.

Life magazine, in its editorial, appropriately calls attention to this offshore mineral potential.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, then chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, likewise championed this legislation in committee. It was reported favorably, passed the Senate without opposition, and subsequently the House of Representatives.

I comment on these matters, Mr. President, as evidence that the Congress is aware of the needs for expanding the Nation's oceanographic program and the facilities for three-dimensional marine research.

A question remains as to how this program may best be coordinated among the 20 separate Government agencies now participating in some phase or phases of the program, each necessarily jealous of its particular interest or activity.

Difficult as this problem is, the national interest requires that it be resolved and two Government groups, the Interagency Committee on Oceanography and the Office of Science and Technology are giving it close attention.

I think the comment is justified that we have not yet attained what might be considered a balanced program, although overall significant advances have been made. These advances have been somewhat of a piecemeal nature. Some agencies, perhaps better funded than others, are progressing rapidly, particularly those responsible for our military security.

Those primarily concerned with basic research, which is fundamental, do not appear as yet to have received the support given those engaged principally in applied research, although several of the latter have suffered also. The greatest lag, however, may be in advancing the education and training program recommended by the National Academy of Science Committee on Oceanography and other science groups.

The administration, Mr. President, is concerned that a long-range coordinated program move ahead.

Several months ago—June 1963—the Office of Science and Technology, headed by that extremely able scientist Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, issued its projection of a national oceanographic plan for the 10 years ahead, a plan based on more than a year of interagency discussion.

This is the program which Life magazine refers to in its excellent, and as I stated previously, timely editorial. In effect, Life endorses this program, and the editorial undoubtedly will quicken public interest in what many of us in the Congress consider to be, in this oceanic age, a national necessity.

Mr. President, our responsiveness to this problem will, I suggest, be important when we consider the proposed 10-year oceanographic program so ably outlined in Life magazine's recent editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, titled "2.3 Billion Should Go Into the Ocean," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

$2.3 BILLION SHOULD GO INTO THE OCEAN

Why has the administration announced a new program to spend $2.3 billion during the next 10 years on oceanographic research?

Why does the administration want to parcel out this sum among the U.S. Navy and 14 agencies—with 56 percent of it allocated for the kind of "basic research" once defined as finding out what questions to ask?

Why should the U.S. Congress and the U.S. public tolerate, let alone support, such a vaguely defined, long-range and perhaps open-ended exercise in Federal spending?

The answers lie in the very character of American geography. Even as the United States thrusts into space it does so from a continent that is in fact a large island enveloped by massive oceans. Whoever knows most about those oceans holds the advantage in the struggle for command of the seas, holds the lead in reaching for the fabulous unknown resources of the ocean floor. "Because we're such a big island the public doesn't realize this," says one of the most famous oceanographers in the United States, Roger Revelle, of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, Calif. "We have to show the flag in oceanography all over the world."

The administration's new program, which Congress and the public should endorse, means coming to grips with oceans of ignorance just as vital as the far reaches of space.

In fiscal 1964 the United States is spending just $156 million on searching and probing the seas that cover 71 percent of the earth's surface, provide the rain, decide the climate, swirl the currents that help make a nation in Britain and a wilderness in Labrador at equivalent latitude. In the same fiscal year the United States is spending $4 billion in space. But the new administration oceanographic campaign, without prejudice to the space effort, will launch the kind of research fleet—cruisers, floating laboratories, submarines capable of exploration 18,000 feet below, a new bathyscaphe for 36,000 feet below—that can perform the critical mission. Some reasons for coming to grips with the oceans:

Defense: The United States least vulnerable strategic weapon is the Polaris-bearing nuclear submarine, 41 of which have been programed to date. Polaris sweeps enemy coastlines, invulnerable because it is undetectable. But the U.S. Navy's own antisubmarine warfare planing against the U.S.S.R.'s 450 or so submarines aims to make all submarines just as detectable and just as vulnerable as surface craft. "There isn't an ocean in the world big enough to lose the sound of a pistol fired at the right depth," said Columbus O'Donnell Iselin II of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on Cape Code, and already the Navy has batteries of hydrophones installed on the edges of the continental shelves and mid-ocean islands to locate submarines hundreds of miles away. It is essential to protect Polaris through the shifting states of the art of sea war by exploring jetstream currents submarines can ride and thermal layers and sea-floor mountains they can hide behind, also by mapping navigational landmarks in the deep. As of now only 3 percent of the ocean floor is mapped.

Food: By 1980 the United States will need perhaps as much as an added 3 billion pounds of seafood to maintain its protein diet. The needs of undeveloped nations run much higher. But the U.S. fishermen have been humbled by Russians, Japanese and Peruvians and the proud old Yankee fishing banks off Cape Cod sometimes look like a Soviet lake. The Russians are even boasting about new floating fish factories in which automation navigates the vessel, searches out the fish, hauls in the catch, freezes it and packages it for the long journey home. In this situation the administration wants to increase the United States present annual catch of 3½ million tons by 1972—among other processes, by cultivating undersea "fish farms" along the Continental Shelf.

Mining: The fabulous success of the U.S. offshore oil industry points the way to establishment of an underwater mining industry within 5 to 10 years. Most realistic projects are the mining of placer deposits of

precious metals in shallow waters offshore, diamonds off South Africa, gold off Alaska, etc. Fifteen thousand feet beneath the Pacific near the Taumotu Islands manganese nodules and other minerals litter the sea floor at a potential value of $1.5 million per square mile. In the administration's 10-year plan the Bureau of Mines even talks about sending an underwater "Lewis and Clark expedition" to find more metals resources. But this type of program has a deep-blue-yonder tone that bewilders inland Congressmen.

The U.S. oceanographers, a glamorous lot aboard their weather beaten survey ships, are going after all these prizes with unusual intramural advantages. By and large they are satisfied with the current administration budgets and they are not inaugurating the program with shouts and intrigue for "more." They also seem fairly satisfied with their loose, almost casual grouping under the Interagency Committee on Oceanography (ICO) of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. There seems remarkably little duplication and interagency bickering and there is no demand for an oceanography czar assigned to determine priorities, wipe out confusion, obliterate red tape McNamara-style. The $2.3 billion, if approved, will therefore be parceled out amicably among the Navy (36 percent), the National Sicence Foundation (22 percent), the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (15 percent), the Coast and Geodetic Survey (12 percent) and 11 other agencies ranging from the Atomic Energy Commission to the Public Health Service.

"The day a Russian Polaris-type submarine surfaces off New York City and waves its red flag, you bet we'd have a crash program," the Navy oceanographers add, just in case. The Navy gets unfailingly agitated about oceanography when the Russians turn five ships loose to research the Gulf Stream off the U.S. coast, which they did last summer. And the Navy is never more effective than when storming ahead on such quiet oceanographic projects as mapping the bottom of the Gulf of Siam, which it is doing right now. But the administration's program sets the Nation on course into its new oceanic age in an orderly manner that will probably render a crash program unnecessary.

What the oceanographers do want is more attention—from Congress, from the public, from places far from the sea—as they set forth on the new venture. They are getting some. Already more than 5 million skindivers are questing. Already family-type submarines are on the market. Hundreds of thousands or more Americans remember the Link trainer, that instrument of torture in which they were flung about blindly while learning to fly in what now seems like the age before last. Where was Link last week—Edwin A. Link, the inventor, that is? Now 59 years old, he was busy on the oceanography ship *Sea Diver* in Chesapeake Bay putting mice through pressure tests equivalent to pressures found at 2,000 feet below as a prelude to indoctrinating humans. The quest for knowledge changes environments, but its spirit remains the same.

Improving Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Improving Congress," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, September 16, dealing with the current problems of procedure and the structure of Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING CONGRESS

Advocates of modernization and reform of congressional procedures are beginning to make a little progress. The Senate Rules Committee, by a vote of 7 to 1, has recommended that a joint House-Senate group be named to study improvement of the congressional machinery.

This may prove only a fruitless gesture. Congressman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, 80-year-old chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee, is reported opposed to such a study. He is satisfied with the status quo.

If the House refuses to join in the study, the Senate could proceed alone, but would in that case limit its attention to its own problems. Even that would be useful, for reform in one body would stimulate public demand for improvements in the other.

Congress has received deserved criticism from the public and from some of its own Members for its timewasting and inefficient operations during the past several sessions. The present one has spent more time doing less than most of its predecessors.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE, New Jersey Republican, an advocate of modernization of procedures. says: "There is a growing—and I think justified—feeling that Congress has become so ensnarled in its own archaic and complex procedures that the executive and judicial branches of Government have had to take over the primary responsibility for conduct of the Nation's business."

Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, comments: "The two basic changes needed are rules changes in the Senate which will curb filibusters when these are used to prevent action by the majority, and, second, the modification of the House rules so as to make the rules committee of that body an instrument of the majority party in Congress in determining the conditions under which legislation shall be presented and debated by the entire House of Representatives

Selection of committee chairmen on the basis of ability instead of seniority also would do much to improve the operations of both the House and Senate. Younger, more vigorous men are needed in key positions. The five most powerful committees in Congress probably are Senate Appropriations and Finance and House Ways and Means, Appropriations and Rules. The average age of the chairmen of these committees is 75 years and 7 months. Several are past 80.

If This Country Is To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with two recent columns by Mr. Ralph de Toledano as published in the Augusta Herald on September 11 and 12, 1963. The columns are entitled "If This Country Is To Survive—I," and "If the United States Is To Survive Our Military Must Not Be Gagged—II." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two columns be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF THIS COUNTRY IS TO SURVIVE—I

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Adm. George Anderson, the Chief of Naval Operations, was pushed out of his country's military service by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara because he insisted on speaking his piece. Admiral Anderson did not argue that Mr. McNamara should accept the Navy's views. But he demanded the right to give the President and the Pentagon civilians his best thinking on vital military questions.

Secretary McNamara, on the other hand, felt that the military leaders of the Nation should be seen but not heard—that their single duty was to carry out the orders of the proliferating whiz kids who now make Pentagon policy. As a result of his insistence. Admiral Anderson was retired and made Ambassador to Portugal. He will serve in this position with distinction, but he belongs at the head of our Navy.

In a valedictory statement, however, Admiral Anderson has been willing to brave the anger of the White House and the Defense Department, to make crystal clear his views on the constitutional rights and duties of the military. He spoke to a group of civilians—most of them newspapermen—at the National Press Club. But what he has to say deserves more than routine coverage. For in outlining some tendencies which give him and many others in and out of uniform great concern, Admiral Anderson has sounded a warning to the American people. They cannot, however, respond, unless they know what he said.

"My first concern," says Anderson, "is over the prospective and maritime position of the United States versus the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that the Soviets are moving forward rapidly on the high seas, both economically and militarily. * * * On the other hand, much of our Navy is growing old. Ships are not being as rapidly replaced as they should be. The status of American commercial shipping is also declining."

What Admiral Anderson wants is not an upgrading of military power. He simply asks that before military decisions are made, the generals and the admirals be (at least) consulted. Under Secretary McNamara, the "operations analysts" using computers and fancy sociological studies have completely elbowed out the men who have devoted their lives to military matters.

For the man who must fly the planes and sail the ships, what is simply a small mathematical factor to the "Whiz Kid" can be the difference between life and death. "Those who fought in the Pacific know what the narrow margin of operational superiority in the Japanese Zero fighter cost in American lives," Admiral Anderson notes.

Objecting to the myth being fostered by the Pentagon civilians and some of their friends in the administration, the former CNO decried the propaganda that military men are opposed to new ideas. "On the contrary," he says, "history shows that daring ideas from the military often have been ignored: Col. Charles de Gaulle in his ignored warning of the maginot line type of defense; Adm. James O. Richardson in his caution against leaving the fleet exposed at Pearl Harbor; William S. Sims, as a young lieutenant before World War I, took his daring case for gunnery reform directly to the President * * * Generals MacArthur, Billy Mitchell, and Hap Arnold, and Admiral Mahan were daring, original, and creative—as were Admirals Rickover and Raborn in engineering Polaris breakthroughs."

It has been a convenient device to paint the military as foolish, backward, and uninformed. But the convenience has been to

the politicians—and the Nation has suffered. It was the civilians after World War II who argued that our generals and admirals didn't know what they were talking about who maneuvered us into a position of such weakness that when the Korean fighting broke out our forces were unable to cope with the Communist onslaught.

Many Americans died then because a civilian "knew better" than those trained in war. The military was silenced. Today Secretary McNamara has gagged the uniformed men at the Pentagon in a manner previously unknown to the United States.

IF THE UNITED STATES IS TO SURVIVE OUR MILITARY MUST NOT BE GAGGED—II

(By Ralph de Toledano)

In his valedictory speech last week to Washington correspondents—and the country at large—at the National Press Club, Adm. George Anderson marshaled in sober and methodical fashion his experience in the Navy and as Chief of Naval Operations. And he pleaded for a Defense Establishment in which decisions that could mean survival or extinction for the United States would not be left entirely in the hands of computer-happy "whiz kids" who don't know one end of a rifle from the other.

Admiral Anderson didn't put it that way, but his intent was clear. "Those who critize the military as being backward," he said, "tend to be the very ones who are proponents of procedures and policies which would discourage a creative corps of military professionals * * *. By attempting to stamp officers of all services into a common mold, we may kill incentive, imagination, and independent thought."

Perhaps the most significant warning uttered by Admiral Anderson—braving the wrath of the administration in remarks addressed directly to the American people—was against "a modern fallacy that theories or computers or economics or numbers of weapons win wars * * *. Good leadership unfailingly recognizes that man is the key to success or failure." This is an unfashionable view in a time in which some technicians have reinterpreted the history of mankind.

A materialistic philosophy holds to the new concept. But Admiral Anderson is a better historian than his critics. He says: "Some of the greatest victories, from Hannibal at Cannae and Nelson at Trafalgar to MacArthur at New Guinea, have come at the hands of forces inferior in numbers but superior in human ability, courage, and determination to win. Our Nation will defy every lesson of history if we think that stockpiles of weapons or the decisions of computers win wars. Man, his wits, and his will are still the key to war and peace, victory and defeat."

But where does this lead? Again Admiral Anderson has proposed a highly unpopular formulation: "The key to leadership is understanding human nature—your opponents, your allies, and your subordinates. To do anything to downgrade the role of the men who have to fight our country's battles is to violate the first principle of leadership. Morale is the business of every leader in our Defense Establishment. Do all else right, and do this wrong—the product in a crisis is disaster."

Admiral Anderson was not simply making a plea for his military colleagues. Speaking of the American system of checks and balances, he said, "The Congress must be a check on the use of either civilian or military power in the Pentagon and must not default, even in part, its constitutional responsibility and authority to provide for our Armed Forces.

The authority has been brushed aside by the "whiz kids" and the White House. Congress objects to the phasing out of America's manned bomber force and the Strategic Air Command, but it has not taken the necessary measures to compel the Pentagon to desist. The Congress watches in something close to panic as Secretary McNamara goes ahead with plans to eliminate the Navy's vital aircraft carrier force. "Overcentralized structures" such as the McNamara "monolithic-structured" Pentagon civilian high command "are conducive to compounding of mistakes."

This is sound judgment. The White House has not been happy with the Anderson statement of principle. But it can do little to stop him. After all, the President has said that he "recognizes the value of dissent and daring, that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change." It may be that Admiral Anderson will get his comeuppance for taking the President's words seriously. But if the Nation is to survive, then our military men must act as bravely in Washington as they have always acted under fire.

"See America Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, each day brings more support for my House Joint Resolution 658, to declare 1964 as "See America Year."

As more and more people become aware of the serious effect American tourist spending overseas is having on our balance of payments, an increasing amount of attention is being paid to find ways to bring international tourism more into balance. Because my bill offers a voluntary, nonrestrictive approach to the problem, and at the same time encourages increased efforts by Americans to travel in the United States and learn more of our great country, many State travel and recreation agencies are very much interested. Two more such agencies have written this week, bringing the total to 15. I am particularly pleased with the letter received from Dennis Clarke, director of the Travel Information Division of the great State of Oregon, expressing the support of my State.

I am also very pleased to have received a letter from Cattie Lou Miller, commissioner of the Department of Public Information of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Both letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION,
Frankfort, Ky., September 16, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I was most pleased to receive your letter outlining your "See America Year" joint resolution.

I believe this resolution could prove to be most profitable and valuable for the separate States and for the United States as a whole. You may be assured that the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the department of public information will support wholeheartedly any suggestions you may have for implementing this resolution.

We are looking forward to hearing more from you about this matter, and to working closely with you on it.

Sincerely,

CATTIE LOU MILLER.

STATE OF OREGON,
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Salem, September 12, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ULLMAN: My reaction to your recent letter informing me of your action in introducing House Joint Resolution 658, may I simply state "the time seems right," and I am certain Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service feels the same way.

As far as the travel industry is concerned, almost all countries are now in the marketplace selling their wares, and if we as a Nation are intending to compete, we had best begin a more intensive effort to sell our best potential customer, the U.S. citizen.

As you know, the State of Oregon, for years has carried on an effective invitational program directed to those travel minded residents of other States. Tourism is Oregon's third largest industry, and so it probably is with others. Naturally, we will welcome any help on the national level in turning the travel balance from international to intranational.

If we could sell "See America" as hard as we are selling "buy bonds," "give blood," or "use your Zip code number," it would seem to me that the unfavorable balance of payments situation would be materially assisted.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS D. CLARKE,
Director, Travel Information Division.

Peace Pact on the Waterfront

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an editorial appearing in its August 17 issue, congratulates the National Maritime Union and the American Merchant Marine Institute on their recent agreement to submit disputes arising between them during the next 6 years to arbitration.

I concur in the view of the New York Times that this agreement is an achievement of major significance, assuring an extended continuity of service and setting up, as it does, fair and equitable voluntary procedures by which the 25,000 members of NMU and management may resolve their differences in the public interest.

Our merchant marine, Mr. President, has long been fighting for survival, as members of the Senate Committee on Commerce, of which I happen to be chairman, well know. One of the major objectives of this committee over the years has been to preserve our American-flag merchant marine, which has been well styled our "fourth line of defense." Some of us would prefer to consider it our "first line."

The National Maritime Union and the American Merchant Marine Institute are equally cognizant of the problem of survival in competition with low-cost foreign competition.

Not only survival but the expansion of our merchant marine will be facilitated

by this agreement to bargain in good faith collectively and to arbitrate their differences.

The New York Times fittingly acknowledges the leadership of Mr. Joseph Curran, president of NMU, and Mr. Ralph E. Casey, chief negotiator for management in bringing about this exemplary agreement, and I join in saluting them on their success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of August 17, titled "Light Over the Merchant Marine," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHT OVER THE MERCHANT MARINE

The long-term labor agreement negotiated by the National Maritime Union and the operators of roughly a third of the American merchant marine is an achievement of major significance. As representative of 25,000 unlicensed seamen on 370 ships, the union has committed itself to a strike-free contract, under which all disputes will be submitted to binding arbitration, until 1969.

If unions representing deck officers, engineers and other crafts on these vessels agree to similar pacts, an unprecedented period of peace will be assured in an industry with a painfully long history of labor-management turbulence. The agreement is much-needed evidence that collective bargaining can function effectively in the maritime field. The turmoil has been so incessant in recent years that Congress is even now considering legislation to compel arbitration when ship strikes imperil the national welfare.

Under the new agreement, all controversies between the National Maritime Union and the American Merchant Marine Institute will be resolved without strikes by Theodore W. Kheel, the industry's impartial chairman. This is a substitution of reason for muscle that ought to be copied in other vital industries. Mr. Kheel rightly calls it a "milestone." The cost of the agreement may be high, especially for operators who draw no Government subsidies. But the industry, given a long period of stability in which to develop and grow, may find the dividends of uninterrupted operation more than sufficient to offset the price in higher wages and benefits.

The union's president, Joseph Curran, and the chief employer negotiator, Ralph E. Casey, deserve congratulations for a blueprint we hope will spread through the merchant marine. Perhaps this good example will even prove contagious enough to introduce similar statesmanship into the thinking of all the ship unions about how to solve the interunion feuds that have caused so much havoc and that still show no sign of abating.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Installation Address of George Pierre, Chief of the Colville Indian Confederated Tribes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very awe-inspiring address made by one of my constituents, George Pierre, on the occasion of his installation as Chief of the Colville Indian Confederated Tribes.

It is with a deep sense of pride that I can say that Chief Pierre is not only one of my constituents but also a personal friend. He is a man of outstanding ability and has earned four college degrees. While serving his country in the U.S. Marines during World War II he received a combat wound. He has also achieved distinction as a motion picture writer, novelist, and as an authority on Indian Affairs. For the past 50 years, his father, until his death, served as Chief of the Confederated Tribes and George Pierre, as Chief, will oversee 1½ million acres of land and 5,000 Indians for the remainder of his lifetime. He is a man of whom America can indeed be very proud. It is, therefore, a rare privilege and honor for me to insert this inspiring installation address of Chief Pierre in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INSTALLATION OF GEORGE PIERRE AS CHIEF OF COLVILLE CONFEDERATED TRIBE, JULY 6, 1963

For a subject worked and reworked so often in novels, motion pictures, and television; the American Indian remains probably the least understood and most misunderstood American of us all.

To preclude further misunderstanding, and to insure continuous understanding, we, the full citizenry of the United States, have a dual responsibility. We must help to restore the Indian's pride of origin and faith in himself. We must arouse in him a desire to share in the benefits of modern civilization.

To encourage pride in the Amerindic is not to turn back the clock. On the contrary, it is to recognize that Government policy has hitherto failed to use this vital factor effectively as a force for assimilation and for enriching American culture.

Therefore, only men who have a foot in each way of life and an appreciation of both can effectively lessen the gap which divides the two and thus cross-fertilize both.

Harvey Davis, retired from the Coast Guard and a professional news photographer; the Paul attorneys, William Paul, Sr., Fred Paul, and Bill Paul, Jr.; Dr. Fox; Dr. Perry; Boeing Engineer Wilbur Betts; and myself, to name only a few, are men of Indian heritage who went forth into the American way of life and achieved a full measure of success. We are the men who can serve as a bridge to enable others to move freely between the two worlds.

We can furnish a degree of understanding which will preclude trial and error. We are the men who stand on the horizon—we can greatly assist the white man to achieve a full understanding of our people. We feel that we have a responsibility and an obligation to our people. And we will discharge these duties with full understanding.

No one can give you this understanding. If you don't have it, you cannot learn it. You have to be born with it. It is a birthright—if a person doesn't know this, you cannot tell him. To illustrate my point, I will cite an experience that Louie Armstrong had while he was touring in Poland. A Polish boy asked him, "What is jazz?" Louie slowly turned toward the boy and drawled, "If you don't know, I can't tell you." What Louie meant was that there are some types of understanding you have or you don't have. If you don't have it, it is impossible to get it. If you have it, it is there and that's that.

Of course this is not to say that in order to understand the Indian, you have to be a full-blood. I know white men who understand. All the men on this platform are men of that caliber. Our honorary chief, Governor Rosellini, and our tribal attorney, Lyle Keith, are men of that caliber.

The point that I make here, that point that I have tried to make for 20 years, the point that I shall continue to make for 20 more years if need be—is that we have men of Indian heritage who are willing and able to help our people, but the powers that be do not utilize these good men.

I believe that we need some imagination in high places. The type of imagination that picked the United States up by the bootstraps a couple of hundred years ago and put America on the map.

Because of this, the United States was destined to accomplish great things, and as it evolved through nearly two centuries of changing times, conditions, and pressures; our greatness as a nation readily became apparent. The expansion across the continent, the Civil War, the building of the railroads, industrial development, growing involvement in world affairs, the airplane, two World Wars, space exploration—none of these could be foreseen by the Founding Fathers. However, without these trials—the plaques of merit and the stumbling blocks of ignorance—we would not have tested the bitter fruits of fear and strife nor the sweet fruits of freedom. We would not have taken our freedom seriously not only to cherish above all else but to share with others less fortunate than ourselves.

That is why we, today, are moving heaven and earth to guarantee, for ourselves and the peace-loving nations of the world, freedom. In order to achieve this, we are arming ourselves to an extent that heretofore was unknown to man in war or peace. It is our belief that we must be strong to insure freedom.

The cause of freedom is not an idle pipedream with us. Our Nation was born under the star of freedom. And to a large extent, our inherent and undying love to be free, down through the years, made this Nation under God truly great.

And my people, the American Indian, contributed mightily to that greatness. This country must not forget the contributions that my people gave, at times reluctantly, but mostly freely, gladly, and willingly.

We need to remember the contributions, spiritual as well as physical, our Founding Fathers found here in America and from which they borrowed so generously. We, and I'm speaking to my people, we need to remember and be proud. We need to regain that living faith in ourselves, the faith which carried us upright with our faces held skyward for untold centuries. We must shake off, we must lose this horrible shame which we have as a people. Sometime in the past 200 years we acquired a terrible inferiority complex, a living shame as a people. No one knows the exact time or the reason that this hideous spell befell upon my people. It might have happened when we were being pushed into the foothills of the Alleghenys, or when we were forced beyond the Alleghenys and across the Mississippi and the wide Missouri. It might have happened when we were beaten and forced onto reservations. And then again, it might have happened during the decade after decade of object poverty. No one knows the exact reason we, as a people, possess this malignant shame.

However, take faith, my people; I know how we shall overcome this handicap. I know how we can take this negative experience and turn it around and change it into confidence, faith, and pride, change it into strength, freedom, and greatness.

The answers are simple and varied. The answers lay in our magnificent past. We must displace shame with pride, inferiority feelings with confidence, disbelief with faith and hope, weakness with strength, guilt with freedom, and backwardness with greatness.

We must examine the great contributions that we made to America. We must examine our history and understand it and use it to build a better future for us all.

When my people the American Indian, controlled the balance of power, the settlers from Europe were forced to consider our views, and to deal with us by treaties and other mutual agreements freely arrived at. The pioneers found that in the southeast there had developed a high civilization with safeguards for ensuring the peace. A northern extension of that civilization, the League of the Iroquois, inspired Benjamin Franklin to copy it in planning the federation of States. Therefore, my people, centuries before the coming of the white man, had found a strength in unity to preserve peace. Today we shall find strength in a rebirth of faith, hope confidence, and freedom.

Only he who makes his people free, can make them strong; and only he who makes his people strong, can make them great.

By great people, I mean people like the giants who came here in the beginning. They, our forebearers, whose conquest was the North American Continent and even more than that they were conquerors of the Western World—the land, the water, and the heavens above.

The Indians are a fine group of Americans, and don't let anybody tell you any different. As a people, their patriotism to country and to God is without parallel in this era of questionable loyalty. Not one Indian do I know of is a Communist or leftist sympathizer; not one a fascist; not a single one has defected or committed treasonable acts against his country.

The forebearers of these fine people, my people, on October 12, 1492, stood on the shores of the great land which was to become

America and watched the first white man arrive. My forefathers loved their land then. Today, my people hold the same deep love for their land.

The continent of North America is very dear to the Indian—to us all. Every part of this land is sacred to my people. Every hillside, every valley, every mountain and plain has been hallowed by some fond memory or some sad experience of my people. Even the rocks, which seem to lay stupid as they swelter in the sun along the silent river banks and lake shores in the solemn grandeur thrill with memories of past events connected with the lives of my people.

The very dust under our feet responds more lovingly to our footsteps than to non-Indians, because it is the ashes of our ancestors, and our bare feet are conscious of the sympathetic touch, for the soil is rich with the life of our kindred.

By strong people, I mean strength in depth. I mean economic solidarity, planned economic development. I mean strong willed men of courage. Brave men who have the courage of their conviction, who can develop their land, build their homes and mills from our vast timber resources. Strong men who can work the land and raise tremendous herds on our great land resource. Enterprising men who can uncover minerals from our untapped mineral resources.

By free people, I mean freedom to choose what you want. Freedom to do with what is yours as you wish. I mean that independent integrity that guarantees you the right to govern your own destinies. If you want your land and gold claims paid out in per capita, then your wish should be law. If you want State jurisdiction, you and you alone should decide this by popular ballot. Nobody in Olympia or Washington, D.C., should tell you what to do, rather they should ask you, "Should we do this or that?"

The freedom of choice should be yours. We came before the Government and its agencies and bureaus. It is because of us that these agencies and bureaus owe their existence—without us they wouldn't be. However, in actuality, the opposite seems to be the case.

We need a public relations system that will tell our story to our fellow citizens and the world. We need to tell them of conditions on our reservations and what is being done to better and improve conditions for our people.

I pledge that this shall be done.

I pledge, standing here where the proud Chief Joseph, the brilliant military tactician, led his people against the U.S. cavalry; and here where the wise and lofty minded Chief Moses hunted in the mountains and fished in the rivers and streams; and here where Moses, Joseph, and the other Colville chieftains have their final resting place.

I pledge to you here and to all those people throughout our great land who wish us well—I pledge that as long as the red blood runs through my veins, I shall work toward the freedom, strength, and greatness of my people. And I pledge that, as long as my heart beats to the rythm of life, all of my strength and power will be directed toward the welfare of my people.

The first order of business in promoting the welfare of the American Indian is to assist in the development of the land and human resources. I can visualize development of our reservations. Our reservations shall be beehives of activity. There will be development and enterprises here that stagger the imagination. We shall flourish. Our lives will be full, and our lands complete.

Now let's get down to specific cases. Case in point: Colville Indian Reservation—nearly 1½ million acres of land; nearly 1 million acres of timber, untold mineral resources; abundant grazing lands; abundance of lakes, streams and river shores.

We know what we've got—land, minerals, timber, and water.

We know what we want—to increase our annual income from $300 to $5,000. Instead of the $300 per capita payments that you now get, each one of you will receive $400 a month for life. And as the years go by, this amount will increase.

We know what we need—to raise our standard of living. We need to build homes for our old people. We must guide our young people. We must show them how they can participate in a housing program that will benefit them. We must train our young people in sensible occupations—occupations with which they can make a decent living. We must train them for jobs that will be mutually beneficial to the tribes as well as them. We should find jobs for our people—today there is no excuse for young people to be out of work.

We know how to get it—by planned economic development, by work, by persistence, by applied imagination, by organization, by energetic leadership. By setting goals and making a timetable for accomplishing these goals.

I firmly believe, with the proper local and national government cooperation, with the proper group participation, with the favorable community relations, we can have $50 million invested and working for us in 10 years time.

We can succeed, because we know what we've got, we know what we want, we know what we need, we know how to get it. Therefore, let's set our goals, let's make our plans, let's set up a timetable, and now let's go get it.

Opposition to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. R. Harland Shaw, of Chicago, Ill., expressing the opposition of many small businessmen to the ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty. Mr. Shaw is chairman of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations which has headquarters in Chicago and Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the text of his letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS,
Chicago, September 20, 1963.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: In the short time allowed for consideration of the test ban treaty it has been impossible to prepare and circulate among our members a study of its probable longrun implications for small business. If the treaty lasts any great length of time, I think its implications for our movement are quite serious. I must therefore submit to you, as one of the Senators opposed to the treaty, my personal views on the historical experience of small business with such "new era" concepts.

We have no special military knowledge, but as a group, small businessmen have had a lot of experience with human nature.

I believe that a sound basis for relating proposals like this treaty, to the everyday experience of independent business, is to look at its history. We are not aware that students of history, or professional students of human nature, were called extensively as witnesses by the Senate committees. I think perhaps we as a class when looking back on our history, can claim at least amateur status in these fields.

It seems to us as if this treaty is being considered generally with eyes on the supposed present and future, but without any attention to the past. I shall endeavor to draw on the small businessman's long historical background.

Next to the family, the small businessman is the world's oldest economic entity. The chances are that tools were his first article of commerce, and if so, he has been around for about 1,750,000 years—the age of the oldest tools so far discovered. The entrepreneur goes back a long way.

There are clearly discernible trade routes which existed between 7,500 and 10,000 years ago—long before any organized empire that we know of. The goods carried on those routes must have been made by individual or family craftsmen and carried by traders who were entrepreneurs. Some of those routes are thousands of miles along, in Asia Minor and Southern Europe. For the means of transportation at that time, this was proportionately farther than going around the world today. The small businessman is an oldtimer at "world trade."

Thus in due course, when empires arrived, the small businessman had already been around a long time.

Passing by endless fascinating stories of his part in various empires; of the transition from the tool to the machine tool (hand-powered, about 600 B.C.); of the great expansion of small business under the long peace of the Roman Empire; of the "Dark Ages" and the Industrial Revolution—passing by all the details of these, let us come to the main question: What does the experience of these thousands of years tell the small businessman about the characteristics of government, and of international affairs, under which he does best?

Four characteristics appear required for the small businessman to prosper:

1. First and foremost, "civil order," the absence of armed conflict for the longest possible period of time over the widest possible area. Your local trade, right where you are, is hurt when there are wars and rumors of war right over the border. "Peace," in the everyday sense, is the greatest need of the small businessman. His numbers were decimated in every period of war in Europe.

2. An atmosphere of inquiry, experiment, and invention, with property rights in the results thereof. For lack of these, small business was stifled in the Babylonian Empire; having no expanding frontier of knowledge, Hammurabi fell back on a police state. He had "order," but it was a dying order.

3. A hard money option: the right to demand and receive silver, or gold, or even the "red feather currency" still in vogue in the South Seas today, in lieu of paper money or the king's coins.

4. A climate favorable to free enterprise, on the part of the government. It may seem strange for this to be found in fourth position, instead of first, on behalf of the small businessman. But this is what the centuries say. Given the first three requirements, the small businessman can endure a good deal of adverse "climate." In fact, his "hard money option" enabled him to do a good deal to improve the business climate, in the 17th and 18th century England.

Anyone claiming responsibility for leadership of small business must, therefore, examine the pending "A-treaty" in the light of the foregoing experience.

My answer must be, that if the treaty is seriously persisted in for any length of time, it clouds all four. Because after a period of time under this treaty, we shall be more and more under the thumb of the Russians, for reasons set forth below. And for particular reasons of face and force, we shall have lost auxiliary strength in the discouragement of our realistic friends throughout the world including those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

The direct impact of the treaty is on the first two characteristics above; its indirect and consequential impact, on the second two. In the small businessman's historical experience, military force either underwrites a sound or an unsound view of the human situation, and his fate is determined more by the sound or unsound than by the military force which supports it.

When asked by any of my members what I think about this treaty from their standpoint, I must reply that the deal is either bad, or phony, or both. My reasoning is related to the fundamental human nature with which the small businessman has lived for centuries and millenia. He has been offered a new deal of some kind at intervals at least as far back as the "Epic of Gilgemesh" about 6,000 years ago. It has always turned out to be a phony deal in the end. He has had the same old human nature to deal with. In the light of the evidence below, no change in human nature is taking place right now or is going to take place in the foreseeable future. Hence there will be no new era. We have got to make and keep the peace, for the longest time we can, among men as they now are, to benefit the small businessman. The evidence says that this treaty is not the way to do it. It will increase tension on balance, not diminish it. It is a step backward, not forward. My reasons are grouped under headings familiar to students of human affairs, but I have not noticed much under these headings in the reports of debates on the treaty. The considerations appear to me to be as follows:

HUMAN NATURE

Aggressiveness: As the Max Planck Institute of Behavioral Physiology at Wuppertal, Germany, found, "aggressiveness is a basic biological phenomenon. [It is shown] by physiological studies of the underlying neural and hormonal processes. * * * In the human being * * * such behavior * * * will have to be controlled. And the first step in the direction of control is the realization that aggressiveness is deeply rooted in the history of the species and in the physiology and behavioral organization of each individual." The treaty now pending in the Senate supposes that aggressiveness will subside. The experience of the small businessman over thousands of years, and the findings of modern investigation, are the same on this point—it will not. It will have to be controlled. It may be controlled by regulation, but never by prohibition.

Curiosity: Not only the obvious lesson of the infant and growing child—and the Biblical story of Eve and the apple—but all experience through the ages, show that the curiosity of mankind is never satisfied. It may sleep for a while, or may be deadened by conditions, but it is always waiting under the surface when not active. This treaty proposes to stop cold one line of curiosity. It has no more chance of doing so than King Canute had of stopping the tide. And the findings from the underground explosions will constantly stimulate more curiosity (as well as fear and jealousy), until one side or the other will literally explode. The treaty in this sense is ultimately an engine of destruction.

Restlessness: As Dr. John Nef of the University of Chicago has so apty said, "What was false [about ideas of automatic peace] was the assumption that nations and peoples of the world would act according to what were, in the long run, their collective material interests; that they would accept the millenium if it were offered to them." The small businessman has been told about the millenium many times. It has never come true. He always finds his own market restless and unpredictable.

This same thing will happen in due course to the market for this treaty. Peace is a process not a condition. On the contrary, the arguments for this treaty look upon peace as a condition to be achieved. This attitude and expectation alone condemn it to failure, in the light of our experience.

Or to illustrate from France in the last century: From 1830 to 1848, France had a good, stable government; there was recovery of order, and business was good. In 1848, the French threw out both the government and the form of government on the slogan, "France is bored." The small businessman is very familiar indeed with this phenomenon. It teaches him that nothing human stays put.

General tension, and tension in the issue of regulation versus prohibition: Why people who lived through the prohibition era would favor this treaty is more than I can see. Prohibition not only (a) has never been successful as to any human activity, but (b) is an invitation to violation. Dam the pressure at a point of great interest and immediately it will rise at other points. The evidence for this is already in hand, in the Wall Street Journal for September 13:

"Secret safeguards against Soviet test ban gains begin taking shape.

"Details can't be told but the Pentagon will deploy more detection devices to check on possible Russian cheating above ground. Included: High-altitude aircraft to sample air for radioactive debris; ground stations to measure shock waves of electromagnetic emanations. A satellite detection system would join in whenever development permits.

"Plans go ahead for speedy resumption of U.S. atmospheric tests if necessary. Two big jet planes get test-measuring equipment. Larger underground shots will probably come anyway. But technicians doubt the yields can approach one megaton, as McNamara claims. Efforts for bigger blasts could actually slow the number of tests possible.

"Extra underground testing figures to cost an additional $30 million, most of it in this fiscal year."

We are forever listening to preachments about relaxing tension. They are almost irrelevant to the human condition. Life is tension. The problem is to manage it. Instead of constructive management of tension, this treaty is already exaggerating it in two ways—by prohibition and by secrecy—as shown above. The whole theory of relaxing tension is false per se. The alternative to the treaty—a realistic and constructive alternative—is regulation, not prohibition. As Representative HOSMER has proposed, in his article in the Saturday Evening Post on September 7, we need merely "a simple treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union stipulating that atmospheric testing be stopped whenever certain reasonable, agreed-upon levels of fallout" have been reached. This will be the method adopted ultimately anyway, human nature being what it is.

By that time, the United States may not be a party to such a treaty; it may not even be an independent nation, and its small business may have gone by the board. Others will do, eventually, what the United States now refuses to do. That is certain. It is the way human nature works.

If the small businessman has learned any lesson from his history, it is that there is some chance for a generally accepted regulation to work, and no chance whatever for flat prohibitions to work. Someone always violates the prohibitions, sooner or later. The damage done until this fundamental lesson is relearned by America may be colossal, and the American small businessman may be the chief victim.

DIPLOMACY

The small businessman (as a class) benefited immensely from the long Roman peace, and still more from the peace that lasted about a century from Napoleon to World War I. How was the peace kept in each case? The answer is, by the same methods by which order is kept in a schoolroom—a combination of face and force. The force may often be moral force, but in the end it is backed up by real force. Children are going to be the same problems generation after generation, and they will grow up to be grownups who continue to be the same problems, generation after generation.

Each solution of a human problem, in short, will bring in a new—different—only perhaps more manageable set of problems. Face and force will continue to be the factors that keep peace in the world, time without end.

The important thing to remember here is, that the effectiveness of moral force which Americans like so well depends in part on confidence in its wisdom, and this treaty will really shake confidence in America's wisdom, among those paying attention to history and human nature—especially the experience of the small businessman with both.

The two steps necessary for the American people to understand this cannot well be taken in a hurry. One is for them to relate their experience with children to the behavior of nations. The other is for them to understand how the peace was kept, when it was kept, in Europe. In American classrooms, we read about the successes of American diplomacy, not about the mixture of frustrations, failures, and successes that are the real makeup of diplomacy. So I guess it is a hopeless task to expound this very much. They will have to learn from harsh experience. It is harsh experience throughout history that has taught the independent businessman to be on his guard.

Actually, to judge diplomacy he has only to glance at the schoolteacher in his own community. Consider the multiple choices of the schoolteacher for keeping order. He can rap the knuckles (except where forbidden by rules), or smile, or give out extra homework, or encourage, or send a note home, or keep the youngster after school, or send him to a different seat or to the principal's office, or keep him in at recess—in any combination that his ingenuity suggests. All these tools and more—with expulsion as the ultimate sanction—are in the hands of the teacher and school authorities. With all this flexibility of choice, keeping order in a schoolroom taxes the best of teachers.

Now suppose that the teacher were suddenly told that as to one situation, he had only two choices—to shake hands with a particularly brutal schoolyard bully and let him loose on the playgrounds, or to have everybody engage in dangerous gymnastics. The teacher would say that this was a wholly false situation; that all kinds of alternative choices and combinations existed, and that the situation was forced without rhyme or reason.

That, Senator, is what we have before us today. Our diplomats have boxed themselves into a two-choice situation instead of a multiple-choice situation. This is something frequently fatal in either war or diplomacy, and always unwise in business. No competent small businessman would knowingly risk such a situation, still less seek it out.

To add but a single illustration which has happened within the lifetime of most busi-

nessmen now living, and simply underscores the risk in this situation:

On November 16, 1933, Mr. Litvinoff pledged to the President of the United States that Russia "would refrain from interference in the internal affairs of the United States; would refrain from any propaganda, acts to disturb tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security in the United States; would not permit the formation of any group having the aim of overthrow of the political and social order of the United States," etc.

Five days later, Litvinoff issued a statement which said, "The Third International is not mentioned in this document. You must not read into it any more than was intended."

One month after that, the Communist International met under the walls of the Kremlin and said: "There is no way out of the general crisis * * * other than via the overthrow of the exploiting classes, the confiscation of the factories, banks, mines, transport, houses, stocks of goods of the capitalists [and] the lands of the landlords [and] the church."

Any businessman reading this would say to himself, "Well, when will I get a letter telling me not to read into this treaty any more than was intended?"

SCIENCE

What the blow to scientific experimentation involved in the treaty may be, the small businessman on the outside has no way of knowing. However, he can read the technical magazines. It is no problem to visualize a series of intermediate space stations between here and the moon, all computerized, and dominating not just the world by the solar system. The question would be, what is the source of energy to keep such a system going? And the only possible answer, of course, is atomic energy. Exotic means of converting sunlight and chemicals into electricity exist, but on the voluminous scale required for such an interplanetary operation, the atom would obviously be the big source. Any businessman competent to watch the evolution of technology is capable of seeing this.

So, on the front which will eventually lead someone to dominance, he sees the United States retreating by freezing. He also sees, separately, a theory which as a theory has been bad throughout history—that some line of knowledge should be stopped at a certain point. On both counts, a free scientific atmosphere is inhibited.

Responsible advertisements in the technical magazines now refer matter-of-factly to populating the moon. Space fiction now measures cop-and-robber stories in terms of light-years. These are more responsible clues to the future than the treatment of human nature which appears in the treaty and its hearings.

It is quite possible that we shall have a fair era of peace in spite of this treaty. But hazards threatening peace, that did not previously exist, have been introduced by the treaty. And new hazards, that the United States will become second-, third-, or fourth-best in the world, have decidedly been introduced.

All of this clouds the outlook of the small businessman in this country.

We shall have retreated on the human-nature front, on the diplomatic front, on the scientific front, and on the military front. Knowing that face and force are indispensable to world order, and that the contribution of the United States to both has been weakened, the American businessman may well wonder whether the next retreat will be on the economic front, where he is. His greatest hope will have to be, that the treaty is merely a passing phenomenon, to be succeeded later by real hard bargaining with the Russians on a durable, give-and-take basis. That, in the light of his history, would make sense.

I cannot close without quoting from one progressive American now dead, and from two contemporary authorities who might well have been called as witnesses, in the hearings on this treaty, since it is a proposal to rest the future of western civil liberties on the supposition that human beings will be better. This supposition is contrary to all the experience of the small businessman's history. Let me call them in turn, in the order in which they spoke.

Walter Rauschenbusch, the American reformer, 1912: "In the best social order that is conceivable, men will still smoulder with lust and ambition, and be lashed with hate and jealousy as with the whip of a slave driver."

Herbert Butterfield, the English historian, 1949: "It is essential not to have faith in human nature. Such a faith is a recent heresy and a very disastrous one."

Prof. Winthrop Hudson, of Colgate-Rochester Seminary: "A romantic and sentimental confidence in the essential goodness of man, and in the purity of his motives, would seem to be one of the major perils of a democratic society."

These quotations express the essence of the experience of the small businessman over some 6,000 years of history, and they are completely adverse to both the premises and the conclusions of the pending treaty.

Yours sincerely,

R. HARLAND SHAW,
Chairman.

Tribute to the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the first Peace Corps men are just now beginning to return after serving their 2 years abroad. An uncertain experiment when it began, the Peace Corps must now be recognized as one of the quickest and most unqualified successes in recent American policy. Not incidentally, it has also been a great benefit to the nations in which the corpsmen are serving. The Peace Corps is an excellent example of how a country can serve its own interests by serving the interests of others.

The accomplishments of the Corps have been depicted well by a recent editorial in the Idaho Falls, Idaho, Post-Register. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, describing specifically the work of corpsmen in Asia, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE PEACE CORPS

More than 1,200 Peace Corps volunteers are working in 11 Asian countries. Evidently their work is effective, for Asian leaders are honoring them, and another 600 trainees are being prepared for duty in the Far East.

When Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver went to Manila in late August to receive the Ramon Magsaysay Award for International Understanding, he stood in for all the Americans doing this job.

The Manila Evening News placed the tribute on their shoulders:

"What millions of dollars in machinery and foodstuffs and other material gifts had failed to accomplish, the Peace Corps workers achieved in less than 2 years—an understanding with Asian peoples that promises to pass all tests."

The Corps volunteers labor in nations which stretch in an arc from arid Afghanistan across the Indian subcontinent to southeast Asia and the Philippines. Mostly they are teachers, but many assist in health, agriculture and community development programs.

Here and there, teachers in the Corps are placed at important colleges and universities. Generally, however, they are found in secondary and elementary schools in rural areas.

The Philippines leads all Asian lands, with 474 Peace Corps workers, nearly all of them teachers. It seems fitting, therefore, that the award to Shriver in the Corps' behalf was created in honor of the late Philippine President Magsaysay, known throughout Asia and the world for his integrity, humanity, and devotion to freedom.

Other Asian nations with large contingents are Thailand, with 225; Malaya, 169; India and Pakistan, about 115 each; North Borneo and Sarawak with just under 100 altogether.

The Corps development work in the Asian countries includes a wide range of projects, not least flood control and irrigation work and the plotting of roads which will open up vast reaches of trackless jungle on the island of Borneo.

Communist cries of "Yankee go home" greeted the mere 17 volunteers who came last May to Indonesia to teach physical education. But that country's leaders offered reassurances, and the workers are still there.

The award citation to Shriver appeared to sum up much Asian feeling about all this. It said:

"In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference."

Hardly an American at home could be anything but immensely proud that their countrymen's efforts abroad have merited such appreciation.

Extension of Bonneville Power Authority Into Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, has been engaged in a concerted CONGRESSIONAL RECORD campaign to try to indicate that the people of Idaho do not favor the extension of the Bonneville Power Authority into the southern part of my State. Why Congressman SAYLOR thinks that he is qualified to pose as an expert on Idaho public opinion is beyond my power to determine. The truth is that the extension of the Bonneville Power Authority into southern Idaho has great support in that area, especially among those people best informed about the benefits to Idaho of such an extension. Such a person is Boyd Ressel, manager of the Salmon River Electric Cooperative of Challis, Idaho. Mr. Ressel, along with many other informed peo-

ple in Idaho, has correctly pointed out that BPA's coming to Idaho will not cost the taxpayers an extra cent. Mr. Ressel's views on this matter appeared in an article in the Challis (Idaho) Messenger of August 29, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article from the Challis Messenger printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALMON RIVER ELECTRIC SIGNS WITH BPA

Salmon River Electric has announced signing of a 20-year electric contract with Bonneville Power Administration. The contract was approved August 21 by the board of directors and manager of the cooperative.

At this meeting Board President Garth Chivers stated, had Salmon River Electric been using Bonneville Power in 1962, when they purchased 8,200,000 kilowatt-hours, there would have been a saving of $20,160 to the cooperative.

Mr. Chivers remarked that Salmon River Electric does not plan an immediate rate reduction to their members, but will wait a period of time, and review the rate structure after the first of the year.

Boyd Ressel, manager, said regardless of the stories officials of Idaho Power and Utah Power would have us believe, Bonneville Power coming to southern Idaho, will not cost the taxpayers an extra cent. All the while the power companies are telling their stories, they are receiving a subsidy from the Government, at the expense of the taxpayers. All private power companies in the United States receive a Federal subsidy amounting to 3 percent of all money spent for construction.

"Also we might mention that Salmon River Electric pays one of the largest tax bills in Custer County. Custer being the principal county in which we operate. We also pay taxes in Lemhi and Blaine Counties.

"Federal money used by BPA is repaid to the Government, with interest. It is true that BPA has been operating at a deficit the past few years, but they have millions of dollars in prepayments that are being used to offset the present deficit.

"Every 5 years BPA must review their rate schedule and at that time adjust their rates, so they will cover all operating costs, plus meeting their repayment schedule. This will be done in 1964.

"Perhaps the most important thing Bonneville Power coming to southern Idaho has done, is to give the people of the area a yardstick by which they may compare the rates they pay with those the people using BPA power pay."

Foreign Currency Loans to Private Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1957 I sponsored an amendment to Public Law 480 providing that not to exceed 25 percent of the local currencies received from the sale of agricultural commodities under title I of that act should be reserved for loans to private American business firms or their affiliates for commercial development in the purchasing country and for loans to any private firm, foreign or domestic, for the construction in such country of facilities which would assist in the sale of American agricultural commodities.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that this has been one of the most popular and, I believe, one of the most constructive uses being made of the local currencies generated by the sale of our agricultural surpluses.

The authority for making these loans was originally placed by the committee in the Export-Import Bank and this organization did an excellent job of administering the program. In January 1962, the responsibility for administering the program was transferred to the Agency for International Development and the report I am submitting herewith is a listing, by countries, of the loans which have been made by AID since that time. I think it shows an excellent record of utilization of these funds and I commend both the agency and the private firms which have borrowed the money for their combined initiative in developing economic opportunity in these countries which have purchased our surplus agricultural commodities:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT—REPORT ON LOCAL CURRENCY LENDING ACTIVITIES, COOLEY LOANS, JANUARY 1, 1962 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1963

Local currency (Cooley) loans stimulate economic activity by providing long-term capital to private enterprise in friendly less-developed countries through the lending of U.S.-owned foreign currency received in payment for surplus agricultural commodities. Under title I of Public Law 480, loans may be made to (a) qualified U.S. firms to develop business and expand trade or (b) U.S. for foreign companies if the loan will result in expanded markets for, and consumption of, U.S. agricultural products. These loans are available only in countries where local currencies have been allocated for this purpose under Public Law 480 sales agreements. The loans are made and are repayable in local currency without maintenance of value. Interest is usually comparable to that charged by local development banks and maturities are related to the purpose of the financing.

The uses for which Cooley loans have been made are extremely varied. The local currency loan proceeds may be used by the borrower to finance local costs such as expansion of plant and equipment, land acquisition, and other normal costs of operation, including working capital. The loan must be acceptable to the host country government. Cooley loans may not be made for the manufacture of products which would be exported to the United States in competition with U.S.-made products or for the manufacture or production of commodities or the products thereof.

The Cooley loan program is one of the principal points of AID's contact with the American business community. In the year and a half since the inception of AID's administration of the program, AID has approved 68 Cooley loans (including 31 in the last 6 months) totaling the equivalent of $61,239,000.

These loans, broken down by region, are as follows:

AID

	Number of loans	Percent of loans	Dollar equivalent	Percent of dollar equivalent
			Thousands	
Latin America	10	15	$4,270	7
Far East	8	12	3,563	6
Africa and Europe				
Near East and South Asia	50	73	53,406	87
Total	68	100	61,239	100

During the first 4½ years of the Cooley program, the Export-Import Bank of Washington (which administered the program during that period) approved 162 loans totaling the equivalent of $95,168,000 as follows:

Export-Import Bank

	Number of loans	Percent of loans	Dollar equivalent	Percent of dollar equivalent
			Thousands	
Near East and south Asia	82	51	$64,085	67
Latin America	49	30	15,488	16
Far East	15	9	3,766	4
Europe	16	10	11,829	13
Total	162	100	95,168	100

In many cases AID has sought to make the Cooley loan program more attractive to potential American investors by not requiring a guaranty from the U.S. investor or a local bank. For example, of the 50 loans made by AID in the Near East-South Asia region, only 17, or 34 percent, have been guaranteed by either a U.S. firm or local bank or made directly to a U.S. firm. Of the loans previously approved by the Export-Import Bank in the NESA Region, 83 percent were guaranteed by either a U.S. firm or a local bank or made directly to a U.S. firm.

Attached is a list of the Cooley loans approved by AID from the inception of the AID administration of the program on January 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963.

Cooley loans approved by AID, Jan. 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963

Region and country	Number of loans	Percent of total	Dollar equivalent	Percent of total
Latin America:			*Thousands*	
Colombia	7		$2,790	
Ecuador	2		650	
Paraguay	1		830	
Subtotal	10	15	4,270	7
Far East:				
China	5		1,463	
Korea	1		150	
Philippines	1		1,410	
Vietnam	1		540	
Subtotal	8	12	3,563	6
Africa and Europe				
Near East and south Asia:			*Thousands*	
Greece	5		$2,846	
Egypt (UAR)	1		244	
Iran	2		429	
Israel	7		1,846	
Turkey	7		14,633	
Pakistan	9		6,788	
India	19		26,620	
Subtotal	50	73	53,406	87
Total	68	100	61,239	100

Cooley loans approved by AID, Jan. 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963

Country and loan No. (1)	Borrower (2)	U.S. affiliate (3)	Purpose (4)	Amount of loan contract (5)	Dollar equivalent (6)	Interest rate (7)	Repayment terms: Years (8)	Repayment terms: Grace (9)	Authorized or approved (10)	Loan agreement signed (11)
LATIN AMERICA										
Colombia:				*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Percent*				
C-14-11/A	Hogares Colombianos, S.A.	World Homes	Housing	$5,000	570	4	15	1	Apr. 12, 1962	Apr. 17, 1962
C-14-12/A	Productora de Papelas, S.A.	W. R. Grace	Pulp, paper	6,000	540	9	5	1½	do	Nov. 29, 1962
C-14-13/A	Goodyear de Colombia, S.A.	Goodyear Rubber	Tires, tubes	2,000	180	9	5	1½	do	Apr. 26, 1963
C-14-14/A	Gillette de Colombia, S.A.	Gillette Razor	Razors, blades	4,000	360	9	5	1½	do	Jan. 6, 1963
C-14-15/A	Owens-Illinois International, S.A.	Owens-Illinois	Glass manufacturing	4,500	410	9	5	1½	do	Jan. 2, 1963
514-E-023	General Electric de Colombia, S.A.	General Electric	Electrical products	5,000	450	9	5	1½	Nov. 16, 1962	May 15, 1963
514-E-208	Productos Quaker, S.A.	Quaker Oats	Foodstuffs	2,800	280	9	7	1	June 26, 1963	
Ecuador:										
518-E-018	Industria Cartonera	W. R. Grace and International Paper.	Cardboard box manufacturing.	5,754	260	9	6	½	Apr. 8, 1963	
518-E-020	Automatic Electric Co. of Colombia, S.A.	General Telephone and Electronics International.	Telephone systems	8,500	390	9	10	1	Apr. 26, 1963	
Paraguay:										
526-E-010	Pan-Western Enterprises, Inc.	Pan-Western Enterprises, Inc.	Cattle, quebracho black palm.	104,000	830	9	10	3	May 10, 1963	May 8, 1963
Latin America subtotal (10 loans).					4,270					
FAR EAST										
China:										
484-E-033	Atlas Taiwan	Atlas Chemical	Explosives	24,000	600	12	9	2	June 29, 1962	Dec. 28, 1962
484-E-032	China Manmade Fibre Corp.	None	Cellophane	5,940	150	12	4	1	July 9, 1962	Apr. 11, 1963
484-E-031	Procter & Gamble Taiwan.	Procter & Gamble	Detergents	3,400	85	12	5	1	May 7, 1962	Oct. 9, 1962
484-E-037	Joys Inter-Associates	None	Popcorn	300	8	12	3½	1	June 11, 1963	
484-E-038	Procter & Gamble Taiwan.	Procter & Gamble	Working capital; purchase assets of local firms.	24,800	620	12	6	2½	June 21, 1963	
Korea: 489-E-017	Shinhan Flour	None	Foodstuffs	20,000	150	8	6	1	Sept. 7, 1962	Dec. 13, 1962
Philippines: 492-E-015.	White Rose Packing Corp.	Francis H. Leggett	Fish canning	5,500	1,410	7½	10	1½	Feb. 26, 1963	Apr. 15, 196
Vietnam: 430-E-007.	Foremost Dairies Vietnam, S.A.R.L.	Foremost Dairies, Inc.	Dairy manufacturing	40,000	540	6	5½	½	June 10, 1963	
Far East subtotal (8 loans).					3,563					
AFRICA AND EUROPE [1]										
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA										
Greece:										
C-40-9	Wood Industry Xelopan.	Pappas & Skouras	Construction of fiber board plant.	18,000	600	6	6½	1½	May 7, 1962	Sept. 19, 1962
240-E-023	Dow Hellenic	Dow Chemical	Construction of plastic plant.	20,000	667	6	8½	3	June 27, 1962	Feb. 28, 1963
240-E-025	Mobil Oil Hellas	Socony Mobil	Construction of service stations and bulk fuel oil terminal.	17,500	580	6	9	2	June 25, 1962	Dec. 5, 1962
240-E-027	Isola, S.A	Rheem Manufacturing	Working capital for home appliance manufacturing.	20,000	666	6	7	2½	Oct. 31, 1962	
240-E-026	Voktas Feeds	None	Expansion of poultry raising facilities.	10,000	333	6	5½	1½	Dec. 6, 1962	Jan. 17, 1963

Footnotes at end of table.

Cooley loans approved by AID, Jan. 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963—Continued

Country and loan No.	Borrower	U.S. affiliate	Purpose	Amount of loan contract	Dollar equivalent	Interest rate	Repayment terms		Authorized or approved	Loan agreement signed
							Years	Grace		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Egypt (United Arab Republic):				*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Percent*				
C-62-2	Pfizer Egypt	Pfizer Co	Construction of pharmaceutical plant.	$107	244	5	10½	1	Apr. 20, 1962	Aug. 17, 1962
Iran:										
C-65-1	International Dairy	Foremost Dairy	Working capital for dairy products.	7,500	100	8	5	1½	May 7, 1962	Aug. 29, 1962
265-E-018	Pars Cotton Ginning & Oil Mill Corp.	None	Construction of bulk storage terminal.	25,000	329	5	5¼	¾	June 27, 1963	
Israel:										
C-71-23	Haifa Silos, Ltd	do	Expansion of grain storage facilities.	[2] 175	58	10	8	1	Feb. 21, 1963	Mar. 22, 1963
271-E-078	Samson Tire & Rubber Co.	General Tire & Rubber Co.	Expansion of rubber tire and tube plant.	900	300				May 3, 1963	
271-E-075	Dagon-Batey-Mamguroth/Le Israel Ltd.	None	Expansion of grain storage facilities.	800	267				do	
271-E-077	Sefen	American Israel Corp	Expansion of plastics plant.	710	237	8	8	2	do	June 18, 1963
271-E-076	Gadot Chemical tankers & Terminals.	Stanalchem, Inc	Expansion of bulk storage terminals.	500	167	8	8	2	do	
271-E-079	Israel Alabama Wire Corp., Ltd.	Alabama Wire	Construction of aluminum wire and cable plant.	450	150	8	8	2	do	June 10, 1963
271-E-085	KLIL Non Ferrous Metals, Ltd.	Rusco Industries	Construction of integrated aluminum extrusion and fabrication plant.	2,000	667	10	10	2	June 27, 1963	
Turkey:										
C-77-11	U.S. Royal Lastik	U.S. Rubber Co	Construction of rubber tire and tube plant.	48,350	5,372	7	9½	1	May 29, 1962	Apr. 6, 1963
277-E-038	Turk Maadin Sirketti	Metallurg	Working capital for chrome ore mine.	7,000	775	7	6½	1½	June 25, 1962	Feb. 26, 1963
277-E-034	Wyeth Laboratuvartori	American Home Products.	Construction of pharmaceutical plant.	10,600	1,178	7	9½	2	July 23, 1962	Oct. 22, 1962
C-77-10	Goodyear Lastik	Goodyear	Construction of rubber tire and tube plant.	[2] 14,000	1,550	7	9½	1½	Oct. 23, 1962	Feb. 5, 1963
277-E-039	Chrysler Sanyani	Chrysler	Construction of truck assembly plant.	35,000	3,875	7	12	3	Nov. 2, 1962	June 18, 1963
277-E-040	Yarimca Starch & Glucose.	None	Working capital for starch and glucose producer.	3,000	633	7	6	2	Jan. 11, 1963	June 5, 1963
C-77-12	U.S. Royal Lastik	U.S Rubber Co	Construction of rubber tire and tube plant.	11,250	1,250	8	9½	1	Jan. 24, 1963	Apr. 6, 1963
Pakistan:										
C-91-10	General Tire & Rubber Co. of Pakistan.	General Tire & Rubber Co.	do	7,113	1,503	6	15	1½	Feb. 27, 1962	Apr. 18, 1963
C-91-12	Pakistan Fabric Co	Belton Bagging	Construction of jute warehouse and milling facilities.	1,000	211	6	5½	1	May 17, 1963	Aug. 14, 1962
C-91-9	Pakistan Services	Intercontinental Hotels	Construction of hotel in Karachi.	2,759	583	6½	20	2	June 25, 1962	(3).
391-E-076	Pakistan American Liberty Tank Terminals.	American Liberty Tank Terminals.	Construction of bulk storage terminal.	476	100	6½	12	2	Nov. 26, 1962	
391-E-075	Pakistan Services	Intercontinental Hotels Corp., Dacca.	Construction of hotel in Dacca.	4,477	940	6	17½	3	Mar. 6, 1963	
391-E-064	Merck Sharp & Dohme of Pakistan.	Merck Sharp & Dohme	Construction of pharmaceutical plant.	1,500	317	6½	12	2	Apr. 24, 1963	
391-E-063	Phelps Dodge, Ltd	Phelps Dodge	Construction of copper and aluminum wire and cable manufacturing facilities.	7,140	1,500	6½	10	4	May 15, 1963	
391-E-074	Intercontinental Hotels Corp.		Financing IHC's equity in Dacca hotels.	2,740	579	6½	18	3	May 29, 1963	
391-E-050	Singer Sewing Machine Co.	Singer manufacturing	Working capital for distribution of locally manufactured sewing machines.	5,000	1,055	6	9½	4	May 17, 1962	Sept. 29, 1962
India:										
C-86-16	Madras Rubber	Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co.	Construction of rubber tire and tube plant.	2,500	528	6½	7	2	(4)	May 23, 1962
C-86-17	Synthetics & Chemicals.	Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	Expansion of synthetics rubber plant.	15,000	3,162	6½	3½	1	Feb. 20, 1962	Aug. 20, 1962
386-E-074	Wyman-Gordon Chemicals.	do	Construction of steel forge plant.	2,500	527	6½	9½	3	May 7, 1962	Feb. 5, 1963
386-E-075	Precision Bearings India.	Norman-Hoffman	Construction of ball bearing plant.	3,000	633	6½	10	5	June 25, 1962	May 17, 1963
386-E-072	Victor Gasket	Victor Manufacturing	Construction of auto gasket manufacturing plant.	750	158	6½	7	1	do	Dec. 6, 1962
386-E-078	Harig-Malik	Harig Manufacturing	Construction of machine tool plant.	285	60	6½	10	1	Sept. 17, 1962	Do.
386-E-085	Arbor Acres India	Arbor Acres	Establishment of poultry-breeding farms.	2,500	527	7	6½	1½	Oct. 23, 1962	Aug. 7, 1963
386-E-080	McNally-Bird	McNally Pittsburgh	Construction of coal washery plant.	5,000	1,054	6½	11½	5	do	Dec. 4, 1962
386-E-079	Mysore Cement	Kaiser Corp	Expansion of cement plant.	4,500	949	7	10	3	Nov. 2, 1962	
386-E-083	Union Carbide India	Union Carbide	Expansion of chemical and plastic manufacturing facilities.	21,600	4,557	7	10	3½	Nov. 26, 1962	
386-E-088	Mandya Paper	Parsons & Whittemore	Refinancing of debt and expansion of paper plant.	15,000	3,150	7	10	3	Jan. 24, 1963	
C-86-17	Synthetics & Chemicals.	Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	Expansion of synthetics and rubber plant.	[2] 18,000	2,160	7	10	6	do	Mar. 19, 1963
396-E-089	Kirloskar Cummins	Cummins	Construction of diesel engine plant.	12,500	2,630	7	12½	2½	May 15, 1963	
386-E-090	Napco Bevel Gear	Napco Industries, Minneapolis.	Construction of bevel gear plant.	4,000	2,300	7	3	2½	May 14, 1963	

Footnotes at end of table.

Cooley loans approved by AID, Jan. 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963—Continued

Country and loan No.	Borrower	U.S. affiliate	Purpose	Amount of loan contract	Dollar equivalent	Interest rate	Repayment terms		Authorized or approved	Loan agreement signed
							Years	Grace		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
India—Continued				*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Percent*				
386-E-095	Chochin Pvt., Ltd.	Atalanta Trading Corp.	Expansion of shrimp processing facilities.	$2,365	500	7	10	2	June 21, 1963	
386-E-096	Frick India, Ltd.	Frick Co.	Construction of refrigeration equipment plant.	2,500	520	7	8	2	do	
386-E-093	Hindustan Aluminum Corp., Ltd.	Kaiser Corp.	Construction of aluminum fabricating facility.	10,000	2,080	7	10	3	do	
386-E-092	Elpro International, Ltd.	General Electric	Construction of electrical equipment plant.	4,000	833	7	9	1	June 27, 1963	
386-E-094	Gabriel India, Ltd.	Gabriel	Expansion of automatic shock absorber plant.	1,400	292	7	8	1	do	
Near East and south Asia subtotal (50 loans).					53,406					

[1] None.
[2] Increase.
[3] To be administered by Export-Import Bank.
[4] Approved by Export-Import Bank in November 1961. Loan agreement drafted and executed by AID.

1964 Marks Anniversary of Reconstruction's End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "1964 Marks Anniversary of Reconstruction's End," written by Holmes Alexander, and published in the Richmond News-Leader of September 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1964 MARKS ANNIVERSARY OF RECONSTRUCTION'S END

(By Holmes Alexander)

Negroes did their marching this year on the 100th anniversary of emancipation, but they aren't the only race with a liberation to celebrate.

Next year, on September 14, 1964, there falls the 90th anniversary of a date which southern white folks in the past have observed as the day when they were freed of the hated Reconstruction.

In New Orleans there stands a monument in Liberty Place to the Battle of Canal Street. It was here that Gen. Fred Ogden, commandant of the White League, smashed the combined forces of the metropolitan police, the federalized militia and their Negro auxiliaries.

A book on the subject, published in 1955 but catching attention now, and one we may hear more about next year, tells the story in detail and dignity. The battle, while not involving large numbers, is held to be one of the turning points in American social history.

Like the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, which had little military significance but made the political career of Andrew Jackson, the Battle of Liberty Place had consequences that proved equally far-reaching. It forced the ouster of carpetbag government and gave the South back to the southern whites. Like the Battle of Concord in 1775, this battle on Canal Street brought out civilians who stood up to trained troops and "fired shots heard round the world."

Only 13 Americans were lost under Jackson, only 10 or 12 Massachusetts Minutemen died against the Redcoats. The White Leaguers lost 18 and 30 were wounded. Not the casualties but the significance—past and future—is what the historian Stuart Omer Landry wrote of this battle:

"The Battle of Liberty Place in 1874 changed the tide of opinion, brought the end of Reconstruction to the South, and started the southern people on their way to the great prosperity which they now know."

Although the patriot groups called themselves the White League, they were not primarily white supremists and the battle was not a race riot. It was a recourse to arms, led by the very best people of the community, to change an intolerable situation of spoilation and corruption.

The patriots' purpose was not primarily to destroy an enemy in the field, although this was effectively done when the enemy suffered the greater losses and ran away. The end purpose was to make it known to President Grant and the Congress that these abuses of occupation would no longer be suffered, and to reach past the President and past Congress to the conscience of the American people.

The battle, fought behind cotton bales and overturned streetcars with cannon, Gatling guns and every form of small firearms, lasted only 15 minutes. The White Leaguers captured the statehouse and police headquarters, but were not long in command of the State government. What they accomplished was to get President Grant's attention, to set in motion three long congressional investigations and to draw favorable reaction throughout the Nation. Single newspapers in Philadelphia, Boston, Cincinnati, St. Louis and six newspapers in New York supported the spirit of the uprising. The New York Tribune sympathetically editorialized:

"The frightful mismanagement of affairs in Louisiana under the present administration has brought out its logical result and culminated * * * in an attempt at revolution on the part of the citizens who suffering under great and continued wrongs, are unable to find any redress."

But redress came with the national election of 1876 when Grant's successor, Rutherford B. Hayes, was apparently beaten by the reform Democrat, Samuel Tilden; Hayes was declared the winner after some strange business with the ballot boxes, but the will of the country had been made known.

Reconstruction ended—and southerners, looking for a handy anniversary to celebrate, could logically pick one that falls in the presidential year of 1964.

Paper Company Giving Land for Public Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, last week an important event was held in my old congressional district in Alabama. The article from the Mobile Register of September 19, which I am including with these remarks, gives the story of the Southern Woodlands Division of the St. Regis Paper Co. dedicating to public use two tracts of southern longleaf pine near Flomaton.

As chairman of the Forests Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, it gives me a great pleasure to pay public tribute to this civic-minded company. One could mention many names of the farsighted officials of the company; however, in passing, let me state Roy K. Ferguson, board chairman, and Paul Dunn, vice president, have led the way in this organization's development as well as Marc Rawls, manager of the Southern Woodlands Division of St. Regis. Mr. Dunn is president of the Society of American Foresters; and Mr. Rawls, who was closely associated with the late Albert Ernest, an official of the company, is doing one of the finest jobs of any forester in this Nation. I regret that I was not able to be present on this occasion.

I have in my office a cross-sectional disk from a virgin longleaf yellow pine tree which is 267 years old; it was presented to me by the T. R. Miller Lumber Co. of Brewton, Ala., and was grown near the two above-mentioned tracts. Natu-

rally, Smokey, the bear, stands as a guardian on top of this slab. This tract of forest land, which is to be used by the public, is named in honor of Senator G. R. Swift of Atmore who is a former U.S. Senator and outstanding lumberman of many years.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register, Sept. 19, 1963]

PAPER COMPANY GIVING LAND FOR PUBLIC USE

BREWTON, ALA.—Two tracts of southern longleaf pine north of Flomaton will be turned over for public use today by the Southern Woodlands Division of the St. Regis Paper Co.

An official dedication will be held. The land includes two tracts of uncut longleaf pine for the information and use of the Society of American Foresters, travelers in the State of Alabama. The dedication site will be on the U.S. Highway 31, approximately 4 miles north of Flomaton, beginning at 2:30 p.m.

Officials of the St. Regis Paper Co. said that part of the area will be designated as a public picnic ground and the company has installed fireplaces, picnic tables and cleared parking areas and footpaths under the trees. An area of about the same size has been designated as a Society of American Foresters natural area.

There are a total of 709 huge trees in the tract, one of which will be named Escambia in honor of this county. The largest longleaf, the official tree of the State, measuring 30 inches in diameter and towering almost 100 feet high, is 12 years older than the State itself and will be named Alabama.

Then the 67 next largest trees are to be named for each one of the State's counties. Each "county tree" is more than 22 inches in diameter and all of them are believed to be older than the State.

Including the 709 "old growth" longleaf pines, there are 5,369 trees in the two tracts. St. Regis foresters will maintain the trees uncut for the benefit of foresters, naturalists, and others. The city of Flomaton will maintain the picnic areas.

The tract of timber north of Flomaton is one of the very few tracts of uncut or virgin timber left in the South today. The company said that it is being set aside as a showplace so that schoolchildren, adults, and even foresters of the future who might otherwise never see virgin pine in its natural state might visit the area stocked with nearly 1,000 of the same kind of trees that awed the early explorers who crossed the Longleaf Pine Belt.

Included on the program will be Leon Clancy of Decatur and Century, Fla., a sawmill operator and lumberman who will act as master of ceremonies at the dedication. M. G. Rawls, manager of the Southern Woodlands Division of St. Regis, will also be a principal speaker.

The tract to be used by the public will be named for G. R. Swift of Atmore, former State and U.S. Senator, sawmill operator and timberman. This area contains all of the county-named trees.

A tract the same size designated as a "natural area" is named for E. A. Hauss, head of the sawmill company which acquired the tract at the beginning of the 20th century and maintained it in its natural state until it was acquired by St. Regis in 1957.

Refreshments will be served during the dedication ceremonies and the Flomaton High School band will play music for the program.

The Longleaf Pine Picnic Ground will be officially accepted for the public by two youngsters, Miss May Rigby, president of the Escambia County 4-H organization, and John White, a Future Farmer of America. Paul M. Dunn, of New York, president of the Society of American Foresters and vice president of St. Regis, accepted the natural area for the society.

Claude D. Kelly, of Atmore, Ala., director of conservation, will trace the ownership history of the forest and speak to the audience on the career and service to the community of Senator Swift. Mayor L. D. Weaver of Flomaton accepted for the city.

Visitors will find the tree, "Alabama," and the 67 county trees marked with nameplates fixed to the trees in such a way as to be harmless to their future growth.

Economic Development of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Anybody Worried About Mississippi?" published in the Richmond News-Leader of September 18, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANYBODY WORRIED ABOUT MISSISSIPPI?

Gov. Ross Barnett goes out of office next January after 4 years of storm, stress, calumny—and major accomplishment. He has brought a prodigious amount of new industry into his State.

This is worth dwelling upon because of the persistent fallacy, sired alike by ignorance and malice, which says that racial disputes in the Southern States howl up a climate that's uncongenial to business. How this canard survives we don't know, because the North now has more racial hubbub than the South does. But the recent Democratic gubernatorial primary election in Mississippi tossed up a lot of facts which were not nationally known about the Barnett administration—and these facts afford the basis for reviewing some general principles on industrial location.

Industries don't decide to come into any State despite racial uproar there. They don't decide upon the move because of racial peace either. Such decisions are made upon market research, the availability of land, water, labor pools, and electrical power, the pertinent statutes and the tax structure. The decisions also yield to the salesmanship of business-seeking State officials—provided, always, that these persons have something to sell.

Governor Barnett has been a tireless huckster of Mississippi's environmental advantages. In the past 28 months he made 29 trips out of his State. He racked up 45,000 miles of travel beyond his borders. He conducted 550 across-the-desk interviews with out-of-State businessmen about Mississippi's physical assets, about 39 pro-business laws which he'd recommended and the legislature had passed, about a referendum that fixed the right-to-work proposition into the State constitution by better than a 2-to-1 majority, about graduated reduction of personal business taxes.

The Governor could talk about the success of the balance agriculture with industry program (BAWI), which has been in effect since 1944. Under this plan, general obligational bonds are sold to finance and prepare industrial sites. He could say that in his incumbency, these bond issues boomed as never before. In the 12 months since the crisis at Ole Miss University, he could tell his prospects, his State has benefited by 83 new or expanded industries, bringing in 7,700 new jobs, with a capital investment of $67.3 million.

How did businessmen respond to this solid salesmanship? Well, last December, with the Ole Miss campus still under Federal occupation, Mr. Barnett attended a long-scheduled industrial luncheon at the Pick-Congress Hotel in Chicago. He had to break through a picket line and endure some ruffianship by the local press. But he sold Paul L. Adams, president of Caradco, Inc., an Iowa firm, on establishing a $2.5 million woodworking plant at Gulfport. Mr. Adams told him:

"The BAWI program offers obvious economic advantages, and although similar programs are offered elsewhere, the combination of many facts and considerations in our survey, including community personality, led us to a choice of Gulfport."

Only last month, on August 15, the American Potash & Chemical Corp., which already had a $13 million investment in Mississippi, added another $14 million with construction at Aberdeen, 120 miles northeast of Jackson. Willard P. Scott, the firm's vice president, wrote to Barnett:

"We * * * are pleased to have the opportunity of demonstrating to you our confidence that economic conditions conducive to sound industrial opportunity will continue to prevail in Mississippi."

There is much else for the record, including the opening next month of a $125 million oil refinery at Pascagoula. William C. Smith, president of Standard Oil of Kentucky, saluted this venture by telling Mr. Barnett:

"Industrialists are looking toward Mississippi in the days of the New Frontier in hopes of finding a way back to the better conditions of yesterday."

Yes, Mississippi is doing all right, and deservedly so. We offer it as an industrial model for other States and for the Federal Government. This is how jobs, job training, and increased revenue can be brought home to the community.

Many Happy Returns, Mr. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two editorials which recently appeared concerning one of America's most distinguished citizens, James A. Farley.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that every Member of Congress and all of the adult population of the United States will join in the birthday wishes expressed in the Savannah Evening Press, and will agree with the editorial in the Valley Times-News of West Point, Ga., concerning an address made by this very great and distinguished American, James A. Farley, who played such a vital role in the history of America and the free world during a very critical period in our history.

For many years Jim Farley participated in the formulation of policies that led this Nation from the depths of de-

pression to the unquestioned leader of the free world.

He is a man of wisdom, foresight, and strong convictions. After he left Government service he did not rest on his laurels. And he continues today to give sage advice on America's future.

I always benefit when I listen to Jim Farley and I urge every Member of Congress to read the editorial in the Valley Times-News commenting on an address Jim Farley made before the Executives Club of Chicago. This sounds like the Jim Farley that many of us knew so well in the thirties, and the fact that he celebrated his 75th birthday this year has not detracted in the slightest from his ability to analyze men and their motives.

Jim Farley is one of those rare Americans who can point with pride to a continuous record of achievement throughout his entire career, which continues even to this day. I am proud to claim him as a friend of many years.

The articles follow:

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press, May 29, 1963]

MANY HAPPY RETURNS, MR. FARLEY

This week a man we regard as a great American will celebrate his birthday. James A. Farley, of New York and the world-at-large, will be 75 years old on Thursday. This age is what his vital statistics show, but to look at him Mr. Farley seems no older than he was in those days of the early 1930's when he managed the campaign that swept Franklin D. Roosevelt into the Presidency.

The domestic policies that President Roosevelt established in direct contradition of the platform on which he was elected are still being debated. There is no question, however, of Mr. Farley's sincerity in his early belief in Mr. Roosevelt, just as there is no question about the great shock he endured when President Roosevelt tossed the no-third-term tradition overboard. The sincere Mr. Farley just couldn't go along with that and allowed himself to be offered for the Democratic nomination in 1940, a gesture that he must have known was futile but which he allowed because that was exactly the way he felt. This was typical of the man.

Mr. Farley is a Democrat and has never pretended to be anything else. His classification is generally regarded as that of a "moderate conservative." He may be regarded as a Democratic "minister without portfolio" but a power in the party nevertheless. This, we believe, is because Jim Farley can be counted upon to say and do what he thinks is right; sincerity coupled with political astuteness is a powerful combination.

For a man "retired" from active politics, Mr. Farley keeps mighty busy. We recently read that he attends an amazing number of eating functions, dinners and such, every week—eight or nine or more. But, we are told, he has learned not to eat much on the "chicken and peas" circuit, picking up a bite at a diner before approaching the festive board. It is our guess that along with whatever he eats at the diner, Mr. Farley ingests as much or more political information as he obtained at the damask-covered table. He just can't avoid this, and at it we wish him many more happy years.

[From the West Point (Ga.) Valley Times-News, Aug. 1, 1963]

PERILS CONTINUALLY GROWING

We live in a time of danger—undoubtedly the greatest danger the world has ever faced, if only because of the incredibly destructive power of the weapons possessed and readied by the two great powers. This dark fact is continually on the mind of every thoughtful American.

But are we, as a people, facing up to it as we can and must? Are we making the most of all the resources we have?

If James A. Farley, once a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, for 8 years chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and long a national figure, is right, we are not.

The lead article in the July issue of the Reader's Digest, which is condensed from an address Mr. Farley made before the Executives' Club of Chicago, presents his view in an effort to remind his countrymen "of the stuff they are made of."

He states his thesis in his opening paragraph: "Night and day the Kremlin's propaganda is directed toward breaking the will of the American people to resist. And, unfortunately, there are well-meaning Americans who unwittingly assist those propagandists. They argue that this is a time of greatest danger, and therefore greatest care must be taken. This is certainly true. But there is a vast difference between taking care and taking to the woods."

Mr. Farley calls on history to supply us with the evidence of what other Americans, most of them long dead, did in times of grave and consummate danger.

The roll is a long one, going an agonizing way from Bunker Hill to the hell of Tarawa. Its meaning is found in Patrick Henry's immortal "Give me liberty or give me death." In Mr. Farley's phrase, "In blunt terms the message is: To stand as an American you must be prepared to fall as one."

Mr. Farley denies that, as the Kremlin repeatedly charges, we are a soft people, dedicated only to lives of as much ease as we can obtain—the story of the pioneers who made this Nation refute such charges with him.

He denies too, the endles Russian claim, which has found currency in many corners of the world, that we seek world conquest. As he points out, Russia herself supports this denial. We saved Russia from Nazi occupation when she was reeling on the edge of total collapse.

We asked nothing in return, and when, because of our monopoly of atomic weapons our military superiority was overwhelming, we bid for world disarmament, it was the Soviets who closed the door against it. In an unprecedented act, we spent $60 billions of our treasure to aid other nations of the world.

It is the Soviets, Mr. Farley writes, pointing to the clear record, who seek world domination. Already they have subjugated, within totalitarian states, almost a billion people and 15 once-free nations.

Mr. Farley goes on to list perils that are continually growing—perils that demand the utmost in resoluteness and courage from us all. Even where communism has not triumphed it is moving in, using every weapon at its command, from bland words to terror. So: "The map proves that we are not moving toward war with the Communist; they are moving war toward us. Each time we seek to disengage, they confront us nearer home. Today they are on our doorstep."

At the end, he sums up his thesis: "I believe the American people must face the danger and the risk involved, and meet this challenge decisively * * * I think it (is) the duty of every citizen to convey to the President that the people stand behind him in the awful risk, confident that, like the great American Presidents who preceded him, he will exert that will only because he can do naught else and again prayerful that it is also the will of God, in Whom we trust."

Fighting the Public Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins debate on the administration's tax bill, it is interesting to note how it has failed to pick up any sizeable public support. The following editorial from the Marion (Ohio) Star points out why it does not have any enthusiastic support from the average person. As the Marion Star so well puts it, the "public conscience" is against living beyond our national income.

FIGHTING THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE

When President Kennedy goes over congressional heads to urge popular support for tax reduction, he is not at his best.

Why should he find it necessary to concince his countrymen they should support tax reduction? Politicians grow up at the ward boss's knee believing tax reduction is the best vote bait in existence.

Rank and file voters are supposed to be helpless when tax reduction is dangled in front of their eyes. Taxes are never popular. One of the prime political axioms, used through generations of applied politics, is: "Vote for all spending and against all taxing."

But tax reduction in 1963 does not find rank and file voters snapping at the bait. A most unusual thing has happened.

Here is a proposition supposedly sure fire that has been sputtering its fuse ever since it was thrown into discussion last January.

The recession it was supposed to ward off has failed to materialize. The Wall Street Journal reported in its September 18 edition that the "current business upswing displays a remarkable immunity to the ravages of time."

The tax relief it was designed to give has been interesting but not irresistible to masses of taxpayers supposed to be hysterical about tax relief. It is as if the ordinary run of people had looked at the array of household appliances mentioned by Mr. Kennedy in his appeal for support and said they intended to buy them tax cut or no tax cut.

As for the unemployed and what a tax cut might mean to them, it is more obvious to people who work for wages than it is to the President that in the first place the unemployed pay no income taxes, being without income, and in the second place do not believe a tax cut would put them to work.

President Kennedy is earnest about a tax cut. He must be puzzled by the cold shoulder his proposal has received.

Has he not been given support by outstanding businessmen? Has he not made it plain that deficit financing—spending excess of income to stimulate expansion—is sophisticated business practice?

One misgiving sticks in the popular craw. Millions of people who have been taught to live within their incomes cannot understand why there should be different rules for the Federal Government.

Why should it hand back $11 billion of anticipated revenue when it is expecting to be short by more than that amount in the next fiscal year?

This would be stupid or crooked if an individual tried it. President Kennedy is fighting the public conscience. Some of the things he is saying sound as if he didn't know the public had one.

Richard M. Nixon Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker—

We must have a positive program; it isn't enough to just be opposed to what the President is doing. We need to have positive answers to unemployment and to Cuba and all of Latin America—

Said former Vice President Richard M. Nixon in a press conference recently.

Mr. Nixon's advice is still looked upon by Republicans in Congress as sound and constructive, and we will all benefit from his thoughts.

In the Christian Science Monitor of September 3, Mr. Nixon expresses his views about the 1964 election, and I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and members of the press. Below follows the complete text of this article:

NIXON SAYS WAIT AND SEE

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Back from Europe and starting a new career as a New York attorney, Richard M. Nixon spoke out not as a private citizen but as a man who still considers himself a prime mover in his party as he granted a postvacation interview.

He said the test ban treaty may have been "oversold" by the Kennedy administration and disillusionment could set in if the treaty does not live up to expectations.

He observed that if "some Republican candidates continue to act like cannibals" no Republican is going to have "a whisper of a chance in 1964."

The former Vice President looked particularly fit as he discussed a wide spectrum of subjects in his Waldorf Towers suite.

The big issues in 1964, he said, "are the same major issues we had in 1960—unemployment and Cuba.

"What is the party going to stand for, that's what we should be thinking about," he said. "We must have a positive program: it isn't enough to just be opposed to what the President is doing. We need to have positive answers, to unemployment (including the economic growth rate) and to Cuba and all of Latin America."

ACTION URGED

What of the civil rights issue?

He says he thinks there should be congressional action, but he call the President's politics "good" in this area but the language of the legislation "poor." He says he will come forward at the appropriate time with what he feels is a "sound, constitutional, and definite solution," which he hopes will be a part of the Republican platform.

Looking at the Kennedy administration, Mr. Nixon questions whether "he is speaking too early." He says the "economy is currently doing reasonably well—even though, as I said before, unemployment and the economic growth rate certainly have not been solved. But is this an economic peak, and will Kennedy be faced with a deteriorating economy in 1964? We had that in 1960, you will remember.

"Also, in foreign affairs, I think this test ban looks better today than it ever will again—people are so desirous of having a relief from tensions. Basically, the test ban's real weakness is that it has been oversold by the administration. Disillusionment may well set in if it does not come up to billing. I, of course, hope it does.

"But I have been through the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of Vienna—so I look on the spirit of Moscow with justifiable skepticism—unless it proves not to be the fraud the others turned out to be."

USE OF RUSK APPLAUDED

Mr. Nixon made two other comments about the Kennedy administration. "On the plus side," he said, "I find him using Rusk more—letting him be the Secretary of State. This is very good." With regard to Mr. Kennedy's advisers, Mr. Nixon said: "I still think his appointments lack balance: There are too many intellectuals and not enough activists."

Mr Nixon said, as he has said before, that he takes the position of favoring all four leading candidates for the nomination, and he expresses personal friendship toward Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York; Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania; and Gov. George Romney.

But within the context of his recollections about encouraging Governor Romney to run for Governor in Michigan (which Mr. Romney acknowledges as a primary reason for his making the run), one gets the impression of special Nixon warmth toward the new Michigan Governor. He said he was helpful, too, in getting Mr. Scranton into the gubernatorial arena in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Nixon says definitely that the Republicans can win in 1964, and that he hopes he can be helpful in shaping winning issues. "I feel," he says, "an acute need for leadership in the international area, and I feel qualified to speak up on these issues at the appropriate time."

Would he under any circumstances be a candidate? "I know what it costs to be a candidate," he says, "in time and money. I have neither. It costs millions." He then spoke of his heavy correspondence load, with letters still coming in "at about 500 a week," and how he has to bear all these expenses personally. He obviously feels, as he said before, that he has no alternative these days than to address himself primarily to "making a little money."

Mr. Nixon seemed desirous to talk politics and of the candidates. "If some Republican candidates continue to act like cannibals," he said, "No Republican is going to have a whisper of a chance in 1964."

"I think, too," he said, "that all Republicans—and certainly it would be the least to ask of any of the candidates—that he should agree to support anyone who is nominated at the open convention. And I think all Republicans can better prove their worthiness from now on by directing their fire against Kennedy and his policies and not against each other. This has always been my premise. The Democrats certainly are the target—always—and Kennedy is a vulnerable target."

SECTIONALISM DECRIED

He continued:

"Also, I feel that for the good of the country, as well as the party (both parties, in fact), the campaign should be national, not sectional. We cannot play one section against another section. I don't believe that any candidate in either party should write off one section—it tends to divide the country, and we certainly have many internal problems without adding this during a political campaign.

"Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats should divide the country sectionally or on a racial basis. We can be different on our approaches to the civil-rights issue—for I do think this is a vital issue. But it will be in the best interests of the country if both parties are similar in their goals and not going around the country adding fuel to the flames by demagoguery."

Turning to his recent trip abroad and observations made there and in previous trips to Europe, Mr. Nixon said he saw something "quite new," something that leaders in the United States would have to come to grips with. He said the new development was in great part the rise of nationalism in Western Europe, which he said the United States must take more into account in its dealings with these countries.

In this vein he said that the President was "unconscionably" wrong in, for example, "equating. De Gaulle's response to the test ban treaty with that of Mao's."

NEW LEADERSHIP URGED

He said that "De Gaulle is seeking to build a deterrent and is not threatening the peace. Mao is out to destroy the world. De Gaulle's program is to help defend freedom."

He continued:

"De Gaullism is not limited to France, just as Castroism is not limited to Cuba. Nationalism is a new form to be reckoned with in Europe. I've been in Europe when it was flat on its back economically—when things were different.

"But we have to learn that we are no longer in the driver's seat. We can lead because we have the ultimate weapon, needed for the defense of Europe. But it must be a new kind of leadership, deeply conscious of the growing nationalism and independence of these countries."

"What has happened," he said, "should have been anticipated when we helped Europe gain economic independence We now are dealing with proud countries—and in France with a proud man. They want to have their say, and any grand design we have for the economy of Europe or its defense must take this new factor into account."

SOVIET SMILE DISTRUSTED

The other new shape Mr. Nixon sees in Europe is Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's smiling face, a face Mr. Nixon says he deeply distrusts. When the Communists smile, then is the time—as Mr. Nixon sees it—that the internal threat gets greater. Thus, he says, "look for the rise of popular fronts (in number and activity) in this country and in subversion." He counseled against letting our guard down internally.

Mr. Nixon speaks of the continued desire for freedom which he finds in the satellite peoples. He was traveling as a private citizen, but he felt he was being welcomed as a symbol of Western democracy when he was welcomed in his visits behind the Iron Curtain a few weeks ago.

ALMOST MOBBED

"I was almost mobbed by friendly people in Budapest," he said. "At one stop I was given 27 bouquets of flowers, and everyone wanted to shake hands. I'm convinced that 90 percent of the Hungarian people would, if they had the chance, cut the throats of their Communist leaders." He continued:

"This is why it is vitally important that the United States not agree to any disengagement policy, on any line that would separate East and West Europe. At the very least we must take the position that we stand basically for more freedom for these peoples.

"Also, the United States must not treat East Europe as a bloc. There is something at work there that is similar to the rising nationalism in Western Europe. There is a common denominator throughout Europe of a developing national pattern. If we play our cards shrewdly, this could be a major disability to Khrushchev.

"It may provide an answer, an opportunity, for the Communist empire to be battered not only by the Russia-China disagreement but also by setbacks in satellites in Europe."

HARRIMAN APPRAISED

In other comments, Mr. Nixon indicated a negative overall appraisal of W. Averell Harriman—at the same time acknowledging

that Mr. Harriman seemed to have performed well at Moscow.

He said he was watching the Percy-Carpentier gubernatorial contest closely in Illinois. He is a friend of both of these Republican primary candidates, Charles H. Percy and Charles F. Carpentier. But he has been particularly close to Mr. Percy during the years when the Bell & Howell executive was a close adviser to President Eisenhower.

Of President Eisenhower as a President, Mr. Nixon said: "Ike will look much better in the perspective of history. He did well. The administration did well, but it sold itself poorly. The Kennedy administration is the other way around, history will find."

Arkansas: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Arkansas, the extent to which organized crime benefits from gambling in that State—thanks to bluenose morality.

Arkansas is one of the many States which allows parimutual betting and the turnover last year came to over $24 million with the State collecting almost $1.4 million in revenue. However, the bookies handle the lion's share af Arkansas' gambling boom. This lucrative tax-free industry has made Little Rock and Hot Springs well-known gambling centers on a national scale

According to the estimates of nationwide off-track betting that were presented before the McClellan committee, almost $500 million was gambled illicitly on the horses in Arkansas in 1962. Of course, as revealed before that committee, off-track betting represents only one-half of the illegal betting in the Nation. So on that basis, total gambling in Arkansas may well approach a billion dollars a year. A neat tax-free monopoly.

No wonder the crime syndicates are prosperous. They take 10 percent of this gross turnover—$100 million as profit—and use this money to finance a lot of narcotics, prostitution, and other illegal activities. But in order to stay in business, organized crime spends about 15 percent of these profits to corrupt public officials and the processes of law enforcement.

Because of its failure and refusal to control and regulate gambling, the State of Arkansas is guilty of subsidizing the forces of organized crime and permitting the crime syndicates to continue to fatten its criminal treasuries and expand its nationwide web of dirt.

The simple solution, Mr. Speaker, is the establishment of a national government-run lottery which would not only clean out the crime syndicates and wipe out corruption in law enforcement but pump into our own treasury billions of dollars in additional much needed revenue.

Anybody Worried About Mississippi?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the self-styled liberals are so busy endeavoring to create an image of my beloved State of Mississippi as backward and unprogressive, it is interesting to note that there are people in our great common country who feel differently about Mississippi.

The truth is that Mississippi is progressive in the advancement of its people and making a worthwhile contribution to these United States. The further truth is that these false liberals who malign this great State do not like the fact that the people of that State are still champions of the true democratic principles as laid down by the Founding Fathers and blueprinted in the Constitution of the United States.

Yes, Mississippi is progressing—it is making progress in spite of the do-gooders and the centralists, who profess to be worried because its people do not believe in integration. Neither did Jefferson and Lincoln.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial which appeared in the September 18 issue of the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va.:

ANYBODY WORRIED ABOUT MISSISSIPPI?

Governor Ross Barnett goes out of office next January after 4 years of storm, stress, calumny—and major accomplishment. He has brought a prodigious amount of new industry into his State.

This is worth dwelling upon because of the persistent fallacy, sired alike by ignorance and malice, which says that racial disputes in the Southern States howl up a climate that's uncongenial to business. How this canard survives we don't know, because the North now has more racial hubbub than the South does. But the recent Democratic gubernatorial primary election in Mississippi tossed up a lot of facts which were not nationally known about the Barnett administration—and these facts afford the basis for reviewing some general principles on industrial location.

Industries don't decide to come into any State despite racial uproar there. They don't decide upon the move because of racial peace either. Such decisions are made upon market research, the availability of land, water, labor pools, and electrical power, the pertinent statutes and the tax structure. The decisions also yield to the salesmanship of business-seeking State officials—provided, always, that these persons have something to sell.

Governor Barnett has been a tireless huckster of Mississippi's environmental advantages. In the past 28 months he made 29 trips out of his State. He racked up 45,000 miles of travel beyond his borders. He conducted 550 across-the-desk interviews with out-of-State businessmen about Mississippi's physical assets, about 39 probusiness laws which he'd recommended and the legislature had passed, about a referendum that fixed the right-to-work proposition into the State constitution by better than a 2-to-1 majority, about graduated reduction of personal business taxes.

The Governor could talk about the success of the balance agriculture with industry program (BAWI), which has been in effect since 1944. Under this plan, general obligational bonds are sold to finance and prepare industrial sites. He could say that in his incumbency, these bond issues boomed as never before. In the 12 months since the crisis at Ole Miss University, he could tell his prospects, his State has benefited by 83 new or expanded industries, bringing in 7,700 new jobs, with a capital investment of $673 million.

How did businessmen respond to this solid salesmanship? Well, last December, with the Ole Miss campus still under Federal occupation, Mr. Barnett attended a long-scheduled industrial luncheon at the Pick-Congress Hotel in Chicago. He had to break through a picket line and endure some ruffianship by the local press. But he sold Paul L. Adams, president of Caradco, Inc., an Iowa firm, on establishing a $2.5 million woodworking plant at Gulfport. Mr. Adams told him:

"The BAWI program offers obvious economic advantages, and although similar programs are offered elsewhere, the combination of many facts and considerations in our survey, including community personality, led us to a choice of Gulfport."

Only last month, on August 15, the American Potash and Chemical Corp., already had a $13 million investment in Mississippi, added another $14 million with construction at Aberdeen, 120 miles northeast of Jackson. Willard P. Scott, the firm's vice president, wrote to Barnett:

"We are pleased to have the opportunity of demonstrating to you our confidence that economic conditions conducive to sound industrial opportunity will continue to prevail in Mississippi."

There is much else for the record, including the opening next month of a $125 million oil refinery at Pascagoula. William C. Smith, president of Standard Oil of Kentucky, saluted this venture by telling Mr. Barnett:

"Industrialists are looking toward Mississippi in the days of the New Frontier in hopes of finding a way back to the better conditions of yesterday."

Yes, Mississippi is doing all right, and deservedly so. We offer it as an industrial model for other States and for the Federal Government. This is how jobs, job training and increased revenue can be brought home to the community.

Wrong Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER F. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the McPherson (Kans.) Sentinel, which emphasizes the impact of the U.S. foreign assistance program upon the outflow of gold.

The editorial follows:

WRONG SOLUTION

For several years, we in the United States have been buying more from foreign countries than they have been buying from us, which means we pay the difference in gold.

Now we are beginning to run out of gold and without gold our paper money becomes worthless. To help correct this gold drain, President Kennedy is urging American businessmen to sell more goods to foreign coun-

tries to even up the foreign trade balance.

That's about like urging General Motors to sell more cars. Those selling to foreign countries have used every possible known sales gimmick already without any Presidential urging.

Our President failed to mention another cause for more money going out of our country than is coming in. That is the many billions we send out in foreign aid each year with nothing coming back.

Cut out the part of this foreign aid now reportedly wasted, and the tremendous outflow of gold would be reduced to a much safer volume.

Hoping for such a decision from our free-spending Government is about like hoping for a homestead on the moon, but what is wrong with our President setting an example rather than just telling others what to do?

The Vice President's Recent Trip Through Scandinavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Vice President's recent trip through Scandinavia has occasioned much favorable comment, both here and abroad. An article by Mr. Gould Lincoln in the Evening Star, and editorials in the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, the Baltimore Sun, and the Dallas Morning News, are typical of reaction in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, Sept. 5, 1963]

JOHNSON'S TRADE TOUR

A great deal of good should result from Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON's good will tour of five Nordic countries. These nations are in the shadow of the huge Soviet Union and it is important that they be kept in the sunshine of the free world.

The purpose of the tour is to cement friendships and promote trade. JOHNSON is doing both. In Sweden, he told the people that trade among freemen must be the instrument of our greater unity, not a device for deepening division. "We are working and shall continue to work to unlock the doors for freer trade in the free world," he said.

Trade is a crux of the problem of unity. If we don't carry on free trade with the Nordic countries, those countries will trade with others. And if they should be compelled to do fuller trade with the Communist bloc, the free world will lose their business, and quite possibly their friendship.

That is why the Vice President's tour is significant. That is why much good should result from the good will he is generating in the Nordic nations.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 17, 1963]

SCANDINAVIA

Vice President JOHNSON's assessment of his trip to Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland is valuable because it points out one of the greatest errors of the American: the tendency to take things for granted. Mr. JOHNSON says he was able to convince the four Governments that they play an important role in Western thinking. We had taken it for granted that they knew it already. They should have known it: the Vice President is the highest ranking American ever to call officially in Scandinavia; had we not assumed the Scandinavians knew how important they are to us, we would have sent them more official visitors than they could have absorbed, the way we do people we are not so sure of.

But let there be no doubt, from the Skagerrak to the North Cape. There is first the matter of neutrality, the pose thrust upon both Sweden and Finland as a matter of geography. With Sweden it is a matter of tradition as well as dramatics, but the neutrality of both countries would be meaningless if it were not guaranteed by Western deterrent power. That guarantee allows Sweden to join the European Free Trade Area by choice.

Norway and Denmark are also members, and additionally members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with vital responsibility in the protection of the northern flank of the alliance. NATO is not anticipating the surrender of any of its parts, and the protection of Copenhagen or Oslo is as important to Western defense as the protection of London or Washington. Deeper than defense and deeper than trade is the fraternal bond Western nations feel for Scandinavia. Stockholm is one of our cities, English spoken, dollars cheerfully exchanged. The mention of Helsinki engenders a natural warmth. It goes for the Danes and Norwegians, too. We would have said it before, but we thought they knew it.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Sept. 7, 1963]

WE BID FOR TRADE

LYNDON JOHNSON's speech at Goteborg, Sweden, was America's answer to recent trade slaps at the United States by Europe's Common Market. The basic idea of the Common Market was relatively free trade by the members with each other, plus barriers against outside trade. The United States, which had a substantial role in official encouragement of the Common Market, now doesn't want its trade with Common Market members curtailed.

In Sweden, not a member of the Common Market, Vice President JOHNSON could speak freely. He emphasized importance of international trade as a factor in prosperity and even in security, and he apparently found agreement, among his listeners. Sweden, always a trading nation, would like to have more trade with the United States.

It does not seem likely that actions by the Common Market will trim our trade much. In spite of recent industrial developments in the member nations, many of them financed by us, those nations need our trade as much as we need theirs. The barriers they erect are not likely to be formidable enough to invite our retaliation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 17, 1963]

JOHNSON AGAIN ABLE AMBASSADOR

(By Gould Lincoln)

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON's goodwill tour of the Scandinavian countries, from which he returned today, has been a major success, judging by the warm receptions accorded him, Mrs. Johnson and their daughter, Lynda Bird. The tour, which was proposed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk with President Kennedy's approval, came at an excellent time. The nuclear test ban treaty had been negotiated and hailed as a step—a first step—toward lessening of world tension, particularly between Communist Russia and her satellites and the nations of the West. It was part of the Vice President's mission to stress again the need of the West to keep its guard up—to maintain unity of purpose and defense against any possible Communist aggression. This meant a strengthening of NATO—not a weakening, not a time for complacency and letting the guard down.

Not since the Vice President's historic and successful trip to West Berlin in August 1961, a week after the Communists had sealed off, with wire and wall, East Berlin from West Berlin, have the Vice President's talents been used more effectively. At that time the West Berliner's morale was at a low ebb, and so was that of all West Germany, fearing that Britain, France and the United States might be lessening their determination to maintain the freedom of West Berlin. Mr. Johnson gave them the reassurance they needed, along with a pledge that this country would live up to its promises to the people of West Berlin. And at the same time President Kennedy sent the Vice President to West Berlin, he ordered 1,500 additional U.S. troops to join the 11,000 already in that city. A million West Berliners turned out to welcome and to cheer the arrival of the Vice President. At one point, he hopped out of his automobile and walked briskly along for five blocks, shaking hands with the West Berliners and stopping to kiss babies.

RENEWS U.S. PLEDGE

It was with the same friendly handclasps that the Vice President met the thousands of Swedes, Norwegians, Finlanders and Danes who greeted him on his arrival in their countries on the latest trip. His last visit was to Iceland before his final flight back to the United States. The tall Texan has an aptitude for making friends, and winning the confidence of people. While the trip was not made under such dramatic conditions and during such stress as was his visit to West Berlin 2 years ago, it nevertheless had its value, at a time when there has been much suggestion that United States and Britain were inclined to ease off, to let the nations of Western Europe look to themselves. As he did in West Germany and West Berlin, the Vice President pledged again and again the willingness of the United States to fulfill 100 percent its obligations.

Geographically, these Scandinavian countries border or are close to Soviet territory to the North and West of Russia. Their cooperation, in case of need in any crisis with the Communists, would be valuable. They are in position to block the straits leading into the Baltic Sea, Russia's way out by water to the North Sea and far reaches of the Atlantic. In the past, these countries have not had an opportunity to see and welcome a Vice President of the United States, and it was a good stroke, diplomatically as well as realistically, to send Mr. Johnson among them.

SAMPLE OF REACTION

A sample of how the Swedes felt about his visit is contained in an editorial appearing in Ny Tid (Social Democratic) published in Goteborg, which reads in part: "The Swedes can feel proud now that for the first time they are paid a visit by a Vice President of the United States. The Goteborgers also feel proud as the program provides room for a quick visit to their city. Since we are not allied with the United States (Sweden remained neutral in the last world war) there are hardly any urgent reasons for either President Kennedy or his alternate to control on the spot the tenure of our relations. When, nevertheless we receive a visit it probably is because we mean, or are considered to mean, something in the world. Lyndon Johnson has been given a much better reception in the Swedish press than Nikita Khrushchev, both when the latter cancelled his visit after the press attacks and when some newspapers

now want him to cancel it anew." The editorial spoke highly of Mr. Johnson's abilities.

In Denmark, the Vice President called for continued NATO defense efforts, and he voiced the same plea in Norway. He impressed on their leaders the need for being on guard in periods of relative relaxation—such as that which may follow the ratification of the test ban treaty. He received assurance on their part.

The Vice President discussed many other questions of interest, like shipping and trade. He still has his report to make to the President, which he is expected to do promptly.

American Jewish Committee Honors Dr. Louis L. Mann

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the autumn of 1960, one of the Nation's outstanding spiritual leaders wrote:

> God has no stepchildren. Both humanity and freedom are one and indivisible. The artificial, arbitrary, manmade distinctions between men must not be allowed to obliterate the God-made resemblances between them.

The words were written for the special brochure which marked the centennial of Chicago Sinai Congregation. They were written by Dr. Louis L. Mann, now honorary rabbi of the temple and the man who held its pulpit from 1923 until his retirement in 1962.

The philosophy expressed in that paragraph epitomizes, too, the human relations appeal of the American Jewish Committee: "One purpose pervades our entire program—to advance man's understanding of his fellow man."

AWARD TO DR. MANN

The American Jewish Committee has selected Dr. Mann as the honoree of the dinner it will sponsor on Wednesday evening, September 25, in the Pick-Congress Hotel in Chicago. On that occasion he will receive the committee's first Human Rights Award for his work, both in the pulpit and in the community-at-large, to combat bigotry.

Among his colleagues, Dr. Mann is looked upon as a courageous preacher in line with the tradition of the Hebrew prophets. He was known to accept the challenge of unpopular causes or, as he preferred to put it, the not-yet popular causes which had to struggle against the forces of superstition, ignorance, cowardice, and timidity.

Both the scholarly Dr. Mann and the American Jewish Committee believe that research and education are the most powerful tools at man's command to achieve the goal of security and dignity for all peoples.

In the centennial brochure, Dr. Mann also wrote: "Every generation has been called upon to reinterpret, to modify and qualify, and to enrich our faith." This recognition of contemporaneousness in religion, combined with respect for an honored heritage, is the foundation, too, of one of the continuing programs of the American Jewish Committee, that of helping Jews to preserve and enrich their heritage while participating fully in the life of America.

The American Jewish Committee and its honoree are virtually contemporaries themselves. The organization was established in 1906, about the time that the future Dr. Mann was a studious teenager.

SCHOLAR AND SPIRITUAL LEADER

Louis L. Mann was born in Louisville, Ky., the son of David and Frieda Mann, on January 25, 1890. His education at Johns Hopkins University, the University of Cincinnati, Ohio, the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, and Yale University brought him two bachelor's degrees, a master's, a doctor of philosophy and, in 1914, his ordination as a rabbi.

That year he became rabbi of Congregation Mishkan Israel in New Haven, Conn., where he was to hold the pulpit until his call to Chicago Sinai Congregation in 1923.

A year after he was ordained, he went to Cincinnati to claim a bride, the former Ruth Cohen, daughter of Senator and Mrs. Alfred M. Cohen. The Manns' daughter, Mary Louise, now is herself the wife of a rabbi, Dr. Richard C. Hertz, of Temple Beth El in Detroit, Mich. Their son, Arthur H. Mann, a stockbroker, resides in Highland Park.

LECTURER AT TWO UNIVERSITIES

The intellectual energies of Dr. Mann have extended beyond the pulpit for many years, beginning in 1920, when he began a 3-year term as a lecturer in comparative ethics at Yale University. From 1924 to 1955, he was a professorial lecturer in the Department of Oriental Literature at the University of Chicago.

In the course of his career, Dr. Mann has received a number of honorary degrees, including a doctorate of divinity from Hebrew Union College in 1944; the doctorate of sacred literature, Northwestern University, 1949; the doctorate of literature, Ripon College, 1952; and the LL.D., Chicago Medical College, 1963.

Academic and other honors have been heaped on Dr. Mann through the years. Northwestern University, at the time of its centennial in 1951, bestowed on him the Distinguished Service Award. The Hillel Foundation, campus organization for Jewish students of which he was a founder, conferred its Distinguished Service Cup in 1953. Phi Beta Kappa in the Chicago area, whose president he became, awarded him the Distinguished Service Medal in 1954.

HIGHEST HONOR OF BOY SCOUTS

The highest honor of the Boy Scout organization, the "Silver Antelope," was granted to Dr. Mann in 1960. And the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which he founded in 1928 with Charles Evans Hughes, Newton D. Baker and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, in 1960 honored Dr. Mann with a silver plaque.

The French Government decorated Dr. Mann with the title, "Member of the French Academy," in 1931 for his academic achievements.

The breadth of Dr. Mann's interests in his world are reflected in the organizations, institutes, committees, conferences and other bodies of which he has been an active part.

In 1947, he was one of the conferees for the Rollins College Institute on World Government and the Atom Bomb. He also has been a member of the board of trustees of the Church Peace Union, established by Andrew Carnegie, since 1926.

During World War II, Dr. Mann served as an arbitrator for the U.S. Labor Board, wage-and-hour division, for the textile industry. Also, during this period, he served in the department of psychological reconditioning at Gardner Hospital in Chicago.

Dr. Mann has also been a member of the executive committee of the Eugenics Commission of the United States and was one of the founders of the American Birth Control League, now known as Planned Parenthood. He also has been a member of the executive committee of the National Crime Prevention Institute.

A former vice president of the National Big Brothers and Sisters Association, Dr. Mann also was president of the Chicago Big Brothers Association.

APPOINTMENTS BY TWO PRESIDENTS

Herbert Hoover, when President, appointed him to the National Conference of Child Welfare, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, during his Presidency, named Dr. Mann to the Traffic Safety Commission of the United States.

The National Association of Manufacturers selected him as a member of its ethics committee and the American Library Foundation named him a member of its advisory council. He is a former vice chancellor of the Jewish Chautauqua Society.

Dr. Mann also has been a member of the executive committee of the Chicago Commission on Reconstruction.

Dr. Mann is as well recognized for his ability as a writer as he is for his sermons and his spiritual leadership. He is a contributing editor to the World Book Encyclopedia and a collaborator for the New Thorndike Dictionary.

He was a contributor to "The Greatest Sermons on Peace" and "World's Best Sermons," published in 1944, as well as to "Message of Israel Sermons." He also is editor of the department of ethics of the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia and the author of "In Quest of the Bluebird."

Development of a Unified Overall Communications Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of great concern to the Committee on Commerce, among the numerous sub-

jects that we have had to consider in that committee recently, has been the problem of the development of a unified international overall communications policy.

A meeting will be held in Geneva within the next 2 or 3 weeks, participated in by representatives of all nations of the world, to deal with international communications. The subject has been made very complex from the standpoint of problems in space with communications by our launching of Telstar, which has been very successful in relaying television programs and messages to various places in the world. Since these programs go around the globe, some agreements must be made between all the nations with respect to this great new means of communications in space, and from the standpoint of what it will mean to the world in the future. The people in the industry have devoted much time to this problem, as has the Government, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, and committees of Congress, notably the Senate Committee on Commerce.

Recently David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of Radio Corp. of America, and Harold S. Geneen, president of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., wrote to me concerning the need for the development of a unified overall communications policy. This question of the establishment of an overall telecommunications policy has been raised by the Senate Commerce Committee during hearings on a number of occasions. Such a policy is essential if we are to meet the current and future needs resulting from the technological development of the space age.

Over a year ago the President of the United States established the position of Director of Telecommunications Management through Executive Order 10995. Under the provisions of the order the Director of Telecommunications Management was responsible for coordinating the telecommunications activities of the executive branch of the Government for developing, after consultation with the appropriate agencies, overall policy and standards. Unfortunately Dr. Irving Stewart, who held this position, recently resigned and the program was affected thereby.

The Senate Commerce Committee is keenly interested in this subject. It is my hope that the interested agencies will complete their various studies in this field so that the Senate Commerce Committee can have the benefit of their views. In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full the text of the letters that I received from Mr. Sarnoff and Mr. Geneen so their views can be available to my colleagues.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, before the Standing Committee on Communications of the American Bar Association at its 86th annual meeting, held in Chicago in August, relating to the same subject.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately 4¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $382.50. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the matter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., June 18, 1963.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I have read with deep interest the recently published excerpts from Mr. Newton N. Minow's letter of May 31 to President Kennedy, and from Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff's letter of April 2 to Mr. Leo D. Welch, chairman of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. Minow's statement that "we can no longer afford the luxury of * * * leisurely policymaking" is one I heartily endorse with respect to merger of the international record communication carriers. But I must respectfully disagree with General Sarnoff's suggestion that the merger should be compulsory and include all international communication facilities, both voice and record, under the Communications Satellite Corp.

Such a merger runs counter to our Government's historical opposition to monopoly in any field. And we at International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. do not believe that private enterprise should abandon a field, to which it has contributed so much, in favor of a corporation which, with Government support, has been established as a private corporation and intended under the law to be a carrier's carrier and not for competition with the communications companies that will use it. Moreover, such a move would mean a complete monopoly.

The real problem, as we see it, is rather to strengthen competition than to abandon it. To this end, we have proposed that the principle of separating voice from record communication, recognized domestically as long ago as 1913 by the Kingsbury commitment, be strengthened and extended to the international field. We have also urged that the international record communication carriers be permitted to merge, as a means of offsetting A.T. & T.'s dominant position in international voice communication.

ITT is confident that private enterprise, so encouraged, can operate international communication services more efficiently than can any resulting quasi-governmental organization, and hence with greater customer satisfaction and at a tax-paying profit instead of a tax-absorbing loss. We therefore stand ready, in view of the currently developing situation, to take the lead in assuring that the private companies operating as oversea record communication carriers through combining will remain an independent and competitive factor in the telecommunications field, provided that we are able to take economic steps necessary to do so. This can be accomplished if Congress will pass the permissive merger legislation needed to permit it. I believe that you will find that the carriers engaged in this field are in favor of such legislation. Perhaps some in the industry may have lost confidence, but with permissive merger legislation we are willing as a foremost company in this field to assume the responsibility of leadership to put together a competitive organization designed to implement fully the legislative intention, as we see it, to use the Communications Satellite Corp. as a carrier's carrier to provide service in keeping with the historical purpose of private enterprise. We say this because it would appear from General Sarnoff's letter that RCA is willing to sell its international communication services and Western Union has been under legislative mandate for many years to divest its international cable operations.

We believe that the solution we propose is infinitely preferable to the creation of a quasi-governmental monopoly whose purpose would go far beyond the original intent of the legislation that created the Communications Satellite Corp. This solution is also preferable when viewed from the standpoint of customer satisfaction, consonance with American traditions, and in the interest of not imposing an additional burden on the taxpayer, particularly at a time when government and business alike are seeking means to lessen that burden.

The solution of this international communication problem is of such urgency and importance to the national interest that we believe action must be taken promptly. I therefore urge you and your colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to recommend to the Congress legislation permitting such a merger. I have this day also urged the same course of action on the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We are most anxious to advance this matter and will be pleased to prepare a draft of suggested legislation or cooperate with your committee in any way you may desire.

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. GENEEN.

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., July 22, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Recently you have received letters from David Sarnoff and myself setting forth certain proposals concerning the international record communications carriers. General Sarnoff's letter of June 27 commented in large part upon my letter to you of June 18 but most importantly concurs in the need for an investigation of present telecommunications policy.

I welcome General Sarnoff's support for urgent congressional action in this field. Also that RCA agrees "that the appropriate merger of international record carriers could be preferable to the prevailing situation."

There are some differences between us but one thing we are all agreed upon is the essence of the statement of Mr. Newton N. Minow, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, that "we can no longer afford the luxury of leisurely policymaking."

Certainly because of the very changed conditions and for reasons that have been stated it is clear that the need for review and action by your committee is immediate and I respectfully urge again that you and your colleagues open hearings on national telecommunications policy at the earliest practicable date.

Sincerely,

H. S. GENEEN.

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., June 27, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: Last August, in an address before a section of the American Bar Association in San Francisco, I urged the development and adoption of a Unified National Communications Policy to meet the current and future needs of our Nation in the space age.

At that time, I cited the inadequacy and the random character of the policies governing our domestic and international communications, and I called for free and open

discussion in order to illuminate the existing problems and advance their timely solution.

It is encouraging that such a discussion has developed in recent weeks through public statements from industry and Government sources. This provides welcome evidence of a growing awareness of our unresolved problems and of the need for a broad reevaluation of the Nation's communications structure—particularly in relation to the international services now provided by American carriers and to be provided in the satellite era.

My reason for writing you at this time is to stimulate further this public discussion on our communications services, and to set the record straight on the position of the Radio Corp. of America and its wholly owned subsidiary, RCA Communications, Inc., in regard to the most recent viewpoints that have been expressed. I wish to suggest respectfully that the time is appropriate, in my judgment, for a full public hearing by the Congress of the views of all who are interested in the formulation of a sound national communications policy.

RECENT COMMUNICATIONS PROPOSALS

By way of background, the following comments on the subject have been made recently:

On April 2, 1963, in response to the request of Mr. Leo D. Welch, chairman of the Communications Satellite Corp., I expressed in a letter to him my proposal for the unification of all American international telephone and telegraph facilities and operations, both present and planned, within the satellite corporation. This proposal was based on my desire to insure the earliest possible development of American satellite communications on a sound commercial basis, consonant with the corporation's private enterprise character as established by the Congress and the President.

On May 31, 1963, in a letter to President Kennedy, Mr. Newton N. Minow, retiring Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, also raised the question as to "whether consideration should be given to fostering, through compulsory merger legislation, a single or unified United States international common carrier."

On June 18, 1963, in a letter addressed to you, Mr. Harold S. Geneen, president of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., urged permissive merger legislation for the international record carriers and offered the leadership of ITT in putting together a competitive organization of the merged record carriers. He suggested that the Communications Satellite Corporation should serve only the limited function of a carriers' carrier.

On June 19, 1963, in a statement quoted in the New York Times of June 20, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. opposed my concept of a single, unified international common carrier. Although not commenting publicly on the ITT proposal, A.T. & T. did support "the present arrangement."

ERRONEOUS PRESUMPTION THAT RCA COMMUNICATIONS IS FOR SALE

I wish to set the record straight with reference to the ITT presumption that "RCA is willing to sell its international communications services."

The inference that RCA would be willing to sell its communications subsidiary to a monopoly of international record carriers organized under ITT leadership, can only be regarded as a frivolous presumption. This would truly be the tail wagging the dog. ITT is a junior participant in U.S. international communications in terms of experience, leadership, and profitability.

RCA Communications, Inc., has been officially described by the FCC as the "bellwether" of the industry. It is the most experienced and most profitable of the American international record carriers. It has reinvested 85 percent of its earnings over the past 10 years in development and modernization of its facilities.

We are now engaged in a further expansion program involving a capital expenditure of more than $35 million. Such a program would hardly be undertaken by RCA if it wished to jettison its communications business. This action makes it clear that RCA certainly cannot be numbered among those in the industry—if any exist—whom ITT suggests have "lost confidence" in the future.

RCA'S PROPOSAL FOR UNIFICATION

Contrary to the ITT proposal for creating its own private monopoly, I have proposed the unification of all U.S. international communications facilities and operations, including those of RCA, within an enlarged satellite corporation. As I said in my letter to Mr. Welch, legal safeguards should be erected aganst any control or domination of the unified company by any carrier or other organization. Participation by RCA and all other carriers in such a unification would not involve a sellout of their international communications businesses, but the exchange of their facilities for securities of the unified private enterprise.

In my letter to Mr. Welch, I also set forth my reasons why the public interest now requires such a unified international communications carrier. Perhaps it would be useful to restate them here in abridged form in order that there may be no misunderstanding.

What I have proposed is a comprehensive solution to two basic problems. One of these is the outmoded and illogical pattern of this Nation's communications. International voice services, now expanding rapidly, are provided by a legally sanctioned A.T. & T. monopoly, which deals and communicates with foreign monopolies at the other ends of the same circuits.

By contrast, international telegraph services are provided by 10 private carriers, on a competitive basis, but they too must deal and communicate with foreign monopolies. This ambivalent situation continues to exist even though technology is abolishing the distinction between voice and record communications, a fact which ITT apparently chooses to ignore.

The other problem is the uncertainty as to how soon the satellite corporation, organized as a profitmaking, privately owned enterprise, can expect to operate at a profit in view of A.T. & T.'s known progress in the development of high-capacity transistorized cables with capabilities claimed to be equal to those of satellites.

The significance of this fine technical achievement was not mentioned in the ITT letter, but Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of A.T. & T. has given us a clear indication of its potential for the future. In a talk on March 18, 1963, before the New York Chamber of Commerce, he said:

"The cables of today are much more effective and capable than those of a few years ago, and the cables of tomorrow will have far greater capabilities than the ones we have now. In fact, we are sure that in a few years their capabilities will fully equal those of satellites. We have a transistorized cable under development at the Bell Laboratories, for example, that will be able to transmit television, and the scientists in other countries—I could name two countries—are not sitting on their hands either. They have a similar cable under construction."

Considering both of these problems—and recognizing as I have from the beginning the urgent necessity from an overall national standpoint of establishing at the earliest practicable date a successful satellite system—I proposed that the Satellite Corporation be authorized by law to acquire the international telephone and telegraph facilities and operations, both present and planned, of all American carriers.

This new unified organization, operating as a private enterprise, could offer three far-reaching benefits to the public:

It could take maximum advantage of modern technology to achieve the most economical and efficient use of radio frequencies, cables and satellites to provide maximum efficiency at lowest cost to the public.

It could start with an immediate revenue base provided by the traffic of existing United States international communications carriers. In 1962, this totaled $160 million. This would place the Satellite Corporation on a sound financial footing at an early date.

It could deal with equal strength, and on equal terms, with government monopolies in foreign countries—a vitally important need in such matters as rates, division of revenues, classes of service and facilities.

SCIENCE OBLITERATED THE SEPARATION OF VOICE AND RECORD

Against the backdrop of the vast technical changes that motivated my plan, the proposal by ITT has a strangely obsolescent ring.

Reaching back to 1913 to find an alleged precedent, ITT proposes now to cement by law a principle of separation between voice and record in the international communications field. However, it fails to define what is meant by "record service"—in which A.T. & T. is already substantially engaged, in addition to voice service. In my judgment, a legal separation of such services would fly in the face of modern scientific and technological developments. It would be a disservice to the public and an exercise in futility.

How do you draw the line today between what is voice and what is record? A wideband cable or satellite system knows no such distinction, and we would turn back the clock of communications progress if we attempted at this late date to draw one.

Which is live, film, or taped television? Is it voice or record, or a combination of both?

Which is data communication? Is it voice or record, or a combination of both? (It is already technically feasible to actuate data processing equipment by the human voice, and great progress is being made in the art of computer talking to computer.)

Which is teletypewriter, when it is alternately or simultaneously used with voice transmission?

Which is facsimile, when it is alternately or simultaneously used with vice transmission?

Which is dataphone? Which is the recording of a telephone conversation?

Others in the industry have clearly recognized the changed technological conditions which outmode the ITT proposal. An A.T. & T. statement, as published in Telecommunications Reports of March 12, 1962, said: "There is no doubt that the public now requires, and it is feasible for the carriers to provide, flexible communications services which can be used for voice, teletypewriter, and data transmission on an alternate or simultaneous basis."

In Telecommunications Reports of April 16, 1962, Walter Marshall, president of Western Union Telegraph Co., is quoted as saying that separation of voice and record services "is no longer possible." He added that "technical advances in communications and new demands for service, particularly on the part of national defense, have obliterated the distinction between record and voice services in the private wire field."

Mr. Minow, in his letter to President Kennedy, also recognized that "the distinction between voice and record communications is being blurred, and there is a growing need for the broadband channel."

Today, the communications customer, whether an individual or an organization, is no longer satisfied with partial service or the

inconvenience of separate services. The customer wishes to talk, transmit and record information at the same time. In other words, he wants complete service. Modern technology makes that possible, but the ITT proposal would make it impossible.

MERGER OR COMPETITION IN COMMUNICATIONS

ITT's merger proposal is made under the guise of strengthening competition, but it would have precisely the opposite effect. It would eliminate competition between record services and create a monopoly similar to that which now exists in telephony.

ITT correctly maintains that RCA at one time supported permissive merger legislation. Even today, we feel that an appropriate merger of international record carriers could be preferable to the prevailing situation. Yet, we realize that at best it could represent no more than a trade-in of a horse and buggy for the Model T, when what is truly needed is a space age model.

ITT also contends that my concept of a unified international communications carrier runs counter to the Government's "historical opposition to monopoly in any field." This has the palatable sound of a popular slogan, but it bears no relationship to the facts of communications life.

We have a legally sanctioned monopoly in domestic public telephone service.

We have a legally sanctioned domestic public telegraph monopoly.

We have a legally sanctioned international telephone monopoly.

In fact, more than 96 percent of all American communications services are provided by monopolies. I fail to grasp the logic of black being black in one form of competition and black being white in another.

Only in the international record field, which represents less than 1 percent of our total annual communications revenues, is there a multiplicity of competing companies. Even here, there is not constructive competition, for the foreign carriers with whom these private companies do business are monopolies that can and have played off one private American company against the others.

A.T. & T. has publicly voiced its opposition to my plan for the creation of a unified international communications enterprise. It favors the present arrangement, which simply means freedom for A.T. & T. to pursue its penetration and absorption of other areas of international communications. It is exercising that freedom today by expanding its wideband coaxial cables and offering combined voice and record services.

Is there any valid reason to believe that A.T. & T. would yield these promising new combined services to a record company? This has not been A.T. & T.'s policy in domestic communications. Its activities in the domestic record field have been, according to Western Union, "the most critical external factor" affecting its operations. This problem is currently the subject of an FCC investigation.

While I understand A.T. & T.'s desire to grow and broaden its activities, and while I give full credit to A.T. & T. for its many fine contributions to the communications art, I believe everyone will agree that the national interest takes precedence over any other consideration. I further believe that the need for maintaining U.S. leadership and for providing the public with the full benefit of advancing technology cannot be met either by preserving the status quo or by limited measures based upon principles which science and technology have outmoded.

Any impartial and knowledgeable appraisal of international communications must conclude that the true arena of competition is between nations, not private companies within the United States. This means competition for markets, competition for technological leadership. It would be a serious blow to our national prestige if failure to respond promptly to the present situation permitted Russia to seize the lead in the establishment of a global satellite system of communications.

It is because the United States must continue to lead the world in communications that I have proposed a means of strengthening our present position. A strengthened Communications Satellite Corp., bolstered by all of this Nation's international communications resources, can be evidence to the world of that leadership. Surely, our satellites must be more than mere space transmission belts for possible overflow cable traffic in the future.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

It is to make all the facts in this complex situation known and understood that I urge the initiation of public hearings by the Congress at the earliest possible time on these vital communications questions which are now being debated in the form of statements and letters.

I believe such action by the Congress would be a public service of the highest order, and would provide a powerful impetus to the search for a new unified national communications policy attuned to the technology of the space age and the best interests of our Nation.

I have sent a similar letter to Chairman OREN HARRIS, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Respectfully,

DAVID SARNOFF,
Chairman of the Board.

ADDRESS BY E. WILLIAM HENRY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, 86TH ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 14, 1963

Chairman Davis, ladies, and gentlemen, it is always a privilege to have an opportunity to speak to a group of fellow lawyers. This is especially true of this occasion because of the common interest we share in seeking to improve our Nation's communications systems. I am pleased to learn of your plans to make the standing committee on communications more active, and I can assure you that the Federal Communications Commission will welcome any suggestions or comments you might wish to make.

I see a number of familiar faces in the audience, some of whom have argued cases before our Commission. Your chairman advises me that I have been allotted approximately 30 minutes and that there may be some rebuttal. But, turnabout is fairplay, and I'm glad to meet with you on those terms.

On the plane out here, I had an interesting discussion with a businessman friend of mine. With some pride I was pointing out to him how many of the world leaders over the years have been members of the legal profession—mentioning such names as Cicero, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln. Finally, to drive the point home, I said: "Did you know that Mahatma Gandhi was a lawyer?" To which he replied: "I don't believe it—the way the old gentleman dressed, I'd have sworn he was a client."

I have found my tour at the Commission most challenging. My association with my colleagues, our staff, the people in the communications industry, and the lawyers who represent them has been most enjoyable and stimulating. While I know that we may not always solve all problems to your complete satisfaction or as rapidly as we should, we do make every effort to discharge our responsibilities as expeditiously and as equitably as possible. And one of my major goals as Chairman is to seek better procedures to eliminate our heavy backlogs. In this area, particularly, we would welcome your advice.

Today, I would like to discuss with you some of the new developments in international communications and also some problems in that field that require immediate attention.

When you work in the field of communications, it is easy to become mesmerized by the sheer excitement of the new technological developments. I assume that most of you had the opportunity to see the recent CBS television program "Town Meeting of the Air." This program, you will recall, was carried live over Telstar. Former President Eisenhower in Denver, Sir Anthony Eden in London, Jean Monnet in Brussels, and Heinrich von Brentano in Cologne, joined in a four-way simultaneous conversation, and answered questions put to them by members of the studio audience. The gathering of these world statesmen was a significant first—and more such programs are planned. Most surely, it points the way of the future in dramatic fashion, demonstrating how scientific advances can and will be applied to erase distance barriers—thus bringing the family of nations into ever closer contact.

But this milestone is just a crude beginning of what the future holds in store—just a peek behind the curtain of future communication events.

In an address in 1961, David Sarnoff, RCA Board chairman, demonstrating a pocket-size color TV set, envisioned the day when an individual, equipped with a vest pocket transceiver could see and speak with any similarly equipped individual anywhere in the world. Now it may be a very long way off, but imagine the possibilities of rapid, reliable and completely private sight and sound connections with anyone, anywhere in the world. It's enough to make Dick Tracy and Diet Smith green with envy. I suppose some day our wives will have to do their hair and put on lipstick before answering the visual telephone.

The march of science is indeed fascinating. But no system will ever be infallible, and difficulties often arise from the most unexpected quarters. Just the other day I read that a telephone pole in the zoo at Chester, England, had to be raised 4 feet because a giraffe named George kept getting on the line. Area residents had been plagued for days by a rash of wrong numbers until George, who stands 18 feet, was detected grabbing the wires with his tongue and playfully letting them snap—making phones ring all over the place.

While we therefore may look forward to the future with some mixed feelings, it might be well to remember that really efficient oversea communications are of fairly recent origin. Although a telegraph cable was laid between Newfoundland and Ireland in 1866, it was not until 1927 that the first radiotelephone service to Europe was inaugurated. Some 12,000 calls were placed that year—with a cost for 3 minutes to London of $75, as compared to $12 today and $9 at night.

The first submarine telephone cable to England was opened for service just 7 years ago—in 1956—and was made possible only by the development of a vacuum tube repeater to boost the signal strength, which could function reliably on the ocean's bed. There are now, of course, numerous cables—over 22,000 miles of them. And even at this moment, A.T. & T.'s cable vessel, the *Long Lines*, is laying a third cable from the United States to England. I was aboard the *Long Lines* a few weeks ago, and it is indeed an amazing operation. Yet, we are told that by 1966, a new transistorized cable, with a capacity almost six times as great, will be available for use.

Statistics are always rather cold, but in international communications they have real significance, because they forecast a tremendous rate of growth. Last year, approximately 5 million phone calls were

placed from the United States to 176 countries and territories. But existing facilities will probably be used to capacity by 1965. With a projected 20-percent increase in demand each year, there are estimates that oversea telephone calls may reach 100 million. requiring 10,000 circuits, by 1980. Other services, such as telegraph, facsimile and high speed data transmissions may well require an additional 2,000 circuits. And this demand doesn't take into account circuitry for international television. Thus we might be talking about a half-billion dollar international communications industry by 1970 or perhaps a billion dollars by 1980.

Now—where does the much discussed space satellite program fit in? In light of the foregoing, I suggest that the answer is clear. We will need communication satellite systems, in my opinion, for at least four reasons:

1. With an increasing demand for international television and broadband data services, which devour channels in big chunks, it will be simpler, more efficient and eventually less costly to use satellites instead of cables. For example, one satellite may equal the carrying capacity of all the telephone cable circuits presently in operation between the United States and the rest of the world.

2. Alternate, or "back-up" communication systems are desirable in the event of the failure of one system.

3. Satellites can bring all types of communication services directly to all nations—even those in the remotest corners of the world—without going through or using the facilities of other nations. By contrast, today a call to Nigeria from New York City must go through London. To call from London to Buenos Aires your circuit must travel via New York City.

4. The availability of the high frequencies used today for long-distance communications is limited, and there are other problems associated with high frequency communications.

So, we must put microwave radio to work through space satellites. But how will satellite systems develop, and what are the factors to consider in their development?

I suggest to you that these factors fall primarily into three categories—foreign relations, technology, and the economics of the system.

In the field of foreign policy, agreements must be reached with other countries for ownership participation in the system, for division of revenues, for access to the system, and on a host of other matters. The problems are knotty, and we cannot expect all to be sweetness and light. But there are substantial grounds for hope in one fact: There is a long history of international cooperation in the area of communications. This is one field in which scientific developments and limited spectrum space very early forced us to recognize a need for nations of differing backgrounds, attitudes and ideologies to reach a measure of agreement in order to protect common interests.

The technical considerations in the development of a satellite system are manifold. Satellite communications must be reliable. They must be capable of interconnecting with the already highly developed communications systems in the densely populated areas of the world. Yet the satellite system must also have the technical capacity to provide reliable service to the developing nations of the world. And enough spectrum space must be found to provide adequate frequencies for use by satellites, without interference to presently existing microwave operations.

Turning to the third problem area, what are the economic considerations? Cables will not become obsolete in the foreseeable future. For some time to come, they will continue to serve a major portion of our international needs, because of their proven reliability and economy. The new transistorized cable, capable of carrying television, is in the immediate offing, and should result in major economies in the future.

So we are faced with a question of when we can expect channels in an operable, reliable satellite system to be provided at costs competitive with cable channels. Pertinent here is the accuracy of projections concerning the volume of all international traffic, and the question of when this traffic will support both satellite and cable systems. Also directly involved are the respective costs of laying cables, of manufacturing and launching satellites, and of constructing the necessary ground support stations.

These are some of the problems our space experts are trying to solve. The Communications Satellite Corp., which was authorized by Congress last year, has the primary responsibility to launch and operate, in cooperation with other nations, a reliable global commercial system. The corporation is going forward with research and development contracts. NASA is also conducting research and will provide the launch facilities on a reimbursable basis. Foreign participation, of course, is necessary, and the State Department and ComSat officials are already conducting exploratory conferences with communications administrations abroad. In addition, we fully expect that international agreement on the allocation of space radio frequencies will be reached at the Geneva Conference this fall.

The FCC is charged with a number of heavy new responsibilities. We must ultimately approve the technical characteristics of the system to be used—whether high, medium or low altitude, or some combination of the three. In making this judgment we will need the advice and research of NASA as an independent check upon the research of the corporation. We must approve the rates to be charged, and authorize all borrowings by the corporation and all stock issues but the first. We must also insure that equitable procedures are developed and employed so that small businesses and large can compete in providing necessary equipment and services.

This is truly a unique venture. While we are confident of success, it will require the continuing and best efforts of everyone concerned. I am pleased to say that the very able group of incorporators whom the President has appointed to launch the new corporation are proceeding with determination. I want to add that our recently publicized differences are more apparent than real, and I am confident that we are now in basic agreement. The Government agencies and departments who have responsibilities in this field, and all with whom we have dealt have likewise displayed a determination to meet the challenges that science and technology have posed.

With this background in mind, let us consider some of the effects of our communication satellite program on the framework of our overall international communications system.

The Congress has already resolved the initial issues by deciding that the basic facilities for satellite communications shall be provided neither by existing international carriers nor by the Government, but by the new corporation. In this new corporation both existing carriers and public investors, on a broad scale, will be represented. But new and different problems already clamor for attention, and strain our capacity for original thought.

Like grandpa's "old time religion," traditional concepts have tremendous staying power. Moreover, in a democracy such as ours, the transition from recognized need for change to change itself is necessarily slow. No one man or group of men has ultimate power, and many minds must meet. But in spite of the difficulties involved we must often undertake the difficult task of reevaluating traditional concepts. So in the field of international communications our traditional regulatory, economic and legal concepts must be given a long, hard look.

Consider, for example, the concept of rate of return as a percentage of net investment in plant and equipment. Generally speaking, the traditional view has been that a public utility should be permitted to charge rates which will permit it to recoup its expenses and earn a reasonable return on its investment. This presupposes that the utility has substantial and growing commitments in plant and equipment which are reflected in its rate base. Thus, it has usually made sense to measure the reasonableness of a utility's rates in terms of the earnings it requires to protect the integrity of its investment in plant and equipment and to attract new capital on favorable terms. And it is an accepted view that the utility that operates substantial amounts of plant will be most likely to have the experience and incentive to perform the research required for improved service to the public.

But what happens to this traditional concept when a new company—the Communications Satellite Corp.—is injected into this field? ComSat will not serve the public directly. Rather, it will be a carriers' carrier—in that it will lease channels in its satellite system to the international carriers, who in turn will provide direct service to the public as they have in the past.

A somewhat similar situation exists even now among international carriers. Our record carriers are looking more and more to leasing needed channels in A.T. & T. cables. These leases represent ordinary expenses, and are not reflected in the carriers' rate bases. Therefore, their plant investment is shrinking in proportion to the total amount of services being provided. If their investment shrinks, so will their relative return, and their relative ability to support the needed research, development, and experimentation designed to provide better and better service.

So, should the primary role in research and development pass to the ComSat Corp., along with the major part of the investing in plant? Or should we seek ways to maintain the traditional role of our international carriers as the primary investors? The Commission must weigh such questions in deciding, under the Communications Satellite Act, whether the ground stations should be owned by the corporation or by individual carriers. It must also consider them in deciding what bearing the carriers' ownership and other interests in ComSat itself have upon the earnings which they should be allowed.

These difficulties will certainly be resolved, but I think from even this oversimplified discussion you can see that we are having to reexamine some fairly fundamental concepts.

Another tradition in communications regulation has been the distinction between voice and record transmissions. Domestically, we started out with a division of this kind between our telephone and telegraph carriers. Similarly, and again speaking generally, voice or telephone service abroad is furnished only by A.T. & T. Record carriers, on the other hand, such as Western Union, RCA Communications, Inc., and American Cable & Radio Corp., provide the oversea telegraph, teletypewriter and facsimile services.

But the distinction between voice and record communications, from a technical, operating standpoint, has become blurred. For example, in what category does televison belong? The same circuitry used for voice can be used for digital computer information. New broad band services now offer the customer communications channels which he can use for voice or record communications as he chooses. A satellite can transmit a photograph or music without batting its

electronic eye. Demonstrations through Telstar and Relay have shown that it is possible to transmit data abroad at speeds up to a million and a half words a minute—fast enough to carry a 10-day filibuster in one fell swoop.

I am not suggesting that this would be necessarily desirable but only that it's technically feasible. The possibilities of intermixing voice and record services are almost limitless. New technology, and the needs of modern business and modern government have made the old distinction between voice and record communications more and more artificial. Yet, we have long sought to maintain separate voice and record companies in international communications. Clearly this concept needs study.

And what about the traditional desire for competition in the field of international communications? First of all, we should recognize that we do not and cannot have, in international communications, the kind of competition that was Adam Smith's ideal. This does not mean that the competitive ideal is inapplicable to this field or that competitive rivalry can never produce here the results it has produced in other parts of the economy. But a handful of competitors do not make anything like a purely competitive market. At most, in international communications, we are dealing with varying degrees of oligopoly—of competition among a few, who understandably keep a close watch on each other's moves. And we must judge each competitive situation on its own merits.

Let me give you an example.

During pre-Castro days, seven domestic record carriers provided service to Cuba. Both Western Union and All-America Cable & Radio owned cables and operated large message centers in New York City. RCA, Globe Wireless, Press Wireless, MacKay Radio, and Tropical Radio & Telegraph Co. all had separate radio circuits. The rates were all the same. And it has been estimated that the combined physical plants of these companies were perhaps twice as large as would be required if an efficient, single entity were to handle all the traffic. True, they all made a profit, but did the ratepaying users themselves profit? And, if legislation were passed permitting the FCC to authorize merger of the record companies, would these companies in fact be able to come to terms and present us with a workable merger plan?

Also, when we speak of fostering competition in international communications, we can no longer think simply of competition among record carriers. Competition ultimately turns on the way companies divide dollars, not merely the way they divide channels. Competition between the record companies and "Mother Bell" with her substantial monopoly of pure voice communications, may well be more important than the brotherly rivalry among record carriers alone.

Moreover, if the record carriers plan to utilize more and more the cable facilities of the telephone company and the satellite facilities of ComSat, what is the nature of the competition which will result? Will it be price competition, competition in terms of service only—or both? Are we likely to get both, or either? Perhaps, too, our attention should be focused more upon competition between all of our international carriers and the communications administrations of other nations.

These are the fundamental issues. Of course, we cannot resolve them here this morning. Nor do I think that we are truly ready to resolve all of the hard questions that confront us. We recognize, in President Lincoln's noble phrase, that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." But we will not help ourselves and our country by rushing into the future without planning that is critical and thorough.

The concept of a merger of international record carriers, for instance, is not new. The FCC has previously supported it, and it certainly has much to recommend it. We need to evaluate that concept, however, in light of the prospects offered by the creation of the Satellite Corp., the possibility of a broader merger of all international communication carriers, the development of the transistorized cable, and the entry of space technology into the field of international communications. We need a comprehensive and impartial analysis of all the underlying facts. Above all, we need to keep in mind that in this field neither competition nor monopoly is to be sought for its own sake or for the sake of any individual company or group of companies. The goal, rather, is a method which will provide the best service to our country and to the world.

To achieve this goal I want to suggest to you an approach involving both immediate action and longer range policy planning.

First, the international record carriers should be equipped to provide broad-band services of the mixed, voice, and record type we discussed earlier. To the extent required the FCC should authorize the provision of such services by them. If access to the cables of others and interconnection with A.T. & T. or Western Union domestic facilities are required we should seek appropriate action to insure that these are obtained. No future goals would be frustrated or prejudiced by such moves. And a number of alternatives, which might otherwise be foreclosed before we find the solutions to our basic problems, would be held open.

Second, we need a broad-gaged study of the organizational framework of our international communications system. Such a study should begin immediately and should not be unduly prolonged.

Because of the variety of interests involved, and because it is actually a matter of national telecommunications policy, I believe that such a study could best be conducted by the agencies and departments of Government most directly involved. This would imply a study group including at least a representative from the Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Director of Telecommunications Management, and the Department of Justice, and appropriate staff members. If desirable, informal hearings could be held and testimony taken by the FCC, whose statutory investigative powers would be available to serve the study's purpose. In any event, other departments and agencies would be consulted, as would ComSat officials, members of the academic world, industry representatives, and other knowledgeable persons.

I would not insist that this is the only form in which the study that is needed might be organized. The important consideration, after all, is not who takes responsibility and credit for doing the thinking, but rather that the thinking be done. And I would stress that what I propose is not a device to put off hard decisions in the hope that the need to make them will disappear—for it will not. What we need, and what I propose, is rather a plan for making those decisions in a manner which will command public support and respect—and one which will give the President, the Congress, and the public the basic materials from which the decisions must be made.

In the meantime, our efforts to establish the Communication Satellite Corp. as an operating entity should not be deflected or delayed. The goals at which the Congress aimed when it created the corporation should not wait upon a resolution of every issue in the organization of our international communications.

Already the growth of international communications has made its mark. People talk about yesterday happenings in Berlin almost as if they had been there. Dictators are overthrown because their people know that a better life exists. Fire hoses play in Birmingham, and the consequences are felt in countries far from our shores. Our President makes a speech on the auld sod, and we view it in our living rooms and react to the warmth of the living event.

The challenge of the future is intense. Nowhere is a task more worthy of the best we have to give. We must find the ways—and find them in time—to make the dazzling contributions of science and technology serve, in the broadest sense, the peaceful commerce of nations.

An Answer to Charges GOP Is Lily White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently some unfortunate charges and accusations about the Republican's position on the racial question were made. This indeed is unfortunate. Any well-posted student of political science and in politics knows of the long and impressive tradition of the Republicans in regard to fighting for minority rights of all people.

One of the best statements in answer to this charge was prepared by Carl Shipley, the Republican chairman of the District of Columbia. Under unanimous consent, I include this statement in the RECORD where it can be read by people who are interested and who should be reassured of the Republican's position on this matter:

AN ANSWER TO CHARGES GOP IS LILY WHITE

Recently there have been a rash of newspaper stories and cartoons in both the white and Negro press implying that the GOP has abandoned its historic tradition of racial equality and is now becoming lily white. Such stories are an outrageous libel on the GOP and a disservice to the two-party system.

All GOP national leaders are strong opponents of racial discrimination. From Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who is a member of the Urban League, to Governor Rockefeller, who is a member of the NAACP, all Republican leaders oppose racial segregation. No Negro anywhere at anytime was ever excluded from voter registration or party membership as a Republican by Republicans. Neither the Democratic Party nor the Kennedy brothers can make such a claim for Democratic leaders. The Republican platform states flatly that racial discrimination has no place in American life and cannot be reconciled with our constitutional guarantees of equal protection under law to all persons. In the face of these facts, an implication that the GOP could ever be lily white is false, and can only be explained as the desperate act of our political opposition.

The only way the GOP can become lily white would be for the national colored community of nearly 20 million Negro fellow Americans to self-segregate themselves into the Democratic Party, despite GOP efforts to increase Negro participation in GOP affairs. A two-party system based on a voluntary de facto division of whites and

Negroes along political party lines would be a sociopolitical disaster for all concerned.

And yet excessive Democratic partisanship on such issues as civil rights and Negro appointments may lead to this result. The uninformed are being misled by Democratic leaders to believe that only the Democratic Party and the Kennedy administration are interested in the welfare of the Negroes.

When it comes to actual votes in Congress on civil rights, which party is the one friendly to Negroes?

The record proves it to be the Republican Party.

Despite all the ballyhoo of Democrats, the truth is that if proportionately as many Democrats as Republicans voted in favor of civil righs legislation in Congress, then civil rights legislation could be passed.

Out of 26 Senate votes a majority of Senate Democrats have voted against civil rights issues in every single case except 2 since 1933. In two cases not a single Democrat voted favorably; in two others, only a lone Democrat joined a majority of Republicans seeking favorable action.

At the same time, in every single Senate vote except one, a majority of Republicans voted in favor of civil rights issues—in five cases by 100 percent.

In the House, the Republicans have likewise consistently outvoted the Democrats in proportion to their strength—Republicans voting 68–100 percent favorable to civil rights on every single vote, while the Democrats have failed in 9 out of 20 votes to muster a majority in favor.

That is the civil rights voting record of Republicans versus Democrats, 1933–62 (S. Doc. 158, 87th Cong.).

The only place in the United States where Negroes have been systematically denied the right to register, vote, or use public schools and public accommodations on a nonsegregated basis, are those States where every public official from Governor to voting registrars has been a Democrat for nearly 100 years. A State (Alabama) where President Kennedy ran and won on a "white supremacy" ballot, is Democrat from top to bottom. Most major committees of Congress have Democrat-segregationist chairmen. The GOP has never had this un-American distinction.

The Republican Party came into being in 1854 primarily because of human rights. The Federal Constitution was amended by Republicans just after the Civil War to outlaw slavery, to prohibit States from abridging rights of citizens, and from denying the right to vote because of race. The first Civil Rights Acts (1866–71) were all passed by Republican-dominated Congresses and signed by Republican Presidents. Later a Democratic Congress attempted to repeal most of these laws, but GOP President Hayes vetoed the effort. Democratic filibusters in Congress prevented any civil rights legislation for 80 years until the Republican administration of President Eisenhower fought the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 through Congress, establishing the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and providing protection for Negroes of the right to vote. It was GOP President Eisenhower who abolished segregation in the Nation's Capital, in interstate travel by bus and train, in schools on military posts, and among civilian employees at naval bases. It was the Republican administration of President Eisenhower that appointed approximately 644 Negroes to top positions above $6,000 a year in the Federal Government, established a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, established the President's Committee on Government Employees Policy to prevent discrimination, and opened all White House social events to Negroes for the first time in history. This is hardly the record of a "lily white" Republican Party. Every Negro should know the facts before he accepts as true the vicious, partisan, and racist inspired allegation that the GOP is becoming "lily white." Self-interest and political fairplay require no less. Elimination of racial discrimination is nonpartisan—it is everyone's business.

Opposition to H.R. 3669

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, in opposition to the quality stabilization bill, H.R. 3669.

It is remarkable to note in this enlightened day that lobby pressure could force out of a major committee of the Congress, legislation opposed by every governmental agency, opposed by all consumer groups, by the AFL–CIO, the Farmers Union, and the Farm Bureau. The resolution amply states the case against the quality stabilization bill, H.R. 3669 and S. 774, and points out why that measure, in the public interest, must be rejected by the Congress of the United States.

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL—H.R. 3669 AND S. 774

Whereas this legislation is bad for the economy, bad for the retailer, and very bad for the consumer; and

Whereas this country became great and powerful because our economic system has been based on competition and competition is as opposed to price-fixing as capitalism is to communism; and

Whereas when we authorized a manufacturer to fix his price right down the line and compel all his distributors to adhere to the manufacturer's price schedule we have destroyed competition; we have destroyed initiative and we have taken away from the local merchant his inalienable right to price the commodities which he bought and paid for at a level which, in his good judgment, would bring him the greatest return. The manufacturer's price dictates would supplant the individual retailer's independent business judgment; and

Whereas the bill masquerades under the title of quality stabilization and there is nothing at all in it that has to do with quality, or with stabilizing quality. The only place the word quality appears in the bill is in the title. It is the same iniquitous fair trade bill which the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee struggled with in the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses; only slightly camouflaged to give it respectability: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, is unalterably opposed to enactment of this legislation. By any name this remains as nefarious price-fixing legislation and is contrary to the President's announced policy in favor of increased competition and consumer protection and passage of this legislation would have the following undesirable consequences:

1. Prices to the consumer would be arbitrarily raised to provide larger profit margins for sellers;

2. Open competition would be eliminated in favor of privately fixed prices;

3. Wholesalers and retailers would be subject to Federal supervision of their day-to-day prices;

4. Federal courts would be flooded with price litigation;

5. All incentive for better quality and better values would be removed;

6. Wholesalers and retailers would be deprived of their constitutional rights in their own property; and

7. The antitrust laws would be gutted; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman and members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee along with a letter expressing the opposition of the MTD to H.R. 3669.

And This Is Fair?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press of Friday, September 13, 1963, on the so-called quality stabilization bill, which would be so destructive of the interests of the consumer, and of the rights of small businessmen to conduct their affairs as they see fit, if Congress were to enact it.

AND THIS IS FAIR?

Testimony before a Senate Commerce Subcommittee shows exactly what would happen if Congress gets suckered into passing the so-called—quality stabilization bill—a trick name, meaning price fixing. Higher, of course.

A store operator from Memphis (Howard Waller, president of the Corondolet Corp., which operates two department stores and is building a third) told just what kind of fair prices this bill would enforce.

Mr. Waller listed for the committee the cost of some of the products on his shelves, the markups his stores originally put on these commodities, and the prices at which they actually are being sold because Tennessee has a "quality stabilization" or fair trade law.

He testified his customers are paying $12.50 for a pen he had proposed to sell for $8.96 and still make a profit of 30 percent.

Some other items:

Nine-cup perculator—his original price, $8.96 fair trade price, $10.95.

Ten-inch skillet—his original price, $10.35; fair trade price, $12.95.

Car wash—his original price, 57 cents; fair trade price, 79 cents.

Cream mascara—his original price, 99 cents; fair trade price, $1.25.

Yeast tablets—his original price, $2.14; fair trade price, $2.67.

Bath powder—his original price, $3.99; fair trade price, $5.

The witness said his profits would have ranged from 23.7 percent to 30 percent on the prices he would have been happy to get. But under the fair trade law he had to raise prices so his profits ranged from 40 to 50 percent.

Confidence Part of a Healthy Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President would have us believe that the answer to all our economic problems is a tax cut of some $10 billion and that to oppose the tax cut will lay the groundwork for recession, unemployment, and other dire results.

We all would like a tax cut. Many of us have been pointing out for years that the present high confiscatory rate of taxes was a drain on the economy and prevented healthy economic growth. The President, however, in his usual superficial approach to all problems, ignores the other factors which weaken the economy. He refuses to make any kind of firm commitment to cut Federal spending. He ignores completely the monopoly role of labor in setting wages and work rules. These are some of the areas in which corrective measures are needed to bring about the principal ingredient of a healthy economy—confidence.

The following editorial by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report for September 30, 1963, points up this argument and I commend it to my colleagues as we prepare to debate the tax bill:

CONFIDENCE

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy's television-radio address to the Nation urging the American people to support his proposal that Congress cut taxes may seem to him the way to win votes. But can it win the confidence necessary to build up the economy? Can the mere distribution of 50 cents per day for each taxpaying family bring an end to current unemployment?

As Mr. Kennedy rightly says, taxes are burdensome. The public doesn't like them. But he is mistaken in assuming that it is the high tax rates alone which "do not leave enough money in private hands to keep this country's economy growing and healthy."

Gross receipts are not at fault. They have been rising steadily in almost every industry. It isn't the tax collector, however, who takes the biggest bite out of gross receipts each year. Many factors contribute to the rapid increase in expenses—not the least of which is the unpredictable course of wages, which in turn affects prices and the volume of sales. All this is related to the arbitrary power exercised by a labor-union monopoly in numerous industries. Coercion by the use of the strike weapon sends wages upward faster than the consumer can absorb the price increases that then are inevitable.

We talk often of the periods of involuntary wage-and-price stability that come with a recession. These are the direct result of the fears of deeper recession and the reduction in jobs for workers as the economy starts downward. Somehow the union leaders are not as demanding when a recession comes. They discover that profit margins are not limitless.

The President's speech revealed an emphasis on only one factor—a tax cut. He argued that it "means more jobs for American workers," and that "more after-tax money means more buying power for consumers and investors—and this means more production and the jobs our Nation needs."

The mere flow of more money into the pockets of the consumers will be meaningless if every dollar coincidentally is losing purchasing power. For it cannot be assumed that wage rates will remain stable. On the contrary, the labor leaders already have indicated that, since the tax cuts will give the corporations more money, they should immediately use it up in higher wages. It may be taken for granted, therefore, that any demands for wage increases will not be limited to the amount of the tax cut. They will go far beyond that, and, of course, price rises will become necessary to make up as much of the difference as possible. The consumer usually shows resistance to price increases, so sales will be adversely affected.

Theoretically, it should be possible to increase wages and hold down prices if the total volume in a business is very substantially increased. But productivity often fails to rise as much as wages.

The American economy is a form of anarchy. Each element proceeds on its own initiative. The Federal Government steps in to interfere only with the price mechanism, as it did in the steel controversy in 1962. The administration pleads helplessness, however, when labor unions threaten nationwide strikes to achieve their wage demands.

The President says that America needs in the next 2½ years "10,000 new jobs every day for a total of 10 million jobs." This will not be accomplished, however, unless the confidence of businessmen and investors is won.

This cannot be won by stressing the rise in consumer income obtained through a tax cut.

It cannot be won by the administration argument that deficits in the Treasury each year and an increasing public debt should be brushed aside by both businessmen and investors in appraising future trends.

On the contrary, confidence in the soundness of the monetary unit has more to do with the launching of new business ventures and with the flow of investor capital to new enterprises than any other single factor.

To grant a tax cut of $11 billion now and turn around and borrow this same sum from the people, while the total national debt grows and grows, is to undermine confidence in the dollar and ultimately perhaps to force its devaluation in world markets.

What then would bring prosperity?

1. A program of restraint, as the term is used in Britain, whereby labor and management agree to a certain period of wage and price stability.

2. A program of restraint in spending by the Government itself so that the budget will show a definite trend toward being balanced.

These are steps that could win the confidence of the managers of business and of the investors and of those leaders of union labor who understand that a free enterprise system cannot experience a steadily increasing national growth without the cooperation of Government and labor and business. For this is the only way to instill the confidence so necessary today to a long-range program of job creation. The establishment of such confidence could even win national elections.

Refutation of Charges of Illegal Gambling in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the remarks on widespread illegal gambling in New Mexico as they appeared in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 16, 1963. I, too, have been very interested in the findings of the McClellan committee upon which the remarks were ostensibly based.

However, I have been unable to find any mention of New Mexico in either the testimony or the detailed committee report. I have, therefore, been forced to draw my facts and conclusions from other accurate sources and based upon these and an unbiased interpretation of the committee report I wish to present my findings, lest there be some confusion on the matter, as I expect there may very well be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite correct, as asserted, that $37 million were involved in legal parimutuel betting in New Mexico during 1962, and from this the State treasury did indeed receive approximately half a million dollars in revenue. With these facts I am in total agreement.

It was estimated by an expert committee witness, Mr. John Scarne of Fairview, N.J., that on a national average of about $16.50 is wagered offtrack for every dollar legally placed in parimutuel betting. However, the figure placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, apparently based on this ratio, set New Mexico's illegal offtrack betting at $265 million for last year. By my calculations, using the same ratio, should such conditions exist, the amount spent on illegal offtrack wagering would equal $610,500,000, not the quoted $265 million.

Moreover, Representative FINO in his remarks applied this $16.50-to-$1 ratio to all forms of gambling. This, in spite of the fact that the source of this figure, Mr. Scarne, in his testimony said, "$16.50 is bet off track for every dollar bet legally at the track." This ratio is an estimate quite clearly related then to horse racing alone. Additionally, the witness intended only this interpretation since such a ratio could not be applied to any other form of gambling because New Mexico, like most States, permits only parimutuel betting, thus, in no other form of gambling is there a corresponding $1 legal sum bet.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the foregoing are but technical and mathematical errors made in the assertion. As far as fundamental inaccuracies are concerned, suffice it to say that no such conditions as those described by Mr. FINO exist in New Mexico. Had the gentleman meant to refer to New York rather than New Mexico, as I suspect he did since New York was frequently referred to in the committee report, I might have some basis for agreeing with him. But, as the error was made and New Mexico was most improperly characterized, I must vigorously disagree.

In order to approach the astronomical sum of $610,500,000, it would be necessary for every man, woman, child, and baby in New Mexico to illegally gamble approximately $650,000 annually. The incongruity of this increases when we recognize that, unfortunately, there are many New Mexicans who have an annual income of less than $1,000. Surely,

we are not to believe that these people are betting 65 percent of their annual income on horses or anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I will gladly compare any county in New Mexico against any county in this great Nation. This is not imprudent. This is not a rash gesture for I can guarantee that in New Mexico there exist no such gross conditions. There is no flaunting of the law; there is no coddling of transgressors. Illegal gambling is not to be found. As further demonstration of my accuracy in this regard, I urge that any individual having evidence of illegal gambling or the sale of lottery tickets in New Mexico immediately notify the attorney general of that State and/or district attorney in any county concerned.

I am proud of my State. It ranks among our finest States. Its contributions to the wholesome American way of life, which we want all men to enjoy, are myriad. Let there be no mistake about it; I deeply resent anyone terming New Mexico as "a vice-ridden gamblers' fiesta land." It is a land of enjoyment, a land of health, and a land of productivity. It is a celebrated example of all that is good and legal.

Chula Vista, Calif., and Sister City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to note that the People-to-People program—an important though inexpensive part of our foreign relations—remains strong, because of unselfish and determined efforts by private citizens in many communities. Often these efforts persist against formidable odds.

An interesting and inspiring example is the "sister city" relationship carried on by Chula Vista, Calif., with the city of General Roca, Argentina. A little more than a year ago, with Argentina in a state of armed turmoil resulting from Peronista victories and the military overthrow of President Frondizi, members of the Chula Vista Sister City Friendship Commission temporarily lost contact with their counterpart committee in General Roca. It became necessary, through correspondence, to familiarize new officials in that strife torn city with America's people-to-people objectives, and to overcome their suspicion of earlier intercity contacts achieved under the program. Subsequently, as the result of new Argentine elections held in July of this year, General Roca's former mayor was restored to office and sister city activities are once again in full swing.

I should like to list some of these activities, as contained in the most recent annual report to its local citizens by the Chula Vista Sister City Friendship Commission:

1. An exhibit of art work prepared by the students of the Chula Vista City Schools was assembled and sent to General Roca as a gift to the schoolchildren of that city. These watercolor paintings of scenes from our national capital and history were accompanied by descriptions in English and in Spanish and by a Spanish translation of our patriotic song "America." This exhibit provoked a favorable response in our sister city, resulting in an art competition in their schools for the purpose of sending a similar exhibit to our city.

2. During the summer sessions of 1962, the Commission compiled a photorecord of the summer school activities in the elementary, secondary, and collegiate schools of Chula Vista. Pictures of classes in action, accompanied by explanations, of the pictures and the summer program were assembled in an album which was sent to General Roca as a gift to its people.

3. Approximately 200 Christmas cards were sent by local citizens to people in General Roca. Responses were received from many of these greetings.

4. The Lioness Club of Chula Vista sent subscriptions for the Spanish editions of U.S. magazines to the mayor and library of General Roca.

5. The local chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma, international honorary society for women educators, is attempting to complete financial arrangements for bringing a teacher from General Roca to Chula Vista for the purpose of spending a year of study at San Diego State College. When these arrangements have been confirmed by that organization, contacts will be made through the mayor's office in General Roca for the selection of a suitable teacher.

6. Arrangements are being made to send suitable textbooks which are no longer in use in our schools to the schools of General Roca.

Independence Day of the Federal Republic of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 21, the Federal Republic of Germany celebrated the 14th anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Dr. Heinrich Luebke; His Excellency, the Chancellor, Dr. Konrad Adenauer; and His Excellency, the Republic's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Heinrich Knaptstein, on this memorable occasion.

It was on September 21, 1949, that the United States, France, and the United Kingdom brought the new Republic into being. The journey to independence had begun just a year earlier when a West German Parliamentary Council, which was, in fact, a constituent assembly, met in Bonn to draft a constitution for Germany. Since Soviet-occupied eastern and central Germany were not represented, the council limited itself to drafting a basic law for the German Federal Republic, until such time as an all-German Constituent Assembly could replace it with a constitution agreed on by the entire German people. By the end of May 1949, this basic law had been drawn up by the Parliamentary Council, adopted by most of the 11 land parliaments, and formally promulgated.

After a general election in September, followed by the choice by the Bundestag the popularly elected chamber of Dr. Theodor Heuss as Federal President and of Dr. Konrad Adenauer as Chancellor, the Western Allies were willing to see the Federal Republic actually launched. The Allies had in the meantime worked out three related instruments: First, an occupation statute, which defined the residual powers of the Allies in the Federal Republic; second, a Trizonal Fusion Agreement, which set up an Allied High Commission for Germany; and third, a charter for this Commission defining its organization and procedure. After the acceptance of these Allied instruments by the President and Chancellor of the German Federal Republic at Petersberg on September 21, the German Federal Republic came formally to existence.

During the first years of the Republic, its sovereignty was considerably limited under the Occupation Statute of 1949. Step by step, these limitations were reduced until the Paris Agreements of 1955 made the Federal Republic a sovereign nation, limited only by a few remaining restrictions on nuclear and other special armaments. The Republic also became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Western European Union. Even before gaining complete independence, West Germany had taken part in establishing the European Coal and Steel Community and had joined the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, and three specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The most startling development in postwar West Germany was the Wirtschaftswunder, or economic miracle. Industry was rapidly reconstructed and the country began to experience prosperity after 1949. By 1955, the net national income was 179 percent of that of 1936. A good part—20 to 25 percent—of this income went into new investments, but per capita consumption, too, by 1953 had reached 114 percent of the 1936 level. It was not surprising, therefore, that West Germany, by then the leading economic power of Europe, became a charter member of the European Economic Community in 1957. She has played a major role in the success of that great experiment in economic integration.

During the postwar period the German Federal Republic regained for the German people something that many Germans had always deeply desired—a respected and honored place in the family of nations. It is for this outstanding achievement above all that we salute the West German people and their government on the 14th anniversary of the Republic's establishment.

Farm Labor Facts—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the need for an agricul-

tural worker program in California, the following statistics were recently published by the California Department of Employment:

California—Peak employment on farms (men, women, and youth), 1960–62, by type of worker, peak weeks ending Sept. 3, 1961, Sept. 9, 1961, and Sept. 8, 1962

Type of worker	Year	Total working at peak	Men		Women		Youth	
			Number working	Percent of total	Number working	Percent of total	Number working	Percent of total
Total workers	1960	419,200	360,300	85.9	32,500	7.8	26,400	6.3
	1961	435,900	377,150	86.5	34,000	7.8	24,750	5.7
	1962	435,500	366,400	84.1	38,550	8.9	30,550	7.0
Farmers and unpaid family	1960	[1] 94,700	82,300	86.9	7,200	7.6	5,200	5.5
	1961	98,400	86,100	87.5	7,100	7.2	5,200	5.3
	1962	96,100	81,800	85.1	8,300	8.6	6,000	6.3
Hired year round	1960	92,200	87,600	95.0	3,300	3.6	1,300	1.4
	1961	90,700	86,600	95.5	3,000	3.3	1,100	1.2
	1962	97,500	92,850	95.2	3,600	3.7	1,050	1.1
Temporary domestic:								
Local	1960	115,600	89,400	77.3	13,200	11.4	13,000	11.3
	1961	122,500	96,500	78.8	14,500	11.8	11,500	9.4
	1962	117,100	82,000	70.0	18,700	16.0	16,400	14.0
Intrastate	1960	38,300	27,300	71.3	6,100	15.9	4,900	12.8
	1961	43,800	32,850	75.0	6,400	14.6	4,550	10.4
	1962	38,200	28,350	74.2	4,950	13.0	4,900	12.8
Interstate	1960	20,200	15,500	76.7	2,700	13.4	2,000	9.9
	1961	22,700	17,300	76.2	3,000	13.2	2,400	10.6
	1962	17,300	12,100	70.0	3,000	17.3	2,200	12.7
Contract foreign	1960	58,200	58,200	100.0	----------	----------	----------	----------
	1961	57,800	57,800	100.0	----------	----------	----------	----------
	1962	69,300	69,300	100.0	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Not entirely comparable with 1961 figure because of differences in the method of estimating. If estimated on the same basis as 1961, 1960 figure would probably be about 9,000 higher.

Source: Annual field reports ES-225, worksheet C. 1960 and 1961 figures revised, based on field surveys, 1960 Census of Population, and 1959 Census of Agriculture.

The statistics show first of all that the bracero workers program constitutes but a small part of the total California manpower. Particularly, the statistics show that in line with national figures, the number of farmers working the land experienced a 3-percent reduction last year, year-round domestic workers increased by 7,000 workers with a simultaneous reduction of interstate and intrastate workers of better than 9,000.

The statistics show an increase in the number of women and children working in agriculture of nearly 10,000 over the past year with a remaining substantial need for a contract foreign worker program.

Walter G. Pratt, Stoughton, Mass., 90 Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 1963, I visited the Stoughton post office in my congressional district and also visited the Stoughton townhall. It was my pleasure to attend an impromptu birthday party for Stoughton's Town Assessor Walter G. Pratt, who was celebrating his 90th birthday. Walter was born September 7, 1873. He married Emma A. Lowe. Walter is the father of two children, grandfather of three children, and great-grandfather of one child. He has had a career as a shoeworker from 1889 to 1931, fence viewer—town of Stoughton—part time from 1915 to 1956, private surveyor—part time from 1915 to 1956, served on the board of assessors from May 1, 1931, and as chairman of the board of assessors from 1945 to the present.

Walter is 90 years of age but very young at heart. He enjoys the love and respect of all the townspeople. Dedicated to his work he has set an example for the young folks in the town. I know I echo the sentiments of all who know him when I say: "Walter Pratt represents all the fine things that can be expected of a public official."

Robert Smales, Stoughton's town manager, was high in his praise for the great work done by Walter Pratt in behalf of the town of Stoughton. Employees at the townhall were warm in their praise of Walter and it is very evident that Walter has a special place in their hearts.

I told Walter that I will want to be one of those who will be present when he celebrates his 100th birthday. I hope he continues having the same bright sunny outlook on life. It's like a breath of spring.

Putting the REA on Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following editorial entitled "Putting the REA on Notice," which appeared in the September 18, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

PUTTING THE REA ON NOTICE

For some time, now, there being hardly any farms left in the Nation that do not have electricity, Rural Electrification Administration-financed cooperatives have been finding outlets for more than half their electric power among nonfarm buyers. And, considering the REA program's original intent was to provide power to rural areas only, some co-op loans of late have been looking mighty citified.

Rural electric co-ops have, for instance, been lending money to gravel-crushing plants, lumber companies and textile mills. And nothing in the legislation that set up the REA says there is anything wrong with that.

For the agency was authorized not only to make loans to build power-generating plants, but under the bill's section 5 the REA's borrowers also were authorized in turn to lend customers' funds to buy electrical and other equipment. And that does keep the co-ops growing, using low-cost Federal loans to help peddle more and more power in suburban areas and among commercial customers, often in competition with investor-owned utilities.

But Congress has not been wholly oblivious to all these goings-on. Last year, the REA provided an Illinois co-op with a loan to help a resort buy equipment to make snow for skiers. When, a little later, hearings on new REA appropriations came around, Representative COOLEY, House Agriculture Committee chairman, warned the agency: "I think you should be very careful not to make loans that are going to go so far afield, because the first thing you know we will have to rewrite that section and make it perfectly clear that we did not intend that. And if you continue to industrialize, we will certainly do that."

And the other day from another quarter came a new rap on the REA's knuckles. The Senate Appropriations Committee voted a curb on the REA's activities; it would require the agency to submit loan applications of $2 million or more for generating or transmission facilities to congressional committees for scrutiny. This restriction was far milder than some Senators wished, and represented a compromise drafted by Senator HUMPHREY who, significantly, has been one of REA's chief defenders.

Whether or not this provision is retained in the appropriation bill's final version, one thing is clear. The REA, up to now considered almost politically untouchable, is on notice that even the lawmakers' tolerance of its abuse of authority has a limit.

The Tax Reduction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech that was presented to the Nation on Saturday evening, September 21, 1963 by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri. Mr. CURTIS has adequately and effectively given a sound viewpoint on the question of tax reduction which will be before the House tomorrow.

I hereby include this address by my worthy colleague Mr. CURTIS:

REMARKS OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, SEPTEMBER 21, 1963

Good evening fellow citizens. In one sense I want to apologize for displacing the regular program you were looking forward

to enjoying this evening. In another sense I really have no right to apologize. I am here serving the very basic and vital function in our system of representative government of presenting to you the other side of one of the great issues now facing our country. President Kennedy on Wednesday night presented one side of this issue for your consideration.

Just as President Kennedy spoke to you without regard to narrow political partisanship, so shall I. This great issue of our country's basic fiscal and economic policies, which was brought to a head by the tax cut bill now approved by the Ways and Means Committee, transcends this kind of narrowness. I have the responsibility of presenting as fairly, and yet as forcefully as I can, a point of view in which I deeply believe. Although this viewpoint is almost unanimously held by Republicans in the Congress, in fairness I must say that it is shared by many Democrats as well. Certainly the vast majority of our people, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, want to hear the reason for a position, not simply what political party or what individual person is for or against it.

The President stated that this tax bill, H.R. 8363, is the most important domestic measure to be considered by the Congress in 15 years. I cannot share this view, as important as I think the tax bill is, unless it is intended to change the basic fiscal and economic policy which our country has adhered to since its foundation. If this basic change is intended, then the tax bill is probably among the most important bills which the Congress has ever considered in its 174 years of history.

The President presented his arguments for the tax bill as if the opposition were opposed to cutting taxes. This is not the case. Those who are leading the opposition to H.R. 8363, as presently written, have been arguing the urgent need to reduce Federal taxes long before President Kennedy decided last August to promote a tax cut. He proposed a tax cut as a solution to the problem of unemployment and the flow of gold from our country—the problems which he has not yet been able to solve by any other means. He has been unable to solve these problems in spite of the normal cyclical upturn which our economy took a few days after he was inaugurated and months before the Congress was able to take action on any of his legislative proposals which were supposed to pep up the economy.

Many of the leading opponents of the proposed Federal Revenue Act of 1963 have been long-time promoters of what many of you probably have heard of as the Baker-Herlong tax cut bill, bearing the name of Congressman BAKER of Tennessee, a Republican, and Congressman HERLONG of Florida, a Democrat, both of them respected colleagues of mine on the Ways and Means Committee. In contrast to the administration approach, the Baker-Herlong bill ties tax cutting to expenditure reform.

The question then, is whether there is agreement between the people, who think as I do, and the President on the great need for a tax cut to help our economy grow, to ease the unemployment problem, and to provide jobs for the increasing number of young people who are and will be looking for jobs. What is the fuss?

The President should have told you what the fuss was all about instead of evading the central issue. Actually much of the fuss is unfounded. Certainly it is not over any disagreement about wanting our country to be better and stronger and our people to have a better and more abundant and more peaceful life.

All of us want these things just as deeply as the President does. The fuss is over whether we move toward these goals by cutting taxes while increasing spending. Can we really move toward these goals if we cut taxes and if, at the same time, we do not reduce our increasing Federal expenditures. The Kennedy administration is spending more money than it is taking in from Federal taxes. It has been doing so ever since 1960 when the Nation last had a balanced budget. But lest my statistics convey erroneous impressions, as I believe those used by the President did in his address Wednesday night, let me add that we have had unbalanced budgets more often than not under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. These deficits were not good then—and I said so at the time. They are not good now.

Spending more money than is being taken in at the Federal level is becoming a serious and dangerous habit. And, mind you, the Federal taxes have been doing a manful job of getting money out of the pockets of our people. We collected $39.7 billion in 1946; $67.9 billion in 1956; $77.7 billion in 1961; $81.4 billion in 1962; $86.4 billion in 1963; and it is estimated that the amount will be $88.8 in 1964.

Now even President Kennedy agrees that this tax system is taking too much from the pockets of the people and businesses, even when it is proving inadequate to meet the cost of our ever-increasing Federal Government.

But the Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, has more than the distasteful task of writing the tax laws. When we find that the taxes do not bring in enough revenue to take care of our bills, we have to figure out how to sell Government bonds to make up the difference. We have to determine what the impact on our economy and on the purchasing power of the dollar will be from selling these bonds and to whom. These are the problems involved in what we call debt management.

It was in the field of debt management that I directed my questions to Dr. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, when he testified before the Joint Economic Committee last July regarding the possibility of the President's asking for a "quickie" tax cut. The idea then was to cut federal taxes by $10 billion. I said, Dr. Heller, to whom will we sell these bonds that will result from our budget deficits and what will be the economic consequences of these sales? Dr. Heller stated that he agreed with me that, if we asked the people and the businesses to buy the bonds, it would take away the benefits sought from the tax cut. Of course this was so. The purpose of the tax cut, according to the President, is to give the people more money to spend. This will stimulate the economy. But what happens if we go right back to the people and say, "Give us back this money we gave you and take these bonds instead?" Of course then they wouldn't have any additional money to spend. There would be no stimulus. Dr. Heller said he thought most of these bonds should be taken up by the system charged with keeping our money supply and the purchasing power of the dollar in good order, the Federal Reserve System. I asked Mr. William McChesney Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, when he appeared before the committee a few days later, "Well, what about the Federal Reserve System taking up these bonds?" Mr. Martin replied that if that were done it would let loose inflationary forces which could not be controlled.

Now if Mr. Martin's appraisal is correct, and I believe it is, this would diminish the purchasing power of the dollar. Not just the purchasing power of those who are fortunate enough to make enough money to be required to pay Federal income taxes but of everyone from the lowest pensioned widow on up.

Inflation is more unfair than any tax ever devised by government. In effect it is a tax on the consumer's dollar and, therefore, it taxes those who can afford it the least at the highest possible rate, 100 percent. It taxes those who can afford it the most at the lowest rate. Indeed, if one is fortunate enough to have money to invest, he can make more money through inflation by buying real estate and common stocks, which go up in dollar value as the real dollar, the purchasing dollar, goes down in value.

Aside from this fact, inflation, contrary to some diehard believers, does not produce prosperity. Quite the contrary, it produces misery and greater unemployment and, if carried far enough, the ruin of the Nation.

Let me illustrate what would happen. President Kennedy talked about the person making $6,000 a year. He estimated that this family would be paying about $600 a year in Federal taxes. He said the proposed tax bill would give him a tax cut of about 20 percent. This is $120. However, suppose the Consumer Price Index, which is one way to estimate inflation or how much the dollar will buy, goes up 6 points that same year, or in the 2 years during which the full effect of the tax cut is to be felt. Then that family would lose $360 in purchasing power—every dollar buys 6 cents less than it did before. Apply this loss of purchasing power to all consumers in the Nation and there is a loss of $27 billion in overall purchasing power. This is a strange way to increase purchasing power to stimulate the economy. Give back $11 billion in tax cuts and take away $27 billion through inflation.

I am not just picking a number out of the air when I suggest that the Consumer Price Index might go up 6 points. In the last month for which we have the figures, July of this year, the index went up one-half a point; the greatest 1-month rise in nearly 4 years. If the next 12 months were to continue at this rate, the total would be 6 points in a year. I don't think the rise will be this great, particularly if we reduce our spending and budget deficits, but let me point out that the index has risen 4 points since President Kennedy took office 32 months ago. This has already cut consumer purchasing power by $18 billion.

President Kennedy boasted about what he called great price stability in the last few years, but did you catch it when to prove his point he said—the wholesale price index has remained almost constant? He tripped over the word wholesale a little bit and well he might have. Who buys wholesale? Almost all of us have to buy retail, and the Consumer Price Index about which I am speaking is the retail price index.

Why has the retail price index gone up so much when the wholesale price index has remained steady? Primarily because items like insurance and medical bills and what are called services are included in the Consumer Price Index but have little to do with the wholesale price index. You don't get hospital service wholesale.

Now the President and his advisers advocate this novel fiscal and economic theory of planned deficit financing. That theory is to deliberately overspend your income in the hope of promoting economic growth and jobs from which the Government will derive more revenue to eventually catch up with the increased spending. Those who advocate this theory have to answer the contention which I have advanced that tax cutting without expenditure control will cut in on the purchasing power of the dollar and destroy any stimulus to the economy. They claim that this will not increase prices. Or put another way, they claim it will not cheapen the purchasing power of the dollar because inflation comes only when there are more dollars than there are goods and services available to be bought. Too many dollars chasing too few goods is the way some economists like to put it. They say that these

new printing press dollars which they plan to give our people will put our idle plants back into production and that, this, in turn, will put the unemployed back to work to produce the goods that the new dollars are anxious to buy.

It is a shame the President didn't tell you about this theory Wednesday night so you could evaluate it and better understand the arguments against it. The arguments against it point out that most of this so-called idle plant is unwanted, obsolete, and inefficient plant. The biggest unused plant are our farms. We surely don't want to put more land into agriculture production. Furthermore, the unemployed are largely among the unskilled and semiskilled, or those whose skills have been rendered obsolete by automation. The decline in agricultural employment has been 42 percent in the past 10 years. These unemployed people would not be put back to work unless they had been trained in the needed skills first. This takes time and locating the new jobs among other things. Furthermore, the price increases are not occurring primarily in the area of goods, but rather in services where there already is a shortage of workers and where jobs are going begging. Employment in services increased almost 42 percent during the 10 years in which agricultural employment declined. More dollars will shoot the prices for services up even higher.

You are hearing some of the fact and arguments that we in the Congress who have been digging into this serious matter for the past 12 months have to weigh and consider in reaching a conclusion as to what is the best course of action for our Nation.

The issue is now sharply drawn. Both sides want to reduce taxes because both have concluded that taxes are so high that they are damaging our economy. One side, my side, says we must earn a tax reduction before it will do any good. An unearned tax cut, we believe, could do serious harm.

What do we mean by "earn" a tax reduction? By that we mean that we must cut back our expenditures so that our Government doesn't have to print and sell bonds to make up the difference between its income and its expenses.

Incidentally, a Government bond is really a deferred tax. It is something the taxpayers of a later day will have to pay. In a sense, deficit financing is tax evasion. It is passing on to future taxpayers the cost of things the present generation wants to have but is not willing to pay for. We're paying interest on it, but nothing toward paying off the principal.

President Kennedy and his advisers have tried to allay the fears of our people about the tremendous Federal debt we have today. It amounts to over $305 billion in bonded indebtedness, but the Federal Government has over a trillion dollars in potential obligations to pay. The President said, among other things, that the debt is a smaller percentage of our economic output than it was in 1946.

Well, I should hope it would be; 1946 is the year right after World War II. Everybody agreed we had to spend vast sums of money over and above our income to win the war. We said then that we should pay this money back as soon as the Nation got back to peacetime operation. Now here it is 17 years later, and the Federal debt is still not down to anywhere near the ratios of any one of our peacetime periods, whether in the thirties, the twenties, the nonwar teens or in the 1900's or in the entire 19th century. The main way the debt was reduced as a ratio of our economic output was through juggling the value of the dollar. The heavy inflation right after the war cut the purchasing power of everyone's dollar in half—bread which once sold for 10 cents a loaf went up to 20 cents a loaf or more. A home which cost $4,000 in 1940 cost $10,000 in 1950. The debt remains fixed in the same dollar amount while the economic output doubled when measured in the inflated dollar. Yes, people who bought war bonds for $18.75 to help the war effort got $25 back in 10 years, but these new dollars bought less than $12.50 of groceries. Who got the difference? The Government and a cagy investor here and there.

We have moved ahead alright but not because of inflation. We have moved ahead in spite of it. But we have done so at the sacrifice of the standard of living and the dignity of millions of our low-income people, including those on retirement and pensions and on other fixed incomes. The cutting of the ratio of the Federal debt to gross national product by inflation instead of by honest taxation and reductions in expenditures is nothing to boast about.

The President seeks to allay our fears about the national debt by pointing out that businesses go into debt and so do individuals. That is true, but when businesses or individuals go into debt, they usually have assets to show for it, a plant and machinery, or a home and a car. The Federal Government spends, however—as it should—most of its money for military goods which have no book value. A fighter plane or a rocket must go on the books at $1, not at the millions of dollars it costs. It is an expendable item, not a productive asset. It is wrong to compare government debt, particularly Federal debt, with private debt.

It costs us today over $10 billion in taxes each year just to pay the interest on this debt. This is more than the entire Federal budget in the 1930's.

In his address Wednesday night, the President had two sentences on the subject of expenditures. He said he would maintain "an even tighter control over expenditures." Well, this has little meaning to those of us in Congress who look at his record and see no tight control to start with. President Kennedy has been spending around $6 billion more during each year that he has been in office. This is twice the rate of increase which occurred in the preceding years. In fiscal year 1961, which was partly under President Eisenhower, we spent $81 billion. In fiscal 1962, we spent $87 billion; in 1963 $93.6 billion. For the current fiscal year, the President says he intends to spend $98.8 billion, although he is asking in this budget for $108 billion additional authority to spend. At this rate, unless Congress does something to check it, he will spend $105 or $106 billion the next year. Incidentally, at the peak of World War II, in 1946, we spent $98.6 billion, the greatest sum in history up to that point. Hence, President Kennedy's expenditure estimate this year will break all our spending records. And this is during a period of peace and during a normal economic upturn.

The tax bill has written in it that it is the sense of the Congress that the President exercise expenditure control. But there are no teeth in this statement. It is a pious hope. The Republican proposal would require the President to exercise expenditure reform. We insist on deeds not words. If the requirement that the President must cut Federal expenditures in the 2 years during which the tax cut goes into effect is incorporated into the tax bill as an amendment on the floor of the House, then many Republicans and Democrats, who will vote against the bill as it now stands without effective expenditure reform, will vote for the bill and it will pass.

I do not wish to mislead anyone. I myself would not vote for the bill even with the amendment. I think that holding expenditures to $97 billion in fiscal 1964 and to $98 billion in fiscal 1965—which is what the amendment proposes—would still create too large a deficit and so create hazards that would overbalance any stimulative effect of the tax cut. It will require the selling of too many additional billions of bonds, not to create a serious loss in the dollar's purchasing power.

In writing the Republican views on the President's economic report to the Congress of January this year, my colleagues and I suggested that in order to make a tax cut meaningful and to really stimulate our economy's growth and to create more jobs we should hold the expenditure level to the level of fiscal 1963—the year ending last June 30—which then was estimated to be about $94 billion—still $13 billion more than fiscal year 1961. We suggested that this level of $94 billion be held not just for 1 year, but for 3 years. Then, indeed, economic growth would increase our tax revenues so that the budget would balance out in about 2 years.

Under the President's own theory the budget would not balance until 1967 or 1968. But this theory is predicated upon many questionable assumptions. Many economists and fiscal experts think 1972 is a more realistic estimate. Secretary of Treasury Dillon refused to estimate what the additional Federal debt would be by then—let alone its consequence on the purchasing power of the dollar.

It is clear that the President does not intend to exercise expenditure reductions. He has carefully hedged his words every time he mentions expenditures. He talks not in terms of dollars but in terms of essentiality. But the level of spending which he believes is essential turns out to be much more than what any other President believed necessary. It certainly turns out to be much more than our anticipated revenues. Indeed, Dr. Heller and his economic advisers have stated that as far as their new theory is concerned, a reduction in Federal expenditures would take away the desired impact of the tax reduction. These men believe this theory. But they will not publicly argue for it. Dr. Heller has been put under wraps for the time being. The President himself would not argue for it last Wednesday night. He left the impression that he, too, agreed with the Puritan ethic that we should not cut taxes unless we exercised expenditure reform. Yet he balks at the modest control which Republicans seek to place in the tax bill.

The President's actions, if not his words, demonstrate beyond doubt that he is advancing a new and untried fiscal theory for the United States, the theory of deficit financing, the theory of planned deficits. The President, with all his talk, has not submitted a revised budget to the Congress for this fiscal year. He is still asking for $108 billion in new authority to spend money, and he is putting all the pressure on Congress possible to get it. His budget estimate for the current year—$98.8 billion in spending with only $88.8 billion in revenues—remains unchanged.

The people surely remember how just a couple of weeks ago the President chastised the Congress, particularly the Republicans, although we can do nothing in this Congress without being able to persuade many Democrats of the wisdom of our point of view, for cutting the foreign aid bill a mere $300 million below the sizable $3.9 billion expenditure of last year.

Next week the President is forcing onto the floor of the House the costly area redevelopment bill, which the House rejected a couple of months ago as wasteful and ineffective in coping with the problem of unemployment. He is continuing to place pressure on the Congress to pass all of his expenditure requests. There is little question that the President intends to increase expenditures, not reduce them if permitted. He has bought the new planned deficit theory of Dr. Heller and his Council of Economic Advisers which claims that we must spend ourselves into prosperity by, in effect, printing more money. This is all the deficit financing proposal really means when it is

stripped of all its fancy economic terminology.

Why else does the President fight the very modest expenditure control that will be presented for consideration by the House next Tuesday and Wednesday? All that is asked is that expenditures for this year be held to $97 billion, instead of the $98.8 he says he will spend, and to $96 billion for the next year, instead of the $104 to $105 billion, which many of us are afraid he intends to try to spend.

I think the most difficult thing for the people of this country to understand, myself included, is why the President doesn't forthrightly argue for his new theory of deficit financing, if he really believes that it is for the benefit of our country. Then let us who disagree with him present our arguments as to why we believe that balanced budgets and lower expenditures and lower taxes are in the best interests of our country, as well as in line with our noble traditions. I believe our country became great through following the Puritan ethic, which is no more than saying that we should spend less than we take in so we can pass on greater assets to our children than we received from our forebearers. Let us debate the issue and out of this debate can come firm policy. But there can be no debate when the President shies away from supporting his theories.

We all want a tax cut. We badly need it. But, my fellow citizens, we must earn it. The process of expenditure control is not just cutting out wasteful programs, as the President said. This is really the easiest part of expenditure control. The tough part is when you get into the business of assigning priorities to good programs. It is tough for a person, particularly one in politics, to say "no" to a desirable program because we can't afford it and all the other desirable programs this year. We must have the courage and integrity to say: "Let's keep it on the list of desirable projects for the day when we have earned the right to have it, by paying for it ourselves." Perhaps if we start this business of self-discipline with our tax moneys, just as we all must exercise this discipline in running our families, we can be certain that the Government our children will be paying for will be their own Government, not part of ours.

Mr. Speaker, during the television broadcast, Congressman CURTIS referred to a memorandum from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services, addressed to assistant administrators, office directors, division directors, and staff officials. I think it would be helpful if this were included in the RECORD and under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1963.

To: Assistant Administrators, Office Directors, Division Directors, Staff Officials.

From: Paul W. McCann, Assistant Administrator, Industrial Analysis.

Subject: The Tax Reduction and Reform in 1963.

It is essential for sustaining an adequate economic growth in the United States that there be a reduction in personal income tax rates and corporate income tax rates this year. The House Ways and Means Committee has completed many months of careful review of the administration's proposal for tax reduction and tax reform. Customarily the House as a whole does not analyze and debate in detail such a conclusion of the committee. The most that the House does is accept, reject, or send back for further study. To send this bill back for further study would simply be a subterfuge for rejection. It is essential that this bill not be rejected either directly or surreptitiously. The reasons for acceptance of the bill were spelled out in several pages of the President's report to the Congress (January 1963), and may be summarized as being essential for the maintenance of a growth rate sufficient to permit positive growth of profits and to reduce U.S. unemployment.

A major reduction of Federal expenditures would almost eliminate the stimulus effects of the bill. Nothing would be gained except a significant reduction of defense and space expenditures; that is, at best, consumer expenditures would be substituted for most of our reduction of defense posture. Other major Government expenditures are either tied and provide very little scope for reduction, such as interest expenditure, or cannot be effectively separated from individual Congressman support, such as public works. It is evident that Congress will not reduce expenditures materially, and proposals to reconsider on these grounds means that such supporters do not want the economy stimulated.

The need to stimulate the U.S. economy is a lesson which can be learned now while there is still time to extend the present recovery or the Nation can go through one more unnecessary recession which will hurt business more than any other sector of the economy. If the gross national product does not grow rapidly, profits do not grow at all. This has been the unfortunate experience of the U.S. economy (in constant dollar terms) since 1958. It would be remarkable if the business community would want this condition continued indefinitely with the share of profits steadily falling. There is great urgency that the tax reduction be achieved now because the recovery is already 30 months long and very few recoveries have gone beyond 30 months under their own power. If Congress passes the tax reduction bill, the results will be to extend greatly the length of the recovery and to place the economy on a more rapid growth rate for some years to come. The personal income tax has a tendency to become increasingly progressive as real incomes per capita increase and as price levels increase. That is why this tax reduction is necessary at this time to correct the accumulated stagnating effect of the structure of U.S. taxes. Every business has a keen personal interest in maintaining a high rate of growth. The only way to be assured of sustained growth at this time is to have a reduction in tax rates now.

More Recent Comments on the Governors' Conference in Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, newspapers continue to print stories about the recent Governors' Conference in Miami and the many constructive things that were accomplished there. One such article recently appeared in the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the press:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, Aug. 3, 1963]

(By Vonda Bergman)

Republican Governors at the recent Governors' conference in Miami passed a resolution expressing appreciation to Senator PROUTY, Senator SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and Senator CURTIS, of Nebraska, for their efforts to increase minority staffing on Senate standing committees.

Last February Senator PROUTY opened a campaign seeking a Senate committee rules change to guarantee that 40 percent of both staff members and funds for hiring be assigned to the minority party. He said, at the time, Republicans, who compose over one-third of the Senate, are presently under a serious handicap in lack of committee staff for analyzing hearings, studying bills, and developing new concepts, etc.

Later in May, the Senator joined SCOTT and CURTIS in a further attempt to gain additional minority staff on committees.

The Republican Governors in their Miami resolution asked that three Governors be designated to meet with U.S. Senate and House Members to consider implementing more effective relationships between the Republicans in Congress and GOP heads of state.

The Urgent Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial, "The Urgent Need," from the Wall Street Journal, September 20, 1963.

This editorial points out the shoddy politics in connection with this bill as well as the irresponsibility of promising that our economic ills can be cured by a $10 billion tax cut and at the same time increased deficits by billions of dollars.

There is only one honest approach to the tax problem—tax cutting must be accompanied by a cut in spending. To do less is to mislead the American people and to inflict dangerous pressures on our economy, the soundness of the dollar, and the solvency of this Nation.

The editorial follows:

THE URGENT NEED

Hardly anyone, we would suppose, will disagree with President Kennedy's observations the other evening on the desirability—even the "urgent need"—of lowering the Nation's tax burden.

The weight of that burden is not only a senseless injustice to the people but, as the President said, is economically harmful in that it oppresses savings and investment, raises costs of production, narrows markets, and in general deprives the people of the resources to keep this country growing and healthy.

But there are a good many people, including ourselves, who do not think the burden of taxes can be separated from the burden of the Government's spending, since this is the sole cause of the tax burden. Therefore it is not possible to deal with the one and not the other. To pretend that the Government can reduce taxes without reducing the burden that causes them is to perpetuate a fraud upon the people.

Bernard Baruch put it aptly many years ago: "Whatever is done in one direction inspires some counterbalancing action by other parts of the economy. Many acts of Government intervention in the field of economics fail for just this reason: Because they are taken as isolated, piecemeal moves instead of being fitted into the whole economy."

In this instance, if the Government reduces taxes while it has a $9 billion deficit (or more) that $9 billion must be taken out of the hide of the economy in some other fashion. In practice the Government will simply print up 9 billion paper dollars. The resulting inflation will take back from the people the relief which the Government professes to give by lower tax rates.

Moreover, it is not true that every tax bill that offers lower rates is all to the good. Individual parts of the bill itself cannot be taken as isolated, piecemeal moves. And the whole of this particular tax bill is by no means an unqualified boon to the public weal.

For example, it is wrong to imply that every wage-earner and every businessman will find his taxes lower as a result of this bill. The effect of the changed rules on the particular situations of some people will be increased taxes. What is true is that something likes a million taxpayers will be removed from the Federal tax rolls entirely.

This, no doubt, is a political blessing for these million voters. But it is no boon for the country. First of all it is this total forgiveness of some taxes that accounts for the greater part of total revenue loss to the Government. More importantly, it means that some million or so citizens, reaping the benefits of Government, will contribute nothing toward its support. So they will hereafter be little concerned whether the cost of that Government be high or low. A worse example of irresponsible politics would be hard to find.

It is all these things—and not the desirability of lower taxes—that is at issue. And it is all these things—and not a whimsical desire to continue higher taxes—that impels the Republican Members of the House to link the tax bill to the achieving of curtailed spending. They would make tax cuts dependent upon next January's actual budget.

President Kennedy, let it be said, is not unmoved by these arguments. That is why he has now pledged a tighter rein on Federal expenditures, reducing his deficit estimate for the current year and promising to keep next year's deficit to a handful of billions instead of bucketfuls. He has even pledged a course leading eventually to a balanced budget.

We are not unmoved either by these welcome assurances. But unfortunately such Presidential pledges have themselves been devalued by inflation. President Truman and President Eisenhower both spoke of their devotion to fiscal responsibility; neither achieved it. Indeed, the grave threat to the dollar which now so harasses President Kennedy is largely a heritage of such broken pledges, both those of his predecessors and his own.

So if there is a certain cynicism in the Congress, that is understandable. And if there is an effort to forge some solid link between tax reduction and spending reduction, that is desirable. For the real cause of the country's economic problems, including the shameful plight of the U.S. dollar, is not just the years of high taxes but the wasted years of almost total economic irresponsibility.

Curing that—not piecemeal tinkering—is the Nation's truly urgent need.

Editorial Comment on the President's Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials. The first appeared in the September 20, 1963, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat and is entitled "Political Tax-Cut Plea" and the second is from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 19, 1963, and is entitled "Directly to the People":

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 20, 1963]

POLITICAL TAX-CUT PLEA

The President has made a glittering appeal, over the heads of Congress, for passage of his $11 billion tax reduction scheme. It was quite a show of political paternalism from the great White House father. Who doesn't hate taxes?

Nothing could be finer in the state of federalia than to dangle a mouth-watering tax cut before voters on the eve of a national campaign.

Mr. Kennedy may have been convinced of his arguments, but his speech was, from the standstill of economics, as phony as a $3 bill.

Any intelligent person, and he doesn't have to be an economist, will concede that Federal taxation is too high. It throttles incentive, has critically handicapped renewal and modernization of the Nation's industrial plant. It oppresses all of us individually.

The economic structure needs a slash in national taxes. But such a move, without corresponding cuts in Federal expenditure, or at least without a sure curb against increased Federal spending, is irrational, dangerous, and fiscally profligate.

It would mean new seas of red ink, which already have spread out of all reason. We now pay about $10 billion a year just for interest on the Federal debt.

It would mean that in addition to the $19 billion of public debt the Kennedy administration has already rolled up the last 3 years, the President's tax knifing, plus his plans for bigger spending, would add another $50 billion to the debt, according to the Republican minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee.

We are for tax cuts. Who isn't? But downward adjustment of wartime income levies should be welded to curtailed expenditures, an end to the prodigal spending conceits of the New Frontier.

Mr. Kennedy said: "We have placed an ever tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting our outlays * * * spending will be controlled and the deficit reduced."

Yet Mr. Kennedy and his administration have measures in Congress for public aid to education which would cost $2.5 billion in about 3 years; for "medicare," estimated to run $1.3 billion a year in new taxes; a mushroomed Area Redevelopment Agency budget of $650 million for "distressed" sectors, many of which don't need Washington handouts at all; for the useless, costly "Domestic Peace Corps."

The President made his tax plea on the eve of departure for a "nonpolitical" tour of some 12 States, where Interior Secretary Udall is pushing Federal power grid projects estimated at $2,548 million of national tax funds. Civilian employees of Washington Government are steadily increasing.

About the only Federal purlieu showing some effort at economizing is the Defense Department. There is room in Defense for squeezing out fat, but this is obviously the area of Government that needs maximum fiscal support more than any other.

Probably, as the President argues, a tax reduction can spur industrial expansion to provide more jobs; unemployment is indeed a critical problem. But what profit to workers or to the Nation, if new spending—piling debt on debt—inflates the dollar and robs the people of purchasing power?

There is no magic about Washington's big brother profligacy, in the name of social welfare. There is never a dollar spent by Government that doesn't come out of taxpayers' pocketbooks. If not paid by us, the dollars must be paid with egregious interest by our children and grandchildren—or the Nation plummets in a financial debacle.

Mr. Kennedy was right when he said "the Nation needs a tax cut now." It needed one in 1960, 1961, and 1962. Even before. But it is utterly foolhardy to make such reductions without halting the free-handed spend proclivities of the Washington establishment.

Federal fiscal policy cannot be evolved by rubbing an Aladdin's lamp with a gleaming eye on election returns.

The sooner the public becomes closely aware that you cannot get something for nothing—from the clan or any socialistic junta in Washington—the sounder our economy will become.

Let's have tax cuts, and "now." But they must be tied in fully with reduction, at least a hard ceiling, to bar Federal overspend manias.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19, 1963]

DIRECTLY TO THE PEOPLE

President Kennedy's television address Wednesday evening was a strong appeal, not only for passage of the tax reduction bill, but for rejection of efforts to saddle it with unwise restrictions on Federal expenditures. Both objectives are essential, we believe, to the Nation's economic health.

It is easy to denounce the fiscal immorality of reducing taxes without also reducing expenditures, but the urgent problem of increasing our economic growth rate cannot be solved by such a simple resort to slogans. Tax reduction is needed because all recent experience demonstrates that the present level of taxation acts as a brake on economic expansion at a certain stage of the business cycle.

Just as the built-in stabilizers of social security outlays, unemployment insurance, and the like cushion and retard excessive contraction of the economy in a recession, so the tax structure in every recent recovery period has damped down expansion well before the point of full employment was reached. Hence, the paradox of persistent unemployment and pockets of poverty in an affluent society—a paradox which must be delt with.

Passing the tax cut but hobbling fiscal policy with arbitrary limits on Government spending would be unwise for two reasons. It would disrupt the orderly operations of Government, and it would reduce the economic effectiveness of the tax cut.

Congress possesses full power to limit Federal expenditures by limiting the appropriation of funds; to appropriate the funds but then require the administration to stay within an overall spending limitation would require the meat-ax slashing of all programs, regardless of merit or their importance to vital national responsibilities. The time to balance the budget is after the tax cut has helped to expand the economy, thereby expanding the tax base. To attempt a balance prematurely would be to create purchasing power with one hand and deplete it with the other.

As President Kennedy emphasized, this does not mean adopting a policy of deliberate waste or profligacy. His indorsement of the statement of intent written into the tax bill by Representative MILLS commits him to an eventual budget balance and reduction of the public debt. But the goal must be a balanced budget in a balanced full-employment economy. To strive for the first without taking the necessary steps to establish the second is, as all our postwar experience proves, an exercise in futility; for unless the economy can be made to grow at a satisfactory rate, not even the best of intentions will balance the budget.

We applaud the President for going directly to the country in this fashion. He has left no doubt in anybody's mind that in his view the national welfare demands passage of the tax bill for economic health, as it demands ratification of the test ban treaty for the cause of peace. If the country agrees with him, as we believe it does, then the people should let Congress know how they feel.

Russian Defector Gives Witness to the Effectiveness of the Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of a Russian defector before the House Committee on Un-American Activities last week produced very heartening evidence of the effectiveness of the Voice of America. The account of the defector's appearance follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 19, 1963]

RUSSIAN SHIP JUMPER HAILS VOICE PROGRAMS

(By Robert K. Walsh)

A Russian seaman who defected to the United States told a House committee today he was influenced by Voice of America broadcasts and books about this country.

A resident of Washington for the last 3 months and an English-language student at Georgetown University, Vladislaw S. Tarasov related how he jumped from a Soviet tanker in a Calcutta harbor last November and swam to a nearby American ship to ask political asylum.

Testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in calm contrast to uproarious sessions last week on the Cuban visit of a U.S. youth group, the 25-year-old witness gave this basic reason for leaving Russia:

"In 1961 and 1962, I began to feel that in the U.S.S.R. I was only a grain of sand in a desert which at any moment could be blown anywhere by the wind of the dictatorial powers. All my life I had been dependent on the whims of other people.

"We had to defend and promote the bureaucratic directives and explain the party line to the masses. That meant we must lie out of fear of losing our means of livelihood and even physical freedom."

He said that during those years he had a chance to listen to some Voice of America broadcasts and read Russian translations of several books including works by Theodore Dreiser, Mark Twain, and Jack London.

"I came to understand that America is the leading country of the free world," he said. "I became convinced that people there really are equal under the law and that each person is able to build his own life without directives from above."

Committee members complimented him on his progress in learning English. He had to confer occasionally with an interpreter but seldom hesitated in answering questions.

Committee Chairman WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, said Mr. Tarasov was a good example to others in Communist-controlled countries. He said other Russians "would have no reason to worry about the reception they will get if they come to the free world; so long as they meet all proper screening requirements."

Mr. Tarasov told how he was held in custody by authorities in India after leaving the Soviet ship, but was released after a "thorough investigation and very democratic court proceedings."

He said the Russians accused him of having stolen money from the tanker but produced no witnesses or documents to back up the charge.

Mr. Tarasov said he was not a member of the Communist Party although he had to join a Communist youth organization to attend a nautical school to study electrical engineering. He added that he apparently was under suspicion for some time on Soviet ships because he once found a ship's political officer searching his room.

Has the Soviet Union Already Set Us Up for the Kill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how far has the Kennedy administration already committed us to the Russian point of view regarding disarmament? This is a question, it seems to me, that should be answered.

On the one hand we are told by the President that approval of the test ban treaty will not mean a lessening in our preparedness. Then we learn that approaches have already been made for high-level discussion with Khrushchev on additional steps to bring about disarmament. The President seeks joint United States and Soviet Union exploration of the moon, but makes no demands that Russian troops get out of Cuba.

Truly, the administration follows a strange and fearful course and seems undismayed that the Communist conspiracy grows in aggressiveness and the United States continues to suffer defeats in Laos, Vietnam, and other areas of the world from Communists. If the administration, of itself, cannot muster the courage nor the understanding to protect the security of the United States, then Congress can do no less than to arouse the American people to the danger of inaction.

In this spirit I would like to include two articles. One, a column by Dr. Robert Morris as a part of his regular feature, "Around the World," and second, an interview from U.S. News & World Report of September 30 with Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, an authority on Communist affairs, "Has Khrushchev Changed His Ways?"

The articles follow:

HERE WE GO AGAIN

(By Robert Morris)

The Soviet Union's invitation to President Kennedy to meet Premier Khrushchev in Moscow next year to negotiate a treaty "for general and complete disarmament" points up how fast we are now moving. This comes even before the "annex" of that agreement, the test ban treaty, has been ratified by the Senate.

This move also comes just after we have been assured that we will not disarm and after we have received specific assurances that we will test underground to the limit of the treaty, maintain an apparatus to test in the atmosphere, if necessary, and to maintain monitoring safeguards. Just watch those melt away as we go step by step toward what is euphemistically but erroneously called "disarmament."

Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada is performing his predicted role of speeding up the process. After the opening of debate at the General Assembly of the U.N. he said:

"The Secretary General in a recent speech has emphasized the advantage it would be 'if countries would in their national military planning make provision for suitable units which would be made available at short notice for U.N. service and thereby decrease the degree of improvisation necessary in an emergency.'

"My own country now maintains forces, trained and equipped for the purpose, which can be placed at the disposal of the United Nations on short notice anywhere in the world."

As the test ban treaty thus blends into the disarmament discussions, we are being treated to the spectacle of top military men, and now Senators, one after another, make the statement that the treaty contains military risks—serious risks—but that since the United States has committed itself on the world forum, a vote against the treaty would cause harm in the eyes of the nations of the world, yearning for peace. That was the conclusion of Gen. Curtis LeMay. It is the position of a number of Senators. The man responsible for 90 percent of the strategic striking force of the country, Gen. Thomas Power, goes further. He is flatly against the treaty. So is General Schriever who is responsible for most of our advanced weapons system. Even the so-called loss of face to the Nation cannot offset their professional and competent judgments.

But let us look how we got into this unenviable position in the first place. Averell Harriman went to Moscow in July to negotiate the treaty. After a series of spectacular but apparently unprofessional meetings, marked by our Mr. Harriman and Khrushchev embracing each other before the eyes of the world, we heard that a treaty was negotiated. No one knew what was in it except we did learn that the right of inspection, which our President had earlier insisted was indispensable, was quietly surrendered by us.

After it had been negotiated, we learned what was in it. It contained ambiguities and legal inconsistencies. The wording of the treaty forbidding "any other nuclear explosion" was directly opposite to the interpretation of the treaty sent to the Senate by Under Secretary George Ball, which did in fact allow for other explosions. Even the State Department admitted legal inadequacies in the wording.

But then other nations—more than 90 at this writing—began to sign, many on the basis that the United States had done so.

The fact of the matter is that the Senate is presented with an accomplished fact. The spirit of the Constitution is clearly thwarted. Here is what it says: article II, section 2, paragraph 2.

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Not only has the Constitution been vitiated but the pressure campaign waged on each Senator who had recognized the dangers, has been a trial run for the next round, the disarmament treaty.

Analyzed now, the disarmament treaty we have already offered, does not provide for disarmament at all. Walt W. Rostow, our Chief Policy Planner, has spelled it out for us. He has written, "It is, therefore an American interest to see an end of nationhood as it has been historically defind."

The valiant Senators who resisted the pressures this time should dig in and organize for the big one. There are at least two safeguards that they should insist upon—no negotiation at Moscow again and the advice and consent should be contemporaneous with the negotiation and the signing. Otherwise the lamentable performance of September 1963 will be repeated.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 30, 1963]

WITH TEST BAN TREATY HAS KHRUSHCHEV CHANGED HIS WAYS?

(Interview with Zbigniew Brzezinski, head of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University, an authority on Communist affairs)

Question. Dr. Brzezinski, with this new nuclear test ban treaty, do you think that Khrushchev now will be taking a softer line?

Answer. I am hopeful that the test ban agreement will somewhat stabilize the situation, and that the Soviets will commit themselves to a more pacific policy. But this doesn't happen overnight.

We ought to realize that the Soviet Union has a certain continuity of purpose, and certain long-range interests, and certain underlying assumptions which don't change from day to day. And they don't change suddenly as a result of the signature of any treaty.

Question. Does that mean they never change?

Answer. They change over a longer period of time, to be sure, just as everything changes in the world.

Yet we in this country keep going through these phases in which we talk first about the Soviets being revolutionary, then about "good old conservative Uncle Joe," then Uncle Joe becomes a tremendous menace in retrospect. Khrushchev was a good guy, then he was an adventurer in Cuba, now he's a good guy again.

I must say, to anyone who works professionally in this field, it's pretty discouraging to see these wild swings of public and press opinion in this country.

Question. Do you mean that this treaty won't bring with it a basic change in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union?

Answer. I think we ought to understand that the Soviet Union operates in long-range terms, that signing of the treaty involves a reassessment by the Soviets of the present world situation, and that this reassessment will have certain binding consequences for the next 3 or 4 years. But it does not represent a fundamental change in our relations.

I feel I ought to make it very clear that the Soviets think of the world as changing in terms of phases. There are revolutionary phases and there are quiescent phases.

Question. Are we now in a quiescent phase?

Answer. Yes, that's the Soviet assessment of the world scene, an assessment that imposes on them a certain broad strategy, that of peaceful coexistence.

Question. Why?

Answer. The crucial factor is the relative balance of power. If, in their judgment, that balance of power changes in their favor, that in itself would put us in a new phase, another revolutionary phase.

Changes come about like this: Khrushchev, I think, overestimated what he thought was a very effective—for him—balance of power last year. Ever since 1957, Khrushchev had felt that Soviet rockets, our overestimation of those rockets—the so-called missile gap—plus his effectiveness on the political-diplomatic front, would force us to yield.

In Cuba, he found that he had overextended himself, and he pulled back. Now, after that very painful reassessment, he's adopting this very different posture.

Question. Do you think the dispute with the Chinese was an important reason for the Russians' getting into this treaty?

Answer. No. I think that by far the most important reason was the confrontation in Cuba, which forced the Soviets to realize that their military power was inadequate to the tasks which Khrushchev has set before the Soviet Union.

But I should add that I think the Chinese business did play a minor part in Khrushchev's decision. I would argue that the conflict with the Chinese closed off an alternative course of action for Khrushchev. It kept him from choosing the policy of what is called the "national-liberation struggle"—that is, stirring up revolutionary struggles in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The reason he didn't do that is the row with the Chinese. The "national-liberation struggle" is what the Chinese emphasize, and to have adopted it would have been to subordinate himself to the Chinese.

Question. Do you mean that it would have meant accepting the Chinese version of the world?

Answer. That's right. And, for that strategy, the Chinese are a better model. In this sense, the Chinese problem enters into the test ban decision in a secondary way, but not as a factor of prime importance.

Question. Are the Chinese really more offensive minded than the Soviets?

Answer. Both are really offensive and revolutionary minded. At the present moment, the Soviets, because they've accepted the quiescent phase, are less revolutionary than the Chinese. But, on the other hand, only a year ago in Cuba, the Soviets proved themselves more adventurous than the Chinese. So I think that we should not accept unquestioningly the Soviet labeling of the Chinese as warmongers. I think the Chinese have been very cautious.

Question. In what way?

Answer. In their handling of the Quemoy-Matsu situation, and again in their attack on India. There, China showed a rather uniquely successful combination of military power subordinated to political ends and subject to very effective political control. And the Chinese were quite right in arguing that their way is far more sophisticated and less dangerous in the world sense than adventures of the sort the missiles in Cuba involved.

Question. Have we actually been swallowing a Soviet line about the Chinese being so bloodthirsty?

Answer. Yes, to an extent. The Soviets have been dishing that out and the Chinese have, in a sense, made it easier for them by adopting rather crude and bloodthirsty formulations in some of their public statements. And it's true that the U.S. public has, by and large, swallowed this Soviet line, which does not, in fact, correspond entirely to reality.

Question. Will Khrushchev use this quiescent phase to try to alter the military balance of power in his favor?

Answer. He may do several things all at the same time. He will probably hope that the knowledge gained in recent tests will improve the Soviet military posture. There's always the unknown factor of a technological breakthrough on either side. But, beyond that, since he does not seem to be undertaking a crash program of military development, he may hope that diplomatic and political opportunities will open up, particularly in Europe, which would create new advantages for the Soviet Union.

Question. What, specifically, does he want to accomplish?

Answer. I think the danger is that Khrushchev is trying to maneuver us into guaranteeing the division of Europe, into recognizing Soviet hegemony east of the Elbe. He wants to maneuver us into more or less overtly favoring this division, thereby alienating our Western European allies.

IF THE WEST RELAXES

Question. Speaking of Western Europe, is there now likely to be a military letdown on the part of our allies?

Answer. I think if the Soviets could achieve a relative weakening of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) defense forces, or of the American commitment to the defense of Europe, particularly because of European-American tension, they would be happy. But, by and large, what bothers me so much about our attitude toward European problems is our failure to understand that the defense problem is no longer the primary problem.

Question. If it isn't defense, what is it?

Answer. There isn't any likelihood in the foreseeable future of the Soviet Union's launching an attack on Western Europe. The Soviets realize that such an attack would be tantamount to signing their own death warrant. Consequently, no one in Western Europe is preoccupied with that problem anymore. But Europeans are preoccupied with their future political relationships with us and with the Russians. And here the United States, since the middle of the 1950's, has had nothing to offer.

Question. Is that what accounts for General de Gaulle's attitude in France?

Answer. I think De Gaulle is slowly and in a deceptive fashion—and you might remember he has said that deception is the art of leadership—moving in the direction of becoming the exponent of the new European policy. His very vague and misleading slogan of "Europe to the Urals" is not yet a policy, but at least it's a guideline indicating where Europe might head in the future. And he has suggested that America now is, in effect, a copartner with the Soviet Union in the division of Europe and that, at some future point, Europe—under De Gaulle's leadership, of course—will have to move forward with proposals of its own.

Question. Do you think De Gaulle really believes he can bring Khrushchev into a European community—in effect, to change sides?

Answer. I think what De Gaulle has in mind is a very long-range historical process. In it, the Soviets, being repulsed by the Chinese, would have no choice but to become associated with Western Europe—they and the East Europeans, both.

Much would depend, of course, on the policy of the United States. If we would seem to be joining the Russians in defending the partition of Europe, that would create opportunities for the Russians to exploit Western European frustration with us.

Question. In this quiescent phase, is it necessary for the United States to maintain its military superiority over the Soviets?

Answer. Yes. I think it follows that, in the nuclear age, the defensive power on the world scene has to be stronger than the offensive one simply because the defender has to be able to absorb the first blow, and then respond.

In the past, in terms of military strategy, the defender could be weaker, because the cost of an offensive in casualties tended to be higher for the attacker than for the defender.

Question. There's no question that the Soviets remain in an offensive role?

Answer. If we look at some of the recent confrontations between the United States and the Soviet Union, such as Berlin, Cuba and, indirectly, Laos, none of them was a matter of the expansion of our sphere of influence. It's the other way around. And, after all, it was less than a year ago that the Soviets forced us to the brink of war, "eyeball to eyeball."

Question. Would you expect that Khrushchev would now shy away from foreign adventures of the Cuba type?

Answer. Yes, I would be inclined to think that the Soviets will avoid a direct con-

frontation with the United States. But this does not mean that, if a favorable revolutionary situation arises—be it in British Guiana, elsewhere in Latin America, Africa—that the Soviets would not exploit it. They would—and they are exploiting such situations right now.

KHRUSHCHEV'S ERRORS

Question. Do you believe it's true that Khrushchev is the best Soviet leader from our standpoint, that we should go along with him because any successor is sure to be worse?

Answer. I think there are some things we should be grateful to Khrushchev for. We ought to be grateful for his mishandling of his relationship with the Chinese. We should be grateful to him for very effectively weakening Soviet control over Eastern Europe. We should be grateful for his introducing disarray into international communism by a lot of quite bumptious and sudden initiatives.

More seriously, though, I think it's very dangerous to conduct a foreign policy on the assumption that you have to help your opponent, especially since we know very little about internal politics among the Kremlin leaders. If there were open debate there, it might be different.

Also, I have never personally subscribed to the idea that, in recent years, there was a Stalinist alternative to Khrushchev. By and large, his policies have been endorsed by the party apparatus, and are favored by those most likely to succeed him.

I Was Castro's Prisoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a very interesting review of the book "I Was Castro's Prisoner" by John Martino. Because of our deep concern over Cuba, I believe there is much we can gain from the experiences of this American businessman who was Castro's prisoner for 3 years. The review of Martino's book was written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, who is a longtime student and expert in United States-Latin American relations.

The review is as follows:

A REVIEW OF "I WAS CASTRO'S PRISONER"

(By Fred A. Orleans)

A most interesting and enlightening book has recently come to the attention of this writer. "I Was Castro's Prisoner," by John Martino strips Communist Cuba of all pretension, all propaganda, all conjecture, and speculation and lays it exposed for all to see.

Mr. Martino, an ordinary American like you or I, boarded a plane for a business trip to Cuba in July 1959. Castro's terrorist G-2 men arrested John Martino, and although they had arrested the wrong man under false charges John Martino stayed in the hell of Cuban prisons for more than 3 years, ill most of the time and near death on many occasions. Completely frustrated by lack of any help whatsoever from the American Embassy (diplomatic relations were still maintained between the United States and Cuba at the time), he tried with the help of Cuban friends and legal aid to save himself. At one time he actually was on American soil in the American Embassay and a freeman, but through an appeal to his patriotism and a promise of his release being arranged within 48 hours he returned to a Communist jail for more than 3 additional years.

John Martino's almost photographic memory brings us an eyewitness account of Castro's Cuba from a man who was there. Space does not permit more than a few references to pertinent sections of this book, and I concur with Hon. Spruille Braden who stated: "This book is absorbingly interesting, but what is more important, it should be read by every citizen, not only of this country, but of the hemisphere."

Speaking of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, Martino indicated that shortly before the invasion broke, one of the key leaders of the underground slipped out of Cuba and arrived in New York with an ambitious program for massive sabotage to cripple Cuban power and transportation. He was given two tons of plastic explosives to carry this out and told to return to Cuba. Despite the vital importance of timing this wave of sabotage for the eve of invasion, he was not told when D-Day would be. Accordingly, he was still in Miami with his explosives when the Cuban volunteers hit the beaches of Playa Giron.

In a discussion with a hard-core Communist, Martino was told; "If Fidel would only listen to the Party, we wouldn't have this economic trouble. We would be friendly with the United States and the Americans would be buying our sugar." On being questioned by Martino as to whether the Communist Party could have taken over Cuba without any trouble from the United States, the Communist replied, "Yes, because you Americans are incredibly naive. We would have had to call ourselves nationalists or neutralists for a while. But words hurt nobody. Our people in the United States and their dupes would not only have proclaimed Castro is not a Communist, they would have urged massive aid to our regime to prevent Cuba from falling into the hands of the 'real Communists.' Our real object is to take what you in the West have. We are not going to give it to the masses, the imbeciles, and dupes. We, the cadres, intend to be the ruling class. Don't think for a moment that I have anything against air-conditioned cars, good wines and expensive women. But we have to put a different show on the road."

Martino injected that Communists can't deliver and that we in the free world produce abundance and the Soviet world produces hunger and people are waking up. To which the Communist replied: "They never really wake up. I have lived in America and you Americans amaze me. We are going to take you over because of the nature of your system and its weaknesses. We use civil rights and freedom of speech, that you give us, in order to destroy you. We manipulate the misguided people—and above all the misguided intellectulals—who have vague desires to do good or to seem important, but who never have the brains to ask themselves where they are going."

For the many who claim that the Cuban people are still the same as before the Castro takeover and are unchanged, Martino's description of one of many executions that he witnessed reveals to the reader with startling clarity how communism in a few short years has corrupted a people:

"Around 9:30 the firing squad came in. An hour later, the jeep arrived with the first victim. The firing squads were busy until after midnight. Every 5 minutes, they would lash a man to the wall; we would hear the commands being shouted to the firing squad, the discharge of rifles, then the fateful thud of the .45 caliber bullets smashing the victim's brain. We could hear the spectators on the roof, laughing, shouting, jeering, cursing the doomed man. I asked myself: What has Cuba come to? Who are these people out there in the dark? They seemed to me demonic creatures unlike the gentle and gay Cubans I knew. As a boy, I used to read about Roman mobs, watching Christians being torn apart by wild animals and I wondered whether we had really made any progress since that time."

After you have read this book and have given thought to recent news items, as the U.S. Air Force standing idly by and watching Cuban Communists kidnaping men, women, and children from a British island in the Bahamas and like occurences, you will know why the United States has lost respect throughout Latin America. You will know why the Alliance for Progress and no other program set forth by the United States can possibly succeed until we take the time to deal with the cancerous growth of communism in the Western Hemisphere. You will know why the leading countries of the hemisphere are afraid to take a strong stand against Communist Cuba and for the United States, when they do not know whether the United States will support them or leave them alone to withstand the assault of the Cuban Communists, strengthened and backed by Mother Russia.

After reading the text of a telegram sent to President Kennedy by Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo, former chairman of the U.N. Security Council, as printed in the August 17, 1963 issue of the Cuban Information Service, all thinking Americans can wonder where our country is going. The text of the telegram is as follows:

"Since Your Excellency has declared on numerous occasions that your administration would not tolerate that the Cuban people be treated by the Russians as they treated the Hungarians, I must assume the responsibility of notifying you that in the caves of Mercedes Estate, Matanzas Province, 200 Cubans who had sought refuge there, including women and children, were murdered with lethal gas. The Cuban militia was ordered to do so by Russian officers. Since it was my tragic duty at the time to denounce the barbarian reprisals in Hungary before the United Nations, I can now inform you that at that time they did not use gas. All America awaits your decision. If these violations of international law are tolerated, all faith will be lost in the effectiveness of the United States to keep our countries free from the claws of international communism."

To those who continually state "it can't happen here," it can be accurately indicated that it is happening all about us and unless something is done now, it will be happening here, very, very soon.

Belated Recognition for Patriot of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it was truthfully said in Gray's Elegy that "many a flower is born to blush unseen to waste its sweetness on the desert air," and by Shakespeare that "the evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones." The case of David Kiyo Enomoto came close to this, and points to the need for early recognition of the great deeds of our fellow men. Immediately after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, David

Kiyo Enomoto, a ham radio operator, living on the island of Maui, Hawaii, completely disappeared. He was not seen or heard from for 15 months. Rumors were rampant that Mr. Enomoto, being of Japanese ancestry, was charged with aiding the enemy by use of his radio set and either jailed or secretly executed. The cloak-and-dagger atmosphere which surrounded his disappearance placed him and his family under grave suspicion and distrust among his fellow Americans. His sudden reappearance after a 15-month period with full freedom to move about as he pleased did not serve to remove a cloud which appeared to hang over his reputation.

After nearly 22 years the U.S. Navy has finally cleared the air and removed all clouds by honoring David Kiyo Enomoto as a patriot and hero of World War II. During the 15 months of his disappearance, Mr. Enomoto had secretly operated his own high-powered amateur radio transmitter and receiver set to enable the Navy contingent at Puunene, Maui, to maintain communications with Pearl Harbor and the outside world. For this contribution, Mr. Enomoto was recently awarded the honorary naval communicator's certificate. Belated as the award has been, the Navy is to be commended for recognizing a patriot whose deeds would otherwise have gone unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the Congress to the following article which appeared in Naval Communications Bulletin No. 73 of 1963:

MR. ENOMOTO HONORED FOR VITAL WARTIME WORK

David Kiyo Enomoto, of Kahului, Maui, Hawaii, ham radio operator, patriot, and good citizen, has received Navy recognition for unusual service to his country nearly 22 years ago, in the critical early days of World War II.

After the Pearl Harbor attack, Mr. Enomoto operated his own high-powered amateur radio transmitter and receiver to enable Naval Air Station Puunene, on Maui, to communicate with Pearl, the U.S. west coast, Corregidor, and the Far East. He reestablished radio contact between Puunene and the outside world, staying on the job for 15 months before the Navy and Army set up adequate communications on the island.

Mr. Enomoto's vital contribution to the war effort was shrouded in secrecy at the time, and remained unpublicized until it was recently brought to the attention of the Chief of Naval Opertaions and the Office of Naval Communications.

On July 10, Maui's "No. 1 ham," with approximately 100 friends and relatives in attendance, received a certificate designating him an Honorary Naval Communicator, and an accompanying letter of citation signed by Rear Adm. B. F. Roeder, U.S. Navy, director, naval communications. The presentation was made by Capt. G. T. Ferguson, U.S. Navy, chief of staff, 14th naval district.

After calling attention to Mr. Enomoto's volunteer wartime work, Admiral Roeder's letter continued, in part: "Since those dark days you have continued to serve your country by being an exemplary citizen, an active participant in the civic activities of your community and by public service through amateur radio.

"Your use of your amateur radio privileges in the public interest is in the highest traditions of the amateur radio fraternity and is in keeping with the acts of patriotism and humanity that have become legion with you and your associated hobbyists."

The President's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives will take up what the President has aptly described as the most important piece of legislation to come before the Congress for a decade.

In Friday's issue of the Washington Post, there appears an excellent editorial congratulating the President for his cogent statement in urging approval of the tax bill, which is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress.

I include it at this point in my remarks:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT'S PLEA

The President's appeal for passage of the tax cut bill was so forceful, so complete, so unreserved that it is difficult to think of a single argument that might have been made for it that he did not make. Given the economic purposes of the administration, the President's arguments are simply unanswerable. They are, in fact, so persuasive that it is remarkable that he had to make them at all. It really is quite astonishing that there is now or has been formidable opposition to an immediate, substantial reduction in taxes.

The essence of the President's argument is simply his direct and uncontradicted and uncontradictable assertion that existing tax rates "do not leave enough money in private hands to keep this country's economy growing and healthy."

One can only view with astonishment some of the opponents to the present cut, who, on previous occasions without number and who, as a matter of general philosophy and political principle always have argued that income taxes are too high. The sentiment in Congress, and the sentiment in the country ought to be overwhelmingly for this bill.

The President rightly reproached those who favor a tax cut "but," "if," "as," and "when" some other measures are added to it. Let the other measures, including those to limit the debt and cut spending, come before the Congress and the country on their own merits. They should be disentangled from the issues raised by a tax cut. Speaker McCORMACK rightly pleads for outright opposition to the tax cut, rather than attempts to defeat it by the backdoor.

A prime minister in a parliamentary regime would not often have to make such a plea as the President voiced Thursday. If he did make it, the forthcoming vote would either put his program into effect or put his government and his party out of office. Our system has other virtues that certainly overwhelmingly recommend it to us. But occasionally, on an issue such as this, a system that more plainly confronted Congress with alternative courses would have its advantages. This tax bill is so central to the purposes of this Government, so essential in the larger economic plans of this administration, so large a part of the total design of this regime, that those who would defeat it ought to be required to present an alternative plan and operate an alternative government.

In a crisis of this kind, and in a debate of this character, our congressional system prevents this sort of clear and surgical choice between one course and another. At least, the President's appeal has helped to make things a little clearer. It is plain enough that the tax cut bill is indeed one of the most important measures before this Congress. Its defeat would be fatal to most of the economic objectives of the Government.

Time To Reassess Our Relationship to U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the United Nations begins another year, we should, in the self-interest of the United States, reexamine our relationship to the world organization. Is our continued membership in the best interest of the United States? Are we helping the free world by continuing to pay the biggest part of the upkeep of the organization while we are out voted by Communist nations and those dominated by the Soviet Union?

At least, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me to be in order to investigate our participation before making additional commitments of money and prestige which may be leading to our own defeat in a final showdown with the Communist conspiracy.

The U.S. News & World Report of September 30 contains an enlightening article on the opening of the new session of the U.N. and its many problems. I include it here in the hope it will arouse some interest among my colleagues and the American people in demanding a reevaluation of our membership:

NEW PROBLEMS, LITTLE MONEY AS U.N. MEETS

(NOTE.—Another year begins for the United Nations, and—it is a financial crisis within the U.N. itself that is stirring real worry—back of all the speeches on colonialism, Red China, disarmament and other problems of the world. The U.N. is deeply in the red. New debts are piling up. Ahead is a showdown over the question: Who will pay the bills?)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Money, again, is turning up as the biggest problem of all for the United Nations as the General Assembly opens for the eighteenth year.

This organization is moving closer to a financial showdown every day.

Its peacekeeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East are adding to unpaid bills that are expected to reach $140 million by yearend.

This sum is in addition to $150 million in costs paid for by the sale of U.N. bonds to member nations—mainly the United States.

PAY UP OR ELSE?

Many nations, among them the Soviet Union and France, are refusing to pay assessments for peacekeeping operations. In the case of Russia and some of its satellites, the question soon will arise as to whether their arrears will cause them to lose their votes in the General Assembly.

Into the foreground of this General Assembly is coming a wide variety of other troubles—old and new.

Disarmament is to be talked about again as a result of the nuclear test ban treaty recently signed by the Soviet Union and the United States.

The question of Red China's admission to the U.N. is on the agenda.

Black African nations, now a powerful bloc in the Assembly, are giving notice that they will ask the U.N. to expel or impose economic sanctions against white-ruled South Africa.

Similar penalties against Portugal also are to be asked for its refusal to promote independence for its African territories of Angola and Mozambique.

This Assembly also is to take up complaints by primarily Buddhist nations charging religious persecution of the Buddhist sect in South Vietnam.

In the spotlight, too, were speeches by President Kennedy and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko during the first week of this year's Assembly meeting.

Yet it is the financial question that hangs over everything else as this session gets underway.

THE COSTLY CONGO

The United Nations Secretary General, U Thant, has recommended an end by December 31 to U.N. military operations in the Congo unless some way is found to finance those operations.

"Peace keeping" in the Congo has cost the U.N. hundreds of millions of dollars since the Congo became independent in 1960.

At present, the U.N. military force there comes to 5,500 men—at an estimated cost of more than $3 million a month to the United Nations.

Most observers are predicting that a U.N. withdrawal in the near future probably would mean trouble, perhaps chaos in the Congo. So far it has been U.N. troops that have enabled the government of Premier Cyrille Adoula to establish and maintain its rule over the countryside.

Secretary General Thant is telling U.S. officials and others that there will be trouble in the Congo whenever the U.N. force is pulled out, and that the step might as well be taken now.

Real reason, however, is said to be worry over the prospect of the United Nations going bankrupt if it remains in the Congo much longer.

WHO OWES WHAT?

Right now, the United Nations is about $102 million in arrears on payment of outstanding bills for its Congo operations. This is mainly because Communist-bloc nations and a few others have refused to pay assessments levied to pay costs in the Congo.

The Soviet Union and its satellites are in arrears to the extent of $43.3 million. France owes $16 million, Belgium $3.3 million.

Altogether, 43 member nations still have not paid their share of the 1960 costs of the Congo operations—let alone the costs in subsequent years.

The same situation, on a smaller scale, prevails in the United Nations' other "peacekeeping" operation, this one in the Gaza Strip between Israel and Egypt.

For this operation the Soviet Union owes $18 million. Arab nations and the Communist bloc account for most of the 26 nations who still owe on assessments for 1957 and subsequent years on a program that is costing the U.N. about $19 million a year.

THE U.S. ROLE

In the past, it has been the United States that has kept alive the "peacekeeping" operations in the Congo and Gaza Strip.

The U.S. contribution to those ventures comes to more than 40 percent of their total costs over the years. In addition, the United States has purchased about $75 million worth of the U.N. bonds, or 50 percent of the total that the world body was able to sell to its member nations.

Even now, American officials are said to be urging the Secretary General to maintain a reduced force of perhaps 3,000 men in the Congo. But getting other nations in the General Assembly to go along with this proposal—to the extent of sharing in the costs—may prove difficult.

Just how long the United Nations can stall off a financial crisis is a question being widely debated.

It is pointed out that the principal creditors of the world organizations are nations least likely to push it over the brink of bankruptcy for forcing repayment.

These include the United States and such nations as Denmark, India, Nigeria, and others contributing troops to operations in the Congo and the Gaza strip.

Even so, there is growing feeling that some kind of showdown lies ahead, perhaps in the current session of the General Assembly.

NO PAY, NO VOTE?

Reason for the worry about a showdown lies in article 19 of the U.N. Charter, which provides that any nation whose indebtedness to the United Nations exceeds the sum of 2 years of its dues shall lose its vote in the General Assembly.

The Assembly last year voted to accept a ruling of the International Court that special peace keeping levies could be considered part of a nation's contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations.

As of December 31, the Soviet Union and five other Communist member nations will be over their limit of indebtedness, and subject to loss of their votes in the Assembly.

If that should happen, the Soviet Union would retain its seat—and veto power—in the Security Council. But the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland would be stripped of any effective voting power.

Most of the smaller nations and neutralists are hoping that the General Assembly winds up before the end of the year, thus putting off the whole issue until September 1964. By that time, they say, the Communists may pay their bills.

WHAT "HAVE NOTS" WANT

In this situation, the votes of "have not" nations in the General Assembly are to play a bigger role than ever before.

At this session 111 nations are represented. Africa alone has 32 members. Many are small, consisting of little more than tribal areas.

Each of these African members, however, has a vote equal to that of the United States, which has been underwriting United Nations costs in the Congo and elsewhere.

Asia has 22 votes in the General Assembly, and Latin America has 20.

Over all, these nations, most of them underdeveloped and with few democratic traditions, account for two-thirds of the votes in the General Assembly. These countries, at this session, are expected to press for expansion of U.N. activities—especially in economic assistance—at greater cost to the world organization.

Until now, it has been the United States, with help from Britain and a few others, that has enabled the U.N. to meet its growing bills.

With Congress showing more reluctance to put up money, that period appears past. Now the U.N. is having to look for new answers to its money squeeze.

The School Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, only the most determined efforts can overcome the school dropout problem. Local and State officials have long been aware that the numbers of dropouts are growing and that special efforts must be made to persuade the young student to return to his studies. At the Federal level, President Kennedy and the Department of Labor have taken direct action to help communities step up their programs to develop talents that otherwise might be lost.

Several communities in New Jersey are now using Federal assistance for programs of immediate usefulness in our national campaign against the dropout. I have been very impressed with the variety of uses to which the program has been put in my home State, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several newspaper articles that give the facts on such programs in several parts of the State. It seems to me that the response in New Jersey indicates a keen awareness of the problem and a determined and far-sighted determination to do something about it.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newark Sunday News, Aug. 18, 1963]

VOCATIONAL TRAINING CAN AID THE DROPOUT

(By Robert F. Palmer)

New Jersey's soaring public school enrollment will reach an estimated 1,210,000 when schools reopen next month, an increase of about 50,000 over last year. The prospect is enough to send shivers down superintendents' spines as they ponder ways of getting more seats and more teachers.

But, there's another aspect of the situation that is giving them special concern. This involves the plight of the pupils who, even though they have not completed their schooling, won't be coming back.

The State department of education estimates that during this summer 5,200 boys and girls will decide not to return to the classroom. The number is about 400 more than the 4,791 who dropped out of school in the summer of 1962. What's more, an additional 13,000 can be expected to drop out during the coming school year.

The dropout statistics, along with expectations of a continued high rate, have given the educators a new determination that changes must be made. For a long time now, they have been advocating smaller classes, more guidance counselors, more experimental programs and specialized teaching, particularly in urban centers where the dropouts are heaviest and the results of technological changes and migration have had the greatest impact. Yet, the gap between recommendations and implementations remains as great as ever.

Both State school officials and the superintendents in the local districts are mindful of the growing social problems resulting from uneducated, untrained youth. They are aware that today's employers are demanding that young people be educated and trained before applying for a job. They recognize the spurt of county vocational programs and the increased favor with which the Federal Government and the public look upon vocational schools. They know that the so-called noncollege preparatory youngsters constitute two-thirds of the State's public school population and education for them must be stepped up.

The schoolmen appear ready to act on new programs, even if it means a shakeup of traditional methods, even if it means revising subject matter drastically, and even if it means making more pleas than they

usually like to make for the money and space required.

Many new projects are being planned this fall, including personal interviews of dropouts, more evening high schools, more special tutoring projects, more inservice courses for teachers, and more expanded opportunities programs.

The New Jersey School Superintendents Association has appointed a committee of its members to explore the development of a new curriculum that might prevent dropouts. The committee, headed by Dr. Edward K. Chace, Bridgeton superintendent, is preparing a report for the superintendents' annual convention this fall and its recommendations are eagerly awaited by schoolmen throughout the State.

Preliminary discussions of the Chace committee have shown a need for a special program for the slow and reluctant learners, taught by specially trained teachers who really enjoy working with such young people and containing meaningful subject matter that is not a diluted academic course. Also, the committee has found, there could be greater emphasis on reading instruction in the junior high grades, using new books that would be written on the reading level of the slow learner; grading could be more on effort and achievement and less on a normal curve; and there might be more job training in the school and on the job.

Dr. William S. Twichell, Essex County superintendent of schools and a member of the State superintendents' committee, feels there is a compelling need for vast expansion of school services for urban children. He says besides smaller classes and more guidance workers, there should be more offerings in music, art, industrial art, and home economics on the upper elementary level as well as in the secondary schools, all of which would afford greater opportunity for urban youngsters to develop latent talents and to acquire a more intense interest in school.

Dr. Twichell also believes more high schools should develop programs in the junior year in which the pupils spend the morning in class and the afternoon working in stores, shopping centers and other commercial and business establishments getting firsthand experience and developing interest in jobs they may go into.

The majority of schoolmen in the State, including Dr. Chace and Dr. Twichell, cling to the belief that the changes seen needed can be carried out within the framework of the comprehensive high school and that separate academic and commercial schools are not the answer.

This was the conclusion reached by a study committee of Newark schoolmen which reported to the Newark Board of Education in June. The committee found there was a great need for specialized occupational programs, experiments with work-study programs, more courses in practical arts—all in the comprehensive school setting.

Dr. Leo P. Litzky, chairman of the committee, long has advocated more experimentation to find ways of reaching the potential dropouts early and giving them individualized attention. As it is, he feels, too many city youngsters are not motivated to go to school and lack a desire to prepare for a job. This, he says, is part of a problem that reaches well beyond the schools and into racial inequalities in employment and housing. Nevertheless, he adds, school motivation can be improved, and one way would be to pay pupils for jobs in and around the school buildings and in the community, with the funds coming from the Federal Government.

The need for Federal funds also was cited by Newark Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio when he told the city school board last month that a vastly improved education program should be established, geared principally to culturally and economically deprived youth.

Federal funds have served to spur the expansion in recent years of county vocational school programs in New Jersey. Vocational boards now are established in 15 of the 21 counties. In the last 4 years, programs have been created in Cape May, Salem, Warren, Sussex, Union, Somerset, and Ocean Counties. Burlington will open a program this fall. Many of the existing programs will be expanded.

A growing number of special courses are being conducted in the Essex County Vocational and Technical Schools with Federal financial support to equip unemployed with job skills. Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, classes for jobless heads of families have been established in machine operation, drafting, auto mechanics cylindrical grinding and automatic screw operation. Under the same act, classes for unemployed youth were set up for waiters and waitresses, clerk typists, and ward attendants. Also, plans are underway to establish an experimental occupational school with Manpower Development and Training Act funds.

In all its courses, the Essex vocational system is making a stepped-up effort to prepare youth particularly for jobs where the demand for workers is known to be heavy. These fields include electronic, tool and die making, refrigeration and heating, drafting, and auto mechanics. This Essex concentration and the growth of the vocational and technical schools in other counties in the State is a reflection of the increasing concern by officials on all levels of government to cut into unempolyment by giving more persons skills to fit the jobs available.

But, with all the vocational expansion and attention, Dr. Albert E. Jochen, assistant State education commissioner in charge of vocational education, is far from happy. Most of the expansion has been in rented, substandard facilities, he points out.

"New Jersey still does not support vocational education," Dr. Jochen contends. "We're at least 20 years behind the times. This year the State gave $442,000 and the Federal Government somewhat more than $1 million. That's only a drop in the bucket. We need $12 million a year for the next 10 years for capital construction and programs."

Among the curriculum changes Dr. Jochen sees needed in the vocational schools are an expansion of the program to the 13th and 14th years with emphasis on technical training, more experimental programs, and better training of teachers for the vocational schools. The general high schools, he says, should expand and update their vocational programs and offer more job preparation and less academic courses.

Simeon F. Moss, special assistant in the State labor department and coordinator of the federally sponsored Newark Youth Career Development Center, agrees there is too much unrealistic academic orientation in school programs now being offered youngsters heading from school to job.

Mr. Moss says the first year's operation of the youth center has produced much important data on identifying the problem of school dropouts and unemployment, but has made little headway on upgrading youth and placing them in jobs.

"There hasn't been much progress made in revising school programs to keep youth in school longer and there hasn't been much cooperation from labor unions and employers," he says. "Education is the most important thing. For example, Newark could establish special programs for the youth migrating to the city. If we had 2,000 jobs thrown at us, we couldn't find that many qualified youths to fill them."

[From the Trenton, Sunday, Times-Advertiser, Aug. 18, 1963]

TRENTON GOES AFTER DROPOUTS: INTENSIVE NEW PROGRAM LAUNCHED

Trenton Central High School may win back 63 of its 230 dropouts from last term.

Staffers, under a new program, will talk it out this week with the ex-pupils who have expressed new interest in a high school diploma.

At the same time, it was announced this weekend that a beefed up effort will be made to seek out jobs for all youths who can use pocket money and a feeling of accomplishment.

City Superintendent of Schools Richard T. Beck estimated 3,000 youths ought to have employment in Trenton. It was pointed out Lawrence Township high school students are also the responsibility of the city district.

WHAT WENT WRONG?

Dr. Roland H. Daniels, administrative assistant permanently assigned to attack the dropout problem, said interviewers will meet with the 63 promising returnees to determine what went wrong last year and how they can be fitted back into the high school program.

These meetings start tomorrow. Schools open in less than three weeks.

Daniels revealed that Trenton's dropouts last term reached 6.7 percent of the student body, while around the State the percentage was only 1.5.

The plan of help for dropouts moves ahead tomorrow as the result of a Thursday session at the high school, where the 63 indicated an interest by responding to a mailing of 200 invitations from Daniels to come back for a conference on the whole matter.

Seven more phoned to say they couldn't make it Thursday but want a chance to talk about returning to classes this fall.

TO SEEK JOBS

Daniels said September has been set aside to seek out those who were in classes the last day of last term but don't show up in either 10th, 11th, or 12th grades this year.

Meanwhile city school officials and City Councilman Carmen Armenti, who is working on the dropout program with the State department of labor and industry, announced that jobs are to be sought for youths through the expanded Youth Employment Service (YES) of the Mercer Street Friends Center, 151 Mercer Street.

Dr. Beck and Armenti emphasized these will be new jobs and that the youths will not compete with adults for work.

"Every industry, in fact, every resident, can be considered a potential employer," Beck said. Mrs. Barbara Weintraub, executive director of YES, listed the types of jobs as:

Yard cleaning, babysitting, helping a homemaker for an hour or two, typing, running errands helping a business house with the mail or by filling in during busy periods.

Also sorting stock or cleaning up a store, light restaurant work, helping skilled employees in industry or helping around a farm at planting and harvesting times.

Mrs. Weintraub said the staff of the center—which is a Delaware Valley United Fund Agency—will screen all applicants for job openings.

SUPPORT URGED

And Beck expressed the hope that community organizations as well as industries would swing behind the program that Trenton educators have been developing all summer.

During a Friday morning meeting with Raymond A. Male, State commissioner of labor and industry, it was reported that, subject to a vote of the membership, the Trenton Junior Chamber of Commerce would be an early supporter of the program.

The Soroptimist Club already supports the YES program, Mrs. Weintraub noted.

Daniels said that 369 students left high school classes here last year but that 231 of these—121 boys and 110 girls—are considered "true dropouts" plagued by a lack of interest, poor attendance woes that grew as the term went on, disciplinary action, and by the temptation of jobs.

Daniels said the nearly 50–50 balance between boy and girl dropouts is unusual. Elsewhere, boys outnumber girls three to one, he said.

William Kastar, vice principal at the high school, said that during the individual interviews starting tomorrow morning, staffers will delve into each dropout's background, learn what he liked or didn't like about school, determine how to meet his needs and learn his goal.

"These youths will help us develop courses to serve Trenton pupils as much as we hope we can help them get through school," Kostar commented.

START NOW

Both Daniels and Mrs. Alice Kuser, board of education personnel director, agreed that the way to meet the needs of these youths is to start right away. "We can develop the program as we go along," commented Daniels.

Beck explained that a pupil may be able to return full time, or attend classes part time and work part time, or work full time and attend night school.

He said this will be the first year that a night school pupil will be required to attend only twice a week instead of four times, as before.

And this year, a pre-high-school preparation course to teach basic reading, writing, and arithmetic will be added to the night school program.

This is for adults as well as youths, Beck said.

Mrs. Weintraub said two interviewers have been added to the YES staff and people with jobs to offer should call the Mercer Street Friends Center.

CALL SCHOOL

At the same time, others interested in returning to school or seeking help to get a job can reach Daniels at Trenton High.

Harry Leslie, director of the Trenton Vocational and Technical High School, said it is planned to launch a program of short courses to help equip youths for unfilled jobs in this area.

Posters are being distributed this weekend to spread the word about the program and Capitol Transit buses will carry them, also.

[From the Trenton Sunday Times Advertiser, Aug. 18, 1963]

"FELT FUNNY BEING DROPPED," TWO BOYS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

Richie and Ben are going back to Trenton Central High School this fall, certain now of two things:

There is not much hope on the outside any more for a guy or a gal without a high school diploma.

And this time, somebody will be around to help as soon as the red flag of scholastic trouble begins to wave.

Richard Chiacchio, a senior from 772 Chambers Street, and Ben D'Amico, a sophomore from 14 Commonwealth Avenue, are among 63 last-term dropouts Central High now hopes to win back to finish their education.

Both volunteered this weekend to talk over matters with the Times-Advertiser.

Richie likes office work—especially bookkeeping—and through the efforts of Councilman Carmen Armenti, he has been filling in this summer as receptionist in the office of Raymond A. Male, New Jersey labor and industry commissioner.

Tired because he ran too much with the guys at night last term, Richie's absenteeism grew. He dropped out just before exams last January. "I thought I was fooling Dad and Mom and everybody when I played hooky," he said.

"When your're in school, you feel it's better outside. My main thought (last January) was to get out and try, anyway," Richie said.

So he tried 15 places for a job. "You could see it on their faces when they looked at your application and read you didn't finish high school. It's different out there. It felt funny being dropped.

Richie noted that missing school "seems OK as long as you know you can go back any time. I found out I just had fooled myself."

What if some of his friends rib him about going back to school?

"Who cares what they think as long as I get ahead," Richie replied. Besides, his parents are all for his decision and "Dad said if I make it, he would help me go farther."

Ben's one goal when he dropped out last March was to "go into the service and get away from everything."

He had trouble in his elementary grades. Things seemed to go a little better in junior high school but Central High seemed a little too big last term. Richie agreed with that.

PARENTS HAPPY

Ben still wants to get into the service but he is convinced he will have a better chance to specialize if he goes in with a high school diploma to back up his ambition.

"My parents are happy I'm going back," Ben said.

William Kostar, Central High vice principal, said efforts will be made to tailor course assignments to the special needs of Richie and Ben and others who are interested in returning to classes this term.

Their individual needs will be determined during conferences scheduled this week.

The conference will probe deeply into the answers the dropouts gave to these seven questions:

Do you wish high school graduation? Do you wish vocational training? What kind of vocational training is desired? Do you wish to attend night school? Do you need help in getting a job? What type of job do you want after graduation? Do you want a part-time job while going to school?

Returnees who fear being placed in homerooms with younger pupils probably will be assigned to groups closer to them in maturity.

Kostar explained there is no worry about the actual classes because they are made up of pupils from different age groups, anyway.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Aug. 14, 1963]

THEY LEARN TOO LATE

School dropouts are learning a bitter lesson, in many instances tragically too late, that there isn't any place in this Nation's modern industrial economy for the uneducated, the untrained, or the unskilled.

A crash program was ordered yesterday in Newark to keep high school students from leaving when the new term starts next month. Emergency Federal funds have been made available to Newark and other New Jersey cities to get their programs moving as quickly as possible. This is part of a nationwide program to stem the critical tide of mounting dropouts.

Automation is one reason for the growing selectivity among employables, because it is cutting deeply into menial tasks formerly done by the unskilled and untrained.

There are still jobs available, but they are going to the educated or trained person, and a high school diploma has become almost a minimal requirement in an industrial society that is depending more and more on automated processes to keep it on a competitive basis.

What we are getting now is an economic minority that is faced with a new kind of discrimination that has nothing to do with race or color. It will be composed of the uneducated and the untrained.

School dropouts have become a matter of national concern. A number of educational leaders believe it has become a crisis in our society. They estimate that up to 40 percent of the students who went into the fifth grade last fall will never graduate from high school.

An authority in labor economics, Dr. William Haber, newly named dean of the college of literature, science and the arts at the university, says the inadequately trained have small chance of sustained employment.

"A high school diploma has become an indispensable application form for almost any kind of employment," says Dr. Haber.

Dropouts face an embittered, uncertain future as the attrition of the simple jobs by automation becomes more marked, in the inexorable search by industry for more efficient methods of production and operation.

"They will be vulnerable, unwanted, and face employment discrimination," says Dr. Haber. "We should recognize that there is real dynamite in unemployed kids. More than 20 percent of the people unemployed at present are under the age of 22."

In conjunction with the Federal action, community programs could do much to alleviate the situation. A number of these projects were started in Newark and other large cities.

In the Newark area, 40 dedicated college students, headed by Miss Barbara Metzger of Summit, have set up a 6-week summer tutorial service to aid young students in their weakest curriculum areas. Since there are almost as many tutors as students, they are receiving an intensive course of instruction in a brief period.

The Newark area project, according to Miss Metzger, is aimed at encouraging better students to go to college and to reduce the number of dropouts.

Actually, what is happening here could be much more beneficial because of its excellent tutor-student ratio that hardly would be available under a massive Federal program aimed at helping a larger segment of the young population.

It is an inspiring example of what can be done on a community level by young people who are genuinely interested in helping less fortunate contemporaries struggling to fit themselves into a society that has become more complex.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Aug. 19, 1963]

SOCIETY CANNOT USE DROPOUTS

Luckily, New Brunswick is one of the four New Jersey communities given Federal aid to inaugurate a crash program to prevent dropouts from our schools. As Sylvia Porter's column on this page today astonishingly presents, this is one of the most acute problems facing the United States today and for decades to come—if not checked.

President Kennedy has inaugurated a nationwide campaign to bring home to high school students the great importance of completing their high school education. Miss Porter says a high school diploma is worth 20 years' experience on a job.

As a result of Kennedy's program, Maurice W. Rowland, superintendent of schools, has received a Federal grant of $800 to promote the back-to-school program here. Frank Woods, guidance director in the local schools, has less than a month to try to convince 35 high school dropouts that they should return to school on September 4. These educators realize the job is a tough one but are enthusiastic and hope that they can change the minds of 35 youngsters.

"It is downright terrifying to realize that over one-third of our young people are entering the labor force without a high school diploma," Miss Porter writes. She then astonishes her reader by stating the U.S. Labor Department continues to estimate that 7.5 million youths across the Nation will have dropped out of high school by the

end of this decade. What happens, as a result, is not pleasant reading.

The dropout program here, and elsewhere, has real educational significance. "We shall study the results carefully," said Rowland, "there may be lessons to learn from it."

One lesson we already know, staying in school—in an automation age—is the difference between success and failure for a youth in today's society.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of September 21, 1963:

THE TAX BILL—H.R. 8363

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, 5th District, Texas, Sept. 21, 1963)

Tax cuts would amount to $11.1 billion over a 2-year period; $8.8 billion in individual and $2.3 billion corporate. Corporate taxes will be cut from 52 percent to 48 percent. Individual rate changes, lowest bracket 20 percent drops to 14 percent, top 91 percent to 70 percent, changes equaling 30 percent and 20 percent, respectively, while middle income brackets average 15 percent. Twenty-three structural changes in the bill increase taxes selectively by $1.1 billion, although the minimum standard deduction at the taxpayers' choice, alleviates further the taxload of the lowest brackets and eliminates 1.5 million taxpayers in the lowest brackets from paying taxes.

Everyone wants a tax cut. Though some Members of Congress, like the President, will only depict the blessings of a tax cut, which everyone wants, others will sensibly ask, "Then where do we get the money to pay Government bills we continue to run up?"

REPUBLICAN POSITION

The Republicans, unlike the Democrat leadership, will demand a limitation on spending so that the tax bill will not become effective unless current fiscal year 1964 expenditures are held to $97 billion and fiscal 1965 budget will not exceed $98 billion. True, these figures are high since they represent the culmination reached after the 1962 spending level exceeded 1961 by $6 billion; 1963 exceeded 1962 by $4.8 billion; 1964 exceeded 1963 by $5.5 billion. However, the Republican position draws the line against further increases. Surely this is not asking too much. And yet, the big spenders, including the President, though always talking economy, will continue to increase spending even as we cut taxes. This course leads to inflation, the worst tax of all, a hidden tax on savings, pensions, and buying power, the devaluation of the dollar, increasing outflow of gold, and destruction of our competitive position in world markets and financial leadership of the free world. Indeed, any such weakening of the United States economically would make us extremely vulnerable to a final Communist takeover. Our greatest defense against the Communist world conspiracy is a strong, healthy, growing economy which is not possible through planned deficits.

The glowing predictions of the feedback, or increasing Government revenues because of the stimulating effect of a tax cut does not obscure the horrible truth, that the President and his congressional leaders are asking Congress to approve deficit spending and so secure the money to pay our bills by borrowing and charging it all to our children and later generations.

My conviction is that we should balance the budget, as we have done before in two Republican Congresses, cut the debt, and then cut taxes—in that order. Further, it seems to me we should move steadily toward a flat percent tax, the same percent for everyone regardless of income level. Finally, the best kept secret of our day is that it isn't someone else who pays—it's each of us. As taxpayers we pay, particularly the low and middle income groups who necessarily bear the cost—84 percent of the total tax comes from the tax brackets under $10,000 liability. We also pay when Government deficit finances and charges the cost to us through reducing the buying power of the dollar. Forgotten, for the average wage earner (1) tax cut at best will be $1 to $2 per week, (2) social security taxes go up next January.

WEEK'S ACTIONS

The civil defense bomb shelter amendment to the existing act, embarks us on another great Federal subsidy of $2.3 billion over 5 years, beyond existing civil defense programs. Simultaneously we cut back our offense, the development of the anti-missile missile, because of the test ban treaty, which ultimately may invite enemy attack. We seem to forget the best defense is a good offense. (2) The CAB examiner conducted Washington hearings on Love Field. I testified on the need of the southwest area for all present aviation facilities and all those to be made available in the future. (3) I asked the President for his views on the status of the Dallas Federal Building and the removal of the VA office, suggesting corrective action emphasizing (1) merit not politics, and (2) a spending priority.

Red China's Designs Show Need for Expanded East-West Center in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a book entitled "Brief History of Modern China," recently published by the Yi-Chang State Publishing House in China, is a poignant reminder to us that we cannot for our own security relax our efforts in our struggle against communism. The book serves to reinforce the contention that a proven effective cold war weapon such as the East-West Center for Technical and Cultural Exchange located in Hawaii ought to be expanded in its operations, and not cut back.

In the hope that it may influence the Senate to consider the need for restoring the cuts made by the House in the proposed 1964 budget for the East-West Center and the House to recede from its earlier position, I offer for the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Weekly India News of September 6, 1963, issued by the Embassy of India, here in Washington, D.C.:

AND NOW CHINA CLAIMS ALL THESE TOO

A book entitled "Brief History of Modern China," published by the Yi-Chang State Publishing House in China, contains a map which claims India's Assam, NEFA and Nagaland areas, and also Sikkim, Bhutan, Burma, Malaya, Singapore, Thailand, North and South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Korea as part of China.

The PTI reports that Mr. R. M. Hajaranavis, Minister of State of Home Affairs, who gave this information to Parliament, also said that while the book itself was not in circulation in India, the map had attracted attention as it "clearly discloses the expansionist designs of the Chinese Government." The book would not be allowed entry into the country as it showed the boundaries of India wrongly, he added.

Fallout Shelter Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8200) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, the city of Los Angeles has virtually abandoned its civil defense program. The Director of Civil Defense has been instructed not to request any material or equipment furnished by the Federal Government, and I must confess that, as a prime target in case of nuclear war, Los Angeles would have practically no chance of escaping total destruction—with or without civil defense preparation.

As a Representative of the people of Los Angeles, therefore, I hope that the House will have an opportunity before the end of the current session to reconsider its voice-vote approval of the $190.6 million fallout shelter construction program.

As with many Federal programs, I am afraid that once it starts, even though it may originally be on a rather modest scale, the program will blossom and grow with little or no effective restraint.

In fact, according to official estimates of the Office of Civil Defense, the current $190.6 million program is to be the initial request of a 5-year program costing over $2.1 billion.

Past civil defense programs have been riddled with charges of waste; the strategic materials program has resulted in the purchase of millions upon millions of dollars of items far in excess of our real requirements; and the problem of technical obsolescence renders almost any civil defense program out of date before it is completed. Even after spending billions on such a program, we may well find ourselves with a thermonuclear age maginot line—of virtually no use in protecting our people from advanced weapons.

It is extremely interesting to note the comments on this subject made by Mr. Hanson Baldwin, senior military editor and analyst for the New York Times, writing in the Saturday Evening Post of March 31, 1962:

Civil defense planners are confronted with the nearly insoluble problem of technical obsolescence. The programs of yesterday are of limited usefulness today; today's shelters may not be worth the cost of tearing them down tomorrow. In an age when the offensive has such a great advantage over the defensive, the enemy can easily nullify all except the most elaborate and expensive attempts to provide passive protection.

It seems to me, therefore, from a practical standpoint, that it is foolish and wasteful to enter into a huge, expensive, longe-range program of fallout shelter construction that will probably never do the job it was intended to do. We will be hiding behind a false protector and deluding ourselves that we are safe against the horrors of atomic war.

Moreover, it seems to me that, at the very time the Senate is considering the limited nuclear test ban treaty as a first step away from war, it is most inappropriate for Congress to be considering a program based on the proposition that the treaty has already failed and we must prepare ourselves for the worst.

By passing this shelter program we are unmistakably demonstrating our lack of faith in the nuclear test ban, and putting a real damper on the spirit of relaxed tension that has recently given us some measure of hope that a way can be found out of the spiraling and costly nuclear arms race.

Perhaps more than anything else, however, this fallout shelter program represents a defeatist, defensive, underground, ostrich-like viewpoint at a time in our history when, above all, we need a positive, constructive, and realistic approach to world problems.

Instead of retreating into a protective shell, we should be looking outward for every opportunity to bridge the communications gap and establish the firm basis of a secure and lasting peace.

In my opinion, this basis cannot be found in a fearful, subterranean defense posture, but rather in a willingness to explore every avenue of possible agreement with other nations of the world—and particularly, a willingness to go that extra mile, and take that extra step in the direction of peace.

For these reasons, I hope the House has an opportunity to reconsider its voice vote on the fallout shelter program, and that it will use that opportunity in a more positive expression of the American people's desire for a better world in which to live.

The Open Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the open space we conserve for parks and recreation is one of the greatest treasures of this Nation. I have spoken often about the need to set aside such land in highly populated areas, and Congress passed a temporary open space program as part of the Housing Act of 1961. If broadened as proposed in a new version of the bill, this program could be of even greater assistance to areas of the Nation where such assets are most needed.

An open space program in our urban areas, of course, will fill just one part of the national need. We in this Nation are fortunate enough to have a well-advanced program of national parks in many of the less populated areas of the Nation. Every now and then we receive new evidence of the great service that such parks give to our citizens.

Once such testimonial was given recently by a New Jersey resident, Mr. Henry M. Owades of Maplewood. He wrote a warm letter to Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. Mr. Wirth was so impressed that he had the letter reprinted in the National Park Courier, a publication distributed to Park Service employees.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the cordial exchange of letters shows that every citizen, no matter what State he is from, has a stake in the large and smaller efforts made in this Nation to keep some part of the outdors free for present and future use. I ask unanimous consent to have the letters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAPLEWOOD, N.J.,
July 30, 1963.

Mr. CONRAD L. WIRTH,
Director, National Park Service,
Chevy Chase, Md.

DEAR MR. WIRTH: My family and I have just returned from our vacation where we visited five separate national parks and monuments. This now makes a total of 10 parks and monuments we have visited.

I wanted to write to you to tell you how thoroughly we have enjoyed each of these installations. It is almost a universal truth to say that I have never seen a single visitor at any of the parks who was unfriendly, discourteous, or unhappy. Something magic happens to people when they enter our magnificent parks. They become helpful, pleasant, even tempered, mild mannered, courteous, and friendly.

It is a wonderful thing to see and experience the feeling of renewal of joy in the beauties of nature and pride in our country. While politically I am generally in favor of all of our Federal expenditures, my feeling is we get the greatest good as a country in the expenditures made on our national parks. Dollar for dollar they are a wonderful investment.

I cannot end this letter without a special word of praise for the park rangers and the ranger naturalists. I am completely convinced that our Creator has a special mold which he uses to make park rangers because they are a special breed of men. They are the personification of the peace and beauty of the parks which they supervise. To a man I have found them to be courteous, diplomatic, and genuinely sincere in their work. I hope the good Lord continues to produce more people of this type.

I am sending copies of this letter to my State Senators so that they know the sentiments of at least one constituent, with the hope that they vote the full appropriation for the National Park Service so that this unique institution can continue to flourish and grow.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. OWADES.

AUGUST 6, 1963.

Mr. HENRY M. OWADES, P.E.,
Maplewood, N.J.

DEAR MR. OWADES: Your very fine letter of July 30, telling me of your visit to the national parks and monuments, the pleasure that your family and you received from these visits, and the very high compliments you paid to the park ranger naturalists, believe me, is very greatly appreciated. We always hope that those who have an opportunity to visit the parks will feel as you do, because it is our belief that the intent of Congress in establishing the great national parks with their scenic and historic values was for this particular purpose, and to preserve for all time their heritage for all people to enjoy. If we can carry out this responsibility we have been successful.

Your letter was read at home, after a hard day in the office, and it did the same thing to me, at least to a reasonable extent, that your visit to the parks did to you and your family, in that it gave me the distinct feeling that what the Park Service has been doing has been worthwhile and appreciated. I should like to share this feeling with the rest of the members of the National Park Service and its alumni by publishing your letter in the National Park Courier, which is a little paper that we get out once a month through the National Park Service Employees and Alumni Association. Will you please let me know whether you have any objections to my doing this?

I am sending a copy of my reply to Senators CLIFFORD P. CASE and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., to whom you referred a copy of your letter.

Thank you again, very, very much for your thoughtfulness in writing me as you did.

Sincerely yours,

CONRAD L. WIRTH,
Director.

The Flexible Reins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial, "The Flexible Reins," from the Wall Street Journal, September 23, 1963.

On the eve of the tax bill debate, I have been reflecting on the statements of the President, Bureau of Budget Director Gordon, and Treasury Secretary Dillon, about our tight budgets and check-reins on spending. At every turn the President asks more. He spent $6 billion more in 1962 over 1961, $5 billion more in 1963 over 1962, $5½ billion more for 1964 over 1963, and 1965 even more. Where, I wonder, is the budgetary control, the reduced spending, the tight budget. How ridiculous to call such spending increases a halt in spending.

Now we are asked to approve a tax bill on the promise of the President that in the future he will exercise tight control of spending. Well, such statements have led to $35 billion deficits in 4 years under President Kennedy. What reason is there now to think downward spending changes are possible? Nor should we leave a tax bill to such wishful language, even though some Democrats may

really believe them. What we need is practice of economy not preaching.

The following article puts it very well:

THE FLEXIBLE REINS

Once again Federal budgetmakers are getting down to their annual task, and once again there's a lot of talk of economy. Specifically, President Kennedy, eyeing the fiscal year that begins next July 1, promises an "ever-tighter rein" on Federal spending.

One way or another, administration officials assert, the fiscal 1965 deficit will be held below this year's expected $9.2 billion. Such determination may seem admirable, but the cold figures—and past history—make the Nation's fiscal prospects seem something less than encouraging.

There was, for example, Mr. Kennedy's remark of last January that he was going to "limit severely" his proposals for spending in this fiscal year. Translated into statistics, this turned out to mean he was planning to lift outlays by $4.5 billion to a record high of $98.8 billion. And it develops that an "ever-tighter rein" on spending next year is expected to lead to another new high—of close to $102 billion.

In such circumstances, some people may wonder how the budgetmakers think they can achieve a smaller deficit next year, especially in view of the fact that the budget will be based on the assumption that Congress will finally okay a sizable tax cut. In reality their thinking is simple enough. They'll just figure that the tax cut will instill so much zip in the economy that revenues will rise more than spending.

Clearly, a tax cut under the right conditions is desirable, to lessen an oppressive burden on the economy. Yet its exact economic impact is not easy to measure. Though administration economists seem to believe the tax cut will unleash a giant wave of new spending, the fact is that a lot of people are likely merely to stash away more in savings or settle up some old bills.

Amid such uncertainties, it is really impossible to be sure that, after the tax cut, there will be any revenue rise at all—much less the gain of $3 billion or more that the budgetmakers will be counting on. This castles-in-the-air approach to Federal budeting is no more encouraging now than it ever was.

It's even less encouraging when you realize that, even if all the optimism on revenues should somehow prove well-founded, we'll still be saddled with yet another deficit of close to $9 billion. This cannot help but store up new fuel for inflation, create new doubts about the dollar's stability and further postpone any truly meaningful attack on our balance-of-payments difficulties.

All this, however, is not to say that the new "economy" drive is entirely without its bright aspects.

For one thing, it's a sort of lefthanded recognition by the administration that some of its earlier economic theories were a bit addled. Any effort to hold down Federal spending, for instance, seems to depart from the idea that Washington can solve all the Nation's problems merely by spending more money—on urban renewal, public works, or whatever happens to come to mind.

Then, too, any effort to keep the deficits from ballooning ever bigger appears to reflect rejection of the oft-expressed notion that such deficits and the resulting increases in Federal debt are nothing at all to worry about. It's true that the restraint talked of now clearly does not go far enough, but at least it's a move in the proper direction.

In part, we suspect, this stems from a recognition of political realities. By now, the administration obviously realizes that there is in the Nation no galloping demand for a tax cut tied to ever-rising spending; otherwise, there would be no need for even the illusion of spending restraint.

It may be that the economic ideas of such men as Senators BYRD and GOLDWATER, so often dismissed as reactionary, have had their impact on the people. Or it may be that the public simply has too much commonsense to believe that anyone, either an individual or a government, can go on forever spending more than is coming in.

However that may be, we suspect that a good many people are going to be a little dubious about the Government's "tight" budget reins. Especially when those reins seem to be made of rubber.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Dirksen Shows Statesmanship on Test Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the victory today on the test ban treaty had many authors. President Kennedy has eloquently brought the essential facts home to the American public. Secretary of State Rusk and Under Secretary Harriman have kept close watch over the treaty ever since our purpose was first announced. Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD and Senate Whip HUMPHREY worked tirelessly with their colleagues to head off any threats and to keep the issues clear. The people of this Nation, too, helped make today's vote possible by recognizing the treaty for what it is—a limited but essential breakthrough to potentially greater future achievements.

One of the men who helped the Nation to recognize the stakes involved in the treaty was Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN. We who serve with him were once again grateful that great issues inspire magnificent responses when they are most needed.

Much has already been said about the great work Senator DIRKSEN has done on this treaty, and I was very much impressed with a comment made in an editorial that appeared in the Camden, N.J., Courier-Post on September 19. I think it sums up much of the commentary, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRKSEN SHOWS STATESMANSHIP ON TEST BAN

Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN is earning increased respect in the Senate by the leadership he has shown on behalf of the nuclear test ban treaty and the way he has cast aside petty partisan considerations to exercise it.

By the same token DIRKSEN has gained stature nationally. Some observers are even comparing him with the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, who was so highly esteemed for his statesmanlike cooperation with Democratic administrations in foreign affairs in the post-War II period. Vandenberg was originally an isolationist who came to see isolationism was a mistake, and was man enough to admit he had been in error. DIRKSEN is following the same path.

Some of the Illinoisan's constituents have attacked him for his change of position. A Chicago audience recently indicated disagreement with it but DIRKSEN courageously held his ground. At the end of a prepared speech and a colloquy with the audience, he said, "I came here to take counsel with you and then exercise independent judgment."

The Role of Business and Education in Our Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I attended the Napa Chamber of Commerce's annual business-education day meeting.

One of the speakers at this event was J. W. Lambert, vice president of personal relations for the Bank of America. In his talk, "The Role of Business and Education in Our Free Enterprise System," he brought up many vitally interesting points about our educational system and how it affects our business world.

I am sure that my fellow colleagues, as well as many other readers, will find Mr. Lambert's remarks thought provoking and of continuing interest.

The address follows:

THE ROLE OF BUSINESS AND EDUCATION IN OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Those of us in the business world often forget just how important education is to the free enterprise system which we value so highly. Business and education, after all, have a common heritage and a common job. In business, we are trustees of the great economic resources of our Nation; in education, you are trustees of our great intellectual resources. Neither of us can survive unless the other discharges his responsibilities well.

I think we need only look at our Nation's history to see that thus far we have both done a creditable job. And it is education that takes the first laurels, for without an enlightened citizenry as voters and workers, business could not have adequately discharged its responsibilities to the Nation.

And for this very reason, it is upon education that the burden for maintaining our free enterprise system rests. In the much more difficult and challenging world of the future, education must produce a reasoned, analytical electorate—one which is capable of finding logical, rather than emotional, solutions to the monumental problems which will face our Nation.

We are on the threshold of this world today—an incredibly more complex and fast-moving world than has ever been known in mans history. Demands will be placed upon each of us and upon future citizens that will make some of the great decisions of the past seem almost elementary. Business and science are, by their nature, in the forefront of these changes, but it is education and government which will have to find ways to make use of them and to bend them to the advantage of our people.

In education you have, of course, already been caught up in the wake of some of these changes. A new concept of mathematics is being born, new understanding is growing about the world we live in—its land masses, its oceans, its atmosphere, its physical properties and laws, and now planets and other worlds in outer space are really coming into focus. So, too, are new concepts growing around government, politics, economics, and many other aspects of our lives.

These are stimulating times if each of us will only face and accept the new challenges as they are presented to us. And we must learn to accept them, for this is just the beginning. We are just starting to gain momentum for the incredible world of the future.

Somehow, we must prepare our future citizens to live in that world—to make decisions, face problems, find excitement and challenges in an environment totally different from that their parents and grandparents were equipped to face. Equipping our future citizens for this fast-moving new world will be the task of education, and a tremendous task it is.

At one time, it was sufficient in a practical sense to teach young people to add and subtract, to read and write. A particularly apt and aggressive young man could leave school around the eighth grade and, with these basic skills mastered, carve an important and vital place for himself in the world. I suppose this still could conceivably happen, but it would be highly dangerous to send young people out into today's world this poorly equipped.

A college education has real plus values—I want to make that point clear. However, our modern reaction to our very fundamental educational effort has been the other extreme—to make a college degree the minimum requirement for real success. I think this phase will pass. It must, because there are not enough colleges nor enough educators to provide this minimum for every citizen, nor is every individual capable or desirous of completing college-level study. And when we finally acknowledge that fact, we will be able to face the challenge of providing the maximum degree of education for our citizens—a sound base of knowledge and reasoning ability—in the years of their grammar and high school careers. To do less is to shortchange the more than half of them who do not go on to college but who must also be prepared to make decisions in this increasingly complex and confusing world.

Just consider some of the problems with which we are faced today which were unknown to our parents; urban sprawl, smog, traffic, allocation of a limited number of tax dollars to a rapidly increasing number of public needs, heavy pressures for civil rights reform, regulation of "big labor" as well as big business, international relations and all the complex related problems of trade, tariffs, balance of payments, disarmament, space law, and many others.

These problems, in both size and number, are increasing at a rate of geometric progession, and it is up to educators to somehow provide our Nation with an enlightened body of citizens capable of grasping the essentials of these issues and making decisions in accord with our Nation's ideals and goals. And it must be accomplished before the student leaves high school.

This, I realize, puts a heavy burden on education, but it is the key to the success of both the individual and our Nation. Each individual must be taught to think in a logical, rational manner—a manner that he can apply to a host of difficult and often confusing issues of extreme importance that

will face him as a young worker, a businessman, a parent, and a citizen.

Providing this kind of training will require a two-pronged effort.

First, subject matter must be greatly expanded and taught in much more depth. For instance, it is not sufficient today just to teach our own Nation's history, its traditions, its principles, and its goals; we must also teach those of all the principal Nations of the world. Our young people must develop a healthy respect for the ideas of others. No matter how much we may disagree with those ideas, we must learn to appreciate the stresses and conditions which caused them to evolve. Only then are we prepared to intelligently refute them.

The second effort is the teaching of an analytical and rational approach to all knowledge, all problems, and all decisions. Our young people must be taught that it is good to question, and that you must have answers to your questions before you can make an intelligent decision. Many times, as citizens, they will be subjected to arguments of pressure groups—one-sided and very persuasive arguments. They must be taught to seek the other side of each issue. We cannot afford to have the decisions which will govern our lives, our communities, our Nation, and even the world made on a "first come first served" basis—in other words, whoever catches the ear of the electorate first and most convincingly wins its loyalty. These young people must understand that majority rule is only valid when every individual in the majority clearly understands the problem, knows the alternative solutions, and understands the consequences of each potential solution.

H. G. Wells foresaw this point in time some 40 years ago when he wrote, in "The Outline of History"; "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." I do not think he overstated the case.

In business today, we understand a great deal more about the problems faced by educators than we once did. We have come to understand that it is no longer enough to hire a man, pay him, and forget him. We do neither ourselves nor our workers justice by that practice.

Today we know we must keep our workers interested. We must present them with challenges and stimulation. We must watch for their special abilities and offer them training with which to develop those abilities. We must see that they progress in accordance with their level of development. What steps more closely parallel the teacher's task than those? Personnel and training have become extremely important functions in today's world of business, and we know we must do these things well if we are to obtain top performance and loyalty from our staff members.

Our Nation needs the same qualities in its citizens if we are to maintain our heritage of free enterprise. It is upon your success at obtaining top performance and loyalty from your students that our Nation's future and its maintenance of freedom depend. And this task will become more and more difficult with each passing year and each scientific advance. Let me give you some examples.

Ours is an extremely prosperous Nation—probably the most prosperous the world has ever seen. Even our lowest income groups are living at a level far above that available to the bulk of citizens in many underdeveloped countries.

But because of our prosperity, it is almost criminal that anyone in this Nation should live a submarginal existence. When we spend billions to train scientists, and to put a man on the moon, how can we justify a miner in West Virginia having to feed his family on Government surplus flour because of the economic fact that oil and gas have largely replaced coal as fuel? What should we do about it, if anything? Should all of these people be trained in other jobs and transported to better locales? What does the Government owe them? What do those of us in better positions owe them? What do their unions and their former employers owe them? At what point does assistance to these people become "creeping socialism" and at what point is it inhuman to ignore them?

What do we do when every one of our adult citizens owns at least one car and our Nation is becoming one huge concrete pavement? Do we only permit so many cars per family? Do we legislate against pleasure driving at particular hours? And where do they all go on weekends? With an ever-increasing population and more and more land being put to commercial and residential uses, do we pass a law stating that only families with surnames beginning with the letters A through H can go to Yosemite Park on a specified weekend?

Some of these examples may sound far-fetched, but believe me, they are not. They are questions that are already looming on the horizon. And there are even more complex ones looming on the international and spacial scenes. These are the very issues upon which many of the young people in our schools today are going to be expected to decide—basic questions caused by our Nation's prosperity, without precedent, and conflicting with our Nation's basic concepts of individual freedom.

The individual freedoms of each of us are threatened each time Government moves into a new area, and yet increased Government control of various areas will be absolutely necessary in the future. Compromises will have to be made by our citizens—a barter in a way, a scrap of personal freedom here for a privilege, or a desperately needed welfare program there. The issues will not be black and white; there will be shades of gray. It will require a highly intelligent citizenry to maintain the maximum degree of freedom while conferring maximum justice in each of these issues.

In the past, we were allowed a certain leeway in making national decisions. If one turned out to be wrong, it could be changed or righted if enough people demanded. Most issues were not quite so personal and not so many participated in the decisionmaking for that very reason. But governmental actions are affecting our everyday lives more and more; and as they do, more and more citizens will be taking a stand. It is vital that their stands be reasoned ones, not emotional ones. They must be fair and just and well thought out. Because if too many wrong decisions are made, we will all find ourselves with very little individual freedom left at all.

In business we have often been faced with threats against our free enterprise. It was popular 30 and 40 years ago, and with some justification I must confess, to decry all business as venal and unscrupulous. There were abuses by business, to be sure, and governmental regulations were adopted to correct them.

There were two reactions by business. One was to retaliate by decrying government and public opinion. But the vast majority of businessmen were much more logical. They were quick to see that business could very well become the scapegoat for a host of problems it could not control, so it took moves on its own initiative to not merely correct the abuses, but to move ahead and accept its responsibilities to the community and to the Nation. Today I would say that business is as conscious of its responsibilities to the public as is government. Many have fringe benefits far beyond those required by law or demanded by unions. Most firms of any size have scholarship programs or community relations projects of tremendous benefit to the public. Witness institutions such as the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation, or our bank's Giannini Foundation. Almost any business of size has some sort of program to help education or the arts, to encourage its employees to become responsible citizens and to take an interest in civic issues. And these measures were not forced upon business by government regulation or intervention. We have learned to shoulder our responsibilities if we wish to remain free; we have learned that the public welfare is the foundation of the welfare of business.

Education has, from time to time, faced similar threats to its freedom. I think the educational world can point with pride to its battles and its victories in maintaining its freedom. The most recent threat to educational freedom was triggered by the panic after sputnik. There was agitation for Government to step in to subsidize education of scientists and engineers. Such subsidies, of course, imply controls—controls which educators were determined to fight and fought successfully. I think the education world can be proud of the compromises which finally evolved. But I think the entire situation did our educational system good; it made both educators and the general public aware of the need for accelerated and strengthened education.

I cite these two examples because they are pertinent to each of our fields. But they are good examples of what each American citizen is going to face increasingly in the future. He will have to choose between an invasion of his freedom, or a compromise and acceptance of a responsibility—and few of the choices will be either pleasant or easy.

Throughout history it has always been the most simple solution—in a conflict of ideas or methods—to argue by namecalling and the use of labels and slogans rather than reason. Argument by namecalling and slogans is a luxury we can no longer afford—if, indeed, we ever could. It makes our citizens grist for the mill of any charlatan or demagogue with a clever gift for words or for appealing to the emotions. There are too many vital issues facing our Nation and looming before us to permit anyone to indulge in this lazy, nonthinking attitude. And this is why I believe there must be greater emphasis on analysis and reason in teaching.

In the past, education has risen to meet every challenge presented to it. After generations of teaching by the same methods, education has begun to move and innovate and adapt. Some of the methods have failed, some have been controversial, but all have been part of the sincere effort by educators to prepare our citizens for the world they must live in. As demands upon our educational system become even more stringent and even more vital, I am confident that they will be met with the same determination and willingness you have shown in the past.

To paraphrase Lincoln: The combination of this Nation's free enterprise economy and its historic commitment to education make the United States the last best hope of an earth bubbling with social and technological change.

It is up to us in business and you in education to do the job. I am confident it will be done well.

Thank you.

The Outdoors Will Soon Be Gone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently the Public Lands Subcommittee

under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Nevada reported favorably to the Interior Committee S. 16 introduced by my distinguished colleague from Missouri and myself to establish the Ozark National Rivers.

The purpose of the bill is to save for America the beauty of two free-flowing streams and the surrounding wilderness. It is essential that action be taken soon on this and other measures to preserve the natural beauty of certain areas of our country. Otherwise, in the not too distant future, we may find that these areas and all others worthy of preservation have felt the blade of the bulldozer and have been lost forever.

The Kansas City Star recently published an excellent editorial, "The Outdoors Will Soon Be Gone." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTDOORS WILL SOON BE GONE

"All outdoors was once at the back door or at the end of Main Street. Today it lies beyond forbidding miles of freeways clogged with automobiles."—John Prokop in "American Forests."

The American outdoors is shrinking rapidly. In our time, millions upon millions of acres of countryside have fallen to the bulldozers. The cities and the suburbs have expanded to the horizon—and beyond. And the urban age has scarcely begun.

By the year 2000, if not long before, there will be little land left for recreation unless bold action is taken now. As Stewart Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, has said: "The most we can do at this late date is not enough." Some have dubbed it the "quiet crisis."

Americans have always felt close to the soil. The frontier played a dominant role in the shaping of this Nation. But the frontier has run out and even the wilderness is disappearing. Walt Whitman once wrote:

"Now I see the secret of the making of the best persons,
It is to grow in the open air and to eat and sleep with the earth."

Whitman's America is vanishing forever. The Mojave Desert is gone. So is Glen Canyon. With only a few exceptions, the lovely Ozark streams of Missouri have been lost. The White is gone. The lower James is now a lake and the Pomme has been cut in two.

Last Wednesday the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee voted to preserve the Current and Jack's Fork of the Ozarks as the Nation's first national rivers project. It was a step in the right direction. But the same men turned down, at least for the present, the proposed Prairie Park of Kansas that would have saved some of the tall grass that once knew buffalo and wagon trains and pioneers.

This pure prairie land of Kansas is but one treasure of the American wilderness. Some of the treasures have been preserved and there is, for most of us, a magic in the names: Yosemite, the Yellowstone, the Great Smoky Mountains. But other treasures of the outdoors—the prairie among them—are in peril: The Sleeping Bear Dunes of north Michigan, the canyonlands of central Utah, and the Oregon Cascades.

There is a second reason behind the urgency for creating playgrounds. Many of our finest parks are already so crowded that they are losing the wilderness flavor. As the population grows, the pressures for more space will grow.

There are places where it has run out. Since World War II, the huge New York and Philadelphia urban areas have virtually grown together. In the short plane ride between the two urban clusters, one gets only a fleeting impression of green, open country below.

The Middle West is in a more favorable position. There is still plenty of vacant space. But it lies sometimes far away, at the end of the freeways "clogged with automobiles." The problem for the cities is to find and preserve open land that is close to the people.

As long ago as 1897, John Muir observed that "the ax and the saw are insanely busy." The poor man would have an attack if he could see what has happened to his beloved West. But progress is progress, and it is inevitable. The key to modern conservation is to strike a reasonable balance between national growth and expansion on the one hand, and recreation and the wilderness on the other. It is a challenge at all levels of government—National, State, local. How is it being met?

THE NATION

The national park system is surely one of the seven wonders of this modern world. Even its beginnings were impressive. On the night of September 19, 1870, a group of men sat around a campfire in the Big Sky country of northwest Wyoming. The bull session lasted far into the night. The men had been sent West to explore the region and they were dazzled by what they found. Two years later the Yellowstone became America's first national park.

There was something here like a fever. By the turn of the century, more than 3½ million acres had been set aside on the frontier to preserve forever the scenic marvels west of the Great Divide.

During the next 40 years, almost 20 million additional acres went into the national park system. Then the program ground to a halt. From Pearl Harbor to the inauguration of President Kennedy, the national park system grew by only 92,000 acres. But the population did not stand still. Neither did public demands on the playgrounds.

Both President Kennedy and Secretary Udall believe that the final land-use pattern of the American continent will be irrevocably set before the end of the decade. That's why they are pushing parks so hard.

Recently, Congress established three national seashores: Cape Cod, Point Reyes in California, and Padre Island in Texas. Creation of the first national rivers, the Current and Jack's Fork in the Missouri Ozarks, seems virtually assured.

But the task is far from complete. Across the land, scores of other areas are being carefully studied as potential sites for national parks and playgrounds. This could be the final drive to save a fragment of the remaining American wilderness. If Mr. Kennedy and Udall succeed they would be worthy successors to Muir and Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt.

MISSOURI

The Missouri park story of recent years has been characterized by a standout program executed on a shoestring budget. The public reaction has been little short of spectacular. A decade ago 1½ million people visited the State playgrounds each year. Through August of this year, 6,890,922 people had passed through the park gates. By the end of 1963, the total should easily exceed 8½ million visitors.

Behind this attendance growth is a remarkable record. It clearly demonstrates what can be done by pennywise people who are dedicated to serving the public.

Overnight camping illustrates the point. Joseph Jaeger, Jr., the park director, and his park board did not wait around until camping had become one of the established outdoor stories of our era. They sensed the trend and have tried to keep ahead of it, as far as limited finances permit.

And how has the public reacted? In 1955, there were 78,700 overnight campers in the State parks and the turnout was considered good. Through August 31 of this year, the total had reached 592,623 campers, with 4 months to go.

There is no guesswork involved in these statistics. They are audited figures based on the small fee that is charged at the campgrounds. But the park board is not resting on its accomplishments. It will use authority granted by the legislature to sell revenue bonds for 1,000 additional camp units in the older, established parks. Capacity will be enlarged 25 percent.

New playgrounds have helped lure additional thousands. These three will be ready next spring, although on a strictly limited use basis: Watkins Mill, Graham's Cave, and a large new park, yet unnamed, in St. Francois County.

None of the land for the new parks has been purchased outright by Missouri. It has been contributed by private individuals and corporations, or purchased with locally financed bond issues. This park board policy means that all available funds can be used for improvements. Limited budgets stretch much further that way.

By the end of the 1960's, 15 million people a year should be using the State parks, with at least 1 million of them staying the night. Missourians can take genuine pride in the fact that their park program has become one of the Nation's finest.

Senator Mansfield Cautions Against Weakness in South Vietnam Policy—Editorial Commends His Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, our highly respected majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] is universally regarded as a man who speaks in dispassionate and measured terms on national and international issues. At a time when much of the discussion of public policy becomes increasingly shrill and when prophecies of imminent doom are offered from all sides, the senior Senator from Montana continues to represent the forces of reason and restraint.

Therefore, when the majority leader draws attention to the disarray in South Vietnam and the divided counsels of American policymakers in that troubled land, it behooves the Senate and the American people to give attention to his views. As a longtime student of Far Eastern affairs and a former professor of Far Eastern history, there is probably no Member of this body who is better qualified to view the American commitment in Vietnam in its proper perspective.

An editorial of the Baltimore Evening Sun of September 21, 1963, has drawn attention to Senator MANSFIELD's recent remarks in this body regarding the need for a coherent and unified American policy in South Vietnam. It offers a perceptive appreciation of the majority leader's contribution toward strengthening the hand of the American mission in

that country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVIDED COUNSEL

Senator MANSFIELD is a sophisticated and knowledgeable man when it comes to matters of diplomacy. He knows that in any diplomatic mission there are honest differences of opinion as to policy. He is aware that any new man in a difficult ambassadorial post such as the one Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., holds in South Vietnam faces a certain jockeying for position among the old hands already there. And he is certainly familiar with the fact that policy direction from Washington is not always clear and unswerving.

Because he knows all this, and accepts such difficulties as routine, his expressed concern for the present situation in Vietnam carries all the more weight. He deplores the failure of certain unnamed groups—presumably the military and Central Intelligence Agency organizations—to give the new Ambassador their fullest support. In the bluntest words he says,

"If we cannot control our own official behavior, if we cannot insure that the man who bears the responsibilities on the spot will have the prompt and full support of all others involved, if bureaucratic inertia or reticences or whatever tie his hands, we are face to face with disaster in South Vietnam. * * * If, to insure this ordering of our own house, certain individuals must be removed from it, then the sooner they are removed the better."

The United States is engaged on an extraordinarily difficult mission in South Vietnam. Because it is involved almost directly in the prosecution of a war, there is a strong tendency to subscribe to the classic victory-at-any-price philosophy. But this is not a war to be won only with bombs and bullets—nor, in the long run, is any war. The complexion of the South Vietnamese Government, the degree to which it receives the support of its people and the view which other nations of Southeast Asia take of it are tremendously important factors.

For this reason, it is clear that the Ambassador simply cannot be frustrated in his task of attempting to persuade and pressure the Diem Government to clean its own house. To what extent this involves reducing certain categories of aid, or putting conditions on its use, is something no one at this distance can judge. But Mr. Lodge is not going to be successful if the Diem Government is uncertain as to whether he speaks with complete authority and with the support of the military and other organizations in the American mission—and in Washington. Divided counsels are one thing. But uncertain and inconclusive action resulting from a failure to choose among these counsels and to act unanimously upon the choice are, as Senator MANSFIELD indicates, the surest way to court disaster.

First District of Massachusetts Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently I tabulated the results of my annual questionnaire, and received over 3,000 replies from my regular 5-county mailing list. The results indicate, to me, the kind of clear thinking that I have come to expect of the First District residents. Thirty-four specific questions were asked in seven areas, and I am happy to make the results of this questionnaire available to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The district, incidentally, includes all of western Massachusetts including the cities of Pittsfield, Holyoke, Northampton, Greenfield, Adams, North Adams and Athol, Westfield, and Amherst:

Results of questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
On domestic issues, do you favor—			
Tax cut:			
The President's recommendations for reduction in individual and corporate income tax rates?	64.5	29.0	6.5
Regardless of $11,900,000,000 budget deficit in 1964?	32.5	56.3	11.2
Only along with offsetting cuts in Federal spending?	78.7	13.9	7.4
The President's proposals for tax reforms?	40.0	38.2	21.8
Limiting itemized deductions such as charitable contributions, etc., to the amount which exceeds 5 percent of adjusted gross income?	28.8	58.6	12.6
Repealing the $50 exemption and 4 percent credit for dividends received?	21.3	63.7	15.0
Medical care for the aged:			
A federally administered plan financed by employer and employee social security payments?	34.7	58.2	7.1
A State-administered plan financed jointly by Federal, State, and individual contributions?	34.6	53.4	12.0
A federally administered plan financed by increased social security payments, with an option to purchase private health insurance policies or social security health plans?	38.0	48.7	13.3
Aid to education:			
Federal funds for public school construction?	59.3	35.3	5.4
Federal funds for public school teachers' salaries?	27.5	65.7	6.8
Federal aid to private schools?	20.7	72.8	7.0
Various issues:			
A federally created Domestic Peace Corps to aid social problems in the United States?	46.8	42.4	10.8
The administration's request for a Youth Conservation Corps along the lines of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's?	50.6	38.9	10.5
Congressional approval of $195,000,000 for a civil defense shelter program?	25.4	60.3	14.3
Repeal of the farm price support program, thereby letting future farm prices be established by normal workings of supply and demand?	80.2	11.0	8.8
On foreign affairs, do you favor—			
Foreign aid program:			
Continued economic aid under our foreign aid program to nations committed as our allies?	73.2	19.3	7.5
Continued military aid to nations committed as our allies?	75.1	17.0	7.9
Economic aid to—			
Brazil	55.4	29.3	15.3
Yugoslavia	21.1	61.7	17.2
Poland	26.8	56.1	17.1
Egypt	24.7	52.8	22.5
South Korea	59.2	20.4	20.4
Indonesia	38.3	36.6	25.1
India	55.4	25.2	19.4
South Vietnam	56.9	23.6	19.5
Newly independent but neutral nations	57.4	21.9	20.7
Cuba:			
Maintaining the administration's present policies	48.2	36.9	14.9
Imposing a total blockade on Cuba	57.7	29.7	12.6
The forcible overthrow of the Castro regime by U.S. military forces	29.4	51.1	19.5
Foreign policy:			
Establishment of a Foreign Service Academy to train future diplomats	74.1	15.1	10.8
U.S. aid to help friendly allies build nuclear forces	30.6	51.2	18.2
Continued negotiation with the Russians to produce a workable disarmament agreement	76.4	17.6	6.0
Continuing U.S. financial support of the United Nations and its overall goals for international peace despite some instances of mismanagement	74.6	15.7	9.7

Letter by Secretary McNamara on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written to me by Secretary McNamara recently:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, September 7, 1963.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in response to your letter of August 24, 1963, requesting my opinion on the effects of the reductions in military assistance voted by the House of Representatives.

For fiscal year 1964, the executive branch request for military assistance was $1,405 million, $75 million below the rock bottom figure I originally had recommended. If the House cut of $405 million is retained by the Senate the United States will be placed in a position of reducing assistance to its allies at a time when Communist threats to free world security are backed by an ever improving arsenal.

In my testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee I stated that if Congress should choose to cut the funds available for protection of our national security, that these reductions should be made in the regular defense budget rather than in military assistance. My opinion has not changed. Even if the Congress feels that the Nation's expenditures for national security should be $405 million less than the administration request, I consider it to be false economy to make that entire reduction in the military assistance program.

In an effort to utilize indigenous forces for local defense wherever feasible, we have hoped to be able gradually to redeploy certain of our forces now overseas. This rede-

ployment, of course, is contingent upon continued maintenance of allied forces at adequate strength. The reduction of approximately 30 percent in military assistance funds for equipping allied forces could result in a slowdown of this effort and continued, if not increased deployment of U.S. forces abroad.

About 70 percent of total military assistance in fiscal year 1964 was planned to go to nine key countries in south Asia, the Far East and the Middle East. Each of these countries is on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc and confronts a direct threat of Communist aggression. These countries are Vietnam, Thailand, the Republic of China, Korea, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan and India. None of these countries has the resources to maintain the forces which our own Joint Chiefs of Staff consider desirable. The reductions in military assistance will have to be made almost entirely in these countries, since the other 30 percent of the program is tied up in international obligations, cost sharing agreements, and for small, but valuable, internal security efforts in Latin America and Africa.

Any reduction of our efforts in Vietnam, Korea, the Republic of China or India will only encourage further Communist activities in these areas; reductions in Iran, Pakistan, and Thailand may encourage Communist penetration; reductions in Greece and Turkey will cause deterioration of NATO strength. The forces of these countries actively guard the free world against Communist encroachments. As a Nation we cannot afford to lower or drop that guard. In my opinion as a nation we cannot afford a reduction in military assistance to $1 billion in fiscal year 1964.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Indiana's Gen. Lew Wallace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Indiana is very proud of one of her native sons, Gen. Lew Wallace, who was a soldier, author, diplomat, and statesman. As evidence of the regard in which Hoosiers hold this gifted individual is the fact that his statue represents Indiana in Statuary Hall.

Mr. Jim Bishop recently wrote a column dealing with the life of this great American and I think it is worth reading. Although most people probably remember Lew Wallace for his authorship of "Ben Hur," yet as this story indicates, he was a man of very broad talents and wide interests.

The column is included herewith:

FAME NOT LASTING FOR LEW WALLACE, BUT NOVEL LIVES ON

(By Jim Bishop)

Fame is the wink of a star, dead at dawn.

Who remembers Lew Wallace? Some historians. A few students. Everyone remembers "Ben Hur." It's a famous movie. How many know that Wallace wrote "Ben Hur," without ever having visited the holy land?

Some men are born with talent. Wallace had it, almost from the time he first saw light on April 10, 1827, at Brookville, Ind. When he was small he drew caricatures in charcoal, and landscapes. He didn't like school, and used the enormous affection between him and his mother to prevent his father from compelling attendance.

Lew was still a little boy when his mother died. At once his mind turned from art to adventure. He took to the woods, carrying gun and rod and such books as he could carry. He would read, but not study. He was 10 when his father, David Wallace, was elected Governor of Indiana.

The boy read everything of value in the State library. By the time he was 15, his handwriting was so Spencerian that Lew was paid to copy public records. At 17, Lew Wallace again changed his habits. He was State capitol reporter for the Indianapolis Daily Journal and, at the same time, began to study law.

Someone asked him what book made the deepest impression, and Wallace said: "Prescott's Conquest of Mexico." This was the key to the boy's character: adventure, soldiering, law, and literature. He was only 20 when the war with Mexico began. At once, Lew Wallace raised a company of volunteers and went off to fight. It was over before he reached Vera Cruz.

He had time. The dull years began in 1849, when Wallace practiced law at Indianapolis, moved to Covington, became prosecuting attorney in 1850, and dropped it to move to Crawfordsville. By 1856, he had been elected to the Indiana Senate, but his only contribution was to advocate popular election of U.S. Senators, and a proposal to liberalize divorce laws.

TWICE DEMOTED, PROMOTED

Peace could not deny Wallace a military life. Four years before the Civil War began, he organized a company of volunteers and drilled it so well that, when war came, almost every man in the ranks became an officer. Wallace was appointed adjutant general of the State.

After Sumter, the Lincoln administration asked Indiana for 60 companies of soldiers. Lew Wallace delivered 130. He would not stay home, and was made colonel of the 11th Regiment. He fought at Harpers Ferry. Within a year, he was a brigadier; after the capture of Fort Donelson, Wallace became a major general. He was 35.

Wallace was a disciplinarian. His men liked him, but some of his seniors didn't appreciate his flash. General Halleck was one. Twice he removed Gen. Lew Wallace from command. Twice, the command was restored. In 1863, Wallace saved the city of Cincinnati from being captured by Gen. E. Kirby-Smith.

Lincoln gave him command of the VIII Army Corps, a depleted group at Baltimore. On July 9, 1864, Wallace's leadership was tested. He had 5,800 men and was attacked by Gen. Jubal A. Early with 28,000. Wallace was beaten, but saved the city of Washington from being flanked and captured.

SOLD 300,000 COPIES

When the war ended, Wallace was appointed to the court which tried and convicted Lincoln's assassins, including Mrs. Mary Surratt. He agreed with the rest of the court that the prisoners should carry heavy iron balls, shackled to their ankles, and be forced to wear black hoods throughout the trial.

The excitement of Wallace's life was over. He tried to raise an army for the liberals of Mexico, but failed. He ran for Congress on the Republican ticket, and was beaten. In 1878, the general was appointed Governor of New Mexico. Three years later, President James A. Garfield appointed Wallace Minister to Turkey.

His first book was "The Fair God," a story of Cortez in Mexico. It was published in 1873, and was an instantaneous hit. In 1880, he wrote "Ben-Hur, A Tale of the Christ." It sold 300,000 copies and was translated into many languages, including Arabic and Chinese. Later, Wallace wrote "The Life of Benjamin Harrison," "The Boyhood of Christ" and "The Prince of India," but none of them achieved popularity.

His literary career, like his military career, was short and highly dramatic. His home life was serene. In 1852, he married Susan Arnold of Crawfordsville. Fifty years later, he referred to her as "a composite of genius, commonsense, and all the best womanly qualities." He referred to the study where he wrote in longhand, as "the pleasure house for my soul."

He died in February 1905, age 77. He was writing "Lew Wallace: An Autobiography," when he gasped and started on his greatest adventure.

Fame is the wink of a star, dead at dawn.

Stuffy, Stodgy?—Not Modern Banking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the leading bankers in the Nation has this advice for the public:

The next time someone asks you what is new in banking, tell him, "Everything. From the front door to the back office."

C. Malcolm Davis, president of the Fidelity Union Trust Co. in Newark, N.J., made that comment in a guest column he recently did for John Soloway, distinguished business columnist for the Newark, N.J., Star-Ledger.

As president of a bank that processes some 50 million checks a year, Mr. Davis is an authority on the growing number of services offered by the banks of our Nation. His column, for example, describes extensive new training programs to help bank employees serve the public. Even the architecture of modern banks has changed in order to make them inviting rather than awesome.

Mr. Davis offers expert testimony on one of the great service industries of the United States. He challenges everyone who might still harbor the notion that banking is somehow stodgy or stuffy. I ask unanimous consent to have his column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKING: STUFFY? STODGY?—NOT MODERN BANKING

(By C. Malcolm Davis)

Bankers have—until the past decade or so—been viewed by the public as conservative, even stodgy, businessmen who knew little about the man in the street and cared less.

Not any more.

During the fifties and continuing into the sixties, the individual banking customer came into his own. After World War II, the Nation's banks realized that a boom was in the making as consumers were satisfying their pent-up demands for homes, automobiles, appliances, and thousands of other products that were unavailable during the war. To meet the financial needs of the American

public—which has become in the words of one economist, "the affluent society"—bankers developed mass marketing and merchandising techniques to acquaint people with the "new look" in banking.

What is this so-called new look? Basically, it is the increase in banking emphasis on the individual customer. It is shown in a number of ways: Changes in the physical appearance of banks, new methods of banker training, the expansion of traditional services and the development of new services for the small customer, and the increasing use of electronic equipment to handle an expanding volume of business.

Let us look at each of these in turn.

Do you remember the old mausoleum-type bank buildings? There are not too many of them left, and those that remain are being remodeled and refurbished as quickly as possible. People did not feel at ease doing business in those cold, massive, dreary buildings with their heavily barricaded teller's cages.

Today, bank buildings are often the most modern in the community. The banking floor is open and spacious, the cages have given way to countertops, and the color schemes are warm and attractive. The best way to tell people that you are interested in their business is to show it. That is why today's bank is designed to look accessible and inviting to any potential customer who may be passing by. (Vaults and cash drawers, though, are still protected with strong old-fashioned locks.)

Banker training has been reoriented to reflect the fact that banks must serve the needs of the smaller customer. Formerly, young men interested in a banking career received most of their training on the job. What little formal instruction there was consisted of technical courses aimed at helping students deal with the accounts of corporations or wealthy individuals.

Today, banks spend a good deal of time and money on training programs designed to inform their employees of the bank's services so that the employees in turn can properly describe to the public how the bank can help them. Technical instruction increasingly is being supplemented with seminars and courses on modern merchandising methods—on how best to tell the public about the bank.

Perhaps nowhere is the new look in banking more apparent than in the dam-burst of new banking services developed in the past decade specifically for the retail customer. Banks are continually looking for ways of improving their relations with the public and of giving more service. It would take more space than I have here today to list all these new services, much less describe them. But I would like to mention two of the more common ways through which your bank can help you.

Special checking accounts, of course, come first to mind. Not too many years ago, banks offered their customers only regular checking accounts which required that a certain minimum balance be maintained at all times. Special accounts enable everyone to take advantage of this important banking service. People can now enjoy the convenience of writing checks without the necessity of tying up thousands of dollars in a regular checking account.

Not content with the mere development of special checking, some banks are now offering their customers colorful, patterned checkbooks whose designs have been approved by leading fashion authorities. Many depositors have shown a decided preference for these stylish checkbook covers over the old brown or black covers.

The basic function of any commercial bank is to lend money. But until banks developed the low-cost personal loan, most people could not take advantage of bank loans which were available only in large amounts to borrowers with recognized credit ratings. Today, almost any employed person with a good record of paying his bills on time can get a bank loan—and for almost any worthwhile purpose. The most common form of personal loan is the automobile loan but other purposes recognized by banks and for which they are anxious to lend money include the financing of education, home improvements, medical and dental work, even boats.

Modern bank buildings, low-cost loans, colorfully designed checkbooks are among the easy-to-see changes in the banking world. Another change, which the average customer never sees and is seldom aware of, is the increasing amount of automation involved in your bank's operations.

The sheer volume of business (Fidelity Union alone will process some 50 million checks this year) demands a rapid, accurate system for handling paperwork. To give their customers the best and fastest service possible, American banks are spending millions of dollars each year on computers, tabulators, punch-card machines, scanners and magnetic encoding.

The next time someone asks you what is new in banking, tell him "Everything. From the front door to the back office."

Foreign Aid and Local Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, during my recent trip to Europe and behind the Iron Curtain, I had opportunities to sample local newspapers.

The following editorial appeared in the Guardian, of Manchester, England, on Saturday, August 24:

FOREIGN AID AND LOCAL POLITICS

The American House of Representatives, the legislative body which represents local constituencies, as distinct from whole States, is running true to its 2-year cyclical form. Elected every 2 years, the House is considered amenable to legislation demanding any broadmindedness only for a few months following each election. With Washington becoming increasingly concerned with next year's election campaign, the House is now entering its most parochial state of mind. This seems to be the best way of explaining the treatment it has given the administration's foreign aid bill in the past 2 days.

It has cut the total aid appropriation for the coming year by just over a billion dollars, to $3 billion. It has voted to ban foreign aid to any country failing to cut off its trade with Cuba. It has fixed a minimum interest rate of 2 percent on foreign aid loans, most of which now bear interest at 1 percent or less. It has also stipulated that at least half or more of such loans be directed to private enterprise operations, and on the same impulses has voted against a large loan to India for another state-owned steel mill. Foreign aid wins few votes, and budget economy has popular support in most parts of the United States, while Cuba seems to have replaced Communist China in American grassroots demonology in the role of the "Great Red Beast."

The Cuban measure seems particularly inequitable to underdeveloped countries, since it is the advanced countries of Western Europe and Canada that conduct by far the largest part of Cuba's trade outside the Communist bloc. If finally passed as law, it will be very helpful to Communist claims that American aid may be at any time withdrawn for political reasons.

It is possible too that the Communist countries receiving aid from the United States—Poland and Yugoslavia—may be the main targets. At least two unsuccessful attempts to cut off aid to these countries have been launched in the House, and it seems probable that this is a roundabout way of achieving the same end. It is more than just that, however, since the political appeal of anti-Cuban measures is very powerful. Much of the damage may be restored when the bill returns to the Senate (which has already cut $700 million from it) and some of the more obnoxious amendments excised. But a total wipeout of the House's work on the bill would be unheard of. President Kennedy's administration will find it very hard to call their foreign aid nonpolitical unless they use very great adroitness in the Senate next month.

From the foregoing it may be seen that the British press views foreign aid in a slightly different light from our own press.

American Farm Bureau on Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a letter of the American Farm Bureau setting forth its position on the proposed tax cut without expenditure reform:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
September 20, 1963

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: On behalf of more than 1,600,000 farm bureau member families in 49 States and Puerto Rico, we wish to express our opposition to the enactment of H.R. 8363, a bill to amend the internal revenue code to reduce individual and corporate income taxes. A tax cut has not been earned through effective control of Federal expenditures.

Farm bureau members recognize the need for a substantial downward adjustment in Federal taxes to create a better climate for economic growth; however, the current budget deficit and our mounting national debt make it mandatory that a cut in Federal expenditures accompany any general reduction in taxes.

We have made specific recommendations to Congress for reductions in the President's requests for new obligational authority for fiscal 1964, including substantial reductions in appropriations for agriculture. With budget requests calling for a record new obligational authority of $108 billion, Congress has to date reduced these requests by only $146 million in the two major appropriation bills on which congressional action has been completed.

The reduction in new obligational authority as a result of House action on the seven major appropriation bills passed by the House has been only $3.2 billion. Despite its plea for tax reduction, the administration has sought full restoration of these cuts in the Senate. In the four appropriation bills considered so far this session by the Senate, House cuts totaling $203 million have been restored.

The continuing increase in Federal expenditures militate against an $11 billion

tax reduction when viewed in relation to the following record of deficit financing:

Fiscal year:		Billion
1961	deficit	$3.9
1962	do	6.4
1963	do	6.2
1964 (estimated)	do	9.2

In view of the foregoing facts, a tax reduction at this time would be fiscally irresponsible because it would: (1) increase the deficit; (2) further enlarge the national debt; (3) threaten inflation; and (4) retard, not expand, economic growth.

We earnestly urge that you vote against H.R. 8363 when it is considered by the House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

Trying To Bypass Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item, of September 20:

TRYING TO BYPASS CONGRESS?

Apparently aware that Members of the Congress Republicans and Democrats alike, are going to insist on a cut in Federal spending before they approve his tax cut proposal, President Kennedy is trying to get around them by going directly to the people.

This was demonstrated in his nationwide television and radio appeal in which he urged citizens to put pressure on their Senators and Representatives to support his $11 billion tax cut program.

He said it is "in the interests of national prosperity, for the sake of the country, and the American family." But is it really?

Of course taxes are too high. Of course they should be reduced. None of us will object to a lesser tax bill, but it must be on a sound basis. And the only sound basis for a tax cut is a corresponding reduction in spending.

President Kennedy says he is going to eliminate waste and unnecessary costs but he does not want it in writing. And for good reason. Despite a campaign promise to reduce Federal spending 25 percent, and give the country a balanced budget, spending under his administration has increased.

President Kennedy would have no trouble at all in pushing through a tax reduction bill if he were serious about curbing spending. But he wants his proposal enacted without restrictions of amendments or congressionally imposed conditions.

In other words, he wants it his way, with no strings tied. But many in the Congress are increasingly skeptical about his vague promises to cut out waste. They want to be more specific, such as with a statutory limit on administrative budget expenditures for 1964 and 1965. That is what the President wants to avoid.

Chairman HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, of the House Rules Committee said the President's pledge to cut expenses might sound good if it were not for the cold facts of what is going on.

By that he meant that since the President sent his $98.8 billion budget to the Congress in January, he has sent messages for new starts and projects for additional spending of $3 billion their first year and over $17 billion over the next 5 years. No wonder Congressmen and Senators are skeptical.

Facing that opposition, Kennedy is hoping the people will bombard their Representatives and Senators with tax cut pleas, without a full study of all facts.

As one Congressman said, this business of constantly going to the people over the heads of their elected representatives, who have opportunity to weigh all considerations, and then act, "is a strange way of running the country."

A tax cut would be fine. But one which would only result in even more ruinous deficit spending is not, despite what the President says, in the best interests of the country.

Apparently the President is looking no further ahead than 1964 which, incidentally, is a presidential election year.

Two Years of the Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the tragic significance of the Berlin wall. This was recently pointed out in a very timely editorial in the Berne Witness, Berne, Ind. Because it does contain so much sober wisdom upon this point, I include it herewith:

TWO YEARS OF THE WALL

Tuesday was the second anniversary of the Communist closing of the border between the East and West sectors of Berlin—the starting point of the Berlin wall.

These have been 2 years of horror in the midst of one of the world's great cities. The wall is a brutal barrier built to close a window through which some of the 17 million prisoners of the Soviet Zone of Germany formerly were able to get an occasional glimpse of an island of freedom, and through which a constant stream of them escaped their captivity.

It is more than just a wall. It is a barricade, a fortification.

It is a line of aggression, not of defense. Its chief function is not to keep out intruders but to keep in the people—the prisoners.

The wall itself is high and thick and heavy, and the Communists keep making it higher and stronger. Six thousand miles of barbed wire were used along the 9 miles of wall to make the approach to it more difficult. The windows and doors of houses are bricked up, and many have been torn down to make it still more difficult for the hapless residents of the Soviet zone to approach the wall. It is guarded, night and day, by pairs and trios and squads of soldiers, always with guns loaded and ready.

Dozens of persons have been shot to death trying to get past the wall. Nevertheless they keep trying, so great is the desperation of their desire to get out of Communist territory to freedom. Thousands have succeeded, despite all the barriers and guards and guns.

The Berlin wall has become a focus point of world attention on the inhumaneness and ruthless barbarism of the Communist system. But let it not be forgotten that this wall is just one tiny spot on a ring of barricades which surrounds the whole Communist empire. It is not just the populace of Berlin and East Germany which is imprisoned. The people of all the Communist nations are prisoners, held behind fortifications of the same sort, with the same threat of death waiting for those who dare try to escape.

The Berlin wall is a focus point also of the weakness and hesitancy of the West. The wall is an illegality and an atrocity. Its building should never have been permitted. It could have been prevented, 2 years ago and in the following days, by decisive and determined action by the three Western Powers. The United States could have stopped it alone, if need be. But it wasn't stopped. Americans, British, and French hesitated and vacillated. While we hesitated, the ghastly wall was built.

We should remember it today not just with sorrow but also with shame and anger. We should make up our minds—the sooner the better—that we will not permit the building of another such wall.

Civil Rights March on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the march on Washington for jobs and freedom made a lasting impression on most Americans. It was carried out in the finest of American traditions. It was a true expression of democracy. The Washington Missourian published an excellent editorial concerning the march and its accomplishment. The editorial also spells out quite clearly why the Congress has a responsibility to quickly enact a sound civil rights program. Our Nation must make up the time which has been lost in making full citizenship a reality for all Americans. The hate and bigotry depicted in our newspapers in the last few days show we have a long way to go. Now is the time to act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Missourian on September 5, 1963, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

Many people are wondering just what the civil rights march on Washington last Wednesday accomplished.

News reports out of Washington indicated that no minds were changed in the body of the Nation's lawmakers. The Senators and Congressmen feel just about the same as they did before.

We doubt very much if the purpose of the march was to change anyone's mind about equal rights. The real purpose was to focus the attention of the population on the injustices suffered by a large group of our citizenry, and if that was the purpose, the march was successful beyond the most optimistic expectations.

The news reports said that more than 200,000 people were involved. Most of them were Negroes, but about 10 percent were white. These people came from all parts of the country—one man even from Alaska. They came by train and plane; by car and

bus; many on foot and some on roller skates.

It was one of the most orderly and best behaved demonstrations in the history of this country. There was not a single fight—not a single incident to provoke anyone. The march started on time, ended on time, and the people went home on time, after listening to speeches, demanding their rights.

We are sure that similar demonstrations in other parts of the Nation would be equally as peaceful if the demonstrators were not provoked into violence on the part of a few rowdies, and bigotted, narrowminded lawmen, whether they walk a beat, or sit in a Governor's chair.

A man is a man regardless of the color of his skin, and an American citizen is an American citizen. The American Constitution does not make provision for superior and inferior citizens. All are equal, and all have equal rights.

The Portuguese have always had the right idea about this. They judge a man not by the color of his skin, but by what he is. The color of a man's skin has nothing to do with his mental capability. If it did, the Chinese would be the world's superior race, and the Indians in India would run a close second. The Chinese are yellow, the Indians dark, some black as the ace of spades.

Educators have proved that they can take a normal child out of the darkest jungles of Africa, and one born in the shadows of the world's greatest universities, and both, given equal educational opportunities, will end up with similar marks in school, and similar accomplishments in their chosen fields.

There is something else about this that many people do not seem to have learned, and that is this: No true believer in God and in a life hereafter can believe that God created a superior race with a white skin, and an inferior race with a colored skin.

In the meantime, the civil rights march on Washington may not have changed any votes in Congress, or the Senate, nor among the population generally, but it did set people to talking and thinking all over the Nation. Action always follows. It may be slow coming, but it will come.

The Negro is asking only for that which the Constitution guarantees him—equal rights and equal opportunities. He is entitled to them just as much as the white man is.

Former Presidents Agree on Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News:

THEY AGREE ON THIS

Former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower have agreed on few things aside from a mutual devotion to their country. Over a period of years they have feuded on just about everything else. It would seem they are poles apart.

And thus it is notable that these two able and honored men are in agreement on their views toward one of the major issues now facing the Congress—a proposed $11 billion tax cut. Both have stated, in somewhat different language, that they favor a tax cut only in the event Federal spending is reduced.

On one of his famous morning stroll press conferences in New York, Mr. Truman said there should be no tax cut until Federal spending is curtailed. "I am not in favor of a tax cut unless the budget is balanced," he said. "I am old fashioned. I believe you should pay in more than you spend."

Previously, Mr. Eisenhower had said: "A tax cut is highly desirable, but only if the persistent and frightening increase in Federal expenditures is halted."

No one really knows how much the expressed views of these two ex-Presidents may have on the Congress with respect to the tax-cut matter. But we do believe that a large majority of American citizens agree with them.

Farm Labor Facts—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the exhaustive recruitment efforts pursued by the Department of Employment of the State of California prior to certification of foreign agricultural workers, I insert the following representative announcement which is sent as a matter of practice to every labor organization and domestic labor recruitment facility long before any certification is effected:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT,
August 14, 1962.

(Form letter sent to the following—Salinas: Central Labor Union, United Packing House Workers of America, CIO–AFL Local 78, Rescue Mission, Father Hermosa, Church of Christ the King, St. Vincent De Paul Catholic Charities, Monterey County Probation Department, Monterey County Welfare Department. Soledad: Monterey County Community Service Organization, Soledad Trading Post, parole officer, Soledad Correctional Facility. San Francisco: California Youth Authority, adult authority.)

The department of employment has openings for farmworkers in crop activities listed in this letter.

Additional numbers of farmworkers are needed to fill the requirements for these activities. It may be necessary to authorize the use of contract foreign workers if more domestic farmworkers are not available.

We solicit your assistance in informing domestic workers of the available job opportunities, and in referring such workers to the local office of the department of employment located at 219 East San Luis Street, Salinas. Hours: 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday and 505 Broadway, King City. Hours: 9 a.m. to 12 noon, Monday and Thursday.

There is need for farmworkers in the following activities:

Crop	Activities	Wages offered	Approximate date of need
Broccoli	Harvest	$1 to $1.12 per hour; $0.24 per crate	Continuous.
Carrot	Pull and tie	$0.28 per 3 dozen bunches	To Dec. 31, 1962.
Do	Pull and top	$0.12 to $0.14 per 40- to 50-pound sack	Do.
Do	do	$1.07 to $1.12 per hour	Do.
Lettuce	Harvest	$1 to $1.25 per hour	To Oct. 31, 1962.
Strawberries	Hoe and weed	$1 per hour	Do.
Do	Harvest	$1 per hour; $0.50 to $0.70 per crate	Do.
Miscellaneous vegetables	do	$1 per hour	Continuous.
Celery	do	$1 to $1.25 per hour	To Dec. 31, 1962.
Vegetables and row crops	Thin and hoe	$1 to $1.12 per hour	Continuous.
Tomato, green	Pick	$0.16 to $0.18 per box; $1 per hour	To Oct. 31, 1962.
Snap beans	do	$0.025 per pound	To Sept. 15, 1962.

A Balanced Budget—When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury has stated that the tax bill will enable us to achieve a balanced budget by 1967 or 1968. This prediction has been the source of numerous statements by proponents of this legislation that the bill represents sound fiscal policy. As the President himself has put it, a balanced budget "cannot be achieved without a substantial tax reduction and the greater national income it will produce."

Upon what facts, upon what analysis was the prediction of the Secretary of the Treasury based?

The plain facts are that it was based upon no facts; it was based upon no analysis; it was based upon a hope; it was based upon a wish; it was based upon a prayer.

Ten days ago I wrote the Secretary of the Treasury stating that it was essential to this debate that the House know the estimates and assumptions he used in predicting budget balance by 1967 or 1968. I asked him specific questions which I felt went to the heart of the question as to whether it was wise to reduce taxes in the face of steadily increasing expenditures and large budget deficits. I place in the RECORD at this point a copy of my letter to the Secretary dated September 13, 1963:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The major issue involved in the tax bill just reported by the Ways and Means Committee, as you know, is the wisdom of a large tax cut in the face of steadily increasing expenditures and large budget deficits. The administration's position, as expressed by you and others, is that the tax cut will stimulate the economy sufficiently to make up the revenue losses within a few years and result in a balanced budget. You recall telling the Ways and Means Committee, that you expected this stimulation to result in a balanced budget by 1967 or 1968.

Other observers have questioned this optimism. Dr. Arthur F. Burns, an eminent economist, for example, has expressed the view that, with expenditures increasing at

or near the current rate and assuming a high rate of economic growth, the budget would not likely be in balance until sometime in the early 1970's, developing large deficits in the interim.

In less than 2 weeks, the House of Representatives will begin debate on the tax bill. It cannot do so intelligently, or responsibly, until the facts surrounding this key issue have been made public and scrutinized. For this reason, it is essential that the estimates and assumption upon which the administration bases its prediction of budget balance in 1967 or 1968 be made available for public study.

This information, at the minimum, should include:

1. Assuming enactment of the tax bill in its present form, the administration's estimates of the gross national product in both current and constant dollars for the years 1963 through the year for which a balanced budget is forecast, showing the annual rate of increase in gross national product for those years,

2. Since the estimates of increased growth in (1) represent the stimulation the administration predicts from passage of the tax cut and forms the basis for the increased Federal receipts which the administration claims are needed to balance the budget.

a. The administration's estimate of Federal administrative budget receipts for each fiscal year until the budget is balanced, and

b. The relationship of the administration's estimate of administrative budget receipts to its estimates of the gross national product and its major components under the new tax bill, comparing this relationship to the relationship of GNP and Federal receipts under the existing tax structure. This estimate of marginal and average tax "takes," under the new and existing tax structures, should be accompanied by the reasoning supporting the choice of data and method used.

3. The administration's estimates of Federal expenditures for each year until a balanced budget is achieved and the rationale for these assumed future expenditure estimates.

The above information should be readily available since the estimates requested would have had to be on hand in order to arrive at the forecast of budget balance in 1967 or 1968 which you have already made. I would hope and expect, therefore, that they will be made available to me sufficiently in advance of the opening of debate on the tax bill in the House on September 24 or 25 so they can be studied carefully and offered for the guidance of the House on this key issue.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BYRNES.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that I asked for a reply sufficiently in advance of this debate so the estimates and assumptions could be studied carefully. I did not receive a reply until today, the day this debate began.

To say that I was surprised at the content of the Secretary's reply is to put it mildly. I was astounded. For the substance of the Secretary's letter is that his prediction of an early balanced budget—the substance of the entire fiscal argument advanced by the administration—is based upon nothing more than a series of hopeful expectations, unsupported by concrete estimates which can be subjected to the test of reasonableness by this House.

I place in the RECORD at this point a copy of the Secretary's reply, dated September 23, 1963:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In reply to your letter, I am glad of the opportunity to give you the reasoning behind my belief that enactment of H.R. 8363, coupled with the cooperation of the Congress in carrying out the President's program of firm expenditure control, should permit us to achieve a "balanced budget by 1967 or 1968," as you stated in your letter.

As you well know from the record of the past 15 years, it has not proved possible to estimate either revenues or expenditures with any precision for a period of 18 months into the future, the time period involved between the first submission of a budget by the President and the close of the fiscal year in question. This is natural because both expenditures and revenues depend on the course of future events, both domestic and international. Such an estimate looking not just 18 months, but nearly 5 years into the future might be an interesting exercise for academic economists, but for me, as Secretary of the Treasury, to set down detailed figures looking that far ahead would give an entirely false impression of the Government's ability to make exact predictions for long periods in the future. It could only serve to mislead and confuse the American people.

The impossibility of making detailed predictions about the future and the undesirability of doing so has been recognized by my predecessors. Thus you will recall that Secretary Humphrey in the hearings on the 1954 revenue bill declined for the same reason to make detailed predictions about future revenues. In 1958, Secretary Anderson took a similar position in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee.

I do, however, agree with you that it would be desirable to set forth the reasoning behind my belief that a balanced budget could be achieved by 1967 or 1968 or sooner.

First, as to revenues. As you point out they depend basically on the growth in our economy, which is most easily expressed by the growth of GNP. The record of the past 10 years has been erratic and marked by a number of recessions, because the burden of high wartime tax rates has consistently prevented the economy from reaching relatively full employment ever since 1957. Enactment of H.R. 8363 will remove this tax brake and usher in a period of steady and rapid growth that could lead us to reasonably full employment of our human and material resources within the next few years. Thus, contrary to our record of the past 10 years, enactment of H.R. 8363 should allow us to look forward to steady and rapid economic growth in the next few years. While this would be a new experience for the United States, it would merely duplicate the recent record of the industrialized countries of Western Europe.

This steady and rapid growth in our economy will naturally lead to greater revenues. However, this is not all. During the period when the economy is climbing rapidly toward full employment we can expect an increased portion of GNP to be translated into revenues. For example, the share of corporate profits in GNP can be expected to rise, returning in the next few years to the 10-percent level that has characterized periods of capacity operation, and which was exceeded in 1955. Since increases in corporate profits yield greater revenues than increases in personal income because of the higher tax rates that are applicable to corporations, the larger share of the corporate profits in GNP will increase our revenues. This increase will, of course, be even more pronounced than usual because of the effect of the acceleration of the payment of corporate taxes provided in H.R. 8363. Largely because of this increase in corporate income tax receipts, overall revenues during the next several years can be expected to grow more rapidly than would ordinarily be the case.

As to the expenditure side of the budget, the President has repeatedly stated that a tight rein will be maintained on Federal expenditures in order that the projected revenue increases flowing from the effects of H.R. 8363 on private earnings will be available for reduction and elimination of the transitional deficit. Under this program of firm expenditure control and with the cooperation of the Congress, it is my opinion that a balanced budget can readily be attained within the indicated period. Indeed, I believe that this is by far the most feasible path to budget balance.

I might add that the projections of Dr. Arthur F. Burns, whom you refer to in your letter as expressing the view that the budget would not likely be in balance until sometime in the early 1970's, assumed revenues increasing only at a constant rate and took no account of the revenue surge which can be expected to occur with the release of the private economy from the restraints imposed by our unreasonably high tax rates. Moreover, Dr. Burns assumed that expenditures would continue to increase at the rate of the past few years, which included a necessary and significant buildup in defense costs. This would, of course, not be the case under the program of firm expenditure control which the President intends to follow in cooperation with the Congress. If these two factors were taken properly into account, then it is easy to see that we could arrive at a budget balance in 1967 or 1968 or sooner rather than the somewhat later period which Dr. Burns' original assumption led him to predict.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

It will be noted, first of all, that the Secretary refuses to estimate either future levels of revenue, if the tax bill is enacted, or future levels of spending, under what he calls the President's "tight rein on Federal expenditures."

This refusal comes somewhat late from a Secretary who, in order to predict a balanced budget by 1967 or 1968, would necessarily have had to make some kind of estimate of the two key elements in a balanced budget—what we take in and what we put out.

It is plain as day, if it is as impossible to estimate receipts and spending as the Secretary indicates, that his prediction of a balanced budget in the near future, as well as the whole burden of the Administration's fiscal argument, is worthless.

The Secretary goes beyond this, however. He even refuses to estimate what kind of a growth in the gross national product we might expect from the tax bill and he refuses to compare this expected growth rate with what we might expect without the tax bill. He merely states his belief that the enactment of the bill will "usher in a period of steady and rapid growth." What degree of growth will be achieved, whether it will be sufficient to provide the revenue to balance the budget, how reasonable is

this vaguely magnificent assumption, these are factors completely disregarded by the Secretary.

It is regrettable, and tragic, that this House has not been furnished with the data supporting the claim that the tax reduction bill will result in balanced budget within 3 to 4 years. It is disturbing—deeply disturbing—that the whole rationale of this bill is based upon nothing more than foggy claims unsupported by basic data which can be subject to the careful scrutiny of the Members of this body.

We must still ask: A balanced budget—when?

General Karge Gets New Jersey Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the Civil War heroes to whom New Jersey lays special claim is Gen. Joseph Karge. This Polish-born soldier came to our Nation 10 years before the great conflict began, and he was a citizen by 1856 and an educator by the time he began his wartime service in the 1st Cavalry of New Jersey as a lieutenant colonel. He had achieved a notable record and the rank of brigadier general before the end of the war.

General Karge's contribution was one of many made by men who, though relative newcomers to the Nation, saw that the Union could survive only through seacrifice and courageous action. We are in their debt and we owe them our thanks, especially during this Civil War centennial year.

In Newark, N.J., Mayor Hugh Addonizio has issued a proclamation designating this week as Joseph Karge Week. A special exhibit will be put on display at the New Jersey Historical Society. This tribute to General Karge is heartfelt and significant. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Newark Star-Ledger article, September 16, giving details of the observance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL KARGE GETS NEW JERSEY HONOR

The name of Gen. Joseph Karge has been added to the roster of Civil War heroes especially honored by New Jersey citizens in the centennial year of the War Between the States.

Mayor Addonizio of Newark recently signed a proclamation making Saturday through September 28 Joseph Karge Week, and a Karge exhibit will be on display next week at the New Jersey Historical Society.

Karge was born July 4, 1823, in Poland. He received advanced academic training in Germany and France, and became a military leader.

Because of his military exploits, Karge fled to the United States in 1851, and earned his citizenship in 1856. He was an educator in New York and Connecticut until the outbreak of the Civil War, when he joined the First Cavalry of New Jersey as a lieutenant colonel.

At Barnet's Fort in 1862, Karge helped save the Army of the Potomac from possible annihilation and aided in the defense of Washington. Suffering from wounds received at Brandy Station, he was forced to retire from duty for a while. But in 1863, Karge reentered service and organized the Second Regiment of Cavalry of New Jersey, becoming its colonel. When General Lee threatened to invade the North, Karge was named supreme commander of all cavalry within the State.

His conduct won his a commission as brigadier general. He stayed with the Army until 1871 to open the West. Then Karge returned to his academic career. He became a professor of continental languages and literature at Princeton University.

The Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, with the Nation's attention focused on the test ban treaty, civil rights and unemployment, let us not overlook other needs of our Nation which are interrelated to the successful solution of the more prominent issues.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently published an editorial concerning a movement against urban rehabilitation. No one can evade the fact that urban America is here to stay unless nuclear weapons are set loose. This means that concentrated efforts must be made to prevent decay and deterioration, to overcome congestion, and to meet a myriad of other problems facing metropolitan areas. The urban renewal program can play a vital role in this endeavor. Careful attention should be given to how the Federal Government can most effectively help local communities in their efforts to keep themselves abreast of the times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO END TO RENEWAL

Even though the urban areas of the United States are growing at a pace described as "explosive," a movement against urban rehabilitation is making itself manifest. It seems to deny the alternatives of progress or decay.

The movement is being nurtured, partly, by romantics who claim that life was better in the old slums than it is in the new projects. Also involved—often against their best interest—are those who see renewal as a perpetuation of old ghettoes in a new form. It embraces those who make profits out of undertaxed, rundown property. But it also appeals to reasonable people who are disappointed with some of the results of rebuilding.

It would be regrettable if, between them, these people influenced a Congress already too reluctant to provide for urban needs. Even those who yearn for Thomas Jefferson's republic of yeomen must know that for us there is no turning off the road of mechanization and urbanization. The only question, really, is whether the revolution of our time, like the first industrial revolution, is to spread blight or whether, as is quite possible, it will enhance our urban way of life. This will be the issue when Congress takes up Senator CLARK'S proposal for updating of the urban renewal program, a bill which surely should have administration support.

We urge second thoughts on those who argue with Jane Jacobs that the old slums were safer, more humane places for living than are the new projects. These critics present an idyllic picture of a slum street in which everybody takes care of everybody. Slum life never was so wonderful. Quite to the contrary, its woeful inadequacies convinced the Nation that the slum is intolerable.

As in the slums, there is crime in some of the projects. Better surroundings alone cannot work miracles; education and employment opportunities are essential to the process of social improvement. Yet official statistics—as well as elaborate studies such as the one made by the Johns Hopkins University—how that rehousing has lowered the incidence of crime. In the St. Louis projects, the rate is lower than in the city as a whole. Further, the projects have brought a marked improvement in physical health and social adjustment. Nor does this indicate that the slums have been relocated elsewhere. A Post-Dispatch survey of people who formerly lived in the Mill Creek area found virtually all of them had improved their housing.

It is a valid complaint, however, that much new construction is architecturally undistinguished. This often was caused by irresistible pressure to provide the most space for the money. There also is justifiable disappointment in the haste with which large areas have been cleared and the slow pace at which they are being rebuilt.

Planners long have advocated a more selective approach which would take greater advantage of existing properties. Areas of outdated and oversized mansions invite imaginative conversion. And where public authorization may be slow in coming, there are opportunities for private investment.

Urban renewal already has achieved significant results. Its mistakes should not be turned into arguments against it, but should be taken as lessons for work still to be done. How much is needed should be apparent to anyone who drives observantly through a city and its environs. And it will have to be done if an urbanized nation is to have the elementary requirements of the good life.

Federal Jobs Filled Through Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short statement which appeared in the Washington Post today. I fear too much of this kind of procedure rather than the proper kind of competition characterizes the filling of Federal jobs in some agencies. As I previously have said several times, if one is truly for the merit system, that which is described in the articles is intolerable.

THE FEDERAL DIARY: HHFA'S JOB QUERY SHOWS MANY FILLED THROUGH FRIENDS

(NOTE.—Mike Causey writes the Federal Diary today. Jerry Kluttz is touring the Pacific area to report on the activities of Federal employees in outlying stations. His reports will appear as they are received.)

Housing & Home Finance Agency's Community Facilities Office made what it admits is a "highly unscientific" study to find out how its recently hired employees found out about job openings.

Less than 5 percent of them were referred to HHFA by Civil Service Commission. About half said they heard about jobs directly through the personnel office or recruiting and the remainder said friends in the agency and former employees alerted them to vacancies.

HHFA officials concluded that the practice of employees bringing their friends is one reason why some offices have hired to few Negroes and other minority group members in the past.

Republican Position on Tax Bill Distorted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that misleading information is being used by the news media in regards to the Republican position on the current tax bill. This information has even been included in a publication supposedly for use by sophisicated taxmen and businessmen. I refer to the Kiplinger Tax Letter of September 20, 1963. In this newsletter, the following appears:

The maneuvering over the tax bill is reaching fever pitch here. Most of the concern is over what will happen when it gets to Senate. House approval within the next few days is pretty much taken for granted. Republicans are not expected to succeed in getting the bill sent back to the Ways and Means Committee, which would assure a quiet death for it.

I am indeed surprised that the business community will pay for this type of reporting. As we all know, passage of a motion to recommit with instructions does not "kill" a bill. Under such circumstances the bill is not sent back to committee. To the contrary, it is passed on the floor with the changes as proposed in the recommittal motion at the conclusion of debate.

It would appear to me that anyone purporting to give an accurate accounting of the legislative process would be familiar with this vital fact. Therefore, I can only assume that such misinformation is being generated specifically to create panic and fear with regard to the ultimate passage of the tax bill. Such misinformation undoubtedly could encourage some to oppose my motion to recommit because of their strong desire for a tax reduction. I, too, want a tax reduction and I am not proposing this motion to kill the bill.

I am proposing this motion because I feel that it is incumbent on us to impose some positive restraint on spending if we are to enact a tax cut in the amount of $11 billion. If I wanted to kill the bill, as the Kiplinger Tax Letter seems to feel is my intent, I would not be offering a motion to recommit, which in my opinion will make it a better bill, but instead I would be urging my colleagues to simply vote against the bill on final passage. This I am not doing. In fact, when I appeared before the Rules Committee in their public hearings on this bill, I expressly stated that if the recommittal motion passed, I would take the floor and strongly urge passage of the bill.

I do not feel that the Congress or the American people should tolerate this type of news reporting. If there are those in the news field who are opposed to spending control, let them come out and so state.

Will History Record a Hungarian Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Cuba continues to remain a threat in the Western Hemisphere because of this country's failure to take stronger action to eliminate Castroism.

While this Nation sits idly by, Cuba, now a Soviet satellite, is embarking on a large-scale program of subversion, which threatens the stability of the nations in the Latin American bloc.

The administration has a number of courses of action—outside of direct intervention—to bring about the downfall of Castro. But procrastination and indecisiveness is permitting communism to spread its atheistic philosophy in this hemisphere.

It was because of this situation that a bipartisan group of Congressmen presented solutions for the Cuban problem in a 4-hour discussion in the House.

An editorial by Larie Pintea entitled "Will History Record a 'Hungarian' Cuba?" poses some interesting questions as to this Nation's intentions if a revolt developed in the island country. The editorial appeared September 17, 1963, in the Erie Morning News, Erie, Pa.

The text is as follows:

WILL HISTORY RECORD A "HUNGARIAN" CUBA?

There no longer is any question but that the Kennedy administration is making every effort, following every Soviet hint thrown their way, to accommodate the Soviet Union.

This is especially true in light of the events that have occurred in our dealings with the Sovietized island of Cuba since the Cuban confrontation.

Obviously the American people are not at this time going to learn of the full commitments made by the President during the Cuban crisis of last year, and perhaps will not learn what agreements were made by the President until he is no longer faced with the prospect of going before the electorate for their votes.

But in view of the soft-shoe dance being performed by the White House it becomes even more imperative that the American people be appraised of a situation which could destroy forever the very principles on which this country was founded, and wipe out every vestige of our historical traditions to support those who are willing to sacrifice their lives for freedom.

The question we are confronted with is this:

What will the White House do if tomorrow, or next week, or next month, the people of Cuba rise up and attempt to destroy the tyrants who have suppressed them with the most vicious jail state since Hungary of 1956?

Such an uprising—without the benefit of weapons, and with little hope of sustaining the revolt for more than 1 or 2 days—would represent the final heart-cry of a brutally subjugated people.

There could be no hope of winning the revolt by themselves.

Their only possible hope would be that another people, stronger than their oppressors, would come to their aid with arms, food, and finally troops.

There can be no doubt to whom the Cuban people would turn for this help.

Only the United States and its American people represent the difference between an infinity of slavery or freedom.

In this instance let's forget the bungled Bay of Pigs invasion and the chance that it would have had in succeeding if the Cuban liberators had been given the proper support of the United States.

But an uprising by the people of Cuba would be an entirely different matter, especially in view of what happened to the gallant people of Hungary who rose against the same oppressors.

Keeping in mind the accommodations which the Kennedy administration has made with the Soviet Union, what support do you believe the Cuban people would receive from the United States if they revolt tomorrow?

Fearfully, shamefully, apprehensively we believe there is every reason to believe that such a Cuban revolt would place a blot on the honor and integrity of this country which would be indelible—a stain which would smear every freedom we enjoy.

Do you believe this country—now—would go to the aid of the Cuban people if they, in their agony, cried for help?

Labor and Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one of the larger manfacturing centers in the Nation, our Niagara frontier area in western New York State has had its share of labor-management problems. Many of them, happily, have been resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both employer and employee.

Just recently the United Auto Workers, AFL-CIO, and the Bell Aerosystems Co., of Niagara Falls and Buffalo, entered into a bargaining agreement that has received favorable reaction from everyone concerned. In contrast to the forced arbitration of the railroad labor dispute, this shows that when mutual trust and understanding are joined with a willingness to compromise and negotiate, labor and management can work together for the benefit of all.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by

Mr. J. Edmund Kelly, labor reporter for the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., with respect to this bargaining agreement. Mr. Kelly has been cited frequently by both labor and management for his outstanding, incisive writing on labor matters. Most recently, he was cited by the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College for his consistently excellent and unbiased reporting on labor and labor-management relations.

The article follows:

LABOR COMMENT

(By Ed Kelly)

There's welcome news for everyone in the new bargaining agreement between the Bell Aerosystems Co. and the United Auto Workers (AFL–CIO).

Welcome news for the more than 1,200 employes affected, because it improves their wages and fringe benefits, bolsters their job security and removes any worry of a work stoppage for nearly 3 years.

Welcome news for the company, because it insures stability of labor relations until mid-1966—a precious commodity when it comes to projecting plans, figuring costs, bidding intelligently and assuring on-time deliveries, all of which gain new business.

Welcome news for the community, because it improves the Niagara frontier's image as a place to work and do business, proves that managements and unions in some sectors of our economy can act responsibly, and offers hope that the local employment picture may brighten.

The pact which accomplishes all this was announced last week by Pete Wacks, Bell's vice president for industrial relations, and by Harold Troidl, UAW subregional director here.

It covers nearly 1000 production and maintenance workers represented by the union's local 501 and more than 200 inspectors, accounting employes, timekeepers and fire captains who are members of the union's local 516.

Local 501 negotiators were headed by President Bob Meredith and Acting Bargaining Chairman Jack Kirisits local 516's by President Greg Pope and Bargaining Chairman Leroy Miller. Assisting them were Harold Troidl and UAW International Representatives Joe Yantomasi, Joe Ferraro and Jay Watkins.

Bell's negotiating team headed by Pete Wacks included Art Skerritt, Joe Bellonte and Bill Fuller.

The parties were assisted by Federal Mediator Bill Buch.

The significance of the new agreement they produced can't be overestimated.

It proves that Bell and the UAW really meant it 2 years ago when they said they'd recognized that their mutual interests and those of the community—could best be served by improving their relationships.

They began the task at that time by negotiating a 3-year agreement whose restraint in economic provisions permitted the company to improve its competitive position.

As the months went by, employer-employe relations and the overall labor-management climate in the Bell plant improved, helping to make possible the dramatic bargaining news of next week.

The only matter legally open for Bell-UAW negotiations this year was their pension agreement which was to expire last July 7.

When the parties got talking early in the year, it quickly became clear that the UAW members were greatly perturbed about their insurance program. Insurance is separate from pensions and is covered in the general labor agreement, the one negotiated in 1961 and which wasn't due to expire until May 1, 1964—8 months from now.

Both sides expressed willingness to negotiate changes in the general labor agreement, there and then, if the new pact which finally emerged provided advantages to each.

In the words of local 501's final report to its members: "It was recognized by all of our members that to get a comprehensive insurance program the union had to give the company the only thing we could offer—stable labor relations through an extended contract."

So Bell and the UAW, in a spirit of compromise representing the best traditions of true collective bargaining, not only negotiated a new pension program but also negotiated an extension of their general labor agreement to June 5, 1966—insuring almost another 3 years of company-union harmony.

By so doing they showed what can be done by an enlightened management and union if both have the will. They showed, too, the advantage of negotiating outside a crisis atmosphere.

And, by turning their backs on the traditional and rigid notion that new agreements are negotiated only when old ones expire, they showed a bargaining flexibility which is refreshing.

This was labor-management statesmanship of the highest order. It does credit to Bell Aerosystems, to the United Auto Workers and to the Niagara frontier.

Jaycees Oppose National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, proposals have been made to initiate various Government youth and service corps—financed, of course, by the taxpayer. I have received a significant letter from the president of a national organization that is both youthful and devoted to service, yet needs no Government payments and wants none.

The 4,800 chapters of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce are meeting community needs across the Nation. Jaycees have always been ready, willing, and able to do all sorts of community improvement projects. They can do the job. They want to do the job.

Presidents of local Jaycee chapters have voted overwhelmingly—2 to 1—against the idea of a national service corps. The following letter, stating Jaycee position, is from Richard H. Headlee, president:

U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tulsa, Okla., September 20, 1963.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FINDLEY: In the coming weeks, you and other Members of Congress will be giving serious conisideration to tax legislation.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce feels strongly that tax rate reform is vital to the economic growth of our country. The tax rate schedule contained in the bill passed by the House Ways and Means Committee, however, does not reflect this need in its entirety.

The steep graduation of rates through the middle income brackets was not eliminated by the committee. These rates must be reduced, as they are a major source of investment capital for economic expansion. This has been the guiding principle of the tax rate reform program conducted by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce over the past 5 years.

I urge you to do all that is possible to achieve meaningful tax rate reform in these middle income tax brackets.

As you consider the saving of taxpayers' money, we would appreciate your recognition of the vast manpower of civic organizations, such as ours. Why not utilize this reserve of manpower in meeting community needs rather than resorting to a national service corps?

Volunteer groups are already doing a tremendous job in their own communities. If the feeling prevails that more effort is required to solve local problems, Congress should call upon local people to do the work. I am confident citizens living in their own community know their problems best. At the same time, American taxpayers would not have another financial burden.

In a recent referendum, presidents of our 4,800 chapters across the Nation voted by a margin of 2 to 1 against the concepts of the Domestic Peace Corps.

Your attention to these important matters will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

RICHARD H. HEADLEE,
President.

Madden Dam Project, Canal Zone: Purchase or Expropriation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as all students of Panama Canal problems know, Isthmian newspapers feature significant stories about movements in Panama likely to affect the maintenance, operation, sanitation or protection of the canal. Such publicity is in sharp contrast with the treatment of silence usually given these matters by the press of the United States.

Recent information from Panama, published in the September 12, 1963, issue of the Star and Herald, the well-known English language Latin American newspaper, is to the effect that Juan Alberto Morales, director of the Institute of Hydroelectric Resources of Panama, in a letter to President Roberto F. Chiari, has urged that the Madden Dam and Power Project be acquired from the United States through purchase or expropriation. This, Mr. Speaker, he advocates on the alleged ground that the water of the Chagres River is a natural resource of Panama. He fails, however, to mention article IV of the 1903 treaty under which Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity" the "supply of water" as may be "necessary and convenient" for canal purposes and that Madden Dam and Lake are in the Canal Zone.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Madden Dam was named by the Congress in honor of former Chairman Martin B. Madden of the House Committee on Appropriations, who, from 1904 until his death in 1928, was a champion of the Panama Canal in

the Congress and a stanch defender of U.S. rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone. His bust adorns the rotunda of the Cannon Building.

The construction of the Madden Dam project, completed in 1935, resulted from experience with a shortage of water for maintaining channel depths and lockages during the dry year of 1919–20 and with the great flood of October 1923 when Gatun Lake saved the Panama Canal from destruction. This project increases the reserve water supply, produces power for canal operations, and reduces the danger of floods from the upper Chagres River. Thus, it is an indispensable canal operating facility.

The report of the pending Panamanian assault on the Madden Dam project is not surprising in the least. It is just one more element in the well-advanced program for the piecemeal liquidation of the Panama Canal enterprise that has been virtually invited by the inept, if not subversive, conduct of our relations with Panama. Moreover, it supplies additional justification for early passage of H.R. 3999 to prevent such surrenders, which measure unanimously passed the House of Representatives and was sent to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, should the Republic of Panama, with or without encouragement of executive officials of our Government, make any formal move that seeks to acquire the Madden Dam project there is only one answer: the sovereign rights, power and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone or its auxiliary lands or waters are not topics for negotiations and will not be discussed.

The indicated news story, which will be of interest to all cognizant committees of the Congress, follows:

[From the Star and Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Sept. 12, 1963]

OFFICIAL URGES REPUBLIC OF PANAMA TO GET MADDEN DAM

President Roberto F. Chiari has been asked to undertake steps for the purchase or expropriation of the Panama Canal Company's Madden Dam hydroelectric plant.

The request was made yesterday by Juan Alberto Morales, Director of the Institute of Hydroelectric Resources.

Morales said the hydroelectric plant, "located on national territory and using our hydraulic resources, reports no benefit whatever to our Republic.

"We are facing the unique case of a powerful and rich country, like the United States, utilizing the potential wealth of another which is small and poor, like ours, without any sort of compensation for the latter."

He said the purchase or expropriation of the Madden plant is feasible since it is owned by the Panama Canal Company "which, for the purposes of our laws and our sovereignty, is a company like any one of the many which are operating in the national territory."

Morales letter is as follows:

"Mr. President.

"I have the honor of writing you to refer again to the matter of electric power produced at the Madden Dam plant.

"Some months ago I expressed to you my disagreement with the fact that Madden Dam, located in the national territory and utilizing our hydraulic resources, reports no benefit whatever to our Republic. We are facing the unique case of a powerful and rich country, like the United States, utilizing the potential wealth of another which is small and poor, like ours, without any sort of compensation for the latter.

"Inasmuch, Mr. President, as Madden Dam is owned by the Panama Canal Company, which, for the purposes of our laws and our sovereignty, is a company like any one of the many operating in the national territory, I hereby request, through your worthy medium, that the necessary steps be taken for the purchase or expropriation of the Madden Dam hydroelectric installations.

"This hydroelectric plant should be owned by the Panamanian nation and should be operated by the Institute of Hydraulic Resources. The price of purchase or expropriation can be easily financed through any international bank, since the income from the sale of power and water would provide the Republic with the means for paying the banks and operating the system.

"Panama cannot and should not accept, henceforward, that our hydraulic resources be utilized free by another country. The growth of the cities of Panama and Colon will result in the not too distant future in a demand three or four times the present one, and we have to see to it that our growth will not be affected because we do not own our own natural resources.

"While the present canal operates with millions and millions of gallons which we furnish free, it turns out that we have to pay 7 to 9 cents per thousand gallons destined for our consumption."

Institute sources said the high voltage lines from Madden Dam are laid across the Chilibre townside, under Panamanian jurisdiction, without any payment to Panama. They reported also that zone officials last month denied permission for a party of Panamanian engineers to survey the Chagres River headwaters.

Balboa Heights sources said they had no knowledge of any such incident at any time.

The Madden Dam site, zone sources pointed out, is covered by a special agreement between Panama and the United States.

Increase U.S. Export Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greenfield News of Indiana dated September 20, 1963:

TO INCREASE U.S. EXPORT BUSINESS

The other day President Kennedy was talking to a group of important U.S. business leaders and executives. He revealed that currently only about 4 percent of U.S. production of goods and services is exported for foreign trade. Years ago we sent about 6 percent of our production into foreign markets.

The President called for an increase in this figure of at least 10 percent. That would make a total of 14 percent, or almost one-seventh of the U.S. production.

His idea was twofold. First, he sought the obvious and important contribution to the "ever-expanding economy." That means more jobs, more wealth, more growth, more tax collections.

Second, he was thinking about the unfavorable trade balance which is steadily draining gold from this country as we owe other countries more than they owe us. To sell them more of our production could rectify this serious situation.

This is all very good reasoning but, it struck us, it fails to go far enough.

Why is it that, despite the fact we produce more and better goods; and despite the fact that we have been sending $4 billion per year to most of the nations of the world for two decades in the form of foreign aid, the percentage of our total production which they buy from us has actually dropped rather than increased?

Much of the blame can go back to a pattern established in this country during the last 30 years, by which our costs of production have increased more rapidly than such costs generally over the world. Therefore, much of our production is in competition with German, French, British, Italian, Dutch, Belgian, and Japanese similar items, at prices considerably higher than the foreign-made.

We have allowed our wages, taxes, work regulations to contribute so greatly to our cost of production, transport, and marketing, and at the same time have so inflated our dollar that we have priced ourselves out of competition in the world markets on many basic and important items. In fact, steel and many of its fabrications we are hard pressed to hold our place in our domestic markets here at home, to say nothing of expanding into foreign market places. This applies also to textiles, footwear, watches, cameras, and a world of manufactured items.

So what the President asks is impossible "across the board." It may be accomplished in certain selective fields where we have maintained a competiitve position.

To find the place of responsibility for this we in a large degree must go back to the general and dominant political pattern and economic pattern, insofar as it is influenced by Government.

Since the great depression American industry has often been painted as a culprit, the "devil in the woodpile," from time to time, a "SOB." At occasional and unguarded moments, dominant politicians of the time have actually used the epithet in describing industrial leaders.

True, the "whip and carrot" technique has been used. Right now the carrot is being suspended before the beast's nose to urge him on to greater achievements. In the days, 18 months ago, of the steel price rollback, it was the "whip."

It is rather difficult to get real cooperation that way, even if such cooperation was possible, which it is not since the matters affecting production costs have been allowed to occur.

A basic change in public and political thinking is essential if we are to take an increasing portion of world markets.

Standards of Performance in Gas Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the important problems which constantly engages the attention of so many of our people throughout the United States is the utilization of our great natural resources. One of the most difficult jobs in our administrative processes, in my judgment, is the administration of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as amended since. The Federal Power Commission is charged with this responsibility.

Most everyone would like to have the benefit of natural gas as a fuel in their

home. This is understandable for many reasons. No industry is of greater importance to the consumers and the economy of the country. It is highly competitive in so many ways and thus has become a most important factor in our system of free enterprise.

Thus, the distribution of this vast resource in providing energy for our people becomes of great importance. The Honorable Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission gave an address to the American Public Gas Association on September 12, 1963, in Memphis, Tenn. on the subject "Standards of Performance in Gas Distribution." For the information of the Members I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE IN GAS DISTRIBUTION

(Address by Joseph C. Swidler)

For many reasons I am particularly happy to be in Memphis today to address this convention of the American Public Gas Association.

First of all, I am glad to have an opportunity to meet the officers and members of this new organization. The public segment in the field of natural gas distribution is one of growing importance. Approximately 700 communities in this country and a total of 2.5 million consumers are now served by publicly owned distribution systems, approximately 500 of which were formed since 1950. With the help of your new organization public gas distributors will be able to pool their ideas and their strength in order to promote the welfare of the communities and the citizens they serve.

The fact that this convention is being held in Memphis and that your host organization is the Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division gives this meeting a special attraction for me. I have been working with and for the Memphis Light, Gas and Water Division and its predecessor organization for 30 years. In 1933 I became power attorney for TVA and in the early thirties helped to negotiate the power contract between Memphis and TVA which has proved the basis of an important and lasting relationship between the two organizations. I have enjoyed the privilege of friendship with the leaders of this great municipal business enterprise over a period of many years. Mr. J. A. Krug and I were the TVA members of the Memphis-TVA negotiating team which negotiated the purchase from Memphis Power & Light Co. of both the electric and gas distribution systems which play such an important role in the economy of this great city. Mr. Krug—Cap Krug, as everyone calls him—went on to become Chairman of the War Production Board and Secretary of the Interior. As in my own case, this was the beginning for him of lasting friendships and professional associations with the officials of the Memphis utilities.

My long association with this city has left many indelible memories. I remember my long and affectionate relationship with Maj. Thomas H. Allen, who served as president of the board through the period of acquisition of the electric and gas systems, through the whole period of the first 20-year contract with TVA, and through the Dixon-Yates episode which required the city to build here on the banks of the Mississippi one of the country's largest generating plants at a cost of $150,000,000. I remember the indomitable energy of this frail little man who worked ceaselessly for the improvement of the Division and the progress of the city he loved. Tom Allen was a modest and retiring man, but no one who worked with him could fail to be impressed with his dedication, integrity and command of his work and his organization. He died loaded with honors and mourned by hundreds of friends throughout the country.

I think, too, of my long and close friendship with Ira Lichterman, who was a member of the board through this whole period until his death only a few months ago. Ira Lichterman was a part-time member of the board, but I am sure that he devoted more time to the affairs of the light, gas, and water division than he did to the commercial and industrial enterprises which he headed. He brought to the board qualities of business drive, executive judgment, and civic vision which have been reflected in the outstanding record of the division. In the tradition of civic responsibility which Ira Lichterman established, his son, Martin, now sits as a member of the board of the division.

The board has had the help of many other distinguisehd Memphians through the years. I remember in particular Wilson Mallory among those who are no longer with us. Of the members of the present board, headed by Ray Morton, it would be inappropriate for me to speak, other than to say that it is a strong board with a notable record of achievement.

Perhaps you know that the division is a former client of mine. In the period between leaving TVA and taking my present position in Washington, I represented the city on electric power matters. I was fortunate to have been able to participate in the early stages of the negotiations which have reestablished Memphis as a TVA power distributor, fully effective in 1965 when TVA will take over responsibility for the Thomas H. Allen Steam Plant and the power supply responsibility for the growing needs of the Memphis area.

I have never represented Memphis on natural gas problems, but I came fairly close. Hardie Johnston approached me shortly after I left TVA and sounded me out on helping the division with some of its natural gas problems. He made no offer, and I was not put in the embarrassing position of turning down a retainer, but I told him I knew so little about natural gas work that I thought I had better not take on responsibilities in that field. I should not be surprised if there were a fairly large body of thought in the natural gas industry which agrees with the statement I made to Hardie and heartily wishes that I had adhered to it.

Some of you may know the history of Memphis' acquistion of its gas system. As I have said, I happened to participate in the original negotiations in 1938 between Memphis and the Memphis Power & Light Co., which then owned both the gas and electric systems as well as the street railway property. Memphis had begun the construction of a duplicate system after a lawsuit had sustained the validity of its program to acquire its own system. At the beginning, the negotiations were for the electric system only. A group of Memphis and TVA people, including Mr. Krug and me on behalf of TVA, negotiated with the company over an extended period, and finally all parties agreed upon a transaction for the acquisition of the company's electric properties, subject only to formal ratification by our respective principals. This was at the time that Mr. E. H. Crump was an important factor in Memphis politics, although he hald no public office. In present day terminology you would say he was an authoritarian figure. At about this time, he and the mayor, Watkins Overton, who had participated in the final stage of the negotiations and who announced their successful conclusion, had a falling out over issues far too intricate and obscure for me to attempt to explain, but I recall that somehow the issue of Sunday closing of grocery stores became entangled in the electric system acquistion problem. At any rate, the result was that the city commission refused to ratify the acquisition agreement but announced instead that it would proceed with its construction plans for a duplicate system.

Of course, the TVA Board was disturbed at the prospect of duplication of a valuable property when the owners were willing to negotiate a sale on a reasonable basis. Before construction by Memphis of a separate system had proceeded much further, Mr. Krug and I were given permission to try to persuade the city to resume negotiations to buy the existing system. We arranged for an interview with Mr. Crump and the members of the city commission. At this interview, which I recall was held in Mr. Crump's office, we attempted as forcefully as we could to present the advantages of a negotiated acquisition. After an hour or more it seemed hopeless to continue, so we summoned up our dignity, rose from our seats, said our goodbyes, and prepared to take our leave. At this point Mr. Crump bade us remain and talk further. We stayed, and before we separated that day it had been agreed that the city and TVA would make another effort at acquisition which would include the gas as well as the electric properties. The negotiations were successful and shortly the properties were transferred to Memphis and TVA. The Memphis Gas System has proved to be an exceedingly valuable property and a great municipal asset. This is some of the background on how your convention happens to be held in Memphis today rather than in Holyoke or Colorado Springs.

The negotiations were conducted during a period when TVA was involved in negotiations with several other companies and after the basic terms had been agreed upon, it became necessary to call in additional help from TVA's legal staff to complete the complex negotiations and to draft the elaborate documents to carry them out. The TVA lawyer called in for this job was Henry H. Fowler, now Under Secretary of the Treasury, who has never forgotten his stay in Memphis or the friends he made here. When he heard that I would be speaking here today he asked that I bring you his regards and remembrances.

Perhaps I have said enough about ancient Memphis history and should get on to current matters.

I have had occasion in talking about the electric power industry to state my philosophy that each community should have freedom of choice as to whether to handle the electric power business in its community through a public or private agency, as it preferred. An outstanding feature of American life is its economic pluralism, its freedom to make use of a variety of instruments to achieve its economic objectives. The people of a community should be free to use whatever instrument they believe will do the best job. In particular I think it is a healthy thing that there should be a public as well as a private sector of the industry, each of them serving to monitor the other and competing with each other on the institutional level in setting ever higher standards of service. In the power industry institutional competition has on the whole been healthy. There are some excesses which I deplore, but this is not the occasion to talk about that subject.

In the case of the natural gas distribution industry, I believe that the same principles apply—that there is room for both and that the existence of each should help the other to attain higher standards of efficiency and better performance in the public interest.

What is the test whether a particular community should franchise a private distributor or carry on its own gas distribution undertaking? I presume that in each case where there is a public system either service from an investor-owned company was not available or the people have decided that in their circumstances a public system could do a better job for the community than a private enterprise. In my view where a public system can do a better job it should

not be cast aside on doctrinaire grounds, but should be permitted and encouraged to serve its role in the public interest. Conversely, I believe there is no magic in public ownership as such, and no more room for doctrinaire support than for doctrinaire opposition. A utility system, public or private, should aim always to prove itself by superior performance. Where there is a choice it should rest upon relative zeal and skill in advancing consumer and community interests.

In my line of work inevitably one tends to compare the natural gas and electric power industries. There are basic differences in the structure of the two industries which make for very different regulatory patterns at the national level, even though the Natural Gas Act and the Federal Power Act are similar in many respects.

From the point of view of industry structure the outstanding characteristic of the natural gas industry is that, unlike the electric power industry, most of the gas distributors are separate companies that purchase their gas supplies at wholesale from nonaffiliated interstate pipelines. In economic jargon, the electric companies tend to be vertically integrated, from generation through distribution. The wholesale rates of the interstate electric companies subject to FPC jurisdiction represent only about 6 percent of their total revenues. Even under conditions of areawide system integration, such as the Federal Power Commission is encouraging through the National Power Survey, for the most part these investor-owned power companies which account for 80 percent of the Nation's power supply would retain primary responsibility for their own production and transmission functions as well as for retail distribution.

On the natural gas side organizational lines tend to follow the functional division between production, transmission and distribution. On the whole, the production function is a responsibility of the so-called independent producers, large and small, who comprise the production segment of the petroleum industry. Many producers operate on a national scale. While deposits of gas are fairly widespread throughout the United States, 80 percent of the supply originates in Texas, Louisiana and the Kansas-Oklahoma fields from which it is transported to distribution centers in 46 States by a highly developed network of transmission lines which constitute the principal, and in some cases the sole, activity of the pipeline companies. In turn, most of the distributors are independent of either the producers or the pipelines and buy their gas supply at the city gate under rates approved or prescribed by he FPC, or by State commissions where no interstate transmission is involved. The importance of these wholesale transactions is underscored by the fact that over 90 percent of the gas which distributors sell at retail has been purchased from a pipeline supplier.

These distinctions in industry structure are of more than academic interest to the members of your organization. On the electric power side the dominant industry pattern of intermingling the generation and transmission functions, in which scale is of great advantage, with the distribution function, tends to put a premium on size even though there is no evidence of a comparable advantage of scale with respect to distribution as a separate function. To assure distributors of a fair share of the economies of large-scale production when they purchase their power supply at wholesale is a major problem of regulation. It is a problem, I might say, which the Federal Power Commission is attacking energetically.

The assurance of parity of treatment to the customers of all transmission systems is one that has been greatly facilitated on the natural gas side by the industry's functional stratification. FPC approves the city-gate price for all interstate sales at wholesale to distribution systems, large and small, public and private. Municipal gas distributors, irrespective of size, are assured of precisely the same treatment on rates and services as the other distributors of the pipeline systems.

I do not mention this congressional protection of the customers dependent on interstate natural gas supplies to encourage you to complacency. On the contrary, this vantage of protection in your source of supply means that the natural gas distributors, public as well as private, are free to concentrate on doing the best possible job of distribution for the benefit of their consumers and their communities. Of course, I know that all of you are interested in the FPC proceedings involving the certificate and rate problem of your pipeline company suppliers, and some of you have been more than moderately active in proceedings involving producer rates on sales to these pipelines. Nevertheless, the managers of the gas distribution systems have a single primary function. This gives them both the freedom and the obligation to focus on constant improvement in the quality of the distribution service and in holding down the cost of that service.

I recognize that the ability of gas distributors to concentrate on their job depends on how well the members of the Federal Power Commission carry out their responsibilities and I also realize that there have been times in the not too distant past when many distributors, not to mention pipelines and producers, felt that the protection afforded by FPC regulation was more illusory than real.

The situation which existed just a little over 2 years ago when the present members of the Commission took office did indeed give credence to the charge that there had been a breakdown of the regulatory process. The backlog of pipeline rate increases had climbed to over $1 billion and many pipelines had two or three rate increases in effect, none of which had been decided, and all of which were being collected subject to refund.

I am sure all of you are familiar with the decisive action the Commission has taken in the past 2 years to eliminate this backlog. We have ordered refunds which now aggregate almost $500 million and have reduced pipeline rates by over $60 million annually. All of you can attest to the Commission's actions by the refunds received and by the fact that in most instances your wholesale gas rates are lower today than they were 2 years ago.

I trust that the Commission's performance has earned your confidence in our ability and determination to carry out our responsibilities. For you to be able to continue to concentrate on the improvement of your distribution operations depends upon the continuing ability of the Federal Power Commission to shoulder its burden of assuring fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory rates at wholesale. This we regard as our paramount responsibility.

It would be appropriate on this occasion to comment on the performance record of the public gas distributors and either to congratulate you on superior performance or to point out ways in which that performance could be improved. I regret to say that I have no solid information which enables me to do so at this time. Little but faith enables me to have confidence in the quality of your present performance. I do have that faith, but I should prefer to have it supported by figures. There are no central repositories of comprehensive financial and economic data with respect to natural gas distributors such as exists in connection with the electric power industry. The Natural Gas Act unfortunately contains no provision conferring upon the Commission responsibility for the compilation and publication of industrywide data comparable to section 311 of the Federal Power Act. Bills have been introduced in the Congress which would remedy this oversight and enable the people of the country to determine the performance of the natural gas industry as a whole as well as to compare the various segments of the industry. Such legislation would fill an obvious need.

For the present this associtaion can perform a useful public service by accumulating from its members information on their facilities, investments, and operating results on a sufficiently uniform and comprehensive basis to permit appraisal of the quality of performance of the individual distribution systems. There is no stimulation to management improvement more potent than the application of measures of performance related to the performance of other systems operating in the same field. The compilation of such data and statistics would in itself be ample justification for the existence of this promising new organization. I suggest also a publication comparable to the "Typical Electric Bills" series of the FPC.

The distribution of natural gas is as yet a relatively new municipal activity. I see no reason why there should not be a great future for public enterprise in this area. What is needed first of all, however, if public enterprise is to prove itself in the field of natural gas distribution, is for the public distributors to face the question of their purpose in existence. Should it be the city's purpose to siphon off the largest possible amount of revenues from natural gas consumers for the support of local government? Or do you visualize the establishment of a reasonable earnings standard, including an amount in lieu of taxes for the support of local government, with the consumers receiving the benefit through improved service and rate reductions of earnings in excess of this standard? In my opinion, without such a standard there is no satisfactory answer to the question why gas distribution should be a publicly owned activity.

The importance of establishing reasonable earning standards by which the operations of municipal gas distribution systems can be judged, and from which reasonable rate levels can be established, can hardly be overstated. Municipal operations are generally exempt from regulation by State or Federal commissions on the theory that such public enterprises are self-regulating. This exemption places a great responsibility on those in charge of municipal gas distribution systems to practice self-regulation. The necessary first step is to establish guidelines by which the gas consumers and the citizens of the community can test the earning performance. Absence of such standards leaves municipal gas distributors and their customers in a most uncertain status. A good example of the existing uncertainty is the fact that FPC's recent survey of what the distributors have done with the vast amount of money they have received from pipeline companies in refunds ordered by the FPC, revealed that municipal distributors retained over 90 percent of the amounts refunded to them by the pipelines, and passed along only 10 percent to their consumers. This showing is understandable only because there is no general standard by which to determine whether earnings are too high or too low. How high should the earnings of a municipal gas plant be before they are enough? How much is too much? My point is that it is impossible for gas consumers to know whether they are paying fair prices for gas or for the citizens of the municipality to know whether the gas operations are on a sound, businesslike basis, unless earning standards are formulated, and unless rates are fixed by reference to these standards.

It is obvious that if you municipal natural gas distributors do not have a philosophy of operation to sustain you that many

of you will be subject to pressures from local governing boards to operate primarily as tax gatherers with only secondary consideration for your responsibility to your consumers. As enterprises engaged in a new municipal activity you have a fresh opportunity to work out with the officials of local government financial programs which are fair to all concerned, and which will impose the restraints of fairness upon what might otherwise prove to be unlimited and unwise financial drains on the resources of the natural gas enterprises while at the same time assuring that gas consumers shoulder their fair share of the cost of government.

I have touched upon only a few of the considerations which are pertinent to the development of public interest standards to guide municipal gas distributors. However, there is a large role which the American Public Gas Association can play in bringing together and distilling the views of your individual members for the benefit of all.

In my opinion, the highest function which this association can serve is to help develop standards of performance oriented to consumer service as a means of helping your members to carry out their obligations as purveyors of an essential utility service.

The Red Cross Centennial: The Role of Its Founder, Jean Henri Dunant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an outstanding article by Philip Slomovitz, editor of the Jewish Daily News in Detroit, Mich., on the Red Cross Centennial celebration and the role of its founder, Jean Henri Dunant. A portion of the article follows:

[From the Detroit Jewish News, Aug. 23, 1963]

THE RED CROSS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION: THE ROLE OF ITS FOUNDER, JEAN HENRI DUNANT, ONE OF THE CHRISTIAN FORERUNNERS OF HERZL

(By Philip Slomovitz)

In 1863, representatives of 14 European nations gathered in Geneva, Switzerland, to plan the formation of an organization of societies for the relief of men wounded in war. It was as a result of that meeting that an agreement was signed "for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies in the field."

Thus, the Red Cross was founded. It was inspired by a 31-year-old Swiss banker, Jean Henri Dunant, who set out on a mission of mercy after witnessing the horrors on the battlefield of Solferino, in northern Italy.

M. Dunant had coined a watchword: Tutti Fratelli—which, in Italian, means all men are brothers. It was a watchword for those who aided the 40,000 men who were wounded in that battle, in 1859.

With 89 nations preparing to mark the Red Cross Centenary this year, the Dunant saga emerges as one of the most fascinating stories in humanitarianism.

M. Dunant not only has earned a place in history as the founder of the Red Cross: he also has gained an imperishable place in Jewish history as an advocate of Jewish settlement in the Holy Land and as one of the great forerunners of Dr. Theodor Herzl among the Christian supporters of the Zionist idea.

The idea of a Red Cross was born at Solferino in 1859. The International Red Cross came into being as a result of the Geneva Conference in 1863. In 1901, M. Dunant was the first recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, in recognition of his great humanitarian ideal.

At the same time, M. Dunant was nourishing in his heart another dream: for the rehabilitation of the dispersed, sorely tried and persecuted Jews.

EXTRAORDINARY MEMORANDUM

In an impressive biography, "Dunant—The Story of the Red Cross" (Oxford University Press—1938), Martin Gumpert wrote about Dunant:

"His prophetic glance did not yet see into the distance not even as far as the misery that was waiting just around the corner. Dunant had a new idea. In March 1866, he divulges his plan for a 'Universal and International Society for the Revival of the Orient.' Did he see so clearly in advance the evil that was brewing in aged and fanatic Europe and which could degenerate at last into an inconceivable race hatred? Once more it was a touching mixture of the apostolic spirit, the humanitarianism of the century and a sense for business speculation that made him the legitimate forerunner of Theodor Herzl and Zionism and finally led his plan astray. In the Biblioteque Nationale is a single copy of his extraordinary 8-page memorandum on this subject. Palestine was to be neutralized in the interests of a great colonial society. And in the following year the International Palestine Co. was actually founded, with Dunant as president; it proceeded to make contacts with Jewish societies until the enterprise broke up.

"Nevertheless, the Palestine project had flourished so far that by 1867 Dunant could discuss it with the Empress Eugenie in the presence of the French Ambassador to Constantinople, M. Bouree."

It is possible that Dr. Herzl may have been totally unaware of the activities of M. Munant; else he might have attempted to enlist his services in behalf of the Jewish National Home in Palestine toward the end of the last century.

Much needs to be said about Dunant's interest in Palestine and his famous statement. It is necessary to understand Dunant to be able to appreciate his concern for the Jewish people.

HIS SPIRIT OF MERCY

Dunant began his movement for the injection of a spirit of mercy in the cruelties of war with a practical act of his own. At Castiglioni, another village in the center of the French position in the collision of the armies of Austro and Franco-Sardina, in 1859, he personally urged the French women and girls to follow him to the fields that were covered with the bodies of the dying and dead and to offer drink to the thirsty, food to the hungry, and whatever care was possible to the wounded and maimed. When Dunant's volunteers began to make a search for the French and Italian wounded and turned their backs on the unfortunate Austrians, the founder of the Red Cross pointed out to them that Austrians were human beings too. "Tutti Fratelli"—all are brothers—he said to them, and with that phrase on their lips they helped all and in reality established the foundation for the humanitarian idea that was called into being by Jean Henri Dunant.

It must have been this spirit of "Tutti Fratelli" that motivated Dunant's "Open Letter," in 1866, appealing for the colonization of Palestine and the resurrection of the East, "which uniting with the rise of religious sentiment, will be aided by the cooperation of Israelites, whose valuable qualities and remarkable aptitudes cannot but prove very advantageous to Palestine."

Dunant's letter was published a year after the publication of Moses Hess' "Rome and Jerusalem," but it is clear that his theories were worked out by himself and were not motivated by earlier writings. In the plans that he worked out, and for which he appealed to the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds, he is one of the foremost forerunners of Dr. Theodor Herzl, and is one of the greatest Christians of the past century to have joined in advocating Palestine's resurrection.

HIS PLEA FOR THE JEWS

Dunant appealed to the Alliance Israelite Universalle in France to settle Jews in Palestine. His appeal fell on deaf ears. He pleaded for his cause with the Anglo-Jewish Association, with Berlin Jews, he wrote letters to the London Jewish Chronicle, but it was not as easy to succeed with a Jewish project, as it was for his Red Cross ideal to triumph. He organized the International Palestine Society and the Syrian Palestine Colonization Society, but his writings and his appeals were only destined to become great historic documents in the story of later efforts for the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home, and the name of Jean Henri Dunant is accorded a golden page in Zionist annals.

When Dunant was found in 1897 in the Swiss village of Heiden (where he also died on October 31, 1910), where he was living in poverty in a home of rest for old men, his name was again accorded the well-earned admiration and respect of the world. In 1901, when the A. B. Nobel Peace Prize was first awarded, it was granted to the founder of the Red Cross.

At this time, when the 100th anniversary of the Red Cross is being celebrated throughout the world and when Palestine assumes a place of priority among humanitarian movements it is only proper that world Jewry remember Dunant for his pioneering efforts in behalf of Jewish national redemption.

News Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the following editorial from the Roanoke Times, of September 23, 1963:

STEP TOWARD MANAGED NEWS

An editorial in the Roanoke Times several weeks ago called attention to the creation by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of a wire service to disseminate market information in competition with private services.

This is a scheme not only for intrusion into the field of private enterprise, but a step that could lead to Government management of the news. Any customer willing to pay for the cost of transmission would be entitled to the service under contract with the A.T. & T. The USDA protests that it has no intention of trying to control the news but it reserves the right to withdraw the service when, "in its sole judgment," a customer "abuses" or "misrepresents" its report. Evidently an editorial the USDA didn't like could be called an abuse.

If this isn't Government control of the news, it would be hard to find a better definition. Department bureaucrats weasel about this, claiming the market report really isn't news after all—it is just useful

information. Secretary Orville Freeman defends the plan as contributing to the "free flow" of agricultural information. How information and news can be placed in different categories is not explained.

The Times editorial also speculated on what would happen if the Federal Government set up a wire service to handle all information coming from departments and agencies. Developments were not long in coming. The Federal Register of August 28 publishes a memorandum from President Kennedy directing establishment of a "National Communications System" to link together, improve, and extend communications facilities to "meet the needs of all Government agencies" "under all conditions."

Now if the USDA can distribute its information with the proviso that it shall be the "sole judge" of the conditions under which it is used, there obviously would be nothing to prevent expanding the President's plan into a national news distribution system. It, too, could prescribe terms under which customers would be permitted to use information emanating from the Government. We would, in effect, have an American Tass giving the people only the news the Government wanted them to have.

Representative HOSMER of California and Representative FINDLEY of Illinois, alarmed by the implication of the USDA challenge to a free press, have introduced bills to block creation of a Federal news service. A foot is already in the door. It is time to push the foot out and padlock the door.

The Quintuplet City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, as the people of the United States and the world continue to marvel at the quintuplet birth in my hometown of Aberdeen, S. Dak., a natural curiosity about not only this exceptional Fischer family but also about the community in which they live has arisen.

Perhaps the best written summary of the community in which these quintuplets will be reared appeared recently in the Aberdeen American-News, whose capable staff and management first brought this story to the attention of the world. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks:

EYES OF THE WORLD ARE UPON ABERDEEN

Since the birth of the Fischer quintuplets in St. Luke's Hospital Saturday the world has been trying to learn more about Aberdeen and South Dakota.

Generally it has been a pleasant experience for Aberdonians to answer the questions they have been asked by editors and reporters from faraway places.

A magazine editor calling from New York asked if there is an airline serving Aberdeen. The answer, of course, is yes.

Another New Yorker posed this long-distance question: "Do you have a hospital out there adequate to accommodate the babies?" The answer again is yes.

"Were the babies delivered by a country doctor?" was another question from the east. The answer is no.

Many Aberdeen doctors are specialists and as skilled as any in the big cities in the east. They practice in Aberdeen because the hospital here is completely modern and because people here need the same type of health protection needed by big city residents. Some of Aberdeen's doctors have come here after experience in big cities. Some, such as Dr. James Berbos, a general practitioner, who delivered the quints, are Aberdeen natives. All of them are here because they prefer the advantages they believe smaller communities have over life in metropolitan areas.

Many of the questions about Aberdeen have been asked by the news media people who came here as fast as they could after learning about the rare multiple births.

"How does it happen," an Associated Press reporter asked, "Aberdeen has such an extensive business district, but claims only 25,000 residents?" The answer: The large rural area for which Aberdeen is the retail, wholesale, cultural, and professional service center contains nearly 120,000 persons.

A photographer who lives in Kansas City and fishes in the Ozarks asked where people in these parts go to do their fishing. The answer: Some of the best fishing in the country is in the new chain of great lakes along the Missouri River and there is satisfactory fishing in the manmade and natural lakes closer to home.

Other facts reporters learned about Aberdeen in their efforts to provide background for the quintuplet story are:

Aberdeen, a rail center in its earlier days, is still a transportation hub. Airline service, buses, trucks, and private automobiles have augmented the service of railroads which extend in six directions.

Aberdeen is the home of two colleges, one State and one denominational. Also the State school for the blind.

Aberdeen is the headquarters of several important Government agencies, including the area office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian health area office, the Internal Revenue Service, and the State employment service.

Aberdeen is the only city in South Dakota that has a team in a professional baseball league.

Aberdeen is located in the center of a rich agricultural area, producing livestock and small grain. It hopes agricultural productivity will be increased by irrigation, using water from Oahe Dam, one of the world's largest rolled earth dams.

Most of the visitors knew before arriving here of the fabulous pheasant hunting and of the duck and goose population in the Sand Lake refuge area.

The reporters had ample opportunity to learn about the excellent facilities at St. Luke's Hospital. They practically lived there as they awaited additional news of the famous Fischers.

Aberdonians are pleased to have the eyes of the world focused upon our town.

We are grateful that the Aberdeen attention compeller was the happy occasion of the birth of the four daughters and son of the Andrew Fischers.

The generous interest Aberdonians are currently showing in the quintuplets indicates they will be appreciated as one of the city's assets and will ever have the best wishes of the community.

Small Refiners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by Mr. E. M. Stone, president of the Empire Petroleum Co., Denver, Colo., at the board of directors meeting of the National Petroleum Refiners Association, on Monday, September 23, 1963. Mr. Stone is a leader in the small refining industry. His remarks are very timely. I know they will be of great interest to all of us.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF E. M. STONE, PRESIDENT, EMPIRE PETROLEUM CO., AT THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING, NATIONAL PETROLEUM REFINERS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 23, 1963

SMALL REFINERS

When I was first invited to speak at this meeting, I was reluctant to accept. I felt that no good purpose would be served by appearing before a group which represents many large refiners to argue for equal treatment for small refiners. On giving the matter some more thought, however, I have come to the conclusion that there is a good deal of misunderstanding about the objectives of the small refiners, and I see no reason why they should not be discussed frankly.

In the first place, although there are a lot of us numerically, we constitute only a small fraction of the industry's total capacity and, therefore, even if special concessions are made for the small refiners, it does not substantially affect the competitive position of the larger companies.

Secondly, for reasons which I will set out in more detail in discussing specific problems, I believe that some things which have been done to benefit small refiners actually will benefit the industry as a whole.

Basically, the reason why I believe that the larger companies should support our objectives is because the fact that there are a large number of small refiners is a guarantee of a truly competitive industry, and the surest way to avoid complete Government regulation of our business is to preserve a competitive industry with opportunity for the smaller companies.

Before discussing small refiners, I think I should define what I mean by a small refiner. The term "small," of course, means small in relation to something else and there are many different ideas as to what is a small business. Actually, what is small in the petroleum refining business may be large as compared with a grocery store or a small wholesale business. However, a few years ago the Small Business Administration adopted a definition. Not everyone will agree that it is correct but it was adopted after a public hearing. It is the official Government definition and we must accept it until a better definition is found. Under this definition, a refiner must meet three tests in order to qualify as small business. He must (1) have not more than 30,000 barrels per day of refining capacity; (2) have not more than 1,000 employees; and (3) be independently owned and operated. These size tests, of course, include all subsidiaries and affiliates. Thus, when I speak of small refiners, it is those who meet this definition that I am talking about.

According to a recent summary prepared by the NPRA, there are a total of 103 separate companies, each of which has a total of 30,000 barrels per day or less of refining capacity. This represents more than two-thirds of the 142 separate companies which own the 287 refineries listed as operating on January 1 of this year. Six of these are presumed to be shut down because they received no import quota for the current 6 months' period, leaving a total of 97 companies operating refineries with 30,000 barrels per day or less. The combined capacity of this group is only about 8 percent of the total U.S. refining capacity. Their percentage of total refinery runs is even less, being about 7.33 percent of the total for the year

ending March 1, 1963 (both of these totals include some companies which, although having less than 30,000 barrels per day of refining capacity, do not qualify as small business, because they have more than 1,000 employees, since they are owned by another company which is not a refiner, such as a chemical company, natural gas transmission line, etc.).

This illustrates my first point, that although there are a lot of small refiners, their total capacity is such a small percentage of the whole that any concessions made to them will not have a serious effect on the industry as a whole.

Now to discuss the objectives that the small refiners seek, I should like to begin by reviewing the actions that already have been taken by the Federal Government, because our first objective is to defend the actions that already have been taken for small refiners. Not all of them were accomplished directly by legislation, but most of them came as a result of action by Congress, which at least pointed the way for Executive action.

GOVERNMENT ROYALTY OIL

One of the first efforts by the Government to assist the small refiners was the O'Mahoney Act enacted in 1946, which provides that small refiners shall be given a preference in the sale of royalty oil resulting from production on Government-owned land. This was passed at a time when many small refiners were having difficulty in obtaining a supply of crude oil, and without it many small refiners would have been forced out of business years ago. It has not been important in recent years except on the west coast where sales were made earlier this year. I might also point out that although this represents an effort by the Government to help small refiners, the oil is sold at the market price and thus the act could not be said to have had any detrimental effect upon the larger companies.

SET-ASIDE FOR GOVERNMENT PURCHASES

Another important action taken by the Federal Government to benefit small refiners was the establishment of a "set-aside" program under which the Defense Petroleum Supply Center reserves a portion of its total military purchases of certain petroleum products to be awarded only to companies which qualify as small business. This program is not all set out in statute form, but it is based on the Small Business Act under which Congress authorized and directed the Government purchasing agencies to take steps to implement the congressional intent that small business should be given preference. The actual details of it were worked out by the Defense Department. Subsequently, a legal question arose as to whether the small refiners should be paid the weighted-average of the prices paid to the larger bidders for the unreserved portion, or whether they should be paid the "cutoff price," that is, the highest price at which an award was made to any successful bidder on the unreserved list. This was resolved in favor of the higher price after pressure from the Senate Small Business Committee. This program was supported by the NPA and the WPRA which were the predecessors of the NPRA.

Many of you may wonder how we can reconcile a program which is frankly for the benefit of small business with my earlier statement that many of these programs benefit the industry as a whole. I am sure that there are many in this room who are old enough to remember the NRA Codes. One of the chief objectives of the Petroleum Code was to establish a system under which the larger refiners would buy product from the small refiners so that it could be marketed in an orderly way instead of being thrown on the market in distress sales which depressed the Oilgram price. Substantially this same program was continued by a group of refiners in the Mid-Continent area after the Supreme Court killed the blue eagle, and this evenutally led to the Madison case, which many of us remember well. I do not mean to bring up unpleasant memories, but I am struck by the fact that the purpose of that program—to provide a market for low grade gasoline for the independent refiners—was remarkably similar to the objectives of the set-aside program which provides a market for large quantities of straight run gasoline.

Many small refiners now feel that this set-aside program should be expanded to include a portion of all petroleum products purchased by Federal Government agencies. Existing competitive conditions within the industry, makes this expansion of the set-aside program a vital necessity to provide for the welfare, and in some cases the survival of small refiners, as well as the prevention of Government control of the entire industry.

We believe that the existing program serves the public interest by maintaining many widely dispersed sources of supply for products which will be needed in the event of a national emergency—notably jet fuel, and that the expanded set-aside program would be equally beneficial to both large and small refiners.

SLIDING SCALE

One of the more recent Government programs which has inured partially to the benefit of small refiners is the "sliding scale" in regard to imported foreign crude. This program, however, is grossly misunderstood by many refiners, who claim that it grants special benefits only to small refiners, whereas, in fact, all refiners, both large and small, get exactly the same benefits on those inputs in the lower brackets of such sliding scale. Since we already have passed into an economic situation where large quantities of foreign oil are available at prices considerably below the domestic prices, the allocation of these quotas is a most important issue for all refiners, both large and small, and therefore, of course, it is the most controversial.

There have been a good many complaints about this system of allocations, and one company—Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)—filed a suit in the district court attacking the sliding scale on the ground that the Secretary of the Interior had exceeded his authority in establishing it. The case was dismissed after an amendment to the Presidential proclamation made specific provision for allocations on a graduated basis. However, I should like to point out that the Jersey company attorneys in their arguments before the court emphasized that the company's objection was not the preference for small business but to the fact that the original sliding scale provided for a series of brackets running up to 300,000 barrels per day, thus meaning, in effect, that many large companies received a preferential allocation. We have been reliably informed that the Jersey company and other of the large importers would have no objection to a sliding scale which was limited in its application to companies which met the official definition of "small business," and that is one of the principal objectives of our group.

In addition to the specific actions which I have listed above, there are many other indications that both the Congress and the executive branch of the Government are sympathetic to the small refiners' problems. Among others, I might cite the consent decree in the Kentucky Standard case, in which the Government permitted a merger between Kentucky Standard and the Standard Oil Co. of California under a decree which provided that the merged company must purchase a substantial portion of its requirements from independent refiners for a period of years.

The recent oil policy report of the White House committee contains the following specific recommendation:

"The committee recommends: * * * that the sliding scale for determining allocations to refiners on the input basis includes special provision for refiners defined as small business under the standards of the Small Business Act." Small refiners certainly agree with this recommendation and this brings us to one of the current objectives of small refiners.

Small refiners feel that they are at serious competitive disadvantages in competing with the larger companies which can and do realize substantial tax benefits under existing laws. It is true that these tax benefits are legally available to all oil companies, however, from a practical standpoint, only the large companies, with international operations, can take maximum advantage of these benefits. Most small refiners do not object to existing tax laws and the benefits thereof. They feel that all such laws should be maintained for the general welfare of the public and the oil industry. Small refiners do, however, believe that they are entitled to some off-setting benefits which would provide more competitive equality of opportunity to small refiners. Consequently, to at least partially provide such competitive equality of opportunity, many small refiners feel that an equitable part of imported foreign crude oil should be set aside for exclusive allocations to small refiners. The executive department of the Federal Government now has ample authority to implement such program but has not done so.

The objectives of small refiners, so far as imported foreign crude is concerned could be obtained by any of three methods:

1. By larger allocations to small refiners under the existing allocation program, or

2. Administrative set-aside to be set-up and administered under rules and regulations established by the Secretary of Interior, or

3. Legislation enacted by Congress similar in nature to congressional actions, as above mentioned, in the cases of Royalty Crude Oil and the Government procurement set-aside program.

It appears that there are only two methods of obtaining these benefits for small refiners:

1. By petitions and requests to the executive department and particularly to the Secretary of Interior and the Oil Imports Administration, or

2. By seeking legislation by Congress, to provide for a set-aside of a portion of imported foreign crude oil for the exclusive use of small refiners.

Much work and effort has been put forth to accomplish the desired objectives by petitions and requests to the Secretary of Interior and the Oil Imports Administration but without apparent results.

Many small refiners believe that congressional legislation is undesirable and should be resorted to only in case relief cannot be obtained in any other way. If, however, the objectives of small refiners cannot be otherwise obtained, then there will be no other course for small refiners to pursue.

In conclusion, I want to say that I have never belonged to the faction that believes in attacking big business just because it is big. While we are waging a battle for survival and welfare of the small refiner, we do not feel that our objectives would seriously damage any of the larger companies and I am sure that the best protection against Government control of the entire oil industry is the preservation of a large number of healthy small refiners. In the long run, the conditions that would be best for us would be the best for the whole industry, and that is healthy markets. If some of the larger companies would exercise more restraint and refrain from the temptation to increase their gallonage by making large quantities of product available on a guaranteed price basis to those who depress the market generally, we would not be so much in need of Government assistance.

Congressman Tom Curtis Receives Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, our colleague, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, was greatly honored by the American Political Science Association as one of its recipients for the association's 1963 Congressional Distinguished Service Awards.

The other recipients were Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico; Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; and Representative GEORGE MAHON, of Texas.

Presentation of these awards was a highlight of the association's 59th annual meeting. Their purpose is to call attention to effective legislative service which might otherwise go unnoticed, thus dramatizing the role of free elections in bringing into public life individuals of high abilities and varied talents.

The speaker for the awards ceremony was Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who was a previous winner. These awards have been made possible by a grant from the William Benton Foundation.

I know that all of us were delighted that such an able Representative as TOM CURTIS was selected for this award and, Mr. Speaker, I herewith append the award as a part of this RECORD:

THE 1963 CONGRESSIONAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION TO REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS B. CURTIS

With selfless tenacity, with a love of hearty debate, and with an honesty and sincerity that have won him the respect of his colleagues, THOMAS B. CURTIS seeks to maintain the vitality of the Congress and of his party.

By articulating and advancing policy alternatives, he has elevated the discussion of economic issues in the Congress and elsewhere. Joining in a bipartisan effort, he worked energetically for enactment of trade legislation consistent with this Nation's role in international affairs. He speaks with a compelling voice in the development of his party's approach to the problem of full employment in a rapidly automating economy. A student of Congress, he is in the forefront among his colleagues in working for alteration of rules and procedures to meet the needs of a changing society in a changing world.

The American Political Science Association takes great pleasure in presenting this Congressional Distinguished Service Award to THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri; respected advocate, courageous individualist, and diligent legislator whose service is in the finest tradition of constructive conservatism.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman CURTIS is currently completing his seventh consecutive term of office. TOM came here with me in the 82d Congress and he has made an outstanding record in 13 years. He is a recognized economic authority, is the ranking Republican of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee and a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee. In every election year Congressman CURTIS has been returned to office by a sizable majority in an area which is largely fluid.

As everyone knows, TOM has been an able debator and his fearlessness in tackling tough problems has given him the deserved notice that he has received.

I know that all of us wish TOM CURTIS many more happy days in this House and we certainly congratulate the American Political Science Association on having selected such an able and outstanding public servant to receive one of its 1963 Distinguished Service Awards.

The Need for the Manned Bomber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force Association is doing much today to bolster our manned defense systems in the face of possible elimination of the manned bomber. I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial by Wallace Kidd, printed in the September 18 issue of the Anadarko, Okla. Daily News, regarding the recent Air Force Association convention in Washington, D.C.

The editorial points out the need for the manned bomber, as well as its economic effect on several communities in my district dependent on military installations to a certain extent:

THE NEED FOR THE MANNED BOMBER

(By Wallace Kidd)

Last week we were among a hundred or so news media representatives who observed the convention of the Air Force Association in Washington. For a fellow who knows little more about flying than to buckle his seat belt on command and be able to read the lighted marker when the plane's restroom is occupied, this particular convention was enlightening.

The Air Force Association itself is a young organization, established in 1946. Its objectives are to assist in obtaining and maintaining adequate aerospace power for natural security and world peace; to keep AFA members and the public abreast of developments in the field of aviation; and to preserve and foster the spirit of fellowship among former and present members of the U.S. Air Force. This organization's results go beyond its objectives, however, because it serves not only as a strong voice for present and former Air Force personnel but also for the many thousands of Americans who are related through business and professions with Air Force activities.

This voice is important. It not only bears weight upon strengthening the aerial might of the Nation but also the economic life of communities which have formed to serve great Air Force installations like the Oklahoma City Air Material Area, with headquarters at Tinker Air Force Base.

Through AFA convention seminars there was the warning sounded by Air Force leaders that danger lies ahead in the present gradual weakening of the Air Force's manned systems. Among others, Lt. Gen. T. P. Gerrity, Gen. Thomas S. Powers, described how for the first time since World War II there isn't a production line anywhere in the United States turning out bombers for the U.S. Air Force. Being phased out are B-47 medium bombers. No additional B-25's—still the backbone of the Strategic Air Command's striking power—and B-58's are now programed.

Aside from the military danger, this brings an acute economic effect that will strike against such bases as Tinker Field, installations at Altus and Clinton-Sherman. Unless the warning of Air Force leaders against continued deterioration of manned aircraft strength is heeded, the need for existence of work forces in communities surrounding these installations will also rapidly deteriorate.

The Oklahoma City area has recognized this danger. Its civilian as well as its Air Force personnel has responded to a membership drive by a voice-giving Air Force Association. During the past year, aggressive AFA workers obtained over 2,600 new members. A convention award to Maj. Gen. Lewis L. Mundell, OCAMA commander, gave recognition to this unusual membership achievement. Communities which depend upon activities around the Clinton-Sherman Base and the Altus Air Force Base should follow the same membership drive pattern. Not only is there defense of homes in the community involved, so is the butter spread upon the bread in those homes.

Hon. John A. Jenkins, Senior Vice Commander in Chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of Vestavia Hills, Ala., has just recently been elected senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Mr. Jenkins is an outstanding public servant, a fine Alabamian and a great patriot. The high honor which has been accorded him by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is one which he richly merits. The Mayor and City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills has adopted a resolution of congratulations in recognition of Mr. Jenkins' election. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to insert a copy of the resolution at this point:

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1963

Whereas the Honorable John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and a resident of our city, was, on the 28th day of August 1963, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Seattle, Wash., elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW, and

Whereas it is the unanimous sense of this body that the honor accorded John A. Jenkins by this outstanding national organization should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That this resolution express the congratulations of this body, and congratulations of the citizens of our community to

John A. Jenkins for the well-deserved honor accorded our neighbor and associate, and as a consequence thereof, the prestige accruing to our community upon his election as the senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be duly adopted and spread upon the official minutes and a copy delivered to the Honorable John A. Jenkins and given other wide publicity.

ROBERT M. GUILFORD,
Mayor, City of Vestavia Hills, Ala.

Motion Pictures and Television Leaving United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. WEAVER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the production of motion pictures for theater and television distribution and video tapes for television constitute an important segment of our economy.

However, with financial and other inducements being offered by foreign countries, especially those in Europe, a substantial amount of video and motion picture production for American showing is now undertaken outside of the United States, leaving many technicians and actors here idle.

This is a growing problem that adversely affects our economy by putting thousands of people on the unemployment rolls, decreasing purchasing power, and creating tax losses on the local, State, and National level.

The seriousness of the situation can be illustrated by the following figures: In the last 10 years, 509 feature pictures backed by American interests and representing an investment of more than $750 million were produced abroad.

The impact of "runaway" films on employment in Hollywood has been amazing. In 1946, the employment was 24,000. By December 1957, the figure had dwindled to 13,000.

During the first 6 months of 1962, approximately 19,000 motion picture workers were without employment in Hollywood.

The production of "runaway" films, some of which are made behind the Iron Curtain, are among the factors bringing the closing of a number of Hollywood film laboratories, including Paramount, Cinecolor, Warner Bros., and Columbia.

At the Technicolor Corp., which processes the major domestic footage, employment has dropped from 581 million feet and 2,300 employees, respectively, in 1953 to 309 million feet and 1,327 employees in 1962.

Current advertising practices on motion picture film and video tape are misleading in many instances, conveying that they were produced in this country.

By proper labeling of television and motion picture films it may help curtail runaway productions and its resulting unfavorable impact on labor.

Because of the aforementioned conditions, I strongly support and urge prompt consideration of H.R. 7670, which provides for the labeling of foreign productions.

Republican Rebukes Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Denver Post set the repercussions of the tax-cut legislation in plain language.

Millions of Americans are watching this legislation which means so much for employment and our economy:

GOP MAKES MISTAKE TO FIGHT TAX CUT

We are amazed by reports from Washington, among them the one from William White on this page today, that House Republicans have decided to make a major partisan fight against the proposed Federal income tax cut.

In theory, the Republican fight is not against the tax cut itself. But the Republican effort to attach a deficit-limiting cancellation clause to the tax cut bill will, in fact, destroy most of the stimulating effect of the tax cut and could wipe it out entirely.

What the Republicans want to do, specifically, is to attach a rider to the bill canceling the cut unless Federal spending is held to $97 billion this year and $98 billion next year. Otherwise, says Representative JOHN BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, spokesman for the House Republicans, deficits expected with the $11 billion tax cut in the next 2 years could lead to inflation and financial ruin.

This is politically inspired nonsense. If the Republicans persist in it, and should succeed in their fight, it is they, not President Kennedy, who will have the albatross of fiscal irresponsibility hanging around their collective neck in 1964. They will be the ones who will have stifled the effort to get some of the burden of the Federal tax off the economy.

President Kennedy made a powerful and logical case for the tax cut last week, and now the Republicans have replied. Their reply is not impressive.

To get a nonpolitical view of the facts, let us look at what a group of responsible businessmen say:

"The deficits in recent years have, in large part, been the product of the failure of our economy to achieve its full potential because of the burden of oppressive individual and corporate tax rates. If unemployment is to be reduced, if idle plant is to be put into production, and if we are to achieve meaningful long term economic growth, individual and corporate rates must be reduced.

"We recognize that tax reduction in the magnitude contemplated * * * will add temporarily to an otherwise existing deficit. However, we believe that additional income flowing from the tax cut will bring the budget into * * * balance significantly sooner than if there were no tax cut at all.

"We commend these Members of Congress for their concern and urge them to do everything possible to assure expenditure control. We also sincerely urge them to reconsider their position and to work aggressively for the passage of a tax reduction as soon as possible."

Who are these businessmen? They are members of a committee headed by Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co., and Stuart Saunders, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway, the most consistent moneymaker among American railroads.

Other members include financiers such as Frazar Wilde, chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Robert C. Baker, chairman of the American Security & Trust Co., in Washington.

It is quite doubtful that there's a Democrat in the lot. And it's quite certain that men of this calibre are not advocating anything that will lead the Nation to financial ruin. Since even Congressman BYRNES himself agreed that President Kennedy was dead right in saying a tax cut is urgently needed, there is no sound reason for playing politics with it. There is not even a sound political reason for doing so, considering that the effect would rebound on the Republicans.

This tax cut should be passed. It should be passed soon. And it should be passed without any uncertainty-creating "ifs" or "buts."

Men on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year David B. Anderson, a young man from Minnesota, was honored by the National Canners' Association and the National Junior Vegetable Growers' Association for his outstanding corn crop. Subsequently, the story of his success appeared in the June issue of the Vegetable Growers Messenger. I was very impressed by this young fellow and those who helped him. Under unanimous consent, I include the Messenger articles, as follows:

MEN ON THE MARCH

Watching and helping youngsters grow and go is a favorite pastime of many thinking Americans.

Practically applied the National Canners' Association for years has been allied with the National Junior Vegetable Growers' Association in encouraging junior vegetable growers to grow in production know-how and marketing ability.

The guest of honor at a special luncheon in mid-May at Washington's International Inn, sponsored by the NCA, was an 18-year-old Minnesota vegetable grower named David B. Anderson.

Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, himself a sweet corn grower, presented the National Canners' Association plaque to David, who hails from the town of Hector in the southern Minnesota vegetable area.

Happily looking on was the president of the National Canners' Association, William A. Free, Sr., of Hungerford, Pa. Both Congressman NELSEN and David grow their sweet corn under contract for the Green Giant Co.

Congressman NELSEN at the same time presented a plaque to John Jilek, the Green Giant fieldman, who advised and counseled young Anderson in his project. The canning industry looks to its fieldman to fill the important role of promoting efficient production, harvesting, and handling methods and putting agricultural research into practical use.

David accepted the award quietly but it was evident that he was deeply moved. The few words he expressed were in appreciation to all who had helped him. He reported that he grew 94.2 tons of corn on 10 acres, which is double the Minnesota

average. His 94 tons of corn produced about 33 cases per ton, or 3,100 cases, making nearly 75,000 cans of famous Green Giant Niblets available to homemakers across the country.

Looking ahead at kitchen-ready foods, David pointed out that he and Green Giant had saved housewives nearly 25,000 hours of kitchen preparation work on his production alone. Incidentally, he netted $713.15 on that crop of corn and won a gold wristwatch, an official jacket, a gold pin and purple ribbon from the National Junior Vegetable Growers Association. The Green Giant Co. gave him an all-expense trip to the 28th annual convention of the Junior Vegetable Growers in Miami last December.

David was graduated from the Hector Community High School, class of 1962. He played saxaphone in the senior band, was president of the student council school-paper reporter, served on the staff of the yearbook, was a cross country runner. He played basketball and was in the senior class play, served as president of the FFA and won the degree of State Farmer.

This year he is president of the freshman class at South Dakota State College in Brookings.

The family attends the Lutheran church. His father has been an outstanding vegetable and Hampshire farmer for many years.

Scientific minded, his Green Giant Fieldman Jilek says, Davy became Minnesota's top sweet corn farmer because he kept good records, ran a detailed fertilizer program and followed accepted production practices and close supervision to win over 425 other contestants.

The Vegetable Growers Messenger in recognizing a "Young Man on the March," David Anderson, also pays tribute to the Green Giant Fieldman John Jilek, William A. Free, Sr., president of the National Canners' Association, Drs. Charles H. Mahoney and Edwin A. Crosby, who held up the Raw Products Research Bureau of NCA, and to NJVGA chairman, Grant Snyder.

Man helps himself most when he lifts a youngster.

Cuba Still a Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, following the good, Madison Avenue style of the New Frontier, the people seem to have forgotten about Cuba and the tremendous danger that lurks there.

The following articles, one by Robert G. Spivack, a Liberal, which appeared in the August 25 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, and the other by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, in the September 17 issue of the Long Island Press, remind us how fraught with danger Cuba still is:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 25, 1963]

CASTRO'S KIDNAPERS

(By Robert G. Spivack)

The U.S. Government looked pathetic when a State Department spokesman announced that a Cuban air and naval force had seized 19 anti-Castro refugees off a British islet in the Caribbean while our jets and a Coast Guard patrol plane helplessly circled overhead.

The description of the incident as one of international "kidnaping" supposedly constituted a severe rebuke to Castro's bad boys. Actually, it made our position look even worse. It is not in keping with American tradition to stand by and allow refugees, or freedom fighters, to be taken by force of arms to the country from which they have sought to escape.

When such incidents have taken place at the Berlin Wall the excuse for our inaction has been that it might touch off a world conflagration, with the Soviet Union and East German armed forces so near at hand.

But if we have become so spineless that such incidents can go unpunished within an area that is not even 100 miles from our shores, how can we expect the rest of the American Republics to take seriously our oft-expressed determination to keep the hemisphere safe from communism?

And why should Castro himself take us seriously when we back down at every confrontation?

The kidnaping incident forces us once again to take a look at our Cuban policy, or nonpolicy. During July, Castro announced expropriation of the American Embassy in Havana; on July 26 he called for violent revolution throughout Latin America. His adherents have carried on ceaseless guerrilla warfare against the democratic regime of Venezuela's President Betancourt.

We still talk grandiosely about the Alliance of Progress, a laudable but long-range objective. But as far as dealing with day-by-day incidents, it seems clear we have no plan for coping with Castro.

As a result, our prestige in Latin America sinks lower and lower.

I base this not on conjecture, or even on what might be considered logical reaction to our indecisiveness, but on what responsible Latin American leaders have told me. The liberal moderates, the conservatives and the ultraleftists all find American conduct incomprehensible.

"Just imagine," one told me, "how Khrushchev would react if such things were happening within 100 miles of his borders."

Again the question naturally arises: What can we do about Castro's conduct? In the case of the Caribbean "kidnaping," I would think the answer was fairly obvious. Our planes should have fired warning shots at the kidnapers, and if they did not back off then, we should have engaged them in the kind of aerial diversionary activity that would have driven them away, or at least given the refugees sufficient time in which to escape.

The argument is made that we needed British permission to act within their territorial waters. This is not a legal quibble, but in a case so flagrant in its violation of international law our forces should have been able to draw the Castroites into open waters; or if not, then we should have provided a shield for the refugees.

Such action, of course, would be an improvisation, but it might drive home the point which, I hope, our Government intends to make; namely, that we do not intend to sit by and allow Castro a free hand in the Caribbean, or in the hemisphere.

Aside from such action, however, Castro is forcing us to do what the Kennedy administration clearly does not want to do: give greater encouragement to the anti-Communist democratic Cubans to engage in guerrilla warfare against the Havana regime.

The longer we delay—the longer we tolerate the presence of Soviet troops on Cuban soil—the more costly such operations are going to be.

It is regrettable that the administration has allowed itself to become so alienated from the Cuban refugees, after so much big talk about what he hoped to do. But if we do not want to lose all of Latin America, we are going to have to come to grips with the problems Castro poses and that includes working with the refugees.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Sept. 17, 1963]

CUBA COULD BOIL OVER AT ALMOST ANY TIME

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Cuban pot is heating up faster than could have been foreseen and could boil over at almost any time.

The best proof is that Castro is scared. Havana Radio's frantic insistence that the Soviet Union has "warned" the United States that any more raids by Cuban exiles will "push the world to the brink of a thermonuclear war" sounds like Mr. K, all right. But it is a cinch that Castro begged Nikita to permit his to make this announcement.

Nikita may even have said something of the sort in one of the private billets doux which he exchanges with President Kennedy. But most Americans have learned by this time that when it comes to brinkmanship Soviet Russia is a Teddy bear and shrinks from direct confrontation with the United States, that "paper tiger" (to quote Red China) "with nuclear teeth" (to quote Khrushchev).

Castro has reason to be scared. For the exile raids are beginning to hurt. Smashing Cuba's largest sugarmill hits Castro just where it hurts the most, on the economic nerve. True, like all police states Red Cuba can for a time terrorize and starve its people into submission. But Cuban tempers are hotter than Russian.

Moreover, as first announced here, several underground groups in Cuba have pooled their resources and concerted their liberation efforts and are securing the cooperation of a steady trickle of deserters from the Soviet forces on Cuba.

Still another sign that the Cuban pot is heating up is the increased haste with which the Rusians in Cuba are converting the entire province of Pinar Del Rio, with the biggest naval base of Mariel, into a single Soviet military camp.

Furthermore, according to the Free Cuba News published by the invaluable Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, at the site of the Soviet Military GHQ in the La Gobernadora Hills near Mariel, Soviet and Cuban workers have dug tunnels 6 miles into the ground. (No more offensive missiles in Cuba, Mr. Kennedy?)

Everything points to a hurried Cuban-Soviet attempt to make the island virtually invulnerable against military attack.

Meanwhile, still according to the Free Cuba News, Castro has been rushing his subversive efforts throughout Latin America, and chiefly in Venezuela. There the Government recently seized from Communist terrorists a "Plan M" which set forth instructions for successful guerrilla warfare including, naturally, the assassination and kidnaping of leading anti-Communists. "The policy of extermination is the one we must follow."

Again, naturally.

The mere existence of such a Castro-made plan raises the question, What is the U.S. Government doing about Cuba? And the answer is, Nothing of any importance—so far.

What could it do? Readers who believe that Kennedy's present passivity is dangerously inept would do well to study the magnificent debate on Cuba in the U.S. House of Representatives (published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1963). There they will find proposals by any number of patriotic Congressmen weary of the administration's doubletalk and urging immediate American action.

At the end, Congressman WEAVER, of Pennsylvania, summed up eight proposals short of war. And when goaded by that faithful administration supporter, Congressman PUCINSKI, of Illinois, to say whether he advocated war, Congressman CRAMER, of Florida, a Democrat of another stamp, replied: "If military action is the only way to get rid of

Castro after all other steps are taken; if it is essential in the Monroe Doctrine that this means kicking the Communists out of Cuba to preserve our security, that is the step we are going to have to take."

This, I submit, is the authentic voice of the American people. Sometime before November 1964, President Kennedy is going to listen to it—or else.

Soviet Plans in Latin America Set

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, our country is fortunate in having in Europe one of its most distinguished news analysts, Constantine Brown, who always writes with the objectivity of the trained observer.

The latest contribution of Mr. Brown, which deals with a subject of vital significance to the United States and, indeed, of the entire Western Hemisphere, follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 31, 1963]

SOVIET PLANS IN LATIN AMERICA SET: RED DEFECTOR SAYS CUBA IS SPEARHEAD, ORDERED TO USE "CARROT" TACTIC ON UNITED STATES

(By Constantine Brown)

MUNICH.—At a place "somewhere in Germany" where important Communist defectors are screened before being given permanent residence here, I met through German friends a Czech who had held a position of responsibility in the Prague hierarchy. He was a man in his late fifties, erudite and keen-minded. He had given up everything because "I could no longer stand the intrigues, the double-crossings and the lies of the regime which I had joined wholeheartedly. But," he added wistfully, "I am afraid I have now joined the losing side."

His explanation for this pessimistic viewpoint about the "losing side" (the West) was simple. The new generation of political men, particularly in the United States and Britain, does not want to believe the U.S.S.R. is planning for the conquest of the world.

Premier Khrushchev has confused and frightened the political men by his tactics of hot and cold showers, frowns and smiles, rattling of missiles and "deep concern for humanity." He is now certain, if his life span lasts for another 10 years, that he can hand over to his successor the socialist world promised by Lenin.

The signing of the Moscow pact and the subsequent steps are only a beginning. Mr. Khrushchev's aims go further, to the Western Hemisphere.

The Czech defector, who my German friends told me is trustworthy, emphasized the plan for a gigantic U.S.R.L.A. When asked what this meant, he explained, "the United Socialist Republics of Latin America."

During the 37-day visit of Fidel Castro to the Soviet Union, the blueprint of such an organization of states was discussed in all details by Mr. Khrushchev, the Cuban dictator and a number of top Soviet officials.

Mr. Khrushchev was confident that there will be no more than token opposition from the United States. Cuba will be, of course, the key point where all the propaganda and subversive moves will start.

The anxiety of the Western Powers, and particularly of the United States and Britain, for accommodation is to be exploited intensively all over Latin America, together with the power element of the U.S.S.R. The first component group of the USRLA would be composed of Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, Chile, and Brazil, as well as the former British Guiana and possibly Hispaniola after the Duvalier regime in Haiti has been liquidated. The target date is 1968.

According to my informant, Mr. Khrushchev has instructed Mr. Castro to take his time and lay the groundwork without haste. It is essential, he is reported to have said, that the chances of reelection of the present Washington administration, sympathetic to socialism and dedicated to a relaxation of tensions, should not be endangered. It is also important that the British Labor Party, headed by Harold Wilson—and described by Mr. Khrushchev as a man of great intelligence and insight toward world trends—should replace the wobbly, uncertain, and tired Conservatives.

Hence, there must be no hasty or rash moves by Fidel and his associates throughout Latin America. Quite the contrary, Mr. Castro must accept with good grace any indications for reconciliation with the United States—even at the price of some concessions regarding the confiscation of American properties.

The Czech defector added that there are already in course such negotiations which may lead to a resumption of diplomatic relations with Washington. But he expects nothing concrete before next year. The pot will be kept simmering until the American elections. After November 1964, however, the work of creating a USRLA will be started in earnest.

Asked about Europe's reaction to the gigantic Soviet plans, the answer was that Europe has relied too much on the United States to be able to successfully resist the trend. Anyhow, he added, the only strong opponents of Mr. Khrushchev are West German Chancellor Adenauer and French President de Gaulle. With Mr. Adenauer out of office Mr. Khrushchev does not worry about Mr. Erhard and Mr. Schroeder. Both are Anglo-Saxon minded and unsympathetic to the French-German alliance. General de Gaulle, if placed in a position of isolation after the departure of Mr. Adenauer, could withdraw his support from the Germans if Bonn breaks the spirit of the alliance and turns to Moscow for a renewal of the historic entente.

"There is not a single head of government anywhere in the world," said my informant, "who enjoys more prestige with the Kremlin gang than De Gaulle. He has been unyielding and that counts with those men more than the chase for relaxation."

Address of Guam's Speaker, Won Pat, at National Conference of Legislative Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the address of Hon. Won Pat, Speaker of the Legislature of Guam, at the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders at Boston on September 21. Forty-seven States of the Union and Guam were represented at the conference.

Speaker Won Pat's address follows:

OUTLINE OF FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS AS THEY APPLY TO THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

I. UNIQUE ASPECTS OF GUAM'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Guam is not a sovereign state; its government is not touched on in the Constitution except in article IV, section 3, which provides that the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations for the territories—Guam has no vote in the national elections, and no seat in the Congress, either voting or otherwise. Accordingly, the unincorporated territory of Guam is not an independent entity, as is a State of the United States, and thus its relations with the Federal Government are similar to those what we might say between creator and creature rather than between equals. As an example, any bill passed by the Guam Legislature and signed by the Governor has to be submitted to Congress, which, for a period of 1 year after submission, reserves the right to repeal or annul the bill, and although Congress has never so abrogated any of our local legislation, the power to do so exists, and the net result is that our legislation does not become, in effect, final until 1 year after its submission to Congress. Our organic act, which serves as our state constitution, is Federal legislation which has been amended in the past and can be amended in the future without the people of Guam having any voice in the matter whatsoever. Although our Government has been self-supporting, operating its typical American governmental structure with tax funds locally collected, nevertheless the Congress can cut off our present sources of revenue at any time, and in any number of ways.

In outlining our rather precarious position in our relationship with Congress, let me emphasize that it is only in examining the legal and constitutional relationship between our territory and the Federal Government that our position appears so precarious, since, in point of fact, Congress, following the Second World War, has been generous to the people and to the territory of Guam and our relations have been generally amiable. The same holds true generally speaking with the executive branch of the Federal Government, also. However, since our territory's principal function is to provide logistic support for the Air Force and naval establishments on the island, the Department of Defense plays the most important role of any Federal department in determining our future, and this despite the fact that the Department of the Interior is the executive agency charged with the responsibility of supervising our activities and our relationship with the Federal Government. We have noted with interest that when there is a showdown between the two departments over some matter affecting Guam, the Department of Defense invariably wins, and over these power struggles between agencies in the Federal Government, the territory of Guam has practically no influence, whatsoever, since we have no one in Washington who can protect our interests and we have no political pressure that we can bring to bear.

Guam also comes under the cognizance of the State Department under the Office of Dependent Areas by virtue of the U.S. relationship with the United Nations. Thus, the Department of State takes a rather condescending interest in our territory. The United Nations classifies Guam as a nonself-governing dependency of the United States, in other words, a colony, and therefore the State Department, as the agency charged with the responsibility of representing the United States in the United Nations, feels that it must make sure that nothing happens on Guam that can be later used against the United States in the United Nations. The people of Guam are traditionally

very law abiding and peace loving and have never resorted to violence as direct action in attempting to assert their rights to achieve their political or social objectives. Hence, we have never in any way embarrassed the U.S. Government in its direction of our destinies.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Guam was a colony of Spain for 300 years—it was governed first from Mexico and then from the Philippines, and had no local government to speak of. Then in 1898, as a result of the U.S. desire for a coaling and cable station between the west coast and the Philippines, Guam was seized during the Spanish-American War and later awarded to the United States in the Treaty of Paris as one of the spoils of war. President McKinley turned Guam over to the Navy Department pending congressional action to set up a more definitive relationship as the treaty provided that Congress shall determine the political status of the people of Guam. However, Congress took no action on Guam for 52 years, and the Navy ran the island more or less as a naval base from 1898 until 1950, with the exception of 3 years when the Japanese occupied it. Although the people of Guam will be grateful to the Navy for all they have done and will continue to do for the territory, it is only fair to note that under the Navy we had no civil government whatsoever; we were governed by Executive orders having the force and effect of laws, and since our legislature was only advisory in nature, our naval Governor could make any laws he wished, anytime he wished—he could even overrule the decisions of the courts of the territory—and even the access to and departure from the island were strictly controlled by the Navy up until just a year ago. The reason that I think this background information is pertinent in considering Guam's relation with the Federal Government is that although at present we have nowhere near the independence or power of a State of the Union, nevertheless we have been accorded many more rights and privileges than we had before 1950, that our present emotion toward Congress and the Federal Government generally is that of gratitude tempered by frustration rather than anger or hostility because of our still severely limited self-government and sovereignty.

III. COMMON PROBLEMS

Although the territory of Guam has little of the power and prestige of a State of the Union, nevertheless many of the problems they both face are similar, particularly in the field of Federal-State relations. I note that in the resolutions adopted by the last General Assembly of the Council of State Governments, one emphasized the desirability of the States acting responsibly and effectively in reapportioning their legislative bodies. This issue is of some importance in Guam also, although, under existing law, all our legislators are elected at large and hence apportionment is not an actual problem. However, there are many people who feel that the territory should be apportioned to assure that all the areas and districts of our little island are fairly represented in the Legislature. A bill had been introduced in the Eighty-Seventh Congress to apportion the seats in the Legislature among the districts of the territory. Thus, the issue in Guam is not how we should be apportioned but whether we should be apportioned at all. When you consider that the territory contains only 225 square miles and that everybody's home is within an hour's drive of everybody else's, one has serious doubts as to whether apportionment is at all appropriate for our small compact community. I would certainly be interested to hear the views of my friends in the State Legislatures respecting this issue.

We are in general agreement with the intent of another resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Council of State Governments covering the Federal-State relations with regard to grants-in-aid programs.

Our Organic Act provides that no Federal law shall automatically apply to Guam except by specific reference in the statute to Guam by name or by reference to possession. Accordingly, many of the laws previously enacted by the U.S. Congress at the time the Organic Act was passed and those thereafter do not apply to Guam and as a consequence, many of the benefits and Federal grants-in-aid programs extended to the States, Puerto Rico, the former territories of Alaska and Hawaii before they came into the Union, were not available to Guam. Then in 1956, Congress passed an Omnibus Bill which provided for the extension of a few of the laws to Guam that permit participation of Guam in some grants-in-aid programs and assistance. Our participation, however, in such programs has been hamstrung by the complex and rigid requirements imposed by statutes and administrative procedures. Our unique situation, especially our peculiar governmental structure, makes it difficult to take advantage of any Federal enactment without first locally enacting a qualifying statute and setting up the administrative machinery, both of which have to meet the Federal criteria.

IV. CIVIL RIGHTS

The burning issue of civil rights takes on a rather peculiar aspect in Guam in that the Congress of the United States in adopting our Organic Act wrote for us a bill of rights giving the residents and citizens of the territory essentially the same constitutional civil liberties afforded the citizens of the United States generally. However, discriminatory practices with respect to employment opportunities are to be found both in the Federal agencies on Guam and in our local government. For instance, if you are a local citizen working for the military activities, you are not paid the same wages as your off-island fellow-American, although you are doing exactly the same work and have the same experience and ability. On the other hand, if you are working for the local government, you get equal pay for equal work, whether you are a local citizen or from abroad. However, our Organic Act as passed by Congress provides that preference shall be given to citizens of Guamanian ancestry in governmental employment and in selection for promotion.

Many of us resent this anomalous situation since it is not in keeping with the traditions of the United States and of the American Constitution which are, of course, that no one is to be favored or disfavored because of race or place of birth, and I can state with some degree of assurance that were the people of Guam ever to have the right to draft their own constitution, with resulting sovereignty over our territory as have the various States of the Union, we would certainly do away with such things. Guam is as much a melting pot as Hawaii and it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish between those who are "Guamanian" and those who are not. In comparing Guam to other American communities, then, our civil rights problems are perhaps not as serious as what they are in the United States; we have a majority of residents more or less of the same racial background, which is a mixture of Polynesian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Spanish, and American.

However, in the important area of civil liberties involving voting rights, Guam might be held to be guilty of restricting these rights in that we require a 2-year residence before authorizing one to vote, which in effect means that our electorate is predominantly Guamanian since most of the outsiders are not in the territory long enough to qualify to vote. As a result, there has been some pressure to lower the residence requirements to enable more of the short-time residents of Guam to take part in our local political activities. However, no one of voting age is denied of the right to vote because of color or creed. The only qualifications are that he must be of sound mind, be 18 years or over and meet the residence requirement. However, when so much of our population is transient and is not concerned with the long-term problems of the territory, one wonders whether they are really entitled to vote as they would not be voting for long-term projects or to solve problems that their children and grandchildren will face, but only for their immediate needs.

In conclusion, Guam is deeply interested in the civil rights movement within the United States, since although we are a majority in our own island, we are definitely a minority in the continental United States with the result that most of us who have come to the States, at one time or another have experienced some degree of racial prejudice. Fortunately, in our own territory, little if any prejudice exists and we do have control, even if severely limited, of our own local affairs. Furthermore, the limitation on our rights to self-government does not result from our race but from our awkward political position as an unincorporated territory of the United States.

Our aspiration is to have more self-government by electing our own governor and to have a voice in the Congress of the United States where our destinies are decided.

Can Peaceful Coexistence Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, September 23 is the Bulgarian National Day of the Fight for Freedom, Independence and Democracy. It was 16 years ago that Bulgaria's great patriot, Nikola Petkov, was executed in a Sophia prison. He was the courageous and popular leader of the Bulgarian Agrarian Party and a stanch fighter against communism. It is most fitting therefore that the Bulgarian National Committee for a Free and Independent Bulgaria chose this anniversary to commemorate their Bulgarian National Day.

Nikola Petkov was one of four who signed the Bulgarian armistice and in his attempt to set up a democratic government in postwar Bulgaria, took an active and leading role in the establishment of a coalition government in September of 1944 after the overthrow of the Bulgarian Nazi regime. Bulgaria is a land of peasants and Petkov was the leader of the peasants. He opposed King Boris when it was the king who infringed upon the rights of these people and when the Soviet army attempted to force a Communist state on the Bulgarians they found Petkov, and his opposition to a totalitarian regime, in their way.

Petkov's violent end came after all appeals for clemency, including those from Great Britain and the United States, were rejected by a special Ministry of Justice commission. The timing and conduct of the trial and its relationship to other repressive measures undertaken by the Bulgarian authorities

made it clear that the trial constituted but one of a series of measures undertaken by the Communist dominated Fatherland Front Government to remove all but token opposition. When a nation drapes itself in the robes of justice to murder its foremost patriot, the world looks on with horror. In this case the world knew that Nikola Petkov's only "crime" was his devotion to the freedom and liberty of his countrymen.

It would seem that this unhappy incident in Bulgarian history is a timely warning for those among us who today preach "peaceful" coexistence. This courageous Bulgarian leader tried to cooperate and to coexist "peacefully" on a democratic basis with the Communist regime. The result was his execution.

Petkov once said:

My father and brother were murdered on the streets of Sophia as traitors. I am ready to share their fate.

How many more Bulgarians will have to share the fate of the Petkov family until their dreams are realized and their country is truly free? On this Bulgarian National Day in 1963, greetings are sent from the people of the United States to all the Bulgarians with a prayer that soon the struggle will be won and they will have what their country has so seldom enjoyed through the years—freedom and liberty.

Gold and the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the September 20 issue of the New York Journal of Commerce. I append this editorial on "Gold and the Dollar" for the information of the Members of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

GOLD AND THE DOLLAR

In a recent series of articles in this newspaper Prof. Henry C. Wallich of Yale has demonstrated that if there ever was a time when the U.S. dollar could be devalued anew, that time has now passed and we have to hold the line whether we like it or not. Any devaluation, or any change in the price we pay for gold, would be helpful to others rather than us; we would gain nothing and, in fact, the dollar as an international currency would be destroyed by any such action.

In a speech this week George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, pointed out that we are now down to our last $4 billion of gold which can be exported or earmarked for the account of foreigners, since $12 billion of the $16 billion of gold we still hold must be kept against Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities. And our currency circulation continues to set new records.

Mr. Moore makes the point that the statute could be changed, but infers that it is too late.

Both the Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board have said that our entire gold reserve will be used to meet international obligations which are payable only in gold. However, Congress has passed no such bill and any prolonged debate on such a proposal would merely erode further confidence in the dollar.

Even if Congress did not act in time, the Federal Reserve Board could temporarily suspend the gold reserve requirement, but this would be contrary to the intent of the law. Not unimportant in the whole question is what the domestic reaction would be to eliminating the 25 percent gold requirement against reserve notes and deposits.

Some recent proposals have involved a spirit of compromise: keep the 25 percent reserve in gold only against currency and forget the deposits. These would fool nobody.

The president of the First National City Bank of New York notes some factors basically favorable to the U.S. position. All the foreign assets owned by the United States, including gold and our subscription to the International Monetary Fund, add up to about $100 billion, which is twice the $50 billion of our liabilities to foreigners. Our foreign investments yield an increasingly large return. Our export surplus continues to run at a rate of around $4.5 billion. Our whole balance-of-payments deficit is about one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product, which is a ridiculously small percentage.

The trouble comes about, as Mr. Moore says, by the fact that we are piling up our liabilities to foreigners at short term, while our assets are very largely illiquid ones, payable at long term.

Mr. Moore does not say so, but the United States has fallen into the age-old trap of borrowing short (i.e., creating short-term liabilities) and lending long, which over the centuries has been the way to bankruptcy.

For a country in such a deficit position the remedy would seem to be absurdly simple: stop encouraging people to borrow money, and particularly foreigners, and instead make this country an attractive field for home and foreign people to invest in at long term. The First National City Bank president says we are in a mixup of fiscal, tax and monetary policy and somebody ought to clear up the confusion.

This can be done by the tax cutting measure now before the Senate. It can also be done by less accent upon Government spending. It means also removal of the artificial measures by the Government to hold down interest rates for the benefit of domestic borrowers—overlooking the fact that foreign borrowers are among the major beneficiaries of such policies. Mr. Moore even feels that the recent hike in the Federal Reserve rediscount rate could be carried further without hurting anybody materially. This may be debatable, but Mr. Moore would have to take that view in the interest of being consistent.

The United States is not acting as a world banker traditionally should. It is trying to have its cake and eat it too. Over a long period this just cannot be done.

Our Uncertain President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's recent proposal to join the Communists in a trip to the Moon startled very many Americans. Arthur Krock, in today's New York Times, analyzes Mr. Kennedy's attempt to cover up:

IN THE NATION: AN UNPERSUASIVE CHALLENGE OF THE RECORD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 23.—The record of the manned moon-landing project from the time President Kennedy announced it to Congress on May 25, 1961, was undeviatingly that of an individual U.S. enterprise until Mr. Kennedy proposed before the United Nations last week that it be changed to a joint expedition with Soviet Russia. This is why the President's proposal startled some Administration officials importantly engaged in the space program.

But when John W. Finney, of this newspaper's Washington staff, duly reported this, with the citation of the record necessary to explain the surprise of these officials, the White House immediately angrily protested that instead of being a fundamental turnabout of a unilateral United States policy on which billions already have been expended, a fusion of the effort with the U.S.S.R. has been in the President's mind all along. To this purpose, however, only one scrap of evidence was offered against a solid opposing record extending from May, 1961, to a White House news conference on July 17, 1963.

This scrap was a remark, "Let's go to the moon together," now disclosed to have been made to Premier Khrushchev by the President when they met at Vienna a few days after Mr. Kennedy recommended the lunar expedition to Congress exclusively in the terms of a nationalistic competition with the Soviet Union that he did not modify until his U.N. speech last week. Since this remark was at the most a "feeler," toward which, according to the same authority, Mr. Khrushchev indicated no reaction, either for or against, this remark is hard to support as proof of a sustained grand design held in reserve for the time when the "gap" created "by the Soviet's clear advantage" in space exploration was "substantially closed."

To accept this contention of the White House spokesman (above quotations his) would require acceptance that the closing of the "gap" occurred since the news conference of July 17, 1963; or that in this short space all the elements which the President then said would make the cooperative effort "impractical" have disappeared with the test ban treaty. These elements he described as "a good many barriers of suspicion and distrust and hostility" of which "there is no evidence as yet that they have broken down."

The President is extremely sensitive to publications which even suggest the inference that he has changed or reversed basic courses. It is then that his public relations barometer, Press Secretary Salinger, bursts from the top of the tube, and explodes all over reporters who, like John W. Finney, serve the public interest by digging out the facts from beneath the official handouts. In this latest instance the following are among these facts:

From the President's message to Congress, May 25, 1961: "I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space."

This proposal was made in a moment of national anxiety, just after the Bay of Pigs episode and the first Soviet manned space flights.

The policy it enunciated was carefully considered for a month in conferences which included the Departments of State and Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

From the time of its announcement the President continued steadily to ask Congress for billions of dollars to finance the connected Project Apollo.

The U.N. speech, on the other hand, was decided on in discussions among a very limited number of officials, not including the Space Council.

It was the duty of the press to review these facts in reporting the speech to which they are wholly relevant. And also to report, which is true, that, because of these facts, the speech surprised a number of officials in the space program; and was viewed by some in Congress as a combination of propaganda for U.N. consumption and a hastily conceived expedient against House sentiment for heavy cuts in the program that threatens a Presidential commitment with politically embarrassing failure.

The New Four Ocean Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., a leading authority on naval warfare, reminds us of the tremendous challenge facing America today on the high seas.

Admiral McCain demonstrated his vast knowledge of our Navy's capability at a recent address before the 50th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

His remarks were aptly termed "The New Four Ocean Challenge" and I recommend them for the Members of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his address:

THE NEW FOUR OCEAN CHALLENGE

(By Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr.)

In this age of missiles and satellites, the first major showdown between the Soviet Union and the United States took place at sea during the Cuban crisis. This was the first time that American had faced Russian, without third parties such as satellite countries involved. As an omen of things to come, this confrontation took place on the high seas.

President Kennedy summed up the situation recently when he addressed the crew of the carrier, U.S.S. *Kitty Hawk*, "Events of October 1962, indicated, as they had all through history, that control of the seas means security. Control of the seas can mean peace. Control of the seas can mean victory. The United States must control the seas if it is to protect our security."

There are three basic points that I would like to make in this presentation. First, we are involved in a total "wet war" with the Soviet Union. This not only includes the naval aspects of the oceans but also the merchant marine, oceanography, and the fishing industry. The second point is that with any further expansion, the Communists must move into those areas which are directly influenced by sea power. And third, one of the most profound changes in the history of warfare has been the extended inland reach from mobile bases at sea. Virtually no spot on earth is beyond range of attack from the sea.

The oceans will play a growing role in the defense of the free world in the future. Some people would like to see the United States take a decreasing interest in world affairs and withdraw to our "island America." But we are inextricably tied to the nations of the free world for our own mutual benefits and we are directly involved in the defense of 60 of them through direct treaty or military assistance agreements.

The British used the oceans to unite their great Commonwealth and to do so they maintained tremendous strength in sea power. Today we must also use the oceans to unite this great oceanic confederation of nations of the free world if we are to resist the massive onslaught of communism which seeks to rule the world.

Almost three quarters of the earth's surface is free real estate to use in the defense of the free world. The oceans are the only way that our national policy can be projected from our own "island America" without being hampered by base rights and other political considerations.

I would first like to discuss some of the peaceful aspects of the oceans which are of importance to us and go on day in and day out.

Science and technology are now looking seaward. As the population of the world increases and our resources on land diminish, we must look to the oceans for food, fresh water, raw materials, and power. Mankind has always derived food from the oceans in the form of fish. We are now investigating the possibilities of extracting other life giving elements which are abundant beneath the surface of the seas. The Japanese are the leaders in this exploration and are now making palatable dishes from such things as seaweed and algae.

Fresh water is already becoming a grave problem in certain sections of the United States. This problem will become even more serious in the years to come. Several distilling plants for making fresh water from salt water are already in operation in this country and there must be an accelerated effort in this field before the problem becomes acute.

Our resources in raw materials are also rapidly giving out. The oceans are a vast storehouse of raw materials. Rock-like nodules of practically pure raw materials have been photographed on the ocean bottom. They range across the entire spectrum from zinc to manganese. All that remains is for science to devise economical methods to unlock the door to this storehouse.

We have just scratched the surface in the exploration of the ocean depths. The *Thresher* tragedy illustrated the fact that we probably know less about the ocean depths than we do about space. We have begun to make breakthroughs, however, and one of these has been with the bathyscaph *Trieste*. About 2 years ago, the *Trieste* descended to the deepest spot in the oceans, a depth of about 7 miles in the Mariannas Trench. The trip that the *Trieste* took to the ocean depths was just as spectacular as the more widely publicized orbiting of the earth.

The Soviet Union is well aware of the importance of exploring the oceans. They have over 100 modern oceanographic research ships conducting the most extensive underwater research program in the world today. They also have thousands of scientists primarily engaged in this research effort which has the full backing of the Soviet Government.

But who owns the riches contained in the ocean depths? Nations have gone to war over fishing rights. That nation which controls the seas will almost certainly have the strongest voice in settling any dispute which may arise as the world turns increasingly to the sea for survival.

Another aspect of the oceans which affects our everyday existence is our absolute dependence upon ocean shipping. The United States is rapidly becoming a have-not nation. Of 72 strategic materials, we must entirely import over 40 of them and portions of all the rest. This Nation occupies the unique position of being the world's largest exporter and importer. Over one-half of the raw materials of the world and one-third of the world's industrial production are channeled to the needs of the economy of the United States.

More than 70,000 miles of vital ocean routes unite the free world and bring together its vast resources. These ocean routes are as fundamental to our own survival as eating, breathing, and sleeping is to the human body. They must be kept open.

There are several factors which affect these vital ocean routes. First, all four bottlenecks of world sea trade lie in areas of political unrest and uncertainty—the Panama Canal, Straits of Gibraltar, Suez Canal and Red Sea, and the Straits of Malacca. We all know of the geographical relationship of Cuba to the Panama Canal. If Cuba ever becomes a predominant military power, it can control that vital artery of commerce.

For 2½ centuries the British have controlled the Straits of Gibraltar. However, today there is considerable unrest in the new nations of northwest Africa. The Soviets have also shown considerable interest in this area.

The Suez Canal is now in the hands of the United Arab Republic having passed from British control in 1956. We know the dislocations which occur in world commerce when that canal is closed off as was done in 1956. Among other things, oil from the Middle East to Europe passes through that canal and Europe cannot survive without that oil. At the juncture of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden, the Soviet Union built a seaport for Yemen about 2 years ago. Today, Yemen is in a state of political uncertainty and turmoil.

As you move further to the east, the fourth bottleneck is the Straits of Malacca which is the great highway between the Indian Ocean, the South China Sea, and the Pacific Ocean. Great Britain has controlled these straits since 1809 by virtue of its possession of Singapore. This entire southeast Asian area is now one of the major trouble spots of the world. The uncertainty in this section could well lead to the closing off of the Straits of Malacca by an unfriendly power.

Every day more than 9,000 merchant ships are steaming the sea lanes of the world. There are about 3,000 ships in the North Atlantic alone. These ships must get through or we as a nation do not survive. Without the necessary imports, we could not build a satellite, a B-58, a Polaris submarine, nor would we have coffee, which is so necessary to our creature comforts.

To further complicate the situation, our own merchant fleet is in a state of decline. American flag merchant ships carry only about 10 percent of our oversea trade. In other words, we are dependent upon ships of other nations to carry 90 percent of our commerce. We have only about 900 active merchant ships flying the U.S. flag today and this fleet is declining by about 4 percent each year. This compares to the several thousand ships we had at the end of World War II. The United States now has only 58 new merchant ships under construction. On the other hand, the Soviet Union is presently building 225.

A more direct military threat to our vital ocean routes is the huge Soviet submarine fleet. Hitler began World War II with 57 submarines and subsequently almost succeeded in cutting the Allies supply lines. Today, the Soviet Union has over 400 submarines. The true significance of this tremendous number rests in the recognition by the men in the Kremlin of our absolute dependence upon the ocean lanes of communications for the survival of the free world.

During the Cuban crisis, many of the Soviet long-range submarines were sent to

the Caribbean area. In fact, our antisubmarine warfare forces persistently tracked these submarines and some of them eventually came to the surface to recharge batteries and for repairs. The Soviets also have missile firing submarines. However, these are not comparable to our Polaris submarines since they can only carry a few short-range missiles and they must come to the surface in order to fire them.

Antisubmarine warfare requires a combination of forces to do the job. Aircraft, surface ships, and submarines are all members of the ASW team. Our ASW forces are built around aircraft carriers which supply fixed wing aircraft and helicopters for patrol and detection. The carrier based aircraft are supplemented by long-range land based patrol planes. Destroyers now carry new weapons such as the remote controlled drone helicopter DASH. Submarines can seek out and destroy enemy submarines in their own environment. The primary mission of our attack submarines is ASW.

There are many facets of antisubmarine warfare which are little discussed. In the first place, we can attack enemy submarines at every available opportunity—in the shipyards alongside the dock fitting out, in the training areas, while en route to the target area, in the target area, and on their way back home again. Secondly, the Soviets suffer in the deployment of their subs from the discontinuity of their coastline. Their submarines can only be deployed from four basic areas—from the White Sea through relatively narrow waters to the Barents Sea, from the Baltic Sea through the Skagerrak and the Kattegat, from the Black Sea through the Dardanelles and the Straits of Gibraltar, and from the Pacific coast of the Soviet Union through narrow waters between Korea, Japan, and the Kurile Islands. We could easily mine many of these narrow waters and also deploy our hunter-killer submarines to lie in wait for the egress of the Soviet submarines.

I would now like to discusse the Communist expansion and how it is affected by the oceans.

In the first few years after World War II, the Communists expanded rapidly. They absorbed the now so-called satellite nations in Eastern Europe by the simple process of marching in. In the Far East, they seized control of mainland China and its 700 million inhabitants.

As a result of this rapid Communist expansion, the nations of the free world began to join together to block any further aggression. Today, the Communists are blocked to the west by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, our Army and Air Force operating from fixed bases in Western Europe, the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, and the possible deployment of other units of our Defense Establishment from the United States. They are blocked to the east by our Army and Air Force operating from fixed bases in Japan, Korea, Okinawa, and the Philippines; the 7th Fleet; and the possible deployment of other forces from the United States. In any expansion northward, the Communists would immediately encounter the climatic and geographic conditions in the Polar icecap.

In addition to the military blocks I have mentioned, the determination of the peoples in these sections of the world to resist communism is also worthy of note.

There is another inescapable fact of geography that faces the Communists if they attempt to expand their borders. Any Communist drive can be outflanked from the sea. We did this in Korea with the Inchon amphibious landings. Our naval striking forces also projected mobile airpower and gunpower on the enemy's flanks which played an important part in the outcome of that conflict. The same principle applies to the southeast Asian Peninsula, the Indian Peninsula, the isthmus which connects Africa and Asia, and to the European Peninsula. In other words, the Communists would be faced with all the disadvantages of peninsula warfare without control of the seas surounding those peninsulas.

Therefore, in order to fulfill the Communist ambition of world domination there is only one direction that they can move and generally speaking this is to the south. The Communists are now leapfrogging to new areas—into Africa where they are attempting to take full advantage of the turmoil and confusion that exists there as the new nations seek to adjust themselves to self-rule, into southeast Asia, and also into our own hemisphere in Cuba. They are now moving into those areas which are directly influenced by seapower.

In southeast Asia, Laos, and South Vietnam are under constant pressure from the Communists. And more recently Communists infiltration attempts in Thailand. But another country in this area which is little discussed is Indonesia. The Soviet Union has helped Indonesia develop a powerful military force. Indonesia has an army of about 250,000 men, many of whom are trained in guerrilla warfare. They have a sizable air force which consists mostly of Soviet bombers and MIG fighters. Their navy consists of over 200 ships led by a Soviet cruiser and about 20 Soviet submarines. This is a powerful force in a section of the world that could explode at any moment.

In Cuba, the Communists have planted a foot on our doorstep. By the same leapfrogging technique, Cuba can now be used as a springboard to further the spread of communism throughout Central and South America. Cuba is also one of the most strategic locations in the Western Hemisphere. It controls the approaches to the Gulf of Mexico, it is within reach of the trade routes between North and South America, and I have already mentioned its proximity to the Panama Canal.

The Communists are now extending their influence to 23 countries outside the Communist Bloc either by military or economic assistance or both. There are some interesting aspects of the pattern which this assistance takes. First, the majority of this assistance is to the underdeveloped nations in the Afro-Asian area. For example, according to an authoritative British trade journal, the Soviet Union now has 10 merchant ships engaged in full-time assistance and trade to Ceylon. Incidentally, Ceylon is very strategically located in the Indian Ocean. Secondly, the majority of the military assistance has gone to Cuba, United Arab Republic, and Indonesia, which I have already mentioned as being located near the major bottlenecks of the world. Third, most of the areas which are receiving Communist assistance are located thousands of miles from the Soviet Union. The only way that they can exert their influence in these areas is by ship. They are now using their growing merchant fleet as a primary weapon in this leapfrogging technique as was demonstrated in Cuba.

The Soviet Union, unlike the United States, is almost self-sufficient in raw materials. Yet they have one of the most modern merchant fleets in the world and it's growing rapidly. They have over 1,100 merchant ships today and they intend to more than double this fleet by 1970. In contrast, they had only 581 merchant ships in 1954. While our merchant fleet is declining, theirs is increasing almost daily. Their ships also employ some of the latest techniques in automation such as remote controlled engines and closed-circuit television to facilitate docking. Some of their ships have extra-large holds and hatches which can be used for carrying missiles below decks and concealed. One of these, the *Poltova*, carried many of the missiles into Cuba.

The Soviets also have the second largest Navy in the world. They have a large number of cruisers and destroyers most of which were built since World War II. One ship of particular interest is the Komar class guided missile PT boat. Some of these PT boats have been given to Cuba and Indonesia.

Ivan has gone to sea. He recognizes fully the importance of the oceans to the achievement of Communist ambitions.

With this as a background, let's take a look at our own Navy. World War I was a one ocean war since it rotated around the North Atlantic. World War II was a two ocean war and involved both the North Atlantic, including the Mediterranean, and the Pacific Ocean. We still have the responsibilities of these two oceans. Ocean number 1 includes the western approaches to Europe or the NATO arc of responsibility. Ocean number 2 includes the Pacific approaches to the Asian continent and extends all the way from the Bering Straits to the Straits of Malacca.

We now have two additional oceans. Ocean number 3 is the Arctic which in the past has been denied to the use of man due to its extensive icecap. Today, by virtue of the advance of modern technology, we can use this ocean with the nuclear powered submarines. In August, 1962, two of our submarines approached from different directions and then rendezvoused at the North Pole. The tactical significance of this evolution cannot be underestimated. Last winter, the Soviet Union announced that one of their nuclear powered submarines had also surfaced at the North Pole. In any future conflict, this could easily become a vast silent battleground between opposing submarines.

Ocean number 4 is the Afro-Asian Ocean and extends from New Guinea across the southern shores of Asia and around Africa. This is a brand new area of strategic importance and the United States will become increasingly involved in the affairs of this section in the years to come.

On V–J Day, political control over this vast Afro-Asian Ocean area was held mainly by five nations—Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, and Portugal. Most of the problems that arose were settled in five European capitals. Today there are over 40 new nations in this section of the world which complicates the political picture. As I have previously pointed out, the Communists are particularly interested in these new nations which are sometimes called the underdeveloped countries, both politically and economically.

Throughout this new strategic area, the United States has few forces, few formal alliances, and few if any bases. Let's take a look at the overall picture of our fixed bases overseas.

The first thing that you would notice in a map of our oversea bases is that they are concentrated generally speaking to the east and west of the Communist bloc. This is in keeping with the determination of the nations of the Free World to block Communist expansion to the east and west. Second, there are few major U.S. fixed bases throughout this new strategic Afro-Asian ocean area. Third, we are in danger of losing many of our fixed bases overseas. The United States is scheduled to abandon all of its bases in Morocco by the end of 1963. In the Azores, we are having difficulty in renewing the lease on the air base at Lajes. In Spain, we have begun to renegotiate the renewal of leases on three strategic air bases and one naval base. This is only one section of the world where the future of our bases is in doubt.

The possibility of establishing new fixed bases overseas particularly in the Afro-Asian ocean area is very slight. Therefore, we must look seaward for an answer to our base problem. There we find our seaborne strik-

ing forces which can fulfill the requirements for a number of fixed bases. Furthermore, these mobile bases can be moved over three-fourths of the earth's surface without having to negotiate for base rights or overflight rights.

These mobile bases have many capabilities. The aircraft carriers are self-sufficient mobile airfields. Mobile strategic missile bases are in the form of Polaris submarines. Our amphibious forces are mobile troop bases and staging areas. All ships have extensive communications capability but we are now building communications ships which can replace an entire communications station on land. The repair ships provide all the facilities for upkeep and maintenance. This entire complex is supported by the tankers and supply ships which give our mobile bases sustained staying power.

Every type of military power can be projected from mobile bases—airpower, gunpower, manpower, and missile power.

The aircraft carrier is a most versatile instrument of modern warfare. It can engage in any type of conflict from nuclear war to cold war. The nuclear powered carrier, *Enterprise,* has the great advantage of being able to steam at maximum sustained speeds for an indefinite period of time.

The most modern high performance aircraft fly from the decks of these mobile airfields. The Vigilante, a Mach 2 bomber, can deliver an air attack over 1,000 miles inland in just a few short hours. Reconnaissance missions can be flown by such planes as the Photo-Crusader. These Crusaders played an extremely important role in the Cuban crisis. The Phantom II, a Mach 2 fighter, can also be used as an attack bomber. And speaking of Phantoms, on the recent Soviet overflights of our carriers in the Atlantic and Pacific, these Phantoms intercepted the Soviet planes while they were about 100 miles away and escorted them while they were in the proximity of the carriers. Incidentally, most of these overflights occurred while the carriers were making an unclassified transit of the ocean enroute to their deployment area or on their way back home. The Navy makes no attempt to conceal ship movements in time of peace. Therefore, it was no remarkable feat for the Soviets to be able to locate these ships under these conditions. During periods of international tension, the movements of our ships could not be predicted and also they would operate under more secretive electronic conditions.

The projection of manpower ashore is an important function of our Navy. This involves the Navy-Marine Corps team which is unique in history because of its mobility and the fact that it can engage in all forms of warfare—land, sea, and air. We put these marines ashore by helicopter or landing craft but preferably a combination of both. New ships such as the amphibious assault ship (LPH) give increased flexibility in vertical envelopment, an evolution in which the marines are put behind the enemy lines with helicopters.

We support the marines with aircraft from the carriers. These aircraft provide close tactical support, fighter cover, and reconnaissance. Gunfire support is also an important element in an amphibious landing. The gun is capable of great accuracy, penetrating power, and can be used under all weather conditions.

The Navy has also moved into space in many areas but the most widely known is the Polaris missile concept. Polaris missiles are now on patrol and ready to be launched if that fatal day ever arrives which will require their use. This is a weapon system of unprecedented stealth and secrecy. It is sometimes referred to as "a ballistic missile in a hole and the hole moves."

All of these capabilities of our modern Navy contribute to one of the most profound changes in the history of warfare—virtually no spot on earth is beyond range of attack from the sea. This is a capability which the United States alone possesses and we must exploit it fully in the precarious balance of power which exists in the world today.

Our fleets are deployed worldwide—the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, the 2d Fleet in the Caribbean and western Atlantic, the 1st Fleet in the eastern Pacific, and the 7th Fleet in the western Pacific. These forces can anticipate trouble and often their timely arrival in an area of tension is enough to deter actual combat.

Seapower is ideally suited to execute a defense policy of "graduated deterrence." Seaborne striking forces can apply any degree of military power required.

At one end of the spectrum is a "show of the flag." The bluejackets and marines are outstanding ambassadors of good will. When these boys go ashore in the ports of our friends and allies, their outstanding conduct inspires in that country a confidence in us to support them in time of trouble. Our ships can also show the flag in areas where the people have never come in contact with Americans before.

Going up the spectrum of power, many problems can be solved by seapower with a show of force without firing a shot. Seaborne striking forces can operate 3 miles off the coast of a potential trouble spot, hovering, poised, ready to take action if required, without committing a hostile act. Formosa in 1958 and the Dominican Republic in 1961 are recent examples of this capability.

Or, if necessary, we can put marines ashore to prevent trouble or to handle it. The timely arrival of a landing team of marines with all their heavy equipment is concrete evidence to any potential aggressor that the United States is prepared to defend its friends. Lebanon in 1958 and Thailand in 1962 are recent examples of the effectiveness of this evolution.

Establishing a quarantine on shipping is a longstanding capability of naval forces which was brought sharply into focus during the Cuban crisis. It is interesting to note that the quarantine phase of the Cuban crisis was carried out without a shot being fired. This points up the fine degree of control which the Nation has with the use of forces at sea to accomplish national objectives.

The Navy has markedly increased its ability to engage in guerrilla or counterinsurgency type warfare. The SEAL teams (abbreviation for sea, air, and land) are molded around the famous frogmen. They are trained to conduct any type of covert activity on land and can be put ashore from aircraft by paradropping into water or from the sea from submerged submarines, PT boats, or rubber rafts from larger ships. The Navy is now building small patrol boats to further its capabilities in this area.

If any trouble spot escalates to a shooting war, seaborne striking forces stand ready to exert a decisive influence. The Navy-Marine Corps team can deliver any type of conventional attack in any war, large or small. Only by sea can the necessary war materials be shipped to support any sustained conflict. During the Koren war, over 99 percent of necessary tonnage to support our armed forces was transported by ship.

At the other end of the power spectrum is nuclear war. Our mobile air and missile bases could well be of decisive significance in an all-out nuclear exchange since these mobile bases are not suitable targets for ballistic missiles.

In summary, control of the seas will play an ever increasing role in the world situation of the future. It is of primary significance that the Communists who occupy the world's greatest single land mass should show so much interest in the sea. You might compare the Soviet Union to a magician. While the world focuses its attention on the right hand which is up in the air or in space, the left hand is carrying out the most important part of the trick and is in our oceanic pocket.

We have had our first showdown at sea and we accomplished our national objectives. Recent world events forecast more showdowns. The next one may not come at the time and place of our choosing. It could occur at any time and thousands of miles from the United States. We must be prepared to meet it promptly and win. This can only be accomplished through strong seapower.

What's the Score?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune, and direct special attention to the first paragraph, which clearly and concisely dramatizes the subject discussed:

WHAT'S THE SCORE?

The situation in South Vietnam is admittedly confused. It is still more confused in Washington. So Mr. Kennedy is sending a factfinding mission to Saigon to discover what's what. It is comopsed of Secretary of Defense McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They will spend a week looking and inquiring.

Supposedly the mission will confine itself to appraising how the South Vietnam Army, with its 14,000 United States "advisers," is making out in the war against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas. This is somewhat peculiar in itself, for the administration has been saying all along that the political policies of President Ngo Dinh Diem are more important than the strictly military operations in the field.

It is even more peculiar in that Mr. Kennedy has a king-sized body of experts already on the grounds. For one, there is Gen. Paul D. Harkins, American commander in Vietnam. Only last Saturday, when Mr. Kennedy was announcing the dispatch of the McNamara-Taylor mission, General Harkins was flatly reporting, "We are winning the war in the Mekong Delta against the Communist guerrillas." If this is a correct judgment, Mr. Kennedy's question is already answered.

Again, Henry Cabot Lodge, the new United States Ambassador, has been around Saigon long enough to learn the facts. Mr. Lodge, from his long experience as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, ought to be capable of an informed judgment.

General Taylor went out to Vietnam before, in 1961, as Mr. Kennedy's military representative. Mr. McNamara has been there at least twice, the last time in May 1962, reviewing the military situation. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State, has also had consultations in Vietnam.

How many people do you need to take a look, and how many times must they do it, before the Kennedy administration can make up its mind?

Of course, the President himself has been no slouch in contributing to the muddiness of the impression of what is going on. Early this month, in a highly undiplomatic pro-

nouncement on television, he announced that Diem's repressions of the Buddhists were "very unwise," that the Diem government was "out of touch" with its own people, and he suggested that Diem make changes in both policy and personnel. The hint was that Diem get rid of his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, boss of the security police, and Mme. Nhu.

Having said so much, Mr. Kennedy did not make the obvious threat that unless these changes were made, the million dollars a day in aid to Vietnam might shrink. Instead, he said in effect: "Change or we'll string along with you anyway."

There was a time when Mr. Kennedy professed to know about Vietnam. He regarded it as a morass to avoid if we didn't want to get bogged down. In his television debates with Richard Nixon, he opposed the Eisenhower administration's policy of defending the Chinese Nationalist islands of Quemony and Matsu, while Nixon upheld their support. Kennedy said scornfully:

"He wants us to be committed to the defense of every rock and island around the world but is unwilling to admit that this may involve American boys in an unnecessary or futile war, as he sought to have us involved in Indochina in 1954."

Now, Mr. Kennedy, finding himself involved in what he called "an unnecessary or futile war," sends out a team to add up the score.

That this is a completely political gesture is attested by the fact that McNamara and Taylor are accompanied by Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Mr. Sylvester is the apostle of the theory of "managed news," maintaining that news is "part of the weaponry" available to the President and that it is proper for government to lie to the people. Maybe the mission to Vietnam will enlighten Mr. Kennedy, but we doubt if it will enlighten the people.

Inflation Hurts Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, farmers are only one of many groups in our country who will be hurt by inflation if a large tax cut is enacted by Congress unmatched by corresponding cuts in Government expenditures.

The following letter is from William J. Kuhfuss, president, Illinois Agricultural Association:

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Bloomington, Ill., September 18, 1963.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: In the next few days you will be considering H.R. 8363, which calls for a tax reduction of some $11 billion in the next 2 calendar years. Farm Bureau recognizes the depressing effect of our current tax structure and the need for tax revision as a means for improving economic growth. However, we feel it is extremely unwise to reduce taxes at this time with the size of the current deficits and the resulting increases in the Federal debt.

Current estimates place the 1964 fiscal year deficit at $9.2 billion before any consideration of tax cuts or tax revision. This deficit, without tax reduction, will likely necessitate an increase in the national debt limit. As the national debt is increased, more and more of the current revenue is required to meet the interest charges.

A tax cut at this time would be an added stimulas to inflation. Farmers facing a constant cost-price squeeze, would be placed at even a greater economic disadvantage. A study of farm costs and gross farm income for the past 10 years will readily reveal that the farmers' economic position has not been caused primarily by a lack of gross income but by the tremendous increase in costs.

Our Nation cannot afford inflation. It penalizes those who live from fixed incomes and those who depend on life savings. Inflation could also undermine confidence in the dollar and aggravate the serious balance-of-payments problem.

We urge you to oppose any tax reduction until Federal spending is brought in line with Government income. We can lose the American economic system by failing to demonstrate fiscal responsibility.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. KUHFUSS,
President.

Forthcoming Visit of Yugoslavia's Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Serbian National Committee which holds a position of leadership in the legitimate pro-Western anti-Communist Yugoslavia emigre groups, has addressed a public letter to the President, Members of Congress, and administration officials on the subject of the forthcoming visit of Yugoslavia's Communist dictator Tito.

Since the public has been subjected to 15 years of continuous propaganda, creating the image of dictator Tito as an "independent," it is especially timely for us to understand the true facts of the case.

Yugoslav dictator Tito is not a friend of the West; is not leading his country to democracy. Instead, he is an autocrat, suppressing the lives of his people, and working closely with the international Communist conspiracy in the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

I place into the RECORD at this point the letter issued by the Serbian National Committee, and urge Members of the House and Senate to carefully review the facts of the case before reaching any premature justification for the political, economic, or social acceptability of the Yugoslav dictator:

SERBIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., September 16, 1963.

President JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Members of Administration, Honorable Senators and Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We hope that you will pardon us for addressing you in this manner. But we have, in this case, a very important petition which, we feel, would be most effective if presented in the same way to all responsible political leaders in the United States.

The subject of this petition is the invitation extended to Yugoslavia's dictator, Josip Bros Tito, to visit the White House and Congress.

The facts of Tito's seizure of power and of his metamorphosis as a political dictator are well known to both the White House and Congress. Many memoranda on this subject have already been presented by Yugoslavian emigrants, especially representatives of Serbians. We do not wish to discuss Tito's policy of dictatorship here, nor the economic and financial disorder of his government, nor the strategic uselessness of the Yugoslavian army in any future war; we wish only to make a few general points.

Tito's expected visit to Washington doubtlessly has provoked Serbian emigrants from Yugoslavia and has caused concern as to how much disturbance it will arouse, while the people in Yugoslavia feel that they have received one more blow from a nation from which they have expected help in being liberated from Tito's dictatorship.

These people know what kind of man Tito is: how he snatched power with the support of Soviet bayonets; how he has never given the people the right to free elections, a free press, or free meetings; how he has killed or oppressed all the proponents of a democracy, beginning with General Draza Mihailovic; how he has imprisoned without judge or court more than 7 million voters only because they were for a real democracy.

That this man who does not represent the people of Yugoslavia should be received with the same warmth and sincerity as if he did in a real democratic sense represent the people is a great paradox.

Ordinary people must ask themselves: "Where are those ideals for which we must sacrifice?" If the principles and ideals of democracy are destroyed, has not communism achieved a very big success? And if we need these people in the final and inevitable struggle between democracy and communism, by what ideals shall we urge them to revolt and fight?

From a short-range point of view, Tito's visit may be politically reasonable, but its long-term effects will be far-reaching in the political life of these people, for their souls will harbor an eternal wound.

Tito is known as an advocate of peaceful coexistence, but, practically speaking, if democratic nations accept peaceful coexistence on his terms, Yugoslavia will remain in perpetual slavery under communism. Thus, although Tito is a conspirator against liberty, justice, and democracy, he will be received by the White House and Congress.

What can Tito, courier and spy for Comintern between two wars, do for the biggest and richest nation in the world? He can give nothing except a spy's smile and secret contempt for a very brilliant reception. What can he receive? Even if he receives only a very nice reception, he will obtain more political and ideological benefits for Comintern than, in a military sense, he would obtain through a gift of the entire 6th American Fleet with all its war potential.

Only 2 weeks ago, Khrushchev visited Yugoslavia. He and Tito made plans for Tito's visits to Washington, Mexico, and South America. This meeting between the two dictators shows that Tito's politics, ideolology, and destiny are very closely linked to Moscow, and that his parrot's declarations about good relations with the West are calculated only to gain the financial help without which Tito cannot survive and which he receives and disperses without question or control. Tito's government finds itself in an economically and financially impossible situation, but Tito, himself, with his estates, palaces, and special resorts, is without example even in feudal times.

Tito enjoys being in the center of international problems. There is not a day in the week without foreign visitors to Yugoslavia; chiefs of state, general secretaries, other functionaries, and administrators arrive daily in Belgrade. The cost of their receptions, dinners, round trips, etc., is without

control, but the mass of the population is short on even the basic necessities of life.

The incompatibility between democratic principles and cooperation with dictators is demonstrated by the invitation to Tito by Mr. Thant, General Secretary of the U.N., to be speaker of this session of the General Assembly. Should Tito, who has refused to pay Yuoslavia's part in the U.N. budget for the Congo and the Middle East, be speaker in the General Assembly?

We present this petition in the name of the Serbian National Committee, political representative for exiled Serbians of democratic Yugoslavia and also the free voice of those oppressed in Yugoslavia today by Tito and the Communist Party. We appeal in the name of all the great principles of democracy, justice, and morality and in the common interest of all men of good will who respect the right, live truly, and believe in God that Tito not be received in Washington.

Our children are already in the jaws of the Communist dragon. We pray to God for your children that they have not the same destiny as ours.

Respectfully yours,

STEVAN D. TRIVUNAC,
President.

BRANISLAV M. STANISIC,
Secretary.

Fiscal Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today and tomorrow we are considering the very important tax bill and, depending upon the success of the Byrnes amendment, this country will either suffer galloping inflation or be able to right itself and thus achieve sounder prosperity.

The following articles and editorials are foursquare on the point and make a great deal of sense: "Sham Tax Cut," by Henry Hazlitt, in the September 2 issue of Newsweek; a Newsday editorial of September 20, "Cut Taxes and Spending"; a Wall Street Journal editorial, "The Flexible Reins," of September 23; and Lyle C. Wilson's article, "JFK and the Budget," which appeared in the Washington Daily News on September 23:

[From Newsweek, Sept. 2, 1963]

SHAM TAX CUT

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Neither the Treasury nor the House Ways and Means Committee that adopted its proposed tax cuts has any reason to feel proud of what it did.

Let us recall some elementary principles that everyone seems to want to forget. Taxes are imposed, not out of pure cussedness, but to raise revenues. Their function is to raise enough revenues to pay for the Government's expenditures. Taxes, in other words, are a purely derivative problem. The real problem is to cut expenditures. But nobody wants to face this. So everybody can be a cheap Santa Claus by voting for tax cuts while voting for more expenditures.

When taxes fall short of meeting expenditures, the tax cut is not real. Either visible taxes must be correspondingly increased in subsequent years (if there is any honest intention of ever having even a "cyclically" balanced budget or ever paying off any of the national debt), or the deficit must be paid for by the hidden tax of inflation, i.e., of higher prices and cheaper dollars. If inflation worked out evenly, it would be a proportional income tax and capital levy on rich and poor alike. It never works out evenly, but falls most heavily on those least able to protect themselves. In brief, any tax cut that leaves a deficit is a deception and a sham.

HUGE DEFICITS

On August 13, Secretary Dillon predicted a deficit of $9.1 billion for the current fiscal year 1964, compared with his estimate in January of $11.9 billion. But he also forecast still another deficit of $9.4 billion for fiscal 1965. The day after the Secretary announced these tremendous deficits, the Ways and Means Committee adopted tax cuts, starting in the election year that begins next January, that will amount when fully effective, according to Treasury estimates, to $11.9 billion annually. How much of this cut was allowed for in Secretary Dillon's estimate of the day before was not clear. In any case the Treasury, this far ahead, has persistently underestimated the deficit. For the fiscal year ended June 30 last, it originally estimated a surplus. There was actually a deficit of $6.2 billion. The same thing happened in the preceding fiscal year, which ended with a deficit of $6.3 billion.

If a tax cut were justified at all with present spending programs, it would not be the kind of tax cut that the Treasury has recommended and the Ways and Means Committee adopted. There would be an argument for a tax cut that ended confiscatory rates, that made the scale of progression less steep, that mitigated the taxes that do most to discourage effort, production, and growth. Such reforms would make possible greater revenues in spite of lower rates.

MASSIVE REVENUE LOSS

But the new tax bill does the opposite. For the present personal income tax scale ranging from 20 to 91 percent, it substitutes a scale ranging from 14 to 70 percent. The result is that the tax cut at the bottom of the scale amounts to 30 percent and at the upper end of the scale varies from about 15 to 23 percent. Moreover, owing to a new "minimum standard deduction" gimmick, 1.5 million taxpayers would be taken off the tax rolls entirely.

The result is that 1.5 million fewer people will give a hoot how high Government spending goes. The loss of revenue will be massive. It will be politically almost impossible to put these people back on the rolls or to restore the 20 percent basic rate. If, as Congressman BRUCE ALGER of Texas proposed, there had been simply a flat tax cut of 20 percent all down the line, the political problem of restoration would not be so serious. If the top rates had been slashed to a maximum of 50 percent, there would have been a maximum revenue loss of $1 billion in the first year and probably increased revenues in succeeding years because of the incentives that would have been restored. Instead, the penalization of investment was made even steeper by the proposed termination of the 4-percent dividend credit.

True, the new tax bill has a few good features. But in the context of planned deficits of more than $9 billion a year, its tax reductions are a fraud that will deceive only the shortsighted.

[From Newsday, Sept. 20, 1963]

CUT TAXES AND SPENDING

President Kennedy has made a strong appeal for public support of his tax cut proposals, and with it has given life service to the principle of economy. A tax cut and prudent budget cuts must go together if the integrity of the dollar is to be maintained.

The difficulty of course is that no President alone can control how much money goes into the budget. For the current fiscal year the figure now stands at $96.8 billion. Congress only can decide how much this can be reduced, and Congress historically has displayed a notable indisposition to cut very deeply. Just about every Member has some pet project affecting his district, State or geographical region. These added together make up a hefty sum allocated for pork-barrel purposes.

When the budget is examined, it becomes clear that a very few items make up most of the cost of Government operation. This year $55.4 billion is allotted to defense (more than 50 percent of the total); $5.5 billion is allotted to the space program; $5.7 billion to farm supports and $10.1 billion for interest on the national debt. Added together, these represent nearly 75 percent of the total.

Excluding the national debt, Congress tends to regard all the figures listed as sacrosanct, or even subject to enlargement. The Senate earlier this week raised the defense budget, even though it had been carefully vetted by the economy-minded oldtimer Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

In fact no budget item should be untouchable. Congress has a duty to scrutinize each one for fat. The national defense is paramount, but the armed services have never been known to exercise moderation in asking for added funds or in justifying such increases on the basis of "Father knows best." Farm subsidies are of course a pork barrel, but even if they are politically touchy, there must be enough Members of Congress from urban and suburban areas to register a loud protest and to force some reductions.

In addition, the President must provide leadership and prove his sincerity if he expects Congress to vote for economy. He must withdraw some of his spending programs.

On experience, it is hard to hope for budget surgery.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 23, 1963]

THE FLEXIBLE REINS

Once again Federal budgetmakers are getting down to their annual task, and once again there's a lot of talk of economy. Specifically, President Kennedy, eyeing the fiscal year that begins next July 1, promises an ever-tighter rein on Federal spending.

One way or another, administration officials assert, the fiscal 1965 deficit will be held below this year's expected $9.2 billion. Such determination may seem admirable, but the cold figures—and past history—make the Nation's fiscal prospects seem something less than encouraging.

There was, for example, Mr. Kennedy's remark of last January that he was going to "limit severely" his proposals for spending in this fiscal year. Translated into statistics, this turned out to mean he was planning to lift outlays by $4.5 billion to a record high of $98.8 billion. And it develops that an "ever-tighter rein" on spending next year is expected to lead to another new high—of close to $102 billion.

In such circumstances, some people may wonder how the budgetmakers think they can achieve a smaller deficit next year, especially in view of the fact that the budget will be based on the assumption that Congress will finally okay a sizable tax cut. In reality their thinking is simple enough. They'll just figure that the tax cut will instill so much zip in the economy that revenues will rise more than spending.

Clearly, a tax cut under the right conditions is desirable, to lessen an oppressive burden on the economy. Yet its exact economic

impact is not easy to measure. Though administration economists seem to believe the tax cut will unleash a giant wave of new spending, the fact is that a lot of people are likely merely to stash away more in savings or settle up some old bills.

Amid such uncertainties, it is really impossible to be sure that, after the tax cut, there will be any revenue rise at all—much less the gain of $3 billion or more that the budgetmakers will be counting on. This castles-in-the-air approach to Federal budgeting is no more encouraging now than it ever was.

It's even less encouraging when you realize that, even if all the optimism on revenues should somehow prove well founded, we'll still be saddled with yet another deficit of close to $9 billion. This cannot help but store up new fuel for inflation, create new doubts about the dollar's stability and further postpone any truly meaningful attack on our balance of payments difficulties.

All this, however, is not to say that the new economy drive is entirely without its bright aspects.

For one thing, it's a sort of left-handed recognition by the administration that some of its earlier economic theories were a bit addled. Any effort to hold down Federal spending, for instance, seems to depart from the idea that Washington can solve all the Nation's problems merely by spending more money—on urban renewal, public works or whatever happens to come to mind.

Then, too, any effort to keep the deficits from ballooning ever bigger appears to reflect rejection of the oft-expressed notion that such deficits and the resulting increases in Federal debt are nothing at all to worry about. It's true that the restraint talked of now clearly does not go far enough, but at least it's a move in the proper direction.

In part, we suspect, this stems from a recognition of political realities. By now, the administration obviously realizes that there is in the nation no galloping demand for a tax cut tied to ever-rising spending; otherwise, there would be no need for even the illusion of spending restraint.

It may be that the economic ideas of such men as Senators BYRD and GOLDWATER, so often dismissed as reactionary, have had their impact on the people. Or it may be that the public simply has too much common sense to believe that anyone, either an individual or a government, can go on forever spending more than is coming in.

However that may be, we suspect that a good many people are going to be a little dubious about the Government's "tight" budget reins. Especially when those reins seem to be made of rubber.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 23, 1963]

J.F.K. AND THE BUDGET

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

President Kennedy's promise to balance the Federal budget with revenue generated by tax reduction would arouse more enthusiasm among the taxpayers if similar solemn promises had not so often been made and broken in the past 30 years.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's promise to balance the Federal budget was an annual affair until it became an embarrassment to him and to his party. He was elected in 1932 on a budget balancing promise that also was a phoney. The 1932 Democratic platform not only promised a balanced budget but pledged a 25 percent reduction in Government spending, believe it or not.

F.D.R. quickly abandoned his platform just as President Kennedy has turned away from the fiscal pledges of his 1960 presidential platform. Mr. Kennedy and the platform promised a balanced budget and laid out a program to achieve it. One important part of that program was higher taxes if necessary.

The Roosevelt years spanned from March 1931 to April 1945. Every one was a deficit year in which F.D.R. borrowed billions to pay Government bills. Four of those were war years in which deficit spending was wholly defensible.

Mr. Kennedy will rack up four consecutive Federal deficits in his first term and at least two more in his second, if he is reelected. Administration economists concede Treasury deficits until fiscal year 1967.

On the record of comparatively recent experience, a politician's promise to balance the Federal budget isn't worth much. Mr. Kennedy refuses to consider reduced spending while speaking only in the generalities of budget balancing. Small wonder that many conservative-minded citizens doubt Mr. Kennedy's performance will match his good intentions.

The conservative-minded citizens contemplate the steadily shrinking value of the U.S. dollar and the rotting effect of endless budget deficits on the dollar's purchasing power. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that since 1959 the U.S. dollar has lost 6.4 cents of its purchasing power. Compared with the dollar of 1949, the July 1963 dollar has shrunk by 23.9 cents. Compared with the 1939 dollar the shrinkage now is 54.8 cents, the purchasing power being calculated at 34.2 cents.

A 45-cent dollar means that it costs more than twice as much to live today than it did 24 years ago. This dollar-rotting process has slowed considerably since the lushly loose Truman years, but the shrinkage continues. The first line of U.S. defense is a stable, strong dollar. It follows, therefore, that the first line of U.S. defense is crumbly and is likely to continue so until Government spending is held within revenue and a beginning is made on public debt retirement.

The alternative to that budget balancing program would be continued borrowing until the public debt became unmanageable and unbearable. At that point there would be no alternative to a tremendous devaluation of the U.S. dollar to dissolve the debt.

Such dollar devaluation would collapse the first line of U.S. defense. The American way of life would end. Too bad we can't believe the politicians when they promise to balance the budget.

Featherbedding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor, entitled "Featherbedding," which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, September 23. This letter points out the hazards of the quality stabilization bill now pending before the Congress, both from the standpoint of the consumer, who will be afflicted by immediately increased prices, and also from the standpoint of the whole of the American economy, and the free enterprise system in which we take pride and to which the United States owes a great deal of its success.

The letter follows:

FEATHERBEDDING

Apparently, the self-styled "independent" businessmen of America will succeed in bulldozing through this Congress the so-called quality stabilization bill. This is, of course, economic featherbedding of the most stupid and potentially dangerous sort. Supposedly one of the prime virtues of free enterprise is that the free operation of the marketplace will protect consumers by weeding out marginal and inefficient producers and sellers.

The effect of so-called quality stabilization is to protect the inefficient retailer and pass the cost of this inefficiency on to the consumer. It is interesting to note that many of the Congressmen who filled the air with their windy denunciations of featherbedding (when some poor railroad workers tried to protect their jobs) are now falling all over one another in their haste to construct the softest possible featherbed for our friendly (but high-priced) neighborhood merchants.

In the past consumer prices have been from 19 percent to 27 percent higher in fair trade than in nonfair trade areas. In the future, according to the Justice Department's estimates, quality stabilization will raise prices on refrigerators, radios, air conditioners, dryers, TV's, and thousands of other electrical, drug, and retail items by at least 20 percent. Those "free enterprisers" who would gladly condemn workers if wage increases caused even a 1 or 2 percent rise in prices are strangely silent about this new form of legalized pickpocketing.

Since quality stabilization is obviously bad economics, it is potentially a time bomb which will undermine and destroy what's left of free enterprise in America. It is axiomatic that higher prices are followed by lower demand. And just as the night follows the day so will lower demand be followed by even fewer employment opportunities in an economy that is already unable to produce enough jobs for millions of citizens who need and want to work.

ROBERT G. RODDEN,
Bethesda.

"To Protect the Public Health," by Weakening Consumer Protections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done a fine job under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] in the consideration and recommendation of legislation to protect the health of the American people. I am therefore very hopeful that the subcommittee will not approve a bill on which subcommittee hearings were conducted last week dealing with animal drugs.

This bill has been strongly urged upon the Congress by large pharmaceutical manufacturers which produce animal as well as human drugs. It would seriously weaken and undermine necessarily stringent provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act applying to drugs intended for animals which provide us with a substantial part of our food supplies. The irony of the bill lies in its title, which maintains it is a bill "to protect the public health" by consolidating in one new

section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act all provisions applying to animal drugs. For in the course of carrying out such a consolidation, the bill leaves out or amends and weakens major provisions of present law dealing with animal drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a statement of mine to the subcommittee which outlines my objections to the legislation and described the possible consequences of enacting H.R. 7247, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 7247, ANIMAL DRUG AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am against this bill from start to finish. As the chairman of the subcommittee will recall, I went through a great deal of background material and information in support of this legislation last winter before any bills were introduced and I felt then as I do now that this bill has as its objective the weakening of consumer protections against adulteration of our food supply.

Of course, I do not believe that anyone in favor of the bill wants to poison the American people or introduce cancer-inducing substances into our food supply. I am sure the supporters of the legislation are sincere in believing that what they seek to do is merely to cut down on so-called needless Government interference and redtape. But even so, I fail to see how this could justify placing in the title of the bill the introductory phrase that it is a bill "to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act" by setting up a new section 511 relating entirely to animal drugs.

This is not a bill "to protect the public health" for, no matter how hard I look for it, I cannot find a single thing in this bill which strengthens in any way at all any law or regulation to protect the public health. Instead, the bill is full of provisions which would weaken existing law now protecting the public health.

ROBERTS AMENDMENT SAFEGUARD TO BE REPEALED

I cannot help but go back to the argument we had here August 6, 1962—just over a year ago—during hearings on the feed additives bill which was later incorporated into the Drug Control Act we enacted last year covering all prescription drugs. I strongly opposed the feed additives bill because I felt it would be a highly dangerous thing to repeal the Delaney anticancer clause for feed additives and color additives in feed, merely to make it possible for more animal feed manufacturing plants to use diethylstilbestrol. I took that fight to the House floor and I lost, thanks to the presuasiveness of the chairman of this subcommittee and his outstanding reputation in the House in behalf of the public health.

There was a saving feature about the relaxation of the Delaney anticancer clause for feed additives in the amendment written into the law last year, however, and I acknowledged that at the time. The Roberts amendment gave the Food and Drug Administration unquestioned authority to move promptly and effectively to halt the use of stilbestrol in animal feed the moment new testing methods should disclose residues of this powerful and dangerous hormone in the tissues of beef cattle receiving the drug in animal feed.

But, now, in this bill, the big drug manufacturing companies which produce drugs for animal feed seek to remove this safeguard—just knock it right out of the law. What possible excuse could there now be for writing into the law a provision overturning the safeguard enacted in last year's feed additives amendment? Is there a fear that we are soon going to begin to find stilbestrol residues in our beef supply, as we did a few years ago in poultry?

The provision of H.R. 7247 I am referring to, beginning at the bottom of page 9, holds that once an animal drug has been approved for use, "a food shall not, by reason of bearing or containing such drug or any substance formed in or on the food because of its use in accordance with such application, or by reason of bearing or containing a residue of such drug or substance, be considered adulterated within the meaning of clause (1) of section 402(a)."

ADULTERATED FOODS NOT TO BE "CONSIDERED ADULTERATED"

This is simply unbelievable. It is incredible. It is astounding. What does section 402(a)(1) say? It says that a food shall be deemed to be adulterated "if it bears or contains any poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health."

But this bill comes along now and proposes that a food product in which there are residues of stilbestrol or any other animal drug dangerous for human consumption—in milk, eggs, beef, and so on—shall not be considered adulterated, because the Government had previously approved use of the substance as an animal drug.

I understand that after the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration testified on Tuesday against many of the provisions of this bill, including the one I just cited, representatives of the pharmaceutical manufacturers supporting the bill came in here yesterday with a satchel full of amendments to satisfy, or attempt to satisfy, objections and loopholes cited by the FDA. Now I just don't understand that. This bill was not slapped together in a hurry. Obviously, everything in it was carefully considered and weighed, before any legislation was introduced. Obviously then, the pharmaceutical manufacturers set out to obtain legislation "to protect the public health" by giving the drug manufacturers a whole series of changes in the law intended to weaken regulations. Under the circumstances, this bill should be rejected.

BETTER WAY TO CHANGE ANIMAL DRUG LAWS—STRENGTHENING THEM

If you're going to change the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provisions dealing with animal drugs, the suggestion I would make is that you throw this bill away and take the relevant portions of my bill, H.R. 1235. My bill rewrites not only the feed additives and animal drug sections of the act but most of the other sections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—dealing with cosmetics, therapeutic devices, pep pills, barbiturates, labeling, factory inspection, and so on. The provisions of H.R. 1235 which are relevant to the bill you have before you on animal drugs would do the opposite of H.R. 7247. Instead of weakening consumer protections in the use of animal drugs on meat animals, H.R. 1235 would strengthen them.

Thus, instead of ending the required batch-by-batch certification of the five antibiotic animal drugs now named in the act—as H.R. 7247 would do—H.R. 1235 would require batch-by-batch certification of all antibiotics used in meat animals. Last year the pharmaceutical manufacturers had asked to end batch-by-batch certification of the original five antibiotics for human use. Instead, when we finally got finished with the drug control bill, we voted to require such certification of all human antibiotics, and a good thing it was, too. Since antibiotics used in animals can definitely affect the public health through food products derived from animals, I don't think we have any right to permit antibiotics which cannot pass Government certification tests to be used in animals which are part of our food supply. So instead of ending certification of the five animal antibiotics now covered in the law, we should include all antibiotics.

H.R. 1235 would also repeal the provision we enacted last year—which I tried to knock out of the bill—which permits cancer-inducing coloring material to be used in animal feed. I have checked and I have learned that not a single feed manufacturer has ever indicated an intention to use a cancer-inducing color to identify a particular kind of feed and distinguish it from another. Why would anyone want to use a cancer-inducing color for such a purpose? It doesn't make any sense. There are plenty of colors available which can be used, and which are being used, for animal feed identification purposes and which are not carcinogenic. So what sense does it make to have in the law a provision which says a cancer-inducing color may be used to distinguish a particular kind of animal feed? H.R. 7247 does not have any provision applying to this matter but my point is that if H.R. 7247 were, indeed, intended to be a bill "to protect the public health" by consolidating into one new section provisions of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act relating to animal drugs, then it would attempt to do some of the things H.R. 1235 does in the area of animal drugs and would not attempt to do the things that are actually in H.R. 7247.

Speaking for consumers, I say to the subcommittee: We do not want to see you "protect the public health" by making it possible for food products containing residues of stilbestrol or other potent animal drugs to be sold to the public. We do not want you to change the law to say such meat products are not adulterated under the terms of section 402(a)(1), even though they bear or contain poisonous or deleterious substances injurious to health.

The Vietnam Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, no one doubts that Vietnam is in a mess; therefore the excellent editorial in yesterday's Washington Evening Star is worth reading. There is something radically wrong and our fighting troops are not to blame:

WHO'S FIGHTING WHOM?

The formal announcement says that Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor are being sent to Vietnam to make a first-hand study of the "military effort" against the Communist Vietcong.

If this means that the President is not already fully familiar with the details of the military effort, then a study most certainly should be made. Such ignorance at this stage of the war would be shocking, but we suspect that the real purpose of the journey to Saigon aims at a good deal more than a study of the military situation.

This suspicion is reinforced by a report citing a "senior Pentagon official" as authority for the announcement that Mr. McNamara intends "to probe every level" of United States and Vietnamese activity bearing on activities against the Vietcong. This same news story also informs us that Mr. McNamara was chosen by the President for this assignment because "he is accustomed to probing complicated situations and coming up with

recommendations that can be translated promptly into action."

Mr. McNamara's past performance in probing complicated situations in the Pentagon raises some doubt as to his qualifications for untangling the can of worms in Vietnam. Still, it is clear that something needs to be done there, and to the extent that the remedy may lie in military refinements Mr. McNamara and General Taylor are as well qualified as anyone else for the task.

There is plenty of reason to believe, however, that the real problem in Vietnam (and in Washington) consists basically of political and ideological issues, and that military considerations are secondary. Reports from Vietnam strongly suggest that Americans there are busily fighting the Vietcong with one hand and President Diem with the other. Although Mr. Kennedy repeatedly says our primary concern is with the military struggle, much of our effort in Saigon goes into fighting the political war. As between the two, it doubtless would be easier to destroy the Diem regime. But how then is it proposed to carry on a successful war against the Vietcong?

Mr. Kennedy should also designate someone to make a study in depth of the situation in Washington. On the home front the inspired report is the principal weapon. And it is being used, depending upon who is being armed at a given time, to shoot down the State Department, the Pentagon, the CIA, or any other target which may come conveniently within range.

This sort of sniping must be bad for morale in Saigon. And in the United States it surely is eroding public confidence in the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam.

Friendship Doesn't Count in Trade War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Chicago Tribune, Columnist Eliot Janeway discussed in a very penetrating fashion the competitive aspects of international trade.

In view of the full-scale administration-supported propaganda drive for increased trade with the Soviet Union and other Communist dictatorships, as well as the headaches developing from the failure to implement the 1962 Tariff Act, it is well for us to take a practical view of the motivations in trade competition. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert this article into the RECORD at this point, for the attention of the Members:

FRIENDSHIP DOESN'T COUNT IN TRADE WAR

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, September 22.—The test ban treaty reaches only the public relations phase of our continuing problem of how to stay competitive with Russia. This competition was originally political, ideological, and military. Increasingly, however, it is taking economic form. And here no treaty can possibly slow down the competition with Russia, or call off continual tests of strength in the markets of the world.

Take the competition for the British market, for instance. Americans naturally assume that this closest ally and friend will stay put as a trading partner, too. But, as Adam Smith might have told Karl Marx (and as Tito made clear when he showed Khrushchev his American-built plant), it is risky to take economic alliances for granted. The prudent statesman's approach is to sell each deal as a new one, and as the best around.

This is what the Russians have been trying to do in Britain. No matter how Britain is oriented politically toward the United States, she is plagued by two chronic economic problems, each of which constantly threatens to become acute. The first is how her island economy is to find the money to pay for imports. The other is how her high-cost industry can find the exports to keep unemployment under control.

GET BEST OF DEAL

Russia has made a shrewd fit of her offerings to Britain's needs. She is selling twice as much in Britain as she is taking from her. This has left Britain in obvious need of increasing her sales to Russia. No American should be surprised by the announcement from Moscow, late in August, that the Soviet chamber of commerce (it has one) has invited the British members of the Russo-British Chamber of Commerce in London to send a sales catalog of what British industry wants and needs to sell in Russia.

No less than 670 British firms belong to the Russo-British chamber of commerce, and the president of the British Board of Trade (the Cabinet officer corresponding to our Secretary of Commerce) has gone to Russia to negotiate with his opposite number.

The immediate and inescapable effect of any increase in British-Russian trade narrows the market open to the exports we need so desperately to sell; and any setback to the United States on the export front is a setback on the dollar front. Moscow may be getting cozy with us politically but, so long as she out-competes us in the British market of all places, she is playing a mighty tough economic game against us.

TAKE CUE FROM SWEDEN

How can the United States trade tough against Russia while talking nice? It's worth taking a quick look at how Sweden is playing her hand. Sweden is small enough and close enough to Russia to feel the threat of her shadow. She is rich enough and progressive enough socially to have a stake in realism and to be on constant notice that she must live by her wits.

Last winter, Russia's successful economic invasion of the British market hit Sweden a bad blow. For Sweden and Russia compete as exporters of forest products, and Britain is a prime market. The backlash of the fancy barter deals which Russia began to offer for Iron Curtain timber, forced Sweden to slash her price list by 25 percent. This was a round Russia won in the North Sea and on the Baltic.

But now Sweden has come back fighting—with her head as well as with her resources. She has just given Britain's sick shipbuilding industry (which accounts for her No. 1 depressed area and her No. 1 job problem) a whopping, well-publicized and, above all, well-timed export order—for a luxury liner. The Clydeside needs the work. And the hard-cash customer—which Sweden is—can certainly claim to regard Britain as a customer in return, particularly for timber, which is as important to Sweden as shipbuilding is to Britain.

INSURED FULL EMPLOYMENT

One little matter of business detail, not yet mastered by our Government, explains how Sweden has managed to work her way back into the British market. She has a shipbuilding industry of her own; and, before she could barter timber sales to Britain for a luxury liner, she first had to use export tax credits and other such devices to insure full employment at home.

Sweden's done it—she's bought her freedom to compete against Russia; and she's given us an example to copy.

Price Fixing Bill Called Blow to Service Stores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article appearing in the Air Force Times of September 18, 1963.

That article, entitled, "Price Fixing Bill Called Blow to Service Stores," again chronicles the evils of the so-called Quality Stabilization bill, so hurtful to the interests of the consumers and the small businessmen.

This excellent article points out how the Quality Stabilization bill would, "bring about substantial price hikes in exchanges, commissaries and service clubs."

The Defense Department further says—

The bill would have such an inflationary effect—on military personnel's purchasing power—that it would seriously erode the value of the $1.2 billion military pay raise now before the Congress.

Certainly, legislation this destructive of the public interest should not be enacted into law.

The article follows:

PRICE FIXING BILL CALLED BLOW TO SERVICE STORES

(By Bob Schweitz)

WASHINGTON.—The Defense Department is vigorously opposing a bill that would allow price fixing by name-brand manufacturers. In the opinion of Pentagon officials, it could bring about substantial price hikes in exchanges, commissaries and service clubs.

The bill, S. 774, is known as the Quality Stabilization bill. Hearings were scheduled before the Senate Commerce Committee this week. The Justice and Agriculture Departments are opposing it, too.

The Defense Department says the bill would have such an inflationary effect that it would seriously erode the value of the $1.2 billion military pay raise now before Congress.

Although the proposal technically exempts sales to the Government from its restrictions, the real effect could be to cause an increase in prices in the service stores or removal from their shelves of some name-brand items. This is because the proposal could require jobbers and wholesalers who sell to the Government to raise their prices. Consequently, the exchanges would have to pay more for their products and, therefore, would have to charge more.

The Pentagon's view is that not only will the measure damage the exchanges, commissaries, and clubs, it also could add billions of dollars to the already high military budget.

Defense points out that most of what it buys comes from firms which in turn buy from subcontractors who would be under the control of the proposed law. Consequently, costs to the contractors selling to the Government would go up, and so would prices the Government pays.

The same might occur in the exchanges and commissaries—prices would go up.

If the general national effect of the measure would raise prices, as its critics charge it will, then the exchange prices would rise

as well, even though they are supposedly exempt.

Furthermore, a Senate Commerce Committee official said there is pressure on the committee to remove the exemption for the exchanges altogether. This means that if the pressure is successful, the service stores must charge the same prices as civilian stores.

Retailers have been sniping at the exchanges for some time and would probably welcome any legislation that would force the exchanges to raise prices or that would remove "name" products from exchange shelves.

Although the measure vitally affects the Department of Defense in many ways a committee spokesman said no Defense Department witnesses are to be called to testify. Nevertheless, Defense sent a blistering letter to the committee in which it said it opposed the bill.

"An Up-to-Date Look at International Trade," an Address by L. Edward Scriven, Acting National Export Expansion Coordinator, South Bend, Ind., September 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, L. Edward Scriven, Acting National Export Expansion Coordinator, recently delivered a fine talk before the Michiana World Trade Club in South Bend, Ind. The occasion was the presentation of a Department of Commerce "E" award—for an outstanding contribution to this country's export expansion program—to the Michiana World Trade Club. I am proud to say that many of the leaders in this organization are numbered among my constituents.

The club, which is an affiliate of the South Bend-Mishawaka Chamber of Commerce, has as its chief purpose the increase of employment in the Michiana area through expansion of local area exports in foreign markets and the reduction of the overall U.S. trade deficit. The nonprofit agency is designed to stimulate and coordinate the export activities of manufacturing industries in the Greater South Bend trade area, which includes parts of Illinois, Michigan and Ohio as well as Indiana.

I believe that Mr. Scriven's speech, outlining a pattern for further private business initiative in searching out and developing foreign markets, will be of interest to Members of Congress and under unanimous consent I insert this address in the RECORD.

The text follows:

AN UP-TO-DATE LOOK AT INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The name, Michiana World Trade Club, has a ring of romance and adventure that is fitting to this area of the explorations of La Salle. And that venerable Frenchman would be proud of the exploration of markets in far places by the men of Michiana.

You may be interested to know that a cursory check of U.S. firms selling in Bangkok, the world trade center farthest removed from this room, revealed nine companies from this area. These firms, with representatives or agents in Bangkok, are Linton Pencil, Orthopedic Fractures Appliances, South Bend Lathe, Voice of Music, Studebaker, Zimmer Manufacturing, U.S. Rubber, Torrington, and Bendix. I am sure I missed a couple. I'll bet I could also buy an Alka Seltzer in Bangkok.

I get excited to observe the scores of opportunities in almost every country I visit. Any manufacturer must get a greater thrill by taking advantage of these opportunities and making some money out of them.

When you speak of adventure today, most people start talking of outer space, or, what's on the other side of Venus. Some believe that the great challenge passed with the covered wagon, or with the days of the industrial buccaneers like Schwab, Rockefeller, and Gary.

It is just not true.

AN EXPANDING FRONTIER

The greatest challenge to Americans is still at hand, and it is in the immediate future. It offers golden opportunities for adventure and profits to those with vision, ingenuity, and energy. It is the challenge of international trade. I know one industrialist, who is scarcely a business tycoon, but who has won adventure and profits around the world—and from a wheelchair. Hearing him describe a business trip abroad is as thrilling as a Tom Swift book used to be when I was younger.

Do you realize that just to satisfy demands of the people of this planet, commerce in manufactured products has doubled in the past 12 years? Not all demands have been satisfied by far. There are lots of people in the world dreaming of having things you and I have had all our lives. The big increases in the sale of manufactured products in the past decade indicates that more people are getting the money to realize their dreams. And their dreams are not of rockets or space ships, but of better household goods, more efficient handtools, a little tractor, some refrigeration, some of the fine musical instruments you make in this area, and many unsophisticated products.

Now, I know that many of you are probably doing a wonderful job of selling in some countries. But, I doubt if any of you are doing a wonderful job in all of the countries where you might. And, some of you aren't doing as good a job as you could in the countries where you do sell. I know this is so because I have been a keen observer of the sales activities, or lack of them, in almost every one of the free countries of the world. I could tell you about one of our biggest corporations, which, in parts of Africa, does a tremendous job, but which seldom has a salesman put in an appearance in other parts of Africa where there is almost as good a market. I could cite many instances of where we are falling down on our opportunities for trade and profits, not to mention improvement of our domestic employment.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Last year, we had a balance-of-payments deficit of $3.6 billion (excluding repayments on loans), despite an export surplus of $4.5 billion. So far this year, exports are above those of the same period last year, despite the shipping tie-up in January and the Common Market increase of tariffs on agricultural products. But, our balance-of-payments deficit, which had shown a steady improvement in 1960 and 1961, is running at an annual rate of more than $4 billion for the first 6 months of this year.

Your country—and that means you—must sell more abroad, because, critical as our balance-of-payments problem is, and it is critical, we have far more at stake in this struggle for a larger share of world markets.

First, there is the matter of jobs—not just new jobs to be created by increased production for an expanding world market—but some 20 million jobs that must not be lost. A noted economist recently estimated that there are 5 million jobs in the United States dependent on exporting, and another 15 million that depend on our ability to import raw materials on a basis that is at least equal to that enjoyed by our industrialized competitors. Since the only way you can pay for imports is with exports, these 15 million jobs are in part dependent on export sales, too.

NEED FOR INITIATIVE

In line with these statistics, I can't help but think that something I noticed the other day is indicative. In the past 5 years, our Department of Commerce Trade Missions have carried overseas business proposals from 2,366 individual U.S. firms located in almost all of the States. But, I noticed that one of our depressed areas, which has at least 200 manufacturing plants, has not submitted a single one of those business proposals that have helped many firms to build markets overseas. You will be interested in knowing that 75 Michigan firms and 57 Indiana companies have used this method of seeking customers abroad. This is not a very large number for either State, and it is some proof that many of your firms are not working very hard to get added business and profits overseas.

You have heard businessmen say, "I am doing all right here at home. Why take on headaches of oversea business?" But, have they asked themselves what would happen if a substantial number of the 20-million whose jobs depend wholly, or in part, on exports were to go off payrolls and on to relief rolls?

Last year, 15 cents out of every dollar of the American farmer's cash income came from overseas. The harvest of 1 out of every 5 acres of this Nation's farmland was sold abroad. Many major American manufacturing companies get much of their net income from exports or earnings of their oversea subsidiaries.

PROFITS FROM ABROAD

James Bush, former Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, told me recently that the Aluminum Co. of America gets about 65 percent of its net income from overseas. He said Colgate-Palmolive obtains 53 percent of its gross and 78 percent of its net profits from its oversea business. Almost 50 percent of Caterpillar Tractor's total sales are made abroad. H. J. Heinz made 64 percent of its net profits abroad. Ford, Eastman Kodak, Firestone, Gillette, Goodyear, International Harvester, Otis Elevator, Singer Manufacturing, and Standard Oil of New Jersey, among others, derived 30 to 65 percent of their net earnings from sales abroad.

But, it is not just the big companies that do this. Many small firms have won President Kennedy's E award, for excellence in exporting. These credit their exports with from 20 to 50 percent of sales volume. From out in California, where almost everything is new, we received a letter from a machinery manufacturer which said:

"One of the things the Department of Commerce program has done is awaken us to the possibilities of selling in Europe and the world. We feel that in 1963 somewhere around 20 percent of the volume of our plant will be exported. We now feel that we have a toehold where we were completely out of the picture a year ago."

GUIDE TO UNEXPLORED MARKETS

A 20-percent increase in business in 1 year is not bad, and it is evidence that you can't afford to ignore markets beyond our borders. We need adventurous businessmen to explore these opportunities and markets. The Government can't sell for you. We can and are helping you to explore oversea markets. Congress authorized more money for trade

fairs, trade centers, and trade missions for this year. It may provide even more help for you next year. Never before has the Department of Commerce been able to give, to those who will ask for it, so much help in selling abroad.

The Bureau of International Commerce's weekly magazine, International Commerce, is now publishing from 300 to 700 oversea trade opportunities a week. We can't make you read these requests for information on products and prices; we can't fill their orders; but we can, and do, publish them for the U.S. companies that want more business. If you don't subscribe to that magazine, for goodness sake, send in your order now—either to your local Commerce Field Office or to Washington.

These trade opportunities come from all areas of the world. But, it is surprising how many are coming from the more than 60 newly developing nations that we have aided during the past decade to get more education, use better tools, increase production, and afford more manufactured goods.

COMMON MARKET

But for a minute, let's just consider the way sales opportunities have developed in the European Common Market countries, our best regional market today. Climbing quickly from the ravages of war, these six countries are booming with prosperity. They have had twice as rapid an economic growth in the past 5 years as the United States. Their gross national product has increased at an average rate of 5.7 percent a year—one of the fastest growth rates in the industrialized world.

The 6 Common Market countries have a population of about 180 million, almost as many potential customers as we have here in the United States. They are compressed into an area only about one-sixth as large. Their industrial expansion gives the average family a higher income, better living standard, and dreams of everything from a new TV or refrigerator to a luxury automobile. And our President now has the authority in the Trade Act to negotiate tariff agreements with these countries to give us an even better chance to get more of this vast trade.

Ten years ago we were giving these countries Marshall plan aid. Last year we sold them $3.5 billion worth of manufactured products. I don't know how much profit that meant. West Germany alone was a $1 billion market for us. The Italians spent $749 million for our goods. The Dutch took $696 million worth of goods from our factories. But the Common Market countries are not the whole market for us in Europe. There are seven other Western nations that last year bought approximately $2 billion worth of goods from us. Those 13 countries look like a great rich sales area, and they are. But there are other doorbells to ring.

WORLD MARKETS

The free nations of Asia buy $4 billion worth of manufactured goods from us each year. Their total purchases from all sources are almost as great as that of Europe.

Japan, of course, is our big customer in Asia, with annual purchases of more than $1.7 billion. India takes almost a half billion worth of goods from us a year; the Philippines, $330 million; Vietnam, $320 million; Pakistan, $195 million; Korea, $162 million; Hong Kong, $127 million; and southwestern Asia more than a half billion.

A few years ago Africa was not considered much of a market for manufactured goods, but things are different today. We are now selling almost $1 billion worth of manufactured goods a year in Africa, and the rate of gain is one of the highest in the world. Morocco's imports are increasing at a rate of 30 percent a year, and last year she spent $66 million with us. Liberia, with a 20-percent annual growth, spent $50 million with us. Ten years ago Libya bought only about $400,000 worth of goods from us, but last year she gave us $40 million worth of business.

There is the Latin American market of more than $3 billion a year, even though right now it is not growing at the tremendous rate of the Afro-Asian market. But, business is picking up in some countries, and it will improve in others during the next 2 or 3 years. There are plenty of buyers now to warrant your getting down there and maybe setting up a distributor or agents and building a product reputation. Many Latin Americans are ready to buy to fulfill their countless needs.

SELLING OVERSEAS

Don't think you can't sell overseas. Most American industries can sell abroad, despite several fictions, like the one that our high wages price our products out of oversea markets. Do you know that 80 percent of our exports of manufactured goods come from our 10 highest wage industries?

If you have been discouraged by reports of the difficulty of getting paid, and the red-tape of shipping, just inquire of the Department of Commerce field offices in either Chicago or Detroit. They will show you how to get credit insurance and guide you through the redtape. Just remember that there are profits to be made and a lot of ground has been plowed for you.

The people in other countries know far more about the United States than we know about their countries. They have had experience with American goods, and usually favorable experience. In most cases, the fact that your product is made in the U.S.A. is a guarantee of quality. Don't be more afraid of competition than you are of competition right here at home. Many British, German, and Japanese competitors claim you have the advantage over them.

You *can* develop export sales without going overseas, but many experienced businessmen recommend that a start be made with an exploratory trip. It helps to meet customers face to face, sell them on your product, and then sit down and talk credit terms, shipping, and delivery dates. A very large percentage of oversea businessmen speak English. In most cities you can easily hire an interpreter if necessary.

If you decide to go overseas after business, spend a few days in the Detroit or Chicago field offices, or come to Washington and talk with our regional specialists. We have people who are intimate with every trade area of the world. They will give you, or your man, a briefing, and also contact the commercial officers in our embassies and consulates in the countries you wish to visit. You can have appointments arranged with the right business people abroad before you start.

A PROFITABLE BUSINESS TRIP

Several months ago the export director of a Midwest firm asked our St. Louis field office to help him set up a 3-month trip around the world, to enlarge an export business already started by mail. The St. Louis office contacted oversea commercial officers, obtained market data for him and had appointments set up in 12 new countries where the man's firm had never sold. On his return, he wrote us that he had sold $73,000 worth of orders and lined up wholesale distributors, that he termed "excellent," in seven countries. He added: "I can say without qualification that the primary factor in the success of this business trip was the help and assistance given me by the commercial officers overseas."

That same help is available to any businessman in the States of Michigan and Indiana, or any other State.

You may say, "that's fine for a big corporation, but mine is a small business and I can't afford to have someone hopping off to Tokyo, Bangkok, or Beirut." That is not true. The small business can afford to spend a little money to open big markets. It seems a bit off to hear a businessman say he can't afford to go out after new business.

I mentioned the man in the wheel chair who found adventure and profits abroad. He is Charles Hawley of the Meat Packers Equipment Co., a small family firm in Oakland, Calif., that employs 27 people. He won one of our first "E" awards. Later, he told the Senate Select Committee on Small Business that his selling trips abroad had helped to increase his firm's sales by 25 percent. A 6-weeks trip to Australia and New Zealand brought new sales to his firm of about $150,000. In addition, his expenses were more than paid from commissions on selling the products of some other neighbor firms that had not been selling overseas. One of these products is produced in that depressed area I mentioned whose businessmen have never submitted a business proposal for a trade mission to take abroad.

The manufacturer of a home barbering kit exhibited and demonstrated his product last winter at a household appliance show in the U.S. Trade Center in Frankfurt, Germany. It was his first venture in oversea selling, but he wrote orders for $30,000 worth of business in the first week.

"E" AWARD WINNER

A winner of an "E" award, who, incidentally, is a woman, says: "A second-rate product, slipshod business methods, an on-again off-again attitude about exports will not make you much profit in the export business. But, if you manufacture high-quality products, determine they can be sold abroad, use sound business procedures, have established sales techniques, have repect for your oversea friends, and maintain a consistent and enthusiastic approach to the export business, the odds are in your favor that you can be very successful."

This woman, whose firm is a small Midwest company, has used all our services at the Department of Commerce, and made several oversea selling trips. If you have a product and are willing to try selling it abroad, we can help you. We also can give added help to those already selling abroad.

And now we come to another phase of the export picture, the awarding of President Kennedy's "E" certificate to the Michiana World Trade Club for its assistance to the development of oversea business by the firms of northern Indiana and southern Michigan.

Resolution Adopted by City Council of Vestavia Hills, Ala., Honors John A. Jenkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently a distinguished Alabamian received national recognition for which our State is very proud and I would call the attention of my colleagues to this honor.

On August 28, at the National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. John A. "Buck" Jenkins, of Vestavia Hills, Ala., was elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW. Mr. Jenkins is city attorney of Vestavia Hills and a leading citizen of Alabama and well deserves the trust which this national organization has placed in him.

An expression of the esteem of his friends and neighbors was unanimously

adopted in the form of a resolution by the city council of Vestavia Hills, of which the Honorable Robert M. Guillot, is mayor, and I submit this resolution for the RECORD.

Following is the resolution adopted on September 16 by the city council of Vestavia Hills, Ala.:

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 16, 1963

Whereas the Honorable John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and a resident of our city, was, on the 28th day of August 1963, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Seattle, Wash., elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW; and

Whereas it is the unanimous sense of this body that the honor accorded John A. Jenkins by this outstanding national organization should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That this resolution express the congratulations of this body, and congratulations of the citizens of our community to John A. Jenkins for the well-deserved honor accorded our neighbor and associate, and as a consequence thereof, the prestige accruing to our community upon his election as the senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be duly adopted and spread upon the official minutes and a copy delivered to the Honorable John A. Jenkins and given other wide publicity.

ROBERT M. GUILFORD,
Mayor, City of Vestavia Hills, Ala.

A Move Against the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week I was pleased to add my congratulations on the floor of the House to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee upon his introduction of legislation to keep the military out of politics.

Chairman VINSON has done the Nation a great service in preparing and introducing this bill.

The Times-Picayune of New Orleans in an editorial in its September 18 edition pointed out that even as Chairman VINSON was making this move against the dangers of the Gesell Report, a new social-political-military order was being unveiled.

The editorial warns of the dangerous road being prepared for more "Gesell advances," and I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

GESELL ADVANCES

While Representative VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Commiteee, was making a spirited attack on use of the military services to coerce civilians, and communities, into accepting far-reaching integration demands, the first-known orders came to light directly affecting the public in its relations with military personnel.

These orders, initiated by the Air Force, presumably through the Secretary of that branch, bar all participation by units, equipment or exhibits in any event or activity where either admission, seating, or accommodations and facilities, is or are on a segregated basis.

Other services, according to a Defense Department spokesman, are following suit. The Air Force orders were 13 days old before they became public. A step that would be more nearly in accord with the corrupting spirit of the Gesell Report and directives hence may or may not have been approved by one of the Secretaries; or may or may not be likewise in the making barring attendance by servicemen, on the recommendation of base commanders, from any public event or activity oriented to segregation, regardless of military contribution to the program.

Congressman VINSON rightly said, in part, that the Gesell movement seeks to make "political agents of servicemen (in several ways); that the military should be "kept where it belongs—in the business of defending the Nation"; that the impending shift in the traditional role of the military is "one of the most serious challenges to our form of government" that has occurred, or will have occurred, in this century; that Secretary McNamara (who was "encouraged" by President Kennedy) "has no right to seek to impose a new social order throughout the United States through use of the armed forces."

He also introduced a bill seeking to use the court-martial process to estop regulation of the way of life of servicemen when they are away from military bases. A dispatch says this bill seems to have "little chance." That the full import of Gessellism has yet to strike the country is an understatement.

Isabel O'Hara Yaeger Dies—Services Monday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 27, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 6, 1963, Mrs. Isabel O'Hara Yaeger, a citizen of the First District of Arizona, passed away. Mrs. Yaeger lived a long, full, and productive life. The friends she leaves behind her are numbered in the thousands. She leaves two daughters and a son, but she is also survived by two brothers, Frank H. O'Hara, and our own esteemed and beloved colleague, the Honorable Barratt O'Hara. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the obituary of Mrs. Yaeger which appeared in the Arizona Republic of Saturday, September 7, 1963:

ISABEL O'HARA DIES—SERVICES MONDAY

Mrs. Isabel O'Hara Yaeger, 85, an English teacher at Phoenix Union High School for 27 years and a resident of Phoenix for 59 years, died yesterday in Good Samaritan Hospital.

Her former students, now in all parts of the world, are legion. She also was outstanding for her contributions to the community in other endeavors.

A native of St. Joseph, Mich., before coming to Arizona, Mrs. Yaeger taught at Chattanooga (Tenn.) University and at Michigan State Normal. She also served as principal of the Michigan State Industrial School for Girls.

She studied at Benton Harbor (Mich.) College, Nicaragua College, National Park College at Forest Glen, Md., the University of Chicago and at Cambridge University in England.

She was said to have been the first woman employed by the U.S. State Department, being assigned to Nicaragua.

She came to Arizona in 1904 to become preceptress in English at the then Tempe Normal School and a year later met and married Benjamin Horton Yaeger, who died August 26, 1927.

Mr. Yaeger, a prominent early-day sheepman, operated ranches in the Flagstaff and Prescott areas. Yaeger Canyon in northern Arizona is named for him.

Mrs. Yaeger began teaching at Phoenix Union in 1921 and retired in 1948. She was regarded as one of the pioneers in Arizona in the fields of Americanization and juvenile delinquency and at one time was chairman of the county detention home.

She had been president of the Glendale PTA and a member of the State PTA council. She was a former president of the Phoenix Business and Professional Woman's Club and was a member of the YWCA board for many years.

Mrs. Yaeger's home was at 2953 North 19th Avenue.

She is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Richard M. Fennemore of Phoenix and Mrs. A. D. Scheffield of Minneapolis; a son, Benjamin Horton of Phoenix; six grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

She also is survived by two brothers, Frank H., for many years a professor in the Drama Department of the University of Chicago and now retired and living in Washington, and BARRATT O'HARA, a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Cook County, Ill., who will be here for the funeral.

Balanced Budgets Abroad, Inflation at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier and a balanced budget are as far apart as the poles. The resulting inflation, as Henry J. Taylor points out in a recent article in the World Telegram and Sun, is our worst swindler. Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in the September 8 issue of the Long Island Press reveal how our taxes balance the budgets of other nations, but not our own.

The articles follow:

[From the World Telegram and Sun]

INFLATION IS OUR WORST SWINDLER

(By Henry J. Taylor)

While the New Frontiersmen spend their borrowed (from us) dollars in the billions—bingo—up goes the cost of living again. At the July and August rate of inflation, our present 50-cent dollar will be worth a quarter in exactly 10 years.

"It is easy to be generous with another's money" was a proverb even in the days of Rome. Inflation is the politicians' tool for power, popularity and self-perpetuation.

Generally, they say they're "fighting against inflation."

What else can they say?

Nevertheless, they refuse to sacrifice inflation's political advantages to themselves—unless the public blows the whistle.

Actually, in view of our country's great productivity—and surpluses—the struggle against inflation should not be too hard a battle. But the crows are guarding our corn and the chief inflationary pressure underlying our economy is our Government's own mishandling of our money at home and abroad.

In due course, however, the creeping effect touches tender political nerves. The popularity of political spenders depends on the public's ignorance and on the timelag between the political giveaways and new debts, and the effects of these on prices and the value of savings. Trouble arises when the public discovers that the spenders pay for nothing, that the people pay for everything, and that the vote-buying handouts and red-ink budgets liquidate the people's money and savings.

The clammy hand of public discontent can reach out and touch tender political nerves as our dollars become dollarettes.

Countless millions have insurance policies, pensions, savings and other safeguards against the future that they have earned the hard way. And when the great mass of prudent folks who sacrifice so much to assure stability in their lives wake up to the truth there's hell to pay.

They should be told the truth. Instead, the New Frontiersmen have now expanded the political advantages of manipulated news into the inflation question as well.

As about the Cuban situation, the gold crisis and other embarrassing affairs, the New Frontiersmen are fogging up the public understanding about the cost of living.

They've quietly changed the statistical yardstick. This destroys comparisons. Official statistics were once compiled on the basis of 1947–49 as the standard for measuring the dollar at 100 cents. On this basis today's dollar is worth about 45 cents.

The index's range of housewives' purchases which then cost $10 now cost $22.20. As one result, most breadwinners can live on what they earn but not on their take-home pay after the inflation and taxes.

So, presto, chango—the New Frontier has a modified basis for measurement. Its official cost-of-living statistics now make 1957–59 the yardstick. By this piece of political self-serving sleight of hand, the increase from $10 to $22.20 becomes an increase from $10 to $10.71. And this is called the fight against inflation.

But public relations techniques can stretch only so far in burying the truth. Even on the basis of the modified statistics, inflation is not creeping. It's leaping. You can hear its high, whinnying laugh every time you put your hand in your pocket or take your paycheck home.

Have you a fixed income? Do you depend on pensions, annuities, or your savings to protect you and your loved ones in the future?

As a decent, self-reliant American are you ready to give 10 more years toward fundamental independence and security?

Well, at the present rate of inflation your pension, which you may have then, your savings, etc., then will be worth exactly half what they are worth today.

Accordingly, the soaring clamor against excessive New Frontier spending, including excessive foreign aid, is the healthiest protest that has gripped our country in many a moon. The Nation's worst swindler is inflation and its artificial pay.

It's not true that it can't happen here, that the dollar cannot go down the drain. It is happening. And it will stop only when the politicians discover that the people know the truth and that, politically, "it's smart to be thrifty."

[From the Long Island Press, Sept. 8, 1963]

UNITED STATES BALANCES BUDGETS OF OTHER NATIONS, BUT NOT ITS OWN

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Although the U.S. budget is running some $10 billion in the red, several hundred million in foreign aid funds are going to balance the budgets of Bolivia, Cambodia, Jordan, and Libya.

That's one of the jarring facts uncovered by the House Appropriations subcommittee in charge of the money bill for foreign aid. This measure will be reported out after the Senate acts on the $3.502 billion authorization bill voted by the House over the President's angry disapproval.

For weeks, the House subcommittee, headed by Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, vigorous opponent of large-scale foreign aid spending, has been holding closed-door hearings on that. Other explosive disclosures are:

The U.S. public debt is $24 billion greater than the combined public debt of all other nations.

Thirty millionaires have been created in Laos since the start of large-scale U.S. aid there.

In the past 16 years, more rulers have been assassinated in countries receiving U.S. aid than in any similar period in history. Nine heads of state and three prime ministers have been murdered. In addition, 29 governments have been overthrown, 17 of them in Latin America.

The foreign aid agency has 64,536 employees—23,767 Americans, 40,769 foreigners.

U.S. Armed Forces are buying more than $300 million a year in petroleum from foreign sources, although we have a surplus in our own country. Reputed reason for these huge oil purchases is a claimed saving of $22 million. It was pointed out this seriously aggravates the already critical balance-of-payments deficit problem.

The charge that "many aid programs are based on political expediency and decisions. If an ambitious head of state wants certain kinds of military equipment, we furnish that to him."

Democrats as well as Republicans sharply questioned Foreign Aid Administrator David Bell about the large expenditures to balance the budgets of Bolivia, Cambodia, Jordan, and Libya.

Chairman PASSMAN demanded, "Why Cambodia?"

"That is the arrangement under which we are operating," said Bell. "It's part of the military assistance program to that country."

"Here is a country that is Communist or practically so," said Representative WILLIAM MINSHALL, Republican, of Ohio, "yet we have put something like a quarter of a billion dollars into it. That does not make sense to me."

Bell argued that the "ruler is interested in increasing the welfare of his people." Also that the "situation is directly related to South Vietnam."

"But just what have we accomplished there?" asked MINSHALL.

"There is grave doubt that we will accomplish what we are trying to achieve in Cambodia," admitted Bell. "On the other hand, we are clearly making solid and effective progress in India, Pakistan, Taiwan, Nigeria, Colombia and other countries. The fact that a country may be a poor risk is no reason to quit.

"There are tense uncertain and difficult countries with leaders who may not be building the kind of solid, independent, democratic-oriented countries we are working for. But if you're going to help them, risks are unavoidable."

Aid to Algerian Premier Ben Bella drew fire from both PASSMAN and MINSHALL. Both assailed that.

"Here is a self-admitted Communist," snapped MINSHALL, "and we are giving him millions in aid."

"I am not aware that he is a self-admitted Communist," shot back Bell. "Algeria got $10.4 million for fiscal 1962, of which $10.1 million was in surplus agricultural products. Prior to that, aid amounted to $4.9 million."

"Ben Bella is not friendly to this country," contended PASSMAN. "He paid a visit to his bosom friend, Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro, and on his way there dropped in here and got a big aid commitment. We have got to stop pouring out taxpayers' money to leftist dictators.

"Gamal Nasser is developing into one of the world's nastiest dictators, yet we are giving him millions in aid. There is no justification for that sort of thing."

Representative GEORGE ANDREWS, Democrat, of Alabama, said he was told by a foreign aid official 10 years ago that this program "could be expected to last for about a decade." ANDREWS asked Bell for his time estimate.

"In a number of countries," he replied, "our aid should end in around 5 years. But in others, I wouldn't be surprised if it was necessary to help them for at least 10 years."

"Treasury Secretary Dillon once testified before our committee that foreign aid might go on for 50 years," said PASSMAN. "Later he revised that to 30 years."

Bell declined to comment on that.

The aid program is now in its 17th year, with 70 nations receiving such assistance.

Chairman PASSMAN is departing for a first-hand inspection of foreign aid spending in a number of European countries. He is sending a bipartisan group of three committeemen to India for an on-the-spot study of the proposed $1.5 billion steel plant to which the United States would contribute $500 million.

Last week, the House, in effect, barred that controversial project.

The Murders at the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, our national conscience has been painfully aroused by the shocking and brutal murders committed recently in Birmingham, leaving as victims several young and innocent children.

Truthfully, we are all morally responsible for these crimes because we have for too many years turned our eyes away from and a deaf ear to so many evidences of lawlessness and injustice affecting our colored citizens.

We now have an opportunity to regain some semblance of self-respect by enacting a meaningful civil rights bill, and by putting into actual practice the commandment to love thy neighbor.

The Long Island Press published two editorials recently on these acts of violence, which eloquently express our feelings on this tragedy, and I would like

to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The articles follow:

[From the Long Island Press, Sept. 16, 1963]

THE MURDERS AT THE CHURCH

The violence which erupted so fiercely in Birmingham yesterday shocks the Nation. The senseless deaths of four children in a church brings the tragedy of segregation into a focus which could not be sharper. These were four children guilty of nothing but living—and the color of their skin.

Governor Wallace's offer of a $5,000 reward for the church murderer or murderers must seem to have little grace to those who remember how many times he has brought Alabama to the edge of violence. The $5,000 cannot restore the lives that were lost in the violence which the Governor himself invited.

Yet out of this madness at the 16th Street Baptist Church and out of this contemptible violence, may yet come the catharsis which the integration problem so desperately requires. Perhaps out of the wanton deaths of four youngsters in church will the conscience of the Nation be reawakened.

[From the Long Island Press, Sept. 18, 1963]

AN AWAKENING IN THE SOUTH?

The bomb that shattered the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham may have done just what its depraved thrower did not wish to accomplish. It may yet have awakened the conscience of the South.

Who threw the bomb that killed those four little girls in Sunday school?

"We all did it," a young Birmingham lawyer told a group of his city's businessmen the other day.

"The 'who' of 'who did it?' is really rather simple," said Charles Morgan, Jr. "The 'who' is every little individual who talks about the 'niggers' and spreads the seeds of hate to his neighbor and his son. The jokester, the crude oaf whose racial jokes rock the party with laughter. The 'who' is every Governor who ever shouted for lawlessness and became a law violator * * *."

And a Georgia Congressman, CHARLES L. WELTNER, also says the moderates who failed to speak out must share the blame. "We have stood by, leaving the field to reckless and violent men. We need to raise and follow this standard—as old as Christianity and simple as truth—'Let right be done.'"

Strong words from the South.

Birmingham has no monopoly on Mr. Morgan's list of "whos," of course. They exist wherever there are men who believe others to be less than human.

A person who sees certain other people as insects can blow little children to bits and then sleep nights because, after all, who feels sorry for slapping a mosquito?

But behind him are the respectable people who share his conviction of the impurity of the victimized.

Like the majority of Germans who disclaimed any guilt for Nazi crimes, these nice people express dismay at violence. After all, they wouldn't do such things.

True. But they sanction them when they let their youngsters hoot and yell and wave their Confederate flags at Negro youngsters who are simply seeking what is theirs by right. They sanction murder when they insist on gradual desegregation in the stores because gradual implies a basic differentness, a basic superiority over the Negro which allows the white man to dole out, bit by bit, the human rights that God, not they, bestowed on all of us.

So long as men are blinded by this illusion, they will fear, they will hate and, in their innermost beings, they will sanction murder.

But if the voice of conscience is heard in the South again, as in the words of the young lawyer and the young Congressman, then there is yet hope. Another sign, perhaps, is that white students are going back to the schools integrated by Federal aid. It would be nice to think the jeering students have finally been shamed. It would be even nicer to think their parents have finally been shamed.

How the Area Redevelopment Administration Has Hoodwinked the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the highly respected national business and financial weekly, Barron's, of September 16, 1963, contains an editorial scrutiny of the Area Redevelopment Administration that I believe the House might well consider. The editorial indicates that the administration of this program, which was largely responsible for the June defeat in the House of the additional authorization request, has not changed.

In an accurate summation of the Administration's progress, Barron's comments: "The agency's tactics have been as questionable as its statistics." Barron's goes on to show that the heralded support of ARA claimed by ARA officials on behalf of the local chambers of commerce is a fiction. Some of those named as local supporters were no longer in office, had never been in office, or were opposed to ARA.

The editorial also includes a detailed list of projects for which jobs are claimed far beyond facts or fancy. For instance, a shirt factory project in Arkansas is still listed in the Directory of Approved Projects, as of August 31, 1963, as creating 1,000 jobs. In fact, the project, already built, only has a capacity for 500 jobs, a situation that has been called to the attention of ARA officials time and again by Members of Congress. Yet the ARA insists, for publicity purposes, on misrepresenting the facts. Nor do the figures released by ARA indicate the number of jobs threatened or lost in already established private industry through efforts by the agency to glut the market even further. Barron's supplies excellent examples of this misuse of taxpayers' money.

There are ways, of course, in which the Federal Government may direct its policies to aid underdeveloped areas. I suggested one, a fast tax writeoff for private enterprise locating in such areas, only yesterday, in introducing H.R. 8525. As Barron's suggests, however, one way to be avoided is any new authorization for the Area Redevelopment Administration. By voting down the proposed authorization, the House will be doing the country a distinct service.

The editorial follows:

DOWN WITH ROBIN HOOD AND WITH THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, TOO

Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review, a journal with a small but select circulation throughout the United Kingdom, has just made a big splash on this side of the Atlantic. To the dismay of all those who cherish the legend of Robin Hood, the magazine recently urged a critical reappraisal of his life and times. Despite centuries of glorification, the merrymen of Sherwood Forest were allegedly a gamy lot: "Friar Tuck is certainly no example of how a devout high churchman should behave, while Little John, apart from his marksmanship, has little to recommend him to law-abiding citizens." Maid Marian gets equally short shrift. The publication has aimed its sharpest shafts at Robin Hood himself, whom it condemns as "an outlaw who deserted his lawful wife for fun and games in the greenwood." It adds scathingly: "Having regard to the fact that the exploits of this legendary hero were chiefly concerned with robbing the rich under the specious motive of giving to the poor, a function which in modern times has been taken over by the welfare state, it is a question of some doubt whether a Robin Hood festival is not contrary to public policy."

Such sentiments, needless to say, are by no means unanimous, in either the United Kingdom or the United States. Last week, Columnist Inez Robb, with a cry of hands off folklore, sprang to Robin Hood's defense. Even the sheriff of Nottingham took up the cudgels for his old adversary. The legend, said the official, has done a great deal to foster relations between Nottingham and the rest of the world. Besides, he added, with an eye toward the tourist trade, Robin Hood is good for business.

While the pen is reputedly mightier than the sword, one editorial in an obscure British weekly will lay low neither Robin Hood nor what he stands for. Nonetheless, its appearance indicates that more and more people are growing uneasily aware of the lack of morality that is basic to the welfare state. In this country, the same theme has been sounded repeatedly of late by Edwin P. Neilan, crusading president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Neilan charges that what is going on in Washington today, especially in agencies like the Area Redevelopment Administration, is "downright immoral." ARA, the record suggests, has committed a multitude of sins, ranging from the release of phony statistics and false information to the abuse of its authority. In the guise of subsidizing so-called depressed areas—robbing the rich to help the poor, so to speak—ARA is spreading the Federal handout and the political payoff from one end of the country to the other. Robin Hood only worked Sherwood Forest. His spirit is roaming the whole New Frontier.

Nowhere has it enjoyed such latitude as in the Area Redevelopment Administration. Established in May of 1961, the agency, in its own words, strives "to help create jobs where none existed before." To that end an open-handed Congress endowed it with nearly $400 million, which may be used to make loans (up to 30 years at 3½ percent interest) for either public facilities or commercial and industrial ventures. ARA is also authorized to furnish outright grants for the retraining of workers and for technical assistance to various localities. As drafted by a Presidential task force, the legislation was designed to limit such help to areas where unemployment far exceeds the national average. As finally enacted, however, it gave the Secretary of Commerce, in whose bailiwick ARA landed, sweeping authority to designate who is eligible. Hence instead of 100-odd areas, as originally estimated, over 1,000 blanketing all 50 States and Puerto Rico, have wound up on ARA's books. The agency, in turn, has been running through its money very fast, to the point where, with strong support from the White House, it is seeking another $400 million from Congress.

Whether ARA will get what it wants remains to be seen—the opposition to its activities, in and outside of Congress, is perceptibly stiffening. As Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, points out, "the standards of eligibility are so vague as to permit almost any project to be approved almost anywhere." The record fully bears him out. ARA to date has gotten involved in such unlikely ventures as a ski lift in Pennsylvania and the processing of reindeer meat in Alaska. Nearly one-fourth of its lending has gone to finance hotels and motels. For one sizable listed company, with a plant in Hazelton, Pa., ARA built a $32,000 standpipe, thereby putting "50–100 men to work on the third and fourth floors" of the building. It has helped reopen idle plywood plants and abandoned coal mines. It has even made a $9,500 grant "to determine the economic feasibility of establishing a cooperative owned livestock feed yard and slaughterhouse complex in North Dakota.

One way or another, the agency boasts of creating over 35,000 jobs, a claim which its critics dispute. For example, according to the ARA Administrator, a 432-unit motor hotel in Detroit will provide work for 450 people; a 50-unit motel in Naples, Tex., is supposed to yield 50 jobs. "I can't imagine a motel that would hire one person per unit," declared a skeptical lawmaker. Similarly, the agency takes credit for a thousand jobs at an Arkansas shirt factory which, at present capacity, can employ no more than 500. It also lists 300 jobs created by a $272,000 loan for the construction of an ordnance plant, which today stands empty. Queried on the point, ARA blandly replied: "The potential is there if we can ever find an occupant for the place."

The agency's tactics have been as questionable as its statistics. In a transparent effort to embarrass the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, ARA issued a press release expressing deep appreciation to 500-odd chamber officials for their cooperation. Subsequent investigation by the doughty Mr. Neilan disclosed that some of those named were no longer in office, had never been in office, or stool flatly opposed to ARA and all its works. The chamber of commerce has also disclosed one case after another of Government pressure on local officials to embrace the program. Its "salesmen," says Mr. Neilan, "are on the prowl all over the country." So great has been their zeal that more than one flourishing community, to its surprise and dismay and against its will, has found itself labeled a depressed area. "Reckless misuse of public funds is bad enough in itself," observes Mr. Neilan. "But the moral implications are even worse when the spenders resort to coercion to get the money spent. Then it becomes more than dishonesty. It's a matter of dividing the people against each other, stirring up strife, weakening community initiative and morale."

It also happens to be a matter of riding roughsode over anyone who gets in the way. Over the soybean processor in Salisbury, Md., who, after borrowing $1.5 million at going market rates to build a new plant a few years ago suddenly is faced with the prospect of a subsidized rival. Over the lumbermen at Happy Camp, Calif., who now must compete with a federally financed mill. Over the coal miners in Carbon County, Utah, who will lose their jobs because ARA, despite a glutted market, is reopening shutdown pits. That is what Robin Hood always comes to in the end. In the words of his first and most fiercely eloquent detractor, novelist-philosopher Ayn Rand, "He is held to be the first man who assumed a halo of virtue by practicing charity with wealth which he did not own, by giving away goods which he had not produced, by making others pay for the luxury of his pity.* * * Until men learn that of all human symbols, Robin Hood is the most immoral and the most contemptible, there will be no justice on earth." Let Congress, as it weighs the future of ARA, ponder well.

Invitation to Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that we open our arms to almost every thug, assassin and subverter of freedom in the world.

Now President Kennedy has invited Tito to visit us. The Tablet, in its issue of September 19, 1963, expresses not only my sentiments but those of millions of Americans:

INVITATION TO TITO

Few dictators in modern times have followed the road of murder, pillage, oppression and persecution as has Josip Broz, better known as Tito, chief ruler of Yugoslavia. He and his partisans initially led a vicious campaign of assassination against the people of Yugoslavia who were supporting the Allies in World War II. A Communist trained in guerrilla warfare in Spain, he was able to seize Yugoslavia and for years carried on a recognized savage campaign against those who opposed him. Hundreds of priests and Sisters were murdered and religion was practically proscribed. The culmination of his campaign was against Bishop Stepinac, later given the title of cardinal, who was arrested in 1946 and sentence to 16 years at hard labor. He died only a few years ago still confined by the Belgrade government.

Tito now has been invited to Washington for informal talks. He will meet the President October 17, and has been invited to address the U.N. General Assembly.

He is the latest in a group of assassins and thieves, foes of the United States, of liberty, religion, and justice, who have been invited here, and in practically every case they have repaid their hosts with contempt or worse.

We entertained Soviet Premier Khrushchev royally, and he since has threatened to "bury us," which is hardly friendly.

Ben Bella of Algeria was the recipient of our hospitality and couldn't wait to visit Fidel Castro next so that he could pledge his undying devotion to Red Cuba's anti-U.S. policy. Now he promises his people a Socialist dictatorship with seizure of all private and foreign property.

Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana broke bread with us in the hopes of getting a financial handout, and said some terrible things about the United States once he got home. He is now endeavoring to make a deal with the Soviet and become a Cuba-style regime.

When Ayub of Pakistan came to tea, he was treated lavishly but now we are trying to coax him (with foreign aid) not to be friendly to Communist China.

As for Tito, only a week ago he and Khrushchev stood side by side and told an international news conference that they represented and would work in harmony for the same thing: a worldwide victory for socialism.

Yugoslavia is a Communist dictatorship to which we have already given some $2,500 million. If the United States has to go to war against communism, Tito and his nation will surely be on the other side, fighting us with weapons our money made possible.

The Tragedy at Babi Yar and the Continued Oppression of the Jews by the Soviet Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made before the Association To Perpetuate the Memory of Ukrainian Jews at the memorial services for the victims of Babi Yar, at the Hotel Commodore, New York, N.Y., and broadcast over radio station WEVD, Sunday, September 22, 1963. My remarks follow:

"Over Babi Yar
There are no memorials"—

Says the young Russian poet, Yevgeny Alexandrovich Yevtushenko—

"Over Babi Yar
Rustle of the wild grass.
The trees look threatening, look like judges.
And everything is one silent cry.
Taking my hat off
I feel myself slowly going gray.
And I am one silent cry
Over the many thousands of the buried;
Am every old man killed here,
Every child killed here."

What happened at Babi Yar that makes the poet weep and rage? On the eve of Yom Kippur, in 1943, the Nazis murdered 100,000 Ukrainian Jews. Though not of the Jewish faith, Yevtushenko identified himself with the victims of the Nazis. Twenty years have passed and let it not be said that we have forgotten. The young Russian poet spoke for the dead.

In World War I, the American poet, Alan Seeger, speaking for all the dead, of wars and massacres and terrorisms, cried out "to you we throw the torch." And so the 100,000 in the mass grave at Babi Yar, over which no memorial rises, cry out to us, "to you we throw the torch." We will carry the torch in which burn the flames of liberty, enlightenment, and equality for all people regardless of race, religion, or national creed. How can we loosen our grasp when hatred still stalks the world and casts its ominous shadow on the future? It is the cruelest of ironies that the young Russian poet, Yevtushenko, should have written "Babi Yar" in a land where today the Jews are singled out, as a religious group, for oppression and denial. He was brave to have written that poem but not brave enough, for while he did, in his poem, depict the antisemitism in the Soviet Union, he, under official pressure, subsequently changed the text when Shostakovitch set the words of "Babi Yar" to music.

Today, the Soviet Union boasts that its constitution guarantees religious freedom and explicitly forbids "any restriction of the rights of citizens on account of their race or nationality" as well as "any advocacy of racial or national hatred and contempt." But the words are not worth the paper upon which they are written for the Soviet Union has committed itself, in practice, to wiping out the religious and cultural rights of the Jews and singling them out, as Jews, for special cruel and unusual punishment.

In May of 1961, the Soviet Union enacted decrees which set forth the death penalty for such economic offenses as pilfering public or state property, counterfeiting, currency speculation, and bribery. The world was

shocked by such uncivilized, excessive, and inhumane punishment, but the Soviet Union has proven itself, again and again, immune to world opinion. Within 2 years, from May 1961 to April 1963, 141 persons were sentenced to death for such offenses. Of those sentenced to death, nearly 60 percent were Jews. If one examines the record carefully, it becomes dismayingly clear that this is a part of a systemic plan, not only to incite the Russian people against the Jews, as a minority group, but also to deny, to the Jews, their religious heritage and to put them outside the pale of the Soviet Union society. When we realize that almost two million Jews reside in the Soviet Union, we are then aware of the extent of this tragic campaign. For example, in one of the trials, 24 defendants were accused of manipulating the price of apples. Though the majority of defendants were not Jewish, only the Jews received the death sentence. In another trial, a Jew was sentenced to death though he was only an employee of some trade organizations involved; the top officials received only short prison terms.

In all of this campaign, the Soviet press makes certain to implicate the synagogues and rabbis in the alleged offenses. Beyond that, we find the arrest of congregation leaders, the ousting of congregation Jewish officials, and the closing of synagogues. While we cannot deny that all religions are subjected to restrictions in the Soviet Union, only Judaism is singled out for very special denials. While other religions can form national or regional associations, Jewish congregations may not. Religious leaders cannot receive permission to leave the country or to study abroad or to make pilgrimages as other religious leaders make. The Jews are forbidden to manufacture any religious articles such as prayer shawls and phylacteries. Only a very few are permitted to print religious calendars. Training for rabbis has been curtailed until now, in Moscow, only three or four are permitted to attend a rabbinical academy. No Hebrew can be taught nor can any prayer book or Bible be printed in Hebrew. However, the Moslems may use their Arabic for religious purposes as may other ethnic and religious groups use their respective languages. The baking of matzah is forbidden. Without the matzah, no Passover can be properly observed. All Yiddish journals are forbidden; no expression of cultural interest in the Jewish language is allowed. Thus the theaters and the dramatic schools and the publishing houses which use the Jewish language are closed. The old Jewish songs are forbidden. The Soviet encyclopedia, which had devoted 116 pages to the cultural achievement of the Jews, now gives only 2 pages to the Jews. The Jews have been eliminated from the Soviet Union political life. They are excluded from the diplomatic service and from the armed services. A study of the status of Jews in the Soviet Union concludes that the Jews are "deprived of their national and religious rights as a group, and of full equality as individuals."

Soviet oppression and denial of equal rights to its Jewish population has been called "spiritual strangulation."

Yet, withal, the Jews are not permitted to leave the Soviet Union to seek freedom from religious persecution. They are forced to remain while the Soviet Union seeks every way of denuding them of their tradition, of their culture, of their faith in God.

We are gathered today in memorial to the 100,000 who perished at the hands of the Nazis 20 years ago. But it is not enough to mourn the dead; our responsibility now, today, is for the living. Indifferent as the Soviet Union may appear to be to world opinion, such indifference cannot remain if the protests are large and loud enough. Let it not be said that the world condones by silence. The Jews of the Soviet Union will not relinquish their religion, their heritage, their culture. Hence, the Soviet Union has placed itself directly on the road that leads to genocide.

The Russians make much of their fear of the Germans. In what degree are they different? The Russians have sought to pervert history and, in so doing, have paid service to it because what one seeks to pervert, one cannot forget. History has proven, and proven again, that tyranny bears within itself the seeds of its own destruction for the heart and mind of man, once awakened, finds the bans of oppression intolerable. From Pharoah, to Hitler, to Khrushchev, the lessons of history loom large. The consequences of tyranny Khrushchev should know will bury him.

We offer prayers for the dead, but we do not forget the living. Let no one forget—whatever his race, his religion, his creed—oppression is a way of life; it feeds on itself yet remains insatiable. When it is aimed at one group, it reaches out to embrace another and yet another. This, too, is a lesson of history none of us can ignore, and I mean, none of us.

Let the religions of the world take note that, in the march of oppression, it is only a matter of on whom it feeds first. There are always the second, and the third, and the fourth, and the fifth until all are engaged. Then it may be too late.

Together we vow there shall be no more "Babi Yars."

Why Nation's Might Halts at State Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday September 22. The article, titled "Why Nation's Might Halts at State Line," was written by James E. Clayton, a staff reporter for the Post, in the form of a letter to answer the query of why Federal troops are not dispatched to restore order every time a situation arises such as that in Birmingham. Mr. Clayton's letter is an excellent analysis and I append his article here for the information of the Members of Congress.

The article is as follows:

WHY NATION'S MIGHT HALTS AT STATE LINE

(By James E. Clayton)

DEAR FRIEND: The reasons why there was no Federal troops in Brimingham last week are partly historical, partly constitutional and partly political. Put another way, the reasons are that the President's power to send in troops was doubtful, the use of them would have been contrary to what Americans think is the Nation's tradition and the consequences of their use could have been politically disastrous to the President.

To understand why this is so, you must remember that a national government was established in the United States as the best means of preserving freedom for the individual. To the men who drafted the American Constitution in 1789, and to most Americans today, the greatest bar to that freedom is oppressive government—government so powerful that it acts for itself, not for the people. The tool of oppressive government is, of course, troops.

TWO INGRAINED FEARS

As a result, two factors—the fear of powerful government and the fear of troops—underlie much of this Nation's system of government and its history. Long before Lord Acton spoke his famous phrase, Americans believed it: "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely." Americans believe those words today.

The American Government is built around that fear of government. The men who wrote the Constitution had suffered abuses of authority during colonial days and they believed that the rights of individuals could be safe only if accumulations of power in government were held to a minimum.

That was why power was divided between three branches of the Federal Government. That was why power was divided between the Federal Government in Washington and the State governments.

That was why the most basic governmental power—to preserve law and order—was denied to the Federal Government.

A SYSTEM OF CHECKS

Recall the words of Montesquieu: "Power should be a check to power." Those words and others of their kind were embedded in the minds of the men who wrote the American Constitution.

The States were to check the National Government, and vice versa; the judiciary was to check Congress and the executive; the executive was to check Congress and the judiciary; Congress was to check the other two.

"The different governments will control each other," wrote James Madison, "at the same time that each will be controlled by itself." This was the argument used in 1789 to persuade the Americans of that day to permit the establishment of an effective national government. It met their fears of strong government and their concern that government would deprive them of hard-won rights.

It is that same fear you hear when there is talk of States' rights or concern that the Federal Government is becoming too powerful. It is that fear which requires a President of the United States to be ready and able to justify in constitutional, as well as political and moral, terms his use of Federal power to suppress domestic violence.

The appearance of massed troops in peacetime on the streets of an American city is abhorrent to most Americans. Troops are for war; police are for domestic violence. And there are no Federal police.

A LOCAL AFFAIR

It was this distaste for troops, this fear of powerful government, that led the men who wrote the Constitution to design for the National Government a national role and to deny it a local role. The National Government was not to concern itself with purely local affairs and the authors of the Constitution regarded law and order as purely a local affair.

The fact that violence in Birmingham is embarrassing to the American Government or is harmful to some American citizens is not, in itself, reason for the Federal Government to override local and State governments. In fact, the Constitution gives the Federal Government no specific power to intervene in situations of domestic violence. The Federal Government does, however, have an obligation to intervene to put down violence if it is asked to by proper State authorities.

But the necessary and proper clause of the Constitution, the 14th Amendment and the uncontested actions of Presidents and Congresses since 1792 have given the President more power than that. Presidents have

used that power to put down domestic violence more often than most Americans care to remember.

Troops (or State militia) were used to put down rebellions in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island in the early days of the Nation. They were used in Illinois during the Pullman strike in 1894 over violent objections of the Governor. They were used more than 30 times between 1917 and 1922 to put down labor strife. They were used during World War II in Government clashes with both labor and management.

But each time troops were used, the public reaction was unfavorable or, at best, mixed.

There are two laws on the books now that permit the President to send troops into a State over the objections of its governor and legislature. One says he can do so if "unlawful obstructions, combinations or assemblages or rebellion" make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States by normal means.

The other says the President can use troops to suppress an "insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination or conspiracy" if it denies to any person equal protection of the laws, obstructs the execution of Federal laws or impedes the course of Federal justice.

These were the statutes invoked by President Eisenhower when he sent troops into Little Rock and by President Kennedy when he sent troops to Oxford and marshals to Montgomery and when he ordered the National Guard to the schools in Tuscaloosa and away from them in Birmingham, Mobile and Tuskegee.

In most of those situations, the President's justification was clear and reasonable in the minds of most Americans. State officials were defying Federal court orders to desegregate schools. They were denying to Negro students equal protection of the laws. They were obstructing the course of justice and making it impossible to enforce Federal law by ordinary means.

In Montgomery, the justification was somewhat different. Marshals were sent because State officials failed to protect interstate travelers (freedom riders). Involved here was another denial of equal protection and, in addition, a failure to protect the federally guaranteed right to travel freely.

In Birmingham the situation is more complex. It is possible to argue, as Negro leaders have, that their people are being denied Federal rights and equal protection; that they are getting no protection at all; that the most fundamental right of all, the right to live, is being threatened. But Birmingham and Alabama officials reply that they are trying to provide protection.

This difference—between making the argument and having it accepted—hits at the key point in the American system of federalism and in the minds of most Americans.

If the President's justification is accepted, it is seen as his effort to protect the freedom the Nation so zealously guards. If this justification is not accepted, it is seen as a misuse of the power that is his. Such abuse of power reopens all the old fears of Americans about oppressive governments and Federal troops.

Thus, the President, in situations like Montgomery and Birmingham, treads a narrow line. If he acts too quickly, the Nation—not just the southern segregationists—is likely to protest his misuse of power. If he waits too long, if citizens die needlessly, if the Nation is shocked and embarrassed, the Nation—not just the Negroes—is likely to condemn his delay.

The balance between oppressive government and freedom is tenuous. To most Americans, an error on the side of freedom is better than one on the side of oppression.

We Prefer Tax Cut With Spending Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his recent speech on the tax cut bill presently before this Chamber, characterized any and all criticism of his fiscal theory of tax reduction without spending control as being both "petty and partisan." This now favorite device of the President was also employed, it will be recalled, to explain the recent cutting back of the foreign aid program agreed to by the House. This is a very clever device for by claiming that all opposition to one's programs is necessarily motivated by personal, political self-interest, no room is left for any reasonable opposition to those programs. It would follow also then that one need not discuss or justify the merits of his programs if all alternative programs are by definition without merit. And this, as my able and articulate colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], so well pointed out, is precisely what the President did. He failed to give the American people any reasoned argument claiming to prove the validity of the very questionable assumptions and presuppositions upon which his novel, depuritanized fiscal theory is based. The President apparently felt either that there were not enough good reasons to justify his theory or that his audience was incapable of properly understanding and evaluating that theory. Fortunately, there are those who are capable of understanding it, and who recognize its dangerous, unsound nature. A case in point is the editorial opinion expressed in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on Friday, September 20, 1963.

The editorial follows:

WE PREFER TAX CUT WITH SPENDING CURB

President Kennedy pulled out all the stops in his appeal Wednesday night for public support in his efforts to push his $11 billion tax cut proposal through Congress.

He aimed his appeal at the entire economic front, portraying the advanages he claims the reduction would have for businessmen and factory workers and other individuals. He also said it would benefit the Nation as a whole by balancing the budget and ending the oversea drain on U.S. dollars.

The President argued a tax cut would mean new markets for American business because citizens would spend an overwhelming percentage of the extra after-tax dollars left in their pockets.

And he mentioned the opportunity for typical families to spend "that extra money on a new dishwasher, or a new spring wardrobe, or a washing machine, or an encyclopedia, or a longer vacation trip, or a downpayment of a new car or a new home."

Kennedy said there are those who for one reason or another "hope to delay this bill—or to attach ruinous amendments—or to water down its effect."

He evidently was referring to those who support a proposed Republican amendment tying tax cuts to curbs on spending.

The President said that no wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary Government activity will be tolerated on the grounds that it helps employment.

"We are pledged," he said, "to a course of true fiscal responsibility, leading to a balanced budget in a balanced full-employment economy."

"My fellow citizens," he said, "let us not be petty or partisan on matters such as this."

One wonders whether Kennedy means that it is petty to be concerned over the possibly grave effects of a big tax cut without safeguards against mounting Government spending or over a national debt totaling a staggering $307.8 billion.

"We are talking about the future of our country—about its strength and growth and stability," he said.

Those who favor a tax cut—with curbs on spending—are thinking about the future of the country but also about the adverse effects of an unsound fiscal policy.

It was in many respects an attractive picture that Kennedy painted in his nationwide talk. But it would have been much more attractive had it included his acceptance of effective curbs on Government spending.

Test Ban Treaty Facts Censored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Moscow test ban treaty was overwhelmingly ratified today by the other body. In a very prophetic article, which appeared in the Long Island Press on September 13, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott revealed how the Kennedy administration has been censoring the truth on this subject:

PENTAGON CENSORS DETAILS OF SOVIET NUCLEAR GAINS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary McNamara's censors have succeeded in keeping part of the story of recent Soviet nuclear-missile gains from being publicly discussed in the Senate's historic nuclear test ban treaty debate.

The lid was tightly put on intelligence showing a major Soviet nuclear test breakthrough by the Pentagon's blue penciling of a number of important passages in the highly critical report before it was released this week by Senator JOHN STENNIS' Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee.

The subcommittee's alarming report, outlining the major disadvantages that the treaty will have on U.S. security, has become a rallying point and the bible for Senators opposing President Kennedy's test ban agreement with Russia.

The Defense Department's censoring, which in effect bars subcommittee members from publicly discussing the deleted information, occurred when Senator STENNIS submitted the 25-page report to Secretary McNamara's office for security clearance before making it public.

After checking with the White House, McNamara's aides ordered deleted from the committee's report all information revealing that the Soviets' big yield nuclear tests probed "the ability of radars to acquire and track a missile warhead through the radar

and communications blackout created by nuclear explosions."

When several committee members vigorously objected to this unexpected censoring, the Pentagon whiz kids made their blue penciling stick by raising the security issue.

They argued that the Senators' blunt report, unless changed, would give the Russians details on the capability of U.S. intelligence detection system that they do not now have.

While reluctantly admitting that the committee's information about the Soviet gains was accurate and fairly reported, they stressed that its publication would be the first admission by Government sources that the United States had information on the live radar-missile tracking test the Russians made during their superbomb experiments.

When the censors were shown secret testimony of Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, that the United States had never conducted similar experiments, McNamara's aides confirmed that this was true, but were unmoved.

They also admitted that General Power was correct in stating the treaty would bar the United States from holding similar tests. However, they disagreed with the Air Force general's contention that the tests were needed to develop an effective U.S. missile defense system and that the public was entitled to this information.

McNamara's censors also struck from the report data on the antiballistic missile system that the Russians are now deploying around Leningrad, including an intelligence estimate indicating:

That the initial operational capability of the Leningrad system could be achieved in 1963, with 32 antimissile missiles already on launchers.

That this anti-missile-missile system is believed to have attained effectiveness against ballistic missiles fired from 300 to 1,500 miles.

During 1963–64 the Soviets plan to deploy a transportable anti-ballistic-missile system to their army fronts. This system will be effective against all U.S. intermediate range ballistic missiles and those of shorter range.

The Soviet system possibly could, under certain conditions, now defend limited areas of the U.S.S.R. against U.S. Titan and Atlas ICBM's.

In his frank testimony against the nuclear test ban treaty, General Power may have given a sneak preview of what could develop into the major issue of next year's presidential campaign.

A close friend of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, General Power is known to have influenced the GOP frontrunner's decision to oppose the treaty by his warning that the Kennedy administration's disarmament approach to peace will actually lead to war.

"In my personal opinion all sensible people in this world desire peace and freedom from a nuclear war," General Power told the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee. "But there are two different theories of how to get there.

"One (theory) is through military superiority and through deterrence, which is the philosophy of the strategy we have used. There is another one through disarmament."

After making it clear he favored the first approach, General Power made it clear that he did not believe that the two theories were compatible, stating:

"I personally think the two theories are diametrically opposed. I don't see how you can arm and disarm at the same time. I have studied previous disarmament measures and in my opinion disarmament is a proven concept to get you into a war. I think history will prove that the surest way to cause a war, nuclear war or any war, is to disarm."

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, a strong administration supporter, is urging Senate Democratic leaders to push for a ratification vote as soon as possible. He reported that his mail, which at first was overwhelming for the treaty, has now turned the other way. "The longer the debate goes on," warned ANDERSON, "the bigger the opposition vote to the treaty will be."

President Kennedy is privately trying to swing Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat of Washington, a member of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee, to support the treaty. He has talked to Senator JACKSON several times on the phone and conferred privately with him at the White House on Monday.

Top administration officials now believe that the next step in easing tensions with Russia will be to work out an agreement to combine on a moon space program. President Kennedy has made an offer to cooperate in this venture and the Russians are showing an interest in opening negotiations to learn more details about the proposal.

Why Isn't the Attorney General Enforcing the Laws of the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said as of late in regard to the students who recently traveled to Cuba in violation of a State Department ban. However, it seems to me that much of the confusion in the minds of Americans on this subject is due to the procrastination of the Departments of State and Justice. The following editorial was broadcast by the Mutual Broadcasting Service and I feel that it sums up the situation so well that I wish to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Under permission granted, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Most of some 59 students who made that ill-timed trip to Cuba, in defiance of a State Department order to the contrary, have returned home.

As of this moment we have seen little effort on the part of Attorney General Robert Kennedy or his Justice Department staff to do anything about enforcing the order which clearly states the students' passports can be revoked and that they are subject to fines and imprisonment.

We are not passing on the validity of the order or on its justification. However, it would seem that when such an order is the law of the land and is preventing law abiding citizens from making such banned visits, violators should be punished to the full extent of the law.

If the State Department order is unfair it should be repealed. If it is not it should certainly be enforced. Therefore, it would appear that action by the State and Justice Departments in this case is long overdue and should be taken without further procrastination.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

A Federal Voice for Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the International Consumer Credit Association's excellent magazine, the Credit World, has published an address given before their 51st annual conference by Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, Chairman of the Consumer Advisory Council of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. This group is a welcome addition to the mechanisms of Government and should improve the exchange of information among consumer associations, trade groups, and the Government. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Dr. Canoyer's address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

(By Dr. Helen G. Canoyer)

The United States has always been interested in protecting and promoting the interest of the consumer. However, there has been a significant evolution in methods, institutions, and problems of concern as they relate to governmental activity on behalf of the consumer. Others have summarized these changes as follows:

1. A shift from common law to statutory law.
2. A shift from remedy for damage to prevention of damage.
3. A shift from caveat emptor toward truth to the buyer.
4. Specialized administrative commissions.
5. A gradual increase in the importance of Federal Government activity in consumer affairs.

Although some of these changes had taken place by the turn of the century and shortly thereafter, it was not until later that formal representation of the consumer in the Federal Government was tried.

Hence, I ask you to go back with me in history to the 1930's—sometimes referred to as the "decade of the consumer"—and the early 1940's. Under the National Industrial Recovery Act many strange and wonderful things were tried. Among these was the first formal representation of consumers in the Federal Government. This representation was in the form of the Consumer Advisory Board of the National Industrial Recovery Act, which position paralleled that of both the Industry Advisory Board and the Labor Advisory Board. Also in the same decade Consumer Counsels were given a place in the operation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and in the National Bituminous Coal Commission. The National Defense Advisory Commission (set up in May 1940) included a Consumer Commissioner as one of its seven members. This Consumer Commissioner had equal status with the Commissioners for Industry and Labor. When the Commission gave way to war agencies during the Second World War, experiments with consumer representation in Government continued in the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, later the Office of Price Administration. Since World War II, the only revival of such representation at the Federal level was in the Council of Economic Advisers, which had a Consumer Advisory Committee at intervals from 1947 to 1956. Although, for over 30 years there have been successes and failures in attempts to represent the consumer at the Federal level, one lesson can be learned from this experience—it is that consumer representation in the Federal Government, if it is to be effective, must be permanent, continuous, and at a high level.

At the State level there has been a good deal of consumer representation activity—most notably, there have been consumer counsels in New York and California. In other States, departments of agriculture and offices of State attorneys general have undertaken consumer protection activity. There are now consumer advisory committees in several States; in some cases they are attached to the Office of the Governor, whereas in other cases to other parts of the executive branch.

The United States is not alone in achieving formal consumer representation. In other democratic countries, there is consumer representation in government. Advisory committees of a consumer character are now to be found in the United Kingdom, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand, Holland, and Australia. There may be others. However, in no country is consumer representation in government as effective as it should be.

It is interesting and important to note that not only has the public focused its attention on consumer problems in a recurring ebb and flow, but, also, there has been diversity in the kind and quality of consumer representation achieved. In some cases the representatives of the consumer have been government officials, but in others they have been private persons serving as advisers or consultants on a paid or unpaid basis. Where it is the latter, the advisers are sometimes selected ex officio—that is, by virtue of their office in some consumer or other organization. Another distinction that can be drawn is that of one-party versus multiparty councils—with, in some cases, business and labor being represented along with the consumer.

THEORY OF CONSUMER REPRESENTATION

The theory upon which all of the consumer representation experiments have been based is that there is a meaningful distinction between consuming and producing, and between individual and group needs as consumers and as producers. Furthermore, there is a meaningful distinction between the public interest as stated and defined by the total process of government and the consumer interest.

In addition, consuming (that is, the final using up of goods and services) has become recognized by other than economists as a distinctive process in our society; one that calls for specialized skills and knowledge on the part of the individual consumer; and one that also calls for a special role for government in protecting and promoting the consumer interest. Just as government protects and promotes the interests of business, farmers, and laborers, so should it protect and promote the interests of the consumer. However, there is one further point that is advanced in support of the idea that there should be special consumer representation. This is that, unlike many producer and labor groups, the ultimate consuming public is relatively unorganized and unrepresented—its wishes and needs are practically unspoken in the halls of government. Indeed, they may not even be verbalized or articulated. The consumer is mute and ineffective partly because he is uninformed of his plight or of ways to resolve it. Moreover, because all persons are consumers there are no clearly defined bases upon which they can organize into manageable groups having recognizable mutual concerns. Consumers, as distinct from longshoremen, printers, steelworkers, advertisers, retailers, credit managers, etc., comprise a huge, unwieldy heterogenous group, and each individual member feels overwhelmed by the size and extensiveness of this group to which he belongs. Hence, he should be and needs to be represented by designated and informed intermediaries between him and the government, who look both ways—interpreting the consumer to appropriate parts of government and vice versa.

PRESIDENT CITES CONSUMER PLIGHT

The plight of today's consumer was recognized by President Kennedy in his consumer message of March 15, 1962, when he said, "Many of the new products used every day in the home are highly complex. The housewife is called upon to be an amateur electrician, mechanic, chemist, toxicologist, dietitian, and mathematician—but she is rarely furnished the information she needs to perform these tasks proficiently.

"Marketing is increasingly impersonal. Consumer choice is influenced by mass advertising, utilizing highly developed arts of persuasion. The consumer usually does not know how much he pays for consumer credit; whether one prepared food has more nutritional value than another; whether the performance of a product will in fact meet his needs; or whether the 'large economy size' is really a bargain."

RIGHTS OF CONSUMER ENUNCIATED

The President undoubtedly voiced a widely held conviction when he affirmed the responsibility of Government to consumers in the exercise of certain basic rights. The rights which he enunciated in that message include the "right to safety," the "right to be informed," the "right to choose," and the "right to be heard." It is the last of these rights; namely, the "right to be heard," which relates to the Consumer Advisory Council. In his Consumer Message the President noted "the failure of governmental machinery to assure specific consideration of the consumers' needs and point of view." With this in mind (he directed):

First, that the Council of Economic Advisers create a Consumers' Advisory Council to examine and provide advice to the Government on issues of broad economic policy, on governmental programs protecting consumer needs, and on needed improvements in the flow of consumer research material to the public. This Consumers' Council will also give interested individuals and organizations a voice in these matters;

Second, that the head of each Federal agency whose activities bear significantly on

consumer welfare designate a special assistant in his office to advise and assist him in assuring adequate and effective attention to consumer interests in the work of the agency, to act as liaison with consumer and related organizations, and to place increased emphasis on preparing and making available pertinent research findings for consumers in clear and useable form.

APPOINTMENT OF THE COUNCIL

That statement which was made in March 1962 led to the appointment of the members of the Consumer Advisory Council in July. Those appointed were: David W. Angevine, public relations director of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.; Dr. Persia Campbell, head of the economics department, Queens College, and former Consumer counsel to the Governor of New York; Stephen M. duBrul, a partner in Lehman Brothers; Mrs. John G. Lee, former president of the National League of Women Voters; Dr. Edward S. Lewis, executive director of the Urban League of Greater New York; the Honorable Walter F. Mondale, attorney general of Minnesota; Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, head of the department of family economics, Kansas State University; Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, director of Governor Brown's Office of the Consumer Counsel, State of California; Sylvia Porter, syndicated newspaper columnist on financial affairs and family economics (Miss Porter has since resigned); Dr. Caroline Ware, consultant; Dr. Colston E. Warne, president of Consumers Union of the United States, Inc., and professor of economics, Amherst College; and Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, chairman, dean of the New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University.

Also appointed were the special assistants for consumer affairs in the 22 Federal departments and agencies "whose activities bear significantly on consumer welfare." These assistants have served as liaison between the Consumer Advisory Council and their departments and agencies.

PRESIDENT INDICATES HIS WISHES

At the January meeting of the Council, President Kennedy clearly indicated that he expected this relationship between the Consumer Advisory Council and these Special Assistants to be one of "enthusiastic cooperation."

Although the relationship between the Consumer Advisory Council and department and agency consumer assistants is a cordial, cooperative and supportive one, yet the amount of actual staff work undertaken by them on Council needs has been greatly limited. In most cases, the person who was designated by the department or agency head as "Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs" already had a full-time job. In the main, consumer assistants have served as a liaison and information function, not a research staff function. They have, however, assisted us in drawing upon the resources of the departments and agencies so represented.

Although the powers of the Consumer Advisory Council are only advisory, it is the first time in the history of our country that the consumer has been represented at this high a level in the executive branch of the Federal Government. It is a broad responsibility that President Kennedy has given to this new Consumer Advisory Council—to advise the executive branch of the government on (a) issues of broad economic policy; (b) governmental programs protecting consumer needs; (c) the flow of consumer research material from the Government to the public; and (d) to give a voice to interested individuals and organizations.

THE CHARTER OF THE COUNCIL

The Consumer Advisory Council has regarded the presidential message of March, 1962 as its charter, so to speak, and with the help and guidance of the Council of Economic Advisers, we have undertaken to translate it into a workable program. Inasmuch as the consumer message charges us with giving advice in several different broad areas, we listed what we considered to be the most important topics to which the Council should direct its attention during its first year. Priority was then given by the Council to six of the 10 "most important topics." We then subdivided the Consumer Advisory Council first into six and more recently into five committees which deal with the six topics selected and which relate to these areas.

COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER CREDIT SET UP

First, we are to advise on issues of broad economic policy—and we set up a committee on consumer credit and economic welfare; and another on consumer standards, grades and labels.

Second, we are to provide advice on governmental programs protecting consumer needs—and we set up a committee on interrelations among Federal agencies and between Federal and State agencies in areas of consumer protection.

Third, we are to provide advice on needed improvements in the flow of consumer research material to the public—and we have a committee on two-way flow of information and opinion between government and consumer.

Fourth, we are to "give interested individuals and organizations a voice in these matters"—and we have a committee on effective consumer representation in government.

COMMITTEES ARE AT WORK

Since September these committees (entirely composed of Council members) have been working on their designated problem areas. Each of them has faced the necessity of selecting a limited number of specific problems within each topic to which they give their limited attention and time. It is not surprising that we have found that just to select the problems and to choose the approach we will take to them is very time consuming. Moreover, because very limited staff assistance was made available to us and because each of the Council members has a regular full time job, our progress has been slower than we expected. Each committee has presented to the Council as a whole, from time to time, its recommendations on selected problems at which time the Council as a whole has decided what should be the next steps. Several of these committees have submitted statements to the Consumer Advisory Council which will be included in the annual report of the Council. The Consumer Advisory Council in turn will transmit this report via the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President and to other appropriate parts of the executive branch of the Government.

Although the committee work outlined above has consumed much of our time, we have also responded to specific requests for advice put to us by the administration, and have devoted considerable thought, time, and energy to learning what Government presently does to advance and protect the consumer interest. Our principal tutors and guides in this learning process have been the special assistants for consumer affairs in the Federal departments and agencies. And I suspect that we have gained more from them than they have from us.

COUNCIL FAVORS "TRUTH IN LENDING"

The Consumer Advisory Council has issued statements favoring "truth in packaging" and "truth in lending," and they have urged the administration to take additional steps to combat the denial of consumers' rights on the grounds of race. The Council has expressed its opposition to the principles and purposes of the "quality stabilization" bills. These statements in whole or in part have been officially released to the press. The Council has endorsed proposals to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of therapeutic, diagnostic and prosthetic devices, and to extend to cosmetics the premarketing testing for safety that is in effect in the fields of drugs and food additives. They have also urged new requirements for cautionary labeling of hazardous substances and containers regulated under the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act. The Council has set out a list of principles which they would like to see used as guides in housing policy, including a massive education program for prospective home buyers. They have called for more funds for consumer research and information work by the several departments and agencies. This Council has also evaluated and made recommendations to Federal departments on the basis of the pilot project carried out by the Government Printing Office and the Post Office whereby over a quarter of a million special order blanks for consumer publications were distributed through a sample of 100 out of the Nation's 35,000 post offices.

COUNCIL STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

The Consumer Advisory Council has urged that certain studies or investigations be undertaken on a number of topics. Among these are the following, some of which, it is gratifying to note, are now the subject of active inquiry: the nature of guarantees and warranties within major areas of consumer expenditure; the establishment of standards for sizes of clothing and clothing patterns, especially for children's clothing and knit garments; the possible adoption of Federal safety standards for electrical equipment; the possibilities for more intensive and extensive work by private and governmental agencies in strengthening and unifying standards and simplified practices programs; the promotion of national standards in the field of highway safety; and the development of uniform warning labels in the form of pictorial symbols on toxic substances.

MEMBERS ASKED FOR THEIR THOUGHTS

In connection with this last question, I want to make an appeal to individual consumers and to consumer organizations. The Consumer Advisory Council needs to know—if we are to do our job well—what the consumer is interested in and what matters are troubling him. The International Consumer Credit Association can be helpful in giving some thoughtful attention to that question and communicating your thoughts to us.

FINAL OPINIONS AND CONCLUSION

It is my conclusion from a good many years of experience in the fields of economics and home economics, that the basic problem underlying all so-called consumer problems is the lack of education. It is not enough, in fact it is impossible, to represent consumers in a meaningful way if they are ill-informed and irresponsible. It is not enough to offer them isolated pieces of information about specific problems if they do not have a broad framework of understanding about their role in our economy as responsible consumers and citizens. I have crusaded over the years for more education in consumer economics in our schools at all levels and in adult education programs.

Educators and many private and professional organizations, including the American Home Economics Association (which was among the first organizations to champion the cause of the consumer) can through their members or their organizational facilities either lobby or more directly work for an increase in courses in consumer economics of both formal and informal types. There has been some progress over the years. For example, today more consumer economics is taught than when I was an undergraduate. But it falls far short of what is needed.

In conclusion, I should like to call your attention to a deep concern of mine which I discussed at the July 1962 meeting of the

Consumer Advisory Council, underscoring what I consider to be the fundamental importance of education of the consumer.

It is my opinion that volunteer consumer organizations and past Government attempts at representing the consumer have been identified too generally with the narrow area of consumer protection such as mail fraud, labeling legislation, food, drug, and cosmetic legislation. I believe this is an important area. But today it is not the only important need which consumers have. I believe that the main reason why there has not been a strong and lasting consumers' organization and why attempts at representing the consumer, both at the State level and the Federal level, have not attracted vigorous and vocal support from consumers, is that the majority of consumers do not identify with programs which are aimed at protection unless something unpleasant happens to them personally and they need this protection. We must direct attention to all parts of consumer education, and especially to consumer economics. This is necessary not only because every citizen in this country should be an intelligent voter, but also because a knowledge of consumer economics is important to us in our everyday living.

I am convinced that if our economic system is to survive, it will come not only by training specialists and leaders but primarily by acquainting the average citizen with simple basic economic truths. For the first time in human history, a world without poverty and without war is technically possible. But it would be the greatest of all tragedies if in our ignorance and fear we should turn this into an age of mass suicide. Ideas can keep pace with technical advancement. But if our Nation is to continue to take advantage of the great opportunities offered by our own form of free enterprise; if we are going to help a free world to survive; then ideas and understanding must spread beyond the circle of the experts and the leaders to every single individual.

Our judgment cannot be better than our information. Our ignorance of simple economic principles is both shocking and frightening—especially when we realize that well over one-half of government decisions at any level are economic decisions and that our decisions will control not only our Nation's situation but the world's. This means that every American citizen should know more about elementary economics. There is a crying need for economic education in our schools and in adult programs so that the people of the United States may realize and appreciate the great opportunities and advantages of this free economy of ours; understand how the economy operates and be made to see the effect on the operation of the economy of the individual's actions. Thus I am interested not only in the science of private housekeeping but also in the science of public housekeeping. I share the conviction of others that knowledge is better ultimate protection of our economy than guns.

CONSUMER REPRESENTATION IN THE FUTURE

Now it is obvious that the Consumer Advisory Council cannot undertake a mass education campaign. However, the Consumer Advisory Council does have a significant educational role to play by its very existence; by being a visible evidence of the fact that there is a distinct consumer interest in what is going on in this exciting world. The consumer's job is not an easy one, especially since the consumer, generally speaking has had no instruction in understanding the importance of his role, and the conditions for its competent performance. However, education and knowledge will form the basis for more effective consumer representation in the future. I spoke for myself when I say that it is because of this conviction that I am committed to do all that I can to make possible the success of the Consumer Advisory Council.

The Education of a General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Paducah Sun-Democrat of Friday, September 13, an excellent article by Bill Powell, an outstanding writer, not only of the State of Kentucky, but of the Nation as well, on the first volume of the biography of Gen. George C. Marshall. This book is entitled "The Education of a General," and was written by Dr. Forrest C. Pogue.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Dr. Pogue for over 30 years as he was my major professor at Murray State College in social science.

As Bill Powell has written elsewhere, and as I have been saying for years:

This country doesn't have a better researcher and research writer, or a finer biographer than Forrest Pogue. In addition to writing about General Marshall, Dr. Pogue is in charge of a project of gathering General Marshall's papers and souvenirs and getting them organized for use and exhibition at the George C. Marshall Research Library now being built at Lexington, Va. The George C. Marshall Research Foundation, of which General of the Army Omar N. Bradley is president, expects to dedicate the building in May of next year.

I quote from a portion of Bill Powell's excellent article:

MARSHALL STORY WILL BUILD NAME OF DR. POGUE

(By Bill Powell)

The biography is out now and I suspect that millions of people who appreciate outstanding research and good biographical writing will agree with the captain.

I mean the biography has started coming out; excerpts from the first massive volume are in the issue of Look dated September 24. The volume itself would be issued in about 3 weeks.

The first volume is called "The Education of a General."

It is based on 250,000 words of Marshall's dictated memoirs, dozens of interviews and about 500,000 documents studied and evaluated by Dr. Pogue.

Look calls the work "one of the major biographies of our century."

About the excerpts from the first volume Look says:

"(It is) the story of the early failures that haunted him all of his life, his brother's prediction that he would disgrace the Marshall family, the risks that could have ended his military career, and the campaigns that led to his appointment as Army Chief of Staff by Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

I don't know much about the biographical writing field but the magazine story certainly seems to show that Dr. Pogue, the former Murray State College professor who became the Army's best known private (including Hargrove) in World War II, has done something great.

The story is interesting and easily read. Pogue, as he has always done, gets quickly to the point and makes every word count. Yet he captures color and human interest as easily as a man telling a story to a few friends.

Here is part of his first paragraph:

"George Catlett Marshall arrived in places of power a man almost unknown to the average American. When he left, his name, his rather homely face, some part of his wartime achievement, his plan for reconstructing Europe and his mission to China were familiar to millions. He had his devoted admirers, here and in Europe and—on far political right—his bitter detractors. Yet in a real sense he remained unknown. Marshall's selection as Army Chief of Staff in 1939 was widely considered, a fluke. It was said then and has been repeated since, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, inspired or sinister, depending on one's point of view had reached reached deep down into the list of generals to raise up a man who had no obvious claim on the job. It was not so. When Marshall's chance came, only four Generals senior to him were eligible for the post. Those in position to weigh the choice had no serious doubt that, on the record of ability and professional achievement, he deserved to be chosen. (General Marshall took his post on a bitterly memorable day—the day Adolf Hitler's tanks rumbled into Poland.)

Pogue doesn't leave it at that; he weaves proof of the weighty statement briefly made in the first part of the volume.

The parts of the book in the magazine simply tell a story which, in no way, reflects the monotony of some life stories chronologically told. There is life to the writing, and it was put there without flowery embellishments aimed solely at arousing of interest.

I used to admire him as a professor and I learned to like him more while he was a private in the Army.

Pogue always had an important job in the Army—such as gathering the war story up at the front or near it as the awful drama unfolded—but through some fluke he was a buck private most of his career.

Then after the war he wrote the story of Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces. This was about SHAEF (later SHAPE) and General Eisenhower's Western Front role in the war.

Later he turned out monumental histories of other phases of the war and, in his spare time, wrote a book, "The Meaning of Yalta."

Then he became head of the George C. Marshall Research Foundation in 1956 and has had his nose stuck in documents nearly every day since.

Pogue again has shown that he has almost incredible ability to stick with a gigantic job and to pick up interest as he goes along. Pogue always has been a calm man; he speaks evenly and you might think, at first, that he is a dry talker. But he isn't; as in his writings, his sentences all mean something and he holds interest very firmly with what he says instead of the way he says it.

Murray State is mighty proud of Pogue. I suppose he is still "on leave" as a professor there. Maybe someday he'll come back for awhile, at least.

Labor Day Celebration at Henryetta, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, recently I had the opportunity to visit and participate in the 17th annual Labor Day celebration at Henryetta, Okla.

Included among the many events of Henryetta's outstanding civic program that day was a Farmer-Labor Conference. As a member of the U.S. Com-

mittee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was particularly interested in this conference and the discussions held there.

The main address was given by president James G. Patton of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. Patton is a farmer and a man widely respected by farmers throughout America. He speaks as a man of the soil with common words and—common-sense.

I think the message he brought to Henryetta on Labor Day is a thought-provoking warning that applies to Oklahoma as well as Henryetta and to America as well as Oklahoma. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY NATIONAL FARMERS UNION PRESIDENT, JAMES G. PATTON, AT FARMER-LABOR CONFERENCE IN HENRYETTA, OKLA., LABOR DAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1963

I can't help but think that the eyefilling Oklahoma farmland, all around us in Henryetta—your countryside—is the best explanation of why we, all of us, are gathered here today.

The rolling hills, the lush pecan groves nestling in the bottom lands, the Deep Fork itself, slowflowing in the sun, and the fields of small grain and peanuts are the real setting for what I have to say today.

This is a land of family farms, but its people are in a state of transition between rural and rural-urban life; for it isn't just farm country. There are oil wells all around us. In Okmulgee, there is the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. plant, where 700 people are employed, and the Eagle-Picher smelter here in Henryetta where 400 people are employed.

The working people in these factories and oilfields aren't faceless. They are people who live on the family farms, many of them, and work in these factories and in these oilfields. They are living, breathing examples of the reason for my appearance before you here on Labor Day.

But Labor Day doesn't belong to organized labor alone, nor does it belong to people who simply work with their hands in factories. No, indeed. In the larger sense, Labor Day is the one day of the year dedicated to the American citizen of our time, whether they live on farm or in town, whether they sweat at the harvest or over a lathe.

This, then is why I am here. That is why George Stone, the president of the Oklahoma Farmer's Union and all the other members and leaders of our State group are here: to join with Oklahoma workers in celebration of Labor Day. That is why the members of the Farm Cooperatives are here and why the Rural Electrical Cooperative's leadership are with you—to help celebrate a Labor Day that has meaning for us all.

But there are other reasons for being here. Most of us are here today not only because of the ideals that move us all, but because we are being pushed away from the realization of these ideals. We are here to protest at being pushed. We are here united in that protest.

It has been said that in America most people vote "agin" things. I suppose we are no different from the rest. We're here to be "agin" forces which seek to destroy our realization of prosperity and peaceful pursuits. We are here to state our intention of resisting forces which seek to take away our hard-won gains and destroy our chance for further advancement.

We have our alliances, both political and economic. We have gained from them. But before telling of some of those old-time alliances between the farmer, who works with his hands and the working man of city and town, let me identify those who confront us.

There are two major coalitions operating in this country against our joint interests. One is an economic coalition based on big business and including the top leadership of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The other is composed of rightwing radicals, most of whom are also active in the other group.

The economic coalition has been at work for a long time, and it started including the Farm Bureau Federation when the big issue was killing consumer price controls during the war. It operates in many ways, but it is formalized every so often in meetings at the fancy Greenbrier Hotel in West Virginia. I am proud to say that I have never been invited but once to these cozy conclaves and I flatly refused to attend or participate, but I have read their programs and found out what they are up to and who shows up.

The program for last January's meeting included appearances by very top men from these organizations: Investment Bankers Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Bankers Association, American Meat Institute (the meatpackers' lobby), American Retail Federation, National Association of Manufacturers, National Restaurant Association, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, American Bar Association, American Medical Association, National Association of Real Estate Boards, American Medical Political Action Committee, and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

That's a formidable list. Do you working men recognize any friends there? Do you family farmers call any of these "friend"?

What did these business tycoons talk about? We don't know everything they talked about, but the printed program gives us some clues. It mentions, "the Federal budget and fiscal picture," "tax reduction," "tax reforms," "employment-unemployment," and "pressures and activities for consumer protection."

The American Farm Bureau spokesman explained legislative proposals for agriculture, just before the doctors got on the program to talk about their new campaign to beat medical care for the aged.

This blue-chip group was plotting the defeat of any kind of legislation which would add to the welfare of the average citizen, the family farmer or the workingman.

This big business-professional coalition is as dangerous as the rightwing radical movement itself—it's against anything that might help our Nation move forward—for it is the financial heart of the far right.

The best known of these new extremist groups is the John Birch Society, but we should keep in mind that some of the most reactionary and powerful of them have been peddling their wares since the early New Deal. They are more dangerous in many ways than the out-and-out Birchers because they don't make crazy statements about General Eisenhower being a Communist agent or about impeaching Chief Justice Warren. Underneath, however, the rightwingers are pretty much alike—and they are against progressive labor legislation, farm legislation and other welfare legislation.

For example, the National Committee for Economic Freedom has been trying to get the Federal income tax repealed (and has convinced the legislatures of six States already). If it accomplished this purpose it would paralyze our Government.

Oh yes, this group is also against farm programs, labor legislation, the TVA, REA, and everything else that workers and farmers have fought for.

Then there is another outfit called the Americans for Constitutional Action, which gives campaign help to ultraconservative candidates. It claims to have no connection with the John Birch Society, but half of its officers are Birch leaders and about one-fifth of its money comes from known Birch members. As you can guess, ACA gives a zero rating to all Congressmen who are trying to improve farm and labor laws, saving its highest honors for those who vote against nearly everything.

There are dozens and dozens of these outfits. They have newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, radio programs, films, and TV shows which saturate the country. They also have a stable of speakers who travel the big cities and the small crossroads with their messages of distrust, suspicion, subversion, book censoring, saber rattling, and general obstruction.

Take the so-called National Right To Work Committee which set up the outfit here called Oklahomans for Right To Work, Inc. Its propaganda chief, Glenn A. Green, is an admitted John Birch Society member.

F. Gano Chance, a Missouri businessman, is a member of the John Birch national council and an ardent right-to-worker. Fred C. Koch, Wichita, Kans., oilman and a right-to-work leader, is on the Birch council. There are hundreds of Birchers who are both chamber of commerce and right-to-work leaders.

How does the radical right work? Well, first they are against communism. Then they are for religion. Then, having convinced everyone that they have nothing but good intentions, they get on to the real reason for their acts. They are against labor unions. Because, they say, labor unions are "monopolists" and because the unions are "leading the country down to socialism." They are against the rural electric co-ops because, they say, this too is socialism and sometimes they even call the REA Communist. They are against any kind of a sensible farm program because it might keep some of the farm income with family farmers instead of siphoning it all off into the pockets of industrial farm operators.

When we realize even a little of what these self-seekers are doing every day to our democratic processes and to our thinking, we understand such events as the failure of the wheat referendum a few months ago. Spearheaded by a so-called farm organization, a great drive was mounted to vote against such phony issues as "regimentation," "dictatorship," and "Government controls." Many farmers were scared out of their wits by this kind of propaganda, even though the same programs had been adopted by farmers for many years.

The campaign of scare, distrust, hate, and obstruction has not stopped with the wheat referendum. It will go on for a long time because this coalition of hate and destruction is even stronger now. The rural electrification program is under attack, not only from the power trust, but from the farm bureau federation and from Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the political hero of the rightwing radicals.

Let me read you what a great newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, said in a recent report from Washington:

"Leaders in an assault on the federally financed rural electrification program include the Republican Party's 'Mr. Conservative,' Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, as well as private power companies, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the American Farm Bureau Federation. In an undeclared alliance that is becoming increasingly important in a number of fields, they are getting strong help from rightwing extremists."

Let me note also the New York Times report of July 30 that the John Birch Society headquarters in Massachusetts reported income for 1962 as $737,617. I stress that this is a report of but one of the Birch Society treasuries. But let me read one more paragraph from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

"GOLDWATER, who has a fondness for simple solutions to complex problems, is the leading advocate of the 'Let's get rid of REA's approach.' Looking at the fact that

98 percent of American farms now have electric service, slightly more than half of them served by REA cooperatives, GOLDWATER comes to the conclusion he advocated in South Dakota last August: 'REA in most States has outlived its usefulness.' Or, as he said in Denver early last month, 'The REA should either be dissolved or revised so that it pays its own way.' "

BARRY GOLDWATER is no friend of the farmer. No friend of the REA. No friend of the rural co-op. He is no friend of labor.

Let me turn from the problem of BARRY GOLDWATER for a moment and discuss the situation we face in Oklahoma—organized labor and farmers alike. We farmers need help. In the past, we have asked for that help and got it. We know from our own experience that no one lives alone in this world.

We all need help. Lots of it. This is true of groups as well as individuals. It's especially true for groups like farmers and workers, who don't have the economic power some others do.

So I'm here to tell you that we in the farmers union are always looking for allies with common needs. In Oklahoma, we have found such an ally in organized labor. You have stuck with us and we're going to stick with you. One thing we're sure going to stick with you on is the defeating this so-called right-to-work law. They don't have that unfair law in any real industrial states, mostly just in the Deep South and sparsely settled States like Nevada, where they make a living from gambling tables. Which proves there aren't any working people hankering for right-to-work legislation.

There shouldn't be any farmers favoring such foolish legislation, either. People earn a lot less money in the so-called right-to-work States than they do in the rest of the Nation. When you outlaw the right to have a union shop, which this law would do, you automatically make it possible for the big employers to cut wages. You make it easier for these big employers to fire older workers, and to take the meat out of pension benefits.

I have to admit that a lot of small merchants, and even quite a few farmers who have brought the American Farm Bureau Federation line, seem to believe right-to-work wouldn't affect them. How wrong they are. If you get a right-to-work law in Oklahoma, the smart merchant and farmer is going to be hurt just as much as the workers. Oklahoma's whole economy will take a nosedive.

Union wages set the pattern for nonunion wages. Shrink the union worker's paycheck, which this law will certainly do, and you'll also shrink the nonunion worker's paycheck. The only difference is that the nonunion worker's paycheck will shrink even more, because he stands alone aaginst the big employers.

I hope the farmers of Oklahoma realize their best customers are union workers who earn decent pay for their labor. Their next best customers are nonunion workers, many of whom also draw decent paychecks because organized labor has set a decent standard for them. They'll both be buying a lot less of our farm products if Oklahomans are foolish enough to vote for so-called right to work.

And what about Oklahoma merchants? Well, they're just flat stupid if they think "right-to-work" can help them. The merchants of Henryetta and all Oklahoma will wind up with from 10 to 25 percent less sales under "right-to-work."

I say to the small merchants, family farmers, and working people of Oklahoma, union and nonunion: Get in there and do battle with these "right-to-work" promoters. Today it's "right-to-work." Tomorrow it will be a bill to hamstring the REA and other farm co-ops. Day after tomorrow it will be some kind of legislation to aid monopoly business at the expense of the small merchants. Take a look at who these people are that have come to Oklahoma with the "right-to-work" pig in their poke. Whom do they represent? Why are they so doggone willing to spend a pile of money to put over this legislation? Is it because they have a tender spot in their hearts for the man who labors, the man we pay tribute to today? Are they concerned for the farmer, the small merchant? Or is there something else up their sleeve?

You can bet your bottom dollar there is. The "something else" is greater profit for themselves by paying less to the workers. Take a look at who is supporting the so-called "right-to-work" law and you get the picture. It's the National Association of Manufacturers, the wild-eyed John Birchers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and, I'm sorry to say, the American Farm Bureau Federation.

I'm telling you working people of Oklahoma, this right-to-work thing is serious for you and the entire State. You better be prepared to fight long, hard and from door to door to defeat it. I promise you this: You'll have all the help we can give you from the Farmers Union. We know the importance of standing together and working together with labor for our common good.

And I say to Oklahoma farmers: If there are any who think they don't have a stake in helping city workers defeat this so-called right-to-work law he doesn't know what's going on in the barnyard these days. What with oversupply and efforts by corporate farmers to drive the family farmer off the land completely, more and more farmers are being forced onto the labor market. And if this keeps up, a lot of the farmer's children will have to be turning from the farm to the Oklahoma factory to make a living.

The important message I want to get over to both farmers and working people is to stick together and help each other in this fight.

Together, farmers and workers of Oklahoma can protect each other's hard-won rights. Alone, you can't. So look to the things you have in common. Beware what might divide you. Don't let the John Birchers, the "right-to-workers" or anyone else fool you into thinking you should be on opposite sides. If that happens, it will be tragic for you and for Oklahoma.

In Oklahoma right now they're most concerned about trying to destroy the right of you workers to bargain collectively for a union shop. But they also have in mind taking Oklahoma farmers back to the good old days of the kerosene lamp by "phasing out," as they call it, your Oklahoma REA system.

The Oklahoma phase of this REA battle, which was fought in Congress as well, was an attempt to take over REA electric customers in areas annexed by cities and towns. Farmers and labor joined forces to defeat this bill in the Oklahoma Legislature. Why? Because it would have forced sale of REA power distribution lines and customers to the private power companies. Under the kind of annexation program they have in Oklahoma City where, I'm told, large areas of several counties have been annexed, it would have been possible to take over even the REA generating plants and put many co-ops out of business altogether.

But it didn't happen. It didn't happen, because labor and the farmer worked together to stop this takeover.

The attempt to phase out the REA's nationally failed in the Congress for the same reason.

So you see these big business monopolists, the NAM, the chamber of commerce, the power trust, the corporation farmers, the farm bureau Charlie McCarthys, and these John Birch characters don't always have it all their own way.

We've seen what they want to do to the REA. For the small farmer they have other plans.

The attack on the wheat referendum was only a crystallization of the all-out opposition of the combine I've told you about. The issue brought the coalition into the open. The fact is, they don't want an effective farm program.

The business members of the coalition benefit from low commodity prices and, as a result, the Farm Bureau wages a holy war against everything the Government does. They are simply doing their duty to the coalition to which they belong.

This rightwing coalition, which opposes everything family farmers and labor stand for, is violently attacking the only means the farmer has for gaining the bargaining power he must have for getting anything like the minimum return and adequate credit he needs to keep going, and to keep from burying himself under excess production.

The same people are against buying power for labor, minimum wages, medicare, or any other item that will help the workingman and his family. It is most significant that the leaders of the right wing are also the leaders of this antifarmer, antilabor coalition. They have the same background, the same thoughts, they use the same methods, they spend big money, they have the big money to spend, and they all have the same aim: to degrade workingmen of farm and factory and use them as a means for greater profits and power.

If they were permitted to have their way, they would legislate all of us, labor, family farmers, co-ops, REA, out of existence.

But they are not going to get away with it. Our family farmers and wage earners in organized labor will see to that.

We have stopped these forces of obstruction dead in their tracks in the past and, working together in a common cause, we will continue to do so.

From the first day I became associated with the farmers union, more than 30 years ago, there has been the closest possible cooperation between us and organized labor. I remember the depression days here, when organized labor and the farmers union worked in double harness, pulling the same plow, in just about every political battle that came along.

One of the greatest laws ever passed in Oklahoma was your Homestead Exemption Act. It's still in effect, but the same people who are trying to pass a right-to-work law and to destroy the farmer's rural electrification co-ops are still trying to wipe out the Homestead Exemption Act which saved thousands of impoverished farmers' homes from going under the sheriffs' hammer in the depression thirties. Farmers and organized labor worked together to save our farms and homes, and we are going to keep it that way.

In closing, let me say that there is a natural affinity between our family farmers and the factory workers who belong to unions, and in this area of eastern Oklahoma they are, oftentimes, the same people.

The farmers produce the food that feeds our Nation and much of the world and the factory workers produce the machinery that makes this abundant farm production possible. They produce the laborsaving devices for the home which, with REA power, have lifted the farm wives out of backbreaking drudgery.

Actually, there is little difference in the aims of our farmers and our city factory workers. The problem of heavy unemployment for organized labor and the problem of big farm surpluses for the family farmer can be solved by raising the buying power of the lower levels of our society. Raise the purchasing power of the impoverished families in the bottom fifth of our population and we will see a tremendous surge in de-

mand for the products of farm and factory alike.

That is the path to national prosperity and abundance for all.

We cannot achieve this goal by turning the clock back to the last century. We cannot do this by taking the electric power from our farms and going back to the kerosene lamp. We cannot produce greater purchasing power for our farm and factory products by enacting so-called right-to-work laws that lower wages and dry up the buying power of 70 million working Americans.

Our farmers and our city workers must stand together to defeat the forces of reaction, corporate monopoly and rightwing radicalism that blindly believe they can have their cake and eat it, too, by exploiting both the farmer and the city wage earner.

Here in Henryetta, in the rolling farm country dotted with family farms, these problems are not abstractions. They are real and meaningful for they affect the future of the individual farmer, of his family, of his children who may have to seek work in the future in the factories and oilfields.

Ask yourself how these threats may involve your future and the future of your family, and I know you will come up with the right answer.

Iowans Support Domestic Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the Domestic Peace Corps has received a great deal of attention recently. I recently received a letter from Dr. Ralph H. Heeren, acting commissioner of public health in the State of Iowa, regarding the need for a Domestic Peace Corps in Iowa. The Governor of the State of Iowa, Harold E. Hughes, recently addressed the citizens of Iowa over the Tall Corn Network in support of this legislation. I would like to submit for the RECORD, and for the benefit of my colleagues, the letter and the address made by Governor Hughes.

The letter and the address follow:

IOWA STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Des Moines, September 9, 1963.

Re Domestic Peace Corps.

Hon. NEAL SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: The Iowa State Department of Health is responsible for the promotion of all areas of public health in all areas of the State. Funds in this division, both from the State and from Federal sources, are currently inadequate to permit us to provide staff to carry out many of the services needed.

If the resources of a Domestic Peace Corps were made available, we could profitably use at least 50 public health sanitarians and another 50 public health nurses.

Yours very truly,
RALPH H. HEEREN, M.D., M.P.H.,
Acting Commissioner of Public Health.

REMARKS OF GOV. HAROLD E. HUGHES

Fellow Iowans, today I'd like to talk with you about a bill that is now before the U.S. Congress.

I seldom mention Federal legislation or matters concerning the Federal Government in my reports or speeches to the people of Iowa, not because I am not interested in what is going on in Washington, D.C., but because I feel I have enough to keep me busy in Des Moines, Iowa.

But I feel that I must speak to you today about a bill before Congress due to the impact this bill could have upon many of the State programs which have been designed to make Iowa a better place to live.

A committee of the U.S. House of Representatives presently is conducting hearings on a bill that would set up a national service corps or, as it is better known, a domestic peace corps.

Such a bill would be of great value to Iowa and most especially to the people of Iowa who need rehabilitation in order that they may become self-supporting, taxpaying, and self-respecting citizens in our State. I urge all Iowans to join me in urging their Senators and Congressmen to give favorable consideration to what this bill would do for the cause of humanity in Iowa.

The domestic peace corps bill would establish a small, carefully selected volunteer corps of men and women of all ages to work under the direction of local officials in mental hospitals, in hospitals for retarded children, in correctional institutions, in public health, and in the educational and social institutions in rural and urban pockets of unemployment and poverty.

I think most Americans of both parties would agree that the Peace Corps has been one of the truly outstanding achievements of the Kennedy administration. It has brought skills, help, and ideals to needy people in other lands. The domestic peace corps would parallel this work by bringing help to needy Americans.

Let's consider what this bill could mean to Iowa.

As you know, I have a continuing interest in the field of mental health and mental retardation. But our institutions presently are overcrowded and understaffed and are in need of skilled help. The director of mental health, Dr. James Cromwell, informs me he could put to work in these institutions more volunteer social workers, special therapists, registered and practical nurses and attendants than the domestic peace corps could ever send him.

With this sort of aid, we can bring more people through the terrifying caverns of mental illness and into the light of normal, healthy lives. We can help most of the retarded children in our institutions to be useful and productive adults, not wards of the State.

One of every ten persons now alive will need mental health care during their lives. Three percent of Iowa's population is mentally retarded. These are not minor problems. They must be major items in any program for a better Iowa.

Iowa is not keeping pace with the times in providing for adequate public health services for our citizens. Our growing urban areas and the problems that come with urban growth demand more attention than we have been giving them. Dr. Ralph Heeren, acting State health commissioner, informs me that Iowa needs at least 50 more public health sanitarians and 50 public health nurses. Some of these could be provided by a domestic peace corps.

There must be a better answer to the growing number of inmates in our State prisons than to build bigger and more secure prisons at the cost of millions of dollars to the taxpayer. I think the answer lies in programs of rehabilitation that will turn convicts into responsible, family-supporting citizens. To do this we need the sort of skilled help a domestic peace corps could provide.

The value of a domestic peace corps can be understood not only by considering what it can do for the unfortunate members of our society, but by considering what it can do for our more fortunate young people, who will comprise the bulk of its membership.

No matter what their critics say, today's kids are not spoiled, complacent and soft, looking for no more than a secure and snug niche in life. They're waiting for a challenge.

The skeptics of every generation in the United States, since the Pilgrim landed at Plymouth Rock, have held that the younger generation was not worthy of its heritage. And yet, every succeeding generation has proven its mettle by conquering the frontier, acquitting itself nobly on the battlefield in war, or facing economic depressions and other hard times with fortitude.

Today's young people can prove their worth, too. It's up to us to ask them to serve. It's up to us to give them opportunities to serve.

A program of voluntary service can generate lasting interest among young Iowans in a wide variety of service fields where serious shortages now exist and will worsen in the years just ahead. We have a growing need for more teachers, more workers in nursing and health care, more specialists in mental health and mental retardation and in penology. Many Americans are unaware that these career opportunities exist. Thousands of young Americans graduate from school every year not knowing what they want to do or what is important to society. Americans trained in the work they will do in the domestic peace corps can find increasing rewards in continuing similar work after graduation.

The domestic peace corps would not be for young people alone. It would provide a means by which retired persons could continue to make use of their skills on behalf of mankind. It would provide an ideal outlet for those whose energy, idealism and abilities do not suddenly end in retirement.

The Peace Corps abroad has already made a record in which all Americans can take pride. But let's not, in our zeal to help the underprivileged abroad, forget about the unfortunate and handicapped people we have right here in Iowa. A domestic peace corps, which would serve the functions of providing help to those who cannot help themselves and of harnessing the energies of youth to the service of their fellow man, is worthy of the support of every Iowan.

International Peace Corps Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the American people can be proud of their efforts to organize the good will and idealism of young people, including many older people too, in the Peace Corps.

Congress, however, is unfortunately slow in realizing that the Peace Corps idea is spreading around the world. The International Peace Corps Secretariat, founded last October at a meeting of 41 nations in Puerto Rico, is making impressive headway in extending the Peace Corps idea.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the following article about the Peace Corps Secretariat's Secretary-General, Richard Goodwin, which appeared in the September 22, 1963 issue of the New York Post:

RICHARD GOODWIN: INTERNATIONAL PEACE CORPSMAN

(By Milton Viorst)

WASHINGTON.—At 31, Richard Goodwin is an oldtimer on the New Frontier. Right-wing politicians have vilified him. Bureaucrats have denounced him. Columnists have written his political epitaph. But, in the third year of the Kennedy administration, he shows few signs of wear and tear and holds one of the most exciting, most responsible jobs in Washington.

"There are only three Secretaries General in the world, U Thant of the U.N., Jose Mora of the Organization of American States, and me," said Goodwin. But lest the company create a mistaken impression, he added, "And I take orders from Sargent Shriver."

Goodwin is the head of the International Peace Corps Secretariat, a body created last October at a meeting of 43 nations in San Juan, P.R. Still relatively unknown, both in the United States and abroad, it has the task of stimulating and guiding the establishment of organizations like the U.S. Peace Corps in countries throughout the Western World.

As Secretary General, Goodwin is legally the employee of the San Juan nations. Actually, he is "on loan" from the U.S. Government, which pays his salary and provides him with office space in the headquarters building of the U.S. Peace Corps. His staff is small. It is made up of young people like him from a variety of foreign countries—Israel, the Philippines, the Netherlands, Germany—also "on loan" from their governments.

Because the U.S. Peace Corps, a mere 2 years old, has been so successful and is the "granddaddy" of national voluntary service organizations, Sargent Shriver, its Director, exercises great influence in the dissemination of the Peace Corps idea throughout the world. Still, for all practical purposes, Goodwin is his own boss, empowered to make his own decisions on where he will go and whom he will see to do a job that a growing number of Western leaders consider vitally important.

"This isn't simply a means of getting more technicians into underdeveloped countries or getting our allies to share the burden of helping these countries to stand on their feet," Goodwin said. "It is that but it's more.

"We're trying to spread the notion of service among the young people of the free world. The cynics said it was impossible, that privileged South Americans and Europeans cared only about enhancing their privileges. We've found that's only partially true.

"It's been a revelation to see that young people in other countries, like so many in the United States were waiting for the Peace Corps idea to come along. And when it did, their response was overwhelming."

Already, substantial volunteer service programs are underway in Argentina, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

France for instance, plans to begin this month to train its first 100-man pilot unit of the "Volontaires du Progres," which soon will be off to Africa to work on rural development projects.

Perhaps even more important, many underdeveloped countries themselves are setting up volunteer corps to work either independently or in conjunction with groups from abroad on projects within their own frontiers. It is hoped that these volunteer groups will provide the manpower for ever expanding social service within the underdeveloped world.

The tiny Central American Republic of El Salvador, for example, has established a Social Progress Corps composed, according to its director, of "the cream of El Salvador youth." Throughout the summer, its leaders joined U.S. Peace Corps volunteers in an intensive training course at the University of Oklahoma. This month, the first of the five-man community development teams—composed of two Americans and three Salvadorans, under the leadership of a Salvadoran—go out to the towns and villages to promote a better way of life.

"The Government of El Salvador," said the Director, "is facing the fact that we have a long way to go. This Social Progress Corps is a great step forward."

The El Salvador experience—adapted to the needs of each individual country and the capacities of the volunteers—is precisely what Goodwin and the International Peace Corps Secretariat are seeking to reproduce throughout the Western World. Because the idea is new, it permits a freshness of approach that older organizations lack. But this very newness requires the development of procedures and techniques and often demands improvisation to cope with the unforeseen.

In the 8 months the Secretariat has been in existence, Goodwin has been on trips throughout Europe and Africa, lecturing, persuading, assisting, demonstrating, consulting, cajoling. In Washington, he has had to consolidate his successes abroad by turning promises and commitments into reality.

It has meant finding money, sometimes out of the Peace Corps budget, sometimes out of the AID budget, sometimes from some agency with only tenuous relationship to international affairs. Most officials, Goodwin said, have been sympathetic and cooperative, most notably Peace Corps Chief Shriver, who he says possesses an unbelievable capacity to get things done.

Goodwin's Secretariat also serves as a liaison between countries and between a given country and U.S. Government bureaus. It acts as a collector and disseminator of information that can be useful in any variety of ways.

"I received a phone call the other day," he said, as an illustration, "offering me the use of dozens of radios that American hams are willing to donate. I had to think of a way to put them to work. It occurred to me that in the wilds of South America there are doctors who serve wide areas but who have no way of knowing where they are needed. We can set up a program to provide the radios and train the doctors to use them, thus multiplying the value of a single man."

The Secretariat has also put its mind to training problems. Several foreign groups have already gone through special courses here. Trainees have been put to work in the Washington office of the Peace Corps, to become familiar with procedures found successful here and apply them when they get home. Goodwin is already thinking of establishing a training camp somewhere in Europe, where volunteers can receive the kind of rugged preparation Americans now get, most of them at a camp in Puerto Rico, before going into the field.

"We've been getting excellent cooperation, on the whole, from the governments we've dealt with," Goodwin said. "I think it's possible that by next year the participating nations will begin bearing costs jointly—my salary and office expenses, for instance—and relieve the United States of much of the expense.

"That's one of our objectives: we want to identify the Peace Corps idea with the free world as a whole. We want all the participating peoples to pitch in to supply training sites, professional personnel, equipment and supplies. The Dutch Government has already offered to set up a European office of the Secretariat in The Hague. We'd like to get a training camp from the Italian Government in Sicily. We recognize that the organization and the idea are still new but we're making headway.

"One problem we recognize is the need to keep the international volunteer groups meticulously nonpolitical. So far, at Shriver's unremitting insistence, the U.S. Peace Corps has stayed out of international intrigue. Its objective, of course, is to give a return to the United States but it must do this indirectly, by showing the peoples of the underdeveloped countries the willingness of Americans to serve.

"We recognize the danger that other countries may not share this objective and we're constantly campaigning for it. We don't want volunteer corps, for instance, to be used to pave the way for later commercial exploitation, for any propagandizing in behalf of a political or an economic philosophy, for any sort of colonialism. We're not worried about the small countries. The big countries could do some damage. We hope they won't.

"You can't imagine, after all, unless you've seen it yourself, how much the Communists are trying to discredit the Peace Corps, both the idea and the organization. They keep pounding away, by every means they can, on accusations that the Peace Corps is nothing more than an instrument of American imperialism, a band of spies, a tool of the CIA, a device for creating markets for American capitalism.

"So far, they may have succeeded in alerting the people in underdeveloped countries but they've been a dismal failure in turning any hostility toward us. But the Communists are afraid of the Peace Corps idea and they'll continue to do their best to destroy it."

Despite the insistence of the Washington wags that Goodwin's present job represents a fall from grace, Goodwin himself contends that being Secretary General of the International Peace Corps Secretariat is the most satisfying assignment he has had in government.

A staff member when Kennedy was Senator, an adviser and speech writer during the campaign, Goodwin began the administration as one of the President's top assistants in the White House. As a specialist in Latin America, he was one of the brains behind the establishment of the Alliance for Progress. As a troubleshooter, he traveled widely for the President, laying the groundwork for what Kennedy hoped—and still hopes—will be a great democratic revolution in Latin America.

Aggressive and ambitious, self-assured to the point of cockiness, Goodwin fits in well with the loose, freewheeling band with which the new President surrounded himself. But as the administration matured, the troubleshooter had to give way to the organization man who could devote himself to the tedious details that make programs operate. Goodwin left the White House to take a place in the State Department hierarchy, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. But he and the hierarchy were not meant for each other. When the post came along with the International Peace Corps Secretariat, with the chance to work both independently and creatively, Goodwin snapped at it. He does not consider it a fall from grace at all.

Slight of build but with a growing waistline, Goodwin has been variously described by Washington writers as an elf and a gnome. He dresses in the prescribed Ivy League fashion but usually is in desperate need of a haircut. His heavy accent, reminiscent of the President's inevitably betrays his Boston background. He went to Tufts and to Harvard Law School.

Goodwin insists he has, for the moment, no plans beyond turning his secretariat into a vital, creative mechanism for international social service. But, justifiably, he refers to

himself as a "young man" and he admits he is looking toward his future. Despite his apparent distance from the White House, frequent contact with the President, including a recent weekend in Hyannis Port, attest to continued esteem at the highest level. Despite the controversy that has surrounded him, many in Washington predict that Dick Goodwin will be heard from more, not less, in the coming years of the administration.

FBI's Civil Rights Duties Are Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is important in my view that there be full awareness and understanding with regard to the responsibilities and activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on civil rights matters.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the September 6, 1963, Suffolk (Va.) News Herald containing a timely discussion of the role of the FBI in this area which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress and the public:

FBI'S CIVIL RIGHTS DUTIES ARE DEFINED

Recent criticism has been directed toward the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its activities and responsibilities concerning civil rights matters. And the criticism has come from both quarters, from pro-integration and pro-segregation pressure groups.

The FBI is undoubtedly the best-run organization among countless Federal agencies. It has in the past been the subject of criticism. But it always comes out on top. This can only be because of its good management, its ability to remain immune from political influences and the fact that it has never exceeded its well-defined responsibilities.

And another point should be reiterated. The FBI pays its way, and then some. Last year recoveries of stolen property and fines assessed by courts which convicted defendants on evidence provided by the FBI exceeded that Bureau's budget. This same record is also found in prior years.

Roscoe Drummond, of the New York Herald-Tribune, well stated the FBI's role in civil rights and cleared the air of certain misunderstandings in this regard. That article was reprinted in the September issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. We consider it of such merit, that it is reprinted in its entirety below:

"Unless the role and record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in dealing with civil rights violations are widely understood, it is going to be unfairly caught in the middle of a hurtful controversy.

"Already extremists on both sides are inaccurately accusing the FBI either of willfully encroaching upon the sovereignty of State and local agencies or of willfully neglecting to do its duty under civil rights legislation.

"This kind of ill-considered uninformed criticism of the FBI will not do anybody any good. It can only do harm."

"It has already brought a strong rebuke from Director J. Edgar Hoover who, in the course of an article in the August issue of the Yale Political magazine, has written:

" 'There are highly vocal pressure groups who feel that the FBI should be obligated to step in wherever, in their opinion, a breakdown in law enforcement has occurred. When we have declined to exceed our jurisdiction in response to these demands, extremists among these elements have gone so far as to accuse the FBI of racism.

" 'Persons such as these are no less bigoted in their thinking than those who parade around in white sheets demanding that the FBI "Stop prying into State and local affairs" and counseling witnesses to civil rights violations, "Don't tell FBI agents anything." '"

"These words deserve to be pondered—and heeded.

"The first necessity is to understand the FBI's assigned responsibilities in the area of civil rights and the limits of its jurisdiction. Its responsibilities are defined in the acts of Congress, including the civil rights laws of 1957 and 1960. It has been given authority to investigate these eight categories of rights violations:

"1. Involuntary servitude and slavery.

"2. Any infringement on the right to vote for a candidate for Federal office.

"3. Conspiracies to deprive any citizen of the free exercise of any right secured to him by the Constitution or Federal law.

"4. The deprivation by persons acting under the color of law of any such rights.

"5. Willful obstruction of any Federal court order—such as an order requiring a public school to desegregate.

"6. Interstate flight to avoid prosecution for firing or bombing private, religious, or educational institutions, to avoid testimony.

"7. Interstate transportation of any explosive with knowledge that it will be used for the foregoing purpose.

"8. Use of any instrument of communication or commerce to threaten to damage private or public buildings.

"These assigned duties give the FBI a wide responsibility in the area of civil rights which it has and will carry out without apology to anybody. But it needs to be understood that the FBI is not a national police force; it is a Federal police force concerned only with the Federal law. It is not an enforcement agency; it is strictly an investigative agency. It cannot and should not exceed its jurisdiction. When no violation of Federal law has taken place, it can't step in merely because there has been a breakdown of State or local law enforcement.

"Civil rights cases are handled by special agents of the FBI who have completed advanced training courses which specifically qualify them to conduct such investigations.

"In recent years the FBI has taken the initiative to provide civil rights training to law enforcement agencies in all parts of the country; a total of 553 special civil rights schools were conducted for police officials.

"From my own observation, the FBI deserves the confidence of every responsible civil rights advocate."

Tito's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the people in my congressional district are indeed shocked at the invitation extended to the Communist tyrant, Tito, to visit our Nation.

The people of Serbian descent and also those of other nationalities whose mother countries are Communist captive nations are especially aroused at this recognition of a tyrant who has been guilty of mass murders and enslavement of citizens of their motherland.

I am submitting their justifiable protest to our State Department against the impending visit of this Communist leader to Washington.

I am hereby submitting telegrams which I have received from the Serbian organizations in Gary, Ind., regarding this unfortunate visit of Tito to our borders:

GARY, IND.,
September 24, 1963.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

The Serbian Sisters Circle of the Serbian Eastern Orthodox Church, St. Sava, of Gary, Ind., expresses its strong protest against the proposed visit to the White House of the godless individual "Tito" Josip Broz of Yugoslavia. It would be a horrible disgrace to the United States of America and its people to have such a Communist cross our borders who is a proven traitor of the people and a dictator over an enslaved nation. Billions of dollars have been sent to the aid of the Yugoslav nation. Tito released false reports that Communist Russia extended them this aid.

ROSE SEVER, *President.*
KOLO BESSIE MARIANOV,
Secretary.
SOPHIE ZORLJENAC,
Vice President.
KOKO SRPSKIH SESTARA,
Former displaced person.

GARY, IND.,
September 24, 1963.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman,
Washington, D.C.:

The St. Sava Serbian Orthodox Church of Gary, Ind., would like to express a strong protest to you regarding the proposed visit to the United States by such a godless individual as Tito, the murderer from Yugoslavia, whose political philosophy is totally contrary to ours in the United States. Please do not permit such an individual to visit our free country.

ST. SAVA CHURCH BOARD,
REV. PETER BANKEROVICH.
NICK SEVER, *President.*
SAVO VRTIKAPA, *Secretary.*

Parliamentary Meeting Useful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the members of the American delegation to the 52d Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union which met in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, recently, were delighted that two distinguished columnists attended the Conference—Mr. Roscoe Drummond and Mr. Paul Martin, both of whom are very well known to Members of Congress and to the people of the Nation.

In the press this morning was an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, written by him from Paris where he stopped after the Conference had adjourned in

Belgrade. The article is a fair appraisal of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the work of its members, especially the members of the American delegation. I agree with Mr. Drummond when he says "What is needed is for more of the informed and articulate Congressmen to realize what they are neglecting in shunning these Inter-Parliamentary conferences".

At a later date I will have more to say about the 52d Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. The article by Mr. Drummond is as follows:

PARLIAMENTARY MEETING USEFUL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PARIS.

U.S. Senators and Congressmen, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Because Congress has taken only a casual and peripheral interest in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, I venture a first-hand report on what your delegation saw and did at the conference in Belgrade.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union is, in a sense, a professional organization of politicians—in my book a most worthy profession. It brings together annually lawmakers from nearly all of its 68 member states from every continent.

Why is it useful that the U.S. Congress should be represented in this Union, the purpose of which is to exchange ideas and exchange friendships? These are the reasons:

1. It enables Congressmen to play a positive and personal role in foreign relations. The heads of state get to know each other. Ambassadors get to know each other. So should the world's elected lawmakers. The Parliamentary Union makes this possible. The Union passes no laws, but it creates a personal bond among the parliamentarians. Periodically it gives Congress its own representation abroad.

2. The annual conferences permit a full exchange of experiences on how parliaments function differently in different countries and how they can be made to function better. This enables our own Senators and Representatives to explain how the American system operates—and none can do it better.

3. U.S. objectives can often be furthered. At Belgrade Representative EMILIO DADDARIO, of Connecticut, won support for American views of laws governing outer space and U.S. aid policies. The progress which the United States is making in ending racial discrimination was impressively expounded.

4. An alert congressional delegation can counter Communist tactics. This year the Poles tucked in a last-minute resolution which, in the guise of praising the test ban, would have put the moral backing of the Inter-Parliamentary Union behind a series of steps which would further the interests of the Kremlin and disserve the interests of the West. The alertness of the U.S. Chairman, Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE of New York, with the assistance of Representatives E. ROSS ADAIR of Indiana and ALEXANDER PIRNIE of New York, enlisted all the backing neded for effective amendments.

My own conviction is that the Inter-Parliamentary Union made a grave mistake when it voted a few years ago to take in the Communist countries except Red China. Theirs are not parliamentary governments. Their "lawmakers" speak for their governments, not for their parliaments.

Ever since the Communist nations were invited to join, they have used the Inter-Parliamentary Union as a forum of the cold war. It was only a little less so this year because of the mellow glow of the test ban.

That doesn't mean we should withdraw. It would be foolish and fatal. It would be leaving the field to the adversary. What is needed is for more of the informed and articulate Congressmen to realize what they are neglecting in shunning these interparliamentary conferences.

It was evident that the U.S. delegation this year was exceptionally well prepared. Representative ST. GEORGE had excellent position papers prepared on all subjects and we were well represented in the debates.

Bulgarian Fight for Freedom, Independence, and Democracy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, September 23 was proclaimed Bulgarian National Day of the fight for freedom, independence, and democracy by the Bulgarian National Committee.

It commemorated the day in 1947 when Nikola Petkov was hanged because of his leadership of democratic opposition to the Communist regime in the Bulgarian Parliament.

Perhaps more than any other, that date signifies the final destruction of those few vestiges of freedom, independence, and democracy which remained in Bulgaria after its occupation by the troops of the Soviet Union.

Since that time the liberty-loving people of Bulgaria have suffered in their yoke of servitude to the masters of the Kremlin. Justice demands the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights to the people of Bulgaria and to the people of the other captive nations.

Today it appears that the United States and the Soviet Union are seeking new areas of cooperation and agreement. As long as these efforts do not compromise our national security or position of world leadership, they are to be encouraged.

At the same time, however, these agreements cannot be concluded in a vacuum. They must be tested against the willingness of the Soviet Union to live up to its pact agreements—especially those which deal with the fundamental freedoms and basic rights of the peoples of the captive nations.

It is my belief, therefore, that before our Nation makes further exploratory moves toward agreement with the Soviet Union, we should insist that the Soviets live up to their pledge—and I quote—"to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems and to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

In the past few years, political and economic forces have worked to ease the burden placed on Bulgaria and the other Eastern satellite states by the Soviet Union. But the change has been very slow and could be reversed at Russia's whim.

It is time for the Soviet Union to recall that it once affirmed—and I again quote—"the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live."

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that as reasonable people, we cannot make new agreements or find new areas of cooperation without demanding that the Soviet Union make good its promises with regard to the Eastern European nations and end the domination of their peoples.

As a first step in demonstrating to the world its good faith and good will, I suggest that Russia take immediate steps to withdraw its troops garrisoned in Eastern Europe, particularly those in Poland and Hungary.

This action, followed by others in the economic and political spheres, would be a true demonstration on the part of the Soviet Union that it desires peace and an end to cold war tensions.

As we mark the occasion of the fight for freedom, independence, and democracy of Bulgaria, let us reaffirm the right of all the captive peoples to live under governments of their own choice and urge the President of the United States to continue to pursue energetically those goals in any future negotiations with the leaders of the Soviet Union.

La Plata's New Town Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the town of La Plata in Charles County, Md., dates back to 1888, when it was incorporated. But not until last June did the town fathers have their own building in which to work, for during the first 75 years of the town's existence the affairs of municipality were conducted from first one rented office and then another.

Now, however, the town fathers have a proper setting in which to conduct their business. I have been in this building and it is, indeed, a fine structure of which all residents of the town of La Plata can be proud.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the September issue of the Maryland Municipal News which gives the history of La Plata's new town hall:

LA PLATA'S NEW TOWN HALL

(By Darrell L. Rudd)

Although the town of La Plata was incorporated as a municipality in 1888, the first town hall was just recently completed in June of 1963. During the approximately 75-year period between the incorporation of the town and the completion of the town hall all municipal business was conducted from a succession of rented offices. The last of these rented offices was located in what had formerly been the kitchen of an old restaurant. It is quite a pleasant change from the leaky old kitchen of a former

restaurant to the centrally air conditioned, Williamsburg inspired building which now houses town offices.

After it had been decided to immediately proceed with the construction of a town hall members of the town's governing board took a tour of Williamsburg, Va., to look at some of the restored colonial buildings in that city. This tour convinced the governing board that a building of colonial design could prove to be functional, yet be dignified and ageless in appearance. Since there were already several buildings of colonial design in immediate proximity to the new town hall, another colonial style structure would fit in very well with the general architectural flavor of the area. Perhaps the most impressive colonial style structure in the area, prior to the erection of the town hall, of course, is the Charles County Courthouse. Such structure was originally designed by the same architect commissioned to do the town hall, Mr. Frederick Tilp, AIA, of Washington, D.C.

The La Plata Town Hall is almost 100-percent masonry and steel construction. Only the trim, windows, and doors are of wood. The exterior bricks are of handmade Williamsburg design, the gutterspouting and roof drains are of leaded copper, the roof is covered with small concrete slabs shaped and colored to look like weathered cedar shakes, and the portico and foyer floors are covered with natural gray slate.

In keeping with the colonial design of the building the furniture and draperies furnished by Lucas Brothers of Baltimore are of traditional design. All desks and chairs are constructed of solid walnut with the chairs being upholstered in leather. Prior to purchasing wood furniture a number of inquiries were made as to the durability of wood furniture versus metal furniture. On the basis of the results of such study it was determined that for the chairs and desks, wood construction would be more durable than metal and such wooden furniture would retain a good appearance considerably longer than desks and chairs of metal construction. However, it was further determined that for file cabinets and storage cabinets metal construction would be the best. Therefore, all file cabinets and storage cabinets are constructed of metal with a walnut grain type finish.

The completed building contains a bit over 2,600 square feet of usable space. This includes a full daylight basement, a first floor, and an as yet unfinished, on the interior, second floor. All town offices, including the main business office, the mayor and council's meeting room, and the manager's office are located on the first floor. We now use approximately 900 square feet of the total usable space available. Therefore, it is anticipated that the approximately 1,700 square feet of usable space remaining will provide enough space for any necessary expansion over the next several years.

The system of air distribution for the heating and central air-conditioning system is somewhat unique. The entire space between the ceiling of the first story and the floor of the second story serves as the air distribution duct system. The cold and hot air outlets for the first floor are numerous tiny slits evenly distributed throughout a special type acoustical ceiling tile. Such a system provides for a much more even distribution of heated and cooled air throughout the room than is possible with one or even several conventional air discharge vents in the room.

La Plata's first townhall cost approximately $44,000 to build, or approximately $16 per square foot of usable space. The contractor, Mr. Frank Gilroy of La Plata, was able to carry through the architect's plans to perfection at a reasonable cost. The end result is a building of which the town of La Plata can be justifiably proud.

Articles by Art Hoppe Read With Interest in Various Parts of the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I have received letters from various parts of the country expressing interest in the columns written by Art Hoppe which appear regularly in the San Francisco Chronicle and about once a week in the Evening Star.

It is my thought that the two following articles will be received with equal enthusiasm as those in the past:

WILL PIERRE PLAY BALL?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

I see the recreation department in Washington has yielded to pressure. And it has at last appointed three commissioners to supervise the new Federal Touch Football League, which plays Saturday afternoons on the lawn just south of the White House. All of us, I'm sure, hope these men of high repute can clean up this scandal-ridden sport.

Now a few naive fans may refuse to believe that touch football in Washington is scandal-ridden. But if not, I ask, why appoint a commission to crack down on what has heretofore been a suspiciously loose-run athletic endeavor?

Oh, I know the lovely picture the New Frontier has presented of ladies and gentlemen playing two-handed touch on the grass these autumn afternoons. But now we millions of sport fans are demanding to know: What's been going on behind the scene?

(Behind the scene: Pierre (the immovable) S., who is known admiringly to his fellow teammates in the White House as "Cosa Nostra," is sitting immovably behind his desk. A secret panel in the wall opens and Bobby (Snakehips) K., star scatback of the Justice Department Rams, slips surreptitiously in.)

PIERRE (immovably). Excuse me for not getting up, but I'm in training. Got to stay in shape, you know.

BOBBY. That is a shape. But Pierre, boy, what I came to talk about was tomorrow's crucial between the White House Wildcats and us Rams. Frankly, our squad looks lousy this year. Ethel keeps trying to produce her own team. Whizzer White can't cut to his left in his new black robe. And J. Edgar won't talk to any of his teammates to the left of the center. So tomorrow the White House Wildcats are going to clobber us. Unless——

PIERRE (suspiciously). Unless what?

BOBBY. Well, Pierre boy, there's a lot of dough riding on this game. The Mafia's down for 10 gees. The Syndicate's anted up 20. And the Clan's down for 100. Now a smart boy like you could pick yourself up a nice hunk of change by making sure the score goes our way.

PIERRE (aghast). I will never sell my loyalty for crass money. Go and never darken my door again.

BOBBY. Okay. But first you might want to see this secret FBI report before I make it public. It solves the 2-year-old mystery of what really happened to Caroline's hamsters. And in what river.

PIERRE (blanching). You win. Tomorrow afternoon, when our White House Wildcats take to the field, I will do what I have never done before in order to insure your victory. I'll play.

Well, you may find that unbelievable. But the only other explanation is that our leaders can't go out and toss a football around without creating a new Federal organization and appointing a new bunch of Federal commissioners in order to establish a whole mess of new Federal rules and regulations. And who'd believe that?

OUR COUP DOESN'T RUNNETH OVER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Mr. Kennedy's so mad at the mess in South Vietnam that he's going to take vigorous retaliatory measures. As soon as he can think of some.

Meanwhile, of course, we're going to go on giving our good friend, President Ngo Dinh Diem, $1.5 million a day. Because everybody says there's nothing else we can do.

Nonsense. I say we should do what we did in neighboring West Vhtnnng, which is the name of a country I made up once.

It was in the 33d year of President Ngo Mahn Ngo's lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Viet Narians and make his nation safe for corruption. We considered him our stanch ally. Mainly because we'd put him in power and given him a total of $3.3 billion. But he was getting kind of an overripe image. So we sent our ambassador, Mr. H. Lowell Cod, to deal with him firmly.

"Look here, my man," says Mr. Cod, "you must fire your brother and sack your sister-in-law. Your government reeks of nepotism and if there's one thing we Americans cannot abide, it is nepotism."

"My regards to your Attorney General," says Mr. Ngo (last names come first in Vhtnnng), smiling scrutably. "And also to the junior Senator from Massachusetts."

"And another thing, fellow," says Mr. Cod, "you'll have to stop picking on those Buddhists. We cannot tolerate repressive regimes anywhere in the free world."

"And how is Governor Wallace?" inquires Mr. Ngo politely. "Such an able administrator. For an American."

"Enough," says Mr. Cod, putting on a poker face. "We are canceling all foreign aid to you effective a week from next Tuesday."

"Oh?" says Mr. Ngo. "Are you soft on communism?"

"All right, then," says Mr. Cod angrily. "You asked for it. Our masterful CIA agents will stir up the Loyal Royal Army, which will make a frenzied banzai attack on your palace and overthrow your rotten regime."

"Are you kidding?" says Mr. Ngo. "You know the Loyal Royal Army can't stand the sight of blood. No, Mr. Cod, you must realize that I am a fiercely independent leader who would never give away his country."

"Okay," says Mr. Cod with a weary sigh. "You win. How much do you want for it?"

So we bought West Vhtnnng. True, it cost us $2.3 billion. But nobody ever said it was a free country. Mr. Ngo kindly let us have it on an E-Z payment plan and even threw in four new tires and a three-tone horn.

Not only did this prove far cheaper in the long run, but we wound up with something to show for our foreign-aid dollars: a whole country. Even Congressman OTTO PASSMAN was pleased.

Once Vhtnnng was a U.S. possession the Vhtnnngians quickly became Americanized. The rich complained about high taxes, the poor went on relief, and the Loyal Royal Army got to die for America. Which every soldier agreed was much more glorious than dying for a lousy little country like West Vhtnnng. If you liked dying.

Moral: If you can't buy a friend, buy a country. At least a country will stay bought.

The Crusaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith two articles—one from the Washington Post of Monday, September 23, and the second from the Washington Post, September 25.

Both of these articles are written by Joseph Alsop who is on the spot in Saigon.

The United States is now in the process of making up its mind whether it intends to stay in Vietnam and also whether or not it intends to face up to the facts or perhaps let Vietnam go the road of Communist China and Fidel Castro's Cuba. Mr. Alsop, in these articles, has been trying to bring some sense into our policy. He is basing that on past experience where the so-called crusaders have tried to make a decision based on emotion rather than the clear facts and the security with which this country is faced.

Right after World War II when we assumed the responsibility that the British had previously maintained in Greece, we did not agree with the Government then in power in Greece. We did not believe it was democratic but we believed that we could get along with that Government until the Communists were eliminated from Greece. Gradually after Greece had been made safe from the Communists' threat, we used all of our diplomacy to assure that Greece would have a democratic government. In that we succeeded. Today Greece has a relatively democratic government that is stable and secure.

When we were facing a desperate war with the Communists in Korea, we certainly did not agree with everything that Syngman Rhee was doing. The same group of so-called crusaders were attempting to cause the same kind of trouble in Korea and Greece that they are trying to cause today in Vietnam.

No reasonable American agrees with everything that is taking place in Vietnam but the overriding issue in Vietnam today is to repel communism. If Vietnam falls, it is very likely that all of southeast Asia will go down the drain. There will be no security in the new Malaysian State, Burma, Thailand, Laos, and the Philippines.

As Joseph Alsop has so well pointed out, our job here is to win. After the victory we will have plenty of time and occasion to insure a democratic government in Vietnam. If we fail to achieve a victory, there will never be a chance for democracy in Vietnam. It will become just another Communist satellite. If we fail and the crusaders which Mr. Alsop mentions in his article prevail, Vietnam will become another China or another Cuba, Fidel Castro style.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1963]

THE CRUSADERS

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—The time was in the year 1944, a couple of months after the U.S. Government first sent observers to the Chinese Communist capital at Yenan.

The occasion, which is now worth recalling, was a dinner at the Chungking press hostel for the first U.S. observer to return with on-the-spot news of the high-minded "agrarian democrat," Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Around the table the nice, virtuous American faces positively shone with innocence and happy belief.

The report from Yenan bristled with all the old familiar phrases. The Chinese Communists "wanted to be on our side, if we would only let them." They alone were "fighting the Japanese."

The atmosphere, the morale, the speckless purity and disinterestedness of Yenan were "like a wonderful cocktail after the fetid corruption of Chiang Kai-shek's government." Mao Tse-tung, "a great man and above all a humane man," would remake China in a new, more perfect image. So it went. For a cynic, listening to this discourse and watching the shining-eyed response to it, it was like taking a bath in a particularly sickening sort of goo.

There were a few American reporters in China, like the wise Arch Steel, who always kept their heads despite the intoxicating crusading atmosphere of the wartime press hostel. Yet the crusaders dominated and, one must add, sometimes seriously warped the news. And then, when the crusade was over, and they were older and wiser men, they were all very sorry about it—except for two press hostel inhabitants, Izzie and Elsie Epstein, who revealed their role as Communist agents by retreating to Peiping, where they still nauseatingly hold forth.

This is not the only case in point, either. One need only recall much of the reporting from Cuba up to and including the triumph of Fidel Castro. Batista, no doubt, was every bit as bad as everyone said he was. But standing out from that episode in American newspaper history was the display of political acumen by that far-seeing progressive, Herbert Matthews of the New York Times.

It is high time to recall these episodes of the past, which were not without their influence on the course of events; for a good many of the newspapermen in Saigon have been carrying on another of these egregious crusades for a number of years.

Unlike China, there is no Communist influence or sympathy here; and there is no one quite like Herbert Matthews either. But the general order of priorities was indicated the other day by one of the leading young crusaders, who announced that many weeks of passion-charged antigovernment stories, mingled with descriptions of the poor morale of the Vietnamese forces, he was going to pay another visit to the fighting front. "After all," he said, "there's another enemy to think about, up in North Vietnam."

Most of what the crusaders have written has been true, or part-true—although this reporter has run into at least one province-team of U.S. officers who were deeply indignant, because they had been described as thinking the Vietnamese soldiers of their province were not putting up a good fight when they all thought the precise opposite.

But it is easy enough to paint a dark, indignant picture, without departing from the facts, if you ignore the majority of Americans who admire the Vietnamese as fighters and seek out the one U.S. officer in 10 who inevitably thinks all foreigners fight badly. (The reduction of the percentage to 1 in 10 marks great military progress in large-mindedness.) The same method used to report the doings of the Diem government has naturally been even more effective, since a great many of these doing have been remarkably misguided, to use the mildest possible word.

In some measure, it must be added, the crusaders have contributed to the Diem government's misguidedness. The Government has asked for it, since its press relations have always been idiotic. But the constant pressure of the reportorial crusade against the government has also helped mightily to transform Diem from a courageous, quite viable national leader, into a man afflicted with galloping persecution mania, seeing plots around every corner, and therefore misjudging everything.

It is not only high time to make the foregoing points. It is also high time to ask whether American crusades to reform foreign governments really are a good idea at any time. Was Chiang, with all his defects, so much worse for the Chinese people and, above all, for the American people than Mao Tse-tung? Has Cuba gained and, above all, have we in the United States gained by the Batista-Castro exchange? What are we in Vietnam for anyway?

Surely we are here only to win the war. And the most annoying feature of the whole situation is that we actually were winning the war this spring, until the Diem government went right around the bend with considerable help from the high-minded crusaders.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1963]

THE WAR CAN BE WON

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—The Communists are trying to capitalize on the bitter backwash of the Buddhist crisis by another round of grenade-tossing in this grenade-accustomed city. The American administration, apparently not content to rely on an exceedingly able Ambassador, has sent a second investigative mission to Vietnam on the very heels of a lower level, just departed mission.

On the surface, in short, both the local situation and the American response to it leave few grounds for encouragement. For the short run, moreover, pollyannaism about the crucially important position here in South Vietnam is sadly out of place.

The resentment toward the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, which has been so long, so often, and so profusely reported by the local anti-Diem crusaders was largely a fiction until quite recently. Local politicians out of a job, many of them former French collaborators, blathering about "Vietnamese democracy," provided the main evidence for this famous resentment until just the other day.

Now, however, the Buddhist crisis has had the political effect of a broken mainspring. One result of the crisis has been to cause President Diem himself to lose all sureness of touch. The other and more important result has been to make all those reports of resentment come true at last. There is real bitterness toward the regime now, and the combination of this bitterness with the singular state of affairs in Gia Long Palace certainly raises grave questions about the viability of the Diem regime.

There is no cause, however, for the kind of panic to which Washington seems to have succumbed. On any practical calculation, President Diem will either take the needed steps to make his Government viable again, or strong internal forces will eventually take stepe to secure a new government, which will be viable. The odds are very heavy that these are the real alternatives.

On this calculation, patience and calm are the prescriptions for Washington. It

is hard to imagine a more ridiculous spectacle than the government of the United States of America reacting like a bee-stung adolescent to the egomaniacal maunderings of Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu. Surely it ought to be possible to ignore Mrs. Nhu—which she will greatly dislike.

The spectacle is rendered alarming as well as ridiculous by Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, with his resolution designed to undermine the U.S. effort here, and his attendance chorus of experts on guerrilla wars who have never seen a guerrilla war, but still speak ex cathedra about the impossibility of victory. This is a war which must be won, and experience teaches that it can be won.

Today, if you go out and have a look at operations in the countryside, the area that matters most, this war is still going remarkably well. Later, if the Government is not somehow rendered more viable, the feeling in the big cities will spill over into the villages; and then the war will not go well. But this has not happened as yet.

It is a pretty moving experience, moreover, to go out into the provinces and see what is happening. To begin with the American officers and men who are daily fighting this war, shoulder to shoulder with the Vietnamese, are a rather special breed who make you proud of your country. A great many of them are men to whom that normally awful adjective, "dedicated," can be applied with accuracy. See them in action, and you find yourself recalling that line of Kipling's, "Ye little know of England who only England know"; for they are somewhat unexpected products of the soft affluent society.

Furthermore, these Americans who daily fight the war do not wail that the war cannot be won, or say that the Vietnamese people will not fight for their own freedom and independence. In fact, they say the precise opposite.

The proof of their good judgment is there, in the open, for anyone to see, moreover. It is there in the villages, whose humble, courageous, hard-working people matter so much than anyone else in Vietnam. The central fact in the whole situation here is the simple fact that under the strategic hamlet program, the villagers have been given very modest arms to defend themselves against Communist terrorism; and they have used those arms to defend themselves, often against repeated attacks and heavy odds.

If the people in the villages did not wish to defend themselves, or were ready to turn their new arms against the Government forces—as some feared when the hamlet program was launched—this would indeed be a war impossible to win. But the great test was made. The big gamble was taken. And despite variations in the quality of the strategic hamlets from province to province, there is no doubt that the gamble has paid off.

This spring, therefore, this war was being won. It can still be won. And those who wish to lay down the burden the United States has assumed here, simply because we are going through a political bad patch, are merely serving the interests of that great humanitarian and democrat, Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

Labor Beware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it ought to be brought to the attention of the American people that the administration's civil rights bill contains a provision that can dynamite the labor movement.

I am referring to title VI and title VII of H.R. 7152 and S. 1731. These titles would set up a Commission "to prevent discrimination against employees or applicants for employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin by Government contractors and subcontractors, and by contractors and subcontractors participating in programs or activities in which direct or indirect financial assistance by the U.S. Government is provided by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise." These titles grant the power to cancel contracts, to blacklist, to withhold or foreclose Government-insured loans and to enforce a myriad of other penalties.

If the Government is granted this sweeping authority, the effect upon the union movement will be profound. Indeed, it most assuredly will alter the organic structure of American trade unionism in every State in the Nation.

Many unions, notably those in the construction industry, building trades, highly skilled crafts, and the railroad brotherhoods, maintain racially segregated locals as a matter of choice and the significance of this proposal is readily apparent to them. But I would raise a flag of caution against complacency among union members as it applies to those unions which already are integrated. Integration, under the Civil Rights Act of 1963 will no longer be enough. The word, today, is "balance." Unless there is an arithmetically balanced racial and religious mix, under this bill, even integrated unions that heretofore have prided themselves on their tolerance would be in violation of this statute as certainly as all-white unions. For, under this bill, every local must attain racial and religious balance at all levels and in all categories, and if this means seniority rules would have to be ignored to obtain the proper mix, then they would have to be ignored. Needless to say, everything that applies to unions applies equally to their apprenticeship training programs.

To be sure, title VII does not specify "racial or religious imbalance" as it applies to labor unions but the term is used significantly in other parts of the bill; eight times in one short section of it, as a matter of fact—"imbalance" is the heart of the bill.

That "imbalance" and "discrimination" are synonomous, so far as this bill is concerned, may be determined by reading a few pages of the Commission on Civil Rights Employment Report—"Employment, Part 3, 1961, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report," pages 25–37—and upon examining the conclusions drawn from statistics on the ratio of Negro employment to white employment. The evidence is clear. So far as the people who would administer the proposed bill are concerned, "racial imbalance" constitutes conclusive evidence of discrimination and title VII says there shall be no discrimination. Therefore, there must be racial balance within a local else, ipso facto, that local is guilty of discrimination.

Under this bill, then, it will not be enough to hire qualified union members as they present themselves, in order, one-by-one, at the hiring hall. If the local finds it cannot balance—racially and religiously—the skilled craftsmen needed, the hiring hall must actively recruit—go out and get—such craftsmen as "balance" may demand, even though paid-up union members of another race sit without work. Such is the sense of this section.

This applies to all labor, equally, to carpenters, to pipe-fitters, to plasterers, to painters, to roofers, to truck drivers—wherever and however a union man works for a living.

Under this act, Mr. Speaker, it seems clear, then, the union movement's time-honored system of seniority will be destroyed.

For those who think this is an extreme or unfair interpretation of what title VII would require, let me read to you just how broad is the authority given by the bill:

> The Commission shall have such powers to effectuate the purpose of this title as may be conferred upon it by the President.

Such authority, Mr. Speaker, is total authority.

That such a constriction of personal liberty is unconstitutional seems to be self-evident, especially in light of the famed sick chicken case—*U.S.* v. *Schecter Poultry Corp.*, 295 U.S. 495—and the Panama refining case—*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan*, 293 U.S. 388.

But in today's emotionally charged atmosphere, a person can never be sure. What the court held to be unconstitutional, yesterday, may no longer hold. And that is the primary reason why I would call attention to the significance of this bill to those who are most closely allied with the union movement. Under it the seniority system would be destroyed.

A Political Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of John A. Gronouski, of Wisconsin, to be Postmaster General of the United States was confirmed yesterday by the Senate. This appointment by the President to his cabinet has raised in certain quarters, the cry of "politics." It was a partisan cry, of course, and has been properly rebutted by the President. But the question has been humorously reviewed by the outstanding columnist of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Charles McDowell, and I think his treatment of the subject proves again that such charges are often best laughed to death. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Mr. McDowell's column in the RECORD:

A POLITICAL APPOINTMENT?

(By Charles McDowell)

John A. Gronouski, chosen by President Kennedy to be his new Postmaster General, has a Ph. D. in economics and has been commissioner of taxation in Wisconsin, but he has never been a postman.

Not only does he lack professional postal experience but there is evidence that he is not even a good letter mailer. His own wife testifies that he carries her letters around in his pocket for days at a time, forgetting to mail them.

Cynics, Republican and journalistic, have implied that Mr. Gronouski's appointment pays off an old debt. He was an important supporter of Mr. Kennedy in the crucial Wisconsin primary in 1960. The cynics have suggested, too, that Mr. Gronouski's presence in the administration is calculated to have a cheerful effect on a large bloc of Polish-American voters in the 1964 presidential election.

The country has been told, in short, that the appointment was politically inspired. This is a truly remarkable charge to make about the selection of a Postmaster General.

Politics. It takes a citizen's breath away.

When we got our breath back, we set about refreshing our memory of some of the distinguished postal administrators among Mr. Gronouski's predecessors.

Almost everyone remembers Arthur Summerfield, who was appointed by President Eisenhower. He qualified for the job by his experience as an automobile dealer in Michigan, and high position was not denied to him just because he swung the Michigan delegation to Eisenhower in the great convention battle with Senator Taft.

We remember seeing Mr. Summerfield at that convention in 1952 and recognizing in him the potential for a great Postmaster General. The way he waited until the last, critical moment to commit his delegation to Eisenhower marked him as an efficient administrator. He served two terms and painted the mail trucks red, white, and blue.

James A. Farley, of course, was the best known Democratic Postmaster General of recent times. He came to the job from the building supply business and the chairmanship of the New York State Athletic Commission. He was floor manager of Franklin D. Roosevelt's convention campaign in 1932, a popular and skillful national chairman of the party, and always a good letter writer and a better-than-average letter mailer.

Mr. Farley was succeeded as Postmaster General by Frank C. Walker, a lawyer and theater executive who had been treasurer of the Democratic National Committee under Farley, and had demonstrated his vision as early as 1928 by contributing heavily to Mr. Roosevelt's campaign fund.

President Truman's first Postmaster General was Robert E. Hannegan, who managed F.D.R.'s fourth-term campaign and was considered more responsible than any other individual for getting Mr. Truman on the ticket.

Mr. Truman having the reputation of a very partisan politician, it is interesting to note that his second Postmaster General was a man named Jesse M. Donaldson. He was a career man in the Post Office—one of the few ever to head the Department. As the cynics will tell you, a partisan politician will stop at nothing when it comes to appointing a Postmaster General.

President Hoover's Postmaster General was Walter F. Brown, a graduate of Harvard, a former reporter for the Toledo Blade, commodore of the Toledo Yacht Club, and a gentleman who had shown his sound judgment many years earlier by campaigning for William McKinley. When the Hoover administration needed a Postmaster General, nobody struck Mr. Brown's name from the list merely because he was one of the three or four men who had done the most to get the Republican nomination for Mr. Hoover.

The Post Office Department did a good business under Mr. Brown and he also lent it quite a lot of style. In 1932, when a depression-ridden Congress was inquiring into the purchase of a new $3,500 car for the Post Office Department, Mr. Brown declared gravely that the roof of the old car was too low to accommodate his silk hat.

We are told that the new man, Mr. Gronouski, sometimes doesn't even wear a hat, which just goes to show you how the dignity of the office has been allowed to decline.

Argentine University Honors Stockton, Calif., Resident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, in November of this year, in Buenos Aires, Argentina, Ward College will celebrate its 50th anniversary and will simultaneously inaugurate four new buildings on its campus. They will consist of a chapel, library, laboratory, and auditorium. The complex will be known as Aden Center.

This will be in direct homage to Dr. Fred Aden, an American educator who for 35 years was its president.

Dr. and Mrs. Aden, now residents of Stockton, Calif., in the 15th Congressional District, have been invited as guests of the college to be present at the ceremony. They are planning to attend.

Ward College is an interdenominational institution founded in 1913 by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Church. The college is modeled after a typical American campus and American principles and standards are employed in the education of Argentine youth, as well as the many foreign students enrolled.

When Dr. Aden, with his wife, left California in 1917 to take a position as business manager at Ward College, the school was barely 4 years old and the students numbered under 50. In 1921 he was made president of the institution, a post he held until his retirement in 1955. Due to his vision, faith, and dedicated labors, Ward College is now housed in modern buildings located on a beautiful 30-acre campus, with a student body numbering well over 2,000.

Dr. Aden is listed in the "Who's Who" of Argentina; he is a past master of the Columbia Lodge of Masons in Buenos Aires, and is a founding member of the Argentine North American University Association.

Among honors held by Dr. Aden are: an honorary doctorate in pedagogy awarded by USC in 1931; and an LL.D. conferred by Occidental College of Los Angeles in 1946. His most coveted award is the "American Award for 1954" which was presented to him at the Rio de Janeiro Inter-American Press Association meeting for his outstanding contribution to better understanding among all nations of the Americas.

It has been said that Mr. Aden not only has helped to educate youth but also to stimulate closer Argentine and American friendship. When he left his post in Argentina, tributes were paid to the educator by hundreds of Americans and thousands of Argentines.

A native of Nebraska, Dr. Aden graduated from the University of Southern California where he met his future wife, Meda, a most essential partner in his interesting career. They have five children who were all born and reared in Buenos Aires.

Notwithstanding their deep affection for Argentina and Ward College, Dr. and Mrs. Aden have always considered California as their home.

Farm Labor Facts—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, during the 1963 harvest season in California a herculean effort was made to exhaust every agriculture labor source in the State. More youth were encouraged to participate in the harvest than ever before and better than 10,000 young people participated earning better than $2 million. The demand for an ancillary labor source, however, persists.

As further evidence of California's efforts to help herself to solve the State's farm labor problem, I submit an editorial contained in the California Department of Employment annual bulletin by Margot Lenhart respecting youth recruitment efforts.

I insert following this editorial one of the standard farm labor department of employment advertising circulars which are published statewide.

The material follows:

YOUTH FARMWORK PROGRAMS GAIN MOMENTUM

(By Margot Wakeman Lenhart, Farm Placement Supervisor, California Department of Employment)

California's pilot programs to put more youthpower into agriculture rolled ahead during 1962 when 7,500 young workers were placed in 10,700 jobs and earned about $750,000. They were employed on 42 different crops as well as on livestock and nursery farms.

Sixty-nine employment offices—three times the number in 1961—participated in the pilot youth programs, and their mounting success was shared with 786 farm employers, 150 schools and colleges, 45 local organizations and agencies, hundreds of parents, and other interested helpers.

The overall advancement was accompanied by local cries of triumph along with some wails of frustration and occasional defeat. Experienced staff assigned to spearhead projects realized more and more how many contingencies affected the outcome. A preseason buildup of enthusiasm and preparedness among youth, schools, and parents was imperative. Advance selling of unseasoned

workers to farmers must succeed to set up job opportunities. Either effort might fail. Both might succeed, and the crop might fail. The program and the crop might be all ready to go when, suddenly, an unexpected supply of experienced adult labor might appear and the whole project would be derailed.

But such contingencies contributed to the challenge of youth farm placement. Instead of the program's being derailed by a shutoff in need, it was more likely that the young crew would get its first chance when an emergency occurred—as when a grower found brown rot in his peaches and the fruit had to be picked at once, or when a farmer's snap beans were ready and the harvest machine broke down. These employers may not have responded to preseason promotion for youth job offers, but they remembered in the pinch and the local youth "machine" was in gear to go.

Building youthpower into a farm machine and getting it in gear to go called for creative and dogged efforts. To teenagers in general, work on the farm lacked the status of other work, as in a service station or store. To illustrate this attitude—a farm placement representative talked up vacation farm jobs before a high school assembly and passed out signup sheets. Only a handful of students responded. Later, several came individually to the farm labor office to apply. The poor group response was due to students' not wanting to let their companions know that they would do farmwork. But when school opened in the fall, the principal of one school conducted a survey, by unsigned questionnaire, and discovered that out of nearly a thousand students who reported summer employment, 40 percent had done farmwork and made good money at it.

In 1962, several local innovations were tried to improve the status and popularity of farmwork. A local TV sports personality, already a teenage idol, appeared on the air to plug the youth farmwork program; this stepped up applicant registrations. Several youth program attained status through sponsorship by local service clubs. Members gave preseason assistance in soliciting employer orders and, during the work, took turns visiting the field or orchard to express an interest in the project and to ask individual workers how they were doing.

One program with status started as an inspiration at county fair time. A youth farm placement booth was set up and a popular demand was created for young people to groom and feed horses and other livestock at the fair. This work was fun, of course, and led to a new service for teenagers to care for horses and other pets of vacationing suburbanites during the rest of the summer. It also paved the way to other farm job acceptance by young people.

In some programs the farmer himself provided the spark which made young workers stand in line for a chance to become his employees. The job became popular because of his own appeal and liking for youngsters, and his fairness and understanding of their needs, tendencies, and capabilities.

Some farm labor office speakers at high school assemblies quickened curiosity and interest in farmwork by emphasizing the hot, dirty labor, aching muscles, low earnings at the start, and then cautiously undersold the advantages in outdoor physical labor and high total earnings by good workers who stuck with it. Instead of soliciting signups at the time, the speaker handed out job descriptions and suggested that the students take them home for study. Then if they thought they could qualify, they should come to the farm labor office for interview and possible selection. The speaker left the students with a challenge to compete for a tough job on the basis of their own fitness and stamina. This was often effective in drawing out the best and most reliable workers, who stayed on the job longest and came out best financially.

One youth program specialist—long a youth leader—built a strong and stable program by requiring each youth applicant to bring a parent to the selection interview. In some instances, the interview was conducted in the evening at the student's home. This dedicated youth recruiter stressed the personal values of farmwork as a maturing experience in learning and developing ability and responsibility. His personal approach successfully impressed both the prospective worker and the parent and, in eagerness to have his child selected, the parent often volunteered to provide some of the transportation.

Although efforts to upgrade the status and popularity of farmwork were pertinent to recruitment, after selection the young people were not to be pampered. Preseason orientation and preparation for the work were serious and impressive phases of the program.

The youth farm placement specialist usually arranged several preseason meetings between the prospective workers and persons who often were hired as field supervisors—agricultural teachers, leaders in Future Farmer, 4-H, and similar youth clubs. There were other meetings with representatives of agencies concerned with farm safety, industrial welfare, school and child labor law enforcement, and the Agricultural Extension Service. Representatives of the local farm bureau, commodity group, labor association, or other farm organizations, as well as the chamber of commerce, service clubs, and other civic groups, attended meetings, gave recognition to the program, and were often instrumental in promoting youth job offers by farmer members and friends.

The prospective employers, along with the agricultural teachers and extension service specialists, attended sessions to provide information about the work and preliminary training on how to select, pick, or otherwise handle the fruit, vegetables, or other farm products. Sometimes slides or movies of the work were presented. Workers were shown how to move, set, and work safely from a ladder; how to develop skill in the task; and how to conserve physical effort in lifting.

General information included the requirements for social security numbers, work permits, and written permission from parents. Discussions covered responsibilities for good behavior, careful following of instructions from supervisor or foreman, and respect for the employer, his tools, and property. Suggestions referred to carrying lunches, and what to wear for comfort and protection from sun and other environmental conditions. Transportation arrangements were developed; the most popular were car pools among the workers themselves, or with parents taking turns in the use of their vehicles to transport crews to and from work.

Preseason meetings, sponsored by the farm bureau, were sometimes arranged specifically to introduce prospective employers and workers. Their acquaintance in advance of the summer season often led to Saturday odd-job offers which gave the students a chance to sample farmwork, build up their muscles, and earn some extra money. These preseason relationships tended to facilitate employment during the rush of the summer harvests. Because of the advance experience, some students were assigned as timekeepers, checkers, and even supervisors during the harvest.

Each youth farmwork program does not call for all the motivation, preparation, and participation discussed here. Rather, this is a composite of conspicuous elements which seemed to provide the 1962 thrust in California's use of youthpower in agriculture. Farm labor offices in the State already indicate that they foresee how such elements can be compounded more effectively and more extensively in conducting their planned 1963 programs.

FARMERS—DO YOURSELF A GOOD TURN, DO A YOUNGSTER A GOOD TURN: HIRE A YOUNG PERSON, ON SUMMER VACATION, FOR SEASONAL SUMMER WORK

You'll get value received for the wages you pay, plus the satisfaction of helping to instill good work habits in tomorrow's citizens, giving the opportunity for healthful, outdoor work, and perhaps contributing to future education.

Call us for information about this program. We can also help with your regular labor needs for farm couples or single men who are trained and qualified to do the job as you want it done.

We offer:

Statewide facilities.

Farm trained placement personnel.

Resources and know-how.

Adequate labor pool and there is no charge for this service.

So contact California Department of Employment, Farm Labor Office, Oxnard, Calif.

More Kennedy Thunderbolts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "More Kennedy Thunderbolts," which appeared in the Tulsa World, September 19, 1963.

MORE KENNEDY THUNDERBOLTS

The Kennedy administration has struck again. The States must conform to Washington's ideas, or else.

This time the "or else" is more dangerous than ever.

Defense Secretary McNamara has decreed that military units may not take part in any event where there is segregated seating in the audience.

No integration, no military participation. It's as simple as that. No Army band, no Air Force or Navy precision fliers, no Military Academy football team. Unless the audience is seated according to Federal specifications, the Defense Department declares a boycott.

One wonders ironically if federalized troops may now be allowed on a college campus where segregation is practiced.

Let us make one point very clear: The issue here is not whether segregation is right or wrong. The issue is the use of Federal power—brute power that has grown so great it can crush all resistance economically, politically, or militarily.

We have all seen President Kennedy—the great god Zeus armed with thunderbolts—hurling the power of his office at the steel industry and driving it to its knees.

We have witnessed the dispatching of U.S. marshals to impose the Federal will on State college campuses.

And now we see the Nation's Armed Force turned into a political arm of the executive branch—segregating, if you will, the taxpayers who are held to be entitled to its cooperation.

Will southern States now be justified in complaining that they are being treated like second class citizens because they can never listen to the Marine Corps Band?

President Kennedy is a resourceful man; no one can deny that. He has found more

power in the White House than any President before him. And he dares to use it as Americans have never dreamed a President would.

If the military is detached from the South over the integration issue, can the Federal Government not deny water from Federal conservation projects to farmers who vote "wrong" in a wheat referendum?

Will mail service be withdrawn from communities that refuse to accept new postoffices? Could Washington cancel Social Security payments to persons in States that failed to follow Federal welfare rules?

Farfetched ideas? Perhaps—but no more so than the concept of allowing military participation only at events with seating arrangements approved by Washington.

The Federal muscle has grown until it is a bulging, fearsome thing—so powerful that it calls for the most judicious restraint by the President. Instead, the Kennedy administration has become more imaginative and more ruthless in its striking power. The Nation's danger grows every day.

Bible Reading in Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and enlightening article relative to the question of Bible reading and prayers in public schools, written by Mr. Nic Spallas and appearing in the issue of the Greek Star, a newspaper published in Chicago, Ill., under date of Saturday, August 3, 1963:

BIBLE READING IN SCHOOLS

It was not my intent to become embroiled in the religious question as was perpetrated by the recent Supreme Court decision concerning the Bible reading and prayers in public schools.

However, in the realm of recent events and statements, I am compelled to offer my personal opinion and observations. More so since the issue has received wide circulation and speculation through your fine newspaper, the Greek Star.

Due to the fact that many of your good subscribers are liable to become influenced by the interpretations that have been presented through your column by Mr. Demetrious Parry. I am taking the privilege with your kind consent, to take issue with Mr. Parry, and his position in the true spirit of open discussion and debate.

First of all, it should be known that I am no lawyer. I have been active politically, and am a legislative representative in Washington at the present time. I realize that the issue and the intent of the signers of the Constitution has been twisted beyond recognition. Nevertheless, I am cognizant of the fact that we should attempt to keep the record straight.

It is quite apparent from Mr. Parry's letter that while he criticizes the Very Rev. Eusebius A. Stephanou for his lack of knowledge of the intent of the Constitution of the United States, that his criticism should have included himself, and I am suggesting he brush up on the law.

Mr. Parry states "The Constitution prohibits the church and the state to mix. It specifically states that the church as an entity shall not participate in any matters which the state has jurisdiction and control."

The fact of the matter, the Constitution states no such thing. It merely states that the state shall not create a church. In other words there would be complete religious freedom in this country, and the State in no way would be empowered to enforce a religion upon the citizens.

It is interesting to note that the framers of the Constitution were both practical and realistic minded men on this key question. Many of them were political and religious refugees when they arrived on these shores.

In many instances they were prohibited from openly or secretly practicing the religion of their choice in their own native lands. Therefore, it is not unusual that they were determined that the new country would not deprive them of their religious rights or beliefs.

I witnessed on many occasions, while the Congress is in session, a Chaplain, or a visiting church dignitary, lead the entire congressional and senatorial delegations in prayer. This is a daily occurrence, as the prayers are usually offered in hope and guidance under stressing times. One cannot help but feel under these circumstances that religion in one form or another is present when the great decisions of the day are made. The prayer is made prior to the opening of the general discussion and debates in a very public place. In fact, about as public as you can get.

Now, Mr. Parry, in order to keep your statement intact about religious mixing with the state, would you advocate a Supreme Court ruling on prayers being offered daily in the Halls of Congress?

Fortunately, we are able under our constitutional rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press to express ourselves freely in an open manner without the fear of reprisal by the state. This fact alone insures the freedom of our religion and its eternity in the United States.

NIC SPALLAS.

SELLERSVILLE, PA.

Maryland Builder Investigates Prefab Market in Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the September 23 issue of International Commerce in the RECORD, as follows:

MARYLAND BUILDER INVESTIGATES PREFAB MARKET IN COLOMBIA—AID WILL FINANCE HELP OF SURVEY COST IF ANNAPOLIS FIRM DECIDES AGAINST MAKING THE INVESTMENT

A Maryland manufacturer interested in producing prefabricated houses in Colombia has concluded an Alliance for Progress investment survey agreement with the Agency for International Development.

The firm, Golden Key Homes, Inc., of Annapolis has produced more than $100 million worth of prefabricated structures in the United States; about 6,000 homes are in the Washington-Baltimore area.

Under the agreement with AID, three company officials will conduct a nationwide study of raw materials sources, labor skills, consumer preferences, and home financing prior to reaching a decision regarding the feasibility of establishing a manufacturing plant in Colombia, in cooperation with Colombian investors. It will also erect, at its own expense, three prototype homes in order to gage the reaction of Colombian homebuyers.

AID has authorized a participation grant of $11,150 to finance 50 percent of the survey cost. Should the company decide to make an investment in Colombia, it will pay the full cost of the survey. In the event the company decides against making the investment, AID will pay the company one-half of the survey cost.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, since March of this year, the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman BOB JONES, has been conducting an intensive study and wide-ranging hearings on the Nation's water pollution problems. This subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations and the high quality of its work is well know to the Members of this body. The subcommittee's efforts have already heightened national awareness, on the part of the responsible Government agencies as well as the public at large, to the need for cleaning up our country's streams, lakes, and rivers in order to assure an adequate supply of water for the future.

The gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman JOHN MONAGAN, who is a member of the subcommittee, addressed the joint meeting of the Pacific Northwest Water Pollution Council and the Subcommittee on Water Supply and Pollution Control of the Columbia Basin on September 20, 1963. With characteristic candor Congressman MONAGAN's speech outlined the national water pollution problem and provided guidelines for measures to deal with it. Because of the interest I know this subject has for other Members of the House, I am pleased to include Congressman MONAGAN's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN S. MONAGAN AT THE JOINT MEETING OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST WATER POLLUTION COUNCIL AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER SUPPLY AND POLLUTION CONTROL OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, SPOKANE, WASH., SEPTEMBER 20, 1963

I am delighted to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems of water pollution control and abatement. This is a subject of concern, not only to us in Congress, but to everyone in this Pacific Northwest and, in fact, to everyone in our country.

The growing concern about water pollution is a direct result of the increasing population and urbanization of our country, the vast growth and increasing complexity of industry, and the steadily improving standard of living. Our urban population within the next two decades will undoubtedly approximate 200 million. The great proportion of this increased population will depend upon

the availability of surface supply for their drinking water and other basic needs, including recreation, industrial use, and agriculture.

Since the total supply of water will not change, it is obvious that the need for protecting the quality of our water will increase.

Distances between waste outfalls and water intakes will be wedged closer and closer. Hundreds of new and more persistent pollutants will be discharged by industry and municipalities and will place a greater and greater burden on the water-carrying waste disposal systems of our municipalities. More and more, the Nation will be forced to depend upon increasing the reuse of water and will necessarily place growing emphasis upon the protection of this water through fuller treatment and stabilization of water-borne wastes.

Unless we act boldly and positively within the next few years to protect our water supplies, the coming generation will face not merely the same problems we face, but an overwhelming flood of pollution, which will bring about permanent loss of the heritage of clean streams, ample fish and wildlife resources, and pleasant living which our ancestors have handed down to us. We live in an environment which we can increasingly control. It is within our power to shape our own future and the kind of surroundings in which we and our children will live. But we must not permit further time to slip by without adequate action.

The control of water pollution, of course, is an integral part of the whole problem of water resource development as well as being connected with the broader problem of protecting our health. The byproduct wastes of the great industrial enterprises expose all of us to many new chemicals in the water we drink, the food we eat, and the air we breathe. All of us, therefore, regardless of our position, share the common need for adequate supplies of uncontaminated water.

It is for this reason that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, established the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives to make an extensive and intensive inquiry to appraise how effectively Government agencies and others are dealing with the problems of our Nation's increasing water pollution and to determine what can be done to improve the techniques for preventing or controlling the rising pollution levels of so many of our Nation's rivers, streams, and other surface waters.

One of the great leaders of Congress in the field of conservation and development of our Nation's resources is the chairman of this subcommittee. Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, JR., of Alabama. It is a matter of deep regret to him that he is unable to be with you today. He therefore asked me to come here to discuss with you the work of our subcommittee in this important field of water pollution abatement.

Our subcommittee was originally established with six members. In addition to Congressman JONES and myself, the subcommittee consisted of J. EDWARD ROUSH of Indiana, WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri, ROBERT MCCLORY, of Illinois, and GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, of New Jersey. Very recently, Chairman DAWSON, recognizing the importance of our subcommittee's work, increased the size of the subcommittee by assigning three more Congressmen; namely, JACK BROOKS, of Texas; TORBERT H. MACDONALD, of Massachusetts; and FRANK J. HORTON, of New York. Our subcommittee now has a wider geographical representation, and although we do not have a member from the Pacific Northwest, I want to assure you, and my presence here today is, I hope, evidence that the subcommittee is as vitally concerned with the problems of water pollution here as in other sections of the country.

Some of you may have followed the extensive hearings which our subcommittee held in Washington during May and June, and the regional hearings we have already held in Trenton, concerning the water pollution problems of the Delaware River Basin, and in Chicago, concerning the water pollution problems of Lake Michigan, the Illinois River Basin and the Fox chain of lakes north of Chicago.

Our subcommittee will conduct its third regional hearing in Connecticut on October 4 and 5, and I hope that the subcommittee in the near future will come here to the great Pacific Northwest to learn in detail about your water pollution problems and your plans for their future control.

Our subcommittee inquiries and hearings have met a response from a broad segment of the national community. We have received testimony on numerous aspects of the pollution problem from Federal, State, interstate and local agencies, from industrial associations and companies, from civic groups, conservation organizations and professional associations, including the associations of State and interstate water pollution control administrators, and the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers with which many of you, I am sure, are affiliated.

We have been deeply impressed with the excellence of the testimony and reports presented to us and with the depth of interest and concern indicated by all segments of the public.

The Federal agencies from whom we have learned to include the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Interior, Agriculture, Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard, Federal Power Commissions, Office of Science and Technology, the Advisory Commission of Intergovernmental Relations, as well as various bureaus of these agencies, such as Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Mines, Soil Conservation, and Forestry.

We have received valuable information from interstate agencies such as: the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Counties.

Conservation groups have included the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, the Izaak Walton League, the Citizens Committee on National Resources, the National Wildlife Federation, the Oyster Institute of North America, the Ecological Society, and others.

Civic groups have numbered among them the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the League of Women Voters.

We receive particularly useful and cooperative assistance from major industrial associations and companies, such as the American Paper & Pulp Association, Scott Paper Co., Kimberly-Clark Corp., National Coal Association, National Association of Manufacturers. American Iron & Steel Institute, Manufacturing Chemists Association, Humble Refining Co., National Canners Association, American Petroleum Institute, the Soap & Detergent Association, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Worthington Corp., Beckman Instruments Co., Associated Industries of New York, and many others.

I mention these agencies and companies whose representatives testified before our subcommittee to give you a better understanding of how wide ranging our hearings have been. Our subcommittee staff is presently processing these hearing transcripts to the printer.

The subcommittee has been deeply impressed by the depth of the water pollution problem and the inadequacy of present-day methods to cope effectively with the growing complexity of domestic and industrial waste. We have heard time and time again of the importance of increased research to develop better methods of treating these wastes. The present system of waste treatment is, as you know, only partial treatment, not purification. Even the very best secondary treatment plant rarely exceeds 90 percent efficiency in reducing the pollution load of its effluent. In many areas, such treatment is at the present time workable and economically justified, but with the increasing quantity of waste loading our streams, it is apparent that improved treatment will increasingly be needed to deal with the composite residual loading which remains after adequate secondary treatment, and also to cope with the many substances such as dissolved salts, detergents, and chemicals which cannot be adequately eliminated from the effluent of present-waste-treatment facilities.

Along with this need for improved methods of waste treatment, many other needs exist to construct facilities for treatment of sewage of municipalities which now provide no treatment or only partial treatment or have obsolete plants.

There is a particularly great necessity to improve and expand the treatment of the large variety of industrial wastes which are now being deposited and which in the future will be deposited in growing volume in the Nation's streams.

Although Congress first enacted pollution control legislation in 1886, the National Legislature did not really begin to meet the national problem of water pollution control until it enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, popularly known as the Blatnik Act in recognition of the outstanding leadership provided by Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, one of my colleagues on the House Committee on Government Operations.

As you know, this act, which was expanded in 1961, established the framework for a national program to control pollution. Under this act the Federal Government makes grants to support State, interstate, and university programs. It also sets up grants to help municipalities build waste treatment plants by contributing up to 30 percent or $600,000 of construction costs. It also supports research and comprehensive control planning and authorizes the use of enforcement powers in connection with interstate waters and, under some special conditions, intrastate waters.

One significant feature of the 1961 amendments was the requirement that water quality control be considered in planning new Federal reservoirs.

It is eminently clear that the Federal water pollution control law has provided a great stimulus to the national effort in dealing with the problems of water pollution. However, it is equally clear that this act alone cannot do the job. It is simply a supplement to the efforts which must be made by every agency of Government, Federal, State, and local, and in particular by the industries of our country whose very existence and prosperity depend upon maintaining and improving the quality of the water they use. Of vital added importance will be the support of a well-informed and interested citizenry.

New concepts and new legal techniques, as well as new scientific and operational methods must be developed. We need stepped-up research and bold action.

I should like to emphasize two points here. First, our emphasis on enforcement and control relies heavily upon local and State action and private response. We believe that the Federal Government should sponsor and stimulate the necessary action wherever possible.

Second, we do not expect radical change overnight. We have no desire to saddle existing enterprise with unfair or impossible expense which would prove prohibitive to profitable operation. We recognize too that modern technology necessarily entails some pollution. With this in mind, however, we do underline the urgency of the problem.

Achieving cleanliness in our streams will entail the making of judgments and the weighing of competing factors of economics and the less tangible benefits of recreational, esthetic, and wildlife values. The lines which must be drawn will vary from area to area, from stream to stream, from basin to basin, and will depend on the varying judgments of many people. There will undoubtedly be disagreements between those who believe in utilizing the full assimilating capacities of the streams, and those who believe that streams are more important for fishing, boating, and swimming. There will be differences between those who believe that water pollution control is solely the job of the locality, the State, or the region, and those who believe that the Federal Government must take an increasingly vigorous role in the control and reduction of pollution.

Our subcommittee recognizes these many problems and differing points of view. We are examining all the available facts, opinions and recommendations on this subject from every part of the country. We are using them to stimulate action in many quarters. From our findings and recommendations will undoubtedly evolve legislation, executive action, research, and new points of view. For example, when we learned early in the course of our hearings that many Federal installations were discharging substantial quantities of untreated sewage into surface waters, we asked some 18 Federal agencies for reports on 1,003 separate discharge points which were alleged to be discharging in excess of 3,000 gallons per day of untreated sewage and industrial waste directly to surface or ground waters. I have been informed by our subcommittee staff that extensive progress is being made in correcting these conditions and we hope that in the very near future water pollution by Federal agencies will be a thing of the past.

When we brought out in our hearings that the Bureau of Mines, which has been charged since 1934 with responsibility for developing methods of control of acid mine drainage, had failed to do much about it, this evidence caused the Secretary of the Interior to set up special task forces within his Department and to establish a new program for dealing with this type of pollution.

When we learned that there was confusion and lack of coordination within the Government in dealing with pollution hazards caused by the transport and spillage of dangerous chemicals along the riverways of our country, we requested more than a half dozen agencies to pool their knowledge and to evolve new approaches for controlling this problem.

When the subcommittee hearings brought out that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare lacked even elementary knowledge of the vast quantity of industrial waste discharge, we obtained from numerous industry groups assurances that they would assist the Department in compiling more comprehensive data concerning these discharges.

Our subcommittee has indeed embarked in the words of Winston Churchill "upon a considerable undertaking." But it is one which badly needs doing.

We hope that we may provide guidance and direction so that the Federal Government in cooperation with local, State, interstate, and private agencies, companies and interested citizens may bring about a better measure of water pollution control, keep our waterways reasonably clean, sustain the efforts of individuals and of local government while, at the same time, expanding the total national effort necessary to assure the basic objection of all of us in minimizing and preventing pollution of our waters, and maintaining our streams with the cleanliness essential to a growing and thriving nation.

Address by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, we, in Baltimore, recently had a most enjoyable evening. The occasion was a banquet given by 700 prominent Baltimoreans honoring Congressman GARMATZ, Congressman FRIEDEL, and myself.

The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a man of outstanding ability, addressed the group. It is with a deep sense of pride that I include his address in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PRESENTED AT TESTIMONIAL BANQUET, EMERSON HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD., SEPTEMBER 22, 1963, 7 P.M.

I am very pleased to be with you this evening and to join in honoring three distinguished Members of the Congress, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, GEORGE H. FALLON, and EDWARD A. GARMATZ. I know that each of these gentlemen is serving your best interest, through their concern for and attention to the needs of their respective districts. At the same time, the record shows they are serving the Nation at large through their support of legislation and programs designed to move this Nation ahead.

I am sure that these gentlemen will agree that it is a great privilege to serve in the Congress, or to serve in the President's Cabinet, at a time when the Nation is moving forward on many fronts and when even greater opportunity for advance lies ahead.

The conscience of America, which abolished slavery, passed child labor laws, provided workmen's compensation, adopted a social security system, and stimulated many other moves toward greater social responsibility, is stirring anew.

The conscience of America, which throughout our history has prompted neighbor to help neighbor and given birth to and sustained the many vigorous community volunteer efforts, is reflecting new, deeper, and broader insights which embrace our total responsibility as a free society.

This reawakened conscience has brought a new resolve to right old wrongs—to relieve human suffering and to meet human needs.

This reawakened conscience is being accompanied by a new vision of the promise that is America—a new recognition of the true potential of America for improving the quality of the human experience and preserving individual identity and dignity.

President Kennedy gave eloquent expression to this reawakened conscience and new vision in his inaugural address and has pointed the way in his subsequent messages to the Congress. And his words have been backed up with action.

One of his first acts was a temporary extension of unemployment benefits through which $800 million was pumped into the economy at the right place and time and alleviated the plight of over 2 million workers and their families.

This initial action was followed by aid to dependent children of the unemployed, the increased minimum wage, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the expanded housing program and the new program of housing for the elderly, the accelerated public works program—these and a host of other measures all reflect the reawakened conscience and a new vision of what America can achieve. They have been measures to help people with their day-to-day problems.

The list is long. It includes the first major revision of the Internal Revenue Code since 1954—a 7-percent investment credit that provided a $2.5 billion incentive to American business to modernize and expand and thereby provide more jobs.

It includes the important Trade Expansion Act to encourage stronger economic ties among the countries of the Atlantic Alliance.

It includes the most far-reaching improvements in our public welfare laws since the passage of the original Social Security Act, the first new major drug control laws since 1938, the first Federal grant program to encourage the expansion of educational television, the first Federal grant program to help communities combat juvenile delinquency.

Within this coming week, the President will sign into law the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. This program will help meet an important national need for new and expanded schools offering training in medical, dental, and other health related fields. It will help provide the physicians, dentists, and other skilled professional and technical personnel needed to serve the Nation's rapidly increasing population and maintain a high level of medical care and medical research capability.

May I say that Congressmen FRIEDEL, FALLON, and GARMATZ helped achieve this by supporting this important legislation.

And soon, almost certainly to become a reality, will be the first nationwide, federally supported program to help the mentally ill and mentally retarded by establishing centers for their care and treatment in their own communities all across the country.

I had the privilege this week of participating in the first President's Conference on Mental Retardation. The widespread and intense interest shown at that conference, attended by State and local representatives from throughout the Nation in that humanitarian program, was extremely encouraging.

Mental retardation represents one of the most critical and one of the most heartbreaking health problems in our country today. Because of the increased birth rate and our longer life expectancy, the number of mentally retarded people has been growing steadily year by year. Unless we are fortunate enough to make major breakthroughs in prevention, by 1970 the number will grow to more than 6 million. Half will be children.

More than $1 billion is spent each year for the special care of mentally retarded children and adults. In terms of lost productivity, the cost to our society goes into additional billions.

The cost of mental retardation in terms of human misery cannot be measured. Infants and children, the most vulnerable, face a long, bleak corridor of a lifetime of disability. Their parents face a lifetime of hardship, plagued by anguish and uncertainty.

But these children and their parents are no longer alone.

President Kennedy has called upon our society to undertake a vast research effort, in our universities and other research institutions, to increase our basic knowledge of the development and functioning of the human mind—with the ultimate goal of preventing mental retardation.

He calls upon our society to provide more adequate nutrition, housing, educational opportunities, and better maternal and child health programs to "reduce mental retardation to the low incidence which has been achieved in some other nations."

And he has called for a wide variety of coordinated community services and facilities to provide for the diverse and changing needs of the mentally retarded of all ages. Through these programs, in community after community throughout the Nation, the mentally retarded will finally become the recipients of the full blessings of modern medical knowledge, of modern educational and rehabilitation techniques.

We are all delighted with the strong support given the legislative proposals—from Congress, from voluntary organizations, and from citizens all over the country. And we are most optimistic that the President's program will soon become a reality for the American people.

I believe that the administration's programs to combat both mental illness and mental retardation point up the fact that understanding human needs is the first step in meeting them. President Kennedy has brought this kind of understanding not only to mental illness and mental retardation but to a wide range of humanitarian causes.

In the foreign field, American contributions to world peace and prosperity include such recent additions as the negotiation of the test ban treaty, the Alliance for Progress, and the highly successful Peace Corps.

These are only the highlights, but even so I think you will agree that they add up to an impressive accomplishment.

The President's tax reduction program, which he earlier this week characterized as one of the most important pieces of domestic legislation in 15 years, his legislative proposals in the field of civil rights, which are of such crucial importance, and hospital insurance for the aged through social security, which holds so great a potential for a better, longer life for our aged citizens, are among the proposals now before the Congress.

There are other crucial areas.

We must open to every individual the paths to opportunity commensurate with his ability.

We must remove the bottlenecks of limited educational opportunity.

We must eliminate the barriers of racial discrimination.

We must open up the dead end pockets of despair which have entrapped the unskilled and the unwanted.

This is the purpose of the educational legislation now pending before the Congress.

This is a purpose that will be served by passage of the civil rights bill.

This, perhaps more than anything else, is the real meaning of America—equal opportunity for fulfillment in the everyday life of each individual.

During the past week, I appeared before a congressional committee to testify on legislation that would help the Nation's 17 million elderly citizens keep their golden years from being tarnished by anxiety, illness, and poverty. The plight of many of our older Americans is a matter of deep concern to President Kennedy; as in other areas of our national life, scientific advances in recent years have run ahead of social progress. As the President said in his message to Congress on the needs of our elderly citizens, "It is not enough for a great Nation merely to have added new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life to those years."

Following my testimony, I was questioned by a member of the committee who asked, "Mr. Secretary, do you subscribe to this cradle-to-grave philosophy?"

If the question is: "Do I believe the Government should hold every citizen's hand from the cradle to the grave, the answer of course is "No."

But, if the question is: Do I believe that the Federal Government should do more to protect the babies in our cradles from the tragic handicaps of physical or mental impairment, the answer is "Yes."

If the question is: Do I believe that the Federal Government should help see to it that the babies in our cradles do not cry out from hunger because their fathers cannot find a job, the answer is "Yes."

If the question is: Do I believe that all the babies in our cradles deserve, in the years ahead, an equal chance to develop their talents to the limit of their capacity, regardless of race or economic status, the answer is "Yes."

If the question is: Do I believe in Federal support of cancer and heart research, in a national effort to curb pollution of the water we drink and the air we breathe, in stringent regulations of the quality and safety of our foods and drugs, and in other measures aimed at protecting the health and prolonging the life of our citizens, the answer is "Yes."

If the question is: Do I believe that our older citizens should have social insurance protection against the economic disaster of hospital costs resulting from severe illness, the answer is "Yes."

As a former mayor and a former State senator, I think I have some understanding of the importance of maintaining strong State and local governments. It is in the States and communities where the problems and opportunities are. States and communities need to be able to deal with their problems, to take advantage of their opportunities.

But this country is not merely a collection of States and communities. It is that—but it is something more. It is a nation. It is a nation with a common constitution, a common purpose, a common heritage.

When part of the Nation is hurt through neglect or misfortune, the whole Nation is hurt. By the same token, to the extent that its cities and towns and States prosper and move forward, so too does the Nation prosper and move forward.

This is no time—if, indeed, there ever was a time—to cut back our investments in the American people, in the American future, in the American dream. The great days of America are not all behind us. There are great days ahead—greater days than any nation has ever known—if we have faith in America.

I would be the last to advocate Federal action for the sake of Federal action, Federal expenditure for the sake of Federal expenditure. I am talking about investments—the kind of investments that President Kennedy has championed and continues to champion.

It will be through such investments, and only through such investments, that great days ahead for America—and all mankind—will be realized.

President Kennedy has given us the vision of a healthier America, a better housed America, a better educated America, a more productive America, and, above all, an America united in its belief in equal rights and opportunity for all citizens regardless of race, color, or creed. He has pointed the way. I am confident that this Nation has, along with its abundant resources, the commonsense, the moral fiber, the will to achieve, which will bring us, under the leadership of a great President, to our goal of a better life in peace and dignity for all.

Mayor Joseph E. Brune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the town of Oyster Bay in New York State has produced distinguished public servants over the years, leading them on the national scene such greats as Teddy Roosevelt and Leonard Hall.

But too often unheralded and unsung are those who give of their head and heart for community betterment on our local government levels. I am honored to bring to the attention of the House one of these fine men.

The mayor of Farmingdale, in Oyster Bay Town, N.Y., Joseph E. Brune, after 6 years as mayor, has announced his retirement from office. This has been caused by a recent severe illness, and his leaving active local government administration is a loss to all who advocate good government.

Mayor Brune, a lifelong resident of Farmingdale, has been an imaginative leader of the highest order. He has known what was needed for his area and has had the perseverance to see projects through to their logical conclusion. He, at all times, has been a most articulate spokesman for progressive government with responsible fiscal administration. In this day of ever increasing problems in local government, it has always been a source of satisfaction to know that a gentleman of his capabilities was willing to give his time to local government.

There are many who only desire to participate in the State or higher levels of government; but in reality, one of the truly tremendous requirements of our country will always be to have men of good will, such as Mayor Brune, actively participate on the community level.

While his decision to retire is completely understandable, the fact remains that local government administration has truly lost one of its finest proponents.

Who's Fighting Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the confused situation in Vietnam is extremely well put in an editorial appearing in the Evening Star on Monday, September 23, and it places the responsibility for the entanglements in the proper hands:

WHO'S FIGHTING WHOM?

The formal announcement says that Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor are being sent to Vietnam to make a firsthand study of the military effort against the Communist Vietcong.

If this means that the President is not already fully familiar with the details of the military effort, then a study most certainly should be made. Such ignorance at this stage of the war would be shocking, but we suspect that the real purpose of the journey to Saigon aims at a good deal more than a study of the military situation.

This suspicion is reinforced by a report citing a senior Pentagon official as authority for the announcement that Mr. McNamara intends to probe every level of United States and Vietnamese activity bearing on activities against the Vietcong. This same news

story also informs us that Mr. McNamara was chosen by the President for this assignment because he is accustomed to probing complicated situations and coming up with recommendations that can be translated promptly into action.

Mr. McNamara's past performance in probing complicated situations in the Pentagon raises some doubt as to his qualifications for untangling the can of worms in Vietnam. Still, it is clear that something needs to be done there, and to the extent that the remedy may lie in military refinements Mr. McNamara and General Taylor are as well qualified as anyone else for the task.

There is plenty of reason to believe, however, that the real problem in Vietnam (and in Washington) consists basically of political and ideological issues, and that military considerations are secondary. Reports from Vietnam strongly suggest that Americans there are busily fighting the Vietcong with one hand and President Diem with the other. Although Mr. Kennedy repeatedly says our primary concern is with the military struggle, much of our efforts in Saigon goes into fighting the political war. As between the two, it doubtless would be easier to destroy the Diem regime. But how then is it proposed to carry on a successful war against the Vietcong?

Mr. Kennedy should also designate someone to make a study in depth of the situation in Washington. On the home front the inspired report is the principal weapon. And it is being used, depending upon who is being armed at a given time, to shoot down the State Department, the Pentagon, the CIA or any other target which may come conveniently within range.

This sort of sniping must be bad for morale in Saigon. And in the United States it surely is eroding public confidence in the President's conduct of the war in Vietnam.

No. 9—Delaware: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Delaware, about the little State that is a big State for gamblers. And of how the moralist contingent have helped make Delaware a haven for the gamblers.

No State in the Union exceeds Delaware in per capita legal betting on the horses. Nearly $100 million was wagered at the racetracks of Delaware last year. This made this little State the 10th ranking in parimutuel betting which helped the coffers of its treasury to the tune of almost $4½ million in 1962.

Delaware's share of the total national off-track betting figure last year was $125 million. The actual figure is probably much higher. However, off-track betting is acknowledged to account for only one-half of the moneys illegally gambled throughout the country, so uncontrolled gambling in Delaware exceeds a quarter of a billion dollars a year.

This kind of money, Mr. Speaker, is enough to adequately finance the crime syndicates when we consider that 10 percent of the gross turnover remains in the underworld hands. With this money, law enforcement is corrupted and various other illegal activities are financed.

In Delaware, as elsewhere in the Nation, the continued lack of Government recognition and regulation of the gambling urge has played right into the hands of the underworld. There is no question that legalized gambling would substantially cut into the bankroll of crime. Parimutuel betting is only a tiny halfstep away from the hypocrisy that has characterized political attitudes toward gambling in the United States. The establishment of a national lottery would be a great stride toward both social and financial sanity.

Tribute to Lions of District 1–J of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to alert my colleagues as to what can be done through individual initiative and humanitarian efforts without reliance on the Federal Government, I insert the following tribute to Lions of District 1–J of Illinois:

TRIBUTE TO LIONS OF DISTRICT 1–J IN THE FIELD OF TRAINING MENTALLY RETARDED

In keeping with the general humanitarian efforts of Lions International, especially in assistance to the blind and CARE, the Lions of Illinois several years ago adopted a program to provide scholarships for students to teach in the Exceptional Education Field. With an estimated 240,000 mentally retarded people in the State there is a crying need for specially trained teachers.

Last year the governor of District 1–J, Walter Kehoe, of Bensenville, started a program of scholarships for students from the district which covers DeKalb, Kane, DuPage, and McHenry Counties, in the hopes of providing teachers in this field for the local area. This program came to fruition under District Governor H. A. "Rocky" Walker of Sandwich, Ill., with the distribution in July and August of 1963 of three $500 scholarships in the district.

The communities in the district will soon receive some benefit from these scholarships on the graduation of one of the recipients, a senior at the University of Illinois at Normal. It is the intention of the District Cabinet to continue to subsidize the present recipients as well as others who are selected on the basis of scholastic ability and need, as long as they continue in the Exceptional Education training program so that they may graduate into the field.

In addition to providing the funds for these scholarships the 47 clubs in the district provided several thousand dollars in aid to local schools for the mentally retarded.

Since the training and education of the mentally retarded has been proven possible the Lions of District 1–J deem it a privilege to participate locally in this nationwide program.

Text of Speech by Senator Barry Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1963, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER spoke to an enthusiastic gathering at a rally held at Dodger Stadium in Los Angeles.

The message he brought to the people contains many astute and pertinent observations concerning this land of ours and our Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the text of Senator GOLDWATER's address:

TEXT OF A SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE A REPUBLICAN RALLY, DODGER STADIUM, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 16, 1963

I want to talk to you about the 1964 elections. Does the subject interest you?

America needs a change. Freedom needs a chance. Rocking-chair leadership isn't enough. Holding the line, preserving the status quo isn't enough. Big talk and little actions aren't enough. A frontier full of oxcart philosophies isn't enough. This is 20th century America, not the old deal America of the 1930's.

The change we need desperately is a Republican President and a Republican Congress in 1964. We need an administration to serve all the people and not just the big political machines. We need an administration to stand up for America all over the world—to work for freedom all over the world. We need a Republican administration to draw together the real will and the real needs of this Nation. Pie-in-the-sky for a few isn't enough. Self-respect and opportunity here and now are what Americans want. Not promises, but performance. Not handouts, but jobs. Not a government that takes and takes, but a government that works and works—with the people, never over the people.

We consent to be governed in this great Nation. We do not elect to be ruled.

This is what most Americans mean when they say freedom. They want this to be what their Government means. We want this to be what the Republican Party means. I say it is what the Republican Party means.

This is a party of principle, not the captive of a clan or cult of personality. The Republican Party does not stand for just one man or one family; it stands for all free men and all their families. This is not a party controled by any one man's money. It is a party controlled by principle.

The Republican Party believes in the people of America. It believes they can use the strength and the brains that God gave them to handle their own affairs. It believes that when they need help it should be the help that neighbor gives neighbor—not the soup kitchen solutions that big brother gives to his poor relations.

The Republican Party believes that government is the servant, not the master. That the job you have and hold, that the money you earn and save or spend is the first order of business—and that government's job is to preserve those things, not take them over.

The Republican Party believes that this is a nation of 50 great States, united in dedication to 1 great Constitution. The Republican Party believes that the representa-

tives of those great States, in the Congress, are the key to freedom, not a barrier to it. The Republican Party believes in an executive branch that is an equal parther, not a ruthless boss; in a judicial branch that also is equal and independent, that interprets laws but does not make them.

The Republican Party believes that the security of the United States in a troubled world is a shield for freedom everywhere and the prime target of the enemies of freedom. Our party believes that the strength of that shield is the main deterrent to war. It rejects the notion that such strength is the cause of tension in the world. It rejects the notion that the way to peace is through negotiated weakness.

The Republican Party does not believe that peace with justice is possible in a world half slave and half free. And it does not believe that communism can mellow into friendship with freedom short of becoming an open society. Until it does, it remains a slave society and an enemy of freedom.

I believe in those principles. I think that most Americans do. Now they need the opportunity to put belief into action. The way we do that in America is via the ballot box.

Some people say that I oversimplify complicated issues. They want complexity. I want understanding. And particularly I want understanding, in our great political party, of a fact that should be simplified.

The way to win an election is to get more votes. And those votes must come from the people, from all people, in all sections of the country and in all walks of life.

The Republican Party must not be the captive of any single section of this country. The Republican Party must not be the captive of any single economic bloc. The Republican Party must not be the captive of any single social faction. The Republican Party must not be the captive of any single personality.

But above all, the Republican Party must not be the captive of the Democrat Party. It must not be the captive of Democrat theories and programs.

The only people I want to see capture the Republican Party are the American people. And I want to see the Republican Party, in turn, capture the imagination, the mood and the spirit of the American people. In 1964, I want to see the Republican Party win the White House and win the Congress of the people of these United States.

Let our party always keep in mind that a presidential year brings two great elections, not just one. The election of Senators and Representatives, of State officials and legislators, of local officials is an election of equal importance. Republicans do not believe that the White House is the only symbol of the American political process. The Capitol, the State houses, the town hall are equal partners in the process. It's time they were treated as though they are. And they are in the Republican Party. Republicans do not want this Nation run from a rocking chair. They want it served, not bossed, by all the seats of government—National, State and local. Our sights must be set on that sort of victory in 1964.

We can't be the party of victory if we insist on talking like the party of defeat. I have heard, until I am sick of it, all of the advice about how we can lose the election in 1964. Now I want to hear how we can win. I believe we can.

There seem to be many in the Republican Party who have decided how we can lose. They say that the Republican Party must write off the largest blocs of potential votes. They keep wanting to read people out of the party. We hear them say nothing as to leading people into the party. They are preoccupied by whom should be kept out, but seldom with whom should be brought in.

These practitioners of defeat and advocates of political suicide, these political isolationists, are suffering from a purge complex. They want to purge the party until no one is left but them and thee—and they aren't so sure of thee.

This purge complex is characteristic not of free societies but of totalitarian societies. The splintering of parties into ever smaller factions, each with its own cherished idols and images and private fantasies, is not characteristic of American political life. The genius of American political life has been its ability to resolve differences and permit the largest possible numbers of people to work together for common goals even though they hold varied views of the best way to achieve those goals.

Should we abandon this American genius now and return to systems of splintered factions and warring classes? I say, no, and I say that the principles of the Republican Party demand that the answer be no.

The party bent on purges becomes a party warped by witch hunts. It spends more time looking for heresy than in proclaiming principles.

The poet, Edwin Markham, apparently knew more about tihs than some of our supposedly smart politicians. Here is a verse of his that could become a set of marching orders for a truly American party, the Republican Party:

"He drew a circle that shut me out—
Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.
But love and I had the wit to win:
We drew a circle that took him in."

Let's draw a great circle of principle for all Americans. Let's take it to them in 1964 and let's draw in a smashing Republican victory, an inspiring American victory.

We have suffered too long under the delusion that the way to write a party platform is simply to add 25 more pages of program detail and promises. This dreary practice in political pitchmanship does not help the cause of principled unity. Rather, it transfers the vigor of our principles into wild debates over details. It builds the sort of house of trick cards that the opposition party is fond of building. Their platform in the past campaign was a gingerbread monstrosity of programs and promises guided only by the principle of offering a little something to every one of the warring factions of which their party is built.

We can do better than that. We must do better than that.

We seek unity but not conformity. We seek unity of principle but diversity of accomplishment. Let our party's statement of principle in 1964, therefore, spell out the principles and then let the Congress, the people, and the Executive working hand in hand, not fist to fist, get on with the job of hammering out the details in the proper forum and in the proper process.

The Republican Party already is a great union of strengths, American strengths. The rugged, restless strength of the growing West—the rock-solid strength of the Midwest heartland—the tall-timber greatness of the Northwest—the busy, bustling strength of the North and the East—the proud, proven strength of the South. As a party of unity, not of exclusion, we must give those strengths principles that match their stature, not sugar candy programs to tempt their weaknesses.

Does this mean that absolutely everyone is welcome in the Republican Party? That we draw no lines, or ask no questions? Of course not. We do not welcome anyone in this party who is not dedicated to America and to America's constitutional order. But we welcome all who, despite differing ideas at other levels, would support that Constitution, strengthen its meaning, and serve its spirit. We offer a party of opportunity to do just that. We offer no narrow, self-seeking doctrines that say you must walk thusly, talk thusly, think just so, wear just this color tie, or any tie at all—no, we offer the broad sweep of American destiny and greatness. We offer the chance to work for principle, and we reject the endless chattering of those who say, "do it my way or I won't play."

Listen on one hand and you hear that we should write off the votes of union members. Why? Because we have stood for integrity and honesty in labor unions? Of course not. That's what decent union members stand for. And many of them see, in the Republican Party, principles for which they can work. This party does not reject progress and fear change; it seeks to unchain progress so that the machines of today can create the jobs of tomorrow.

Is it the Republican Party that has hit hardest at the rewards for honest labor? No. The New Frontier, with its commitment to the notion that ordinary men and women cannot be trusted to spend their own wages, the New Frontier with its reflexive recourse to regulation and coercion has been the enemy of honest wages, honestly held and honestly spent. No. The Republican Party does not write off the votes of union members. It does not write off the hopes of union members. It knows that prosperity comes from busy factories and busy offices, not from swollen bureaus in Washington—and union members know that, too.

Listen on another hand and you hear that we should write off the votes of Negro citizens. Why? Because we always have stood for the principle that a man should be free to make his way to the limits of his ability regardless of race, creed or color? Of course not. It is not the Republican Party that has bred racial discontent in this land. It is not the Republican Party that has dealt mortal blows to the progress that was being made between men of good will who know that the point of a bayonet can kill the point of a principle. It is not the Republican Party that has played politics with prejudice. Write off the votes of Negro citizens? Not at all.

Listen on the other hand and you hear that we should write off the votes of citizens of this or that religion. Why? Are there not all religions in our party? Is there a different God for New Frontiersmen and a different one for Republicans? Of course not.

But listen also and you hear the unmistakable portents of a campaign in which smear and invective, violence and vitriol will be used freely to batter and smash at Republican hopes—to divide and conquer.

We may well be moving toward the most vicious campaign of opposition since the War Between the States. But we must not be moved by the threat. We must move forward instead, armored by principle and powered by unity.

Are there no votes we must write off? How about the big-city political machines whose votes are ground out like sausages? Our hopes may be low there. But I cannot believe that the citizens of those great cities will forever be content to march to the orders of the political boss. Some will rebel. Every election some rebel. When they do, where can they go? They can go to the party that has not sold out to the political bosses, the Republican Party.

Here in Los Angeles you know who the big daddies are.

Talk of parties that have become captive. What about the Democratic Party? What about a party that is chained to the big-city machines on one side and chained to the far-left theorists on the other side? What about a party whose big men think it's cute to lock legislators in the State capitol while at the same time its young men are voting to unlock Red China?

The Republican Party is not captive to such extremism. No one in its leadership is or will be captive to such extremism.

Surely there is a battle for us to fight against our opposition, against the corruption of the machines, against the conniptions of the theorists.

That is the battle to which we should turn our big guns. Why waste our time and spend our ammunition aiming those guns at our own heads?

Those in our party who would win their own little skirmishes while losing the war are committed to a form of political suicide. Do it my way, they say, or I will slit your throat. They will only kill all our chances.

Let me put it bluntly. I am a Republican. I believe in this party and its principles. I want to see Republicans win in the coming elections. I will support Republican candidates for office wherever and whenever I can.

Anyone who hangs back, anyone who says he will support only those whom he has chosen, anyone who says that only his credentials are to be honored, only his faction fought for—anyone who says those things is not working for the Republican Party.

He is working against it. Anyone who says that the Republican Party must be the exclusive party of any section or faction, who will not embrace the entire Nation in his thinking, in his hopes, in his principles is not working for a stronger America, he is working for weakened America—shorn of the greatness that a two-party system has given it.

Let's not say that our party looks one way when viewed from the skyscrapers of the East and another way from the sweeping horizons of the West. Let's not say that our party looks one way when viewed from the fields and factories of the South and another way when viewed from the streets and businesses of the North—and still another way when viewed from the lush land of the Midwest. We are no sectional party. We are an American party.

Ours are the principles that draw men together in common cause and not the greeds and spites that split them apart.

United in principle, united in effort we can and will win—and with those principles, also, America can be the forge of freedom for God's entire world and freedom's fullest future.

The Government's Role in the Modern Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 3, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of an address which I made on Monday, September 23, 1963, before the American Meat Institute in Chicago. The address follows in full:

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN THE MODERN ECONOMY

(By Hon. HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, majority whip of the U.S. House of Representatives. A 24-year veteran of the Congress, BOGGS is chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee and a member of the House Ways and Means Committee)

When I was asked to address the American Meat Institute, I agreed to discuss the Government's role in the modern economy. Frankly, gentlemen, I cannot think of a more important phase of the Government's relation to the economy than its tax policies. Therefore, I believe I can best serve my function today by discussing the tax bill of 1963.

This bill has just been reported by the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member. It has had a long and hard journey. Many months of preparation were involved by the Treasury Department and the administration generally before January 24 of this year when the President formally submitted his tax message to the Congress. Since that time, the Ways and Means Committee has been industriously at work examining the proposals and reaching decisions concerning the nature of tax changes which should be enacted at this time.

And tax legislation is, of necessity, complicated and difficult. It takes the mind of the proverbial Philadelphia lawyer simply to understand the existing law. Then it is necessary to comprehend the nature of the proposed changes from the point of view of the effect upon the economy and equity.

Everyone is interested in the total impact of the bill. By 1965, individuals will obtain rate reductions of approximately $9.5 billion or, putting it another way, an additional $9.5 billion per year will be in the hands of our people to spend. This amount is offset by approximately $800 million of tax reform so that the net tax reduction for individuals in 1965 and subsequent years will be about $8.6 billion. Corporations obtain an additional $2.2 billion by 1965, and structural reforms increase that to about $2.3 billion. Thus the total reduction will be about $11 billion. Approximately two-thirds of this amount will be obtained by individuals and corporations in 1964, and the remaining one-third in 1965.

Why should we have such a tax reduction at this time? The basic answer is that this is the only way to relieve the weight of a tax system which has become repressive on the entire Nation.

As our Nation and our economy have grown the burdens of our progressive income tax structure have risen even more rapidly. In fact, the tax structure accomplished exactly what it was designed to achieve. The present system was essentially based upon the idea that as the economy grew into inflationary periods, progressively greater amounts of taxes and, hence, of purchasing power should be drained from the economy, thereby reducing the inflationary pressures. In actuality, as the economy has grown, the tax burden has grown so much more rapidly that it drains off purchasing power long before we even begin to approach inflationary conditions. This has occurred gradually so that while we are growing it has been at a rate much lower than the level that could be achieved with a lighter tax burden. The result has been increasing amounts of unemployment, both of men and of plants and equipment. It, therefore, is the height of folly to continue such excessive tax burdens when their ultimate consequence is to create unemployment of usable resources that could more adequately satisfy the needs of our citizens.

Some have suggested that the results of the new tax bill will be to initiate a new round of inflationary pressures. How can we have inflation when over 5½ percent of the largest labor force in the history of this country is unemployed even though actively seeking work? How can we have inflationary pressures when a considerable percentage of our industrial capacity is unused and when we have surpluses in all foods and fibers?

Think back to the immediate postwar period when there was excessive demand, when unemployment was low, and when as a result, our present tax structure was initiated. Then we were having very substantial price rises. In terms of current prices, we had a rise from 1947 of 81 to 97 percent by 1961. Just think of that—roughly a 15-percent increase in wholesale prices in a 4-year period. Similarly, from 1952 to 1957, we had roughly a 7-percent increase in wholesale prices. But in 1958, the price index was 100.4 percent. In the latest week for which I have available information, the index was 100.5 percent. In other words, from 1958 until the middle of July, there was only a one-tenth of 1 percent increase in the prices of all wholesale products. Where is there a threat of inflationary forces when price levels are remaining that stable?

No one welcomes an increase in debt for its own sake—whether it is in his household, his business, or his government. Every debt should pass this test of soundness and prudence: Will it pay for itself in added productive power and human well-being? We must therefore ask ourselves whether the added debt resulting from the tax program will pay for itself in higher output, more jobs, and a greater legacy of real wealth—houses, schools, productive plants and equipment, and so on—to use and to pass on to our children. Under conditions of full employment and inflation, the answer would be "No." But when manpower is idle and excess capacity is waiting to be activated by a tax stimulus, the answer is "Yes."

For those to whom the existing size of the debt is worrisome, two sets of facts should be reassuring. First, the Federal debt has been growing far more slowly since 1947 than private debt. It has risen 15 percent, while corporate net debt rose 218 percent, other private debt 383 percent, and State-local government debt 412 percent. Second, the Federal debt is falling steadily in relation to the economic size and strength of the country. In 1947, the Federal debt was 110 percent of our gross national product. Today, it is only 53 percent, and steadily falling even with recent and prospective deficits. The Federal debt is becoming a progressively lighter burden on our growing economy.

What specifically have we accomplished? The first and by all odds the most important set of changes to be proposed is tax relief for individuals. In my view, this relief is long overdue. The idea of taking 20 percent from the poorest man in direct taxes alone and up to 91 percent of additional income from the higher income individuals seems to me almost reprehensible except in wartime.

The new rates for individuals are much more reasonable. The present 20 percent rate for lowest income individuals will be reduced to 14 percent on the first $500 of income subject to tax. A minimum standard deduction is established. It will be most helpful to the very poor who relatively have carried a tremendous burden. In general, the rates across the board are reduced by at least 15 percent so that each of you here can confidently predict that by 1965 the income which you earn will be taxed about 15 percent less in direct Federal income taxes than your income was in 1963. The tap rate of 91 percent will be lowered to 70 percent.

On equity grounds, these new rates seem much fairer. It is also appropriate, I believe, that the rate reductions be spread evenly among all individuals regardless of income level. But certainly of at least equal importance to the equity aspects of this tax reduction are the economic consequences that should stem from the rate reductions.

What should we expect to occur in the economy as the result of this proposed tax cut? The most logical assumption is that individuals generally, as they obtain tax reduction, will spend a fairly substantial portion of the additional income that they have net after taxes. Certainly, all of our recent historical evidence supports this assumption. Taxes were reduced by about $4.7 billion in 1948 and consumption expenditures continued to remain a relatively constant

percentage of disposable income even though that disposable income had risen as the result of the tax cut. Similarly, taxes were cut by about $6 billion in 1954, and consumption continued to remain at roughly the same percentage of the increased disposable personal income. In fact, this seems a very logical result. It is usually difficult for individuals to distinguish any particular reason for income increases. All that we really know is that the dollar amounts which we have are somewhat greater. It follows from this that with the greater amounts, we can spend somewhat more.

A significant percentage to keep in mind in examining the economic consequences of tax reduction is the figure of 65 percent. For many years now, personal consumption expenditures have remained at about 65 percent of gross national product even though GNP has increased substantially in certain years, and has increased very slowly in other years. What happens to the 35 percent of increases in GNP which are not associated with consumption? Some portion of this amount is earned by corporations. Corporations do not generally consume but the amount that are obtained by these corporations are, as I shall indicate in a moment, very important from the standpoint of stimulating the economy, independent of increases in consumption demands.

Second, with respect to increases in personal income, some of these are going to be paid in the form of increased taxes. This segment of the amounts not going to consumption is very important because it reflects the feedback to the Federal Government and to State and local governments from a tax reduction. Thus, as I will indicate in a moment, the stimulus to the economy should help to eliminate much of the additional deficit which in the short run will result from tax reduction. Third, even of the disposable income left after taxes, some portion will be saved rather than consumed. But, this portion, affects the economy favorably because it provides funds which business firms can then convert into additional capital goods.

Another way to view the stimulus to the economy that will result from tax reduction is by tracing out the things that will happen to a typical $10 bill obtained by a typical individual in the form of tax reduction. Let us assume for this purpose that as a result of the tax bill our typical friend has an increase in his take-home paycheck of $10. Since he is the typical individual, he will probably save about 7 percent of this amount, or 70 cents, and his wife and family will probably spend about $9.30 of the $10. Since he and his family have spent the $9.30, this means that other people have received the $9.30 as income. It is important to recognize that this is income that would not have occurred to these other people had it not been that our friend originally had an increase of $10 in his take-home pay resulting from the tax reduction. Some of the $9.30, let's say $2 of it, will go to corporations. We'll come back and take a look at that $2 in a little while. But this means that others—individuals rather than corporations—will obtain about $7.30 in increased income. From this increase in income, these individuals will have to pay about 95 cents in increased taxes so that they will have left after taxes about $6.35. They will probably save about 45 cents of this amount, which means that they, in turn, will spend about $5.90 of their additional income. This means that even without any other changes by corporations or by governments or by savings institutions or anyone else, the total demand for goods and services and, therefore, for resources in our economy, has gone up first by the $9.30 spent by our friend and his family, and then, secondly, by the $5.90 obtained by the individual as the result of our friend's spending.

This process will continue except with lesser and lesser amounts, but still continue as a result of the subsequent turn around of the original $10 received by our friend in the form of tax reduction. It has been recently estimated that the total direct consequences in terms of increased consumption of this $10 tax reduction will probably be about $25. This is not simply economic hocus-pocus. This process and these figures which I am using have actually been based upon specific instances in recent times when individuals' incomes have increased, both because of tax reductions and for other reasons.

I think we can confidentially predict that from the net $8.7 billion of tax reduction to individuals, the gross national product and, hence, the demands for usable resources in our economy should increase by about $22 billion from its present approximately $580 billion to over $600 billion.

But this is far from being the end of the story, even insofar as individual tax reductions are concerned.

Over 20 percent of these increases in GNP will be accruing to corporations. You and I full well know that corporations will not "sit on these increasing assets." These funds will be used, and actively, since they constitute a primary source of fuel for additional investments, both in new plant, new equipment and machinery, and new research and development programs. But the subsequent expenditure of these funds by corporations will serve as an additional stimulus to the economy from tax reduction in exactly the same way that individual expenditures of funds obtained as a result of tax reduction will stimulate the economy. Both individuals and corporations have unsatisfied demands for things which money can buy. As additional money is made available to both individuals and corporations, this money will be spent. My own opinion is that a much higher percentage of funds accruing to corporations will be spent in the form of increased investment than the percentage of increased income to individuals that will be spent for consumption purposes. Notice here that I am talking about the additional funds coming to corporations as the result of individual tax reduction. Part of the profits accruing to the economy as the result of expenditures by individuals will be profits coming into the hands of corporations. It is these funds that will be spent, completely aside from the additional funds being obtained by corporations as the result of corporate tax rate reduction.

Another reason why all the amounts obtained in the form of increased personal income are not spent for consumption is because certain portions of these amounts go in the form of increased taxes back to the Government. This is something which is frequently overlooked by the critics of tax reduction. These critics point to the initial revenue losses to the Government from tax reduction and forget about the fact that these tax reductions will stimulate the economy, lead to increases in income, and, hence, lead to increased taxes. This stimulation is exactly the same as a corporation which prices itself out of the market by charging too much. A reduction in price may so stimulate demand for its product that the total profits of the business firm actually increase. Similarly, the Government has been repressing the economy by tax rates. As a result of lowering these tax rates, incomes generally will be increased to such a point that tax yields at lower rates can actually be greater than the tax yields that the Government presently obtains.

I don't know what Government budgetary deficits or surpluses are going to be in the future. However, I do know that they are not going to be $10 billion more than they would be without tax reduction. Obviously, incomes will be increased as the result of tax reduction and obviously, therefore, tax yields at the lower rates will be greater than simply the amounts by which revenues are reduced through tax reduction. I am impressed by the fact that fiscal experts, such as Secretary Dillon of the Treasury Department and others, forecast lower budgetary deficits with tax reduction than would occur without tax reduction. In fact, I think that this is the fastest way by which to obtain a budgetary balance. One forecast made by the technical staff of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, indicates, that, under present conditions, within 2 years after tax reduction is initiated, total revenues coming to the Federal Government alone will be greater than the amount of revenues accruing to the Government prior to the tax reduction. This estimate is based simply on the idea of tax reduction and ignores other growth factors in the economy, such as increased demand resulting from technological change, from population increases, and so on.

This is obviously no argument in favor of rampant increases in Government expenditures. Certainly, we should have economy in Government wherever these economies are possible, consistent with our world position and our obligations to our own citizens. What this argument essentially says is that the economy is operating at below par because of excessive tax burdens and that a lightening of these burdens may well stimulate the economy sufficiently that the Government can more easily pay for necessary Government expenditures with the lower rates of taxes.

However, in assessing the economic consequences of the tax bill, we cannot overlook the fact that substantial tax reduction has also been given to business firms. By 1965, corporations will be receiving over $2 billion of tax relief. As I said earlier, it is impossible to conceive of corporations simply taking these additional tax savings and burying them. The funds may go to purchase additional capital assets in which case the economy is stimulated in producing these additional capital requirements. The funds may go in other forms of outlays, such as new advertising campaigns or new research and development expenditures. In any of these instances, incomes are increased in the economy and greater activity is taking place. The tax savings of corporations may be used to pay additional dividends to stockholders. In this case, the stockholders can make the additional funds available through the investment markets. This increased availability of investment funds will, in turn, permit other corporations to obtain equity capital for expansion purposes. The significant thing is that in no case do tax reductions tend to lie fallow. They are used, and actively, to lubricate the economy, to make it operate more efficiently, and to expand the use of our productive resources.

Another significant, though unmeasurable consequence of tax reduction is psychological.

Surely there must be some favorable effect on corporations in knowing that the Government will no longer be a majority shareholder in the income earned by the corporation. Surely there must be a beneficial effect on individuals who will know that lesser amounts of additional income earned through personal effort will be taken by the Government. These stimuli cannot be guessed at in advance but their total psychological impact will probably be very significant in encouraging the operation of our private enterprise economy.

Time does not permit me to discuss in detail all of the other provisions that are in this lengthy and complicated tax bill of 1963. However, let me simply mention a few in the so-called reform area because many of these proposals also will serve to stimulate the economy as well as obtaining

improved equity of tax treatment among various groups. Much has been heard during the past few years about the tax treatment of capital gains. One of the capital gains proposals in the present bill is to distinguish particular types of capital gains which accrue to investors as contrasted with speculators. These so-called class A capital gains will be those realized on assets held for more than 2 years. In this case, the amount of the gains that need to be reported as ordinary income will be reduced to 40 percent from the 50 percent now in the law. The maximum rate on these gains will also be reduced from the present 25 to 21 percent.

Moreover, the present loss carryover provisions are going to be expanded so as to permit capital losses incurred in a particular year to be carried over as far into the future as necessary in order that the losses can be absorbed against other income. These capital gains changes can be justified both in terms of equity, in view of the fact that ordinary income tax rates are being reduced, and also on ground that they will stimulate investment activity that is induced by the hoped for capital gains.

Certainly the 25-percent rate has in the past served to discourage some investment activity. The lower rate should not only encourage more investment but also more mobility of investment funds from one direction to another based upon investors' judgment as to the greatest promise of financial returns.

Also, in the capital gains area, the bill would permit an exclusion from gross income for certain gains obtained from the sale of a personal home by taxpayers who are 65 years of age or over. This is in order to permit these older individuals to get out from under a home which is too much for them after their children have grown up without imposing a tax penalty upon these individuals at the time of the sale.

In another business area, you will recall that in the Revenue Act of 1962, an investment credit was established designed to encourage greater investment by American business firms in machinery and equipment. This credit was in the final act, qualified in part by requiring as a precondition for the credit that the depreciation base be reduced by the amount of credit obtained by individual firms. That requirement would be eliminated by the present bill so that the entire advantage of the credit could be obtained in an undiluted form.

On the individual side, a number of changes will be made by this bill. A minimum standard deduction is being provided equal to $300 for an individual taxpayer plus $100 for each of his exemptions, up to a maximum of $1,000. The advantages of this change are that, first, it will take cognizance of the difficulties in maintaining a minimum standard of living by lower income individuals and, at the same time, will concentrate a substantial amount of tax relief among lower income families who will probably spend virtually all of the relief that they obtain. This increase in expenditures, as I have indicated earlier, should significantly increase general economic activity.

Another individual change will permit for the first time averaging of income over a period of years for anyone whose income fluctuates substantially from year to year. As it is now, these individuals are hurt by the progressive rate structure because more is taken when incomes are high than the amount of tax reduction when incomes are low. The proposed change would permit these persons to spread their income out over a 5-year period for tax computation.

Another change affecting a limited number of individuals concerns the treatment of personal holding companies. These personal holding companies are essentially devices by which a few individuals can convert personal investment income into corporate investment income and thereby avoid the higher individual income tax rates. Now that these rates are being lowered substantially it makes less sense for individuals to use these personal holding company devices and, therefore, the penalties associated with this tax avoidance are being tightened.

My friends, I could go on with many, many other provisions of the proposed law—the liberalization of the charitable cntributions deductions, the dividend tax credit and exclusion, the multiple corporation provisions, the provisions for the time payment by corporations, the simplification of the personal casualty and theft losses, the adjustments on the medical expense deductions, the liberalization of the child care expense treatment, granting of new deductions for moving expenses, the many changes with respect to insurance, and so on. But I think it is clear from what I have said so far that at least three things are true with respect to this tax bill. First, it is complicated and detailed. Second, it is designed to obtain greater equity among various individuals in their payment of taxes and certainly no one can deny that taxes in this country should be imposed as fairly and evenly as possible. Third, I think it is clear that this tax bill should have a profound effect in activating our economy to greater heights and thereby reducing unemployment and stimulating demands for most types of products. I hope that as your time permits you will examine this bill in detail. I further hope that after your review, you will approve the action which the Ways and Means Committee has taken in order to maintain a strong free enterprise system with full employment and maximum opportunity in a free society.

Paderewski's Unmarked Grave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1963, President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk joined a number of Members of Congress and representatives of Polish-American organizations in the United States at the U.S.S. *Maine* Memorial in the Arlington National Cemetery to do honor to the memory of the great Polish musician and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Ceremonies on May 9 were for the purpose of formally dedicating a marker to designate the grave of this outstanding Polish patriot and friend of freedom.

Before Paderewski's death during World War II, he had expressed the wish to be buried in his homeland once his country was free. President Franklin Roosevelt therefore ordered that Paderewski's body be entombed in the Arlington National Cemetery until Poland was liberated.

Because Poland passed from Nazi occupation to Communist rule, Paderewski's body has not been moved but has for the last 22 years remained in an unmarked vault beneath the memorial to the victims of the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine*.

On learning of this fact, a number of other Members of Congress and I undertook action which led to approval of the construction of the marker.

Among those Members of Congress who showed particular interest in this project were Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey; and Representatives ROBERT M. GIAIMO, of Connecticut; HARRIS MCDOWELL, of Delaware; and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of an excellent article from the October 1963 issue of the American Legion magazine by Ruth Hume entitled "Paderewski's Unmarked Grave":

PADEREWSKI'S UNMARKED GRAVE—THOUSANDS PASSED BY EACH YEAR UNAWARE OF HIS PRESENCE

(By Ruth Hume)

Very few people have been aware that for 22 years the remains of the great Polish musician and statesman—Ignace Jan Paderewski—have rested below the *U.S.S. Maine* Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery. For most of that time, no marker identified his grave.

"But why is Paderewski in the *Maine* Memorial and why was his grave so long unmarked?" asks anyone who hears the story for the first time.

Paderewski was buried in Arlington on July 5, 1941. But the answers to the questions begin many years earlier, when, as a boy, Paderewski vowed that if he ever succeeded in making a name for himself in the world of music, he would, when the time came, put the weight of that name wholly at the service of Poland, his native country. He never wavered from his vow.

It was in 1891 that Paderewski made his American debut as a pianist at Carnegie Hall in New York. The date was November 17, the eve of his 31st birthday. His electrifying impact on this country was without parallel in our musical history.

Nearly 24 years later, in January, 1915, with the coming of World War I, the pianist—his name made; a vow to fulfill—came to the United States to make a different kind of nationwide tour. He was coming to plead the cause of a nation that did not exist, of a country that had been wiped off the map of Europe more than 100 years before. Three times—in 1772, 1793, and 1795—the kingdom of Poland had been hacked apart and divided among its neighbors. But although German, Austrian and Russian conquerors had worked ruthlessly at suppressing every trace of Polish individuality, they had never succeeded in stamping out the spark of hope that still lived in the hearts of the Polish people. Now, the spark flamed and Polish leaders were hopefully preparing for the war's end—for the day when statesmen from all over the world would meet at a conference table to draw the new boundary lines of Europe. If the century-old dream of a free and reunited Poland was ever to be realized, it would be then.

POLISH WAR RELIEF

Paderewski arrived in the United States with a double mission to perform. The first— to raise money for Polish war relief—was by far the easier. Paderewski traveled thousands of miles, through every State in the Union, to tell the story of Poland to his friends in America. "I have to speak to you about a country that is not yours," he would begin, "in a language that is not mine." In freedom-loving America the story had a peculiarly ironic plot. Self-governing since the 15th century, Poland had been one of the first nations in the world to advance the principles on which America had been founded. Yet Poland had lost her independence 4 years before America's had been declared.

Americans who contributed in response to the Polish patriot's plea were unaware that he had already given his entire fortune, the fruit of nearly 25 years on the concert stage as the greatest living pianist, to Polish

relief. (In 1925, when the American Legion's Endowment Fund was started and contributions were being solicited, Paderewski gave four concerts for the sole benefit of the fund, totaling almost $30,000. It was the largest individual contribution.)

His second mission? Secretary of State Robert Lansing was surprised one day when the pianist called to discuss a reunited Poland. "What does a pianist know," Lansing wondered, "about international politics?"

On January 8, 1918, President Woodrow Wilson presented to Congress his 14-point program for peace. The 13th of these read: "An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations * * * whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant." The wording was Paderewski's.

POLAND'S PREMIER

Paderewski gave up political life in 1921, after presiding as Poland's Premier for 2 years, and resumed his music career, which he was to pursue until his retirement in 1939. In that year, the beginning of World War II, Poland was overrun by Hitler's Germany and Paderewski, after first refusing, accepted the position of President of Poland's exile government in 1940. Later that year he returned to the United States where, on June 29, 1941, he died, at 80.

Paderewski wanted to be buried in his beloved Poland when it was free again, and, until that time, President Franklin Roosevelt offered his family Arlington Cemetery as a temporary resting place.

Roosevelt probably thought that Poland would be free when the Nazis were driven out, within a year or two or three.

At any rate he did not use his Presidential authority to provide for a marker for Paderewski's "temporary" resting place. But as the beaten Nazi armies moved to the west, the new darkness, long distrusted by Paderewski, moved into Poland from the Soviet Union. Two or three years stretched out to more than 20, and Poland was not free to receive its hero, who remained in his unmarked tomb in Arlington. Polish-American groups and the Paderewski Foundation all tried to have a marker put up. But the Army, following the rules that govern burial in Arlington, refused. Paderewski was there temporarily and he was a non-American, nonserviceman.

It took years, the power of the press, the pressure of various Members of Congress and intercession by the President before a memorial tablet would be erected to honor this great man.

On May 9, 1963, President Kennedy ascended the steps of the *U.S.S. Maine* Memorial to dedicate the plaque and address the assembly of Cabinet members, Congressmen, and Polish-American groups. Recalling President Roosevelt's promise in 1941 that Paderewski's body would be returned to Poland when the land is free, the President continued:

"That day has not yet come, but I believe that in this land of the free Paderewski rests easily."

Stampede to Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, realizing the long-range detrimental effect of passage of the administration's aid to higher education program, Dr. John Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., has become a leading spokesman for the group of college presidents who have courageously risen in opposition to the proposal. They are able to foresee that the inevitable result of enactment of this legislation would be the loss of our present system of education free from governmental control.

I call the attention of Members of the House to Dr. Howard's recent comments on the aid to higher education program as expressed in the Committee for Constitutional Government's publication Spotlight:

STAMPEDE TO DISASTER

(By Dr. John A. Howard)

What is a stampede? It is a rapid mass movement. It is engaged in thoughtlessly. It is caused by fright. It is dangerous, and it is exceedingly difficult to stop. The press toward Federal subsidy of education, in my judgment, meets precisely each of these qualifications.

We are being rushed into ill-advised remedies for education that violate the nature and neutralize the vitality of the educational system which has ably served this country's needs under circumstances the most various.

If our Nation permits our educational system to be circumscribed and distorted by Federal involvement as the agricultural system has been, the destructive consequences will be seen in every aspect of our lives.

The qualities of the educational system—strength or weakness, wisdom or folly, diversity or uniformity—will inevitably be reflected in the society some years later. As we may undermine the effectiveness of our schools and colleges, we reduce the potential of our society and alter its character. It is my belief that we as a nation are unwittingly placing in jeopardy our entire system of education.

As the Federal Government becomes the largest single source of funds for college after college, and there are a number already in this category, the institutions become beholden to the Government. This is not a chimera born of a doctrinaire distrust of Government.

Recently I wrote to the president of a well-known university inviting him to join a group of college presidents in making known the arguments against the ever-growing Federal subsidies of education. He replied that, although he was in full agreement with our position that subsidies are not in the long-range best interests of the colleges or the country, his own university was now so dependent upon funds from Washington he could not take a public stand on this issue without jeopardizing the university he served.

Think of that answer, if you will. The mere flow of money has silenced the opposition. The loss of political freedom on the part of those who depend on Government for their income was the reason for refusing suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Project the Federal aid programs ahead, not too many years the way things are going, to the time when all colleges and universities will receive the largest part of their budgets from the U.S. Treasury. It is likely that all faculty members in that day will feel some obligation to vote for whichever party promises the largest amount of additional educational subsidies, regardless of other partisan differences. Political freedom is sacrificed by those who depend upon Government resources. Can we afford to forfeit the political freedom of the whole academic community?

There is no need to depend upon conjecture for ascertaining the effects of Federal funds in education. There is now a manual of almost 800 pages devoted to a brief description of each of the educational programs in which the U.S. Government is already engaged. College executives may subscribe to a periodical soley devoted to the presentation of new Federal programs, and new interpretations of changes in old programs. The scope of current Federal programs offers plenty of opportunity for observation.

Early this year an issue of Nation's Business contained an article describing the inconsistencies, the distortions, and the general confusion which characterize the aggregate of Government educational programs. The source of that article is John F. Morse, who not long ago completed a 9-month study for the Higher Education Subcommittee of the House of Representatives. I urge you to read Mr. Morse's statement.

The inescapable conclusion seems to be that we must have a Washington superauthority to make plans for the academic segment of our society and to coordinate as well as pay for education through a central bureaucracy. This will be the disaster referred to in the title.

The predominant characteristic of American higher education has been its diversity. Each collegiate institution has its own particular nature, totally distinguishable from every other. The degree to which spiritual concerns affect the student during his undergraduate years ranges on different campuses from predominance to insignificance. Similarly, the political impact upon the student varies from pure conservatism at one college to extreme liberalism at other institutions. College curricula differ to a much greater extent than is generally recognized. I am convinced that it is a convergence of diversely educated people in each of the different enterprises of our society that has been the one condition which more than any other has made ours a dynamic, successful, and altruistic Nation.

What fosters this diversity? Principally it is the autonomy of the various institutions. As a college conceives or receives a new idea that seems promising, it has to sell it only to its own board of control. However, each new educational undertaking of the Federal Government provides a single board of control and thus diversity of American education is curtailed.

I do not know of one college executive who would not quickly agree that programs now supported on our campuses by Federal funds could be carried on at least as effectively by a comparable amount of funds from other sources and, in many, many cases, could be conducted with more imagination, more flexibility, less bother and at a much lower cost. Why then, do not the same executives oppose Federal aid? The answer is money.

Money is a good servant but a dangerous master. The only legitimate justification for Federal aid is that education lacks money and the Federal Government is far more prodigal with its funds than are other sources. If only the proponents of Federal aid would come right out and state this fact, we could face the issue head on and measure what the easy money buys against what we must sacrifice in order to obtain it from Washington.

It is undeniable that our increasingly technical society requires an increasingly skilled and knowledgeable population and, to accomplish this end, a larger part of gross national product must be invested in education.

The issue is whether this urgent objective is to be achieved through congressional action—which forces people to pay more for education and at the same time diminishes the diversity and circumscribes the creativity of the separate colleges—or whether the Nation can be persuaded to provide the necessary funds through traditional sources and thus preserve the freedom and the strength of American education.

I cannot believe that my colleagues in college administration would so readily forfeit the full potential of their respective institutions if they fully realized what was at stake. As difficult as their financial future may appear to them, it cannot be the reason for abandoning integrity. The course of educational statesmanship is to protect the greatest creative potential and the greatest institutional individuality. That course does not lie via the Federal Treasury.

The college executives and the officers of the Government who may have a part through their silent or vocal support of Federal subsidy will have to answer to history for the consequences of their work.

May this Nation recognize in time the stake it has in keeping education decentralized and unfederalized. If these views make sense to you, I urge you to do everything in your power to defeat additional Federal subsidies of education and also to increase the flow of funds to higher education through other channels. The accomplishment of both objectives is essential to the strength and vitality of this Nation.

Address of Senator Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Before the Interparliamentary Union in Support of Resolution on Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the address by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, to the Interparliamentary Union at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, last week has received worldwide acclaim for its forthright position of the U.S. Government in dealing with racial discrimination. Senator KENNEDY was speaking in support of a resolution on racial discrimination before the Interparliamentary Union. I insert Senator KENNEDY's speech and an editorial from the September 18 edition of the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, commenting on the Senator's speech, at this point in the RECORD:

THE SENATOR SPEAKS OUT

Senator TED KENNEDY is making a good impression in Yugoslavia. First of all, he had a chat with the formidable Madame Nhu, making it clear, no doubt, that the Kennedy administration has no objection to family combines in politics, so long as they behave themselves. Then he gave a speech at the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference that won great applause for its direct statement on racial prejudice.

It may well be that the administration is going out of its way to give younger brother a chance to look good, both at home and abroad, but if this is so the junior Senator is indeed making the most of it.

We need clear-speaking emissaries at international convocations, whether they are Senators or delegates, Kennedys or Lodges. And we like the way TED KENNEDY told the meeting at Belgrade that the United States is facing up to the problems of prejudice and has already made commendable progress. He sugested also that such problems exist in other parts of the world, even behind the Iron Curtain. By the time he got through talking, nearly all the delegates had turned up to applaud him—except Madame Nhu.

SPEECH BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY TO THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION IN SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

It is a very great privilege for me to be here at this conference. I have had the good fortune of being able to visit many of the nations of Europe at various times of my life, but this is my first opportunity to visit Yugoslavia. This nation and its leaders have been most hospitable to us. I think it is very significant that the delegates from so many nations can get together here, in pursuit of their mutual interest in parliamentary government. It is clear proof that the interests and problems we have in common can transcend the disagreements of diplomacy and the ideologies of politics.

I speak today on behalf of the U.S. delegation, in support of the draft resolution on racial discrimination of the committee nonself-governing territories and ethnic questions. Racial discrimination is not limited to any one country or one racial group or one period of history. The gypsies in central Europe, the "colored" in South Africa, the Negros in England and the United States and the minority racial groups in many European nations suffer from discrimination. My own Irish ancestors felt the sting of prejudice, both in the nation they left and, initially, in the country where they settled.

But racial discrimination in 1963 certainly is most publicized in the United States. In a sense, my Nation has asked to be judged in this area, because of the leadership we have taken in the cause of freedom and democracy around the world. I am sure all of you read about the gathering that occurred on the 28th of August in our Capital City of Washington. There came together at that time over 200,000 citizens—Negros and white people who believe deeply in the Negro cause. They exercised the traditional right of American citizens to petition their Government for redress of grievances. This demonstration was impressive both in its numbers and its dignity. I believe it made a lasting mark upon the conscience of the people of the world.

In a sense this demonstration showed both how much has been done and how much must be done to alleviate racial discrimination. The Negro race was brought to America, against their will, as part of the slave trade. The effort to free them from slavery precipitated the only Civil War my Nation has known. While this war freed the Negroes from their status as property, they were left without property, without education, without the means to participate fully in the democratic parliamentary process.

In the hundreds of years that have passed, the Negroes in the United States, despite discrimination, have made significant advances in their life. The average income today of the American Negro is more than that of white citizens in most nations of the nations of Europe. * * * The men and women who participated in the demonstration in Washington had means enough to travel hundreds of miles in modern forms of transportation. Among the participants were Negro business leaders, professional men, teachers, ministers, and entertainers.

But as I said before, the very fact that a demonstration was necessary shows how much must still be done if discrimination is to be ended.

The Negroes in America were asking for protection of their right to vote which is denied in some parts of the United States.

They were asking for more jobs, higher wages, better education for their children; and most of all for the chance to enjoy, on an equal plane with white people, the accommodations of restaurants, motion picture houses, and hotels.

Most of the United States is free of this form of discrimination. In my own State of Massachusetts, where the movement to abolish slavery began 130 years ago, a Negro today can eat in any restaurant, live in any neighborhood, apply for any job. He is protected by strong laws against discrimination which are enforced by the attorney general of our State who is himself a Negro.

And so I say to you, despite our failings, we of the U.S. delegation can support this resolution in good conscience. We have come to grips with our problem. We realize our special responsibilities. We are determined to clean our hands of racial prejudice so we can go before the world with deeds to match our words.

The American people have solved problems of discrimination before. Our Nation could not have prospered unless groups of immigrants from Europe, all of whom faced hostility when they arrived, had not become an integrated part of our society.

Neither I nor the President of the United States would hold the positions we do if America had not taken down the sign that said, "No Irish need apply."

I am sure that every nation represented here can point, as we can, to chapters in its history where the breaking down of discrimination—be it racial, religious, or geographic—helps unify and strengthen the country.

Whether it be the unification of Italy in 1861; of the unification of Germany in 1871, or the union of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes into Yugoslavia after World War I.

Let us all unite in supporting this resolution. Let us declare together that racial discrimination is wrong. It is legally wrong, morally wrong, and is bad for humanity.

Let us make an effort to end discrimination wherever it is, wherever it weakens and dilutes the principles upon which all our nations were founded. And in doing so, let us work together to achieve that happy situation best described in the words of the Scottish poet Robert Burns:

"For all that and all that,
It's coming yet for all that;
When man to man the world around
Shall brothers be, for all that."

The Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include an editorial from the Dallas Morning News reminding us that the strength of our system is founded upon the Constitution. I am afraid too many have forgotten how this Government was formed and why the United States has become the mightiest Nation on earth.

The editorial follows:

THE CONSTITUTION

In the hustling 20th century, we Americans are often too busy thinking about today and tomorrow to bother about yesterday. Always looking to the future—with hope and apprehension—we sometimes neglect our duty to learn the lessons of the past. Why is it that those who have the

most blessings are sometimes the least aware of them?

Americans today share an enviable place in history. Though they make up only 6 percent of the earth's population and occupy only 7 percent of its surface, they have produced 50 percent of the world's wealth.

Without doubt we have inherited the greatest amount of freedom, happiness and justice ever enjoyed by any people at any time in history.

Was all of this an accident? Or was it the direct result of something in our past which we would do well to remember?

Perhaps the most important single event in our past was the adoption of the U.S. Constitution 176 years ago, on September 17, 1787. For it was that Constitution which established the form of government under which we, as a people, have been able to achieve liberty, justice, and progress.

"To form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare and to insure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity"—these were the high aspirations of men who authored the document. They knew enough of human history to fear the mob as well as the king.

They were wise enough to know that no man or set of men could safely be trusted with excessive power. They set out to establish a new system of government under which all men would rule, yet all would obey.

The result of their endeavors—the Constitution—was the greatest compact for freedom known to history. It guaranteed against tyranny by dividing and limiting the powers of government, establishing a representative republic, and by concentrating on the dignity and freedom of the individual rather than the collective needs of society.

Adoption of the Constitution and establishment of the form of government it prescribed were a turning point in recorded history. For the first time, all of the tremendous resources and energies of individual mankind were released, sparking a worldwide revolt against the medieval concept of collectivist economies and feudal subjugation of the individual.

Those who today cry out that, in the name of progress, the Constitution must be amended or discarded ignore the fact that the very progress with which they identify themselves would not have been possible without the Constitution. They fail to understand that the Constitution, more than anything else, has been responsible for the tremendous progress to which they claim we must now adjust.

September 17–23 is Constitution Week, and it's wise to remind that our constitutional system which many believe to be outmoded is actually the most modern and progressive form of government ever devised.

Most of the up-to-date remedies proposed as substitutes for that system are, in reality, the same old doctrines which were in force for centuries before the Constitution lit the spark of liberty and progress.

But the greatest threat to our constitutional system comes not from those who attack it directly, but from those who are changing this system little by little and from those of us who fail to speak out against this gradual erosion.

Daniel Webster warned: "If the Constitution be picked away by piecemeal, it is gone, and gone as effectually as if some military despot had grasped it at once, trampled it beneath his feet and scattered its loose leaves in the wild winds."

When the Constitution was adopted 176 years ago this week, its authors pledged to defend it with their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor." Can we who have benefited so greatly from their gift afford to do less?

How To Kill the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an editorial from the Evening Star, dated, Tuesday, September 24, entitled "How To Kill the U.N.":

HOW TO KILL THE U.N.

As expected, members of the Afro-Asian bloc have marked the opening of the 18th session of the United Nations General Assembly with a formal demand that drastic action be taken against South Africa. The significance of their position can be summed up quite simply: Should they have their way, the world organization would very rapidly begin to fall apart.

For these members (most of them fledglings) have called upon both the Assembly and the Security Council to consider expelling South Africa from the U.N. and imposing an all-out economic and military blockade against it. And why? Because of its apartheid policy. This is a policy that enforces a strict separation of the races—not unlike the segregation that we have had, and still have, in many parts of our own country. What the Afro-Asians are shrilly asking for, in short, is the immediate end of all this—or else severe sanctions against the South Africans, including a U.N. vote to cast them into the outer darkness as a sort of international pariah.

Yet, however hateful apartheid may be, South Africa is a sovereign nation endowed with inherent rights to govern itself, and handle its programs, in what seems to it to be the best way. The action sought by the Afro-Asians would be the grossest kind of intervention in the internal affairs of a free and independent land. The people of that country therefore have reason to feel incensed. Americans would certainly feel the same way if a cabal in the U.N. undertook to condemn and punish the United States for the segregation that still exists in many of our States, north and south, east and west.

Accordingly, when it comes to voting on this matter, our country should neither equivocate nor abstain. Instead, it should emphatically support South Africa—a good ally of the free world—against the effort of the Afro-Asian members to meddle in what is none of their business. The U.N. cannot put up with such intervention without stultifying itself and digging its own grave.

Mr. Speaker, while I have no brief for the present United Nations, this situation in which we find ourselves only demonstrates how ridiculous and nonsensical our African policy really is.

Our African policy needs a careful and thorough review for there are many indications it is a failure which will have serious and perhaps disastrous consequences.

Our policy for the Dark Continent seems to be a very simple one. We oppose colonialism and apparently our definition of colonialism is a situation in which Negroes oppose whites. The United States has been the primary factor in the so-called freedom wave which has swept both Africa and Asia. We have pressured France, Britain, Belgium and Portugal to give up their territories. In Africa alone, 33 new states have been created since the end of World War II. There are only a few white enclaves left and these are concentrated South of the former Belgian Congo. The giant provinces of Angola and Mozambique still are Portuguese territory and South Africa is firmly in white hands. Elsewhere in Africa the whites have relinquished power or are in the process of doing so.

Obviously, old style colonialism could not be maintained indefinitely in Africa. But just as obviously, independence for the former colonial areas was not the answer to every problem. Not every mistake or mishap in Africa is this country's fault. Yet, as I have stated, we did put pressure on our former allies to get out and get out fast.

As a result, the continent has gone backwards. The civilization which the former colonial powers built has eroded; dictators control many of the new countries; many of these leaders and their favorites live on a profligate scale; the condition of the masses is worse than it was when independence came. There is little prospect of improvement but there are plenty of indications that the situation will get worse.

Nevertheless, we seem to have learned nothing by experience. This country has taken the lead in attempting to force the Portuguese out of Angola and Mozambique. Once that event takes place, we probably will try to throw out the South Africans. If we pursue our present course, we might even find ourselves at war with both Portugal and South Africa.

If this statement sounds extreme let me point out to you that we backed the United Nations attack on Tshombe in the former Belgian Congo. To all intent and purposes, this was our fight and it was pursued for motives which still remain obscure. The African nations wanted Tshombe crushed, the latter being a friend of the whites in the Congo. Our own Negro leaders also wanted the defeat of Tshombe. Perhaps these factors were decisive in our decision to convert the U.N. established to keep world peace, into an instrument of war.

Our State Department has tried to represent the downfall of Tshombe and the so-called unification of the Belgian Congo as a great victory. Actually, the Belgian Congo is torn to pieces and only the presence of U.N. troops prevent tribal fighting and other disorders. The situation in the Congo is so chaotic that it will take years for that unhappy country to reach the degree of stability and order which it had prior to independence.

If our dislike of Tshombe is a mystery, our attitude toward Portugal is even more so. In March 1961, a goup of terrorists invaded Angola from the Belgian Congo. They killed and tortured without mercy, being finally defeated and driven out by the aroused settlers and Portuguese troops.

Coincidentally with the invasion of Angola, the United Nations Security Council considered a resolution calling for an inquiry into conditions in the province. To the amazement and consternation of Portugal, a NATO member and long-time friend of the United

States, this country voted for the resolution.

Shortly afterwards, the United States voted in the U.N. General Assembly for an inquiry into the situation in Angola, the Security Council resolution having failed despite our vote for it. But before any inquiry could begin, we voted for a resolution before the Security Council which called upon the Portugese to "desist forthwith from repressive measures in Africa." This resolution carried.

In reality, we voted at the Security Council to condemn the Portuguese for defending themselves against the terrorists, whose atrocities are beyond description. Our censure of the Portuguese prior to any investigation of the fighting in Angola amounted to "a form of lynch law."

The Belgian Congo furnishes an example of what happens to a colony which achieves freedom before it is ready for it. Not only will it take a long time to undue the damage already done, but our own poor taxpayers must pay a large part of the bill. The United States has put more than $200 million into the Congo, to say nothing of U.N. funds which we furnished indirectly. Our taxpayers will be shelling out for a long time to come.

I do not think there is a single new state in Africa which isn't worse off now than when it gained its independence. The trend was summarized in a series of articles this year by Arthur Veysey, London correspondent of the Chicago Tribune. He wrote from Lagos, Nigeria:

> To travel through Africa 10 years ago was an exciting experience. Everywhere buildings, from proud city skyscrapers to neat one-room houses, were rising. New fields were being cleared and planted, pastures contoured to save water and soil, schools and hospitals opened.
>
> Each year fewer people were going to bed on the ground, hungry, cold, and sick. Fewer babies were dying. Everywhere people of all races were full of hope.
>
> Then came independence for most of the colonial countries.
>
> To travel through Africa today is a saddening, heart-searing ordeal. Building has stopped or slowed down, productive fields are going back to unproductive bush. Idleness has increased. Standards, both physical and moral, are slipping.
>
> People who so short a time ago saw an ever-brightening future, today ponder how bad things can get.

Even under the best of circumstances, many of the new countries cannot exist. They simply do not have the resources necessary for statehood. The well-known African geographer, George H. T. Kimble, said in a recent interview in the U.S. News & World Report that only five or six of the new nations were viable. Among these he named Nigeria, Uganda, the Belgian Congo, the Sudan, Tanganyika, and Ghana. He did not predict that these six had bright futures, or would remain as entities. He simply said they could get along if they were run right. But they are not being run right. Without exception, I think most of them are in bad shape today. Under the policies being pursued at present, they will continue to do downhill.

The independence wave in Africa has been followed by a series of unpleasant developments. Increasingly, the Afro-Asian bloc at the U.N. has become racist. They violate the charter frequently and with impunity. Not too long ago, the bloc used the U.N. as a forum for assaults on Portugal and South Africa. They are using the world organization as a megaphone in their campaign to drive Portugal and South Africa out of Africa, itself. They cry colonialism, which has come to be a very bad word, indeed, but they have no interest whatever in the colonialism practiced by Russia and the Red Chinese.

During the U.N. debate, the world's greatest colonial power cheered the Afro-Asian bloc on and took an active part in the proceedings. Our representatives at the U.N. sat by straight faced and let Russia get away with cynical and blatant hypocrisy. The U.N. has greatly damaged its prestige by its irresponsibility during the past few years. Regardless of the propaganda in its behalf, its destruction is likely unless it mends its ways.

Our own Negro leaders should be the first to criticize the U.N. for racism. Their goal in this country, or so they say, is complete integration. They do not want to be judged on the basis of skin color. Yet, curiously enough, they back racism in Africa. The Negro papers denounce not only South Africa, which practices apartheid, but the multiracial Portuguese. The latter, alone among the European colonizing nations, eschew discrimination based on skin color. Many Negroes have risen to high positions in the Portuguese African territories. Intermarriage and association between the races are common in Angola and Mozambique. But Dr. Martin Luther King, James Farmer, Roy Wilkins, and almost every prominent Negro leader denounces the Portuguese. They say they are not sincere and, in effect, argue for Negro rule in Angola and Mozambique because the Negroes are in the majority. If that argument is turned around, the whites should rule in this country. They are not only greatly in the majority but they settled North America and developed it. Sometimes I wonder whether our Negro leaders are as sincere as they profess to be. If they are sincere, they would be greatly exercised over the wrongs done the whites in Africa, or so it seems to me. Along with their denunciation of southern leaders in this country, they would be denouncing racists like Tubman in Liberia, Mboya in Kenya and Nkrumah in Ghana.

I wonder sometimes also about the sincerity of our anticolonial policy. I cannot understand why our spokesmen at the U.N. and the State Department are so quiet, not to say supine, in the face of Russian colonialism. We seem also not to mind Red Chienese colonialism in the least. Tears for Tibet long since ceased to flow, and we actually are talking about closer relations with the Russian regime in Hungary. We were greatly upset at the brutal massacre of the Hungarian revolutionists, but now our anger has abated. Our ire seems to be directed toward Western leaders like De Gaulle and friendly countries like Portugal.

Moreover, I am astonished at our part in making Dutch New Guinea an Indonesian colony. The story is long and involved but the purport is clear. Dutch New Guinea is a primitive area lying between Australia and Indonesia. As the name indicates, it formerly belonged to Holland. As is customary, we told the Dutch to get out. They agreed and suggested that New Guinea be turned over to the U.N. for an interim period.

About that time, Sukarno, the cocky little Indonesian ruler, decided he wanted New Guinea. Why, I do not know. This country is mostly jungle and is inhabited by a race called Papuans, a backward, tribal people. The former Dutch New Guinea had no economic, political, or ethnic ties with Indonesia. That did not matter. This country helped Sukarno and a deal was worked out. The net result: Sukarno took over the Papuans. Instead of being heartily ashamed of this breach of principle, our officials were very complacent about it. They seemed pleased that they had been able to do something for Sukarno, a dictator with close Communist ties.

I have tried very hard to understand our African policy. The best explanation, when it defects and consequences are pointed out, is that the whites cannot maintain a foothold in Africa. The Portuguese say that Angola and Mozambique are as much a part of their country as Hawaii and Alaska are part of the United States. Our Government pays no attention to such statements. Our officials simply shrug and say that the Portuguese cannot hold on. Nor does it help to point out that Angola and Mozambique are thriving and prosperous by comparison with the new states on the continent. Obviously, if the Portuguese are forced out we will see a repetition of the Congo mess all over again. Once again, our taxpayers will be handed the bill.

Our Government says it wants the Portuguese to make concessions. We should know that no concession made by the Portuguese will suffice, short of complete surrender. The drive against the Portuguese seems to have little support in Angola and Mozambique, themselves. If it had such support, the new African nations would not be threatening an invasion of the Provinces. After the first attack on Angola in 1961, the terrorists have never been able to muster any strength. If they had any real following inside Angola, there would have been trouble all along. Also, in view of the demoralized situation inside almost every new African state, it would seem that the first order of business would be to try to set some things right at home. But no, they are united on one thing—they want to end all white authority in Africa and the consequences do not seem to worry them in the least.

The Arab countries, including Ben Bella, Algerian dictator and friend of Castro, also want to drive out the whites. As an aside, I might say to the new Negro nations that they have a lot more to fear from the Arabs than from the remnants of white rule in Africa. After all, the Arabs were the original African slave traders.

Our Government seems to feel that events in Africa constitute a triumph in the cold war. None of the new African nations is avowedly Communist, al-

though several are very close to Russia. The real Communist threat in Africa is demoralization. If the trend continues, the Communists can pick up the pieces. The ruling politicians in Africa have made a lot of promises. They told their people that things would be great after the whites were gone. Instead, things get worse and worse. Below the rulers are younger politicians, impatient with the way things are going. They are more radical than existing leaders and much closer to the Communists. If the State Department wants to know what is likely to happen in Africa, I suggest that somebody take a look at the recent revolution in the former French Congo. This is a most ominous portent. I suggest also that the Russians are all for driving the Portuguese out of Africa. They support, most enthusiastically, this part of our policy. They are not doing it out of concern for the African natives.

This doctrine that certain events are foreordained does not convince me. If colonialism is dead, does that include Communist colonialism? Must we pursue a course which tears Africa to pieces? Would it not be the part of wisdom and commonsense to try to work out an African program which would include sensible cooperation between the Negroes and the whites? The needs of Africa are almost limitless. If we are to back racism and irresponsibility, Africa cannot possibly hope to get the money and help from white technicians and administrators which it must have. Surely, there are Negro leaders in Africa who have some sense of reality. But they have no reason to show it so long as the United States, itself, pursues an irresponsible course.

Un-American Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we still shudder in disbelief when we recall what took place in the halls of the House just a little over a week ago when certain members of our unruly younger generation invaded the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article relating to this incident which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, September 15, 1963.

The article follows:

DISORDER OVER CUBA

Last June 28 about 60 young American students left New York for a trip to Cuba, all expenses paid by Premier Castro. Their route was circuitous—via London, Paris, Amsterdam, and Prague—because they were making the trip in violation of a State Department ban on travel to Cuba except with special permission of the Secretary of State. "Our trip," the students claimed on their return last month, "violates no law and is in the best interests of all Americans." The House Un-American Activities Committee apparently thought otherwise; it subpenaed 10 of the students to testify.

The committee opened its hearings last Thursday in the House caucus room. For 2 days, the staid chamber was the scene of wild disturbances by the students and their supporters. They shouted that Southern committee members were racists. One witness who refused to answer questions declared: "I will not be forced to become a stool pigeon, a rat, a fink, or informer on anyone." When police moved to eject them they cried. "Police brutality." Fifteen were hustled out on Thursday, and 16 more the next day. Five persons were arrested for disorderly conduct.

The hearings, it was felt, would result in no more harm to the students than some bad publicity; but a few of them may be in for more serious trouble with a Federal grand jury in Brooklyn, which began hearings on the trip last week—the travel ban falls under a law permitting such regulations by the Secretary of State—and was said to have issued 15 subpenas. Some observers felt, however, that the trip had raised serious questions about whether and to what extent the Government should limit the travel rights of U.S. citizens.

Maybe We Are Stupid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Members of the House to an editorial entitled "Maybe We Are Stupid," which appeared in the Rochelle Leader on September 20, 1963. From time to time I have taken this means of presenting to the Congress some of the truly outstanding and thought-provoking columns published in this newspaper.

The article to which I bring your attention today offers some most succinct comments on the lack of consistency and coordination in our foreign policy with respect to trade with Communist-controlled nations.

The article follows:

MAYBE WE ARE STUPID

The news that Canada has agreed to sell Russia 228 million bushels of wheat has been greeted with anguish by many Americans who feel that such transactions undercut this country's foreign policy and strengthen the enemies of freedom.

They press the point further by referring to a section of the agreement that provides for transfer of 16.5 million bushels of the grain to Cuba to prop up Fidel Castro's sagging food supplies.

Our Canadian friends have shocked us before by selling grain to Red China and participating in trade with Cuba contrary to the wishes of the United States.

However our objections to deals of this kind have been growing more feeble and in this latest episode official sources said they were aware of the negotiations and offered no serious objections.

HUBERT HUMPHREY, Minnesota Senator and often a spokesman for the administration, went even further and said, "We might just want to take a look and see just how stupid we've been."*

He certainly has a point there in admitting that the Canadians have been right all along in making whatever deals they could with the Communist nations.

The most obvious factor in U.S. foreign policy has been its inconsistency. We have lamented the fact that some of our allies traded profitably with the Communist nations and at the same time we were doling out billions in gifts to Communist bosses—partly in economic aid and partly in military assistance that enabled the dictators to strengthen their hold on the people.

Our idea seemed to be that it was wrong to deal profitably with such nations but that it was right to give the stuff away.

So while we were chiding our friends for wanting to do business with the Communists we were furnishing $2.5 billion in aid to Tito in Communist Yugoslavia, a half-billion to Gomulka in Communist Poland and $6.7 million to Sukarno in Communist Indonesia.

Our argument for bolstering the regimes of these strong men is that they just might occasionally talk back to the Russian and Chinese Communists or show a little gratitude for our gifts.

But until recently we have at least kept up the pretense of enmity for the two Communist giants and have spent hundreds of billions for arms for ourselves and our allies and for keeping wavering nations out of the Communist orbit.

Even this is changing now as our leaders have decided to coexist with Russia and Red China and by inference to concede the legitimacy of their conquest of neighboring nations.

In the interest of coexistence we are adopting a nuclear test ban treaty "on faith," we have decided to accept the fact that Cuba is now a Communist stronghold and have even started being friendly with the bloody-handed Kadar regime in Hungary.

We've dropped our belief that the world cannot exist half slave and half free and no longer contend for free elections in the captive nations.

Perhaps this is the practical way to have peace in our times but we sincerely hope that Senator HUMPHREY won't have to look back in some future year and "see just how stupid we've been."

Immune Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the September 4, 1963, issue of the Ramsey County Suburban Life, which has recently come to my attention. I think my colleagues will be interested in its message and the following summary of a study being conducted by the W. E. Petersen Research Institute of St. Paul, Minn., on the physical and financial values of immune milk.

With football practice at Alexander Ramsey high school underway, 14-year-old Jack Pardun of 1647 West County Road B., Roseville, feels like he's got a new lease on life.

You see, Jack, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Pardun, couldn't have even considered going out for football a year or so ago. He had to stay indoors in an air-conditioned room all during the early fall season.

"But then the father of one of Jack's friends told us about the 'immune milk,' developed out here at the University of Minnesota," said Jack's mother who dropped in the other day to tell us about it. "He began drinking it, and believe me, life has taken on a completely different color entirely. This year he feels wonderful and has no trouble breathing. I just can't believe it.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: "Immune milk" is produced by the Struss farm out on Snelling Avenue, across from the Roseville Drive-In Theater, and has been subject of a series of articles in this paper before. Each season, other hayfever sufferers tell us about it entirely. This year he feels wonderful and has no trouble breathing. I just can't believe it."

Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years, Drs. Berry Campbell and W. E. Petersen of Loma Linda University and the University of Minnesota, respectively, have been conducting an extensive research project to show that the essential function of the mammary gland is not nutritional, but is instead toward the protection of the young mammal from a hostile microbic environment. They have evidence that this gland is an important mechanism for the immuniological protection of the otherwise helpless newborn. Such a view has important implications in medicine and animal husbandry.

Colostrum and milk contain a constantly appearing fraction of immune globulins. The antibodies constituting this globulin appear to have identical chemical composition with those in the blood serum. Heterologous antibodies introduced passively into the circulation of the mother appear in the milk. Experiments along these lines have established the fact that some of the antibody in milk is derived from the immune fraction of the serum.

At the present time this new discovery; namely, that antibody is synthesized locally in the mammary gland and may best be stimulated by direct immunization through the teat canal, has made it possible to produce with the same number of animals a much greater volume of antibodies. For this reason the use of milk rather than serum antibodies has become a practical endeavor.

In experiments with people suffering from arthritis and meningitis, sufficient remissions of the infection have occurred during four separate regimens of oral immunotherapy. In addition to the medical application, the newer understanding of the immunodynamics has a direct bearing upon certain problems of animal husbandry. The tremendou losses of young animals particularly in the dairy industry and in swine raising seems to be due to inappropriate measures taken to prevent infectious diseases.

Drs. Campbell and Petersen have shown that the mammary gland plays a dynamic role, receiving antigens from intercurrent infections during infancy and responding with the production of protective immunity. Practical use of this reactivity of the mammary gland of the cow may be made for the production of therapeutic antibody. Children and adults drinking immune milk infused with antibodies would receive immunity from diseases and dairymen in Minnesota would receive a higher price for immune milk produced and thus improve the standard of living for themselves and children. This research suggests that the greatest contribution of the cow to the human race is yet to be made and will be realized only when these remarkable features of the mammary gland are exploited.

Oklahoma Businessman Defends Water Development Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, community, State and National leaders throughout our country have voiced their resentment at last month's Life magazine article distorting and degrading Federal spending in the area of water resource development.

These Americans have made known their disapproval of Life's unfair attack in many forms—including letters written to the magazine's editor.

One such letter from William Morgan Cain, one of Oklahoma's foremost business and civic leaders and presently the president of the Water Development Foundation of Oklahoma, Inc., was not reprinted in Life's "Letters to the Editor" column.

Mr. Cain's letter to Life contains a thorough and thoughful discussion of some of the important reasons for developing and harnessing our water resources. In a calm, but firm manner, he illuminates some of the fallacies of the Life article.

Because of Mr. Cain's masterful job in answering the Life smear, I wish to have the full text of his letter published in the RECORD at this time:

WATER DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION
OF OKLAHOMA, INC.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., August 14, 1963.

Mr. GEORGE P. HUNT,
Managing Editor, Life Magazine,
Time-Life Building, Rockefeller Center,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HUNT: Your pork barrel exposé published August 16 which ripped into Government spending for water development projects was undoubtedly the greatest disservice you could have possibly done to the United States.

Water resources development is the country's greatest single challenge, as your publication pointed out in a lengthy article in 1961.

Life has glorified such Federal spending as the Space race, the foreign aid and Peace Corps efforts and our buildup for national defense.

But each time you speak of projects aimed at making capital improvements for the Nation—projects which will help build the economy and diversify our industrial base—you berate them. It costs an average $24,000 to create just one job for a single industrial employee. This is far too large a job for government to undertake with the quantity of unemployment now existing. But if Government aids projects which will create new climates that stimulate industrial investment, the private economy may well be able to give our unworking labor forces new opportunities.

The efforts of individual States to modernize their highways and increase their waterways are vital segments in industrial growth. Without economic transportation facilities, the less populous States of the Nation will never be developed to handle exploding conditions of overpopulation now occurring along both coasts.

To fill the interior of the country with opportunity, and avoid a predicted decline in the Nation's standard of living due to overcrowding, we must build up the areas which don't have all the natural endowments of more fortunate regions.

Oklahomans are doing what they can on their own to build the State. This year, Oklahoma City completed a $62 million project moving water 100 miles into its metropolitan area. Thousands of Sooner farmers annually match Federal aid dollar for dollar to dam up water for agricultural use. But the job is too great for a small population. We admittedly need help.

America desperately needs the new horizons being created in Oklahoma with "Kerr's Lakes" and the economic transportation to be available along the Arkansas River.

This is a region of low cost energy fuels such as coal, gas, and oil. Economic studies show the new canal will move these fuels and other vital minerals out of five States—goods and minerals now sitting untapped. To question that this region shouldn't be developed is tantamount to questioning man's development of the atom or his efforts to conquer space.

If our Nation can push costly exploration along the frontiers of science why shouldn't it use its know-how in ways to develop every section of the country to its fullest capacity.

We submit that every State in the United States will be amply repaid for their collective investments in Oklahoma. The vast resources tapped here and the development of a thriving economy on the plains will increase the gross national product and furnish great volumes of new taxes for the U.S. Treasury.

Our foundation represents and is financed by over 300 businessmen in the Oklahoma City area. We know the Arkansas navigation project isn't just a channel to tiny Catoosa, Okla. We have studies by economists which prove the Arkansas will be a gateway for goods coming to and from Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Wichita, Kans., Amarillo, Tex., and even Trinidad, Colo.

Thanks to a coming population of 230 million, Americans will be untolerably thirsty within 15 years if we don't continue to build reservoirs to stay ahead of industrial, domestic and agricultural demand. And if we are to continue growing economically, we must provide for expanded transportation networks.

Although you successfully beat the August slump in news with a sensational article colored with half-truths and blown past proportions, what price is America to pay for the misinformation about water projects you disseminated to millions of your readers?

Yours very truly,

WM. MORGAN CAIN,
President.

The Minority Error on the Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that some of our colleagues on

the other side of the aisle have decided to oppose H.R. 8363, the administration's tax reduction bill. I am convinced they are making a mistake. This bill is in the best interests of the economy and of the country in general. An excellent statement of the reasons why the Republicans are making a mistake in opposing this bill is contained in the following editorial from the Denver Post of September 22, 1963. I commend it to our colleagues:

GOP MAKES MISTAKE TO FIGHT TAX CUT

We are amazed by reports from Washington, among them the one from William White on this page today, that House Republicans have decided to make a major partisan fight against the proposed Federal income tax cut.

In theory, the Republican fight is not against the tax cut itself. But the Republican effort to attach a deficit-limiting cancellation clause to the tax cut bill will, in fact, destroy most of the stimulating effect of the tax cut and could wipe it out entirely.

What the Republicans want to do, specifically, is to attach a rider to the bill canceling the cut unless Federal spending is held to $97 billion this year and $98 billion next year. Otherwise, says Representative JOHN BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin, spokesman for the House Republicans, deficits expected with the $11 billion tax cut in the next 2 years could lead to inflation and financial ruin.

This is politically inspired nonsense. If the Republicans persist in it, and should succeed in their fight, it is they, not President Kennedy, who will have the albatross of "fiscal irresponsibility" hanging around their collective neck in 1964. They will be the ones who will have stifled the effort to get some of the burden of the Federal tax off the economy.

President Kennedy made a powerful and logical case for the tax cut last week, and now the Republicans have replied. Their reply is not impressive.

To get a nonpolitical view of the facts, let us look at what a group of responsible businessmen say:

"The deficits in recent years have, in large part, been the product of the failure of our economy to achieve its full potential because of the burden of oppressive individual and corporate tax rates. If unemployment is to be reduced, if idle plant is to be put into production, and if we are to achieve meaningful long-term economic growth, individual and corporate rates mus tbe reduced.

"We recognize that tax reduction in the magnitude contemplated * * * will add temporarily to an otherwise existing deficit. However, we believe that additional income flowing from the tax cut will bring the budget into * * * balance significantly sooner that if there were no tax cut at all. * * *

"We commend these Members of Congress for their concern and urge them to do everything possible to assure expenditure control. We also sincerely urge them to reconsider their position and to work aggressively for the passage of a tax reduction as soon as possible."

Who are these businessmen? They are members of a committee headed by Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co., and Stuart Saunders, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway—the most consistent moneymaker among American railroads.

Other members include financiers such as Frazar Wilde, chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Robert C. Baker, chairman of the American Security and Trust Co., in Washington.

It is quite doubtful that there's a Democrat in the lot. And it's quite certain that men of this caliber are not advocating anything that will lead the Nation to "financial ruin." Since even Congressman BYRNES himself agreed that President Kennedy was "dead right" in saying a tax cut is urgently needed, there is no sound reason for playing politics with it. There is not even a sound political reason for doing so—considering that the effect would rebound on the Republicans.

This tax cut should be passed. It should be passed soon. And it should be passed without any uncertainty-creating "ifs" or "buts."

National Gallery of Art—Calendar of Events for October 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following calendar of events for October at the National Gallery of Art:

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New publication: 18th century Venetian drawings from the Correr Museum. Central gallery, October 27 through November 24.

New publication: 18th century Venetian drawings from the Correr Museum. Exhibition catalog; 144 pages, 7½ by 10 inches, with introduction and catalog notes by Prof. Tiriso Pignatti, 100 illustrations; $1.50 postpaid.

Continuing exhibition: Water colors by J. M. W. Turner from the collection of the British Museum. Central gallery, through October 13.

Recent publication: Turner watercolors. Exhibition catalog; 54 pages, 7½ by 10 inches, with introduction by Edward Croft-Murray, 1 color plate and 37 illustrations; $1.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: Christmas cards. Folders (with envelopes) reproducing paintings, sculpture, prints, and drawings from the gallery collection—5, 10, and 15 cents each, postpaid. Free illustrated catalogue available.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6

Painting of the week: Harnett, "My Gems." (Gift of the Avalon Foundation) Gallery 71 Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00 Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Van Dyck and Hals. Rotunda. Tuesday through Saturday 1:00. Sunday 2:30.

Tour introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday 11:00 and 3:00. Sunday 5:00.

Sunday lecture, Ernest Barlach: "The Image in Word and Sculpture." Guest speaker Ernst Scheyer, author, lecture hall, 4:00.

Sunday concert, Rögnvaldur Sigurjonsson, pianist, East Garden Court, 8:00.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 13

Painting of the week: Cuyp, "Mass at Dordrecht" (Mellon collection). Gallery 47, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Titian and El Greco. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "John Trumbull, American Painter." Guest speaker, Thomas N. Maytham, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra. Richard Bales, conductor, Charles Crowder, pianist; east garden court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the educational office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 14 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20

Painting of the week: West. "The Battle of La Hogue" (National Gallery of Art purchase fund, Andrew W. Mellon gift), gallery 65, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Bellini and Giorgione. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Charles Willson Peale and family, Maryland artists. Guest speaker, Wilbur H. Hunter, Jr., director, Peale Museum, Baltimore, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: David Burge, pianist (program in honor of United Nations Day), east garden court, 8.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 21 THROUGH SUNDAY, OCTOBER 27

Painting of the week: Rubens. "The Meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek" (gift of Syma Busiel). Gallery 38, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Degas and Cassatt. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Problem of the Guardi Brothers." Guest speaker, Terisio Pignatti, director, Museo Correr, Venice, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Earl Carlyss, violinist; Donald Nold, pianist; east garden court, 8.

Praise for Senator Moffett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Texas State Senator George "Cotton" Moffett has long been recognized as an outstanding member of the senate in Texas. The list of his accomplishments is long indeed.

An example of the work he has done for the area he represents is contained in an editorial which appeared in the September 18, 1963, edition of the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times. The editorial, titled "Proven Over and Over," outlines the contributions Senator Moffett has made to the growth and progress of Midwestern University, which is located at Wichita Falls. This is indicative of the type of service Senator Moffett has given to the people of Texas. I commend the editorial to my colleagues:

PROVEN OVER AND OVER

Progress which Midwestern University has made since it became a part of the State system of higher education is gratifying to many individuals and officials but no greater satisfaction can come to any than accrues to State Senator George Moffett of Chillicothe, the Wichita Falls district's member of the Texas Senate.

What a friend Senator Moffett has been to Midwestern University.

While many citizens here and numerous State officials had a role in bringing into being the admission of Midwestern University into the circle of State colleges and universities, the effort was centered in the hands of the veteran and respected lawmaker who represents this district in the senate.

Senator Moffett joined in the preparations which were necessary to bring Midwestern University to the attention of the State. His skill as a lawmaker was called into play in winning acceptance of the proposal. But Senator Moffett has recognized, with others, that admission of Midwestern University is not an end in itself.

The growth which Midwestern University has enjoyed in its relatively brief existence as a fully supported State university has emphasized further requirements which have to be met if the institution is to keep up its value in the State picture of higher education.

Senator Moffett was instrumental in the move to secure a new and adequate library building on the Midwestern University campus. The structure is rising eminently and work is proceeding even ahead of schedule to bring this invaluable addition to facilities into being.

In the last session of the Texas Legislature, Senator Moffett performed still another great service to Midwestern University in getting agreement of the lawmakers on an appropriation which will provide Midwestern University with a science building that has been urgently needed to meet the challenges of the present era of upgraded sciences.

Senator Moffett's close contact with Midwestern University and his concern for its future have provided him with firsthand knowledge of the institution's assets and problems. His service to Midwestern University has been invaluable and as Midwestern University gains in student enrollment, in campus facilities and equipment, and in stature and prestige among the State schools it is heartening to know that his friendship and interest are assured because they have been proven over and over again.

Is History Repeating Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, each year on September 14 the decendants of a group of southern patriots gather at Liberty Monument in New Orleans to pay homage to the memory of their forebears who gave their lives during Reconstruction Days to drive the carpetbagger out of the South. The monument is located on the very site where men died in order to preserve the right of self-government and self-determination. As a result of this battle, Federal troops were withdrawn from Southern States, carpetbaggers driven out, and local government restored.

Today a new kind of carpetbagger is the scourge of the South. He is called by another name but his activities of unrest, dissension, hatred, and prejudice accomplish the same objective.

All of this has come about because of a Supreme Court decision overthrowing all previous decisions of the Court and invalidating the long-accepted doctrine of equal but separate facilities. When this decision was handed down I predicted that strife would be the result, that the races would be pitted against each other as in the days following Reconstruction, that violence would erupt, that blood would flow, and that both whites and blacks would die. Unfortunately my prediction has come true, and where there once was order there is now chaos; fuel is being poured on the fire by ambitious politicians, paid demonstrators, racists of both colors, and selfish men and women.

At the recent observation of the battle of September 14, Justice Walter Hamlin, of the Louisiana Supreme Court, gave a most learned address. It is interesting to examine this address, place it alongside of conditions as they exist today, and ask ourselves the question: "Is history repeating itself?"

Justice Hamlin is a distinguished jurist and an authority on Louisiana's history. Here is his address:

IS HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF?

Mr. Toastmaster, Reverend Clergy, and gentlemen, again I am indebted to you for the kind invitation to be present at your annual dinner, and to address you this evening. You are to be commended for your efforts to perpetuate the traditions of this community, and for calling attention to its citizens once more the sacrifices made by those gallant patriots who participated in the very important engagement of September 14, 1874.

This event was the act of a people who had once partaken of the nectar of freedom; who suffered under the iron heel of the carpetbagger; who had been oppressed, and were determined to again be free.

I would like to again bring before you some of the events, which, in my opinion, had much to do with sparking the actual shooting. They pertain to the history of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, of which I have the honor to be a member.

The story of the 8 years of misrule in Louisiana, from 1868 to 1876, has never been fully told. In the time allotted to me I will attempt, within my limited abilities, to give you the highlights of this story, insofar as the supreme court is concerned.

History affords few parallels for the spoliation and demoralization of that time. The supreme court was a part of the governmental and party system under whose auspices and by whose members this gross wrong was perpetrated, and contemporary criticism did not separate or spare any department.

The political leaders of that period were a litigious set. They were in court all the time; history records that the courts had never been called upon to decide so many controversies of a public or quasi-public nature. The supreme court was the battlefield where officers and emoluments were lost and won, and these political quarrels were not always aired and adjudicated without leaving scars on the judicial body.

The supreme court reports of cases decided—called annuals—of that period establish the supreme court as one of the chief instruments in the overwhelming and subjugation of Louisiana in those days.

Associate Justice William Wirt Howe, appointed by Governor Warmoth in November 1868, was particularly restive during much of his term; it is said that his resignation in 1872 marked his final rebellion against the political methods of the day.

All of the other justices save Howe were antebellum residents of the State and more or less well-known personages. Howe had been a major in the Federal Army, reaching New Orleans at or just after the capture in 1862, and while in the Army he had been assigned to various tasks which brought him in contact with the people. This contact was favorable to both the people and Mr. Howe, because he engaged in the successful practice of law in New Orleans until the time of his death in 1911. He was senior member of the firm of Howe & Kennard, the law firm which over the years has continuously existed and is now known as Phelps, Dunbar, Marks, Claverie & Sims, in the Hibernia Building. A few years ago, I had the pleasure of seeing every letterhead in a large frame showing its evolution, commencing with the letterhead of Howe & Kennard which was used over the years by his firm. When I was admitted to the bar in 1919, the firm was known as Howe, Fenner, Spencer & Cocke, even though Mr. Howe had been dead 8 years.

During the 8 years from 1868 to 1876, the supreme court was known as the Ludeling court, the chief justice being John T. Ludeling of Ouachita. It is indisputable that the 8 years of the Ludeling court left a bad taste in the mouth of the people of this State. The underlying reason was, of course, found in the fact that the great mass of the population here before the War Between the States, and the bulk of the property of the State, were unrepresented in the political party which was then dominant.

These unrepresented masses considered the Government of the time to be venal and corrupt. It was regarded as a revolutionary creation established by the power of the National Government, which was always ready to sustain it, and did, in fact, maintain it by a show of force whenever the reviving democracy seemed able to shake it off.

It was, therefore, believed that a State judiciary existing under such conditions could not be better than the State government itself; consequently it could not and did not command the respect and affection which has always been felt for a supreme court more happily constituted.

It was charged and believed that the judges were ardent partisans, active in counsel and advice, and influenced by the leaders in all cases having a political aspect. It was the general opinion that no argument would convince the court in any case where the result would be injurous to the interests of the dominant party, or would tend to advance the prospects of their opponents. It was also believed that this intense partisan bias affected the decision of every case where counsel, parties, or witnesses happened to be of opposing political families.

A tribunal thus always under suspicion, where one particular class of litigation was concerned, was, of course, on the defensive in all matters; but there is no evidence to sustain any charge against the fair conduct of the general business of the court.

The judges were a strong, forceful body of thinkers. Indeed, their undoubted ability and capacity was the bulwark of the wicked government under which they served.

The annuals from 1868–72 cover a great course of jurisprudence—not even at the beginning of that century were the questions at issue so intricate or the matters at stake so important. This court was engaged, as had been the case with the first court, in rebuilding a government. It was called on to interpret and to enforce legislation which was intended to reverse the ancient and create a new order of things.

These judges were contemporaries of the men they now rode with whip and spur; they had ripened under the same influences, yet they were vindictive, unyielding partisans who abated not one jot or tittle in favor of their ancient fellowship. They wrote a jurisprudence which on public questions was specious and unsound, and it was torn to pieces by the succeeding court and by subsequent legislation; indeed, the whole hope of life in this part of the world ran contrary to the ruling dogmas of that frightful time, supported by the ability and authority of this high tribunal.

But when I have brought this indictment, it is my duty to say that in other aspects, on general questions of jurisprudence, this bench was the equal of any. No student of the law can deny the learning and the strength and ability of the reasoning by which many great questions were then settled—decisions which have been reexamined and maintained by all succeeding courts.

Stormy times continued to exist.

Then came the battle of September 14, 1874, and the coming to the forefront of the great Francis Tillou Nicholls.

The State election held on November 7, 1876, was involved in the returning board troubles of that winter, with the result that dual governments were inaugurated in the ensuing January. Almost the first act of Governor Nicholls was the appointment of a full bench for the supreme court. These persons qualified on January 8, 1877, before A. L. Tissot, district judge of Orleans, and early in the morning of the 9th secret preparations were made by the Nicholls police and militia to capture the Supreme Court Building and to seat these judges.

The Packard government had installed its own police in the building, and at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, January 9, 1877, Ludeling, Leonard, and King called upon the sheriff to open court, which he refused to do, and he was thereupon suspended, and a sheriff appointed by the court, who performed the usual ceremony. Opinions were handed down by Ludeling and Leonard, and on motion of the Packard attorney general the court adjourned.

About noon the Nicholls police demanded the surrender of the building, and after some delay physical possession was taken, and the Nicholls justices were brought into the courtroom, where at noon the court was opened by the sheriff of Orleans Parish. The commissions of the justices were spread on the minutes. Alfred Roman was appointed clerk, several motions and orders were entered, and a distinguished lawyer of the New Orleans bar pronounced a mortuary eulogy—not on the old court, but on a recently deceased district judge—and thereupon the court adjourned out of respect to his memory.

The capture of the courtroom and the installation of these justices was a political master stroke, and gave the Nicholls government a solidity and authority that was of immense service as matters then stood. For a time it was feared President Grant would order the dispersal of the court, but ultimately he recognized the status quo, and the Nicholls justices remained in possession of the courtroom, which was, moreover, guarded day and night by volunteer militia. After President Hayes' inauguration, the support of the army was withdrawn, and the Packard government disintegrated.

The court as thus constituted was Thomas Courtland Manning, of Rapides, chief justice; Robert H. Marr, of Orleans; Alcibiade De Blanc, of St. Martin; William B. G. Egan, of Caddo; and William B. Spencer, of Concordia, associates. They were without exception leaders of the democracy, and had taken an active part in all the stirring events of reconstruction.

At its first sitting the court entered orders reassigning all cases under advisement, and also rearranged the fixed causes so that business could be resumed on the day succeeding. The installation was necessarily a dramatic spectacle; literally it was the act of embattled people, but the justices gave no outward manifestation that any unusual or extraordinary event was in progress. The minutes make no note of the abortive session of the evicted judges, nor is any mention made of the physical capture of the seats.

On the next morning, January 10, 1877, the routine business was taken up, and thereafter the tribunal never faltered or delayed in the ordinary conduct of affairs. When the rival government passed away forever, the incident fell unnoted upon a court secure in the confidence and respect of all the people.

Resolution of the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce in Opposition to Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to believers in constitutional government that young business and professional executives recognize the dangers inherent in the so-called civil rights bill before the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution recently adopted by the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce which I feel to be timely, thought provoking, and appropriate.

It follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI STATE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas all members of the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce are imminently concerned with the future of our State and Nation, with the freedoms which are so dear to the citizens of all democratic nations, and with the prospects of being deprived of any of our fundamental rights by governmental encroachment; and

Whereas we believe that the free enterprise system is one of the fundamental qualities which has attributed to the success of our Nation and that whenever anyone in the free enterprise system is told to whom he must sell, from whom he must buy, whom he must hire, or whom he must serve, the system is being destroyed and along with its destruction the essence of all freedoms which we hold so dear are being destroyed; and

Whereas we believe that education, voting, and relations between the citizens of any community are matters entirely of local concern; and

Whereas we believe that any action of the Federal Government to interfere with these matters of local concern is beyond the authority granted to the Federal Government by our Constitution, is an intervention upon rights of citizens of this Nation, and is an infringement upon the responsibilities of the States as established by the Federal Constitution; and

Whereas though we fully realize that great problems exist in the area of race relations in our Nation, we believe that any efforts to force a solution to these problems, whether it be by the force of a governmental power, the force of lawless action, or the force of mob action, will serve only to widen the chasm that now exists rather than to diminish the antipathy that now exists; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering legislation commonly referred to as the civil rights bills which strive to force solutions to our race relations problems; which contain provisions that deprive citizens of this Nation of essential freedoms upon which this country was founded and which we hold so dear; and which intervene in affairs that, if to be satisfactorily handled, must be dealt with by the people directly involved; and

Whereas we believe that enactment of legislation of this nature tends to transpose our Nation into a dictatorship rather than a democracy, though all the principles of freedom in which we so strongly believe are so violently opposed to a dictatorial government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled, That we unanimously oppose every phase of the legislation now before the U.S. Congress commonly referred to as the civil rights bills, and we earnestly urge each and every Member of Congress and each and every citizen of the United States to consider the dimensions of this bill and its complete undesirability and to strenuously oppose its passage: and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce, that it be made available to the press, and that the executive vice president of the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce deliver forthwith a copy of this resolution to Senators JAMES O. EASTLAND and JOHN C. STENNIS, and Representatives THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, JAMIE L. WHITTEN, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, WILLIAM ARTHUR WINSTEAD, and WILLIAM M. COLMER.

Passed and adopted by the board of director of the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce at its summer all-State (board) meeting at Pascagoula, Miss., on September 22, 1963.

J. C. MCDONALD,
President, Mississippi Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Tito Visits Chile in Quest of Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as is known, the Communist dictator, Tito, is now on a foray of certain countries in Latin America and soon will be arriving in the United States as an unofficial guest of our Government.

A short but very revealing AP news item on Tito's visit to Chile appeared in the Washington Star last evening. The gist of the news item is that Tito

launched his campaign to neutralize Chile from its pro-Western policies as soon as he arrived at the airport in Santiago. This news item confirms what has been patently evident for a long time. Tito is Moscow's No. 1 "Trojan horse" in the free world.

It is time that practical thought was given to the implications of Tito's unofficial visit to Washington. There can be no doubt the status of respectability he will thus acquire will serve as a powerful letter of credit for further disruptive forays into the camp of the free world community. It will also provide propaganda ammunition for the enemies of the United States whose subversive work is carried on under the cover of neutralism.

By what rule of reason would the United States accord favored-nation treatment to a Communist dictatorship whose leader works openly to turn our sister Republics of this hemisphere against us?

The Associated Press dispatch from Chile follows:

TITO VISITS CHILE IN QUEST OF ALLIES

SANTIAGO, CHILE, September 24.—President Tito of Yugoslavia says he came to see Chilean President Jorge Alessandri in the hope of furthering "the cause of peace and constructive international collaboration."

His remarks on his arrival from Brazil yesterday were interpreted as an attempt to swing Mr. Alessandri from a largely pro-Western to a nonalined course in world affairs.

Mr. Alessandri welcomed Marshal Tito at the airport. A crowd of 1,500 turned out. There were no incidents. Roman Catholics and conservatives have opposed Marshal Tito's 5-day state visit.

Bonneville Says "Do It Our Way or Else"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently contained an article on page A5906 from the September 14, 1963, Idaho Daily Statesman reporting on a speech made by Charles F. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator. Our colleague from Idaho, who inserted this article in the RECORD, said Luce clarified many of what he calls "the false impressions that the power companies have been attempting to give of BPA." However, I have read the article very carefully and fail to see where it clears up anything. So far as I am concerned, it further clouds the issue with some more typical Bonneville doubletalk.

It should be noted that the same paper carried another article, September 17, entitled "Idaho Power Head Decries Luce's 'Incorrect' Speech; Raps BPA Threat to Idaho." I will include this article at the conclusion of my remarks so as to keep the RECORD complete.

The article previously inserted by our colleague said Luce expressed his hope of cordial and cooperative relations with the Idaho Power Co., despite the firm's anti-Bonneville campaign. What I would like to know is how a company can establish cordial and cooperative relations with an outfit that is getting ready to cut its throat?

Bonneville has requested terms for a possible contract with the Idaho Power Co. to wheel BPA power from the Columbia River system to southern Idaho over the company lines. I would not dignify this act by calling it a request—it is more in the form of a blackjack ultimatum. If the company is reluctant to cut its own throat by wheeling power from the Bonneville system into southern Idaho so Bonneville can take over the Idaho Power Co.'s and Utah Power & Light Co.'s customers in southern Idaho, we will find Bonneville running to Congress with a request for appropriations to construct about $80 million in Federal lines into that area.

The Administrator is quoted by the Idaho Daily Statesman as saying that "in talks with the company, we already have assured its top executives that Bonneville has no intention of damaging the company." That is just like the little boy fishing on the Mississippi River telling the catfish, "I don't want to hurt you, little fish, all I'm going to do is gut you." All Bonneville wants to do is to take over customers now being served by investor-owned electric companies. In the article I am inserting, the president of the Idaho Power Co. states that:

> It is a known fact that even now Bonneville is actually planning, among other things, the taking over the phosphate industry's requirements of power and is actually negotiating with some of those phosphate producers.

Those producers are presently served by electric companies.

Mr. Speaker, I have an original copy of the article our colleague inserted in the RECORD which quotes Mr. Luce as saying:

> Bonneville is ahead, not behind, on its "mortgage payments" to the U.S. Treasury, presently by about $200 million.

I thought that $200 million must have been a typographical error since I did not believe even the Bonneville Administrator would stretch the truth that far. I am very happy to note that our colleague corrected this error in his insertion by changing the $200 million to $20 million. However, the Administrator did not tell the people that this $20 million will probably be eaten up this year by Bonneville losses.

In Mr. Luce's speech I am not sure whether he used the figure $200 million quoted by the paper or $20 million as inserted in the RECORD, but nonetheless he was attempting to convey the impression that Bonneville was in no financial difficulty and was actually ahead of its payments to the Government. The Administrator continued by saying:

> The Bonneville Act requires it to pay its own way.

But the truth of the matter is that it is not paying its own way, and has not been for several years. I see no indication of Bonneville increasing its rates so as to put it in the black despite assurances given to me earlier this year by BPA that a general review of their rates would be completed during the summer and fall of 1963. On March 4, 1963, in a statement before this body I said:

> Mr. Luce has indicated in his letter that BPA realizes that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964–69.

I went on to say:

> This realization will be welcomed warmly by the taxpayers provided that the increase is sufficient to eliminate the drain which BPA currently inflicts on the taxpayers' funds.

Six months have passed since these assurances were given me by BPA; and as I said a moment ago, I see no indication of Bonneville increasing its rates so as to put itself in the black. Instead we find them invading southern Idaho.

This invasion of southern Idaho is going to increase rather than decrease the Bonneville deficit; and, if Bonneville builds a high-voltage transmission line into southern Idaho, as I am sure it contemplates, the deficit will be further increased by several million dollars. The increased Bonneville loss does not include all of the losses to the Treasury, since the Bureau of Reclamation was selling power at a price of approximately twice that charged by Bonneville. With Bonneville's taking over the marketing of power the Bureau has been marketing, this will result in a further loss to the taxpayers.

The Administrator tries to gloss over the impact of its reduction in power rates by saying the Bureau projects have been merged with 22 dams, either existing or under construction, which are included in the BPA's rate base. He says the allocation to power of the Bureau projects taken over is only about 1 percent of the total of more than $2 billion invested in Federal power facilities in the Northwest. I fail to see where a statement of this type alters the situation one iota. A loss is a loss, whether it is on $2 billion or on only $20 million. And, when you increase the loss on $2 billion or $20 million, it results in an added drain on tax funds.

Mr. Luce said:

> The chain of events which lead to inclusion of southern Idaho in BPA's marketing area included the finding of a possible power shortage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have been intimately acquainted with the power situation in southern Idaho because one of the committees of which I am a member has made many investigations of this situation in connection with a proposal to authorize Burns Creek. I can say categorically there is no power shortage in southern Idaho and no indication of a shortage in the foreseeable future.

If we looked behind the scenes and really smoked out the reasons for Bonneville's invasion of southern Idaho, I am satisfied the real reason would be pun-

ishment of two power companies for having the temerity to oppose the construction of two Federal power projects in Idaho. It would be a vindictive reprisal against Idaho Power Co. for construction of dams in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River and against the Idaho Power Co. and Utah Power & Light Co. for their opposition to Government construction of a hydroelectric powerplant at the Burns Creek site on the Snake River.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a sad state in this country when the bureaucrats can waste Federal funds in reprisal against taxpaying, investor-financed companies for protecting their investors and those they serve.

The president of Idaho Power Co. has done a good job in calling attention to the misstatements, inaccuracies, and doubletalk included in the Bonneville Power Administrator's speech, and under unanimous consent I insert the Idaho Daily Stateman's report of his answers in the Record:

IDAHO POWER HEAD DECRIES LUCE'S INCORRECT SPEECH—RAPS BPA THREAT TO IDAHO

T. E. Roach, Idaho Power Co. president, declared Monday that a Bonneville Power Administration official made incorrect statements and issued a "do it our way—or else" threat in a recently reported speech at Idaho Falls.

The utility president, who described the Federal agency as "freed of any regulatory responsibility or restraints," was commenting on a speech by Charles F. Luce, BPA Administrator, last Friday.

Pointing out that investor-owned companies were supplying southern Idaho with ample power "long before BPA ever came into existence," Roach said:

"Probably the most significant statement made by Luce at Idaho Falls is the implied threat that if the companies serving southern Idaho do not walk up to the counter and sign a wheeling contract as dictated by Bonneville, it will provide an alternative source—meaning using taxpayers' money to duplicate transmission lines.

RATES CHALLENGED

"Luce's statement that BPA is able to offer rates lower than those charged by the Bureau of Reclamation because they are based on a larger group of projects with a lower average cost of generating electricity is not supported by BPA's own 1962 financial reports or the cost figures found by the General Accounting Office. On the contrary, BPA costs are shown to be higher than those of the southern Idaho Bureau of Reclamation plants by at least 25 percent.

"Likewise incorrect is his reported statement at Idaho Falls that there exists a probability of power shortages in southern Idaho in 1965 or in fact in any other year in the future. Through the foresight and abilities of investor-owned taxpaying companies, southern Idaho was being supplied ample power long before BPA ever came into existence, and it is those same companies and their long record of performance that assure adequate power for any needs of the future, including those of the so-called preference customers, no matter the size.

"To assume, as Luce does, that only BPA can supply these needs is the characteristic position of Federal bureaucracy that only agencies of the Federal Government are capable of meeting the needs of the area because taxpaying enterprise is incapable of doing so. It is significant that no proof is ever offered on this point—only generalized and pontifical statements.

"DOUBLETALK CLAIMED

"Luce's statement that the taxpaying utility companies serving southern Idaho have been assured that Bonneville has no intention of damaging the companies carries little assurance of sincerity when it is a known fact that even now Bonneville is actively planning, among other things, the taking over of the phosphate industry's requirements of power and is actually negotiating with some of those phosphate producers.

"Moreover, the so-called feasibility study upon which the marketing area expansion was predicted is grounded in the assumption that BPA will do just that. This is the BPA plan, notwithstanding Idaho Power Company's scheduled construction of added generating capacity at Hells Canyon and Utah Power & Light Co.'s similar construction of facilities at Kemmerer for the express purpose of supplying all future needs of the phosphate industry.

"And contrast the wheeling-contract threat of this unregulated and uncontrolled Federal agency, which is responsible to no local authority, with the democratic processes which State and Federal laws have specified for investor-owned, taxpaying suppliers such as Idaho Power Co.

"REGULATIONS CITED

"An investor-owned utility must first obtain a permit to do business from the Idaho Public Utilities Commission; then it must obtain a franchise from each organized city or town as well as franchises from the county for areas outside of cities. Its rates and contracts must be approved by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission and, additionally, by the Federal Power Commission if interstate sales are involved. Moreover, the quality of the service rendered and all proposed expenditures for generating, transmission, and other necessary facilities must be likewise approved and authorized.

"Freed of any regulatory responsibility or restraints, BPA is quick to lay down the threat; 'do it our way—or else.' Certainly with this evidence of roughshod, threatened Federal dictation, it is time for the taxpaying citizens of Idaho to ask themselves these important questions:

"Does Luce or any other Federal employee acquire greater ability, greater knowledge, or greater dedication to public service by reason of employment in a Federal agency than the individuals who operate the investor-owned taxpaying utilities?

"BPA INTEREST QUESTIONED

"Does Bonneville Power have a greater interest in the welfare of Idaho's economy or its electric customers than does Idaho Power or the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, which regulates the industry in the interest of the local people?

"The answer can only be that the Washington or Bonneville theory of individual superiority and dedication is a myth without foundation. Federal employees and other public officials are merely servants of the people placed in those jobs or offices to carry out the people's will and not to dictate or destroy by using the unlimited and uncontrolled power of centralized government," Roach said.

Human Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to speak at the Shevchenko Memorial Banquet held at the Mayflower Hotel on Saturday, September 21, 1963. This banquet followed impressive ceremonies dedicating the location in our Nation's Capital where a statue of Taras Shevchenko, poet-patriot of Ukraine, will be raised in the spring of next year.

Under leave granted, my address on that occasion follows:

HUMAN DESTINY

The curtain was lifted today on an epic chapter in the great book of human freedom which for too long has remained closed to the Western mind. That is the real meaning of the dedication ceremonies which took place today in connection with the memorial to Taras Shevchenko, soon to take its rightful place among the monuments to freedom which grace our Nation's Capital.

For Taras Shevchenko was a unique champion of freedom for all men and independence for all nations, just as he was an avowed enemy of tyranny, despotism, and imperialism.

Shevchencko stands among that small but select group of gifted men whose toils and sacrifices over a lifetime have won them a lasting place of honor in the annals of their native lands. He shared as well as sensed the sufferings of his countrymen under the oppressive yolk of Russian imperialism. He sensed as well as shared with moving convictions the aspirations of his countrymen for a life of freedom and human dignity. He was able to see beyond the travail of his own people and the despotism of their oppressors and thereby to understand the spirit of the new hope which had been lighted up across the seas by George Washington. With gifted pen he recorded all these things and communicated them to his people in a style which won for him the enduring role of poet laureate of Ukraine.

A century has passed since the death of Shevchenko. But the message of his literary works burns more brightly today in the hearts of his countrymen. The reasons for this are all too obvious. Ukraine remains a victim of Russian imperialism and her people now suffer the tyranny and exploitation of the Red Tsars.

During the century since the death of Shevchenko much has happened and much has changed in the affairs of men and of nations. The autocratic Tsars, who felt the literary barbs of Shevchenko and who put him to exile and prison for his efforts, have met the fate he predicted for them. The empire over which the hated Tsars ruled crashed and was broken in 1917 and 1918 by the power of the national independence movements, unleashed by the circumstances of World War I. Ukraine won its national independence, as did more than a score of other non-Russian nations long submerged by an evil concert of empires. Petrograd, the seat of despotic Russian power, temporarily rid itself of a corrupt aristocracy when the chains of its historic imperialism were broken. The world, so it then appeared, was on the threshold of a new era of peace in which freedom and the independence of nations long was assured.

This illusion of peace was short lived. The vacuum of imperial power in Petrograd was soon filled by a new batch of despots, who sailed under a red banner and called themselves revolutionary Marxists. They were not long at the task of fixing their dictatorial power over the Russian nation—whom Shevchenko called the Moskals. These so-called social revolutionaries were unable to reform or contain the chauvinism or the imperial spirit of the Moskals. But they did manage to change the name of the Russian nation from Muscovy to that of Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republics, and to make Moscow the permanent seat of imperial power. Wars of subversion and aggression were soon launched by the Red Moskals against all the newly independent non-Russian nations—in an effort to reconstruct the Russian empire.

By 1923 the Red Moskals had destroyed the national independence of Ukraine, along with that of Byelorusia, Georgia, Armenia,

Azerbaipan, Turkestan, Cossackia, Idel-Ural, and the Republic of Siberia among others. But the theories of Marxism on imperialism and colonialism were in danger of exposure as a fraud by this exercise of historic Russian imperialism. So the Russians solved this embarrassment in 1924 by announcing the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The formerly independent nations recolonized by the Red Moskals were labeled Union Republics. This served and continues to serve as a propaganda cover for the reconstructed empire of the Russian Tsars.

Lenin, the oracle of Russian Marxism, recognized before he died that the theories of Marx and Engels had become the victim of Russian despotism and imperialism. He made this deathbed prophesy in 1923:

"There can be no doubt that the insignificant percentage of Soviet and Sovietized workers will drown in the great Russian sea of chauvinist riff-raff like a fly in milk."

The 40 years since his death have proved Lenin's prophesy to be correct.

World War II restored by force of arms the former imperial Russian colonies of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to the U.S.S.R. and added a new crop of Russian colonies, called Peoples Republics or Socialist Republics. While the new crop of colonies were not forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R., the spirit and national life of these colonies are imprisoned by Imperial Russia.

It is proper, therefore, to observe that while much has changed in the affairs of men and of nations during the century since the death of Shevchenko, Russia, the Russians and their empire have not changed in substance. They are little different today than they were in the days of Shevchenko. Some alterations in form and tactics have been forced upon the Russians by the pressures of time and change, but the rock-bed substance of Russian national life and purpose remains as imperialist and chauvinist.

Nevertheless, I am convinced time and the unchangeable aspirations of the common man in the captive, non-Russian nations will yet make Shevchenko a prophet among his people.

The signs are many that imperial Russia will again be forced to meet powerful currents of change within and without her empire.

If we look calmly and objectively at the roots of the dispute between Moscow and Peiping, we will discover that alleged disagreements over Marxist theory are nothing but a camouflage for the real issue. The real issue is Chinese nationalism versus Russian chauvinism within the ranks of the international conspiracy. Peiping is openly charging Moscow with great power chauvinism, by which they mean Russian chauvinism and imperialism. In reply the Russians are charging Peiping with inciting racism, by which they mean nationalism. Moreover, it is an old Russian trick to brand as a "racist," anyone who exposes Russian superrace practices. But Peiping is as accurate today in its charges on Russian chauvinism and imperialism as Lenin was 40 years ago in his deathbed prophecy on this issue.

This struggle within the international conspiracy between Chinese nationalism and Russian imperialism has its geopolitical counterpart in the Central-East European area of the Russian Empire. The captive non-Russian nations throughout that vast area are under siege of the spirit of nationalims, that is, the spirit of national independence. None of them are able, on their own, to regain their national independence. That was the prime lesson learned from the Hungarian Freedom Revolution of 1956. A symphony of revolutionary actions by all of the captive nations would, however, bring down the Russian Empire into a state of total collapse. That was the second or afterthought lesson of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution. It is certain that the pressures of Chinese nationalism in the Far East have added encouragement and strength to the forces of nationalism in the captive European nations. Some of the communist regimes in the captive European nations recognize this reality of life and are beginning to respond to these pressures by trying to shake off their assigned role of subservient tools of Moscow. While it must be recognized that those regimes are thus taking out life insurance against the coming political storm, this must not distract from an objective evaluation of the growing power of nationalism in those countries. Desperation politics makes for strange bedfellows, particularly when a well identified common enemy is involved.

Should Peiping decide on action to recover ancient Chinese territory annexed by the Russian Tsars in the past, this would confront the Russians with an insoluble problem. If Moscow moves its elite guard Russian troops to the Far East in the numbers required to meet the Red Chinese threat, this would present the captive European part of their Empire with an open invitation to a symphony of revolts. Moscow does not have enough dependable military force at its command to meet this double barreled geopolitical challenge. It has often been said that 90 million Russians cannot long hold control over their vast Eurasian Empire—stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. The proof of that observation is now in the making.

These facts urge in the strongest possible language that the United States stay out of the dispute between Peiping and Moscow. If they—the Russians and the Red Chinese—want to bury each other, that is their business and certainly not ours. If Peping seeks to recover Chinese territories from Imperial Russia, that is none of our business. If Peiping seeks allies among the Communist regimes of Central-East Europe in an effort to break up the Russian super race practices within the international conspiracy—that is likewise none of our business.

The Communist dictator Tito has finally pried his entry into the United States and will soon be, I regret to say, an unofficial guest of our Government. There is well founded feeling that the real purpose of Tito's mission is to convince our President that the United States should side with the Russians in their growing conflict with the Red Chinese. Tito will advocate a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations in order to free Russian imperial hands to meet problems of the Empire in the Far East. And, incidentally, he will be looking for another handout for himself.

A Russian propaganda campaign has been underway in the United States and in much of the free world based upon a so-called "Yellow Peril." The objective of that propaganda is to spread fear that a new Genghis Khan has arisen in the East and that soon his hordes will be sweeping the entire world. It is all to obvious the Russians expect to generate sufficient false fear in the West to make this proposed nonaggression pact an easy choice between two evils. We must never forget that it is the Russians who are the full inheritors of the despotic system of Genghis Khan and that they have preserved that heritage intact for 500 years. The Chinese people were the victims of Genghis Khan—their ancient and advanced civilization was a prize coveted by all the Khans who ruled from Ulam Bator. Moreover, the Chinese people sought for centuries to live at peace with their neighbors, but after Russian ideology gained a beachhead in Peiping the Chinese engaged in organized aggression. The only threat to civilized man now and in the foreseeable future comes from Moscow.

Hence the only meaningful nonaggression pacts possible in this situation are pacts between the Red Moskals and the people of every captive nation within the Russian Empire. These pacts should be exchanged for the freedom and national independence of each and all of those captive nations. Such pacts with Moscow could be entered into only by free and independent governments empowered to guarantee that their people would not attack the Russians if they became engaged in a conflict with the Red Chinese. Those are the only kind of nonaggression pacts the United States should taken an interest in—and no others. Those are the only kind of nonaggression pacts that can further the cause of peace worthy of the name. That is the only kind of peaceful coexistence the United States should be advocating and supporting throughout the world.

The poet patriot whom we honor here tonight raised this question in one of his most famous poems:

"When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law?"

That question remains unanswered for over 40 million Ukrainians who now inhabit the land of Shevchenko. But hundreds of millions of other non-Russian people behind the iron curtain would welcome an answer to that burning question. Our world is sick of tyranny and human slavery. The nature of man deserves a destiny which accords to all the fullness of freedom and human dignity, without which mankind will soon cease to exist. Fulfillment of that destiny must become and remain the goal of all civilized men.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Amending Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Reduce Individual and Corporate Income Taxes and To Make Certain Structural Changes With Respect to Income Tax

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, acting on the representations of the President and the leaders of the Democratic Party, the House of Representatives is now being asked to pass a tax bill, which is expected to decrease the tax load of individuals and corporations by a total of $11 billion per year. This sounds great. But before we start celebrating, let us look at the facts. This change has been advocated at a time when we are running the country in the red at a rate of over $6 billion, and it is expected that the reduction in revenues will result in running the country in the red by over $9 billion in the current year. Even on the rosiest estimates—estimates which the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to back up with any accurate computations—that are based upon the most optimistic guesses as to the stimulus to spending that might result from the tax cut itself, we are dooming ourselves to operate in the red through the year 1967. Sounder judgments place this target in the 1970's.

The theory upon which this decision is advocated is that deficit spending on a massive scale, caused either by increased Government expenditures or by decreasing revenues through a tax cut, will have a favorable effect upon the economy. The total continued commitment of the President and his advisers to massive deficit spending is clear. As late as April 19 of this year, the President himself indicated that if the Congress cut back on the proposed budget for the current year by $5 billion, a target which we are still hopeful of attaining, this would have a devastating effect on the economy and would greatly increase unemployment. The President's economic advisers, led by Mr. Heller, have from the outset stated and continue to indicate that they believe we must achieve a bigger deficit in order to promote greater demand and to stimulate the economy. As though they are doing the American people a favor, they state they have chosen the tax-reduction route to this deficit spending, rather than more spending, because this will favor the private sector of the economy rather than the Government sector. Since his state of the Union message, however, the President has held a blackjack over the heads of Congress and the American people in his statement:

> No doubt a massive increase in Federal spending could also create jobs and growth, but in today's setting private consumers, employers, and investors should be given a full opportunity first.

That is nice of him.

In spite of President Kennedy's recent protestations that Government expenditures will be held in line and that we will aim at balancing the budget and checking the increase in the national debt, the administration's spending target for next year is still at least $102 billion, an increase of $4 billion over the target for 1964 and of about $9 billion over the expenditure level in 1963. On the very same day that the House of Representatives is acting on the tax bill on the basis of the President's representations and on the basis of the representations being made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Congressman MILLS, and the head of the Appropriations Committee, Congressman CANNON, to the effect that increased spending must be checked and that new programs should not go ahead until the results of the tax cut are studied, the President is out on the stump in Duluth, Minn., calling for support and expansion of many Federal programs such as increased ARA funds, accelerated public works, a youth conservation corps, rural areas development program, Federal aid to education, Federal aid to science and technology, and other extremely costly programs. In view of such duplicity, is it any wonder that the Republican Party in the House of Representatives is asking for some formal commitment or bond that the President's promise is worth more than a wooden nickel? The apparent refusal of the Democrats in the House to vote for and the refusal of the President to accept reasonable limitations on future expenditure increases, which are incorporated in the Republican amendment, reemphasize that, if the Senate should pass the tax bill under this administration's leadership, we are committed almost irrevocably to deficit spending on a tremendous scale and for an indefinite period unless our present leadership is replaced.

For this reason, let us examine the deficit spending theory and see if we can get the American people to understand the fallacy involved in it. The theory moves on the assumption that a dollar spent by the Federal Government is, somehow, going to result in a faster turnover of dollars and greater prosperity for all. The fallacy of the theory is that the dollar to be spent by the Federal Government must come from some other source. These sources are three.

First. It may come from taxes. By embarking upon a tax cut at this time, we cannot expect the increased dollar to come from this source.

Second. It may come from borrowing, which involves the purchase by someone in the private sector of the economy of Government bonds, and the dollars spent by that investor had they not been used for purchase of bonds would have been available for investment in private enterprise, spending on consumer goods, expansion of capital plant, or some other productive use. Even if the holder of the dollar in question did not decide to spend it himself, he would have put it in the bank, in which case it would have become available for loans and investments by others in the private sector of the economy.

Finally, if the dollar taken by the Federal Government did not come from one of the first two sources, it must have come from an increase by the Government in the total money supply. This in turn means that it would reduce the value of all other dollars since no additional wealth has been created by it, and this of course is the meaning of inflation. In other words, rather than taking the money to be spent in taxes directly from taxpayers, it is being taken from all citizens by reducing the value of their holdings.

This latter course is indeed the course upon which we seem about to embark. While it is dangerous, even at the present time with relatively steady price levels and good economic conditions in spite of the high unemployment figures and the growing lack of confidence in our fiscal stability, this course could be devastating in other economic circumstances with which we may possibly be faced.

Government fiscal policy, like military strategy, should be based upon enemy capabilities. Any military plan which fails to take into account all of the enemy capabilities is likely to result in defeat and disaster. With the many differing economic views and with the unpredictability of the economic factors—which we have learned to our sorrow by past experience—this is even more true of Government fiscal policies.

Recognizing this principle, we should be asking ourselves where the road of deficit spending for its own sake leads, or could lead under given circumstances. As we have noted, we are presently embarked upon a policy of reducing taxes in good times in order to stimulate our economy. Conceivably this stimulation might work, or the basic strength of the American free enterprise system may be such that we can proceed without eco-

nomic difficulties in the foreseeable future. The lessons of history are, of course, to the contrary. Let us consider for a minute what we might do if we are faced with economic recession or with massive inflation, with a resulting fall-off of revenues that would be enhanced by the proposed tax reduction. What course do we follow then? Presumably, a course of doing nothing would result in national bankruptcy, excessive costs of further borrowing, and a probable increase in the money supply that would result in galloping inflation. We would, therefore, have to do something. The alternative courses that would be left would be three.

The first course would be to decrease taxes still further, thus creating a larger deficit in the hope that more of the medicine that had not worked would make us well. If it did not, it would surely finish us.

Secondly, we could cut expenditures. Since times would presumably be bad, according to the theory of the prophets of deficit spending, this would have a disastrous effect upon our economy and drive us even further into the hole.

Finally, of course, we might have to come around to increasing taxes again, probably by more than the decrease we are presently considering. According to the dogma of the deficit spenders, this would also result in hurting the economy more and indeed it probably would. The answer is, however, that there would be no other alternative.

Faced with these alternatives of action, what will happen is that the American people will go off their spending binge and demand that we return to sound economic principles of aiming at balanced budgets, keeping our expenditures within our available revenues and encouraging private enterprise to move forward to meet the needs of our people under the stimulus of a profit system and with the willingness that Americans have always shown to work when their efforts are not threatened by massive Government.

This bill should be defeated, unless Government spending is checked.

Urban Renewal Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a news item appeared in the August 11 issue of the Arkansas Gazette reporting a speech made by Mr. Raymond Rebsamen, of Little Rock, Ark., concerning urban renewal programs.

Mr. Rebsamen pointed out that the Federal Government is not an enemy, as alleged by some frustrated people today, but in reality plays an indispensable role in providing public necessities which touch the daily lives of every citizen. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOVERNMENT ISN'T AN ENEMY

Upholding Federal aid in the development of central Little Rock and, for that matter, many other parts of the city, Raymond Rebsamen says he is "not willing to concede that the U.S. Government is my enemy."

President of the Urban Progress Association and the employer of more than 500 persons with an annual payroll in excess of $2 million in Pulaski County, Rebsamen said: "Too often we hear from those who resist change the complaint that urban renewal is socialistic and is a type of Federal encroachment in the field of private ownership of property."

Then he took a look at earlier years of his career to clarify his thesis that funds from Washington should be welcomed.

"I have known for a long time that I was a privileged young man," he said. "I was reared at Fort Smith where the public schools were excellent. I well remember that one of the reasons we had such fine school buildings was a Federal land grant. The sale of those federally donated lands provided funds for the construction of schools.

"I was a student at the University of Arkansas (and later a member of that institution's board of trustees), which is a land-grant college, receiving substantial money every year for its operation from the Federal Government.

"When I fly to Fort Smith I land at an airport financed largely with Federal funds. Returning to Little Rock, I land on another airfield bought partly with Government help. Local men manage and control these airports.

"In Arkansas we are participating in the Federal program of building roads and bridges on the Interstate Highway System. Ninety percent of the cost is furnished by the Federal Government. Almost no one complains that any of these programs are socialistic. I have heard no protests that Federal bureaucracy has ever attempted to dictate to the Fort Smith School Board, or to the trustees of the university, or to the airport and highway commissions.

"This talk of socialism disturbs me. I am not willing to concede that the Federal Government is my enemy. It is my government and it should work for me. Urban renewal is based on a partnership of government and private capital."

The Crusaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article by Joseph Alsop to the attention of my colleagues.

While I do not always agree with Joe Alsop, I think this column is one of his best. He asks two questions which many people might well ponder in these troubled times. They are—

First. Was Chiang, with all his defects, so much worse for the Chinese people and, above all, for the American people, than Mao Tse-tung?

Second. Has Cuba gained and, above all, have we in the United States gained, by the Batista-Castro exchange?

Joe Alsop's stirring column follows:

THE CRUSADERS

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—The time was in the year 1944, a couple of months after the U.S. Government first sent observers to the Chinese Communist capital at Yenan.

The occasion, which is now worth recalling, was a dinner at the Chungking press hostel for the first U.S. observer to return with on-the-spot news of the high-minded "agrarian democrat," Chairman Mao Tse-tung. Around the table the nice, virtuous American faces positively shone with innocence and happy belief.

The report from Yenan bristled with all the old familiar phrases. The Chinese Communists "wanted to be on our side, if we would only let them." They alone were "fighting the Japanese."

The atmosphere, the morale, the speckless purity and disinterestedness of Yenan were "like a wonderful cocktail after the fetid corruption of Chiang Kai-shek's government." Mao Tse-tung, "a great man and above all a humane man," would remake China in a new, more perfect image. So it went. For a cynic, listening to this discourse and watching the shining-eyed response to it, it was like taking a bath in a particularly sickening sort of goo.

There were a few American reporters in China, like the wise Arch Steel, who always kept their heads despite the intoxicating crusading atmosphere of the wartime press hostel. Yet the crusaders dominated and, one must add, sometimes seriously warped the news. And then, when the crusade was over, and they were older and wiser men, they were all very sorry about it—except for two press hostel inhabitants, Izzie and Elsie Epstein, who revealed their role as Communist agents by retreating to Peiping, where they still nauseatingly hold forth.

This is not the only case in point, either. One need only recall much of the reporting from Cuba up to and including the triumph of Fidel Castro. Batista, no doubt, was every bit as bad as everyone said he was. But standing out from that episode in American newspaper history was the display of political acumen by that far-seeing progressive, Herbert Matthews of the New York Times.

It is high time to recall these episodes of the past, which were not without their influence on the course of events; for a good many of the newspapermen in Saigon have been carrying on another of these egregious crusades for a number of years.

Unlike China, there is no Communist influence or sympathy here; and there is no one quite like Herbert Matthews either. But the general order of priorities was indicated the other day by one of the leading young crusaders, who announced that many weeks of passion-charged anti-Government stories, mingled with descriptions of the poor morale of the Vietnamese forces, he was going to pay another visit to the fighting front. "After all," he said, "there's another enemy to think about, up in North Vietnam."

Most of what the crusaders have written has been true, or part true—although this reporter has run into at least one province team of U.S. officers who were deeply indignant, because they had been described as thinking the Vietnamese soldiers of their province were not putting up a good fight when they all thought the precise opposite.

But it is easy enough to paint a dark, indignant picture, without departing from the facts, if you ignore the majority of Americans who admire the Vietnamese as fighters and seek out the 1 U.S. officer in 10 who inevitably thinks all foreigners fight badly. (The reduction of the percentage to 1 in 10 marks great military progress in large mindedness.) The same method used to re-

port the doings of the Diem government has naturally been even more effective, since a great many of these doings have been remarkably misguided, to use the mildest possible word.

In some measure, it must be added, the crusaders have contributed to the Diem government's misguidedness. The Government has asked for it, since its press relations have always been idiotic. But the constant pressure of the reportorial crusade against the Government has also helped mightily to transform Diem from a courageous, quite viable national leader, into a man afflicted with galloping persecution mania, seeing plots around every corner, and therefore misjudging everything.

It is not only high time to make the foregoing points. It is also high time to ask whether American crusades to reform foreign governments really are a good idea at any time. Was Chiang, with all his defects, so much worse for the Chinese people and, above all, for the American people, than Mao Tse-tung? Has Cuba gained and, above all, have we in the United States gained, by the Batista-Castro exchange? What are we in Vietnam for anyway?

Surely we are here only to win the war. And the most annoying feature of the whole situation is that we actually were winning the war this spring, until the Diem government went right around the bend with considerable help from the high-minded crusaders.

A Southerner Speaks: A Flower for the Graves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta Constitution of September 15, 1963:

A SOUTHERNER SPEAKS: A FLOWER FOR THE GRAVES

(The Atlanta Constitution, one of the South's leading newspapers, placed the responsibility for the bombing of the Birmingham church Sunday morning on the entire "white South" in the column printed below, entitled "A Flower for the Graves." It was written by Eugene Patterson, a native Georgian and editor of the Constitution since 1960.)

A Negro mother wept in the street Sunday morning in front of a Baptist church in Birmingham. In her hand she held a shoe, one shoe, from the foot of her dead child. We hold that shoe with her.

Every one of us in the white South holds that small shoe in his hand.

It is too late to blame the sick criminals who handled the dynamite. The FBI and the police can deal with that kind. The charge against them is simple. They killed four children.

Only we can trace the truth, Southerner—you and I. We broke those children's bodies.

We watched the stage set without staying it. We listened to the prolog unbestirred. We saw the curtain opening with disinterest. We have heard the play.

We—who go on electing politicians who heat the kettles of hate.

We—who raise no hand to silence the mean and little men who have their "nigger" jokes.

We—who stand aside in imagined rectitude and let the mad dogs that run in every society slide their leashes from our hand, and spring.

We—the heirs of a proud South, who protest its worth and demand its recognition—are the ones who have ducked the difficult, skirted the uncomfortable, caviled at the challenge, resented the necessary, rationalized the unacceptable, and credited the day surely when these children would die.

This is no time to load our anguish onto the murderous scapegoat who set the cap in dynamite of our own manufacture.

He didn't know any better.

Somewhere in the dim and fevered recess of an evil mind he feels right now that he has been a hero. He is only guilty of murder. He thinks he has pleased us.

We of the white South who know better are the ones who must take a harsher judgment.

We, who know better, created a climate for child killing by those who don't.

We hold that shoe in our hand, Southerner. Let us see it straight, and look at the blood on it. Let us compare it with the unworthy speeches of Southern public men who have traduced the Negro; match it with the spectacle of shrilling children whose parents and teachers turned them free to spit epithets at small huddles of Negro schoolchildren for a week before this Sunday in Birmingham; hold up the shoe and look beyond it to the statehouse in Montgomery, where official attitudes of Alabama have been spoken in heat and anger.

Let us not lay the blame on some brutal fool who didn't know any better.

We know better. We created the day. We bear the judgment. May God have mercy on the poor South that has been so led. May what has happened hasten the day when the good South, which does live and have great being, will rise to this challenge of racial understanding and common humanity, in the full power of its unasserted courage, assert itself.

The Sunday school play at Birmingham is ended. With a weeping Negro mother, we stand in the bitter smoke and hold a shoe. If our South is ever to be what we wish it to be, we will plant a flower of nobler resolve for the South now upon these four small graves that we dug.

William O. Hall, New Assistant Aid Administrator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon is indeed proud of William O. Hall, the new Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, who was nominated by the President, and whose nomination was confirmed by the Senate on September 9.

Mr. Hall is a career Foreign Service officer. He is a graduate of the University of Oregon; and he served as acting director of the Oregon Bureau of Municipal Research, and as executive secretary of the League of Oregon Cities. He received his elementary and secondary education in the Prineville public schools.

Mr. President, I salute Mr. Hall; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Meet the New Assistant Administrator" from the September 9 issue of Front Lines, the internal publication of the Agency for International Development.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE NEW ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR

"We have dedicated people in this program. We need more of them. Career development, training, and recruitment are some of our big jobs."

These are some of the principles upon which the new Assistant Administrator for Administration will work. His nomination was confirmed by the Senate September 9.

His name is William O. Hall, and until he was nominated by President Kennedy to fill the vacancy resulting from the resignation of Bernard T. Brennan. He was Minister Counselor and Deputy Chief of Mission at the U.S. Embassy at Karachi, Pakistan, for the past 5 years.

A career Foreign Service officer, he is tall, thick-shouldered, and soft-spoken. But he speaks with authority and knowledge when it comes to foreign aid, based on experience here and abroad.

Mr. Hall, who is 49, began his Federal career in 1940 as a budget officer and administrative analyst for the Bureau of the Budget. Following service in the U.S. Navy, he became budget director for the United Nations Secretariat in New York City.

From 1946 to 1952, he served with the Department of State in Washington as Adviser, Office of International Administration; Office Director, Budget and Fiscal Division and Office Director, United Nations Affairs.

In 1952, he was named deputy U.S. representative and senior adviser, U.S. Mission to the United Nations with headquarters in New York. He served as special adviser on organization with the U.S. Mission to NATO and European regional organizations in Paris in 1956.

While at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations he also served as an expert member of the General Assembly's Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. In 1956 and 1957 he served as counselor for administration, U.S. Embassy, London, and for the succeeding 2 years was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Budget and Finance.

Before entering Federal service, Mr. Hall was acting director of the Oregon Bureau of Municipal Research and executive secretary of the League of Oregon Cities from 1939 to 1940. He was a staff member of the Bureau of Municipal Research and League of Oregon Cities from 1936 to 1938.

Mr. Hall received his bachelor's degree in political science and economics from the University of Oregon in 1936, and in 1938 and 1939 was a fellow in public administration at the University of Minnesota.

Born in Roswell, N. Mex., his home State is Oregon where he received his elementary and secondary education in the Prineville public schools.

He is married and has three children.

The Golden Spigot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of dialog within and

without the Congress regarding a very courageous address recently delivered before the National Press Club by Mr. Edwin Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Members of this body will recall Mr. Neilan criticized congressional "vote buying" through efforts to pump more taxpayers' dollars for fat pork projects in home districts and States. Those with a constant eye on the next campaign are not above promising Federal handouts through some favorite spending program; this ballot bribery is an unfortunate type of spoils designed to assist a Member's reelection. Mr. Speaker, I know this practice goes on, and so does every Member of the House, even though there may be those who refuse to admit it. I hope my colleagues will agree that we must not mortgage the future of our children with the public funds of today. We must redouble our efforts, even if unpopular, to combat waste and extravagance engendered through the pork barrel of politics.

An editorial in the Wall Street Journal of August 22, 1963, calls attention to Mr. Neilan and funds flowing from the "golden spigot"—a tap on the Treasury which represents a great deal more than a leaky faucet. Under unanimous consent I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE GOLDEN SPIGOT

From all the uproar in Congress in the wake of a talk by Edwin P. Neilan, a Delaware banker, you might have thought Mr. Neilan had said something downright treasonable.

What he said was that the wholesale purchase of votes on an unprecedented scale was a public scandal; that, although the spoils system is not new in American life, never has it been more sinister or more sophisticated; that too many voters are willing and eager to turn their elected representatives into "bag men."

A voter may be a pusher, said Mr. Neilan—who also happens to be the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; such a person helps send a man to Congress for the purpose of getting Federal dollars for his own district. Or the voter may be a taker who votes for the candidate promising the fattest handout.

In either case "the voter sells his ballot to buy a Congressman; the Congressman sells his high office to buy votes." He said he found it "difficult to rank such conduct higher in the moral scale than the association of politicians, party girls, and spies in Great Britain."

There was much more in the same vein, plus a rather candid appraisal of the area redevolpment assistance program, cited as an illustration of the spoils system at work. This program distributes largess to areas carefully selected as "distressed."

Well, sir, Senator MANSFIELD got up in the Senate and said the "wild statements" in the talk were "unfortunate," "regrettable," and "an affront to the integrity of our citizenry." Representative PATMAN was "shocked." Representative MCDOWELL called the talk "unrealistic," "intemperate and ill-considered," and apologized to the House for his fellow Delawarean. And so on.

Now the speech was certainly blunt, but it's hard to see how anyone could call it unrealistic. Everyone knows, or should know, that there are some voters who are indeed pushers and takers, and that there are some officials—not only in Congress—who use their office in effect to buy votes.

The only really arguable point might be whether it is worse now than it ever has been. In one sense it is unquestionably worse, for at stake are not millions of dollars but hundreds of billions.

We think the worthy lawmakers might have spared the Nation their self-righteous indignation and paid attention to what the man said. Only they, after all, have the power to turn off the golden spigot that corrupts as it pours.

Opposition of Veterans of Foreign Wars To Selling of U.S. Wheat to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, opposing the proposal to sell large quantities of wheat to the Soviet Union, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Explaining the VFW position Commander Lombardo said, "Throughout the world today the Communist agriculture is in trouble. There is no reason why the United States, which is engaged in a long, expensive, and bloody conflict against Communist aggression, should have to pull the Communist chestnuts out of the fire. Communist agriculture is in trouble because Communist regimes have placed a higher priority upon large armed forces and armament production than they have on food production."

Commenting further, Commander Lombardo said, "Ever since the Kremlin embarked some months ago on its program of 'sweetness and light' the world has been wondering why this superficial change was decided upon by the Red rulers. One reason, now becoming evident, is that agricultural shortages are plaguing Red regimes. Consequently, the Soviet Union is moving into the free world markets for the foodstuffs to make good the false promises of the Red dictators."

"If the free world's way of life is to prove its superiority over the cruel methods of communism," Commander Lombardo said, "then the shortcomings of communism must be made obvious. This can never be accomplished if communism can make up for its shortcomings with purchases of U.S. agricultural products."

"We must not forget," the VFW commander continued, "that the Kremlin-Castro regime is still building Cuba into a powerful Communist base 90 miles from the United States. Castro's agricultural programs also are a dismal failure and there can be little doubt that Russian purchase of our wheat would make it possible for Khrushchev to increase his wheat shipments to Castro. Thus the United States would be engaged in a disastrous program of strengthening the Red control of Cuba which our Nation cannot tolerate. For the United States to make up for the Communist agricultural deficiencies, brought about in large measures by Red emphasis upon military power and Communist aggression, would be an act of a nation with a suicide complex."

Continuing, the VFW commander stated, "reports of financial negotiations preparatory to Russian purchase of U.S. wheat supplies indicate that the Kremlin is confident that it can dupe the U.S. Government into making such a sale. The United States should let Khrushchev and his satellites know in no uncertain terms that as long as communism is conducting its bloody aggression and subversion against free peoples, the 'no sale' sign is up for the Reds."

Commander Lombardo concluded, "freemen learned to their sorrow only a couple of decades ago that they couldn't do business with Hitler. We should recognize right now that we can't do business with Khrushchev."

Private Capital Often Preferable to Government's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article by Paul E. Belcher:

PRIVATE CAPITAL OFTEN PREFERRED TO GOVERNMENT'S

(By Paul E. Belcher)

There are two ways by which the United States can provide substantial economic assistance to foreign countries: (1) Through private investment, and (2) through public aid.

Private investment is represented by the development of a rubber plantation in Liberia; the erection of a tire plant in England; or the creation of a business subsidiary in South America—all by private persons with private funds for private gain.

Public aid is represented by the gifts, grants, and loans our Government and its agencies make to foreign countries from public funds or public credit covering everything from dams, electric plants, and roads, to automobiles for some ruling potentate.

Private investment abroad usually plays an economic role that public foreign aid can't touch. Its use is preferable, therefore, wherever both could go.

Where private capital cannot go, either because of restrictive laws or the risks involved or because no local need then exists for the products or services of private development, public aid or no aid at all are the only possibilities.

Under these circumstances, public aid is akin to pouring sand in the ocean—the recipients get little benefit and the giver takes a loss.

Certainly, we must have learned by this time that we cannot buy friendship or loyalty. There is no lasting appreciation for what we did yesterday.

Only tomorrow counts, and we never seem to enjoy more than an even break with the competitive political forces tomorrow produces.

No aid, it seems to me, should often be the answer.

But where private investment is a possibly, its use by business should be encouraged rather than banned or curbed by our Government.

All business investment in foreign lands is based on the hope of profit. A new facility is created or an old one acquired.

If a new one is created, economic benefit does not end with the completion of construction—by then, it has barely begun. The facility is intended for continuous use.

If an old one is acquired, the sellers have funds for reinvestment in other productive enterprises.

In either event, output should raise the standard of living of the people served; daily operations provide employment and wages for employees.

Neither foreign peoples nor their natural resources are exploited by U.S. business investment overseas.

Even the most carefully considered investments are sometimes subject to losses over which the investor has no control. This is especially true in the underdeveloped countries where revolution and expropriation are always threats.

Instead of spending taxpayers' money on foreign aid, our Government ought to engender a healthy respect for law and order on the part of foreign countries seeking American capital.

If a foreign country does not care to bind itself in this way, let it develop without foreign aid, either private or public. The future of every nation lies mainly within itself, anyway.

Foreign investment merely enables a nation to advance faster and further than would otherwise be possible. The presence or absence of foreign investment does not mark the difference between eventual success and failure.

Wheat Victim of Soreheads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial from the Wellington, Kans., Daily News written by the publisher and editor, Stewart Newlin:

WHEAT VICTIM OF SOREHEADS

The Kennedy administration's sorehead attitude toward the wheat farmers is continuing.

Both Republican and Democrat Members of Congress have introduced wheat and feed grain legislation for the 1964 crop year, but there is a blank wall as far as the New Frontier is concerned. The most acceptable explanation is that this is continued retaliation for the wheat farmers vote last May which defeated Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's referendum.

Still getting a cold shoulder is the wheat legislation introduced on May 23 by Representative BOB DOLE, of Kansas, and 19 other Republicans.

DOLE is one of the leaders who is keeping the pressure on the administration for action, but Representative GRAHAM PURCELL, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Wheat Subcommittee says that "prospects are not bright" for new wheat legislation.

Here is the latest GOP statement on the situation, in the form of a letter to President Kennedy:

"It is generally recognized that the choices your administration proposed to wheat producers for the 1964 crop year were unacceptable. When faced with these two completely unacceptable alternatives, over one-half of our Nation's wheat farmers indicated dissatisfaction with the strict control certificate plan on May 21, 1963, but, nonetheless, were left with a program, which had been rejected by them 12 times in previous referendums."

The GOP lawmakers said the wheat farmers have been denied the opportunity of choosing between "reasonable alternatives" and said the Democratic-controlled Congress and administration have an obligation to take positive action on wheat. They continued:

"We had been working on a more acceptable wheat program long before the referendum and on May 23 introduced legislation which, in our opinion, meets the three tests for new legislation you set forth May 22, 1963. Other Republican and Democrat Members of Congress have also introduced wheat and feed grain legislation for the 1964 crop year. This, in itself, is an indication of significant interest in the enactment of legislation from Members representing the great bulk of wheat and feed grain farmers."

The GOP legislation has three major purposes:

1. It would raise farm income. The administration's program scheduled to go into effect for 1964, by contrast, would reduce wheat supports to $1.25 per bushel to cooperators and add to the possibility of the ominous prospects of "$1 wheat" mentioned frequently by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. It would decrease Government-held stocks of surplus grains. The land retirement features of the GOP's proposed program would be financed by the use of payment-in-kind. This would be similar to the present voluntary feed grain program which President Kennedy described in his Agriculture message this year as a successful program which "has earned wide bipartisan support."

3. It would reduce Government costs. Cost of the GOP voluntary program, combining wheat and feed grains, would be from $500 million to $1 billion less anually than the combined cost of the proposed wheat certificate program that wheat farmers rejected and their 1954 feed grain program.

The only lack of interest in new legislation seems to be not on the part of the farmers but of the Democrat administration and Congress.

The Kennedy Camarilla of Pillage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the column of Lucius Beebe, which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on September 23, entitled "The Kennedy Camarilla of Pillage." Mr. Beebe points out how the Federal Government, through income taxes and rapidly increasing usurpation of power, has become the enemy of the American people.

The column follows:

THE KENNEDY CAMARILLA OF PILLAGE

(By Lucius Beebe)

Mr. Walter Lippmann, the venerable political commentator whose judgment may or may not be impaired by extreme age and the elder statesman delusion, has assayed the core of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's philosophy as "opposition to the Federal Government as a guarantor of personal liberty and as a protector of the national welfare. To the Senator the Federal Government is a kind of foreign power which must be reduced or distrusted."

If Mr. Lippmann's estimate of Senator GOLDWATER's political thinking is correct, it is beyond all argument the most resounding endorsement any aspirant for political office could ask, for it puts plainly and in few words what thinking Americans for years have known and what less perceptive voters and taxpayers have intuitively sensed: The Federal Government of the United States is, indeed and in very truth, in large measure and from a vast multiplicity of aspects, every man's enemy.

And it is a foreign power. To the average American taxpayer, Washington is as foreign as Moscow and almost as hostile. The American people and the Federal Government have been at war now for nearly a half century and distrust of their alleged surrogates in electoral office and a continuing effort to curb their every instinct is the individual citizen's only possible salvation.

Obviously the Federal Government is not every American's enemy at every hour of the day and night or it would have been eliminated long since. It is not hostile in the conduct of the Post Office Department, the Army, Navy and Defense, which are necessary to our and its survival. There are a number of good and useful offices which it fills and must continue to fill to enjoy popular suffrage, but its basic premise is predatory, its every instinct hostile to the individual and its every act and purpose dedicated to the confiscation of his property and the abatement of his liberty.

When this standoff had its inception, for it has not always existed, is difficult to determine with any precision, but it probably began with American involvement with world affairs on an overall scale in the Wilson era and the emergence, within a few years of each other, of the two most tyrannical abominations ever invoked by any source of authority, the graduated income tax and prohibition. The revolt against prohibition was the most salutary episode in the 20th century record, for it rocked the Federal Government on its heels, mocked the Federal Government and all its works to its face on a universal scale and degraded the image of Federal authority to one of soiled and fanatic bigotry dictated by an unwholesome mafia of religious and moral creeps without peer since Cotton Mather.

The income tax is still with us, the principal support of arrogant demagoguery and an agency of pillage and confiscation on a moral par with the communes of bankrupt China. Except that its victims are conspicuously the superior element in intelligence and industry of the population and that popular envy can therefore be directed against them by the Peepul's friends in Washington, it would long ago have been discarded as the political and moral equivalent of chattel slavery.

On every hand the average citizen, who pays 10 times in taxes what he gets in return and conducts himself with furtive discretion lest a worst thing befall, gets the news that the Federal Government for which he is paying through the nose thinks of him as less than dirt.

He gets it when the Internal Revenue Service installs electronic machinery as instruments for the extortion of taxes; he knows it when the Post Office Department, usually the one aspect of big government the ordinary man counts his friend, attempts to reduce his personality to a coded cipher; he has intimations of paternalistic bigotry when the Federal Government begins tampering with his smoking habits with the explicit implication that the time is coming when cigarettes may be illegal and he will have to take up smoking, as millions took up drinking during prohibition, simply to tell the Federal Government of the United States to go straight to hell.

And he knows it every time he has to provide his social security account number for the record of savings bank or employer so that the electronic picking of his pockets in Washington may overlook no dime of loot

to be spent on congressional junkets and swindles and boondoggles almost beyond the comprehension of human intelligence.

Make no mistake about it, the Federal Government is moving in on everybody. It has been whenever, since 1914, there has been a Democrat in the White House.

Everywhere an American looks about him, there are encroachments on his person and upon the exercise of his social and political philosophy. He wants nothing of the obscene political hassles of Asia or the Congo, but finds his money being spent in Niagaras, as he is patronizingly told, "to maintain American world leadership." Most Americans don't give a belch in a windstorm about world leadership when it involves financing military adventures by blackguard dictators in places they couldn't find on the map if it didn't have an index.

If, like Senator GOLDWATER, the American citizen regards the Federal Government as the enemy, it is because the Federal Government, under the Kennedy camarilla, is determined upon the conquest, subjugation, and pillage of the American people. It is the enemy, a conspiracy of enmity on a gigantic scale and one that Americans had better be aware of before it swallows them whole.

Farm Labor Facts—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in spite of California's tremendous program to improve standards of living, health, and welfare of the migrant worker, the need for a substantial targeted work force to handle specialty crop harvests remains eminent.

California Department of Employment recently described California's efforts in this area including a new health and disability insurance program for agricultural workers as follows:

MIGRANT PROGRAMS

The California Department of Employment continued to provide farm employment and related data to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals concerned in programs, services, and facilities for agricultural workers—primarily migrants.

Farm placement staff participated with such agencies and organizations in conferences and programs of common interest, at State, area, and local levels. One illustration was the Third Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops, held in Visalia, March 1962. State and local staff of the department of employment participated and the State office processed the conference proceedings.

The department's farm placement service was represented on the Advisory Committee on Health of Seasonal Agricultural Workers, and the year 1962 was marked by increasing attention to this subject. The California Legislature included $75,000 in the 1962–63 budget for extension of local health services to agricultural workers and their families. It was also expected that additional funds might be forthcoming from congressional appropriation subsequent to the passing of a U.S. Senate bill authorizing grants to "State and local health departments, grower associations, health and welfare councils, medical societies, educational institutions, and other community groups interested in planning and conducting a project to improve health services or conditions of domestic farmworkers and their families."

California farm labor offices continued close liaison with local welfare agencies to assist in finding jobs for potential workers among welfare recipients, and to refer to such agencies, workers in need of their respective services.

Local reports included references to volunteer educational, child care, recreational, and welfare projects by many church groups, civic clubs, and miscellaneous organizations. One report of such services follows:

"Again in 1962, informal education was offered to migrant children, mainly in the Sebastopol area where most of the campgrounds are located. This project was accomplished through the Sebastopol Board of Education plus civic organizations and personnel volunteers. The Migrant Ministry of Santa Rosa and Sebastopol again provided clothing, food, bedding, as well as spiritual guidance. This program was expanded with the participation of an additional local church group. Handicraft sessions plus games, movies, and other aids were provided for the migrants. A mobile library again visited the area to provide books and allied services to the families."

Under the disability insurance program, which was extended, in 1961, to include agricultural workers, migrant farmworkers became eligible to claim disability insurance benefits after May 1, 1962. Migrants and other agricultural workers were also eligible for training under the MDTA.

Hon. Lee Gavin

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was not until Monday morning, when I arrived at the Capitol, that I learned of LEE GAVIN's death on Saturday.

My reaction was one of disbelief. This just could not be.

And yet I realized in the next moment that this tragic news must be accepted and that a fine friend and great American was suddenly no longer with us.

It was my pleasure not so very long ago to speak in Oil City, LEE GAVIN's hometown.

On that occasion it was evident to me that the people he represented in the Congress so diligently and ably for so many years held him in highest esteem and had for him the deepest affection.

For those of us who knew him here, this was not hard to understand.

Our departed colleague is reported to have described himself as a "sort of maverick." I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that report. But I can say that, if this was the case, he was the most helpful maverick I ever knew.

The short biography LEE GAVIN offered for the Congressional Directory speaks volumes for his inherent modesty. It tells us that he was a Republican, an Army sergeant in World War I, that he was married and had a family, and that he served continuously in the House of Representatives from the 78th Congress to the present.

He must have been a great sergeant: tough, two-fisted, but with the most wonderful sense of humor a man could possibly possess.

He carried these same fighting qualities to his career in the Congress—and that same genius for rib-tickling comments that endeared him so very much to all of us on both sides of the aisle.

LEE GAVIN was a man genuinely loved by all who knew him, and he was held in highest regard here in the House of Representatives for his significant contributions as an experienced, dedicated, hard-working member of the Committee on Armed Services.

His presence in this Chamber will be sorely missed, and to his wife and family I offer my deep sympathy in their sudden bereavement.

Safe Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I read an article in the Washington Star, datelined, Akron, Ohio, to the effect that the Rubber Manufacturers Association is considering a proposal to set up minimum safety standards on all automobile tires.

As chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, having devoted a great deal of time to safety on the highways, I am most pleased with this announcement. I believe it essential to the safety of the driving public to be assured that the products on and in their automobiles are or measure up to safe standards. Most recently, Mr. Speaker, this body unanimously approved a bill I introduced to prescribe safety standards for seat belts. We believed this necessary in view of the numerous numbers of these belts that were being sold and the fact that certain manufacturers were placing an inferior and unsafe belt on the market.

The initiative taken by the Rubber Manufacturers Association, I hope, will eliminate the necessity for the passage of legislation for the establishment of standards for automobile tires as I believe, as I am sure the majority of this body does, in the free enterprise system and with the least amount of Government interference.

Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I place the article referred to in the RECORD at this point:

SAFETY CODE FOR CAR TIRES TO GET STUDY

AKRON, OHIO.—Ross R. Ormsby, president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, said yesterday that consideration will be given a proposal to set up minimum safety performance standards on all automobile tires sold in the United States.

Mr. Ormsby said the industry will give its answer in a week on whether to establish minimum standards. Previously the industry was opposed to such an idea, but that attitude has changed, Mr. Ormsby added.

The appeal came from a 17-member New York State legislative delegation headed by State Senator Edward J. Speno, Republican, of Nassau County, at a dinner meeting with top officials of nine tire and rubber companies and Mr. Ormsby.

Senator Speno's committee seeks a minimum safety performance standard, constituting a legal floor below which no tire could be sold. The standard would include tread wear, blowout resistance, resistance to the tire.

Citation Presented to William S. McNary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we in Michigan are very fortunate in having an outstanding and effective citizen as president of the Michigan Hospital Service, Mr. William S. McNary. Mr. McNary was recently honored by the American Hospital Association for his outstanding work in the Blue Cross Association. The Justin Ford Kimball Award is nationally recognized and is one which is highly deserved by Mr. McNary. Following is the text of the citation presented to Mr. McNary:

CITATION PRESENTED TO WILLIAM S. MCNARY ON RECEIPT OF THE JUSTIN FORD KIMBALL AWARD AT THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION'S 65TH ANNUAL MEETING

William Selwyn McNary, describing the Blue Cross contribution to the public good recently remarked, "We really came up with something that people needed and we provided it for them in the best way we knew how. They have liked it and it has probably saved as much heartache and financial disaster as any other thing that ever happened in this country."

Mr. McNary entered the voluntary prepayment field in 1938 when he became the first president of the Colorado Blue Cross plan. In 1942, he became the first executive director of Colorado Blue Shield as well. In the years since, Mr. McNary has worked hard to extend the benefits of Blue Cross to the American public.

It is as the guiding and energizing spirit of the Michigan Hospital Service, of which he is now president, that Mr. McNary made his greatest contribution to the cause of Blue Cross. Of him, Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association has said, "Mr. McNary is a capable administrator with a great deal of personal courage, a refreshing forthrightness, and a high degree of honesty. On most difficult issues facing Blue Cross, he is an indispensable catalyst, an essential part of the decision making machinery of Blue Cross. The Michigan plan, already large and successful when he took it over, became even larger and more successful under his direction. It is a tribute to his consummate skill that he did this in an exceedingly difficult environment involving an active labor movement, a vocal State government, and other vocal and interested parties that were scrutinizing every move Blue Cross made."

Mr. McNary was one of the two Blue Cross pioneers and experts to be invited by the Australian Government in 1953 to help design its present unique prepayment system. Active all during his Blue Cross career in hospital association activities, Mr. McNary has served two terms as a trustee of the American Hospital Association. In this capacity, he has demonstrated an outstanding grasp of the interrelated problems of hospitals and Blue Cross and shown an unusual ability to analyze these problems and to select meaningful solutions to them. At the same time, Mr. McNary has also been a highly successful trainer of Blue Cross plan executives; his pupils can be found all across the United States.

In recognition of his outstanding achievements in the field of voluntary nonprofit prepayment of hospital care, the American Hospital Association is proud to present this well deserved honor—the sixth annual Justin Ford Kimball Award to Mr. McNary.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater Before the Republican Men's Club of Bartlesville, Okla., on September 13, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following speech made by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, before the Republican Men's Club, Bartlesville, Okla., September 13, 1963:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN MEN'S CLUB, BARTLESVILLE, OKLA., SEPTEMBER 13, 1963

How can the Republicans win the Nation in 1964?

This is one of the most intriguing, fascinating, and, in some respects, baffling questions now occupying the minds of Republican leaders and workers throughout the country.

And, I might say there are almost as many theories as there are sections. Certainly there are as many theories as there are factions within the Republican Party.

If I might I should like to discuss this with you for a while today and, if possible, lay to rest some popular misconceptions and root out some downright ridiculous arguments.

Let me begin by saying that I disagree with people who argue that we should write off the eastern seaboard and the industrial areas of the country. I disagree with people who insist that we must forget all about the Negro vote, and that we might as well concede the labor vote. I do not believe the Republican Party should write off any section of the country or any group of potential voters. I believe the Republican Party should strive to its utmost in every part of America and among every possible group to win votes.

When I say votes, let me make it entirely clear that I mean American votes—not Negro votes, or labor votes, or Hungarian votes, or Jewish votes—but American votes. I am sick and tired of the efforts we see today that are designed to further divide the American people.

And while I'm at it, let me say that I believe the most stupid, irresponsible suggestion I have ever heard put forward is the argument that the Republican Party should soft-peddle its efforts in the South because a determined effort in that area might give the party a racist tinge and cost our candidates votes in the metropolitan areas of the North.

Some people, who advise the Republican Party to aim almost exclusively at the big city vote, would have us practically renounce the South. They hint darkly that we were subordinating the party to segregationists when we picked up a few House seats south of the Mason-Dixon Line in 1962. This, of course, is completely and transparently untrue. Not one of the southern Republican Members of the House or Senate has ever campaigned on racial issues, whereas almost without exception their Democrat opponents have.

I suggest this is a theory that is politically impractical, factually dishonest, and statistically weakminded. It says, in effect, that the best way for Republicans to win elections is to write off the largest blocs of potential voters. It says that the Republican Party must avoid sectionalism by abandoning most sections of this great Nation and become a party of only one section.

The theory is suicidal. It would kill the growing realization that this Nation wants to get off the old, low road of machine politics and get onto a high, new road of government representative of all the people.

The theory is selfish. It seeks to hold control of the Republican Party in the hands of men committed to defeat and to duplication of Democrat programs.

The theory is timid. It would forsake the great principles upon which Republicanism is founded. It would say to the voters of the Nation that we dare not go to the American people with the clear-cut choice they want, only with the warmed-over, watered-down arguments of the Democrats.

Most important, the theory is not a Republican theory.

The Republican Party is a great union of American strengths—the rugged, restless strength of the growing West; the rock-solid strength of the Midwest; the busy, bustling strength of the North and the East; and the proud, expanding strength of the South.

The Republican Party is a party of unity, not of exclusion. It is a party of principle not of big city machines.

The Republicans can and must offer this Nation a choice when any of our candidates go before the electorate. We must offer the chance for sound policies here at home and for freedom around the world. We don't want to be know as Little Sir Echo. We want real Republican voices and choices to be heard.

Those who would put chains on that choice do not serve Republican principles; they serve only liberal Democratic objectives of spending and spending to elect and elect.

I say to you that the South today, with its growing restiveness over radical Democrat economic policies, offers the Republican Party one of its most important political advantages in many decades. Those who believe that Republican gains in the South are somehow mysteriously tied to racism, ignore the obvious facts. They ignore the fact that Republican influence in the South is growing in direct proportion to the South's moderation on the race issue. They ignore the fact that Republican strength in the South is located in the cities and urban areas where a new view is emerging, while Democratic strength is more and more being confined to the rural communities where the race issue has undergone little change.

It is my firm conviction that any arguments which attempt to connect Republican strength in the South to the race issue ignore no only the process but causes of what is happening throughout the Southern States of our country. They miss—wittingly or otherwise—the point that the South is, and has been for sometime past, undergoing a profound evolution of political think-

ing and acting. They fail to take into account the vast changes which have taken place in the South over the past two decades.

But perhaps the greatest mistake made by the newly risen host of experts on southern politics is the belief that the Republican trend is something new.

This, of course, is utter nonsense. The Republican trend in the South has been developing over a period of years and has kept pace with the evolutionary process of change.

In effect, it amounts to the political flowering of a new society.

It is the expression of progress toward a two-party political system in a section of the country which had long confused traditional political practice with its own welfare.

Call it an awakening if you like. But remember it has been a gradual, slow-paced awakening which has gone on for a long time and only showed up in a relatively massive way in the last election.

I say that the very deliberateness of the process attests to its soundness and marks its lasting qualities. Make no mistake about it, Republicanism is in the South to stay. If it were the overnight development that many commentators and politicians would like us to think, then I believe we might be justified in looking for a single reason for the Republican strength shown in the 1962 elections.

The changes which are now finding political expression in the South have been going on for years. They are attuned to new economic and commercial developments and attitudes. They have their roots in the new industrialization of a part of the country which, from its earliest settlement has existed in an agriculture economy and society. They are related to the growing importance of business activity and concern for the interests of the business community. They are tied in with the steady and growing expansion of urban communities and cities and the declining influence of the rural areas.

And this last point is of particular importance. Republican strength is greatest in the cities—the urban areas—of the South. These areas are growing in numbers and in size. The recent Supreme Court decision on reapportionment makes it certain that the urban areas of the South will become increasingly important in statewide elections.

And, as Republicans gain in these elections, so will the political sinews of the party organization. More and more patronage at the State and local levels will fall into Republican hands and become the framework for enduring political organization at the "grassroots" of the South.

I suggest to you here today that it is the South itself that is changing; not the approach of political parties to the South. A new and vigorous middle class is developing in the wake of industrialization and heavier emphasis on commercial attitudes.

Because of this, it is particularly significant that Republican strength in the South is emerging in a city environment. It shows that a new and different conservatism is rising to displace the old, rural traditional—almost hereditary—conservatism of the Democrats. It is primarily an economic conservatism stemming from the growth in business, the increase in per capita income, and the rising confidence of the South in its own ability to expand industrially and commercially. And it is a brand of conservatism which sees liberal Democratic policies of inflation, unbalanced budgets, and deficit financing as part of the old pessimism which once gripped this region.

In the Republican Party, I suggest, the South sees a welcome trend away from centralized control of Government and an emphasis on States rights, local responsibility and individual freedom.

The Republican Party in the South is based on truly progressive elements. It is manned by young, energetic and imaginative southerners who are standing up in the Nation and looking about them with a kind of pride and optimism and hope which hasn't been seen since before the days of the Reconstruction. These are the new, vigorous southerners who have adopted the full scale of modern technology without sacrificing respect for and belief in the essential underpinnings of history. And, having adopted this modern technology, they are following through with a realistic political outlook that is unwilling to be taken in by the reactionary devices and mechanisms of government extravagance and the other manifold varieties of economic fallacy which have become the standard program of the northern Democrats.

Consequently, I believe the South has become an area of new opportunity and therefore new challenge for the Republican Party. And it has become an area which will demand and obtain an increasingly strong voice in the conduct of Republican Party affairs.

What we do with this opportunity can affect the future of the Republican Party and the Nation for many years to come. By the same token, what we might fail to do—through some mistaken interpretation of what the growing Republican trend in the South actually means—could have long and lasting effects. In this, I strongly disagree with some members of my own political party who have evidenced a timidity and a reluctance to take full advantage of the enlightened trend toward Republicanism and economic conservatism in the South.

The Republican Party's record on civil rights is clear and cannot successfully be challenged. We have not had to ignore the law to force integration, nor have we deliberately evaded the law in an effort to win votes in the northern cities. It is the liberal Democrats who have been guilty of such acts more times than can be counted. Most sensible southerners—both Negro and white—are aware of this. Their increasing support for the Republican Party is based simply upon their preference for honesty and their revulsion at political deceit.

I suggest that the majority of the American people today see more clearly just what differences separate our two major political parties and I believe they will cast their ballots accordingly. That all of this has geographical implications cannot be denied, but the overall national effect is one which I believe augurs well for a healthy, perhaps vital, change of attitude which will be reflected at the polls in 1964.

But when it comes to arguments that the GOP should write off the South or refuse to conduct a vigorous campaign in the South, I should like to remind you of the strategy devised by Franklin D. Roosevelt. No matter what else you might think of him, the fact remains that F.D.R. was one of the sharpest and shrewdest politicians the Democrats ever put up. He fully recognized the value of the South in every national election, often pointing out that since that area was solid Democrat in its voting, any reasonable amount of support in the rest of the country could bring election victory. This estimation served F.D.R. well in his lifetime, but—like his deficit financing—future generations of Democrats are going to have to pay for it.

It is not at all surprising that a proud section of the country should first become restive and finally become resentful over its classification as a slave state of the Democratic Party.

Southern people, generally conservative in nature, resent the gradual takeover of the Democrat Party by liberal and radical forces. They have displayed this resentment graphically and effectively by casting more and more ballots for Republican candidates who represented honesty in office and dedication to American principles.

Now I don't intend to stand here and pretend that the racial issue has not contributed at all to the defection of southerners from the Democratic ranks. But neither am I willing to accept the premise that segregation is the great delineation between the parties. Far more important than the race issue to most southerners has been Federal encroachment on local government, the curtailment of individual liberties, growing Federal control of just about everything. In addition, many Southern States through whose ports move large amounts of Latin American trade, are repulsed by this administration's fainthearted handling of Fidel Castro and the Soviet military base in Cuba.

So I say that it would be foolhardy and unrealistic for the Republican Party to adopt a strategy aimed at the northern big cities to the exclusion of the South. I say that our party cannot afford to write off any part of the United States nor any group of potential voters.

I say we are not going to write off the suburbs, which figure to be one of our strongest sources of support. And we are not going ot write off the cities no matter where they are, because we understand that the more votes we get the more certain we can be of victory. We are not going to write off the South, because we can read in the political trends of the past few years a Republican presidential sweep in 1964 that could give us many new Republicans in the House of Representatives. We are not going to write off the East, because we have ample proof in several of the biggest of these States that we can elect Republicans to any and all offices. And, in view of a wide variety of recent polls, our growing strength in the Midwest and West makes it obvious that we are not going to abandon them.

Why should we write off anything in an American election? The Republican Party is an American party, a party for all Americans.

And now let us look at another great area of our Nation—one which, despite its size, has pulled a few political tricks out of its bag that startled the whole country.

I know that all of you here had some responsibility in staging that latest showstopper with the election of Henry Bellmon to the Governorship of Oklahoma. One of the secretaries in PAGE BELCHER's office back in Washington refers to the Governor as "Henry the First"—meaning that he is the first member of our party ever to hold this office, the first to prove that we have the statewide strength to do it again and again and again, if you'll pardon that New Deal expression.

So we have no intention of writing off Oklahoma either. And we certainly don't intend to write off Bartlesville, because you proved in the election of Denny Garrison to the State senate that you have an organization that can work and win.

Now this is very important. We're going to need good organization in 1964, not only to retire the Kennedy clan but also to replace a gentleman whose name I won't mention but whose initials are ED EDMONDSON. I'm sure you Oklahomans can do without Mr. EDMONDSON just as the entire country can do without the Kennedys. What has happened and what continues to happen here proves to my satisfaction that you can retire your local liability with not outside help and that you can assist in the retirement of the Kennedy clan with the help of the East, the South, the North, the Midwest, the West, the cities, the suburbs, the farms, and all other sections and communities of this great country.

In 1964, we'll do some real writing off. We'll write off the Kennedy brothers and the New Frontier and we'll rack up an overwhelming Republican victory.

Thank you.

Kill Christmas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday's Washington Star carried an excellent editorial on the civil rights crisis confronting this Nation.

It describes the feelings of a number of prominent Negroes who, embittered by the terrible events in Birmingham, have called for the abolition of Christmas this year.

The editorial is right in stating that an attempt has already been made to kill this Christian feast day of the most ultimate significance by the fanatics who bomb churches, by those who deny Negroes the right to vote and by segregationists in all parts of the country.

I accept also the contention in the editorial that Christmas has been vulgarized, but I cannot believe that the intelligence of James Baldwin and others is being fully demonstrated here. Rather, let us pray during this Christmastime that the infinite wisdom of the One whose birth we celebrate will prevail in this most serious of crises.

It may be, as I suggested in a statement made after the Birmingham bombing on Sunday, September 15, that only the inate belief in the goodness of our Judaic-Christian tradition will be our saving grace. The point, as this editorial so poignantly states, is not to abandon Christmas but to once again hope for "peace on earth and good will among men."

The editorial follows:

KILL CHRISTMAS?

During Sunday's march of mourning for the Birmingham children killed by a bomb, Dick Gregory told the crowd that he will give his own children no Christmas presents this year to impress upon them the meaning of those deaths. On the same day it was announced in New York that a group of Negro artists has started a campaign to eliminate the celebration of Christmas in 1963. Actress Ruby Dee asks parents to tell their children, "Santa Claus didn't come because bombers came in Birmingham." James Baldwin says flatly, "Americans have no right to celebrate Christmas this year."

We share fully the horror and sadness evoked by Birmingham. But we think Mr. Gregory, Miss Dee, and Mr. Baldwin are wrong.

True, Mr. Baldwin is on solid ground when he says we have no "right" to celebrate Christmas this year. Neither we nor any other nation ever had that right in any year. In the most liberal sense, Christmas is a gift of God, not something earned or deserved by man. Its celebration is our acceptance and thanks for that gift.

Christmas, to be sure, for many years has been commercialized and vulgarized. There are drunken office parties and there are gifts given solely with an eye to gain. There are parents who use the occasion to get their children one up in their peer group by the lavishness of their presents. With all that, we do not believe the spirit of Christmas has been seriously touched. It still lives and the exchange of gifts at that time is a pledge, a kind of promissory note, for our charity, our givingness, in all our human contacts on all our days.

Does this relate to the tragedy in Birmingham and to the wider struggle for racial justice? It does indeed. Had the spirit of Christmas been fully accepted by white American Christians, there would be no need for that struggle, for the American Negro would long since have been received into full citizenship.

The challenge of Birmingham will be met not by the elimination of Christmas but by the deepening of our understanding of that feast and by our extension of its spirit throughout our lives. Surely what the civil rights movements want of America is not less Christmas, but more.

Kill Christmas? The attempt has already been made: by the church bombers, most surely, but also by public officials who deny Negroes education and votes, by segregationists in all parts of the country, by those of us who harden our hearts and wish the trouble would go away. It would be a great mistake for Negroes to join that effort against the message of the angels, "Peace on earth to men of good will."

Loud Voice Gets Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of September 4, 1963, in opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill now pending before the Congress. The editorial tells of the evil effects enactment of this legislation would have on the economy in general and the consumer in particular:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Sept. 4, 1963]

LOUD VOICE GETS HEARD

In Washington one of the most persistent and wily lobbies is making good progress. It is the fix-prices lobby.

The House Commerce Committee, with only one dissent, has approved the so-called "quality stabilization" bill, once known as the "fair trade" bill. It is neither. It is price-fixing.

For all the creamy words with which the bill is promoted, its purpose is the same as ever—to permit manufacturers to force retailers to sell their products at the same prices, backed by the Federal Government. Violations would be subject to prosecution.

The promoters of this device call it a "small buisness" measure, and anything glossed out in that name has an appeal to most Congressmen.

But the Justice Department, which knows better, say enactment would cost consumers probably 20 percent more for many things—billions of dollars a year. The Department says that in States which have so-called "fair trade" laws prices range from 10 to 27 percent higher.

The "quality stabilization" bill has strength because it is being pushed by a loud lobby. The consumers, who will pay the bill, will get short shrift if it passes.

Are You a Patriot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an article by Art Buchwald, entitled "Are You a Patriot?"

In light of the debate on the tax bill these past few days, I am sure this article will prove somewhat refreshing:

ARE YOU A PATRIOT?

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy made an urgent, and what we considered moving, speech last Wednesday night when he pleaded for public support of his tax cut legislation. Realizing he was in difficulty on Capitol Hill, Mr. Kennedy took his case to the people, and he will be happy to know it was not in vain.

No matter how we felt in the past about paying high taxes, the President convinced us that the only way to save the country was to pay less taxes to the Government. If this is the kind of sacrifice it takes to be an American, we're willing to make it.

When President Kennedy first took office, he said that Americans shouldn't ask what America could do for them, but what they could do for America. For 3 years we've been waiting for an opportunity to do something constructive, meaningful, something patriotic. And at last the President has shown us the way.

By supporting his tax legislation, we will not only save the country from going into a recession and we will not only boost employment, but we will also have money left over to buy a new car, a new television set, perhaps a new house, and surely two orchestra seats to Cleopatra.

Tough as it is, we want the President to know he not only has our support, but of every member of our family. Even if it means less deductions in our pay check, and more take-home pay, we say we're willing to stand up and be counted.

We want above everything else for America to be strong, and if it can be done with a tax cut, then we say cut taxes. We'll even go further and come out for eliminating them altogether.

What moved us most in the President's speech was when he said high taxes are not only unnecessary, but actually harmful to the economy. This is something we've secretly maintained for a long time. Even our wife, who knows very little about economics, has told us on occasion that she would rather have money for a new coat than pay it to Uncle Sam.

"Hush, Mother," we used to say, "or people will think we're Communists."

But now it's out in the open. We no longer have to talk in whispers. Those who would keep taxes high are the subversives—those who would buy dishwashers, clothes, and take vacations with the money are the true patriots in the United States.

If going to a discount house makes us a flag waver, then we say wave the flag. If taking a trip to Florida makes us a good American, then we say hurrah for America. And if Congress refuses to pass the tax cut bill, we say investigate Congress and see who are really behind them.

As a matter of fact, we have decided that, even if Congress doesn't pass the bill, it is up to every American to support the President on his own. He can best do this by de-

ducting from his return the money he would have saved if the bill was passed.

If the Internal Revenue Department raises any questions, the taxpayer can refer them to the White House. The President has asked us to support him. Surely he will support us if we refuse to pay the taxes that are harmful to the country's growth.

Time is running out. There are those in the United States who are opposed to the tax cut plan. They are for the most part either ignorant of what it will do or unwilling to make the supreme sacrifice that has been asked of them.

But we're happy to say we don't know any of them personally. If we did we'd report them to the FBI.

VFW and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, now that the nuclear test ban treaty has been ratified by the Senate and the administration is seeking other ways to cooperate with the Soviet Union, are we going to forget that Russia keeps her international promises only as long as they are of advantage to her? As a word of warning, I commend to my colleagues the following provocative editorial written by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, which appeared in September's VFW magazine:

VFW AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired; director VFW National Security and Foreign Affairs)

There's sweetness and light radiating these days from the Kremlin. The question is: "Why?" The answer is simple: The Kremlin's master strategists have decided that it's to communism's advantage to put on the mask of cooperation and peace.

But this is really nothing fundamentally new. The long and lamentable history of Communist aggression is one of alternating eras of the hard and the soft line. Now, the Kremlin has finished a hard line "zig," and has started a soft line "zag." But communism is still on its base course of world conquest. That's the way of Lenin charted it. That's the way Khrushchev is steering the Communist ship of state.

The soft line should be no surprise. The Kremlin planned it this way. When Khrushchev called the Communist bigwigs together at a meeting of the Supreme Soviet, on December 12, 1962, he coldly announced the plans for the soft line of "political compromises." He told the Red faithful: "We follow the instructions of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, who more than once stressed the possibility and necessity of compromises in politics."

But Khrushchev made it clear that Kremlin smiles and cooperation would not be a departure from Communist goals. He pointedly reminded the Supreme Soviet that communism's mission is to "be able to carry * * * one's revolutionary task through all compromises so far as they are inevitable."

In other words, he reaffirmed the Communist doctrine of deceit as a tool of furthering Communist conquest.

Furthermore, he is giving abundant evidence of his faithful adherence to the goals of world domination. A few examples: Large-scale and aggressive Red spying against the United States and our allies; use of Red China as a base for exporting subversion, terror, and revolution into Latin America, thus tightening the Red noose around Panama and weakening the southern flank of the United States.

While arguing with the Red Chinese over the surest method of killing us, Russia and her Polish puppets support Red Chinese stategy in Laos. There is no major, and few minor areas, on the globe where the Kremlin is not engaged in terrorism, revolution, subversion, and conquest. Anyone who is under the illusion that communism has changed its goals, should pause and remember the following:

The record of communism—written in the blood of its victims—is one of treachery, deceit, broken promises, and violated treaties. The 20th century has been littered with the wreckage of nations, who, in their folly, believed the ruthless leaders of the Kremlin.

Khrushchev has never withdrawn his promise to "bury" us. He may be smiling in Moscow, but throughout the world his Red agents are busily engaged in his pet project of digging our Nation's grave.

City of Hollywood, Fla., Condemns Russian Trawlers Sailing Close to Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have drawn the attention of the Congress to the violation of U.S. territorial waters by Russian trawlers many times this year. Their presence along the coast of Florida has been a threat to our security due to their highly technical capability to snoop or spy on our shores. The people of Florida have been concerned some time over the presence of these trawlers, and I have certainly shared in that concern.

The city of Hollywood, Fla., has adopted a resolution condemning the action of trawlers from Communist countries for sailing close to the Florida coastline and the presence of such trawlers that can be detrimental to the safety as well as to the tourist industry of Florida. I would like to insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION 2964

Resolution condemning the action of trawlers from Communist countries for sailing close to the Florida coastline

Whereas many times in the past, it has been reported by newspapers, radio, and television media that trawlers from Communist countries, in increased numbers, have been observed in close proximity to the Florida coastline; and

Whereas pictures show that such ships are fully equipped with the latest detecting devices; and

Whereas, since Florida has become a hub of outer space research and there are many facilities throughout this State constructed for such purpose, that the sudden presence of many of such trawlers from Communist countries sailing continuously close to the Florida coastline is believed to be far from coincidental: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Hollywood, Fla.:

SECTION 1. That the City Commission of the City of Hollywood, Fla., hereby condemns the action of trawlers from Communist countries for sailing close to the Florida coastline and that the presence of such trawlers can be detrimental to the safety as well as to the tourist industry of this State.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to Members of the Congress from the State of Florida and to Florida League of Municipalities.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in force and take effect immediately upon its passage and adoption.

Passed and adopted this 18th day of September 1963.

WILLIAM G. ZINKIL, Sr.,
Mayor.

Cleveland Community Action for Youth, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Cleveland, and especially those of the Hough area, have urgently requested that the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 be extended so that the intensive work undertaken during the past 18 months by Community Action for Youth can be realized in a working program. A bill to extend the program for 3 years (S. 1967) has been reported in the other body and we are hoping that favorable action will be taken by the Congress in this session.

Community Action for Youth, Inc., is a demonstration program for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency in Cleveland, Ohio, and is jointly funded by Federal and local organizations. From March 8, 1962, until July 10, 1963, the present organization was known as the Greater Cleveland Youth Service Planning Commission, Inc., whose existence was made possible by a planning grant of $124,228 under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

After an intensive analytic study was made of the sociological, economic, and demographic data of 11 social planning areas in Greater Cleveland by specialists from various cooperating organizations, it was determined that a subsection of 2.2 square miles within the inner-city would best serve as the target area for a massive assault on juvenile delinquency. This section, known as the Hough area, is characterized by rapidly changing factors which have created problems whose deleterious effects have far-reaching consequences not only for the citizens of the Hough area but also for the city of Cleveland and the Nation as well.

Since 1950 the Hough area has witnessed a transition from less than a 2-percent nonwhite population to more than 75-percent nonwhite residents at

the present time. In 1950 there were 863 nonwhite residents under the age of 21 years; in 1960 this group numbered 18,475 and is appreciably larger now. This shift in population and its increase in size have resulted in concomitant problems of: unemployment among unskilled workers, severe problems of youth unemployment—77 percent of the out-of-school youth are without employment; special educational problems and lowered median years of school completed from 10th grade to the 9th grade; 134.3 general relief cases per 1,000 population in 1961 compared to the city of Cleveland's 43.7 cases; and 103.1 Aid to Dependent Children cases per 1,000 population in 1961 while Cleveland averaged 26.2 cases. But most significantly, the Hough area is afflicted with 18 percent of the city's major adult crimes, even though it has only 8 percent of the total city's population, while the juvenile delinquency rate for both boys and girls has soared from 57.1 cases per 1,000 population in 1950 to 128.3 in 1961 while the city of Cleveland rate rose from 47.5 to 78.6 cases during the same period.

Of profound importance for research and applied possibilities in combatting juvenile delinquency is the proposal by Community Action for Youth, and accepted by the Review Panel of the President's Committee on Juvenile Deliquency, to engage various tax-supported and private organizations in concerted action toward the pursuit of solutions of prevalent social problems. Particular emphasis is placed on strengthening education, training of youth for employment and strengthening services which support family life. These organizations have previously sought these ends independently of each other without significantly altering the course of social disorganization within the inner city.

To qualify for Federal funds under the matching fund conditions governing demonstration grants and to meet the requirements of the Community Action for Youth proposal, it was necessary to undertake extended negotiations with the city of Cleveland, the Cleveland Board of Education, the Cuyahoga County Commissioners, local foundations, and the United Appeal. Planning procedures had to be related to the functions, restrictions and problems of the participating organizations. Of special concern was the problem of allocating funds, services and personnel to a sub-section of the total community in the face of other responsibilities carried by political organizations.

These preparatory efforts occurred over the entire phase of the planning period during which time the demonstration planning was continued unabated toward refinement and precision. After some delay in securing vital organizational commitments to the project there was finally pronounced agreement among the organizations to participate in Community Action for Youth. A start at undergirding its premises and fulfilling its objectives is now a matter of fact.

The small staff of Community Action for Youth is currently seeking qualified appplicants to fill its program and research positions. Several top administrators have been hired so that the schools program, youth employment and pre-school family nursery programs are now being developed and will be in operation within the immediate future. During the winter months other phases of the action programs will begin. These programs include the neighborhood extension service and services to families.

The real effort to put this program into effect and see it through to completion cannot be accomplished entirely by the local community without some Federal assistance. Therefore, we in Cleveland are hoping that action will be taken on an extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act.

Farm Outrage Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the Wellington (Kans.) Daily News. I am pleased to note that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, has at last yielded and removed the so-called loyalty oath which local farmer-elected committeemen were required to take:

FARM OUTRAGE ABOLISHED

The Department of Agriculture has finally yielded to pressure and removed the so-called "loyalty oath" which local farmer-elected committeemen had been forced to take.

Coming on the same day as a soaking rain, this made it a banner day of good news for farmers.

Under the loyalty pledge, the committeemen obligated themselves to boost every program that the Department put forward.

These programs could be misguided, politically inspired, harmful to the farm economy, a threat to the farmer's own freedom. No matter—if it came from the Department of Agriculture, the farm committeeman was sworn to uphold it and to tell one and all he thought it was a fine thing.

Imagine such a system operating for even 5 minutes in a democracy. But it has been in force for months, an outrage put on us by one of the most vital agencies in our Federal Government.

A handful of Republican Congressmen have been protesting the loyalty oath since last summer, and finally it has been abolished—but abolished reluctantly, we must suppose, since it took the Department so long to get around to it.

One of the Congressmen who has been fighting the practice was BOB DOLE of Kansas, who issued the following statement Thursday.

"It was never intended by Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture should seek to intimidate or coerce farmer-elected committeemen to support or oppose any specific farm theory or program.

"In fact, Congress has traditionally established and supported a policy of independence and separation of power for such committeemen."

He added that Freeman, by administrative order, would have "compelled these farmer-elected committeemen to have become an integral part of the administration propaganda team, requiring them to support programs which they, and the farm neighbors who elected them, might flatly oppose."

Self-Determination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the forthcoming tragedy of the administration wholeheartedly embracing the Soviet Union, there is still time for Congress to maintain some sanity in our foreign policy by the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

This point is effectively presented in an editorial of September 26 from the Hairenik Weekly, which I place into the RECORD at this point:

SELF-DETERMINATION

In his speech before the United Nations General Assembly last week, President Kennedy, while hailing what he saw as a more temperate atmosphere in the world of East-West relations, nevertheless insisted that the basic American formula of the right of a nation or a people to determine for itself its political fortunes was not in the least being altered.

The President's expressions in favor of a continuing American championship of the right of a nation to forge its own destiny were of course quite heartening but nevertheless, in their contextual unity with the question of the lessening East-West difficulties, pointed up a dichotomy of serious proportions.

How can the United States, as an example, pursue vigorously a policy of lessening East-West tensions and, at the same time, redeclare itself forcefully as advocating the right of self-determination when the Soviet Union, the principal object of the American effort to "improve the international atmosphere", continues to hold within itself fifteen once-free non-Russian nations which do not enjoy the right of self-determination, which continue in fact to suffer the iron rule of Moscow?

This difficulty in official American thinking is highlighted, of course, by the continuing recalcitrance of the Department of State in the matter of the proposed Special House Committee on Captive Nations, pending now for 3 long years, and strongly supported not only by eminent Washington legislators, but also almost as a body by American groups interested in implementing behind the still very Iron Curtain the basic American cornerstone policy of self-determination.

It is widely known in Washington that House resolutions (there are about 30 such bills pending) calling for a Captive Nations Committee have been buried in the Committee on Rules of the House not because of a majority reluctance of Rules Committee members to act favorably on the matter but because the Department has been urging that such bills be not released.

Originally, the Department's argument against enactment of a captive nations bill was predicated on the feeling that formation of such a committee would upset East-West talks on the Berlin crisis. As Congressman DERWINSKI has pointed out however, bills advocating a Captive Nations Committee, at

departmental insistance, were indeed pigeonholed in Rules—but still a settlement of the Berlin question did not ensue.

It appears that the Department is now suggesting that enactment of the Flood-Derwinski Resolutions 14–15 would upset negotiations on the lessening of tenisons—and this precisely underscores the dichotomy tragically illustrated by the President's speech.

Are we so interested in reducing East-West frictions as to go so far as to abandon the basic American doctrine of self-determination as far as the Soviet itself is concerned; or are we simply going to decide that the God-given right of self-determination will be recognized everywhere except where it is most needed—the Soviet Union itself?

It seems clear that the United States cannot abandon self-determination as a keystone of American foreign policy without becoming something recognizably not American, something foreign to the American way of life, something new, strange and different—an American abjuring those very doctrines which made America, and which keep America; on the other hand, the U.S. Government cannot hew to the principle of self-determination and at the same time create two categories of nations—one, nations which must be given the right of self-determination, the other, nations which must not be given that right. It appears to us that the latter method is being attempted by people in government—and it simply won't work, because it is an expediency, and self-determination is a principle inherited by all nations—whether to the east or the west of the Iron Curtain. There can be no expediencies in the application of a policy of self-determination. It is either self-determination for all or for none.

What must be done patently then is this: America must boldly make use of the present rapprochement (if what we have is honestly an era of international good feeling) to convince the Soviet leaders that the captive Soviet states must be given the right of free plebiscite, of self-determination, so that the peoples of these nations themselves, in the best of democratic traditions, may express their own views on the most pressing, and potentially most explosive international problem existing today—whether the captive states wish to continue government from Moscow or else choose to reject continued enforced rule from the north in favor of self-government as freemen.

Given such a choice, which would the American people elect?

Hon. Leon Gavin

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, LEON GAVIN was my friend and I shall miss him. All of us shall miss him and that makes our sorrow all the more poignant.

I have many enjoyable memories of association on the Committee on Armed Services and although our political views differed we were drawn together by virtue of the fact we were both World War I veterans. This was a strong tie.

It was my good fortune to travel to Europe on more than one occasion with Mr. GAVIN. We were both interested in history, particularly that of World War I. We visited several of its battlefields and cemeteries together.

Like you, I shall miss LEON GAVIN but I am the better for having known him and to have considered him a personal friend.

Mrs. Miller joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Gavin and his family.

West Virginia Makes Progress—Appalachian Power Co. Lauds State's Cleanup Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the citizens of West Virginia have, in recent years, been engaged in a conscientious and organized effort to bolster their economy and to create a richer and more productive life. Well-reasoned programs of a positive nature have been instituted to attract new industry, build community spirit, and encourage tourism.

During 1962, over 8 million persons visited West Virginia, an increase of 14 percent over the previous year. Some $300 million was spent by travelers in the State and private interests are now committed to investing some $17½ million aimed at hoisting tourist trade. State department of commerce commissioner, Hon. Hulett C. Smith reports that during the first 8 months of 1963, the department had helped to bring 82 new plants into the State, and that 93 expansions of existing facilities had been accomplished.

Mr. President, another evidence of the energies and efforts of West Virginians to enhance the appearance and commercial attractiveness of the Mountain State is the cleanup campaign now underway. Citizens in every part of West Virginia are working cooperatively to improve the cleanliness of local areas, and thus make towns and farms more pleasing to the eye of prospective buyers and travelers.

A helpful article on the cleanup campaign appeared recently in the September-October issue of the Development, the publication of the Appalachian Power Co. In a lucid manner, it tells the story of groups and individuals throughout the State as they participate in what Gov. William Wallace Barron has called A "people's program"—a grassroots movement inspired by the enthusiasm and hard work of innumerable individuals and organizations.

I request that the article "Basic Actions Can Boost Economy; Cleanup Campaign Is Good Example," in the September–October 1963 issue of Development, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC ACTIONS CAN BOOST ECONOMY; CLEANUP CAMPAIGN IS GOOD EXAMPLE

"If we're going to have company, we're going to have to clean up the house."

That homey observation was made by Luther Hodges, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, but he was referring to something bigger than a home.

He was talking about industrial development and tourism, and he made the remark when West Virginia paused recently to take stock of its statewide cleanup campaign.

Going on the basis that a cleaner State makes it a better place to live, and enhances its chances of getting new industry and attracting more tourists, West Virginia launched its antilitter campaign 2 years ago. For its efforts, the State was presented a national clean-up award by the Keep America Beautiful Conference, and three women's organizations in the State were presented checks for $1,000. The clubs—West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, West Virginia Garden Club and West Virginia Home Demonstration Council—were presented the checks by Sears, Roebuck & Co. for their cleanup efforts in this the State's centennial year.

THE METHODS

Cleanup can take many forms. In West Virginia, for example, it includes an antilitterbug campaign, concerted efforts by citizens to clean up trash along highways and roads, community cleanup campaigns, State laws proposing fines for littering, setting of trash barrels at appropriate locations along highways and roads, a State law prohibiting open junkyards and automobile graveyards along roads, and extensive promotion campaigns initiated by the Governor's office.

As West Virginia Governor W. W. Barron described it: "It is not a Governor's program. It is not a State government program. It is a people's program—a grassroots movement inspired by the enthusiasm and hard work of innumerable individuals and organizations."

CASE HISTORY

Secretary Hodges harked back to his days as Governor of North Carolina in remarking on the importance of cleanliness in industrial development. He remembers that this State and another were vying for a new industry, and just when the North Carolina community thought it had things sewed up, the industry announced it was locating in the other State. Mr. Hodges went to the industry to find out why the North Carolina town was rejected. The answer as Mr. Hodges relates it, "I hate to say it, but the North Carolina town was just plain dirty. The streets were littered with trash, paper was blowing about—and we simply decided that a community that didn't have enough civic pride to keep its streets and public areas clean wasn't the kind of place we wanted to locate in."

Secretary Hodges went on to point out that the economics of clean up were not limited to industrial development. Litter is also an enemy of tourist promotion. He said the travel service people in his department question hundreds of people from abroad each year about what they like and dislike about America. The majority named the friendliness of the American people as the thing they liked most, and the noise and litter of the city as what they liked least.

Next step in West Virginia's continuing clean-up program is the destruction of abandoned or unoccupied shacks. The State is in the midst of a 2½-month campaign, with counties competing against counties for cash and trophy awards. Counties have been asked to survey the number of shacks that need to be destroyed, destroy as many as they can before the October 15 deadline, and present a plan for getting rid of those that are left.

It is another step in cleaning house, and house cleaning is an excellent way to offer a warm welcome to visitors. The challenge for all communities is there—clean up is a basic action that any community or area can undertake, with good results.

Capt. Frank Manson Tells Value of Water Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 28, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer, my good friend and fellow Oklahoman, Capt. Frank Manson, U.S. Navy, delivered an inspiring and forward-looking address at the annual banquet of the chamber of commerce at Tahlequah, Okla.

Captain Manson directed his remarks toward the multiple-purpose water development program now underway in Oklahoma. Drawing on his rich experiences in this area, he told of the great importance and value this water project will have to Oklahoma and to our Nation as well.

Captain Manson spoke, not as a layman with a limited background, but as an expert who as a Navy officer for two decades has studied and witnessed firsthand in many areas of the world the economic value of developing our water resources.

Frank Manson is one of Oklahoma's most successful native sons. As a naval officer, author, humanitarian, and unofficial goodwill ambassador in many foreign ports, he has indeed been a glowing credit to the State of Oklahoma and to America.

We in Washington perhaps best know Frank Manson for his proposal to create a "great white fleet" of mercy ships to carry the United States technical and medical know-how and American hospitality to the needy peoples of the world.

He is also well known for originating people-to-people programs for the Armed Forces. In recent years, he began numerous long-range programs for utilizing our military men as ambassadors of goodwill.

Captain Manson is a most distinguished military author having written numerous books and magazine articles on military subjects including such books as "Sea War in Korea," and "The U.S. Navy in World War II."

Frank Manson's remarks to the Tahlequah Chamber of Commerce are fruitful reading and at this time I wish to have them inserted in the RECORD in their entirety.

OKLAHOMA'S MARITIME HORIZONS

(By Capt. Frank Manson, U.S. Navy, June 20, 1963)

Fellow Oklahomans, at this stage of my life, it divides almost equally into two parts. The first half of it was spent as a landsman here in Oklahoma. I never had opportunity to see either the Atlantic or the Pacific—much less such remote ocean areas as the Philippine Seas, the Yellow Sea, the Red Sea, the South China Seas, and the Mediterranean. The later half of my life has been spent as a sailor with frequent opportunities to visit remote sea and land areas.

Since this is one of my rare opportunities to visit in my hometown, I hope to bring these two parts of my life into focus; to tie my hopes and dreams for Tahlequah's future and in a broader sense, Oklahoma's future, and the geographic heartland of the United States, with my experience as a naval officer interested in using the seas to improve man's lot and maintain maritime supremacy for the United States and our freedom-committed friends.

I well remember my first speech to a civic group in Tahlequah as a commissioned naval officer. It was 21 years ago. I was a newly commissioned ensign fresh out of the naval training school at Cornell University. I began by apologizing for undertaking to talk on naval power, a subject in which I had no experience and precious little knowledge. Now, 21 years later, I think I owe you another apology. Although I have written several books, articles, and speeches on naval subjects, and, although I have spent these 21 years in concentrated study of the ocean's challenges and opportunities, I feel I should start by saying there's a lot I don't know about the world's oceans and waterways.

I am still a student of the maritime world. I am still in the process of learning; and, in some respects, I am less knowledgeable than I was 21 years ago when I was unable to see the horizon, much less try to see beyond it. At least I have gained some idea of how much we have yet to learn about the oceans.

We earthians should not forget that our oceans are vast and deep, that they hold unlimited threats and opportunities—and that we know very little about them.

Our Navy and military services have built the most modern and versatile weapon systems of the world; aircraft carriers, frigates, and submarines propelled through the water by nuclear power; ocean- and continent-spanning jet aircraft; electrons capable of doing almost anything but create living cells; and yet we have barely scratched the ocean's surface.

This, my fellow citizens, represents a serious oversight. Let us not forget that while ours and Soviet space capsules defy man's imagination, there is still three-fourths of this earth shrouded in mystery, untapped—virtually unexplored. Man reaches out for the stars before he has conquered, or in fact, comprehended the promise of its watery surface; before he has had but a few brief glances at the ocean's floor. The ocean's surrounding land areas have all been located, and to some degree these land areas are under exploration and development, but the oceans themselves, their exploration and exploitation are still around the corner—I hope just around the corner.

Only a few months ago, a close personal friend, Britain's Peter Small, lost his life off our California coast in an effort to advance man's oceanic knowledge. Peter was an underwater explorer and writer. He, along with the famous Swiss mathematician, Hans Keller, wanted to prove man could descend 1,000 feet by utilizing a special gas Mr. Keller had devised. Peter told me shortly before he left London for his drive, that if the dive proved successful it would open the Continental Shelf for exploration, for food, for mineral wealth to help care for the world's exploding populations. Peter's trip was partially successful. Both he and Keller collapsed during their ascent from 1,000 feet and Peter died a few hours later.

Our efforts to find the lost submarine *Thresher* brings home to each and all of us, how little we really know about the ocean depths.

I say all this as prelude to the theme of my subject tonight—Oklahoma's maritime horizons.

Who could have imagined two decades ago that Oklahoma would stand in 1963 on the threshold of true maritime greatness; that Oklahoma, apparently landlocked in the heartland of the United States, would show promise of becoming one of the industrial power centers of the United States and, indeed, of this world—as powerful as the highly industralized Ohio Valley, as productive as the Ruhr—second to none as an industralized and diversified center. Yet, I fully expect this optimistic forecast to come to pass.

As many of you know, during the past 4 years I have lived in Great Britain. My duties have taken me throughout Europe, the Middle East and Africa. During these years in Europe, I have come more and more to the conclusion that economical transport is the key to community development and progress.

From the banks of the Thames I have watched the endless barge traffic moving to the English Channel and from it; I have studied Britain's inland canals and waterways, her coastal and transocean shipping. Britain's strength and her greatness, her role as a competitor among nations is closely keyed to the economic accessibility of her raw materials and her markets. In a word—water transport.

The same is true on the continent of Europe. As early as the 17th century the governing princess wanted to industrialize their states. They wanted to capitalize on the scientific revolution of that period. They realized the necessity for inland waterways and started their construction.

Today the West Germans are still digging new canals and deepening rivers. At the moment they have under consideration an inland waterway from Hamburg to Hannover. The Germans have just opened a new waterway into Stuttgart and German authorities tell me they fully expect the Stuttgart area to become more famous than the Ruhr in the years ahead. Throughout Europe, in France, the Netherlands and Germany, the economy depends on water transport to make their industries competitive. They find that water transport saves from 30 to 50 percent of transportation costs. The barge traffic on the Rhine is never-ending day and night—and so it is elsewhere in the world—including Communist dominated territories.

This brings me to the point I wish to make in Tahlequah and throughout the States of Oklahoma and Arkansas. The opportunity for economic advancement is knocking heavily on your door. Two days ago I attended the congressional hearings in Washington, D.C. on the future of the Arkansas River development plan. The future is beyond one's imagination. As the late Senator Kerr said, "It is beyond our dreams." Later I talked with Congressman Edmondson, a strong and persuasive advocate of this maritime program, who put me in touch with Mr. Don McBride and Col. Francis J. Wilson. I said I would like to get down to brass tacks because the people of Oklahoma like to look over the facts. These are the facts:

With the completion of the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers projects you people here in Tahlequah will have access to the seven seas. You will be 20 miles from access to salt water. Oklahoma will be opened to the sea. Your products will be moved to world markets. About 13 million tons of goods will move on Oklahoma's waterways. Seven million people will benefit. This afternoon Mr. L. L. Gulver drove me from the Tulsa airport to the future port of Catoosa on the Verdigris. The people in Catoosa told us the price of land was on its way up—house lots which sold for $300 or $400 a few years

ago are now selling for $1,000. Industries from East and West are sending in teams of experts. Missile and space industries have already started moving here in anticipation of water transport.

As a boy I used to wonder how it was that Oklahoma could be so rich in oil and yet be too poor to support the relatively few people living within its boundaries. Now I think I know part of the answer and water navigation will help solve it. Navigable rivers will bring diversified industry. Our people will have many industries. We have 65 commercially producible minerals accessible to the Arkansas River Basin. Not only can our resources be mined, farmed, manufactured and sold, but we can buy things more cheaply—molasses and high protein supplement from New Orleans, barbed wire fencing from Pittsburgh and farm machinery can be brought in more cheaply.

Nor will the rail and trucking industries suffer with expanded trade and production, they will be required to expand—to provide feeder lines and connecting overland routes. The entire transport industry will benefit from the expanding economy.

Another point of great significance. I think it will return many Oklahomans to their native state. The University of Oklahoma recently found in a survey that 75 percent of their transplanted Oklahoman students would return home if they had job opportunities. Oklahoma's growth as a maritime State will bring job opportunity and the economic benefits so richly deserved by this young dynamic State.

Yes, I feel Oklahoma has a bright economic future. The "Sooner" State looms as a very bright star in the maritime world. As you expand, as your products move out across the oceans, you will become extremelly interested in whether these products can move safely across the seas. Your Navy will be on hand to help insure that the oceans remain free.

The people of Oklahoma have helped to build inland waterways to other regions of the United States and I know these regions of the United States now benefiting will want to help you. With your high quality representation both in the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington, I feel confident Oklahoma's destiny of maritime greatness is sure to happen. I hope each of you will join in this advancement and I assure you I will do what I can to hasten the day that the river ports of Muskogee and Catoosa are open to the high seas.

Center To Train School Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 9, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us acquainted with the current events of the District of Columbia are aware of the great emphasis placed this summer on the need for a return to school by the so-called dropouts.

Statistics released by various public school agencies in this area reveal that the drive made during the summer was quite productive in the number of dropouts who returned to school in September.

I am pleased to say that this emphasis on reorienting young people to the desire to foster educational pursuits is not limited to the East but is of first concern in my congressional district.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., of September 20, 1963, which outlines what the Alameda County Board of Education is doing on this important subject.

CENTER TO TRAIN SCHOOL DROPOUTS

HAYWARD.—The Alameda County Board of Education Thursday threw full support behind a project aimed at establishing a residential training center for boys who dropout of high school.

Board members commended the effort, said they will back the plan fully and urged that it be expedited.

They will serve as the governing body for the center, once it is established. They expressed enthusiasm at this prospect.

The move to establish the center got underway last October, with a joint powers agreement between the county department of schools, Oakland public schools, the board of supervisors, the city of Oakland and the State department of employment.

The county schools office in August was asked by the Youth Opportunities Board to handle the project.

Deputy County Schools Superintendent Robert C. Coney said the center is the first of its kind in California. It will serve, he said, "the boy without a place to be helped * * * the dropout."

It will offer him prevocational training with emphasis on basic academic skills such as reading, writing and math as they relate to jobs.

The center will, it is now thought, provide housing, so boys would remain there on a boarding basis Monday through Friday.

Only boys between 16 and 20 will be accepted. They must, Coney said, be out of school and out of work. Our objective would be to prepare them to work or return to high school or perhaps junior college for further training.

The center is not, he emphasized, designed for delinquency problems. But it will offer extensive help in the area of counseling and guidance.

No site has yet been found, Coney said.

Boys from throughout Alameda County will be eligible to attend the training school. It appears now they will be selected on a voluntary basis from department of employment referrals.

Resolution and Declaration by the Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Assembly of Captive European Nations is an organization dedicated to the restoration of freedom to the satellite countries that are now controlled by the Soviet imperialistic regime.

At the 10th session of the ACEN which convened in New York on September 17, a resolution was unanimously adopted dramatizing the hypocrisy of the Soviet Union and the need for the U.N. to face this issue. I insert this resolution in the RECORD at this point, along with a declaration adopted by the ACEN dealing with the international situation and the Captive Nations:

DENIAL OF SELF-DETERMINATION TO THE PEOPLES OF EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

(Resolution unanimously adopted at the 109th meeting of the plenary assembly, on September 18, 1963, held in New York. Rapporteur: Dr. Vilis Masens (Latvia)).

The Assembly of Captive European Nations—

Recalling that under specific provisions of the United Nations Charter (arts. 55 and 56), the member nations are pledged to the "respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all * * *";

Recalling further that one of the purposes of the United Nations is (art. 1, par. 2) "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples";

Reminding that the universal declaration of human rights (art. 21, par. 3) provides that "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures";

Noting with satisfaction that since the end of World War II the United Nations has played an important role in helping no less than 48 nations on their road to independence;

Considering that on December 14, 1960, the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted a declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, proclaiming the principle "that all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their sovereignty," and stressing "the necessity of bringing a speedy and unconditional end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations";

Bearing in mind that the Soviet Union has established a colonial system in a large part of Europe: in an undisguised form in the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; under a cloak of national independence in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania;

Stressing that the Soviet colonial rule in East-Central Europe has all the oppressive hallmarks against which the new members of the United Nations have struggled and won, namely, economic exploitation, imposition of alien institutions and values, denial of basic human rights;

Emphasizing that the situation in East-Central Europe violates the United Nations Charter, lowers the world organization to the level of hypocrisy and double standards, and endangers peace and security;

Noting that despite all the facts enumerated above the special committee on the situation with regard to the implementation of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, has so far bypassed the captive countries of East-Central Europe and has only two European territories—Malta and Gibraltar—on its agenda;

Appeals to the free members of the United Nations (1) to put an end to the double standard now prevailing in the United Nations on the issue of self-determination; (2) to urge the Committee of 24, established by the General Assembly Resolution 1654 (XVI), or any other United Nations organ, to undertake an investigation of the denial of self-determination to the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Declaration unanimously adopted at the 109th meeting of the plenary assembly, on September 18, 1963, held in New York. Rapporteur: Mr. Constantin Visoianu (Rumania).)

Having carefully examined the present international situation as it affects the nations of East-Central Europe, the Assembly of Captive European Nations has set forth its findings and conclusions in the following declaration.

1. Renewed efforts on the part of the Western Powers to ease international tensions constitute the main development in the world arena. The recent signing of the nuclear test ban agreement is viewed as a first step in this direction, and the Western Powers are set to start further negotiations aimed at resolving the European problems and difficulties which are at the root of the present world tensions and which stand in the way of a real peace.

2. It is not the prerogative of the Assembly of Captive European Nations to comment on the nuclear test ban agreement. It is, however, all the more incumbent upon the spokesmen of the once free nations of East-Central Europe to affirm their deep concern in any negotiation dealing with European problems, particularly when they aim at reducing international tensions and at establishing conditions conducive to a genuine peace. This concern rests, on the one hand, on the fact that the nine nations whose rights and aspirations the Assembly is voicing are European nations intent upon resuming their rightful place, as free and independent nations, in a Europe united within its natural confines; on the other hand, on the obvious fact that the suppression of the freedom and independence of these nine nations constitute the fundamental cause of the present tensions.

3. The Assembly of Captive European Nations notes with deep concern that the forthcoming negotiations appear to be restricted to issues brought up by the Soviet Government. As though the present tensions were due to the Western Powers and not to the encroachments and aggressions perpetrated by Soviet Russia. In their anxiety to improve the international situation, the Western Powers appear ready to discuss only Soviet claims and proposals and, in the process, leave aside the real causes of the tensions prevailing in Europe since the end of the Second World War.

4. What causes of tensions are there in Europe other than the subjugation of nine once free and independent nations and the partition of Germany? And if so, should not any attempt to remove tension, any logical effort to resolve the abnormal legacies of the Second World War, address itself to these causes? That the present tensions flow directly from the violation by Soviet Russia of valid international agreements, from Soviet aggression and continuous interference in the affairs of other nations, is an inescapable fact. That there would be no tensions in Europe now, had the Soviet Union stayed within its borders and had it refrained from subjugating nine independent nations and partitioning Germany—is beyond dispute.

5. In line with her whole postwar record, Soviet Russia raises issues and initiates negotiations aimed exclusively at the consolidation of the illegitimate results of her past aggressions. That the Soviet Government resorts to such methods and pursues consistently its own selfish ends is not surprising. The fact, however, that the Western Powers permit Soviet Russia to enjoy, again and again, this privilege, is a tragic paradox of our times. Far from easing tensions, the causes of tensions are thus further deepened. Peace can certainly not be built on such unjust foundations, on such grave wrongs.

6. One of the proposals made by the Soviet Union is that of a nonaggression treaty between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the so-called Warsaw Pact states. Such a treaty has a most obvious purpose. It is designed to place the satellite regimes and the imperial system disguised under the name of the Warsaw Pact on an equal footing with the free and voluntarily associated NATO powers. It aims, above all, to consolidate the status quo in East-Central Europe, through a direct or indirect recognition on the part of these powers, and to hinder, in the future, any active concern and any legitimate activity, in the free world, on behalf of the freedom and independence of the now captive nations.

In other words, instead of removing the causes of tension, Soviet Russia seeks to aggravate them. The possibility of aggression on the part of the Western Powers does not even enter into the calculations of its rulers. For they know that the Western Powers will always abide by the unconditional nonaggression commitment implict in the Charter of the United Nations. A new nonaggression treaty would, therefore, only serve to weaken the commitments under the charter by casting doubt on their adequacy and effectiveness.

The Soviet proposal for a nonaggression arrangement is not motivated by a genuine need of new security safeguards. Its real purpose is to gain recognition of Soviet dominion over the captive nations, to sanction the partition of Germany, and to paralyze any Western political or ideological activity designed to help the peoples of the captive nations to recover the full exercise of their right of self-determination.

7. The Assembly of Captive European Nations cannot believe that the Western Powers will ever yield before such a cynically transparent maneuver. The Assembly is aware that to sacrifice the nations of East-Central Europe in order to satisfy Soviet expansion is incompatible with both Western interest and Western principles. The sad experiences of the captive nations enjoin it, nevertheless, to warn against the consequences, equally adverse for the free and the captive nations, of a nonaggression arrangement that would bestow legitimacy to a status quo brought about by Soviet aggression and maintained by continued Soviet intervention.

8. No one yearns for peace more than do the captive nations. They have suffered too much from the effects of the war and from the Soviet policy of imperialistic expansion. To be neighboring on the Soviet Union is, indeed, a tragic fate for a small nation.

Our nations wish to see established in the world a genuine peace. But a genuine peace cannot be established, and even less secured, on the tortured bodies of our nations. In 20th century Europe, at a time when the right of self-determination has received such widespread application in Africa and Asia, a genuine peace cannot be founded upon the servitude of 10 European countries, upon their continued subjection to the most brutal and far-reaching colonial rule ever known.

Our nations want a true peace. And a true peace, based on the rule of law instead of the rule of might, will be beyond reach as long as independence is not restored to our nations and human rights do not reign supreme in our lands.

9. In conclusion, the Assembly of Captive European Nations appeals to the governments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to all other Western governments (1) to avert any nonaggression treaty or arrangement because, regardless of its form, such a treaty or arrangement would only serve to condone Soviet aggressions and confer, directly or indirectly, recognition upon the status quo in East-Central Europe; (2) to be mindful, in any negotiation aimed at easing tensions, of the real causes of these tensions and, accordingly, to strive to remove them by pressing for an all-European settlement based on the independence and freedom of all European countries, making such a settlement the necessary prerequisite of nonaggression or security agreements; (3) to demand, in negotiations with Soviet Russia, that the right of self-determination be granted not only to dependent peoples under the administration of Western nations but also to the peoples of the European countries today held captive: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

Public Housing and the Credit Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an article from Credit Union magazine that I have found of tremendous interest and recommend to the thoughtful reading of my colleagues, especially those concerned with the problem of housing for low-income families. The article discusses the ways in which credit unions can serve these families in public housing projects.

The idea of using credit unions to help the tenants in Chicago's public housing was first expressed by Edward Marciniak, the very able and dedicated executive director of the Chicago Commission on Human Relations, and was promoted as a project by a staff member of the mayor's committee on new residents, a department of the Chicago Commission on Human Relations.

As the credit union in the area charted by Mr. Marciniak has implications and areas of interest for communities throughout the United States and had its origin in Chicago, I am proud and happy to have the opportunity of bringing the article in the Credit Union magazine to the attention of my colleagues. The article follows:

CREDIT UNION SERVICE FOR HOUSING PROJECT

"I have always felt that if credit unions couldn't succeed among our poor families, they have little claim to special consideration. I think credit unions have a great future among our urban poor if we put our hearts and minds into it."

This statement by Edward Marciniak, executive director of Chicago's Commission on Human Relations, sums up very well the Illinois Credit Union League's feelings about the responsibilities of the credit union movement toward low-income people in Chicago.

Certain to agree with it is William Reid, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, a leader both in New York City government and the credit union movement. A year and a half ago, Reid, a former CUNA president, issued an official statement advocating credit unions in municipal housing projects as a means of combating the loan sharks who prey upon the poor residents of low-income housing.

In both New York and Chicago today credit union leagues and city government

departments are cooperating closely to extend credit union benefits to residents of low-income housing projects. Both are convinced of the social and economic values of credit unions to low-income city dwellers, but both are also well aware of the difficult problems involved.

For some years, Sidney Blitz, New York State League education director, had been working on consumer and credit union education projects for low-income groups with city and private agencies, and the Illinois League has participated in many consumer education projects of the same type.

New York City's concerted effort began a year and a half ago. Since that time the New York League has conducted scores of meetings and expended hundreds of man-hours in trying to interest 10 different housing units in organizing credit unions, always with the full cooperation of the housing authority. As of today, no such credit unions have been established—this is what Leo Schwartz, New York League director of field services, calls the "heartbreaking" part—but no one has given up.

And it doesn't mean credit unions aren't serving low-income people in New York City. A dozen or more credit unions are located in settlement houses and churches serving low-income people, including many people who live in housing projects nearby.

It is worthwhile to note that in cooperative housing units credit unions have been successful for years in New York. In a cooperative tenants own their own apartments, just as they would their own separate houses. Some credit unions in these units have been operating successfully as long as 25 years, and there are 30 such credit unions in the city.

So it is obvious that good credit unions can be established in housing projects. The problems arise in low-income housing units. What are these problems?

"Suspicion and distrust on the part of tenants are the big ones," League Fieldman Schwartz said. "You can call it lack of interest, poor attendance at educational meetings, or poor response to posted notices," he said, "but suspicion and distrust are behind it all."

"These people have been pushed around so long," he said, "and cheated, overcharged, and victimized in so many ways, that they don't trust anybody. They have had very little experience with anyone wanting to help them. They're sure we've got something up our sleeve, that there must be something in it for us, or we wouldn't be down there. You can't blame them.

"Many of these people believe the credit union is a means for the city to check up on their family income," Schwartz said. "They're afraid the city will find out, through the credit union, how much income they have, and if it goes over the maximum for that project, out they'll go."

The league assures them that there is no connection between the credit union and the housing authority; that there is no possible way for the city to find out any of its tenants' credit union business.

Actually the question of extremly low income people amassing large savings is an academic one; none is likely to save a large enough amount to interest any authorities. However, such savings can be of immense importance to the people themselves, most of whom have never saved, or had a means of saving before.

Other serious problems are language differences and illiteracy. Many tenants are illiterate in any language. This makes it almost impossible to reach them except by word of mouth.

* * * * *

The potential for low-income housing credit unions is tremendous; the number of families living in New York City low-income public housing in June was 93,900, in 82 projects. The income of these families was $5,000 a year or less. The number of individuals making up these families was an estimated 378,000. The total number of families in the city with incomes of $5,000 or less was listed at 745,885 by the 1960 census.

Credit unions occupy an important place in the city's overall plans for improving the lives of tenants in New York public housing. Last year the department of social and community services created a new agency, the tenant organization division, headed by Martha S. Lewis. Behind the new division is the belief that the best way to improve living conditions and living habits, is through participation by tenants in their own tenant organizations.

Along with the credit union campaign, a financial management and consumer education program was carried on by a housing authority staff member in a group of tenants that included some "problem" tenants who were behind in rent payments. The program included information on grocery shopping, "bait" advertising, wise buying, discussion of credit, and family budgeting.

In her study of a large low-income project, Shoshana Lichtenstein, city consultant on tenant education, found after interviewing a number of families, a great need for consumer education among the tenants.

Lack of planning was cited time and time again, Miss Lichtenstein said. Tenants reported they had never thought about financial planning and management; that it was too hard to keep a budget, and that they didn't know where to begin if they ever considered it.

One woman summed up a general feeling of helplessness and hopelessness by saying she and her husband expected to be in debt for 40 years.

Evidence of exploitation came from many tenants. A common practice of door-to-door peddlers is leaving an article "on approval" with an unsuspecting tenant who signs a "receipt" that turns out to be a binding contract. The tenant has signed to pay $1 or $2 a week for an item for which the price is not given. The payments can continue for years—on merchandise often available elsewhere at a low cash price.

* * * * *

The only tenants who have any savings are those who belong to credit unions at their places of work, including the post office and municipal credit unions, Miss Lichtenstein reported.

The tenant organization agency believes the credit union is an excellent way to discover people who may possess leadership potential that might not come to light in the usual order of business.

Other types of low-income credit unions are serving people in housing projects in New York. Caballeros de San Juan Credit Union is located in a modest parish hall on Third Avenue in Harlem, and was organized 3 years ago as a sort of experiment. It is open to members of the Church of the Holy Agony, a parish open to all Spanish-speaking Catholics in Manhattan. Practically all members of the church are low-income people, and many live in low-income housing units.

The credit union has 300 active members, $22,000 in loans, $27,000 in savings. Most of the loans so far have been made for furnishing apartments. Members include laundry, hospital, restaurant, and factory workers and unskilled labor. Potential membership is estimated at 1,200 by Leopoldo Quiles, a machinist, treasurer-manager of the credit union. An average of eight new members joins every month.

At first this credit union had trouble getting its members to borrow, though it was successful from the first as a savings institution. Quiles said an active education program has largely solved this problem. Several business loans have been made: one to start a laundry, one to get a member started in the house-to-house selling business, and one to start a grocery that today is doing very well. Some auto loans have been made, and a large number of vacation loans have been granted. A third of these have enabled members to visit Puerto Rico. At first the board worried about making these Puerto Rico travel loans; there was some fear that the members would not return. "But we've never had a bad one yet," Quiles said proudly.

* * * * *

The New York League feels this credit union is an example of the good that can be done for low-income people; proof that with dedicated leadership and hard work the credit union idea works among people considered by other lenders poor or marginal risks.

Another credit union in Harlem serving low-income people as well as some middle-income members is St. Martin's Federal Credit Union, open to members of an Episcopalian church. A long-established credit union, St. Martin's was organized in 1939 and has 1,500 members among the church's 4,000 communicants. Oscar D. Cotton, full-time manager, said the credit union has $480,000 in loans and $490,000 in total savings, indicating that our money is out and working all the time.

* * * * *

Union Settlement Credit Union, in East Harlem, is 6 years old and has 250 members. It serves settlement house employees and their families, and people in the settlement program. Originally officers and board members were social workers connected with Union Settlement, but today many are community people, according to Nora Bowen, full-time social worker and credit union treasurer.

Savings now total $21,000 and loans $20,000, she said. Average family income of members is $3,700.

* * * * *

Today, the credit union has 50 percent turnout at annual meetings, and the family feeling about the credit union is growing. "We are beginning to provide valuable family financial counseling," she said, "now that we have the trust of the people. And we find they not only need it but they want it."

The credit union now has representatives in several nearby housing units seeking members and volunteers for credit union work.

Mrs. Bowen believes low-income people need credit unions more than anyone else because they are so vulnerable to the loan sharks.

* * * * *

Take the case of a recent arrival in Chicago from rural Puerto Rico. To his horror, he learned from a Spanish-speaking salesman, an air purifier is necessary to survive in this northern climate. Without it, his children would sicken and die. For such a necessity he gladly signed a conditional sales agreement, which held him to a lengthy series of monthly payments. It was many payments later before he learned from a visitor that he had purchased a vacuum cleaner. The poor victim didn't even have a rug to his name.

* * * * *

These people need consumer credit counseling. Some are receiving it through the Mayor's Committee on New Residents. They also need a source of low-cost credit. Again, some are getting it through credit unions serving Chicago's low-income groups. Three for example, are operated by councils of the Knights of St. John (Caballeros de San Juan). Another was recently started by the congregation of the Waldensian Presbyterian Church, which includes residents in a nearby low-income housing project. There is also

a 13-year-old credit union in a middle-income cooperative housing project.

But Chicago's first in a low-income project is the Rockwell Bardens-Maplewood Courts Credit Union on the Windy City's West Side. The project has about 6,700 residents (1,260 families) living in 10 high-rise buildings. The first credit union contact with residents was made in June 1962, and the group held its organization meeting on November 18. Before the year was out, a second such credit union was in the making. Meetings were being held at the Frances Cabrini-William Green Homes on the near North Side. A much larger low-income project, it has approximately 18,000 people (3,600 families) living in 23 high-rises and 586 row-houses. By mid-May its residents were ready to sign the charter, and now the Cabrini Green Credit Union is also in business.

It is an impressive beginning, but many more credit unions are needed. By the end of this year, the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) expects to have nearly 31,000 low-income families of 125,000 persons in public housing projects throughout the city.

The idea of using credit unions to strengthen the economic position of tenants in Chicago's public housing was Edward Marciniak's. The responsibility was Jesse Escalante's, staff member of the mayor's committee on new residents, a department of Marciniak's commission on human relations. Escalante saw the project as one "designed to help people most in need of credit union benefits. It will also provide all opportunity to counsel tenants on installment contract buying and other credit issues," he said.

Escalante immediately enlisted the aid of the Illinois Credit Union League, particularly George Tinnes, now retired director of league field services, and Charles Schumacher, Jr., a league field representative.

With 39 Chicago Housing Authority projects to choose from, the league, Escalante and CHA selected Rockwell Gardens-Maplewood Courts, for two reasons: the project had the lowest ratio of welfare recipients of any project, and active building councils were already established.

The councils, one in each building, are composed of residents and act as liaison between the tenants and CHA. They were to provide the initial source of contact with the residents. The low proportion of welfare recipients (about one-third compared with an average of 50 percent for all CHA projects) was important because it meant more potential members. Although few will deny they need a credit union as much as if not more than others, welfare recipients simply cannot join. These people, it is believed, should receive only enough money to buy the necessities of life. If they have funds remaining for savings or interest on a loan, they are evidently receiving too much in the way of assistance. Still, it is hoped the credit union can help them through counseling if not with its two primary services. Some family incomes in the project do go as high as $5,000, but these are supporting large families. The median income is less than $3,000; the average family is almost six persons.

In June of 1962, Escalante and Schumacher met with Sister Mary Williams, director of Rendu House, an extension in Rockwell Gardens of the settlement house, Marillac House. Among them, they set the course of action: start with a small group and slowly increase its size. The council presidents undoubtedly were the logical contact.

Following a meeting with the presidents in July, Escalante and Schumacher met with the entire councils in August to present their case. It was apparent that the main stumbling blocks were the attitudes of the people toward CHA and outside do-gooders. They were sure the housing authority would try to run the credit union or at least use the records of family savings to increase rents. As for outside groups, they always used the "you do it for us" method. Why should "credit unions" be any different? What was their angle?

These were the feelings of suspicion and distrust Schumacher and Escalante set out to overcome in the long progression of meetings. The major breakthrough came in September when representatives from each building were invited to attend a general meeting. Only five buildings were represented, but those attending agreed to start a 5-week study course on credit unions.

Sensing a genuine desire on the part of the people to learn how to help themselves, Schumacher eagerly guided them through the why's, how's, when's, where's, and what's of the credit union idea. When the course ended, the prospective members were thoroughly quizzed by the Illinois Department of Financial Institutions to see if they were able to operate a credit union. Half a month later a credit union charter was presented to the group by Joseph E. Knight, director of financial institutions. It marked the first time in the memory of league personnel that a charter was presented personally by the director.

Mrs. Shirley Sidney, now chairman of the education committee, admits she was a bit leery when she went to the first class. "When I started to learn what it meant, though, I knew it was just what we needed." Agreeing to this, Mrs. Matilda O'Neal, chairman of the supervisory committee, pointed out that too many of the area were getting stuck with $1 down, $1 a week high-cost credit. They also saw it as a way to help the residents with budgeting and general consumer information.

This community spirit and willingness to help each other prevails throughout the three-and-a-half-year-old project because, as Sister Mary Williams says, "It is just like a small community." The people live and relax together, their children play together in the project playgrounds.

Although the charter members knew the credit union would be operated and controlled by the members, "we wanted it off CHA property so the people wouldn't think it's CHA connected," explained Mrs. Mercedes Mallette, treasurer.

The fledgling credit union was given a solid start when Henry Fort, president of Musicians Local 208 Credit Union donated office space and furniture in his eight-story building adjoining the housing development.

William McCurine, manager of the CHA project, explained, "Belonging to the credit union would not in any way jeopardize tenants' occupancy in CHA. The amount of money they save, which would be considered an asset, would not accrue at a rate which would make any individual an excess income."

* * * * *

In April, board members contacted merchants in the neighborhood and received donations of chickens and canned foods. After must advance publicity, the women held a chicken fry and had the dinners delivered throughout the community at a dollar a throw. Profits went to the special promotion committee. Three weeks later, to coincide with a cleanup program in the Rockwell Gardens-Maplewood Courts community, the credit union proclaimed May 11-18 Credit Union Week. Its purpose was to let the people know how the credit union operates and who runts it. Two credit union queens were crowned and a car was entered in the cleanup parade on May 11.

During the week each director was assigned part of a building to canvass, so that every person in the community would be contacted and made aware of the credit union. "We wanted to tell them about the credit union firsthand," Mrs. Sidney explained, "and get all the misunderstanding cleared up. We didn't try to sign up members, just get them to the office."

* * * * *

"We stress the savings foremost," said the treasurer, Mrs. Mallette. "We try to get them to save regularly, even if it's only $1 a week. We also try to teach the children to save for what they want."

And it is working. "Children are the regular savers," added Mrs. Sidney. "They come in regularly. Not like the adults who are spot savers." Youngsters make up about 25 percent of the membership. * * *

* * * * *

"The credit union is more than money," said Sister Mary Williams. "There could be no measurement in money for what it did to the people." Although Sister Mary Williams worked behind the scenes in getting the credit union started and shared Escalante's and Schumacher's enthusiasm, she didn't share their optimism quite as readily. Recently, however, a resident of the project met her on the street and said, "Sister, do you know that we have a credit union at Rockwell?" He then proceeded to tell her all about it and credit unions in general, ending with the advice: "Sister, you should find out about credit unions. It'll help you with your work."

Sighed Sister Mary Williams, "Then I knew it was a success."

Clinton Lodge Elks, No. 1306, Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 14, 1963, the Clinton Lodge Elks, No. 1306, fittingly celebrated its 50th anniversary. Many dignitaries and a large crowd of members of the Elks, Emblem Club, and their friends gathered for the banquet and the impressive program that followed.

The invocation was delivered by Msgr. John F. Gannon, beloved by the entire Clinton community, pastor of St. John's Church.

The toastmaster, who presided with moving eloquence, skill, and graciousness, was Henry T. Flaherty, past exhalted ruler and past district deputy, who made a great contribution to the evening and pointed out:

Fifty years ago tonight a group of men were gathered in Pierce Hall in Clinton. The occasion for that meeting was to celebrate the institution of the "Baby Lodge of Elkdom"—Clinton Lodge No. 1306. These men were the leading citizens in our community, and it was their hope that Clinton Lodge of Elks would become the outstanding fraternal organization in our town and their ambition that Elkdom would grow and prosper in the town of Clinton.

Things were a lot different, that night 50 years ago—The J. H. Martin Co., located in the Fitch Building, was selling sirloin steak at 25 cents a pound, lamb chops were 18 cents and you could buy a pound of butter for 30 cents. The Boston branch was selling coffee for 20 cents a pound and the leading drygoods store, W. L. Hubbard Co., was advertising ladies' gingham dresses for

59 cents. Hamilton & Butterfield advertised ladies' shoes at $1.69 and our brother, Anton Schlickman was selling men's shoes, $2 to $4.50. Boyles Cafe was advertising whisky at 10 cents a shot and the Morgan House listed their rates at 50 cents a night for lodging and 25 cents for meals. You could buy a new Glenwood kitchen stove from David Dias for $23.

Joe Paine was selling the latest model Ford, black of course, for $690 and the police department reported that there were 100 automobiles in the town of Clinton. Three of our brothers owned cars. Ev King had a Regal, Perley Hamilton a Huppmobile, and our leading knight, Dr. Bastian, owned a Chalmers.

But, some things were normal—the Red Sox were in fifth place. They beat the Giants in the World Series the previous year when Fred Snodgrass muffed a fly ball in center field.

And so, in spite of the great change in the economy of our country, despite two World Wars and all other changes, the "Baby Lodge of Elkdom," Clinton Lodge, has grown and prospered. Tonight we are not only celebrating the 50th anniversary of our lodge, we are also honoring the memory of these men who brought Elkdom to Clinton.

This evening I heard someone say, "A lot of water has gone over the dam since Clinton Lodge was instituted. More appropriately, it should be said that a lot of charitable work has been done, quietly, by the Order of Elks and by the members of Clinton Lodge since that night 50 years ago."

During the course of the evening the toastmaster introduced several very distinguished guests, who made very appropriate remarks. Among these, the famous Judge John E. Fenton, of Lawrence, Mass., famed jurist, civic leader and fraternal leader and past grand exalted ruler of the Elks. In accordance with his usual custom, Judge Fenton delivered an exceptionally brilliant and eloquent address, touching upon the great contributions of Elkdom and its future destiny.

Mr. Harold Burns and his fine orchestra presided over the musical program and gave an exceptional performance.

The occasion was one of the finest in the tradition of the Elks and emphasized the outstanding patriotism and loyal Americanism exemplified by one of our greatest American benevolent and fraternal organizations.

In my own brief remarks I said, in substance, that—

This celebration, attended by so many distinguished leaders and members of the lodge and Emblem Club and their friends, is reminiscent of the colorful glorious past, points up the vigorous, progressive present, and forecasts the magnificent future of the Clinton Lodge.

Our community, State and Nation are indeed under great debt to the leaders and members of this lodge who, since the time of its origin, have been so conspicuous and meaningful in exemplifying lofty principles and standing and working for every worthy cause.

True benevolence has flourished here, generous charity has been fostered here, justice and freedom have been safeguarded here, and the spirit of good fellowship, loyal friendship, and community cooperation has abounded here in so many ways that have brought untold benefits and blessings to the people of Clinton, our State, and our country.

Like Brother Elks everywhere, and with a fervor and zeal that could not be denied, this lodge has nurtured and spread the spirit of Americanism, loyal citizenship, and a deep sense of civic responsibility and has displayed an allegiance and devotion to American institutions that could never be surpassed.

Tonight we are proud to recall and express our profound sense of gratitude for these unselfish contributions that have done so much to uphold and strentghen charity, justice, fellowship, and understanding among all our people, regardles of class or creed, and to fortify, preserve, and build the vigor, power, usefulness, and greatness of our free enterprise institutions and the freedoms we cherish.

Tonight from grateful hearts, we hail and salute all these men and women, too, of past and present, who have so willingly given of themselves to make this lodge the great American institution and inspiring influence that it continues to be.

Perhaps, as never before, the values of Western civilization and our Nation are challenged and beset by many difficult problems. Whatever the future may bring, we may be confident, and we may have justifiable and firm faith, that this outstanding lodge will continue its commendable work for truth, for charity, for justice, and for the perpetuation, growth, and advancement of the greatest and best free government that the world has ever known.

Let us resolve here tonight with our great distinguished jurist and leader, Judge Fenton, our beloved and talented charter member, George Connors, our other distinguished guests and all our officers, brothers, and sisters of this magnificent branch of illustrious Elkdom, that we will remain stanch, loyal, and strong in our loyalty to this honored, esteemed lodge and the high purposes to which we are pledged as Elks and Americans.

Let us continue to carry out this great work with supreme confidence in ourselves and in the future, and with the help of Divine Providence, reaffirming our ideals and our fidelity, go forward together in friendship and brotherhood to promote all the great spiritual and patriotic causes to which we are committed. In this way, we can best strive for a stronger and greater Elkdom, a better and more prosperous community, a greater America, and a peaceful world.

Long live our lodge, our order, and our country.

OPENING REMARKS OF MR. HENRY T. FLAHERTY, PAST EXALTED RULER AND PAST DISTRICT DEPUTY

Monsignor Gannon, distinguished guests at our head table, officers and members of Clinton Lodge of Elks, ladies and gentlemen, my brothers; 50 years ago tonight, a group of men were gathered in Pierce Hall in Clinton. The occasion for that meeting was to celebrate the institution of the "Baby Lodge of Elkdom"—Clinton Lodge No. 1306. These men were the leading citizens in our community and it was their hope that Clinton Lodge of Elks would become the outstanding fraternal organization in our town and their ambition that Elkdom would grow and prosper in the town of Clinton.

Things were a lot different, that night 50 years ago. The J. H. Martin Co., located in the Fitch Building, was selling sirloin steak at 25 cents a pound, lamb chops were 18 cents and you could buy a pound of butter for 30 cents. The Boston Branch was selling coffee for 20 cents a pound and the leading drygoods store, W. L. Hubbard Co., was advertising ladies gingham dresses for 59 cents. Hamilton & Butterfield advertised ladies shoes at $1.69 and our brother, Anton Schlickman was selling mens shoes, $2 to $4.50. Boyles Cafe was advertising whisky at 10 cents a shot and the Morgan House listed their rates at 50 cents a night for lodging and 25 cents for meals. You could buy a new Glenwood kitchen stove from David Dias for $23.

Joe Paine was selling the latest model Ford, black, of course, for $690 and the police department reported that there were 100 automobiles in the town of Clinton. Three of our brothers owned cars. Ev King had a Regal, Perley Hamilton a Hupmobile, and our leading knight, Dr. Bastian owned a Chalmers.

But, some things were normal—the Red Sox were in fifth place. They beat the Giants in the World Series the previous year when Fred Snodgrass muffed a fly ball in centerfield. And so, in spite of the great changes in the economy of our country, despite two World Wars and all other changes, the "Baby Lodge of Elkdom," Clinton Lodge, has grown and prospered. Tonight we are not only celebrating the 50th anniversary of our lodge, we are also honoring the memory of these men who brought Elkdom to Clinton.

This evening I heard someone say, "A lot of water has gone over the dam since Clinton Lodge was instituted." More appropriately it should be said that a lot of charitable work has been done, quietly, by the Order of Elks and by the members of Clinton Lodge since that night 50 years ago.

Among the honored guests were: Joseph A. Morano, selectman, town of Clinton; Thomas Kerrigan, exalted ruler, Hudson Lodge No. 959; George Connors, PER, PDD, only living charter member; Michael E. Kelly, chief, Clinton Police Department; John J. Harty, member, Grand Lodge Committee on Credentials; Msgr. John R. Gannon, P.A., V.G., pastor, St. John's Church; Judge John E. Fenton, past grand exalted ruler; Henry T. Flaherty, PER, PDD, toastmaster; Hon. Philip J. Philbin, Congressman, Third Congressional District; Thomas J. Dowd, president, Masachusetts Elks Association; Domenic P. Dululio, district deputy, West Central District; Walter F. Belaska, exalted ruler, Clinton Lodge No. 1306; Thomas Moore, chief, Clinton Fire Department; Alfred J. Mattei, secretary, Massachusetts Elks Association.

The committee in charge was headed by my valued friends, Mr. David B. Reisner, prominent Clinton businessman, and Mr. Enoch L. Jones, high official of the Colonial Press, who did a truly fine job in setting up the arrangements, Mr. Reisner concentrating on general matters and Mr. Jones handling the very beautiful memorial program for the occasion.

Congress Must Hit With the Heat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by a distinguished editor and publisher of the Baxter Springs Citizen, F. D. Krueger, Baxter Springs, Kans.:

CONGRESS MUST HIT WITH THE HEAT

With an administration that seems to have little idea of fiscal sanity and a Supreme

Court that is encroaching upon the legislative branch by decree, we have felt that our only hope for the future must lie with the Congress. We still think so, but our faith is shaken.

This Congress is being hailed as one of the most inactive and inept in many years. This charge is one made by the New Frontier advocates who would like to see all of their harebrained ideas rushed through the legislative body.

Students tell us that Congress is rapidly losing its place in our so-called democratic system of government. They base this on such a divided membership that no real program is possible and for this reason the executive branch is usurping the real rights and privileges of Congress. We feel that this charge has much basis.

We differ from some in that we feel that the failure of Congress to be stampeded into programs about which there is serious doubt is our one source of hope. We would like for the leadership to be more resolved and more of the prerogatives of Congress saved. This is not necessarily done by passing all the recommendations of the administration.

The latest brainchild of the administration which is being processed in Congress is a pay boost for practically all those in Government employ. And that includes an additional 17,180 more civilian employees added by the administration in June. Congress must accept some of the blame for this fiasco. They appropriate the money. It seems that Congressmen and Senators too often lack the guts to say "no" when they down deep know that that is the real answer.

Raises are in line for civil service employees, postal workers, military personnel and Congressmen themselves, if plans are materialized. Civil service employees have had a 14-percent increase in the cost of living in the past 10 years and a 39.8-percent increase in pay. Postal clerks have already a raise coming in January and the President wants another on top of that.

Military personnel we are not so sure about. We have a feeling that there are at least some categories in this department that need some close scrutiny. We force a large portion of our Armed Forces to serve. They must not be allowed to seek charity to maintain a normal life because of that service.

Congressmen are considering a raise in their own salaries from $22,500 to a possible $35,000. With their many other expense accounts and family work checks in Congress, we feel that now is no time to boost their own pocketbooks.

We appeal to our Congressmen and Senators to hold the line. Certainly they cannot expect labor to even try to hold a sane pay program if they themselves are the worst violators.

We still have practically all of our wartime taxes and excises. They are very high. With an all-time high in prosperity it seems more than a travesty that we can't at least operate on a balanced budget.

Oh, for more "statesmen" with "guts."

Defense Fears Cost of Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Post of September 25 entitled "Defense Fears Cost of Stabilization Bill."

The article points out the inflationary effect enactment of this price-fixing legislation would have on the defense budget as well as its effect on Federal civilian employees and military personnel:

DEFENSE FEARS COST OF STABILIZATION BILL

The Defense Department has estimated that the so-called quality stabilization bill, which comes before the House Rules Committee today, could add billions of dollars to its projected budget of $55 billion this year.

The Department's stand is outlined in a heretofore unpublished letter from Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert to Budget Director Kermit Gordon last month.

The letter also said "the recent pay raise to all Federal civilian employees and the increase presently being considered by the Congress for military personnel would be considerably eroded by the passage of this bill."

The quality stabilization bill is a 1963 version of national fair trade measures rejected by earlier Congresses. But this time, even its opponents believe the full House will pass it later this fall.

The bill would permit brand name manufacturers to put a floor under the prices which wholesalers and retailers could charge for their products.

"The Defense Department, being the largest consumer in the United States and encompassing every aspect of life faced by the average citizen, is deeply concerned with the inflationary and anticompetitive potential of the bill," Zuckert wrote Gordon.

He said that as the result of surveys in States with fair trade laws, the Justice Department estimates a price increase of approximately "20 percent for all sales that may be covered by the operation of a national price maintenance law."

The bill's provision to exempt the Federal Government is "meaningless," the Air Force Secretary argued, because it does not exempt subcontractors, fails to provide for enforcement of the exemption and would lead to a manufacturer's control of distributors dealing with the Government.

The bill has been voted out of the House Interstate and Commerce Committee, which seeks clearance today from the Rules Committee for consideration of the measure by the full Chamber.

The Newly Elected Senior Vice Commander in Chief of the VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce that the city attorney of Vestavia Hills, Ala., a very close personal friend of mine, and a person who has performed an outstanding job for his community and State, John A. Jenkins, was, on the 28th day of August 1963, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Seattle, Wash., elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW.

John Jenkins was recently honored by a resolution adopted by City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills which I would like to have placed in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 16, 1963

Whereas the Honorable John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and a resident of our city, was, on the 28th day of August 1963, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Seattle, Wash., elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW; and

Whereas it is the unanimous sense of this body that the honor accorded John A. Jenkins by this outstanding national organization should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That this resolution express the congratulations of this body, and congratulations of the citizens of our community to John A. Jenkins for the well-deserved honor accorded our neighbor and associate, and as a consequence thereof, the prestige accruing to our community upon his election as the senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be duly adopted and spread upon the official minutes and a copy delivered to the Honorable John A. Jenkins and given other wide publicity.

ROBERT M. GUILFORD,
Mayor, City of Vestavia Hills, Ala.

Loans to Nonprofit Private Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Harvard Educational Review contains an article on the constitutionality of Federal loans to private schools provided under the National Defense Education Act. It is of immediate interest to the Congress because of its obvious application to a wide range of pending education legislation. The author is Charles W. Radcliffe, a New Hampshire resident—his family resides in Lebanon, N.H.—whom I have known for 15 years.

Mr. Radcliffe is a competent lawyer with a decade of experience in the field of Federal education legislation. He is now serving as Minority Counsel for Education on the House Education and Labor Committee. His previous experience in the Congress was on the staff of the late Senator Charles W. Tobey, Republican, of New Hampshire, who ably served the people of my district in this House before going to the Senate, and as legislative assistant to Senator Robert W. Upton, Republican, of New Hampshire, who served with distinction as Senator Tobey's successor.

This article presents a thoughtful argument for a moderate approach to the church-state issue in education, a subject too often debated in extreme and heated terms. I know from my mail that this subject is of interest to many of my constituents, and that they would

welcome a dispassionate discussion of it. The article also sets forth a forceful legal exposition of the presumption of constitutionality of an act of Congress.

Mr. Radcliffe's analysis should be of value to every Member of Congress, whether or not he agrees with the conclusions, and I am placing it in the RECORD for that reason. It is a scholarly and, in my opinion an objective treatment of a controversy which could prove needlessly divisive in our society.

The article, which follows, has been revised by the author since its publication in the Harvard Educational Review:

LOANS TO NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOLS—THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 305 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

(By Charles W. Radcliffe)

On September 2, 1958, President Eisenhower signed into law the National Defense Education Act. Many observers consider it to be the most important Federal education legislation to be enacted in this century; it is undoubtedly one of the three or four most significant Federal actions on behalf of education in our entire national history.

The act was the end result of many months of work and thought by both the executive branch and the Congress (work which began long before the opening of the 2d sess. of the 85th Cong. and months before the Soviet sputnik alarmed the Nation, in the late fall of 1957, about the state of our technological and educational preparedness). This work was a marvel of bipartisan legislative action, reflecting the general consensus (only reinforced by sputnik) that the strengthening of educational resources of the Nation was a matter of urgent and fundamental national concern.

The spirit and purpose of the act is caught in the second paragraph of the report on the Senate bill issued by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on August 8, 1958:

"In reporting S. 4237 to the Senate, the committee has approved a coordinated program for strengthening the national defense through an interrelated set of proposals designed to assist State, local, and private effort to develop America's brainpower for defense, by stimulating students, teachers, parents, and school authorities to seek the highest possible attainment in learning." [1]

This interrelated set of proposals included specific forms of assistance for all levels of education from primary grades through graduate school. It is notable that the act, with a few exceptions, provided assistance to both private and public education at all levels, including both loans and grants to private colleges for a variety of programs. At the secondary school level, title V of the act authorizes payments to the States for testing students in both public and private schools, with provision for direct Federal financing of private school testing programs in States having no legal authority to conduct them.

The legislative history of this act does not support the contention that Congress determined to provide appropriate and effective assistance for private education as a mere afterthought or without due consideration. The act is broad in concept and is directed to those deficiencies in the whole of American education found most dangerous to the national security. This memorandum develops that point at some length, as it is essential to a consideration of the validity of section 305, both as to constitutionality and with respect to public policy.

Title III of the act deals with one of the several deficiencies Congress found most serious—the widespread inadequacy (or absence) of instruction in mathematics, the physical sciences, and modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools. Title III authorizes appropriations for payments to State education agencies for "(A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment." [2]

Title III (section 305) also authorized the Commissioner of Education to make loans to private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools for the same purposes as set forth above. Such loans are made for a period not to exceed 10 years, and bear interest at a rate determined by adding one-quarter of 1 percent to the average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. The loan funds may not be used to purchase textbooks of any description, nor, indeed, any material of a sectarian nature. As of June 30, 1962, there had been approved 207 loans to 214 schools located in 43 States and Territories, in an amount of $2,708,000. Of the loans approved, approximately 90 percent have been for secondary schools.

It is this loan program which has been questioned on grounds of constitutionality and of sound public policy. National publicity has been given to the findings and conclusions of a study of parochial school textbooks used by some schools at some grade levels to teach science, mathematics, and languages. The study was conducted by Mr. George R. La Noue at the request of the Department of Religious Liberty of the National Council of Churches of Christ.

Mr. La Noue found that some of the textbooks used by some parochial schools in the subjects eligible for assistance under section 305 contain religious and sectarian references and that these courses have religious content. It should be noted that no claim was made that any such material was purchased with Federal loan funds. Indeed (as Mr. La Noue unfortunately does not stress in his published articles), no such materials may be purchased with the loan funds.

From this finding Mr. La Noue leaps to the sweeping conclusion that the loan program authorized by section 305 is an unconstitutional violation of the first amendment prohibition against Congress making a law respecting an establishment of religion, and, moreover, that such assistance is bad public policy.[3]

The purpose of this article is to examine both of these conclusions in detail. Except as may be necessary to a consideration of the constitutionality of section 305, no attempt is made to delineate the ultimate constitutional reach of the establishment clause of the first amendment as applied to Federal education programs. The same restraint must be imposed with respect to the examination of public policy. Such far-reaching issues must be left to the long-range and continuing development afforded by judicial and legislative bodies, and to the American people. The relevant facts are reviewed with every attempt at fairness, and conclusions of law have been reached after a conscientious effort to avoid the toils of advocacy.

THE PURPOSE OF CONGRESS

We live in a curious time, extremely ominous, yet holding luminous promise for mankind. It is a supremely dangerous time for our Nation. As nearly as we can make such judgment, it appears that scientific and technological advances have brought the world to the point where a free society can be universally realized or wholly extinguished. In this context, the policies of the Government of the United States assume a significance unique in history.

This weight of decision rests in large measure upon the Congress, which must constantly assess our situation and the elements of national strength with which we confront it. The Congress liberally utilizes its power of inquiry and its access to expert opinion to probe even the minute aspects of the problem with which it deals. Despite the fact that its numerous and exhaustive hearings are largely public records, too few citizens appreciate the depth and scope of these deliberations. It is one of the ironies of our political life that the most critical work of the Congress is so little understood. This power of inquiry was brought to bear fully in the consideration of proposals which became the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The legislative basis for the National Defense Education Act

When the impact of sputnik was felt across our land in November of 1957, the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, had already completed its first round of hearings on educational deficiencies. These hearings had been held at a number of locations around the Nation since early August. At the same time, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a special task force was completing its work of many months on educational needs, work which had been initiated by Secretary Folsom and Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Thus the essential basis for the National Defense Education Act had been laid well before sputnik.

On January 21, 1958, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of Senator HILL of Alabama, began its own series of hearings on "Science and Education for National Defense." A few days later, on January 27, President Eisenhower sent a message to the Congress transmitting "Recommendations Relative To Our Educational System," which set forth the general outline for legislation that was to become the National Defense Education Act. The President stated in this message:

"Our immediate national security aims—to continue to strengthen our Armed Forces and improve the weapons at their command—can be furthered only by the efforts of individuals whose training is already far advanced. But if we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress. Because of the growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special, but by no means exclusive, attention to education in science and engineering. * * * National security requires that prompt action be taken to improve and expand the teaching of science and mathematics." [4]

Simultaneously with the message, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's draft bill to carry out the President's recommendations was introduced in the House by Representatives KEARNS and FRELINGHUYSEN (H.R. 10278, H.R. 10279) and in the Senate by Senator Smith of New Jersey and others (S. 3163). Immediately, somewhat different and expanded versions of these proposals were introduced by Representative ELLIOTT (H.R. 10381) and by Senator HILL and others (S. 3187). The final act, with certain variations, represented an amalgam of these bills.

It is impossible to summarize briefly the substance of the House and Senate hearings on these proposals, conducted during the winter and spring of 1958. The printed House hearings, in three volumes, contain 2,096 pages; the bulky single volume of Senate hearings, 1,602 pages; the list of witnesses in each reads like a "Who's Who" of

Footnotes at end of speech.

the American scientific and educational community. The theme of the testimony was the constant emphasis upon the close relationship of education to defense, and the necessity of making broad improvements in certain aspects of education.

The Senate committee report contains excerpts characteristic of testimony heard by committees in both Houses:

"The bill takes cognizance of the vital relationship between a good educational system and national survival. Witness after witness appearing before the committee testified to the fact that stronger and better education, especially in the sciences, mathematics, engineering and modern foreign languages, is absolutely essential to an adequate national defense. For example, Dr. Detlev A. Bronk, president of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research and president of the National Academy of Sciences, stated:

" 'We cannot compete with Russia and China * * * in terms of numbers of men and women. Because of that, it is especially important that we have a very high level of education in our country in order to compete against greater numbers with men and women of greater competence. Only this way can we defend our national strength and be effective champions and defendants of the human freedoms on which the whole free world depends.'

"The following colloquy which took place during the hearings * * * indicates the seriousness with which Dr. Teller views the present situation in education:

" 'The CHAIRMAN. "Doctor, I guess we would agree that our top scientists of the next 5 and 10 years will be young people who are now in college and graduate schools. Would that not be true?

" 'Dr. TELLER. I am quite sure that in science more than in other fields * * * the children who are now in school will be the ones on whom we will have to depend primarily 10 years from today.

" ' The CHAIRMAN. "We should now, at this time, do all we can to encourage and help them to move forward and develop as much as possible. Is that not true?

" 'Dr. TELLER. "That is what we have to do or I think our way of life will not survive."

"Dr. Wernher von Braun, one of the world's greatest authorities on rockets and missiles, agreed that proper training and education of scientists at this time, regardless of cost, 'is a matter of national survival.'

"The Chairman of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers * * * recently summarized our situation in these words:

" 'The rate of Russian progress in most scientific fields is so rapid that, unless we broaden and strengthen our own efforts, there is little question of Soviet superiority 5 or 10 years from now.' " [6]

The foregoing is from the report of the Senate Committe on Labor and Public Welfare, favorably reporting S. 4237 to the Senate. Section 405 of that bill became, without further amendment, section 305, "Loans to private, nonprofit schools," of the National Defense Education Act.

Legislative history of section 305

Neither the original administration proposals (S. 3163; H.R. 10278, H.R. 10279) nor the bills introduced by Senator HILL and Representative ELLIOTT (S. 3187; H.R. 10381) contained a provision for loans to private, nonprofit schools for the purchase of mathematics, science and modern foreign language instructional equipment. The provision was drafted by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and included in the bill it reported to the Senate (S. 4237). It is to be expected that a committee, after lengthy hearings and discussion, would shape its own bill, and this is, in fact, the usual practice (the committee bill is very often given a new number). This is the process followed in the development of the National Defense Education Act. The bills reported by committee in each house differed from each other and from the bills that were first under construction, although the major purposes and the general outline of the legislation remained the same. The fact that a particular provision is initiated in committee does not signify that it has not been carefully considered. Quite the contrary, it means that the Senators or Representatives principally concerned with the legislation are enough impressed by a particular need to draft a new provision to meet that need.

The implication that section 305 was not a thoughtful and well-considered part of the act overlooks several essential points:

First, the design of the entire act discloses a purpose to carry out remedial programs for students in both public and private institutions at all levels. Title V provides for a program of aptitude testing of students in public and private secondary schools (to be directly financed by the Federal Government) in any State that is unable to undertake such a program in private schools. Titles V and VI authorize, respectively, institutes for school counsellors and for teachers of modern foreign languages. The institutes, which the Commissioner of Education arranges through contracts with both public and private universities, may be attended by both public and private school teachers. The original administration proposals would have authorized the payment of stipends to private school teachers attending such institutes, but these payments were restricted to public school personnel by the congressional committees.[6] Nevertheless, tuition-free attendance is a form of assistance. Titles II and IV authorize, respectively, loans to college students and the award of graduate fellowships in both public and private institutions; and title VI authorizes the establishment of language and area centers in both private and public institutions for the study of important languages which are rarely taught in this country, and provides for language fellowships. All of these provisions, in some form, were contained in the bills first before the committees. In the entire National Defense Education Act only title VIII, which authorizes the establishment of vocational-technical programs, relates exclusively to public institutions, and it is in the form of an amendment to the Vocational Education Act of 1946.[7] Vocational education has long been recognized as an exclusive concern of public schools, in terms of Federal support.

Second: there was ample testimony before the Senate committee to justify its action to help private schools purchase adequate equipment for instruction in mathematics, science and modern foreign languages. Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, for example, testified to this need in general terms that would apply to private as well as public schools:

"Since laboratory equipment, particularly in advanced courses, constitutes a major expense, many schools have resorted to nonlaboratory methods of teaching. It is not uncommon to find a complete absence of laboratory facilities in the required general science and biology courses, to say nothing of those sciences requiring more complicated and expensive equipment." [8]

Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president of the National Academy of Sciences, in response to questions by Senator Kennedy, stressed to the committee the central importance of adequate equipment in the classrooms.[9] Indeed, the general inadequacy of instructional equipment in our schools, particularly in the fields of science and languages, was often emphasized in the hearings.

Finally, there was adequate explanation of this section and ample opportunity for the Senate and House to consider its validity, had any Member seen fit to question it. The Senate committee report contained both an explanation of the provision and its full text.[10] A copy of this report, together with a copy of the bill, is customarily placed upon the desk of each Senator in the Senate Chamber prior to debate. Moreover, the report on S. 4237 was available on August 8, several days before debate commenced in the Senate. An opportunity was afforded the full House to consider this provision when it approved the conference report which contained an explanation and the full text of the section.

No conclusion adverse to section 305 may be drawn from the fact that there was no Senate or House debate concerning it. There was little or no debate concerning several very important (and relatively very expensive) proivsions of the act. A review of the discussion and debate in both Houses leads one to conclude that controversy mostly centered upon Federal scholarships. Most of the less controversial aspects of the bills were not debated.[11]

The congressional assessment

While the deliberations and debate in both the House and the Senate could leave no doubt that the Congress as a body considered the National Defense Education Act a vital defense measure, our attention is focused upon the Senate debate, because the bill before the Senate included the private school loan provision. Many excellent contributions were made to the Senate debate, including statements in support of the legislation by Senator Alexander Smith (senior Republican member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and a cosponsor of the legislation) and many of his Republican colleagues. It was a bipartisan effort in every sense. The most comprehensive statements of congressional purpose were those made on the Senate floor on August 13, 1958, by Senator HILL, the committee chairman, who said:

"Americans are united in our determination to meet this (Soviet scientific) challenge. Americans know that we must give vastly greater support, emphasis, and dedication to basic scientific research, to quality in education, to instruction in the physical sciences, to training in foreign languages, and to developing to the full our intellectual, cultural, and scientific resources. Americans know we must mobilize our brainpower in the struggle for survival.

"The Constitution solemnly placed upon the Federal Government this responsibility for the national defense, as we call it today, and for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

"We had before our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare many witnesses, including distinguished scientists, distinguished educators, and distinguished leaders in American public life. All these witnesses, without exception took cognizance of the vital relationship between a good educational system and national survival." [12]

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the majority leader, stated his belief that history might record that by this program for education "we saved liberty and saved freedom." [13]

The legal significance of this legislative history, and the reason it is reviewed in such detail herein, is that section 305 must be considered as an integral part of the whole act. In nearly all cases the view of Congress as to its own purpose in enacting a law is binding upon the Court. Moreover, the stated conviction of the Congress that the programs thus authorized were undertaken as a measure of national defense greatly strengthens the legal presumption of constitutional validity.

On September 2, 1958, President Eisenhower signed H.R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, into law. In a White House press release issued that day, the President took the occasion to say: "I consider this act to be a sound and constructive piece of legislation."

Footnotes at end of speech.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 305

The constitutional reach of congressional power was best stated by John Marshall, over 140 years ago, in his famous opinion in *McCullock* v. *Maryland*.[14] He wrote:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."[15]

This is generally considered by legal scholars to be the definitive statement of the meaning of the final clause of article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which confers upon the Congress the power "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

Marshall's doctrine is a convenient frame of reference for the matter in issue, because it narrows our inquiry. It is beyond dispute that the strengthening of education for national defense is a legitimate end for legislation, quite within the scope of the Constitution. Clearly, the strengthening of private education in defense-related subjects is one appropriate means plainly adapted to that end. It only remains to be determined if this is a means prohibited by the Constitution.

At this point a hallowed principle of constitutional law, also enunciated by Marshall, among others, comes to bear on the issue with potent force: an act of Congress is presumed to be constitutional.

The effect of a presumption in law is not always appreciated. Stated most simply: a conclusive presumption absolutely decides an issue; a rebuttable presumption (as the constitutionality of an act) shifts the burden of proof to the party attempting to overcome the presumption, with reasonable doubts resolved in favor of the presumption. In the instance of an act of Congress (or, indeed, of a State legislature), by long-established precedent, the presumption is very strongly in favor of constitutionality. The quality of judicial restraint is nowhere better shown and adhered to than in this principle.

The presumption of constitutionality

As early as 1798 the cautious attitude of the Court was voiced by Justice Iredell in his opinion in *Calder* v. *Bull:*[16]

"If any act of Congress, or of the legislature of a State, violates those constitutional provisions, it is unquestionably void; though, I admit, that as the authority to declare it void is of a delicate and awful nature, the Court will never resort to that authority but in a clear and urgent case."[17]

In 1870, in his opinion in *Miller* v. *United States*,[18] Justice Strong wrote: "for when a statute will bear two constructions, one of which would be within the constitutional power of Congress to enforce, and the other a transgression of the power, that must be adopted which is consistent with the Constitution. It is always a presumption that the legislature acts within the scope of its authority."[19]

One of the most comprehensive discussions of judicial restraint in this respect is supplied by Justice Brandeis in his concurring opinion in *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*,[20] in which he outlines seven rules the Supreme Court has formulated for itself to avoid passing upon constitutional questions in cases within its jurisdiction.[21] Brandeis spoke of "the long established presumption in favor of the constitutionality of a statute" and quoted with favor the statement of Chief Justice Marshall in *Dartmouth* v. *Woodward*[22] that the Court had several times declared "that, in no doubtful case, would it pronounce a legislative act to be contrary to the Constitution." He also quoted with favor (in footnote 12 to the opinion) the admonition of Chief Justice Tilghman of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in 1811, that "an act of the legislature is not to be declared void, unless the violation of the constitution is so manifest as to leave no room for reasonable doubt."

One might well ask whether this self-imposed restraint of the Supreme Court is relevant to the question of constitutionality, per se. The obvious answer is that the restraint of the Court is itself a recognition of the powers, duties, and responsibilities which the Constitution imposes upon the Congress. The Congress is a coordinate branch, with an independent power and duty to assess the validity of its acts. The solemn judgment of the Congress with respect to the means chosen to discharge its responsibilities is entitled to great consideration. Therefore this just deference is an inextricable part of the issue of constitutionality. The application of this principle to section 305 is inescapable in view of the legislative history reviewed above.

The Congress, acting upon the most detailed investigation of educational needs for defense, chose to accord to the millions of our children attending private schools a measure of the assistance for improved instruction accorded all others. The instructional fields aided were those found to be most closely related to defense needs. Congress stated its findings and declared its purpose in the very preamble of the act:

"Sec. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles.

"This requires programs that * * * will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."[23]

When the Congress acts to provide for the national defense it does so as a logical extension of the war power of the Federal Government. The Court has declared the war power to be an inherent attribute of national sovereignty, independent of affirmative grants of power in the Constitution.[24] Justice Story, years ago, gave the war power its logical extension to the maintenance of national defense in peacetime. He wrote:

"How could a readiness for war in time of peace be safely prohibited * * *? The means of security can only be regulated by the means and the danger of attack. * * *" It will be in vain to oppose constitutional barriers to the impulse of self-preservation."[25]

In *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*,[26] the Court gave explicit recognition to this principle.

The constitutional issue, then, might very well be decided by the answer to this question: How compelling is the presumption of constitutionality in the case of section 305's loans for private schools The answer must be that it is so great as to place an overwhelming burden of proof upon those who would assert that these loans violate the establishment clause of the first amendment. For this reason, it is a shallow and naive legal argument that this issue is decided by a paragraph of dicta in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*[27] to the effect that tax funds may not be used for a religious purpose.

The case of *Dennis* v. *United States*,[28] provides a graphic demonstration of the effect of the presumption of constitutionality. The issue was the power of Congress, in peacetime, to restrict freedom of speech in order to meet the threat of Communist subversion. The Court has often declared free speech to be a "most favored" right. In a concurring opinion sustaining the congressional judgment, Justice Frankfurter wrote:

"The demands of free speech in a democratic society as well as the interest in national security are better served by candid and informed weighing of the competing interests, within the confines of the judicial process, than by announcing dogmas too inflexible for the non-Euclidian problems to be solved."[29]

After observing that the Congress has the primary responsibility for adjusting competing interests in our society, he concluded: "We are to set aside the judgment of those whose duty it is to legislate only if there is no reasonable basis for it."[30]

The establishment clause

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is the admonition in the first amendment to the Constitution with which our Bill of Rights begins. We are concerned here only with the first clause, dealing with "an establishment of religion." The decisions of the Supreme Court which interpret this clause have been few in number and have been applied to an extremely limited set of circumstances giving rise to the cases. Nevertheless, despite the continuing debate among legal scholars as to the true purpose of the clause, we may conclude that the Court has given it the effect of raising "a wall of separation between church and state."[31] It is beyond the scope of our immediate concern to inquire into the precise dimensions of that wall. Our concern here is limited to whether the doctrine of separation, as it has thus far been developed, constitutes a bar to the loan program authorized by section 305. We must therefore examine the relevant decisions of the Court.

Bradfield v. *Roberts*[32] was a taxpayer's suit originating in the District of Columbia. It questioned the right of the District Commissioners to use Federal funds for the purpose of erecting a medical facility at Providence Hospital which was operated by a Roman Catholic religious order under a congressional charter. The Court never reached the constitutional issue of separation of church and state, for it held that the hospital was a corporation separate from the religious order, although organized under the auspices of members of that order. Similarly, in *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp*,[33] in which there was questioned the use of Federal funds to support parochial schools on an Indian reservation, the Court held that the funds were appropriated to the use of the Sioux Tribe under an 1868 treaty, and were therefore the private funds of that tribe to be used as the Indians saw fit.

The constitutional issue involved in the use of public funds for the alleged benefit of private, parochial schools was not reached until 1930, in the case of *Cochran* v. *Louisiana State Board of Education*.[34] The case brought into question, on the grounds of violation of the 14th amendment, a State law providing State-approved textbooks free of charge to children attending both public and private and parochial elementary and secondary schools. The State courts upheld the practice as constitutional. Counsel for appellants argued that if the provision of free textbooks to private school students were to be considered a legitimate incident of the State's interest in education, then there could be no logical end to the purposes for which State funds could be used in support of private schools. The Court rejected this

Footnotes at end of speech.

argument. Speaking for the Court, Mr. Chief Justice Hughes reasoned:

"The legislation does not segregate private schools, or their pupils, as its beneficiaries or attempt to interfere with any matters of exclusively private concerns. Its interest is education, broadly; its method, comprehensive. Individual interests are aided only as the common interest is safeguarded." [35]

This reasoning would apply to any consideration under the establishment clause of title III of the NDEA.

McCollum v. *Board of Education* [36] and *Zorach* v. *Clauson* [37] brought before the Court the question of whether particular "released time" arrangements violate the establishment clause. These are arrangements whereby public school pupils are released from classes for a short period to participate in religious instruction sponsored by local churches. In *McCollum* one such arrangement in Champaign, Ill., was declared unconstitutional, principally because the religious instruction was actually conducted in the public school facilities. In Zorach the decision in the McCollum case was somewhat limited when the Court approved a New York arrangement in which the students were released for religious instruction conducted outside the public schools.

Each of these two cases is very important to a consideration of the broad issue of the reach of the establishment clause. The opinions, concurring opinions and dissents cover a range of judicial views and contain excellent dissertations on both the legal concept and the history of separation of church and State. The factual situations in these cases, however, are so different from that presented by the loan program authorized by section 305 that the cases have a very limited application. An earlier case, *Everson* v. *Board of Education*,[38] is much more analogous.

Everson involved the constitutionality of a New Jersey law which permitted local school authorities to provide free bus transportation for students attending parochial schools. The case was argued and decided under the establishment clause. A sharply divided Court sustained the right of the New Jersey Legislature to meet what it considered to be a public need. Speaking through Justice Black, the Court upheld the legislative appraisal:

"But the New Jersey Legislature has decided that a public purpose will be served by using tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of all school children, including those who attend parochial schools. * * * The fact that a State law, passed to satisfy a public need, coincides with the personal desires of the individuals most directly affected is certainly an inadequate reason for us to say that a legislature has erroneously appraised the public need.

"It is true that this Court has, in rare instances, struck down State statutes on the ground that the purpose for which the tax-raised funds were to be expended was not a public one [cites cases]. But the Court has also pointed out that this far-reaching authority must be exercised with the most extreme caution." [39]

The Court also concluded that the provision of free bus transportation to parochial school students does not constitute an establishment of religion, but added this sweeping obiter dictum on the subject:

"Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force or influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion." [40]

Literally applied, without regard to other constitutional principles or precedents, this language would appear to forbid even the maintenance of a Chaplains Corps in the Armed Forces. No such literal application could be intended by the Court because, for one thing, the Court itself insists that the facts presented by every case coming before it be viewed separately.

In the recent case of *Engel* v. *Vitale*,[41] in which a divided Court struck down a prayer prepared by the New York State Board of Regents as a daily opening exercise in public schools, Justice Douglas' concurring opinion would literally apply the Everson dictum to every phase of our national life. He would condemn with equal impartiality free bus transportation for parochial students, Federal aid for church-sponsored hospitals, the use of the Bible in administering oaths of office, tax exemptions for religious organizations, preferential Federal income tax treatment for gifts to religious organizations, and the use of the inscription "In God We Trust" on coins and stamps. However great the respect which we must and should accord to the views of every member of the Supreme Court, we are privileged to be thankful that many such views, throughout our history, have never been accepted by the Court as the law of the land.

One other recent case should be mentioned. In 1961 the Court denied certiorari (declined to review) in the cast of *Swart* v. *South Burlington Town School District*,[42] in which the Supreme Court of Vermont had held to be a violation of the 1st and 14th amendments the use of tax funds to pay tuition for children who (because of the absence of a public high school in their district) attended a parochial school. No conclusion of law may be drawn from a refusal to grant certiorari, although the reasons are open to speculation. Certainly the payment of tuition for attendance at parochial schools goes far beyond the provision of loan assistance for improved instruction in specialized subjects related to national defense.

Application of the facts to the law

Federation of Labor v. *McAdory*,[43] Chief Justice Stone wrote:

"It has long been its [the Supreme Court's] considered practice not * * * to formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by the precise facts to which it is to be applied, [citing cases], or to decide any constitutional question except with reference to the particular facts to which it is to be applied, [citing cases]." [44]

One may wonder, as has Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of Harvard Law School, at the extraordinary attention paid to dicta in the establishment cases.[45] Dicta, by which we mean expressions of the judges on points other than the precise ones involved in the case, are far less important than the actual holding of the court on the facts before it. The Supreme Court of the United States has twice ruled upon the constitutionality of legislative actions that provide forms of assistance to parochial schools. The two cases were Cochran (free textbooks) and Everson (free transportation).[46] Neither case involved an act of Congress; neither involved a legislative finding that the assistance constituted a national defense measure. Both cases sustained the assistance as constitutional; both rejected the argument that an incidental benefit to religious education would nullify the basic intent to achieve a public purpose.

In each of these cases the aid was rendered directly to the parochial student, rather than to the school. Quite properly, the Court could consider only the fact situation presented by the case before it. Some commentators have elevated this circumstance to a legal principle, calling it the child benefit theory. It should be apparent to all that such a distinction is illusory. The Court surely was aware that there was a benefit bestowed upon the school itself and, incidentally, upon religious education. What the Court has actually propounded is a public benefit theory. The true distinction which the Court appears to have made in each case was this: Was it the primary purpose and effect of the legislation to aid a private or parochial school, per se, or was it to accomplish a broad and legitimate public purpose, in which the aid to the school is a necessary incident?

My view, then, is that—short of "across-the-board" general aid, such as for construction or general operating expenses—special purpose aid for private schools is constitutional if it is a necessary incident of a public program to strengthen all education. In this context, the form of the aid—whether it is a loan or a grant—has no constitutional significance.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare took a narrower view of the constitutional issue in a 1961 memorandum on the subject.[47] The General Counsel of the Department concluded that a program which incidentally benefited a parochial school would be valid if the financial benefit were comparatively meager and could not be avoided without defeating the legislative purpose. Even on this very narrow ground (which has been much criticized),[48] the Department expressed the view that the section 305 loan program is constitutional.[49]

The loans are available only for laboratory and audiovisual equipment and equally neutral instructional materials. Textbooks are not eligible for purchase. And, of course, the equipment is limited to that used in instruction in mathematics, science, and languages. Obviously, by any measure, this is a far more restrictive assistance than the Court considered in either Cochran or Everson. Free textbooks and free bus transportation are far more pervasive aids to the entire parochial school system (and in a more attractive form than a loan). What grounds, then, could Mr. La Noue advance for his statement that the loans are unconstitutional?

Mr. La Noue ignores the actual holdings of the Court in the only two cases in point and goes back to the Everson dictum, in effect with a plea of "new information."

First, he argues that Congress based the loan program on the assumption that mathematics, science, and languages are "secular" subjects that could not have a religious content. To establish this, he cites questions asked by Representative PUCINSKI during a House committee hearing held nearly 3 years after the enactment of the National Defense Education Act.[50] This, of course, is wholly irrelevant to the legislative history of that act. Although there is no direct evidence that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare even considered the question when they devised section 305, we may speculate on whether those sophisticated men were so naive as to think that there is no religious content in the study of science. What is more likely is that a congressional committee which included a number of superb lawyers among its members would have recognized that a legal question would have to rest on other grounds. The Court had itself considered, in Cochran, the argument that there is religious instruction in parochial schools, and had unanimously rejected this argument as an irrelevant consideration.

But let us consider Mr. La Noue's argument on its own terms. Does religious content in a science class change the essentially secular character of the subject matter? This is the kind of question that ought to be rhetorical. If one were to answer it in the affirmative, he should be prepared to assert that a theology course is really secular be-

Footnotes at end of speech.

cause it may also add to the student's knowledge of art and literature. The inflexible logic sought to be imposed tends to reductio ad absurdum.

Commonsense is a more useful tool than so rigorous a logic. The equipment purchased with the loan funds does not add more teachers, or more classrooms, or more pupils to the parochial schools. It does not effect any element of religious instruction in any course. It simply improves the quality of instruction in mathematics, science, and languages. The pupils who already attend parochial schools are better prepared in these subjects of such critical importance to the Nation. That was the intent of Congress in approving section 305; that is the legitimate public purpose sought to be achieved. The public interest in this result is scarcely compromised if the student may also gain a more profound appreciation of the working of God in nature.

In a sense, not wholly relevant here, Mr. La Noue seems to have violated an old legal maxim about the danger of proving too much. For he actually proved that the religious element in these courses, in those schools where it exists at all, is subservient to the secular subject matter. Moreover, his examples for the most part show that the religious influence is mostly present in the lower grades, whereas almost all the equipment purchased with the loan funds is for use in advanced courses.

The practical importance of these loan funds to the institutions is that they permit the school to embellish its curriculum. They do not actually support the basic, ongoing program of the schools, but merely strengthen it. Much the same thing is true of the grants to the public schools under title III. The Federal funds are not substituting for funds that would have come from some other source. The sad experience prior to this assistance was that these schools were struggling along without modern equipment. They could not afford it on their customary level of financial support, whether from public taxes or private gifts and tuition. For this reason it cannot be maintained that this program releases funds for other uses. The loan assistance has afforded an opportunity to achieve excellence.

Conclusions of law

It is concluded that the loan program authorized by section 305 of the National Defense Education Act is a constitutional means by which Congress, in the interest of national defense, sought to improve the general level of elementary and secondary school instruction in mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages. It is further concluded that this program comes well within the actual holdings of the Supreme Court as to permissible uses of public funds for education under the establishment clause of the first amendment to the Constitution.

THE PUBLIC POLICY

An affirmative finding of constitutionality does not establish that a program is good public policy. The best tradition of the judiciary rejects the notion that the wisdom of a law is a matter for the determination of a court. That decision must be left to the legislature, and to the reflections of an informed public.

Approximately 6 million American children attend private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools. About 90 percent of this attendance is in the parochial schools of the Roman Catholic Church. The parents of all these children have assumed a private obligation; they exercise a constitutionally protected right in doing so.[51] The quality of education received by children attending these schools is a matter of public concern, evidenced, among other things, by the fact that the schools must meet standards set by the State in which they are located.

It would appear that many parents of private, sectarian-school children (and a number of clergy) feel that there is some public obligation to assist them in carrying out a private, religious purpose in education. This memorandum is not intended to support that position, with which, indeed, its author profoundly disagrees. There seems to be no more (or less) public interest in the expansion of a local parochial school than in the expansion of the Groton School.

There are also those who feel that private elementary and secondary education is inherently undemocratic and divisive, and that it poses a threat to public education. Many of these individuals would deny all public concern for the vitality of private education, and, in fact, would make the State a virtual enemy of these institutions. This observer believes that to be a narrow, petty, and essentially destructive attitude.

Relatively few thoughtful citizens of any religious faith would suggest that we break down our well-conceived principle of separation of church and state; and few citizens would suggest that we turn our heads from the religious heritage that shaped our concept of a free society from the beginning of our national life. Yet it is most often just these few on both sides who dominate the public discourse on such matters. The political effect is often unfortunate; the effect of these extreme positions on our society is corrosive. It is time for all of us who are concerned with education, whether public or private, to muster a degree of passion for commonsense.

Whether the Federal Government should or should not become involved in educational finance is a political question. Many able and informed Members of Congress oppose virtually all Federal aid to education. Assuming some degree of Federal aid, the sole question of this memorandum is: "How are we to view the position of private elementary and secondary schools?"

This Nation will rely for its very existence upon the products of our schools, private, and public. Most of our private, nonprofit schools are in about the same situation and are facing the same problems as are the public schools in the communities they both serve. Efforts to improve the excellence of all our schools come as an intelligent response to the central danger of these times.

Our situation should not prevent, or even dilute, debate over the means chosen to improve education; but it should focus our attention upon realities. Private schools, apart from their purely private concerns, are an integral part of a great public enterprise. Is it unreasonable to assume that we can accommodate the public interest without giving undue preference to the private concern? The answer could be framed in the words of Chief Justice Vinson, written in another but analagous context: "To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending threat by encasing it in a semantic straightjacket we must reply that all concepts are relative."[52]

The Federal Government renders many forms of aid to private education at all levels. At the college and university level, increasing assistance has flowed for a hundred years without any distinction as to the public or private character of the institutions.[53] The dollar amount of aid to higher education combined with payments for directed research, is in the magnitude of $2 billion annually. Different factual and legal considerations apply to elementary and secondary education, but Federal benefits for private schools are not inconsiderable. The section 305 loan program is one of the least vital of these. Yet this loan program has helped provide improved instruction for many thousands of students located in every part of the Nation. The accomplishments of the program, unquestionably in the public interest, are impressive. It is reported that nearly half of the aided schools have used the funds to add new, advanced courses in the specified subjects. New courses in physics (for which equipment is very expensive) lead this list. A considerable number of the schools have been able to inaugurate new programs for gifted pupils (for whom the Congress has expressed much concern). There have been more language laboratories equipped with these funds than existed in all of the schools of the Nation before the enactment of National Defense Education Act.[54] Moreover, every penny of the funds will be paid back, with interest.

These are the very results Congress intended. They benefit every American citizen as they strengthen the Nation. It strains credulity that this program should not be regarded by every fair-minded person as sound public policy.

---

[1] S. Rept. 2242, 85th Cong., H. sess., p. 1.

[2] Sec. 303(a)(1), Public Law 85–864.

[3] See George R. La Noue "Religious Schools and 'Secular' Subjects: An Analysis of the Premises of Title III, Section 305 of the National Defense Education Act," Harvard Educational Review, vol. 32, No. 3 (summer 1962), pp. 255–291.

[4] House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess., Doc. No. 318, pp. 1-2, 4.

[5] 85th Congress, 2d sess., S. Rept. 2242. "National Defense Education Act of 1958," pp. 3, 4.

[6] This creates an anomalous situation in Federal programs, since the National Science Foundation has been paying stipends for about 7 years to private school teachers attending its summer institutes for science and mathematics teachers.

[7] Title X authorizes payments to State education agencies to improve their collection of statistics; title IX establishes a Science Information Service in the National Science Foundation.

[8] "Science and Education for National Defense," hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, p. 265 (Feb. 7, 1958).

[9] Ibid, p. 19.

[10] Ibid, pp. 13, 35.

[11] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 7–22, 1958.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 13, 1958, p. 17231.

[13] Ibid.

[14] 4 Wheat. 316 (1819).

[15] Ibid., p. 420.

[16] 3 Dall. 386, (1798).

[17] Ibid., p. 399.

[18] 11 Wall. 268 (1871).

[19] Ibid., p. 309.

[20] 297 U.S. 288 (1936).

[21] Ibid., pp. 346–356.

[22] 4 Wheat. 518 (1819).

[23] 20 U.S.C. 401.

[24] See *United States* v. *Curtis-Wright Export Corp.* 229 U.S. 304, pp. 316–18.

[25] "Story Commentaries on the Constitution," II, sec. 1185 (4th ed., 1873).

[26] 297 U.S. 288 (1936).

[27] 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

[28] 341 U.S. 494 (1951).

[29] Ibid., p. 524.

[30] Ibid., p. 525.

[31] This was the phrase Thomas Jefferson used in 1802. See Saul K. Padover, "The Complete Jefferson" (1943), pp. 518–519.

[32] 175 U.S. 291 (1899).

[33] 210 U.S. 50 (1908).

[34] 281 U.S. 370 (1930).

[35] Ibid., p. 375.

[36] 333 U.S. 203 (1948).

[37] 343 U.S. 306 (1952).

[38] 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

[39] Ibid., p. 6.

[40] Ibid., pp. 15–16.

[41] 370 U.S. 421 (1962).

[42] 122 Vt. 177, 167 A 2d 514, cert. denied, 366 U.S. 925 (1961).

[43] 325 U.S. 450 (1945).

[44] Ibid., p. 461.

[45] See Professor Sutherland's letter to Senator MORSE of Mar. 28, 1961, published in S. Doc. 29, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 52–62.

[46] The decision in the Everson was reinforced in 1961 when the Court dismissed an appeal in *Snyder* v. *Town of Newton*, 147 Conn. 374 (1960), 365 U.S. 299 (1961). The appeal was from a decision of the Connecticut court that bus transportation for parochial students does not violate the 1st and 14th amendments; the dismissal is an adjudication on the merits.

[47] S. Doc. 29, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1–48.

[48] See Professor Sutherland's letter, op. cit.; also, in the same document, pp. 65–72, the legal analysis by Senator KEATING. By necessary inference, Prof. Mark DeWolfe Howe of Harvard Law School would also disagree with the narrow interpretation of the memorandum of the Department, as he offered the opinion that loans to parochial schools for classroom construction would be constitutional, although he would not favor them (in letter published in the same document, pp. 50–51).

[49] S. Doc. 29, cited above, p. 23.

[50] Joint Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Hearings on H.R. 6674 and H.R. 7378, 1961, part I, pp. 121–122, 280.

[51] *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925).

[52] *Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U.S. 494, p. 508.

[53] For a comprehensive analysis of Federal aid for higher education, see the speech of Representative ALBERT QUIE in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Aug. 8, 1962, pp. 14863–14870.

[54] From personal conversations with Dr. George Decker, U.S. Office of Education, who administers the loan program, and with Dr. Samuel Halperin, Director of Legislative Services, U.S. Office of Education.

We Must Not Ask Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following editorial from the Humboldt (Kans.) Union written by the publisher and editor, Malcolm Higgins:

WE MUST NOT ASK TOO MUCH

A story in the paper the other night about the man who jumped over the barbed wire to freedom made me do some thinking about this thing called liberty.

He was an East German border guard and someone took his picture as he jumped across to the freedom of West Berlin 2 years ago. Now he is married, has a small son and is a factory worker in West Germany. He is happy now—and never wants to go back to East Germany—until the Communists leave.

Most of us here in America didn't have to jump or do anything else—to win our freedom. We don't stop to consider how blessed we are.

None of us would like to be trapped deep in the earth as were the miners at Hazleton, Pa. It was a dangerous situation—and aside from that, it seems to me that to be shut in and prevented from coming and going as you like, or from coming to the surface would be almost intolerable.

To be shut behind an Iron Curtain in a Communist land would be nearly as bad. You couldn't go as you like, work where you want to, worship your God in your own way, talk as you please—or even choose your rulers.

Suppose you were a Buddhist in South Vietnam—undergoing fierce persecution from bigots. You'd not be free there, either.

Americans don't realize how blessed we are. We should get on our knees each night and thank God for our liberty.

For it is a gift of God. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," said the Saviour. Our ancestors were given to know the truth—and they set up a system which protected men's liberties from religious bigotry, from political exploitation, and from mob rule.

Someone has said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We have liberty as a gift. But we must be alert to resist any infringement.

We must not ask too much—in asking more than liberty, we may lose our freedom. We must not ask government to be a Santa Claus and to meet our every need—for then it may turn to an overly protective giant that can stifle and take away our freedoms.

Changes in Public Laws 815 and 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would amend Public Laws 815 and 874 in order to bring them more in line with their original purpose.

These laws had their genesis in late 1949 and early 1950 when the Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted extensive hearings all across the country, the printed record of which extends to some 2,400 pages. In the report of that committee, it was stated:

Federal assistance as called for in these recommendations is restricted to meeting the Federal responsibility only in these affected school districts; it is not intended to provide assistance that would be available under proposals for general Federal aid.

Over the years since 1950, however, due largely to various amendments, the program has become a kind of general aid to education, "under a poor formula" as one authority put it. While I would be opposed on principle to a Federal program of general aid to education, if we are to have such a program it should be drawn up, introduced, and debated on its own merits. It should not be foisted off on this Congress and on the public by hacking up, amending, and distorting a bill designed to meet a limited and specific problem. It is with an eye toward eliminating some of the more serious inequities and unjustifiable provisions of these laws that I am proposing the following changes:

ELIMINATE ONE-HALF OF NATIONAL AVERAGE CONTRIBUTION RATE

First of all, my bill would eliminate the one-half of national contribution rate as an alternative basis for computing the "local contribution rate." At present, the local school district can use as its "local contribution rate" any one of three different figures—the amount spent per pupil from local revenue sources in "generally comparable" school districts within the State, one-half of the State average per pupil cost, or one-half of the national average per pupil cost in the continental United States.

This latter alternative should be eliminated since—

Such a rate bears no reasonable relation to the revenue losses or financial burdens occasioned for a particular school district by Federal property tax exemption. Its effect, indeed, is a Federal payment of the full cost per "A" category pupil to many school districts which receive in addition substantial State aid for these same pupils. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

The original purpose behind the one-half of national average contribution rate was to make the payments to school districts throughout the nation more nearly equal. Before the amendment, there was a very wide discrepancy among payments to school districts in different States. This was due to the fact that Federal payments were based on local contribution rates, and in States where the State contribution to education was high, the local rates were low, and vice versa. It was felt by many to be inequitable for a State which contributed highly to education to be penalized by the terms of the act. Again, however, the present act is being confused with a program of general Federal aid to education.

As was said by Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958:

The relevant measure is that amount which will put the school district in the same situation as other school districts in the State.

The purpose of Public Laws 815 and 874 is to alleviate the burden caused by Federal activities; its purpose is not to equalize the quality of American education or to provide a gratuitous boon to fortunate school districts. This amendment would save $17 million.

REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS FOR 3(B) "OUT" CHILDREN

The second change would provide that, in a situation where the parents work on tax-exempt Federal property but live in a school district other than the district in which the property is located, payment for each child would be reduced from 50 to 25 percent of the local contribution rate. Under the existing laws, all "B" category pupils are compensated for at the 50-percent rate, whether the Federal property is located within or without the district of residence. Yet, it is obvious that the burden is greater in the one case than in the other.

When both the Federal property and the residence are in the same school district—the B "in" pupils—school revenue

per "B" pupil is cut one-half by reason of the Federal property tax exemption—retaining the other one-half which comes from the residential property. On the other hand, when the Federal property is located outside the district of residence, there is no reduction due to Federal tax exemption. In many States, however, the contribution to local school districts from State tax funds is fairly substantial. Tax-exempt Federal property located anywhere in the State would reduce this State contribution to the local district. To compensate for this reduction, this bill does not entirely eliminate payments for B "out" pupils, but rather provides that they will be compensated for at a rate of 25 percent of the local contribution rate.

In addition, if payments were reduced when the Federal installation is not in the school district, there would be an incentive to consolidate school districts, a procedure generally supported by educators and others who have concerned themselves with the problems of the American school system. This amendment would save $52,411,662.

THREE PERCENT ABSORPTION REQUIREMENT

A third change would revive the 3-percent absorption requirement. In Public Law 874, as it stood in 1951, it was provided that the school district should absorb a number of federally connected students equal to 3 percent of average daily attendance, the theory being that the Federal installation brings certain benefits to the district which should offset to a certain extent the burden caused by the federally connected pupils. Implementation of this provision was postponed for a year in order to give the local school districts time to prepare for its effects. Yet, when it came time to put this section of the law into effect, the opposition of school district superintendents throughout the country was loud and vocal, since it would, of course, cut down, or in some cases eliminate, their allotment. As a result, the provision was again postponed and eventually eliminated. In its place, it was provided that there should be a 3-percent eligibility rather than an absorption requirement. Thus, a school district would receive payment for all federally connected pupils as soon as their number reached 3 percent of all pupils in average daily attendance. This provision is both inequitable in its effect and unjustifiable in terms of the original purpose of the laws. It is inequitable in that a district which has 3 percent federally connected pupils is compensated for all of them, while a district with 2.99 percent receives no help at all. What has been done, in effect, is to eliminate the absorption requirement in some cases and retain it in others. If the absorption requirement were revived, this inequitable situation would be remedied.

The provision is unjustifiable, since it fails to take into account the benefits which a Federal installation brings to a community. In the words of M. L. Reese, county manager, Montgomery County, Md., testifying in 1958 before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> The loss of assessable base resulting from incoming Federal installations is, to a great extent, offset by a general tendency of stimulation to local commerce and area property values.

Reviving the 3-percent absorption requirement would recognize these benefits. This amendment would save $44,111,023.

ELIMINATION OF PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 WHEN PRESCRIBED ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS ARE NOT MET

A further provision of my bill would eliminate the so-called Purtell amendment. This amendment, approved in 1958, provided that a school district that has met the 3 percent—or 6 percent—eligibility requirement in any year but fails to meet the requirement in the next 2 succeeding years is still eligible for payment for the actual number of federally connected children in average daily attendance in the school district the first year, and for 50 percent of such payment the second year. This is designed to lessen the strain on the school budget which would result from a sudden elimination of Federal funds. With a 3-percent absorption requirement substituted for the present 3 percent eligibility requirement, such as phasing out would, of course, not longer be necessary. The school district would only be receiving payments for those students in excess of 3 percent, not for all students or for none as at present.

Yet, even if the 3 percent eligibility requirement were to be continued, the Purtell amendment could not be justified. According to L. G. Derthick, Commissioner of Education, testifying on June 9, 1959, before the Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

> This amendment is manifestly discriminatory as respects a school district which barely meets the 3 percent condition of eligibility in a given year and barely fails to meet that condition in a subsequent year, as against another school district which barely fails to meet such eligibility condition in either year.

Furthermore:

> Such phasing out of Federal payment is unnecessary since section 3(f) of the law permits a 1-year continuance of payments in the case of a decrease in the number of federally connected children for which a school district had reasonably prepared in anticipation of eligibility for Federal payment when such decrease is due to a cessation in Federal activities. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

Thus, the Federal Government would aid the local school district only when the need is a direct Federal responsibility. Again, it should be remembered that this is not a general Federal aid to education program based on need but, rather, it is a limited program to fulfill a specific Federal responsibility. This amendment would save $528,467.

INCLUSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

My bill also contains a provision which would make the District of Columbia eligible to participate in the impacted area school aid. There is no logical or equitable reason for not treating the District on the same basis as other States, territories, and possessions. In fact, the Federal Government has a more obvious and immediate responsibility for education in the District of Columbia than in any other jurisdiction. This community should and could be a showcase of educational and social advancement. Without prompt corrective action, it may well become a shambles. Adequate financial support for the public schools of the District is the most vital requirement for corrective action.

The District participates in the benefits of virtually all other Federal programs in the field of education, including the Vocational Education Acts, the National Defense Education Act, and other major legislation. The only rationale for not including the District in impacted area aid is that it receives a general Federal payment. This is not persuasive in view of the fact that the Federal payment is for general budgetary purposes and is made by virtue of the fact that Washington is our National Capital, whereas impacted aid is specifically directed to education in areas in which Federal activity creates a heavy burden on schools. In terms of Public Laws 815 and 874, Washington, D.C., is one of the most heavily impacted areas in the Nation. About 43 percent of all property in the District is owned by the Federal Government.

In fact, employment of parents of public school children on Federal property located within the District of Columbia is the basis for Federal payments of millions of dollars to school districts in nearby Maryland and Virginia. Yet the same employment on the same tax-exempt property by a parent who resides in the District does not yield one penny to the public schools of the District.

Surely the relationship of the Federal Government to the District is not remarkably different from its position with respect to Wake Island, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, all of which participate in the impacted area school aid programs.

These arguments for including the District, based upon considerations of equity, would be valid even if the Federal payment to the District were adequate. The fact, however, is that the Federal payment is grossly inadequate.

The administration this year recognized the inadequacy of this payment and recommended that it be increased to a level of $61.8 million annually, or nearly double the rate for fiscal year 1963. However, $50 million has been approved for fiscal year 1964. While this figure represents a substantial increase over previous years, it is still an inadequate amount.

Clearly, if the schools of the District are to receive the increased financial support that they so desperately need, they must look to a source other than the Federal payment. Public Law 874, which would provide annual payments to the District of about $4 million, is one such source.

Furthermore, statistics show that the District has experienced a slight decline in total population but, at the same time, has had an enormous increase in the numbers of schoolchildren in the public schools. Bare statistics do not tell the whole story, however, of the flight of wealth to the suburbs coupled with the continued influx of socially underprivileged families into the heart of the capital. The children of these families require far more extensive services and far more intensive effort from our schools than do those children of more fortunate families. These children are just as much a part of the reality of America, and of the hopes we have for the future, as are those of more fortunate background. They deserve our best efforts. Even if the attention of the whole world were not focused upon Washington, D.C., our responsibility toward the children of our Capital would be the same. This is the one Federal responsibility of education which is undisputed, and which we must discharge with honor.

TO PREVENT THE REDUCTION OF STATE PAYMENT TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Finally, there are a number of States that reduce the local school district's entitlement from State funds when these local districts receive aid under the impacted areas program. The State of California is the best example of this. Under California law, 60 percent of the funds received by the local school districts under Public Law 874 are considered to be "local resources." Since the State contribution to the local school district is based on the local resources of the district, this provision has the effect of cutting down the State contribution to the local district by an amount equal to 60 percent of their entitlement under Public Law 874. As a result, the Federal Government is not only aiding the impacted school district, but may be providing a form of general aid to education in the State if the State funds that would have been available to the impacted school districts if they had received no Federal payments are used for other educational purposes in the State.

My bill provides that Public Law 874 payments to the local school district are to be reduced by an amount equal to the reduction in the State entitlement. The State would thus be deterred from reducing its payment to federally impacted school districts.

I firmly believe that if these changes in the impacted areas legislation are adopted, a long step will have been taken toward making these laws both more equitable and more in line with their original purpose.

Accident Investigations by Civil Aeronautics Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, I was pleased to have brought to my attention an editorial in the August 27, Rochester, N.Y., Democrat and Chronicle complimenting the Civil Aeronautics Board for the attitude of its officials in the conduct of its recent inquiry into the unfortunate July 2 accident of Mohawk Airlines; and I ask that this editorial accompany my remarks:

CAB COOPERATES

Occasions seem few when newspapermen are confronted by Government officials who defend the public's right to know. There are even fewer instances, it seems, when officials act upon that belief.

Last week's Civil Aeronautics Board inquiry into the July 2 air crash here was refreshing in many respects, according to reporters assigned to cover the proceedings.

Seven trained investigators from the CAB's Washington office arrived in Rochester within 2 hours of the Mohawk tragedy.

From the beginning, they offered their full cooperation. To help keep the public informed, they brought Edward E. Slattery, Jr., a CAB public information officer, to Rochester.

During the early phases of the field investigation, Slattery held daily press briefings and labored at night to provide newsmen with the facts as they were learned. During the 4-day hearing just concluded, newsmen were allowed free access to transcripts and exhibits and panel members were never too busy to explain or elaborate.

We hope other governmental agencies will learn from this trained panel that cooperating with the press is easy—once you get the hang of it.

The FBI and Civil Rights Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable confusion surrounding the role the public believes the FBI should play in recent civil rights flareups. I would like to call attention to two recent articles on this subject which point up that the FBI actually does not have jurisdiction in 95 percent of these cases. Where they do have jurisdiction they are on the job in their usual efficient and effective way.

The articles follow:

[From the Joliet (Ill.) Herald-News, Sept. 21, 1963]

IN RIGHTS CASES: FBI OPERATES ONLY UNDER JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ORDERS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been "caught in the middle" in the angry protests that have arisen following the fatal September 14 bombing of a Birmingham, Ala., church.

Four Negro girls were killed in the blast.

FBI agents began an investigation of the church explosion immediately and Friday it was announced that the agents and sheriff's men have determined that the bomb was planted beneath the church steps and was not thrown from a passing car, as originally reported. Their investigation is continuing.

"We have to solve this one," said one FBI agent.

In the indignation over the explosion, however, a number of Negro and civil rights leaders have accused the FBI of failing to act in civil rights incidents. Since January 1, 1959, there have been 46 bombings in Alabama, 19 in Birmingham.

Under the Civil Rights Act of 1960 the FBI cannot investigate such incidents without direct orders from the Department of Justice, regardless of requests for help from local authorities.

FBI records show that in each of the 46 Alabama bombings, agents reported the facts to the Department of Justice. In only five cases was the FBI ordered to investigate. The Birmingham church blast was the latest and there FBI men acted immediately because of the fatalities involved.

The other four incidents under FBI study—all in Birmingham—were the two May 11 bombings of the home of the Reverend A. D. W. King, brother of the Reverend Martin Luther King; the May 11 blast at the Gaston Motel and the September 4 bombing of the home of A. D. Shores.

"The FBI jurisdiction (under the 1960 Civil Rights Act) is very limited and is not intended to supplant local and State authority," said one source. "At all times it operates directly under instructions from the Department of Justice."

No arrests have been reported in the bombings in Birmingham, but FBI agents have been successful in a series of investigations involving civil rights violence.

Arrests were made after investigation of two Negro church burnings in 1962 in Terrell County, Ga., and another at Leesburg, Ga. Nine men were arrested after FBI investigation of the burning of a Greyhound bus near Anniston, Ala., in 1961. The bus was carrying members of the Congress for Racial Equality on a so-called freedom ride.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Sept. 21, 1963]

FBI GIVES TOP PRIORITY TO BOMB INVESTIGATION

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

FBI laboratory experts are now working around the clock on a mass of fragments and other debris collected at the scene of last Sunday's church bombing in Birmingham, Ala.

But scientific work has not yet reached the stage where the FBI can say definitely whether the explosives were planted in the church or thrown from a passing car.

That was the FBI's comment on a statement in Birmingham yesterday by U.S. Attorney Macon L. Weaver that investigation showed a high-lo order explosive planted under the steps of the 16th Street Baptist Church caused the fatal blast.

The FBI laboratory sleuths are seeking more than how the explosives penetrated the church.

SEARCH DEBRIS

They are testing the debris for any evidence that might place a suspect on the scene or aid in identifying him later. This could be a book of matches, a cigarette from which saliva could be recovered and typed or a beer can with fingerprints on it.

More than a score of agents imported from all over the county to supplement the Birmingham FBI office have followed a methodical pattern in their crime scene search to preserve the chain of evidence.

The scene of the bombing has been drawn off and mapped. As the agents comb through the debris, they pick up with tweezers any fragment which might be material, scratch an identifying mark on their find; noting on their copies of the map the location of the find and the time of its discovery.

ONTO MASTER MAP

These notations are then copied onto the master map with the name of the agents who recovered the fragments in case they are later called to testify.

Placement of the fragments on the map is also part of the slow process of trying to reconstruct the crime in terms of the force and direction of the blast.

Although there have been approximately 46 bombings in Alabama—19 in Birmingham alone—since January 1959, the church bombing is only the fifth such case where FBI agents have been told to make a full investigation.

Since the latest bombing, Negro leaders have been asking why the FBI hasn't delved into the other Alabama cases. Here is the explanation given by Federal authorities:

The Justice Department has taken the position that the primary jurisdiction for investigating the bombings remains with local authorities and that Congress wanted it that way when it passed the bombing sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

FEDERAL VIOLATION

Under this act, it's a Federal violation to carry explosives across State lines with intent to use them to destroy property, for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, residential, business, or civic purposes. Although the act is broad, the Justice Department has specifically told the FBI that no FBI investigation should be launched without special departmental authorization.

That directive applies even where local authorities request an FBI investigation.

Where local officials request help, the FBI informs the Justice Department to get an immediate decision. If there is no local request, the FBI presents the facts of the bombing to the Department but doesn't go ahead with the investigation without Department approval.

In an aggravated case like the church bombing, the FBI immediately launched a full-scale investigation and told the Department what it was doing. Of course, official approval was promptly forthcoming.

Heading for the Moon: One-World Government Looms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the San Diego Union (Calif.) on September 24, entitled "Heading for the Moon." This editorial points out the dangers of the President's proposal that the United States and Russia join together in an effort to reach the moon:

HEADING FOR THE MOON: ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT LOOMS

The President has jumped the gun. The Moscow treaty hadn't even been ratified before he was shooting for the moon.

It was proposed that we and the Russians go hand in hand in the attempt to land men on the moon, and, not stopping there, go on toward broader nuclear test bans and new efforts toward making the United Nations a greater force in international cooperation.

It is understood that the President was reluctant to address the opening of the United Nations General Assembly without being able to offer some concrete proposals for peace, and thus, even before the Senate had acted to support his rapprochement with Communist Russia, he came up with a number of surprise suggestions that seem to commit the United States to a program, which, though it might be general in nature, nevertheless puts us farther down the one-world path.

This was the real danger foreseen in the treaty, that more would be read into it than the actual wording. The treaty merely says we won't test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere and in the sea. It doesn't say anything about taking off to the moon.

The original Atlantic Community idea that the administration supported so eloquently but vaguely in its earlier days, which implied the pooling of economic, financial, and even political rights with a bloc of Western nations, fell by the wayside.

Instead of drawing closer together, the Western nations have drifted farther apart, and the United States must share a great part of the blame for this disintegration.

But that was a small vision. There is a bigger one now.

It suggests that the Communists and the Americans have more in common than the need to avoid an atomic war; that we have similar goals for our people, and that by changing the United Nations into an organization endowed with authority and power not originally foreseen, we can, thereby, be united in common purpose.

Our differences are thus political, and not fundamental. They are economic, and not social. It is not freedom against ideological dictatorship, but one governmental system competing against another.

Can we shoot Communists in South Vietnam, and sit down with them in Moscow? Can we hurl accusations against President Diem, and welcome President Tito of Yugoslavia? Can we forget the people of Cuba and Eastern Europe, while we admire the dancers and artists sent here by their oppressors?

So many things suggested by this administration are never thought out. Ideas are tossed up like toy balloons. When one pops, up comes another.

Meanwhile, we seem to be forgetting we are in a war to see whether a free system or a slave system will survive, and that we are champions of the free system, and for us, there can be no compromise. Or, are we, as some leftists are urging, to follow Europe on the path of socialism, and meet the Communists coming the other way, until we arrive at a point where we can merge under a one-world government?

We must count the ultimate cost of cooperation, as well as the present cost of tension.

Should Not Civil Service Prefer the Best?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, there is included below a letter written by a citizen of Wayne County, Mich. He presents in my judgment a most justifiable complaint. He points out the possible reason for the Veterans' Preference Act and show with some exactness what it does to civil service:

DEARBORN, MICH.,
September 16, 1963.

Hon. MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GRIFFITHS: The phasing-out of the Defense Automotive Supply Agency has brought forcibly to my attention a situation in the Federal service that has, in my opinion, long been in critical need of legislative reform if the merit system of civil service is to have a valid meaning. I am referring to the Veterans' Preference Act, as currently implemented and administered through the U.S. Civil Service Commission wherein, within the letter and intent of the law, the nonveteran is subjected to unjust discrimination in the matter of retention. Whether or not any of our legislative representatives realize it, a noncombatant, healthy veteran with 1-year military service and 3 years under civil service is placed in a caste above a 25-year nonveteran civil servant, notwithstanding the possibility that the nonveteran might be a double-amputee, have a Ph. D., and an outstanding record in the service of the U.S. Government.

I happen, through no fault of my own, to be a nonveteran. (Classified as 4-F because of polio, which left me with limited use of my right leg.) I also happen to have managed to survive nearly 23 years of Federal civilian service. This survival has only been possible through my finding a job for myself following four reductions in force, including the acceptance of a change to lower grade on two occasions, and a willingness and stamina (now weakening) to work myself back up through the ranks in a new agency.

I am now facing possible reduction-in-force No. 5 in my career. Presumably I will have functional-transfer rights to either the Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, or back to my former agency, the Army Tank Automotive Center, here in Detroit. One would normally think that with 23 years of civilian service I would be relatively safe. This is simply not so. For example, representatives of the Defense Construction Supply Center (DCSC), in an advance recruiting trip to our activity (DASC) to fill existing DCSC vacancies informed me that, although they were impressed with my background and experience, they must pass over me in filling their key positions. Why? Simply because I am a nonveteran, and it appears that there will be more veterans in my categories (GS-13) than there will be available jobs. It matters not that the combined service of the veterans (military and civilian service) may be much less than my 23 years; it matters not that many of the veterans are retired military personnel, on retirement pay, with only slightly more than the minimum 3 years civilian employment; it matters not I have a highly commendable performance record, as opposed to the veteran who may have a mediocre rating. Only one thing does matter, that is the veteran, if he has passed his 3-years of civilian service in the Federal Service, has "veterans' preference" that subordinates all other considerations, and this preference is protected by public law, enacted by the legislative bodies of the U.S. Government. Consequently, I have no argument with those who enforce the law of the land. I do have argument with those, however, that enact or perpetuate the existence of such laws.

I have no desire nor intention of leaving the impression that I am opposed to giving some sort of preferential treatment to those who have served, voluntarily or otherwise, with the Armed Forces of the United States. I would propose, vote for, and sustain any veterans' preferential consideration in employment, when other factors are basically equal. However, following employment, somewhere along the line, the factors of tenure and job performance should become the prevailing factors. Whether this is after 1 year, 3 years, 5 years, or 10 years, certainly performance and tenure must be of foremost consideration, at some point.

Embittered? Yes; perhaps I am. I must admit that I find it chafing to sit to one side and observe the mass exodus of DASC employees to continuing jobs wherein vet-

eran preference, under the law, plays so important a part in determining destiny.

The Veterans' Preference Act, it appears to me, expressed an emotional response befitting of its time. However, as a continuing thing, I feel that many of its features are prejudicial beyond reason, and inimical to the interests and welfare of the U.S. Government.

I understand that there may be legislation in process to remedy this inequity. If so, whose bill is it? What does it provide? What is the status of such bill (or bills)?

If there is no pending legislation, would you consider introducing legislation? What are your views on this situation?

Very truly yours,

HENRY O. GIVENS.

P.S.—Specifically, I am not requesting intercession with the agencies involved (DASC, DCSC, DSA, and ATAC). I am confident that they are doing everything within their power to minimize the impact on the employees involved, consistent with laws, rules, and regulations, including the Veterans' Preference Act.

New York Governor Is Misinformed Concerning West Virginia Response to Local and National Programs During the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, quoting from an article in the Monday, September 23, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Daily Mail, "West Virginia's economy reached a record height in 1962, the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce reported."

Only the day before, however, the newspapers of our State and others across the Nation carried accounts of a Saturday, September 21, 1963, speech made by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, at a West Virginia fundraising dinner for the Republican Party at Huntington. The papers reported that he attacked what he termed "the Kennedy record of broken promises to West Virginia and the Nation."

Although the unemployment rate continues to be high in several areas of the State, there has been the degree of economic improvement detailed in the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce report which was the basis for the news account. Governor Rockefeller was misinformed and it is obvious that he was not briefed concerning the true economic facts as reported in the chamber of commerce document which was available to the New York Governor.

And, as Harry Hoffmann, editor and political columnist for the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, wrote in the September 23, 1963, issue:

If there is one thing that Rockefeller revealed about himself to the people as a whole during his Huntington visit it was a colossal ignorance of what has been going on in West Virginia since John F. Kennedy has been in the White House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Charleston Daily Mail article of September 23 with the headline, "State Economy Set New Mark in 1962," and the Charleston Gazette column by Harry Hoffmann on September 23 with the heading, "Rockefeller Showed Vast Misinformation."

There being no objection, the article and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Daily Mail, Sept. 23, 1963]

STATE ECONOMY SET NEW MARK IN 1962

West Virginia's economy reached a record height in 1962, the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce reported.

The economy's 1962 performance surpassed that of 1957, the previous record year, by "a comfortable margin," the chamber said in its annual review.

The chamber's composite index of the economy reached a level of 106 last year, compared with 1957's 104. The index is based on a 1957–59 average of 100. Ingredients of the index include figures on bank debits, department store sales, personal income, coal production, and electric power reduction.

For the fourth consecutive year, according to the chamber, property assessments reached an alltime high. They rose 4.6 percent to a new level of $4,306 million. Personal income jumped 2.8 percent to $3,210 million, although West Virginia experienced a 4.7 percent drop in its population to 1,773,000 between the 1960 census and the end of last year.

The chamber also gave this statistical summary of the 1962 performance of other facets of the State's economy.

OIL, GAS CLIMB

Natural gas production continued a 2-year upswing that brought it at the end of 1962 to the highest level since 1948. About 205.1 billion cubic feet were pumped in 1962, an increase of 5.6 percent over 1961.

West Virginia oil producers posted last year their third successive annual increase from the alltime low of 2,177,000 barrels produced in 1959. Last year's production of 3,345,000 barrels bettered 1961's performance by 23.8 percent.

The aggregate value of stone, sand, and gravel, and salt production set an alltime high at $28,819,000. This was 7.1 percent over the 1961 value of $26,906,000 and represented an improvement of 4.9 percent over the old record of $27,476,000 set in 1960.

LUMBER REBOUNDS

Lumber production rebounded from its 23-year low in 1961 to a level of 302 million board feet in 1962. Last year's production was 9.8 percent better than 1961's.

Electric power production reached a total of 17.09 billion kilowatt hours in 1962. This was the second straight year that a record was set in that category.

After a 2-year decline, the dollar value of manufactured products improved enough last year to set a record of $2,573 million. The year's performance represented a 12.3 percent increase over 1961 and an improvement of 6.1 percent over the old record set in 1959.

Farm income was down to its lowest level since 1943, but bank deposits set a record for the year ended last June 30, rising 9.5 percent above the old mark set a year ago. During the year just ended, deposits amounted to $1,477,244,000.

Coal production rose from 113,070,000 tons in 1961 to 118,499,000 last year.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Sept. 23, 1963]

ROCKEFELLER SHOWED VAST MISINFORMATION

(By Harry Hoffmann)

As is to be expected when any national political figure puts in an appearance, New York's Gov. Nelson Rockefeller was the center of attraction during his visit to Huntington last weekend.

And, since this potential candidate for President was on hand to address a fundraising dinner for West Virginia Republicans, he was unquestionably the darling of the Republicans attending the event—even those who would prefer Senator BARRY GOLDWATER for President.

After all, Rockefeller was helping the GOP to raise money—so intraparty partisanship could be laid aside for another time. He did what was expected of him—he criticized the Kennedy administration in particular and Democrats in general—and was cheered lustily by the party faithful present, without any indication that they heard or understood just what he was saying.

The simple fact that he was critical of Kennedy—that alone was sufficient cause for cheers and applause.

But if there is one thing that Rockefeller revealed about himself to the people as a whole during his Huntington visit it was a colossal ignorance of what has been going on in West Virginia since John F. Kennedy has been in the White House.

If he prepared at all for his West Virginia appearance, Rockefeller either was badly misinformed and misguided or he simply decided to throw truth to the wind and launch upon what he knew would be popular with a gathering of Republicans—an attack on Kennedy.

So he put the wood to the President for what he called "the Kennedy record of broken promises" to West Virginia.

Quoting Kennedy as saying in 1960 that "within 60 days of the start of my administration, I will introduce a program to the Congress for aid to West Virginia," Rockefeller said that "960 days plus 2 full weeks have elapsed since the start of John F. Kennedy's administration and what do we find? No commission, no report, no recommendation, no legislative program for this State."

Rockefeller, either out of ignorance or for political expediency, overlooked the fact that the very first Executive act of Kennedy as President was to order an increase in the size, variety, and nutritional value of surplus commodities distributed to families denied a means of livelihood or public welfare by reason of mechanization in the coal industry.

This was under an authority voted by a Democratic Congress during the Eisenhower administration—which refused to implement it—and, quite properly, it covered all States with such a problem, and not just West Virginia.

Rockefeller, again either out of ignorance, or for political expediency, also discarded the fact that even before his formal inauguration Kennedy appointed a task force on area redevelopment, which included more members from West Virginia than any other State—plus a special subcommittee to deal with the problems of West Virginia alone. Furthermore, nearly all of the recommendations of this task force have been put into effect.

Rockefeller said West Virginia could be helped by Federal leadership in assisting in the development of recreational facilities with a view of increasing tourist trade.

He ignored or did not know that West Virginia had been given $25 million in grants and loans for development of Bluestone and Hawks Nest State parks and for the creation of three new tourist-recreation facilities at Canaan Valley, Twin Falls, and Greenbank—

making it five times as big as anything ever done before in West Virginia by way of recreational facilities.

Rockefeller said the Federal Government could help West Virginia by providing leadership for industrial development.

He ignored or did not know about the conversion of the South Charleston Naval Ordnance Plant to private industry, and the number of new industries created through the aid of ARA.

Rockefeller said the Kennedy administration could help West Virginia by providing better transportation through more roads and highways.

He ignored or did not know about the release of new Federal interstate funds to make possible a long-needed north-south superhighway through central West Virginia—Interstate 79.

Rockefeller said Kennedy promised to channel more defense spending to West Virginia, but responded by cancelling the Navy's radio telescope project at Sugar Grove.

He ignored or did not know that the Kennedy administration increased defense contracts in West Virginia by four times within 2 years, moving the State from dead last among the 50 States to 30th in this category.

None of this has been easy for Kennedy, because he has been catching hell from the Republican press and Republican politicians outside the State for doing too much for West Virginia.

In fact, if Rockefeller had read some of the stuff he probably would have come into Huntington and criticized Kennedy for doing too much for West Virginia. But that hardly would be in keeping with political protocol.

Another thing Rockefeller said in inspiring the Republicans to cheer in Huntington over the weekend was that "we've got a talk-big, act-little administration."

The truth is that the Kennedy administration, at least so far as West Virginia is concerned, has been a "talk-little, act-big administration." The important thing is that the President has kept his promises, and this is something Rockefeller should be informed of—even if he has to change his method of attack the next time he visits West Virginia.

Judgment Without Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am privileged to submit for inclusion in the RECORD a recent statement made by Mr. William M. Spencer, a distinguished gentleman and true American, of Birmingham, Ala., entitled "Judgment Without Trial," which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress and the public:

JUDGMENT WITHOUT TRIAL

I

In reporting the recent bombings in Birmingham, all news media—press, radio, and television—have so slanted their reports of such incidents as to imply that the same were perpetrated by white persons. The white people of this city and this community deeply resent such implications.

It is a fundamental principle of common law jurisprudence that a person charged with the commission of a crime is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. The most skilled investigators of the FBI, the law enforcement agencies of Birmingham, of Jefferson County, and of the State of Alabama, have searched diligently and thoroughly for evidence to identify the criminal or criminals, but to this date, there has been disclosed to the public not one shred, not one scintilla, of evidence which would point an accusing finger at any person.

Such being the case, it is reasonable to infer that the bombings were the work, not of amateurs, but of trained and expert criminals who probably were brought to this city from the outside to perform the dastardly deeds. If the crimes had been committed by amateurs, it is reasonable to suppose that some clue or some evidence would have been left which would have led to a solution. This conjecture, that the bombings were perpetrated by outsiders, is supported by the fact that rewards, in excess of $75,000, have been offered for pertinent evidence; $75,000 is a lot of money, and had the criminals not so expertly covered their tracks, someone would have come forward with information leading to their identification.

With respect to the bombing of the Gaston Motel, a large segment of the Negroes of this city freely expressed the opinion that the bomb could not have been thrown from a passing car, that it must have been planted by someone on foot on the premises, and that no white man could have come on the premises to plant the bomb without being detected by occupants of the motel or by the officers of the law then on guard.

It is a gross injustice to infer, (a) that these crimes were committed by white persons, or (b) that these crimes were committed by any citizen of this community, white, black, or any other color.

II

The bombings appear to have followed a consistent pattern. First, sleek, fat agitators from outside Birmingham come to our city, and with demagogic oratory inflame the Negro citizens. After a few days, such oratory becomes stale and ineffective; then a bomb explodes and mobs form.

It is difficult to believe that the bombings of the home of Arthur Shores could have been done by a white person; he is a Negro, an able and respected member of the Birmingham bar; he is conservative and moderate; he is the last Negro whom the white people might have cause to molest.

The home of A. G. Gaston has been bombed. According to press reports of the incident, the physical location of the explosion which caused the damage to his home was such that the explosive could not have been tossed from a passing car, that it was planted by someone on foot. He is a Negro and is among the wealthiest men in this district. Gaston is a conservative citizen and there would be no point in the conservative white citizenry doing harm to him.

It is significant, and almost miraculous, that, with the exception of the murderous explosion at Sixth Avenue Baptist Church, no person has been killed by any of the bombs. Could it have been that the bombs were planted in such a manner as to preclude personal injury?

III

It is an old saying that two wrongs do not make a right. Last spring, when the agitators saw their efforts flagging, they called the Negro children from their classrooms, harangued them to a state of frenzied excitement and put them on the streets at the head of a mob as a shield to the real agitators in the rear. The Birmingham School Board directed these schoolchildren to return to their classrooms and warned them that if they did not do so, they would be subject to disciplinary action. They did not return, and the board did take disciplinary action. A Federal judge countermanded such disciplinary action and ordered that none be taken against the truant Negro children.

With the desegregation of three schools early this month, white children protested by absenting themselves from their classes. The school board did not feel that it could take disciplinary action against these white children, in view of the fact that it had been forbidden to discipline Negro children for infraction of the same rule. They did not believe it right or just that they should punish white children for the same offense for which they had been restrained by Judge Tuttle from punishing the Negro children. This is an example of the evil results which follow replacing local authority with Federal rule.

The unrestrained defiance of the school board orders by white children created an atmosphere which those persons, who desired a continuance of turmoil, believed propitious for another strike; they planted the bomb under the steps of the Sixth Avenue Baptist Church, with results known to all. The pastor of that church was reported in the newspapers to have said that he had expected such an occurrence and was surprised that it had not happened sooner. Such being the circumstances, it would seem that some member of the church might have been able to furnish to the authorities a clue which would lead to the identity of the perpetrators of the crime.

IV

Before the agitators descended upon Birmingham with their satellite organizations, having names conspicuously including the words "nonviolent" and "Christian," there was not a place anywhere in Birmingham where any person, white or black, could not go in safety at any time of the day or night. Such is not the case now. Are the Negro citizens of this city doing their part to promote peace, order, and good feeling between the white and Negro citizenry? Do the Negroes feel any responsibility for the acts of members of their race, (a) who throw rocks at passing automobiles, (b) who commit arson by throwing incendiary bombs, and (c) who lie in wait to throw rocks at the fire trucks responding to calls to extinguish fires set by them?

V

Even more reprehensible than the slanted and partial reporting of untoward incidents which have occurred in Birmingham, are statements made by responsible officers of other cities. Despite the advancement of civilization and the amelioration of the human race in general, there are some individuals who retain the barbaric trait of bearing "false witness against thy neighbor" condemned in the Ninth Commandment.

How does the death of the four Negro children from the bomb explosion at the church compare with (a) the unsolved strangulation deaths of at least nine defenseless women in the Boston area over the past several months, (b) the unspeakable and indescribable conditions which exist in New York City, (c) the Negro mob at the football game in Washington last fall, and (d) untoward incidents in other cities, too numerous to mention?

The Negro agitators seem to have exerted their maximum effort to make Birmingham a symbol of their activities, and they have succeeded in that there is scarcely a description of tumult in which the phrase "like Birmingham" is not used. With adequate funds at their disposal, and with the blessing of Federal authority, these agitators could have made such a symbol of any city which has a sizable Negro population.

VI

The good name of Birmingham has been besmirched and begrimed by false state-

ments and misleading innuendoes. Every citizen of this community has been injured, most of all, the people in the lower income brackets, both white and Negro. If industry leaves the district, they will lose the jobs they now hold; if new industry does not come to the district, there will be no new jobs for the unemployed. What would happen if the Federal atuhorities were to heed the plea of Roy Wilkins that every nickel, dime or dollar of Federal money be withheld from or denied to this district? It is a greater moral and ethical wrong to libel and slander a city than an individual, because it damages innocent people; furthermore, the law provides no redress to the innocent for the damage suffered by them.

VII

Widely circulated reports to the contrary notwithstanding, Birmingham's gallant police force and the sheriff's deputies have discharged their duties in a highly creditable and commendable manner. Every officer has conducted himself with almost superhuman restraint and control in the face of danger and the taunts, threats, and unprintable indignities from participants in the mobs.

We deed it to be the duty of the President of the United States and of the Attorney General to make public a full report of all the facts found by the investigators of the FBI of the bombings in Birmingham; that if no evidence has been found that the crime, or any of them, were perpetrated by a white person, or persons, such fact should be clearly stated; that if no evidence has been found that the crimes, or any of them, were perpetrated by a citizen of Birmingham, white or black, or any other color, such fact should be clearly stated.

The President and the Attorney General owe this duty, both to the citizens of Birmingham and to themselves, for without such a clear statement, there will always be a suspicion that the Federal authorities discovered facts in Birmingham which would embarrass the administration if revealed.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., *September 23, 1963.*

You and Your Ballot: A History of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Citizens Honest Elections Foundation, with headquarters at 332 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., have developed a booklet entitled, "You and Your Ballot: A History of Freedom," which has had excellent response from teachers and students who are using this booklet for classroom instruction.

It appears to me there is a need for a publication of this kind which merits wider distribution. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my remarks it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding that the cost might exceed the allowable limit.

There being no objection, the booklet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND YOUR BALLOT—A HISTORY OF FREEDOM

FOREWORD

Regardless of their political party affiliation, citizens of the United States know that the preservation of the right to vote is the absolute cornerstone of our political freedom.

The first right—and the first duty—of every citizen is to vote in every election in which he is an eligible voter.

Whether you are just reaching the age when you are entitled to vote, or have voted for many years, this brief history of how mankind won the right to choose its own leaders is of vital importance to you.

If the time should ever come when Americans become lackadaisical about the importance of their ballot box, the very foundations of our Nation will be shaken. The ballot box is a heritage to which we must dedicate ourselves with resolute purpose to insure that freedom shall survive.

This booklet describes how men and women have won their voting rights and privileges. If it shows you how important these rights and privileges are, it will have fulfilled its purpose.

DON R. GRIMES,

Chairman Citizens Honest Elections Foundation.

VOTING THROUGH HISTORY

In the earliest days the strongest man in the tribe was chief. Voting was done with a club or sword, and as long as the ruler could defeat his rivals in physical combat, his rule remained secure.

This was the pattern through hundreds of centuries, and it was not until 2,500 years ago, in Greece, that free voting was inaugurated. In the Greek city states, free citizens could vote. They did it usually at their open air assemblies by the show of hands. But when they voted to elect a leader, or to banish a politician into exile, they found means to have a secret vote. The judging of a politician was first done by dropping pebbles or stones into bronze helmets, a light stone for acquittal and a dark one for exile. Gradually these devices became more sophisticated, and the Greeks developed brass wheels, about 3 inches in diameter with short spokes on either side. Each voter was given two of these wheels. The spokes of one were solid, and of the other hollow. The voter went up to the voting table, holding the spokes between his thumb and forefinger so that no one could see which one he dropped into the voting urn. After the voting the wheels were counted, and if more solid spoked ones were in the urn, the victim was sent into banishment.

The Greeks granted a limited suffrage. Slaves and foreigners were entirely excluded. No rights of naturalization were allowed and only native-born free citizens could exercise the voting right.

But as the Greek states became decadent, citizens lost their interest in voting. Leaders paid them to "go to the polls," and the candidate who could hire the largest number of free citizens to vote for him was sure to win. As always, when interest in voting declines, decadence grows, and it was not long before Greece became a vassal of Rome, with all rights surrendered to the Caesars.

America, where the divine right of kings was ended, where government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" is a shining beacon to the world, still does not enjoy universal suffrage. Even in States where widespread suffrage does exist, political bosses and vested interests have found means to deny many the right to vote.

Public apathy exerts a deadening influence. Vote thieves stuff ballot boxes, and keep eligible voters from voting at the polls. And in this democracy, whose government was created to serve the people, the number of voters at any election is appallingly low. Recent studies have shown that of 66 democratic nations in the world, 64 exceed the United States in the percentage of eligible voters who go to the polls.

This booklet is designed to give you a brief idea of how important voting is, how it has developed through the centuries, and of what you as an individual citizen can do to make your vote more effective in selecting the leaders that you want to represent you in your government.

A few ancient Romans were allowed to vote, and they used such materials as seashells, beans, metal balls, stones, and clay ballots to show their preferences. But voting in Rome was never very successful. Pliny the Younger in 100 A.D. complained that many citizens wrote indecencies instead of candidates' names on the clay ballots they dropped into the voting urns.

Despite the fact that voting was allowed, the sword and dagger, bribery and force, were used more often than not to select tribunes and aediles, senators, and Caesars. Very few of the ancient peoples were politically interested. Instead they were resigned to suffer under tyrants who ran the governments as they pleased.

Through the first nine centuries A.D., kingmaking was the province of only a few nobles, and it was not until the 10th century in the western world that any semblance of voting appeared again. It was in Italy that voting was resumed, and it is the Italian language that gives us the words ballot and balloting. A "ballotta" is a small ball in Italian, and it was employed in the city states by free men to cast their votes. Voting methods change, but whether we use paper, machines or electronic gadgets, it appears likely that the Italian-derived word balloting will remain as the common term for voting.

In the 13th century voting was well known in the communes of Italy, and in 1268 we find the first record of the use of a written ballot. During that same decade we find, too, the first laws being passed to prevent stuffing the ballot box. The battle for the franchise has always been matched by the war to steal elections.

THE FREEDOM TO VOTE

Through the long centuries, from the days of tyrants, kings and dictators, the story of man's fight for freedom has been the history of his struggle to vote—to choose his own leaders and to have a voice in the government under which he lives.

Since the earliest history of mankind, force, murder, and bloodshed were the dominant ways kings made their rule secure, and only gradually have men been able to wrest some of this power from both self-appointed and hereditary despots and to shape their own political destinies.

The very word for the right to vote—suffrage—indicates that it was a privilege that kings "suffered" their subjects to have, and only when pressures became too great for kings to resist did they allow more freedom and more suffrage for the people in their realms.

As early as the fifth century B.C., free citizens of Athens could vote, and in 300 B.C. certain members of the higher castes in India enjoyed the privilege. Today after 24 centuries, we still have progressed only to a point where about half the people in the world are allowed to vote.

During the Middle Ages burghers and freemen in the German states, Holland, Belgium, and France began to have a say in municipal elections. But property restrictions were severe, and only a small proportion of the residents of any town could vote. By the 16th century Polish noblemen had won the

right to elect their kings, though the common man still had nothing to say about his choice of ruler.

It was in England, where the barons had slowly won concessions from their kings, such as those won at Runnymede, by Magna Carta, that the battle to extend the suffrage really made advances. By the 16th century Englishmen were allowed to vote for municipal officials in some boroughs. The lord mayor of London was elected by a relatively few Londoners who dropped white or black peas into a ballot box in 1532. Fifty years later King James I permitted a great advance when he allowed the universities to elect their own members of Parliament. University graduates were empowered to elect these representatives, and since this voting had to take place by citizens living great distances apart, the alumni wrote the names of their favored candidates and sent them by post to Oxford or Cambridge for counting.

About the same time a secret ballot was allowed in the Netherlands. Pellets, red and white bullets, and even paper ballots were used in Dutch municipal elections. Twentieth century Greece still uses lead balls for its elections, and voters drop them into separate candidate's compartments to show their preferences.

As the American colonists began to select their own officials, one would have expected a wide measure of voting freedom, but such was not the case. Restrictions were heavy. Only property owners could vote in most of the colonies. Many colonies refused the franchise to all Quakers, Catholics, and Jews, and no freed Negroes could vote anywhere in colonial America.

Actually the first record of voting in America occurred in 1629, when parishioners elected the minister of the Salem, Mass., church. But in 1634 a Governor of Massachusetts was elected by paper balloting. Property owners eligible to vote assembled and wrote down names on any old piece of paper they happened to have in their pockets. Lesser officials in Massachusetts were elected by means of kernels of corn and beans handed to eligible voters. If you were for a man, you dropped in a kernel of corn; if you were against him, you deposited a bean.

Throughout the 18th century whispers of liberty, equality and fraternity echoed through the Western World. But only a tiny proportion of the people had the vote, and then only for low officials in their towns and cities. National officers were selected by the kings and their closest advisers.

Out of the two great revolutions for freedom, in America in 1775 and in France in 1787, grew the doctrine that all men are created equal. But even these democratic philosophies did not believe in universal suffrage. Less than 10 percent of adult citizens of France voted between the time of the French Revolution and the advent of Napoleon, and it was undoubtedly because of the wide lack of interest in government that Bonaparte was able to take over control of France.

Even at the time of our Nation's birth, our leaders did not believe in giving every man the vote. Our constitutional fathers opposed direct elections, and the Constitution itself is singularly silent as to how the American voting process will take place.

SUFFRAGE IN AMERICA

Less than one-quarter of adult Americans were permitted to vote in 1787 when the Constitution was framed. Eleven of the Thirteen Original States had laws that kept all but property owners and taxpayers from exercising the franchise. In some States corn and beans were used to cast a vote. In others election officials provided blank pieces of paper on which voters wrote their choices. Virginia did not allow written ballots, but used a "voice" method of electing delegates to the House of Burgesses. However, when the vote sounded close, electors were required to write down their choices.

The framers of the Constitution considered the questions of who could vote and how to vote so touchy that these subjects were left completely out of that document. All the problems of suffrage were left up to the individual States. And that is how the situation remained. The right to vote was still conferred by the States until the Civil War when the 14th amendment provided that no State might deny the right to vote to males over 21.

The 14th amendment was proclaimed in 1868 and provided that all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens, and that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge their privileges, including the right to vote. But Indians, not taxed, were excluded from these rights, and in fact this amendment was not ratified by many States for a good number of years. The last State to ratify it was Maryland—in 1959.

Until very recent years many States have managed to avoid the clearly-stated principles of this amendment, and it is only in recent years that real progress is being made toward universal suffrage. There are still American States with prohibitive poll taxes. And there are still many States in which large blocs of citizens, due to poll taxes or for other reasons, do not vote, even though they now have the theoretical right to do so.

According to the Constitution, the voters may directly elect Members of the House of Representatives, but the various State legislators were given the right to choose U.S. Senators. It was not until 1912 that the 17th amendment provided that Senators may be elected by direct popular vote. Voters still, theoretically, do not vote directly for the President, but vote for presidential electors instead, and they in turn make their choice for President. This has resulted in many queer situations, as in 1800, when the election of Thomas Jefferson was thrown into the House of Representatives because the electors gave Aaron Burr as many votes as Jefferson.

Today the President is still elected through the electoral votes of the 50 States, and not by the total of the popular vote. Four times a man with a larger number of votes has lost the presidential election to a man who polled fewer votes than he did, and several other times, when there were several candidates, men with a minority of all votes cast have been installed in the White House.

These occurrences have shown how a few votes have changed the course of history. For many times, a difference of less than one vote in each precinct of the country could have completely reversed the results of a presidential election. In 1824 John Quincy Adams received 105,321 votes and Andrew Jackson won 155,872, but Adams was elected President by the House. Rutherford Hayes had 4,033,950 votes to Democratic Tilden's 4,284,757, but Hayes was declared the winner. Benjamin Harrison beat Grover Cleveland in 1888 by 5,440,337 votes to Cleveland's 5,540,050, and in 1912 Woodrow Wilson received but 6,286,214 votes to the combined total of over 7,600,000 for Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft, but was elected.

And in 1960 less than 119,000 votes separated John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon—fewer than 1 vote per precinct in the Nation.

HOW AMERICA VOTES

When Americans first voted as citizens of the United States, most of them went into a polling place, took a piece of blank paper from an election official, wrote in the name of the candidates they favored, and dropped the ballot in a hat. At the end of election day the hat was emptied and the paper ballots were counted.

But many people in those days could not write, even though they are property owners. As a consequence they were disenfranchised.

Soon members of the two political parties which had been formed decided it would help if the party itself printed a thin strip of paper with its candidates' names on it, and handed one to each voter, making it easier for him to vote "the right way." This practice became more and more general throughout the States—The Massachusetts Supreme Court approved it in the case of *Henshaw* v. *Foster* in 1829, and party printing of ballots became general. Soon the two parties were printing their own ballots on different colors of paper, so that workers could tell how the voters were voting when they dropped their ballot in the box.

Sometimes the party workers printed their tickets, as they were known, on thin tissue paper. A voter could take several tickets of this thin paper, put a cross mark on them all, and drop them all into the ballot box. So was born the expression "stuffing the ballot box."

Other abuses took place as well. Whigs printed ballots marked and colored to look like the Democratic tickets, and vice versa. In this way both hoped to fool opposition voters into voting for their own candidates.

But despite these evils, the party printing of ballots was in general use until long after the Civil War. It was not until the 1870's that Louisiana and California passed laws providing that the State should print uniform ballots, with the names of candidates of all parties.

Other States followed suit, and many laws were passed providing that all ballots must be on white paper, so that voters could not be intimidated in voting and could insure the secrecy of their voting choice. Some States provided envelopes into which voters could put their ballots before depositing them in the ballot box.

But chain voting and stuffing the ballot box went on. Chain voting is accomplished when a party worker gives a bribed voter an already marked ballot, which has been stolen from the precinct polling palce and marked by the party hack. The voter than goes into the polls, gets an unmarked ballot, but places the marked one in the ballot box. Then he comes outside, gives the worker the unmarked ballot in order to receive his pay, either in money or in a free drink. The worker then marks the unused ballot and gives it to the next voter in the chain.

Obviously the State-printed ballots were a help in combating this type of vote fraud. But they were not enough. Many States started printing ballots with numbered stubs on them, so that the voter had to return the same numbered ballot after voting that he had been issued. Counterfeit ballots were frequently used after the States started printing their own, and many States have printed serial numbers as well as stubs on ballots to reduce this violation.

In the 19th century perhaps the greatest abuse of the voting procedure was the way party workers could detect how a particular voter voted, which greatly impaired the secrecy of the ballot. In the early 1850's the States of Australia began to adopt a secret, uniform nonpartisan ballot with all parties' candidates' names on it. This ballot was introduced into England in 1869, and 3 years later the Ballot Act was passed providing for its universal use. Other nations adopted this reform between 1877 and 1886, among them Belgium, Italy, Canada, and Norway.

In 1881 Robert Schilling, editor of the Milwaukee National Reformer, launched the Ballot Reform League and began calling for ballot reform in America.

Kentucky, in 1888, was the first State to adopt the "Australian ballot" in this country. The next year seven States adopted it, and by 1929, when North Carolina approved the legislation, every State except South Carolina had a law insuring a secret nonpartisan ballot.

In most American States a vote was cast simply by placing a large X in front of a candidate's name. But in many States, and Arkansas is still one, the voter crosses out all the names except the ones he wishes to vote for.

Meanwhile the fights to gain wider suffrage—and to suppress it—went on. Following the Civil War Negroes took over the control of every Southern State except Georgia. By 1876, when the whites regained control of these old States of the Confederacy, supremacy laws were enacted to prevent Negroes from voting. Poll taxes were instituted, literacy laws passed, force was used, and every device imaginable was followed to keep Negroes from exercising their right to vote as guaranteed by the 14th amendment. It has been only in recent years that these restrictive measures have reluctantly been removed, one by one, in Southern States.

And while the privilege of the franchise was increasing gradually in the 19th century, one-half of the adult populace was completely barred from the vote. One hundred years ago no woman anywhere in the entire world was allowed in a polling place.

The long battle for women's suffrage began with the abolition movement. In 1848 the first Women's Rights Convention was held in a church in Seneca Falls, N.Y. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Mrs. Lucretia Coffin Mott, an abolitionist who had been expelled from the World Abolition Convention in London a few years before, were its organizers. The 1848 convention voted for "equal education, suffrage, and property rights." New York State actually granted women property rights the same year, but equal suffrage was a long time coming. Mrs. Susan Brownell Anthony, founder of the WCTU in Massachusetts, was another women's rights leader, as was Carrie Chapman Catt.

Under the militant leadership of women like these, the fight for women's votes went through many decades, but the original leaders never lived to see it a nationally accepted reality. Wyoming granted women's suffrage for State offices when it was admitted as a State in 1869, but Colorado and Utah were the only other States to grant it during the 19th century.

Mrs. Anthony actually voted in the election of 1872, and was fined $100 for her audacity.

The battle was still going on when Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated as President in 1913. In his inaugural parade were many Congressmen and Senators with their wives, as well as 10,000 shouting women. The shouting women created a mob riot in which many people were injured. It was perhaps the sensational aspect of this march that induced both parties to uphold women's suffrage in their party platforms of 1916, and finally in 1920 made possible the enactment of the 19th amendment, giving women an equal vote with men.

It required 70 years of agitation, hard work, heartache, and trouble to pass the women's suffrage amendment, but since 1920 women have taken an increasingly active part in American politics.

The English suffragist crusade began in 1906 when Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, the mother of the movement in the British Isles, created a violent scene in the House of Commons for which she and her cohorts were sent to jail, where they promptly launched a hunger strike. But because of their great patriotic work during the Great War, English women were granted the vote in 1918.

In the years after World War I a few democracies in Europe granted women's suffrage, although it was later abolished in Nazi Germany. And yet in 1930 even France, Belgium, Spain, Switzerland, and Italy did not allow women to vote, although since World War II they have done so. Japan and Western Germany made the great concession during the post-World War II occupation era.

Only half the world's women today enjoy the voting privilege. In 20 countries of the world, notably communistic ones, women have no rights of voting. There the dormant desire to vote lies smothered beneath dictatorial repression, but in this country, every year, the influence of women in politics increases.

VOTING AROUND THE WORLD

The Encyclopedia Britannica states that "a low poll, accompanied with widespread skepticism regarding the efficacy of the electoral process, is a danger signal. It indicates that the masses do not have much faith in the democratic process. Those citizens who will not even go a short distance to the polls to mark their ballots may not be relied upon to put forth the strenuous efforts necessary to defend democratic institutions in troubled times."

Put in simpler terms, that means "the less you vote, the greater the danger of dictatorship."

This precept seems true when one considers that it is in the free nations that the greatest actual participation in elections is found. Americans may find cause for alarm that of 66 democratic nations the United States is next to last in the percentage of eligible citizens who bother to vote. Many countries, such as Australia and Norway and Sweden make voting compulsory with fines set for anyone who fails to vote without a legitimate reason.

Through history a drop in the voting percentages has signaled trouble ahead. In decadent Athens the plutocratic leaders paid citizens to vote, and it was not long before their democratic institutions fell to despotism and then to Rome.

In Italy before 1922 less than one-tenth of the population bothered to vote. It was easy with such apathy for Mussolini and his Fascist Black Shirts to march on Rome and take over control.

In Germany under the Weimar Republic voting gradually slipped until only one-quarter of the people voted in the Reichstag elections of 1928. Five years later the same number of people voted for the same parties, but the vote for the Nazis went up by 5 million, and freedom in Germany was doomed. It is well known how Hitler made his deals to become Reichschancellor, burned the Reichstag, took over dictatorial powers and eliminated the right to vote for an opposition party entirely.

In Russia, where there has never been such a thing as a free election, ruthless despotism has held sway for centuries. While it is true that more than 98 percent of the people go to the polls in the U.S.S.R., it is also a fact that there is only one candidate to vote for, and voting is a mockery.

The first thing that dictators have ever done is take away the vote. How many times have refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Eastern Germany echoed the complaint of five Cubans who recently declared in Miami:

"It is all our fault. We never cared about politics and whom to vote for until it was too late. We were too interested in our own affairs to bother about understanding politics."

Only half of the world's governments allow their people to be interested in politics. And in these free countries probably less than half even bother to be informed. Around the corner from us all hovers the threat of ruthless, power-hungry men scheming and conniving to take over control.

If the United States is to remain free, its citizens must take an ever increasing interest in political affairs, work and strive to elect the better candidates, and watch them while they are in office.

THE VOTE THIEVES WILL GET YOU IF YOU DON'T WATCH OUT

How much is it worth to us as citizens to have free elections?

How much does it cost us as taxpayers to enjoy the right to vote?

In Cook County, Ill., it costs more than $4 million a year to operate the election machinery. And the budget is going up.

In virtually every metropolitan area of the United States it costs more than $2 each year for every ballot that is cast.

High as this figure may seem, the alternative of ending free elections would, of course, be worse.

But citizens, if sufficiently aroused, can do a great deal to keep these costs down, to insure more efficient election machinery and to see to it that their true choices of elected officials are placed in office.

Throughout history the fight for the rights of suffrage has been matched by a fight against vote thieves. Election dishonesty is no new thing. The first law against ballot box stuffing in America was passed in Rhode Island in 1647, when all voters were required to write their names on the backs of their ballots, so their signatures could be checked.

The election reforms that have taken place have been designed to stop ballot crookedness through requiring uniform size and color of ballots, numbered ballots, registration laws, and other legal regulations.

Voting machines, which were first used in this country in 1892 are used not only to improve election efficiency and counting procedures, but to prevent dishonest minorities from tampering with elections.

Only a militant, aroused, industrious army of citizens, working every day in the year, can truly expect to end election frauds. It takes only a few dishonest political hacks to swing an election, but it takes thousands of citizens to prevent them.

If you want to end voting dishonesty, you must know the techniques that criminals use to alter election votes.

How do thieves steal elections?

They don't do it by stealing thousands of votes in one bloc at a time. They do it little by little, in each precinct. There are 165,000 precincts in the United States. President Kennedy won the 1960 election by only 119,000 popular votes. That is less than one vote per precinct.

A swing of only two or three votes a precinct can turn a defeat into a landslide. Your vote is truly important, and if you can persuade three or four people to vote who would not otherwise do so, you can significantly affect the course of an election. This is the principle that election thieves follow: "If you steal three votes a precinct, you're in."

In most States of the Union voters are required to register in order to be eligible to vote. Certain qualifications are almost unanimously laid down. In all States except four, voters must be 21 years of age. In Georgia and Kentucky the age limit is 18, in Alaska 19, and in Hawaii 20.

Qualified voters must be citizens, never convicted of a serious crime, must have fulfilled a residence requirement in their State, county, and precinct, and in a few States must have passed a literacy test.

Obviously some voters can be kept from voting by the literacy test. Even a Supreme Court Justice might not know how to quote the next to the last sentence of article II, section 1, of the Constitution, if that was all he was told about it. Yet unwanted voters who have been stumped with such impossible questions as this have been disqualified.

Three States still have a poll tax, and it is easy to "lose" the records showing that poll taxes have been paid.

When citizens register to vote it is possible for dishonest election officials to "lose" their registration cards which are usually kept in

large binders used by election officials in the polling places on election day. When a voter comes in to vote, the officials cannot find his registration card. He is refused a ballot. He may rant and rave, and perhaps he will be told he must go down to the city's central election headquarters where the original is on file. If he does go there, the crowds and confusion may be so great that he cannot get any service. And even if he does get service, he may not be able to get back to his own precinct place before the polls are closed. Of course, many voters won't even bother to go to headquarters. They are so angered that by this time they don't want to vote, anyway.

It requires losing only two or three cards from a binder in half the precincts of a large city to swing several thousand votes.

Another common fraud connected with registrations is to have "floaters" register several times in different precincts of a city, registering from vacant lots, cemeteries, drugstores, and boardinghouses. Dead men's names can be left on the registration lists, and no one is likely to know that a man is dead when someone bearing his name shows up on election day to vote.

Only extremely careful, incessant activity by canvassers working for many weeks in each precinct, checking every name and address, can hope to counteract this type of crime.

Such tampering with registrations can take place long before an election. Superficially the voting may seem to go off without a bit of difficulty, and still votes may have been taken away from one candidate or ticket and added to another candidate or ticket.

For many years buying votes with free drinks was a common election practice in poorer sections of cities. All States require that saloons be closed during election hours, but even this precaution does not completely eliminate this abuse.

Such violent kinds of fraud as stealing ballot boxes, shooting voters, intimidating them, and scaring them away from the polls have been largely eliminated from the American voting scene. But they have been replaced by more sophisticated tricks.

In paper ballot percincts in slum areas chain voting still takes place with alarming frequency.

One of the classic ways of altering election results has been the use of a short stub of pencil concealed in the hand, or a bit of lead stuck under a finger nail. A judge uses it surreptitiously to put a cross for his candidate on a ballot that is only lightly marked for an opponent. Such tricks are not entirely out of fashion in dishonest election polling places, even today.

When one considers how long the American ballot is likely to be—Oregon held the record with a list of 177 different offices to be voted for at one recent election—it is not surprising that mistakes can enter into the counting. Election officials have to open the polls at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning. They work all day, and not until after 6 in the evening can they start counting. In a precinct where several hundred people have voted, it may be 2 or 3 o'clock the next morning before their task is done. Few humans can remain efficient and not make any mistakes for so long.

It would be easy to transpose accidentally a figure or two, and give a candidate, say, 361 votes instead of 163. Or ballots might be dropped unintentionally on the floor and, by the time they are retrieved, no one might be certain whether or not they have already been tallied. Such mistakes can be honest ones, or they can be fraudulent. But in court afterwards, it has often been absolutely impossible to prove that wrongdoing has in fact occurred.

Voting machines have been installed in most States to end many of the abuses of paper balloting. Even with these the vote thieves have found ways to cheat. Few people are around at 5 o'clock in the morning when the machines are opened up. And it has happened that when the polls opened at 6 o'clock some machines have been found that already recorded as many as 85 votes for one candidate—even though supposedly no one had voted so far.

But voting machines have definitely made the final count quicker and less susceptible to cheating. The vote thieves have had to find new ways to outwit them.

One means that occurred on a widespread scale in Cook County was through illegal assistance to voters. Precinct officials of one party have gone into the curtained machine with voters who said they wanted assistance—even though not legally qualified to have it—and the voters have voted as the precinct officials wanted.

Even trained watchers cannot guarantee that there will be no fraud in a polling place. They cannot know whether John Smith who comes in to vote is really John Smith, or whether he is a floater from somewhere else assuming a dead person's name—unless they have themselves canvassed the precinct before and know that John Smith actually died last March. But trained watchers can create an atmosphere in which vote stealing is less likely to occur. If election fraud is to go, it is imperative that more and more watchers—working honestly for both parties—enter every questionable precinct in every city of America.

But great as it the danger from voting frauds, the greatest danger to America's political future is the voter who stays at home. For every stay-at-home voter means one less vote the thieves must steal.

No wonder the Greeks had a word for it: Idiot.

In Greek the word "idiot" is translated to mean "the person who does not vote."

YOUR VOTE COUNTS

Maybe you can't personally select the candidate for President yourself. Maybe you can't decide yourself who will be the next Senator from your State.

And maybe, because of this you think: "My vote doesn't count. What's the use of voting?"

But if you feel this way, you are seriously wrong. For every vote is important to the preservation of our democracy. Every vote in each election is a vote to help counteract the voteless dictatorships abroad; it is a vote to show that the American way will work and that democracy is the way of the future.

Throughout history your ancestors have fought to have the right to vote. They fought for it when they bled on thousands of battlefields all around the world—when they rebelled against the Hapsburgs or against Napoleon—when they fought with Cromwell or with Washington—and each drop of blood that flowed at Chancellorsville or Gettysburg, Belleau Wood, or Guadalcanal, is a sacred tribute to the right to vote.

Don't say your vote does not count. The Government of the United States derives its very power from the consent of each individual American. The control of the United States comes up from every precinct in the land.

When you enter your precinct polling place, you not only vote for a Senator, a Congressman, a Governor, and a President, you vote for a ward or township committeeman, State legislators, municipal, and county officials. These men are your representatives, and exercise the leverage that determines who will be the candidates for higher posts of public service.

When you elect your party committeeman, he in turn sits on the town or county central committee. It is this body that decides who will be your party's municipal and county candidates. The number of votes your committeeman receives in his election determines the strength of his influence in the central committee.

And it is the strength of your party—and who represents it—at the local level that decides what policies will be followed at State and National levels.

There are only about 165,000 precincts in the United States. Just about 6 votes per precinct means a difference of about 1 million votes in a national election. Only seven of our Presidents have been elected by such a large popular margin, and in this century three Presidents have been elected by less than that.

Your vote counts.

Apathy at the polls is the disease that has destroyed democracy in countries all around the world. Due to apathy, crime and corruption have run rampant in our cities. When an aroused citizenry has rallied to a cause of decency and reform, political bosses, no matter how firmly entrenched they may have seemed, have been thrown out of their plush offices.

Political bosses like apathy. With it they can put up inferior candidates. When there is no interest in public affairs, city halls can be run for the benefit of the politicians instead of for the people.

Today your very survival depends upon the decisions of our political leaders. When Washington was President, a man could live and die without knowing there was a government. Today all of us work at least 1 day in 5 to pay our taxes. Many work half their time or more to pay tax bills. Government costs consume a large percentage of our gross national income. Millions of people work for government and are paid by taxpayers' contributions.

The decisions made in your own city hall, county building, State capital, and in Washington today will affect your livelihood—perhaps your life—tomorrow.

Freedom is at stake. Only the alert and interested can be strong. And only the strong can be free.

Henry Love of the San Diego Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men that I have known in my lifetime recently passed away while vacationing in New York City. Many of the men and women in this Congress, and Congresses over the past 25 years know this man. Especially, do the men and women of the California delegations for more than two decades remember with reverence and affection Henry Love, who served the San Diego Union as a political writer for a quarter of a century, more than half of his career of coverage for that newspaper.

In all, Henry Love reported and wrote for the Union 47 years, becoming a recognized expert on veterans affairs, water resources and highway development as well as on politics. His was the longest continuous service of any editorial employee in the Union's history. Shortly before his death, Mr. Love had attended the American Legion Convention at Miami, Fla., both as a reporter and as a California delegate. He died on a sightseeing trip to the Statue of Liberty in

New York. A longtime friend, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, now a resident of New York, identified Mr. Love's body, thus filling the legal requirements necessary before it could be returned to the old and devoted reporter's beloved San Diego. American Legion Post No. 6 in San Diego was in charge of the military funeral.

It is with sadness that I insert in the RECORD the following story of Henry Love from the San Diego Union:

HENRY LOVE RITES WILL BE THURSDAY

San Diegans in many walks of life, including leaders of veterans and political organizations, Thursday will pay final respects to Henry Love, a San Diego Union writer nearly half a century, who died Friday in New York City.

Post 6 of the American Legion, of which Love was a member, will be in charge of services at 9:30 a.m. in Benbough Mortuary and also will assist in military graveside honors at 10:40 a.m. in Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery.

Love, 63, died of a heart attack aboard a New York Harbor excursion boat while on a side trip to the metropolis after attending the American Legion National Convention in Miami, Fla.—both as a reporter and a California delegate. He was fulfilling a lifelong ambition to visit New York City and see the Statue of Liberty.

NIXON GIVES AID

It appeared yesterday that the service might have to be delayed until someone from San Diego identified Love. Such positive identification is necessary in New York.

Former Vice President Richard Nixon, long a friend of Love and now a New York resident, heard of the problem and rushed to the public health office to provide quick identification and to allow the release of the newsman for transport by air here.

LONG CAREER

Love had covered politics for the San Diego Union more than 25 years, but during his 47 years on the newspaper staff—the longest continuous service of any editorial employee—became expert also on veterans affairs, water resources and highway development.

Love was the second veteran San Diego newspaperman to die within 4 days last week. Harry T. Bishop, 68, retired chief photographer of the San Diego Union and Evening Tribune, died September 10 in a hospital here.

LOCAL POLITICS: MAIL REREGISTRY PLANNED

(By Henry Love)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last politics column written by Henry Love, the San Diego Union's politics writer, who died late Friday night. The column was written before Mr. Love left for the East to cover the American Legion convention in Miami.)

Electoral relief for thousands of San Diegans, who move between elections and fail to realize that their voting franchise doesn't automatically follow them, is in sight. But relief of one problem is piling up others.

Charles J. Sexton, county registrar of voters, fresh from finishing the registration for the November 5 city primary, has begun operations looking toward the October 1 start of mail-type reregistrations. He is a little awed at the proportions of the task that seemed simple when the legislature authorized it.

The new procedure permits the registrar, with the cooperation of the post office, to look at all the address changes filed in the county. He will have to pay 5 cents an individual peek.

When he gets a card he will look to see if the signer is a registered voter. If so, he can send the voter a note asking if he wants to be registered at his new address. If the voter says he does, Sexton will make the address change on the registration and that will be that. The voter will not have to come in and reregister as he does now.

If the voter says he is away only temporarily and expects to resume his old address, the registration will remain the same.

What awes Sexton mainly is the postal estimate on the number of address changes likely to occur annually. The post office told him it might run up to 500,000 and half a million nickels total $25,000.

But it also is expensive to reregister the thousands who move within the county in a year, and tough to listen to the complaints of voters who find on election day that they can't vote because their registrations do not follow their moves under present law.

The long mayoralty ballot and the numerous candidates in other contested races on Tuesday's ballot have roused speculation on the value of ballot position.

In the city election the names go on alphabetically, except that incumbents get top billing. In State elections covering more than one assembly district, incumbents still get top spots but other candidates rotate the upper ranges of the ballot.

Some who claim to know say that the top position is worth 5 to 10 percent more votes than the possessor of the spot would get if he were further down on the ballot.

The range is due to predilection of voters to get their voting done near the top of the list. Thus a top spot might be worth 10 percent to a man who otherwise would be at or near the bottom, but only 5 percent if he was near the top.

The value of the top in a close election readily can be seen. In election of party central committees the alphabetical system is not used. The names of candidates are shaken in a box and first one drawn gets top spot and so on.

As election closes in on the voters, City Clerk Phil Acker again reminded San Diagans that they should not try to write in a name if they are dissatisfied with the choice given them in any contest.

This writing-in will mean the whole ballot will be thrown out, under provisions of the city election law, he said.

One of the First Peace Corps Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the first Peace Corps men, Thomas J. Kincaid, of Seaford, Del., has come home for a brief rest and is visiting with his parents, Clifford and Allene Kincaid.

I include here as part of my remarks an interview which was published by the Seaford (Del.) Leader and Seaford News, on August 9, 1963:

T. J. KINCAID, ONE OF FIRST PEACE CORPSMEN

Thomas J. Kincaid, the 25-year-old son of Clifford and Allene Kincaid, has just returned from 2 years' service with the Peace Corps, spending 19 months of that time in the Philippines. This is a tremendous experience for anyone, and Tom didn't let a single minute of it go to waste. Needless to say, it has left him a very mature adult, wise in the ways of human relations and world understanding.

Tom was born in Durbin, W. Va., but since his father traveled with Du Pont Construction he attended several schools. His final year or so was spent in Woodstock, N.J. High School, where he excelled on the baseball diamond as a pitcher and won the popular vote of students by being elected student council vice president. Tom was graduated in 1956 and entered Bridgewater College in Virginia that fall where he majored in history. His natural athletic ability and his very likable personality kept him a most busy student. In addition to being on the dean's list several time, he was the dorm representative to the student senate; wrote the sports column for the student paper; belonged to photography and science clubs; and was the key pitcher for the baseball team. Incidentally, he once pitched a no-hitter. Tom was graduated in 1961 with a bachelor of arts degree.

The Cincinnati Redlegs had hoped to sign Tom up after his graduation, but that spring he took the Peace Corps test and was accepted for training in July. From then on his ball playing was limited to his new job. While in the Philippines he coached a team in the Island National High School Sports Tournament and they won the baseball championship. Later, changing the game, Tom was a guard on the Peace Corps basketball team that played in a community chest tournament in Manila.

"There were a number of reasons why I joined the Peace Corps. It offered an excellent opportunity for travel and a chance to 'broaden my horizons' concerning world affairs and events; to relate my college experience to what life is really like on a practical level and to be sure, there was an element of adventure involved. The primary factor, however, was the fact that it allowed me to contribute, in some personal way, to a greater degree of understanding between people of different cultures and backgrounds. It used to be extremely frustrating to read the newspapers and see the United States being soundly criticized all over the world by the very nations to whom we had been sending millions of dollars in foreign aid. The main difficulty seemed to be that we dealt mainly with the 'uppercrust' of the population of these countries and never got to know the other 90 percent. I certainly wouldn't go so far as to say that reading 'The Ugly American' was why I joined the Peace Corps but the book certainly reinforced my own thoughts.

"In April 1961 I took the Peace Corps general examination and in July took another test given for people interested specifically in teaching projects. The Peace Corps informed me that I had passed the preliminary tests and was invited to go to Puerto Rico for physical training in preparation for going to the Philippines. On August 27, I went to Washington, D.C., for 5 days of orientation and physical and psychological exams. Following this I went to Puerto Rico with 18 other men for a month of physical training which entailed rock climbing, canoeing, hiking, running, and survival swimming. The objective of all this was to instil a greater degree of self-reliance in each volunteer. For 1 week during this period we lived with Puerto Rican families, an experience which proved of great value when we went to the Philippines as it gave us an idea of what to expect when dealing with people of different cultural roots.

"In October, our group of 19 went to Penn State University for 10 weeks of further orientation regarding U.S. foreign policy, government, history, science, English, and Philippine culture. There we were joined by 7 other men and 21 women who would be going with us. Our project in the Philippines would be to serve as teaching aids or assistants to Filipino elementary school teachers in upgrading the instruction of science and English as a second language. In addition, we would help out where we

could in programs of community development.

"On January 4, 1962, we arrived in Manila and immediately embarked on 4 more weeks of training in Philippine culture and languages. We were then divided into groups of 2, 3, or 4 and given our assignments on the island of Panay in the west central Philippines. I was assigned to the town of Mambusao along with three other volunteers.

"The house was constructed of bamboo and nipa with no electricity, running water, or other modern conveniences. We hired a cook, houseboy, and lavendera, which is a lady who does the laundry. Our salary, or living allowance, was 212 pesos each per month, the equivalent in U.S. dollars being about $50. Out of this we paid all the help, the rent (45 pesos per month) and our personal expenses.

"I spent about 6 hours a day in my school which was the central school for the town. The others went to schools outside the town but within 2 miles of it. We did not have our own classrooms, as such, but merely assisted upon the request of the teachers.

"For recreation, I did quite a bit of reading and hiking. Almost every day I played basketball with the local boys in the town plaza. The nearest theater was 20 miles away so saw a movie once or twice a month.

"We ate Filipino food, mostly rice, although the diet was occasionally supplemented by a can of pork and beans or spaghetti and there were plenty of Coca-Colas, 7-Ups, and Pepsi's. Generally the local food was very good although at times it was difficult to get fresh meat. The local people did not drink much milk and that was what I missed the most.

"There were several amusing incidents, owning mainly to differences in English pronunciation by Filipinos. Once a fellow came to our house and without saying a word to anybody, began to sweep the rooms. Every once in awhile he would start jumping around and making noises like a machine-gun. Somewhat taken aback by all this, we asked who the fellow was and what he was doing. A neighbor replied nonchalantly, 'Oh, he's a policeman.' Of course, this did nothing for our confidence in the local gendarmes. It was not until some time later that we learned that most Filipinos do not use the English letter 'f.' Instead, it is pronounced as 'p' so what our neighbor had really said was that our visitor was a 'foolish man' and not a defender of the peace.

"Filipinos are usually very honest and friendly. Sometimes, though one wonders how a statement or remark should be taken. For example, I was walking down the street toward the local drugstore one day and the druggist was watching me approach. As I got to the store, she said, in all seriousness, 'You know, you look very nice at a distance.'

"For the last 4 months I spent in the Philippines, I was living with a Filipino family who were my best friends and companions. This was the most enjoyable part of my Peace Corps experience. Besides treating me as one of the family, they helped me in such things as learning the local dialect and in getting a realistic view of Filipino customs and traits. In fact, I soon forgot that I was an American and they were Filipinos. I will always be a little homesick-in-reverse for my friends and hope to go back in 5 years or so.

"I have realized innumerable benefits from having served as a Peace Corps volunteer and I have learned a great deal about other people as well as quite a bit about myself. One of the most significant benefits was the occasion my experience afforded for seeing how basically similar people are all over the world. I feel all of us, as human beings, have the same basic needs and desires and a common characteristic is our yearning to be understood and respected. Another thing I learned is that we should, as Americans, have a greater appreciation of the greatness of our own country. We just don't know how well off we are as compared to people in other areas of the world. Personally, I have gained more self-reliance and confidence and my objectives in life have been clarified.

"In closing, I want to say that the Peace Corps was surely an unforgettable experience and I would gladly do it all again, as someday I may. I don't believe we Americans are as soft or as ugly as some people think."

Now that Tom has ended his 2 years with the Corps he is looking forward to earning his masters degree in international relations. He has been accepted at the University of Virginia graduate school for September, but he has applied for a Ford Foundation scholarship and is waiting to hear from that before making a final decision. What does he want to do after college? Why, go to work for the Government in an international agency of some sort.

Tom has a wealth of side interests. He is an avid reader, preferring historical novels and current events. For years he has dabbled in coin collecting and astronomy. Tom even plays a little golf, too. Now that he is at Seaford he will join his family in attending St. John's Methodist Church.

Anyone who wishes to meet this extraordinarily interesting young man will have no trouble finding him at 512 Sussex Avenue. He'd love to talk with you and it would be a few minutes well spent. This article just begins to touch on the vastness of the Peace Corps and Tom's enthusiasm and experience could keep you spellbound for hours.

Value in a Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the September 10 issue of the Wall Street Journal an editorial entitled "Value in a Vacuum" concerning the Supreme Court's decision on Bible reading and prayer recitation in our schools. This excellent editorial clearly illustrates how our Court is getting further and further from its originally intended purposes.

I think this editorial will be of great interest to my colleagues and, under unanimous consent, ask that this be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

VALUE IN A VACUUM

"I have no doubt myself that the (first amendment), as written and adopted, intended that there should be no libel or defamation law in the United States under the U.S. Government, just absolutely none so far as I am concerned."

That is the stated view of Mr. Justice Black, and it reflects a way of thinking which has found no little favor both inside and outside the Supreme Court. Though it has not yet brought an actual ruling that all libel and slander laws are unconstitutional, this "no law means no law" philosophy has affected judicial decisions ranging over a number of other significant issues and promises to influence more.

So it may be useful, as the Supreme Court prepares to start a new session, to recall some remarks of Dean Erwin N. Griswold of Harvard Law School, made at the University of Utah early this year; he finds scant merit in the Court's frequently absolutist approach to constitutional questions.

Justice Black's literal-minded approach may sound at first like a commendably strict interpretation of the Constitution, since the amendment explicitly says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or off the press." Yet the result of a rigid application of the words "no law" is to leave out most of the considerations needed for a correct interpretation of the Constitution.

That result could hardly be more startlingly clear than in the cases of prayer recitations and Bible readings in the schools. Not surprisingly, the Court decisions have given tremendous impetus to moves to eradicate all traces of religion from the schools and from all manifestations of public life as well—even to such ridiculous extremes as banning a stanza of "America" because it refers to God.

As Dean Griswold observes (and these columns have said), this sort of thing is an affront to the long religious tradition so deeply entwined in our history. "Are the Mayflower Compact, Ann Hutchinson, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and William Penn, and many others, no part of our history?" It is an affront to the religious instincts and concepts of the writers of the Constitution themselves.

Still, the Constitution says "no law." But to focus on those words exclusively is to miss the others and hence the whole context. Who shall make no law? Congress. No law about what? "An establishment of religion." Which means, if history means anything, state religion such as existed in a number of places in America at the time the first amendment was adopted. That is what the Constitution forbids.

Congress has in fact made no law respecting an establishment of religion, and local recommended prayer and Bible readings have nothing to do with the Constitution and no business before the Supreme Court. Ironically, however, a supposedly strict construction of the Constitution turns out to be a profound misreading of it.

In view of the consequences, It's also perhaps worth speculating how such attitudes develop. Obviously much depends on the particular thinking of individual justices, but that thinking is not divorced from the temper of the times.

In recent times, among other things, America's traditional tolerance toward minorities has shown a tendency to get twisted; if a person is a member of a minority his rights are sometimes alleged to be superior to the majority's by virtue of his minority status. Thus it is not enough for a child of atheist parents to remain silent or leave the room during voluntary prayer reading; the religious expression of the majority must be stamped out for his sake.

This is plainly a perversion of any rational concept of equal rights and religious freedom, not to mention good manners. Dean Griswold recalls visiting Tunisia, where the overwhelming majority is Moslem.

"While there, I expected to comply with their laws and customs. They are a tolerant people, and did not seek to compel me to participate in any of their religious observances. But it would have seemed most inappropriate to me to have taken advantage of their tolerance and to have sought to interfere with their customs simply because they were not mine." In this country we seem to be losing a sense of the fitness of things.

Another part of the current climate is the existence of a paradox embedded in the so-called absolutist approach in a period noted for "relativism." When people speak of "relativistic" values prevailing today, they

mean that many individuals no longer look for guidance as they once did to the authority of supernatural beliefs or the standards of conduct of the civilized past.

But to cut oneself or one's society off, to say the past has no relevance to the present, the lessons of experience are meaningless to today—surely this is an absolutism of its own. Exactly the kind of absolutism which results in focusing on a couple of striking words to the exclusion of the meaning of the Constitution and the continuity of history and tradition.

To that extent the Supreme Court is reflecting more general attitudes in sociology, economics, and politics. But the prevalence of those attitudes does not make them healthy ones. Not the least of the troubles with such "relativistic absolutism" is that it represents an intellectual emptiness. And political authority no less than nature abhors a vacuum.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Meaning of the Bill of Rights—Address by Hon. Donald Barbeau, Judge, District Court, Fourth Judicial District of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Honorable Donald Barbeau, judge of the district court for the Fourth Judicial District of Minnesota, recently spoke to the students of Roosevelt High School in Minneapolis on the meaning of the Bill of Rights.

Judge Barbeau warned the students that—

Each successive generation must remake the promises contained in the Constitution or it loses its vitality.

I believe that his words have wide relevance. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Ten years of study at Purdue University have quite clearly established that unless we adults in our homes, our schools, and other educational media can affect changes in the attitudes of young people, the true meaning of the American Constitution and the tendency of young people to disregard its importance will continue to gain great influence in our society, to the extent that we Americans may someday lose our great tradition of individual rights. The Purdue studies show conclusively that we are failing to teach our young people the true meaning of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

For example, a 10 year study of 12,000 students shows that 51 percent of those interviewed believe in restricting in some manner freedom of the press; 42 percent approve of the third degree; 30 percent are opposed to the right to petition; 25 percent would restrict freedom of speech in one manner or another; a shocking 60 percent would give authorities a strict right of censorship; and an unbelievable 10 percent would abolish trial by jury in criminal cases.

Something is seriously lacking when we American adults fail to communicate to the next generation our great constitutional guarantees, such as freedom of speech; freedom of the press; religious freedom; peaceful assembly; the right to petition; the right to be secure in your home and person from unreasonable search and seizure; a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury in the district where in the crime was committed; and a prohibition against excessive bail or cruel and inhuman punishment.

All of these rights are inherent to our democracy and if we give up any one of them we, in effect, give up all of them.

We Americans, apparently, are taking our liberties and these individual rights for granted. Liberty and the rights that flow therefrom constitute a living thing and must come from within ourselves. Our forefathers recognized that each individual had the right to a sovereign inner life. Liberty, as it prevails in a free nation, is the acceptance of the idea that in each person there is an inner life which is worthy of preservation and protection and the primary job of a free government is to protect and preserve such individual inner life. Liberty and individual rights have a unique quality in that they seek to accomplish no fixed end but to provide a process of living by which each man can work out for himself his own life and his own concept of his own destiny, provided he stays within an area which will allow his fellow man to share such rights equally with him.

We cannot have our great freedoms, as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, unless we earn them daily and unless we accept the moral task that they impose. An effective promise of individual rights cannot be just a group of words contained in the Constitution, but only in the individual spirit of each of us who would cherish it. Each successive generation must remake the promises contained in the Constitution or it loses its vitality. Each day of free government is a new day and liberty must be given new life each day.

When the survey conducted by Purdue University found that high school graduates are saying, "What is the Bill of Rights?" or, "I never heard of them or looked at them," something is wrong.

History shows that just having a wonderful constitution and the bill of rights is not enough to sustain a free government for a free people. Those who just write a constitution or a bill of rights and do not cultivate it, nourish it or protect it, soon lose it. Germany under the Weimar Republic composed the finest constitution ever written, but all their people did was write it, not believe in it. Hitler destroyed it in 24 hours. Russia wrote a constitution that reads better than ours in the year 1906, but we all know that it is no longer in existence. Spain wrote one in 1876 that is no longer in existence. Mexico wrote one in 1857 that is no longer in existence. None of these constitutions exist today because they were merely written and then forgotten. Freedom and liberty have no secrets; they are neither myth nor magic; they are a democratic political fact for a particular nation whenever and wherever there are a sufficient number of individuals within that nation with the required strength, courage, and intelligence to make freedom and liberty a live, daily point of faith for each of them in the conduct of their everyday individual lives.

Our liberties, our freedoms, our very form of government were brought into being and kept alive by the law, even more than by the sword.

Today we are spending billions of dollars to conquer space so as to protect our country from aggression, but this alone will not keep us free. Our rights under law which make us free are the real protection. A free people, devoted to law and justice, can never be conquered.

Dictators have come and gone. World conquerors have lived their short, hectic day and then drifted to oblivion; world emperors have had their day of glory, only to be shattered by the not to be denied demand for freedom. In the end we will find that the one thing that will hold a free people together and forever free is the thought chiseled in stone above the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court—"Equal Justice Under Law."

The Bill of Rights in its entirety is the most precious heritage that we have and if we infringe on any part of it as to any one individual, then the whole system fails.

We must remember that the only kind of real liberty that can preserve our government is not just liberty for ourselves but that we be just as interested in the rights of our neighbor or, as Justice Douglas said, "Freedom is the man next door."

We adults must renew our faith in the principles of the Bill of Rights and communicate daily these principles of toleration and respect to the next generation of Americans. Because, quoting again Justice Douglas, "The reality of freedom in our daily lives is shown by the attitudes and policies of people toward each other in the very block where they live. There we will find the real measure of a living Bill of Rights."

The United States has practically the oldest continuing form of free government on earth today. Partly we have succeeded because our Founding Fathers laid down a masterful plan; we have continued because men of ability have volunteered to make that plan work. To preserve this miracle of stability and to transmit it to new generations should be the undertaking of all adult Americans.

The new generation of Americans must be given the message that, in spite of human frailties, in our country today the lowliest person enjoys a broader opportunity to possess happiness, more equal justice, more protection of life, liberty, and property and a greater personal freedom than has ever been provided for man by any other governmental system in recorded history.

Farm Labor Facts—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, during the harvest year 1963 I believe the growers of California have made a serious effort to curtail their utilization of bracero labor considering the expressed interest of a number of Members of Congress in limiting this labor source.

If it is the bona fide intention of Congress to promote agricultural employment rather than to desecrate it, I believe that responsible Members will not seek to impress catastrophic change on a highly successful California industry in their efforts to accomplish social change.

The following statistics indicate that California farmers are working with Congress. I certainly hope that in the next few weeks the Congress can enact meaningful legislation which will show an attitude of Congress cooperative with the farmers:

TABLE I.—*Employment of contract foreign workers in California agriculture by county and month* [1]

JANUARY-DECEMBER 1962

County	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
State total	17,080	17,280	17,270	19,100	40,140	44,030	35,730	39,430	72,930	62,940	20,230	13,410
Imperial	6,230	6,130	4,850	2,500	3,910	3,310	2,090	880	970	3,540	6,230	4,090
Riverside, East [2]	2,220	2,110	2,700	2,860	3,520	3,830	2,550	880	1,260	1,730	2,120	2,310
Los Angeles	820	710	740	700	1,380	1,230	920	660	390	300	330	230
Orange	950	1,070	1,110	1,470	3,450	3,700	3,110	2,730	2,850	2,060	1,070	970
Riverside, West	380	760	880	790	300	200	740	220	260	160	10	90
San Bernardino	750	840	900	900	870	620	380	400	990	1,160	350	530
San Diego	1,310	1,150	1,130	1,000	1,240	1,400	1,280	1,270	1,290	1,290	1,380	860
San Luis Obispo	230	240	270	290	640	740	670	730	710	670	290	280
Santa Barbara	1,010	930	960	1,010	1,520	1,660	1,550	1,230	1,170	1,130	620	780
Ventura	3,130	3,340	3,730	3,680	4,390	3,390	2,960	2,490	3,280	5,530	3,130	1,310
Alameda					30	220	210	290	570	470		
Contra Costa				250	680	620	30	320	970	1,350	70	
Monterey				1,360	8,500	10,500	8,640	8,700	11,200	9,250	3,100	1,550
San Benito						150	50	100	1,230	2,230	130	
San Mateo						10	10	10	520	560	500	200
Santa Clara					590	450	240	410	2,640	2,180	10	
Santa Cruz					990	1,500	1,400	3,290	3,650	1,590	540	210
Fresno							2,100	1,990	1,370	520		
Kern						90	640					
Kings							300			190		
Madera									170	120		
Merced						200	1,300	1,730	2,220	1,240		
San Joaquin				2,170	5,010	5,520	2,100	3,030	12,300	11,400		
Stanislaus					500	1,190	430	840	3,720	3,750	120	
Tulare						200						
Butte					280	220	120	620	940	300	10	
Colusa					320	340	190	470	580	130	40	
Sacramento				80	470	580		310	3,270	2,050		
Solano				40	680	750	470	970	3,450	2,430		
Sutter					40	100	20	20	2,400	1,090	40	
Tehama	50				40	130	90					
Yolo					730	1,140	800	3,820	8,550	4,520		
Yuba					60	40	40	1,020	10		40	

[1] Data are for weeks ending nearest the 15th of the month.
[2] Coachella and Palo Verde Valleys.

Source: Weekly farm labor reports.

Prepared by Research and Statistics Section, Department of Employment, State of California, Sept. 18, 1963.

TABLE II.—*Employment of contract foreign workers in California agriculture by county and month* [1]

JANUARY-SEPTEMBER 1963

County	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September
State total	11,310	11,240	12,350	16,390	29,730	39,260	34,440	34,460	54,010
Imperial	4,670	4,590	1,540	520	1,320	2,550	750	250	140
Riverside, East [2]	1,400	1,460	2,220	1,530	2,860	3,430	2,100	1,130	1,010
Los Angeles	380	540	540	1,090	1,360	1,250	780	480	440
Orange	710	670	980	2,460	3,410	3,900	2,970	2,830	2,730
Riverside, West	160	300	520	580	240	240	490	110	40
San Bernardino	690	750	780	860	750	800	560	350	210
San Diego	590	460	320	460	580	920	1,030	1,130	1,080
San Luis Obispo	180	170	220	320	420	630	620	700	660
Santa Barbara	680	430	610	690	1,270	1,500	1,610	1,260	990
Ventura	1,630	1,880	2,650	2,870	3,380	4,260	3,720	3,320	4,400
Alameda						180	220	420	460
Contra Costa			70	350	480	580	50	410	640
Monterey	10		810	2,700	9,100	9,800	9,300	9,800	10,400
San Benito					70	100	100	100	1,020
San Mateo	90					20	20	60	240
Santa Clara					150	300	260	430	1,800
Santa Cruz	120				700	1,300	1,100	2,250	2,350
Fresno							700	2,150	1,550
Kern						250	1,250		
Kings							170		
Madera						40	20		60
Merced						130	1,480	1,710	2,330
San Joaquin			1,090	1,800	3,240	5,060	2,300	2,100	8,900
Stanislaus					30	610	700	810	1,970
Tulare						180			
Butte				160	150	150	80	240	570
Colusa					120	290	260	150	300
Glenn								30	40
Sacramento					70	200	30	50	1,680
Solano						180	780	710	1,850
Sutter						10	50	180	1,320
Tehama					30			40	
Yolo						400	910	1,240	4,830
Yuba							30	20	

[1] Data are for weeks ending nearest the 15th of the month.
[2] Coachella and Palo Verde Valleys.

Source: Weekly farm labor reports.

Prepared by Research and Statistics Section, Department of Employment, State of California, Sept. 18, 1963.

Rugged Individualism Gives Way to Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. Perry Swisher is the Republican State senator from Bannock County in Idaho and is publisher of the Intermountain, one of Idaho's most intelligent and lively newspapers. Mr. Swisher writes an extremely thoughtful column, "The 38th Precinct," which appears in his own paper and also in the Lewiston Tribune. I was especially impressed by his latest column, "Rugged Individualism Gives Way to Progress." I wish to call special attention to the beginning idea of this column; an idea in the fine tradition of education through free discussion so eloquently espoused by John Stuart Mill:

The ill wind from the far right does blow some good. We are free enough, barely, to learn even from those movements that oppose freedom. In fact, it is the interplay among noisy causes, not the calm in the middle that keeps us free.

I ask unanimous consent to have this excellent column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 38TH PRECINCT: RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM GAVE WAY TO PROGRESS

(By Perry Swisher)

The ill wind from the far right does blow some good. We are free enough, barely, to learn even from those movements that oppose freedom. In fact, it is the interplay among noisy causes, and not the calm in the middle that keeps us free. If by the middle we mean avoiding all causes outside the general consensus, then life in the middle is so dull and accepted so thoughtlessly that freedom doesn't have much meaning there. The citizen who accepts things as they are—including the things everybody wants or is against—doesn't need freedom, even in a dictatorship. He doesn't use it.

One complaint from the far right throws a valuable light on the nature of radicalism. I refer to the one right-wing tenet that is essentially antibusiness and pro-Government: That the private wizards of finance and not the Government determine the rate of issuance of currency, manage the public debt including Federal Reserve discount rates, and control the relationsip between bullion and the value of money.

The world of private finance does make key decisions about currency and debt financing that were once solely Government decisions. But to object to this is out of character for the extremists whose basic philosophy is that Government is evil and private economic considerations are paramount, a view that brings them down on the side of segregation, income tax repeal, withdrawal from the U.N., etc.

What they say about money is surprisingly like the views expressed late in the last century by William Jennings Bryan and Eugene Debs, by Populists and Socialists and the people who were once as far to the left as Birchers are to the right. This is the important continuous thread that indicates, once again, that today's recationary is the grandson of yesterday's reformer.

The link is significant. Examined, it could enlighten the automatic liberal who regards the Birchers as simply demented, who is baffled at BARRY GOLDWATER's popularity, who is incredulous as the rise of the student conservatives, and for whom Franklin Roosevelt was the infallible prophet of modern liberalism. How could today's rightists have inherited that issue, unresolved and basically unaltered, from yesterday's ultra-liberals?

Why is money management a mysterious and largely private rite? The far right contend that this subject is taboo in our schools. Their dislike for the New York power complex brings the neglected topic into their narrow view, but actually it is only one in a list of troops that are taboo because they are so controversial. If schoolchildren could cut their teeth on the facts of economic change, making up the list, the liberal cause would have far more to gain—and retain—than the right.

A young man takes a summer construction job for $115 a week and gets a check for $79.04. He is then ready for the Goldwater Club. Good or bad, every gouge out of that check has a history, but its history wasn't taught. Why did he have to join a union? What did unions ever do for him? He doesn't know. What will the union do for him? The union may no longer know, though once it did. Why all that U.S. income tax? What good is it doing? He doesn't know. That State withholding tax. Does everybody pay it? What would medicare do to that social security bite? Double it? He thinks so. How much unemployment insurance does he pay so someone else can loaf? His employer pays that, but he doesn't know.

Minimum wage and hour laws and collective bargaining helped underwrite the unprecedented living standard he grew up under. The subject was verboten in school, and at home (and this is human nature) papa was a self-made man who did it all himself. Social security closed the poor farm, and did it while old age itself was becoming a fringe benefit. Nobody told our boy.

So, to him, Government is too big, wasteful, impersonal, and it should be every man for himself. Yes, there's Government fat and callousness. But education, the best substitute for those experiences, that range from crippling to fatal, has been denied in the area of knowledge as to what economic progress was made through Government.

Our young man didn't travel by buggy or study by kerosene lamp but he appreciates that cars and planes and lights spell progress. He has never seen a breadline, a hobo jungle, a WPA crew, a bank failure, a tax sale, a foreclosure, a typhoid epidemic, a blacklist, a company store or house or scrip, a workhouse, a sweatshop. Their absence also spells progress, some of it temporary progress if the new generation doesn't know how they went and why. Economics, not nuclear weaponry, is the best kept secret of our time.

Research, Development, and the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include an address, "Research, Development, and the Federal Budget," delivered by William D. Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget on September 11, 1963, before the 17th National Conference on the Administration of Research at Estes Park, Colo.

By reason of his years of dedicated service, and his broad knowledge of and experience with government, the views of Mr. Carey who, by the way, was born in my district, are significant and worthy of deep consideration.

The address follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Address of William D. Carey, Executive Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget before the 17th National Conference on the Administration of Research, Stanley Hotel, Estes Park, Colo., September 11, 1963)

I take for my opening text the observation by Malcolm Muggeridge that human beings suffer more as a result of being unduly serious than of being unduly flippant; their worst blunders arise out of their solemnity, not out of their mirth.

The relationship of government to science in the postwar years is a case in point. Without very much visible deliberation, but with much solemnity, we have in little more than a decade elevated science to a role of extraordinary influence in national policy; and now that it is there, we are not very certain what to do with it. We have evolved a variety of rationalizations for what we have done and for what we doubtless will continue to do: science for national security, science for a better life, science for a growing economy, and science as a cultural end in itself. What we have done less well is to employ research support as an effective agent in upgrading higher education not just for a few leading institutions but at its broad base, provide safeguards against expediency in influencing career and vocational commitments, and establish a truly competitive marketplace within which science and technology must justify itself and its costs in fair competition with other social priorities and preferences.

We have gone through a whole generation of science administrators and political executives who developed ulcers in bringing science and technology to its present dimensions. Now we are inducing ulcers in another generation of scientists, administrators, economists, and politicians who are trying to solve the problems left by their predecessors. Is big science and technology for space and defense in fact bleeding the private economy of the incentive and capability for innovation and creativity? Where is the high-grade intellectual manpower coming from to make good the commitments we are so freely entering into for the next decade? How are we to make certain that rising expenditures for research and development are not lost by dwindling productivity and quality in research? Can some way be found to ensure an adequate spinoff from space and defense research for the benefit of civilian technology? Have we approached the time for a healthy shaking down of our Federal science and technology for purposes of taking stock and consolidating our efforts where the priorities lie?

In short, reaction is at last setting in. It is apparent in the scientific community, perhaps because of fears lest major programs and enormous hardware costs will push less exotic science to one side. It is apparent also in the executive branch of the Federal Government, where the budgetary pinch is becoming acute. And it is perhaps most spectacularly apparent in the Congress, where a mounting wall of frustration and uneasiness is being reflected in a rash of proposals to bring science and technology to heel, possibly reflecting a thought uttered by the quotable Mr. Justice Holmes, who

said, "We need education in the obvious more than investigation of the obscure."

The point I want to make is that Government's part in the research and development business has now reached the point where it commands attention because of its sheer size and propensity for growth. From here on, we will have to be more choosy in what we do, and better prepared to supply answers to questions about marginal costs and benefits. The budget this year for research and development is a husky $15 billion. Its growth potential dwarfs anything else in the budget. Someone has figured out that the doubling time for research and development as a fraction of national income is only 7 years, and that if this continued for 30 years research and development would rise to one-half of the national income. Dr. James Killian estimates that on the basis of present trends, total national expenditures for research and development could exceed $40 billion by 1970, with the Federal Government tagged for most of it.

In my judgment, without for a moment discounting the talent of the research and development community for finding new and expensive frontiers, these trends are not realistic. In absolute terms, I expect the level of Federal support for research and development to rise, but at a diminishing rate which could produce a leveling-off of the budget for science and technology over the next few years. Nevertheless, even a moderate upward trend is not to be taken for granted. Funds for research and development have come so easily during the past decade that in some quarters of the scientific community we find a state of mind that assumes that the miracle of the loaves and the fishes will go on indefinitely, and that the mere assertion of a valid scientific need will suffice to turn on the financial gusher once more. I should like to make it plain that the justification for the sixteenth and seventeenth billion will have to be very different from the justification which sufficed for the first billion. We have arrived at the point in the Government's budget where the trends of the past are meaningless. A budget which quadrupled in the 1940's and doubled again in the 1950's is extremely unlikely to behave in that style in the 1960's, even for science and technology. And so that next billion dollars will come under both executive and legislative scrutiny of a kind previously unknown. And the scientific community will have to take a major responsibility for being sure that Government chooses to put its dollars behind the best of many choices.

I would further hazard the view that this tightening of the Federal purse strings will cause some convulsions in the scientific community. When dollars for big science become scarcer, the science community can be expected to break ranks and form clusters of opinion and dissent to a greater extent than is the case to date. If a massive program for high energy nuclear physics costing $6 to $8 billion, or a development program for a supersonic commercial air transport costing even $1 billion, has the effect of heralding the displacement of other urgent claims for Federal support, we can expect the fur to fly and the issues to be illuminated with far more pungency than we have seen thus far. And this is precisely as it ought to be. This is the competitive marketplace at last.

To be sure, with this comes a new hazard, and one which is already visible. This is the danger of injecting the technique of the "pork barrel" into the area of science and technology. While I run some risk of excommunication for even bringing the matter up, it is a risk someone needs to take. We are talking about large sums of money, highly attractive physical plant, research tools to tantalize any self-respecting scientist with a forgiveable eye on a Nobel Prize. We are speaking of national prestige science and technology which can be vital to the intellectual standing of a university or a group of universities. Where the tools are located, where the facilities are built, how funds are disbursed to equalize research opportunity among the various sections of the country—all these are very real issues in the era of big science. Scientists and educators with all this at stake are already learning how to bring pressure on their political representatives on their behalf, first for the approval of the programs and then for the location of facilities and the disbursing of operating funds. As new thresholds of research and experimentation materialize requiring highly sophisticated hardware, this phenomenon will become a force to be reckoned with. If I may say so, we can expect to face this not only in the area of applied science and technology, but even within that cloistered and rarefied world concerned with basic research. But if I am right about all this, and I think I am, one result will be to make science somewhat less luminous and other-wordly than it has been to date, and add a slight tinge of green to its halo.

As a more or less living example of the type of people who work on the Federal budget, I should like to venture some general observations about that operation insofar as it touches science and technology.

To begin with, the budgetary process is the closest thing we have in Government to a systematic effort at resource planning. Imperfect as it is, we would probably have to invent it if it did not already exist. What it provides is a round-the-year examination and reexamination of needs and resources in a changing society, in a setting of economic purposefulness and a Presidential program of political action. It is a process which stresses challenge and the evaluation of responses to that challenge. It reaches for rational criteria against which to sift competing claims and demands, and it aims toward a workable synthesis of goals within a financial and economic plan. In our framework of government, the budget process is the President's chief tool for facing up to the issue of what must be done now and what must wait. Underlying the exercise of this process there must, of course, be some basic strategy, and this will vary with Presidents and their public philosophies. One President may view the budget as a built-in maginot line against further extension of the arc of public action and intervention, while another will recognize it as an opportunity to advance our society purposefully in many fields of action important to both internal and external progress.

The Bureau of the Budget has never agreed with suggestions that it should establish within its structure a Division of Science, staffed with qualified scientists and engineers, to review R. & D. proposals. We prefer to do our work by using a broad approach which examines program issues in the field of science and technology from the standpoints of public policy, soundness of justification, the availability of money and manpower, and the balance of financial effort as among alternative program commitments. To be sure, our analysis frequently requires input of sophisticated professional judgment as to technical feasibility, state of the art, and possible alternatives to a proposed line of development, as for example in the moon program or in the missile field. In recent years, however, we have been able to obtain this kind of judgment through the Office of Science and Technology and the President's Science Advisory Committee. We have also arranged each year to undertake an overview of selected fields of science with the objective of relating levels of effort and support in particularly vital areas of science and technology to our general budgetary planning. This year, for example, we selected the areas of atmospheric science, oceanography, water research, high energy nuclear physics, basic science, and science information for special review, and we conducted this exercise jointly with the office of the President's Science Adviser. I might say that the budget review process is not slanted toward exposing the weaknesses and follies of science proposals, although at times it has that result. But the process we employ is also calculated to bring out situations where we feel that there are distortions and imbalances in the Government's support of science and technology and education, and in such instances we look for corrective solutions even though this might actually run the totals up.

I would like to be able to assure this select company that the budget process employs an ideal combination of criteria which guarantees a fully rational exercise in decision-making where we are dealing with science and technology. The truth is that we have a long way to travel before achieving that utopia. There are still too many variables, too many unknowns, to leave us comfortable. We have no way to measure satisfactorily the potential yield to civilian technology from military and space R. & D. We lack a dependable data to judge whether we are approaching—or have already reached—the point where Government-supported science and technology is displacing or impeding private investment in the R. & D. which feeds economic growth and creates the new products and markets needed for an economy on the path to full employment. Our crystal ball is still very foggy in forecasting what all this scientific and technical exuberance may mean in accelerating automation with all its implications on the mix of skills and utilization of our basic labor force. After 12 years of the National Science Foundation, we are as far away as ever from any clue as to how much basic research should be supported, year in and year out, as a national purpose, and we continue in that area to depend too much on the oversimplified formula of budgeting for some rough percentage of the worthwhile acceptable research proposals that are expected to roll in. We have found no absolute answers to the dilemma of priorities when we are faced with a well-reasoned but vastly expensive long-range program in high energy nuclear physics and simultaneously programs for major outlays for oceanography, supersonic aircraft development, and the moon program; how does one assign relative values to the spectrum of opportunities to advance knowledge? James Reston, of the New York Times, has seen fit to draw attention to the dilemma of priorities in a piece entitled "Kennedy and the Scientists: The Quiet War." It is not a war at all, but an abundance of opportunities which Government itself has invited and which only Government can seize for the benefit of its people. The problem is that Government today cannot take the easy way of recognizing them all and endowing science and technology with an unlimited drawing account. As I said earlier, the 16th and 17th billion are harder to come by than the first. Our problem is an embarrassment of intellectual riches which is not matched by the affluence to employ them fully. While Mr. Reston is entitled to his doubts about the adequacy of the Government's method for reaching sound choices, it is my view that the difficulty here is not one of inventing more superauthorities but rather one of organizing research about research, of developing more adequate insights into cost-benefit relationships, of illuminating our value analysis so that we can with greater confidence strike a balance between being first in high energy accelerators and being first in education and in decent living and job opportunity. I do not think that Government alone can reach these answers, but perhaps Government can—and indeed I believe it must—be as proportionately lavish in stimulating this kind of intellectual inquiry as it

has been in endowing science and technology.

Perhaps, after all, Mr. Justice Holmes had the right perspective. He observed, half a century ago:

"If I am right, it will be a slow business for our people to reach rational views, assuming that we are allowed to work peaceably to that end. But as I grow older I grow calm. If I feel what are perhaps an old man's apprehensions, that competition from new races will cut deeper than workingmen's disputes and will test whether we can hang together and fight; if I feel that we are running through the world's resources at a pace that we cannot keep, I do not lose my hopes. I do not pin my dreams for the future to my country or even to my race. I think it probable that civilization somehow will last as long as I care to look ahead—perhaps with smaller numbers, but perhaps also bred to greatness and splendor by science. I think it not improbable that man, like the grub that prepares a chamber for the winged thing it never has seen but is to be—that man may have cosmic destinies that he does not understand. And so beyond the vision of battling races and an impoverished earth, I catch a dreaming glimpse of peace."

Vietnam Trip Linked to Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of Friday, September 27, 1963, had two articles which attracted my attention. One comment was by Mr. Fletcher Knebel, who even in jest, properly diagnosed the tax bill recently passed by the House when he made this remark in his column, "Potomac Fever":

The House votes an $11-billion tax reduction. That's two bucks for you and me—and $10,999,999,998 for a bunch of guys who don't need it.

The other article was by Joseph Kraft in regard to the Vietnam trip, which likewise he properly diagnoses. His article follows:

VIETNAM TRIP LINKED TO POLITICS

(By Joseph Kraft)

Senator GOLDWATER's sudden spurt and the President's western tour are not the only signs that the presidential election campaign is nearly upon us. There is also coming into view the familiar tidying-up process that, every 4 years, becomes the touchstone of American foreign policy.

An important case in point is the so-called factfinding mission to South Vietnam of Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor. There have been, to be sure, conflicting reports—from Saigon on the one hand, and from the field installations on the other—as to the progress of the military campaign against the Viet Cong. A fresh, firsthand look by the President's principal defense advisers will not come amiss. But the real background of the McNamara-Taylor mission is political.

At least some of the American military are clearly unhappy with the trend of U.S. policy in South Vietnam. Working through the usual journalistic channels, the Pentagon-leak artists have been putting out stories purporting to show that the State Department, in showing its coolness toward the Diem government, has been interfering with the prosecution of the war. So far the leaks are only skirmishes in a tug-of-war between State and the military over Vietnam policy. But trumped up and oversimplified, they could easily become the basis for a political attack, combining the charges that the administration was soft on communism, and paid no heed to professional military counsel.

The underlying aim of the McNamara-Taylor mission is to make a public show of consultation with the military. In addition, Secretary McNamara will presumably try to block out a line of policy to which the military can subscribe. Thus committed, the soldiers will be at least somewhat constrained from sniping at their Government. By so much, the President will have neutralized the danger of political attack.

A similar political caution is evident in the handling of the Soviet bid to buy American wheat. Acceptance of the Russian gambit is manifestly in this country's interest. It can be justified for its beneficial effect on the balance of payments alone. But fear of being vulnerable to political charges of trading with the enemy has caused the White House to move with circumspection. Instead of snapping up the Russian offer, the President is allowing farm interests in the Congress to build up pressure for making the wheat deal. And even if the President finally bows to the pressure, it is certain that he will take out political insurance by emphasizing that the wheat deal is a one-shot operation, without general significance for American trade with Russia.

Another holding operation is being conducted in trade with the European Common Market. Political considerations have debarred the administration from making the only good response to the Common Market's discriminatory poultry tariffs. That would have been an undoing of last year's increase in American tariffs on glass and carpets—a gesture of liberalization that would have created a climate for European reduction of agricultural levies. Instead, the administration has decided to pay back the Europeans by retaliation. The chief present concern is to work out with the Europeans an agreement on the amount of damage done to this country by loss of the poultry markets. That amount would govern the extent of American retaliation. In that way, retaliation would not beget counterretaliation, and a protectionist cycle.

By their very nature, holding operations are not pretty, and it is tempting to decry the constraints placed on foreign policy by domestic politics. Tempting, but not realistic. For the world has shrunk to the point where foreign relations cast a long shadow over the domestic life of all nations—and notably the United States. Inevitably, foreign policy has become a principal staple of domestic politics. And if it ever existed, the day is long since done when politics could stop at the water's edge.

Sale of Wheat to the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the question of whether the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union is currently receiving much attention in the news. There seems little doubt that in accordance with our no-win policy in the cold war that our Government will permit the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union at a subsidized price.

I have been pleased to read over the weekend three eloquent editorials which drive home important arguments against bailing the Communists out of their economic difficulties brought on by a system which cannot match the productive capacity of our great free enterprise system.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorials: "Fattening Up Our Enemies" which appeared in the New Hampshire Manchester Union Leader on September 27, 1963; "Our Policy Helps the Reds" which appeared in the Augusta Chronicle of Augusta, Ga., on September 28, 1963; and "Shall We Help Russia?" a Jefferson Standard Broadcasting editorial dated September 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Sept. 27, 1963]

FATTENING UP OUR ENEMIES

The Kennedy-backed proposal to reverse our policy and sell wheat to Soviet Russia is just as insane as feeding a wild beast that is out to destroy you. The Communist agricultural system is a dismal and horrible failure. Collectivized slave farmers just don't raise food.

We are now going to make good on this deficiency of the Communists, allowing them to divert manpower from the farms to the munition factories, where they are building the weapons of war to destroy this country.

The Communist agricultural system is in such a mess that it takes 52 percent of the population to raise sufficient food. In this country, only about one person out of 20 is employed in agriculture and yet we have an enormous surplus.

Nobody is starving in Russia, so our wheat sale it not a matter of being humanitarian. It simply represents the greed of some U.S. businessmen to make money and the administration's desire to be able to say it got rid of the wheat surplus which has been piling up in this country, due to the crazy governmental policies in Washington.

With this wheat purchased from the United States, the Soviet will be able to make its crazy system much more palatable to the average Russians. It will (1) take pressure off of the government and (2) it will release manpower for the armament plans.

Only the left wingers and the theoretical planners around Kennedy could think up a crazy scheme like this.

If the Russians do pay us for this wheat, it will be in money produced by the slaves in the Soviet Union.

When the test ban treaty was passed, this newspaper warned our readers that it was just the beginning of a number of concessions to Russia for which we would get nothing in return and which would result, in the end, in building up and strengthening the Communists for their final onslaught to destroy the United States and to enslave all of us.

Publisher.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Sept. 28, 1963]

OUR POLICY HELPS THE REDS

In its implied support of a plan to permit the sale of American grain to the Soviet bloc, the U.S. Government again is permit-

ting itself to be motivated by emotionalism rather than by the hard realities of international life.

It is also conning itself into accepting the deluding belief that our benefit from foreign trade, no matter with what country it is to be undertaken, is worth all the future headaches and heartaches bolstering of communism's faltering economy may induce.

Examined under the cold and penetrating light of reality, the economic shot in the arm that extensive trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites will provide the United States will be a mighty expensive price to pay for the windfall the Communist countries receive from our generous gesture.

And generous is the word. For not only is trade with the Communists unnecessary, it is unwholesome—from our standpoint.

Few, if any residents of the Communist nations, will ever be permitted to know that they are enjoying free world grain, whether it is obtained from the United States, Canada, or Australia. Nor, do we imagine, is any fanfare made by the Soviet officials of the fact when machinery or other commodities arrive from this country or other Western nations.

The effect is to create a condition of satisfaction in the minds of the Russian and satellite peoples that all is well with the Soviet system. Yet, the reverse is true. The Soviet agriculture program has failed miserably, and routine commodities produced in the Soviet Union cannot compare in quality or efficiency with their Western counterparts.

Not only, then, do we play into the psychological hands of the Kremlin by permitting their subjects to believe their well-filled stomachs are the courtesy of the Communist system, we will create a situation which can be ever more dangerous to our well-being than the perpetuation of that myth.

By trading with the Communists we are helping to strengthen the Soviet Union's basic industries. Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York, the solon who sounded the alarm on the use of Cuba as a Soviet missile base, said recently that as late as 1961 Russian industry was still so backward that two-thirds of all automobiles in the country, one-fourth of all construction machinery and one-third of all metal-cutting tools had been idled by shoddy components and lack of spare parts. Then, at a time when Soviet officials would normally have had their hands full with their domestic problems, the Western nations stepped up their exports to the Soviet bloc. These, said KEATING, now top $4 billion a year, with "technologically advanced machinery, even entire factories, accounting for more than half the total."

The Battle Act, passed in 1951, called for termination of all U.S. economic and military assistance to any nation that ships embargoed items to hostile nations, specifically the Soviet bloc. However, except for arms and implements of war, a loophole, said KEATING, allows the White House to ignore the act if "unusual circumstances" should make it detrimental to U.S. security to cut off aid. Nineteen aid-receiving governments, the New York Senator said, have ignored the Battle Act some 33 times, and in every case the State Department has persuaded the White House that "unusual circumstances" were involved.

That seems to be the situation now that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman all have expressed interest in lowering the trade bars with the Soviets to permit the sale of some of this Nation's subsidized wheat.

Instead of helping the Communists in their determined bid for world domination, the United States and its allies should adopt the realistic attitude that so long as we provide the Soviets with commodities it does not have or cannot successfully produce, we are assisting them to utilize their industrial and agricultural manpower—needed sorely elsewhere—in the production of weapons and strategic equipment.

The NATO countries, along with Japan and Australia, control two-thirds of the world's industrial capacity. They have the economic force to put communism on the defensive.

The United States and its allies, as KEATING said, must make use of this force

---

[From the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Sept. 26, 1963]

SHALL WE HELP RUSSIA?

All reliable information from behind the Iron Curtain indicates that the socialist economy is failing. But every time such news is received, some well-meaning Americans are ready to rush in and help the Soviet bloc out of its difficulties.

Senator HUMPHREY's proposal that the United States change its trade policies and sell surplus American wheat to the Soviet Union strikes us as being in that class. The Latta amendment passed in 1961 discourages the sale of farm products to Russia, and its author says any sales without repealing the amendment would be illegal. He admits, however, that the President may have authority to issue a permit for the export of wheat to the Soviet Union.

If this is done, it will play into Khrushchev's hands. It has been suggested that one of his reasons for suddenly pressing so hard for the test ban treaty is that his civilian economy is in such bad condition that he must reduce military expenditures or face a possible crisis at home.

One of the recent indications was the report of a bread shortage in Russia. This could be serious in a country in which the chief food in the diet is bread. In spite of all his rosy predictions about the bumper wheat crops, this bread shortage has forced Khrushchev to buy 200 million bushels of wheat from Canada. He has not even inquired about the possibility of buying American wheat, but Senator HUMPHREY appears willing to offer it before Russia indicates a desire to buy.

If his motive is merely to cut down the American surplus, he is being shortsighted, because the wheat would be a tremendous help to Khrushchev, but the benefit profit to the United States would be very small.

If Mr. HUMPHREY's motive is humanitarian, we think it is misplaced. The Soviet people are plagued by shortages, but they are not suffering. They are irritated, uncomfortable, and restive. They complain about food, about the poor quality of consumer goods, about the inefficiency of the topheavy bureaucracy. Our tactics should be to make them more dissatisfied rather than less.

The collective farms have failed everywhere they have been tried, from Cuba to Kowloon. Now is our chance to let it be proved to the world as well as to the people of the Socialist bloc.

The Soviet economic squeeze is so tight that Khrushchev is resorting to all kinds of improvisations, such as allowing people to make a capitalistic private profit and then tightening the screws with a semi-military control.

If anything can topple the Red monolith, it will be the failure of the Socialist economy, and all signs indicate that it is tottering.

Now that we have caught it off balance, we ought to give it the shove that will send it crashing to its rotten foundation. We should not prop it up.

Time To Protect Pedalers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the campaign to promote improved physical fitness is gaining increased support throughout our Nation. The accent is on youth but hundreds of thousands of adults, too, are responding to the leadership of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, the YMCA, and the other agencies, both State and private, which are engaged in this effort. I am glad to note a renewal of interest in one of the most salutary of recreational activities—bicycling.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the following editorial from the Aiken (S.C.) Standard & Review:

TIME TO PROTECT PEDALERS

At the risk of putting the bicycle in the spinach category—as something that's good for you—the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, with the personal endorsement of President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower's heart specialist, Paul Dudley White, is recommending cycling for a prominent spot in the Nation's school fitness program of 1963–64.

In an exhaustive, 55-page treatise on the subject of cycling now being sent to its membership of over 34,000 coaches, physical education instructors, athletic, and recreation directors in primary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and civic recreation bureaus, the association gives full recognition to the fact that fitness comes faster when means employed is fun. In other words, the AAHPER is firmly on the side of fun and regards the bike as its embodiment.

The booklet urges and advises on the formation of bicycle clubs, on intramural and intraschool bicycle racing from the elementary school level to the university, and places considerable emphasis on the value of the two-wheeler in the conditioning of atheletes in all the other scholastic sports. And just by way of starting the coach or instructor to hiking beyond the campus, this guide on how to be happy while becoming physically fit outlines no less than nine different hikes—from a predawn "breakfast hike" to far-ranging "cycle train or truck tours."

With the added impact of this advice to educators on cycling for fun and fitness, more riders than ever, in and out of school and of all ages, will be pedaling their way to euphoria. Thus, since we will have our share of them in our own community, perhaps it is time as the schools open, to take a look at the facilities we are providing for their comfort and safety. What about cycle paths, planning and marking bike safety routes—or at very least making sure we have adequate bicycle racks at schools and shopping centers?

We shouldn't forget the wheel is one of man's greatest inventions—and the bike wheel one of his happiest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation for

publishing the fine booklet referred to in this editorial.

Such actions are in the public interest and deserve our enthusiastic support.

A New Future for the Bar and Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a profound and important address made last Friday evening by John H. Colburn, editor and publisher of the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle & Beacon before the Missouri Bar Association in Kansas City, Mo. Mr. Colburn has wisely emphasized the responsibilities of the bar, the judiciary, and the press in the preservation of individual liberties as guaranteed by the law. He once again cautions us against news management as practiced by the administration and warns against the "use of news as a weapon of national policy—a policy to lie if necessary."

I commend this address by Mr. Colburn to the Members of Congress. The address follows:

A NEW FUTURE FOR THE BAR AND PRESS

(By John H. Colburn)

This is a distinct honor—and a significant one, too, for an editor to address this group this evening. It is significant because it recognizes the tremendous mutual responsibility shared by the bar and the press more than any other group. This is a day-to-day responsibility to keep the people of this great country fully informed on their rights—and obligations—in a society where they enjoy freedom unsurpassed anywhere else.

Whether it be cold war or hot war, the greatest threat to our freedom will be complacency. As Government grows in power and influence over our daily activities—no matter what its political complexion may be—so grows the threat to individual liberty unless the bar, the judiciary, and the press are alert to protect the liberties guaranteed by law.

Look to Cuba—to the Iron Curtain countries—anywhere there is a dictatorship. What was the pattern? First the press was muzzled—then the judiciary was stripped of its powers of administering justice by law. Sometimes the process was reversed. In any event, the judiciary and the press first had to be controlled before a police or dictator state could operate. Once the liberty of the courts and press was suppressed, then the people were stripped of their educational and religious freedoms.

In a society of liberty and freedom of the individual, the bar and the press must be constantly vigilant to protect the people's constitutional rights—and their rights to worship and to go to the school of their choice. The first amendment gives the press no special occupational or professional privileges; no license to do what it pleases. It imposes on the press a terrific responsibility to uphold the constitutional right of free speech, respect rights of privacy and serve the people—and the bar—by helping to protect all of their rights.

To say that the press has scored 100 percent in meeting these obligations would be foolish. Just as foolish as saying that everyone here faithfully abides by the Ten Commandments, or that the bar and the judiciary, as a whole, have a perfect record in meeting their responsibilities. However, your discussion of professional problems of lawyers and judges here this week illustrates what is being done by bar and judiciary groups throughout the country to improve the administration of justice. This is essential for the successful functioning of our system of freedom under law.

Just as vital is the responsible functioning of your press—and that includes television, radio, news magazines, and other periodicals as well as newspapers. Today, responsible editors and responsible managers of other media are most conscious of their obligations.

Mine is both a profession and a business. Producing a newspaper involves the creative work of an alert and diligent staff of writers and editors, the manufacturing skills of top engineers and craftsmen and the persuasive salesmanship of the circulation and advertising departments. Our news staff must have the professional pride and competence to breathe life and meaning into the daily record of history. We must provide wise counsel in editorials, be dedicated to public service and to leadership—but uppermost we must have an unwavering concern for truth, the hallmark of freedom, and a concern for human decency and human betterment. In short, the good newspaper functions as the conscience of the community.

Press responsibility today by any standard of objective measurement is higher than it has ever been. But ours is a unique business. What other business produces a new product every day—365 days a year? What other business operates on such a split-second system of production schedules? In the legal profession, you can ask for a continuance or stay until you are ready for a presentation. In our business, once a decision is made, the product goes into print or on the air. In how many other businesses are human errors and faulty judgments exposed for all to see? No wonder the press is vulnerable to criticism. This is especially true in these days when most people think they can run the country better than the President, prescribe for your ills better than a physician, determine the merits of a complicated case better than a judge, and run a newspaper better than a publisher.

Considering the magnitude of our task, our proportion of errors of commission and ommission—or in judgment—are no more and maybe fewer than for any other business or profession. Just review the vast improvements in responsibility you have seen in your own newspapers in the past 25 years. This is the trend for the future along with vast technological changes that will revolutionize our production techniques. This trend toward greater press responsibility is a compelling reason why there should be closer press ties with the bar and judiciary. The antipathy—often antagonism—between our groups must be replaced by a better understanding of our mutual responsibilities and obligations to protect the freedom and individual rights of our people.

On the basis of this better understanding, I am confident of a bright new future for the bar and press. Already a solid foundation is being laid in many areas for a better appreciation of our mutual responsibilities and a better appreciation for the need of informing the people of what we are doing. The public relations activities of the Missouri bar are noteworthy advances and the Missouri press served its function well in your successful program to put the selection of judges on a nonpartisan basis.

But to achieve the full potential of what is being done in the area of press-bar understanding will require solid foundation work at the college level. There is a community of interest that must bring our law and journalism schools closer together. Far too often the areas of conflict between the bar and the press have been the result of ignorance of the roles each should play in a free society.

Reporters should know more about the problems of lawyers and of judges and about the techniques of legal and court procedures. Lawyers and future judges should be better informed on the type of information a newspaper needs to accurately inform the public and should have more information on the problems involved in the processing and production of news copy.

Words are the tools that writers and editors must use expertly and they also are the tools of a lawyer or judge. The need for excellent writing by the bar was underscored by Justice George Rossman of the Oregon Supreme Court, who said too many lawyers never learn to use these tools skillfully. Writing in the American Bar Association Journal last November, Judge Rossman said:

"We are a word-bound profession. We must not regard words merely as words; they are symbols that represent thoughts and purposes in the mind of a lawyer which he wishes to communicate."

Where could you find a stronger endorsement for the type of training in writing which many of our best journalism schools are providing today? Likewise, students of journalism could benefit by taking law school courses in research and case work, the right of privacy, the libel laws—even participating in mock trials as reporters. Through such an interchange the future lawyer would be better equipped to deal with the press and the future journalists would achieve a better understanding of work of the bar as it relates to the administration of justice.

This interchange will be especially valuable in the years ahead because of the tremendous technological changes already underway in the newspaper business and because of changes which I foresee for the bar and judiciary.

Let's take a quick look into the crystal ball. By 1975, I can see many changes in our courtrooms based on present known technology. Briefly, these include:

1. Court reporters will stenotype notes that will be transmitted directly from their machines by tape to a central computer. The computer will translate these cryptic shorthand notes into a printed record of the proceedings that will be transmitted almost instantly by teletype to communications rooms and press booths recessed in the balconies of new courtrooms. This will give reporters a complete record so that their accounts will be more accurate and more meaningful; it also will provide counsel with a running transcript of the proceedings to assist in cross and recross examinations.

2. Closed circuit television cameras operated by court personnel from recessed booths will provide a video tape record in picture and narrative form of a court proceeding. This record would be invaluable for appellate court work and for future instruction in our law schools. It also could be made available to the press under controlled conditions.

3. Our law schools or law centers will become headquartres for information retrieval centers. Through use of punchcard systems, lawyers and court attachés will be able to obtain reference data from these centers within minutes, thus saving hours of research work.

In the newspaper field, computers already are being used for typesetting operations and the compilation of stock market information. Closed circuit TV systems will be common in newspaper offices 10 years from

now to expedite editing and page makeup. These are just a few illustrations of what can be done and new discoveries also are being made faster than they can be tested.

Modern courtroom facilities with the recessed booths that I have described would make it possible for the press to provide pictorial coverage of court proceedings in an atmosphere of dignity and decorum. The decision as to whether such proceedings should be photographed, broadcast or televised must be left to the discretion of the presiding judge and counsel in the case so as to protect the rights of the defendant and of the State.

It would be a tremendous advance for the cause of justice, I believe, if satisfactory arrangements could be made to photograph and televise certain court proceedings. Perhaps this start should be made in our United States and Supreme Courts where the issues are ready for a final decision. The American public needs to be made more aware of the processes of our judicial system because the days have long since past when most of a town or a city turned out to view events in the courtroom. I speak here not of the sensational trials, but of the many judicial processes that affect our school system, our industry, our local government—even our pocketbooks through questions of tax policy. With the advantage of more modern courtroom facilities, of more modern equipment and with a mutual understanding of the objectives and the conditions under which court proceedings would be photographed or televised, I believe that the press and the bar can demonstrate convincingly that this can be done in a responsible way to inform the public and satisfy the objections of the bar and the judiciary.

Our technological advances will not erase all of the problems involved in the relationship of the bar and the press and they will have no effect at all on our present-day problems of reporting on civil and criminal cases. One of the fundamental difficulties, of course, is that there is a lack of agreement among lawyers in what should be published in the public interest and what jeopardizes an individual's rights. The reasons for this disagreement are many and varied and range from emotional considerations to political pressures and public opinion.

Two events during the past year, though, have prompted many editors to take a fresh look at their policy for pre-trial reporting. These were:

1. A conference on "Prejudicial News Reporting in Criminal Cases" which was held last year at Northwestern University. This conference ended without agreement, but produced a proposal by Justice Bernard S. Meyer of the New York State Supreme Court for a statute that would specifically spell out what could and could not be published prior to trial.

2. The U.S. Court of Appeals of New York ruled in January of this year that a man who admitted murder and was sentenced to be executed was entitled to a new trial. The court majority held that he did not receive an impartial jury trial because pretrial statements issued both by the State and the defense resulted in scare headlines and mass coverage of three slayings which the defendant had admitted.

In Oregon and in Massachusetts, cooperative steps have been undertaken by the bar and the press to set up voluntary restrictions to improve pretrial reporting. The Oregon code says in part "the demands of accuracy and objectivity in news reporting should be balanced with the demands of fair play. The public has a right to be informed. The accused has a right to be judged in an atmosphere free from undue prejudice."

The codes are indicative of a growing awareness among editors that if the press is to accurately and objectively fulfill its responsibilities it must change some of its long-accepted practices. John McMullan of the Miami Herald, a law school graduate who became an editor, suggested after the Northwestern conference that instead of statutory regulations, the press should adopt voluntary restrictions along these lines:

1. Avoid deliberate editorialization even when a crime seems to be solved beyond all reasonable doubt.

2. Don't call a killing a murder until there is an indictment as to the degree of homicide.

3. Don't solve a case on the basis of police statements.

4. If the accused wants to make a statement—to the police or to the public—call it that and not a confession.

5. Don't let the defense or prosecuting attorney or the police use the press as a sounding board for public opinion or personal publicity.

6. Don't call a person a suspect if he is only brought in for questioning.

These provisions are the basis for the voluntary codes in Oregon and Massachusettes and they are being used by newspapers throughout the country as guidelines for better reporting and a better understanding with the bar and the judiciary. This new approach, I hope, will erase a feeling among many lawyers that newsmen apparently regard the right of freedom of the press as a license to prejudge persons charged with crime. The majority of responsible editors feel quite strongly that more can be done on a voluntary basis than will be done through statutory restrictions. They point out that the law profession now, through Canon 20 of the "Canons of Professional Ethics," has power to police much of the pretrial material. Justice Meyer, after considerable research, found, and I quote, that "In more than 50 years that the canon has been on the books, there has never been one reported proceeding against an offending lawyer, prosecutor or judge." Federal Judge Herbert L. Will, of Illinois, writing in the DePaul Law Review, discussed the proposed statutory restrictions for newspaper reporting, and said that "voluntary action by the press may not be easy to instigate, but it should not be written off as a possible solution to the problem of prejudicial publicity." Judge Will is not optimistic about this possibility of voluntary action, but he said it seemed to him that this was the course which any self-respecting professional should follow. The vast majority of responsible editors agree. They feel that if the bar and the judiciary do an effective voluntary job of enforcing Canon 20, that the press also can, by voluntary effort, substantially eliminate the problem of prejudicial reporting.

Statutory regulations might well create more problems than they would solve. They could lead to curbs on our search for the essential truth; they could impinge on our individual rights and responsibilities; and they could lead to a bureaucratic—or even tyrannical—form of justice that would violate the very tenets of our Constitution.

In short, the press must clean its own house and police its own ranks to prevent prejudicial reporting and the lawyers and judges must reexamine their own violations in this area.

In this discussion of press and bar cooperation, there has not been time to review what has emerged during the past year as a concept of government "managed news." Actually, the term "news management" is a misnomer, because the essential issue is distortion and misrepresentation of information for political purposes. News has been managed and always will be and there is no quarrel with that so long as there are alert reporters who have access to all news sources and so long as there is no controlled effort to distort or misrepresent news and thus deceive the public.

Your distinguished Senators from Missouri, EDWARD LONG and STUART SYMINGTON, are sponsoring a bill drafted by Senator LONG which would go a long way to insure that there is adequate public access to all vital Government records. Senator LONG states that "the volume of material which is denied the public is in itself staggering, but it becomes even more so when one realizes that much of it is withheld for petty reasons." Nearly 200 years ago James Madison, who was chairman of the committee which drafted the first amendment, made a comment that is just as appropriate today as it was then. He said:

"A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both."

What Senator LONG proposes is an amendment to the Administrative Procedure Act, which was adopted in 1946 but which is inadequate today in our growing centralized Government. He proposes to set up more workable guidelines to make information available and still provide adequate protection for military secrets and private communication regarding personnel or foreign governments. His proposal contains also much needed teeth which provide for court procedures when there is a question about information that is being withheld from the public. I hope that this association and the American Bar Association will support this legislation.

Today, there are uncounted thousands of Government press agents representing all of the activities of the Federal Government. Some of them are necessary and most helpful in digging out information of interest to the public. But if all of these services are ever coordinated into a Government wire network, you will see more efforts to impose controlled views on the public and the access by the press to legitimate sources of information will be curtailed further.

The framework for such a wire service already has been laid by the Agriculture Department. It said such a service was needed to provide more information for the farmers. The political overtones of this entire business of controlled information were best outlined by Agriculture Secretary Freeman who said he authorized the Government news wire because "a strongly oriented GOP press made it difficult to get across to farmers gains made by the present administration."

The limitation on press access to legitimate news sources is illustrated most vividly in the restrictions imposed during the Cuban crisis and which are still in effect at the Pentagon. In the Pentagon no one can talk to reporters without having a public relations observer present or without making a full report to the public relations office. Secretary McNamara said this procedure is necessary to promote more coordination in the handling of Pentagon information. The actual result, on the other hand, has been that no one will give the press information that is critical of Defense Department policy no matter how accurate that information may be.

During the Cuban crisis, under this cloak of coordination to protect national security, the Defense Department did more to deceive our own people than it accomplished in deceiving the Soviet Union or Fidel Castro. In this perilous nuclear era, the security of the Nation must be paramount. But our security can best be maintained by the full reporting of all the factual truth that is not harmful to the national interest. During times of crisis, the American press in all history has never wavered in its patriotism to protect our security.

Since World War II, we have been called upon to report unprecedented changes in our way of life. Developments in our social and scientific revolutions have erupted on our front pages day after day. These new

developments—especially the necessity for recognizing and intelligently reporting change—require new reporting and editing techniques. But there should be no sacrifice to the fundamental necessity of reporting the full, basic truth.

Should this Nation ever establish use of news as a weapon of national policy—a policy to lie if necessary—we will have undermined the bedrock of our free society. Instead of deceiving an enemy, who will be naturally skeptical and suspicious of any move or statement we make, we will have destroyed the confidence of our own people in our national institutions.

The history of free government is a history of escape from the evils of suppressing or controlling or manipulating news. If your press is to remain a powerful force for public good, how can anyone ignore this history? How long would you be content with news spoon-fed by powerful bureaucratic and other propaganda organizations? Not for long, I hope—not any longer than the press would wait to go into action if it saw the people's rights being jeopardized through governmental interference in the vital functions of the bar and judiciary.

We cannot be complacent about this and we should be seriously concerned about the complacency of many young people toward our freedoms. Everyone seems to understand the nature of freedom for himself, but somewhere there is a psychological block in respecting the same freedom for others—especially in times of tension.

Three years ago a poll conducted at Purdue University showed that high school students favored censorship of the press, motion pictures and of the sale of books and favored third-degree methods in FBI procedures. Another survey by Eugene Gilbert, pollster of teenage opinion, showed that a third approve a central government agency as a censor.

A remark by Justice Black in 1959 is apt today. He said that we as a people have not yet decided "whether in accordance with our traditions and our constitution we will have the confidence and courage to be free."

What bigger challenge is there than to stimulate among our young people confidence and courage so as to erase any complacency about freedom and freedom of expression?

Long ago that famous Kansas newspaper editor, William Allen White, said to an anxious Governor: "You say that freedom of utterance is not for time of stress, and I reply with the sad truth that only in time of stress is freedom of utterance in danger. No one questions it in calm days, because there is no need, and the reverse is true also; only when free utterance is suppressed is it needed and when it is needed it is most vital to justice."

In conclusion, there is no greater responsibility faced by the bar and the press in the future than in cooperating to protect our freedom, to protect justice for all, and to guarantee that free utterance never is suppressed. In this joint venture, we must be vigilant sentinels to guard against violations of individual rights in the name of protecting civil rights and to prevent any subjugation of freedom in the name of freedom.

British See Taint on White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is well once in a while for us to see ourselves as others see us.

I include the following article:

BRITISH SEE TAINT ON WHITE HOUSE

(By Rene MacColl)

It is the No. 1 topic of conversation in America. It is the nagging constant fear overhanging the whole American scene. It is the biggest domestic crisis the United States has faced since her Civil War a century ago. And it just might bring ruin to the hitherto brilliantly successful career of John Kennedy in next year's presidential elections.

It is the Negro problem. And the relentlessly operative word in the crisis is, "now."

The whole placid and complacent snail's pace approach to giving the American Negro a square shake has been wrecked almost overnight.

The isolated incidents which have seemed so important but only passingly so during the last half a dozen years as they briefly captured the world's headlines have suddenly become part of everyday life.

VIOLENCE

Those incidents ranged from the affair of Little Rock and the sit-in demonstrations aimed at integrating white restaurants in Alabama, to the riots and killings at Oxford.

Now south, north, west, and east passions are flaring and violence rips towns and villages as the descendants of the Africans brought here in slavery hundreds of years ago abruptly run out of patience and demand equality—now.

They won't wait any longer. They can't wait any longer.

It is as if some chemical which has been working quietly in their veins while they remained subservient and docile, has clicked, making them rage and rise.

They will not be fobbed off any longer. Houses, schools, public amenities, above all jobs, must be theirs for the asking and on exactly the same basis as for the whites.

FRIGHTENING

The situation is increasingly dangerous. For the melancholy fact is that white Americans in the North as well as in the South are not ready to see the Negro obtain equality.

They like to say that the Negroes are human beings just like the rest of us.

But when it comes to the point they don't want them as neighbors.

And it has been unmistakable that the Negro demonstrations of the past few months have tended to alienate and frighten the northern whites, so that now even the moderates are beginning to say the Negroes are getting out of hand.

And there is a widely held conviction that if once a Negro family is allowed to move into a hitherto white housing estate property values will plummet 30 percent overnight.

Nobody likes to be hit in his pocketbook—but so far it has not been conclusively proved anywhere that this alleged loss of values is really true.

WORRIED

Politically the Negro revolt holds the potentialities of catastrophe for Kennedy.

For the whites are beginning to blame Kennedy for encouraging the Negroes.

"The Negroes have overplayed their hand—but it was the White House that let them do it," is a commonly heard remark these days.

So the tense and worried white electorate is talking of a swingback to Kennedy's opponents, the Republicans.

Kennedy only won the Presidency by a touchback in 1960. It might not take much of a swing to unseat him next year.

NEXT REPUBLIC BRITISH MUSLIMS?

"We Negroes are far worse colonized here in America than are the blacks in South Africa."

And again: "President Kennedy should get an Oscar from Hollywood as the best actor of the century—because he beats all his predecessors when it comes to posing as the friend of the Negro.

"He is nothing of the sort, of course. He is a monumental hypocrite."

This is Malcolm X, heir-apparent of the Prophet Elijah Muhammad, who heads the extremist antiwhite group known as the Black Muslims.

He is called Malcolm X because the Black Muslims have all renounced their last names, which they spurn as detested relics of the slave days.

He poured savage scorn on the huge Negro march on Washington 11 days ago.

"It was nothing but a farce. Kennedy got scared and simply arranged for the White House to take the thing over. It was a Government-run march."

There is a chance that Britain may be hearing about the Black Muslims before much longer. Prophet Elijah Muhammad is considering establishing British and Caribbean branches.

Malcolm X theorizes that racial strife is at hand in America because until now the white man has pursued the policy of evacuation.

"Rehousing? If the Negro moves in, the white man has moved out.

"Education? If the Negro children have moved in, the white children have moved out.

"But now we want the good jobs—and the white man isn't going to move out of those.

"That's where the violence and bloodshed are going to start."

Anthony Eden: Munich Could Be Repeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during his long years of able and honorable public service, during which he was Prime Minister of Great Britain, Hon. Anthony Eden, now Earl of Avon, gave strong leadership. He knew the evil minds of both nazism and international communism. He was one of the few in his country who realized that Munich was a defeat, and would lead to dangerous results because instead of the Munich Pact representing a contribution to peace when made, was in fact appeasement, and only an invitation for Hitler to keep moving to attain his evil purposes. History shows how Churchill and Eden were right.

So when the Earl of Avon (Anthony Eden) expresses his views on world affairs and particularly for the leaders of the free world to be ever watchful of following the pathway of appeasement, his opinions should be given serious consideration.

In my remarks I include an article written by him appearing in the Washington Star of September 29, 1963:

ANTHONY EDEN: MUNICH COULD BE REPEATED

(By Anthony Eden, Earl of Avon)

From the day when the Munich agreement was signed 25 years ago, argument about it has been bitter but confused. A pretext can be made for Munich as a desperate expedient to gain time; it was never a constructive act of statesmanship heralding peace.

Unfortunately it was as peace in our time that its authors sought to defend it. These illusions, misplaced as they were, can hardly be understood unless they can be traced to their source.

Mr. Neville Chamberlain and those who thought like him, whether in Britain, France, or the United States, did not see the Czech crisis as a further step in the aggrandizement policy of a dictatorship avid for conquest. On the contrary, they placed themselves in the position of the men they were facing and concluded that they had some grievances. The Czech rule, it was argued, had not been uniformly considerate to the German minority. Czechoslovakia was a recent creation and something of a polyglot state; it was not so extraordinary that the Nazi rulers should be impatient.

THE BRITISH FAILURE

A neutral disposition, to be fair to the point of being blind, had its inevitable consequence, that the British Government approached the crisis as an honest broker instead of an honest facer of truths. This stemmed from a failure to read the character and intentions of the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini, whether in Abyssinia or Austria, Czechoslovakia, or, later, Albania.

As a consequence the unfortunate Lord Runciman was sent upon a mission to find a reasonable solution between two parties. One of whom, the Czechs, was prepared to accept any concession which still allowed of national survival, while the other, on Hitler's instructions, was always to ask that amount more than President Benes could give, to keep ahead in the bidding, but not too far ahead all at once. The consequence was inevitable. The Czechs were asked by those to whom they looked for support and understanding to yield more than their country's safety permitted, and they were doomed.

Yet, up until the hour of the Nazi invasion in March 1939, there were apologists defending the Munich settlement as compatible with the survival of Czechoslovakia. Sir Winston Churchill and I, then, of course, out of office, were sitting together discussing a cartoon which derided as scaremongers those who held opinions such as ours, when the news of the German entry into Prague was brought to us.

It should be worth while to probe how these mistaken thoughts could have grown so strongly and to have a care lest they should thrive again. Fundamentally it was the fault of "appeasement," of cherishing the illusion that to buy a little time, even at the expense of the security of an ally at second remove, was to contribute to peace, whereas it was in truth a surrender to the threat of force, laying the paving stones to war. The distinction should always be recognize, if often unwelcome. I tried to define it in a speech in the House of Lords 2 years ago:

"It is whether the agreement for which they (the government) are working will serve only to relax tension for a while, or whether it is in the true interests of lasting peace. We must not perpetrate an injustice in order to get a little present ease; and the government has to consider whether its decision gives peace, not just for an hour or a day or two, but in its children's time. That is the difference between appeasement and peace."

FATEFUL LURE

There have been some modern applications of appeasement and, as always, they are catching. From the Middle East with Nasser they spread to the Far East with Sukarno, and then across to the Caribbean where Castro, encouraged by the success of his predecessors in seizing foreign national or international property with impunity, laid hands on many million dollars' worth of American commercial enterprises in Cuba.

Castro's career being unruffled by protests, he tempted fate too far by inviting or allowing deadly Soviet weapons of attack upon his soil. The American reposte was salutary and effective. Its nearest parallel in the 1930's was when, in conditions of less danger, Anglo-French naval action, sustained by the smaller Mediterranean powers, sent Mussolini's pirate submarines hastily home to base. Yet the tendency to "perpetrate an injustice in order to get a little present ease" persists now as then.

Southeast Asia presents some disturbing recent examples.

WOLF VERSUS LAMB

When Indonesia's demand for Western New Guinea rose to a crescendo 2 years ago, no pretense was made that the population of Papuans had any affinity with their would-be annexers. On the contrary, the summons was just a new piece of colonialism made all the more blatant by Indonesia's own pledges toward Western New Guinea when she became a state in 1949.

Yet, when Indonesia took physical action against the territory by parachute landings and other means, the request of the Netherlands Government to the United Nations for observers to view and report upon these events was refused by the Acting Secretary General. The pretext was extraordinary: That to do so would be to depart from neutrality unless both parties agreed to their presence. It can hardly be accepted that the alleged aggressor and the victim must agree before the United Nations can inform itself on events in response to an appeal from one of its members.

When I read of these happenings, the memory of the well-intentioned Runciman mission came back to me with its inevitable failure, and inescapable sequel. The wolf and the lamb having been cautioned in the same terms, the wolf is not the least bit embarrassed and only craves permission to approach its jaws within striking distance of its victim's throat, which being granted, the final meal is simply delayed a while. So it was that Munich settled nothing except the fate of Czechoslovakia, just as the heralded agreement about Western New Guinea settled nothing except the fate of the Papuans, behind the facade of a plebiscite after the event.

The predictable sequence has followed with Indonesian clamor for Borneo and Sarawak, coupled with a denunciation of the new federation of Malaysia. If Indonesia is once again appeased, it is doubtful that she will be the final beneficiary. The Chinese Communists are more likely to figure in that part.

But it is to be hoped that the lesson of Munich will be in the minds of those with whom the responsibility lies to give guidance and to say "no." They should, above all, remember that after the Munich agreement, as in every other instance of surrender for appeasement's sake, the appetite of the demanding power had grown with what it fed upon and soon returned for more, to be satisfied either by persuasion or by force; or to be resisted with greater difficulty than before.

The 25 years which have passed since Munich have seen many attempts to overthrow or subvert the ideas and practices of freedom, and they have not all failed. Some nations now behind the Iron Curtain might have been saved their fate if the West had been united and alert to the danger in time. No such experience must be allowed to befall the countries of southeast Asia, particularly those whose wise statesmanship has led them to form Malaysia, where a rising standard of living contrasts sharply with the mounting poverty of their heavily-armed southern neighbor, Indonesia.

The message of September 1938, stands clear for everyone to read. Never try to satisfy greedy appetites by concessions that are in themselves unjust.

Minority Group Distribution at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with the clamor of minority races for fairness echoing loud in the ears of Capitol Hill, many times, outstanding existing performance goes unrecognized. It is my pleasure to call the following matter to the attention of the Nation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1963.

Rear Adm. EDWARD J. FAHY,
Shipyard Commander,
Mare Island Naval Shipyard,
Vallejo, Calif.

DEAR ADMIRAL FAHY: As a result of our recent discussion in Washington I have reviewed your statistical head-count of minority group distribution at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. On broad review, it would appear that the shipyard should certainly be congratulated on assuming its obvious nondiscriminatory employment attitude, not only as is exemplified by the statistics which you provided, but also by a long history of fair employment practices at the yard of which I am cognizant.

Your 1963 statistics indicate that there is a total of 8.6 percent Negro, 3.7 percent oriental, and 1.8 percent other minority groups for a total of 14.2 percent, representing a total of 1,471 workers out of a shipyard personnel level of 10,329 as of 31 July 1963.

According to the 1960 census, there is listed a total of 13,436 minority persons in Solano County out of a total census count of 126,566—a minority percentage of 10.6 percent. This statistical consideration is extremely favorable and is evidence of perhaps an overly fair employment policy. This fairness policy is further exemplified by the fact that, despite a shipyard loss of better than 700 personnel from 1962 to 1963, the minority group workers were depleted by only 61 persons and their overall percentage of yard employment was expanded from 12.8 percent to the 14.2-percent figure.

A further review of the balance of the statistics presented shows that the percentage of minority white-collar workers is steadily expanding and bears a reasonable relationship to the total number of minorities. Additionally, the overall number of journeymen and those above the class of journeymen has expanded over the past year, in spite of the fact that the overall personnel level of the shipyard has declined.

I am particularly impressed with the statistic indicating that in the classification "above journeymen and less than supervisor" there is a total of 228 minority persons out of 1,679 in this classification for a total of 13.6 percent.

I am sure our democracy in the West has been enhanced by such employment practices. Certainly our shipyard is nonetheless competitive because of such employment practices and stands as a model of Americans of all races and faiths working competitively for the good of the Nation.

Sincerest congratulations.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., minority group distribution, July 31, 1963

	1962		1963	
	Number	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*
A. Total	11,035		10,329	
Negro	865	7.74	894	8.65
Oriental	393	3.55	387	3.75
Other	152	1.38	190	1.84
Total minority	1,410	12.8	1,471	14.2
B. White collar	1,988		1,890	
Negro	36	1.8	43	2.3
Oriental	47	2.4	48	2.5
Other	7	.3	11	.58
C. Blue collar	9,047		8,439	
Negro	829	9.15	851	10.1
Oriental	350	3.9	339	4.01
Other	147	1.6	179	2.12
1. Less than journeyman	3,005		2,632	
Negro	521	17.3	533	20.3
Oriental	204	6.8	200	7.6
Other	47	1.6	59	2.24
2. Journeyman	3,507		3,295	
Negro	184	5.25	183	5.56
Oriental	89	2.5	92	2.8
Other	61	1.7	64	1.94
3. Above journeyman, less than supervisor	1,760		1,679	
Negro	120	6.8	130	7.7
Oriental	45	2.6	43	2.6
Other	98	5.6	55	3.3
4. First line supervisor	538		581	
Negro	4	.75	5	.9
Oriental	2	.4	3	.5
Other	0		1	.2

Merit System Violated in Negro Hiring Policy, Legion Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD Mr. Joseph Young's column entitled "The Federal Spotlight," which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Star and refers to a resolution passed by the American Legion in convention with regards to the hiring and promotions in the Federal Government.

The article follows:

MERIT SYSTEM VIOLATED IN NEGRO HIRING POLICY, LEGION CHARGES

(By Joseph Young)

The American Legion has condemned Kennedy administration policies in the hiring and promotions of Negroes in Government.

At its recent convention, the Legion unanimously approved a resolution accusing the administration of attempting to isolate the merit system in the hiring and promotions of Negroes.

The Legion declared, "an expedient policy of attempting to aggressively encourage employment in the Federal civil service without regard to its rules and regulations constitutes illegal preference and violates the principles of the merit system."

The Legion urged Congress to investigate fully the situation. Already a House Civil Service Manpower Subcommittee has started an investigation as to whether the administration's policies aimed at giving equal Government employment opportunities to Negroes constitutes discrimination in reverse—bypassing better-qualified whites for promotions and appointments.

The Legion acted on resolutions submitted by its Mississippi and Nevada State departments. The approved resolution deleted the words "Negroes" and "minority groups," but there was no doubt that it referred to the hiring and promotions of Negroes.

Overcoming Risks and Disadvantages of Test Ban Treaty Costly but Vital to United States National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I have asked that a copy of my September 24 letter to President Kennedy, relating to the actions necessary to minimize the admitted risks and disadvantages of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, be reproduced here. The letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Secretary Dean Rusk, Secretary Robert McNamara, Under Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, you and others in your administration have conceded that there are risks and disadvantages in the limited test ban treaty. This concession is implicity from your assurances and promises to take steps to reduce the effects of these risks and disadvantages upon the national security.

The assurances and promises given have been instrumental in obtaining both Senate and public support for ratification of the treaty. In this sense, they constitute a solemn compact between you and the American people, which must be kept.

Amongst the steps to be taken, as outlined in separate communications each dated August 23, 1963, to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, from Under Secretary Gilpatric and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are the following:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities manned by top-flight scientific personnel.

3. The maintenance of facilities and resources necessary for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of Soviet abrogation of the treaty or should the national security otherwise require.

4. The improvement of our capability to detect treaty violations and Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

Unfortunately, these assurances and promises have been only general in nature. What, specifically, in terms of personnel, materiel and programs are needed to meet and keep them are yet to be determined. The Joint Chiefs' communication defined them as "criteria" and added that they were stated "necessarily in general language since additional study will be needed to determine specific standards and programs."

Obviously and regrettably, these specifics were not worked out before the treaty was negotiated. Had this been done, perhaps the treaty terms might have been written to make them less onerous and less expensive to carry out. In any event, the fundamental security of the country depends first, upon determining what they are, and, second, upon actually taking those actions specifically determined to be necessary to meet the "criteria." Any error risking action less than the minimum necessary must be scrupulously avoided. Uncertainties always must be resolved positively, on the safe side, to make certain we adequately flesh-out all the necessary specifics of each of these skeletal general criteria.

Unfortunately, these specifics will involve a considerable effort because of the magnitude of the risks and disadvantages involved.

You, yourself, on February 7, 1962, described an atmospheric treaty without an adequate "inspections system" guarding against preparations for surprise abrogation as "extremely vulnerable." The treaty at hand, of course, has no "inspections system" at all—adequate or inadequate.

Again, on March 2, 1962, you warned that if we are to maintain our scientific momentum and leadership, "our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves." The treaty at hand, of course, does fix such limitations.

At that time you also warned: "in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not only difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative and found it impossible of execution."

Thus, observing your assurances and promises respecting the treaty calls for doing the difficult and, in addition, what you yourself have described as the impossible. It will surely call for a large expenditure and a large effort—much larger than Secretary McNamara indicated during his treaty testimony. For instance, his off-hand estimate of the cost of maintaining a readiness-to-test posture was $200 million. My own calculations, detailed below, considerably enlarge this figure.

Unfortunately, also, there appears to be a line of resistance developing domestically against the taking of these vitally necessary actions at all. This was hinted in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times written by the scientists, Dr. Eugene P. Wigner. It was amplified in a letter to the editor of the New York Herald-Tribune by the scientists, Dr. Leo Szilard, who argued that should the vigorous underground testing program be carried out, "then, rather than furthering the cause of peace, the test ban agreement would be likely to do just the opposite." Presumably his same reasoning also would apply in opposition to the other three categories of action to which you are committed. I note with apprehension that the thinking of even some of your official family seems to parallel that of Wigner and Szilard.

Thus, keeping your assurances and promises regarding steps to reduce the risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty will require, on your part, overcoming the resistance of some of the very people who work closely with you, as well as others who have given you strong and consistent political support.

In determining what, specifically, will have to be done to meet and keep your assurances and promises, certain fundamental considerations must be in mind. With respect to each of the criteria, these include:

UNDERGROUND TEST PROGRAM

Either a community must be built at the Nevada test site for personnel working there, or a rapid transit system from Las Vegas must be constructed in order to attract and keep topflight personnel on the work.

Due to the proximity of both the city of Las Vegas and the Hoover Dam to the Nevada

site, there is a limitation on the yield of devices which can be tested underground there without unacceptable off-site seismic shock damage. It will be necessary to find and develop a second underground testing site for high-yield experiments.

Much greater discretion and flexibility in scheduling events and conducting tests will have to be given laboratory and test site personnel than was the case during our 1962 test series. At that time, I personally pointed out to Dr. Jerome Weisner, your science adviser, that his tendency, in your name, to act as test director from his office in Washington, remote from the Nevada and Pacific test sites, operated both to decrease the scientific data gained from the tests and increase the cost and difficulty of conducting them.

MAINTENANCE OF LABS AND RETENTION OF TOP-FLIGHT SCIENTISTS

The test-site improvements and testing discretion at the laboratory and test-site levels discussed above also have a bearing on our ability to keep topflight scientists' interest in the nuclear weapons program under partial test-ban conditions.

The added difficulties of analyzing samples from underground experiments—contaminated with extraneous elements from the soil—requires added radiochemistry facilities and personnel. Simulation facilities for other than underground environments and other limitations imposed by the treaty also require a boost in personnel and new laboratory physical facilities, equipment, and instrumentation for diagnostic and extrapolation purposes.

The flow of qualified and capable new, young, topflight scientists into the nuclear weapons laboratories must be stimulated and encouraged by stepped-up activities at such nonweapons, but related facilities, as the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley.

The importance of immediate starts on new laboratory facilities—as encouraging physical evidence to our nuclear weapon scientists now working that their efforts are not devoted to a dead-end program—is most vital to prevent them from drifting away from the laboratories.

PROMPT READINESS FOR ATMOSPHERIC TESTING

This capability must include readiness to proof test weapons systems in stockpile, new experimental devices, and weapons effects in a variety of environments and under all operational conditions.

Since testing, if and when resumed, will be under emergency conditions, considerable redundancy in test hardware is necessary in order thats tests may be conducted promptly and not suffer delay from the unavailability of standby equipment.

A complete missile range, including ICBM silos at both ends and operational anti-ICBM installations at one end must be in readiness for proof tests of both ICBM and anti-ICBM weapons, as well as to determine effects of nuclear explosions on the reliability and capabilities of each.

Johnstone Island, little larger than an aircraft carrier, is unsuitable for installing equipment which must obtain test data simultaneously from different directions. This "triangulation" problem must be solved. Proper readiness involves an iron-clad agreement with the British for continuing access to and availability of Christmas Island facilities, installation of necessary testing equipment and facilities at Howland and Baker Islands, and construction of two, better three, unmanned floating test diagnostic ships, together with nuclear submarines which connect with these ships by underwater cable to protect test personnel safely underwater from the effects of weapons being tested.

Present aircraft available for collecting radioactive air samples at various vital altitudes are about worn out. They should be replaced by a new fleet of approximately 12 fully equipped aircraft.

A second fleet of three diagnostic aircraft should be provided in addition to the fleet of three aircraft now being readied. This will provide both a stand-by capability and a simultaneous testing capability for air-dropped experimental devices.

Both drop aircraft and rocket vehicles must be in readiness for the delivery of test devices.

Facilities should be provided for constantly updating and revising test schedules for instantaneous use in the event of test resumption—similar to procedures for keeping our strategic deterrent plans always current.

BROADENING AND IMPROVING DETECTION CAPABILITIES

Both the importance of, and difficulties regarding, this effort, plus a necessity for strict classification of equipment and installations, call for a relatively large effort and expenditure in this area.

The very fuzzy situation respecting both space-detection hardware and space-testing procedures requires prompt clarification.

My preliminary estimates of the capital expenditure required for hardware and facilities to meet your assurances and keep your promises to take the actions necessary for reducing the risks and disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty are as follows:

	In millions
Underground testing program:	
Nevada test site improvements and additions	$50
Additional high-yield test site	50
Total	100
Maintenance of labs and top-flight scientists:	
Los Alamos laboratory	25
Sandia laboratory	25
Livermore laboratory	50
Department of Defense laboratories	50
Education, training and encouragement of top-flight scientific personnel at weapons labs	10
Total	160
Readiness for atmospheric testing:	
Test range, silos, missiles, A-ICBM equipment, etc., etc	150
3 pairs—surface/submarine effects tests units	300
Drop aircraft and rockets for launching experimental devices	20
2d standby diagnostic fleet (3 fully equipped jet aircraft)	25
3 aircraft for shuttling samples from test sites to labs for prompt analysis	10
Air sampling fleet (12 jet aircraft)	15
Johnstone/Howland/Baker/Christmas Island testing complex	30
Rear base logistic facilities	10
Upper atmosphere and space diagnostic/detection equipment	50
Total	610
Detection system improvements:	
Classified items	80
Miscellaneous and contingencies	50
Grand total	1,000

In addition to the foregoing capital outlays, which should be made promptly if we are to have a readiness for testing, it is estimated that the cost of maintaining, improving, and keeping this capability in constant readiness to move on an emergency basis will involve operating outlays of approximately $250 million annually.

It is sincerely hoped that you are planning to call upon Congress forthwith for funds of the foregoing magnitude to take the actions necessary to forestall, to the maximum extent possible, the disadvantages and risks to U.S. national security and survival inherent in the partial test ban treaty. Under the circumstance I see no possible course for me but to support such a request vigorously.

Very respectfully,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

No. 10—Florida: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would lie to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Florida about the importance of gambling in that State. In Florida, as in many other States, gambling is a billion dollar business oiling the wheels of organized crime syndicates.

Last year, $158 million was gambled legally at Florida racetracks. This made the Sunshine State the sixth ranking in parimutuel betting which helped the State treasury to the tune of over $13½ million in 1962.

However, Mr. Speaker, this accounts for only a small part of the money wagered in Florida last year. It is illegal betting which lines the pockets of the criminals and it is illegal betting that makes up the great bulk of the gambling that takes place in that State.

Miami is a national nerve center of the gambling syndicates. According to the McClellan committee, Florida's share of estimates of off-track betting came to almost $1.4 billion in 1962.

But, off-track betting is not the only form of illegal gambling. The consensus of testimony before the McClellan committee was that off-track betting accounts for less than half of the total illegal wagering in the United States. In the light of these figures, gambling in Florida may well have seen a $2½ billion turnover last year.

The gross profits of the gamblers could very well have been in the neighborhood of a one-fourth billion dollars. Certain expenses must be met, because illegal gambling supports public corruption as well as organized crime and its various other illicit endeavors. This has given organized crime quite a bankroll in Florida. Because of its social ignorance Florida is bankrolling the mob.

If gambling were both legal and controlled, Mr. Speaker, there would be no great opportunities for corruption and the crime syndicate's treasury would be badly depleted.

The best form of controlled and legalized gambling is a national lottery. Throughout the world, it has shown itself effective in cutting the financial prop of gambling out from under the crime rings, while at the same time causing new revenues to flow into the Public Treasury.

A Tribute to Stan Musial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, my favorite baseball player retired yesterday.

Stan Musial was the finest baseball player of the last two decades. He is a model sportsman and gentleman. He has deserved and received many tributes and will receive his greatest honor in a few years when he is named to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

Under leave to extend, I include a tribute to Stan Musial which appeared on the editorial page of the St. Joseph, Mo., News-Press of September 24:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

St. Joseph baseball fans first heard of Stan Musial one night in May, 22 years ago. The Saints, representing this city, were in Springfield for a western association baseball game. Musial, then a 20-year-old, smashed 2 home runs to lead Springfield to a 4-3 win. The next night, he went three-for-three. The final night of the three-game series, he tripled, homered, and then singled in the winning run in the 12th inning.

Springfield came to St. Joseph later that month, and Musial continued his rampage. He had 10 hits in 4 games here. This was the ballplayer, a news story said, who "would batter down fences and make himself a general nuisance around the plate." Most of the people who saw Stan Musial here in 1941 may have felt he couldn't miss the big leagues. But it is likely anyone realized the baseball legend he would become.

Stan Musial is more than just a sports page story. He belongs to that select list of baseball immortals that includes names such as Ruth, Cobb, Gehrig, Johnson, Mathewson, and a few others. He has become, over a span of some 20 years, more than just a baseball hero. He is one of the best known persons in the United States, and a bearer of all the qualities that make a man worth idolizing. As exteammate Joe Garagiola once described Musial, he is "a saint with money."

Musial not only has been probably the greatest baseball player of his generation, he has been at all times an exemplary individual. There, unfortunately, are character flaws in the lives of many great athletes. Not with Musial. He has been the perfect example of what the sports idol should be: A great athlete, a fine family man, and possessed of the qualities of humility and loyalty. There has never been the slightest suggestion of any ill conduct on Musial's part. He has been a 100-percent credit to his family and his sport, to his country and his church, to his community and to his fellow man.

Musial has announced he will retire at the end of this season. It is unfortunate that the Cardinals, for whom he has played so long and so well, folded in the crucial stretch series with the Dodgers. A world series would have been a wonderful windup for Musial's career, but things didn't work out that way. He played key roles on Cardinal pennant winners of 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1946.

When baseball fans sit around for years to come, there will be memories of Musial. This is the man who holds or shares more than 50 major league or National League records, for durability as well as for hitting. For some, the great memory of Musial may be the night he stepped to the plate against the Cubs 2 weeks ago, making his first appearance since becoming a grandfather. He hit a home run. Or the minds of some may go all the way back to that second world series game in 1942, when Stan singled in the 8th to give the Cards a 4-3 edge over the Yankees and the boost they needed to go on and become world champions.

Musial, seven times National League batting champion, has always described himself as a singles hitter. But there are memories of that day in 1954 when he smashed five home runs against the Giants in a doubleheader, to establish a major league mark. There would be the memories of many games when Musial set some sort of a record as a baseball player, for his achievements fill more space in baseball yearbooks than do those of any other player. But there is more than just incredible baseball ability in the story of Stan Musial.

There is a wonderfully compassionate side as a man. In 1940, Musial was in his third season of organized baseball, as a pitcher. He was 18-5 at Daytona Beach, Fla., but injured his shoulder while making an outfield play. That might have spelled the end of his career. But Dickie Kerr, who had pitched honestly for the "Black Sox" in that 1919 series scandal, was Musial's manager that year, and he convinced Stan to keep going, as an outfielder. Musial never forgot the kindnesses of Kerr and his wife, even when he became the biggest name in baseball. He bought the Kerrs a home in Houston, not in any effort to get publicity, but simply to help a man who had helped him. Gratitude is in Musial's vocabulary.

Ballplayers frequently are booed on the road, sometimes even at home. But the cheers have always been there for Musial, even when he beat the hometowners. He has been honored in nearly every city in the league, and his adopted State of Missouri has paid him tribute by naming him a squire.

Resolution by City Council of VesTavia Hills, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution unanimously passed by the city council of the city of VesTavia Hills, Ala., expressing congratulations to Hon. John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of VesTavia Hills, upon his election as senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars during their convention in Seattle, Wash.:

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS

Whereas the Honorable John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and a resident of our city, was, on the 28th day of August 1963, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Seattle, Wash., elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW; and

Whereas it is the unanimous sense of this body that the honor accorded John A. Jenkins by this outstanding national organization should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That this resolution express the congratulations of this body, and congratulations of the citizens of our community to John A. Jenkins for the well-deserved honor accorded our neighbor and associate, and as a consequence thereof, the prestige accruing to our community upon his election as the senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be duly adopted and spread upon the official minutes and a copy delivered to the Honorable John A. Jenkins and given other wide publicity.

Unanimously adopted this 16th day of September 1963.

ROBERT M. GUILLOT,
Mayor, City of Vestavia Hills, Ala.

Endorsement of Administration's Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last July, more than 400 professional economists in some 40 colleges and universities of the Nation joined in endorsing a statement regarding the administration's tax proposals. The economists stated that they welcomed "the administration's clear recognition of the role which Federal fiscal policy can and should play in maintaining and expanding the level of economic activity."

I believe that the 10 points subscribed to by this group of economists will be of interest to Senators in considering the tax bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statement and the list of those who signed it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and list of signers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODROW WILSON SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N.J., July 12, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a statement on the tax program endorsed by more than 400 professional economists in more than 40 colleges and universities throughout the country.

We hope you will consider it and find it useful.

Respectfully submitted.

LESTER V. CHANDLER,
Professor of Economics.

THE TAX PROGRAM OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

As professional economists, we welcome the Administration's clear recognition of the role which Federal fiscal policy can and should play in maintaining and expanding the level of economic activity. While some of us disagree with one or another specific feature of the tax program now before the Congress, we all, without exception, subscribe to the following propositions:

1. There is now a substantial deficiency of aggregate demand in the American economy, with the result that the level of unemployment is significantly higher than it need be—and, in our opinion, higher than it should be.

2. While there are significant "structural" problems which make it difficult to find jobs for the more disadvantaged of the unemployed, the first need is to achieve a higher overall level of economic activity. If this is done, efforts to retrain and relocate displaced workers will be more effective.

3. We subscribe to the belief, as recently expressed by Walter Heller, that an "increase in aggregate demand is most appropriately brought about in a predominantly private-enterprise economy such as ours by means of monetary or fiscal measures."

4. It is generally agreed that, in the present situation, monetary policy by itself cannot bring about the necessary expansion of economic activity—in part, because of the restraint imposed by the present balance-of-payments situation. Hence the primary reliance must be on fiscal policy.

5. While we welcome the improvement in economic conditions which has occurred in the last few months, we believe that "natural forces" alone will not eliminate excess unemployment this year or even next year.

6. It therefore follows that, in the months ahead, substantial use should be made of fiscal policy as a means of stimulating aggregate demand and raising the level of employment. This can be done by reducing tax revenues, by increasing Government expenditures, or by some combination of the two.

7. We believe that the increase in the Federal deficit proposed by the administration is not too large, given the objective being sought. We are confident that both the short-run and long-run effects of the tax reduction will be beneficial. Indeed, insofar as there is a difference of opinion among us, it is that some of us believe that a larger tax cut should have been proposed.

8. On the whole, we believe that the administration's program, as originally submitted to the Congress, represents a reasonable compromise. It provides tax reductions for both individuals and corporations. It should provide a significant stimulus to consumers' spending, and it should have a beneficial effect on private investment. Virtually all of us believe that substantial tax reform is badly needed, but we also believe that arguments as to the details and timing of tax reform should not delay the prompt approval of a substantial across-the-board reduction in Federal income tax rates.

9. We should like to assure the American people that a Federal deficit of the magnitude proposed, given the extent to which capital and labor are not now being fully utilized, carries no danger of accelerated inflation. Nor does such a deficit in any manner or degree threaten the solvency of the Federal Government. This country's outstanding record of economic growth during the last century and a half or more has been associated with increases in debt representing mobilization of the people's savings by business and Government. It should be noted, also, that the size of the deficit will automatically decline as rising incomes generate increased tax revenues at the lower rates.

10. We should also like to affirm—and we do so with complete confidence—that there is nothing to fear from the present size of the Federal debt. Nor is there anything to fear from the moderate increase in the debt that will result from the deficits envisaged in the next few years. Indeed, measured as a fraction of the gross national product, the Federal debt today is much smaller relatively than it was 15 years ago. And interest payments on the debt absorb a significantly smaller fraction of the national income than they did at the end of World War II.

In the realm of economic policy—as in all social and political action—there are as many versions of what is "best" as there are people who are likely to be affected by any proposed line of action. To insist on a "perfect" tax program is to insure that nothing will be done. The administration's program is a significant step in the right direction.

We subscribe to the propostions included in the statement on "The Tax Program of the Kennedy Administration." Each of us signs as an individual economist and not as a representative of an institution.

Amherst College: Ralph E. Beres, Arnold Collery, Irwin Kleinberg, Heinz Kohler, Willard L. Thorp, Colston E. Warne, James R. Wilson.

Bowdoin College: Albert Abrahamson, Paul G. Darling, Giulio Pontecorvo, William D. Shipman, James A. Storer.

Brandeis University: Richard I. Weckstein, P. J. D. Wiles.

Brookings Institution: Barbara R. Berman, Edward F. Denison, Gary Fromm, Bert G. Hickman, Joseph A. Pechman, Merton J. Peck, Alice M. Rivlin, Walter S. Salant.

University of California, Berkeley: Joseph S. Bain, George T. Break, Eugene W. Burgess, Norman R. Collins, J. M. Culberston, Malcolm M. Davisson, Kenneth B. Farrel, Hugh Folk, V. Fuller, Theodore J. Goering, R. A. Gordon, E. T. Grether, Gregory Grossman, Saul H. Hymans, Sydney Hoos, Van D. Kennedy, Ivan M. Lee, John M. Letiche, Choh Ming Li, Sherman J. Maisil, Julius Margolis, Hyman P. Minsky, David Olbe, Andreas G. Papandreou, Ray Radner, Earl R. Ralph, David A. Revzan, Henry Rosovsky, Arthur M. Ross, Bernard Saffran, Tibor Scitovsky, Lloyd Ulman, Dow Votaw, Frank A. Waring, Sidney G. Winter, Jr.

University of California, Davis: Oscar R. Burt, Frank C. Child, Bruce Glassburner, Warren S. Gramm, Curtis C. Harris, Jr., Trimble R. Hedges, Gordon A. King, Martin P. Oettinger, J. Herbert Snyder, Stephen H. Sosnick, J. M. Tinley.

University of California, Santa Barbara: Mortimer Andrew, J. F. Halterman, Jerry F. Karer, William J. Kennedy, Walter J. Mead.

University of California, Los Angeles: H. Robert Bartell, Jr., E. F. Brighen, C. J. Huizinga, R. J. Jessen, Erwin L. Kelly, Jr., Buruhan T. Campbell, H. Lawrence Miller, Jr., Harold P. Moody, Frank E. Norton, George E. S. Murphy, J. Fred Weston, Robert M. Williams.

Carnegie Institute of Technology: G. L. Bach.

University of Chicago: B. M. Fleisher, Harry G. Johnson, Dale W. Jorgenson, Arnold Harberger, Marshall D. Ketchum, Lloyd A. Metzler, Merton H. Miller, Albert Rees, T. W. Schultz.

Columbia University: Harold Barger, Arthur R. Burns, Alexander Erlich, Carter Goodrich, Albert O. Hirschman, Robert Lekachman, David E. Novack, Julius Rubin.

University of Connecticut: David G. Edens, Dorothy C. Goodwin, James C. Loughlin, Morris Singer, William P. Snavely, Paul N. Taylor, Philip E. Taylor, H. John Thorkelson, Paul Weiner, Imanuel Wexler.

Cornell University: William D. Carmichael, Douglas F. Dowd, John A. Henning, George H. Hildebrand, Alfred E. Kahn, Chandler Morse, George J. Staller.

Dartmouth College: William A. Carter, M. O. Clement, James F. Cusick, Clyde E. Dankert, Thomas J. Finn, Jr., Herbert Goertz, Martin L. Lindahl, Kenneth J. Rothwell, Martin Segal, Ian A. Stewart.

Duke University: William Porfohe.

Harvard University: Abram Bergson, Richard E. Caves, Robert Dorfman, John T. Dunlop, James Duesenberry, Otto Eckstein, Alexander Gerschenkron, Seymour Harris, R. B. Heflebower, Richard O. Mallon, Edward S. Mason, Rhod J. Ohyme, Gustave F. Papanek, T. Schelling, Wolfgang F. Stolper.

University of Illinois: V. Lewis Bassie, Ruth A. Birdzell, John D. Bowman, Sanford Cohen, Milton Derbe, John F. Due, Robert Ferber, Marvin Frankel, Donald W. Paden.

University of Indiana: Robert W. Campbell, Troy J. Conley, Irvin Grossack, Taubman A. Miller, Henry M. Oliver, Lloyd D. Orr, Ross M. Robertson, Nicolas Spulber, Ted Witney, E. R. Wicker.

University of Iowa: Raymond R. Beruke, Eugene A. Brady, Harold W. Dewey, Hirschel Harper, Earl O. Heady, Bob R. Holden, Sydney James, Lee Kolmer, Francis A. Kutish, Stanley S. Long, Dudley G. Luckett, Charles Meyer, John W. Rowe, Jr., J. T. Scott, Erik Thorbreke, Karl A. Totz, John F. Truemont, Don Winkelmann.

Johns Hopkins University: Z. Adel, G. Heberton Evans, Jr., James K. Kindahl, Kelvin J. Lancaster, Edwin S. Mills, R. T. Sparrow.

University of Maryland: John H. Cumberland, Dudley Dillard, Norton T. Dodge, Lyle E. Gramley, Robert E. L. Knight, Philip C. Packard, Melville J. Ulmer, Paul Wonnacott.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Albert Ando, Francis Bator, E. Cary Brown, Paul H. Cootner, Rischard S. Eckaus, Everett E. Hagen, Daniel M. Holland, Edwin Kuh, Louis Lefeber, Max F. Millikan, Paul A. Samuelson, Robert M. Solow, Charles P. Kindleberger.

Michigan State University: Abba P. Lerner.

University of Minnesota: John Buttick, E. Coen, Edward Foster, Lowell Gallany, Ralph H. Hofmeister, Leonid Hurwicz, A. O. Krueger, Jim Schwinden, Harlan M. Smith, John G. Trumbull.

New York University: Clifford D. Clark, Lawrence S. Ritter, Arnold W. Sarnet, Harvey H. Sezal.

University of North Carolina: Paul N. Guthrie, Leopold B. Koriebroski, David T. Lapkin, Henry A. Latane, R. S. Winslow, Marice Whee, Irving B. Kravis, Wilfred Malrubaum, Robert Summers, C. R. Whittlesey, Willis J. Winn.

Pennsylanvia State University: Edward Budd, William M. Hench, Philip A. Klein, Will E. Mason, Arthur H. Reede, Randall S. Stout, Robert J. Trusk.

University of Pittsburgh: Benjamin Chuntz, A. T. Eapen, R. D. Entenberg, Alan E. Fechter, Shinkyung Kim, Charles L. Levin, Daniel McFadden, William C. Pendleton, Robert J. A. Pratt, Merrill J. Roberts, Edward Sussia, C. Edward Weber.

Princeton University: William Baumol, Arthur Benavie, William G. Bowen, Ansley J. Coale, Warren W. Eason, F. Aldrich Finegan, Peggy Heim, Edward J. Kane, Klaus Knorr, Richard A. Lester, David McFarland, R. A. Musgrave, Gardner Patterson, Richard E. Quandt, Frederic C. Shorter, John Williamson, Burton A. Weisbrod, Lester V. Chandler.

Rice University: S. N. Afriat, John H. Auten, Dwight S. Brothers, Edgard O. Edwards, Hans Jurgen Jalesch, Gaston V. Remlinger.

University of Rochester: Marcus Alexis, William E. Dunkman, Robert R. France, Myron J. Gordon, Ronald W. Jones, Lionel McKenzie, Rudolph G. Penner, Richard T. Rostoff, Edward Zabel.

Southern Methodist University: Leo T. Bakomy, Paul T. Hornan, Attiat A. Farag, Richard B. Johnson, W. J. Lovejoy, Daniel J. Ott, J. H. Pratt.

Stanford University: Kenneth Arrow, Richard Attrych, Paul David, Emile Despres, John G. Gurley, Bernard F. Haley, Paul Hartman, James Howell, Theodore J. Kreps, Alan S. Manne, Ronald McKinnon, Mel Reder, Louie Tarshis, Dale Yoder.

Tufts University: V. E. Andric, John Cornwall, Franklyn D. Holzman.

University of Utah: Sigmund Krauthauser.

Vanderbilt University: Rudolph C. Blitz, John A. Brittain, Reynold E. Carlson, Reulias Fels, E. J. Eberling, Leo J. Raskind, Ewing P. Shabor, George W. Stocking, Fred U. Wertfield, Jeffrey G. Williamson, James S. Worley.

University of Virginia: George R. Hall, Almarin Phillips, James R. Schlesinger, Rutledge Vining.

University of Washington: Henry T. Beuchel, J. A. Crutchfield, Barney Dowdle, J. P. Gillingham, William S. Hopkins, W. D. Morris, Vernon A. Mund, Judith Thornton, Charles M. Tribout, D. A. Worcester, Jr.

Wesleyan University: Clyde Olin Fisher, Burton C. Hallowell, Lawrence C. Jones, Stanley Lebergott, Melvin Lurie, Gerald M. Meler, Richard A. Miller, Edward J. Nell, Vladimir L. Stoikov.

Williams College: Henry J. Bruton, Paul G. Clark, Robinson G. Hollister, Jr., Joseph A. Kershaw, Robert Miki, Frederick S. O'Brien, William G. Rhoads, Norman Schneider, John Sheehan.

University of Wisconsin: Benjamin Bridges, Jr., Martin H. Daid, James S. Earley, Arthur S. Goldberger, Edward Greenbey, Farsham Hall, Kathleen Haygood, Edward B. Jakubauskas, David B. Johnson, John Korbel, Roger F. Miller, Guy H. Orcutt, Robert Ozanne, Gerald G. Somers, James Stern, G. E. Swingay, William Russell, Hans O. Schmitt, Ernst W. Stromsdorfer, Leonard W. Weiss.

Yale University: John Arena, Bela Balassu, Sylvester E. Berki, Ronald G. Bodkin, William Brandio, William T. Bruns, Jr., Duncan R. Campbell, Mariam Chamberlain, Neil W. Chamberlain, John Davis, F. Trenery Dolbear, Jr., Eeme Draudabej, Stanley Engerman, John Fei, James W. Frieda, Reginald H. Green, Joseph Grunewald, Donald A. Hester, John W. Hoofer, Shane J. Hunt, Zoran Horfert, Lawrence B. Krause, Michael C. Lowell, Peter Mieszkowski, Harry A. Miskimin, Arthur M. Oken, Hugh D. Patrick, Richard C. Porter, Raymond Powell, Gustave Ranis, Lloyd C. Reynolds, Leonard Schifrin, Peter Schran, Adolph Strumthel, James Tobin, Harold W. Watts, Menuhin Yaari.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during the past 2 weeks, I have placed letters to me from several State recreation and travel agencies, expressing their support for my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year." This bill has the dual purpose of providing one means of getting at our serious balance-of-payments deficit and to promote a greater appreciation of America in our great country and its heritage.

Support for my bill is continuing to grow, and I wish to include a letter I have received from the Department of Commerce and Development of the State of Idaho at this point in my remarks, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
AND DEVELOPMENT,
Boise, Idaho, September 23, 1963.

The Honorable AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: Thank you for sending to me the sheet from the September 16 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to your resolution on "Travel America." Your balance-of-payments reasoning for the resolution is good, but I believe that the byproducts of Americans visiting areas as yet unknown to them will have an even greater beneficial effect.

Within the past few years, the travel industry has arisen rapidly in Idaho and we are personally grateful for encouraging measures such as your resolution.

Sincerely,

LOUISE SHADDUCK,
Executive Secretary.

Just Plain Jack Is Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Just Plain Jack is back. Arthur Hoppe brings to us another television episode and I am happy to pass it along to the readers of the RECORD in his column that follows:

JUST PLAIN JACK IN THE WILDERNESS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time for another visit with Just Plain Jack, the warm story of a never-say-die young man who constantly plans to win through another day. Like on November 3, 1964.

As we join Just Plain Jack, he and the Beautiful Society Girl he married are in the bedroom together packing their suitcases.

Jack: "Oh, it's good to do things together. And there's nothing like the adventure of traveling. It saves many a marriage. By the way, dear, where are you going?"

Society Girl: "Greece. Ah, the wine dark sea. Ah, the——"

Jack: "Good. And don't forget to say how much our Nation owes our wonderful Greco-American voters. As for me, I'm off to the wilderness. Ah, wilderness; nothing cleanses the soul like communing with nature. The sky, the stars, the pines—besides, Pierre says it'll be good for my image. You know, like Teddy Roosevelt."

(Portly Pierre, the faithful family retainer, rushes in waving a sheet of paper.)

Pierre: "We got your itinerary worked out, Chief. It's great, It's dramatic. First stop is the giant redwoods of California, even now threatened by the loggers. You stand erect. You throw out your arms. You cry, 'Woodsman, spare this tree.' You are surrounded by thousands."

Jack (happily rubbing his hands): "Of voters?"

Pierre: "Of trees."

Jack: "Oh."

Pierre: "Then on to the Point Reyes coast, home of the clam and seagull. You stand on the desolate strand, defying the real estate interests, protector of the poor thousands around you who cry out for help."

Jack (wryly): "Poor clams?"

Pierre: "And seagulls. Then you trek across the vast empty deserts of Nevada. On to the pinnacles of the Rockies where none has trod before. You lose yourself in the lonely depths of the Grand Canyon. You——"

Jack: "Don't I get to dedicate a dam? You usually get a good turnout when you give the people a dam."

Pierre: "Oh, no, Chief. This is a conservation trip. We worked it out so you won't see a soul for days. Ah, wilderness; nothing but wilderness. You'll preserve all this grandeur. Think how your memory will be revered by generations yet unborn."

Jack: "Right. And think how many of them will vote next November. Maybe we better change that itinerary a bit. Now, let's see. We'll make speeches in Salt Lake City, Laramie, Seattle-Tacoma and Great Falls, Mont. We've got trouble in Montana. Toss in Las Vegas. Nevada's touch and go. And throw in a dam in California. That's a real swing State. And——"

Pierre: "But, Chief, what about the wilderness?"

Jack (hand over heart): "No one, Pierre, loves the wilderness more than I. Even though I've never seen it. And I will prove this to one and all. No matter how many big cities I must go to."

Will Jack save the wilderness? Will Jack give a dam? Tune in to our next episode, folks. And meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: To preserve the age-old glories of nature all you need is Just Plain Jack.

Is It Really Fair?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Aegis, of Bel Air, Md., which asks for a thoughtful reevaluation of the Draft Act. Each time the Selective Service Act has been before Congress for renewal, there has been criticism voiced of its fairness and effectiveness. This law has been continuously in effect since World War II, and its basic structure goes back to World War I. I believe, as the editor of the Aegis believes, that it is time for a congressional overlook of the Selective Service Act.

The editorial follows:

IS IT REALLY FAIR?

Many Members of Congress, and a large segment of the country's adult population, have for sometime questioned the equity of the national draft law. Now the law seems to become even more unfair with the issuance of a Presidential order last week exempting married men from the draft—short of total mobilization.

Thus 340,000 married men in the 1-A pool or about 20 percent of the 1,700,000 now in this classification and eligible for military call, may breathe a sigh of relief as their prospects of serving in the Armed Forces are almost nil.

No law is ever entirely fair to all, and it must be realized that a married man in the service is more expensive to taxpayers than a single man.

Twenty-three years ago this October the first mass registration for the draft took place in order to maintain a ready fighting force and after World War II the law has continued in effect. Thus every young man since has known that at sometime he had a military obligation to fulfill to his country as a part of living in this great democracy.

But there are several ways for a young man to skip this obligation today and it is the boy who is inducted, who may in the future become known as the "sucker."

For instance, few young men, who do reasonably well in colleges or universities are inducted during the course of their studies, and for many marriage takes place at the conclusion of their education. This group seems destined to be exempted from the draft.

It is the boy who, for many reasons, is only a high school graduate who appears the victim in this case. He doesn't know at what age or when he will be drafted and employers shy away from hiring him until after his service is completed.

While the new Executive order may encourage some unfortunate young marriages, it seems a shame to discriminate against the man who desires to remain single thus running the risk of being drafted.

No doubt before Congress again extends the draft law there will be considerable pressure brought to update the bill in order to clearly define who is to serve, before bitterness develops among the country's population.

What is fair to one seems only fair to all.

Parks for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller addressed the closing banquet of the Parks for America Conference at the Sheraton Park Hotel. The conference was called by the American Institute of Park Executives, the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, and the National Conference on State Parks.

Mr. Rockefeller is an outstanding leader among the conservation and recreation forces of America and the world—a leader in thought, in word, and in deed. His address to the conference was so full of sound sense that it deserves to be read, studied, and taken to heart by all of us. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I include it here in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER BEFORE THE PARKS FOR AMERICA CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 26, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am particularly pleased to be a part of this Parks for America Conference. The relatively few represented here tonight are the people who do the real work for the millions who benefit from parks.

The American Institute of Park Executives, the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, and the National Conference on State Parks are the frontline of the effort to keep the outdoors a part of American life. I am proud to be associated with you.

This joint conference represents the full range of outdoor opportunities—from the small green oasis amid urban asphalt and steel to the outstanding shrine of scenic grandeur. It is a significant and productive event that you are meeting to consider the full range of outdoor experience. A balance of opportunities is the key to a successful national program, and this conference represents an excellent effort to look at the full picture.

Each aspect of the range from the city core to the wilderness is important, and each presents hard problems. In the cities, in places near enough for day and weekend use, and in the faraway areas, the challenge must be met. In each case there must be adequate acquisition, development, personnel, and public education.

But tonight I would like to address my remarks to a problem pertaining to the large parks away from the city—our showplaces of scenic beauty.

The issue is the matter of strict preservation versus development of facilities.

On the one hand, we want to preserve outstanding natural areas for posterity—we want them untouched and untrammeled. And on the other, we want to provide outdoor recreation for millions every summer weekend or holiday.

And this is more than a matter of what we would like to do. Many resource agencies operate under basic laws which direct them to do two jobs—to preserve and to provide mass recreation.

Anyone who bears the scars of a fight over a new park road or a new building can testify that the two tasks can come into violent conflict. It is no wonder there are frustrations and family quarrels.

And at this crucial time, we cannot afford conflict or divisive weakness. Right now is perhaps the most important time for outdoor recreation since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. A new awareness has come over the politicians and the administrators—an awareness that people want and are willing to pay for outdoor recreation.

The evidence is all around us. On the Federal level there is the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the pending land and water conservation fund bill, and the most significant additions to the national park system in a generation.

The States are more vigorous and dynamic than at any time in their history. Voters have enthusiastically approved bond issues in New York and New Jersey. Similar votes are coming up in Pennsylvania, Florida, and California. Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Connecticut have enacted imaginative new legislative programs. All this gives heartening evidence of a dynamic surge in State action.

Town, city, and county governments across the country are on the move also—particularly in the field of imaginative new devices to restore green space to urban living.

So this is a day to get things done. Public support for parks and recreation, which has so long been lacking, is surging. We are on the verge of a great breakthrough which can make the 1960's a memorable decade for conservation and outdoor recreation.

But we must be capable of seizing this opportunity. If we appear to be ineffectual, petty people quarreling over what the public thinks are minor points of dogma, support will wane. This great chance will slip from our hands, and another half century may pass before the time will be ripe again.

To be fully ready for the task, I suggest that we must recognize the problem of our dual responsibility and carry out both sides of it well. We are expected to accomplish the often conflicting roles of preservation and mass recreation; yet too often we tell ourselves that it is all one job.

Let's be honest. There is conflict here, and we must have the good sense to resolve it. The concept of multiple use is a fine thing. It is a good administrative tool where commodity uses and recreation are carried on together in large areas. And it is helpful as an approach in allocating resources among various recreation activities.

But multiple use is sometimes used to sweep problems under the rug—problems which should be solved out in the open. It is easy to say glibly that various uses can go on in harmony, but at a certain point this bliss breaks down. You can't have 20,000 people converging on the floor of Yosemite Valley on a summer Saturday night and pretend that you are managing a wilderness. You are running a small city with all its problems, and it must be so managed or there will be chaos.

Once we accept the fact that there are two distinct sides to our job, the next step is to allocate our energies and resources between the two. Here is the key to serving the public well and earning their support. We must provide a balanced response to the diverse demands upon us.

This is easy to say, but hard to do; and here is where the trouble begins. Dedicated, honest, intelligent men differ on how resources should be allocated. And in some of the ensuing spats these same dedicated, honest, intelligent men get so carried away that they sometimes become petty, quarrelsome, and stupid.

Here are a few guidelines—guidelines for allocating our efforts to meet all our responsibilities well.

First, as a fundamental, we are dedicated to the preservation of outstanding examples of our natural heritage. This includes the well-known, highly used areas and the more remote, primitive areas. There can be no question of this dedication or we might as well give up and turn our parks over to the hotdog stands and honkytonks.

Secondly, we must realize, however, that by far the greatest public demand is for developed facilities. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission found that Americans participated in various outdoor recreation activities on 4.4 billion separate occasions in 1960, and it is predicted that this figure will double by 1976 and triple by the year 2000.

And the breakdown of the activities in that huge total is enlightening. For example, Americans went picnicking approximately 387 million times; in the wilderness areas of the Forest Service and the Park Service, on the other hand, there were less than 3 million visitors days.

I don't mean to imply that picnicking is 100 times as important as wilderness use. But I do mean to draw your attention to the fact that perhaps we have been paying an excessive amount of attention to opportunities used by the few and not enough to those by the many.

The vast majority of those 4.4 billion outdoor recreation occasions generated demand on developed facilities. To those of you who are in the business of managing such facilities, I don't have to point out that they are in short supply.

If we are to meet the doubling and tripling of demand which ORRRC predicted—and by the way, these predictions are conservative by other forecasts—we must expand supply where the demand will be—on developed facilities.

The public is going to generate pressure for facilities. The millions of voters who support bond issues and higher taxes for recreation are going to want something concrete for their money—and I mean that in the literal as well as the figurative sense. They are going to want good campsites, with water and sanitary facilities; they are going to want picnic areas, boat launching facilities, and all the rest.

The problem is not really one of "if" but of "how." We can respond to pressures on a case-by-case basis and produce a patchwork patterns of shortsighted decisions. Or we can plan for balanced and orderly development which will provide facilities and which will preserve the values of the outdoors.

I think the choice is clear. We must guide development according to plan—not on an issue-by-issue, dogfight-by-dogfight basis.

Thirdly, I would suggest that by planning for and providing facilities in an orderly manner, we will be able to carry out the other side of the job—preservation of natural heritage—in a far better fashion. What we are talking about here is a balance—a planned balance.

The classification system proposed in the ORRRC report, in my opinion, can be an excellent balancing tool. The six categories of use—ranging from high-density urban areas to wilderness—cover the range of our job. No computer can tell us just how many acres should go into each category, but the

use of this classification system does provide a framework in which rational decisions can be made.

For example, if a region containing a national park, a national forest, and other resources is zoned according to the classification system, a balance of various kinds of recreation can be provided. There will be high-density areas and space for facilities, outstanding natural and historical sites will be preserved, and primitive areas will be delineated.

The system, or modifications of it, can also be used to allocate space in a single unit.

A proposal for development, a new road, or any other change in use can be evaluated in terms of the classification system. A high-density parking lot should not be placed in any area zoned for natural values, but if the system is applied properly there will be a place for the cars. And it will be a place that was determined by looking at the overall needs for the area—not one dictated by opportunity or the course of least resistance.

The use of a system will help defend those areas where development should not take place as well as providing space for development. The case for keeping areas roadless and undeveloped is much stronger if it is part of a reasonable plan to provide a balance of opportunities, rather than another emotional appeal against the bulldozer blades.

A classification system does not relieve us of hard decisions. But such a system does provide a rational basis on which to make decisions.

In my judgment, we are fortunate to have a new, major tool to assist in this important decisionmaking process. It is the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, established by the President and the Congress upon the recommendation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

BOR has the statutory responsibility, a deep concern, and the technical know-how to help in both preservation and recreation problems. It will make a major contribution in balancing and coordinating the various Federal recreation programs. And in its role as an overall planning agency and focal point for Federal assistance to the States, it will help park programs at all levels of government.

The Bureau is still new and its task is only begun. I hope it will enjoy the support of all of you, for its success is important to the future of outdoor recreation in this country.

In summary, I am recommending that we do both the jobs given us by doing three rather specific things: (1) recognizing that we have two tasks and setting out to do them both well, (2) realizing that we must provide facilities to meet public demand, and (3) using a classification system to meet that demand and carry out our important task of preservation as well.

This may not be the only possible cure. But I do strongly urge that we take some action to clear away our indecision and lack of clear direction to meet the demands for outdoor recreation the public is placing upon us.

The 1960's can be a historic decade of progress. Or they can be 10 years of petty bickering and inaction. In very large measure, the question rests upon how well we do our job.

At this historic joint meeting of park people from all levels of government you have taken a giant step forward. Your meeting together is an encouraging sign of fruitful cooperation for the future.

I have every faith that the dedicated men and women here tonight will lead the way with energy and with wisdom. If we do our job well, the 1960's will be an era future generations will bless as crucial in preserving the outdoors in American life.

A Question of Who

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Dixon's column, "Washington Scene," from the Washington Post of September 27, 1963, represents a proper picture of the actions of Mr. Baker, majority secretary of the Senate. But since Bobby Baker belongs to the proper family, he will in all probability get the family protection. Mr. Dixon's column follows:

A QUESTION OF WHO

(By George Dixon)

I had always thought of Bobby Baker as a messenger boy because about all I've ever seen him do is run errands for Senators. You may imagine my delight, therefore, when it was revealed that—away from the Capitol—he is a tycoon, in a $3,500,000-a-year business.

I am a pushover for American success stories. Nothing warms the cockles of my heart so much as to see a friend alter his circumstances. My sentiments are those inscribed on a watch that Frank Sinatra once gave to the late burlesque comedian, Rags Ragland: "From Riches to Rags."

The nicest part of it for Robert G. Baker is that he achieved his riches at only 35. Supposing he had had to struggle until he was 36 or 37, and too old to enjoy them?

While occupying the humble role of secretary to the Senate majority, however, he moonlighted interminably—and in 18 long months helped in the financing of this sideline. It is a vending machine company with the cute name of Serv-U Corp., and holds franchises in aerospace plants, whose research and development is almost wholly underwritten by the Federal Government.

When it was suggested to Bobby that he was in a position to carry on conversations not disadvantageous to his welfare, he asked in wide-eyed innocence:

"Who in the world would I talk to?"

Firstly, I am pleased that he didn't say "Whom." Secondly, I am happy to be able to relieve him of his puzzlement. I can tip the secretary to the Senate majority who in the world he could talk to.

Every Democrat in the Senate.

Without leaving this world he could talk to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate Majority Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and the chairmen of important committees, all of whom are Democrats, and constantly calling upon the secretary of the majority to do this and that for them.

He could talk to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, which authorizes aerospace contracts, and Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, which votes the money.

He could talk to 10 of the 15 members of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee—Senators ANDERSON, MAGNUSON, SYMINGTON, STENNIS, YOUNG, DODD, CANNON, HOLLAND, EDMONDSON, and the aforementioned RUSSELL.

The remaining five members of the committee are Republicans, and not worth Bobby's time talking to.

If young Master Baker is too busy filling his vending machines to go to the Capitol he can phone all of them at Capitol 4-3121. If he's in the Capitol, all he's got to do is dial the following extensions: 4451 (for L.B.J.); 2644 and 2424 (for the majority leader and whip respectively), and for others above mentioned, in this order: 3521; 2235; 6621; 2621; 6154; 6253; 2315; 4041; 6244; 5274, and 4721.

Without resorting to a little black book he can even call L.B.J. at home. Believe it or not, the Vice President has his home number in the phone book.

Now that I have done Bobby this favor, I wish he would find it in his heart to reciprocate by talking to the right people about having his statement preserved for posterity.

"Who in the world would I talk to?" belongs in Bartlett's Familiar Quotations."

"Who in the world would I talk to?" should rank with the great "Who?" question of history—"Who killed Cock Robin?", "Who discovered Dixie?" and Richard Burton's deathless riddle in Mexico City the other day when asked if he was there to get a Mexican divorce so he could marry his traveling companion, Elizabeth Taylor, "Who knows? I don't."

Bobby Baker's conundrum should become more familiar than "Who's afraid of the big bad wolf?" and "Who's on first?"

Or, the most poignant of all human interrogatories:

"Who, me?"

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the quality stabilization bill—S. 744—of which I am a sponsor, has been criticized as a price-fixing bill. The bill, of course, does not authorize the Government to impose minimum prices. It does not fix prices on any category of goods, but it does permit the manufacturer of a brand name competitive product to control the use of his trademark. The bill indirectly offers protection to small independent retailers from unfair competition.

Mr. Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Indepedent Business, Inc., deals with the charge of price fixing in a letter he wrote to the editor of the Cincinnati Post and Times Star. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE OF CUTTHROAT COMPETITION

To the EDITOR:

How in the world can you hold to your view that the Quality Stabilization Act is a price-fixing bill, when it will only protect the right you are exercising in establishing an area wide price of 7 cents for the Post and Times-Star? It was your decision, and every distributor had to abide by it. Is this price fixing?

This is a profit country. Profits alone induce businesses to spend money for advertising, expansion; contribute to Community Chest drives, join the chamber of commerce.

and keep in a modernized, competitive position.

General Motors was trying to protect its dealers in California when it was indicted for trying to keep Chevrolets out of discount houses. General Electric was trying to save its distribution system by entering nearly 3,200 cases under the old fair trade laws—to keep the name of G.E. from being a bait for the chiselers.

Hundreds of thousands of small businesses have gone the bankruptcy route so that Joe Bush could buy a name-brand electric razor below cost, and Mrs. Bush a name-brand toaster, below cost. A pretty high price for a low price, isn't it?

I wonder just how much those toasters and razors have cost in lost taxes, lost jobs, unemployment, relief, and disillusionment? Just what do we gain, for example, in a tankful of gas that is sold by a gasoline dealer trying to squeeze out a living for his wife and kids—if he sells it at a loss? Is there satisfaction seeing the big oil company order him out, broke and beaten?

The price of cutthroat competition is always the highest price, and, today, we are paying it. The Quality Stabilization Act is one small approach to a gigantic problem—the problem of restoring at least a shadow of ethics to a marketplace gone mad with greed.

ED WIMMER,
Vice President, Public Relations Director, National Federation of Independent Business, Inc.

Virginians Protest Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, since the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against the offering of prayers and reading from the Bible in our public schools I have received literally hundreds of protests from northern Virginia residents against this decision

Two items which came to my attention this past week, which I believe are particularly descriptive of the grave concern this decision has caused, are a letter of September 21 from the official board of the Culmore Methodist Church in Falls Church, Va., and a poem written and sent me by Mrs. Kathryn Thorne Bowsher of Fairfax, Va.

I am pleased to insert, so that all my colleagues may share, these two items in this RECORD today:

CULMORE METHODIST CHURCH,
Falls Church, Va., September 21, 1963.
Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROYHILL: We are deeply distressed by recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which downgrade and tend to destroy religious faith as a vital part of our national life. This Nation was founded upon the belief that human liberties are endowed by God, not by man.

Aside from legal technicalities, the Supreme Court decisions reflect a view by the Court's majority that references to Almighty God in historic documents and ceremonies of our Nation are merely matters of form, and have no meaning.

Acknowledgment of a power greater than man is the decisive difference between the United States and those pagan and atheistic forces which threaten to engulf the world. Unless we, as a nation, pay homage to and draw strength from Almighty God, this Nation will surely fail in its responsibility to its own citizens, to mankind everywhere, and to our Creator.

The antireligious views of those who deny the existence of a Supreme Being have no standing in our courts or other official bodies. Citizens are entitled to protection of their lives and property but not of philosophies which contradict the very nature of ideals upon which this Nation is based. We believe the attached clippings from the Evening Star dated August 12, 1963, and the Northern Virginia Sun dated September 12, 1963, reflect the concern of citizens everywhere.

We respectfully request that you take all possible steps to initiate constitutional reforms which will recognize, regain, and safeguard the ideal that ours is a nation which draws its strength from a Supreme Being.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK W. SENCINDIVER,
Chairman, Official Board.

THEY TOOK THE BIBLE OUT OF SCHOOL

They took the Bible out of school.
They silenced our children's prayer.
They say it's against the rule
To show our Creator we care.
The Court interprets for our land
Just how we may worship God.
Before we seek our Lord's hand
We must bend 'neath the judges' rod.

O, slothful Christian, where were you
When all of this came to pass?
Did you sleep the battle through
While godlessness conquered at last?
The hosts of Satan took bold stand
Their blasphemous cause to win.
Has judgment come to our land
In chastisement for our gross sin?

O, God, forgive us for Christ's sake.
May Congress, in measures fair,
An amendment swiftly make
To bring back in school our Lord's Prayer.
From Thy tribunal may there fall
Thy mercy and righteous rule.
Most Sovereign God, hear our call.
O, establish Thy Word in school.
—*Kathryn Thorne Bowsher.*

Aid to Tito: What United States Got for $2.5 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond appeared in the Washington Post of September 30.

Mr. Drummond has been making an intensive study of Yugoslavia, and his views should be given consideration and study by the many Members on both sides of the aisle who are interested in this situation:

AID TO TITO: WHAT UNITED STATES GOT FOR $2.5 BILLION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BELGRADE.—When President Josip Broz Tito arrives in Washington October 17 to confer with President Kennedy on trade and foreign policy, one question which most Americans would like him to answer is this: What has the United States got for its $2.5 billion of aid to Yugoslavia during the past 15 years?

This question greatly concerned the 6 Senators and 12 Congressmen who made up the American delegation to the Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union here in Belgrade. They raised it pointedly on several occasions.

It is a good question, a fair question, particularly since Congress is being asked by the administration to reverse the decision it made a year ago denying Yugoslavia most-favored-nation treatment in trade. The most-favored-nation provision means that when the United States makes tariff arrangements with one country, it grants the same arrangement with other nations.

First, it should be understood that all United States aid to Yugoslavia is ended. Aid is neither being sought nor given.

But the United States has put a lot of resources into Yugoslavia. It is reasonable to want to know what benefit they have produced for us, because there is no justification for such aid unless it serves our national interests.

The facts, I think, show that we have received large dividends.

Until Tito broke with Stalin in 1948, Soviet-controlled military forces lined the Adriatic and stood menacingly along the borders of Greece, Austria, Italy, and Albania.

Tito's declaration of independence from Russia wiped out this menace at one stroke. American aid has greatly helped to nourish and sustain that independence until Yugoslavia could get on its feet economically. It has done so by virtue of its own hard work, through U.S. aid, and through the economic resurgence of all of Western Europe. Yugoslavian trade is now 77 percent with the West, only 23 percent with the Soviet bloc and other countries.

Here are some of the other dividends which have come from Yugoslavia's independence of the Soviet Union which our aid has helped to maintain:

Yugoslavia withdrew all of its military help to the Communist civil war in Greece and the war soon collapsed.

The long-festering dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy over Trieste was amicably settled.

Albania was geographically isolated from the Soviet bloc.

Though Tito is a dedicated Communist, he withdrew his country from the Cominform, an instrument of Communist world subversion, and has refused to join the Warsaw Pact.

Only a Yugoslavia independent of the Soviet Union could pursue policies which have produced the foregoing results. Its independence is possible only because of its economic association with the United States and Western Europe.

Clearly it is in the interests of the United States to do everything practicable to keep it that way.

It seems to me shortsighted for Congress to direct the administration to discriminate against Yugoslavia in withdrawing the normal most-favored-nation provision. We were, of course, piqued by Tito's refusal to criticize the Soviet Union for breaking the test moratorium in 1961. This was one of Belgrade's political mistakes.

But Yugoslavia has often sided with the United States at the U.N. and has more frequently voted with the unalined nations than with the Soviets.

If Congress does not soon reverse its action cutting off Yugoslavia and Poland from normal trade relations, the effect of this policy will be exactly the opposite of what its sponsors said they want. It will not help isolate Eastern Europe from the Soviet Union; it will isolate us from Eastern Europe and abandon the field to the Soviets. Surely this is a policy of retreat, not advance, and

a detriment to the national interests and security of the United States.

The choice before us in Eastern Europe today is not between supporting communism on the one hand and democracy on the other. The choice is between governments dominated by Moscow and governments, like Yugoslavia's, which, while Communist, are independent, which are not abetting the Communist conspiracy, and which are pursuing their own national interests—not Russia's national interests.

An American Tass?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there have been many expressions of deep concern by newspapers across the Nation concerning administration news management policies.

A recent step along these lines is the action by the Department of Agriculture to disseminate market news to commercial subscribers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a noteworthy editorial on this matter which appeared in the September 19, 1963, issue of the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz. As will be noted, the Arizona Republic mentions an editorial by Mr. Eric Ridder, publisher of the Journal of Commerce commenting on the news control implications present when the Government disseminates news. I placed Mr. Ridder's editorial in the RECORD on August 22, 1963. It may be found beginning at page A5396.

The editorial from the Arizona Republic follows:

AN AMERICAN TASS?

Most Americans would agree that the U.S. Department of Defense got its fingers burned when its under secretary tried to defend "news management" as a policy of the Kennedy administration. But precedents apparently mean nothing to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which on August 1 started selling its "market news service" over a leased wire to commercial subscribers.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association has quite properly objected to the Government news service. Its petition to the Federal Communications Commission stated: "This is a new venture of the U.S. Government into the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies. Petitioner knows of no statutory authority by which the U.S. Department of Agriculture may expend Federal tax funds for this purpose." But the FCC rejected the petition, claiming it had no jurisdiction. We are beginning to wonder if anyone has jurisdiction, except of course the White House, which is quite willing to let a subordinate branch of the executive go into the business of collecting and selling news.

Eric Ridder, publisher of the Journal of Commerce, reported on September 9: "The Federal Register of August 28 has a memorandum from President Kennedy to the heads of executive departments and agencies, directing them to cooperate and assist in establishing a unified governmental communications commission to be called the 'National Communications System.' The memorandum states that the new system shall be established and developed 'by linking together, improving and extending, on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies.'"

Mr. Ridder recently wrote a piece in the Journal of Commerce called "The American Tass." It is what he later called "a whimsey," but its description of how the Federal news service might grow into an American version of the Soviet news agency deserves considerable attention.

The Department of Agriculture's news agency is in direct competition with the PAM News Corp., a privately owned company which relays to its customers Federal-State market news reports and supplementary information collected by its own reporters. In its way, PAM does the job in a specialized news field that AP and UPI do in the general news field.

If the Agriculture Department can form its own news service to compete with PAM, we see no reason why the Federal Government couldn't form a news service to compete with AP and UPI. The Government certainly has plenty of newsmen available in its publicity departments and in the U.S. Information Agency.

Properly put together, federally financed, and backed by news management policies in the administration, a Federal News Service might well do the job for the papers of this country that Tass does in Russia. Nothing unfavorable to the government moves over Tass, nor would it move over FNS. Such an agency would give the Central Government a weapon that could establish a dictatorship overnight.

If the Federal Communications Commission has no jurisdiction, we imagine Congress does. At least it holds the power of the purse over the Department of Agriculture. It certainly ought to investigate this latest scheme of the bureaucrats. Whenever the Government gets into the business of peddling news, look out.

Oh Happy Day?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed clipping from the Wall Street Journal was sent to me by a friend and constituent.

My constituent and I are both inclined, after reading the above, to repeat the famous saying "Who's loony now."

The clipping follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Stp. 4, 1963]

O HAPPY DAY?

We see where the International Business Machines Corp., acting under a court order, has reduced its share of the punch-card tabulating business to half of the industry's total capacity.

It seems that back in 1950, before the world went punch-card crazy, IBM produced some 90 percent of this country's total of 18 billion pieces of paper with the little holes in them. Very bad situation. Monopoly, and all of that. So naturally the Government got a court order against it. IBM could have only 50 percent of the market.

Trouble was, if IBM cut production there wouldn't be enough to meet the demand for empty holes. Especially since that demand was growing every year; by 1960 the country was already devouring 90 billion punch-cards a year, and no man knows what it will be next year. Even with 35 new companies in the business, and everybody punching like mad, the presses could hardly keep up.

However, a court order is a court order, and IBM finally licked the problem of cutting its share. Sold some of its giant presses to its competitors, who presumably would keep on punching. When even that wasn't enough to get under the 50 percent rule, the company shipped five of its presses to Europe and in desperation scrapped one of them entirely.

We trust the Government is happy over its trust-busting, and we're pretty sure IBM's competitors are. Silly of us to have a nagging question: For the U.S. Government to increase European production, decrease U.S. production, and force the scrapping of useful machines making a sorely needed product—that's a happy day?

A Housewife Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is time the Congress became more concerned with the vast majority of American people who have no pressure group to speak for them and who are becoming more and more frustrated at the lack of fiscal responsibility on the part of their Government. One such person has written a compelling letter to her hometown newspaper, the Joplin Globe, and under unanimous consent, I insert her letter in the Appendix of the RECORD for all to see:

A HOUSEWIFE SPEAKS

To the GLOBE:

Calling all little middle-class people with set incomes. Let us unite and demonstrate—everyone else does.

I am not referring to those of you who spend a half-week's check on a fling every Saturday night, or who take big vacations or drive a big, expensive car or two.

I am referring to those of you who are like us, trying to raise a family simply; who, although you make fairly good wages, all but sweat blood trying to keep your head above water meeting everyday expenses; who buy nothing but essentials and many times not even that.

Were you raised with the ideas we were? That parents tried to support themselves as long as they lived or were physically able and didn't expect the children or the Government to support them? And yet, because of increased giveaway programs and crazy schemes of Government officials, have such a chunk taken out of their checks each week they may be forced to do just that?

I am not a rabble-rouser, nor do I begrudge taxes. I do begrudge feeding my children beans, rice, and soups, etc., instead of a balanced diet, all because so much was held out of our check for siliness by politicians at all government levels.

For example, city-wise, the urban renewal. Taxpayers wake up. We pay for that and twice, through city and Federal taxes. Statewise, the thousands of dollars spent to notify people their drivers' licenses are due—a responsibility any adult should remember. Federal-wise, millions spent for highways in places where the majority cannot afford cars.

The poor have programs to aid them. The wealthy have money and don't have to worry. But we're in the middle. Everyday living expenses go up, and we're expected to meet them.

No household or business can continue to go on living beyond their means. If Government officials were forced to get by on what they actually have, as we are, I'm sure they could find a lot of leaks to plug.

Citizens, forget your apathy and indifference. Quit just griping. Think, and then write all of your Government officials, calling upon them to cut out waste and extravagance. If enough of us do this, they'll have to listen. They do want to be reelected.

VIRGINIA TYLER,
A Joplin Housewife.

Net Profits and Dividends of Private Power Companies Soar to New Heights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the net profits and dividends of the private power companies are soaring to new heights. The "combined" ads of "unfair competition" by the public power companies, notwithstanding and to the contrary.

In these advertisements, the impression is given that private power is in great danger from public power operations.

Nothing could be further from the truth. A recent story in Power Association News points out the folly in these contentions and shows quite clearly the increased profits and increased dividends the private power companies are making.

The story shows that in the 25-year period from 1937 through 1962 the net profits of the Nation's private power industry increased by 320 percent. However, the net profits of the nine private power companies that border on the TVA service area increased their profits by 494 percent over the 25-year period—this net profit increase is more than 1½ times as much as the national average.

The dividends paid on common stock of the private power companies bordering the TVA area also show a greater increase than for the national private power dividend average. While the dividends paid by the Nation's private power companies rose by 333 percent over the 25-year period, the common stock dividends paid by the nine power companies which are neighbors of TVA went up by the astonishing amount of 4050 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the power companies in fact are doing better than ever and those companies adjacent to the Tennessee Valley area are doing even better than the other companies. As the story points out perhaps these high price advertisements are really aimed at taking the customers' mind off how much profit the private power companies are really making from rate paying consumers.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this very informative article from the September 1963 issue of the Power Association News in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

PROFITABLE POWER COMPANIES

If you believed the national advertising of the private power companies, you would be certain that public and co-op power was about to drive the private companies out of business.

Private power complains that public power is "unfair competition," and suggests that the Nation's private power companies are in great danger. But a recent analysis by the Electric Consumers Information Committee has revealed that private power companies in the Southeast "have not only survived this 'dangerous force within,' as an industry propaganda ad put it recently, but they and their stockholders have fared better financially than the private power industry as a whole."

In the 25-year period from 1937 through 1962, the net profits of the Nation's private power industry increased by 320 percent; but the net profits of nine of TVA's neighbors—Middle South Utilities, Southern Co. and Kentucky Utilities—went up to 494 percent, more than one and one-half times as much.

On common stock dividends, the record is much more striking. Common dividends paid by the Nation's private power companies rose by 333 percent in the 25-year period; but the common stock dividends paid by these nine power company neighbors of TVA went up by whopping 4,050 percent, more than 10 times as much.

Earlier this year, Time magazine, commenting on TVA's 30th birthday, said: "Despite TVA's gigantic operations there is no evidence that nearby private utilities have been hurt. * * * Competitively lowering rates, the private companies have kept them low—yet the latest studies show that their common stock earnings are twice as high as the U.S. average."

BASICALLY, THE FACTS ARE THESE

1. Competition by example from TVA and its distributors has helped the private power companies around the TVA area * * * stimulating them to lower rates, and through increased efficiency and higher sales of electricity, to recordbreaking profits.

2. The public power systems have led the way for the private companies, instituting the low rate-high use policy which the private companies previously had been fearful of. Once the private companies began to lower their own rates, they found that this was a good way to greater electrical growth. In other words, the greatest period of power company profits came not when the companies followed their long-time conservative approach but when they adopted the new concept advanced by public power.

Here are the tables that show the remarkable record of profit progress made by these private power companies in the 1937–62 period:

Net profits

Company	1937	1962	Percent increase
Middle South Utilities	$4,300,000	$28,000,000	551
Southern Co.	9,600,000	52,300,000	445
Kentucky Utilities	1,100,000	8,900,000	709
Total	15,000,000	89,200,000	494
Total, private power industry	500,000,000	2,100,000,000	320

Common dividends

Company	1937	1962	Percent increase
Middle South Utilities	$500,000	$18,200,000	3,540
Southern Co.	900,000	35,300,000	3,882
Kentucky Utilities	None	4,600,000	----------
Total	1,400,000	58,100,000	4,050
Total, private power industry	300,000,000	1,300,000,000	333

The Southern Co. is a holding company, including the Georgia Power Co., Alabama Power Co., Gulf Power Co., and Mississippi Power Co.; the Middle South Utilities is also a holding company, including Arkansas Power & Light, Louisiana Power & Light, Mississippi Power & Light, and New Orleans Public Service.

Here, in quick summary, is the record of the Nation's private power companies for the 1937–62 period:

Net profits—up from $½ billion in 1937 to $2.1 billion in 1962, an increase of 320 percent; common stock dividends—up from $3/10 billion in 1937 to $1.3 billion in 1962, an increase of 333 percent; total assets—up from $15.3 billion in 1937 to $49.6 billion in 1962, an increase of 224 percent; and net utility plant—up from $12.4 billion in 1937 to $44.9 billion in 1962, an increase of 262 percent.

The study by Electric Consumers Information Committee also shows that private power companies have already set new records in the first half of 1963—new highs for profits, dividends and revenues. Nationally, electric revenues for the first half of 1963 were up 5½ percent; net profits were up nearly 6.5 percent; and common stock dividends declared were up 5.3 percent over the first half of 1962.

To any objective observer, it is obvious that the private power companies are doing better than ever. The year 1962 was a record year; the first half of 1963 saw even higher records set.

Frankly, it's difficult to work up a tear for the "poor" power companies. Maybe they spend so much money on negative propaganda advertising—telling people how much they're threatened by public power—to take their customers' minds off how much money the companies are making. In any case, the facts speak for themselves—the power companies are doing better than ever * * * and those companies adjacent to sizable public power areas are doing better than the rest.

The Sixteenth Street Baptist Church in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, radio station WMCA in New York is in the front line in public service. WMCA president, R. Peter Straus, has never hesitated to editorialize on matters of public interest and concern.

Recently Mr. Straus broadcasted an editorial on the bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham,

Ala., in which four little girls were killed. Mr. Straus and WMCA is raising a fund for the church in order to rebuild it and make it a shrine in memory of the dead children. I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the radio editorial of R. Peter Straus, of station WMCA:

Nothing you and I can do will bring those children back to life. But the sense of helpless outrage felt by most Americans—and especially those of us far away from the scene—can at least be directed toward one constructive end. We can help to restore the House of God demolished by the same agents of racial hate who murdered these little girls. WMCA is therefore asking you, our listeners, to join us in raising a fund for the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham. The fund would rebuild this church and make it a shrine in memory of the innocent children who died there worshiping peacefully on a Sunday morning.

Vice President Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent journey of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON to Scandinavia and Iceland is one more example of the ability of this great statesman to spread a warm feeling of good will wherever he goes. His wonderful reception is evidence of the worldwide love and respect for this outstanding American.

An editorial in the September 20, 1963, edition of the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, titled "Good Will Stirred," describes the reception the Vice President received on his trip and the results of his ability to arouse the warmest feelings of people in any land. I commend the editorial, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues:

GOOD WILL STIRRED

No camel herder episode arose from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S visit to Scandinavia and Iceland. This means that the aftermath of his visit to India is not likely to be repeated in the months which follow the most recent tour the Vice President has made.

The good will that Vice President JOHNSON stirred among the people of the nations on his itinerary, however, is impressive. Newspapers in Sweden, Finland, Norway and Denmark carried glowing accounts of Vice President and Mrs. Johnson and their daughter, Lynda, and their availability to the people wherever they stopped. More than one foreign editor pointed out that a lesson to be learned from the Vice President was the fact he invited close personal contacts.

"The Vice President is undoubtedly the world's leading practitioner of person-to-person contacts as a method of building good will," the Austin American observes. "He has done it on the crowded streets of three continents with the same success that he has known on the streets of America. In more than 30 countries the past 3 years LYNDON JOHNSON has walked among people of many races and tongues, using the universal language of the smile and the handshake, and receiving full return in warm friendliness."

What the Vice President has proved, if it required further substantiation, is that despite differences of customs, tradition, culture and speech, people everywhere are pretty much alike. They respond to the warmth of a friendly greeting, handshake and smile, and no one can exceed the Vice President in this talent.

Profit and Loss Statement of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Carl H. Wilken, director of research for the National Foundation for Economic Stability, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., has prepared a profit and loss statement of the United States for the period 1951–62 as compared to the period 1946–50.

In his analysis, Mr. Wilken emphasizes that without a restoration of equitable farm prices and the earned income of rural areas, we face eventual economic collapse comparable to 1929–33.

I commend his analysis and accompanying table to the attention of my colleagues:

AN ANALYSIS OF PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1951–62 AS COMPARED TO THE PERIOD 1946–50

(By Carl H. Wilken)

In 1946–50 the income of private enterprise was in balance with wages, salaries, and capital costs, the principal items of cost in our production of goods and services. The price of farm products, the principal source of income in rural areas, averaged 99.5 percent of price balance with other commodities, thus establishing a rural market in balance with cost factors.

1. In the period 1951–62 wages, salaries, and interest averaged 85 percent more per year than in 1946–50. To meet this increase the national income should have averaged 185 percent of the 1946–50 level, or $393 billion. The actual income averaged $358 billion, or a total shortage in the 12 years of $420 billion.

2. Private enterprise consists of 9,200,000 business units, made up of farm operations, small business, and corporate enterprise. The income of private enterprise in the period 1951–62 averaged 19 percent more than in 1946–50. To balance with the actual rate of wages, salaries, and interest involved in operating our economy the income of private enterprise should have increased an average of 85 percent.

The shortage of income of private enterprise in the 12 years totaled $436 billion. This shortage of income has steadily increased since 1951, and in 1962 private enterprise lacked $59 billion to balance with 1962 wages, salaries, and interest.

3. Adjusted to an increase of 34 percent in the consumer price level, the income of private enterprise in 1962 would buy only 2.4 percent more goods and services than in 1946–50. The shortage of income for private enterprise has been the missing market which prevented a fully operating and solvent economy.

4. To offset the operating loss involved in an underpayment of $285 billion to agriculture in 1951–62, as compared to the relationship of gross farm income to wages, salaries and interest in 1946–50, we added $610.9 billion to the total debt (public and private).

5. As farm prices were permitted to move downward following 1946–50, while on the other hand wages, salaries and interest in creased, we lost the source of earned income from new production and substituted increases in the total debt and unearned income to operate the economy.

6. Theoretically the spending of $610 billion of borrowed capital and the increases in wages and salaries should have kept the income of private enterprise in balance. Instead, however, the share of income available for private enterprise dropped from an average of 26 percent in 1946–50 to 16.5 percent in 1962.

7. In 1946–50 each $1 of income of private enterprise translated into $3.85 of national income. In the period 1951–62 as the income of private enterprise moved downward in proportion to the underpayment for farm products, we lost $1,680 billion of national income, as shown in the profit and loss statement.

8. It is interesting and important to note that in the 12 years (1951–62) as farm prices were moved downward because of the theory that price supports were a subsidy, private enterprise and the United States as a whole lost income in direct proportion to the normal trade turn of $7 of national income for each $1 of underpayment to agriculture as compared to wages, salaries and interest (average trade turn in 1929–51).

9. In reducing the share of national income for private enterprise from 26 percent in 1946–50 to 16.5 percent in 1962 we have set the stage for liquidating our economy with ever-increasing totals of debt to offset our operating loss.

10. Our failure to maintain farm prices in 1929 to 1933 forced a similar loss of income for private enterprise as the income of private enterprise moved down from 26.2 percent of the national income in 1929 to 12.9 percent in 1933.

11. In 1930–41 we had an operating loss of $563 billion, due to our failure to maintain farm prices. We absorbed the loss at that time by doing without the goods and services which that amount of money would have purchased at 1929 price levels.

12. In the past 12 years we have had a much greater loss due to higher levels of prices and production. Instead of accepting a depression, as was the case in 1930–41, we offset the operating loss by increasing the total debt, or mortgage, against our future income.

Summed up, for each 1 percent of gross farm income we have a stake of 1 percent of the national income for a fully operating economy and 1 percent of the income required by private enterprise to pay a fair return on capital investment and to earn new capital for expansion. We canont afford high wages and capital costs and cheap farm products, the principal source of earned income. Without a restoration of farm prices and the earned income of rural areas we face a continual operating loss in direct proportion to the underpayment to agriculture and eventual economic collapse comparable to 1929–33.

Profit and loss of the United States, 1951–62

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Income of private enterprise	Income earned by private enterprise	Wages, salaries, and interest	Income required to earn wages and interest	Operating loss	Increase in debt	Total national income
1951	62.0	238.7	186.6	281.7	43.0	41.1	279.3
1952	59.4	228.7	202.1	305.2	76.5	39.5	292.2
1953	58.8	226.4	217.0	327.6	101.2	37.9	305.6
1954	57.3	220.6	216.7	327.1	106.5	30.2	301.8
1955	65.2	251.0	234.3	353.8	102.8	72.3	330.2
1956	67.2	258.7	254.2	383.8	125.1	44.7	350.8
1957	66.8	257.2	268.9	406.0	148.8	36.2	366.9
1958	64.8	249.5	271.9	410.0	160.5	49.4	367.4
1959	71.0	273.3	294.9	445.3	172.0	69.3	400.5
1960	69.2	266.4	311.8	470.8	204.4	50.0	415.5
1961	71.2	274.1	322.2	486.5	212.4	60.2	427.8
1962	75.8	291.8	343.8	519.1	227.3	80.1	458.0
Total	788.7	3,036.4	3,124.4	4,716.9	1,680.5	610.9	4,296.0
Average	65.7	253.0	260.35	393.0	140.0	50.9	358.0

Note.—Increase in debt is in terms of gross debt (public and private) as computed by Department of Commerce.

Earned income in 2d column is based on earnings of private enterprise in the production, processing, and distribution of goods and services.

The 4th column shows the income required to sell enough goods and services to meet wages and interest.

The 4th column minus 2d column equals the operating loss.

The 6th column shows debt expansion or addition to the total debt against the economy to offset the operating losses.

The actual national income minus income earned by private enterprise equals the unearned income created by excessive debt expansion.

A Mother's Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I received the letter which follows from a constituent. It was so down to earth and so sincere I felt that I should share it with my colleagues. Also, Mr. Speaker, I felt that perhaps by inserting it in the RECORD I could help Mrs. Learned get her point across:

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I received the newsletter you sent me entitled "The Pulse Beat of a Congressional District."

We as people, as Americans, have the pulse beat of freedom. It is like a drumbeat each minute of every day of our life; the life of freedom of America, our country which men have died to protect.

You said in your newsletter anything that is important to me is important to you.

I am a mother with two boys serving in the U.S. Army. They are doing their bit to preserve our freedom which I believe, as a mother, people have forgotten, not intentionally, but they think no harm can come to the people because we are Americans.

I deeply believe the racial trouble in this country is not what Americans want.

President Kennedy said in his speech on the day he took office, "Ask not what America can do for you but what you can do for America."

I believe what we as parents can do for America is teach our children the meaning of what is right and what is wrong and what freedom really means in this country. Not only to a few but to everyone. And let the teaching of freedom and the love of our country grow in their hearts and minds as long as they live.

I believe that the racial trouble in our country is looked at and talked about all over the world. I don't believe this is the American way of life.

Mr. ROUSH, I have written what I believe should be planted and which should grow in our hearts and minds as Americans. This trouble in our cities and in this country must be stopped before it destroys this whole country.

If I send you what I have written would you read it? I don't know what to do to get it across to the people.

Thank you.

MRS. ALTA LEARNED.

ANDERSON, IND.

Are You a Patriot?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Art Buchwald has done it again. This time he announces that he is prepared to make the supreme patriotic sacrifice and support the tax cut.

For 3 years, says Art Buchwald, he has been waiting for an opportunity to do something patriotic for America, as the President asked of all citizens when he took office. Mr. Buchwald has finally found a way in which he is willing to make this sacrifice. He is willing to pay less taxes. Congratulations Mr. Buchwald, you are a courageous citizen.

If my colleagues do not believe it, read the following column by Art Buchwald that appeared here and there on September 24:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 24, 1963]

ARE YOU A PATRIOT?

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy made an urgent, and what we considered moving, speech last Wednesday night when he pleaded for public support of his tax cut legislation. Realizing he was in difficulty on Capitol Hill, Mr. Kennedy took his case to the people, and he will be happy to know it was not in vain.

No matter how we felt in the past about paying high taxes, the President convinced us that the only way to save the country was to pay less taxes to the Government. If this is the kind of sacrifice it takes to be an American, we're willing to make it.

When President Kennedy first took office, he said that Americans shouldn't ask what America could do for them, but what they could do for America. For 3 years we've been waiting for an opportunity to do something constructive, meaningful, something patriotic. And as last the President has shown us the way.

By supporting his tax legislation, we will not only save the country from going into a recession and we will not only boost employment, but we will also have money left over to buy a new car, a new television set, perhaps a new house, and surely two orchestra seats to "Cleopatra."

Tough as it is, we want the President to know he not only has our support, but of every member of our family. Even if it means less deductions in our pay check, and more take-home pay, we say we're willing to stand up and be counted.

We want above everything else for America to be strong, and if it can be done with a tax cut, then we say cut taxes. We'll even go further and come out for eliminating them altogether.

What moved us most in the President's speech was when he said high taxes are not only unnecessary, but actually harmful to the economy. This is something we've secretly maintained for a long time. Even our wife, who knows very little about economics, has told us on occasion that she would rather have money for a new coat than pay it to Uncle Sam.

"Hush, Mother," we used to say, "or people will think we're Communists."

But now it's out in the open. We no longer have to talk in whispers. Those who would keep taxes high are the subversives—those who would buy dishwashers, clothes, and take vacations with the money are the true patriots in the United States.

If going to a discount house makes us a flag-waver, then we say wave the flag. If taking a trip to Florida makes us a good American, then we say hurrah for America. And if Congress refuses to pass the tax cut bill, we say investigate Congress and see who are really behind them.

As a matter of fact, we have decided that, even if Congress doesn't pass the bill, it is up to every American to support the President on his own. He can best do this by deducting from his return the money he would have saved if the bill was passed.

If the Internal Revenue Department raises any questions, the taxpayer can refer them to the White House. The President has asked us to support him. Surely he will support us if we refuse to pay the taxes that are harmful to the country's growth.

Time is running out. There are those in the United States who are opposed to the tax cut plan. They are for the most part either ignorant of what it will do or unwilling to make the supreme sacrifice that has been asked of them.

But we're happy to say we don't know any of them personally. If we did we'd report them to the FBI.

President Hancher Welcomes New Students to the University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the

RECORD, I take pride for the privilege to include an editorial in the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa, of September 24 last.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT HANCHER'S ADDRESS WELCOMING ENTRANTS TO STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

As has been his custom for several years, President Virgil M. Hancher welcomed new students to the University of Iowa at the beginning of the college year. His address was so appropriate that we quote from his remarks, as follows:

"Today we welcome you into the University of Iowa and into the great university tradition which has illuminated the life of the Western World for nearly a thousand years. You should be proud to be part of that great tradition.

"But great traditions carry their obligations as well as their privileges. Let me warn you, therefore, that the past is prelude—the school from which you come, the orientation days, the registration days, and the many activities preceding this occasion. All those are behind you now. Today we welcome you into the full life of the university, into the life of the mind, into the great adventure of knowing and understanding.

"However," he continued, "it is one thing to embark and it is another to reach your destination. Let no siren song divert you from your course and no beguiling pastime lure you from your labors. What you achieve here is very largely up to you. In this university you will find teachers and books and laboratories; but no single one of them, nor all of them combined, can give you an adequate education against your will. Learning is not something imposed on you from the outside. It is something which takes place within you. Teachers can lecture, books lie open, and laboratories stand ready—but what they do for you will depend on you. Nothing can force an education upon you. On the other hand, nothing can keep you from an education if you are determined to have one.

"Make your choice today—and do not flag or fail. Extracurricular activities can be fun, and we want you to enjoy them. Wisely employed, they can add to your knowledge and skill, but they are no substitute for learning, creativity, and a passion for excellence. These are the things for which you came. These are the things for which this university stands.

"Begin today to put first things first. Let me repeat what I have said on other induction days: The next hundred days may well be the most important hundred days of your life. In all probability they will be the most important days in your university life. Once gone, they can never be recaptured. Once wasted they can never be reclaimed. Thereafter your future here will be dark indeed.

"Yet with proper application to your studies, your future here should be secure. Each of you has been selected in the belief that you have the competence to do university work, if you work steadily day after day. Most of those over whom you had marked superiority in the past have been left behind. Here you are among your intellectual peers. Here is a challenge you must accept and accept at once.

"In that spirit, I welcome you to the University of Iowa. Here generations of men and women have found knowledge and inspiration and joy and praise. Here they have experienced joy and sorrow. Here they have passed from youth to manhood and womanhood, from immaturity to maturity, not in one solitary leap, but by steady growth in wisdom and intellectual stature day by day.

"Today you join a fellowship as old as the Western world and as lasting as civilization, itself."

We have quoted most of President Hancher's address because we regard it as one of the best such addresses we have ever read.

If you are about to enter a college or university, it will do you good to read what he said to the incoming students.

If you have a son or daughter who has entered or is about to enter an institution of higher learning we suggest that you make this quotation available to the one who is embarking on this great adventure. Every freshman ought to read and ponder what President Hancher said.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure every parent who has a son or daughter starting their college career would want them to read and harken to these words of wisdom by one of the leading, if not the leading university presidents in the United States of America, Virgil M. Hancher. I know I speak for our entire family when I say we were especially pleased and proud to read this outstanding address, since our oldest granddaughter, Miss Anne Fitzpatrick, whose home is in Massachusetts, chose to attend the Iowa University. She is now in her second year there, and loves it.

The Idaho Russet Potato

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Idaho Falls Post Register in an editorial appearing in its September 15 issue, discusses a bill I have introduced to require Irish potatoes sold or shipped in interstate commerce to be labeled as to their State of origin.

The Idaho Falls Post Register serves the area of my State that is most prominent in the production of the famous "Idaho Russet Potato."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Idaho Falls Post Register editorial of September 15 entitled "Potato Label Vital," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATO LABEL VITAL

The "point of origin" legislation now before Congress can become the most vital piece of Federal law ever enacted for Idaho's fresh potato industry.

How it will fare with congressional delegations from other potato producing States, however, is the key question.

The law would require all potato containers in interstate commerce to carry a point of origin label.

The law is invaluable to Idaho which must maintain its quality image to compete in a national market so covetous of that image that it consistently sells potatoes from other States under the guise of Idaho Russets. The fact that more and more potato areas are producing Russet varieties make it all the more important for Idaho to maintain her quality identity. If the repackers do not actually label cheaper potatoes of other States as from Idaho when they label the containers, they at least sell Russets from other areas as "Idaho's" by inference. The housewife has not yet caught up to the fact that the Russet is not an exclusive trademark for Idaho.

Some of the other potato producing States have a certain pride in their own product as well and are reported interested in the origin labeling legislation. But whether there are enough of these is the question. States who have been capitalizing on Idaho's traditional quality advertising campaign may like the status quo.

The legislation is entirely sensible. It merely seeks to avoid misrepresentation of a product moving in the channels of free trade by identifying it. It is not strictly one State legislation although its opponents may contrive to demonstrate that it is.

One problem which has already been raised is the interpretation of the bill's language which would permit a repacker to avoid point of origin labeling if "it is sold on the premises." Inasmuch as much of the repacker trade is sold in this manner, this would render the law useless. It is hoped that this loophole will be plugged as the bill is considered.

The fact that Idaho may be moving to individual stamping of potatoes by stamping machines at potato packing houses does not detract from need of the new Federal law. Idaho stamped potatoes will not prevent a repacker from selling unidentified Russet varieties from other States as Idaho potatoes by inference.

Senator FRANK CHURCH has been forwarding the law in the Senate and Representatives COMPTON WHITE and RALPH HARDING have been pushing the bill in the House. All of Idaho should hope that enough in the Congress join with them in the passage of this bill.

Federal Aid Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I note that on August 16 Life magazine published a rather unfactual attack on Federal aid projects, distastefully titled, and labeling all Federal and Federal-State cooperative programs as "pork."

I took the trouble of making inquiry into Life's activity in the field of "pork barrel" and my inquiry led to writing the following letter to the editors after their second request for my views.

I hope this letter helps to set the record straight:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1963.

Mr. MORTON B. WHITE,
Assistant to the Publisher, Life Magazine, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I had chosen to ignore the Life editorial on pork barrel as being well intentioned but ill conceived, but your last communication brought the matter so forcefully to my attention that I felt obliged to give the comment which you requested.

I hope you will publish this comment in your "Letters to the Editor."

I called the Post Office Department to ask the deficit on copies of Life magazine sent through the mail. They advised me that costs exceed revenues on the average magazine by 4.6 cents.

The Post Office estimated that Time sends 130 million pieces, Fortune 4.4 million pieces, Sports Illustrated 48.4 million pieces,

and Life sends 315 million pieces through the mail per year, making a total of 497.8 million pieces of mail for 1962, subsidized by the taxpayer to the tune of 4.6 cents each.

My computations led me to conclude that, using the Post Office's figures, Life received a postal subsidy of approximately $14.49 million in 1962. Since 1956, when statistics concerning mail subsidies were inserted into the RECORD by one of my colleagues, Life has averaged a postal subsidy of somewhere between this $14.49 million figure and $9,494,000, which was the subsidy in that year. On this basis we can compute an approximate postal subsidy to Life magazine alone of approximately $100 million over the past 10 years.

When we turn to Time, Life, and Fortune, which sent 497.8 million copies through the mail during 1962, the postal subsidy at the average rate indicated by the Post Office Department can be computed at $22.89 million, for 1962.

You will note I have not included the book rate at which Time and Life, now major book publishers, are mailing books through the offices of the Post Office at a subsidized rate with a public service allowance. This, I am sure, comes to another substantial figure.

It would appear, on the basis of these figures, that Time and Life have not done bad at the pork barrel either.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

Marine Staff Sergeant DeBarge of Springfield, Mass., Seriously Wounded in Korean War, Is Inspiration to All Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as an inspiration to those seriously disabled veterans of all of America's wars, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the amazing story of courage and persistence displayed by former Marine S. Sgt. Robert L. DeBarge of Springfield, Mass., as told by William J. Burke in the September 27, 1963 edition of the Springfield Daily News:

STORY OF REHABILITATION: SERGEANT DEBARGE, MARINE THEY COULDN'T KILL, IS INSPIRATION

(By William J. Burke)

About 10 years ago an amazed Marine Corps doctor looking over the bodies of Marines killed in action in Korea found that one of the "bodies" was actually alive.

Today the man who "rose from the dead" on that morgue ship off the Korean coast is proving to be an inspiration for men lying in hospitals throughout the Nation for whom World War II and the Korean war will never be over.

The Korean war will certainly never be over for this man who wouldn't die, S. Sgt. Robert I. DeBarge, who formerly lived in Springfield, and according to his family members living in this city, would be back here today if he were able to be.

CLOSE TO HOSPITAL

DeBarge, now lives in San Diego, Calif., with his son, Robert, Jr., and wife, close to the San Diego Naval Hospital where he is under constant care and where his saga of unbelievable courage is a source of constant amazement and pride to the doctors and patients with whome he comes in contact.

For the twice-wounded veteran is paralyzed completely on his left side. He functions, with just the right side of his brain, since the blood supply to his left side had to be cut off to save his life.

He has had to learn to speak using his diaphragm since his vocal chords had to be removed because of the extent of damage to his body. He has had to learn to write again and to walk again.

But during 10 years of never failing to fight through the day, he has thrown away his crutches? then a cane and, finally, now he walks unassisted.

His doctors find him the kind of an inspirational case that they want to exhibit to others who may become depressed because of the heavy burden of their disability.

MEDICAL CONVENTIONS

He has appeared before medical conventions to tell how he learned to speak again, and never has failed to smilingly answer the call if a buddy in the hospital needed to be witness to a real slice of leatherneck courage.

The plight of DeBarge was one of the first of the many personal requests growing out of war situations handled by the then freshman Congressman, U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND of Springfield in 1953.

Mrs. Bertha DeBarge of 175 Laurelton Street, mother of five sons and three daughters, most of whom live in Springfield today, at that time had been informed simply that her son, Robert, had been seriously wounded on January 18, 1953.

Tracing the whereabouts of the son led to the discovery by the Congressman of the amazing story of how the Marine sergeant had been presumed dead and just lay on the snow-covered field of battle until the dead were picked up for the morgue ship.

It was Representative BOLAND who had to break the news of the extent of the injuries of the Marine to the anxious family and had to tell them there was not too much hope that the sergeant would live.

CONDITION IMPROVED

But the sergeant's condition did improve—to such an extent that he was shipped to the San Diego hospital from Japan for special physical therapy.

With nothing but raw courage working for him, the marine beat his way back to life. Every day now is a fight to hold the faculties that he is still able to use. Recently he offered, upon his death, to give his brain to medical science.

The service record of the 41-year-old sergeant is terse and to the point and in Marine Corps fashion notes that the former Springfielder was awarded the Purple Heart with gold star for wounds received in action on September 2, 1952, and on January 18, 1953.

Mrs. DeBarge helped to raise a real military family, since the San Diego marine is just one of four who are in the service or have seen duty.

Maj. Renold DeBarge of the Air Force is now serving in Greece. He was a World War II pilot instructor.

Brother Leo is a sergeant in the Marine Corps, in Winston-Salem, N.C., and saw World War II service in the South Pacific. Raymond was discharged from the Army Medical Corps a year ago because of a heart condition. The youngest of the brothers, Lawrence DeBarge, is a motorcycle officer of the Springfield Police Department.

The daughters in the family are: Mrs. Doris Muise of the staff at Classical High School; Mrs. Janet Ely, who is employed in the office of Monsanto Chemical Co.; and Mrs. Gloria Anop of the Springfield School Department office.

Is This 1,400 m.p.h. Airliner Really Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 30, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced H.R. 8104 on supersonic jet aircraft which would establish by an act of Congress certain safeguards for the American people against sonic booms and would also protect people in the vicinity of supersonic jet airports from the deafening noise which these aircraft of the future will produce during takeoff and landing.

I am very pleased to call attention of my colleagues to an excellent article dealing with this entire subject which appeared in an editorial in the Washington Post.

This article was written by Dr. B. K. O. Lundberg, a wartime aircraft designer who is director general of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden.

There are those sophisticates in the airline industry, and in some of our Government agencies, who have a tendency to minimize Dr. Lundberg's warnings about the supersonic age.

I am including Dr. Lundberg's excellent article because I am sure that it is sufficiently well documented to convince even these doubting sophisticates that we have a very serious problem facing not only the United States, but the entire world with the development of a supersonic transport. A problem, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress cannot afford to ignore.

Dr. Lundberg's article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 15, 1963]

IS THIS 1,400 M.P.H. AIRLINER REALLY NECESSARY?—THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT HITS BAD TURBULENCE FROM A SWEDISH AIRCRAFT EXPERT

(By B. K. O. Lundberg)

(NOTE.—A wartime aircraft designer, Lundberg is director general of the Aeronautical Research Institute of Sweden and author of the recent "Speed and Safety in Civil Aviation." He wrote this criticism of the supersonic airliner for the London Observer.)

LONDON.—For the past few years there has been a controversy raging, essentially within the aviation community, whether or not to introduce civil supersonic transports—SSTs.

Now that the British and French Governments have decided to build the mach 2.2 Concorde, and President Kennedy has proposed an SST development program, it might seem that there is no point in continuing the discussion. In my opinion, however, the launching of supersonic aviation would have such serious consequences—for civil aviation and for virtually the whole of mankind—that the discussion must not stop at this point.

SAFETY IN QUESTION

The prospective SST manufacturers have declared repeatedly that supersonic airliners will be at least as safe as the jets of today. The facts, however, suggest otherwise.

An aircraft designer can normally do a great deal to minimize forseeable risks.

When working on a new aircraft, vast experience and laboratory tests help him to exercise this all-important foresight. But he can do nothing about risks that he fails to foresee.

The number of such risks increases rapidly with the number of radically new design features that are introduced. Supersonic transports cannot be built without introducing a host of radically new features simultaneously.

Furthermore, the SSTs will operate at exceptional altitudes where atmospheric conditions are still largely unknown. Hail and rain may be present in clouds up to at least 75,000 feet. Collision with hail at supersonic speed can undoubtedly be catastrophic; even flying through heavy rain might be serious.

Improvements in radar seem unlikely to solve these problems, so elaborate control from the ground will be essential. For instance, the aircraft will need very wide and deep "flight corridors" along the whole route. Weather conditions will often compel rerouting just before or during flight. There will also be unpredictable conditions; clear air turbulence and jet streams are not, so far, detectable by ground radar or weather satellites.

For the first time in the history of transport, therefore, passengers will be carried in a vehicle whose crew is virtually blind.

TEN YEARS OF TESTING

Another hazard facing the SST's is structural fatigue. Friction of the air on wings and fuselage will produce aerodynamic heating and hence thermal stresses, also possibly "creep." These effects will be far more complex and difficult to predict than in the case of subsonic aircraft.

Laboratory tests will be much more extensive but will be of rather limited value. This is because when high temperatures are involved, the duration of exposure is significant.

To sum up, the SST safety level—contrary to the case of a new type of subsonic aircraft—can be assessed only by actual service experience.

The present overall safety level in scheduled aviation is about one fatal accident in 300,000 hours of flight. Thus no clear indication of whether or not the SST safety level is of the same order can be obtained until a multiple of 300,000 hours has been flown. For reasonable confidence, at least 1,500,000 hours—or 50 SST's entire service life or, say, 30,000 hours—will be required. In other words, the "testing" time will be over 10 years.

Therefore, assurances that SST's will be as safe as subsonic aircraft can be nothing but wishful thinking.

BILLION-MILE GOAL

The need for higher safety standards is becoming urgent. In scheduled commercial aviation, the deaths per passenger mile are some 5 to 10 times higher than for commercial surface transportation. Deaths per travel hour are 30 times higher. The situation for charter aviation is even worse.

The safety of civil aviation improved steadily until 1953, but has since remained virtually static. The result has been a steady increase in the annual total of passenger deaths in proportion to the growth of civil aviation. If present trends continue to the end of the century, there will be some 60,000 passenger deaths a year.

In "Speed and Safety in Civil Aviation," I have proposed a new long-term policy designed to achieve a radical improvement in the safety level. I have suggested a 1980 target of not more than 1 passenger death per 1 billion miles—i.e., one-tenth of the present rate.

The fundamental feature of the method—too technical to describe in detail here—is to divide up the various categories of aviation risk and allocate numerical safety standards to each based on a statistical probability analysis. This could, I think, be a useful tool for controlling and regulating safety standards with the help of airworthiness and flight operation regulations.

The continuous improvement of the safety level in this or any other way calls for immediate international planning. The next 5 to 10 years are critical. There can be no doubt that an all-out effort in the next decade to develop and introduce SST's will seriously hamper the prospects of improved safety.

Passenger safety is not the only serious hazard. There are two other grave problems: cosmic radiation and the sonic booms.

Two classes of radiation need to be taken into account: background cosmic radiation, which is always present, and sporadic bursts of radiation from solar flares.

The latter can be intense, although below 55,000 feet most of it is absorbed by the atmosphere. It appears that passengers in an SST flying above 55,000 feet during the most severe solar flares might receive a dose of the same order as the maximum permitted for a radiation worker in the course of 3 months.

The proposed solution is that the SST's should dive below some 40,000 feet when instruments show a rise in radiation level and continue the flight at subsonic speed. The decision to dive would have to be made in a matter of minutes because the radition dose builds up very quickly. But permission to leave the SST "flight corridor" will probably have to be obtained from air traffic control. Thus even prompt action may not avoid exposure to an appreciable radiation dose.

An aircraft flying at supersonic speed produces a continuous shock wave which is heard on the ground as a sonic boom.

The boom strikes everywhere along a "boom carpet" varying from 25 to 100 miles wide according to the weight and height of the SST.

The effects of this manmade thunder range from annoyance to severe shocks for people taken unawares, as well as broken windows and other property damage.

If supersonic flying becomes widespread, the globe will be banded with boom carpets. It is a frightening prospect.

Advocates of SST's assure us that everything will be done to keep the boom intensities within tolerable limits by limiting supersonic flight to 35,000 feet and above. The tolerable limit is usually defined as an overpressure not more than 1.5 pounds per square foot. This will be produced by a mach 2.2 SST weighing 220,000 pounds and cruising at 60,000 feet.

One may well ask: Who has accepted this limit? Certainly not the victims—the general public; nor the International Air Transport Association; nor the International Civil Aviation Organization; nor, to the best of my knowledge, any government. And why should any nonmilitary boom disturbance be tolerated at all?

Then what should be the criterion? I suggest that the average boom intensity must be low enough not to wake up more than a small percentage of people sleeping in bedrooms with open windows where the background noise is low. Furthermore, the average boom intensity must not be appreciably higher in daytime.

Focusing effects of the atmosphere and maneuvers by the aircraft can frequently magnify the average bang two or three times. "Superbanks," perhaps 5 to 10 times more powerful than the average, will occur occasionally. Thus the average must be kept low enough for serious local magnifications not to occur too often.

The above conditions indicate that a higher average boom intensity than about 0.3 pounds per square foot will probably not be acceptable. The only way to achieve this is to reduce the gross weight of the SST. But even if the average intensity were allowed to be as high as 0.5 pounds per square foot, the aircraft would have to be so small that it could carry only a handful of passengers.

The suggestion that SSTs should fly only over sparsely populated areas seems to me a ruthless proposition. If sonic booms are unbearable for people in cities, they are equally unbearable for people in the country.

Practical routes confined to sparsely populated areas would in any case be few, and scarcely economic. Even so-called sea routes cross many populated areas, and besides, there are limits to the boom disturbances that can be accepted by ships.

The SSTs now being designed might not be permitted to fly at all outside the SST manufacturing countries.

PASSENGERS UNCONSULTED

Do passengers want to fly supersonically? It is remarkable that they have not been asked whether they wish to be shot rather than flown through the air.

The airlines did not demand supersonic aircraft. Indeed they have expressed great anxiety about the premature introduction of these machines.

Let us not be misled by the tentative orders that have been placed for Concordes. These are nothing but options to secure a place in the production line, and are the result mainly of the airlines' fear of falling behind their competitors.

The main pressure has come from large aircraft manufacturers on both sides of the Atlantic. But neither they nor the governments concerned have carried out any market research to discover what the passengers really want.

Aviation has brought about spectacular reductions in traveling time. It is natural to think of days and nights spent on trains and ships as lost time and the hours gained by flying as saving. Is this outlook valid when estimating the value of further increases in flight speed?

The few hours now spent in jet flights cannot be counted a complete loss to the passenger since the flight offers opportunities for relaxation and eating. The by now classical story of the man who, upon landing after a jet flight across Europe, refused to leave the aircraft until he had had time to finish his dinner, is, I think, a most important lesson for the supersonic enthusiasts.

In contrast to flight time, ground time must be regarded as a 100-percent loss. The time spent in taxis and buses, waiting at terminals and airports, is thoroughly inconvenient. This is the field where improvements are really wanted.

Compare a subsonic and a supersonic flight of 1,500 miles, such as from London to Athens. Assuming the airport distance at each end to be 20 miles, the total ground time is almost 3 hours.

The flight time is 1½ hours shorter for the SST. Thus, while the SST is 150 percent faster, it will cut the total journey time by only 25 percent.

This might seem to be a real advantage, nevertheless, but other factors must be taken into account. To begin with, it seems inevitable that the SST will be substantially less comfortable than the subsonic jets for these reasons:

Seat-belt time when passengers have to keep their seat belts fastened, will be three or four times longer in the SST's. There will also be greater discomfort as a result of the high acceleration and deceleration and steep angles of climb and descent.

Jet passengers at present can expect to remain unbuckled for almost 3 hours of a 3¼-hour flight—ample time to serve and eat a meal. But SST passengers on a 1,500-mile flight must expect to be strapped in for all but some 45 minutes. This will leave little

time for a meal, so passengers will have to eat after arrival. If time for a meal is added, practically all the SST's time advantage is dissipated.

Supersonic aircraft are likely to be noisier inside, mainly because of greater boundary-layer sound of air rushing over the fuselage.

Space will be at a premium on these expensive aircraft, so passengers will sit closely packed.

SST passengers are likely to be subjected to a greater number of severe bumps because of the high speed at which turbulent regions will be encountered.

PREMIUM ON DISTANCE

For very long ranges—say, on routes of 2,000 miles or more—most passengers might prefer the SST provided that it offered equal fares, equally convenient arrival and departure times, and equally accessible airports.

Let us consider the last point first. Many cities will have to build new airports when the existing ones become saturated. For noise reasons, the SST's will no doubt normally use the more distant airports.

The importance of reduced airport distance can be seen by comparing an SST using airports 20 miles from city centers and a jet operating only 5 to 10 miles from those centers. The gain in ground time would be more than an hour.

Next, fares. It is claimed that the seat-mile costs for SST's will be no higher than for present jets. Although this is open to doubts it is only part of the story.

To begin with, SST's sheer complexity, coupled with the effects of aerodynamic heating, will substantially increase maintenance times as well as costs.

Secondly, convenient scheduling of SST flights around the clock, essential if the aircraft is to be used economically, will not be easy. Passengers may prefer SST's when their departure and arrival times do not encroach on the normal sleeping hours. But an Atlantic night flight on a SST will allow practically no time for sleep.

It seems unlikely that passengers will prefer SST night flights or very early or late SST flights to conveniently scheduled subsonic flights unless they can fly at an appreciably reduced fare. But the SST's will be helpless in a fares war.

RANGE FLEXIBILITY

A further great advantage of the subsonic aircraft is its superior range flexibility. Whereas the SST will not be practical for ranges under 1,500 miles, long-range subsonic jets can fly economically over very short distances. On the many routes where there is too little traffic for profitable direct flights, they can thus make one or more intermediate stops.

Finally, some of the present subsonic jets fly nonstop over very long distances—up to 6,000 miles. This will be quite beyond the SST's, so that on routes such as London to Los Angeles, where their speed advantage would be indisputable, they will not be able to offer a direct service.

To sum up, the standard seat-mile cost of the SST will have to be well below that of the present jets to compensate for the lower annual utilization higher depreciation rates, higher maintenance costs, and lower overall payload.

On present knowledge, a sufficiently low seat-mile cost seems unattainable. It will certainly not be realized by current SST projects. Therefore, unless supersonic aviation is heavily subsidized, SST operators will lose money, either by charging subsonic fares which do not cover the seat-mile costs or by applying SST surcharges which will discourage potential passengers.

The long-term indirect consequences of supersonic flight are about as serious as its direct shortcomings. The enormous investment and effort needed to develop SST's will hamper the brilliant prospects now in sight to make aviation a really safe, cheap, and convenient means of mass transportation.

The governments concerned might, for instance, find it unwise to support energetically projects to reduce fares and airport distances which would effectively kill any chance of profitable SST operations. These governments will also be tempted to conceal an economic failure of SST's and to prop up supersonic aviation with special fare policies and trade agreements.

A SNOWBALL DANGER

Civil aviation has, indeed, come to a crossroads. It might seem that with the decision to build the Concorde, a point of no return has already been passed. This is not so, since not a single airline has signed a firm contract.

Nevertheless, there is a danger that one airline after another may feel compelled to secure a place in the Concorde production line—and later on become firmly committed. Thus, even if there were no landslide, there might be a snowball effect pushing us inextricably into the supersonic adventure.

What, then, should be done? For a start, the United Nations might be able to use its influence to prevent supersonic aviation being regarded as "inevitable" merely because development work has started on the Concorde. At the same time, several governments might announce that they will prohibit SST's from flying over their countries until the sonic-boom implications have been assessed and provided acceptable to the public.

Then the still uncommitted airlines might discover that they would be much better off if they waited to see whether SST's would be permitted to fly on the intended routes. This would give them time to carry out really thorough studies of the passenger appeal and economics of these aircraft.

The Price of Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious effects of the recent cuts voted in our foreign aid program by this body is the harm that the Alliance for Progress will suffer.

I would like to call to the attention of every Member of Congress an article written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk pointing out the health activities being conducted in Latin America and expressing his concern over their possible curtailment. Dr. Rusk was a member of the Clay Committee.

The article, which was published in the New York Times, September 15, is as follows:

THE PRICE OF ECONOMY: ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FACES REDUCTION IN HEALTH PROGRAM FROM HOUSE AID CUT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Among the drastic cuts made by the House of Representatives in President Kennedy's proposed budget for foreign aid for the current year is a reduction of $150 million in the Alliance for Progress.

Officials of the Agency for International Development who administer this program cannot predict precisely how the Alliance for Progress will be reduced if the Senate fails to restore these funds.

There is little doubt, however, that if the cuts stand, our cooperative health activities with the 19 free republics of Latin America will be substantially curtailed.

Self-help projects in health have been among the most fruitful and appealing of the Alliance for Progress activities.

MALARIA IN GUATEMALA

In 1957, Guatemala with U.S. assistance initiated a program to eradicate malaria. Before this, 73 percent of its area was malarious, and 300,000 cases of the disease occurred annually with 3,000 deaths. More than 30 percent of the people given malaria tests showed positive reactions.

By 1962, as a result of the program, 58 percent of the area previously malarious—with a population of more than half a million persons—had been freed of the disease.

The amount of land under cultivation in this area has increased nearly four times, and the value of agricultural output has increased 60 times.

The number of positive reactions to malaria tests has dropped to 3 percent, one-tenth of the former rates.

OTHER DRAMATIC RESULTS

There have been equally dramatic results in Brazil, Costa Rica, Columbia and other countries in Latin America.

The gamut of selp-help projects in health being aided under the Alliance for Progress ranges from such vast projects as a public health program for 2,300,000 people in Brazil's state of Pernambuco to a water pipeline for a Bolivian village.

In San Salvador, for example, the Alliance for Progress has furnished the funds for creation of 10 rural mobile health units.

These units, which include a physician, nurse and sanitary assistant, are bringing medical care to villages that have never before had the benefit of modern, scientific medicine. The village health centers are built by the people themselves who contribute the land and labor.

In Panama $930,000 has been allocated for work on 15 health centers, including the first pediatric institution in this republic.

STRESS ON SELF-HELP

The important factor in these projects is the emphasis on self-help.

The United States is not doing these things for the people of Latin America. The Latin Americans, with the assistance of the Alliance for Progress, the Pan American Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, and many voluntary agencies, are doing these things themselves.

Here are some examples of activities that were being considered by the Alliance for Progress before the House of Representatives made the $150-million budget cut.

Projects costing $1,500,000 were planned for the expansion of surplus food distribution to 6 million more Latin American schoolchildren.

U.S. support of 60 more mobile clinics providing modern medical services for the first time for 2 million persons in more than 600 villages in Central America was budgeted at $2 million.

A half-million-dollar expenditure was planned for textbooks for 200,000 schoolchildren in Central American areas where the literacy rate is less than 50 percent.

Ten thousand more classrooms to accommodate 500,000 more schoolchildren would cost $50 million.

The general health goals of the Alliance for Progress during the next decade are to increase life expectancy at birth by a minimum of 5 years and to increase the ability to learn and produce by improving individual and public health.

To achieve this will require the provision of sewers and potable water for 70 percent of the urban population and 50 percent of

the rural population; the eradication of smallpox and malaria and the control of other communicable diseases, and the improvement of basic health services at national and local levels.

In one of the Central American Republics, the infant mortality rate is 90 for every 1,000 live births. In the United States it is 25.3; Denmark, 20.1; Australia, 19.5; and the Netherlands, 15.3.

In this Central American republic, 80 percent of the deaths of young children and 60 percent of their illnesses are preventable.

With proven health measures, the infant mortality rate could probably be reduced by one-third in 5 years and two-thirds in 10 years.

This Nation, however, cannot hope to achieve even minimum standards of modern material and infant care without U.S. assistance.

It is eager to have our help under the Alliance for Progress. That help, however, will not be forthcoming unless the Senate restores the $150 million that the House of Representatives has cut from the budget of the Agency for International Development.

This writer, like most of our citizens, wants sensible economy in government, but not at the expense of sickness and malnutrition among the children of Latin America, tomorrow's leaders in this important part of the world.

Education in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of two significant measures expanding Federal assistance to education, the College Facilities Act of 1963 and the vocational education assistance, many times I believe proponents and opponents of the measures are mesmerized as to the overall significance of such legislation. Total efforts in the two referenced bills will comprise for 1964, $45 million for vocational education and $375 million for College Facilities.

Reader's Digest has recently reprinted an article by Ben Hibbs recapping the singular effort of the University of California, in the Nation's first State, indicating that the annual budget of the University of California alone is now in the $450 million level with the State educational effort expected to rise to the $2 billion level by 1965. It is obvious that the Federal contribution will never dominate the California system during our lifetime.

The article is as follows:

CALIFORNIA BUILDS BIG FOR EDUCATION: UNDER AN AMBITIOUS NEW MASTER PLAN, CALIFORNIA'S HIGHEST EDUCATION SYSTEM IS WORKING MIGHTILY TO MEET THE SKYROCKETING NEEDS OF TOMORROW

(By Ben Hibbs)

On the eastern approaches to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, a flashing signboard ticks off California's moment-by-moment population growth, in figures that grow larger as you watch—like the meter on a gasoline pump.

The signboard is worth noting. Since 1950, California's population has rocketed from about 10,600,000 to something over 17 million. The State's soothsayers forecast 42 million by the year 2000. Any Eastern State with industry and population surging in at this rate would view the phenomenon with consternation. Californians, however, who describe their State as "dynamic," seem undismayed. They are ceaselessly making studies of the problems—and opportunities—ahead, planning, building, getting ready.

The foresight and exuberance being poured into this planning can best be seen in the area of public higher education, where the State faces a staggering problem. By 1975—just 12 years hence—it is expected that 588,000 students will be streaming to State and junior college and university campuses. Add the estimated enrollment in California's numerous private institutions and you get the fantastic total of 659,000 students. For all these institutions a faculty of 44,000 will be required, as compared with 20,000 today. To prepare for this dizzy growth, California in the spring of 1960 passed into law its Master Plan for Higher Education, which has since come to be regarded as a model throughout the Nation.

Under this plan, California is now building, simultaneously, three huge new branches of its State university. One campus is near Santa Cruz, 80 miles south of San Francisco; another is in Orange County, some 50 miles southeast of Los Angeles. The third, rising a few miles north of San Diego, will be integrated with a small nearby branch of the university which consists of a graduate science school and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Each campus is being laid out to accommodate an eventual student body of 27,500, the maximum set by the Board of Regents. Each will become a full-fledged university, with professional schools, graduate training and research facilities. San Diego will be ready for its first undergraduates in autumn 1964, the other two a year later.

Even without its new campuses, the University of California is the largest in the Nation. UC's enrollment of fulltime students last fall was 58,616, and its faculty now numbers close to 9,000. Wisely, California does not try to pack all these students onto one campus. When the new branches open their doors, the university will be operating on nine campuses.

Berkeley, the parent campus, and the Los Angeles branch (UCLA) are already huge, with 25,000 and 20,000 students respectively. The other campuses now operative—at Davis, Santa Barbara, Riverside, San Diego, and the medical school at San Francisco—are smaller but ticketed for immediate expansion in varying degrees. Davis, for example, once an agricultural college, is becoming a full-range university. Among other far-flung facilities, UC operates 70 research and extension stations, 50 farm advisory offices, adult-education courses in 175 communities, and two atomic-research installations.

In addition, California has a fast-growing system of 17 State colleges—several with enrollments over 10,000. The State also gives substantial support to 69 2-year community junior colleges. In sheer numbers, both these systems are larger than the university.

Giantism in education, as in any other area of life, brings its problems. In the mid-1950's the State's higher education complex seemed headed for chaos. Each of the three systems was vocally jealous of its rights, and demanding expansion in line with its own ambitions: junior colleges wanted to become 4-year institutions, State colleges wanted to achieve university status. There was no strong central planning body to iron out the differences.

Finally, in 1959, a team of eight top-flight California educators was appointed to study the problem. President Arthur G. Coons, of Occidental College, a private institution, was named chairman. A year later, the team turned in a far-reaching and decisive report. Adopted almost in full by the legislature, this master plan became law.

The plan lays down clear lines of authority and coordination, states the duties of each system, suggests orderly programs of expansion. Under its provisions, the university will become more and more for juniors, seniors, and graduate students, with a gradually diminishing ratio of freshmen and sophomores. The State colleges will continue to be colleges, but will give graduate work through the various master's degrees and will take part in selected doctoral programs jointly with the university. The community colleges will remain 2-year institutions, giving (1) instruction leading to further college work, (2) academic courses for those who plan to go no further, and (3) strong vocational training to teach the skills for which California's highly technical industrial complex is clamoring.

Perhaps the most important provision of the plan is its firm ukase on the division of students. The university now draws its young people from the top eighth of the State's high school graduates, the State colleges from the top third. The junior colleges must accept any boy or girl with a diploma from an accredited California high school. Students, however, can move freely from one system to another—when they have raised their academic performance to the necessary levels. (Actually, many students eligible for the university attend State and junior colleges from choice.)

Where will California find the horde of additional college teachers needed by 1975? UC has long prided itself on the quality of its teaching and research staff—which includes 11 Nobel Prize winners, more than any other institution in the country. Will quality suffer in the search for quantity? Not in the opinion of Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the statewide university complex. "We'll get the people," he says, "and the quality will be just as good as it is now, maybe better."

The UC chancellors are trying to make college teaching a more attractive career for young people. They are combing lists of retired faculty for still vigorous men, and they are looking hopefully to retired military, diplomatic and business personnel. But, above all, UC frankly expects to raid other institutions, particularly the big universities of the East and Midwest.

"The East is sending great segments of its population to California," said Dr. Kerr, "and we must have some of its faculty."

The building of the new campuses offers an exciting challenge. The one in Orange County is a good example. This county is among the fastest-growing areas in the world. Space-age factories and research installations, flanked by vast housing developments, spread across the landscape. In the middle of this seething activity is historic 93,000-acre Irvine Ranch, an immensely valuable land mass only now beginning to move toward urbanization. Here, on 1,000 choice acres given to the State by the Irvine Co., will rise the University of California, Irvine. Ground will be broken for the first classroom building this fall.

Around the perimeter the Irvine Co. has set aside 10,000 acres for the development of a university-oriented town and residential communities. On the drawing boards are industrial parks, subdivisions, shopping centers, highways and water reservoirs.

"Just as the land-grant colleges were founded a century ago to serve the rural Nation of that era," says Chancellor Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., "so we are building Irvine to serve the urban world of today. We expect to develop the closest kind of cooperation with southern California's industrial complex, but this doesn't mean that Irvine will become just another big technological school. Here, technology and culture will not be mutually exclusive."

The plan for the Santa Cruz campus is the bold brainchild of Chancellor D. E. McHenry,

formerly dean of academic planning for the statewide university system. On a 2,000-acre site a complex of 15 to 20 residential colleges will be built, each to have its own faculty, classrooms, housing, and eating facilities for perhaps 600 students. Each college will lean toward one branch of learning: history, modern languages, literature, the natural sciences. Typically, the student will get at least half of his instruction in his own college, but will cross the campus to other colleges for courses not offered in his own unit. A university library and other general facilities will be centrally located, and graduate and professional schools will be added as needed. As at Irvine, closed-circuit TV cables will connect all buildings.

"We think we have a concept here," said Chancellor McHenry, "that will combine the advantages of the small college and the big university."

At the new San Diego campus, a modified plan of smaller units will be used. Three clusters of four colleges each will be built, and each cluster will operate as a unit. Heading this development is Chancellor Herbert F. York, one of the country's leading physicists.

A real conundrum is whether California's taxpayers can and will support all this panoply of higher education. The annual budget of the university alone is about $450 million. About half of this, however, is Federal money—chiefly for research work which the Government hires UC to do. Thus the university's actual operating budget is about $225 million, and of this about $158 million comes from State funds. The rest is derived from student fees, gifts, and endowments. In addition, UC is currently spending from $50 million to $75 million a year on new buildings and facilities. The estimated tab for constructing the three new branches is about $400 million each. By 1975, the operating budgets for California's three systems of higher education are expected to add up to more than a billion dollars annually, about two-thirds of which will come from State funds.

California is a wealthy State with a relatively high level of personal income. With a skyrocketing population and burgeoning industries, perhaps it can continue to foot the bill. The team of master planners say flatly that it can. Despite a 4 percent sales tax and a State income tax already in the middle ranges, Californians last autumn voted 2 to 1 for a large bond issue, chiefly to finance new plant for higher education.

Will California's higher education cosmos become a ponderous learning factory in which the average student loses contact with his teachers, loses his own identity? Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy, of UCLA, an outspoken defender of the big university, says, "In recent decades there has been an explosion of knowledge as well as of population. Consequently, it is almost impossible these days for the smaller school to offer the enormous range of subject matter that young people need to prepare for useful lives in this complex world.

"The day of spoon feeding in higher education is past. We must encourage independent study, put the student more on his own responsibility and treat him like an adult, as European universities do."

Since its earliest days, California seems to have been more passionately committed to public education than most States. Ever since it was founded in 1869, Californians have particularly loved and cherished UC. The State constitution gives the university autonomy, there is no political meddling with its management and the university's board of regents is a hard-working, nonpartisan body. Under the warming sun of such boons, the university has flourished. Not surprisingly, it feels equal to the challenge—as do the State and junior colleges, and the Californians themselves.

Liberation of the Macedonian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at its 42d annual convention in Chicago, Ill., on September 1, 2, and 3, 1963, the Macedonian Patriotic Organization of the United States and Canada adopted a resolution recommending to the United Nations that it take steps to assist in the liberation of the Macedonian people and the creation of a self-governing and independent Macedonian state.

I believe my colleagues in the Senate may find the sentiments in this resolution of interest and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resoluton was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FREE, UNITED, AND INDEPENDENT MACEDONIA A NECESSARY REMEDY FOR BALKAN PEACE AND TRANQUILLITY

The Macedonian Patriotic Organization (MPO) of the United States and Canada convened in its 42d annual convention in Chicago, Ill., on September 1, 2, and 3, 1963, in regard to the Macedonian question, has unanimously adopted the following declaration:

"For 70 years the Macedonian liberation movement has been, and it still continues to direct its appeals toward the great governments of the world to focus part of their attention to a country which has been subjected to unrecognized fearsome oppression.

"For decades the 3 million Macedonian inhabitants, living in a country of over 25,000 square miles, have been waiting and hoping for the application of the most elementary principles of self-determination, not only to determine their political destiny, but also to enjoy the right on national consciousness, religious faith, and to speak their native language.

"Ever since the fateful Berlin Treaty of 1878, the Macedonian Bulgarians and Arumanians had launched a struggle for liberation; and it was only in 1903 that they in a great insurrection had openly, with arms in hand, defied the Turkish administration.

"Meanwhile tumultuous events have been taking place in European Turkey, which had culminated into the Balkan War of 1912. This war, fought ostensibly for the liberation of Macedonia, turned into a war of conquest. Instead of giving Macedonia's freedom after the defeat and expulsion of Turkey, most unfortunately by the provisions of the Bucharest Treaty of 1913, Macedonia had been divided between Serbia, Greece, and a small part included in Bulgaria. As a result of this division, great sufferings befell to the Macedonian population.

"Immediately after the occupation of Macedonia, the Serbian and Greek authorities had launched a policy of persecuting the Bulgarian inhabitants of the country. Terror, imprisonment, killings, executions, and banishment had been, and for that matter it still continues to be, the order of the day by the Belgrade and Athens regimes. The report of the Carnegie International Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars, published in Washington, D.C., in 1914, contains scores of documents and testimonials showing the fearsome Greek and Serbian campaign for the expulsion, denationalization, or the total elimination of the Bulgarians in Macedonia.

"Of the scores of thousands of cases, we shall here allude only to two incidents typifying the brutalities that had been used against the Bulgarians in Macedonia. The Greek authorities at Salonika, loading a ship with Bulgarian prisoners and on their way to exile, had been most cruelly thrown into the Aegean Sea, the noted Bulgarian Archmandrite Evlogi of Salonika along with other Bulgarians.

"The Serbs on the other hand, not to be outdone by the Greeks, had committed among the huge number of atrocities the following incredible crime: The Abott Theofan, of the Prechista monastery in the district of Kichevo, after being brutally tortured, had been nailed upon a cross; and to make the scene resemble that of Golgotha, two peasants from his native village of Slatino had also been crucified, one on either side of him. The three victims had died on their crosses only because they had professed Bulgarian consciousness.

"Decades have passed since Serbia (now Yugoslavia) and Greece had occupied their respective zones of Macedonia. And ever since, the political, social and economic conditions of Macedonia's population have been getting from bad to worse. The Bulgarians living in Serbian or Yugoslav Macedonia have been referred to by former Serbian regimes as Old Serbs, later on as South Serbs, but now the Belgrade regime has declared them so-called Macedonians, and it has created for them a Serbianized so-called Macedonian language, which aims toward a total assimilation or Serbianization.

"Athens, on the other hand, refers to the Bulgarians living in Greek Macedonia as 'Bulgarophones Greek or Bulgarian speaking Greeks.

"The Belgrade regime has, since the end of World War II, been casting its eyes toward Salonika and the Aegean Sea; and it was because of this aspiration that the Greek civil war of 1948–49 was promoted.

"Although fearing the 'colossus of the north Greece on the other hand has been looking northward for further territorial acquisitions. Must we not suspect then that the Sofia regime would not also initiate a more dynamic policy toward this apple of contention, Macedonia?

"Because of this rivalry and struggle over Macedonia, the three Balkan States—Greece, Serbia, and Bulgaria—have, during the past 50 years, rendered huge sacrifices; hundreds of thousands, even millions, of people have been killed, not to speak of the material losses, sufferings, and economic retardation.

"Must the peace loving world continue to tolerate the existence of such explosive state of conditions in the Balkans? Must one ignore the fact that the First World War had originated in the Balkans?

"In view of this Balkan state of conditions, the Macedonian liberation movement has, ever since 1893, subscribed to the motto suggested by the great English statesman, William E. Gladstone: 'Macedonia for the Macedonians.'

"And for the past 70 years, the Macedonian liberation movement has been fighting for the creation of a self-governing and independent Macedonian state, patterned after that of Switzerland. The creation of such a state out of Macedonia would not only neutralize the rivalry and aspirations of her neighbors, but it would guarantee the free development of the various ethnic national groups living there; it would create peace and happiness not only for the Macedonian population, but also for the peoples of the entire Balkan Peninsula.

"Taking all of the above under consideration, the delegates of the Macedonian Patriotic Organization (MPO), loyal citizens, assembled at its 42d annual convention in Chicago, Ill., deem it as their humane and Christian duty to have the honor of recommend-

ing to the United Nations Organization, the responsible sovereign governments, and the world peace-loving public opinion, the following just humane, and the only equitable solution of the Macedonian question:

"1. Efforts should be made as soon as possible to place Yugoslav, Greek, and Bulgarian Macedonia under civil and military control of the United Nations organization.

"2. After a certain period of time, there should be instituted a plebiscite or free election for the people themselves to decide on the character and organization of the future Macedonian sovereign state.

"3. Once organized as a free and self-governing entity, its independence and neutrality should be guaranteed by the United Nations organization.

"Imbued by our free way of life in the United States and Canada, we are convinced that only such a solution of the Macedonian question, would forever end the suffering of its inhabitants; it would ultimately terminate the controversial Balkan problems, and create a climate for real rapprochement among the Balkan peoples. In other words, Macedonia from an apple of contention would become a unifying link; instead of wars there would reign friendship and understanding. Indeed, peace and tranquility would triump over the tragic and bloodstained Balkan Peninsula."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 28, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

TAX BILL PASSED AND REAL ISSUE NEVER DEBATED

In 2 days of consideration by the House the provisions of the President's tax bill and the real issue of planned deficits were never debated. Yet, the bill passed 271 to 155. The key vote was on the Republican motion to recommit to add an amendment which would trigger the tax cut if Federal spending in fiscal 1964 were held to $97 billion and in fiscal 1965 to $98 billion. This move was defeated 226 to 199—1 Republican voting against—26 of 251 Democrats voted for the motion. To summarize:

1. The tax bill was brought to the floor under a closed rule which prevented any amendment except the motion to recommit.

2. The 305-page bill and the 250-page report containing rate and structural changes in tax law was not read, explained, or debated and undoubtedly understood by only a few.

3. The whole assumption of the President's tax proposal is based on planned deficits and it passed, but no one championed that point of view.

The greatest danger is No. 3, the merit of a tax cut within a balanced budget concept as against the planned deficit concept and an increased public debt. Strangely, not a single liberal champions deficits and debt, but subscribes to it. The proponents of the bill almost entirely overlooked the reality of present debts and deficit financing. On the other hand, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee firmly disassociated himself from the President who would follow both tax cut and increased spending paths at once. Our chairman chose the tax cut route and indicated that he would refuse to go the spending route. But he is alone as far as the President is concerned. Let's see what the Kennedy administration believes:

1. In January the President said there must be no matching cuts in spending when taxes are cut.

2. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Economic Advisers, says repeatedly there must be no cutback in spending. Indeed, spending must be increased and new programs started.

3. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who dictates a certain amount of Democratic policy, says that cutbacks in spending would nullify the advantages of a tax cut.

4. Only recently the Commerce Department took the same position.

There you have it. The leaders of the Kennedy administration believe in deficits—in planned deficits, not a balanced budget. Yet, no proponent admitted this.

THE KENNEDY APPROACH

The Kennedy spending program is not only incompatible with tax cuts but proves that we have not earned a tax cut. This tax cut without spending cuts means deficits for years to come. President Kennedy, following the Walter Heller philosophy, has abandoned the balanced budget concept over a yearly balanced budget or business cycle. The Heller philosophy is based on the disproved theory that prosperity can be built on big Federal spending and a constantly increasing public debt.

The record proves that the Kennedy administration will not hold the line on spending. The report on the tax bill shows an increase in the annual spending level of $23 billion in 5 years from $78.9 billion in fiscal year 1961 to the estimated $102 billion of 1965. At the same time the public debt level has gone up $35 billion. There is every evidence our present $305 billion debt will be boosted to $320 billion in the next go-around demanded by the President.

REPUBLICANS DEMAND RESPONSIBILITY

The Republicans, and I agree fully, have historically championed fiscal responsibility—lower taxes within a balanced budget. Republican tax cuts have resulted from balanced budgets, surpluses and debt retirement in 1947 and 1954. Historically, Republicans have cut taxes 9 times—boosted them once—Democrats have cut them 1 time and boosted them 14 times.

SUMMARY

1. The tax bill will lead to bigger deficits, deficits which have never produced growth or employment in the past.

2. The President will not cut spending. Many new programs and new increases await congressional action at his demand—foreign aid, ARA, Domestic Peace Corps, YCC, mass transit, public works, aid to education, to name a few.

3. He has added 137,000 more Government employees plus 36,000 requested in fiscal year 1964 for a total of 173,000 additional.

Will Republicans, and some Democrats, now rebel at increases and reduce appropriations in the remaining eight appropriation bills and refuse the next requested debt ceiling increase? Perhaps, we conservatives have lost a battle, but may yet win the war.

Evils of Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared on WTVT at Tampa, Fla., and is published in volume VI, No. 443, dated September 24, 1963, of the editorials of that excellent television station pointing out the evils of the price-fixing bill known as the quality stabilization bill.

The Department of Justice points out that enactment of this legislation would boost prices about 20 percent on items covered.

If the Congress chooses to pass inflationary and destructive anticonsumer legislation it can enact no better legislation to serve such purposes than this. Certainly a 20-percent increase in costs across this country would have a fearfully inflationary impact upon the economy of this country and would do much to put the rising economy of this Nation into a major tailspin.

The editorial follows:

Tomorrow in the Nation's Capitol the House Rules Committee opens a hearing on a piece of legislation with the high-sounding title, "Quality Stabilization Bill." Actually, it is a price-fixing bill. Its backers thought up the fancy new name to make it more palatable to Congress, which has turned down legislation of this type every year since 1914.

This time, it looks like it might get through, leaving it up to the President to veto it or accept it. However, a chance still remains to stop the bill in committee. What the bill would do is allow manufacturers to fix minimum prices for their products. Any retailer who sold the item for a lower price would be in violation of Federal law. The backers of the bill claim it is necessary to protect small businessmen from competition. On the other side, the Department of Justice says it could boost prices about 20 percent on items covered. The agency warns that this would cost American consumers billions of dollars, and would have an inflationary effect on the economy.

WTVT does not believe that allowing manufacturers to fix minimum retail prices is the proper way to protect small businessmen.

If governmental intervention is justified at all, it should be through some other means, along the line of antitrust regulations.

Channel 13 feels the Suncoast Council of Senior Citizens in St. Petersburg has the bill pegged for what it really is. The council says: "It is apparent that the title of this proposed bill is designed to lead the public to believe that it is an act to provide quality in merchandise when, in fact, its provisions have little or nothing to do with quality."

The council statement concludes: "The title of this bill is so misleading that it can only be interpreted as an attempt by its proponents to fool the consumer public."

WTVT agrees, and suggests that all citizens opposed to Federal price fixing let their Congressmen and Senators know before this fair trade bill is railroaded through Congress.

Down With Twaddle-Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joseph Alsop says many things that need to be said and

many things that should be repeated often.

For those of us who have been interested in foreign affairs and world problems, it is baffling and pathetic to see our countrymen constantly wanting to be loved, and always believing that the world is just longing and hoping to become like us in every way.

Indeed, Mr. Alsop is right when he coins a new expression for these aberrations, and I will repeat again and again: "Look at the facts. Mouth no more cliches. Down with twaddle-think."

The article follows:

DOWN WITH TWADDLE-THINK

(By Joseph Alsop)

HONG KONG.—The needless political bad patch encountered in South Vietnam and the excitable American reaction to it are both rendered extraexasperating by another highly important set of facts.

In brief, although less is known about North Vietnam than almost any other country in the Communist bloc, it is now quite certain that the condition of North Vietnam is downright desparate.

Prof. P. J. Honey, the Englishman who is literally the only serious authority on Vietnam with no French or other ax to grind, compares the present situation in the north "to the worst moment in China after the disaster of the great leap forward." That was the moment, of course, when Communist China came perilously close to internal collapse, as was proven by the breakdown of discipline when the Hong Kong border was opened.

Professor Honey, whose information has been authoritatively confirmed here in Hong Kong, describes the North Vietnamese masses as living on or below the brink of starvation outside the two show towns of Hanoi and Haiphong. Cloth is so short that the peasant women work the fields in breech clouts—a real horror to the Vietnamese. And deaths from simple hunger are reported from the villages.

None of this is particularly surprising. North Vietnam never had enough food to support its population, even without the huge additional burden of a large Communist army and bureaucracy. The Communists are so eager to get the rich South within their grasp precisely because the North is not viable. The cause of the present crisis conditions is quite certainly the cumulative effect of this basic nonviability.

One of the more idiotic cliches of our time is the reason, in turn, why almost no one but Professor Honey and a few professional intelligence collectors have paid the smallest attention to the state of North Vietnam. The cliche is that, once the Communists fix their grip on a nation, that grip can never be broken. Hungary proved the contrary—for Hungarian communism was restored, after all, not by Hungarians but by Soviet troops. Yet the cliche continues to be parroted.

If the position in North Vietnam is anywhere nearly as desperate as it is thought to be by the only persons who know anything about it, then this fact should be given much weight in the American calculations about South Vietnam. When you may be nearer to winning than appears on the surface, it is no time to cut and run. But here again, the cliches operate.

In its present state, the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem is neither admirable nor even dependable at least without radical measures of self-improvement. But the power of idiotic cliches has helped mightily to bring the Diem government to this pass.

The central cliche is that, if a country like South Vietnam receives American aid, then its Government ought to be remodeled in the image, let us say, of the government of the State of Michigan—not, of course, the Michigan which has had so many incompetent, reactionary, and corrupt State administrations, but the new, bright Michigan of good George Romney. Michigan springs to mind because members of the staff of the University of Michigan for so long played a large and often ludicrous advisory role in Saigon.

But this idealistic American demand for Asian democracy is doomed to be unfulfilled. Highly educated, highly industrialized Japan is a special case. But Asian countries which have not fully emerged into the modern world are even less well prepared for democracy than, let us say, Alabama.

The persistent application of our standards to Asian leaders, the insistent demand that Asian leaders perform in a manner more ideally American than many an American State Governor, is not merely silly in itself. In addition, the underlying self-righteousness is deeply pernicious. Its pressure warps and cripples Asian leaders who might otherwise perform quite respectably, as in the case of President Diem. Worse still, American policy itself is also warped and crippled by the same pressure.

About an Asian government, in short, it is a clear sign of "twaddle-think" to ask most of the questions that are usually asked at home. About such a government, only three questions need to be asked. Does it work? Does it serve American interests? And is it not better, with all its faults, than the probable alternative—which in present-day Asia is quite often a Communist government like that in North Vietnam.

Even today, the Diem government is at least far better than that in the north. But the problem goes beyond Diem. Look at the facts. Mouth no more cliches. Down with "twaddle-think." These should be the new slogans.

Historic Newspaper Scoop Gives Joyous American Public First News of Dewey's Naval Victory on May 1, 1898

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in the House today I made mention of the historic scoop of the Chicago Tribune in bringing to a hysterically delighted American public the first news of Admiral Dewey's astounding victory in Manila Bay on May 1, 1898. The full story is related in the following news article in the Chicago Tribune of September 29, 1963:

ADMIRAL DEWEY'S MEMENTOS TO BE DISPLAYED

A collection of mementos of Adm. George Dewey, the hero of Manila Bay, including many which had been on loan to the Chicago Historical Society, were flown to Washington, D.C. last week. Part of the collection will be displayed at the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., and part in the Naval Historical Foundation in the capital.

The items included the one-star flag which Dewey, then a commodore, flew from his flagship, *Olympia*, in the Battle of Manila Bay, many of his personal journals and papers, a diamond-studded sword, and 27 of his medals.

One of the most unusual items in the collection was a small section from the underwater cable between Manila and Hong Kong which was, in 1898, the sole means of wire contact between the Philippines and the world.

Dewey had the cable cut, and thereby set up the circumstances by which the Tribune scored one of the most famous of news scoops, the first story of the outcome of the engagement. The story even beat Dewey's official communique.

The late James Keeley, then managing editor of the Tribune, telephoned the news of the victory to President McKinley.

The Tribune dispatch had been filed by Edward W. Harden, who had seen the battle from one of Dewey's seven fighting ships, the revenue cutter *McCulloch*. The *McCulloch*, with Harden and two other correspondents aboard, was sent as a dispatch boat back to Hong Kong, the nearest cable office once the Manila line had been cut.

From Hong Kong, Harden's message—sent "urgent" although the cost per word was a staggering $9.90—started out second to Dewey's official dispatch. But the Dewey message was repeated back at every cable station to insure against transmission error. When the message reached a point where there were two cables between stations, the Dewey message was held up for a check-back while Harden's "urgent" went ahead on the other wire.

Because there was a further delay in decoding Dewey's dispatch after it had reached New York, Harden's message beat the official communique by 6 hours.

The collection was presented to the Navy recently from the estate of Admiral Dewey's only son, George G., a Chicago financier who died at 90 in February 1963.

The bequest was accepted for the Navy by Rear Adm. Howard A. Yeager, commandant of the 9th Naval District with headquarters at Great Lakes. There, the mementos were crated for shipment to the East.

Included in the collection is a four-star flag of Adm. David Farragut, the hero of the Battle of Mobile Bay, during the Civil War. Dewey served under Farragut during his early career, and Farragut was his personal hero.

Other mementos include one of Dewey's dress uniforms, miniature portraits of the admiral and his staff officers aboard the *Olympia*, an 18-carat gold cup valued at $10.000 given him by the city of New York, and an 18-inch-high sterling silver urn presented him by the people of Savannah, Ga.

Eleven Pioneer Friends of TVA Who Voted for the Original Act Continue To Serve as Statesmen in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the TVA was passed in 1933 by the 73d Congress.

This year we are celebrating the 30th anniversary of that significant action of the Congress. This act, every fairminded citizen today recognizes, was one of the most important actions ever taken by the Congress to assist in an area of our country to help itself for growth and economic progress. The seven States area has made great strides and progress

in many ways in recent years since the original TVA Act was passed.

Today TVA stands as a fruitful example of how democracy works and how a democratic society through utilization of its resources in a cooperative effort can uplift an entire region and its people. Today TVA is not only returning rich dividends to the people of the valley area and to the United States as a whole, but it is one of our Nation's most impressive showcases to the world. It stands, on its 30th birthday, not only as a symbol of democracy in action throughout the United States but as a monument of progress to other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Library of Congress to provide me with the names of the Members of Congress who are serving in Congress who originally voted for the TVA Act. These men—11 in number—who are continuing to serve in the Congress were among the real pioneers and statesmen who made this great development possible.

Mr. Speaker, it seems only fitting and appropriate that the names of these original supporters of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act who are still serving in Congress be acknowledged and their names spread upon the record.

Those still in the Congress who supported and voted for the original TVA Act in 1933 include our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi, ranking member of the Committee on Rules; the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Rules; and the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The Members of the other body who were in the Congress and voted for the bill in 1933 are Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama; and Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia.

These men—pioneer friends and supporters of TVA—are all great American statesmen.

Protest on Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I signed a cable to Soviet Premier Khrushchev protesting anti-Semitism, which is official policy in the Soviet Union, and is encouraged by the state. The cable attempted to remind Premier Khrushchev that the Soviet Union's policy of oppression against its Jewish citizens is in direct contradiction to Khrushchev's oft-repeated claim that Russia is a so-called champion of human dignity and equality.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release about this cable—the release is from the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Jewish Committee—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA RELIGIOUS, CIVIC LEADERS PROTEST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

PHILADELPHIA.—In a strongly worded cable to the Russian Ambassador in Washington, 42 Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen, educators, civic, and government officials in Philadelphia yesterday assailed Soviet anti-Semitism and urged the Russian Government "to lift its official policy of oppression against its Jewish citizens."

The telegram to the ambassador sent on the eve of the observance by Jews all over the world of the Day of Atonement was undertaken cooperatively by these leaders, the Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Jewish Committee, a 56-year-old human relations agency.

Among the signers of the telegram were: Archbishop John J. Krol, archbishop of Philadelphia; Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, president of the World Methodist Council; Mayor James H. J. Tate and James T. McDermott, Republican candidate for mayor and Rabbi Morris Pickholz, president, board of rabbis of Greater Philadelphia.

The Philadelphia leaders sharply criticized the blanket restraints against all religions in the U.S.S.R. They underscored that Judaism is placed outside even the narrow framework of permissible religious practice allowed in the Soviet Union.

Leaders from the following fields—all of whom signed the cable in their individual capacities—were: Religion: Arlin M. Adams, chairman of the board, Philadelphia Chapter, American Jewish Committee; Rev. J. A. Alexander, presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rt. Rev. J. Gillespie Armstrong, bishop of Pennsylvania, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rt. Rev. George W. Baber, bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Church; the Rev. Dr. Henry H. Bagger, president emeritus, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia; Rev. J. S. Benn, Jr., presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rabbi Israel Botwinick, president, Rabbinical Association (Orthodox); Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, president of the World Methodist Council; Rev. C. Paul Felton, district superintendent, Philadelphia Methodist Conference; Dr. Aaron E. Gast, dean, Conwell School of Theology; Robert K. Greenfield, president, Jewish Community Relations Council; J. Arthur Hookway, moderator, Philadelphia Baptist Association; Rev. A. Scott Hutchison, executive secretary, Philadelphia Baptist Association; Rev. Matthew Jones, presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rev. Samuel E. Kidd, president, eastern Pennsylvania Synod of the Lutheran Church in America; the Most Rev. Archbishop John R. J. Krol, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Rabbi Reuben J. Magil, president, Philadelphia branch of Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative); Rev. Arnold D. Nearn, presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rev. Henry H. Nichols, president, Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches; David G. Paul, clerk, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends; Clarence E. Pickett, secretary emeritus, American Friends Service Committee; Rabbi Morris Pickholz, president, board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia; Rabbi Arthur J. S. Rosenbaum, chairman, Community Relations Committee, Board of Rabbis; Dr. E. Preston Sharp, moderator of the Philadelphia Presbytery; Rev. Paul T. Slinghoff, president, southeast Pennsylvania Conference of the United Church of Christ; Dr. Samuel L. Spear, president, Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and vicinity; Rev. F. H. Stroup, executive secretary, Philadelphia Presbytery; Rev. Leon M. Sullivan, pastor, Zion Baptist Church; Rabbi Harold M. Waintrup, chairman, Philadelphia Association of Reform Rabbis; Rev. Henry W. Zehner, superintendent, Atlantic Conference, Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Civic and Government. Senator Joseph S. Clark; Senator Hugh Scott; Samuel L. Evans, manager, Philadelphia Chamber Orchestra; W. Thatcher Longstreth; president, Urban League; the Honorable Thomas B. McBride, president, Fellowship Commission; James T. McDermott, Esq., Republican candidate for mayor; Cecil B. Moore, Esq., president, Philadelphia Branch, NAACP; Mayor James H. J. Tate.

Education. Brother Daniel Bernian, president, LaSalle College; Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, president, Temple University; Rev. John A. Klekotka, president, Villanova University; and the Very Rev. William F. Maloney, president, St. Joseph's College.

The leaders pointed out the sharp contrast between the Soviet Constitution, in which equality of citizens is guaranteed, and the Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion. Devout members of any religion, the statement said, "suffer harassment."

The telegram, delivered to the Soviet Embassy in Washington for transmission to Premier Khrushchev, charged that while most other faiths are permitted bare necessities needed for religious practices, the almost 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union are denied minimal rights.

Among the repressive measures against Jews in the Soviet Union listed in the cable were:

"Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

"Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors in their synagogues.

"Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned, except for a lone Yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April.

"No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is forbidden.

"Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters have been stamped out. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books and newspapers in their own languages."

The conditions, the cable said, revive "memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime" which, it pointed out, Premier Khrushchev has denounced.

The telegram urged Soviet Union to implement its oft-repeated claim that it is "a champion of human dignity and equality" and "a defender of minority rights" by lifting these repressive measures. It called on the Soviet Government to conform its behavior "to its own professed principles," and to the standards of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the con-

stitutions of enlightened countries which affirm that "freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being."

Unless the Soviet Government takes steps to guarantee complete freedom of religious practice, the cable said, "it forfeits the confidence of all peoples."

"By deeds alone can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man."

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I have often expressed our deep concern about events in the Panama Canal which threaten the safety and future usefulness of this vital link in our economic and defense considerations.

I would like to extend in the RECORD at this point an excellent statement on the situation from a recent Life Lines broadcast:

PANAMA CANAL

To most Americans it seems incredible that our Government would ever give any serious thought to surrendering our control over the Panama Canal. The great canal, almost certainly the most important waterway in the world, links the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and provides the only direct seat communication between our east and west coasts. It was built entirely by America and primarily for American use, though ships from every nation in the world pass through it every year. It is a keystone of defense and of trade.

The land through which the Panama Canal is cut, one of the wildest and least developed regions on earth, was worthless before the coming of the canal. Still we pay Panama $2 million a year for it. The canal is the heart of Panama's economy and its only major source of wealth.

If any rights, either moral or legal, are left in the world, then we can claim by right the Panama Canal. Yet high officials in our Government and particularly in our State Department have outlined a policy of gradual dilution of American control over the Panama Canal. Their final goal is its so-called "internationalization."

Fidel Castro of Cuba has made it a primary objective of his policy to take control of the Panama Canal out of the hands of the United States. His goal is to have Panama nationalize the canal under the guidance of his agents. If our foreign policy were guided by reason and the national interest of America, such a plot would be laughable. Panama has an army of less than 1,000 men. Cuba is an island hundreds of miles away from Panama, and the United States has the greatest Navy in the world. No conceivable force that Castro and his henchmen in Panama could command—internal or external—would even begin to threaten our control of the canal. We will lose it only if we give it up. And if we give it up it will be for no reason at all except plain appeasement.

Nevertheless, we are seriously considering giving it up. Not, to be sure, directly to Castro; but to some international or regional grouping of nations. This is almost unbelievable policy. It is directly contrary to the expressed will of Congress. No American President of either party has ever endorsed it. There is nothing to suggest that any measurable percentage of the American people now favor it or could ever be persuaded to favor it. Yet the policy exists.

The one-world view of the Panama Canal first came to the surface in 1960. Reports reached leading Members of Congress that the State Department (fresh from its delivery of Cuba to Castro in the preceding year) was now planning to weaken our claim of right to the Panama Canal Zone by permitting the flag of Panama to fly in the Zone next to the American flag. By ironclad treaty, the United States holds a perpetual lease on Canal Zone territory. But this did not seem to matter to the State Department. It worried about Panamanian agitators and, as usual, world opinion. The Department did not worry at all, it seemed, about American rights and the loss of prestige that always results from a surrender of rights. And the State Department also saw fit to violate completely the expressed mandate of the Congress.

In February 1960, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 380 to 12, adopted a resolution calling upon the State Department not to permit the flag of Panama to fly anywhere in the Panama Canal Zone. State Department officials cannily waited until Congress had adjourned and the Nation was in the midst of a Presidential election campaign; in late September 1960, our Ambassador in Panama ordered the flag of Panama flown beside the American Flag in every part of the Canal Zone.

In the confusion of a National election and a change of administrations, no steps were taken to override this action and punish or even reprimand those responsible for it.

Naturally, this concession led only to more demands from agitators in Panama, egged on by Castro and encouraged by Castro's repeated successes against the United States. The flag issue, though important, had been only symbolic. Now America's critics and enemies began to insist on at least a share in actual control of the canal. Some of our policymakers were only too willing to oblige.

Increasingly ominous signs of a new weakening in our position on the Panama Canal are clearly to be seen. While in Panama, Adlai Stevenson, American Ambassador to the United Nations, said that "the logical future of the canal may be some form of internationalization. Senator WAYNE MORSE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America, sponsored a university study on the Panama Canal which concluded that the canal should be regionalized by being put under the control of every nation in the Western Hemisphere, acting as a group. Finally, this year, the State Department brought to Panama the secretary general of the Suez Canal Authority, who was the man who carried out the one-sided, forced nationaliaztion of the Suez Canal on the orders of Nasser of Egypt. This official, so experienced in taking over canals that did not belong to him, lectured audiences in Panama on how it was done. And this was a man sent not by Castro or by the Kremlin or even by Nasser himself, but invited to Panama by our own State Department.

There are signs enough to indicate that the incredible may be about to happen again. Five years ago it could hardly have seemed possible to anyone that the United States would ever permit the establishment of a Soviet-armed Communist satellite on our very doorstep in Cuba. But this took place. And, unless the present trend is reversed, the same sort of disaster and surrender could happen in Panama.

Before Congress, as one answer to the policy of retreat and surrender on the Panama Canal, is a resolution demanding that our "ownership and protection" of the canal remain unimpaired. But in view of the way the last congressional resolution of this kind was treated—directly violated as soon as Congress had adjourned—it is too much to hope that this action alone will be enough. The policy of backdown and appeasement in Panama is no more than an especially flagrant example of this same policy in most of the rest of the world. Never in American history has our foreign policy been so completely irrational. In faraway places on the enemy borders, as in West Berlin and South Vietnam, we try to stand firm, risking and even sacrificing lives to that end. But close to home, where our most vital interests are concerned, we make one needless concession after another to a foe who can scarcely believe his own good fortune.

There is good reason to suppose that the worst examples of the policy of concession and retreat as in the Panama Canal, are not the result of clear-cut decisions taken at the highest level of Government. Instead, they are the product of the middle echelon of the State Department—called the "fourth floor" by our last Ambassador to Cuba before Castro's takeover, who fought them long but in vain. The deskmen on the "fourth floor" make the day-to-day decisions of our foreign policy, especially in countries which, because of crises elsewhere, are not getting the personal attention of the President, his Cabinet, and other members of the National Security Council. The men of the "fourth floor" are almost all career foreign service officials, the product of a handful of eastern universities, most of them hired and trained during a period when it was widely and sincerely believed that international organizations could cure all the world's worst ills and that every nation should defer to them. The men of the "fourth floor" have built their careers on that false assumption. To give it up now would be to expose virtually everything they have done as a mistake. So they push steadily forward with their folly.

This type of thinking was clearly revealed in a recent speech by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, in which he welcomed what he called "the social revolution of the 19th and 20th centuries" and scorned "conservatism and silly resistance to change." It would be very interesting to know if the Governor's idea of the "social revolution of the 20th century" and the sort of change it is so silly to resist would include the surrender of the canal he is sworn to guard, to some international body. It is hard to explain such incidents as the visit of the man who carried out Nasser's orders to seize the Suez Canal, and the sponsorship of his visit by the American State Department on any other basis.

The facts about the downfall of Cuba, when joined with the facts about the changing status of our control over the Panama Canal, are surely enough to show that a great deal is deeply wrong at the working level of the State Department, and in the thinking of officials like the Governor of the Canal Zone. To give up the Panama Canal for no better reason than a desire to prove to everybody our limitless good will would be probably the most childish and self-defeating action any great power ever took.

Active patriots throughout America should keep a careful watch on this Panama Canal issue, often almost lost to sight in the turmoil of other events. Congressmen who stand up to protest our piecemeal surrender of our rights should get the public support they deserve by constructive groups of every kind. It should be made clear to the top officials in our Government that public opinion, especially after the disasters in Cuba, will not tolerate a new series of craven retreats in Panama. The situation is so serious, and the potential threat to American interests so great, that a full-scale congressional investigation would be fully

justified, at least to determine what our Panama Canal policy actually is. After all, the State Department is not quite the Supreme Court. It is not a coordinate branch of the Federal Government under the Constitution, it is a creature of Congress and the Executive, and must ultimately depend upon both for the power and authority to carry out its policies.

Until we meet again, remember: If a man does not respect his own rights, he is not likely to find anyone else willing to respect them. And the same is true of nations. It is just possible that unless we make it clear to all that we have rights—legal and moral—in the Panama Canal Zone, those rights will be ignored, and the canal could conceivably be lost to our continued use.

Indiana Bendix Engineer and Family To Fight Poverty in Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of an American family dedicated to helping persons living in poverty in other lands is the family of Richard C. Stouffer, a missile engineer at the Bendix Corp., Mishawaka division, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

Mr. and Mrs. Stouffer and their family of five children have left Indiana to go to Brazil where they will work for at least 3 years in slum areas of that country.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an excellent article describing the plans of the Stouffer family which was written by Jack Colwell and published in the South Bend Tribune of May 20, 1963.

The article follows:

BENDIX ENGINEER AND FAMILY TO FIGHT POVERTY IN BRAZIL

(By Jack Colwell)

A Bendix missile engineer, his wife and their five children plan to leave South Bend for South America, where they intend to live amidst poverty for at least 3 years.

This isn't one of those cases where somebody decided to forsake the United States because he found taxes too high, controls too rigid, or the possibility of nuclear attack too great.

On the contrary, it is a firm faith in God and country which is prompting the move by Mr. and Mrs. Richard C. Stouffer, 4016 Manor Drive, and their children, Michael, 7; Charles, 6; John, 4; Janet, 2, and Peter, 8 months.

Stouffer will leave his job as a Talos missile design engineer for the Bendix Corp., Mishawaka Division, at the end of June, and the family will head for White Plains, N.Y. There they will undergo an orientation period designed to prepare them for life in Curitiba, Brazil.

They are going as volunteers for a relatively new organization known as Catholics for Latin America.

WILL GET SUBSISTENCE PAY

While in Brazil, Stouffer will receive no pay other than a subsistence allowance which will be calculated to meet the family's minimum living expenses.

For the privilege of going, Stouffer will use his own money to pay for the plane transportation to Brazil. He will use his own $1,500 to set up housekeeping in the new country (after selling his furniture here at a loss) and he won't start getting that subsistence money from CFLA until after the family is there a month.

Figuring losses on the sale of their property here due to the need for hurried sales, the elimination of bank savings which could have resulted from Stouffer's salary at Bendix and the amount of his own money which must be spent on the Brazil trip, Stouffer estimates the venture will cost him $9,000.

Why did the Stouffers decide to make such a costly trip so far from home?

CONSIDER POPE'S WORDS

Words of Pope John XXIII and the example of the Peace Corps both had something to do with it, said Stouffer.

Mr. and Mrs. Stouffer are Catholics. They were looking for something to do beyond just tossing an envelope in the Sunday collection basket to exemplify their religious ideals.

"Pope John called in 1960 for volunteers to go to Latin America," Stouffer explained. "I'm not sure how directly he influenced our decision," he said, but at least the Pope's words encouraged the Stouffers' thinking about the possibilities of helping the peoples of South America.

"Then the Peace Corps came along and showed us that it is possible for people to go to other countries and provide such help," Stouffer said.

The Stouffers even investigated the possibility of joining the Peace Corps, but they found as they had suspected that the size of their family made this impossible.

"We wrote to eight different organizations," Stouffer said, but each of these groups replied that they couldn't use the seven Stouffers in their oversea programs.

Then they heard about CFLA. "We were so tired of writing long letters that we wrote them only a two-line letter asking for information," Stouffer said. This was in February.

Later in the year the family went to the CFLA headquarters in White Plains to get more information and to let CFLA gain more information about the Stouffers. Both parties apparently liked what they saw.

The size of their family was no handicap in joining the CFLA program, Stouffer said. In fact, he said, the group encourages large families to go to South America because of the theory that youngsters are the Nation's best ambassadors of good will.

Stouffer isn't exactly sure what he will do in Curitiba, a growing city in the south of Brazil about 40 miles from the Atlantic Ocean. A 1962 almanac lists the population at 231,628, but Stouffer said the present population of the city may be almost double that figure.

WILL WORK IN SLUMS

Although the family will live in a middle-class section of the city, most of Stouffer's work will be in the slums.

Stouffer will work with the people, attempting to assist them in projects which will improve their standards of living. His wife also will join women's groups, and the older children will go to school with Brazilian youngsters.

Stouffer is a 1959 electronics graduate of Michigan State University, East Lansing. His wife, also a graduate of Michigan State, is a music education major. They hope use of these skills will come in handy.

One of the major goals of the CFLA program is to attempt to get the middle and upper class people of the South American countries to become interested in helping the vast number of poverty-stricken persons in their nations.

WILL SET GOOD EXAMPLE

Combating the Communist influence attempts in the Curitiba area and other parts of Latin America is another goal, Stouffer said, but he stressed that the combating will be done by setting a good example for the American and Christian way of life, not by any Communist-hunting or political activities.

While the bishop of the area has indicated a desire to have a CFLA family in his diocese, Stouffer also stresses that he will not be taking orders from the bishop.

And Stouffer also makes it clear that he does not plan to launch a campaign to obtain converts. "I'm not going to try to be a priest," he said.

CFLA was only a year old in March. During the first year, the organization sent nine families (one with seven children and three with six children) and three individual to live and work with the people of South American countries.

The Stouffers and another family from Massachusetts will be the first CFLA families in Brazil.

FINANCING COMES FROM PLEDGES

Financing of the CFLA program, including the subsistence funds for the families, comes from pledges by persons in this country. The pledge range from $1 to $200 a month, according to a CFLA booklet.

The booklet explains the goals of the organization this way: "CFLA is dedicated to the apostolate of being there. Its members possess an interest, concern and love for their Latin American neighbors which is manifested by their actual presence in slums, in schools, in hospitals, in policlinics, in private homes, and in the marketplace.

"A CFLA member's personal example, his Christian family life, his attitude of wanting to understand the poor and assist them in any way he can, constitute his first and greatest contribution to his Latin American neighbors."

One of the questions he is asked most about his South American venture, said Stouffer, is why he is going to work in slums in Brazil when he could do work in the slums of America.

CITES DIFFERENCE IN SLUMS

There is a big difference between the poverty-stricken areas here and in many nations of South America, Stouffer explains. Here the slums amount to less than 10 percent of the cities, and it is possible for a person to escape from this poverty with the help of the many agencies now at work in this Nation's slums, he said.

In some South American nations he added, the slums hold 60 to 80 percent of the people captive. They are surrounded by slums and nobody is offering them any chance of escape, said Stouffer.

The children will hate to leave their friends, Stouffer said, but they also are looking forward to the trip.

One advantage for the two older boys, he said, is that they will arrive in Brazil in October, springtime in South America, and they will experience their second consecutive summer vacation from school.

Trade Expansion or Trade War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, there is a continuing debate going on in the world

with respect to tariff and trade. All of us realize how important it is for us to increase our trade with other nations, while providing sensible protection for domestic producers.

One of the largest importers of photographic film and related items is the Gevaert Co. of America, Inc., now located in New York City, but preparing to move to a new location in Teterboro, N.J. The distinguished executive vice president of the Gevaert Co. of America, Inc., Mr. Rene Aerts, has made a very persuasive statement for sensible moderation to the Trade Information Committee. His remarks shed considerable light on the harmful effects that will follow should a tariff war start as a result of the Common Market's sharp increase in duty on U.S. poultry.

Because of the universal interest in this subject matter at present, I insert Mr. Aerts' statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the committee, I appear before you today on behalf of the Gevaert Co. of America and its 310 employees throughout the United States.

For 43 years, the Gevaert Co. of America has been in existence. In 1920 we were chartered as a corporation in New York State, and we have been engaged in business in the United States continuously since that time. Now the company's very existence is at stake, since the photographic products appearing on the retaliatory list represent, for all intents and purposes, our entire product line.

In 1962, the United States exported $75 million worth of sensitized photographic products, whereas only $35 million were imported from all foreign sources. That is, $40 million worth of materials less were imported by the United States than were exported.

In this favorable balance of trade, the Gevaert Co. of America accounts for approximately 59 percent of all sensitized imports. However, at manufacturers and import price level, Gevaert accounts for less than 2 percent of the gross national photo product. All of our products are supplied by Gevaert Photo Producten, the only sensitized photographic product manufacturer in Belgium. Twenty-three percent of their total output is marketed by the Gevaert Co. of America. Therefore, the unfavorable economic impact an increase in duties would have on just one company, the Gevaert Co. of America, is almost incredible.

Such a singular result hardly seems consistent with known goals and objectives of our Government and the true intent of the Trade Expansion Act. The future of 310 U.S. employees and approximately 2,000 of the 9,000-plus workers in Belgium hangs precariously in the balance.

The American sensitized products market is a highly competitive one. Previous tariff concessions have permitted Gevaert to grow and establish a long record of service to all types of American consumers. Withdrawal of any tariff concessions will cause the dissolution of our organization and in the final result it will be the end consumer who will suffer.

Here are some of the economic facts in the matter. To give you some idea of our expenditures and investments in the United States during 1962, following are some major categories which should be of interest:

Payroll	$1,800,000
Other administrative, selling and general expenditures	2,700,000
Import duties	1,700,000
Purchases by Gevaert Belgium	2,000,000
Capital investment	2,500,000

This, then, was the economic picture in 1962. Expenditures in this country will increase during 1963, and our payroll alone will be over $2 million. Renovation of a recently purchased facility in Teterboro, N.J., should be completed in the early part of 1964, and our total capital investment in the United States will be over $5 million.

I believe the facts indicate Gevaert's plans for the future will bring a larger proportion of investment and expenditure moneys into the American economy. In fact, this has been the picture over the years in our consistent efforts to expand the American company.

In addition to the direct effect tariff increases would have on the Gevaert Co. of America, there is a separate, autonomous American firm, the Low X-Ray Corp., which employs 80 people engaged in the marketing of Gevaert X-ray film. If imports in this area were curtailed, a doubly harmful effect would be imparted, in that, this company's employees as well as related Gevaert employees would suffer. Mr. Solowey, president of Low X-Ray Corp., is here today to present his company's views in this matter.

In the Gevaert Co. of America's long and tenacious effort to market products here in the United States, we have come to command a position of respect and reliability in our field. Customers range in size from large industrial firms to the small studio photographer down the street. These people, over the years, have come to rely on our company for the service and quality which are so important in this highly competitive market. Our intent on survival is also the concern of these important American interests; some of whom are here today, and many others who have contacted this committee by mail or telegram in our behalf. The impact of our dissolution to these companies has been and will be again, today, brought to your attention. We pray this will lend further credence and force to the scope of the threat to the U.S. economy by increased duties on our products.

Gentlemen, like many other American citizens, I would like to go on record in saying that I am completely in disagreement with the Common Market's action in raising the duty on U.S. poultry. In light of the free world's hope for the freer flow of goods, the raising of poultry tariffs was completely uncalled for. But must the United States compound this unseemly error with retaliatory action affecting industries not directly involved in the chicken affair? Can the free world afford a tariff war?

I, like many other American citizens, believed we were entering a new era of trade expansion in the free world. Many of us thought the economic strength promised by the freer flow of goods represented the one true hope and the one final proof of free world superiority to the Communist system. Now this hope is threatened by economic reprisals and possible counter reprisals. We, the Gevaert Co. of America, are but a pawn in this economic game of chess which can have no winner. But our mere survival—the jobs of our many employees and the interests of many others, hinges on the decision which is about to be taken. Our customers who welcome the competition we bring to the American market; our workers, whose livelihood depends on our ability to remain in business; the suppliers of cotton linters in the South; the suppliers of woodpulp in Washington State; the equipment manufacturer in Minneapolis, Minn.; all of whom sell to Gevaert in Belgium; the national and international transportation companies who deal with Gevaert on both sides of the Atlantic; these and many more have a stake in the outcome of the decision before you.

We ask not the chance to compete without being efficient. We ask not the chance to dominate the market in which we sell, since our share is less than 2 percent. We ask not the chance to displace American workers, because there is a balance of trade heavily in favor of the United States.

We ask only the right to offer our goods in a competitive market which has been nurtured by the competition we bring. We ask therefore, must the brunt of economic retaliation in the photographic field be made to fall heavily upon just one country, upon just one importer, upon just one company? Gentlemen, I leave this far-reaching economic decision to your good judgment. The facts speak for themselves. Yours is a decision that will determine our economic life or death.

Grower Says No Further Need for Bracero Progam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said pro and con on the legislation to extend the period during which Mexican braceros can be brought into this country. One of the main arguments put forth against this extension by those of us who are opposed to the bill was that these Mexican workers benefit less than 1 percent of the growers of the United States; and these are generally the large corporation-type farms, which have been squeezing the smaller independent producer out of business.

In addition, with the high percentage of our own farm workers underemployed and unemployed, it is ridiculous to think of importing workers from another country to harvest crops when there is an ample labor force here which can do the job, and which is so desperately in need of employment.

I was therefore quite pleased to receive a letter from one of the growers, who feels that there is no further need for the bracero program, and who advocates that work be allocated to our own farm workers. He is A. W. Bodine, of the Bodine Produce Co., Phoenix, Ariz., and I am inserting his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so my colleagues can have the benefit of his views.

The letter follows:

BODINE PRODUCE CO.,
Phoenix, Ariz., September 25, 1963.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the extension of the bracero program or Public Law 78, which I understand is slated to come up for discussionsion in the House of Repesentatives, I wish to ask your help in defeating the bill.

I have been for a long time a large user of the Mexican nationals but it is time to eliminate this law as it is causing a hardship on the migrant labor who are citizens of the United States. We have plenty of labor available now. We realize we will have to pay more money for this labor but we should as no one can live on wages now being paid on account of this bracero program.

The only grower and shippers that want this program extended are the large growers that are trying to dominate our business in all producing areas. We have an overpro-

duction on practically all fruits and vegetables today due to this bracero program.

I am an American and I would like to work the American people at a wage they can live on, so I ask for you to vote against the extension of this program.

We farm today 3,000 acres of land, one of the largest grower-shippers in Arizona and without this program we intend to stay in business and we intend to help the American farm labor earn a better living.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

A. W. BODINE.

German-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the first permanent German settlement in America was made at Germantown, Pa., with the arrival of 13 families there on October 6, 1683. Two hundred years later, in 1883, the anniversary of the arrival of these colonists was celebrated as German Pioneer Day by large numbers of citizens of German descent. This is believed to be the first formal notice taken of the importance of the German migration to this country. German-American Day is a continuation of this traditional celebration, and it reminds us not only of the early settlement of this Nation but also of one of the great original sources out of which the Nation itself—its growth and its prospertity—developed.

The migration of Germans to Pennsylvania came about through the influence of William Penn, who encouraged some of the leading Protestants in Frankfort to form the Frankfort Co. to arrange the migration of Germans to America. The first impulse to migration, however, came from Crefeld, a town on the Rhine near the Netherlands border. Penn had visited the Quakers and Mennonites there during this visit to the continent in 1677. In 1682 Penn deeded to three citizens of Crefeld 5,000 acres each in Pennsylvania. Francis Daniel Pastorious heard of the Frankfort Co. and went to London as its agent; in the spring of 1683 he bought a tract of 25,000 acres. He then put himself at the head of a colonization movement and sailed for America on June 10, 1683, reaching Philadelphia on August 20. Thirteen families followed him from Crefeld, sailing from London in the ship *Concord* on July 24, 1683, arrived in Philadelphia on October 6, and took up the land in Germantown which had been bought by Pastorious, thereby founding the first permanent German settlement in North America.

This beginning of their history in America is celebrated with speech and song every year on the first weekend in October by San Franciscans of German descent. The *Concord* is the German *Mayflower* and the descendants of its passengers are the first families of the German Americans. A third of the names of the pioneer settlers in California are German. The German newspaper, first published in 1853, is the oldest German language paper in the West. The first church, St. Mark's Lutheran, was founded in 1856. The number of immigrants has steadily grown until now there are about 65,000 in the city who are of German descent, and more whose origins are found in other German speaking parts of Europe.

One of the many fields in which the German Americans enrich the life of the city is music. There are hundreds of German musicians in the city—members of the symphony orchestra, music teachers, and makers and repairers of musical instruments. The German churches have the best choirs in the city and there are over two dozen German singing societies.

It gives me great pleasure to join these German Americans of San Francisco and of other parts of America in celebrating German-American Day, a meaningful occasion which symbolizes the richly varied character of this great land and its people.

Senator Humphrey Praised for Test Ban Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many individuals and groups deserve praise for the promulgation and final ratification of the test ban treaty. But one man stands above the rest in his continuing efforts to secure a world free from the dangers of nuclear testing. That man is Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Beginning in 1956 when he persuaded the Senate to establish a disarmament subcommittee, Senator HUMPHREY has worked ceaselessly in promoting a world less troubled by the grave dangers of nuclear warfare. He has indeed become the conscience of the Senate in matters of arms control and disarmament.

Recently, Charles W. Bailey of the Minneapolis Tribune wrote an article listing several major achievements that came into being largely through the leadership of Senator HUMPHREY. This article is a chronicle of the Senator's efforts to secure a world in which peace and human dignity prevail. Now that we have achieved this significant agreement on testing, I feel we should pause for a moment and recall the efforts of the one man who has led the fight for arms control and disarmament:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Sunday Tribune, Sept. 22, 1963]

HUMPHREY'S TIME FOR SMILING WILL BE TUESDAY

(By Charles W. Bailey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When the voting bells ring in the U.S. Senate Chamber at 10:30 a.m. Tuesday, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, will lean forward in his seat, a rollcall sheet in his hand, to record the vote on the nuclear test ban treaty.

When the vote is completed, and the treaty ratified—as it is considered certain to be, by a vote of at least 80 to 15—HUMPHREY can be pardoned if he lets a satisfied smile cross his face.

HUMPHREY, for more years than any other Senator and sometimes almost alone, has pursued the subject of nuclear test control with endless patience.

He has cajoled and exhorted, wheedled and persuaded, held hearings and written reports, talked to presidents and diplomats, traveled and made speeches.

As long ago as 1956, despite widespread apathy on the part of his congressional colleagues, he persuaded the Senate to set up a special subcommittee to study the problems and prospects of disarmament.

His aim was "to seek progress in those areas in which there appears some chance of agreement and progress." His instructions to the new subcommittee's staff: "Let's stop talking in generalities and get to specifics—go into the most important aspects of the field in a responsible, practical way."

At one of the first hearings of the committee, Chairman Thomas E. Murray of the Atomic Energy Commission spoke on the risks of unlimited nuclear fallout. Murray's testimony was a major basis of Adlai E. Stevenson's call for a test ban in the 1956 campaign.

HUMPHREY continued to press the subject, writing a series of letters in late 1956 to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, asking what the U.S. Government was doing in the disarmament and test ban area and urging that more be done.

In early 1957, HUMPHREY raised another new issue: the need for developing an effective U.S. inspection system as a prerequisite for a test ban agreement. In the same year, he began an effort—which finally came to fruition in 1960—to get Congress to earmark funds for a disarmament agency in the State Department.

He repeatedly turned to a favorite weapon in his long effort to focus public attention on disarmament. On February 4, 1958, he spoke for 4 hours in the Senate on the subject. During the week before Easter that year, he spoke every day on it.

By then, he had a new key point to suggest: that the United States should separate the test ban problem from the larger, less promising field of general disarmament negotiations.

Behind the scenes, he tried to strengthen President Dwight Eisenhower's test ban efforts with apathetic or reluctant Senators. On several occasions, he met at length with Harold E. Stassen, then serving as Eisenhower's disarmament coordinator.

In early 1960, HUMPHREY offered a bill to establish a "National Peace Agency" to work on the test ban and disarmament. It went no where—but in 1961, he offered it again, argued the new Kennedy administration into backing it instead of setting up the agency by Executive order and got it passed.

In 1962, convinced that the United States had developed an inspection system that could detect covert tests in the atmosphere, underwater or in outer space, HUMPHREY began to urge seeking a test ban that would cover these tests but leave out the underground tests requiring on-site inspection—which the Soviets would not agree to.

During this period, HUMPHREY went personally to President Kennedy. The Chief Executive accepted the idea, but the Russians rejected it.

When general disarmament negotiations resumed in Geneva, Switzerland, last winter, HUMPHREY went to the sessions. They became stalemated. He returned to Washington, warning that chances for an agreement

would be "nil" unless one was negotiated within 6 months.

He again privately renewed his suggestion that the United States offer to negotiate a limited test ban and joined with Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, in rounding up 32 other cosponsors for a resolution calling for such a limited test ban effort.

The rest is history: the President's American University speech in June announcing that the United States would take part in such negotiations, the meetings in Moscow, U.S.S.R., in July, the agreement on a pact.

The final chapter presumably will be finished Tuesday when the Senate ratifies the treaty.

The National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to a communication inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 17 by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER]. The communication contains a resolution passed by the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Frankfort expressing the chapter's opposition to the proposed National Service Corps. The resolution more specically opposes H.R. 338 introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. Moreover, the Frankfort chapter stated that it took this action after a "careful study of the issue." I certainly do not want to disparage Mr. HALPERN's bill, but the fact is that his is not the National Service Corps proposal which the gentleman from Kentucky asserts has been placed forward by the New Frontier. The administration bill upon which the Special Subcommittee on Labor has been holding hearings these several weeks past is, of course, H.R. 5625. Its counterpart is S. 1321. I find it rather remarkable, therefore, that the Frankfort chapter's careful study was apparently wasted upon the wrong piece of legislation. I would sincerely hope that the views recently expressed on the National Service Corps by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce were based upon a more substantial study of the legislation than that made by its Frankfort chapter. We are all aware of the many good works sponsored by the National Junior Chamber and its local chapters. Indeed, the Nation's attention was directed very recently to an event sponsored by a California chapter. Nevertheless, as a former officer of a Jaycee chapter I can state that the members' willingness to undertake programs on behalf of the unfortunate has not entirely preempted the field. Mr. Speaker, I would therefore commend to my colleagues another view of the National Service Corps as expressed in the following comment which appeared in the July–August Mental Health Newsletter published by the Department of Public Health in Minnesota. That comment, by Dr. David J. Vail, is as follows:

NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS TRANSCENDS PARTISAN ISSUES

Bill numbered S. 1321 on the National Service Corps, often popularly referred to as the "Domestic Peace Corps," is now before the Congress of the United States.

It is hard to comment on the bill without entering into some issues of controversy. One division of opinion is generally along partisan lines, around the issue of Federal-State relations, and participation by the Federal Government in areas of local or private responsibility. It is not appropriate or intended by this newsletter to enter into partisan political debate. Neither are our comments intended to either clarify or confuse the issues of Federal and State relationships. The question of the National Service Corps can be dealt with on other levels.

Certainly this particular bill is not the first one concerning mental health that has posed problems of Federal-State relations. The history of Federal-State coparticipations in the broader areas of health and welfare considerably antedate mental health activities as such. The problem of Federal and State sovereignties and responsibilities is as old as the Constitution, and the tensions, cleavage lines, and points of mutual facilitation are not only a continuing source of weakness or strength for the Nation, but also a study of perpetual interest and concern to the political scientist and average citizen alike.

Other objections to the National Service Corps have been voiced. For example, jurisdictional anxiety concerning entry of outside-sponsored personnel into existing establishments, and all the problems of xenophobia, differing loyalties and identifications, and organizational discipline that this may entail. It has been argued that there is no real analogy between foreign and domestic service, and that the success of the oversea Peace Corps is not immediately or even ultimately transferrable. There have been some semantic problems over the definition of "volunteer." It has been pointed out that this will not solve manpower problems in mental institutions and that it should not attempt to substitute for regular personnel nor seduce State legislatures into a relinquishment of their responsibility. Arguments as one actually hears them vary not so much in their intrinsic validity as in their mode of expression. Some would evidently view National Service Corpsmen as alien invaders.

It should be pointed out that the program is permissive—States may or may not apply for Corpsmen at their own option. Areas of availability as stated in S. 1321 as introduced are "for work with persons in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded and during their return to normal living; in meeting the health and education needs of migratory workers and their families, Indians living on and off reservations and residents of depressed areas and rural and urban slums; in care and rehabilitation of the elderly, the disabled, the delinquent young and dependent chidlren; in improving standards of educational opportunity; and in other projects directed toward critical human needs."

The purpose of the bill is to "strengthen community service programs in the United States." The preamble continues:

"In the United States there remain critical human needs in this time of general prosperity. In this Nation of great human resources, many more of our citizens should be encouraged to serve in their local communities to help meet these needs.

"The purposes of this act are to open new opportunities for full-time service working with those Americans in greatest need; to illuminate those needs so as to expand the attack on deprivation in the United States; to motivate many more citizens to volunteer their services in their own communities, thus encouraging communities to help themselves; and to inspire more people to choose professions that serve their fellow citizens."

Can we not set aside jurisdictional disputes and concern ourselves with the nobler and more urgent duties of citizenship? Can we not direct our efforts toward "the critical human needs of our countrymen?" Can we not accept the full burden of elevating the dignity of this Nation? Can we not bring our citizens and especially our young people to the awareness that misery and bitter privation exist in this country and that public morality requires a commitment by all of us toward their alleviation?

S. 1321 is not the only way to do these things, but it is a way. A way that is available to us now.

DAVID J. VAIL, M.D.,
Medical Director.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Address by Mayor Dawahare, of Hazard, Ky., Before the U.S. Conference of Mayors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech of Mayor William C. Dawahare, of Hazard, Ky., on June 12, 1963, before the U.S. Conference of Mayors, meeting in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Hazard, Ky., a community of 6,000 people, is the county seat of Perry County, named for Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry. Mayor Dawahare's speech tells of the heroic efforts of the people of Hazard and Perry County to meet the adverse economic conditions resulting from the technological changes in the coal industry which have reduced the number of miners employed in the coal mines of eastern Kentucky. It is an inspiring story of the spirit of the people of eastern Kentucky.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL-CITY COOPERATION ON PUBLIC WORKS

(By Hon. Wm. C. Dawahare, mayor of Hazard, Ky.)

When I became mayor of Hazard, Ky, I felt a real sense of honor and privilege. This was my greatest challenge—to do something to help our city become a better place in which to live. But, I never realized that this office would lead to this wonderful opportunity to speak to so many of the great mayors of America. I am deeply honored and grateful on behalf of all the citizens of Hazard for this moment to talk with you.

I asked someone why I was included on this program. I'm mayor of a little town in a depressed area in the mountainous coal mining country of southeastern Kentucky. Hazard is the county seat of Perry County, Ky., named for Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, famed naval hero of the Battle of Lake Erie. The official population of Hazard is about 6,000. The immediately adjacent fringe area brings this to about 35,000 within a few miles, and it serves as a geographic, trading and business center for about 300,000 people.

Hazard is in the John Fox, Jr., country of Kentucky, the locale of the "Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come" and "The Trail of the Lonesome Pine," two famous bestsellers of a half a century or more ago. Unfortunately, much of the glamour of the realization of the dreams of Mr. Fox's novels is gone and many of our present troubles in southeastern Kentucky are those incidental to the dislocation growing out of changing technology, economic adjustments and realinements in the fuels industry.

Our town faces the same problems of those of the many small towns throughout the country. These include the problems of transition from a declining mining or agricultural based economy to the industrial economy we must have to provide new jobs. The underdevelopment of basic facilities, not provided adequately before, but now absolutely essential to development of a new economy, and blight and decay of all kinds, now frustrate any efforts to redevelop. Finally, the problem is aggravated by the combination of high and rising costs of development—population with great needs and growing percentages of young and old persons with greater public needs in the fields of education and welfare—and the problem of a dwindling and inadequate tax base resulting from various factors, including a heavy outmigration of citizens at taxpaying age.

Citizens all over America face big problems—growing needs, rising costs and diminishing tax bases. What makes Hazard different? What makes our problem worse? Well, we sometimes say that we've been so far behind in eastern Kentucky that we don't even have modern problems.

Hazard is located in the very heart of the beautiful but economically distressed eastern Kentucky mountain region. This region has been hit by every problem that troubles America—and twice as hard. With automation in coal mines and loss of coal markets; dwindling timber reserves; loss of marginal farming opportunities; the absence of an established industrial base for new growth—eastern Kentucky represents the most severely distressed area in the United States. We're not proud of this. But we are proud of eastern Kentucky and we have to face these facts to rebuild a fair opportunity for people to live in this great region.

My privilege here today is to tell you that, in spite of all the problems of Hazard and all the problems of eastern Kentucky, we are succeeding in development.

Our progress in eastern Kentucky began with the administration of our current Governor, Bert Combs. Governor Combs comes from this region; he understands our problems. These problems and the action that would have to be taken to meet them were realistically outlined by the eastern Kentucky Regional Planning Commission in a report made at the time of Governor Combs' inauguration. The new Governor recognized the report as a blueprint for action.

Construction of a regional highway is moving fast, and a great section leading toward Hazard is already in use. No single action is more dramatic or symbolic than the great highway which is a breakthrough to the barrier of isolation of our mountain country.

The building of this symbolic highway is, of course, much more than a construction project. It is an act of faith in the future of our region. It is a demonstration of faith that our people will work for themselves—that we will use the new highway and other facilities to the fullest and that we will build up our communities as centers of commerce and industry, of education and culture, and of development and technology.

When I became mayor of Hazard, we were already working hard on development. In addition to efforts made over and over to bring in industry, we were trying hard to solve the problems of community improvement needed for industry. We carried out the first successfully completed urban renewal project in the southeastern United States. We have three additional urban renewal projects in the planning stages. Also, we have three projects under the accelerated public works program in the construction stage—extension of water and sewer facilities, a street paving project and a new municipal building.

In the way of financing our portion of the cost, Hazard has always enjoyed excellent credit. We take pride in the fact that, even in spite of the handicaps Hazard has experienced, we have never been in default with interest or principal on any obligation. Our floating debt is current, and because of this, almost all improvements are being financed by revenue bonds, which are eagerly sought by investors. We recommend revenue bonds wherever possible because of the speed with which funds may be made available. Our street paving project now in progress is financed by property assessments, which are insignificant, thanks to the accelerated public works grant.

At the time I became mayor, spirits were lower than I had ever seen them. Business was at a low ebb. More and more we heard people threatening to sell their homes and take their businesses elsewhere.

I needed advice and I needed help. I was determined that there had to be a way to solve our problems. In setting up his program for eastern Kentucky, Governor Combs had appointed a special assistant, a young man named John Whisman, to develop new ideas and to coordinate action. I decided to talk with him.

"Willie," he said, "the difficulty is that each project you want to do in Hazard seems impossible. But each one seems impossible because you need so many things all at once before you can create a situation in which any project is possible. The only answer is to try to do them all. It will be harder. But a program of several projects can be possible where each individual project seems impossible."

I had only one question: "How do we get started?"

John suggested that we set up a plan of attack in which we would get our local people to work outlining our problems and their own ideas for action. At the same time, we would talk to all the people in State and Federal agencies, and in organizations such as the State chamber of commerce, the State university, and any others who could help. In talking to these people, we asked them to provide members for a technical task force to come to our community for 3 days of intensive work to help us lay out a program of action. Our purpose would be to review all the problems and all the programs that might be used in any way to meet, then try to put together a combination of immediate actions to meet several problems at once, and to lead to a full-fledged program of development that would give us success in the years to come. Mr. John Gibson of the regional office of Urban Renewal Administration assisted immeasurably in this task.

Our program was started in just that way. We ran into many, many persons who were most helpful to us—men like Bill Slayton of the Urban Renewal Administration and Bill Batt of the Area Redevelopment Administration; our own Congressman, Carl Perkins; our Senators John Sherman Cooper and Thruston Morton, and many others; all were anxious to help. We held our 3-day task force meeting, and, while at first it did not seem to make much happen, I found it

laid the groundwork for the successes we have had since.

And we are having success. The thousands of people who will travel the new Mountain Parkway into eastern Kentucky will soon see a new center of our mountain economy developing in the city of Hazard. We have taken all the help we could get. We have used every program we could use, where before we didn't know how to use any helpful programs. We now have a full-time planner, Mr. Paul Townes, working for our community. We have learned to use technical assistance, to have plans ready in advance, and to work and work until we find a way to carry out the plans.

I won't bore you with all the details of our program in action today. But in the list of actions I will run through quickly, I hope you will share my pleasure and encouragement in the knowledge that our community, which has hungered for many years for success on any major project, now finds itself busily engaged in many projects. Today we have underway the provision of water to 1,300 homes which have never had running water before. We are expanding our entire water and sewerage system; we are building a new municipal building; we have three urban renewal projects in process involving major reconstruction of blighted sections of our town; we have two public housing projects, and we are seeing new activity in private home construction; we have a new health building, and we are planning a new hospital, a new courthouse, a new sewage disposal plant, new streets, and—most important—many new business developments. Beyond this, we have our first new industry, employing only 20 people. We are working on a new factory which will employ 170 people and a major tourist resort complex which will provide employment for 500, in addition to bringing thousands of paying visitors to our city. This major tourist resort, Magic Mountain, is to be built on a mountaintop, with spectacular scenery, about 1 mile west of Hazard with 200 motel units. There is to be a model mine, depicting the progress of coal mining from its primitive beginning into the spectacular future. A museum will contain many exhibits related in character. There is to be a ski run and ski lift, an ice skating rink, a lake for boating and fishing, an amphitheater, swimming pool, horseback and hiking trails, high quality shops, rifle range and skeet shoot, nightclub, and restaurant. Our portion of the cost of Magic Mountain is being raised by the sale of stock, and an application for financing the rest is pending with the Area Redevelopment Administration.

We have used every program available—urban renewal, community facilities, public housing, area redevelopment, small business administration, and accelerated public works. We have shaped a long-term, workable program which we intend to carry through. We are participating in an area development program. I have been elected to serve as Chairman of the Upper Kentucky River Area Development Council, which is uniting many interests in several counties and communities to create an overall economic development program for our entire area.

Local projects, area projects, regional projects, statewide projects—Hazard is active in all of them. We can't whip our problems in Hazard or in eastern Kentucky or in the great Appalachian region until we have a great deal more help to shape a great program of recovery for the millions of people who at the present time are denied a reasonable American economic opportunity. President Kennedy, just last month, directed that such a program be formulated and put into action. We know that no such program would be worthwhile, however, unless we in the local community are willing to work and to sacrifice to make the help effective. We in Hazard are determined that our community will be a pilot example of doing the most we can for ourselves and that it will be a successful proving ground for an overall program to bring real opportunity to our people.

In conclusion, words cannot express my appreciation for being invited to attend and address this meeting. Each one of you has my personal invitation to come and help us enjoy life in the biggest and best Hazard in the world. Thank you.

Address by Hon. Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Before the 64th National Convention of VFW at Seattle, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States recently completed it 64th national convention in Seattle, Wash.

During that convention many distinguished persons spoke to the thousands of delegates who traveled to Seattle for this convention. Among those who spoke was the Honorable Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower. Secretary Paul's address to the convention was of particular interest to the VFW, in view of that organization's longstanding support of legislation and programs helpful to those on active service in our Armed Forces, as well as the retired personnel.

I am confident that Members of this House share my respect and admiration for the manner in which Secretary Paul has faced the many personnel problems for the armed services, as well as the sincerity and ability with which he is working in the interest of our Armed Forces personnel.

It is pertinent, I believe, to note that the VFW, too, shares the widespread admiration for Secretary Paul. With good reason, then commander in chief of the VFW, Byron B. Gentry, of Pasadena, Calif., introduced Secretary Paul as "the serviceman's friend." Such an introduction was certainly well justified.

Mr. Gentry was succeeded as commander in chief of the VFW by Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, of Brooklyn, N.Y.

In view of the interest of Members of this House in matters pertaining to those in our Armed Forces, and because of the importance of the information provided in Secretary Paul's address to the VFW, I include his speech of August 26 to the VFW convention, in Seattle, Wash.:

ADDRESS OF NORMAN S. PAUL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, MANPOWER, AUGUST 27, 1963, SEATTLE, WASH.

The first thing I'd like to say is that it's always a pleasure to meet with this distinguished combat veterans' organization. I want to thank you for inviting me to your convention again this year.

Speaking personally, it's good to see so many friends and associates gathered here, and I am looking forward to the opportunity of exchanging a few thoughts and ideas with them.

Speaking officially, it's good to know that the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense are continuing to benefit from the counsel and support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Because of your individual personal experiences, your collective viewpoints have been characterized by consistency and realism.

Over the years you have given your backing to a great many essential programs and policies, ranging from concern for adequate defense measures in general, to appropriate defense measures in general, to appropriate actions on behalf of the individual men and women who make up our Armed Forces in particular.

It is to this latter area of interest that I wish to address myself briefly here today, reporting to you on what has been done over the past year in the manpower field and related areas, and what we believe lies ahead for the future.

A year ago I made the following statement at the convention in Minneapolis: "It is plain that one of our principal responsibilities continues to be that of attracting, training, and keeping the kind of high quality, high performance personnel that today's complete weapon systems demand, and those of tomorrow foreshadow.

"One of the basic requirements for coping with this problem—both in its immediate and long-term implications—is a sustained program of realistic attention to the problems and needs of the individual serviceman and the service family—coupled with the awareness that they are deserving of the best."

Over the past 12 months we have been working to fulfill our responsibilities in this respect—and to get programs and policies moving ahead to accomplish specific ends and objectives. We have just made a start and there is a lot more to be done.

PAY BILL

The most important of these, of course, has been the Defense Department's proposal for a general pay increase for the Armed Forces. When I left Washington the other day this legislation was moving toward final enactment. I believe I am on safe ground by predicting that the increases will become effective on October 1.

We are grateful for the support this measure has had from the public, from the Congress, and from the administration, for it has long had the highest legislative priority Secretary McNamara could assign to it. We are hopeful that it will greatly assist us in all of our other efforts to build and keep the quality career force our Nation's defenses require.

The pay bill will add about $1.2 billion to the annual cost of the Defense program amounting, in the aggregate, to three times the increase that was approved in 1958.

This increase follows and is additional to the substantial increase in quarters allowances which went into effect on January 1 of this year.

Secretary McNamara commented on this point not long ago, saying: "These are huge amounts. They will add importantly to our costs. But I want to emphasize again that it is true that the military personnel pay has lagged substantially behind the compensation of civilian personnel in this country. The increase is long overdue. There is nothing I know of that will do more to support the morale and efficiency of this department than to pass the pay bill as we recommend it."

I think that the Secretary of Defense stated the case as well as it could be stated. Apparently the Members of the U.S. Senate agreed for they passed a pay bill substantially along the lines we had recommended by a unanimous 84–0 vote 2 weeks ago. The house had passed a similar bill, also by

unanimous vote a short time previously. We are confident that the difference between the two bills can be ironed out without too much difficulty.

Without going into all the details, or the differences between the House and Senate versions, the pay bill provides base pay increases ranging from $60 to $110 per month for officers, $5 to $120 per month for enlisted ranks—with the biggest increases going to officers below the rank of colonel and to the middle and highest enlisted ranks. The bill also includes provision for a special "hostile fire" pay of $55 a month. Other major changes are included such as an increase in medical officer pay at selected career points. One of the major innovations provides for a family separation allowance of $30 per month payable in addition to other allowances and per diem payments.

At the time I left Washington it was not yet clear what final arrangement would be made with respect to increased rates of retired pay. I am sure that many of you are extremely knowledgeable with respect to the various alternatives under consideration by Congress.

We believe that the important subject of retirement benefits has been given an accurate new perspective and a constructive approach for the future. We are convinced that the most effective, equitable, and workable system upon which to base further adjustments will be through the cost-of-living formula.

The entire concept of military retirement, I might add, including the important problem of medical facilities and care for retired personnel and their dependents is also under study. The total number of retired citizens is growing at a great rate and there is no question but what intensive attention must now be devoted to their problems and to the entire subject of retirement programs and activities in general.

PAY SUMMARY

For the Department of Defense, the pay bill of 1963 represents one more step (and obviously a substantial one on the long road to a fully modern, fully adequate compensation system for the U.S. Armed Forces. We have benefits from the work of the Hook Commission in 1948, the Cordiner Committee in 1957, and most recently from the exacting staff work and studies that went into the present pay proposals. We are mindful, too, of the principles reflected in the Federal Salary Act of 1962, and of the recommendations of such groups as the Randall Committee, which has proposed a broad comparability program for the Government employee and civil service official.

What is involved here is the question of changing needs in a changing world—where the guidelines must continue to be a fundamental concern for the individual, but where the military compensation system itself may require annual reevaluation and, on occasion, basic overhaul. While the current pay bill is of great importance, it will probably serve as a prolog to further the more basic changes in the pay system of the future—based upon studies now in progress at the request of the Secretary of Defense, and based upon changing needs and concepts, the annual review concept is most important.

DUAL COMPENSATION

Having mentioned the retirement situation. I might say a few words about the administration's dual compensation-dual employment legislative proposal which was submitted by the Civil Service Commission and introduced as H.R. 7381.

Presently we have 40 statutes concerning the Federal civilian employment of our retired military personnel. Although only two of these laws place Government-wide restrictions on civilian employment and total compensation of retired military personnel, the exceptions by statute and judiciary interpretations together with over 200 decisions by the Comptroller General, have created a situation that is restrictive, confusing and complex, and most difficult to administer. Even the so-called experts in Government are not sure, at any given time, that the Federal pay of certain retired is legal or not, until GAO lowers the boom. How can we expect the poor individual to know?

Under these laws, certain retired military personnel—primarily regular officers—are barred completely from Federal civilian employment. Others may be employed subject to certain compensation limitations and others may be employed without limitations on their total combined income. These conditions, in addition to preventing the Government from obtaining the services of certain highly qualified personnel, have created a serious morale problem among our personnel, both active and retired.

We are of course concerned with the morale and well-being of the civilian work force. I am particularly concerned, because the DOD is the largest civilian employer in the Government. But we are also keenly aware of our obligation to insure that retired military personnel, many of whom are forced to terminate their military career at a time when they are relatively young and with family responsibilities at their peak, have an equal opportunity to seek civilian employment on the same basis as other citizens.

This legislative proposal would permit all retired military personnel to seek Federal civilian employment and would provide fair treatment for all categories of personnel insofar as compensation limitations are concerned. It would also consolidate and simplify the many conflicting and confusing statutes on dual employment-dual compensation.

Furthermore, enactment of this legislation would establish a fresh start principle for retired military personnel employed in Federal civilian jobs. Since persons retiring from the military service have generally realized retirement benefits based on a military career, it seems desirable and equitable for them to start a Federal civilian career on the same basis as others who are also entering the civil service for the first time. However, because the career military member has also earned certain rights and privileges to which the citizen-soldier, who served with him during periods of hostilities, is also entitled, consideration should be given to such service when the retiree is employed in a Federal civilian position.

We believe the proposed law is eminently fair and in the best interest of all concerned. We are hopeful of its enactment by this Congress.

ADDITIONAL ACTIONS

The past year has seen a great deal of additional, and important, activity in the general area of personnel—most of which has been translated into proposed legislation or administrative directives.

We have vigorously presented to Congress recommendations for a consistent program for construction or improved troop and family housing. Our program is directed to the relief of serious deficiencies in both quantity and quality. This program appears to be in some trouble.

We have not yet been able to gain action on the Bolte package of career management items, but we propose to do our best with respect to it following final decisions on the pay bill. We consider this legislation of prime importance, and are prepared to accord it the same kind of priority attention as that given to compensation matters.

Joint travel regulations have been greatly changed to provide new, or more equitable, travel and transportation allowances in the United States. These include:

Establishment of actual expense allowances in the United States.

Authorization of $1 per diem for members of deployed units.

An increase to 10 cents a mile of the reimbursement rate for use of privately owned vehicle for local travel.

Authorization of reimbursement of entry fees, boarding taxes and other expenses incident to dependent travel, and

An increase to $16 per diem while in travel status.

Along with these changes to travel regulations are two related items: The first, authorizing advance return of dependents and effects from overseas, and the second, authorizing payment of travel and transportation allowances on permanent change of station when orders are canceled or revoked. Both of these measures have passed the House of Representatives.

Our bill for the award of cold war medals has passed both Houses of Congress, and only awaits the President's signature.

As a result of Defense reclama to the Treasury Department, we have thus far delayed the proposed reduction from $10 to $1 on gifts to be admitted into the United States duty free. We based our position, and we think rightly, on the adverse effects such a reduction would have on morale of military personnel. I might add here that this item, although receiving little attention in general, was noted by your Washington office and the Defense position was supported by your organization, for which we are most grateful.

CONCLUSION

I am aware that I have dwelt at length and in detail on aspects of the present and contemplated program in the military manpower area. I have done so, first, because of your well-known interest in matters of this nature, and second, because of our own belief in the Defense Department that they stand at the core of all our other program effectiveness in the Armed Forces. I believe this to be true from personal contact with men and women in the services in Alaska, California, Texas, Montana, North Carolina and other sites where we have camps and stations. I have seen their duty stations, their quarters, their living conditions and have talked with their dependents.

We are dealing with immense sums of taxpayers' money, great numbers of human beings working under all kinds of conditions, and countless human situations and problems. We are fully convinced that to cope successfully with all that is involved in this total situation calls for increased attention to broad programs in support of the individual, and of the military service family.

I have said on many previous occasions that we know that pay and material reward alone will never give us the kind of dedicated, professional military service people whom we need in this troubled era.

It takes men to man the machines—intelligent and courageous men. General Schriever placed emphasis, and properly, on the particularly heavy demands for technically qualified personnel to develop, operate and maintain the unbelievably complex weapons systems of today and tomorrow. There is another breed, however, that we need to find and keep. If we find ourselves in a shooting situation with an enemy in the coming years, and I think of anyone who is shooting at me as an enemy, whether he has been officially declared such or not—it is likely to be less than a nuclear exchange. This means bullets, high explosives, fired by men who are being fired at. We must have the weapons, and plenty of them, that we hope and pray we will never have to use. But we must also have that man, ready to go and fight under any conditions, and on short notice, the men who combine new-fashioned knowledge of the weapons he will have to use with the old-fashioned courage, sometimes known as guts, which have been

a trademark in this part of the world for a couple of hundred years and more. We in Defense know, and do not intend to forget, that without continued effort in the direction of improved personnel programs, and without continued attention to the daily needs and requirements of those who serve this country in uniform, we would not be meeting our responsibilities.

We are doing our best, therefore, and so are the military departments, to see to it that full attention is given to these problems, and to their intelligent resolutions for today and tomorrow.

Townsend Plan 30 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, September 30 marked a milestone in our Nation's history.

It was on that date 30 years ago that Dr. Francis Everett Townsend wrote a letter that launched the Townsend Plan. It appeared in the columns of the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram.

The Townsend campaign became an institution and as such it defined the nature of the social security problem.

I wish to insert in the RECORD at this time the letter of the late Dr. Townsend which has had such tremendous social and economic effect:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
September 30, 1933.

To the EDITOR,
Press-Telegram,
Long Beach, Calif.

DEAR SIR: If the human race is not to retrogress, two facts of essential importance must be recognized; the stimulus to individual effort must be maintained by the certainty of adequate monetary reward. If business is good at all times, we need not worry about the reward of individual effort; and if money is plentiful, we need have no fears that business will become bad. Of late years it has become an accepted fact that because of man's inventiveness less and less productive effort is going to be required to supply the needs of the race.

This being the case, it is just as necessary to make some disposal of our surplus workers as it is to dispose of our surplus wheat or corn or cotton. But we cannot kill off the surplus workers as we are doing with our hogs; nor sell them to the Chinese on time as we do our cotton. We must retire them from business activities and eliminate them from the field of competitive effort. What class should we eliminate, and how should it be done? Wars have served in the past to hold down surplus population, but the last big war, in spite of the unprecedented slaughter, served only to increase production, while reducing the numbers of consumers.

It is estimated that the population of age 60 and above in the United States is somewhere between 9 and 12 millions. I suggest that the National Government retire all who reach that age on a monthly pension of $200 or more, on condition that they spend the money as they get it. This will insure an even distribution throughout the Nation of $2 or $3 billions of fresh money each month, thereby assuring a healthy and brisk state of business, comparable to that we enjoyed during wartimes.

Where is the money to come from? More taxes? Certainly. We have nothing in this world we do not pay taxes to enjoy. But do not overlook the fact that we are already paying a large proportion of the amount required for these pensions in the form of life insurance policies, poor farms, aid societies, insane asylums, and prisons. The inmates of the last two mentioned institutions would undoubtedly be greatly lessened when it once became assured that old age meant security from want and care.

A sales tax sufficiently high to insure the pensions at a figure adequate to maintain the business of the country in a healthy condition would be the easiest tax in the world to collect, for all would realize that the tax was a provision for their own future, as well as the assurance of good business now. Would not a sales tax of sufficient size to maintain a pension system of such magnitude exhaust our taxability from other sources, I am asked? By no means—income and inheritance taxes would still remain to us, and would prove far more fertile sources of government income than they are today. Property taxes could be greatly reduced and would not constitute a penalty upon industry and enterprise.

Our attitude toward government is wrong. We look upon government as something entirely foreign to ourselves; as something over which we have no control, and which we cannot expect to do us a great deal of good. We do not realize that it can do us infinite harm, except when we pay our taxes. But the fact is we must learn to expect and demand that the Central Government assume the duty of regulating business activity. When business begins to slow down and capital shows signs of timidity, stimulus must be provided by the National Government in the form of additional capital. When times are good and begin to show signs of a speculative debauch such as we saw in 1929, the brakes must be applied through a reduction in the circulation medium. This function of government could be easily established and maintained through the pension system for the aged.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND, M.D.

Proposed Public Defender Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, several months ago, I placed in the Appendix an excellent editorial from the Southeast Missourian urging the enactment of a public defender law. Since that time, a bill has been reported by the Judiciary Committee and passed by the Senate. Recently, the Southeast Missourian published another editorial concerning the need for such legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this second editorial be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

On three occasions the House of Representatives has rejected bills which would establish a public defender system to work at the opposite pole from the U.S. attorney in criminal cases.

Soon it will have another bill providing legal aid through a system of paid public defenders for those charged with a crime in the Federal courts.

Missouri Senator EDWARD V. LONG is one of those supporting the measure. He joined with other Senators in sponsoring legislation establishing public defenders. The measure has passed the Senate.

Under the Senate bill, defendants in criminal cases who do not have necessary funds or credit to employ an attorney will be given the services of one.

This is done now, but the attorneys are court appointed and serve without pay.

Under the public defender bill passed by the Senate, four avenues provide for legal services for defendants:

The court can appoint a private attorney and pay him not to exceed $15 an hour, plus reasonable expenses.

Employ and pay a Government attorney as a public defender on a full-time basis.

Provide payment to local and State bar associations and legal aid societies which would provide attorneys for the indigent.

A combination of the three.

Of the four, the second appears to us the most practical. If the Government can maintain a staff of attorneys to prosecute criminal cases, it certainly should provide another staff to defend the indigent.

Presently, fundless defendants are assigned an attorney by the court. Frequently only a perfunctory defense is given after a brief consultation between the two, with a plea of guilty almost invariably entered.

Attorneys with their own practice most often have all they can do to take care of their regular clients and while it is considered an obligation of the profession to aid indigent defendants, it is evident not as much attention is going to be given to a penniless, unknown client as one who pays.

It is for this reason that a good many attorneys and professional legal societies have urged a public defender system. They feel those without means should be afforded equal protection under the law as those who can pay.

With this we agree and it is for this reason we believe the House should pass this fourth attempt to put a public defender system in operation.

The Kennedy Administration Wastes Our Children's Tax Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the sole and only way to finance Government spending is by taxes imposed on the people. If we are paying our own way, current taxes pay for current spending, if we are deficit financing, today's spending increases and is paid for by tomorrow's taxes. But regardless of whether we pay our way or borrow our way, taxes inescapably must be collected from the people to pay the Government's bills and debts. There is no way a nation can interminably spend without taxing somebody sometime; and the longer the day of settlement is deferred, the greater is the waste of the tax dollars because of interest on the debt.

Last week the House of Representatives passed an $11 billion tax cut bill at a time when the Federal Government is

running $10 billion in the red for fiscal year 1964 because of a projected record spending level of $98 billion. The fiscal implication of this action was to in effect tell our children and the generations of American citizens yet unborn that we could not afford our own extravagance; we asked them to pay for it and give us a tax cut to boot. We voted to raise their taxes as we lowered ours.

While the tax bill was being debated in the House and votes were being desperately sought in support of this retreat from fiscal morality, the Democrat House leadership was urging that the record spending and record debt of the Kennedy administration be forgotten. We were urged to think "positively" about how frugal the Federal Government was going to be in the future. These promises about future frugality would have been much more convincing if President Kennedy at the same time had not been on a very partisan "nonpolitical" tour of the Midwest and Far West urging more and more spending. He used the taxpayers' money for a political junket to sell an unwilling public on unnecessary and unwanted spending schemes.

One of the extravagant schemes he sought to peddle to the people was the so-called area redevelopment program, to create bigger Government spending and bigger Government debt. A factual expose of ARA mismanagement and boondoggling was set forth in the Washington Daily News for Monday, September 30, 1963 under the caption "Taxpayers Build Ski Lifts—U.S. Area Redevelopment Helps Finance the Good Life."

As you read this article you should remember that this is the kind of spending the President says we must have at a time when our public debt is more than $305 billion, our deficit this year is $10 billion, and we are voting ourselves a tax cut in the amount of $11 billion. I wonder how our children will feel about this kind of spending as they pay their taxes to finance our waste.

Mr. Speaker, I will include the Daily News article as a part of my remarks. I opposed area redevelopment legislation in the past and I will oppose it in the future. The Federal Government has an obligation to be more constructive in expenditures from the Federal Treasury. The Congress is dutybound to end the fast and loose wastefulness of the Kennedy administration and here is a good place to start:

U.S. AREA REDEVELOPMENT HELPS FINANCE THE GOOD LIFE

(By Robert Dietsch)

In the last 2 years, your tax money has been spent or loaned to—

Build motels, ski resorts, and other recreational facilities in a dozen States, on an Indian reservation and in Puerto Rico. Builders or promoters have received $43 million in Government loans.

Help buy snowmaking machinery for several of those resorts and help build golf courses, cocktail lounges, and bowling alleys in others. Also train waitresses for the motel restaurants.

Train sightseeing guides in Hawaii.

Build a summer theater in North Carolina.

Build roadside handicraft display stands in Arkansas.

Study the "feasibility of harvesting, processing, and marketing" sea lions in Alaska.

Help train copper workers in Montana for new jobs with Anaconda, the company which laid off the workers in the first place and which was looking for people with different skills to hire.

FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Loans or grants for all these projects came from the Area Redevelopment Administration, an agency set up by the Kennedy Administration in 1961 to help business and employment in depressed areas.

Since then, the ARA has become one of the biggest subjects of controversy on the New Frontier.

Republicans dub it the "Area Reelection Administration."

Businessmen charge it is competing with private industry, making reckless loans and giving money to dubious enterprises, the type rejected as unfeasible and uneconomic by private experts.

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has called ARA the "Christine Keeler" of an American scandal involving "wholesale buying and selling of public office."

TOO EAGER?

Other critics say ARA is overly eager to farm out its money. They say ARA supports new businesses even after local industrial developers refuse to contribute their 10 percent required by law.

(ARA can loan up to 65 percent of the cost of a project; the rest of the money must come from private financial sources, the local community booster group and the project owners.)

ARA officials, understandably, argue their case with vigor.

Administrator William Batt says his agency goes into programs shunned by private businessmen.

"They aren't interested in creating employment," Mr. Batt said.

He defends the millions put into motels by pointing to overall tourist and recreation growth and its potential.

What's more, ARA claims it has created, or laid the basis for creating, 47,500 jobs and for training 23,500 persons.

PROBE

An investigation into all phases of ARA activity by the Scripps-Howard newspapers gives the edge to ARA's critics.

While the agency has indeed acted to create some legitimate businesses in depressed areas (and even some not so depressed) and has created some employment, the investigation showed—

That ARA is overeager to farm out the $394 million given to it in 1961. For example, it pressed hard to lend $222,000 to developers of a ski resort between Altoona and Bedford, Pa., despite reluctance of the Altoona community development group to go along; the latter deemed the project too risky and thought it would create few jobs.

Not only did the resort owners get ARA's $222,000 but they also received $110,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA).

In another case, a wealthy Detroit industrialist got almost $1 million to help build "one of the world's most luxurious resorts" in northern Michigan; he reported the other day, during a phone conversation, that "ARA was around suggesting I was eligible for more loans."

That many of the 222 technical assistance studies approved by ARA (at a cost of more than $7 million) have been done by others in the past year. The sea lion study in Alaska, is one; also grants to study better exploitation of Indian arts and crafts, uses of timber in various States, handicraft development in the Appalachians and marketing of peaches in Georgia.

That ARA job totals are exaggerated; far fewer than 47,500 positions have been created or seem in prospect. A metal fabricating firm in southwestern Pennsylvania, for example, carries a notation of "50 jobs" in ARA's directory; the firm now employs 11 persons and the president acknowledges it will be a long time before the total reaches 20. A candy manufacturer says his employment may even decrease after he uses ARA loan money to buy new machinery. He's on ARA's books for 50 jobs.

That some ARA loan recipients don't try very hard to seek private financing before going after Government money, as required by law. ARA loans carry 4 percent interest; private loans 6 percent or more.

"Sure, I would have expanded my plant if ARA weren't around," conceded one industrial plant manager. "I would have used my working capital or gone after bank financing harder than I did. But I got together with ARA; after all, you don't find 4 percent money very often these days."

That some ARA training programs are of a dubious nature. There presumably are plenty of sightseeing guides in Hawaii but ARA nevertheless spent $5,000 to train 22 part-time farmers in that work. It spent $10,000 to train 100 copper mine workers for Anaconda—a giant company with the capability to train its own workers with its own money. To this list can be added the waitresses trained with taxpayer funds for duty at a Michigan resort and others trained for restaurant jobs in a motel at Paintsville, Ky. This motel, incidentally, is across the highway from a taxpayer-built handicraft stand.

HOW FAR?

Inherent in the ARA program, and in a growing number of other assistance programs initialed by the Kennedy administration, is the philosophical question of how far the Federal Government should go in seeking to create jobs and loan taxpayer money to private enterprise.

As Chamber President Neilan has pointed out and as the Scripps-Howard probe of ARA showed, even those who abhor the idea of Federal intervention solicit Federal money after programs are approved.

While a few local business groups across the country have spurned ARA help, most have accepted it and many have sought it.

The idea of having Uncle Sam help bring a new firm into town overshadows criticism of Federal intrusion into private enterprise.

The Kennedy administration obviously thinks highly of ARA. It wants Congress to double the agency's budget and extend its life.

The Senate has agreed but the House, in June, rejected the proposal by five votes.

The Democratic leadership now wants the House Rules Committee to send an amended ARA bill to the floor.

The Threat of the Sino-Soviet's Growing Mineral Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the recent full-scale debate on the test ban treaty has served to focus our attention on our relationship with Russia and China and their military strength in comparison with our own.

While our attention to date has largely been focused on weapons potential, I am sure we all realize that the raw materials which are required to support production of weapons should be of equal interest to us.

Therefore, I should like to offer for the Appendix a statement prepared by Mr. Charles Will Wright, now a consulting engineer and formerly Chief of the Mining Division of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, giving his analysis of "The Threat of Sino-Soviet's Growing Mineral Potential."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREAT OF THE SINO-SOVIET'S GROWING MINERAL POTENTIAL

The Sino-Soviet's threat to outrank the Western Powers in production of 38 strategic minerals and output of heavy industries is confirmed by the comparison, in percentages of world mineral production statistics in 1954 and 1962, which show an increase in the output of iron ore from 25.6 to 35.6; that of steel from 17 to 31 percent; and that of coal from 39 to 54 percent. They have also increased their output of manganese ore from 47 to 55 percent; of chromite from 19.3 to 33.5 percent; nickel from 19.6 to 32.5; tungsten from 38.9 to 53.4; aluminum from 13.4 to 23.9; antimony, 28.8 to 44.8; copper from 12.1 to 16.7; lead from 14.3 to 26.6; mercury from 11.7 to 22.2; platinum from 12.1 to 35.1; tin from 5.4 to 26.5; zinc from 15.9 to 25.5; and that of crude petroleum from 9.9 to 17.1 percent. Their increase for the 38 minerals was from 18.3 percent in 1954 to 34 percent in 1962, or about 2 percent a year.

In 1962 the U.S.S.R. outranked the United States of America in output of iron ore and coal.

These increases are most disturbing as there has been a corresponding decrease within the Western Powers in the output of these metals. The aggressive Russians and Red Chinese have well defined plans and are waging a trade war which they are winning, while the Western Powers, with no unified mineral policy, are competing among themselves for mineral supplies. Some, who prefer today's trade to tomorrow's security are supplying the Soviets and Red Chinese with metals and manufactured products they lack thus helping them to gain world domination. This paradoxical situation can become serious if not corrected.

The U.S.S.R. is 2½ times the size of the United States and nearly as large as North America. It extends 6,000 miles from its eastern to western boundaries and has vast fields of unexplored mineral resources. During the last decade it has made notable gains in mineral output and has now surpassed the United States as the leading producer of coal and iron ore and nearly equaled it in the output of steel.

The U.S.S.R. mineral resources are being implemented by new discoveries. Over a thousand geologists are in the field as well as mining engineers, detailed to explore and develop mines and bring metallurgical plants to completion, regardless of cost, thus the Soviet Union became an independent industrial power. Strict control of labor and industry has made possible great gains in mineral output, but living standards and output per man-hour are much lower than in the United States. When I visited Magnitogorsk I saw workmen crowded in bunkhouses, poorly fed and dominated by their Communist foremen. It was a real slave state. To counter these inhuman conditions and for the survival of the free world every effort must be made, not only to prevent shipments of metals and metal products to Communist countries, but to increase output and acquire the mineral products needed for greater industrial progress within the Western nations. Obviously such effort to be successful, will require considerable reorientation of our foreign policy.

CONCLUSIONS

Although mineral output of the Western powers has been adequate to meet industrial requirements and have large undeveloped mineral resources and capacities to produce, in making a comparison one must realize that the Sino-Soviet countries are rapidly gaining in mineral output and in industrial developments. But their threat of world domination is weakened as their metal, coal, and petroleum resources are great distances from sources of power for mining and metallurgical plants—far greater than in the United States, Germany, France, Italy, and England. Also in the Sino-Soviet countries the costs of labor in man-hours per ton output are relatively high, but their system is to produce regardless of cost and living standards.

To meet this situation it is vital that the Western powers establish without delay, a firm and aggressive mineral policy to maintain their present dominant industrial position in this changing and confused world, which position may be lost by the Sino-Soviet's growing mineral potential—a real threat to our survival. By such cooperation we may look forward to the time when the Allied Powers will be ready to dig the grave for the burial of Khrushchev and his gangsters who are planning to bury us.

Extension of Territorial Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent disclosures of the 200 Russian fishing boats operating as close as 4 miles from the shores of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the senate in that Commonwealth passed a most interesting resolution regarding territorial limits.

The Senate of Massachusetts, a body in which I was deeply honored to serve for 8 years, deserves great credit for this impetus and distinguished influence upon the Congress of the United States. I am certainly hopeful that this Congress will attempt to meet this problem, not only for Massachusetts but for the Nation as well. The resolution, which was adopted on September 19, 1963, follows:

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION TO EXTEND THE PRESENT TERRITORIAL LIMITS

Whereas the presence of some 200 Russian fishing boats operating as close as 4 miles from our shores poses a serious threat to the commercial fishing industry of Massachusetts and this country; and

Whereas the historic fishing grounds of our fishing fleets are being depleted at an alarming rate by the great invasion of foreign fishing fleets, total food fish landings having dropped 13 million pounds in New England so far this year; and

Whereas the economic welfare of the coastal communities of our Commonwealth and their citizens depends upon the sea to produce sufficient quantities of fish and the loss of our domestic fishing industry would have a crippling effect on the economy of our State; and

Whereas this situation with all its attendant problems is of vital and primary concern not only to Massachusetts, but to the New England States and to the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to extend the territorial limits in regard to fishing rights from the present 3-mile limit to one of 200 miles; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Independence Day of the Republic of Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today Nigeria celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe; and His Excellency, the Nigerian Ambassador to the United States, Julius M. Udochi.

The Federation of Nigeria is a populous and prosperous country on the southern coast of west Africa. This anniversary is a special one for Nigeria, since October 1, 1963, will also mark the date of Nigeria's transformation into a republic under a new constitution. Nigeria will remain a member of the British Commonwealth, but a President, elected every 5 years by the Nigerian people, will replace the Queen of England as Nigeria's head of state.

The first 3 years of Nigeria's independence have been a transitional period during which the Nigerians have modified and adapted the political structure bequeathed by the British to the realities of independent Africa. A fourth federal region has been created, based on a referendum vote which resulted in overwhelming approval for establishment of the new region. The new midwest region is seen by many Nigerians as the logical outgrowth of an old tribal kingdom; its creation is viewed as a recognition of, and attempt to utilize, tribal solidarity in molding a viable federation.

The democratic Western World is impressed with Nigeria's constitution-writing and nation-building process, for the Nigerians, in modifying the institutions and political framework created by Britain, have built on, not destroyed, their parliamentary heritage. We are wholly sympathetic to Prime Minister Balewa's point of view—that Nigeria must evolve its own type of democracy—and we congratulate the Nigerian constitution drafters on the judicious deci-

sions of the recent constitutional conference. We found particular satisfaction in the conference's rejection of a proposed preventive detention act. It is only too easy for a new country faced with the many difficult problems of developing a national consciousness in peoples of different tribal loyalties to succumb to the temptation of political repression of the opposition. A preventive act provides a good excuse for such repression. Rejection of the proposed preventive detention act confirms Nigeria's dedication to democratic principles and gives evidence of that country's determination not to succumb to the trend to authoritarianism so enticing to new nations.

It must not be thought that Nigeria's transitional period has simply been a period of suspension, of changing gears, for Nigeria has made noteworthy progress in the economic and educational spheres in the first 3 years of independence. Educational facilities at all levels have been expanded considerably since independence, with the result that whereas only 40–45 percent of the total school-age population was attending primary school in 1960, today free and nearly universal primary education is being provided everywhere but in the north where progress has been somewhat slower. The economy has been enjoying a steady rate of growth amounting to an average annual increase in national output of about 4 percent. A 6-year development plan initiated in 1962 is focused on increasing and diversifying Nigeria's agricultural output as well as encouraging additional industry. Already Nigerian petroleum, a rich but until recently largely unexploited source of wealth, has increased in export value from nil in 1957 to $45 million in 1962. Before the end of the year work is scheduled to begin on the nearly $200 million Niger River Dam, one of three major hydroelectric projects planned in Nigeria.

Nigeria's natural resources, her human potential, her steady rate of economic development, and her skillful political leaders have already made her a leader among the new African states. We congratulate you, President Azikiwe, Prime Minister Balewa, and the Nigerian people on the third anniversary of your independence.

John Mather Appointed Executive Officer of African-American Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release concerning appointment of John Mather as executive officer of African-American Institute:

JOHN MATHER APPOINTED EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

John Mather, director of the Social Studies Institute in St. Paul, Minn., has been appointed to serve as executive officer and director of special programs for the African-American Institute, it was announced today by Mr. Waldemar A. Nielsen, president of the institute.

Mr. Mather, 41, will assume a major role in the operation of the African-American Institute as the assistant to Mr. Nielsen and as the executive officer. He will also be responsible for the development of special programs in the United States and overseas in Africa.

The African-American Institute, a private, nonprofit organization, is the leading American agency conducting educational activities with Africa. It has offices in New York, Washington, Nigeria, Tanganyika, Ethiopia, and Ghana.

At the present time the African-American Institute, representing the private sector of America, is responsible for a number of educational programs and special projects developed in concert with African governments and American organizations. Some of the programs are the African scholarship program of American universities, educational partnerships for Africa, and books for Africa. The ones cited are but a few of the significant operations conducted by this expanding and effective organization.

Mr. Mather has been associated with the public schools of St. Paul for the last 11 years. During this time he served successively as a teacher and as director of the Social Studies Institute. He has also been a public relations consultant, a television producer, and a writer. He is noted for the development and management of a school-community program of African studies that comprehended a unique Oxford-type study program, a television series, "Faces of Africa," a radio series, "Africa in the Sixties," and an exhibition of African art, "Africa Images and Realities." The exhibition will soon be placed on tour of the United States under the auspices of the American Federation of Art and the St. Paul Art Center. Working with private organizations, the Junior League of St. Paul, foundations, and individuals, he generated a program that registered with many publics. It has become a prototype program for other cities.

Mr. Mather was originally from Iowa where he attended the State University in Iowa City. He holds both B.A. and M.A. degrees in history from that institution.

Mr. Nielsen has commented that Mr. Mather will be a genuine asset to the organization and that he will have an opportunity to use his wide spectrum of talents.

Washington's Crime Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the gravest problems in our Nation's Capital today is the alarming and increasing crime rate here.

On September 16, Mr. Arthur W. Arundel, president of Radio Station WAVA AM and FM in Arlington, Va., presented an editorial on this subject which I believe should be noted by all persons responsible for legislating for our Nation's Capital. I am pleased, therefore, to submit Mr. Arundel's editorial in full in this RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WASHINGTON'S CRIME PROBLEM

(By Arthur W. Arundel)

The time is midnight and John Q. Public is turning home after a late meeting in Washington. Striding along the walk toward his car, he is approached by three men. A half hour later, he is regaining consciousness, if he is lucky, from a crashing blow to the head. The only other evidence of the mugging he has just suffered is that his wallet containing $2.10 is missing.

The latest published arithmetic of Washington's darkening crime picture has left frustrated police and city officials in a dismal silence. Stunned as this already hard-to-shake city is with the dull mathematics and occasional big news of name citizens knocked about or murdered here, there has not seemed much evidence or indeed real hope of correcting this shameful picture.

The only real action in months past, it would seem, has come from influential civil liberties organizations, whose attack is not on the soaring crime rate, but in their determined efforts to disarm literally the District police, require mental stability tests for policemen, checkmate the questioning of suspects and similar measures designed to prevent what they protest as a general condition police brutality. This approach is not only wrong, in our view, but damaging and irresponsible.

The police here need more tools, not less, to carry out their job in tracking down and questioning suspects. But they need something else, and that is tangible public support. We have a situation in which victims, for fear of publicity, won't take their cases to the police—of witnesses who will watch but will not testify, of too many leaders who won't take a public stand, and consequently of criminals assured in the knowledge that if caught, they will probably never be convicted under the system. The cops have become their patsies.

Those who are suffering are both the decent citizens who want no more of living in the District. They are moving out and the city's businessmen who complain that suburban Maryland and Virginia families won't shop in this jungle, and that tourists are reluctant to visit here. They are right, but if these same businessmen will, instead of complaining about the chaos, if they will support the Washington Board of Trade and Police Chief Robert Murray in the plea for stronger law enforcement procedures, then Congress in the omnibus crime bill may correct what is becoming a grim and sorry era of life in the Nation's Capital.

Crew of "Bard," Nuclear Sub, Puts Craft Through Its Paces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the people of my native town of Pascagoula, Miss., are very proud of the Ingalls Shipyard located there. This yard has built a goodly portion of the most modern merchant and naval ships that today sail the high seas. Among the splendid vessels built there has been the most modern atomic subs of the Navy. The U.S.S. *Barb*, a 283-foot attack submarine of the *Thresher* type, is the latest of these fine vessels. The ill-fated *Thresher* was not built at this yard, but it is interesting and gratifying to note that the Navy has

recently had a thorough check made of the *Barb* and other subs of the *Thresher* class to insure that they were entirely seaworthy. It is gratifying to further note that the *Barb* was found to be entirely seaworthy after the trial run and is now joining the fleet under the command of Comdr. C. D. Grojean. I regret that I was not able to accept the commander's gracious invitation to make the trial run of this $60-million investment in the Nation's defense.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I submit an article written by Mr. William Hines, reporter for the Washington Star, who did make the trip as a civilian guest of Commander Grojean.

The article is as follows:

CREW OF "BARB," NUCLEAR SUB, PUTS CRAFT THROUGH ITS PACES

(By William Hines)

ABOARD U.S.S. "BARB" AT SEA, September 28.—Zooming through the Gulf of Mexico like a tremendous porpoise, the Navy's newest and flashiest atomic submarine went through a fancy set of paces today.

It was a coming-of-age for U.S.S. *Barb*, fourth in the line of deep-diving subs. The senior member was *Thresher*, lost forever last April 10 off Cape Cod. *Barb*, a 283-foot black whale of a ship, has just finished being outfitted at the Ingalls shipyard in Pascagoula, Miss.

Memories of the ill-fated *Thresher* were in the minds of *Barb's* 100-man crew and the dozen civilians who cast off at first light today. But there was no anxiety, even among the landlubbers who accompanied the vessel on a brief showoff cruise in the gulf.

Obvious high morale of the crew and equally obvious fitness of the ship erased worries.

NEW DEPTH LIMITS

Comdr. C. D. Grojean of Jacksonville, Ill., took the typical submariner's attitude towards the *Thresher* disaster as he stood high in the *Barb's* sail, conning the ship on the long surface ride out to deep water from Pascagoula.

He said "we haven't lost a single person from the crew because of *Thresher*."

Like many other officers in the submarine service, Commander Grojean said he would like to see the name *Thresher* used again.

Barb, officially designated SSN-596, was sent for sea trial at the time of *Thresher's* loss. She was delayed while modifications were made, and even now operates under depth limits that did not apply before *Thresher* went down.

That limit will be lifted soon and nuclear subs again will go to the astonishing test depth approved for *Thresher*-class ships. Exactly what that depth is, or speed data, cannot be told.

OFFICERS OPTIMISTIC

Both Commander Grojean and his executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Albert J. Baciocco of San Francisco, expressed belief that *Barb* will be the first *Thresher*-class submarine to be re-rated to the designed depth.

Two other *Thresher* subs, *Permit* and *Plunger*, have been in operation at reduced performance levels since the *Thresher* sank. *Barb* is the first of the class to join the fleet after the disaster.

The trip on which the $60 million *Barb* was to embark today after discharging a small group of civilians at Pascagoula, is officially her shakedown cruise.

It will take her to Key West, Fla., where she will load a fearsome array of antisubmarine weaponry. Then she will steam to the Panama Canal and off to San Francisco.

Except for the canal trip, *Barb will be* underwater all the way—probably at a safe, comfortable 200 feet.

Barb is a bundle of muscle, brain, and steel built to fight a lonesome war all on her own, in a medium as strange and inhospitable as outer space itself. Her sole mission is to locate and track enemy submarines and—if the word should come—kill them.

To this end, she is equipped to carry the amazing "Subroc," a missile fired from a torpedo tube through sea and air. She can also fire conventional torpedoes.

In going through her paces today, *Barb* gave her guests a taste—but only a taste—of what happens in a nuclear submarine at sea.

This included a simulated emergency—one of the drills called for repeatedly by *Barb's* skipper. This drill—not proclaimed as such throughout the ship until it was over—involved simulated flooding in the engineroom.

Some of the landlubbers were caught unaware, while others got the word in advance as a courtesy from the captain. The surprised majority reacted as if thoughts of *Thresher* had never been very far from their minds.

SUB WENT WEIGHTLESS

Operating in water far too shallow for real highjinks, *Barb* cut capers which in some ways reminded her passengers of an airplane's performance. A few took turns at the "fairwater planes," winglike projections from the ship's conning tower sail which controls depth.

At slow speed and in shallow water—conditions under which *Barb* was operating—her controls handle rather like those of a very sluggish bombing plane. At optimum speeds and in water of good depth she is reputed to "slide like a neptune."

Commander Baciocco remarked that the crew has an unusual distinction—it is the first to go weightless.

Commander Grojean amplified. On one test recently *Barb* surfaced so rapidly that for an instant she was actually in a zero gravity situation, something more normally associated with planes or spacecraft.

"We tried to go into orbit, but we didn't make it," the skipper said, jokingly.

Some Facts on Buffalo's Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Representatives from the city of Buffalo, N.Y., the "City of Good Neighbors," I have been the recipient of some good-natured ribbing from my colleagues and others in our Nation's Capital about the arctic aspects of Buffalo's weather.

True, it can be classed among the most wintry of cities in the United States, with more than its fair share of sleet and ice and snow and cold and wind. But, fortunately, none of these elements impede our normal course of activities for very long. Our city has an effective crew of employees who are dedicated to their task of clearing the streets and keeping traffic on the move. Industry cooperates and the citizens of the community pitch in to help.

While our winters may be long and cold and blustery, we do have enviable summers. Few cities can boast of a summer climate such as we enjoy in Buffalo. Weatherwise, it is an ideal vacation spot which should be more widely publicized because it also offers a wide range of attractions for the tourist.

Buffalo can be justly proud of its cultural centers. Its three museums, which are 100 years old, are noted nationally for their collections. Buffalo has many recreational and sports attractions. State and county parks nearby afford the vacationer with an abundance of play facilities. Not far from Buffalo is Niagara Falls—long known as the honeymoon capital of the world and one of the greatest natural wonders of the American continent.

These and other highlights beckon you to plan a visit to Buffalo and the surrounding area when your next vacation rolls around.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a column written by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Courier-Express and a former president of the National Press Club, giving us some facts on Buffalo's weather:

STATISTICS SHOW BUFFALO'S CLIMATE HAS ITS VIRTUES

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SUMMER

Buffalo is still among the windiest, cloudiest, and stormiest cities in the United States in the wintertime, but the area also still ranks as having one of the most hospitable climates in the summer.

Such conclusions are inescapable after studying a newly issued tome by the U.S. Census Bureau. The Bureau has just published its eighth edition of a statistical abstract of the United States. It is crammed with facts, among them complete, meteorological data on 70 cities in all 50 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

JULY READING

To accentuate the positive, let it hereby be recorded that over a 30-year period, the normal monthly maximum temperature at Buffalo has been found to be only 80.1 degrees in July. This pleasant reading is faced with competition by only five other major cities with slightly lower maximum July temperatures.

The amount of sunshine is a pleasing 70 percent during July, enough to satisfy vacationists while permitting enough rainfall to please the area's farmers.

LAKES INFLUENCE

A number of years ago, a U.S. meteorologist told this correspondent that because of the proximity of the Great Lakes, western New Yorkers are privileged to miss the extremes in temperature in both summer and winter.

"In the winter," the meteorologist, George N. Brancato, said, "the lakes have the effect of making Buffalo warmer than some regions in the same latitudes not close to the lakes. In the summer, the lakes have the opposite effect and make Buffalo cooler than many other places not so favorably located."

STATISTICAL SUPPORT

The Census Bureau statistics would indicate that such still holds true.

But the lakes are, of course, also the villain for Buffalo's windy, cloudy, stormy weather.

In December, for example, Buffalo has sunshine only 30 percent of the daytime hours, according to an 18-year record through 1961. Only 6 other cities, in the group of 70, have less sunshine in this winter month.

PLENTY OF SNOW

The averages on total snow and sleet do not place Buffalo in a favorable light. In

January, its 26.3-inch average fall is the largest among 70. Buffalo's annual average of 106.8 inches is also unequalled. Next highest is Sault Ste Marie's with 97.8 inches and Juneau, Alaska, with 91.2 inches.

As a windy city, Buffalo has only three major competitors. An average hourly velocity of 13 miles an hour for Buffalo winds is exceeded, in the group of 70 cities, by Oklahoma City with a 14 mile an hour average, Wichita, Kans., with 13.3 miles per hour, and Great Falls, Mont., with 13.9 miles per hour.

BACK SEAT

A city such as Chicago, known as the Windy City, takes a back seat to Buffalo and Oklahoma City with an average hourly wind speed of only 10.1 miles per a hour.

Buffalonians are allowed one wintertime consolation. Humidity, which can be a curse in hot summer weather, can make a winter's cold more bearable. An average relative humidity of 79 percent at 7 a.m. and 66 percent at 1 p.m. in January—going up to a corresponding 82 and 75 percent in February—is considered to be in the "comfortable humidity" range for winter.

HUMIDITY FACTOR

Nor is Buffalo's midsummer humidity rated nearly as uncomfortable as in some places. The July average at 7 a.m. is 87 percent and at 1 p.m., 67 percent. Many other places are in the high 80's and 90's.

As an industrial city, Buffalo can be expected to have some air pollution and it does. But many other cities have a much poorer record.

In Buffalo, the Census Bureau finds that the average amount of so-called suspended particle matter, including smoke, dust and fumes, is 123 micrograms per cubic matter.

BELOW MANY

This is considerably below heavily air-polluted cities such as Phoenix, Ariz., with 213, Los Angeles, with 162, Chicago, with 190 and New York City with 172.

It would seem that about the only major defect in the Buffalo meteorological picture is the cloudy and snowy winter.

Perhaps science someday will be able to solve that problem.

It is known that low-lying cumulus clouds forming over the Buffalo area in the wintertime are responsible for the problem.

ATTACK ON CLOUDS

Science is developing ways of dispersing such cloud formations. By artificial means, such as "seeding" them with dry ice carried by aircraft. As the art of weather making progresses, there may come a day when the effect of Buffalo's big blizzards can be softened.

And in the meantime, the blessings of a pleasant summer climate, favorable to both good living and farming, and the lack of temperature extremes in both winter and summer should be emphasized.

U.S. Labor Movement Aids Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not generally known that private capital plays such a large part in the Alliance for Progress program. Through the Social Projects Department of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, a cooperative organization jointly financed by labor, business, and the U.S. Government, $13 million from the U.S. labor movement was committed last year in direct loans for workers' housing in Latin America.

The extent to which the U.S. labor movement has assisted in the Alliance for Progress program is told in the article below, which was printed in the New York Times, September 17, 1963. The failure of the House of Representatives to approve sufficient funds for our foreign aid program recently has greatly endangered the Alliance.

The article is as follows:

ROLE OF U.S. LABOR GROWS IN LATIN AID PROGRAM

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—The U.S. labor movement is playing an increasingly important role in assisting the Alliance for Progress in Latin America through direct cooperation with local trade unions.

The effort is still little known in this country. According to its sponsors, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, it is making a noticeable impact, turning Latin workers away from Communist leadership and helping them develop theinr own welfare projects.

The movement, which uses both funds and technical assistance, operates through the American Institute for Free Labor Development. It also works closely with the office of the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress.

The institute was created in 1960, but its social projects department has been fully operative for only a year. It is administratively financed in equal parts by the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Government, and the business community. George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, is president and J. Peter Grace, president of W. R. Grace & Co., is chairman of the board.

The social projects department reported that in the year ended last month the American labor movement committed about $13 million in direct loans for workers' housing in Mexico, Peru and El Salvador.

The loans coming from AFL-CIO welfare funds, carry a 100-percent guarantee from the Administration for International Development.

In Mexico, the labor movement has obligated $9,569,000 for a housing cooperative for the Graphic Arts Workers Union in Mexico City. The Government has guaranteed full repayment in dollars. The Mexican Government has also donated land for the 3,104-dwelling project in the Balbuena district of Mexico City.

In Peru, where the institute has assisted in the creation of a "Workers Democratic Alliance for Cooperative Housing," the AFL-CIO has committed $3 million. The U.S. Government is supplying $6 million in addition, through the Alliance for Progress.

In El Salvador, the labor movement is contributing $400,000 toward a $1 million workers' housing project directed by the Alliance for Progress.

William C. Doherty, Jr., director of the social projects department, said today that the labor movement was prepared to lend an additional total of $15 million for workers' housing in Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Uruguay and Ecuador under the U.S. Government guarantee.

In some instances, labor is matching U.S. and local funds. In others, it will cooperate with the Inter-American Development Bank.

The AFL-CIO is also seeking to develop savings and loan cooperatives among the workers in Latin America. The institute insists that a benefiting worker put into savings at least 5 percent of the total value of his home; that the land represent only 25 percent of the value of the home and its improvements, and that the worker pay a maximum of 25 percent of his regular family income toward the home.

The institute is also assisting unions in Latin America with the development of housing blueprints and the preparation of loan applications to the aid agency in Washington.

Mr. Doherty said workers in several unions had deposed Communist leadership after the institute had advised them that no assistance would be forthcoming so long as they were led by nondemocratic elements.

A Positive Policy for Attacking Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, in a profound and highly instructive article in the Washington Post of September 28, 1963, the distinguished Englishwoman, Barbara Ward Jackson, advocated a positive policy for attacking anti-Semitism. Lady Jackson, a Roman Catholic, discusses a problem which the late Pope John hoped the Ecumenical Council would take up. Under unanimous consent, I insert this article into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

ANTI-SEMITISM LAID TO MYTH FIXED IN CHILDHOOD

(By Barbara Ward Jackson)

LONDON.—As the memory of Auschwitz and the gas chambers fades, is there a chance that such horrors could recur? This is a question of particular and urgent force in Europe for, whatever the reactions of anti-Semitism in other lands and other cultures, only in Europe was the apocalyptic climax reached in which 6 million people were exterminated for being Jews.

No one can be sure of the answer to this question unless another is asked: Have all the roots of the old anti-Semitism been finally torn from Europe's conscious and unconscious mind?

And this is a question of particularly poignant force for Europe's Christians since, whatever other sources there may be of anti-Semitism, one immensely strong taproot has been the historical antagonism between church and synagogue and a tragically perverted Christian interpretation of the Biblical role of the Jews.

"Interpretation" is in fact much too weak a word. Christian attitudes toward the Jews are all too often fixed in childhood by a reading of the Gospels in almost primitive terms of "goodies" and "baddies."

The Jews reject Jesus, Caiaphas cynically hands Him over to Roman power, Judas betrays Him for money, the crowd howls that His blood will be on them and their children. These simple images of treachery and violence invade the childish mind with the force of myth. Unconsciously, the Jew is seen as evil.

This in turn influences attitudes—of distrust and dislike. These then induce in the Jews a set of hostile or defensive reactions which confirm the original Christian dislike. All too often there is no later re-

examination of early attitudes. Myth takes over; anti-Semitism is confirmed.

It need hardly be underlined how fantastically far removed is this myth from Christianity's true doctrine. At the universal level, to believe in the possibility of a collective guilt, handed on, generation after generation, to innocent people wholly removed from the original tragedy, is to make nonsense of two fundamental Christian concepts: the redeeming compassion of God and the personal moral responsibility of His creatures.

At the particular level, the tragedy itself had nothing to do with any collective Jewish reaction. At a time when a very large part of Jewry lived outside Judea, a few Jewish leaders cooperating—in ways which are likely to remain forever obscure—with the dominant power of imperial Rome, contrived to get rid of an embarrassing local "prophet." Jewry was never involved since Jewry knew nothing about it.

Yet the myth persists. Inquiries in France within the last decade have uncovered children's catechisms which still paint the Jewish community in terms of collective guilt. It is only in the last two Pontificates that the Good Friday liturgy has been modified to remove such dangerous discourtesies as its contemptuous reference to "perfidious Jews."

It is for this reason that many Christians wonder whether there may not be urgent need for much more specific Christian action to undo the old myths and establish a new context for Christian-Jewish relations. The World Council of Churches, meeting in Delhi in 1961, did in fact solemnly call on all member churches "to denounce anti-Semitism as absolutely irreconcilable with profession and practice of the Christian faith."

The reopening of the Vatican Council this autumn could offer Catholic Christianity a similar opportunity to restate with the utmost emphasis and solemnity its rejection of anti-Semitism and its condemnation of every myth making of the Jews a species of cosmic villain in the divine drama.

But, clearly, such solemn declarations would be only a starting point. External statements of principle, however valuable, do not necessarily work at the level of the imagination. The groups we are told to love and not hate remain alien to us. The reasons for switching from distrust to sympathy touch no more than the surface of our being.

If love and respect are to become the true context of the dialog, fears, prejudices, ignorance, the old fatal myths have to be hunted down where they have really sunk their roots. The problem is not simply the enlightenment of Christian minds. It is Lear's old question: What will "sweeten" the imagination?

This is a question which it is probably impossible to answer in any abstract sense. The first need is for Christians and Jews to be ready in a new and concrete way, to conduct the search together.

In a sense, the method is no different from the methods necessary to the whole ecumenical encounter—careful cooperative work by by scholars, regular discussions between leaders, wide dissemination of agreed findings, organized encounters at various levels to bring more and more people face to face as men of good will, trusting in each other's good faith and attempting to discern God's purposes and man's response.

Clearly, it is hard to say in advance what results would flow from such a confrontation. It is precisely for the lack of it that we are still in the age of myth and ignorance. We can only say that without the encounter, the myths will remain, still fed from the depths of the same unreformed imagination.

Yet it is perhaps possible to guess at one or two potentially liberating approaches. If one asks how it was that John XXIII made so profound an impression on so many in so short a time, the most likely answer is that he was able to articulate some of the deepest thoughts and hopes of contemporary man.

There can be no doubt of the themes to which he returned most readily: the theme of the unity of the whole human species and the theme of a common human substance shared by all the children of God. And these two great lieux communs—of unity and humanity—have surely a special relevance in any more sustained dialog between Christians and Jews.

It can be argued that it was the Jews who first conceived with total commitment the unity of the human race. Leaving behind the god of the tribe, rejecting the earth mother worshiped under a score of titles, they proclaimed the single universal Godhead, Creator of the universe, Father of all men.

Then comes the paradox. The people whose vision of divinity was universal became, in the process of defending it—through defeat and captivity and dispersion, enclosed, exclusive, separated, apart. The crisis and tragedy of the Gospels is, from the Christian point of view, the inability of Jewry to encompass the full universal implications of its own vision of God.

But over the last 2 millennia it has remained perfectly faithful to this vision. Fidelity has flowered again and again in the sanctity of Jewish sages, the wisdom of Jewish writing, the heroism of Jews suffering.

Today, in an age crying out for unity, the witness of both Jew and Christian to the common fatherhood of God surely provides a context of faith and respect within which each can search out the other's meaning. And it should be said that, even though such an approach may seem strange to those reared in the atmosphere of latent anti-Semitism, it is profoundly in keeping with St. Paul's great meditation on Jewish destiny in his Epistle to the Romans.

There he sees the failure of the Jews to realize their common sonship with the Gentiles as only a stage in the unfolding of human destiny. Jew and Gentile alike are under the grace and mercy of God and are destined to discover an ultimate and common salvation.

The theme of a shared humanity may be even more potent as a purifier of the imagination. So much of the evil arises, as we have seen, from the incredibly primitive attributions of good and evil at the serious study of the events puts humanity on trial—not Jewry, not Roman power, not even this or that Jew or Roman.

Christ is betrayed by attitudes and reactions which everywhere and always betray mankind; the cowardice of His own disciples, the retreat from objective justice by a Governor who does not want to jeopardize his career by a local disturbance, the hostility of a religious "establishment" confronted with new and disturbing spiritual inspiration, the fear felt by respectable people everywhere for those who dispel their complacency with the reminder that the poor will inherit the earth.

To turn so sharp and illuminating a spectacle of humanity's general weakness into an indictment of a particular group at a particular point in history robs it of its deepest religious significance, its insistent reminder that we all behave thus; that all with power are tempted to its abuse, all with religious authority to a failure of spiritual awareness, all with comfort and wealth at stake to the closed eye and the hardened heart.

Indeed, the last tragedy of Jewry in Europe is a crucifixion on such a scale that it should have burned out forever any complacent confidence among Christians that, had they confronted the dilemmas of a Caiaphas or a Pilate, they would have avoided their ignominy.

A vision of unity, a sense of common humanity—these perhaps provide a starting point for a new dialog between Christians and Jews and with it a new understanding and a new respect.

Resolution Adopted by the New Jersey Region of the Zionist Organization of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the resolution adopted unanimously on September 15, 1963, at the convention of the New Jersey Region of the Zionist Organization of America held in Atlantic City, N.J.

In his letter transmitting the resolution, the Honorable Joseph H. Lerner, chairman, convention committee, stressed the need for its prompt implementation "in view of the tragic loss of life suffered by citizens of Israel because of the unlawful aggression by Syria and Jordan and in further view of the warlike threats made against Israel within the past 2 weeks by President Nasser of Egypt.

I urge the administration and the Congress to give serious consideration to the thoughtful recommendations contained in the resolution which are designed to achieve peace and stability in the troubled Near East.

The resolution follows in full:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT THE CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERSEY REGION OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA ON SEPTEMBER 15, 1963

Whereas Arab leaders, now federating in military alliance, have formally renewed their threat to destroy Israel; and

Whereas the Soviet Union is providing Arab States with bombers, fighters, submarines, tanks, torpedo boats, and missiles; and

Whereas German scientists are helping the United Arab Republic to produce guided ground-to-ground missiles; and

Whereas, Western governments are providing unconditional economic assistance to Arab States, despite their war preparations and their refusal to meet Israel in direct peace negotiations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we appeal to the President and to the Congress for these measures:

1. Careful administration of our aid program to insure that none of our assistance is diverted to finance preparations for aggression. Our aid must not assist belligerent countries which threaten the peace of their neighbors.

2. Resistance to the Arab boycott and Arab belligerence and insistence that Arab leaders meet their United Nations Charter obligations to negotiate a peace settlement with Israel.

3. Continued economic assistance to help raise the living standards of the people of the area.

4. Action to hasten the rehabilitation and training of the Arab refugees and their resettlement in lands where there is room and opportunity for them.

5. A firm security guarantee by the United States commiting our Government to move swiftly to deter and prevent any aggression.

6. To grant arms to Israel to insure an arms balance and to enable Israel to defend herself and to deter attack. This is imperative until such time as Arab States halt their arms acquisitions.

We urge our Government to counteract incitement to hate and preparation for war. It is right to press vigorously for Arab-Israel cooperation and peace negotiations. It is wrong to be defeatists and to acquiesce in a continued state of belligerence. We must press for an Arab-Israel peace with a firm policy clearly announced and vigorously pursued. This resolution expresses the established will and goals of every Zionist and the policy of the Zionist Organization of America.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FORT WAYNE, IND.,
September 18, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: This letter is written to obtain information on House Resolution 14 to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The specific information desired is the answer to this question. Can the objectives of the Special Committee on the Captive Nations be achieved through the House Foreign Affairs Committee?

I admire your perserverance in continually pressing for the establishment of the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The enslaved peoples of the captive nations can never be abandoned, because our freedom and theirs are interdependent. If they are free, we are free—if they are not free, our freedom is in danger.

There is a Catholic organization which supports the captive nations through prayer: League of Prayer for the Captive Peoples. The ultimate aim of the League of Prayer is: "To reach the abandoned, all those peoples under Communist control: to assure them of our prayers and to ask theirs; to shift morale and hope to our side, for without them no battle is won."

At present I am attempting to inform the public of H.R. 14 via the letter-to-the-editor route, and have sent four identical letters to different newspapers. Your continuing efforts to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations are certainly not in vain, as I am confident it will be established in the future. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. ERDMAN.

NEWPORT, R.I.,
August 25, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Will you kindly have sent to me a copy of your proposed measure to create a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations? I am naturally deeply interested in this proposal.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS FRANCIS BUDENZ.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE FREEDOM RALLY HELD ON THE OCCASION OF THE FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN BOSTON, MASS., ON JULY 20, 1963

Whereas President Kennedy and Governor Peabody proclaimed the week of July 14 to 20 as Captive Nations Week in accordance with the Captive Nations Week resolutions passed by Congress in 1959; and

Whereas the Soviet Government continues to annihilate the national, cultural, and political, indentities of the captive non-Russian nations through Russification and deportations; and

Whereas Russian communism made its way to Cuba, making Cuba an armed outpost in Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas many millions of citizens of the United States of America are linked by family and cultural bonds with those who live in the captive countries under the tyranny of communism; and

Whereas the United States has failed to develop effective policies toward the captive nations to regain freedom and independence: Now, therefore, we assembled at the fifth observance of the Captive Nations Week in Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1963, do hereby resolve—

1. Urge the U.S. Government to declare, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, its support on the right of self-determination of all peoples held in Communist captivity and, consequently, make this issue the permanent concern in all negotiations with the Soviet Government; and

2. Urge the House Rules Committee to speed action on the pending Flood resolution (H.R. 14), Derwinski resolution (H.R. 15), and other resolutions calling for the establishment of a permanent committee on the captive nations which will advocate a progressive program to aid captive nations to restore their historical freedom and independence; and

3. Compliment all Congressman for their resolutions and support; we commend all Americans who voiced their support for the establishment of the Captive Nations Committee; and we urge those who did not lend their support to do so now; and

4. Deplore the State Department for not supporting the establishment of the said committee and urge our State Department to endorse and support the passage of the Flood resolution in its entirety.

AUGUST 19, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the Committee of Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States, branch of East Chicago, Ind., are sincerely urging you for quick action on House Resolution 14.

The hopes of millions, free and enslaved, are in your hands. Why not demonstrate that a free country as ours wants the world to be free? Why not show the true colonialism which exists in enslaved Europe? This resolution is the beginning of peace for all, but not a piece by piece for the aggressor.

With warm personal regards, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

DR. JONAS PAUKSTELIS,
KAZIMIERAS VALEIKA,
VIKTORAS T. MAKIEJUS,
Committee of Americans for Congressional Action to Free the Baltic States.
EAST CHICAGO, IND.

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
August 20, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: Please persevere in your fight to have the House establish a Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations. The need for such a committee is increased by every State Department blunder in this area.

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to Representative SMITH urging that the Rules Committee pass House Resolution 14.

May God be with you.

Sincerely,

MARY M. KRAYCHY.

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
July 9, 1963.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Please schedule prompt action on House Resolution 14, the proposal to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. The need for such a committee increases the longer the cold war continues.

Truly, the captive nations are the Achilles' Heel of the Communist empire and their peoples could and should be our best allies against communism.

Now that President Kennedy has proclaimed Captive Nations Week, 1963, I can think of no better way for the House of Representatives to observe this week than by passing House Resolution 14.

Please, Representative SMITH, give the House this chance by working for a prompt and favorable report by the House Rules Committee.

Thank you very much for your attention in this matter.

Mrs. STEPHEN KRAYCHY.

NORTHBROOK, ILL.,
June 26, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: In accordance with Public Law 86-90 of the 86th Congress, the third week of July has been designated as Captive Nations Week.

I urge that the Department of State give full support to Captive Nations Week, 1963. I have written President Kennedy to request that he issue a forthright proclamation of Captive Nations Week, to give courage and hope to the almost 1 billion captives of Communist tyranny. These people could be our firmest allies in the cold war, for they know from bitter experience what it is to live under communism. All we must do is to assure them that we have not forgotten them. Mr. Secretary, please give them this assurance.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

MRS. STEPHEN KRAYCHY.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, BOSTON BRANCH,
August 22, 1963.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am pleased to enclose the editorial page from the Boston Record-American (a Hearst paper) of July 30, 1963. There you will find published my letter, "Ukraine First Red Victim," which urges the enactment of House Resolution 14.

With warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OREST SZCZUDLUK,
Public Relations.

[From the Boston Record American, July 30, 1963]

UKRAINE FIRST RED VICTIM

BOSTON.—The otherwise timely and penetrating Record American editorial of July 23, "Crowded Summit," cannot be passed without comments.

The editorial limits itself to enumerating captive countries that fell under Communist rule after 1939. We cannot, however, forget those countries which were captured by Russian Communists after World War I. Among the latter was Ukraine, the first and the biggest victim of the new Communist colonialism. As a reminder here, Ukraine proclaimed its independence on January 22, 1918. Armenia, Georgia, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, and other non-Russian countries also gained their independence.

Certainly, Ukraine's incorporation into the Soviet Union did not result from the exercise of free will of the Ukrainian people. Let us not divide captive nations under Soviet colonialism into groups; they all are in the same boat.

Let us support the establishment of a permanent congressional Committee on the Captive Nations, which was proposed by Congressman FLOOD (House Resolution 14), DERWINSKI (House Resolution 15), and supported by many Massachusetts Congressmen: MCCORMACK, O'NEILL, PHILBIN, CONTE, MORSE, BURKE, and DONOHUE. Since last January, the subject resolutions have been pending before the House Rules Committee. Now is the time to enact these resolutions. The proposed committee will handle all matters pertaining to the captive nations.

Furthermore, our Government should make freedom and independence to all captive nations held in Communist captivity the issue in all negotiations with the Soviet Government, direct and at the United Nations.

O. SZCZUDLUK,
Director of Public Relations, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.

Farm Labor Facts—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, strongly supporting full employment and most of the programs of organized labor, I, like many of my colleagues, am forced to make a decision contrary to my usual policy when I support an extension of Public Law 78.

In making a determination against the allegations of labor, I considered carefully a few of the reply arguments of the Coachella Valley Farmers Association published the other day.

1. Public Law 78 does not depress U.S. farm labor wages nor limit job opportunities for U.S. farmworkers. California, which is forced to use more braceros than any other State, pays the highest farm wages in the United States. Wages for stoop labor since the start of the bracero program have increased from 65 cents per hour to $1 and $1.10. California farmers have recruited in Texas and other States, have used all available, able and willing workers, have orders on file with the State employment service for 48,000 domestic workers. The State employment service has not been able to fill the orders. Job opportunity for at least 48,000 able, willing, domestic workers exists now.

2. If U.S. farmworkers desperately need the jobs now filled by braceros, why don't they take them? The jobs exist and are waiting for workers. Specifically, the Coachella Valley needs 700 date pickers from October 1 to February 15. Pay is 1 cent per pound, free housing, utilities, to-job transportation, workmen's compensation insurance. Off-job health and accident insurance can be purchased for $5.70 per month. The State employment service has tried desperately to find workers; farmers have tried every known source without success.

3. It is stated that less than 1 percent of U.S. farmers use Public Law 78. That may be correct, but less than 1 percent of U.S. farms produce the fruits and vegetables for the entire country. Florida and other Atlantic coast States have thousands of farms using the BWI program; Maine farmers have their Canadian program; and Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' State of New Jersey imports thousands of Puerto Ricans. The Coachella Valley has over 650 farmers, only 8 of which are corporations. The largest of these raises crops which are largely mechanized and rarely uses any braceros. At least 98 percent of the 2,800 braceros we have at peak are used by us family farmers. A small family farmer, with only 10 acres of market tomatoes, needs 10 pickers to harvest his crop; 10 acres of peaches will require 10 pickers at peak, etc. There is no such thing as a fruit or vegetable farm, in California, large enough to support a family and pay taxes, which can operate with the labor of the farmer and his wife. One farmer raising grain in North Dakota can, with mechanization, operate 640 acres so he needs no helpers. The small farmer in California is finished the day he cannot get supplemental labor, while the very large operators can survive by mechanizing at heavy cost.

4. The House's vote to terminate Public Law 78 was not welcomed by the President of Mexico or any other branch of Government. Mexico desires and is hoping for a continuance of the program. To verify this, contact the Mexican desk in the United States Department of State or the Mexican Embassy. Two minor riots occurred in Mexico when the termination was announced.

ARA's Critics Have Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Scripps-Howard newspapers have, according to the two articles which follow, recently made an investigation into all phases of Area Redevelop-Administration activities. The article, entitled, "U.S. Area Redevelopment Helps Finance the Good Life," published in the September 30, 1963, edition of the Washington News, lists a number of additional reasons, real valid ones, I believe, why the House of Representatives, if called upon, should reject this program for the second time. Robert Dietsch, Scripps-Howard staff writer, has spun an interesting story which should attract the interest of all Members. The second article, also by Mr. Dietsch, published today, October 1, pertaining to ARA's motel and tourism loans, is also revealing. Both articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 30, 1963]

TAXPAYERS BUILD SKI LIFTS: U.S. AREA REDEVELOPMENT HELPS FINANCE THE GOOD LIFE

(By Robert Dietsch)

In the last 2 years, your tax money has been spent or loaned to:

Build motels, ski resorts, and other recreational facilities in a dozen States, on an Indian reservation and in Puerto Rico. Builders or promoters have received $43 million in Government loans.

Help buy snowmaking machinery for several of those resorts and help build golf courses, cocktail lounges, and bowling alleys in others. Also train waitresses for the motel restaurants.

Train sightseeing guides in Hawaii.

Build a summer theater in North Carolina.

Build roadside handicraft display stands in Arkansas.

Study the feasibility of harvesting, processing, an marketing sea lions in Alaska.

Help train copper workers in Montana for new jobs with Anaconda, the company which laid off the workers in the first place and which was looking for people with different skills to hire.

FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Loans or grants for all these projects came from the Area Redevelopment Administration, an agency set up by the Kennedy administration in 1961 to help business and employment in depressed areas.

Since then, the ARA has become one of the biggest subjects of controversy on the New Frontier.

Republicans dub it the "Area Reelection Administration."

Businessmen charge it is competing with private industry, making reckless loans, and giving money to dubious enterprises, the type rejected as unfeasible and uneconomic by private experts.

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has called ARA the "Christine Keeler" of an American scandal invoking "wholesale buying and selling of public office."

TOO EAGER?

Other critics say ARA is overly eager to farm out its money. They say ARA supports new businesses even after local industrial developers refuse to contribute their 10 percent required by law.

(ARA can loan up to 65 percent of the cost of a project; the rest of the money must come from private financial sources, the local community booster group and the project owners.)

ARA officials, understandably, argue their case with vigor.

Administrator William Batt says his agency goes into programs shunned by private businessmen.

"They are not interested in creating employment," Mr. Batt said.

He defends the millions put into motels by pointing to overall tourist and recreation growth and its potential.

What is more, ARA claims it has created, or laid the basis for creating, 47,500 jobs and for training 23,500 persons.

PROBE

An investigation into all phases of ARA activity by the Scripps-Howard newspapers gives the edge to ARA's critics.

While the agency has indeed acted to create some legitimate businesses in depressed areas (and even some not so depressed) and has created some employment, the investigation showed:

That ARA is overeager to farm out the $394 million given to it in 1961. For example, it pressed hard to lend $222,000 to developers of a ski resort between Altoona and Bedford, Pa., despite reluctance of the Altoona community development group to go along; the latter deemed the project too risky and thought it would create few jobs.

Not only did the resort owners get ARA's $222,000 but they also received $110,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA).

SOME MORE?

In another case, a wealthy Detroit industrialist got almost $1 million to help build "one of the world's most luxurious resorts" in northern Michigan; he reported the other day, during a phone conversation, that "ARA was around suggesting I was eligible for more loans."

That many of the 222 technical assistance studies approved by ARA (at a cost of more than $7 million) have been done by others in the past year. The sea lion study in Alaska is one; also grants to study better exploitation of Indian arts and crafts, uses of timber in various States, handicraft development in the Appalachians and marketing of peaches in Georgia.

That ARA job totals are exaggerated; far fewer than 47,500 positions have been created or seem in prospect. A metal fabricating firm in southwestern Pennsylvania, for example, carries a notation of "50 jobs" in ARA's directory; the firm now employs 11 persons and the president acknowledges it will be a long time before the total reaches 20. A candy manufacturer says his employment may even decrease after he uses ARA loan money to buy new machinery. He's on ARA's books for 50 jobs.

That some ARA loan recipients don't try very hard to seek private financing before going after Government money, as required by law. ARA loans carry 4 percent interest; private loans 6 percent or more.

"Sure I would have expanded my plant if ARA weren't around," conceded one industrial plant manager. "I would have used my working capital or gone after bank financing harder than I did. But I got together with ARA; after all, you don't find 4-percent money very often these days."

That some ARA training programs are of a dubious nature. There presumably are plenty of sightseeing guides in Hawaii but ARA nevertheless spent $5,000 to train 22 part-time farmers in that work. It spent $10,000 to train 100 copper mine workers for Anaconda—a giant company with the capability to train its own workers with its own money. To this list can be added the waitresses trained with taxpayer funds for duty at a Michigan resort and others trained for restaurant jobs in a motel at Paintsville, Ky. This motel, incidentally, is across the highway from a taxpayer-built handicraft stand.

HOW FAR?

Inherent in the ARA program, and in a growing number of other assistance programs initialed by the Kennedy administration, is the philosophical question of how far the Federal Government should go in seeking to create jobs and loan taxpayer money to private enterprise.

As Chamber President Neilan has pointed out and as the Scripps-Howard probe of ARA showed, even those who abhor the idea of Federal intervention solicit Federal money after programs are approved.

While a few local business groups across the country have spurned ARA help, most have accepted it and many have sought it.

The idea of having Uncle Sam help bring a new firm into town overshadows criticism of Federal intrusion into private enterprise.

The Kennedy administration obviously thinks highly of ARA. It wants Congress to double the Agency's budget and extend its life.

The Senate has agreed but the House, in June, rejected the proposal by five votes.

The Democratic leadership now wants the House Rules Committee to send an amended ARA bill to the floor.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Oct. 1, 1963]

TWO FIRMS GET U.S. LOANS FOR MOTEL IN PUERTO RICO: THE COST, $4.8 MILLION

(By Robert Dietsch)

The Government is helping two large construction companies put up a Howard Johnson motor lodge in Puerto Rico.

The 322-room facility, in suburban San Juan, will cost $4.8 million.

Of that, $2.7 million will be lent to Tishman Realty and Construction Co. and Transcontinental Investing Co.—New York firms which together had net profits of about $2 million in the past year.

SET UP IN 1961

The Government loan comes from the Area Redevelopment Administration, set up by the Kennedy administration in 1961 to help depressed areas find new businesses and new jobs. In announcing the Howard Johnson project, the agency said the hard-hit area of Carolina, Puerto Rico, "has a current unemployment rate of 11.8 percent as compared with the national average of 5.6 percent.

Of $170 million distributed by the agency in industrial and public facility loans and grants, $45 million has gone directly to leisure-type projects—motels, resorts, hotels, marinas. About $12 million has gone into leisure-connected programs. More than $500,000 in grants have been made to leisure-connected studies—like the "study of tourist potentials" in Colorado.

Tishman Realty and Transcontinental Investing announced last April they were joining in the Howard Johnson motel in San Juan—an area which in the past several years has attracted millions of private investment dollars for commercial, industrial, and tourist development. On September 15, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced the $2.7 million loan to Transcontinental San Juan, Inc.

INQUIRY

Inquiry by Scripps-Howard newspapers brought out that application for the loan was made jointly by Tishman and Transcontinental Investing, which would operate the six-story motel under a Howard Johnson franchise.

Just why Tishman and Transcontinental, with their own resources, turned to the Area Redevelopment Administration for financing could not be learned. A Tishman spokesman replied "no comment" to inquiries; Robert K. Lifton, president of Transcontinental, was described by his office as "in conference" or "out of town."

In the 9 months ending June 30, Tishman—whose stock is traded on the New York Exchange—earned $819,370. Transcontinental—whose stock is traded over the counter—earned $1 million in the year ending February 28.

Churches Have Civil Rights Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs of the Lincoln Star:

CHURCHES HAVE CIVIL RIGHTS TASK

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—In the aftermath of the emotional outpouring of the civil rights march it is evident that one force and one force alone can persuade the Congress to pass far-reaching civil rights legislation.

The churches of America have it in their power to convince doubting legislators of the need to bring social justice to millions of citizens deprived of their American birthright. In short, this is a moral rather than a political issue if it is to generate support sufficient to overcome the bitter-end resistance of the Southern bloc with its conservative Northern allies.

The march itself laid the base for this support. Conspicuous from beginning to end were the representatives of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths. They spoke eloquently in support of the goal of the marchers, and clerical figures, many of them carrying placards, were interspersed through the vast crowd.

This was followed by the strongly worded statement of the World Council of Churches. It was a grave warning to Christians who support segregation by action or inaction and thereby betray Christ and the fellowship which bears his name. The council, made up of the principal Protestant and Eastern orthodox congregations, was saying in effect that Christians failing to work to end segregation are as guilty of undermining their faith as those actively supporting segregation.

Pope John XXIII in his great encyclical, Pacem In Terris, called for recognition of the rights of every individual of whatever color or race as a child of God. When Pope Paul VI met with President Kennedy he publicly expressed his concern for the civil rights program. Except for a few splinter extremist groups religious support for integration covers the whole religious spectrum.

The question is whether this support will be translated into concerted effort to convince the waverers that a majority of Americans of every kind and color and not just the leaders of a few pressure groups want action. In many States—in the Midwest, in the Plains and Rocky Mountain States—the proportion of Negroes to white is small. Unless Congressmen from these regions hear

from the folks back home who have a real conviction of the need to correct ancient wrongs they may get the impression that no one cares very much.

Compromise Offered on the Controversial Indiana Dunes Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, for several years legislation has been introduced in the Congress which has affectionately been called the save the dunes bill by its many ardent proponents.

The issue involved has been widely discussed in those areas which are closest to the Indiana Dunes State Park. Many conservationists in my own area have written me regarding the pending bill which has obviously created more public enthusiasm and interest than that which it has aroused within legislative circles in Washington.

Because many Members of Congress who are not as close to the issue because of the geographical location as are we in the Midwest, I feel that the commentary of Newscaster John Madigan on this subject should be of considerable interest to my colleagues.

I submit, therefore, a copy of the editorial views presented recently on the WBBM-TV program, "Standpoint":

In April of last year, "Standpoint" insisted that the Indiana Dunes controversy should end in a compromise; not only that it should, but that the "cold, bare facts of politics" made it certain it would. We said we could not conceive of Congress disregarding the thinking of its Indiana members in favor of the out-of-State views of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois.

The harbor-park proposal just advanced by the Bureau of the Budget in Washington is a compromise. As Senator VANCE HARTKE of Indiana predicted, it does not please everyone, Senator DOUGLAS, for instance. But we think it sounds fair. Of almost equal importance, the plan can probably get through Congress.

Senator DOUGLAS and other conservationists, we feel, should let well enough alone.

The half-a-loaf formula is certainly not demeaning in this instance. A large part of the dunes, 11,700 acres, would be preserved as part of the national park system. This would include the present 2,000 acre Indiana Dunes State Park. Also, private owners of dunelands would be able to use their land for life, before it is surrendered to the Federal Government.

The other side of the compromise coin should mean industrial progress, much needed in this day of booming population and growth of national needs. A deepwater port would be constructed at Burns Ditch in Porter County. Estimates of cost range up to $80 million.

The Federal Government would pay $25 million. The Indiana Port Commission intends to raise the remainder in a bond issue.

The administration's proposal has a string attached to it. The Burns Ditch harbor will get a Federal green light only if private interests agree to build one fully integrated steel mill and to ship 10 million tons of coal through the port each year; or they can build two mills and guarantee shipment of 5 million tons annually. Pollution control is also demanded.

Indiana Governor Welsh considers the conditions reasonable, says they will be met. Two steel companies, Bethlehem and National, have pushed for the development. The former has begun clearing its property, has discussed building a fully integrated plant. Governor Welsh says he is certain the company will follow through.

Senator DOUGLAS disputes this; insists no commitment has been made by either company; says the coal shipment conditions will not be met.

Senator DOUGLAS, we suggest, should let the companies, the Government, and Congress worry about it. The conditions are their problem, not Save-the-Dunes groups.

Target date for the harbor is at least 5 years away. The Bureau of the Budget and Congress will make final judgment on the conditions demanded.

As for the Federal park phase, "Standpoint" joins conservationists in applauding the Government's endorsement. We recall how Senator DOUGLAS doffed his shoes, rolled up his trouser-legs and led a band of nature lovers through the sands 3 years ago to emphasize their feelings.

It serves no purpose to "pick a winner" in this compromise, as some are doing. Both nature and industry can be served. This plan may show the way. We hope the conservationists will stop pecking away at it, stop demanding more dunes land.

A Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to a recent resolution unanimously adopted by the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc. This fine group, anxious to formally recognize the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, passed the resolution at their 38th annual conference at Bretton Woods, N.H., on September 24. I am sure that the members of the New England delegation and other of my distinguished colleagues will be interested in reading this well deserved tribute to the FBI Director.

Whereas the valued freedom of all Americans, the pursuit of individual liberty and happiness under law, is a vital aspect of the responsibilities of law enforcement; and

Whereas, with wisdom, foresight, and outstanding personal integrity, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has given to our profession a preeminence in its role of public service; and

Whereas Director Hoover and his associates have shared with all law enforcement their facilities, talents, and cooperation; and

Whereas in this day of mounting world and national tensions we continue to seek the inspiring leadership of this dedicated American: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., in conference assembled at Bretton Woods, N.H., September 24, 1963, express our deep gratitude to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover for his years of outstanding public service and extend our continued cooperation in the accomplishment of our joint responsibilities.

It is the sense of this resolution that copies shall be forwarded to Director J. Edgar Hoover, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C., Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C., and to the members of the congressional delegations in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Connecticut.

Racial Demonstrations in the North and South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by a very distinguished educator, Dr. Charles J. Smith, president emeritus of Roanoke College, Salem, Va.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHAVIOR OF MAN CAN'T BE LEGISLATED

Every true American is deeply disturbed by the racial demonstrations both in North and South. These demonstrations have often gotten out of hand and resulted in physical injury to many and death to others. All of these things are unnecessary and greatly to be deplored.

In my humble judgment this unfortunate situation is compounded of the failure of Washington and the American people generally to read aright the lessons of history; namely, that human behavior cannot be regulated by the enactment of laws.

According to scripture God Almighty tried it with our first parents in the Garden of Eden and did not succeed.

Our own noble experiment with the 18th amendment sought by law to wipe out alcoholism. Instead it created an era of lawlessness from which our Nation has not yet recovered. Moonshining, bootlegging, hijacking, gangsterism, and murder resulted. In the end it had to be repealed after having made America the hardest drinking Nation on earth.

We have a multitude of laws against all sorts of crimes, yet the crime rate in America is increasing in alarming proportions.

The church and its leaders appear to have missed this point entirely. When distinguished Christian leader Dr. Eugene Carson Blake bleats platitudes and turns up in the forefront of Negro demonstrations, when a prominent Protestant bishop is reported to have said publicly in Cleveland, Ohio, that the greatest two Christian leaders of our time are the Pope and Martin Luther King, and when our own gentle and lovable Bishop Marmion considers it his duty to split his diocese wide open over a point of interracial contention, then one is bound to ask whether the church and its leaders have not abdicated the belief that only the power of the Gospel can refine and control human behavior.

It is my sincere belief that only gentleness, kindliness, and tolerance which are the essence of the teachings of Jesus are alone able to superinduce rectitude in human behavior. The enactment of more laws will never attain this highly desirable end.

CHARLES J. SMITH.

SALEM.

United States Can't Win Without Trying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following news article entitled "Diem's War Not Limited Enough?"—the Allen-Scott report appearing in the Peoria Journal Star of September 18, and an editorial, "United States Can't Win Without Trying" from the Journal Star of September 23:

[From the Peoria Star, Sept. 18, 1963]

DIEM'S WAR NOT LIMITED ENOUGH

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—There's a lot more behind President Kennedy's pressure for "reforms and personnel changes" in the South Vietnam Government than just an effort to end President Ngo Dinh Diem's bloody dispute with the Buddhists.

The President and his chief foreign policy advisers are using the internal dissention in South Vietnam as a cover for their efforts to oust Diem or strip him of control over military operations against the Communist Vietcongs.

Since Diem—under a plan prepared by his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu—began sending guerrillas into North Vietnam in June, powerful forces within the administration have clamored for the President to curb the strong anti-Communist leader.

Headed by Dr. Walt Rostow, chairman of the State Department Planning Council, this group of advisers argued that Diem's strategy of carrying the war into the "privileged sanctuary" of the Vietcongs in North Vietnam could cause the fighting to "escalate" into a bigger war.

Gen. Paul D. Harkins, head of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Saigon, who favors the initiative by Diem's forces, violently disagreed with the views of the Rostow group, but President Kennedy accepted the diplomatic rather than the military view.

On White House orders, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge requested Diem to quickly end these "across-the-border" raids. on the grounds they might "enlarge" the present conflict and involve the United States in a war with North Vietnam.

Reacting with fury, President Diem flatly refused to accept this U.S. dictation, countering with plans not only to continue the raids but to step them up to meet new Communist military threats.

Increased behind-the-line guerrilla raids are necessary, according to Diem's reply, in order to cut the Viet Cong supply lines and blunt a new Red offensive slated to begin this month from bases in Laos and North Vietnam.

SEEKING NEW HELP

President Diem also notified the White House that he was opening talks with a representative of Chiang Kai-shek on his offer to send Chinese Nationalist troops to South Vietnam from Formosa for both training and combat purposes.

This defiant show of "independence" by Diem so infuriated President Kennedy that he authorized an undercover effort to curb control of military operations of the South Vietnam President by ousting Nhu, who has influence over the government's security forces, and to organize a military junta to run the war.

When agents of the Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department failed to induce Vietnamese military chiefs to take control, the President backtracked and ordered the covert operation temporarily abandoned, shifting to a policy of diplomatic pressure on Diem.

In support of this new strategy, the Rostow group got boyish Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat of Idaho, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to denounce Diem on the Senate floor and introduce a resolution calling for Congress to cut off aid to his government.

The Church resolution, which is now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was approved in advance by President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk before it was introduced in the Senate. The President told Senator CHURCH that he thought the resolution could be used to bring new pressure on Diem.

SPLITTING THE PARTY

These new pressure tactics on Diem by President Kennedy are splitting the Democratic Party wide open.

In the House, Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat of Massachusetts, is so disturbed over the President's policies in South Vietnam that he asked Representative THOMAS MORGAN, Democrat of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to send a group of congressional observers to Saigon to determine what is actually going on.

Already, Speaker MCCORMACK and Representative EDNA KELLY, Democrat of New York, a ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, privately warned President Kennedy that the United States is courting sure disaster in South Vietnam if the Diem government is ousted or greatly weakened by the withholding of U.S. aid.

They plan to vigorously oppose any attempt by Senator CHURCH to write a curb on South Vietnam aid in the President's foreign aid program now pending in Congress. The Church resolution, if attached to the foreign aid legislation, could touch off one of the bitterest intraparty squabbles in recent years.

Speaker MCCORMACK is also seeking information on why the State Department forced Army Secretary Cyrus R. Vance to change at the last minute long-approved plans to visit United States forces in Vietnam. Vance left Washington for Taiwan last week, 3 days later than scheduled, after eliminating Vietnam from his itinerary.

Congressional sources point out that this is the first time in their knowledge that a U.S. service secretary was barred from an on-the-scene meeting with senior U.S. commanders and troops, deployed to fight against Communists in an allied nation. Secretary Vance was set to get on-the-spot reports from General Harkins and other U.S. military officers about some of the highly questionable activities of some U.S. civilian officials in Saigon and the effect their policies were having on the war effort.

UNITED STATES CAN'T WIN WITHOUT TRYING

A year ago this time, the administration in Washington and our afternoon Journal Star columnists penning the Allen-Scott report from Washington had violently different things to say about what was happening in Cuba. We thought the Allen-Scott reports were pretty wild and fantastic—until in a very short time all that they had been saying proved to be true.

Now, Allen-Scott has just made a similar report concerning what is really going on in South Vietnam, and it also differs widely from the official reports.

On the basis of what happened just a year ago, we are no longer inclined to ignore Allen-Scott. They have proven to be right too often.

They now report that the real problem in Vietnam has been, in fact, an effort on the part of our Government to get the power of decision away from Diem and into our own hands, and why?

Because Washington adviser Walter Rostow thinks Diem has become too aggressive in his war with the Communists.

Specifically, with the full blessing and approval of the American professionals on the scene, Diem has sent his own guerrillas across the border into North Vietnam to strike at their home bases.

Diem has also been seriously considering, say Allen-Scott, an offer of troops from Formosa.

Now, it is a simple fact of experience and doctrine that the only way to beat a guerrilla war is to strike at their home bases, and if this is what Diem is doing, it is a mighty poor reason to tear up his country and try to pull the rug out from under him.

Diem, if he is doing that, wants to win that war.

And this report indicates, that once again, when it comes to winning a victory over the Communists in the field, some of the civilian thinkers in the administration get terribly jittery.

It is not the first time we have flinched at the moment of decision, and been afraid to win, for fear we'll make the Russians angry.

It also seems axiomatic, that so long as we flinch at such moments, and refuse to win, we can't win.

Certainly, we have added much to the confusion in Vietnam. And certainly, the U.S. military commanders on the scene have been isolated and we have been unable to get their views on what is going on there.

We don't have too many choices in Vietnam. If we aren't willing to let the government they have and the forces we have there seek a real victory without being sabotaged by us as well as the Red underground, the responsibility for failure must rest squarely at the White House.

We are sick and tired of losing countries and being told that we undercut or abandoned them because "they couldn't possibly win. There was no way they could win."

Who says so? There's no way they can possibly win, or we can possibly win without trying.

It has been a sin to really try before, in Korea, in China, and in Cuba. Is it now a sin in Vietnam to try to beat the Reds, decisively?

Are our leaders that frightened?

New England Association of Chiefs of Police Salutes J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., an active group representing New England's many fine law enforcement agencies, has unanimously adopted a resolution which will, I am sure, be of interest to my colleagues. The resolution commends FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover for his outstanding public service as a leader in their common cause of law enforcement. It gives me pride and pleasure to call to the attention of all who share in our Nation's deep-seated admiration for this man's great contribution to democracy the inspiring resolution of the New England Association of

Chiefs of Police. The battle for freedom and decency is waged on many fronts. Let us never forget—as a people who respect the law—the debt we owe to those who enforce the law. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this resolution saluting Mr. Hoover:

Whereas the valued freedom of all Americans, the pursuit of individual liberty and happiness under law, is a vital aspect of the responsibilities of law enforcement; and

Whereas, with wisdom, foresight and outstanding personal integrity, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, has given to our profession a preeminence in its role of public service; and

Whereas Director Hoover and his associates have shared with all law enforcement their facilities, talents and cooperation; and

Whereas in this day of mounting world and national tensions we continue to seek the inspiring leadership of this dedicated American: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the members of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., in conference assembled at Bretton Woods, N.H., September 24, 1963, express our deep gratitude to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover for his years of outstanding public service and extend our continued cooperation in the accomplishment of our joint responsibilities.

Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, many of the great newspapers of the country which consistently have urged the preservation of the Indiana Dunes have received the administration's recent compromise proposal with cautious optimism. The Louisville Courier-Journal, for example, views with skepticism the chances of there being a Federal harbor at Burns Ditch and greets with cautious optimism the promise of administration support for the creation of an 11,700-acre Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

The Courier-Journal, in a recent editorial, points out that the port promoters will have difficulty in meeting the conditions laid down by the Bureau of the Budget which must be met before appropriations are requested for a Federal harbor. But the editorial appraises as "good" the chances of getting a national lakeshore park in the Dunes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the September 26, 1963, edition of the Courier-Journal, along with an analysis of the Bureau of the Budget report by Richard Harwood from the same newspaper of September 25.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal Sept. 26, 1963]

ESSENCE OF THE PORT COMPROMISE

The latest development in the Indiana port controversy is another round in a continuing battle; but it is a round in which those fighting to preserve Indiana's unique dunes land seem to have the edge. Certainly, Indiana Governor Welsh's assertion that the Burns-ditch-or-bust crowd won a great victory is dubious in the extreme.

At issue in this round is Federal aid for the Burns ditch project. The Burns ditch backers want the Federal Government to hand over $25 million to help build a deepwater port in the midst of the finest remaining dunes land on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan, primarily for the benefit of two steel companies.

The Kennedy administration has now decided that it will approve the aid—but only if certain conditions are met. And the conditions must give the port backers pause. At the same time, the administration promised to ask Congress to create an 11,700-acre national recreational park in the vicinity of Indiana Dunes State Park, near Burns ditch. This is good news to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and conservationists throughout the country who have fought the port project because they want to save as much of the dunes as possible. The dunes area in dispute is an irreplaceable natural and recreational asset. The port backers have never made a real effort to find another location for a deepwater port in Indiana.

The administration's decision is a compromise. Like most compromises, it is rather a mixed bag. In essence, however, this is where it seems to leave the situation: The chances of getting a national lakeshore park in the dunes area are good, the chances of getting Federal aid for the port project are doubtful.

In analyzing the port backers' claims about the future of the project, the Budget Bureau concluded that Senator DOUGLAS had some basis for his contention that the claims are exaggerated. Thus, these strings were attached to any Federal aid: Either Bethlehem or Midwest Steel must make a firm commitment to build an integrated steel plant at the Burns ditch site. Furthermore, such a mill must be constructed simultaneously with the construction of the port. Neither firm has made such a commitment. (An integrated mill is one that starts with iron ore and turns out finished steel products.)

Furthermore, a certain volume of coal traffic through the port must be guaranteed—10 million tons a year if one integrated steel mill is built, 5 million tons if two such plants are constructed. The Budget Bureau expressed doubt that such a volume could be achieved.

From the standpoint of those seeking to save the dunes, the chief drawback to the compromise is that the unit 2 section would be sacrificed to the port complex. This is the dunes area, which also has a fine stretch of beach, most prized by naturalists. Senator DOUGLAS intends to continue to fight to get some of this 1,000-acre tract within the boundaries of the proposed national park.

The dunes fight now moves into Congress, and the only certainty is that the issue is still in doubt.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Sept. 25, 1963]

INDIANA PORT DATA QUERIED

(By Richard Harwood)

WASHINGTON, September 24.—The Budget Bureau raised major questions Tuesday about the economic future of the proposed Burns Ditch industrial harbor in the Indiana dunes area of Lake Michigan.

There are indications, the Bureau said, that cargo estimates for the harbor have been exaggerated. The feasibility of the project is further clouded, according to the Bureau, by uncertainties surrounding the the plans for construction of steelmills in the area.

Until these matters are cleared up, the Bureau said, the Kennedy administration will not request construction funds for the $25 million project.

VIEWS LESS OPTIMISTIC

The Bureau's views on the project were made public Tuesday. They appeared to be somewhat less optimistic than Indiana Gov. Matthew Welsh and other sponsors of the project had indicated Monday.

Welsh reported at that time that the Bureau had given conditional approval for the harbor construction and that the conditions laid down could be easily met.

The basic conditions was that there would have to be sufficient industrial activity at Burns Ditch to justify Federal construction of the harbor.

Specifically, the Government stipulated that at least one fully integrated steel mill that turns raw ore into finished products would have to be built there and that coal traffic through the harbor would have to total 10 million tons a year.

TWO MILLS ACCEPTABLE

An acceptable alternative would be the construction of two integrated steelmills and a coal traffic volume of 5 million tons.

Welsh said the steel-mill stipulations posed no problem. Both Bethlehem Steel and National Steel intend to build integrated mills in the area, he declared. He also was confident that the harbor would generate the necessary coal traffic.

The bureau, however, said these are assumptions, not certainties.

The steel companies, the bureau said, will have to give specific assurances that they will build integrated mills before harbor-construction funds will be requested.

The construction of these mills and the construction of the harbor, the bureau said, should proceed simultaneously.

"This consideration is highly important," the bureau report said, "as shipments into the harbor of iron ore, limestone, and coking coal, which constitute the underlying justification for the steel-mill benefits claimed, are dependent upon the construction of such steel-making facilities."

"We, therefore, believe that explicit arrangements should be made by the Secretary of the Army to obtain more specific assurances prior to submitting an appropriations request to undertake the construction of the harbor."

It appears doubtful that Bethlehem, at least, will be willing to commit itself to a specific timetable.

Robert F. Willey, manager of Bethlehem's Washington office, said the company hopes to ultimately build an integrated mill at Burns Ditch with an annual capacity that may reach 8 million tons of steel. But these plans, he said, are entirely contingent on the development of new markets for Bethlehem products.

"We're not going to build until we've got the customers for the steel," Willey said.

For the present, the company intends to proceed with the construction and operation of rolling and finishing mills in the area that will use ingots produced at other Bethlehem mills, Willey said.

If it should develop that a public harbor is not built at Burns Ditch, he said, Bethlehem will build its own harbor whenever it is needed.

COAL TOTAL HELD UNCERTAIN

Another uncertainty cited by the Bureau involved the projections of coal traffic through Burns Harbor. The Corps of Engineers has estimated that future coal shipments from southern ports on Lake Michigan will average 24 million tons a year and that up to 10 million tons probably would be shipped out of the Burns Ditch port.

The Bureau, however, has challenged this estimate. Coal traffic through the southern ports of Lake Michigan now totals less than

6 million tons annually, according to the Bureau, and has not increased substantially since 1957.

The Bureau said the 24 million ton estimate should be rechecked. "Recent technological developments in rail transportation and electric generation and transmission do not appear to have been fully considered in the (Corps of Engineers) coal projections. In addition, we believe that more recent information with respect to the possibilities of nuclear power generation in the area should be given further consideration."

The Bureau further rejected as excessive estimates by the Corps of Engineers on the probable savings that could be realized by moving coal, grain, and general cargo through a Burns Ditch port instead of existing ports on the lake.

The question raised by the Bureau are the same questions Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has repeatedly raised in his opposition to the project. His concern is to try to save the Indiana Dunes area around Burns Ditch from industrial encroachment.

The Kennedy administration shares that concern and announced Monday that it will develop an 11,700-acre national park in the area. The park would not include a section of land identified as Unit 2, where the port would be built and where Bethlehem is building its rolling mills.

After the March Is Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1963]

AFTER THE MARCH IS OVER

The 200,000 marchers for racial equality are back home. The signs demanding freedom now" have been stored away or swept up by Washington's garbage collectors. The walls of discrimination remain unleveled—racially imbalanced schools, segregated housing, closed jobs, "white only" rules at places of public accommodation, daily humiliations for the Negro. The House Judiciary Subcommittee that must give the first go-ahead signal in the long road to final congressional action on the administration's civil rights bill is in recess until September 9. Congressmen say nothing much has changed in their evaluation of the bill, and few display any heightened sense of urgency.

Does all this mean that the most impressive assembly for a redress of grievances in America's history has been in vain? We are convinced that when the record of 1963 is written the answer will be just the opposite. The national conscience, most potent of all spurs to social action, has been stirred in ways that will find expression in laws and in community practice. The only question is whether the translation of attitude into action will come fast enough to prevent new explosions of interracial violence.

The unity of Negro and white citizens in the leadership of the march and in its rank and file demonstrated the indivisibility of the fight for genuine equality in all phases of American affairs. It was a rebuke to those in both races—the White Citizens Councils and the Black Muslims—who favor a pulling apart instead of a pulling together in the drive to give substance to constitutional guarantees. This is all America's battle—a battle in which intolerance and injustice are the common enemy.

Yet, even with strong Federal legislation and an aroused community will, monumental obstacles must be overcome before racial barriers can be wholly erased. There are not enough jobs to provide full employment for everyone; there are not enough schools or teachers to erase quickly the educational handicaps that block the Negro's progress; there are not enough good homes to raze the racial ghettos. The important thing now is to accept as a priority commitment in all our individual and national planning the necessity for faster movement to correct these deficiencies and to assure equal access to a richer life for all our citizens.

The picnic atmosphere that pervaded much of Wednesday's march should not be misinterpreted as betokening any lack of determination on the Negro's part to insist on the rights he has been so long denied. Rather it was an affirmation of his confidence in the efficacy of an appeal to national morality to make true the dreams so eloquently evoked by Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King in the shadow of the Great Emancipator. It is up to all of us to make certain those dreams are not destroyed.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1963]

THE FIRST SIGNIFICANT TEST OF THE FREEDOM MARCH

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 29.—The first significant test of the Negro march on Washington will come in the churches and synagogues of the country this weekend.

It is no good waiting for a political reaction in Congress, for if there is no effective moral reaction out in the country, there will be no effective political reaction here.

This whole movement for equality in American life will have to return to first principles before it will overcome anything. And as moral principles preceded and inspired political principles in this country, as the church preceded the Congress, so there will have to be a moral revulsion to the humiliation of the Negro before there can be significant political relief.

THE TV MENTALITY

The preachers at the Lincoln Memorial here this week understood this better than anybody else, but they were not able to speak for the whole religious community of the Nation.

"If," said the executive head of the United Presbyterian Church, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, "all the members and all the ministers of the constituency I represent here today were ready to stand and march with you for jobs and freedom for the Negro people, together with all the Roman Catholic churches and all of the synagogues in America, the battle for civil rights and dignity would be won."

The president of the American Jewish Congress, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, put the point another way. "When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned many things. The most important thing I learned * * * under those tragic circumstances is that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problem. The most urgent, the most disgraceful, the most shameful, and the most tragic problem is silence.

"A great people, which had created a great civilization, had become a nation of silent onlookers. * * * America must not remain silent. It must speak up and act * * * and not for the sake of the Negro, but for the sake of the image, the idea, and the aspiration of America itself."

Few people would question the validity of these points, but two misfortunes have debased the power of the church and of church opinion. Too many preachers, like too many Congressmen, are not leading but following their flock, perpetuating rather than destroying illusion and prejudice. They are "passing by on the other side." And their parishioners, even when they want to be participants instead of spectators, have lost faith in their power to influence great events.

Nothing, however, is more fallacious in American political life than the popular idea that Congressmen pay no attention to letters from their constituents. Some of them are impervious to reason and others either will not of cannot read, but all of them want to be reelected, and all of them know the political power of the church, even if they never go there except for votes.

If the preachers said what they really thought about this racial crisis and even half of those who heard and believed them wrote their honest convictions for or against racial equality to Capitol Hill, the political balance on racial equality might easily be transformed.

If, however, the churches do not react and the march on Washington is regarded by the religious community as just another TV show, the political battle for civil rights could easily be worse off than before.

For while the politicians here are not saying much about the march they are listening. And if such a mammoth demonstration, dramatizing the basic religious concept of equality, does not get an impressive response even from the churches, Congress could easily conclude that the Nation was indifferent or worse.

WE NEED ALLIES

The Negro leaders were less exuberant here today than during the big demonstration yesterday. After the spree comes the hangover, and President Kennedy warned them before they left that only with strong bipartisan support could his civil rights bill be passed.

Asa Philip Randolph, who organized the march, admitted the obvious fact. "We need allies," he said. "People who are victims must take the leadership. No one but a Jew could lead the fight against anti-Semitism. No one but a man from the ranks of labor could lead the labor movement.

"But the Negro cannot win the fight alone, no more than the Jew or labor leader could win his fight alone. We need allies."

And if he cannot find them first in the churches, he is not likely to find them among the politicians.

Growing Public Awareness of the Tragedy of Americus, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week I stated my hope that that the news media would focus public attention on the brutal suppression of the Negro campaign for equal right in Americus, Ga.

I am pleased to note that yesterday the New York Times carried a dispatch from Americus which in the words of that distinguished newspaper's editorial writer told in chilling detail how the officials of Americus have "used the forces of law to smash the desegregation drive."

Today the Times followed up its story with an editorial in which it aptly noted that the holding of Don Harris and his

colleagues for a capital offense, "degrades the rule of law into an instrument of terror and oppression."

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in giving the Americus story the prominence it deserves, the New York Times has once again rendered a great public service. I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate.

I would also like to call attention, Mr. President, to further evidence of the growing public awareness of this tragic situation in Americus.

The September 26 edition of the Newark Evening News reports a protest at the arrest of Don Harris by Dr. Mason Gross, president of Rutgers University, in a statement at the Rutgers opening convocation exercises. Dr. Gross expressed his indignation at the treatment these young men in Americus have received, "without regard for any kind of legal procedure."

The following day, 1,200 Rutgers students attended a rally to raise funds for Harris' legal defense. The story of how these young people are devoting their time and money to help a former fellow student shows the growing anger at this great injustice as knowledge of the situation spreads. An excellent report of the rally is contained in the September 27 article of the Atlantic City Press.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 29, 1963]

AMERICUS, GA., STIFLES NEGRO DRIVE

(By Claude Sitton)

AMERICUS, GA., September 28.—An organized challenge to this Black Belt community's racial customs has been all but crushed by the use of the law.

In a situation without parallel in the South, four leaders of a desegregation campaign that began here last July face possible death sentences on charges of inciting an insurrection.

Two riots by demonstrators and a series of other protests that have lasted for a month and a half have resulted in injuries to 28 Negroes and 7 law enforcement officers and the arrest of more than 250 persons. Thirty-eight of them remain in prison.

Negroes have made numerous charges of police brutality and mistreatment that have allegedly taken place in the filthy, sometimes improvised jails.

They also have accused officials of harassing them, of imposing arbitrary bail bond requirements and of charging imprisoned juveniles $2 a day for board.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has said that it could find no evidence of police brutality here.

ADMINISTRATION CRITICIZED

Nevertheless, Negroes complain that the Kennedy administration has little or no interest in their plight and has made no move to prosecute perpetrators of "legal terror."

A climate of fear and intimidation exists in the Negro community. For their part, whites seem to be engaged in a conspiracy of silence—voluntary or imposed. There is no apparent hope for a compromise.

The support among white segregationists for the policy of repression here was summed up by Tommy Hooks 3d, an insurance agent, former Sumter County superior court clerk and former president of the Americus Chamber of Commerce. He declared:

"I hope they will get any outsider for anything they can get them for until they find out that they are not wanted here."

Mr. Hooks and other whites argue that were it not for the presence of civil rights advocates from elsewhere this would be a hospitable, happy community with no Negro unrest.

This county seat town of 13,471 persons, a trading and manufacturing center 137 miles south of Atlanta, has known racial violence in the past.

Whites here and on surrounding farms became aroused in 1955 when they learned that Clarence L. Jordan, a native of western Georgia, and his wife had established a biracial center for communal living 8 miles southwest of here.

CAMP SURVIVED ATTACKS

Koinonia, as Mr. Jordan and his supporters called the camp, survived months of attacks by night riders armed with weapons ranging from pistols to machine guns. It also endured a boycott by merchants in this area who, for almost 4 years refused to do business with its operators.

Some whites, including Mr. Hooks, say Mr. Jordan and the presence of the camp is responsible for the county's present racial difficulties. Mr. Jordan denies this.

The current period of tension grew out of a voter registration campaign started last January by members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee from Albany, 38 miles to the south.

With the assistance of Donald Harris, a former student at Rutgers University, local Negroes formed the Sumter County Movement. Mr. Harris and others began visiting the surrounding cotton, peanut, and cattle farms to urge Negroes to apply for voter registration.

Negroes outnumber whites in the county 12,980 to 11,672. About 500 to 600 Negroes are now on the voting rolls, more than twice the number previously registered.

CAMPAIGN IS BLOCKED

Negroes then began a desegregation campaign against the Martin Theater. Eleven were arrested by the police last July 11 when they sought to buy tickets at the movie's white entrance.

The Sumter Movement subsequently failed in efforts to negotiate an agreement for desegregation of the theater, the public library, and other facilities.

On the night of last August 8, more than 200 Negroes poured out of a mass meeting at the Friendship Baptist Church and headed south toward the business section for a demonstration.

The Americus police, Sheriff Fred D. Chappell and other law enforcement officials halted the group. A police sergeant ordered Mr. Harris to tell the demonstrators to disperse.

The officer said that instead Mr. Harris had encouraged the crowd to continue demonstrating. He was then arrested.

At a hearing before Justice of the Peace M. Cooper Bradley officials testified that Mr. Harris had laid down in the street. They said that when they began dragging him away the mob attacked the police with bricks, bottles, and other missiles.

The rioters were dispersed by shots fired over their heads, but not before considerable damage had been done to business establishments in the area.

Mr. Harris; John Perdew, another Negro youth working for the student group; and Ralph Allen, a white who is a group fieldworker, were later charged with insurrection, unlawful assembly and rioting.

Mr. Harris was also charged with assault and battery and resisting arrest. The others were additionally charged with assault with intent to kill and aiding an attempt to escape.

Sheriff Chappell, in his testimony, said he had jabbed Mr. Harris with an electric cattle prod in an attempt to make him get up.

C. B. King, Jr., of Albany, attorney for the three students, asked the sheriff what Mr. Harris' reaction had been.

"He didn't move any more than he was moving before," the sheriff replied. "He was wiggling and twisting. That's the only thing I seen. And he was doing that when I went up there and he was doing it when I quit."

Mr. Bradley bound over the three students to the Superior Court Grand Jury, which convenes November 25. He denied their request for release on bond on the ground that insurrection is a capital offense.

The justice of the peace refused a plea by Mr. King that the insurrection charge had no standing. The lawyer contended that the U.S. Supreme Court had held this use of the statute in a similar Georgia case unconstitutional.

Mr. King filed a writ of habeas corpus yesterday in which he argued that the three students were being held without cause "in violation of due process of law secured by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of Georgia."

Judge T. O. Marshall set a hearing on this request for their release in Superior Court for next Tuesday.

Negroes attempted to stage another mass demonstration the night of August 9, but were overwhelmed by the police, sheriff's deputies, deputized white citizens and State troopers.

James Williams, an Americus Negro, asserted in a sworn statement issued later the troopers and policemen had halted him while he was walking along a street at night. He said one had clubbed him and another had jumped on his leg and had broken it.

"They kept asking me to get up," Mr. Williams said. "Then the State patrolmen pulled out a 'hot shot,' a long silver-looking stick run by batteries, and burned me."

Americus whites contend that Mr. Williams' leg was broken when he fell in a ditch.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1963]

LEGAL TERROR IN AMERICUS

How one Deep South community has used the forces of law to smash a desegregation drive by its Negro citizens was described in chilling detail yesterday in a Times dispatch from Americus, Ga. Four civil rights leaders face possible death sentences on charges of inciting an insurrection, and Negroes have made numerous complaints in the last 3 months of police brutality, arbitrary bail bond requirements and official harassment.

A Federal Bureau of Investigation report that it could find no evidence of police brutality has caused no abatement in Negro charges that "legal terror" is being applied to bar them from exercising their legal rights. Claude Sitton, the Times' chief Southern correspondent, found a climate of fear and intimidation among the town's Negroes and a belief that the Kennedy administration had little or no interest in their plight.

As in Birmingham, leaders of the white community blame all the trouble on outside agitators. They make it clear they favor the policy of repression and want it to continue. "I hope," says a former president of the Americus Chamber of Commerce, "they will get any outsider for anything they can get them for until they find out that they are not wanted here."

Getting people for "anything they can get them for" is the technique of the police state. It degrades the rule of law into an instrument of terror and oppression. President Kennedy has rightly declared to all Americans—white and Negro, North and South, big city and hamlet—that respect for law is the foundation for all freedom and all government. Unjust application of the law is the surest way to destroy such respect.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Sept. 26, 1963]

HELD IN GEORGIA—GROSS, WILLIAMS HIT HARRIS JAILING

The jailing—without bail—of a Rutgers University graduate in Americus, Ga., brought reverberations yesterday from both the Rutgers campus and the Nation's capital.

Dr. Mason W. Gross, Rutgers president, and U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, both protested the arrest of Donald S. Harris, 1963 Rutgers graduate, who has been in the Americus jail since August 8, on charges stemming from his participation in a Negro voter registration drive here.

Harris, 23, who was graduated from Rutgers in June, had gone to Georgia as a field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Committee. He is being held on five charges—one of which carries a possible death penalty.

"We should make our indignation felt," Dr. Gross told several thousand university students attending opening convocation exercises in Rutgers Stadium, Piscataway Township. "The atrocious stories from Americus, Ga., reveal that people are being treated wthout regard for any kind of legal procedure."

Harris, a Negro, faces five charges including attempt to incite an insurrection against the State of Georgia—the charge punishable by death.

The Rutgers-Douglass Chapter of the NAACP is selling black armbands on the campus and has joined with the student daily newspaper "The Targum," in a fund-raising campaign to aid Harris. A civil rights rally will be held at Voorhees Chapel on the Douglass College campus tonight at 7.

In Washington, Senator WILLIAMS took the floor of the Senate to make a strong protest against the treatment accorded Harris.

SHOWS SECRET PHOTOS

With him he carried pictures—"secretly taken and smuggled out"—which he said showed young demonstrators in Americus lodged in an abandoned newspaper building without furnishings, bedding, toilet facilities or adequate ventilation.

"It could be expected," the Senator said, "that the police might charge Harris with something like unlawful assembly and failure to obey the orders of an officer but it passes all understanding that he should also be charged with an attempt to incite insurrection, for which he faces a possible death penalty. Yet he was."

That charge, WILLIAMS said, had not been used since the 1930's. He added that the peace bonds of $40,000 placed against Harris were "incredible."

[From the Atlantic City (N.J.) Press, Sept. 27, 1963]

STUDENTS STAGE RALLY FOR JAILED GEORGIA NEGRO

NEW BRUNSWICK.—About 1,200 solemn students, many wearing black armbands, filled a college auditorium to overflowing Thursday night to protest racial violence in Birmingham, Ala., and the arrest of a colleague in Americus, Ga.

Several hundred more, unable to fit in the Voorhees Chapel on the Douglass College campus, sat on wooden chairs in an adjacent gymnasium, where the addresses of rally speakers boomed over a public announcement system.

Some young men and women wept openly when speakers discussed the plight of Donald S. Harris, 24, a 1963 graduate of Rutgers University who is in a Sumter County, Ga., jail charged with the capital offense of attempting to incite insurrection.

WITHOUT BAIL

Harris, a Negro, was one of four field secretaries of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, who were arrested during a demonstration August 8, in Americus. They have remained in jail without bond awaiting action by the grand jury.

Charles Scherrod, a SNCC representative, who directed Harris and other students in a voter registration drive in southwest Georgia, urged the students to promote demonstrations October 8 "on every college campus" protesting the action of local authorities in Americus.

"Look at me," Scherrod said, "a young fellow like you, though black, telling you that one of us, a colleague in education, is sitting in a jail this minute, that he possibly may be faced with death * * * if we have to die, then we have to die."

WE NEED YOU

Scherrod, who wears hornrimmed glasses and was clad in dungarees, told the assembly of mostly white students from Rutgers and its women's branch, Douglass:

"You're white and free and 21. You don't have to worry about this thing. But if you love your children, if you love what America can mean, you've got to hate this system. You've got to do something about this system.

"We need you. We need you. We need you."

Mrs. Nancy Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of Senator Estes Kefauver, the State of Tennessee and, in fact, the country lost a distinguished public servant whose legislative monuments will outlast many of his contemporaries. He left a very charming wife and family. Nancy Kefauver was a steadfast, helpful helpmate to her great husband. She, like many other widows of public officials, was faced with a difficult decision. She made her decision and made it wisely. As Mrs. Kefauver has indicated, her first responsibility is to her children, but I am also certain that her intimate knowledge of the trying days of an outstanding legislator's life brought her to the realization that the great State of Tennessee should be represented in the Senate by someone else.

No one, in my opinion, can exceed Nancy Kefauver's charm and her deep interest in the welfare of her State and her country. She knows that the selection of her husband's successor will not be an easy choice. She knows the trials and tribulations of public service and, while she has eliminated herself from consideration, I am certain that the people of Tennessee will be interested in the one whom she thinks will best follow in the footsteps of her great husband. The people of Tennessee should harken to her advice. I am sure they will.

In connection with this, a very appropriate editorial appeared in the great New York World-Telegram on September 24, 1963. That editorial follows:

MRS. KEFAUVER'S DECISION

Widows, sons, and other kinfolk often have taken the place of Members of Congress who died while in office.

Some have succeeded fathers or husbands by appointment of friendly Governors, others by winning subsequent elections.

Some have become outstanding legislators; most merely have held the seat.

After Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, died last month there were many proposals that Mrs. Nancy Kefauver succeed him. Although Gov. Frank Clement, of Tennessee, had filled the job on an interim basis, it was widely suggested, and speculated, that Mrs. Kefauver might run in the 1964 election.

But the wise and gracious Nancy has just put an end to all this in one sentence of uncommonly good sense:

"My first responsibility is to my children and I am not trained or qualified for public office."

The Communists Like That Capitalist Cash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, another great fraud is about to be perpetrated on the American public in the administration's proposed expansion of trade and resulting concessions to the Communist bloc.

The financial condition of the Communist bloc, and its devious money practices are effectively described in an article by Sterling Slappey which appeared in the September 16 edition of the Los Angeles Times. I insert this article into the RECORD at this point:

THE COMMUNISTS LIKE THAT CAPITALIST CASH

(By Sterling Slappey)

LEIPZIG, EAST GERMANY.—The Communist nations of Eastern Europe are caught up in an intensive effort to acquire hard Western currencies.

The Russian ruble, the East German mark, the Czech koruna, and all the rest are attractively printed and impressive enough in appearance, but beyond the Iron Curtain they are worth scarcely more than the paper they're printed on.

Communist embassies in the West cannot be financed with money backed by no more than promises of redemption and questionable government bonds. Nor can Western products be paid for with such currency.

Moreover, no knowledgeable spy would go abroad without a supply of banknotes issued by the government of his target country.

For these reasons and many others, Communist countries are going to incredible lengths in search of sound, reliable, adequately supported capitalist currency.

In recent months there have been indications that Communist governments are even competing with one another in search of the dollar, the pound sterling, the Swiss franc, the Dutch guilder, and the West German mark.

The Communists' techniques for luring hard money are many and varied. They range from ugly little quasi-legal schemes involving only a few dollars to grand strategies based on millions of barrels of cheap Soviet oil.

Here in Old Saxony, for example, there are shops—well hidden from the common East German—which sell unbelievably rare Western goods. Only Western money is accepted. These shops are state-owned and state-oper-

ated and the Communists wink at themselves while smashing Communist principle.

Prices are posted in American dollars: fine Scotch whisky is $2.95 a quart; American cigarettes, 20 cents a package; fine English lingerie, a quarter of the price it would bring in London.

Meissen china, once among the world's best, is still lovely and ranks high on East Germany's list of Western currency earners. Ninety percent of it goes into export channels.

The same percentage stands for Zeiss optical products, manufactured at Jena.

In their dollar campaign, Rumania and Bulgaria are competing for Western tourists with as much enthusiasm as any private enterprise agency in the West.

They have thrown open to Western tourists their Black Sea resorts of Varna and Mamaia, but all expenses—including transportation, meals, accommodations, and sightseeing fees—must be paid in advance in hard currency.

Bulgaria and Rumania lose money on such tourists. They charge only $150 for a 15-day trip, including round-trip air fare from Frankfurt. But the money they collect is sound and internationally negotiable.

In most Communist countries a foreigner cannot buy gasoline except with Western currency or with coupons bought in the West. And in East Germany the Communists charge 5 marks to use the access roads to West Germany—payable in West German marks.

One of the neatest schemes of all is practiced in Bulgaria with East German autos.

A three-stroke Wartburg car, which sells in East Germany for 18,000 East German marks, or $1,375, can be purchased in Bulgaria for 1,800 West German marks, or $450.

Bulgaria gets the cheap, sleazy Wartburg under the forced trade imposed on all Communist countries then sells it to westerners for little but good money.

From such relatively big operations the Communists plunge to the depths of monetary pettiness.

When you buy something with Western currency, you rarely get change in anything but the cheap currency of the nation where the purchase is made.

The Communists make a little here, lose a little there. But in these deals, they always come out ahead.

Representative Ken Hechler, Democrat, of West Virginia, Sponsors "Week in Washington" Program for High School Students—Educational Value Praised by Participant Mary E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this past summer 50 young high school juniors from West Virginia enjoyed a unique experience, thanks to the thoughtfulness and energy of Representative KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia. The winners participated in the "Week in Washington" program, initiated by Mr. HECHLER when he came to Congress in 1959.

Financed by business firms from West Virginia's Fourth Congressional District, this imaginative, educational experience gives the students an opportunity to observe the processes of government at close range, and to work with their elected Representative as he serves his constituents. In groups of three to six they come to the Nation's Capital, staying in a private home, and touring Federal agencies. They observe the Senate and the House in session, attend committee hearings, and meet governmental officials. During the evenings they are entertained at the Sylvan Theater or the Watergate Concerts.

Selections are made by a panel of three judges on the basis of a letter of application, scholastic record, and recommendations of teachers.

Mr. President, on September 26 and 27, 1963, the Youth Section of the Christian Science Monitor reported on Representative HECHLER's "Week in Washington" program as seen by one of this year's participants, Miss Mary E. Walker, of Red House, W. Va. She writes of the lasting values inherent in such an experience, and of the hospitality of the welcome extended by members of the Representative's staff. In concluding her letter to the Monitor, Miss Walker wrote:

> I had looked forward to entering the program for several years, and it went far beyond my expectations. Although I had never been exposed to a city larger than Charleston, W. Va., I felt at home in Washington, and returned home feeling much more attached to our National Government. I wish every young person in the Nation could spend such a week in Washington.

Mr. President, I echo the sentiments of Miss Walker as she assesses this significant educational opportunity. It is a pleasure to commend Representative KEN HECHLER for his resourcefulness in carrying forward such a worthwhile activity. He is providing genuine service to the young citizens of West Virginia, and through them, to the United States.

I request that the letter by Miss Mary E. Walker in the September 26 Christian Science Monitor, and Miss Walker's article of September 27, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON INTERNSHIP FOR HIGH SCHOOLERS

YOUTH SECTION: I read with interest your recent articles about Washington's intern program for college students, for I went to Washington this summer and attended several of the seminars held for them. I was an intern of sorts myself, taking part in the only intern program for high school students on Capitol Hill.

The enclosed article concerns this program, which is sponsored by an ex-college professor who felt that young Americans needed to be brought closer to their National Government. From 22 to 76 high school juniors come to Washington for a week at a time during the summer.

The program receives much publicity within the District, and is also well known on the Hill. The chairman of a Senate committee once halted a meeting and introduced "Congressman HECHLER and his kids," who were attending the meeting.

The only words which can express my feeling towards this program are "absolutely wonderful." I had looked forward to entering the program for several years, and it went far beyond my expectations. Although I had never been exposed to a city larger than Charleston, W. Va., I felt at home in Washington and returned home feeling much more attached to our National Government. I wish every young person in the Nation could spend such a week in Washington.

MARY E. WALTER,
Red House, W. Va.

WONDERFUL WEEK IN WASHINGTON: HIGH SCHOOLERS SEE GOVERNMENT IN ACTION

RED HOUSE, W. Va.—"Nothing I've ever done in Congress is as close to my heart as this program. I started it in 1959—the first year I came to Congress—and it gets better every year." These words were written by Congressman KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, about his "Week in Washington" program, in which three friends and I recently participated. The Congressman, who has a doctorate in political science and once taught at Marshall University in Huntington, now teaches politics on the scene.

The program is an attempt to bring young West Virginians closer to their National Government, and to give them a better understanding of it. It is open to all high school juniors who live in the Fourth District, which consists of 13 Ohio River Valley counties. Winners are chosen by a panel of three judges appointed by the Congressman, and no consideration is given to family politics. The funds for the program are provided by business firms in the district, and are administered by the American Political Science Association. The cost per student is about $75.

When the program began, 22 students were taken to Washington. The original plan was for 2 winners from each of the 10 counties, and for 2 from the city schools of Huntington, the largest city in the district. When the district acquired 3 more counties, this number became 28; but the interest in the program has become so great that this year Congressman HECHLER received about 350 applications, out of which 50 winners were selected. In 1962 additional contributions, including a $2,500 donation from Mrs. Charles H. Hechler, the Congressman's mother, made it possible to select 76 winners, the largest number yet.

As the program grew, changes were made. Selections were originally made by three judges within each county, but this was awkward, and left room for criticism when a judge and a winner were acquainted. Each applicant was formerly asked to write a one-page essay on "Why I Would Like To Work in My Congressman's Office," and judges placed much emphasis on it. Applicants are now required to write a brief letter explaining their desire to participate in the program, but more consideration is given to scholastic records and teachers' recommendations.

The winners travel to Washington in groups of three to six. Round trip train tickets are provided, and each student is given $20 to help defray expenses. This year, winners stayed in a private home, occupied for the summer by Rev. and Mrs. David Kirk. Transportation during the week was provided by either Reverend Kirk or Bob Nelson, a member of the Congressman's staff.

A "Week in Washington" winner usually spends his first afternoon seeing the well-known sights of Washington. On Monday morning he meets Congressman HECHLER and his staff, and is briefed on the business before Congress, committee meetings, and other events scheduled for that week. He will see both Houses of Congress in session several times, and meet Senators, Representatives, Cabinet members, and perhaps the President. He will spend part of his time

in the office—typing, addressing mail, rechecking files, clipping material for the Congressman's newspaper and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD scrapbook, and generally being exposed to all the work in a Congressman's office. In the evenings, he may attend Watergate concerts, armed services parades, and performances at the Sylvan Theater and the Carter-Barron Amphitheater.

Part of the schedule is the same every week. Each group goes to Andrews Air Force Base Monday morning when the President returns from his weekend. Each group tours the White House, Capitol, State Department, Supreme Court Building, Library of Congress, FBI Headquarters, Pan-American Union Building, the U.S. Information Agency section of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, and the Smithsonian Institution.

The remaining time is spent at the office or attending various events which occur during the week. While we four girls were in Washington, we attended three seminars held for the college interns. We heard Edward R. Murrow speak on the USIA, Congressman FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, orate on national defense, and James Hoffa defend his Teamsters Union.

We were on the scene at Averell Harriman's press conference following his testimony on the nuclear test ban treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We witnessed a House Rules Committee meeting on the vocational education bill, where Congressmen CARL PERKINS and ADAM CLAYTON POWELL testified.

We heard part of a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, with Attorney General Robert Kennedy testifying. We met the Attorney General after the meeting.

We were present when the House passed H.R. 7500, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We also saw a game between the Washingtno Senators and the Chicago White Sox. Before the big league game, we saw the congressional ball game, where the Democrats beat the Republicans 11-0.

Congressman HECHLER rates the program as highly successful, and we four girls agree wholeheartedly. Our week in Washington was the most informative and exciting week we had ever spent anywhere. We met people and went places; but we cannot measure the success of our week by whether or not we met a certain person or went a certain place. The real measure is the better understanding of our Government and the feeling of closeness to it that we gained from our trip.

MARY E. WALTER.

The Rewards of Meddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of developments in the Dominican Republic, where patriotic military and civilian officials found it necessary to remove President Bosch from office before he acquiesced to a Communist takeover of that country, it is absolutely necessary that the dangerous policy of the administration in embracing leftwing governments in Latin America be terminated.

This question and its complications are discussed in a timely fashion in an editorial in the Chicago Tribune of Monday, September 30, which I insert into the RECORD at this point.

THE REWARDS OF MEDDLING

General Imbert has told the Tribune's Latin American correspondent, Jules Dubois, that the army deposed Juan Bosch as President of the Dominican Republic because Bosch refused to act against the Communists in the face of a report that they intended to make the country a second Cuba.

The general, chief of internal security, gave Dubois a copy of a document summarizing a secret meeting of Dominican Communists. Their move was to have been made next January. The Communists felt that by then the people of the country would rise in revolt if the army moved against Bosch, whereupon the Communists would exploit the revolution to install themselves.

Once this was accomplished, the report said, the Dominican Republic would serve as a bridge for Communist operations against neighboring countries, among them Haiti and Venezuela.

When General Imbert showed the document to Bosch, pleading that the President crack down on the Communists, Bosch refused. At a second meeting, the President told army leaders that he would rather resign than take a stand against the Communists. So the army deposed him.

Bosch was the Kennedy State Department's baby. It had been carefully nursing him along. The Department indignantly suspended diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and cut off foreign aid.

It is evident from the facts that the administration, pursuing its usual penchant for "kingmaking" in the cause of reform and democracy in the Caribbean, picked another lemon. In fact, the whole sequence of events repeats the pattern which brought Castro to power in Cuba. The one difference, at least for the short run, is that there has been no Communist takeover in the Dominican Republic. If that is averted, the army, which is in the Kennedy bad books, will have been responsible.

The State Department's irresistible urge to leap from the fryingpan into the fire in its dealings with Latin American countries can be traced to the dogmatic view that dictators, even though they are strongly anti-Communist and on our side, are bad. The perfectionist view demands that they be routed out and that constitutional government be instituted in their place.

The Latin record of competence in self-government is notoriously poor and military juntas and dictators are familiar facts. Yet the academic outlook of the State Department ignores the reality.

Thus Batista of Cuba had to be toppled because he represented a "bad" dictatorship. American military aid was cut off while gunrunners were allowed to build up Castro, whose cause commanded much sympathy in the State Department. Batista, whatever else he may have been, was anti-Communist and pro-United States. With a considerable assist from Washintgon, he was driven out in favor of a new dictator who turned out to be a Communist who hates the United States and has converted Cuba into a Soviet beachhead in the Americas.

It was the same with Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. He was on our side, but he was a dictator and, necessarily, bad. So, when his regime ended, Bosch was wet-nursed as the man Washington thought could install constitutional government. He turned out to be a weak sister whom the Communists intended to use as a dupe in their own rise to power.

Maybe someday Washington will get over its habit of meddling to render barely tolerable situations far worse, but on the record to date this persistent urge seems incurable.

Nation Needs Goldwater Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration hatchetmen are scrambling desperately to cut down the growing confidence of the American people in BARRY GOLDWATER. The following editorial by Raymond Moley in the October 7 issue of Newsweek points out the one thing the anti-Goldwater partisans fear most is his commonsense. I agree with Mr. Moley, this kind of commonsense is something the Nation sorely needs today.

GOLDWATER'S EDUCATION

(By Raymond Moley)

In the press and in the talks which I have had with the anybody-but-Goldwater Republicans I note a sudden change in the criticism of the Arizona Senator. There is no longer a harping on the charge that he is an "extremist." Over the past 6 weeks GOLDWATER has in printed interviews and many press conferences stated his views on a great range of national and international issues. Even his most violent earlier critics grudgingly admit that he is not an extremist but a moderate.

Nor can it be claimed, as it was about Taft, that he would be an unpopular candidate. His recent appearances from coast to coast, culminating in a 42,000, world-series-size crowd in the Dodger Stadium in Los Angeles, have disposed of that attack.

A more subtle gambit is now current among anti-Goldwater Republicans. This is a snooty appraisal based upon the rather limited contribution to GOLDWATER's equipment provided by formal education and "deep" reading. These critics are mostly sitting proudly upon an A.B. or sporting a Phi Beta Kappa key (which may or may not have been earned in college). Arthur Krock, whom I revere as the foremost American political commentator, tells that another commentator, who is published over the Nation, said in a dinnertable conversation that GOLDWATER "is illiterate and third rate."

RESOURCEFUL MIND

Perhaps I have the academic credentials to comment upon this anti-Goldwater attack. But academic credentials are a minor qualification in grappling with public issues and national policies. The indispensable ingredients are a resourceful mind and an abundance of commonsense.

BARRY GOLDWATER's grammar school record was only fair. After a rather poor first year in high school, his father and his highly intelligent and practical mother sent Barry to the Staunton (Va.) Military Academy. After 4 years there he graduated, leaving behind a high opinion of his mastery of military matters in the cadet corps. He then entered the University of Arizona, but left in 1929 when his father died. At the age of 20 he entered the Goldwater merchant enterprise and helped carry it successfully through the depression. He ultimately became manager of the stores. When in 1952 his semi-learned opponent, the incumbent Senator, called him a "ribbon clerk," GOLDWATER replied that he sold not only ribbons but shoes, calico, and dishes, and that he was a "damned good clerk."

From 1941 to 1945 he served in the Air Force. In the years that followed, his great energies permitted him to learn more and

more of military affairs, civic problems, business enterprise, and his special interests—electronics and photography.

COMMONSENSE

After he entered the Senate he carried on studies at the Air University at Maxwell Field and wrote serious papers on such military matters as the Polaris submarine.

It is most relevant to suggest that since the Government spends half its substance on military matters and a good proportion of the remainder in technical affairs, this intellectual equipment could serve the Nation well. And since foreign affairs is so largely a matter of psychological appraisals, a knowledge of human nature should be indispensable.

Also, since a President, as Woodrow Wilson once said, is the major spokesman to as well as for the Nation, GOLDWATER's capacity to make matters of state intelligible to the people should clear up much of the confusion that now afflicts public knowledge of what Government is doing and planning.

I recently asked a priest and editor with whom I have had a long correspondence to explain an obscure passage which I encountered in my reading. He replied:

"Today there is a cult of obscurantism. The 'professional' scholar must lapse into his own form of hieroglyphics. Don't let it bother you. Today the tendency is to say, 'The man is crazy. He is talking sense'."

If GOLDWATER's reliance on commonsense is what is now occupying the attention of critics, I am content. For commonsense in high places is what the country sorely needs.

Pennsylvania's Good Governor, Bill Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of the Congress an excellent article from Time magazine, issue of September 13, 1963, entitled "Republicans":

REPUBLICANS

MAKING THEIR RECORDS

Goldwater and Rockefeller remain the names most frequently mentioned in talk about the 1964 Republican presidential nomination. But if both Barry and Rocky were to falter, the most likely GOP choice would be either Pennsylvania's Gov. William Scranton or Michigan's Gov. George Romney. Both took office last January, replacing Democratic Governors in key States with staggering economic problems. How each has met those problems may yet dictate the choice of next year's GOP nominee. An interim report on their gubernatorial records:

Pennsylvania's Scranton took office with State unemployment at a horrendous 9.4 percent. He was presented by outgoing Democrat David Lawrence with a budget carrying a $53 million deficit—and, because of already authorized new spending projects, holding the red ink even to that amount required raising $175 million more than State tax revenues brought in the previous year.

Moreover, of some 80,000 State employees, about 60,000 held no civil service job tenure, were subject to the will and whim of Pennsylvania's notoriously patronage-minded politicians. Teachers' salaries were abysmally low and highway construction was behind schedule.

Scranton, 46, went right to work, paring projected State financial obligations by $90 million. But even that would have left a total deficit of about $138 million. To raise the needed revenue, Scranton last April went before the legislature, asked for a hefty increase in the general sales tax, along with hiked cigarette and liquor taxes.

By numbers, Republicans controlled the Pennsylvania House 109 to 101, the Senate by 27 to 23. But there was bitter factionalism within the ranks of the GOP legislators. It took Scranton more than a month of hard-nosed, behind-the-scenes persuasion before the legislature passed a bill that raised the sales tax from 4 to 5 percent. Scranton can now lay claim to a balanced budget, a feat that had been considered impossible only a few months before.

He also tackled Pennsylvania's patronage mess. He wanted more than 50,000 State employees put under civil service regulations that would place them safely beyond the reach of pork-barreling politicians. Again, Scranton pushed his proposals through a reluctant legislature.

He next won legislative approval of many more controversial proposals: $35 million to raise school subsidies, the bulk to go for higher teachers' salaries; $12.4 million for loans to struggling new and staggering old industries that could bolster the State's economy; new tax breaks for industry; $262 million for the State's highway building program; election reforms.

Under his administration, Pennsylvania's unemployment rate dropped steadily all year, was down to 6.5 percent in August. He pitched into a hard-hitting national advertising campaign that promised new Pennsylvania industries "100-percent plant financing, a State-aided job-training program, a favorable tax climate." Since Scranton took office, 121 companies have announced that they will build new plants in Pennsylvania, another 138 have said that they plan to expand.

Last week, back from a hard-earned vacation, Scranton returned to his arduous Statehouse job. He met with his industrial development advisory committee, cut a ribbon to open a new highway, read a batch of ceremonial proclamations every day, took a thick sheaf of paperwork home every night. He still insisted that he had no presidential ambitions—but, as some of his admirers recalled, he had to be drafted to run for Governor.

Revenue Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the action by the House in passing the Revenue Act of 1963 was an effective declaration of our intention to stimulate economic growth, provide the American consumer and American business with more opportunity to invest according to their own decisions, and strengthen the national economy.

In any tax bill, the decisions which must be made are often difficult ones. This was the first general tax revision in almost 10 years. The Ways and Means Committee studied volumes and volumes of material on tax matters, the evidence accumulated since 1954 of the way our tax laws actually worked, and the recommendations of many witnesses on desirable changes. Even so, we all recognize that the total language of the bill constitutes the best joint agreement among members of the committee and of the House, rather than a perfect bill.

The difficulties of working on such legislation are not always recognized. I was pleased, however, to read a fine news column by John McKelway in the Washington Star, under the title of the Rambler column, which hits a striking note of the atmosphere of the House in its considerations.

This column, and an editorial in the distinguished periodical Business Week pay special tribute which I believe should be generally recognized to our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, who played such an important part in this legislation. I offer the text of both articles for publication in the RECORD so that they may be brought to the attention of the House.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

THE RAMBLER FINDS A WORK OF ART

(By John McKelway)

The Rambler had the impression the tax-cut bill was a fairly simple issue—cut or don't cut—and decided to drop in on the debate in the House.

For a while, everything fell into place.

Representative COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi, objected to the rule on the bill. He said his colleagues were being gagged in that amendments could only be offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. No one disagreed with him and no one did anything and the rule was accepted.

Mr. COLMER did make an interesting point on another subject. Discussing the Nation's financial condition, he said that there was a time when he was worried about the future of his grandchildren. "Now," he said, "I'm worried about my own."

But soon the House was floating quietly along on the words of Representative MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, a suave, red-faced man in a dark suit, perhaps the most effective Member of that body, chairman of Ways and Means.

He called the bill, the tax cut, the most important piece of legislation affecting the economic front since he came to Congress 25 years ago. It would breathe new life into our economy, he said. Answering Republicans who want to set a limit on spending if we are to have a tax cut, Mr. MILLS pointed out the President can't spend $1 more than Congress appropriates.

He completed his usual, decisive performance in 35 minutes and had them applauding on both sides of the aisle. He walked away from the well of the House and began shaking hands with other Members, tilting his chin upward a bit and looking them straight in the eye from a few inches away. He even sought out a few Members, sitting alone, who had not rushed to congratulate him. Quite a guy.

He was followed by Representative CURTIS, a dry but factual speaker, and Representative KEOGH, who called himself a little boy from Brooklyn, bowled over by the brilliance of Mr. MILLS.

The Rambler's mind and eyes began to wonder. The debate was orderly. There were no sneaky questions. The members seemed cautious and actually were listening.

He picked up a document and discovered he had the actual bill in hand. Sweet Agnes. It was 310 pages long, as heavy as a novel.

He tried to read a section:

"Deduction for estate tax—If an amount is required to be included under section 422 (c)(1), 423(c), or 424(c)(1) in gross income of the estate of the deceased employee or of a person described in paragraph (1), there shall be allowed to the estate or such person a deduction with respect to the estate tax

attributable to the inclusion in the taxable estate of the deceased employee of the net value for estate tax purposes of the option."

TOTALLY INCOMPREHENSIBLE

The report on the bill, the explanation, was even more detailed and complicated. It reads at one point: "Your committee's bill provides that in determining the tax which is attributable to the income subject to averaging, the first income subject to tax is to be the ordinary income not eligible for averaging."

There were, however, a few notes the Rambler was able to pick up. Hearings on the tax cut and other revisions in tax laws, had started back on February 6. They continued until March 27. For 27 days, members and staff members of the Ways and Means Committee had listened to testimony—one of the most tiring practices in the civilized world. The words collected were enough to fill seven volumes.

Executive sessions followed. The bill was presented to the House September 13.

To one who has trouble with addition and subtraction, the tax bill alone—passed or not—is a remarkable achievement, the product of a collection of fine minds. Perhaps it's in order to suggest a joint session of Congress to honor the men who, from time to time, revise tax laws. They could ride up the Avenue together, like the astronauts.

[From Business Week, Sept. 28, 1963]

A STEP AHEAD FOR THE TAX BILL

Few pieces of legislation in recent years have generated as much confusion or produced as many misdirected arguments as the tax bill that finally cleared the House of Representatives this week. The trouble started with the administration's unhappy effort to couple badly needed tax reduction with "reform" measures that were not true reforms but disguised increases. Once that issue was settled, it was replaced by the ill-conceived attempt to make relief contingent on a cut in Federal spending.

Fortunately for the country, a majority of the House was able to see through the smoke to the central issue: the fact that the United States must cut the burden of its taxes if we are to achieve the levels of output and employment we have set as our goals.

The man primarily responsible for driving this point home—as well as for putting the bill into its present form—was Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee. He deserves full credit for the skill and wisdom with which he used the powers of his office.

The tax bill now goes to the Senate where it will not have WILBUR MILLS to look out for it. Perhaps it is too much to hope that the Senate will not insist on covering in detail all the ground that was traversed so painfully in the hearings and discussions in the House. It certainly is not too much to hope that the Senate, like the House, eventually will see the compelling logic of tax reduction and give the country the relief it so badly needs.

Foreign Aid Cuts Hinder Work of Cooperative League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a strong appeal to restore foreign aid cuts has been made on behalf of the 15 million members of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. by its executive director, Jerry Voorhis in a letter to "Dear Congressman." For years the league has been working to firmly establish systems of private ownership in developing countries, especially Latin America. The cooperative form of private ownership has proven highly successful in offering these people an alternative to both their old systems of servitude and the promises of the Communists.

Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Cooperative League, recently testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His highly sensible proposals for rural development in these lands drew bipartisan praise as reported by Shelby Southard in the Co-op Report for September 1963. As Congress continues its study of the foreign aid program, we would do well to keep in mind Mr. Lincoln's remarks that our appropriation "be mixed with the ideas of democracy and self-help represented by the cooperative concept."

The above-mentioned open letter and report follow:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE
OF THE U.S.A.,
Chicago, Ill., September 13, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Many, many people in this country are shocked and dismayed by the apparent willingness of the Congress to cut the heart out of the foreign aid program of our country. This letter is to urge you to do all in your power to reverse this tragic mistake.

For many years the Cooperative League has been using all the resources it could put together to work with people in newly developing countries, particularly Latin America, in order to enable them to develop their own desperately needed economic institutions along the lines of private ownership and freedom. If any of these countries are to escape communism, they have got to have an alternative to replace their old feudal systems. The one alternative which the people in those countries most readily accept is a cooperative form of private ownership. We have made a great deal of progress in many of these countries. We know that we have changed the anti-American and largely pro-Castro attitude of a great many South American leaders by the work we have done with them.

We have helped organize a federation of free and independent cooperative organizations in all countries of the Western Hemisphere except Cuba, Haiti, and Paraguay. This will give us a people-to-people relationship with organizations in these countries which could become invaluable to the cause of freedom.

If anything like the deep cuts in foreign aid that the House of Representatives has projected are actually carried out, our ability to carry on this work effectively will become almost hopeless. And our efforts are, of course, only a small part of the total effort of the foreign aid program as a whole.

Delegates to the policymaking Congresses of the Cooperative League have commended the Agency for International Development for its efforts to bring higher living standards to free people. They have repeatedly endorsed the policy that the United States must use such measures as will offer substantial hope of economic and social betterment to the distressed people of the world.

On behalf of some 15 million members of our organization and its affiliates, I beg you to vote to restore these ill-advised cuts.

Nothing could be more to the liking of the pro-Castro forces of the Western Hemisphere than the repudiation of the pledges the United States made at Punta del Este. And such repudiation is what these foreign aid cuts will necessitate.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS,
Executive Director.

EVERY TIME YOU HELP SOMEONE ELSE, YOU HELP YOURSELF—CONGRESSMEN PRAISE LEAGUE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN AID TESTIMONY

(By Shelby Southard)

In a rare example of bipartisan warmth, a sizable number of Members of both Houses of the 88th Congress hailed testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Murray D. Lincoln, Cooperative League president, in support of the 1963 foreign aid bill.

Typical of the 28 Senators who commented was the reaction of Senator JACOB JAVITS, Republican of New York, who said: "It is indeed good to see such foresightedness and leadership undertaken by the Cooperative League. Helping people to help themselves has always been in the best American tradition, and I commend you for your perception."

Senator JAVITS added that he believed "the private sector of the U.S. economy should take increasing part in the development of less developed nations, and I have consistently supported private enterprise provision of the foreign assistance act, adding to it a number of ideas myself."

Senator DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, the minority leader said, "I believe the proposals * * * you have indicated would be of real value. I am especially interested in the proposal to establish fertilizer plants abroad."

Commenting on the success of the historic Marshall plan, Lincoln's testimony pointed out that "the focus today must be on the developing countries of Africa, Latin America, and Asia, where we are seeing exciting instances of the magic of self-help. Through people-to-people and technical know-how, these scattered instances must be fused into a trend—and they can be if we combine the instincts of our heart, the intelligence of our head, and the financial support required to translate the dreams of heart and head into commonsense reality."

"Each cooperative," Lincoln said, "is a small proving ground for its membership to practice democracy—to see democracy functioning on a stage small enough for the least sophisticated member to understand. It is a way to move this concept from the capital city to the village square and countryside, out of the hands of government functionaries and into the hands of the rank and file of people—the only place where it can have reality, in the lives of ordinary men."

Commenting on the testimony, Democratic Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, said: "The contribution (of cooperatives) to our domestic economy as well as to the foreign aid program is one of the sources of this country's strength." He said he hoped American cooperatives active in the foreign aid program would be able to convey "along with economic benefits the spirit and ideals for which the movement stands."

In the same vein, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, noted that "* * * I am always interested in responsible foreign aid. Your method seems to be just that. Development without detrimental entanglement for any of the parties concerned is an admirable goal. * * * Self-help without the tool of knowing the correct procedure or missing some of the necessary resources is an impossible task. On the other hand, outright gifts are often misused and little appreciated. The only successful approach, as Mr. Lincoln indicates, is helping the underdeveloped to help themselves."

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin's other Senator, said, "I have been convinced for some

time that the exportation by our country of the cooperative idea is among the most valuable and effective things we can do in * * * oversea development. * * * I will give my wholehearted support to such endeavors." Words of specific commendations also came from Senators INOUYE, of Hawaii, METCALF, of Montana, and MCGOVERN, of South Dakota.

Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, couched his approval in these words: "I believe that the cooperative movement in the United States deserves a world of credit for the part it is playing in supporting our foreign aid program and in encouraging the development of * * * the democratic cooperative movement * * * overseas."

The House minority whip, Representative LES ARENDS of Illinois, said Lincoln's testimony "is marked for my 'take home' file for weekend reading," because, he explained, "I know I will find it informative." The statement reminded Representative FRANK BOW, Republican, of Ohio, of a meeting in his district at Canton where he had first learned what an Ohio cooperative (Nationwide Insurance) was doing to promote social welfare in Central America. (This self-help effort at the outset involved only employees and agents but now has attracted support of policyholders as well.)

In Lincoln's testimony, his idea of $100 million in loans to build fertilizer plants abroad sparked the most concentrated reaction from the lawmakers. About this proposal (originated by Howard Cowden, now a Nationwide consultant), Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, said, "I would agree that there is much merit in this suggestion * * *. Technicians and agronomists are presently teaching farmers in many countries the various uses of fertilizer * * *. In Cambodia, for example, a weed was recently discovered which, when processed, served beautifully as a fertilizer * * *. (Your) suggestions deserve extensive consideration." Representative HALPERN, Republican, of New York, also expressed particular appreciation for the Cowden suggestion regarding fertilizer plants.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM LINCOLN'S FOREIGN RELATIONS TESTIMONY

"We ask that the sum involved * * * be mixed with the ideas of democracy and self-help represented by the cooperative concept so that they may achieve the maximum good in the lands where they will be spent. * * * The institutions we are helping (local people) to start are such that they will in time develop their own local leadership and we can turn it over to them and withdraw.

"You can remember the first appearance (in rural America) of the county agents, the extension workers, the home demonstration ladies. The experiment farms, the 4-H Clubs, the rural electric co-ops, the soil conservation practices which followed were forerunners of the exploding productivity of America's farms today. These developing countries face most of the same problems rural America knew at the turn of the century.

"Palm trees instead of pine, camels instead of mules, and flowing sheets instead of overalls—these may make the scene more exotic, but * * * it's the same story of men wanting to lick their own problems and needing to be given the know-how and a "grubstake"—whether they ask for it in Arabic, Spanish, Swahili, or Hindi.

"One of our directors, Howard Cowden, helped half a million farm families build their own tremendous economic institutions. He has suggested that $100 million in loans or stock investments be made available through AID for building fertilizer plants in the developing countries.

"He estimates that $100 million would build at least 10 new plants which would produce 3,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia per day. Agronomists tell us that one dollar's worth of nitrogen, applied where nitrogen is a limiting factor, will produce $4 worth of additional crops. * * * The fertilizer produced under this program with a value of $270,000 per day would create new foodstuffs totaling $1,080,000 per day. Fertilizer produced in 320 days per year could create new wealth valued at $345 million in 1 year with a $100 million investment. Furthermore, these plants would yield about 30 percent on their sales and would, therefore, pay for themselves in approximately 3 years of operation. * * * In the long run these investments could repay themselves with interest while performing a specific national and international service.

"Another specific suggestion is that $10 million be set aside as a pilot operation to allow AID to make such loans to marketing, purchasing, credit, or service-type cooperatives and other associations of farmers, and that a program be undertaken to make such loans within this limited authorization.

"The great voluntary organizations of America should be used even more effectively than they are today in our international assistance programs.

"We believe that every time you help someone else you help yourself."

Congress Looks at Electronic Data Processing Automation in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks:

CONGRESS LOOKS AT ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING AUTOMATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Chairman ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, before the Washington chapter of the Systems and Procedures Association, September 25, 1963)

When you sent an invitation to our subcommittee for a speaker for your meeting this evening, I decided that I would like to accept the invitation myself. This gives me the opportunity of becoming acquainted with your association, and at the same time telling you something about our work.

My understanding is that you would like me to discuss automatic data processing in the Federal Government and the results of our subcommittee hearings and reports. This is a good subject, and of interest to all of us, but I shall talk about EDP (electronic data processing) rather than ADP (automatic data processing), if you don't mind. In addition, I should like to tell you about some of the other EDP activities of Congress so that you can appreciate how deeply we have become involved in this new technology. With the foregoing objectives in mind, I have selected the topic, "Congress Looks at EDP Automation in the Federal Government."

EDP—A USEFUL TOOL

Now, fortunately, Congress isn't like the fellow who in commenting on the atom bomb test ban said that he is all for it if it works. Congress (and I believe I speak for the majority) knows that EDP works, and our job then is rather one of making it work better.

In general, Congress looks at EDP as a useful tool which should be applied sensibly, skillfully, and economically to help perform the work of the Federal Government and I am sure my fellow Democrats and Republicans alike would agree. As a matter of fact, it may be of interest to you to know that there is a total absence thus far of partisanship on EDP issues. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have received excellent cooperation and support from my Republican associates, as well as from the Democratic side.

Now, I referred to applying EDP sensibly. By this I mean getting away from the idea that an EDP system is a status symbol. There is still some inclination for everyone to want a big system (we used to call these fellows "the erector set boys" and a few of them are still with us), but by and large agencies have become more mature in these respects. Congress, I can assure you, wants agencies to have EDP systems when they need them, but certainly not for purposes of creating some kind of an organization image.

I said also that Congress wants EDP applied skillfully. Such a system certainly is not much good unless an agency has the expertise to use it and this is where we are falling short in many cases. Our vision of EDP potential is not sufficiently forward looking; we are not working hard enough toward integrated systems; we look at EDP as a tool to be used in one application in one bureau or one department when we must look at it from a Government-wide point of view, as the Comptroller General has pointed out.

In regard to applying EDP economically, have you ever stopped to realize that no one knows how much EDP has saved the Federal Government? Everyone does his best to respond to our questions about savings, but as our committee report will say, the information simply is not available. Congress goes along with the agencies when they say that they now process their workloads faster and cheaper, but frankly, we'll just have to have statistics to back up some of these claims.

EFFECTS OF EDP ON JOB SECURITY

In encouraging greater use of EDP, I want to make clear that Congress has certain reservations. These concern the relationship of automation to unemployment. We want economy in the operations of the Federal Government, but Congress is concerned about the effect of automation on unemployment, and we certainly want the employees of the Federal Government to be treated with full consideration for the security of their jobs. I am happy I can tell those of you who are Government executives and supervisors that so far you have done a good job in protecting the job security of your employees. You are doing this by planning the conversion of operations to EDP well in advance, by keeping employees informed of what is going on, and by retraining employees for the new EDP jobs, and by avoiding costly RIF procedures.

We want to commend you for what you have done, but also we want to caution you that much remains to be done. There are a number of individual cases of Government employees being automated out and some Federal employees have had their grades cut. Others have been offered the choice between moving to another city or being separated. Now, moving from one city to another is an expensive matter. On the average, it costs an employee and his family about $550 out of their own pockets, and the amount can run into thousands if the sacrifice sale of a home is involved. Government transfer allowances are just not adequate at present, and our committee is looking into the need for remedial legislation in this matter.

I want also to ask you to look ahead to the future when we will face the real effects of EDP automation on job opportunities and

I would suggest that you take care not to be misled. Each of you has heard at one time or another that there is no such thing as technological unemployment. For example, recently the vice president of a large corporation wrote to me saying, and I quote:

"Obviously, you are greatly concerned about the job loss as a result of automation and we all should be. However, some of us are of the persuasion that these jobs won't be lost but rather the nature of jobs will change. But perhaps more importantly, the direct cost dollars released by increased efficiency will be put to work to create more jobs for all."

Now, I like this idea and I hope the gentleman is right, but it is very difficult to tell this to a person who has just been automated out of his job. He doesn't take much satisfaction from the theory that he doesn't have anything to worry about now because if he's patient, eventually this new technology will take care of him. And let me repeat now what I said earlier, that we just don't have the facts to prove that we have such increased efficiency.

I have heard it said also that through technological advances we won't be worrying about the number of jobs in the future. Rather, we are going to be worrying about what to do with our spare time. Being naturally lazy, this idea appeals to me also, just so that as unemployed we don't make a career out of spare time.

Now, maybe some of you read in a recent editorial in the Washington Daily News the suggestion that we should stop fretting about automating people out because the number of jobs in the Federal Government is increasing, and that maybe we should start worrying about the taxpayer. I think EDP is serving the purposes of the taxpayer and that it wouldn't be worth much if this were not the case. Also, I don't think this country could have reached the high gross national product of recent months without automation—if you don't believe me, go out and try to hire a good secretary.

Of all of these views, I subscribe more to some of the ideas of Roy Hallbeck, President of the AFL-CIO Postal Clerks, presented in a two-part report in the News by John Cramer in the September 6 and September 9 issues. If you haven't already read them, I suggest that you do.

Mr. Hallbeck starts by discussing "* * * the ability of certain creatures or things to perform feats which experts say are impossible.

"Or, conversely, their inability to do the very things they were engineered to do best."

He goes on to take the example of the bumblebee, and says—"any scientist worth his salt can prove absolutely that this bug will never fly because his design violates every known principle of aerodynamics.

"But the bumblebee doesn't know this."

Mr. Hallbeck wonders whether EDP systems, having been designed for the job, will perform equally well in opening "new vistas of economic progress and social enlightenment."

I am sure that this is the hope of all of us, but we cannot proceed on hope alone.

The second section of Mr. Hallbeck's comments refers to President Kennedy's statement that "the major domestic challenge of the Sixties is to maintain full employment at a time when automation is replacing men." Mr. Hallbeck discusses the possibility of a Presidential Commission on Automation "to study, identify and describe the major types of worker displacement likely to occur during the next decade." Mr. Hallbeck mentions also that "our committee has just asked the President for an evaluation by the Budget Bureau of the impact of automation in Government." I shall go into this a little further later on. The message I want to leave with you at this point is to be watchful in the future of EDP automation and its effects upon employment. Anticipate these effects and plan ahead so that we can have the benefits of automation with a minimum of hardship and dislocation on personnel.

Before I leave this subject, I should like to mention one area which is of considerable concern to me personally. This is the possible effect of automation in the Post Office Department as the new ZIP Code comes into use. Let me quote from a recent report made by the Post Office Department:

"It is apparent that some device must be developed to process the possible 15 billion ZIP coded documents that cannot be presorted. To this end the Post Office Department has initiated a development effort to design automatic address reading equipment which can mechanically read the ZIP Code. It is expected that this optical character recognition (OCR) device will be hooked up with the sorting machines which are currently in use. The OCR principle will require the use of the previously mentioned code sorting technique; i.e., an electronic memory to store the cross reference between ZIP Code and the pocket in which the letter is to be placed. This device will make it possible to simplify internal post office processing for ZIP coded mail which has not been presorted."

Now, what happens to over 100,000 postal clerks if and when optical scanning takes over? I know that the clerks are already talking about being "Zipped" out of a job and I want to assure you that we will watch this development closely.

EDP COMES TO CONGRESS

To go on with other observations about the Congress on EDP automation, I am not sure that Members know what to think. In addition to the articles I have just drawn to your attention, a Congressman must have seen considerable EDP coverage in his CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and it even has been mentioned in connection with the sentence that a person known to all of us received for failure to file a tax return. EDP, the story tells us, in effect, may bring about uniform justice in enforcing tax laws. Another personality in the news recently discussing the Defense Department referred somewhat disparagingly to "those who rely on computers to determine policy."

At this point the individual Congressman might say to himself, "Is it any wonder EDP is always coming up in my committee meetings." He thinks, too, about the work his colleague, Mr. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, is engaged in. He is looking into the possibility of a national science and information retrieval center. But what the Congressman recalls most vividly is the afternoon of July 18, 1963, when the entire body of the House of Representatives was involved for the better part of 6 hours in debating an EDP issue. Irrespective of everything the Congressman has heard and read, he wonders now as he wondered then how EDP made the floor of the Congress as a major piece of legislation.

I had addressed the House on a previous occasion in support of Comptroller General Campbell's EDP purchase versus lease report of March 1963, and therefore discussion of the subject was not new to the Members, but full scale debate was quite another thing.

The occasion was consideration of the bill H.R. 5171 of my colleague, JACK BROOKS, of Texas, which if ultimately enacted into law would centralize authority over EDP in the General Services Administration. The reaction of the individual Members of the Congress was varied. Some commended the Committee on Government Operations for bringing the subject to the floor because EDP is an important part of our budget and the cost of EDP is certainly going to increase. Others asked questions about the bill and others proposed amendments. Some, and I dare say it was a goodly number, were amazed and chagrined at the complete involvement of the Congress in EDP. Several of us who were directly associated with EDP or with agencies which would be affected by the bill, spoke out against it vigorously.

For my part, I agreed with the Comptroller General's recommendations which started the whole issue, but I could not go along with the bill. My position is set forth in the interim report of the subcommitee, and I quote:

"The subcommittee recommends, therefore, that the President authorize the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to evaluate the present EDP policies and practices in the Federal agencies and to develop guidelines for future Federal policy on EDP. In conducting the review, the Director should (1) consult widely with Members of Congress and with representatives of the principal Federal agencies, industry, business, labor, professional groups, and others concerned, (2) cooperate fully with pertinent congressional committees and keep Congress advised periodically concerning his progress, and (3) on or before June 30, 1964, submit a report and make recommendations to the President and to Congress for such administrative and legislative changes as are determined to be in the public interest.

"The subcommittee proposes, therefore, that a letter recommending the above actions be sent by the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the President."

Chairman Murray's letter to President Kennedy was sent on August 1. Only last week a reply was received from the President which reads, in part, as follows:

"House Report No. 627, Interim Report on the Use of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Agencies, which you forwarded with your letter to me of August 1, 1963, has been reviewed with much interest. It deals with many of the problems involved in the use of automatic data processing (ADP) equipment for which there is no easy solution.

"I agree with your recommendation and I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to initiate a study of the administration of automatic data processing in the executive branch of the Government, along the lines you have suggested. The Director will submit appropriate recommendations to me and to the Congress by June 30, 1964."

I am sure you know also that EDP is before the Senate, or the other body, as we say. Senator DOUGLAS has introduced an EDP bill, and, of course, the Senate has the Brooks bill to consider. So now, both Houses of the Congress are involved.

The staff of the Senate Government Operations Committee has gone about the job very methodically, beginning with a briefing session on the various aspects of EDP and I am sure that they will be looking into the entire matter most thoroughly and give every Federal agency a chance to be heard.

ROLE OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS

Now, how did the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics become so deeply involved in EDP? You all, know, I am sure, that the Bureau of the Census was the pioneer of EDP applications in the Federal Government. Naturally, as EDP found its way into all census operations, it was necessary for our subcommittee to evaluate EDP as a part of the census program. The same thing occurred in all of the data collection and compilation responsibilities of the subcommittee. We simply couldn't review the effectiveness of these operations without some understanding of EDP technology. Now since, by House Resolution, our subcommittee handles the investigation phase for the Congress of all data compilation activities in the Federal Government, we could not discharge our responsibility these days if we ignored EDP. Moreover, the importance of this responsibility is now being accentuated by the increased recognition

given to people in EDP systems and workers in the Federal Government are, of course, the concern of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. So, our subcommittee has a two-way interest in EDP and we plan to pursue these interests "with vigah," to coin a phrase.

ADDITIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Now, before I close, let me briefly summarize some of our subcommittee conclusions, one subject at a time.

Organization: We conclude that the agencies' EDP organizations need improving and that the matter should be carefully reviewed. This includes the responsiveness of the EDP organization to the mission for which it was established. We think that EDP cannot be mixed in with a lot of other things and operated successfully. Our recommendation is that EDP be run by an official at the top of the organization and that official should be solely responsible for EDP functions and EDP functions only.

Management: While our hearings were going on last summer, we were receiving reports from the General Accounting Office about agency shortcomings. Frankly, we heard a lot more about the real problems of the agencies from the General Accounting Office than we heard from the agencies themselves in direct testimony. This leads us to believe that agencies should be more alert to their problems on their own and that they should report them. We have recommended that agencies undertake management review with this purpose in mind.

Now, in order to solve the man/machine ratio problem, we have to educate the top managers, and let me quote from some Navy testimony on this point:

"The educational problem that we have is not with technicians solely, in developing competent individuals to develop and make ways of making use of the equipment; but it is with top management, getting them alerted to what can be done to assist them in better decision-making, determining what appraisal performance indexes they need. This is what is going to govern the ultimate sophistication of computers, eventually."

EDP Contracts: For the most part, agencies just don't know how many EDP systems are being used by contractors in connection with Government work, nor how they are being utilized, nor whether it is proper for the contractors to have title to the machines rather than the Government, and so on. The Bureau of the Budget's 1963 inventory, to be released soon, will show 1,248 in-house EDP systems. Contractors may be using this many again, and maybe more. The subcommittee thinks we should know a great deal more about them. So does the Comptroller General, who is looking into these arrangements in a number of agencies.

Man/Machine Ratio: I think the Navy was the first Department to go on record that we need a better balance between people and machines. Machines seem to have gotten out ahead, somehow, and it wasn't until the Department of Defense clarified the point for us that we realized that personnel costs are half of all EDP costs. As we say in our report, never have we heard so little about so much.

You all know, I'm certain, that the greatest personnel need is in programing. We need more and better programers, and we need a breakthrough in automatic programing technology. These days we are fortunate if we can keep current with our regular programing load, let alone reviewing and rewriting old programs, and this situation is costing the Federal Government money, plenty of it.

Now, some good work is being done on automatic programing languages, but there are differences of opinion about them and the arguments seem endless. We think it's time we began to break some of these programing bottlenecks.

Working Conditions: I now would like to talk to you for a minute about people whom I consider to be the unsung heroes of EDP. They are the men and women who through the early hours of the morning, and on weekends and holidays, keep the reels spinning, the circuits operating, and the programs from looping. I think we should fully recognize the contribution these employees are making to the EDP programs of their respective agencies. I think, too, that management should see to it that the conditions under which they work are as pleasant as possible and that accommodations and facilities for them are adequate. By that, I mean adequate transportation or parking facilities, hot food if they want it, and anything else that contributes to their well-being. Certainly, an employee who works irregular hours should not be expected to undergo hardships simply because he is working on a night shift.

Reports, statistics, and evaluation guides: With EDP, we have the typical example of the shoemaker's children not having shoes. If you think of the reports, statistics, and printouts turned out by EDP systems, you might expect that we would have similar comprehensive information in regard to EDP itself; but, outside of the annual inventory of the Bureau of the Budget, we have very little information about EDP for the Government as a whole.

We need a Goverment-wide reporting system of EDP activities, including personnel and personnel costs as well as machines. We need to back the system up with measures of the effectiveness of our utilization of EDP equipment, and we should be able to evaluate our EDP accomplishments.

Purchase versus lease: Of all the EDP problems we have, this one is the most controversial. In this audience, I wonder how many of you purchase your EDP systems? Would you raise your hands. How many lease them? How many don't know?

This is not a problem in Government alone, you know. The differences of opinion in private industry are just as divergent. We had one insurance company testify in favor of renting its equipment. Another insurance company wrote to us and made an equally strong case for purchase.

What the subcommittee is asking for the time being, is that agencies be completely objective in the matter. Base your decisions on facts, and not how you feel about it or how you think an appropriation subcommittee will react. Try to look at the problem from the point of view of the Government as a whole.

Meanwhile, we are recommending that a study be made of manufacturer's pricing systems and other factors so that we can learn the underlying causes of the problem, and we would like to see a study made of the possibility of using the competitive bidding process. We assume that at present we must use negotiated contracts, but no one has made a thorough study of competitive bidding as it might apply to EDP.

We would like also to see more use of discounts and installment purchase plans in EDP procurement.

Standardization: Our subcommittee concurs with the National Bureau of Standards that "at the present time we have just begun to attack seriously the problem of compatibility and standardization." We have also taken special note of the work being done by the American Standards Association, Inc., the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, and the Standardization Panel of the Budget Bureau Advisory Council, but progress seems slow. As stated in the June 1963 issue of datamation, and I quote:

"Standardization progress, like a glacier, move slowly. This is partly because the work is generally conducted by part-time, widely scattered committees made up of people who spend most of their time doing other things * * * earning a living, for instance. And it's partly because standardization can be as rigidly and frigidly binding as a glacier. Another panelist summed it up: 'A bad standard is worse than no standard at all.' "

The subcommittee believes we need a more dynamic program of EDP standardization and our report will make specific recommendations on this point. We know the job is a difficult one, but this is all the more reason to atack it strenuously. The stakes for the Federal Government alone are very high. We all know how costly it is to go from IBM to Univac to RCA and back again, and yet we recognize the problems require a careful and studied approach.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me ask you, the members of the Washington Chapter of the Systems and Procedures Association, and through you your 73 other chapters, and your full membership of 3,300, have you noticed how many of the EDP problems I have mentioned tonight can be resolved by professional systems and procedures personnel? There are a lot of them, including the real tough ones. This is what I had in mind when I accepted your invitation. I wanted to pinpoint these problems and to stimulate your thinking about them. And, if you have some ideas, send me a letter about them. Congress will be in this business for a long time to come.

Thank you so very much for you attention and especially for your patience.

Reevaluation of Farm Policy Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter on September 12 from a constituent of mine, Mr. Grant J. Marquardt of Millville, Minn., through which one can sense the human pathos of our farm problems. This letter also points out graphically that the exodus from the farm is no longer limited to the marginal farmer, who so-called experts have been saying for years should probably leave the farm anyhow.

That it is not just the marginal farmer who is giving up the vocation of a lifetime and the tradition of generations, is well known to many of us from the farm States. For many years, the farmer's son has been beating a path to the cities, often because of economic necessity. The urban problems this has caused are a matter of record. Now, he is being followed by his father, disgusted and disillusioned with what Mr. Marquardt calls an inferior living.

This is Mr. Marquardt's letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Each week, Maas & Maas, local auctioneers, post public auctions, such as the enclosed. My great concern is the more than 40 closeout auctions already booked by Maas & Mass, with more to come.

In the past few years there were, in many cases, sales of farmers with smaller reserves and lesser equities, who had in many cases

overbought on farms and especially machinery.

The many auctions this year, however, are reflecting more of the regular, medium, close, down-to-earth type farmer who is just tired of the struggle that nets him an inferior living. The latter, Al, I am afraid is the backbone of the country and will be sorely needed in event of some major disaster in the future.

In realizing that you are but one man with many problems, I feel that perhaps I am asking for too much of your attention.

However, I must continue to urge you to use all of your influence to see that this crippling situation is remedied before it's too late.

Please urge your colleagues to take heed. I have never favored too much Government handouts, but would work more along the line of controlling the huge monopolies that are setting our prices, mainly the chain stores.

Congressman QUIE, am I a lone voice in the wilderness? Can't you people in Washington do something before it is too late? It's hard for me to keep writing letters and I don't get paid for it. I should be plowing today.

Thank you sir.

GRANT J. MARQUARDT,
Millville, Minn.

Today, Mr. Marquardt feels very much alone. "Am I a lone voice in the wilderness?" he asks. I wonder if perhaps he is just that?

No; I do not think so. For the Mr. Marquardt's of the wheat belt showed last May what they thought of Government controls in exchange for higher prices. Then, if ever, the farmer struck a blow for free enterprise and his own traditional independence, for better or worse, richer or poorer.

People may not agree with the methods of the National Farmers Organization, but it cannot be doubted that the rapid rise of this organization is an indication that the farmer wants to gather the reins of his destiny back into his own hands—bargain for himself, deal for himself—without Government interference. He may have to do so collectively, which is an unfamiliar approach for him, but the important thing is, he wants to do it himself.

None of us will disagree that there has been a revolution in agricultural procedures. But to just go on saying that this has occurred, as though it was a full explanation for every ill of the farmer, is an oversimplification of the problem and brings us no nearer to solution.

It is also an oversimplification, not substantiated by fact, that large, corporate farming is the inevitable fate of the rural future. One has merely to drive through the Midwest to realize that corporation farming has not occurred and is not likely to. Why should it? Why scrap a system which has made us the most agriculturally productive nation in the world's history?

What people on farms throughout the breadbasket of America are asking today is the right to make a decent living, while continuing to maintain the independence which has contributed so much to the cultural heritage of the United States. The farmer is demonstrating again his rugged individualism, as he votes out strict governmental control and as he seeks to find a solution to his own problems.

Has our Government reached the point where it can not allow Americans to seek their own destiny? I felt that recent comments by many people miffed at the outcome of the wheat referendum, that now the farmers could "stew in their own juice," because they had rejected bureaucratic control, was laced with a cynicism unworthy of officials of our Government.

We are hearing much these days of reevaluation. We are reevaluating our tax policies. We are reevaluating our foreign policy. We are reevaluating our educational system.

It would be well if we also reevaluated our farm policy.

This reevaluation, I admit, might be a long and painful operation. But when the patient is seriously ill, drastic surgery may be necessary.

If 40 regular, medium, close, down-to-earth-type farmers are leaving the farm in one small area, what is the overall picture?

This is happening under a system in which Government has reached its hand into many phases of farming.

Playing Politics With Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, some people from distant places tried to play politics with the horrible train-bus accident in my district in which 32 men lost their lives recently.

In dramatic contrast to those depraved ghouls who would capitalize on the misery and anguish of such a terrible accident, the shocked and stunned community responded magnificently. The following are two of many editorials by newspaper editors who know the true facts:

[From the Salinas (Calif.) Californian, Sept. 19, 1963]

BLOOD DONORS SHOW HUMANITY OF MAN

For the dead there could be no help, but for the injured in Tuesday's labor bus-train accident the response to the plea for emergency blood donations was heartwarming.

Between 8 p.m. and 12:30 a.m., 243 prospective donors showed up and 189 pints were received. As Salinas Valley Red Cross chapter officials said, it was "fabulous," since during monthly blood bank donations the goal of 185 pints is rarely achieved.

But, the immediate need was apparent enough to attract not only Mexican national friends of the injured but area residents, and, most unusual, complete strangers passing through the valley.

The response was almost like an international hand of friendship being extended in time of great need to our Mexican neighbors. More important, it displayed man's humanity to man, a truly heartwarming thing in a sometimes callous world where we often forget the good deeds among the bad.

[From the Salinas (Calif.) Californian, Sept. 21, 1963]

HATS OFF TO OUR EMERGENCY WORKERS

The Salinas Californian offers sincerest compliments to everyone who worked so ably and so hard after the train-bus collision Tuesday that has, so far, claimed 31 lives. This includes the California Highway Patrol, Monterey County sheriff's office, Salinas hospitals (their doctors and staffs), ambulance firms in the valley, and Fort Ord personnel.

We especially want to honor the highway patrol, sheriff's deputies, the passersby and other volunteers who stepped in to help immediately after the tragedy near Chualar. Within an hour all evidence of injured or dead was removed from the scene. The injured were already in hospitals receiving medical attention. This rapid action after a major tragedy—the worst such accident in U.S. history—is an example that proves our local agencies can be mobilized within minutes to cope with any emergency. Their action should give all valley residents the assurance that they will get the best care possible should they be the victims of a similar accident.

The dedication of the workers is attested to by the fact that many of them served throughout the night without sleep and didn't get any rest until the next day.

Also, no one could have, or is still working harder, than staff heads and members of the Growers Farm Labor Association. They, too, were at the accident scene within minutes, in the hospitals and mortuaries doing the great amount of exacting work that is always necessary after such a grim tragedy in direct connection with the deceased, their grieving families and coworkers, the injured, their employers, and governmental agencies involved.

Sure, some will say that this is the job of most all the people mentioned above. But, we would like to point out that when you accomplish emergency work so flawlessly and with such remarkable speed you are more than doing your job. The extra effort is dedication and a strong feeling to help your fellow man in time of need. This marks the true professional. The community is sincerely grateful it has so many in its midst. Hats off to all of them for the job well done.

Contrast the sympathetic reaction of the community to that of some of the vociferous opponents of the bracero program. Sometimes actions speak more loudly than words.

I am proud of the response of my community. Some from afar who have tried to exploit this sad event for mean, political profit should be ashamed.

Tallahassee's Capital Lions Club Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, there are many outstanding civic organizations in this Nation, and in my opinion one of the most outstanding local groups is the Capital Lions Club of Tallahassee.

I felt that it would be of interest to the Members of the Congress and the people of this Nation to know of the outstanding work this club has done with regard to the Candle of Hope School for mentally retarded children.

In line with this, I present an editorial which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat, of September 26, 1963:

CAPITAL LIONS CLUB RANKS HIGH

The Capital Lions Club has been selected by its international organization as the district winner for its community project of constructing the Candle of Hope School for mentally retarded children.

This is a well deserved honor. In our opinion, the club should be in the running for the title of the best Lions Club in the entire world.

We doubt that a project of this type has ever been more ably planned and quickly carried out to completion. Of course, the Lions had the help of many local people and organizations in building the school.

But it is still heartening to know that there are clubs and people of this type in Tallahassee who will make the extra effort to do something worthwhile for their less fortunate neighbors.

This project took more than 1 day's work by the Lions members. Many of them worked every spare minute for weeks and months. Some actually got out and helped with the construction work. Wives chipped in to help with decorating and landscaping.

All of Tallahassee's civic clubs have annual projects which are worthwhile but this one, by the Capital Lions, puts them at the top in our book.

The Manpower Retraining Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Kansas City Star recently published a two-part editorial in support of the manpower retraining program. The editorial sets out the accomplishments of the program during its first year in Kansas City. It also points out the great potential of the program in helping to solve the problem of unemployment. Because I believe all Members of Congress will find this editorial of interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Sept. 7, 1963]

THE LOCAL RESULTS: HOPE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

In Kansas City, 231 retraining enrollments since last November have resulted in 69 completions and 72 terminations—with the remainder still in various stages of job retraining. But those statistics are more impressive than they might appear at first glance.

Many of the terminations occurred a day or two after the training began—when the individual decided that this was not for him. Others got good job offers in their field training before they finished the course. Others—with little or no money coming in from benefits—took jobs unrelated to the training.

However, the point is this: Scores of unskilled persons who were out of work, on relief or on the aid-to-dependent-children rolls, now are working as motor car mechanics, clerk-typists, power sewing machine operators, stenographers, welders or hotel and restaurant cooks. Before, they were engaged in digging ditches or moving boxes and they had been replaced by machines. Now they have skills that machines can't replace.

The program here, and elsewhere, still is only a drop in the bucket in relation to the problems of automation and unskilled individuals that add up to unemployment. But this is a positive approach to a social illness of our times. Jobs are available and people are unemployed. The task is to train the unemployed people for the jobs.

The job retraining program is a beginning that holds promise. For full effectiveness, it demands the utmost in Federal, local—and State—participation.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Sept. 7, 1963]

THE NATIONAL PROBLEM: JOB RETRAINING NEEDED, WHATEVER THE WAY

If the States are not interested in the problem of manpower retraining, someone has to be. The "someone" can only be the Federal Government. That was the meaning of the Senate action that extended the essential program and its 100-percent Federal financing for another year. The Nation, with its continuing problem of unemployment, cannot afford to let this program die beneath the weight of statehouse inertia.

Properly, President Kennedy listed the program among his civil rights proposals. It belonged there because among all groups, Negroes have been hurt the most by the obvious changes in the makeup of the labor force. It is a statistical fact that the jobless rate among Negroes is far higher than it is among white people. More and more the premium is on the skilled worker and many Negroes have been denied the opportunity to acquire the skills that the times demand.

With equal propriety, the Senate chose to consider the measure apart from the rest of the civil rights program. By doing so, it avoided a filibuster that could have destroyed the whole retraining plan. For if unemployment is a part of the civil rights problem, it is a part of the entire economy's problem, too. A few million more jobs and the men trained to fill them would go far toward easing the pressures in both the civil rights arena and in the economy.

We do not suggest that this bill, assuming the House concurs with the Senate, will solve all the problems of unemployment. So far 8,000 workers have completed their retraining programs and some 70 percent have found jobs to employ their new skills. But the program has been underway only a year. It has shown, however, what it can do and it would be unfortunate to lose it now. We do not regard the expense involved as a waste of public money. It is a sound investment in the future.

It is unfortunate that the principle of 100-percent Federal financing had to be extended another year. But only four States—Kansas, Montana, Tennessee, and Connecticut—have approved matching funds. Other States have not acted, and presumably for 46 different reasons. We have here a little lesson in State responsibility and in State failure. It has a point for those who, with good reason, fear the encroachment of Washington.

Nevertheless, this program, small in scope though it may be, is too important to be lost in a prolonged debate over States rights. Too few States exercised their rights in this instance. They failed. If the Senate and the administration have their way, the Federal Government will not fail.

Prayer for Our Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a poem written by a constituent, Mrs. Virginia Jay, of San Angelo, Tex.

The poem is as follows:

PRAYER FOR OUR REPRESENTATIVES

Dear Lord we pray before Thee now
For understanding. Let us see
Our Nation is Thy gift to all
And we act only as trustee.
To realize this trust and know
That in our hands You've placed the key
To open wide the door to health,
Protection, and prosperity.
Humility, for this we ask.
For reverence, dear Lord, and then
Bestow on us the gift of love
And kindness to all fellowmen.
Lord give us patience; this we need
For we are prone to act in haste.
Then give us knowledge that we'll know
How to conserve and not to waste.
Lord guide our minds and hands in work
To keep our Nation strong and free,
And other countries, looking on,
Can see our light reflect from Thee.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very important series of articles published in the Evening News of Perth Amboy, N.J., entitled "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1."

This series was written by Ian McNett, a staff writer of the Evening News and presents to us in a vivid style a problem with which every informed citizen should be familiar, as its proportions are increasing in magnitude and may within a space of two decades exercise a powerful influence over our daily lives.

Air pollution is a vital problem not only because it has already contributed to the death of thousands and can at any time strike again, but also because it is the byproduct of our age of industrialization, it is the concomitant evil which will grow more potent as our Nation grows larger and greater, and we desire to grow mightily. It is a vital problem because there is in America today a great movement toward urban living, and these great concentrations of people, especially in industrial areas like my State of New Jersey, are the ones who are most susceptible to this killer from the air.

I therefore wish to call my colleagues attention to this series of eight articles which will commence with today's RECORD and will appear in the succeeding seven issues:

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1—"KILLER FOG" COULD STRIKE ANYTIME

(By Ian McNett)

By 1985, residents of New Jersey and other metropolitan areas probably will tune in their radios each morning to pick up the latest air pollution forecast.

"In 1985 the people will be more interested in whether the air is safe to breathe than whether it will rain. This will com-

pletely change the paramount function in the normal operations of the Weather Bureau."

This prediction was made 2 years ago to an air pollution symposium by Arthur C. Stern, chief of the Laboratory of Physical Sciences, Division of Air Pollution at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Stern went on to say the number of vehicles allowed to pass highway entrance control points will be limited; industries will have quotas of emissions they will be permitted to spew into the atmosphere; and households and commercial establishments will have quotas of energy that can be drawn hourly from central energy storage reserves.

"Thus on bad days we will balance the ability of the atmosphere to handle pollutants with the amount we throw into the atmosphere," Stern said.

Sound fantastic for just 22 short years away?

Los Angeles today does curb certain emissions when pollutants reach what is called an "adverse level."

Only 15 years ago, air pollution graduated from nuisance status to become considered a full-fledged public health hazard.

Heavy fogs trapped air pollutants around Donora, Pa., in October 1948. Twenty people died and half the city's 12,000 residents became violently ill. Almost everybody suffered burning eyes, raw throats, and coughing spasms.

"The effort to curb air pollution in this country started with Donora," says Dr. Raymond Manganelli, professor of sanitation at Rutgers University. Dr. Manganelli's department teaches courses in air pollution.

Bad as the Donora disaster was, worse was yet to come. Most of England was smothered by fog for 6 days in 1952. In the 2-week period bracketing the fog, 4,000 people died. Again the finger pointed at air pollution.

London repeated the experience again early last winter. This time 300 to 400 died from trapped air pollutants.

It can't happen here?

Dr. Richard Prindle, deputy chief of the U.S. Air Pollution Control Division, went to London last December to study the killer fog.

He returned saying air over Atlantic Coast cities contains enough pollutants to turn killer under similar weather conditions.

Last December a fog blanketed the east coast at the time of the London incident.

"If the temperature inversion last December had lasted a few more days, we could have had the same situation here as they had in England," says Dr. Edward Seidmon, a Plainfield allergy specialist whose concern for his patients has led him to study air pollution and its effects.

The local situation has not been exaggerated. In 1953 an air pollution incident in New York City took 200 lives.

Two modern revolutions have helped make air pollution dangerous. Starting about 200 years ago, industry started replacing agriculture as king of the western world's economic structure.

As advancing technology created surpluses, men were released from the fields and went to the cities to work in factories. At first a trickle, the flight from the farms became a torrent in the 20th Century.

Today half the population of this country lives on 10 percent of the land. By the year 2000, two-thirds of the people will live on the same 10 percent, or maybe a little more as cities continue to flatten out into suburbs.

Dr. Seidmon notes that 20 million people live in the super city that sprawls 500 miles down the Atlantic coast from Boston, Mass., to Washington, D.C.

By the time the next census rolls around in 1970, the population of this area will jump another six or seven million. Megalopolis East may stretch from Portland, Maine, to Norfolk, Va.

Megalopolis is a fancy name sociologists thought up. Taken from the Greek language, it means giant city. One strings down the Pacific coast, and another spreads out from Chicago and other Great Lakes ports.

New Jersey lies at the heart of this eastern super city. Here is an excerpt from "Air Pollution Control in New Jersey," a document by the State air pollution control commission:

"The U.S. Census of 1960 established that New Jersey is the most densely populated of the 50 States. It ranked seventh in the 1960 monetary value of its industrial production.

"More than half of New Jersey's approximately 6 million inhabitants live in Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, and Passaic Counties. About two-thirds of New Jersey's approximately 15,000 factories are located in the same five counties.

"Since there are more factories to emit pollutants and more people to be affected by them in the five counties * * * it is clear that the greatest potential for substantial and sustained air pollution is found in these counties, although the possibility exists in greater or lesser degree in many other areas of the State."

The excerpt makes clear that air pollution arises from the activities of man. It becomes a problem when man jams together in confined areas. Even natural pollutants like plant pollens and dusts are made worse by the heavy hand of mankind.

Man's effort to keep warm, to move about, and satisfy his manifod material wants and needs pose the most serious problem.

Burning in some form is the best method yet devised to power most of these activities. Burning is, at best, an inefficient process. Most wastes from burning go into the air and are sucked into people's lungs.

Many people still believe, despite evidence to the contrary, that a limitless atmosphere can soak up all the waste materials mankind wants to pour into it. However, Dr. Manganelli points out, if the earth were an apple, the atmosphere would be equal to the skin.

And weather conditions he goes on, can slice the skin both horizontally and vertically, further limiting available air space.

Weather conditions (fogs and thermal inversions) permitted the air pollution concentrations to build up in Donora, London, and New York.

Air usually cools as it rises. This permits lighter warm air to rise and carry away pollutants. Winds act as a natural ventilating system by blowing pollutants away from an area.

But all too often natural weather conditions fail. A layer of warm air sits on a layer of cold air, blocking the normal updrafts that help disperse pollutants.

When the wind fails, a vast aerial sewage area is created over a city, State, or region, filled with a variety of foul and harmful vapors, gases, fumes, and particles.

Inversions usually occur at night and are burned off by the morning sun. They occur in New Jersey about 40 days in each year.

In flat areas, like this State, inversions come about in two ways. Masses of cold air push in under masses of warmer, lighter air, creating the inversion. The process may be reversed with warm air sliding over a cold air mass.

Second, as the earth cools at night, it cools the air nearest to ground first, leaving a layer of warm air above. This is why most inversions are formed at night.

Area Redevelopment—Political Pork at the Taxpayers' Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an article on the subject of the Area Redevelopment Administration and its pork-barrel programs. The article, written by Scripps-Howard staff writer, Robert Dietsch, illustrates the wisdom this body exhibited in rejecting the Administration's request for an additional $455.5 million for area redevelopment.

Should the program come before this body again, this article illustrates why it should be permanently retired.

I urge this article, which appeared in the September 30, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News, be carefully read:

TAXPAYERS BUILD SKI LIFTS: U.S. AREA REDEVELOPMENT HELPS FINANCE THE GOOD LIFE

(By Robert Dietsch)

In the last 2 years, your tax money has been spent or loaned to:

Build motels, ski resorts, and other recreational facilities in a dozen States, on an Indian reservation and in Puerto Rico. Builders or promoters have received $43 million in Government loans.

Help buy snow-making machinery for several of those resorts and help build golf courses, cocktail lounges, and bowling alleys in others. Also train waitresses for the motel restaurants.

Train sightseeing guides in Hawaii.

Build a summer theater in North Carolina.

Build roadside handicraft display stands in Arkansas.

Study the feasibility of harvesting, processing and marketing sea lions in Alaska.

Help train copper workers in Montana for new jobs with Anaconda, the company which laid off the workers in the first place and which was looking for people with different skills to hire.

FOR DEPRESSED AREAS

Loans or grants for all these projects came from the Area Redevelopment Administration, an agency set up by the Kennedy administration in 1961 to help business and employment in depressed areas.

Since then, the ARA has become one of the biggest subjects of controversy on the New Frontier.

Republicans dub it the "area reelection administration."

Businessmen charge it is competing with private industry, making reckless loans and giving money to dubious enterprises, the type rejected as unfeasible and uneconomic by private experts.

Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has called ARA the "Christine Keeler" of an American scandal involving "wholesale buying and selling of public office."

TOO EAGER?

Other critics say ARA is overly eager to farm out its money. They say ARA supports new businesses even after local industrial developers refuse to contribute their 10 percent required by law.

(ARA can loan up to 65 percent of the cost of a project; the rest of the money must

come from private financial sources, the local community booster group and the project owners.)

ARA officials, understandably argue their case with vigor.

Administrator William Batt says his agency goes into programs shunned by private businessmen.

"They aren't interested in creating employment," Mr. Batt said.

He defends the millions put into motels by pointing to overall tourist and recreation growth and its potential.

What's more, ARA claims it has created, or laid the basis for creating, 47,500 jobs and for training 23,500 persons.

PROBE

An investigation into all phases of ARA activity by the Scripps-Howard newspapers gives the edge to ARA's critics.

While the agency has indeed acted to create some legitimate businesses in depressed areas (and even some not so depressed) and has created some employment, the investigation showed:

That ARA is overeager to farm out the $394 million given to it in 1961. For example, it pressed hard to lend $222,000 to developers of a ski resort between Altoona and Bedford, Pa., despite reluctance of the Altoona community development group to go along; the latter deemed the project too risky and thought it would create few jobs.

Not only did the resort owners get ARA's $222,000 but they also received $110,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration (REA).

SOME MORE?

In another case, a wealthy Detroit industrialist got almost $1 million to help build "one of the world's most luxurious resorts" in northern Michigan; he reported the other day, during a phone conversation, that "ARA was around suggesting I was eligible for more loans."

That many of the 222 technical assistance studies approved by ARA (at a cost of more than $7 million) have been done by others in past year. The sea-lion study in Alaska is one; also grants to study better exploitation of Indian arts and crafts, uses of timber in various States, handicraft development in the Appalachians and marketing of peaches in Georgia.

That ARA job totals are exaggerated; far fewer than 47,500 positions have been created or seem in prospect. A metal fabricating firm in southwestern Pennsylvania, for example, carries a notation of "50 jobs" in ARA's directory; the firm now employs 11 persons and the president acknowledges it will be a long time before the total reaches 20. A candy manufacturer says his employment may even decrease after he uses ARA loan money to buy new machinery. He is on ARA's books for 50 jobs.

That some ARA loan recipients do not try very hard to seek private financing before going after Government money, as required by law. ARA loans carry 4-percent interest; private loans 6 percent or more.

"Sure, I would have expanded my plant if ARA were not around," conceded one industrial plant manager. "I would have used my working capital or gone after bank financing harder than I did. But I got together with ARA; after all, you do not find 4-percent money very often these days."

That some ARA training programs are of a dubious nature. There presumably are plenty of sighseeing guides in Hawaii but ARA nevertheless spent $5,000 to train 22 part-time farmers in that work. It spent $10,000 to train 100 copper mine workers for Anaconda—a giant company with the capability to train its own workers with its own money. To this list can be added the waitresses trained with taxpayer funds for duty at a Michigan resort and others trained for restaurant jobs in a motel at Paintsville, Ky. This motel, incidentally, is across the highway from a taxpayer-built handicraft stand.

HOW FAR?

Inherent in the ARA program, and in a growing number of other assistance programs initialed by the Kennedy administration, is the philosophical question of how far the Federal Government should go in seeking to create jobs and loan taxpayer money to private enterprise.

As chamber President Neilan has pointed out and as the Scripps-Howard probe of ARA showed, even those who abhor the idea of Federal intervention solicit Federal money after programs are approved.

While a few local business groups across the country have spurned ARA help, most have accepted it and many have sought it.

The idea of having Uncle Sam help bring a new firm into town overshadows criticism of Federal intrusion into private enterprise.

The Kennedy administration obviously thinks highly of ARA. It wants Congress to double the agency's budget and extend its life.

The Senate has agreed but the House, in June, rejected the proposal by five votes.

The Democratic leadership now wants the House Rules Committee to send an amended ARA bill to the floor.

Russian Deeds Needed To End Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, with all the optimism expressed by the Kennedy administration concerning the reaching of agreements with Soviet Russia, only one little ingredient is missing—the unwillingness of the Communists to deal in honor. The cold war could be ended in a matter of hours if the Communist conspiracy was disavowed, if Russia pulled her troops out of Cuba, put an end to subversion in the United States and put a halt to Russian imperialist expansion.

President Kennedy has asked for none of these things before asking the American people to stake the future of this Nation on more Russian promises.

David Lawrence puts it very well in the following editorial, "Euphoria," from the October 7 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

EUPHORIA

(By David Lawrence)

There's a new word in the vocabulary of the day—or at least a more noticeable use of an old word—"euphoria." The dictionary defines "euphoria" as a "sense of well-being" or a "buoyancy" of spirit. But the word has lately been used to convey the fear of a complacency which could follow the recent ratification of the test ban treaty.

White House spokesmen and Senators have warned against euphoria. The Pentagon chiefs have used the word to emphasize the importance of continued precautions in the field of armament. The military leaders who have the direct responsibility for maintaining the Nation's security naturally do not want to see an era of passivity in which the Nation might let down its guard.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in testifying before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on August 14, said:

"The most serious reservations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with regard to the treaty are more directly linked with the fear of a euphoria in the West which will eventually reduce our vigilance and the willingness of our country and of our allies to expend continued effort on our collective security."

Several Members of the Senate who voted against ratification argued vehemently that it was risky to stop testing of any kind, as the other side might in the meantime gain a superiority which could be fatal.

President Kennedy gave formal assurances that the United States would not adopt a complacent attitude. He pointed out that the new treaty could be abrogated by a 90-day notice if it was found unsatisfactory to this country and that it could be cast aside overnight if any violations by the Soviets were discovered.

Basically, what's lacking is mutual trust, which is only another way of saying that a deep-seated distrust prevails between Moscow and Washington despite the outer appearance of "euphoria." There are, for instance, those who contend that the Soviet Union is behind us in certain nuclear fields and that they will try to catch up clandestinely. There are others who say the nuclear terror cannot be worse than it as at present and that the power to kill and destroy human life has already reached an incredible capacity.

But the President has referred to the need to pursue negotiations with the Soviet Union so as to obtain agreements which might limit nuclear production and cause self-restraints to be imposed in the making of deadlier weapons. Certainly it will seem paradoxical to be discussing limitation of nuclear production when a real breakthrough might come in the form of a device that could intercept nuclear missiles and leave a country without the military strength necessary to retaliate effectively against a surprise attack.

What is really missing today is a mutual confidence in the motives and purposes of the two major powers in the world—the Soviet Union aand the United States. For distrust of this country prevails in Moscow just as distrust of the Communists prevails here.

The latest argument supporting the "euphoria" idea is that Russia is in economic trouble and cannot continue year after year to maintain huge budgets for armaments while depriving her people of the necessities of life. Another point advanced is that the Soviet Union is worried about the irresponsibility of Red China and needs a period in which tension can be reduced by an East-West understanding.

Already there is talk of selling the Soviets some of America's surplus wheat and starting trade in other categories. This naturally is viewed with suspicion and as an assist by the United States to Russia without anything being obtained by way of diplomatic concession to this country in the cold war.

It would seem that the much-talked-of next step logically is not necessarily to engage in more palaver about disarmament—which could go on for years—but to get an agreement whereby the Soviet Union would end the cold war. Surely it seems difficult to believe that any treaty in the disarmament field made now will be of any avail if Communist imperialism continues its invasions, its aggressions, its infiltrations in countries on every continent. Russia is actually financing today a military base in Cuba that could be used at any moment to attack the United States.

Mutual trust can be built and distrust diminished, if not destroyed, when the Soviet Union takes its military forces out of

Cuba and stops interfering in the politics of nearly every republic in this hemisphere. It would be helpful if aid from Moscow to the Communist Parties in the United States—both the overt and the covert groups—were to be terminated. This would do more than anything else to establish mutual trust. Who knows, it might even bring in reality a diplomatic euphoria.

This could create an atmosphere in which international agreements might be signed without waiting for the customary decade or more to get Soviet assent. It's the logical next step.

Statement by Consumer Advisory Council on Quality Stabilization Bills, Including S. 774 and H.R. 3669

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the actions of the Consumer Advisory Council meeting of June 3 and 4, 1963, at which the Consumer Advisory Council expressed its opposition to the quality stabilization bills, S. 774 and H.R. 3669, and urged the administration to take necessary steps to combat this legislation.

This statement clearly points out the evils of the so-called quality stabilization legislation from the consumer standpoint:

STATEMENT BY CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL ON QUALITY STABILIZATION BILLS, INCLUDING S. 774 AND H.R. 3669

We oppose these bills and all similar attempts at price fixing at the retail level which have been sponsored under the name of "fair trading," "resale price maintenance," and "quality stabilization." Such attempts to limit freedom of individual merchants to sell goods at prices they choose are antithetical to the free enterprise system and, hence, to the best interests of American consumers.

These bills propose, in effect, that the Federal Government should protect a manufacturer who wants to establish the minimum price at which his product will be sold at retail. It would give manufacturers the right to prohibit retailers from selling brand name or trade marked goods at prices other than the retail price established by the manufacturer. Such legislation would limit competition, inhibit innovation and progress at the retail level, and would also tend to encourage price fixing at the manufacturers' level. In any event, it would tend to deny consumers the benefit of downward price adjustments which flow from increased efficiency and improvements in production and distribution.

We are not impressed by the argument that such legislation would aid small business. The evidence in States which have fair trade legislation indicates the contrary to be the result, since it encourages the introduction by large retail businesses of private brands and other techniques for avoiding the effect of the legislation.

We believe that so-called quality stabilization (fair trade) bills are inimical to the interests of consumers. They violate the third right of the consumer as stated in the President's consumer message, the "right to choose; to be assured, wherever possible, access to a variety of products and services at competitive prices." We, therefore, commend the administration for its opposition to these bills.

STATEMENT BY CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL ON DENIAL OF CONSUMER RIGHT ON GROUNDS OF RACE

Whereas the President of the United States of America, in his message on consumers protection and interest program of March 15, 1962, emphasized among the basic rights of the consumer: (1) the right to safety, (2) the right to choose, (3) the right to be heard, and that "consumer interests will receive full and sympathetic consideration in the formulation of government policy," and

Whereas thousands of Negro consumers in all parts of the Nation are denied their rights as consumers to purchase goods and services freely in the marketplace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, we urge immediate and positive action by the administration through all available administrative and legal means and by the support of legislation prohibiting discrimination against customers by stores, hotels, theaters, restaurants, and other businesses on the ground of race.

We are heartened by the news that the President will deliver a special message on basic human and civil rights and urge that this message stress the relationship of these rights to the rights of citizens as consumers, as a followup to his original basic address on consumer protection and interest program.

MEMBERS OF THE CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, chairman, dean, New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Mr. David W. Angevine, public relations director, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Persia Campbell, professor and chairman, Economics Department, Queens College of City University, Flushing, N.Y.

Mr. Stephen M. Du Brul, Jr., partner, Lehman Bros., 1 William Street, New York, N.Y.

Mrs. John G. Lee, past president, League of Women Voters, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Edward S. Lewis, executive director, Urban League of Greater New York, 202 West 136th Street, New York, N.Y.

Hon. Walter F. Mondale, Attorney General, State of Minnesota, 102 State Capitol, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, professor and head, Department of Family Economics, Justin Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, California Consumer Counsel, Governor's Office, Sacramento, Calif.

Dr. Caroline Ware, consultant, R.F.D. No. 1, Box 138, Vienna, Va.

Dr. Colston E. Warne, president, Consumers Union of U.S., Inc., Professor of Economics, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 29th of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multi-million-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

Mrs. Ralph Baughman of Buhl, Idaho, wrote to the editor of the Times-News, of Twin Falls, Idaho, that she wants to keep Bonneville out of southern Idaho because she is fearful of the kind of service she would get if Idaho Power Co. is forced out of business. Her letter follows:

[From the Times-News, Twin Falls, Idaho, June 16, 1963]

BUHL WOMAN IS CONCERNED OVER BUREAUCRATIC DELAYS

EDITOR, TIMES-NEWS: Lately we've been hearing from our Federal Government about the benefits that our area will receive from having Bonneville power here.

I can't help but wonder if we'll consider it a benefit when Bonneville power has forced Idaho Power out of business and we have a power failure.

Whenever we have a power failure now, Idaho Power immediately gets the crews out working to repair it.

It doesn't make any difference whether it's in the middle of the night or Saturday or Sunday, the crews still go out and repair the trouble.

Perhaps we wouldn't be so conscious of this, but last Saturday night our mail box and 31 others were stolen. I contacted the post office late Tuesday afternoon and they said they had notified the postal inspector in Twin Falls Monday morning and he hadn't been able yet to make the long trip from Twin Falls to Buhl and until he did and made a report, nothing could be done. This seems to be a typical bureaucratic answer.

Let's all do what we can to help keep Idaho Power Co. in Idaho and keep another Federal agency out. Think what a hardship it would be if our electricity went off and no one would get right out and fix it.

MRS. RALPH BAUGHMAN.

BUHL.

The editor of the Meridian News-Times of Meridian, Idaho, headed his editorial for August 15, 1963, "Uncle Sam—Model for Deadbeats," then adds another item under the heading, "Not That It Matters." In this latter item he uses the Bonneville power deal in southern Idaho as an example of the loose moral standards discussed in the editorial. The editorial and related article follows:

[From the Meridian (Idaho) News-Times, Aug. 15, 1963]

UNCLE SAM—MODEL FOR DEADBEATS

As a rule, children are apt to adopt the general standards of morals and behavior that they see practiced in their own home. If Mom and Dad do it, then it must be right—or, at least, it must be acceptable.

We wonder if a similar pattern isn't being followed by many adults, in basing their individual standards upon the standards they see followed in our National Government?

That thought was emphasized this week in a full-page advertisement in Argosy, a national men's magazine. The ad was headed: "If you're in debt and want to get out—I can show you 71 ingenious (but perfectly legal) ways to do it."

The thing offered for sale was a book, and here are some of the things the ad promised that book would teach you:

"There are dozens of legitimate ways (a full 71 in all) to delay your debt, and eventually get out of it."

"How to 'freeze' your indebtedness indefinitely, paying it off only when you're ready * * *."

"Did you know, for example, that you can borrow yourself out of debt? The process involves a number of thoroughly tested

steps—the first of which is to borrow about twice as much as you need."

"How to get more credit—even when it seems you have reached your limit."

The implication of those exactly quoted statements is unmistakable. An advertisement in a national magazine, reaching millions of readers, was offering in effect a textbook on legal tactics for getting by without paying your bills, or at least without paying them when due.

Just in case some people might have qualms about using the suggested tactics, the ad spelled out the situation in these exact words: "* * * a perfectly proper technique that works fine for the U.S. Government, and can work just as well for you."

Morals aside, can anyone argue with that statement? Our Government does use "ingenious but perfectly legal" methods to avoid paying its old debts while incurring new ones. It does operate on the theory that you can "borrow yourself out of debt." It does obtain more and more credit, even though it has exceeded its limit—by the simple expedient of raising its debt ceiling. It does use financial tactics that sidestep normal, decent business practices.

Morals aside again, if it works for a nation, why shouldn't it work for a person, or a family? According to the ad, the writer of that book thinks it will.

In fact, since a full-page advertisement in that national magazine costs thousands of dollars, the advertiser obviously assumes there's a wide market for that type of information.

He's probably right. At least his book costs less than we pay the Federal Government for demonstrating how to operate an entire nation on financial trickery.

In both cases, the only drawback is that final question. How long can it last?

NOT THAT IT MATTERS

In this week's editorial, there is the claim that the Government keeps incurring new debts without paying the old.

If you think that's an exaggeration, consider the Bonneville Power deal that is cooking so hot in southern Idaho right now.

For years, the Bureau of Reclamation projects, operated with our tax funds, supplied electric power to several rural co-ops. A typical Government operation, it cost us taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

Now another Government bureau, the Bonneville Power Administration, has taken over several of the same power supply deals. They are using the same facilities, the same methods, the same everything—except that they have added all those new people to our payroll.

But the real insult is that the Bonneville bunch is now flooding Idaho newspapers with this incredible boast—they are reducing the former power rates by as much as 40 percent.

Now we are not talking about public rates versus private rates. We are talking about rates charged by one Government-operated bureau compared to money-losing rates charged by another Government-operated project.

The totals run into, literally, tens of millions of dollars. And you know who is paying that loss. In fact, you know one of the payers quite well.

He is the fellow whose name is signed to your own income tax report.

Now maybe you wonder, if the old rates were losing millions of dollars, how in the world can the BPA cut those rates by 40 percent?

The answer is simple. Bonneville Power Administration has already lost multimillions of dollars—so what do a few more millions matter? Except to you and me.

No wonder the guy decided to write that book described in this week's editorial.

Area Redevelopment Administration's Helping Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said on the program initiated under the Area Redevelopment Act and the advisability of such a program. The developing accomplishments of the town of Stilwell, Okla., point out vividly the significance and effect of a constructive helping hand extended by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Stilwell is a community which has long been recognized by State officials and Federal agencies as being in an area with a minimum of job opportunities and a critically low per capita income. The area has an abundance of good people who are not afraid of work but who have had only limited chances for employment in the area.

The community's financial position, with respect to available private capital to finance area facilities, has been inadequate. The prime target of Stilwell's leaders for many years has been to obtain an adequate source of municipal water—an absolute prerequisite to industrial progress. The town has a cannery which is well established but which cannot even run on a one-shift-per-day basis for many days during the year due to the scarcity of water in the area.

Approval of a well-founded project by the Area Redevelopment Administration has helped the area's prospects to an amazing degree. The Tulsa Daily World under date of September 6 carried a splendid article about Stilwell's new lease on life and I would like to invite the attention of the House to this article. It is an excellent example of what the Area Redevelopment Administration's program is accomplishing:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World, Sept. 6, 1963]

NEW LAKE TO REMOVE SNAG FROM STILWELL'S ECONOMY

(By Conaly Bedell)

STILWELL.—When contracts for construction of a $1 million plus lake and city water system 5 miles southwest of here are let this fall, a snag in this town's economy will be nearly eradicated.

Hilly Adair County depends almost entirely upon the land for its meager per capita income, which in 1961 was $1,491.

The one industrial payroll in this county of few more than 13,000 persons is the Stilwell Canning Co., which processes the fruits and vegetables raised on the hillsides and in the creek valleys.

But the size of the payroll is closely tied to the quirks of weather.

In dry years, such as this one, the city water supply from a creek and a spring falls below the 600 gallons per minute needed to operate the cannery for the desired 16-hour day, and the plant cuts back.

"Right now we are not even running one full shift," said canning company president Claude Todd. "We could be running 50 percent more raw produce if we had enough water.

"Our objective is to run two full shifts as much as we can between March and December. Then our payroll of about 275 persons is going to shoot up to 350 or 400."

The aim of Stilwell business leaders is to be freed from the ravages of drought by the start of canning season in 1965. They are investing $972,000 to build the 2.2-million-gallon-per-day system, which will handle nearly double the present peak consumption of 1.3 million gallons daily.

The lake, which will be constructed as a cooperative effort by the Stillwater group and the Soil Conservation Service, is part of the Sallisaw Creek Watershed District program for flood control in the area.

Forty-two water retardation structures are to be built on the tributaries of Big Sallisaw Creek in Adair, Cherokee, and Sequoyah Counties within 8 years under the program.

Under the SCS and municipality cooperation plan the town pays approximately 55 percent of dam construction costs, acquires the land and builds its own water treatment and distribution systems.

Stillwell's funds came partly from a Federal Area Redevelopment Administration grant of $522,000 and partly from two Federal agency loans totaling $450,000.

The lake capacity is projected to meet Stillwell's needs for 40 years, according to J. H. Hargis, engineer with Hudgins, Thompson, Ball & Associates, Inc. The water treatment system is expected to be adequate for at least a decade.

With a water surplus of more than a million gallons per day, the cannery will have unlimited growth potential, and outside industry will find the town more attractive, city leaders believe.

"We've had a nibble on some industry already," said C. J. Carson, president of the city utilities board and the water development trust. "I think the lake will bring some more in."

Industry will not be the only beneficiary from this dam and the others in the Sallisaw watershed district.

Agricultural interests will gain protection again floods, and this will stimulate many farmers to develop their creek-bottom land to a higher level of productivity, Todd believes.

"Now a farmer hesitates to irrigate because if he irrigates one night and it rains the next day, he's got puddles and too much water," Todd said.

"When the rivers are under control, he can go in and level his land with a certain amount of drainage. Then if it rains after he irrigates, he isn't hurt.

"But that land leveling costs a considerable amount of money—$100 to $150 per acre—and a farmer can't afford to do it if next year a flood is going to dump 4 feet of sand on his land," he explained.

Until other industries come here to take advantage of the low-cost labor and abundant wanter supply that Stillwell will have, the canning plant remains all important.

The plant was started by local businessmen in 1942 with $25,000 capital, is still home owned and is estimated to be worth more than $1 million now.

It has a distribution area stretching from Denver to Cincinnati and from Minneapolis to the Gulf of Mexico. About 40 percent of the finished product is sold under the Stillwell brand label, and the remainder is marketed under private labels. About 60 percent of the produce is frozen, the rest is canned.

The prospects, when the water problem is finally solved, are bright for the company. "We can sell more than we can produce," Todd said.

Veteran's Calls for Needed Hospital Beds at Bay Pines, Fla., Fall on Deaf Ears of New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, the crying needs of thousands of veterans on Florida's veteran-impacted west coast have been the subject of New Frontier neglect and disregard. A much needed veterans' hospital, for which $1.722 million was appropriated for planning money has been, for all practical purposes, abandoned by this administration.

That I place the entire blame on the Kennedy administration becomes justified when the facts are reviewed.

The VA hospital in question, Bay Pines, is a long-established facility. It is situated on beautiful Boca Ciega Bay, minutes from the Gulf of Mexico, in one of the healthiest climates in the country. Even VA Administrator Gleason, while testifying against Bay Pines before the Senate Appropriations Committee recently, had to admit that if he had to enter a VA hosptial, he would choose Bay Pines.

Bay Pines has received the support of all veterans' organizations in Florida, thousands of interested citizens, and the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate have urged, in unmistakable language, that the Bay Pines expansion and modernization program "move forward" and that the planning money be spent in calendar year 1963.

In testifying against Bay Pines, Mr. Gleason has vacillated through a defective list of excuses, has exhibited an amazing ignorance of the geography of Florida, and has unsuccessfully attempted to juggle the 1960 census figures to show that Bay Pines isn't needed.

Mr. Speaker, the 1960 census figures show clearly and indisputably that the west coast of Florida is one of the most veteran-impacted areas in the United States and that Bay Pines continues to be the necessary and logical site for an expanded and permanent Veterans' Administration hospital program.

The Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital presently serves the needs of over 254,000 veterans in 21 Florida counties; or, over 38 percent of Florida's veterans. Of this total, over 111,000 come from just the two counties of Pinellas, wherein Bay Pines is located, and Hillsborough. Three of Florida's largest counties, Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Polk, adjoin each other within the Bay Pines' service area and no conceivable plan could be devised that did not make many of these veterans travel long distances to some other location.

Mr. Speaker, these figures and conclusions have never been challenged; and, Mr. Gleason has refused to make public the figures he is using to substantiate his analysis which he claims leads him to conclude that Bay Pines is not needed in its present location.

There is no question but that this hospital expansion program is being held up on orders from the White House for reasons thus far undisclosed. The refusal of this administration to move forward with Bay Pines should illustrate to the people of America how hypocritical President Kennedy is when he speaks, in well-tutored oration, of his concern for senior citizens. This administration has even reduced the needs of veterans to politics.

On September 5, 1963, the City Council of St. Petersburg, Fla., adopted a resolution urging the development of Bay Pines. I am inserting a copy of this resolution in the RECORD at this point:

Whereas Bay Pines Veterans Hospital has been established for many years to the mutual advantage of both veterans and the city of St. Petersburg to the extent that it has become an integral part of the city; and

Whereas this facility has been filled to capacity for a number of years and this council is reliably informed there is a large waiting list of veterans anxious to take advantage of the facilities of Bay Pines and the wholesome environment of the city of St. Petersburg and neighboring communities; and

Whereas there appears to be Federal moneys appropriated for the extension and expansion of Bay Pines, but this extension has not been forthcoming and it appears the reasons given for the failure to enlarge this important facility are nebulous and based upon far future developments that may or may not occur, but the need for immediate care for disabled veterans is present: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Fla., That we strongly urge all proper Federal authorities to secure the expansion of Bay Pines Veterans Hospital; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND and the Honorable GEORGE SMATHERS, Senators from the State of Florida, a copy transmitted to each Member of the Florida delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable BOB SIKES, CHARLES E. BENNETT, CLAUDE PEPPER, DANTE B. FASCELL, A. SIDNEY HERLONG, JR., PAUL G. ROGERS, JAMES A. HALEY, D. R. MATTHEWS, DON FUQUA, SAM M. GIBBONS, EDWARD A. GURNEY, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, and a copy transmitted to Hon. J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

HERMAN W. GOLDNER,
Mayor-Councilman,
Chairman of the City Council.

Now It's Vending Machines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of recent date printed a story by Sarah McClendon, a Washington newspaper correspondent, concerning the activities of one Robert G. Baker, who apparently is operating a lucrative vending machine business while on the taxpayers' payroll at a salary of more than $19,000 a year.

The story as it appeared in the Register follows:

NOW IT'S VENDING MACHINES

(By Sarah McClendon)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A civil suit for damages concerning vending machine service to a defense subcontractor has set off a widescale investigation of Robert G. Baker, secretary to the Democratic majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Baker is a protege and close personal friend of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

VENDING CONTRACT

The suit was filed in U.S. District Court by Ralph Hill of Washington, president of Capitol Vending Co., Inc.

Hill alleges that Baker negotiated with Melpar, Inc., a defense subcontractor, to award Hill the vending machine contract for Melpar, then took monthly payments from Hill from April 1962, through July 1963, for securing the contract.

Then, the petition asserts, Bake notified Hill that if Hill did not sell the outstanding stock of his vending machine company to Baker's Serv-U Corp., a vending machine company operating in California, Baker would arrange to terminate the Melpar contract.

In answer, Hill filed suit for $300,000 damages.

The suit alleges that Baker and two codefendants are stockholders in Serv-U Corp., which now has contracts with North American Aviation Corp. plants at various California locations.

One codefendant is Fred Black, described by a North American spokesman as "not an employee, but a part-time consultant on public affairs and congressional activities who advised us in Washington."

A STOCKHOLDER

Hill's petition alleges that Black is a stockholder in Serv-U Corp. and "is employed in the District of Columbia for the purpose of securing contracts from the U.S. Government on behalf of North American Aviation Corp."

The petition further asserts:

That Hill believes Baker was "able to interfere with the outstanding agreement between Capitol Vending and Melphar" because "Baker was able to, and did, represent to defendant Fred Black that he was in a position to assist in securing contracts for North American Aviation Corp.

"That as partial return for the services performed by defendant Fred Black and defendant Robert G. Baker, North American Aviation Corp. entered into an agreement to permit Serv-U Corp. to install vending machines in its plants in California.

"That defendant Fred Black and defendant Robert G. Baker assisted in securing contracts between Melpar, Inc., and North American Aviation Corp.

"That in partial return for these services, Melpar, Inc., has agreed to enter into an agreement with a vending machine operation in which defendants Fred Black and Robert G. Baker have a financial interest."

Another codefendant is Ernest C. Tucker. He is alleged to have assisted and counseled in the foregoing activities. He is the law partner of Baker in an office at 2000 P Street NW., Washington.

Baker came to Washington from Pickens, S.C., a son of an extremely poor family. He became a Senate page and rose to his present position during the time when LYNDON B. JOHNSON (Democrat of Texas) was majority leader of the Senate.

REMAIN CLOSE

Baker and JOHNSON have remained extremely close. When JOHNSON left the office to become Vice President, Baker remained in his post under JOHNSON's successor, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana.

Baker appears on Senate payrolls as receiving $19,611.72 annually. His wife, Dorothy,

as records manager of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, makes $11,757.36 annually. At various times, Baker's brother, Ernest, and sister have been on Senate or House payrolls.

Baker, listed as worth over $500,000, built and operates the Carousel Motor Lodge on the ocean front at Ocean City, Md., with records on file at Snow Hill, Md.

When Carousel was opened in July 1962, Baker chartered a bus to bring Senators to the resort. Vice President and Mrs. LYNDON JOHNSON and famed Washington hostess, Mrs. Perle Mesta, attended along with Senate and House Members.

Baker has other businesses of a varied nature in Washington and South Carolina.

He is also one of the chief dispensers of Democratic campaign funds through the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee. These funds go to elect Democratic Senators.

Hungarian National Day of Mourning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the heroism of the Hungarian people is written large in the annals of history. The Rakoczi rebellion of 1703–07, the War of Independence in 1848–49, and the uprising of the freedom fighters in 1956 are but the most illustrious of the Magyars' valiant struggles to overthrow oppressive foreign rule.

The revolution of 1848–49 occupies a place of honor in the Hungarian national heritage with such stirring figures as Kossuth and Gorgei. The Hapsburg Empire was splintered by revolutionary uprisings in Hungary, Croatia, Italy, and elsewhere. One by one the Austrians suppressed these revolts until Hungary was the last stronghold of resistance. In April 1849 the Hungarian Diet proclaimed the Hungarian Republic, and Kossuth was elected "responsible governor-president" by the Diet. In June Emperor Francis Joseph accepted the offer of Tsar Nicholas of Russia to aid in the suppression of the Hungarian revolt. The Russians attacked from the north while the Austrian Army invaded from the west. This two-front was proved too much for the Hungarians, and they were decisively defeated at the battle of Temesvar. The Russian intervention prevented the Magyars from achieving independence for another three generations.

The repression which followed this Hungarian defeat was one of the most brutal in history. Despite promises of clemency, the Austrian general, Haynau, known as the butcher, visited sanguine vengeance on the Hungarians at the "bloody assizes of Arad." There on October 6, 1849, nine generals were hanged and four shot. The same day Louis Batthyany, who had taken no part in the war, was shot at Budapest. Over a hundred patriots were executed in a butchery which roused indignation all over Europe.

The anniversary of this grim day is a national day of mourning for Hungarians, and today, 114 years later, the recollection of these bloody events is no less painful. I join all Hungarians and Hungarian-Americans, particularly the many San Franciscans of Hungarian descent who greatly enrich the life of that city, in observing this sorrowful anniversary.

Touro Synagogue—Glorious Rededication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit Jewish News of Friday, September 20, 1963, about the 200th anniversary of the rededication of the Touro Synagogue, the oldest Jewish temple in New England. In that article, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Jewish News, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, recalls the great tradition of that grand institution, established in 1763, and now a national shrine:

TOURO SYNAGOGUE—GLORIOUS REDEDICATION

NEWPORT, R.I.—There was a glorious rededication of the famous Touro Synagogue last Sunday, on the 200th anniversary of the founding of the oldest Jewish synagogue in New England.

Federal, State and local officials took note of the historic event. Preceding the ceremonies on Sunday, a glamorous ball was held in the Belcourt Castle of the Belmonts where champagne was served from a large silver container, under the huge crystal chandelier.

The old synagogue—Congregation Jeshuat Israel—was the scene of the impressive event during which the famous letter from George Washington was read from the platform on the left where Washington stood when he personally visited and addressed the congregants.

Rabbi Theodore Lewis, who has gained the affections of the entire community, was among the participants in the events.

The celebration was conducted under the supervision of the Society of Friends of Touro Synagogue National Historical Shrine.

Services are held in the Touro Synagogue regularly. The building was designed by Peter Harrison. It was considered one of his masterpieces. He used the Georgian style which he modified to conform for use in accordance with the sephardic ritual.

Explanatory notes issued by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior state in describing the synagogue which has been turned into a national shrine:

"Georgian architecture—so called because of its popularity in England during the reigns of the first three Georges—uses classical motifs as formalized by the ancient Romans. Symmetry, balance, ordered rhythm—these are terms descriptive of the style.

"As was the custom of Sephardic Jews, the synagogue was inconspicuously located on a quiet street. It stands diagonally on its small plot so that worshipers standing in prayer before the Holy Ark face eastward toward Jerusalem. This symbolic placement gives an air of individuality to the synagogue and subtly insulates it from its surroundings.

"Twelve Ionic columns, representing the tribes of ancient Israel, support a gallery. Above these rise 12 Corinthian columns supporting the domed ceiling.

"In the Orthodox tradition, women sit in the gallery and men sit below. The wainscoted seat running along the sides of the hall provided the only seating for men at the time of the synagogue's dedication. A raised section of this seat at the center of the north wall is used by the president and vice president of the congregation.

"Five massive brass candelabra hang from the ceiling. Two were the gift of Jacob Rodrigues Rivera in the name of his son Abraham; they bear the date 1765. Another, dated 1760, was presented by Napthali Hart Myers; and the fourth, the gift of Aaron Lopez, is dated 1770. The inscription on the large center candelabrum identifies it as the gift of Jacob Pollock in 1769. In front of the Holy Ark hangs the Eternal Light, a symbol of the Divine Presence, was presented to the congregation in 1765 by Samuel Judah of New York.

"Above the Ark is a representation of the Ten Commandments in Hebrew, painted by the Newport artist Benjamin Howland. In the center of the room is the Bimah, an elevated platform where the cantor intones the liturgy and reads the Torah.

"These holy objects, all rich in symbolism, give to the synagogue a profoundly religious atmosphere. The total effect does indeed give 'a faint idea of the majesty and grandeur of the ancient Jewish worship mentioned in scriptures.'

"Touro Synagogue is on Touro Street in downtown Newport, R.I., about 1½ blocks east of the Old Colony House on Washington Square.

"By terms of a cooperative agreement between the Secretary of the Interior, the Shearith Israel trustees of New York City, and Congregation Jeshuat Israel of Newport, Touro Synagogue was designated a national historic site on March 5, 1946. The agreement—authorized by the National Historic Sites Act of 1935—enables the National Park Service to lend technical assistance in preserving the synagogue.

"The Society of Friends of Touro Synagogue National Historic Shrine, Inc., assists in perpetuating Touro Synagogue as a symbol of religious liberty. Through its restoration committee, the society has gone far toward restoring the site to its 18th-century appearance."

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is another in a series of statements calling attention to my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, to proclaim 1964 as See America Year.

Recently, news articles have been cautiously optimistic about the balance-of-payments situation during the third quarter of 1963. Indications are that if this country can bring the balance of payments into line in 1964, wise management may be able to hold the line at any substantial further gold loss.

My bill is part of a broad program to get at various causes of our payments deficit. Last year the payments deficit attributable to tourism amounted to $1.4 billion while the total deficit was just $2.2 billion.

My bill offers a voluntary approach to encourage Americans to do their tourist traveling in the United States during 1964. I have now been contacted by a full third of the recreation and/or travel departments of the various States.

I include at this point a letter received from Wendell Jarrard, Chairman-Director of the State of Florida Development Commission.

FLORIDA DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
Tallahassee, Fla., September 26, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Thank you for sending us a copy of your resolution (H.J. Res. 658) proposing that 1964 be proclaimed as See America Year.

We certainly concur in your statements and efforts encouraging more Americans to see America first. We are sure this program will strengthen our Nation's economy, as well as making Americans more informed of the beauty and history of our country.

Your thoughtfulness in asking our support is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

WENDELL JARRARD.

Alabama Proud of "Buck" Jenkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding citizens of my State of Alabama is Mr. John A. "Buck" Jenkins, a prominent attorney of Birmingham and a dedicated worker in many worthwhile causes and organizations.

Buck's tremendous capabilities have been recognized particularly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of which organization he has just been elected senior vice commander in chief. The City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., Buck's home community, has just adopted a resolution which bespeaks our pride of our fellow Alabamian and I insert that resolution in the RECORD herewith:

RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED THIS DAY OF SEPTEMBER 1963

Whereas the Honorable John A. Jenkins, city attorney for the city of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and a resident of our city, was, on the 28th day of August 1963, at the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Seattle, Wash., elected senior vice commander in chief of the VFW; and

Whereas it is the unanimous sense of this body that the honor accorded John A. Jenkins by this outstanding national organization should be recognized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That this resolution express the congratulations of this body, and congratulations of the citizens of our community to John A. Jenkins for the well-deserved honor accorded our neighbor and associate, and as a consequence thereof, the prestige accruing to our community upon his election as the senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be duly adopted and spread upon the official minutes and a copy delivered to the Honorable John A. Jenkins and given other wide publicity.

ROBERT M. GUILLOT,
Mayor, City of Vestavia Hills, Ala.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Unifying the Common Carrier Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is rather an unusual role when you find the president of a trucking company advocating a policy of unifying the common carrier industry on a program of transportation as opposed to the unregulated carrier.

At a time when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is considering H.R. 4700, the following talk by Mr. W. G. White, president of Consolidated Freightways, comes as a piece of refreshing advice:

REMARKS OF W. G. WHITE, PRESIDENT, CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS, BEFORE SPECIAL LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY THE TRANSPORTATION CLUB OF THE ROCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND ATLANTIC STATES SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD, ROCHESTER, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 26, 1963

For many years I've felt that the Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board is one of the more energetic and productive groups of many similar groups throughout the country. Perhaps this feeling is not without some prejudice since I was an active participant in these meetings for many years when I was a proud employee of the "Route of Phoebe Snow." It's good to be back and I do want you to know how sincerely pleased I am with this opportunity to renew acquaintances with many old friends both from the advisory board and the Transportation Clubs of Rochester.

There may be some who think it strange that a representative of the motor carrier industry would be invited to speak before a rail shippers advisory board. Actually, it's not strange at all. Times have changed and the fact that I am here today is indicative, I believe, of a growing awareness within our transportation community that many problems involve the common carrier industry rather than just the railroad industry or the trucking industry.

Think on that for a moment—a common carrier industry. Perhaps one of our past failings has been an inability to think in terms of a common carrier industry. How many of us, for example, think in terms of motor carriers or rail carriers without ever visualizing the two as an industry with many common problems. Obviously, there are problems and goals to which the respective industries will have divergent approaches. But there are many problem common to both modes and I believe there is increasing realization that the time has come for a united common carrier effort in pursuit of solutions. Such an effort, of course, will require the support and the active assistance of the shipping public if it is to be successful. No matter how the picture is projected, the problems of the common carrier are the problems of the shipper and vice versa.

To adopt this approach, we must first agree on what is needed. A strong common carrier system (both rail and truck), in my humble opinion, is a vital necessity to a healthy economy in peacetime and an absolute necessity in time of war. Common carriers serve large and small shippers and large and small communities all at published rates and on planned schedules. Most public investment in the transportation industry is in the equities and debt of our common carriers. Common carriers are the regulated segment of our transportation industry. Yet, in spite of all of this we find that most problems in transportation are centered in the common carrier segment of the industry. Additionally, there is little doubt that common carriers have been seriously weakened in past years by constant intermodal bickering and the publicity attendant thereto. The time has come, therefore, for common carriers to unite and exert their efforts toward common goals.

We can move forward, then, if we agree on the importance of our common carriers and the need for unified action to find solutions to common problems.

Some of the many areas in which a united common effort would prove worthwhile are—

1. Recognition of each mode's contribution to the common carrier system as a whole;
2. Elimination of gray area or illegal for-hire carriage;
3. Further expansion of trailer-on-flatcar activities;
4. Intermodal shipper-carrier committees;
5. Joint rates and routes;
6. Intermodal 5a agreement.

In attempting to recognize each mode's contribution to the common carrier system, we must be objective. Each mode of transportation has carved a niche in the overall scheme and each contributes a portion of the transportation lift essential to the economy of our country. Unfortunately, some common carriers appear to be lacking the maturity necessary to present an intelligent appraisal of the situation. Consequently, we have constant intermodal bickering on subjects not important enough to warrant the attention. There is no "one" mode of transportation. All are necessary and each furnishes a valuable contribution to transportation generally.

In his transportation message to Congress in April of last year, the President requested the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, "to meet at frequent intervals to discuss regulatory problems affecting the various modes of transportation and to seek coordinated solutions in the form of legislation or administrative action that will improve the regulatory process."

Without attempting to predict what effect, if any, such meetings would have, could not common carriers do something similar? How about periodic meetings of top officials of the American Association of Railroads, American Trucking Associations, Air Transport Association, and the Freight Forwarders Institute? Representatives from the bus, pipeline, and water industries could also be included. If nothing else, such meetings might help the respective participants to become more aware of the common problems facing all.

Illegal for-hire carriage is a cancerous growth presently affecting all forms of common carriage and the shipping public. But rather than a combined, united effort, we have each group pursuing separate antibiotics with some groups taking little or no interest at all in this problem.

Seventy percent of the transportation in this country is unregulated. Yet, it falls upon the remaining 30 percent to provide day-in, day-out transportation lift upon which the continued growth of our economy is dependent. Part of the unregulated transportation is in the so-called gray area. We have all heard, I am sure, the various estimates, ranging as high as $5 billion for illegal transportation yearly. I submit that profit margins in the common carrier industry are not sufficient to provide for this continuing drain.

I don't mean to imply that progress is not being made. The Transportation Association of America has a Committee Against Unlawful Transportation. The trucking industry has its Committee on Transportation Practices. Various other groups, including some shippers, are taking a closer look. The Interstate Commerce Commission and some State regulatory agencies are increasing their enforcement activities. Yet, I can't help but feel that we are just scratching the surface and it is going to take a long, hard, combined effort to stem the tide.

The Interstate Commerce Commission's 76th annual report (for fiscal year ending June 30, 1962) contains 16 legislative recommendations, 5 of which are designed to help combat the malignancy of gray area transportation. As in the past, there has been some support for all or some of these recommendations emanating from various individual groups. But think how much more effective such support would be if it were a combined common carrier effort fully supported by the shipping public.

I know that the Atlantic States Shippers Advisory Board has gone on record as favoring Senate bill 1061 and House bill 4700, but I am sure everyone here will agree that deregulation, as a suggested solution to illegal for-hire carriage, leaves much to be desired as an approach acceptable to everyone. In my opinion, the deregulation bills are dead for this year. On the other hand, I firmly believe that much can be salvaged if we choose to unite our efforts.

The exemptions in section 203(b)(6) of the act, in spite of the limitations placed thereon by the Transportation Act of 1958, still include many commodities that are rarely, if ever, hauled directly from farms, fisheries, or other producers for whose benefit they were intended. As a result, these exemptions are continuing to be exploited by commercial interests without any provable benefit to such producers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its last two annual reports, has suggested that these exemptions be made inapplicable to motor vehicles or combinations thereof having more than three axles.

It seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, that this should be an approach palatable to common carriers, shippers, and regulatory agencies alike. Enactment of legislation along these lines would contribute substantially to lessening the erosion of the traffic of regulated carriers without derogating from the original purpose of section 203(b)(6) of assisting farmers and other producers of exempt commodities in getting their products to market.

Summing up in the affirmative, I suggest to you now that we unite and direct our total efforts toward passage of this suggested legislation as quickly as possible. To me, this

would truly constitute a common carrier effort.

We are all familiar with the rapid expansion of TOFC service in recent years. In 1957, for example, rail cars loaded with highway trailers amounted to 250,000. This figure had grown to over 700,000 by the end of 1962 and estimates of 850,000 carloadings have been given for 1963.

These figures are quite impressive but they are lacking specific data as to the growth of the individual plans. For example, the Commission's 76th annual report speaks of the availability of various plans in the following manner:

"Limiting the tally of survey data to class I railroads or systems, according to the treatment by the surveys, plan II was being provided by the greatest number of railroads followed closely by plan III. Plans I and IV ranked third or fourth depending upon the survey used. * * * Plan V was available on slightly more than half of the roads in each survey."

As of June 30, 1962, 232 railroads were shown as participants in trailer-on-flatcar tariffs; and in one survey, 59 roads replied to an inquiry relative to the plan having the fastest growth. Plan III was placed in this category by 27 roads, plan II by 25 roads, plan I by 6 roads, plan V by 1 road, and plan IV by no roads. Unfortunately, this particular survey did not attempt to relate reported growth of a particular plan to the number of plans offered by the railroad reporting.

What is to be grasped from these surveys? We note that more railroads offer plans II and III and that the greatest growth of piggyback has been under plans II and III. Who is to say, however, that this would continue to be the case if plan I were the plan most offered by railroads?

My company is an extensive participant in plan I arrangements with over 20 railroads, and we have seen our utilization of plan I continue to grow. However, we may be reaching the point of diminishing returns. We have attempted for some years now to secure plan I service on our transcontinental moves. Since this service has not been made available to us and it does not appear likely that it will be, we may be forced to reevaluate our whole concept of TOFC utilization. Obviously, we should not be expected to gear our operational capabilities to two divergent concepts simply because of the unwillingness to cooperate we have encountered in some areas.

Last month the examiner's report and recommended order in ex parte 230 became available. Since this proceeding is still pending, I do not care to dwell on the merits of the 23 proposed rules recommended in the report. For our purpose here today, I think it sufficient to say that once again there is ample common ground for a common carrier approach to the entire subject, and I believe Examiners Boss and Ries summed it up quite clearly by stating: "We believe that the transportation industry is on the threshold of a new and exciting era. At last the heat of competition between the various modes of transportation appears to be congealing into a formula that is not only beneficial to the various common carriers but also to the shipping public."

This points up the important point that the third segment of the carrier-regulatory agency triangle is the shipper. Each mode has long recognized the need for shipper-carrier groups embracing one form of transportation. Have we not now progressed to the point where intermodal shipper-carrier groups are worth considering? Such groups could well be the sounding boards for many common problems. I have already suggested that any united intermodal common carrier effort will require the support and active assistance of the shipping public; and it seems to me that intermodal shipper-carrier groups could function in that direction.

Another area in which common carriers could exert more common effort would be in the field of joint rates and routes. The last annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission carries a recommendation to Congress that parts I, II, and III of the act be amended to authorize the Commission to require, where necessary, the establishment of through routes and joint rates between common carriers. In discussing this recommendation, the Commission said:

"In recent years greater stress has been placed upon the importance of having a more coordinated national transportation system. * * *

"In many instances, the failure or refusal of the carriers voluntarily to enter into joint-rate arrangements is contrary to the public interest in the establishment of a coordinated transportation system."

At a time when great attention is being accorded the concept of coordinated transportation by all modes, it is somewhat sobering to find that the carriers, although supporting the concept outwardly, have been reluctant to actually provide the service. Consequently, the Commission now finds it necessary to seek legislation which would enable it to force the carriers to do what they profess to favor. Intermodal coordination, if it is to be successful, must arise from spontaneous reaction of the carriers and not through legislative flat.

Plan V piggyback as we know it today is really a through rate and route arrangement involving carriers of different modes. This concept is still in the embryo state of development but I believe the time is coming when it will come into its own. When this occurs, I believe we will see joint sales calls by motor and rail representatives on the same shipper. This would appear to be a logical development and I, for one, think that the time when this becomes a reality is not far off.

As this occurs, perhaps the next step will be an intermodal 5a agreement. The conference method of ratemaking is a long established principle, as is the immunity from the antitrust laws, granted thereto by section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Everyone today, both carrier and shipper, is cognizant of the need for a more simplified rate structure. The Defense Traffic Management Service is actively pursuing this goal through its DART (development of advanced rate techniques) program. Additionally, the Department of Commerce recently awarded a research contract to the Batelle Institute for a study of simplified rates.

No one can argue that we aren't presently confronted with a hodgepodge of rate and tariff publications that are so complicated that even the computers are having difficulty. It seems to me that the common carriers should work together to a solution of this problem. This could be done through an intermodal 5a agreement.

I'm sure that as I have been talking all of you have probably brought to mind other areas of common interest to common carriers. My list does not purport to be all inclusive and I only mention these few examples to pinpoint the need for more common effort.

Again, I want to thank you for inviting me to speak here today. I will consider it worthwhile if I have left you with the thought that we let history speak the virtues of any particular mode of transportation and that we, in turn, as representatives of railroads, the trucking industry and the shipping public combine our efforts to protect, foster, and encourage the greatest common carrier system in the world.

Thank you.

Food for the Hungry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Food for the Hungry?" published in the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times on October 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY?

Representative M. G. SNYDER (Republican of Kentucky) made a statement last week in the House that in the town of Carnauba northeastern Brazil more than 1,000 old, sick, and crippled people labor at building roads in the hot sun for 10 hours each day. Their wages are 45 cents a week plus beans, rice, and flour.

The food used as part wages to these workers was given to the Brazilian Government by the American people under Public Law 480—food for peace.

Representative SNYDER's information came from a missionary on the scene who also sent along an article from one of Brazil's major magazines excoriating the exploitation of these poor people. The magazine said the food given as payment was in "deplorable condition, some being rotten and all looking bad." Pictures accompanying the magazine article show food containers clearly labeled "Not to be sold or exchanged."

Letters written to Representative SNYDER by the missionary say that the officials of Brazil do not distribute the food sent them by the United tSates to those who hunger but use it as pay for people to work for them. The missionary also said that millions are close to starvation in Brazil and that very little of the money from the Alliance for Progress is getting to the people who are in extreme need.

Representative SNYDER sent a copy of the magazine article and the missionary's correspondence to the Agency for International Development for comment. He received in return a long and rambling letter that spoke of the efforts made by AID all over the world to share the abundance of the United States with the needy and the hungry. Deep in the letter is the statement that in the case of northeastern Brazil the use of food as wages appeared to be part of a drought relief program undertaken by Brazil. The United States shipped some 25,000 tons of surplus foodstuffs to Brazil to alleviate a critical food shortage in northeast Brazil and the United States and Brazil agreed that the food could be used as part payment of wages in kind on work relief projects.

This sort of agreement would have to be, it is assumed, part and parcel of a program of "self-help economic development," a noble and worthy aim. Bread given for work performed is always more nourishing than bread given as charity.

However, an editorial from a Brazilian newspaper is quoted in the magazine article submitted as evidence by Representative SNYDER. The quoted editorial gives the lie to any noble aims in the area of self-help economic development in this case. The quoted editorial reads:

"The Federal Government (Brazil) receives susbtantial American aid in foodstuffs for distributuion to the needy, and the agencies which implement the aid policy

of the Government have converted this donation into a medium of payment to complement the shameful hunger wages paid the worker who is, this way, the victim of even more torpid exploitation, which is more inhuman, more abject and more sordid because it is being perpetrated by the Government.

Representative SNYDER, a freshman in the Congress, should be complimented for his thorough exploration of this example of misuse of food given for the hungry by the United States. The underpaid, oppressed Brazilians drawing their wages from the Brazilian Government's company store will not associate the rotten and deplorable food with any kindness on the part of the people of the United States. Nor will the Alliance for Progress, a fragile instrument at best, gain any strength so long as its funds are diverted from the purposes for which they are appropriated.

National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will recall the skepticism with which the Peace Corps was greeted 3 years ago.

They may also recall that two very important lessons have been learned from the Peace Corps. The first is that the Corps' success has exceeded even the most optimistic expectations and that its value has been proven far beyond its relatively modest annual cost. The second lesson is that the principles and ideas underlying the work of the Corps abroad may well be utilized to combat the many social problems we face at home.

The groundwork for a domestic program has been laid by the President's Study Group on a National Service Corps. The basic legislation to establish the National Service Corps was drafted by the Study Group and passed recently by the Senate. It is my sincere hope that this legislation will come before the full House within the very near future.

A great deal has been said about the National Service Corps: The areas of possible activity of such an organization in the United States; the need to help the unfortunate and underprivileged to help themselves; the fuller use of our vast human resources in constructive people-to-people programs here at home. But perhaps most important of all, the National Service Corps would afford opportunities for our citizens to use those great moral resources which throughout our history have been our greatest strength—our capacity for compassion, for self-sacrifice, for devotion to a determined goal, for patriotism, and for all that is best in us.

Americans of all ages, of all parties, in all stations of life can, I believe, honestly subscribe to the ideals propounded by the National Service Corps. These ideals are expressed nowhere better than in the speeches and statements of Capt. William R. Anderson, the President's Adviser on the National Service Corps.

As Members of this House are aware, Captain Anderson was the commander of the atomic submarine *Nautilus* who conceived and executed that ship's spectacular and historic journey under the polar ice to the North Pole some 5 years ago, completing the first polar passage in man's history.

In the 20 years of his service with the Navy, Captain Anderson has learned to understand young Americans as few others do; we may consider ourselves fortunate in having him as the Presidential Adviser on this important program.

Last week Captain Anderson spoke before the opening meeting of the Philadelphia United Fund. The remarks he made on the national service program are so important and so basic to the understanding of this program that I am inserting them at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, PRESIDENTIAL CONSULTANT ON A NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS AT THE UNITED FUND OF THE PHILADELPHIA AREA, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 26, 1963

I am particularly honored to be present at the opening of the United Fund Drive in Philadelphia. The ideas which motivate the work of the agencies participating in this fund are in the finest tradition of this so fortunately named city; indeed, they are inseparably bound to the very basis of our democracy.

Throughout our history, the forces of patriotism, of self-sacrifice, of devotion to duty have been our strongest national characteristics. Although voices of doubt have arisen in each generation to lament the passing of these great American virtues, history shows that we have not lost our capacity for compassion, our willingness to help our fellow man, and our determination to see justice done.

In these times of unprecedented prosperity, we often associate the qualities of heroism and devotion to a great cause with the challenges of war or the adventures of discovery.

But not all conquest is to be found in the depth of the sea or the vastness of outer space. We can build atomic submarines or sophisticated spacecraft; our sciences can discover frontiers of knowledge undreamed of even 10 or 20 years ago. We can win the leadership of the world in every conceivable field, and yet lose ourselves right here at home on the human front, U.S.A.

Despite our affluence, 1 in 6 Americans is handicapped for one reason or another, and thus fails to share our general level of prosperity and opporunity. Eight and three-tenths million American adults are school dropouts with less than 5 years of education; in our technological age, few of them can make a satisfactory living. Five and two-fifths million Americans are mentally retarded; for many if not most of them, there is only the prospect for custodial care. More than half of the 400,000 children of migrant farmworkers are retarded educationally from 1 to 4 years; few have a real chance of bridging that gap or escaping the hopelessness of their parents' way of life. The American Indian has a life expectancy of 20 years less than the average American.

The statistics of educational and economic deprivation in the midst of plenty comprise a lengthy catalog. But it is not necessary to cite them all in order to convince ourselves that we must find some new approaches to these problems if the United States is not to deprive herself of the talents and resources of millions of her citizens.

Those who are active in various areas of social work know that the most effective form of charity is that designed to help the individual to help himself.

This principle indeed is in the great American tradition. In early America, neighbors helped each other to build their houses and protect their homesteads from armed attack; in the 19th century, we taught our immigrants the language of their adopted country; we opened trade schools and free colleges to make them and their children productive members of our society.

More than ever, we must listen today to the call of that vast number of Americans who are not full partners in our prosperity and opportunities.

There are two basic reservoirs on which we can draw—money and human resources. Of the two, our human resources are by far the most important, the most easily available, and the most useful.

We must use our capacities not merely to alleviate conditions as we find them, but to go to the root of these problems, to cure them where we can, to create conditions under which all Americans can participate in our country's well-being and contribute to its progress to the best of their abilities, unhampered by conditions which they themselves are powerless to overcome.

In every age, men have believed that poverty is unavoidable; that human suffering must be endured; that the misery of the man gives the fortunate few the opportunity to redeem themselves by material charity.

The experience of the many agencies who participate in the United Fund indicates that suffering and poverty and deprivation are not inevitable or incurable. It is this conviction that gave birth to the concept of a National Service Corps.

The most profound, the most basic idea underlying the National Service Corps is the belief that our human resources can and must be brought to bear to a considerably greater degree on our own social and economic problems. If enacted by Congress, the Corps will give a modest number of dedicated men and women of all ages the opportunity to offer a year or two of their lives on the frontlines of human distress in this country. They will live under the general conditions of the unfortunate with whom they are working; they will only go where they are invited; work where the needs are greatest; help on projects that are locally conceived, locally designed, and locally administered.

I cannot stress too strongly that except for the use of a broad national base—the spirit and tradition of service to our country—to attract the best corpsmen possible, the program is entirely local. By its very intent and construction, it neither can nor ever will be used as an unwanted thrust of the Federal Government into local community affairs.

Of equal importance is the Corps ambition to be a seed-planting, catalytic effort rather than an end in itself. All projects would be undertaken on a purely temporary basis with the understanding that the corpsmen would be replaced by local part- or full-time personnel within the period of 2 to 4 years. A major goal of the National Service Corps will be to stimulate part-time volunteer service work by Americans in their own communities, in the best tradition of American ideals.

The basic law creating a National Service Corps has passed to Senate, but it has not yet reached the floor of the House.

I strongly believe that the National Service Corps is based on principles to which all Americans can repair, be they Democrats or Republicans, from the South or the North, liberal or conservative. The National Service Corps evokes much that is best in us, much that is deeply imbedded in our tradition. It will not supplant the work of local agencies, but will supplement and encourage that work; it will derive its greatest strength from the experience of local volunteers. Certainly, it will not be able to solve all our social problems; but it will go a long way to convince our less fortunate citizens

that they have not been forgotten by their fellow Americans, and it will give many of us the opportunity to serve, and reduce the waste of vast and able human resources all around us.

The National Service Corps and the agencies participating in the United Fund have a great deal in common. But perhaps more important than any other point of contact is this: they give to each American the singular opportunity to enrich himself by giving; for the giver always benefits more than he to whom he gives; giving enriches far beyond the measure of the gift, and ennobles the mind and the spirit; giving is the tribute which we pay for being free in a free America.

The Ethics of Challenging Supreme Court Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune of today carries an interesting article by the distinguished writer and columnist, David Lawrence, Esq., entitled "The Ethics of Challenging Supreme Court Decisions," in which he quoted a recent speech by Attorney General Kennedy in Kansas City, Mo.

In that article, Mr. Lawrence said:

Mr. Kennedy asserted that "to seek reversal of a judicial ruling" is nowadays being defended as merely to exercise one's Constitutional right and that the arguments for such action are being given a gloss of respectability and can even take on the disguise of a patriotic, high-minded dissent.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lawrence, in his splendid defense of the right of lawyers to challenge the correctness of recent Supreme Court decisions in civil rights cases could well have mentioned another inconsistency of the Nation's chief legal adviser. That legal adviser prepared what has since been called the President's omnibus civil rights bill. In it, he included in title II a provision which authorized the Federal Government to require desegregation of all hotels, motels, and public eating places. The the President's chief legal adviser said that he based the authority for such congressional action upon the due process clause of the 14th amendment. It is reliably reported that the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States earnestly pleaded with the chief legal adviser of the United States not to call upon him to overrule all previous decisions of his Court which have consistently held that the 14th amendment did not apply in cases of that kind. It is further reported that the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States asked the chief legal adviser of the United States to base the authority of the Congress to enact what is known as the accommodations provision of the omnibus Civil Rights bill upon the Interstate Commerce Clause of the Constitution because the meaning of that Clause of the Constitution had not been distorted since decisions of some years ago by the U.S. Supreme Court relating to the coverage of the Wage and Hour Law.

Therefore, I not only agree with all that Mr. Lawrence says about the propriety of lawyers challenging the clearly unsound rulings of the Court in past civil rights cases, but I also call attention to the inconsistency of the Attorney General of the United States in suddenly asking for an observance of the old English common law rule of "stare decisis," while requesting at the same time the Congress to clearly violate it by provisions not only in title II but likewise of title VI of his omnibus civil rights bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the David Lawrence article mentioned above.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS: THE ETHICS OF CHALLENGING SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Kennedy in a speech at Kansas City, Mo., the other day gave some advice to lawyers which, if it had been followed prior to 1954, might never have brought about a reversal by the Supreme Court of the United States of its decision of 1896 which had declared "separate but equal" facilities to be constitutional in dealing with the racial problem.

Mr. Kennedy told the Missouri Bar Association that, while "it is proper and just to avail oneself of every legal defense to test either the validity or the applicability of a rule of law," the principle is today being "used in isolation, invoked in improper contexts, espoused as absolutes and carried to extremes." He indorsed in general the "legal propositions" that "a court decision binds only those persons who are a party to it" and that "a court-made rule of law should always be open to reexamination and is susceptible to being overruled on a subsequent occasion." But today, he said, those same principles are "being proclaimed by lawyers and public officials as the justification for tactics to obstruct the enforcement of laws and court orders."

Mr. Kennedy asserted that "to seek reversal of a judicial ruling" is nowadays being defended as merely "to exercise one's constitutional right" and that the arguments for such action are being given "a gloss of respectability" and "can even take on the disguise of a patriotic, high-minded dissent." He added that it is a position "publicly espoused today by the Governors of two States, by a past president of the American Bar Association, and by a Federal district judge who recently overruled the Brown decision (1954) on grounds that its findings of fact were erroneous."

But where does this leave the lawyer who is asked to defend his client before the bar of justice? What would have happened if the lawyers for the Negroes in those 58 years between 1896 and 1954 had accepted the defeatist doctrine that what had been decided in the courts in one set of cases was final? Mr. Kennedy says a reversal of the 1896 decision had been expected some day but no such reversal of the 1954 ruling is ever likely now. Who can be a prophet in the field of legal technicalities and judicial whims? For decades many a lawyer in this country felt that the 1896 decision was just as permanent as Mr. Kennedy today thinks the 1954 decision will be.

Is it the function of a lawyer to defend his client by every legal method, or must he accept a court precedent as binding in all future cases? Whether he likes it or not, the lawyer feels he must at least try to get a reversal on the very same basis perhaps that Mr. Kennedy has argued—that times may change and that the justices may see their errors of the past. Many school boards, for example, are testing in the courts today just how far the prayer decision of the Supreme Court really applies. Their lawyers evidently feel that the recent ruling was merely the law of the case.

"What do we really mean, as lawyers," asked the Attorney General in his speech, "when we say that it is proper and constitutional to avail oneself of every legal defense?" He answered that it doesn't mean using dilatory tactics and requires good faith and cooperation with the courts.

But suppose Negro and white lawyers over the decades had advised their Negro clients not to challenge State laws and to show good faith rather than to test and retest segregation laws of various kinds. Would the Negroes have ever secured a reversal of the 1896 decision? And what of the Negro organizations which openly argue now for street demonstrations which they know will lead to friction and bitter feeling and perhaps violence? Are they cooperating with the courts?

Some of the lawyers on the other side can, moreover, ask these questions:

1. Is the demand for the right of a trial by jury just the raising of a technicality when the Governor of a sovereign State is being charged with contempt for trying to test a court order? No case like it has ever come before the Supreme Court.

2. Isn't the Department of Justice availing itself of a technicality in its proposal to justify interference with the right of owners of public accommodations to choose their own customers? Wasn't this issue decided by the Supreme Court in 1883, and why should circumventing tactics be used now?

3. Is it right for the Department of Justice to tell Congress it expects the Supreme Court to rule in its favor? Is this a proper statement to make, and does it mean that Justices will be nominated hereafter who conform to the administration's expectations?

The records over the years show that the lawyers for Negro organizations didn't mind defending their clients who had disregarded the law of the case or the law of the land again and again. Mr. Kennedy said this was because they expected a reversal in the desegregation cases. He described it as "a decision that the vast majority of the American public holds to be morally correct." But can a system of law and a written Constitution be effective if the Supreme Court rewrites the laws and amends the Constitution? This is the true weakness today.

If public opinion alone, moreover, is to be the guiding influence, then maybe a system of elected judges or appointments for a fixed tenure—so that the High Court Judges could perhaps be changed with each administration—would reflect the wishes of the vast majority as to what is morally, if not constitutionally, correct.

Tito Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will be interested in a letter I received from the Serbian National Defense Council of America

concerning the visit to this country by Yugoslav Dictator Tito.

In this letter, Dr. Urosh L. Seffer, president of the council, points out that the visit damages the prestige of the United States, especially in the captive nations. His letter follows:

SERBIAN NATIONAL DEFENSE
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Chicago, Ill.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

DEAR SIR: It has been officially announced that the Yugoslav Dictator Tito is coming to Washington. In the name of the members of our organization we would like to ask you to do everything in your power to prevent this visit.

We feel that Tito's visit to the White House would only damage the prestige of the United States in the world, reaffirm Tito's role of a missionary of communism in the underdeveloped regions and deliver additional grievance to the suffering Yugoslav people.

We feel that this visit has been poorly evaluated and that its consequences were not properly taken into consideration. The United States has nothing to gain from such a visit and has a lot to lose. We can confidently predict that in Eastern Europe and in Yugoslavia specifically the image of the United States would sink to a new low.

The U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia and the invitation to Tito is a flagrant violation of the principles for which this country stands. As American citizens and anti-Communists, we ask you to use your influence to prevent this shameful and damaging visit.

DR. UROSH L. SEFFER,
President.

A Model Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the September 20 St. Louis Post-Dispatch relating to the foreign lobbying investigation being conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 20, 1963]

A MODEL INVESTIGATION

The new Fulbright-Hickenlooper legislation to control foreign lobbying is thoroughly justified by an investigation which itself was a model of how Congress can constructively use its power of inquiry.

Chairman FULBRIGHT and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were moved to investigate the activities of agents for foreign governments and interests by the high-pressure activities of these lobbyists concerning 1962 sugar legislation. The Arkansas Senator and Iowa's Senator HICKENLOOPER, ranking Republican committeeman, have concluded the inquiry with a package of bills to—

Prohibit foreign interests from making political contributions to American political candidates;

Require every foreign agent to report any such personal contribution;

Prohibit arrangements under which an agent's fee is contingent on his success in influencing the Government; and

Require full disclosure of a foreign agent's status and interest if he appears before congressional or Federal agencies.

Each one of these proposals grew out of a finding in the investigation. For example, an agent for Philippine sugar interests testified that he contributed $9,300 to the campaign funds of 24 Congressmen and 2 others in 1960. Many of those who received the contributions were said to be related in some fashion to efforts to pay increased Philippines war damage claims. Such testimony offers ample reason for forbidding campaign gifts by foreign interests to Senators and Representatives.

Other testimony concerned the case of an American employed by the Dominican sugar interests who, Senator FULBRIGHT said, "apparently filed exaggerated and sometimes inaccurate reports to his (foreign) principal." Working on a contingent fee basis, such agents could manage to increase their profit whenever they convinced their foreign employer that they were increasing his profit from the United States.

Still other witnesses described activities of a Washington law firm working for Dominican interests which did not report the terms of its agreement to the Justice Department, and did not report the complete fee it received. Altogether, the Senate committee had good reason to oppose the contingent fee system and to demand open and full reporting of the special interests of foreign lobbyists.

It is, of course, the specific purpose of a congressional inquiry to consider new or changed legislation. In both its hearings and results, the Fulbright investigation did just that. The responsible work of the Foreign Relations Committee deserves acceptance by Congress. More than that, its high standards deserve acceptance for other committees which have gone off on various publicity hunts with no other visible purpose.

The Attack on Barry Goldwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the marvels of our age sems to be the inability of the vaunted left to tarnish the armor of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. Writers like Messrs. Lippmann and Childs and cartoonists of the Herblock type have found their penpoints blunted by the ineptness of their attacks.

On September 30, the Wall Street Journal carried an excellent editorial which reflected on this situation and I commend it to the Members of this body, as follows:

THE ATTACK ON BARRY GOLDWATER

After a quarter-century of musing on the marvels of American politics we can't say we're surprised. Still, we can't help being fascinated by the violence of the assault on BARRY GOLDWATER.

We're not surprised because we are watching a replay of the same battle, with the same contending forces, that has been going on in the Republican Party since 1940. It's a battle, incidentally, not likely to be finished in the GOP convention of 1964.

Geographically, the contending forces are roughly divided between the two seaboards, East and West, and the central part of the country, including the South. For 20 years the seaboard forces were polarized around Governor Dewey, who got the nomination once for Willkie, twice for himself and finally for Eisenhower. The loser each time was the late Senator Taft of Ohio, acknowledged by even his foes as one of the great statesmen of his generation but always abandoned at the last minute, even by many of his friends.

This geographic division hinges on the fact that the seaboard areas embrace the most populous States with the largest urban areas. Since most politicians are interested first in their own survival, and since in these areas Republicans judge they must be "liberal" enough to compete with the local Democrats, their aim is to have a "liberal" Presidential candidate and platform. The fate of the national ticket is secondary.

Add to this practical political consideration the fact that the Democrats are quite happy to have the Republicans promise only an imitation of their programs since it almost guarantees them victory. And the fact that most of the articulate intellectual community is of the same political persuasion. The result is a struggle at the Republican convention, generally successful, to see that the country gets the same programs and policies no matter which party wins.

So it will be next summer at San Francisco. But this time there are some important differences which give the battle a different aspect and which account, we think, for the shape of the attack on Senator GOLDWATER.

Until 1952 it was possible to make a persuasive argument that a relatively conservative politician couldn't win. This was the weapon that time and again turned back Senator Taft; it wasn't necessary to tag him with epithets about the radical right or attack his character. But President Eisenhower proved to be more conservative than his backers anticipated, and it was plainly evident that his conservative impulses struck a responsive chord in the electorate.

Thus against Mr. Nixon that attack was almost wholly on his character; that attack was one of the more venomous of recent political history. Yet in spite of this, he very nearly won, and that without the votes of the big Eastern States. And in spite of Mr. Kennedy's victory, and his evident personal popularity, he has made practically no headway with his programs in Congress.

Meanwhile, before anyone quite realized what was happening, Senator GOLDWATER's political strength around the country grew to astounding proportions. What made this even more significant was that for a long time the Senator did nothing to encourage it. Clearly something has been happening to the political mood of America.

So today you hear very little about how Senator GOLDWATER can't win. Perhaps he can't, but nobody now thinks any other Republican could do better and almost everybody thinks he just might. This possibility poses a new problem for those who want to keep the Republican nomination in liberal hands.

Hence, we think, the rumbling drumfire about the radical right. You hardly ever hear anyone discuss, much less answer, Senator GOLDWATER's actual views on the current issues of the day. You hear a great deal of discussion about the radical ideas the Senator is alleged to have, and much innuendo about the dangers of his being made captive by the John Birch Society, as if that tiny group were somehow threatening to take over the country.

For example, one of our more famous journalists, and an honorable man, describes the Senator as a radical reactionary whose program is a recipe for panic. And a Governor of one of our States, himself spoken of as a candidate for President, speaks ominously of the peril to the country raised by those who support the Senator. In each

case the attack is not by argument but by epithet.

Senator GOLDWATER does have some controversial views. He would make no move toward disarmament until the Communists change their ambitions; he would put an economic blockade on Cuba. He would cut back on foreign aid, reduce Government spending, shore up the dollar. He would curb the absolute power of labor unions, overhaul the tax system to encourage incentive and investment, try to slow down the trend toward big Central Government. He would, however, provide help for the mentally retarded, support the Peace Corps, and provide a Federal retraining program for jobless workers. But however controversial, these are hardly radically reactionary or recipes for panic.

Unless, perhaps, the panic is on in the camp of the political liberals. Only an overpowering fright would seem to account for the wild arm-flailing at BARRY GOLDWATER.

Just Where Do You Stand, Sir, This Week?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, considering the widespread interest recently evinced in the breathtaking changes occurring in the domestic, if not foreign, views of one member of the Arizona delegation, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial published last Friday in the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson.

Those who may be asking, "Just how do you stand, sir, this week?" will find in this editorial, I believe, a summation of their own reactions to recent startling turns of events and phrase.

The editorial follows:

GOLDWATER'S STARTLING STAND

Certainly most if not all Star readers went word by word and paragraph by paragraph through the page 1 story Thursday morning quoting Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in his stand on a number of key issues. This story had the following origin: the Yuma Daily Sun carried a Goldwater interview provided by a private Washington information service, the Congressional Quarterly, not to be confused with any Government publication or agency. As a result, the Star got directly in touch with Senator GOLDWATER'S office to check the accuracy of this purported interview, and in the course of the telephone call obtained the story carried Thursday.

This story put GOLDWATER firmly on record as being:

1. For enforcement of the Constitution, with military force if necessary. (This would include in-school integration.)
2. Agaiinst three proposed States rights constitutional amendments.
3. For the Supreme Court's action in ordering Tennessee to redistrict its legislature.
4. Against application of present antitrust laws to unions.
5. For a "complete revamping" of the Internal Revenue Code, with adjustment of the progressive rate of taxation "where they become punitive."
6. Against a national fallout shelter program.
7. For liberalizing immigration regulations.
8. Against Federal fair trade regulation.
9. Neither for nor against water fluoridation.

These nine principles put BARRY GOLDWATER so close to the middle in American political life that he must suddenly have come under the suspicion of many of his former friends. The new stand is powerful in its implications, clear down to the apparently trivial fluoridation of water view, for the ultraright has charged that water fluoridation is virtually a Communist plot.

Think of what GOLDWATER has said. He has said he will enforce the Constitution with military power if necessary. That's what Eisenhower did at Little Rock and what Kennedy did at Oxford, Miss. How is that stand of GOLDWATER'S going to be taken through the South, which up to just recently (and perhaps still) could be considered solid Goldwater territory?

How will GOLDWATER'S stand on the legislative redistricting situation affect the enthusiasm of his support in Tennessee or Georgia or any other State with redistricting problems, including Arizona, which follows the Federal system with a proportional house and a senate made up of two members from each county?

He no longer can be the darling of the people backing the so-called liberty amendment, which would end the income tax; for BARRY sees the income tax as necessary but wants the Revenue Act gone over carefully. So do a lot of liberals and moderates.

BARRY has moved in giant steps away from his ecstatic far-right, Birch Society-type of backers, toward the middle of the road where every successful presidential candidate has run so profitably for at least a dozen years.

Only in his foreign policy does he still stand where his backers thought he stood a few weeks ago. Will he alter his foreign policy stand, too; and, if so, when?

This poses the question of what sort of a President BARRY would make. The Star, on Monday, April 29, 1963, answered that. It said, "Being forced into the normal political situations any President faces, GOLDWATER would find that he had to be just about the same sort of President as all other Presidents * * * found they had to be."

Alliance for Progress Making Headway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress program will be hampered greatly unless the cuts in the foreign aid authorizations made by the House of Representatives are restored in the other body. The following editorial, printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on August 17, 1963, points out the progress we are making in this regard. I commend this report by Ambassador Moscoso to the attention of all my colleagues:

ALLIANCE, AND PROGRESS

Theodoro Moscoso agreed that the first anniversary of the Alliance for Progress last year offered no cause for celebration. But on the second anniversary, the U.S. coordinator of the program reports that it is "beginning to make an impact."

In 2 years more than 140,000 homes and more than 8,000 classrooms have been built in Latin America, together with new roads, water supplies, sewage systems, and modest powerplants. The major accomplishments are less tangible. Some Alliance nations have improved their tax systems. Others have created cooperative savings and loan associations, and agricultural and industrial development banks to spur local and private initiative. School programs have been modernized.

Mr. Moscoso notes that the present phase of the Alliance, known as institution building, will create the social machinery to make democracy work in the future. But he also repeats President Kennedy's admonition that the Alliance has a "long, long way to go."

Where does the Alliance show possibilities for failure? Some Latins think the United States is trying impossibly to make them over in its own image; Argentina's economics minister has just said so. Other Latins, such as Archbishop Camara of Brazil, insist that the blindness of the ruling oligarchies is the major impediment to progress.

Another difficulty is that Latin governments are spending $1.5 billion annually on military establishments, or more than the Alliance received from Congress last year. The million dollars that would buy 40 tanks, Mr. Moscoso points out, would build 500 rural schools or graduate 130 engineers.

There are obstacles enough to go around. The fact remains that the United States can advise, prod and help pay for social progress, but it cannot drive its sister republics into matching the revolution of rising expectations. Some, such as Venezuela and Colombia, are struggling to implement democracy. Argentina has not so far produced an accurate plan for using Alliance funds. Brazil, another potentially wealthy country, has wanted aid for rescue from fiscal difficulties where rescue never seems permanent.

Whatever the record, 2 years of experience have not diminished the principles of the Alliance. The first principle is not help, but self-help. Latin American leaders especially owe an effort matching the assistance, for their liberties and positions are at stake. They cannot buy time against revolution by buying arms. "If we fail to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the people for a better way of life," Administrator Moscoso has said, "no amount of arms can assure us freedom and security."

North America risks dollars in the Alliance. Latin America risks its way of life. It has the greater reason not to fail.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski evokes memories of gratitude and esteem in the hearts of Americans. October 11 has been designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day. It is a genuine honor to speak to you here at the Polonaise Hall to honor a gallant Polish warrior. I notice that today's rain undoubtedly washed the red and white stripe that should have been painted on Bay Street for the parade that was canceled this afternoon.

I would also like to congratulate Miss Carol Ann Osowiecki whose success here today in being crowned Miss Polonia is

another tribute to the great contributions Poland has made to this country.

Today time brings us to the 183d anniversary of Pulaski's death. Like Lafayette and his own fellow countryman, Kosciusako, he came across the seas to aid the American States in establishing a new order of things, based on individual liberty.

Casimir Pulaski, better known to us in America as Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski of Revolutionary War fame, was born in Winiary, Poland, in 1748. He was the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski, a venerable old man who belonged to the Polish nobility. The father was the chief magistrate of Warsch and was noted for his knowledge of jurisprudence.

Pulaski, almost from the moment of his birth throughout his short life of 31 years, was devoted to horses and the cavalry branch of the fighting forces. His father was obliged to keep a large band of armed retainers on his great estates and, from their frequent clashes with invaders, Pulaski derived his earliest lessons in warfare. As a boy, from the family cook around the large cozy kitchen hearth, he listened to harrowing tales of the swift merciless Coasacks whose cavalry raids slaughtered all before them, men and animals alike.

Young Casimir received his early education in the local parish school. This was followed by rigorous training in the Latin classics. Before he reached his majority, the youth became interested in the efforts to redeem Poland. A nation, then one-fifth larger than France in area and containing a population of approximately 20 million people, had been torn asunder. This catastrophe did not come about all at once, but gradually.

When the puppet of Catherine of Russia was elected by the Polish deputies, under the impending threat of the Russian Army, who surrounded the Polish Diet at the time of the election, he became a tool in her hands for the execution of her will in Poland. Such patriotic and gallant Poles as Count Joseph Pulaski—the father of the man we honor today—realized it was time to arouse the spirit of their countrymen. Under the circumstances they took the risk of resorting to force. Pulaski's father was then about 60 years of age. He advised his three sons of a plan derived by himself and other Polish nobles to forestall the enemies. They formed an organization in the town of Bara—in Podolia—about 20 miles from the Turkish border. It was known as the Confederation of the Bar.

Under the most trying conditions and the greatest adversity, this patriotic organization fought the enemies of Poland against overwhelming odds. Casimir Pulaski and his brother, Francis, became the life of the movement. At the head of a small force of cavalry, he performed heroic feats. With his brother they crossed and recrossed Poland and carried the revolt into Lithuania. During the winter of 1769–70, he maintained himself in the mountains of Galicia, and became a constant terror to the Russians.

The failure of this movement ended Pulaski's career in Poland. His aged father died in prison. One of his brothers was killed before his eyes. The youngest brother was taken into captivity. Many of his countrymen were doomed to slavery.

The energy Pulaski possessed to fight in the cause of freedom did not desert him. He escaped into Turkey and journeyed on to France and eventually came to Paris.

During his stay in Paris, Pulaski read and heard of America's struggle for freedom. Through an old family friend he obtained an introduction to Benjamin Franklin. This elder statesman forwarded to Gen. George Washington excellent letters of introduction.

Wrote Franklin to his Commander in Chief—

> Count Pulaski of Poland [is] an officer famed in Europe for his bravery in defense of the liberty of his country against the three powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. * * * The opinion here is that he may be highly useful to our Service.

On the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the monument to Pulaski's memory at Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1853, it was stated:

> Across the Atlantic came to [Pulaski] the tidings that the people of another hemisphere had bid defiance to oppression and were arming for the struggle. The sound stirred the heart of Pulaski like the voice of a battle trumpet. It was a struggle for liberty. It was his cause, whoever the people and wherever the scene of conflict. Fate forbade him to achieve the independence of his own country, and true to the noble impulses of his soul he came to aid in establishing that of America.

He saw—

Jared Sparks, in his "Library of American Biography" says:

> a new field opened for vindicating with his sword the same principles, the same rights of mankind, the same unchangeable laws of justice as those for which he had wielded it with so much courage and singleness of purpose in his own country.

George Washington seemed much attracted by this dashing newcomer when introduced to him personally by Lafayette and recommended to Congress that Pulaski be commissioned as a brigadier general and be given command of the cavalry. Washington added in a letter to John Hancock, dated August 27, 1777:

> The Count appears, by his recommendations, to have sustained no inconsiderable military character in his own country; and as the principal attention in Poland has been for some time past paid to its cavalry, it is to be presumed that this gentleman is not unacquainted with it.

Up to the time Pulaski arrived in Boston in July 1776 and met Washington the following month there had been no regular cavalry in the American Army. Four regiments were projected and Washington suggested to Congress that Pulaski be put in command of all the cavalry. Pulaski was, of course, borne to the saddle.

Flinging himself into combat, Pulaski presently organized the cavalry unit which became known as Pulaski's Legion, by which he will always be remembered. He participated in the battles of Germantown and Trenton, was attached to the main army at Valley Forge during the winter of 1777–78, and was later detailed to join Gen. Benjamin Lincoln for the southern campaign.

At the Battle of Brandywine it was Gen. Casimir Pulaski's gallant request of General Washington to use his own bodyguard, some 30 horses, and launched a furious charge at the pursuers, the British Army which had broken through the American lines. It was this small group led by General Pulaski which threw the British ranks into confusion and saved the day for the American forces.

On February 2, 1779, Pulaski was ordered to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina. He arrived at Charleston on May 8. Learning of the approach of General Provost northward from Savannah, he rushed to the attack of the British advance guard but suffered defeat.

Pulaski now joined forces with General Lincoln, who, assisted by the French fleet, was preparing to attack Savannah. On August 19 he wrote Congress a long letter in which he detailed the disappointments that he had encountered and expressed the hope that he might still find the opportunity of proving his devotion to the American cause.

On October 9, at the siege of Savannah, he bravely but impatiently charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry and fell with a grapeshot in the loin. He was removed to the *Wasp* where surgeons were unable to remove the bullet. He died on board, probably October 11, 1779. Whether he was buried at sea, or beneath the oaks of St. Helena's Island, or in Greenwich, has never been established.

Thus ended the career of a gallant soldier.

In Savannah, Ga., there is a shrine which every year has a memorial service for the memory of this gallant Polish count whose contributions to America were so great that he did not even live to bear the fruits of citizenship.

Our celebration is not without sadness for Poles and Americans of Polish descent. Poland was not free when General Pulaski fell on October 11, 1779, in defense of American liberties. Poland is not free now. Its people cannot raise their voices for Polish interests, nor act as Polish patriots, nor openly cherish what is good and noble in Polish traditions.

But there is profound inspiration and comfort in the fact that Poles have survived partitions, conquests, and suppressions over the centuries. The Polish character, personality, and culture have survived in the hearts of a freedom-loving people.

We are reminded that Pulaski's cause was the cause of freedom. It is our present cause. It is the eternal cause of mankind. In its steadfast pursuit lies the best hope of the world.

Unemployment Related to Education and Skills, Michigan Professor Shows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an important contribution to an understanding of

the effects of automation on employment has been made by Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth, of Michigan State University, in a statement of September 20, 1963, before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

Dr. Killingsworth believes that the President's Council of Economic Advisers is "the victim of a half truth" in believing that our current unemployment problem is caused by a lagging growth rate as contrasted to basic structural changes in the economy. Dr. Killingsworth says that a lagging growth rate may not be the most important part of the problem. As a result, the administration's economic program is seriously incomplete because it gives "woefully inadequate attention to what I regard as a key aspect of the unemployment problem of the 1960's; namely, labor market imbalance."

Dr. Killingsworth points out that the fundamental effect of automation on the labor market is to twist the pattern of demand. In other words, it pushes down the demand for workers with little training while pushing up the demand for workers with greater amounts of training. In his opinion, the shift from goods to services is a second major factor which twists the labor market in the same way. There are some low-skilled, blue-collar jobs in service-producing industries, but the most rapidly growing parts of the service sector are health care and education—both of which require a heavy preponderance of highly trained people.

As a result, between 1950 and 1962, there was a redistribution of unemployment with the unemployment rates at the top of the education attainment ladder going down and the rates at the middle and lower rungs of the ladder going up substantially. He also points out that since 1950, people at the lower end of the education ladder have been squeezed out of the labor market, whereas those at the upper end have been pulled in.

Dr. Killingsworth is critical of the theory of the Council of Economic Advisers that the administration's tax cut program would reduce unemployment to an interim target rate of 4 percent by 1966. Although he supports a tax cut in his paper, Dr. Killingsworth seriously questions the validity of the administration's assumption that no severe bottleneck of labor supply would appear before the achievement of the overall 4-percent unemployment rate. Experience shows, he says, that unemployment at the bottom of the education scale has been relatively unresponsive to general increases in the demand for labor, while there has been a very strong responsiveness at the top of the education scale. Before the Nation could achieve a 4-percent unemployment rate, Dr. Killingsworth says, "we would have a severe shortage of workers at the top of the education ladder. This shortage would be a bottleneck to further expansion of employment."

Dr. Killingsworth's analysis makes a highly significant contribution to an understanding of the economic issues facing the country. It should be read in the light of the administration's contention that we can cut taxes and increase spending without inflation becaus of a large pool of idle manpower.

Under unanimous consent, I insert an excerpt from Dr. Killingsworth's lengthy statement before the committee in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

III. WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF AUTOMATION ON JOBS?

Automation, especially in its advanced forms, fundamentally changes the man-machine relation. Such a change is not unprecedented in economic history. The assembly line, as it replaced earlier techniques, helped to create literally millions of simple, repetitive jobs that could be learned in a few hours or a few days. Anybody who had two hands, two eyes, and a capacity to endure monotony could do the work.

Today we have the electric eye, the iron hand, the tin ear, and the electronic brain. We also have the know-how to tie them together in self-regulating systems that can perform an enormous variety of jobs. There are two major results. One is a great reduction in the number of simple, repetitive jobs where all you need is your five senses and an untrained mind. The other result is a great increase in the number of jobs involved in designing, engineering, programing and administering these automatic production systems. Industry needs many more scientists, engineers, mathematicians and other highly trained people, and many fewer blue-collar workers.

Table I shows what happened between 1957 and 1962 in manufacturing:

TABLE I.—*Employees on manufacturing payrolls 1st half year averages, 1957 and 1962*

[In thousands]

	Total	Production workers	Nonproduction workers
1957	17,223	13,264	3,959
1962	16,589	12,295	4,294
1957–62 change	−634	−969	+335

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Production workers declined by nearly a million in this period, while nonproduction workers increased by about a third of a million. The net change was a reduction of about 600,000 in employment.

Not all of the increase in white-collar employment in manufacturing was due to automation, of course, and not all of the newly hired employees were scientists and engineers. But the changing composition of employment was partly due to automation. Moreover, what happened from 1957 to 1962 was the continuation of a postwar trend. Figure 5 (not printed in the RECORD) shows what has happened to the ratio between production and nonproduction workers in manufacturing since 1919. Throughout the 1920's, the ratio fluctuated between narrow limits at around 19 or 20 percent. The great depression and World War II temporarily affected the ratio; at the outset of the depression, the blue-collar workers were laid off before the white-collar workers were, and in the war salesmen and clerks were drafted while blue-collar workers were added. By about 1950, the prewar ratio of about one white-collar worker to four blue-collar workers had been reestablished. But as automation gathered momentum during the 1950's, the ratio continued to change. It is now at about 26 percent and the trend is still strongly upward. Generally, the most highly automated industries have the highest ratio of white-collar workers. In chemicals and petroleum, for example, the ratio is 40 percent.

In an economy in which so many patterns are changing rapidly, broad averages and grand totals may conceal more than they reveal. I think that this is especially true of the effects of automation and the concomitant changes of today. Let us take as an example the figures showing total civilian employment since 1949. Those figures are shown in chart form in figure 6 (not printed in the RECORD). The chart clearly reveals the persistent upward trend in total employment—from 58 million jobs in 1949 to more than 68 million in 1963. This great increase is another piece of evidence often cited by those who claim that "machines make jobs." But there is another side to this coin. As figure 7 (not printed in the RECORD) shows, unemployment crept upward during the latter part of this period—first two notches up, then one notch down, and then another two notches up. In 1951–53, the average was about a 3-percent rate of unemployment. In 1962–63, the average has been almost double that, or between 5½ and 6 percent.

It is not self-evident from these figures that any part of this creeping unemployment problem is due to automation or other basic changes in the patterns of the economy. There is eminent authority to the contrary. The President's Council of Economic Advisers has repeatedly declared that automation and "structural unemployment" are not responsible for the gradul creep of unemployment above the 4 percent level of 1957. For example, the 1963 report of the Council includes the following passage (p. 25): "The problems of structural unemployment—of imperfect adaptation of jobs and workers—are persistent and serious, and they are thrown into bold relief by the prolonged lack of sufficient job opportunities over the past 5 years. But these problems of adaptation have not constituted a greater cause of unemployment in recent years than in earlier periods. The source of the high unemployment rates in recent years, even in periods of cyclical expansion, lies not in labor market imbalance, but in the markets for goods and services."

This analysis of the unemployment problem—that it is caused primarily by a lagging growth rate—is the basis for the administration's emphasis on a large tax cut as the top priority item in the program to "get the economy moving again." Chairman Walter Heller of the CEA has repeatedly said that there is a "good prospect" that the tax cut would reduce unemployment to the 4-percent level. (See, for example, "Employment and Aggregate Demand," address delivered in Berkeley, Calif., Apr. 19, 1963.)

I think that it can be demonstrated that the Council is the victim of a half-truth. The lagging growth rate is only a part of the problem, and it may not be the most important part. I think that it is extremely unlikely that the proposed tax cut, desirable though it is as a part of a program, will prove to be sufficient to reduce unemployment to the 4-percent level. Perhaps it is true that in politics you can't get everything all at once. But I feel compelled to say that my analysis leads me to the conclusion that the administration's economic program is seriously incomplete. It gives woefully inadequate attention to what I regard as a key aspect of the unemployment problem of the 1960's; namely, labor market imbalance.

The Council's position on labor market imbalance, quoted above, rests on meticulous and extensive statistical studies. I am sure that the members of the Council, who are scholars of the highest competence and integrity, are willing to go where the facts lead them. The trouble is that their staff studies have not analyzed the figures which, in my judgment, clearly show a growing problem of labor market imbalance.

Let me preface my own analysis of those figures with a brief restatement of my argument to this point. The fundamental effect of automation on the labor market is to twist the pattern of demand—that is, it pushes down the demand for workers with little training while pushing up the demand for workers with large amounts of training. The shift from goods to services is a second major factor which twists the labor market in the same way. There are some low-skilled, blue-collar jobs in service-producing industries; but the most rapidly growing parts of the service sector are health care and education, both of which require a heavy preponderance of highly trained people.

I have already presented some figures showing the changing patterns of demand for labor. These changing patterns of demand would not create labor market imbalance, however, unless changes in the supply of labor lagged behind. We turn now to the figures which show that such a lag has in fact developed.

Table II shows the relationship between rates of unemployment and levels of education of males 18 and over in 2 years—1950 and 1962.[1]

TABLE II.—*Education and unemployment, males 18 and over, April 1950 and March 1962*

Years of school completed	Unemployment rates (percent)		Percentage change, 1950 to 1962
	1950	1962	
0 to 7	8.4	9.2	+9.5
8	6.6	7.5	+13.6
9 to 11	6.9	7.8	+13.0
12	4.6	4.8	+4.3
13 to 15	4.1	4.0	−2.4
16 or more	2.2	1.4	−36.4
All groups	6.2	6.0	−3.2

Source: See appendix, tables A1, A2, A3 (not printed in the RECORD).

The overall unemployment rate was substantially the same in both years—6.2 in 1950, 6.0 in 1962. But there was a redistribution of unemployment between these 2 years. The unemployment rates at the top of the educational attainment ladder went down, while the rates at the middle and lower rungs of the ladder went up substantially. The most significant figure in this table, I think, is the one showing the very large decrease in the unemployment rate of college graduates.

In a sense, these unemployment figures are only the part of the iceberg that is above the water. For a better understanding of their significance, we must consider also the changes in demand and supply that took place at the various educational levels between 1950 and 1962. Figure 8 (not printed in the RECORD) shows (for males 18 and over) the percentage changes in the supply of labor (labor force), in the demand for labor (employment), and in unemployment rates at various levels of educational attainment between 1950 and 1962. The left-hand bars show labor force changes, the center bars show employment changes, and the right-hand bars show unemployment rate changes (which were presented in tabular form in table II). The three bars at the far right of the chart show these changes for all groups combined; these aggregates obviously conceal some differences between educational levels which are of cardinal importance.

The bars for the 0–7 years of education group show that the number of this group in the labor force declined very greatly from 1950 to 1962; but the jobs held by this group declined even more, so that its unemployment rate went up. The supply of labor with 8 years of education also decreased, and the demand for this group decreased even more, and its unemployment rate increased by more than the increase in rate for the 0–7 classification. We see different relationship between supply and demand in the 9–11 years of education group. Supply increased; demand also increased, but by less than the increase in supply, so that a higher unemployment rate resulted here, too.

The high school graduates (12 years of education) fared somewhat better. There was a substantial increase in supply in this group, and demand almost kept pace, so that this group's unemployment rate went up by less than the rates of the less-educated groups. The groups with college training were quite fortunate, especially those with at least 4 years of college. The supply of men with 13 to 15 years of education increased by almost 50 percent, but the jobs for them increased by slightly more, so that their unemployment rate (which was already low) went down slightly. The experience of the group with 16 or more years of education was particularly striking. The suply of men in this group increased by 75 percent, but the jobs for them increased even more than that, so that their unemployment rate went down by more than a third.

It is important to note that all of the improvement in the unemployment situation in 1962 as compared with 1950 was concentrated in the elite group of our labor force—the approximately 20 percent with college training. In all of the other categories, which have about 80 percent of the labor force, unemployment rates were substantially higher in 1962 than in 1950. These figures, I contend, substantiate the thesis that the patterns of demand for labor have been twisted faster than the patterns of supply have changed, and that as a result we had a substantially greater degree of labor market imbalance in 1962 than in 1950.

But these figures do not fully reveal the power of the labor market twist. The "labor force" enumeration includes only those who say that they have jobs or that they have actively sought work in the week preceding the survey. Those who have been out of work so long that they have given up hope and are no longer "actively seeking" work—but who would take a job if one were available—are simply not counted either as unemployed or as a member of the labor force. The percentage of a given category of the total population that is "in the labor force" (under the foregoing definition) is expressed as the "labor force participation rate." It seems probable that worsening employment prospects for a particular group over a long period would force down the labor force participation rate; i.e., would squeeze a number of people out of the labor market altogether, in the sense that they would give up the continuing, active search for jobs. Conversely, it seems probable that improving employment prospects would tend to pull more people into the labor market and thus to raise the labor force participation rate. These two trends are indeed observable since 1950. The squeezing out of people at the lower end of the educational ladder and the pulling in of people at the upper end is another manifestation of the labor market twist. Table III presents the pertinent figures for males:

TABLE III.—*Labor force participation rates and educational attainment, males 18 and over, April 1950 and March 1962*

Years of school completed	Labor force participation rates (percent)		Percentage change in rate, 1950 to 1962
	1950	1962	
0 to 4	74.6	58.2	−22.0
5 to 7	85.0	74.6	−14.4
8	88.1	78.2	−12.7
9 to 11	92.1	88.8	−3.9
12	94.0	90.7	−3.7
13 to 15	79.6	83.0	+5.4
16 or more	92.1	92.3	+.2
All groups	87.6	83.5	−4.7

Source: The 1950 labor force data are taken from appendix, table A1 (not printed in the RECORD) and population data from the 1950 census. The 1962 figures are from unpublished data supplied by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This table tells us that the participation rates at the lower end of the educational scale, which were already relatively low in 1950, had gone much lower by 1962. At the other end of the scale, participation rates had gone up by 1962. (The reason why the increase for college graduates was so small is that even in 1950 their participation rates in the prime age groups—especially 25 to 54—were already quite high, in some categories 98 or 99 percent.) Some of the decline in participation rates at the lower end of the scale is due to higher average ages, with a larger proportion in this group (as compared with upper groups) attaining age 65 and voluntarily retiring. But that is by no means the whole story. A detailed comparison by age group as well as by educational level shows that declines occurred at almost every age level in the noncollege category, while there was a rise in participation rates for a majority of the age groups of men with college training. (See Appendix, table A4, not printed in the RECORD.)

The important point that I want to make with these figures is that in all likelihood the official unemployment statistics substantially understate the size of the labor surplus of men with limited education. If we found jobs for most of those now officially reported as unemployed, the news of improving opportunities would undoubtedly bring back into the labor force many men who are not now counted as members of it. Unfortunately, we cannot count on the same flexibility of supply at the top of the educational scale. Even the most extreme pressures of demand cannot pull the participation rate much above 98 or 99 percent, which (as just stated) is the current rate in some college-trained age groups.

Our overall unemployment rate has now been above 5 percent for more than 5 years, and we cannot be sure what effects a substantial increase in spending by consumers, businesses and government (i.e., an increase in aggregate demand) would have on the patterns of employment, unemployment and labor force participation just discussed. Many respected economists believe, as one of them once put it, that the hard core of unemployment is made of ice, not rock, and that it would melt away if overall demand rose high enough. As already noted, the Council of Economic Advisers has virtually guaranteed that the administration's tax cut program—which in its current version would put about $11 billion in the hands of consumers and businesses—would reduce unemployment to an "interim target" rate of 4 percent by 1966. This line of reasoning assumes (either implicitly or sometimes explicitly) that no serious bottlenecks of labor supply would appear before the achievement

[1] The reasons for confining the analysis to males here and in the following paragraphs are explained in the technical note below, which also explains the derivation of the figures.

of the overall unemployment rate of 4 percent. I seriously question the validity of this critically important assumption under the labor market conditions of today and the foreseeable future.

The benefits of a decline in the overall rate of unemployment appear to be quite unevenly distributed among the educational attainment groups that we have been considering. The year 1957 was the last one in which we had an unemployment rate as low as 4 percent. It is instructive to see how the patterns of unemployment changed from 1950, when the overall rate was above 6 percent, to 1957, and then again to 1962, which had about the same overall rate as 1950. This comparison is made in two forms in table IV. This table shows the actual unemployment rates for the various educational attainment groups in those 3 years, and it also expresses the unemployment rate for each group in each of the 3 years as a ratio of the rate for all of the other groups combined. (Thus, the 0 to 7 years of education group had an unemployment rate about 50-percent higher than all other groups combined in 1950; its rate was more than double the rate for all other groups in 1957; and its rate was 70-percent higher in 1962.)

TABLE IV.—*Actual and relative unemployment rates by educational attainment, males 18 and over, April 1950; March 1957 and March 1962*

Years of school completed	Unemployment rates					
	Actual percentages			Relative [1]		
	1950	1957	1962	1950	1957	1962
0 to 7	8.4	6.9	9.2	154	203	170
8	6.6	4.4	7.5	108	110	132
9 to 11	6.9	4.7	7.3	115	120	142
12	4.6	3.0	4.8	70	67	75
13 to 15	4.1	2.7	4.0	64	64	65
16 or more	2.2	.6	1.4	34	14	21
All groups	6.2	4.1	6.0	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] The relative unemployment rate is the ratio between the percentage unemployment rate for a given educational attainment group and the percentage unemployment rate for all other groups at the same point in time.

Source: Percentage unemployment figures from appendix, table A3 (not printed in the RECORD); relative unemployment rates computed from data in appendix tables A1 and A2 (not printed in the RECORD).

Clearly, unemployment at the bottom of the educational scale was relatively unresponsive to general increases in the demand for labor, while there was very strong responsiveness at the top of the educational scale. The percentage unemployment rate for college graduates in 1957 merits close attention. It was an almost incredible 0.6 percent. I have queried the experts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics on this figure, and they assure me that they have confidence in it. Surely a figure as low as that represents what is sometimes called overfull employment—i.e., demand which seriously exceeds supply.

Bear in mind that the unemployment rates for the lower educational attainment groups (those with 80 percent of the men) are now higher than in 1950, and that the unemployment rate for college graduates is now substantially lower than in 1950. Also bear in mind that the labor force participation rate figures strongly suggest a large and growing reserve army—which is not counted among the unemployed—at the lower educational levels, and that there is no evidence of any such reserve of college-trained men. Finally, bear in mind the differences between the lower end of the educational scale and the upper end in responsiveness to overall decreases in the unemployment rate.

When you put all of these considerations together, I believe that you are ineluctably led to the conclusion that long before we get down to an overall unemployment rate as low as 4 percent, we would have a severe shortage of workers at the top of the educational ladder. This shortage would be a bottleneck to further expansion of employment. I cannot pinpoint the level at which the bottleneck would begin to seriously impede expansion; but, on the basis of the relationships revealed by table IV, it seems reasonable to believe that we could not get very far below a 5 percent overall unemployment level without hitting that bottleneck.

Thirty-seven Occupational Groups Have Critical Manpower Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, while the rate of unemployment stands at an uncomfortable level of 5.5 percent of the civilian labor force, untold job vacancies exist throughout the Nation.

According to a recent publication of the U.S. Department of Labor, entitled "Mobility and Worker Adaptation to Economic Change in the United States," 37 occupations have been designated for purposes of draft deferment as having critical shortages of trained manpower. Generally, these occupations require high levels of education and/or training, which most of the jobless do not possess. But the filling of these vacancies can greatly aid the unemployed by opening up jobs further down the skill ladder. The key to this process lies in the constant upgrading of our labor force at all levels of the skill ladder. As those already having skills train for and move into even more demanding jobs, they create vacancies for many of the less-skilled unemployed.

In order to point out the specific areas of manpower shortages, under unanimous consent I include an excerpt from the Labor Department's recent report in the RECORD at this point:

MANPOWER SUPPLY SHORTAGES

Even with the persistence of comparatively high rates of unemployment, there are still occupations in which shortages of qualified manpower exist. The general import of occupational trends in the United States, as elsewhere, has been to create increasing demands for highly skilled and educated workers.

The occupations listed below are currently labeled as critical by the Department of Labor for purposes of draft deferment. These occupations generally require high levels of education and/or training, and in virtually each field the educational requirements are becoming greater. In some of these occupations, very special categories are required, with the specialities defined in detail in other lists:

Aircraft and engine mechanic; astronomer;[1] bacteriologist;[1] biophysicist;[1] chemist;[1] clinical psychologist; dentist; die setter (forging); electronics mechanic; engineering psychologist;[1] engineer, professional; geologist;[1] geophysicist;[1] glass blower, laboratory apparatus; health physicist; instrument repairman; jig and template maker; machinist; mathematician;[1] nurse, registered; orthopedic appliance and limb technician; osteopath; parasitologist;[1] patternmaker; pharmacologist;[1] physician and surgeon; physicist;[1] physiologist;[1] structural linguist;[1] teacher, college; teachers, high school mathematics, physical and biological sciences, and modern foreign languages except French, German, Italian, or Spanish); teacher, technical institute; teacher, vocational (critical occupations only), technician, engineering and physical sciences; tool and tie designer; tool and die maker; and veterinarian.

In order to provide a basis for anticipating the demand for and supply of workers in some critical occupations, projections were prepared on the number of entrants and withdrawals in these occupations under certain assumptions. An example of the shortage which might be expected under these assumptions is given by the projection prepared for engineers. The United States may fall short by almost a quarter of a million between 1960 and 1970 in meeting the total needs for engineers projected under the full employment and other conditions assumed unless strenuous efforts are made to increase personnel resources in the profession and to improve utilization of engineers. The situation will probably be most acute during the mid-1960's, when the needs generated by the space program and the expanding economy will reach new highs and the number of engineering graduates may be at their lowest point in recent history.

The balance sheet that follows compares the projected requirements for and supply of engineering personnel.

REQUIREMENTS	
Growth requirements:	
1970 projected employment	1,375,000
Duct 1960 employment	−850,000
Net growth requirements, 1960–70	525,000
Replacement requirements (retirements, death, transfers, and other separations), 1960–70	165,000
Total requirements	690,000
SUPPLY	
Gross number of entrants with bachelor's degrees in engineering, 1960–70	347,000
Deduct persons with engineering degrees who are not in engineering positions	−64,000
Net supply of engineering graduates	283,000
Entrants with nonengineering degrees, 1960–70	71,000
Other entrants (persons without degrees and emigrants), 1960–70	97,000
Total supply	451,000
DEFICIT	
Total requirements	690,000
Deduct total supply	−451,000
Total deficit	239,000

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Research Bulletin No. 1, "Mobility and Worker Adaptation to Economic Change in the United States," July 1963.

[1] Limited to those individuals who meet 1 of the following criteria: (1) Have a graduate degree directly related to the occupational area concerned; (2) have equivalent experience, education, and training (generally considered to be not less than 1 year beyond bachelor degree level).

More United States-Soviet Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of discussion about the possibility of a sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, and I fear that there have been more general conclusions drawn than careful analysis of the problem.

One of the betters discussions of this subject appeared in last Sunday's New York Times in an article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr. Mr. Dale, a distinguished European reporter on financial and other matters, has analyzed the problem in the proper light. I think he has clarified it.

With the permission of the House, I would like to insert Mr. Dale's article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MORE UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE?

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 28.—The possibility of a mammoth sale of wheat to the Soviet Union has developed into one of the most fascinating American policy questions in the recent history of the cold war.

The chances are regarded as fairly good that the President will make a favorable decision on the wheat sale. But such a decision will not commit the Government to any overall change in its trade policy vis-a-vis the Russians—a question that has only begun to be examined. For the time being at least, the wheat deal, if it is made, stands by itself and need not set any precedents.

American trade policy toward the Communist countries is unusual in the non-Communist world. In a word, the American policy is antitrade, and it works. U.S. sales to the Soviet bloc are running at less than $200 million a year, much of that sales of surplus farm products under a policy that makes a special exception for Poland.

SALES GROWING

The other non-Communist nations together sell about $5 billion a year—products ranking all the way from such items as coffee and rubber that the Soviet Union does not produce, to whole factories for making plastics, synthetic rubber and the like. They refrain only from selling direct military equipment and quasi-military strategic items, and they have whittled the list of these.

In order to do the business they do, the other free world nations must also import from the Communist countries. The great bulk of the trade is conducted through bilateral agreements under which the individual Western nation pledges its best efforts to import specific amounts of specific categories of goods from the Communist country and, where necessary, open import quotas for these goods.

The reason for the imports is simply that the Communist countries, which already run a small overall deficit in their balance of payments with the non-Communist world, must sell in order to acquire the foreign exchange to buy. The Russians limit their purchases to what they can pay for.

U.S. POLICY

As noted, the U.S. policy is simply against trade, though Washington does not say so in so many words. Basically, it works through a system of requiring export licenses for all sales to Communist countries, which tend to be granted grudgingly, and by a firm policy against sales on easy-payment terms.

On the import side, the United States charges extra-high tariffs on goods from Communist countries.

Why, then, has the United States adopted its policy, so different from that of our allies?

The underlying reason is that we have a harder "cold war line" than they and take a far stronger view of the economics of the cold war. A good summary of the attitude behind our policy was given this week by Representative MELVIN LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin, commenting on the proposed wheat deal:

"If the free world provides the food they need, even if it is only in so-called nonstrategic goods like wheat and flour, we will in effect be freeing large sections of their labor force to continue the development and construction of the weapons they hoped to use to bury us."

According to this philosophy, accepted to some extent within the administration, any sale to the Soviet Union of any kind strengthens our enemy in the cold war.

What, then, are the arguments for a change in the policy? There are several main ones.

ALLIED TRADE

The most persistently heard is that the present policy is a head-in-the-sand approach that is wholly ineffective because the Russians can get what they want from our allies. According to this view, we are needlessly losing a good market.

Another is based on our balance of international payments and the urgent need to expand exports. If we had to import from the Soviet Union as much as we export, the balance-of-payments would not be helped, but there is some reason to hope that we could sell more than we bought.

It is quite clear that any decision by the President to change the fundamental policy would be a political decision, both domestic and international. The pure economics of the case, given our balance-of-payment deficit in particular, obviously favors more trade with the Soviet bloc as well as with anyone else. The politics, however, is another matter.

Should we retain our view that we are in a ruthless struggle in which any Soviet economic gain hurts us? Or should we switch closer to the British view, well described by a high official here as "a fat Communist soon becomes a bourgeois"—in other words, favor rather than oppose Soviet economic advance on the ground that it could lead toward a less agressive and nervous society?

THE POLITICS

Should we consciously try to consolidate the current era of good feeling, or at least of nontension, through a changed trade policy, in the hope that it will further convince the Soviet leaders that our purposes are peaceful?

And what about the domestic politics of the situation? The American public has been accustomed for so long to a totally hard line in the cold war that any change would be bound to stir up all sorts of adverse emotions, and in an election year.

The President and his advisers have only begun to think about these great questions. Fortunately for them, the wheat case can be treated as and presented as a case apart, and as a case in which the American farming community would be specifically benefited.

However, even if the wheat case is not necessarily a precedent, a favorable decision by the President, at the least, would open the great debate on the issue and speed the process of reexamination on the trade question as a whole.

Farm Labor Facts—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as of August 31, 1963, the United States had on hand in the form of Commodity Credit Corporation inventories $2.142 billion of wheat, $737 million of corn, $739 million grain sorghum, $41 million barley, oats, and grain, $239 million butter, $40 million cheese, $99 million dried milk, $245 million cotton, and zero of canned tomatoes.

The California tomato industry, in spite of certain competitive economic handicaps, has been extremely successful in the post-World War II period at no cost to the taxpayers.

Prof. Kenneth R. Farrell of the University of California recently pointed out in a speech delivered in California that the expansion of the European Common Market and expanding foreign tomato production will seriously jeopardize the California tomato industry irrespective of congressional tampering with the labor supply. Dr. Farrell's speech is as follows:

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

(By Dr. Kenneth R. Farrell)

TRENDS

As a result of the rapid expansion in production of tomatoes for processing, U.S. per capita consumption of canned tomato products has increased from approximately 26 pounds in the years just prior to World War II, 35 pounds in 1947–49, to about 46 pounds in the past 2 years. Within this general upward trend in consumption, there have been notable and important differences for various tomato products. Consumption of canned whole tomatoes for example has declined a little more than 1 pound per capita since 1937–39 to about 4.6 pounds in recent years; per capita consumption of catsup and chili sauce combined has almost doubled; paste and sauce consumption has risen from about 0.5 to 3.8 pounds; pulp and puree consumption per capita has remained virtually constant, while juice has increased moderately. These trends are extremely important to California where a large proportion of the tomatoes are utilized in the production of more concentrated products, such as paste and sauces.

CONSUMPTION UP

Long-term national demand prospects for processed tomato products as a group appear very favorable. Even if per capita consumption of products remained constant, the projected 1975 U.S. population of 230 million indicates an expansion on total demand of approximately one-fourth over 1962 levels. Although it is unlikely that per capita consumption of canned tomato products will continue to expand in the next decade at the relatively high rate of the past decade, a moderate increase in per capita consumption may be anticipated. Based upon USDA projections, it appears reasonable to expect per capita consumption to approach 50 to 51 pounds by 1975. Such an increase, coupled with the projected increase in population, indicates that total consumption of canned tomato products might rise by about one-third between 1962 and 1975.

EUROPEAN TOMATOES

There remains the question as to how the various products will share in this expanding market and what the competitive position of the California industry may be in relation to other producing areas of the Nation, Europe, and Italy in particular. Obviously, no precise or definitive conclusions can be reached with respect to these questions. Much will depend on whether and to what extent California tomato producers and canners are able to maintain or improve the efficiency of their operations relative to competing areas. That, in turn, is dependent upon such matters as the extent to which growers will be able to efficiently produce tomatoes having the quality characteristics important to efficient processing operations at prices which will permit California canners to compete with products from other areas. The longrun competitive position of the industry may also be influenced substantially by the extent to which new processes and product forms are developed, particularly weight-reducing product forms to offset the relatively high transportation costs with which the California industry must contend in selling their products in eastern markets. Promising developments are in the offing in this respect. However, continued and perhaps increased expenditures for research and development will be required if the industry is to maintain or improve its competitive position.

Although California still accounts for 40 to 45 percent of the national pack of canned, whole tomatoes, it is well known that a large proportion of California's processing tomatoes are used in the production of the more concentrated products, such as catsup, paste, puree and sauce. In view of per capita consumption trends, characteristics of varieties produced here and elsewhere in the country and for a variety of other reasons, it seems probable that continued—if not increased—emphasis will be placed on production of the concentrated products in California. In this respect particularly, but also in the case of canned whole tomatoes, foreign competition in the U.S. market is to be reckoned with.

IMPORTS

U.S. imports of tomato paste and sauce for consumption totaled 48.3 million pounds in the year ending June 30, 1962. That volume of imports was about three times as large as in 1960–61 and almost seven times the average annual imports in 1955–59. Prior to 1960, virtually all of such imports were from Italy. Since then, Italy has provided about three-fourths of the imports, as imports from France and Mexico increased sharply in 1960–61. It is interesting to note that 1960–61 was the first in recent years that any substantial volume of French paste and sauce was imported and the first year since 1955 that Mexico contributed a substantial share of our total imports of these products. While imports of these products, even at their relatively high levels of a year ago, are small relative to the U.S. pack, it is important to note that both the relative and absolute volume of imports has been rising.

Canned, whole tomatoes imports have also been trending upward from an average of 96.5 million pounds in the fiscal years 1955–59 to 126.2 million pounds in 1960–61 and 148.1 million pounds in 1961–62—the equivalent of 19 percent of the U.S. pack. Italy is the dominant supplier.

EXPORTS

We also export tomato products principally to Canada, Central and South America; and in the case of catsup, chili sauce, paste and puree, also to Western Europe. While exports of some products have been increased since 1955, they normally vary considerably from year to year. In the past several years, the balance of trade in tomato products, as a whole, has become increasingly "unfavorable" to us—that is, imports have risen more than exports.

Much has been written and said about the European Common Market and its implications for American and California agriculture. It poses both problems and opportunities. Depending on whether the "Six" develop policies of an ingrown and protectionist nature or of an outward-looking, trade-stimulating nature, we stand to lose or gain insofar as agriculture is concerned. Evidence can be cited to support either thesis you choose to advance depending upon the commodity you choose to discuss and the interpretation you wish to place on the general policy pronouncements of the EEC Commission. Realistically, it seems to me that exports of some products will be enhanced by developments of the EEC; others will likely be damaged. It is far too early to say whether, on balance, California agriculture will gain or lose, since even the membership of the market is in a state of flux. And there are many specific policies yet to be hammered out and implemented with respect to agriculture.

ITALY

However, it is well known that the tomato industry in Italy's Po Valley has been expanding rapidly in the past 5 years, in part, as a result of the investments of private American capital and the application of American production and processing technology, which has accompanied capital investment in plants and facilities. Even without the Common Market, that development would have occurred because of expanding consumer markets in Europe and the availability of generally plentiful and lower priced production resources. The evolution of the EEC may have hastened or accelerated these developments. There is no doubt that the creation of the Market will favor the Italian industry relative to the American industry in the markets of the six member countries and in the United Kingdom, if that country is accepted as a member. This may well mean that the California industry will have to develop new export markets or further exploit those which it now has.

With respect to Italian and French competition in the U.S. market, it seems probable that in the absence of U.S. quotas or higher tariffs, we might expect imports to continue near present levels, if not to increase, as production increases in those countries. In part, the level of imports will depend on how competitive domestically produced tomato products are priced. Rising product prices in this country would very likely lead to further imports even in the short run. Pricing of products at unrealistically high levels over any prolonged period of time might further encourage foreign production and competition.

TARIFFS

There is also the question of what may happen to prevailing U.S. tariffs on tomato imports under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. American tariffs on tomato paste and sauce imports from the EEC were lowered from 21 to 17 percent ad valorem during the 1961 GATT negotiations. In view of the emphasis of the Trade Expansion Act on freer trade, the questions as to whether tomato product tariffs will be lowered further and what the impacts of tariff reductions might be on the domestic industry are valid and important. It seems to me that while the EEC is interested primarily in expanding exports of industrial products to the United States, there are some agricultural products, including tomato products, in which they might be interested in negotiating lower U.S. tariffs.

I do not know whether tomato products will be placed on the list of products for tariff negotiation in the forthcoming GATT meetings. Nor do I know what the economic impact of any given tariff reduction would be upon the California or U.S. tomato processing industry. But, it does seem reasonable and prudent that your industry should carefully follow trade developments in the next few months and that it find the means of apprising itself of the potential impact of possible tariff reductions.

Speaker Jesse Unruh at Last—A Fair Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at last we have had a fair appraisal of the value and work of Speaker of the California State Assembly, Jesse Unruh.

Many of us in the California Democratic Party had almost given up hope of seeing this fine and honorable man publicly recognized for the leader and responsible liberal that he is. The newspapers and news magazines have delighted in caricaturing him; mocking him; painting him as a political ogre and hamfisted manipulator.

Those of us active in the party know that this has been a false image. In a State traditionally afflicted with political leaders of little stature Jesse Unruh has been one of the few, glorious exceptions.

The Democratic Party in my State has not been accustomed to the role of leadership. During the years 1900 to 1957 only one Democratic Governor was ever elected, and at no time did the Democratic Party control a majority in the State senate. During this same 57-year period the Democratic Party held a majority in the State assembly for only three sessions.

How different the story is today. From 1958 to the present the Democratic Party has had a majority in the State assembly; a majority in the State senate; and the services of a Democratic Party Governor. We also now have a majority of the congressional delegation. This did not happen by accident or chance. Jesse Unruh has been the prime mover in this sequence of events.

It has been difficult for some California Democrats to understand the change that necessarily comes with being the party in power. The old pastime of "dump the leader," and the game of political musical chairs can be enjoyed only when we have no real responsibility to the people and the Nation. With political power comes the need for maturity and a strong sense of responsibility. Some of our people have not been able to adjust to this change, and they yearn for the slaphappy years spent in the political wilderness.

More than any other man, Jesse Unruh has been the one that welded together our split and ineffective party. More than any other man, Jesse Unruh has fashioned a Democratic Party that

is a force to be reckoned with in California and at last truly represents the people of our great State. It is no wonder he has incurred the wrath and enmity of those self-first individuals that wish to use our party name for their own personal advancement. It is no wonder that he has incurred the opposition of those that benefit from a party that is divided and bickering.

The rumor that Jesse Unruh has had enough has startled me and disturbed me. I can well understand the feeling of frustration this man must bear. To do the best you can for the party you love, and to be continually greeted with insults and distorted facts is to carry a cross of crushing proportions. I fear for the future of my party if these carping little men accomplish their aim. Jesse Unruh has done what no man before him could do. It will be a black day for the Democratic Party if he now decides to leave.

I know I speak for a great many Democratic officeholders when I say: Jesse, the party needs your leadership and your wisdom. Stay on—fight on. Your cause is right, and the people of California are the beneficiaries. There is much work for you still to do.

Mr. Speaker, without further comment I direct the attention of my colleagues to the following syndicated column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak printed in the Washington Post, September 30, 1963.

The article follows:

CALIFORNIA'S "BIG DADDY" UNRUH HAS HAD ENOUGH

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Although its members don't realize it yet, a strange California coalition of leftwingers and Republicans has just about won its campaign of ridicule against Jesse "Big Daddy" Unruh.

Unruh, California's most powerful Democrat, is telling close friends that he's had enough of the vilification—much of it from leftwingers in his own party. From one end of the State to the other, he's been belittled as "Big Daddy" and "Boss Unruh." Now he's ready to quit as speaker of the State assembly in exchange for a safer, less powerful job.

That's good news for the far-out liberals and Republicans. With Unruh gone, they'll be able to run wild in the assembly. But it's dark tidings for the Democratic Party and a distinct liability for President Kennedy's attempt to carry the State in 1964.

Once removed from the speakership, Unruh loses most of his political leverage. His power to bring some order to the chaotic California Democratic Party would vanish. More important, perhaps, his prodigious fundraising would be no more.

Unruh's desire—thus far expressed only privately—to get out of the main line of political fire is part of the legacy of political confusion resulting from the tragic illness of Democratic Senator CLAIR ENGLE.

Suffering from an inoperable brain tumor, ENGLE almost certainly cannot seek reelection next year. The State's Democratic politicians hope he will resign, so that Gov. Pat Brown can name a successor. That would prevent blood-letting in next year's Democratic primary. The man Brown named to replace ENGLE would be the automatic nominee in 1964.

Unruh would dearly love to be a Senator in the safety of Washington, some 3,000 miles from the madding crowd of California politicians. But he can't convince even himself that he could be elected in 1964, particularly against a comeback attempt by Republican William F. Knowland.

Brown's most likely selection to succeed ENGLE is State Controller Allan Cranston, Unruh's arch enemy and darling of the leftwing CDC, the California Democratic Council, which governs the State's Democratic clubs. If Cranston came to Washington, the Governor would have to appoint a new State controller. And that's the job Unruh really covets.

Why? Mainly because it's relatively sheltered from political attack and publicity.

Unruh, the son of an illiterate Texas sharecropper, might have welcomed publicity when he first exploded onto the national political stage in 1960 as a key California supporter of John F. Kennedy. But now at 40, he's had more than enough. Kingsized Jesse Unruh is plagued by being colorful and quotable in an age of political blandness.

The last straw from Unruh might have been last week's picture story about him in Life magazine. Expecting a favorable story, Unruh eagerly awaited the magazine. He was shocked to discover an odd-angle camera shot that makes him look like a circus fat man, twice as big as his 250 pounds.

Some of Unruh's associates are pleading with him not to yield his power and take a subordinate State job. But other Unruh friends agree with him that his present position is untenable.

If so, it's a sad commentary of California politics and the fatuity of the State's leftwing Democrats. While the leftists have been chasing the rainbow of unilateral disarmament, Unruh has been hard at work passing solid liberal legislation in Sacramento.

The State's basic civil rights law carries Unruh's name. Governor Brown has Unruh to thank for what success he has had in passing his key proposals. Typically, it was Unruh (derided as an "unscrupulous machine politician") who rammed Brown's tax program through the assembly this year while Cranston (lionized as an "enlightened liberal") was opposing it.

It's ironic that, at a time when California Republicans seem to be making some progress in welding together their splintered party behind Knowland's leadership, Democrats there are sacrificing their ablest leader.

No. 11—Oregon: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon, about gambling in that State.

Only $11 million was gambled at the horse race tracks last year in Oregon. Other forms of gambling amuse Oregonians more than betting on horses. The late Senator Neuberger summed it up in an article entitled "Oregon Goes to the Dogs." He estimated—back in 1951—that four times as much was wagered on greyhounds as on horses. I am certain the ratio has since increased.

Not all of Oregon's gambling is legal. The late Senator said that the city of Portland was a lush source of dividends for a strange collection of doubtful characters. This is not surprising. Oregon's share of the annual national illegal betting estimates presented to the McClellan committee exceeds one-quarter of a billion dollars a year. A fat treasury for the underworld crime syndicates.

Legalized gambling on the horse and dog tracks was not initially popular in rural Oregon. Not until the gambling syndicates got a brainstorm. They cut the hypocrites in on the take. They bought off the rural bluenoses by getting the State to assign a portion of its percentage of the gross to the county fairs. Later, the legislature added the Pacific Coast Turkey Show and the Corn Show.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I would be talking turkey to the Corn Belt if I changed my national lottery proposal to provide that gambling revenues pay for the masses of surplus agricultural commodities that are cluttering up huge Government warehouses. After all, it worked in Oregon.

The United States needs a National Government-run lottery to drag gambling out of the criminal domain and bring the moneys now financing the underworld into the public treasury.

VFW Opposes Wheat Sale to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the significant statement in opposition to U.S. wheat sales to the Soviet Union made September 30 by Joseph J. Lombardo, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I was already proud to be a member of the VFW, and this courageous and timely statement makes me all the prouder.

Here is the text of a telegram sent by Mr. Lombardo to President Kennedy:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1963.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this telegram is to express the opposition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to proposals for selling U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union. The VFW holds to the firm conviction that communism has not abandoned or renounced its long-range objective of destroying the United States and all other governments and peoples who believe in and practice the concepts of freedom.

Communist agriculture is in deep trouble because the Red rulers have placed a higher priority on industrialization necessary to produce weapons for use against freemen than they have place on food production for their people. It is both dangerous and paradoxical for the United States even to consider using the products of our way of life, which communism is determined to destroy, to strengthen communism. With communism engaged in cruel and vicious aggression and subversion against our friends and ourselves, it would be morally and strategically wrong for the United States to subsidize those intent upon burying us.

If the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union, thus making up for the

deficiencies of the Communist system, it will, indeed, be difficult hereafter for our Nation, as the leader of the free world, to ask our friends in the path of Soviet-directed aggression to give their lives to resist the Communist system, which we would have helped strengthen.

On behalf of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I respectfully request that your disapprove proposals for the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH J. LOMBARDO,
Commander in Chief.

Bible Reading and Prayer in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging to find a number of our leading ministers actively supporting the efforts that some of us in Congress are making toward bringing forth a resolution seeking to amend the U.S. Constitution in order to legalize Bible reading and prayers in all the public schools of our country.

One of these encouraging and helpful ministers is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Harlan, Ky., in my district. He has written some outstanding views supporting this issue, which he and I both agree is probably the most important question that will come up in the Congress of the United States either during the present session or in any other session. I would like to insert Dr. Kerr's written statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and they are as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT ERRED IN ITS JUDGMENT IN BANNING GOD'S WORD FROM THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Dr. S. McMaster Kerr, pastor, the First Presbyterian Church at Harlan, Ky.)

Our Founding Fathers fled their native lands because of the persecutions they suffered under the state church and were determined that no state church would be allowed in this new land. They carried not a sword but a Bible and believing that "God was the author of liberty," they taught God's word in their schools, put it in the courthouses of the land and opened their public conventions with prayer.

The writers of the Constitution followed in this tradition. When the Colonies became States and the convention met in Philadelphia to undertake to prepare a constitution, we had an illustration of high adventure through this very faith in God. The 55 men who constituted that convention were brilliant and patriotic, but they had many different political conceptions. For almost 5 weeks they met each day and made no progress. On the last day of the fifth week, in the midst of a heated discussion, they were about to adjourn and abandon the project together. It was then that Benjamin Franklin arose, and addressing George Washington in the chair said: "Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks' close attention and continual reasonings with each other, our different sentiments on almost every question * * * is, methinks a melancholy proof of the imperfection on human understanding * * *. How has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings * * *? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it * * *.' I, therefore, move that henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business."

From this time on the convention began to make progress in the framing of that document which Gladstone, the great British statesman, declared to be "The greatest piece of work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Mrs. Madeline Murray, of Baltimore, the atheist whose case against public school devotions was sustained by the Supreme Court, in an interview to "The Realist," said: "If I can't come through this case the same offensive, unlovable, bullheaded, defiant, aggressive slob that I was when I started it, then I'll give up now. My own identity is more important to me. They can keep their gawd-damn prayers in the public schools, in public outhouses, in public H-bomb shelters, and in public whorehouses."

The issue is clear: Do we Christian Americans allow our Nation to become a godless, socialistic state or do we remain "One Nation Under God"? Ask your Senator and Congressmen to sponsor an amendment to the Constitution to put God's word back in our schools that its great truths may mold the character of our youth. If you require help to this end, please telephone Dr. S. McMaster Kerr, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Harlan, Ky., No. 145.

LIBERAL PROTESTANT LEADERSHIP APPROVES SUPREME COURT BLUNDER—ROMAN CATHOLIC LEADERSHIP CONDEMNS COURT'S DECISION

(By Dr. S. McMaster Kerr, pastor, the First Presbyterian Church at Harlan, Ky.)

It is ironic to say the least that the great Protestant Reformation was fought to bring the Christian Church back to God and His Holy Bible, and yet today, we find a type of Protestant leadership that would keep God's word out of the Nation's schools where it could influence American youth. At the same time, Roman Catholic leadership is deploring the Supreme Court's decision. The following quotes are from Human Events, July 27, 1963:

James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, archbishop of Los Angeles: "The effect of the decision can only mean that our American heritages of philosophy, of religion, and of freedom are being abandoned in imitation of the Soviet philosophy of Soviet materialism and of Soviet regimented liberty."

Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston: "It's a great tragedy that the greatest book ever published—a continuing best-seller—cannot be read in our public school system.

"There is nothing we can do about it but to have an amendment to the Constitution relative to the reading of this masterpiece of literature in our public schools.

"The United States, it seems to me, is no longer what we love to call it—one nation under God."

Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York: "I deplore it. I think that says enough."

By contrast, the National Council of Churches supported the contention of stocky atheist 44-year-old Madalyn Murray, who won a major victory from the socialist judges of the Supreme Court. These socialist judges upheld her contention that recitation of the Lord's Prayer or verses from the Bible in the public schools is unconstitutional. The fight over, Mrs. Murray is off to a new venture: A center for atheists on the plains of northwestern Kansas. The center, if Mrs. Murray's plans mature, will have a university, a printing plant, a radio station, an auditorium for seminars and a home for aging atheists. Incorporation papers were filed in Maryland for the organization to be called Other Americans, Inc., as reported in the National Observer, July 8, 1963. In this connection, let us ponder the words of the great American statesman and patriot, Daniel Webster, who said: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering; but if we, in our prosperity, neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury our glory in profound obscurity." Neglect of God's word by Christian Americans is all that will be necessary to bring to fulfillment Khrushchev's boast: "We will bury you."

Dr. Billie Graham in his TV presentation has called for a march on Washington to demand that the Bible be put back in our Nation's schools. Let us support Dr. Graham in this challenge and march not 200,000 strong but 2 million strong and also demand the resignation of the Justices of the Supreme Court who have consistently favored the Communists and their causes.

Jesus said: "If you confess Me before men, I shall confess you before My Father."

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AT HARLAN, KY.

(By Dr. S. McMaster Kerr, pastor)

The Supreme Court erred greviously when it barred the Bible from our schools. We are "a Nation whose God is the Lord" and Christian Americans must insist that it so remain. We sing: "I'm not ashamed to own my Lord or to defend His cause." If we mean this, now is the time to act in His defense by demanding that His Word be put back into our schools. Let no one be embarrassed about holding a high regard for the Bible, the Word of God. Let this be a time of individual standing up for it, for its defense and advancement.

Those of us who stand for the Bible are in good company, for many outstanding figures in the past who made our country "One Nation under God" have thus stood. Let us hear from some of them:

Abraham Lincoln: "I believe the Bible to be the best gift God has ever given to man. All the good from the Saviour of the world is communicated to us through this Book."

George Washington: "It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible."

Daniel Webster: "If there is anything in my thoughts or style to commend, the credit is due to my parents for instilling in me an early love for the Scriptures" * * * and * * * "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our prosperity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bury all our glory in profound obscurity."

U. S. Grant: "The Bible is the sheet-anchor of our liberties."

Patrick Henry: "The Bible is worth all other books which have ever been printed."

Horace Greeley: "It is impossible to enslave mentally or socially a Bible reading people. The principles of the Bible are the groundwork of human freedom."

John Quincy Adams: "So great is my veneration for the Bible that the earlier my children begin to read it the more confident will be my hope that they will prove useful citizens of their country and respectable members of society," and "I have for many years made it a practice to read through the Bible once a year."

Andrew Jackson: "That Book, sir, is the rock on which our Republic rests."

Robert E. Lee: "In all my perplexities and distresses, the Bible has never failed to give me light and strength."

President Woodrow Wilson: "Give to the American people the Bible, pure and unadulterated and watch it do its work."

A boast of the Soviet leader Khrushchev was "We will bury you." The blunder of our socialist judges on the Supreme Court may well be the forerunner of the fulfillment of this boast as well as the fulfillment of Daniel Webster's prophecy above. Only you can keep this from happening to our Nation. What is your answer?

Write to your Senator and Congressman and demand an amendment to the Constitution that God's word may again be in our schools to mold the lives of our Nation's youth.

Independence Day of the Republic of Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Guinea celebrates the fifth anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Ahmed Sekou; and His Excellency, the Guinean Ambassador to the United States, Bangoura Karim.

The Republic of Guinea, which emerged as an independent nation on October 2, 1958, has been called a sphinx buried in an enigma by a Washington Post writer on Africa, and many Americans are still looking for clues to solve the Guinean enigma. Guinea's accession to independence was startling and abrupt: a "No" to the Constitution of the Fifth Republic and to joining the French Community; the withdrawal of the French; and aid from the Soviet Union. The Western press announced that Guinea had gone Communist.

But today, 5 years after Guinea's accession to independence, things look somewhat different. Guinea has not become a Soviet satellite. Guinea was among the African countries which at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly voted for a resolution appealing to the Soviet Union not to explode a 50-megaton bomb. At the 17th General Assembly Guinea's position diverged from that of the Soviet bloc on several important disarmament and East-West items. Guinea's alinement is with the neutralist African nations, not the Soviet bloc.

In addition, Guinea seems to be the African nation where Soviet aid has gone most wrong. The Soviet bloc extended $125 million to Guinea in low-cost loans and aid grants, and bilateral trade agreements were negotiated for exchange of goods. But Guinea received Russian shoes that fell apart and textiles imported from Egypt, then reshipped at a higher price. Much of the Soviet loan money was allocated for propaganda projects, and Soviet equipment turned out to be inferior.

Also, the attempts at interference in Guinea's internal affairs by Soviet representatives have not been welcomed by the Guinean Government. Soviet Ambassador Danil Solod had to be recalled at the end of 1961 because Guinea charged that his Embassy had been used to foment student demonstrations against the Government.

This is the backdrop to recent changes in Guinea's policy, changes warmly welcomed by the West, for they indicated the failure of the Soviet Union to win Guinea to the Soviet bloc. No new Soviet projects were begun in 1962, and near the end of the year only 700 Soviet bloc technicians remained compared with 12,000 the previous year. After a reappraisal of the socialist economic structure, the Sekou Toure government decided in April 1962 to open its doors to private enterprise. A new industrial code has been enacted which is designed to protect and to give certain advantages to foreign investment. As a result, a number of Western private firms have initiated industrial development projects in Guinea.

Symbolic of Guinea's new policy, and perhaps the most important indication of Guinea's new approach to the West, was the signature of agreements between Guinea and France in May 1963, ending 5 years of strained relations between the former administering power and its former colony. The agreements call for a settlement of debts, technical assistance by France including the training of technical and administrative personnel as well as the dispatch of scientific and technical missions, and the development of cultural relations. Relations with the United States have also been extended; Guinea is now purchasing American movies, newspapers, magazines, and books.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Guinea's independence we would like to take the opoprtunity to welcome the Sekou Toure government and the people of Guinea in their renewed relations with the West. We understand their desire to remain nonalined. We respect their foreign policy, above all their support for, and their initiatives in, the African unity movement. We commend their pragmatism and their willingness to modify policies which do not prove effective.

Hold Fast That Which Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, nurserymen are primarily interested in beautifying and keeping the exterior of homes lovely.

The following editorial, which appeared in a recent issue of the Pennsylvania Nurseryman, is also eloquent testimony that their concern in life is more than a mercenary one.

HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD

This is another year of national infirmity; civilizations become ill just like people; and like sick people, they become diseased, decadent and deceased. The history books are full of dead civilizations, like Greece and Rome, Macedonia, and Carthage. Philosophers have filled pages explaining the fall of ancient cities, but they are all agreed that when any nation loses its ideals, that driving power which gave it growth, when it becomes cynical toward those fundamental ideals, national corruption breeds defeatism, and nature calls the undertaker.

No one doubts that Uncle Sam is a very sick patient; for more than 20 years he has labored in the fetid, poisoned, suffering atmosphere of "social gospel," "regimentation," "security," and other Marxian distempers; his wealth has been wasted in a dysentery of global distribution; political quacks have aggravated his misery; he has been fed on a diet of untruths and uncertainties and there is no health in him. He has forgotten the only prescription from one of the greatest teachers of all time that will cure him: Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

Dr. Washington and Dr. Jefferson and others of their staff invented this simple remedy way back in 1776 A.D.:

"We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Under this treatment, America became the greatest nation in the world. Think of the Pilgrim Fathers battling the rigors of New England winters, the heroes of the Alamo, the prairie schooners on the wilds of Kansas, the gold rush to California. They pioneered progress under free enterprise—the mines, the steel mills, better homes, autos, radios, and the myriads of necessities and luxuries unknown elsewhere in the world. Those Pilgrims, those heroes and those early settlers proved all things; it is up to us to hold that which is good.

Let us look at the record: Have patriotism and religion been proven? Have constitutional government and the right of private property been proven? Have the laws of inheritance and honorable family life been proven? Then let us all unite to maintain them. Let us fight the moral pestilence of regimentation, planned economy, the welfare state, progressive education, and all of the miasma and pollution of foreign ideologies.

The Bracero Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following excellent editorials entitled, "Unemployment and the Braceros," which appeared in the September 24, 1963, edition of the Los Angeles Times, and "Using a Tragedy for Political Gain," which appeared in the September 30, 1963, edition of the Ventura County Star-Free Press:

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE BRACEROS

The bracero program, under which Mexican farm laborers are brought to the United States for a portion of the year to help in the harvesting of crops, was begun because there was a need for it. That need will remain so long as other means of harvesting are unavailable.

This is a point overlooked or deliberately ignored by those who oppose extending the bracero program, due to expire at the end of this year. They argue, among other things, that it is immoral to import foreign workers when the United States is burdened with a serious unemployment problem.

Yet, as Senator KUCHEL noted on the Senate floor, cessation of the Mexican farm labor program "will not mean a new job opportunity for the unemployed metal worker on an airframe assembly line in Los Angeles." Nor will it necessarily mean a job opportunity for the migrant U.S. farm worker: Last month the California Agricultural Labor Commitee had 49,000 certified openings for domestic farm laborers, who by law have first call on jobs.

Efforts to fill these openings with U.S. laborers were largely unsuccessful. Mexican nationals had to be used.

The explanation for this is in part the explanation for the whole bracero program. The crops on which Mexican laborers are principally employed—tomatoes, lettuce, celery, strawberries, snap beans—are "stoop labor" crops. Harvesting them means working bent over in the sun, and the work must go fast since a delay of even 1 day means a loss of millions.

U.S. workers simply will not do this kind of labor. The alternative to using braceros is to develop mechanized harvesting procedures. Some progress has been made in this direction, but adequate machinery is not yet available.

California growers are reconciled to a phase-out of the bracero program within the next 3 years, and are planning for it. But an abrupt termination of the program would mean a loss of millions of dollars and thousands of domestic jobs, affecting not only growers but also packers, canners, truckers, and retailers.

The Senate has already passed a 1-year extension of the bracero program, and the House is scheduled to vote soon on a similar extension. Hopefully, Congressmen will heed the arguments of those who know something about the program and not be swayed by inapplicable citations of the unemployment problem.

USING A TRAGEDY FOR POLITICAL GAIN

When 32 braceros were killed in a horrible truck-train collision near Salinas 2 weeks ago, one Congressman who quickly capitalized on the tragedy was Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat, of Texas, an arch-opponent of the bracero program.

In Mr. GONZALEZ' twisted logic, these deaths were attributable to some basic shortcoming in the program which imports Mexican nationals to work on U.S. farms. The tragedy, he said, was "a natural result of this very noxious situation."

It was nothing of the sort, of course, and Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of Ojai, has accused his fellow legislator of taking strange advantage of the accident. The facts are on the side of Mr. TEAGUE.

There is so far no evidence that the truck in which the men were riding was a jerry-built rig. Mr. TEAGUE points out that it was a late model vehicle, driven by a properly licensed chauffeur and that the accident was due to human failure—the failure of a driver to see an onrushing freight train.

If some of those who operate vehicles transporting braceros lack the desired ability, as they may, that is more a criticism of driver licensing than of the bracero program itself.

"In recent years," said Mr. TEAGUE, "similar catastrophes have claimed the lives of Navy bandsmen, Cal Poly football players, Georgia Art Association members, and many school children. Shall we then abolish the Navy band, football, art associations and schools?"

This was a shocking and sad accident. But accidents will happen, as they did to this small group of the 404,000 men who were working on California farms that day. The sorrow that has been brought to homes in Mexico by this event is shared by those who know these Mexican people as industrious, gentle men. That sorrow will not be softened, but at least the future of their survivors in Mexico will be made easier, by payment to them of nearly $750,000 in accident insurance compensation provided wholly by the growers who employ braceros.

The bracero program—now being considered for extension by Congress—should be judged on its merits, not on the shameful attempt of a politician to make political capital out of tragedy.

Balkan Salesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have heard little but objections to the visit of the Dictator Tito to this country. Even those few who do not oppose his visit cannot find much good to say about him.

I see no reason for such a visit, which will only add to the prestige of this avowed Communist. He is no friend of ours; he has a long history of oppression; he has clearly indicated his intention to line up with the Soviet Union in any world showdown.

Despite these facts, this country has poured $2.4 billion into Yugoslavia. Recently Americans were reportedly barred from visiting a chemical plant built with our own money there, but Tito gave Khrushchev a "grand tour."

In my first month as a Member of this body—January 1957—I signed a petition directed to the White House protesting against a proposed visit to this country by this same Tito. My feelings have not changed one bit. I think it is bad for this country to invite dictators, and I think it breaks faith with millions of people who look to this country as the symbol of individual freedom and dignity to receive this international gangster.

I include now an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald concerning this visit. I believe it expresses the feelings of the vast majority of Nebraskans:

BALKAN SALESMAN

As one who embraces Communist doctrine but plays both sides of the street for foreign aid, Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia combines the traits of a Communist dictator with those of a confidence man.

In Leninist doctrine, all Communist leaders must be conspirators and double-dealers. And while Tito may be a renegade on some articles of Communist faith, this one he adheres to.

This fact has raised suspicions as to what he and Nikita Khrushchev were up to during the latter's recent 15-day visit to Yugoslavia.

The usual explanation at the time was that Khrushchev has become so frightened about his split with Red China that he wants to get everybody he can on his side. There may be truth in this reasoning.

But a few realistic thinkers in the American State Department are said to believe that Khrushchev and Tito have something else in mind.

The Yugoslav dictator, it will be recalled, is scheduled to visit the United Nations and to break bread with President Kennedy. He plans also to visit Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, and Chile.

Khrushchev already has quite an interest in the Western Hemisphere. He owns Cuba, has what amounts to a sizable mortgage on British Guiana, and he keeps oil-rich Venezuela in terror. His kind of subversion is pretty obvious, and it frightens a good many people. Here is where Tito comes in.

Columnist Bill Henry writes in the Los Angeles Times that the previously mentioned people in the State Department are not sleeping well these nights. They suspect that Khrushchev and Tito may have been plotting a new campaign of Latin American subversion in which Tito will act as the salesman of communism.

And what a sales pitch the Balkan dictator is in a position to make.

He can say that Uncle Sam apparently likes to be kicked around. Shoot down a couple of American military planes, as Tito did, and Uncle will come running—not to punish but to contribute massive aid.

He can demonstrate that the squeaky wheel gets the most grease—something more than $2 billion worth of aid in his case.

He can present a delightful picture of Nikita Khrushchev shaking their hand while the United States is stuffing aid dollars in their pocket.

How can the United States answer such persuasive propaganda, especially when much of it happens to be true? The United States does support Communist regimes. It gives aid and extends the hand of friendship, not only to Yugoslavia, but also to Poland.

So long as that situation continues, so long as Latin Americans can see pictures of a smiling President Kennedy shaking hands with Tito on the steps of the White House, why should they—or anyone else—seriously believe the United States is committed to an all-out effort to defeat Communists the world around?

We are glad to learn that such questions are keeping some people in the State Department awake at night. We earnestly hope that the dreams of the country's top leaders also are being disturbed.

The Veterinarian Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to coauthor with Congressman ANDREWS legislation expanding Federal assistance to the construction of veterinary medical education facilities.

As evidence of intention and beneficial efforts of the legislation, I am pleased to insert the following letter received recently from Dean W. R. Pritchard, dean

and assistant director of the School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of California at Davis.

The letter follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE,
Davis, Calif., September 27, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: We were delighted to learn that you would like to introduce a companion bill to the Veterinary Medical Educational Facilities Construction Act of 1963 (H.R. 8445) which recently was introduced by Congressman ANDREWS, of Alabama. Mrs. Solarz has asked me to send you information on California's stake in this legislation. I shall be happy to supply you with any additional information that you may need relating to this matter.

The Veterinary Medical Education Facilities Construction Act of 1963 will correct the omission of veterinary medicine from the Medical Educational Facilities Act (H.R. 12) recently signed into law. Veterinary medical science is as vital to human health and welfare as are other medical sciences. Support of legislation to insure continued development of veterinary medical science is especially important in California, where over 17 million people frequently are exposed to animal diseases transmissible to people, where agriculture plays such an important role in our economy and where research in the biomedical and space sciences has contributed so much to the state and the health and welfare of our people.

The need for veterinarians and animal disease research in California has been studied in detail by the university. The nationwide needs have been determined by long-term studies by many groups, including the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

A NATIONAL CRISIS IN VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATION

There is a critical shortage of doctors of veterinary medicine in California and the Nation. The following statement taken from the summary of the Centennial Evaluations of the Veterinary Division of the American Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges accurately reflects numerous national surveys:

"The demand for veterinarians is at an alltime high and is constantly growing. The best estimates based on current needs indicate that the number of veterinarians in the country should be trebled by 1980. This means that over 40,000 new veterinarians must be graduated in the next 20 years. It means that in order to accomplish this that the capacity of all the present veterinary medical colleges must be doubled and at least five new veterinary medical colleges established immediately."

Studies by two congressional committees also have pinpointed the urgent need for expanded veterinary medical services and the importance of veterinary medical science to human health.

"Veterinary Medical Science and Human Health," Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, U.S. Senate, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman, 1961.

"Report on Manpower for Medical Research—Part Four." Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies Appropriations. JOHN E. FOGARTY, chairman, page 182.

VETERINARY MEDICAL SCIENCES ARE VITAL TO PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE NATION

Modern veterinary medicine serves society in unique and important ways.

The veterinarian is called upon to create much of the knowledge of diseases of all kinds of animals important to human welfare and to apply this knowledge to the control of these diseases for the benefit of man. Diseases of the important food and fiber producing, draft, pet, zoo, and wild animals and all kinds of birds, as well as all the animals used for biological and medical research, are primary responsibilities of the veterinarian.

Veterinarians also have primary responsibilities to human welfare in regard to the zoonoses, a group of over 100 diseases of animals secondarily infectious to man. A few common examples of these diseases are rabies, tularemia, psittacosis, brucellosis, equine encephalomyelitis, trichinosis and listeriosis.

Veterinary medicine's greatest contribution to human welfare, however, flows from its contribution to medical science. Much of the basic information on the principles of disease and disease processes in people can best be determined by studies on naturally occurring and induced diseases in animals. The magnitude of this contribution to the health and welfare of the people of the world is great indeed and is just now being fully recognized.

No other group of biological or medical scientists serve society in these ways. The health and welfare of the people of our State and Nation to no small extent depend upon the quality of the veterinary medical services of this country.

The quality of the veterinary medical services in California and the Nation depends to a large extent on the excellence of the teaching and research programs in our schools of veterinary medicine. A quality program of veterinary medical teaching and research also will contribute greatly to the overall medical education program in California.

NEED IN CALIFORNIA

Even though there are 2,300 veterinarians in our State, California now has a deficit of nearly 500 veterinarians on the basis of generally accepted criteria for determining needs. The principal shortage exists in public health activities and food animal disease control.

If no expansion in veterinary medical education occurs, this deficit will increase to approximately 1,400 by 1980. A deficit of this magnitude would have serious effects on the health and welfare of the people of our State. California is particularly vulnerable because we depend upon other States to educate nearly 75 percent of our veterinarians.

The University of California presently is planning on expanding the enrollment of its School of Veterinary Medicine by 130 percent in 10 years. Even with this increase, because our population is rapidly expanding, we will still only educate about 25 percent of the veterinarians who become established in our State each year.

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATION FACILITIES VITAL TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

California's only school of veterinary medicine is located at the university at Davis. Plans currently are underway to expand the program to better meet the needs of our State. A new physical facility will be constructed for the school to house the nearly 1,000 professional and graduate students and faculty of the expanded veterinary medical program.

Our new veterinary medical facility will cost many millions of dollars. The passage of a veterinary medical education facilities construction bill coupled with present legislation providing funds for medical research facilities will make it possible for the university to obtain 50 to 60 percent of the funds required from Federal sources.

It is unlikely that the university can provide facilities for this vitally important medical program at an early date without significant Federal assistance. The construction of planned facilities for the school of veterinary medicine will require 10 to 14 years unless Federal support becomes available. Federal assistance would permit the construction of this vitally needed facility in the few years required to meet California's needs.

Your help with this matter of greatest importance to our university is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

W. R. PRITCHARD,
Dean.

British Banker Assails U.S. Bid To Tax Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's so-called Interest Equalization Tax on American purchases of foreign securities has met with very little favorable reaction since it was proposed by the President in July. One of the latest prominent financial leaders to criticize the plan is Sir George Bolton, a Director of the Bank of England and Chairman of the Bank of London and South America.

According to a New York Times article of September 30, Sir George charged that the tax could "damage the efficiency of the international monetary system and the working of international capital markets." He characterized the administration's proposal as a clear indication that it "now formally opposes foreign investment by residents of America, except in countries which do not attract foreign investment."

Mr. Speaker, from the moment of its introduction, I have contended that this tax is nothing more than an artificial wall to the free flow of private capital which, if enacted, would distort private investment decisions and strike at the very roots of confidence. This feeling is also shared by Sir George who states that its mere publication "must have a restrictive effect on individual initiative."

As Sir George pointed out, if this tax is enacted, it "could turn out to be an unmitigated disaster for the Western World unless some alternative is developed."

Under unanimous consent, I insert the article from the September 30 New York Times outlining Sir George Bolton's views in the RECORD at this point:

BRITISH BANKER ASSAILS U.S. BID TO TAX SECURITIES

LONDON, September 29.—A director of the Bank of England criticized today the Kennedy administration's proposal to curb the outflow of American capital.

Sir George Bolton, who is also chairman of the Bank of London and South America, said such measures could "damage the efficiency of the international monetary system and the working of international capital markets."

An article by Sir George in today's Times of London declared that the proposed tax—up to 15 percent on the value of foreign securities and issues bought by U.S. residents—was bound to have long-term effects, some of which could not even be foreseen.

He characterized the proposal as a declaration that the administration now formally opposes foreign investment by residents of America, except in countries which do not attract foreign investment.

The mere publication of this fact, regardless of whether Congress rejects or modifies it, "must have a restrictive effect on individual initiative," he declared.

"The sterling area is the oldest and best known of the restrictive monetary areas, but it is being followed by the Communist area known as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON)" the article said.

"The six countries included in the European Economic Community are in the course of developing a closed system; and now a dollar area composed substantially of North and South America and some parts of Africa, has begun to appear.

"How far these developments represent a granulation of the world into opposing groups in the economic field, in addition to the political antagonism between the Western world and the Communist group of countries is difficult to forecast with any accuracy; but, in view of the undoubted exchange tensions that exist and major differences of opinion on monetary policy, there seems to be little doubt that, as the monetary areas become more efficiently organized, friction will develop between them."

One of the effects of the U.S. proposals, Sir George wrote, "will be largely to eliminate New York as a source of long-term capital, except on a semicharitable basis, as the majority of the countries allowed access to the New York market have an indifferent credit status."

The proposed measures "may be justified by the condition of the dollar," Sir George conceded, but in the long run "they could turn out to be an unmitigated disaster for the Western world unless some alternative is developed."

He called for the restoration of London to its prewar position as a world capital market although this would be only a partial answer to the problem.

A Black U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial which appeared in the Mansfield News-Journal, an outstanding independent newspaper in the district which I represent. It pierces the facade of the self-righteous Indian approach in international affairs. I might add that I was amazed at the television comment of Madame Pandit. She expressed the amazing duplicity of her kind when she told Mr. Spivak that she would like to see Red China in the United Nations because of the concept of "universality" but later said, notwithstanding this pious proclaimation, that she would support the ouster of South Africa. Strange times in which we live.

The editorial is as follows:

A BLACK U.N.

Madame Pandit, sister of Prime Minister Nehru and India's ambassador to the U.N., told an American audience Sunday evening that "The U.N. (majority) will soon be black and will no longer tolerate domination by a few rich and powerful nations."

Rapid admission of the newly-free African states to the U.N. is, of course, making Madame Pandit's statement absolutely correct. Control of the U.N. is passing to the Afro-Asian bloc.

There could be a hitch. The U.N. is broke. The Afro-Asians seem less inclined to contribute money than talk and votes. They probably anticipate that the taxpayers of the United States will continue to foot at least 40 percent of the U.N. costs even though we have only 1 percent of the votes.

But some of the other "rich and powerful" nations may not be inclined to be so generous.

To be effective the "black U.N.," which Madame Pandit predicts, will have to first get itself out of the red.

A good many American citizens are already tired of going its bond.

Pennsylvania's Good Governor, Bill Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Coatesville Record of September 12:

PENNSYLVANIA'S GOOD GOVERNOR, BILL SCRANTON

It's been many a year since Pennsylvania had a native son as presidential nominee, but don't be surprised if such is the case in 1964. Although much of the talk about such a possibility has abated, there's a good outside chance that Gov. William Scranton could become the Republican Party nominee next year. There is (in my opinion) a good chance that he will be the party's top choice in 1968. Personally this writer hopes the nomination will take place in 1968. The statement is based on entirely selfish reasoning. If the Governor were to accept a nomination this year, Pennsylvania would lose a topflight administrator at a time when his services are sorely needed.

As for the Governor's record to date as our top executive, I don't believe it can be faulted. It is, incidently, that record which has brought him from way back in the presidential nominee race to a comfortable third or fourth position. As Goldwater and Rockefeller turn toward the homestretch, Governor Scranton can take dead aim on both if he so chooses. Should either of the two men now on top falter in the stretch drive, Governor Scranton could move into the lead.

This possibility is discussed at some length in the current issue of Time magazine. No doubt much of the item relating to Scranton was based upon a report issued by Bill Keisling, assistant to the Governor, which has been forwarded to this writer. It is a report on the 1963 legislative session and its accomplishments for Pennsylvania.

According to the Time article, Governor Scranton took office with State unemployment at 9.4 percent. Also staring him in the face was a budget with a $53 million deficit. Already authorized projects had jacked that figure to $175 million.

The first thing Governor Scranton did was to chop at the overhead, chipping away $90 million. This left $138 million still to be raised. As we know, the Governor asked for increases in the general sales tax, along with an increase in cigarette and liquor taxes. Even though the Republicans are in the majority in the general assembly this took some doing. There was a lot of behind-the-scenes maneuvering by the Governor to get the ball rolling back in the direction of fiscal responsibility. The result has been a balanced State budget—something most Pennsylvanians had come to look upon as an impossibility.

High on the list of administration accomplishments has been the move toward establishment of a meaningful civil service program. When Governor Scranton took over about 20,000 of the 80,000 State employees enjoyed civil service status. The rest were at the whim of patronage minded politicians who swung a very broad ax with every change of administration. The Governor (and this must have been one of the toughest tasks he undertook) got his civil service bill pushed through the legislature. Although he couldn't get approval for full civil service, he did get a large part of the measure approved.

AT LONG LAST

It was Governor Scranton who got $35 million to raise school subsidies. This meant a well deserved and long overdue increase in teachers' salaries, and should do much to help this State retain qualified teaching personnel. Before this it wasn't unusual for a teacher to be educated in Pennsylvania, and then, upon graduation, seek employment in another State where the salaries were higher.

Since the change in administrations, the State unemployment rate has dropped from the 9.4 percent prevailing at the start of the year to its present 6.3 percent. The drop, in part, has been due to the constant administration endeavor to bring new industry into Pennsylvania, as well as aid wherever possible in the expansion of present industry. One result of this program has been that 121 new industries have announced they will build in Pennsylvania and 138 plants have said they will expand.

There's much more to the Scranton record of accomplishment, but the above more than speaks for itself. Not only to thinking Pennsylvanians, but to leaders of the Republican Party who might find themselves in need of a top candidate for their Republican Presidental nomination. They could do a lot worse.

Too Long Neglected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the mental health and retardation bill is now before a joint conference committee which met on Tuesday, came to no final agreement, and will meet again next week. Among the differenees to be resolved is one relating to the cut in staffing funds for mental health centers. The effect of this action will serve to largely negate the passage of the building appropriation. I believe that the staffing section was the most vital and important provision in the bill. Perhaps a reading of a most moving little poem I received this week may point up to a few the necessity for doing all we can for those who have been too long neglected. I urge

the return of these staffing funds to the bill.

A RETARDED CHILD'S PRAYER

Dear Lord, I thank you for this day
But there is something I must say.
I made believe I spoke to Nan
And this is how my words began:
I may not be the same as you
In body, mind, or beauty, too.
I may not walk or talk at all
Or play with others, run or fall.
I may not say I love you mom
Or grow to dance at my school prom.
I may not hear in all my life
"I take thee as my wedded wife."
I may not grow to be called mom
By little angels called Sue or Tom.
When I go by I hear you say
"Gosh, doesn't she walk in a funny way."
Through all this though I always pray
That God be near me both night and day
To be my mind, my legs, my heart
In prayer and play at each day's start.
I ask our Lord to make you see that
We are the same, both you and me.
Now my God if I am wrong
Forgive me now and make me strong.

—*Salvatore B. Curiale.*

Trade With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial, "Too Choosy a Bride?" from the Wall Street Journal.

TOO CHOOSY A BRIDE?

"If you do not find it profitable to buy our goods or to sell your goods to us, do what you consider necessary. * * * Do not forget one thing, however. It sometimes happens that too choosy a bride will wait too lang and find herself an old maid."

Thus Premier Khrushchev advised the United States a few years back. Now the vexing question of East-West trade is before us again reopened by Canada's half-billion-dollar wheat sale to the Soviet Union, optimism over the test-ban treaty, and Moscow's growing split with Peking. Powerful voices in our own country are urging that we ease our trade restrictions, and particularly that the Government approve sales of wheat. Other voices, are, of course, raised in opposition to any easing.

In the uproar, it is easy to lose perspective. The whole point of trade is that each party to a transaction feels benefited by it. Any discussion of an increase in East-West trade should, we think, concern itself with realistic considerations of possible advantages to the United States and not so much with what are more or less fringe issues.

On the one side, opponents may be making too much of the military aspects of trade with Russia. They naturally recall World War II when American scrap became Japanese armaments. Yet it is by no means certain that materials from the United States enabled Japan to go to war. It is even possible that cutting off critical materials to Japan may have increased that country's feelings of frustration, isolation, and belligerence.

In any case, Russia is certainly not in the dependent position of the Japan of 1941. Rich in strategic resources and equipped with rocket capability, it is likely to receive little military benefit from Amercan commercial imports; no one is talking about selling the Soviets arms.

On the other side of the issue, too much optimism is probably being generated over the possibility of solving specifically American problems through East-West trade. Some see an opportunity to reduce our own hefty farm surpluses through a colossal deal. Perhaps; but the root of the farm problem is in misguided Government policies. We should take steps to correct the policies rather than assume that the Russians or anyone else can do it for us.

It is also unrealistic to suppose that deals with the Soviets will solve our balance-of-payments problems. For one thing, the Russian market is hardly that lucrative, and they already owe us billions that probably never will be paid. For another, our payments difficulty involves our domestic fiscal and monetary policies, and these must be corrected before there can be any substantial solution.

Neither should be we disturbed over the fact that we are somewhat alone in our refusal to trade extensively with Russia. East-West trade may be more to our allies' advantage than it is to ours. Italy, for example, is dependent on Soviet oil, while Canada stood to gain a great deal from the wheat transaction. Similar pressures do not exist here to any such extent.

Finally it has been suggested that more trade would ease tensions in the cold war. It is true that trade often makes for amicable feelings between countries, but this is not usually the central reason for embarking on trade ventures. Indeed, trade so motivated is likely to run into some serious snags further on down the road. The same difficulties that strain diplomatic relations can wreck trade arrangements in short order.

What it seems to us to boil down to is that a reasonable increase in trade with the Soviet Union is feasible and not necessarily dangerous. That is, so long as we keep in mind the basic reason for trade, which is getting something of value in return for what we are exchanging, and do not think of it primarily as a solution for U.S. economic problems or international political ones.

Being too choosy a bride, as Khrushchev says, can run the risk of loss. But it ought to be possible to be choosy without closing the door to an attractive proposal if and when it comes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems we are about to cast aside morality once again and make a further contribution to strengthening our enemy. There are those who justify the sale of wheat and resumption of trade with the Communists because it is good business and will mean money in their pockets.

I think the American people are entitled to know if the agitation to sell wheat to Russia is a direct result of the trip to Russia by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. Did Mr. Freeman enter into one of those secret understanding with Khrushchev? Was the whole wheat deal an accomplished fact and all the discussion now merely window dressing?

In addition to the answers to these questions, the advocates of trade with Russia should remember a few facts.

First. The Communists use trade as a political weapon to further the end of the Communist conspiracy, world domination.

Second. Agriculture production has failed in Russia under the Communist system. Now, we are going to help bail out the Communist leaders by supplying the food so that the weakness of their system will not be recognized by the Russian people.

Third. While it may be argued that food is not a strategic material, although I do not agree with this premise, it is certain that by supplying wheat to Russia we free more Soviet workers from agriculture so that they may be put on heavy production including weapons.

For my part I believe it is morally wrong to deal with the Soviet Union as a worthy member of the family of nations until she has, by deed, proved eligible for such membership. Nor can we take pride in making money by dealing with the enemy. Should a subsidy be involved; that is, a sales prive below market price levels or with American taxpayers footing part of the cost, the situation morally becomes even worse. For what possible reason can we subsidize the enemy or do business with them.

The Communists mean to destroy the U.S. form of government and society and enslave the people. Why should we help them? More than this since the best defense is a good offense why don't we stop accommodating the commies and outsmart them for a change.

Hydrofoils Operation and Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

HYDROFOILS OPERATION AND GOVERNMENT FINANCING

(By Congressman JOHN M. MURPHY of New York)

On July 15, 1963, American Hydrofoil Lines, Inc., initiated the first commercial use of a hydrofoil boat in the United States. At 8:30 a.m. in the morning a boatload of passengers left Port Washington, Long Island, for a nonstop trip to Wall Street. Not only was this the first commercial use of a hydrofoil in this country, but it was the first use of a hydrofoil in the Western Hemisphere for commuter service. Today, only 2 short months from the commencement of this new commuter service, the 21-mile Port Washington to Wall Street run is as routine as any other form of commuter service. The operating time has been reduced from 52 minutes to 47 minutes and schedules have been met with clockwork accuracy despite many days of adverse weather during this period.

In connection with the time factor for hydrofoil commuting from Port Washington, it is interesting to note that the hydrofoil is from one-half hour to 45 minutes faster to Wall Street than any other form of commuter service (auto, Long Island Railroad, and subway). In addition to the hydrofoil's speed, added features are personal comfort for the passengers, in the form of individual reserved seats and scenic beauty aboard the hydrofoil.

The Soviet Union has been aware of the importance of travel by hydrofoil since 1950.

Regular hydrofoil boat schedules are maintained on the Volga and other Russian rivers and lakes. It is estimated that the Soviet Union has several hundred commercial hydrofoils operating at the present time. The Soviet Union is not the only European country utilizing hydrofoils as commuter boats; Italy, England, Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries have also been expanding the use of hydrofoil boats. Recognizing the growth possibilities for hydrofoils in the United States, the Secretary of Commerce has recently referred to statistics supplied to him by a research institute showing that hydrofoil business in the United States will amount to over $750 million in the next 10 years.

American Hydrofoil Lines feels that a substantial portion of hydrofoil development in the next 10 years will provide better transit systems for metropolitan areas surrounded by water and the expediting of transit between cities connected by waterways. In that connection, there are over 26,000 miles of nature's highway in this country capable of being used by hydrofoil boats. Communities interested in hydrofoil commuting to assist in solving the transportation problems of metropolitan complexes must also solve one of the other major problems of our cities in the 20th Century—financing. Of all the forms of commuter service available to points within a city such as New York, the hydrofoil boat definitely offers the lowest overall cost per passenger mile in the development of new commuter routes. New railroad or subway lines would require expensive condemnation for new rights-of-way, not to speak of the capital construction costs that would be required after the land is acquired. Even the use of buses at speeds close to that of hydrofoils would require extensive modification of our already overcrowded roadway facilities in and around the city.

Hydrofoil boats on the other hand do not require any condemnation of land or expensive construction costs for terminals. For the most part, hydrofoils can operate out of existing dockage along the New York waterfront with little or no modification.

The right-of-way for hydrofoils is nature's highway, thus again saving tremendously in initial capital construction costs. Once in operation, maintenance on hydrofoil boats is minimal. The only major moving parts on a hydrofoil boat are its rudder and power unit while other forms of transportation have to contend with axles, wheels, springs and other equipment not required in hydrofoil operation.

It is not possible at this time to explore all aspects of hydrofoil operation; however, American Hydrofoil Lines has developed extensive economic data pertaining to hydrofoil commuter service and has also been cooperating in a study being conducted by the Nassau Planning Commission of water transportation for Long Island. These statistics could be made available on request. American Hydrofoil Lines has examined several means through which hydrofoil commuter boats could be financed in the metropolitan area. Similar programs would be applicable in other cities. The balance of this memorandum will be devoted to those several means.

SALE OF PORT AUTHORITY BONDS

In 1959, New York State Legislature provided for a New York State railroad equipment program. The program was created to provide public financial assistance in the purchase of new passenger car equipment for leases to three railroads operating in the New York City area. For example, the Long Island Railroad is scheduled to receive 30 cars under the program before the end of this year. The 30 cars are expected to handle 3,750 commuters daily. It would be interesting to speculate what 30 hydrofoil boats of the *Albatross* class could do in commuter service from Brooklyn or Staten Island to Manhattan.

In a 2-hour morning rush hour period, 30 hydrofoil boats could carry approximately 4,320 people.

Under the equipment program, the port authority is authorized to sell special port authority commuter car bonds which are State guaranteed and then purchase cars for lease to the private carriers. There is no reason why legislation for a similar program, on the basis of the same public interest, could not be passed for State guaranteed port authority bonds to aid in the purchase and subsequent lease of hydrofoil boats.

If the port authority would not be the acceptable public authority to handle such a bond issue, other agencies should be considered for a similar program.

NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY OPERATION

Most rapid commuter transit in the city of New York is operated by the New York City Transit Authority (transit authority). While it would require enabling legislation, the transit authority could make outright purchases of hydrofoil boats and operate them on regular routes much the same as buses and subways. Another possibility would be transit authority bonds guaranteed by the city or State for the purchase of hydrofoil boats and operation of the boats by the transit authority.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND AVIATION OPERATION

At the present time, the New York City Department of Marine and Aviation operates ferryboats for the city between several points within the city. Therefore, should it be decided that New York City prefers public operation of hydrofoil service within the city rather than private, marine and aviation could be the logical city agency to expand its operations to include hydrofoils. Marine and aviation has the harbor know-how needed for any hydrofoil commuter operation. Financing could be arranged through bond issues or outright purchases of boats by the city.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Under the provisions of the Kennedy administration's mass transportation proposal now pending before the 88th Congress, it is possible that additional Federal assistance would be available to metropolitan areas such as New York to assist in "the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems * * *." New York City has already received some Federal assistance for mass transit in a grant made by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency (FHHFA) last June. This grant of $3,185,000 was made under the provisions of a law which expired on June 30, 1963. One area of study, according to the announcement made by the FHHFA in making the grant, is whether new short connecting links between present transit facilities can help eliminate bottlenecks.

In that connection, we suggest that experiments could be conducted, under the terms of the grant, to establish hydrofoil feasibility between Staten Island and lower Manhattan. With the population expansion on Staten Island that can be expected when the Verrazano Bridge is completed, experimentation on a new short and faster connecting link between Staten Island surface lines and transit facilities in lower Manhattan is certainly in order and would unquestionably be in the public interest. The legislation for mass transit currently pending in the 88th Congress would, for practical purposes, provide authorization for grants similar to the grant just mentioned. However, the legislation is considerably broader than any transit legislate ever before enacted and would provide the means for a massive attack on mass transit problems.

The Senate has already passed mass transit legislation, S. 6, and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives has favorably reported H.R. 3881, a bill in most respects similar to the bill already passed by the Senate. The prospects for the enactment of legislation to provide massive ($500 million) assistance to metropolitan transit systems appears to be good. If not in this session of Congress the bill is almost assured of passage in the next session. In addition to programs for outright Federal grants and Federal loans to finance effective mass transportation, the proposed legislation calls for an accelerated research, demonstration, and development program for all phases of urban mass transportation.

It is in this area that hydrofoil development could be substantially furthered. The proposed legislation requires that a project must be one which could produce results usable in other areas. It is apparent that the results of a demonstration program of hydrofoil operations between Staten Island and lower Manhattan could be readily usable in other areas of the country. In connection with the loan provisions of the bill, it should be noted that loans for transit facilities can be made to public bodies where the transit operation is self supporting but may have difficulty in obtaining financing at reasonable terms.

This provision would be of particular interest should a New York City public body such as marine and aviation or the transit authority decide to purchase and/or operate hydrofoil boats. Grants and loans under the legislation must be made to public bodies, however, the legislation specifically provides that the equipment or facilities financed may be leased to private companies for actual operation. Thus, it would be possible for the port authority, the Tri-State Transportation Committee or other public body to arrange for the financing of hydrofoil boats and lease the boats to a private carrier to operate.

CONCLUSION

While some of the means for public financing have been discussed in this memorandum, it should be kept in mind that there is a great deal of flexibility. American Hydrofoil Lines believes that hydrofoils can help solve the complex transportation problems of many metropolitan areas in an economical and efficient manner. The Soviet Union has shown that hydrofoil communter service is feasible and we believe after our 2 months of service in the New York area that hydrofoils are feasible in New York and will be accepted enthusiastically by the public.

Health Projects Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, recent cuts in President Kennedy's foreign aid authorization bill may threaten seriously the progress of worldwide long-range health projects which are currently receiving partial support from the U.S. aid program.

The following articles by Dr. Howard Rusk in the New York Times aptly illustrate the need for continued aid to these projects. Of particular interest is the first of these articles in which Dr. Rusk discusses the possible effects of for-

eign aid cuts on the Alliance for Progress:

THE PRICE OF ECONOMY—ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FACES REDUCTION IN HEALTH PROGRAM FROM HOUSE AID CUT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Among the drastic cuts made by the House of Representatives in President Kennedy's proposed budget for foreign aid for the current year is a reduction of $150 million in the Alliance for Progress.

Officials of the Agency for International Development who administer this program cannot predict precisely how the Alliance for Progress will be reduced if the Senate fails to restore these funds.

There is little doubt, however, that if the cuts stand, our cooperative health activities with the 19 free republics of Latin America will be substantially curtailed.

Self-help projects in health have been among the most fruitful and appealing of the Alliance for Progress activities.

MALARIA IN GUATEMALA

In 1957, Guatemala with U.S. assistance initiated a program to eradicate malaria. Before this, 73 percent of its area was malarious, and 300,000 cases of the disease occurred annually with 3,000 deaths. More than 30 percent of the people given malaria tests showed positive reactions.

By 1962, as a result of the program, 58 percent of the area previously malarious—with a population of more than half a million persons—had been freed of the disease.

The amount of land under cultivation in this area has increased nearly four times, and the value of agricultural output has increased 60 times.

The number of positive reactions to malaria tests has dropped to 3 percent, one-tenth of the former rates.

OTHER DRAMATIC RESULTS

There have been equally dramatic results in Brazil, Costa Rica, Colombia, and other countries in Latin America.

The gamut of self-help projects in health being aided under the Alliance for Progress ranges from such vast projects as a public health program for 2,300,000 people in Brazil's State of Pernambuco to a water pipeline for a Bolivian village.

In San Salvador, for example, the Alliance for Progress has furnished the funds for creation of 10 rural mobile health units.

These units, which include a physician, nurse, and sanitary assistant, are bringing medical care to villages that have never before had the benefit of modern, scientific medicine. The village health centers are built by the people themselves who contribute the land and labor.

In Panama $930,000 has been allocated for work on 15 health centers, including the first pediatric institution in this Republic.

STRESS ON SELF-HELP

The important factor in these projects is the emphasis on self-help.

The United States is not doing these things for the people of Latin America. The Latin Americans, with the assistance of the Alliance for Progress, the Pan-American Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund and many voluntary agencies, are doing these things themselves.

Here are some examples of activities that were being considered by the Alliance for Progress before the House of Representatives made the $150 million budget cut.

Projects costing $1,500,000 were planned for the expansion of surplus food distribution to 6 million more Latin American schoolchildren.

U.S. support of 60 more mobile clinics providing modern medical services for the first time for 2 million persons in more than 600 villages in Central America was budgeted at $2 million.

A half-million-dollar expenditure was planned for textbooks for 200,000 school children in Central American areas where the literacy rate is less than 50 percent.

Ten thousand more classrooms to accommodate 500,000 more schoolchildren would cost $50 million.

The general health goals of the Alliance for Progress during the next decade are to increase life expectancy at birth by a minimum of 5 years and to increase the ability to learn and produce by improving individual and public health.

To achieve this will require the provision of sewers and potable water for 70 percent of the urban population and 50 percent of the rural population; the eradication of smallpox and malaria and the control of other communicable diseases, and the improvement of basic health services at national and local levels.

In one of the Central American Republics, the infant mortality rate is 90 for every 1,000 live births. In the United States it is 25.3; Denmark, 20.1; Australia, 19.5, and the Netherlands, 15.3.

In this Central American Republic, 80 percent of the deaths of young children and 60 percent of their illnesses are preventable.

With proven health measures, the infant mortality rate could probably be reduced by one-third in 5 years and two-thirds in 10 years.

This Nation, however, cannot hope to achieve even minimum standards of modern maternial and infant care without U.S. assistance.

It is eager to have our help under the Alliance for Progress. That help, however, will not be forthcoming unless the Senate restores the $150 million that the House of Representatives has cut from the budget of the Agency for International Development.

This writer, like most of our citizens, wants sensible economy in government, but not at the expense of sickness and malnutrition among the children of Latin America, tomorrow's leaders in this important part of the world.

HEALTH PROJECTS ABROAD—REDUCTIONS IN AID BILL CAN HARM MANPOWER NEEDS OF POOR NATIONS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

For the current fiscal year, President Kennedy originally requested $4,900 million for foreign aid.

After a study by the Committee to Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, this request was reduced to $4,500 million.

President Kennedy, General Clay, and David E. Bell, Director of the Agency for International Development, have warned Congress and the people of possible serious consequences from the military, political, and economic standpoints of this reduction. The President warned that "freedom does not come easily or cheaply."

As a physician, this writer, who serves on the Clay Committee, is deeply concerned that these cuts may undermine the long-range health and education projects being supported by U.S. foreign aid. This is truly a people-to-people program.

BASE FOR GROWTH

These projects, most authorities agree, are fundamental in building a base for economic growth, political stability, and military strength.

Dr. Charles W. Mayo summed up this relationship aptly when he said with great simplicity, "Poverty makes people sick—sickness makes people poor."

This adage is well illustrated by malaria, which disables more people and extracts a higher material cost in lost productivity than any other disease.

Programs to eradicate malaria have now cut cases from a worldwide total of 350 million to fewer than 100 million. The goal is now the complete eradication of the disease.

The advances of this program date to 1955 when member nations of the World Health Organization voted to initiate this worldwide effort.

In fiscal year 1962, the Agency for International Development committed $28,300,000 to this effort, nearly half of the $59 million devoted to 193 projects in 55 countries.

The results have been dramatic in all nations, but particularly so in India, which has the largest single program.

In 1953, India recorded 1 million deaths from malaria among 75 million cases. These 75 million meant more than a billion days of work were lost.

DECLINE IN MALARIA

In 1953, malaria accounted for nearly 11 perecent of all illness in India. By 1961, it fell to 1 percent.

As a result, the output of India's coal mines were increases sharply and long delayed railroad and irrigation construction projects have been completed.

Malaria has practically been eliminated in the rich tea-growing areas of Assam and West Bengal where formerly as much as 25 percent of the total population had malaria at the height of tea-packing seasons.

When this writer was in India last year a village observed the 40th "birthday" of a child. The infant had lived 40 days, a record for a child born there in the malaria season.

Wheat acreage in Iran went up 758,000 hectares, or 27.3 percent, between 1949 and 1953 after malaria control began.

In Taiwan, malaria eradication has cut cases from 1,200,000 in 1950 to 61 in 1961. Deaths in the same period dropped from 12,000 to zero.

The largest single factor in expansion of the important logging and lumber industry in the Philippines has been malaria eradication, which has made new timber concessions available for the first time.

RECORDS GO ON

Country by country the record goes on of more economic output because of malaria control—Jordan, Pakistan, Thailand, and Indonesia.

Currently the Agency for International Development is providing bilateral assistance in malaria eradication to 18 nations with a total population of 805 million.

Any substantial financial cut in the Agency's budget will mean an increased risk of of this disease for these 805 million persons.

It should be noted that by far the greatest portion of these Agency funds was spent in the United States for commodities and equipment and, therefore, did not contribute to the balance-of-payments deficit.

In fiscal year 1961 this included more than 74 million pounds of DDT, nearly half of the DDT manufactured in the United States and 70 percent of its exports.

In India and many other countries these programs are gradually being shifted from outright grants to long-term loans.

Malaria, however, is not the only disease problem. Round worms chronically infest 600 million persons throughout the world. This can be treated and prevented.

DISEASE FROM SNAILS

Schistosomiasis, a disease spread by snails, infects the intestines or bladder; it debilitates and eventually completely incapacitates 100 million persons. Public health measures could reduce the incidence tremendously.

Yaws, which produces open sores that soon cover wide areas of the body, and affects 80 million people, can be controlled with penicillin at an average cost of 10 cents a case.

Trachoma, the leading cause of blindness, affects 15 percent of the world's population. It can be prevented and treated.

The control of these and other diseases that contribute to poverty, lack of education, malnourishment, economic underdevelopment, and political instability is fundamental.

The failure to throw the full weight of this Nation's knowledge and resources into the battle against disease and disease and disability because a lack of funds represents a callousness toward human misery.

It also shows a lack of understanding of the basic fact that health is fundamental to economic well-being and political stability.

DAR Constitution Week Essay Contest Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Francis Broward Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., conducts an annual Constitution Week essay contest for school students to encourage greater awareness of our democratic institutions among young people. It has been my privilege in past years to present the winning essays here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Miss Betty Lee Schadel, a member of the senior class of Fort Lauderdale High School and Mr. Scott Baker, sixth grade student at Harbordale School are this years' grand prize winners, senior and junior divisions. Their essays on the topic "My Individual Freedom Under the Constitution," are presented hereafter in the RECORD. But in addition to these two outstanding essays, other winners and runnerups deserve full recognition and commendation. This list indicates that we have much to be proud about the younger generation.

I wish to congratulate Betty and Scott, and also the following other winners, their schools, and their teachers:

Wilma Yates, Fort Lauderdale High School.

Nancy Haywood, Olsen Junior High School.

Alice Mary McKeown, Olsen Junior High School.

Kathy Bell, Fort Lauderdale High School.

Linda Haynes, Fort Lauderdale High School.

Susie Corcoran, St. Coleman Catholic School.

Cynthia Gray, Deerfield Beach Elementary School.

Sherri Eschelman, Bayview Elementary School.

Delores McKethen, Carver Ranches Elementary School.

Jacquelyn Baker, Carver Ranches Elementary School.

Frank Aloise, Deerfield Beach Elementary School.

Edith Johnson, Coleman Elementary School.

Richard Martin, Harbordale Elementary School.

Philip Hancock, Harbordale Elementary School.

Carol Renkel, Rogers Junior High School.

The winning essays follow:

MY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Betty Lee Schadel, 12th grade; Mrs. Rickman, Fort Lauderdale High School)

Do you thank God that you're an American? Are you proud of your country—your flag—your home? In these times of wealth, the freedom of the individual established by the Constitution of the United States of America in 1787 is not given adequate acknowledgment for our fortunate way of life. Perhaps it's no longer smart to be patriotic. Why should we be? That makes one a square. Just maybe we should be patriotic to show respect to the only country on the earth which is run by "we, the people of the United States."

Do you know what it is like to disagree with others in discussion without being suppressed for your opinions? Can you express your thoughts and receive respect for them being original in your own mind? Yes, you can. I can. We're Americans. Growing up in this country, one decides the course of study in which he is interested and, even if he is going to study or not. He can go out for the sport of his choice and select where he wants to go to college. One becomes what he wants for himself through hard work and can marry the one he loves. He can teach his children what he thinks they should know to be honorable adults, and he can worship the religion which best answers his beliefs. Throughout one's life, anything he wants bad enough is attainable through his own effort, and he is accepted in society according to what he has made himself. As a young person, nothing could be more inspiring.

Preparing for citizenship and adulthood are the duties that come with the freedoms—speech, the expression of ideas, freedom from other men; religious freedom; the privilege to petition for and against; and the right to live in privacy and solitude in one's own home, enjoying the music one likes, curling up with a good book, studying for exams, teaching oneself piano, or relaxing in the sun. These individual liberties are mad possible by the Constitution's attitude of people governing both their own country and their own lives. "These are the times that try men's souls," for, truly, every man deserves the right to be free.

MY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(By Scott Baker, Grade 6; G. Tucker, Harbordale School)

Have you ever really thought about our individual freedom? Well, I don't know about you, but it seems to me that so many of our freedoms are taken for granted. This essay assignment really made me think a little harder about the rights and privileges I have as a citizen of the United States. Just to give you an idea of what I have been thinking about, let me start with this afternoon.

I came home after school and sat down to read the paper. Well now, as you can imagine, our newspapers are full of various ideas and opinions. People write letters to the editor agreeing or disagreeing with what our President, Congress, or city fathers are doing. Editorials are written that are critical of our Government's policies, but they are printed anyway and read by thousands of people. I am sure you know that in some countries the people only read what the government permits them to read. Now the day is getting short and it is about time for my dad to come home. Here he comes now. He has come home in the kind of car he has selected. The Government doesn't tell him he can only buy one kind of car, or even tell him he can't buy any car at all. His job is also the job he selected, and the Government doesn't have to own the company he works for. He is free to move from one State to another if his job requires, or he may choose to live in another State. The same privileges I hope to have when I become a man.

After dinner I will get ready for Boy Scouts. I am really glad that there are groups of Scouts scattered over the United States because they teach citizenship to boys and many other wonderful things. For example tonight we are going to have an election for officers in our Scout troop. In our own way we are exercising the same rights and privileges the adult members of our free society have.

Our school happens to be a polling place, and in the last elections the voting machines were placed in the sixth grade halls outside my classroom. Quite a few people came to vote and sometimes during my schoolwork, I would stop for a minute and just listen to the voting machines clicking away with votes. Then, that night I was telling my dad about the disturbing noises that the machines made. Later he said that that's probably the best noise that I will ever hear in my lifetime because that is the symbol of independence and freedom.

Space Program Should Not Be Political Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include an article which appeared in the Houston Post for September 8 relating to our space program. I commend it to the Members of this body.

[From the Houston Post, Sept. 8, 1963]

SPACE PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE POLITICAL ISSUE

At least one Washington writer sees the prospect that the Nation's space program will become a major political issue in the 1964 campaign. He reads this into the fact that, for the first time since the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created, House Republicans generally voted against the space authorization bill, even after it had been cut $342 million below the President's request.

This is the history of the legislation: The House cut $489 million from the $5.7 billion asked, but the Senate restored $1.47 million. In the House, an amendment which would have sent the compromise bill back to a conference committee with instructions to cut the total to $5.2 billion, was defeated by a vote of only 200 to 176, and the final vote on the measure was 249 to 125, with 5 Republican members of the space committee opposing it.

Last year, when the administration asked only $3.6 billion, the NASA authorization bill was approved unanimously. The Apollo moon program, for which Houston is the nerve-center, was largely responsible for the higher request this year, and congressional opposition seemed to center on the wisdom,

need for, and urgency of this program. The Washington writer predicts additional cuts when the appropriation bill comes up.

The attitude of some Members of Congress appears to be: Is this trip to the moon really necessary? Or, if they concede that it is, they asked: Is the landing of a man on the moon of sufficient urgency to justify this large an expenditure at this particular time, when there is an outcry for governmental economy?

There has been a tendency to picture the Apollo program as a "race" with the Russians. It is to some extent. There also has been an attempt to present the prime objective of the program as being "national prestige." It is to a degree. Also, partisan and personal politics has been projected into consideration of the space program in Congress.

It would be regrettable if the space program should become a political campaign issue. The program is being and should be undertaken because it is in the national interest, and for that reason it deserves the support of all Americans.

Now that it has been demonstrated that it is possible for men to navigate space, somebody is going to do it. And just as in the case of the land surface of the earth, the seas, and the atmosphere, somebody is going to try to achieve ascendancy. If this country is not first, some other country will be. And the only candidate in sight is Russia.

Space may be too vast for any country actually to control it, but the country that has preeminence there will have an advantage.

It is to be hoped that the East-West arms race can be limited to the earth and its atmosphere, but the military implications and potentialities of leadership in space cannot be ignored. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Congress and the country at large will not permit themselves to be led off into side alleys in their thinking about the space program but will keep their eyes on the ball.

If cuts are made in appropriations for the space program, with the result that it is slowed down, they should be made with caution and as the result of mature, balanced judgment, taking into account the effect upon the national interest and security. They should not be made because Massachusetts or Texas will benefit from the expenditures. Yet these are factors which influenced the attitudes of some Members of Congress toward the requests which the administration made for the next fiscal year.

Some Congressmen are said to fear that the space program will become a huge political boondoggle. There is no need for it to become that if Congress does its job properly and acts responsibly.

If cuts are made, Members of Congress would do well to be certain that the risks involved are not serious. They might have a great deal of explaining to do if the Russians should pull another exploit—say on the eve of the 1964 elections—and the American public should begin trying to figure out who was responsible for the Soviet's being ahead in the "race" for space leadership.

Pope John XXIII: In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written in honor of Pope John XXIII by Miss Marty Hale, the "Old Spinner," of Steubenville, Ohio:

IN MEMORIAM: POPE JOHN XXIII

What can we say of such a man as this—
Whose virtues belong only to a saint.
My feeble pen would not attempt this task,
No painter there is who would try to paint
The gentleness upon that kindly face.
God had a mission and he chose this man
Above all others, that he might release
All men who are enslaved and set them free
To lead us on a pilgramage for peace.
The lowly knew the blessings of his hand,
Altho he was entitled to a crown,
Now other willing hands inspired by him,
Take up the burden where he laid it down.
Of humble parentage his great heart clung to
Simple things—creations of the sod,
All lovely things had meant so much to him
Perhaps thats why he loved the things of God.
Faiths are forgotten as we speak of him;
We'll urge along the mission he began,
His followers had loved him as their Pope.
The whole world loved him as a fellow man.
Rich regal robes had never changed the man
Within, who never lost the common touch,
We but regret his reign should be so brief—
So brief and yet he left the world so much.

—*Marty Hale.*

If Taxes Are Cut, Government Spending Must Be, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the tax bill last week, and by doing so lays the groundwork for a cut in taxes exceeding $11 billion. The story is not complete, because the Senate still has to deal with this legislation. Many of us here in the House felt there should be a tax cut; however, at the same time we urged that Government spending be cut. It was our opinion that to have a cut in taxes and balloon spending would be fiscally unsound. To approach a tax cut without the determination to hold down Government spending would be a mistake that I am sure the Congress would not want to make.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of the September 20, 1963, editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News, that addresses itself to the responsibilities of Congress:

TEST BAN TREATY, TAX CUT ILLUSTRATE HOW CONGRESS YIELDS RESPONSIBILITIES

In recent days the American people have been given two very good examples of how Congress, through its own failure to exercise its constitutional responsibilities, is more and more handing over these responsibilities to the White House and the Executive.

These examples are in the handling of the nuclear test ban treaty and in the debate over whether or not the country can afford an $11 billion tax cut.

In both cases it is the Congress and the Congress alone that has the final say-so on just what is to be done, but in each case we are observing a rather strange inclination on the part of our legislators to abandon their own prerogatives and permit President Kennedy to call all the shots.

As far as the test ban treaty is concerned it has now become an acknowledged fact that a great many Senators have serious doubts about the wisdom of ratifying this treaty unless certain safeguards are taken. To resolve these doubts President Kennedy has taken the almost unprecedented action of writing a letter to the Senate Minority Leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, pledging himself and his administration to the observance of these safeguards if the treaty is ratified as expected.

But, if the Senate is to fully exercise its constitutional responsibility and duty, why should it even be necessary to seek from the President a written pledge that necessary safeguards will be taken. The Senate has the unchallenged responsibility to "advise and consent" in the making of treaties. Why then, in view of the serious nature of this whole business, should the Senate not make these necessary safeguards a part of the treaty by including them in an official reservation clause which will be binding not only upon President Kennedy but his successors, as well?

Such a reservation will not kill the treaty. It will not require its renegotiation. But it will spell out in clear and unmistakable form the rights this country reserves in becoming a party to the treaty.

This is not an unprecedented step. It has been done quite often in the past when the Senate, in its official role of "adviser and consenter" in the treatymaking process wanted to spell out the conditions under which it was approving a treaty.

Since it has been done in the past, in instances where the national security and national interest were not nearly as involved as they are in the nuclear test ban treaty, why should the Senate bypass its responsibilities and permit a Presidential pledged, however sincere it might be, to replace what should be attached to the treaty, itself?

Much the same thing applies to the current tax bill. Here we have another situation in which the Congress seems to be abdicating its responsibilities and buckpassing them on to the President. Congress is the controller of the national purse strings, and, if it wants to condition the granting of a tax cut on the reduction of Federal expenditures, there is no necessity for Congress to seek the President's permission or his pledge to reduce Federal expenditures. The President cannot spend a dime without an authorization and an appropriation from the Congress and, if the Congress sincerely wants to limit spending to a prescribed figure, all it has to do is to refuse to appropriate any money over this figure.

Yet, here again we have a case of the President writing letters to congressional leaders and taking to the airwaves to pledge his cooperation in reducing pump-priming spending in order to enhance the chances of passing a tax-cutting bill.

Again the President may be perfectly sincere, but why should words take the place of deeds in a matter of this sort? The Kennedy administration has a long string of broken promises and pledges not only in regard to reducing Government spending but in a lot of other fields as well.

So why should Congress tie any proposed tax cut to any Presidential pledge in regard to spending when it is the Congress and the Congress alone that determines how much money is going to be spent?

Any President's promise to cut spending or to hike it means very little unless he has the majority support in Congress for what he wants to do. And for Congress to put the prime responsibility for heavy and unwarranted spending on a President is putting responsibility in the wrong place as we

have yet to hear of any President who has spent money that hasn't been given him to spend by Congress.

Both the President and the Congress are eminently correct in assuming that a substantial tax cut is needed and will be a good thing for the Nation's economy. But unless a tax cut is accompanied by a substantial reduction in Government spending it can do more harm than good. Thus, again we ask, Why should the Congress rely on a Presidential pledge to slash Government spending in order to balance a tax cut when, in the final analysis, control over spending lies in the hands of Congress and not with the President?

We are hearing much these days about the President exercising too much power and too much control in too many areas. In almost every case, however, control and power go to those who exercise them, and when Congress abdicates its responsibilities it puts itself in a poor position to squawk about somebody else taking them over.

Women in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great strengths of our Nation is its two-party system. It guarantees responsible majority rule with an organized effective minority. Women are playing an increasing role in our political life. This is good for our parties and our country.

Mrs. Clare B. Williams, assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee, has announced the appointment of three outstanding Republican women to key positions in the women's division of the Republican National Headquarters. Mrs. O. Blake Willcox, formerly of Englewood, N.J., will serve as special staff assistant, women's division; Mrs. W. Merritt Peterson, of Charlott, Mich., will serve as executive director; and Mrs. George B. Green will serve as public relations director.

In announcing these appointments, Mrs. Williams said:

> We have selected women whose broad experience in related fields will greatly strengthen GOP women's activities across the country. They are dedicated to a GOP victory in 1964 and will add vital stimulus to all facets of our women's campaign activity, including the GROW program. Their energies will be utilized to the fullest in mobilizing womanpower from precinct to national level—nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I know from my personal knowledge of the exceptional ability of Mrs. Willcox in working in many New Jersey campaigns. These women will make a substantial contribution toward electing a Republican President and a Republican Congress in 1964. I ask unanimous consent to have Mrs. Willcox's biographical sketch printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. O. Blake Willcox joins the staff of the women's division, Republican National Committee, October 1, 1963. She again brings to the national headquarters her wide and valuable experience in Republican activities. Born in Cleveland, Ohio, Mrs. Willcox is the mother of three children and a grandmother 12 times. She is the widow of the late O. Blake Willcox.

A participant in the national conventions of 1948 and 1952, she was elected as the only woman deleagte-at-large from New Jersey to the 1956 convention, and appointed to the resolutions committee (civil rights and immigration).

From 1961 to January 1963, she was director, women's finance program, Republican National Committee. She has served as a county committeewoman; president, Englewood (N.J.) Women's Republican Club; and is on the board of the District of Columbia League of Republican Women. She was vice chairman of the Bergen (N.J.) County School of Politics in 1951–52, having previously written a popular booklet "What Every Republican Worker Should Know," published by the Bergen County committee.

At the State level she was a member of Governor Driscoll's campaign committee, vice chairman of Congressman Frank C. Osmers, Jr., campaign committee (chairman of women's division), 1951. For 5 years she served as president, New Jersey Federation of Republican Women, 1952–57, and also was cochairman women's division, New Jersey campaign committee, 1952–56. She moved to Washington, D.C. from New Jersey in April 1959.

Mrs. Wilcox has held a number of appointive public offices including board of local assistance, city of Englewood; representative from New Jersey Federation of Republican Women on Women's Council on Human Relations, New Jersey Department of Education; division against discrimination, 1951–57.

Mrs. Willcox was appointed a member of the Annual Assay Commission by President Eisenhower, 1954.

Her professional career includes two previous associations with the Republican National Committee in addition to serving as assistant to the director, special staff on aging, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1959–61. She was in charge of the program organization and arrangements for the White House Conference on Aging. She has been an officer of the Englewood (N.J.) Junior League; officer, Englewood Women's Club; president, Parent's Council, Dwight School; hospital board of trustees, secretary; school of nursing, vice chairman; chairman of the St. Paul's Church fair.

Mrs. Willcox was educated in New Jersey public schools and the Dwight School for Girls in Englewood; Dana Hall, Wellesley, Mass.; Elmira College, N.Y. She is an Episcopalian.

As a special staff assistant for the women's division, she will associate herself with newly formed as well as revitalized programs being instituted in line with the stepped-up campaign tempo.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of the series titled "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1," which follows:

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1—PART II: MANY FACTORS CAUSE BAD AIR

(By Ian McNett)

"Ask the average man what air pollution means to him, and he probably will point to the plume of smoke rising from the stack of the nearest factory," says Dr. Raymond Manganelli, professor of sanitation at Rutgers University.

"He will be puzzled if you tell him he also pollutes the air; but he does, every time he lights his furnace, drives his car, smokes a cigaret, burns trash and leaves, or charcoal broils a steak at his backyard barbecue."

Some will argue, Dr. Manganelli says, that one person doesn't add much to the pollution total.

He adds, "A single individual does not. But millions of individuals plus industry create the air pollution problem."

Air pollution experts fret if people aren't specific when talking about pollution. They argue that you can't say air pollution does this or that; you have to talk about specific pollutants and their sources.

The generally accepted definition of air pollution is anything in the outdoor atmosphere in sufficient quantities to hur humans, animals, or plants, damage property, or keep people from enjoying their property.

This sweeping definition still doesn't say what air pollutants are specifically, how they are formed, or what effects they have on people or property.

To be specific, "pure" air contains 78 percent nitrogen, 21 percent oxygen, and traces of carbon dioxide, water vapor and inert harmless gases.

People living in metropolitan New Jersey on an average day will breathe "pure" air plus some sulfur compounds, nitrogen oxides, aldehydes, hydrocarbons, pollen, soot, dirt dust, industrial dust, rubber particles and fungus spores, to name a few things.

Most people on normal days aren't even aware they are breathing anything but pure air.

If humans never did anything but breathe, there still would be natural pollutants. About 20 million Americans get the sniffles every summer from ragweed and other plant pollens. Others suffer from allergies to fungus spores—tiny seeds of life from plants that don't reproduce by pollenization.

Spores and pollens can ride light air currents for miles. So can the dust in dry weather than billows from ground denuded of vegetation.

Human beings can't completely escape guilt for the spread of the so-called natural pollutants. Ragweed thrives unchecked in areas stripped of other vegetation. This includes abandoned farms, roadsides, railroad rights-of-way, and property awaiting housing or industrial development.

But human beings don't sit still and live off the land. They move about, burn fires, grind things, extract minerals from ores, and do a myriad of other activities.

From this multitude of sources arise the baffling variety of pollutants.

SMOG LABEL COINED

In 1905, Dr. Harold Antoine Des Voeux coined the word "smog" at a London public health congress. This handy word fits easily into headlines, but experts find it too imprecise.

They broke smog into two types—London and Los Angeles or photochemical smog.

London smog is true smog—a combination of smoke and fog. Where coal is the chief fuel of homeowners and industries, London smog blankets an area at night and on cold, foggy, windless days. It contains smoke, sulfur compounds, and fly ash (the unburnable material in solid fuels). London smog brought death in England and Donora.

Photochemical smog, on the other hand, is a fair weather phenomena. Experts think it is caused by sunlight acting on hydrocarbons and compounds of oxygen emitted mainly from automobiles. It causes eye irritations and plant and property damage. Medical researchers haven't decided what effect it has on human health.

Photochemical smog is what Dr. Manganelli means when he talks about primary and secondary emissions. Primary emissions, he says, are pollutants that go directly into the atmosphere. Secondary emissions are new substances created from the interaction of one or more primary pollutants.

MANY POLLUTANTS

New Jersey is a potential and real source of air pollutants. It has 15,000 industries, millions of homes, 2½ million motor vehicles, and thousands of commercial establishments and public facilities.

The State's industry ranges from metal extraction plants and oil refineries through plastics and paint manufacturing.

The State clearly can and does have almost every pollutant known to man.

Nobody has ever computed the amount of pollutants that pour into the atmosphere every year. It's an impossible task. But we can know which pollutants come from what sources.

Pollutants either take the form of aerosols or gasses. Aerosols are tiny solid and liquid particles that range from the microscopic to the visible in size.

Dr. Edward Seidmon, Plainfield allergy specialist, says the new synthetic chemicals are a growing problem in air pollution. They come, he says, "from the so-called powdered plastics plants."

Smoke is the most visible air pollutant. People often think the air is clean if they don't see any smoke. It is the result of incomplete burning—a sign of waste. It contains both solid and liquid particles which create dirt, lung damage, ugliness, and discomfort.

Fumes, chemists say, are made of solid particles—dirt, in other words. They are produced by the condensation of vapors, heating distillation, or chemical action. They are emitted by processes in the chemical, paint, rubber, and metal industries.

DUST PARTICLES

Dusts are also troublesome solid particles. In addition to blowing off fields, they come from grinding, drying, sawing, crushing, and other processes in the rock, cement, asphalt, rubber, tile, metal, soap, dry foods, lumber, and construction industries.

Mists are liquid particles released in spraying, coating, and impregnating operations. An organic mist is formed from automobile exhaust emissions by the action of sunlight on nitrogen oxides and certain hydrocarbons.

Gases, like the aerosols, come from almost every human source, be it industrial, domestic, commercial, or automotive.

Nitrogen oxides are formed when anything is burned. Nitrogen in the air combines with oxygen released by the burning process to form nitric oxide. The new gas further combines with more nitrogen to form nitrogen dioxide. The sources of these gases include furnaces and automobiles.

Intense sunlight causes nitrogen dioxide to react with hydrocarbons and produces gases that cause eye irritation. Ozone, which cracks rubber and damages plant life, is also formed in this reaction.

Sulfur oxides are formed by burning sulfur-containing fuels. Oil, coal and gas used for industrial heating, home heating, smelting, refining and electric power production all contain sulfur. Sulfur dioxide is the biggest single chemical air pollutant. In foggy weather the gas is often changed to sulfur trioxide and sulfuric acid mist. Both are harmful in high concentrations.

Hydrocarbons formed from hydrogen and carbon enters the atmosphere from many sources. Unburned gasoline from motor vehicle exhausts is an important source. An olefin is an unstable hydrocarbon that can combine with other chemicals very easily. For example, it can combine with chlorine or bromine with very unpleasant effects on delicate human and plant tissues.

Aldehydes contain hydrogen, carbon and oxygen. They are formed by the incomplete burning of fuel or by action of sunlight on nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons. Formaldehyde has been found in the air in sufficient concentrations to cause eye irritations.

CAN DAMAGE TISSUES

Both organic and inorganic acids are products of incomplete burning of fuels. Some of them, like hydrogen fluoride can damage vegetation and human tissues in fairly low concentrations.

Odors are a third air pollution problem. But they defy any chemical analysis yet devised by man. Chemists suspect they contain a number of different chemicals. They are important because they can make people sick, disturb sleep, and drive down property values. Odors are often associated with other air pollutants, especially the sulfur compounds.

This is not intended to be a complete list of air pollutants, but is representative and contains many harmful ones. It was chiefly drawn from pamphlets published by the U.S. Public Health Service.

Worcester, Mass., City Council Recorded in Favor of H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to include in the RECORD the correspondence, on behalf of the Worcester, Mass., City Council, sent to me by the Honorable Robert J. O'Keefe, city clerk, together with the contents of the resolution adopted by the city council favoring the expedient enactment of this measure, H.R. 5131.

The correspondence and resolution follow:

CITY OF WORCESTER, MASS.,
CITY CLERK DEPARTMENT,
September 26, 1963.

Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DONOHUE: Enclosed is an attested copy of a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester endorsing House bill 5131.

The City Council of Worcester, Mass. requests that the city of Worcester be recorded as favoring the passage of this bill.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT J. O'KEEFE,
City Clerk.

CITY OF WORCESTER RESOLUTION ENDORSING HOUSE BILL 5131

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Worcester endorses House bill 5131 of the U.S. Congress, being an act called the Youth Employment Act.

Hon. A. R. Stout, Judge, 40th Judicial District of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a condensation of an address made by the Honorable A. R. Stout, judge of the 40th Judicial District, Waxahachie, Tex. This condensation appeared in the September 15 edition of the Dallas Morning News.

I count Judge Stout as one of my very good friends in Texas, and he is a Democrat of long standing; but a very conservative and wisened jurist. I am sure that anyone reading the article will perceive in it the number of years this gentleman has sat on the bench and his keen insight of our Constitution.

SUPREME COURT'S POWER GRASP

(By A. R. Stout)

There is a mad grasp for power going on in this country, and this is particularly true of our highest court. The 10th amendment, reserving to the States all powers not expressly granted to the Federal Government, has become a dead letter and is no longer followed.

The purpose of the 10th, as a part of our Bill of Rights, was to preserve local government and the powers of States and definitely to restrict the powers of the National Government to those specifically granted by the Constitution.

Each day we witness the nullification of precedents, upon which this Nation has thrived and grown great, and the concentration of power in the Federal Government or the Supreme Court.

The powers and rights of States are brushed aside and the effect of their decisions, regardless of law and customs, is to make national law as they would have it be and to reduce our people to a sameness and oneness as bees in a hive or ants in a hill.

Landmarks and precedents have no binding force and what was good yesterday may be invalid today.

From 1953 to 1961 some 70 subversion cases were considered by the Supreme Court and in 46 of them the positions advocated by the Communists were sustained.

You and I could hire the best lawyer in America and have every ground in the U.S. Constitution for having our case reviewed, but the chances are that we could not even get into this Court.

The Justices grant only about 200 applications out of the 2,000 presented each year, and they are choosy as to whom they hear.

Cases concerning the Federal Government, labor, Communists, and colored men constitute about 75 percent of their total business.

A year ago I examined all of the 62 written opinions in the last bound volume of reports. There were dissenting opinions in 49, 18 of which were by a 5-to-4 vote and 12 by 6 to 3.

The Federal Government was a party in 21. Sixteen were cases involving States and criminal convictions in States, in the great majority of which the State lost.

The appeals of seven Communists were sympathetically considered; eight affected labor organizations; four involved State Sunday-closing laws; one held that belief

in a supreme being as a requisite for holding a State office in Maryland was invalid; and the remaining five that affected private litigants only also involved Federal power or the power of the Court itself.

During the entire Court year recently ended there were 147 written opinions. Sixteen affected labor organizations; 5 were subversion cases, and 13 involved Negroes.

The labor unions won all but three of their cases while the winning record of the Negroes and subversives was 100 percent.

You be the judge of just a few cases. A statute of Pennsylvania was directed against communistic and subversive activities. The statute was declared invalid upon the ground that the question was a national one, notwithstanding a Federal statute that expressly permitted such a State law.

In defiance of our dual system of government, the Court said that such matters should be handled by the Federal Government alone without the benefit of State help.

One act by Congress required the Communist Party to register; another made it unlawful to be a member of an organization which advocated the overthrow of the government by violence. Both were upheld by the narrow vote of 5 to 4, but the opinions in the cases would make most Americans shudder and blush.

I presume that if a man began up at the old H. & T.C. depot and turned loose a thousand wild cattle or hogs on Main Street and ran them down the street, through plate glass and into stores, he would be doing some damage to those who owned businesses along the way.

Yet, when applied to stand-ins, sit-ins and sit-downs, the Supreme Court invariably finds against the owner and in favor of those conspirators who would wreck his business, no matter what their conduct is.

Now, a man's home is his castle and his place of business is next to his home, and everyone's rights end where yours begin. A man has no freedom when he is denied the individual liberty to control that which is his own.

If this be not true, then the next short step is to take his property completely and divide it up.

If anything is new or involves in any way these Justices' own power, they will review it.

In Louisiana, the electric switch failed to work on a man under sentence of death. This conviction was reviewed, though affirmed, upon the queer ground that the case had thus become one in which jeopardy had attached; in other words, if the jail door breaks, the felon should be turned loose.

Each day they rewrite, remake and reshape the criminal law and procedure of our various States as they want the law to be—not as it is and not as they are permitted to do under American law and the Constitution of the United States, but contrary to the Constitution and as they desire the law to be, as if they were legislators.

The office of a judge is simple. It is, as Lord Bacon said, "to interpret law and not to give or make it." A judge is merely a judicial umpire who sees that the law is followed. If he follows his whim and wish, then we have no law and the rights of no one are safe. When the law fails, all fails.

The Constitution, save for a limitation on the presidential term of office and the repeal of the 18th amendment, has not changed in the last 30 years; but nine Judges have changed our law beyond true recognition, not in a legal fashion or under or by virtue of the Constitution, which is their sole repository of power, but in spite of the Constitution and in the face of it.

We have been run by selfish groups, minorities and Socialists for so long that they have almost accomplished their will of changing the people, and they will do so if we do not change them first.

I still believe that we can be free, that a man can have his own vine and fig tree and can run his own business without giving up all of his profits to Fabians, demagogs and no-accounts. We must be unwilling to be bribed with a part of our own money, and willing to stand up and be counted.

Human Beings Are Unequal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is time for us to restate what equality means. Today we are faced with violence and death because many from the best of motivation, insist that all human being are equal in ability, in intelligence, in talent, and in ambition. This is not true.

Under our system of society all men are equal before the law and in the spirit of our Judeo-Christian heritage, all men are equal in the sight of God. There equality ends. As human beings, no two of us are alike. In our own families we find our children are different than their parents, and brothers and sisters are different. Why, then, do we suddenly reach a national conclusion that all races and all individuals of every race must be identical in all the characteristics which make up a human being?

Much of the turmoil which now exists is caused by this perversion of natural law. The attempt to make every individual absolutely equal in every aspect of his living has led to brutal violence and finally to murder.

We could eliminate much of the tensions which now exist if we recognize the inequality of humans and start from the point of making secure the right of equality before the law, thus making it possible for any individual regardless of race, sex, national origin, or economic class to attain whatever goals he may reach through his own initiative, ability, talent, and willingness to earn recognition.

The following editorial, "The Heretical Professor," from the Wall Street Journal, deserves careful reading to remind us of the inequality which does exist:

THE HERETICAL PROFESSOR

Anyone who's ever raised two or more children knows that people are different. Save perhaps for twins, no two children, for all the sameness of their environment, are alike in personality, intelligence, interests, aptitudes or natural skills.

This commonplace observation is even more apparent to teachers whose classrooms are filled with children from many families. Some pupils are inherently more intelligent in the "bookish" sense; some more skilled in manual dexterity. Some born with a natural love for music; others with a tin ear.

And anyone who has ever travelled beyond the borders of his native country knows that races, too, differ from one another. In some cases the differences are slight, due mainly to custom or tradition. In other cases they are marked; there are tribes in remote places with few members able to follow thought processes which are simple to the average European or American first-grader.

Nonetheless, Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, the distinguished British philosopher-scientist, startled the International Congress of Genetics in Geneva—and made newspaper headlines—when he said right out loud what everybody knows.

Professor Haldane said that greater attention needs to be paid to human genetic diversity, and that there is no evidence that either individuals or races are equal in their natural endowment. Moreover, he said some of these inequalities are genetic, or inborn. That is, there are limits to what can be done to equalize men's abilities by equalizing their environmental opportunities, as by education, for example.

What makes this heresy is that it runs counter to so many of the official social, political, and philosophic attitudes of the day, expressed in everything from our foreign aid program to elementary education. There the premise is that all men are created equal not only in their rights as human beings but also in their endowments; the differences are mainly due to environment.

Thus education and training, the argument runs, are all that is necessary to bring an emerging nation of backward people to full civilized estate; they are backward only because they have not been so lucky in their history. Among individuals here at home differences of estate are also mainly differences in opportunity; the key is simply equal opportunities for all.

Anyone who speaks, as Professor Haldane does, of inherent inequality is bound to bring down wrath upon his head. At the very least he will be accused of denigrating democracy. At the worst he will be charged with preaching racism, with giving support to the likes of the Nazis or the remnants of the Ku Klux Klan.

Yet the truth will not go away because some people may use it as a spurious argument to segregate schools in Alabama. And we don't think that recognizing the inherent inequality among peoples need really pose any philosophical dilemma or destroy the democratic idea.

That trouble arises only when people confuse inequalities with some abstract idea of superiority and inferiority. We are unequal in some natural endowments to both Mickey Mantle and Professor Haldane, and they to each other. Whether any of us is inferior to the other, depends entirely on what you are talking about. But it is not necessary to deny the inequalities to insist upon the equal rights of all of us as human beings.

And it is certainly not necessary to deny the inherent differences among people to support the objective of wider opportunities for all people. In the civil rights struggle, for example, it is totally irrelevant whether the Negro people as a group have less, equal, or superior natural intelligence than their white counterparts. What is relevant is that we do the best we can in public education to provide each white child and each Negro child with the kind of education suitable to his natural endowments.

That is why it is wrong to have an educational policy which forces all children, whether they're white or Negro, into the same classroom with the same curriculum, just as it is equally wrong to deny a public classroom to any child solely because of the color of his skin and irrespective of his individual abilities. Both attitudes, though they be now joined in battle, are socially evil because each in its own way denies the truth of the inborn differences in people.

As Professor Haldane put it, "Any satisfactory political and economic system must be based on the recognition of human inequality." Perhaps the world would be better if that were not so. But nothing is ever made better by denying what is true.

American Legion President Daniel F. Foley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ta pride in the fact that the newly elected president of the American Legion is a resident of my district.

Daniel F. Foley, of Wabasha, Minn., has long been active in many community affairs which have greatly enhanced his own community and our entire area.

He is amply qualified for the high post to which his fellow Legionnaires have elected him. In Minnesota, Dan Foley served the Legion on the local, district, and State levels and built a solid record of achievement as district commander, then State commander, and as a national committeeman.

As a Minnesota lawyer, civic leader, family man, and Legionnaire, Dan has distinguished himself. He now brings to the post of commander of the American Legion the qualities which won him the respect of his neighbors. I think he shows these fine qualities in his acceptance speech delivered at Miami Beach, Fla.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY DANIEL F. FOLEY

My fellow Legionnaires, for me this is the most thrilling moment of my life, and I cannot find words to adequately express my deep gratitude and appreciation for the devoted assistance of my many, many wonderful friends in the ranks of the American Legion who have helped to make this moment a reality for me.

I also believe this to be a moment of truth for me—for I have campaigned for the high office of national commander of the American Legion for some 2 years. During this period I have been telling my fellow Legionnaires how I would propose to discharge the great responsibilities which accompany this office. The time for talking is over—the time for action is at hand.

I am proud for my department, I am grateful to all of you who have afforded me this opportunity to serve. I am humble in the knowledge of the tremendous work to be done this year, and I am confident that with your help and with God's guidance that it shall be done.

This convention of the greatest of all veterans organizations, which now draws to a close, has given me direction for the year ahead. By your deliberations and the mandates which we have adopted here, I believe we have given all of America new cause to look to the American Legion to chart a true course along the path toward preservation of our basic freedoms and the great American heritage that is ours.

We have here reaffirmed our faith that governments are instituted among men to promote peace and to preserve the inalienable rights of man as a creature of God. We have here, through the various resolutions of our several commissions, determined what we believe to be the most effective policies for achieving the objectives of all of our fine action programs which have proven their worth through the years—not only for the benefit of the veteran population, but for the benefit of all Americans.

History has revealed to us time and again that the course of extremism, either to the right or to the left is the course of failure, and that to follow such a course has brought about the downfall of many men, of many governments, yes, even of entire civilizations. During my formative years, as I watched the activities of the American Legion in my home community, then in my early years as an American Legionnaire observing the work of my own post and its members, I became thoroughly convinced that this was the type of organization with which to cast my personal lot if I wished to offer some tangible service to my God, to my country, and to my fellow man.

I firmly believe this American Legion of ours to be the greatest stabilizing factor in America today, and I believe that through close adherence to the principles, policies and programs of the American Legion that America and the free world will be better prepared to fight and to win the struggle with the forces of atheistic communism.

The American Legion has a glorious past and an even brighter future, and I pledge to you my very best efforts to help us to realize that bright future. We have not even scratched the surface of our potential, and within the next 2 weeks I will be off on a tour of 21 regional membership conferences to help convince other eligible veterans that we can do well with their help in this endless battle to keep forever free the land they already have fought to protect.

It is my fondest hope that this year may mark the beginning of a new era in the life of the Legion where courageous men and women with brave hearts rededicate themselves to service in the high cause of freedom. We shall realize that objective if we, as Legionnaires, remain true to the principles which brought us together nearly 45 years ago.

I look forward to my term of office as a year of rededication—a year of rediscovery, if you will, not just of the principles of the Legion, but a year of rediscovery of America herself in the light of her great history and of action to safeguard and preserve our priceless heritage in these momentous times in which we live.

The problems of yesterday, Legionnaires, are not necessarily the problems of today or tomorrow. Yet, if we are aware of our past we cannot help but be better prepared to live today and to face tomorrow. The solutions to the problems of yesterday may not be applicable to the problems of today, but knowledge of the past and the sacrifice that was required to solve the problems of other eras will give us new wisdom and courage to cope successfully with the problems of our own times. A rediscovery of America and of ourselves is, I believe, an essential element to successful living today.

The American Legion constantly is rediscovering itself through a continual process of reevaluating the problems with which we are concerned in order that we may approach those problems on a realistic basis, in keeping with our times, and that we may make a constructive contribution to the growth of our free society.

First, and most importantly, we must concern ourselves with the preservation of that society and history has taught us that, in order to do so, the Nation's defenses must be maintained at adequate strength and the very finest quality to deter the threat of aggression.

Because the Soviet Union has been willing to become a party to a partial nuclear test ban, is no evidence that communism has abandoned its long pronounced objective of world conquest. It simply means, that for the time being, it does not best serve the cause of communism to engage in an all-out nuclear arms race.

It would, of course, be our fondest hope that the Soviets have entered into this agreement in all sincerity and that they will live by its terms. We would hope that it might even lead to the exploration of other areas of agreement to further ease the cold war tensions. This we will believe when it comes to pass for the Communist record of shattered treaties and agreements is one of the most infamous in the annals of international relations.

Again we are reminded of our past and of a famed quotation from history as we look to the solution to a modern day problem. The quote I have in mind is "Keep your powder dry."

In our day this simply means the maintenance of defensive forces unsurpassed by any potential attacker. This is a policy that the American Legion has advocated since our founding days—it would have served us well in other days. This is the policy which the American Legion advocates today, for it will serve America well today.

The Communists have shown no inclination to decrease pressures now being applied to our sister republics to the south. Red Cuba, just some 90 miles from where we are gathered, is the springboard for introduction of propaganda, sabotage, and potential open revolt in some areas of the hemisphere. This can mean only that America must exert her best efforts to maintain hemispheric solidarity, and the American Legion believes this can best be achieved by the elimination of Fidel Castro and his government.

Our defenses must go beyond the military and into the area of people, for they must be designed to last beyond the lifetime of this audience. The American Legion, through its great Americanism programs, seeks to build a stalwart citizenry for tomorrow.

We believe that if we give our youth the proper guidance that they will "discover" the basic principles for which America stands while we are rediscovering them for ourselves, and that in so doing they will find the will and the way to defend the freedoms we solemnly pledge that they shall inherit from us.

We cannot and we shall not abandon our sacred obligation to defend and preserve the rights and privileges of the widows and orphans of our deceased comrades. We shall continue to fight for them as we shall carry on the battle on behalf of the disabled veteran and those who by reason of advancing years can no longer adequately discharge their responsibilities to their loved ones. Our legislative-rehabilitation program must be geared to meet the changing needs of the veteran population.

The problem of the aged and aging veteran may well be one of the most serious with which we have ever come to grips in the entire history of our rehabilitation program. But we propose to meet this problem head on, and one of our high priority objectives of the coming year will be the establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs.

All these great ideals, my friends, will have no tangible value if we should lose our freedoms, and as your national comander for the coming year, I commit our organization to this pledge.

"Though the forces of atheistic communism may beat with all their fury on the breasts of liberty, this Nation shall endure strong in justice. This Nation shall prosper, rich in compassion. This Nation shall stand down through the corridors of time, secure in freedom."

May each of us as individuals and as an organization so conduct our lives and affairs that we might continue to contribute significantly to the high cause of freedom. In so doing, we shall glorify God, bring honor to our country, and contribute to the establishment of a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

Michael J. Wargovich—Noted American Slovak Fraternalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Dobry Pastier-Good Shepherd, official publication of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, issue of March 1961:

MICHAEL J. WARGOVICH—NOTED AMERICAN SLOVAK FRATERNALIST

(By John C. Sciranka)

On Tuesday, January 17, 1961, the American Slovaks lost a noted fraternalist and a leader—Michael J. Wargovich, who died in McKeesport Pa., after a brief illness at the age of 65.

The name Wargovich is known throughout the world, where the Slovak people live. He was born in Slovakia and brought to this country as a mere child. His parents after a brief stay in Brooklyn, N.Y., settled in Pennsylvania. McKeesport was the city where the late fraternalist learned his ABC's in fraternalism. And since McKeesport has the distinction of being also the domicile of the first American Slovak newspapermen and organizers of a faternal society—Ján Slovensky and Julius Wolf, who settled there in 1879, "Big Mike", as he was widely known, followed in their footsteps. But his inspiration came from the late pastor of the Holy Trinity Slovak Catholic Church, Father Panuska. Here Mike served as an altar boy 55 years ago to a noted priest during the national convention of the First Catholic Slovak Union of United States and Canada, which is the largest Slovak organization in the world and which the late Michael J. Wargovich headed as supreme president for 20 years. Praiseworthy is the fact the junior order of the union was established then. The priest, to whom Mike served was the Rev. Stephen Furdek known as "Father of American Slovaks." This meeting with the famous priest inspired the late Michael J. Wargovich to the dedication of his life to the American Slovak fraternalism.

The writer had the pleasure to attend the first national convention of this the largest Slovak fraternal organization in the summer of 1922 in Bethlehem, Pa., with late Wargovich. It was the first national convention for both of us. Shortly after this convention, the writer became assistant editor of Jednota (Union), published in Middletown, Pa. Michael waited for his chance until 1926, when he was elected supreme auditor at the national convention in Scranton, Pa. This was followed by chairmanship of the board of auditors. Then in 1940 during the Pittsburgh national convention he was elected supreme president and reelected at every national convention, which grew steadily under his leadership. The organization's headquarters are in Cleveland, Ohio, where it was founded in 1890 but it maintains a printery, orphanage, and an old folks home at Middletown, Pa., on a large farm near Harrisburg. Pennsylvania has over 60 percent of the organization's membership.

OFFICER OF NATIONAL FRATERNAL CONGRESS

During the past 20 years, Mr. Wargovich attended all the conventions of the National Fraternal Congress of America in which he served on various important committees and also as member of its executive committee. He was also president of the Pennsylvania Fraternal Congress and treasurer of the Slovak Catholic Religious Association, which raised a quarter million dollars under the auspices of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America and the National Catholic Welfare Conference during World War II for the war-torn Slovakia.

He attended and served on the important committees of the Slovak League of America and the Slovak Catholic Federation of America. During that period he visited every State in the Union and all the principal cities of the United States, and Canada at various celebrations and functions of his organization.

SERVED UNDER FIVE GOVERNORS

Mr. Wargovich was a stanch Republican and took active part in all Republican activities from the time he started to vote. He served on local and county, as well as State committees. The Republican National Committee recognized his services and he served on its advisory board. He was also national chairman of the Slovak division of the Republican Party for several years and took part in various campaigns, visiting many States as a speaker. His voice was heard over the air during the last presidential campaign in English and Slovak languages. During the 1960 Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill., he had the honor to serve as one of the assistant secretaries of this historical conclave, which he considered one of the highest honors. Mr. Wargovich served as district representative of the Pennsylvania State Workmen's Insurance Fund under five Governors. He also served as the treasurer of the Pittsburgh Fraternal Societies.

He was active in civic affairs and served as officer of the local branch 60, of the First Catholic Slovak Union, also was member of the National Slovak Society Assembly 31, which is one of the oldest Slovak societies in America. Also the Knights of Columbus, Council 955, the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, Assembly 46, and the Serra Club.

Under his leadership the organization had youth conferences in the principal cities of the United States and Canada and the last such conference was in August 1960 in Washington, D.C., with a solemn mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. He arranged the programs for these conferences and the national conventions of the organization which he headed. The writer had the privilege to be temporary chairman of two such national conventions in New York City, the first one in 1928, when the late Patrick Cardinal Hayes greeted the convention and second in 1952, when Francis J. Cardinal Spellman presided at the pontifical mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral. Similar conventions with solemn pontifical masses were held during his tenure of office in Chicago, Ill.; Youngstown, Ohio; Milwaukee, Wis.; New York City; Reading, Pa.; and Detroit, Mich.; with Cardinals Stritch, Mooney, and McQuigan pontificating and preaching.

The most impressive celebration under Wargovich's presidency was held on Labor Day, 1955, in Cleveland Public Auditorium in honor of the centennial birthday of Father Furdek, founder of the union. The late Cardinal Stritch preached the sermon and some 30 American archbishops and bishops took part in the picturesque celebration with many monsignori, priests, and all American Slovak fraternal leaders present.

He was in midst of gigantic preparations for the national convention to be held in August 1961 in Pittsburgh, Pa., when death put an end to his prolific fraternal career. He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Mary Lucanish Wargovich; two sons: Dr. Raymond Wargovich, of McKeesport, Pa., active fraternalist, and Matthew, Wargovich, of Bel Air, Md.; also two daughters, Miss Dolores Wargovich at home, and Mrs. Mildred Coffman, of Akron, Ohio; two brothers, Joseph and Andrew, of McKeesport; and a sister, Mrs. Anna Evans, of Munhall, and seven grandchildren.

In spite of inclement weather, all American Slovak fraternal organizations were represented at his funeral on Saturday, January 21. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Clement J. Hrtanek preached the eulogy and represented Most Rev. John J. Wright, bishop of Pittsburgh diocese, and Rt. Rev. Abbott Theodore G. Kojis, O.S.B., celebrated pontifical mass of requiem, assisted by local pastor, Father Edward J. Duwell, who officiated at the Calvary Cemetery, Port Vue, Pa.

Msgr. Andrew Biros, supreme chaplain; Msgr. Michael Shuba, organization's supreme chaplain for Canada; Very Rev. Canon Joseph S. Altany, LL.D., editor of Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Martin B. Rubicky, former supreme president of the Slovak Catholic Federation; Rev. Louis P. Hohos, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, and many priests attended funeral. The late Michael J. Wargovich from Phoenixville, Pa.

Mr. Wargovich was lifelong resident of Allegheny County and great citizen of Pennsylvania, who preached and lived as a true American Slovak fraternalist, aiding his fellow men for a better tomorrow.

He will always be remembered by his countrymen as a typical American Slovak fraternalist.

Lief Erickson Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Lief Erickson Day commemorates the discovery of North America about A.D. 1000 by Leif Erickson. The explorations of the brave Norseman in this hemisphere are an early milestone in the development of our continent and our Nation.

Lief was the son of Eric the Red, a Norseman who discovered Greenland in A.D. 945, and founded a colony there. Lief discovered land to the west of Iceland which he called Vinland and which was probably what is known today as Nova Scotia. He was particularly struck with the charms of Vinland, where he spent one winter. His explorations took him to lands "of which he had previously had no knowledge," where "self-sown" wheat grew, and vines, and "mosur" wood. Lief took specimens of all these, and returned to his father's home in Greenland.

Lief Erickson Day reminds us of the heritage that all Americans have received from these early explorers and from the generations of Nordic peoples who followed them to these shores in the centuries that have followed. Of the latter-day voyagers from Norway many have found their way to San Francisco. Norwegian sailors have been sailing into the port of San Francisco since early days, and it was Norwegian fishermen who introduced modern methods into the whaling industry on the Pacific coast. They have also played a large part in the development of shipping and in the navigation of inland waters. The marine surveying in our ports is largely in the hands of Norwegian engineers.

With their varied crafts and professions the Norwegians make a vital contribution to the colorful, bustling life of San Francisco. They are deeply proud of their adventurous Norwegian forbears and so Lief Erickson Day is a particularly meaningful occasion for them. I join them in commemorating the memory of this great explorer.

A Columbus Day Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the United States, the energies and customs of the people of all nationalities forwarded the rapid and continuous growth of this Nation in which we, their descendants live. But, during our labors for freedom and the pursuit of happiness we are constantly reminded of the adventurous spirit of one man who contributed so singularly to our country. On October 12, citizens in the United States will pay homage to the man with whom we credit the discovery, on this day in 1492, of the Western Hemisphere. Pageants and parades are scheduled and performed while children recite appropriate poems and plays. Yet, we should think of Christopher Columbus not only as a famous explorer or admiral of the seas. We should recognize him as a national of Italian origin, destined to lead a group of Spaniards, Portuguese, and Italians, to the New World. As the leader of this multinational group, he established a principle which would contribute to the development of the greatest Nation in the world, the bringing together of many nationalities to live and build together in this new land a new life.

In San Francisco the celebrations for Columbus Day are citywide; yet the Italian community of 96,000 leads in the festivities for their countryman. There is a Columbus Avenue in San Francisco and appropriately on October 12, the Italian Americans parade on that concourse. They represent one of the largest concentrations of Italian Americans in the United States and have become an integral part of the city since its founding.

San Franciscans look with pride at the offices of the Bank of America, founded by A. P. Giannini amidst the ruins of the fire in 1906. This bank is now one of the richest and largest in the world.

There is Angelo Rossi who became mayor of the city and who has left behind him a legend of an honest and hardworking administration.

The San Francisco Opera grew to greatness because of its Italian managers and singers. Louisa Tetrazzini was discovered in 1905 by San Franciscans, who thereafter claimed her as their own.

We must look not only to the individual Italian Americans who contributed so much to the growth of the city. We should remember the part the Italian community played during the great fire when they fought the flames with their precious barrels of wine, thus saving Telegraph Hill from destruction.

Just as the Italian community of the North Beach area is part of San Francisco, so are all the communities of San Francisco a part of the United States, all contributing their efforts to their country. Columbus sought a route to the Indies but found the Americans. It is therefore fitting that all citizens of the United States, whether of Italian, Spanish, German, or Irish origin, joyfully and reverently pay tribute to his services to our great Nation.

American Negro Lawyer, 1844–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 5, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article in the Chicago Daily Defender of August 5, 1963, by the scholarly Edward B. Toles, chairman of the National Bar Association Committee on Judiciary.

The article follows:

THE AMERICAN NEGRO LAWYER 1844–1963

(By Edward B. Toles)

The 38th Annual Convention of the National Bar Association (representing 4,000 Negro lawyers) convenes at Chicago's Sherman House, Wednesday, August 7.

During this centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation many Americans do not realize that the Negro lawyer was on the American scene some 20 years before the proclamation. Herein below are chronological highlights in the record of the American Negro lawyer.

The year 1844: The first American Negro lawyer, Macon B. Allen, admitted to bar of Maine, July 3, 1844; and during Reconstruction, admitted to Charleston, S.C. bar. In February 1873, elected judge of the inferior court of Charleston by the South Carolina General Assembly.

The year 1852: Robert Morris, Boston, Mass., first American Negro magistrate, appointed by Massachusetts Governor George N. Briggs.

The year 1855: John Mercer Langston, first Negro lawyer to win elective office as clerk of Brownhelm Township, Lorain County, Ohio.

The year 1856: Aaron A. Bradley, admitted to Massachusetts Bar February 2, 1856; later elected to Georgia Legislature.

The year 1861: Edwin Garrison Walker, admitted to Massachusetts Bar, May 1861, first American Negro legislator; elected to Massachusetts Legislature.

The year 1865: John S. Rock, physician, dentist, and lawyer, first Negro admitted to practice before U.S. Supreme Court.

The year 1870: Jonathan Jasper Wright, first Negro State Supreme Court Justice, elected to full 6-year term as Associate Justice, South Carolina Supreme Court.

The year 1872: George Lee, elected by South Carolina Legislature judge of the inferior court of Charleston, March 13, 1872.

Charlotte Ray, first Negro woman lawyer, a graduate of Howard University Law School, admitted to practice in 1872.

The year 1873: First Negro law firm established—Whipper, Elliott & Allen (Judge Macon B. Allen).. Whipper and Elliott, both members of South Carolina Legislature, and Elliott later Representative in U.S. Congress.

The years 1883–90: George L. Ruffin, one of the first Negro graduates of Harvard Law School (1869), served in Massachusetts Legislature and Boston Common Council, appointed municipal judge of Charleston, Mass., November 7, 1883. Other Negro judges—Judge Mifflin Gibbs, Little Rock, Ark. (1873); Judge John H. Ballou, Florida (1888), and Judge Joseph E. Lee, Florida (1890).

The years 1869–1901: In Congress, 1869–1901, 6 of the Negroes elected (2 Senators and 20 Representatives) were lawyers.

The year 1901: Robert H. Terrell, first Negro judicial appointment of President Theodore Roosevelt, judge of the District of Columbia Municipal Court, December 17.

The year 1911: William H. Lewis, Boston, first Negro Assistant U.S. Attorney General, appointed by President William H. Taft.

The year 1924: Albert B. George, elected municipal judge, Chicago, 1924, first Negro elected in the North since Reconstruction.

The year 1936: Charles Anderson, former president of the National Bar Association, elected to Kentucky Legislature (later appointed United Nations Delegate by President Eisenhower).

The year 1937: William H. Hastie, appointed judge of the U.S. District Court for the Virgin Islands by President Franklin D. Roosevelt; succeeded by Judges Herman Moore (appointed by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman) and Walter Gordon (appointed by President Eisenhower).

The year 1939: Jane Matilda Bolin, first Negro woman judge, appointed by Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia to the court of domestic relations in New York City.

The years 1940–63: First elected Negro women judges—Chicago's Edith S. Sampson, former United Nations Delegate; and Juanita Kidd Stout in Philadelphia. First Negro woman judge appointed by President John F. Kennedy—Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, to the District of Columbia Juvenile Court. First Negro woman appointed judge in Los Angeles, Calif.—Vaino Spencer.

The year 1945: Judge Irvin C. Mollison, first Negro lifetime Federal judge, appointed by President Harry S. Truman to the U.S. Customs Court.

The year 1949: WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Member of Congress, first Negro chairman of a Congressional Standing Committee, House Committee on Government Operations.

The year 1949: William H. Hastie, first Negro judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, appointed by President Harry S. Truman.

The year 1954: J. Ernest Wilkins, Chicago, first Negro Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, appointed by President Eisenhower.

The year 1955: E. Frederick Morrow, first Negro Special Assistant to President Eisenhower.

The year 1956: Archibald J. Carey, Chicago, first Negro chairman of President Eisenhower's Committee on Government Employment Policy; United Nations Delegate.

The year 1956: Genoa Washington, Chicago, appointed U.N. Delegate by President Eisenhower.

The year 1957: George Johnson, former Howard Law School professor, appointed to U.S. Civil Rights Commission by President Eisenhower.

The year 1957: Scovel Richardson, appointed Judge, U.S. Customs Court, by President Eisenhower.

The year 1958: Richard A. Harewood, now Judge of the Superior Court, Cook County, first Negro to win statewide public office since Reconstruction, when elected Trustee of the University of Illinois.

The year 1958: Otis Smith, first Negro elected, Michigan, to statewide public office, Auditor of Public Accounts.

The year 1960: Frank Reeves, first Negro Special Assistant to President Kennedy.

The year 1961: Thurgood Marshall, former Chief Counsel NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, appointed Judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, by President Kennedy.

The years 1961–62: Otis Smith, first Negro associate justice of Supreme Court of Michigan since Reconstruction, in a statewide election.

Leroy Johnson, first Negro senator elected to Georgia's Legislature since Reconstruction, in a statewide election.

Gerald Lamb, first Negro elected State treasurer in Connecticut, in a statewide election.

Edward R. Brooke, first Negro elected attorney general in the United States (Massachusetts).

Spottswood Robinson III, appointed U.S. Civil Rights Commission; Clarence Ferguson, counsel; appointed by President Kennedy.

The years 1961–63: First Negro appointments by President John F. Kennedy to positions never previously held by Negroes:

James B. Parsons, Chicago, Ill., and Wade McCree, Detroit, Mich., first judges of the U.S. District Court.

Cecil Poole, San Francisco, Calif., and Merle McCurdly, Cleveland, Ohio, first U.S. attorneys.

A. Leon Higginbotham, member, Federal Trade Commission.

Howard Jenkins, Jr., member, National Labor Relations Board.

John B. Duncan, member, District of Columbia Commission.

Luke Moore, marshal, District of Columbia (first Negro marshal was Frederick Douglas, appointed by President Hayes. Douglas was not a lawyer).

Of the Nation's 8,000 judges, over 75 are Negro and are presently elected and appointed in the Federal and State courts.

Other first Negro appointments: Hobart Taylor, executive vice chairman, President's Committee on Equal Job Opportunity (Earl B. Dickerson, first appointed member, FEPC, by President Roosevelt, 1942); John Wilkins, general counsel, Agency of International Development; Elmer Henderson, general counsel, Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization (House Committee on Government Operations, William L. Dawson, chairman).

Soviet Vessels in U.S. Waters Being Taken Too Lightly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the October issue of the National Fisherman carries a story by William O. Foss calling attention to the investigation conducted by the Porter Hardy Subcommittee on Armed Forces into the Russian trawler traffic along the U.S. coastline. Because this publication reflects the feeling of a large segment of the U.S. fisheries industry, and the concern we all feel about the Russian violation of our coastal waters, I ask that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD:

COAST GUARD, NAVY BELIEVED TAKING CLOSE-IN SOVIET VESSELS TOO LIGHTLY

(By William O. Foss)

An immediate step-up in the Coast Guard's surveillance of Russian trawler traffic in U.S. territorial waters has been urged by the House Armed Services Investigations subcommittee.

The subcommittee, which made a lengthy investigation and held hearings this summer, recommended that:

1. The Government agencies concerned should adopt a uniform national policy which would permit the Coast Guard to take such immediate and unilateral action as may be required in the national interest, whenever Russian vessels having electronic or other capabilities which constitute a threat to the security of our country are found transiting our territorial waters.

2. The Coast Guard initiate daily air and sea patrols along the territorial waters on the Florida coast from St. Lucie Inlet to Miami.

3. The 7th Coast Guard District publicize the assistance which civilian sources would render to augment its surveillance activities, and, particularly, invite commercial and private boatowners to report all sightings of Iron Curtain craft in U.S. coastal waters.

4. The Navy consider greater use of the established Naval Reserve program so that some of its training cruises may simultaneously perform a patrol function along the east coast of Florida.

The subcommittee was not at all satisfied that the Coast Guard and the Navy were doing enough to prevent Russian trawlers from fishing and spying in U.S. territorial waters.

It took a dim view of statements made by Coast Guard, Navy, and State Department officials that the trawlers in U.S. territorial waters constitute no threat to our national security. The services said that if they had reached a contrary decision, the trawlers would have had to be stopped, searched and perhaps taken into custody.

AVOIDING TROUBLE

The subcommittee noted, however, that this is a situation the agencies appear to be striving to avoid because of problems it might raise for the State Department, which is primarily concerned with the impact of such action on the overall foreign policy of the United States.

"Such a divided interest is bound to have a retarding influence on any future emergency action the Coast Guard may be required to undertake in connection with Russian vessels in our territorial waters," the subcommittee observed.

In the report of its investigations, the subcommittee, headed by Representative PORTER HARDY, Democrat, of Virginia, noted that Russia maintains a fleet of from 200 to 400 fishing vessels operating off the Grand Banks and Georges Bank in the North Atlantic. Furthermore, more than a dozen seagoing Russian trawlers of the *Okean* class make regular round trips between the North Atlantic fishing banks and Cuba.

On their round trips south these vessels hug the south Florida coastline for a distance of approximately 150 to 200 miles and at times are well within the 3-mile limit of U.S. territorial waters. While the ostensible purpose of the trawlers' southern trip is to deliver fish to Cuba, this could be a cover for operations of a military or paramilitary nature.

The Coast Guard and the Navy, following a policy laid down by the State Department, let the Russian trawlers pass close to our shores unhampered because the vessels are granted innocent passage.

Coast Guard officials told the House Armed Service Investigations Subcommittee that the Coast Guard regarded the Soviet trawlers as typical fishing vessels and considered their passages through the territorial waters as innocent passage. The Coast Guard has not interfered with the Russian trawlers but told the subcommittee that they have been watched closely.

This testimony angered the subcommittee, which asked "if the passage of the Russian ships in territorial waters is viewed as innocent, then why is surveillance activity by the Coast Guard limited to Russian vessels?"

DOUBT SHOWN

The subcommittee answered its own questions with this statement: "Such activity would suggest that neither the Coast Guard nor the Navy really believes that the presence of the Russian vessels in our coastal waters is completely innocent in the sense that their presence so close to our shore does not constitute a threat to our national security."

While it is possible that the Russian vessels are no more than fishing boats taking their cargo to Cuba, witnesses before the subcommittee hearings agreed that these ships could be gathering scientific information, charting our coastline and ocean floor for the purposes useful in submarine warfare, or selecting sites for the landing of spies and saboteurs. Both the Navy and Coast Guard admitted that the ships could be landing or picking up spies or saboteurs or smuggling military items and that this could be done with little chance of detection in the landing or picking up operations.

Other witnesses discussed the possibility that Russian fishing vessels are conducting electronic surveillance of certain aspects of our military defenses and exploring ways of interfering with or controlling the guidance and abortive systems of our missiles and rockets fired from Cape Canaveral.

During testimony of Coast Guard headquarters officials it was brought out that the Coast Guard surveils only those Russian trawlers that the Coast Guard has determined are in U.S. territorial waters. Officials said that the Coast Guard relies heavily on private shipping for notification of the presence of Russian trawlers in or near the territorial waters.

Peacetime deployment of Coast Guard facilities on the eastern coast of Florida is so thin that the Russian trawlers could put ashore or take aboard agents, weapons, and other contraband with slight chance of detection.

The present U.S. policy of considering foreign fishing vessels within territorial waters only as fishing vessels and not as potential instruments for gathering of military information is considered deficient by the subcommittee. It called for changes which would require immediate action by the Coast Guard whenever a foreign vessel appears in our waters.

Waterfront Commission Investigator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to submit for inclusion in the RECORD, an article entitled "Waterfront Commission Investigator" which was written by Thomas F. Coon, a distinguished law enforcement officer, teacher,

and author, of Dumont, N.J. Because it affects all citizens, it will be of interest to Members of Congress and the public.

Mr. Coon, a graduate of New York University, is senior investigator with the waterfront commission of New York Harbor. This commission is charged with the vital responsibility of keeping this major gateway for commerce between the United States and the rest of the world free of crime and corruption. An accomplished writer, Mr. Coon is also editor of the Bulletin, a widely distributed law enforcement publication of the Society of Professional Investigators and a regular contributor to the Nation's leading law enforcement publications, newspapers, and magazines on subjects pertaining to law enforcement, internal security, and world events.

Thomas Coon has served his country as a supervisory special agent with the Office of Naval Intelligence and is a lieutenant senior grade in the Naval Intelligence Reserve.

This particular article first appeared in Police, a national magazine on law enforcement and was later reprinted in Excerpta Criminologica, a Netherlands publication.

WATERFRONT COMMISSION INVESTIGATOR

(By Thomas F. Coon, Dumont, N.J.)

One of the newest law enforcement agents on the national scene with a major law enforcement function is the investigator with the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor. The waterfront-commission investigator is primarily charged with the responsibility for enforcing the provisions of the Waterfront Commission Act which was enacted by the States of New York and New Jersey in 1953. This law came into being because of a crying need. The New York State Crime Commission and its counterpart, the New Jersey Law Enforcement Council, as well as Federal investigative bodies spelled out a deplorable condition upon the piers in the port of New York which was degrading to the men who worked the piers as well as detrimental to the large segment of our commerce which in some manner or other is tied in with the port of New York.

The trend toward seaport superiority of the port of New York dates back to the 17th century when Dutch settlers colonized at the mouth of the Hudson River. Coupled with the natural asset of being located at the end of a long and richly yielding river valley, the acquisition of the Northwest Territory brought to the New York Harbor area the pinnacle position as the shipping center of the Nation. The port is ice free throughout the year. Heavy fogs are a rarity. The anchorage facilities in the port are excellent for deepwater ships. Transportation facilities of every type are readily available. The port, through natural endowments and gradual developments since the days of the Dutch settlers, should at this time be in a position that no city could contest its outstanding leadership. The investigative bodies, however, spelled out the story that all was not well.

What were some of the evils which were uncovered? Large-scale stealing on an organized basis prevailed. Payrolls of steamship companies and stevedoring outfits were padded with "phantom" employees who collected paychecks for little or no work. Loan sharking existed to a large degree. The investigative bodies also revealed corrupt payments by management to labor leaders to overlook legitimate labor rights. Guards were threatened with loss of life or job if too vigorous in their attempt to prevent stealing. Many union officials were proven to be criminals with extensive records. And there were many other abuses.

Another broad area of evil existed in the public loading racket. The public loaders who were often in with the union officials performed the function of loading trucks at the pier heads. They often commandeered equipment and labor from the steamship or stevedoring companies to perform their operations. The companies were adverse to object for fear that they might suffer a strike which, on the waterfront, costs thousands of dollars a day. The fees of the public loaders were frequently exorbitant, being based very often upon "whatever the traffic would bear."

In fairness to the people who make this port of New York waterfront run, however, it should be commented that there were, and are, fine, upstanding men in all areas of the industry. Nevertheless, many of the evils were spelled out in sworn testimony to exist to such a degree that it was felt that the port of New York was in danger of losing its position of supremacy to which its natural advantages entitled it—all because of the mess of corruption, venality, and general turbulence.

I shall touch briefly upon some of the provisions of the law which struck directly at abuses which the Crime Commissions substantiated. The public loaders were, through the stroke of the pen, put out of business. The law also struck at the area of wrongful persons holding offices in waterfront workers' unions. It was basically provided that no person could solicit, collect, or receive any dues, assessments, levies, fines, or contributions within the States of New York and New Jersey from persons required to be registered or licensed under the law if any officer or agent of the labor organization had been convicted of a felony. Recent experience indicated that there was a considerable degree of circumvention of this provision of the law by placing persons disqualified from holding union office in various statuses under which they were able to influence union affairs and obtain funds from union sources. The commission moved quickly through legislative enactment to close the door upon such activity.

Control has been exerted upon the various individuals who work upon the piers by requiring registration or licensing of longshoremen, checkers, pier superintendents, hiring agents, stevedoring companies, and steamship companies. In essence, persons and businesses engaged in the waterfront business of loading and unloading the ships and delivering the cargo to and receiving cargo from trucks at the various piers must be passed upon by the commission to determine whether they are suitable for such activity. Under these provisions, individuals who have extensive criminal records or who are tied directly to unsavory activity with the waterfront mob may be denied registration or licensing. Companies which engage in illicit activity such as making improper payments to labor officials or other illegal practice may also be denied licensing.

The law also endeavored to give dignification and protection to the men who guard the piers. They too have to meet rigid standards for licensing. These "port watchmen" are given every degree of cooperation by commission investigators. Threats against their physical safety are looked upon very seriously by the commission. If investigation corroborates such allegations, the person or persons who issue the threats are dealt with most severely by the commission.

Other provisions of the law are aimed at lessening the opportunities for phantoms, kick-backing, and making coercive payments. The establishment of hiring halls for the employment of casuals and fill-ins has placed such hiring under the direct supervision of Commission personnel and reduced the opportunities for wrongful activities in connection with hiring.

The turbulent brawling over promotions, control of the rackets, personnel differences and other causes that was once an everyday part of the vigorous activity on the piers is pretty much a thing of the past. Anyone who elects to solve his differences in such manner is, as in the past, subject to possible arrest. In addition, he is brought before the Waterfront Commission for a hearing and receives a suspension from work if the conditions warrant. This the men are more apprehensive of than the arrest.

There are two broad functions which the Waterfront Commission investigators perform. They are peace officers as well as gatherers of information. The sundry information obtained is funneled to the two commissioners and the executive director for evaluation with the object of administrative hearings or to serve as a basis for suggesting remedial legislation as the needs present themselves.

Police powers were granted to the executive director of the Commission and whomever he deemed needed it. The chief investigator, all of the investigators and a few other persons were granted such power by the executive director. The present executive director is Myles Ambrose, former assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Treasury for law enforcement. Mr. Ambrose served in the past as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 27th and 28th General Assemblies of the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) in London and Paris. He also served as U.S. observer in 1958 at meetings of the United Nations Economic and Social Council Commission on Narcotics in Geneva. Thomas F. Jones, a former FBI agent, is the chief investigator. (Mr. Ambrose has since been replaced by Howard Finney, former Police Commissioner of Buffalo, N.Y.)

All of the approximately 50 investigators granted the police power had been former law enforcement agents with the exception of 3 men who had an unusually valuable background to offer during the formative years in lieu of enforcement experience. Members of the investigative staff are well qualified men who previously served for at least 5 years with other leading enforcement agencies. Applicants for employment as investigators are closely screened for competence, general adaptability, and most particularly, character. The qualities of tact and judgment are essential, since many of the investigator's activities are concerned with matters that touch upon the delicate area of labor-management affairs.

The Commission has been on the scene for a protracted period at this point and has developed close cooperation with the other law enforcement agencies which also have jurisdictions over the waterfront. The Commission has given assistance to and received valuable aid from Federal, State, and local authorities. As a byproduct of its own functions, the Waterfront Commission has created a valuable reservoir of information that is not only utilized in the conduct of its own investigations but is also made available to all authorized law enforcement agencies that have cognizance over specific items developed by the Commission.

In another area of activity, subversive information and evidence are forwarded to the FBI and interested congressional committees pertaining to persons who, under the law, require Waterfront Commission registration or licensing in order to work on the waterfront. Personnel who have had extensive background in subversive work are detailed to investigate all matters of possible subversion as well as applications of persons suspected of subversive activities.

The Commission has met with noteworthy success in its investigations along the often

described impenetrable Port of New York waterfront. Major investigations have been completed upon pilferage from the piers, loan-sharking, kickbacks, shakedowns by longshoremen who work as baggage porters, "phantoms" on company payrolls, as well as general violations of the Waterfront Commission Act pertaining to hiring and licensing regulations. Not yet 10 years of age, the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor has had a profound impact upon the Port of New York and the lives of the men who work the piers. It has assuredly improved the manner of living of the waterfront workers and has done much to foster a more efficient, economical, and safer movement of trade.

It should be noted, in conclusion, that the Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor is not a permanent agency. At the end of each year, the New York and New Jersey commissioners, who are presently Joseph Kaitz and David C. Thompson, respectively, make their recommendations in conformity with article IV, section 13, of the Waterfront Commission Act concerning the necessity for: (a) continuing the registration of longshoremen; (b) continuing the licensing of occupations or employments required to be licensed under the Waterfront Commission Act, and (c) continuing public operation of the employment information centers (hiring halls) provided for under the law. As long as a public need exists for the Commission, the Commission will continue to function and the investigators will continue to discharge their responsibilities as guardians of the waterfront. The successful execution of their duties will determine in no small measure the degree of tranquillity which will exist on the waterfront of the Port of New York—the major gateway for commerce between the United States and the rest of the world.

Taxpayers, the Tax Bill, and the Dividend Credit and Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in common, I am sure, with many of our colleagues, I have found that one of the major objections to the Revenue Act of 1963, which the House approved a few days ago, concerns the effect on certain taxpayers of the bill's provisions eliminating the dividend credit and simultaneously doubling the dividend exclusion.

While I have consistently opposed the repeal of the credit and exclusion, there was no possibility of voting on this issue under the terms of the closed rule which governed House consideration of the tax bill. It was nevertheless an important factor in coming to a final judgment on the overall merits of the legislation. For this reason, I requested information from the Treasury Department shortly before the bill came to the House floor explaining specifically and in some detail what the effect of the proposed change in the credit and exclusion provisions would be on the taxpayers most directly concerned, those with varying amounts of dividend income which is taxable at varying rates.

The Department has now completed its study of my questions and has sent me a detailed memorandum incorporating its answers. In view of the widespread interest in this subject, I feel sure many of our colleagues will find the Treasury's analysis very useful, whether or not they agree with its conclusions, and so I include the memorandum as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

DIVIDEND CREDIT AND EXCLUSION

A. EFFECT OF TAX BILL PROVISIONS ON DIVIDEND RECIPIENTS

1. Two-thirds of all dividend recipients would be the same or better off because of the additional dividend exclusion under the House bill

Present law permits the exclusion of the first $50 of dividends—$100 for married couples. One-third of all returns with dividends now exclude all of their dividend income. Of the 7 million tax returns with dividends in 1963, 2.4 million excluded dividends from income entirely.

The House bill would double the exclusion from $50 to $100—from $100 to $200 for married couples—and would repeal the 4 percent dividend credit.

An additional 2 million dividend recipients would be better off with the increase of the exclusion and the repeal of the credit, irrespective of any other provisions in the House bill, such as individual and corporate tax rate cuts. These 2 million taxpayers could have substantial stockholdings. Combined with the 2.4 million who now exclude all dividends, two-thirds of all dividend recipients who file tax returns will come out as well or ahead just from the House dividend provisions.

The additional 2 million would be better off for one of two reasons—either their dividends will be entirely excluded by the additional exclusion under the House bill, or the tax savings from the additional exclusion will more than outweigh the loss of tax savings from the dividend credit.

Assuming, for example, a 3.2 percent return on stock investment (the average yield on corporate stocks), a single taxpayer in the 20 percent marginal tax bracket would have to have stockholdings of at least $9,375—and dividends of $300—before the proposed changes in the credit and the exclusion would actually increase the tax on his dividends. A married couple in the same bracket filing jointly would have to have stockholdings totaling $18,750—and dividends of $600—before the tax on their dividends would be increased from these changes. All those with lesser holdings, of course, would benefit under the proposal.

As another example, take the case of a married man with three children who earns $15,000 a year. Assuming that he takes the average amount in itemized deductions for his income group, his taxable income would put him in the 26 percent bracket under the present rate schedule. Assuming a 3.2 percent return on his securities, his holdings would have to amount to at least $23,438—and his dividends to $750—before his tax increase from the repeal of the credit would equal his tax reduction from doubling the exclusion. At anything less than that amount he would benefit from the change.

The attached table provides additional examples of single and married taxpayers at different marginal tax rates whose taxes on dividend income would be unaffected or reduced by increasing the exclusion and eliminating the credit.

TABLE 1.—*Taxpayers benefiting from an additional dividend exclusion and repeal of the dividend credit*

Taxpayers receiving total dividends of this amount or less	On stocks valued at (3.2 percent rate)[1]—	And subject to marginal tax rate of—	Will pay the same or less tax because the additional exclusion is equal to the 4-percent dividend credit on dividends of—
SINGLE TAXPAYER ($50 ADDITIONAL EXCLUSION)			
		Percent	
$225	$7,031	14	$175.00
$237.50	7,422	15	187.50
$250	7,812	16	200.00
$262.50	8,203	17	212.50
$275	8,594	18	225.00
$287.50	8,984	19	237.50
$300	9,375	20	250.00
$312.50	9,766	21	262.50
$325	10,156	22	275.00
$337.50	10,547	23	287.50
$350	10,937	24	300.00
MARRIED TAXPAYERS ($100 ADDITIONAL EXCLUSION)			
$450	$14,063	14	$350.00
$475	14,844	15	375.00
$500	15,624	16	400.00
$525	16,406	17	425.00
$550	17,188	18	450.00
$575	17,968	19	475.00
$600	18,750	20	500.00
$625	19,532	21	525.00
$650	20,312	22	550.00
$675	21,094	23	575.00
$700	21,874	24	600.00

[1] June-July 1963 weekly average, Standard & Poor's Corp. (500 stocks).

Prepared by Office of Tax Analysis, Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Sept. 23, 1963.

2. All dividend recipients would benefit from the overall program of tax reduction

Dividend recipients, like other taxpayers, would benefit substantially from the overall program of tax reduction—including the reduction in individual tax rates and the reduction in corporate tax rates.

The reduction in individual tax rates would mean lower taxes for nearly all those who receive dividend income—including those whose taxes on dividends would be raised by the repeal of the credit. The relatively few dividend recipients who might have slightly higher net tax bills as a result of the change in the dividend credit are those whose dividends constitute an extremely large proportion of their total income and who thus own large amounts of invested capital. But even in this situation, since nearly all people who own large amounts of stocks also have income from capital gains, the slight increase in their taxes as a result of the change in the dividend credit would be offset by the amount their taxes are reduced by the lower capital gains rates as they sell or exchange securities.

Low income dividend recipients would also benefit from the new minimum standard deduction which would—for single people with incomes of less than $3,000 and married couples with income of less than $4,000—offset any possible adverse effects of changes in the dividend credit.

Even those few people who might be adversely affected by repeal of the credit and doubling of the exclusion—despite the individual tax cuts, despite the cuts in the capital gains tax and despite the new minimum standard deduction—would have higher after-tax incomes in the end. This is because the overall tax bill programs—and particularly the reduction in corporate tax

rates—should mean increased dividend payments and increased dividend incomes.

More specifically, the four-point corporate rate reduction would increase corporate after-tax income by 8.3 percent. If corporations continue to pay out the same proportion of corporate earnings, then dividend income of taxpayers generally would increase by 8.3 percent.

The U.S. News & World Report in its September 2 issue points out this important fact for the benefit of its readers who are investors. The magazine stated:

"If you own common stock, take careful account of the rate cuts planned for corporations. These cuts can mean increases in dividends.

"Suppose you are receiving $1,000 in annual dividends from a large company. If, after the full cut in corporation rates, the company continues to pay out the same percentage of profit, you would get an additional $80 a year in dividends.

"These are the results to be expected from rate changes."

The interesting fact, however, is that only a 2-percent increase of dividend income would offset the worst possible effect of the repeal of the dividend credit on an individual, and such cases are extremely rare.

Corporations at midyear 1963 are paying dividends to individuals at an annual rate of $17.6 billion.[1] If corporations continue to pay the same proportion of their earnings after the corporate tax cut, then their dividend payments would increase by $1.5 billion. Only a $350 million increase in dividend payments to individuals would be required to assure that, even in the most extreme cases, aftertax income under the House bill could not be less than aftertax income under the present law.

3. *Retired persons with only dividend income would generally be nontaxable under the House bill, or, if taxable, would have to be very wealthy individuals (over $100,000 of stock if single and about $200,000 of stock if married)*

It is occasionally pointed out that the repeal of the dividend credit would be a hardship on low-income aged persons with dividend income only. This is not true. Such persons would be typically nontaxable, even though they would have substantial dividend income and substantial stockholdings. For example, a retired couple with dividend income only and both entitled to the maximum retirement income credit would need to have almost $200,000 of stock holdings before becoming subject to tax under the House bill. They would not be subject to tax liability until their dividend income exceeds $6,253 ($6,253 minus $200 of dividend exclusion minus $2,400 of exemptions minus $605 of deductions equals $3,048 of taxable income, which would be tax free because of the retirement credit). Dividends of $6,253 are earned on stockholdings of $195,406 at the current rate of return of 3.2 percent (Standard & Poor's average yield from 500 stocks).

Similarly, an aged widow with dividend income only and entitled to the maximum retirement income credit would need to have over $100,000 of stock before becoming subject to tax under the House bill. The widow would not be subject to tax liability until her dividend income exceeds $3,224 ($3,224 minus $100 of dividend exclusion minus $1,200 of exemptions minus $400 of minimum standard deductions equals $1,524 of taxable income, which would be tax free because of the retirement credit). Dividends of $3,224 are earned on stock holdings of $100,750 at the current rate of return of 3.2 percent.

B. DIVIDEND CREDIT IS NOT AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY FOR "DOUBLE TAXATION" OF DIVIDENDS

The present dividend credit is based, in large measure, on the concept that stockholders pay tax twice on their dividends; once when the corporation pays income tax on its earnings, and again when they pay individual income tax. This, of course, assumes that the shareholder bears the burden of the corporation income tax. Whether this assumption is actually warranted has been debated at great length. Some, for example, maintain that there is, in fact, no double taxation of dividends—that the shareholder cannot be regarded as paying the corporate income tax inasmuch as the corporation, with its special privileges and characteristics, is a separate legal entity having a taxpaying capacity quite apart from its stockholders. Others have questioned how much of the corporate income tax is actually borne by the corporation in the first instance and how much is shifted to consumers in higher prices, to employees in lower wages, and to former owners who sold their stock at lower prices to take the tax into account.

Whatever the merit of the double taxation argument, the dividend credit adopted in 1954 does not provide an effective solution.

The major part of the tax savings from the dividend credit accrues to upper-income taxpayers and the credit removes a very substantial part of the extra burden of double taxation for high-income taxpayers, but only a small part of the burden for small- and moderate-income shareholders. The extra burden of the corporate tax is highest at the first taxable income bracket and is lowest at the highest taxable income bracket. As an individual's income increases and he is subject to higher marginal tax rates, he would be able to retain less of the funds that are taxed at the corporate level.

The tax reduction received by the shareholder on each $1 of corporate earnings available for distribution after payment of corporate income tax amounts to 1.9 cents (4 percent of the 48 cents remaining after paying the present 52 cents in corporate income tax). The credit is of no help at all to the nontaxable individual with dividends, who bears a 52-percent tax on his dividends, assuming the validity of the double taxation argument. It removes less than 5 percent of the extra burden resulting from the corporate income tax at the $4,000 to $8,000 taxable income level, over 9 percent at the $88,000 to $100,000 income level, and more than 12 percent of the extra burden at the highest taxable income bracket of $400,000 and over.

The 4-point corporate rate reduction in the House bill will not only make investment funds directly available to corporations but it will also provide relief from double taxation of 7.7 percent for all shareholders no matter what their incomes are. It is noteworthy that the dividend credit falls far short of providing the 7.7 percent relief except at the highest tax brackets.

C. DIVIDEND CREDIT HAS NOT BEEN EFFECTIVE IN STIMULATING EQUITY INVESTMENT AND HAS NOT BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR INCREASE IN NUMBER OF STOCKHOLDERS

Historical evidence indicates overwhelmingly that the credit has not been effective in stimulating equity investment. There has been no upsurge in net purchases of stock by individuals since 1954 when the credit was adopted. In fact, in recent years net stock purchases by individuals have been outpaced by other forms of personal savings (such as time and savings deposits). See attached table 2.

Moreover, there has been little change in the ratio of equity financing to total corporate long-term financing in the period 1954–62. Also, there is factual evidence to indicate that in 1962 corporate funds secured from internal sources, including retained profits and cash flow attributable to depreciation and depletion, were more than 3¾ times as important as a source of corporate funds than new stock and debt combined. On this latter point, the dividend credit obviously is much inferior to the tax credit for new investment in the Revenue Act of 1962 or the 4-point corporate rate reduction in the House bill.

TABLE 2.—*Net stock purchases by individuals in relation to personal saving, 1951–62*

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Net stock purchases	Personal saving	Net stock purchases as a percent of personal savings
1951	1.8	17.7	10.2
1952	1.7	18.9	9.0
1953	1.0	19.8	5.1
1954	.8	18.9	4.2
1955	1.2	17.5	6.9
1956	1.6	23.0	7.0
1957	1.4	23.6	5.9
1958	1.3	24.7	5.3
1959	.8	23.6	3.4
1960	−.4	20.9	
1961	.6	25.6	2.3
1962	−1.6	26.2	

Source: Securities and Exchange Commission, Department of Commerce, and Council of Economic Advisers.

[1] Dividends in personal income (national income definition).

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 30th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

Mr. Aden Hyde, the editor of the Eastern Idaho Farmer, of Idaho Falls, in an editorial on June 13, 1963, comments on Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. Mr. Hyde notes that "all the rosy promises for a bright new future for southern Idaho have not worked out for north Idaho, long in the Bonneville powerfold." He says that anyone who expects economic utopia from Bonneville is blind to a lot of hard economic facts.

The entire editorial follows:

VIEWS AND NEWS ON SUBJECTS HERE AND THERE

(By Aden Hyde)

There's no point in screaming after you've spilled the milk; it's spilled and that ends it.

The old adage applies to what happened when, by the stroke of a pen, Secretary Stewart Udall converted all of southern Idaho into a segment of Bonneville Power Administration's empire.

That's exactly like spilled milk; it's too late to scream. But the point has long since been made—before Secretary Udall acted—that adequate hearings on this expansion program were in order and should be held. They were not.

Now comes J. R. Simplot Co. vigorously protesting a threat to Simplot's sulfuric acid process of manufacturing phosphate fertilizer. W. Grant Kilbourne, vice president and general manager from Pocatello, puts it this way:

"We have here a unique set of circumstances whereby Bonneville Power would create a highly artificial, unfair and disastrous competitive situation in the phosphate industry of Idaho. To subsidize one already

large, prosperous, and well-financed competitor in this industry at the expense of another when this competition is now in balance is hard to understand."

It's difficult to quarrel with that viewpoint. Indeed, our sympathies are wholly with the J. R. Simplot Co. But we are minded to say once more that Government is the most unfair of all competitors and when Government enters a business field, somebody gets hurt.

Why, then, wasn't the J. R. Simplot Co. accorded an opportunity to point out that BPA power rates could wreck an establishd Idaho industry with an investment running to $20 million and an employment roll twice as large as that of the presently producing phosphate fertilizer plants using electricity?

Mr. Kilbourne says only that he had hoped the whole BPA controversy might quietly go away. It didn't.

From where we sit, if BPA provides Simplot's competitors with BPA power at a figure much below the rate they are presently paying, the Simplot Co. has a choice. It can convert to plants using electricity and enjoying BPA rates or it can go broke. We suspect that Uncle Sam doesn't care—as it is obvious that Secretary Udall, Senator FRANK CHURCH and Congressman RALPH HARDING don't care. If any of them did, they would have given southern Idaho time and opportunity to get a few of these things into the record.

One thing is certain, phosphate plants using the electric method—and power is presently about 25 percent of the operating costs in such plants—can qualify as BPA customers.

That is, they can if and when BPA power is available for them. Presently, the major fertilizer plant using the electric method is at Georgetown. That's a long way from any present source of Bonneville power. Indeed, until something is done about augmenting the present power supply provided by plants formerly under the direction of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, nobody except present users will get Bonneville power. There's no power which isn't already committed.

What's involved in getting Bonneville power into the southern Idaho territory?

Transmission lines, of course—or a wheeling contract with Idaho Power and Utah Power & Light. Congress has to approve appropriations for the transmission system—and we can expect a battle royal on that one if ever it's advanced.

Private utilities today are sounding off on the alternative—a wheeling contract. But we suspect that someday that's exactly what will happen—unless BPA is kicked out of southern Idaho which seems a remote possibility.

For the time being, then, Bonneville Power Administration is merely taking over where the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation left off. That means there won't be any Bonneville power or Bonneville rates in Pocatello—where the J. R. Simplot Co.'s sulphuric acid phosphate plant is located—for years. BPA puts that at a probable 10 years—or maybe more.

We've often pointed out in these columns—and it still stands—Bonneville has no surplus firm power for this or any other area. But Bonneville does have a lot of dump power—and that can become usable power by pouring it into a system as complex as the one which presently serves southern Idaho.

Looking ahead to those next 10 or 15 years, then, the first conclusion is that, long before that, will come the end of hydro development on the Snake-Columbia system. The big dams have already been built or are "a building." Only on the middle Snake, from Hells Canyon to Lewiston, is there hydro potential whose future is still obscure because of controversies among those who want to develop the last remaining site.

But looking far forward, it's possible that the future power needs of this reigon which was originally so rich in hydro potential will take a completely new turn. Some day it well may be that atomic power plants will be feeding the BPA system—from Idaho.

And that brings us back where we started: why this region was incorporated in the BPA administrative region without giving the people a chance to be heard. It was an unwarranted, hasty action by Stewart Udall, Secretary of Interior, which set all this in motion. And that gives some cogency to what U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON of our neighboring State of Wyoming, said recently:

"It is a national tragedy that Americans, proud and self-reliant, are now mere pawns on the national chessboard of Stewart Udall."

Both Senator CHURCH and Congressman HARDING have hailed BPA's invasion of Idaho as a great stride forward for this State. We're going to tuck those statements away and dig them out in a few years to examine them again in the light of what's happened by that time. All of the rosy promises for a bright new future for southern Idaho haven't worked out for north Idaho, long in the Bonneville power fold.

We expect no economic utopia from BPA—and we think that anyone who does is blind to a lot of hard economic facts.

Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Hyde questions whether there is any point in screaming over spilled milk, other southern Idahoans have indicated they feel that something should be done about Secretary Udall's unwarranted action. As noted in my 24th article of this series on page A-5651 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 9, 1963, the Boise Kiwanis Club passed a resolution asking Secretary Udall to rescind his order.

Mr. Silas K. Skinner who lives in Oregon just over the line from southern Idaho also wants the Udall order rescinded, and offers to assist in anyway he can. His letter follows:

JORDAN VALLEY, OREG.,
August 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I am gratified to know that you are making an effort to have the BPA order rescinded as regards southern Idaho.

We own and operate a large livestock ranch just over the line in Oregon and are strongly in favor of private enterprise in all industries.

If the Secretary's order does go into effect we realize the unfair position in which all private utilities will be placed.

If we can assist you in any way please feel free to call on us.

Sincerely,

SILAS K. SKINNER.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

6

Appendix

Control of Savings and Loan Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in American Banker of October 3, 1963, relating to a speech made by Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in San Francisco to the Mortgage Bankers Association, regarding the activity of some of the savings and loan associations on the west coast.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO CORRAL THE MAVERICKS

Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, ordered the maverick savings and loan associations, gamboling recklessly into ever higher dividend rates, back into line this week and in no uncertain terms.

Jolted by recent increases to 5 percent by some west coast savings and loans, Mr. McMurray abandoned his tactics of warning admonitions to the industry—admonitions which some have now pushed aside by their actions—to tell all savings and loans straight out that he had the tools to punish offenders and, in the light of recent events, the affirmative will to use them.

At a time when the quality of credit is a source of grave concern to the highest officials in the U.S. financial structure, Mr. McMurray's wrath over the lunge to a 5 percent dividend rate is understandable. And the vigor of his response is heartening.

"I believe it only fair to inform all associations that the board is greatly concerned," he declared in a speech to the Mortgage Bankers Association in San Francisco this week, "and is preparing certain measures to insure that rapid growth does not jeopardize institutional soundness * * *" at a time when slackening mortgage demand and signs of deterioration in loan quality make a move to the 5-percent rate unwise.

He then explained just how the Board could crack down. The board would require higher reserves, thereby tying down part of savings and loans high-cost money, preventing it from being loaned out for profit. It could stretch out the time over which loan fee income is paid, thereby reducing the speed of return on investment, speed which such high-cost money requires. And it could get very tough in its evaluation of credit standards for borrowings by offending associations.

Good. This is responsible, fair and, hopefully, effective leadership by the chief of an important regulatory agency.

But Mr. McMurray and the FHLBB alone cannot police the offenders in their particular section of the financial community. This will require straight talk, and possibly firm action, from all members of this community—for all have a stake in soundness.

There has been in some banking circles a tolerance bordering on encouragement of the high-rate savings and loans on the west coast. This tolerance is based on the premise that these rates were pulling west money which was needed there for investment, but which commercial banks could not pull in—and which, at that cost, had to be put into high return mortgages which were therefore softer, than banks could properly invest in. So long as the west coast boom is running full blast this practice, which thrives in an expansion, contributes to it, and could not survive without it, can perhaps be tolerated.

Indeed, tolerance is easy when, as has for some years now been the case in that area, there has been plenty of growing business for every financial institution to handle.

But for some months, thoughtful bankers on the west coast and elsewhere have been worrying more and more over the danger to all financial institutions if any member of the community should overreach itself, stumble and fall.

In a climate of broad and deeping concern over the quality of credit, the psychological effects of such a fall could be extremely serious. And in the geographical area of the boom, the possibility of a leveling off in defense spending, stemming from the twin pressures of an easing in cold war tensions and growing political demands that the Federal purse strings be tightened, could have a modifying effect on the west coast economy. The slightest slowing in the pace of that boom will hit the softest credit area first, and hard. And that could be where the stumble and fall could take place, to the distress of all financial institutions, and ultimately, of the entire community.

This rate scramble has been called a "mess" and "irrational" by one of the leaders of a responsible west coast savings and loan holding company. Certainly the most thoughtful savings and loan leaders want to keep their rates rational. And it is heartening that Mr. McMurray has taken such a strong stand.

But this problem does not belong to the savings and loans alone. Every member of the financial community has a stake in its solution, before the mess spills over and spoils things for many more than those who have brewed it. Tolerance toward the rate scramble no longer makes sense. Bankers should make their feelings known to their counterparts in the savings and loans, and should cooperate with the savings and loan leaders who are working to bring the scramble under control. As individuals, through rank talk and firm action in dealing with maverick savings and loans, all members of the financial community can help in putting an end to a problem which contains the seeds of trouble for all.

Arkansas Basin Association Tells Value of Water Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said recently about the wisdom and value of spending Government money to develop our Nation's rich water resources.

Too often, these writings and statements are made by persons who have failed to investigate the facts and who give a distorted picture of our water development programs based upon their opinions.

Recently, however, a factual study was completed and released by the Arkansas Basin Development Association. This study answers many of the questions concerning water development in general and the Arkansas River multipurpose water development project in particular.

Drawing from facts supplied by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, from statements made by experts in the field, and from actual records of performance, the Arkansas Basin Development Association's fact sheet is a timely and authoritative answer to the critics of water projects.

The Tulsa, Okla., Tribune, on September 23, 1963, printed most of the ABDA fact sheet. The Tribune article follows:

ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION ANSWERS "PORK BARREL" CHARGES

The Arkansas Basin Development Association answered charges that Arkansas River navigation is a "pork barrel" project by issuing today what is called a "fact sheet."

The ABDA said Army Engineers now estimate benefits from the $1.2 billion project due to be completed in 1970 will average $65,739,000 annually for 100 years.

These estimates give the project a benefit-to-cost ratio of $1.40 for each $1 invested, ABDA said.

The breakdown of the corps' estimate of benefits includes $40,470,000 in savings in transportation costs; $10,921,000 from hydroelectric power; $6,336,000 from flood control; $800,000 from water supply; $6,575,000 for channel stabilization; and $637,000 for fish and wildlife.

Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, former chief of Army Engineers, is quoted as saying the extensive industrial development on the Ohio River in recent years "has been based primarily upon three things—coal, cheap water transportation, and abundant water supply."

Itschner, in a speech at Western Hills Lodge in 1956, said:

"Here in the Arkansas Basin the same elements are present, with oil and bauxite and chemicals in addition.

"Once waterway transportation is available for the hauling of bauxite and pig metal and fuels, once hydropower is available near at hand to backstop the low-cost power advantage inherent in the coal resource and the easily available natural gas, once water supply possibilities are developed to the fullest possible extent, the Arkansas Basin will possess the physical attributes needed for truly great expansion."

ABDA said Army Engineer estimates of bare tonnage on other streams have proved very conservative.

He said the corps once predicted Ohio River barges would carry 13 million tons of commodities annually while last year barges on the Ohio moved 85.3 million tons.

The corps predicted the Illinois Waterway would carry 8.3 million tons annually, but

by 1958 the figure was 23 million tons, ABDA said.

The Upper Mississippi was forecast to carry 9 million tons annually and last year carried 38 million tons, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which was expected to carry 5 million tons a year last year carried 69 million tons, according to ABDA.

The Army Engineers' forecast that 13 million tons of commodities will move annually on the Arkansas-Verdigris waterway is based on traffic studies made in 1949 "when the chemical industry, a principal user of water transport, was in its infancy, and long before the space industry was born," ABDA declared.

The association said the Army estimates makes no allowance for recreation and commented, "It is not unreasonable to argue that the Arkansas Basin project may create a tourist industry worth as much to Oklahoma and Arkansas as all the benefits foreseen in the Corps of Engineers forecast."

Petroleum and its products, grain and grain products, iron, steel and other metals, coal and coke, and nonmetallic minerals make up more than three-fourths of the tonnage moved by barge on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway last year, ABDA reported.

The fact sheet said liquified petroleum production totaled 42 million tons last year in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, the States expected to benefit most from Arkansas River navigation, and 25 million tons in Colorado and New Mexico.

Kansas produced 8 million tons of wheat last year and Oklahoma 2 million tons, with half the crop going to the Gulf for export, ABDA continued.

It said the Arkansas River flows through coal reserves in eastern Oklahoma and western Arkansas estimated at 55 billion tons, and "the oil industry in Oklahoma and Kansas and landlocked States to the west is one of the Nation's largest users of pipe and other steel products.

Army Engineers predict the Arkansas-Verdigris River system will carry annually 4 million tons of petroleum and products, 1.2 million tons of coal, 628,000 tons of wheat, 3.7 million tons of iron and steel, and 3.5 million tons of other items.

Questions posed and answered by ABDA included:

"Question. Aren't barges becoming obsolete and giving place to air and truck transport?

"Answer. Quite the contrary. Today the first requirement in locating a plant for the space industry is that it be on a navigable waterway.

"Between 1930 and 1960 the ton-miles of traffic on America's inland and intracoastal waterways increased more than 10 times.

"Prior to the completion of a dependable navigation system in 1929, waterborne traffic on the Ohio River ranged between 250 million and 1 billion ton-miles per year. Last year it totaled 19.7 billion ton-miles.

"Question. How does barge transport compare to other forms of transportation costs?

"Answer. Barges, four-tenths of a cent per ton-mile; railroads, 1.4 cents per ton-mile; pipelines, 2.5 cents per ton-mile; trucks, 6.5 cents per ton-mile.

"Question. How important are savings in transport costs made possible by barge navigation?

"Answer. Steel goes from Houston to Minneapolis for 70 cents per 100 pounds, thanks to water competition. The rate from Houston to Tulsa, half as far and without water competition, is 65 cents.

"Grain moves from St. Louis to New Orleans by barge for export at $2.76 per ton. The competitive rail rate is $5.30. From Tulsa to New Orleans, the same distance but without barge competition, the rail rate is $8.

"Coal goes to Minneapolis from southern Illinois by barge for $2.10 per ton, and by rail for $3.39. The rate on Oklahoma coal shipped from Tulsa by rail to Minneapolis is $6.44.

"Pipe moves from Pittsburgh to Kansas City by barge for $8.30 a ton, and by rail for $17.40. The rate by barge to Houston is $10.07, and by rail, $17. But from Pittsburgh to Tulsa—halfway between Kansas City and Houston—the rail rate is $22.40.

"Question. Who supports the Arkansas Basin project?

"Answer. In the Arkansas Valley, there is no opposition worthy of the name. The project has the backing of both major parties, and of the leading bankers, industrialists, and businessmen, even by some of the railroads."

ABDA quotes Robert E. Thomas, of Tulsa, chairman of the executive committee of the Katy Railroad, as saying:

"I firmly believe the benefits to be gained by the Katy Railroad in the years ahead will far overshadow the loss, if any, of the traffic either to the Arkansas River or from lower so-called water-compelled freight rates."

Recent Secret Soviet A-Blasts Revealed by U.S. Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in my recent speech explaining my position in opposition to the nuclear test ban treaty, I pointed out the difficulty we might have in positively detecting, identifying, and verifying atomic explosions which the Soviet Union wished to conceal. My fears on this score have been reinforced by an article in the October 1, 1963, issue of the Washington Star written by Mr. Earl H. Voss.

According to Mr. Voss, who is the author of a recent book entitled "Nuclear Ambush," U.S. intelligence reports indicate the probability that Russia has conducted a number of secret nuclear tests since last June, and that one of them may have taken place as recently as August 3, after the test ban treaty had already been initialed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Voss be printed in he Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS FIRED A-BLASTS IN JUNE, INTELLIGENCE DATA INDICATES

(By Earl H. Voss)

In important segment of the U.S. intelligence community has now concluded that Russia secretly tested at least one and possibly as many as three nuclear weapons in central Asia last June.

Sound signals indicating the possibility of three low-kiloton shots were recorded on June 6, 12, and 19, it was learned today.

There is dispute over whether the explosions were above the ground, at ground level or under the ground. The partial nuclear test treaty, signed August 5 in Moscow, permits underground testing and the United States has continued such testing.

Data on the June 12 event was particularly convicing to some intelligence analysts that a nuclear test caused the sound signal.

Two craters, which had not been noticed before, were reported last July by U.S. intelligence in the Semipalatinsk area of Asia where relatively small Soviet nuclear weapons have been tested in the past. It is not known how the craters were discovered, but photographic satellites have been passing over Russia.

REPORTED THUNDERSTORM

Negotiations in Moscow for the partial nuclear test ban treaty already were well underway when the craters were found.

One Soviet news account reported a thunderstorm in the Semipalatinsk area on June 12.

The Central Intelligence Agency reportedly has concluded that the craters probably were caused by the same events whose acoustic signals were picked up in June.

There has been no official conclusion yet that all three events were nuclear tests or that any one of them was.

The Atomic Energy Commission continues to maintain publicly that the evidence of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union in June is "inconclusive" because radioactive fallout has not been picked up in sufficient quantity.

Radioactivity has long been considered the final proof of occurrence of a nuclear test. Both Russia and the United States, however, have been developing so-called clean nuclear weapons which produce relatively little radioactivity.

FEAR CLEAN WEAPONS

Some analysts fear Russia may have produced a clean nuclear weapon which emits so little radioactivity it cannot be detected at long range.

The craters in Semipalatinsk could indicate shallow underground testing or surface bursts or low-altitude testing.

The craters conceivably also could have been caused by nonnuclear explosives, but no plausible theories on this possibility are reported to have been advanced.

The absence of seismic signals coinciding with the sound pickups raises doubts that the events were held underground.

Surface or low-altitude bursts would produce less fallout and little or no seismic signal. These types also would be more likely to send out an acoustic signal than a shallow underground shot.

SIX "BIG BOOMS"

At least six unexplained "big booms" have been picked up by the United States in the last 15 months.

The first two occurred in the Soviet Union in July 1962. Three more were picked up last June, two of them after President Kennedy said in his June 10 American University speech the United States would not test in the atmosphere unless another power did.

On August 3, after the partial test ban treaty had been initialed and 2 days before Secretary of State Rusk signed it in Moscow, a large atmospheric disturbance with the explosive force of 500,000 tons of TNT was picked up from the Antarctic region.

Again no radioactivity has been discovered in the area of the blast, so evidence of a nuclear test is again inconclusive.

Eight stations recorded the Antarctic shot on acoustic detectors.

Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming is noted for its many attrac-

tions for the tourist. Not the least of these is the heritage of our Western history now recreated daily, with some distortion, on the television screens across the Nation.

Mr. President, Wyoming is accustomed to having many visitors to our State, and of late we have noticed that more and more of these visitors have come from overseas, partly I am sure because of the efforts of the U.S. Travel Service.

A recent issue of "Ferienland Amerika"—"Vacationland America," a private publication published in Germany—was devoted to the good works of the Travel Service and the services it offers the foreign tourist. The issue also contained an article, the lead article, on Wyoming. Our State, it said, "presents still today what the European hopes to find in the 'Wild West.'"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a translation of this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING

Wyoming, the "Land of Vast Plaines" as the originally Indian name expresses, presents still today what the European hopes to find in the "wild West."

It is a vast, scarcely populated land with one-tenth of its population of 320,000 consisting of Indians. The white people are mainly farmers and cattle ranchers, and uncounted cattle herds, attended by cowboys, are passing through the almost endless prairie.

Here are the battlefields in which the first pioneers fought the Indians down in desperate struggles. And every year the Indians meet for big celebrations, and the cowboys perform the most significant rodeo shows in America and outdo each other in daring riding contests. The famous first friendship meeting between Indians and trappers is being repeated every year at a symbolic celebration.

Fort Laramie, once a post against the Indians to guard the roads for the pioneers and for their protection, can still be visited today, as a museum, however.

Aside from recollections and relics of the Indian time Wyoming has retained a natural beauty untouched by civilization. The chain of the Rocky Mountains crosses the country. Natural rock caverns, canyons formed by eroding waters throughout thousands of years, glittering waterfalls, and high gushing hot springs, all that was discovered by wandering trappers looking for rare fur-bearing animals.

Known as Yellowstone National Park this part of Wyoming became the first national preserved park. Today as a hundred years ago Wyoming is the wild West, nothing has changed, only the dangers, which arose through human controversies, have been banned.

Visitors nowadays can fish in the mountain lakes and rivers, can build up their tents at the riverbanks, can observe elks and other rare species of animals on their remote paths, they can search for special stones and may even still find precious stones, all that without having to fear to be held up and scalped by Indians.

Time has settled those human dissensions, but nature is not concerned with such minor details. For many thousands of years the snowcapped mountains have reigned over this fairy land in all their superiority.

Notwithstanding all carefulness to retain her naturalness Wyoming is equipped, like any other American State, with all achievements of modern civilization for her guests. There are modern hotels, motels, dude ranches, well preserved highways, and convenient rail and bus connections.

Excerpts From a Talk Given by the Honorable Joe B. Hunt, Oklahoma Insurance Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk given by the Honorable Joe B. Hunt, who is a close personal friend of mine, and one of the most respected gentlemen in the State of Oklahoma. Joe is an elected official of our State who has served as insurance commissioner in Oklahoma for many years. His constant return to office is a testimonial to the splendid service he is rendering to the residents of the Sooner State. It is a pleasure to insert his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM A TALK GIVEN BY JOE B. HUNT, STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER, BEFORE A MEETING OF THE AGENTS AND THEIR WIVES OF THE GLOBE LIFE & ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO., SHERATON HOTEL, SEPTEMBER 20, 1963

Thomas Jefferson once said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

Thomas Jefferson could substantiate that statement today for the Federal Government, for all practical purposes, is telling us when we can sow and when we can reap, and there are people walking the streets of this great Nation today begging bread.

Now our Federal Government wants to supervise the business of insurance, which has always been under the supervision of State regulatory authorities. This Federal threat should be of concern not only to the insurance companies, but to you, their agents, and to your loved ones, because it affects your livelihood and your profession.

I have just returned from Washington, D.C., where several other commissioners and I protested to the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and his staff the enactment of a proposed law, Senate bill 1642, which has already passed the U.S. Senate, requiring stock insurance companies to file annual and/or quarterly reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission on forms to be furnished the companies by the Securities and Exchange Commission. This would cause additional expense, and once the SEC took over jurisdiction of annual statements and reports, it would mean dual regulation by the Federal Government and State governments.

The Federal Government has already entered the accident and health, life insurance field, the workmen's compensation field, crop hail damage, and many other facets of insurance coverage.

In a recent meeting I protested Senate bill 1705 by U.S. Senator DODD, of Connecticut, which bill proposed that the Secretary of Commerce issue Federal charters to alien insurance companies, which bill if passed, would later be amended, without doubt, to include Federal charters to all insurance companies where a company writes in more than one State. Senator DODD told me the Hartford companies approved of this. I don't doubt it. I'm sure the big companies in the Northeast would like to wrap up our great young companies here in the Southwest in Federal redtape.

I quote from a book, "As One Man Thinks," by Lester O. Schriver, former president of the National Association of Life Underwriters and an outstanding man and speaker, known throughout these United States:

"A short time ago it was discovered that great flocks of sea gulls near St. Augustine were starving. The water abounded in fish. It should have been a paradise for sea gulls. But they were dying of starvation by the hundreds. For several sea gull generations they had lived from the scraps from the shrimp fleet. No sea gull then alive remembered when the shrimp boats hadn't provided them a living without effort. They had become welfare state sea gulls. Now the shrimp boats had moved to a new location off the Florida Keys and the sea gulls, unaccustomed to getting their living from the sea, were starving.

The sea gull is a natural fisherman, but they did not have to fish themselves as long as the shrimpers fed them and they never taught their children to fish, so they and their children died. They retained all their freedoms, but they died.

They had freedom to scream as all sea gulls do, freedom to float on the breeze unhampered, freedom to take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost part of the sea, but they died because they had acquired the habit of living without effort.

Are we becoming dependent on the shrimp boats? Have we lost our ability to fight to preserve life and liberty? Are we still living to preserve happiness? Or do we really believe that the political shrimp fleet will feed us forever?

Our tradition is one of self-reliance. Our way of life is the envy and the marvel of the entire world. It has been wrought out by work, and thought, and eternal vigilance.

Social security on a subsistence level, if kept on a sound financial basis, is probably good sociology, good philanthropy, and sound economics, but unless it is guarded and confined, it will destroy our character and ruin our economy. In which case we shall deserve the fate of the sea gulls.

The other night on the TV News, a U.S. Senator was quoted as saying, "People should be like sea gulls."

No doubt, this Senator has not heard of the sea gull story I have just told you.

I am sure you agree with me that some of the foolish decisions of our Federal Government are "for the birds," but we are not all birds of a feather. There are still those of us that like to think we have a soul, a conscience, and the freedom of human dignity.

Let us remind our Congressmen that the national emblem of these United States is the eagle, noted for its sharp vision and powerful wings, not the sea gull with its webbed feet, looking for handouts.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Food

Field Reporter of September 23, 1963, in opposition to the quality stabilization legislation pointing out the obvious evils and the misnaming of that legislation in a manner so as to deceive the public as to its real purpose.

The article follows:

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

We don't know who is trying to lull whom, but when the Bureau for the Advancement of Independent Retailing makes a plea to its brethren—retail druggists and other captive supporters—"not to be lulled into complacency by predictions that the quality stabilization bill will pass," we can't help wondering if this is not a case of whistling past the graveyard—to mix a metaphor. True, quality stabilization has fared better in Congress up to now than any sober-minded observer might have expected, but because we believe that sanity and justice must in the end prevail, we find ourselves simply unable to believe that this bill will in fact ever become law.

Every attempt in the past to achieve a legal right to a stipulated markup has been defeated, eventually. For one thing, such a law is extremely difficult to enforce. It is written indelibly in the annals of legislative history that an unenforcible law is a bad law and a doomed law.

Fair trade by any other name is just another euphemism for price fixing. What kind of "free enterprise" are they talking about when they make a plea for "fair opportunity for survival as independent proprietors?" We notice quite a difference in prices at the "mom and pop" delicatessen than at the big supermarket, but we notice that both are doing pretty well in their own way, because they offer something more than equality in prices.

Statement in Opposition to Federal Communication Commission Proposed Rule on Broadcasters' Time Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1963, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a Notice of Proposed Rule Making inviting comments on a proposal to incorporate the National Association of Broadcasters' time standards in its rules and regulations. This part of the NAB's codes of good practices limits the amount of commercial time which may be included in radio and television programs of various lengths. For instance, 1-hour radio programs with participating commercial announcements may include a weekly average of 14 minutes of commercial time and a maximum of 18 minutes of advertising. Only 7 minutes of advertising time plus station breaks are permitted on hour-long radio programs having a single sponsor, and 30-minute prime time television programs may include only 4 minutes of commercial time plus a 70-second station break.

As part of the NAB's codes of good practices these time standards represent an admirable industry effort to prevent overcommercialism. As part of the Federal Communications Commission's rules these same standards would place the entire broadcasting industry under unwarranted Federal regulation and would create economic hardship for a great number of broadcasting stations. The adoption of these rules cannot be justified on the grounds that they were formulated by the broadcasting industry. Their operation as a code of self-regulation by the industry and as a Federal rule are two entirely different matters.

In the first place, restriction of the amount of broadcasting time available for advertising is not a proper subject for Federal regulation. It is well recognized that the broadcasting industry should be subject to Government regulation, but the industry is not a public utility. Yet this regulation, by limiting the amount of advertising time, is in effect a form of ratesetting. Limitation of commercial time cannot help but affect the advertising rates charged, especially since advertising is the only source of revenue for most broadcasting stations. The establishment of the proposed regulations would be an unjustifiable intrusion by the Federal Government into the economic operations of the broadcasting industry. It is essential in a democracy such as ours that our communications media be subject to the minimum amount of Federal control consistent with the public interest.

This encroachment of the Federal Government into what is and should remain the business of private enterprise is all the more uncalled for because the industry itself is taking measures to correct the abuses at which the Federal regulation is directed. If its attempt to regulate itself is rewarded by the imposition of further Federal control, there is certainly no encouragement to future industrial efforts at self-regulation.

The proposed FCC rule not only would transfer enforcement of commercial time standards from the broadcasting industry to the Federal Government, but also would make these limitations mandatory instead of voluntary. This means that every one of the 3,860 AM radio stations, the 1,120 commercial FM stations, and the 575 commercial television stations on the air—as of July 1, 1963—would be forced to follow these limitations. Yet, the differences among these stations are almost too great to catalog. Some serve wealthy metropolitan areas; others serve sparsely settled rural market areas. Some AM stations have a power of 50 kilowatts; other AM stations have a power of 100 watts. Some stations operate 24 hours a day; other stations operate only during daytime hours, with their operating time decreasing during the winter. Some broadcasting stations serve stable economic markets; other stations serve summer or winter resort communities or industrial markets subject to seasonal or cyclical fluctuations. Some broadcasting stations are in a strong financial positions; other stations face strong competition. Yet, these limitations would apply to each station, each hour, each day.

It seems to be generally understood that a number of broadcasting stations have not subscribed to the NAB Codes of Good Practices because it would be economically disastrous for them to abide by the time standards. What is a reasonable standard of good practice for most of the broadcasting industry is an impossible ideal for many stations providing valuable services to their listeners. Would it be in the public interest for these stations to go out of business or to become relay stations for the networks as a result of adopting these mandatory time standards? The economic consequences of Federal time standards would be extremely serious for the broadcasting industry.

It is stated as justification for adoption of this Federal regulation that the efforts of the broadcasting industry to regulate itself "have not met with success." Nineteen subscribers who refused to abide by the code review board's ruling had their membership in the code canceled. In May 1963, the National Association of Broadcasters entered into a contract with Air Check Services to monitor code subscribers' programing. NAB monitoring will cover all television code subscribers and 60 percent of radio code subscribers in 1963. By both refusing to modify time standards and by close enforcement of the code, the Codes of Good Practices have more meaning to advertising agencies as well as prospective members, who had not previously subscribed because they felt the codes had no teeth and were therefore largely worthless.

In view of these recent efforts of the broadcasting industry to improve its self-regulation and in view of the economic hardship which the proposed FCC rule would create, I wish to record my strong opposition to this proposed Federal regulation.

Balance Sheet of Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has consistently and actively supported the Assembly of Captive European Nations, I was gratified to have this fine organization bring to my attention the fact that Captive Nations Week in 1963 received substantially increased attention as compared with previous years.

I have long advocated bold and meaningful action to show the world that we are not willing to accept as everlasting fact the continued enslavement of millions of people. The following report shows that we are making progress in working for freedom for all and I call it to the attention of my colleagues:

BALANCE SHEET OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1963

The Assembly of Captive European Nations is heartened by the substantially increased attention given to Captive Nations Week 1963 as compared with previous years. An important implication of this increased impact

is that the American public is becoming more deeply interested in the plight of the captive nations.

To be specific, 1963 brought twice as many proclamations for Captive Nations Week by mayors and Governors as last year. Four new States appeared on the roster, and 33 new cities. A total of 26 States and 48 cities issued Captive Nations Week proclamations. Eighteen more Senators and Representatives spoke on the captive nations issue on the floor of Congress than did a year ago. The impressive total for 1963 was 91. And in addition, 47 Members of Congress attended the Captive Nations Week dinner held in Washington, D.C., during the week.

The most dramatic new element in the recognition given by the people of the United States to the observance of Captive Nations Week, however, was the press, where the gratifying total of 277 editorials called attention to the observance of Captive Nations Week. In addition to the editorials, this press coverage included many articles, pictures and columns—again to a greater degree than ever before.

Press coverage was amazingly broad across the United States. Included were newspapers not only in major cities, but also in a tremendous number of smaller cities—cities as diverse as Muncie, Ind.; Boise, Idaho; San Angelo, Tex.; Ada, Okla.; Macon, Ga.; Warsaw, Ind.; Rockford, Ill.; Long Beach, Calif.; and Petersburg, Va.

The activities of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and observance of Captive Nations Week were quite similar to those of previous years. As before, letters and information kits were sent to Governors, mayors, Senators, Congressmen, church leaders and editors. Also, as in previous years, ceremonies were held in New York and Washington, D.C., and participants appeared on three broadcasts.

The increase in press and governmental interest in the plight of the captive nations is encouraging to the democratic exiles who form the Assembly. It must also be significant, however, to those who ahe interested in public sentiment in the United States.

Views of a Constituent on Matters of Current Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the special attention of my colleagues in the House some highly pertinent comments received from one of my constituents, Mr. Earl K. Lostetter, of Roswell, N. Mex. I think Mr. Lostetter's remarks will be of special interest:

Representative THOMAS G. MORRIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I do not favor bringing undue pressure to bear on our elected Representatives and I have written very few letters to those who represent the people of New Mexico. It seems reasonably probable, however, that our elected Representatives are interested in the views of their constituents. This letter is an expression of the considered judgments of one of your constituents.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is my belief that all citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, are entitled to equal opportunities for employment, education, and advancement, and to the use and enjoyment of all publicly owned and operated facilities. I do not believe, however, it is necessary to abridge the private rights of all the people in order to provide civil rights to any one group. I lived in Pennsylvania during the influx of Europeans. With the right to employment, education, and advancement, these immigrants were able to do very well for themselves, but a generation was required.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

It now appears that this treaty will be ratified. However, I believe it to be the responsibility of our Representatives to provide for the development of the best possible missile defense and to provide for the security of our country in the event of cheating by any of the signatories.

FOREIGN AID

The Marshall plan was very successful a number of years ago but it now appears that the foreign aid program has gotten out of hand. It is my studied belief that a sharp reduction is called for, that a year-by-year reduction must be made as rapidly as is consistent with our security and that, in the meantime, the program must be administered efficiently in a commonsense way by qualified personnel. Our balance-of-payments predicament demands this reduction.

TAX CUT

As I study this problem it seems that the cut in rates should be pointed toward growth, not votes. For instance, I see a stimulation in consumer demand, which might result from primary emphasis on a cut in the lower brackets, as a temporary thing of little lasting benefit. On the other hand, I see a cut in unreasonably high tax brackets to be productive of risk capital. Furthermore, I see a reduction in corporate rates as tending to encourage cost-reducing modernization needed to make our exports more competitive with the rest of the world and to help restore full employment. In 1913 I was employed as a payroll clerk at $45 per month for an average of 200 hours and at that time common labor was paid $2.12 for a 12½-hour day. I submit that the Federal Government did not bring about the improved conditions today excepting as it provided an appropriate climate for industry, the word "industry" including capital, labor, and management.

WELFARE EXPENDITURES

It is my judgment that a tax cut should be accompanied by economy and that economy requires that there be no extension of the so-called welfare expenditures of the Federal Government. Even as we now have them, our welfare expenditures appear to stifle the initiative of many of our citizens.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Reductions in foreign aid probably will have an immediately salutary effect on our balance of payments. The right kind of tax relief will probably enable our industry to compete on better terms and thus improve our balance of payments. It seems to me that we have to get to the root of this problem. We can no longer rely on expediency.

Very sincerely yours,

EARL K. LOSTETTER.

Two Schemes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Two Schemes," appearing in the Moline Daily Dispatch of September 30, 1963. I am sure all of my distinguished colleagues who are interested in halting some of these unnecessary Government spending projects will agree with the views expressed therein:

TWO SCHEMES

The Federal Government is considering two questionable schemes to generate electricity.

One plan is to build the largest dam in the Western Hemisphere at Rampart, Alaska, create a body of water as large as Lake Erie, and generate 20 times as much electricity as is used in all of Alaska today. The job would take almost 20 years.

Cheap electricity would thus be made available in Alaska, and with it the State hopes to lure industry. Unfortunately electric bills are a small part of the cost of operating an industry, and shipping costs to mass markets alone would be enough to gobble up any saving. And Alaska also offers the disadvantage of high labor costs, due to the high cost of living in an area which must haul in by sea nearly everything it uses.

The other power plan under consideration is the old Passamaquoddy idea. Miles and miles of dams across the Bay of Fundy on the Maine coast would produce a great surge of electricity now and then, and a trickle of it between times. Presumably, this would be wired to the Boston area for sale, but Boston has all the electricity it needs now. There is no practical way to use all 'Quoddy's output near the generating site. This, too, would drain more than a billion dollars in taxes.

The country has enough coal to produce all the electricity it needs now, and atomic generation of power is becoming steadily more economical. Both methods produce the current where it is needed without requiring long transmission lines.

If anybody in Government is looking around for ways to exercise a little economy, these two projects will make a good starting place.

No. 12—Rhode Island: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Rhode Island—the Nation's littlest State—about gambling in that State.

For its size, Rhode Island has quite a large parimutuel turnover each year. As a matter of fact it ranks 11th in parimutuel betting. In 1962, over $95 million was bet on the tracks. But illegal gambling is far more important.

According to the figures presented to the McClellan Committee, Rhode Island's share of the annual off-track betting came to almost one quarter of a billion dollars in 1962.

In a State the size of Rhode Island, the neighborhood bookie is never far away. Not that off-track betting accounts for all of the illegal gambling in that State. By generally accepted figures, off-track betting constitutes less than one-half of

the illegal gambling total. Therefore, it is safe to report that illegal gambling in Rhode Island is about a $500 million a year business.

About 10 percent of the total turnover is skimmed off as profit by the gambling syndicates. After payoffs for protection and operation, there is more than enough left to provide a fat checkbook for the gangsters who feed on gambling profits. Little Rhode Island is a pocket-size playground of crime syndicate operations.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that this country faced reality and put an end to a system whereby official hypocrisy is hand in hand with the tentacles of organized crime. So long as Rhode Island persists in refusing to recognize and control the humane urge to gamble, it will, by its sins of omission, remain a vital silent partner in the vast activities of the underworld.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the congressional delegation from the State of Rhode Island join with me in smashing the handcuffs of hypocrisy—by establishing a national lottery.

A Tribute to Prentice-Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 13, 1963, a most significant event will take place in Englewood, Cliffs, N.J.—the 50th anniversary celebration of Prentice-Hall, Inc., one of the Nation's greatest publishing companies.

To all who doubt the values of accomplishments of free enterprise, Prentice-Hall is a living testimonial to the tremendous opportunities that can be created within a free enterprise system—when the proper combination of genius and hard work is applied.

Imagine, if you will, 1913 when two young New York University law professors—dynamic Richard Prentice Ettinger and scholarly Charles W. Gerstenberg—decided to launch a modest publishing venture, taking its name Prentice-Hall from the maiden names of their mothers. The United States was just beginning to tinker with mass production; its vast industrial potential was for the most part untapped; as for America's role among the so-called world powers, the Nation acted somewhat isolated, as if it did not quite belong.

Reflect now on our Nation today as it spearheads the scientific march into space, as it throbs with the power of its industrial might, and as it symbolizes the spirit of democracy to the free world.

Prentice-Hall has not only spanned the 50 years between, but has contributed immeasurably to the progress made. Paced by the dynamic Richard Prentice Ettinger—Dr. Gerstenberg passed away in 1948—Prentice-Hall is today a veritable publishing giant with assets totaling millions of dollars, employees numbering thousands, and an office headquarters in Englewood Cliffs, N.J., that is a marvel of architectural beauty and efficiency.

More important than physical growth is Prentice-Hall's exemplary role in providing enlightenment and education to peoples throughout the world.

From Prentice-Hall comes each year an impressive array of hundreds of trade book titles of all types—self-help, inspirational, useful, stimulating, informative, and entertaining.

Through its college division, Prentice-Hall publishes more college textbooks than any other publisher in the world—books that are helping our Nation bridge the educational gap created by the population explosion.

Prentice-Hall through its educational division supplies the books that impart knowledge and instruction to America's preteenage and teenage students, guiding and helping them to prepare themselves for higher education.

Through its looseleaf services division and its famous corporation system, Prentice-Hall keeps supplied with accurate, up-to-date information—on taxation, laws, and so forth—our Nation's lawyers, accountants, banks, insurance companies, and business houses.

Prentice-Hall's newsletters, courses, and study improve the functioning of company executives and professional men. Prentice-Hall's institute for business planning suppplies up-to-date information for estate planners, tax authorities, and business managers. Prentice-Hall's New York institute of finance specializes in preparing men and women for careers as registered representatives of stock exchange member firms. Prentice-Hall's national foremen's institute provides a much-needed service for industrial foremen—publishing training materials for all occupations.

Eleven book clubs, textbooks from Charles E. Merrill Books and the Wadsworth Publishing Co., books of major importance in the social and behavioral sciences and humanities from the Atherton Press, sales incentive programs and communication vehicles from Carr-Spiers, religious publications from Hawthorn Books, the Center for Applied Research in Education—Prentice-Hall's activities extend to every business and profession and cast light into every facet of American life. And for hundreds of millions of non-Americans, Prentice-Hall's international division plays a highly significant role through its offices in the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Australia, and India. One of the major projects of this division is printing where needed low cost editions of college textbooks. Thus helping to raise the educational level of many underdeveloped areas.

In many other ways, Prentice-Hall has established itself as a shining symbol of American business. Its employee benefit plan is world renowned for its uniqueness and foresight in providing maximum benefits to employees. Its policy of stimulating and encouraging art endeavors among its employees as well as the outside community is creating an appreciation of art where it did not exist before. Its many scholarships and awards demonstrate the company's awareness of the responsibilities of business and its willingness to translate that awareness into meaningful action.

To focus proper attention on the accomplishments of Prentice-Hall, Inc.—and in particular on Richard Prentice Ettinger, its chairman of the board, and John G. Powers, its president—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an inspiring editorial from the Englewood, N.J., Press-Journal praising this great publishing company:

TO PRENTICE-HALL

A flag will be flown over the U.S. Capitol at Washington, D.C. sometime during the next 2 weeks, and will be presented to the Englewood Cliffs firm of Prentice-Hall—largest publishers of educational books on the college level in the world on October 13, 1963, an occasion marking the company's 50th anniversary.

There could be no more fitting a tribute to the firm's half-century of dedication to the advancementof education than this symbolic ceremony. For Prentice-Hall, from its world headquarters here, reaches out to all corners of the world with its publishing and distributing business. The firm publishes upward of 600 new and revised titles each year, plus hundreds of reprints, and ships an average of 100,000 books daily to all corners of the globe. During its half-century, it has published over 10,000 titles. Now penetrating the booming paperback market, the company is advancing at a rapid rate, and its trade book division is constantly researching other series possibilities.

Prentice-Hall, a veritable giant in its field or in any field was founded in 1913 by Richard Prentice Ettinger and Dr. Charles W. Gerstenberg, both professors of law at New York University prior to becoming publishers. Dr. Gerstenberg has died, but Mr. Ettinger is still active as chairman of the board. The top management team now includes John G. Powers, the firm's dynamic 46-year-old president; and Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, former president of New York University, as vice chairman of the board.

The story of Mr. Ettinger is a veritable reprint from Horatio Alger's famous success formula, and Mr. Ettinger—in recognition of his great success from small beginnings was actually presented with the Horatio Alger Award only a short time ago.

No better commentary can be established upon the possibilities for advancement and success in the American way of life, and the American tradition of competitive business, than the story of Prentice-Hall, and of its founders. We salute them upon both their vision and their accomplishment.

Prentice-Hall has been an asset to Englewood Cliffs. Its community relations have been of the highest type, and its contributions to the borough materially and spiritually have been great. Other important industries, all of them clean and beautiful in their physical aspects, have followed the Prentice-Hall pattern to make Englewood Cliffs outstanding.

Wyoming's Treasure of Soda Ash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of Wyoming's great natural resources is our

supply of minerable trona, or soda ash. This mineral, which has hundreds of uses in modern industry, is found in useful quantities only in Wyoming, Africa, and Russia.

An excellent article describing the operations of the FMC Corp.'s trona mine at Green River, Wyo., appeared in the September issue of Humble Oilways, the magazine of the Humble Oil & Refining Co. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TREASURE OF GREEN RIVER

Sixteen hundred feet can seem like a long, long way when the direction is straight down into the earth. The light from above, seen through the top of the elevator cage, fades to the size of a walnut and then disappears altogether. Below, there is only blackness. But the trip is a swift one, traveled at the rate of 976 feet a minute, and in no time at all a visitor finds himself in the subterranean world of the miner.

This is no typical mine which FMC Corp. operates below the plains of the Green River Basin in southwest Wyoming.

The ore that's sought is trona, a hard, grayish-white rock that can be dissolved in water and calcined to yield a fine grade of soda ash crystals. Soda ash, or anhydrous sodium carbonate, plays a basic role in making such diverse items as glass, paper and pulp, aluminum, textiles, soap and detergents and water softeners. It's also a first cousin of that old upset-stomach remedy, bicarbonate of soda.

Trona is relatively scarce in mineable quantities. Only two other deposits approaching the Wyoming bed in size and accessibility are known to exist in the world. One is in Russia, the other in Africa. Some natural soda ash is precipitated from trona brine found in California, but the great bulk of industry's needs has traditionally been produced synthetically by the Solvay or ammonia-soda process (in which crystalline sodium bicarbonate is produced by passing carbon dioxide gas through a sodium chloride solution already saturated with ammonia gas).

It was 25 years ago this summer that the bed of trona in Green River was discovered by oil prospectors. Their failure to find oil or gas went into the books as another dry hole for the petroleum industry. But it was probably the most profitable duster ever struck. The bed spreads over several hundred square miles, and each square mile boasts 10 million tons of trona.

The trona was formed, geologists believe, when the basin was a great salty lake upward of 60 miles wide and 100 miles long. This might have been 75 million years ago. Tons of sodium salts precipitated on the bed of that primeval lake in a layer 10 to 20 feet thick. The mud which settled over the salts was destined to become the oil shale that is now the chief insoluble impurity in trona.

The No. 1 shaft was sunk to the trona bed in 1947 by Westvaco Chemical Corp., as it was known then. The firm was later to become the Intermountain Chemical Corp., and finally a division of Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. which has since condensed its name to FMC Corp. The mine and the processing plant above ground, now part of FMC's Inorganic Chemicals Division, has close to 500 employees. Many of the men acquired their mining skills in coal mines in the region.

In 1948, a pilot plant was built to process the ore brought from below. By 1953, there was a full refining plant and a second shaft (one for ore, the other for men and materials). The third and most recent shaft was completed in 1957 to improve mine ventilation. Current expansion work, expected to be finished this fall, will lift the plant's design capacity to 700,000 tons of soda ash a year.

The mine itself is unusual in many respects. It is all on one level, with no appreciable grade to the mine floor. There are no tracks. All vehicles are rubber-wheeled and run on their own power—electricity in most cases, provided by batteries or by trailing 440-volt cables. Some vehicles are diesel-fueled now that State mining laws allow them.

"Drifts," or rooms, fan out in an orderly grid like city streets, each with its own name (1 Main East, 3 Main West). Because the mine was developed from scratch, it was possible to lay it out on paper and follow the basic plan almost exactly. No wooden beams support the roof. Rather, roof bolts are used to bind layers of shale together, creating a "beam" of rock overhead. The bolts are 5 to 8 feet long and work on the same principle as Molly bolts used to hang pictures on sheetrock walls.

Safety first is a way of life in the mine. Signs such as the one that says "If you have plans for tomorrow, work safely today" are everywhere to remind the miner that there is danger in his world if he grows careless.

Thousands of cubic feet of fresh air are pumped into the mine each minute, flowing through the tunnel-like drifts as water flows through pipes. The new air picks up dust particles, methane gas and powder fumes as it makes its way through mile upon mile of underground passageway. Get a whiff of the foul air as it's expelled from the mine and you appreciate what good air means. In cold weather, the air has to be heated before it's pumped into the mine (where year 'round the temperature never varies more than a couple of degrees from a comfortable 68). And it can get cold in Wyoming. They have a saying there that the snow never really melts. It blows back and forth across the State until it wears itself out rubbing against the frozen ground.

Trona ore, harder than anthracite coal, is dug out of the walls by two techniques.

One is the conventional mining method: a section of the wall is undercut to provide room for expansion, holes are drilled for sticks of blasting powder, and the charge is ignited. The rubble that results from the blast is mechanically scooped into shuttle cars (holding from 6 to 13 tons in a single load) and carted to the nearest conveyor belt. The ore moves by belt to an underground crushing station and then feeds into a storage bin where it waits its turn to be shot to the surface in balanced skips.

The second method, newer and more efficient, involves the use of continuous miners, mammoth machines that bore into the solid ore with twin rotating cutting arms studded with steel bits. Similar to continuous miners used in coal mines, the machines were engineered with the help of FMC personnel to serve in the trona mine. The machines, FMC owns three of them, are so big they had to be cut apart with cutting torches before they were brought down into the mine aboard the hoist. Bigness is a rule in the mine. ("We have two sizes down here," says a superintendent. "Heavy and damn heavy.") To maintain the continuous miners and other equipment, there's a repair shop underground that can handle most routine problems. Th shop is moved forward every couple of years to keep pace with the advancing miners.

Above ground the ore goes through relatively uncomplicated but carefully controlled processing steps that turn it into high purity, refined soda ash.

It's ground to a powder and fed to tanks where near-boiling water, abetted by mother liquor (dilute trona solution), dissolves the ore. The dissolving is accomplished in a series of tanks, after which shale and other insoluble impurities settle out in large clarifiers. A battery of leaf filters removes the last fine impurities from the solution.

The purified liquor is cooled under vacuum in a line of three successive crystallizer vessels, each with the capacity of 3 railroad tank cars. The temperature is dropped stepwise in the crystallizers; as it drops, the crystals form out of solution. After passing through settlers, concentrators and centrifuges, damp crystals are calcined to drive off moisture and carbon dioxide.

Natural soda ash refined by this method has a distinctive needle shape to its crystals. The individual crystals are said to flow freer than the pebble-shaped synthetic crystals and to dust less. The soda ash is very pure, with traces of impurities held to minimum quantities. Iron, for example, exists in a ton of soda ash at a weight equaling less than 4 carpet tacks.

Most of the markets for soda ash are on the far side of the Mississippi River from Wyoming—a thousand miles away. Synthetic soda ash plants are also in the East. To compete effectively with these suppliers in a market that pays $31 a ton, FMC has been taking steps this spring and summer to cut its transportation costs.

Eighty percent of the soda ash leaves the plant in bulk form, the rest in 100-pound bags. The bulk ash now is loaded into huge railroad hopper cars holding 100 tons versus the old 50-ton capacity, and sent by rail to St. Louis. From there, barges which hold 1,200 tons apiece take the cargo to FMC's newly built storage terminal on the Ohio River, near Pittsburgh.

The soda ash market is growing at a rate of only 1.4 percent a year. FMC now supplies about one-tenth of the 5½ million tons consumed in the United States each year, but hopes to increase its share of the market by cutting into the synthetic volume. Another competitor is caustic soda which can be used as a substitute alkali in some applications and which, as a byproduct of chlorine manufacture, is in plentiful supply and low demand.

"Lubrication," says Services Superintendent Harry G. Hartman, "is one of the most basic tools of preventive maintenance." Humble supplies nearly all of the petroleum products that help keep the mine and plant running smoothly.

Nebula EP 1, a multipurpose grease, is used throughout the mine and plant. Pen-O-Led EP 3 serves as a gearbox lube in the mill while grades 5 and 6 are used below ground. Roxtone 90 is a gear oil used in loose gearboxes. Coray 50 keeps hydraulic equipment lubricated while a product available in the east as Teresso 43 is used to lubricate the turbine generators. Other Humble products include Surett Fluid 30, a cable and bull gear lube; Canthus 210, used as a lubricant in a hot-steam environment, and Esstic 50, a rust- and oxidation-inhibited oil used as a compressor lubricant.

Address of Hon. Douglas Dillon Before the Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues

the following address of our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, before the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington on October 1. Secretary Dillon is the U.S. Governor of the Fund and directs his remarks toward the U.S. balance-of-payments situation, the steps we are taking to establish a more favorable balance, and our relationship to the other member nations of the Fund.

Secretary Dillon's address follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND U.S. GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1963

At the outset of my remarks, I ask you to join with me in paying tribute to our late, great colleague and good friend, Per Jacobsson. Firmly dedicated throughout his long and distinguished career to the cause of financial stability, he guided the International Monetary Fund with a deep understanding of the needs and realities of his times. The responsibilities of managing director now passed into the capable hands of Pierre-Paul Schweitzer. His willingness to assume these duties provides us with fresh assurance that the Fund, building on its current strength and influence at the center of the international monetary system, will successfully meet the fresh challenges that lie ahead.

It is also a pleasure to welcome to the Fund family an unusually large number of new members, bringing our group to more than 100. The election of a 19th executive director who will cast the votes of a group of the many new African members is symbolic of the increasing usefulness of the Fund to the emerging nations.

I am sure that each of these new members will profit from the important assistance the Fund can render to their further development through its expanding program of technical assistance in the areas of central banking and fiscal practices and policies, through its regular consultations, and by providing timely financial support for well conceived stabilization programs. In addition, the new compensatory financing facilities announced last March mark an important and constructive advance in the services aavilable to members heavily dependent upon exports of primary commodities.

These activities in support of balanced, dynamic growth are, of course, complemented by those of the Fund's companion Bretton Woods institution, the World Bank and its affiliates, now under the able direction of George Woods. I should mention particularly at this year's meeting the work of the International Development Association, whose activities in so short a span of time offer so much promise for the future. Action by the part one countries on the proposals for increasing its resources will mark another milestone in the work to which it is dedicated and in which we are all joined together.

The successive annual reports of the International Monetary Fund have expertly traced the evolution of our international monetary system since World War II. They have also made clear that new problems have a way of emerging as older ones are solved. The report for 1963 is no exception. In particular, it deals at some length with the adequacy of existing arrangements for providing international liquidity during the coming years. The authors point out that liquidity is not simply a matter of the aggregate of official holdings of gold or foreign exchange, and they review the progress made in recent years—in considerable part under the auspices if the Fund itself—in supplementing these resources with international credit. But the report also recognizes that the needs of nations for assured means of financing balance-of-payments deficits—either by drawing upon a stock of fiquid assets or by means of borrowing—can be expected to increase over time. At the same time, as the deficit in the balance of payments of the United States is narrowed and closed, that deficit will no longer contribute to the liquidity of other nations in the manner and magnitude of the last few years.

The Fund's report has now been supplemented by the thoughtful and important statement of its new managing director. Mr. Schweitzer indicated that the Fund expects to study the problem of international liquidity and has expressed the Fund's readiness to cooperate with others in such a study. He points out that studies of this problem are timely even though there is at present no sign of any shortage in international liquidity. He has also given us his view that the Fund should be at the center of whatever strengthening of the international monetary system may prove to be desirable. The United States finds itself in general agreement with all of these thoughts.

But in discussing this matter, I would like to make one point crystal clear: The United States does not view possible improvements in the methods of supplying international liquidity as relieving it of the compelling and immediate task of reducing its own payments deficit. Indeed, it is largely the prospect of the elimination of the U.S. payments deficit that makes it necessary and advisable to undertake these studies.

Nor can the provision of appropriate facilities for international liquidity relieve nations of their joint responsibilities for effective and timely action to eliminate such imbalances in trade and payments as may arise in the future. In a world of fixed exchange rates and convertible currencies, deficits and surpluses emerge from a wide variety of causes, both domestic and international. The necessity to make cash outlays for defense and aid, shifts in the basic pattern of demand for internationally traded goods, the development of new products, resources and production techniques, and developments in capital markets can be just as important as changes in average price levels and aggregate demand within countries.

The adjustments necessary to correct these deficits and surpluses take time if they are to proceed in an orderly fashion, without damaging consequences for either domestic growth and stability or the free flow of trade among nations. That is why, as part of the adjustment process, a country experiencing deficits needs reserves to draw upon, or credit that it can rely upon. That is also why a country receiving the counterpart in surpluses needs assets of assured value, in amounts and forms that will not disrupt its own economy. But in the last analysis without effective adjustments by both deficit and surplus countries, no amount of liquidity will enable us to achieve the mutual benefits of a closely integrated world economy within a framework of steady growth accompanied by monetary stability.

The challenge implicit in this situation is clear. Side by side with our studies of possible liquidity needs, we must consciously seek out means of improving the process of international adjustment itself, while preserving our separate abilities to meet our respective domestic needs.

This is a large order, but one that is well within our capacities. Much has been learned from the experience of recent years. We have come to recognize that in shaping domestic policies and choosing from the various tools available for use, their varying impact upon our external accounts, and upon those of our trading partners, must be taken fully into account. There is greater awareness of the need to identify and eliminate those market rigidities that inhibit the process of adjustment. And we are learning that new techniques can be developed for assisting the process of adjustment that are consistent with domestic goals and competitive markets.

Much of this can be illustrated by analysis of the position of the United States, faced as we are with the twin tasks of achieving more rapid growth at home while simultaneously closing the troublesome gap in our balance of payments. And many of the lessons of this experience, I believe, will prove sooner or later to be more generally applicable to the problems of international adjustment.

Business activity in the United States has continued to expand over the past year at a fairly steady pace. Total output has now reached a rate of over $585 billion a year—in real terms more than 13 percent above the level of early 1961.

Measured against other peacetime expansions of the past 40 years, this performance has been encouraging. All but one of these recovery periods have now been equaled or exceeded in terms of percentage increase in output, and that single exception took place only after the steep declines in production during the early 1930's. Prices of manufactured goods have remained virtually unchanged during the current expansion, extending the period of stability that has existed since 1958. However, unemployment is still excessive. And we are not fully utilizing our available savings of our existing productive plant capacity. True, investment activity has risen in response to increases in demand and to measures introduced a year ago to liberalize the tax treatment of depreciation and provide an investment tax credit. But new investment still remains below the levels required to support a full employment economy and to assure the position of our industry among the leaders in technological progress.

At the same time, our overall balance of payments has responded slowly to the series of measures we have undertaken since 1961. The overall deficit was reduced to $2.2 billion in 1962, from $3.9 billion in 1960, and $2.4 billion in 1961. But the deficit grew markedly larger during the first half of 1963.

When this situation first became apparent, we made a thorough-going review of our entire balance-of-payments program, which culminated in a series of decisions announced by the President on July 18. Resulting programs now underway will, by the end of next year, bring a reduction of $1 billion in the annual rate of dollar expenditures abroad for defense, aid, and other Government programs. Savings of similar magnitude are also expected on capital account as a result of the proposed interest equalization tax and the firmer structure of short-term interest rates accompanying the recent one-half percent increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate. We can already see indications that the deterioration in our accounts during the first half of the year is being arrested.

These new actions will complement and reinforce the longer run measures we have been taking to achieve both external balance and more rapid domestic growth. Basic to our strategy for achieving these twin goals is a broad program of individual and corporate tax reduction totaling $11 billion, which, after passage by our House of Representatives last week, is now before our Senate. It will provide an impetus to the domestic economy in a manner consistent with our international position. It will give increased flexibility to our monetary authorities in meeting balance of payments requirements. The added incentives for use of capital in the United States will enhance

the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. At the same time, the increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports.

Our ability to expand production—which is implicit in our current unemployment, in our rapidly growing labor force, and in our margin of underutilized industrial capacity—provides protection against upward price pressures as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Meanwhile, we are continuing successfully to finance our budgetary deficit outside the banking system. For instance, in the year that ended August 31, the latest date for which figures are available, the combined holdings of Government debt in the hands of our Federal Reserve and commercial banks declined by more than $1½ billion. We have also made further progress in improving the maturity structure of our marketable debt. As a result of our latest advance refunding, the average life of that debt exceeded 5¼ years for the first time since 1956. We are not faced, therefore, with the kind of excessive liquidity that could fuel inflationary developments as our economy moves toward fuller employment.

Perhaps most significant of all in terms of the outlook for prices, our manufacturing labor costs per unit of output have declined over the past 3 years—the first time since World War II that this basic measure of our competitive strength has improved for so long a period, or during a time of substantial recovery. And the rate of wage increases in our manufacturing industry is holding within the range of past and anticipated productivity increases.

In this way, we are encouraging basic corrective forces in terms of costs and prices that should provide a firm base for improving our trading position, thus contributing to the orderly adjustment of our entire balance of payments. Highly tentative, but nonetheless encouraging, signs of an improvement in our international competitive position are developing. But it is clear that the contribution that exports can make to overall balance will be heavily dependent upon the adjustment policies of other nations as well. By this I do not, of course, mean to suggest that surplus nations have a responsibility to inflate, any more than it would be consistent with our internal needs to force deflation. Nor, in our particular situation, would it be reasonable to look only—or primarily—to increases in our commercial trade balance as the solution for our payments problem.

But opportunities do exist for surplus nations, in instances where inflationary pressures are evident, to serve the interests both of their own domestic stability and of external balance by reducing or eliminating barriers to imports, including those from the United States. In the search for effective adjustment mechanisms within the context of a convertible currency system, this kind of action, it seems to me, can become, for surplus countries, a modern substitute for the inflationary price adjustments that we must all do everything we can to avoid.

A basic factor in our own deficit position has been the heavy burden we carry for the defense of the free world and for assisting the development of less favored nations. This burden, in a wider context, is an inescapable part of the kind of world we live in. But we are also learning that methods of handling these Government outpayments, and more appropriate distribution of their balances-of-payments impact, can also contribute to the adjustment process without subverting their essential purpose.

Important savings have already been made in this area, reducing net outflows under our defense and aid programs from $3.8 billion in 1960 to $3 billion in 1962. A large portion of this improvement can be traced to the recognition by some European countries of their growing capacity to assume a greater share of the foreign exchange costs of the common defense. As a result, the drain on our payments from maintaining our troops in Germany and Italy is now virtually fully offset by their purchase of military equipment and supplies from the United States—equipment which, because of the size and flexibility of our defense industry, can be produced more rapidly and more economically in the United States than in their own countries. Thus these arrangements have simultaneously strengthened the free world's military and economic defenses.

In addition, we have adopted a policy of providing the great bulk of our economic aid to developing countries in the form of goods and services, so that it can be brought within the limits of our capacity without impairing its effectiveness. When current commitments are fully reflected in actual disbursements, only some 10 percent of the aid from our various foreign assistance programs will be provided in the form of dollars. At the same time, I believe that we must guard against any tendency to make the "tying" of aid into a subtle new form of protection for home industries. Rather, the logic of our efforts to expand multilateral trade and promote international efficiency through competition among the producers of all nations demands that it be used as a temporary device, reserved for periods of balance-of-payments strains.

With forces of adjustment underway in both our Government and our commercial trade accounts, the most pressing problem in terms of our balance of payments has been the recent acceleration in the outflow of long-term capital. The net outflow of such capital during the first half of this year reached an annual rate of $3.8 billion. This was fully $1.3 billion higher than the already substantial figures for 1962, and nearly double the rate maintained over the years 1959–1961. While some of this recent increase stemmed from direct investment, a flood of new foreign borrowings totaling nearly $1 billion in only 6 months was the major factor. This is considerably more than three times the volume we have been accustomed to.

It is entirely consistent with restoration of full equilibrium in international payments that the United States, with its capacity to generate large savings, continues to supply reasonable amounts of capital to aid the development of other nations. But, it is perfectly clear that maintenance of outflows at the recent pace, far from being a constructive force in world payments, would soon put intolerable strains on the international monetary systems as a whole.

As our program of tax reduction takes hold and there are stronger incentives to employ a larger portion of our savings at home, normal market forces will work strongly in the direction of reducing this outflow of long-term capital to more tolerable levels. But the experience of the past year makes clear that we cannot rely on these longer-term forces of adjustment to meet our immediate problem. Nor is it feasible to speed the process of adjustment by artificial attempts to force our entire structure of long-term interest rates sharply and suddenly higher. If possible at all in the face of the huge supply of savings flowing into our markets, this course of action would require so drastic a tightening of credit as to seriously jeopardize the prospects for domestic expansion.

In this situation, we have recommended enactment of a temporary interest equalization tax which will have the effect of raising the costs of portfolio capital in our market by 1 percent for borrowers in the developed countries abroad. This will bring these costs into a rough alinement with those in most other industrialized countries. The purpose is quite simple—to speed the essential redirection of capital flows in a manner comparable to an equivalent, but presently impracticable, rise in our entire structure of interest rates.

We view this tax solely as a necessary—but temporary—expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world. Borrowers from deficit and surplus countries alike converge upon the New York market, not only because of our lower structure of long-term interest rates—since equivalent or lower rates can be found in at least two other countries—but because it is still the only source for international capital in whatever size and form desired, freely available to any borrower able to meet the normal market test of credit worthiness, and offering highly efficient distribution facilities with low issuing costs. In contrast, potential alternative markets are in most cases subject to official controls or have difficulty in supplying the needed funds in the volume required. And, with few exceptions, they are characterized by high and rigid rate structures. In the face of this situation, we must temporarily help to redirect the demands pressing on our market through a tax that will increase the costs of long-term borrowing hereby foreigners.

The impediments to the development of more adequate European capital markets are currently under close and continuing study within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and progress is beginning to be visible. As efforts to improve European capital markets come to fruition and the remaining controls and restrictions are eliminated—and as our own domestic demands for capital put increased pressures upon our supply of savings—there is every reason to believe that the need for extraordinary action of the kind we are now taking will be eliminated.

When the Fund was established, there was great apprehension that sudden and massive short-term capital movements might again become a disruptive influence as they had in the disturbed climate of the 1930's. Gratifying progress has been made in developing sturdy defenses against such threats to our convertible currency system through the concerted cooperative efforts of the industrialized countries. A chain of new facilities for coping with such pressures is now in place and tested, and there are grounds for confidence that the processes of adjustment can be shielded from perverse speculative flows in the future.

With the restoration of convertibility, however, it has become apparent that a sizable volume of capital is ready to move from country to country in response to relatively small shifts in interest rates. Thus, the stability of exchange rates and freedom of markets toward which we have all worked in the postwar period carries with it the implication that short-term interest rates in the major trading countries must inevitably be kept reasonably well in line with each other.

Both problems and opportunities are implicit in these circumstances. Domestic objectives will sometimes limit the practicable range of fluctuation in interest rates that can be undertaken for facilitating balance-of-payments adjustment. But, since the margin between rate relationships that attract or repel short-term funds is likely to be relatively narrow, it will usually be feasible to encourage small changes in short-term rates in the interest of speeding restoration of international equilibrium without disturbing the domestic economy.

Most promising of all in terms of facilitating the adjustment process is the increasingly close and continuous consultation on these matters that has developed in the forums provided by this institution, by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and by the Bank for International Settlements. This has been particularly evident in the area of short-term capital flows and interest rates. But we are also coming to understand that this same kind of consultation and cooperation is essential in other areas as well. We know that any adjustment demands offsetting changes in the position of deficit and surplus nations. We also know, in the last analysis, that these adjustments must take place, for no workable international monetary system will allow a nation to continue to run a deficit—or for that matter a surplus—for an indefinite period.

The critical question is how the adjustments are to be made. Balance can be—and too often in the past has been—forced by measures that endanger domestic stability or the prospects for growing trade. Those alternatives are not open to us today if the bright promise of all that has been accomplished since Bretton Woods is to be fulfilled. Nor can the industrialized countries afford to undermine the defenses of freedom or to withdraw their support of the developing nations.

The only realistic solution is to find effective ways for reconciling the requirements of a convertible currency system based on fixed exchange rates with the freedom of each nation to pursue domestic growth and stability. No methods will work instantaneously, and one prerequisite to their proper functioning is the availability of adequate liquidity—in the form of international reserves or ready access to credit. The studies now being launched provide fresh assurance that these liquidity needs will be met effectively in the more distant future, just as they are being met effectively today.

But adequate liquidity will not make our machinery of adjustment work automatically, nor can its development be safely put off until emergencies arise. Instead, its effective use will require governments of all nations with a stake in a liberal trading order to work together continuously in many areas; in developing a mix of domestic policies appropriate to external circumstances, in adjusting trade policies, in sharing the burdens of aid and defense, in providing long-term capital, and in eliminating rigidities and inefficiencies in their economies that impede and distort the adjustment process. That willingness, I believe, is now being demonstrated more fully than at any time in the past. This is the real source of my confidence—not only that the United States will restore balance in its own accounts, we intend to carry out that responsibility in any event—but also that a true equilibrium can be restored within a framework of expanding trade, flourishing growth, and monetary stability.

Worthy Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members the activities of an organization called the Saginaw Blue Cross-Blue Shield Member Council in my hometown, Saginaw, Mich. The following newspaper articles from the Saginaw News, "Home Care Program Progresses," December 13, 1962, and "Saginaw Home Care Plan Features Explained to 75," September 19, 1963, explain quite well the need for a medical home care program. Saginaw, population of about 100,000 persons, was one of the first communities of its size to undertake this project. The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Dec. 13, 1962]

HOME CARE PROGRAM PROGRESSES

A Michigan Blue Cross home care coverage program may become operative here early next year as the first among comparable Michigan cities.

That was indicated last night at the YMCA when members of the Saginaw Blue Cross-Blue Shield Member Council discussed the contemplated program's progress.

Under the program, Blue Cross would cover costs of care by Visiting Nurse Association nurses and therapists. Blue Cross also would pay for drugs, supplies, and laboratory tests through hospital outpatient departments and half the cost of housekeeping aids on recommendation of the Visiting Nurse Association.

Claimed benefits are that recovery of some medical patients is speeded by the home care method, that it provides a greater turnover of hospital beds, and can reduce community health care costs.

Mrs. Max P. Heavenrich, Jr., chairman of the Visiting Nurse Association program and personnel committee, reviewed progress in developing the proposed Blue Cross home care medical plan.

"We hope the program can be solidified in the next few weeks," she said.

Daniel J. Kehoe, of Detroit, assistant director of the Blue Cross Hospital Affairs Division, commended efforts of the council under direction of R. Lee Gilbert, chairman, and Mrs. Heavenrich, and the Visiting Nurses Association.

"Saginaw," he said, "is the first city of its size to adopt the home care program."

He said similar home care programs are being developed in Lansing and Grand Rapids. He said others have been established in Detroit, Traverse City, and Albion.

Kehoe said the support of Saginaw physicians and hospitals also has helped substantially toward speedy development of a medical home care plan here.

Gilbert said the Saginaw Blue Cross-Blue Shield Member Council's next project may be to undertake an educational program to study and discuss Blue Cross and Blue Shield rate charges.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News, Sept. 19, 1963]

SAGINAW HOME CARE PROGRAM PLAN FEATURES EXPLAINED TO 75

(By Edward W. Miller)

Features of a coordinated home care program to be inaugurated here next month by the Saginaw Visiting Nurse Association were explained last night before 75 persons at the YMCA.

The meeting was conducted by the Saginaw Blue Cross-Blue Shield Member Council. R. Lee Gilbert, chairman, introduced speakers.

The coordinated home care program here will be the seventh in Michigan, all approved by the Michigan Hospital Service. Blue Cross directors are expected soon to approve participation in the Saginaw effort.

The coordinated home care program aims at holding the line and perhaps eventually reducing mounting hospital costs by making more beds available for patients absolutely requiring hospitalization.

Dr. Sidney Chapin of the Michigan Health Council traced the history of home nursing care from early days when children were born at home and cared for there.

One reason hospital care has become so expensive, he said, is that modern mothers go to the hospital to have their babies and for postnatal care.

"In the organized home care program," he said, "what we are trying to do is to bring the hospital home."

For a patient to be serviced under the home care program, he explained, his physician must approve; the patient's home environment must be right, and the patient must want to leave the hospital for home.

"The home care program," he concluded, "helps to solve a serious economic problem."

Kenneth E. Wolz, Saginaw General Hospital administrator, outlined coordinating procedures needed in hospitals.

"This is a fine program," he said, "which will make more beds available for acutely ill patients."

Dr. Roy J. Gerard commented: "The Saginaw County Medical Society is viewing this program with a great deal of interest."

"One of the faults of modern medicine in recent years," he observed, "is that we've got further and further away from the home."

Dr. Samuel P. Kurn, Saginaw County Osteopathic Society president, called the home care program sound.

"The plan will benefit the individual patient and alleviate a critical bed shortage in Saginaw County," he predicted.

Mrs. Max P. Heavenrich, Saginaw Visiting Nurse Association vice president, traced the Visiting Nurse Association's early interest and its efforts toward development of the Saginaw program.

Miss Amalia Krause, Blue Cross representative, praised the combined effort of the Visiting Nurse Association, Blue Cross-Blue Shield member council, physicians, hospitals, and charitable interests involved in the Saginaw home care program.

"Yours is a fine example of people in a community pooling their resources without a lot of Federal assistance," she said. "I will be surprised if Saginaw's program is not one of the most outstanding in the country."

She cited figures showing that the average cost per patient per day under the home care program operating in Michigan the past 3 years is $3.71, the average cost per nursing visit is $7.07, and the average cost per patient case is $212.32. She said the case cost would have been about $800 if the patient, on the same comparative basis, had remained in the hospital for the full course of his illness or treatment.

Farm Labor Facts—Part XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I find that proponents and opponents of extension of the Mexican-American labor program differ primarily with respect to their understanding of the facts. I think we are all victims of the tendency to believe the facts which we like to believe. A Mexican-American, Joseph A. Vargas, director of the Council of Mexican-American Affairs in Los Angeles, recently made a statement which I tend

to believe. He stated as follows in rebuttal to a statement made by Dionicio Morales, a member of his organization, that the bracero program is causing horrendous unemployment among Mexican-Americans:

Mr. Morales knows as well as any of us that any American citizen can replace a bracero merely by going to the nearest Department of Employment office in the State and applying for a job—

Vargas declared—

This is provided in Public Law 78. This law also provides that the Department of Employment shall not certify a farmer for braceros as long as citizens are available.

Vargas added that:

What makes Mr. Morales' testimony even more ridiculous is that on August 9, 1963, he and others in Los Angeles were publicly challenged by the California Growers Farm Labor Committee to prove their claim that a sufficient number of Mexican-Americans were available to fill the jobs being held by braceros. To this date they have not proved it.

On August 9 representatives of Cal Growers produced telegrams from farm employer groups with firm orders for 48,148 workers, and challenged Morales in a Los Angeles press conference to produce them.

"We are still waiting for Mr. Morales, or anyone else, to fill these jobs," said Carl Samuelson, Montalvo, chairman of the California Growers Farm Labor Committee.

Right now there are approximately 60,000 braceros working on California farms, representing about 10 percent of our total work force. We will send all of them back to Mexico if Mr. Morales, or anyone else, can send us enough workers to replace them.

Actually, says Vargas, many Mexican-Americans employed in farm-related fields would lose their jobs if the bracero law is killed. He explained this by saying that:

Large numbers of our people are employed in activities related to crops in which braceros are employed as field hands. These related activities include box and container manufacturing, fruit and vegetable packing, canning and preserving and transportation. Production of tomatoes, strawberries, lettuce, and many other big crops would be cut if the bracero law is suddenly ended. That most certainly would mean fewer jobs in the processing, packaging, and handling of those products. Incidentally, an important fact many people don't know is that, under Public Law 78, no bracero may be employed in off-the-farm work. Therefore, he doesn't compete for the kinds of jobs just described.

Surplus Wheat Shipments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the administration currently has under consideration a change in U.S. policy in regards to the sale of grain to the Soviet Union. There have been many questions raised concerning such a transaction with the Communists. It is important that consideration be given to the grassrpots thinking of the U.S. press and citizenry. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Lindsborg (Kans.) News-Record which is indicative of one facet of that grassroots opinion and should be weighed carefully by the administration in its policy decision. The editorial follows:

SURPLUS WHEAT SHIPMENTS

It is not our normal policy to comment on the national news, as the big boys are much more qualified to do this than we are. However, this is one time that I want to get my 2 cents worth in.

You have been reading a lot in the daily newspapers about the wheat shipments being made by Canada, and other countries, to Russia. This has really stirred things up. You can hear all sorts of arguments as to whether or not we should try to sell Russia some of our surplus wheat, or if we should even go to the other extreme of trying to stop our friends from selling wheat to the Soviets.

Your editor does not remember the time years ago when the Russian people were starving, and we stepped in with food and clothing to keep them from dying of starvation—but I have read about it.

If you remember the incident—we were the heroes of the day for the starving people. But I bet that you will not find a mention of our kindness in any of the history books now being used in the Soviet Union. In fact, if there is any mention at all, it is in such a manner that it appears we were doing it only for our own benefit.

Somehow I feel that if we were to help the Russians again, the same thing would happen. Instead of thanks we would probably receive another kick in the teeth.

I hope that the United States does not let itself be panicked into selling wheat to the Russians. Let the other countries have their try at dealing with them. Maybe they, too, will learn that their help is all too soon forgotten.

Reply to Gambling Figures in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest the critique of my remarks on gambling in New Mexico placed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 23, 1963, by the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman MONTOYA. It seems to me that the "refutation" made by the gentleman from New Mexico, embodying as it does several misconceptions and errors, constitutes fair reason for further comment.

As Mr. MONTOYA mentioned in his remarks, Mr. John Scarne of Fairview, N.J., America's leading gambling expert, testified before the McClellan Committee that $16.50 is wagered nationally off-track for each dollar legally placed in parimutuel betting. I have utilized Mr. Scarne's well-researched figures in my statements pertaining to illegal gambling in many of our States. Taking Mr. Scarne's estimate that $16.50 is bet illegally on the horses throughout the Nation for every dollar legally wagered on the tracks, Congressman MONTOYA asserts that I should have concluded that off-track betting in New Mexico is $610,500,000—New Mexico's parimutuel turnover of $37 million multiplied by $16.50. Does the gentleman from New Mexico think that off-track betting occurs only in States with parimutuel betting? His statistics indicate that he has been thus misled; witness his assertion that in each State with parimutuel betting, off-track betting is calculated by multiplying the parimutuel turnover by $16.50. Clearly, Mr. Scarne's position is that $16.50 is bet off-track nationally for every dollar bet legally in the 24 parimutuel States. It is ludicrous to allege that off-track betting does not occur in Pennsylvania or Texas, but only in those 24 States where parimutuel betting has been introduced.

My figures for off-track betting have been arrived at by taking Mr. Scarne's national off-track betting figure and apportioning it among the States on the basis of population as indicated by the 1960 census. I feel that this is the best way to allocate Mr. Scarne's carefully assessed total of off-track betting's national subsidy to crime. By my computations, New Mexico's share of crime's national off-track betting bankroll is as I have stated—$265 million.

Mr. MONTOYA does not directly deal with the veracity of the above figure, save by the argument that I should have used instead the incorrect figure he so carefully, but erroneously, derived. Having put words into my mouth—having by misapplication of mathematics constructed an off-track betting figure with which he might safely joust, the gentlemen from New Mexico nevertheless wobbles somewhat as he rides to battle. Citing his self-conceived $610,500,000 figure as an astronomical one, Congressman MONTOYA states that to reach it, "it would be necessary for every man, woman, child and baby in New Mexico to illegally gamble approximately $650,000 annually." I can only conclude a premise that the State Mr. MONTOYA so ably represents contains a population of somewhat less than 1,000 persons—unless the figure was not intended.

I wish that more people would dwell on the real financial worth to crime of the great gambling turnover in America—that worth is a product of gambling's illegal status. I believe that much of this unhappy state of affairs is susceptible of rectification on our part with but little effort, and to that end I have attempted, and shall continue to attempt, to elucidate the full magnitude and meaning of gambling in America. The illegality of gambling in America is in reality no boon to America—it is a Trojan horse within the walls of our society. I urge the Members of this House to consider, compute and reason in the manner I have tried to bring to their attention—and to work for social and fiscal sanity.

Statement by Senator Kuchel on the Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the many Senate and House proponents of the quality stablization bill have recently been receiving letters and messages opposing its enactment. They usually come from retired people and written with such erroneous fears that I personally believe they are directly in result to being planted by some factions who are well financed and without honor in so scaring these good people.

Answering the senior citizens who so write becomes a desired necessity, but it also poses an extra workload on our already heavy schedule.

Senator TOM KUCHEL has prepared a statement for his own use in answering these misinformed people. It is direct, it is profoundly intelligent, completely honest.

As a possible suggestion to other busy Members of Congress, and with Senator KUCHEL's permission, I include the statement:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL ON THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

In 26 years of public service, I have fought for a square deal for all of our people. I have voted for laws to protect the working people of America from exploitation of their labor; I have voted for decent pay for those who devote their lives to the public service, whether it be civil, postal, or military; whether they be still employed or retired. I have voted for improvements in our social security system so that those who are living on fixed incomes might be able to lead a comfortable life in retirement which is not haunted by the constant fear of poverty knocking at the door. I have supported legislation to protect veterans disabled in the service of our country. Now, I am concerned about the future for the small businessman in our country. And, apparently, on this issue you and I respectfully disagree.

You are opposed to the quality stabilization bill which I have coauthored with my counterpart Senator HUMPHREY, the Democratic assistant leader, and a bipartisan coalition. Many who have written me say that this is price fixing. It is not. If a manufacturer feels that he can secure more sales through an emphasis on selling to so-called discount houses, he can continue to do so should this act be approved since the provisions of the law are not compulsory. However, if a manufacturer is sick and tired of seeing his quality merchandise displayed at less than the price which he has sold it to various dealers (not to mention sales below his own cost of manufacture) in order to bait customers into their stores (the so-called price leader), then he might properly be concerned with the effect of such unreasonable pricing policies over which he has no control on the confidence which consumers will have in the value of his product. The market for practically every brand-name item is developed not by the local store owner but by the manufacturer who spends a large amount of his sales budget in advertising expenditures on all media. If a store owner wants to sell an item below cost or at less than a fair price, the legislation which I have coauthored permits him to do so provided that the brand name of the manufacturer is removed.

Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has been an argument that a tax cut lies in the hands of each American citizen, in that if he would take the initiative in his own community to hold down requests for government funds every time he feels there is a need for some improvement, then the drain on government funds would not be so great. The result would be more being done on a local level, and less dependency on the Federal Government.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of the September 28, 1963 editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News, that concerns this approach:

INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYER HOLDS KEY TO FEDERAL LEVY CUT BY ASKING FEWER HANDOUTS

A possible cut in taxes looms large in the public eye at present. A proposal to reduce the Federal income tax is pending in Congress and virtually all of us are in favor of a reduction. Most of us are aware of the income tax burden we bear, since sometime before midnight of April 15 of each year we drop our tax return, accompanied by a check for the amount due, into a mailbox.

However, there is a very formidable obstacle to effective reduction of taxes, an obstacle which has been scarcely mentioned, either in the Halls of Congress or by news reports of maneuvering as the law to cut the levy is brought to the floor of both houses. That obstacle is you, the taxpayer, the person whom the reduction is intended to benefit.

You, the taxpayer, are an obstacle to reduction because of your constantly increasing demands for more and more government service and facilities at all levels—Federal, State, county, and city. You, in the form of your lower level government agencies, are continually dashing off to Washington with requests for aid on projects.

And our requests are not minor. We ask a half million dollars for this, another half million for that, $200,000 for something else. When there is damage due to weather, such as weakening of paving of streets and roads by heavy rains, we want the Government to bear part of the cost of repairs.

Broward County, for instance, recently received a sizable chunk of Government cash—about a half million dollars, to pay part of the construction cost of a garbage and refuse incinerator. A request for another sizable chunk of cash to pay part of the cost of a second incinerator is pending.

The county is also asking the Federal Government to pay a sizable portion of the cost of the proposed multimillion-dollar jetport. Allocations for other airport programs are also pending. All these requests total several million dollars.

The Bureau of the Census lists a total of 3,072 counties in the United States and most of them have obtained Federal funds to pay part of the costs of their projects. Of course, some are not requesting as much as Broward County, but others are seeking several times as much as our requests and grants total. The total funds granted and requested by the more than 3,000 counties adds several billion—not million, but billion—dollars to the Federal budget each year.

There are thousands and thousands of municipalities in the United States and virtually each has received, or is seeking, Federal funds to pay part of the cost of some project. Many are asking money to aid on sanitary sewer systems, water systems, storm sewers, beach and shore protection. The list is endless.

Virtually all tax-supported hospitals in the Nation received Federal funds as an aid in paying construction cost. Virtually all which will be built in the foreseeable future will also receive such financial assistance.

We excuse this continual drain on the national till by saying "We might as well get it, everyone else is," or that "We pay money in and we might as well get some of it back." True, perhaps, but we in Florida are also paying for other projects throughout the 50 States, just as people in those States pay a bit on our projects.

Taxes are now the largest item of expense for an individual. You pay much more in taxes of all types—income, property, sales, and excise—than you do for food, clothing, or shelter. It is logical to seek to reduce the cost of living, including taxes. But we go about it in an odd fashion.

It is true sizable cuts can be made in the Federal budget by drastically slashing, or eliminating, the ineffective foreign aid program. We can make additional sizable slashes by trimming welfare programs to eliminate the abuses, gouging, and featherbedding, while still meeting needs.

However, we can also reduce our budget, and tax burden, by a reduction in our demands for government services and financial help. It is a move which must start at the grassroots—with you—since bureaucrats will never reduce costs or size of government until forced.

Of course tax cuts are desired, the problem is how to obtain the relief. It will not come from Congress, it will not come from the executive or administrative branches of government. There will not be tax reductions until you, the taxpayers, insist.

Perhaps an excellent starting point would be elimination of the constant requests to the Federal Treasury for a few hundred thousands dollars for this project, a half million dollars for that project. It will take a concerted effort on the part of all of us, in all States, to do this.

That effort can be made. Remember, it was our concerted efforts to obtain these aid grants which has pushed total spent for such purposes to several billion dollars a year.

You must make the move.

JOHN C. GERARD.

OK, Who Took Our Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hoppe in his inimitable manner has given us some advice on foreign aid and stomach distress as outlined in the following articles:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 26, 1963]

OK, WHO TOOK OUR FOREIGN AID?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Is our Defense Secretary, Mr. McNamara, all right? I've been worried ever since Mr. Kennedy dispatched him to Vietnam to see what's going on over there. Frankly, I doubt we'll ever hear from him again.

That's the way it goes in Vietnam. We keep sending the $1.5 million a day. It sort of disappears. So we send over diplomats and generals to check up. But they kind of disappear. Then, with much fanfare, we send over Ambassador Lodge. And have

you heard anything about him lately? So now, with Mr. McNamara, we're up to Cabinet rank.

This has got to stop. How long I ask can we keep pouring our foreign aides down this rathole?

What happens to them over there is, of course, the crucial question. Who knows? I don't even know what happened to them in the nearby kingdom of West Vhtnnng. Not exactly, I don't. But I've got my suspicions.

It was in the 20th year of Prince Ngo Mahn Ngo's lightning campaign to wipe out the dread Viet Narians—for 10 years with French francs and for 10 years with U.S. dollars. Yet his dedication still grew daily. Along with his numbered Swiss bank account.

Finally, we got so perturbed we dispatched our most famous troubleshooter to Vhtnnng, none other than our unforgettable Vice President, Mr. Lyndon B. Whatshisname. "L.B.W.," as he's called, stalked into the palace and laid it on the line.

"Ngo," he says, "we got a bone to pick with you. Now it h'aint the $4 billion. Keep it. And it h'aint our 397 missing diplomats. Keep 'em. But what in tarnation have you all done with our Secretary of Defense?"

"Who?" says Mr. Ngo. "Oh, him. Try the first door on the left." Mr. Ngo then hums a little tune as L.B.W. fiercely pushes open the door. And vanishes. An hour later the door opens and out comes the dread leader of the dread Viet Narians, Prince Ho Ho Ho. He is carrying a shovel and perspiring profusely.

"Boy, Cuz," says Mr. Ho, "he was sure a long one. I like the French better. They were shorter."

"We must take what we get, Cuz, if we are to keep our beloved Vhtnnng a going concern," says Mr. Ngo. "Excuse, there's the phone. Hello? Oh, Mr. President. I suppose you're deeply disturbed by the disappearance of your good friend, Mr. Lyndon * * * Oh. Well, what is it then? You? Over here? Personally? No, no, we'll be glad to set you at ease. Yes, personally." He hangs up and turns to Mr. Ho with a smile. "Won't we, Cuz?"

"I don't know," says Mr. Ho doubtfully. "I think he'd definitely be missed."

"You're right," says Mr. Ngo sadly. "But now that we've run through the French and Americans, who's left? The British are broke, the Swiss are neutral, the lira is soft * * * Hold it. I've got it." He picks up the phone. "Hello, Mr. Adenauer? Deutschland uber alles, I always say * * *."

Of course, this may have nothing to do with Vietnam. But the more I read of the war there, the more impressed I am with the determination of the Vietnamese leaders to fight to the last. To the last American dollar.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 24, 1963]

HOW TO RELIEVE STOMACH DISTRESS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

You keep reading about these newly emerging nations in Africa and places like that. Personally, I'm all for them. But every time I hear of another new nation bravely emerging, this same nagging question runs through my mind:

"Why?"

Maybe I wouldn't feel this way if I hadn't read "A Recent History of the Republic of Mbonga and How It Emerged." Which I just wrote. It follows.

For centuries, the Secret Valley of Mbonga lay hidden from the outside world. Its natives tended their flocks, tilled their vineyards and greeted each other daily with a gay smile and the single word, "mbonga." Which means, "Mind your own business."

Its discovery by a team of drunken spelunkers caused a worldwide sensation. Forty-two minutes later a long string of Ambassadors from the leading powers crawled through the tunnel into the valley to present their credentials.

"Take us to your chief," said the Ambassadors to an elderly Mbongan who happened to be passing by.

"Chief?" said the startled Mbongan.

"You know, the head of your government."

"Government?" said the Mbongan.

"Good Lord" said the Ambassadors and immediately called in a U.N. truce team to supervise the first free elections ever held in Mbonga. A ne'er-do-well Mbongan named Clauswitz was unanimously elected chief. Primarily because he was the only native who bothered to vote.

"Congratulations," cried the Russian Ambassador. "Mbonga is now officially a newly emergent democratic republic struggling to throw off the yoke of capitalist imperialism. Allow us to send you 10 billion rubles for your people's army of liberation."

"We don't have an army," said Chief Clauswitz.

"You will," said the Russian Ambassador.

"Congratulations," cried the American Ambassador. "Mbonga is now officially a bastion of democracy struggling to stem the tide of Red communism. Allow us to send you $10 billion to meet the wants of your people."

"We don't have any wants," said Chief Clauswitz.

"You will," said the American Ambassador. And to make sure he presented the Mbongans with 27 television sets.

The Mbongans gathered around the television sets and tuned in the 6 o'clock news. It was all about stomach distress, the hydrogen bomb, headache miseries, an airplane crash, stomach distress, traffic fatalities, nasal congestion, race riots, and stomach distress. The Mbongans looked at each other, took up a collection to send Chief Clauswitz to the U.N.

At the U.N., Chief Clauswitz took the rostrum, smiled gaily at the representatives of the other 111 nations and delivered the briefest speech in U.N. history.

"Mbonga," he said.

He then went home, filled in the tunnel personally and no Mbongan was ever seen again.

So hats off, I say, to Mbonga. It's the only newly emergent nation that's got a foreign policy I can understand.

Soft-Sell Hate Is No Better Than the Crude Variety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, describes a new tactic being used by those who would continue to deprive the Negro of his rights. To state hate in more pleasing language does not change its character. Publicity, however, can expose this approach as being just as invidious. With that in mind, I commend Mr. McGill's column of September 29, 1963, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune:

FOR YANKEE COALITION

(NOTE.—Ralph McGill, as publisher of the Atlanta Constitution and one of the country's most-honored journalists, is the ablest reporter and analyst of events and trends in the South. Here he reveals the strategy adopted at a secret meeting of white supremacists to combat integration and discusses the reasons why that strategy will fail.)

(By Ralph McGill)

About a month ago, top strategists of the White Citizens Councils in Mississippi, birthplace of what came to be called the white-collar Ku Klux Klans, held a council of war and decided all was not lost after all.

Their decision was—and is—"The Yankees are about to panic. We will give them a push. We will win with the help of the North."

Speakers and envoys were sent out to rally the dispirited and to lay down a new party line. Cynically and privately, they described the night of the strategy discussion as "Be kind to niggers and Yankees week." A decision also was made to step up propaganda in the East and West.

According to information from one who has been slowly disillusioned by the White Citizens Councils, but who still retains membership for personal economic reasons, the citizens are encouraged, and hope to exploit, the fears of eastern suburbia, especially in the area of real estate. "Those liberals in split-level houses are scared to death a nigger will buy next door," said one of the gleeful speakers. "We have got friends up there that tell us all we got to do is make hay while this sun shines, and brother, we aim to do it."

FEAR AND FALLACY

That this fear has been expressed in several suburbs and that a cross or so have been burned, perhaps with advice and suggestions from friends in the South, has been a part of recent news. Exploitation of this fear, which in part is based on guilt, as it is in the South, has long been at the heart of much of the resistance to civil rights by southern segregationists. They now move north.

That these fears are not based on facts has been demonstrated in every southern city that has desegregated all or most of its facilities. Restaurant owners were afraid they would immediately be overrun by undesirable Negro customers.

Another revelation of the power of prejudice and regional mores is that cities considering measures to grant equal citizens' rights, usually nurse an image of the Negro and of what will happen that is almost wholly inaccurate. They somehow expect that most of the Negro customers who come will be in the stereotype of the yardman, the illiterate laborer or the Negro they know, both in appearance and education.

The facts are that few Negroes come to the restaurants and hotels for a very simple reason—economics. The prices for lunch and dinner are too much for the average person of whatever race. Experience has shown that weeks go by, and the total of Negro customers is small.

FREE FIGURES

This also is true in real estate. The traditional young executive in his suburban split-level house need not give way to the guilt fear in his mind. His property is most unlikely to be affected in price by having a Negro as a neighbor.

The urban league will be glad to give statistics. They will show that Negro income varies, of course, from city to city. But, the figures will reveal that a perhaps astonishing small percentage of Negroes can afford to buy homes in suburban developments.

Nor is this all. The Negro family with enough income to make such a purchase very likely might be a superior neighbor. The point is, however, that fears of an invasion are negligible. In the South they are planted and encouraged by unscrupulous real estate dealers out after a quick buck and hoping to panic home owners, especially those who are having mortgage payment

troubles and those who are subject to quick transfer and often must sell quickly, in a sacrifice sale.

Now and then a Negro real estate dealer, also unethically motivated by this sort of profit, will work with a white associate in promoting a "block-busting" trick to make their panic plans look good. But, the truth remains. There are relatively few Negroes who can now afford suburbia.

This is, in general, the background for the gleeful hopes and plans of the South's most aggressive segregationists—the white citizens' leadership of Mississippi. It was they, who, in 1954, proclaimed "Never." It is some of their leadership that has maintained correspondence with the South African politicians who have legislated citizenship rights out of existence for some and rigged court trials against others so that prison is more or less automatic repayment for criticism of segregation.

Coupled with the real estate panic propaganda by the southern segregationists is their abandonment of the former crude and callous comments about "the niggers." Their strategists now believe they can win over much opinion in the East by propaganda that is stripped of its former hate and crude and insulting comments about "the nigger."

In its place they have substituted a soft-sell line. It consists of statements that "We don't hate the Negro. We really want to help him. He isn't ready yet to take his place. Let him develop more responsibility. The jobs are open for him, and he can't fill them * * *" and so on. Coupled with this is likely to be the statement that "Of course, he isn't ready to be your neighbor."

OFF THE HOOK

This approach is the most cynical of all, but it is what they believe some persons want to hear. It lets the silently prejudiced off the factual and moral hook. This propaganda dishonestly attempts to bypass the harsh facts of life.

The Negro has been, and still largely is, either in or just out of an agricultural culture in which he had little or no chance for education or training. He was not allowed to vote, save in isolated towns and cities, until comparatively recent years. Neither father nor mother was allowed to participate in PTA groups or to join in community discussions of problems or plans.

The psychological position of Negro children can only be imagined. They grew up knowing that no matter how hard they studied they could not get a job except in teaching, nursing, domestic servant occupation or as a laborer.

There was no reason to try to become an engineer, an architect, a physicist, a chemist or a skilled technician. Even if they were brilliant students, there were no careers open to them. A handful could, with help, become doctors or lawyers. But, the painful truth is that for the overwhelming majority of Negro children, there was not much incentive to study or go to school. It was a dead-end experience insofar as beckoning opportunity was concerned.

DUAL DENIAL

High school education for the Negro outside the larger urban centers did not really begin to come to the South until 1924. It was not established in any modern sense in many of the larger cities until just a few years before the 1954 school decision when the States busied themselves building modern schools for the Negro children, hoping thereby that the (Supreme) Court might be persuaded to sustain the fiction of separate but equal school facilities.

No responsible white southerner denies that education for the Negro has been a scandal. Indeed, many of the young southerners, and a not inconsiderable number of adults, are beginning to see that it has not been merely the Negro child, but the white one as well, who has been deprived of a fair and adequate chance at education.

A recent report by the Southern Educational Reporting Service found that the highest percentage of dropouts is to be found in the Southeastern States. A grievous number of white children, especially in the vast Appalachian region, have been equally cheated and psychologically depressed.

Today, no person or nation comes to a simple crossroad. We all encounter cloverleaf turns in this last half of the 20th century. But, the thoughtful observer of the national scene can readily see that it will be the greatest of tragedies, and the worst of follies, if we do not move to meet the challenge of morality and of what we have called the American dream. Some 165 million Americans surely cannot be made afraid to do what is demanded of us by civilization—to proceed honestly and forthrightly in removing discriminations against a mere 19 million or so of our population. There are many disadvantaged Americans, and the structures of the white citizens councils seeking to make us afraid are hardly an American answer.

No Subsidized Wheat for Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, any negotiations and deals that are made with the Soviet Union should be made on our terms, to suit our needs and our cause—which should be the elimination of the worldwide Communist conspiracy. Coexistence with communism, as it is dreamed by administration foreign policy planners, could only lead to international disaster.

The Chicago Sun-Times forthright editorial of Sunday, September 29, devoted proper, thorough attention to the subject of possible commodity sales to the Soviet Union, and I insert the article into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members.

NO SUBSIDIZED WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

Members of President Kennedy's cabinet apparently have adopted a wait and see attitude concerning any deal to allow Russia to buy wheat in the United States. They will wait and see what congressional and public opinion is expressed on the subject in the next few days.

The Russian negotiators who recently arranged the purchase of 239 million bushels of wheat from Canada have offered to buy some 165 million bushels from American grain dealers. The sale cannot be made without approval of the U.S. Government. Russia, usually a wheat exporter, has had a bad crop this year.

The sale would involve more than an ordinary business transaction. Sales of American wheat abroad are subsidized by the American government. American farmers are guaranteed $1.82 a bushel. The world price for average quality American wheat is about $1.30. When a private grain dealer sells wheat abroad, the Government pays him the difference between his normal selling price and what he receives from the foreign customer. In other words, the American taxpayer subsidizes wheat sales abroad for the benefit of American wheat growers to the extent of about 60 cents a bushel.

Section 2c of the Agricultural Act of 1961 states that it is the sense of Congress that subsidized agricultural products should be sold only to friendly countries. As a consequence, export rules bar sales of subsidized wheat to the Soviets. That is why the Government must approve the proposed wheat deal and to do so it will have to change its policy.

Pressure for the change in policy has been put on by some Americans, including many so-called liberal members of Congress. The grain dealers, naturally, would like to make a profit.

There has been some talk that the Russians are interested in buying some 200,000 bushels of wheat directly from the United States which owns the big surplus pile of 1.2 billion bushels. But Russia would not pay the price of $1.82 a bushel the United States paid for this wheat and if the sale were made at the world price, a subsidy paid by American taxpayers would still be involved.

The issue, therefore, centers on the question whether wheat should be sold to Russia at a price cheaper than it is sold to Americans, with the difference being made up from the U.S. Treasury.

We believe that Congress was right in 1961 in taking a stand against selling subsidized farm products to unfriendly countries and most Americans have yet to be convinced that Russia is a friendly country in the usual meaning of the word. The Communist countries make no secret of the fact that they believe that their system and our capitalist system are in conflict. The Communists use every method at their disposal to carry on the conflict, including trade.

The United States, naturally, would like to improve its balance of trade and reduce the overall supply of wheat here which is stupendous, but as Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation says, more than an agricultural issue is involved here. The American taxpayer, he said, should have a voice in the decision. The taxpayer should have the right to say whether his tax dollar should be sent on a wheat cargo ship to Russia.

Put to a vote of the people, we believe the sale of subsidized wheat to Russia would be turned down. Moreover, we believe Americans would disapprove the resale to Russia of subsidized American wheat by other countries, such as West Germany.

Russians will not go hungry for lack of American wheat. And American dealers should be able to find ready markets for their grain in friendly countries, such as Italy and France, which, like Russia, appear to be facing a drop in their wheat crop this year.

Judge Mary C. Barlow, Native West Virginian, Honored in the District of Columbia Bar Association Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the October 1963 issue of the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia gives deserved recognition to one of West Virginia's beloved and respected daughters. She is Judge Mary C. Barlow, Associate Judge of the District of

Columbia Court of General Sessions, who has earned high honor and esteem as an effective member of the legal profession.

A native of Grafton, Judge Barlow was appointed to the bench of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia by President Harry S Truman on February 21, 1950, and is the youngest woman ever appointed to a judgeship. In September of 1961, she was named to her present position by President John F. Kennedy.

As a student, teacher, lawyer, and judge, Mary Barlow has achieved the fruits of success which come to those who are dedicated and capable. In 1960–61, she was selected as West Virginia's Daughter of the Year, and she has won numerous other awards and commendations for citizenship and service.

Not only a knowledgeable professional woman, Judge Barlow is a devoted homemaker. She is married to a prominent dentist and civic leader, Dr. W. Lawrence Smallwood, and they have one daughter and three granddaughters.

The Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia printed Judge Barlow's picture on the cover of its October issue, and also gave her interesting biographical sketch.

I ask unanimous consent that the sketch of Judge Mary C. Barlow be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Mary C. Barlow was born in Grafton, W. Va., on Thursday, January 24, 1918, the daughter of the late J. H. S. Barlow and Mrs. Mary Lynch Barlow.

Judge Barlow is the youngest woman in history to be appointed to a judgeship by the President of the United States. Her nomination by President Harry S. Truman to the municipal court for the District of Columbia on February 21, 1950, was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate the following week. President John F. Kennedy on September 18, 1961, appointed her to the post she now holds on the bench of the District of Columbia court of general sessions.

Judge Barlow's father was a well-known practicing attorney in West Virginia, and for many years a newspaper publisher. He died when she was 10 years old, shortly before the depression, and the judge and her mother came to Washington, D.C., to live.

She graduated from both the grade and high school of St. Patrick's Academy. Her higher education was earned through scholarships won in competitive examinations. She attended the Columbus University Junior College and received her bachelor of laws degree from the Columbus University School of Law, now part of the Catholic University of America. She studied library science at the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America, where she received highest honors in college and university library administration.

From 1938 to 1941, she was registrar of the Columbus University Junior College. During the academic year 1941–42, she was named law librarian. She taught legal bibliography, legal ethics, and introduction to law; and was chosen to be a full-time professor of law—the only woman on the undergraduate faculty, and the first to be so honored. The judge taught conflict of laws and equity jurisprudence in addition to her subjects of legal research and legal bibliography.

On August 7, 1944, she became legal assistant to the then 10 judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, a position she held until her elevation to the bench in 1950. During this period she also taught legal bibliography in evening classes at National University School of Law, which is now part of the George Washington University. She was the only woman on the law faculty at that time.

Judge Barlow was selected West Virginia's Daughter of the Year for 1960–61. The award was presented by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH was chosen Son of the Year.

The judge is the wife of Dr. W. Lawrence Smallwood, a Washington native, prominent dentist and civic leader. He is past president of the District of Columbia Dental Society, and a fellow of the International College of Dentists. He attended the University of Maryland and Georgetown University School of Dentistry, and has been the recipient of numerous awards. During World War II, he served as lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the U.S. Army. Dr. and Mrs. Smallwood have a daughter, Anne, who is married to Mr. Richard Menges Schwartz, of Arlington, Va. They are the very proud grandparents of Marianne, Betsy, and Dana. Dr. Smallwood was president last year of the M Club of the University of Maryland, where, during college he earned his letters in lacrosse and football.

The Smallwoods are members of Columbia Country Club, the Army-Navy Club, and Farmington Country Club of Charlottesville.

Judge Barlow is a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. She is a charter member of Beta Gamma Chapter of Kappa Beta Pi International Legal Sorority, the American Bar Association, the National Association of Women Lawyers, the Washington Board of Trade, the American Judicature Society, the Women's Bar Association, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

Aid to Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for many years the question of U.S. aid to Yugoslavia has been widely discussed. I would like to insert in the record an enlightening article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond which I am sure will add to greater understanding among Members of Congress:

AID TO TITO: WHAT UNITED STATES GOT FOR $2.5 BILLION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BELGRADE.—When President Josip Broz Tito arrives in Washington October 17 to confer with President Kennedy on trade and foreign policy, one question which most Americans would like him to answer is this: What has the United States got for its $2.5 billion of aid to Yugoslavia during the past 15 years?

This question greatly concerned the six Senators and 12 Congressmen who made up the American delegation to the conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union here in Belgrade. They raised it pointedly on several occasions.

It is a good question, a fair question, particularly since Congress is being asked by the administration to reverse the decision it made a year ago denying Yugoslavia most-favored-nation treatment in trade. The most-favored-nation provision means that when the U.S. makes tariff arrangements with one country, it grants the same arrangement with other nations.

First, it should be understood that all U.S. aid to Yugoslavia is ended. Aid is neither being sought nor given.

But the United States has put a lot of resources into Yugoslavia It is reasonable to want to know what benefit they have produced for us, because there is no justification for such aid unless it serves our national interests.

The facts, I think, show that we have received large dividends.

Until Tito broke with Stalin in 1948, Soviet-controlled military forces lined the Adriatic and stood menacingly along the borders of Greece, Austria, Italy, and Albania.

Tito's declaration of independence from Russia wiped out this menace at one stroke. American aid has greatly helped to nourish and sustain that independence until Yugoslavia could get on its feet economically. It has done so by virtue of its own hard work, through U.S. aid, and through the economic resurgence of all of Western Europe. Yugoslavian trade is now 77 percent with the West, only 23 percent with the Soviet bloc and other countries.

Here are some of the other dividends which have come from Yugoslavia's independence of the Soviet Union which our aid has helped to maintain:

Yugoslavia withdrew all of its military help to the Communist civil war in Greece and the war soon collapsed.

The long-festering dispute between Yugoslavia and Italy over Trieste was amicably settled.

Albania was geographically isolated from the Soviet bloc.

Though Tito is a dedicated Communist, he withdrew his country from the Cominform, an instrument of Communist world subversion, and has refused to join the Warsaw Pact.

Only a Yugoslavia independent of the Soviet Union could pursue policies which have produced the foregoing results. Its independence is possibly only because of its economic association with the United States and Western Europe.

Clearly it is in the interests of the United States to do everything practicable to keep it that way.

It seems to me shortsighted for Congress to direct the administration to discriminate against Yugoslavia in withdrawing the normal most-favored-nation provision. We were, of course, piqued by Tito's refusal to criticize the Soviet Union for breaking the test moratorium in 1961. This was one of Belgrade's political mistakes.

But Yugoslavia has often sided with the United States at the U.N. and has more frequently voted with the unalined nations than with the Soviets.

If Congress does not soon reverse its action cutting off Yugoslavia and Poland from normal trade relations, the effect of this policy will be exactly the opposite of what its sponsors said they want. It will not help isolate Eastern Europe from the Soviet Union; it will isolate us from Eastern Europe and abandon the field to the Soviets. Surely this is a policy of retreat, not advance, and a detriment to the national interests and security of the United States.

The choice before us in Eastern Europe today is not between supporting communism on the one hand and democracy on the other. The choice is between governments dominated by Moscow and governments, like Yugoslavia's, which, while Communists, are independent, which are not abetting the Communist conspiracy, and which are pursuing their own national interests—not Russia's national interests.

Our Puzzling Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that our foreign policy bewilders me. The more I see of it, the less I comprehend it. If I were alone in this lack of comprehension I would conclude that the ways of high diplomacy and the State Department simply are too much for a countryman from Nebraska. But I find that my confusion is shared by many of my able colleagues and by others whose views I respect. Even some of my liberal friends, who follow and support our serpentine foreign policy, cannot explain it to their own satisfaction, much less mine.

Let us get down to cases. Tito, the Yugoslav dictator, soon is to visit the United States. We will roll out the proverbial red carpet for him and he will be greeted genially and warmly. Offhand, one would suppose that a real friend and ally had arrived. Yet Tito is not only a dictator, and an absolute dictator, but he is a Communist. As a Communist, he is dedicated to the destruction of our system; in short, to our destruction.

Some years back, Tito broke with Stalin, who wanted to dictate to all Communists and all Communist countries. Our Government hailed this development enthusiastically, and hastened to press aid on Yugoslavia. Not too long before, the dictator's airmen had, without provocation, shot down American planes which were flying near Yugoslavia's borders. Some of our airmen were killed in cold blood. Our Government and people were indignant and upset. But all this seemed to be forgotten when the two Communist dictators fell out.

Over the years, Tito has maintained his independence of Russia, but relations between the two countries have improved and are very close. Not long ago, Khrushchev, Russia's boss, visited Tito. They hugged each other fraternally and left no doubt that any rift between the two countries, if one existed before the meeting, had been closed. Nor is there any doubt that Yugoslavia would be on the Communist side in the event of a general war. I cannot then for the life of me see why we consider it such a blessed privilege to take money from the pockets of our taxpayers to give to the Communist dictator.

In the Washington Post of September 23, Roscoe Drummond wrote glowingly about the high standard of living in Yugoslavia. He said in some areas it is higher than in the Soviet Union itself. He explained that the Yugoslav system is considerably closer to capitalism than the Soviet economy. However, there may be another explanation for Yugoslavia's comparative prosperity. Since 1945, we have given Tito around $2.5 billion, which is no inconsiderable sum even in these days. This $2.5 billion has helped the Yugoslav economy in many ways. We have underwritten communism in Yuogslavia and have underwritten dictatorship. From all indications, we will continue to do so.

In all probability, everything will go smoothly during Tito's visit here. The atmosphere will be cordial. Our liberal newspapers and spokesmen will go out of their way to discover and detail the virtues of the Communist ruler. We have a habit of feting Communist dictators and neutralists here. We even had Khrushchev himself here a few years back and gave him a most hearty reception. Nehru was greeted here with reverence. Afterwards, he launched a savage attack on Portugese Goa and the gloss rubbed off his saintliness. We have held out our arms to Sukarno, the Indonesian tyrant, and to Ben Bella, friend of Castro, who is busy turning Algeria into a socialist state.

Our fawning and truckling before Tito is disgraceful. Our invitation to him is shameful. It all adds up to a policy of appeasement which goes much further than anything which has happened since World War II. The way things are going I would not be surprised to find the White House advocating an aid program for Russia running into the billions.

Very few rightwing dictators get the opportunity to visit this country. If an invitation were extended to Franco, of Spain, he would be greeted, undoubtedly, by a loud and vociferous crowd of hecklers. The Communists would have their bands out. They would be joined by their dupes, the liberals. The Spanish dictator would have a rough trip, I am afraid. He is stanchly anti-Communist, but this would be held against him. In any event, I do not foresee any invitation to Franco any time soon.

Salazar in Portugal is called a dictator but his regime is democratic compared to that of Tito. There would be demonstrations against him all over the place. But if the Portuguese Premier visited us today, he too would have rough going. Nor are we likely to invite Salazar. We are displeased with him. Our State Department thinks he is a colonialist, a very dirty word. He refuses to give up the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique to terrorists from the outside. Portugal says that these two Provinces are as much a part of Portugal as Hawaii and Alaska are part of the United States. We do not pay any attention. We have pressured our European Allies to give up their possessions in Africa. Thirty new states have been created in Africa since the end of World War II. Many of these new countries simply have not the resources necessary for statehood. Others are torn by tribal feuds which have erupted with the end of European rule. The continent of Africa has gone backward as an aftermath of the freedom wave. The new rules do not have the experience necessary to govern. They lack the technicians and administrators formerly supplied by the colonial powers. Moreover, they seem more concerned with their own perequisites and privileges than they are in the welfare of their masses. They live in luxurious fashion while their subjects get poorer and poorer. They would be in a bad way indeed if it were not for the money and help which Britain, France, and Belgium continue to give them.

Some African areas gained independence before they were ready for it, notably the Belgian Congo. The Belgians say we almost literally pushed them out of their former colony. In any case, chaos followed. There have been rape, riots, murder, chaos, and deterioration of the entire economy. Finally, the U.N., that Organization founded to keep world peace, made war on Tshombe, the Katangan leader, and forced him to submit to Cyrille Adoula, the Congo Premier. We backed the U.N. and Adoula and now we are saddled with the bill. Already, we have spent more than $200 million to prevent the former Belgian territory from going completely to pieces. We will spend a good deal more, for things are not getting any better. The well-known African geographer, George H. T. Kimble, says it will take many years to get the Congo back to where it was before it was given the blessing of independence. To all intents and purposes, the Congo is occupied territory. U.N. troops have to stay there to keep any semblance of order. American taxpayers, in addition to paying millions to the Adoula government, will bear most of the cost of the U.N. occupation.

Our stand against colonialism is described as a matter of principle. Even so there are aspects of our policy which puzzle me. Let me cite the case of the Papuans, who live in what used to be Dutch New Guinea, which lies between Indonesia and Australia. The area was a Dutch colony, but we wanted the Dutch to leave, pursuing steadfastly our allegedly noble opposition to colonialism. The Dutch agreed to give up their colony, suggesting that it be made a U.N. ward. About that time Sukarno, also a dictator but leftist, decided he wanted the former Dutch New Guinea. The Papuans are not related to the Indonesians, in any way whatever and there are no economic ties. It seemed plain that Sukarno wanted to make Dutch New Guinea his own colony. Did we stand steadfast and tell the Indonesian dictator that this violated our hallowed principles? Did we tell him that we had labored since World War II to end colonialism and were not about to be any part of a deal which included such a horrendous and immoral arrangement?

To answer my questions briefly, we did not. We helped work out an arrangement which turned the Papuans, who did not have anything to say about the matter, over to Sukarno. Our liberals had a ready and smug explanation. It saved, they said, trouble.

In the New York Times of Sunday, September 22, the respected columnist Arthur Krock, had this to say:

> The fate of the administration's experiment of trying to buy peace in southeast Asia by paying his blackmail price to President Sukarno of Indonesia is, however, no longer in doubt. Once the administration, in concert with Secretary General U Thant of the U.N., condoned and promoted Sukkarno's use of force to annex Dutch New Guinea, in clear violation of the U.N. Charter, the usual effects of surrender to illegal violence were not long in coming. First, Sukarno found too slow the timetable for the award to Indonesia of territory for which it

had neither ethnic nor historical claim. Then he became, if possible, cozier than before with the national agents of world communism definitely including Communist China. Most recently, after attempting and failing to frighten former British possessions from adhering to the peaceful new nation of Malayasia, his troops and police stood by in Jakarta while the mob the Indonesian Government had incited destroyed the British Embassy and endangered the lives of the ambassador and his staff.

"These are the merited and prophesied results of an immoral United States and United Nations policy by which a loyal ally of this country and a people faithful to the Charter were denied even the transport of their own facilities to protect their teeritory from seizure by military aggression.

Incidentally, we have given Sukarno around a billion dollars and we are gently threatening a cutback in blackmail pay unless he stops being such a bad boy.

Our definition of colonialism seems to be a situation where whites rule a colored race. The world's foremost colonial power is Soviet Russia. But we sat supinely while the Russians shot down the Hungarian revolutionists and we seem about to resume cordial relationship with the Russian regime in Hungary. The State Department explains that things have changed and the Russian rule in Hungary is not as burdensome as it used to be. Nor do we seem bothered any longer about Red China's seizure of Tibet.

Bluntly speaking, our anticolonial policy is fraudulent and hypocritical. When it suits the devious ways of our devious and mysterious foreign policies, we not only condone colonialism, we help bring it about. A former U.S. Ambassador to Argentina, Ellsworth Bunker, was one of the principal architects of the Papuan sellout. As for Russian and Red Chinese colonialism, the administration wants nothing said about it. Nor does it want the people in slavery to rebel. That might reveal, as the Hungarian revolution did, that we will do nothing whatever to free the people under the Communist colonial yoke. But we will—and have—worked assiduously to end any semblance of colonialism on the part of our allies. In so doing, we have just about wrecked the continent of Africa, but that seems to make little difference. We are bent on wrecking it completely.

When a country falls into the hands of the Communists, we seem to give it up for dead. The people are ruled by a dictator. They may be oppressed in many ways. There may be a veritable reign of terror, but we do nothing about it, and say very little. The State Department calls for no reappraisal of policies, nor for liberalization of conditions. If there is the slightest sign that the ruler in the particular state has any freedom whatever, we rush forward with money and help. Two examples are Yugoslavia and Poland. We go much further for we are paying blackmail to Castro's admirer, Ben Bella, in Algeria, and Sukarno, also the "neutralist" Nehru.

We cannot even do anything about Cuba, which in effect is a Russian colony off our shores. Actually, we seem more concerned right now with overthrowing the anti-Communist regime in South Vietnam than in getting rid of Castro.

The explanation for our tribute to outright Communist countries is that we might wean them away from communism if we give them enough money. Just how, I do not quite see, since we make no attempt whatever to overthrow the Communist rulers and since our money props up their rule. Tito remains devoutly, stanchly Communist, but we seem to feel we have gained a great victory in our relationship with this Communist toughie. We want to congratulate him personally on letting us subsidize him, which makes things easier for the entire Soviet bloc. This sort of thing is sickening.

But in the case of rightwing dictators things are different. We never let up on them. Batista was anti-Communist but he was a bad man, our liberals said. Undoubtedly they were right, but do they think the Communist Castro is a saint? The attacks on Salazar and Franco go on and on. These rulers are anti-Communist. If they are overthrown, which they may well be, due to our State Department, then we would rush in to subsidize their leftist successors. That is what happened with Ben Bella, the far left Algerian dictator.

Why? Well, judging from the past, the excuse would be that they then would be not quite so communistic, even though they are dictators. But Salazar, Franco, and some other rightists already are anti-Communist. Surely their misgovernment, if it exists, is not any worse than the misgovernment of the communistic dictators. Why do we not try to keep them in power instead of concentrating on their faults? In this connection, a couple of columns by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post of September 23 and 24 raises some very pertinent questions about the situation in Vietnam. They should be read and reread.

My version of the events in Vietnam is that the Communists were beginning to lose the war. They, as they frequently do, decided upon a propaganda diversion. At once, our liberals fell for the ruse and we are upset over the alleged abuses on the part of Vietnam's rulers. For the life of me I cannot understand why our liberals accept Communist misrule and dictatorship so complacently and simply go to pieces when they consider the derelictions of the rightwingers.

To me, it is very significant that Communist organs like the Worker and all the far leftists are not after the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem. They are baying like dogs on a warm scent. I am sorry to say that they seem to have deluded some ordinarily sensible persons.

The Reverend Donald S. Harrington is secretary to a so-called Ministers Vietnam Committee. This outfit has taken full page advertisements in the New York Times and the Washington Post denouncing Diem. I am profoundly suspicious of anything with which the Reverend Harrington is connected. He is executive board chairman of the American Committee on Africa, which apparently wants all the whites run out of Africa and the Portuguese in particular. I think Communist or Communist sympathizers have infiltrated the committee. The Reverend Harrington, himself, has played footsie in the past with Communist causes and is following the Communist party line on Africa. Incredibly enough, some of the Africa Committee's members are advisers to our State Department on African policy. But this is just another in the list which adds up to the fact that much of our foreign policy is incredible.

We are rapidly approaching the point where Khrushchev, who not long ago put missiles in Cuba, will be portrayed to our public as a friendly benevolent gentleman, who wants to end the cold war. We should know better. He is out to bury us. If he signs the nuclear test ban, he doesn't do it to help us. He does it for his own reasons. Tito also would like to pat the shovel in our face, for he is a dedicated Communist. We cannot bribe such men as Sukarno. The overthrow of a rightist dictator and the substitution of a leftist does not solve our problems. This is a dangerous world, test ban treaty or no. Only strength and wariness will save us. If the framers of our foreign policies will only keep some fundamentals in mind, including the fact that we must help our friends, and oppose our enemies, perhaps in time we will have a policy which the average American and I can understand.

I, like any sensible person, want peace. The consequences of nuclear war are horrible to contemplate. But, as I see it, American strength is our only guarantee of peace. We are not the aggressors and the reason for world tension is not atomic weapons but Communist designs for world conquest. If he wanted to, Khrushchev could remove most of the threat of world war tomorrow. He could pull out of Cuba, end the Berlin and West German controversies and many other rows which could at any time, flare into major conflict. While the Red Chinese are active and belligerent, they do not have atomic weapons. They are not the real source of martial peril.

The test ban treaty is taken by the United States on faith, and faith is a poor platform from which to deal with the Communists. We restrict the development of weapons which may be necessary to save us from slavery, or destruction. The Russians know this, in my opinion, and know the treaty gives them an advantage. Otherwise, they would not sign it.

The danger of fallout from testing in the atmosphere has been exaggerated until it befuddles our people and paralyzes our capacity for vigorous and constructive action. In signing the test ban treaty, we have risked a lot; insofar as we know the Russians have risked nothing. Now, let us wait for the next move. Once again, I am afraid, we will be asked to take the risk. The argument has been made that to continue the development of nuclear weapons means atomic war. If this is true nothing less than total disarmament will save us, and in the face of the Communist challenge this is not only asinine, it is impossible. Let me repeat, the only hope for peace lies in our strength.

First SBA Public Service Award Presented to Rulon Nagely of North American Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Honorable Eugene P. Foley, presented that agency's first Public Service Award on September 25, 1963, to Mr. Rulon Nagely, vice president, materiel, North American Aviation, Inc. This award has been established to recognize the contributions of those like Mr. Nagely to the programs of the Small Business Administration and to the small business community.

I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the Administrator's remarks upon the presentation of the award to Mr. Nagely:

FIRST SBA PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD PRESENTED TO RULON NAGELY, OF NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION

Remarks by Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in presenting the first SBA public service award September 25 to Rulon Nagely, vice president, materiel, of North American Aviation, Inc.:

The Public Service Award that we're awarding here today is for outstanding service to the SBA or to the Nation's small business community by individuals large or small or other organizations outside of the Federal Government. Mr. Nagely, as I indicated, is the first recipient of this award. He was born in Salt Lake City, Utah, too many years ago and he first entered the aircraft industry in 1937 as purchasing agent for Vultee Aircraft. In 1941 he joined North American as purchasing agent and was appointed director of materiel in 1944, corporate director of materiel in 1951 and was elected to his present position of vice president, materiel, in 1960. He is member of the Aerospace Industries Association's Materiels Committee, the National Association of Purchasing Agents, and the Department of Defense Small Business Industry Advisory Committee. I am going to outline here just very briefly Mr. Nagely's background in the small business field and why we feel that of all the people in the country he most deserves the first Public Service Award. Put in a nutshell Rulon Nagely is not what you might call a "can't doer." He recognizes problems and he decided to do something about them. First thing is, he made an effort to develop prime and subcontract opportunities for small businesses in the areospace industry. He gave active support to the SBA's programs for small firms and he contributed service on an industry-Government task force which increased small business' share of defense and subcontract awards. He has worked closely with the SBA, he has been a strong force in the establishment and successful operation of the voluntary source referral program.

As vice chairman of the SBA industry task force and by his activities on other working committees, Mr. Nagely has been of inestimable assistance in the development of the subcontracting program. As a leader in the aircraft industry, North American Aviation was one of the first companies instituting a voluntary program of developing subcontracting opportunities in direct cooperation with SBA. With the cooperation of Mr. Nagely and his company, our agency has been able to develop and improve its program of assistance to small firms to the prime contractors through increased facilities of competitive sources. He has been active in sponsoring Small Business participation in defense products since 1951, and he is one of the original members in the Air Force Industry Committee established to formulate policies and practices to assist small business. Mr. Nagely worked with the Air Force in 1959 in developing the Air Force industry voluntary small business subcontracting program which provided better control of small business subcontracting through the use of a buyers checklist. It has also established more effective control over small business subcontracting programs of North American Aviation's major suppliers.

This program, unique at the time, is now common practice throughout the industry. North American has developed a recognized major six point program fully supplemented and supported to develop maximum small business subcontract opportunities in support of and in cooperation with SBA's programs. In 1962 North American's total small business purchases amounted to $305 million or 37.5 percent of the aggregate purchases of its company. These contracts went to 11,851 small companies and 2,126 large concerns. From 1951 through 1962 North American's dollar commitment to small businesses has averaged 46 percent of total dollar value of all contracts. It is a stated policy of North American to expand their small business policies and procedures to assure, and I'm quoting, "that small business will have an opportunity to participate through successive tiers of subcontracting programs we are managing and too, that small business will continue to receive a fair proportion of the commitments made directly by the company. Existing procedures to implement the policies, especially in the area of weapon system procurement, will be amended from time to time to assure us maximum participation by small business in these programs." So in recognition of all of this, our agency with Mr. Maness' cooperation and consent, has decided to award this first Public Service Award by the SBA to Rulon Nagely. We are very, very happy and very proud to make this presentation.

If you want to read the scroll it says "The United States of America—Small Business Administration presents this Public Service Award to Rulon Nagely in appreciation of outstanding service rendered to this agency for the small business communities of the Nation." Signed "Irving Maness" and "Eugene Foley."

Address of Hon. William G. Bray, of Indiana, at the Old Country Festival, by Mutual Aid Association of the New Polish Immigration of Chicago—Chicago, Ill., September 8, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana, BILL BRAY, recently addressed the Mutual Aid Association of the New Polish Immigration of Chicago, at its annual Old Country Festival.

His remarks indicate his thorough knowledge and understanding of the plight of the captive nations of Eastern Europe and Asia, and give added evidence of the need for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. I insert his speech into the RECORD at this point, for the attention of the Members:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY, OF INDIANA, AT THE OLD COUNTRY FESTIVAL, BY MUTUAL AID ASSOCIATION OF THE NEW POLISH IMMIGRATION OF CHICAGO—CHICAGO, ILL., SEPTEMBER 8, 1963

The greatness of America lies in the fact that races throughout the world have sent their pioneers to our shores—each bringing a bit of their heritage with them. You who came from Poland brought with you a religious zeal and a love of individual freedom and dignity that has been exceeded nowhere; and I am happy and proud that that tradition of freedom has become a part of our national structure.

In addition to these spiritual qualities you have brought a desire for economic stability and a culture that is rich in fine art, music, science; you brought a strong physical vigor that is the pride of football teams from coast to coast.

You brought with you a heritage of courage in battle. There is not a combat battalion in the American wars that did not carry Polish names. It was Sgt. Alexander Drabik, who earned the Distinguished Service Cross at Remaagen Bridge. There were two Polish-Americans on the raft with Rickenbacker. Col. Francis Gabryszewski was one of the greatest aces of World War II. I could go on with this list for hours.

I do want to point out that heroic Polish blood mixed with the colonial blood in the Revolutionary War. Two great heroes who fought for Polish independence also were outstanding leaders in the fight for American independence. Pulaski and Kosciusko are so revered for their contributions to our national independence that two counties in my native State of Indiana are named for these great Polish heroes.

In speaking of Polish heroes, one can never forget the name of John Sobieski, who defeated the great Turkish wave of invasion at the gates of Vienna and saved Central and Northern Europe for Christendom. Neither can one forget that it was the heroic leadership of Joseph Pilaudski that defeated the Communist army in 1920 after Poland had obtained their freedom from Russia 2 years earlier, after 143 years of foreign occupation.

Russia's unfortunate proximity to Poland has caused untold suffering and debasement to Poland. Back in 1763 Tsarina Catherine of Russia had planned a partitioning of Poland. Following a typical Russian pattern, she interfered as the protector of the Russian Orthodox Church (as against the Roman Catholic Church of Poland). Russia also participated in the partitioning of Poland in 1783 and 1795.

Poland revolted against her oppressors many times and despite armed suppression first by the tsars and now by the Soviets, has remained dedicated to Polish nationalism and freedom. Poland steadfastly refused to accept communism and prospered far more than her Russian neighbor during her period of freedom in the 1920's and 1930's. Although having been jammed between Germany and Russia by the misfortune of geography, Poland maintained a friendly relation with each.

The end of this freedom for Poland came in 1939 when Soviet diplomats encouraged Hitler to wage war against Poland while at the same time encouraging Polish resistance to Germany by promising Russian assistance. Germany attacked Poland on September 1, 1939, with 87 divisions. Seventeen days

later, 100 Russian divisions moved across the Polish eastern frontier while Polish troops were fighting the Germans on the other frontier.

Russia never intended that there should be a free Poland. She intended that Poland should remain a controlled, regimented satellite under Russia. Since Teheran it has been apparent that Russia has intended to keep military control of East Germany. To accomplish this it was necessary for her to keep control of Poland—Poland was on Russia's road to the West.

RUSSIA INTENDED TO KEEP POLISH PEOPLE IN SUBJUGATION

The postwar bitterness of the Polish people has demonstrated that only the presence of Russian armed forces will keep these countries in the Russian orbit. Russian strategy was directed toward only one goal, the enslavement of Poland.

Though there are many instances which emphasize the point that Russia intends to keep Poland under subjugation, I should like to recall two of the most infamous. In April of 1943, an episode occurred in Russo-Poland relations which still plagues Russia and is especially embarrassing to her "parlor pink" friends in the Western world. Thousands of Polish officers, the elite of the educated young men of Poland, were missing, presumably killed in the war. However, evidence began to point out the fact that Russia had murdered them en masse. In 1952 a Select Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, after thorough investigation and a well-documented report, "The Katyn Forest Massacre" (H. Rept. No. 2505) found that: "beyond any question of reasonable doubt, the Soviet NKVD committed the mass murder of the Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, Russia."

Because Stalin didn't intend that there should ever be a free Poland, he had these 15,000 officers, together with other leading Polish citizens, murdered in the Katyn Forest.

The second incident occurred as the Russians were advancing toward the capture of Warsaw. The Polish underground that had been bitterly and effectively fighting Germany was making preparations for a mass revolt to assist the oncoming Russian army. At 8:15 p.m. on July 24, 1944, a radio station in Moscow named "Kosciuszko" called upon the Polish people to arise and assist in expelling the Germans. "Poles, the time of liberation is at hand. Poles, to arms. There is not a moment to lose." Two days later the Polish people in Warsaw arose and fought valiantly; but the Russian army stopped its advance toward Warsaw in order to allow the German Army to massacre the poorly armed Poles.

Many thousands of Poles were killed and Warsaw was destroyed while the Russian army encamped 6 miles away. This tragic battle of the Polish people for freedom will go down in history as one of the great epics in courage of our age.

In the fall of 1961, I stood where the Soviet army had been encamped in 1944, and looked across the Vistula River where I could plainly see Warsaw. It was evident that the Russian army could have assisted the Polish underground as promised if they had chosen to do so.

POLISH PEOPLE RESIST COMMUNISM

While on my visit to Poland in 1961, I was much impressed with the manner in which the farms are being operated. The fence rows are clean; the livestock are well kept. In spite of the constant government pressure, more than 85 percent of the farms are individually owned and operated. They are producing better than the state-owned farms. The Soviets are attempting to furnish mechanical equipment which would subject the farmer to Russian control and would ultimately mean that the Communists could take over the farms. The Poles stubbornly resist and still use fine horses.

Perhaps the strongest factor in resisting the Communist takeover is the Catholic Church. Cathedral and church spires still dominate the skylines of Polish cities and villages; and those churches are not empty or abandoned. They were built by the sacrifices of the people and they are now being repaired and maintained by sacrifices.

If the Polish people were given the opportunity for a truly free election, I am certain that the vote would be 20 to 1 for freedom and against communism. From my observations, I know that all of the Soviet massacres, regimentation, and armed might have not eliminated the stubborn love of freedom that exists in the Polish people.

In America the destruction of Polish freedom perhaps has aroused more bitterness than any other single act of Russian tyranny. Our large Polish population and your unrelenting zeal for freedom have gained the respect of the American people.

Here in America we so much need to have your Polish understanding of Russia and Russian tactics incorporated into our national thinking. Your people have a wealth of such understanding.

If you will pardon a personal example, in research for my recent book "Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev," I found a book written by Wlodzmierz Baczkowski, "Toward an Understanding of Russia." He is a most learned Polish scholar and authority on Russian behavior, and fought against Russia in World War II. This book was written before he came to America. There are only a few copies, but I found it gave a better understanding of Russia than any other single publication I have ever seen. It should be required reading for all members of our State Department. I regret to say that they are not following the warnings of Baczkowski.

UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE OFFENSIVE

Our country is failing to utilize our greatest and strongest weapon in the cold war. For too long we have allowed the Soviets to take the initiative, to keep on the offensive. For too long we have merely tried to answer their false charges, to repair the damage made by the Soviet blasts against the dike of freedom. Our leadership apparently believes that if we yield and give enough to the Russians, the Kremlin will change.

We do have a weapon that will throw the Soviets on the defensive in the cold war if we have the courage to use it to the fullest. This weapon is the demand that Russia give to the captive nations a freedom of choice—allow these peoples to vote for the kind of government they want and to elect the officials they want.

Russia is constantly demanding that we negotiate with her. Our leaders apparently refuse to recognize that negotiations with the Kremlin mean that Russia will keep what she has and negotiate for what we have.

When Russia wants to negotiate, let's give her a strong answer. Yes, we will negotiate; let's negotiate as to when she will give freedom to Poland and the other captive nations. When will she allow them the right to vote? When will she allow them the rights guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta Declaration, both of which Russia accepted?

We should demand that Poland and the captive nations have their freedom. This demand should not be stated just once; it must be repeated a million times—in the legislative forums of the free world, from the rostrum of the United Nations, by the press, radio, and television throughout the world. It should be beamed hourly to the captive nations. If we will publicize the truth with the same vigor that Russia publicizes her lies, truth will win.

The demand for free elections is one that Russia cannot openly refuse and yet one which she knows she can never accept and still keep the people of these captive nations under her dictatorship. Russia well knows that if freedom of choice were given the people of these nations that they would vote overwhelmingly for freedom. The demand that Russia allow her captive peoples the right of free choice will put her on the defensive as nothing else will.

Let us lead from our strength to Russia's weakness. Our greatest strength, the strength that has made America what it is today, is the recognition of the freedom and dignity of man. It is the recognition of freedom and dignity that has made America so strong economically that our problems are those of surplus while the Communists' problems are those of continuing scarcities. Our freedom has been so successful that we must regulate the number of those who would come to America, while Russian communism must erect walls of stone and barbed wire backed up by bayonets to keep her people within.

RUSSIAN EMPIRE ATTEMPTS TO COMBINE MANY NATIONALITIES

This Russian empire, held together by force, is the last conglomerate empire, composed of peoples with no racial, geographic, or linguistic reasons for their association. What Russia is really attempting to do is to teach 46 nationalities who speak 61 different languages that they should be happy children under the "one mother, great Russia," and accept the guidance of the "elder brother," the Russians. Millions have been murdered, millions starved or banished to alien areas; millions enslaved, all to make subject people grateful to be the children of "mother Russia" and live under the direction of the "elder brother."

Will Russia ever change? We have indications that the Russian people are changing as they become aware, through education and contacts, of a better and happier life among the people of the free nations. But the rulers of the Kremlin, operating an empire to satisfy their own greed and lust for power, will not change until the people, both Russian and captive, demand a government responsive to their own needs instead of one which exists for the gain and glory of the new class, the commissars.

The so-called Rostow paper is a study by Walt W. Rostow, Special Deputy Assistant to the President on Security Affairs, which reputedly arrives at the conclusion that the United States should work toward the removal of tensions, oppositions and troubles confronting Khrushchev with the captive peoples.

Aside from those with a line directly into our State Department, no one knows exactly what is included in the Rostow paper. I called our State Department and asked for a copy but was told that it was secret and was, in effect, for departmental use only. While we cannot as yet learn the exact content of the Rostow paper, from a study of his philosophy and from his other writings, we have reason to believe that it suggests a softer attitude toward Russia.

Will the Rostow approach succeed in bettering our interests and those of the freedom-loving peoples of the world? Such yielding to Russia in the past has not brought better conditions or economic or political gain for those who adopted such an approach.

For the last 2 years various Members of Congress have been attempting to establish a Captive Nations Committee, to study, document, and publicize the continued Russian subjection of peoples of the captive nations. Our State Department has strongly opposed and so far has blocked the formation of such a committee. I would like to point out and pay tribute to a Congressman, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, from this city, of Polish descent, who has been the most

vigilant fighter for the formation of this important "Captive Nations Committee."

Another shameful example of our yielding to Russia was the action taken on December 20, 1962. On that day the U.S. delegation to the United Nations made a motion to eliminate the reports of Sir Leslie Munro in the future. Russia had maneuvered for more than 3 years to eliminate these reports because they were well-documented reports of the continuing Soviet persecution of the Hungarian people.

The U.N. had appointed Sir Leslie Munro of Australia to make this investigation. Each year he had presented documented information that proved Hungary is not a free country but is controlled by the Kremlin through a heavy concentration of Russian armed forces.

These reports kept before the people of the captive nations as well as the free world the fact that, despite sweet talk and promises, Hungary is still a Russian police state.

A somewhat similar line of thinking is shown in a study that was made for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and was recently filed by President Kennedy in the second annual report of this agency to the Congress of the United States. While this statement has not been announced an approved policy, its philosophy is startlingly similar to a line of thinking all too prevalent in the State Department today. I quote from that report:

"Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200 million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918."

If the peoples of the world would forsake their liberty to give absolute obedience to one master, then we might have world order; but we certainly would be slaves. Is that the kind of world that we want today? I know that it is not the goal that I want, and I know it is not the goal of the Polish people.

I know that it would not be the answer of the 15,000 Polish patriots who were murdered by the Russians at Katyn. I know that it would not be the answer given by the untold millions who have died to achieve and to maintain freedom from the tyrants, the "men on horseback," through the centuries.

FREEDOM MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

Freedom is the most priceless heritage of man and it is also the most expensive. In every age there have been those who through force of arms or honeyed promises or treachery would take away the freedom of man.

You from Poland know from centuries of experience that the Russian Government cannot be trusted. You know that the commissars of today are following the same ruthless greed for territory and power that was followed by the tsars of the Rurik and Romanoff dynasties for centuries before them. The Polish people know that the Kremlin respects only two things—strength and determination. You of Polish ancestry need to make all in America aware of the tragic experiences of Poland in dealing with Russia.

Unless we understand and face up to the cold war challenge of this reactionary, imperialistic power of Russia; unless we expose in detail the atrocities toward and the subjugation of the whole family of captive nations from the Danube to the Pacific, and even Cuba; unless we develop a strategy to assist all the captive nations on the principle of indivisible freedom, we will not only have to answer the question "Who will be next on the long list of captive nations?" but we also will have to prepare more than ever for the increasing possibility of a hot global war.

Yes, the challenge ahead of us is great, but the goal is worth the price.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 31st of a series of articles on why "Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho."

My last few articles on Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending Bonneville's power marketing area into southern Idaho have utilized a few of the many editorials and newspaper articles on why southern Idaho does not want Bonneville. Today I shall dip into the pile of letters I have received from southern Idahoans who are very much opposed to the Bonneville invasion.

Not to be outdone by her husband, Mrs. Willis C. Brassey, of Boise, Idaho, sent along a letter of her own to join with Mr. Brassey's letter commending me for opposing the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho.

The two letters are as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I wish to join my husband in urging you to continue your commonsense American program in Congress, especially with the public power issue. We do not need Bonneville power or any other public power program. Our Government should never enter any field of business where private enterprise can handle the situation. The Idaho Power Co. is very ably taking care of southern Idaho power needs.

I personally think that our Government is trying to control all private business, State affairs, and personal affairs. How much nearer to communism can one get?

Sincerely,

MARY J. BRASSEY.

BOISE, IDAHO.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SAYLOR: I hope you will continue your valiant fight in opposition to bringing Bonneville power to southern Idaho. We are served by a fine power company and there is not, nor has there been, a power shortage in our area.

This so called aid (foreign) which is really, aid to the aiders, and other fool spending programs is rapidly spending us down the river to socialism and slavery. I hope you and other sensible Congressmen will be successful in blocking building of any lines whatever, to bring Government power to southern Idaho.

Yours most respectfully,

W. C. BRASSEY.

P.S.—Am neither a stockholder or employee of Idaho Power Co.

David Bivens of Payette, Idaho, says that there are very few who are so nearsighted as to want Bonneville power. He thinks and rightly so, that if Bonneville's going to compete with the private power company, there should be a law to make Bonneville pay the same taxes and be required to operate out of the red.

PAYETTE, IDAHO,
August 4, 1963.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is certainly a pleasure to read of your work in opposition of the advance of Bonneville power into Idaho. We have heard that there is talk by our Representatives and one Senator from our State that everyone in Idaho is in favor of Bonneville power.

I am writing this letter to let you know that there are actually very few who are too nearsighted as to want Bonneville power.

I am always interested in cutting operating costs, in our farming operation we do use a lot of electrical power for pumping, etc. However, I am very much opposed to competition by a tax-free governmental agency who operates in the red at the cost of all taxpayers.

The loss of tax revenue from our local independent power company in our county would mean additional taxes for us to support our county schools. Last year Idaho Power Co. paid roughly $30,000 in taxes in our county.

And our county is the smallest in our State.

If Bonneville Power Administration is going to sell power in competition to private power companies I feel there should be a law requiring the same tax be paid by each and that the Government agency operate out of the red.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

DAVID BIVENS.

Mr. J. P. Watson of Parma, Idaho, who is in the fruit and vegetable business, says that if Bonneville power is cheaper it is "because some of us taxpayers are being charged the difference."

PARMA, IDAHO,
August 5, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We here in Idaho now are experiencing the invasion of public power by means of Bonneville Dam into our State. Our power resources are being and have been developed by the Idaho Power Co.

We know of no shortage of power through this area and see no reason why we should have the expense of Government subsidized power competing with private industry. If the power is any cheaper, it is certainly because some of us taxpayers are being charged the difference.

We would appreciate your efforts in protecting private enterprise in our area.

Yours very truly,

J. C. WATSON CO.,
J. F. WATSON.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part III of the series

titled "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1," which follows:

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

POLLUTED AIR CAN RUIN CITIES, FARMS

(By Ian McNett)

Air pollution picks everybody's pockets.

Figures have been tossed around claiming air pollution costs the Nation from $1 billion to $18 billion a year.

The latest of these figures was $7 billion a year mentioned by Dr. Luther H. Terry, Surgeon General of the United States, in his opening remarks to "Let's Clear the Air," the National Conference on Air Pollution held last December in Washington.

Using Dr. Terry's figure and rounding the U.S. population to 180 million, a quick calculation shows air pollution would cost every person in the United States $38 a year. Using the $18 billion figure, the cost would be $100 per person a year.

All these figures mean, say the experts, is that air pollution costs a lot of money in places where the costs can't be calculated.

For example, how do you figure the economic loss to a city when a highly skilled, highly paid worker takes one look, a couple of whiffs and decides to take his talents elsewhere?

The community loses more than taxes on his salary and property, or money he would spend in stores. It loses the talents and potential leadership qualities that every community needs.

The problem is especially pressing in Perth Amboy. This city's air pollution problem is acute, according to the Smith Associates report.

A city with an acute air pollution problem not only loses potential new residents, but higher paid local residents move to the suburbs as quickly as they can. Almost every city has the same problem.

Industries will not locate in a community with a serious air pollution problem. They have difficulty attracting highly skilled workers. And pollution presents a special problem for some industries. Pollution causes odors in certain foods such as lard or shortening.

The brightest and most adaptable young people tend to flee from areas with high air pollution concentrations. Most people, if they have a choice, refuse to live among filthy streets and deteriorating buildings.

A downward spiral started by air pollution is hard to stop. Grime and odors depress property values. Lower property values mean fewer tax revenues for education, streets, fire protection, and other municipal services.

As these services diminish more people leave. Those left behind either can't afford to escape, or are older residents who have roots in the town. Many of those who remain lack sufficient skills to get good jobs.

BUSINESS SUFFERS

Out-of-town shoppers are discouraged from patronizing businesses in a community with an air pollution problem. Tourists pass through and stop for the night in a cleaner area, depriving restaurants, hotels, motels, and tourist homes of business and money.

But there is really no escape. Today's jobs are in urban areas. Most people can't afford to live far enough away to get out from under the pall of smoke, soot, dust, and chemicals.

They don't trade polluted city air for unpolluted suburban air, but only for less polluted suburban air. Last December's temperature inversion covered most of the Middle Atlantic coast suburbs and even the countryside got a taste of air pollution. And with more pollutants coming from more automobiles, the suburbs catch it, even on nice days.

How do you measure the mental costs of people who live in polluted areas; who cough and hack when pollutants attack their nose, throat, and lungs, and who cry when pollution irritates their eyes?

There are other incalculable costs of air pollution. The housewife doesn't fill out a form and send it to Washington or Trenton every time she cleans her rugs, washes her windows, or scrubs her woodwork.

She probably doesn't think about air pollution as she performs these tasks. But she performs them more often because of air pollution.

A man washes his car on a bright sunny afternoon. There is no wind and no rain. He returns a few hours later and runs a finger along the surface, leaving a shiny path through a fine layer of dust. He may not know it, but air pollution dirtied his clean car.

People send clothing to the cleaners and laundry more often than they would if there were no air pollution.

And how do you measure the embarrassment of office girls in Richmond, Va., and St. Petersburg, Fla., whose nylons disintegrated while they were at work? Chemical analysis showed the stocking had been heavily fumigated with sulfur dioxide while the girls were walking to work.

FARMERS AFFECTED TOO

All these are urban problems, and a farmer might be a little smug, having chosen the clean fresh air of rural life.

But air pollution is also attacking the farming industry, especially in New Jersey and California.

Crops in New Jersey yield the highest cash value per acre of any State in the Union. Certain high-yield crops are extremely sensitive to air pollutants.

Dr. Robert Daines, professor of plant pathology at Rutgers University, probably knows more about air pollution damage to crops than anyone in the State, and maybe the Nation.

He has been working on the problem since 1946. He says Rutgers was the first university in the United States, and probably the world, that studied the effects of air pollution on plants.

Dr. Daines says sulfur dioxide emissions from industry used to be the big culprit in crop damage from air pollution. There are still a few areas where industrial pollution is a problem, he says, but it is much less a problem now that it used to be.

"In recent years, the problem involves a new group of pollutants—the oxidants," Dr. Daines says. "They come from any fire that burns—leaves, gas in the cylinders of automobiles, home fires, or the fires that power industry.

"We've found that automobile exhausts are very high in oxidants."

Under the action of sunlight, nitrogen dioxide breaks down and forms aldehydes that cause eye watering and burning throats, Dr. Daines explains. The other product is a chemical called PAN, which burns vegetation very severely.

CROPS DAMAGED

Ozone is another product of the action of sunlight that damages vegetation, Dr. Daines says. Connecticut tobacco growers reported a $1 million a year loss from ozone damage, before they found a strain of tobacco that is resistant to ozone, Dr. Daines says.

"Driving out agriculture would cause a substantial economic loss to New Jersey," Dr. Daines says, "People say the midwestern farmers can feed the country, but a time is coming when their crops will also be hurt by pollutants.

"The problem is already important in crop losses, especially in young sensitive plants. It will grow increasingly more severe as the years go by and bring more autos and greater concentrations of people.

"I am concerned about what will happen 10 years from now unless some kind of action is taken. We have no suggestion from any quarter whether agriculture can survive in highly polluted areas. We've got to find a control for air pollution.

"A day will come when all agriculture will be in the injury range of large cities. We can't be passive."

How much does air pollution cost farmers?

Dr. Daines says, "I don't know if any estimates given of damages are worth much. A U.S. Department of Agriculture man said recently at a conference that crop damage amounted to hundreds of million of dollars a year in the continental United States.

"All that means to me is there is quite a bit of damage. His estimate is as good as any. It is hard to make an accurate estimate."

Let's Not Be Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in view of recent developments between the United States and Soviet Russia—the test ban treaty signing and now the discussion of wheat sales—my constituents are becoming uneasy lest the United States be drawn into a state of euphoria over Russia that well might not be in the best national interest. This uneasiness is being expressed in many ways but none of them quite so articulately as expressed in the accompanying editorial taken from a newspaper of general circulation within my State, the Omaha Stockman's Journal of October 1, 1963. The editorial follows:

LET'S NOT BE FOOLED

If we don't miss our guess too far, it is quite likely that Americans are about to behold a grand Indian summer rapprochement with Soviet Russia reminiscent of the great United States-Russia togetherness binge of World War II days. And if such a mood of warm good feeling develops, as it appears to be doing now, it is going to take an awful lot of individual straight thinking on the part of all Americans to keep a clear image of the Communists as the ruthless apostles of totalitarianism that they really are.

Apostles and fuzzy thinkers are already painting a big picture, trying to gloss over the defficiencies of dictatorships on the way to making them more acceptable to good Americans.

For example, a nationally respected news commentator recently noted that Russia is probably headed for a bad harvest, but that "in all fairness," much of the blame must be attributed to "the poor climate." He failed to mention, however, that the poor harvest in prospect will be the fifth in a row, and if it weren't for the opening up of new lands to cultivation, Russian agriculture could be said to be in a virtual state of stagnation.

Experts, however, are not limited to this apology for Russian farm failures. They point out that "Soviet farming is much less abundantly supplied with tractors and other farm implements, fertilizer, herbicides, fungicides, etc.—in short, with capital and modern technology," than we are. Nothing is said, of course, of the fact that the Russians have had the same 45 years that we have had to develop all these things, but they have not done so.

These and other apologies for Russian failures usually lead up to the classic general apology of all. That is that the Communists (not just Russians, but all Communists) have been really just misguided. They are like adolescent boys and are merely in "a stage" in their progress toward commonsense "adulthood." It is implied that once they see the light, they will, of course, all become free enterprisers. All it takes on our part is reasonableness and good will.

But this is utter nonsense. We know by their own statements that Communists are dedicated to dictatorship of the proletariat, which can be conveniently shortened to dictatorship, period. We know that in actual fact, privileged classes of gangsters operate Communist countries, and that these gangsters are ruthless, cunning, utterly self-serving, faithless, and unreliable. And we must not fall for their bunk—especially when they talk about agriculture.

Let's not forget that the Canadians have a poor climate for raising food, too. But they have managed to come up with huge wheat surpluses. Let's not forget that the Scandinavian countries have a northern clime and a socialist bent, yet they manage societies of abundance.

Let's not forget that the Russians have had almost a half century to build an agricultural industry as well as a housing industry, consumer goods industry, steel industry and armament industry, and so far they haven't matched us in any of these things. Certainly, they have had the same 18 years the Japanese and Germans have had to develop a food industry. But bread is in tight supply in huge Russia today, while overcrowded Japan is self-sufficient in rice—unbelievable as it may seem.

Let's face it and capitalize on it. Communism is a failure as a system. Democracy is a success; free enterprise is a success. Yes, we may have a thaw in the cold war, but communism is still dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, true democracy and liberty. Let's not rush to bail the Communists out of their troubles—food troubles or otherwise—unless it is to our real advantage. Let's keep our heads and remember that the last time we were all good friends, the Russians stole half of Germany, most of the Balkans, took a Japanese island, and declared they won the war by themselves. Since then, they have tried to run us out of Berlin; they have put a base at our back door; and have threatened us almost without ceasing. It takes more than one swallow to make a summer. It should take more than one test ban treaty and one Canadian wheat deal to make a Communist a good guy.

Jefferson Military College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of the Register, published at Baton Rouge, contains an interesting article on Jefferson Military College located at Washington, Miss.

Jefferson Military College is a private school with high academic standards. It has a long and illustrious history. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article.

The article follows:

HISTORY AND TRADITION ARE HALLMARKS OF JEFFERSON

(By Orene Muse)

Framed by huge, moss-hung oaks, Jefferson Military College, at Washington, Miss.—just 100 miles from Baton Rouge—is a private institution with historical and military background extending back to 1 year before the Louisiana Purchase and some 15 years before Mississippi became a State. The college was chartered in 1802, the very same year that the U.S. Military Academy was established at West Point, N.Y.

Recognized for its fine scholastic standards backed by military training and strict discipline, the institution attracts college preparatory students from all over the United States, as well as from several foreign countries. The classes are presently limited to cadets from the 7th through 12th grades.

There is a certain spit and polish typical of the military which is immediately recognized by the visitor arriving at Jefferson College in Mississippi. It is evident in the manner—and the manners—of the less than 100 cadets who are enrolled for the coming term. It comes to full flower when the regiment is seen on parade on the picturesque campus at nearby towns for special events or nationally spotlighted as the college was in 1953 when Jefferson cadets were invited to march in the Louisiana Purchase celebration in New Orleans.

All of this, of course, leads to a certain pride of school, of belonging to a "crack outfit," among cadets who are privileged to be part of this private institution.

DISTINGUISHED PERSONALITY HEADS OLD SCHOOL

Welcoming cadets back to its campus—and enrolling new boys for the 1963–64 school year—is the president and superintendent, Rear Adm. Marcy M. Dupre, Jr., U.S. Navy (retired) and members of the staff. The personable head of the institution, graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, has had a long and distinguished career afloat as well as important shore duty, including three periods of service on the faculty of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, serving in the departments of economics, government, mathematics, electrical engineering, and physics.

The plan at Jefferson has always been to keep the classes there small enough so that cadets may receive individual attention. That this has been an exceedingly successful plan is seen in the records made by students who have received their college preparatory training there.

Speaking with pride of the history of the school, and of the high scholastic and military achievements of former students, Admiral Dupre pointed out that only students of the highest type are accepted at this college which was chartered as a private institution. It is, also, nonsecetarian, nonpolitical, and noncommercial. The courses are designed, he said, to emphasize scholarship. In addition, he pointed out, the school has always had as one of its goals to cultivate in each cadet a keen sense of responsibility not only to the school, but to society, as well.

"The faculty of Jefferson is particularly well equipped to prepare candidates for entrance to Annapolis, West Point, or the Air Force academy," he added.

SCHOOL IS SOUTHERN AS REBEL YELL

As southern as a rebel yell, the Jefferson Military College has all of the charm of a small, closely knit school where everybody knows everybody else. Close friendships—and warm camaraderie—are invaluable "fringe benefits" of this small college where the cultural and social side of student life has a definite place. The college cooperates with the Middleton School of Dancing in Natchez with instruction available to cadets on Saturdays. It is not difficult to understand why the dancing classes are so popular—Mrs. Thomas Middleton arranges her classes so that cadets may meet young women from outstanding homes in the area. These young women may also be invited to the dances which are held on campus.

It is considered a high honor for cadets to be chosen to participate in the Jefferson Tableau of the Pageant which is held in Natchez as a part of the annual Pilgrimage each year. Only those who qualify in manner and grace are chosen. Naturally, there is much rivalry among students for this honor.

The college yearbook, which is completely a student activity and is called "Shipmates," always has a hard-working staff. In this annual year book is reflected some of the interesting extracurricular activities including pictures made at the yearly soirees at Jefferson, the Christmas dancing party, and the like.

INTRODUCTION TO HISTORY IS STORY OF JEFFERSON

It is an introduction to the history of their country for cadets to learn about their college which was chartered more than 160 years ago. Established by an act of the legislature of the Territory of Mississippi, passed May 13, 1802, the college was named for Thomas Jefferson, president of the United States and President of the American Philosophical Society.

Some 34 of the Territory's most prominent men were its founders, including Gov. W. C. C. Claiborne, Col. Anthony Hutchins, Dr. David Kerr and Mr. William Dunbar. The original charter gave the trustees, who serve without pay, the privilege of choosing their successors and it is believed by many that this inherited honor was one of the factors which has assured its continuity.

A little more than a year after the chartering, the Territory legislature meeting in Washington passed an act establishing a permanent site for Jefferson College. The site, donated for the purpose by the Foster and Gibson families, included Ellicott's Spring, named for a former U.S. Government surveyor who received possession of the Mississippi Territory from the Spanish authorities and determined the line of demarkation between the United States and the Spanish province of West Florida.

Cadets like to point out to guests the famed Aaron Burr oaks, just inside the campus gate. It was here in 1807, they will tell the visitor, where the unfortunate Burr was given his preliminary hearing following his arrest on his flatboat flotilla just above Natchez. They will also point with a certain pride—regardless of individual State of origin—to the handsome monument erected by the Mississippi Legislature in 1935. This monument thus officially marks the spot where on December 10 the Convention of 1817 drafted the constitution under which the Congress of the United States admitted the Mississippi Territory into the Union.

"You see," one of them is bound to say with pride, "Jefferson College campus is truly the birthplace of the State of Mississippi."

FAMOUS NAMES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH BACKGROUND

There are famous names associated with the background of this private school which is located near Baton Rouge. For instance, it is reported that Gen. Andrew Jackson camped on the Jefferson College campus in 1815 when going to—and returning from—the Battle of New Orleans. Records indicate, too, cadets will tell you, that General Lafayette visited the college in 1825 and reviewed the cadets in drill. (At that time military drill and discipline was an extracurricular activity.) Several years before this—during the term of 1822–23—the faculty included among others a drawing master by the name of John James Audubon, who was

later to become the world famous artist and naturalist. That same session, or thereabouts, (or so legend has it) a certain Mr. Joseph H. Ingram, later to become one of the prominent clergymen of his time as well as author of pirate stories, was a member of the Jefferson College faculty.

Jefferson College has gone through six great wars, including the Civil War when the college buildings were taken over by Federal forces and occupied for nearly 3 years. It was involved in the Indian Wars in Alabama as well as the Texas Revolution. It has seen disastrous overflows, the horror of yellow fever epidemics, the financial panic of 1837, and the 40 years of economic "convalescence" which followed the tragic War Between the States.

The campus that has seen so much of history in the making for more than a century and a half covers some 78 acres on which there are eight buildings. Three of these are modern dormitories but the five others are more than a century old. These old buildings add a certain impressive quality to the campus scene.

PRESIDENT OF CONFEDERACY WAS STUDENT THERE

A costly fire in 1836 at the college partially destroyed some of the early records of the beginning of the institution, including those concerning faculty and students. However, it is known that among early students was Jefferson Davis, who later was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and also served in the Indian and Mexican Wars. The man who was to become president of the Confederate States, also served as Secretary of War under President Pierce, and as U.S. Senator from Mississippi.

There is a most interesting story told about Jefferson's most famous alumnus, Mr. Jefferson Davis. After attending school in Woodville, he was sent to the military college at Washington, Miss. Legend has it that a week after enrollment, he wrote to his father in high indignation about the strictness of the discipline, and declared that he no longer wanted to go there. So young Jeff was told to come home. When he arrived, a mule and plow were waiting for him. It took only a week or so for the young man, who was to play such a vital role in the South's history to decide that Jefferson Military College and all its rules was far preferabe to a landscape viewed daily with the rear end of a mule in the immediate foreground. So he returned to Jefferson College, where he was graduated, thus beginning a career that resulted in his leadership of the southern cause.

The picturesque and colorful campus of Jefferson Military College annually attracts tourists and others. It was in 1959 that a Hollywood movie outfit used the campus and the well-drilled regiment in their production of "Horse Soldiers," shooting almost all of the film at this locale. As can be imagined, this stirred up tremendous interest in the countryside. A number of alumni of the college in this area have recently seen a rerun of the 1959 movie on local television.

Jefferson Military College has become something of a legend in school history. This institution is the best known of all the early educational efforts of the old Southwest during he first few years of the 19th century. The college was chartered and set up at a time when the education of its young presented unique and knotty problems to the people of the State of Mississippi. The rural character of the State in its formative period—and the scattered population—made the establishment of good schools difficult. This was the era when children were instructed by their parents, or in some cases by teachers whose salary included "boarding" in the plantation homes of their charges. Real education was confined to those who could pay—and pay well—for the privilege of private schooling. Since this was an era of almost incredible wealth among a limited number of families, it is not surprising that the children of the rich were sent to well-established schools in the North—or even abroad. Slaves of these wealthy land owners were forbiden to seek book learning but, in individual cases, some apprentices who had a deep desire to learn, did achieve some education.

This private school little more than a stone's throw from Natchez, has old and venerable traditions but instruction and training is as modern as the tomorrows which its cadets will serve.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Ailing Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, Appalachia, an area including from 9 to 11 States, is suffering from an economic decline which has not only grimly affected life in the area, but which imperils the future of Appalachian citizens and their communities if remedial action is not undertaken. Although rich in natural resources, the unemployment rate in Appalachia is more than twice that of the national rate; per capita income is 25 percent below the national average.

The severity of the problem has been recognized, and attempts to lessen it have been made. Essential for further economic progress in the area is a coordinated regional approach such as is provided in H.R. 7935, which promotes the cooperation of Federal, State, and local officials dealing with the problems of Appalachia.

The following article from the Wall Street Journal supports the vital need for action in Appalachia:

AILING APPALACHIA: NINE-STATE AREA IN EAST MAKES LITTLE HEADWAY IN CURING CHRONIC ILLS—U.S.-STATE GROUP TACKLES JOBLESS PROBLEM; LEWIS OF UMW FEARS AN EXPLOSION

A POLITICAL DEBT FOR KENNEDY?

(By J. Russel Boner)

In Rosemont, W. Va. (population: 280), a once bustling mining town where only a trickle of coal is now loaded, 33-year-old Richard Mayle sits idly on the front steps of his neat, modest home. It has been 6 years since Mr. Mayle last had a steady job—as a slate picker at a nearby tipple, where now only a few men work. "I pick up a dollar now and then sawing wood or mowing," Mr. Mayle says, "but I live off my mother, mostly."

In the Broadtop region of central Pennsylvania, chubby Charles Defibaugh, a retired miner, witsfully tells a visitor that 7 of his 10 children have moved away because they couldn't get jobs at home. Once there were 3,000 miners on Broadtop, Mr. Defibaugh recalls, but fewer than 250 are left.

The plights of Mr. Mayle and Mr. Defibaugh are shared by hundreds of thousands of other residents of small communities tucked away in the mountainous nine-State Appalachian region of the eastern United States. In this area unemployment is more than twice as high as the U.S. rate; the overall population is barely holding its own while the unproductive under-18 and over-65 age groups are growing, and per capita income runs some 25 percent below the national average.

Chances are not bright for any immediate general relief of the area's basic problems.

COAL AND FARMING DOWNTURN

For the most part, towns in the so-called Appalachia region grew up around coal deposits and about 65 percent of the Nation's soft coal is still mined there. But coal's loss of the big home heating and railroad markets, coupled with depletion of some seams and mechanization of most mines, has had devastating effects. Since 1957 annual coal output in Appalachia has dropped 22 percent to 274 million tons and mine employment has fallen 41 percent to 120,000.

To make matters worse, another of the area's important income producers, agriculture, has been getting weaker competitively for many years—as farms in other parts of the country have been gathered into ever-larger units and mechanized, vastly increasing efficiency. In Appalachia the rugged terrain usually prohibits large farms and many small ones have died out.

As coal and agriculture have declined, so too have related industries such as trucking and dependent industries such as retailing. And the inaccessibility of much of the area, caused by its mountains, has made it unattractive for new industry to come in and fill the void. Thus most ambitious young people today move out in search of jobs, leaving a huge number of old folks idling their lives away on fixed income from social security, sometimes augmented by welfare payments, by a miner's widow's pension, or by other modest means.

"ASTONISHED AT PATIENCE"

John L. Lewis, 83-year-old president emeritus of the United Mine Workers, who is intimately familiar with the Appalachian mood, says he is "astonished at the patience" of the region's people. Warns Mr. Lewis: "I know well that the longer their patience is maintained, the more violent will be the explosion when they reach the limit of their endurance."

Appalachia extends from the northwestern tip of Pennsylvania, where it touches Lake Erie, to mid-Alabama. It includes all of one State, West Virginia, and parts of eight—Pennsylvania, Maryland, Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama. The specific boundaries of the region were set more or less arbitrarily by the Appalachian Governors' Conference, an organization of chief executives of the States involved. But generally the area lies either in the Appalachian Mountains or foothills.

To head off any such explosion, as Mr. Lewis fears, President Kennedy is now making the most persistent push ever tried to turn around Appalachia's economy. He has set up the joint Federal-State President's Appalachian Regional Commission, with Under Secretary of Commerce Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as chairman. The Commission's aim is to promote a joint effort between State governments and Federal agencies to generate 500,000 new jobs in ailing Appalachia.

PATTERN FOR OTHER AREAS?

Federal officials say the region has been selected for special attention because it represents the most chronic and hard-core area of unemployment in the Nation. "If we can find a solution to the problems here, we can lick unemployment elsewhere," one planner says.

But there are plenty of political overtones, too. President Kennedy plainly is eying the 113 electoral votes the region's nine States will cast next year; they could make a big difference if 1964's balloting is anywhere near as close as 1960's. Mr. Kennedy has acknowledged that his smashing 1960 primary election victory in West Virginia—achieved with the aid of F.D.R., Jr.—catapulted him toward the White House. There's some resentment in the State that Mr. Kennedy hasn't fully repaid his political debt. Over the weekend, New York's Governor Rockefeller drew added attention to the political overtones of the region's problems when he charged in a speech to West Virginia Republicans that President Kennedy had broken all his campaign promises to help West Virginia out of its depression.

In any event, the President sent Mr. ROOSEVELT and an entourage of bureaucrats from a number of Federal agencies into Appalachia this summer to confer with State and local leaders. Their mission: Devise a "formula for action" either through an existing Federal bureau such as the Area Redevelopment Administration or through a new agency especially devoted to Appalachia. Their report is due to go to Mr. Kennedy by late December or early January.

Appalachia has three abundant resources which the planners hope to use: Coal, water and lumber. But some observers believe tourism is the best hope for aiding the region. As Don McSween, Tennessee's Commissioner of Conservation and Commerce, jokingly puts it, "One tourist equals two bales of cotton and is twice as easy to pick."

"There are a vast number of Americans with time and money to enjoy recreational facilities," Mr. ROOSEVELT declares. "Appalachia lies between a great and growing complex on the East and a gigantic industrial complex to the West." Mr. ROOSEVELT is pressing for an improved network of roads in Appalachia which he believes would help boost tourism as well as make remote parts of the region more attractive to industry.

Mr. ROOSEVELT believes the Government should take a door opening approach in Appalachia, aimed at making the area accessible for private enterprise to move in. The States "should not look for public money for creation of long-term jobs," he contends.

FUNDS OUTLOOK CLOUDY

One reason officials aren't encouraging States to depend on Federal funds is that there may not be any to hand out. The jaunt of Mr. ROOSEVELT and his party into Appalachia was clouded by a surprise defeat in the House of Representatives of the Kennedy administration's area redevelopment bill, which sought $456 million in new loan and grant authorizations to add depressed regions. The Senate resurrected the bill and it looked for a while as if a smaller authorization would win approval. But an antidiscrimination edict recently issued by the ARA may cost the bill needed southern support. Democratic strategists were astounded at the timing of the ARA's edict and concede the bill now faces an uphill battle at best.

The outlook for a special Appalachia development program also is clouded. Many GOP legislators who oppose the ARA on the ground that it's become another pork barrel say they'd support spending to help a few hardstricken areas get on their feet. But since outlays would provide benefits to rela-

tively few congressional districts, some present ARA supporters might not back a regional aid program.

Whatever program finally evolves at the Federal level is likely to undergo considerable debate before being translated into action. The report of Mr. Roosevelt's group will be submitted to each State for approval and it's not probable that all the States would endorse much broadening of Federal powers over them. And one Federal official figures that in its current mood Congress is unlikely to grant any sweeping authority to an Appalachian agency even if it should agree to create one.

BIG U.S. OUTLAYS ALREADY

The region's troubles already have been attacked with large though uncoordinated doses of Federal spending. About $6.5 billion in Federal funds was pumped into the area in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, for instance. This included more than $1.3 billion in social security payments, $9.1 million for job retraining, and $120 million by the Army Corps of Enginers for such things as flood control dams, navigation locks, and stream clearance. Half of the $40 million the ARA has dispensed so far has gone into Appalachia.

There is evidence that some of this spending has been helpful in solving the region's basic troubles. The ARA says a $7 million loan and $2.5 million grant to develop Bluestone State Park in southern West Virginia into a major tourist attraction will create 358 jobs in that area and businessmen are now planning expansions of their own there. A $642,000 grant to the University of Kentucky for a wood-use demonstration center figures to help eastern Kentuckians develop forest and woodworking resources, besides providing 300 jobs at the center. Altogether, the ARA says its present programs will generate 15,000 new jobs in Appalachia.

PROBLEM OF EDUCATION

Efforts of the States themselves sometimes help, too. The West Virginia Industrial Development Division in 2½ years to last July 1 helped spark 164 new plants or plant expansions in the State, representing a total investment of $143 million and providing 10,936 jobs. Eastern Kentucky is expected to reap dividends rfom a $78 million toll road being built by a State authority to improve the region's accessibility and, hopefully, attract industry.

But some authorities believe Appalachia's problems are so great they cannot be overcome without a huge, cooperative effort on the part of the Federal and State Governments. These officials note that the average educational attainment in Appalachia is 2 years below the national average and that even on something as seemingly uncontroversial as raising these standards there is likely to be resistance. One businessman in Tennessee says that in many communities "attitudes are actually opposed to education." A Kentucky school official says that uneducated parents in his State "often don't see any need for children to stay in high school."

And even though unemployment rolls are huge, employers may have trouble finding qualified workers. An official at the West Virginia Department of Employment Security in Charleston says that city's labor force has fallen 2,100 in a year because the "cream of the working force" is leaving to seek jobs elsewhere. Charles L. Briner, head of the Maryland Department of Employment Security office in Oakland, says that when local high schools graduate students "most of the girls go to Washington, D.C., and the fellows to Baltimore." He concludes: "What we need is industry to take care of our youth."

The Problem of Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with the sermon delivered on September 15, 1963, by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville, Tenn. It is entitled "The Problem of Equality," and contains one of the most incisive analyses of this subject that I have ever had the opportunity to read. A number of persons have likewise been impressed with this sermon, Mr. President, because it has been sent to me by persons from several States.

I think, Mr. President, that it might be well for the Members of the Congress to read this outstanding sermon and to study it well, particularly in view of the increasing demands that are being made on the Congress to complete the establishment of a fantastic equalitarian welfare state at the price of liberty, the maintenance of which should be the primary purpose of all governments.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have this sermon printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF EQUALITY

(By Dr. Walter R. Courtenay)

(1 Corinthians 11: 17–34)

During the past summer the air was filled with the raucous sounds of conflict in Birmingham, Chicago, New York, and Danville. It was also redolent with discord within the United Nations, and within the backward countries demanding recognition. Accompanying these was the endless struggle of labor and capital, and the seemingly endless drain of our resources into the giveaway programs at home and abroad. The air was charged with social electricity as individuals, groups, and nations fought for new status under the banner of equality.

Equality has intoxicated the modern world. Men walk starry-eyed through streets and halls dreaming of new days and improved status. The whole world seems in a pep rally mood, and the bonfires grow larger and burn more fiercely, even as the songs, chants, and shouts of the participants become louder and more fervent. In a thousand tongues men scream their demands for equality, for place, for recognition, for rights, for privileges.

As one listens he frequently hears the words, "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But the words never end there, but hurry on to declare that it is the responsibility of government to make all men equal and to maintain equality amongst men. Still other words are heard, declaring that democracy has failed to establish equality, and that men, therefore, must now turn to socialism and communism.

In my summer setting, close to nature, I looked around for evidences of equality in nature, and found none. Trees and hills are not the same in breadth and height. Rivers and lakes are not of uniform size. Not all animals and birds are swift and beautiful. The lion does not recognize the equalness of the antelope, nor the fox the rabbit. Some fields are fertile and others sterile, and clouds and puddles are not the same, though both are water created. In nature inequality seems to prevail, and yet the inequalities of nature produce the beauty we admire.

As I thought of it the same seemed to be true of history. Nations and races do differ in size, wealth, prestige, power, creativity, and vision. Some soar like eagles. Some build like beavers. Some grow like vegetables and weeds in the garden called the earth. Between individuals, races, groups, and nations there are broad differences, and equality is not a characteristic of either nature or human nature.

Having reached this point my mind asked the question, Can we have both freedom and equality? Someone has said, "Freedom without equality tends to become license. Equality without freedom tends to produce stagnation." How can these great objectives be secured without damage to the highest social system men have yet devised, democracy?

Looking back across history, I realized that the Jews preached concern for the poor, but not equality. The Greeks preached democracy, but not equality. The Romans preached justice under law, but not equality. The Middle Ages in Europe preached Christ, but not equality. In fact, not until the French Revolution did men openly affirm that "men are born and always continue free and equal in respects to their rights," and not until our Declaration declared that "all men are created equal" did the world come alive to the possibilities of equality. These two events placed a new chemical in the cup of life, and the contents of that cup are changing men.

Here I paused to rethink the words, "All men are created equal." Are they? I could see that all men are created equally helpless, equally ignorant, equally inexperienced, equally sin touched, but I could not see how they could be said to be created equal in any other sense. Men do not begin life with an even start for all. Their beginnings are marked by differences in pedigrees, health, educational and moral levels, economic strength, social status, and personality potentials. There are broad differences in temperament, talents, drives, and desires. They do not begin life on a common line.

And what of the so-called unalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? Life is the gift of God, and so are liberty and happiness—in a certain sense. But being born is never enough. Getting here alive is only a beginning. In order to really live one needs medical science, proper nutrition, adequate care, and a chance to become educated and equipped for adult responsibilities. As to liberty, it is not something that comes with birth. Liberty is man created, man achieved, and man maintained. God approves it, but man must win it. Happiness is a byproduct of a way of life rather than something granted us by birth. It, too, is something we achieve by effort. It depends on many things: employment, purpose, personal development, and the right use of the opportunities and duties of life. Life God gives, but liberty and happiness we must achieve.

Having reached that state of mind, I wondered why men ever thought that government could make men equal and keep them equal. How can mere laws produce equality amongst men on a heart level? How can coerced fellowship ever become real fellowship?

That government has a role to play in the mighty, moving drama of man's progress is not to be denied. Our Constitution and our Bill of Rights stand to affirm it. It is the function of government to state the conditions of liberty, equality, and responsibility, but unless it is the will of the people to give life to the law, it will not work. The prohibition era proved that beyond our contesting.

Then why do we believe and state in our legal documents that "all men are created equal," and have "unalienable rights"?

I presume it is because we must find some means of limiting the powers of the powerful and of protecting the rights of the weak. Great power, unpoliced, tends to become destructive power. The rights of the weak tend to be lost in a land where only the strong prevail.

We all understand this, even as we all realize that the clamor for equality is always a push from below rather than a pull from above, although it has often been both in these United States. Slaves have never enjoyed being slaves. The poor have never enjoyed being poor. The exploited have never been happy with exploitation. Those who fail have never been proud of their shortcomings, and the employed have always felt that it would be better if they were the employers. It is from this level of life that the hunger for equality rises. It is here that utopia displays its broad green fields and still waters. It is from here that the valley of Shangri-la appears as the answer to all the ills of man. It is the hopelessness of the masses that provides the soil for hope in those who will not surrender to the accidents of birth and environment, and it is well that it is so.

And yet, one must face facts. In any classroom of pupils only a few qualify under the letter A. Below these leaders of the class are the B students, and then the C's, and then the D's, and then the F's. Some by ability and effort rise to the top, while others because of lack of ability or application take their places on the descending curve of scholarship.

In every nation it is the same. Only a small percentage of people have the ability, the desire, the drive, the willingness to work and sacrifice, to foresee and prepare for success in any realm. The people who struggle to succeed are never interested in equality, but in superiority. Their goal is never the level of the masses, but a level above the masses. They endorse and espouse liberty because it creates for them a favorable climate in which to think, plan, create, work, and achieve according to their abilities and desires. They never pace themselves by the speed of the mediocre, but by the speed of the best. They are never satisfied by crumbs; they want half loaves and whole loaves.

It is such people who made America possible, and who have always led men in the upward climb. They are in truth the benefactors of the race. It is their ideas and creativeness that establish businesses and industries, thereby providing employment for others, and the taxes that make community and national progress possible. They furnish our best leadership, and give to the Nation our best guarantee of security. It is because of them that progress is produced in all areas of life, the intellectual, the artistic, the economic, the governmental, and the social. While they did not build America alone, they provided the means whereby our Nation came into existence and has continued on its upward way.

Looking critically at such a line of thought, I suddenly realized that the success of the few creates the inequalities that loom large in the minds of the many. The haves highlight the have-nots. It is the successful who outlive the failures and all others who take their places on the curve of life as it sweeps downward.

During my summer days it seemed to me that:

It is the nature of some men to succeed, and others to fail.

It is the nature of some men to get by, and others to achieve.

It is the nature of the have-littles to want more.

It is the nature of the successful to seek to dominate.

It is the nature of those who are unsuccessful to resent it.

It is the nature of the poor to envy.

It is the nature of the wealthy to assume unjust privileges.

It is the nature of those who inherit wealth to use it well, to misuse it, or to feel guilty because they have it.

It is the nature of the intellectuals who receive their compensation from taxes or the gifts of the economically successful to advocate a change of system in order to get one wherein the intellectuals will be as generously rewarded as business executives under free enterprise.

It is because men are unequal in ability and drive, in opportunities for recognition and advancement, in rewards for work done and services rendered that people become restless socially. It is the inequalities of humanity that create the crusaders for equality. In the 18th century men looked to democracy as the answer to the inequalities amongst men, and now in the 20th men look toward socialism and communism.

Democracy as we have tried to shape it in America has been heavily impregnated with the 10 Commandments of Judaism and the spirit of Jesus. Because of this we are suspicious of any system that advocates the big lie, covetousness, greed, the stealing of property, the destruction of life, and the taking away of liberties. Democracy condemns without reservations the confiscation of private property and capital by the state and the regimenting of human beings like animals on a farm. Our democracy is not perfect. Imperfections exist, but its virtues exceed those of any other system mankind has tried.

These observations moved me then to reach certain opinions concerning American democracy:

1. Democracy was never created to be a leveler of men. It was created to be a lifter, a developer of men.

2. Democracy was created to let the gifted, the energetic and the creative rise to high heights of human achievement, and to let each man find his own level on the stairway of existence.

3. Democracy was created to help men meet responsibilities and shirk no duties. That is why our Nation has been concerned about the honest needs of its citizens. We lead the world in justice, even though justice does not always move with prompt alacrity. Our Nation has been noted for the size of its heart and not merely for the size of its pocketbook.

4. Democracy demands that the nation be governed by the capable, the honorable, the far seeing, the clear seeing, and not by mediocre men. In the beginning it was so. May it be so again.

5. Democracy demands more from men than any other system in the realm of self-discipline, dependability, cooperativeness, industry, thrift, and honor. Democracy will not work when party politics are not guided by basic ethical principles. For a party to foster class consciousness, class conflict, misrepresentation, covetousness, violence, theft, and an open defiance of established law is to breed anarchy.

6. Democracy must give to all its people the following rights:

The right to equal learning.

The right to equal employment.

The right to equal treatment.

The right to equal justice.

The right to adequate housing.

The right to vote.

The meditations of the summer convinced me that governments of themselves cannot make men equal or remake men into the beings they ought to be. That is a spiritual venture, not an economic and political one. A change from democracy to either socialism or communism, or a change from private capitalism to state capitalism, will not solve the basic problems of mankind; it merely shifts the areas of power.

I am disturbed, therefore, when church leaders and church groups seem to advocate socialistic means and objectives as the answer to the problems of democracy, and especially the problems of equality. This is especially true when certain leaders voice slogans that appear logical and Christian, but are not. Let me name four:

1. "The world owes every man a living." No, it doesn't. Christian ethics have never said so, and I have never known any man worth his salt who has claimed special rights under such a slogan. It is the cry of the lazy, the inept, and the failures. Such a slogan is a far cry from our meeting the needs of the needy, which, of course, is our duty.

2. "Production for use, and not for profit." That sounds good, but it is as phony as a Russian promise. It is profits that have produced the blessings of our Nation and enabled her to be a blessing to the nations of the world. Profits are essential to the general well-being of society. When the state takes over under the slogan of "Use, Not Profits" men lose their liberties and their standard of living. Such a switch merely augments the insatiable appetite of the state.

3. "Human rights, not property rights." As I look out over the world, one thing is clear: Where there are not private property rights there are no human rights. Private property rights form the seed bed in which human rights mature. As long as private property rights are clear human rights will flourish.

4. "The end justifies the means." According to Christian ethics the statement is not true. It was just such a statement that produced the crucifixion of Jesus, the torture of the martyrs, the burning of witches, and the denial of life and liberty to the inhabitants of current communistic lands.

Churchmen, whether lay or clerical, who seek to solve the problems of our society through socialistic processes rather than democratic ones within the free enterprise system are heading down a road that leads toward darkness. Only by encouraging Christians to envy, to covet, to be class conscious, to foster class conflict, and to approve stealing and even murder, can such objectives be attained. To realize them would bring about a broad denial of law and order, and the orderly handling of social problems. Whenever we as a church, an educational system, or a Supreme Court encourage people to misrepresent facts, to use force wrongfully, to flaunt law and order, and to stimulate bitterness and hatred, we depart from logic, Americanism, and Christianity.

I unhesitantly oppose the use of socialistic and communistic methods in the solving of the problems of our free enterprise democracy. Our problems are problems of human nature rather than of economics and sociology. The man who has two cars is not preventing another from having one. The man who earns $50,000 a year is not robbing him who receives $300 a month. The man who owns a good house does not thereby force another man to dwell in the slums. And the people who prosper under our system cannot be blamed for the problems that plague the lives of those who compose the lower 25 percent of the Nation. The so-called privileged are not always a credit to either church or state, but they are not in the main parasites on the body politic. We are therefore wrong when we damn the successful, the wealthy, the enlightened and

the patriotic in order to gain what we call equality.

Having said that let me hasten to add that the redistribution of wealth will not solve the human problem that plagues us. Wealth is not fairly distributed in any land under the sun; it never has been and I presume never will be. Nor do we solve social predicaments when we blame the top 20 percent of our people for the inequities that seem to mark the 80 percent. Nor is it logical for our Government to be forever emphasizing the neglected duties of the employer while ignoring almost totally the neglected duties of the rest of us. The wealthy have many sins to confess, but so do we all. And when we come to the advocacy of moving from private capitalism to state capitalism, and the listing of the sins of democracy while ignoring its multiple virtues, and assuming that virtue resides in the have-nots, but not in the haves, I can only shake my head at the presumed wisdom of such positions.

Let no one hearing my voice conclude that I am speaking as a have or a defender of the haves. Let no one believe that I am unconcerned about those in our midst whose rights are often ignored and whose status is questioned. I am not blind to the sins of the privileged any more than I am the sins of the underprivileged. The business leaders do not need my voice to defend their position; they are strong defenders of themselves. But I have walked the roads of life with men of all classes, and have reached one conclusion, "there is none righteous, no, not one." We are all bearers of the telltale gray of selfishness. The 5 o'clock shadow is on all our faces.

The Lord I love and serve was not overly optimistic about humanity. He knew man as he is, and worked with him for what he could become. He ministered to the multitude, teaching, healing, feeding, encouraging, comforting, but He never assumed that equality was part of the human scene. He talked of love and neighborliness, but not equality.

Perhaps that is why the New Testament puts the emphasis on brotherhood and not equality. It emphasizes responsibilities, not privileges. It stresses love toward God and love toward neighbor. It seeks to create a church that will be brotherly within, and concerned for those without. It urges men to find the God-way to selfhood, success and happiness, and offers a heat-treated cell to all who misuse life, be they rich or poor.

Paul, in his letter to the Church of Corinth, denounced the lack of brotherhood within the church, and urged men to be concerned for one another, but he did not assume equality to be one of the must characteristics of Christianity. It was not a matter of love without differences, but love in spite of them.

The church, as someone has said, learned a long time ago that it is easier to create liberty than it is to establish equality. It has always known that equality can only be had by a loss of certain liberties. If men want equality above all else they may best find it in communism. If men want liberty and a fair portion of equality they must turn toward democracy.

What the world needs is a change of heart, a change of climate born of faith in God, a reaching up that there may be a reaching out, a confession that produces a new dedication. This governments and laws cannot create, for governments and laws are but the reflection of the standards of a people. Everything in social Christianity depends on the wise use of possessions, time and talents, and only when we, Christian members of a democracy, become good stewards of the things that bless life do we begin to move in the direction of righteousness and justice, peace and true prosperity.

The problem of equality may be in many ways the greatest problem of our day. We cannot solve it by government, and we shall not solve it en masse. Only when we as Christians take seriously the teachings and example of Jesus shall equality and liberty exist without detraction or subtraction. Only when we stand before God confessing our needs shall we be empowered to meet the needs of others.

If I must choose between liberty and equality, I must choose liberty and then hope and work for equality, for such seems to me to be the Christian's way.

Thwarting Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly encouraging to notice the many newspapers now interested in the minority staffing effort being made by some of us in Congress. Some papers across the country have picked up the issue and are now writing more editorials on this highly important problem facing the Congress today.

One such newspaper is the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times. On Friday, September 20, 1963, the following editorial appeared, entitled "Thwarting Good Government," and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THWARTING GOOD GOVERNMENT

Makeup of congressional committees' staffs may at first glance seem academic but in reality it can be one of the most important links in good government or, when abused, as it is, it promotes inequitable legislation and coverups.

The point is this:

Republican members of House and Senate committees are deprived of staff members to the degree that they practically are stymied in inquiries essential to clean administration and effective legislation.

Representative FRED SCHWENGEL has been and is major proponent of reform of this situation to the end that it is a long step toward the better government to which Americans are entitled.

Political science experts do not consider this an academic question at all. They recognize in the present partisan setup a snag that calls for removal if interests of the citizenry are to be served.

In colleges, universities, and in political science conferences the subject is receiving attention on the basis of facts as summarized by Representative SCHWENGEL and those associated with him.

Under the heading "The Great Staff Steal," the New York Herald Tribune editorially assails the refusal of the majority party to permit equitable division of the committee staffs.

Says the editorial:

"It's in committee that Congress does most of its work, and it is on the committee staffs that individual Congressmen have to place their chief reliance for legislative assistance. If one party hogs the bulk of the committee staffs, that party has a lopsided advantage over the opposition.

"This is precisely the condition that prevails in Congress today.

"Committee staffing may seem a parochial issue, but it cuts to the heart of the legislative process and of the two-party system. When one party controls all the vast staff resources of the exectuive branch, and also maintains a disproportionate control over the legislative staff, what chance does the opposition have to oppose effectively? Staff assistance, loyal and responsible to the minority members, is essential if the opposition is to find the flaws in majority proposals under committee consideration and to develop responsible alternatives.

"Study of Senate staffs came up with these ratios of majority and minority professional staff—which are typical—on several Senate committees: 2 to 0, 2 to 1, 3 to 2, 4 to 1, 5 to 1, 12 to 1.

"The Democrats, who control both Houses, have stubbornly refused to yield up this partisan plum. But if enough of the public cried out for fairplay, they might conclude there was some political advantage to playing fair."

The First District of Iowa, which SCHWENGEL represents, has interests equally balanced between industrial and agricultural. Further, it has transportation needs—including those on the Mississippi—which are vital to the district.

Necessarily, proposed legislation affecting the district must be researched, investigation must be made as to purposes behind proposals, such as undue advantage in competition and in transportation.

This is true of every district in the country. With staffs under absolute control of Democratic chairmen, opportunity to gain advantages for the South, as an example, lies open for their seizure.

Thus both industry and agriculture in Iowa and the First District have vital interests at stake which can readily be jeopardized in a committee staff system so radically unbalanced and so politically oriented.

Shifting Winds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Aviation Week & Space Technology, September 16, 1963:

SHIFTING WINDS

(By Robert Hotz)

Any group that is influenced so strongly by the shifting winds of international politics and spurred so hard by the pace of modern technology as the aerospace industry must spend a great deal of its effort sniffing out the first faint indications of these changes, and then assay their direction and import accurately to determine how they will affect this industry's future. There are a number of strong politico-technical wind shifts in the Washington air this fall that were hardly perceptible a year ago. The rate at which these trends can gather significant velocity, and the abruptness with which they can change direction, is one of the major hazards of corporate piloting in the aerospace field.

The politico-technical climate the aerospace industry is facing this fall is quite different from that in which it comfortably entered the year last winter. Here are some of the rapidly developing factors that are changing the aerospace environment:

Increasing competition from Europe and Japan across the entire technical spectrum from aircraft to space technology.

Sudden thaw in the cold war, as evidenced by the nuclear test ban treaty. Will this lead, as some people think, to major disarmament in a few years, or will it really mean a major increase in the pace of defense technology to insure all possible safeguards against a nuclear ambush by the Communist bloc?

Effects of the continuing civil rights conflict on relations between the Southern Democratic congressional leadership of key military committees and the administration's defense and space policies. Revolt has already broken out against both the defense and space budgets for fiscal 1964, and increased intensity of the conflict is forecast for the fiscal 1965 budgets.

Growing schism in the politics of the national space program, with the strong prospect that the size and character of this program may become a major 1964 presidential campaign issue.

Reversal of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's strong opposition to development of military space systems, and the possible beginnings of a major effort in this direction beginning soon enough to influence the 1964 election.

Application of the new Defense Department industry rating policy on profit determination. As Professor Cherington emphasized, whether this policy works well or becomes the biggest paper shuffle in Pentagon history, aerospace management must become expert in every detail of this operation as it develops.

Problem of maintaining an effective manned bomber force through the next decade, despite the phaseout of the technically obsolescent B-47, the diminishing structural life of the B-52 because of its shift to low-level mission roles and the effects of continuous airborne alert exercises, the phaseout of B-58 production, and the curtailment of B-70 and other follow-on manned systems development. If Defense Department lets this situation slide much longer, look for Congress to make an angry intervention.

Widening rift in the NATO alliance over future roles and missions and types of weapon systems required. The fate of the MMRBM will offer a strong clue to how this hassle may be resolved.

Increasing opposition of foreign airlines to U.S. air transport policy on fares, capacity, and bilateral negotiations. The marked trend of the U.S. passenger traffic shift to U.S.-flag carriers on the North Atlantic last summer, as a result of foreign political blackjacking to enforce higher rates, should have warned the foreign-flag carriers of their folly. But it hasn't and the battle will be bitter at Salzburg.

This is by no means a comprehensive list of all the elements in the changing values of the aerospace equation, but it should provide a good indication of how sensitive to these swift and often drastic changes the managers of the aerospace industry must be to avoid political shoals and the reefs of technical obsolescence.

Perhaps no other endeavor is so closely intertwined with domestic and international politics as the aerospace industry has become in the past two decades, but there is no prospect that this will change. The vital technologies to which the aerospace industry is virtually indispensable are also the keys to power in the modern world. Those nations that possess them must work hard to keep their exploratory edge sharp and their industrial base solid. Those nations without them are working feverishly to develop them as the power behind their international aspirations. The case of Red China, which has been working frantically to develop these key modern technologies during the past decade, and India, which now lies virtually helpless except for what foreign technology may provide, are good examples of how these factors tip the international scales.

Although the eventual cacophony of the 1964 presidential election is only a faint murmur at present, space and defense policy will once again be key issues, and the leaders of the aerospace industry should be devoting some thought now as to how to sail through the impending political storms safely.

Anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 183d anniversary of the historic Battle of Kings Mountain. On October 7, 1780, American patriots crushed a strong British Army at Kings Mountain and thus paved the way for the ultimate surrender of the British Commander in America, Lord Cornwallis, at Yorktown, Va., on October 19, 1781.

The citizens of Kings Mountain, N.C., commemorated the historic battle, which took place in their vicinity, with a huge parade on October 5, 1963, and a fine address delivered by our distinguished colleague, Hon. BASIL L. WHITENER, who represents Kings Mountain in the Congress.

I know that my colleagues will want to read the remarks he made on the battle, which, along with the Battle at Guilford Court House, is described as the turning point in the American Revolution. Under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT KINGS MOUNTAIN, N.C., OCTOBER 5, 1963

Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for the honor you have bestowed in inviting me to take part today in the ceremonies commemorating the 183d anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain. It is a privilege to join in paying tribute to our heroic forebears whose great victory on October 7, 1780, guaranteed the success of the American War of Independence.

One feels a deep sense of history as he stands here this afternoon in a countryside hallowed by the blood and sacrifice of men who put liberty before life and honor before fortune.

The Battle of Kings Mountain was not just another conflict in the long march of history. The heroic deed accomplished here at Kings Mountain on October 7, 1780, was one of the great and decisive military events of all time. The blow struck for liberty by the God-fearing patriots from South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky, and Georgia, who marched to meet British tyranny at Kings Mountain, has earned for them an honored place forever in the hearts of freedom-loving men.

Kings Mountain is a name cherished by all Americans. It is a name of particular significance, however, for us who live in this section of North Carolina. Nearly all of us have been reared in the shadow of Kings Mountain. Many of us can trace our lineage to the gallant men who met Ferguson's British Regulars and Tories and inflicted upon them a defeat which rallied the faltering cause of freedom in the gloomy fall of 1780.

At that time the cause of American freedom was at a low ebb. American arms had suffered one defeat and disaster after another. The struggle for independence for a time seemed hopeless. Lord Cornwallis occupied Charlotte. The Tory sentiment loyal to the English King was strong in certain parts of North and South Carolina.

In a letter to a friend, General Washington wrote: "I have almost ceased to hope."

The decisive defeat inflicted upon Ferguson and his men here at Kings Mountain electrified the Colonies. The death of Ferguson swept away the clouds of doom and despair which hung over the Revolutionary Armies. With renewed vigor and determination they won victory after victory until their struggle was crowned with success by the British surrender at Yorktown.

In writing of the Battle of Kings Mountain in 1822, Thomas Jefferson said: "I remember well the deep and grateful impression made on the minds of everyone by that memorable victory. It was a joyful annunciation of that turn of the tide of success which terminated the Revolutionary War with the seal of independence."

Vice President George M. Dallas, in a letter written in 1855, said: "The spot where that battle was fought is certainly linked in thought inseparably with the independence of our country and the patriotic gallantry of Southern men."

And the great orator, Edward Everett, who delivered the address at Gettysburg immediately preceding Lincoln's immortal message, had this to say of Kings Mountain: "History will reserve a bright page in the annals of the Revolution for the names of the gallant men who fought the Battle of Kings Mountain."

Our forefathers did not march on Kings Mountain in the pursuit of fame, fortune, or at the command of a powerful government. The gallant men of the mountains descended upon the British tyrants to protect their homes, their loved ones, and their cherished way of life.

It has been said that nothing is more typical or representative of the early pioneer spirit of America than the people of the southern highlands. Their love of personal independence, their loyalty and devotion to the principles of free government, and their belief in God have been, since the beginning of our Nation, a powerful and sustaining influence. Their strong character was reflected in the victory at Kings Mountain.

The descendants of the heroes of Kings Mountain have helped to create great States. They have made a lasting contribution to our free institutions. Our liberty today can be traced back through the descendants of the patriots of 1780.

My friends, there is an inspiring lesson to be learned from the sacrifice made here 183 years ago. It is a lesson we must not forget for, as an eminent philosopher has said, those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

The patriots of 1780 faced tyranny in the form of British oppression. They were taxed without representation, impressed into the military and naval service of the British crown, and their homes and crops laid waste by Tory loyalists. Through their indomitable spirit and fierce determination to be free they overcame insurmountable obstacles and fashioned for us a free nation.

We are faced today, in a manner, with some of the same problems which confronted our forefathers. The concept of military warfare and the political and economic conditions existing in the world have changed since victory was won at Kings Mountain.

But, my friends, freedom still has its enemies. British tyranny has long disappeared but Americans must still be vigilant lest the heritage bequeathed to them by our forefathers at Kings Mountain be sacrificed for all time.

The enemy of freedom in the world today is communism, a materialistic philosophy

which proclaims that man has no God, and whose purpose in life is for the greater glory of the state. The enemy of freedom today is communism, and it is nurtured and supported by hunger, disease, privation, ignorance, and intolerance wherever found in the world.

Communism has enslaved nearly 1 billion people throughout the world. It has required the American people to spend billions of dollars since World War II to halt its insidious spread. American boys at this very moment are in isolated encampments in southeast Asia, in Berlin, and in countless other points around the globe because of the threat of communism to the free world.

We must never forget that communism is dedicated to the destruction of our way of life. Our forefathers knew that there was no hope of reconciliation with the British sovereign. They dared, therefore, to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

It is for us, their descendants, to realize that there can be no lasting conciliation with a system of government which has as its purpose the enslavement of mankind, a political philosophy which proclaims that the end justifies the means, and a form of tyranny that offers no hope for the future of civilization.

This we must realize as we face the strong tides of the future. Our Nation must not be lulled into a false sense of security. We must not permit the conciliatory gestures of the Communist masters to lead us into a fatal trap.

Less than 3 million Americans fought the greatest power on earth in 1780 and out of their great victory fashioned a free government which has been the marvel of the ages. Today 190 million Americans are faced with the challenge of preserving that government. We can do so only if we keep our faith in Almighty God, the source of all freedom, and continue to cherish and defend the great ideals and principles forming the bedrock upon which rests our free society.

The Battle of Kings Mountain is a stirring reminder of the fact that America was launched upon its course by courageous men dedicated to the high ideal of freedom. As we remember the deeds of Campbell, Sevier, Shelby, Cleveland, Chronicle, Hambright, McDowell, Winston, Preston, and the patriots under their command, let us resolve to protect the liberty they gave us in October 1780, on the slopes of Kings Mountain.

On October 4, 1855, John S. Preston of South Carolina delivered a great speech in this vicinity commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain. In conclusion, I would like to quote his closing remarks:

"That spirit which won these fields and now makes them sacred to us is of the Eternal God, and will live and dwell forever on this American soil. We are the sons of heroes and sages. Let us be true to ourselves, be true to our country, be true to the God who gave it to us; be faithful to the blood shed here by our sires, and we will be the sires of free men as long as the earth owns man for its master. Such, at least, is the faith and hope of the Christian and patriot as he kneels on this holy place."

Parkinson's Laws and Pennypinching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the time that Mr. J. Edward Day was Postmaster General, I served on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It was a pleasure and privilege to work with Mr. Day. His accomplishments are many and his record as Postmaster General is most impressive.

On September 25, 1963, Mr. Day addressed the Federal Bar Association's annual convention at the Sheraton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Day's outstanding address which follows:

PARKINSON'S LAWS AND PENNYPINCHING

All lawyers are familiar with the famous Mr. Parkinson and his laws.

The Parkinson's law that gets the most attention has to do with the alleged tendency of paperwork organizations to keep growing needlessly and to manufacture more paperwork to keep the enlarged organization busy.

Newspaper editorial writers and chamber of commerce speakers simply love to cite this one of Parkinson's laws as a means of deriding and scoffing at the Federal Government establishment. I am sure there is many a newspaper in the country that has a stockpile of canned editorials, available for use any day there is nothing much else to complain about, claiming that Parkinson's law is proved out in official Washington.

According to the prefabricated editorials, the size of the Federal payroll is increasing by leaps and bounds.

The speeches and editorials claiming that the total number of Federal employees is getting completely out of hand have been repeated so many times that the statement has been accepted as gospel. With the charge about skyrocketing Federal payrolls go the companion charges that a huge number of Federal employees are unnecessary, that Federal employees do not work very hard, and that the level of competence, dedication, and performance among Federal personnel is lower than in the private sphere.

I feel that as lawyers who work in or have worked in the Federal Government and as opinion leaders in cities all over the country, you should be in a position to refute these unfair and untrue charges and to uphold the proud status of the Federal professional career.

Jokes about Parkinson's law and its supposed applicability to the Federal Government are all well and good. But the jokes should not obscure the true facts.

While total Federal employment has had minor ups and downs in the past 20 years, the fact is that it has remained amazingly stable despite huge growth in population and economic activity and despite a resulting incredible increase in workload.

There are, in fact, fewer Federal civilian employees today than there were 10 years ago—or even 17 years ago after World War II had been over for a year. Total Federal civilian employment is down when compared with 1946.

Not only has Federal civilian employment actually gone down in total numbers as compared with 17 years ago, or 10 years ago, but the relation to total population has gone down in an even more startling way.

In 1946, 19 people out of every 1,000 were civilian employees of the Federal Government. Ten years ago the figure was 17 out of 1,000. Today—in 1963—the figure is only 13 out of 1,000.

Many of those who talk, quite inaccurately, about a big increase in Federal employment like to say that the trouble is that not enough Government functions are turned over to the States and to local governments. But let us see what has been happening to these other levels of government.

Between 1946 and 1963, when Federal employment went down, employment by State and local governments went up by three and a half million people. Population and economic growth has forced immense increases in State and local government employment. But for some reason, there is an irrational belief in many quarters that any increase in Federal Government staffing comes from sinister causes.

And yet people who have responsibility for making the Federal Government function must face up to the fact that steady increases in workload cannot be absorbed without staffing adjustments.

As President Eisenhower said in his 1960 budget message to Congress:

"We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Hand in hand with the unjustified charges about staffing the Federal Government so equally untrue charges that Government personnel are just easygoing bureaucrats who don't work as hard or as well as people in private industry or private professional life.

That attitude is just 100 percent wrong.

Mr. W. H. Ferry, Director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, has said:

"A cherished corporate legend is that governmental bureaucracy is inefficient, full of featherbedding dullards, and tends toward venality; while the bureaucracy of the large company comprises high-minded and overworked gentlemen, whose eyes are on a brighter star.

"This line is one of the main strands of the political irresponsibility of corporations. Though it might at first glance seem merely an engaging self-deception, it in fact tears away at respect for law and government, the joint creations of people for their own good, and aggrandizes the private company as somehow superior both in aim and practice."

I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant life insurance company which is the third largest corporation in the world—a fine, well-run, progressive company.

And yet I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I was while serving in the Federal Government. Every day I worked with Federal executives and Federal Government lawyers who demonstrated superb imagination, energy, good judgment, and practical idealism.

And they had a further advantage over management and professional personnel in many other large organizations—sense of humor.

With few exceptions, the Federal executive and the Federal Government lawyer sees himself in context with the great complicated world we live in, he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizon—and he does not take himself too seriously.

There is a second one of Professor Parkinson's famous laws which has an important bearing on the problems of lawyers and the Federal Government. The professor calls it the law of triviality. It might also be called the law of pennywise and pound foolish. It is illustrated by the unwillingness of Congress, while appropriating billions for certain glamorous and high-publicized Government programs, to allow sufficient money for carrying out vital but conventional and unglamorous responsibilities of Government, particularly in the law-enforcement and regulatory field.

You may recall that in his illustration of his law of triviality the intrepid Professor Parkinson gave a facetious but telling account of how a board of directors of a big English corporation handled several items on its agenda.

The first item, a nuclear reactor involving an expenditure of many millions of pounds, was approved with almost no discussion, because no one understood it or felt competent to question it.

But when a proposal was presented to spend 300 pounds to build a new bicycle shed for the employees, everyone on the board

fancied himself as an expert on the subject. There was lengthy and acrimonious debate, and the matter was put over to the next meeting so that new estimates of cost could be submitted.

In the Federal spending picture billions are authorized for defense, space, foreign aid, and for new highly publicized programs. Last week the House even voted $190 million for a fallout shelter construction program. But when the established, traditional functions of Government come up for their budget hearings and pennypinching sets in with a vengeance.

Here is an illustration:

Everyone obviously is against drug addiction. Nearly everyone says why don't we do more about it. No one denies that almost all of the illicit narcotics used in this country are smuggled in from foreign countries. Prevention of smuggling, including narcotics smuggling, is the function of the Bureau of Customs and of that Bureau alone. No other Government agency shares the responsibility for controlling smuggling.

For 14 of the past 15 years the Bureau of Customs has requested additional enforcement personnel, citing, among other reasons, the specific problem of narcotic smuggling. What happened to these requests? With the exception of one token increase of 37 officers, the Bureau's requests have been denied every year and, instead, reductions have been made.

As a result, comparing the Bureau's manpower today with the volume of export and import transactions it is required to handle, it doesn't have one-fourth of the manpower it had 15 years ago.

This means that customs, with the full responsibility for preventing smuggling of narcotics, is like a man with a short blanket. To keep the head warm it must expose the feet.

World trade and travel has expanded almost four times in the last 20 years without any corresponding increase in customs enforcement personnel. The Bureau of Customs and every group which has inquired into this problem has consistently urged an increase in customs enforcement and investigative personnel.

For an incredible example of Parkinson's law of triviality or penny pinching in action, I refer you to the printed report of this year's House appropriation hearings for the Civil Division of the Department of Justice. Twenty-nine additional positions were requested. There is a whole series of questions from committee members about whether the salary for a GS-12 is $9,475 or $9,485. It must have cost many times more than this $10 difference just to print up this part of the testimony.

The Government witness expressed his problem this way:

"I think it is rather false economy not to represent the Government adequately in major litigation and to suffer the loss of millions of dollars for the lack of a few thousand dollars to hire some attorneys to do the job properly."

New duties are piled on Government enforcement and regulatory agencies without new personnel being authorized and without adequate space being authorized.

The Food and Drug Administration has jurisdiction over products which account for 30 cents out of every dollar spent by the American consumer. Any one food (tuna, for example) or any one drug (thalidomide, for example) produced by any one manufacturer may call into action FDA's total resources. Yet much of their most important laboratory research is performed in the subbasement of a converted garage in Washington.

My point is that we are penny pinching on vital but unglamorous functions of government. We are all for economy. I, myself, am a firm believer in a balanced budget in times of peace and prosperity such as the present.

But with the enormous commitments for defense, space, grant-in-aid programs, foreign aid, interest on the national debt, and the like, there is an enormous squeeze on the budgets of conventional government activities which must have some hope of keeping up with increased population and increased workload.

The Department of Defense spends about $150 million a day. We all want a defense position second to none. But we should not let normal civilian functions of the Federal Government be strangled in the process.

Nondefense Federal expenditures are now 7 percent lower, in relation to gross national product, than they were 25 years ago.

Too many people seem to think it a kind of victory for the forces of virtue if the funds that the Federal Government needs to do its work are cut.

Too often, moreover, the cuts are made in the everyday, undramatic, but enormously vital, domestic program.

I would ask the same question President Kennedy asked earlier this year when he spoke at the 50th anniversary dinner of the Department of Labor:

"I don't know why it is that expenditures which deal with the enforcement of the minimum wage, that deal with the problem of school dropouts, of retraining workers, of unskilled labor, all the problems that are so much with us in the 1960's, why they are always regarded as the waste in the budget, and expenditures for defense are always regarded as the untouchable item of the budget."

I saw that Parkinson's law of needless bureaucratic growth cannot be and should not be applied as a smug generality to the Federal Government.

And his second law, of pennywise and pound foolish attention to triviality, should not be used in setting the budgets for vital Federal regulatory and enforcement agencies.

We should cut the suit to fit the cloth when we decide on total Federal spending. But we should not kid ourselves into thinking we can have the services and the programs without paying for them.

Instead we should limit our Federal commitments to what we can afford to pay for and then provide the money to see that those programs are carried out, with adequate space, adequate personnel and level of compensation reasonably comparable with private industry.

In the squeeze that now takes place, the Federal lawyer is often called on to perform a heruclean task. But he has the satisfaction of being part of a dedicated, highly professional group that can take justifiable pride in its public service.

Speaker Unruh Reflects on the California Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 10, 1963, at a luncheon sponsored by Democratic Associates, Inc., of Los Angeles, the principal remarks were given by speaker of the California State Assembly, Jesse Unruh, who discussed the California political scene.

Democratic Associates, Inc., is a most distinguished group and draws its membership from the leaders of the Los Angeles area business and professional community. The former Postmaster General, Edward Day, has long been a member of this organization. Mr. John Ferraro, president of the board of trustees of Democratic Associates, has made Speaker Unruh's remarks available to me. I consider them timely, and important. Many Members have expressed interest in the problems and political climate of California, and I therefore draw to their attention the following speech by Speaker Jesse Unruh.

Remarks of the Honorable Jesse M. Unruh:

SPEAKER UNRUH REFLECTS ON THE CALIFORNIA SCENE

My friends and fellow Californians, on the serious side I thought today we might spend some time reflecting on California's immediate past—under a Democratic administration and legislature—where we have been. Then we should size up the present—where we are now and finally take a look at the future—or where we are going.

In the 5 legislative years since Pat Brown's first great victory in 1958, California's Democratic party has written the broadest, most meaningful program of any legislature of any State in the last half century. I would go back even further than that were it not for the seeming sanctity with which California's newspapers now treat the first Hiram Johnson legislature of 1913. That sanctity did not exist in 1913, however, when the San Francisco Chronicle termed the Johnson Progressive body as "a legislature of Progressive cranks," complaining that "the number of tomfool bills is beyond computation." The San Francisco Call branded the 1913 session "the legislature of a thousand freaks."

Based upon their ability to separate fact from fiction, Pat Brown and the Democrats will have to wait until 2013 to be giants in the eyes of the San Francisco press.

Nonetheless, I renew my claim that the three general sessions where both houses of the legislature, as well as the executive branch, have been controlled by Democrats have been the most productive of any in the last half century.

Let he who doubts this look at the record.

1. Enactment of these major civil rights programs: Fair employment practices, fair housing under commission enforcement, the Unruh civil rights act to prohibit discrimination in public businesses and accommodations, fair employment for teachers, and plus a host of minor ones and more appointments of minority persons than the previous 10 Governors combined.

We have also moved to protect minority voter's rights to participate to the utmost in selecting their representatives.

2. These programs to protect California consumers: The Unruh retail installment sales act, establishment of an office of consumer counsel, abolition of deficiency judgments in everything but automobiles, regulation of 10 percenters, regulation and near abolition of advance fee business brokers, regulation of credit life and credit disability insurance, and again many, many others.

3. A State water plan which 30 years of Republican rule had been unable to accomplish.

4. A master plan for higher education which will enable us to keep ahead of our higher educational needs.

5. More dollars for the working people of California in social insurance benefits than had been attained in the previous 10 years of Republican rule.

6. California's first comprehensive narcotics control program.

7. Legislation to outlaw discrimination in employment because of age.

8. Legislation aimed at correcting the near criminal neglect which had allowed a weed patch of special interest cities and districts to spring up and flourish in our Garden of Eden.

9. A $12 billion freeway program.

10. A vastly expanded recreational and cultural program.

Meanwhile all this has been done while maintaining a balanced budget and an economic climate which has attracted nearly one-third of the Nation's space age industries with consequent average income of more than $15 a week above the national average.

A myriad of other accomplishments—many just as important as those I have listed—can be recalled.

That brings us up to now.

I think I might here comment briefly upon the late unlamented sessions.

The 1963 session was indeed different from any at least that I have ever seen. I doubt that very many observers, close or distant, understood the reasons, some indeed couldn't have cared less.

I began to comment on the reasons for this difference as early as February when I told the Sacramento press club the three principal reasons why I felt the session was moving slowly. I said then that:

1. Democrats were victims of their own success—we had enacted so much major legislation in 1959 and 1961 that many of the obvious problems were already solved.

2. Governor Brown chose to move vigorously ahead with a program which dealt largely with the more sophisticated and less discussed, therefore, less understood problems which today confront us—largely in the field of metropolitan growth.

3. A changing legislature—better equipped, better staffed and, most important, better itself qualitatively was perhaps for the first time in recent history able to take alternatives other than yes or no. Add to this a changing balance of power between the houses, within the senate and a partisanship new in the senate and accentuated in the house, and it adds up to trouble.

Despite this and 34 freshman assemblymen the results were magnificent. By the Governor's own words our house passed over 90 percent of his program.

And let me say a word here about those 34 freshmen. I cannot speak to highly of them. I doubt that any organization—and particularly one dealing with problems the size of those that confront us in the legislature—could perform its duties with nearly half its members completely new unless the quality of those new members was extremely high.

That we did as good a job as we did attests to the high quality of our freshman members. Even the Republicans were able and dedicated—and I might add a vast improvement on many of the older GOP members.

You are as aware of the achievements of 1963 as I am so I will not enumerate them although I have listed some in my first 10 points.

All of this it seems to me leaves the Democratic Party today in this position. We have managed to solve many of the State's most pressing problems—we have made substantial beginnings on many others. There yet remains a great deal to be done.

But to continue the great beginnings of Pat Brown we must first of all be reelected. I'm sure all of you know Alben Barkley's great reply when asked what you have to be to be a great Senator. He said pungently, "First you have to be elected." I've paraphrased this myself by replying to those persons who say "Winning isn't everything" thus "True, but losing isn't anything."

I believe that the Democratic Party will continue to win in California as long as its leaders, its public figures, continue to reflect the basic policy of the Brown administration which I like to refer to as "Vigorous Moderation."

In case you want a definition of that I'd say it means anticipating problems and solving them in advance rather than waiting for them to run you down—but solving them with the least possible disruption of existing institutions and practices.

I believe the Democratic Party presently portrays this image—their true one—despite the efforts of a few groups and individuals inside and outside the party to distort the picture, and I believe no one knows this better than the Republican Party—I think this accounts for the frustration of its leadership and their frenzied attempts at political alchemy, their need to create a golden political issue out of their lead balloons—That so far have gone across like lead ballons.

I expect they will be moderately successful—political alchemists such as Whittaker and Baxter will present a glittering package to the people but I predict the people will recognize it for what it really is—fools gold—and reject it as they did in 1962.

And I believe it terribly important that the Democratic Party continue to steer the California ship. I believe it because California's problems are so huge, so complicated that they can no longer be dealt with only after they have arisen.

And mark my words this is the principal and often the only readily distinguishable difference between the two major parties—but a great one. Democrats are willing to anticipate, to gamble, to envision. We believe in change because like Winston Churchill we believe "To change is to improve and to be perfect is to have changed often."

We believe with Emerson that we should "speak the truth in hard words today and then speak tomorrow's truth in hard words, though it contradicts everything we say today.

Republicans do not refuse to change but they use it only as a last resort and often after tragic delay. They are largely unwilling or unable to plan ahead.

If we can define our interests, and our beliefs, and our jurisdictions so that we do not constitute threats to the little duchies which each of us have carved out in what still largely remains as a state with a system of fiefs as its basic political structure.

And if we can accept each other's words as truthful and sincere in this area, I believe we can pull together toward the goals which all of us as Democrats are largely agreed on.

Perhaps it is important that we do this more often publicly as well as privately.

I would in this respect repeat what I told the San Francisco Democratic Association last January 18. I believe that the best posible way to run politics is by a system of volunteers, issues—motivated.

I believe also that no political procedure is sacred—if it does not produce results it should not bar the adoption of other techniques, either as a substitute or an adjunct—no amount of dialectics can justify means for means sake.

I believe firmly also in the truth of the saying, although it has been hung like the mariner's albatross around my neck, that "money is the mother's milk of politics" and so does every other politician if he is not too afraid or too hypocritical to say so. There is simply no way of reaching California's 18 million people without the use of political money or whether it be spent at $10 a crack on election day workers or $1 million a crack through Whittaker and Baxter.

Mind, however, I said I believed in the saying truth—not necessarily its desirability. If the strong majority of my party prefers it, I will as I have before, support legislation outlawing all political contributions and financing political campaigns by Government subsidy. Note again I said I will support this if my party—and particularly my Democratic colleagues in the assembly—desire it, but I will not initiate the move for I believe its effect on the business community would be potentially very injurious. And the Democratic Party has a strong duty to consider the health and well-being of the business community.

I might add that I think we have done a good job of this too. And the fact that we have managed to garner a fair amount of business support because of our moderate program is another source of Republican tooth-gnashing—they are perturbed that we can play in this sandpile.

In this general field of campaign financing I have merely played the game by rules written long before I was on the scene. I would prefer to be thought of in this area as Gibbon described Belisarius, the great Byzantine general—"His faults flowed from the contagion of the times—his virtues were his own."

I believe the divergent elements (disagreeing over procedure—not ideology like California Republicans) in the Democratic Party can and will live and work together—I certainly intend to try much harder myself to accomplish this.

Assuming the continued confidence of California citizens in Democratic leadership we ask ourselves, "Where are we going?"

What are the problems of tomorrow—whence the solutions.

I think American society and certainly California's is today like a huge army whose main body has left its rearguard far behind—two-thirds of our people live sumptuously, very well, or at least in some creature comfort.

The rearguard, or lower one-third economically, are something quite different—true they have made advances but not commensurately with the main body of society.

I believe the principal job of tomorrow's political leadership is to move our society forward while at the same time seeing that the disadvantaged rearguard drastically narrows the educational, economic, and cultural gap which sets it apart from its fellow Americans. Let there be no misunderstanding—I believe firmly in an economic class society—derided and depreciated as much as it has been by liberal scoffers I believe the profit incentive, properly safeguarded still offers the purest, most consistent, most predictable motive to man. At any rate it provides him with the broadest possible range of access roads upward.

But I believe deeply that our institutions, their advantages, their weakness, their need for modification and where they cannot be modified without injury to our basic values need to be more clearly defined.

If this is done I think we can protect our incentive systems while at the same time modifying the extremes in our society substantially.

How do these generalities fit particular in California?

I do not know all the answers or even all the problems but I can suggest several. Unlike Anton Chekhov, a doctor as well as an author, I do not believe that "A malady for which many cures have been advocated suggests that it is incurable."

California's problems of tomorrow are those of growth—growth which is heavily metropolitan. I would list them in this order.

Education—We must redouble our efforts to keep California's supremacy in higher education and drastically improve our primary and secondary systems. This means we cannot afford the provincial attitude that for a while threatened to dominate the legislature and deny our academic faculty even the modest salary increase they were asking, and entitled to.

It means we must face the prospect of increased taxation at the State level to reduce class size and local property taxes. I think we have gone the absolute limit in asking local property taxpayers to carry the governmental load. I think any State tax increase for educatoinal purposes should be large enough to immediately give local property taxpayers some relief—and I think we should insist this relief be given.

Fortunately we have enough money available to increase aid to education next year without increasing taxes.

It means we must demand equal taxes so that we can have equal educational opportunities. If I need to illustrate let me say it looks like the worst kind of regressivism for Beverly Hills and Santa Monica to have a $2.20 educational tax rate while Little Lakes is over $6.

It certainly means that we must place heavy emphasis on compensatory education for our culturally disadvantaged so that they will one day be able to take advantage of the equal rights they are asking for now—and are entitled to.

And may I say here how happy I am that an attempt by what appeared to be impatient and intolerant people to referendum our recently enacted fair housing bill has apparently failed.

This act deserves a fair chance to see if it will work and I am confident it will. Aid to our schools is inexpressibly important. California prospers today because we have built our higher educational facilities into the greatest producers of brainpower in the world—we cannot falter in this task.

Our economic well-being, our social adjustment and indeed the free world's existence depends on us.

Secondly: conservation, recreation, and culture.

As our leisure time grows the need for more recreation becomes desperate. Private enterprise can and should supply a great deal of this but I doubt they can do it alone. Certainly the State needs a crash program of beach and park acquisition—I believe every bit of beach from Santa Barbara to San Diego ought to be available to the general public. Further development of our water resources almost goes without saying, as does conservation of our wilderness areas and other natural resources.

3. Metropolitan planning—we have made only a small step toward ending the chaos that exists in this area.

The San Francisco Bay area; for example, has some 700 districts. It seems to me that this represents a greater threat to the functioning of democracy than anything else that exists. Almost all of these districts have taxing or bonding authority.

Obviously, the brake of public opinion does not apply here for not even the Los Angeles Times has enough political reporters to cover this many meetings.

Today our planning work consists largely of discussion of exceptions, exemptions and changes to our plans of development instead of how we can improve and implement those plans. I could commend the work of California tomorrow in calling this so forcibly to our attention even if they have stepped on some toes in the process.

If this cannot be arrested by home rule, then the people have a right to expect State action—and get it.

4. Unemployment—I list this far down, much for the same reason I do civil rights—if the first three problems are properly dealt with it would do much to alleviate these two. We can and must do more—nor should we be fearful of new ideas and approaches. Certainly we should solicit their advancement into the marketplace of ideas.

One authority has tentatively suggested we may find it cheaper socially and perhaps even economically to pay our present unemployables not to work rather than spend money trying to train them for jobs that do not exist or that they cannot perform.

Certainly we shall have to accept the premise that we well may be entering an era when 90 percent of our population can supply 100 percent of our goods and services. The remaining 10 percent should be encouraged to work—if not profitably at least productively.

5. Civil rights: No conscientious member of the majority can rest until equal opportunity exists for all on the basis of ability. Again, however, without education and the solution of transportation, housing and other metropolitan problems, there can be no real equality—just equality of opportunity.

There are many other problems but the ones I have listed are important and typical. They will require courage, tenacity, and imagination to solve.

They will require that we as Democrats and liberals understand that just as the transition occurred from anti-Wall Street liberalism to big-city liberalism that another transition from many aspects of traditional urban liberalism to the more sophisticated liberalism of planning, educational opportunity and cultural achievement is now in process.

At the same time we must redouble our efforts at helping our elderly, our sick, and our underprivileged, and in educating our people that they are their brothers keepers. We must convince our more fortunate that in a civilized society social costs cannot be avoided and are in the long run roughly equivalent.

Expenditures denied now for teachers salaries cannot be denied on the morrow for aid to needy children. Taxes not collected for school buildings and equipment will one day be levied for prisons and guards; money not today spent on proper recreational facilities today will be spent and spent again on mental institutions tomorrow.

These are gigantic problems—problems that cry out for giants while the Republicans, to paraphrase Simone de Beauvoir, "send us less than men."

But they can and will be met, staggering though they are and fearful as we may be. Yes, fearful, for only the hopeless know no fear and in California no one need be hopeless.

Radio and Television Audience Ratings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1963, Mr. Charles P. Howze, Jr., chief counsel of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, delivered an address before the Ninth Annual Conference of the Advertising Research Foundation at the Commodore Hotel in New York City.

Mr. Howze spoke on radio and television audience ratings, a subject which was covered in hearings held by the subcommittee during this session and at that time some very valuable material was developed which I am sure is going to improve radio and TV audience ratings of the future so as to place them in a proper perspective.

His address follows:

REMARKS OF CHARLES P. HOWZE, JR., BEFORE THE NINTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ADVERTISING RESEARCH FOUNDATION, HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 1, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen of the Advertising Research Foundation, and honored guests, I appreciate the opportunity offered me by your organization to appear before you today. I want to thank Al Lehman, your president, who was kind enough, in your behalf, to ask me to express some views reflecting a layman's outlook on radio and TV audience ratings.

Let me make it clear at the outset that the views I express and the approach I pursue are mine alone, and are not to be taken as binding on the Members of Congress who serve on the Special Subcommittee on Investigations.

The other day, as I was browsing through the Library of Congress, in a thoroughly random way, I came upon a passage in a book which said what a philosopher is. Here is the definition.

A philosopher is: "A blind man in a dark cellar at midnight looking for a black cat that isn't there. He is distinguished from a theologian, in that the thelogian finds the cat. He is also distinguished from a lawyer, who smuggles in a cat in his overcoat pocket, and emerges to produce it in trimuph."

The congressional investigator (and probably anyone else, for that matter) feels much like the philosopher when he first sets out to understand the broadcast audience research business. He begins with some general notions about how the broadcasting industry works. He has heard from many quarters that ratings are most important. Yet the more people in broadcasting and advertising he talks to, the more tempted he is to conclude that ratings are just one of many, many factors that influence the decisions of buyers and sellers of broadcast time, programing executives, and others. But as the investigator goes still further into the matter, he becomes more and more impressed with the leverage wielded in these vital decisions by the rating figures alone.

There seems to be, at least among some broadcasters and advertising people, a great reluctance to concede that the role of the rating services is as pervasive in American broadcasting as I am persuaded it is. This reluctance amounts almost to a conspiracy of silence. Just to indicate to you that I am not alone in my appraisal of the role of ratings, let me quote briefly from testimony given before our subcommittee by Mr. E. William Henry, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission:

"The record in our (network television program inquiry) proceeding, as well as in this proceeding, indicates quite clearly that the single most important factor determining the continuance of the great bulk of programs broadcast is the number of homes and persons tuned in or listening to or viewing the programs."

At the beginning of the subcommittee's hearings, Chairman OREN HARRIS posed a question, which he has asked over and over again. He is aware that broadcasters and advertising men are men of considerable creativity, with many concrete achievements to their credit, and with substantial financial resources at their command.

To paraphrase Mr. HARRIS' question, he asked how have the men who run the broadcasting and advertising facilities of this country let themselves get into a position where they are so critically at the mercy of quantitative audience research? In view of the fact that broadcasters are licensed and held accountable to the Government every 3 years—or oftener—and that advertisers pay the bills for broadcasting, Mr. HARRIS' question is a pretty good one. He has yet to get a satisfactory answer from either broadcasters or advertisers.

I'd like to touch briefly on the subcommittee's hearings on broadcast ratings held earlier this year. The subcommittee addressed itself to two basic questions: first, have the rating services actually been doing what they say they do; and, second, how are rating reports used by advertisers and broadcasters and how important is the role they play?

The answer to the first question—whether the rating services have actually been doing what they say they do—is, at least in many instances, "No." This is not to say that the best of the rating services are not trying to do as honest and conscientious a job as their subscribers require. I do say, though, that even the most respected of the companies producing broadcast audience research on a regular basis have been found vulnerable on a number of counts. Not all these criticisms are equally applicable to all research companies, but let me mention just a few brought to the subcommittee's attention:

First. A wide disparity between the sample designed at company headquarters and the panel actually sampled; a corollary of which is that a carefully designed sample may be substantially redesigned by fieldworkers; quality control of fieldwork is thus haphazard at best.

Second. A susceptibility to manipulation. The practice known as hypoing is one to which most audience reseachers seem to be fairly alert. Hypoing can be blamed largely on the local broadcaster who learns (usually because he pays for a survey) the precise dates his market is being checked. I hope the Federal Trade Commission is taking an increased interest in this practice.

Third. Once the fieldwork—such as it is—gets back to the rating company, all kinds of fascinating things happen. Certain tecnhiques, variously described as "editing," "weighting," "averaging," and "smoothing out unexplained fluctuations," came in for considerable criticism by the subcommittee and its statistical consultant, Dr. Herbert Arkin, a widely respected statistician and authority on market research. Dr. Arkin acknowledged the legitimacy of some kinds of editing of fieldwork. But he was quite critical of some of the other techniques that were brought out in the hearings. For example, he characterized a weighing scheme of one company as: "[N]othing more or less than an excuse for doctoring the figures which were developed in the survey to perhaps bring out the personal opinion of whoever does the weighting."

Also, I can't resist mentioning the comment by the head of another research company that the figures circulated to his subscribers amount to little more than a calculated guess."

This hurried tour through 5½ weeks of public hearings can only hint at the impact made on almost everyone who was present in the hearing room, by the testimony we heard. I do not know the extent to which the subcommittee's hearings have been understood by people in advertising; the trade press tells conflicting stories. But I can say that in Washington the feeling is that there is something radically wrong with audience research. The great wonder to me is that there seems to be so little concern about it among advertisers and agency people.

The second broad topic considered by the subcommittee in its recent hearings was the uses to which rating information is put and its importance in influencing programing and buy-sell decisions. I have already hinted at my conclusion that rating information is much more of a determining factor in these decisions than many people care to admit—perhaps even to themselves. The delivered cost-per-thousand concept presupposes the use of a rating figure, often computed in terms of tenths of a rating point.

Seldom, as a practical matter, is recognition given to the element of statistical variance. To be sure, most if not all of the survey companies print something in their pocketpieces about statistical variances, tolerances, confidence limits, standard deviations, and what not. But from what I hear about cost-per-thousand bying, I am not convinced that any large percentage of buy-sell decisions take account of these statistical warning signals. The result is that rating and share figures are imbued with a degree of precision that not even the rating companies in their more candid moments claim for them.

Part of the problem here is poor communication between rating services and users of ratings. This, in turn, is partly attributable to the difficulty laymen experience in understanding complex statistical data and concepts. A more important reason for misunderstanding is a lack of desire for understanding among users. This lack of desire is, I submit, partly due to laziness—an unwillingness to bother with statistical complexities and to evaluate the numbers in the context of other pertinent facts about a broadcaster's operation. It is also attributable to a quite understandable reluctance of business competitors to advertise their weaknesses. While the researcher is well aware and the users are vaguely aware of the existence of sampling and other errors, it looks much more "scientific" if audience percentages and total audience projections can be shown as absolute numbers. And what station, shown by a survey to be "number one" in its market, wants to create any doubts about that fine showing? What agency time-buyer who has been justifying his decisions over the years by invoking the authority of Nielsen, Pulse, ARB, or the others, wants to let the cat out of the bag and admit to the client that his cost-per-thousand figures don't necessarily originate from the top of Mount Sinai?

There is nothing wrong with the pursuit of certainty. But an illusory certainty can be fraught with danger. During our hearings, the idea was expressed several times that some figures, however inaccurate, are better than no figures at all. In view of the amounts of money spent each year on broadcast advertising, I would urge a searching reconsideration of that notion.

I have been wondering lately whether it might be a good idea for researchers to consider changing the format of rating reports to dramatize the fact of statistical variance. There are quite a few sophisticated users of ratings who understand the fallibility of absolute numbers, but I fear they are hopelessly outnumbered by those who don't.

Again, considering the huge sums involved, I am amazed that broadcasters and advertisers have accepted audience measurement figures so uncritically for so long. With isolated exceptions, which have not been met with unqualified joy by the research companies, few efforts have been made by users of research to verify the accuracy and integrity of the information they have been using and paying for. I have heard that since the hearings (perhaps since the Federal Trade Commission's orders issued last December) some rating services have been somewhat more hospitable than before to subscribers who have questions to ask. I hope the reports I hear are true.

Several examples of questionable "editing" procedures brought out during the hearings were labeled "trade secrets." There are a number of legitimate "trade secrets" in the research field. The location of Nielsen's "audimeter homes" may be a good example. But I suspect the reason some techniques are called "trade secrets" is that if they became known, the rating services would have to spend most of their time answering questions about them.

We have an analogous problem in the Federal Government. In that great, sprawling enigma, the Pentagon, a bad habit has grown up that might be called "classifying" mistakes. Whenever events happen that make a document embarrassing to whoever was responsible for it, the temptation is strong to regard it—all of a sudden—as "top secret." Considerations of national security, which never existed before, mysteriously become obvious to those inclined to prevent the press and public from finding out what is going on.

This practice is not confined to the Pentagon. It has many variations, but the idea is the same. Other departments or agencies involved customarily resort to the ritual incantations of "executive privilege." This phase is grand sounding, but it usually rests on a pretty shaky legal and constitutional base.

It is reassuring that Congressman JOHN MOSS of California and his Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information have made substantial inroads on these habits of the Executive regarding their "trade secrets." Mr. Moss' efforts are in the direction of requiring agencies of the Federal Government to operate in the metaphorical goldfish bowl that I promised to say something about in this talk.

I think the time has come when businessmen are going to have to operate in much the same way. Let me outline why I think so and urge your support for the programs now being developed to make them a working reality.

In 1917 Walter Lippmann expressed some very dark and brooding sentiments comparing the ethical level of business conduct tolerated by the American people with that expected of Government officials. He found that our people expect our bureaucrats and politicians to meet much higher standards than those of businessmen generally. Let me quote his conclusion:

"We expect more of the politician. We say in effect that no public servant must allow himself to follow the economic habits of his countrymen. The corrupt politician is he who brings into public service the traditions of a private career. Perhaps that is a cynical reflection. I do not know how to alter it. When I hear politicians talk "reform" I know they are advocating something which most drummers on the road would regard as the scruples of a prig, and I know that when businessmen in a smoking room are frank, they are taking for granted acts which in a politician we should call criminal."

Much has been accomplished in achieving greater candor in business dealings since 1917. Much has been done to protect competitors and consumers from adulterated, poisonous, and mislabeled products put out by the less scrupulous elements of the business community.

These efforts are congressional responses to a spreading awareness that business ethics can and should be far better than they were in 1917. Today, there are measures pending in Congress to require what their supporters call "Truth in Lending" and "Truth in Packaging." These proposals, which ask that widespread and strongly entrenched commercial practices be changed—in the hope of greater protection for consumers—may seem novel, particularly to those businesses affected. Their fate is uncertain. But they have ample legislative precedent in other fields of business activity.

The most conspicuously successful one is the Securities Act of 1933, which was advertised by its supporters as the "Truth in Securities" law. That statute, now 30 years old, imposed on issuers of securities a single dominant obligation—disclosure: disclosure of what the top management had at stake in the company; disclosure of what recent past performance had been, in terms of balance sheets, profit-and-loss statements, and surplus accounts; a general disclosure of the history of the company; and a rather detailed statement of what the company planned to do with the money it hoped to get from selling its stocks or bonds.

Without the support of the late, great Sam Rayburn and his farseeing faith in this legislation, I don't think it could have been brought about. Speaker Rayburn bridged the gap between the original securities legislation and the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight, a predecessor of Congressman HARRIS' present Subcommittee on Investigations. The foresight of Sam Rayburn in 1933 and the present confidence that the Nation's investors can have in the Securities and Exchange Commission illustrate a significant historical development.

Let us look at the conditions that gave rise to the Securities Act of 1933. Senate hearings laid bare details of why investors had lost their figurative shirts in the great crash of 1929. The "prosperous" 1920's had already spawned Ponzi, Insull, Kruger, and others who, while becoming masters of financial and industrial empires, were revealed as somewhat lacking in the fundamentals of fiduciary sensitivity. To put it mildly.

It was insisted in those days, that the stock market was merely a reflection of general business conditions. But Sam Rayburn saw the situation more clearly. He recognized that the financial community—Wall Street, if you will—was in no position to disclaim responsibility for the financial situation the country found itself in. Hence his strong and stubborn support of the Securities Act of 1933.

In that legislation, as with the present day truth-in-lending and truth-in-packaging bills, the opponents of honest disclosure used every method they could think of to block the reforms hoped for by Mr. Rayburn.

The opposition generated by the Wall Street community to the Securities Act of 1933 was tremendous. "Unnecessary, impractical, and dangerous," the bill was called. President Roosevelt was accused of leading the country down the road from Democracy to communism. The business community, however, had clearly fallen short of its promise to the country. The administration and the Congress, after long and patient years of letting things slide, decided to call the chips back in.

Clearly, certain of our conventional habits had to be changed. Returning to our present discussion, I foresee, hopefully, comparable changes in outlook. I can see hopeful parallels.

There is nothing in the Securities Act of 1933 that compels a prospective investor to scrutinize a registration statement or a prospectus. Federal legislation does nothing to protect the investor who jumps at a hot tip on a hot issue from a hot source. The latter may be a legitimate investment adviser, a bellboy, or a "bookie." The SEC knows full well that it cannot enforce wisdom on the American public. It doesn't pretend to. But it does insure the availability of reliable information for those investors who take the trouble to keep their eyes and minds open before they plunk down their money.

Today, no responsible members of the financial community would call for repeal of the Securities Act of 1933.

I hope that advertisers and broadcasters can profit from the lessons taught by the securities legislation of 30 years ago. I bring the subject up only to indicate that needed changes are not always so painful as they may seem at first.

Turning from the past to the present and future, I have a few concluding remarks.

It may be argued that I have been talking from hindsight. I readily admit that I have. I have been trying to share some of my hindsight with you. I hope you will agree with me, and many others, that past conditions have been far from satisfactory—from the standpoint of your own enlightened self-interest as well as that of the public.

I hope that legislation in the field of broadcast audience research will not be necessary. But I remind you that it is being discussed. The surest way to ward off legislation is to make it unnecessary by supporting industry-sponsored efforts looking toward reform.

The most widely talked about proposals today are those of the National Association of Broadcasters. The NAB is in the process of implementing a 3-point program to improve the rating picture.

First, NAB proposes a system of accreditation of rating services. It will bestow its sanction only on research organizations whose methods meet certain statistical and quality control criteria.

Second, the association is establishing a corporation which will exercise overall control over independent audits and analyses of rating surveys. Negotiations are now in progress to determine who will do the actual auditing.

Third, NAB plans a long-term, continuing study of audience measurement methodology. As knowledge advances, standards and criteria can be refined and perfected.

In addition to, or possibly as part of, NAB's plans, the Radio Advertising Bureau is sponsoring an ambitious methodology study to the end that radio audience measurement in the future will be far more meaningful than it is today. And I am, of course, aware of the various studies planned by ARF to develop improved market research.

I strongly urge the support and encouragement by all advertisers and advertising agencies of these activities. While the prospects for better, more accurate research look good, improved research may cost more. I hope that by now you will be willing to pay the price.

I want to leave with you one more parting thought. Accurate, dependable research is a necessity to intelligent advertising. But when you use radio and television as the media for your sales messages, you must keep in mind the obligation of all broadcast licensees to serve the public interest—as well as their own commercial interests. The broadcaster may not delegate the exercise of his statutory duty to the public to anyone—rating companies, networks, or advertisers. It is up to these other groups to deal with broadcasters so as to make it as easy as possible for them to serve the public interest. This means, as I understand the Federal Communications Commission, that "programing by the numbers," while acceptable part of the time, cannot be the sole aim of broadcasters or advertisers. If our advertiser-supported system of broadcasting is to continue to flourish, research men, advertisers, and agency representatives must voluntarily assume responsibilities to the American people commensurate with those required of broadcasters.

Burying Ourselves With Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, are we going to bury ourselves?

Considerable has been said and written about selling American wheat to the Communists and from all indications, the Kennedy administration is preparing the public for a grain deal with Russia and possibly other Communist nations.

I have opposed the sale of wheat to the Russians because, in my opinion, it is not in the best interests of this Nation either economically, politically or militarily to make such a sale.

Communism has not abandoned or renounced its long range objective of burying this Nation of ours and all other nations and peoples who believe in the concepts of free enterprise and freedom.

Communist agriculture is in deep trouble because the Red rulers have placed a higher priority on industrialization and the production of weapons designed to destroy us, than they have placed on food production for their own people. It is both dangerous and paradoxical for the United States even to consider using the products of the American way of life, which communism is determined to destroy, to strengthen that ideology. How do you meet the challenge of communism by enhancing its economy, by helping it overcome its shortcomings? By supplying the Russians and other Communists with food products we will, in effect, be freeing large sections of their labor force to continue the development and construction of weapons they hoped to use to bury us.

With communism engaged in cruel and vicious aggression and subversion against our allies and the United States, it would be morally and strategically wrong for us to subsidize those intent on destroying us. It is bad enough to subsidize wheat that is to go into domestic storage, but it would be sheer financial and political madness to give Khrushchev a subsidy for wheat that he needs. It would amount to American taxpayers subsidizing communism.

In the struggle to preserve freedom, no form of warfare can be neglected. If America aids Russia in waging economic warfare with wheat purchases we are asking for trouble. In exchange for sales now, we would be harvesting possible national tragedy later on.

We are spending more money on our defenses than ever before in peacetime to meet the challenge of communism. Now to turn around and feed the mouth that is going to bite us seems, indeed, foolhardy.

If the United States should sell wheat to the Russians or any other Communist nation, thus making up for the deficiencies of the Communist agricultural system, thus enhancing the Red economy, it will, indeed, be difficult hereafter for our Nation to call upon our friends and allies to assist us in resisting Communist aggression, the same system which we would have helped strengthen.

If the United States-Russian wheat transaction is consummated, how can we then request other free nations to curtail their trade and aid to Cuba? What will be our policy toward Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba in the event any of these nations should hereafter offer gold or dollars in exchange for wheat or other U.S. surplus commodities? Certainly a sale of wheat to Russia would affect the success of our policy of containment in regards to Cuba.

The value of the relatively small amount of grain it would remove from our surpluses is very small in comparison to the billions we are spending all over the world not only to maintain our own defense and security, but to help other countries defeat communism. One of the arguments for foreign aid is that it is used to defeat and contain communism. It seems rather ridiculous on one

hand to spend billions in foreign aid to defeat and contain communism, and on the other hand feed and nurture its suffering economy.

The wheat deal certainly runs counter to our professed policy which is to oppose the spread of communism and to help others oppose it.

No wonder the rest of the world does not understand our foreign policy. By such a sale we would in effect be burying ourselves.

Under present circumstances, I shall continue to oppose any such sale.

A Ruether Memo Calls for Iron Fist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., appeared in the New York Journal American of October 6.

In view of the fact that we are constantly being warned about the great dangers from the radical right, which though noisy has little or no power, it is interesting to read some of the words from the left. The difference is that they have the power, and are high in the counsels of our Government:

A REUTHER MEMO CALLS FOR IRON FIST

(By William F. Buckley Jr.)

You may remember that in September of 1961 President Kennedy, in Seattle, warned the Nation against the dangers of the radical right, which was giving him unmitigated hell for delinquencies high and low, including the disaster at the Bay of Pigs, our supine acceptance of the Berlin wall, and the training of Yugoslav pilots at American Air Force bases in Texas.

J.F.K.'s tactic, in attacking said radical right, was the hoariest in political polemics. It consists in pointing to the most indefensible piece of treachery, or nonsense, committed by any disciple of the target group, and blasting off as though said foolishness were characteristic of the whole opposition.

Because Robert Welch has written that Eisenhower is a Communist, it is insinuated that all those who raise their voices in protest against the foreign policies of the President are the kind of people who think that poor old Ike is a commie.

Ho hum. Such is the nature of the political beast in a democracy, and he is not likely to change. But what is rhetorically, and even morally, mischievous becomes alarming when it is translated into a program of action that aims at flesh and blood persecution of dissent.

I do not know how it got out of his possession, but I have a copy from the Church League of America (422 North Prospect St., Wheaton, Ill.), of a memorandum that will snd chills up any libertarian spine. The original belongs to Robert Kennedy, Attorney General; and it was composed by the brothers Reuther, Walter and Victor. It is a program for Federal action against the "Radical Right," defined by the Reuthers, as "an unknown number of millions of Americans of viewpoints bounded on the left by Senator GOLDWATER and on the right by Robert Welch."

Here is what the Reuthers proposed, in a memorandum following the President's Seattle speech, that the Government do to quell the activities of an unknown number of millions of their fellow citizens:

1. Muzzle the military. Present the recall to active duty of such persons as Gen. James Van Fleet, and others known for their extremist, anti-Communist views. Prevent military men from declaring their own views on public policy.

2. Begin listing rightwing groups as subversive in the official Attorney General's list of subversive organizations and fronts. That will scare a lot of citizens away from support for these groups, the Reuthers observe.

3. Get Internal Revenue to revoke the tax exemptions of a number of these conservative-minded organizations, irrespective of whether they are religiously, or educationally oriented. In other words, even though the groups in question qualify under the law for tax exemption, remove that tax exemption for the single reason that they are right, rather than left-oriented.

4. Use the power of the Federal Communications Commission to harass radio and television stations that give time to conservative broadcasters.

5. "The Administration should take steps to end the Minutemen." By whatever are the appropriate means; at the least, they could be dubbed "subversive."

6. We must put an end to the "exaggeration of the domestic Communist menace," that is to say, put an end to J. Edgar Hoover, the principal offender who, because he has so often called attention to the menace of the domestic arm of the Communist Party, "contributes to the public's frame of mind upon which the radical right feeds."

There we have it: Use the power of the administration, the power of the Attorney General, the power of the Internal Revenue, the power of the Federal Communications Commission, to execute the Reuthers' will; and smash everyone on the right up to and including those who agree with Senator GOLDWATER.

There, my friends, are important liberals talking. Dare I suggest that not in the wildest writings of the radical right can a student of extremist rhetoric and extremist solutions find anything to compare with the Reuther's contempt for our free institutions?

I'm sorry the Attorney General didn't ask your humble servant for a memorandum on how to solve the problem his brother is worried about. I would have told him how to knock the living daylights out of the radical right in a single sentence—(1) free Cuba; (2) dismantle the wall; (3) boot the Yugoslav fliers out of Texas.

No. 13—"California: The Gamblers' Paradise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to point out to the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of California, the extent of gambling in that State.

California is indeed a Golden State for organized crime rings that finance their shoddy operations with the proceeds of illicit gambling.

Legal betting at the track is a bigtime operation in California. Last year's parimutuel turnover was $522 million. The revenue to the State treasury was over $39 million. This legal gambling activity made California the second ranking in parimutuel betting in the country.

However, this action is peanuts when compared with illegal off-track wagering. California's share of the estimated national off-track gambling last year was over $4.3 billion. This represents California's share of the figure given to the McClellan committee.

Other testimony by State investigations commissions indicates that total illegal gambling in California could have reached over $8½ billion in gross turnover in 1962. About 10 percent of this gross is retained by the professional gamblers—more than $800 million lines the filthy pockets of the mob.

Since this kind of money helps support other criminal enterprises, it can safely be said that crime activities in California are well endowed. Illegal gambling bankrolls every shady operation in the book.

According to expert opinion, Mr. Speaker, the crime syndicates use about 15 percent of their profits to corrupt law-enforcement agencies and other public officials. Needless to say, this money is not working for the legalization of gambling. Only legalized gambling would wipe out the treasury of organized crime.

Because of the failure and refusal to legalize gambling under proper Government regulation and control, ostrichlike officialdom has made the people of California unknowing colleagues of the crime syndicates.

Government supervised and regulated gambling, in the form of a national lottery, would not only undercut the underworld, but would clean up the political process and build up our depleted National Treasury.

Farm Labor Facts—Part XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, many supporters of Mexican immigrants to the United States under Public Law 414 are anticipating a substantial influx of this type of worker and permanent resident in the event the existing Mexican worker program is not extended, Public Law 78.

The California Department of Employment just locked out this additional labor source as is evidenced by the following public release in the Woodland Daily Democrat, Woodland, Calif.

GREEN CARD FLOOD HALTS, SAYS LARIN

Donald Larin, assistant director of the State department of employment yesterday told the Democrat that "there will be no flood of green card Mexican nationals into

the State next year regardless of the outcome of the bracero program, Public Law 78, in Congress."

Many had been concerned that a great number of immigrant Mexican laborers might have an overall bad effect upon the State despite the fact that they would be invaluable to portions of the agricultural community at harvesttime.

Larin said the possibility of wholesale immigration had been eliminated by the application of an immigration rule to all Mexican entrants not merely to those entering in groups of 25 or more.

The procedure which used to be applied to the larger groups required several kinds of certification from the department of employment through its local branches before the group could be allowed to enter.

The same procedure has, since July, been applied to all prospective agricultural labor immigrants from Mexico, Larin said.

PROCEDURE OUTLINED

Briefly, the following is the procedure which must be followed:

The local manager of the department of employment must certify that the applicant employer is indeed a bona fide employer; he must certify that the employer is offering year-round work on a contract basis and, most important, that there is no domestic worker capable of handling the job. He must further certify that the employment of the Mexican national will not lower the wages, living conditions, or other perquisites of the job, for domestic workers.

The employer's application must state the duration of the job, the hours and days of work, the exact pay, and any other perquisites of the job. The application must be signed in person by the employer in the presence of the manager of the local employment office. "In fact all nine copies must be signed in the foregoing manner," Larin said.

The application would then be forwarded to the district office of the Federal Bureau of Employment Security which then would certify either for or against the application. The documents next would go through channels to the U.S. consul nearest the area where the particular bracero lived.

WORKERS AVAILABLE

Larin noted, "There are very few year-round jobs on U.S. farms for which domestic workers are not available."

From the bracero's side, he must obtain an exit permit from his own government in addition to his birth certificate, health certificate and police clearance.

Larin said that the procedural change had been made necessary because of fears that with the possible lack of an organized bracero program next year, too many "green carders" might flood the country with a consequent depressing effect upon the wages and living conditions of domestic agricultural workers, primarily, and after the end of the harvest season, stay to swell relief rolls and create other social and economic problems.

Lumber Promises Still Unmet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, after considerable urging by Members of Congress, the President presented a six-point program to aid the ailing timber industry. This program included a recommendation to repeal provisions of the Jones Act, which now prevent American lumber from being shipped between American ports on foreign ships. Also, he recommended a voluntary quota on Canadian lumber exports to the United States. So far, little has been done to implement these recommendations.

Recently, 105 Members of this body joined me in signing a letter to the President asking for quotas. These quotas, I believe, are necessary because our negotiators need leverage to persuade the Canadians to limit their lumber exports. The administration rejected this approach, however.

Mr. Speaker, several Members, including myself, have introduced legislation to impose a temporary quota and legislation to repeal the Jones Act as it applies to shipment of lumber. But time moves on while we wait for the administration—appointed department heads to report their views to the committees of the House.

The situation is summed up in an editorial that apeared in the Seattle, Wash., Times on September 20, 1963. This editorial points out that the administration talks as though it has been 14 days, rather than 14 months since the President announced his six-point program. Also, the editorial suggests that the administration could show it is not giving the lumber industry the runaround by exerting strong influence behind measures it has recommended.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

LUMBER PROMISES STILL UNMET

The Kennedy administration has rejected a plea by 106 Congressmen for quotas on Canadian softwood lumber, stating that the distressed lumber industry should look instead to President Kennedy's announced lumber-aid program of July 1962, for relief.

This leaves the petitioning congressmen with a one-word question: When?

The administration talks as though it has been 14 days, rather than 14 months, since the President's program was announced.

Very little has been done to meet the program's promises.

(The program included negotiations with Canada with an eye to a voluntary curb on Canadian exports, consideration by the Tariff Commission of higher tariff protection, preference for domestic lumber in government purchases; road development in national forests; amendment of the Jones Act to permit use of foreign vessels in intercoastal lumber shipments; increases in allowable timber cuts on land managed by the Interior Department; speedier action on lumbermill loan applications, and plans for a continuing review of the lumber industry's problems by an interagency governmental committee.)

Two comparatively small, but valued, steps within the framework of the President's program are awaiting early congressional action.

These are a Tariff Act amendment that would require Canadian lumber shipped to the United States to be marked as to origin, and renewal of the Jones Act amendment permitting U.S. cargo-lumber shippers to use low-cost foreign vessels in serving Puerto Rico.

One way for the administration to show it is not merely giving the hard-hit lumber industry the runaround would be to exert strong influence behind these measures, both of which are at critical junctures in the congressional committee process.

Nursing Care Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, in the September 26 issue of the Stars and Stripes—the National Tribune—there appeared an editorial entitled "Nursing Care Bill," which contains an endorsement of the proposal H.R. 8009 and speaks in kindly fashion of the activities of the Subcommittee on Intermediate Care, which I had the honor to head. The bill is now pending before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, where I hope it will receive early and favorable attention.

It was a distinct honor and privilege to be designated by the chairman of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, to be chairman of this important subcommittee and have the opportunity to participate in the drafting of this vital legislation. One member of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration has advised me that in his opinion no bill since the passage of Public Law 293, 79th Congress, which created the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the VA has been more important to the medical and health care of the veterans of this country. Passage and favorable consideration of this legislation would not have been possible without the wholehearted cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the other members of the subcommittee, who worked so hard and diligently in preparing this proposal. I refer to the gentleman from Texas, RAY ROBERTS; the gentleman from Ohio, ROBERT SECREST; the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY C. SCHADEREBG; and the gentleman from Kansas, ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of this editorial.

NURSING CARE BILL

Action by the House of Representatives on September 16 in giving approval to the nursing care bill promises to be a long step toward providing for the many thousands of older veterans who are desperately in need of additional care once they have received maximum benefits at the hands of the Veterans' Administration.

Passage of this legislation by the Congress, although not meeting the approval of the VA, would give assurance to families of ailing veterans that they would be relieved from the financial burden of caring for these men in their declining years.

We believe that the Veterans' Affairs Committee and particularly the Subcommittee on Intermediate Care which worked so diligently on the details of the bill, are to be congratulated. Subcommittee members listened to pages and pages of lengthy testimony from both proponents and opponents of the proposed legislation. They visited various VA hospitals throughout the country to ascertain for themselves the urgency of extending nursing care to older veterans.

Judging from correspondence received over this desk relating the hardships which many wives and families have undergone to care for their loved ones after discharge from VA

hospitals, we are convinced of the vital and urgent need of legislation of this character. We hope the Senate will act promptly upon the House bill and that it will receive the approval of the Chief Executive.

Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our new Commissioner of Immigration, Raymond F. Farrell, received a well-deserved tribute in the following article by Karl Detzer in the Reader's Digest issue of September 1963.

By reason of his long experience as a career employee of the Immigration Department, Mr. Farrell is well equipped for the difficult task involved in the directorship of this important branch of our Government.

WELCOME, STRANGER

(By Karl Detzer)

The big jet plane, slipping through the clouds into New York's International Airport at Idlewild, brought 97 passengers to the United States. Such a planeload lands at Idlewild on an average once every 20 minutes; every day of the year 4,500 passengers arrive from abroad, half of them noncitizens.

Off this plane came a dozen British, Swedish, and Belgian businessmen and a score of European tourists. Seeking permanent residence in the United States were a few uneasy immigrants from Norway and the Netherlands, a handful of East German refugees, and one little Austrian orphan bound for grandparents in New Jersey. From the Middle East were six exchange students. An African in tribal robe emerged, followed by a thin, dark woman in a sari. There were American tourists, students, teachers, business people. American or foreigner, each had to pass muster by inspectors of the U.S. Immigration, Public Health and Customs Services.

As the passengers swarmed off the plane, one old woman stood confused, clutching an Italian passport. She turned, startled, when a pretty young girl in a trim blue uniform touched her arm.

"Welcome to the United States, signora," the young woman said in rapid Italian. "Per favore, may I see your papers? Thank you, signora. My name is Angela. If you will please follow me?"

The old woman looked anxiously about. "My son, he was to meet me," she quavered.

"He's probably up on the balcony," the girl replied. "Oh, you see him already? We will hurry to him, signora. But come inside first, please—it will take only a few minutes."

The Public Health officer spent less than 15 seconds examining the woman's health certificate. The Immigration inspector stamped her passport quickly and in Italian curdled by a Brooklyn accent said, "You may go to Customs next, signora. The signorina will guide you."

Under Idlewild's new experimental system, the forms to fill out are much shorter, the approach friendlier. It took Customs and Agriculture inspectors only a minute or two to assure themselves that the two bulging bags contained nothing dutiable or proscribed. That was all; the Italian grandmother was in. Chatting amiably, the girl in blue led her to the door, and there was her son. Eight minutes after this frightened woman met the health officer, she was hugging her grandchildren.

The young woman who had greeted her, Angela Aiello, was one of Idlewild's 10 port receptionists, a small elite corps established 7 years ago by the Immigration Service. These smiling young ladies meet oversea arrivals at most of our major airports. They serve as interpreters, help with tired children or confusing documents, allay strangers' fears, guide them to inspectors; in short, they create good will.

Forty receptionists serve in seven ports, including San Juan and Honolulu. To qualify, a girl must be proficient in at least one foreign language. More than half of the present receptionists speak French, Spanish, or German. Others are at home in Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, with smatterings of other tongues. In Miami, the six busy receptionists are fluent in Spanish, and a few also speak Portuguese. Workers at Honolulu have to speak Japanese or Chinese. Timid Hong Kong refugees arrive there in large groups, and only a good receptionist can ease their anxieties.

The port receptionist project and Uncle Sam's other efforts to meet the stranger with a smile are part of the "Welcome to America" campaign designed to help reverse the outward flow of dollars. Authorities believed that to substitute a smooth red carpet for snarls of redtape at our major entry points might encourage tourism here. At the port of arrival, each visitor is handed a welcome printed in English and Spanish, opening with President Kennedy's words: "No one who sets foot in the United States need do so as a stranger." Visitors for pleasure in 1962 numbered 852,000, up 11 percent in a year; from Europe alone the increase was 28 percent.

When the President dedicated the Dulles International Airport outside Washington, D.C., he said, "I hope that all the men and women who work at our airports and piers will show our best face to the world, realizing that the people who arrive here make a judgment of our country. We want it to be the best."

The Immigration Service responded. Its new "Handbook for Inspectors" incorporates the President's words, emphasizing that the good officer "affects the lives and well-being of many people" and, therefore, "tempers his judgment with sympathy."

Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell, appointed by President Kennedy in January 1962, is a mild-mannered but tough-minded career official of 55. He got his first Government job while a Georgetown University student, has been with Immigration since 1941. The laws for inspection of every arrival, alien or citizen, are unchanged, but the new commissioner has simplified procedure, given his inspectors and supervisors more freedom to make on-the-spot decisions. He admits that at New York City's piers, and at airports where international terminals are unfinished, tieups still occur. But at completed jet-age ports experienced officers, with the help of women receptionists, can make the average check in less than 1 minute.

Another timesaver is preinspection by U.S. officials at foreign airports. This system, which uses the often wasted hour between the time an international passenger confirms his ticket and the plane takes off, is now in force for flights from Canada, the Bahamas, and Bermuda, and soon may include Mexico. Preinspection officers also ride certain trains from Canada and most ships from Far Eastern ports to Honolulu.

"Welcome to the United States," a card in their own language, greets those passengers who have been inspected. "Upon arrival at your entry port, you may proceed to your destination without further inspection."

At Montreal's International Airport recently, U.S. Immigration officials handling the preinspection of two Canadian brothers noticed that something seemed seriously wrong with the younger one. He was suffering from a mental disease, it was disclosed, and his brother was accomanying him to Boston for treatment. American law bars any alien with a disabling mental illness from entering the United States. But the inspector, using what Commissioner Farrell calls a reasonable approach, worked out with the U.S. Public Health officer a "parole," under which the healthy brother and a Boston doctor would be responsible for the invalid. The brothers caught their plane.

Immigration's policy of helping where you can falls directly on 37 district directors, career officers in cities in the States and in Frankfurt, Manila, Mexico City, and Rome. It is their privilege to snip redtape and clear a passenger in double time.

At another level, inspectors and supervisors are learning when to "expedite," and probably few have more opportunities to extend a helping hand than those at our border stations. On the Mexican border, an average of more than 200 persons a minute pass the check points. Most go back and forth often, to work or to visit, and carry simplified "border crosser" cards. But officials must still check each one.

Maria Socorro Compos-Velencia, a Mexican woman crossing into the States each day to work, one morning brought the guards at San Ysidro a scorched piece of her alien registration card, damaged the night before when her house in Tijuana burned. Worse, the documents necessary to obtain a similar card for her 5-year-old child had been destroyed. When the officers routinely advised her, "You will need new photographs. Come back in a week or two," a supervisor interrupted: "Why wait?"

The woman returned next day. Her own papers were ready, along with a 2-month "parole" for her child and a gift from Immigration employees of a $20 bill.

The Immigration Service's schools are at Port Isabel, Tex. In 1962, at the Officer Development Center, 795 officers attended classes in a dozen areas of study. Additional hundreds participated in extension courses in such subjects as elementary criminal evidence, nationality and immigration laws and rules of arrest. A course in "public relations," Associate Commissioner Mario Noto explains, deals with "how to make friends among all races and conditions of men."

Last Christmas the New York district director received a letter from a Latvian woman his agents had just helped. She wrote:

"Sir, it is the happiest day since I left my mother country. I am far from Latvia but the feeling that I am welcome in your brightest and most beautiful United States makes me very happy. I will with my duties be like a native citizen. Lina Elvins."

She was a foreigner and needed help. But an Indiana high school student who went to Europe last summer with 50 others was just as pleased with her reception when she returned. Back home, she wrote:

"One of my warmest memories is of the officials at Idlewild who were so friendly."

Trade With the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this week's column by Mr. Thurman Sensing, of the Southern States Industrial Council, is concerned with the ques-

tion of whether the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union. It is entitled "Shall American Taxpayers Subsidize Communism?"

In this column, Mr. Sensing has done an excellent job of analyzing this important question which is of much concern to the Members of the Congress, who expressed in 1961 a consensus against such trade with the Communists. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Sensing's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of his column my newsletter for this week which is also on this subject. It is entitled "Two Wrongs Don't Make a Right."

There being no objection, the column and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSING THE NEWS—SHALL AMERICAN TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE COMMUNISM?

(By Thurman Sensing)

No sooner had the Kennedy administration achieved ratification of the treaty of Moscow than the New Frontier began to push for agricultural trading with the Soviet Union. This trade, if allowed to come into existence, would be a major danger to the American safety and economy.

The administration's hopes and plans became apparent in a number of ways. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who steered the Moscow treaty through the Senate, promptly ordered hearings for a study of ways and means of relaxing export controls. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, who recently returned from a trip to Russia, also began discussing the possibility of selling agricultural products to Russia.

No doubt, the pressure will be heavy to approve this trade. The Soviet Union again has suffered a disastrous crop failure. It is badly in need of wheat and has made large purchases from Canada. Evidently, it hopes to make similar purchases of American wheat.

"Why not sell it to them?" some people ask. "We don't lose anything by getting Russian money for surplus U.S. wheat." There is plenty wrong with that observation. Let's see what it is.

It is well to begin with Canada. In order to sell its wheat to Russia, the Canadian Government had to agree to regard the Soviet Union as a favored trading partner. This means, for example, that the Canadians will have to buy large quantities of Russian goods. When this kind of two-way trade is established, it links countries together. Henceforth the Canadians will have to orient their thinking more in the direction of what the Russians want.

One reason the Canadian Government approved a trade deal is that it wanted to boost prosperity in the wheat-growing areas and win popularity. Perhaps the Kennedy administration has a similar political goal for the U.S. wheat States. But when Canada buys more Russian goods, it buys fewer United States goods. This means that the gold flow into the United States is reduced, thereby making more vexing an already critical gold problem. The dollar is further undermined.

If the United States were to sell wheat to Russia, the Russians would, of course, pay the world price. This is 60 cents a bushel less than our domestic price. But this domestic price is supported by U.S. subsidies. Understand what that means. If the Russians buy United Statest-supported wheat at the world market price, the American taxpayers will be subsidizing wheat sold to the Reds.

It's bad enough to subsidize wheat that is to go into domestic storage, but it would be sheer financial and political madness to give Khrushchev a subsidy for wheat that he needs. It would amount to American taxpayers subsidizing communism.

Actually, it is in the United States interest to deny Russia access to wheat and to force her thereby to divert more labor into farm production. The Soviet Union much prefers to pay cash for wheat overseas than to make such a diversion of labor. The Reds don't want to take manpower out of their armament plants and heavy industry, the areas where they are fiercely trying to catch up with the United States.

Therefore, if the United States allows Russians to buy wheat over here, it is helping Khrushchev carry out his grand design to strengthen the Soviet industrial system. Obviously, this is not in the U.S. interest. But these days the American Government seems to have forgotten all about preserving the American interest, whether it is in the Caribbean, in space, the Far East, or on the farm.

In the struggle to preserve freedom, no form of warfare can be neglected. If America allows Russia to wage economic warfare with wheat purchases, we are asking for trouble. In exchange for some sales now, we would be harvesting possible national tragedy later on.

Also, it is silly and shallow thinking to take the position, as some people do, that it would be all right to sell wheat to Russia and the other Iron Curtain countries but not to Red China and Cuba. A Communist is a Communist.

STROM THURMOND REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE, OCTOBER 7, 1963

TWO WRONGS DON'T MAKE A RIGHT

In August 1961, Congress restated the policy that the United States should "in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation other than * * * friendly nations." Wheat sales by the United States to the Soviet Union are within the prohibition of this policy. Yet it has become obvious that the executive branch of Government, at least, now looks with favor on sales of wheat to the Communist nations.

Three main arguments are now advanced for selling wheat to the Soviets:

First, the United States has large surpluses of wheat, and the cost of storage is high; sales to the Communist bloc would diminish the surplus and reduce storage costs.

Second, the Communists can obtain wheat from other free world nations such as Canada and Australia, even if we don't sell to them.

Third, the sale of wheat and other products to the Communists would help to offset the serious balance-of-payments deficit of the United States, which results primarily from the heavy outflow of foreign aid.

A fourth argument, used privately, is that the political consequences of the rejection of the wheat plan by the farmers in the referendum of last spring could be softened.

The factors on which the public arguments are based are not new. They were all in existence in 1961 when Congress made the latest policy decision against selling such commodities to unfriendly nations. U.S. wheat surpluses go back for years. Canada was selling wheat to Red China in 1961. The balance-of-payments problem reached a high in 1960.

Regardless of the soft words from Khrushchev in the past few months, no one could seriously believe that the Moscow test ban treaty converted the Soviet Union from an unfriendly nation into a friendly nation. No witness who testified on the treaty denied that the Communists, including Khrushchev, continue to stanchly maintain their goal of world domination.

Communism still pits its atheistic slave system against our free system. As Khrushchev so often repeats, the "conflict of systems" must continue until one or the other falls.

Although the conflict of systems takes military, economic and psychological forms, the conflict is fundamentally ideological. The basic issue in the conflict is whether the despotic slave system of communism is better than the free systems of the non-Communist nations, or whether an orderly existence of society can result from an applied philosophy of godless materialism.

In no other way has communism proved its abject failure more clearly than in its demonstrated incapacity to feed the people under its control. Continuous Soviet agricultural failure confronts every person behind the Iron Curtain with daily evidence of the bankruptcy of Communist regimes and the Marxist doctrine.

There is reason to believe that the Soviet agricultural failure this year was intensified by sabotage efforts of the Soviet people, expressing their opposition to the Communist regime in the only way they have, albeit a costly one to themselves.

If the United States now participates in covering up the Communist agricultural failures, the greatest weakness of the Communists will be hidden, and the opposition to communism of the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain nullified. Instead of having to devote even greater portions of its resources to overcome its agricultural failures, the Communists can divert material and human resources even further toward military and subversive efforts to dominate the remainder of the world.

Khrushchev now has trouble with the people throughout the bloc. The people want more freedom, and the more they could get, the more they would want and the more trouble Khrushchev would have. Is it either moral or advantageous for the United States to help the Soviet leaders relieve their internal political difficulties?

Our free world allies are now trading with the Soviets far more than we. The efforts of the United States to curtail such aid to the enemy have been halfhearted. We have mildly criticized our allies for yielding to the lure of profits and temporary internal political gains flowing from dangerous trade with the Communists.

It is now time to prove that we will support our principles with actions as well as words. Two wrongs do not make a right, and if the United States now demonstrates the courage of its convictions, our allies may be influenced to reexamine their own actions and policies on trading with the enemy.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Soviets Scheme To Take South African Gold, McGrath Warns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, W. L. McGrath, chairman of the board of the Williamson Co. in my district, for many years served as an employer-delegate to the International Labor Organization and later as a member of its governing body. As a result, he came to know key and influential people in various countries throughout the world. He just returned from an extensive European trip where he conferred with a considerable

number of these leaders. These discussions dealt generally with the subject of gold on which Mr. McGrath is somewhat of an expert.

The Cincinnati Enquirer of Sunday, September 29, 1963, in a column by Bob Webb, carried a comprehensive report of Mr. McGrath's keen analysis of the current situation with reference to Soviet designs on South African gold. It is my feeling that the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of this distinguished citizen's findings:

AS CINCINNATIAN SEES IT: RUSSIA LUSTING FOR GOLD—EYES SOUTH AFRICA'S TREASURE

(By Bob Webb)

Does the Soviet bear lust for the 60 percent of the world's gold produced in South Africa?

The answer of a Cincinnati business leader, W. L. McGrath, board chairman of the Williamson Co., is an emphatic "Yes."

And he regards the Soviet appetite for South Africa's precious metal as a lunge at the jugular vein of the free world.

"Russia knows the most lethal weapon in the world is gold," Mr. McGrath said.

A recent European trip to get at the facts on the torrid June Conference of the International Labor Organization in Geneva sharpened his conception of Soviet designs on South Africa.

It was the June session that African delegations, supported by Communists, jarred with a shouting denunciation of South Africa and walkout from the world assembly.

From 1949 through 1957, Mr. McGrath was either an employer delegate, adviser or member of the governing body of the ILO. He had been a keen observer of the agency which he believes has bent sharply to the political and economic left.

After the June session, Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, Republican, of Ohio, member of a special ILO review committee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, requested Mr. McGrath's views on the Organizations' current status.

As a result, Mr. McGrath decided to go on his own to Europe to interview men who were at the Conference, or who as close observers were qualfied to speak.

In essence, he concluded that the Soviet Union, with carefully laid strategy, is using the ILO—just as, in his opinion, it has used the United Nations—in an effort to paralyze and take over the Government of the gold-rich, industry-rich Republic of South Africa.

To a friend he wrote:

"The conclusion that I have reached from my investigation of the South African situation, is in view of what happened at the June ILO Conference when South Africa became the focal point of interest, that this is all a put-up, well-designed conspiracy by the Communists to disrupt and ultimately overthrow the Government of the Republic of South Africa, and thereby remove the relationship of that nation from the Western Powers to the Communist bloc, just as they have succeeded in doing in Cuba."

African delegates, many from the new nations, raced out of the Conference when a South African employer delegate asked to speak. They labeled their action a protest of the right of the delegate to the floor since the ILO in 1961 had invited South Africa to withdraw as a member because of its racial separation policy known as apartheid.

In a memorandum, Mr. McGrath warned that "with world opinion so drastically against the South African Government, I do not see how it can resist the pressures and attacks that have and will be leveled against it in the months ahead unless in the U.N. and elsewhere, we come to its defense; not on the ground of support of apartheid, but the ground that a country should have the right and the freedom to shape its own destiny and should not be subjected to external dictation. The issue is serious. If the Government of South Africa should fall, under pressure from the left, the Western World will, in my opinion, suffer one of its greatest defeats."

Russia itself, with about 20 percent of the total world production, is the second largest gold producer, Mr. McGrath explained. With the South African mines, the Communists would have a potential death grip on the world economy, he emphasized.

Mr. McGrath stressed America's balance-of-payments problem as a critical element in Soviet strategy to wrest control of the world through control of its economy. The U.S. gold supply has dropped to about $15.5 billion, of which $12 billion is required by law to back Federal Reserve notes and bank deposits Mr. McGrath observed.

That leaves only about $3.5 billion to meet foreign demands for gold in payment for goods, services' and other oversea obligations of Americans, he noted, adding that such claims amount to more than $20 billion.

All that deters other countries from demanding U.S. gold is their faith in the dollar, Mr. McGrath said.

"But if the Soviets can bring enough pressure on us, through persuasion of our creditors to foreclose with demands for our gold, they will cause economic chaos for America, and the rest of the world," he declared.

By constrast, with South African gold added to its own, the Soviet Union might soon dictate the world economy through its main money metal, Mr. McGrath believes.

In his memorandum, Mr. McGrath compared Communist techniques prior to the Cuban takeover and propaganda leveled now against South Africa.

"In Cuba the slogan was 'American imperialism.' " he said.

"In South Africa it is 'apartheid' and, in both cases, the springboard for propaganda action has been the United Nations. In the case of South Africa, the ILO, as an affiliate and a political subsidiary of the U.N., has been used as a forum and as a so-called impartial agency which * * * reaffirms the charges of apartheid against South Africa, which is the same charge that for many years has been made against that nation in the United Nations."

Mr. McGrath warned that the Communists will attempt, in the current session of the United Nations, to win economic sanctions against South Africa.

"If they can get the nations of the world to cut off trade with South Africa," he declared, "they will make the country vulnerable to Soviet agents from within."

South Africa, with a population now of about 16.1 million, was first settled by the Dutch who pushed up from the tip of the continent. Later the Bantus came down from the central region of Africa. Asiatics and British also form sizable population segments.

Convinced the United States should no longer belong to the ILO, Mr. McGrath observed that at the June session a Cuban delegate charged this country had sent low-flying planes to poison Cuban crops. And the provisional record does not show where any U.S. delegate answered the charge, he noted.

"The charge was not answered on the assumption that nobody would believe the Cuban delegate," Mr. McGrath said. "But no doubt many people there did believe it."

A U.S. delegate should have replied promptly, he added.

Time after time the Soviets seize the ILO platform through delegates from other countries and lash the United States, Mr. McGrath asserted.

In his eyes, then, the ILO is a dagger, poison tipped with Soviet propaganda, at the heart of America—though ironically the United States, with fewer than 1 percent of the 432 delegates, is responsible for payment of one-fourth of the Organization's budget.

He emphasized what he regards as the sham of the ILO's "tripartite" makeup. Under its constitution the 108 member nations are instructed to send delegates from labor, management, and government.

"But the delegates from the Communist countries speak in a single voice," Mr. McGrath said. "There's no distinction in their opinions—all voice the government line."

And in Mr. McGrath's view, the single-minded Communists laid their strategy for what happened in June at the Addis Ababa Pan-African Conference shortly before.

We Must Not Aid the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union, under date of September 30, 1963:

RED TRADE NOT THE ANSWER—WE MUST NOT AID THE ENEMY

An overhaul of U.S. trade policies and practices is inevitable because of increasing competitive pressures from European nations and the Japanese.

Nowhere is the challenge more apparent than in the steel industry. The Japanese sell 2-inch pipe to the United States, for instance, at $56.25 a ton less than the same pipe is sold in Japan. The British sell their pipe on the American market for $132.92 per ton as compared with $183.88 at home. Even when shipping costs and duty are added, the price of British pipe comes to only $166 a ton in the United States. Producers in this country must charge $196.16 per ton for the identical material.

The situation is similar in dozens of other fields. But the administration, instead of seeking means to assure fair trade practices with our competitors, now is looking to Communist-bloc nations as a source of relief to our world trade problems.

Even now, congressional and administration leaders are trying to decide who should take the initiative on proposals for sale of wheat to the Soviet. Government attorneys contend there isn't any legal prohibition against such a sale. A congressional statement of policy, attached to the Agricultural Act of 1961, specifies, however, that such sales are opposed to the will of Congress.

Once the barriers are removed to permit wheat sales to the Soviet there is no reason to believe that the practice would not be extended into virtually every export field. Secretary of State Rusk already has reported the Soviet Union has evidenced an interest in buying corn from private U.S. traders.

Ironically, if the wheat deal goes through, the United States would charge the Russians about $1.30 a bushel, approximately 60 cents less than domestic mills are charged. This is because of the Government's farm price support program which maintains domestic wheat prices above world market levels.

The State Department reportedly has told U.S. exporters that it probably would be a good idea to explore trade possibilities also with Red China. This would be in gross violation of the law and the national will.

Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges insists that by selling to the Chinese Reds and the Soviet, the United States will eliminate unemployment, increase production and in general guarantee its own prosperity.

The United States doesn't need to trade with the enemy to prosper. Despite keen competition in world markets, America's businessmen have more than held their own. In fact, their exports have expanded. In the first 7 months of this year, commercial shipments were at an annual rate of $21.5 billion, up 2 percent from the previous year.

The administration nevertheless is bent on greatly increasing trade with the Communists, supplying them the foodstuffs and industrial equipment they need to continue their campaign of harassment against the free world.

A change in trade policies is essential. But they should not involve trade deals that would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

An Important New Book by Father Robert F. Drinan, S.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to a new book by the dean of Boston College Law School entitled "Religion, the Courts and Public Policy."

Father Drinan is one of the most distinguished Jesuit priests in the United States, a leading American intellectual and an outstanding civil leader. His opinions on church-state matters and other issues are of major concern to all of us, and this book deserves wide reading.

In a New York Times Book review, the eminent critic, John Cogley, stated that the dean's book "reflected a philosophic as well as legal turn of mind worthy of any jurist's attention."

Going beyond Mr. Cogley, I would like to say that the book should also be of interest to every Member of Congress. I am happy to include a review of this book which appeared in the Sui Juris, the publication of the Boston College Law School, September 1963. As a graduate of this school, I am deeply proud of its great tradition and, of course, of its distinguished dean. The article follows:

FATHER DRINAN'S BOOK IS WIDELY ACCLAIMED

Father Drinan's recent book, "Religion, the Courts and Public Policy," has been widely acclaimed by reviewers across the country.

In his book, the dean examines the three major problems that have aroused so much controversy in the past few years: religious education in the public schools, tax support of church-related schools and the Sabbatarians' request to work on Sundays. He thoroughly discusses three basic issues that have reached the U.S. Supreme Court: released time, Bible reading, and the reading of the Lord's prayer.

Father Drinan discusses his topics from the points of view of the main parties concerned, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and nonbelievers, and also examines the historical and legal aspects, pointing out the confusions that have arisen because of the many interests involved and because of what he feels are the inherent contradictions of recent Supreme Court decisions defining the place of religion in relation to the tax-supported school.

The dean points out that it was not until 1947 that the Supreme Court was called upon to rule on the first amendment clause that for 150 years the Nation seemed to be satisfied with the status quo. He deals in detail with the many areas in which an almost universally accepted understanding on church-state matters exist, tax exemption for churches, for example.

"Whenever conflicts arise out of hitherto settled legal-moral or church-state issues," Father Drinan writes, "the contemporary tendency is to attempt to resolve all these problems by immediate reference to the first amendment and the U.S. Supreme Court. The wisdom of employing the establishment and free exercise clauses of the first amendment for such purposes is open to question. In a relationship as profound and complex as that between church and State it should not be expected that one set of legal-moral or constitutional principles will render self-evident the rights of all interested parties."

The dean also writes that "the profoundly religious and theistic presuppositions of the American state appear to be so deeply ingrained in American public policy that it is doubtful if congressional or Supreme Court endorsements of a neutral or secular state can, in the absence of a complete reversal of public opinion, change the fundamental direction of church-state attitudes in America. But new and influential voices today are urging as never before that the American state can and must be not merely neutral, but avowedly secular in its attitude to all religious groups. The entire future not only of American church-state relations but of this Nation's public and private morality will depend on the extent to which American lawmakers are influenced by those individuals who feel that the total separation of government from religion is a desirable development."

John Cogley, reviewing the book for the New York Times on Sunday, August 4, characterized Father Drinan's understanding of the characteristically Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and secular humanists approaches to the various problems of church-state relations as "better than many of his coreligionists, including some eminent prelates who tend to see our current church-state controversies as simple contests between the forces of faith and those of irreligion." Mr. Cogley stated that the dean's questions "reflected a philosophic as well as legal turn of mind worthy of any jurist's attention." The book has also been reviewed favorably in numerous other publications including the National Observer, wherein it was said that when the dean "writes of issues that most distress Protestants (religion in the public classroom) and Jews (Sunday closing laws), he writes brilliantly and fairly."

Wrong Method in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial by John R. Scamehorn, in the Niles (Mich.) Daily Star on October 2, 1963. This editorial expresses the current attitude of many Americans on our foreign aid programs, and I commend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

WRONG METHOD

The House has voted for a $585 million cut in foreign aid. But even at the $3.5 billion level approved by the House, foreign aid will cost the average American family about $70 a year. This amount would pay a month's average rent, buy a new suit, or meet a car payment.

Even if the average American could spare this amount, the world could still not become rich on it. Nor would all misery and suffering be eliminated from every nook and cranny of the globe even if all of this country's income were to be distributed around the world. As President Kennedy, when he served as a Member of the House, was quoted in 1951 in the Boston Globe as saying:

"The vision of a bottle of milk for every Hottentot is a nice one, but is far beyond our reach. There is just not enough money in the world to relieve the poverty of all the millions of this world who may be threatened by communism."

Bottlefeeding the world is still beyond the means of the United States.

There is nothing wrong with the principle of foreign aid, though. What is wrong is the method of applying it.

Americans are always ready to help the needy, but they have become aware that relatively little of their foreign aid tax money helps other peoples much. Indonesia's starving millions didn't benefit when the United States made an emergency loan to help their economy. Their Government bought several passenger jet airplanes.

But the United States continues to provide loans and grants. If a nation is friendly, that is given as a reason; if it is indifferent or hostile, that is deemed a good reason, too.

Here in the United States the steel industry is striving to raise slightly more than a billion dollars for a single year's improvements. Meanwhile, our Government wants to loan the Indian Government a billion dollars of tax money for steel expansion because India can't get private capital. Why? Their laws and regulations upon business, plus political decisions involved in them, forbid prudent men from putting up the money. So our Government proposes to use the money of American taxpayers.

In the past 16 years, the United States has loaned or given more than 100 nations a total of more than $124 billion, including interest paid on the money that was borrowed to give away. Many of the nations which have received these funds have closer ties to Russia today than to the United States. The failings of our foreign aid administration have not been trivial.

Even so, most Americans probably are not opposed to foreign aid of itself. But no doubt there is a belief that if spending is confined to those programs and projects which make a minimum of sense, the $3.5 billion suggested by the House should be sufficient.

Recognition for Test Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, at the annual convention of the Illinois Asso-

ciated Press editors held in the city of Chicago, a series of articles on the nuclear test ban treaty by Mr. Jerry Moriarity, editor of the Kewanee Star-Courier, was judged as the best single entry in its class.

This was a well-deserved recognition for outstanding news reporting and I am pleased this honor came to Mr. Moriarity. This editor of a small city newspaper typifies all that is decent and good in the news media field and is a shining example of why the freedom of the press must be preserved.

Mr. Moriarity must feel a deep sense of pride in accepting this honor and I wish him continued success in his efforts to bring interesting, factual and readable material to the subscribers of this fine Midwest newspaper.

I ask permission to insert an editorial from the Star-Courier of Monday, September 30, which was written after the award was made.

[From the Kewanee (Ill.) Star-Courier, Sept. 30, 1963]

RECOGNITION FOR TEST SERIES

That a special award for the best entry in the Illinois Associated Press newswriting contest in our circulation category was earned by this department for a series of articles on the nuclear test ban treaty is both pleasing and reassuring to us in the newsroom.

You may recall that early in August this department published a three-part series, which included a review of a new and controversial book, "Nuclear Ambush—The Test Ban Trap." The book was authored by Earl H. Voss, former La Crosse, Wis., Tribune newspaperman with whom we were associated in the days immediately before World War II. He now is a respected chronicler of events in our Nation's capital as a top writer for the Washington Star.

We tried to balance his work with information obtained from other sources, but the conclusions seemed to point the same, that peaceful nuclear test fallout dangers had been exaggerated. It was interesting to hear our State's own Democratic Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS admit in an interview at the Kewanee Post Office dedication that the fallout dangers were not as great as originally believed.

There are other aspects still to come out. Now it is reported that Gen. Thomas H. Power, head of the Strategic Air Command, who urged votes against the ban treaty, felt the United States must be free to test high-megaton bombs in the atmosphere to find out effects on communications and missile systems.

When the Russians exploded their big bomb 2 years ago, parts of our defense communications system and a number of our concrete-shielded ICBM's were rendered useless because of electronic magnetic pulses set off. We were as helpless as kittens.

However, the treaty now is a reality and, as the sopnsors hope, could be a step toward a longtime peaceful era.

Presentation of these and other thought-provoking articles is done as part of our attempt to bring to our readers interesting and readable material. That this particular series on the nuclear test ban treaty was judged as the best single entry in the newswriting contest is relatively unimportant, but we must frankly admit we are pleased with the recognition.

Inaugural Address of Dr. George Alexander Heard, Fifth Chancellor of Vanderbilt University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday Dr. George Alexander Heard was inaugurated as chancellor of Vanderbilt University—my own university. Dr. Heard became the fifth chancellor of this university in its 90-year history and delivered a magnificent and inspiring address.

Dr. Heard, former dean of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina and a distinguished political scientist and author, noted with pride the past history of the university and pledged an all-out effort to meet the challenges and responsibilities of the future.

More than 5,000 attended Chancellor Heard's inauguration, including representatives of 256 colleges and universities around the world, 26 educational societies, and friends and alumni of Vanderbilt University.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to insert the inaugural address of Dr. George Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, at this point in the RECORD.

CHANCELLOR TELLS PLANS

Ladies and gentlemen, we of Vanderbilt have come together this autumn afternoon to reaffirm again our faith, and to speak aloud our dreams for this noble and historic university, set in a great strategic center of our Nation, in a great strategic time in our history.

I, myself, draw strength from the presence of many friends whose generous spirits have led them here this day, and from the honor done Vanderbilt University by these many delegates from the world's community of education. No university stands alone. All men everywhere have a stake in the welfare of every university anywhere.

CITES GOVERNOR, MAYOR

I cherish especially the presence of two alumni, the Governor of our State and mayor of our metropolitan government. They not only offer testimony that Vanderbilt's sons make good. They also symbolize Vanderbilt's long role as a private university in the public service.

The kind and thoughtful words spoken by the representatives of our immediate university family—a student, an alumnus, a faculty member—give me heart, and I am grateful for the informed observations and felicitous greetings borne here by the eminent president of America's oldest and the world's greatest university. I thank you all.

There is considerable comfort, too, in the survival power of Vanderbilt's chief executive officers. It is demonstrated on this platform by former Chancellors Oliver C. Carmichael and Harvie Branscomb. They look hearty to me, and I am touched by their courtesy in coming, and I am stirred by their imposing careers as creative and tireless leaders, at home and broad, of education in a world afflicted.

STILL IN SERVICE

The sense of continuity of Vanderbilt University is much with us this day. Persons who took part in installing both of these chancellors are here. I have been intrigued to note that even those who spoke over a quarter of a century ago for the students, the alumni, and the faculty at the time of Chancellor Carmichael's investiture—Randolph Batson, Eldon Stevenson, Jr., and Madison Sarratt—are all here this afternoon, all still in the service of the university.

These men make us realize how close the past is to us. And if the past is close, the future must be too, so we shall hurry along

Vanderbilt proclaims itself a university.

Vanderbilt's duty is to be a university to be fully a university in the largest, modern meaning of that ancient, always-changing institution.

OPENED IN 1875

Vanderbilt has been commited to many features of a university from its beginning. It offered, from the outset, in addition to its curriculum in philosophy, science, and literature, programs of instruction for three professions—law, medicine, the ministry. It opened its doors in 1875, one year before the founding of the first great graduate school in America, the Johns Hopkins University, and it grew to manhood in the first upward sweep of graduate education across our land. Chancellor Kirkland found it tactful on assuming office in 1893 to state that he did not plan to follow the advice of the university's friends who urged that college offerings be abandoned and that the university devote itself exclusively to postgraduate work.

Undergraduate education occupied then, as it does now, and as it shall in the future, the center of Vandebilt's attention. Our undergraduate schools and colleges are inseparable from the larger university. In the main, they are the same professors and the same facilities. Yet a university is more than a collection of colleges, and it is this something more that defines Vanderbilt's duty of which I speak today.

TEACH AND TRAIN

As I read the history of universities, now stretching across eight centuries in the Western World, the thread that runs through the university as a distinctive social institution, in all its forms in all the centuries, is the thread of inquiry.

Colleges and other educational institutions may bring the student to beauty, or thought, or skill, or maturity. They teach and train. Sometimes their object is the whole man, sometimes just his hands or one section of his brain. Universities do these things too, but it is the addition of expoloration to exposition that underlies the unique opportunities of a university. And if and institution is to be a university, it must provide the conditinons under which this exploration can take place. The thread of inquiry has no meaning without freedom to inquire, and freedom to state the conclusions of inquiry. There is no inquiry without freedom, and no university without both.

ROOTS GO DEEP

Vanderbilt's duty as a university is rooted deep in the significance to the world around us of university inquiry. It is rooted deep in the significance to the world around us of university freedom.

Mr. Pusey's panorama of a modern university in motion explains how universities are more important in these years of our lives than they have ever been before. It

also, I may say, gives a fair notion of the range of concern that preoccupy university presidents and chancellors these day. Mr. Pusey has somewhat more to say grace over than I, but I understand that at Harvard all the students are brilliant, all the faculty distinguished, and all the alumni contented, so he has no problems. The steadily mounting importance of universities in their many realms of action has flowed ultimately and inevitably from their importance as the home of free and independent inquiry.

DRIVING FORCE

The most driving force of our time is scientific inquiry and the technological development it spawns. The most compelling need of our time is cultural and political accommodation to the consequences of scientific change. The most pervasive aspiration of our time is for greater human freedom in many forms. The university, as an institution, is more an ultimate source of scientific change, more an ultimate hope for coping with its consequences, and more itself dependent on a climate of freedom for all than any other secular institution in our society. More than any other, the university is now the central thinking institution of our society—more an explorer, more an inventor, more an interpreter, and more concerned with the outcome of the meaning of it all. Beyond these things, the university is also the ultimate wellspring of educational advance at many levels, for many purposes, all about the globe. The watchword of the future everywhere is education—education in how to read and write, education in technical skills, education in professional competences, education in the arts and science of government, education for a richer inner life, education of every kind. And always men look eventually to the university as the chief source of educational goals and the means to them. Wherever peoples aspire to prosperity, or to power, or to independence, or to more effective self-government, or sometimes just to happiness, they search through education. Everywhere on our planet education is marching. At the head of the procession is the inquiring university.

FUNCTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Universities have always been creatures of their time and place, whether in Salerno, Paris, or Oxford in the 12th century, or in New Haven, New Delhi, or Nashville in the 20th. They are functional institutions that respond to the needs and reflect the character of what is about them. But they also shape the world about them, and now more than ever, and hereafter more than now.

The influences of Vanderbilt are many. One hardly knows just when, or just how, or just how much, we touch our students. But no one familiar with Vanderbilt can doubt that through them it helps to shape the affairs of men. This it does, too, through discoveries in its libraries and laboratories, through the free public debate that its mission requires and its campus encourages, through the practitioners it trains in the professions of its competence. This it does, too, in the councils of its faculties and students, of its alumni and friends, of its beneficiaries and benefactors, in the councils of all who taken together make up the whole community of a vital university. And this it does, too, whenever it makes a decision, wherever its countenance is seen.

The United States cannot arm for war, plan for peace, seek prosperity, maintain domestic tranquility, or go to the moon, without the freely inquiring universities of this land. It makes a difference what kind of university Vanderbilt chooses to be.

URGES BIGGER SCHOOL

What does it mean, then, what does it take, for us to be more fully a university than we already are? A larger, more vigorous, and diversified graduate school, to be sure. The plant and equipment and books required by advanced research in many fields, to be sure. Better rounded and better taught curriculums, to be sure. And gold, to be sure, the food that Chancellor Kirkland, standing a few feet from this spot 70 years ago last week, said that universities thrive on. And, to be sure, it means and takes much else that we seek daily in the course of our affairs.

But these things and others like them are the products of a great university as well as the means to one. The spurs to greatness are of a different order. They stem from the spirit of mission that animates a university. It is this spirit within us that must be ceaselessly refreshed if Vanderbilt is to grow in greatness. The depth and scope of our research, the vitality and inspiration of our teaching, the range and value of our services, all flow from the spirit of mission that excites what we do.

SPIRIT HOLDS MUCH

For me, Vanderbilt's spirit of mission holds more than one can ever say, but it also holds much that one must never fail to say. A sense of relevance to our times infuses it. A comprehensive vision enlightens it. The will and adventure of leadership inspire it. The style and joys and emotions of life concern it. And the spirit of mission belongs in all of us, to be of fullest meaning to any of us.

Less than 10 years after the Civil War Commodore Vanderbilt started this university off with a sense of relevance to its times. He hoped that Vanderbilt University, in a nation asunder, would, he said, "contribute to strengthening the ties which should exist between all sections of our common country."

University professors are not bound by the test of utility in their personal inquiries and teaching, but universities in the breadth and thrust of their concerns must remain significant to the society that supports them. In the years just past, under the leadership of Chancellor Branscomb, Vanderbilt has kept a keen awareness of our Nation's world affairs. Here, for one example, it has pioneered with academic programs appropriate to our Nation's need and to its own fulfillment.

GAVE LEADERSHIP

Vanderbilt early gave much in leadership to the educational progress of our southern region. We must do so more so in the years ahead. The central South in which we live—from the Mississippi to the Appalachians, from the Ohio to the gulf—this central South holds one in 15 of the Nation's people and awards one in 50 of the Nation's Ph. D. degrees. The roots of economic advance are found increasingly in the educational resources, in the research capacities, and in the cultural growth that universities foster. We would play our part in many ways in lifting the prosperity and enriching the life about us.

For our country, the most tenacious and important issue of our time is the struggle of American Negroes for a fuller freedom. I am proud to follow the leadership of the Vanderbilt board of trust in its voluntary decisions, taken before my time, that qualified students shall be admissible to all of Vanderbilt's schools without regard to race or creed. And it goes without saying that all students are treated alike by Vanderbilt, without regard to race or creed.

ROLE OUTLINED

There is necessarily more, however, to a true university's role in this compelling matter of our time. By definition, a university must be a place where anybody's plea for a fuller freedom can be calmly heard, fairly debated, and conclusions about it stated freely. The more perplexing a public issue is, the more significant to society is this inherent responsibility of a university.

University faculty members have an essential dependence upon a climate of freedom for themselves, if they are to achieve personal and professional fulfillment. I find it appropriate when, in consequence, university faculty members have a special understanding of the drive by other persons for the fuller freedom they need to achieve their personal and professional fulfillment.

Many aspirations for a fuller freedom hinge in the end on opportunities for a fuller education—more education and especially better education. With their special resources, universities have obligations to aid however they can in creating wider educational opportunities for all citizens.

The universities of America in their great influence have responsibilities in the crises of our times.

MUST KEEP PERSPECTIVE

Along with its sense of relevance, Vanderbilt must keep a large perspective in all it does, a vision that is nationwide and a choice of standards that is national. In a message to the opening exercises of this university in 1875, Commodore Vanderbilt said that he had given his support hoping it would "promote the general interests of learning, and of this whole nation, without regard to sect or section."

In the complex combination of institutions that comprise the American university system, each university, on the Charles or on the Cumberland, has its unique bundle of qualities—its heritage, its resources, its special opportunities and responsibilities, its hopes—that defines its role. Our role, perforce, is partly set as the only independent university in this strategic center of the Nation offering a wide range of advanced academic programs. We strive daily to expand the value to this city and to this section of what we do. The broader we keep our perspective the greater to them will this value be.

HELD CITIZENS' SUPPORT

Vanderbilt has enjoyed the unbroken interest and important support of the citizens of Nashville since its founding. We cherish our Union with its inhabitants and it will bind us closer in the years ahead. We are grateful, too, that Vanderbilt's sons and daughters, and those who support her in a myriad of essential ways, are strewn across this land and in many lands around the globe. Our interests wherever they may be are indivisible: to be a university.

The will and adventure of leadership form part of Vanderbilt's spirit of mission. I have been impressed, as one who was once a newcomer, by the flexibility of this university, by the willingness of Vanderbilt to experiment, by its readiness to replace old buildings and old programs with new ones, by its ability to change its ways in many ways. I find innovation all around me, even, I discover, in the procedures for installing a chancellor. (The speechmaking at only one of several sessions celebrating the ascent of an early chancellor required 4 hours. The rewards of change are profound.) There is no lack of tradition here; it is merely that innovation itself is one of the traditions.

FROM MANY SOURCES

Doubtless this adaptability springs from many sources, the inheritance of strong executive leadership being one. But more important than any other, I find its source in the wisdom and vision of the governing authority of the institution, the board of trust. In the councils of this board, I find that our hopes are hung to the stars. A spirit of adventure is there, and the will to make the trip, a sense and tenacity of high purpose.

And I must say that the most adventurous voyager of us all, perhaps because he is the best navigator of us all, is the president of the board of trust, Harold Vanderbilt. My friends, more than one Vanderbilt has

founded this university. And the latest of our continuing founders is with his wisdom and determination the greatest of them all.

We will need to adapt in the years ahead, perhaps to join in new endeavors with other institutions, probably to grow in size even more in the future than in the past, certainly to alter in many ways now unseen.

Vanderbilt knows, too, that life is a many-splendored thing. Our first concern is the human intellect but our main concern is the human being. We seek to fathom not truth alone, but goodness and beauty, too. In its view of man's needs and hopes, a university must be universal.

FACULTY ROLE IMPORTANT

The sense of mission of a great university, moreover, weighs upon the many who make it up. No president or chancellor, any more if ever, runs a university by himself. The commitment to high quality—which I assume we all assume is a prerequisite to being, fully, a university—must permeate the institution. The quality of a university is determined most by its faculties, and faculties are mostly self-determining. The energies and genius of a complex modern university must ascend from many springs of initiative throughout its faculties and student bodies. Unless Vanderbilt's spirit of mission animates every quarter of the campus, it is likely to be no spirit at all.

And so we come to an end, which is also a beginning. As the past of Vanderbilt was once its future, this future that now stretches ahead will soon become its past. We in all the distant reaches of the university family have much to do. For the privilege of being joined in the task, no one is more grateful than the chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

Resolution Commending Hon. J. Edgar Hoover and His Associates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the FBI National Academy of Associates of Ohio, commending the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and especially its head, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, and his associates for devoted service and the many contributions to the welfare and well-being of the people of the United States, as certified to me by L. Thomas Wilson, president, Ohio FBI National Academy Associates, chief deputy, Montgomery County Sheriff's Office, Dayton, Ohio:

RESOLUTION

Whereas one of the greatest safeguards to the dignity and freedom of all men in the United States has been the loyal and dedicated service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas under the matchless leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the diligent and impartial discharge of its duties, has contributed mightily to the preservation of the rights which are guaranteed all Americans by the Constitution and the laws of the land; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a selfless effort to elevate the standards of law enforcement has through its National Academy and training programs better prepared law enforcement officers throughout the Nation to acquit themselves effectively without infringement on the basic rights and freedoms of those whom they serve: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ohio FBI National Academy Associates endorse the FBI in its contributions to the welfare and well-being of one and all in these United States; and be it further

Resolved, That J. Edgar Hoover and all his associates in the FBI be especially commended for their loyal and devoted service and their record of accomplishments without reservation.

No Other Gods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a very eloquent and outstanding sermon which was delivered on July 7, 1963, by Dr. Pierce E. Cook, pastor of the Buncombe Street Methodist Church in Greenville, S.C. The sermon is entitled "No Other Gods."

In view of the tremendous responsibilities that we as Members of the Congress shoulder in helping to govern this country, I am convinced that we could all benefit from studying the most pertinent lesson embodied in this sermon. In fact, Mr. President, while this sermon is addressed to all Americans, it particularly points to the need for the Congress to reassert its authority in the governing process.

I ask unanimous consent that this sermon by one of our most distinguished and dedicated ministers in South Carolina be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO OTHER GODS

(A sermon delivered at Buncombe Street Methodist Church, Greenville, S.C., on July 7, 1963, by Dr. Pierce E. Cook, pastor)

Scripture lesson: Exodus 20:1–17.

Text: Exodus 20:3 "Thou shall have no other gods before Me."

Our Founding Fathers gained their concept of democracy from the ideas and ideals which they had received from their Judaeo-Christian heritage. The first document of government drawn up on American soil, the *Mayflower* compact, opens with these words, "in the name of God. Amen."

During the debate on framing the Constitution of the United States, Benjamin Franklin urged his colleagues to turn to God in prayer for guidance that the instrument to which they were dedicating their efforts would endure to the benefit of all men. In exhorting his fellow Americans to turn to God for guidance, he referred to a well-known statement in Pslams 127:1, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Mr. Franklin declared that he firmly believed this, and that without God's concurring aid, they would succeed no better in the political building in which they were engaged than did the builders of Babel.

History has shown how well God answered the prayers of those who turned to Him. Gladstone said of this Constitution, "It is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

The roots of democracy are deeply embedded in the Judaeo-Christian culture of which the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are such integral parts. Both these pillars of our faith have stood and will continue to stand the test of time and therefore are firm foundations on which to build an enduring social order. They are as essential to the continued welfare of the people as when they first appeared. Acquaintance with these utterances and identification with them are vital if we are to recognize the inner strength of democracy.

There can be no true democracy unless it is built upon ideals given to us through our Judaeo-Christian heritage. Democracy recognizes, first of all, that there is a God, that He is supreme, that He is creator, ruler, and sustainer of all; all man has, all the joys he possesses, and all he hopes to be is not something that he wins but something which God gives. Democracy is built upon recognition that we must bow before a sovereign being, that God is our ruler, that He is, as He pictures Himself in the giving of the Ten Commandments, a "jealous God"; that He will have no other gods before Him. There can be no adequate respect for other persons or other laws until one first of all respects the person and the laws of God. The primary foundation of democracy is the recognition of our worth as individuals in the sight of God. As evidence of this, we have the right of trial by jury and other constitutional guaranties recognizing the rights of the individual as a person. It is God's love for us and that alone which makes each person of invaluable worth.

It is rather strange that in 1776 when such a small percentage of the people belonged to the church that Christian ideas permeated the leadership of our land. Today when we have the majority of our people belonging to the church, the ideas of those who lead are not as firmly founded on Christian principles as they were when our fathers drew up the Declaration of Independence and framed the Constitution.

Students of American history place a clear shift in American culture from God to man in the years immediately following the Civil War. Joseph Haroutunian, in his book "Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of New England Theology," has described this shift in these words: "Before religion was God-centered; now it is centered in man. Before whatever was not conducive to the glory of God was infinitely evil; now that which is not conducive to the happiness of man is evil, unjust, and impossible to attribute to deity. Before the good of man consisted ultimately in glorifying God; now the glory of God consists in the good of man. Before man lived to glorify God; now God lives to serve man."

Many years have passed since this shift from God to man first became apparent among thought leaders of America. It has now filtered down to the rank and file and we are beginning to see some of the consequences of it.

When most Americans were firmly convinced of the Providence of God, they found their security in that faith. Such men built our economy because they were willing to take risks. Like Abraham they launched out on new ventures, "not knowing whither they went." Lloyd C. Douglas described Abraham as "the father of the dreamers who leave all and venture to place their trust in the guidance of God. No disappointment can do them in. No loss can shake their hope. No task is too weary; no test too severe."

This does not describe modern Americans looking to Government for security. This does not describe college graduates who look not for a job with the greatest challenge but for one with the greatest pension. A welfare state produces no Abrahams and without Abrahams, no great things will be done. With the relative disappearance of this kind of faith from contemporary life, Americans are turning more and more to the state to create "justice." We modern Americans are committing idolatry by seeking security and equality through Government action. We have put the state in place of God and consequently have set in motion a process which inevitably will destroy the fabric of our society.

I cannot help recalling some words uttered by the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, about the year 1926: "We are constantly sitting around for the gods at Washington to make the next events happen." I think Senator Borah was referring to an agricultural bill before the Congress.

What was true in 1926 has become increasingly true since then. We have tried the New Deal and other deals. We have moved continually away from government of the people, for the people, and by the people to a government centralized in Washington that passes down to its constituents certain beneficent gifts. This "looking to the gods in Washington" instead of looking to the God and Father of us all has cost us in more ways than we can possibly enumerate. When Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated in March 1933, our national debt stood at $20.9 billion. When he went out of office and Mr. Truman took over in April 1945, the national debt had grown to $235.1 billion. When Mr. Eisenhower took over in January 1953, the national debt was $267.4 billion. When Mr. Kennedy took over in January 1961, the national debt was $290.2 billion; and as of June 24, 1963, our national debt had gone to $305.1 billion, and there is no end in sight. There is a constant lifting of the ceiling on the limit of financial indebtedness. There is no regard for people whose savings have because of inflation been wiped out to a large extent.

This is only the monetary side. What else is happening is that we are looking to Washington and expecting them to do the things for us which we ought to be doing for ourselves here at home. At last we Americans are getting to the place where we are tired of our Congressmen coming back and saying, "Look what I got for you," because we realize that what they have gotten for us has come out of our pockets; and as our income tax and other taxes increase, we say, "Yes, but look at the price we paid for it."

While we are on this matter of money, we should mention the decreased value of the dollar abroad as well as at home. We are soon going to be again in a very crucial stage with reference to the value of the U.S. dollar. Our creditors abroad are going to be pushing us because the outflow of gold continues at a too rapid rate for the health of our economy. We have long since ceased to pay attention to George Washington who said that we should avoid entangling foreign alliances. We also have ceased to pay attention to Mr. Franklin with his insistence that we take care of the pennies and the dollars would take care of themselves. We spend with a free hand and have no regard as to what it is going to cost future generations to pay for our folly. Our Government must face up to this matter. Stalin said, "We will force the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy." I do not think the Communists have forced us as much as we have forced ourselves. We have not had the leadership or guidance in these matters which we have needed and the times have required.

It was never intended by the Founding Fathers that the Central Government should take away from the State and local governments money which they needed for their own programs. There are many today who are advocating that the National Government should take over the support of our educational programs. One of the basic reasons for this is because the National Government is about the only one that has any money to do the things that need to be done; but we should always remember that any time Washington spends a dollar, it costs much more than when the money is spent at home. What we need to do is get the Government out of meddling with business and let business have an opoprtunity to take care of its own interests, and to let them quit taking most of the money away from the State and local governments and allow them to provide for their own needs.

The National Government has a very poor record in the way of helping businessmen. The agricultural situation is another outstanding example. Having once begun helping the farmer, there is no end in view and the plight of the American farmer today is indeed deplorable and alarming. We have had too much politics in business and not enough business in politics. The farm is the backbone of the Nation but the income of our farmers is woefully inadequate. Nonetheless, the Government continues to offer a helping hand and we continue to pile up surpluses that we are not able to get rid of and to spend billions upon billions of dollars in the program hoping for relief that never really comes.

There is a great deal of talk today about rights and we are sure that we all have certain inalienable rights, but a democracy cannot be built upon rights alone. It must be built upon duties as well. A man must understand that until he meets certain duties, fulfills certain obligations, he can really ask for no rights. We were taught in our catechism that the first duty of man is to glorify God, to love Him, and to obey Him. It is only when man is obedient to God that he can be the real recipient of the benevolence and love of his Heavenly Father. As long as man is arrogant, self-sufficient, and egotistical, God cannot help him because he is not conscious of any need for help.

There have been many times in my life when I have been very, very proud and thankful for the privileges of being a citizen of these United States. One of these was on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, when I sat in the halls of Congress and heard the best musicians from the various branches of the Armed Services render individually and collectively some of our great national music, then a brief message about the fact that for the first time we were placing in our Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag the words, "Under God." Following this service which stirred us all, it was my privilege to have lunch in the congressional dining room and to meet the late Congressman Louis Rabaut of Michigan, who had been largely responsible for getting Congress to vote this phrase into the Pledge of Allegiance. He was a loyal Roman Catholic, proud of his church and very devoted to it but, most of all, proud of his country and devoted to his God. Many times I have thought about that man and his devotion to his God first and then to his family, his country, and his church. I have thought how glorious it would be if all Americans would feel as he did. All we have is from God; therefore, if we are to continue to be blessed of Him, we must continue under Him. What a great history we could write. How different it would have been especially during this past century.

We cannot recall the past. It is done. But we can by God's grace determine that in the years that lie ahead we will be a nation truly under God, that we will be a nation whose God is the Lord, the Lord who created the heavens and the earth, the Lord who gave us everything that we have. We can determine to devote ourselves to seeking not our own selfish interest but the interest of each person regardless of his class, color, or creed. We do this in gratitude for what God has done for us.

We must return to the principles upon which our fathers built this country. They developed a system of checks and balances which would insure that the land was ruled well. It was the duty of the legislative branch to pass the laws, of the executive branch to approve and faithfully execute the laws, and of the judicial branch to interpret the laws. In this century, we have seen a sad accumulation of powers by both the executive and judicial branches which never was intended by the framers of the Constitution. It is time for the Congress to assert itself. It is time for the people of the land to understand the principles upon which our Constitution was built and to study democratic government and participate in it. Any person who did not vote has no right to criticize those who are in office. Let us remember that it is much better to sympathize and to help than it is to criticize. Plato wisely said: "The punishment that the wise suffer who refuse to take part in the government is to live under the government of worse men."

This is the time for every American to inform himself not so much of his rights as of his duties. We need to have the vision which led our fathers in founding this country to pledge to it "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." It is not enough that we should call upon our heroes to prove in liberating strife that more than self their country they love and mercy more than life. It is time for us to prove ourselves worthy, in part at least, of the heritage which has been so nobly given unto us. Let us remember that the Founding Fathers believed devotedly that there was a God and that the inalienable rights of man were derived from Him. It is time for us to return to God and to place Him above all things else, His will, His way, His law; to be conscious that love is a wonderful thing but that God is a God of law and order and justice as well as a God of mercy and compassion and love.

We must have a shared dedication to an ideal so compelling that its radiance will shine forth with blinding light in this age of anxiety, of conformity, of organization men and men in grey flannel suits. Let us remember that it was the hope of our Founding Fathers that this Government of ours would become so worthy that it would be a model for all governments. No man can worthily lead unless he has first of all been led by the One above. Let us know that no nation can prosper unless its god is the Lord. Let us, therefore, this day purpose in our hearts that we will give our allegiance to Him who is above us all and to whom we owe our all; then we will seek no selfish or personal advantage but we will seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, knowing full well that when we do this, all other things will fall into their proper place.

I recall during the war years it was my privilege to attend many conventions and many meetings. Always we sang the song, "God Bless America." We sang it with hope and with prayer. God has blessed America. He has blessed her more than any of us ever realize, more than we can ever possibly appreciate. We have a heritage such as has never been given to any other people; but we are too much like Esau, we are ready to barter it away for a mess of pottage, for easy ways instead of the hard way of self-denial and self-discipline and self-sacrifice. Oh, America, let us remember whose we are, whom we serve, and let us hear the call of our God saying to us as He said to His people long ago: "If My people who are called by my name will humble themselves and pray and return from their wicked ways, then will I hear from Heaven and will forgive their sins and will heal their land."

The Eisenhower Perspective on 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the transcript of the on-the-record interview of David Broder with former President Eisenhower, entitled "The Eisenhower Perspective on 1963," which was published in the Washington Sunday Star of October 6, 1963. It is my understanding that the interview of Mr. Broder was for the Washington Star, the Detroit News, the Newark News, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In the interview, President Eisenhower discussed many of the critical issues which are confronting Congress and the people of our country. As always, his views are marked by the wide knowledge and sound judgment which is the result of his long and distinguished service to our country.

The people of the Nation hold former President Eisenhower in high respect and esteem; they have confidence in him, and his views on our national and international problems will be widely read throughout the country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER PERSPECTIVE ON 1963

Question. General, you have been away from the White House now for 30 months. Do the problems of the world, the Presidency and the Republican Party seem any different when viewed from Gettysburg than they did from the White House?

Answer. Well, the problems are there, of course. And we must remember that some problems seem to be imbedded in human nature and are never going to be answered. What you do is to find the best way to live with them in view of the situation and conditions of the time. But, by and large, what we might have called the issues of 1960, for example, when Nixon was running, are largely the same in their general sense.

From this distance, I find myself just as concerned as I was about them then. I have been relieved of the burden of having to make decisions and plans and programs respecting them. On the other hand, I have the frustration that I can do no more about them than can anyone else of our 190 million population.

I don't believe that anyone can have gone through the kind of experience that I have, both in the military and in the political world and disabuse his mind of concern about these things. And he cannot help thinking and figuring what we would try to do.

THAW IN COLD WAR?

Question. There have been indications in recent months of a thaw in East-West relations—the test ban treaty, some likelihood of a wheat sales agreement with the Soviet Union, and a change in tone of propaganda. How do you appraise this; as a meaningful trend, or a temporary shift?

Answer. I think this: The free world would be badly advised to take every Communist move as a clear indication of change in strategic purpose. They have, time and again, publicly announced their purpose of destroying freedom. In the absence of something that would prove they have abandoned that basic purpose, we can by no means take any action that would drop our guard.

You speak of a thaw. You have read this dictum of Mao Tse-tung in respect to military operations. He said: "The enemy attacks, we withdraw; he stands still, we harass; he starts to withdraw, we pursue and destroy."

This applies to the whole Communist strategy and tactics in the world. They are using every possible way to achieve their basic objective—our own destruction.

We have to remember this: We are not trying to destroy anything. They say they must destroy our form of life. Now why do they say that? It is because they are afraid of the comparison between their way of life and ours. They believe that their form of political existence does not have the appeal that ours does. That is the reason they have to destroy us. Until they do that, they don't feel safe. Consequently, we just cannot expect them to abandon their basic purpose and therefore we have to be very, very careful.

So I would not call this a thaw. I would call it more of a change in tactics for the moment. And I would say this: If, in a matter of an economic deal, we saw that we got a very great advantage in it, well, then it is a good horse trade. And in a horse trade, if you get a good thoroughbred for an old plug, there are no ideals about the thing. There is no principle that is being furthered. It is just a material gain.

SURPLUS WHEAT SALE

Question. Is that the way we should view the sale of surplus wheat to Russia?

Answer. If we don't get a very definite advantage in it, I don't see the reason for doing it. Certainly we are not trying to be altruistic. We are not trying to strengthen their system. If there is a mutual advantage, you can't kick about a trade.

Question. And trading gold for surplus wheat might be the kind of horse trade you had in mind?

Answer. It might be. But I would look at this thing very carefully. It has been argued, of course, we should go ahead and trade if others do so. Well, I think we ought to make our own policies for ourselves.

Question. General, another thing that is discussed in terms of East-West cooperation is a joint trip to the moon. You have said it would be foolish for us to spend tens of billions to be first on the moon. Does it make any more sense for us to spend less money and get there at the same time as the Russians?

Answer. This would take away the appearance of a stunt and a race. I don't see the need for such a race. To me this is just putting our substance into something that has no particular value to us as a people or to the world in general.

If there were some joint venture, it probably would not only be much cheaper economically, but it would take away this pressure of the race. Of course, this race was proposed right after the Cuban fiasco. It looked a great deal like a very fine way to get Cuba off the front page.

ON FRANCE'S COURSE

Question. Sir, do you find any cause for concern in the independent course that France seems to be taking now in nuclear testing, the Common Market, and NATO?

Answer. Am I somewhat disappointed about it, of course. I am disappointed because it looks as if in France it has been decided that there is no immediate prospect of global trouble, certainly of a military kind, in any important part of the world. Consequently, they apparently have decided they can afford to take a competitive rather than a cooperative position and attitude toward a great many of their neighbors and even ourselves.

Now I think this is a mistaken notion, but we must not forget one thing. France from the 17th century has been a very proud nation. She had her setbacks in 1870 and in 1940. I think she was determined to get back into her place in the international sun. I believe this is a notable and proper ambition, but I would like to see it done with a little bit more consideration for the people who in the case of real trouble would have to be again the allies of France. So I think we ought to act among ourselves a little bit more as close allies rather than trying to exploit each other in any way.

VIETNAM SITUATION

Question. General, have you thought of any way there might be better relations between the United States and the government we are supporting in South Vietnam?

Answer. This thing has become acute in the past few years. I know President Diem and what his ideas and purposes were some time back. I admired him very much. He took a courageous position back in 1955, but since that time things have happened and I would not have a real suggestion to give in that particular area.

Question. His sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, is coming to this country for a 3-week speaking tour. Do you have any thought as to the proper way for the American people or the Government to react toward her?

Answer. We ought to listen carefully and make our own judgments. By no means do I think there should be anything that could smack of discourtesy. On the other hand, I would hope that she would not come over here to stir up trouble. I am quite sure she won't.

They are quite smart people, you know, and I think she is going to try to put her case, the case of Diem and his family, in the best light they can. So I would just say listen with courtesy and let it go at that.

DISAPPOINTED IN AID

Question. Why is it that the American people so often seem disappointed by the outward results of the help this country has given such countries as South Vietnam and the Dominican Republic?

Answer. These problems are imbedded deeply in human nature. I am not sure that we should expect too much. There has been a lot of talk about the $103 billion that we have given away since World War II. But I wonder if anyone ever thinks of this: What would this world be right now if we had not given that money away?

No one can prove that we would not today be surrounded by a complete sea of communism. Now we know very well what Europe would have been like without the Marshall plan. So I just think that we should not scream and yell about the money we have put out.

I would like to see the program on a more stable and enduring basis so that you could demand efficiency and effectiveness from all your employees and get it. In other words, spend the money for what you need and not for anything else.

Question. On a long-range basis?

Answer. That is right. What I would like to see is the program projected for, let's say, 5 years, and each year you add 1 year at the end. Then you would know what you are talking about.

WHAT ABOUT TAX CUT?

Question. Do you think the President has given sufficient assurances on spending control so that Congress should go ahead and vote the $11 billion tax cut?

Answer. Well, personally, I still believe that the President ought to tell us exactly what he is going to do when he is asking that taxes be reduced by that amount. I think we ought to know more about administration expenditure plans.

We ought to remember this Nation is a collection of 47 million families. A nation can print money, but if the family does so, someone goes to jail. I do not think the Government ought to be printing money.

Our civilization has really come to the point where you might call it a pension civilization. You no longer depend just on your savings and the stocks you buy, the real estate and so on, to take care of you in your old age. You depend on social security and your company pension and the insurance you can take out. All of these things are in fixed dollars and therefore I think if we do not give our earnest attention to preventing the deterioration of the currency and eroding of its value, then one of these days we are going to be in one of the most terrible pickles you ever heard of.

Our dollar is worth about 50 cents compared to 1939. So we have a very, very cheap dollar. Now if this continues, how are all these great insurance plans going to work out, including social security? You are going to have to say, "Well, I thought I was going to have a rather comfortable old age and now I am going to be out scratching just to keep a roof over my head."

ON RACIAL CRISES

Question. To turn to the racial issue which seems to be tearing the country apart, is there any counsel you could offer to help bridge the gap between the segregationists and integrationists?

Answer. Unfortunately, people seem to react more to emotional and sentimental factors than to cold statistics. So you get a situation where a consensus as to the best method for proceeding is very difficult to reach.

Just as a matter of history, there has been only one real civil rights law passed in something over 80 years, almost 90 I guess. It is very difficult. If you try to cure everything at once by law, the number of clauses that you put into a bill gives you the aggregate of the negative votes.

I am one of those who is on the side of the underprivileged people in their struggle to get their political and economic rights respected and observed. Now I believe it is not only a legal but a moral problem for every one of us. I have been preaching this for 12 years and more, ever since I went to Columbia. I deeply believe this.

Now the practical question is, how do you make progress? If the leaders on both sides could get together and say that the first law that we need is so and so, it will be much easier to put that through than it will be to put all of them through at once. We should go after the thing as a soldier does to win a campaign. We win 1 victory in 10 in order to go to another victory. We should not try to put everything in one basket at one time. Every time you get one law passed, it opens the way for another, because success breeds success. As each successive step became understood and accepted by the public, the legislative jam would soon be broken.

For example, the voting law passed in 1957 could, if fully and impartially inforced, accomplish an awful lot by the very power of the vote.

Question. The greatest opposition seems to be to this so-called "public accommodation" law. Are you suggesting that perhaps that should be put aside for the time in order to move on the voting rights and job rights areas?

Answer. Well, I don't know. That is the most emotional one for those people who have been denied their rights, for the simple reason they run into it every day, every minute. My own solution, if I were recommending one, would probably be to make sure of the voting first and then, right after that, the public accommodations law. And I certainly wouldn't base it solely on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. I think the relationship is too remote.

I would put it on both the 14th and the 15th amendments and the interstate commerce clause. I think the interstate commerce clause probably applies to the institutions, at least the large institutions, but I don't see how it applies to the man as an individual. I would think that any business that has to be licensed by government in order to operate probably has an obligation to treat everybody the same.

MOST PRECIOUS RIGHT

Question. You are suggesting as a matter of tactics, that it might be well to let this go for a while?

Answer. Public accommodations ought to be taken up soon. But I still believe that the most precious right you have, even more than where you sleep, is can you vote or not, can you participate in your government?

I had reports when I was President that some Negroes who had their Ph. D.'s were denied their right to vote in certain areas because of illiteracy. They must have given them Sanskrit to translate. I don't know how they did it. But that is exactly what they did.

But again I say, there has got to be a moral victory won. Each of us must try to live up to the Constitution and its nobly phrased principles of equality for all.

Address by Hon. Basil L. Whitener at Kings Mountain Battleground, October 6, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 1780, a decisive blow was struck for American independence. On that date, 183 years ago, patriots from North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and Georgia inflicted a disastrous defeat on the British Army at the historic Battle of Kings Mountain.

The battle was fought in the congressional district I am privileged to represent in the Congress. My district adjoins that of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable BASIL L. WHITENER. The town of Kings Mountain, N.C., is located in Mr. WHITENER's district.

On Sunday, October 6, 1963, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] made a stirring speech on the Kings Mountain battleground commemorating the American victory of October 7, 1780, before a distinguished gathering of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I know that my colleagues will find his remarks to be most interesting:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT KINGS MOUNTAIN BATTLEGROUND, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1963

It is a great pleasure for me to be here this afternoon and to have the privilege of joining you in commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain. I am particularly pleased that I have the opportunity to be with a group dedicated to the preservation of the principles upon which our great Nation was founded.

I know of no organization in America more imbued with the spirit of Kings Mountain than the Daughters of the American Revolution. Your great organization stands for the very highest ideals of American citizenship. Through the years it has been the vigilant guardian of constitutional government. Your organization has faithfully protected and defended the liberties won by our forefathers and the free institutions which they bequeathed to us.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the Daughters of the American Revolution on the great service the organization has rendered, and is rendering, to the American people. May your efforts to defend our cherished institutions and to expose the enemies of our country from within and from without continue to be crowned with success.

It is good to be here this afternoon and have the privilege for a few minutes of sharing with you some of the history and some of the inspiration of the Battle of Kings Mountain; 183 years ago the American Colonies were locked in a great struggle for freedom with the mother country. They had been ignored by a haughty sovereign and oppressed by a tyrannical Parliament. Their pleas for a redress of grievances had gone unnoticed by Parliament and the Royal Court. Forced at last to take up arms in the defense of the liberty their forefathers had wrested from King John at Runnymeade and which had been guaranteed to them in the Magna Carta, they engaged the English Armies and Loyalist sympathizers.

In the fall of 1780 the outlook for the success of the American effort for independence was not bright. An event was soon to happen, however, that was to rouse the Colonies to one last magnificent effort which was to culminate in victory.

In every great struggle for the rights of man throughout history there has been one decisive event which has determined the subsequent course of mankind. The Greeks had their Thermopylae, the British and French their Waterloo, and the Blue and the Gray their Gettysburg.

In the great struggle for American independence the decisive event was the Battle of Kings Mountain. It was not a military effort that required great planning, nor was it one supported by trains of supplies and equipment. The battle was one of those events that quite frequently happens in the course of history without major planning, but which leaves its imprint indelibly stamped on the affairs of men.

On October 4, 1855, one of America's greatest historians journeyed to this vicinity to take part in the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain. He was the learned and respected historian, George Bancroft.

Of the great victory won here he had this to say: "Let the battleground before us be left no longer as private property. Let it be made the inheritance of the people; that is, of all who are heirs to the benefits that were gained on the day which we commemorate. Let a monument rise upon its peak as a memorial of the heroism of their fathers, as an evidence of the piety of their sons. The deeds that were there performed bid us ever renew our love of country. Let the passion for freedom flow forth perennially like the fountains that gush in crystal purity from your hillsides. Let the Union stand like your mountains which the geologist tells us are the oldest and firmest in the world."

Were Bancroft living today he would be pleased to note that a grateful Nation has reserved the Kings Mountain Battleground as a national shrine.

History has reserved a bright page in the annals of the Revolution for the names of the gallant men who fought the battle of freedom on the slopes of Kings Mountain. I think it is altogether fitting and proper this afternoon to recount something of what took place here on October 7, 1780. As members of a patriotic organization dedicated to pre-

serving the history and traditions of our wonderful Nation, I know that you share with me the pride that I have in the stirring events leading up to the Battle of Kings Mountain.

In the report of the battle signed by William Campbell, Isaac Shelby, and Benjamin Cleveland we have this stirring account of the battle:

"On receiving intelligence that Major Ferguson had advanced up as high as Gilbert Town in Rutherford County and threatened to cross the mountains to the western waters Col. William Campbell with 400 men from Washington County of Virginia, Col. Isaac Shelby with 240 men from Sullivan County of North Carolina, and Lt. Col. John Sevier with 240 men from Washington County of North Carolina assembled at Watauga on the 25th day of September (1780) where they were joined by Col. Charles McDowell with 160 men from the counties of Burke and Rutherford who had fled before the enemy to the western waters. We began our march on the 26th (of September) and on the 30th we were joined by Colonel Cleveland on the Catawba River with 350 men from the counties of Wilkes and Surry. No one officer having properly a right to command in chief. On the 1st day of October we dispatched an express to Major General Gates informing him of our situation and requesting him to send a general officer to take command of the whole. In the meantime Colonel Campbell was posted to act as commandant until such general officer should arrive.

We marched to the Cowpens on Broad River in South Carolina where we were joined by Col. James Williams with 400 men on the evening of the 6th (October) who informed us that the enemy lay encamped somewhere near the Cherokee Ford on Broad River about 30 miles distant from us. By a council of the principal officers it was then thought advisable to pursue the enemy that night with 900 of the best horsemen and leave the weak horse and footmen to follow as fast as possible. We began our march with about 900 of the best men that evening about 8 o'clock and marching all night came up with the enemy about 3 o'clock p.m. of the 7th (October) who lay encamped on the top of Kings Mountain 12 miles north of the Cherokee Ford in the confidence that they could not be forced from so advantageous a post. Colonel Shelby's and Colonel Campbell's regiments began the attack and kept up a fire on the enemy while the right and left wings were advancing forward to surround them which was done in about 5 minutes and the fire became general all around. The engagement lasted an hour and 5 minutes, the greatest part of which time a heavy and incessant fire was kept up on both sides. Our men in some places where the regulars fought were obliged to give way a small distance two or three times but rallied and returned with additional ardor to the attack. The troops upon the right having gained the summit of the eminence obliged the enemy to retreat along the top of the ridge to where Colonel Cleveland commanded and were there stopped by his brave men. A flag was immediately hoisted by Captain DuPoistre, the commanding officer (Major Ferguson having been killed a little before) for a surrender. Our fire immediately ceased and the enemy laid down their arms. The greatest part of them charged and surrendered themselves to us prisoners at discretion. It appears from their own provision returns that day found in their camp that their whole force consisted of 1,125 men out of which they sustained the following loss: Of the regulars, 1 major, 1 captain, 2 sergeants and 15 privates killed, 36 privates wounded. Left on the ground, not able to march, 2 captains, 4 lieutenants, 3 ensigns; 1 surgeon, 5 sergeants, 3 corporals, 1 drummer, and 49 privates taken prisoner. Loss of the Tories, 2 colonels, 3 captains, and 201 privates killed. One major and 127 privates wounded, and left on the ground not able to march, 1 colonel, 12 captains, 11 lieutenants, 2 ensigns, 1 quartermaster, 1 adjutant, 2 commissaries, 18 sergeants, and 600 private taken prisoner. Total loss of the enemy 1,105 men at Kings Mountain. The loss on our side, 28 killed, 60 wounded."

I have read this partial report of the Battle of Kings Mountain signed by William Campbell, Isaac Shelby, and Benjamin Cleveland because it is the most succinct and descriptive narrative of the conflict that I have ever been able to find.

In 1 hour and 5 minutes of fighting on Kings Mountain the whole course of American history was changed and the concept of free government was firmly established in the new world.

The significance of what had happened at Kings Mountain was immediately realized throughout the American Colonies. No one understood what the victory meant better than did the British. Realizing that the Southern Campaign had been lost, British forces began the retreat which ended with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis approximately a year later at Yorktown.

The Continental Congress adopted a resolution praising the heroes of the decisive battle. The Congress resolved:

"That Congress entertains a high sense of the spirited and military conduct of Colonel Campbell and the officers and privates of the militia under his command displayed in the action of October 7 in which a complete victory was obtained over superior numbers of the enemy advantageously posted on Kings Mountain in the State of North Carolina and that this resolution be published by the commanding officer of the Southern Army in general orders."

The mountain men who marched to glory at Kings Mountain were of the fine English, Scotch, Irish, and German blood so prominently identified today with the industry and culture of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. The heroes of Kings Mountain fought to maintain the liberty they had inherited from their forebears. In so doing they were military architects for a system of government which has been the model of free governments in the Western Hemisphere and of many other parts of the world.

From 13 colonies comprising approximately 3 million people in a loosely bound confederation, our Nation has grown under the principles bequeathed to us by our forebears at Kings Mountain to a giant among nations.

In 183 years our 3 million people have become 190 million Americans. Our prosperity and material progress has been without equal in history.

We owe a lasting debt to the brave men who marched down out of the mountains and rescued a war for independence that was about to be lost. We can best pay our debt of gratitude to our Revolutionary forebears by reaffirming our faith in the ideals for which they fought and rededicating ourselves to the principles which guided their destiny.

So long as we have organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American ideal will be kept bright and our constitutional principles will be venerated. As long as the Daughters of the American Revolution continues to support the heritage of our past the light of freedom will not be extinguished.

Our Nation is faced with grave problems on the domestic and international fronts. The challenge of the times in which we live requires the very best in our national character.

The faith of our fathers made us great. That faith, if preserved, will sustain us in the future and will continue to guide our paths along the way of freedom. Our enemies will never triumph unless we turn our backs upon the heroic heritage of our forefathers.

The Daughters of the American Revolution hold high the torch of liberty. The DAR is the embodiment of the spirit of Kings Mountain.

I want to say again how happy I am to be with you this afternoon. It has been a high honor to join with you in commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain. The story of that battle has passed into history, but the lesson to be gained from it will last forever.

Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein's Sermon on the Atonement of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the sermon delivered on the eve of the Day of Atonement September 27, 1963, by Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein of K.A.M. Temple in the district I have the honor to represent.

Because of the unique role of K.A.M. Temple and Rabbi Weinstein in the problems of urban renewal and integration in Chicago, much attention and much comment have been focused on Rabbi Weinstein's sermon on this occasion.

Rabbi Weinstein is a vice president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis; and a member of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, and the Business Ethics Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce. With the advent of the new year, he began the 25th year of his ministry at K.A.M. Temple, the oldest Jewish congregation in the Middle West, and which numbers among its members Associate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Rabbi Weinstein's sermon follows:

THE ATONEMENT OF A NATION

(By Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein)

The literal meaning of the Kol Nidrei has been lost in the multiplex folds of history. We respond to the haunting melody. We hear in it not only a call to waken from our own dogmatic slumbers and let our conscience shine forth, but we hear in it the collective cry of all our ancestors, their anguished appeal to God that He release them for the vows imposed on them by the fell clutch of circumstances, so that they could be free-willing people again—masters of their destiny, captains of their souls.

Our sages and the people with them realized long ago that while there might be good and bad, where there was no free will, there could not be right and wrong, and therefore no sin and repentance. Choice and responsibility, we were taught, were indispensable in the confrontation of the mature man with a mature God.

This is not to say that people accept the bitter burden of choice and responsibility with great enthusiasm. Paul the Apostle was not sympathetic to many human weaknesses—the eye that lusts, pluck it out—but he was to this one. In the theory of vicarious atonement (discarded by the Jews

in the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel) he did what the loan companies daily sweet talk the unwary into doing: Consolidate all your miserable, prickly little loans into one, easy, long-deferred payment. Billboards throughout the land and the famous Billy boys—Sunday and Graham—have sold millions of Christians on the proposition that if you believe on Him and that He was crucified for your sins, those committed and even those not yet contemplated, your salvation is assured—if not in this world, then surely in the next. A corollary of this teaching was that those who innocently suffered from the sins of others would find recompense in the blood of the lamb, in that kingdom which is not of this earth, in that heavenly house with many mansions.

It was this religion which Karl Marx called the opiate of the masses and it was an opiate. I am not ready to accept the Marxist judgment that it was all evil. The Jews, who used a milder sedation—the hope in a reign of peace and justice—were often traumatized by their suffering and still bear the scars in their souls and in their nerve ends of the beating they took from their oppressors. Many a rabbi in Dachau and Auschwitz must have wished that he could have dispensed that stronger sedative. Let me not give the impression that Christianity sanctioned or compromised with evil. It rather taught its people to ignore it, by making it spiritually irrelevant, and to be confident in its ultimate defeat by exclusion from the world to come. Christianity was indeed a philosophy and a strategy of gradualism and it counted on the infinite patience of the true believer.

And no people was more receptive to this philosophy than the Negro. He identified with the suffering servant, intimate with grief and acquainted with sorrow, bearing the stripes of the oppressor. The image of the crucifix was worth an army of taskmasters. The gentle Jesus did what Simon Legree could never have done by himself. He kept the black man bound and bent to his master vampire—white cotton—until an Old Testament prophet, Abraham of Illinois, came out of the prairie wilderness and resolved to end slavery, even if every drop of blood drawn by the taskmaster's whip would be paid for by one drawn by the sword.

"For," he said, "the judgments of the Lord are righteous altogether." Nowhere in the Scripture can we find a more positive assertion of the prophetic credo in the gravitational pull of justice. In their book, every sin had to be balanced with an act of reparation, lest the very harmony of the universe be breached. Abe Lincoln, brooding over the course of American history, saw the same grim sequence of wrong and retribution operating here: and he was too honest a man to prettify it, though the acceptance of it broke his heart. He spoke also of the unfinished business of that war and how we should dedicate ourselves to the completion of it.

You and I are living in that very decade in which a major attempt is being made to finish that business and in which a radical agitation is being injected into the 2,000-year-old teaching of Christian patience and resignation. It is a fearsome, a bittersweet experience to live in such a time, but it is inescapable. We are caught by forces let loose long ago, in a tidal wave of national atonement, and that national atonement will be all the purer and all the more effective as a prelude to a better world for all the children of men if we could take inventory of our own sins and link our acts of repentance into that of the Nation.

Perhaps we could say such an al chet (the phrase meaning "concerning the sin," which begins the litany of confession in the atonement service) as this:

For the sin which we have sinned through stress or through choice, openly or in secret, in stubbornness or in error.

For the sin which we have sinned by using the word "nigger" and the grit in our voice and the slur in our eye when we have spoken of "the colored," or "the schwartze," as though we could merge all black folk into one unseemly image.

For the sin which we have sinned by word of mouth in spreading as truth the shadiest rumors, the most disparaging jokes, the most cynical judgments.

For the sin which we have sinned by moving from a neighborhood because Negroes moved into it.

For the sin which we have sinned by paying the Negro less for the same labor performed by a white man, and charging him more for the same goods or services.

For the sin which we have sinned by believing that God made the black man inferior to the white and intended to keep him so.

For the sin which we have sinned in aiding and abetting segregated schooling and thus changing the locks on the doors of the one place where the Negro might find the means to redeem himself from the handicaps of his primitive origins and his slavery.

For the sin which we have sinned in standing idly by the blood of our black brother, in wiping our hands clean because some one else pulled the lynch rope, fired the gun, cracked the skull, threw the dynamite.

For all these sins, O God of forgiveness, bear with us, pardon and forgive us.

We sit here peacefully in this temple. Police cars scout around this block to make sure that our worship will not be disturbed. Less than a month ago, on a Sunday morning, a group of Negro children, in a Baptist church in Birmingham, had just finished their religious study and were assembling in the sanctuary to hear the word of God, to hear how the Heavenly Father had made us all in His image, destined to love one another as children of the same Father. Sticks of dynamite were hurled through the stained glass windows of that church, shattering not only the sacred symbols etched into the glass, but shattering the life of four little Negro girls and wounding, some severely, a score of other adults and children.

Perhaps we witnessed here a kind of barbaric sacrifice, a throwback to the Aztec ceremony, where the heart of a virgin maiden was offered on a high altar to appease the gods of rain and the harvest. Or it may have been an echo of the Moloch rite, where an infant was immured into the foundation stones of a new house to bribe the favor of the local spirit djins. But these acts—the ancient and the modern sacrifices—would not have been possible without the supportive consent of the people, whether vocal or silent. The murderous, cowardly hands which threw the dynamite into the Baptist church were upheld by the polite and kindly people of good will and good manners who would never kill a dog, who can't even bring themselves to say "nigger," but who support a Bull Connor and vote for a Governor Wallace and who have maintained the conditions which have denied elementary opportunity and elementary dignity to the Negro; and who then justify their behavior on the grounds that the Negro is lazy, incompetent, inherently inferior.

Charles Morgan, a Birmingham lawyer, said it quite plainly to the young businessmen of that city:

"And, who is really guilty? Each of us. Each citizen who has not consciously attempted to bring about peaceful compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court of the Unitde States, each citizen who has ever said, 'They ought to kill that nigger'; every citizen who votes for the candidate with the bloody flag; every citizen and every school board member and schoolteacher and principal and businessman and judge and lawyer who has corrupted the minds of our youth; every person in this community who has in any way contributed during the past several years to the popularity of hatred, is at least as guilty, or more so, than the demented fool who threw that bomb."

O good and polite people, you here and everywhere in this troubled land, look into your souls on this day when we seek the approval of our conscience and the favor of God. What makes us silent in the face of evil? What makes us stand idly by the blood of our brothers? Is it that we really don't believe in human decency? Are we reconciled to the ineradicable rascality of human nature? Do we need to believe in the black man's inferiority to cover up hidden inferiorities of our own? Can we not stand on our own feet unless they rest on the neck of someone meaner, less worthy, less honored by our fellow man? Do we think, perchance, that we can isolate and departmentalize our emotions—be kind and gentle and loving to our own and cruel or indifferent to those beyond the parochial pale?

Cleanse your soul from such callousness of spirit. Pray rather for the sensitivity of the poet of renascence:

"All sin was of my sinning, all
Atoning mine, and mine the gall
Of all regret. Mine was the weight
Of every brooded wrong, the hate
That stood behind each envious thrust,
Mine every greed, mine every lust.

"A man was starving in Capri;
He moved his eyes and looked at me;
I felt his gaze, I heard his moan,
And knew his hunger as my own.
I saw at sea a great fog bank
Between two ships that struck and sank;
A thousand screams the heavens smote;
And every scream tore through my throat.

"No hurt I did not feel, no death
That was not mine; mine each last breath
That, crying, met an answering cry
From the compassion that was I.
All suffering mine, and mine its rod;
Mine, pity like the pity of God."

This is the enlargement of the heart and the renewal of spirit for which we pray. Would that we could open our hearts that God might enter in. There would then be no room for lesser thoughts. And yet we must not forget that the kind of atonement you can earn here is a limited atonement. God can pardon you only for the sins you have committed against Him—by denying His sovereignty, by withholding your worship, by failing the urge for perfection in imitation of Him. Those sins you have committed against your fellow man, only the injured can forgive.

Since in our collective sins against the Negro people it would obviously be difficult to obtain personal pardon from each of the aggrieved, it is incumbent on us to do the following: To do all in our power to open the doors of equal opportunity in employment to the Negro breadwinner. His rate of unemployment is four times that of the white. Give him a break. Give him the same opportunity for promotion. Don't be bound by the conventional bind that the public is not ready to accept the Negro as salesman or office executive. You accept the Negro as nurse when your aggressions are muted by illness. You can learn to accept the Negro in any capacity where he qualifies when you are well. If you are in the labor field, fight to put an end to Jim Crow in apprenticeships and job training. This may drive you to make an assault on our restricted employment market, but this will be all to the good.

Work in your neighborhoods for open occupancy. The Negro has a right to live where he can pay the rent and observe the maintenance standards of the community. If you deny him freedom of residence, you deny him the fruit of his labor

and you condemn him to segregated schools. If there are members of this congregation who are involved in the Real Estate Association's attack on the recently passed ordinance which subjects real estate brokers to penalty for discriminatory practice, I want to say to them that there is no way in which they can reconcile this attitude with their commitment as Jews. Nor can it be reconciled with their faith as Americans; since, I believe, all business partakes of the nature of a public franchise and therefore all businessmen are bound to treat every customer equally and fairly.

This brings us to our solemn obligation to integrate our schools, since the schools are the crucible of our American way of life; and since residential patterns change slowly, we must insist on such changes in boundaries and such transfer privileges as will give our young people a chance to live democracy while they are preparing to serve it with trained skills. These are but the broad outlines of our path to true atonement. We know that revolutions are not fulfilled without painstaking and sacrificial attention to infinite detail.

The responsibility for the successful outcome of this revolution weighs most heavily on the great, churchgoing, middle-class elements of our population. The Ku Klux Klan, the White Circle folk, the Black Muslims have their plans to abort this bloodless revolution and settle the question by violent means. We can make their plans of no account. We have had in Birmingham, in Montgomery, in Jackson, in the march on Washington profound and exacting testimony that the Negro can still turn the other cheek, that the incredible patience under suffering instilled in his blood and his bone is still with him; that by some magic chemistry of his own history and his nature he can still have faith in the white man.

Can we match that patience with our concern; yes, with our impatience? Can we, the good white folk, move sufficiently out of our privileged circle to draw him in? Surely we Jews should give the right answer. Patience has been the badge of all our tribe. We know the stranger's agony and the stranger's heart. Would it not be a Chillel Ha-shem (a desecration of the Name) for us who have watched the callousness of the nations through 2,000 years of discrimination and persecution to become callous ourselves the moment equality and prosperity shined upon us? That be far from a people that holds itself to be the compassionate children of compassionate parents. That be far from us.

It is not merely patience that we are called upon to exercise. It is that compassionate understanding we describe as empathy. We must make allowance for past injustices and ingrained inequities and bend over backward without being patronizing. We have to practice a kind of discrimination in reverse, not only to atone for past wrongs but to create the condition in which an ultimate equality of opportunity can be achieved. Never were we called upon so urgently to exercise that quality for which our tradition and our experience have made us the proud bearers—the wisdom of the heart.

We gave the world the most tragically heroic example of invincible faith it had ever known. Our brethren marched to the furnaces and gas chambers of the Nazis singing "Ani Maamin"—"I believe with perfect faith that the Messiah will come, that though He tarry, God's will will be done." Must we not then join the ranks of our black brothers as they march from their Egypt to their promised land singing "I believe, deep down in my heart. I truly believe that some day, somehow, we will overcome?"

On the eve of the great white day of atonement, is it necessary to spell out that their march and our march is one march, to the same promised land; and that if we help them achieve it, it will be our security, too, and the Nation's as well, for there is no division in God—who is One as His name is one? A sentence from the New Testament has been begging for utterance: "If ye do it unto the least of these, it is as though you had done it unto Me."

I think we shall be solving more than our domestic race problem if we take the steps that will do justice to the Negro. I believe we shall be taking a giant step toward solving the incredible problem of 5 million unemployed in this, the richest country on the globe. I believe we shall have removed a psychological barrier between our country and the ever-expanding bloc of new nations of the colored populations of the world and thus make more certain not only that we can create a universal government of a world federation of nations, but that such a world government will embody the precious insights of a humane democracy. We set out to put our own house in order and we may, by that very act, help to make our globe habitable. Goodness grows by what it feeds upon and God's reward is measured out with an opulent hand.

Isaiah, so long ago, described this kind of atonement:

"Behold, ye fast for strife and contention, and to smite with the fist of wickedness; ye fast not this day so as to make your voice to be heard on high. Is such the fast that I have chosen? The day for a man to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord? Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To loose the fetters of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and they healing shall spring forth speedily."

Pennies for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, within the next several weeks the House will be considering a bill authorizing new funds for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as well as some minor amendments to the basic act itself which the Congress passed in September 1961.

I am pleased to include hereunder for the attention of my colleagues an editorial in the September 30, 1963, edition of the Milwaukee Journal, Wisconsin's leading newspaper. The editorial is captioned "Pennies for Peace," and in concise form details why this investment, although pitifully small compared with the defense budget, ought to be made in behalf of peace:

PENNIES FOR PEACE

We are spending $51 billion a year for defense—preparing for a war we hope won't come, in effect—and Congress has few qualms about providing the money. But the House of Representatives think that $15 million is too much to spend to prepare for peace.

At least the House has refused to give that much to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It has held the Agency's budget to $10 million, about what it spent last year.

The Agency, according to Director William C. Foster, would like to spend $11 million next year to finance research projects by outside experts. The operating cost of the Agency itself he sets at $4 million.

There are greater reasons for hope now that steps toward meaningful arms control and reduction may be possible. The processes are ticklish. We need to know in detail what the effects of reducing arms would have on our economy and how to prepare for possible difficulties. We need to know in what areas arms reduction can most safely be agreed to and the order in which reductions in various forms of arms should be carried out. We know too little about means of mutual inspection to guarantee that disarmament agreements are being carried out honestly.

Certainly it makes sense to study these matters. In our own interest and that of mankind we must seek every means that we can, while maintaining our security, to stave off war and end the arms race. Planning for all contingencies is the purpose of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. To deny it the money it needs is self-defeating.

Director of Peace Corps Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State—Harold R. Moskovit, State president—on Tuesday, September 24, 1963, presented their annual award and plaque to Hon. Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, at his office, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Moskovit presided at the meeting of more than 50 members of the organization who were present to honor Mr. Shriver.

Mr. Moskovit praised the outstanding work that Mr. Shriver has done as Director of the Peace Corps with its great accomplishments and commended him and the Peace Corps on their second anniversary.

Hon. G. Joseph Minetti, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board and an honorary member of the Affiliated Young Democrats, presented the plaque to Mr. Shriver. The plaque reads as follows:

AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE—MERITORIOUS CITATION TO HON. ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, JR.

In appreciation for faithful, unswerving, untiring and extraordinary service on behalf of all the people of our country.

Admired, venerated, and honored by our members for your outstanding assistance and guidance given to us and all young people for many years by helping us to promote the highest ideals of our young men and women, the future leaders of our city, State, and Nation.

Given this 24th day of September 1963, at the Peace Corps, Washington, D.C.

HAROLD R. MOSKOVIT,
State President.

Rocking the Boat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial "Rocking the Boat," which appeared in the Arizona Republic of September 24, 1963, contains such commonsense that I thought it should be brought to the attention of all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ROCKING THE BOAT

Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, flew to Saigon yesterday to take a look at the military situation in South Vietnam. Unfortunately, the problem is no longer purely, or even mainly, a military one. It has political and religious overtones that are of primary importance.

The dirty war in South Vietnam was going well until a couple of months ago. Then President Kennedy made the colossal error of trying to unseat, or at least reform, the South Vietnamese Government without having any workable alternative if President Ngo Dinh Diem got his back up.

Whether Diem is the arch villain he has been portrayed is debatable. But when President Kennedy, through Ambassador Lodge, told Diem he would have to get rid of his brother and sister-in-law, the Nhus, he should have known in advance what he would do if Diem refused. Diem did refuse, and the United States was caught looking like a card player whose bluff has been called. Far from being prepared to back up his ultimatum, President Kennedy announced the United States would continue military and economic aid to South Vietnam. So the Diem family, which is as closely knit as the Kennedy family, appeared to have thumbed its collective nose at the United States and gotten away with it.

Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu, Diem's sister-in-law and usually cited as the cause of Diem's woes, says President Kennedy is misinformed about the religious situation in South Vietnam. Although Diem is a Roman Catholic, he has a majority of Buddhists in his cabinet. Mrs. Nhu showed callous and atrocious taste when she described the self-destruction of a Buddhist monk as "a barbecue." But her claim that Buddhists have considerable religious freedom in South Vietnam appears to have merit.

We don't know where the President will go from here, and we doubt if he does. Having tried to pull the rug out from under the Nhus, he has succeeded mainly in damaging the wall-to-wall carpeting of Diem. Mr. Kennedy has been the victim of bad planning. Whether the McNamara-Taylor survey can come up with a solution remains to be seen. In the meantime, the United States had better give Diem full support because he can fight communism (which he has done successfully) or withdraw all support from Diem because of his row with the Buddhists (which may or may not prove fatal to his regime).

One thing the President can do is to tell the junior officers in the numerous American agencies in Vietnam to stop undermining Diem. Their constant criticism is reminiscent of the way that the Amerasia clique turned American opinion against Chiang Kai-shek when the generalissimo was in Chunking and Nanking. Unlike Chiang, Diem doesn't have an island to flee to if his regime is toppled. Nor does the United States have any equally determined anti-Communist to take his place. Until the United States finds such a man, it had better quit rocking Diem's boat.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 5, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

WORLD'S SICKNESS IS COMMUNISM

The whole world is suffering today because of the basic infection, communism. To meet the problem we must start with a basic policy.

1. Recognize the world's sickness is communism.

2. Isolate the sickness—label it—refuse to deal with it.

(a) Communism is based on godless materialism;

(b) In any deals in which godless materialism is engaged with the God fearing the evil will sabotage the trusting.

3. Determine to give no foreign aid to the enemy, no aid to be used in subjugating people, no action to dignify the dishonorable.

We have failed to accept this basic policy and have encouraged the spread of the sickness.

THE UNHAPPY RECORD—WHAT DEALS HAVE COST

The growth and spread of the sickness has been helped by appeasement, deals, trusting unwisely, indication of weakness, lack of firm policy.

1. Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran: results: a divided Germany and the encirclement of Berlin; the enslavement of free Poland, Czechoslovakia, the death of free China, communist control of the Kuril Islands to set the stage for present Communist influence in Asia.

2. Berlin: Building the wall, thus violating a number of agreements including the right of free access. Enslaving behind the Iron Curtain millions of free Germans, wholesale murder of men, women and children for the crime of trying to escape to freedom.

3. Cuba: The loss of a free nation, the establishment of an enemy military base within shooting distance of the United States, a training area and embarkation point for saboteurs and subversion throughout Latin America.

4. Laos: Acceptance of a Russian proposal for a "troika" and the eventual control of the country by the Communists. Providing a staging area to export communism to surrounding free nations.

5. Vietnam: Recognition of a divided country giving the Communists a stronghold in North Vietnam has resulted in continued pressure on South Vietnam and has now brought death to American boys who are fighting a war that is not a war.

6. Korea: Communist control of North Korea resulted in war and 133,000 American casualties, humiliation and defeat for the United States and the strengthening of Communist influence throughout Asia.

7. United Nations: Trusting Soviet Union proposals for the charter and subsequent understanding has made it possible for the Russians to have their own man as head of the military secretariat continuously, even during the Korean war when Russia was supporting the enemy the U.N. was fighting. The Soviet Union has used the veto power to sabotage the U.N. and use its machinery against the United States; has bled the taxpayers of the United States to build and strengthen Communist countries.

8. Finally, we now have in being a test ban treaty which endangers our defenses and we are trying to enter into a deal to help the Soviet economy by selling Russia wheat to make up for its own inefficiencies. We will use American taxpayers' money to subsidize the sale.

AN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

No deals with the enemy—communism

1. Accept and recognize the challenge of the all-out war the Communists have declared on us.

2. Brand the sickness as communism. Stop supporting and aiding Communists, socialists, and neutrals. Provide foreign aid only to our friends and then on a self-help basis through loans and providing know-how for them to do the things they feel best for their country.

3. Withdraw recognition of Communist governments—brand them outlaws of civilization. Do not dignify them by negotiation and deals. Recognize they will not honor contracts, but use them as a step to victory for their side.

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?"—(II Corinthians, 6-14).

Burns Ditch-Indiana Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a September 26 broadcast over WANE-TV and WANE radio in Fort Wayne, Ind. I believe that this editorial well summarizes the feelings of many people in Indiana and in the Nation as a whole as regards the Burns Ditch Indiana Port and Lakeshore Park project.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURNS DITCH-INDIANA PORT

The long battle of the industrial developers versus the conservationists in Indiana apparently has ended, and we believe the way in which it was resolved will benefit all the people of Indiana.

The Federal Budget Bureau, which advises the administration on monetary matters, recommended this week that Federal funds for offshore work on the proposed Burns Ditch Port be approved, and that a national lakeshore park also be created in the northern Dunes area. Thus, the people who want the Lake Michigan fort because of the future economic advantages it is likely to bring the State, and the people who wanted to preserve the Dunes area for its recreational value and its abundance of wildlife useful for scientific research, are both the winners.

The save-the-dunes people are not getting exactly the land they wanted, but while they set out to preserve only 3,000 acres, they now end up with over 11,000 being set aside for a national park. For both recreation and biological research, this is a boon, and we believe they should be happy. For those who want the Burns Ditch Port, the Budget Bureau set down certain requirements that must be met before the Federal funds are granted. But these conditions seem to be realistic, and we believe they, too, should be happy.

Now that a reasonable compromise between the two sides has been reached, the recriminations and arguments should come to an end. We hope the conditions the Budget Bureau set down for the Burns Ditch Port can be met and that Congress will approve; and we hope work can then go forward on the port for the sake of Indiana's industrial growth, and that work will also go forward with all due speed on the National Lakeshore Park.

On the Urban Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Mark Hatfield, of Oregon, recently delivered an excellent address before the 12th Annual Commissioners and Governors Conference of Metropolitan Washington's problems sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

Governor Hatfield, in the course of his remarks, told of the experience of the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments which is similar in operation to our own Washington Council of Governments.

The text of the Governor's remarks follows:

ON THE URBAN FRONTIER

Governor Harrison, Governor Tawes, Chairman Sickles, Mrs. Wilkins, members of the conference, and distinguished guests, in this citadel of the New Frontier, I am reminded of Ambassador-Professor Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society," and its memorable description which goes like this:

"The family which takes its air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour [and] passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts for wires that should long since have been put undergound. They pass on into a countryside that has been rendered largely invisible by commercial art. They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals. Just before dozing off on an air mattress, beneath a nylon tent, amid the stench of decaying refuse, they may reflect vaguely on the curious unevenness of their blessings."

We do, indeed, have an unevenness of blessings—as has every generation before us and as will every generation that follows. What will really count for us and for those who come after us will be the effectiveness with which we transform problems into progress and adversity into advantage.

Our metropolitan areas have been facing a crisis brought on by the movement of our population from farm to city and compounded by the flight of great masses from the central city to the suburbs. The studies by political scientists of this continuing crisis have resulted in a new specialty I understand they want to call metropology. Whatever the name, study and solution of these problems are matters which have concerned me as a professor of political science, as a legislator, as Secretary of State (of Oregon), as Governor and—perhaps most important—as a citizen of Salem. They concern you (or you would not be here). They should concern the resident of every metropolitan area, but the fact of the matter is that they do not. We may not like it, but it is nonetheless true.

It reminds me of the statement of Prof. Arthur Bromage (University of Michigan) that "the influence of practical politics will surely be one key to metropolitan government of the future." I believe he understates the case. Practical politics will be the key to the future of urban government.

We must deal with the realities of people as they are, where they are. We must recognize that much of the inefficiency of local government exists because people want it that way. Prof. Charles Adrian (Michigan State University) has said of those who assume otherwise that they "sometimes exclaim in wonder and horror, 'Why, there are 76 different fire departments in the metropolitan area.'

"Efficiency and economy are probably among the suburbanites' lesser concerns—to him other things have a far higher priority. This attitude is in accord with a traditional view of Americans. We do not like to pay taxes and we do not associate taxes with services. Because this is the case, efficiency and economy arguments are nearly meaningless—the typical citizen probably does not see an important relationship between the way in which services are provided and the size of his own tax bill. He, rather, cynically, expects government to be relatively inefficient."

This is the political reality of local government to which we must bring in our home communities, in our State governments, and in the Federal Government whatever powers of prophecy, administrative skill, and political leadership we may possess.

In the metropolitan area from which I come, we have been attempting—with some success—to deal with the problems created by our own urban sprawl. Although our problems are small enough to permit a greater chance of comprehension and solution, there may be some value to this audience in a brief reference to the experience of our Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments.

Five years ago, a conference of some 200 citizens, called together by the Salem Area Chamber of Commerce, studied the governmental problems of our metropolis. At the end of a year, they made a long series of recommendations for action by the city, the State, our two counties, the school and other districts.

The key recommendation, however, was that a formal compact of voluntary cooperation be agreed to by the elected representatives of the five major governmental units involved. This formal compact is a remarkable document in several respects:

1. It establishes no supergovernment.

2. It takes no power from any present government.

3. Yet this legal, legislatively sanctioned compact of cooperation has led to improved solutions of our metropolitan problems.

Let me cite two or three examples.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

The forecasts of automotive economists are frightening. By 1983, I understand, there will be 115 million cars, trucks, and buses on our streets and roads (a 40-percent increase over 1963.) This on top of the fact that we now have 22 cars for every mile of road and street compared to 11 cars per mile in 1941. (American Municipal News, Aug. 12, 1963). Similar forecasts relating to air and other travel systems offer little hope of effective solution by a single local government.

This district is not a Federal enclave, isolated from Virginia or Maryland, from Chevy Chase or Arlington. Your National Capital Transportation Agency has sought to deal with your mass transit problem and has encountered the usual difficulties engendered by a complex structure of local government.

I am glad to report that we are engaged through our Council of Governments on a cooperative transportation study that has been cited by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads as a model for other metropolitan areas. The real test of our study will come in the implementation decisions yet to be made. Our optimism on this score rests in the main on the fact that the study was cooperatively initiated, is cooperatively being made under the cooperative supervision of our council. The active role played by the elected officials of city, county, and State governments will make the necessary political action to implement study results much easier to achieve.

I trust that your Transportation Committee, with respect to the National Capital transportation problem, will enjoy a similar role, with similar prospects.

WATER POLLUTION

I once had a colleague who began his course in municipal government with: "Welcome to this class on street cleaning, garbage collection, and refuse disposal."

Metropolitan problems are real.

Increased population and expanding industry, plus home laundries, dishwashers, and other additions to our standard of living, have increased the demand for water while pollution has been aggravated by inadequate and overloaded treatment systems.

For this problem, our council has provided the political leadership necessary to achieve a solution. Through the council, we have developed a truly metropolitan approach. The central city is developing a sewage treatment plant to serve, in addition to its own 12 square miles, the 50 square miles of unincorporated area surrounding it. The counties are developing sewer districts for which the boards of county commissioners are the governing bodies. The districts have foreknowledge that, as annexation of the core city progresses, the districts will be abandoned. Cooperation from the State sanitary authority and State legislature has been invaluable in the execution of this program.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

Recently, our council has assumed an extremely important role in the overall coordination in the provision of facilities and services to our citizens. This was accomplished when the council accepted the responsibility for reviewing our regional 6-year capital improvement programs and making recommendations thereon to the participating governments. Each of the participating governments annually develops a projection of the capital improvements it anticipates during the coming 6 years. Until recently, these projections had been forwarded to our regional planning agency where they were brough together in a single report. During this process the regional planning council was able to negotiate certain revisions with the individual governments. However, because it lacked the political power which is involved in the decisionmaking on these projects, the planning council was not able to approach the more important problems such as the coordination of the scheduling of bond and special levy elections, the balancing of the overall community expenditures

for capital improvement and the many other policy decisions which require action by the responsible elected officials.

"We are now in the process of revising the planning operation to bring it more directly under the guidance of our Council of Governments. Planning is futile unless it is related to decisionmaking. Unless such a connection between planning and decision exists, a metropolitan area faces confusion, contention, and the chaos of inaction that would cost us dearly in the years ahead."

In these and other areas of our council's action, it has been a privilege and a challenge for me to serve as the Representative of the State of Oregon. I have been repeatedly impressed by the fact that simple cooperation among local governments cannot meet the metropolitan challenge. Both State and Federal Governments have roles to play.

Governor Harrison's Commonwealth has pioneered in far-seeing State legislation of local import. Annexation, city-county consolidation, and the present legislative study of local government seem to me to exemplify some of the constructive steps the States must take. Greater flexibility should be afforded to local governments by the States so that they may deal with new problems with the means most suitable to the circumstance. This applies, in my judgment, to the issues of local finance, to the question of the structure of local government, to the distribution of powers, functions, and responsibilities. Of course, I include in this prescription the authorization for cooperative and joint solution of interlocal problems. We should seek less to regulate and more to encourage local action on local matters.

One other State action should parallel that of Maryland, where Governor Tawes was so instrumental in initiating a Baltimore Metropolitan Area Study Committee. I hope that the mandatory study commission required for the Portland metropolitan area by action of our legislature will find the same enthusiastic reception I am told is true in Baltimore. Hopefully, these commissions, and others like them, will help us identify and prevent potential problems before they reach the critical proportions that are represented by decayed and blighted areas in each of our major cities.

For some, massive Federal programs (such as public housing and urban renewal) are the only solution to the gamut of metropolitan problems. The Federal Government cannot escape concern for urban problems that extend well beyond State and local boundaries. In the field of transportation, water supply and sewage disposal, and others we could name, we are dealing with national and regional issues many of which cannot be solved by action of local governments or a single State.

The solid research produced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (established by President Eisenhower), the continuing congressional interest reflected in the special subcommittees on intergovernmental relations will be helpful in keeping national focus on the metropolitan problem.

It is my fervent hope that Federal action in the future will continue to provide us with the research data on which effective local, State, and regional action may be taken. I hope, too, that Federal action will encourage and support voluntary, cooperative, local, and State action and that the Council of State Governments may join with the American Municipal Association and the National Association of Counties in a similar effort.

It should be made easier for the States to enter into and give effect to compacts such as Incodel and the Port of New York Authority. It should be the Federal purpose in matters such as water resources planning to take action which will strengthen rather than weaken the sense of State and local purpose and responsibility. And, above all, it should encourage the kind of intergovernmental cooperation that preserves the significance of participation in the processes of local government.

I have talked of the critical metropolitan problems that concern our local, state and National Governments. I have described something of the cooperative effort in which we—like you—have been engaged. I have not discussed metropolitan government—of the Dade County or Toronto type—less because they are controversial than because I am convinced that the councils of government can do the job, while preserving the responsiveness of government that is so essential to the success of democracy itself. It may be that other forms of government—like "metro"—will prove themselves equal to the metropolitan task, but I can assure you that our community (a stronghold of conservatism) finds our voluntary cooperation compact both acceptable and effective. It preserves home rule and it issures an approach to our problem that is responsive to local control. In Professor Adrian's words, "If our goal is to preserve the institutions of democracy, the burden of proof is on those who would take away the little governments (or give them nothing to decide, which amounts to the same thing)."

The voluntary council of governments does not "take away the little governments." Instead it permits the study and solution of metropolitan problems on an areawide basis; permits the coordination of planning, decisionmaking, ad execution; meets local problems in a democratic and responsive way; and improves the capacity of local government to remain the master of its own destiny.

It is clear that the strength of our democracy lies in local self-government and in the cooperative solution of our problems—where the problems are. We can cut at the roots of "the tree of liberty" by a steady centralization of governmental power and responsibility. Or we can nourish the tree. If local government is to continue to flourish, it must have the understanding support of the State and Federal Governments but it must also have the will to meet and solve—individually or cooperatively—the problems it confronts. This council—and others like it—provide a tool that widens and strengthens the capacity of local government. It must be our high resolve that we will never rest on our quest for patterns of local government fuly equal to the needs of today and adaptable as well to needs of tomorrow. Only thus may we reduce the unevenness of our blessings and satisfy our commitment to the preservation of democracy and the tree of liberty.

Wasted Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House action in substantially reducing the foreign aid authorization has received tremendous acclaim from the American public. Since we will eventually consider a conference report on the authorization bill and later the appropriation for the current fiscal year, it would be well for us to continue to evaluate the foreign aid program.

In its editorial of September 4, the Palos Regional in Palos, Ill., expressed an opinion typical of local publications across the country on the subject of "Wasted Foreign Aid," which I place in the RECORD at this point:

WASTED FOREIGN AID

Looking back to the beginning of foreign aid, and to the idealistic yet practical principles on which it was then postulated, gives one something of an Alice-in-Wonderland feeling.

The start is found in the Marshall plan. The idea was to use American resources to help rebuild war-shattered nations, and to bring about a peaceful, cooperative world based upon free institutions—including free popular elections.

The tragedy is that many billions of our foreign aid have been used for very different ends. It has gone to dictatorship, in which the people have no voice at all in affairs. Worst of all, it has gone, in instance after instance, to members of or sympathizers with the Communist bloc. Thus, our own dollars have been used to strengthen our enemies—and even to buy them advanced weapons of war.

One can understand that foreign aid distributions of billions of dollars are often wasteful and misdirected. That is inevitable in so vast an undertaking. But there can be no excuse for employing it to our own disadvantage and danger. A drastic change in policy has long been in order. Let us aid our friends, and stop right there.

A State Within a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, recent events in South Vietnam have once again raised the question of the role the Central Intelligence Agency plays in the formulation of foreign policy. In the 87th Congress and in this Congress, I have introduced bills which would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. On October 6, the New York Times published an editorial which supports legislation to establish such a committee and which I believe should be read by all of us. The editorial follows:

STATE WITHIN A STATE?

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence; it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programed, controlled, and directed—tend willy-nilly to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when

that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of king makers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us eons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A joint congressional committee on intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

Jewish Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise my remarks I include therein a scholarly, well-prepared, interesting and inspiring article on Rosh Hashonah and the Day of Atonement by Mr. Anthony Cama, gifted teacher, author and poet, and also two fine poems that he has written concerning these great Jewish holidays. I think Mr. Cama's article and poems memorializing these days sacred to our Jewish brethren are in the best traditions of our Nation:

[From the Lynn Sunday Post, Sept. 15, 1963]

ROSH HASHONAH

I hear the shofar's call, this is the holy day,
How clear and loud the ram's most sacred horn.
Let Israel remember, kneel and pray
And lift the spirit high to greet the dawn.
Two are the days that Rosh Hashonah brings
Let every Hebrew seed grow strong and free.
The prophet Micah lifts his voice and sings,
"Cast all your sins into the depthless sea."
Stand proud and valiant by the gushing stream,
Oh, sons of Israel, O, mortal man.
The Book of Life is opened; bright the dream,
Of brother love to bridge the pogrom's span.
Let Rosh Hashonah come. Behold its light.
The prayer shawl will conquer hate and fear.
Hold high the torch of Israel, so bright,
And bless the Lord this Rosh Hashonah year.

—*Anthony Cama.*

ROSH HASHONAH

(By Anthony Cama)

On September 19, 1963, the Holy Days of the Jewish people lift their sacred voices high above the teeming rushing modern hours of this huge, rich, and powerful Nation. For the people of the land of Israel this is a calendar year of 5724 years.

Woven within our Judean Christian religious and philosophical culture are the immortal contributions from the wonderfully spiritually rich Jewish religion. This country is proud and honored by the presence of this race of people who have brought inestimable and priceless human and cultural riches to the land of democratic hope and freedom. From the mountain tops to the valleys, the desert fringes, and the stormy shorelines of our oceans the Star of David has shone ever brilliant and continues to give forth a valiant illumination of the generations of the American Jews—outstanding citizens, distinguished and unselfish patriots, indomitable force of religious faith and trust in the brotherhood of man.

The Rosh Hashonah is the Jewish New Year's Day, which comes on the first of Tishri. It is also called the Day of Remembrance and the day of the blowing of the shofar (ram's horn). Its celebration and observance are for 2 days, and its religious laws serve to awaken the Jewish people to a realization of their shortcomings and to make new resolutions for the coming years.

Rosh Hashonah during the first day (or the second day, if the first day occurs on the Sabbath) the "Tashlich" ceremony is performed after the afternoon (Minchah) service. Reference is made to the prophesies of Micah: "And thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea * * * O mayest Thou cast all the sins of Thy people into a place where they shall be no more remembered or ever again come to mind."

The Tashlich ceremony consists of several verses from the prophecy of Micah, together with various other prayers and psalms. On the first day of Rosh Hashonah it is performed on the banks of a stream of running water.

YOM KIPPUR—THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

There is a period of time between Rosh Hashonah and Yom Kippur (including these days) called the Ten Days of Penitence. During this time individuals must make special efforts to atone for sins committed during the previous year and strive for better conduct in the future.

Yom Kippur is the most awesome day in the Jewish calendar. It occurs on the 10th of Tishri and is observed by 24 hours of intense fasting and by prayers and supplications. It ise called the Day of Judgment. We are told that on Rosh Hashonah the book of life is opened and in it is inscribed the fate of mortal man. On Yom Kippur the book is sealed, and man's destiny is decided. At this time the Almighty forgives (if repentance is sincere) man's sins against Him. But man's sins against his fellow men can be forgiven only if he makes atonement to the individual harmed. So speaks Micah, the great prophet.

It is indeed an honor and privilege for this teacher-writer to bring to the readers of the Sunday Post little-known facts about other races and other religious philosophies not only for educational purposes but also to show their invaluable contributions to the establishment and the preservation of our great democratic Nation. During these spiritual uplifting days of the Jewish holiday observances every gentile should try to help the children understand and respect the dignity of the religious rights of the Jewish people. The Judean-Christian culture is eternally inseparable.

For thousands of years the fulgid Star of David has illuminated the roadways of humanity from the heavens of many civilizations. During this holy Jewish observance let us all be respectful and humble. From this writer and the staff of the Sunday Post go forth the most sincere best wishes for the sacred holiday season.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part IV of the series "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1":

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1—PART IV

"BAD AIR" MAY CAUSE FATAL LUNG DISEASES

(By Ian McNett)

Doctors and scientists are beginning to think that dramatic killer fogs are not the major public health hazard of air pollution.

The experts recognize the tragic implications of such incidents. However, they feel the lethal fogs are isolated incidents. By their very dramatic character they tend to overshadow the real menace of air pollution—the long-term disabling effects of low concentrations of pollutants on the respiratory tract.

Along with this concern, doctors are considering something new in medical theory. The new idea is that a single disease may have more than one cause.

This thinking differs from medical thinking that originated with Louis Pasteur, who discovered germs. The germ theory of medicine held that each disease is caused by a single species of microorganism.

Experimenters have found that a substance that won't cause cancer in mice when used alone, will cause cancer when combined with influenza germs. The doctors now think that a single disease may have two or even three causes working in combination.

The multiple causes of lung disease and the long-term effects of pollutants were the ideas most discussed by doctors last December at the National Conference on Air Pollution in Washington.

Actually, the process that brings death from air pollution is fairly simple, and well understood by the experts.

"After Donora, everyone started looking for some mysterious substance in the air," says Dr. Horace Gerarde, professor of toxicology at Rutgers University.

"It was found that any airborne particles will irritate the delicate linings of the lung. The irritation causes a protective fluid to pour into the irritated compartment of the lung. The fluid interferes with the transfer of oxygen from the lungs to the bloodstream.

"The heart is required to work harder to get enough oxygen for the body. The extra stress on the heart is enough to make it stop in people who have preexisting heart conditions."

Elderly persons die

Elderly people with heart and lung disease are the ones who died at Donora and London.

But what about normal, healthy people? Dr. Walter Grossman, of New Brunswick, a specialist in chest diseases, is concerned about them.

"It has been generally felt," he says, "that only people with chronic heart and lung diseases are the victims of air pollution. We lose sight of the fact that air pollution has a cumulative effect on healthy lungs, slowly and insidiously over the years.

"The average individual is rarely aware of this, because of the body's great ability to compensate for the failure of one organ by bringing other forces into play.

"As the human lung slowly loses its function because of the scarring effects of chronic

irritation, the heart compensates by beating a little faster and pumping a little harder. The rate of breathing is increased slowly and imperceptibly so that the individual is not aware of what is taking place."

Notice too late

It is only after many years pass, Dr. Grossman says, that the changes wrought by air pollution become noticeable. By that time the lungs have been damaged beyond repair.

Dr. Grossman says it is often difficult for even the trained specialist to tell the differences in lung damage caused by air pollution and the effects of such diseases as bronchitis and pneumonia.

The difficulty is compounded by the fact that air pollution may play a role in the development of chronic lung disease, it was pointed out at the Washington conference.

So far the evidence has all been circumstantial. Study after study has shown that air pollution and lung disease are found together. It was only last month that doctors induced lung cancer in living lung tissues by subjecting the tissue to air pollutants. But this was done in a test tube, not a living human being.

But the studies show that urban cigaret smokers have a higher rate of lung disease than rural smokers. The same correlation holds for nonsmokers.

British doctors conducted a study that shows a revealing correlation between lung cancer and air pollution.

The studies were made on British people who migrated to South Africa and New Zealand. Britain is heavily industrialized and populated. South Africa and New Zealand are relatively free from air pollution. And South Africans and New Zealanders smoke more than practically any other nationalities.

The study showed a 44 percent higher rate of lung cancer among the migrating British than among native South Africans, and 75 percent more lung cancer among immigrants than among New Zealanders.

Benzopyrene, the substance in cigarette smoke that causes cancer in mice, is found in the atmosphere. It is a hydrocarbon and it comes from automobile exhausts.

But you don't have to go to Britain, South Africa, or New Zealand to find revealing studies.

One much closer to home was cited at the air pollution conference. The report of the chairman for the panel discussing the biological effects of air pollutants said:

"Recently, a British-American team * * * found a 3-percent prevalence of chronic bronchitis in a group of workers with similar occupations from Washington, Baltimore, and New York. * * *

"A 22-percent prevalence of chronic respiratory diseases in males aged 40 through 59 has recently been found in a New Jersey housing project."

Leading time-losers

Chronic bronchitis and emphysema have become the leading causes of lost worktime in Great Britain. Emphysema is a lung disease caused by irritation of the lung lining.

Doctors can't prove it conclusively, but all the circumstantial evidence points directly at air pollution as the cause for the rise in lung ailments in industrial areas.

Experts at the Washington conference felt critics would argue that not enough evidence has been accumulated to show that air pollution causes lung disease.

Although the experts can't tell you just how or why air pollution causes these lung diseases, they are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that it does. They say we've got to go to work today, stopping pollution, even if we can't establish exact standards for ambient air quality.

Seek safety standards

Ambient air quality is another term experts use. They mean they would like to set standards that would make the outdoor atmosphere safe to breathe—short- and long-term.

The experts point out that doctors started preventing certain diseases by practicing cleanliness before Louis Pasteur ever saw a germ. The same principal should prevail in cleaning up the air, the experts argue—go to work before we have all the answers.

It has been almost 100 years since Pasteur first saw the germ through a microscope, and many diseases caused by tiny living organisms still aren't completely controlled. We can't afford to wait that long on air pollution, the doctors say.

It seems that man creates problems for himself faster than he can solve the ones nature provided.

Fiftieth Anniversary for Rev. Gabriel Takacs, OFM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1963, a well-known and beloved member of the Hungarian Franciscans, the Reverend Gabriel Takacs, OFM, will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his monastic vows.

This half century of dedicated work by a dedicated man will be observed at the monastery of the Transylvanian Franciscan Fathers in Youngstown, Ohio. On that occasion the laying and blessing of the foundation stone of a new chapel at the monastery will take place. The first mass will be celebrated by Father Gabriel in a setting which is dominated by a statue of the first Saint and King of Hungary—Saint Stephen.

Father Gabriel began his priestly life in 1913, during World War I, in Transylvania, then under Roman rule. During World War II he worked among the Hungarian refugees in the displaced persons camps of Europe for a period of 6 years. When the displaced persons camps were emptied, Father Gabriel followed that part of his flock which took up a new life in the United States of America. After arriving in the United States he resumed his work among the Hungarian emigrees in Cleveland, Ohio. His leadership and intellectual attainments were soon recognized and he became editor in chief of the Catholic Hungarian Sunday, which is the now the largest Hungarian language newspaper published in the United States.

Over the years Father Gabriel has been a tower of strength to the cause of the Hungarian nation and to the emigrees from that land who have taken up a new life in the United States. This mild, charitable, and warmhearted priest is revered by his countrymen and respected by many thousands of Americans who have come to know him through his many good works and unusual undertakings. To all he is a champion, a Christian life as a living answer to the problems and dangers of this age.

Father Gabriel Takacs, OFM, can look back over the past 50 years with the satisfied reward that comes only to those who live by the dictum, "The crown of victory shall go only to those who enter the fray."

Coal: Furious Guile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, ever since quota restrictions were placed on the importation of residual oil by President Eisenhower in March 1959, the price of this gummy substance, left behind after byproducts have been refined off, has risen to a point where it is now estimated to be costing the New England consumer $30 million per year more for residual oil than it was before quotas were imposed.

The New England delegation in Congress has been fighting to have these quotas eased, because New England is a large buyer of residual oil from Latin America, particularly Venezuela. The Latin American residual oil can be shipped to New England at a cheaper price than domestic residual oil is sold in this country. Besides, the refining process of domestic petroleum is so efficient that there is very little residual oil left over to satisfy all of the domestic consumption requirements. So, New Englanders are forced to buy the foreign residual oil to fulfill the needs of our region, but we are paying a higher price per barrel because of the harsh quota restrictions. I think my colleagues will be interested in reading an editorial from the Boston Herald of October 3 on this subject, and I include it with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COAL: FURIOUS GUILE

The well-heeled coal lobby is after us again up here in New England. Not content with cutting down our imports of cheap residual oil by means of Presidential proclamation under false pretense of a threat to national security, the lobby now has turned to Congress to impose a statutory limitation. And all the old misrepresentations and guile have been amassed again to do this harm to us with little or no gain for the coal industry.

The bill that 37 Representatives in Congress have sponsored would cut imports to half the consumption of both domestic and imported residual oil in the previous year. With typical guile this is represented as offering a 3 percent increase in imports. Actually the bill would prevent any increase in imports to match the steady continuing decline in the production of domestic residual. Year after year our oil supply would be cut back even as our needs grow.

Also unmentioned is the illegality of the present import limitations. These can be justified only if imports threaten our security, and the President's Office of Emergency Planning has determined that they do not. Only a congressional enactment can legalize the restrictions.

The guile does not stop there, however.

Members of Congress from the coal States, leaning on the coal lobby's falsifying propaganda, have come up with these devious dicta:

"Despite the control program, residual imports have increased from an original rate of 343,000 barrels a day to the present quotas at a rate of 375,000 barrels a day." But this is misleading. The increase in imports balanced a decrease in domestic production of residual; consumption remains about constant—the gain in consumption last year was only 1 percent. Coal has more than held its own against residual.

"Total imports this year will be the equivalent in energy value to 50 million tons of coal, or about 11 percent of total U.S. production." An irrelevant statistic. Even the coal lobby is not proposing—at least not yet—a total halt to imports. No statistics are offered to show how an increase in the use of residual has cut into coal production, because there has been no relative increase. Residual has about the same share of the east coast industrial fuels market as it had in 1958. It is natural gas that has expanded—from 16.9 percent of the market to 21.3 percent. "Imported residual has practically no market at all in Latin America where it originates. As a result it can be sold in the United States at almost any price." Preposterous. The world demand for residual is in excess of 2 billion barrels and is rising at 10 percent a year. Latin America exported over 400 million barrels in 1962, and over 135 million went to industrial countries competing with the United States.

And to show the hypocrisy of all this, the coal States so vocal about our use of residual are also substantial users of residual—even with all their native coal. If residual has a market next to the mines, why can't it be allowed a market up here where transportation doubles the cost of coal?

The coal lobby is playing dirty to force up fuel costs in New England and the rest of the east coast in the delusion that it will help the coal industry. And coal State Congressmen have been trapped by the lobby's propaganda.

Tribute to J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD a very fine tribute to J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for which I am indebted to the FBI National Academy Associates of Ohio:

Whereas one of the greatest safeguards to the dignity and freedom of all men in the United States has been the loyal and dedicated service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas under the matchless leadership of J. Edgar Hoover the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by the diligent and impartial discharge of its duties, has contributed mightily to the preservation of the rights which are guaranteed all Americans by the Constitution and the laws of the land; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a selfless effort to elevate the standards of law enforcement, has through its National Academy and training programs better prepared law-enforcement officers throughout the Nation to acquit themselves effectively without infringement on the basic rights and freedoms of those whom they serve: Be it

Resolved, That the Ohio FBI National Academy Associates endorse the FBI in its contributions to the welfare and well-being of one and all in these United States; and be it further.

Resolved, That J. Edgar Hoover and all his associates in the FBI be especially commended for their loyal and devoted service and their record of accomplishments without reservation.

Attest:

L. THOMAS WILSON, *President*.

All Guns Should Be Registered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have believed that guns should be registered. It does not make sense to allow people to obtain and use these weapons without the slightest control. While many States do have a registration and permit system for handguns, hunting rifles, and shotguns, and the like are not usually covered by such laws. I need hardly say that these latter weapons can kill just as easily as a pistol.

No one can object to the citizen arming himself if he has some reason to do so, such as self-protection, hunting, or target shooting. By the same token no one should object to obtaining a license to carry guns for these purposes. It is no different than a fishing license as the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of September 23, 1963, points out:

LICENSE ALL GUNS

Why should known underworld characters be able to drive around with shotguns and rifles and the ammunition for these weapons?

Only last week, Albert "Kid Blast" Gallo was discovered parked outside the Manhattan district attorney's office with a .12-gage shotgun in his car and shells handy on the seat. But shocked police found that they had to give back the weapon. Under the law, anyone can carry an unloaded shotgun provided he has not been convicted of a crime. And though Gallo has been arrested 12 times, he has never been convicted.

We are gratified that three such prominent law enforcement officials as District Attorneys Silver of Brooklyn and Braisted of Richmond and Supreme Court Justice John E. Cone are determined to fight for legislation to bar the indiscriminate sale of guns.

The Journal-American has long advocated that rifles and shotguns be licensed just as pistols are. That is why we applaud Justice Cone for appointing a three-man committee to draft legislation at the local, State and Federal level. This will be done by Joseph Ruggieri, Democratic candidate for Brooklyn councilman-at-large; State Senator Frank J. Pino, Democrat, of Brooklyn, and Congressman John M. Murphy, Democrat, of Staten Island.

No one who has a legitimate reason for possessing firearms should object to having these weapons registered. This is no more a restriction of individual liberty than is a fishing license.

Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, President of University of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a series of three articles by Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., who has just completed his first year as president of the University of Connecticut, located at Storrs, Conn., in my congressional district. In these articles he reports his impressions of his first year at the university, discuse it growth in recent years, notes its contributions to the State in the fields of education and research, and considers its needs in the future. The articles were published in the Hartford Times, October 1, 2, and 3, and read as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

HIS FIRST YEAR AT UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT EXCITING

(By Dr. Homer D. Babbidge)

STORRS.—If I had to describe my freshman year as president of the University of Connecticut in a single word, it would be "exciting." For during my first 12 months at Storrs, I have been fully infected with a spirit that pervades this vigorous and growing institution—a sense of excitement with each day's activities and eager anticipation of tomorrow's developments. What were only hopes a year ago have become confident expectations.

Not unlike many another freshman, I've found that college is all I'd hoped for—and more.

One of the most heartening discoveries of my first year has been the fact that the people of the State are beginning to discover their university. Its threefold functions of teaching, research, and public service are increasingly touching the lives of Connecticut citizens, and they in turn begin to appreciate the benefits that flow from the pursuit of educational excellence.

It has taken some time for them to realize it, but the people of the State are now awakening to the fact that we have a State university in fact as well as in name.

Institutions, like people, grow from what they were and are, to what they will be. The University of Connecticut's history is longer than most citizens of our State realize, stretching back to 1881. Admittedly, in New England this is a little like boasting that your ancestors came over on the *Queen Mary*.

Though this year we celebrated our 80th commencement, we have been a university only since 1939. We were founded as an agricultural school, then became a State college and ultimately, a university. Our enrollement has increased some tenfold since we were elevated to university status, and it can be said that the University of Connecticut has burst upon the public consciousness as a major institution only in the last decade.

This rapid growth has been accompanied by growing pains. In the last decade a 60-percent increase in enrollments has been accompanied by an increase of faculty of only 36 percent.

The Wilbur Cross Library, built in 1937 to serve the needs of fewer than 1,000 students of the Conecticut State College, is woefully inadequate to the needs of the 9,000 students who now attend the University of Connecti-

cut at Storrs. These deficiencies must be repaired promptly, or the quality of our instructional and research programs will be endangered.

But our inheritance from the past is not a negative one. Vigor and a determination to preserve quality while meeting quantitive demands, are the strongest strains in the university's tradition.

Physically, the University of Connecticut is made up of 16 schools and colleges, with 4 2-year branches located strategically throughout the State in a plant that is valued at some $78 million. But more importantly, the university is liberally sprinkled with students, teachers, and researchers who would be ornaments to any university in the Nation.

Because I can take neither credit nor blame for what the university is today, I can with objectivity say that it is bigger, better, and more promising than most citizens of the State realize.

Excellence is a contagious condition and the university is well infected with the germ. Manifestations are to be found in the programs of teaching, research, and public service. But more important, the spirit that characterizes the faculty, alumni, and students of the university and recent gestures of public support and appreciation insure that these examples of excellence will multiply in the future.

[From the Hartford Times, Oct. 2, 1963]

UNIVERSITY'S CONTRIBUTION IN PROGRAMS

(By Dr. H. D. Babbidge, Jr.)

STORRS.—The University of Connecticut is one manifestation of the State's provision for public postsecondary education.

The four State colleges now provide a full 4-year program of liberal arts instruction, in addition to their traditional programs of teacher preparation. And a new system of 2-year technical institutes is rapidly maturing. The qualified Connecticut high school graduate has, therefore, a broad and growing range of higher educational choices before him.

The university itself can accommodate about 2,000 freshmen at its Storrs campus, and a growing number at its 4 2-year branches located at Stamford, Waterbury, Hartford, and Torrington. Competition for admission is such that only high school graduates ranking in the top half of their class can expect to be admitted. Total undergraduate enrollment of the university now approximates 9,800 of whom 9,160 are full-time students.

The truly distinctive contribution made by the university to that State's program of public higher education lies in its programs of graduate and professional education and research. It is quite apparent that these aspects of the university's work will receive increasing proportionate emphasis in the years to come.

The first Ph. D. awarded by the University of Connecticut was given in 1949. The university now offers programs leading to the Ph. D. in 22 different fields, from anthropology to zoology. More than a dozen professional schools are embraced within the university, offering superior training in such areas as engineering, education, agriculture, and business administration. Indication of the vigorous growth of the professional areas is the current construction of a new building for the school of law and authorization for a new school social work building. The health-related sciences, which already include pharmacy, nursing, and physical therapy, were given major impetus this year by the appointment of deans for the schools of medicine and dentistry, which should open their doors within 5 years.

What must be kept in mind is that all of this development has taken place in less than a quarter century since the Connecticut State College was designated the University of Connecticut. It is predictable that graduate and professional programs will continue to grow in size and quality in the next quarter century, such is their importance to the economy and the life of the State.

Research, too, can be expected to flourish in the years to come. Stemming from outstanding work in agricultural research, the university has a long tradition of contributions to mankind's fundamental knowledge. Grants from governmental agencies, charitable foundations and industrial organizations flow to the university in increasing numbers and amounts, to encourage faculty research.

Federal research grants and contracts this year totaled more than $2 million and permitted members of the university's faculty to concentrate their attention on problems ranging from dread diseases to space travel. The value of such research to the life and health of her people is obvious, and its feedback into the university's instructional program is enormous. Teachers who are themselves intellectually alert and growing will encourage the same qualities in their students.

[From the Hartford Times, Oct. 3, 1963]

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT'S STRIDES UNKNOWN TO MANY

(By Dr. H. D. Babbidge, Jr.)

STORRS, CONN.—Public understanding and appreciation of the University of Connecticut lags behind its actual accomplishments.

Perhaps this is because the university has been nurtured in the shadow of ancient and honored private institutions of the State. Or perhaps this is because the location of the main campus at Storrs seems remote to many citizens. But more likely, it is because the growth and development of the university has been so recent and so rapid that it has been difficult, even for those close to it, to keep track of all the change.

I have had the experience repeatedly during my first year at Storrs, of watching visitors' jaws drop as they viewed the large campus or looked over the shoulders of researchers or listened to lecturers. They are impressed initially by the existence of our Fine Arts Center, our magnificent auditorium and theater, or our Life Sciences Building; but what really counts is what they see going on inside these structures—the vital and exciting process of building a true university.

In my judgment, based on a year of the most intensive kind of introduction, the University of Connecticut stands on the threshold of admission to the company of leading American institutions. Some of the most difficult and expensive steps remain ahead. I am convinced we can manage them.

Several things are urgently needed at this stage in the university's development. First and foremost is greater public understanding of what we're doing and what we aspire to do. I hope that during the next few years we can do much to acquaint the citizens of Connecticut with their State university.

We also need urgently a roadmap for the future—an outline of planned growth and development that can be followed in the next decade. With this object in mind, a committee on university planning has been appointed and charged with the development of a "master-plan" for the future.

The University of Connecticut will have to grow bigger in years to come, if only because of the growing census of young people and their rising educational needs and expectations. We must be on guard lest this growth in size be paid for through a diminution in the quality of our offerings.

We must strive to keep our educational doors open to all young people of the State regardless of the accident of birth or circumstance. Though we have resisted the mounting pressures of cost, we find that our costs are almost prohibitive for a significant number of our students, and that our student aid funds are seriously inadequate.

We must broaden the base of our financial support. As it is, we must look essentially to either the general assembly or to our students for the funds with which to operate the university. The cost of many needed objects and programs cannot legitimately be assessed against either group.

In my first year, my freshman year, at the University of Connecticut, I have been greatly reassured. Every indication is that students, faculty, and alumni are prepared to make the effort and the sacrifice necessary to bring distinction to the university. And I have found, too, a thrilling degree of interest and encouragement from the people of the State, their leaders and their representatives. In the language of the space age, "all systems are 'go.'" I am honored to be part of an institution whose proud past leads to such a brilliant future.

Administration's Front Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, some of the day to day occurrences concerning the sale of American wheat to Soviet Russia are confusing to say the least since they seem to be developing from so many different quarters.

The ability to take these unrelated circumstances and from them draw a conclusion, is a mark of a sharp news analyst and I think this skill is exemplified in no better way than the following editorial in reference to the wheat sale.

The editorial follows:

All the reports out of Washington and Ottawa contain convincing evidence that the Kennedy administration is about to sanction a huge sale of American surplus wheat to the Soviet Union. Between 100 and 200 million bushels of wheat may be involved in the deal, according to the reports, which also indicate the soviets may be interested in buying additional quantities of feed grains and soybean oil.

Thus it is becoming clearer why our State Department did not protest Canada's recent $500 million wheat deal with Russia (239 million bushels of wheat and flour equivalent), although the Department was advised of it in advance. The administration thinks it discerns some political benefits in supplying foodstuffs to the Communists and possibly liberalizing other areas of trade with them.

For one thing, it might ease, temporarily at least, our critical balance-of-payments deficit. For another, it would boost grain prices by relieving the vast wheat glut, factors which otherwise surely would be a source of serious discontent in the rural areas in 1964, an election year.

One of the chief questions still to be resolved in the wheat deal is how much the Russians will pay. Soviet trade negotiators in Ottawa already have served notice that if the deal goes through, they will pay no more than the subsidized export price at which we have been selling wheat to Western European countries. This means that American consumers and taxpayers may soon witness the spectacle of Russia buying our wheat about

60 cents a bushel cheaper than our own domestic millers have to pay for it.

In other words, on a 100 million bushel sale, American taxpayers would contribute about $60 million.

If the deal goes through, the administration's campaign to sound out public and congressional opinion on the matter will have been disclosed for what it is—an elaborate pretense. In recent days Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has been polling farm audiences and reports finding them favorable to the idea.

Mr. Freeman, along with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, has held closed-door meetings with a joint session of the Senate Foreign Relations and Agriculture Committees, supposedly to get reactions there. And in Congress Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Senate Democratic whip, and other leaders, have been carrying the ball with statements about our outdated export policies.

In the light of these activities it is intriguing to note the comments and actions of a group of American grain traders which has been holding talks with the Russians in Ottawa. This group is headed by Burton Joseph, president of I. S. Joseph Co., Minneapolis, Minn., the State where Mr. Freeman served three terms as Governor. Mr. Joseph's wife is Democratic national committeewoman for Minnesota, and Mr. Joseph himself is identified as a Democrat who has contributed to various party fundraising events.

In Ottawa the other day Mr. Joseph declared that the U.S. Government had known all along about his initiative in contacting the Russians. Spokesmen for other grain firms said they had the impression that the venture had the tacit approval of the administration.

Mr. Joseph and his group may well have more than their own business interests in mind in this deal. They may very well be acting as frontmen for the Kennedy administration, and in particular for Secretary Freeman, who started out pretending he was innocent of any knowledge there had been a crop disaster in Russia or that it might be possible to do business with the Communists.

International Fisheries: The Problems Are Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an excellent article on the problems of the fishing industry in the North Pacific Ocean. This article by Don Page, the marine editor of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, is especially timely in view of the negotiations that are taking place in Tokyo between the Japanese, the Canadians, and ourselves:

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES: THE PROBLEMS ARE COMPLEX

(By Don Page)

In this world where shifting conditions and shrinking distances are constantly raising new problems and embarrassments for us peoples who inhabit the globe, that fisheries conference going on now in Tokyo is an especially embarrassing event.

The fisheries conference certainly must be embarrassing to the Japanese people.

The Japanese pride themselves on an orderly way of life, with meticulous concern for the rights of others. Yet at the Tokyo fisheries conference a few great monopolistic Japanese fishing cartels are trying to frame a legalistic right to invade and plunder fisheries built and maintained by other peoples. Many Japanese people must be lowering their eyes in humiliation from the spectacle.

In turn, there lies embarrassment at Tokyo for us on the eastern rim of the North Pacific. We Canadians and Americans see our representatives traveling almost halfway around the world to account to another nation for the way we are running our fisheries and to engage in legalistic debate with that other nation, Japan, on why we should be allowed to keep our fisheries.

These are our fisheries. We did build them. We do maintain them.

MUCH MONEY INVESTED

Our Canadian and United States Governments have invested many millions of dollars in their programs to study, protect, and conserve our North American stocks of salmon and halibut. Our fishermen, too, have sacrificed the harvest of millions of dollars worth of fish to protect the longtime welfare of these stocks.

If Canada and the United States had not seeded these stocks with their investments and their sacrifices, there wouldn't be enough salmon and halibut left here today to make the Japanese want to move in on the harvest.

The North American salmon is a carefully reared creature. It is a family creature, too. It returns almost invariably to spawn in the same stream where it was born. In the Columbia River, the Fraser River, the streams of Bristol Bay and Southeast Alaska and Puget Sound, our two countries—Canada and the United States—pamper the salmon, nurse it through its infancy and rigorously control the catch of salmon off the mouth of these spawning streams to insure that every race of salmon is given the best possible chance to survive and reproduce.

The halibut is not a creature of inland streams. But it lives all its life and in the North Pacific is best harvested on ledges of the Continental Shelf off Alaska and Canada. Some decades ago the halibut of the North Pacific seemed headed for near extinction. Then the United States and Canadian Governments joined in an international commission that studied the halibut, learned how to protect it and by the sacrifice of some immediate gains for fishermen, nursed these halibut stocks back to their present flourishing state.

The halibut of our North Pacific waters, like the salmon of North American origin, are there because we, or our forebears put them there.

A DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

Japanese proposals for high seas fishing would endanger, might even wipe out, the stocks of salmon and halibut we have planted. In the one area where Japanese fleets now can catch some red salmon of Bristol Bay origin, their narrow mesh nets are sweeping up great numbers of immature salmon.

High seas net fishing for salmon scrambles our efforts to insure proper escapement to each spawning ground. Our United States and Canadian fishermen are not allowed to fish as the Japanese do, at sea with nets for salmon.

Not many years ago, distance and the nature of the world would have protected such national resources as the salmon and the halibut from raids like the ones proposed by these few Japanese monopolies. Back in the days when the present 3-mile limit to territorial waters was determined by the range of a cannon ball, nations could safely nurture such stocks of fish along their shores, secure from encroachment by foreign powers.

Today technology has wiped out that protection of national resources. Today great fishing fleets can sail anywhere in the world. The traditional 3-mile limit still seems appropriate for "ownership" of territorial waters and an adequate limit to curbs on navigation. For fisheries, the 3-mile limit is outmoded. Fisheries resources in our age demand the protection of more flexible, thoughtfully considered methods than territorial waters can provide.

New, modern, international understandings, vigorously asserted by this Nation, are necessary to guard the rights that once were guarded for us by our own isolation.

Our framing of such international understandings and statements of our rights have been hindered by a lag in awareness of the new set of ground rules imposed on us by the modernization of our world, by apparent lack of understanding by our Government of how important the wealth of our seas will soon become to our national welfare and, frankly, by the same pussyfooting approach that in the years since World War II has put the United States behind the eightball too often in varying fields of international relations.

It is a sad fact that America's stand on its property rights in these homegrown North Pacific fisheries is not so strong as it was a quarter century ago.

Our United States and Canadian claims to these fish and our effort to keep intruders out are not, as the Japanese monopolies would have us believe, an indignity imposed on the defeated Japanese by our conquering forces of World War II. As early as the 1930's Canadian and United States pressure was successfully exerted on England to keep her from sending a fleet of boats to our North Pacific halibut grounds.

And in 1937 when Japanese interests made a grab at North American fishing stocks, sage old Cordell Hull, as U.S. Secretary of State, sent the Japanese a warning note. Hull wrote then:

"Because of the sacrifices and the part that American citizens have played in bearing the cost of conserving and perpetuating the salmon resources, it is the strong conviction * * * on the part of the American public generally that there has been established a superior interest and claim in the salmon resources of Alaska. * * * The fact that salmon taken from waters off the Alaskan coast are spawned and hatched in American inland waters and when intercepted are returning to American waters adds further to the conviction that there is in these resources a special and unmistakable American interest."

THE TRUMAN PROCLAMATION

Later in 1945, President Harry Truman wrote this:

"In view of the pressing need for conservation and protection of fishery resources, the Government of the United States regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas of the United States wherein fishing activities have been or in the future may be developed and maintained on a substantial scale * * *. The character as high seas of the areas in which such conservation zones are established and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

Those statements of 18 and 26 years ago certainly are stronger and more forthright than the "abstention principle" spelled out in the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty 10 years ago.

The abstention principle adds the requirements that nations operating the exclusive fisheries shall maintain scientific studies, conservation measures, and "full utilization" of the affected stocks. Japan seized on these requirements to lean over the shoul-

ders of the United States and Canada and demand that they justify all details of their protected fisheries. It was this technical demand that forced our two nations to admit Japanese boats to the Eastern Bering halibut grounds this year. Japan could not prove we were not operating our halibut fishery there efficiently, but we could not, in turn, prove "maximum utilization."

Certainly, this is not a strong position for the United States and Canada, letting a third nation sit in judgment on how we are operating our fisheries.

The abstention principle is not, as the Japanese say, too strong. It is too weak. A firmer assertion of our property rights in these home-developed coastal fisheries is in order. There are enough farmers in Asia and in North America for a principle like this to be understood on both continents:

"It is we who have sown the seeds. It is we who must reap the harvest."

Married Men Have 3 Percent Unemployment Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's program to reduce our 5.5-percent unemployment rate through expansionary fiscal policies and an increase in aggregate demand fails to strike at the roots of the problem.

As an October 1, Wall Street Journal article points out, it is extremely important to look behind the overall unemployment statistics to see who the unemployed are. Such an examination throws new light on the subject and offers the chance for finding a workable solution.

The most striking fact is that unemployment among married men has slipped to the lowest level in more than 6 years—3 percent. At the same time, unemployment among the unskilled, youth, and women remains high.

Official statistics show that today 55 of every 100 people unemployed are women or teenagers, compared with 47 per 100 in 1957. It is not, therefore, primarily breadwinners who comprise the bulk of the unemployed, but rather unskilled workers, many of whom would be little affected by increases in aggregate demand.

Even with a high rate of unemployment, there are numerous job openings available. Some employers are reporting great difficulty in finding the qualified workers they need. For example, the Hupp Corp., a Cleveland producer of heating equipment and appliances needs specially trained personnel, as do the New England Life Insurance Co. and the Stop & Shop retail chain.

Mr. Speaker, our unemployment problem will not be cured by increasing aggregate demand. Our problem is one of labor dislocation and a lack of up-to-date skills in demand. It can only be cured by a program of education and retraining. As workers constantly upgrade their skills to fill the jobs going begging at the top of the ladder, the jobs they leave vacant farther down the ladder should be filled by those less skilled—many of whom are among the chronically unemployed.

This article from the October 1 Wall Street Journal looks behind unemployment statistics and suggests one of the basic causes of our unemployment problem:.

BUSY BREADWINNERS—RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG MARRIED MEN DROPS TO 6-YEAR LOW—MANY COMPANIES PLAN TO LIFT HIRING; FURTHER DECLINE IN OVERALL JOBLESSNESS SEEN—SOME FIRMS CAN'T FIND HELP

Unemployment among married men has slipped to the lowest level in more than half a decade.

Joblessness among all toilers combined—men, women, boys, girls—nears a 3-year low. And a bubbling autumn economy suggests it may drop lower still.

New claims for unemployment insurance in September averaged around 220,000 weekly, down from some 280,000 weekly 3 years ago—when the Nation's population was 10 million smaller than today.

These are the highlights on the job front as summer fades. They stand out through the fog of talk about job destruction by automation. They are not obscured by much-publicized idleness among 14- to 19-year-olds. They are not nullified by widely noted long-term job contraction in special areas like the Appalachian mine country.

BEHIND THE STATISTICS

Statistics on the job front bring this comment from Ira T. Ellis, economist for Du Pont Co.:

"Unemployment is a serious problem for the individuals involved, but the problem is very much less than the headlines indicate. Unemployment is relatively high among unskilled workers, particularly the very young. But it is relatively low among professionally trained and other technical workers."

And this from George W. Taylor, chairman of the industry department at the University of Pennsylvania:

"There is need for greater emphasis on qualitative analysis of employment statistics, as opposed to sweeping, quantitative analysis which tends to focus on magic numbers."

The latest official check (August) shows only 2.96 percent, or about 1 million, of the country's job-desiring married men unemployed, the lowest rate since 1957. The rate for the entire labor force is down to 5.48 percent, only a whisker above the 5.34 percent reached in a temporary drop last October—which was the lowest level since early in 1960.

Here's how both these rates have come down from the high points of the past two recessions, reached in 1958 and in 1961. Figures represent percent unemployed.

	1958 high	1961 high	Latest rate
All civilians	7.62	7.11	5.48
Married men	5.80	5.09	2.96

The unemployed rate among married men, the major breadwinners is now only half as high as in the 1958 recession.

Today's unemployment is highly concentrated among women and teenagers. Some women support families, of course. Some teenagers do. But the husband is still the primary family supporter.

Official calculators say 55 of every 100 people unemployed now are women or teenagers. The more-than-half proportion of these among the jobless is something new. As recently as 1957 the figure was only 47 per 100 unemployed.

Just before World War II, less than 20 percent of the teenage girls and less than 40 percent of the teenage boys participated in the labor force. Today nearly 30 percent of the girls and nearly 50 percent of the boys participate. Participation in the labor force consists of having some kind of job or else seeking one—and, if just seeking, being counted unemployed.

INVASION OF WOMEN

A startling statistic: Today around 50 percent of all American women in the 45-to-54 age bracket are holding some kind of job or looking for one—and, if just looking, being labeled "unemployed." In prewar 1940, less than 25 percent of the women in this age group were in the labor force.

The 6-year low in unemployment among married men "shows there's a job for the breadwinner who really needs one," says Eugene C. Zorn, Jr., economist at Republic National Bank, Dallas. "If he's willing to go out and look for a job—and perhaps even move to another city—he can get a job."

Mr. Zorn adds: "I think there's too much emphasis put on the overall unemployment figures, anyway; sometimes the unemployment picture changes when you look behind the figures."

An indication that breadwinners are indeed busy comes from a loan officer of First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co. in Greensboro, N.C.: "I can't remember when we've last had a loan request from an unemployed married man—there just don't seem to be any in Greensboro."

OVERALL RATE SEEN DROPPING

Many businessmen and economists believe the Nation's overall unemployment rate—led by the dropping rate among breadwinners—will decline further in the months just ahead.

"I expect to see additional inroads in unemployment as industrial production continues to rise in the coming months," says an economist at Bankers Trust Co., New York.

Donald Sherbondy, labor relations director of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., says, "As business gets better, and there's every indication it will, I think you'll see more young men going back to work and the general unemployment rate going down."

Many executives plan to boost their work forces in the months ahead. In many instances, it's noteworthy, the new jobs will be opening up not in factories, where employment trends often get the most attention, but in the service field.

The 3,000-man sales force of Combined Insurance Co. of America, Chicago, will be doubled in the next 2 years, reports W. Clement Stone, president. "Anyone can get a job by going into sales," Mr. Stone asserts.

Aerospace Corp., a nonprofit organization supplying technical support to Air Force installations in the Los Angeles area, has taken on some 400 more workers in the past year, to bring its total employment to about 4,400, and expects to hire another 300 before mid-1964, a spokesman says.

W. F. Stemmons, president of Stemmons, Inc., Tulsa, Okla., operator of Thrifty Rent-a-Car System, expects to double his staff within a year. Mr. Stemmons already has added 40 employees to handle his expanding car rental service since the year's start.

Frank Zacher, director of personnel of Norton Co., reports the Massachusetts abrasives firm will add 20 to 30 employees to its Worcester work force in the next few weeks. Norton now employs about 4,300 at its Worcester facilities, up from 4,100, 6 months ago.

Tufts-New England Medical Center, near Boston, now employs 1,900 full-time personnel, 200 more than a year ago. "And em-

ployment will probaly rise even more in the next year," a spokesman says, "because we are expanding a research lab and setting up a facility to produce enzymes synthetically for distribution to other institutions."

WORKERS WANTED

Some administrators even report difficulty hiring as many new workers as they need.

"We've been having trouble getting and keeping qualified workers," says Don Gearheart, president of Hupp Corp., a Cleveland-based producer of heating equipment and appliances. The company's infrared heating division is especially in need of skilled personnel, Mr. Gearheart says.

New England Life Insurance Co. is having trouble finding enough key punch operators to handle electronic data processing equipment recently installed by the Boston company, a spokesman reports. Another shortage at New England Life: Girls who can transcribe material from dictating machines to paper.

"We're having trouble finding the people we need to staff new stores in some communities," says an executive of Stop & Shop, Inc., a Boston retail chain with 11,346 employees, up from 10,186 a year ago. Since the start of 1963, the retailer has added five food supermarkets and seven self-service department stores.

NOT ENOUGH TEACHERS

Checks with school districts show hiring of teachers would rise more sharply if school budgets would permit.

The New York City school district can't fill 500 jobs for specially trained teachers because of insufficient funds. The instructors would have trained backward pupils.

Michigan State University is facing a faculty shortage because of a money pinch. There are 2,000 more students at the university this year than last, but only 14 more faculty members.

Expanding employment in many fields, however, hasn't altered the concern of many economists about the Nation's long-term job picture.

These observers fear, despite its growth, the economy won't be able to expand fast enough in the years ahead to provide jobs for the millions of post-World War II babies who will be entering the job market. And they doubt that a tax cut, now pending in Congress, can be of much help to the jobless workers who lack special training in an age when skills are so much in demand.

"The current decline in unemployment is a result of good business conditions, but shouldn't be construed as a sign that the basic trouble is diminishing," says Richard Vogt, a vice president of the First National Bank of Miami. "On the contrary, I see a much bigger unemployment rate ahead—how high I don't know, but it will be high for a long time to come."

U.N. Now Proclaiming Our Moral Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for nearly two centuries the moral code of the people of the United States has been a beacon to the freedom loving people of the world. Today, it seems, we have officially abandoned the code of decency, of morality, of our religious heritage and are actively engaged in heaping honor and reward on those who advocate immorality, slavery, the subjugation of mankind.

While we pour millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money into support of the United Nations, we stand idly by while the Secretary General belittles our customs, questions our motives, and does his best to promote socialist governments and worldwide government.

It seems to me the American people had better be aroused to the danger we face, the threat to our sovereignty posed by the apparent objectives of those who control the U.N.

Dr. Robert Morris points out what is happening to our moral codes and the part Secretary General U Thant is playing in depreciating the United States. Under permission to extend my remarks I include, at this point, Dr. Morris' column, "Crimes and Codes of 1963":

CRIMES AND CODES OF 1963

(By Robert Morris)

Our moral codes are being inverted before our very eyes and a whole new cast of norms of right and wrong imposed on us and we do not seem to be able to react within anything stronger than a shrug.

I read last week of a decision of the Superior Court of New Jersey which said:

"Disregard of compliance with and enforcement of the supreme law of the land will result in teachers, principals and superintendents actually violating their oaths of allegiance to the U.S. Constitution given pursuant to the laws of this State.

"There is also a possibility of Federal criminal prosecution under the Federal civil rights statutes heretofore noted. * * *

"Suffice it to say, that in these turbulent and troubled times, the absolute violation of directives emanating from the U.S. Supreme Court by local school officials or anyone in authority is not conducive to good moral training, strength of character, and a healthy respect for the laws which we are striving to imbue in all people—particularly our young people."

This sounds like a dispassionate judicial warning against the commission of a serious crime. Apparently the judge intended it as such. The crime—recitation of a nondenominational prayer and Bible reading in school.

Commissioner of Education for New York State, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., has expressed the same indignation against a similar offense—reading the fourth stanza of "America" which begins "Our Father's God to Thee, Author of Liberty," as a devotional exercise in school.

We read last week of a former foreign aid official who committed the serious wrong of reporting to his superiors that our foreign aid money was going directly to the construction of a Red Chinese radio station that could be expetced to hurl invectives at us and everything we stand for and of a Soviet propaganda hospital in Cambodia. As a result of this "wrongdoing" he is now out of service.

I am assisting in the defense of a North Dakota farmer before the U.S. Supreme Court who has been given a 2-year jail sentence for aiding his brother over-plant wheat on their own land. The Department of Agriculture had lost their file and retroactively applied the allotment that the brothers exceeded.

In the punishment of these "crimes," our officials become morally exercised and the unfortunate criminals are suffering sanctions that include prison terms. Yet when we move into the realm of serious crimes against humanity and its suffering individuals, there is no longer even a whisper of protest.

The crimes against the billion human beings in Soviet bondage, the thousands on torture racks, the millions in prison camps, the forced starvation, the organized campaign against God and every vestige of religion and of human liberty—these are no longer crimes in the councils of today's world.

No longer is it an appropriate commentary on all of this to say that we are losing our sense of moral indignation. That is putting the problem negatively. We are now affirmatively rewarding these crimes that have been traditionally held to cry to Heaven for vengeance. If you think this is an overstatement just watch how our leaders next week treat one of the cruelest despots in history—one of the greatest foes of religion and of religious men and women—Marshal Tito. The world's loftiest arbiter of right and wrong, Secretary General U Thant, fawns on this Tito.

The United States, in the late 1940's and in the 1950's made many sacrifices in blood and in resources to defend small nations like Korea, Greece and Turkey from wanton aggression. Yet let us look how this new high priest of moral authority, U Thant, viewed this effort in retrospect.

"Let me be candid. When American foreign policy did concern itself with what was happening in the rest of the world, it did so out of fear and suspicion—fear of communism and suspicion of Communist motives. Fear and suspicion are very undesirable states of mind.

"They breed hatred, and hatred in turn breeds cruelty and intolerance. Fear of Soviet communism has led the United States, and those who follow her lead, to take a distorted view of the world situation and of the forces that are at work in modern society."

Later in Red Poland, in 1962, U Thant made a new code official by saying, "I firmly believe that the world is heading for a synthesis * * *. Various strong religions and political convictions are not a permanent feature of society."

Where are the voices of moral indignation? What of our eternal verities?

Two-hundredth Anniversary of Touro Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the historic Touro Synagogue, which is located in Newport, R.I.

My bill provides that the profile of George Washington shall appear on one side of such coins with his immortal words "To bigotry no sanction" inscribed under such profile, and on the reverse side of such coins there shall appear a likeness of Touro Synagogue.

That venerable house of worship was dedicated on December 2, 1763, and almost 27 years later, our Nation's first President, George Washington, visited Touro Synagogue and first proclaimed religious freedom. Shortly thereafter, President Washington wrote these meaningful words:

For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no

sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection shall demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It is also appropriate to recall that the General Assembly of Rhode Island met in Touro Synagogue for the first time after the evacuation of Newport by the British during September 1780. Today, it is the oldest house of Jewish worship standing in the United States and is of national interest to Jew and Christian alike.

It was, therefore, quite natural that in view of its historic associations, the Touro Synagogue was designated as a national historic site under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of August 12, 1935. I feel that this is a most opportune moment to reassert our recognition that the United States is still a religious nation.

The bill I am introducing today is a companion to S. 2179, sponsored by Senators PELL, PASTORE, JAVITS, and KEATING, and I most strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that it may be enacted into law at this crucial time in our history. Surely religious freedom is no less important now than it was 200 years ago when Touro Synagogue was dedicated.

Restricting Capital Outflow Will Cut U.S. Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration's plan to reduce the outflow of capital through a tax on foreign security purchases overlooks an important principle of economics. The fact is that capital exports increase a country's exports of goods and services, whereas a decrease of capital outflow reduces a country's exports of goods and services. One reason why the United States has had such a favorable balance of trade is because of our large capital exports.

The weakness in the administration's approach of restricting capital exports is that it makes no provision for this "boomerang principle." As an article in the New York Times of October 3 says, "Since a cut in U.S. capital exports would produce a reduction in the U.S. trade surplus, the net effect on the balance of payments would be nil—one factor would tend to neutralize the other."

The article from the New York Times of October 3, discussing the administration's plan to curtail capital exports, follows:

MONETARY BOOMERANG—EUROPEANS WARN U.S. EFFORT TO STEM OUTFLOW OF CAPITAL COULD CURB EXPORTS

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, October 2.—A number of monetary experts here are making private bets that U.S. spokesmen at the International Monetary Fund meetings in Washington this week will do their utmost to steer clear of one painful subject: the von Bohm-Bawerk boomerang law.

European money men have expressed surprise at the Kennedy administration's disregard of the Austrian economist's law relating to international capital flows. The states that as a nation increases its capital exports, its exports of goods and services also will increase; and conversely, decreased capital exports will bring on decreased exports of goods and services.

Commenting on the Kennedy administration's dollar-defense program in Neue Zurcher Zeitung, Prof. Albert Hahn, of Frankfurt University, said recently, "It is astonishing, but also typical of the empiricism of American exchange policy, that neither in President Kennedy's message (to Congress in July) nor in the testimony by his financial ministers was the link between the export of capital and the export of goods mentioned."

SURPLUS IS NOTED

As Professor Hahn and other economists here have demonstrated, much of the capital exported by the United States has been used for purchases of American goods and services This has helped provide the United States with a continuing balance of trade—a surplus of exports over imports.

For example, last year the European Common Market countries were on the receiving end of the large sum of American capital. Thus the Common Market was able to purchase about $1,250 million more in U.S. goods and services than the six member countries sold to the United States.

Europeans say the Kennedy administration has ignored this sort of economic reality in attempting to sell Congress its new balance-of-payments action program. The balance of payments, expressing the relationship between the total outflow of U.S. funds and the inflow from abroad, has been in deficit every year but one in the last decade.

The latest Dillon-Roosa payments syllogism goes like this:

Net U.S. capital exports are running at an annual rate of $3 billion.

Capital exports are a major cause of the payments deficit, which also is running at about $3 billion a year.

Ergo: Restrict capital exports and the payments deficit will be reduced.

The weakness of this reasoning the Europeans say, is that it makes no provision for the boomerang principle. Since a cut in U.S. capital exports would produce a reduction in the U.S. trade surplus, the net effect on the balance of payments would be nil—one factor would tend to neutralize the other.

The more cynical observers here profess to believe there are two Under Secretaries of the Treasury named Robert V. Roosa. One is the Robert V. Roosa who has written in the current issue of Foreign Affairs that some basic changes in the international monetary system may be in order. The other is the Robert V. Roosa who argued a year ago in the Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank's Monthly Review that for the foreseeable future no such changes would be either necessary or wise.

A group of central bankers in the New York Federal Reserve Bank's August review published a patronizing statement saying that the right questions were being asked, but the right answers had not been given.

One French economist said with a straight face that if someone knew the right answers it was too bad they were not told to Washington 5 years ago when things began to go bad.

Some observers in private banking circles here have remarked that when it comes to handling the U.S. balance-of-payments problem, the Dillon-Roosa team has shown great skill in maintaining the status quo. Their view is that the deficit in October 1963 was just about where it was in October 1961.

This does not mean that the ingenious foreign exchange schemes of the Treasury, aided by Federal Reserve intervention in foreign exchange markets and abetted by central banking cooperation abroad, have not evoked admiration on the eastern as well as the western side of the Atlantic.

Money men here appreciate the skills shown in combatting speculative pressures—such as on sterling in 1961, on the Canadian dollar last year, on the U.S. dollar during the 1962 spring stock market break and again on the dollar during the Cuban crisis last fall.

They appreciate these accomplishments, but they are not blinded by them. They know these feats are not wholly relevant to the undiminished problem of controlling a basic outflow of U.S. funds that continues to be dangerously in excess of inflow from abroad.

The danger many Common Market observes see not only threatens the United States but also the Europen Community. This is why they are privately, but nonetheless severely, critical of the Kennedy administration's failure to come to grips with the balance-of-payments problem.

Their view is that the Potomac experts refuse to face a difficult choice: either to accept the discipline of the gold standard or reject it entirely in favor of a new worldwide monetary system.

If Washington were to follow the unchanging precepts of the gold standard, it could correct the U.S. payments imbalance by using the classic therapy—a constriction of the money supply and a repatriation of U.S. funds, particularly Eurodollars, now abroad.

Land of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all been reflecting during the past few weeks on the Birmingham church bombing. So serious an incident has not, of course, gone unnoticed and must certainly not be forgotten. Though some of the shock has worn off it yet remains for us to act to preserve the prestige, justice, and peace of our land. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial to this effect which appeared in the Bristol Press on September 20, 1963:

NATIONAL OUTRAGE

Four little colored girls were buried this week in Birmingham, Ala., victims of a vicious bombing of a church by an individual or individuals whose minds, warped with hatred, must have been unbalanced when the foul deed was perpetrated.

There is nothing that can be done to bring these innocent childern back to life. But as President Kennedy said:

"If these cruel and tragic events can only awaken that city and the State—if they can only awaken the entire Nation—to a realization of the folly of racial injustice and hatred and violence, then it is not too late for all concerned to unite in steps toward peaceful progress before more lives are gone."

It is perfectly understandable that the first reaction to this awful deed would be to cry for vengeance. Yet, vengeance only beget more violence. And violence will set back

the cause of the Negro rather than enhance it.

In spite of the clamor of some for speedier justice in the matter of civil rights, undeniable progress in race relations has been made. For example, the school was reopened in Prince Edward County this week for the first time in 4 years. The Negroes who attended were joined by four white pupils.

Integration in the schools of other southern States has occurred without untoward incidents.

In order to insure the continual progress, we must not let emotions get the better of reason.

Respect for and obedience to the law is the only way to bring about racial peace and justice. On this we must insist as the Negroes struggle for more equality and justice.

A call for the Federal Government to impose martial law in Alabama is not the answer because martial law was never intended as a permanent solution for anything. The proper answer is for southern leaders of good will to band together to make sure that, under the law, justice will be given the Negro and the equal educational opportunities will be provided.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, with several Congressmen and Senators from both parties, I have sponsored H.R. 3669, the quality stabilization bill. This bill has been reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I expect it will be on the floor within a short time.

This bill is soundly conceived and written to help preserve our American system of free enterprise. Such men as Congressmen THOR TOLLEFSON, CHET HOLIFIELD, ELFORD CEDERBERG, RAY MADDEN, and OREN HARRIS, as well as several other Members, have joined me in sponsoring the bill in the House. In the Senate, as S. 774, it bears the names of such distinguished men as HUBERT HUMPHREY, THOMAS KUCHEL, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and KARL MUNDT.

In spite of the extended hearings, at which all facts on the quality stabilization bill were developed, some critics are attacking it with slogans that carry a completely erroneous impression of what the bill actually will do. There are valid reasons to support this bill. I have heard of no valid reasons to oppose it. But that does not stop the sloganeers, who cry out in the name of the so-called little people—the miners, laborers, the small store owners, and the retired people.

Mr. Speaker, these little people are the ones who elect me to this House. I am thoroughly convinced the bill is in the best interests of these people. It will help protect them from the unscrupulous. It will do nothing to harm them.

The editors of the National Independent Labor Journal have carefully analyzed the quality stabilization bill. This Journal is the newspaper of the national independent unions, and speaks for these fine people who will benefit, along with all Americans, from this bill. The labor journal studied the bill. The editors went over it carefully. Their editorial is based on objective study, not on slogans.

Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial from the National Independent Labor Journal in the Appendix of the RECORD:

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL HAS OUR SUPPORT

The Journal believes that the free, competitive enterprise system will be fortified by the enactment of the quality stabilization bill (H.R. 3669 and S. 774) now before Congress. That system of free, competitive enterprise has helped give the American consumer more economic benefits than any other system in the history of man.

It is 100 percent consistent with free, competitive enterprise to urge that a manufacturer who builds a valuable property in the good will for his trademark be able to protect that property. The quality stabilization bill will permit just that, but at the same time it will safeguard the consumer against arbitrary pricing or conduct by the requirement that the trademarked product be in free and open competition before the law can be used.

We foresee many benefits flowing from the enactment of the quality stabilization bill. We believe that it will be a major step toward the elimination of the "let the buyer beware" philosophy so harmful to the consumer. We see a strong assist to our small businessmen, because this act will help eliminate the "might make right" philosophy of the jungle.

We believe that a stable and fair distribution structure, coupled with stable and fair conditions of employment, will give added incentives to a manufacturer and to labor to build better and better products, thereby giving the consumer greater and greater value for his investment in the product.

When a manufacturer gets hurt by retailer pirates who for their own gain usurp and damage the manufacturer's good will in his trademark, then labor gets hurt in two ways—one, as a consumer; second, as an employee, because the welfare of the employee—the welfare of labor—is interdependent with the welfare of the employer.

The quality stabilization bill therefore has our vote.

Who Is To Save Our Cities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Victor Gruen which appeared in the May-June 1963 issue of the Harvard Business Review.

Mr. Gruen makes two exceptionally important points: One, that business must enter into the job of saving our cities from the deterioration inherent in the move to suburbia, and two, that business must cooperate with government in doing this job—a job that cannot wait until somebody else takes the initiative.

The redevelopment agencies now found in most American cities cannot do the job alone and we would think that business would voluntarily join this effort, which is in its own best interest. Mr. Gruen's article follows:

WHO IS TO SAVE OUR CITIES—FROM THE BLIGHT OF ENCROACHING SLUM AREAS—FROM THE STAGNATION OF OUR CENTRAL CORES—FROM THE CONFUSION OF SPRAWLING METROPOLIS?

(By Victor Gruen)

Should government take the lead and use its power and authority to revitalize our cities?

Or should business, in this area as it has in others, take the initiative, using the power of free enterprise to rebuild those areas which are the main centers of industry?

As America evolves from an overwhelmingly rural to an emphatically urban society, we are experiencing severe growing pains. Undirected or misdirected growth has created problems of all types in our cities. Today there is unanimous agreement that a severe urban crisis exists, but few are prepared to deal with it straightforwardly. There are those who think things will take care of themselves; those who feel that easy compromise solutions will do the trick; and only very few who are willing to engage in major efforts which will go to the heart of the problem. Thus, in the face of a severe and very real urban crisis, the majority of American cities either limp along in accordance with a do-nothing policy or at best get a meaningless surface cosmetic treatment.

What is the reason for this bungling approach? To put it bluntly, I believe that the responsibility for it lies largely in the lethargy of the American businessman. In an area of complex and vital self-interest, it appears that free enterprise is proving itself neither free nor enterprising, but timid, passive, and defeatist. Even in those cases where individual businessmen in a community, committee, or chamber of commerce have shown concern, their efforts are reminiscent of an anxious bather slowly entering the water: brave enough to get his toes wet but never working up enough courage to jump in and swim.

I have had many years of experience working with Federal authorities, State governments, municipalities, private developers, and citizens' organizations. On the basis of this experience and the research and studies conducted in dozens of cities in America, as well as large cities of the Western World generally, I have to conclude that—with a few exceptions so slight that they tend to confirm the rule—it is government that has taken the initiative while free enterprise has proved to be either hostile, unconcerned, or, if interested, rather ineffectual.

STATE OF REVITALIZATION

Government has shown concern for the fate of our cities for some time; it has developed methods of approach over the last 5 years, though slowly and sometimes hesitantly. The legal and administrative tools shaped for this purpose are still far from perfect, but a steady effort toward improvement and sharpening of the tools can be observed.

In the main, government action toward the revitalization of our cities proceeds in the framework of urban redevelopment legislation. In the short history of urban redevelopment and renewal, the approach has undergone significant changes.

LACK OF SUCCESS

In the beginning, all attention was concentrated solely on residential buildings, and the program sailed under the flag of slum clearance. Blighted residential areas were razed by bulldozers; structures which were found to be physically unsound were demolished and replaced with new ones of sound structural qualities and up-to-date plumbing. However, urban redevelopment was a new field and, because of inexperience, the results were not always satisfactory. There was sterility in planning and design, and there were well meant but mistaken concepts concerning density and land coverage. These resulted, more often than not, in rather inhuman, institutionalized projects.

It also soon became obvious that these efforts did not succeed in removing the slums. Economically or racially underprivileged population groups were driven out and replaced by those who could afford to pay the rent in the new projects. Those who had to leave settled nearby, causing new conditions of overcrowding and resultant blight.

Slowly, urban redevelopment procedures in residential sectors are becoming more sophisticated. The idea that only total clearance can help is being abandoned and replaced by a combination of spot clearance, rehabilitation, and conservation. Increasing attention is being paid to the aim of saving not only structures but the community itself. Thus, in many cases at least part of the original population remains but is better housed. Where considerable relocation is necessary, procedures for resettlement are being improved.

Even more significantly, redevelopment authorities now insist on the furnishings of over-all plans of either the entire community or general neighborhood in order to gain assurance that redevelopment efforts will indeed lead to genuine improvement. There is also evident a striving toward the abandonment of large, one-income-group developments, and at least the beginning of efforts to avoid these ghetto-like, single-income projects.

WIDENING CIRCLE

But the greatest and most dramatic change is to be found in the broadening of the redevelopment concept from its original application (residences exclusively) to include all types of land-use functions: retailing, offices, industry, recreational and cultural facilities, civic administration, and so forth.

This change in governmental approach should effectively eliminate every excuse private enterprise can offer for its lethargy and inaction, since now the concern of redevelopment is so broad that it can deal effectively with the business and cultural life of the city.

Decline of the city

This approach is of great importance, since the most troublesome aspects of our urban crisis express themselves in the central cores of our metropolitan areas. With very few exceptions, city cores are stagnating, and statistics registering the number of visitors entering the city cores as workers, shoppers, or participants in urban activities show a stead and increasingly steep downward trend.

This trend is most easily traceable in the fate of retailing. Merchants have emigrated en masse from central business cores to suburbia where they have found havens in new, shiny, Lilliputian towns—regional shopping centers, exemplified by those giants of the species: Northland and Eastland near Detroit; Bergen Mall and Garden State Plaza in New Jersey; Old Orchard and Randhurst near Chicago; and many others. The flight of retailing has been joined by other enterprises: headquarters offices of corporations, hotels and motels, professional offices of all types, cultural and recreational facilities, and so on.

The reason for this hegira is not difficult to identify. Whenever and wherever people find it increasingly difficult and dangerous to move within a city in the advanced stages of automobile congestion, when the trip to the central core becomes a time-consuming and tiring adventure, the attraction power of the city dwindles and it becomes unprofitable to conduct any business there at all.

The mass flight of people, retailing, business, and other urban functions into the countryside has created the phenomenon of spreading, sprawling metropolis. In some highly urbanized areas, such as on the east coast, the result has been the growing together of metropolitan influence areas into an amorphous and disorderly pattern, which has given birth to the new term "megalopolis."

Dissatisfaction with the new spread-out pattern is beginning to set in. Sprawl cannot be continued indefinitely. Communications become overextended, public improvements cannot keep pace with the tremendous costs that sprawl involves, and, most important of all, we are running out of one national resource that is irreplaceable, that can neither be manufactured nor imported; namely, land. The flight to the countryside has effectively destroyed the landscape, and many feel now that suburbia is a place which offers neither the advantages of the city nor those of the country.

Thus, during the last few years, some counterforces have arisen and a trend back to the city has become apparent. This has spurred new interest in the fate of the central core: an increasing awareness of its problems and the desire to do something about them.

Government, responding to the as yet uncrystallized popular change of mind, has broadened, as already shown, its concepts for redevelopment to the point where it has steered efforts from the so-called "gray areas" surrounding the city cores straight into the hearts of urban communities. Dozens of American cities of all sizes are now taking advantage of the widened legal possibilities and have filed applications for Federal assistance in their efforts to rebuild and revitalize their languishing and suffering city centers.

Will business help?

One might assume that the business community of every city would enthusiastically take the initiative, since Government is willing to help in the reinvigoration of those areas which are the main seats of business corporations, large and small, and of every kind of individual entrepreneur; now that concern is directed toward areas containing a most significant portion of the banks, insurance companies, and real estate interests.

One might expect that the business community would realize that the health of the entire metropolitan region and its ability to attract new residents and new industries depends on the economic, social, and cultural strength of its heart area; that the municipality's ability to meet its obligations toward the safety, health, and education of its people is directly dependent on the tax revenue which it must obtain to a significant degree from the densely built-up core.

Now that Government has opened the door, one might expect that all the attributes which we connect with the concept of free enterprise—daring, imagination, creativity, the willingness to take risk—would come to the forefront to push the slow bureaucratic apparatus into speedier action. Unfortunately and disappointingly, this is generally not the case.

WHEN BUSINESS LEADS

There are, to be sure, some noteworthy exceptions, but their rarity is proved by the fact that they become headline news. Such news was recently made in Boston, Mass., with an announcement by the mayor, John F. Collins, on July 31, 1962.

Mayor Collins described the cooperative effort between business and city government as "without parallel in the history of the United States." This cooperative effort is directed toward the rehabilitation of the 160-acre "core area" of Boston, to be jointly undertaken by the city government and a citizens' committee known as the Committee for the Central Business District, Inc. Since it soon became apparent that retailers were not the only businessmen interested in the redevelopment of the downtown core, the CCBD, as the committee is called, includes leading figures in public utilities, banking, publishing, and the hotel, restaurant, and real estate fields. The planning effort, the mayor announced, would not only be jointly undertaken but jointly supported monetarily as well by the citizens' committee and the Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Members of the CCBD already have raised over $200,000 to finance preliminary planning for the Central Business District and have entered into a planning contract. What is perhaps most important, they have proceeded, with the aid of the mayor and the Boston Redevelopment Authority staff, with the preparation of a memorandum of understanding which provides for close teamwork among the CCBD, the Authority, and the city. This will be the foundation of a cooperative effort that will guarantee that the eventual plan will represent the best thinking of the city authorities and the citizens interested in the district. Total costs of the revitalization are presently estimated to be $200 million.

In Paterson, N.J., a group known as PLAN, Inc. (Paterson Looks Ahead Now), a businessmen's organization, is cooperating with the Redevelopment Agency and the mayor. In Fresno, Calif., a similar pattern of cooperation has been achieved by the "Fresno Hundred Percenters." Although in neither of these two cases has the cooperation between city and business community and their joint relationship been as clearly formulated as in Boston, satisfactory progress is being made.

Crucial role of timing

What persists throughout these examples is the element of timing as a crucial determinant. It is important not only that private enterprise should show interest and initiative in a given city, but that this should happen at the right time, i.e., in synchronization with governmental efforts. It is important that this interest and activity should constitute a continuing and never-abating effort until the goals are fully reached.

This vital need for simultaneity is illustrated in the case of Cincinnati, Ohio:

Here, as in Boston, free enterprise cooperation was an important factor, but the trouble in Cincinnati was that recognition of the problems and action toward their elimination came very late. Instead of leading governmental action, business followed it, in a delayed fashion. The fate of Cincinnati's revitalization effort, therefore, still hangs in the balance.

In Cincinnati, recommendations were based on the businessmen's awareness and the planner's conviction that without implementing basic improvements designed to reverse past and continuing downward trends (most clearly expresed in the diminishing number of people entering the downtown city core daily), redevelopment of individual parcels was economically unsound. It either would not take place at all or would result in attracting tenants and businesses from other downtown buildings into the new ones, resulting in new blight formation. Planners emphasized such basic trend-reversing measures as:

Better accessibility.

Increased and improved public transportation.

A distribution system for automobile traffic over loop road systems with adjoining carstorage facilities along the fringe of the core area.

Construction of a public transportation terminal located in the geometric center of the core and effectively reached by underground roads located within the core (this was a key measure).

Finally, the plan demonstrated that through the introduction of the distributing road and garage systems, and underground public transportation roads, it was possible to free all major public surfaces within the core from the dangers, disturbances, and inconveniences of surface automobile traffic. Also, by reserving special roads for service

or truck traffic, a convenient solution for the servicing of all buildings could be found.

CASE HISTORY IN SUCCESS

Revitalization plans are underway for dozens of city centers all over the United States, but, for the most part, they are still only on paper or in the beginnings of implementation. There is, however, one instance on record in which a significant portion of a city core has been rebuilt. This one case, the Midtown Plaza development in Rochester, N.Y., offers us an opportunity to study methods and effects of downtown revitalization not as a theoretical case but as a fait accompli.

Some of the widespread publicity which Midtown Plaza has received stresses the fact that its existence proved the superiority of private enterprise efforts (without governmental help or interference) over the federally assisted redevelopment procedure. This statement, however, is not based on fact. What the rapid execution of the Midtown Plaza project, which was opened in April 1962, really proves is that cooperative efforts between free enterprise and government, with the initiative being taken by free enterprise, holds the key to success.

The Midtown Plaza project presents the answer to the question raised in this article's title: "Who is to save our cities?" The answer is: a partnership of business and government. It must be obvious that in the framework of a free democratic society the task of revitalizing our cities can be accomplished only by the bold efforts and intimate partnership of government and free enterprise. In such a partnership, "enterprise" should be the initiating force, and government—as the servant of the people—should use its power and authority to help in the carrying out and implementation of the project.

Climate for initiative

In the case of the city of Rochester, initial government actions created potentials which were quickly realized by truly enterprising entrepreneurs who then took the initiative and presented a plan whose execution depended on further government cooperation. This aid was promptly given.

The initial improvements which created the climate that encouraged free enterprise to dare to take a reasonable risk were directed toward easier accessibility to the city's core and greater circulation around the core. New arterial highways were constructed, leading from various points of the region toward the city center. But the usually resultant congestion was forestalled by the construction of a freeway-type loop road around the core and of municipal garages easily reached from this loop road which provided retainer basins for the flood of automobiles. The city also acted with regard to civic and cultural improvements by the construction of new public buildings.

With these basic prerequisites established, the story of Midtown Plaza unfolded:

In 1956 the officers of the McCurdy and Forman department stores first started thinking about Midtown Plaza. Representatives of the city had approached the McCurdys and the Formans with a plan to build a 500-car parking ramp to serve both stores. The city had previously built ramp garages to serve Sibley, Lindsay & Curr Co., the city's largest department store, and the nearby E. W. Edwards & Son.

The McCurdys and Formans decided that the proposed 500-car facility wolud not be large enough. They proposed a 1,500-car ramp but decided against it, too. They realized that parking space alone was not the answer. What was needed, they believed, was an attraction in the central city, an urban center, and they approached our firm to develop a plan.

It was clear from the beginning that, for the project to be successful, the city would have to cooperate in the plan. Specifically, here is what was needed:

1. Permission to close one surface street completely, and one partly, to surface vehicular traffic.

2. The construction of a new road serving one of the main entrances of the Midtown Plaza complex (the so-called Broad Street extension) as part of the future inner loop around the core area.

3. The construction and operation of a 3-story underground garage with 2,000 parking spaces on underground rights leased by the Midtown Plaza Corp. to the city for $1 a year.

When presented with the plan, the city council voted to go ahead with the project. Excavation for the garage began in April 1959. It was built in two sections. Construction of the plaza began in March 1961. It was finished in an amazing 13 months and opened April 10, 1962.

Stimulus to business

Today, a little more than a year after the opening, business is booming at Rochester's Midtown Plaza as, indeed, it has been from the beginning. Here is what Midtowners say:

According to the manager of the Midtown branch of Lincoln Rochester Trust Co.: "The volume of new business acquired since our opening has been substantial. Our overall volume is approximately 75 percent ahead of our projection for this period, and floor activity is such that we have been forced to increase our staff well ahead of our earlier anticipation."

George Peck, vice president of Peck & Peck specialty stores, reports: "In the 2 weeks since our opening, sales have been more than double our original estimates, and we've already added more staff in order to serve our customers properly. Midtown's Peck & Peck store opened with as much sales vitality as any other branch in the history of our 62-store chain."

Furthermore, Fred Forman says that much to his surprise—for they had never expected to make this a profitable real estate venture—it now appears that "if our tenants' business keeps on the way it's going, we may actually make a profit out of the overages."

Recently, all the merchants of Midtown Plaza have decided to keep their stores open 5 nights a week. The additional costs seem to be more than justified by the business potential. Not only is business in Midtown Plaza booming, but activities in the entire downtown area have received new impetus. For the first time, after 30 years of hibernation, new office buildings and hotels are being constructed within the city core of Rochester. The privately operated bus company was able to improve its operations by introducing new bus lines with Midtown Plaza as a terminus and by offering better schedules.

It is important to understand that the success of Midtown Plaza is not due simply to the construction of new buildings in the downtown area. Nor is it solely explainable on the basis of improvement of accessibility to the core, through governmental action. Additional features which explain its success are:

The improvement of public transportation: This has been accomplished by the construction of a bus terminal serving long-distance buses as part of the complex, and the arrangement of bus stops near all entrances to the plaza.

Resurrection of the town square: Rochesterians, like citizens of other cities, had no place to gather for important occasions. By closing off one street and turning it into a pedestrian area a block long, 100 feet wide, 3 stories high, with arcades and colonnades connecting it to surrounding downtown streets, it was possible to recreate the features of the town square. It is, moreover, covered, skylighted, weather protected, and, by means of air conditioning, blessed with a spring-like climate all year round. Today, political rallies take place there, as well as balls, receptions for important visitors, art exhibits, and sports shows.

Significant lessons

Altogether, a number of lessons can be learned from the experience that led to the successful completion of Midtown Plaza:

1. Anticipation: What is especially to the credit of Midtown's developers is that, though their own businesses were holding up pretty well and had satisfactory sales, they looked ahead and, observing the fate of other downtown areas, concluded that decisive action before trouble started was the most prudent step.

2. Magnetism: Midtown Plaza has visibly affected the entire downtown business climate, as witnessed by the increasing sales volume of downtown enterprises generally and the construction of new downtown buildings, a situation in strong contrast to the complete cessation of building activity in the core during the last 30 years.

3. Cooperation: The success of Midtown Plaza does not mean that revitalization of our downtown cores would be better left to private enterprise alone. Rather, it is a valid example of the type of teamwork between government and business which alone is a suitable tool for the accomplishment of the task. Indeed, governmental work aiming toward transportation improvement, in particular, is just about indispensable.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The experiences of Boston, Rochester, and a number of other cities across the country amply demonstrate that urban renewal is by no means a do-it-yourself project. Fortunately, the trials and tribulations encountered in bringing about the more successful instances of urban revitalization can be converted into a number of proven concepts for the businessman.

You have to take the lead. The businessman should decide that it is up to him to take the initiative, for he has the most to gain from urban renewal. Knowing his own needs and requirements intimately, he is best equipped to work with planners in formulating a program.

Your enthusiasm will be contagious. Because of the actual participation of businessmen, not only in a monetary role but in support of the planning activity, the continued interest of all parties is assured. A psychological atmosphere is created which results in the heightened enthusiasm of the business community for the development of its own city. This optimism is contagious and has resulted, in Paterson and Fresno, for example, in the introduction of new enterprises of all types, including department stores; investment in the form of major building construction; and the attraction of new industries.

Your presence blocks opposition. An educational task is performed within the membership of the business community since, as a result of its active participation, a greater understanding of the problems, potentials, and goals of its city is fostered. The effect of this self-education is that the kind of opposition based on ignorance, misunderstanding, and lethargy is removed in advance of final planning or implementation.

Your dollars multiply. Financial contributions by the business community enable the planners to delve much more deeply into the individual needs and requirements of the various elements which make up the core area, with the result that a more human, more realistic, and more successful plan can be achieved.

Your interest is paramount. The responsibility for implementing master plans should not be left to outside developers alone. The outsider obviously can be motivated

only by the direct profits of a redevelopment venture. He cannot possibly perform as effectively as the insider who has the advantage of intimate knowledge of local conditions and the additional motivation of protecting his own investment and the well-being of his own city. This is not to say that local free enterprise should not call for assistance from professional developers who have acquired experience in the field. But local free enterprise should assume a leadership role and participate significantly in the program.

You must realize that flowerpots are not enough. It is certainly true that thosuands of members of committees, chambers of commerce, and other civic groups have spent millions of highly valuable man-hours in thoughtful discussions, and in attending lectures and talks on city planning. Yet the time invested in these events, though given in good faith, has rarely led to results because it was not directed toward positive action. Only too often these groups ease their collective conscience by prescribing palliatives like the decoration of downtown streets with flowerpots and flags, the holding of special downtown days, or possibly the improvement of lighting and, here and there, construction of a garage or parking lot. These beautification measures are about as effective as the treatment of cancer by aspirin, or whatever time and money is spent on them results in short-lived effects or none whatsoever.

You have to work with government. Besides those businessmen who feel that government should carry the ball, with free enterprise sitting in the bleachers, sometimes applauding but more often booing, there are others who feel just as strongly that government should get out of the city-saving business and leave the task solely to the genius of private enterprise. The fact is, of course, that neither group is right. Successful urban revitalization depends on the unstinting and full cooperation of all the groups involved. Indeed, the roles of local and Federal Governments and the businessmen are all inseparable and interdependent.

CONCLUSION

Northland Center near Detroit is still the country's most successful regional shopping center. At the time it opened, I discussed it in Harvard Business Review.[1] Engaging in the risky business of prophesying, I stated:

"The suburban regional shopping center would have significant and positive influence on our downtown cores.

"It was the first organized expression of new retailing methods.

"It would act as a shock treatment to galvanize government and private enterprise into action to save the economic, cultural, and human values of our downtown cores.

"It would be, in effect, an experimental workshop in which new planning techniques and principles (like separating various modes of transportation from each other, and all of them from human activity areas) could be tried out and proved."

A direct result of that article was an assignment to develop the first revitalization project for an American city core; namely, the plan for downtown Fort Worth, which was commissioned by J. B. Thomas, president of the Texas Electric Service Co. The Fort Worth plan has been successful in every respect but one. Though enthusiastically received by the public and hailed nationally and internationally as the most forward looking and most realistic approach to downtown revitalization, it has not been implemented. The reason for this nonimplementation lies, in all probability, in the fact that the planning for Fort Worth was undertaken soley by private enterprise; namely, the forward-looking Texas Electric Co. and its president; cooperation with government was sought only after the plan was completed.

Yet the effects of the Fort Worth plan were far reaching. It has become the prototype for similar projects throughout the Nation. Edmund Bacon, city planner of Philadelphia, characterized this phenomenon most fittingly in saying: "The Fort Worth plan is the only unborn child I know which has dozens of grandchildren."

Having established myself as a crystal gazer in 1954, I now dare two more prophecies:

1. I believe that over the next 10 years local private enterprise will take the initiative in the revitalization of its own cities, that the task will be carried on in partnership with government, and that it will be implemented by the citizens through their own redevelopment corporations, possibly with the help of experienced builders and developers from the outside.

2. I further foresee changes in Federal urban redevelopment legislation and its application tailored to the specific needs of the downtown cores and widening the area of assistance to include improvements in existing public transportation and the construction of new rapid transit facilities.

Should these prophecies come true, then we will truly experience in our lifetime a renaissance of the American city and of American urban civilization.

[1] "Dynamic Planning for Retail Areas," November-December 1954, p. 53.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 32d of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multi-million-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

As I read over the never-ending stream of letters from southern Idahoans who are opposed to Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho, my heart is warmed by their expression of thanks for my stand. The two-sentence letter of Mr. Orrin A. Tuttle, of New Plymouth, Idaho, is an example. He writes:

SIR: I have a family of five and have lived in southern Idaho since 1935. I sincerely admire your stand on the BPA.

TUTTLE TIRE SERVICE CO.
ORRIN A. TUTTLE,
NEW PLYMOUTH, IDAHO.

In contrast is the two-page letter from the mayor of the city of Shoshone, Idaho:

CITY OF SHOSHONE,
SHOSHONE, IDAHO,
August 7, 1963.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: I write for many people—especially of residents of this area—concerning the Bonneville power project and it is with the suggested subject of "Bonneville, please include us out."

The fact that a few influential politicians disregard the opinions of so many taxpayers and use their prestige to promote a favorite idea of their own, or one of their friend's ideas, with total disregard and actual contempt for the wishes of the remaining voters or taxpayers, is ,to say the least, very disconcerting.

It is my understanding that the BPA merely pays interest on borrowed money (who pays?—the taxpayers). That the project is not self-sustaining—they pay no State or local taxes and also that the taxpayers will be forced to pay for many hundreds of miles of transmission lines to areas that are now serviced by the Idaho Power.

All of this means more taxes and less revenue for the State and municipalities. From what source will the money for education be derived. The Idaho Power is one of the largest tax-paying units of the State. Their service is not too costly. I have as yet to find one who complains of the rates.

Resentment is running rampant here, concerning the Federal dictatorship and the obscurity of their machinations. The centralization of the Government, the tendency to ignore States rights is threatening the future of the citizens. Private enterprise is being erased. Original and personal incentives violently discouraged. In fact, through the newspaper mediums, the little people are being called stupid and dumb. How can experienced citizens be so dumb. They vote for a honest man to represent them and so many fall to the lure of pestige and forget the ones who placed them in their position.

I am very sorry to have taken your time and burdened you with such problems but I feel that you will be able to assist us in this dilemma.

As mayor of this city, I realize only too well that one cannot battle or overcome such a problem by himself. Your efforts will certainly be appreciated.

If I can be of any further assistance to you would you please ask it of me.

Most respectfully,

MYRTLE C. BURDETT,
Mayor.

Mrs. Mabel Sturgis used a 4-cent post card—the kind we paid a penny for not so many years ago—to express her opposition to Bonneville and added a footnote of "Get us out." Her message follows:

AUGUST 29, 1963.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: This is just to tell you that I am very much opposed to the BPA coming into southern Idaho.

I shall be pleased with any opposition you offer.

Sincerely,

MABEL M. STURGIS.

BOISE, IDAHO.
P.S.—Get us out.

Testimony Presented to the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation October 2 and 3, 1963, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation by Mr. Edward J. Gruble, vice president of the Hilton Seafoods Co. of Seattle, Wash., appearing before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation on October 2 and 3, 1963.

Mr. Gruble's testimony is perhaps the most extraordinary commentary on pollution affecting adversely our fresh water resources that I have ever seen.

My name is Edward J. Gruble, vice president of the Hilton Seafoods Co. of Seattle, Wash., and representing here today the Pacific Coast Oyster Growers Association, Northwest Fisheries Association, Citizens for Clean Waters, Inc., and numerous other groups concerned with the water resources of Washington State.

I want to first thank you for this opportunity to present a short review of the water pollution problem as it pertains to that State and to ask for your help in alleviating wherever possible the degradation of those waters.

We are not particularly concerned with water pollution from domestic sources in the Pacific Northwest, even though forecasts predict a tremendous increase in population for that area in the next 10–20 years. The reason is, that local and State authorities, with the help of the Federal Government, have been keeping abreast of the problem and are making substantial improvements in the field. But it should be noted that without Federal assistance this problem could not have been dealt with adequately by local and State governments.

We are becoming increasingly concerned, however, with the rapid increase in the use of insecticide, pesticides and detergents, and believe that adequate and prompt control over the use of these chemicals is essential if the water resources of the Nation and the Pacific Northwest are to be protected.

Recently in Washington, 70,000 acres of timberland were sprayed with DDT and a chemical called Sevin to kill one insect—the looper bug. This spraying contributed to a further contamination of the Columbia River and Willapa Bay. DDT and zinc residue traces are being found in increasing amounts in the fish and shellfish of those areas. Not satisfied with an 84.3 percent kill of the bug, two large timber companies, Weyerhaeuser and Crown Zellerbach, resprayed 14,000 acres with DDT despite recommendations by the Federal Pest Review Board that DDT not be used. This example points to an obvious need for adequate Federal legislation controlling the use of these poisonous chemical sprays.

But neither domestic pollution nor the use of chemical sprays has had the devastating and destructive effect on the water resources of Washington State that effluent from one major industry has.

I refer to the pulp and paper industry and in particular to the sulfite pulpmills with their effluent—sulfite waste liquor. Despite more than 30 years of effort on the part of local citizens, whose livelihood depends upon clean waters, conservationists, and often local authorities, this remains the major water pollution problem. It has been responsible for immeasurable damage to the water resources, the fisheries and the recreational areas of the State. It continues to pour in ever-increasing amounts from the outfalls of some 17 sulfite pulpmills located within the State, with immunity from the punitive efforts of local authorities. In the Puget Sound area alone, where seven sulfite pulpmills are located, 210,000,000 gallons of waste water containing sulfite waste liquor is discharged daily into the estuaries having a biological oxygen demand of the population equivalent of 8,400,000 people.

The banding together of the pulp and paper industry in the Pacific Northwest under the auspices of the Northwest Pulp and Paper Association have made it impossible for delegated authorities to enforce pollution abatement laws. This conspiracy has as its objective the circumvention and evasion of the pollution laws of the State.

The collective efforts by the Northwest Pulp and Paper Association and its members, take the form of propaganda disseminated through the press, speeches and statements before civic and industry groups, the production of motion pictures with wide distribution in schools, social and civic groups, letters to employees suggesting loss of jobs if mills are forced to make expenditures for pollution abatement facilities, infiltration of civic and sports groups in order to divide and confuse, intimidation of local communities and businessmen with threats of shutdown if State pollution laws are enforced, and political pressures for removal of officials who attempt to protect other water users.

All these measures have made it virtually impossible for duly appointed and elective officials to enforce existing pollution laws without fear of political reprisals.

In addition, it must be noted that this industry, individually and collectively, is of such financial strength that injured parties cannot by litigation hope to successfully cope with the situation and, in fact, it is impossible for local and State regulatory agencies, operating under fixed and limited budgets, to resolve this problem.

In order that you may have a clearer understanding of the problem, we have prepared a chart of Puget Sound showing the location of the mills and the areas of contamination.

In the Anacortes area, Scott Paper Co. owns a 120-ton-per-day sulphite pulpmill, discharging approximately 8.7 million gallons of waste water per day. Surveys indicated that sulphite waste liquor concentrations in excess of 73 parts per million have been found over oyster growing areas. Fisheries' biologists have concluded that 8 ppm are lethal to oyster and clam larvae. This mill, as have all others, has consistently fought abatement efforts with threats of shutdown.

Three mills are located in the Port Angeles area. Fibreboard Paper Products owns a relatively small mill, 95 tons per day of which is ground-wood pulp and 65 tons per day of sulphite pulp. It discharges 5.2 million gallons of waste water, having a population equivalent of 260,000 people.

Rayonier, Inc., has a 350-ton-per-day sulfite pulpmill, discharging approximately 35 million gallons of waste water, with a population equivalent of 1,500,000 people. Incidentally, this company, largely responsible for the near extinction of the Olympic oyster in lower Puget Sound, has successfully stalled litigation brought by oystermen of that area (June 1956) for 7 years. It is noteworthy that since this company stopped discharging effluent in the Shelton area, Olympic oysters, a swell as other fisheries in the area, are prospering once again.

The third mill is owned by Crown-Zellerbach, a 500-ton-per-day mill, with 90 tons production of sulfite pulp, the remainder ground-wood pulp.

Discharges from this mill have a population equivalent of 360,000 people.

The maximum sulfite liquor concentration that has been found in the Port Angeles area is approximately 17,000 parts per million and dissolved oxygen as low as 0 have been obtained in areas of the inner harbor and adjacent to the outfalls. Biologists have established that ppm of sulfite waste liquor destroys important salmon food supply. Sludge beds have been formed near these outfalls definitely degrading the inner harbor.

In the Bellingham area, Georgia-Pacific has recently acquired the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. mill, which started in 1925 as a 25-ton-per-day production and today is producing 500 tons of sulfite pulp per day. It discharges approximately 45 million gallons of waste water into Bellingham Bay daily, which has a population equivalent of 1 million people. Surveys of Bellingham Bay and surrounding water areas indicate that sulfite liquor in excess of 500 parts per million within a mile of the mill are common, the maximum concentration being about 4,500 ppm with minimum dissolved oxygen 0. Concentrations as high as 48 ppm have been found over oyster beds more than 10 miles distant. The oyster industry of the area has been practically wiped out resulting in heavy economic losses and unemployment. Numerous fish kills have been observed in the area and experiments with live fingerling salmon result in 100 percent mortality of the fish within 3 minutes. Sludge beds requiring periodic dredging are formed and marine life in the vicinity of the mill has become extinct.

This mill has consistently fought installation of recovery facilities and has refused to acknowledge pollution of the waterways. It announced several days ago a $3 million expansion of its pulp making facilities—increasing its production by another 80 tons of chemi-ground wood pulp per day.

In the Everett area there are three mills—two discharging to Port Gardner Bay and one into the Snohomish River, which empties into the bay.

Simpson Lee Paper Co. has a 145-ton per day kraft pulpmill. The mill discharges approximately 10 million gallons per day of waste water to the Snohomish River, with a population equivalent of 72,000 people.

Weyerhaeuser Co. owns a 300-ton-per-day sulfite pulpmill with a waste discharge of approximately 20 million gallons and a population equivalent of approximately 1,300,000 people. This company developed the highly successful MGO recovery process which recovers 85 percent of the effluent

with savings in chemicals and fuel costs. It has refused to install this system in the Everett area and has threatened to shut the mill down if required to do so—this, in spite of assurance by Mr. Howard Morgan, president of Weyerhaeuser, in 1950, that if the recovery system proved effective at its Longview plant it would be installed in the Everett mill.

The third mill in the area, and reportedly the largest pulpmill in the world, is owned by Scott Paper Co. It has a daily production of 875 tons of sulfite pulp per day and discharges approximately 90 million gallons of waste water daily. It has a population equivalent of 3,500,000 people. I would like to point out here that for every ton of pulp produced 2,400 pounds of waste solids are produced which, unless recovered, are dumped into the receiving waters.

Effluent from the Weyerhaeuser and Scott mills are discharged through a common deep water outfall pipe, which when permitted to be built in 1948, was considered a temporary installation. It has become a permanent installation as far as the mills are concerned.

Innumerable fish kills have been noted in the area and extensive sludge beds built up degrading the waters of the area.

The three mills in the Everett area alone have an approximate degrading effect on the waters as a population equivalent of 4,800,000 people—this exceeds the population of the city of Los Angeles. 97 percent of the pollution in the Everett area is attributable to pulpmills.

Let me reiterate that the total gallonage of waste waters discharged by these seven mills is approximately 210 million gallons per day, have a total population equivalent of roughly 8,400,000 people. It is to be noted that the entire population of Washington State, according to the 1960 Federal census is only 2,853,214.

When we consider that there is a total of 17 pulp and paper mills situated in the State of Washington pouring millions of gallons of toxic waste, it is readily understandable why pulpmill pollution is the major pollution problem in the Pacific Northwest.

But, what about the future?

The latest figures from the U.S. Department of Commerce show that Washington State is the leading pulp producing State in the United States. In 1959 production in short tons was 2,804,823, in 1960, 3,087,422, and in 1961—the latest available year—3,282,162 tons.

In May of this year (1963), Lawson Turcotte, president of Pugent Sound Pulp, reported that the first 4 months of 1963 was running at a record rate. That U.S. pulp production is "3.6 percent ahead of last year."

It is predicted by the Senate Select Committee on Natural Water Resources that by 1980 the pulp and paper industry will use 19 billion gallons per day of water in manufacturing and by 2000 A.D. the amount will have climbed to 47 billion gallons.

Predictions are that the west coast production of pulp can expand 80 percent in the next 12 years, a survey by two Washington State University economists indicates. The study was made for the Northwest Pulp & Paper Association by Drs. John A. Guthrie and William Iule.

Beginning to bear out these predictions is the recent announcement by Georgia-Pacific to increase pulp production at its Bellingham mill by 80 tons and by 250 tons at Toledo, Oreg.

Plans by Crown Zellerbach to construct a new pulp mill at the mouth of the Columbia River—a river already grossly polluted by pulp mill effluent.

All of which spells dire consequences for the future of our greatest natural resource—clean water. Unless prompt and effective measures are taken by Congress immediately, I am afraid that it will be too late. We have already passed the 11th hour in the conservation of this resource. Stringent Federal laws must be enacted now where navigable and interstate waters are concerned, which would allow the delegated Federal agency to become the prime mover in protecting and preserving this resource. Federal laws must be passed providing for heavy penalties for those who willfully and knowingly despoil the clean waters of the Nation. Greater concentration on expanded crash programs by agencies charged with protecting and preserving the waterways are essential. This job can only be done on the Federal level. We, who have for so many years fought for the preservation and conservation of our waters, sincerely ask you to do something before it is too late.

In closing, let me again thank you on behalf of the organization and people for whom I am speaking here today. Thank you.

Early U.S. Satellite Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a thought-provoking historical essay, the prize-winning essay for 1962 of the Robert H. Goddard historical essay competition sponsored by the National Rocket Club of Washington, D.C.

The Goddard historical prize essay for 1962, chosen by a judging committee of professional historians and analysts, is a thought-provoking essay indeed. It discusses the proposals in the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics and the Air Force's Rand Corp. for studies which might have led to the orbiting of an earth satellite by the United States as early as 1951 or 1952. The essay, entitled "Early U.S. Proposals for Earth Satellites, 1945–49," was submitted by Mr. R. Cargill Hall, of San Jose, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, there are many cogent reasons why I bring this historical essay to the attention of the Congress. But the major one is that we would do well to examine the problems of research and development in rocketry and astronautics today with the perspective which history provides.

In space affairs we cannot afford to be shortsighted or wrong. The pace of scientific and technological progress in space exploration and exploitation ever quickens. It is an unprecedented and complex business, requiring deliberate speed and courageous initiative. The Soviet Union is demonstrating an excellence in maintaining an aggressive program in space. And we should reflect carefully upon what we might have done yesterday as we examine and decide on where we are as a nation, are going today, and tomorrow in space.

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the Members of the Congress read Cargill Hall's essay on the proposals for earth satellite development studies in 1945–49 in the context of today's public dialog on our space effort. What if the United States had launched a satellite in 1952 or even 1954? Would history have been different? Would not science and engineering have been stimulated in this country earlier? Would not the image of the United States in the eyes of the rest of the world have been spared the historical blemish of sputnik, the appearance that we were not the scientific and technological leader in the world? Our affluent society, with its surplus food production and great use of technology to appease our creature wants for comfort and pleasure, cannot afford to turn its back on progress in rocketry and astronautics. If we would remain free and maintain peace on a small and troubled planet, America had better make sure that superior space science and technology are on our side.

The essay follows:

EARLY U.S. SATELLITE PROPOSALS [1]

(By R. Cargill Hall [2])

INTRODUCTION

At the end of World War II the United States stood preeminent in the world in political influence, in industrial productivity, and in sheer military power. The United States alone emerged virtually unscathed from the conflict, and more significantly, was the sole possessor of the atomic bomb. Her European Allies were financially and materially prostrate, Germany and Japan lay in ruins. Soviet Russia, having had a substantial percentage of her industrial and agricultural capacity destroyed as well as having suffered innumerable casualties, faced the monumental task of rebuilding simply to attain prewar levels of productivity.

International rivalry, which has frequently acted as the catalytic stimulus to technological advance, was replaced by a victorious enthusiasm and ephemeral unity of the Allied powers. An emergency climate which would sustain continuous experimentation and investigation leading to advancement in the state-of-the-art in rocketry and astronautics no longer existed in this country at the conclusion of hostilities in August 1945. To the United States, sole possessor of atomic weapons and global air supremacy, a military threat from a foreign power was hard to visualize. Wartime military and civilian programs were subject to a return to normalcy—to peacetime operation.

The layman's inherent skepticism manifested by his reaction in 1920 to Robert H. Goddard's moon-impact proposal (and his daring suggestion that rocket thrust could operate in a vacuum)[3] was displayed once again in 1945, at a more critical time in our history, by an influential member of the scientific community and a U.S. defense pol-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

icymaker. Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office for Scientific Research and Development, and Chairman, Joint Committee on New Weapons of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (1942–46), made the following comments before the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy in December 1945:

"Let me say this: There has been a great deal said about a 3,000-mile high-angle rocket. In my opinion such a thing is impossible and will be impossible for many years. The people who have been writing these things that annoy me have been talking about a 3,000-mile high-angle rocket shot from one continent to another carrying an atomic bomb, and so directed as to be a precise weapon which would land on a certain target such as this city.

"I say technically I don't think anybody in the world knows how to do such a thing and I feel confident it will not be done for a very long period of time to come. I think we can leave that out of our thinking. I wish the American public would leave that out of their thinking." [4]

America's global power, her demobilization—the return to normalcy—and the influence of decisionmakers in the same frame of mind as Dr. Bush determined to a great degree the course of events which were to follow for the first rocket and satellite programs initiated immediately after the end of the war.

Regardless of the thinking at higher levels, within several months after the conclusion of hostilities in 1945, the armed services of the United States did embark upon a number of advanced rocket and satellite programs. However, these programs, which might well have culminated in the orbiting of an American satellite by 1951, were not to receive the support of the War Department.[5]

SATELLITE STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES—1945–47

The first formal studies of earth satellite vehicles made with Government funds in the United States were conducted during the 1940's by the Navy and the Army Air Force. However, knowledge of this early work has been limited. Available information concerning these studies, although now unclassified, has been published in disrelated segments, scattered widely, and has contained no unifying historical thread bonding a relationship between the parallel work. As an example, a recent reference to one of the major satellite studies conducted in the mid-1940's appeared inconspicuously within the "Chronology of Missile and Astronautic Events," published by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics:

"May 12, 1946: Project Rand presented its report to the Army Air Force entitled 'Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship.' " [6]

While the U.S. Congressional Chronology mentions the 1946 Army Air Force-Project Rand satellite study, no mention was made of the satellite study conducted by the Navy which had begun the year before, in 1945. Insight into this unique phase of American astronautical endeavor has been provided by Dr. Harvey Hall, who was instrumental in starting the original Navy satellite study, and remained with the program until its termination in late 1948.[7]

In early October 1945, a Committee for Evaluating the Feasibility of Space Rocketry (CEFSR) was established in the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics.[8] This group performed calculations and profile analysis on a proposed liquid hydrogen-oxygen single stage earth satellite vehicle and, in late October 1945, the CEFSR submitted the satellite proposal to the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics with the strong recommendation that an experimental program be adopted for the explicit objective of constructing and launching an earth satellite vehicle to carry electronic equipment for scientific test purposes.

This early Navy satellite proposal (not to be confused with the later Vanguard program) was based upon a contemporary hydrogen rocket motor development program then being conducted by the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics. Late in 1945, under the BuAer program, personnel of Aerojet succeeded in actually burning gaseous hydrogen and oxygen in a rocket motor for the first time and, shortly thereafter under the same Navy auspices, the largest hydrogen liquefier in the world was placed in operation at Aerojet (an early rocket propulsion firm), where liquid hydrogen was successfully stored, pumped and burned in what became routine test operations.[9] At this early date the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics effort on large rocket propulsion systems was composed of several serious hardware development contracts. Other contracts were also undertaken for the study of borohydride fuels and for electronic components that could be employed in rockets.

As a result of the CEFSR satellite recommendations, the Bureau of Aeronautics placed a contract with the Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology in December 1945, to conduct research on the relationship between the orbit (altitudes), rocket motor and fuel performance, structural characteristics (mass ratio), and payload.[10] The results of these calculations, implementing those already made within the Bureau of Aeronautics, confirmed the feasibility of a single-stage liquid hydrogen-oxygen earth satellite rocket vehicle provided: (1) the fuel and engine combination would perform according to theory, and (2) that the assumed structure (mass ratio) could actually be realized. Consequently a second contract was awarded to Aerojet in order to determine whether a test stand value of the specific impulse of liquid hydrogen-oxygen was sufficiently near the theoretical value to justify these conclusions of satellite feasibility. This propulsion system contract led to the construction of the large hydrogen liquefier, and actual test stand operation of liquid hydrogen-oxygen rocket engines which verified theoretical performance specifications. Verification of the second condition on structures was undertaken later in 1946.

Even before some of these early investigations had been completed, support for the satellite project was solicited from many individuals and at many levels in the Navy. It soon became apparent to BuAer personnel involved in the project that full Navy support for an actual flight test vehicle program would not be forthcoming. Cost estimates for the preliminary design phase of the project had been set between $5 and $8 million in November 1945.[11] In early 1946 there were clear indications that whatever progress could be attained would have to be done on a great deal less than $5 million.

Faced with this unpromising situation, members of the Navy CEFSR approached the Army Air Forces in the hope of establishing a joint earth satellite project. The first meeting between representatives of the two services took place in Washington, D.C., on March 7, 1946. At this meeting the status of the Navy BuAer rocket and satellite developments were reviewed, and a plan was presented to serve as the basis for the proposed joint Army Air Forces-Navy experimental program. Reception of the Navy proposal by the Army Air Forces representatives was most favorable, and a tentative arrangement was established:

"It was agreed at the conference that the general advantages to be derived from pursuing the satellite development appear to be sufficient to justify a major program, in spite of the fact that the obvious military, or purely naval applications in themselves, may not appear at this time to warrant the expenditure.

"On this basis, the Army representatives agreed to investigate the extent of Army interest by discussions with General LeMay, and others, after which a future joint conference is planned." [12]

For several days in March 1946, it appeared that a satellite project might possibly commence in the United States. Ten years were to lapse, however, before an American satellite program was ever accorded an official go-ahead.

After review of the Navy proposal at higher levels, Gen. Carl Spaatz designated Gen. Curtis E. LeMay to represent the Army Air Forces before the Navy satellite proposal team In mid-March Dr. Hall was summoned to the office of General LeMay, and was informed by the general that the Army Air Force would not support the proposed Navy satellite project, although the possibility for further discussion on the subject of earth satellites was left open. Personnel at the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics returned to continue work on their single-stage satellite investigations. In the meantime the Army Air Forces turned to the Project Rand [13] research group quartered on the west coast. This consultant organization was instructed to perform a separate earth satellite feasibility study.

Further attempts by the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics to arrange another conference with the Army Air Forces on a joint satellite proposal met with repeated delays. The second meeting was finally held in early June under the War Department's Aeronautical Board. This board, formed during World War II, was composed of representatives from the Army and Navy Air Forces to review new developments and coordinate similar requirements for the two air corps. (Later in 1946 this organization was supplanted by the Joint Research and Development Board [14] (JRDB) of the War Department which expanded and formalized the functions performed by the Aeronautical Board.) At this second joint meeting the Army Air Forces representative, Gen. Laurence Craigie, introduced the Project Rand satellite study report "on which the ink was hardly dry, as the basis of a bargaining position that the AAF was on an equal or similar developmental position with the Navy. From this point on, no further progress was made toward a joint project." [15]

The Navy Bureau of Aeronautics satellite vehicle, designated high altitude test vehicle (HATV), was to have been a single stage "multimotored liquid oxygen-hydrogen rocket craft capable of achieving orbital motion about the earth. It is 86 feet long and has a maximum diameter of 16 feet. It is constructed of stainless steel and has nine individual thrust motors. The vehicle is capable of attaining a maximum velocity of 25,400 feet per second at an altitude of about 150 miles." [16] North American Aviation (NAA) performed the CEFSR studies on the HATV structures in mid-1946. The HATV was designed to weigh 101,400 pounds initially, broken down into several components:

	Pounds
Propellants	89,000
Payload	1,000
Motor and accessories	5,000
Structure	6,400

Footnotes at end of speech.

The ratio of propellent weight to initial gross weight was 0.89. Previous investigations by the California Institute of Technology had established that "if a rocket ship could be built composed of 0.89 percent oxygen and hydrogen in liquid form as fuel, and 11 percent as deadweight, then the craft could attain free flight orbital movement around the earth at an altitude which would allow a number of revolutions before its energy is decreased due to atmospheric drag. * * *" The starting weight required an initial thrust of 233,000 pounds, varying to about 308,000 pounds at altitude.[17]

Since the structures portion of this single-stage vehicle could not weigh much more than 5 percent of the total weight of the rocket, the specifications called for a mass fuel-to-structure (content-to-shell) ratio approaching that which exists in an egg.[18]

The engineers at North American Aviation were aware at that early date that a satellite could be made by multistaging conventional (V–2) rockets, but they were responding to the Navy's requirements to see if a single-stage satellite could be made. With the exception of the extensive work on the propulsion system, the satellite studies conducted for the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics in 1946 were not hardware contracts, but rather substantial preliminary feasibility studies for the purpose of evaluating the upper limit to which a single-stage liquid hydrogen-oxygen booster-satellite design could be carried. For the NAA engineers, answers to this problem came out in the affirmative: with appropriate extension in rocket engine burning time and with small improvements in metallurgy, a single-stage satellite vehicle was definitely a feasible device. In addition to the NAA design study the Navy also found confirmation of the concept in two additional design studies; one by the BuAer design group, and one under a joint contract to the Glenn L. Martin Co. and Aerojet.

In the Army Air Forces satellite studies which commenced in 1946, as a direct result of the Navy satellite efforts, no predetermined specifications were imposed upon Project Rand. However, this consultant group was instructed to complete their satellite feasibility study in 3 weeks * * * because the Army Air Forces and the Navy were scheduled for a presentation of their respective cases for unmanned satellites before the next monthly meeting of the Aeronautical Board of the War Department. Ultimately, this unrealistic date was postponed and extended by the Army Air Forces for about 3 months. In 1946 the separate satellite studies being conducted by the Navy and Army Air Forces had assumed the character of programs undertaken to demonstrate to the War Department that one or both of the two services had a feasible satellite program, and thus might lay claim to weapon developments in the medium of space.

Administratively the early Rand project was managed through the Douglas Aircraft Co. Actually, however, there was participation by North American and Northrop. Although the three-way venture did not reach maturity until early 1947, there was sufficient technical interchange among the three participating companies to make the Douglas/Rand group keenly aware of the severe engineering problems inherent in the Navy's single-stage satellite specification. Project Rand also knew of a possibly easier solution to the problem; the staging of conventional fueled rockets.

Even with a common knowledge of fundamentals and a free exchange of technical information within aircraft engineering circles in 1946, it was not an easy task for the Project Rand group to produce its first satellite feasibility study within the time limits. Finally on May 12, 1946, 20 copies of a document entitled "Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship," were rushed from Project Rand to the Air Materiel Command at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

"Prophetic" is the only term which can be applied to the following excerpts from the introduction to this unique engineering report:

"Although the crystal ball is cloudy, two things seem clear:

"1. A satellite vehicle with appropriate instrumentation can be expected to be one of the most potent scientific tools of the 20th century.

"2. The achievement of a satellite craft by the United States would inflame the imagination of mankind, and would probably produce repercussions in the world comparable to the explosion of the atomic bomb.

"Since mastery of the elements is a reliable index of material progress, the Nation which first makes significant achievements in space travel will be acknowledged as the world leader in both military and scientific techniques. To visualize the impact on the world, one can imagine the consternation and admiration that would be felt here if the United States were to discover suddenly, that some other nation had already put up a successful satellite."[19]

That the author of these statements was correct in his prophecy was evidenced by the state of shock in which the free world found itself on October 4, 1957, when Sputnik I rocketed into orbit, propelled by a missile with ICBM characteristics.

Feasibility of a world-circling spaceship

After carefully analyzing the state of the art and potential developments, the men working at Project Rand stated that "technology and experience have now reached the point where it is possible to design and construct craft which can penetrate the atmosphere and achieve sufficient velocity to become satellites of the earth." This statement was well documented in the Rand report which, admittedly, was a design study for a satellite vehicle "judiciously based on German experience with the V–2," and which relied for its success only on "sound engineering development which could logically be expected as a consequence of intensive application to the effort."

Although deemed feasible as a satellite per se (it was felt that a 500-pound satellite could be placed on a 300-mile orbit within 5 years, or by 1951), Project Rand ruled out the satellite as a military "ballistic weapon"; i.e., a device which would carry a destructive payload. No known propulsive system could lift a heavy A-bomb to orbital altitude, and any explosive force less than atomic could not inflict enough damage on an enemy to make worth while the expense of transporting it via a satellite. Here the status quo of military feasibility was to remain for some years. The problem was not a lack of the wherewithal to orbit a satellite vehicle, but rather the problem of devising a useful function for the satellite to perform once it was in orbit.

The satellite, therefore, had been determined a feasible device, but not a military weapon. Because it was not a "weapon," no funds were available for its development. Personnel at Project Rand were aware of this condition, and yet, through logical extrapolation of potential based upon the standpoint of feasibility, the mathematicians and engineers knew that a satellite would provide scientific and psychological advantages which would transcend the utility of such a vehicle as a mere weapons carrier. In an attempt to circumvent contemporary War Department rationale and establish a secondary basis for evaluation and review of "radical" proposals, and at the same time gain official sanction to proceed with its development, the report went on to urge the early adoption of a satellite program:

"In making the decision as to whether or not to undertake construction of such a craft now, it is not inappropriate to view our present situation as similar to that in airplanes prior to the flight of the Wright brothers. We can see no more clearly now all of the utility and implications of spaceships than the Wright brothers could see flights of B–29's bombing Japan and air transports circling the globe."

The technicians at Project Rand who might at first have been intrigued with the novelty of an unmanned satellite turned to plead the case for continued work on the satellite program regardless of its nonmilitary nature, thereby following the earlier lead of the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics. To establish the case for the usefulness of a satellite vehicle, the Project Rand summary went into considerable detail on nonmilitary uses for such a device, including astronautical observation of cloud patterns and short-range weather forecasting, as well as biological observations in a gravity-free environment. Heavy emphasis was placed on the possibilities of the satellite as a communications relay station. And like the Navy personnel in the Bureau of Aeronautics, the plea to justify further fixed effort also fell on barren ground.

Conclusions concerning world-circling spaceship

"The work has been based on our present state of technological advancement and has not included such possible future advancements as atomic energy. If a vehicle can be accelerated to a speed of 17,000 miles per hour and aimed properly, it will revolve on a great circle path above the earth's atmosphere as a new satellite. The centrifugal force will just balance the pull of gravity. Such a vehicle will make a complete circuit of the earth in approximately 1½ hours."

One of the important conclusions of this design study was that it would be highly advantageous to have multistage rockets utilizing given types of liquid propellant in order to achieve the required performance; i.e., alcohol-oxygen, or as in the case of the Navy proposal, hydrogen-oxygen. As a refutation of the Navy's case, the study further sought to prove that neither hydrogen-oxygen nor alcohol-oxygen would be capable of accelerating a single-stage, unassisted vehicle to orbital speeds. Further analysis of the propellent combinations for staged vehicles revealed that four stages were optimum for conventional fueled liquid alcohol-oxygen rockets. The gross weight of such a vehicle was listed at 233,669 pounds with a final fourth-stage payload—or satellite—of 500 pounds.

Three stages were determined to be optimum for a liquid hydrogen-oxygen rocket. However, the report was published with all data based on a two-stage liquid hydrogen-oxygen rocket (an addition of one more stage over the original Navy proposal). A postscript was added explaining that time did not permit the substitution of data, but that the addition of a third stage would afford substantial weight savings.

"It is planned to fire the rocket vertically upward for several miles and then gradually curve the flight path over in the direction

Footnotes at end of speech.

in which it is desired that the vehicle shall travel. In order to establish the vehicle on an orbit at an altitude of about 300 miles without using excessive amounts of control, it was found desirable to allow the vehicle to coast without thrust on an extended elliptic arc just preceding the firing of the rocket of the last stage. As the vehicle approaches the summit of this arc, which is at the final altitude, the rocket of the last stage is fired and the vehicle is accelerated so that it becomes a freely revolving satellite."

It was also planned that the launching of a satellite would be made from one of the Pacific islands near the equator in a west-to-east plane[20] and that a series of telemetering stations would be established around the equator to obtain the data from the scientific apparatus contained in the vehicle. "The first vehicle will probably be allowed to burn up on plunging back into the atmosphere. Later vehicles will be designed so that they can be brought back to earth. Such vehicles can be used either as long-range missiles or for carrying human beings."

Note of warning

In a chapter entitled "The Significance of a Satellite Vehicle," Dr. L. N. Ridenour, another member of the original group of consultants to Project Rand, emphasized that by creating a satellite and booster system one has the same time developed an intercontinental ballistic missile:

"There is little difference in design and performance between an intercontinental rocket missile and a satellite. Thus a rocket missile with a free space trajectory of 6,000 miles requires a minimum energy of launching which corresponds to an initial velocity of 4.4 miles per second, while a satellite requires 5.4. Consequently, the development of a satellite will be directly applicable to the development of an intercontinental rocket missile."

More than a decade later, at the conclusion of the Senate's special 1958 investigation of sputnik and America's lagging space effort, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON belatedly paraphrased Dr. Ridenour when he noted that "it (sputnik) demonstrates beyond question that the Soviet Union has the propulsive force to hurl a missile from one continent to another."[21]

Dr. Ridenour stressed the possibility of a military use for the satellite in a passive capacity: "It should be remarked that the satellite offers (itself as) an observation 'aircraft.' Perhaps the two most important classes of observation which can be made from a satellite are the spotting of points of impact of bombs launched by us, and the observation of weather conditions over enemy territory."

Ridenour saw the impending decline in the importance of the manned bomber, and it is evident that he recognized the significance of the satellite as a means of surveillance. These speculations which had arisen in the "crystal ball gazing" of 1946 were reiterated by General Gavin in a less subtle manner a decade later:

"The ICBM is the consequence of manned bomber obsolescence * * * not the cause. The manned bomber will become obsolete when effective (armed) surface-to-air missiles can be employed against it * * * as soon as they are on site in numbers.

"If manned bombers cannot penetrate enemy territory (in the future) then certainly manned observation aircraft cannot.[22] Observation must be provided by an unmanned reconnaissance vehicle * * * for a short-range missile it will be a recoverable drone operated by remote control; for an ICBM it will, in time, be a satellite.[23]

Time—The essence

Time is impartial and indiscriminate, and does not wait for individuals, nations, or ideologies. Subsequent to the release of the initial satellite study in May, Rand issued on October 18, 1946, a special report, "The Time Factor in the Satellite Program," written by Dr. James Lipp (who is considered to have been Dr. Hall's equivalent on the Air Force satellite program) in the support of the world-circling spaceship. Excerpts from this report contain several rather accurate guesses as to immediacy of satellite developments and the trends to expect in competition from foreign powers:

"The possibility of constructing a satellite has been well publicized both here and in Germany and the data of the Germans are available to various possible enemies of the United States. Thus, from a competitive point of view, the decision to carry through a satellite development is a matter of timing, depending upon whether this country can afford to wait an appreciable length of time before launching definite activity.

"Since the United States is far ahead of any country in both airplanes and seapower, and since others are abreast of the United States in rocket applications, we can expect strong competition in the latter field as being the quickest shortcut for challenging this country's position."

Another implied advantage of satellite development which transcends any financial commitments was touched upon:

"The psychological effect of a satellite will in less drastic fashion parallel that of the atom bomb. It will make possible an unspoken threat to every other nation that we can send a guided missile to any spot on earth. Combined with our present monopoly of the atom bomb such a threat in being will given pause to any nation which contemplates aggressive war against the United States. It will be necessary to produce such deterrents from time to time because of the probability that other nations will eventually produce atom bombs of their own."

From a purely psychological standpoint the author noted that "as an aid to maintaining the present prestige and diplomatic bargaining power of the United States it would be well to give the world the impression of an everwidening gap between our technology and any other possible rivals since other nations are obviously hoping to play for time in an effort to overcome the existing lead."

The special report stated that the United States might conceivably have to be content with spending anywhere from $50 to $150 million to orbit a satellite by the early 1950's. Recognizing the underdeveloped state of the art in this country, the report concluded on this terse note:

"It is hardly necessary to point out that most of the reasons for beginning a satellite development program cannot be assigned values in terms of dollars and cents lost in each year of delay. It is equally clear that some of the items discussed are of sufficient importance that the probable cost of the project becomes insignificant.

"It is therefore recommended that the satellite be considered not as an academic study but as a project which merits planning and establishing of a priority in the research program of the Army Air Force."

Following the Navy and Army Air Force satellite presentations in June 1946, the Aeronautical Board's failure to authorize a to let each service pursue their independent studies were ordered to continue. Evidently dictional assignment—thereby confirming the situation established by General LeMay in March of that year. Regardless of the Aeronautical Board's failure to authorize a single formal program, the Navy satellite studies were ordered to continue. Evidently having received word of the new Army Air Force study prior to its formal presentation, the Chief of Naval Operations directed the Bureau of Aeronautics to proceed with further preliminary investigations of an earth satellite vehicle in May 1946. The stated purpose of the continuing investigation was to "contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field of guided missiles, communications, meteorology, and other technical fields with military applications.[11 24] The Navy single-stage rocket satellite study was to continue through mid-1948, conducted by a structures division in the BuAer, and under a joint contract by the Glenn L. Martin-Baltimore Co. and Aerojet, in addition to the NAA structural study already noted. Further investigation of borohydride fuels as an alternative for hydrogen had been disappointing in spite of the optimistic early estimates of high specific impulse based on results of theoretical chemistry.

Project Rand also commenced a second study in mid-1946, directed toward preparing more detailed specifications which would set forth minimum requirements for achieving a successful satellite vehicle. This work was completed in late 1946, and the reports were published in April 1947. General conclusions resulting from these studies pointed to an optimum arrangement for a satellite booster as a three-stage rocket employing liquid hydrogen-oxygen for propellants and having an initial gross weight in the range of 82,000 pounds.[25] A final orbit altitude of 350 miles was recommended, and overall cost was estimated at $82 million including sufficient rounds for preliminary testing.

Results of this second Rand study, which was actually a refinement of the world-circling spaceship, indicated a need for additional research in several vital component areas; certain subsystems had to be further perfected before a realizable satellite system would operate satisfactorily. As noted previously, at no time was there a lack of confidence in available talent or materials for building airframes or developing rocket engines and guidance systems that would be sufficient to put something on orbit. Rather, the areas which needed to be further advanced were those which would make that something useful and not simply amount to blasting rocks into orbit. Several of the significant areas which required additional research and development were guidance and flight-control, orbital attitude control, ground-space communications techniques and equipment, and dependable auxiliary power sources. In 1947 there were no miniaturized circuity and no solar energy devices or other prime internal power sources that would operate for any length of time in free space.

When the second Project Rand study was published in early 1947, the Army Air Force was preparing to recognize as a separate service under the National Security Act, which became law on July 25, 1947. The National Military Establishment replaced the War Department on September 17, 1947, and a new Cabinet post, the Secretary of Defense was created. Decisions as to which service would

Footnotes at end of speech.

have jurisdiction for development and deployment of long-range rockets were postponed by the RDB.[20] None of the three services was immediately authorized to further the development of long-range ICBM-type rockets needed to put a satellite into orbit.[21]

As a consequence of severe economies in the military research and development programs directed by the administration in December 1946, the limited satellite studies in the United States came to a virtual halt. From mid-1947 until mid-1948 only the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics continued limited satellite research activity. The Air Force discontinued work on the satellite and ICBM programs and placed primary emphasis on strategic bombers and air-breathing ram or pulse-jet guided missiles which operated in the atmosphere, and were, therefore, legitimately within Air Force jurisdiction. The Air Force satellite study program recommenced in 1949, about the time the Navy satellite studies were terminated due to a lack of funds, in part due to advances in guidance and control and the miniaturization of some hardware made by U.S. industry while working on other rocket programs, and in part due to new directions received from the research and development board. In early 1949 Rand was directed to begin extensive studies on the potential military utility of earth satellites, including work on the possible advantages of using such devices for purposes of observation.

Recent techniques of aerial observation

In Europe, at the turn of the century, rockets had been developed specifically for the puprose of tactical aerial surveillance. Work on this advanced concept of applied aerial observation was first described by a Mr. A. Bujard in a paper entitled "Rockets in the Service of Photography," given at a conference in Stuttgart, Germany, in 1906. The paper dealt primarily with the work of a German engineer, Alfred Maul, who first devised and tested rocket-borne camera devices in 1904.

Alfred Maul was to continue his work, improving the size and reliability of rocket, camera, and final descent systems:

"The largest model, made in 1912, was equipped with a stabilizing gyroscope, reached an altitude of 2,600 feet, had a takeoff weight of 42 kilograms (92½ pounds) and carried a camera with a plate size of 200 by 250 millimeters, or about 8 by 10 inches. The rocket was ignited electrically from a distance and was reliable, but by the time this model was ready it was also possible to aim a camera at the ground from an airplane."[22]

Arrival of the airplane as a dependable platform from which aerial photographs could be taken, displaced the development of balloon and rocket surveillance systems. Although Zeppelins and dirigibles were flown from World War I forward, airplanes performed the bulk of the required surveillance tasks for the various nations. An early manifestation of this change in thinking occurred in August 1915, when the U.S. Naval Observatory requested the Eastman Kodak Co. to develop a camera which would be suitable for taking aerial photographs from heights of 1,000 to 2,000 yards. Nevertheless, not all minds were confined to the altitudes particular to aircraft during the first half of the century. "As early as 1926, a Leningrad scientific journal carried an article by V. P. Glushko, now a prominent scientist and military technologist, in which he quoted an earlier article by H. Oberth, a German (sic) professor, stating that 'one can observe and photograph inaccessible countries' by using a giant mirror mounted on a satellite."[23] Progress in rocket technology by 1945 brought many earlier ideas to life. For advanced observation techniques the pendulum swung back to the early observation concepts. This time a satellite would be visualized as an observation platform.

SATELLITE STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1948–49

The Air Force/Rand satellite development effort which began in 1946, progressed through production of type specifications in 1947, and then came to a temporary halt awaiting a Research and Development Board go-ahead on work in those areas requiring further expanded and intensified study. The Navy studies which had sparked the Air Force satellite effort reached the point of detailed subsystem analysis, particularly in the area of auxiliary power during 1947.

In September 1947, the Research and Development Board formally assigned responsibility for coordinating work on the earth satellite programs, scattered among the separate services, to their Committee on Guided Missiles.[24] Shortly thereafter the committee notified the services that a review of contemporary earth satellite programs would be conducted in early 1948. The Technical Evaluation Group of the Committee on Guided Missiles, chaired by Clark Millikan, completed a review of the Navy CEFSR and USAF Project Rand satellite programs[21] in March 1948, and released a statement that "neither the Navy nor the USAF has as yet established either a military or a scientific utility commensurate with the presently expected cost of a satellite vehicle. However, the question of utility deserves further study and examination."[25] This was the same story: no support without a military requirement, but this time from a scientific agency staffed by civilians.

Further recommendations were made by the Technical Evaluation Group, "some of which were restrictive or limiting in nature, but which nevertheless encouraged continued efforts along various lines, including continuation of the Project Rand studies of the utility of such a vehicle under joint Navy, USAF sponsorship."[26] At this time Rear Admiral D. V. Gallery did make an attempt to place the Navy in joint sponsorship with the Project Rand effort, however, the new proposal for a combined program was refused by the Air Force.

In September, 1948, the Committee on Guided Missiles of the Research Development Board "approved recommendations that the Army Hermes project 'be given the task of providing the National Military Establishment with a continuing analysis of the long-range rocket problem as an expansion of their (study) task on an earth satellite vehicle.'"[24]

The first public announcement of an American satellite program appeared in the First Anuual Report of the Secretary of Defense, issued in late 1948. Secretary James Forrestal reported that:

"The earth satellite vehicle program, which was being carried out independently by each military service, was assigned to the Committee on Guided Missiles for Coordination. To provide an integrated program with resultant elimination of duplication, the committee recommended that current efforts in this field be limited to studies and component designs; well-defined areas of such research have been allocated to each of the three military departments."[28]

Forrestal's early veiled announcement of the U.S. satellite program caused a great deal of consternation among the parties who were working on the satellite project in this country in 1949 and who were trying to preserve its aspect of secrecy. The ill will engendered by this report was not confined solely to America however. Within months the Soviet journal New Times made specific reference to the "madman Forrestal's idea of an earth satellite" as an "instrument of blackmail." It should be noted, however, that as early as December 1947, New Times had "ridiculed the alleged American use of 'Hitlerite ideas' and in particular the 'fantastic' idea of reconnaissance satellites."[29] After this occurrence, no official reference in open literature was made of an American satellite effort until November 1954, when the Department of Defense, in a terse two sentence comment, reported that studies continued to be made in the earth satellite vehicle program. The statement, approved by Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, was issued after an earlier press conference statement by the Secretary that he was unaware of an American satellite program.

Navy Bureau of Aeronautics studies conducted on the high altitude test vehicle since 1945 had progressed as far as they possibly could go on paper when the Air Force rejected their second proposal for a joint satellite program in mid-1948. Any further effort now had to go into hardware and component parts contracts. A cost analysis and proposal for a program consisting of 12 satellite vehicles (figured on the basis of at least two satellites attaining orbit), set at $150 million together with a 5-year leadtime from go-ahead to first launch, had been turned down by the Research and Development Board in 1948. The total funds spent by the Navy over the 3-year period for studies on the single-stage HATV project had come to about $2 million. With Research and Development Board restrictions against building any flight vehicles to support a satellite program, and no funds authorized by the Navy to move into this development area even in clandestine fashion, or to pursue further utility studies, the Bureau of Aeronautics was forced to abandon their satellite project.

Still, one last determined attempt to maintain the Navy satellite program was made in late 1948, by Dr. Hall and the members of his organization, when an ad hoc subcommittee in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA)[27] was formed to explore and organize methods of obtaining information on the upper atmosphere above 20,000 feet. (The data was needed to provide aircraft firms with information on atmospheric drag and heating effects at these high altitudes for use in the design of advanced jet aircraft.) The idea advanced by this die-hard group of space scientists was based on their 3 years of study, and consisteds of a liquid hydrogen-oxygen high altitude test vehicle reconfigured to a super performance sounding rocket which would rise to an altitude in excess of 400 miles and thus, it was hoped, rally financial support for an earth satellite vehicle. The sounding rocket proposal was backed up by a detailed engineering report submitted by the Glen L. Martin Co. under a BuAer contract. Formal acceptance and support for this new rocket was sought not only from the NACA Subcommittee on the Upper Atmosphere, but also from the Research and Development Board, Geophysical Sciences Committee. And the results:

Footnotes at end of speech.

"No record has ever been found of RDB Geophysical Sciences Committee action. The legal position assumed by BuAer here, in spite of the technical evaluation group (of the RDB) stipulation against flight vehicles in support of the earth satellite vehicle program, was to the effect that the high altitude sounding rocket could be properly justified under BuAer's long-range rocket program rather than by the satellite program. (Although the proposal was accepted by the NACA Subcommittee on the Upper Atmosphere). Funds, however, were not forthcoming, even for this lesser but significant effort so that this promising program essentially came to an end around the close of 1948." [38]

These various occurrences resulted in a deferral of Navy sturies of a satellite project until many years later, and no significant satellite project was pursued by the U.S. Army until the Rdestone rocket team joined in the proposed Project Orbiter in 1954. The Air Force was the only participant which actively continued an earth satellite program from 1949 forward, the Rand Corp. performing the bulk of the Air Force satellite studies until satellie programs came into being at a much later date.

Motivation for an earth satellite program existed in various limited scientific sectors in 1948. And although several small organizations had been established by the armed services to work on this project, still, no funding of any consequence or formal support for this work at higher levels in the Government was forthcoming. At this time public acceptance for these ideas could hardly be expected when official acceptance was at best skeptical, and at worst altogether negative.

The satellite as a political and psychological weapon

Among the satellite studies resumed by Rand in 1949, was a study conference on the utility of satellites composed of consultants in both the physical and social science disciplines. The study was concerned specifically with an intensified examination of the satellite as a political and psychological weapon. The primary aim of this conference [39] was to determine what probable effects the orbiting of a satellite might have upon the ruling hierarchy in the Soviet Union, especially if, through use of photographic or television facilities, it possessed the capability of penetrating the shroud of secrecy draped over the Iron Curtain countries.

This particular approach to the utilization of a satellite was determined by: (a) the Research and Development Board directives to continue study of the utility of a satellite—the desirability of achieving certain sociopolitical objectives which might result from orbiting a satellite, and (b) the conclusions of the 1946–47 Rand studies (i.e., that existing state-of-the-art precluded the use of a satellite as a destructive weapon, but there was the possibility of using the vehicle in a passive military capacity for communications or surveillance purposes).

In setting about the study, personnel assigned to the project first established a guideline of basic satellite characteristics:

1. It would carry a small payload.
2. Its capactiy for destruction would be insignificant compared to existing methods.
3. Its orbit could be chosen to pass over selected areas of the earth.
4. It could not be brought down by present weapons or devices.
5. It could be made visible or nonvisible to the naked eye for certain periods of time and at certain intervals.
6. Radio signals or voice messages could be transmitted from the vehicle to listeners equipped with proper receivers on the ground.
7. It could be equipped with photographic and television facilities.
8. Its development in-being would be a costly undertaking.

Having established these guidelines, the conferees categorized and examined the specific functions which a vehicle retaining these characteristics might perform while on orbit.

1. The satellite as a spectacle: The study determined that a satellite might cause initial mystery, consternation, fear, or even panic; but it was deemed unlikely that the impact would be of major significance or of lasting duration.

2. The satellite as a demonstration of U.S. technological superiority: Here the value of a satellite was concluded to be "limited"—that other weapons and devices might register greater impact. As indicative of the growing self-confidence evident in the late 1940's (prior to the announcement of a Soviet A-bomb) the study noted that "the appearance of a satellite would only confirm existing Soviet assumptions concerning the advanced state of long-range missile development in the United States."

3. The satellite as a device for communications: The use of the term "communication" in this context in no way related to present day concepts of a 24-hour stationary communications satellite. Rather, the study visualized communication techniques as most effective for disseminating propaganda. Its value as an attention-getter was minimized.

4. The satellite as a surveillance instrument: The study noted that a most useful avenue of approach would be one of utilizing the satellite in a capacity for weather prediction, as well as for the purpose of military surveillance.

5. The satellite as an instrument of political strategy: Hypotheses advanced about the intrinsic nature of the Soviet regime led the study to conclude that "major intelligence secrets obtained through a visible or nonvisible satellite, and then disclosed to the Soviet Government, may produce results of a magnitude eclipsing all other possible uses of the vehicle. No other weapon or technique known today offers comparable promise as an instrument for influencing Soviet political behavior."

General conclusions of this Rand study conference placed prime emphasis on the satellite as an "instrument of political strategy;" that is, the utility of a satellite probably would reside in its potential as an instrument for the achievement of political-psychological goals if the surveillance capacity of the vehicle were exploited "in a comprehensive, imaginative strategy designed to register maximum impact upon the leaders of the Soviet Union." The satellite would be developed into a surveillance instrument which could penetrate the enforced secrecy behind the iron curtain. Assuming that this approach could be achieved, two possible psychological objectives were considered under separate situations:

1. If information obtained by satellite observation were systematically conveyed or leaked to key Soviet officials, suspicion, disruption, and possible purges on high levels of the Soviet political and military structure might follow.

2. If pertinent data were made public and reinforced by dramatic indications that secrecy was no longer possible in the modern world, a major reorientation in Soviet political calculations and plans (e.g., concerning international inspection of atomic energy installations) might follow.

Rand hoped that disclosure of information acquired by a satellite would place Soviet leaders in a position where they would not be able to escape necessity of revising the basic Marxist-Leninist assumptions and principles (inevitable warfare joined by the U.S.S.R.) which guided their behavior. The possible reaction in the Soviet heierarchy, in terms of this study, rested upon the recognition of the Politburo's particular vulnerability to "hard facts," and the premium placed upon "realistic adjustments." "If used as an instrument of political power, the satellite can be translated into a hard fact to which realistic adjustment becomes necesssary."

Several suggestions were advanced for refining the use of the satellite to achieve the several political-psychological objectives. The suggestions ranged from painting it black (thereby making it invisible), to what appropriate message might be relayed to ground receivers.[40] Debate was even given to the legal complications which might arise from its orbital path over nations considered unfriendly to America.[41]

At the termination of the study conference specific recommendations were made to the parent Rand Corp.:

1. The conference urged the Rand Corp. to stress to the Air Force the possible opportunity afforded by the surveillance potential of a satellite vehicle.

2. Rand was advised to explore in more complete and more systematic detail the assumptions and possibilities advanced for the political-psychological utilization of the vehicle.

3. On the basis of its deliberations the conference further recommended that the United States, at the highest policy level, be informed of the unique political/psychological opportunities provided by this nonviolent instrumentality.

The Rand Corp., which organized the study conference primarily as an exploratory method for the study of the psychological effects of unconventional military devices, took these conclusions and recommendations under consideration. Implementation of a satellite program based upon conference recommendations was never undertaken. However, emphasis remained attached to a passive surveillance application when Rand began serious component studies and designs for an earth satellite in the following year (1950), after authority to develop long-range booster rockets was initially made in favor of the Air Force by the Department of Defense. These later satellite studies, 1950–56, are another story.

In retrospect

The group of consultants who conducted the 1949 AF/RAND satellite study has been seeking solutions of existing problems in an effort to deter the possibility of armed conflict with the Soviet Union. The study was concerned solely with research in the realm of plausible socio/political reaction to given physical phenomena. The solution was designed to take advantage of certain conditions within a given historical moment. When viewed in terms of current Soviet space accomplishments and the recent revision of Marxist-Leninist principles outlined at the 21st and 22d Party Congresses, one is in-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

clined to dismiss the conclusions as far-fetched. Foregoing 20–20 hindsight and accepting the conditions in existence shortly after the Second World War (Soviet pre-atomic/Stalinist era), the credibility of a number of these early propositions assume a greater significance, especially since several of the psychological propositions were of a "timeless" or universal nature. Had the suggested course of action been implemented, it might well have succeeded. This becomes apparent when one gives thought to the impact that Sputniks I and II had upon the ruling hierarchy in the United States in 1957. The initial Soviet satellite successes more than fulfilled the overall political/psychological expectations of the 1949 RAND study conference—in reverse. It precipitated Congressional investigations into U.S. missile and satellite programs. Defense Department reorganizations were recommended. Bitter accusations on the "missile gap" were traded among top military and Administration personalities, followed by a number of resignations of key personnel in the military services. Subsequently the Administration with the Congress created NASA and established new control agencies to "coordinate" national space activities.

With the first Soviet satellite in orbit in 1957, West Berlin's Tagesspiegel lamented that the propaganda impact of the event—the evidence it conveyed of Russian superiority in a field of incalculable importance—would be most serious in underdeveloped nations "whose narrow tie to the West has been maintained only by their belief that it represented the peak in technical civilization." In England, Mr. Ritchie Calder, a leading British science writer for the New Statesman and Nation wrote: "This (sputnik) is a technological achievement which must shatter forever any illusions about Western engineering superiority." And in the United States Bernard Baruch expressed these views in the New York Herald Tribune: "America is worried. It should be. We have been set back severely, not only in matters of defense and security, but in the contest for the support and confidence of the peoples throughout the world."

The first satellites, as Rand predicted, did become instruments of political strategy, but not for the United States. The early Rand predictions of probable political/psychological reactions to the first satellites was, of itself, not an exceptional accomplishment. The true originality and strategic importance of this device, recognized in 1946 by Project Rand and the Navy CEFSR, was never completely understood by the American Government until the month of October 1957. Even the 1949 Rand study conference ignored the possibility that the U.S.S.R. might orbit a satellite before the United States. This conviction ran in confluence with a general tendency to disregard Soviet technical accomplishments. As General Medaris (former head of the U.S. Army Ballistic Missile Agency (ABMA) at Redstone Arsenal), dryly commented:

"During all this time, the Russians were known to be working on rocket development, but it was fashionable to think of them as retarded folk who depended mainly on a few captured German scientists for their achievements, if any. And since the cream of the German planners had surrendered to the Americans, so the argument ran, there was nothing to worry about." [48]

In 1949, there was, and would continue to remain for a number of years, a genuine failure to realize the tremendous strategic advantage it would give the Russians to be first into space.

---

[1] Winning essay of the Robert H. Goddard historical essay competition for 1962, sponsored by the National Rocket Club, Washington, D.C. The essay was submitted in October 1962 under the title "World-Circling Spaceships: Satellite Studies in the United States During the 1940's," and was based upon material from a projected book, "Astronautics and the War for Space," by the author and W. H. Ramsell.

[2] Historian and operations research analyst at Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Sunnyvale, Calif. Mr. Hall is the author of numerous monographs on Air Force satellite programs, was an exchange student in 1957, at the Brazilian School of Public Administration in Rio de Janeiro, and is presently continuing graduate work in political science at San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.

[3] In January 1920 the New York Times had castigated Goddard for the proposals he outlined in his Smithsonian paper, "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes."

[4] U.S. Congress, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Inquiry Into Satellite and Missile Programs," 85th Cong., 1st sess. and 2d sess., pt. I, November 1957–January 1958, p. 823.

(NOTE.—It is to Dr. Bush's credit that he adjusted to the inevitable evolution of astronautics and, in November 1957, a month after sputnik was launched, testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Service: "I am quite frank to say that when this (ICBM satellite) work began soon after the war, I was exceedingly skeptical whether that tough problem could be solved." Dr. Bush then proceeded to make a plea for the "eccentric," saying, "What he wants more than anything else is the respect of his peers, the respect of his fellow scientists * * * he wants to feel that he is working in an area where the public * * * the businessman, the men he meets casually, think of him as a fellow worker for the good of the country, and not as a highbrow or egghead that is off somewhere on a pedestal and not to be approached.") Ibid., p. 65.

[5] Prior to 1947 the Department of Defense (and a separate Air Force) had not been established.

[6] U.S. Congress, "A Chronology of Missile and Astronautic Events," report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, p. 9.

[7] Subsequent Navy satellite documentation cited in this paper is noted in Dr. Hall's memorandum, "Early History and Background on Earth Satellites," ONR: 405: HH: dr, Nov. 29, 1957.

[8] BuAer Memo Aer-E-203-KWM, of Oct. 3, 1945.

[9] The availability of this hydrogen liquefier was later to fill an important requirement in the AEC's hydrogen bomb development program, after the Navy Bureau of Aeronautic's hydrogen rocket program had been terminated.

[10] California Institute of Technology Contract and Report NOa (S) 7913 of Dec. 10, 1945.

[11] BuAer Memo Aer-E-31T-HH, CX-281360, Nov. 27, 1945.

[12] BuAer letter to commanding general, Army Air Forces, Aer-EL-1-HH, F 41(1), ser. CO2262, Mar. 15., 1946. (With enclosed memo of committee of Mar. 7., copy to Maj. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Maj. Gen. E. M. Powers, CNO, ORI.) Members attending the conference of Mar. 7 were: Maj. Gen. H. J. Knerr, AAF; Maj. Gen. H. M. McClelland, AAF; Brig. Gen. W. L. Richardson, AAF; Capt. W. P. Cogswell, U.S. Navy; Comdr. H. Hall, U.S. Naval Reserve.

[13] Project Rand was established in late 1945, and initially operated as a semiautonomous branch of the Douglas Aircraft Corp., responsible directly to the vice president, engineering. Qualified physicists, engineers, and mathematical analysts were drawn from Douglas and other aircraft firms, and assembled at Santa Monica in separate quarters. The originl concept was that several companies would get together and set up an advisory type function which, in turn, would allow Rand to advise the various services on what they should procure so that the services would not request the "impossible" from industry in the area of aircraft armaments. In November 1948, the Rand Corp. was created and became a completely autonomous nonprofit research institution.

[14] The chief responsibility of the JRDB was the preparation of an integrated program of research and development, in the light of which individual projects of the Army, Navy, and Air Force could be evaluated. The Board decided who developed what weapons. It made sure that there was no unnecessary duplication in the activities of the services, although it could permit competition which promised to produce a better result. By the late 1940's the principle of preventing duplication of effort had been seriously erroded.

[15] Hall memorandum, "Early History and Background on Earth Satellites," op. cit., p. 4.

[16] "Structural Design Study, High Altitude Test Vehicle," contract NOa(s)-8349, North American Aviation, Inc.; Rept. No. NA 46-758, Sept. 26, 1946, p. 1-1.

[17] Ibid., p. 3-1.

[18] Ultimately the United States approximated just what the CEFSR had proposed when Project Score guided an entire Atlas ICBM into orbit in late 1958. The "single-stage plus" Atlas ICBM is a pressure-stabilized structure and in itself an extremely lightweight vehicle. Moreover, the Air Force Atlas employs conventional propellants (kerosene and liquid oxygen) which do not approach the higher specific impulse delivered by liquid hydrogen-oxygen, in many ways making that vehicle a more difficult engineering achievement than the original Navy Bureau of Aeronautics single-stage rocket proposal.

[19] From Project Rand engineering report "Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship," Santa Monica, May 1946. Subsequent quotes in this section are from the same report unless otherwise noted.

[20] An eastward firing from a 30° to 40° latitude yields a velocity increment of 1,000 to 1,300 feet per second as a performance margin due to the earth's peripheral velocity. This is equivalent to several hundred pounds of additional payload capacity. This approach is currently being employed in the NASA Project Mercury launches.

[21] U.S. Congress, "Inquiry into Satellite and Missile Programs," pt. 3, hearings before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 85th Cong., 1st sess. and 2d sess., Feb. 26, Apr. 3, and July 24, 1958, p. 2428.

[22] This point was brought home to a startled American public in 1960 when a CIA U-2 weather observation aircraft fell to earth near Sverdlosk in Central Russia, victim of a Soviet antiaircraft rocket. Although details are not available, and even pilot Powers appears uncertain, it is believed that it was indeed the close proximity explosion of a surface-to-air rocket which brought the plane down.

[23] Gen. James Gavin (U.S. Army, retired), "War and Peace in the Space Age" (New York: Harper Bros., 1958), p. 11.

[24] Eugene M. Emme, "Aeronautics and Astronautics," 1915–1960 (Washington, D.C., 1961), pp. 51–52.

[25] A weight reduction of some 147,669 pounds over previous 1946 Rand estimates for a conventional fueled four-stage rocket.

[26] The JRDB was reorganized as the Research and Development Board (RDB) under the Department of Defense. Dr. Van-

nevar Bush was named as first chairman (see p. 2).

[27] The U.S. Air Force finally received such authority from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Mar. 15, 1950.

[28] Willy Ley, "Rockets, Missiles, and Space Travel," rev. ed. (New York: Viking Press, 1957), pp. 106–107.

[29] U.S. Congress, "Soviet Space Programs: Organization, Plans, Goals, and International Implications," staff report, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, May 31, 1962, p. 56.

[30] U.S. Congress, "A Chronology of Missile and Astronautic Events," op. cit., p. 11.

[31] At that time the Army evidently had not gathered sufficient data to make a presentation.

[32] Dr. Hall memorandum, op. cit., p. 5.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Eugene M. Emme, op. cit., p. 60. (However, in late 1948, Army Ordnance formally accepted a technical evaluation group dictum not to pursue a task on the earth satellite program.)

[35] First Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1948, p. 129.

[36] U.S. Congress, "Soviet Space Programs, Organization, Plans, Goals, and International Implications," op. cit., p. 57. Soviet comment on the possible American application of satellites for surveillance purposes appeared again in January 1952, when Red Star "attacked Secretary of Defense Forrestal and Dr. Wernher von Braun for having written about the possible military use of satellite vehicles to 'peep into other countries as through a keyhole.'" Ibid.

[37] The immediate predecessor of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

[38] Dr. Hall memorandum, op. cit., p. 5. There is an ironic historical wrinkle to this commentary. The advanced structures engineering and propulsion system specifications contained in the U.S. Navy BuAer sounding rocket proposal were several years ahead of equivalent Soviet rocket designs when the project was allowed to die for want of support. At that time the Soviet Union was just beginning high altitude research with large conventional fueled sounding rockets which culminated in parachute recovery of ejected capsules and animals a short time later; one of the first early steps toward the Russian achievement of an earth satellite vehicle.

[39] Quoted material contained in this section was extracted from Rand Research Memorandum RM-120 (unclassified), unless otherwise noted.

[40] At a much later date Dr. L. N. Ridenour, a member of this study group, remarked that during a meeting on this topic a young engineer ventured the thought that the message should be "God bless you," whereupon another member immediately countered with "no, it should be, 'This is God, Bless you.'"

[41] This was resolved by noting that a satellite which remains in a north-south orbit cannot be accountable for the earth's rotation beneath it which carries every country sweeping by.

[42] Maj. Gen. J. B. Medaris (U.S. Army, retired). "Countdown For Decision" (New York: Paperback Library Inc., 1960), p. 45.

Pine Trees Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, pine tree farming in the Southeast is now our most profitable single crop. Pine trees have a fantastic future in the South. The following is from "Today in the Southeastern States" in the October issue of Farm Journal:

PLASTICS FROM PINES

Wood is fighting its synthetic competitors by joining 'em. USDA researchers in Florida have developed a tough polyester resin plastic from pine gum. It's stronger and longer lasting than similar plastics derived from petroleum. The new plastic could grab some of the market which now runs to 200 million pounds a year.

And a Little Child Shall Lead Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court's decision on prayers in public schools we have seen much anguish and much confusion develop over this issue. The answer is clear and simple: religion should be taught in the church, the home, and the parochial school. To require the State to assume this burden—even on a so-called permissive or voluntary basis—is a step toward making our Government a religious state.

The following article from Liberty magazine of July-August 1963, makes this point succinctly and clearly:

SHOULD RELIGION BE TAUGHT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

(By Alger H. Johns)

I was sitting in the back of the city transit bus when it took on a load of teenagers. Obvious to the few adults in the bus, they continued a discussion evidently begun in their classroom. I mentally checked off the usual after-school topics—dating formulas, hot rods, the big game and the prom, Mrs. Beazley's English lit. No, this one was not the usual. Their subject: Should religion be taught in public schools?

During the next 10 minutes the question took several forms: Should students be required to repeat a prayer written by the State? Should schools hold morning devotions? Which version of the Bible, if any, ought to be read? What about students who object to participation in religious exercises?

Courts debate such issues for months. And when they decide them, they need an interpreter to translate what they said. It took these teenagers only 10 or 12 bus stops to come up with a conclusion that got a majority vote. A serious-faced youth wearing a letterman jacket used a minimum of words to express it:

"Morality and integrity should certainly be taught, but public schools shouldn't get involved in teaching religion. Whose religion would they teach, anyway? Our parents and our churches are the ones that ought to instruct us in religious matters."

As a director of the International Religious Liberty Association I had for years been involved in religious liberty issues. Religious practices in public schools had figured in a few of these—the McCollum case had seen the Supreme Court rule against released-time religious education carried on in public school buildings; in the Zorach decision the Court had ruled religious education constitutional when carried on off the campus.

Then in the *Regent's Prayer* decision the Supreme Court had decided that it was not part of the State's legitimate function to write and direct the saying of a prayer in New York's schools.

A right decision, too, but what an uproar had followed—with most roaring being done by those who had not read, nor understood, the Court's decision. Senators and Representatives who ought to know better had introduced some half a hundred religious amendments to the Constitution—"to legalize the saying of prayer in the public schools," they said. (The Court had not said prayer was taboo in public schools; it had ruled that a state-written and directed prayer was unconstitutional.)

Not that the issues were all black or all white, I reminded myself, with an ear cocked toward the youth so freely arguing their convictions. I wondered what they would do with some of the questions I had faced during the past few years:

1. Do religious practices in public schools violate the American principle of separation of church and state? (The question looks deceptively simple.)

2. Where the Bible is read, should it be presented as the word of God or simply as literature?

3. What should be taught children whose parents do not believe in the Bible? Can parents properly object to having their children taught religion by a teacher they have no hand in choosing?

4. What interpretation should be placed on the Sabbath commandment where Sunday laws are in the news? Should teachers point out that the fourth commandment concerns the seventh day, not the first? (What questions this observation might elicit.)

5. Should the teachings of various sects be opened to examination and criticism?

6. Can differing religious beliefs be presented fairly? Objectively? Or is an objective presentation in itself an interpretation, implying as it does that all beliefs or teachings are of equal merit?

7. What of students who object to participating in religious exercises? Can their convictions be respected without their being subjected to social ostracism?

8. Would not the school inevitably get into conflict with the church and the home—some church, some home—by intruding into the sacred area of religious conviction? Is religion, after all, only a parade of facts, or is it a heart experience?

9. Where public schools emphasize such qualities as kindness, cooperation, honesty, dependability, loyalty, which are important to making good citizens, what can the state gain by insisting on religious exercises? (Do not parochial schools exist to teach youth who want religious philosophy to permeate their training?)

If these youth only knew the half of it, I thought, listening again to their energetic dogmatism. Just how would that young miss arguing for the teaching of religious morality implement her program? Take the question of gambling, for example. Which of the churches would she have decide whether gambling is in harmony with religious morality? Some church organizations believe that gambling is all right—and even raise money for religious purposes by church-sponsored bingo games, often to the consternation of law enforcement officials who have antigambling laws on their books. Other churches maintain that gambling is morally wrong, and will tend to corrupt good government, not to mention its more direct effect on family relationships and finances. Someone would have to decide which church-brand of morality our youth ought to have—hardly an enviable task.

The American brand of democracy is unique in that it is founded on the right of religious division, of individual conviction. Its citizens are permitted to follow their conscience in spiritual concerns. No

state-supported religion feeds itself on the funds of those who deny its precepts. A citizen can start his own church and freely preach its creed.

And American youth can, without fear, argue their convictions while riding a public bus. I was glad to hear them do so. Many youth are caught up in much less momentous questions. These had tackled a question that could ultimately touch the philosophy of our very form of government and the freedom of each of us.

I looked at them again: bobby-socked and levied, bouffanted and flat-topped, pimpled and pimpleless. Our youth, wealth of our Nation. We dare not ignore their morality, their training, religious and secular. For when a nation's youth grow corrupt, that nation falls.

But are corrupt morals the consequence of school curriculums that exclude recitation of a prayer, the singing of a hymn? Or are they instead the consequence of homes, of churches, that have failed their responsibility? And where these have failed, can lip-service to the form of worship suffice?

I looked appreciatively at the serious-faced youth in the letterman jacket. "Our parents and our churches are the ones who ought to instruct us in religious matters," he had said. How right he was.

And when they don't?

The bus stopped and he got up. He had the answer before he reached the door.

"When they don't, they shouldn't expect the schools to make up for their neglect."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Prize-Winning Essay by Young Student Tells of Good Life in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a young junior high school student from Bluefield, W. Va., Barbara Evans, recently won a prize of $500 for her essay on West Virginia and the American way of life. The prize was sponsored by two business concerns in West Virginia which are interested in promoting an understanding of the American free enterprise system among students.

Miss Evans' comments on life in the Mountain State show a remarkable depth of understanding for so young a student.

I ask unanimous consent that her essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA AND THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Barbara Evans)

What does the future hold for West Virginia? Hope? Growth? Prosperity?

Basically in my humble judgment, West Virginia has no problem that more industry won't cure. We have good natural resources in abundance, beautiful scenery, excellent educational facilities, river and rail transportation, industrial facilities, fair roads, a good labor supply, and proximity to the Nation's marketplace. No opportunity should be lost by our Governor and legislature to create a political climate favorable to the attraction of more industries to the State.

We are fortunate in having our present industries which are a great help in reducing the migration of our people to more industralized States. New industries, besides reversing the present migration of our people, would also tend to create better educational and highway facilities. With good roads through the State from north to south, people from other States would become acquainted with the advantages of living and plant location in West Virginia.

WRONG PROJECTION

West Virginia's future is bright as the best of States in which to live and do business if we evidence a desire for such a State.

The world's finest people live in our diversified areas, affluent industrial valleys, verdant eastern counties, and central farming sections.

We project a State concept of poverty and let the world believe our slums are representative of the whole State and that labor bosses control our State and local governments.

Through resurgence of interest in our State, election of representatives of proven character and ability and shucking our symbols of poverty, West Virginia will progress and prosper.

Instead of apologizing for our State we should be boasting of its virtues; scenic beauty, abundant natural resources, beautiful State parks, excellent colleges and universities.

DEPRESSION IS NOT OUR SYMBOL

Parts of our State have been labeled "depressed areas" due to automation caused unemployment, and the news media have used West Virginia as a symbol to show what is happening, also, in other industrialized States. Poverty is no disgrace, not to try to improve our situation is. I think West Virginians are trying. Some indications of aroused civic responsibility are: retraining programs for jobs; community improvement projects; cleaning-up campaigns; growing concern for mental health; recently enacted strip-mining law; increase in teachers' salaries and purchase of new school equipment.

One of the best indications of West Virginia's growth is the orderly way integration was accomplished in the State.

Three things need to be done which are not easy to do but which can be done:

1. Sell the idea to those who need employment that they can learn new skills.

2. Provide the means for learning those skills.

3. Attract industry which will find it profitable to utilize the vast material and personnel resources of the State of West Virginia.

In recent years, the economic and social make-up of West Virginia has been undergoing a marked change. The trend toward urbanization has increased sharply with the population masses shifting from the rural areas into the industrialized valleys along the Ohio, Kanawha and Monongahela Rivers. As industrial development is accelerated, I believe this trend will continue proportionately.

A major statewide effort has been launched to broaden the economic base of the State through development of new types of industries. Employment in the coal mines, the traditional mainstay of the economy gave way to automation and new industries were needed to provide jobs for thousands of miners.

The present state of industrialization in our State provides a good base from which to launch a program for industrial growth. The State has within its borders or close at hand a ready supply of natural raw materials and primary manufactured products which are capable of being upgraded into products of higher value.

FROM BASIC INDUSTRIES

I believe the following four industries will be West Virginia's future essential industries based upon my knowledge of present industrial growth and expansion.

1. Chemicals: Where low-cost raw materials, fuel, power, water, reasonable taxes, and efficient labor are required, West Virginia is believed to be one of the first States considered by chemical companies seeking a new plant location.

2. Wood and wood products: Abundant forests have made West Virginia traditionally a wood-producing State. Most of the lumber produced in the State is now being exported to other States for final processing and manufacture.

These facts emphasize that the principal opportunity for increasing employment and income in the State's woodworking industry is in the field of upgrading present lumber production.

3. Apparel: Manufacturing concerns requiring a combination of market accessibility, adequate and reasonable priced transportation, moderate labor costs, and large quantities of adaptable female labor will find a West Virginia location suited for their requirements.

4. Metal working (including electronics): The excellent sources of steel in the northern Panhandle and the new aluminum rolling mill at Ravenswood have provided new opportunities for fabricators to be located profitably near both the source of supply and the best U.S. markets.

EDUCATION, LEADERSHIP

West Virginia is expanding its industrial base. Industrialists interested in locations for either new or expanding factories find that West Virginia's government wants and welcomes industries for the State.

I am convinced that the economic growth of West Virginia depends upon intensified efforts in three fields: Education research and leadership.

We are in the midst of the greatest scientific development in the history of the world. The future belongs to those who prepare for it. The key to the future of West Virginia lies in education. The greatest asset in West Virginia is the minds of its young people. We have the opportunity to support this need. Education is one of those wonderful things which is purchasable at a profit to the buyer, which enriches the State which provides it, which returns infinitely more, even in dollars, than it has given, and costs only those who will not invest. The best investment any State can make is in education.

The lack of leadership has put West Virginia in its present economic condition and only unselfish dynamic leadership can decide which is the best for West Virginia and not what is beneficial to a small segment of people or a given locality.

Basic, perhaps to all we might envision, is the building of an educational system equal to the best. We see such a system taking form within the next decade or so. The signs of our times are encouraging.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

We envision new developments in relation to present basic industries in a changing economy. But we must put first things first and on them write in a total State effort. We must necessarily choose good leadership if we are to build for ourselves a new design and new image as a people. The dramatization of our role in hillbilly fashion won't do in this new image.

It has always been my belief that opportunity is ever with us, that all that is required is the proper combination of imagination, perseverance, commonsense, deep faith and service to our fellow men. In this way, tradition and opportunity become one.

It is my belief that, orienting ourselves in terms of time and events, we are but at the beginning of mighty changes in our ways of working and living which will make it possible for us as a people to scale undreamed of heights. We find no reason today to change our outlook for progress provided we, as West Virginians, stay alert to the opportunities and challenges which will con-

tinue to face the State, her industries, and her people. It is a growth that can be achieved and maintained, most of all, by working together as partners toward improving the economic educational and cultural climates.

NEW INDUSTRIES ARE KEY

Yes, our future is contingent upon progress in obtaining new industries, in scientific research, continued expansion of the chemical, wood, coal and glass industries and farming, increased tourism and perhaps most important of all enlightenment and highly improved education. All this can and will be done.

Then, this, is West Virginia's "industrial doorway to tomorrow."

Farm Labor Facts—Part XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to many of my urban colleagues, the Mexican national work program is a doctrinaire, theoretical consideration and their information is nebulous at best. In the Fourth Congressional District of California this is a very real issue, not only historically but during the current year. Farmers in my district are making every effort at domestic recruitment this year, anticipating the possibility that the current Congress will fail to act. They are also making plans now for next year's crop—what they will grow, what labor they will require. The Yuba City Independent Herald, deep in the north central valley, recently analyzed our current situation as follows:

FEW DOMESTICS LOOK FOR JOBS

More than 100 braceros arrived at the Northern California Growers Association office in Yuba City this weekend, swelling the total number of Mexican nationals now at work in Sutter and Yuba County tomato fields to 2,000.

"This is the peak of the tomato harvest," said Yuba City association manager Ed Dennis. "Without the braceros it is improbable that the crop could be harvested."

Delays in picking cannot be tolerated this year, as a few early rains have already hastened the growth of mold in some fields.

"We've tried to get workers from the State employment office," Dennis said, "but we've met with little if any success. Workers are available only in small numbers—and those are not always reliable.

"We tried running a bus to Sacramento and got only a few workers. One of these was sober when he got on the bus, but by the time it arrived here he was anything but that. When the bus stopped he leaped off, shouted 'I'm going to work at the J. L. Sullivan ranch,' and shambled off down the road. That was the last we saw of him."

The bus to Sacramento had to be discontinued.

"It was too costly for the few workers it brought in," Dennis said.

One area grower, he said, attempted bringing in domestic laborers from Texas during a previous harvest and this bus ride, too, ended in failure.

"They just drifted off in two's and three's not long after they got here," Dennis said. "Some of them worked only a few days in the fields."

Dennis thinks long hauls from other States will not provide the answer if the bracero program is killed by Congress this year.

"Long hauls are expensive in transportation and food costs. Also, soon after they get here, many of these workers melt away into the local population. Growers get little work from them in relation to the money they spend bringing them here. Further, these indigents often end up causing a welfare problem where they settle."

Thus Dennis, at least, sees no solution for members of the association if the bracero bill ends. The braceros themselves say nothing, apparently wanting to stay out of controversy which, according to Dennis, might edge them out of jobs that currently bring them up to $25 income per day—many times what they could earn in their native Mexico.

So for this year, what remains of it, braceros continue to stream into the area, earning what will perhaps be their income from this country.

And the tomato growers, what will they do? Dennis says they might cease growing tomatoes. Then, when the price of tomatoes rises to a point where it will be profitable to gamble on machine harvesting, they might once more plant the crop.

"I can't see what legitimate objections there can be to the bracero program," he said. "It's probably the best form of foreign aid that we have, and one of the few instances where the American people get a direct return—lower consumer prices—as a benefit.

"What it does is alleviate unemployment in Mexico and provide income where it is most needed—among the low income classes. It does not affect employment in our country, for we cannot contract braceros until we've exhausted our domestic labor pool. Here in Sutter and Yuba Counties that supply was quickly exhausted, and reaching into urban areas such as Sacramento did little to help.

"In the end we still had to put through a call for braceros or see tomatoes rot in the field for lack of a means to pick them."

Program at Constitution Hall Commemorating Anniversary of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Richard L. Coe in his column in this morning's Washington Post discussed the program that will be presented in Constitution Hall on October 21 commemorating the anniversary of the United Nations. It will be presented entirely by artists who have appeared before foreign audiences under the auspices of the State Department's international cultural exchange program. This is a very versatile and talented group of artists and I hope that Mr. Coe's article will stimulate additional interest in the program.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TASTE OF OUR OVERSEA FARE

(By Richard L. Coe)

On October 21—a week from next Monday—Congress will have a firsthand opportunity to judge for itself the State Department's international cultural exchange program.

This inspection trip will take legislators no further than Constitution Hall, where the third annual concert commemorating the anniversary of the United Nations will be presented entirely by artists whose global tours these past few years have brought honor to their country.

This will be a richly varied group, as it should be, considering the enormous demands of State's modestly budget program, still working at the same annual sum set when President Eisenhower created it a decade ago.

With Jean Morel conducting, the Juilliard Orchestra will begin the evening with Samuel Barber's overture to "The School for Scandal." Eleanor Steber and Richard Tucker will sing arias and join forces for the act I duet of Puccini's "Tosca." The choral finale of the Beethoven Ninth will feature Dean Warner Lawson's Howard University Choir, with Juilliard's Gwendolyn Walters, James Wainner, Marilyn Zschau and Alan Wentt as the solo quartet.

Martha Graham and her company will open the second half in "Diversion of Angels" to music by Norman Dello Joio. This will be Miss Graham's first Washington appearance since that recent week when London audiences packed a theater to cheer her while a Brooklyn Congresswoman was expressing dismay over Miss Graham as a cultural diplomat.

Hal Holbrook, whose "Mark Twain Tonight" appearances in non-English speaking countries caused no lingual dismay whatever to his audiences, will be saying goodby for a time to his well-loved re-creation of Twain. Immediately after this appearance Holbrook will join the new Repetory Theater of Lincoln Center where, among other roles, he will play the title one in the revival of O'Neill's "Marco Millions."

Constitution Hall's finale will go to Louis Armstrong and his concert group, another State Department aggregation which caused gasps of consternation when chosen and cheers of adulation from east of Berlin to east of Suez.

President and Mrs. Kennedy head the list of patrons and hosts for the evening will be the Secretary of State and Mrs. Rusk and the national chairman of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations and Mrs. Robert S. Benjamin.

Tickets, from $3.50 to $15 are on sale at the Hayes Concert Bureau, 1108 G Street NW., aiding the U.S. Committee for the U.N.

I write this intelligence, by the way, with no strings. Contrary to published reports, I am not a member of any of the State Department's advisory panels on this program. It's just as well. I've been a member for years of the National Press Club and look what that did for the Capitol Theater.

A Negro on Dynamite Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article by Paul Hope:

A NEGRO ON DYNAMITE HILL

(By Paul Hope)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., September 23.—Four Negroes sat around a living room on Dynamite Hill and talked about what it's like to be a Negro in Birmingham.

Here's some of what they said:

You're "boy" and "uncle" from your first white man to your last.

You say "Yes, sir" to white people if you want anything.

You can be a teacher and be denied the right to vote while a white man with a third-grade education can register.

You go to segregated schools, many of them in rundown condition.

You ride segregated taxis. You drink at segregated fountains and go to segregated restrooms at city hall.

If you're hurt, you wait for a Negro ambulance, even though a white one might be closer.

You can run the elevator and make the beds in the hotel, but you can't eat in the dining room.

You can almost be sure that if you're convicted of some offense you will get the maximum sentence. You fear police instead of looking upon them as protectors.

You go to bed at night and wonder where the next bomb is going off.

As the four talked, Negro vigilantes patrolled the streets outside to protect their neighborhood from bombers.

"We are subjected to every type of discrimination to make us feel inferior," said A. B. White, a college graduate. "It's drilled into us every day."

They said the Negro of Birmingham gets the short end in recreation, jobs, voting, eating, schools, housing, in the courts, in every walk of life.

Mr. White said he was refused a driver's license until he would say "Yes, sir" to the man who was issuing them.

"If we want to take the family out to eat we can go only to the Gaston Motel (a Negro motel), the bus station or the airport," said L. S. Gaillard, a college graduate who runs a contracting business and lives in an expensive home. The bus station and the airport were desegregated under Federal court orders.

Mr. Gaillard said that when he came back from the University of Michigan several years ago, he took his last ride on a Birmingham transit bus because the driver called him a "rich nigger" when he put a dollar in the tray and asked for change.

Negroes are supposed to have the right change, he said.

"I went downtown to buy a belt the other day," said R. F. Coar, an employee of a newspaper. "Just the owner of the store was there and he surprised me by talking friendly at first about racial problems. Then one of his employees, just a kid, came in and he stopped talking right away and got hostile. He thought the employee would report him to somebody, I guess."

TURNS BACK SHIRTS

Mr. White said a friend of his went into a store and selected some shirts. When the salesman said "Anything else, boy" the friend replied, "I didn't know those were boys' shirts. I just picked out; I don't believe I want them now."

"Not long ago we wouldn't have done something like that," said Mr. White. "We would have taken it and said nothing."

It hasn't been long since a Negro couldn't try anything on in a clothing store to see if it fit. Fitting rooms were desegregated after last spring's Negro freedom demonstrations.

The Negro boy can't aspire to be a policeman or a fireman like white boys, said Mr. Gaillard. "There are no Negro policemen or firemen here for our boys to sit around and talk to. The Negro youth has little to shoot at, he's born that way, with little hope."

GOLF IS PROBLEM, TOO

Mr. Gaillard likes to play golf but he said the only place he had to play until a couple months ago was the "rockpile," the Negroes' name for what has been their segregated course for many years. Recently the new city council opened on a desegrated basis the municipal golf course the previous regime closed rather than integrate.

Now Mr. Gaillard goes to the Highland Park Course. "But the locker room is still closed," he said. "Any place where there might be some togetherness is closed."

The swimming pools are closed, too, he noted. "If you're lucky enough to live near someone with a private pool, you can swim once in a while. The others have to use the bathtub, if they have one, or go to the creek."

Mr. Gaillard said that only since the 1954 Supreme Court decision have Birmingham officials made much effort to improve Negro schools and then only to try to prevent integration.

"Almost any Negro who finishes school here and goes to a reputable college has to take remedial math and very often remedial English. The Negro definitely is penalized in what he gets out of school here," he said.

"Our houses and churches get bombed and when we run out in the streets to see what's happened to our people, the police come and start pushing us back," said James Lay, who laid out the plans for the vigilante patrol.

KEEP PUSHING BACK

"They say we are rioting. Who do they think we're going to riot against out here in our own neighborhood? The Negroes aren't going to fight with each other.

"They shoot over our heads. They keep pushing us back, pushing us back. They stir us up and when someone throws a rock, some Negro gets killed 'accidentally' by a police bullet."

At a church yesterday, where Negroes were burying the last victim of the previous Sunday's holocaust, a matronly Negro walked up to a reporter and said:

"I just want to tell you, I called the police the other night and asked them to send an ambulance for a woman who was having a baby. They said, 'We're not going to take you niggers to any hospital to have a baby. Why don't you call Martin Luther King'?"

The American Dollar: Will It Be Torn Asunder?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Iron Age entitled, "The American Dollar: Will It Be Torn Asunder?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DOLLAR: WILL IT BE TORN ASUNDER?

A big-dome, long-hair piece is hard to write. Hard to write so one can understand it, that is. But it has to be done. This one is as serious as all get out.

For many years we have been collecting opinion about the strength of the American dollar—abroad. In the past year or so, friends and acquaintances—in private—have taken down their hair. What they have to say should shake you.

Here in this country the ace disturber of the placidity of the economic mind has been Eliot Janeway, national—and maverick—economist. He has been warning about the future of the dollar for at least 2 years.

In case you feel this is no skin off your bankroll, you are dead wrong. It will reach down into your home, your plant and your guilt complex. But even so, after you have read this alarmist piece (your opinion), you will probably go back to routine things such as politics, taxes, fringe, country club dues and your chances of getting over bursitis.

Now the plain unadulterated fact is that the dollar is in trouble. We have about $15.5 billion in gold. We back our currency to the tune of $12 billion or so. That leaves mighty little to play with—against the $25 billion we owe outside our borders.

Even if we remove the need to back the currency and boost our free gold to $15.5 billion, we are losing a lot each year and we are not doing much—if anything—about the negative (minus) balance of payments.

Even if you are not a hotshot bookmaker or an economist, you must know that the fabric of our dollar is weakening. Political pap from Washington is just that and nothing more. No nation which spends as we do, owes as we do, cuts taxes as we may do, and generally says ho-hum to dangers, can't be taken too seriously abroad.

So, if come 1967 or 1968 the dollar is torn asunder, don't be surprised. Inflation has started. But that is price inflation. Currency inflation may come next. And if it does, don't be standing there holding the American eagle printed on paper that may be worthless. Get something for it before then.

Or at least wire, badger, plead or threaten your Congressmen and Senators to do something to protect our future—while there is time.

TOM CAMPBELL.

National Columnists To Be Broadcast Nationally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a number of prominent Washington columnists will be aired nationally through the facilities of the Corinthian Broadcasting Corp., a recent statement by Mr. C. Wrede Petersmeyer reveals.

In addition to being heard on stations managed by this nationally recognized civic leader, whom I have gotten to know well this past year because of his work as chairman of the Program Development Project of the National Republican Citizens Committee, these programs will also be carried on independent stations in major cities like WOR-TV in New York.

I think this is a healthy development, and the fact that thoughtful commentators like Mr. Roscoe Drummond can now be seen and heard on hometown radio and TV will certainly increase public understanding of the many difficult is-

sues facing our country. I am especially interested because writers like Mr. Drummond have written so constructively regarding the need for more staff for the minority on congressional committees, and this ties in closely with the work done by the House Republican Conference Committee on Minority Staffing, of which I am chairman.

I hope that many issues facing the Congress will be more fully explored through the means of the radio and television tapes made available by the Corinthian Broadcasting Corp., a subsidiary of the Whitney Communications Corp.

Below follows an article from the New York Herald Tribune of September 23, 1963:

CORINTHIAN NETWORK ENLISTS TRIB COLUMNISTS

Herald Tribune byliners are among 14 top columnists, analysts and feature writers of the Nation's press who have been enlisted by Corinthian Broadcasting Corp. in an unprecedented project aimed at bringing "a new dimension to television reporting."

The journalists will write and appear on camera in videotaped commentaries to be seen weekly as special news features on the five Corinthian stations: KHOU-TV, Houston; KOTV, Tulsa; KXTV, Sacramento; WANE-TV, Fort Wayne, and WISH-TV, Indianapolis.

Among those featured will be the New York Herald Tribune's Washington syndicated columnist Roscoe Drummond; Marguerite Higgins, Pulitzer prize winning diplomatic correspondent for the Herald Tribune; Stewart Alsop, national affairs contributing editor of the Saturday Evening Post; Red Smith, Herald Tribune sports columnist; Robert J. Donovan, author of "PT-109" and recently appointed Washington bureau chief of the Los Angeles Times, and Earl Mazo, national political correspondent for the Herald Tribune and author of "Richard Nixon: A Political and Personal Portrait."

Other Herald Tribune staff members on the panel include the Washington reporting team of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak; woman's feature editor and fashion expert Eugenia Sheppard, drama critic Walter Kerr, film critic Judith Crist, book reviewer and columnist Maurice Dolbier, art critic Emily Genauer and science editor Earl Ubell.

Other commentators will be added in the near future, Corinthian announced.

"We believe," said W. Wrede Petersmeyer, president of the TV station group, "that the outstanding people we have selected for this project will bring a new dimension to television journalism. * * *

"There is a definite place and need for responsible observing in the television medium. This new service will broaden our local news programing. These outstanding analysts and commentators will be relating today's events to clarify tomorrow's headlines."

Corinthian is a subsidiary of Whitney Communications Corp., which also owns the Herald Tribune.

Fighting Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the initiative and ingenuity of four New York housewives have resulted in a booklet which is proving to be an effective weapon against juvenile delinquency throughout the country. Mrs. Sydney M. Spector, Mrs. William J. Kelley, Mrs. Leon C. Laub, and Mrs. George J. Ames who are residents of White Plains, deserve the highest commendation for their efforts. Without preaching or condescension, they have found a way to reach young people with information about basic laws within their States and penalties for violators which has had very salutary consequences.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report by Merrill Folsom, headlined "Housewives' Book on Youth Praised," which appeared in the New York Times, September 29.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSEWIVES' BOOK ON YOUTH PRAISED: FOUR WESTCHESTER WOMEN AID FIGHT ON DELINQUENCY

(By Merrill Folsom)

WHITE PLAINS, September 28.—Four Westchester housewives who started 2 years ago with pin money and hard work to fight juvenile delinquency now find that their weapon—a booklet in plain talk for children—is an influence in every State.

Tabulations of response from adults today showed it has had considerable success in helping to curb crimes and objectionable behavior of boys and girls, both rich and poor.

The housewives, who had been baffled for years by the irresponsible actions of youths, formed the Westchester Citizens Committee of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and went to State Supreme Court Justice James D. Hopkins for advice.

He told them that "youthful offenders are generally uninformed and misinformed as to the nature of their acts and of the grave consequences that follow."

FULL OF POINTED ANECDOTES

So the four—Mrs. Sydney M. Spector, wife of a lawyer; Mrs. William J. Kelley, wife of an advertising executive; Mrs. Leon C. Laub, widow of a contractor; and Mrs. George J. Ames, wife of a Wall Street broker—drafted the booklet "You and the Law" to acquaint children with basic New York State laws and the penalties for violators. It is loaded with pointed anecdotes.

The booklet, with a supplement to help teachers, has been widely used in Scarsdale and occasionally in other schools in Westchester and other parts of the State. It has been endorsed by the American Bar Association as well as many social studies teachers.

Schools in all the 50 States have asked about the program. Revisions of the booklet to conform with local statutes have been issued in Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Connecticut, Massachusetts, West Virginia, Georgia, Ohio, Washington, D.C., and Canada.

EVALUATION IN MINNESOTA

Kiwanis International issued a revision good in any State of which several hundred thousand copies have been distributed.

From Minnesota came the first detailed evaluation of the program. The report was drafted by Gene D. Flaten, probation officer of Yellow Medicine, Lac Qui Parle, and Chippewa Counties, where tests were made and Dr. Nathan G. Mandel, research director of the Minnesota Department of Corrections.

"Teachers and students agreed that the information should be incorporated in high school social studies," they wrote of "You and the Law."

"There was agreement that the material was well within the comprehension of ninth-grade students.

"Neither teachers nor students felt that this study required too much time from regular course material."

The Westchester committee said that copies of the New York State booklet could be obtained from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency at 44 East 23d Street, New York City. The universal edition may be obtained from Kiwanis International at 101 East Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

And a Little Child Shall Lead Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court's decision on prayers in public schools we have seen much anguish and much confusion develop over this issue. The answer is clear and simple: religion should be taught in the church, the home, and the parochial school. To require the State to assume this burden—even on a so-called permissive or voluntary basis—is a step toward making our Government a religious state. Not religious in the sense that all of its people believe in a deity, but a religious state in the connotation that a State adheres to, supports and requires its people to belong to, a single religion and that, the one ordered by the State and to which all of its citizens must belong, as a matter of law and not of conscience.

The following article from Liberty magazine of July-August 1963, makes this point succinctly and clearly:

SHOULD RELIGION BE TAUGHT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

(By Alger H. Johns)

I was sitting in the back of the city transit bus when it took on a load of teenagers. Oblivious to the few adults in the bus, they continued a discussion evidently begun in their classroom. I mentally checked off the usual after-school topics—dating formulas, hot rods, the big game and the prom, Mrs. Beazley's English lit. No, this one was not the usual. Their subject: Should religion be taught in public schools?

During the next 10 minutes the question took several forms: Should students be required to repeat a prayer written by the State? Should schools hold morning devotions? Which version of the Bible, if any, ought to be read? What about students who object to participation in religious exercises?

Courts debate such issues for months. And when they decide them, they need an interpreter to translate what they said. It took these teenagers only 10 or 12 bus stops to come up with a conclusion that got a majority vote. A serious-faced youth wearing a letterman jacket used a minimum of words to express it:

"Morality and integrity should certainly be taught, but public schools shouldn't get involved in teaching religion. Whose religion would they teach, anyway? Our parents and our churches are the ones that ought to instruct us in religious matters."

As a director of the International Religious Liberty Association I had for years been in-

volved in religious liberty issues. Religious practices in public schools had figured in a few of these—the McCollum case had seen the Supreme Court rule against released-time religious education carried on in public school buildings; in the Zorach decision the Court had ruled religious education constitutional when carried on off the campus.

Then in the Regent's Prayer decision the Supreme Court had decided that it was not part of the State's legitimate function to write and direct the saying of a prayer in New York's schools.

A right decision, too, but what an uproar had followed—with most roaring being done by those who had not read, nor understood, the Court's decision. Senators and Representatives who ought to know better had introduced some half a hundred religious amendments to the Constitution—"to legalize the saying of prayer in the public schools," they said. (The Court had not said prayer was taboo in public schools; it had ruled that a State-written and directed prayer was unconstitutional.)

Not that the issues were all black or all white, I reminded myself, with an ear cocked toward the youth so freely arguing their convictions. I wondered what they would do with some of the questions I had faced during the past few years:

1. Do religious practices in public schools violate the American principle of separation of church and state? (The question looks deceptively simple.)

2. Where the Bible is read, should it be presented as the word of God or simply as literature?

3. What should be taught children whose parents do not believe in the Bible? Can parents properly object to having their children taught religion by a teacher they have no hand in choosing?

4. What interpretation should be placed on the Sabbath commandment where Sunday laws are in the news? Should teachers point out that the fourth commandment concerns the seventh day, not the first? (What questions this observation might elicit.)

5. Should the teachings of various sects be opened to examination and criticism?

6. Can differing religious beliefs be presented fairly? Objectively? Or is an objective presentation in itself an interpretation, implying as it does that all beliefs or teachings are of equal merit?

7. What of students who object to participating in religious exercises? Can their convictions be respected without their being subjected to social ostracism?

8. Would not the school inevitably get into conflict with the church and the home—some church, some home—by intruding into the sacred area of religious conviction? Is religion, after all, only a parade of facts, or is it a heart experience?

9. Where public schools emphasize such qualities as kindness, cooperation, honesty, dependability, loyalty, which are important to making good citizens, what can the state gain by insisting on religious exercise? (Do not parochial schools exist to teach youth who want religious philosophy to permeate their training?)

If these youth only knew the half of it, I thought, listening again to their energetic dogmatism. Just how would that young miss arguing for the teaching of religious morality implement her program? Take the question of gambling, for example. Which of the churches would she have decide whether gambling is in harmony with religious morality? Some church organizations believe that gambling is all right—and even raise money for religious purposes by church-sponsored bingo games, often to the consternation of law enforcement officials who have antigambling laws on their books. Other churches maintain that gambling is morally wrong, and will tend to corrupt good government, not to mention its more direct effect on family relationships and finances. Someone would have to decide which church-brand of morality our youth ought to have—hardly an enviable task.

The American brand of democracy is unique in that it is founded on the right of religious division, of individual conviction. Its citizens are permitted to follow their conscience in spiritual concerns. No state-supported religion feeds itself on the funds of those who deny its precepts. A citizen can start his own church and freely preach its creed.

And American youth can, without fear, argue their convictions while riding a public bus. I was glad to hear them do so. Many youth are caught up in much less momentous questions. These had tackled a question that could ultimately touch the philosophy of our very form of government and the freedom of each of us.

I looked at them again: bobby-socked and levied, bouffanted and flat-topped, pimpled and pimpleless. Our youth, wealth of our Nation. We dare not ignore their morality, their training, religious and secular. For when a nation's youth grow corrupt, that nation falls.

But are corrupt morals the consequence of school curriculums that exclude recitation of a prayer, the singing of a hymn? Or are they instead the consequence of homes, of churches, that have failed their responsibility? And where these have failed, can lip-service to the form of worship suffice?

I looked appreciatively at the serious-faced youth in the letterman jacket. "Our parents and our churches are the ones who ought to instruct us in religious matters," he had said. How right he was.

And when they don't?

The bus stopped and he got up. He had the answer before he reached the door.

"When they don't, they shouldn't expect the schools to make up for their neglect."

Widespread Support Develops for Hollywood Communist Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since my letter was recently released requesting the Senate Committee on Internal Security to comply with the resolution passed by the National American Legion Convention in Miami Beach, Fla., last month calling for a congressional investigation of Communist infiltration into the motion picture industry, a great amount of support has developed across the country supporting such an investigation.

Typical of the many favorable editorials and letters which have come in is one from the Richmond News Leader published in Richmond, Va. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINK OR MINSK?

Some of the advance publicity for the forthcoming movie, "The Long Ships," discussed in these columns yesterday, is scarcely more than rank Communist propaganda. It is perhaps a foretaste of what may be coming in the movie itself, which is now being filmed on Yugoslavia's Dalmatian coast. To be released under the imprint of Columbia Pictures' flaming torch of liberty, the movie is one of many so-called American productions made largely with Communist personnel behind the Iron Curtain.

The death of Hollywood has been long heralded by the runaway flight of producers seeking cheap labor and tax benefits abroad. Now it is evident that Hollywood is assiduously rebuilding—in Yugoslavia.

"The Long Ships" shows the trend. The Yugoslavian Communist actress, Beba Loncar, is costar in this frothy $16-million tale about a Moor (Sidney Poitier) who woos a Viking maiden. This major American production is filmed entirely in Yugoslavia, with 89 percent of the production cost underwritten by the worker's paradise.

A. T. Dennison, business agent for IATSE 728, the motion picture electricians, has protested the deal which Tito offers: Free sound stages, free sets, free technicians, free back lot facilities. All that Tito asks in return is a $100,000 guarantee in American dollars, all profits from showings in Iron Curtain countries, a split of the profits from the rest of the world, and script control.

It is no secret that more than two-thirds of so-called American movies are being made abroad at cheap rates, although the movie fan sees no indication on the screen that the picture is not made in Hollywood. Worse yet, fans are unaware that many major pictures are under the control of Communist censors. The following movies are in production in Yugoslavia or recently released: "The Long Ships," "The Achilles Affair," "Bridge on the Drina," "The Cavern," "The Dubious Patriots," "Lancelot and Guinevere," "The Visit," and "Journey to a Far Meridian."

All of these movies use established American stars for bait. They include Mickey Rooney, Gregory Peck, Dirke Bogarde, Cornel Wilde, Richard Widmark, Buddy Hackett, Ingrid Bergman, Anthony Quinn, and others. The film "Journey to a Far Meridian" should be especially interesting, because it is made from the first novel published jointly in New York and Moscow. It is the story of an American scientist, misled by anti-Communist propaganda, who is sent to work with Soviet technicians and finds that they aren't such bad guys after all. This picture has the express approval of the U.S. State Department.

In addition, two films are before cameras in Poland, "Millie Goes to Budapest," and "My Name Is Ivan." There is a whole slew of cartoons being made in Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, including such favorites as Popeye, and Tom and Jerry. By contrast, there are only five pictures under production at the moment in Hollywood.

Movie patrons who are interested in the country of origin of the films they see may subscribe to a monthly bulletin published in Hollywood by SAM, Save American Movies, Inc. ($5, Post Office Box 467, Hollywood, Calif., 90028). The people behind SAM have had a long association with the industry and the problems of Communist infiltration. SAM also pinpoints movies which use identified Communists in writing and production—and SAM is accurate, unlike some other services of this kind.

At SAM's urging, Representative CECIL KING, of California, has introduced a bill into the House which would require all movies to be clearly labeled as to country of origin. Interested moviegoers should ask their Congressmen to support this bill, H.R. 7670. If furs must be labeled, why not movies? Patrons should know whether they're buying mink or Minsk.

Literacy the Key to Job Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has reported a bill by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] which would amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. One of the principal amendments is that which would authorize courses in reading and writing for those enrolled in occupational training projects. It has been established beyond reasonable doubt that adult illiteracy is a major stumbling block in our efforts to reduce the ranks of the unemployed. While I am still of the belief that we should enact a national program to eliminate adult illiteracy, I think we can agree that Mr. HOLLAND's bill will materially help make the Manpower and Training Act more responsive to the needs of our unemployed. I am pleased to report that responsible State officials in New Jersey have recognized the need to combat adult illiteracy and are addressing themselves to this task. As evidence thereof, I commend to your attention an editorial which appeared in the October 7 edition of the Trentonian, a newspaper published in our capital city of Trenton. The editorial is as follows:

LITERACY PROGRAM KEY TO TRAINING FOR JOBS

(By J. Willard Hoffman)

How are you going to recruit people for retraining projects when they are not schooled enough to read and fill out the application forms? And until that handicap is overcome, how are you going to decrease chronic unemployment when you can't train people for jobs?

These are some of the questions which come into focus as a result of the current emphasis being placed upon greater employment opportunities in New Jersey, as exemplified by the conference on Negro employment opportunities which was held here this week.

Dr. Clyde Weinhold, director of adult education in the State department of education, related that 11 of 15 persons recently screened for a Federal training program were unable to read the forms because they had fewer than 3 years of schooling. He also said that 90 percent of the unemployed have no high school diplomas. Furthermore, he cited 1960 census figures which show that 59 percent of New Jersey adults over 25 years of age never completed high school and that something like 300,000 Jersey residents over 25 had received fewer than 5 years of schooling.

Labor Commissioner Raymond F. Male scored a bullseye when he noted that the Federal Government stands ready to spend millions of dollars to train the unemployed "but not 1 penny for reading, writing, and arithmetic."

This is not just a handy reference to the three R's. It was a statement based on plain fact—too many people cannot be employed because they cannot read and write.

But perhaps waiting for the Federal Government to do something is not the answer; certainly it isn't as helpful as the answer which Trenton and Newark have supplied and which Paterson is about to supply.

Trenton and her sister New Jersey cities have built what they call adult literacy programs, and the first session in Trenton was held at the YWCA last Monday, with 22 students in attendance. Here the program is in charge of the advisory committee on basic education, and financed—for the time being, at least—by a $2,500 grant from the administrative budget of the division of welfare.

We were impressed by the competent manner in which the advisory committee brought the program into being, and we commend the members for it. At the same time, we were even more impressed by the number of students who started the course.

And, getting back to what Commissioner Male had to say about Federal help, there can be little doubt that Washington will be keenly attuned to Trenton and the other New Jersey cities who have seized the initiative.

Indian Raids Delayed Settling Monroe County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail states that the original settlement in what is now Monroe County, W. Va., was broken up by Indians in 1763, just 200 years ago. The county, which was eventually named after President Monroe, was resettled and fortified 6 years later and eventually developed into a prosperous agricultural community.

The Gazette-Mail article also recalls that Andrew S. Rowan, who gained renown after carrying the famous "Message to Garcia" in the Spanish-American War, came from Monroe County, W. Va. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANS BROKE UP MONROE SETTLEMENT 200 YEARS AGO

Monroe County was formed from part of Greenbrier County by an act of the General Assembly of Virginia which was passed on January 15, 1799. It is one of the older counties of West Virginia, the 12th to be formed by the Old Commonwealth in the territory west of the Alleghenies. It was named for James Monroe, the fifth President of the United States.

The county government was originated on May 21, 1799, at the home of George King who lived near what is now Union, the county seat. The original settler on Monroe soil was James Moss, who in 1760 erected a cabin near Sweet Springs. James Byrnside was also an early settler. In 1763 the Indians, led by the relentless Cornstalk, broke up the settlement in this area and the settlers had to flee to more thickly populated parts in order to escape the attack. In 1769 the county was again settled and pioneer forts were erected at several places as a means of defense against the recurring Indian raids.

The land area of Monroe is 473.8 square miles. By the 1960 census count the population numbers 11,584 people. It is the extreme southwestern county of the State and borders on Giles County, Va. For many miles Peter's Mountain forms the boundary line between Monroe County and the State of Virginia. Large areas in the northern, central, and southern parts of the county are occupied by elevated and gently rolling plateaus. The luxuriant limestone areas contrast sharply with the steep and stony mountain ridges, and form many landscapes of unusual interest and rare beauty.

Monroe is an agricultural county situated just outside the coal producing area of southern West Virginia. The eastern section lies within the limestone area. It is one of the great bluegrass regions of the world and is admirably adapted to grazing and raising livestock. Dairy farming and poultry raising are prosperous in Monroe County. There is also an abundance of fruit culture in the area.

The county has a great variety of mineral waters and springs which were well known and were famous with the early settlement people who visited the fashionable resorts, and by those who sought health in the curative power of the waters from the medicinal springs. Red Sulphur, Gray Sulphur, Salt Sulphur, and Burdette Springs were all considered to have great power to cure the ills of mankind.

The Rehobeth Church, near Union, was erected in 1786 and is the oldest Methodist church west of the Alleghenies. The building is in an almost perfect state of preservation and is an historical landmark. It is visited by many people each year.

This county is also the home of Andrew S. Rowan of Spanish-American War fame. He was immortalized by Elbert Hubbard's classic "A Message to Garcia." The home for the aged citizens at Sweet Springs is named in his memory.

The county seat is Union which was settled by James Alexander in 1774. The original charter was granted in 1799, and the town was named Union because in frontier days the site of the town was a rendezvous for troops during the Indian wars.

Other municipalities in the county are Peterstown and Alderson. The land for the town of Peterstown was surveyed in 1801 by James Byrnside. It was first incorporated in 1892 and was named for Christian Peters, a Revolutionary War soldier, who was one of its first settlers. He set aside the land for the town.

Alderson belongs to both Monroe and Greenbrier Counties. It was settled in 1777, and was named for James Alderson. Mr. Alderson was a Baptist minister who helped to settle the town. An early school of high rank was established here and was maintained for many years. It was called the Alderson Academy.

U.S. Highway No. 219 passes through the county from north to south, from Lewisburg to the Virginia border at Peterstown. The county has a well developed system of highways. Many of the roads follow the old Indian trails and are noted for the scenic beauty of the countryside.

Feeble Assurances of Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial entitled "Feeble Assurances on Gold" which appeared in the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus on October 2.

I am sure that those of us who are so vitally concerned with this extremely serious problem would hope that this administration could do better than give us "feeble assurances."

The editorial follows:

FEEBLE ASSURANCES ON GOLD

President Kennedy and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon have given new assurances about the drain on U.S. gold, which leave the American people with small reason for consolation.

Mr. Kennedy told governors of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank that the United States is moving cautiously to overcome its deficit in international payments and is determined not to reduce the value of the dollar. "But no one," he said, "should confuse caution with timidity or a careful and deliberate pace with lack of determination."

That is the kind of language for which he has become famous and which is identified with the style of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a special White House assistant and occasional speech writer.

Actually, the deficit reached an alltime high rate of $4.2 billion for the first half of 1963. The administration has alleviated the situation a bit by raising the interest rate on Government notes available to foreign creditors so they will not be tempted to convert their claims into gold.

It is as though, to stave off the foreclosure of a mortgage on your home, you treated the mortgage holder to a fine dinner and thereby induced him to hold off a while.

The administration has made no attack on the chief cause—its role as Santa Claus to the world, causing a continual outflow of dollars, which more than wipes out the favorable U.S. balance in trade. The House has made a sharp cut in foreign aid, but only with painful outcries from the White House; and the Senate has yet to act.

Anti-Communist Committee in Western New York Voices Opposition to Proposed Tito Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York has, for many years, devoted itself to the task of alerting this Nation to the dangers posed by the international Communist conspiracy. Mr. Walter V. Chopyk has done an outstanding job as public relations director of the committee.

The United Anti-Communist Committee recently expressed its strong opposition to the proposed visit of Marshal Tito to the United States. I respectfully submit that the committee's objection is shared by a great many Americans.

A press release covering the Anti-Communist Committee's statement follows:

OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED TITO VISIT

At a special meeting of the executive committee of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York held at the Hotel Statler-Hilton, Monday evening, September 30, 1963, deep concern was expressed in regards to the pending official visit of the Yugoslav Communist Dictator Tito. His recent honeymoon with Khrushchev confirms his rededication to the aims and purposes of the international criminal Communist conspiracy.

Despite the almost $3 billion given him by the American taxpayer on the naive hope that this would wean him away from the Kremlin, Tito constantly votes with Russia against the United States and maintains a bloody police state.

Today he carries the Red line to South America—tomorrow he'll ask for additional millions of dollars while being cloaked with an unnatural dignity as the invited guest of the American people.

The committee urges that all citizens contact their Representatives immediately to demand the withdrawal of the invitation.

Down With Robin Hood, and With the Area Redevelopment Administration, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly of September 16.

The comparison of our modern socialistic "do-goodism" with Robin Hood and his merry men is most apt. I have always found that one thing every human being knows he can do better than anyone else is: spend the other fellow's money.

DOWN WITH ROBIN HOOD AND WITH THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, TOO

Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review, a journal with a small but select circulation throughout the United Kingdom, has just made a big splash on this side of the Atlantic. To the dismay of all those who cherish the legend of Robin Hood, the magazine recently urged a critical reappraisal of his life and times. Despite centuries of glorification, the merry men of Sherwood Forest were allegedly a gamy lot: "Friar Tuck is certainly no example of how a devout high churchman should behave, while Little John, apart from his marksmanship, has little to recommend him to law-abiding citizens." Maid Marian gets equally short shrift. The publication has aimed its sharpest shafts at Robin Hood himself, whom it condemns as "an outlaw who deserted his lawful wife for fun and games in the greenwood." It adds scathingly: "Having regard to the fact that the exploits of this legendary hero were chiefly concerned with robbing the rich under the specious motive of giving to the poor, a function which in modern times has been taken over by the welfare state, it is a question of some doubt whether a Robin Hood festival is not contrary to public policy."

Such sentiments, needless to say, are by no means unanimous, in either the United Kingdom or the United States. Last week, columnist Inez Robb, with a cry of hands off folklore, sprang to Robin Hood's defense. Even the Sheriff of Nottingham took up the cudgels for his old adversary. The legend, said the official, has done a great deal to foster relations between Nottingham and the rest of the world. Besides, he added with an eye toward the tourist trade, Robin Hood is good for business.

While the pen is reputedly mightier than the sword, one editorial in an obscure British weekly will lay low neither Robin Hood nor what he stands for. Nonetheless, its appearance indicates that more and more people are growing uneasily aware of the lack of morality that is basic to the welfare state. In this country, the same theme has been sounded repeatedly of late by Edwin P. Neilan, crusading president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Neilan charges that what is going on in Washington today, especially in agencies like the Area Redevelopment Administration, is "downright immoral." ARA, the record suggests has committed a multitude of sins, ranging from the release of phony statistics and false information to the abuse of its authority. In the guise of subsidizing so-called depressed areas—robbing the rich to help the poor, so to speak—ARA is spreading the Federal handout and the political payoff from one end of the country to the other. Robin Hood only worked Sherwood Forest. His spirit is roaming the whole New Frontier.

Nowhere has it enjoyed such latitude as in the Area Redevelopment Administration. Established in May of 1961, the agency, in its own words, strives "to help create jobs where none existed before." To that end an openhanded Congress endowed it with nearly $400 million, which may be used to make loans (up to 30 years at 3½ percent interest) for either public facilities or commercial and industrial ventures. ARA is also authorized to furnish outright grants for the retraining of workers and for technical assistance to various localities. As drafted by a Presidential task force, the legislation was designed to limit such help to areas where unemployment far exceeds the national average. As finally enacted, however, it gave the Secretary of Commerce, in whose bailiwick ARA landed, sweeping authority to designate who is eligible. Hence instead of 100-odd areas, as originally estimated over 1,000 blanketing all 50 States and Puerto Rico, have wound up on ARA's books. The agency, in turn, has been running through its money very fast, to the point where, with strong support from the White House, it is seeking another $400 million from Congress.

Whether ARA will get what it wants remains to be seen—the opposition to its activities, in and outside of Congress, is perceptibly stiffening. As Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, points out, "the standards of eligibility are so vague as to permit almost any project to be approved almost anywhere." The record fully bears him out. ARA to date has gotten involved in such unlikely ventures as a ski lift in Pennsylvania and the processing of reindeer meat in Alaska. Nearly one-fourth of its lending has gone to finance hotels and motels. For one sizable listed company, with a plant in Hazleton, Pa., ARA built a $32,000 standpipe, thereby putting "50 to 100 men to work on the third and fourth floors" of the building. It has helped reopen idle plywood plants and abandoned coal mines. It has even made a $9,500 grant "to determine the economic feasibility of establishing a cooperative-owned livestock feedyard and slaughterhouse complex in North Dakota.

One way or another, the agency boasts of creating over 35,000 jobs, a claim which its critics dispute. For example, according to the ARA Administrator, a 432-unit motor hotel in Detroit will provide work for 450 people; a 50-unit motel in Naples, Tex., is supposed to yield 50 jobs. "I can't imagine a motel that would hire one person per unit," declared a skeptical lawmaker. Similarly, the agency takes credit for a thousand jobs at an Arkansas shirt factory which, at present capacity, can employ no more than 500. It also lists 300 jobs created by a $272,000 loan for the construction of an ordnance plant, which today stands empty. Queried on the point, ARA blandly replied:

"The potential is there if we can ever find an occupant for the place."

The agency's tactics have been as questionable as its statistics. In a transparent effort to embarrass the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, ARA issued a press release expressing deep appreciation to 500-odd chamber officials for their cooperation. Subsequent investigation by the doughty Mr. Neilan disclosed that some of those named were no longer in office, had never been in office or stood flatly opposed to ARA and all its works. The chamber of commerce has also disclosed one case after another of Government pressure on local officials to embrace the program. Its "salesmen," says Mr. Neilan, "are on the prowl all over the country." So great has been their zeal that more than one flourishing community, to its surprise and dismay and against its will, has found itself labeled a depressed area. "Reckless misuse of public funds is bad enough in itself," observes Mr. Neilan. "But the moral implications are even worse when the spenders resort to coercion to get the money spent. Then it becomes more than dishonesty. It's a matter of dividing the people against each other, stirring up strife, weakening community initiative and morale."

It also happens to be a matter of riding roughshod over anyone who gets in the way. Over the soybean processor in Salisbury, Md., who, after borrowing $1.5 million at going market rates to build a new plant a few years ago, suddenly is faced with the prospect of a subsidized rival. Over the lumbermen at Happy Camp, Calif., who now must compete with a federally financed mill. Over the coal miners in Carbon County, Utah, who will lose their jobs because ARA, despite a glutted market, is reopening shutdown pits. That is what Robin Hood always comes to in the end. In the words of his first and most fiercely eloquent detractor, novelist-philosopher Ayn Rand, "He is held to be the first man who assumed a halo of virtue by practicing charity with wealth which he did not own, by giving away goods which he had not produced, by making others pay for the luxury of his pity * * *. Until men learn that of all human symbols, Robin Hood is the most immoral and the most contemptible, there will be no justice on earth." Let Congress, as it weighs the future of ARA, ponder well.

Americans First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a forceful editorial appeared in the Antioch News, one of the leading newspapers in my district published by Margaret E. Gaston, in its issue of Thursday, September 15, 1963.

The editorial, which calls attention to the unconscionable burden of taxation on our private economy, commends my colleague, Congressman HENRY SCHADEBERG, who represents the 1st District of Wisconsin which lies directly across the State line from my 12th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent.

I commend to my colleagues in the Congress and to those enlightened citizens throughout the Nation who review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this significant editorial:

AMERICANS FIRST

Congressman HENRY SCHADEBERG, of Wisconsin, has reminded his constituents that the $4,087,075,000 requested for foreign aid next year represents an involuntary gift (tax) of approximately $100 for each family of four in the United States.

SCHADEBERG also pointed out that since the inception of the foreign aid program, the American taxpayer has been relieved of a total of $110 billion, which represents one-third of our national debt.

President Kennedy has run into opposition on his request for foreign aid appropriation and has accused Republicans opposing it of party politics. Truth is, one doesn't have to be Republican to oppose foreign aid.

Presumably, we dispense these billions of dollars in the hope of buying the friendship and loyalty of the recipient nations.

No one has ever yet managed to buy friendship and loyalty with money. No matter how well intentioned the philanthropist may be, the object of his charity invariably and instinctively responds with dislike and resentment. No matter how pure the motives of the giver or how grateful the receiver, the free and mutual enjoyment of friendship is impossible under such conditions.

Nations are, after all, only a great many separate people. And those people react the same as we do. You can't buy their friendship, singly or in groups. Uncle Sam has tried, long enough. It hasn't worked.

If someone wishes to insist that we're not trying to buy friendship—that we dispense these billions because we're a rich nation who must aid the less fortunate, then foreign aid should be cut off at once. Charity begins at home. When we have no hungry people left in our own country; when we have no mental patients left rotting in institutions for lack of money for proper treatment; when every person in our country has access to the best education he can utilize; when we aren't paying out money for taxes that should be going in to the care of our children's teeth, or medical treatment; time enough, then, to start thinking of helping others.

Our best propaganda, in fact, has been accomplished by private enterprise and organizations. If they make a mistake, there are no political repercussions. And there is no need for them to give undue weight to political considerations in reaching decisions.

The burden of taxes in the United States is strangling personal initiative, the one force that has made this a great country. Foreign aid seems one of the very best places to start reducing the Nation's expenditures. We don't have to be isolationists to believe in Americans first.

U.S. Policies Fail To Stem Communist Advance in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, recent events in a number of Latin American nations have underscored the failure of the U.S. policies and programs to effectively engage and counter the forces of international communism.

In a recent article, appearing in the Register, Father Juan M. Dorta-Duque, S.J., expresses his views on the failure of the materialistic policies of the United States to successfully stem the spread of communism in Latin America.

This article was brought to my attention by Mr. James Moran, of Buffalo, N.Y., who has unselfishly devoted so much of his time to educating the citizens of the Buffalo community on the techniques, strategies, and objectives of the Communist Parties and their millions of fellow travelers and associated sympathizers:

The article follows:

FULL STOMACH NOT ENOUGH

Providing the means for full stomachs for the people of Latin America is not, in itself, going to save the continent from communism.

That is the opinion of Father Juan M. Dorta-Duque, S.J., in the United States to conduct a special institute on communism at St. Louis University. Father Dorta-Duque once was jailed by Fidel Castro for being "an enemy of the revolution."

The priest warned that the materialistic outlook of many Americans is having an adverse effect on Latin Americans.

"If you in this country offer Latin Americans only a better material life, you will be helping communism," he said. "If you excite the appetites for material things which you cannot give them, they will turn to communism."

He objected to some films, exported from the United States to Latin America. These films, shown in Latin America but without the deletions U.S. censors require, portray an immoral way of dress and conduct which is imitated by some Latin Americans, he said.

Middle-class people are shocked by the indecencies in the films and some compare them to exports from Russian countries—which usually portray a more moral standard of conduct, while laden with Communist propaganda, he said.

"The only way to combat communism in Latin America is on the ideological level—with ideas," he said. "If you give Latin America material goods—roads, houses, tractors—without ideas of a Christian social structure—they will be used against you."

Father Dorta-Duque said he was neither optimistic nor pessimistic about the chances of saving Latin America from the Communists.

"I'm a realist," he said. "One has to face the facts as they are. Latin America is going to have leaders, and if they are not educated in Christian principles they will be educated in Communist ones. It's a tough problem. But we have to start doing something—because in every age of men, men can change the world."

Bad News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, when the Washington Post editorially criticizes any act of the State Department, one must assume that the directive or regulation must be terrible in the extreme. The attached editorial, which speaks for itself, appeared in the Post on October

7 in regard to the State Department's efforts to control the news out of South Vietnam:

BAD NEWS

The U.S. Government's prompt and vigorous protest against the outrageous attack of South Vietnam police on three American newsmen should be followed up until there is satisfactory assurance that this brutal interference with the press will not be repeated.

Reporters in South Vietnam have had a hard time. They have had the unpleasant task of reporting unwelcome news. They have been criticized for it by their own Government and even by some partisans of the Diem regime in their own craft. They have been obstructed at every turn in a situation where the natural obstructions already were formidable. They have persevered in spite of it, and have managed to convey to the American public a sense of the dangerous situation in South Vietnam that the American people never would have been able to obtain from the Diem government or from their own officials.

The State Department itself, until quite recently, seemed to be obsessed with the idea that the news out of South Vietnam had to be good news. Information officials in South Vietnam, early in 1962 were warned by the State Department that news stories which criticize the Diem government could not be forbidden but that they "only increase the difficulties of the U.S. job." They were told to advise newsmen that "trifling or thoughtless criticism of the Diem government would make it difficult to maintain cooperation." And they were advised that "newsmen should not be transported on military activities of the type that are likely to result in undesirable stories." A House committee succeeded in getting these extraordinary "guidelines" rescinded only last month. They reflected an all too common frame of mind about "bad news" from South Vietnam. It is a good thing we are over this particular phase of official stupidity.

The American people need to have the truth about South Vietnam and about its Government. They are supporting a military operation there to check Communist aggression in southeast Asia. This is a matter of such importance that we may have to persevere in it despite distaste for the Diem government. Nevertheless, Americans in or out of government, are under no compulsion of duty or responsibility to conceal the defects of this incompetent, corrupt, and misguided family tyranny. Reporters, thank goodness, have been in no confusion about their duty and responsibility from the beginning. By their accurate reporting they have vindicated the best traditions of press freedom.

Labor Union Questions Russian Wheat Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, an interesting an informative column by Victor Riesel entitled "Profit Loses to Patriotism" appeared in Friday's issue of the New York Mirror and other papers using Mr. Riesel's widely syndicated column. It merits the careful reading of Senators as well as administration leaders who appear to be toying with the temptation to use Executive authority to process a wheat sale to Russia without permitting the Congress to consider its ramifications or its merits.

The fact that the International Longshoremen's Association is reluctant to participate in shipping supplies designed to bail out the Communist economy and to strengthen the hand of Red Russia provides additional argument in support of the efforts of Senator DODD, of Connecticut, and other Senators to have a Senate committee consider all of the facts and factors involved and to secure congressional approval or disapproval before a major department in our American foreign policy is initiated by White House decree.

I ask unanimous consent that the Riesel column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFIT LOSES TO PATRIOTISM

(By Victor Reisel)

The decision of the President of the United States to sell American wheat to the Communist world will not be sufficient to assure the flow of the foodstuff to Iron Curtain ports. A second decision must be made by the president and other officers of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA).

On Monday, September 30, shortly past noon, Secretary Hodges telephoned Ted Gleason, ILA president. Hodges asked the union chief, who was in his New York national headquarters, whether the longshoremen would boycott the Communist-bound cargo.

The Secretary of Commerce said he would see President Kennedy shortly. Hodges wanted to know what to tell Mr. Kennedy.

Gleason replied that he alone could not set policy. If President Kennedy personnally requested the longshoremen to abandon their boycott, Gleason promised to summon the union's executive board—representatives from all major ports from New England to the Gulf of Mexico.

Gleason said the longshoremen are entitled to their own views on feeding economically chaotic Russia. He hoped that none of the wheat which the longshoremen might load would find its way to Cuba. Secretary Hodges listened and replied unenthused that he would pass all this on to the President.

The longshoremen feel that they are being pressured into an abandonment of a traditional policy which they have backed up with more than pious anti-Communist words.

They believe they have lost over $50 million in wages over the past decade by refusing to load or unload imports from the Communist world and from America to the Iron Curtain, and by boycotting any shipping company which permits one of its freighters or passenger vessels to call on Cuba.

If the ILA should decide to boycott the wheat shipments, the pressure on the union would be enormous. Already the White House has talked to national labor leaders who have influence on the waterfront. Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman has had at least one long conversation with a prominent labor representative.

But if the longshoremen do agree to load the wheat, they could not logically refuse to handle other Communist-bound cargo. How they feel about this is reflected in a telegram they dispatched on September 26 to Mr. Hodges and other Cabinet members. They said:

"ILA urgently requests that you reject any proposal to sell U.S. wheat to Russia. The membership and officials of this union are baffled as to why our Government even contemplates providing economic aid to an ideological enemy who has vowed to bury us economically.

"The longshoremen in the United States would probably gain more money in wages than any other American working man if the United States decided to trade with Russia. Nevertheless, the longshoremen * * * are not interested in any of the so-called easy money, and are going to object vigorously to loading any such cargo."

That says it.

Mingo County, W. Va., Named After Indian Tribe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Mingo County, the last county to be formed in West Virginia, was named after an Indian tribe, according to a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. Originally a part of Logan County, Mingo was created in 1895, when an extension of the railroad brought an influx of trade and settlers to the southwest portion of the Mountain State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MINGO WAS THE LAST COUNTY FORMED

On June 20, 1863, West Virginia separated from the mother State of Virginia. The new State was called West Virginia, after much discussion, and then this area was called Logan County.

Williamson, the county seat of Mingo, was incorporated in 1892 while Mingo was still a part of Logan County. In 1776, this section was part of Montgomery County, Va., but in 1824 it was changed to Logan County and remained so until 1895 when Mingo County was separated from Logan County. The bill to sever Mingo from Logan County was actually passed on June 20, 1894, but was held up until March 1895, because of some discussion, according to information received from a relative of Dr. Sidney Lawson (now deceased), of Logan, who was then a member of the legislature.

Mingo County is 423.5 square miles. When the railroad began coming through here and with coal mines opening all along Tug River, Wallace J. Williamson, whose farm was located in the area now covered by the city of Williamson, decided that what is now Mingo County should no longer be a part of Logan County. With the railroad running down Tug River and business increasing rapidly, and the barrier at Guyan Ridge almost impassable, this was a sane and practical idea.

Wells Goodykoontz came to this area about this time, and with Wallace J. Williamson, a Democrat leader and Goodykoontz, a Republican leader, and both in favor of the decision, it should have been simple, but some political trading had to be done first.

James Hughes, a Republican, was leader of the State senate at the time, and in fact leader of the whole legislature of West Virginia, so in order to have the bill passed severing Mingo County from Logan County,

W. J. Williamson, agreed to permit Hughes to name the first sheriff of the county, or at least agreed to not oppose his choice, so the bill passed and N. J. Keadle was named the first sheriff.

When all arrangements were made W. A. Lee, an engineer, surveyed the line and fixed it where it is today. By referring to a map it is easy to understand why he should take the Guyan Ridge from the Wayne County border, but you may wonder why he failed to keep the ridge to the McDowell County line. Here the peculiar topography of the territory decided the line.

Mingo County was named for the tribe of Indians of which Logan was chief.

The county seat was named for Benjamin F. Williamson, the father of Wallace, and not for Wallace himself as many people mistakenly believe.

The first school in Williamson was a log cabin, and was built in the area where the A. & P. Super Market now stands. J. F. Keyser, was the only teacher in that first school. The first commencement exercises from high school level were held in Williamson in 1910, when the school was a 3-year course. The first graduates were Miss Mary Belle Culross, a recently retired teacher, and Okey P. Keadle, now deceased, but who was an attorney at law.

The first newspaper was published by Thomas B. Garner and his wife. It was a weekly, called the Williamson Enterprise. Mingo County has had a lot of publicity during its short life, the Hatfield and McCoy feud mostly took place around Matewan, and then of course there was the mine war and the infamous Mother Jones who while she didn't live in Mingo County, sure came here and let everyone know she'd been here.

The Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce is housed in a building made out of coal mined from local mines, and honoring the business which made this once a thriving county, and now sadly enough machinery has replaced the men to the extent no one knows that to expect next.

Mingo was the last county formed in the state, and may be the smallest, but she's done her bit to contribute to the colorful history of the state.

NANCY SUE SMITH.

Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Review Bulletin of October 15, 1963:

Granted one initial premise, it all follows logically enough. When the Canadians get X million selling them their wheat, and when the Australians get Y million selling theirs, why shouldn't we Americans get in on the deal? If we don't supply it, they'll get their wheat anyway from the other producers, won't they? And we've got our mountainous surplus and our shaky dollar to add special motives to the normal—isn't it normal?—wish of a man to find a market for his products. When Britain sends them chemical plants and Italy sends them steel pipe and West Germany sends them locomotives, what sense does it make for us to be so nice-Nellie?

Yes, it's all logical enough if we're sure, quite sure, of just one point; that Khrushchev isn't serious when he says he is going to bury us; that a free society is not threatened by a totalitarian society, based on a state-owned industry and a state monopoly of foreign trade, and committed to world revolution.

If we are wrong on that point, we are very wrong indeed. Because then this wheat that we and our friends are sending them, the machines and chemicals, tools and ships that will follow soon enough now that the door is opening—that started flowing from our friends some while ago—cannot have any other effect than to strengthen the hand of an enemy that he may the more surely slay us. What is the meaning of the current Soviet wheat shortage that their Government is so frantically striving to fill? (We may be sure, in passing, that the shortage does not extend to the vast war reserves that the Communists have always assigned an absolute priority over stomachs.) This shortage is the expression of the silent but persistent and wonderfully effective resistance of the peasants to communism. It amounts to a general strike of the peasantry, perhaps the major obstacle on the Communists' road to the completion of the revolution. They are held back from conquering the world because they cannot conquer the farmers and peasants in the regions they have already seized. We now arrive as the strikebreakers, enabling the regime to breathe more freely, to redirect into the arms-supporting industries the energies drained—as Khrushchev quite frankly admits—by "the peasant problem."

Khrushchev isn't going to have much trouble burying us if we are determined to prove Marx right when he predicted that, from the nature of capitalism and the profit motive, we will inevitably dig our own graves.

Mutual Use Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, thanks for the privilege to include this editorial from the Waterville Empire-Press, Waterville, Wash., which deals with the use, abuse or un-use of so large an amount of our great western reserves that so badly need the mutual use purpose which has been enacted into law. These great areas need everyone's serious consideration. Even the competitive market position of our slow growth western forests is widely involved:

THE WILDERNESS BILL—LOCKING UP THE HIGH CASCADES

This week the Sierra Club of California is holding an exhibit of fine photographs at the Bright Moon Restaurant in East Wenatchee. The superb pictures of the high cascades area of this State and Oregon do justice to the magnificent scenery a trail ride or backpack trip reveals to the visitor.

The subtle message the exhibit carries is that this is unspoiled nature that must be preserved for posterity. It is a plea for the wilderness bill now pending in Congress that would lock up the high Cascades country to all but a select few—including members of the Sierra Club.

As the high Cascades deer hunt is about to start, all this focuses attention on the feasibility of locking up the Cascades from those who get pleasure from hiking and trail riding in this area. This writer recently took a 3-day 45-mile trip with trail riders into this area which borders on the restricted wilderness area. What impressed us most was the fine work the U.S. Forest Service has done on the trails, providing forage for horses, building recreational facilities for backpackers and trail riders. We were impressed with the timber that needs harvesting by selective cutting. We became aware of the delicate balance between the uses of the forest for industry and recreation with at the same time preserving its natural beauty.

One fact the wilderness area zealots must keep in mind. These trails are built and maintained by the moneys paid by private enterprise for timber. Ten percent of what is derived in timber sales to Forest Service go to trail and road building and maintenance. In other words, if the Cascades is locked up and horses, tote goats eliminated, the rest of us taxpayers will have to pick up all the cost of maintaining these trails for the Sierra Club and such sportsmen organizations.

Another disadvantage of locking up the Cascades is that it will mean the loss of mature timber that should be cut by selective cutting program for industry. Then there's the danger of fire—who will build the access roads for fire crews?

The principal weakness of the wilderness bill is that it takes tax property off the rolls and passes on the costs to the rest of us for the benefit of the few. The counties lose the distribution of tax money from sale of Federal Forest Service lands. And we think these primitive and wilderness areas violate the principles of our Republic. Natural resources should be used for the benefit of all the people, not just the select few. This encroachment of our rights should be resisted by all communities and counties in the State. It should be resisted especially by the sportsmen—the fishermen and hunters among our people who derive so much pleasure from the high Cascades area.

Show Business and Civil Rights—Nonviolence in Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in August a very heartening, but little-publicized event took place in Birmingham, Ala., that city of so much violence and danger for those engaged in the civil rights movement.

On August 4 the American Guild of Variety Artists, under the determined leadership of Joey Adams, its president, held a highly successful nonsegregated variety show entitled "Salute to Freedom," the proceeds of which were used to help defray expenses of the great civil rights march which took place here in Washington on August 28. The story of the show, given by a large mixed cast of performers and attended by a mixed audience of 22,000, is an inspiring testimonial to human dignity, just as was the march which it helped to support.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on the show, in the August 10 issue of the weekly Show Business, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEITHER HEAT, BOMBS, NOR BIRMINGHAM COPS SHALL STOP THE SHOW—IT MUST GO ON

(By Leo Shull)

Two invasion planes flew into Birmingham, Ala., Monday, August 5, and captured the city.

"They captured the right people, too," said Rev. Martin Luther King, "the Negroes and whites who are fighting to attach Birmingham and the whole South to the United States of America." Joey Adams, president of AGVA, had decided to integrate Birmingham for the entertainment industry.

The first plane of showpeople drafted by Adams had 76 aboard. "The Spirit of '76," said Joey, who had conceived, produced, and financed the show and was now the denmother and nursemaid to the apprehensive collection of talent. The second plane departed afterwards and had Ray Charles and his orchestra crewmen and staff. Mr. Charles and his manager, Milt Shaw, with Stan Seiddenberg, had chartered and paid for this plane.

In the first aircraft with Joey Adams were his wife, Cindy, and stars, celebrities, newspapermen, Life and Saturday Evening Post and other photographers, disc jockeys and commentators of radio and TV stations, plus several hundred pounds of food and drink, donated to Mr. Adams and his "Salute to Freedom" riders by Max Asnas, Stage Delicatessen. The planes were paid by donations which Mr. Adams got from Northerners, including $500 from Radio City Music Hall, Maurice Uchital ($2,500); David Dubinsky of ILGWU ($500); Jacob Potofsky of the Hatmakers' Union, $250. Union official Harold Gibbons, $1,000, AGMA, $200, and International Building Trades, $200 plus many smaller individual contributions.

To dare say, and a Yankee at that, that an integrated show would be smuggled into Birmingham to encourage Negroes and whites to integrate into a black and white audience was like waving a red flag in front of a bull O'Connor—an intolerable insult.

The enemy camp decided to meet it with volleys of silence, from the mayor of the city, the police, political figures and the Birmingham press which never printed a stick of linotype before or after the event. Blackout.

The police and mayor had refused protection, because "this was the first integrated show and audience in the history of Birmingham," declared Rev. A. D. King, brother of Martin Luther, who had organized 500 volunteers to deal with the local problems and preparations, including ticket sales for the show.

Taxi drivers had refused to transport the show's cast and personnel. Reverend King then collected a caravan of 50 private-car volunteers. Hotels had refused lodgings; Adams got a motel, run by A. G. Gaston, former Negro undertaker and now owner of the motel, the local Negro bank and Negro insurance company to provide lodgings. Restaurants refused service. Adams brought along his own food. The city theater and auditorium owners had refused a meeting hall.

Adams and King got a Negro college campus. There were no chairs. Adams issued a radio call via Negro diskjockey in Birmingham asking people to carry their own—on the night of the show, for 3 miles people could be seen walking to the campus, carrying their own chairs—they had also paid $5 per ticket to see the show.

There was no stage or lights.

"Build one, buy lights," said Adams, "I'm sending a check for the lumber, lights and electricians. And don't spend a cent of the ticket sales, keep it all to pay for the march to Washington, August 28, I'm paying all expenses for this 'Sale to Freedom in Birmingham'."

Threatening calls and letters, promises of bombings, riots and physical injury all failed to deter the group or the show which went on 9 p.m. and lasted for 5 hours. Ku Kluxers and white violence groups began to hold meetings.

Joey Adams had collected for his production Johnny Mathis, Nina Simone, comedian Al Bernie, writers James Baldwin and Harry Golden, Dick Merson, assistant director of News; Billy Taylor and Wm. B. Williams of WNEW; Paul Duke, magician; Billy Rowe, formerly New York City deputy police commissioner, now Joe Louis' partner, and Conrad Buckner, dancer, the Gamm Sisters, the Raelettes, Clyde McPhatter, the Shirelles, Dick Gregory, Magid Triplets, the Alabama Christian Movement Choir of 150, the whole orchestra of the Harlem Apollo Theater led by its conductor, Reuben Phillips. The Alabama musicians' union refused to permit Negro and white musicians to play on the same stage.

The cast and crew got off the plane, had lunch at the Gaston Motel, then went to a nearby hall and began rehearsals with the orchestras. Sid DeMaye, of AGVA, began coordinating the stage routine.

Meanwhile in New York and over press wires the story began to go out. The radio stations from the North began phoning in for progress reports. The newsmen and photographers—about 50—began work. So did Cleveland Robinson, chairman of the march on Washington committee, Clarence Jones, of the Ghandi Society.

On the campus, Dr. Lucius H. Pitts, president of Miles College, had mustered volunteer students and alumni to prepare an organization of ushers, service personnel; the carpenters and roofmakers, lighting men and technicians were working in the 98-degree heat—an unusually hot day.

Civilian defense guards had been gathered to take over the protection job that the police refused and had always given to all other public gatherings—and these Negro volunteers came with shotguns to protect the audience from Ku Kluxers who had paraded a few days earlier in protest against the show.

Makeshift floodlights had been set up to light the way for the ticket buyers and to show up any lurking hoodlums or invaders. There were no toilet or restroom facilities, no water, since the field was about a half mile from the college, and 5 miles from center of town.

Although the show was not scheduled till about 9, the audience began to come at noon. Adams had expected 5,000; more than 20,000 people bought tickets, and brought chairs. Many white ticket agencies accepted tickets for sale, a new first.

The Negro people, who had reason to dislike whites, treated the "Salute to Freedom" members with generous welcome and affection. The response to the show at times was deafening, and great roars greeted many of the acts and the quips of Master of Ceremonies Adams, Rev. Martin Luther King, Joe Louis. Adams made a point of publicly embracing many Negro members of the local committees, a sight that would have caused instant arrest a few months ago. The Negroes watched with disbelief and amazement as Negroes and whites chattered, worked, and mingled on stage and at the Gaston Motel (which had been bombed a few months ago when they found that Martin Luther King was sleeping on the second floor. A wall of new bricks replaces the old shattered one). Some Negroes asked if they could walk on the street with white members of the show; never seen in Birmingham before.

NBC and other televisions companies had brought their cameras, as did many of the film newsreel companies.

White and Negroes sitting and eating together became the big photo catch for Negro photographers shooting for southern Negro newspapers and magazines. More than a dozen Negro diskjockeys journeyed to Miles College and were introduced on the stage. They had been broadcasting this coming event for weeks.

Said James Baldwin to the audience: "This is a living, visible view of the breakdown of a hundred years of slavery—it means that white man and black can work and live together. History is forcing people of Birmingham to stop victimizing each other."

The only member of the U.S. Government or any of the 50 States to acknowledge there was a new kind of integration drive, was New York's Senator JACOB JAVITS. He sent a telegram to Joey Adams saying: "Congratulations to all those participating in this significant variety show, my warmest praise goes out to you for this inspiring show which deserves the support of all America interested in freedom and human dignity. Birmingham is an appropriate site for this event. I think this will become the symbol of the breakthrough so long awaited, and tell the people present I will work to overcome the Senate filibuster to bring civil rights this year."

About 4 hours after the show began as Johnny Mathis began his song, the stage collapsed and 50 people were hurled down, some of them struck by the falling lumber. The whole field went dark. Electricians restored lights in about a half hour, the audience stayed, the show went on. One man with two broken legs, and the other wounded were taken to hospitals.

The noise of the crash made people think a bomb had gone off, some jumped, John Mathis dove for the floor. (This writer was thrown clear to the grass below.) One of the Magid Triplets was injured, but he did his turn later anyhow. Orchestra instruments were broken, they will be paid for from the $10,000 fund Joey Adams raised.

Upon the return trip, a warning came that a bomb was on one of the planes. It was searched, then all plane riders were halted at the airport gate and questioned, some searched for possible bomb or weapon. The Ray Charles plane flew off. Then the 76 on the second plane embarked. At 5 a.m. it took off. At 9 a.m. it landed at LaGuardia, New York City, U.S.A., August 6, 1963.

Sooners "Harness" the Washita

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, for a number of years the Washita project in Oklahoma has been a national showcase of soil conservation work.

One of 11 national pioneering projects to show how the little dams could stop water where it falls, the Washita has done an amazing job. It would be impossible to estimate the dollars and cents benefit it has brought to Oklahoma but it certainly would be in the millions. Even more important is the protection given to human life in an area where a single Washita River flood left 17 dead.

The Washita project is not a Government handout, but a cooperative program between the landowner, city folks, and the Federal Government.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and as an

Oklahoma Senator it is a pleasure to work for such vital projects conserving our natural resources. The agriculture appropriations bill which passed the Senate a few days ago, and which I supported, contains $5,313,047 to keep the Washita project on schedule this year.

Mr. President, the story of the Washita project is told in the October issue of the Progressive Farmer in an article entitled "Sooners 'Harness' the Washita." I am happy to call this article to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOONERS "HARNESS" THE WASHITA

Floods make good headlines. But it's a strikingly different and more tragic picture to those living in the stricken areas. It means lost or damaged crops and homes, washed-out land, and often death.

And a flood doesn't have to be a "headliner" to cause severe damage. A tiny, peaceful stream winding through fertile farmland can suddenly erupt into a vicious, twisting mass of destruction. As it and other small creeks race for the main river or "stem," they leave behind about 75 percent of all the damage caused by floods. The same peaceful little stream will likely be dry a few weeks later.

Oklahomans know this story well. For their own Washita River—fed by 64 major creeks and notorious for frequent and damaging floods—is now under heavy fire from flood-prevention authorities and conservationists. Leading the fight are local folks themselves. The Washita—snaking 650 miles across Oklahoma from Miami in the Texas Panhandle and dumping into Lake Texhoma near Tishomingo—is slowly but surely being "haltered."

The determined effort to control the Washita has propelled Oklahoma to the Nation's lead in upstream flood prevention—a two-phase program involving land treatment and upstream floodwater retarding structures.

It's with good cause. The Washita has been "flood crazy." Seventeen people died in the Hammon, Okla., flood in 1934. Other floods have left thousands homeless, vast areas of cropland and pastureland destroyed. Ranchers and farmers have known the misery of crop and livestock loss—of creeks that dried up in summer. Yearly losses from the Washita stand at near $6 million, with 70 percent due to direct damage to crops and pastures.

Since work was started in 1948, activity has mushroomed. Of 915 dams planned, 524 are built or are under contract. When it's all done, the annual benefit will be nearly $20 million. Some say it's worth $10 for every $1 spent.

Landowners have cooperated splendidly, giving voluntary easements, raising needed money, establishing conservation plans on the land, and putting in land-treatment measures. Actually, landowners have stayed out in front of the program, with land-treatment practices. These include range seeding, terracing, farm ponds, grassed waterways, cover cropping, stubble mulching, tree planting, wildlife habitat development, irrigation management, strip cropping, etc.—all necessary in making a go of flood prevention.

"It's all well worth it," says Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisor Curtis Murphy of Custer County. "Before this war started, we might harvest a crop and we might not. Some farmers would lose their wheat crops 3 out of 5 years."

Another SWCD supervisor, L. L. "Red" Males of Roger Mills County, says, "Flood control has helped stabilize the economy of entire area." Sandstone Creek, in Rogers Mills County, was the first creek in the Nation to be harnessed by flood control measures. Yearly benefits from flood prevention on Sandstone stand near $157,000. Males has told the Sandstone story in about 20 States.

Local cooperation is one of the big plus values of the program. In the Cordell, Okla., Soil Conservation Service Work unit, land leveling has reached an all-time high; more than 300 miles of terraces have been built, and goals for conservation cropping have been exceeded by 25 percent.

When asked, "Who benefits from the program?" a local booster countered, "Who doesn't?" It's a program tailored for everyone—rural or city. Benefits are for all to share.

For the landowner—program allows use of the flood plain for crop and livestock production; protects topsoil; offers a more dependable water supply; allows water-retarding structures to be used for recreation and recreational leases; makes irrigation easier; insures harvesting a crop, and prevents the obvious disaster of flooding.

For city folks:

1. Holds check on floodwaters.

2. A cleaner, healthier water supply is insured. For example, three structures above Clinton lake have lengthened life of water supply considerably. Structures and land treatment filter water as it moves toward the reservoir, leaving it clean and sparkling clear. Program doesn't hold back water permanently, as some have criticized. It merely slows down, saves more of it, and conditions it for later use.

3. It offers more recreation space. Near Cheyenne, in Rogers Mills County, 79 of the 112 structures will be suitable for fishing, duck hunting, and swimming—29 are large enough for boating and water skiing.

4. Recreation brings in outside income to local towns.

"Actually," says Males, "this recreation may be the biggest thing of all, as far as cities are concerned.

"And it brings other values," he continued. "I saw two oldtimers going fishing the other day, cutting up like a couple of kids. Folks are happy—that's hard to put a dollar mark on."

Further area benefits pointed out by Males, were: It's brought young folks back to the area. There are more father-son ranching and farming partnerships. No farms have been abandoned. County road commissioners, with less time and money needed to repair washed-out roads, can put effort into building shale and blacktop roads.

"But the greatest overall benefit," Males believes, "is in education—folks are taking care of the land."

The program can't stand alone. The example set—and the successes already realized on the Washita—have proved its workability and have emphasized the necessity of dedicated effort and cooperation by farmers, agricultural workers, and city folks. The program is working because local folks are making it work.

Hon. David Dickson Terry

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was very saddened to hear of the death of David Dickson Terry. Dave Terry was a Member of this House when I first came to Congress, and he was also dean of the Arkansas delegation. I owe much to him for his very valuable guidance and assistance in my early days here. He gave unstintingly of his time and he was very, very patient in advising me as a newcomer to the Congress.

He served his State both locally and on a statewide basis as an unselfish, public-spirited citizen in addition to his service of 10 years in the Congress. He was one of those rare individuals who put public service above self-interest. Our State and our Nation are the winners in having such a man who was so devoted to his State and country. I, like many others, had the good fortune to have him help shape my career in the Congress. He will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mr. Terry's family in their bereavement.

Infatuation With Aggregates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Infatuation With Aggregates."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFATUATION WITH AGGREGATES

As the tax cut wends its slow way toward Senate discussion, it may be useful to consider its specifically economic objectives.

Many people, including us, have questioned the idea of an $11 billion tax reduction in a period of budget deficits and without any offsetting reductions in Government spending. Many people also object to particular reforms in the present bill. And of course the whole business is heavily overlaid with politics.

But if these important matters were to be put aside for the moment, there still remains the issue of the bill's underlying economic theory. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has put what is in effect the administration's case very well. In an interview with New York University's Challenge magazine, he argues that the trouble with the economy, reflected in unemployment and underutilization of plant capacity, is insufficient purchasing power or aggregate demand.

One remedy, the Senator observes, would be a bigger program of public works. The other would be a tax cut, "putting more money in the pockets of people. Either program of creating adequate demand necessarily involves a deficit. * * * There is a lot to be said for public works programs, but they take time to get underway. * * * So I personally think that the President's program to increase aggregate demand through a tax cut is probably the quickest and wisest method of solving this problem."

The argument plainly rests on a number of assumptions, and to us they seem dubious at best. It is becoming widely recognized, for instance, that the unemployment figures are inflated, while in a number of

fields there is if anything a labor shortage. "Excess capacity," moreover, often means merely that industries are not using some of their old and obsolescent facilities; even so, in a number of activities utilization is close to capacity these days.

The major assumption, though, is that the proposed tax cuts actually would be a big stimulus to spending. This overlooks the fact that people are also capable of saving money, and have shown quite a propensity in that direction despite the existing high taxes.

Even if it would be reasonable to expect at least a moderate rise in spending in the wake of lower taxes, much depends on what the spending is for. An increase in beer consumption is not of the same economic value as investment in research for new products or outlays for new capital equipment. In the same way, increased Federal spending on nonproductive projects will raise the gross national product on paper, but is all but meaningless economically or may in fact be a drain on the economy.

As the editor of Challenge, indirectly taking issue with Senator DOUGLAS, notes, too much attention is paid to aggregates, those great big round figures economists like to talk about. "The quality of expenditures is all-important. The quantity, the aggregate, is deceptive."

It is on this basic point that Roswell Magill, chairman of the private Committee on Federal Tax Policy, also parts company with the House-passed bill. A stimulus to consumption, he says, "can help raise gross national product only in the short run. For the longer run, growth of consumption depends on expansion of production—and this, in turn, depends on investment." The committee has devised an alternative tax proposal, designed to spur the savings and investment which are the real route to more jobs and sound economic growth.

If the budget were in balance, even the bill now before Congress could be welcomed as a step in the direction of reforming our horrendous tax structure. But the budget is not in balance, and the administration has overstated the supposed wonders that would ensue from the bill as it now stands.

For the Senate to act responsibly, it seems to us, requires two things: An insistence on spending reductions. And a close analysis of the bill's infatuation with foggy economics.

Audits & Surveys Co. Marks 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 10th anniversary of the Audits & Surveys Co., the Nation's second largest marketing research organization. Although the headquarters of this company are located in the State of New York, its work and the effects of its work touch every region represented here. It is for this reason that I feel the following will be of interest to all my colleagues and that they will join me in paying tribute to this pioneering firm.

Since our birth as a nation, the American marketplace has evolved from village square to shopping center. This development has radically altered traditional marketing techniques. Instead of artisans or farmers selling their wares to familiar customers, giant corporations are filling the needs of a public from which they are separated by thousands of miles and echelons of distributors and retailers. The resulting loss of immediate, direct communication between producer and customer is one of the central problems of modern marketing. In the last few decades, the enormous growth of the Ameriacn business community has emphasized the pressing need for accurate, meaningful statistical profiles of the consumer marketplace.

Marketing research, blending the diverse disciplines of mathematics, psychology and sociology, supplies this vital information to the Nation's manufacturers. However, as with any scientific research, valid findings can only result from valid methods. It also follows that meaningful interpretations can be made only in full knowledge of a study's limitations and aims. It is interesting to note that 5 years ago, Solomon Dutka, founder and president of the Audits & Surveys Co., admonished the entire research industry to avoid using data which carried no specifications as to its quality or reliability. In a speech before the American Marketing Association, he called for rigid application of statistical quality control procedures to assure greater accuracy of research findings.

His comments were based on long experience. Prior to forming his own firm in 1953, Mr. Dutka was well established in both the academic and business worlds. He began his career as a college statistics instructor and is still active in academic circles as an adjunct professor at New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration.

In 1945 he received a special citation from the Secretary of War for his work in nuclear physics during the Manhattan project. In 1950 the American Statistical Association, of which he is a fellow, appointed him a delegate to the United Nation's Subcommission on Statistical Sampling.

Audits & Surveys was founded by Mr. Dutka when he was 29. From a 1-room office with one secretary and one client, his firm has had a dramatic growth. Today it maintains a headquarters staff of 300 and a nationwide network of more than 2,500 field reporters who collect, tabulate, and analyze marketing data for some 100 clients.

Among the firms it serves are some of the Nation's leading corporations, including American Telephone & Telegraph, Campbell Soup, Columbia Broadcasting System, DuPont, General Electric, General Foods, General Motors, Life magazine, Look magazine, Procter & Gamble, S. C. Johnson.

During its 10 years of operation, the company has pioneered new methods of market analysis which are contributing valuable marketing data for the Nation's manufacturers.

This includes an advanced concept of market analysis which involves the auditing of every type of retail outlet that carries a specific product category. This is a continuous and comprehensive nationwide audit which reports the brand-by-brand share of the total market held by competing products.

To achieve statistical accuracy in this project, Audits & Surveys conducts a yearly sample census of the country's retail population—the largest privately conducted study in the United States, second in scope only to the business census of the Bureau of Census. It provides current information on the number and type of retail and service outlets in the country.

In addition to these research services, the firm maintains a consumer survey division which seeks to determine consumer attitudes, opinions, and behavior.

Working closely with Mr. Dutka in the development of these concepts and services, is a member of the U.S. Census Advisory Committee, Lester R. Frankel, executive vice president of Audits & Surveys. As a statistician with the Bureau of Census, Mr. Frankel designed and organized the first nationwide probability sample of the labor force in the United States. His sample design, created in the late 1930's, is still used by the Bureau.

Also an adjunct professor of statistics at New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration, Mr. Frankel is president of the Market Research Council, a director of the American Management Association, and fellow and past national director of the American Statistical Association.

Audits & Surveys has traveled a long way in 10 years. It has attracted special assignments from business and the Federal Government. It has expanded into foreign markets, establishing operations in Canada, Latin America, and Europe.

But more important, it has helped to bring market research further along the road in its quest for accuracy and reliability.

Audits & Surveys can be justly proud of its record of achievement. I am happy to offer my congratulations to this firm as it begins its second decade of service to American business and very best wishes to Solomon Dutka a leader of our free enterprise system.

Research of OSU Historian Brings National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HOWARD EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I want to call attention to a new book, "Lincoln's Gadfly Adam Gurowski," which will be published next spring by the University of Oklahoma Press.

Written by Dr. Leroy H. Fischer, professor of history at Oklahoma State University, it has won a $5,000 prize as the best book-length unpublished manuscript dealing with the Civil War period.

I congratulate Dr. Fischer on his achievement and ask unanimous consent that an article about the book, published

in Research Reports, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY HISTORIAN BRINGS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

"Lincoln's Gadfly Adam Gurowski" is the title of the book manuscript by Dr. Leroy H. Fischer, professor of history and Civil War researcher at Oklahoma State University. It has already won a $5,000 award, and is to be published next year by the University of Oklahoma Press.

This apparently is the largest prize ever given a manuscript treating the Civil War, and probably the largest ever awarded a manuscript in any field of American history. Certainly it ranks high among the accolades that have been given to Oklahoma scholars.

Dr. Fischer modestly says it was just "accident" that he won the prize offered by the Loyal Legion of the United States for the best book length unpublished manuscript dealing with the Civil War period. It just happened that he had been working on it for 10 years and had the manuscript in such condition that it could be completed in time for the Civil War centennial contest.

It was hardly by accident that it was chosen by a panel of 10 judges from 151 manuscripts submitted by research students from all over the United States. The selection was made "on the basis of significance and importance to the general public as well as literary merit."

Dr. Fischer and his family went to Gettysburg in July to receive the award and to participate in the centennial commemoration of the Battle of Gettysburg. The historian, a member of the Oklahoma Civil War Centennial Commission, has also spoken at similar commemorations in Vicksburg, Miss., and in Oklahoma on the site of the Battle of Honey Springs, near Muskogee.

Although there are probably a number of reasons for Dr. Fischer's dedication of the manuscript to his parents, surely one is that he considers them responsible for his interest in this period of American history. When he was a child, many family vacation trips were in the South where sightseeing always included visits to Civil War battlefields and other points of historical significance. This interest in history was intensified in high school and college and it seemed only natural that it should focus on the Civil War period.

Dr. Fischer's research, in part sponsored by the Research Foundation, has not been into the battles which caught his interest as a boy, but into the political situations which affected not only the war itself but the course of history since.

His study of Adam Gurowski offers clear insight into political conditions in the North. Gurowski, a radical or anti-Lincoln Republican, was the leading propagandist and lobbyist of his wing of the party. His writings candidly divulge radical methods and reveal the origins of their inspiration, ideas and information more fully than other source. Gurowski was, moreover, unique among his political associates because of a European background combining a mixture of aristocracy, erudition and revolution.

A study of the political climate of the Civil War era offers opportunity for a better understanding of many situations which exist today, Dr. Fischer feels. It was during this period that important steps were taken in the same battle for human freedom which continues today. The centralization of authority in the Federal Government, at present the subject of much concern and controversy, also began during the war years.

Address by Dr. David N. Licorich Before the Baptist Ministers Conference of Greater New York and Vicinity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered to the Baptist Ministers Conference of Greater New York and Vicinity, which has a constituency of over 400 members, by Dr. David N. Licorich, chairman of its civic committee, at the civic committee crusade, encouraging the members of all churches to register and vote. The Reverend Mr. Licorich, who is serving his 20th year as chairman of civic affairs for the conference, has been just elevated as administrator of Abyssinian Baptist Church where he has served as associate minister for the past 19 years.

His address follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. DAVID N. LICORICH

Our community is being invaded by certain insidious incursions of indifference that strike at the very lifeline of democracy. Unless checked and beaten back and destroyed in their tracks such inroads may wipe out what gains we have made during our so-called Negro revolution. We have come to identify revolution with violence and bloodshed. Nothing could be more erroneous than that. Revolution does indeed employ force and strength but it is not necessarily violent or destructive. The thrust for change aims to smash only the old shibboleths, mores, and cliches and that support the outgrown status quo which eventually sinks us down into stagnation and decadence.

One of the significant areas in the whole broad field of democratic progress without which full freedom is impossible is the proper use of the ballot. Today in this important phase of the Negro revolution we have permitted ourselves to be caught and held tight in the slough of indifference. Over 1 million Negroes are scattered throughout New York City. We have a potential voting strength of 424,000. In Harlem, out of a potential voting strength of 300,000 men and women only 140,000 are registered voters—and that is 50 percent less than the potential. In the 11th and 14th assembly districts only 42 percent of the potential votes are cast. In the 12th and 13th assembly districts we have 50 percent of the potential. It is to be noted that these districts all have a large percentage of white voters. These figures reflect most embarrassingly the indifference, apathy, inertia, idleness, and irresponsibility of a community that likes to boast of its unique position of freedom in the body politic.

There is, furthermore, a professional lag that is holding back political participation and progress. What has happened to our doctors, teachers, editors, lawyers, social workers, educators, and others who are looked upon as the intellectuals among us? It is reported that only 40 percent of the eligible voters among these intellectuals, cast their votes. We have permitted indifference to make its inroads into the very areas we should look to for accomplishing the objectives of the Negro revolution.

Another disappointing factor in the thrust of the young Negro aspirant to leadership is that those who do take part in politics are chiefly concerned with capturing a job for themselves. They appear to have very little incentive to work for the total freedom of the community which is bound by the chains of economic servitude. There is a great deal more to work for in the Negro community than the mere handout of a job as the result of one's alliance with a political party. Too often do we see the eager young entrant into politics becoming closed mouth and safe on the very issues that prompted his challenge and concern before the alliance took place.

Harlem has many problems. We live in a ghetto and although we must count ourselves fortunate that our fathers and mothers inculcated within us the need to acquire an education that prepared us for our professions and vocations or avocations that have put us in the forefront in many social and economic respects, yet, we must realize that the ghetto is still with us and will be with us for a long time. We are aware that a few have escaped the compulsion of living in the Harlem ghetto, but we still see around us cesspools of vice, and iniquity, of economic exploitation of unemployment, of overcrowding in dilapidated houses. There is no novelty in the heavy caseloads of relief recipients, of conjestion in every area, of the lack of civic involvement and improvement, of filthy streets, of odorous garbage, of poor lighting, and loose dogs prowling the parks, occupied by an army of outcast men and women who appear to have been dispossessed from the common decencies of life, of prostitutes and pimps, dope peddlers and pushers, taking over the busy thoroughfares and crossroads of the community, of poor hospital and health facilities and services, of poverty, want, and penury in the midst of plenty. All these become a serious challenge to the indifference of the professionals and the intellectuals—if their concern is truly for the betterment of humanity.

An insight into the paralysis of indifference of our own times come to us in the query of Jesus of Nazareth concerning another generation. He asked, "How shall I describe this generation?" They are like the children sitting in the marketplace and shouting to each other, "We piped for you and you would not dance. We wept and wailed, and you would not mourn."

This generation scoffs at experienced leadership; it seeks to depose the respected for the raucous; it rejects tried and proven standards of procedure and laughs all authority out of court. How pathetic was the generation that Jesus pictured. He observed: "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, 'He has a demon'; the Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, 'Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners.' Yet wisdom is justified by her deeds." Mathew 11:16–19.

We are badly enough off, in Harlem, in the matter of indifference to our civic responsibilities. But if we took the Abyssinian Baptist Church and its minister, Dr. ADAM C. POWELL, out of this Negro revolution, I would like to know what would become of it? What would we have left? The awakening of the Brooklyn ministers, too, although it has been a somewhat belated effort, has gone a long way in the dramatization of the economic plight of the Negro people in the whole State of New York, not just New York City alone.

How can we be indifferent to the demands of these times? We are indifferent to the call to integration. There are those who feel that there is no need for them to push for

total integration if it involves their having to get up a little earlier and make the child more presentable, to meet the demands of integration. We appear not to want to go to the trouble of seeing that our children receive an education commensurate to that received by other communities which are receiving the same amount of money for the education of their children. Parents are indifferent about attendance at Parent-Teachers Association meetings. They are indifferent about their children's report cards. They are indifferent about the foul language which their children use. Respect for the rights of others appear to be a thing of the past and children ride roughshod over anyone who might be standing in their way.

If Jesus came to Harlem today He would castigate the churches for their bland indifference to the needs of the community. The churches have neglected the program of human redemption and of social and economic betterment through the use of the ballot. They have not urged the taking of an active part in the affairs of government through training of the moral leadership without which a society becomes decadent.

If Jesus came to Harlem today He would drive out of the churches the moneychangers who sit in prominent places, those who buy and sell in the temple, trafficking their wares and exchanging their goods at the expense of the worship of God. He would drive out those in high places who use the church for their own self-aggrandizement and the satisfaction of their greedy appetites for monetary prestige and social prominence. He would break down the barriers of segregation and discrimination and would call for one worship of the one true God and one true church.

There is no place for indifference to the crying needs of the oppressed. Do you not hear the voices of little children calling for response to their tears? The program of Jesus must be the program of the church. If we do not want to follow Him then we should get out and let the church roll on. If you have some personal ax to grind the church is no place for you. What did Jesus say about His program? He said: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He anointed Me to preach good news to the poor: He hath sent Me to proclaim release to the captives, and the recovering of sight to the blind. To set at liberty them that are bruised. To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." (Luke 4: 18, 19.)

If Jesus came to Harlem today He would upbraid those who reject His program of social welfare of the benighted masses. He would oppose those who turn their attention away from the appeal for action in the affairs of the community. What a sad indictment of them because of their indifference. How cold, how icy, how frigid, how callous. "We piped and you have not danced. We wailed and you did not mourn."

How can a people live in an age like this, with all the media of communication at hand calling for response to the many social, economic, political, educational, health, and welfare problems all around them that demand a sympathetic ear, and for response to the pressing needs of the Negro revolutions, and be aroused to reply to the appeal to do something about it? Yes, we have piped but our piping has fallen on indolent and deaf ears. We have wailed but there is a callous indifference, that prohibits any response.

Never has there been an era so potentially enlightening and inspiring as ours. Yet we find more docility, passivity, and mediocrity possessing the people of this age than at any period in our history. Certainly, if the appeal for registering and voting in Harlem, in New York, in the North, had been made in Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, and Tennessee—in the Southern States as a whole—they would have voted many of the segregationists out of their offices a long time ago. But we cry, "Send troops to Alabama," "Send troops to Mississippi," and in our impetuosity we would seek to undermine the one President of these United States who has done more to break the back of segregation and discrimination and Jim Crowism than any other President since Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. Not that I am opposed to the sending of troops to the troubled spots in the South or anywhere else in the United States where law and order has broken down in the defiance of the Federal laws which run in conflict with State laws, but I wish to affirm the importance of backing up our demands with the casting of our votes at the ballot box. In fact, I would like to see the troops permanently entrenched in the South until every vestige of discrimination, segregation, and Jim Crowism is eradicated. If we can send troops to Vietnam to keep the peace, we should also send troops to the South to keep the peace there. If we are trying to maintain democracy abroad we should begin at home first, or at the same time. There must be no two-way policy in this matter of democracy.

The best way to bring about the right to send troops to the troubled areas of the South is to say it at the ballot box. Every vote we cast in the North will enhance the full emancipation of the Negro in the South. We should settle this thing once and for all. Either we register and vote, exercising our franchise right here in the North or else we stop shouting for freedom now. The quickest way to achieve freedom is to strike the blow for it at the ballot box. We talk about the country's responding to the demands of our brothers in the South but have we done anything here and now to expedite the registration and get out the votes here in the North for the change or support you wish to make in leadership?

Our intellectuals, our doctors and lawyers, could start a campaign for registering and getting out the votes by emphasizing that each patient or client take the matter of his civic responsibilities seriously. Suppose every doctor's office had in it a person dedicated to the encouragement of the civic responsibilities of those who visited that office? What an awakening there could be here in Harlem. Suppose every lawyer would encourage and guide his clients to the polls to register and vote, what a new surge, what a great thrust, what a great blow would be struck for freedom.

What if every barber shop and beauty salon would talk shop about registering and voting? Can you imagine what a blow would be struck for freedom both in the North and in the South?

What about the supermarkets, the dry goods stores, the restaurants, and places of amusements? Do you know that the crusade for freedom and equality could become a thing of the past were we to enlist all with whom we come in contact to register and vote?

These are only a few areas of social contact that time will permit me to mention, but you can carry this appeal to register and vote to all walks of life, to every area of life. What we need today in Harlem is something forceful enough to smash the crucible of indifference. The Negro revolution must be the concern of all of us. Don't stand off and think that the crusade for freedom is going to be won without your enlistment. You are part and parcel of it, whether you actively respond to its appeal or whether you shield yourself in the cloak of indifference. There is no escape from this fresh phase of the American revolution. It involves us all and we must make up our minds to dance to the music that others pipe. We have got to mourn when others mourn and wail. It is a matter of empathy, everybody in all America must be involved, for the revolution is American in its purport.

A great thing happened in Cleveland, Ohio, at the 83d Annual Session of the National Baptist Convention on Friday, September 6, 1963, when Dr. Joseph H. Jackson, the president presented the report of his commission on civil rights for adoption. It was an answer to a long dream for many of us who have wanted to see the National Baptist Convention in the United States of America become more concerned with the social problems confronting the Negro and, for that matter America and the whole world.

It was a great forward step because it promised to involve every local pastor at the grassroots, soliciting his services in calling upon the people of his congregation and community to register and vote.

It further took the matter of civil rights out of the hands of certain secular organizations which seem to feel that they should have and hold the monopoly on civil rights and any other program or project that seeks to achieve better economic, political, educational, and social progress for the masses of the Negro people.

It also brought back to the church its rightful place of implementing the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

It placed the church in the forefront of the conflict because Jesus Christ called upon the church to lead the world and not allow the world to lead the church. He said to his disciples: "You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven."

It also brought Baptists back into the limelight of freedom, for from the days of Roger Williams until this very day, Baptists have believed that freedom is the bedrock and foundation stone of the Baptist philosophy of religion. It brought the convention in the place where it belongs: out front.

The National Baptist Convention must not be an adjunct to any secular movement for freedom. It must not play second fiddle. Christian strategy will not permit the church to identify itself with the ungodly tactics and techniques of certain secular organizations whose members have no true allegiance to God or man.

The convention further gives us a positive approach to the whole matter of freedom. It centers in the Christian approach. It avoids unnecessary provocation which often causes friction at the grassroots of the problem. It is comprehensive as to civic matters by making provision for the solving of all those problems in education, housing, health, hospitals, jobs, and other areas where the tide of integration must be guided through the common ground of understanding, devoid of any atmosphere of hostility and violence.

It emphasized voting at all levels, maintaining its autonomous independence yet not devoid of the wholesome spirit of cooperation with all other civil rights groups who have as their major function and objectives the ahievement of integration.

Now the National Baptist Convention in the United States can move together for civil rights and the entire program of freedom and progress from protest to production. It does not have to fear molestations or embarrassments that are so often experienced by the ministers. The Methodists have organized their civil rights bloc, the Presbyterians have set aside half a million dollars to foster and and perfect a plan for integration. The Congregational and Christian Churches have instituted Commissions on Civil Rights and Integration. The Episcopalians and many other churches, along with the Roman Catholic Churches, founded organizations working toward the whole campaign of civil rights and integration.

And now the Baptists have theirs. If only 1,000 ministers out of the 27,000 affiliated with the National Baptist Convention, if only 5,000 members of the 5 million constituency of the convention accept the invitation to sponsor and support the provisos of the Civil Rights Commission of the National Baptist Convention, then we shall have started something toward the total redemption of the Negro in the United States.

Now we do not have to dance to the music of those who have not always been respectful toward the church and its ministry.

In the words of St. Paul: "In all this, remember how critical the moment is. It is time for you to wake out of sleep, for deliverance is nearer to us now than it was when first we believed. It is far on into the night; day is near. Let us, therefore, throw off the deeds of darkness and put on our armor as of soldiers of light." Romans 13: 11, 12.

Labeling Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, a letter by Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., the distinguished Washington attorney, appeared in the Washington Post this morning. Because it is a carefully documented reply to those who label the civil rights bill as approved by the House Judiciary Subcommittee an extreme bill, I commend Mr. Rauh's letter to the attention of my colleagues:

LABELING CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

The civil rights bill, which the House Judiciary Subcommittee has now aproved, is endangered by what appears to be a concerted campaign to label it "extreme." I would most respectfully suggest that this subcommittee bill is a realistic effort to cope with segregation and discrimination in America and that it is both inaccurate and unfair to label it "extreme."

It is true that the subcommittee bill contains much to commend it to the civil rights groups. It would, in addition to opening public accommodations to Negroes, speed up voting cases, permit the Attorney General to bring suits to desegregate schools and to protect peaceful demonstrations (a proposal which passed the House in 1956 and 1957), and provide for a Fair Employment Practices Commission (a proposal reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee with bipartisan support).

One wonders how Congress could do less in this year of the Birmingham atrocities and the inspirational march on Washington. A quick comparison of the subcommittee bill with the September 30 recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission indicates that the Commission, with the full support of its southern members, not only endorsed the principal proposals of the subcommittee bill but went far beyond them. One can only smile at calling Dean Storey, of Dallas, and Professor Rankin, of Durham, extremists.

Indeed, the subcommittee bill leaves out many of the most worthwhile civil rights suggestions of recent times; for example:

The Democratic platform of 1960 promises legislation to require an immediate start in desegregation in every school district in the land. No such provision is contained in the bill.

The Civil Rights Commission 4 years ago urged legislation providing for Federal registrars to bring about wholesale enfranchisement of Negroes rather than the present retail case-by-case method. No such provision is in the bill.

Many thoughtful civil rights observers have urged that no Federal funds should ever go into segregated or discriminatory activities, but the bill simply makes such withholding discretionary.

The label "extreme" cannot stand the light of analysis. Would those who call the bill extreme want to deny Negroes the right to go into places of accommodation open to other members of the public? Would those who call it extreme want to leave peaceful demonstrators at the mercy of police dogs and fire hoses? Would those who call it extreme want to leave Negro unemployment at its present tragic heights?

Is it unfair for us to suggest that those who label this bill "extreme" really will be satisfied only when it is watered down to a point where it will not mean perceptible progress toward human equality?

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has called for the enactment of the subcommittee bill without dilution and without delay. For Congress to do otherwise is to invite the very civil disobedience which its Members decry. Patience can hardly be asked 100 years after emancipation. The subcommittee bill is the last clear chance to meet the problems of human equality within the processes of law and the Constitution.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
Americans for Democratic Action.
WASHINGTON.

Marion County, W. Va., Site of Fierce Indian Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail relates the history of Marion County, W. Va., where early settlers in the 18th century battled heroically to defend their farms against the Indians. Prickett's Fort, built in 1774, was the scene of some incredibly fierce encounters which have become a part of the legends of Marion County.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

MARION COUNTY, W. VA., SITE OF FIERCE INDIAN WARS

Marion County, named for Gen. Francis Marion, the "Swamp Fox" of the American Revolution, was formed in 1843 from parts of Monongalia and Harrison Counties. The county seat was established at Middletown, a small village incorporated in 1820 on a newly opened road connecting Clarksburg and Morgantown. The name was changed to Fairmont in 1843. In 1850 there were 10,552 people in the county.

The first settlers had come after the close of the French and Indian War. Among them were Jacob Prickett, Frederick Ice, Thomas Merrifield, James Booth, David Morgan, Nicholas Woods, Peter Straight, William Snodgrass, Asa Hall, William Haymond, and John, Nathan, Boaz, and Benoni Fleming.

Prickett's Fort, built in 1774 at the time of Dunmore's war was a famous place of defense against the Indians. In this border warfare period, David Morgan had his heroic contest with two Indians at his farm near Prickett's Fort in 1779; a fight in which he shot one Indian and mortally wounded the other after a desperate hand-to-hand combat.

Morgan's neighbors later killed the wounded Indian, skinned him, tanned the hide, and made from it bookcovers and other useful articles.

Marion County was also the scene of Levi Morgan's classic encounter with two Indians on Buffalo Creek in which Morgan shot one of the Indians, threw away his shot pouch and rifle to divert the other savage who was close on his heels, and finally escaped by tricking the Indian into believing that help was coming.

More than 40 grist and saw mills were built along the streams of the county by 1852. Names associated with early mills were Cochran, Reeder, Evans, Prickett, Morgan, Barnes, Ice, Richard, Tennant, Nuzum, Polsley, and Jackson.

The first post office in the county was established in 1820 at Polseys Mill across the Monongahela River from Middletown. Rivesville was laid out in 1837, Palatine was laid out in 1838, and Boothsville had its early beginnings in 1839.

Other inhabited places included Worthington and Willeytown (Farmington). The Marion County Pioneer, established at Middletown in 1842, was the county's first newspaper.

In 1849 turnpikes were constructed to connect Fairmont with Beverly, Fishing Creek on the Ohio River, and Weston. The first steamboat came to Fairmont in 1850. In 1852 the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was completed to Fairmont; and a suspension bridge was built across the Monongahela River connecting Fairmont and Palatine.

The coming of the railroad made possible shipments of coal and was the beginning of Marion County's commercial coal economy. Early coal men were James O. Watson and Francis H. Pierpont. The first bank in the county was organized in 1853 at Fairmont. The town of Mannington was chartered in 1856.

The Civil War divided Marion County. A majority of the inhabitants supported the Union, but many prominent persons, including Alpheus Haymond, William J. Willey, and Thomas F. Conaway were secessionists. The first militia company organized in the county was the Confederate Marion Guards.

Francis H. Pierpont, of Fairmont, was one of the early leaders of the Unionist cause in northwestern Virginia. In 1861 he was chosen to be Governor of the restored government of Virginia by the second Wheeling Convention. Governor Pierpont aided in the formation of the new State and is called the "Father of West Virginia." His statue stands in Statuary Hall.

The highpoint of the Civil War in Marion County came on April 29, 1863, when Gen. William E. Jones led a charge of 2,500 Confederate cavalry into Fairmont. The town was captured, the magnificent iron bridge across the Monongahela River was destroyed, and Governor Pierpont's library was burned in the street in front of his house before Jones' raiders rode south at dusk.

The free public school movement began in 1864. In 1868 the Fairmont Normal School, founded in 1865 as a private normal school, came under State control. Joseph Rosier, its president from 1915 to 1945, served as U.S. Senator from 1941 to 1942.

Large-scale commercial coal operations began in 1886 when the Watsons opened mines north of Fairmont at Montana and Johnson N. Camden opened mines south of Fairmont at Monongah. Railroads connect-

ing Fairmont to Morgantown and Clarksburg were completed in 1886 and 1890.

In 1901 Clarence W. Watson, later a U.S. Senator, formed the Fairmont Coal Co. which became part of the Consolidation Coal Co. in 1903.

On the morning of December 6, 1907, Monongah Mines No. 6 and No. 8 exploded with terrific force killing 361 miners, the worst mine disaster ever to occur in the United States. Oil was discovered at Mannington in 1889. Natural gas was discovered at the same time. The exploitation of coal, oil, and gas reserves brought great wealth to the county and caused the population to rise to 32,430 by 1900, 42,794 by 1910, and 54,571 by 1920.

A new courthouse was completed in 1900. Industry was attracted after 1890 by the railroads and cheap fuel. Shortly after 1900 the Monongah Glass Co. came to Fairmont. In 1910 the Owens Bottle Works was established at Fairmont. In 1941 Westinghouse built a large fluorescent lamp plant at Fairmont. The 1960 population was 63,717.

Marion County has given three Governors to the State—A. Brooks Fleming, 1890–93; Ephraim F. Morgan, 1921–25; and Matthew M. Neely, 1941–45.

Neely had a political career unique in West Virginia history, serving 39 years as Congressman, U.S. Senator, and Governor. Congressmen from Marion County since statehood have been Neely and Robert H. Mollohan who served from 1953 until 1957.

Judges of the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals from Marion County were Alpheus F. Haymond, John W. Mason, James A. Meredith, Hershel H. Rose, and Frank C. Haymond.

State superintendents of free schools from the county were William R. White, Bernard L. Butcher, and Thomas C. Miller.

Since 1937 Harry E. Watkins, of Fairmont, has been the U.S. district judge from the northern and southern districts.

Dr. G. WAYNE SMITH.

Strategy for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the General Electric Forum under the title "Strategy for the Future" is a most thought-provoking panel discussion. The panel of analysts was moderated by Dr. David M. Abshire and the members of the panel included, Dr. Herman Kahn, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Dr. Thomas C. Schelling, Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Arnold Wolfers, and Mr. Frederick S. Wyle.

With the thought that other Members of the House would find the viewpoints of these analysts interesting and stimulating, I have requested that the discussion be printed in the RECORD:

STRATEGY FOR THE FUTURE

Dr. ABSHIRE. Gentlemen, in classical writings on military science, strategy often was described as the art of best utilizing the means available to accomplish the objective. Certainly there can be no coherent strategy—no optimum use of the resources available—until objectives are clearly defined. We entered and fought two World Wars without our ultimate objectives well established and grounded in beneficial and long-range political aims. Thus we allowed the sowing of the seed of another world struggle.

Certainly if strategy is not to be an end in itself, it must be the servant of national policy. And in turn national policy must clearly define the objectives.

At our January conference on "National Security: The Demands of Strategy and Economics in the Decade Ahead," again and again participants came back to the thought that the strategies we might employ in the next 10 years were first dependent on what objectives we established for ourselves. This led to the question: What does the United States ultimately intend to do vis-a-vis the Soviet system? And of course this brings the related question: what can it do? Some suggest that the objective of the United States in the cold war should be the maintenance of a balance of power, while others suggest it should be not equilibrium but the type of superior power and initiative which will enable us to elminate Communist power as the disturber of freedom and order.

Professor Wolfers, would you start the discussion on policy objectives?

BALANCE OF POWER

Dr. WOLFERS. As I interpret American military policy in the cold war, its objective is a military balance of power between the East and the West, to be understood as a continuing effort to attain and preserve military power sufficient to deter Soviet armed aggression. This seems a wise goal to me, in fact the only practical one as things stand. To aim at more would presuppose that we could arrive at a state of supremacy which would be meaningful under nuclear conditions. It would give us the power to disarm Soviet retaliatory might to a point at which it could cause us no intolerable damage.

Such a goal is not in sight and, failing an unforeseeable breakthrough, will become less so as time goes on. But to aim at less than the ability to deter would place us and our allies at the mercy of the Communist leaders. Some believe that there would be little risk in doing so, because allegedly, the Soviets have shifted from military means to ideological and economic instruments of expansion. However, even if they had done so—of which I see no evidence—they could switch back at any time and would be likely to do so if they were freed of military constraint. Actually, there is nothing in the intimate alliance between Soviet imperial power and world communism to suggest that it relieves us from military preoccupations. Instead, it renders them more serious by adding to the dynamism of Soviet expansion.

Regarding our ability to stand up to the crusading ideological movement of communism and our ability to meet the challenge of Soviet military might, I am more concerned about the latter. Communism is making no headway in the West and is converting few people on other continents, except where backed by prevailing Sino-Soviet military power. Unfortunately, our superior and truly impressive strategic nuclear power cannot be relied upon to protect our oversea friends and allies against Communist military inroads into their territory. It may save us from becoming the target of a nuclear Pearl Harbor, but it does not solve the problem of containment inside of Eurasia.

NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICY

Dr. NIEMEYER. I do think that the balance of power in a military sense is important. It is needed as a minimum. However, it seems to me that Professor Wolfers is talking of this conflict as if it were a conflict between nations. If that were the case, I, too, would not claim an objective of supremacy. First of all, this is not exactly within our reach. Secondly, before we ever get there we will have brought about a war. So, in the sense of a national policy of defense—U.S. military preparedness vis-a-vis Russian military power—I fully agree with Dr. Wolfers.

What I would like to suggest is that we look at the Communists not as people who simply have a purpose of world conquest. Rather, they have an expectation. The expectation is that our system, the system of "bourgeois" society—a capitalist society—is doomed, that our society will be followed by a socialist society, sooner or later—the time is unessential—and that the Communists are necessarily the people of the future. The expectation is deeply rooted in a world view, a philosophy of history and a doctrine of the supposedly ongoing Revolution.

COMMUNIST EXPECTATIONS

The Communists will stop being Communist only to the extent to which they give up their world view and their expectations, their way of thinking in terms of a historical struggle of the future Socialist society versus the present-day society.

This kind of change is something that comes extremely hard to any individual. It comes 10 times as hard to an individual who is a member of a society where this kind of expectation is authoritatively maintained and socially rewarded. We must consider Communists as people who live among us with an irrational world view—an irrational attitude toward the world and toward men. So that Communists, as long as they are organized and have power, will disturb world peace—as a matter of fact disturb the peace in their own land and in their own party. For these reasons there can be no peace in the world until the Communists as organized power have been reduced to impotence.

Dr. ABSHIRE. Professor Wolfers, you will recall that at our conference, Professor Frank Trager said he felt there is no clear-cut objective within American society today. In discussing the Far East, of which he is a lifelong student, he described three possible postures: disengagement, which he feels we accepted, in effect, in Laos; containment, to which he feels we are committed in Vietnam; and rollback. He then argued that the only way that we could achieve even containment was to apply rollback. In short, the only way we could defend Saigon was, in effect, to attack Hanoi. These three possible postures were also discussed in regard to other parts of the world as well.

HOLDING THE LINE

Dr. WOLFERS. I often run into the argument that Mr. Trager put forth so forcefully, according to which a policy of holding the line militarily—which is what containment or balancing of power implies—inevitably spells defeat in the end. In my opinion it need not do so, provided one is speaking of defense and defensiveness on the military level only. Moreover, it may be the best we can do, because holding the line along the remote and far-flung periphery of the Sino-Soviet empire is in itself a formidable task.

A military roll-back, as an alternative, would in all probability spell thermonuclear war if applied to Central Europe. And it would call for readiness—in the case of southeast Asia, for instance—to fight wars that might escalate and spread. It is not the local opportunity for victory that is decisive but the total degree of risk compared with possible local gains.

Whether the United States has been too cautious in some instances, as in Laos or Cuba, I will not seek to judge here. But the fact remains that Communist expansion has been strikingly limited since the close of the war, thanks largely to American efforts. Countries that seemed lost to the West at some time or other, like Iraq, Syria, or Guinea, have not taken the road of Castro's Cuba. And West Berlin, as exposed as it is, has retained its freedom.

It is doubtful to me whether a more aggressive or audacious policy on our part would have proved as successful or would

have preserved for us the solidarity of dozens of friends and allies on all the continents of the world. We cannot be dynamic enough in efforts to gain suport for our cause, and we are still amateurs in the art of transforming our superior values, institutions, and accomplishments into assets of cold war strategy. But it is encouraging that in the absence of greater effort on the part of the West—or possibly because of it—we have more allies among the peoples on the other side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains than the Communists have on our side.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM

Dr. KISSINGER. I would like to say that the debate about containment or roll-back does not seem to me to be the most acute issue that we face right now in the free world. Rather, I think that perhaps the deeper problem is a psychological one.

We have a notion that the normal pattern of relations among states is peaceful. At least the Communists, for example, can put bases into Cuba and 4 weeks later, when they begin a peace offensive, we immediately assume that fundamental changes must have taken place. It is, after all, reasonable that people be peaceful and engaged in peace offensives.

We talk about settlement, as if we knew what we meant by settlement. I have the impression that if the Russians came to us today and offered to sign a settlement, we couldn't describe what our notion of the settlement would be. When national leaders write that our goal is decency and a good human life, I am not overwhelmed by the precision of that description. Likewise, it is not necessarily easy for foreign governments—attempting to predict what we are going to do—to guide their actions, based on such assertions.

RESPOND ONLY TO IMMEDIATE PRESSURES

Because we really do not know what we would consider a settlement or a possible solution, as soon as the immediate pressure ends, we tend to relax our efforts. One of our problems is that people around the world have the impression that we either respond only when there are immediate pressures, or that we are so tactically oriented that we are completely unreliable. They feel that we respond in every situation to the exigencies of that situation, but that we do not know our goals 4 or 5 years from now. This, I would think, is a more fundamental problem than rollback—important as this issue is. The question of what kind of a world we want is really the one we haven't sufficiently considered.

Dr. ABSHIRE. Professor Niemeyer, at our conference Professor Kertesz agreed with you that the destruction of the Communist Party is a solution to the conflict today. But he followed this by saying that the real problem is: How can we destroy the Communist Party when it is at the same time one of the most important territorial states? He said that this problem called for an entirely different strategy, unprecedented when compared with all past situations.

THE IRRATIONAL IDEOLOGY

Dr. NIEMEYER. I do agree that what to do about the Communist Party is indeed a problem. So far the best minds of the Nation have not addressed themselves to that problem. The trouble in the world at present—the trouble about which we are all talking—stems from the presence of an activist movement with the irrational ideology of communism.

The Communists themselves are fully aware of our power, and, as we have already said here, are not trying to destroy our power by a frontal military assault. They are trying to erode and destroy our power by breaking up the social fiber that makes possible our military strength.

I suggest that a similar strategy is possible against the Communists, and with far more chances of success than the Communists have against us. Between the Communist leaders and the populations ruled by them, there is no natural link, there is no confidence, there are no shared values. There is indeed a formidable totalitarian organization; but it is possible to drive in wedges between the population and the party leaders.

NATO STRATEGY

Dr. ABSHIRE. Professor Kissinger, in our discussion on objectives, you said we had not really asked ourselves what kind of Europe we want. NATO strategy is certainly uppermost in everyone's mind today, and strategy these days is not based on military factors alone. Would you enlarge on what questions you think we should be asking ourselves?

Dr. KISSINGER. First, we have to ask ourselves: What is it that we really want from Europe? What do we mean by Atlantic Community? Do we mean that we want governments in Europe that will carry out any policy devised in Washington? Or do we mean that we want a Europe which is a partner.

It is in our interest to have a powerful and united Europe, because its natural interests are likely to run parallel to ours. If it is true that the interests of the Atlantic Community are indivisible, as we never tire of proclaiming, then I fail to understand why we are so excited about the assertions of independence in Europe.

THE NUCLEAR PROBLEM

I have the impression that our basic approach to the nuclear problem within NATO has been to retain control over the nuclear strategy of the Alliance, and therefore physical control over the ability to conduct nuclear war.

Theoretically, this is not an undesirable situation for us. Practically, politically, and psychologically, it is bound to be unacceptable to the Europeans. Let me put it another way. It can be put into effect in Europe only by strengthening all those forces not only opposed to nuclear strategy, but opposed to any kind of strategy. These forces would like to put the whole responsibility for the defense of the free world into our hands. If we are successful in this attempt, we are not going to get a conventional build-up, as some of our people believe. Rather we are going to get a neutralist Europe with a sense of impotence.

Therefore, I believe that if we are serious about the notion of partnership, we can afford to have Europeans participate as equal partners in the development of a NATO nuclear strategy.

EUROPEAN POLITICAL COMMUNITY

Dr. KAHN. I would like to defend to some degree the multilateral proposal with mixed crews for a revived Western European Union or a newly organized European Political Community. I think Dr. Kissinger is absolutely right when he says many U.S. proposals basically advocate transferring control from one U.S. headquarters to another U.S. headquarters. And, to the extent that the multilateral proposal expresses such objectives, I absolutely agree that it is dangerous for the Alliance and for the defense of the NATO area.

The fact that it is "gimmicky" does not impress me as being necessarily a defect. Any concrete proposal in this area is likely to have some gimmicks if it is to guarantee central control. It is all right to talk about political control as being central, but, what does such control mean? Are you going to have a committee? Under most circumstances committees will not press buttons and the Soviets will know this. Are you going to turn control over to an executive? This will be very tough, unless that executive is somehow under very close control.

TRIGGER AND THE SAFETY CATCH

The problem of the control of nuclear weapons is often described as a problem of the trigger and the safety catch—that is, who can press the trigger, or who can prevent the trigger from being pressed? Of course, it turns out that each nation wants to have its hands on both the trigger and the safety catch. They want safety catches for all the other weapons systems, because they don't want to be involved in a war which they didn't start. And they want a trigger for their own weapons systems. These ideas, of course, are incompatible.

How do we get some degree of compatibility? Well, first we must decide what it is we are trying to do with this force. I think the minimum that the Europeans need is a force under their own control, which would fire nuclear weapons at the Russians, if the Russians fired nuclear weapons at the Europeans. I suspect this is also the maximum that they really need.

If this is all they need, then the problem can be solved by gimmicks, because you can in fact have an executive officer with a firing doctrine. I would especially recommend the controlled-response doctrine. You fire the same number of weapons back, but you fire at the Soviet heartland. You might even tell the Soviets what the target lists and firing doctrines were, or you could publish them.

MULTILATERAL DETERRENTS

Dr. POSSONY. I do agree that, in addition to national deterrents of some sort—and maybe the only deterrent really needed is the ability to fire back—multilateral deterrents would be useful. I am basically in favor of those. But the whole argument about deterrents at the present moment, when the United States does have a very large deterrent force, is a bit in the wrong time perspective. What we need to consider is the overall nuclear problem, and we have to consider the question of the total forces of Europe, the ground forces, and the air and missile defense forces. Those are more urgent problems, I think, than the question of the multinational deterrent.

Dr. SCHELLING. Now that Dr. Possony has brought us back to the ground forces, it seems to me that the discussion about nuclear relations with France, Britain, and Germany involves a number of things. One is this question of a NATO deterrent. Another is the question of nuclear strategy for ground forces.

My own belief is that deterring the Russians from an attack on Western Europe is the one thing we have done best for 10 years, the one place where the alliance is in excellent shape. The more we discuss NATO nuclear strategy and what it takes to deter or stop a Soviet attack on Western Europe, the less time we have to consider other functions of these weapons and strategies.

NONNUCLEAR STRATEGY

The main reason for being interested in what is being called nonnuclear strategy now is not a desire to disengage, in the hope that disarmament is coming. Rather, it is a recognition that the armed forces of NATO nations in Western Europe are not really just defensive forces, and they are not really just there for NATO purposes.

Many kinds of activities that might be considered offensive would require a good deal more flexibility than we might have if all troops of all nationalities had access to nuclear weapons—more flexibility than we would have if there were a single common strategy. We need more flexibility than we probably have with the present number of troops. I have in mind the kind of contingencies in the years to come that are suggested by the Hungarian uprising, the situation in East Germany, or relations with Finland, Yugoslavia, Albania, and any other place in Eastern Europe.

For several reasons the United States may want some independence of military action in Europe. There may be a number of contingencies that can be responded to only in a non-NATO way, actions that would not invoke the NATO treaty, actions in which the political difficulties of acting as a NATO force would inhibit quick, decisive reaction.

EUROPEAN DESIRES

My own belief is that we don't really need to talk about what makes a feasible deterrent, by way of an independent force. I would even guess that the notion of something not available in 1970 satisfies what the French mainly want—even what General de Gaulle wants. If I were a Frenchman, or an Englishman, or a German, I would desire a national nuclear weapon program, not because I think that in the 1960's my own forces would be more reliable than American forces in an emergency. But I would want a national nuclear program because I wouldn't want to be frozen out of the nuclear technology in the 1970's or 1980's if NATO should cease to exist, if the Americans should drop out of the alliance, or if one of the NATO countries should decide to go its own independent way.

We must also recognize that there is possibly a European demand to be engaged in nuclear technology that we just cannot resist. Our thinking must be geared essentially toward satisfying an irresistible and a quite natural political demand for some kind of nuclear program, rather than a way to patch up deficiencies in a defensive alliance—for the most part, one of the most effective and successful bits of American military strategy anywhere around the world.

WEAKENING THE ALLIANCE

Dr. TELLER. We are withdrawing our missiles from Turkey and Italy. I think that this will weaken the alliance and will undo a lot of effectiveness that Dr. Schelling has correctly described.

We have been very paternalistic in our approach: We claim that we need more conventional forces; what is good for another country is a sea-based nuclear deterrent. In order to prevent any thought that the 1970's or 1980's will see anything else but solid Atlantic unity, would it not be best, instead of offering this or that cure, to sit down around the table with our Western Allies? Rather than have a U.S. position, let us abolish all secrets while talking in the family. Talk it out clearly as to which of the many disagreeable alternatives might, after all, be the most acceptable to the reasonable people, who will hopefully convince the others. And by "reasonable" I mean perhaps the United States, perhaps De Gaulle, perhaps the British, perhaps the Germans, perhaps the Danes.

Dr. ABSHIRE. Mr. Wyle, what are your comments on the problem of a multilateral NATO nuclear force?

POLITICAL CONTROL

Mr. WYLE. I quite agree with Henry Kissinger's feeling that political control is a difficult and important element. That does not mean however that the multilateral force is a "gimmick." The multilateral force can accomplish a great many things immediately. In time, any continuing problem of political control can be resolved.

I think Tom Schelling put his finger on it in saying that as yet the European desire is not articulated and not crystallized accurately in the field of nuclear weapons aspirations. They do not want to be "out" and the multilateral force is clearly a way in which they will be "in." The precise arrangements of the force are not yet determined. This is something that is very much a matter of discussion among the allies now. But clearly the force involves participation of a substantial kind for its members in the nuclear weapons field.

I should like to comment briefly on two of Henry Kissinger's points. It is, of course, an easy matter to criticize the multilateral force because it is unconventional, and it is a difficult endeavor. Our own people have not denied the proposition that this is a very difficult thing to do. They have, however, decided that it is feasible to do from a military point of view if there is a sufficient political will among the participants.

NUCLEAR PARTNERSHIP

Each of the points of criticism he has mentioned has been carefully considered, and I think each can be resolved in a way perfectly acceptable to the Alliance and to the European nations. The multilateral force is not solely a military force, although it is that. There are substantial political benefits to be derived from the multilateral force. It provides a means for nuclear partnership in the Alliance which is a new and valuable element. Whatever the outcome of our current discussions with our European allies, the multilateral force is not a gimmick but an honest American effort to meet European desires.

Dr. ABSHIRE. We have heard many debates over the current nuclear posture of the United States relative to the U.S.S.R. There has been much discussion as to whether we are entering inevitably a period of nuclear stalemate, or whether there is a possibility of a breakthrough which would upset the stalemate. What about this, Dr. Teller?

TEST CESSATION

Dr. TELLER. The question of test cessation has been before the American public for more than 6 years. In these very days, due to the "generosity" of Khrushchev of as many as three inspections per year, this has become, in the opinion of many of our copatriots, acutely interesting.

I have listened to a number of comparisons between the state-of-the-art in the United States and in the U.S.S.R. There is nothing more frightening to me than to see such comparisons which indicate that we are ahead, and that we certainly will continue to stay ahead. In actual fact, I am not quite sure who is ahead now, but I am sure of one technical characteristic, and here I am not facetious, I am in dead earnest. A characteristic property of nuclear explosives is that they are being developed with great speed and in an unpredictable manner. Technical surprises are an almost yearly occurrence in this rapidly advancing field. A test moratorium will close to us the avenue of such advances.

THREE INSPECTIONS—RIDICULOUS

At the same time we have seen that in the time of a moratorium the Russians can fully and effectively prepare their next test series. Test moratoria in general cannot be policed. Three inspections are ridiculous. Thirty inspections are not enough, and 300 inspections would not quite do the job either. But even if the Russians kept the agreement to the letter, and merely prepared for their next series, we might find ourselves in 1968 outclassed, for instance, in really reliable missile defenses. The result might be the same as would be the case if they had missiles and we had none. What are the uses of a thousand missiles, if none of them can hit?

Dr. ABSHIRE. Dr. Possony, in regard to the issue of whether we are really faced with a nuclear standoff, do you believe that there is a possibility of nuclear aggression by the Soviets?

HISTORY REMAINS UNPREDICTABLE

Dr. POSSONY. No state, regardless of whether it is a Communist state or a democratic state, ever can make an apriori decision that it will never launch a nuclear attack. If there is such a decision on a piece of paper, the decision will remain a piece of paper. Any attempt to predict history assumes that there will be no crises and that peacefulness has settled down after half a million years of human history. We must operate on the recognition that history is unpredictable.

We have heard a number of discussions about what is going on in the Soviet Union. We have heard that there may be an erosion of the Communist system. We could not quite define the meaning of "erosion," but I think one interpretation might be that we have a situation in which the symbol of the U.S.S.R.—namely the Communist ideology—loses its attraction, and that therefore the ruling elite in the Soviet Union loses its claim for legitimacy. Any time legitimacy evaporates, the affected elite becomes irrational. As a matter of historical record, when an elite becomes irrational, it is given to rash acts.

RATIONALITY A RELATIVE TERM

What is irrationality in this particular case? Rationality is a relative term. It is irrational to go into a nuclear war when you are a "have" nation. It would be very irrational to destroy your resources for no particular gain you can make. But the situation is entirely different when you realize or fear that your days are numbered. The feeling that, if you go under, maybe some other people ought to go under too, may or may not be irrational. But it is not irrational to think that your last chance to postpone your fate is to fight a victorious war.

Some assume that deterrence is assured. But deterrence does not happen by itself. It is a challenge which the strategists of the country must meet. For example, we have a very great deterrent force today. But while we are enjoying this superiority we are making all kinds of decisions which in essence will reduce ultimately our firepower by a very large percentage.

COUNTERFORCE STRATEGY

To carry the contradictions one step further, we announced a counterforce strategy, a perfectly good idea—but when you use a counterforce strategy, the opponent must guard himself against this particular danger. Hence, he is going to harden his sites. If you do not counter his hardening by increasing your nuclear yield, you just will not be able to apply a counterforce strategy.

In fact, by now we get all kinds of rumors which say that, since the Soviets already have hardened, or are about to harden their sites, the very concept of our coming to the rescue of the European Allies by a first strike has to be abandoned. Do these results fit the announced intentions? In my judgment, they do not.

I believe the main problem for the United States is the nuclear problem; including—and I stress this—delivery, defense, and protection.

ACT TO AVOID SURPRISE

As Professor Teller pointed out, technological change is unpredictable. Hence there is the absolute rule that we must act to avoid surprise and not invite surprise by inaction.

The reason why we need military supremacy is perfectly simple: it is to make the deterrent really credible. The way to get a credible deterrent is, of course, to race ahead in the technological area. We have all the technological capabilities to beat the Soviets. This, then, leads to the next point: Is the United States capable of maintaining this superior posture by itself? I would say yes, given various qualifications, but only with extreme effort. The one other point to remember is that we need a second strike force. Consequently, we must have a broader spectrum of technical weapons than the enemy. Otherwise we cannot be sure that the other side has not gained a certain advantage, which we did not foresee and which we cannot neutralize.

MAINTAINING TECHNOLOGICAL SUPERIORITY

Turning this around: what is the optimal way of maintaining technological superiority? It is to join forces with our European allies—the French, the British, the Germans, the Italians, etc., and in Asia, with the Japanese—not necessarily in all technological programs, but according to a well-conceived division of labor. If we succeed in revitalizing the alliance, we will have concentrated in our hands about 80 percent of the world's intellectual, technological, and industrial resources.

In my judgment, the way toward effective security leads through a real, firm, and integrated alliance. As a first doublestep, we should refloat the alliance through nuclear sharing and then set up a genuine NATO-wide R. & D. program—a program which would enhance the security and physical protection of all allies.

Dr. ABSHIRE. Dr. Kahn, do you feel that in the future we will approach a point where both sides will have invulnerable retaliatory capabilities which will rule out a counterforce strategy?

Dr. KAHN. This has to be discussed from two aspects. The first is with regard to Soviet behavior and doctrine. Anybody who has examined this knows that it is likely to be quite different from what American strategists playing Soviet decisionmakers are likely to suggest. The second aspect has to do with the ability of even efficient planners to procure invulnerable assistance.

INVULNERABILITY BY ASSUMPTION

It is important to realize that when we talk about the invulnerability of future forces, it is an invulnerability by assumption. We are all theorists today. Nobody has fought a thermonuclear war. Some people were involved in a very small kiloton war, but that is not a thermonuclear war. And the most important part of this theory, typically, is the belief that your forces survive a first attack. That is a theory. We have never tested it.

I have examined 10 to 15 weapons systems in the last 10 years. Others have examined equal numbers. It has been almost uniformly true, when people took a hard look at particular weapons systems, that they found holes in them that they had not expected to find. This is likely to continue to be true in the future, in part because of the current suspension of large nuclear yield surface tests. This has some very important effects. Our silos are not tested. The Russians may already have tested such silos in Siberia. But because of geographical and other limitations, we cannot do such testing. This is not an overwhelming argument for or against test suspensions. It is simply an observation on one of their costs.

The point is that invulnerability by assumption is a different thing than invulnerability by test. And the so-called invulnerable forces of the future, which do not allow for counterforce operations and the like, are so by assumption, and not by either analysis or test. The greater the conflicts in these forces, the more likely they are to develop weak spots.

LIMITED NUCLEAR WAR

Dr. ABSHIRE. Dr. Teller, again looking at future strategic situations, do you feel that limited nuclear war is a possibility?

Dr. TELLER. I think that limited nuclear war should be seriously considered and planned. Though limited war has been excellently discussed in a book by Henry Kissinger, it has not been sufficiently explored either in this country or within the NATO alliance. Keeping of secrets has led to a situation where it is almost impossible to discuss rationally the question with our allies, who simply lack information.

Limitation on war, avoidance of escalation, is what we want once war comes. But to limit the weapons exposes the loser to temptation. If instead you try to limit the territory, then the loser will, in his own interest, desist from expanding the war, because when he has lost a little territory, why should he next risk to lose more?

WEAPONS SYSTEMS OF THE 1970'S

Dr. SCHELLING. I am skeptical that we shall in fact achieve the technological superiority which Doctors Teller and Possony exhort us to strive for. No matter what we do in the 1970's, we will be depending on untested weapons. Nuclear testing in the interim will only make a minor improvement in the fact that we will be dealing with whole weapons systems that have never been tested in war, ranging from shelters on up to communications and reconnaissance.

If we insist on trying to have local military superiority, because anything else makes war too risky, then I think we are conceding to the Soviets a free hand all over the world. As long as the Soviets think we will only fight in limited territories, where we can win militarily, we have given them appreciable promise that any place else is without risk for them.

RISK OF GENERAL WAR

The reason for engaging the military in most places, and especially in the area of Berlin, is to take advantage of the fact that general war may occur, but not by any foreseeable process.

Dr. ABSHIRE. It seems to me that several issues have been clarified by your discussions. Perhaps part of the problem of strategy formulation is that, as one of you noted, we don't know what kind of Europe we want. Perhaps we don't know what kind of world we want.

On the military side, some have advocated the objective of a military balance of power, possibly as the best we can get, or possibly because we have faced with a nuclear standoff. Others have argued strongly for a goal of technological superiority, as the only way of making the nuclear deterrent really credible, or as a way of influencing enemy behavior.

But as we move from the military portion of our power to the political, economic and ideological portions, no one in our discussion, at least, has suggested an East-West political balance as a desirable objective. The balance of power which produced peace in the last century was based upon powers with limited aims not dedicated to the destruction of the existing world order. The system was also based upon a keeper of the balance—in this case Britain—committed to evolutionary, not violent revolutionary, premises.

At the time of the First World War it was said that the leaders were using strategy and tactics appropriate not for that, but for the previous war—they were one war behind. It would be equally tragic for us ever to fall into a strategy one century behind.

Even the nuclear strategy of the Soviet Union has its greatest pay-off in terms of blackmail and psychological warfare, not in terms of pushing the button. Long ago the ancient Chinese strategist, Sun Tzu, noted that the highest art is to win a war without battle.

One might conclude that the strategy we forge on all levels—military, economic, political and psychological—must seek to control the will of those people devoted to our destruction; it must erode that system of totalitarianism until it is powerless and is transplanted by limited government where internal power is balanced in a way that will make external balances of power again workable. But this erosion is not an automatic process—it must have an initiating force. The task of the strategy for the future in all areas of power—is to marshal and shape the military, paramilitary, economic, political, and psychological forces that can accomplish this erosion process, while preserving the world for the future of freemen.

Rights Without Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal sets forth one of the many problems confronting our country in its efforts to keep our merchant marine in operation.

Not only must we contend with strikes in violation of existing contracts, as the one mentioned, but we are faced with strike threats each time a contract expires. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been studying this aspect of maritime labor relations for the past 7 months and has evolved a bill, H.R. 1897, which would prohibit strikes for 60 days while the parties are bargaining and for an additional 90 days to give the Congress an opportunity to find a solution. While labor leadership finds this standstill period objectionable, the rest of the country finds periodic paralysis of a vital segment of our economy at the whim of these leaders beyond understanding. The exercise of responsibility must be an integral part of the right to strike.

The moderate and practical viewpoint of this editorial is commended:

RIGHTS WITHOUT RESPONSIBILITY

It is always a little sad to see a majestic ocean liner out of action for any reason. But in the case of the *America*, now tied to a New Jersey pier for a stay of indefinite duration, there is absolutely no excuse for it.

This senseless spectacle is not the result of any union grievance against the employer, United States Lines. Ostensibly the issue is the demand of unlicensed seamen represented by the National Maritime Union for the dismissal of an engineer belonging to the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. Almost everyone acknowledges, however, that the real trouble is the bitter rivalry between the two unions, for years a cause of havoc in the shipping industry.

In any event, the *America's* September 14 sailing was canceled, with over 900 passengers already on board—a charming testament to the unions' regard for innocent bystanders—and sailings through this month have also been withdrawn. So far it's reckoned that the crew has lost some $700,000 in wages and the line more than $1 million in gross revenues.

Such extreme irresponsibility is unfortunately not unusual in union affairs. Like this one, strikes are often the outcome of unions' jurisdictional disputes; or when they are against management they are frequently undertaken for trivial reasons. With unions in a position to close down nationwide industries, including basic ones like shipping, railroads, trucking, and steel, it is time to reexamine the whole concept of the right to strike.

It is a right, to begin with, which is not quite in the same category as the fundamental rights we associate with democracy. Obviously in a free society a man must be able to quit his job when he wants to; also to join with his fellows and collectively refuse to work if there is literally no other way to satisfy what are considered just demands. It is by no means obvious that the right to strike is unlimited, embracing freedom to injure countless other people, the economy, and the entire Nation.

Even the fundamental right of free speech is not limitless. The classic case of

its necessary abridgment is that free speech does not include the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater. Yet here we have unions starting fires all the time, with open contempt for the public and sometimes even for the interests of their own members.

Moreover, the right to strike, unlike the fundamental ones, is subject to modification through changing conditions. Originally it was a weapon employees used against their own employer, not a nationwide industry, and that at a time when working conditions often did indeed need improvement.

Today working conditions are excellent almost everywhere in the country. Most managements fall all over themselves to make the conditions attractive, and never has the workingman been more affluent or had more leisure time. This makes a strike all the harder to justify. It is also one of the reasons why the majority of those of us who have to work for a living never even think of going on strike.

In a word, any right entails responsibility. It is bad enough that many unions refuse to recognize this elementary fact. What makes it worse is that they have been expressly empowered by Government to use the strike weapon ruthlessly against the public.

No other group in society is permitted to behave in this fashion. If unions were put on the same footing as other groups, including removal of their immunity from antitrust prosecution, the right to strike would not be a source of so much wreckage.

Sensible restraints would be in the unions' own interest. They can get away with immobilizing America and numerous other unintelligent performances for a time, but they are building up an increasingly unfavorable public image. If they continue to reject responsibility, they may find they are sailing into a storm.

Retirement of Dr. Charles W. Mayo From the Board of Governors and as Senior Surgeon of the Mayo Clinic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the recent retirement of Dr. Charles W. Mayo from the board of governors and as senior surgeon at the Mayo Clinic calls attention to the great contribution to medical science and medical art made by the remarkable Mayo family.

Dr. Charles W. Mayo is the grandson of the English born physician, Dr. William W. Mayo. The first Dr. Mayo came to Minnesota over a century ago and practiced medicine in the pioneer territory of southern Minnesota. Later, he established his office at Rochester, Minn. He was joined in practice by his two sons, Dr. William J. Mayo and Dr. Charles Horace Mayo, after they earned their medical degrees in the 1880's. The fame of the Drs. Mayo has grown steadily since that time.

The Mayo Clinic is one of the most distinguished institutions in Minnesota. Doctors throughout the world are familiar with the extraordinary leadership provided at the clinic in medical diagnosis, surgery and treatment. Many hundreds of thousands of people have come to the Mayo Clinic with confidence that they were receiving the most advanced treatment available to medical science.

The Mayo Clinic is famous not only for its treatment of the sick but also for its contribution to medical education and research. In 1915 the Mayo brothers established the Mayo Foundation and endowed its educational work. It is affiliated with the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, and many doctors in the United States and in other lands have received specialized training through the Mayo Foundation.

Dr. Charles W. Mayo has followed the example of his father and his uncle as a leader in community and civic affairs. In 1953 he was appointed by President Eisenhower as an alternate delegate from the United States to the United Nations. He is chairman of the board of regents of the University of Minnesota, and he has served the advancement of medicine and the Nation in many other ways.

The retirement of Dr. Charles W. Mayo marks the first time that a member of the famous Mayo family has not been directly associated with the clinic. However, one of his sons, Dr. Charles H. Mayo II, is now a fellow in surgery at the Mayo Foundation.

I join with Minnesota citizens in expressing appreciation to Dr. Charles W. Mayo for his many contributions to society and in expressing best wishes for his future.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story regarding Dr. Mayo's retirement, which appeared in the Minneapolis Star on September 18, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. C. W. MAYO WILL RETIRE

ROCHESTER, MINN.—Dr. Charles W. Mayo, son of one of the founders of the Mayo Clinic, will retire from the world-famous medical center here.

His retirement as senior surgeon at the clinic and from the board of governors marks the first time a member of the Mayo family will not be on the clinic staff since its founding some 50 years ago.

The name Mayo also will be absent from the board of governors roster for the first time in 42 years.

Mayo has reached the clinic's mandatory retirement age of 65. One of his sons, Dr. Charles H. Mayo II named after Dr. Mayo's father, a cofounder of the clinic, is following in the family tradition. He is now a fellow in surgery in the Mayo Foundation, a graduate school of the University of Minnesota.

Mayo will continue as chairman of the University of Minnesota Board of Regents. Among the many other posts he will retain will be that of editor in chief of Post Graduate Medicine, national medical journal he has headed since 1946.

It was also announced today that Mayo has been appointed chief medical consultant with Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr. He has been a member of the insurance firm's board of directors for 12 years.

Mayo, who will continue to make his home in Rochester, is the grandson of Dr. William Worral Mayo, father of the two famous brothers, Dr. Charles H. and Dr. William J. Mayo, who founded the clinic.

As grandson, son, and nephew of Mayo surgeons, Mayo represented the third generation of Mayos to practice in the clinic of that name.

Mayo's 32-year medical career has included memberships in more than a dozen international, national and State medical groups, including membership in the founders' group of the American Board of Surgery in 1937 and an associate fellowship in the International Society of Surgery.

He was appointed in 1953 as an alternate delegate to the United Nations, and in that post Mayo outlined the methods used by the Soviets in seeking to force false germ warfare confessions from American prisoners.

Mayo served as an officer in the Army Medical Corps during World War II, and held the rank of colonel at the time he was separated from the service in 1946. He served as a member of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Armed Service Training Installations in 1951.

Mayo was elected president of the American Association for the United Nations in 1954, and that same year turned down an effort, backed by President Eisenhower, to get him into politics. Minnesota Republican strategists wanted him as a candidate for the U.S. Senate seat held by Democratic Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

He was born in Rochester and received his medical training at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his master of science in surgery at the Mayo Foundation in 1931.

As a surgeon, Mayo specialized in abdominal operations, especially those of the colon.

Logan County, W. Va., Named After Indian Chieftain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Logan County, W. Va., was named after a famous chief of the Mingo Indians, according to a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail. This article tells of the early history of Logan County in which wars with the Indians played a prominent role.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Gazette-Mail be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LOGAN HISTORY TIED TO FIGHTING

The mine workers and the mine operators fought in Logan County. A world heavyweight boxing champion spent his boyhood there but did his best fighting elsewhere. Earlier, Chief Cornstalk's daughter Aracoma was killed in a battle there.

All this sounds as if Logan County must have been an unpeaceful place, as at times it was. But there also have been long periods of quiet, in which its importance to West Virginia developed.

Created by an act of the General Assembly of Virginia in 1824, Logan County at that time was much larger. Out of the county as it existed then were carved Fayette, Raleigh, Mingo, and Wyoming Counties.

The county and the county seat are both named after the Mingo chieftain, whose sad history and famous speech are known to much of the world.

Many braves other than the Mingoes hunted in Logan County's valleys before Aracoma and her white husband, Bolling Baker, came to the area in 1765. The dwellings of their people stood on an island in the river south of what is now the Logan business district.

Settlers from the Greenbrier Valley came, and in a battle with them in 1770, Aracoma was fatally wounded.

The name of Lawnsville was changed to Aracoma before it eventually became Logan. The change to Aracoma was urged by Thomas Dunn English, the town's first mayor.

(English wrote a poem, "Rafting on the Guyandot," which isn't as well known as his "Ben Bolt.")

The first permanent white settlers also were island dwellers at Logan—James Workman and his brothers, Joseph and Nimrod, erected a cabin and planted corn on the island in 1794. William Dingess came along in 1799.

Timber provided the county's first industry. It first was removed next to the watercourses and shipped to market by rafts. Lumbering operations grew at Christian, Man, and Omar.

The original hardwood forests were reported equal in stand and quality to those of any other part of the State; the black walnut trees were noted for unusual size and quality. The forests were depleted, as forests were in many parts of West Virginia.

Coal hasn't been depleted yet, however, and probably won't be for many years. At one point, a State geologist estimated six seams of coal for every surface acre in the county. Every known kind except anthracite was found.

The bitter days of the mine wars are a story in themselves. Logan County will remain a supplier of coal for as long in the foreseeable future as a market for the mineral exists.

The railroad came into the county and was an important industry in itself in its pursuit of the other industries. Electric power also found markets in the county's mines and other businesses.

An extensive gas field was developed in the western section of the county, centering around Chapmanville.

In recent times, a new industry, tourism, had been discovered by West Virginia. Logan County appears to be one of the areas that may find a future in it.

Two Cabinets Compared: Springfield Republican Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Sunday Republican of October 6 carried a most interesting and illuminating editorial comparing the Cabinets of President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower, which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. Therefore, under permission previous granted, I wish to have this editorial, entitled "Two Cabinets Compared," printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TWO CABINETS COMPARED

This newspaper supported Eisenhower in two elections. But we must concede, since it has become an obvious fact, that the Kennedy Cabinet, in most if not all positions, is stronger than the Eisenhower Cabinet.

John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State in the Eisenhower Cabinet, was a dedicated man who carried bravely on even when he was suffering the pangs of cancer. But he was never able to negotiate anything remotely as important as the test ban treaty which Dean Rusk, present Secretary of State, negotiated and which the Senate has now ratified.

Dedicated though he was, Mr. Dulles blundered again and again. One of his great blunders was to withdraw at a critical moment our aid in the building of the Aswan Dam across the Nile. This he did in such a way, according to a confidant at the State Department, as to humiliate President Nasser, of Egypt. Richard M. Nixon, while recently touring Africa, volunteered his opinion that this was a mistake on Mr. Dulles' part.

There is an old New England adage that after a raid on an apple orchard the most clubs will be found under the best trees. This applies to Secretary McNamara. He has been under attack almost from the day he took the oath of office. To compare him, and his capacity for correct decisions, with Secretary Wilson, Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense, is a reminder of Mr. Wilson's extraordinary capacity for putting his foot in his mouth.

President Kennedy's Attorney General, his brother, Robert F. Kennedy, so far outranks either Brownell or Rogers, Eisenhower's Attorneys General, that there is no comparison. Robert F. Kennedy has committed no such blunder as Brownell's unwise attempt to induce Judge Luther Youngdahl, former Republican Governor of Minnesota, to withdraw as presiding judge in the trial of a distinguished professor at Johns Hopkins University or to refrain from removing from the indictment of that professor, Owen Lattimore, an absurd charge which must have been prepared in Brownell's office. Brownell must, however, be given credit for having cleaned up the Department of Justice in which, under the previous administration, there had been inefficiency.

President Kennedy's Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, has made himself inconspicuous. But Mr. Dillon compares well with Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, both on the ground of administrative efficiency and on the ground that, as admitted by stanch Republicans, Humphrey committed such political indiscretions as Dillon has never even thought of.

And so it goes. Secretary Udall of the Interior Department is a better official, despite some too partisan indiscretions, than either of Eisenhower's Secretaries of the Interior, Douglas McKay and Fred A. Seaton.

The situation invites a comparison between the way in which President Kennedy makes use of his Cabinet and the way in which President Eisenhower made use of his Cabinet. Eisenhower, with the passion of a military officer for careful organization, organized the Cabinet as it had never been organized before. He gave it a Secretary who kept notes of its weekly meetings and whose duty it was to check on the way in which each separate Cabinet officer carried out the duties assigned to him.

It all sounded very fine. But was it? The actual result was that all of the heads of the separate departments met each week and listened to a discussion of a matter with which only two or three of them were conversant.

President Kennedy's use of his Cabinet is very different. He seldom, if ever, calls his Cabinet together in a meeting of the entire body. But he requires of each Cabinet member a thorough report of what has been done within that Cabinet member's jurisdiction. It must be remembered that the Cabinet is an extra-legal body and was never created either by the Constitution or by statute law. It follows that the President, no matter who he is or what his party affiliation, is under no obligation to call his Cabinet together as a body even once during his 4-year term.

It is true that George Washington did initiate the wise custom of calling his whole Cabinet together to advise with him. But the entire Cabinet then consisted of only three members. They were the Secretary of State, the head of the Department of Justice and the Secretary of the Navy. In those early days in the history of our infant Republic, each of these three Cabinet members was necessarily conversant with any matter that might be brought up.

To sum up, President Kennedy's way of dealing with his Cabinet is incontestably more efficient than Eisenhower's way and his Cabinet is a better Cabinet, man for man, than Eisenhower's Cabinet was.

Our Dollar in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the wizards of deficit financing, which include the present Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, and the cordon of Fabian Socialists around the President are deliberately ignoring the man who pays the biggest part of the income tax bill—the chap whose income is $10,000 annually and under. Apparently these theorists in Washington are going to be caught up with, soon.

Lyle Wilson, in yesterday's Washington Daily News tells us why:

THE DOLLAR CONTINUES TO SHRINK

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

The big-time spenders of the taxpayers' dollars never had it so good in peacetime as during the past 3 months. These months comprise the first quarter of the 1964 fiscal year.

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon believes big-time spending and Treasury deficits are good business for everybody including the common man and, of course, the Democratic Party.

If Mr. Dillon is right about that, things will be looking up for the Democrats as they go into the 1964 Presidential campaign—and for the common man. Mr. Dillon, the Democrats and the common man should rest easy. They are assured of another big fat deficit when the books close next June 30 on fiscal 1964.

Some citizens will not be as enthusiastic as Secretary Dillon about the first quarter Treasury figures. These will be citizens with life insurance policies, pensions, money in the bank and other assets measured in terms of U.S. dollars. These big fat deficits gradually are creating a currency inflation that sweats the dollar of its purchasing power.

The U.S. dollar was worth 45.6 cents in October 1962, in comparison with its purchasing power in 1939. When the Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes its Consumer Price Index for October of this year, the dollar will have slumped a little to about 45 cents. Not much, perhaps, but overall it adds up to 55 cents in 24 years.

At that rate we will have a two-bit dollar in 10 years or so, and then a dollar worth a dime, a nickel, and a penny. At that point the pensioners, the prudent savers, the family collecting life insurance on a breadwinner—all of these are likely to be out in the woods fighting the squirrels for nuts.

The Treasury does not regularly publish figures for expenditures and receipts. It did

at one time on a daily basis. What is daily published now is an accounting of withdrawals from and deposits in the Treasury These figures roughly represent expenditures and tax revenue. The daily figure also includes the public debt, the gold balance, and some additional matter, including figures for the same period in the last previous year. There is a lag of several days.

Thus, the Treasury has reported that as of September 30, 1963, withdrawals since July 1 were $31.3 billion compared with $29.4 billion in 1962. Deposits were $28.9 billion so far this year and $26.8 last. Since September 30, 1962, the public debt increased by $7.3 billion to $306.9 billion, a record that should encourage Secretary Dillion, if not the Democratic Party.

The U.S. gold hoard, meantime, had shrunk since September 30, 1962, by $485 million to $15.5 billion; a statistic that will encourage nobody unless perhaps it be Nikita Khrushchev.

The Treasury probably will collect more than $100 billion in taxes in this fiscal year. But that won't be enough to pay the bills incurred by the politicians in behalf of the U.S. Government. Deposits so far in this fiscal year are more than $2 billion greater than in the like period last year. But the spenders still are able to get rid of the dollars faster than they roll into the Treasury.

It is a fact little noted that most of these tax dollars are from the pockets of the little fellows, the common man. The little guys will find out about that some day.

Government Catering Can Weaken Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 12, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial, which appeared recently in the Plattsburgh Press-Republican, Plattsburgh, N.Y.

The editorial points out the real danger in how the growing centralization of power and control of the Federal Government can undermine the rugged, self-reliant spirit of America, which accounted for so much of our progress and success. A great many people apparently do not relate Federal funds or Government money to the state of their own pocketbook. They do not realize that every cent must be paid one way or another by the taxpayers of today and for generations to come.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT CATERING CAN WEAKEN OUR SOCIETY

A Protestant minister from Corinth, N.Y., posed an old question to Gov. Phillip Hoff of Vermont the other day: How can we stem the growing interference of the Federal Government in our personal lives and in the operation of our communities?

His complaint: The Federal Government is growing bigger and bigger and is reaching out to affect the lives of every one of us in some manner. The trend disturbed him.

Governor Hoff expressed a degree of concern, and suggested that this could be stopped if States would meet their responsibilities. When they don't, the Federal Government does.

There are good and bad sides to this matter of Federal help.

Recognize that the Federal Government is responsible for the overall health and vigor of a nation. It can't stand by while some States are in desperate straits and their people are sorely in need of basic facilities. For if one area of the Nation is weak, it weakens the whole Nation.

Thus we have Federal concern over those things which, in the end, have a tendency to weaken the Nation as a whole.

But here a fine line must be drawn between those who are able to help themselves and those who don't want to help themselves. There are political parties in power within communities and States about the Nation that will not face up to their responsibilities and raise taxes to solve local and State problems.

The reason is simple: The taxpayers rise in a storm of protest, often kicking out the officeholder at election time.

Thus really it is the taxpayers and the voters who keep a tight rein on officeholders and discourage them from urging a community or State to face up to its responsibilities. The taxpayers seem to prefer the Federal handout system. And with Federal handouts come controls. For Federal aid cannot be dispensed without laws governing its use.

So really the blame rests with the taxpayers, for they are the ones who forge, by and large the local or State operating philosophy * * * a philosophy that reflects responsibility or lack of it.

The interesting thing is that when a community shirks its responsibilities, and invites repeated Federal help to solve its local problems, that community also begins to shirk its responsibilities in other areas, too. This philosophy begins to be reflected in the total community life.

Thus the Federal Government can undermine the health and vigor of society by doing too much for it and discouraging responsibility. It can weaken the moral fiber of society by catering rather than helping just in time of need.

These are fine dividing lines, to be sure. But they must be drawn in the minds of Government policymakers and in the minds of taxpayers.

For, as we have said, to cater to a society can undermine its very strength and vigor.

Only the Stupidest Calves Choose Their Own Butchers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany is one of the greatest men of our time. He has stood like a stone wall against the onrushing hordes of communism in Central Europe.

Chancellor Adenauer, being on the firing line, is more familiar with Communists intrigue than many of us. The warning of Chancellor Adenauer should be heeded by the leaders of our own country. Chancellor Adenauer is reported in the New York Times of October 6 as having restated his opposition to Western grain sales to the Soviet Union. The Chancellor said—

If the free peoples of the West or certain circles among them are ready now to help the Soviet Union despite all the dangers that threaten us, I must say, only the stupidest calves choose their own butchers.

A Tax Cut With a Timetable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial in this morning's Chicago Sun-Times discussing the relationship between the tax cut and the administration spending plans, and the proposed timetable tax plan submitted by the Magill committee.

I believe this editorial and the committee to which it directs attention merit serious consideration, most certainly by the executive branch and also by all Members of Congress, since we will again face the question of tax cuts in a House-Senate conference next spring.

The editorial follows:

A TAX CUT WITH A TIMETABLE

President Kennedy promises that eventually the Federal budget will be balanced if Congress approves his tax cut plan. The key word is "eventually." Since Mr. Kennedy is not disposed to cutting his spending program, it could take several years before Federal revenues, boosted by better business brought about by a tax boost, caught up with Government spending. Meantime, continued deficits would bring continued creeping inflation.

In contrast to Mr. Kennedy's ambiguous program, a group of acknowledged authorities in the field of finance yesterday proposed a tax cut plan with a timetable. Assuming a medium national economic growth of 5 percent, this group estimated that in 3 years, the Government would be again operating in the black. A most important feature of the plan: a $95 billion ceiling on Federal budget expenditures during the 3-year period, or a new general excise tax to be imposed if Federal expenditures are not reduced or controlled.

Mr. Kennedy's present plans call for an expenditure of at least $99 billion in the immediate future.

The financial authorities who propose the timetable tax plan include some of the Nation's most respected experts on money and taxation. The group is called the Committee on Federal Tax Policy and is headed by Roswell Magill, who was Under Secretary to the Treasury during President Franklin Roosevelt's second term.

The emphasis of this group is, as properly it should be, on stimulating investment in jobmaking productive facilities. That means a greater emphasis on tax cuts that will put more money into such facilities. Mr. Kennedy's tax program is primarily aimed at putting more money in the pockets of consumers to be spent by them and thus stimulate business.

Mr. Kennedy's approach is obviously more political than the approach of the Magill group. Mr. Kennedy hopes that sometime, somehow, tax reduction will get the Government out of the red. The Magill group said: "The problem of budget deficits cannot be dismissed as something which tax reduction will eventually eliminate."

In other words, elimination of the deficit must be planned; it won't happen automatically.

We have said, time and again, that as welcome and as necessary as tax reform to cut income taxes may be, it must be accompanied either by a reduction in Federal spending or the imposition of other or higher taxes to make up the losses.

The Magill committee estimates that its program would necessitate operating in the red in the next 2 years but it sees a way out of the fiscal rut the following year. Mr. Kennedy offers no such definite goal.

Politics being what they are and 1964 being an election year we do not expect the Washington establishment to embrace the Magill report. Yet it is a study that deserves the greatest attention. We hope that it can be influential in persuading Congress that spending must be cut if taxes are to be reduced.

Aid to the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I submit to be included herein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 19 entitled "Aid to the Alliance."

This editorial summarizes my feelings, and I believe the feelings of many people throughout the Nation, on the importance of the continuation of an efficient and adequate foreign aid program in Latin America.

The text of the editorial follows:

AID TO THE ALLIANCE

Events in Latin America seem to be confirming the belief that the House of Representatives made a bad mistake when it cut $150 million from the annual $600 million aid authorization for the Alliance for Progress.

We are sympathetic to the idea that foreign aid in general needs skeptical congressional scrutiny. But the House action on Latin America has dealt a psychological blow to the Alliance at the worse possible moment. For the first time in the 2-year life of the program, governments all over the southern continent are beginning to implement badly needed—but costly—basic reforms. Our coordinator for Alliance affairs, Teodoro Moscoso, has just returned, for instance, from an inspection tour of Ecuador and Peru with enthusiastic reports about concrete moves on tax, land, and administrative reforms which are at the heart of the Charter of Punta del Este.

But Ecuador and Peru are not alone. Farther south in Chile the Senate is putting the finishing touches on an important new income tax law. Next door in Argentina a newly elected and reform-minded civilian government is preparing to take office after a year and a half of chaos and veiled military rule. Even Brazil—too often considered the incorrigible reprobate of Latin America—has introduced stricter tax collecting methods which have netted a 23 percent increase in real tax revenues for the first 6 months of this year compared to the same period last year.

No one should mistake these first glimmerings of progress for the finished product. It is also understandable that many Congressmen may have endorsed the aid cut out of exasperation with Latin American tardiness in carrying out reform promises. But now that those reforms are beginning, it would be inexcusable for the United States to renege on its commitment to help share the heavy financial burden. Predictably Communists and extreme nationalists throughout Latin America have already launched a loud campaign using the House action to prove North American insincerity.

The Senate can undo this damage by restoring the $150 million when the foreign aid authorization bill comes before it in the next few weeks. We hope not only that the Senate will cancel the cut but also that in the subsequent conference action, the full $600-million authorization limit for Latin American aid will be maintained.

Remarks of Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall at a Meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 the gentleman from Colorado, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, spoke at the meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association. As always, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], gave an outstandingly fine speech on reclamation, a subject with which few people are as familiar and knowledgeable as he. Since the reclamation program is of interest and importance to every Member of the Congress and to every citizen of the United States, I felt his remarks should be given an even wider audience than that which was fortunate enough to hear him speak in Phoenix. Therefore, it is my real pleasure and privilege to place Congressman ASPINALL's fine speech in the RECORD for all to read:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE N. ASPINALL AT A MEETING OF THE ARIZONA STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

It is indeed a pleasure to have this opportunity to join you at this luncheon meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association, and comment briefly on a program that has been so important in your past and is the key to your future—the Federal reclamation program.

I believe that the surroundings in which you are meeting today constitute the best example in our entire Nation of what reclamation means to an arid land. For it is in this valley that a Federal expenditure of only about $25 million over 50 years ago is today producing crops each year valued at about four times that amount, and the project provides the primary support for more than a half million people.

I could give you other examples of how reclamation development has paid comparable dividends and speak to you in glowing terms of the great contribution which the Federal reclamation program has made to the economy and wealth of our Nation. I could paint for you a rosy picture of great expectations and hopes for the future of reclamation. However, I believe you would prefer to have from me, instead, a completely frank appraisal of the Federal reclamation program as it exists today and some of the problems which we presently have before us. I have chosen to make my remarks along this line in order that you may better understand what we are up against in moving this program forward in the years ahead. After a few comments on the general program, I intend to give you my thoughts on future water development in your area.

Today, all parts of the Nation are being caught up in a movement toward full comprehensive development of water resources. This movement is emerging as the dominant conservation issue of our times. In no area is this more evident than in the Pacific Southwest where available water resources are already overcommitted and the problem is one of conservation and finding new sources. While the water problems in other areas are not as critical as they are in the Southwest there are ever-increasing demands throughout our entire Nation for the limited supplies that are available. Water shortage is no longer just a western problem. Our Nation's economic future demands that we develop to the fullest extent all of the Nation's water resources, whether the water eventually is to be used for agriculture, for industry, or for our rapidly growing cities and towns.

The problem, which we who are interested in the Federal reclamation program are facing, is to determine the role which this program will play in our overall water resources development task. Will reclamation play an important role in a balanced national water development program? Or will it be shoved aside, leaving a serious gap in meeting our national needs? The answer depends on our resolving the many serious problems facing reclamation today, and on getting our overall Federal water programs better coordinated and under control.

As you know, the Federal reclamation program for reclaiming arid lands in the West was initiated largely to meet an urgent need that developed around the turn of the century after numerous setbacks and failures in private irrigation undertakings. The program has undergone changes in purpose and direction from time to time to meet the changing needs of our people. Congress has met these needs as they developed by providing statutory authority for the changes. For example, in 1926, after a study of a special fact finders committee, Congress passed legislation alleviating some of the shortcomings of the reclamation program and returning it to a sound and supportable position. In the 1930's, when the need developed for overhauling the basic legislative authority to take into account the multiple-purpose concept, it was met by enactment of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, which modified and brought up to date the general provisions of reclamation law with respect to multiple-purpose projects, nonreimbursable allocations, repayment periods and contracts, power and municipal water operations, etc.

During this period when Congress was changing the scope and direction of the reclamation program, it was also initiating and modifying other water resources development programs. The number of Federal agencies with responsibilities for water resources development has increased and agency missions have been broadened. There are now four Federal departments with major nationwide operating responsibilities for water resources programs—Army, Agriculture, Interior, and HEW. For a while, these programs went along without any serious conflicts or apparent need for coordination. However, more recently, due to the expansion and broadening of programs and the ever-increasing demands placed upon our limited water supplies, conflicts have developed. There is competition among the agencies for the water resources funds included in the annual Federal budgets. The Federal water agencies operate under different laws, policies, and procedures, and, unfortunately,

under the multiple-purpose concept, some of the water development agencies have, in some instances, been given overlapping authority. The Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service have been empowered by law to do, in many cases, much of the same work. In addition, there is the problem of improving the arrangements for State and local participation in the planning of water resources development.

It became obvious to me several years ago, with respect to the Federal Government's total water development effort, that we very much needed better means of orderly planning, coordinated effort, and a sensible division of responsibilities. It seemed to me to be particularly important to the reclamation program that we find the answer to this need, for reclamation, being a sectional program, would be the first to be hurt in any every-agency-for-itself approach. It was 5 years ago that I first introduced legislation aimed at meeting this need, but during this 5 years, little has been accomplished. This is a critical period for the reclamation program.

The problems of those of us who are friends of reclamation are really twofold. First, there are problems directly related to the reclamation program itself, and, second, there are problems involving all the water development agencies which cut across the jurisdiction of several committees of the Congress. I shall comment upon only a few of the problems now facing us.

First, with respect to getting our reclamation projects through the Congress, we normally have no major difficulties if we stick to the policies and criteria that have been recommended and established for general application. It is when exceptions are made to our established policies that we get into trouble. Not only do we have difficulty in justifying authorization and construction but sooner or later the projects which do not conform to established policies, come home to haunt us. We have several projects in this category at the present time—projects on which serious problems exist because, years ago, we made exceptions to the policies relating to sound planning procedures.

The matter of repayment is one area of project consideration where we have not followed a consistent policy. The 1939 act set the permissible repayment period at 40 years plus a development period—but exception after exception has been recommended by the Department of the Interior and concurred in by the Congress, with no time limitation, until very recently, placed upon payment of that part of the irrigation cost to be repaid by power revenues.

In 1956, we developed a repayment formula in connection with the consideration of the Colorado River storage project. The authorizing act for that project calls for repayment of the entire irrigation cost within a period of 50 years plus any authorized development period, including that portion which is to be repaid by power revenues. This has seemed to me a sound and supportable policy with respect to repayment of all projects and Congress has followed it since that date. Although it has not been written into each authorizing act all projects authorized since 1956 will comply with this policy. Therefore, during the last few years we have been following, for the first time, a uniform policy although it is not written into general law. My position, and that of my committee, is that this repayment policy should be continued and that all new projects recommended for authorization should comply.

At the present time, my committee is holding up consideration of any Missouri River Basin project units until the Missouri River Basin project is made to conform to this repayment policy. It has been over a year now since I requested the Department of the Interior to take the necessary actions to put the Missouri basin project on a sound basis and to furnish my committee the financial studies to show this had been accomplished. The study still has not been received.

Another example of a policy that has been developed over the years and is being followed, although it is not a matter of law, relates to the amount which the irrigation water users must repay. By numerous actions on individual project legislation, Congress has indicated that water users should be required to pay in accordance with their ability to pay, on the basis of economic studies by the Department, and that the remainder of the irrigation cost would then be paid by surplus project revenues from the disposal of power and municipal water where such revenues are available. This policy has worked well in connection with our large multiple-purpose basin developments. I believe that financial assistance can be provided in this manner to all potential projects although the Reclamation West is not entirely covered by basin accounts. For instance, there is no basin account in the Northwest but irrigation projects in that area have been tied to the Bonneville power system or units thereof for assistance. This policy of power assistance to irrigation development is, of course, very important to the future water development in your area as well as the entire Pacific Southwest.

The policy of water users paying in accordance with their ability to pay is sound and supportable provided the repayment ability determination is equitable and some other means is used for determining project justification. However, when procedures are altered so that the amounts required to be repaid by the water users are becoming smaller and smaller percentagewise, while benefit-cost ratios are more favorable under the recently adopted formula for determining irrigation benefits, questions are bound to arise, especially when it appears that established procedures have been changed for the express purpose of making certain projects conform to a particular policy. For instance, about 2 years ago, the Bureau of Reclamation revised its procedures for determining irrigation benefits when it was having difficulty showing favorable benefit-cost ratios for many of its projects. The new procedure was used for the first time in connection with the Garrison project and has even been referred to as the "Garrison formula." Since the Garrison project had an unfavorable benefit-cost ratio under the previous procedures, it appeared that the new formula had been worked out in an attempt to justify this project as well as others that were in difficulty. In other words, some projects that were economically unfeasible in the past have become economically feasible due to application of the new yardstick. This naturally caused criticism by the committee and others and has raised serious problems in connection with moving projects through the House. I believe the new formula is justified and supportable but the way it was adopted certainly left it open to suspicion. We still haven't authorized a large project that depends upon this new formula for justification.

We get into trouble when the Executive tries to assume the responsibility for establishing policy. Congress is the policymaking branch of our Government and that is as it should be, for Congress is most representative of the people. The policies which Congress adopts should be responsive to the need and desires of the people. However, the way in which Congress is organized to consider the legislative matters relating to water makes it very difficult to obtain uniform water policy application to all Federal programs and agencies. I refer particularly to the committee structure where legislation bearing on water resources policy is considered by several congressional committees. Nevertheless, in my opinion, Congress must face up to this problem if it is to retain its policymaking prerogative.

Congress is going to have to give increased attention to policies for adjustment to newer uses of water such as recreation, fish and wildlife, and to the impact which these uses have on those uses established in the past. The problems brought about by increasing urban and suburban growth will have an impact on the direction that future water policy must take and there must be more consideration given to the important problem of Federal-State relationships in dealing with water resources. Water quality control is becoming ever more important as a matter to be considered in water resources development all over the country. We must find supportable methods for determining project feasibility, comparing projects, and making judgment as to where Federal assistance is most needed. The policies must be flexible to meet conditions as they emerge so they may be adapted to changing requirements.

Experience has shown that if Congress does not fulfill its responsibility to set policy, the Executive will and must attempt to assume this responsibility. Let's take, for example, the matter of allocations to recreation and to fish and wildlife. Congress has not established a firm policy with respect to allocations to recreation in connection with water projects. In the absence of congressional policy, the Executive has been making its recommendations, until very recently, in accordance with an Executive order known as Budget Circular A-47. In October, 1961, President Kennedy established the Water Resources Council comprising the Secretaries of Interior, Army, Agriculture and HEW, and asked this Council to draft new policies and procedures to be used in evaluating water projects.

In May of 1962, the Water Resources Council submitted its recommendations to the President and they were approved and put into effect on May 15, 1962. Unfortunately, the Council only completed a portion of the task assigned to it. Its recommendations involved only the formulation of projects and procedures for determining economic justification. The recommendations did not cover the matters of cost allocation, reimbursement and cost sharing. Project planning under the new procedures has resulted in recommendations for expanded land acquisition programs and large joint-cost allocations to recreation and to fish and wildlife without any established policy with respect to reimbursement or cost sharing. There is not even agreement among the executive departments as to what they should recommend to Congress in connection with the individual projects that are submitted. The Corps of Engineers adopted its own policy which, in effect, permitted 25 percent of the project cost to be allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife on a completely nonreimbursable basis. The projects authorized by Congress in the 1962 Omnibus Flood Control Act were authorized on the basis of this policy and, as a result, Congress has gone along with a writeoff of about $250 million or about one-fourth the total cost, chargeable to recreation and to fish and wildlife, although I venture to say that this fact is known to very few members.

In view of the situation, my committee held 4 days of hearings in March and April of this year on this matter. The purpose of these hearings was to try to determine what policies and procedures were being followed and to develop an allocation policy which would be applicable to all Federal water programs. Not only is allocation policy involved but the question of entrance and user fees at Federal reservoirs is involved, and this, in turn, gets us into recreation policy which is involved in other broad general legislation presently being considered by

my committee and the Congress. This is the land and water conservation fund bill. As we proceeded with our consideration of this matter, it became apparent to the committee that it could not adopt an allocation policy without statutory establishment because allocation policy involved several executive departments and several committees of the Congress. In other words, the committee could not follow the procedure used in establishing the maximum repayment period—a policy involving only reclamation projects and only the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. Having determined that statutory establishment of a general allocation policy was required, the committee decided that the appropriate procedure would be for the administration to recommend legislation upon which all the departments and the Bureau of the Budget could agree. On May 22, my committee adopted a resolution calling for the administration to submit its recommendations with respect to allocation policy and stated that, pending receipt of such recommendations, no project plan should be submitted to the Congress proposing a joint-cost allocation to recreation and to fish and wildlife. This action by the committee has held up submission of all reclamation projects while the administration attempts to meet the committee's request. To date, the legislation has not been submitted to Congress. I do know that the departments and the Bureau of the Budget are diligently trying to reach agreement. The Bureau of the Budget now claims that it never gave its blessing to the Corps of Engineers' allocation policy last year.

I hope that the administration will submit its proposed legislation soon. When it is received, it will be given top priority by my committee. It should be considered before any of the projects. In the meantime, the reclamation program is stalled.

When the program does get rolling again we will have the problem of priorities among projects. Reclamation must be a program of orderly advancement. Our program of project authorizations should be generally in the same order of magnitude as our construction program. I see no sense in authorizing in one Congress projects costing in total say $2 or $3 billion when our construction program is running from one-half to six-tenths of a billion dollars. If our authorization program greatly exceeds our construction program over any extended period, we permit the executive branch to pick and choose the projects it wants to build, perhaps on the basis of political considerations, and we end up with a lot of out-of-date plans on the book shelves. Our experience in the Missouri Basin in this connection should have taught us a lesson.

There are also problems involving the relationship of reclamation projects to agricultural surpluses. This relationship must be better understood or it will continue to plague us. For instance, it is not generally known that the reclamation program has been less of an offender in connection with this problem than such programs as the agricultural research program, the agricultural conservation program, or the Corps of Engineers' flood control program. Information furnished me by the Corps of Engineers some time ago indicated that agricultural production on lands reclaimed or protected by the corps has exceeded the production on reclamation projects and that the crops on corps protected lands are those which contribute more to the surplus problem than crops grown on reclamation project lands. Of course, aside from the fact that crops grown on reclamation projects have little effect upon agricultural surpluses, I have always contended that our ability in the United States to produce surplus food is reassuring in view of the future world food shortage predicted by many economists. I would say that surpluses are preferable to shortages. Just last week Soviet Premier Krushchev called for stepped-up agricultural production on irrigated lands, and during this same week Russia concluded a deal to purchase 6.2 million tons of wheat from Canada over a 10-month period. A few days later, Russia also announced the purchase of an additional 1.3 million tons of wheat from Australia.

In addition to the few specific problems which I have discussed, there are the usual and longstanding problems that stem from the fact that reclamation is a sectional program. The reclamation States have only 107 Members out of 435 Members in the House of Representatives and many of these are not friendly to the program. Success in getting reclamation projects through the House depends upon (1) having favorable and worthwhile projects to present, (2) having the reclamation West united in support, and (3) having a better understanding among Members of the House from outside the reclamation States.

My remarks up to this point should give you a realistic idea of the rather rough and tough road which any large water development program faces in Congress today. Now, what you are most interested in, of course, is what this all means in terms of needed water conservation and development in the Pacific Southwest.

During the hearings on the central Arizona project over 12 years ago, I made it clear that I did not oppose development in Arizona of water resources to which Arizona was entitled. On that memorable day of April 18, 1951, when the central Arizona project was "put on the shelf" by action of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I offered a substitute motion to the motion offered by Mr. SAYLOR requiring that the controversy between the States of Arizona and California be taken to the Supreme Court. My substitute motion, which would have permitted reconsideration of the project upon request of a majority of the committee, was offered because I did not believe it was in the province of the committee to say that this matter must be decided by the Supreme Court, and because I had hoped that Arizona and California, following the example set by the Upper Basin States, might arrive at a friendly compromise agreement. However, my substitute motion failed and the original Saylor motion, on which I voted "present," was adopted.

My position with respect to water resources development in Arizona has not changed since 1951. I will support any program for developing water resources that Arizona is entitled to if it conforms to the policies and criteria which we have established with respect to justification and feasibility. Of course, the legislation must be brought before the Congress in a timely manner. By this, I mean that Arizona should not expect the Congress to lay aside all the other projects and water policy matters it has been working on and studying over the last several years in order to give immediate attention to Arizona's desires. I understand, of course, how Arizona feels after waiting more than 12 years for a court decision. However, we must face reality. Conditions have changed. New studies are necessary. The condition of water surplus which prevailed 12 years ago has been drastically altered. Ground water supplies in the Lower Colorado River Basin are being seriously depleted by overpumping. The Glen Canyon Reservoir is now being filled and the lower basin has to share Colorado River water with the upper basin. There has been a shift in water usage. Water needs for recreation and fish and wildlife are receiving more and more attention. The water needs for municipal and industrial use are greatly increased. For example, I noticed just a few days ago where Arizona's mineral industries would require an additional 3½ billion gallons of water annually by 1980, raising the total requirements for these industries alone to 32 billion gallons per year. The point I am making is that we cannot just pick up where we left off on April 18, 1951, in the committee of which I am now chairman. There are only four members of the committee who were serving in 1951. While it may seem that I am advocating "starting over from scratch," I assure you that I shall keep in mind and give consideration to the long delay forced upon Arizona in its water development program.

I have continued to be interested over the years in potential water resources development in the Lower Colorado River Basin. As a matter of fact, it was my letter to Secretary Udall last November, prior to the Supreme Court's decision, which initiated the "basin approach" and resulted in expediting Interior's studies in the lower basin. My letter requested an outline for a coordinated comprehensive program under which the water needs of the entire southwest area might be provided for. In his reply of January 18 of this year, Secretary Udall recognized the need for an areawide approach and on January 22 he announced the start of a new study aimed at a regional solution of the water and power problems of the Pacific Southwest. This is the study which was speeded up and given top priority in June after the Supreme Court's June 3 decision in the case of *Arizona* v. *California* and which was completed and submitted to the Colorado Basin States last month.

I have not studied in detail this five-state regional plan—referred to as the Lower Colorado River project—but I will comment to this extent: First, I believe that an areawide approach is necessary and that unity and cooperation are imperative if the water needs of the Pacific Southwest—the fastest growing area in the Nation—are to be met. This approach has been successful in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Extended controversy will benefit no one and will serve only to worsen, for all concerned, the water crisis in the Southwest.

Secondly, I believe that the plan must be one that will provide better water management and develop new water supplies and not one that would benefit one area to the detriment of another. An effective water conservation program must necessarily be a part of the plan. In order to help finance the cost of works that will be involved, I agree with the proposal for a basin development fund. All the States that are involved should take an active part in developing this regional plan.

My advice to you, in Arizona, and to water leaders in California and the other States as well, is that you not be too impatient but that you carefully evaluate this proposed areawide plan in a constructive and cooperative manner, and that you honestly attempt to develop in cooperation with the Department of the Interior a plan of development which all States can support. I sincerely believe that this approach on the part of a united Arizona has the best possible chance of success with respect to relieving the water crisis here in Arizona and the Southwest. If you bring to Congress such a plan and it conforms to present policies and criteria, I can assure you that it will be placed in position for the earliest possible consideration by the Congress consistent, of course, with the consideration of other water development projects on which we are already working.

Finally, I cannot emphasize enough the importance of unity within Arizona and agreement among the five States, and especially Arizona and California. My committee and the Congress have been following a policy of not deciding differences within a State and hesitate to consider a basin water development program when there is a serious controversy between or among the States involved. The problems of successfully moving a large reclamation program through

the House of Representatives are so great under the best of conditions that the addition of a serious intrabasin controversy would present a very difficult task.

Pennsylvania Governor Outlines Moves To Lure Space Age Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the industrial development efforts of the Scranton administration are attracting more and more attention among the business publications of the country these days.

Here are articles that recently appeared in Metalworking News and Women's Wear Daily:

[From the Metalworking News, Sept. 23, 1963]

PENNSYLVANIA GOVERNOR OUTLINES MOVES TO LURE SPACE AGE INDUSTRIES

(By Ed McLaughlin)

HARRISBURG, PA.—In a big way, Pennsylvania is becoming competitive in the race to lure burgeoning space age industries to new homes within its borders.

Over the past several months, the administration of Gov. William W. Scranton has moved in the following ways:

1. Bolstered the State's industrial development program to include more liberalized tax benefits to business, and particularly to research and development companies. At the same time, it is providing more funds to be used for industrial development purposes.

2. Set into motion the formation of a task force of 100,000 Pennsylvanians who, by word of mouth, letter, and other contacts, will talk up the industrial and economic advantages of this Commonwealth. Chairman of the "100,000 Pennsylvanians for the Economic Growth," as this project is know, is Frank L. Magee, chairman of the executive committee of Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh. The program will be launched October 1.

3. Taken steps to improve the State's general business climate, especially where business relations with the State government are concerned, by utilizing the talents of 21 top business and industrial leaders to serve on the Governor's council of business and industry.

THE REASONS

Why the sudden muscle flexing by Pennsylvania?

Governor Scranton, in an interview with Metalworking News, pointed out that Pennsylvania was saddled with an economy extremely dependent on industries that had become less vital, leaving the State with a legacy of unemployment problems.

Last year, for instance, the Governor said, plants in Pennsylvania experienced a 6.8 percent decline in the dollar amount of prime contracts awarded and the State's total share of defense contracts for production and research dropped nearly 9 percent.

In research and development alone, Pennsylvania in 1961 received 3.7 percent of prime military projects, compared with 41.34 for California, 12.19 for New York, and 5.78 for Massachusetts.

Not only that, but Pennsylvania has lacked a reservoir of skilled technicians. In California, he explained, there are five or six trained technicians to every engineer, Pennsylvania has four or five engineers to every technician.

This, observers say, points up a lack of adequate technical institutes, which is hurting the State.

However, as the State government tackles the problem of improving education, it is going ahead full swing to attract new industry.

LOAN PROGRAM

The legislature recently approved measures to make it possible for research and development facilities to qualify for Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA) loans, just as manufacturing facilities do.

Because of expenses involved in their establishment, research and development facilities are now eligible for loans up to 45 percent of total costs, rather than the usual 40 percent.

"The new emphasis on research and development is important because these are the so-called multiplier industries which create many other jobs wherever they locate," it was explained. Pennsylvania-based industries will be encouraged to develop research and development facilities just as "foreign" operations will.

In addition, research and development industries were exempted from capital stock and franchise tax to encourage their location in this Commonwealth.

In late August, tentative approval was given by PIDA for $2,821,608 worth of projects, including the first for research and development firms. The same day, approval was given to 10 other loan applications, worth $1,201,574.

The first two requests for research and development loans came from Allegheny County. One of the applications was filed for the American Institute of Research, which seeks $787,500 for a new building to house expanded operations, creating an estimated 175 jobs. The other was for a $463,000 loan for a new building to house an unidentified firm moving into the State from New York. It was estimated the firm would create 72 jobs.

[From the Women's Wear Daily, Sept. 25, 1963]

SCRANTON IN CLOSE HARMONY AS STATE'S BUSINESS HUMS

(By Ed McLaughlin)

HARRISBURG, PA.—Within the past few weeks these events have happened in widely separated parts of Pennsylvania:

A $456,012 loan was made to Diversifications, Inc., the industrial development branch of the Greater Johnstown Chamber of Commerce. That money will be used by Bestform Foundations of Pennsylvania, Inc., in the erection of a $1,040,000 undergarment plant in Cambria City, which will eventually employ 250 persons.

Out in the Dutch country of eastern Pennsylvania, a clothing manufacturer was at his wit's end from trying to cut through bureaucratic redtape in order to complete a sizable expansion to his plant. He turned to a newly created State council, comprising top people in key departments. The council found that a bureaucratic menial had misread the manufacturer's plans, and refused him permission to install a necessary elevator. The council saw to it that this difficulty was quickly corrected, and the producer is now completing his expansion plans.

Frank L. Magee, chairman of the executive committee of Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh, was named chairman of the One Hundred Thousand Pennsylvanians for Economic Growth. Beginning October 1, this group will attempt to enlist 100,000 citizens of this Commonwealth in a massive talk-up-Pennsylvania campaign.

Though seemingly unrelated, these three developments are sympatomatic of the vigorous action the State government is taking to hypo an economy long watered down by the decline in the importance of coal as a fuel, the exodus of the textile industry to the South, and the minimized importance of rail transportation.

Some call Gov. William W. Scranton the catalytic agent behind Pennsylvania's new drive to become a formidable factor as a business-industrial location and as a tourist mecca.

In fact, aids of Governor Scranton contrast his approach to those of his immediate predecessors. "If you wanted to see Gov. George M. Leader in the mid-1950's, you had to be interested in mental health. With Gov. David Lawrence, whose administration preceded Scranton's, the pitch was highway safety. With Governor Scranton, it is strictly industrial development."

Under the Governor's urging, the legislature this year bolstered the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority by providing it with more funds. In addition, tax benefits to business were liberalized. Research and development firms establishing new facilities, were exempted from capital stock and franchise taxes. Better depreciation allowances were permitted, and extension of Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority help was made available for firms in the distributing industry, to encourage the building of new trucking centers, warehouses and the like. Scores of loans have been approved this past summer alone.

Governor Scranton, in an interview with Fairchild News Service, said he is interested not only in encouraging out-of-State firms to locate in Pennsylvania, but also in showing that "Pennsylvania loves the firms already operating here."

For this reason, he has been campaigning to eliminate as much redtape for businesses as possible, and in weeding out incompetent State employees. For this latter purpose, he utilizes an interdepartmental clearing council, comprising key State people, which has the express purpose of "unsnarling redtape and the inevitable delay and confusion caused by bureaucracy."

Recently, a Governor's aid explained, it was the action of this council which enabled the Dutch country apparel manufacturer to get his expansion plans moving after months of delay. The council also has helped speed up the approval of architectural plans for new buildings in a department—that of labor and industry—which reportedly was "notorious" for losing material in its bureaucratic mazes.

Governor Scranton carried out a campaign promise when he encouraged the formation of the committee of One Hundred Thousand Pennsylvanians for the Economic Growth. Officially, this organization will come alive October 1, and recruiting efforts will begin.

Businessmen, industrialists and other citizens participating will be urged to "talk up" Pennsylvania's economic advantages, the impact that the new network of interstate highways will have in making this State the hub of the northeastern U.S. megalopolis, the State's scenic beauties and historic sites, and the like.

In working so closely with businessmen, Governor Scranton is seen in many quarters as taking on such stature that he is being seriously mentioned as a possible Republican presidential candidate.

He denies any such intentions, pointing out he has no organized group supporting him. However, political observers feel the Governor—whom the Pennsylvania delegation will support as a "favorite son" candidate next summer—may be the answer if the GOP convention is hopelessly deadlocked over Governor Rockefeller or Senator GOLDWATER.

Many segments of the press—notably Time magazine—have written favorably of Governor Scranton. In fact, Greater Philadelphia,

a local magazine for businessmen, recently projected Scranton's nomination in an article called "Scranton Versus Kennedy: Bright Hopes for a Dark Horse."

Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, one of the great values of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is that it circulates ideas, opinions, and evaluations of the issues of the day. It also stimulates debate and discussion.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have made two speeches recently on the subject of oceanography. I was amazed by the response—many private firms, Government agencies, and individuals have communicated their opinions of those speeches to me. The great majority expressed agreement with my concern that the United States may be falling behind the Soviet Union in this vital area of knowledge.

One letter I received was from Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce. In his letter Admiral Karo outlines the work the Coast and Geodetic Survey is doing in the field of oceanography.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include Admiral Karo's letter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It is my sincere hope that this speech will serve to continue what has developed into a mutually valuable and educational exchange of ideas and data:

Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA,
1516 Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of your concern over the U.S. oceanographic program, I know you will be interested in knowing that the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey is actively engaged in an oceanographic program which holds great promise for the advancement of American interests in an area of the earth which is still largely unexplored.

Of the 21 different U.S. agencies which are engaged in one way or another in oceanographic research, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, an agency of the Department of Commerce, is playing the leading civilian role.

This is in accord with the recommendations of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences. The Committee recommended that the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which is the oldest scientific body in the Nation, play a primary role in worldwide oceanic surveys, concentrating its efforts on those areas which are primarily of scientific and commercial interest.

Development of a national program in deep-sea oceanography is being undertaken for the Federal Government by the Federal Council for Science and Technology, acting through its Interagency Committee on Oceanography. The Committee earlier this year drafted a tentative schedule for new ship construction for ocean surveys which called for the building of 12 new oceanographic ships by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Navy by fiscal year 1967.

Of these, two 3,800-ton ships are now under construction for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. They are the *Oceanographer* and the *Discoverer*. These sister ships will be the largest oceanographic ships built in this country. They are being constructed from the keel up specifically for the study of the sea.

These vessels are being equipped with modern oceanographic instrumentation and facilities, including shipboard laboratories, and a large computer facility. They are designed to supply the scientific community and commercial and industrial interests with oceanographic information important both to the enhancement of science and to the stimulation of economic growth.

In addition, the Committee schedule provided for the construction of another two 3,800-ton oceanographic ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey in fiscal year 1965; one 3,800-ton and one 1,600-ton ship in fiscal year 1966; and one 3,800-ton and one 760-ton ship in fiscal year 1967. This program is, of course, subject to revision, but it provides an indication of future plans in this area.

At present, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has five oceanographic ships probing the mysteries of the seas. They are the *Pioneer, Surveyor, Explorer, Pathfinder* and the *Marmer*. In addition, six of the agency's remaining 10 ships are also engaged in various oceanographic activities, although their primary work is in hydrography. These are the *Bowie, Hydrographer, Peirce, Whiting, Patton*, and *Lester Jones*.

It is true that in the past the oceanographic activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey have been primarily confined to collection of hydrographic information in the coast areas and in the immediate vicinity of the Continental Shelf. Deep sea oceanography has become a new responsibility of the Coast and Geodetic Survey as a result of the scientific importance of the national program in oceanography.

To meet this increased responsibility, a Coast and Geodetic Survey ship participated just recently in a program of International Cooperative Investigations of the Tropical Atlantic, part of an armada of 13 ships which also included vessels from Argentina, Brazil, Congo (Brazzaville), Ivory Coast and the Soviet Union. The purpose of this program was to take a simultaneous look at the structure and properties of the water masses extending across the entire ocean from Brazil to the Ivory Coast.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey is also planning deep sea studies in cooperation with Japan in accordance with plans of the United States-Japan Commtitee on Scientific Cooperation, a committee established by President Kennedy and the Prime Minister of Japan.

Still another Coast and Geodetic Survey vessel will participate as part of the U.S. effort on an international oceanographic expedition to the Indian Ocean in 1964.

This represents only a part of the deep sea oceanographic program being engaged in by the United States, including the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Taking into consideration the activities of all U.S. agencies, including the military, American oceanographers feel that this country is ahead of the Soviet Union in this field.

This is the opinion, among other, of Dr. Harris B. Stewart, Jr., chief oceanographer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. "The United States," said Stewart, "is still considered the leader in the field of oceanography because of its constant imput of new ideas and the intellectual contributions it has made in this field. It takes more than ships to achieve supremacy in oceanography."

As for ships, no less an authority than Comdr. Robert J. Alexander, head of the Navy's oceanographic programs branch, estimates that the United States has at present 66 oceanographic ships in operation, ranging in size from 10 to 13,000 tons. Alexander added that according to a compilation he has made, the Soviet Union has exactly the same number of oceanographic vessels. Writing in the magazine Data, he added that present shipbuilding plans of American agencies engaged in oceanographic work call for a total of 92 ships in operation by 1970, all over 250 tons displacement. Alexander also expressed the opinion that the United States is ahead in this field. He stated, "I am absolutely confident that the United States is the world's leader in oceanography."

I hope this helps bring into a sharper perspective the work being done by this country in this very important area of earth exploration.

Sincerely yours,
REAR ADM. H. ARNOLD KARO,
Director, Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Price Increases May Portend New Round of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's tendency to discount the inflationary possibilities of tax cuts accompanied by higher levels of Federal spending poses serious risks for our economy. As I have repeatedly pointed out, the so-called excess capacity and idle manpower, which the administration says is a shield against inflation, will not, in fact, prevent a new wave of inflation. The idle capacity is largely obsolete, and most of our unemployed require extensive retraining before they can fill the jobs which should open up as the economy advances.

Even without the administration's tax and spending programs, price pressures are beginning to be felt as the economy recovers from the mild recession of 1960–61. An article by Frank C. Porter in the Washington Post of October 5 makes clear that broad price increases have occurred in a number of major industries in recent weeks. Although economists differ on the inflationary threat, conventional market analysts believe that increasing demand is primarily responsible. They point out that the period, 1958-62, was marked by overcapacity and swollen inventories, but that demand has now caught up with output.

If these observers are correct, the administration's program to increase aggregate demand in order to stimulate the economy could touch off a new round of inflation. As Bernard D. Nossiter reports in the Washington Post in another article published October 5, some economists have noted that a 2 percent rise in prices, spread throughout the economy, would wipe out all the increased demand that the tax cut is designed to create. It thus appears as though the administration's program could touch off an inflation which—even though mild—would offset the benefits which the administra-

tion hopes to derive from its economic program.

I include Frank C. Porter's article from the October 5 Washington Post in the RECORD at this point.

PRICE RISE TREND EYED FOR SIGNS OF INFLATION

(By Frank C. Porter)

Broad price increases in a number of major industries in recent weeks have again conjured up the old specter of inflation.

So far, few economists seriously believe that the Nation has embarked upon a dangerous new price spiral.

But analysts are nonetheless apprehensive about substantial price boosts for a variety of materials and commodities: steel, aluminum, zinc, lead, silver, asbestos, glass, paperboard, foodstuffs, and others.

The most dramatic and controversial increases have come in steel.

"SELECTIVE" BOOSTS MADE

This is the industry against which President Kennedy marshaled the might of the Federal Government in angry confrontation with United States Steel Chairman Roger M. Blough in April 1962. The company finally rescinded the industry's first across-the-board price increase in 4 years.

Last April the administration warily gave its assent to price increases for sheet and strip first announced by a comparatively small producer. These increases were "selective," the White House reasoned covering only 38 percent of all basic steel products and averaging out at 1 percent of total volume.

Some experts claimed the boosts would not stick because of such market factors as competition from low-priced imports and substitute materials. But stick they did. And recently the industry has pursued this selective and piecemeal strategy to raise prices on reinforcing bars, oil country pipe and casing, hot rolled bars, plates and structural shapes.

Now price increases cover some 65 percent of the industry's output by volume and amount to an estimated 2 percent on total sales.

This will bring the steel price index only 3 percent above the level of 5 years ago, however.

PRICE EROSION CITED

And leaders in other industries say they have raised prices recently only to mitigate price erosion that has taken place since the great postwar inflation was largely halted in 1958.

Primary aluminum producers, for example, last month increased the price of ingots from 22½ to 23 cents a pound. But the price had been 25 cents 5 years before and had been steadily slipping until this year despite increasing production.

What has brought about the wave of higher prices?

The experts tend to disagree. Conventional market technicians claim increasing demand is primarily responsible.

The period 1958–62 was largely marked by overcapacity and swollen inventories against soggy demand in many commodities, they explain. Demand has finally caught up with output. By way of example, they point to sharp boosts in sugar and firmer prices for such commodities as cocoa, coffee, zinc, and lead.

CALLED EXPLORATORY

Others argue that the increases are merely exploratory in some industries and may not be sustained by demand. Still another school invokes the theory of administered prices, insisting that some industries such as steel are dominated by a few powerful firms that are able to raise prices arbitrarily without regard to market factors.

So far, the consumer has been little touched by higher prices for primary materials.

The rise in industrial materials could be reflected later in consumer manufactures, however. But economists cite as a favorable sign the auto industry's decision to hold the line on car prices for the 5th year in a row despite higher steel costs.

They also point out the absence of many of the classic conditions for inflation. Wages, for example, are rising more slowly than productivity. The economy is far from the full employment level. And industry is still operating well below top capacity.

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 33d of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losss and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

Doctors, lawyers, merchants, chiefs. The list of those southern Idahoans who have written to me to express their opposition to Secretary Udall's unwarranted and untenable action in extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho is truly a cross section of community life.

A professional engineer, Mr. Charles L. Sudweeks, asks why he should help bear the burden of the cost of providing cheap power for a few groups selected by the Government:

POCATELLO, IDAHO,
August 6, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: I am a registered professional engineer in the State of Idaho engaged in the practice of consulting engineering. I have carefully studied the arguments for and against the bringing of Bonneville Power into southern Idaho and I feel it is my duty as a citizen of this State to make my wishes known regarding this subject.

It is impossible to understand why the Government should spend $100 million to extend Bonneville Power into this area, to serve a few selected customers. Since Bonneville Power continues to operate in the red, how can this expenditure be justified? Also, as a private citizen who would not benefit from this cheap power, why should I bear the burden of the cost of providing cheap power for a few groups selected by the Government?

My studies indicate that Bonneville Power does not have enough firm power to supply its needs now and yet intends to expand into areas that are well served by public utilities. These public utilities are controlled by the Government now as to the rates they charge and the profit they can make. I feel that the Government should not get involved in businesses that are well served by private enterprise. We have enough government controls without adding to the list.

I would like to urge you to do all you can to show the Congress that it is not economically feasible nor desirable to extend Bonneville Power into southern Idaho.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES L. SUDWEEKS.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilson of Emmett, Idaho, do not indicate their occupation but they both signed their letter opposing Bonneville's coming into southern Idaho. The letter follows:

EMMETT, IDAHO, *August 3, 1963.*

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SAYLOR: We are writing with reference to Bonneville power coming into southern Idaho. We really resent the way what the administration "decided" to bring this power in, with not even public hearings and just going ahead with plans to do so even though the Congress hasn't appropriated the money for this. We want to thank you for your stand on this issue and hope that it can be kept in committee and then shelved.

The administration seems to have a way of doing things that put the Congress on the spot. The test ban treaty is such a spot.

We know that three of our Representatives from Idaho are pulling for this Government power, but of course they all three do just what is expected of them from the White House. Senator JORDAN will be good support and will work with you. COMPTON WHITE is from the northern district and they have Bonneville power and it is a most depressed area. We believe in private enterprise that pays taxes to our State to keep our schools running without any more Federal aid. We hope, sir, that you have success in keeping this off the floor of the House.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

HOWARD R. WILSON,
MERNE WILSON.
Mr. and Mrs. Howard R. Wilson.

Next is a letter from Mr. E. E. Jones of Jordan Valley, Oreg., who owns the Jordan Valley Gift Shop. He objects to Government competition with private enterprise in these words:

JORDAN VALLEY GIFT SHOP,
Jordan Valley, Oreg., September 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have been reading a great deal about the Bonneville Power.

We feel that the Government should not compete with private enterprise when it is not necessary. This is being done in Idaho and is taking the bread out of one of the largest taxpayers mouths in that State.

We have been using Idaho Power for about 20 years and it has been 100 percent satisfactory.

We don't want a change in our form of Government and feel that if Government is not stopped from competing with private enterprise, we cannot go on as we have in the past in regard to our freedom.

E. E. JONES.

A postcard from Mrs. Wm. Chess of Twin Falls, Idaho, congratulates me on my opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho and asks that I keep up the good fight. Her message is as follows:

May I congratulate you upon your good works you are doing upon the BPA project. Keep up the good fight.

Sincerely,

MRS. WM. CHESS.

Mr. J. Paul Smith is a well driller of Jerome, Idaho, who says he strongly resents the Federal Government going into business against a private enterprise that is and can supply the services for the area in question. He thanks me for my stand in the following words:

SMITH DRILLING & PUMP CO., INC.,
Jerome, Idaho, August 17, 1963.

Hon. JOHN C. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that you have taken a definite stand against the extension of BPA into the area of southern Idaho, and that you have made your weight felt against this matter.

Please let me congratulate you on this stand. I am in the business of pumps as you can see by the above letterhead and I am in the position to know the Idaho Power Co. very well. I have no stock in the Idaho Power Co. and stand to gain no monetary gain one way or the other, but I strongly resent the Federal Government going into business against a private enterprise that is and can adequately supply the service for the area in question.

If the Government were to pay its own way and operate in the black for once it could not possibly sell power cheaper than the Idaho Power Co., because this private business is most efficient and cooperative.

I am taking the liberty to enclose a copy of a letter I have written this date to Senator LEN B. JORDAN, which is self-explanatory.

Thank again, Mr. SAYLOR, for your efforts in behalf of the Idaho Power Co. I only wish we had more people like you to stand up to the big government advocates for the ideals that you and I and every loyal citizen know are correct and patriotic.

Respectfully yours,

G. PAUL SMITH.

Sylvester's New Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Sylvester, the Defense Department mouthpiece, is at it again. Recently, after telling us about the war in South Vietnam, he quickly reversed himself about what he had said the previous day. He believes in news management at its worst and we certainly have that in the Kennedy administration.

The September 27 editorial in the New York Herald Tribune elaborates on the subject:

NOW WE'RE WINNING IN VIETNAM

The public must be forgiven if it's confused. A few days ago Washington spokesmen, beginning with President Kennedy, were telling us that we were losing the war against the Communists in South Vietnam because of the Diem regime's internal troubles, ignited by Buddhist self-immolations. Now Arthur Sylvester, spokesman for Mr. Kennedy's two special envoys to Saigon, Defense Secretary McNamara and General Taylor, tells us that we're winning the war.

Is this a relapse into Mr. Sylvester's former practice of using news as part of his arsenal of weaponry? Or is it that Washington, from the President downward, simply goofed?

We're inclined to the latter version. Mr. Sylvester spoke after General Taylor had a firsthand look at the situation. And General Taylor should know what he's talking about.

This implies that the President didn't when he started out to blow up the Diem regime. Mr. Kennedy overstated the damaging effect of the Saigon political situation and he underestimated the favorable situation at the front.

An article by Joseph Alsop on this page provides further evidence that the war is going our way. He reports that living conditions in Communist North Vietnam are downright desperate. That may explain recent rumors that the Communists are seeking a truce and are encouraging the French to promote a reunited neutralist Vietnam.

Was Washington so blind and so careless as to have been on the point of jeopardizing a victory in Vietnam which was and still is within our grasp?

One Man's Pork Another's Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine in a recent issue carried an overwritten article which I suppose its editors would describe as being a muckraking one. However, the article is written in a style of the barrister who, according to an English legal anecdote, so vigorously pursued his case that he overstepped by attacking the jury.

On September 16, 1963, the Oregon Journal published an editorial which, I believe, places the matter in a somewhat more temperate light. Under unanimous consent, I place this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ONE MAN'S PORK ANOTHER'S GOLD

It is not always easy to judge what a U.S. Senator will do on the basis of his political affiliation and philosophy.

One usually thinks of liberal Democrats as advocates of big Federal spending and conservative Republicans as consistent opponents of the same.

Several weeks ago Life magazine published a blistering attack on what it termed the "pork barrel outrage." Among the few Members of Congress Life praised as antipork campaigners were two liberal Democrats, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin, and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois.

In a later issue, Life published a letter from Senator PROXMIRE voicing unstinted approval of what he termed Life's completely honest expose.

A letter from Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona, the standard-bearer for Republican conservatives, agreed with part of what Life had written but chided the magazine for having put reclamation projects, which are extremely important to the economic welfare of his State, into the pork barrel category. GOLDWATER said that while he voted against many resource projects, he always supported reclamation developments because they represented sound investments.

Opinions differ among Members of Congress and the public as to what is pork and what is not. Sometimes this judgment may depend on the distance of a particular project from one's own State.

We are pleased that Life did not include in its list of horrible examples any resource projects in Oregon or Washington. Perhaps we can interpret this as tacit admission that ours are generally sound.

What is most damning about Life's report was the charge that many projects are approved less on the basis of their worth than on the influences of this or that Member of Congress. The late Senator Robert Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, was termed the master procurer of pork for his State.

Resource development by the Federal Government is a long-established and legitimate enterprise. Many such developments pay big dividends not only in the returns which they themselves produce but in related enterprises which they stimulate.

There can be no question that abuses exist and that money is wasted in programs that cannot stand on their own merits. A key step in the ending of these abuses would be for the public to cease judging the effectiveness of their Senator or Congressman on the amount of Federal money he brings home to their States or districts.

Future of Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following news item from Pennsylvania shows the possibilities for the future of the coal industry as well as the cooperation between the coal, railroad, and utility interests in developing and perfecting methods for the use of coal in the lower cost production of power.

This is another answer to the profiteering importers of fuel oil who come before Congress and the administration with their oily plans to kill off the domestic coal industry with imported fuel oil.

Coal is still the world's best heat and power producer.

The news item follows:

FUTURE OF COAL INDUSTRY

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. has placed a $1 million order with Bethlehem Steel Co. for 74 coal cars of the 100-ton hopper type to form a P.P. & L. unit train that will run directly from Pennsylvania mines to the utility's powerplants, Mr. Chas. E. Oakes, chairman of the board, announced today. It will be the first unit train to be built by Bethlehem at its Johnstown, Pa., car shops, with delivery scheduled for February 1964.

Hauling in excess of 7,000 tons of coal each trip, the unit train will operate on a passenger train schedule. The train will haul coal from new bituminous mines at Tunnelton, Indiana County, and near Osceola Mills, Clearfield County, to P.P. & L. plants at Martins Creek, near Easton, Pa., and Brunner Island, below Harrisburg, Pa. The cars will travel over 80,000 miles per year—six times the travel log of ordinary hopper cars—and the train will haul about 1 million tons of coal per year.

"The unit train concept is a major breakthrough in cutting fuel costs, which total close to $20 million annually," Mr. Oakes said. "The unit train offers several opportunities to reduce shipping costs, the greatest being in speeding up the 'turn-around' time where empty cars are returned to their original shipping point in about 2 days as compared with the former 14 to 20 days. The fast 'turn-around' is made possible by highly mechanized loading equipment at the mines and high capacity unloading equipment at the powerplants—the savings being in the more efficient utilization of the transportation equipment.

"The faster delivery also keeps coal in prime usable condition, particularly during

cold weather. With the coal no longer solidly frozen, the need for thaw sheds is minimized and time is saved in unloading. Also, the mechanical parts of the cars are less likely to be subjected to heat needed for thawing, which can cause damage to the equipment.

"Savings also are realized because large numbers of cars go directly to a single point of delivery—there is no need to switch and reroute cars to a number of separate destinations," Mr. Oakes added.

Trial runs by P.P. & L. on integral trains made up of the railroad's regular equipment have been underway since June 1962. Cars designed and assigned specifically to this nonstop service assure more efficient operations and further savings for the company.

P.P. & L.'s unit train will move over Pennsylvania Railroad lines, with five Pennsylvania Railroad lococmotives assigned to the service. The cars will be uncoupled at each of the powerplant destinations, unloaded by car dumper, and immediately recoupled so that the train remains intact throughout its service life.

The cars, equipped with roller bearings for fast travel, will be modified. Committee-type hoppers which have proven successful in coal service since their introduction several years ago. Sides of the standardized type of cars will be increased about a foot in height—to slightly over 12 feet—so that each car can be loaded to its 100-ton capacity.

With larger wheels required for the higher capacity cars to distribute the heavier loads on the rails and prevent rail damage, Bethlehem will supply roller bearing trucks equipped with 38-inch, two-wear, heat-treated wheels. It will be the first time that these larger wheels have been produced by the company's wheel shop.

"The new unit train will mean further gains in P.P. & L.'s continuing drive for new economies," said Mr. Oakes. "Fuel, of course is only one of the many areas under continuing study for new savings. Our success in these efforts have been a factor in the series of rate reductions the company has made over the past 2 years. We are also looking for the means to further efficiencies and therefore further rate savings for our customers in the coming years. Economies and efficiencies will be the determining factors as we strive to make electricity an increasingly better bargain by continuing to take advantage of new equipment and technology as they become available.

Extension of Civil Rights Commission

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in urging the temporary extension of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year. Obviously several weeks will elapse before debate can be heard on the omnibus civil rights bill which I hope will include the permanent establishment of the Commission. Unless this bill is passed, the country will be deprived of the moral force of the Commission together with the investigation and reports of complaints dealing with the deprivation of voting by a segment of our citizenry.

All men of good will, those who believe in fair play for Americans irrespective of their race, creed, or color, will vote for this bill. For so long as there are Americans who are deprived of their right to vote, of equal opportunity for economic advancement, and the right of all to the use of public accommodations, just so long must there be maintained a body that will keep the country advised of conditions adversely affecting the rights of some of our citizenry and recommend remedies. During its life the Commission has made a major contribution to our knowledge and understanding of the civil rights problem. It must be permitted to continue to do so.

Uncle Sap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the way the Kennedy administration is giving concessions to the Soviet Communists without getting anything in return is not only dangerous but shameful.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star, William S. White reminds us of the perils ahead with the Kennedy policy of appeasement:

ONE YEAR AFTER CUBAN CRISIS

(By William S. White)

Another October finds an immense change in the American mood from that October of a year ago when we stood at the brink of nuclear war over Cuba. Determination and sensible fear sensibly suppressed; but determination above all—these were in the American mind.

The new October has arrived with anxiety largely gone and a new and understandable but also largely unsupported hope and optimism hanging over most of the Nation.

We were right a year ago to stand fast as a country in settled resolve to meet unavoidable peril in the spirit of men prepared to die rather than surrender, even though happily the dice of history turned our way instead of against us. But we are wrong now, as it seems to me, in having rushed over, in a single 12 months, from the thick but not ably rational gloom of October 1962, to the very nearly irrational, best-of-all-possible-worlds attitude prevalent in October 1963.

THE WHEAT SALE

The partial nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, though a defensible enterprise and though just possibly some herald of a true easing in the cold war, has not yet either ended that war or given any assurance whatever of the identity of its eventual winner.

From much that is happening now, however, one might suppose that if the worst was not already past then a good bit of the worst was in sight of being over. So we talk happily of wheat sales to the Russians—an appealing notion no less to hard-line conservatives than to soft-line liberals, for conservatives are traders and trade is an honorable underpinning of the very capitalist system itself.

We talk of cutting back on our multi-billion-dollar space program—and this is good to hear by both sets of different reasons. The conservatives naturally would like to save the money. The liberals have long been resentful at those billions being set aside for the moon when it all might be spent on dozens of earthy welfarist schemes hatched or in incubation.

But wheat deals with the Russians, no matter how momentarily helpful to our farm surplus problem, would nevertheless undeniably strengthen the Russians where they are weak. Have we waited for 17 years for this weak spot in order now to dash in to fill it—and without, apparently, demanding anything in return except the price of the wheat itself?

And should we really reduce the space appropriation even though it is quite true that the President has renewed suggestions that we might cooperate in space research with the Soviet Union? Surely not, if we remain aware of the towering central fact that the power which in future is first in space will be first as well in this world we live in.

What the President said, at any rate, never meant we should lessen our own exertions. It only restated an old American policy in offering certain cooperative ventures to the Soviet Union, as we have offered so many others, if, as and when the Soviet Union might like really to cooperate.

WISE APPROACH NEEDED

We still intend to be first in space as Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has just pointed out in behalf of the administration. Nothing will change that, unless Congress and country insist upon heedlessly withholding the means to do it. And a little cooperation from the Russians—in the unlikely event it was given—would do no harm to our central purpose.

But even greater than the need for a wise, calm-minded approach to all these specific questions is the need for a national spirit which rejects any notion that the game has about been won.

Some say we need as well to shun the opposite notion that no concessions whatever should be made in the cold war. To this the proper answer is "Yes"—but. It is "Yes," wherever such a concession is clearly matched by Soviet concession and wherever refusal would be mere hysterical reflex. It is "No" wherever concession are made simply in some vague notion that we could thus, in some "iffy" way, somehow improve the international atmosphere.

The Second Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, October 1 of this year was a proud day in the history of Orange County, Calif., for it was on this day at 12:01 a.m. that Derek Frank De Bana was born and proclaimed "Mr. One Million," the 1 millionth resident of Orange County. This was, of course, a proud day for me as well, since I have the honor of representing that portion of Orange County which has experienced the bulk of the county's tremendous growth.

Along with pride, however, achieving the status of 1 of the 17 counties in the United States with a 1-million plus population has had a sobering effect on every responsible citizen of our county. A booming population brings with it many problems, some we have solved and some

we have not, but the prospect of having a population of 2 million in a little over 10 years from now presents a tremendous challenge to every Orange Countian.

The Garden Grove News, in an excellent October 1 editorial, has outlined the great challenges this projected growth presents.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD:

THE SECOND MILLION

This morning at 9:30 a.m. announcement was made before the board of supervisors that Orange County had acquired its 1-millionth resident. Population projections show that we will have 2 million people in a little more than a decade.

Such growth is reason for pride. It could be cause for civic terror. Are our leaders really thinking about what lies ahead? Do they really have any appreciation for the challenges we face right now and the situations which will confront us tomorrow?

The most urgent exercise for everyone concerned with the county and our cities is that they face the future. We have too many people still looking at the past—still insisting that because something worked in 1950 or 1955 it will always work. We have too many who are completely engrossed in the present.

High on the agenda for the next decade is a hard, practical look at our governments. They must achieve efficiency, a high level of professional competence and a greater degree of responsiveness to the people. If they do not make immediate progress on these fronts, we will very shortly experience an overwhelming crisis in local control. New residents cannot help but become impatient with officials who plod on deferring primarily to the established power groupings and individuals whom newcomers neither know nor care about.

The time is now to do something about our crazy quilt of special tax districts. Either they must justify themselves in terms of our present and future needs or they should be abolished.

We will not much longer be able to tolerate the situation where all these governments set their rates oblivious of what the rest are doing or in blissful ignorance of the total impact upon the property owners and consumers.

Ours is a young population and the median age is likely to become even younger. Implications for our schools are crystal clear.

Ours is a mobile population and it will continue to be. Implications for our roads and traffic patterns are ominous.

Our economy is strongly oriented toward aerospace industries. This can be a great strength or a dangerous dependence.

Today is a day for celebration. It is also a day for stocktaking and for civic rededication.

Such rededication is necessary in the leaders of business, labor, government, and every other area. Such rededication is also necessary in the hearts of all who feel an obligation of conscience to the cities and the country in which they live.

Concern on the part of every citizen is not just a matter of idealism. It is a matter of commonsense. Orange County is the place where we own homes, work, do business, raise families, educate our young, build and support our churches. Every one of these activities is hostage to the kind of a future which we create.

Nostalgia for an Orange County that once was won't do a bit of good. Daydreams brought by recent arrivals will merely be obstacles to the seizing of opportunities and meeting of challenges awaiting us.

We hail this day as the moment when our population reaches 1 million. Will we have cause for rejoicing when resident No. 2 million gets here?

Expertise of Mankato Firm Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article which appeared in the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press prompted me to give thought to the contributions made to our Nation's scientific and productive capacity by hundreds of competent, small firms throughout the Nation. One of these small firms recognized for its technical excellence is the Kato Engineering Co. of Mankato, Minn., and I include the Mankato Free Press article describing the Kato Engineering Co.'s recent performance on a procurement contract in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

MANKATO FIRM TURNS OUT CONVERTER FOR JFK USE

A special rush order recently completed and shipped by Kato Engineering Co. of Mankato is slated to accompany President Kennedy on a proposed trip to Russia later this year.

That is what a notation revealed on the priority purchase order for a rotary converter from a military ordinance command at Brooklyn, N.Y.

Designed and built by the Kato Engineering staff, the rotary converter can be used either on the ground or in the air and is considered portable despite its 250 pounds.

It will change an input of 24 volts of direct current to an output of 115-volt alternating current totaling 1,500 watts and presumably will permit the President to shave or operate any other conventional electrical appliance he or members of his staff take along on the trip.

The order was received June 21 and the finished product was shipped to McGuire Air Force Base, N.J., 2 weeks ahead of the stipulated deadline. Cost of the converter, apparently the first of its kind designed and built for the President's air transportation fleet, is around $1,000, according to Cecil H. Jones, president of Kato Engineering.

"It will run anything that operates on 115-vote commercial current," the spokesman for the firm said.

Kato Engineering has had quite a few special orders from Government agencies, but this is the first to the knowledge of the firm that is intended specially for the President's use.

As to the special order, Jones commented that the bulk of his firm's business is special or custom order. Kato Engineering is unique in this field, he said, maintaining a staff of design engineers and electronics technicians whose job includes turning out many unique products.

Other than for Government, Kato Engineering has done special order work for such major aircraft and missile firms as Martin, Lockheed, Hughes Aircraft, General Dynamics, and Astronautics.

Producing the rotary converter for the President's trip to Russia posed some special technical problems. Along with basic information on the item needed came rigid military specifications. Compactness and minimum weight were stressed.

The finished item measured 18⅙ inches long and 14 inches in width and height. It is contained in a cast iron frame, with an eyelet provided for convenient attachment of lifting and moving devices, and a base or mounting.

Jones said the mounting feature is necessary only for use in aircraft, as the unit operates completely free of vibration. The direct current motor that operates off 24-volt batteries develops 1,800 revolutions per minute.

Administration's Economic Theories Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the theory behind the administration's program of tax cuts accompanied by more spending is that this will increase aggregate demand in the economy and thus lead to an increase in business activity and employment.

An interesting analysis of this theory is provided in the editorial in the October 1963 issue of Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs, which is published by the Institute of Economic Affairs of New York University. As the editorial points out—

Theories have been known not to work as well in the real world as they do in the intellectual laboratories that give birth to them.

The editorial urges that we not be so fascinated by aggregates that we fail to examine the components that make up the total. As the editorial points out, there is nothing in the aggregate concept itself that tells us what growth in which sector of the economy is a proper stimulator of expansion. The administration says that it wants to help consumers and business by cutting their taxes and that this is the proper way to stimulate the economy. But in the next breath it says that we must not decrease or even hold the line on Government expenditures because this would offset the stimulus of the tax cut.

As this editorial points out—

The quality of expenditures is all important. The quantity, the aggregate, is deceptive.

The kind of expenditures that will provide for real increases in aggregate demand and economic growth occur in research and development and in other areas which bring forth new ideas, techniques, goods, and services, and new jobs to enable those of low income to earn more.

Under unanimous consent I include a copy of the editorial from Challenge, as well as an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of October 8 which discusses the Challenge editorial and the administration's fiscal policies, in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The editorials follow:

[From Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs, October 1963]

AGGREGATE DEMAND

The rationale of the tax cut proposal currently before the Congress is that individuals and business enterprises will have more

money left in their hands, after taxes, for additional consumption and investment. Since Government expenditures are not to be decreased, even though the Government will forego substantial tax revenues, the result will be an increase in aggregate demand. This increase, magnified by the multiplier of new vibrations passing through the entire economic body, will step up business activity and employment, and generally abet the process of economic expansion.

This, at least, is the theory behind the tax cut. But theories have been known not to work as well in the real world as they do in the intellectual laboratories that give birth to them. More on this later.

What has always bothered me about the concept of aggregate demand is that although it provides a most convenient total figure to work with, that figure obviously involves the sum of different demands from Government, individuals, and businesses. A step-up in demand from any one of these three sectors would have the effect of increasing the aggregate.

Yet there is nothing in the aggregate concept itself that tells us what growth in which sector is a proper stimulator of economic expansion. This problem is left to ideological preference. So right from the start the neatly laid out arithmetic of aggregate demand becomes subject to the variables of choice.

The administration early expressed its preference for helping consumers and businesses, the idea being that in our type of economy it would be better if the pump-priming were done by the private sectors rather than by the public sector. This was a generally encouraging sign for some. But then came the letdown. Obviously there could not be a decrease in Government expenditures, if, indeed, there was to be the desired increase in the aggregate of demand.

Under these circumstances the ideological preference for stimulating the private sectors cannot be consummated without a continuing high rate of Government expenditures. We ought not, therefore, to become so enamored of the aggregate, quantitative possibilities that we fail to see the qualitative default hidden beneath the umbrella of total sums.

Now let's examine the question: Will the increase in the potential of demand from the private sectors help to bring about economic growth? Once again, I think it is important to focus attention on the components of demand, which the use of aggregate figures has a tendency to obscure. Here is what I mean.

It is said that in the aggregate individual consumers will have approximately $8.7 billion more to spend as a result of the proposed tax cut. But what consumers, from which income categories, and on what is the additional consuming power to be spent?

The lower income earner, whose tax savings will be small, can dissipate his presumed increased spending power without appreciably increasing demand on those businesses that need to sell more. The higher income earner, whose tax relief will amount to something, has a greater propensity to save. He just may not buy that new boat; whereas the fellow at the lower end of the income ladder, who has never bought a new car, will still be unable to buy one.

As for additional moneys for business investment—approximately $2.3 billion more as a result of the proposed tax cut—will this investment occur among industries that already have overcapacity? Or, one might ask, "Will the availability of more investment funds result in the rationalization of older industries, like steel, which will further decrease employment opportunities and, in fact, decrease employment absolutely in those industries?"

I have the feeling that this tax cut business could turn out to be like shifting figures from one column to the other without changing anything very much. If the object is to step up expenditures on durable goods or capital equipment in traditional lines, I believe that the tax cut is going to fall far short of its goal to spur the economy and, incidentally, bring about the practical concomitants of more employment and less unemployment. The quality of expenditures is all-important. The quantity, the aggregate, is deceptive.

AND ITS MORE DIFFICULT PARTS

If the additional funds realized by the private sectors are spent on a greatly stepped-up program of research and development, covering the gamut of scientific, technological and social improvement, then I think something meaningful will result. This, of course, precludes greatly increased expenditures on goods by people who already have the greater capacity to purchase durables. Also precluded is expansion and modernization of industries that already have overcapacity. New ideas, techniques, goods and services, and new opportunities to earn more for those of low income—these will bring about real increases in aggregate demand.

All of this suggests a direction of growth quite different from the one that says: "Increase aggregate demand, and the total economy will move."

Analysis in terms of neatly stated aggregates is analysis on paper only. The sooner we begin thinking about analyzing its various parts, the better off the aggregate will be.—H.B.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 8, 1963]

INFATUATION WITH AGGREGATES

As the tax cut wends its slow way toward Senate discussion, it may be useful to consider its specifically economic objectives.

Many people, including us, have questioned the idea of an $11 billion tax reduction in a period of budget deficits and without any offsetting reductions in Government spending. Many people also object to particular reforms in the present bill. And, of course, the whole business is heavily overlaid with politics.

But if these important matters were to be put aside for the moment, there still remains the issue of the bill's underlying economic theory. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has put what is in effect the administration's case very well. In an interview with New York University's Challenge magazine, he argues that the trouble with the economy, reflected in unemployment and under-utilization of plant capacity, is insufficient purchasing power or aggregate demand.

One remedy, the Senator observes, would be a bigger program of public works. The other would be a tax cut, "putting more money in the pockets of people. Either program of creating adequate demand necessarily involves a deficit. * * * There is a lot to be said for public works programs, but they take time to get under way. * * * So I personally think that the President's program to increase aggregate demand through a tax cut is probably the quickest and wisest method of solving this problem."

The argument plainly rests on a number of assumptions, and to us they seem dubious at best. It is becoming widely recognized, for instance, that the unemployment figures are inflated, while in a number of fields there is if anything a labor shortage. "Excess capacity," moreover, often means merely that industries are not using some of their old and obsolescent facilities; even so, in a number of activities utilization is close to capacity these days.

The major assumption, though, is that the proposed tax cuts actually would be a big stimulus to spending. This overlooks the fact that people are also capable of saving money, and have shown quite a propensity in that direction despite the existing high taxes.

Even if it would be reasonable to expect at least a moderate rise in spending in the wake of lower taxes, much depends on what the spending is for. An increase in beer consumption is not of the same economic value as investment in research for new products or outlays for new capital equipment. In the same way, increased Federal spending on nonproductive projects will raise the gross national product on paper, but it is all but meaningless economically or may in fact be a drain on the economy.

As the editor of Challenge, indirectly taking issue with Senator DOUGLAS, notes, too much attention is paid to aggregates, those great big round figures economists like to talk about.

"The quality of expenditures is all-important. The quantity, the aggregate, is deceptive."

It is on this basic point that Roswell Magill, chairman of the private Committee on Federal Tax Policy, also parts company with the House-passed bill. A stimulus to consumption, he says, "can help raise gross national product only in the short run. For the longer run, growth of consumption depends on expansion of production—and this, in turn, depends on investment." The committee has devised an alternative tax proposal, designed to spur the savings and investment which are the real route to more jobs and sound economic growth.

If the budget were in balance, even the bill now before Congress could be welcomed as a step in the direction of reforming our horrendous tax structure. But the budget is not in balance, and the administration has overstated the supposed wonders that would ensue from the bill as it now stands.

For the Senate to act responsibly, it seems to us, requires two things: An insistence on spending reductions. And a close analysis of the bill's infatuation with foggy economics.

Extension of Civil Rights Commission

SPEECH

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted in favor of the resolution extending the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year, as it is most important that this Commission be permitted to remain in operation and to continue its great work. This was an emergency action required of the Congress.

I introduced a bill to extend the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for 4 years; this provision was contained in the administration bill on civil rights which is now under consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member. When the subcommittee in charge of the bill took action, an amendment was offered to make the Commission permanent. At this point, I cannot predict what action our full committee will take regarding the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. I would like to see it become a permanent body, and shall vote accordingly in committee when the opportunity presents itself.

The Civil Rights Commission performs invaluable services for us. The 1963

report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights once again shows us the true picture of the deprivation of civil rights suffered by millions of our citizens. The report proves that discrimination is rampant in all parts of our country; it shows us where and what evils exist and what action must be taken to correct injustices and to protect those denied their rights guaranteed by our Constitution. The Commission furnishes us with the information we need in order to legislate effectively and intelligently. The Committee on the Judiciary relies upon the information furnished by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

In this time of grave crisis in the matter of civil rights, it behooves us to take all possible, effective action in behalf of Negroes and members of other minority groups, at every opportunity. I, for one, shall continue my best efforts in this regard.

An Invaluable Document in the Struggle for Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, the Civil Rights Commission issued its 1963 report. This is an invaluable document in the struggle for equality. The 1963 report, as well as the Commission's previous reports, indicates the great usefulness of the Commission and constitutes convincing proof that the Commision should be given permanent status. The report has received much praise. The New York Post on October 2 published an editorial concerning this report which I believe should be read by all of us.

The editorial follows:

THE KEY DOCUMENT

The third biennial report of the Civil Rights Commission is an eloquent and courageous document. If the Commission had done nothing else its usefulness would have been vindicated. It will be a national crime if Congress does not make the Commission a permanent body and give it enlarged powers, especially the power to guide and assist local communities to establish "lines of communication" between Negroes and whites to develop corrective programs.

The report's preface is a memorable assessment of where the Nation stands today in the great civil rights struggle. A nonpartisan body, the agency praises Presidential leadership and declares that "for the first time * * * the Commission is able to report an atmosphere of genuine hopefulness."

But just because Negro expectations have been so deeply aroused, failure to satisfy them could drive Negro and white Americans even further apart, the Commission warns. In some respects its vigorous recommendations—supported by both southern and northern members—are significantly ahead of administration policy.

They call for enactment of FEPC legislation, reducing membership in the House of Representatives of States denying voting rights to Negroes, and a 90-day deadline for the filing of school board desegregation plans. The Commission favors stronger measures to assure that public money will not be spent in ways which foster racial discrimination. It wants the Attorney General empowered to institute civil rights suits.

This is an agenda for action. It deserves to be read—and followed.

California Liberals Please Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, not only California liberals but Democratic liberals throughout the country have hated Richard M. Nixon for beating Helen Gahagan Douglas in the senatorial campaign of 1950. I wonder how they feel today when it is revealed in Victor Lasky's book, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth," that Congressman Kennedy gave a $1,000 contribution to Mr. Nixon to help defeat Mrs. Douglas. How times change.

The following chapter of the book appeared in the Washington Daily News, yesterday:

J.F.K.: THE MAN AND THE MYTH

(By Victor Lasky)

(NOTE.—This is the 7th chapter of a 24-part series of excerpts from Victor Lasky's new bestseller, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth" (The Macmillan Co.), an unabashed attack on President Kennedy which is bound to please his enemies and anger his friends. It is rapidly becoming, nonetheless, the most widely discussed and debated book in Washington—and seems likely to fan the political fires throughout the Nation.)

A GIFT TO NIXON

"On November 10, 1950," began a New Republic article published nearly 2 years later, "a young Massachusetts Congressman told an informal gathering of Harvard University students and professors—of which this writer was a member—that—

"He could see no reason why we were fighting in Korea.

"He thought that sooner or later we would have to get all these foreigners off our backs in Europe.

"He supported the McCarran Act and felt that not enough had been done about Communists in government.

"He rather respected Joe McCarthy and thought he 'knew Joe pretty well, and he may have something.'

"He had no great respect for Dean Acheson or indeed almost any member of the Fair Deal administration.

"He personally was very happy that Helen Gahagan Douglas had just been defeated in California by Richard Nixon."

The young Congressman was, of course, John F. Kennedy. The article was written by John P. Mallan, then a Harvard teaching fellow and more recently a professor at Smith College.

Kennedy's liking for McCarthy seemed to be on a personal basis, as was his feeling that Mrs. Douglas was "not the sort of person I like working with on committees."

So aroused emotionally was young Kennedy against Helen Gahagan Douglas that he made what could well have been a disastrous slip in terms of his later ambitions. In 1950, John F. Kennedy made a personal contribution to Richard M. Nixon in his Senate campaign against the California Congresswoman.

"The check, of course, is of record," according to Robert W. Richards, chief of the San Diego Union's Washington Bureau. Like any other contribution it was turned over to the Nixon Senate Campaign Committee in California.

Fortunately for Kennedy, the Richards dispatch, published on July 20, 1960, soon after Kennedy's nomination for President, did not obtain wider circulation.

As Richards told the story:

"The new Democrat standardbearer's pop, Joe, who masterminded son Jack's climb up the money tree to the party's presidential nomination, also liked Nixon as a warrior against communism. But the check which Jack Kennedy, then in the House, brought in person into the Nixon office—the Vice President also was serving his second term in Congress—was signed not by his father, but by himself and drawn against his own account."

There had been published reports that Joseph P. Kennedy had contributed liberally to the Nixon campaign because he considered Mrs. Douglas "too far to the left." But the Richards dispatch was the first to disclose that Jack Kennedy had personally helped Nixon out with a four-figure contribution.

All this happened during the bruising Nixon-Douglas contest, the repercussions of which were still being felt a decade later during the 1960 presidential campaign. Ironically, anti-Nixon sentiments nurtured in 1950 were to be capitalized upon by the Kennedy forces. As Richards wrote of the 1950 episode:

"Shock-haired Kennedy strode into the Nixon House offices to ask if the Congressman was available. He was informed that Nixon was out. Jack then suggested that he'd like to see Nixon's confidential secretary privately and was turned over to William Arnold. Pulling the check for $1,000 from his pocket the Boston House Member said he wanted to offer it to help out Nixon's campaign against Representative Douglas.

"He didn't need to spell out to the Nixon aid that it might be embarrassing if a Democrat Member of Congress was known to be giving cash to the campaign of a Republican senatorial candidate.

"Nor has Nixon ever betrayed the Kennedy campaign gift to this day."

Richards' unimpeachable source, who, he said, was neither Nixon nor any of his staff, had revealed the story only because Kennedy, in his speech accepting the presidential nomination, had struck some low blows against his Republican rival.

For one thing, Kennedy had asserted that before Nixon deals, "someone had better cut the cards." Such statements, according to Richards' informant, "were paradoxical in view of what had happened only a decade ago" when Kennedy sought the defeat of Mrs. Douglas.

"Perhaps," observed Richards, "it is one of those swings of the pendulum that politics imposes on the ambitious."

How the pendulum swung for Kennedy, in terms of his Senate ambitions, was described by the Mallan article. It was in the fall of 1951, during another Harvard appearance, when Representative Kennedy disclosed his intention to seek election to the Senate the following year. And, without characterizing his remarks as off the record, he outlined the kind of campaign he intended to wage against the Republican incumbent, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., promulgating what could be termed the theory of the visual contrast. (This, of course, was before the term "image" had entered the language.)

Dr. Mallan continued: "Lodge, said Kennedy, is young, as I am. He is a veteran of World War II, as I am. (He might have added that both men were decorated for bravery.) I cannot disagree with him on foreign policy. There is no way, in short, that I can create a visual contrast between myself as a young

reformer bringing change and Lodge as a crusty repersentative of the Old Guard. One thing remains: I must attack Lodge on domestic issues. I must attack his record on housing, on price control, on labor, on the St. Lawrence Seaway and economc aid for New England. I must, in brief—Kennedy might have added—become a New Dealer."

Actually, Kennedy had been running for higher office even before his first term as Congressman was over. This was one of the reasons why his record of absenteeism in the Congress was the worst of any of the 14-member Masachusetts delegation. "Indeed," wrote the Reporter's Ralph Blagden, "Kennedy's on-the-record percentage for the entire 82d Congress was 57, placing him among the bottom four Members in the whole Chamber."

Tourism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was personally proud and pleased that when the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, so wisely decided to create a small Subcommittee on Tourism within the Banking and Currency Committee that he saw fit to name this particular Representative from California to serve with the gentleman from Florida, Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER, and the gentleman from New Jersey, WILLIAM WIDNALL. I hope it is now well known that the 34th District which I represent is the home of one of the best known tourist attractions in the world—Disneyland. It is also widely known for the Knott's Berry Farm, a longtime tourist attraction of growing size and complexion, and a more recent addition the Movieland Wax Museum. Orange County, Calif., has also enjoyed for years a wide renown for its beautiful beaches and the colorful and useful Newport-Balboa Harbor.

That such an area should be acutely aware of the economic potential within the fields of tourism and travel is clearly understandable. We know from first-hand and productive experience the economic advantages that come with the development of a product to meet people's demands for recreation and diversion within a society which is at the same time creating frustrating complexities and a scale of income sufficient to finance a short respite from the mundane demands of the daily grind.

Chairman PEPPER has called the tourist industry the "sleeping giant" of our economy; and he has chosen his descriptive phrase well and accurately. The potential for business expansion by encouraging the growth of tourism by both Americans and foreign visitors is truly great.

The President has recently announced a program of intra-America travel under the banner of "See the U.S.A." To prepare for a realization of the expectations of this new program, we must upgrade our travel accommodations, increase the number, the spectrum of choice, and the quality of living accommodations and above all learn how to become better hosts. By doing this for our own citizens we will be automatically building a more attractive product to merchandise abroad. It would be unfortunate if we gave the impression of the "Ugly American" in reverse because we failed to realize how important the role of the good host is in tourism.

The side benefits in the social, economic, and political facets of our lives by the healthy development of this industry of tourism are particularly impressive. Mr. Speaker, we hope to be able to bring to this House in the near future some of the positive fallout that can inure to our betterment from a dynamic, well-planned tourist program.

Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, this great Republic has been the true refuge for all classes of people who have sought freedom from autocrats and tyrants. We are infinitely proud that our Republic was and still remains a safe haven for political refugees. Among a host of peoples who have taken advantage of this situation the Poles are among the most deserving and they have also profited most by it. They have come to this country by the hundreds of thousands, and, besides finding happy homes, they have found unexpected opportunities here for bettering their economic, social, and cultural life. Thus today we find them very active and successful in all trades and professions. As intellectuals and hardy laborers, as artists and scientists, as doctors and lawyers, politicians, as public servants, and as statesmen, Americans of Polish descent are unexcelled in many of our communities throughout the country. Only the other day a distinguished public servant of Polish descent was sworn in as Postmaster General in the President's Cabinet, which indicates that there is no limit to the height a deserving citizen may climb in this truly democratic Nation. We are rightly proud of all these people, especially of those whose forebears had settled around the Bay Region of San Francisco more than 100 years ago. But since today marks the 225th birthday anniversary of a great Pole who gave the best of his mature and active life for the cause of our independence, I would like to say a few special words about this singularly great man and gifted warrior.

Casimir Pulaski was born into a fairly wealthy family in 1748. His father was a prosperous lawyer, active in Polish politics and especially concerned with Poland's fate. He wanted his son to embrace his patriotism and show intense interest in national issues. Fortunately young Casimir showed remarkable aptitude in manly sports and as a leader. While in school he did not shy away from studies, he loved physical activity even more. As soon as his secondary schooling was over he became the courtier or the aid of a prince, and here his interest turned to matters concerned directly with warfare. Soon he became painfully aware that Poland's leaders were helpless against the powerful enemy forces of Russia. But by 1768 Pulaski had become a young man of action, and at the head of some 8,000 men he was fighting the Russians. During the next 4 years he led the best organized and bravest fighting guerrilla bands in Poland against the Russians, but outnumbered and overpowered, he was forced out of Poland in 1772, never to see it again.

Late in 1775 he arrived in Paris, penniless and without employment. Someone suggested that he go to America and fight in the Revolutionary War here. A year later he was in touch with Benjamin Franklin who on May 29 of 1777 in a letter recommended Pulaski's services to Washington. Pulaski arrived in Boston in July, and met Washington, who recommended him to the Continental Congress. On August 27 he was placed in command of all the cavalry, thus he became the father of our cavalry. In September he joined Washington and participated in the Battle of Brandywine with distinction. He commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton, later at Flemington, and acted in unison with General Wayne in scouting for supplies for the famishing troops at Valley Forge.

In 1778 Congress gave Pulaski permission to organize an independent corps of cavalry. Having accomplished this task, finally he was sent in May of 1779 to Charleston, S.C. Then on October 9 at the siege of Savannah he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry and fell with a grapeshot in the loin. This was the last daring act of this great Polish patriot and soldier of freedom. He gave his life for the noble cause of our freedom and independence, and today on the 225th anniversary of his birth we honor him and pay tribute to his blessed memory.

Shocking Conduct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press and freedom of broadcasters is being threatened by agencies and officials of the Federal Government. I commend the executive committee of the South Carolina Press Association for their courage in condemning a Federal Government official for his direct attack on the right to editorialize.

The following story from the Index-Journal, my hometown newspaper, should be carefully studied by every Member of this Congress and every news-

paper and radio station in the United States:

PRESS ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE SCORES ACTION OF NLRB DIRECTOR

COLUMBIA.—Recommendations of a National Labor Relations Board regional director in an Orangeburg union election were scored Saturday by the executive committee of the South Carolina Press Association.

An election was held at Orangeburg May 13 in which the International Association of Machinists sought to be the bargaining agent for Utica-Herfrand Tool Division. The union move was defeated, but the union moved to have the election set aside and a new election ordered.

Among the charges was "allowing and encouraging the editor of the local newspaper to make statements and write editorials that prevented a free vote by creating confusion and fear of reprisals among employees."

The NLRB examiner upheld the union claim, finding that "the newspaper editorials and radio broadcasts, generated an atmosphere of fear of economic loss and complete futility in selecting the union as the bargaining representative, thus destroying the laboratory conditions deemed necessary in the conduct of Board elections and prevented the expression of a free choice by the employees.

Following is the statement of the press association executive committee on the ruling:

"The executive committee of the South Carolina Press Association views with great apprehension the recommendation by a National Labor Relations Board regional director in a union representation election at Orangeburg, S.C., which if approved by the Board and the courts would stifle freedom of the press.

"A principal point of the recommendation that the election be set aside was that the Orangeburg newspaper expressed its opinions in editorials prior to the election.

"The right of free expression by the press is guaranteed under the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution. It is not subject to repeal by an NLRB examiner—or by any other agent of government.

"We feel confident that higher authority will reject forthwith this flagrant attack on freedom of expression, and we urgently suggest that this freedom be upheld in unequivocal terms.

"We are deeply concerned that even one Federal official, acting wtih the authority of a government agent, should trespass upon this foundation of American liberty; it is shocking to us that he should recommend the nullification, through NLRB edict, of this basic constitutional right."

Secret Soviet Flights Peril Atlantic Lanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as President Truman referred to Stalin as "good old Joe," it seems President Kennedy is referring to Khrushchev as "good old Nikita." At any rate, he has started another era of "good Communist feeling" and the Soviet is so friendly that it has been imperiling normal air traffic lanes, as indicated in the following Associated Press dispatch of October 5, 1963:

SECRET SOVIET FLIGHTS PERIL ATLANTIC LANES

SHANNON, IRELAND, October 5.—Secret flights by giant Soviet military jets on the Cuba run have gravely imperiled trans-Atlantic air traffic, aviation sources said today.

They added that a report has gone to the Irish Government, which is considering an official protest to Moscow.

The flights, according to Shannon air traffic control officials, cut right through the Atlantic lanes which at peak times carry a plane a minute between the United States and Europe.

Exact details of the numbers and dates of Soviet flights were not available. It is known, however, that Shannon's report included an American airline captain's complaint that he spotted two Soviet jets crossing the civil route.

WITH 140 PASSENGERS ABOARD

This pilot was flying an American jet to Europe with 140 passengers.

He reported sighting one Soviet Bear-type jet at 34,000 feet and another at 36,000. The Bear is a military jet about the size of a Boeing 707 and can make Cuba from the Soviet Union nonstop.

The pilot said he believed the Soviet planes were flying from Cuba to Northwest Russia, probably to a Soviet base in the Murmansk region.

The Soviets make the flight nonstop—sometimes a considerable hazard, according to aviation authorities—because Western countries bar intermediate landings without inspection of their cargoes.

This ban is part of the West's quarantine against the buildup of Soviet military power in Cuba.

COULD HAVE BEEN DISASTER

A senior operations official at Shannon said of the American pilot's report: "There could easily have been a disaster. Air space over the Atlantic is scarce at jet levels. It is difficult to accommodate all the normal passenger aircraft. Any plane flying between 29,000 feet and 39,000 feet without furnishing a flight plan would present a real hazard."

Officials explained that passenger jets are sent west from Europe on tracks at 31,000 feet, 35,000 and 39,000. They must keep north of an imaginary barrier fixed daily by air traffic controllers to divide the Atlantic in two.

Jets flying from America to Europe keep south of the barrier. As an added precaution their tracks are fixed at 29,000 feet, 33,000 and 37,000.

The Peace Corps—Its Benefit to Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Miss Monica G. Klein recently won a national oratorical contest sponsored by the Catholic War Veterans on a county, State, and National level.

Miss Klein has cogently described the role of the Peace Corps and it gives me pleasure to bring it to the attention of my colleagues at this time.

The winning orator is a lovely Brooklynite and a recent graduate of St. Agnes Seminary, one of our city's finest schools:

THE PEACE CORPS—ITS BENEFITS TO OUR NATION

(By Monica G. Klein)

We have planted our youth in the fields of troubled countries and we are harvesting the first crop. From sturdy seeds given little chance to grow, has come the richest harvest the world has ever seen.

On March 1, 1961, President John F. Kennedy established by Executive order the Peace Corps of the United States of America. In it, highly qualified men and women were to go into those countries such as Pakistan, Colombia, Thailand, Sierra Leone, and Ghana which needed our help. They were to impart to these people all of their knowledge. There was a tremendous response, particularly from the college campuses, and in May of that year the first Peace Corps, derisively called the Kennedy Kiddie Korps, the Children's Crusade, and even draft dodgers by the national press, was ready to be sent overseas. No one realized the benefits we would obtain from this crop of young people.

For we are the reapers. We are reaping the good will of the people and the governments of those backward countries we have helped. We have planted in these countries youths with a knowledge of modern agricultural methods, bricklaying, construction, and mechanics. These grew strong and produced a special seed, developed and continued by the people of each country.

We have planted teachers. Their roots went deep and their seeds blew to all in every part of the country. And the fruit they bore were the people they raised from illiteracy.

These countries are indebted to us now, not for a billion dollars in foreign aid, but for a path to a progressive future and the day they will take their place among the nations of the world as an equal.

Their friendship is true, based on respect and not debt. We have won them now, when we need their friendship most.

Two thousand years ago, our Lord told us the way to heaven was to treat all men as our brothers. The United States has finally learned this is also the road to world understanding.

For we are the reapers. We have reaped teachers and educators for our understaffed schools. Many of the young men and women who joined the Peace Corps as teachers had no intention of making that their life's work in the United States. They have found, however, such satisfaction in raising others from the blank wall of illiteracy that they will return home seeking to help the young of their own country.

For we are the reapers. We are reaping youth with an understanding of an alien culture, tongue, and civilization. Members of the Peace Corps have watched clever Communists work in these countries to spread their corroding doctrine. The comrades learn the language, customs, and superstitions of the unsuspecting natives and promise them a better life—a promise never fulfilled.

The Peace Corps enters the country armed with the same knowledge. But it promises nothing; rather it gives. It gives the people the means to a better life. In this way they actively fight America's greatest enemy and form a contract with the people to be fulfilled many times, in many ways.

Our people will return with a knowledge of the nature of our enemy and will be able to fight then much more effectively from our own shores.

For we are the reapers. We are reaping the effects of the true power of the United States. This quotation from Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY explains quite clearly what I am trying to say: "Peace is not passive, it is

not merely the absence of violence. There can be no peace for the middle-aged woman in Burma, suffering from malaria. There can be no peace for the emaciated teenage boy in India who barely survives on several hundred calories a day. There can be no peace for the illiterate and unskilled tribesmen in Tanganyika bound to a quagmire of want.

"The real power of the United States is not in the Government. It is not in the modern weapons of destruction or the tools of industry.

"The real power is in the people, in the compassion of individual Americans for others."

Therein lies the greatest benefit the Peace Corps is giving us. It is giving us the means to a lasting peace. For it is only when helping others to achieve peace that we can truly have peace ourselves.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part V of the series "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1," which follows:

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1—PART V

(By Ian McNett)

New Jersey entered the battle against air pollution in 1954 when the legislature passed the Air Pollution Control Act.

Under the act, an air pollution control commission from 1955 to 1961 set up a code of six chapters. The air sanitation program, a division of the State department of health, is charged with enforcing the code.

Chapter I deals with definitions. Chapter III permits local governments to enact regulations "not inconsistent with this act."

The other four chapters prohibit air pollution. Chapter II bans pollution from salvage operations and refuse burning. All types of open burning are banned except two.

Plant life may be burned on private property if it isn't done regularly. This permits homeowners to burn leaves. But it wouldn't permit a florist to burn flowers every day.

Certain industrial wastes may be burned in the open "where no other known method of disposal can be used without hazard to health or property."

The wastes include dynamite and volatile fluids that might explode if burned in the confining space of an incinerator.

Chapter IV says no one shall pollute the air by smoke emissions. The code prohibits smoke emissions darker than No. 2 on the Ringelmann smoke chart. No. 2 represents a density of smoke that can be seen through at the source.

Industries may emit denser smoke for short periods of time while cleaning furnaces and boilers Diesel engines may also emit denser smoke. Smoke density relates to the number of particles it contains.

Chapter V regulates the amount of fly ash that may be emitted for a given amount of heat. Fly ash is the part of solid fuels that won't burn. It is emitted in tiny particles.

These chapters are preventive. The code sets standards that must be met. But the three chapters cover only a small part of the total air pollution picture.

CATCHALL PROVISION

The Air Pollution Control Commission in 1961 enacted a catchall chapter to cover all kinds of air pollution for which standards have not been set.

Chapter VI states, "No person shall cause, suffer, allow, or permit to be emitted into the outdoor atmosphere any substances in quantities that will result in air pollution."

William A. Munroe, coordinator of the air sanitation program, admits chapter VI is the weakest tool in the air pollution control kit.

He says, "The State can take no initiative under this chapter. Somebody has to make a complaint before we can act."

And even if someone does complain, the chapter is still difficult to enforce.

Without standards to go by, the State official must decide if air pollution is occurring. Then he must decide how much of the pollution to stop.

Chapter VI is like a speeding law that says a motorist shall not drive his car too fast, but doesn't set a speed limit in miles per hour.

TWO QUESTIONS RAISED

The chapter's weakness raises two questions. Why haven't standards been set for all pollutants? And, if the State has a law curbing air pollution, why can't it just order people to stop polluting?

In the first case, Munroe says, nobody knows what the standards should be.

In the second, he says, State officials think they should be able to tell a polluter how to stop polluting. Where devices and procedures do not exist that will stop the pollution, Munroe doesn't think the State can or should make a violator stop polluting.

In addition to the weakness of chapter VI, which is a significant weakness, many observers of the air pollution scene believe the code doesn't contain stiff enough penalties.

It provides for fines of from $100 to $500 for each week anybody is in violation of the code.

The State's efforts also had been hampered by a provision of the control act that required State inspectors to sign an affidavit before they could enter a factory, promising not to reveal any industrial secrets.

This section was amended last year and inspectors can now gain immediate entry if they believe air pollution might be occurring.

The State's efforts are also hampered by a budget of about $100,000 a year. This amounts to a cent and a half a year in tax money for each person who lives in New Jersey.

The budget only permits the hiring of eight inspectors who must watch the activities of 15,000 industries and many other possible sources, including diesel engines, commercial establishments, and government facilities.

Very little is left over for research that is needed to set the standards all the experts say are needed before tougher laws can be passed.

Some critics of the State's efforts say the U.S. Public Health Service should be brought in to help the State find out what is in the air.

Munroe answers he would "love" to have the Service make a survey. However, he says, the State must provide some of the money for the survey.

CAN'T GET MONEY

His requests for money to bring in the Service have been whacked from budget after budget that he has submitted.

Even if the Service made a survey, it wouldn't recommend a control policy. Its surveys are designed to get a long-term evaluation of what is going on in the atmosphere over a State.

However, the Public Health Service is the only agency that has the sophisticated devices that can measure the evasive gaseous pollutants.

Munroe is trying to build such a device himself. However, this also takes money. Several New Jersey industries have contributed money toward the cost of the device, Munroe says.

Munroe says he and the Air Pollution Control Commission are now working on a program that he thinks will become a model for other States when it is completed.

DISTINCTION STRESSED

He says the distinction between local and ambient (overall) pollution is very important. Local and overall pollution present different problems and should be tackled from different angles, he says.

Local pollution is what one polluter does to his neighbors. Munroe would set up separate standards for every kind of pollutant that comes from local sources.

First, standards would be set for heavy particles that fall to the ground near the factory. Since most of the particles would fall on the property of the polluter, standards would not need to be very rigid.

After that, standards would be set for the various lighter particles that travel farther before reaching the ground.

Before these standards can be set, Munroe says studies will have to be made of the heat of stack gases, temperatures around factory stacks, and wind speed and direction near factories. All these factors affect how far particles will travel.

Finally, Munroe envisions standards for all types of gases that industries would be permitted to emit.

SEEKS TOTAL PICTURE

Then, with the local situation in hand, Munroe wants to get a "total picture of the overall atmosphere of the State." This would include the role automobiles and home heating units play in air pollution.

With knowledge of the overall atmosphere, "which nobody can even guess at now," Munroe says it will be possible to decide whether air quality standards should be set for the entire State.

This could involve control devices for the automobiles.

All new cars coming into New Jersey have the crankcase blowby devices installed. These devices return crankcase vapors that would otherwise escape to the cylinders to be burned.

Automakers are now working on afterburners that will destroy many of the exhaust gases that still escape. These devices could cost as much as $200.

Muroe says that would be a sizable amount of money to ask the State's 2½ million motorists to make without pretty convincing evidence that auto air pollution makes the devices necessary.

However, the time may come when the State will have to ask the motorists to make this financial sacrifice. It is one of the questions that makes research so important.

A Sketch of Mark Van Doren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that many of the most distinguished writers in America call Connecticut their home. Foremost among these writers is Mark Van Doren, the poet, short-story writer, novelist, playwright, and critic, who resides in Cornwall.

In conjunction with the publication of his latest book—collected and new poems, 1924–63, N.Y. Hill & Wang—the

distinguished book review critic of the New York Herald Trbune, John Hutchens wrote an interesting sketch of his life.

In speaking of the Pulitizer Prize winning poet, Hutchens quoted another former Connecticut resident, the late and great humorist Jim Thurber who said that Mark Van Doren is "so many men that I have to open my front door and my windows when he visits me in order to let all of him in."

This is just one of the many tributes that have been paid Mark Van Doren over the years, Mr. Speaker, and few men have contributed so much to our strength as a Nation. Among so many other things, Mark Van Doren was one of the leading supporters of the war bond program during World War II, and presided over the auctioning of many valuable books, the profits of which were used in the war effort.

But Mark Van Doren is so many men, Mr. Speaker, that I will not attempt to even summarize his distinguished life. Suffice it to say, this sketch, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune book week section (and also the Washington Post this past Sunday), September 29, manages to catch the flavor of his long and memorable life. As a Member at Large from Connecticut, I am immensely proud that Mark Van Doren has found our State a good one in which to live and work.

A SKETCH OF MARK VAN DOREN

Early in one of the most rewarding autobiographies of any living American man of letters, Mark Van Doren recalls that "I was an affectionate child in an affectionate family." In the 60-odd years since his Illinois childhood, the "family" of the Columbia University professor emeritus of English has grown beyond any easy reckoning. It includes some thousands of those who studied under him during his 39 years as a teacher on Morningside Heights, colleagues who served with him there, innumerable other friends in and out of the academic world, readers (who could possibly estimate their number?) whom he has reached as poet, critic, short-story writer, novelist.

Friendship being a two-way street, it stands to reason that the "affectionate child" grew into an affectionate adult who returned as well as earned this warm regard. When 500 old friends met at Low Memorial Library on April 29, 1959, to salute him on the occasion of his impending retirement from the faculty, it was James Thurber who said that Mark Van Doren is "so many men that I have to open my front door and my windows when he visits me in order to let all of him in." He was speaking for everyone present, and for all those, down the years, who could not be.

The first of those "many men" named Mark Van Doren was the young one who arrived at Columbia in 1915, with his B.A. and M.A. from the University of Illinois, the M.A. having been secured by a thesis on Henry Thoreau that Houghton Mifflin published the following year—not a bad literary start for a 22-year-old aspirant for a Ph. D. After 2 years of World War I service in the U.S. Army—an experience he enjoyed so much that he later was homesick for it—he returned to Columbia to take that Ph. D. with a dissertation on Dryden as a poet, and that too became a book, praised in the London Times Literary Supplement by no less a one than T. S. Eliot.

In 1920, as an instructor in English, he was a full-time faculty member there, but in the Mark Van Doren career there somehow has always been time beyond the full-time. In 1924 he published his first book of poetry, "Spring Thunder" (which appropriately leads off "Collected and New Poems, 1924–63)." In the same year he began a 4-year term as literary editor of The Nation, a post formerly held by his older brother Carl. (From 1935 to 1938 he was its film critic—"I have relished few duties more," he says in his autobiography).

His happy and still continuing marriage to Dorothy Graffe, herself a writer of distinction, began in 1922. (For a delightful account of their life together, see her "The Professor and I" (1959).) As an editor he assembled the "Oxford Book of American Prose" and the extremely successful "Anthology of World Poetry." The 1920's were fruitful years for him, bringing as they did two more books of poetry, "7 P.M. and Other Poems" (1926) and "Now the Sky" (1928).

To his genius as a teacher such former students as Lionel Trilling, Clifton Fadiman, and Mortimer Adler have long since attested—notably the Shakespeare course ("all of Shakespeare," he proudly said) that he taught for 16 years. Out of it came his "Shakespeare," one essay to each of the plays, of which Lewis Gannett said in 1939 that it was "almost as if no one had written about Shakespeare before." In the 1930's he found time also to lecture at St. John's College and to take part in the administration of its Great Books curriculum.

Still another of the Mark Van Dorens is the playwright who in 1959 wrote "The Last Days of Lincoln," a drama bringing the special flavor of a poet born in the Lincoln country. In much of his other poetry critics have found an affinity to Robert Frost, of which Mr. Van Doren says he is not aware, but adds: "I wouldn't care if it were true. I admire him immensely." The major influence he recognizes, he once told an interviewer, is Dryden, "in the fundamental sense of clarity, movement, vigor, plainness. I love plainness."

Of poetry in general he has said elsewhere: "The best poetry, I still think, does not seem hard. Its coming to birth is of course as hard as it is rare; but the poets responsible for it prefer to sound like men who happily, luckily, had those things to say." Another of his dicta, one that says much about him as a teacher: "No thought, no feeling, is to be rejected for the simple reason that it is old. Or because it is new. The truth of it, if one can find that out, is all that matters."

—JOHN K. HUTCHENS.

We and Nikita to the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the do-gooders around the President and some whom I suspect are not do-gooders have talked him into a joint moon effort with the Soviet Union. What do the real experts say about it?

In yesterday's New York Times, D. Brainerd Holmes, former head of the Nation's moon flight program, tells us why it would not be such a good idea, as does Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I would recommend to the President that in the future, even though he is interested in votes, a bit of study would be most helpful before he goes off half cocked.

The article follows:

JOINT MOON TRIP HELD INEFFICIENT

(By Richard Witkin)

The former head of the Nation's moon flight program, D. Brainerd Holmes, voiced strong reservations last night about President Kennedy's proposal for a joint Soviet-United States expedition to the moon.

In an American Broadcasting Co. television interview, Mr. Holmes also urged that the strong manager philosophy followed in developing nuclear submarines and ballistic missiles be copied in the lagging man-on-the-moon project.

Differences with the head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, James E. Webb, led to Mr. Holmes' unexpected resignation in June as director of manned space flight.

The former official said he thought any attempt to combine Soviet and U.S. flight equipment, or even to send a mixed crew to the moon, would be "a very costly, very inefficient, probably a very dangerous way, to execute the program."

Mr. Holmes expressed the view that President Kennedy probably had something much less ambitious in mind. He suggested that perhaps the President was thinking merely of an exchange of information or of hooking together ground stations used to track moonbound spacecraft.

In a companion interview Comdr. Alan B. Sheppard, Jr., who made the first manned Mercury flight, disclosed that the next group of astronauts would include a number with scientific backgrounds. They will be named later this month.

The scientific community has been urging for some time that trained scientists be included in space crews.

However, informants said the men Commander Sheppard had in mind would meet the criteria only partly. They would be professional jet pilots who happened to have a bachelor's or master's degree in some scientific field.

The scientific community contemplates using men with extensive experience in fields for which space flight would offer rich research opportunity—fields such as astronomy, geology, and physiology.

They would be scientists first, possibly with little or no pilot expeirence, and might have to receive a limited amount of training in handling spacecraft controls.

It is considered likely that men such as these will be added to the astronaut program in 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Holmes, now a senior vice president of the Raytheon Co., said he still thought it possible to meet President Kennedy's goal of a lunar landing by 1970, despite schedule slippages and budget troubles.

"It's different working in Government than it is in industry," he said. "There are more approvals necessary and I found * * * there often were time delays in getting approval for things which I thought should be approved more rapidly."

Mr. Holmes said the felt that the only way to run a large project "is to put the project manager in such complete charge that he makes policy with very little approval above."

DRYDEN SEES PROBLEMS

CLEVELAND, October 6.—Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said tonight that possible U.S.-Soviet cooperation on space exploration would be bogged down by Soviet security in that field.

Mr. Dryden spoke to 500 persons at the eighth annual Inter-Church World Peace Seminar, in suburban Lakewood.

"Their bureaucracy is even more complicated than our own," he said of the Russians. "I think that from now on there will be relatively slow progress in cooperation between the United States and Russia."

Mr. Dryden said the Soviet Union must alter its security program if any cooperation can be expected. He said there had been no reply from the Russians yet on President Kennedy's proposal.

The Russians covet their rocket program and the information gained from it as much as we covet hydrogen bomb secrets, Dr. Dryden said.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Supp. 2).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Lt. Gen. James Doolittle Evaluates NASA's Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, October 4, NASA's fifth anniversary of its establishment was highlighted by a banquet at which several outstanding Americans of our times were present. One of those men, Lt. Gen. James Doolittle, Air Force, retired, was master of ceremonies. As I sat there I could not help but be almost overawed by Jimmy Doolittle's incredible career. He is surely a man set apart from his contemporaries in the high regard his associates throughout life have had for him.

Just look at his achievements. As a young test pilot in the 1920's he established record after record in high-speed aircraft. He was a winner of the Schneider Cup Trophy for high-speed flight and was a winner of the Bendix Trophy for cross-country racing. He was the first to demonstrate the feasibility of blind, instrumented flight. He was a winner of the Thompson Trophy at the Detroit races.

As an executive of the Shell Oil Co., he worked unceasingly to improve fuels of our military aircraft. In the face of the opposition from many bureaucratic minds in the military he was responsible for the development and acceptance of 100-octane gasoline which was indispensable to the performance of our military aircraft in World War II.

He will always be remembered for his leadership and indominitable courage in the organizing and leading of Tokyo raiders against Tokyo and Japan in 1942 for which he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. He rose to the rank of lieutenant general in the U.S. Air Force and became one of the outstanding combat leaders of our bomber forces.

In the postwar years, he served as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. He has been an adviser to three Presidents on scientific and aeronautical matters. He has served as Chairman of the Board of the Space Technology Laboratory.

During the busy years of his career he found the time to obtain a doctorate in aeronautical engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Hence, he brings to the field of flight not only his enormous experience as a pilot and leader of men but also a broad scientific and engineering capability that has led him to the forefront in the planning and organizing of our space exploration program.

I know of no other man in this country who is better qualified to evaluate the progress and achievements of NASA in the past 5 years. I know of no other man whose opinion is more widely accepted than his. His high order of intelligence, his breadth of experience and his unquestioned intellectual integrity underwrites the authority with which his judgments are expressed and accepted.

Included in his remarks at the NASA dinner was the evaluation of the achievements that NASA has accomplished in the last 5 years. I think it would greatly benefit the Members of the House to read those remarks and to evaluate them in the light of the man who said them. Jimmy Doolittle more than any other man I know is the one man of our times who can make a realistic evaluation of NASA's progress. I urge every Member not only to read what he said but to keep his remarks for reference when future milestones of achievement are realized by our national space team.

If there is any gathering in the world that does not need a detailed recitation of NASA accomplishments during its first 5 years of operation, this is that gathering. Here are the people, or their leading representatives, who over the past 5 years have planned the programs, secured the funds, built the hardware, and reported the progress of every space venture, from countdown to splashdown or, better, from congressional hearing room to drafting room to clean room to family room.

Need I remind anyone here tonight of the superb engineering judgment that brought our astronauts back, time and again, in Project Mercury, or of the unprecedented feats of spacecraft guidance and control that sent Mariner II to the vicinity of Venus and Syncom to its assigned spot—and I do mean spot—in space?

Need I mention the impressive reliability of the Thor-Delta workhorse, the highly productive sunwatching of OSO, our first orbitting observatory, the long and faithful service of the Tiros weather satellites, or the ocean-bridging feats of Telstar and Relay, which always seem to be turning up in the press or on our TV screens?

Just as well known, to this audience at least, are the less tangible achievements of NASA's last 5 years. I think, however, that they bear reemphasizing.

I refer first of all to the rapidly growing competence and effectiveness of the Government-industry-university space team—an American space team that simply did not exist 5 years ago. Today, the team is a valuable source of national strength, prestige, and security.

All of us are aware of the record of Congress in these 5 years. The bipartisan support and the vision shown in this new field of human endeavor has been based on our lawmakers' confidence in the importance of the national space goals.

I remind you of the openness of the NASA program which has impressed the world with America's supreme interest in the future of man. I note increasing efforts to cooperate effectively in the national interest by those responsible for the civilian and military aspects of our space program—a cooperation which I am proud to say was a heritage passed on from the days of NACA.

I refer to the inspiration which the astronauts of our space program have given to our youth, and to all of us, for a nation which looks only to its past for its inspiration will stumble on the road to the future.

And I refer to something more prosaic, but nevertheless something valuable, that has to be continually fought for amid conflicting pressures from all sides. This is a balanced program which will meet the requirements of science, assures mastery of the art of manned space flight, provides the benefits to all mankind that will flow from useful satellites and space technology, and yet observes the stern necessity to prepare now in the laboratory and in the field for the space achievements and space security of the next decade and, indeed, of the next century.

Let me sum it up this way:

Tonight we salute NASA for the courageous planning and vigorous administration that have served the Nation well in passage from a late and relatively small start to a position of leadership in space exploration. It is a position based today on a broad program whose momentum will, I am convinced, lead the country to preeminence in every aspect of space exploration that is in the national interest.

If this sounds too enthusiastic, let us pause for a moment to think how gloomy were those months preceding NASA's birth. The roof of American leadership in space science and technology was leaking badly, but we sent NASA out in the rain to fix it. And I would say, in these 5 years of work, that they have fixed it very well. Let us not neglect to keep that roof of scientific and technological leadership in repair, and even build a still stronger and better one.

There is no stopping place on the road to preeminence in space, no opportunity to mark time. So tonight we honor the NASA first of all, I believe, for the future promise revealed in the achievement of the past. We honor the vision, the wisdom, the drive, the unswerving determination that will take America, and all who want to cooperate with America, forward to new heights of human achievement.

Centennial Roadside Park Is Tribute to Growth and Expansion of West Virginia State Road Commission Development Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia's proximity to major centers of population in the Eastern United States makes it ideally suited as a vacationland and recreation area for millions of Americans. Consequently, citizens of the Mountain State are vitally concerned

with the development of tourism, recreation facilities, and parks. Aid from the Federal Government has helped this growth and improvement, particularly through the ARA, which approved a grant and loan of nearly $24 million in June of this last fiscal year.

On Sunday, October 6, it was my pleasure to participate in the dedication ceremonies of West Virginia's Centennial Roadside Park on U.S. 219, in Tucker County. The 500 persons in attendance were addressed by Gov. W. W. Barron and State Road Commissioner Burl A. Sawyers.

Taking part in the program were Rev. Andrew Mann, of Thomas; Master of Ceremonies Joe Gilmore, of Parsons; the American Legion Post No. 22 Color Guard; the Parsons and Davis Mountaineer High School Bands; the Boys Forestry Camp Choir, directed by the Reverend Harry Atzenhoter; and State Senator Kenton J. Lambert, of Parsons. Distinguished guests present were Representative Harley O. Staggers and State Senator Dallas Wolfe. Both men spoke. Also introduced was Commissioner Hulett Smith, of West Virginia's Department of Commerce.

I request that my remarks at the dedication of the State's 100th roadside park be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT STATE CENTENNIAL PARK DEDICATION NEAR PARSONS, W. VA., U.S. 219 IN TUCKER COUNTY, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1963

A few days ago I was privileged to address a conference gathering of 1,500 officers, members, and guests of three important parks organizations. The groups assembled were the American Institute of Park Executives, the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, and the National Conference on State Parks.

The consensus of recreation specialists from all States of the Nation was that for those of us concerned with the preservation, utilization, and development of this Nation's vast potentials in recreational resources, this is a decisive time * * * a time of moving forward.

This State centennial park, in its location of scenic grandeur, demonstrates one of the appropriate ways in which West Virginia is moving to meet the challenge of this era of rapid population increase and the greater mobility of our citizens.

We are bringing into focus the important part that the roadside park system of our State bears to the requirement that government and private enterprise must provide more abundantly and more expeditiously the recreational and facility needs of traveling Americans.

Population statistics underscore the fact that there is more and more gravitation to urban centers. The 1960 census revealed that 70 percent of the people of the United States dwelt in cities. Forecasters predict that by 1980 the population will be nearly four-fifths urban. There is a further forecast that there will be a growth of 70 million in population between 1970–80 and that metropolitan areas will absorb all of this total national increase.

These are startling statistics. They make it clear that more and more Americans will be traveling, seeking the beauty and inspiration of out of doors and the recreational and rest opportunities it can provide.

West Virginia has abundant natural attractiveness for the tourist and we are reasonably close to population centers. We have no excuse for being inaccessible. This means that we must constantly improve and expand our public roads system, adding to it both recreation and scenic highways as well as the interstate freeways.

It is clear that usage of public recreational facilities is skyrocketing everywhere and that the time for imaginative planning is imminent.

I congratulate Governor Barron and Road Commissioner Sawyers and others of the State administration for not only having done imaginative planning, but, indeed, for the forward thrust of actual development of such facilities. Also, I commend the State administration's cooperative action with the Federal Government to finance and begin moving on other important projects. I refer in particular to the impending Blackwater Falls expansion and that projected for three other State park areas downstate, as well as the Cass Scenic Railroad and the Highland Scenic Highway.

In all of these developments—as in many others which will follow in the future—there have been and will continue to be complex problems to be solved. One of the most important and difficult of these is the question of conservation versus use.

Involved, of course, in recreation areas and scenic highway planning and development, as in all public recreation programs, there is the need to conserve for future generations the priceless gift of unspoiled natural areas. These must be protected for their significance to the history and heritage of the State and the Nation.

There is the challenge to provide more and more areas of developed recreation where water and woodland are enhanced through the addition of public access and facilities which must be attractive to sportsmen, sightseers, and fun-seeking families.

Admittedly, it is a big order to satisfy the requirements of conservation and recreation development in the same "package." But there must be a middle course which can effectively provide for both preservation of natural treasures and full recreational opportunity for all. There must be a blending of methods to satisfy the desires of the wildlife enthusiasts and the recreation seekers, and the best interests of timber industry progress. Above all, we must not succumb to desires of a few to isolate ourselves in our own natural wonderland. We must share it with those who would be our visitors. It is a requirement of good neighborliness. Beyond this consideration, our economic well-being demands that we establish tourism as one of our major facets of commerce.

A Specter Haunts the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 9, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the September 1963 issue of Reader's Digest there is an article by Eugene Lyons reporting on the hope for freedom which burns in the breast of young people in Russia. It points out how the hiearchy took strong steps to suppress an expression of freedom by young artists behind the Iron Curtain.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SPECTER HAUNTS THE KREMLIN—BEHIND KHRUSHCHEV'S WAR ON THE NEW POETS AND ARTISTS: A FEVER OF FREEDOM IN SOVIET YOUTH

(By Eugene Lyons)

On the evening of last November 30, some 14,000 people, most of them young, jammed into Luzhnikakh Sports Stadium outside Moscow. They were noisy and excited, like fans anywhere gathered for a major event. Thousands more were milling around unhappily outside. A thunder of applause rolled through the stadium as two men and a women, thirtyish and unremarkable in appearance, took their seats on the platform. Then, as one of the men stepped to the lectern, the crowd subsided in hushed expectancy.

Strange as it may seem, the event attracting this multitude was a Poets' Evening.

The first performer was Andrei Voznesensky, one of the new writers idolized by Soviet youth despite the fact that his poetry, stylized and often obscure, is considered difficult. Voznesensky was followed by Boris Slutsky and Bella Akhmadulina. All were widely applauded. Clearly, the audience knew most of their poems by heart; people shouted for their favorites.

What these three stars had in common to gain them nationwide popularity has less to do with their literary talents than with their boldness in criticizing Soviet life and official dogma. The poems evoking the greatest enthusiasm were those most hostile to Soviet ideas. They fed the hungers of the new generation, and of many of their elders, for less drab and regimented lives, for truth, justice, freedom, idealism, and other such values frowned upon or outlawed by the regime.

Under the truce flag of literature, the Soviet capital was thus witnessing another political demonstration. No one knew this better than the men in the Kremlin.

Such literary events, in halls and at open-air gatherings, have in recent years been drawing huge crowds throughout the Soviet Union. The demonstration at the sports stadium was the most spectacular of them all and probably precipitated the crackdown on nonconforming writers and artists, and the restive youth for whom they speak. The next day, December 1, Khrushchev made his furious denunciation of modernist and abstract art. He and his top ideology commissar, Leonid Ilyichev, swooped down on a show of experimental works at the Manezh, one of Moscow's largest exhibition halls. The collection covered a period of 30 years, proof that artists had been producing heretical stuff in secret even in the darkest Stalin days.

At the exhibition Khrushchev staged a tantrum. He raged at "pictures painted by jackasses" and "piles of rubbish" called sculptures. His ominous parting words: "Gentlemen, we are declaring war on you."

How that war will be pushed remains to be seen. What is clear is that a fever of freedom is spreading through Soviet youth—and that the Kremlin leaders are scared of its portents. The oligarchs know that throughout Russian history the disgruntled intelligentsia has voiced the grievances and secret hopes of the people. And they remember that the uprisings in Poland and Hungary in 1956 began with agitation among writers, students, and other intellectuals. In the Soviet epoch as under czarism, students have been a thorn in the flesh of the regime. Even under Stalin, subversive youth groups were constantly being liquidated by the secret police.

In the mellower climate after the passing of Stalin, and especially after his denunciation by Khrushchev in February 1956, came the period known as the thaw, from the title of a novel by Ilya Ehrenburg that was cautiously critical of Soviet life. Stalin's heirs, aware of the pressures building up under the lid of censorship, were taking the calculated risk of providing some safety valves.

The ferments in youth thereupon became increasingly apparent. They took antisocial forms in crime, alcoholism, and Soviet versions of American beatniks. But on another level the ferments found expression in what looked remarkably like the soul searching of the Russian past. Young writers, painters, composers—and many older ones emboldened by their example—not only broke away from the prescribed styles and subjects but openly questioned Communist ideas. Since they could have no personal memory of pre-Soviet times, theirs was not a nostalgia for the past but an authentic revulsion against the present.

What followed was a veritable flood of prose and poetry—some good, some atrocious, but nearly all questioning the established order. Little of it was frankly anti-Communist, but none of it was pro-Communist. Only a tiny fraction of this outpouring was published. Most of it was passed from hand to hand in typewritten copies or read at literary evenings. At the same time, more and more underground magazines began to circulate.

Most alarming to the Kremlin was the fact that the main themes in the literary eruption were love, compassion, truth, justice, human dignity—the very feelings and concepts forbidden to the "new Soviet man." Neither physical terror nor mental terror nor indoctrination, the rulers discovered, had killed these "bourgeois prejudices" in the heart and mind of Russia.

Out of the surge of new writers, men and women of high talent emerged. Their impassioned or satiric words were soon familiar to vast audiences. Among the loudest and most gifted voices was that of Yevgeny Yevtushenko. What quickly made his verses rallying cries for the young was their daring: "Not weakness but great and glorious deeds my Russia is expecting of me. * * * I am proud because they cannot break me down, or force me to my knees." Everyone, of course, knew who "they" were.

A great craving for courage, mixed with guilt over past submission, came to the fore. As Semon Kirsanov put it: "A hunger for audacity of thought and sound and color * * * no longer to live as supplicants behind a silent door * * * discussion everywhere candid, frank, and open, free of secret whispering, 'This may lead to trouble.'" Or in Yevtushenko's words:

"Posterity will remember,
And will burn with shame,
Remembering these strange times
When common integrity was
called courage."

Truth was the obsessive theme. "Without regrets for life, but to be truthful to the end," Sergei Vasiliev urged. And Yevtushenko declared that "there is no happiness without truth."

Ivan Kharabarov, then only 19, openly challenged the rulers:

"Rusty, iron men who want to
throttle me forever
With their lifeless hands.
So I shall forget, like them,
That I was once human. * * *
Frightful iron men—petrified
brains.
I walk out alone
To meet their countless legions."

In czarist times, rebels consoled themselves with the familiar saying: "In Holy Russia, cocks are crowing; soon day will break in Holy Russia." During Khrushchev's thaw there was the same sense of impending daybreak, an aching hunger for light. The image of the rising sun, of darkness dispersed, ran through an astonishing number of the new creations. For the beleaguered masters in the Kremlin the obvious implication—that the country was steeped in Stygian darkness—must have been shocking.

In a novel by Veniamin Kaverin, "Searches and Hope, the heroine is a scientist who records in a diary the evil she hates. But all this, she writes, "is only an interval, which stretched itself like an anguished, endless night. But night never passes into night. It ends, and morning comes."

A story by Tendryakov, "An Extraordinary Occurrence," deals with a schoolgirl, daughter of a Communist official. Her dreadful secret is uncovered—she believes in God. Some revile her; others defend her. But the author's sympathies, obviously, are with the girl and her defenders.

Such was the thaw. Kremlin bosses at first contented themselves with denouncing the "heinous and deceitful literature" and those who read it. Then, frightened by the uprisings in Poland and Hungary, Khrushchev tried to call off the thaw. In early 1957 he appeared at a meeting of the Union of Soviet Writers and laid down the law—the old Stalinist law. "These people chafe under the leadership exercised by the party and the Government," he said, but discipline must be restored. Look at the awful things their vaunted creative freedom had created in Budapest. If our Hungarian comrades had shot a few of the ringleaders, he said, the whole business would have ended. And should anything like that threaten our Soviet land, he assured the assembly, "our hand will not tremble."

For a while editors once more closed their doors to the so-called liberals, who again wrote "for the drawer." Painters again hid their experimental canvases in garrets and cellars. But the ferment persisted under the surface, and by 1960 the muffled revolt had broken into the open, this time more defiantly. That September Pravda wrote about the rash of clandestine little magazines and mimeographed writings being circulated: "Most of it is subversion."

In a book dealing with his sojourn in Russia in 1961–62, Harrison E. Salisbury of the New York Times said that he found in the new generation dissent in words and conduct, reckless of the consequences, a spirit of independence and even a defiance of authority. Everywhere he saw the persistence of idealism, of dedication to humanitarianism.

The insurgent mood of Soviet youth has also been reported by Prof. James H. Billington, of Princeton University, a lecturer at Leningrad University under an exchange program. One night he went to see a new play, followed, as is often the Soviet custom, by a discussion. A party hack started to read a speech filled with quotes from Khrushchev.

But he didn't get far. Young people began shouting, "Sit down! Go tell it to the Central Committee!" A youth explained to the American: "Our young people just don't put up with that sort of propaganda anymore."

Since the death of Boris Pasternak, a spiritual cult has developed around his memory. His grave in Peredelkino, outside Moscow, is always banked with flowers in summer. On weekends hundreds of young people come there; for hours they recite Pasternak's poetry or their own, or just sit under the trees in reverent contemplation.

A few years ago the heroes of Soviet fiction, drama, and films were 10-foot-tall Communists and "revolutionary" shock workers. But recently these have been displaced by sensitive, poetic types—the kind that abound in Turgenev, Dostoevski, Tolstoy—concerned with love, beauty, their conscience and their private happiness. Communists, when they do appear in the new literature, are rarely the heroes.

Small wonder that the Kremlin is moving, cautiously this time, to put the lid on again.

Khrushchev is hardly interested in art as such. Yet three times in 3 months he called writers, artists and cultural commissars to the Kremlin to confer on "the struggle against unhealthy tendencies in literature and art." Each time he lectured them on their sins—skepticism, nihilism, a hankering for Western ways and, above all, rejection of the party's authority. The climactic conference, in March, attended by 900, heard Khrushchev's toughest speech. It was published in full and broadcast to the nation. The struggle was out in the open.

Khrushchev made it clear that the regime meant to pull tight again the straitjacket on Soviet minds which had been relaxed in line with de-Stalinization. Only the ghost of Stalin could find comfort in the harangue. Khrushchev felt it necessary to scale down his predecessor's crimes to mere mistakes, and ordered those who harped on the evils of the past to desist.

For this he had good political and personal reason. Exposure by writers of the evils of the Stalin years has tended, more and more, to edge over into attacks on similar evils today and on leaders who, like Khrushchev, had been Stalin's henchmen. So Khrushchev now warned that de-Stalinization must not be taken as license for ideological and political liberty. Don't delude yourselves, he said, that "the reins of government have been loosened." In the arts, "the Central Committee demands from everybody unswerving obedience to the party line." He ridiculed "the moldy idea of absolute freedom"—there won't be any, he said, "even under full communism."

Most significantly, the conferences did not conceal the Kremlin's dread that the rebellious youth and its literary mentors, while giving lipservice to communism, actually despise the regime. "Those who preach ideas of peaceful coexistence in ideology are sliding down to the position of anticommunism," said Khrushchev. "It is not excluded that these people, having accumulated strength, would undertake attempts against the revolutionary achievements." In Soviet jargon this meant the kind of disorders which shook Poland and Hungary.

In the fierce debate between liberals or truth-seekers and conservatives or orthodox adherents of Socialist realism, the more educated Soviet public has sided overwhelmingly with the insurgents. While the debate was on, the controlled press gave space to both sides. Nevertheless, it heaped abuse only on the liberals, and even more so on the youth which supported them. But the party leaders pretended to be neutral. Evidently they hoped that the excitement would blow over. Instead it kept mounting. The Kremlin, as in police states in other times and places, faced the tormenting question: How much freedom can it allow without endangering its own survival?

As yet, the Kremlin has not gone much beyond persuasion peppered with threats. At a party plenum in June called to consider the problem, speakers thundered against "alien ideas" and "ideological instability." But Ilyichev ruled out "administrative punishment," meaning force; the erring artists were not "hopeless incurables," he said, and would be helped to correct their mistakes.

Apparently the regime is reluctant to resort to old-style police methods. After all, the main target is youth—this in a country where nearly half the population is under 25. Khrushchev can no longer take for granted that the old methods will work. Stalin, no matter how many millions he liquidated, never ran short of musclepower.

Today an industrialized Soviet Russia is dependent on skills not so easily replaced. The "technical intelligentsia," as it is called, knows that it is not expendable, and, in general, a vastly better educated generation may not be so easily intimidated.

But the old machinery of terror, as everyone is nervously aware, is intact, and new machinery has been set up. There is the new committee for ideological surveillance headed by Ilyichev. In addition, more than 2 million citizens, chiefly young zealots of the strong-arm breed, have been organized into vigilante formations reminiscent of Hitler's storm troopers. Under beguiling names like Peoples' Militia, Comradely Courts, and Friendly Groups, they watch over the personal and political morals of their neighbors and mete out punishment.

Already a general repression, this side of Stalinist terror, is underway. Publishers are rejecting liberal works. Dissidents have been removed from important editorial chairs and from leading posts in cultural organizations like the Academy of Art. The gates have been slammed against liberals wishing to travel abroad. Yevtushenko, who was to lecture at Princeton last April, and Alexander Tvardovsky postponed their trips to the United States on account of "sickness." An East-West meeting of writers scheduled for Warsaw last May was postponed at Moscow's request. Soviet citizens have again been cautioned against fraternizing with foreigners.

Without doubt, fear is coming back. But as yet there has been no wholesale surrender. One high official, Nikolai Podgorny, laments that some writers are refusing to bow to party criticism. Ilyichev speaks of "stubbornness in the defense of erroneous views." The men under attack even dared to address a joint appeal to Khrushchev. "Unless a variety of artistic trends can exist," they said, "art is doomed. We beg you to stop this return to former methods, which are contrary to the spirit of our time." The appeal, of course, was angrily rejected as "ideological coexistence."

Thus a war is shaping up between the regime and millions of its subjects who have had a taste of independence. The unlimited abuse being poured on the culprits is a measure of the resistance the rulers are up against. But unless the Kremlin can impose its will on the most articulate part of the population, it risks a decline of its authority in the nation at large. Will it insist on complete ideological submission? If it fails to get voluntary compliance, will it use the whip again?

The war the Soviet bosses have declared is not just about art. It's about freedom. The rebellious spirit in the arts is not a cause but an effect: it reflects ferments in Soviet society at large. The encouraging fact is that in 45 years of total power the dictatorship has failed to produce a standardized "Soviet man." Instead it must contend with the same old rebellious human being, searching for the spiritual and ethical values expresesd in the new writings. To paraphrase the opening lines of the Communist Manifesto, a specter haunts the Kremlin—the specter of freedom.

Extension of Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming 265-to-80 vote of the House in favor of extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year is extremely heartening news to supporters of freedom and equality for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Civil Rights Commission has probably done more to publicize and report on the serious national problems we face in the civil rights and civil liberties field than any other single agency in our history. It has helped throw the bright, cold light of exposure on the festering wounds of inequality in America since its establishment in 1957. I find it difficult to measure the debt of gratitude we owe this outstanding Commission for its service to the cause of a better America in the days and years ahead.

Admittedly, it was unfortunate that the House had to resort to a piecemeal, one-shot, temporary extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but, under the circumstances, the only other alternative would have been to allow the Commission's authority to expire, and with it, much of the good work it has done.

As we know, the omnibus civil rights bill, just reported out by the Civil Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and now to be considered by the full committee, contains a provision making the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency.

Since it may be some weeks, however, before we know the final version of the civil rights bill, and what more permanent status it may accord the Commission, the action of the House was most timely and most appropriate.

As additional comment on the importance of the civil rights bill and its historic roots, I insert in the RECORD the text of my October 7, 1963, weekly report to the residents of the 30th Congressional District.

The report follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

STRONG CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM GIVEN TOP CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITY

The first real break in the 9 months long legislative logjam on the administration's civil rights proposals came last week with final approval by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Rights of a greatly strengthened bill designed to assure equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color, ancestry or national origin.

Though marking only the beginning of what promises to be a long and arduous legislative journey, this development is extremely heartening to those of us who believe Congress has an urgent duty to take a strong, unequivocal stand in favor of the principle of equality in education, training, employment, use of public facilities, access to public accommodations, housing, and voting.

As Californians, with such protections already on the statute books, and as early leaders in the fight to extend our American constitutional heritage of freedom, equality, and individual liberty to all the State's citizens, we sometimes tend to take this heritage for granted and often do not fully realize the importance of dynamic national leadership in the civil rights field.

Comprehensive program

The subcommittee's sweeping 10-part bill includes provisions on voting, public accommodations, legal remedies for deprivation of rights, desegregation of public schools and public facilities, a new Community Relations Service, a permanent Civil Rights Commission, State and local programs getting Federal financial assistance, a new Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, nationwide Census Bureau factfinding surveys on the extent of voting discrimination, and strengthening the right to higher Federal court review of civil rights cases.

In the Bill of Rights tradition

Coming during this year's 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, this comprehensive civil rights proposal reminds me of another interesting and pertinent chapter of early American history.

The Founding Fathers and a solid majority of the citizens of the original 13 States were so much in favor of written, enforceable guarantees of civil rights and civil liberties that they insisted on what became the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—the world-famous Bill of Rights—as a condition for ratification.

Historians unanimously agree that, without this firm assurance that the first order of business for the new Government would be adoption of such civil rights guarantees, it would have been nearly impossible to obtain ratification from the required nine States.

A meaningful bill

I was very happy that the subcommittee has approved such a strong proposal on civil rights. It assures that, even though the full committee, the House and the Senate may tone it down somewhat, we will nevertheless come out this year with a good bill, of which we can all be proud.

It will be a major step in our effort to eliminate the poison of racial and minority group discrimination, abolish, once and for all, second-class citizenship in this country, and fulfill the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality for all Americans.

Address by the Mayor of Baltimore at Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 9, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we in Pennsylvania were delighted recently to be visited by the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of the city of Baltimore. He addressed the 71th anniversary banquest of Lafayette Lodge No. 71, Free and Accepted Masons, in Philadelphia on September 25, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Mayor McKeldin's thoughtful speech and also the list of lodge officers in attendance.

There being no objection, the address and the list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN AT MASONIC TEMPLE, PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER 14, 1963

Before the Constitution of the United States was adopted the Legislature of Maryland by special act conferred citizenship on the Marquis de Lafayette. Then when the Constitution was ratified, all citizens of the Original Thirteen States became citizens of the United States; and as a citizen of Mary-

land the marquis was included. No other member of a foreign nobility was so honored until by special act of Congress Sir Winston Churchill was made a citizen of the United States without renouncing his status as a subject of Queen Elizabeth.

Maryland has always been well aware that it honored itself in honoring Lafayette, but it seems to me that the distinction is a little brighter today than it ever was before, for I think it is a little clearer today that we honored the right man. You should be able to understand that, for this lodge has cause to be at this moment prouder than ever of its name.

Lafayette came to us at a moment of bitter need and became our powerful advocate at the court of France. It is a matter of documentary record that largely through his assistance we obtained the men and money that turned the scale in our struggle for independence.

The men of that time understood the value of this aid and for it they were duly grateful. But they understood, also, that Lafayette brought us more than military aid. He brought youth, courage, idealism, and generosity. For the military aid we thanked him; but for these other gifts we loved him.

Today the United States no longer stands in need of military aid. We have become the donors instead of the beneficiaries of men and money. But never, not even in the bleak year of 1777 when Lafayette arrived, have we had greater need for the spirit that he brought with him, the spirit of youth, courage, idealism, and generosity.

Youth, in this sense, is a relative term. On that 4th day of July 1776, when the men gathered in this city affixed their signatures to the Declaration of Independence, one Philadelphian among them had already lived for 70 years; but on that day Benjamin Franklin was younger than those two of his colleagues who shuddered and drew back. Call no man old as long as he has in him the ability to face the future and take the necessary next step. On the other hand, if his heart fails him in the presence of danger and difficulty, he may be an old man at 21.

I doubt that any earlier generation of Americans has been more profoundly perplexed than ours. The trend of history has thrust us into leadership that we never desired at a moment when all the old precedents seem to fail. Patrick Henry said that he knew no light by which his feet were guided except the lamp of the past; but in the obscurity of the future into which we are moving that light is dim and flickering. No matter which way we turn we are confronted by shadow shapes that may conceal we know not what menaces, what dragons, what giants, what monsters of shapes and powers never imagined before. With a new fervency we may well echo Tom Paine's words, "These are the times that try men's souls."

If there is any formula that will dispel the illusions and reveal the facts so that our course is made clear and plain. I have never heard it. What is this thing called communism? There are a dozen answers, each contradicting the others. At home, what is the meaning of this sudden upsurge of a minority race demanding the status of full citizenship?

Why is it in the midst of a time of unprecedented, of fabulous economic production there are still many millions of Americans with no work, no place, no hope?

Why is it that to many other nations every expression of American good will—utterly sincere expressions, if I am any judge, seems to contain a hidden threat?

Why is it that in a society in which comfort, and even luxury are more widely distributed than ever before in history, youth is infected with a hatred of the whole system that breaks out in juvenile delinquency of the most appalling kind?

If I could answer these questions I should be wiser than all philosophers. No man can answer them; and because none can do so some of us have fallen into the belief that there are no answers, that the foundations of civilization are crumbling, and that the great experiment undertaken in 1776 is about to end in failure.

But is not that despair really based on ridiculous conceit? Are we not saying, in effect, if we are not wise, there is no wisdom? Compare that with the spirit of Lafayette.

Remember how all the chronicles of the period noted with astonishment how modest were his claims, how readily he, a Marquis, obeyed the orders of George Washington, a commoner, but his commanding general. I think if we do that we shall be ashamed of our gloom.

There were brave men before Agamemnon, said the poet, and there will be wise men after you and me, wiser men, let us hope and believe, than we have ever produced thus far.

Our task is not to create the brave new world, but to lay the first courses of the masonry on which greater men than we are may build magnificently.

Let us not pose as soothsayers who can penetrate all mysteries. Let us strive, rather, to emulate John Bunyan's allegorical character, Mr. Greatheart, who walked in front, sword in hand, while the weak and the timid followed step by slow step.

Let us quit shuddering at communism, and, instead, look at it, coolly and closely, in all its varieties, for only by studying it carefully can we discover what is the sensible next step. Let us remove the obvious injustices against which the minority race is in revolt; for only after they are removed can we decide what further adjustments may be necessary. Let us prepare to carry the burden of workers whom automation and technology have displaced until such time as they can be fitted again into the economic system. When other nations respond to our friendly overtures with snarls, let us not snarl back, but examine the way the overtures were made to discover why foreigners mistook them for therats. Let us trace the roots of juvenile delinquency and attack them as boldly as we now attack the flower and the fruit.

It is not to be denied that this entails some risk. But why try to deny it? Breaking new paths always entails risk of costly mistakes; but not to break them entails not a risk but a certainty of ruinous loss. Civilization doesn't stand still. If it isn't moving forward, it is sliding back. Therefore, a nation of freemen, in order ot survive, must add to LaFayette's spirit his bold heart, for a nation without courage is a nation of slaves.

After youth and courage, the third term I used was "idealism," but I am not sure that that is the right word. LaFayette believed in the rights of man, but is that idealism or just plain recognition of fact? If men have no inalienable rights, then our whole political system is a mistake and we should go back to subjection to George III—or, rather, to the Sultan of Turkey. We are committed to belief in the rights of man, and to recognize that commitment is not idealism; it is plain commonsense.

The truth is that what we call commonsense is very uncommon. It is so rare that when we find a man full of it we are struck with admiration and astonishment. It is ironical that the man with the keenest vision, the man who sees furthest into the real nature of things, is often mistaken for an idle dreamer, while the half blind are called the practical men. I think it was Emerson who said, "Only the eternal is practical." It is a great truth that few have believed.

Finally, we need Lafayette's generosity, for a wise generosity is the most enduring form of thrift. He gave his services and refused any pay except the esteem of his adopted country. But that we paid in full measure. That we have continued to pay for nearly 200 years. That we are still paying gladly, happily, counting it a privilege to be allowed to pay him honor and praise as long as memory lasts. The assistance we have given other nations since the last great war is subject to much criticism. Men grumble because it is sometimes repaid with anything but honor and praise. But they forget to examine how it was given. Was it generously, or grudgingly? Were we expressing our friendship or trying to buy their friendship? In short, was there any real generosity in it?

I am no prophet. I refuse to predict either blessing or doom in the misty future.

But I do believe that if we are to find blessing, it will be through the qualities that Lafayette brought us in addition to military aid. And I am sure there is no better way to attain those qualities than to remember in honor the man who was so greatly endowed with them that we separate his title into two words and call him no longer nobleman, but noble man.

OFFICERS, LAFAYETTE LODGE, No. 71

ELECTED OFFICERS—1963

Jacob Stein, worshipful master; Nathan B. Margulies, senior warden; Myron D. Eisenberg, junior warden; William W. Roisman, past master, treasurer; Rudolph M. Silva, past master, Secretary; Herman M. Modell, past master, Joseph Atlas, past master, A. Alvin Blumberg, past master, trustees; and Saul Babbitt, past master, representative in the grand lodge.

APPOINTED OFFICERS

David Cohen No. 3, chaplain; Bertram Roy Levy, senior deacon; Herman J. Sokoloff, junior deacon; Bernard D. Solomon, senior master of ceremonies; Nathan Fischer, junior master of ceremonies; Oscar J. Oltman, pursuivant; Richard P. Barron, past master, tyler; Harry Weinstock, Nathan H. Wesler, Benjamin Polin, stewards.

Committees

Grievance committee: Jacob Burstein, past master, chairman; Herman M. Modell, past master; Louis L. Shutoff, past master; Charles J. Benshetler, past master; Bertram Abrams, past master.

Charity committee: Jack J. Bittner, past master, chairman; Adolph Levey, past master; Samuel Fellman, Joseph Auspitz, Stanley L. Wisnoff.

Furniture committee: Martin L. Douglass, past master, chairman; David H. Zimmerman, Philip I. Blitstien, Benjamin Gitman.

Committee on masonic culture: Manuel B. Fuerst, past master, chairman; Malvin L. Skaroff, past master; Norman Sachs.

Sunshine committee: Abe Lefkowitz, chairman; Simon Lusky, Irvin R. Schaeffer, Paul C. Breslow.

Representative to Masonic home: David Marder.

Instruction committee: Mark Perloff, past master, chairman; all past masters, elected officers, appointed officers; and Jacob Abramson, Leonard H. Blum, David R. Cohen, Samuel Cohen, L. Meyer Grobman, Louis J. Goldfield; Marvin E. Goldfield, Reuben Goldman, Martin E. Halpern, Rubin L. Jacobs, Isidore Katz, Joseph Krause, Joseph Kahn, Jordan I. Lessack, Bernard D. Levin, Simon H. Levine, Joseph Leff, Aaron Magdule, Jerome J. Marks, Aaron Mezey, Alexander A. Mines, David B. Moisselle, Nathan Nitzky, Stanley L. Perlberg, Solomon H. Pitt, Charles I. Pollock, Anthony Polillo, Morris Rabinowitz, Samuel Ravich, Benjamin Robinson, Herman Rosett, Abraham Schwartz, Seymour Sechtin, Bernard Silverman, Samuel Shlomchik, William Smith, Alex Snyder, Alexander Sherman, Martin I. Spivack, Gerald Stein, Frederic B. Skaroff, Joseph Tarnoff, Lazar T.

Vangel, Charles Weinstein, William Wexler, and Colman Winter.

Grand master's appointments: Rudolph M. Silva, past master, trustee, Charles Jackson McClary memorial fund; Jacob Burstein, past master, almoner, grand lodge charity fund; William W. Roisman, past master, steward, Stephen Girard charity fund; and Mark Perloff, past master, Thomas R. Patton memorial charity fund.

Address of Dr. Edward C. Welsh at NASA Fifth Anniversary Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, at the recent dinner, under the auspices of the Aerospace Industries Association, honoring the fifth anniversary of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, delivered an excellent address in which he succinctly covered the accomplishments of NASA and the need for pressing the space program.

The address follows and I commend it to you:

REMARKS BY DR. EDWARD C. WELSH, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 5, 1963

It is a privilege to be here this evening and to make some brief remarks as the representative of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

First of all, I want to express the regrets of the Vice President, who is Chairman of the Council. The only reason he is not speaking to you tonight is that, despite his great mobility, he just cannot be in two places at once.

As we honor NASA for its 5 years of vital growth and accomplishments, I would like to make some observations which, taken together, may give some perspective to our space activities:

1. In a short 5-year period, the space successes of this country have been truly remarkable. No other complex program in our history—or any other country's history—has had comparable success in such a short period of time. Many articles are written about program slippages, delays, and failures. They seem to be the things which make news. I, however, cannot help but be amazed at the record: More than 160 successful earth satellites; hundreds of thousands of weather pictures; volumes of information about Venus and the whole spectrum of space; radio and television via satellites; worldwide tracking facilities; the perfect record of Mercury; the shrinkage of the booster gap; the increase in our defense strength; and the overall amazing advances in technology. The country has a right to be proud—not satisfied, but proud—of the Nation's space progress.

2. This is a national program—not a series of programs by competing agencies. Of course, there is some competition for the relatively limited resources available for space activities. During the past 5 years, NASA has spent about $5 billion and Defense about $4 billion on space projects. I am confident that each of these agencies would have liked to have had more of the total. But, despite public emphasis of differences, coordination and cooperation between NASA and Defense are the norm, not the exception. The Mercury project is an excellent example. No one agency supplied the rockets, the spacecraft, the tracking facilities, the recovery teams, the launching pads, the astronauts, and the total technology empolyed. This interagency cooperation is on the increase, and I believe the Space Council has contributed to this trend.

3. This is also an international program. More than 60 countries are participating with the United States in some one or more aspects of space activities. The amount and nature of this cooperation will increase. It is worth emphasizing, however, that this international cooperation is not only required by law, but it is mutually helpful. Moreover, it is this Government's policy that no cooperation with any country on any project will slow down this Nation's schedules or efforts.

4. This is a growing and permanent program. While we pause on this significant anniversary to sum up our accomplishments and evaluate our failures—and there have been both—this is not a stopping-off place in the space program. We have not reached a plateau in the space effort. We have many more things to do in space, in addition to going to the moon. There are space stations as a national project, exploration of the planets, operational applications in a wide range of competences—there are many more missions of both civilian and defense significance to be carried out in space. The program is a permanent feature of our vital economy.

5. This is no time for complacency about our space competence. We seem to go through cycles of upgrading and downgrading the space ability of the Soviet Union. Such reactions are due to various doses of complacency, discouragement, and wishful thinking. In my judgment the correct approach is to recognize that the Soviets got a head start; have an orderly, well planned, and vigorous space program; and will continue to impress us with both their technological accomplishments and their space spectaculars. They are in a technological race with us; they can afford to continue it; and it would be dangerous to underestimate their abilities.

I want to add a comment or so about another aspect of the space program. The many competent individuals who write in the field of space are doing and excellent job both in informing the industry and the public and in keeping Government officials on their toes. Of course, no one likes to work long hours trying to make the space program more effective, and then read in a magazine or newspaper that the whole thing is a boondoggle, or wasteful, or mismanaged, or unbalanced. Yet if anyone in the space business thinks that all criticism is unmerited or that the public does not have the right to know what is going poorly as well as what is successful, that person does not understand the democratic process. We deserve criticism as well as praise. It just happens that we naturally prefer the latter.

In conclusion, I congratulate NASA for its contributions toward making this country great and strong; and I thank those organizations and their leaders who made this historic occasion such a successful event.

Thank you.

The War Can Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 9, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in a recent column written from Saigon, Joseph Alsop, set forth some facts on the war and Vietnam and his thoughts is that this war can be won. I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR CAN BE WON

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—The Communists are trying to capitalize on the bitter backwash of the Buddhist crisis by another round of grenade-tossing in this grenade-accustomed city. The American administration, apparently not content to rely on an exceedingly able Ambassador, has sent a second investigative mission to Vietnam on the very heels of a lower level, just departed mission.

On the surface, in short, both the local situation and the American response to it leave few grounds for encouragement. For the short run, moreover, pollyannaism about the crucially important position here in South Vietnam is sadly out of place.

The resentment toward the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem, which has been so long, so often, and so profusely reported by the local anti-Diem crusaders was largely a fiction until quite recently. Local politicians out of a job, many of them former French collaborators, blathering about "Vietnamese democracy," provided the main evidence for this famous resentment until just the other day.

Now, however, the Buddhist crisis has had the political effect of a broken mainspring. One result of the crisis has been to cause President Diem himself to lose all sureness of touch. The other and more important result has been to make all those reports of resentment come true at last. There is real bitterness toward the regime now, and the combination of this bitterness with the singular state of affairs in Gia Long Palace certainly raises grave questions about the viability of the Diem regime.

There is no cause, however, for the kind of panic to which Washington seems to have succumbed. On any practical calculation, President Diem will either take the needed steps to make his government viable again, or strong internal forces will eventually take steps to secure a new government, which will be viable. The odds are very heavy that these are the real alternatives.

On this calculation, patience and calm are the prescriptions for Washington. It is hard to imagine a more ridiculous spectacle than the Government of the United States of America reacting like a bee-stung adolescent to the egomaniacal maunderings of Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu. Surely it ought to be possible to ignore Mrs. Nhu—which she will greatly dislike.

The spectacle is rendered alarming as well as ridiculous by Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, with his resolution designed to undermine the U.S. effort here, and his attendant chorus of experts on guerrilla wars who have never seen a guerrilla war, but still speak ex cathedra about the impossibility of victory. This is a war which must be won, and experience teaches that it can be won.

Today, if you go out and have a look at operations in the countryside, the area that matters most, this war is still going remarkably well. Later, if the Government is not somehow rendered more viable, the feeling in the big cities will spill over into the villages; and then the war will not go well. But this has not happened as yet.

It is a pretty moving experience, moreover, to go out into the provinces and see what is happening. To begin with the American officers and men who are daily fighting this war, shoulder to shoulder with the Vietnamese, are a rather special breed who make you proud of your country. A great many

of them are men to whom that normally awful adjective, "dedicated," can be applied with accuracy. See them in action, and you find yourself recalling that line of Kipling's, "Ye little know of England who only England know"; for they are somewhat unexpected products of the soft affluent society.

Furthermore, these Americans who daily fight the war do not wail that the war cannot be won, or say that the Vietnamese people will not fight for their own freedom and independence. In fact, they say the precise opposite.

The proof of their good judgment is there, in the open, for anyone to see, moreover. It is there in the villages, whose humble, courageous, hard-working people matter so much more than anyone else in Vietnam. The central fact in the whole situation here is the simple fact that under the strategic hamlet program, the villagers have been given very modest arms to defend themselves against Communist terrorism; and they have used those arms to defend themselves, often against repeated attacks and heavy odds.

If the people in the villages did not wish to defend themselves, or were ready to turn their new arms against the Government forces—as some feared when the hamlet program was launched—this would indeed be a war impossible to win. But the great test was made. The big gamble was taken. And despite variations in the quality of the strategic hamlets from province to province, there is no doubt that the gamble has paid off.

This spring, therefore, this war was being won. It can still be won. And those who wish to lay down the burden the United States has assumed here, simply because we are going through a political bad patch, are merely serving the interests of that great humanitarian and democrat, Chairman Mao Tse-tung.

Remarks of Senator Clinton P. Anderson at NASA Fifth Anniversary Banquet, Washington, D.C., October 5, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, delivered a fine address at the dinner given by the Aerospace Industries Association, celebrating the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Senator ANDERSON's address is particularly pertinent to the times and I call attention of all who are interested in the space program.

The address follows:

I would start tonight with a question: What do you do on the birthday of a 5-year-old child? If it's a boy, you will pat him on the head and say he will grow up to be President. If it's a girl, you pat her too, but you rarely know whether to wish her well in the movies or in matrimony. But when it's an institution, something more than a pat on the head is required. Usually, it's a pat on the back.

Tonight has been no exception. Tributes are being paid to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration this evening and they are abundantly deserved.

NASA's achievements over the last 5 years can be calculated and counted. As a result of its endeavors, man's knowledge of the universe has been significantly increased. The accomplishments of the agency have impressively added to the confidence we feel as a Nation in our scientific and industrial ability. And a firm foundation has been laid down on which new accomplishments can be erected. These, I am confident will come to pass.

At the pace NASA is developing, it is fast approaching adolescence. As a father of two children and a grandfather of five, I claim some experience with the problems of childhood. The capacity to consume increases voraciously, energy is poured out in many directions, and sometimes the growing process starts more bonfires than adoring parents can put out.

It would be extraordinary, indeed, if an agency, whose budget has multiplied some 15 times in but half a decade, whose numbers have grown by a factor of four, and whose bases of operation literally circle the globe, were free of difficulties. Large private enterprises and institutions are not immune to internal troubles. It is not surprising to find a large public enterprise such as NASA encountering some difficulties.

There are problems as to how much of its research and development NASA should do within the agency and what portion should be done by private contractors. This gets to the heart of NASA's ability to monitor effectively vast technical endeavors. There also is the problem of whether the space program will have the number of qualified people and the support it requires to fulfill its objectives. This is a matter of establishing priorities for human, as well as material, resources.

The top men at NASA headquarters here and the men who run the centers are vigorous, knowledgeable, and ambitious for the success of their enterprises. This is as it should be, and I would be deeply disturbed if I thought these qualities were being stifled.

But the very strength of the centers and their directors presents problems in management for headquarters.

Tonight we might recall the words of a stoic philosopher, Lucius Seneca, who long before Apollo was anything other than a Greek god, cautioned: "When a man does not know what harbor he is making for, no wind is the right wind." I believe it is good seamanship to follow the rule that once the captain chooses the harbor, all in the crew must help reach it. My hope is that the centers and the farflung organization of NASA never forget that rule of good organization.

NASA at the top recognizes its problems and intends to do something about them. Jim Webb and others who have responsibility for this program know that they have my abiding support, and I believe that of the Congress generally, in solving these problems—problems that are on a lesser order than the technical and natural obstacles we may encounter on the journey to the moon. But the expedition to the moon will be far more difficult if we do not overcome the managerial impediments here on the ground.

While our attention is focused on NASA, the aerospace industry also has its responsibilities for its future is inexorably bound to the future of the space program. The aerospace companies must measure up to the precise demands that success in space requires.

The price tag on space is expensive, and it just might make very good sense to mix dollars and rubels in space exploration. I support President Kennedy's pronouncement at the United Nations.

But let's remember that there would be no basis for the modest space research agreements the United States has with the Soviet Union if this country had not demonstrated to the Russians the great strength of our space program. We bargain—and must continue to bargain—from a position of strength and those who criticize space spending should not overlook this fundamental point.

The most urgent question of the moment is: What will be the level of space appropriations for fiscal year 1964? No, I did not misspeak myself. I am not thinking of the level to be recommended in the 1965 budget soon due for review. I am worried about fiscal 1964—one-third of which is now behind us with no space appropriation bill even close to adoption and no clear signal as to what the outcome is likely to be. If reports are accurate, the House Appropriations Subcommittee had one four-to-four tie vote on the question of whether to provide NASA a meager feeding or a starvation diet. This is no way to raise a healthy child. Normally we overfeed the children a little, burp them over our shoulder, and hope they will keep down most of the formula received from the nursing bottle. We are trying to raise NASA on a skimpy feeding and if we are to attain our goals which have been publicly announced and generally accepted, we must give this 5-year old the food which will sustain its life.

How can NASA tell what to do in the present, unsettled circumstances? Do we hold to the moon shot in the 1960's as the national goal? Or do we depend upon some unlikely occurrence to minimize NASA needs and relieve an already unbalanced budget?

It is quite obvious that there is an attitude of holding tight reins on space spending. This is reflected in the statements I hear on the Floor of the Senate by some of my colleagues who are sympathetic to the pursuit of new knowledge in space but whose criticism of NASA is based on the matter of priorities. They contend that there is much unfinished business, many social needs unmet, here on earth. I agree, but we cannot operate a massive venture such as NASA on a stop and go, wait and see, basis. NASA's objectives and its timetable cannot be shuffled and reshuffled every week to meet the mood of the moment. There should be flexibility, but this flexibility should not become uncertainty that weakens an important effort. NASA should fly to the moon, but not by the seat of its pants.

NASA should not have to depend for support on whether or not the Russians succeed in a rendezvous. It should not have to win favor simply on the number of astronauts it puts in space or how much attention it receives in the magazines. These 5 years have been amazingly successful and the next 5 years and the years which come after will also bring success.

I am willing to support a treaty that we do not test atomic bombs in the atmosphere, but I am not willing to sit down in contentment until the Russians have surprised the world again as they did with their first sputnik and are able to announce that they have completed a rendezvous in space and have taken the first long steps toward putting a man on the moon.

So tonight I suggest to you that NASA does not so much need a pat on the back as it needs a strong shoulder at the wheel. The space appropriation bill must come from the Congress above a $5 billion level, and it must come soon. Too many projects hang in the balance; too much momentum will be lost; too many NASA people will wonder whether it is worthwhile to work long hours under stress and strain when the life of their organization hangs in the balance. This group tonight can and should help turn the tide by devoting itself vigorously in the coming days toward pushing through Congress an adequate space appropriation bill.

I can well imagine what Jim Webb might be wishing for as he blows out the candles on NASA's birthday cake. You and I can put on that cake the one candle for NASA to grow on. Let's be sure we do it tonight.

And so, God Bless us everyone as Jim Webb surveys, not three coins in a fountain, but five candles on a birthday cake.

Petition of Grievance of Northeast Airlines Employees

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest in the strongest terms of which I am capable against the recent attempt of one J. G. Adams, Director of the Bureau of Enforcement of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to "gag" the aggrieved employees of Northeast Airlines and, by so doing, prevent them from engaging in the "heinous crime" of trying to protect their means of making a living.

Recently, as all Members know, the CAB capriciously ruled that the New York-Miami service of Northeast Airlines must cease and that service to Florida will be the exclusive province of Eastern and National Airlines. The result of this strange ruling would be that not less than 2,000 employees, most of them Massachusetts residents, would lose their jobs with an annual loss in wages in excess of $10 million.

Even the dullest bureaucrat, however insulated and remote he might be from the public at large, should have some idea of the amount of human misery caused by this type of action. It is hard to conceive of any member of the human race so devoid of sympathy for his fellowman who would not be stirred by the plight of 2,000 families suddenly and whimsically cut off from their means of obtaining the necessities of life.

It is hard to imagine anyone who would be surprised that those individuals caught in this terrible predicament would fight against this decision with every legal means at their disposal. I am not surprised and I am sure that no Member of this House is surprised that the employees of Northeast Airlines have launched a gigantic campaign to have this unjust ruling reversed. Mr. J. G. Adams, however, is surprised and he has attempted to pressure Northeast Airlines into forcing the airline employees to stop urging their relatives and friends to write to the President, to Members of this House, and to Members of the other body enlisting their support.

In a letter to James W. Austin, president of Northeast Airlines, Adams held Northeast responsible for the activities of its employees. The letter read in part as follows:

Whether employees have engaged in these activities with or without the knowledge or approbation of Northeast's management does not alter our conclusion. In our opinion, Northeast has an obligation to assure compliance by its entire organization with applicable Board regulations in matters of this nature. Continuation of such activities after this notice, without objection on the part of the company and lack of firm corrective steps where the company itself seems involved would, in our opinion, be equally violative of the Board's principles of practice.

In all my years in public life I cannot recall any statement quite as asinine as Adams' letter to the president of Northeast. Does Adams really think that the company could, even if it wanted to, halt the spontaneous efforts of several thousand American men and women who stand face to face with the eminent prospect of joblessness? Where has this man Adams been all his life? The reaction of the employees is as natural as any action ever could be. I am proud of the men and women of the Northeast work force who are willing to stand up and fight for their jobs.

On the other hand, I am ashamed that we have people like Adams holding positions of responsibility in the upper echelons of the Federal Government. The removal of such individuals from positions of trust should receive the very highest priority.

I sincerely hope that this Government has not gotten so remote from the American people that obscure officials can thwart the wishes of the President and Congress with complete impunity. The actions of Adams are out of keeping with the American tradition; they are more in line with the arbitrary edicts of a government official in some totalitarian state.

This whole situation involves a sordid mess which should give cause for Congress to look carefully into the operations of the so-called independent regulatory bodies. Judging by the Northeast case, the CAB is independent all right; independent of justice and apparently independent of the Congress of the United States. But I wonder if the CAB is entirely independent of favoritism toward one airline over another?

Northeast Airlines, in the past 6 years, has made an impressive contribution to the general public with its Florida service. In 1957, Northeast's share of the winter traffic from New York to Miami was but 5.9 percent of the total; by the winter season of 1962–63, it had risen to a very respectable 26 percent, despite fierce competition from its two strongly entrenched rivals. With the tremendous growth in traffic along this route, I am at a loss to explain why if Northeast was needed in 1957 it is not needed even more in 1963.

I feel strongly that the CAB should do all in its power to strengthen and not try to kill progressive airlines like Northeast. I cannot understand either the Board's strange solicitude for Northeast's two rivals who stand to be the only recipients of the action of the CAB or the strange lack of concern for a much smaller airline struggling to gain a place for itself.

Governor Peabody of Massachusetts was absolutely right when he labeled the action of the CAB as "illogical, ill-conceived and incredible." Clearly, the strange antics of the CAB deserve the closest possible scrutiny from the Congress.

The CAB has obviously adopted a policy of "the public be damned" and has clearly chosen sides in the economic struggle. Having created this situation by its absurd decision the Board now seeks to muzzle justifiable criticism which comes as a result of this decision. Can anyone help but wonder about what kind of mind is responsible for such an incredibly stupid state of affairs?

Even greater efforts on the part of the men and women of Northeast Airlines must be forthcoming. If enough enthusiasm is enkindled I am sure that this unjust situation will be rectified and that Northeast Airlines will have its New York to Florida service restored on a permanent basis. Simple justice demands at least this.

Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I include the following:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1963.

Re Violation of the Board's Principles of Practice.

Mr. JAMES W. AUSTIN,
President, Northeast Airlines, Inc., Logan International Airport, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. AUSTIN: This Bureau is in possession of information indicating that Northeast Airlines, Inc., has engaged in a program designed to exert pressure upon the Board, in an improper manner and contrary to the Board's Principles of Practice, in an effort to have the Board reverse its position in the *New York-Florida Renewal Case*, Docket 12285, *et al.*

As part of this program, Northeast or its employees allegedly have engaged in the following activities:

A. Distribution of handbills attacking the Board's decision and urging the public to appeal to the President for reversal of the decision. These handbills reportedly were distributed by Northeast employees during periods of employment and were available at Northeast ticket counters.

B. During in-flight announcements, Northeast pilots have urged passengers to write or wire the Board and Members of Congress requesting reversal of this decision.

C. Handbills and petitions requesting similar action by the Board and Congress have been distributed to passengers on Northeast flights, and at Northeast ticket counters in the United States and Canada.

D. Employees and management personnel of Northeast have solicited friends, travel agents, hotel operators, and various businessmen to take similar action.

E. Travel agents have received mail solicitations from Northeast employees to wire or write their Congressman concerning the subject decision.

F. Automobile bumper stickers and buttons to be worn on the person have been distributed by Northeast employees in an effort to arouse public opinion.

G. Banner towing has been used in an effort to influence the President to seek a reversal of this decision.

H. Seat packs on Northeast flights have contained copies of a letter from Mr. Leo A. Furlong, Jr., of Florida, to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board criticizing him for his vote in this proceeding.

I. Northeast's Director of Purchasing has distributed a letter on Northeast's letterhead soliciting letters and telegrams to the President and Members of Congress urging a reversal of the Board's decision.

J. A letter has been circulated bearing the signature and title of a Northeast captain attacking the Board's decision and soliciting letters and telegrams to the President and

Members of Congress urging reversal of such decision.

K. Northeast officials reportedly have spoken over the radio and in person before groups or to individuals and have urged public action in an effort to overturn the Board's decision.

L. Northeast has allegedly inspired newspapers and radio editorials to arouse public opinion against the decision.

Northeast, as any other applicant, has the right to inform interested persons as to the merits of an application. A party may also communicate with civic and municipal groups, who are parties to the proceeding, for the purpose of urging them to seek reconsideration, pursuant to the Board's regulations, of an adverse decision.

In the opinion of this Bureau, however, Northeast's activities, if they have actually occurred, exceed permissible bounds. Solicitation of assistance from nonparties in an effort to persuade the Board to change its decision in the New York-Florida case, in our view, is contrary to the Board's principles of practice.

Efforts to bring pressure upon the Board, which are instigated directly or indirectly by an applicant, are totally inconsistent with a proper recognition of the Board's quasi-judicial functions. In this connection, your attention is invited to the principles governing practice before this Board. Section 300.2 thereof provides, in pertinent part, that:

"It is essential in cases to be determined after notice and hearing and upon a record, or any other cases which the Board by order may designate, that the Board's judicial character be recognized and protected. Therefore, from time of filing of an application or petition which can be granted by the Board only after notice and hearing, or, in case of other matters, from the time of notice by the Board that such matters shall be determined after notice and hearing and upon a record or that its principles of practice shall be applicable thereto:

* * * * *

"(d) It is improper that there be any effort by any person interested in the case to sway the judgment of the Board by attempting to bring pressure or influence to bear upon the members of the Board, its staff or the examiner in the case, or that such person * * *, directly or indirectly, give statements to the press or radio, by paid advertisements or otherwise, designed to influence the Board's judgment in the case.

"(e) It is improper that any person solicit communications to the Board or any of its members or its staff or to the examiner in the case other than proper communications by parties or nonparties permitted under rules 14 and 15 of the Board's rules of practice. Anybody soliciting the support of another person shall call such person's attention to the provisions of rules 14 and 15."

This provision is designed to prevent and condemn pressure tactics in a proceeding such as the New York-Florida case. On the basis of the information presently available to us, we construe such circularization and solicitation of the public in the manner described above as a disregard of the Board's established standards, and such activities should be terminated immediately. In the *Reopened Kansas-Oklahoma Local Service* case, order E-19560, May 3, 1963, one of the carrier parties was found to have violated the principles of practice as a result of a campaign to bring external pressure from the public, newspapers, and congressional leaders to compel the Board to change its decision in the same case. That situation closely parallels the instant case and the allegations concerning Northeast's present activities.

There can be no excuse for the management itself engaging in or encouraging activities such as these, if such allegations are true. The Board's rules are well known. Whether employees have engaged in these activities with or without the knowledge or approbation of Northeast's management does not alter our conclusion. In our opinion, Northeast has an obligation to assure compliance by its entire organization with applicable Board regulations in matters of this nature. Continuation of such activities after this notice, without objection on the part of the company, and lack of firm corrective steps where the company itself seems involved, would, in our opinion, be equally violative of the Board's principles of practice.

Because we feel that it would be appropriate that you advise key persons in your organization of the contents of this letter, 100 copies are being supplied.

Sincerely yours,

J. G. ADAMS,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES
Boston, Mass., October 3, 1963.

Re your letter of September 24, 1963.

Mr. J. G. ADAMS,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: Although we in Northeast's management know that there has been a widespread reaction to the Board's decision in the New York-Florida case, and that this reaction has resulted in certain of the activities outlined in your letter, I wish to assure you that such activities do not reflect any program on Northeast's part to exert pressure on the Board and that, quite to the contrary, Northeast's management has, in my judgment, done all that it reasonably could do to assure compliance by Northeast's people, with the Board's principles of practice.

I might say that, in analyzing the specific matters referred to in your letter, the activities fall, in general, into three categories; namely:

(a) Activities which had their initial origin in the spontaneous reaction of Northeast's people and the general public to the impact of the decision. Except to the extent that such activities have been continued under the sponsorship of others, such as labor unions—over which Northeast has no control and no right of control—these have been halted;

(b) Activities in which, to the best of my knowledge Northeast employees have not been involved. An example is paragraph H of your letter. Northeast does not supply seat-packs, and if copies of Senator Furlong's letter, which his office distributed in Florida, were left in Northeast planes, they were not, to our knowledge, placed there by Northeast people;

(c) Activities in support of so-called grandfather rights legislation now pending in Congress, with which we believe Northeast's management—even if it wished to do so—would have no legitimate right to interfere.

I would like further to point out that we in the Northeast organization have not taken a mere passive attitude in this matter, but rather have taken scrupulous care to observe, and to see that our people observed, the Board's principles of practice. At the outset of the case, our office of general counsel was asked to prepare an outline of permissible conduct during preparation for, and hearings in, the case and to discuss and answer questions with respect thereto at a meeting of key company personnel. This was accomplished, and I know of no instance of departure from the advice there given. Following the Board's press release and subsequent formal decision, counsel was again consulted, on several occasions, with respect to the propriety of particular action. In conformity with that advice, we in management have adhered to a policy of:

(a) Not making public statements concerning the decision; [1]

(b) Not commenting to newspaper and other media reporters, except to answer questions relating to planned procedural steps;

(c) Informing parties to the case of their procedural rights, but informing others who inquired as to how they might assist Northeast that the Board's rules did not permit any action on their part.

The strictures which I, and the rest of us in Northeast's management, have imposed upon ourselves have been frustrating to an extreme degree. However, we have recognized that, whatever others might do to mar the quasi-judicial image of the Board, we were personally bound by the principles of practice and personally obligated to do what we could to bring about full organizational compliance with those principles.

This we have done, and if your office has been informed that any program of pressure has been "instigated directly or indirectly" by Northeast, as page 2 of your letter suggests or that Northeast has "engaged in or encouraged" activities which were improper, this information is simply incorrect. As previously stated, we have halted improper activity where we had the ability to do so. Mr. Thomas Grace, our operations vice president halted the inflight announcements referred to in paragraph B by a communique to all pilots dated July 30. Mr. F. M. Coates, vice president, administration and finance, halted the circulation of the letter referred to in paragraph I, as soon as we learned of its existence and reprimanded its author.

Where activity which would be improper on Northeast's part, however, has sprung, independently: (a) from distress on the part of families and friends of Northeast people; or (b) from the reactions of labor unions to such things as Mr. MacIntyre's public statements or the chairman's letter of late August to other airline presidents with respect to employment of Northeast people; or (c) from the general public response to what their Senators and Congressmen and the Department of Justice have said publicly about the decision; it is obvious that halting of such activity is beyond my power or the power of anyone else in Northeast Airlines.

I have, in accordance with your suggestion, distributed copies of your letter to our appropriate supervising personnel. I have also distributed a copy of this letter to the same individuals, so that our company's policy of compliance may be confirmed.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. AUSTIN,
President.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA AFL-CIO, LOCAL 515, AIR TRANSPORT DIVISION,
Saugus, Mass., October 3, 1963.

ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

MR. BOYD: As representatives of nearly 1,000 employees at Northeast Airlines this is to inform you that these employees take exception to the charge that their efforts to retain employment is being labeled as il-

---

[1] As you undoubtedly know, I was requested by the New England congressional delegation to appear before it in early August to answer questions concerning the decision. I was also asked, with Chairman Boyd and the president of Eastern Air Lines, to testify before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. On these two occasions, and only on these two occasions, have I commented publicly on the decision. Northeast management has had no taped or other radio interviews and has issued no press releases, such as those released by Eastern's president in mid-August commenting upon the merits of the decision.

legal. How long has it been considered, in this country, illegal to foster and encourage passage of legislation by duly elected representatives? No one will ever convince us that our efforts have been of a clandestine nature, nor will anyone ever convince us that the original decision stemmed from anything but a clandestine plot.

A recent article in the Miami Herald stated that you were bleeding but that you were not going to be pushed around. Sir, we have been bleeding and have been pushed around for the past 2 months. We, however, are able to hold our head high.

Your weapon is absolute power and immunity from the ballot and obviously the administration. Our only weapon is the ballot. Unfortunately your future does not depend on the ballot directly, but the administration can give you the credit for every vote they lose in the next election, because the authors of this letter pledge that their future vote and those of whom we represent will be reflected by the outcome of Northeast's struggle to rectify a gross injustice.

The recent letter to the company listing the violations by the employees included all our efforts as near as we could ascertain, but in event something we carried out was not brought to your attention and to keep you up to date conveniently, enclosed are the back issues and the latest issue of the weekly publication that is prepared by the undersigned.

You will note that this is a form letter, the reasons being (1) we want to make sure that all interested parties receive a copy and (2) after the many visits to Washington of late, a little bit of the political was bound to rub off on us.

ROBERT COOMBS,
Vice President.
GEORGE MORRIS,
Secretary.

OCTOBER 4, 1963.

Mr. J. G. ADAMS,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: It was rumored, Monday last, September 30, 1963, that you had notified the company (Northeast Airlines, Inc.), of the Civil Aeronautics Boards' displeasure at certain activities by the company and its employees relative to the adverse decision in the New York-Florida Renewal case.

I have, this day, seen this document and find that it, in fact, exists.

I will not now, or at any time, presume to speak for the executive body of Northeast Airlines. I speak only for myself and the employees embraced by the local that I represent.

If I wish I may read many things into this document that negate the Constitution of the United States and the Bill or Rights. So I may better understand; are you saying that we may not address ourselves, regarding this adverse decision, to our families, friends, business acquaintances or the press? That we may not solicit the support of the public servants that are public servants because the majority of us have so wished. Do you really feel free to tell us what we will or will not wear on our person? Can you, legally, strip our cars of any adornment that is in no way "slanderous"? Have you, sir, notified the President of the United States that he is not permitted, under rules 14 and 15, of the Board's rules of practice, to suggest that we make our attitudes known to the CAB? Have you at any time suggested that Mr. M. McIntyre, president of Eastern Air Lines, be muzzled?

Your Mr. Boyd has had a field day at the expense of Northeast and I am sorry that you saw fit to compound his felony.

I have no intention of seeking legal advice or interpreation on this document that you have sent. I answer it sir, because I am first, an American. I represent hundreds of others that are also, first Americans and secondly, Northeasts' employees. We cannot allow anyone to rob us of the privileges contained in the Constitution of the United States or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Boyd may be able to render this company bankrupt—he may be able to curtail our life's work but he will not, through your Bureau, deprive us of our privileges under the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

It is inconceivable that either Mr. Boyd or yourself think that fighting for the survival of this company, or our jobs, in any way necessary, is improper behavior.

It must be comforting to Mr. Boyd to be able to seek relief through your Bureau. It is unfortunate for the rest of us that we cannot be aided and abetted by an "official body" of the Government.

In closing, I make a request for 200,000 copies of the letter addressed to Mr. James Austin: Re violation of the Board's principles of practice. In reading this document, you have suggested distributing 100 copies to key persons. We consider all persons, interested in our welfare, key persons. We had over 200,000 signatures on the petition to our Congressmen and feel they should all be made aware of the "rules of behavior" in this matter.

Respectfully,
CHARLES F. SINCLAIR,
President, Local 515 TWU ATD.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated before that if the CAB does not reverse its decision, I am going to call for a reappraisal of their decision and reappraisal of the Board's activity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is something that Congress should look into. I do not think we can take this decision lightly, not when it affects the economic future of New England, not when it affects the jobs of over 2,000 persons, not when it is a decision that acts favorably in behalf of 2 other airlines.

Mr. Speaker, competition should be encouraged in this country. Congress never intended, when it established the CAB, for it to hand down or prepare decisions of this type. I serve notice that this fight is not over. We are just beginning to fight. We are waiting to see what the CAB is going to do and believe me, we will be on the floor of this House fighting all the way for the Northeast employees.

Minority Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 9, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful discussion of the need for minority staffing which appeared in the August 1963, issue of Koppers News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR MINORITY PARTY SOUGHT

In order to do a professional job well, we all know it takes qualified people, and enough of them. For example, the activities of Congress require staffs of professional skills to research resolutions before they are introduced, to investigate pending bills, and to provide counsel on the worth and faults of legislation.

To the average citizen, the staff function of a political party may seem to be unimportant, yet it is a vital part of our system. It is particularly vital to whichever party is in the minority. When staffing is too heavily weighted on the side of the majority party, the necessary research and investigation conducted by the minority party is weakened.

Such a condition now exists in Washington. Professional committee staffs responsible to the Democrats outnumber similar staffs responsible to the Republicans by 11 to 1 in the House and by 12 to 1 in the Senate.

A more evenly distributed staff function is necessary, no matter which party is in the minority or in administration.

Now pending are two resolutions which suggest a 60–40 division of staffs. They are H.R. 143, introduced by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, and Senate Resolution 41, introduced by Senator WINSTON PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont.

Such a division of staff numbers and talent will provide your elected representatives with sufficient assistance to properly investigate legislation before it becomes law.

Letters written to your Congressman and Senator in favor of the proposed bills—H.R. 143 and S. Res. 41—may help them become a reality. If passed, the resolutions will erase the existing off-balance staffing and will assist in the needed scrutiny all resolutions should have.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Director of Research and Development of Bureau of Public Roads Notes Savings in Lives and Money Through Highway Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the role of the Federal Government in subsidizing research and development is becoming an increasingly important factor in the economic, industrial, and scientific advances of the United States. The annual outlay of the Federal Government in this field now exceeds $14 billion, and though the rate of increase is expected to level off somewhat in the future, there are no indications that the absolute amount will decrease. A comparatively small portion of this total—less than two-tenths of 1 percent—is devoted to highway research programs administered by the Bureau of Public Roads.

In the past fiscal year the Bureau spent $4,100,000 on research, with the States having programed another $20 million for highway research, much of which is financed by Federal-aid matching funds. The State highway research programs represent an increase of 250 percent compared with the previous year. This reflects the action of Congress in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, in the provision of that act that 1½ percent of the sums apportioned to the States be available for purposes of planning and research, beginning in fiscal year 1964.

This year the Senate incorporated in the Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1963 an amendment introduced by myself which would make this 1½ percent of apportioned funds available to the States also for development projects, as well as research. It is hoped that this amendment will be acceptable to the other body, and the measure will soon be sent to the President.

This modest expenditure for highway research and development, equivalent to only a few additional miles of new roadways per year, is paying dividends in reducing the costs of highway construction and maintenance and in increasing the safety and efficiency of highways for the user.

The benefits, both tangible and intangible, accruing from our highway research dollars are discussed by Robert F. Baker, Director of the Office of Research and Development of the Bureau of Public Roads, in the August 15 issue of Engineering News-Record.

Mr. Baker estimates that the results of highway research, if fully applied, could yield an annual saving of nearly $750 million in 1963, and more than $1 billion in 1975.

In view of the widespread interest in federally sponsored research, I call attention to Mr. Baker's article and ask permission that it be entered in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHWAY RESEARCH SAVES LIVES

(By Robert F. Baker)

The results of highway research, if fully applied, could yield an annual saving of nearly $750 million in 1963, more than $1 billion in 1975.

Many benefits of highway research, while real enough, are intangible and do not lend themselves to dollar computations. This is true, for example, of the overall development of a more efficient highway transportation system to serve varying social and economic needs. Similarly, the humanitarian benefits that could be derived from reduced accident rates cannot be given a monetary value.

Other savings from highway research can be calculated with varying degrees of precision on the basis of records of past performance. These include dollar savings that accompany improved highway design, construction, administration, and maintenance; better drainage structures and bridges; and accident reduction.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SAVES DOLLARS

One product of research, the slipform paver, brought about a demonstrable saving of $0.40 per square yard in the bid price of concrete pavement. This amounts to $2,816 per lane-mile, or $11,264 per mile of four-lane highway. During 1963, savings from the use of this piece of equipment are estimated conservatively to be $5 million. More extensive application of the method could yield an estimated annual saving of $25 million by 1975.

Highway construction now totals $6 billion a year. The amounts of steel, cement, asphalt, and other road materials being used are known with a reasonable degree of accuracy, as are the costs of manpower and machinery involved in the program. Research and development already have given us a potential saving of more than $75 million a year in grading, drainage, and surfacing techniques.

Even greater savings, however, are being realized through increased highway engineering productivity. There are rather definite limits on savings in the cost of the vast quantities of materials used in highway work. But there are no such limitations on savings in such intangibles as site selection, computation of quantities, determination of grades, location of materials, testing and inspection. Photogrammetry and applications of nuclear, sonic, and spectral energy are bringing about spectacular savings. Full application of research already completed in these fields would yield a saving of more than $130 million a year at the present rate of highway activity.

Combined savings of $205 million from increased productivity in grading and paving, photogrammetry and engineering methods may seem high, but are only 3 percent of the current rate of capital outlay.

ON DRAINAGE AND BRIDGES

Research and development in hydraulics (and hydrology) have produced specific savings through cost reduction.

About 25 percent of the total cost of major highway construction goes for structures and stream crossings, in which hydraulic factors are critical items in design and selection of materials. Research results permit adequate design without unnecessary cost and prevent use of designs that risk failure or would require excessive maintenance. Their full application would yield savings conservatively estimated at $27 million in construction costs, plus another $40 million in maintenance costs.

As an example, the Rock Run Interchange on Interstate 495 near the Cabin John Bridge in Maryland, included a 540-foot-long box culvert in its original design. By the application of recent research this culvert originally estimated to cost $276,000, was redesigned to cost an estimated $201,000, a saving of $75,000.

Research involving bridges offers dramatic examples of demonstrable savings resulting from relatively small investments in research. In 1940, after less than a year of service, the Tacoma Narrows Bridge went down in what was perhaps the most spectacular structural failure of the century. Subsequent research by the Bureau of Public Roads and cooperative agencies, costing less than $1 million, aided the design and construction of a $14-million suspension bridge to replace the one that failed. The new bridge has now been in service for 13 years, under the same conditions as its predecessor, yet there has been no sign of the wind-generated wave motion that destroyed the first crossing.

Later, a type of wind-generated harmonic vibration similar to that which destroyed the Tacoma Narrows Bridge caused alarm and temporary closing of the Golden Gate Bridge. Measured vertical oscillations reached a maximum of 14 feet, and caused serious damage to the bronze slide shoes and guides at the free end of the main roadway truss system.

Studies of the Tacoma Narrows failure were already underway, including field studies of the Golden Gate Bridge. Thus, when trouble developed at Golden Gate, a solution was at hand. Engineers directed a $3.5-million modification; as a result the bridge, valued at perhaps $40 million, is now a safe, trouble-free structure. Results of the studies since have been applied to the design of other major suspension bridges.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SAVES LIVES

Highway safety offers perhaps the greatest yield from highway research, from both the humanitarian and monetary viewpoints. Magnitude of the savings can be estimated by making some statistical assumptions on the value of accident reduction or prevention.

Highway safety research takes many forms. Studies include skid resistance of surfaces; driver reactions; the types, materials and placement of highway signs; and many others.

Highway and insurance authorities generally agree that the cost of highway acci-

dents in the United States is about $8 billion a year. Continuation of present trends in vehicle ownership and use could increase this to $12 billion a year by 1975. Experts estimate that full application of research and development could reduce these costs by 25 percent. A reduction of only 5 percent would save more than $400 million a year now, $600 million by 1975.

Many research efforts produce benefits of obvious value, which are savings only in the sense that they supply something more or better without additional cost. A smoother ride is an obvious benefit; it may also be a saving.

Reduction of headlight glare, highway signs that are easier to read and understand, or anything else that reduces driver fatigue or makes a trip more pleasant is a benefit to the highway user, entirely aside from its accident-reduction value. Research produces many such benefits.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TRAFFIC FLOW

Research and development offer the potential of great savings in better control of traffic on both existing and planned highways. A traffic control system that enables seven lanes to carry the same number of vehicles that, without research and development, would have required nine lanes, produces substantial savings. In even a moderately urbanized area, annual savings could reach $200,000 per lane mile.

It costs, on the average, about one-third cent in brakes, tires, and fuel to stop a car and start it again. Research that can reduce interruptions to the free flow of traffic can effect very large savings. Reductions in vehicle operating costs, plus time savings, when combined with the reduction in highway plant needs, offer almost incalculable benefits.

ON HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

There are many opportunities to improve highway administrative procedures and organizations, with the twin objectives of cost savings and more effective management of highway operations. Research and development in this area covers organizational structure, financing, accounting, estimating, engineering relationships, contract procedures and other aspects of the broad fields of law and management.

The workflow and manpower utilization of the highway departments appears to invite research. Nationwide, the State highway departments are spending at the rate of $235 million a year (excluding preliminary engineering) on administration alone, and fuller application of modern management methods and management tools should yield substantial savings. The value of greater efficiency and demonstrable savings might be expected to equal 10 percent of administration costs, an annual savings of nearly $25 million.

One index of improvements in management generated by research is the number of State highway department engineers employed per million dollars of capital outlay for highways. In 1956 there were 8.5 engineers employed per million dollars of capital outlay; this figure dropped to 4.5 in 1960.

The benefits of highway reserach are realized by taxpayers through reduction in costs of building and operating highways; by vehicle owners through reduction of the cost of vehicle operation; or by purchasers of goods whose price includes the cost of highway transportation.

Estimates of dollar savings attributable to research and development are reasonable, although they do not lend themselves either to mathematical support or challenge. One fact they demonstrate clearly is that past and present efforts in highway research have been pitifully small, in view of the potential dividends.

Joe Falardeau: A World's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent feat of one of my constituents, Joseph Falardeau, of Webster, N.Y., in crossing 62 miles of Lake Ontario while clinging to a boat-towed kite some 75 feet above the surface of the water is believed to have established a new world's record.

I am tremendously proud of Joe Falardeau for this accomplishment. His will to do what no man had ever done before reflects great personal credit to him and through the national notice accorded his record-setting "flight," he has brought distinction to his home community.

I know that many of my colleagues will be interested in the following news story of Joe Falardeau's America-to-Canada trip as it was published in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle on September 26:

FALARADEAU'S RECORD FLIGHT: 62 MILES VIA KITE

(By Jack Tucker)

The Great Falardeau made it last night. He flew 62 miles across Lake Ontario in his huge kite contraption, hauled by a powerboat, and immediately claimed a world's record.

Despite a crackup shortly after take-off from the Coast Guard station at Summerville here, Project Man-in-a-Kite ended successfully near the Canadian village of Colborne.

The new distance champion—Joe Falardeau II of 1030 Sunset Trail in Webster—came down on water skis just as the powerboat escort ran out of fuel.

"I'm hungry," the jubilant Falardeau announced in a telephone call to Rochester afterward. "But it was a good trip, although the lake was rough. I had a good view, from 75 feet up."

Unbeknown to him and three friends in *Mustang*—an inboard runabout driven by a 265-horsepower motor—the Coast Guard became concerned when there was no word from the party 3 hours after takeoff.

As search-rescue plans were being formulated, the telephone rang at about 7:25 p.m. in the home of Falardeau's mother, Mrs. Edna Falardeau of 27 Meriden Street, Charlotte. "We made it!" announced her 31-year-old son.

The call touched off a celebration at the Meriden Street home, where the new champ's wife Carolyn, three young children and grandpa Falardeau were anxiously awaiting word.

Actually, the record flight almost didn't come off at all.

About 3:30 yesterday afternoon, after Falardeau and party left Summerville, the powerboat made a turn off Nine-Mile Point in the Sea Breeze-Webster area but up-in-the-air Falardeau apparently didn't swing about fast enough.

His 12-by-10-foot kite, attached via 120 feet of rope to the craft's stern, nosedived and crashed into the lake. Falardeau injured his nose in the process. But after getting reorganized, the party again took off for Presq'ile Bay in Ontario Province.

More than 3 hours later they arrived just off the Canadian shoreline at Colborne, a few miles west of the planned destination. *Mustang*'s fuel supply at that stage gave out. But a boat near the docks spotted the party, and towed them ashore.

What the unidentified rescuer thought of the weird-looking kite-and-boat expedition was not reported.

Mustang's skipper was Bob Krause of 3678 Culver Road, Irondequoit. The other two aboard was Richard (Corky) Holden of Webster, and Jim Nolan, who operated a floating hotdog "stand" on pontoons during the summer in Irondequoit Bay.

After refueling and having dinner in Colborne, the party expected to take right off again for Summerville last night—but the Great Falardeau had done enough flying. He stowed the kite aboard.

Yesterday's airborne mission had been scheduled for last Saturday but the weather wasn't right.

Falardeau, former wrestler and water skier who works for Hammer Lithograph Corp., 425 Exchange Street, wore scuba-type gear and goggles. His skis are 4 feet long and weigh 4½ pounds. He grips a bar on the nylon sailkite with both hands.

Afternoon winds were out of the southeast at 10 knots when the husky Falardeau took off on his record-setting jaunt. The previous man-in-kite achievement reportedly was 55 miles, achieved by a Florida man last year.

But Falardeau pointed out that the Florida flier didn't go nonstop because he was interrupted by a storm.

Also aboard the powerboat yesterday was a little fellow named Charlie, who had a "doggone good time" and proved to be a good canine sailor, the skipper said. Charlie is the Falardeau family's pet.

New York World's Fair Hall of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., regarding the hall of science.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65 CORP., REGARDING THE HALL OF SCIENCE

There seems to be considerable misapprehension regarding the hall of science. The facts are these:

1. The hall of science was originally recommended by the fair to the U.S. Government as a permanent wing of the temporary U.S. pavilion, and this was discussed with those responsible for the permanent excellent science museum at the Seattle fair. For various reasons the U.S. Commission rejected this idea. We then proposed a space exhibit in the transportation area to be developed for the fair by the Port of New York Authority under the direction of Guy Tozzoli, with the city department of public works in immediate charge. Our revised plan was to build a permanent structure temporarily devoted to dramatic contemporary space exhibits by, among others, the corporations manufacturing for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency with the full cooperation

of that Federal agency, but late to be developed in stages as a general hall of science. To this end Dr. Spilhaus, who conceived the science museum at Seattle, and other experts were consulted and the ranking administrator of the Chicago Museum of Science, Mr. Daniel McMasters, was employed by the fair as adviser. NASA, at the instance of President Kennedy, agreed to arrange various exhibits in accordance with official notice we received recently from the Department of Defense.

2. In the absence of donated private construction funds, the city of New York, at the instance of Paul Screvane, offered to build the hall of science. William Harrison was employed as architect. The original rough estimated cost of $3 million has risen to about $6 million, due to inescapable factors too numerous to detail. A million dollars can be obtained from a balance we have saved in the $24 million advanced by the city for permanent fair improvements. Generally speaking, rises in cost, as ideas have been enlarged, is no different here than in the case of numerous major industrial, State, and foreign pavilions throughout the fair.

3. The fair expects by prudent management to have enough of a balance to complete Flushing Meadow Park. At least $2 million is planned to be spent for the second stage exhibits in the hall of science when most of the temporary space exhibits have been removed. Similarly, the second stage of development of the Queens Botanical Garden, which will be expanded into a zoological and botanical garden, is being planned in post-fair Flushing Meadow, to be financed out of fair balances.

4. There is no hall of science board in existence. A group which obtained a charter from the board of regents as a museum of science and technology for this purpose has no official status whatever and has had no part in designing the building and furnishing the hall of science. The eventual governing board, following numerous precedents such as the Metropolitan Museum, Brooklyn Museum, New York Zoological Society, American Museum of Natural History, and the New York Botanical Garden will no doubt consist of long-term trustees, initially appointed and thereafter self-perpetuating, and several ex officio city officials. The city will have to pay for upkeep, acting through the city park department. The museum will be expected to establish a private endowment which will grow over the years and be used for exhibits and curators.

5. No part of the Ford Building could possibly remain as an addition to the hall of science. The Ford Pavilion is temporary and must be removed after the fair. Similarly, no part of the U.S. pavilion is available as a permanent structure.

6. The hall of science construction is being expedited.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1963.

Mr. ROBERT MOSES,
President, New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., International Exposition at Flushing Meadow Park, Flushing, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MOSES: This is to confirm my telephone conversation with Mr. Tozzoli of your office regarding the Department of Defense's participation in the forthcoming World's Fair. Within the Department of Defense, Secretary McNamara has appointed me to represent him on all matters pertaining to Armed Forces participation in the fair.

As I stated to Mr. Tozzoli, the White House had recently directed both NASA and DOD to develop a joint space exhibit which would be illustrative of the U.S. overall national space program. Accordingly, it is to be an U.S. space exhibit rather than an agency (DOD or NASA) display. I am making available my representative, Lt. Col. Richard F. Hum, to confer with your office on the Defense interests in space allocations, expenditure of funds, manning requirements, etc., and ask that you please pass the word on to Mr. Tozzoli.

As the project progresses, I hope that I will have occasion to visit the fairgrounds and possibly pay my respects to you and your key personnel. In the meantime, please be assured that the Department of Defense will place the highest priority on the development of a quality exhibit to demonstrate this Nation's space program as a contribution to the great effort you and your people are making for an outstanding World's Fair.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR SYLVESTER.

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65 CORP., INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT FLUSHING MEADOW PARK,
Flushing, N.Y., September 30, 1963.

Mr. ARTHUR SYLVESTER,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY SYLVESTER: We were very much pleased with your letter of September 23, 1963, concerning the Department of Defense's participation in the U.S. Space Park.

Mr. Tozzoli has advised me that he has already met with Lt. Col. Richard F. Hum and representatives of NASA and that all steps are being taken to make this exciting project a reality.

I assure you of the full cooperation of the fair corporation and look forward to having you visit us here at the fair at an early date.

Cordially,

ROBERT MOSES,
President.

New Major Industry for Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 24, representatives of industry and government assembled in Liberal, Kans., to participate in the dedication ceremonies of a new helium plant. The industry was represented by persons who were interested in financing, constructing, and finally operating this new Kansas plant. Present, of course, was the president of the National Helium Corp., F. J. McElhatton. High on the list of government dignitaries were the Governor of Kansas, the Honorable John Anderson, and numerous members of the Kansas Legislature. Since this facility has contracted to produce helium for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this Agency was represented by Dr. Charles H. Zimmerman, Director of Aeronautical Research. Dr. Zimmerman also made the principal dedicatory address. The Bureau of Mines, Helium Division, was represented by Deputy Director Henry Wheeler. From the Kansas congressional delegation, Congressman ROBERT DOLE and myself were in attendance.

There are several significant factors relating to this new Kansas facility. The obvious aspect is that a new $30 million plant has been established in our State. The selection of Kansas for this plant was a further recognition of a great natural resource in Kansas. Helium is extracted from natural gas. Kansas ranks fourth among all States in the production of natural gas. The direct result of this plant will be approximately 100 new jobs in Kansas. The indirect result of the establishment of this plant in Kansas will not be known for many years. We only know that it has been the conclusion of leading scientists that helium gas will be an important commodity for the space age. We are naturally grateful that Kansas has been selected as one of the principal producers of this strategic commodity and even more appreciative of the fact that the natural resource is so abundantly available throughout such a large portion of Kansas. These facts and others were well summarized and presented in a recent editorial printed in the Hutchinson News of September 27, 1963.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in my remarks:

[From the Hutchinson News, Sept. 27, 1963]

NEW MAJOR INDUSTRY FOR KANSAS

What one day may prove to be Kansas' most important basic industry was put into operation at Liberal this week. It is a plant for the extraction of helium from natural gas.

Its product will be sold to a single customer, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA has pledged itself to pay for it at a price sufficient to warrant a $30 million investment.

All of us know what helium is. It is an inert gas for filling toy balloons and dirigibles that won't explode. Since NASA isn't in the toy balloon and dirigible business, this doesn't explain what the space agency will do with its helium.

But it would be futile to ask for an explanation. Were NASA to supply one it would be couched in such scientific jargon as to be beyond lay comprehension. But the remarks of the spokesman at the dedication of the helium plant, even though they are phrased in the conventional bureaucratese double talk, do provide a clue.

"Some of the knowledge that we now are gathering in the broad areas of space research," he said, "we will use for our own gain. But much more than that, it will be a legacy to our children and grandchildren, for them to use in furthering their own welfare."

This is awfully comforting although few of us, including the speaker perhaps, knows precisely what it means. It is only another reminder that the longer we live in this world the less we seem to know about it.

Anyhow Kansas now has another new major industry of an importance only the distant future can measure exactly. And through it the welfare of our grandchildren is more secure.

Construction of Garrison Diversion Irrigation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor. This resolution, supporting the construction of the Garrison Diversion Irrigation project, was unanimously approved at the recent State convention of the North Dakota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor.

Mr. President, I am extremely gratified with the position taken by North Dakota labor. Labor unions in North Dakota, as well as elsewhere, have long taken a great interest in water projects in the United States, particularly the recreation and wildlife benefits to be derived from these projects. I am sure that the views expressed in this resolution are in accord with the thinking of the vast majority of people in North Dakota.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NORTH DAKOTA AFL–CIO FEDERATION OF LABOR

Whereas North Dakota, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, was promised a million-acre irrigation development to compensate for the one-half million acres of fertile farm and bottom lands that were sacrificed to provide reservoir storage for two major dams on the Missouri River, as provided in the Missouri Basin plan; and

Whereas there has been a shocking decrease in farm units and the rural population during the past 20 years in North Dakota, which has created an overcrowding of the labor market in urban areas; and

Whereas the Garrison Diversion Unit will assure industrial water to municipalities in North Dakota and thus spur the growth of industry and provide opportunities for labor in depressed areas, both within and out of State; and

Whereas irrigation development will supplant surplus crops with forage and cereal grains that are now in demand and create added farm units for North Dakota's young people; and

Whereas the reauthorizing legislation for the revised Garrison Diversion Unit is now pending in the U.S. Senate and will be considered in this session of the Congress by the U.S. House of Representatives; and

Whereas said project thas the unanimous distinction of having the personal endorsement of President John F. Kennedy: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the sixth annual convention of the North Dakota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor affirm its unanimous support for this project, which will mean much toward the stabilization of North Dakota's business and agricultural economy; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of the North Dakota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor be directed to solicit the support of Hon. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO Federation of Labor and that he urge all organized labor groups throughout the United States to solicit the support of their respective Members of Congress for this project, which will be of immense future economic and social benefit, not only to North Dakota, but the entire Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the above resolution be spread on the minutes and unanimously approved by the North Dakota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor and that copies be transmitted to the Members of Congress from North Dakota, Gov. William L. Guy, and officials of the U.S. Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation in Washington, D.C.

This resolution is supported by Local 49 Engineers, Minot, N.Dak., Robert McPherson, area representative.

Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks the 184th anniversary of the death of an outstanding champion of human freedom, a man who spent his entire adult life fighting in behalf of liberty, both on the plains of his native Poland and in the American Colonies far from his homeland.

Casimir Pulaski was born in Podolia, Poland, probably in 1748. Of his early life only enough need be said to show the background of his lifelong dedication to the cause of liberty. He became interested in military affairs at an early age and served in the guard of Duke Charles of Courland before he reached the age of 20. In 1768 he joined his father and others in the Confederation of Bar, the purpose of which was to drive the Russians from Polish soil and liberate Poland from foreign domination. They fought valiantly and sometimes successfully for several years but finally, in 1772, their forces were crushed and scattered. Pulaski's property was confiscated and he was forced to flee to Turkey.

By 1775 Pulaski had made his way to France. It was in Paris that this man who had already sacrificed so much for liberty became interested in the American cause. Seeing another opportunity to fight for freedom, the ideal that dominated his life, he decided to cast his lot with that of the colonists.

Bearing a letter from Franklin to Washington, Pulaski arrived in Philadelphia in August 1777. After serving briefly as a volunteer on Washington's staff and participating with distinction at the Battle of Brandywine, he was made a brigadier general and placed in command of the cavalry of the American Army. He may with justice be said to have been the father of the American cavalry.

During the winter of 1777 Pulaski commanded the cavalry at Trenton and later at Flemington, and acted in unison with Gen. Anthony Wayne in scouting for supplies for the famished troops at Valley Forge. Discouraged by the jealousy of his fellow officers and subordinates, he resigned his command of the cavalry in March 1778. During the same year he was given permission to organize an independent corps of cavalry that became known as the Pulaski Legion. After a period of inactivity, which he found distasteful, on the Upper Delaware River, he was ordered in the early part of 1779 to go to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina.

Pulaski saw action in the defense of Charleston and later in the assault on the British works at Savannah at the head of the combined French and American cavalry. It was there that he received a fatal grapeshot wound, on October 9, 1779. He was carried on board the brig *Wasp* where he died, probably on October 11.

Thus ended in the heat of battle the career of a gallant soldier and courageous champion of liberty on two continents. He was a worthy member of that heroic band of men who came to help our forefathers in their hour of need.

Few men have shown a more steadfast dedication to the cause of liberty or have sacrificed more in its service than this valiant Polish officer. To him we owe the tribute of a grateful republic.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, October 12 is observed as Columbus Day in many parts of the United States, and is a legal holiday in several States, including my own great State of Maryland. In my opinion, Columbus Day should be made a national holiday. This is provided under Senate bill 108, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. As a matter of fact, Senate bill 108 is cosponsored by 33 Senators.

We Americans take pride in the discoverer of America, Christopher Columbus, not only for his courageous journey into unchartered seas, against great odds, and his pressing on despite a mutinous crew and other handicaps, but also for his bringing to these shores the Christian faith.

A proclamation by Mayor Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, of Baltimore, designating October 12, 1963, as "Columbus Day" in Baltimore, is apropos. I ask unanimous consent to have the proclamation printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THEODORE R. McKELDIN DESIGNATING SATURDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1963, AS "COLUMBUS DAY" IN BALTIMORE

Christopher Columbus discovered America 471 years ago and the anniversary of that great event is commemorated throughout the Western Hemisphere, including the plorers and settlers of the United States.

We take pride in this great Italian navigator who brought to our shores the Christian faith and whose memory renews our dedication and purpose to meet the challenges we as a Nation confront both here and abroad.

The courageous example of Columbus going forward into the unknown against the forces of ignorance and prejudice, as well as uncharted seas, a mutinous crew and hostile natives, inspired the other great explorers and settlers of the United States.

Christopher Columbus in his search for material accomplishments did not sacrifice his immortal soul and died in a Franciscan monastery wearing the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis uttering "Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit."

Columbus Day has not been recognized as a national holiday and Senate bill 108 has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by 33 Senators to make Columbus Day a legal holiday.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore City, do hereby proclaim October 12, 1963, to be "Columbus Day" in Baltimore, and urge the U.S. Senate to enact S. 108 making Columbus Day a legal holiday and our citizens to join in the celebrations and "the wearing of the purple," sponsored by the city and civic, fraternal, patriotic, and military organizations.

Problems of the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Sixth International Congress on Gerontology in Denmark this year gave participants the benefit of a discussion by representatives from 35 nations on problems that confront the elderly citizens of practically every modern nation. For 5 days the participants traded information and viewpoints on such questions as housing for the elderly income levels of our older citizens and the overall increase in the number of older citizens throughout the world.

One of the participants was Mrs. Eone Harger, director of the New Jersey Division on Aging. Mrs. Harger has been at work since 1958 to establish information programs and other State programs to help the many public agencies and private groups now at work on problems that face New Jersey citizens near or beyond retirement age. The work of this division is vital in a State which has a net increase of almost 17,000 each year in its over-65 population. Just about 10 percent of New Jersey people are now 65 or over.

Mrs. Harger recently reported on the meaning of the International Congress in a column she did for the Newark-Star Ledger on September 26. She was a guest columnist for Mrs. Helen Meyner, wife of former Gov. Robert Meyner. Mrs. Meyner's comments about Mrs. Harger reflects the high esteem held in New Jersey for the director of the State division.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE BEGINS AT 65 IF WE CAN WAIT

(By Mrs. Eone Harger)

It was a British physician who summed up the problem of aging in the final plenary session of the Sixth International Congress on Gerontology, held in Copenhagen, Denmark, by pointing out the need to separate facts from myths in regard to age and pleading for an end of specialized words which make communication between professions almost impossible.

The illustrations he gave, which included the erroneous stereotype of indigency and illness, are the reasons that make the work of New Jersey's Division on Aging increasingly important if we are to prevent added years from becoming a problem instead of a blessing.

With a net increase each year of almost 17,000 in our over-65 population, we are the Dutch boy with his finger in the dike as we work with State agencies, community groups, and individuals to help them adjust to the new situation. Almost 10 percent of New Jersey people are now 65 or over.

This was the concern of more than 900 people from 35 countries who met at the congress to share knowledge on aging around the world. The largest delegation, almost 300, was from the Gerontological Society of the United States, an organization dedicated to research on aging to improve the well-being of older people by promoting scientific study of the aging process, and disseminating the knowledge gained.

There were 5 solid days of meetings with four sessions running simultaneously, under the categories of biology, clinical research, and social science and welfare (which included pyschology and economics). Each day opened with a plenary session at which the leaders in each of the fields presented a broad point of view against which the numerous short, individual papers could be judged in the rest of the sessions of the day.

That so many withstood the charms of Copenhagen with its Tivoli Garden and beautiful shops is a tribute to their dedication. Particularly encouraging was the care with which those in social welfare and social research listened to the medical doctors to gain insights important to social policy of the future.

It is possible to report only a small part of the congress but, out of the mass of words, a few ideas stand out. Biologists and clinicians are pressing forward to spell out what aging really is—to determine what in aging is innate in the cells in contrast to symptoms that result from environmental factors.

The experts are not sure what one should expect at a given age, but they are convinced that some of the "extrinsic" factors that cause aging are emotional stress, repeated childbirth, lack of sleep, malnutrition, lack of physical activity, and temperature. One can draw his own conclusions.

Some economists probed the relation of the labor market and large-scale unemployment to aging and concluded that attempts to return older people to work and reverse present retirement patterns are unrealistic. The technology that makes possible the tremendous production with less and less labor, means that we must anticipate that the years of paid employment will be reduced yet further with young people starting work later and retirement coming at an earlier age. Meaningful use of free time and management of income to support this situation are problems that must be faced.

Research studies by American sociologists in the field of family relations were among those that probed the myths referred to by the English doctor. They found that telephones, automobiles and airplanes keep families closer today than they were in earlier generations. Most older people dont regret the passing of the big house with the spare bedroom, providing there is a suitable apartment available.

Housing was a subject that was discussed at length. Delegates to the congress were taken on tours of a variety of housing arrangements, multiple units as well as congregate homes primarily in Copenhagen and its environs.

Every municipality in Denmark is required to provide a home for the aged who seek it and the ones I visited were brightly painted, with invalids as well as neatly dressed well people sitting around.

Visits to homes after the congress were more interesting and gave an opportunity for grassroots evaluations of the housing arrangements by people not involved in the meetings. The operator of one home, when I commented on its attractiveness said, "Yes, but people come in 10 years too soon. They would be better off in their own home with someone to give a little bit of help if they needed it."

The same opinion was expressed by the doctor in a small fishing village who pointed out that his village was lucky because it was too poor to build the usual facility and instead had made some small apartments out of a very large home. Even frail older people were able to live by themselves with the occasional visit of a nurse or a housekeeper and access to a hospital when necessary.

This conversation was as important as many a speech during the congress. This wise doctor, unhampered by an official obligation, spoke words that might well be listened to as we plan housing for the elderly in the United States. Housing should be housing, not something created in the image of a nursing home or an isolated community which develops a new kind of segregation.

We may need more research to prove that life can begin at 65, but there are lots of us who can't wait for research. If you add 10 years to your present age, how close does it bring you to the social security horizon?

A Novel Solution to Transportation Problems in the Far North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I have been considering what the Nation must do to achieve a decisive breakthrough in meeting local transportation needs, especially in local service aircraft development. I wish to draw attention to one inventive approach in another field, overcoming the immense difficulties of transportation in the Arctic. Our best efforts should enlist equal reserves of imagination and individual enterprise to meet local service aircraft needs. The story of Douglas William Connor and the Autair Helicopter Services is indeed an inspiring one. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the current issue of Canada Month, entitled "Opening the Arctic," appear in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING THE ARCTIC

Up there in the million appalling square miles, the third of Canada that lies inside the Arctic Circle, the old Arctic hands have been joined by a new generation of relative youngsters: men in their thirties and forties who still have time ahead of them. What destinies those lives hold. For these men are confident that they stand on the verge of an almost unimaginable adventure.

There are two Arctics. The one that is more familiar is the land of Eskimos, the DEW line, icebreakers, and the barges shunting painfully slow down the Mackenzie River for 4 months a year with supplies for Inuvik.

The less-known area is the High Arctic—the 150,000 square miles of islands cut off from the rest of the country by a deep trench running just a little south of the 75th parallel. In 1953 they were named the Queen Elizabeth Islands. The biggest of them are Ellesmere (82,000 square miles in area, or

almost as big as New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia put together), Devon (21,000 square miles), Melville (16,000 square miles).

The whole Arctic is tantalizing fascination to Canadians: mysterious, fearful, unthinkably desolate and hostile, perhaps fabulously rich in minerals and oil, certainly the last unknown, the ultimate piece of earth that can still offer a man a life-and-death challenge. And in the 1960's more and more people are responding to it.

Douglas William Connor got into the High Arctic in a way that could so far be true for few Canadians. His business extended there. Connor, 45, is the president of Autair Helicopter Services, a company he started in 1957. He was brought up in British Columbia (he was born in England, but his family moved to Canada before he was a year old) and joined the RCAF in 1940. He won the DFC and bar while flying for Bomber Command and Coastal Command, and came out of the war with a burning desire to get into business for himself. He did—several times. Aviation was the obvious direction for his energies, but when he looked at Canada, he felt only that the commercial transportation field was, in his words, "quite sick."

So he returned to Europe, and for 10 years started and folded companies in and around aviation in Britain and on the continent. In 1957 he took another crack at Canada. It was to be a helicopter company: "We would get work wherever we could."

The first contract was with Hydro Québec, a powerline patrol and he started with his first helicopter. Helicopters seemed to him to be one part of the commercial transportation field that wasn't sick, though there were lots of little and big helicopter outfits competing for business. Now he says: "We're in the remote transportation business. We provide transportation for out-of-the-way areas; whether it calls for three-toed oxen or dog teams, we'll do it." Canada is full of out-of-the-way places. It looked like a good idea.

And so it was. He has learned a lot of the tricks of helicoptering since 1957. He recalls his early days: "In the beginning it was jeezly competitive. It still is, but it's getting less competitive because of our know-how." Some of Connor's former competitors would ruefully support that cocky statement.

Of course Connor is exaggerating when he suggests he'll do anything to provide transportation to remote areas. He has stuck with helicopters for 6 years, until now he owns 21 of the machines and operates another 14 for the Department of National Defense, supplying and servicing the mid-Canada radar line. The 35 are spread from the Rockies in British Columbia to New Brunswick. Five of his own helicopters are in the high Arctic.

As far as possible he has long-term contracts for all the helicopters, mostly on supply, survey, and patrol contracts. He runs one base in Winnipeg, a similar base in Montreal. He employs 70 people directly to operate the 35 helicopters and about 20 more in various administrative jobs. Two and a half people per helicopter: "That's bloody low—about as low as you can cut it."

It is really only this year that Connor has broken out of the helicopter field, and the breakout is still more possible than actual. And it is not into three-toed oxen, but into ACV's—air-cushioned vehicles—hovercraft.

Basically, the hovercraft made by Westland Aircraft Ltd., a United Kingdom firm, is a flat-bottomed, bloated, boat-shaped, propeller-driven craft that rides on air over anything tolerably smooth—water, mud, ice, bog, city streets, but not mountains. SR.N2,[1] the one demonstrated in Canada, has two engines, each one simultaneously driving a propeller, and a fan that sucks in air from above and forces it down to jet out around the periphery. The addition of a rubber skirt helps keep the air cushion in underneath the craft (as does the incoming air), and reduces shudder over rough water or bumpy ground. It is 65 feet long, 30 feet wide, weighs 16 tons, can carry 64 passengers and their baggage or 8 tons of freight. SR.N2 Mk.2 is very similar; the changes are in length (71 feet), weight (23 tons), and capacity (up to 150 "commuters," or 12 tons of freight). With additional fuel tanks, it has a range of 700 nautical miles.

An ardent hovercraft booster is the Montreal director of the Arctic Institute of North America, Michael Marsden. He sees a number of advantages the craft offer in comparison with almost any other means of transportation in the Arctic: "They could extend the icebreaker season; you could put your hovercraft over the side and it would run across open water, ice, onto the land, and actually drive right into storage sheds. One icebreaker with a hovercraft could do a great deal. In the high Arctic, Ellesmere or Devon, the icebreaker season for shipping in the year's supplies, is about 7 weeks. You could triple or quadruple that. There's no place in the North we can't get to, but there are a lot of places where it's very hard to get supplies in without the expense and difficulty of building roads and railways. Hovercraft would certainly help there. There is still a severe limit on payload, of course. My main caution is economic—whether we can afford them. If a lot of people would use them, then of course the cost would come down."

Hovercraft, then, transform our view of the difficulty of getting anything done in the Arctic. They also offer the enterprising operator some profitable commercial opportunities down South. Connor is hotly interested in both possibility, responding in about equal part to a technical-organizational challenge and the chance to make a buck. He secured the Canadian hovercraft agency, got Westland to send out their latest model, the SR.N2, for a Canadian demonstration this summer, and secured—apart from trunkloads of press publicity—the awed and enthusiastic interest of about 1,000 top transportation, Arctic, scientific, government, and business people from all across Canada. From that point on, Autair has been in uninterrupted turmoil.

This is the sort of thing that has happened:

A man who runs supplies to mining camps high up on the chain of lakes in central and northern Manitoba said he was interested in hovercraft. He uses barges and tractor trains, depending on terrain and weather. Sometimes he loses tractors through the ice. It is easy to see his interest.

Toronto Transit Commission, which presently runs streetcars and subways in and around the Ontario capital, inquired with moderate interest into the possibility of running a hovercraft bus service for its lakeshore customers.

Parties from the two Mackenzie River barge companies, the Crown owned Northern Transportation, and the privately owned Yellowknife Transportation, separately dropped in to discuss the problems of running hovercraft on the Mackenzie; ice jams, floating trees, icebergs, rapids.

Prof. Norman Radforth of McMaster University, Hamilton—Canada's best-known expert on that mossy, tussocky bog called muskeg—offered the view that hovercraft might open up much of remote Canada. He subsequently told an inquirer: "I think this vehicle could be piloted across the Canadian Northwest. We need every kind of access possibility for the development of this country. There is a line of access across the country that is mostly muskeg. It offers a minimum of undulation and a minimum of trees. With this vehicle we don't have to go into the field and do this as if we were building a road. That's why I am excited about it." One route that Professor Radforth suggests: from Moossoonee, the port at the southern tip of James Bay which is connected by rail to southern Ontario, to Great Slave Lake in the Northwest Territories—a trip of some 1500 miles, and lovely smooth bog most of the way.

A private group of businessmen in Nanaimo, British Columbia, thought they could run a profitable hovercraft ferry between their Vancouver Island city and Vancouver itself, on the mainland.

Canadian Pacific's President N. R. Crump came to the Montreal hovercraft demonstration at 9:30 a.m. and was buttonholed at 3 p.m. by Doug Connor, who asked what caused him to spend 6 hours watching the hovercraft. Replied Crump enigmatically: "I want to know about it."[2] No further developments from C.P. as yet, reports Connor.

Dr. E. Fred Roots, coordinator on the polar Continental Shelf project, sent along a letter listing a score of requirements for hovercrafting on Arctic scientific projects: could it operate in temperatures between +10° and −30° F.? (In Britain's bitter last winter a hovercraft was run in subzero temperature without problems, though not at −30° F.) Could it climb a 10° slope? (It has already sailed up a 13° slope.) Could it ride over 5-foot vertical ice ridges? (It could; with rubber skirts to build up and hold in the air cushion, SR.N2 Mark 2 can be run as much as 6 or 7 feet off the ground.)

The junior executives of a paper company spent so much time asking Autair questions about running a hovercraft on the waters round their timber preserves that Connor finally asked the executive vice president if they were serious or not. Yes, Connor quotes the V.P. as replying, we are very serious; only we don't want to be the first to run one in Canada. Adds Connor: "We'll be back on their doorstep next summer."

That is when Connor hopes to take delivery of one SR.N5, a small, $250,000 version that he plans to use for tourist cruises on the St. Lawrence, and two SR.N2 Mark 2's, worth $1,400,000 apiece. With the Mark 2's, he will run a twice-a-day shuttle between Montreal and Quebec, a 160-mile trip that his hovercraft will do in just 2 hours and 10 minutes, thus beating cars, trains, buses and, allowing time to and from the airports, even jets.

The economics fascinate Connor: "Operating cost per hour is the basic guide in this field," he says. His SR.N5 will cost him $250,000 and he expects to fit it out to seat 15 people. A Sikorsky S55 helicopter (of which he owns 5, and operates 14 more) costs $120,000, seats 7 or 8. The speed is the same—and the cost per hour is the same.

Capital is the big problem. To raise it, Connor signs contracts and raises bank money at 6 percent. "There are very few bad debts in this business," he says. He looks at governments' consuming interests in exports—Britain's generous subsidy plan to boost exports to, among other places, Canada; Canada's financing plan to encourage exports to, among other places, Britain—observes that Britain's plan is what enables him to buy hovercraft, and adds rather wistfully: "If the Arctic weren't in Canada we could probably get a subsidy from here, too."

He also thinks Canada could make the hovercraft its own (which wouldn't, of course, hurt Connor a bit). "Canada keeps constantly dropping the ball in the transportation business. We had a magnificent opportunity to manufacture helicopters and become a world leader. The number of helicopters in Canada is far higher than in the United States in relation to population. We should have been able to take the lead. We certainly can't get into supersonic aircraft; I wish we could take the lead in hover-

Footnotes at end of speech.

craft. It's certainly something that would catch the public's imagination."

Another Vision of the North, in fact; or an extension of the one that John Diefenbaker patented in 1957. In that million square miles of dangerous emptiness up there, the conditions are bad for conventional flying, costly for airports. Much of the rest of Canada is muskeg, which again makes airport-building hard. "We need a form of transportation that's independent of those conditions," says Connor. "Helicopters are, hovercraft are reasonably so. But helicopters are not built to take huge loads."

That leaves, so far, three-toed oxen, dog teams—and hovercraft. They could carry Canada up north as it has never gone before.

[1] For Saunders-Roe No. 2. Saunders-Roe was an independent British aircraft company, is now a division of Westland Aircraft Ltd.

[2] This is Connor's account of the exchange: Crump would not confirm or deny it to Canada Month.

Wheat Deal With Russians Not in America's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Tribune, San Diego, Calif., October 2, 1963:

WHEAT DEAL WITH RUSSIANS NOT IN AMERICA'S INTEREST

American wheat should not be shipped to Russia to help Premier Nikita Khrushchev escape blame for the failures of Red farm policy.

It is the worldwide bankruptcy of Communist agriculture that causes the Reds to send feelers to our shores to seek out our bulging granaries.

The immense productivity of American farmers has indeed created for us the Communist problem in reverse. Instead of famine, we have a glut.

American wheat farmers, anxious about the future of the market for their crops, understandably would like to see the foreign market for grain expanded as widely as possible.

But many of them are inclined to recoil for patriotic reasons from the prospect of doing business with Moscow.

Don't forget that Russia has been shipping wheat to Cuba.

So American grain sent behind the Iron Curtain might be transshipped and find its way to the hands of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, who like Khrushchev is having trouble feeding his people.

The national commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars spoke some forceful words on this subject the other day.

"The United States should let Khrushchev and his satellites know in no uncertain terms that as long as communism is conducting its bloody aggression and subversion against free people, the 'no sale' sign is up for the Reds," said the commander, Joseph J. Lombardo of Brooklyn.

"For the United States to make up for the Communist agricultural deficiencies, brought about in large measure by Red emphasis upon military power and Communist aggression, would be an act of a nation with a suicide complex.

"Freemen learned to their sorrow only a couple of decades ago that they couldn't do business with Hitler.

"We should recognize right now that we can't do business with Khrushchev."

Commander Lombardo speaks for the American people on this question.

No matter what temporary advantages may seem to come from a wheat deal with the Soviet Union, they are false.

Such a deal could only strengthen the athetistic Communist tyranny in Russia, in Hungary, in Cuba, and wherever its tentacles extend.

And how would such a deal be paid for? And when? Ever?

Don't forget that the Soviet Union is still in default of billions of dollars of American wartime aid and other international debts.

There can be no profit in dealing with the enemy.

Our Mounting Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent House debate on the effects of the administration's proposed tax bill, major questions relating to the financing of the mounting public debt were generally overlooked.

According to a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal, the administration finds comfort in justifying the size of the Federal debt in terms of indebtedness in the private sector of our economy. However, the comparison stops there. As the editorial points out:

Not only is there no thought of paying off any part of the (public) debt; the policy of deliberately planned deficits insures against it.

These mounting deficits are therefore potentially inflationary and impose great burdens and distortions on the whole economy.

Furthermore, it is inaccurate to say, as the administration does, that the burden of the debt is declining because the proportion of the debt to GNP is declining. As the Wall Street Journal states:

The GNP in itself is swelled by the enormous Federal spending which helps keep the debt so high.

The editorial also notes that if it is accepted that creating new money is an unhealthy method of attempting to cover debts, then the Government is clearly in the position of a householder or business enterprise. It continues:

Far from being some unique entity wholly detached from the workings of the general economy, the Government by its nature is also subject to the sometimes painful rule that the money must come from somewhere.

I include the Wall Street Journal editorial of September 6, 1963, highlighting some of the relevant questions relating to the public debt in the RECORD at this point:

EXCUSE FOR EXCESS

It sometimes seems as though the advocates of perennial Federal deficits have worked themselves into an intellectual cul-de-sac.

On the one hand they contend that the National Government's budgeting cannot fairly be compared with that of individuals, businesses or even other levels of political authority; it's supposedly in a special category. Yet on the other hand they point to private indebtedness as a justification for Federal deficits; why shouldn't the Government be allowed to do what most families and companies do all the time?

To begin to sort out this multiple confusion, it's true that many people seem infatuated with charge-account and credit-card living. For ourselves, we are old fashioned enough to wish there were a more general regard for savings and living within incomes.

But there is nothing inherently wrong, or necessarily dangerous to the Nation's financial structure, in large accumulations of private debt. One reason is that all concerned understand that debt must be repaid at some point; the few who may think otherwise can expect to end up in trouble.

This common consent is missing from the attitude of many Federal economists and their academic supporters. The public debt continues to mount as the budget deficits pile up year after year. Not only is there no thought of paying off any part of the debt; the policy of deliberately planned deficits insures against it.

To see no danger in such practice must require a major effort of the imagination. The deficits themselves are potentially inflationary; the growth of the debt imposes burdens and distortions on the whole economy. Just to service it now costs more than $10 billion a year.

Apart from those evils, the debt represents a huge overextension of public credit. Whereas private debt is constanly in the process of repayment, public debt can cause trouble because there is neither attempt nor intent to reduce it at all.

It is no answer to say, as the officials often do, that the burden of the debt is declining because the debt is declining as a proportion of gross national product. The GNP in itself is swelled by the enormous Federal spending which helps keep the debt so high. And no amount of percentages can alter the fact that the debt has been steadily increasing instead of declining. Such statistical doubletalk should not commend itself to men in positions of responsibility.

Now by what special dispensation is it assumed that the Central Government can escape the consequences which apply elsewhere in the economy? Though differences obviously exist between public and private business, they are not of such a nature as to make it safe for the Government to continually defy economic laws.

For one difference, only the Government can create money. This unfortunately is also a way of saying that only the Government can actually cause an inflation, though other forces can contribute to its development. The belief that inflation is a form of economic salvation is indeed a sad delusion.

If it is accepted that creating new money is an unhealthy method of attempting to cover debts, then it seems clear that the Government is very much in the position of a householder or business enterprise. Far from being some unique entity wholly detached from the workings of the general economy, the Government by its nature is also subject to the sometimes painful rule that the money must come from somewhere.

We suspect that, deep down, the devotees of unending deficits know it. Otherwise they would not get themselves in the unwieldy position of putting the Government in a special category while at the same time taking comfort from the extent of private debt. That excuse for excess should be scant solace for them or the Nation.

British Guiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, because of my concern over the extension of international communism, particularly in the Western Hemisphere, I have addressed a special television message to my constituents on the threat posed by full independence for British Guiana.

Knowing the interest many of my colleagues have in this situation, I am including a copy of the script which I used in making this broadcast:

SPECIAL NEWS REPORT FOR WHEC-TV, ROCHESTER, N.Y.

(By Hon. FRANK HORTON, Member of Congress, 36th District, New York)

Is a Castro-style dictatorship coming to South America? Is the stage being set for the establishment of the first Communist state on the South American continent?

These are questions which trouble many officials in Washington today. The puzzle centers on British Guiana, a land of swamp and jungle along the northeastern coast of South America. Most of the 600,000 inhabitants of this Minnesota-size country are squeezed into a coastal strip no more than 10 miles wide.

British Guiana is a crown colony that Britain seized in the early 1800's. Since the 1940's, British control has rapidly diminished. Today, it extends only to foreign affairs, defense, and communications.

The domestic government is headed by Premier Cheddi Jagan, a dedicated Communist. Jagan is an East Indian who came to the United States and was trained as a dentist. While here, he married Janet Rosenberg of Chicago. She, also, is an avowed Communist. At one time, Mrs. Jagan was a leader of the Young Communist League in the Chicago area.

Great Britain—largely for financial reasons—is scheduled to give this sugar and molasses producing country its full independence by the end of this year. There is little doubt that under present conditions this action would drive a wedge of Communist subversion between neighboring Venezuela and Brazil.

The only reason holding Britain from divesting itself from the colonial territory is the political instability which would be left behind. There is a deep racial split between the rural East Indians, who give Jagan his support, and the urban Negroes. Because of multiparty elections, Jagan holds power with the votes of only 42 percent of the people of British Guiana.

Under normal circumstances, Britain should be urged to grant independence to this small South American country—this is the goal of the free world. However, until free and honest elections can be guaranteed, a Jagan Communist takeover will be the result.

Already the Jagan regime is serving as a way station for smuggling Communist agents and funds from Cuba and Iron Curtain countries into Latin American nations. Bank records also show indirect financial aid from the Soviets and Cuba for Jagan's government.

President Kennedy told a news conference the British Guiana problem is "primarily a British matter and we should leave the judgment to them." I cannot agree. I think it is a problem for the free world.

The United States should work with Great Britain to find a solution or be faced with further Communist takeovers in this hemisphere. A "second Cuba" providing another base for Soviet missiles in a strategic area and an expanded base for Communist operations in the Western Hemisphere must not be allowed.

Independence should come to the people of British Guiana, but in an orderly and effective manner to insure their freedom. This is the goal of the free world.

The Retirement of a Distinguished Veterans' Service Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent retirement of a distinguished veterans' service agent, William F. Casey of Greenfield, Mass. His life story is one of dedicated concern for the well-being of his fellow men. Throughout his 11 years of service as veterans' agent for Greenfield, he established an enviable record of service and fought tirelessly for the rights of veterans.

Recently, the town hall employees of Greenfield honored Bill Casey on the day of his retirement at the age of 70. His retirement, characteristically, was short lived. The Governor's council in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts confirmed him at the nomination of Governor Endicott Peabody, to a trusteeship at the Soldiers Home in Holyoke. Everybody who has had the good fortune of knowing Bill Casey is gratified with this appointment. It is also good to know that his outstanding service to the Nation will continue.

I am happy to include an article from the Greenfield Recorder Gazette, of Saturday, September 28, which describes Bill Casey's Greenfield retirement party. It is a genuine indication of what the people who knew him best feel about his distinguished career:

CASEY ENDS TOWN SERVICE

For William F. Casey, Greenfield veterans' service agent more than 11 years, Friday was the end of the career line.

Town hall employees gathered in the selectman's room in the afternoon to wish Casey well on his retirement from the veterans' post. He officially ended his duties at 5 p.m.

Chairman Stanley L. Cummings of the selectmen said of Casey: "As a public servant, he has always done a little bit better than was demanded of him."

The retiring official was presented a carnation by Miss Mabel Huckins, assistant treasurer-collector and a longtime town hall employee.

Cummings presented him an engraved silver bowl from all of those present—which included most of his town hall associates. The ceremony was brief, followed by a get-together.

Casey said he will continue to be active in the community and added: "When you need a pinchhitter in veterans' services, just send for—for old Bill."

A highlight of the testimonial affair was the reading of an original poem by Mrs. Ellen Forgey of the welfare department staff. Selectman Cummings read the poem for Mrs. Forgey, who was ill and unable to offer it:

"FAREWELL, FEARLESS FIGHTER

"Alas-Alas, now comes the day
When this broth of a boy
Must be on his way.
And what will we do
If the Russians attack,
Or a broken down vet gets
A crick in his back?
And where will we find
Such a sunny grin
Or a fellow so valiantly
Stanch agin sin?
Ah! We shed a tear
As he trots away
In his 70th year
With his heart still gay
But for a few rounders
Who yell with glee
Hurrah. He didn't get
To bury me."

A People-to-People Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1962, the Gary Post-Tribune carried an article entitled, "Refugees Can't Understand Why United States Gives Aid to Tito," which points up the tragic contrast in judgment which has clashed over the years in our Nation's policy toward Tito.

One side has sought to wean the Tito government away from the Soviet bloc, acknowledging, but in effect forgetting, the agony of the people of Yugoslavia; the opposing camp, remembering our own heritage, resisted this government of tyranny as not in the interests of our country or the free world; adamantly held that these people, too, were endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; demanded that our Nation fulfill its corresponding responsibility not to aid and abet in their oppression.

To help the nameless subjects of this article teach our American people their lesson of terror, I include this article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

REFUGEES CAN'T UNDERSTAND WHY UNITED STATES GIVES AID TO TITO

(By Ruby Proctor)

For those who have escaped from under the iron heel of communism, life holds one great objective—to fight it, wherever possible with whatever weapons one can find.

This is the story of a man and woman who fled the terror in Yugoslavia and came after a time to America and settled finally in Gary. From half a world away they came to find the freedom that was lost under Tito.

Citizens since 1959, the man and the woman have found peace of a sort and the freedom they had dreamed about. They have jobs, a home of their own, food and warmth, but there is still fear.

Their names cannot be told with this story nor their picture published. There are still several family members behind the Iron Curtain who might be forced to pay because this man and this woman have dared to tell their story. And there is another fear, a deep, continuing anxiety that America sleeps while the smoldering fire of communism comes closer.

Born in the same province of Serbia in what is now Yugoslavia, the man and the woman did not meet until she came to this country in 1956 to become his wife. The union was arranged by a relative who had known him in the old country. An officer in the Nationalist Army of Yugoslavia, he fought against the Communist forces of Tito and against the Germans. He was captured in 1943 and held prisoner at Nuernberg for 2 years. Because of the communization of his homeland, he dared not go back to Yugoslavia when he was released. He was in a refugee camp until permission to enter the United States was obtained in December of 1949.

After the deprived and desperate years the man faced the "Lady With the Lamp" with one prayer—that somehow beyond that "golden door" he would find the means to fight again against communism.

The woman, when she came 7 years later was of the same mind. She had seen enough of communism to make her hate and fear it forever. A probing question brings forth a flood of memories, a torrent of words.

There was the day the Communists swept into Belgrade, October 20, 1944, and began a systematic search of every building in the city. The woman hid with others in a basement for 2 weeks trying to decide whether to go or stay, to live or die. There was no food and no water and those who were hiding took turns in furtive excursions outside in search of food. Finally, the Communists came. There were two of them with machineguns, but they were searching for Germans and the frightened civilians were not molested.

Times were very hard under the Communists. Spies were everywhere and a person would be taken away and shot for expressing an opinion contrary to communism. The woman had been cashier at a theater before the war. Soon after the city of Belgrade was taken over by Tito's forces, she ventured into the streets to see what the people were saying.

She stood in line at the theater where she had once worked. A Russian film was advertised and there was some complaining.

"Let's come back tomorrow, maybe they'll be showing an American or a British film," a woman said to her companion. Suddenly there was a hand on her arm and she was led away. The companion never saw her again.

The woman remembers when Tito came to Belgrade later that year. He made a big speech. At that time he was very thin, tense, and nervous.

"People," he said, "from this day there will be no more rich, no more poor. All will be even. Those on the top will be on the bottom, and those on the bottom will be lifted up." He made a great sweeping gesture as though he lifted millions from the level of his shoe tops to high above his head.

It was only propaganda, the woman says. He took from the rich, but gave nothing to the poor. Everyone was poor and the suffering was unbelievable. Tito took the lands, the houses, the personal possessions, even the clothing if there was more of it, or its quality was better than was thought necessary. A ruffle or a bit of embroidery on a blouse was considered a stigma of wealth and the garment must be confiscated.

Landholdings larger than 20 acres were broken up. Farmers were permitted to work about that much land. What was raised on 17 of those acres belonged to the government of Tito. Crops on the remaining 3 acres provided the only livelihood for the farmer.

The commissars told them what they could raise and how much. If the season was too dry, too cold, or too hot so that the crops were destroyed, it did not matter. There was no leniency. Tito must still receive his share. Many took their own lives in desperation. The woman's eyes darkened and her voice falters as she tells of the friends who hanged themselves from the ceilings of their homes because it was intolerable to live under communism.

It was rumored that many priests were shot. The woman does not know for sure about this. But of the fate of her own parish priest she knew "for true," because she lived in the same house. The Communist police came for him and tied him to the back of a carriage and dragged him through the streets of Belgrade until he died.

The schools were greatly changed after the Communists took over. The children were questioned everyday about their parents. "What did papa talk about?" "Did mama tell you a story last night? What was it about?"

And the child in his innocence talks, perhaps condemning his parents to punishment or death. "She told me a story of the old days when people were free, when our family lived in a big house, and there was plenty of food and nice clothes. She told me about God and the church and about the King."

"All lies," the teacher insists. "Your mama and papa lie to you. I will tell you a true story about Tito."

Thus are family traditions and the folklore of a people erased from memory and the stories of the Communists substituted.

By a simple ruse children were taught to substitute trust in Tito for religious faith. They were asked how many would like to have some candy. Of course, everyone did. Then they were told to pray to God for some candy. None was forthcoming.

"Now let us pray to Tito to see if he will give us candy." So the children prayed again this time to Tito, and miraculously that very day there was candy for all.

By repeating the deceit a few times many were led to believe that Tito was indeed a god.

Are there elections in Yugoslavia? Yes, but they are not free. Everyone must vote. It is required. In the voting place are two boxes, one is for the Communist government, the other is for those opposed to it. Each voter is given a small red ball which he is to deposit in the box of his choice.

"I listened," the woman said of one election. "The balls made a different sound in each box, so that you could tell how it was going."

She estimated that nearly 80 percent had voted against Tito's government, but when the announcement was made that night, Tito had won by 99 percent. "He always wins by 99 percent," she says.

Between the spasmodic outbursts of words and the inarticulate silences, the writer sensed the tension, the longing to communicate a warning of imminent danger.

The man tried to explain. "Americans do not understand about communism. There is no truth and no honor. Lies are the tools of expediency. Peace has only one meaning to them and that is absolute submission to Communist demands."

He spoke of the constant surveillance that is an insult to personal integrity and human dignity, of the fear of talking that comes from knowing everything one says is reported and that there will be punishment for every word the Communists do not like.

There were tears of frustration in the man's eyes as he spoke of his work in a factory that produces military equipment. "I want to help fight communism, so for 11 years I help to build army tanks. Now I see labels on some of those tanks. They are being shipped to Yugoslavia to build the strength of Tito." And to be used sometime, he is convinced, against the free world.

Why does the U.S. Government give money to Tito? He does not need money, the country is rich enough to feed half of Europe, he says. The United States cannot buy Tito's friendship. He will never turn away from communism. He only pretends to be our friend to get from this country as much as he can. Tito would have been deposed by by own people years ago, if the U.S. Government had not aided him, the former Yugoslav officer said.

"I talk to many people. My wife talks to many people. We think 80 percent of the American people are against communism, but the Government goes right on helping Communist countries. America better wake up soon, or it will be too late."

In the man's den there is a bulky manuscript beside a typewriter. He works nights and weekends on a book he is writing in the Serbian language, by which he hopes to arouse his countrymen in America to the danger.

Ole Miss Had One of Its Best Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the integrationists, the do-gooders, the false liberals and generally those politicians who would use the South and particularly Mississippi as a whipping boy were loud in their prophecies a year ago, following the Federal coup of the University of Mississippi in forcing Negro troublemaker, James Meredith, into the University of Mississippi, that Ole Miss was through as an educational institution.

We are happy that their prophecies of doom were wrong.

The following article by Pat D. Smith, University News Service, one who is in position to know the facts, proves just how wrong they were:

SAYS OLE MISS HAD ONE OF BEST YEARS

(By Pat D. Smith)

OXFORD.—One year ago today they said Ole Miss was dead.

The almost unanimous opinion of newspaper reports and editorials around the Nation was that the University of Mississippi had had it.

The night before, a bloody riot against the admission of Negro James Meredith had engulfed the otherwise sedate campus. Almost all the rioters were outsiders, but that mattered little. Most of the Northern press launched an anti-Ole Miss campaign as if the university itself had planned and carried out the riot.

Did these soothsayers prove to be right? Did the University of Mississippi walk silently to its grave? Hardly. Under the most adverse of conditions, it enjoyed one of its most productive years. But that is a story that has never been published.

As soon as the tear gas cleared, Ole Miss started repairing the cracks in its battered reputation. And what it came up with is an incredible success story stemming from what to most universities would have been complete disaster.

The first step forward was made while the month of October was still an infant. Installation was begun on the Ole Miss campus of a Dynamitron, the only such particle accelerator on any college or university cam-

pus in America. This installation opened fields of research to be found in the academic world only at Ole Miss.

More than $2,400,000 in grants rolled in during the year from governmental and private sources. The University Medical Center opened its new psychiatric unit. A record 26 students enrolled in the School of Pharmacy's doctoral programs. The artist series, the ODK-mortar board forum and the Christopher Longest lecture series brought to the campus such outstanding people as Vance Packard, Dr. Louise Bellinger, Hal Holbrook, Dr. Henri Peyre, Dr. C. C. Abbott of Scotland, Dr. A. N. J. den Hollander of Amsterdam, and many others.

The students also lost no time in displaying their determination to uphold the Ole Miss tradition of excellence. The university players' October production of "Saint Joan" was called by a drama critic "the best college production ever staged in Mississippi." Honor roll figures for the fall semester showed an increase in the number of students on the honor roll and a decrease in the number of students dismissed for academic reasons. The football team went undefeated. The number of students selected for membership in honorary scholastic societies reached an alltime high.

Nearly $6 million in construction was underway on the Oxford campus during the fall, and the university medical center in Jackson started construction on its new $3,150,000 research wing.

The second semester of Ole Miss' most difficult year proved to be even more successful, although some national news mediums continued to pounce on every insignificant mistake made by a student. School pranks that would go unnoticed at other universities made headlines if they happened at Ole Miss. The mistakes were pointed out—the success overlooked.

More than a quarter million dollars in research projects were underway in the school of engineering during the second semester, and the pharmacy school alone received more than $100,000 in research grants. Corporations and individuals established a large number of scholarships. More than 10,000 people participated in the university's conference and institutes programs. More graduates than ever before received scholarships and fellowships for graduate study at other universities. Graduates of the school of engineering received job offers of from $75 to $200 per month above the national norm. During the 1962–63 year, Ole Miss awarded approximately 1,350 degrees—a record.

Enrollment in the 1963 summer session fell short by only nine students of breaking the all-time high for a summer session. A record number of doctoral degrees were awarded at the close of the summer session—10 in chemistry alone. Medical research teams at the university medical center completed the first successful lung transplant on a human being, and completed the first successful transplant in this county of adrenal glands. The university acquired Rowan Oak, Oxford homeplace of Nobel Prize winning author William Faulkner, to be used as a center of scholarly research and as a memorial to the famed writer.

During the year some few professors made bitter attacks on the university, knowing that their words would make national headlines and enable them to receive better job offers elsewhere. The part of the faculty story at Ole Miss that has not been told is that the vast majority of Ole Miss professors have refused more lucrative jobs in order to stay at Ole Miss simply because they are fiercely loyal to the university, love the university, and are determined to help rebuild its reputation.

Although enrollment now is down from the previous year, the school of law, the graduate school and the school of pharmacy all have the highest enrollments in the University's history. Ole Miss has been hurt—yes. But its wounds have healed so rapidly that the scar tissue is barely visible. Given time it will not be visible at all. Ole Miss successes during the year have not been easy nor accidental. The fight has been uphill and tough. But the significant fact is that accomplishment has been reaped from havoc.

The prophets of gloom and doom have been proved wrong. What they did not reckon with was a 115-year history of adverse conditions and dogged determination.

Ole Miss has refused to die—in fact, it has refused even to sleep.

The McClellan Committee Hearings on Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the current televised McClellan committee hearings on organized crime have not only aroused a great deal of criticism but have enraged millions of people, more particularly Americans of Italian origin.

These hearings which are a political farce and a political circus represent a disgraceful waste of legislative time and a reflection on all Italo-Americans.

Among the groups resenting the manner in which these hearings are conducted is the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service which is headed by Police Lt. Mario Biaggi.

I am privileged to insert in this RECORD the remarks of Lieutenant Biaggi in criticism of the McClellan committee crime hearings:

THE MCCLELLAN COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON ORGANIZED CRIME

(By Police Lieutenant Mario Biaggi)

The recurring spectacle of prominent government officials hamming it up before television cameras is making its reappearance and, as usual, the public is being entertained by a grim circus.

It is not, however, being fooled.

The not quite spontaneous performance of a gangland witness is serving as a vehicle which enables the dignified, staid, respected pillars of the country—U.S. Senators who are up for votes and their hand-picked political aids whose jobs depend on votes—to get on camera and into the homes of listeners across the Nation.

The viewer wonders what has happened to the proper law enforcement officers: the police, FBI, prosecutors, the system of justice through due process of law and a hearing in court.

Any springboard will do, so long as the circus will be sensational. Some years ago it was Costello. This time it is Valachi. The chartmakers and illustrators even drew up a chain of command and a family of descendants to enable them to get everybody in on the act, criminals, or suspects who were otherwise unknown. Two dozen names, all of them of similar national background, were enough to indicate to the casual, disinterested observer that the crimes of the entire Nation were associated with one group.

This is convenient politics especially for those whose policy it is to deny Americans their just due because of a heritage different from those who happen to be in political power because of their own (and different) ancestry.

This is the United States of America, 1963, whose Italian-American servicemen represent a disproportionately large segment of the population. This is a republic where the principles of a democratic form of government are supposed to enable all men to be judged, rated, and rewarded on a fair system of justice.

This is also the Nation under whose system of political government power-grabbing politicians are able to wilfully smear and thus, for all practical purposes, disenfranchise any group or groups whom they choose to not recognize.

It is a well planned, conceived and executed program so diabolical that the long litany of the contributions and the accomplishments of Italo-Americans to this country are inundated by the frightening enormity of a TV circus which preempts legitimate programs, and whose side effects include radio comments and appalling headlines which can be compared only to the Biblical deluge.

The Grand Council of Columbia Associations includes scores of thousands of Government officials among its 80,000 members. We stand for the enforcement and administration of law and order and endorse legislation outlawing organized crime and criminals. Our record of public service needs no elaboration or amplification. Criminals and other similar offenders should not remain free to pursue their illegal purposes. This Nation, under law, has a system of jurisprudence to protect the innocent and bring the wrongdoer to task. Our jails are filled with those who have been convicted under this process of law. The prisoners were arrested by appropriate agents, prosecuted by other appropriate agents in the appropriate court before appropriate jurists.

It was not necessary to invade the courts with a circus atmosphere nor would a conviction, under those circumstances, remain in force. What we are now subjected to is neither a trial nor even a hearing but a disgusting political spectacle of politically inspired characters seeking an opportunity to project themselves into the homes and meeting places of people of all ages, all stations, all interests.

The principal in this farce has not only been questioned by the proper enforcement agencies but has also been questioned, beforehand, in off-the-camera executive sessions before the same politicians who now frame improper leading statements for the purpose of adding further sensationalism so as to keep the show on the road a few more days.

This technique of milking the audience is transparent to even the most naive of viewers.

Meanwhile, back in Cuba—

Meanwhile, back in Vietnam—

Meanwhile, back in Berlin, off the Grand Fishing Banks, in space.

No. 14—Colorado: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congres-

sional delegation from the State of Colorado, about gambling in that State. Colorado is the center of Rocky Mountain gambling operations, and organized crime profits accordingly.

While only $16 million was bet on Colorado tracks last year, most of the action was strictly illegal. Colorado's share of the figure given to the McClellan committee as representing nationwide off-track betting is a shade under $500 million. This is only half of the total monies gambled each year. The annual gross illegal gambling in that State would probably approach $1 billion.

Based on the percentage that stays in the hands of the gambling syndicates, it is not easy to figure that almost $100 million is available to finance other aspects of organized crime.

Out of this profit comes all kinds of payoffs to keep gambling illegal, unregulated and uninterfered with—thanks to bluenose gambling laws which have put crime in clover in Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, legalized gambling in the form of a national lottery would knock the props from under the mobs. It would purify the governmental process through elimination of the major source of payoff money. Lastly, it would bring needed revenue flowing into the coffers of our own Treasury.

Europe Moves To Curb Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, while our balance-of-payments position in the second quarter of 1963 deteriorated sharply, the Kennedy administration has sought solace in the theory that our problems will be ended by inflation in Europe and price stability at home. At the same time that it clings to this hope, however, the administration presses for immediate tax reductions and more spending—an inflationary recipe if there ever was one.

Aside from the likelihood of renewed inflation at home, the Europeans are making strong efforts to end their inflation. According to recent articles in the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, both Italy and France are taking positive measures to curb their inflationary trends, including reduced budgetary deficits—an example which should be followed in the United States. Furthermore, the French Government has enacted reductions in import duties, a freeze on factory prices, curbs on consumer credit and new taxes, while the Italians have approved sales tax increases on luxuries, stimulations for increased investment and speedups in the construction of low-cost housing.

Mr. Speaker, as these articles make clear, our Nation cannot sit idly by waiting for solutions to our balance-of-payments and gold outflow problems to come from other countries. Under unanimous consent I include the articles from the September 13 Wall Street Journal and the September 26 New York Times in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 13, 1963]

FRANCE FREEZES PRICES, CUTS IMPORT FEES, CURBS CREDIT BUYING IN ANTIINFLATION DRIVE

PARIS.—The French Government announced a freeze on factory prices of all manufactured goods, cuts in import duties, curbs on consumer credit, new taxes, and a long list of other measures designed to reverse an inflationary trend that threatens the country's economic health.

The broad program was much tougher than most Frenchmen had anticipated, and it seems certain to prompt protests from many affected groups. Prime Minister Georges Pompidou, however, gave any potential critics advance warning that their protests will go unheeded.

At an overflow press conference in his official residence, he declared: "For such a policy to succeed, it is essential that the state accept its responsibilities and prove its authority and its perseverance. We have the political means. We also have, I can tell you, the determination."

With an overwhelming majority in the National Assembly, Mr. Pompidou's party—the Gaullist Union for the New Republic—is politically impregnable for years, and nothing short of uncontrolled strikes or farmer revolt seems capable of diverting the Government from its course.

FARMERS DISLIKE PROGRAM

There is little visible in the program, announced by Mr. Pompidou and Finance Minister Valery Giscard-d'Estaing, to offend the unions. Prices and profit margins were attacked directly, while no restrictions on pay increases were introduced. Economic officials here, however, believe the Government is—by forcibly stabilizing prices—laying the groundwork for a later get-tough policy on wages. On the other hand, farmers, who have been clamoring for special Government measures in their favor, are expected to be angry with the program.

In their prepared talks, the two French officials asserted that the French economy is good—even excellent. But Mr. Pompidou added. "We don't have the right to allow it to deteriorate, and neither the chief of state (President Charles de Gaulle) nor the Government will accept that."

Only the influx of a million Algerian refugees, the Prime Minister said, kept the Government from taking action a year ago. The unavoidable delay, he seemed to imply, made even stronger measures necessary now.

BUDGET DEFICIT IS CUT

Mr. Giscard-d'Estaing, who gave the details of the plan, began by noting that the budgetary deficit had been cut from the equivalent of $1.4 billion this year to under $1 billion in 1964. This, he added, is the lowest level since 1952.

Although expenditures will rise 11.2 percent, he said, this will be offset by a 5-percent boost in income taxes, a 6-percent increase in parimutuel betting taxes and imposition of a special tax on profits from real estate sales. Speculation in the sale of land, and especially apartments, has been bitterly attacked in the French press as an important factor in the rise in living costs.

In the field of credit, he disclosed that the required downpayment on new cars is to rise to 30 percent from 25 percent and the maximum term for repayment is to drop to 21 months from 24 months. Downpayments on television sets also are to go up, but other household appliances, for the time being aren't affected.

AUTO MAKERS CANCEL PRICE RISE

Auto manufacturers, who have been enjoying a boom year were also hit by another measure. The finance minister announced that the auto makers had agreed to cancel the price increases most had recently announced on their new models.

The freeze on factory prices, an extension of an earlier action applying to a few products, is the most severe move in the price field, but the Government also will exercise control over retail profit margins and directly over the price tags of some retail goods. Average beefsteak prices, for example, have been set at $1.22 a pound until the first of the year.

Professional organizations representing producers, wholesalers, and retailers are immediately to put into effect a campaign for stable prices that will persuade their members to maintain 1962 prices on shoes, textile, and household supplies. The campaign will later be extended to cover furniture, hardware, books, auto accessories, sewing machines, watches, handtools, and heating equipment.

CUSTOMS DUTIES REDUCED

Finally, customs duties on imports from other members of the European Economic Community (Common Market) will be reduced temporary by 15 to 20 percent and duties on shipments from third countries by 25 percent.

The Government program, called "the plan for economic and financial stabilization," also includes many less dramatic provisions such as the early release of 77,000 army draftees in an effort to relieve the shortage of industrial workers.

To set a good example on prices, the Government will cut the price of its Gauloise cigarettes from 28 to 27 cents a pack and regular gasoline from about 80 cents a gallon to 76.5 cents.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 26, 1963]

ITALY ACTS TO END RISING INFLATION: LUXURY TAXES TO INCREASE—BUDGET DEFICIT TO BE CUT

(By Arnaldo Cortesi)

ROME, September 25.—A program of greater austerity was approved by the Cabinet today in an effort to halt Italy's inflationary spiral.

The inflation has alarmed authorities of the European Economic Community, who fear it may ultimately damage the economies of other Common Market countries. These are France, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

The Common Market authorities advised the Italian Government to take immediate measures to end the inflation without raising the rate at which the Central Bank lends money to member banks.

Four main measures were approved by the Cabinet. The first increases by an unspecified amount the sales tax on some luxuries, such as precious stones, furs, sparkling wines, some liquors, playing cards and antiques.

The second step seeks to decrease the budget deficit. The equivalent of $128 million in additional tax revenue produced so far this year will go entirely to reducing the deficit. The third main measure seeks to stimulate increased investment in new industrial plants and expansion of existing ones.

The fourth is aimed at speeding the construction of low-cost housing.

Before approving the austerity measures proposed by the Treasury Minister, Emilio Colombo, the Cabinet Council took a moderately optimistic view of the situation.

Progress in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. George Todt, columnist for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner. In this column Mr. Todt makes reference to the fine work being done by Assemblyman John L. E. "Bud" Collier, who is one of the assemblyman from my congressional district. He further points up the dangers of an excessive concentration of bureaucratic power in Washington, which will result in extending control over all business and every American citizen. On this subject he quotes my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], who has always been in the forefront in opposition to massive Federal control.

The article follows:

PROGRESS IN REVERSE

(By George Todt)

"The Democrats in California have been splitting the Republican Party wide open in recent years. They have caused us to snipe at each other. Let's save our shots for the ADA and the CDC, instead."—Assemblyman John L. E. "Bud" Collier, speech, September 27, 1963.

Not long ago I hied me to the Disneyland Hotel in Anaheim and watched my own assemblyman, Bud Collier, receive an award from the La Habra Republican Assembly for outstanding 1963 service in Sacramento.

The Orange County organization picked Bud, whose 54th assembly district runs eastward from Eagle Rock (where I live) to Arcadia, as one of "three outstanding assemblymen" on the basis of his conservative voting record.

The other two gentlemen also similarly honored were E. Richard Barnes, of the San Diego 78th assembly district, and Robert E. Badham, of the Orange County 71st assembly district. All were cited for their determination to preserve rights, freedoms, and resources of individual American citizens here in California.

WIN BACK ASSEMBLY

It was an outstanding dinner, emceed by Ron Rankin and attended by a host of Orange County Republican bigwigs, including the eminent Walter Knott. When it came Bud's turn to speak, he called forthrightly for GOP unity.

"The most vital item on the agenda next year," Collier told his large and receptive audience, "is to win back and organize the California Legislature. If we stop squabling we can do it.

Bud Collier has been my assemblyman during all 14 years I have lived in Los Angeles and I think he is a capable, effective legislator. The statewide GOP factions, so often at each others' throats, could profit from his down-to-earth advice.

The main address on this occasion was delivered by Orange County's beloved Congressman JAMES B. (JIMMY) UTT, one of the finest conservative statesmen in our Republic today, and a truly great patriot.

His is one of the most logical minds in Congress and he is absolutely fearless. When he speaks out, he makes reason and good ense. Let's hear him now:

"This Nation is under a massive assault to get every man, woman and child under the control of the Federal Government," said UTT.

FEARLESS LEADER

"The 'lethal left' has forgotten that the States created the Government, not the other way around. Unfortunately, the American people have become apathetic.

"The so-called New Frontier has no new ideas of its own. In fact, it has gone backward to the time of Plato's Republic and demands for us soon a rule by the elite. It wants a world community—meaning world government.

"The public must get up off its apathy and regain its own government again. We must take it away from the entrenched bureaucrats and their rapidly multiplying bureaus. We must stop unholy spending and borrowing. Do we want the twin evils of inflation and depression in the future?

BLACKMAIL COMING

"As an aftermath of the wrongful nuclear test ban treaty—and the real heroes were the 19 Senators who voted consistently against it—we are going to proceed downhill until we have full diplomatic recognition of all Red countries.

"We must be strong militarily and neither appease nor coexist with Red butchers in whatever guise they approach us. We have the greatest military force the world has ever seen in SAC—but we are phasing it out.

"Then the Communists will blackmail us into surrender. But we ought to remember the words of Winston Churchill. It is best to stand up to our enemy while we still have a chance to win. We cannot afford to fall."

Let's Keep America on the Right Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the October 4, 1963, issue of the Latonia Christian, Covington, Ky.:

LET'S KEEP AMERICA ON THE RIGHT ROAD—AN APPEAL TO ALL AMERICANS

The most single important document in American history is the Bible. It was read at the making and signing of the Declaration of Independence. Its underlying principles were copied into the Constitution of our Government.

JEFFERSON

In 1776 Thomas Jefferson wrote into the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are equal, that they are, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

FIRST AMENDEMENT

The provision adopted in 1791 as the first of 10 amendments (Bill of Rights) to our Constitution reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *." This provision guaranteeing each American freedom of worship in the way his conscience dictated was certainly never intended to deny the freedom of worship.

PROHIBITING RELIGION

Yet, the free exercise of religion is being prohibited, by a conspiratorial apparatus gaining momentum in America today, that is removing God from the public conscience. A great American patriot stated recently, "Thus it seems that we are being told by some religious leaders, that we must make an accommodation with the forces of secularism, which aim to debunk public recognition of God; and by our national leaders, that we must accommodate ourselves and our national policies to an international, insidious, and atheistic force, determined, as Karl Marx stated so many years ago, "to dethrone God and destroy capitalism."

COMMUNIST STRATEGY

Understandably then, a prerequisite of Communist strategy in taking over the United States is: Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principles of separation of church and state. To ban the acknowledgement of God from our schools under this insidious guise of advancing liberty is a victory for international communism and utter defeat for the forces of liberty as guaranteed by our Constitution.

SUPREME COURT

In the June 1962 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Engle* v. *Schempp*, the Court held unconstitutional the use of the following "voluntary" 22-word prayer recited in unison as part of the school schedule:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, and our country."

In the June 1963 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Murray* v. *Curlett*, the Court held unconstitutional a rule adopted by the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Baltimore consisting primarily of the following: "Reading, without comment, of a chapter in the Holy Bible and/or the use of the Lord's Prayer."

Have we, the taxpayers, become so neutralized and conditioned by liberal and Communist propaganda as to accept without protest the U.S. Supreme Court decisions which upholds the rights of the antiprayer few, thereby imposing tyranny upon the overwhelming majority of American citizens who believe prayer to God in our public schools is good?

RECORD OF VOTING

A cursory examination of how some of our Supreme Court members voted on issues involving Communists would lead us to believe that a pattern has developed inimical to the best interests of the United States. Senator JAMES EASTLAND read the following statistics to the Senate of the United States May 3, 1962, based on their (Supreme Court Justices) votes (pro or con) on issues favoring the Communists:

"Justice Hugo Black, 102 pro; 0 con (100 percent pro-Communist).

"Justice Felix Frankfurter, 69 pro; 34 con.

"Justice Wm. O. Douglas, 97 pro; 3 con.

"Justice (Chief) Earl Warren, 62 pro; 3 con.

"Justice Wm. J. Brennan, Jr., 49 pro; 2 con."

(Statistics taken from the Fact Finder and reprinted.)

ON TARGET

Today the Communist conspiracy is "on target" in fulfilling Lenin's blueprint to take over the world, when in 1917 he said, "First, we will take Eastern Europe. Next, the masses of Asia. Then we shall encircle that last bastion of capitalism, the United States of America. We shall not have to attack; it will fall like overripe fruit into our hands."

PSALM 9:17

"God is firm in His judgment of a nation that once knew and recognized God, then turns its back on God." "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."—Psalms 9:17.

STAND UP

Then let us dictate our God-given American heritage, in strength by numbers, equip ourselves with truth, and dedicate our lives to victory over the most ruthless conspiracy ever unloosened from hell. The night is far spent—if we do not as Americans take action immediately, we shall soon deserve the tyranny history inevitably imposes upon fools.

Military Coups in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, of the land where politician is a swearword, Ed Lahey of the Knight newspapers has made clear in a minimum of words our problem with Latin American military coups.

In spite of many briefings the reason for our own military being involved with these people who have used might to enforce tyranny is not quite clear to me; nor am I positive who is teaching who, what.

One American officer in attempting to explain the reason for military takeovers said to me, "Well, of course, the reason for the takeovers is that the politicians are so corrupt." He was speaking of Colonel Jimenez's takeover in Venezuela.

The article follows:

RECENT LATIN COUPS ARE LED BY U.S. "PALS"

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—Military officers in recent months have ousted civilian authorities in Guatemala, Peru, the Dominican Republic, and Honduras.

This has caused some hand wringing in Washington, where the belief has somehow developed that a few years of Alliance for Progress preachments about the democratic process will cure everything in Latin America.

Actually, the colonels with the machineguns—who have reacted to the new cult of democracy as though its advocates were beatniks or glue sniffers—are on our ball team.

These are the people who get the military aid we spend in Latin America. These same militarists are frequently free loading guests of the Pentagon on trips to the United States.

Many Latin American officers are also educated in U.S. military schools in Fort Leavenworth, Fort Benning, and elsewhere.

Even though Washington officially frowns on such recidivism as a 3 a.m. military coup in Latin America, the fact remains that these are our guys, as much so as the democratic leaders who have just been run out of town.

Democracy at least has made one good dent in Latin American manners. The losers in these nocturnal coups at least get a chance to leave town with a little walking-around money. Too often in the past they have been ventilated with machinegun slugs.

The really frightening thought about Latin American military coups is rarely brought into the open.

Suppose some morning there's a coup, and its leaders calls the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City and asks for further instructions?

The United States would find itself in another eyeball-to-eyeball nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union.

There are a few jurisdictions in Latin America where such a major tragedy could take place.

As has been pointed out in the past, the Latin American military coup is possible because the best brains find their way into the military organizations of these poverty-stricken countries.

To a poor boy with leadership qualities and a high I.Q., the military academy in his little Latin American homeland offers the best chance of an education.

It is to him what the church was to a boy in the Middle Ages—the only hope to find the level in life commensurate with his talents.

When this boy reaches the top of the military heap, along with others like himself, it is easy enough to make decisions that mean revolution or a coup, all in the name of "patriotism."

Leaky Batteries and Loose Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

LEAKY BATTERIES AND LOOSE MANAGEMENT

The Government's criticisms of industry's work in space are serious and should produce some managerial soul-searching. At the same time it seems the National Aeronautics and Space Administration itself is not wholly blameless.

Contractors for Project Mercury, which ended with Major Cooper's 22-orbit flight last May, are charged by NASA with deficiencies in workmanship. The agency cites, among other things, spare parts that were 50 percent defective, improperly installed valves, leaky storage batteries, capsules leaving the ground cluttered with loose washers, bolts, and wirecuttings.

Industry's poor performance is said to have helped delay the Nation's first manned orbital flight until 1962, after two Soviet astronauts had been orbited successfully. In the same vein, the General Accounting Office accuses industry of technical faults that played a major part in a $100 million loss and a 2-year delay in NASA's Atlas-Centaur rocket project.

The GAO, however, also brought NASA into its sights, criticizing it for inadequate management. And indeed it is hard to see how the agency can avoid shouldering some responsibility for the shortcomings.

The space program's rapid growth alone puts a huge strain on the industrial capabilities required to keep up with it; from a relatively small activity just a few years ago, it has rocketed to a far-flung enterprise with a current budget of some $5 billion. To that must be added the complexity of the diverse projects, the unbecoming climate notable in the political placing of installations, and the hurryup fever of a space race.

Given, in addition, project target dates that have turned out to be unrealistic and constant changes in plans, and the strain becomes greater still. Perhaps the wonder is that there haven't been even more mechanical failings.

None of this can fully explain poor workmanship. It does suggest the space agency may be shooting too far and too fast and in too many directions—in the process collecting a few loose washers and bolts of its own.

Domestic Farm Labor Recruiting Programs in Northern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, next week the Congress will have an opportunity to work its will on a 1-year extension of the Mexican treaty work program. I deplore slave labor, inadequate wages for a day's work, limitations on civil rights of workers. It is undoubtedly true that in many commodities in many States the farmer has the capability to make wages more adequate. The real deterrent to most unemployed accepting farm jobs is not that wages are inadequate or the work too difficult, but rather that agricultural labor is not covered by the State unemployment insurance laws.

Abrupt termination of the bracero program will not solve the problem, will clearly injure the farmer and martyr the recalcitrants. As further evidence of wage adequacy and farmers endeavoring to solve their own problems, I insert following a portion of a letter received from Mr. J. E. Price, field representative for California Packing Co.:

RIO VISTA, CALIF.,
October 4, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: In line with my letter of September 1963, I am offering some information on our domestic recruiting efforts. We are gratified that you are endeavoring to accumulate case histories on domestic farm labor recruiting programs in northern California. I would like to review for you our experiences in this area.

Our company has utilized the bracero program in a very limited way in recent years. However, we firmly believe in the necessity of a supplemental labor program for California agriculture for the foreseeable future due to the many specialized stoop labor crops which are grown here. Certainly they are needed to help feed the increased population expected in California and elsewhere. Prior to 1960 we utilized annually the services of nearly 2,000 braceros on our various California ranches. Our per man cost was $31.95 in 1957, $34 in 1958, and $31.34 in 1959.

We believe that mechanization will move forward and may alleviate the need for supplemental farm labor, but, again, on many of these specialty crops, it will be a number of years before agricultural engineers can develop proven harvest machines for field use that will reduce the need for seasonal harvest workers.

Regarding our domestic recruiting program, it is our feeling that we have been quite successful in having sizable numbers of domestic workers apply directly for employment at our ranches this past season, both for the asparagus harvest in San Joaquin County and for peach thinning and harvesting in Yuba, Sutter, and Merced Counties.

We are very happy about this. The average hourly earnings of qualified agricultural harvest workers in our San Joaquin County fields in 1963 were approximately $1.64 per hour. For peach thinning operations in Merced County in 1963, the average qualified farmworker, working on a piecework rate, earned $2.07 per hour. For the Merced County peach harvest recently completed, average earnings on a per box piece rate were $2.30 per hour. In each of these instances the average represents over 60 percent of the work force, all of whom were domestic workers.

The good earnings, good housing and working conditions, along with an active in-State and out-of-State recruiting program, have made it possible for us to operate without heavy dependence on braceros in recent years. We realize, however, that this could be a temporary situation if all California farmers were competing for this same labor. This is exactly what would happen should Public Law 78 cease operation as scheduled on December 31, 1963, and we are firmly convinced there just is not enough qualified domestic labor to fill the total need. No matter how one assesses the situation, the need for supplemental labor remains.

We have undertaken an active out-of-State recruitment program during the last 3 years and, as noted above, have achieved some degree of success. In 1960 we endeavored to operate through the California State Deparment of Employment annual worker plan in Texas. Our experience in this program was unsatisfactory, largely due to poor screening and inadequate follow-through by the service. We testified in this connection to the California State Senate Fact Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare (Report 1961 California Farm Labor Problems, pt. 1, p. 169). Subsequent to this experiment we have tried working through private employment agencies, and again our most recent experiment was not altogether satisfactory. A study of 253 workers recruited in 1963 showed 17.4 percent left us before going to work at all.

Yours very truly,

J. E. PRICE.

No. 15—Illinois: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to give the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Illinois, some interesting figures on the extent of gambling in that State.

In 1962, some $343 million was gambled legally on the horseraces in Illinois which gave the State about $23 million in revenue. This gambling activity made this State the third ranking in parimutuel betting in the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is only a small part of the State's gambling story. Illinois' share of national off-track betting figures presented to the McClellan committee stacks up as an amazing $2.8 billion. Gambling is like an iceberg. The part above the surface is only a tiny part of the whole action. On top of illegal betting on the horses, other forms of gambling must be considered. The New York State Investigations Commission would double off-track betting to arrive at total gambling turnover. That makes gambling in Illinois approach $5.6 billion a year.

Throughout the Nation, illegal gambling is the source of the operating revenues of organized crime. The syndicate's share of the total betting turnover in Illinois could very well reach over one-half billion dollars a year. A part of these funds is spent on corruption of the local political and law enforcement process.

If anything, the McClellan hearings proved that crime thrives on illegal gambling. If gambling were legalized, controlled and supervised, it could no longer finance the underworld. Underworld shrinkage would clean up the governmental process.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, a lot of birds can be killed with one stone by a national lottery.

Opposition to the Sale of Wheat to Communist Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, considerable controversy currently centers on whether or not American wheat should be supplied to any Communist nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars Department in my State of Maine has written me and advised of its sentiment with regard to this proposition, these views having been presented by Mr. Stanley E. Johnson, the department adjutant.

Because I consider these observations keen and appropriate to the moment, I insert Adjutant Johnson's letter in the RECORD:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF MAINE,

Togus, Maine, October 7, 1963.

Re sale of wheat to Communists.

Congressman CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McINTIRE: Maine VFW, representing more than 8,000 Maine families, is solidly opposed to any sale of wheat to any Communist nation.

We do not believe United States should underwrite Communist failures. This is not a humanitarian issue based upon natural disaster. It is a political maneuver to aid our sworn enemies.

Unless Communist powers show a true intent by paying United Nations assessments, abolishment of the wall, withdrawal of all government personnel—military and technical—from Cuba, etc., then we are just being played for suckers.

We gain nothing by such a deal. Communists have failed to pay morally obligated debts on lend-lease for 20 years, they play their own rules in U.N., reneging on legal assessments. They doubletalk in all directions on Cuba and Latin America.

The administration would save face on balance of gold. (If wheat was paid for which I doubt it would be.) Better the wheat should be dumped than used as a method to sell our birthright.

VFW is not of the far right—we are a patriotic organization with the Nation's welfare and future as our prime concerns.

If we bolster Communist failure in agriculture we are, in effect, also bolstering their policy of all-out armaments (which was more or less responsible for agriculture failure because of funds diverted to armament research, etc.).

Very sincerely yours,

STANLEY E. JOHNSON,
Department Adjutant.

Independence Day of Uganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Uganda celebrated the first anniversary of its independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President, Frederick Edward Mutesa II; and His Excellency the Prime Minister, A. Milton Obote, on this momentous occasion.

Yesterday, Uganda celebrated the first anniversary of its independence not as an independent dominion of the Queen of England but as a sovereign state. The Uganda National Assembly decided in late September that Uganda should sever its last links with the British Crown. Uganda will remain in the British Commonwealth, but the representative of the British Crown in Uganda, the Governor-General, will be replaced by a President of the sovereign state.

When Uganda achieved independence just a year ago, a 60-year period of British protection came to an end. In the 1890's and early 1900's agreements were signed between Britain and the native rulers of Uganda establishing a British protectorate over the territory. Prior to the arrival of the British two very different political systems existed in Uganda as a result of tribal immigrations over about a thousand-year period. The north and east was organized in small villages and clean communities, whereas in the south and west strongly centralized kingdoms, each with a hereditary ruler and native parliament, had developed. Several of these kingdoms have persisted to the present, with the result that the kingdoms of Buganda, Ankole, Bunyoro, and Toro, and the district of Busoga were granted federal status under the 1962 constitution. Under the Federal relationship the kingdoms have wide powers of legislation over local matters and finances, but the central government has full authority for public order and safety throughout Uganda. The Ugandan constitutional arrangement offers an interesting example of the adaptation of the Western federal system of government to African political traditions.

The first year of Uganda's independence has been one of stable political development under the able leadership of Prime Minister A. Milton Obote. Fur-

thermore, the Ugandan economy is sound and the country has a very favorable trade balance. Two agricultural crops—coffee and cotton—account for a large portion of the country's export earnings, but one of the objectives of a 5-year plan initiated in 1962 is to expand Uganda's already growing copper industry and to diversify further the economy. The government, in fact, anticipates an increase in the value of exports from £37.6 million in 1962 to between £43 and £45 million in 1963; it expects an increase in the gross national product from £155.2 million in 1962 to between £163 and £165 million in 1962.

Uganda will need some outside assistance, but the long-term economic outlook for this East African country is very favorable. Unemployment is not a serious problem, and Africanization of the civil service is progressing satisfactorily. Meanwhile, relations with Britain have remained friendly, and Uganda is benefiting from the expertise of British technicians and administrators who have agreed to stay on until Uganda's own population is adequately trained to meet the country's needs.

We congratulate the people of Uganda, Prime Minister Obote, and the other political leaders of Uganda on the first anniversary of their independence. May the future bring increasing political stability and economic development to a country which has already accomplished much in 1 short year of independence.

Government Versus Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Farmington Bugle entitled "Government Versus Private Enterprise." This small weekly newspaper is located in my district in the heart of our great country. This editorial reflects the growing concern at the grassroot level—not only in the Midwest, but throughout the entire Nation—with the ever increasing encroachment of the Federal Government on the free enterprise system. I highly recommend to my colleagues that they read this article:

GOVERNMENT VERSUS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

With a tax system such as the income tax of the Federal and State Governments, one would think these governments would welcome private citizens with enough nerve to risk their savings in enterprises that if profitable immediately become subject to a punitive tax for being successful.

But such is not the case, particularly with the Federal Government which is constantly extending its competition with taxpaying citizens and industry on which it depends for its revenue—for example, its unnecessary use of tax revenue to promote and build tax-exempt power systems, misnamed public power plants.

Such plants are not nearly so publicly owned as taxpaying investor-owned private enterprises in which millions of people have put their savings. These companies are first taxed 52 percent on their net earnings. Then the investor is taxed again on any dividend he gets.

These taxes are used to help pay for the Federal system which are tax exempt and called public plants. They can cut rates for privileged customers because they pay no taxes, but the general taxpayer must pay higher taxes to make up for the taxes that would have otherwise been generated by taxpaying power production.

The people will never get real relief until they turn thumbs down on political projects that kill private enterprise and thereby build toward a socialistic form of government from which we are spending billions to protect ourselves.

What Happened to the Progressive Income Tax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear a lot these days about the heavy tax burden borne by high-income people under our progressive income tax. The contention is that incentive has been taken out of our economic system by the exhorbitant percentages applied to incomes in the higher registers.

Some time ago a low-income taxpayer wrote me in this vein, observing that while he had nothing to gain from a change, he believed the rich deserved a better break under our tax laws. When I replied that there are millionaires who pay no income tax at all, he was incredulous.

Now comes Alvin Shuster, a staff reporter in the Washington bureau of the New York Times, who took pains to study the 1961 records of the Internal Revenue Service. The article he subsequently wrote, published in the New York Times magazine of September 15, 1963, may be an eye opener to many who have imagined that the progressive income tax is really progressive.

For example, Mr. Shuster points out that in 1961 there were 17 persons who made more than a million dollars who paid no tax at all.

He also cites the case of one taxpayer who made income totaling $20 million in 3 years who paid no income tax.

And finally, he observes that the effective tax on the total income of "Mr. Average Millionaire" that year was not 91 percent, or 75 percent, but 27.6 percent—just a little more than that of the average taxpayer in the $20,000 to $50,000 bracket.

The article follows:

OUR 398 MILLIONNAIRES: A NEW BREED

(By Alvin Shuster)

WASHINGTON.—It was easy in the old days to tell the millionaire from the rest of us. He had that private railroad car, courted Lillian Russell and assorted French actresses, imported chefs from Paris to prepare 20-course meals to be served on gold plates, swam in pools of white Venetian tile or Carrara marble, built "cottages" with 110 rooms and 45 baths and owned a Nile steamer just in case he went to Egypt.

Not so the millionaires of today. They live well but, for the most part, quietly, without the flamboyance of their predecessors. A few even live in the house with the 100-foot lot they bought 15 years ago before they hit it big. With a few exceptions, most are a little shy about it all. And even though one of their kind reached the White House by popular demand, many still feel ill at ease when publicly identified as "a millionaire."

Accordingly, it's difficult to calculate just how many of the breed are around these days. But the Internal Revenue Service, which naturally keeps its statistical eyes on such things, has just disclosed that the club is growing; 398 taxpayers had incomes of at least $1 million for 1961.

This was 92 more than in 1960, and the highest number since the record 513 in 1929 when the stock market hit its catastrophic peak. By 1932, the number had fallen to 20. But the millionaires fought back. In 1944, the figure inched to 62 and, by 1954, leaped to 201.

The income reports turned out by the service's experts who peeked at the returns obviously mention no names—it's against the law to reveal that kind of information. So the Service is not very helpful to those who would like to follow in the precise footsteps of the present-day 400 (minus 2). The Government may put out plenty of "how to" books ("How To Control Bedbugs") but you are on your own when it comes to trying to pinpoint just how to become a millionaire.

There are some facts around, of course. The experts tell you where most of the millionaires earned their money, how many got tax refunds, whether they paid alimony, whether they were big givers to charity, how sick they were, how many dependents they have, what States they hail from, and other such tidbits.

Surprisingly, they also tell you that there were 17 taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of over $1 million who paid no income tax at all for a variety of legitimate reasons.

Obviously, the 398 are not the only millionaires in the country. There's a difference between "wealth" and "income" and there are probably thousands worth more than a million who reported less in income. Their wealth was in property, or businesses, or stocks, or jewels, or tax-exempt local bonds, among other assets. For example, 16,600 taxpayers reported they got dividend checks in 1960 totaling more than $50,000. This means, assuming a 4-percent return on their dough, that they had stocks valued at more than $1 million.

A neat package of facts about these thousands is impossible to come by. But perhaps a lesson or two can be learned from the preliminary figures on 1961's "over a million" 398 and from the more detailed figures on 1960's 306.

California, which has now edged New York for the population title, falls short on millionaires. New York had 84 in the club in 1960, while California, with 17, sits fifth behind Delaware with 23, and Pennsylvania and Illinois with 22 each. Texas reports 15, but this is clearly misleading: a Texas oilman can pocket 27½ percent of his profits as depletion before he even begins to figure his income.

Nineteen States, including the newest, Alaska and Hawaii, had none. And if there were any big winners in Las Vegas that year, you couldn't tell it from the tax returns. Nobody in Nevada reported an income over $1 million.

How did the 398 do it? "Mr. Average Millionaire" in 1961 showed an adjusted gross income of $1,907,165. Most of it—59.8 percent or $1,140,000—came from capital gains, buying low and selling high stocks, real estate, or other property. By earning the

majority of his income this way, he kept more than if he "worked" for it and earned a salary. Capital gains are never taxed at more than 25 percent under present law, while the rates on other income go up to 91 percent.

Of the 1961 group, 137 "didn't work"; they showed no income from salaries and wages. And those who did get paychecks averaged "only" $48,800 a year, a piddling 3 percent of their total reported take.

Next to capital gains, the biggest moneymaker for these millionaires was dividends. Some 35.7 percent of the average income, $681,300, came in dividend checks—a huge portfolio of stocks his mother left him or he managed to build up himself. Thus 95.5 percent of the total income came from just two sources—capital gains and dividends.

But Mr. Millionaire had some losses, too. He reported an average business setback of $35,000. Don't fret. Tax experts say few millionaires lose money because of the fortunes of fate. The tax laws provide incentives for "losing ventures" and some of the losses may have come from racing stables that never seem to produce winners.

Apart from helping describe in general terms how he makes his money, the bare statistics also show a few other things about the millionaire taxpayer.

Some, for example, would appear to be moonlighting. The 1961 figures show that 58 of them in effect had "more than 11 job." Actually, they show that that many get social security tax refunds, because the tax was withheld at more than one source. Presumably these men were drawing salaries as officers or directors from more than one company.

As for their ages, 100 of them were over 65 in 1960.

As for their families, they had an average of four exemptions, about the same as ordinary people.

As for their married lives, 10 of them paid alimony averaging $24,000 a year each. As this doesn't reflect any huge multimillion dollar lumpsum divorce settlements.

As for their bad luck, 77 reported casualty and theft losses: uninsured jewels stolen, uninsured racehorses dying, an uninsured yacht sunk. This totaled $1,220,000.

As for their big hearts, they gave an average of 15 percent of their incomes to charity. But there was one, in 1960, who gave less than $100, and 14 others who gave less than $500.

As for their bookkeeping, 63 paid too much in advance; 5 of them got tax refunds totaling $127 million, and the 58 others applied the surplus, totaling $2,900,000, to their next year's tax bills.

And, as for their health, 12 had medical deductions of over $10,000. (A taxpayer has to have medical expenses over 3 percent of his gross income before he can take any deductions, so this means that those 12 had medical costs of at least $40,000.)

But perhaps the most amazing of all to the layman are the 17 in 1961 who made more than a million dollars and paid no tax at all. Presumably these are men of inherited wealth who escaped taxes through a loophole known as "unlimited charitable deductions." In simple terms, they donated the equivalent of their incomes to charities under a rule that says you can deduct all such contributions without limit if you have been giving away an amount that equals most of your income in the past 8 to 10 years.

What happens is that a millionaire gives away a piece of property that originally cost very little, but deducts the value of it at today's prices. This could be real estate or securities in his family for years. For example, one taxpayer had an income totaling almost $20 million in the 3 years beginning in 1958, yet he paid no income tax.

Thus, through a variety of methods, particularly with the help of the lower capital gains tax, millionaires in general have managed to get their tax rate down considerably. In 1961, the experts figure, the effective tax on total income of "Mr. Average Millionaire" was 27.6 percent. This is only a little more than the average tax bill of individuals in the $20,000 to $50,000 income group.

Indeed, the most heavily taxed people in the country are those with incomes of $500,000 to $750,000. The typical taxpayer in that group, with income mostly from salaries rather than investments, is the only one who pays out more than 50 percent in Federal taxes.

In short, if at all possible, become a millionaire.

Kennedy's Space Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in the controversy begun by the President's sudden suggestion of a joint Soviet-American moon effort, the views of the space experts and the industry itself seem to have been overlooked. The September 30, 1963, edition of Aviation Week and Space Technology, for example, carries an editorial by Robert Hotz indicating the blow that may have been dealt the space effort by the President's off-the-cuff remark at the United Nations.

For the past 2 years we have been hearing about the race to the moon, and the apparently overriding consideration of American versus Soviet prestige. Now, no one really knows how much money we need, or whether the effort is still on. The prospects of a reduced budget are enticing at this point in our budgetary picture, but in fact a combined effort may ultimately cost us even more than we now expect to pay alone.

Aviation Week and Space Technology raises the question of why would the Soviets be interested? The answer would undoubtedly be because they have fallen behind and need additional information. Our past exchanges of technological missions, the magazine points out, have been a flop on the part of the United States gaining any new information, and a possible success for the Russians.

Yet there does not seem to be any sound scientific, technological or political reason for assuming that the Soviet Union has any interest in the idea. That the President was aware of this is indicated by testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, dealing with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget. On August 19 of this year, more than a month before the President's speech, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, NASA's Deputy Administrator said:

In my discussions with (Soviet Lt. Gen. Anatoly A.) Blagonravov, the question of cooperation in manned space flights was mentioned in the early part, but was pretty well dropped as something that was not practical.

Dr. Dryden, our chief negotiator with the Russians on space matters, then went on to indicate that the secrecy attached by the Russians to the program would bar joint space efforts of this nature. His superior, Dr. James E. Webb, said that he saw no evidence of any opportunity on the part of the United States to gain anything significant from such an effort.

It is clear, therefore, that the suggestion by President Kennedy was made up on the spur of the moment, and was a political play. I do not think it does our prestige any good, however, to advance an illogical suggestion for publicity purposes. This "attempting to create a fleeting political impression," as Aviation Week calls it, may well "cast grave doubts on the sincerity," not of just this administration, but of the Untied States itself, in other fields.

I have long questioned the use of so much money to put two people on the face of the moon, when we do not spend a fraction of that amount to move millions of American citizens on the face of the earth through mass transportation development. Both these programs were claimed as priority items by the Kennedy administration earlier this year. Mass transportation legislation lies unwanted in the Rules Committee which is controlled by the Democratic majority, because of the administration's failure to live up to its promised efforts on the bill's behalf. Now moving a man to the moon appears to be joining the effort to move a man to work. Far from getting the country moving again, the Kennedy administration has brought it to a standstill.

The editorial from Aviation Week follows:

KENNEDY'S SPACE BOOMERANG

President Kennedy has dealt his own national space program its hardest blow. This extraordinary feat of political contortion was achieved with his recent United Nations speech appealing to the Soviet Union to share this Nation's effort in a joint program to land men on the moon. No matter how hard the White House apologists try to recast recent history, this speech represented a basic shift in U.S. space policy that is losing political support for the program and braking much of the technical momentum already achieved. It is also a good example of the brittle brilliance of the White House staff members who spawn scintillating ideas without much thought on their ramifications and are continually surprised by the fires they ignite.

IMMEDIATE EFFECTS

The immediate effects of the President's ill-conceived invitation to the Soviets to join the U.S. Apollo program are twofold:

First, it will provide congressional opponents of his space program with the well-sharpened ax they need to cut its fiscal 1964 budget drastically and retard U.S. space progress even more than the restrictions of technical development. It has changed the fiscal 1964 NASA budget bill from an essential instrument to achieve a top-priority national goal essential to this Nation's security and international leadership into what can easily be construed by its opponents as a Russian foreign aid bill. It also leaves the congressional supporters of the President's space program with neither inclination nor ability to defend it successfully.

Second, it will induce a psychological drag into the vast program that has just begun to build promising technical momentum. It may change the motivation of several million Americans who are involved in all phases of the manned space flight effort from a patriotic sense of extreme urgency to a routine 9–5 job in which the fruits of their labors may be retailed to the Soviet Union.

The long-term effects are difficult to perceive in detail, but there is little doubt that the manned space flight program faces the prospect of dwindling from one of the most exciting challenges ever accepted by a nation to an unimportant pawn in the cold war to be sacrificed in the first gambit of appeasement.

There are certainly many indications that the Soviets are finding the current U.S. pace in space technology a serious challenge to their present claim of international leadership in this vital area. During the period of their unquestioned leadership they were not interested in exchanging any technical data on their manned space flight programs with anybody. Now that they are feeling the pinch, they are making overtures to tap U.S. technology.

To understand just how the Soviets view technical exchanges, it is worth recalling the few experiences in the aerospace field of recent years.

Andrei Tupolev was shown the modern Convair plant at San Diego, then producing F–106 supersonic interceptors, and the Douglas plant, where Thor ballistic missiles were being built. When USAF brass visited Moscow they were shown the two oldest aircraft factories in Russia—one producing jet engines of British design, and the other, Serge Ilyushin's versions of a Convair 240 transport. Who benefited most from that exchange?

AEROFLOT VISIT

When an Aeroflot delegation visited the United States as a preliminary to negotiations for a bilateral air transport agreement, they were given a thorough look at U.S. airline operations, including inspection of a modern jet overhaul operation. When the U.S. group arrived in the U.S.S.R. for reciprocity, they were denied access to any jet engine overhaul facilities and shown more operahouses and ballets than Aeroflot operations. Who benefited most from that exchange?

The Soviet contributions to international space technology gatherings in recent years have been vapid and inconsequential compared with the data that they have obviously garnered from their pioneering efforts.

The shock of the President's lunar landing policy reversal has not yet been fully felt, either technically or politically. This casual act that could divert the purpose of a vast technological effort and billions of taxpayers dollars in attempting to create a fleeting political impression must certainly cast grave doubts on the sincerity of many other phases of the Kennedy administration's program.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Heavenly Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a short article by Mr. Jack Kurtz appearing in the company publication of Kirkhill Rubber Co. which is located in my district.

In very few words Mr. Kurtz points up the fatal results on printing-press money which leads to inflation. It took France 40 years to devalue their currency 97 percent, while in this country, our currency and the purchasing power of the dollar has been reduced 54 percent in the last 25 years. I commend Mr. Kurtz for his forthright views on the subject.

HEAVENLY DOLLARS

Paper money floated down from the skies all day long over every part of the world.

People scooped it up; everybody was a millionaire.

Everybody quit work. Why work when everybody had all the money he could use—and more?

Not a wheel turned in any shop; crops lay unharvested in the fields; no typewriter key was touched in any office; no trains ran; no gas station was open.

No one was producing anything.

Within a short time the supply of goods ran out, the shelves were bare, there was nothing more to put on them.

Everybody had money, but there were no things being produced to buy with their money.

The important fact is that money can never take the place of things; our Nation's high standard of living depends upon production.

We all want more of the goods and services which raise the standard of living for ourselves and our families.

But we cannot get more of these things by merely adding more dollars to our paychecks unless we can, at the same time, increase our production.

America is richest, not when it rains money, but when its rains production.

JACK KURTZ.

Discrimination Against Handicapped Persons Must Be Ended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, discrimination in employment is being practiced today not only against Negroes, but also against Negroes and whites alike because of individual handicaps or disabilities.

This is a great injustice affecting many men and women who, if given the opportunity, would be fully able to perform as well or better than those without handicaps. As a recent New York Times editorial points out, rehabilitation programs are thriving. Many handicapped persons are being trained for productive employment. They deserve and should get equal opportunity from the Nation's employers.

Under unanimous consent I include the New York Times editorial of September 24, 1963, calling for an end to these discriminatory practices toward the handicapped, in the RECORD at this point:

JOBS FOR THE DISABLED, TOO

Much attention is deservedly being given these days to the discrimination that bars Negroes from entering and progressing in many trades and professions. At the same moment in history another group of persons—white and Negro—in American society deserves to get an even, or more than even, break in employment. These are the handicapped and the disabled.

Figures just released show that in the year ended June 30 a total of 110,136 men and women were rehabilitated into productive jobs under a State-Federal program. This is a new record. The fact that disabled persons can do excellent work is nothing new to organizations dedicated to serving the handicapped. Employers, personnel directors, supervisors, foremen and co-workers should rid themselves of discriminatory practices toward the handicapped. Not merely for compassion's sake, but to help their own businesses.

Passamaquoddy Project To Benefit Massachusetts Industries and Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, in a special report to President Kennedy, stated that the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power project and the companion Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Power Development are "economically feasible" and should be constructed for the benefit of the United States. As I have stated on previous occasions, congressional approval of the Quoddy-St. John project will be a giant step forward to bring abundant power and lower electricity to Massachusetts, as well as to the other New England States.

Not long ago; a New England newspaper columnist declared: "Where there is cheap power in large amounts, industry follows." He added that the people of our area are forced today to choose between remaining a potential economic distressed area or developing a major base for industry. This choice faces all of New England.

Too many of us for too long have looked with envy at the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest, with their low-cost Federal power and resulting industrial development. I believe it is time to take a positive approach, by developing our own power resources here in New England.

The road to low-cost power and industry is clear. Construction of the Passamaquoddy and St. John River projects in Maine can inject inexpensive Federal hydroelectric power into our Massachusetts economy. Thanks to the technical improvements in high-voltage transmission, the benefit of "Quoddy" can be spread over a larger area.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has told President Kennedy that, on the basis of his Department's new study, the billion-dollar Passamaquoddy and St. John River power projects will completely pay for themselves, and result in no burden on the taxpayers generally. New recreational areas can be developed in conjunc-

tion with power, bringing tourists and profits to the region. I am especially interested in Secretary Udall's recommendation that the project include two high-voltage transmission lines from Passamaquoddy to Boston, bringing the power into the heart of New England.

Just how important is this new power source to Massachusetts? We must consider this question both from the standpoint of the average homeowner and of the workingman whose job may depend upon the health of Massachusetts industry and the rate of its growth.

Federal Power Commission figures show that the residential consumer in Massachusetts pays 33.5 percent more than the average consumer does nationwide.

Manufacturing industries in New England are even worse off than residential users. In 1960 New England manufacturing industries paid the highest electric rate per kilowatt-hour of any in the Nation, 65 percent more than the national average, and 181 percent more than in the eastern south-central region that includes the TVA.

Does this hamper our industries? Obviously it does. A reduction of only one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour in 1960 would have saved our industries $11.4 million. Does it prevent new industry from coming to our area? It has been a factor in many cases, and a determining factor in some. All of us have seen the impact of the Niagara-St. Lawrence projects on upstate New York, we can recall the upsurge in industry in the Pacific Northwest during the great era of dam building and the revitalization of the Tennessee Valley.

Recently, Profs. Thomas P. Bergin and William F. Eagan of Notre Dame polled 5,000 companies which have expanded or relocated in 7 Southern States during the past 5 years. There were 1,800 replies to their questionnaire, giving reasons for their decision in order of importance.

A total of 229 listed electric power as an important reason, and 18 listed it as the most important. I might add that convenience to markets, availability of suitable buildings or sites, and availability of labor were the three most frequently mentioned reasons. Lower labor costs, which frequently is given credit for the new industry of the South, was in first place with only 38 industries, and favorable tax structure was considered most important by only 16.

Massachusetts, as well as the other New England States, can offer convenience to markets, good transportation, skilled labor, and many outstanding plant sites. If we bring Passamaquoddy and St. John River projects into being we can offer low-cost power, too.

Several years ago the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sampled nine counties—again, primarily in the Southeast—to determine what impact a new industry has on a community. The purpose was to measure statistically the effect of 100 new industrial jobs on various other economic and social factors in the counties sampled. Here are some of those effects:

One hundred new industrial jobs meant $590,000 more personal income per year, 4 more retail establishments, $360,000 more retail sales per year, and, most important, 174 more workers employed. In other words, each 100 new industrial jobs also created 74 new jobs in other industries—33 in retail trade, 25 in construction, 14 in professional and related services, plus a few in other types of work.

The great differential in power costs has graphic meaning when stated in terms of the experience of a specific manufacturing establishment. The president of a Massachusetts textile manufacturing company wrote me a few days ago and said very candidly:

> If we expect industry to develop and grow in New England, these power rates must be brought in line with comparable rates charged elsewhere.

He added that "we * * * are almost forced to consider seriously the feasibility and desirability of remaining" in Massachusetts. "In fact," he declared, "we are studying the relative merits of several other locations in the South."

The president of this textile company told me that in 1961 his firm purchased slightly more than 3 million kilowatt-hours of electricity at an average cost of 1.5267 cents per kilowatt-hour. That was 62 percent higher than the average cost of power purchased by the textile industry, nationally, in 1961.

If this Massachusetts textile manufacturer had been able to buy power at the average national rate for his industry, his company would have saved more than $18,000 in 1961. That saving would have amounted to 38 percent of his total power bill, which was $47,000.

This textile company president also told me that his power bill, next to wage and salary costs, is his largest single expense. While I have compared this company's power costs with the national average for the textile industry, the president of this firm was far more specific. He has compared his power bill in Massachusetts with the rate he would pay if his plant relocated in the South. He found that his present power bill is 55 percent higher than it would be in one southern city and 144 percent higher than it would be in another southern city.

Projecting the savings in power costs over a 10-year period, this Massachusetts textile company found it would save a minimum of $240,000 and a maximum of $420,000 on power costs by leaving Massachusetts and relocating in the South.

With planned additions of new equipment, this textile company estimates its annual power costs will be about $70,000. The 10-year savings by relocation will thus be the equivalent of from 3½ to 6 years of free electric power.

Now this is a serious problem for this company, for all manufacturing plants in Massachusetts and for our entire region. We do not want to lose our industry. We do not want to see men and women left without jobs.

To my colleagues from the South, let me say emphatically that neither do we want your region to raise its electric rates.

What we in New England want is action to reduce power rates in New England. We can move in this direction by harnessing and developing our water resources.

With Passamaquoddy as a start, and the New England region's additional 2.6 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydropower as future potential, we will have the tools with which to build a reinvigorated economy. With a real effort to bring electric rates down through integration of this hydro with efficient steam generators—both conventional and nuclear—and an orderly pattern of electric transmission, we can help create the kind of economic climate which will result in new industrial growth, new jobs, and a new spirit of progress.

After all, it was the water wheels of New England which sparked our Nation's first industrial revolution. The 20th century counterparts of these water driven generators can bring a new era of prosperity.

Bell System Teaching Aids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. has created what it calls the high school science program, involving the use in public high schools of Bell System educational aids. They have produced machines and kits which are used in schools throughout the country to bring science to life for students and teachers alike, and which also provide an opportunity for teachers to explain to the students some of the problems facing our modern industries. This program is proving itself a significant contribution by industry to the raising of quality and broadening of scope in secondary school science education. The Bell System feels that it has a responsibility to American education and is trying to fulfill that responsibility through this program, and for this attitude and effort I feel they should be commended.

In the summer issue of the Bell Telephone magazine there appeared an article by Dwight A. Johnson and Gordon I. Robertson which discusses the developments and successes of this program. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BELL SYSTEM HAS A RESPOSIBILITY TO AMERICAN EDUCATION: ONE WAY IN WHICH WE ARE TRYING TO FULFILL THAT RESPONSIBILITY IS THROUGH THE HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE PROGRAM

(By Dwight A. Johnson and Gordon I. Robertson)

In Terre Haute, Ind., strange looking devices take shape in a high school workshop. The materials are mostly straight pieces of coat hangers, washers, and wire. Put together, they look like nothing more than neat rows of rods joined together by a wire down the middle.

They're more than that. A supervising director in the Washington, D.C., public school system calls the device "a major contribution to the understanding of wave phenomena. Seldom in my experience has a teaching aid caught on as quickly as has this wave machine." And in Chicago, Ill., the board of education orders 23 of them.

These are brief samples from the record being made by "the Bell kits," as high school science teachers call them. More exactly, they are the teaching aids of the Bell System aid to high school science program. The wave machine is only one of them, and the collection of anecdotes about them runs long.

In Springfield, Mass., 100 advanced students at the Technical High School's summer science course combine chemicals, heat, perserverance, and plain hard work. The aim: 50 working solar cells made from slabs of silicon.

Not all of them make it, but many do. One is Jim Flynn, and he's proud of it: "I wish to thank the Bell Telephone Laboratories, American Telephone & Telegraph, and New England Telephone & Telegraph for making these kits possible. Thank you all, again, thank you all, 'cause mine works."

"THERE'S MORE TO MAGNETISM THAN SHAKING A LOT OF IRON FILINGS ONTO A PIECE OF PAPER"

In schools across the country magnetism will never be taught the same again because of another Bell unit, and among their science students the term "ferromagnetic domains" is no more erudite than H_2O. "My students are learning there is more to magnetism than shaking a lot of iron filings onto a piece of paper," writes a North Carolina teacher.

Last summer Michigan State University asked for 53 units of the experiment called "From Sun to Sound," put 53 teachers to work making sun-powered audio oscillators. Reason given: To update their course content. The science consultant for the Minnesota Department of Education calls this unit one of the finest I have seen. The accompanying manuals fulfill what we have been harping about for years—depth. I would not hesitate to endorse or recommend widespread use of this material in our schools.

These are some of the new aids to science teaching designed by the Bell System. But the materials know no Bell System boundaries in their use. Terre Haute, for example, is a General Telephone community, and from the beginning the independent telephone companies have participated in the program.

The reason for this industrywide character of the program comes from its main purpose: To aid American education, not just education in Bell territories.

THE BELL SYSTEM HAS NO SECRETS

In its 3 years, the program has become well known to high school science teachers. It has also become well known to industrial organizations outside the telephone industry. Recently, a leading chemical company wanted to learn about it in detail; what they found out may be of interest to others.

First, the chemical company discovered that the Bell System has no secrets about its school relations. What the system has learned it would like to share with every industry that has the technical competence to give significant aid to American education. Without that competence the effort won't work anyway.

A company has to ask itself, What is our main purpose? Is it to get into the schools or is it to give valid, needed aid to education? If it's the former, the program won't work; not since World War II and least of all today.

If it's the latter aim there is at least a chance of success. This is the aim which makes the Bell System program an unusual one: it is designed to answer educators' needs, not company needs.

The fact is that science teachers need some aid from industry. But the restrictions are many. The aid must be quite specifically what the teachers need and want, because their curriculums are crowded as never before. And the aid must come from the kind of organizations which have unique competence to provide it.

NO FORCE HELPING THE INDIVIDUAL OR THE NATION TO GROW IS STRONGER THAN EDUCATION

Why the Bell System makes the effort to meet educators' needs is revealed in a formal "Statement of Objective—School and College Relations." Essentially, it recognizes that no force helping the individual or the Nation to grow is stronger than education, and it recognizes that the Bell System has a responsibility to American education.

Partly this is the normal obligation of corporate citizenship. But it is more than that. Ours is an increasingly technical business, and we take some of the best men and women that the schools prepare for science and engineering careers. It's only fair that we reinvest some of their contributions to science and technology by sharing these with the schools that trained them. This is also in our own best interest. The Bell System will benefit just as the Nation benefits—from better teachers and abler young scientists and engineers.

"IT USED TO TAKE YEARS TO GET NEW DISCOVERIES INTO THE CURRICULUM"

The people who make these aids possible are of course the scientists and engineers of Bell Telephone Laboratories. They make technological progress faster than it can be put into textbooks. According to R. B. Scheetz, school-industry coordinator for the State of New Jersey, it used to take years to get new discoveries into the curriculum, but with the cooperating industry's help it can now be done quite promptly.

The laboratories' scientists and engineers develop the teaching aids assisted by their educational aids and film production departments. The wave demonstration machine was devised by John Shive, inventor of the phototransistor and the laboratories' director of education and training. E. A. Nesbitt, an expert in magnetism, prepared the materials on ferromagnetic domains. George Frost, a member of the education aids department designed the "From Sun to Sound" experiment. Daryl Chapin, a coinventor of the Bell solar battery, contributed the solar energy experiment.

This fall, the telephone companies will introduce two new teaching units. These are on the physics and biology of speech and hearing and were developed by three specialists in the field, Peter Denes, Eliot Pinson, and Cecil Coker.

Bell Laboratories has distinctive competence in all of these fields of study, and educators have asked us for help in each area. That is the character of the program.

How does a company know what teachers need? It asks them at every opportunity. It convenes with them at meetings designed for this purpose, meets with them individually, participates in their conventions, reads their publications, studies their curriculums and their class texts, and occasionally hires them to assist in the day-to-day development of the materials.

Educators play an important part in selecting the subjects that Bell Laboratories develops. Each year, formal presentations of possible subjects are made to groups of educators. Last year, for example, there were three such meetings—in New York, Cleveland, and San Francisco. In each case, about 25 leading teachers and administrators were invited from the surrounding territory. The local operating company was the host and representatives of Bell Laboratories and A.T. & T. made the presentation.

In the final running last year were six subjects: Masers, superconductivity, computer mathematics, crystallography, satellite communications physics, and biophysical communications—each an important area of laboratories work.

THE PROOF OF THE PUDDING IS IN THE EATING

When the three meetings were over this year's subject was selected: biophysical communications. The great majority also recommended that two kinds of units be developed on this subject—one kind for use by the teacher before the entire class and the other for use by the advanced or specially able student.

The result, as teachers are now learning, is "The Speech Chain—The Physics and Biology of Speech and Hearing," for classroom use, and the "Speech Synthesis" experiment for the superior student.

However, the advice of educators did not end with choosing a subject. Several months later in Washington, D.C., another meeting was held. Nationally recognized educators attended, including staff members of the National Science Teachers Association and the U.S. Office of Education. This time laboratories people presented the partially developed teaching aids they were working on. This was a final check to see if we were on the right track. The educators concurred ("schools need such expert help," said one) and also gave several useful suggestions that were used in the final development.

There was some further trial use of equipment by teachers and students. Altogether, their participation in the formative stages of a project's development is the only way a company can be reasonably sure its aid to education is really aid.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. High school science teachers across the country know about the aids and more and more are using them. One reason the materials are so well-known is that Robert H. Carleton, executive secretary of the NSTA, has endorsed the program in letters to each high school physics and chemistry teacher in the country. "Put together by scientists and science teachers," he describes the materials, "these resources offer educators a unique opportunity to expand their effectiveness."

Another reason the materials are so well-known is due to the efforts of the telephone companies—Bell and independent alike. Theirs is a program of information, not promotion. Their role is to let the teachers and administrators know what the materials are, and that they are available. To accomplish this, the companies find it best to invite teachers to meetings where they can describe the year's offering to them.

Meetings are held because the science subjects presented are difficult. They are at the forefront of technology. The teachers know little about them and they want to know more. When the telephone company engineer gives his presentation, he is helping the teachers keep up to date.

The meetings take a lot of effort—some for the teachers and a good deal for the telephone engineers and commercial and school relations men and women who do the work. But there's every indication they're worth it. You know the teachers are gaining something from them when one writes that a demonstration was "a magnificent performance, both scientifically and educationally. It was a pleasure for me personally to observe a 'master' teacher in action." The writer is Samuel Schenberg, director of science for New York City schools.

A NEW KIND OF RESPONSIBILITY TO EDUCATION

Today, what the educators tell us serves as a most important barometer. A few years ago, their advice caused the Bell System to establish the program.

It was 1959. The international race in space had begun. The Nation was bemoaning its lack of engineering and scientific

manpower, and people were blaming most everyone—including teachers—for the various technological gaps.

Against this backdrop, people in several parts of the Bell System saw that an industry like ours has a new kind of responsibility to education. As it happened, in quite a short time their views coalesced and a task force was formed to determine how the Bell System might improve its assistance to schools—if and where educators desired assistance.

The task force talked with educators and studied existing education programs in and out fo the Bell System. In short, the conclusion was that the greatest need the system might fill is in secondary school science education and that one of the best ways to serve it is to develop teaching aids in certain areas of science.

It is interesting to look back on what teachers told us they needed because it very well describes what the aid to high school science program is today.

They said they needed material that bolsters weak spots in school texts. This, they frankly admitted, would help them raise their own level of teaching competence and help them narrow the widening gap between the laboratory and the classroom.

They looked for material that would help stretch the imagination and thinking power of the better student whose talents move him ahead of the class. Specifically they asked for projects which would tie together some of the disciplines the student had studied and which would provide exercise in problem solving. We were warned against providing material of the solder wire A to contact B type.

A REAL CHALLENGE TO THE STUDENT

The need for such advanced student projects produced the science experiments "From Sun to Sound," "Solar Energy," and "Speech Synthesis." These are open-ended projects; by substituting problems and modifying design, different results can be achieved. When they are satisfactorily completed, they become laboratory teaching devices for the teacher.

These units are difficult. Unlike the electronic kits one finds on the market today, says one educator, these experiments offer a real challenge to the student wishing to sample what a scientist goes through during the course of an experiment.

"I was simply amazed at the number of topics which were thoroughly covered by the text" (accompanying "From Sun to Sound"), wrote a teacher. An Ohio student would probably agree: "Before I started this experiment," he reported, "I thought I had a fair knowledge of electricity. But after I read the book I found out that I had known very little. I hope to improve this situation."

Educators also asked the 1959 Bell System task force for materials that can be used in teaching the entire class, something beyond their own resources that either illustrates important physical concepts or informs where their own information is slight.

The result of that request has been the teacher-oriented classroom units on wave behavior, ferromagnetic domains, and speech and hearing. They include demonstration devices, books, and films—all developed at Bell laboratories.

Some of these have even been used to teach teachers. The wave machine has been used by one school system to train elementary science consultants, to help them teach pupils something of the phenomena of light. The materials on speech and hearing, some educators have suggested, will be useful to speech and psychology instructors and teachers of the hard of hearing.

It comes as a surprise to some that a number of the demonstration devices must be purchased by the schools. It is an arrangement that has worked well. Teachers know it costs the Bell System money to develop the devices, and schools are willing to pay the moderate unit cost set by the private manufacturers. Quantity orders of the books are also purchased from the publisher. Information about the materials, and some of the items themselves are available from telephone business offices. The films are loaned to the schools. The advanced student experiments, single copies of books, and the record associated with "The Speech Chain" are free. Invariably, however, they are given to teachers or administrators, not to students or their parents. Generally the teacher can best decide which students can benefit from the materials, and when.

How successful is the program? Surveys have been made and they certainly show that educators endorse Bell System Aids to High School Science. One recent study was made among 269 teachers and administrators, most of whom had attended company meetings introducing the teaching aids. This 4-State study revealed that 7 out of 10 teachers have used at least 1 of the aids in their classes and many of those who have not yet used them plan to.

Members of the professional opinion research organization making the study told us they never enjoyed an assignment as much as this one. Nearly everyone they talked to was enthusiastic about the program, they said.

To date, more than 38,000 advanced student experiments have been presented to teachers, more than 80,000 instruction books are in the schools, more than a thousand wave machines have been purchased by schools and untold others have been built by students from instructions in Dr. Shive's book. Ferromagnetic Domains demonstrations and all the films are increasingly in use.

In spite of the evidence, there is no sure way to evaluate this program. Many of its benefits may not be apparent for years. But there are strong indications that the Bell System is "providing an excellent, needed service," as a New Jersey principal, E. J. Piel, describes the program. It will continue, with the cooperation of educators, as long as it serves that useful purpose.

That will likely be for some time to come. A good reason is given by Fr. Francis Heidig, assistant director of education for the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C. "Let's face it," says Father Heidig, "what organization is better equipped?"

National Helium Corp. Dedication Ceremonies, Liberal, Kans., September 24, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are naturally proud of industrial development within their districts, so you will understand my special interest in the world's largest helium plant, which is located in my district at Liberal, Kans. On September 24, 1963, the plant owned by National Helium Corp., was dedicated in a most impressive ceremony.

Our Kansas Governor, John Anderson, Jr., pointed out in the proclamation presented to National Helium Corp., that natural gas reserves in Kansas have played a significant role in the economic growth of Kansas and the Nation, and the vast Hugoton Field, two-thirds of which lies within the borders of Kansas, has assumed new importance because it contains the free world's major source of helium-bearing natural gas. The indispensable role of helium in U.S. space programs, coupled with the vast development in Kansas, and the national policy providing for the conservation of helium, prompted Governor Anderson to proclaim the week of September 22–28, "Helium Conservation Week" in Kansas.

There were many highlights during the dedication ceremony, and for the benefit of Members and others interested, I include herewith the remarks of F. J. McElhatton, president of National Helium Corp., and master of ceremonies, and at the dedication the remarks of W. J. Maguire, chairman and president of Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. Their remarks are symbolic of the spirit prevailing in western Kansas and of the proper role of Federal-State cooperation in the development and conservation of this most important resource.

ADDRESS BY W. G. MAGUIRE AT THE NATIONAL HELIUM CORP. DEDICATION CEREMONIES, SEPTEMBER 24, 1963

We are gathered here today to mark a new beginning for National Helium Corp.

It was right here in Seward County that Panhandle Eastern got its start in the natural gas business. That was December 1929. A lot of gas has passed through the pipelines since.

We were a struggling organization in those days—struggling with the problems of financing a new company in what amounted to a brand new industry; struggling with the problems of adopting a new technology in transmitting natural gas hundreds of miles; struggling with selling a new energy source to people who had been used to other fuels and manufactured gas for about 100 years.

These and many other obstacles were overcome, not by wishing them away but by rolling up our sleeves and going to work.

While I cannot, in a brief time, recount all those frustrating but exciting events, one or two observations seem to be in order.

That we succeeded—and when I say "we" I mean the entire natural gas industry—in becoming a major force in the economy was by no means an accident. There was then, and I like to think there still is, a fierce devotion to private enterprise that enabled us to move ahead.

We built a better mousetrap, so to speak, and we sold it. As sales improved, we were able to reward the investors who, gaining confidence in the concept, placed additional funds to work, which enabled us to expend the business, buying and building and creating jobs and generating economic activity.

In the early years, we acquired production properties and built the first pipeline. Subsequently, during the 20-year period from 1943 to 1963, our investors supplied an additional $563 million for this enterprise. The value of our properties is now vastly greater than the amounts invested. In short, we have been working to create a profit for our investors who supplied all of those funds.

And what has been the result in the modern natural gas industry?

Today nearly one-third of the Nation's energy supply comes from natural gas. About 35 million customers use natural gas. Panhandle serves about 5 million of them. Something over half of the natural gas marketed is consumed by industry which has come to rely on this modern fuel to stay competitive.

May I say too that none of this has come about by virtue of Government directive.

My intention is not to give you a natural gas sales talk but rather to use the experience of this industry to illustrate how the profit system can and does serve the long-term concerns of our people.

Just as Panhandle Eastern found its start here in what does not seem so long ago, now National Helium Corp. is engaged in proving itself.

The plant and facilities, the world's largest, dwarf those of Panhandle in the early thirties. But what created the plant and facilities was the same dependence on private initiative that built Panhandle Eastern.

As you all know, the Government invited Panhandle and our able and experienced partner, National Distillers, to build this plant in order to conserve helium, a valuable natural resource. We accepted and the plant is now complete but that's not the whole story.

In making our contract with M. W. Kellogg, we relied on Kellogg's desire to make a profit—its performance has been exceptional; in our contract with Air Liquide we again relied on that profit motive—it performed admirably; and in our contract with Western Light & Telephone we once more relied on that profit motive and it also has performed excellently. And so while we are all here congratulating one another on what has been achieved by everyone who took part in this highy complicated and difficult undertaking, let us not forget that a large part of the credit should also go to the keystone of our economy, free enterprise.

Our entire national experience bears witness to what can be accomplished by free men making decisions. This evidence stands up in comparison to any nation on earth and in comparison to any other economic theory.

Within this framework we shall continue to find feasible answers to the many problems which confront us just as the partnership concept enacted by the Congress in passing the helium bill in 1960 is providing the Nation with the helium supplies it now must have.

In closing, I want to commend all the people who have had a role in the research, design, construction and operation of this plant. It is truly symbolic of how things are accomplished in the American tradition.

TWENTIETH CENTURY PIONEERS

(By F. J. McElhatton)

Governor Anderson, Members of Congress, Kansas State Legislature, reverend clergy, and distinguished guests all, I am pleased to welcome you here today to share what we believe is a significant occasion—significant for what has been accomplished, noteworthy for how it was accomplished, and important for the future achievements to which we are dedicated.

It is interesting to note that we stand close to the banks of the Cimarron River, a legendary waterway in the conquest of the West. This ground was trod by the tough-minded pioneers of another generation, men and women who wrote a glorious chapter in America's history.

As we stand in this historic place, only the time element has changed. It is the 20th century but the pioneering atmosphere still abounds. Admittedly the terrain and objectives are different but I submit the spirit that enabled our forebears to meet the challenge of their time will stand us in good stead as we face the challenge of our time—opening wider man's vistas through scientific investigation and the advancement of knowledge.

This plant represents a sampling of what the technology of this century can accomplish. You are looking upon a facility that probably could not have been built 10 years ago.

Of course helium extraction plants have been constructed before. The Bureau of Mines has a proud record of accomplishment in this field, but no previous facility has approached the capacity we have constructed here.

It was considerably more than just using larger pipe, or bigger compressor engines. It was rather a problem of designing a new process, using vessels of a size never before fabricated. Before the design could be attempted, research was necessary to ascertain additional data on the low temperature characteristics of helium, nitrogen, and methane in the volumes we contemplated using.

In one major study a new type of calorimeter was developed to measure enthalpy changes required to liquefy nitrogen-methane mixtures at high pressures. This basic research was done at the Cincinnati laboratories of the U.S.I. Division of National Distillers and filled a gap in cryogenics literature.

This plant had to be different for still another consideration. Because of the relatively small helium content of the incoming natural gas—about 0.4 percent—an extremely efficient extraction process had to be developed for several reasons.

The concept of the conservation program demanded recovery of helium at the greatest volumes possible. But this recovery had to be accomplished within an economic framework that met criteria established by the Department of the Interior but which, at the same time, produced a reasonable profit commensurate with the risk this undertaking represents.

On the basis of our operating experience since our first helium deliveries were made on July 30, I can now report these objectives have been accomplished. The efficiency of this plant is running at 98 percent, meaning that 98 percent of the helium in the incoming gas is being extracted. I would publicly commend our design and process engineers and the researchers for the work they have accomplished.

This is a brief highlight summary of what has been accomplished here—how the technology of the sixties has turned theory into reality and allowed us to construct here the world's largest helium extraction facility. This, I submit, is a demonstration of how research is directed to serve the general welfare.

Of equal significance to my mind is the "how" of this conservation effort. In 1958 and 1959 when it became abundantly clear that decisive action was necessary to stop the waste of helium, the Nation had two alternatives. Conservation could have been developed as a 100-percent operation of Government; or a system could be worked out whereby private industry could be made an integral part of the plan.

To the credit of all concerned—executive department officials and congressional leaders—the latter course was followed. I say that, not because we have become a part of the program, but because such a cooperative plan squares with our allegiance to the fundamental principles upon which our way of life is based. Too often in the past these kinds of problems have been resolved in favor of broadening Government's role. In this instance, at least, the cooperative course has been followed and will pay dividends to the American people.

The Helium Act of 1960 provided the alternative of a 100-percent Government effort should private industry fail to meet the challenge. But industry has stepped forward and approximately $100 million has been invested in new extraction capacity.

The Helium Act became effective in March of 1961 and it was not until August of 1962 that the Congress appropriated the funds to implement it. In the brief time since, industry has designed, constructed and financed five new conservation facilities without cost to the taxpayer. Had this been a total Government undertaking, the Treasury would have had to come up with the capital funds to build the plants but that would have been only the start of the cost to the taxpayer.

This is not to be interpreted as criticism of the Bureau of Mines. They have a fine record of achievement in helium production dating back 45 years, but the fact remains that this nationally important program is moving forward without tax funds being spent, and is being implemented at a lower total cost than could otherwise have been achieved.

Furthermore, the entire conservation effort is self-liquidating. The sale price set by the Bureau of Mines is calculated to recover all costs for the life of the program, thus accomplishing conservation without tax expeditures or deficit financing.

That is the second significance of this occasion—the how of helium conservation.

The third point is implicit in the total program—the assurance of an adequate supply of helium to meet clearly rising demands in a variety of important fields.

Scientists tell me that cryogenic research has the potential of producing untold benefits in terms of new knowledge of the universe. We are proud to be a part of this endeavor in terms of implementing a national objective.

Thus we see more in the helium plant than pipes, valves, and cold boxes.

We see in it the efforts of a lot of skilled people who refused to give up on a tough problem of technology. We see it as symbolic of the American way of getting big jobs done—the kind of intangible asset that sets our Nation apart in the world.

We see it too as a contribution to the efforts of 20th century pioneers in space and in science—men motivated by the spirit that sent our forefathers across the Cimarron on another day.

It is with this spirit that we dedicate this facility to public service and express our pleasure that you have journeyed to Liberal to share this occasion.

Long Beach City Council Recommends Constitutional Amendment To Permit Nondenominational, Voluntary Prayers in the Nation's Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have before this body a proposed joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment permitting Bible reading and prayers in public schools on a noncompulsory basis. Other Members have introduced similar proposals. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will act favorably on these and pass them on to the State legislatures for ratification so that the prohibitory decision of the Supreme Court may be voided by action of the people's representatives.

The city council of Long Beach, Calif., which I have the honor to represent, has taken action in support of such an amendment to our Constitution in a resolution adopted on September 17, 1963. Under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the resolution at this point:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIF., EXPRESSING ITS CONCERN AND URGENTLY RECOMMENDING THE ENACTMENT OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA SO AS TO PERMIT, AS DETERMINED BY THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, THE RECITATION ON NONDENOMINATIONAL TYPE PRAYERS, ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS, IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THIS COUNTRY

Whereas the trend of events and the interpretative decisions of this Nation's high tribunals with respect to the recitation of prayers in the public schools have occasioned this council, and many of the citizens of the community, to be concerned in a very real sense; and

Whereas while this council is unalterably of the belief that no person, whether he be adult or minor, should be subjected to the requirement of joining in prayers of any character against his will, it is equally of the belief that this privilege should not be denied or foreclosed to those who desire to participate; and

Whereas this council, by these presents, elects to place itself on record as being of the confirmed view that in school districts which so desire, the permitted recitation of nondenominational type prayers of petition and thanksgiving to a Supreme Being in the country's public schools would serve as a strong and effective measure for good and a deterrent to the insidious spread of crime, atheism, communism, and materialism among our Nation's youth; and

Whereas, although coming at a time somewhat removed from those days of historic decision and the infant flourishing of this great Republic, it is felt that the recommendation herein made and the principle involved are as vital and fundamental as any of those considered and acted upon by our founding fathers in the formulation of the Constitution, and merit the earnest and forthright consideration of the members of the legislative and executive branches of our National and State governments: Now, therefore, the City Council of the City of Long Beach, Calif., resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. That this city council urgently advocates and recommends the enactment of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America which will permit the recitation, as determined by the local school disricts, of nondenominational type prayers to a Supreme Being, on a voluntary basis, in the public schools of this country.

SEC. 2. The city clerk shall prepare certified copies of this resolution and shall forthwith transmit a copy to each of the persons, governmental departments, agencies and organizations as the mayor and city council may deem appropriate in the circumstances.

Adopted this 17th day of September 1963.

EDWIN W. WADE,
Mayor of the City of Long Beach.

Fiscal Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, fiscal responsibility is alien to this administration. The promises of the New Frontier to the American taxpayer are hollow and meaningless. In fact, this administration is deliberately misleading the American taxpayer and has no intention of holding down expenditures. It is now seeking to double Federal expenditures for the boondoggling accelerated public works program.

The House Public Works Committee has scheduled hearings October 15 to October 18 on a proposal to increase the $900 million authorization for Accelerated Public Works to $1.8 billion.

President Kennedy told the Nation on TV just before the House tax bill vote that he would hold down unnecessary Federal expenditures. Yet, just a few weeks later, he is trying to double the size of a program that is not justified.

In Wednesday's press conference, Kennedy took great pains to create the impression that the economy is doing wonderfully well under the New Frontier. How can he justify a massive WPA-type program when his own propaganda line is that profits are higher than ever, that the Nation is progressing economically, and that the indicators are up?

Mr. Speaker I call your attention to the fact that APW is just WPA spelled backwards, this program under Kennedy has deteriorated into financing of barbecue pits, picnic tables, and ski resorts. After promising to cut wasteful spending, the New Frontier now tells us we need to double the frills, and the bills, to the taxpayer that such unneeded programs bring.

The President should level with the American people. Either the economy is weak and needs pump-priming WPA-type projects, or it is, as he publicly claimed Wednesday, strong, and, therefore, not in need of Federal make-work.

Such fiscal irresponsibility in the face of a tax cut and mounting deficits will surely bring inflation and its resulting chaos. Just this morning an article appeared in the paper indicating that the President was concerned with price increases. What else can the New Frontier expect from its fiscal policies. Continued Federal spending in the face of anticipated deficits and tax cuts increasing those deficits can only bring higher prices and inflation. You don't have to be a Harvard wizard to figure that out. And, Mr. Speaker, with this comes loss of confidence in the dollar and the demands on our gold are increased because of this lack of confidence.

The New Frontier is taking an unprecedented gamble with our economic system and the American taxpayer better prepare himself for it. A tax cut under these circumstances is indeed foolhardy. This effort by the New Frontier will simply add another $1 billion to the deficit.

Tenth Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, early in July, my 10th annual questionnaire was mailed to more than 100,000 voters in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey. Approximately 90,000 on my list are registered voters selected without regard to party affiliation. The remaining 10,000 are leaders in the professions, labor, business, industry, religion, education, and government. This 1963 sampling of grassroots opinion in my district has proved immensely helpful to me in doing my job here as have similar polls in the past 9 years.

Except for mining and important agricultural activities, the Ninth New Jersey District is one of the most diversified in the Nation. Nearly every conceivable type of business and industrial activity is carried on there. Although income levels are well above the national average, occupations are normally distributed among workers, both union and nonunion; proprietors of, and stockholders in, small and large businesses; and the professions. Compared to similar suburban areas, minority groups are in normal proportions. About 80,000 of my constituents commute out of the district each day to New York City and elsewhere in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area to their jobs and businesses. Approximately the same number commute into the district each working day from outside its boundaries.

In addition to receiving more than 30,000 completed questionnaires, about 3,000 of my constituents made extensive comments or wrote letters expressing their views not only on the subjects covered but on other issues as well.

As in previous years, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief comments about the results. Because of the recent House debate on the tax bill, Members will be interested to learn voter reaction to the administration's theory that by spending more and taxing less, with resulting huge deficits, we will create jobs and boost the economy. This theory is rejected by five out of every six who expressed an opinion on it. Among the other domestic issues covered, only the farm program had less support. Since my constituents pay for the farm program twice, first in taxes and then at the sales counter, it is no surprise that they oppose it by a margin of 15 to 1.

This year, 68 percent of those responding do not favor the overall record of the Kennedy administration, 22 percent do, and 10 percent are undecided. When compared to my previous polls, these percentages indicate that impressive numbers of voters in my district have lost confidence in this administration in the last 2 years. In response to my 1961 annual questionnaire, only 47 percent of those replying opposed the administration's overall record while 26 percent favored it with 27 percent undecided, while last year the percentage opposed was 59 percent; in favor, 28 percent; undecided, 13 percent.

Foreign policy questions brought some interesting results. Responses to questions about Cuba clearly indicate a strong desire for more positive action by the United States to curb or depose Fidel Castro and his Communist government. Our present Cuban policy is opposed by nearly 5 to 1. Of those op-

posing, three out of four favor economic sanctions against nations trading with Cuba while nearly half favor U.S. support of a refugee invasion of that country. With respect to Asia, three out of four with opinions on the subject favor our fight to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control. A large majority express opposition to the present level of our foreign aid spending and would stop all aid to pro-Communist nations.

The enactment of strong civil rights laws is favored by two out of three. A majority of those favoring such laws want action in these areas: voting rights, 92 percent; schools, 73 percent; union membership, 65 percent; employment, 64 percent; denying Federal funds to States practicing segregation, 56 percent; while only a minority favor Federal action in housing, 49 percent; and business establishments, 42 percent.

Concern over school dropouts and unemployment among our youth is reflected in support by a more than 2½-to-1 margin for broad Federal action to assist unemployed and untrained youth. A complete review of public school courses and methods to determine if we adequately prepare our noncollege youth for today's jobs has support by about 5 to 1.

Of course, not everyone replying answered every question listed. The percentages shown for each question in the tables below are based on the tabulation of all the replies received to that particular question or part thereof.

Mr. Speaker, as in past years, many Members of the House and Senate have indicated strong interest in the results of my annual poll. I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the tabulated percentages of the replies to my 10th annual questionnaire:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you favor—			
1. The overall record of the Kennedy administration?	22	68	10
2. Our present Cuban policy?	16	77	7
If no, would you favor—			
(a) Blockade of Cuba at risk of war? 34			
(b) Support of refugee invasion? 40			
(c) U.S. invasion of Cuba? 12			
(d) Economic sanctions against nations trading with Cuba? 73			
3. Our fight to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control?	63	22	15
4. Continued strong U.S. financial support of the U.N.?	45	40	15
5. Foreign aid spending at about present levels?	14	81	5
If no, do you favor—			
(a) More spending? 2			
(b) Less? 66			
(c) None? 12			
(d) Stopping aid to pro-Communist countries? 80			
6. Nuclear test ban treaty without foolproof inspection?	12	82	6
7. A $50,000,000,000 program to land a man on the moon by 1970?	23	63	14
8. Broad Federal action to assist unemployed and untrained youth?	65	24	11
9. Complete review of public school courses and methods to determine if we adequately prepare our noncollege youth for today's jobs?	75	17	8
10. $500,000,000 Federal mass-transportation program to aid commuters?	49	35	16
11. Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools?	76	19	5
12. The President's program for tax reduction, tax reform, and higher spending with resulting $12,000,000,000 deficit?	16	71	13
13. The theory of high Government spending, tax cuts, and large deficits as best means of creating jobs and boosting the economy?	15	75	10
If no, do you favor a balanced budget policy?	94	0	6
14. Continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee?	73	17	10
15. Stronger Federal action to prohibit distribution of obscene matter?	74	15	11
16. Present $7,000,000,000-a-year farm program of controls, subsidies, and storage of surpluses with resulting higher consumer prices?	6	90	4
If no, would you favor letting supply and demand set farm prices?	85	0	15
17. Enactment of strong Federal civil rights laws?	59	29	12
If yes, check those areas in which you favor Federal action:			
(a) Schools 73			
(b) Housing 49			
(c) Employment 64			
(d) Voting rights 92			
(e) Union membership 65			
(f) Business establishments 42			
(g) Denying Federal funds to States practicing segregation? 56			

The Free Enterprise System

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] for taking this special order in honor of Free Enterprise Day, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks and make a few additional comments of my own.

I have always believed that the American way of life was the free enterprise, capitalistic system. Our early American settlers made an effort to establish a collectivist system with common warehouses and common distribution to all regardless of his own production. This system failed miserably, as it has in every country which has tried it. Since these early efforts, Americans swung into the free enterprise system with the profit reward for industry and ingenuity.

Under this system, America became the greatest producer of true wealth of any other nation in the history of the world. The system of free enterprise which gives one a hope and a promise of reward for his efforts, has always been the hope of every individual. It has made it possible for a bootblack or a paperboy to become a giant of industry, and with this phenomenal growth in industry and agriculture, we have brought to the American people the highest standard of living known to man.

I know that each of us in his own community can point with pride to some great industry which grew from a small "mustard seed." One of these great examples is Knott's Berry Farm in my own county. I can well remember when Mr. Walter Knott arrived in Orange County, Calif., with nothing but a few family possessions and an idea and a determination to show what can be done in this great country of opportunity. He started out with a roadside stand, not much larger than one of the rooms in my office here, and in the space of some 45 years, he has become nationally and world famous. It should not be overlooked that Cornelia Knott, his wife, and his four children have been working side by side with him all these many years. Their dining room alone oftentimes feeds as many as 17,000 people in 1 day, and their "ghost town" exhibits are enjoyed by millions of Americans each year.

Those who have been in Washington for the past half century can well remember that Mr. Mariott started the Hot Shoppes with a single hotdog stand. These are examples of what can be done under the free enterprise system.

Government competition in the private segment of our industry is attempting to destroy free enterprise, and to supplant it with monolithic Government production and distribution. It is high time that the Federal Government should withdraw from these operations which are not specifically permitted under the Constitution. Government ownership and private ownership are opposed to each other and the two systems of collectivism and free enterprise cannot coexist. Only one can emerge successful. An examination of the collectivist systems throughout the world should warn us against the destruction of the capitalistic system which we have in America.

Fair Compromise on Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an editorial which appeared in the October 1 issue of the Tribune-Democrat of Johnstown, Pa.:

FAIR COMPROMISE ON RESIDUAL OIL

Last week 32 Members of the House of Representatives and 5 U.S. Senators from both political parties introduced legislation to establish by law a requirement that no more than half the residual oil needs of the United States shall be served by imported fuel.

This bill would take away from the executive branch the unlimited discretion it now exercises over permissible quotas of imported residual oil. The import control system was established by Presidential proclamation April 1, 1959. But the quotas first set have been increased eight times since then, from 343,000 barrels daily when the program began to 575,000 barrels daily now.

The legislators sponsoring the new bill made the reason for this clear. The pressures upon a President and Secretary of the Interior for higher quotas of cheap oil are almost intolerable, they said—both from coastal users of the fuel, and from countries, principally Venezuela, which furnish it. Only a firm and legal division of the market will stop the increasing dependence upon foreign soil.

Congress, said Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, one of the prime movers on this legislation, should set the formula under which these imports are brought in—"not the President or some subordinate official to whom he delegates the responsibility." The coal producers of this and other States "have a right to share in the growth of this fuels market," said SAYLOR, but they will be frozen out because they cannot compete "against this waste product from foreign countries."

This newspaper believes firmly in fair competition. But, as Representative SAYLOR said, residual oil is a waste product—the leftover residue after the more valuable light oils have been extracted from crude oil. It is fit only for burning in large boilers. And, because it is the "sawdust" of the oil industry, it can be dumped at any price it will bring. That kind of competition is destructive of the coal industry which produces fuel as its primary product.

Also, the very areas which demand this cheap imported oil protest vigorously against the import of textiles, and ceramics, and chemicals, and other things they produce; while overriding the far more justified protests of the coal industry for some reasonable limit on the dumping of residual oil in the market coal seeks to serve.

This legislation offers a fair compromise, leaving half the growing market for fuels to imported residual, and reserving half for domestic oil and coal. We trust it will receive the support from leaders of both parties it deserves.

Mr. Neumark's Lost Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is a tribute to our Government and way of life that the champions of minority points of view have access to the forums of Government and the press. Not long ago in Andover, Mass., Mr. Arthur Neumark conducted a campaign to have the town reject an offer of Federal funds to aid in a local sewer project on the ground that the Government does not have the funds due to persistent deficits. Mr. Neumark was defeated in the town meeting, but his fight on behalf of his point of view demonstrated once again the virtues of a society that permits the expression of all points of view.

Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial regarding Mr. Neumark's action which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on September 26, 1963:

MR. NEUMARK'S LOST CAUSE

It's a long way from Washington, D.C., to the quiet town of Andover, Mass., where the citizens still decide things in town meeting. But distant as it may be from Andovers all over the country, Washington is not deaf to their needs, even down to such little things as a sewer extension project.

So when more than a thousand Andover voters assembled at the town hall to vote on a sewer project, the Federal Government's presence was very real, in the form of its offer to give Andover $839,500 toward the estimated $1.7 million cost.

During the lengthy debate, one Arthur Neumark of Elm Street moved to amend the plan by deleting its provision to accept the Federal funds. Citing the size of the Federal debt, he argued that the Government proposed to give Andover money which it actually did not have.

Those supporting Mr. Neumark's position were so few that, according to one account, they weren't even tallied. He was, indeed, deserted by the Andover Taxpayers Association, whose spokesman explained that though the association previously opposed the principle of Federal aid, it supported a grant for this particular project.

A local paper, commenting on the outcome, singled out Mr. Neumark for praise. "He was fighting for a lost cause; it's nice to know there are still men of individuality who will propose unpopular procedures because they think it is right to do so." In the Andover newspaper's opinion, "thousands of voters" would support Mr. Neumark's position "if rejecting the grant would truly mean a reduction in Federal spending. This it would not do."

True enough, if Mr. Neumark must fight the battle alone. But his "unpopular" idea already has been espoused in some other localities. If it ever really catches on, his cause might not be so lost after all.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed a questionnaire to many of my constituents in North Carolina. The questionnaire went to a representative cross section of our people without regard to race, color, or creed in the counties of Gaston, Cleveland, Rutherford, Burke, Catawba, Avery, and Mitchell.

Out of the questionnaires mailed 34 percent have been returned as of this date. This, I am told, is a remarkably high percentage of participation in such polling. Eight issues were listed on the questionnaire. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in learning the results obtained from my questionnaire as the issues listed on it concerned some of the most important legislative matters with which we are confronted.

I include the results of the questionnaire in the Appendix of the RECORD:

1. Do you approve of the administration's civil rights proposals?

	Percent
Yes	12.6
No	84.7
No opinion	2.5

2. On tax cut proposals should Congress:

(a) Cut taxes regardless of the deficit?

	Percent
Yes	22.4
No	76.5
No opinion	1.1

(b) Cut taxes only if spending is reduced?

	Percent
Yes	82.2
No	16.1
No opinion	1.7

(c) Reduce spending, balance the budget, and then consider a tax cut?

	Percent
Yes	88.6
No	9.2
No opinion	2.2

3. Do you favor the administration's proposed Federal aid for mass transportation for cities initially costing $500 million in grants and loans?

	Percent
Yes	5.1
No	83.7
No opinion	11.2

4. Do you think our foreign aid appropriations, which now approximates $4 billion a year, should be reduced this year?

	Percent
Yes	93
No	4.9
No opinion	1.8

5. In view of the continuing Cuban crisis, do you believe the United States should:

(a) Prohibit any ship that trades in a Cuban port from thereafter entering a U.S. port?

	Percent
Yes	77
No	13.7
No opinion	9.3

(b) Take whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?

	Percent
Yes	54.2
No	31.6
No opinion	14.2

6. Do you favor increasing your Social Security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home care for those over 65 as proposed in the King-Anderson bill?

	Percent
Yes	16.2
No	80.3
No opinion	3.5

7. Do you favor Federal aid for:

(a) School construction?

	Percent
Yes	18.7
No	78.9
No opinion	2.4

(b) Teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes	9.1
No	87.9
No opinion	3

8. Do you favor legislation:

(a) Removing the two-price cotton program whereby foreign mills purchase American cotton cheaper than domestic mills?

	Percent
Yes	87.7
No	6.3
No opinion	6

(b) Restricting textile imports?

	Percent
Yes	80.9
No	10.5
No opinion	8.6

International Inspection of Atomic Reactors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an important event occurred at the annual conference of the delegates to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, in early October.

A breakthrough agreement was ratified on the principle of international inspection of atomic reactors under the sponsorship of the agency. While this is limited in scope and does not apply to reactors which have been completed in different nations, it is a start towards the goal of total inspection of all reactors capable of making atomic-hydrogen weapon material. As additional nations acquire atomic reactors, it will become more and more important to establish information and control of the inventory of available atomic-hydrogen weapon material.

Under unanimous consent to append my remarks I include an article from the editorial page of the October 10 Washington Post.

The article follows:

INSPECTING REACTORS

Moscow deserves a note of appreciation for its enlightened vote in the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. Trailing their client states behind, the Soviet agreed to accept international inspection of large nuclear reactors supplied or supervised by the International Agency. Their vote allows the Agency to extend to these civilian reactors a system of safeguards designed to prevent their use for any but peaceful purposes. Since an ever growing number of nations is gaining these reactors, and since they are capable of producing fissionable material suitable for the manufacture of weapons, the agreement in Vienna is heartening.

Unfortunately, no operating reactors anywhere fall at once under the provisions of the new agreement. The Soviets have not put any of their reactors within the reach of the International Agency and the United States has determined not to take that step unilaterally. The Euratom nations inspect their own. The Tarapur power reactor which the United States is now building for India, however, will become subject to the new international safeguards upon its completion. Surely it would be wise of the United States to transfer to the International Agency the duty of safeguarding the reactors which it has given to other countries. The international inspectors are ready, thanks to the practice the United States has given them on four medium-size reactors of its own.

It is pleasant to bask in the thought that the Vienna agreement represents the first time the Soviets have accepted the principle of international inspection of nuclear facilities. In view of the Soviet penchant for equating inspection with espionage, this represents an important symbolic change. However, the agreement affords no sign that the Soviets wish to extend the principle outside of a narrow field from which they exclude themselves. Rather, it reflects their fear of nuclear proliferation. It is too soon to leap to the hope that the Soviet Union will now consider international inspection in matters of arms control or disarmament, let alone nuclear reactors.

Nonetheless, Moscow has made a technical admission that inspection provides one assurance that an instrument of peace will not be converted to a tool of war. Perhaps its experience in making and carrying out one agreement on inspection wil give it the confidence to essay another.

No More Freeloading, Navy Contracting Officials Are Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been hearing about an interesting directive that has been floating around the Bureau of Ships. It was issued by Rear Adm. W. A. Brockett, head of the Bureau of Ships, and in so many words, I was told, orders Navy contracting officers not to freeload at the expense of defense contractors.

In short, so the report has been, Navy people are now to pay their own way at lunch and are to avoid nighttime entertainment "like the plague."

I thought it rather odd that adult human beings should have to be warned about the dangers inherent in accepting lavish lunches and the entertainment that sometimes followed. I also thought it rather strange that a Government employee who obligates billions of tax dollars, supposedly endowed with at least normal intelligence, should have to be ordered not to accept presents.

Naturally, these people who obligate billions of dollars should be as free from taint as Caesar's wife. I have always been told by high-ranking Navy officials that such is exactly the case, that not one of their number could ever be suspected of being influenced by anything other than genuine red, white, and blue patriotism.

Therefore, you can imagine my surprise when I heard of this directive. I decided to take a look at it; that is, if it wasn't classified confidential or top secret..

I tried for a week to get a peek at it with no luck. The transmitting letter had been signed, I was told, but for some reason or other it could not be sprung loose.

Finally, I told the BuShips people that I was going to give them until 12 noon to produce the directive. If it was not on hand by that time, I planned to inform the Members of the House about what I called the Navy's "get lost" policy, hoping it would come to light for some Member's perusal. That was 11 a.m. The directive was in my office at 11:45 a.m.

Before I could bring it to the attention of the Members of the House, a Chicago newspaperman, Charles Nicodemus, also dug up the story. His account of the directive follows, as printed today in the Chicago Daily News:

NO MORE FREELOADING, NAVY CONTRACTING OFFICIALS ARE TOLD

(By Charles Nicodemus)

WASHINGTON.—The admiral heading the Navy's Bureau of Ships—one of the service's biggest buyers—has warned his employees against "freeloading" on manufacturers' representatives.

"The acceptance of evening entertainment at nightclubs is to be avoided like the plague," he exhorted.

And "if Bureau officials join industrial representatives at lunch or for other entertainment 'Dutch treat' is the order of the day," he directed.

The unusual, unpublicized internal memorandum, obtained by the Chicago Daily News, has been put out by Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, who took over this summer as new head of the Bureau of Ships.

BuShips, as it is called, is one of the Navy's major purchasing agencies, handing out hundreds of millions of dollars annually in defense contracts.

Unlike most other Defense Department purchasing agencies, virtually all of BuShips buying operations are centered in Washington, making its personnel particularly susceptible to observation by interested onlookers such as Members of Congress and the press.

Indeed, the gastronomical and gustatorial capabilities of certain BuShips contract negotiators, administrators and engineers—when a "live one" from industry is handling the tab—have become so legendary that it is waggishly suggested that Washington's restaurant industry would be decimated without them.

Perhaps because most readers would logically assume that Brockett was issuing the directive to meet a special need, the admiral clearly sought to word the memo to overcome this inference.

Navy contracting officials "know that their judgment is not for sale for any favor, great or small," he intoned.

"But," he acknowledged, "the fact remains that the occasional official who 'free loads' and the still rarer official who allows his judgment to be influenced, creates impressions which, unfortunately, can be eliminated only by placing uniform restrictions on all officials."

Admiral Brockett's for-the-record suggestion that freeloading is rare in BuShips contrasts with this apocryophal saying still current in the Main Navy building:

If a cannon were fired during "noon hours" (11:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.) through Washington's most expensive "expense account" restaurants—such as Paul Young's, Duke Zeibert's or the Goldon Parrot—half of Washington's manufacturer's "reps" and half the complement of BuShips would be wiped out with the first shot.

Admiral Brockett concluded the two-page policy statement by warning that "under no circumstances shall gifts of intrinsic value be accepted from industrial representatives.

"Bureau of ships officials are expected to use their good judgment," he cautioned, "but doubtful situations should be resolved by not accepting proferred favors."

Needless to say, Mr. Nicodemus' excellent story gives a nonpartisan slant on this directive. It was my thought, however, that Members might want to see for themselves the latest change in policy and regulations that has come about in the Navy Department as a result of this Congress looking closely over the shoulder of procurement officers who spend billions each year.

Mr. Speaker, the full directive follows and I should be happy to discuss it with any of my colleagues.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1963.

From: Chief, Bureau of Ships.
To: All Assistant Chiefs, Director of Contracts and Comptroller.
Subject: Policy on social relationships between Bureau and industrial representatives.

1. Over the past few years, there have been a number of policy statements concerning the responsibility of Federal officials and employees to maintain exceptionally high standards of conduct. These statements have emanated from the White House on down and are summarized for military and civilian employees of the Naval Establishment in references (a) and (b).

2. Within the broad subject of conduct, there is one area of special concern to organizations such as the Bureau of Ships which manage huge sums of tax money in the interests of national defense. This is the area of personal relations between Government officials and contractors or potential suppliers of material and equipment. In normal dealings with such groups, it is inevitable that military and civilian officials of the Bureau will frequently find themselves in situations where acceptance of relatively minor favors may conflict or appear to conflict with the stringent impartiality required by the public interest.

3. It is often difficult for the conscientious military or civilian official to understand why many of the common amenities of social life, fully accepted among social and business acquaintances in our society, are viewed with suspicion and distrust when they occur between representatives of the Federal Government and industrial suppliers. Such officials know without question that their judgment is not for sale for any favor, great or small. But the fact remains that the occasional official who freeloads and the still rarer official who allows his judgment to be influenced, create impressions which, unfortunately, can be eliminated only by placing uniform restrictions on all officials.

4. Because of the importance of this matter to the Bureau, we can no longer depend upon vague and general exhortations to avoid situations of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict. It is my desire, that all Bureau officials, military and civilian, who deal with industrial representatives observe the following specific guidelines in their dealings.

A. When not in a travel status: Bureau officials will not accept meals and drinks at the expense of industrial representatives. The acceptance of evening entertainment at nightclubs is to be avoided like the plague. If Bureau officials join industrial representatives at lunch or for other entertainment, "dutch treat" is the order of the day. This restriction is not intended to apply when food and refreshments are provided as a formal part of an organized professional or industrial society meeting or social affair.

B. When in a travel status, it is desired that the same principle be observed to the fullest extent possible. However, it is recognized that during travel it is sometimes not possible to avoid complimentary meals, quarters or refreshments without excessive embarrassment. When accepted from an industrial representative, such meals and quarters should be listed on the travel claim, just as though they were provided by the Government, as required by references (c) and (d). The provision by a contractor of transportation between terminals and his plant may be accepted only if freely offered, and should be noted on the travel claim.

C. Under no circumstances shall gifts of intrinsic value be accepted from industrial representatives. This provision does not apply to trinkets and souvenirs of nominal value which are widely distributed by business firms.

5. It is obviously impossible and undesirable to provide specific guidelines for the many varying situations which may arise in this general problem area. Bureau officials are expected to use their good judgment, but doubtful situations should be resolved by not accepting proferred favors.

6. Addresses should insure that all Bureau personnel who deal with industrial representatives are aware of these guidelines.

Approved.

W. A. BRACKETT.

Federal Charters for Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on October 29 and 30 the Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee which I have the honor to chair will hold hearings on H.R. 258, my bill to grant Federal charters to the mutual savings banks.

I have sponsored this legislation because I believe that it is good legislation that is in the public interest. Some of those opposed to it say that our country is already "overbanked" and that Federal mutual savings banks will merely make a bad situation worse. This is simply not true. There are many areas which still need an increased supply of funds for homebuilding and business expansion.

The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks recently ran several advertisements in nationwide magazines requesting those wishing information on mutual savings banks to send to them for it. The following editorial from the April issue of the Savings Bank Journal tells of the results of this rather modest advertising:

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

The 1962–63 advertising campaign of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks has just been completed. It has produced some interesting results with regard to the extension of our system of mutual savings banks.

From a single advertisement explaining savings banking to Nikita Khrushchev at the time of his visit to the United States in 1959, the national advertising program has expanded into an annual series. Its budget still is modest compared to that of its competitors—extremely modest—but in effectiveness of presentation and copy the savings banking industry need offer no apologies.

The series just completed, like that of the year before, was directed toward the extension of our industry. This year we published three advertisements, each of which appeared once in both Newsweek and U.S. News & World Report. The first two listed non-savings-bank States and their capitals and implied that States without mutual savings banks were missing something worthwhile. It was pointed out to the residents of these 32 States that one of the benefits they are missing is a more plentiful supply of capital for home ownership, expansion of industry, and municipal improvements.

It was also disclosed that where there are mutual savings banks, home financing costs tend to be lower.

The final advertisement reproduced the cover the report of the Commission on Money and Credit and outlined the route to a nationwide system of savings banks by means of Federal charters.

Each of the ads contained a printed coupon which invited the reader to send for additional material on savings banking. Some 1,600 were received, with the third attracting 3 times the response of the other 2. Each of the inquiries was answered with a letter enclosing a copy of "Important Benefits from Mutual Savings Banks for You and Your Community." Included in answers to inquiries from residents of savings bank States were the names of the savings banks in that particular State.

In addition to the large number of coupons, the national association received no less than a hundred letters from people stating they were interested in helping establish mutual savings banks in their communities, since sufficient funds for home-ownership and construction were not available and local banking institutions were not equipped to meet the needs of their growing communities.

The content of these letters read something like this: "I am one of a group interested in starting a mutual savings bank in this community. Would you please supply us with information on what is required to organize a savings bank and, if legislation is needed, send us a copy of a model bill?"

It is interesting to note that many of these letters came from States where advertisements in eastern newspapers would imply an abundant supply of financial institutions—California, Texas, Florida, Arizona. Most of them were sent by attorneys and businessmen concerned with construction and home financing, although small retailers were also well represented.

While the advertisements primarily stressed the desirability of the extension of the mutual savings bank system through Federal action, considerable interest was stimulated in extension via the State route. As a result, a bill to authorize savings banks was introduced in one State, and public officials and legislators in other States have shown much interest in learning more about the unique institutions that have been promoting thrift in America for 147 years. Several of our correspondents also wrote their Senators and Representatives indicating support of the Federal Mutual Savings Bank bill.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the response to this series of advertisements are that the United States is by no means overbanked and that many areas are desperately in need of thrift institutions to stimulate local savings for home purchasing and other worthwhile local investments.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, taken from the Christian Science Monitor of October 9, a newspaper which has always supported achievement of full civil rights for all, is very pertinent at this time:

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OVERSHARPENED?

The House Judiciary Committee this week is beginning study of a draft civil rights bill

proposed by a subcommittee. The subcommittee version is even more drastic in several respects than the recommendations in President Kennedy's civil rights message.

The bill at this stage reflects the militancy of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, subcommittee chairman, and other Congressmen from northern city constituencies. It probably will have to be toned down to meet the approval of the whole committee and of the House of Representatives, let alone to weather a filibuster in the Senate

In the particularly sensitive public accommodations section, the administration bill extended to hotels, motels, theaters, and stores substantially involved in interstate commerce. The subcommittee bill would bar racial discrimination in any business operating under State license, excepting owner-occupied homes renting not more than five rooms.

As to restrictions of registration for voting, the original bill covered only elections at which Federal officeholders were to be elected. The subcommittee has taken the dubious step of attempting to apply Federal regulations to all elections, including State and local ones.

The most far reaching move of the subcommittee is to attempt to write into the bill a complete fair employment practices statute covering most businesses and labor unions in the country. This would be extremely difficult to enforce, though agencies such as the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity are making headway with voluntary methods.

The important function of Congress is to formulate legislation that embodies the sentiment of a substantial majority in the country at large.

But Barry Has the Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader on September 23, 1963. It carries a fine story which recounts an incident in the illustrious life story of our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK]. It also is a good story to remind those who may through some misunderstanding underestimate the strength of the Senator from Arizona. The editorial follows:

BUT BARRY HAS THE VOTES

Sunday's reception in Roanoke for Governor Rockefeller recalled the time, about 15 years ago, that Governor Tuck and President Truman wound up on the same platform at William and Mary. The redoubtable BILL and the waspish Harry had been carrying on an acrimonious feud. It was plain that Mr. TUCK had not the slightest thought of supporting his fellow Democrat in the 1948 election.

The two of them, attired in full academic regalia for the occasion, met in the Wren Building.

"Well, Governor," said Mr. Truman, doffing his mortarboard, "I think we're expected to stage a fight out there."

"What?" said Mr. TUCK, flopping his robe. "In these things?"

The Governor grinned and the President grinned. They led the academic parade in cordial companionship. And the instant Mr. Truman had left town, Mr. TUCK went back to calling him names.

Our point is that Governor Rockefeller ought not to be deceived by the apparent cordiality of his welcome to Roanoke. As the distinguished Governor of a great State, he was of course entitled to a friendly reception; and his Virginia hosts, as representatives of an ancient tradition of southern hospitality, owed him a pleasant afternoon. The Governor's speech, denouncing the excessive growth of Federal grant-in-aid programs, was perfectly chosen for Virginia ears. This was "the sound doctrine," to recall Mr. TUCK again, and his audience ate it up.

But let there be no misunderstanding. So far as the Republican nomination is concerned, our hearts belong to BARRY. Mr. Rockefeller has our best wishes. Senator GOLDWATER has our votes.

History of an Integrated Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the July 20, 1963, edition of the Kings Courier, published weekly in my district. This integrated community in the Sheepshead Bay area of Brooklyn is a fine example of the peace and harmony that can exist between the races; indeed which does exist in Brooklyn and in many other areas in our Nation.

The article follows:

HISTORY OF AN INTEGRATED COMMUNITY

(NOTE.—The following history was prepared by Mrs. Florence Brown, the secretary of the Committee on the Preservation of a Self-Integrated Community, in cooperation with neighborhood residents. News Editor Stuart D. Bykofsky visited the area Saturday afternoon on a picture-gathering assignment. He found the residential area to be everything spokesmen claim. He saw the many close interracial friendships, the spirit of cooperation and amity between residents. As he walked from block to block with Joseph Payne, a community leader who acted as his guide, he found that on every block people washing cars, riding bikes, tending their gardens and just sitting and talking would take a minute to wave and chat. The area is as unrelated to the hustle and bustle of New York as any whistle stop in Kansas. But it is a nice, pleasant friendly community where mutual respect between the races and nationalities has given birth to a wonderful air of warmth and dignity.)

The totally integrated area of Sheepshead Bay from East 13th Street to East 16th Street from Avenue X to Avenue Y dates back to 1880 and possibly further. The population is made up of Irish, German, Dutch, Italian, and Negroes. Their accents may have been varied but their economic circumstances were the same. They had the same doctors, midwives and nurses. The Coney Island Hospital was a thing of the future. Around 1910 their doctors were Dr. Pettit, Dr. P. I. Nash and Dr. Beck. Mrs. Gunderman, now 83 years old, was the neighborhood nurse. She was of German origin. Her sheets and blankets were shared in emergencies by the neighborhood. Her home was a lodging place for members of Sousa's Band when they would come to the area to play at the Old Brighton Beach Hotel. Their mascot at that time was a little Negro boy named Buster Johnson. She lives on East 15th Street wtih her son William. Another son, Charles Van Valkanburg, is captain of Marine Company 9 of the fireboat *Alfred E. Smith*.

Great-grandfather Forehand brought his family of 13 to Coney Island from Nashville, Tenn., to be near and work on the Sheepshead Bay Race Track. Two of his sons were jockeys and his eldest son, William, was one of the grooms for the once-favorite horse Man O War. The family moved to Sheepshead Bay in 1917 from Coney Island and William Forehand's 6 children and 15 grands and great-grands are still part of this neighborhood.

Most Negroes in the neighborhood came with the races and stayed to work in and around the track. You cannot mention the race track without remembering Sonny Jim Fitzsimmons, whose estate has been a showplace for years in this immediate neighborhood. His cook, the late Mrs. Ella Lee, lived in the neighborhood for years and kept you thrilled with her tales of the great "Mr. Fitz," as she called him.

Leon J. Newton, famous galloper and son of his famous father, Sammy Newton, who was rated "one of the best exercise boys of all time," has worked all the best known stables and is still piling up laurels for himself. His godfather was John Fitzsimmons, son of Sonny Jim. See June Backstretch for an elaborate reading on his career. Leon and his wife live in the Newton homestead on East 14th Street with his mother, a grand old lady of 80.

The Baptist Church had a rare beginning. It was founded by Maria J. Fisher, better known the bay over as Mother Fisher. She sold pies and cakes to the race track personnel to raise money to build a church. The site of the church was given to her by Mr. W. A. Engeman, owner of the then Brighton Rapid Transit. She begged bricks for the foundation from John McKane and had to borrow a wheel barrow to haul them. Of course, the men of the neighborhood, of both races, joined in and helped her. The first pulpit was an old icebox and the worshippers had to bring their own lamps for light. The current edifice was reconstructed in 1939. The pastor for the past 9 years is the well-loved Rev. G. Thomas Foster, who was called from Clifton Forge, Va. In addition to his many duties as pastor, he is a chaplain at Kings County Hospital. Familiar names connected with the original church were: Joshua and Fannie Winston, of East 15th Street; William and Margaret Jackson, of East 14th Street; Bertha Greene and Fannie Brown, daughters of the founder; and Mrs. Mary Woods, all deceased. Miss Mary Johnson and daughter and grandchildren of William and Margaret Jackson still live in the Jackson home on East 14th Street.

All other churches in the area are integrated, i.e., the St. Marks Catholic Church, Father Walsh, Priest, has a Protestant Negro, Mr. Joe Payne, as their athletic director. Emmanuel Episcopal Church under the pastorate of Father Regan, has Mr. Arnold Cann, a Negro, as their Sunday school superintendent. Homecrest Presbyterian Church, under the Reverend David M. Cory, has Mr. Roland Hill as one of the ruling elders and Mr. Joseph Payne as a deacon, both are Negroes. The Methodist Church, under the Rev. David P. Ver Nooy (successor to the beloved Rev. Robert Lowell) is also integrated. It was under Reverend Lowell that most unique plan of march to celebrate Sunday School Anniversary Day was instituted. The Baptist, Episcopal and Methodist Church Sun-

day schools march hand in hand according to size place disregarding race.

Here are some of the reminiscences of some of the old timers of this area:

Ophelia Wedekind, 70, of East 13th Street, says: "My father John Koelsch bought three houses on East 13th Street in 1921. In the early 1920's card parties and dances were held at McClocklins Strawberry Festivals. That was the open space between the old Sheldon Theater and the Army and Navy store on Sheepshead Bay Road. When we came to East 13th Street the Dixsons and the Fords (both Negroes) were our neighbors. When Margaret Dixson was married to Walter Miller, the family had a platform built in the yard to dance on and all the neighbors, white and colored, went to the wedding. Mrs. Dixson baked the wedding cake and my father, who was a baker decorated it."

Dorothy Wedekind, age 62, says: "I remember the Osborne House on the waterfront where they held dances and musicales for the benefit of the churches. There was a blacksmith shop on Avenue Z and Sheepshead Bay Road. There was a bridge at the beginning of the creek and people had to go across to get to Father McCarthy's church located near the station. (Now St. Marks on Ocean Avenue and Avenue Z.) Everyone was friendly, times have changed, things are different, but the friendship has been passed on to the new generation.

Jack Beer, age 62, says: "I've lived in this section since 1920. After a hard struggle, I sent my sons to school. One graduated from Fordham University and is now a Treasury agent. There were always block parties to go to and the fun we had at the picnics held in the baseball field near Avenue Z called Celtic Oval. I remember when Jack Dempsey visited Rudy's Bar and Grill on East 15th Street and Neck Road."

Myrtle Johnson, age 60, says: "My father was Charles Harrison and my mother's name was Phillipina. My father was an engineer with my brothers Randolph, Charles, and Alfred, when we moved to our house in 1921. I have lived here for 40 years. I remember the block parties on Avenue X between Sheepshead Bay Road and East 13th Street. All the ladies, both colored and white, cooked fried chicken and fish and made cakes to sell. The money was donated to the Baptist Church. My brothers caught muskrats in the old creek and a man from the city bought them from the boys for 50 and 75 cents. My father planted all kinds of vegetagles, even peanuts, on the corner of Avenue X and East 14th Street. Carrie La Call and Annie Jackson, and Evelyn Taylor, all Negroes, stayed with me when my daughter was born. Mrs. Annie Blue and Mrs. Mack baked many a nice birthday cake for me. They were real neighbors."

Mrs. Lena Spera Huesaver, age 71, says: "When my children were small, I lived across the street from the Haynes family on East 14th Street. The children of both families always played together and often went to the woods nearby to pick berries. The woods were located where Doddy's Lumber Company is now located, and there was a farm in that area with cows and chickens."

The largest Negro family of homeowners in the neighborhood are the Bussey family with a total of eight, 1- or 2-family houses. They migrated to Sheepshead Bay in the early 1920's from Orangeburgh, S.C., and Georgia.

Allan Haynes, known throughout the Bay and Coney Island as "Tom," and his present family of 10 children (there were 12) came to Sheepshead Bay in 1921. He is a master carpenter and built his own home in 2 years. Mr. Haynes was instrumental in getting electricity in the neighborhood. He went from door to door with a petition getting signatures. His entire family are members of Homecrest Presbyterian Church.

The Floyd family of seven own their own home on East 14th Street, and are very proud of Eugene, III, who is attending Villanova, and their daughter Delores, who is majoring in math at Brooklyn College.

There is no playground in the area, but the children of both races make their own on Avenue X between 14th and 15th Streets, dodging cars as they play punch ball, etc. In the summer, they come for "Boys Day" and "Girls Day" in Mrs. Florence Brown's portable swimming pool for a cool dip. Her yard has also been used for the Baptist Sunday School Easter Egg Hunt. All the children under seven are invited regardless of race.

Martha Richardson, deceased, was known the borough over for her rare century tree which bloomed the last time in 1937 in her spacious garden on the corner of East 14th Street and Avenue Y. The horticulturess of today is the 80-year-old Mrs. Colbert of East 15th Street. Her flowers are sought after by florists. She has many rare species which make her garden a beautiful sight to behold.

The Salvatore Lezzaro family says: "We are the homeowners of a two-family house in the area—we have lived here for 40 years in harmony in a perfectly integrated area where there is no juvenile delinquency, and everyone is proud of it. In view of the housing shortage we are afraid that our tenants who have five children will be unable to find such a decent neighborhood like they are already living in.

Resolution on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the following resolution adopted by the City Council of East Orange, N.J., with respect to civil rights legislation. The city of East Orange enjoys an enviable reputation as one of the most progressive and beautiful communities in the Nation. Its splendid spirit is epitomized by the council's resolution on civil rights. The resolution reads in full as follows:

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL RIGHTS BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF EAST ORANGE, N.J., ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 23, 1963

Whereas the President of the United States has submitted to the Congress of the United States for its consideration legislation to strengthen enforcement of civil rights in behalf of all of the citizens of the country and particularly in such matters as voting rights and public accommodation; and

Whereas it is the public policy of this city as well as of the State of New Jersey that there be guaranteed and afforded to all of the citizens therein full and equal opportunity in employment, education, housing and public accommodation and other aspects of community life: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That in behalf of the citizens and residents of East Orange, the mayor and city council do hereby urge early consideration and expeditious approval of the civil rights legislation proposed by the President to the Congress without restriction as to the scope thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the views as expressed herein be forwarded to the President of the United States, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives, and to each of the two Senators from the State of New Jersey and Congressman from the 11th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey.

"J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth" Is Nation's Bestselling Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely significant to note the meteoric rise of Victor Lasky's book, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth." On the bookshelves of stores throughout our country for less than a month, it is already the Nation's No. 1 seller, according to the New York Times book review section of October 6, 1963. What does this mean? It means that we finally have an account of the President which does not carry with it the makeup, the Hollywood touch, the press-agency and managed news. It is exactly what it purports to be on the cover: a critical portrait. It means that the liberal establishment is in for a hard time and they know it. It means problems for the New Frontier.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S books have been selling like hotcakes. His "The Conscience of a Conservative" has sold almost 2 million copies and "Why Not Victory?" has topped the 1 million mark. There is a hungering in this country for books which pierce the liberal facade and Victor Lasky's book certainly does this.

It has been panned by reviewers from Time magazine to the New York Times but the people are not listening. Victor probably has the best answer himself. Speaking in my district a week ago, he said:

> There are those who say the book is "out of the trash pile." I tell them this is a trashy administration.

It is great reading. It will go a long way toward bringing a fuller understanding of the man who now occupies the White House. Political books normally do not sell very well. What significance can we attach to the fact that well over 250,000 people will soon have purchased a 600-plus page book for $7.95? I think the significance is very clear.

At the same time that Mr. Lasky's book was published, Hugh Sidey's book "John F. Kennedy, President" went on the bookstands. Despite glowing reviews by the liberal press it has not even made the bestseller list, let alone hit the top. With the help of Mr. Lasky, possibly Mr. Sidey can write a sequel in 1965 and call it John F. Kennedy, Former President.

I include with these remarks an editorial from the New York Daily News of September 9, 1963, and the Roscoe Drummond column of that same day:

[From the New York Daily News, Sept. 9, 1963]

LATEST REPORT ON J.F.K.

The Macmillan Co., New York, publishes today a book which seems certain to make President Kennedy's friends gnash their teeth with rage and his enemies lick their chops with fiendish delight.

The book is "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth," by Victor Lasky; 653 pages, $7.95. It has been a long time in preparation, Mr. Lasky being a most careful and conscientious writer and researcher; but we think it was definitely worth waiting for.

It takes apart various legends about Kennedy, goes into his record in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, quotes extensively from his speeches and other public utterances.

In the course of the book, Kennedy is seen to have been on two or more sides of many public questions at different times, so that you have a tough time figuring out where he really stands on any question.

Lasky considers J.F.K. a political opportunist without any strong convictions, except the conviction that members of the Kennedy family ought to have a lot of the best political jobs available to Americans.

Up to now, Lasky says, the Kennedy administration has proved to be one of the weakest in U.S. history—though of course there is always hope that it may change for the better.

This volume is being publicized as the book that will make Kennedy a one-term President.

Whether it will do that remains to be seen. It might, if J.F.K. were the only person the Republicans had to beat next year. But how about Caroline and John-John, and the gorgeous Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy—three secret weapons which the White House publicity and propaganda wizards are already putting through practice maneuvers and dry runs?

"I," says a sentimental friend of ours, "can't stomach J.F.K. or brother Bobby or Papa Joe; but I'd vote for Caroline for any job fitted to the little honey's talents."

So, we suspect, would many other Americans.

Well, the 1964 presidential campaign promises to be most interesting; and in the course of it we hope his publishers may sell hundreds of thousands of copies of Mr. Lasky's bold, thoroughly documented, and healthily skeptical book on J.F.K.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 9, 1963]

A NEW BOOK ON J.F.K.: "THE MAN AND THE MYTH"

(By Roscoe Drummond)

To those who feel that President Kennedy has long basked in the glow of a substantially uncritical press, Victor Lasky's "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth," is exactly what the doctor ordered.

This book is going to create an explosive stir in political Washington. If it catches on, as is likely, it may be one of the hottest items of conversation in the country clubs and ADA circles since the United States went off the gold standard or Babe Ruth hit 60 home runs.

Here is a crackling volume of 586 pages of unrelieved and unmerciful criticism of John F. Kennedy from political birth to presidential press conference, plus 87 more pages of appendixes, sources and index. (The Macmillan Co., N.Y.)

With another election just around the corner, it will be hard for anybody to be indifferent toward "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth." It will painfully infuriate the all-out Kennedy admirers. It will deliciously delight the all-out Kennedy critics. It will nourish the detachment of independents who can now see, perhaps more fully than before, why the Kennedy performance raises honest doubts in the minds of some people.

Figuratively, Lasky, Washington columnist for the North American Newspaper Alliance, is a one-armed author. By that I mean that there is hardly a single "on the the other hand" in the entire book. Mr. Kennedy comes off second-best in every paragraph.

Lasky avoids vituperation. He neither rants nor calls names. He relies very little upon sweeping assertions drawn from his own bias. He documents his contentions with pertinent quotations from many respectable sources, mostly liberal.

The two kinds of criticism of the President which the Lasky book seems to me to develop with the most care are:

1. The extent to which Mr. Kennedy's instincts, views, and policies have wrenched and disappointed the Democratic liberals.

2. The extent to which Congressman Kennedy, Senator Kennedy, and President Kennedy has been on both sides of so many big questions.

Assuming that Mr. Lasky's quotation and sources—which he cites explicity and at length—are accurate, it develops that during his public career thus far Mr. Kennedy in varying degrees has been for and against: (a) McCarthyism; (b) the reciprocal trade treaties; (c) President Truman's defense of Korea: (d) U.S. involvement in South Vietnam; (e) high farm price supports; (f) diplomatic recognition of the Vatican; (g) defense of Quemoy and Matsu; (h) expressing regrets to Khrushchev over the U-2 incident; (i) the St. Lawrence Seaway; (j) confirmation of Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

Obviously any man in public life will resonably change his mind some time or other on something or other. But this is a pretty formidable list for a politician who accused his political opponent (Senator Henry Cabot Lodge) of "lacking integrity and sincerity" because Lodge changed his position on one issue, the Taft-Hartley law.

The most thoughtful passage in Mr. Lasky's book is this:

"Lacking interior convictions and purpose, Kennedy's most noticeable quality lay not in adherence to a coherent view of things, but to a remarkable ability to acquire whatever happened to be the political fashion of the moment * * * he has indeed been responsive to national moods. 'Kennedy was committed only to noncommitment,' was the way James Burns put it. Neither liberal nor conservative, Kennedy's peculiar strength lay not in the possession of any particular ideological viewpoint, but rather in its absence."

If President Kennedy were being blasted and buffeted by hostile criticism, I would warn against "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth," as being dangerously one sided. As it is, it is a useful corrective.

Well Done, Sgt. Kenneth N. Bracken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, indeed to all Americans, of a commendable example of the kind of man this country has serving in its Reserve units.

It gives me considerable pleasure to pay tribute to the Nation's "Outstanding Air Force Reserve Airman," S. Sgt. Kenneth N. Bracken, of Johnstown, Pa. Airman Bracken was chosen for this honor over approximately 500,000 members of various Air Force Reserve units around the country.

All too often, Mr. Speaker, we take for granted the superior job our Armed Forces Reserve units do in contributing their part to our country's defense. However, when we realize that such units as the 9204th Air Force Reserve Recovery Squadron, of Johnstown, Pa., are staffed with men of the caliber of Sergeant Bracken, we can rightfully be proud—and thankful, I might add—of our country's military posture.

I think it altogether fitting, Mr. Speaker that I say a few words about this fine man, if only to expose for others that diligence, ambition, hard work, and imagination are the antecedents of excellence.

Sergeant Bracken was born March 26, 1928 in Johnstown, Pa. He left Ebensburg High School for the Army Air Corps in 1946. His tour of duty with the Air Corps lasted 12 years, during which time he distinguished himself several times. His career in the field of information and special services has brought him superior ratings by his commanding officers, commendations by various public and civic organizations, and a military commendation by the commanding general of the 4th U.S. Army. His career in information was interrupted by a tour of duty with the 5th Regimental Combat Team in Korea.

Although Airman Bracken did not graduate from high school, he has conscientiously continued his education since 1946. He is a graduate of several Army and Air Force schools, he has completed 20 correspondence courses with the USAFI, he has attended several colleges, he has graduated from at least two schools, one a university, and has been certified to teach in the State of Texas. He is presently enrolled in an officer's candidate course.

After leaving the service, Sergeant Bracken worked for several years in the field of journalism as a staff photographer, sports editor, photographic editor, and freelance photographer for International News Photos, United Press, and King Features Syndicate. He has worked closely with civic and fraternal organizations. Because of his father's poor health, he returned to his hometown and started to work in 1959 for the U.S. Post Office, where he was honored for outstanding work in 1962.

Sergeant Bracken has been eminently active in his local Reserve unit, and several times he has been honored by his fellow airmen and local civic organizations.

Last month Airman Bracken and his wife, the former Grace F. Kuwahara, were here in Washington where he received his official recognition as the country's outstanding Air Force Reserve airman. At that time he was a guest of the Air Force Association's convention, a guest of Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force and a guest of Gen.

Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff.

It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the country's top airman should come from the 9204th Air Force Reserve Recovery Squadron. This unit is a fine example of an Air Force Reserve program. The squadron not only attempts to carry out its primary duty as part of our country's defense, but both the squadron and individual members of the group are active in community projects. The spirit of the squadron is excellent. It would not surprise me if in the future the 9204th would again contribute the country's outstanding Reserve airman.

I have brought S. Sgt. Kenneth N. Bracken and his honor to the attention of my fellow Americans because it is my deep hope that he will be an inspiration to countless other U.S. Air Force Reserve airmen around the country.

We are proud of Airman Bracken. We wish him well, but I have the strong suspicion that he will do well in the absence of our good wishes. Well done, Sergeant Bracken.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, while the contributions made to the development of our Nation by citizens who came here from Poland or who were born in this country and have their ancestry to that land need no detailing in this Chamber, it is appropriate that we acknowledge today the anniversary of the death of a man who, perhaps more than any other, symbolizes this group of fine Americans—Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The district I represent has many Americans of Polish ancestry. They are active in every field of endeavor—business, social, religious, and political. They contribute to the well-being and the welfare of the community. I consider myself fortunate to have grown up in their midst.

Today has by proclamation been set aside in the cities in my district as a day to honor General Pulaski. This is a day to recall the heroic service to America rendered by that gallant soldier in our war for independence. His service is of special significance to those of us in New Jersey for he commanded Washington's cavalry troops in the Battles of Trenton and Flemmington in our State.

One of the country's early and great highway engineering accomplishments, the vehicle skyway that crosses over a large stretch of industrial New Jersey in my district is named for Pulaski, an indication of the esteem in which he continued to be held 184 years after his death.

While we are aware of General Pulaski's great service in the Revolutionary War, we are sometimes inclined to overlook the fact that earlier in his career, he led military forces of his own country against Russian domination of Poland.

We are mindful that we honor today a man who is revered as a great patriot in two nations—the United States and Poland.

Following brilliant service in campaigns in the North under General Washington in our war for independence, General Pulaski was sent to Charleston, S.C., in 1779 to command troops opposing the British there. Leading his cavalry forces further to the south, General Pulaski led the attack against the British at Savannah, Ga. In that action he was gravely wounded and died a short time later.

His was a gallant death in the cause of his adopted country, and worthy of remembrance on this day by all Americans whatever their descent may be. Polish Americans may take special pride that at the time of the birth of the Republic one of their own was at the head of a heroic cavalry charge against the enemy of a new country dedicated to the cause of freedom. Polish Americans have always made large contributions in life and suffering to American struggles against tyranny. In so doing they are at one with the heroic history of the Polish people and that great Pole and great American, Casimir Pulaski.

Hon. Sidney Leviss Receives Praise for Accomplishments as Queens Deputy Borough President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, over a period of some 300 years, the city of New York has established the enviable reputation of attracting and electing some of the most highly competent and qualified individuals to administer the municipal government. Historically, politically, and geographically the city is divided into five boroughs, each of which has its own elected administrative officials.

In my own Borough of Queens, we are most fortunate in having an extremely outstanding assemblage of officials to administer the local government. One of them is the Honorable Sidney Leviss, now the deputy borough president. He has been most active in many organizations and in various community affairs, and has worked diligently and devotedly in the interests of Queens and her almost 2 million residents. I include herein a copy of a letter in praise of Mr. Leviss from the office of the mayor of the city of New York, which is indicative of his work and accomplishments:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., August 21, 1963.

Hon. MARIO J. CARIELLO,
President, Borough of Queens,
Kew Gardens, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is not often that residents of the city are aware of the dedicated and important work which public servants perform anonymously. I feel that I should inform you of the excellent results that have accrued from a suggestion initiated by Deputy Borough President Sidney Leviss.

Mr. Leviss brought to our attention the fact that the new city charter leaves in a vague state the whole question of highway processing, street openings, etc. He proposed that the city administrator bring together all of the agencies involved in order to work out a more effective flow of these activities to assure smooth, expeditious action. The results of a series of conferences on this problem are embodied in a flow chart, in which every stage, from an original proposal through to completion of action, is fully documented. In place of the former state of confusion, there will now be clarity and understanding at every stage by all agencies involved.

I am delighted to report to you that full agreement on the new flow chart was achieved among representatives of all five borough presidents, the department of highways, the budget office, the department of city planning, the board of education, and the city administrator's office.

Mr. Leviss deserves our thanks for initiating action and keeping on top of us until the matter was successfully concluded.

Sincerely,

MAXWELL LEHMAN,
First Deputy City Administrator.

The New York World's Fair will be located in the Borough of Queens, and Sid Leviss' most recent efforts have been directed toward coordinating the tremendous amount of work involved in the complex preparations for this remarkable display which will bring together in our city the peoples, cultures and products of many lands. As one of the official representatives of Queens, the host to the fair and its millions of visitors, Mr. Leviss conceived and did much of the work on a brochure on the Fair Borough, which has been published by the borough and which has met with much favorable comment from Federal, State and city officials.

We are most fortunate to have such a devoted public servant to represent us, and I set forth herewith a biographical résumé of Mr. Leviss and his record of achievement.

SIDNEY LEVISS

Wife, Marion F. Leviss.

Two children, Jean and Nancy.

Graduate of New York University School of Law; member of Law Review.

Admitted to practice law, New York State, January 1942.

Admitted to practice before Southern and Eastern Federal District Courts and to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Member: New York State and Queens County Bar Association; Flushing Lawyers Club; American Legion, Leonard Post, Flushing; board of directors, Flushing Chamber of Commerce; Temple Beth Sholom, Flushing; board of directors Flushing YM and YWHA; Queens County Bar Association Committee on Individual Rights and Fundamental Freedoms; board of directors Queensboro Council for Social Welfare; member board of directors Flushing Boys Club; member honorary board of governors, Electchester Athletic Association, Inc.; member board of sponsors, Mental Health Committee North Queens; member National Democratic Club; Democratic Assembly District Leader, 6th A.D., Part B, Queens County; secretary, Democratic Executive Committee, Queens County; advisory council, New York University Law Alumni Association.

Captain Air Force World War II.

Queens County commander Jewish War Veterans 2 years, held State and National offices, member Post No. 115 Jewish War Veterans.

Queens chairman United Nations Day.

Former assistant district attorney, Queens County; assistant chief, racket bureau; county court trial assistant; and member of Operation Checkmate team to curb juvenile delinquency; special deputy attorney general, State of New York; member of Borough President of Queens Human Relations Committee; member of committee on Legislative Information, National Community Relations Advisory Council; member of American Jewish Tercentenary Committee on Military Participation; past president, Flushing Merchants Association.

Active in following charities: Red Cross; March of Dimes; Salvation Army; United Jewish Appeal; Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; United Hospital Appeal; Greater New York Fund; Queens Lighthouse; Yeshiva University; trustee, Bowne House Historical Society; sponsor of Boy Scout troop; guest of honor, 1961, at testimonial dinner sponsored by the Greater Flushing Community of the Queens Division Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; Flushing Boys Club Man of the Year, 1962; borough coordinator for Queens civilian defense; assistant commissioner, borough works, Queens County, 1958–62, from time to time has served as acting borough president.

Presently deputy borough president, Borough of Queens.

Interested Citizen Asks Clarification on Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, although the nuclear test ban treaty is now an accomplished fact, we can only hope and pray it will not spell defeat for the United States. We have accepted the President's assurances that he would protect the security of the United States, even though his assurances in the past have not always lived up to their promise.

Many people are concerned as expressed by the following letter to the editor of the Chicago Tribune which I include as a part of these remarks.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 16, 1963.

To the EDITOR,
Chicago Tribune,
Chicago, Ill.

SIR: As a political novice, I appeal for help to clarify my thinking on the Moscow test ban treaty.

It seems that many people and some Senators who were previously "on the fence" have been induced to favor the treaty by the President's assurances that the United States will take all precautions necessary to prevent disaster which might result from Soviet duplicity.

I am bothered by this question: What reason is there to believe that such Presidential assurances have any more validity now than the promises of resistance to Communist expansionist policies (including Cuba), which he gave us in his 1960 campaign speeches and later, in 1962, the assurances of removal of the Soviet arms and personnel from Cuba which are still there?

Sincerely yours,

GERALDINE M. BERRYHILL.

Service to Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, because of its significant contribution to a better understanding of the importance and true meaning of a life dedicated to the service of mankind, I wish to place in the RECORD, and respectfully commend to the attention of my colleagues, an address by the Reverend Henry C. Fletcher of Ironton, Ohio, on the subject, "Service to Humanity Is the Best Work of Life."

The address follows:

SERVICE TO HUMANITY IS THE BEST WORK OF LIFE

It was once spoken "He that is greatest among you, let him become the servant of all." Again we've heard it spoken:

"For this I plainly see,
Is the essence of life's plan,
"Tis not what I do for me,
But for my fellow man."

You must concur with me, gentlemen, when I say, "that service is the highest form of leadership in our democratic way of life."

Service to humanity is the best work of life because this is the moral fiber; this is the foundation upon which we stand as true Americans. What are the basic requirements of any good American but to love justice, to execute mercy, and to walk humbly before his fellow man and before his God.

Service to humanity is the best work of life because life in itself is nothing more than a passageway to service and self-sacrifice.

Service to humanity is the best work of life because what is more rewarding than the feeling one gets out of helping his fellow man. What is more rewarding than to see an underprivileged family happy, and to know that we helped to administer this happiness; or what is more rewarding than to see the rate of polio coming down, and to know that our hands have administered the Sabin oral vaccine; or what is more rewarding than to see a community rise to a higher form of human existence through the Jaycee programing and know that we belong to such a worthwhile organization.

It is an evident fact, gentlemen, that when we lose our desire to serve, we lose our stronghold in democracy; yet, on the other hand, is it not true that sometimes we carry our service so far beyond its extended boundaries, that we lose sight of the true essence of democracy, and the true essence of democracy is for a man to be of service to himself and to his fellow man. Is it right for the Government to do that for a man which he ought to do for himself? Is it right to destroy a man's initiative? Today in the face of our labor crisis when automation is retiring thousands of workers annually, would it not be better to retrain those retired individuals rather than to retire them to unemployed compensation?

Should our welfare agencies be agencies to destroy or create initiative in man?

Is it right for us to discriminate against each other because of age, sex, social position, religion, race, or color? Is not democracy on trial today such as it's never been before in the history of our great and powerful Nation? Are we not indulging in the illusion of false hopes and securities building upon foundations of sand?

Gentlemen, my mind goes back a few years ago to the time when I was a small boy playing in the sand. I had decided to build a city. Using my boyish imagination, I put within my small city, houses, stores, schools, streets, and anything else that makes up our great American cities. I was about half through when I noticed in the atmosphere around me signs of rain, for the dark clouds were gathering overhead. I worked hard in completing my city, and when it was completed I gathered some small stones together with the intention of building a wall around the city and placing a piece of canvas over it to protect it from the rain. When the wall was built, I looked inside and much to my dismay, the city crumbled to ruin. You see, I was so concerned with the impending threat of the weather that I forgot to cement my city together with the necessary ingredients.

Gentlemen, even in real life we play upon the sands of time, building our cities, so concerned with the impending threat of not gaining a stronghold behind the Iron Curtain; or so concerned with losing our reciprocal foreign trade; or so concerned with the dark clouds of international gangsterism that threaten the shores of America, that we lose sight of the real test of America. If we are to maintain our strength in America, then let not our strength be in some foreign country such as Korea, Formosa, Laos, or Cuba; but let the core of our strength reside in America and be felt by all Americans and then move out to foreign shores.

It is well for us to remember that the greatest hour of victory that we as Americans will experience will not come when we have the greatest display of military might; nor will it come when we have reduced our unemployment to its lowest ebb; nor will it come when we can mount up with the wings of eagles and fly to astronomical heights in the face of the sun; but the greatest hour of victory that we as Americans will experience, will come when we can forget our indifferences and join at the base of the mountain and climb the rugged mountain of life arm-in-arm and hand-in-hand chanting in unity "I am my brother's keeper." Then and only then we shall realize that all of the combine forces of the world cannot interrupt nor vanquish the cadences of 180 million marching Americans.

Prefers Foreign Aid to Belly Dancers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I receive many thousands of letters in the course of representing the 17th Ohio District and they range everywhere from the ridiculous to the sublime, from the terse to the tome, and on every subject conceivable, I have not received one which I felt more like sharing with the Members of this body, however, than one which good-naturedly poked fun at our foreign aid program. One of my constit-

uents spotted an advertisement in the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal which pictured a seductive belly dancer and was captioned as follows:

Opening Monday at Benny Klein's Charcoal Steakhouse is Princess Jozella, the queen of the Persian dancers. She'll be joined on the bill by Crazy Willy Kelsey, New Orleans jazz clarinetist, who returns after an absence of several weeks.

This ad prompted the following letter, facetious indeed, from this tax-paying constitutent:

DEAR JOHN: I know you have been against foreign aid and so have I, but the enclosed article in Monday's Columbus Citizen-Journal has caused me to have some second thoughts.

I know that foreign royalty has been having difficult times because I notice that a large number of dukes and counts have been engaging in wrestling for a livelihood, but when a Persian princess has to do a belly dance in Benny Klein's Charcoal Steakhouse and on the same program with Crazy Willy Kelsey no less, I feel it is a shame.

I would like to see Persia get enough foreign aid so that their princesses can stay home and keep their clothes on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact this makes far more sense than do many of the projects we are frittering away our resources on and this letter probably deserves a second thought.

Alabama Trucking Association Receives Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee it makes me very proud to be able to announce that the Alabama Trucking Association, a non-profit trade association comprised of for-hire and private truck operators and allied industries of the fine State of Alabama, which it is my pleasure to represent, recently received high honors and recognition in meriting an Award of Merit by the Jury of Awards of the American Society of Association Executives at its annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., during September of this year.

To indicate, Mr. Speaker, the great emphasis that the Alabama Trucking Association has placed on safety I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the highway and traffic safety program of the association.

The excerpts follow:

SAFETY PROGRAM OF THE ALABAMA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

THE PROBLEM

The trucking industry, more than any other, is dependent upon the privileged use of the public thoroughfare for the conduct of its everyday business. The inescapable character, size and sound of commercial motor vehicles is such as to cause unwarranted trepidation on the part of some highway users and citizens. This attitude is unwarranted as borne out by the superior safety performance and record of professional truck drivers, and the lack of factual information and understanding by most people.

THE PLAN OF ACTION

In large measure, the attempted solution of this problem takes the form and method of a public relations effort. The plan therefore sought a change in public attitudes which was executed on a double standard of (1) responsible conduct and performance by the industry, its members and employees on the broadest possible basis, and (2) a continuous, concerted action for effective public education of the industry's vital role and importance to all citizens.

Within these goals the following activities have been developed over a period of time which as conducted during the past year 1962 merited the Alabama Trucking Association the highest national "Summa Cum Laude" Award for a State trucking association safety program by American Trucking Associations for the third consecutive year, with the added distinction of the highest point score ever achieved.

The projects and activities constituting this balanced program are briefed following.

SUMMARY FOR PUBLICITY PURPOSES

A year around, continuous program to reduce highway and traffic losses, promote safety and improve public confidence in trucks and the trucking industry, is the entry of the Alabama Trucking Association.

The safety program, founded on management support through a standing association committee, was executed through a council organization of experienced, professional, safety supervisory personnel. The program was additionally advanced by a full-time, technically trained association staff member, and a specially retained safety counsel.

The plan of action begins with performance of good safety practice within the trucking industry, and association members' truck fleets. It is furthered through promotion with public agencies, civic and other groups. It embraces general safety practices, though emphasizing highway and traffic safety. The program was designed to serve the association membership, its members employees and customers, the industry as a whole including nonassociation members, public agencies, and the general public.

The program has been successful and has experienced favorable results. "An excellent contribution to the betterment of traffic safety in the State and Nation," was the comment of one national safety authority.

This safety program for 3 consecutive years merited the highest national award of the American Trucking Associations for a State association safety program, and this year received the highest point score ever achieved.

More even than these high honors, this safety program has been a cornerstone of association-industry public relations that has united membership, brought favorable attention and acceptance by public officials, law-enforcement agencies, the press, and the general public.

SERVICES OF THE ALABAMA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

The Alabama Trucking Association conducts a wide range of activities for the improvement of the trucking industry and its service to the public. It maintains a continuing program of public relations emphasizing information services through news media and other channels to bring better understanding and acceptance of the trucking industry. Its membership is served by information service on industry developments, legislation, taxes, and regulations covering both Alabama, other States, and the Federal and local level. Representation of the industry with other organizations, governmental agencies and regulatory bodies is also provided.

In conjunction with higher educational institutions and State agencies it offers instructional courses and programs to improve employee performance and efficiency of its members. Legal and research services are provided on matters of general industry application, and continuous efforts are directed to advancement of reciprocal recognition between Alabama and the other States benefiting the free flow of interstate trade and commerce.

The association is the exclusive publishing agent for all Alabama intrastate motor carrier tariffs as well as publisher of a monthly magazine, the Alabama Trucker, which serves as both an internal and external medium.

The association has become the recognized leader in Alabama among nongovernmental groups in the field of highway and traffic safety and has received numerous national awards for its public interest safety program. This activity is directed by a full-time, technically trained and experienced staff member Charles J. Burns, who is director of safety and information.

Mr. Speaker, some of the various projects that the association has in the field of traffic safety are: monthly membership safety service, supervisory personnel training, safety publicity and information material, annual truck fleet safety contest, driver of the year program, cooperative road patrol, Alabama truck rodeo, education activity, special courses on ICC regulations, retention of special safety counsel, participation in official State safety activities, speakers' bureau, arrest report service, safety awards to civic organizations, traffic, speed and noise surveys, highway hazard reporting, school safety shows, fleet safety program assistance, road condition reporting, driver training school, driver license service, driver courtesy campaigns, Alabama teenage driver rodeo, courtesy impromptu truck inspection checks, lights on for safety campaign, holiday safety patrol, truck routing projects, Alabama Press Association Safety Awards, heroism awards, vehicle safety check, national newspaper safety writing contest, "arrive alive" campaign, general safety training, and truck accident investigations.

As you can readily see, Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Trucking Association has gone out 100 percent for safety and I have been pleased to have been a part of this program in the lights on for safety program over the Fourth of July periods by making a radio tape recording encouraging drivers to drive with their lights on during daylight hours. This recording was aired some 1,428 times during the holiday period.

THE RESULTS

While it is difficult to appraise the results of a program of this nature due to the intangibles involved, there have nevertheless been beneficial, demonstrated results. Some of these have been mentioned within each activity description. Some have been specific and statistically accreditable, others very general.

It is important to note that the cumulative results have been significant. The variety of activities provided a continually fresh news angle during the year, that a less number or a series of more similar activities would not have afforded. This built a cumulative effect in reception by the news media, reader interest, general recognition and acceptance, and favorable public attitude throughout the year.

A yet greater cumulative effect resulted from repetition of activities from one year to the next, which brought better identification of the trucking industry with its safety purpose in the public mind. Among recognized safety authorities in the State, the association has attained the posture as the leader in the field of safety among all nongovernmental groups.

The association's safety program has been the cornerstone of its total public relations effort. All other public relations activities have been built upon and rise from it, as has become so evident in press and media relations, law enforcement agency relations, and government relations.

Nothing succeeds like success and the axiom has become a truism among the membership, since the recognition given the association's safety program has had a uniting effect upon membership and has been important in merchandising better safety practices to an ever-increasing number of truck fleets.

This was dramatically characterized when the State highway patrol in need of a tractor-trailer combination for use in special, undercover investigative work was provided the equipment needed by one truckline. Not using the identical equipment needed, this carrier modified one of its own trailers and bought for the purpose the truck-tractor required and turned it over to the patrol on indefinite loan. Not stopping with this, the carrier's safety personnel then trained the police officer in use of the equipment and other necessary information to perpetrate the use, right down to driver slang and mannerisms. This unique project, coordinated by the association, brought the apprehension of persons making illegal sale of harmful barbiturates and amphetamines to drivers of automobiles and trucks alike, and in one case to schoolchildren.

This like the other ample experience of this continuous safety program constitutes genuine results, results beneficial to association membership, to the cooperating agencies, government, the public interest, and thereby, back again to the association members and the trucking industry as a whole. The program will be continued, and as before it will be annually reviewed, revised as needed, and added to, as has been done each year.

The program has already been accorded distinction, honor, and recognition as having merited the highest national award of the American Trucking Associations for a State association safety program. It has further been awarded this "summa cum laude" distinction 3 years consecutively, and last year received the highest point score ever achieved. The recognition and awards received by this safety program, attesting its value in the judgment of experts in the field, while constituting positive results in its own way, had the further effect of calling such attention to the program as to increase and broaden its acceptance and effectiveness thereby bringing greater results in those basic accomplishments of the program.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski: Son of Poland, American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that on October 11 we pause to recall the anniversary of the death of a great patriot, and to pay tribute to the memory and life of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, one of Poland's unforgettable heroes who sacrificed his life in our own struggle for independence during the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Speaker, liberty is a very strange thing. It has the fascination of its own. Throughout the centuries, men with such patriotic devotion were drawn into its service that the course of history has often been altered by a few men dedicated to the cause of freedom and independence. The pages of history are filled with the names of such patriots, and included among them will forever be found the name of Casimir Pulaski, a native of Poland; so thoroughly inoculated with the spirit of freedom that he joined the forces of our struggling colonies to assist them in attaining this priceless possession.

Because of his great service, as well as that of another great Pole, Kosciuszko, a traditional bond of friendship has long been held by the American people for Poland. And that bond, I hope, will be more firmly cemented through our efforts to destroy the shackles of communism that now bind her brave people and she will again take her rightful place in the family of nations as a free and independent country.

I am glad to have the opportunity of paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimer Pulaski who was a great son of Poland and a great American patriot. All freedom-loving Americans are acquainted with the deeds of the Polish hero. They know of his fruitless struggle for freedom in Poland when that country was partitioned by Germany, Russia and Austria. They know of his interest in the cause of American freedom and his arrival to the 13 colonies to fight brilliantly at the side of George Washington. General Pulaski organized cavalry units and trained American men. History has come to call him the father of the American cavalry.

Casimer Pulaski was born in Poland in 1748, the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski who was a member of the Polish nobility. The young man received his education in the local parish school and later was taught the Latin classics. Although born to wealth and ease, Pulaski joined his father in 1769 in the popular uprising against the Russian puppet, King Stanislas. Without resources, without large organization, without adequate arms or men, the heroic band of patriots fought gallantly against ever-increasing odds. Finally the fatal day came, however, when Pulaski had to decide whether to make a final desperate, suicidal stand, and be slaughtered with the remaining forces, or go abroad to seek aid.

He chose the latter course, dispersing his men to await help and another opportunity to resist. He first sought aid for his cause in Prussia, then in Turkey. By that time he was a penniless refugee since the family estates had been ravaged. His father and brother had been killed, and another was being held prisoner. Countless relatives and friends had died for Poland's right to be free.

His path finally led to Paris where he met Benjamin Franklin, a man of similar tastes. Learning of the dire need for trained soldiers and leaders, Pulaski journeyed to the United States where he soon distinguished himself by his personal courage and brilliant tactical knowledge. At the battle of Brandywine, Pulaski demonstrated the value of cavalry so ably and he distinguished himself so well in battle that he was commissioned brigadier general by Congress and given command of the entire American cavalry. General Pulaski proved to be a spirited young commander who fervently believed in the cause for which he was fighting. At the head of his men, in the thick of battle, he fought for 2 long years for our Nation and contributed to the winning of the revolution.

On October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry unit and was seriously wounded. He was removed to the brig Wasp where surgeons were unable to remove the bullet. He died on board on October 11 at the age of 31, ending a career of a gallant and brilliant soldier. General Pulaski died as he had lived—in the midst of a fight for freedom.

Thus General Pulaski inscribed his name in the hearts and memory of every American. His name has become synonymous with freedom—a quality inherent in every person, particularly persons of Polish descent who have known so little freedom during the last 2 centuries.

Americans owe a debt of gratitude to him which can never be fully repaid. Our love and admiration for him is matched only by our love and respect for the country from which he came and whose spirit and love of liberty he typified. We Americans should dedicate ourselves to bring freedom to Poland, Pulaski's homeland, so that it will again be in the sunshine of liberty and independence.

New Life for the Area Redevelopment Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, unless some immediate action is taken the area redevelopment program will come to a halt very shortly. ARA, originally enacted to provide Federal assistance to help increase permanent employment in economically distressed areas of the Nation, can only be complimented on a job well done. Great strides have been made during the past 2 years, but certain long-range problems linger on. Serious and persistent unemployment continues to plague the Nation.

We in Connecticut are familiar with the accomplishments of ARA. We do not wish to see their good works go down the drain. This week an ARA official is

visiting our State trying to determine whether additional aerospace subcontracts may be let to our firms. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues one of many letters I have received in appreciation of the assistance rendered by the Area Redevelopment Agency and also to urge them to support the ARA program when it reaches the House floor:

KNOX GLASS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., October 1, 1963.

Hon. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRABOWSKI: No doubt you have heard by now the good news that the Area Redevelopment Administration has approved our application for a loan in connection with the expansion of our Danielson plant facility. All 3,400 of us here in Knox Glass are extremely pleased and we intend to start immediately on the preliminary work that must be done prior to groundbreaking, which we hope to begin in the spring.

We are most appreciative of the help and assistance you have rendered to us in connection with our application. We feel that your continued personal interest in this matter over the past year was a decisive factor in this major community development

Our expansion could not be realized without the financial assistance of the Area Redevelopment Administration We sincerely believe that this project is good not only for Knox Glass, but also will be tremendous help to the Danielson area. The expansion will result in additional jobs for the Danielson community in excess of 175 people and will bring an additional annual payroll of $1 million to the community, as well as increased job security for the 240 people presently employed there by Knox Glass.

There are, of course, other indirect benefits that will accrue to the community, such as the proposed reopening of the U.S. Corrugated's fiberboard box plant located in that area. This plant had closed in April of this year with a layoff of about 50 people.

We are grateful for the wholehearted cooperation which we received, during the long months of negotiations, from Mr. Ward Miller and his associates at the Area Redevelopment Administration in Washington including their Northeast Representative, Mr. Charles Hammarlund, and the cooperation of the New York office of the Small Business Administration, particularly, Mr. Charles Kriger and Mr. William Myles and his staff.

Thank you so much for your help in our plans for the Danielson plant.

Sincerely,

R. A. RICH,
Chairman of the Board and President.

Our Coming Battle With the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress as well as many people throughout the Nation are vitally interested in seeing that something is done to protect the military from implementation of the so-called Gesell report. In my opinion, the Defense Department is trying to gradually implement this report and see that its recommendations are carried out.

The recommendations of the Gesell Committee are intended to use the military politically and as a club and lever over entire communities. It is shocking to me that the Executive Branch of our government could seek such means to regulate private business and thus further gain control and authority over private enterprise, over the Armed Forces and the free enterprise ssytem which has made America strong.

The Honorable CARL VINSON, member of the House of Representatives from Georgia and chairman of the House Armed Services Commitee, has introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, would prevent the implementation of the Gesell report. Representative VINSON, of course, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has the right, power and duty to refer his bill to the proper subcommittee so that this matter may be gone into thoroughly and the people of the Nation informed as to the dangers confronting our Nation as a result of this iniquitous report of the so-called Gesell committee. This will give an opportunity to investigate the background and philosophy of the members of the committee as well as the effect of the recommendations if implemented upon the military, the free enterprise system of the Nation, the right to choose our associates and to operate our private businesses without interference. I trust that some action will be forthcoming on this matter in the very, very near future. We cannot stand idly by and permit the rights, liberties and freedoms of our people to be siphoned off by a power-crazed and political partisan government bent on self-perpetuation.

On Tuesday, October 1, 1963, there appeared in the Lynchburg (Va.) News a very timely editorial entitled "Our Coming Battle With the Military." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial which is as follows:

OUR COMING BATTLE WITH THE MILITARY

Representative CARL VINSON, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has fired the opening shot in the civilian battle to keep President Kennedy from using the military services as an economic weapon to enforce his racial policies.

Mr. VINSON has introduced a bill (H.R. 8460), which makes it an offense punishable by court martial for military men to carry out Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's directive on off-base racial discrimination.

McNamara's directive was based on the recommendations of the special group appointed over a year ago by the President and headed by Washington attorney Gerhard A. Gesell. While the Defense Secretary issued the order he did so at the direction of the President.

The order, issued July 26, instructs base commanders to work for the integration of facilities in communities near bases and gives them power to declare segregated facilities off-limits. It throws the full weight of the armed services and all the economic power they represent against the civil governments of this Nation. It is not stretching a point to state that this order places every community near a military base and every community with military installations, under a degree of martial control through the power of the economic boycott.

The Pentagon says it is not integrating anything. It says it is merely prepared to order its men not to patronize places which are segregated.

The best that can be said for this explanation is that it is a lie. The worst that can be said is that it is intended to deceive.

The key word in the statement is "patronize." The order does not mean that only restaurants, bowling alleys and the like will be placed off-limits and servicemen forbidden to enter them. It also gives the Pentagon the power to boycott any firm with which it does business. And it does billions of dollars worth of business each year, and those billions come from the American taxpayer. Now they are to be used as a weapon against him, to enforce the President's racial policies.

The order not only authorizes a direct, or primary boycott, but it can be used to enforce a secondary boycott—to force supplier businesses into line. There is practically no limit to its use nor to the firms and individuals against whom it can be used.

The South will bear the brunt of this despotism at first, but the order applies to military installations and forces anywhere in the Nation. The South fights alone today, but the remainder of the Nation will have to fight tomorrow.

VINSON's bill seeks to prevent the use of this massive economic weapon against the people who pay for it. The bill would make any member of the armed services subject to court-martial who "seeks to direct or control any activity" of any serviceman off base on the basis of race, color, or religion.

It would make it a court-martial offense for a serviceman to direct, implement, or request the use of the off-limits sanction because of race, color, or religion.

And it would penalize those who complained about military racial policies or processed complaints without going through the regular channels and without informing the target of the complaint.

VINSON included the latter provision as a result of the Gesell report which stated that Negroes are often inhibited from making complaints through regular channels. The report suggested that they be encouraged to bypass regular channels.

The bill also bars the use of any Defense Department appropriations to carry out McNamara's directive.

VINSON accuses McNamara of trying to "impose a new social order throughout the United States through use of our Armed Forces."

"This is a direct invasion by the Department of Defense into local affairs," he continued. "If it is social reform today, it may be direct participation in national elections tomorrow."

He could have pointed out that the President has thrice ordered these forces into the field against two member States of the Union in the past 12 months.

No American in his right mind trusts any military force, much less his own. The greatest military threat to an American comes from his own armed services, since he has nothing to protect him from them. He has established them to protect him. And he has only to look around him, in his own hemisphere, to find civilian governments overthrown regularly by military juntas. The most recent example occurred last week, in the Dominican Republic. History catalogs the triumph of the military over civil government.

The President is setting a dangerous precedent. He is dragging the military into the political arena, to enforce a partisan policy. Once engaged, the military will be in a position to bargain. It will, in short, become a power in civil government—the greatest power, since it has the means to force compliance with its will regardless of law. The first step toward a military dictatorship in this Nation will have been taken if McNamara's directive is allowed to stand.

That directive is only one more case in point in a long line of Kennedy decisions which reveal that the President appears to

ignore the consequences of his decisions as long as he gets his way now and the vote tomorrow.

All that stands between us and this bleak future is Mr. VINSON's bill.

The Cooley Cotton Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of an editorial that appeared in the Progressive Farmer concerning the Cooley cotton bill that I hope the House will soon have an opportunity to vote on.

This editorial, Mr. Speaker, I believe very clearly indicates the general feeling in regard to this bill. Therefore, I am hopeful that when the bill does come to the floor for action that an amendment can be offered that will make the legislation more acceptable to the farmers.

I would like to place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

COOLEY COTTON BILL NEEDS CHANGES

As we go to press, there seems to be grave doubt as to whether any cotton legislation will be approved by Congress this year. This could be as dangerous in the long run as bad features in some of the bills proposed. Our considered judgment is that we cannot afford either no legislation or bad features of possible legislation.

The only bill that has a chance of passage in the House—the Cooley bill—is aimed in the right direction. It is furthermore fairly obvious that unless the House acts, nothing will come out of the Senate in 1963. This Cooley bill has a number of provisions that will help the cotton industry. It seeks to help mills meet their problem of competing with imports from other countries; it provides a crash program for weevil eradication and other measures to cut growing costs. But the bill is saddled with a couple of features that could be disastrous to growers.

The bill makes it mandatory that the U.S. Department of Agriculture provide cotton to U.S. mills by August 1, 1964, at a price "not in excess of that for which it is made available for export." The export price is now about 8½ cents a pound lower than U.S. support prices, or around 24 cents.

In 1961, mills would have been fully satisfied with 30-cent cotton and no special payment. A 5-cent payment now would supply them cotton from the 1963 crop at a price equivalent to 27½ cents per pound—the cheapest in many years.

At present price support levels, an 8½-cent payment to mills would cost the Government $340 to $400 million. But, say you, why should growers worry about giving mills a windfall? There's good reason why. Struggling as it is to reduce cost of farm programs, the Government would almost certainly take advantage of lowered supports the bill would provide under the McIntire amendment. That's 30 cents for 1964, 29½ cents for 1965, and 29 cents for 1966, compared with 32.47 cents now.

A cut to 30 cents would then reduce today's export subsidy and the mill payment to 6½ cents. On 14 million bales, that would save $175 million and it would all come out of growers' pockets. If the amendment should not be accepted, then support prices could be cut to about 26¼ cents under already existing law.

It is true that under the Cooley bill the first 15 bales of an allotment would be supported at up to 10 percent more than the basic support price, but not to exceed 32.47 cents. We estimate this would cover a fifth of the crop southwide and somewhat more than half in Alabama and Georgia. Yet favoring the 15-bale grower over the 50-bale man is in itself a dangerous precedent. Discrimination could grow like weeds in manured ground. Moreover, it favors the type of grower who is rapidly going out of cotton. It favors him at the expense of folks who will continue to be the backbone of the industry.

Last year, we traveled over our territory and talked with many cotton people about cotton costs. We concluded that it is costing our best growers from 24 to 25 cents a pound to grow cotton in most areas. We found that with a 32½-cent support price, these growers had about 8 cents a pound for risk and management after paying all costs. Take 3 cents off this 8-cent margin, and you have cut a grower's profit margin 40 percent on every bale he produces beyond 15. That's cutting the profit margin far too thin.

We need new cotton legislation. There is no doubt about it. But the Cooley bill gives mills too much and growers too little. To be acceptable, it must be amended to give growers more price protection. A still better move would be substitution of S. 608, the Sparkman-Hill bill, for the Cooley bill. We would urge addition of the Cooley bill's research section to the substituted bill.

Next month we propose to analyze some of the real dangers that we see ahead if we get no cotton legislation this year.

Who Wins on the Wheat Deal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in his usual manner President Kennedy made the approval of the sale of wheat to Communist Russia sound very pleasing as he glossed over any dangers to the United States. He glibly assured reporters at his press conference that the Russian people would know that they were receiving wheat from the American people in spite of the fact that we have had no success in reaching the Russian people. He barely noted that Russia would agree not to supply wheat to Cuba and other satellites, but failed to say how we can depend on their word in this case any more than when Khrushchev promised to get the troops out of Cuba.

No, the President just does not understand communism, the world struggle and what needs to be done to preserve the security of the United States, or he does not care.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the October 15 issue of the National Review which points out how well we are playing Khrushchev's game in the President's wheat deal.

The editorial follows:

WHO WINS ON THE WHEAT DEAL?

Granted one initial premise, it all follows logically enough. When the Canadians get X millions selling them their wheat, and when the Australians get Y millions selling theirs, why shouldn't we Americans get in on the deal? If we don't supply it, they'll get their wheat anyway from the other producers, won't they? And we've got our mountainous surplus and our shaky dollar to add special motives to the normal—isn't it normal?—wish of a man to find a market for his products. When Britain sends them chemical plants and Italy sends them steel pipe and West Germany sends them locomotives, what sense does it make for us to be so Nice-Nellie?

Yes, it's all logical enough if we're sure, quite sure, of just one point: That Khrushchev isn't serious when he says he is going to bury us; that a free society is not threatened by a totalitarian society, based on a state-owned industry and a state monopoly of foreign trade, and committed to world revolution.

If we are wrong on that point, we are very wrong indeed. Because then this wheat that we and our friends are sending them, the machines and chemicals, tools and ships that will follow soon enough now that the door is opening—that started flowing from our friends some while ago—cannot have any other effect than to strengthen the hand of an enemy that he may the more surely slay us. What is the meaning of the current Soviet wheat shortage that their Government is so frantically striving to fill? (We may be sure, in passing, that the shortage does not extend to the vast war reserves that the Communists have always assigned an absolute priority over stomachs.) This shortage is the expression of the silent but persistent and wonderfully effective resistance of the peasants to communism. It amounts to a general strike of the peasantry, perhaps the major obstacle on the Communists' road to the completion of the revolution. They are held back from conquering the world because they cannot conquer the farmers and peasants in the regions they have already seized. We now arrive as the strikebreakers, enabling the regime to breathe more freely, to redirect into the arms-supporting industries the energies drained—as Khrushchev quite frankly admits—by "the peasant problem."

Khrushchev isn't going to have much trouble burying us if we are determined to prove Marx right when he predicted that, from the nature of capitalism and the profit motive, we will inevitably dig our own graves.

Mrs. Fournier Wins Wilkinson Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and energetic community leaders I know received a well-deserved honor in Lawrence, Mass., last week. Mrs. Louise Haffner Fournier was awarded the Ralph B. Wilkinson Award for "dedicated leadership toward an improved community." Mrs. Fournier has played an active role on the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce; she served as chairman of Business Education Days and the access roads committee and was active on the State legislative committee.

In addition she has been a director of St. Ann's Orphanage in Methuen and of the United Fund. These are just a few of Mrs. Fournier's accomplishments and I must also mention that she is the mother of five children.

Mrs. Fournier's achievement should serve as an inspiration to all those who seek to help their communities.

Under unanimous consent, I include the fine account of the occasion of the presentation of the Wilkinson Award which appeared in the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune on October 4, 1963, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MRS. FOURNIER WINS WILKINSON AWARD

Dedicated leadership toward an improved community was recognized Thursday night when Mrs. Louise Haffner Fournier was presented the 1963 Ralph B. Wilkinson award.

The award, resoundly applauded by the nearly 400 Greater Lawrence residents gathered at Freedman's Hall for the annual dinner sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce, was the 10th presented in honor of the late local business and civic leader.

Past winners, most of whom were in the audience, were: 1954, Walter V. Demers, Sr.; 1955, Dr. Milton J. Meyers; 1956, the late Abbot Stevens; 1957, James F. Hennessey; 1958, William F. Lucey; 1959, Dr. Nina E. Scarito; 1960, Walter N. Webster; 1961, Charles J. McCabe; and 1962, Fred E. Dionne.

MAYOR MAKES PRESENTATION

Mrs. Fournier was presented the emblamatic plaque by Mayor John J. Buckley who has officiated in that capacity at all 10 award dinners.

Obviously moved and deeply touched, Mrs. Fournier expressed her gratitude to the organization, remarking that she only "wished my father, who so respected and liked Mr. Wilkinson, could have been here tonight * * * he would have been so proud."

Her husband and children were with her to share the honor.

It came only moments after the gathering was urged to take a more active part in community affairs.

The speaker was Frank S. Christian, vice president in charge of marketing for the New England Merchants National Bank of Boston.

Christian told from personal experience how too often businessmen work 24 hours daily and become expert in their fields, but know very little about other things that surround them.

His awakening came, he said, when he and another man formed a committee of two to foster redevelopment of the Hub's waterfront area, once a thriving port and now 100 acres of "dilapidated" structures.

TOTAL COST $90 MILLION

He estimated that $250,000 would be needed for preliminary planning of the project that eventually will cost $90 million. The Boston Chamber of Commerce gave $60,000 and he raised the remaining $190,000 during the next 3 months by private subscription of businessmen.

During and after the formation of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, Christian said, was when he became aware of the lack of communication in many instances between industrial and business specialists and public office holders.

"We must realize," he said, "that the decisions of legislators and officeholders will make or break our free enterprise system. Too often, each has been insensitive to the other's needs."

The speaker also lamented the image of the business world in the minds of the country's youth.

STUDENT SURVEY CITED

In four major surveys completed nationally, he said, it was found that a majority of high school students considered profit immoral and felt that the Government should regulate it.

"If they are going to find places in our system," he said, "they've got to be instructed so that they will understand it."

He reminded his listeners that businessmen are in a minority group.

He suggested that we take an entirely fresh look at our problems and find the guts to find solutions to them.

In introducing Mrs. Fournier, Mayor Buckley told of the "difficult task" faced by the judges whose "choice * * * exemplifies the very spirit of selfless devotion to civic service."

The recipient, he said, was a "dedicated supporter of our free enterprise system. She has never been hesistant to put her shoulder to the wheel in any program that will be good for the Nation, the State, or Greater Lawrence."

CHAMBER DIRECTOR

Mrs. Fournier, president and treasurer of Haffner Service Stations, Inc., was the first woman elected to the board of directors of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce.

She was the chamber's first chairman of the Business Education Days and was active on the State legislative committee. More recently she was chairman of the chamber's access roads committee.

She is a director and friend of St. Ann's Orphanage, Methuen; a director and division chairman of the United Fund; a member of the Ladies of Merrimack and a director of the Girl Scouts Council.

Earlier this year, she headed the committee that planned a civic reception to singing star Robert Goulet.

She is married to Emile L. Fournier and they have five children.

THREE OTHER SPEAKERS

Other speakers at the dinner were Toastmaster Thomas R. Roussell, Arthur T. Compagnone, president of the Greater Lawrence Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Donald E. Peterson, State president of the JayCees.

Rev. J. Edison Pike, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, Andover, gave the invocation and benediction.

Also at the head table were Robert E. Maguire, president of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, and the organization's exective vice president, Elbert G. Moulton.

Andrew Alvino and Robert E. Gauthier were cochairmen of the dinner committee.

The award committee included: Philip Saracusa, Ervin N. Livingston, George Stern, Robert Pangione, William V. Flynn, Warren Lafferty, Francis J. MacDonald, and Richard R. Rochon.

Federal Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the introduction, conclusions, and recommendations of the report by the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, whose chairman is Mr. Roswell Magill, former Secretary of the Treasury under the Roosevelt administration. I believe that this report constitutes a most sensible approach to our Federal tax policy, and I recommend the reading of the full report by Members of this House:

I. INTRODUCTION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our Federal tax system is one of the most important influences affecting economic growth and the full employment of labor and the country's productive facilities. While it is not the source of all our economic troubles, the Federal tax structure is obsolete and wastefully complex. When tax rates and total tax burdens are as high as they are now, the tax system inevitably influences the economy adversely, in ways other than those directly involved in collecting dollars for the Treasury.

Tax revision is long overdue. To a great extent the structure has been shaped during periods of emergency—the depression of the 1930's, World War II, and the Korean conflict—to meet "temporary" needs. Yet, a decade since the end of the fighting in Korea, no basic recasting of the system has taken place. Moreover, inflation has brought a rise of about 14 percent in the level of prices in this period and has made higher tax rates applicable at lower levels of real income. Thus in effect the progression of the individual income tax has been steepened.

The fundamental reason for taxes is to pay for government expenditures. Federal taxes collected in the fiscal year 1963 were about $100 billion, equal to 20 percent of the net national product or 22 percent of national income. Even so, the system did not yield enough to carry the costs of Government.

The need for tax changes is no longer questioned, but the problem is not one of taxes alone. Federal expenditures must be considered along with tax revision—and the outlook for the control and reduction of Federal expenditures is not encouraging. Unless expenditures are controlled reasonably to match the revenues generated by a tax system with lower rates of income taxation, the people must make a clear national choice between a higher level of private spending and new taxes to support more government spending.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Our Federal tax system has a pervasive influence on our economic life. As presently constituted, it is a significant impediment to the investment required for economic well-being today and future growth. The tax system urgently requires revision.

2. The current concern about the unfavorable balance of payments and the stability of the dollar as an international currency emphasizes the desirability of removing tax impediments to investment for business modernization and growth.

3. Jobs, income, and the goods and services we consume depend primarily upon the activities of private business. Corporations and unincorporated businesses are the source of the vast bulk of our national income. To advance economic welfare, we should minimize and endeavor to eliminate tax impediments to business expansion and efficiency.

4. Tax revision on any broad scale should be the best we can design not only for immediate needs, but for the long run. Current conditions cannot be ignored, but the prin-

cipal emphasis should be on the needs of the decades ahead.

5. Excessive progression in the rates of the individual income tax and the unduly high rates of the individual and corporate income taxes are serious deterrents to initiative, saving, and risktaking. The extremely high rates exert a substantial distorting influence on business and individual decisions. They retard economic growth and attainment of adequate investment, employment, and consumption.

6. Whatever the conditions of the moment, longer-run considerations call for tax reductions which encourage investment as a means of increasing consumption. The rate of economic growth will be governed to a large degree by the rate of investment for expansion and modernization, and the efficiency of its utilization.

7. The required revision of the tax system is inextricably related to Federal expenditures. Tax relief on the scale needed is possible only as Federal spending is reduced or as the economy grows and Government expenditures are held at a level which will permit reduction in tax rates without continuing deficits. The efficacy and the desirability of tax cutting without reduction in expenditures as a deliberate means of restoring the economy to full employment are viewed by the committee with great skepticism. Tax reduction which results in deficits for this purpose is a tenuous and uncertain means and can, at most, be condoned only temporarily. Deficits as a way of life invite uncontrolled spending, price inflation, and a further weakening of the dollar. Under present conditions of the economy, however, tax reduction which promotes faster economic growth can properly be advocated in spite of a resulting deficit, provided it is coupled with an orderly program to bring the budget into balance through expenditure reduction and control.

8. Substantial tax reduction is possible without continuing deficits if the administrative budget can be held to $95 billion for 1964 and if future increases in Federal expenditures are rigidly limited (table A). But even if spending is stabilized, tax reduction will unavoidably increase deficits until economic growth yields the revenue to match expenditures.[1]

9. The problems involved should not deter the Congress from prompt action to reduce taxes. The need for appropriate tax reduction is urgent. Expenditures can be controlled, and if they are, the prospects of a balanced budget by 1966 are good enough to warrant the acceptance of the initial deficits which will be incurred (table A).

10. The program of rate reduction of the individual and corporate income taxes should not be interrupted or reversed in order to raise revenues to finance increased Government spending. Any inadequacy of revenues from failure to control expenditures within the capacity of the new income tax structure should be covered by new tax sources; the alternative of continuing deficits and inevitable inflation is unacceptable. If the level of expenditures requires additional revenues, income tax rates should not be increased. The additional revenues should be derived from a new general excise, which would be less likely to impede investment or economic growth.

11. While the basic rate of the individual income tax is too high, the progressive rates, especially those applicable to the higher brackets, are not only punitive but have the greatest deterrent effect on capital formation. Thus, priority should be given to reduction of these rates; the revenue loss is not large but the national advantages would be great. Overall reduction in the entire rate structure depends in final analysis on the degree to which Government expenditures are held in check or alternative taxes are employed.

Footnotes at end of speech.

TABLE A.—*Estimated tax yield under recommended rate and bracket structure, selected levels of gross national product, 1964–66*

[In billions of dollars]

MEDIUM GROWTH ESTIMATES

[GNP increasing at 5 percent annually ($607 in 1964, $637 in 1965, $669 in 1966)]

	1964	1965	1966
Revenues:			
Individual income tax	$47.0	$49.9	$51.1
Corporation income tax	23.8	24.1	24.3
Excise tax	10.9	11.5	12.0
Estate and gift tax	2.4	2.6	2.9
Customs receipts	1.4	1.5	1.7
Miscellaneous budget receipts	4.5	4.6	4.8
Total revenue	90.0	94.2	96.8
Expenditure assumption	95.0	95.0	95.0
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−5.0	−.8	+1.8

LOW GROWTH ESTIMATES

[GNP increasing at 4 percent annually ($601 in 1964, $625 in 1965, $650 in 1966)]

	1964	1965	1966
Revenues:			
Individual income tax	$45.3	$48.5	$48.4
Corporation income tax	22.7	21.8	22.8
Excise tax	10.8	11.2	11.7
Estate and gift tax	2.4	2.6	2.9
Customs receipts	1.4	1.5	1.6
Miscellaneous budget receipts	4.5	4.6	4.8
Total revenue	87.1	90.2	92.2
Expenditure assumption	95.0	95.0	95.0
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−7.9	−4.8	−2.8

HIGH GROWTH ESTIMATES

GNP increasing at 8 percent 1st year, 6 percent thereafter ($624 in 1964, $661 in 1965, $701 in 1966)]

	1964	1965	1966
Revenues:			
Individual income tax	$48.3	$51.7	$53.5
Corporation income tax	27.1	25.9	26.5
Excise tax	11.2	11.9	12.1
Estate and gift tax	2.4	2.6	2.9
Customs receipts	1.4	1.6	1.8
Miscellaneous budget receipts	4.5	4.6	4.8
Total revenue	94.9	98.3	101.6
Expenditure assumption	95.0	95.0	95.0
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−.1	+3.3	+6.6

12. Elimination of inequities in the present tax structure and modification or elimination of unjustified special provisions should also be undertaken. There is merit in many of the proposals now before the Congress which are characterized as "structural reforms." Changes which will broaden the base of the income tax and thus permit greater rate reduction are especially to be sought. Some of the proposals for "structural reforms" are eminently desirable in principle, but several are primarily designed to increase the tax, not to reform it. Furthermore, there are "structural reforms" which are not presently before the Congress but should be, since they have already been studied exhaustively by congressional committees in the past. However, controversy over changes to modify special provisions, eliminate inequities or broaden the tax base should not be permitted to delay prompt reduction of the rates. Reduction of the great disparity between the highest and the lowest tax rates is the most urgently needed revision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In general

1. The tax rates on both individual and corporation income should be reduced in progressive stages starting January 1, 1964.

2. The amount and the pattern of tax reduction should be designed to achieve the optimum permanent improvement of the rate structure. Short-term problems should not dominate action which will have long-run significance. Tax reductions should be planned so that budgetary balance by 1966 will be achieved.

3. The program of tax reduction and reform should be accompanied by control of Federal expenditures—by reducing some programs, avoiding or deferring authorizations, eliminating some areas of Federal activity, and by holding spending programs to such levels that the budget will be balanced at lower levels of income tax rates as economic growth increases revenue yields.

4. If Federal expenditures are not reduced or controlled, neither the program of progressive reduction of income tax rates nor the ultimate goal for the income tax rate structure should be sacrificed. Rather, the revenues required to balance the budget should be obtained from a new general excise such as a tax on goods and services sold at the retail, wholesale or manufacturing level, or a value-added tax. We see no prospect of adding significantly to revenue by restricting deductions or by including in the income tax base receipts now excluded.

5. The present structure of selective excise taxes (other than those on alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, and gasoline) should be revised to apply more broadly.

6. National policy to relieve small business entities from tax rates which will still be high even after the proposed reductions, should continue to be recognized by equal reductions in both the corporation normal tax and surtax rates.

7. The Congress over the past decade has developed a wealth of material on many needed reforms which have not yet been acted upon. A commission or similar body should be established with representation from the Congress, from business and professional groups, and from the public, to review and update this material, undertake any additional studies needed, and prepare recommendations in legislative form for congressional consideration. Efforts for tax reform should give emphasis to the simplification of the provisions affecting the determination of taxable income of business.

TABLE B.—*Recommended rate and bracket structure of the individual income tax*

Step 1		Step 2	
Bracket ($1,000)	Rate (percent)	Bracket ($1,000)	Rate (percent)
0–1	18	0–1	16
1–2	19	1–2	18
2–4	21	2–4	20
4–6	23	4–6	22
6–9	25	6–9	24
9–12	28	9–12	26
12–15	31	12–15	28
15–20	34	15–20	30
20–25	37	20–25	32
25–30	40	25–30	34
30–40	43	30–40	36
40–50	46	40–50	38
50–70	49	50–70	40
70–100	52	70–100	42
100–150	55	100–150	44
150–250	58	150–250	46
250–500	61	250–500	48
Over 500	65	Over 500	50

As to the individual tax

1. The rates of the individual income tax should be reduced from the present range of 20–91 percent to a range of 18–65 percent effective January 1, 1964, and to 16–50 percent effective January 1, 1966 (table B).

2. The brackets of the individual income tax should be broadened, the steps arranged in a more logical relationship, and the brackets extended to higher levels of income (table B).

3. The personal exemptions should not be changed. Relaxation of the burdens on in-

dividuals and families with low incomes, in addition to rate reduction, should take the form of splitting the first bracket (table B). Further relief for low incomes should be achieved not through the rate structure but through a credit against tax of a flat dollar amount, or alternatively a tax credit reduced by a percentage of taxable income in excess of the first bracket so that it "vanishes" as taxable income rises.[2]

4. The $50 dividend exclusion and 4 percent dividend credit should be increased. The present allowances are inadequate as a means of mitigating the double taxation of distributed corporate income. The objective should be an allowance at the initial rate of the income tax.

5. True capital gains should be taxed at progressively lower effective rates, the longer the holding period. Revisions should be made in the law to provide more rational bases for distinguishing between ordinary income and capital gains. A system should be devised which would permit disposition of investments and reinvestments without incurring tax, but with a carry-over of basis and safeguards to insure that the transfers are between equity investments, or from debt to equity. This would recognize that mobility of capital is hampered by the tax liability incurred when investment capital is withdrawn from one enterprise and reinvested in another enterprise; this is a particular burden on availability of funds for new enterprises which need venture capital.

6. A system of income averaging for individuals should be implemented to avoid discriminatory taxation of fluctuating income.

7. The sick pay exclusion should be eliminated. As an alternative, a deduction of medical expenses incurred but now not allowable because of the percentage limitation should be allowed up to the amount of sick pay excludable under present law.

8. As a means of broadening the income tax base and to facilitate essential rate reduction, (a) the present deduction for taxes should be allowed only for taxes incurred in a business or in the production of income, plus State and local income, property, and general sales and use taxes; and (b) the deduction for casualty losses not incurred in a business or in the production of income, should be limited to the excess over some appropriate percentage of adjusted gross income.

9. The program of tax reduction should include a lowering of estate and gift tax rates. This step should be taken quite apart from the long needed reappraisal of the estate and gift tax structure by the Congress.

As to the corporation tax

1. The corporate income tax should be reduced from the present 52 percent by 2 percentage points per year, 1 point each in the normal and surtax, commencing on January 1, 1964, and continuing until the combined rate is 30 percent.

2. The following changes in the taxation of business are desirable to encourage growth:

(a) Congress should provide a statutory basis for determining "guideline" lives for depreciable property, but the reserve ratio test should be eliminated.

(b) The base for computing depreciation should not be reduced by the investment tax credit.

(c) Intercorporate dividends should be freed from tax.

(d) The 2 percent penalty tax for filing consolidated returns should be eliminated.

3. Changes in the taxation of natural resources subject to percentage depletion and the amount of such depletion to be allowed should be considered in the light of present resource needs and reserves, and in the light of the desirability of incentives for economic development and growth generally, such as incentives to research and development. Decisions concerning major changes in the taxation of income from natural resources should await the development of more factual information, particularly in view of the uncertain economic and revenue effects.

4. The gain on the sale of depreciable property, including depreciable real property, should be taxed as ordinary income to the extent of depreciation previously allowed.

5. The problems of taxing income from foreign sources have not been solved satisfactorily. The statutory changes in 1962, by and large, added complexity and inequities in an already difficult area. The Congress should reexamine the basic philosophy of the 1962 amendments. This rests on an unsound concept which would require that income earned abroad by American businesses be taxed on the same basis as income earned at home, with an objective of discouraging investment in certain countries. We believe that income earned abroad by American companies should be taxed in a manner conducive to meeting the competition of foreign businesses in other countries. Such a policy would best serve the long-term balance-of-payments interests of the United States. A study should be undertaken to determine whether a solution can be found by means of international agreements for a rational allocation of income from international business.

---

[1] Note by L. E. Kust: "If the thesis is sound that the present tax structure yields a budget surplus before full employment is achieved, and that larger budget deficits can solve our unemployment problem, it should be noted that under the proposed rate structure and the assumed expenditures, a budget surplus would not be achieved until the GNP is approaching what should on this thesis be a full employment level."

[2] Note by Alfred Buehler: "It would be preferable, in my opinion, to meet the problem of burdens of taxes on the lower incomes directly through the rate schedule rather than by introducing another special tax differential. The tax rates on all incomes should be related to revenue requirements as well as to economic considerations."

Proposed Curtailment of Service on New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad recently announced that it will further curtail passenger train service on its lines from New London, Conn., to Worcester, Mass., and from New London to Providence, R.I. If the railroad is permitted to go through with its plans it will mean the elimination of all passenger train service in that area affecting eastern Connecticut, Rhode Island and parts of Massachusetts.

As the Representative of the Second District of Connecticut, which includes the eastern part of the State, I want to express the strongest possible protest in behalf of my constituents over the proposed curtailment of train service. This is not the first time that this railroad company has taken such steps. In recent years it has abandoned no less than 18 passenger trains, all under the excuse of saving money. The people of our area, while dissatisfied with the railroad's actions in the past, tried to understand and to be helpful. This time, however, its action means complete elimination of passenger service.

The action being taken by the railroad will seriously affect the economy and growth of eastern Connecticut. Curtailment of train service will also mean the curtailment of further expansion of this area. Not only will it affect business, but it will also hurt many of our educational institutions of which we in Connecticut are very proud.

Let me cite an example in my immediate community. I reside in Putnam, which is a stopping point on the New London-Worcester line. There are now two stops a day at Putnam, both of which will be eliminated under the proposed curtailment and our area will be left without any passenger railroad service. We have three very fine schools in this vicinity attended by many hundreds of young people from all over Connecticut and nearby States. They are Annhurst College, Marianapolis School, and Pomfret School, the latter two being of secondary level. The rail service is being used by many of the students, as well as their parents visiting them. They will now be deprived of this service.

I am today introducing a bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, which permits a railroad to discontinue passenger train service on its own without consulting State authorities. Prior to enactment of that section in 1958, State railroad commissions or similar agencies would regulate passenger train service. These local agencies were in a better position to understand local needs and to evaluate the effects it would have on the areas in question. Since the enactment of that section, the railroads have taken it upon themselves to curtail service without consulting State authorities and almost completely disregarding the public interest. A situation of this kind cannot be tolerated any further. My bill, therefore, seeks to return control over passenger train service and the regulation of such service to State agencies.

In addition to introducing this bill, I am writing a letter to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission calling for an immediate investigation and public hearings, either in Washington or in Connecticut, on the New Haven Railroad's proposed curtailment of passenger service on all its trunk lines in Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Interstate Commerce Commission, also the text of an editorial published in the New London Day on October 7, 1963, and a letter I received from Mr. Daniel B. Fuller of the Chamber of Commerce of Mystic, Conn., objecting to the discontinuance of train service in the area. They are as follows:

[From the New London Day, Oct. 7, 1963]

THE FATE OF 508

Every morning at 7:22 a.m. (Monday through Saturday except holidays), train No. 508 meanders up the track, crosses the Thames River and heads for Providence from New London. In late afternoon it heads

back home to New London again. It's a safe guess that few here, outside of railroad men, know the first thing about No. 508.

In fact, the New Haven Railroad's bankruptcy trustees said the Budd unit has so few friends it operates at a deficit. It proposed that the train be discontinued.

All of a sudden, No. 508 hit the headlines. Three U.S. Senators appeared in its behalf, a fourth submitted a plea by proxy. For 6 hours, a Senate Commerce Committee heard testimony in Providence, most of the witnesses demanding the train be continued.

No. 508 never basked in such popularity.

Yet, the situation is no joking matter. It illustrates the difficult questions the Nation—particularly the northeastern United States—faces in regard to mass transportation.

It isn't just No. 508 (which would have several cars, not just two, if it really were supported by the public). The problem involves dozens of commuter trains, medium-haul lines serving a string of communities, and the long-haul runs like those linking New London with New York and Boston.

The New Haven seeks to cut its losses by peeling off unprofitable runs and immediately hits a wall of resistance, formidable opposition even though it concerns a relatively minor matter.

But nobody seems to have a clear idea of the total railroad picture. We're told the New Haven will have a chance if commuter operations are subsidized. All well and good. But what about other elements of the service which show signs of deterioration and which, in years to come, will threaten vital rail communications between urban centers like New London and other cities?

If some of the brains and energy expended on the Providence hearing could be channeled into a broader study, or at least on initiating such a study, communities along the line might be better served.

OCTOBER 9, 1963.

Mr. LAURENCE K. WALRATH,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALRATH: I am writing to you to lodge a strong protest against the proposed curtailment or discontinuation of passenger train service from New London to Worcester and New London to Providence, as announced recently by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

The curtailment of railroad service in those areas, which is to become effective on October 21, 1963, will have a detrimental effect on the economy and growth of eastern Connecticut, as well as other parts of our State and sections of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

The Second Congressional District of Connecticut, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is comprised of the eastern half of the State. These railroad lines are vital to the public interests in this area, an area which has grown considerably over the past decade in population and industrial expansion. Discontinuation of railroad passenger service will definitely hurt the future growth and further expansion of eastern Connecticut.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has been the recipient of substantial Federal and State financial support during recent years in the form of loans and subsidies reaching into many millions of dollars. This assistance was provided to the railroad not merely for the purpose of its freight service, but also to facilitate its continued passenger service. By discontinuing or curtailing such passenger service, the railroad is defaulting on its obligations to the State and to the various communities which it has dutifully undertaken to serve. If these communities deteriorate economically, as they may do if railroad service is discontinued, it will in the long run also affect freight shipments and the railroad's income from such shipments. Thus, the railroad will find that, rather than having solved a problem, it will have hurt itself by killing the "goose that lays the golden egg."

It is my conviction that before any railroad passenger service is discontinued, a responsible Federal agency such as the Interstate Commerce Commission should carefully examine this situation. The purpose of my writing to you at this time is to urge your Commission to undertake an immediate investigation of the proposed abandonment of passenger railroad service on the New Haven Railroad and to hold public hearings, either in Washington or in Connecticut, where all interested parties will have the opportunity to present their views.

It has been charged in the past that the Interstate Commerce Commission is an agency which is "railroad management-minded." As a Member of Congress, I do not believe in such rash accusations. I feel that the deplorable railroad situation in Connecticut now presents an excellent opportunity for your agency to firmly and quickly step into the picture, in order to provide the public with the necessary protection and to safeguard its needs for railroad passenger service.

In view of the short time left between now and October 21, when the proposed curtailments are scheduled to go into effect, I urge your agency to act without further delay along the lines proposed in this letter.

May I hear from you on this very important matter as soon as possible?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 3, 1963.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The board of directors of the Mystic Chamber of Commerce, Inc., would like to register its strong objection to the proposed discontinuance of train service between New London, Conn., and Providence, R.I.

The elimination of trains 508–521 and 525 of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would, in effect, eliminate just about all regular train service to and from Mystic.

Train No. 508 from New London to Providence and further to Boston, is a great help to Mystic people in getting to Boston on business and pleasure trips. We would like to point out that the reason many Mystic people do not board the train in Mystic is that they prefer to drive to New London or Westerly, R.I., where they can leave their cars and have a larger number of trains to select for their return.

Since there is only one train back into Mystic, this is not nearly as convenient as having a number of trains to select for the return to Westerly or New London. It is this train, in particular, that the chamber of commerce feels should be retained.

The writer personally uses the train six or seven times a year, throughout the year and the train is full or nearly full, on every trip.

We therefore ask that the Interstate Commerce Commission refuse to permit the discontinuance of service for trains 508–521 and 525 in the New London, Conn.-Providence, R.I., area, as it would work a hardship on the communities in one of the fastest growing areas in Connecticut.

Thank you for your consideration of this report.

Sincerely,

DANIEL B. FULLER,
Transportation & Traffic Committee, Mystic Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Mervyn LeRoy: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, marking a precedent in Hollywood history, Producer-Director Mervyn LeRoy will be honored with an impressive ceremony in Grauman's Chinese Theater forecourt, October 15, on the occasion of his starting preparations for the 75th film of a distinguished career, it was announced yesterday by Eugene V. Klein, president of National General Corp., nationwide theater circuit.

A bronze tablet, commemorating the "Salute" to LeRoy, will be cemented in the Hollywood theater's forecourt, which hitherto has honored the film industry's foremost stars.

Participating in the colorful ceremonies will be many of the top stars who were directed by LeRoy over the past 35 years, since 1928 when he debuted as a director at First National Studios with "No Place To Go," starring Mary Astor and Lloyd Hughes.

Others participating in the impressive event will be representative civic and community leaders.

On the long list of 74 distinguished and popular screen successes bearing LeRoy's name are such milestones in cinematic history as:

"Quo Vadis," "The Wizard of Oz," "Waterloo Bridge," "Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo," "Random Harvest," "Fugitive From a Chain Gang," "Madame Curie," "Oil for the Lamps of China," "Anthony Adverse," "Tugboat Annie," "Little Caesar," "Five Star Final," "Little Women," "They Won't Forget," "Mister Roberts," "Three Men on a Horse," "Gold Diggers of 1933," "The Bad Seed," "The F.B.I. Story," and many others, including his most recent film for Warners, "Mary, Mary."

Stars and "name" players who have been directed by LeRoy include a virtual cavalcade of actors and actresses who helped write motion picture history.

They include such stars as: Clark Gable, Greer Garson, James Stewart, James Cagney, Dick Powell, Marion Davies, Ronald Colman, Judy Garland, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Alice White, Gloria Swanson, Marie Dressler, Wallace Berry, Joan Blondell, Barbara Stanwyck, Elizabeth Taylor, Spencer Tracy, Frank Sinatra, Rosalind Russell, Robert Taylor, Norma Shearer, Frederic March, William Holden, John Wayne, Loretta Young, and many others, including latter day stars as Natalie Wood and Debbie Reynolds.

Over the past 35 years, Mr. LeRoy has contributed immeasurably toward the development of the motion picture production medium to its present important level in the Nation's economic structure.

Through his artistry and genius, Mr. LeRoy has enriched the lives of Ameri-

cans throughout our land as well as the lives of people throughout the world.

He has provided much-needed entertainment for a public in need of diversion, and he also has brought great honor to the motion picture industry through his outstanding and widespread efforts on behalf of education and philanthropy.

The Myth of the Pesticide Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, both sides in any controversy should be heard and their opinions carefully considered. The following article appeared in the October 5, 1963, issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

THE MYTH OF THE PESTICIDE MENACE

(By Edwin Diamond)

Thanks to a woman named Rachel Carson, a big fuss has been stirred up to scare the American public out of its wits.

A year ago, in a book entitled "Silent Spring," Miss Carson warned that pesticides were poisoning not only pests but birds and humans too. It was just what the public wanted to hear. No matter that Miss Carson's conclusions were preconceived; no matter that her arguments were more emotional than accurate. "Silent Spring" became a best seller and a conversational fad, and in Washington a congressional committee met to investigate the pesticide menace.

Implied in this attack on pesticides are the much more serious charges that scientists are ignoring human values, experimenting for the sake of experiments, and upsetting the traditional natural laws and the so-called balance of nature. Caught up in all the noise over "Silent Spring's" revelations, we tend to forget, perhaps, that the lamentably widespread distrust of scientists and their works is anything but new.

When I was growing up in Chicago, I read, bug-eyed, a book that described the wholesale poisoning of the American public. A bestseller of the time, the book was "$100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," and it recounted how an unholy trinity of government bureaucrats, avaricious businessmen and mad scientists had turned American consumers into laboratory test animals. I recall most vividly the danger ascribed to a certain toothpaste, which, if used in sufficient quantity, could cause a horrible death.

Today, a generation later, the American population has changed in many respects; for one, there are almost 190 million of us now instead of the 125 million around at the time the guinea-pigs book was written. In other respects, however, Americans are not much different. They still love to buy a book like Miss Carson's "Silent Spring" to read about their imminent death.

An indictment of the use of pesticides on farms, in forests, and in suburban backyards, "Silent Spring" might just as easily have been called "190,000,000 Guinea Pigs." For in "Silent Spring" I met again the old villains of my childhood, dressed in more graceful prose. "As matters stand now," Miss Carson wrote, "we are in little better position than the guests of the Borgias." She conjured up an apocalyptic vision of a "silent spring," a time when plants, birds, animals—even humans—poisoned by DDT and other manmade chemicals, sickened, and died.

In June 1962, The New Yorker serialized portions of Silent Spring. Newspapers carried stories about the book before its publication the following September. With this running start Silent Spring landed on the best seller lists in a few weeks. The Book of the Month Club offered it as the October selection. "CBS Reports" did two TV shows about it, and President Kennedy was questioned on pesticides at his news conferences. The ultimate accolade came when Miss Carson appeared before a Senate committee investigating pesticides: One of the Senators asked her for her autograph.

I have heard several theories to account for the vast stir that Silent Spring has created. First, there is Miss Carsons reputation and literary style. A quietspoken, retiring, single woman, Miss Carson for 16 years was employed as a biologist and later as editor in chief in the Bureau of Fisheries and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In 1951 she published the evocative and widely praised The Sea Around Us, which was on the best seller lists for 86 weeks and was translated into 30 languages. In 1955 she followed with another bestseller, The Edge of The Sea. While Silent Spring—with its impassioned listing of case after case of sick sheep, sterile robins and dead fish—has little of the beauty of the earlier Carson books, it nevertheless has a high expository gloss. As one of her critics said, "She's an alarmist and a sensationalist—and she's done it beautifully."

Second, there was the timing of the book, coming as it did soon after the thalidomide drug tragedy had stirred Europe and the United States. Though "Silent Spring" does not deal with the licensing and marketing of new drugs, Miss Carson herself suggested in a newspaper interview at the time "It is all of a piece, thalidomide and pesticides. They represent our willingness to rush ahead and use something new without knowing what the results are going to be."

Third, there is the attention-getting quality inherent in any exaggeration. Rereading the reviews of "Silent Spring" not long ago, I found this echoed in such disparate journals as the New York Times ("She tries to scare the living daylights out of us and, in large measure, succeeds.") and the magazine Scientific American ("* * * what I interpret as bias and oversimplification may be just what it takes to write a bestseller").

Undoubtedly the noisy year that has followed publication of "Silent Spring" is as much a result of Miss Carson's alarmist approach as it is of her own literary reputation and the book's fortuitous—for sales—timing. But, at the risk of being charged with practicing psychology without a license, I'd like to suggest that there is another and less well understood reason for the popular reception given "Silent Spring" this past year.

"Silent Spring", it seems to me, stirs the latent demons of paranoia that many men and women must fight down all through their lives. At one time or another all of us have been affected by the feeling that some wicked "they" were out to get "us." In recent years the paranoids among us could be observed in the ranks of such cultists as the antifluoridation leaguers, the organic-garden faddists and other beyond-the-fringe groups. And who are the "they" intent upon poisoning or tricking "us"? In the rough handbills passed out on street corners by the antifluoridationists, the plotters turn out to be Communists—scientists and dentists who want to soften, literally, the brains of the American citizenry to prepare them for Russian takeover by adding an insidious chemical to the drinking water.

In "Silent Spring" the villains aren't much more subtle. Miss Carson's "they" turn out to be the same tired stereotypes of "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs." This is "an era dominated by industry, in which the right to make a dollar at whatever cost is seldom challenged," Miss Carson writes by way of explaining why the aerosol hiss of doom will continue unabated. Moreover, the greed of the businessman extends to the scientists; they also, are venal. "The major chemical companies are pouring money into the universities to support research on insecticides," "Silent Spring" reveals darkly. "This creates attractive fellowships for graduate students and attractive staff positions. * * * This situation also explains the otherwise mystifying fact that certain outstanding entomologists are among the leading advocates of chemical control." That, of course, also explains away possible criticism in advance: Anyone who questions "Silent Spring" is obviously on Monsanto's or Shell's payroll. What it doesn't explain is why an industrialist or a scientist, no matter how grasping, would poison our food and water—the same food and water he himself eats and drinks.

But what about the accuracy of "Silent Spring"? Miss Carson's supporters frequently argue that, even though her book is slanted, she "got her basic facts right." Praising a science writer for getting the facts right, I would say, is like applauding a musician because he keeps time well. Equally important, however, are the facts that a writer leaves out and the half-facts or nonfacts that are offered instead. "Silent Spring," to take a hyberbolic example, speaks of the fall of "chemical death rain." This is vivid, but is it a "fact"? As Prof. I. L. Baldwin of the University of Wisconsin noted in his review of "Silent Spring" in the authoritative journal Science, "Many may be led to believe that, just as rain falls on our land, so is all of our land sprayed with pesticides. Actually, less than 5 percent of all the area of the United States is annually treated with insecticides."

Then, too, there is the fact, gravely stated by "Silent Spring," that "for the first time in the history of the world, every human being is now subjected to contact with dangerous chemicals from the moment of conception until death." Assuming for a moment that this is true, what does it mean? In May of this year a nine-member panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee noted that deaths from the misuse of pesticides have numbered about 150 throughout the United States each year. To put this figure in perspective, consider these figures: The annual death toll from accidents involving aspirin is about 200 and from bee stings—yes, bee stings—is about 150. No one, however, has seriously proposed eliminating the use of aspirin or exterminating all bees. Nor has anyone, with the possible exception of Miss Carson, proposed to abolish pesticides. As the panel put it, the more reasonable goal is to achieve "more judicious use of pesticides * * * to minimize risks."

Another of "Silent Spring's" facts concerns the "many cats [that] are reported to have died" in western and central Java in the course of an antimalarial program carried out by the World Health Organization. But we are told absolutely nothing about the cat's owners, the numberless Javanese men, women, and children who had previously suffered and died of malaria. Nor are we told anything about the fate of life—human life, not a cat's life—where there are no agricultural sprays or other modern food-growing techniques. We hear nothing, for example, of the 10,000 people throughout the world who die of malnutrition or starvation every day. Nor do we read of the 1.5 billion people—more than half of the world's population—who live in perpetual hunger.

I mourn for the dead cats of Java and for the silent birds of the United States. I understand that the spraying of weed killer along roadsides also destroys some shelter for

wildlife and therefore upsets the balance of nature so mystically evoked in "Silent Spring." But is man to refrain from disturbing certain circumstances in nature that if kept in "balance" may balance him right out of existence? Science has been unable to find any such thing as a "balance" in nature, delicately tuned and hovering around some fine ecological point. Nature has been altered by man ever since he first stood upright. If DDT kills some cats but saves many humans, if weed killer destroys a pocket of wildlife shelter but increases highway safety, so much the better.

"Silent Spring," of course, is solicitous of humans, when the material suits its point of view. Miss Carson is particularly intent upon establishing a link between chemical sprays and a variety of diseases, including cancer and mental disorders. She acknowledges that "it is admittedly difficult, in dealing with human beings rather than laboratory animals, to prove that cause A produces effect B." But this difficulty doesn't stop Miss Carson from attempting the same "proof" in the case of hepatitis, an inflammation of the liver. First she cites the increased use of DDT, a chlorinated hydrocarbon, over the past two decades; then she notes that such chemicals can cause damage to the human liver; finally, she cites "the sharp rise in hepatitis that began during the 1950's and is continuing a fluctuating climb." Put them all together, she tells us, and "plain commonsense" suggests that there is a relationship between the increase in liver ailments and the DDT spraying. Any number can play in the game of post hoc, ergo propter hoc reasoning: Nuclear testing also increased during the 1950's; so did television viewing. But there is no need to play the game at all, for many cases of hepatitis, as at least one critic of "Silent Spring" has pointed out, can be traced to infectious sources such as unsterilized hypodermic needles and water polluted by sewage.

What, finally, is "Silent Spring's" game? If we were to believe Miss Carson's own description of our times—an era where the right to make an irresponsible dollar is seldom challenged—then the answer would be an easy one. But I believe this description, like so much else in "Silent Spring" is an extravagant one.

A more accurate description would be that this is an era of stereotyped thinking, scattershot charges, shrill voices and double standards of behavior. "I may not approve of Miss Carson's methods," someone is likely to say, "but she gets things done." In my experience, the speaker is usually the same person who, a decade ago, was most shocked by the flagrant techniques employed in Senator Joseph McCarthy's great Communist hunt. The record shows that the Nation, once down from its McCarthyite orbit, was able to deal with subversion without dismantling its noble mansion of constitutional law and civil rights. Similarly, I think the pesticide "problem" can be handled without going back to a dark age of plague and epidemic.

Pulaski Day, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 184 years ago tomorrow, at Savannah in the First District of Georgia, a lover of freedom and a courageous fighter died from wounds received battling against tyrannical colonial rule in our country.

Count Casimir Pulaski, a brigadier general in the Continental Army, was by birth a Polish nobleman, but by death one of the bravest of American soldiers.

He fought with great courage at Brandywine, Trenton, and Fleming, and in his valiant charge against the British Tories who occupied Savannah, he was mortally wounded on October 9, 1779. Two days later, this gallant cavalry officer gave his life in the cause of America's freedom.

Today at Savannah, one of the fine coastal fortifications under the management of the National Park Service, Fort Pulaski, bears this great soldier's name and serves as a reminder of his unselfish gift to America.

We owe our freedoms today in great part to men such as General Pulaski, who joined our American Revolution and fought side by side with our citizens to secure the blessings of liberty.

Truth, Honesty, Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps science, after all, does not have the answer to every human need. Perhaps it is still true that "man does not live by bread alone."

What a supreme irony it would be if, in this golden age of modern communications, we should lose the one priceless thing which makes communication between human beings meaningful and worthwhile, namely, the ability to believe and trust what is said and heard—and especially what is said by the peoples' chosen leaders of government.

If there is not the basic honesty of fiscal responsibility, whereby government is prepared to match out-go with income and pay its debts, of what significance is an increased capacity to produce goods or a rise in the gross national product?

And what defense do the most advanced and sophisticated military weapons provide for the Nation if the will to take a firm stand against our enemies is lacking?

I think the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Calumet, which recently came to my attention, addresses itself to the same basic concerns.

And I suggest that the fundamental virtues to which it refers are ageless:

TRUTH, HONESTY, COURAGE

George Washington is remembered not only because he was the Father of his Country, but because he told the truth. Even as a young boy he couldn't tell a lie.

We all remember well the story of his hatchet and his father's cherry tree.

Abraham Lincoln, the Emancipator, is remembered because of honesty. Who can forget the grocery clerk who walked 6 miles to return 3 cents he had overcharged a widow?

Theodore Roosevelt, the hero of San Juan Hill, is remembered as the President who said "speak softly but always carry a big stick." When we were a small nation he had the courage to stand up and defy the Europeans who would tamper with our Monroe Doctrine.

John F. Kennedy will be remembered as the President who in one term in office didn't tell the Nation the whole truth, wasn't always honest with his people, and who didn't have the courage to stand up to Khrushchev long enough to make him get his troops out of Cuba.

Could it be that in this day of science and the space age that the virtues of yesteryear have become so tarnished that even our President can discard them?

South Bend Tribune Urges Civil Rights Commission Be Placed on a Permanent Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial from the October 7, 1963, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune calling on Congress to place the U.S. Civil Rights Commission on a permanent basis.

I agree with the point of view expressed in this editorial and hope that Congress will put the Commission on a permanent basis.

The editorial follows:

COUNTRY NEEDS ITS CONSCIENCE

In its newly published 1963 report to the President, Congress, and the country, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission had these things to say:

"The right to vote is still denied many Americans because of their race.

"Negro schoolchildren still attend segregated schools in all parts of the Nation. In the South, most schools continue to be segregated by official policy * * *.

"Federal, State, and local governments are still the promoters of residential segregation.

"Official actions taken to stop recent civil rights protest demonstrations in the name of peace and order often have infringed upon * * * (constitutionally) protected rights."

In short, the Commission once again served as the conscience of America. Yet its voice came close to being stilled last week through congressional failure to extend it into a new term.

Not until the 11th hour did the Senate vote a 1-year extension for the Civil Rights Commission, an action the House is expected to confirm.

It would have been insane, in the midst of the moral revolution of 1963, for Congress to let the Commission disband. Even the 1-year extension that now appears probable is inadequate.

The civil rights package now being pondered by a House Judiciary Subcommittee includes a proposal to put the Commission on a permanent basis. It's a sound proposal, for the simple reason that the country needs its conscience—and is apt to need it for some time to come.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part VI of the series "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1":

CITY LED WAY IN 1957 WITH POLLUTION CONTROL—PART VI

(By Ian McNett)

The Pure Air League of Perth Amboy saw its efforts succeed in 1957 when the city commission enacted an air pollution control ordinance.

The ordinance banned air pollution and set up air pollution control bureau with a director.

The league had been formed a year earlier by members of city women's clubs. The ladies had become fed up with an increasingly intolerable air pollution situation, says Mrs. John Papp, who was president of the league.

Great strides were made under the air pollution control bureau's first director, the late William V. Garretson.

About $15 million was spent on pollution control devices by local industry, Colonel Garretson said in his first report made in late 1958. The ordinance was passed in February 1957.

Since then no accurate figures have been collected of the money spent on air pollution.

An informal poll of some area industries by the Evening News indicates that another $2 to $3 million has been spent on new devices and for maintenance.

One firm says it spends $4,000 a month on fuel for a fume burner.

Many flagrant abuses have been curbed. The burning of insulation from copper wire, once a large source of pollution, has been stopped.

Dust collectors have been installed in many local factories. Fume burners, which destroy gases that create noxious odors, have been placed in chemical plants. One company has built taller stacks to get better dispersion of pollutants.

Colonel Garretson was able to devote all his time to controlling air pollution. After his death John Maloney filled in for a short time.

Then Mayor James J. Flynn, Jr., appointed Joseph J. Soporowski, who is still director.

Soporowski administers the air pollution ordinance in addition to other duties as deputy mayor. His training is in business administration.

The ordinance states: "The director shall be a registered professional engineer * * * qualified by technical training and experience in the theory and practice of the construction and operation of furnaces, fuel burning equipment, and combustion devices or in the theory and practice of air pollution control."

Although Soporowski is not a professional engineer and had no training in air pollution control before his appointment, he has worked hard since being named to learn as much about his job as possible.

He attended classes in air pollution theory and control at Rutgers University's Department of Sanitation. He also attended the National Conference on Air Pollution last December in Washington, D.C.

Other men in the air pollution control field feel Soporowski has made every effort to qualify for his position and to carry out his duties to the best of his ability.

Soporowski says, "I check out every complaint that comes into my office or to police."

He admits, however, that he could use some help in controlling air pollution.

LACK OF COOPERATION

He also is hampered by lack of public cooperation. He says people will call in a complaint, but refuse to give their names or addresses.

Soporowski says, "I have to explain that formal action can't be taken without the name of the complainant. The caller then becomes belligerent and threatens to go elsewhere for relief."

What the anonymous callers don't understand, Soporowski says, is that he checks out the complaint on an informal basis anyway, and tries to get adverse situations corrected.

The ordinance is essentially the same as the State control code. It provides for a $200 fine and 30 days in jail for each day that a person is in violation of the ordinance, a stiffer penalty than in the State code.

Some Perth Amboy industrial leaders seem to think that an air pollution problem no longer exists in this city. They speak with pride of the money they spent and still spend on pollution control.

They complain that pollution from surrounding communities causes a large part of Perth Amboy's problem. This is true. It is equally true that pollution from Perth Amboy causes problems for surrounding communities.

However, Perth Amboy has made an effort toward controlling air pollution. Other communities in Middlesex County have not made this effort, although nothing but inertia prevents them from doing so.

Zoning ordinances contain certain regulations against industries that emit offensive substances or odors into the atmosphere. A health officer usually enforces those sections of the zoning code in addition to his many other duties.

CARTERET STUDY

Only recently, Mayor Andrew Banick of Carteret appointed a committee to study air pollution problems in the borough.

A county advisory committee meets occasionally to discuss air pollution problems. The committee was created by the State, not the county, and has no power.

One doesn't need a delicate measuring device to realize that air pollution is a problem in Perth Amboy and much of the rest of metropolitan New Jersey.

Without these devices, any citizen with an average sense of smell and normal eyesight can determine that pollution is occurring.

It becomes especially apparent during calm, early morning hours in Perth Amboy. As the nose is assailed by a variety of odors, it starts to close and the body is wracked by a spasm of sneezes.

Irritants cause the eyes to water and the throat to burn.

A grayish haze clouds much of the city for several hours before and after sunrise. Eventually the thermal inversion which has trapped the pollutants burns away and the more offensive pollution escapes upward.

The haze occurs on otherwise perfectly clear days. It isn't fog and it isn't smoke. It seems to be a devil's brew of a great variety of pollutants.

Perth Amboy doesn't suffer from this haze alone. It hangs over much of Middlesex County. It can best be observed from high ground.

On the worst mornings the Edison Bridge is invisible in the haze as you look east from Woodbridge Avenue at Raritan Arsenal. The bridge is clearly visible on normal days.

From this vantage point it also becomes clear that air pollution is a daily morning problem for Edison, Woodbridge, Sayreville, South Amboy, and Metuchen.

Some people claim thermal inversions don't occur in New Jersey very often.

But drive to high ground in suburban areas of Middlesex County on a quiet, clear morning.

PLUMES OF SMOKE

There is a good chance you will be able to watch plumes of smoke and vapors rise from factory stacks until they hit the inversion level where they flatten out. A slight breeze will cause the plumes to flow out like pennons from the masts of sailing ships.

Rosy fingered dawn often tints the haze and plumes pink, salmon, and purple, imparting a sinister beauty to an otherwise ugly scene.

A drive north along the New Jersey Turnpike quickly reveals that pollution is not only Middlesex County's problem. The haze often lingers all day over the cities like Newark, Jersey City, and Bayonne, that string along the Hudson River and the Arthur Kill.

Amid this giant web of refineries, chemical plants, and highways, odors often reach overpowering proportions—especially around Esso's giant Bayway refinery.

The haze and smog from this industrial complex spread out over nearby residential areas.

Black smoke pours from the tops of wigwam-shaped incinerators that were designed to prevent air pollution.

But the evidence of the eyes and nose is not all.

A letter released July 5 from State Health Commissioner Roscoe P. Kandle to a Sayreville resident said the Aglite Division of Sayre and Fisher Co. hadn't done everything it was supposed to do to get rid of air pollution sources.

CAN BE REDUCED

Commissioner Kandle's letter said, "All of the recommendations by the (State health) department do not appear to have been satisfactorily complied with and * * * there are sources of air pollution that can be reduced."

In 1958, Colonel Garretson's report said a plant had been built in Perth Amboy that removed 8,000 tons of sulfur a year from the atmosphere. The report noted that 22,000 tons a year were then dumped into the air.

The plant is still in operation, removing 8,000 tons of sulfur a year. No information is available about what happens to the other 14,000 tons.

It may be destroyed by control devices. It may still be spewed into the air.

Rotten egg odors on cloudy, smoggy, and rainy days suggest a lot of the sulfur still gets into the atmosphere.

Desire, Self-Help Needed in Manpower Retraining Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the major reasons for our present unemployment rate is the lack of trained workers for jobs which are now or could be open. The Federal Government, through the bipartisan manpower training program, and State and local officials, have moved to meet this problem. It is not enough, however, to provide training opportunities. The major difficulty arises in many areas of encouraging the unemployed to take advantage of training programs.

A case in point arose recently in Paterson, N.J., where a training program in building crafts, urged by civil rights groups and public officials, was abandoned because of a lack of interest on the part of the citizens it was designed to help. Despite an exceptional effort at publicity about the program only one person signed up for the course.

The problem is one that all of us who support the retraining program should ponder. What seems to be needed in particular is an effort on the part of Government officials, and civic groups of all races, to creat an understanding of why this program is needed. The distinterested who do not have any desire to work, or to help themselves, will be difficult to reach. On the other hand, many are undoubtedly among the unaware, and these can be taught and encouraged to help themselves.

I enclose a copy of the news article on the discontinuation of the classes as it appeared in the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, of September 30, 1963, and an editorial by the same paper, dated October 3, 1963, which succinctly states the frustration involved on the part of civic leaders and government officials:

[From the Paterson Evening News, Sept. 30, 1963]

TRAINING CLASSES DROPPED NO ONE WILLING TO TRAIN

Lack of interest today resulted in announcement of abandonment of a plan, urged by civil rights groups and endorsed by Mayor Frank X. Graves, Jr., to conduct special training classes in building crafts open to Patersonians without regard to race, creed or color.

The courses, in carpentry and electrical work, were to have been conducted evenings without fee. It was required that there be a minimum of 15 applicants for each course.

The deadline for applications had been a week ago last Friday, but it was extended another week until last Friday evening.

ONLY ONE APPLIED

Schools Superintendent Dr. Michael Gioia today announced that the special program is being dropped after Henry D. Bourhill, director of vocational training, revealed that there was only one applicant for participation.

Availability of the courses had been announced in newspaper advertisements and civil rights groups were notified.

Expressing disappointment at the results, Mayor Graves said today: "We have done everything possible to publicize the availability of these courses and my disappointment cannot be expressed in words.

"Technical training is one of the keys to overcoming unemployment and it is regrettable that our unemployed apparently do not recognize this fact, or are disinterested. The problem is selling them on the point.

"We are putting our best foot forward trying to help all groups by providing the training which would make it possible for them to join the ranks of the employed."

[From the Paterson Evening News, Oct. 3, 1963]

EVERYTHING FOR NOTHING

Time was in these United States when it was an axiom that we worked for the things we most wanted. Neither the friend, nor the stranger, certainly not the Government, produced for us what we could attain by the sweat of our own brows.

Since the great depression of the early thirties, however, the tenor of American life has changed. We came more and more to rely on Government to give us the things we needed. In the evolution of time and changing patterns, our lives have become more and more inextricably interwoven with Government.

First there was local welfare, then it spread to county, State, then Nation until our rolls have grown into multibillion costs. Social security became a vital essential to life, as did old age pensions, care of widows and dependent children.

Cities and States came to look to Washington for assistance in maintaining a level of economic security. From all this evolved our hopsital growth, our highways, our revision of communities through urban renewal. We have made education of our youths a matter of governmental support. This discussion can be most extensive but for purposes of this editorial, we channel our thoughts into an incident which developed recently in a number of communities, Paterson included, in which efforts were made to bring progress to people untrained in the skills of life which would enable them to move into a better life.

Paterson Board of Education, at the direction of Mayor Graves, had proposed special training classes in construction skills to prepare any men interested for better paying jobs.

Classes would be at least of 15 each, to be conducted in the evening when the potential students would apparently have the time to learn.

The classes were well publicized, even in paid advertisements. After a month's time, with an extra week's extension, the program has been called off. Only one eligible from Paterson had applied.

Where are all the young men who are crying out for opportunity to enjoy the good things of life?

Paterson isn't alone in this experience. In Newark, a "workshop action" course was to be instituted.

The executive staff of the school had spent several months lining up 20 city and community leaders to lead the 10 weekly discussion meetings that were intended to develop effective participation in community affairs, considered vital to the health and welfare of the city's changing social and economic life.

According to Irving J. Goldberg, director of the adult school, 12,500 catalogs had been distributed, giving special emphasis to the workshop among the listed courses. There had been considerable newspaper advertising. Interest in the course had been anticipated in view of the general attention being focused on intergroup relations, which was to have been a major part of the course.

Only four persons had registered for the program and it was abandoned, for the time being at least. The opportunity for training in a wide variety of skills has been lost.

Where do we go from here? Wait for someone to drop luxury in our laps?

Casimir Pulaski: Patriot of Two Continents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 216th anniversary of the death of one of the world's most illustrious heroes, it is with genuine admiration and respect that I rise to commemorate the life of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Many Americans are acquainted with his extraordinary story, for in the comparatively brief span of 32 years, he became a champion of the rights of men throughout the world. Because he refused to accept the oppressive regime which caused the partition of Poland and, seeking to defend liberty wherever he found men willing to fight for it, he came to America at the time of our own Revolution.

He arrived in this country in the summer of 1777 and in the 2 years which followed he became an integral part of American history and American legend. He was an outstanding soldier, a brave and skillful general, and a man upon whom General Washington could rely with utmost confidence. He was so much a part of our early struggle for independence that it is undoubtedly safe to assume that the Revolutionary War might have lasted even longer were it not for his ability to lead his men into victorious battle and his sense of tactics and logistics.

Casimir Pulaski belongs to all Americans and, on this anniversary of his death, when President Kennedy has publicly acknowledged our great debt to this man of honor, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a résumé of his life which appeared in the Polish American Journal on October 5, 1963. Mr. Speaker, this informative biography follows:

CASIMIR PULASKI

(By Dr. Eugene Kusielewicz)

Casimir Pulaski was born on March 4, 1747, in what proved to be one of the stormiest epochs of Polish history.

Little is known of his early youth aside of the fact that his father was a member of the Polish nobility and that he, Casimir, was brought up in accordance with the traditions of that class. At an early age, he was sent to the Court of Prince Charles of Courland, like many other young men of his time, where he served as a page and learned the ways of a nobleman.

It was during this time that the old King of Poland, Augustus III of the House of Saxony, died. In the election that followed, Catherine of Russia forced her favorite, Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski upon the Poles, thinking that he would be a useful tool in her hands. As Russian troops were everywhere, the Poles acceeded to her wish, but contrary to expectations, Stanislaus Augustus turned out to be a patriotic King who used his energies to reform the antiquated Polish Constitution. When Catherine tried to interfere with the progress of these reforms, an insurrection against her influence took place, led by Jozef Pulaski, Casimir's father.

The story of what followed is a tragic one. Not being completely united in their opposition to the Russians, the Poles were unable to succeed in their fight for freedom, especially as Austria and Prussia joined the Russians in their war against the Poles. Despite a series of heroic military forays led by the young Casimir, and a host of other nobles, the cause of the Poles was lost. For Poland, the result of the insurrection was the first partition. For Casimir Pulaski it was a life of exile.

Like most Polish exiles of his day, Casimir eventually made his way to Paris where he heard of another war for liberty being fought in the English colonies across the sea. On hearing that Benjamin Franklin was recruiting volunteers against the British, Casimir

applied, bearing the highest recommendation of the French Government. Franklin accepted Pulaski's offer of assistance and on May 29, 1777, sent the following letter to George Washington:

"Count Pulaski of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into your Excellency's hands. The Court here have encouraged and promoted his voyage, from an opinion that he may highly useful to our service. Mr. Deane has written so fully concerning him, that I need not enlarge, and I only add wishes that he may find in our armies under your Excellency, occasions of distinguishing himself."

On his arrival in America, at the end of July 1777, Pulaski went directly to General Washington who was so impressed with our Polish exile that he sent Congress the following recommendation that he be made the commander of the newly organized American cavalry:

"Having endeavored, at the solicitation of the Count de Pulaski, to think of some mode for employing him in our service, there is none occurs to me liable to so few inconveniences and exceptions, as the giving him the command of the horse * * * a man of real capacity, experience, and knowledge in that service might be extremely useful. The count appears by his recommendations, to have sustained no inconsiderable military character in his own country, and as the principal attention in Poland has been for some time past paid to the cavalry, it is to be presumed this gentleman is not unacquainted with it. I submit it to Congress how far it may be eligible to confer the appointment I have mentioned upon him."

While waiting for his commission, Pulaski was invited by Washington to serve on his staff as a volunteer officer, a capacity in which he performed a notable service in the Battle of Brandywine, September 11, 1777, where, "at a critical moment, with Washington's permission, he gathered together Washington's bodyguard and made an unexpected charge on the British which stayed their advance.

Later, he was the first to detect the approach of the British in such force as to menace Washington himself, and part of his command near Warren Tavern.

Washington was engaged when Pulaski rode up and he was told that Washington could not be disturbed. Pulaski insisted, however, on seeing him and reporting the near presence of the British forces. Col. Alexander Hamilton, who understood French, suggested that Pulaski may have mistaken British troops for American troops but Pulaski, with great heat, insisted that his report was accurate, and this afterward proved to be true and it was through his intelligence and activity that further disaster was prevented."

In light of his praiseworthy conduct at the Battle of Brandywine, Congress hastened to award Pulaski a commission as Brigadier General in command of the American Cavalry.

As Pulaski's position was resented by a number of his subordinate officers who did not think a foreigner worthy of his honor, and as this led to some friction in the execution of his orders, Pulaski resigned his command of the American Cavalry, requesting Congress to be allowed to raise an independent corps "of horse and foot." As Washington supported his request, Congress quickly granted it. Soon Pulaski was in command of his own "legion" distinguishing himself at the batle of Egg Harbor, and later, in 1779, when he was ordered South, at the Battle of Charlestown. Five months thereafter Pulaski was killed leading his forces at the Battle of Savannah.

His tragic death at so young an age did not diminish his deeds in "the memory of future generation, either in the old world or the new. Pulaski could not save Poland from partition, but by his undaunted courage * * * as well as by the unceasing zeal with which he incited thousands of others, he contributed to the preservation of the Polish spirit. He was the man who, with Kosciuszko, inculcated in the younger generation a strong faith in the restoration of Polish independence.

The heritage that Pulaski left to the Americans was a noble one. His legion earned Washington's approval and was a model for the formation of others in subsequent campaigns. The cavalry which he organized became the nucleus for future squadrons, for which he has been rightly called the father of American Cavalry.

Extension of Civil Rights Commission

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to add my voice to those who have spoken so eloquently in support for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission. The importance of this Commission in focusing our attention on the racial troubles that beset us and analyzing them constructively is obvious. The racial crisis of today makes the work of the Commission more crucial, and its continuation more necessary.

I am confident that there is strong support throughout the Nation for extending the life of the Commission. Certainly this is the case in Hawaii, even though we are fortunate to have avoided the racial strife found in other areas. The citizens of Hawaii are concerned, however, not only for the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but also with the total civil rights program. This concern is so clearly exemplified by the correspondence I have been receiving from church members in the Aloha State. I am happy to include herewith some examples:

ST. TIMOTHY'S CHURCH,
Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii, September 29, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS P. GILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The death of six young Americans in Birmingham on Sunday, September 15, in an incident of senselessly evil violence, has moved this congregation to show our concern for the conscience of the Nation and for our own responsibility during our regular Sunday worship services.

We agree with those national religious leaders of many faiths who gathered in Washington September 18 to register with Congress and the President, through the Attorney General, their conviction that this kind of incident must not occur again. We agree that every citizen of this Republic must have full protection of the laws of the United States as he exercises his rights and privileges as a citizen.

Following a period of silent mourning and prayer for the dead children, for their bereaved families, and all others besieged by sanctioned forms of discrimination and prejudice, we are writing this letter to let you know of our action, of our concern lest our mourning be empty. It is our deep hope that the Legislature of the United States will initiate and carry through to completion laws to insure that out of such dark violence social and racial justice can arise.

Signed:

Mary Kirchhoffer, Mrs. Robert E. Ritchie, Thomas D. Ritchie, Seep Lau, Edith Steele, Ellen C. Hughes, Lucius E. Eckles, M.D., Virginia T. Davis, Laura G. Morrison, Shirley A. Williamson, Edythe Turner, Kirby V. Anderson, M.D., R. K. Hoefener, Jocelyn Wong, Mildred Ozaki, Joe Mook, Marlene Wilcox, C. H. Heard, Jr., Robert Williamson, John Barry Grahovac, Mrs. Murray Johnson, Mary Anderson, Lt. (j.g.) and Mrs. Perry A. Beem, James A. Bartlett, Mary M. Yeager, Lt. Comdr. and Mrs. James A. Burgess, Mrs. Betsy Lei Pablo, Robert T. W. Wong, Angel C. Pablo, Mr. and Mrs. L. Barney McNeil, Jr., CMS and Mrs. Frank J. Pickard, Archie L. Stevens, Patricia E. Kirchoffer, Diana De Lano, George B. De Lano, Patricia L. Grahovac, Richard Kirchhoffer, Craig Grahovac, and Lou Grahovac, members of St. Timothy's Parish; Richard A. Kirchhoffer, Jr., Vicar, St. Timothy's Episcopal Church.

IN SUPPORT OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Representative TOM GILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The members of Calvary Lutheran Church in Honolulu are deeply concerned about the passage of a strong civil rights bill.

We thank you for your personal support and leadership in Congress and urge you to continue to do all that you can to bring about the enactment of meaningful legislation as expressed in the Civil Rights Act of 1963, H.R. 7152.

We write this as Christians who believe that a vital faith demands strong action in the area of civil rights.

Mrs. Mary Dedman, Mrs. Elizabeth Ramey, Mrs. Francis E. Clark, Mrs. James A. Bergquist, Mrs. Rudolph S. Ruud, Miss Yoshiko Kondo, Mrs. Henry C. Halboth, Mrs. Wilbur Harris, Miss Betty Pederson, Gloria Berry, Mrs. R. Kim, Mrs. Dwane R. Collins, Mrs. W. Liljegren, Lillian Spengler, Ruth Aishe, Mrs. James W. Bernard, Mrs. Norman Rian, Mrs. Gloria Hunt, and Mrs. Thomas L. Bowers.

ST. PATRICK SCHOOL,
September 29, 1963.

DEAR SIR: I know it is hard to pass a bill out without help from the people of America. We from St. Patrick are eager to help you pass this out. Perhaps if schools in every State could participate in this act we can convince the South to treat Negroes in equality to us. I think judgment of race and color is absolutely unjust.

What I mean is that we are on your side to abide by the Declaration of Independence and convince ourselves that all men are equal and that other Americans should convince themselves likewise.

Mr. GILL we are with you all the way.
Mahalo,

GERARD CYPRIANO,
Student of St. Patrick School, Honolulu, Hawaii.

P.S.—The Fathers of St. Patrick are also with you.

G. C.

It's the People's Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House has approved two appropriation bills running into billions of dollars. Every legitimate effort to cut nonessential spending was beaten back. There seems to be no disposition to protect the peoples' money or to practice the strict discipline in spending the President promised in begging the people to support his tax bill.

The Kennedy administration has no intention of cutting Federal spending. At the same time the President talks about budget cutting he is demanding new welfare projects, increased Federal grants, more and more spending, bigger and bigger deficits. No administration in history has been more adept at double-talk than the present one. In the end, it will be the American people who lose through higher taxes, less money to spend for themselves as they struggle to maintain the extravagances and the failures of a President unable to cope with fiscal responsibility.

Just two editorials from the October 8 issue of the Dallas Morning News, point out where some of the money is going and I include them at this point in my remarks:

GRANTS-IN-AID

Last year Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments topped $10 billion for the first time in history. The total of these grants—$10,385,549,606—represented an increase of 6 percent in 1 year.

There are more than 100 separate Federal programs of this type—the largest for highways, old-age assistance, unemployment compensation and aid to dependent children. But there is much duplication—or at least a number of programs serving the same purpose. For example, there are 31 separate programs of Federal aid for public health and 13 programs dealing with aid to education.

While Congress is worrying about how to reduce Federal spending if the Government's income is trimmed by a big tax cut, here's a suggestion:

How about scaling down the grants-in-aid dole? A good portion of the money spent on these projects is merely making an expensive round trip to Washington anyway, and in many cases State and local governments could do the job better themselves.

SLAP ON REA WRIST

A mild slap on the wrist was administered to the Rural Electrification Administration by the Senate recently. "Don't do it again," said the Senate to REA for lending $110,000 to build a seven-slope ski resort at Huntingdon, Pa. Except that it is unusual for such a public reprimand to be delivered in voting an appropriation bill, this gesture would be almost meaningless.

The action came as the Senate appropriated more than $6 billion to run the Department of Agriculture during the next fiscal year. The $110,000 is but a drop in the bucket of record public spending for REA and Agriculture—much of it essential and constructive, but many other dollars going down the drain for outmoded, misdirected activities. For REA to be singled out, even by strong supporters of big spending for agriculture, indicates how far off base this USDA activity is.

To bring electricity to farms, REA was established by Executive order in 1935 as one of eight categories of depression relief, a study by American Enterprise Institute points out. Initial allocation for REA was $10 million. Since then, REA has loaned more than $4.6 billion. Ninety-eight percent of all U.S. farms have been electrified, almost half by investor-owned utilities and slightly more by REA-financed cooperatives.

With its mission accomplished, REA has sought new worlds to conquer. Financed by 2 percent U.S. Government loans, the search has been highly successful. Moving into urbanized areas, industrial and commercial enterprises, REA has expanded rather than decreased its spending, personnel, and programs.

Low interest rates aren't REA's only advantage over investor-financed utilities. Salaries and administration costs come from direct appropriations. REA is exempt from most State and local taxes, as well as all Federal. The credit rating of the U.S. Government is a powerful tool of REA borrowers in the money market. In spite of this, say the authors of this study, 1952–60 average yields of REA-financed systems were only 1.8 percent on total assets. Earnings before taxes and interest averaged about 4.5 percent of net assets.

The author's comment: "If the measure of success is the ability to earn a return on total resources employed * * * then REA borrowers have not even begun to make their own way."

Big government's big problem is thus personified in REA: How to put an end to a program after it has served its purpose. Federal deficits can never end, if Federal programs never stop. Record employment by Government can never be reduced, if no agency ever reduces its manpower.

The need of agriculture for a streamlined, efficient, economical program to meet modern needs of farmers and consumers is critical. But every dollar spent should meet a current need, not perpetuate a depression project of three decades ago. If Congress and the administration honestly want to cut spending, there's no better place to start than with REA.

Progress, Daniel Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of job opportunity and equality is being solved in the South. We have been making steady but sure progress.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the State, Columbia, S.C.:

PROGRESS, NOT PROPAGANDA

While northern politicians and labor bosses prate of civil rights and equal employment opportunities, southern industrialists quietly are providing their people, white and colored, with decent jobs at decent wages.

We cite the instance of the Daniel Construction Co., headquartered in Greenville but operative all over the South and one of the world's largest construction firms. At latest count, the Daniel company had some 8,800 employees on its payrolls. And of that number, more than one-fourth are Negroes.

Mind you, this is in South Carolina and the South—not in the hypocritical North where bitter Negroes are daily demonstrating for smaller job quotas than are being granted voluntarily by some southern firms like Daniel.

The matter of motive enters the picture, and it does little to the credit of those who single out the South as a whipping boy for alleged racial discrimination.

Take the Daniel Construction Co. again, or more particularly, take the man who heads that giant firm, Charles E. Daniel, one time an interim U.S. Senator but fundamentally a hard-driving, clear-headed, cost-conscious businessman.

"Charlie" Daniel is no do-gooder, obsessed with the cause of integration. Nor is he a politician catering to minority bloc voters. He is a builder by inclination and occupation. If there be any social consciousness in his scheme of operations it is the consciousness that his people need good jobs at good pay—and are willing to produce in such jobs.

Fortunately for Daniel, and for his thousands of employes, he is not hog-tied by restrictive labor union practices, including those of racial discrimination. Skilled workers, white or colored, get skilled jobs with Daniel. The almost 2,300 Negroes on his payrolls include 800 skilled mechanics, working beside and at the same pay as the skilled white mechanics.

No one is telling "Charlie" Daniel he must hire these people. He does it out of conviction that he is getting good work out of good workers. He said as much earlier this month at the dedication of the Magnolia Finishing Plant of the Deering-Milliken mills. Here (at Blacksburg, S.C.) is probably the world's finest-textile plant of its kind, a multi-million-dollar plant put on the line in 134 working days.

"Only free American labor on an open-shop basis," Daniel declared, "regulating their own right-to-work laws, could have accomplished this remarkable project."

This, then, is the South Carolina pattern of progress—based on individual performance of both employers and employees in the byplay of free enterprise.

But we all should remember that as freedom shrinks—through Federal encroachment, labor dictation, or mob action—opportunities and progress of the type provided by the Daniel Construction Co. will wither on on the vine.

Negroes as well as whites have a vital stake in free enterprise under constitutional guarantees.

The Wheat Deal in the Context of the Cold War—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the major wheat sale to the Soviet Union, when considered against the backdrop of the continuing cold war conflict, should have generated more widespread earnest discussion, in and out of Government, than it did. That it did not reflects a potentially serious apathy in regard to the importance of economic leverage in the ultimate cold war decision.

In this connection, I believe it worthwhile to direct attention to a survey prepared by the Stanford Research Institute

on assignment from the executive branch, and submitted in February 1962. In some particulars, its assessments and recommendations have been overtaken by events, but it retains a high degree of pertinence, particularly in view of its consideration of the cold war leverage value of food grains.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, with reservations as to certain of the recommendations, I should like to include the preface, introduction, summary, and conclusions of this report, entitled, "Economic Countermeasures: An Examination of the Role of Economic Power in World Conflict," as follows:

ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES AN EXAMINATION OF THE ROLE OF ECONOMIC POWER IN WORLD CONFLICTS

PREFACE

The following report on the development of economic countermeasures has been made at the request of the Office of Emergency Planning, and is directed to the support of that agency's charter, which requires that it insure that "this country's resources would be utilized effectively in waging the cold war."

Although the report does consider the general problem of countermeasures in some detail, it must be regarded as preliminary in that it develops only two specific countermeasures as illustrative examples. A comprehensive program and an adequately developed general theory in the field would require a more extended investigation, a detailed inventory of specific measures, and a continuous updating of the inventory.

Dr. Herbert E. Striner, senior economist, Emergency Planning Research Center, Stanford Research Institute, was the project leader of this study. Mr. Ralph McCabe, of the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research of the Johns Hopkins University, served as consultant. Helpful comments were received from Dr. J. B. Condliffe, Dr. Francis P. Hoeber, both of SRI, and Dr. Yuan-li Wu, of the Hoover Institution.

CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTION

In its first year in office, the Kennedy administration reached a major, and perhaps historically inevitable decision—to enter into closer economic relations with Europe. This continued the series of events that began with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Coal and Steel Community, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Rome Treaties, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the British decision to enter the Common Market. These were the affirmative, constructive developments that emerged from the policies that were formulated to deal with the cold war threat posed by the Sino-Soviet bloc. They were widely agreed to be desirable, despite the formidable difficulties they present.

There is a reverse side of the coin. The construction of a closer alliance among the nations of the Atlantic Community aims at strengthening the position of the West in the cold war by creating greater unity. However, the West must also recognize that one of the major objectives of the bloc has been to divide the West by such economic measures as preferential trading, barter agreements, and price cutting. These measures are not only used to create disorder in non-Soviet economies, but also to create friction and dissent among members of the Western alliance. For example, a trade agreement between Canada and Cuba, or Australia and China, can have but one effect on the relationship between the United States and these Western allies—that of creating an aura of suspicion and disenchantment. In addition to blunting the divisive effects of Soviet trading operations, the West must also develop its own great capabilities in economic countermeasures—and the keynote of this capability is a move toward greater economic unity. There is, in brief, an offensive and defensive aspect of the problem.

Thus, the two sides of the coin are the strengthening of the West and its negotiating position and the weakening of the bloc and its bargaining position. Little advantage can be derived from the growing unity of the West if the power of the Sino-Soviet bloc has been, as a matter of fact, disproportionately increased during the same period.

There has been recognition, since the advent of the cold war, of this reverse side of the coin: The Export Control Act, the Battle Act, and the regulations issued pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act.[1]

The initiative taken on the exclusion of Cuba from the Organization of American States in January 1962, and earlier at Caracas, are the political coordinates of economic countermeasures. The policies and legislation of a decade ago are no longer adequate. The new initiative taken at Punta del Este and after requires a reexamination of the problem and the formulation of a new approach.

The weight of U.S. economic power has been effectively used in the creation of the Common Market, NATO, and other institutions for insuring the integrity of the West in the cold war. The purpose of this paper is to consider, in preliminary terms, the way in which the economic power of the United States and the West, may be brought to bear to weaken the bloc and strengthen Western unity. A major premise upon which this preliminary inquiry will proceed is that the West, possessing "18 percent of the world's population commands two-thirds of its industrial capacity. * * * the way in which this preponderant power is used will be a major factor in determining the issues and outcome of the cold war." [2]

There are many witnesses to the role of U.S. economic power in creating the institutions of Western unity. However, the coercive force implicit in the possesion of preponderant economic power is rarely considered in detail. The United States possessed such preponderant industrial power at the beginning of the 1950's. Though it still possesses immense economic power, the industrial rise of Western Europe, Japan, Australia, and Canada has altered the former position of the United States. The combined power of these countries must now figure in programs to exert economic leverage on the bloc.

The United States is not the only country whose policies must be altered to take account of the shift in the balance of economic power. Soviet policy has also been strongly affected. The doubling of West German economic output by 1955, and the subsequent doubling between 1955 and 1960, was a major factor in the continuing hemorrhage from East Germany, the Western extremity of the bloc. The wall was a simple tourniquet applied above the wound, West Berlin, to stanch the flow of the economic lifeblood of the Soviet Zone.

Khrushchev's memorandum of December 1961 to Chancellor Adenauer requesting the initiation of separate talks was further evidence of the growing weight of West German economic power. The Soviet overtures were accompanied by what might be described as lurid accounts of the immense markets that would open up once a new basis was found for Soviet-German relations. In Germany, nationalistic elements were immediately favorable, and even leaders of the Chancellor's own party—Herr Gerstenmaier, for example—favored initiation of bilateral discussions. The handwriting of a new Rapallo has been on the wall for many months since the Wall and the German elections.

The consequences of a major reorientation of German trade toward the bloc cannot be lightly regarded. A redirection of capital resources would almost certainly follow such a shift, to the serious detriment of the claims of the underdeveloped countries, and OECD's intended role in development aid A similar shift would almost certainly follow in the sources of German raw materials—oil, iron ore, coal, manganese, wood and wood products—and other requirements that now come largely from the less developed countries and the West. Such a set of developments, inevitable if any major German reorientation occurred, can hardly be regarded as compatible with United States or Western objectives.

An Italian reorientation toward the bloc is similarly in evidence. The power of Enrico Mattei is closely bound up with Soviet oil; Mattei is also the major force in the Italian opening to the left. The economic base of Mattei's power once rested on the Italian oil monopoly; now his power tends to extend to all stage-owned industry by the removal of Mario Ferrari-Aggradi from the Ministry of State Participations and the substitution of Mattei's own former subordinate, Giorgio Bo.[3] Mattei has also been a major source of disturbance in the Common Market and was sharply rebuked in a 1961 memorandum by Robert Marjolin. If an Italian government based on the participation of Nenni socialists is formed, Mattei will have been largely responsible. And while the issue of NATO will remain temporarily in abeyance, a major reorientation of Italian trade may be expected, with concurrent adverse effects on Western unity.

The shift in the balance of economic power in the West, combined with economic difficulties within the bloc, are certainly major factors in the new effort of Khrushchev to achieve an economic détente. In any realistic accounting, the economic affairs of the bloc are in acute disorder, as the desperate food shortage in China suggests. Similar shortages exist in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. Khrushchev's problem in the USSR has been clear for a long time; food is the bloc's Achilles heel.

Khrushchev's 20-year plan reveals other, similarly critical deficits in the Soviet industrial organization. Under Stalin, the U.S.S.R. failed to build up a chemical industry—the source of fertilizer, weed and pest killers, and other essentials of a sound agriculture, as well as industrial raw materials. A similar weakness lies in the mass production sector of manufacturing, which depends on two industries in which the U.S.S.R. is also weak—electronics and mass production metalworking equipment.

Western Europe, which extended massive credits to the bloc while the United States continued to restrict economic relations, is the only major source apart from Japan, of the desperately needed requirements of the bloc in the chemical, electronics, and metalworking fields. The Khrushchev program for an economic détente with the major industrial countries of Western Europe, therefore, has two bases: (1) the growing power of the Common Market countries, and (2) the critical economic weakness of the bloc itself.

Accordingly, given the first premise of preponderent economic power of the West and the second premise of the shift in the balance of economic power in the West, the third major premise of this inquiry postulates the existence of acute economic disorder in the bloc.[4] Food is the fundamental weakness, but this weakness in turn rests (at least partially) on other, industrial, weaknesses of the bloc—chemicals and mass production technology. Soviet requirements for these are available only in the West, and because the United States still

Footnotes at end of speech.

retains rigorous controls over traffic with the bloc, they are available only in Western Europe, Japan, Australia, and Canada.

We turn now to the fourth and final premise of this inquiry, for which Cuba may be regarded as the critical example. The bloc has added a third dimension to its political and military efforts in the cold war. After 1955, the major political objectives of the cold war were basically altered. Western Europe had become relatively impregnable to direct Soviet subversion and Communists efforts were reoriented to the underdeveloped countries, where the population eruption of the 1950's had begun to create extreme economic stress in the growing conflict over declining supplies of food and space.

The Herter-Clayton report stated this problem in the following terms:

"The declaration of Soviet economic hostilities against the non-Soviet world has been made. The immediate objective in this war is the control of the contested countries. The ultimate objective is the control of the world. The struggle will be relentless, irreconcilable, merciless. The West need expect no quarter from the enemy. If Western determination is less than the Soviet bloc's eventual Soviet triumph is assured."

The emergence of a Soviet satellite, Cuba, on the U.S. doorstep has brought this premise into clear relief. In west Africa, north Africa, and non-Soviet Asia, the processes of revolutionary conflict are in evidence. They are being exploited, systematically, by all the political, military, and economic measures the bloc can bring to bear.[5]

CHAPTER II—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the continuing discussion of the relations between members of the Sino-Soviet bloc there is no evidence that the differences between Red China and the U.S.S.R. arise from any change in the ultimate objectives of either countries. The disputes appear largely to develop over ways and means, which, in turn, are conditioned by qualitative differences in the nature of available resources and geographic location. Therefore, it is assumed in this inquiry that bloc objectives remain as stated in the pronouncements made by the Congress of World Communist Parties in December of 1961, and Khrushchev's historic speech of January 6, 1962.

In the West, there is little doubt about the sources of world industrial power. A small number of countries, only 13, with less than a fifth of the world's population, control over two-thirds of the world's industrial power. Three of these countries, Australia, Canada, and the United States, are the only major areas of the earth with significant surpluses of basic foodstuffs. These countries control more than 95 percent of world trade in food grains. The way in which the West uses this preponderant economic power will largely determine the issues and outcome of the cold war. The West possesses decisive power in only one of the three dimensions of the cold war—the economic sector. It has little better than equal status in the political and military spheres.

During the last year, the Kennedy administration initiated a historic program—a trade partnership with Western Europe designed to provide the economic undergirding required to support the political and military objectives of the NATO Alliance system. Some of the problems involved in closer economic relations with Europe are now beginning to emerge. The Rome Treaty is a Western European instrument and aims at certain supranational objectives shared only by members of the community. In due course, tariffs may be eliminated between members of the community and a common tariff wall may be built around the countries moving toward a "United States of Europe." The United States does not now share in these political objectives and will not, accordingly, enjoy the same degree of preference that members extend to each other. The developing economic arrangements that will determine the relation of the Common Market countries to the other major areas of the world should be of a kind that will reflect established political and military relations and provide the fullest economic support to alliance policy.

It has become increasingly apparent since the formation of the Common Market that economic and trading relations profoundly influence, and may control, political, and military relations. Soviet economic manipulation of the Finnish Government has been effective. Economic changes of the last decade have similarly affected relations among NATO members. In this sector, alliance problems may never have been more serious. It may even be assumed that they will worsen as the balance of economic power continues to shift within the Western community, and particularly if that shift occurs at the rate that has prevailed over the last 8 years. The effect of the economic resurgence of Western Europe has been compounded by the rise of the dynamic Japanese, Australian, and Canadian economies. The economic conditions of 1950, on which the U.S. alliance system was based, have disappeared. Section 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty which provided for economic collaboration may no longer be disregarded—as Secretary Dulles was wont to do. The United States is now in the position of being a petitioner for the activation of section 2, but interestingly, as a result of problems originating in the Western Hemisphere.

Cuba and China are being fed by the Australians and Canadians. Cuba, China, and the other members of the bloc are being supplied with essential industrial requirements from Western Europe and Japan. A decade ago the economic situation did not permit this; today it obviously does. The question the new situation raises is whether the United States can continue to act on the economic assumptions of 1950. The shift in the balance of economic power within the Western community may be one of the most fateful developments in the midcentury era.

The pattern of trade developing in bloc relations with the West has several apparent economic objectives. The first is to obtain commodities, technology, and services not available or in short supply within the bloc, and thereby avoid disrupting their planned economic development schedules. The second is to deploy exports so as to accomplish the maximum amount of disorder in non-Soviet markets, that is to displace Western markets of the less developed countries, to disturb normal trade flows within the Western community, and to create a maximum amount of dissension and suspicion among the Western trading partners.

It would appear that because of the rigid constraints under which bloc economies operate and the urgent necessity of obtaining critical supplies from the West, the first objective has overriding priority. The rapid expansion of bloc imports over the last 5 years is sufficient evidence of the growing need to supplement shortages and meet critical deficits in the resources required in their development schedules. Unless the West acts to control the rate at which the bloc exchanges with the West or growing, and the composition of bloc imports, two important consequences will ensue: (1) the West will make a major contribution to the economic development of the bloc; and (2) bloc exports will create significant disorder in established trade patterns of the non-Soviet world. Therefore, since there are major economic problems in the bloc that can be most effectively dealt with by trade with the West, the increase in bloc trade with the West will increase bloc political authority, support and contribute to their military resources, and work major economic damage in the non-Soviet economies—not least by displacement of the markets of the less developed countries. Western economic countermeasures are needed if these developments are to be avoided.

There is an immediate need for the development of new policies to apply economic leverage on the bloc. This is the sort of measure bloc countries use and understand; they will be quickly aware of the retaliatory values of the trade mechanism. A broad economic countermeasures program is urgently needed and the relevant Federal agencies should be called upon for contributions to the program and assistance in considering changes in old legislation and development of new legislation. Research and analysis leading to the development of an inventory of specific countermeasures should be encouraged and supported.

The problem that Cuba will present in the spring and summer of 1962 is not one that should encourage reliance on ad hoc measures or casual improvisation. The entire armory of economic countermeasures needed to deal with the Cuban problem should be in stock and available for immediate use. In the case of Berlin, a careful examination would probably suggest that a number of economic countermeasures are available (e.g., the fact that the Soviets canceled a number of long-term contracts with West German suppliers suggests that they were apprehensive of a possible Bonn economic reaction).

The operational requirements that flow from the foregoing findings include:

1. The immediate activation of a high level interagency committee, chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning, to develop the programs most urgently needed and to consider the legislative requirements for a broad economic countermeasures program.

2. Authorization and financing for research which will develop a general theory of economic countermeasures and a comprehensive program capable of dealing with the probable contingencies.

---

[1] Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty envisaged not only the elimination of economic conflict among the members, but also economic collaboration which has been less than effective in the Coordinating Committee operations (COCOM).

[2] Herter-Clayton report, Nov. 1961.

[3] Cf. unpublished mss. submitted to Joint Economic Committee of Congress: "ENI: The Profile of a State Corporation," by Charles Dechert.

[4] In the January 6, 1961, speech Khrushchev made to party organizations at the Higher Party School, he noted that, "To win time in the economic contest with capitalism is now the main thing. The quicker we increase economic construction, the stronger we are economically and politically, the greater will be the influence of the Socialist camp on historical development, on the destiny of the world" (p. 59, par. 3).

[5] The "active fronts" as Khrushchev said in his Jan. 6, 1961, speech are Asia, Africa, and Latin America and not Europe and North America.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Bungling in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 11, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, though only a little more than 5 years old, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is today a huge agency which sprawls across the country and which accounts for a very sizable chunk of public spending. Indeed, its current budget request is exceeded only by those of the Department of Defense and the Agriculture Department.

The American people generally, I believe, support a vigorous space effort. They know that venturing into the unknown is costly, and they do not begrudge the necessary funds. But the fact that the space program is involved does not excuse waste of public money or bungling administration. Further, the very size of the sums involved as well as the nature and objectives of the program make it especially important that even the appearance of political manipulation is scrupulously avoided.

An editorial in the New York Times of Tuesday, October 8, makes some pertinent comments on these points. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial and of the news story by John Finney to which it refers be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1963]

BUNGLING IN SPACE

The execution of the space program, already under heavy congressional fire, has now been subjected to severe additional criticism by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the General Accounting Office.

By inference, NASA criticizes itself as well as American industry in the catigations of industry's quality control that mark the final report on Project Mercury. Careless and sloppy workmanship and numerous failures to meet specifications for capsules and boosters and equipment led to repeated delays, undue costs, and unnecessary risks of life.

NASA lays these faults on the shoulders of industry alone, but the General Accounting Office is more embracing in its distribution of responsibility. Its report explicitly blames bungling and poor management by NASA, as well as poor performance by contractors, for a 2-year setback in our lunar program and a $100 million loss to the taxpayers.

All this has become regrettably familiar language in evaluations of defense and space procurement. Pentagon officials and various officers of the armed services have repeatedly criticized the standards of workmanship of many contractors and have loudly complained about heavy cost overruns.

It is true that the new frontiers of space, like the new frontiers of the ocean depths, require finer tolerances, better workmanship, novel techniques and processes, and the solution of problems undreamed of a couple of decades ago. It is true that the American space program, unlike the Russian, has had to work within the confines of limited rocket boost, which meant that capsules and equipment had to be miniaturized to a degree that compounded all the engineering problems. It is true that the best of U.S. industry has performed some prodigies of development and production in the space and military hardware program.

But the record has been marred too often by sloppiness and carelessness. Industry cannot meet the exacting challenges of the new technology by old patterns. Contracting procedures must be placed as far as possible on an incentive and penalty basis—more money for excellent performance, economical production and early delivery; severe penalties for poor performance, uneconomical production and delays.

And while criticism is being parceled out, a considerable measure should be bestowed on both the Kennedy administration and Congress itself for the aroma of the pork-barrel that they have allowed to spring up around the space program. The Manned Spacecraft Center, for example, was located near Houston under circumstances which, as described in yesterday's Times by our correspondent John W. Finney, could only make the public more cynical than ever about the whole program.

The disgraceful maneuvering to establish multi-million-dollar space projects—whether in Texas or Massachusetts—reflects on the administration, the Congress, and the country and undermines popular support for the program itself. No wonder the expenditure of such vast sums has been meeting so much well-founded public resistance.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1963]

MOON RACE SPURS BOOM IN HOUSTON—MANNED SPACECRAFT CENTER HAS IMPACT ON AREA

(By John W. Finney)

CLEAR LAKE, TEX., October 6.—When the going gets rough on Capitol Hill, the Space Agency Administrator, James E. Webb, likes to point out that all those 20 billion for going to the moon will be spent in congressional districts here on earth. Texans appreciate what Mr. Webb means.

Rising almost like a mirage out of the coastal flatlands southeast of Houston are sparkling slabs of precast concrete with exposed aggregate.

In their incongruous contrast to surroundings of bobbing oil pumps and vanishing cattle ranges, the slabs stand as an architectural symbol of what happens on earth, politically, socially, and economically, when a nation decides to go to the moon.

When fully assembled into office buildings, laboratories, and auditorium, the slabs will provide the home for the Manned Spacecraft Center, which will serve as the command center for the assault on the moon.

WILL BUILD CAPSULES

It is here that the Apollo capsules will be built to carry a manned expedition. And it is here that technicians, sitting behind electronic consoles, will maintain contact with the lunar explorers as they set foot on the moon 235,000 miles away.

As the slabs have gone up, so has the cost of the Center, from an original estimate of $60 million to the current estimate of $160 million. And it is expected that within another few years of expansion the total capital investment will come to $250 million.

The construction that began in April 1962 is now 75 percent complete. Over the weekend the first contingent of 100 persons from the Center's logistic division began moving into the new headquarters.

It will be next June, however, before all the Center's 3,500 employees, now scattered in rented buildings all over southeast Houston, will take up quarters in the technological complex carved out of the grasslands and quicksand of an old cattle ranch.

ECONOMY BOOMING

Meanwhile the mere presence of the uncompleted Center has given new impetus to an already booming economy of a community that boasts above the newspaper headlines of being "The Nation's Sixth City."

The Manned Spacecraft Center is being acclaimed as the biggest boon to the Houston economy since the Houston ship canal was completed more than 40 years ago.

Houston is finding itself thrust into the middle of the space age, with all its outpourings of Federal research dollars. Aerospace companies with space agency contacts are flocking to Houston to set up offices for their contact men, and some are talking about putting up research or production plants.

In a society where so many fortunes have been made on real estate, the influx of Government and industry families is stimulating an already roaring real estate boom. "Planned communities" are springing up on the flatlands around the Manned Spacecraft Center in much the same way that housing subdivisions took over the sand dunes around Cape Canaveral, Fla., 10 years ago.

REASONS FOR SELECTION

Just how this ranchland, where deer still roam, came to be selected back in September 1961, as the site for the Center still causes cynical smirks on Capitol Hill, particularly among the Congressmen who wanted the Center for their home districts.

For the record the space agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, explains that Clear Lake was selected because it best met three criteria: It has an "outdoors type" climate; it has ready access to the sea for transporting space vehicles, and it is convenient to New Orleans and Huntsville, Ala., where the rockets are being developed, and to Cape Canaveral, where the Apollo spacecraft will be launched.

On Capitol Hill, however, there are lingering suspicions that political factors entered into the decision, suspicions that date back to the day when the selection of Houston was first announced by Representative ALBERT THOMAS in the Houston office of Vice President JOHNSON.

HEADS KEY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS, a Houston Democrat, is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that dealt with the space agency project. Vice President JOHNSON is Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

With the selection of the site there ensued a real estate transaction that in its

swiftness and complexity could only be followed by a title insurance company lawyer or a Texas entrepreneur.

Humble Oil & Refining Co. donated to Rice University 1,000 acres of the 30,000-acre Jim West Ranch that it had purchased for $9,200,000 in 1938. Before the ink was dry, Rice gave the land to the space agency.

Almost immediately the space agency decided it needed 600 more acres, but this time Humble and Rice were not so charitable.

Under the arrangement finally worked out, Rice gave Humble 625 acres of land in Metropolitan Houston in return for 678 additional acres of the West Ranch land. Rice kept 78 acres for its own use and sold the remaining 600 to the space agency for $1,200,000.

Rice originally asked $1,400,000. Space agency officials felt that this was a little high, particularly since three appraisals of the fair market value of the land ranged from $720,000 to $1,200,000.

In the end, after some bargaining, they agreed to pay $1,200,000, or $2,000 an acre, rather than go into condemnation proceedings.

Directly or indirectly, Humble still has an interest in the Center. Set aside in the middle of the Center's property is a 20-acre plot held by Humble for the oil drilling rights.

Humble also was a coowner in a $500 million project to build a planned community, Clear Lake City, enveloping the Center.

With the site for the Manned Spacecraft Center selected, the next step was the award of a $1,499,280 contract to Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston to do the architectural and engineering work. Some of the top officials of Brown & Root have long been political supporters of Vice President JOHNSON and Representative THOMAS.

STYLE IS A MIXTURE

The architectural style chosen is a mixture of windowless modern and Federal penitentiary.

Workshops and laboratories are built with slabs of precast concrete set off by black seams. The office buildings follow the current Government vogue of vertical lines of windows separated by angular columns of concrete, but the cell-block-like rows of windows are tinted gray for protection against the Texas sun.

As the buildings go up, Center officials have been traveling around the civic club circuit with a set speech to explain the virtues, both scientific and economic, of the space age.

The speech opens with the customary passage about the excitement of manned exploration of space and closes with a section explaining what impact this exploration will have on earth, particularly on southeastern Texas.

EXAMPLES OF IMPACT

The speech gives these examples of how the Center will stimulate "the industrial growth of the whole Texas and Southwest area":

By this July the Center was providing approximately 3,000 new jobs in Houston with a payroll of about $20 million a year.

About half the new employees came from outside Houston and will require about $20 million worth of housing.

The Center will be spending about $8 million on local supplies and service contracts. Much of the funds for construction will be spent in the local area.

Since the Center was established, more than 100 industrial concerns have set up offices in the Houston area, with staffs ranging from 1 to 20 persons.

PANORAMA OF BILLBOARDS

The immediate and tangible impact of the Center is evidenced by a panorama of billboards stretching along the superhighway from Houston to Clear Lake, all advertising homes "next to the new NASA Center."

The biggest and the most billboards belong to Clear Lake City, which last month proclaimed "the grand opening" of "a complete city in every respect."

A brochure notes that Clear Lake City is a joint venture of Humble Oil and the Del E. Webb Corp. "When these two firms got together," it says, "almost anything was possible."

What has happened is the seeming impossibility of a city being built in reverse. Or, as the brochure puts it, "completeness from the beginning is the philosophy."

EVERYTHING BUT HOMES

Shopping centers have been built. An industrial research park has been laid out. Office buildings are going up. A country club with a 9-hole golf course has been completed. A spaceage playground, with a jungle gym in the shape of a rocket, awaits children. Gemini Avenue has its street sign although at this point it leads only to a hillock of sand.

But thus far the city has few homes completed, except for the model exhibits, such as the Stardust, a 3- or 4-bedroom house which sells for $27,450 and has "the unique optional of a slideaway ceiling in the master bedroom."

By 1975, the promoters are predicting, Clear Lake City will have 180,000 inhabitants.

Even by Texas standards, that seems ambitious. But then the Manned Spacecraft Center started through Congress 2 years ago as a $60 million venture, and its promoters are already talking in terms of $250 million by 1966-67.

Economic Conditions in Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article on economic conditions in Nigeria from the September 1963 issue of the Morgan Guaranty Survey, the monthly publication of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York. The article, which follows, points out that Nigeria has the potential to attract private investment needed in the development of new nations:

BIG YEAR FOR NIGERIA

In a year that already has brought the Federation of Nigeria communication by satellite and its first world-championship prize fight, more excitement is still to come. On October 1, the third anniversary of its independence, Africa's most populous state will become a republic, functioning under a new constitution. As soon as plans for elections and other procedures can be completed, the new midwest region, split off from one of the three that until now have made up the federation, is scheduled to come into existence. And, some time before the end of the year, work is likely to begin on the huge Niger River Dam, planned as the first of three hydroelectric power developments.

The hubbub of large events, while richly enjoyed by the Nigerians, is not likely to divert attention for long from the main business of economic development—a job for which the country is in many ways better endowed than most of the newly independent African nations, but one which nevertheless looms as a long, hard assignment. Annual national income, estimated at the equivalent of about $90 per capita, is not high—even among African countries. There is a rich potential, however, in natural resources and in the human assets of an industrious, education-conscious people living in a politically stable setting. The task of development is to bring this potential to fulfillment.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the situation is the steady rate of growth the economy has been enjoying—an average annual increase in national output approximating 4 percent over the past decade. At that rate, it has kept comfortably ahead of the increase in population, estimated at about 2 percent per year. Paradoxically, two of the fruits of progress—better nutrition and health care—are likely to make more difficult the maintenance of such a rate of improvement in the statistical standard of living. There is room for fairly dramatic reduction in infant and child mortality rates, with consequent step-up in the rate of population increase.

LAND OF VARIETY

Nigeria's nearly 40 million people—about one-sixth of the entire population of Africa—live in an area bigger than California, Washington, and Oregon combined. From steamy coastal swamps along the Gulf of Guinea, the land extends north through a belt of rain forest, then over broad grassy sweeps broken by woodland to a hot, dry plateau approaching the fringes of the Sahara. The entire country is within the Torrid Zone.

Although Nigerian unity is a solid political fact, the three regions of which the federation presently consists have slight historical background in common. They were brought together only in this century as an administrative and trading convenience under the British protectorate. The northern region, with three-fourths of the total area and 60 percent of the people, has a Moslem tradition. The western has been most affected by European influence; Lagos, seat of the Federal Government, is located on its coast. The eastern contains much of the burgeoning oil and gas industry and also includes Port Harcourt, through which moves a large part of the country's foreign trade. The new midwest region slices off a strip of the western, taking in rich timber lands and holding hope of substantial agricultural development. Its formation was determined by a referendum this summer, the vote reflecting tribal fears of domination by larger groups in the western region.

In the federation, the separate units hold a high degree of autonomy. Accordingly, each has developed a fairly large administrative apparatus. Together with the Federal machinery, these add up to a governmental overhead that could prove to be a considerable economic burden. The Nigerians are aware of this danger. In tax policy, for instance, care is taken to avoid duplication between Federal and regional levies.

Financial support is not the full measure of the cost of the elaborate governmental structure. The public service steadily drains off personnel who have received some administrative or managerial training in private industry, which is hard-pressed to fill its requirements for talent and experience.

UPGRADING CROPS

The economy is predominantly agricultural, and the main emphasis in the 6-year (1962–68) national development plan is on increasing and diversifying the output in this sector. Programs to improve yield and upgrade quality in such major export items as cocoa, peanuts, palm products, cotton, and sesame seed have lifted receipts from these sources by some 25 percent in the last 5 years. Technical services are made available to farmers in a long-range effort to modernize methods, combat blight, and encourage maximum use of chemical fertilizers and pest controls.

Through joint government-producer efforts, the quality of Nigerian rubber has been

sharply improved in recent years in order to compete with synthetics. As a result, rubber exports totaled more than $30 million last year, double the average level of 1957–58. Further increases are likely from development of new estates.

Diversification efforts are aimed at broadening production of citrus fruits, bananas, and other crops not now produced in large quantity. Agricultural exports account for more than 60 percent of all foreign-exchange earnings, and greater variety is being sought as a hedge against price fluctuations.

Nigerian agriculture is slanted heavily toward the "cash crop" for export. The development plan hopes, without sacrificing this source of needed foreign-exchange earnings, to step up use of the land as a source of food for home consumption. Nutritional deficiencies, particularly a lack of protein, are a serious drag on Nigerian health and thus on economic vitality.

OIL ON THE RISE

The degree of dependence on exports of crops may be reduced in coming years by rapidly increasing flow of Nigerian oil. Discoveries already made suggest that the country may become an important world producer. Output is now running at about 70,000 barrels a day and is scheduled to reach 100,000 by 1965. Oil export earnings, which currently just about cover the cost of refined petroleum imports, should by then show a substantial margin of surplus. The two companies now jointly producing in Nigeria project their 1970 flow of crude at 200,000 barrels a day.

Oil has brought substantial foreign investment to Nigeria. The companies already producing there have spent some $280 million since they began exploration in 1937, and expect the total to rise to $560 million by 1970. Included in the total are a new refinery at Port Harcourt (over $22 million), pipelines and loading facilities, and dredging operations for the larger tankers required to handle an increasing volume of export shipments. The refinery, with an initial capacity of 1.6 million tons a year (32,000 barrels a day), will supply a large proportion of domestic requirements.

Meanwhile five other major companies are actively exploring Nigerian concesions. An offshore platform, towed across the Atlantic from Louisiana, is drilling off Port Harcourt. Further sizable discoveries are possible in the 14,000-square-mile delta of the Niger, where extensive reserves already have been located.

Natural gas has been found along with Nigeria's oil. Availability of this low-cost fuel for heat processing has been a major factor in the promotion of glass manufacture and other new industrial developments. Gas also is being used by the government-owned utility system to generate power. A new $15 million gas-turbine generating station went into operation in May.

Chief emphasis in the development of electrical power, however, is on the big Niger Dam at Kainji, in the northern region. This project, to cost the equivalent of nearly $200 million, is the chief element in a $275 million program for increased electric generating and transmission facilities. It is the largest project in the entire national development plan.

Scheduled to go into operation in 1967–68, Kainji will have an eventual installed capacity of 280,000 kilowatts. A total national capacity of 640,000 kilowatts is projected for 1968. Presently the total is about 200,000 kilowatts.

Expected to help take up the added power supply are a projected steel mill, a proposed aluminum smelter, and the petroleum refinery now under construction, along with the growing commercial and domestic demand which the increased availability of power is counted on to stimulate. For the longer run, feasibility studies have been conducted for two other powersites on the Niger, at Shiroro and Jebba. The latter is regarded as suitable for a multipurpose project like Kainji, providing—in addition to power—a river crossing, a large reservoir for fishing, and flood and navigation control. Subject to growth in demand for electricity, development of Shiroro and Jebba probably is at least 15 years away.

Nigeria's national development plan sets investment targets for trade and industry, primary production, electric power, transportation, communications, water supply. It calls for capital expenditures, Government and private, equivalent to some $1.9 billion over the 6 years of the plan. The financing projections are based on obtaining half that amount from abroad, the sources to include both government-to-government loans and foreign private investment.

Great Britain, which retains a large share of the trade of its onetime protectorate (Nigeria is a member, the fourth largest, of the British Commonwealth), has allocated some $84 million of aid since 1960 and presumably will keep the tap turned on. The United States has committed over $225 million through the 6 years of the plan, in addition to previously authorized aid of $45 million. Specific projects and programs are being financed for smaller amounts by Switzerland, West Germany, the Netherlands, and others, with indications that additional proposals will be considered.

Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister of the federation, has affirmed his country's receptivity to aid ("not only because we need it, but also because we think we deserve it") while expressing some concern over the "strings" that may be attached. "If those who are in a position to render this assistance," he wrote in an article in Foreign Affairs last year, "use it only as an opportunity to project their own narrow national interest or to propagate their ideologies, rather than seek a normal, fair return on their investment or the satisfaction of being of service to humanity, national independence is bound to be compromised."

The Prime Minister's recognition of the need for a return on investment is borne out by Nigerian national policy toward foreign capital. The development plan leaves a broad area open for private undertakings. Tax concessions, tariff protection, and a constitutional ban on confiscation of property without adequate compensation are offered as incentives to outside companies prepared to set up operations that fit into the plan's framework.

Responding to a favorable investment climate, as well as to Nigeria's generally stable political situation and its huge long-range market potential, several important American and European companies have established plants. Manufactures include textiles, glass, aluminum sheet, pharmaceuticals, tires, and other products.

Building up manufacturing and processing industries fits the plan's objectives both by increasing employment opportunities and by conserving foreign exchange through substitution of domestic production for imports. Cement, bicycles, cotton cloth, flour, and beer are among items of which local output is increasing.

Efforts are under way also to expand and modernize the mining industries, which produce a substantial amount of export revenue. More efficient mine operation is sought, and it is hoped that processing of ores can be carried further in Nigeria to increase the value of the tonnage shipped. Tin is an important export. The country is also a major producer of columbite, an essential alloy in heat-resistant steels required for jet engines and atomic-power equipment.

Lumber exports, including mahogany and other high-value tropical woods, are being upgraded. One of the world's largest plywood plants is now processing a portion of the forestry output into veneers.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

There is an outspoken socialist group in the federation's political life, who urge a larger role for government in the economy. Concessions are made to this viewpoint from time to time, but actually the government would prefer not to be as deeply involved in business as it is. A number of industries—among them coal, electric power, railroads, airlines—are government-owned, but in at least some instances this is explained as an interim expedient.

"In many cases," the Nigerian Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs recently said, "the governments (Federal and regional) of Nigeria have to participate in undertakings they would prefer to leave in private hands if the private hands were there to undertake them. In many cases, the governments participate in these ventures merely as trustees for the public of Nigeria, and they hold themselves ready to divest themselves of the shares they hold as soon as Nigerian private investors are available to take them over."

Spurring local participation in the ownership and management of industries is a continuing governmental aim. A stock exchange has been established in Lagos. Nationalism, as well as economics, underlies the desire to promote domestic influence in the economy. There is broad recognition, however, that training and experience must precede assumption of managerial and technical responsibilities. Nigeria is one of the most education minded of the African countries, and technical schooling holds a high priority in the current development program.

FOREIGN FUNDS NEEDED

Inopportunely for the import requirements imposed by the development plan, reserves of foreign exchange—which Nigeria, as a member of the British Commonwealth, holds largely in sterling—have been worked down from a 1955 high point of about £263 million ($736 million) to about £129 million last year-end. The familiar combination of falling export prices and rising costs of capital-goods imports contributed to the erosion of reserves. Tariffs have been raised sharply on consumer goods to discourage that kind of import, and this action has helped reduce the deficit on foreign transactions.

Clearly, however, continued infusions of outside funds are going to be needed if Nigeria's ambitious program of development is to keep moving. The sensible orderliness with which it thus far has managed the transition to self-government, combined with the realistic attitude it displays toward foreign capital, should help greatly to attract the needed financing.

While Nigeria's political moderation and its solid prospects for economic success make it an appealing candidate for government-to-government assistance, help of that kind cannot be counted on to do more than part of the job. The chief aid-giving countries, the United States and Britain, increasingly must measure their aid capabilities against balance-of-payments problems, and acceleration in the pace of official support seems unlikely.

Chief reliance, therefore, must be placed on private investment, from domestic and foreign sources. Nigeria has the potential to attract a continued flow of such funds. Besides the favorable investment climate it has created, it offers the attraction of its size and of the key role it is likely to play in the coming evolution of west Africa.

ROLE IN AFRICA

There is a feeling among some in the country that non-Africans have tried to force on Nigeria an exaggerated status of exemplar for other newly free states of the continent.

The Federation is especially wary of appearing to lead—or even aline with—any bloc of countries within the African community.

In an effort to cool differences between rival groupings, Nigeria 2 years ago joined other unaligned African states in sponsoring a meeting aimed at greater amity. This was the Monrovia convocation, held in the Liberian capital in 1961. Chiefly because a number of countries unexpectedly stayed away, the upshot of the meeting was to appear to create yet a new bloc, called the Monrovia-Lagos group, with Nigeria to its dismay widely regarded as the prime mover.

Not only does the Nigerian leadership view the divisive clustering of African states as wasteful of energies badly needed for development within the countries themselves. It also sees such cliquing as a possible threat to the ability of some countries to make their newly gained independence work and last. While basically receptive to the idea of a true pan-Africanism, Nigeria is acutely mindful of the huge practical obstacles that stand in the way.

Just a year ago, Sir Abubakar wrote: "I cannot speak by telephone with my brother Prime Ministers in most African capitals without going through London or Paris. Whereas I can talk directly with someone in New York, it is quite often impossible to call someone in a neighboring country 200 miles away. And even if telephone communications were adequate, it would probably be impossible for us to conduct a conversation except through an interpreter."

Within his own Federation, in fact, the Prime Minister may encounter more than 200 different languages, spoken by tribes whose members range in number from several hundred to several million. And although its railroad, highway, and communications networks are better than most in Africa, there is far more isolation than connection along and even within the separate regions.

Despite these and other difficulties, however, the new African spirit of movement is definitely afoot in Nigeria. To impatient observers outside—and perhaps even more so to impatient participants within—the pace may seem agonizingly slow, but a path for progress appears to be clearly marked out. And, whether or not the Federation actively seeks a leadership role, sheer size and status are likely to give its course a broad significance for the future of all Africa.

Let's Call a Spade a Spade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 11, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on October 6, 1963, in a broadcast by Gerda Pugell, United Nations correspondent for the Mutual Broadcasting System, it was clearly pointed out that while some of the leadership in various areas of the world may be lulled by the overtures of the Communists that certainly the voice of Nationalist China in the United Nations' General Assembly has not fallen for this era of conciliation.

It is a broadcast of warning by our Chinese friends to all freedom-loving people everywhere. I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpts of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF A BROADCAST OF OCTOBER 6, 1963, BY GERDA PUGELL, UNITED NATIONS CORRESPONDENT FOR THE MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

The tone of this year's United Nations General Assembly has been set by the signing of the test ban treaty and the conciliatory speeches by President Kennedy and Foreign Minister Gromyko, so that all differences between East and West are mentioned only vaguely by both sides. But there is one voice which is still calling the devil by his name, and "a spade a spade."

This is the voice of the Chinese delegation. Ambassador Liu of China has warned the West, in clear words, not to get too optimistic about the current favorable atmosphere. He said his country welcomed the test ban treaty and acceded to it. However, the treaty was, at best, only a start toward larger goals which were still not easily attainable. "Russia's drive for Communist expansion on a world-wide basis had not ceased," he declared, "and the signing of the treaty did not alter an iota the basic Soviet plan to remake the world in its own image." The Chinese Ambassador said that Russia, undoubtedly, had compelling reasons to shrink from the consequences of nuclear war, but that this in no way contradicts the fact that communism assumes the necessity of continued conflict. "As long as Cuba represented an extension of Soviet power in the Western Hemisphere and served as an accomplice in the Communist conspiracy for world domination," Ambassador Liu continued, "it constituted a direct threat to the security of the American States."

Commenting on the United Nations drive to end colonialism, the Chinese Ambassador said "this was applicable not only to Angola, Mozambique, and other African territories, but also to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all captive people of Eastern Europe."

Ambassador Liu also expressed his views freely on the question of the charter revision. He said that China favored it, but that there was little reason to believe that Russia would change its stand on this question. Russia claims that there could be no charter revision without Red China in the United Nations, but Ambassador Liu said he believed that the real reason for this opposition was that the Soviet Union feared a restriction of its veto as a potent weapon to block United Nations action in the cause of peace.

"Notwithstanding the lipservice the Russians pay to the importance of Asia and Africa," he said, "it was really only interested in increasing Soviet-bloc representation in the principal organs, at the expense of other geographical areas."

"In his view," the Chinese Ambassador said, "the Soviet Union wanted to cripple the machinery of the United Nations, particularly by its refusal to pay its share of peace-keeping operations" and he calls this "a glaring manifestation of that policy."

Joint Committee on Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this Member is one who feels that the subject matter of oceanography has reached that degree of maturity and that level of national importance that it deserves a better defined home in the halls of Congress. Presently the U.S. Navy and 14 separate agencies are involved in the important work of this field. Necessarily these 15 separate entities bring the problems of their sector of public activity to a variety of committees. This forces us to approach the problems and programs in Oceanography in a fragmented way. The power and thrust we need in this new frontier is thus dispersed and disconnected. It fosters competition between segments of an activity which needs cooperation to educate the public and the politcians to the importance of the work to be done and the long range public interest to be served.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that other Members both in the House and in the Senate will see the wisdom of this suggestion and seek in the near future a joint committee which can act as the coordinating forum for the diverse public effort and the presently scattered and confused private interests.

A small article in this month's Washington World reminds us that this Congress has committed a substantial sum to oceanographic research and under permission previously granted, I include the aforesaid article at the conclusion of these brief remarks. May we predict that the benefits to be gained from this very worthwhile expenditure will be greatly increased if the Congress provides the kind of forum we have above suggested.

The article follows:

NATION LAUNCHES 10-YEAR, $2.3 BILLION SCIENTIFIC STUDY INTO OCEANS' SECRETS

The administration has announced a new program to spend $2.3 billion during the next 10 years on oceanographic research.

That vast sum will be parceled out among the U.S. Navy and 14 other agencies, with 56 percent of the sum allocated for basic research.

VITAL NEED EXISTS

Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Republican, of Maryland, is among sponsors of the research program. He believes the tragedy of the lost U.S.S. *Thresher* and the tragic, unsuccessful search for it and its complement of 129 men off Cape Cod in April indicates a lack of sufficient knowledge of oceanography.

Proof that a vital need exists lies in the very character of American geography. While the United States thrusts ahead in space, it does so from a continent that is, in effect, a large island enveloped by massive oceans. Whoever knows most about those oceans, holds the advantage in the struggles for command of the seas and holds the lead in reaching for the fabulous unknown resources of the ocean floor.

Roger Revelle of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla, Calif., believes "we're such a big island, the public doesn't realize the need to consider the importance of the earth's oceans."

In fiscal 1964 the United States is spending $156 million on searching and probing the seas that cover 71 percent of the earth's surface, provide the rain, control the climate, and swirl the currents that help make a nation of Britain and a wilderness of Labrador at equivalent latitude. In the same fiscal year the United States is spending $4 billion in space.

The new oceanographic campaign, without prejudice to the space effort, will launch the kind of research fleet—cruisers, floating laboratories, submarines, capable of exploration 18,000 feet down, a new bathyscaphe for depths of 36,000 feet—that will perform certain critical missions in ocean research.

For the "Forgotten Men": $35 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1963, page A5471, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extension of remarks by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, with which was included an article entitled "The Crisis—The World War I Veteran: His Interest, Welfare, and Pension," by Mr. Julian R. Drake, of Albany, Ga.

Mr. Drake's article was critical of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee because it has not reported H.R. 2332, the billion-dollar pension bill of the World War I veterans' organization and it was Mr. Drake's contention that the World War I veteran has been neglected and mistreated. Nothing could be further from the truth. Included in my remarks is a copy of the letter which I have written to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT, and I commend its reading to those of you who are being inundated by letters from the World War I veterans, repeating the fictitious nonsense that World War I veterans have not been dealt with generously by our Government:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1963.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Tuesday, August 26, 1963, on page A5471 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you inserted an extension of remarks entitled, "The Crisis." This extension of remarks consisted principally of an article prepared by Julian R. Drake which was entitled, "The Crisis—The World War I Veteran, His Interest, Welfare and Pension."

In his article, Mr. Drake contended that the World War I veteran has been neglected and mistreated. The following statements were employed by Mr. Drake in his contention of mistreatment of the World War I veteran:

"Times are so good, except for the poor neglected World War I veteran who was the root of all such prosperity."

"Yet, why has this World War I veteran been so badly neglected? * * * The present Congress has done almost nothing in the way of getting a pension passed which would give World War I veterans a pension to offset any pauperism or become subjects of charity."

"Why has the Congress appeared so negligent or unconcerned? Why has even the President of the United States appeared so unconcerned?"

"Now the poor forgotten World War I veteran must wake up and fight for existence."

"Thousands of World War I veterans have had to turn to charity because they are unable to make ends meet on their meager incomes."

In your own remarks you said: "All of the major political issues are worthy of consideration and attention but this can be done without closing our eyes, our minds and our hearts—the ever-increasing problem of the World War I veteran who is truly becoming the forgotten soldier rotting away in the thrushes of crowding old age, unemployment, despair and in some cases abject need with all its miseries, worry, and personal degradation of spirit, pride and will."

In your remarks you referred to the author, Julian R. Drake, as your friend and termed his article as a masterful appeal. There is no basis in fact for the contention that the World War I veteran has been neglected or mistreated, and there is even less basis for the argument advanced by Mr. Drake that H.R. 2332 is a bill which is primarily intended to help needy World War I veterans.

To date, this Nation has spent $35,435,835,000 in benefits for World War I veterans. This exceeds $7,400 per man. World War I veterans comprise 15 percent of all participants of all of this Nation's wars. They have received 28 percent of all of this Nation's expenditures for veterans. This year the Veterans' Administration's budget is almost $5½ billion. World War I veterans constitute 11 percent of the veteran population in America today. They will receive $2 billion, or 40 percent, of the money being spent on veterans this year. Listed below is a detailed compilation of the programs which have been available to World War I veterans and their dependents, and the costs:

Adjusted compensation (bonus)	$3,875,674,000
Death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation	1,954,104,000
Disability compensation	7,869,270,000
Pensions:	
Veterans	8,443,687,000
Dependents	3,327,173,000
Medical care	5,841,474,000
Insurance	[1] 1,871,548,000
Vocational rehabilitation	644,865,000
Burial allowance	240,918,000
Housing for disabled	6,757,000
Others [2]	1,360,365,000
Total	$35,435,835,000

[1] Excludes premium and other collections—$456,595,000. If at any age WWI veteran becomes totally and permanently disabled he may stop paying insurance premiums and start drawing benefits of $5.75 per month for each $1,000 of insurance in force. WWII veterans are entitled only to a waiver of premium for total disability which must begin before age 60.

[2] Includes administrative costs and capital expenditures.

About one-half of all living World War I veterans are now receiving a pension. On June 30, 1963, 1,015,835 World War I veterans were on pension rolls. Seventy-four percent of the Nation's expenditures this year for veterans' pensions are going to World War I veterans and their dependents. Forty-five percent of the patients in the Veterans Administration's billion-dollar hospital and medical program are World War I veterans, even though they comprise only 11 percent of the veteran population. A married World War I veteran, with less than $3,000 a year income and a single World War I veterans with less than $1,800 a year income may now receive pension assistance. World War I veterans in the low income brackets receive from $90 to $100 a month, depending upon the dependency status of the veteran. Those with serious health problems receive an aid and attendance allowance, making the maximum pension payable $170 per month. The contention that World War I veterans have been neglected or mistreated is utterly without foundation.

To understand clearly the nature of the demand of Julian R. Drake and the World War I Veterans' organization for enactment of H.R. 2332, it is necessary that the detailed provisions of the bill be considered. The clamor for the bill is in the name of the sick and needy. Mr. Drake's article is typical. H.R. 2332 actually does nothing for many of the sick and needy veterans and widows. A widow's pension is $75 a month if she has one dependent and an income of less than $1,000 a year. H.R. 2332 gives this widow no increase. A World War I veteran with two dependents and less than $1,000 a year income now receives $100 a month. This veteran gets no increase under H.R. 2332. A veteran so sick and disabled as to require aid and attendance now receives $70 a month in aid and attendance allowance. This veteran gets no increase in his aid and attendance allowance under H.R. 2332.

About two-thirds of the proposed additional expenditure under H.R. 2332 of $1,200 million per year goes to veterans in the top quarter of the age 65 income group, while the remaining one-third goes to provide small increases to some cases in the lower income brackets.

It is ironic, indeed, that the World War I Veterans' organization, and an individual such as Julian R. Drake, should launch a pressure campaign for pensions for the well-to-do, and do so in the guise of help for the needy. An examination of the individual circumstances of the author of the article you inserted in the RECORD clearly shows the nature of the deception which is being heaped upon the Congress. The author of the article served in World War I for nearly 2 years. He is married and is retired. He is currently receiving a non-service-connected pension of $90 a month and has been receiving this pension since February 19, 1962. This pension will continue until he has recouped all of his contribution to social security and the Federal Civil Service retirement system. In addition to the $1,080 per year which he receives from the Veterans' Administration, he receives $199 a month in civil service annuity and $45 a month from social security. He has in excess of $5,000 invested, yielding additional income of approximately $100 a year. Apparently, the author sees no reason to be grateful for the $90 a month he receives from the Veterans' Administration, but feels called upon to criticize the Congress and the administration in general, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee specifically, because he does not receive more.

The author is receiving $90 a month on a non-service-connected pension. A 50-percent disabled, service-connected veteran receives only $107 a month. An orphan child who lost a parent from a service-connected cause receives $77 a month. Two dependent parents living together, who lost a son and have $2,000 a year other income get $44 a month. A totally and permanently, service-connected, disabled veteran receives $250 a month, or $3,000 a year. This is $1,108 per year less than the annual income of the author of this article.

The author of the article's annual income of $4,108 compares with the median income for all families headed by a 65-year-old individual which is only $2,897 per year. One-half of the male population of this country has an income of only $4,081 per year. The author's annual income exceeds this figure even though he is retired.

He and the proponents of H.R. 2332 seek more. This bill raises income limits for most married individuals to $4,800 and for most single individuals to $3,600. In addition to these amounts, veterans would be eligible for $1,200 per year additional in a tax-free pension. Individuals in these income brackets are in the top 10 percent group at age 65. It is apparent, therefore, that

neither the author of the article nor the proponents of H.R. 2332 have any real concern for veterans in need because of low income or serious health problems, but are really concerned in obtaining a pension for the upper income groups. Their attempt to obtain such a pension is being made in the name of the poor, sick, needy veterans. I view Mr. Drake's article and your endorsement and insertion of it in the RECORD as part of the campaign.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has repeatedly considered these questions and has rejected bonus-type pension bills. The committee is obligated to see that there is an equitable balance between benefits payable to the service connected and the nonservice connected. It feels an obligation to the taxpayer who must bear the burden of payment. And the committee is convinced that first priority non-service-connected payments should go to those badly in need because of serious health problems and low incomes. For this reason, it has been rejecting bills such as H.R. 2332 and other similar attempts to secure pensions for the upper income groups in the guise of helping the needy.

I would be most interested in receiving the names and addresses of any World War I veterans known to you who are not receiving non-service-connected pensions and who are "rotting away in the thrushes of crowding old age, unemployment, despair * * * and abject need."

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

A Strong Big City Case for the Bracero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a big city newspaper understands the intricate, complex problems of rural America or agriculture. Its readers and advertisers naturally are more concerned with urban matters. Big city editors and reporters seldom understand and cannot appreciate the farm labor situation without getting out on the farm, actually living and migrating with a fieldworker's family or talking with a farmer.

The provincial Washington Post did not even know the difference between a wetback and a bracero although the editorial writer did admit that the bracero legislation was shameless.

The San Francisco Examiner, a large metropolitan newspaper, which has never won any proagriculture awards has taken a second look at the bracero program. A cursory, unbiased study quickly demonstrates the urgent need for an extension of Public Law 78—for the benefit of the big city consumer housewife, for the many workers in big city industries dependent upon agricultural products, and for the human beings of Mexico. The Examiner has now discovered how important the bracero—from faraway Mexico—who works at stoop labor—on faraway United States farms—is to the general business, employment and welfare of the big city dwellers. The Examiner does not overlook the pathetic plight of the nomadic migrant farmworkers. But the Examiner after study, after a second look, discovered that the bracero program is probably the most effective humanitarian solution to an important, tough, social-economic problem which affects the city people as well as the rural.

For my colleagues from big cities, who respect big city editors who do their homework, I commend the following editorial:

THE STRONG CASE FOR BRACEROS

Proposed extension of the bracero farm labor program, after an earlier and ill-considered rejection in Congress, is currently undergoing reexamination.

The second look at the problem is well-advised. For a time it proceeded expeditiously. The Senate voted decisively for a 1-year extension. The House Agriculture Committee also gave approval.

But there the measure bogged down. The delay in getting the necessary authorization by the House has become a matter of grave concern to the American and especially the California farm economy.

The bracero program involves importation of Mexican workers for stoop labor in California and other American fields. If the program ends on January 1 as now planned, California farm production will be drastically curtailed.

This is because no other labor force is available to do the job. Domestic workers are either unwilling or unavailable in sufficient numbers. Japanese, Filipino and other workers formerly relied upon have mostly moved up on the economic scale.

And here we make a significant point: Mexican workers, too, get a definite boost upwards on the economic scale from the bracero program. They return to their homeland with more than money in their pockets. They have been exposed to an industrial economy they never knew existed. They become models, evangelists and teachers in Mexico for that economy.

The 400,000 braceros give an improved standard of living to more than 1 million dependents—and this in times of widespread unemployment in the rural areas of Mexico.

Continuation of the bracero program is decidedly to the advantage and benefit of both countries.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part VII of the series "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1":

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1, VII—HOW DIRTY DO WE WANT TO BE?

(By Ian McNett)

New Jersey's effort to control air pollution has reached a plateau. Much has been accomplished, but much remains to be done.

One should not carry the plateau analogy too far, however. Geological plateaus endure millions of years. The air pollution situation in this State will crumble in a short time if vigorous action is not pursued.

It will be eroded by the effects of a flood of new people moving into the State. New Jersey can expect to gain 3 million more people in the next 20 years, according to a recent study.

These people will bring with them a train of potential pollution sources—automobiles, home heaters, new industries, stores, commercial establishments, and public facilities.

But the amount of air that must handle the potential added pollution will remain constant.

Even if air pollution control were completely satisfactory today, which it is not, more stringent controls would become necessary as more people settle in the State.

Air over Perth Amboy and the rest of metropolitan New Jersey will never be absolutely free of pollution.

No reasonable person can expect to live in an industrial society and not suffer some disadvantages.

"We have to find out just how dirty do we want to be," says William A. Munroe, coordinator of the air sanitation program.

To find out how dirty we want to be requires "research and more research," according to Dr. Robert H. Daines, Rutgers University plant pathologist.

Dr. Daines says we must do the research now.

"When the citizens are storming city hall it will be too late," he says.

Research must be aimed in several directions at once.

NEED BETTER TECHNIQUES

Dr. Raymond Manganelli of the Rutgers Sanitation Department says better measuring techniques must be found.

Weather conditions should be studied in great detail, Munroe says.

Dr. Walter Grossman and Dr. Edward Seidmon, physicians who are interested in air pollution problems, would like to see research go into the effects of pollutants on human beings.

Dr. Daines would be interested in more research in the effects of pollutants on agriculture. Other experts want research into pollution's effect on various materials like rubber, stone, wood, and paints.

Research in all of these areas is needed if standards are to be set for pollution permitted from local sources and for overall air quality.

Although it is hampered by lack of funds, personnel, and equipment, the air sanitation program carries out some surveys.

A mobile laboratory in 1960 made a survey of oxidants at Elizabeth, Trenton, and New Lisbon.

The survey found pollution levels were below the adverse level set in Los Angeles. However, pollution was found in even the relatively rural New Lisbon area.

A smoke sampling program is carried on continuously in several cities, including Perth Amboy.

Perth Amboy samples show that smoke levels are heaviest in the winter, and between 6 and 9 a.m. during the day.

HOME UNITS PLAY ROLE

Munroe says the timing of the heaviest smoke emissions suggests that home heating units play a big role in smoke pollution.

To set standards, it becomes necessary to be able to learn how much pollution is in the atmosphere. Measuring contaminants in the overall atmosphere and tracking them down to their specific sources is a difficult and frustrating job.

Even though the air is limited in its capacity to absorb pollution, it still is a pretty big place when it comes to tracking down specific pollutants.

Weather conditions help make pollution hard to track down to specific sources.

Joseph J. Soporowski, Perth Amboy air pollution control director, says, "I get a call from a resident complaining about air pollution. He tells me the pollution is coming from a certain factory and, sure enough, the wind is blowing from that direction.

"But when I check the incident out, I find it wasn't from that factory at all, but from one on the other side of the city."

What happens, Soporowski explains, is that the wind may blow in one direction at ground level, and in a completely different direction 100 feet in the air.

Pollutants rise into the upper stream. They are carried along until a downdraft sucks them to the ground.

This is one thing that makes weather studies important. The studies become doubly important in cities like Perth Amboy, where old zoning laws permitted industries and private homes to live side by side.

Such a zoning pattern means more rigid control of pollution at the local source is needed than would have been necessary if industry had been more rigidly segregated from the residential areas.

ZONING IMPORTANT

Zoning of new industry coming into a community is very important. Zoners should have weather information available. They should set up zones so the industries will be placed where pollution will blow away from residential areas, if possible.

A Los Angeles air pollution expert told the Washington Conference on Air Pollution, held in December, that knowledge of how weather acts is advanced enough to supply the information zoners need.

The expert said weather studies must be conducted to chart the temperatures and air current patterns that affect pollution.

This weather information can then be superimposed on a map, the expert said, giving a general weather picture of an area.

The effort to set air quality standards for the overall atmosphere is complicated by the difficulty of measuring pollution.

Air contaminants are hard to measure in the atmposhere because of their great variety, and because pollutants combine to form new pollutants.

No techniques yet exist that measure the polultant itself. All devices now used measure some property of a pollutant.

For example, researchers can measure the ability of sulfur dioxide to conduct electricity when it is dissolved in a liquid.

But other subtances in the atmosphere, such as nitrogent oxides, will affect the conductivity measurement also. This means that precise measurements are very hard to obtain.

PATTERNS VARY

Pollution patterns very from place to place. The researcher must decide where to take his measurements. Most air pollution devices are very expensive. It would be impossible to set one up in every city block.

A group of cans on the roof of the department of sanitation building at Rutgers illustrates the variation in pollution.

Dust falls into the cans and is measured at regular intervals. The amount of dust in a can on the northeast corner of the building will be different than the amount in a can on any other corner or in the middle of the roof.

Dr. Manganelli says, "If you get that much variation in such a small, area you can imagine the differences you would find over an entire city."

So we must decide how dirty we want to be.

To do this we need research, every expert agrees.

But what happens when the research is done?

When the technical experts decide that certain levels should be the standard for pollution, it will be up to the citizens to make sure the politicians enact the appropriate legislation.

But the need for research should not be used as an excuse to do nothing. At least we can appropriate the money to do the research—and then do it.

The air pollution battle lacks an advocate with the eloquence Rachel Carson brought against the indiscriminate use of pesticides.

But air pollution affects more people more often than pesticides. Residents of industrial areas suck pollutants into their lungs every moment of their waking lives. Not even rural residents can escape entirely.

The University Named for Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, I have a deep interest in Lincoln University near Oxford, Pa., because among its graduates are many who are now dedicating themselves to building on the continent of Africa an enduring cathedral of democracy, of government by the people and in the interest of all the people.

I am interested, too, in Lincoln University because the vice president of that great school is Frank J. Dowd, Jr., son and namesake of one of the dearest friends I have had, the late Frank J. Dowd, than whom Chicago never produced a greater lawyer.

I am interested, too, in Lincoln University because numbered among its distinguished alumni is my dear friend, Congressman ROBERT N. C. NIX, my colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and my close coworker on the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Philadelphia Sun Bulletin magazine of February 10, 1963, on the university of which Abraham Lincoln truly would have been proud.

The article follows:

LINCOLN WOULD HAVE LIKED IT

(By Glenn White)

Abraham Lincoln's ultimate political philosophy, according to historian Bruce Catton, was "full freedom and untrammeled liberty for every man." Of all the institutions named for him, none is a better demonstration of the effort to achieve that objective than Lincoln University.

Located 45 miles southwest of Philadelphia in southern Chester County near Oxford, Pa., it is the oldest college in the United States having as its original purpose the higher education of Negro youth. Originally called Ashmun Institute, it received its charter in 1854, was renamed after the Civil War.

I first visited Oxford, Pa., shortly after a visit in the region of Oxford, Miss., where it took an army of U.S. marshals and soldiers to get a single Negro youth, James Meredith, into the University of Mississippi. With little publicity or fanfare, something quite different is happening around Pennsylvania's Oxford.

Lincoln University is practicing integration in reverse. Some 60 of its current enrollment of 450 students are white.

White students have never been barred from Lincoln; the first two were graduated with the class of 1868. Hundreds more will be welcomed to its campus as the college expands to an expected enrollment of a thousand or more by 1970.

Lincoln's aim is to become a superior liberal arts college with a completely international and interracial student body. It is well on its way.

"I came here because I was excited about the place," Lincoln's new young president, Dr. Marvin Wachman, said to me. "It is in the center of the most important happenings in the world today.

"Lincoln University," he said, "was the first institution of higher education to be founded on the concept, restated for all time in Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, of 'a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'

"It was the first university to demonstrate that proposition by successfully offering liberal arts, preprofessional and professional training to a group of people universally denied such opportunity.

"Lincoln University did this when other predominantly Negro institutions were offering a trade-school type of education, which is certainly honorable and valuable, but is an insufficient demonstration of the proposition espoused by Abraham Lincoln."

The tradition of Lincoln University has been international for over a century, and continues to be. Eighteen percent of its students are foreign (compared to the national college norm of 1.5 percent), bringing cultural backgrounds of 20 different nations.

On Lincoln's campus today you can meet young men like Victor Khodabakhsh, an accomplished pianist from Iran, or Kunihito Takeuchi of Kyoto, Japan—who had no idea of Lincoln's racial makeup when he came last year as a freshman. "Who would think about that?" he asked. Now he fits in as well as any boy from Philadelphia. "I came to Lincoln because I could get a 4-year scholarship here," he explained, "but now it would be my choice anyway."

Lincoln's present student population includes representatives from the Philippines, British West Indies, British Guiana, Taiwan, China, and numerous students from Africa. The Nigerian delegation is the largest.

As Lincoln was among the first American colleges to welcome African students, many of the leaders of the new African nations are Lincoln graduates. These include Kwame Nkrumah, President of Ghana; Nnamdi Azikewe, Governor General of Nigeria; Dr. K. O. Mbadiwe, adviser to the Prime Minister of Nigeria; Dr. William H. Fitzjohn, High Commissioner of Sierra Leone; and many others.

Its alumni also include the novelist and poet, Langston Hughes; Thurgood Marshall, the lawyer who led the way to the Supreme Court decision to desegregate public schools, now a judge in the U.S. court of appeals, and a trustee of Lincoln; and Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, United Nations Under Secretary, and also a trustee.

No less distinguished in Philadelphia are Lincoln alumni Robert N. C. Nix, a Congressman; William T. V. Fontaine, professor of philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania; E. Washington Rhodes, publisher of the Philadelphia Tribune, and E. Luther Cunningham, minister of St. Paul's Baptist Church, Civil Service Commissioner, and also a trustee of Lincoln.

"Lincoln University's orientation toward the city of Philadelphia is inevitable," President Wachman said. "I wish more Philadelphians knew more about us."

Of course, Lincoln University is close to the hearts of a number of Philadelphians. There are about 550 alumni living in the city and an additional 175 in eastern Pennsylvania.

Walter M. Phillips, former city representative and chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, is chairman of Lincoln's board of trustees. Other trustees who live in Phil-

adelphia or its environs are F. W. Elliott Farr, Roger S. Firestone, Walter D. Fuller, Albert M. Greenfield, George M. Leader, Julius Rosenwald II, Lewis M. Stevens, Stephen B. Sweeney, and Elinor K. Wolf. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK was awarded an honorary degree in 1961.

Seventy-nine students currently are from the Philadelphia area.

In the student lounge of the guest cottage on the Lincoln campus, I talked to a group of serious young Lincoln students who were, of course, Lincoln boosters.

Among them was Everett Hoagland, a graduate of Philadelphia's John Bartram High School. Everett who was also admitted to both Howard University and Pennsylvania State, but chose to attend Lincoln. "Lincoln is progressing," he said. "This is an age of excellence, and we have got to progress." He pointed out that Lincoln's new student union and dining center, a building of strikingly modern design, was nearing completion, and that a fine arts and humanities building would be built next year.

The college has 17 main buildings and 24 faculty residences on its 350 acres. The new student union, it is hoped, will bring greater unity to the student body. (At present, all of the white students, most of them Oxford residents, commute to the campus.)

Hoagland noted that while it is true the attitude of people in Pennsylvania toward race relations differs from that of people in Mississippi, the differences in actual customs and practice are not so great. Last year, the Lincoln chapter of the NAACP picketed the Oxford Hotel, which had refused to rent rooms to Negroes. "There were white students, too, in that picket line," Hoagland observed quietly. The hotel soon affirmed a policy of equality.

"Lincoln has to grow with the times," Leslie Harris agreed. "So have we." Leslie is a graduate of Overbrook High School and plans to do his interne teaching at Temple University.

William Gibbons, a graduate of Friends' Select, said he thought he had been well-prepared for Lincoln. "The first year is the toughest," he said. "If you can make that—"

"I think it depends upon the attitude you have," Hoagland cut in, "whether you punch out or not."

He explained that to "punch out" means to fail or drop out of school. Students at Lincoln, like college students everywhere, have a special vocabulary; every now and then a Lincoln man has to stop "fighting the material" (studying) and "hit the pike" (have some fun). When things are going their way, they "see the grass grow green," and a roommate is often referred to as "my old lady."

These Lincoln men are also eager to point out that the college is, in token, at least, coeducational. Fourteen women students are currently enrolled. The girls commute from their homes. This, the men feel, is regrettable, particularly as Dr. Wachman has announced that building a women's dormitory is not among Lincoln's future plans, and it is simply not feasible to encourage more women to attend.

The costs of attending Lincoln are low—$1,390 a year for board, room, and tuition. Most Pennsylvania students are eligible for senatorial scholarships, which make the tuition item even lower—$250 a year instead of $600. The college is State aided, receiving approximately 29 percent of its annual budget from State funds. It has an endowment of around a million dollars, but like many other small educational institutions, Lincoln must continually seek new sources of income to sustain itself and keep its charges low.

"One of our greatest challenges," Dr. Wachman said, "is to convince more students that they can and should go to college, that there is now opportunity for them in nearly every profession and vocation—if they will prepare themselves to take that opportunity. We must help them raise their sights.

"In many cases, it's true, the opportunities are so new they can hardly believe they exist. But they do exist," he emphasized. "More will exist in the future, but for the untrained and the uneducated (regardless of race, creed or color) there will be fewer jobs."

In an address delivered in Illinois, referring to the drafting of the Declaration of Independence, Abraham Lincoln said:

"These representatives in old Independence Hall said to the whole world of men that all men are created equal. This was their lofty and wise and noble understanding of the justice of the Creator to His creatures. Yes, gentlemen, to all His creatures, to the whole great family of man. In their enlightened belief, no one stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on, degraded and imbruted by his fellows."

The miraculous vision is still only a vision, not yet a fact. But I left the Lincoln University campus with the feeling that there is no spot in Pennsylvania where that vision is brighter, where one of the best dreams of mankind is being more certainly molded into reality.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The Inflation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter to the editor from Mr. F. Chapin Breckenridge which appeared in the Evening Star of October 12, 1963.

I have known Mr. Breckenridge well and favorably for 21 years. He is a keen and serious student of public affairs and I am certain that his thoughts reflect the concern of millions of other Americans throughout the Nation:

PLANNED INFLATION SEEN AS TAX CUT OBJECTIVE

Since I generally agree with your editorials, I regret that I cannot accept the implications of the very pleasantly stated comments on the "Tax Burden."

When the President on TV marshaled all current ideas favorable to his tax cut proposal, he made a plausible case. But Congressman CURTIS' reply to the President put a different face on the proposal. On one point there can be no doubt. The real issue is not tax reduction but planned inflation. The President's refusal to accept any restrictions designed to avoid inflation, and the arguments he used for his program, both show clearly that he expects monetary inflation as asserted by Mr. CURTIS. Let us henceforth call it the inflation bill.

Monetary inflation through deficit financing of part of the Federal budget is not ipso facto an economic sin. Nor is it a device to be employed any time there are unemployed people, or to boom business, as the President's supporters imply. Any sound theory of economic stabilization must recognize that business depressions and price inflation are both caused by variations in the amount of money in use. There is a time to inflate and a time to deflate, but also there is a time to do neither and that, at present, is most of the time.

The number of unemployed has been relatively constant for 2 years and is now only slightly above the number expected from the long-term trend. The number of employed is almost at the all-time high. Moreover, there are many unfilled jobs available. Congressman CURTIS pertinently points out that most of those now unemployed are not qualified either for the work presently available or for the work which might become available if a Federal deficit is financed through the Federal Reserve System. In such a situation, deficit financing must bring price inflation.

How serious could that inflation be? The deficit for the present fiscal year is estimated at $6.8 billion. Add a tax reduction of $11.1 billion and you have nearly $18 billion which could be added to the money in circulation. This is about 12 percent of the total of currency and checking account balances on which this country is doing business. It could support a 12-percent increase in all prices.

Why is the President urging such large deficit financing at this time? Could it be he hopes the pleasant effects of tax reduction and such business boom as may follow will be felt during the campaigning months but that price inflation will not get serious until the votes are counted? And why does Governor Rockefeller propose that the inflation be put to work sooner? Is it with the hope that the boost will have been superseded by rising prices by the time the voters cast their ballots?

Economic stabilization can not be safely entrusted to either the administration or Congress. With some notable exceptions, Presidents, Senators, and Congressmen will serve their personal and party interests rather than those of the people as a whole, especially when a complex problem their constituents do not understand is involved. It is too difficult to explain such problems in campaigning for votes. In consequence, we have had price inflation as the result of Federal deficits in all but 4 years since 1948, notwithstanding that prices had risen in the previous year, which should have been a warning that deficit financing was not needed. And this has happened in a period when increased production efficiency should have lowered prices.

On the other hand, if we were again faced with a situation like the collapse of 1929, Congress could not act promptly enough to prevent the starting of the downward vicious cycle. Moreover, it is not reasonable to expect men selected for positions of broad responsibilities to have the expert knowledge of economics necessary to distinguish the times and estimate the amounts when deficit financing is desirable.

If the administration, or the Republican Party, want to make history in a constructive way, let them devise, and if possible enact, a law increasing the powers of the Federal Reserve Board so that it can deal as successfully with a major dislocation of the economy as it now does with minor ones. This would require giving the Board control of the Federal debt. Deficits and debt repayment would be used to supplement or counteract changes in the total of commercial loans. Congress would still determine the purposes and priorities of the expenditures, and the administration would carry out the approved projects according to the funds available each quarter.

And what of the unemployed? Encourage the States to carry out adequate programs of training for the unemployed, and since not many of them can be trained for existing vacancies, deliberately increase the demand for unskilled workers. For example, we could step up work on beautifying parks and highways. We could also encourage more attention to the appearance of private property.

F. CHAPIN BRECKENRIDGE.

Wheat for Freedom, Not for Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the infamous sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. and its satellites is a matter of history, the larger consequences of bolstering communism remain to be faced. I deem it necessary for public debate on the subject to register the fact that more wholesome and practical alternatives were possible.

One alternative might have been the suggestion of the National Captive Nations Committee which was described as "Wheat for Freedom, Not for Sale." I submit for the RECORD a press release issued by this committee on October 2, which dramatizes its views on this subject.

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 2, 1963.—Opposing the sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R., the National Captive Nations Committee today called upon the President to issue a food-for-freedom declaration, ringing with the theme "Wheat for Freedom, Not for Sale." In a telegram to the Chief Executive, the committee's chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University, stated: "The time now is for strong moral and political leadership in this respect, not tolerated commercialism."

The declaration the committee urges would contain three parts: (1) detailed emphasis on the inability of the so-called Communist economies to feed adequately the captive people, both within and outside the U.S.S.R.; (2) concrete contrasts between the food-producing capability of the United States and that of the empire-state U.S.S.R.; and (3) a free offer of wheat and food to any of the captive people, both within and outside the U.S.S.R., provided it is stamped "Food for Freedom" and distributed by the International Red Cross.

Dobriansky pointed out that "it is truly fantastic that, historically, Ukraine alone was regarded as 'the granary of Europe,' but under Soviet-Russian imperiocolonialism it has not been able, along with other areas in the new empire, to feed adequately the population in this empire-state." He added, "Thirty years ago a politically manmade famine blighted Ukraine and adjacent areas; today, institutionally man-made shortages of wheat highlight colonial Russian performance."

The committee discounts the rationalizations offered for wheat sales, such as the examples of Canada and Australia or balance-of-payments deficits. "As the leading nation in the free world," Dr. Dobriansky declared, "the United States must maintain its dignity of purpose and will to weaken the Red totalitarian governments"; and stressed, "Let's not give credence to habitual Russian propaganda that for money Americans would sell their souls."

In addition to alternatives, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the sale of wheat to Russia, there are serious doubts concerning the long-range wisdom of the President's decision. One of the most thoughtful editorials appeared in the Friday, October 11, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times. Since the editorial speaks for itself, especially emphasizing the deliberate disregard of congressional opinion by the executive branch, I also place this effective analysis of national viewpoint on the subject into the RECORD at this point.

ON LIFTING RED EMBARGO

In 1961 Congress went on record as opposed to the sale or export to Russia of any agricultural commodity subsidized by the U.S. Government. Although this still remains the declared policy of Congress, President Kennedy on Wednesday lifted the embargo on wheat sales to Russia that has been in effect as a result of the congressional action.

As the wording of the congressional policy printed below shows, Congress did not specifically make sales of subsidized products to Russia illegal. It merely stated a viewpoint. President Kennedy further argues that in allowing private sales of wheat to Russia there is no subsidy to the foreign purchaser. This is an exercise in semantics; up until Wednesday the White House by banning wheat sales to Russia showed it regarded such sales as subsidized.

(In the Agricultural Act of 1961 appears these words: "It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress as amended and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations." Section 107 reads: "As used in this Act 'friendly nations' means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R., or (2) any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.")

There has been no ban on sales to Russia of such items as corn, barley or oats because these are exported without benefit of Government subsidy. But every bushel of wheat sold abroad by private American grain brokers carries a Government subsidy. The Government pays the dealers the difference between the artificial high price the Government guarantees American farmers (and paid by American consumers) and the lower world price paid by foreign buyers. In the upcoming transaction with Russia this subsidy is expected to amount to about 55 cents a bushel. If Russia and her satellites buy an additional 228 million bushels, the subsidy will run to about $125 million.

Mr. Kennedy has given a number of reasons for changing the previous policy and lifting the embargo and it may well be that the majority of Members of Congress now agree with him. But it also is true that there is opposition to the change in policy, even by some members of his own Democratic Party. And Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has said Congress should have had a voice in any change of policy.

Mr. Kennedy presumes that there has been a change in public opinion about this country's relationship with Russia, a change that justifies the lifting of the emargo. He argues that the sale will relieve the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, that if the United States did not sell to Russia other nations would, that the transaction will move a considerable amount of grain out of Government bins and save storage costs.

On the latter point, since grain dealers may receive their Government subsidy "in kind"—that is in Government-owned wheat—the Chicago Board of Trade estimates that the Government furnishes about one-fourth of exported wheat. Thus the wheat deal will nibble away at the Government's huge surplus of more than 1 billion bushels, and will reduce some storage costs.

The arguments given the President are largely economic, while the position of the Congress in 1961 was largely political. The political side of the argument deserves consideration. A loyal Kennedy Democrat, Representative ROMAN PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, last Monday expressed concern about that:

"I must say we are going to find it rather difficult to explain to the American people how we can give the Soviet Union favored-nation treatment through the sale of any wheat or other commodity when we are faced with the problem of Soviet troops in Cuba on the one hand and a $50 billion national defense budget on the other hand. * * * I do not think we in the United States should bail out the Soviet Union unless we get some concessions."

There are many Americans who believe this. President Kennedy has ignored their opinions. He appears to be satisfied that his Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, is right when he says public sentiment is running 4 to 1 in favor of the Russian wheat deal. We doubt that can be proved. Congress is faced with a fait accompli and the public cannot express itself politically until the elections next year.

The Guided Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under the present administration, the Pentagon always rings twice on defense contracts—once for Members of Congress who belong to the President's party, and hours and even days later, for those on the Republican side of the aisle. This untenable situation, which should not exist regardless of which party controls the executive branch, is described in accurate detail in this morning's Wall Street Journal. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the article:

THE GUIDED LEAK: HOW DEMOCRATIC FAITHFUL GET WORD ON ARMS CONTRACTS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly every morning at about 10:30 a messenger carries a sheaf of papers from the Pentagon across the Potomac River to the White House. A great deal of secrecy shrouds this daily drive. No one will talk about the route, nor the type of vehicle used, nor whether the courier is military or civilian. Indeed, many officials deny the mission even occurs; others insist "its a matter not appropriate for discussion."

Why the hush-hush attitude? Top secret military reports for the President? Not at all. Strange as it may seem the clandestine mission has nothing whatsoever to do with national security. Rather, it is an essential gambit in a slick political strategem that seeks, by employing the combined energies of top Pentagon brass, shrewd White House agents, distinguished Senators and Representatives, and powerful news agencies, to bamboozle the naive.

You see, the information carried by the shadowy courier is nothing more than advance word on multimillion dollar defense contract awards that will be announced officially by the Pentagon later in the day. White House agents telephone these exclusive data to favorite Democrats on Capitol Hill who make headlines in their hometown newspapers by disclosing the scoops to reporters.

The effect, in large part, is that the Pentagon no longer announces much of its own contract news. Congressmen do, in news stories that sometimes wink at the facts by declaring that Senator so-and-so "announced" a contract award, but usually make some attempt at accuracy by confessing that the legislator "was notified" or "was advised" of the event.

This legislative legerdemain is dismissed by many as harmless politics. "This is something the White House can deliver on; they can't deliver on much else in this building," contends one Pentagon source. "As far as I'm concerned, this is the least of the available evils. I'd rather continue this than do something substantive."

HIGH COSTS OF CAMPAIGNS

Another administration official insists the real problem rests with the high cost of political campaigning. His explanation: "Every man who's running for office feels he needs to make the impression that he has influence in Washington if he's to get the campaign contributions he needs. Patronage used to be more important than it is now. What's a postmastership worth nowadays? Very little.

"If we didn't make such information available to Congress, the public would be given by other means the impression that defense contracts were influenced, but the administration would get less benefit. I'm against the impression. But if it's going to be given away, I think the administration should reap some benefit."

Though offered as a defense, this line of reasoning also stands as an indictment. For, as critics are quick to point out, the quest for credit not only introduces partisanship into the Government's immense contracting business, but can hardly help but give voters, including business-seeking corporate managers, the clear impression that the politician who announced a contract award probably influenced the decision.

The erosive effect this can have on public confidence becomes clear when viewed against a larger background. During the early days of the Senate probe into the Pentagon's controversial TFX fighter-bomber, the Kennedy administration made no secret of its indignation at comments suggesting that political considerations determined the selection of the contractor. But by playing politics on routine contract announcements, the administration every day contributes to the public notion that influence does, indeed, swing million- and billion-dollar decisions.

Too, the system is fraught with temptation. The legislator who receives inside information on major contract awards is presented with the opportunity to benefit in the stock market; or, if he is too scrupulous for that, others he informs may not be.

Today's chief critics of the political tipoff habit, quite naturally, are Republicans. Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, warned Defense Secretary McNamara in a recent letter: "Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous. * * * I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent mink coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic."

Nevertheless, it wasn't too many years ago that some Republican legislators were criticizing President Eisenhower for not making greater use of the scoop technique to help the party faithful, particularly around election time. And to some extent he did; so the Republicans are not above reproach. But what the GOP did spasmodically, the Democrats now do methodically.

The fact of the matter is that Congress, not the administration in power, is the motivating force behind the system. Mr. McNamara made the point in replying to Senator WILLIAMS. "Barring some further indication that the Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice," the Defense

Secretary wrote, "I am disposed to continue it."

Underlying Mr. McNamara's reply was the knowledge of a top secret conference held during the early days of the Kennedy administration. It was called by aids to several influential Democratic Congressmen; it was attended by representatives from the White House, the Pentagon, and other Federal agencies; and it was designed to firmly establish the right of Democrats on Capitol Hill to enjoy the perquisites of power by getting advance word on contract awards.

Though there's no official record of the decisions reached at that unpublicized gathering, what has evoled is a two-part operation for speeding prior notice to Caiptol Hill that has all the precision of a well-planned military maneuver. The midmorning Pentagon-White House mission is a strictly partisan affair. White House aids won't talk, but it's known they pass along their exclusive data to congressional favorites as routine procedure.

A NONPARTISAN NEWS SERVICE

Thus, the favored are assured of receiving word of contracts of interests to them before noon each day. This extra-special attention to party stalwarts is an extension of a separate procedure that seeks to give politicians of both parties a smaller lead on contract news. Each of the armed services has a separate staff of congressional liaison officers that sees to it that all interested legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, get about 1 hour's notice before public release of contract awards. The legislators are notified at 3 p.m. each day, the press at 4 p.m. The Air Force delivers its information by personal messenger to congressional offices; the Army and Navy uses the telephone for the most part.

Until recently, Congress witnessed the spectacle of uniformed majors and colonels, their watches synchronized, delivering confidential contract memos with split-second timing to avoid charges of leaking the leaks to one legislator ahead of another.

But this got to be a bit too much, and several Congressmen objected to the use of high-ranking soldiers as messenger boys. So the Pentagon adjusted its tactics; it now uses enlisted men to carry contract news unless a contract must be explained to a lawmaker. For these more delicate maneuvers, officers are still preferred.

The rationale offered to justify the 1-hour news break for Congressmen is to enable them to intelligently answer press queries on contracts awarded to companies in their States. There's no mention of the fact that, since the Pentagon awarded the contracts, maybe its representatives should be the ones to reply to questions. Nor is the point made that Congressmen seldom are given any more contract information than is the press, so they can't add substance to a news story anyway.

In the final analysis, then, the entire operation—both the partisan and nonpartisan phases—boils down to nothing more than political sleight of hand. And quite a few Pentagon officials express the private (very private) wish that the whole procedure be abandoned once and for all. This view, not surprisingly, is heard most frequently from those officers who are required to spend hours on the phone assuring nonfavored Congressmen that the military was not responsible for contract leaks to their rivals. Sighs one harried diplomat-officer: "I'd much rather wrestle with the many complex problems of guided missiles than of guided leaks."

A Threat to Our Domestic Cattle and and Meat Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgent problems on the domestic front today is the rapid expansion of beef and veal imports since 1957—coupled with a decline in exports—and the fact that beef and veal production in this country has made almost no gain since 1956, in spite of our expanding population. Instead of the increase in demand reflecting growth and expansion on our important cattle and meat industry—this increased demand has been taken up with imports. At this same time, our surplus grains continue to pile up in storage elevators and bins to plague our economy—and slow down the rate of economic growth which this administration professes to be so interested in spurring into new activity.

None of us are so shortsighted as to suggest a closed-door policy on imports. Apparently, however, we are not to even enjoy the privilege which other countries of the world enjoy—that of controlling imports in some fashion which will not harm our own industry.

On October 7, I received a letter from Mr. Cal Foss, president of the North Dakota Beef Council, in which he expressed the feeling of the council concerning imports of foreign beef. I wish to ask unanimous consent that this letter be included with my remarks today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It summarizes in clear language the true picture of what is happening in North Dakota—and while not demanding that imports be stopped—it does request some fair restrictions.

On October 8, at the request of Mr. Floyd A. Segel, vice president of the Wisconsin Packing Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., I was furnished with facts and figures, taken from official Federal Government sources, which refute the claims made by the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury, State Department and others, that these imports do not hurt our domestic economy. I wish to ask unanimous consent that news report No. 1, entitled "Foreign Meat: Threat to the U.S. Cattle and Meat Industry," and a page of statistics—also taken from USDA sources—entitled "Rising Flood of Imported Processing Beef Takes Growing Share of Domestic Market," be included with my remarks today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder how many other countries of the world today would tolerate imports which hurt their domestic industries? We have seen the results already of such restrictions by these countries during this past year in several products—and it is obvious that these countries do not intend to take a self-defeating view that our administration seems to feel is justified.

Legislation has been introduced, not only by me, but by many Members of Congress in both Houses—which would in some fashion or other deal with our problems in a constructive manner. Negative departmental reports have been received on my bill, H.R. 5560, and it appears no congressional consideration will be given these proposed measures.

I join with my North Dakota constituents, and with the multitude of producers and industries connected with the domestic cattle and meat industry, in urging that some relief be granted. This could be in the form of a mechanism that would tend to hold down imports of beef at a time when our domestic prices were depressed and imports were increasing beyond a normal level.

The news report and statistics follow:

NORTH DAKOTA BEEF COUNCIL,
Bismarck, N. Dak., October 7, 1963.

Representative DON L. SHORT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: The North Dakota Beef Council (which is nonprofit and nonpolitical and organized under the laws of North Dakota for the single purpose of promoting beef and beef byproducts) gives wholehearted support to the objectives sought in S. 557 and H.R. 5560.

These identical bills, as you know, seek to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas.

It is the unanimous opinion of our board of directors that this is not only desirable legislation but it is essential legislation if we are to prevent further depression of the domestic beef market.

Contrary to recent USDA reports, imports of foreign beef are having a serious price-depressing effect on the domestic beef cattle market and relief is needed.

Imported beef is being sold even in small, remote butcher shops in North Dakota and every pound of it displaces several pounds of domestic feed grains. It displaces domestic labor and it reflects on the local economy of every beef producing area of the United States. This council does not believe that imports should be stopped. It does believe there should be some restriction.

Any effort you might exert which would enhance the passage of the above legislation will be most genuinuely appreciated.

Sincerely,

CAL FOSS, *President.*

[From the Wisconsin Packing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.]

News Report No. 1

FOREIGN MEAT: THREAT TO THE U.S. CATTLE AND MEAT INDUSTRY—IMPORTS OF PROCESSING BEEF MULTIPLY BY 4 IN LAST 5 YEARS

The enormous and continuing growth in imports of processing beef—already at flood stage—is shown strikingly by the enclosed figures from U.S. Department of Agriculture sources.

These imports already have caused serious damage to American cattle producers and others in the meat industry; and the economic threat is becoming steadily more crit-

ical as the foreign meat volume keeps on climbing.

A few official figures put the situation in focus:

In 1957—the year before duties on these imports were slashed by 50 percent—total imports of processing beef were just under 237 million pounds. In 1962, the total was more than 942 million pounds—very close to four times as much. Thus, our imports in 1962 were nearly 706 million pounds higher than 5 years before. And, for the current year, the import rate is even higher: nearly 482 million pounds for the first 6 months alone.

The effect upon U.S. ranchers, farmers, and others in our meat industry becomes still more sharply evident from the rise in imports as a percentage of domestic production.

In 1957, processing beef imports amounted to 10½ percent of the boned weight of processing beef produced in the United States under Federal Government inspection. In 1962, the imports had soared to 60.6 percent. And, for the first 6 months of 1963: 68 percent.

The damaging effect of these huge and increasing imports falls heavily upon the cattle States, for this reason: With foreign beef consistently underselling domestic by 5 cents a pound, the packer who uses domestic beef has no choice but to put pressure on the price he pays to the producer.

Packers who bone beef for processing—usually small, independent companies—work on a profit of about one-fourth cent per pound. Obviously, they can't meet the 5-cent differential by cutting profit. The only means is to pay less to the farmer.

The consequence is reduction in the farmer's and rancher's income and the value of his livestock, which is collateral for his loans. Continuation of the depressing effect of cheap foreign meat will force further liquidation of herds and bankrupt many producers, just as it has already bankrupted many small packers.

THE NEED

The need is not for total exclusion of foreign meats. They are necessary to meet the demand for processed products.

What we need is a combination of quotas and tariffs that will limit imports to the amount needed to satisfy domestic needs, while assuring a market for domestic products; and will discourage the favoring of foreign meats over domestic.

Rising flood of imported processing beef takes growing share of domestic market

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963 [1]
Imports: Processing beef:							
1. Beef: Fresh, chilled or frozen (boneless) thousand pounds	88,635	285,854	469,184	383,864	527,521	819,057	407,339
2. Beef and veal: Pickled or cured do	10,843	6,144	7,124	938	945	526	287
3. Meats: Canned, n.e.s. and prepared or preserved meats, not specifically provided for: [2]							
Mexico thousand pounds	170	1,292	398	74	48	57	50
Brazil do	287	2,784	15,202	606	2,343	3,667	--------
Paraguay do	--------	5,474	5,235	256	--------	--------	--------
Uruguay do	155	47	4,034	--------	--------	9	--------
Argentina do	13,134	125,373	65,662	5,097	8,781	10,094	6,724
Subtotal, item 3 do	13,746	134,970	90,531	6,033	11,172	13,827	6,774
4. Boneless weight of canned beef (product weight times 1.3 [3]) thousand pounds	123,845	147,468	123,067	99,494	123,805	109,145	67,400
Total do	236,900	574,500	689,900	490,300	663,400	942,600	481,800
Processing beef produced in the United States under Federal Government inspection:							
Total slaughter [4] thousands	6,455	4,851	4,076	4,714	4,283	4,472	1,948
Total dressed weight [5] million pounds	3,227.5	2,425.5	2,038	2,316.7	2,139.4	2,221.6	1,009
Total boned weight [6] do	2,259.2	1,697.9	1,426.6	1,621.7	1,497.6	1,555.1	706.4
Imports of processing beef as percentage of domestic production percent	10.5	33.8	48.3	29.6	44.2	60.6	68

[1] Through June.
[2] "N.e.s." means not elsewhere specified. Specific countries shown are believed to account for virtually all of the salted beef shipped to this country, which was restricted in May 1959, and for the cooked beef which has partially replaced this product since then.
[3] Factor of 1.3 takes account of weight shrinkage from cooking in preparation for canning.
[4] Cows, bulls, and stags.
[5] Based on Market News monthly figures for average dressed weight of cows. Bulls and stags are insignificant percentage of total, and monthly weight figures are not given in U.S. Department of Agriculture tables.
[6] Calculated on basis of 70 percent of dressed weight.

NOTE.—These figures, from U.S. Department of Agriculture sources, have been prepared and distributed in behalf of the Wisconsin Packing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Sources. Import figures from U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, Livestock and Meat Products Division. Domestic figures from Market News, "Weekly Summary and Statistics," published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service.

Funny Way To Bridge an Ocean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Clarence K. Streit, editor of Freedom and Union magazine, in the October issue of that publication expresses graphically the weakness of the Kennedy administration's dumbbell approach to Atlantic unity.

The theme is presented in a front cover cartoon, and developed in this editorial comment by Mr. Streit:

FUNNY WAY TO BRIDGE OCEAN

Our specially drawn front cover cartoon brings out graphically one of the funny features in the administration's partnership plan for Atlantic unification (originally and more accurately called Operation Dumbbell by its authors in Washington). An engineer would be laughed into the asylum if he submitted a plan for spanning a river with a suspension bridge which would be built in the normal way out to the tower on either side—but would then link the two towers by the primitive rope or vine footbridges natives build to cross chasms in South America or Asia.

TOO AWED TO LAUGH?

The architects of the Dumbbell project have offered an even more fantastic plan. This has been done with such solemn earnestness and august approval that Senators, Congressmen, and pundits of press and campus have apparently been awed into believing that a plan sponsored by such intelligent authorities must be sound, and commonsense must be wrong. They forget that "the greatest minds," as one of them, Descartes, observed, "as they are capable of the highest excellences, are open likewise to the greatest aberrations."

DUMBBELL REASONING

The Dumbbell engineers aim at making the European side of the Atlantic bridge as strong as the U.S. side. This, and not the need of making the long central span over the ocean as strong as the two approaches, is—believe it or not—the heart and soul of the Dumbbell way to bridge the Atlantic. Its fathers called it Dumbbell, in fact, because they were so centered on making the European side equal in strength to the U.S. side and so little concerned with the strength of the connecting link, that the operation of uniting the Atlantic Community effectively seemed to them comparable to the gymnastic instrument whose two spheres have equal weight. It never occurred to them that this was indeed, in the slang of commonsense, a dumbbell way to bridge the ocean.

BOTH APPROACHES FEDERAL

Why is the U.S. side of the bridge so much stronger than the European one now? Because the American States are federated. They have a common market, a common currency, a common defense force, a common foreign policy, and a common citizenship and government in addition to their State citizenship and government. They have solved the problem of balancing the voting power of the larger and the smaller States by the Federal balance between the Senate and House, in which representation in the House is in proportion to the number of citizens in each State, but in the Senate the people of each State have two Senators—Alaska, two, and also two for New York.

And so the first objective of the Dumbbell planners has been to make Western Europe as strong as the United States by uniting its nations in a Federal union. The British blocked the first efforts in the late forties to federate Europe under a common government in the way the 13 American States united in 1789. This led to the decision to unite the European nations step by step, by the functional method. The first step was to be a common defense force, but when the French rejected the European Defense Community because the British wouldn't come in, the Six Nations of the Continent—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—decided to set up the European Economic Community, or Common Market.

The next steps are to be a common currency, and then a common defense force, and finally a common citizenship and government. The key problem of voting power among the six nations would then be solved by the Federal balance between senate and house—whatever the institutions are called. Thus a Europe in which Western Germany is 170 times more populous than Luxembourg would be made as strong as the United States by the same structural principle which effectively unites the people of Alaska with those of New York State which has 115 times its population.

TIGHT ROPE CENTRAL SPAN

When they turn to the central span—the long, dangerous span over the stormy waters of the Atlantic—the august architects of the Dumbbell plan blandly toss these federal principles into the ocean. They do not propose to unite the American and the Euro-

pean towers of strength by the methods that made them strong, nor by even the flimsy kind of footbridge whose crash inspired Thornton Wilder's tragic story, "The Bridge of San Luis Rey." They link the two federal approaches by a principle as different from federalism's balance as the bar is from the two spheres it connects in a dumbbell. To unite the American and European Federal Unions, they propose the tightrope of diplomacy, and the trembling balance which its equally weighted pole offers the people of Atlantica.

The funniest thing (in the sense of queerest) about this is that the Dumbbell plan for bridging the Atlantic makes sense apparently even to such practical realists as the Wall Street Journal, the U.S. News & World Report, and Senator GOLDWATER'S supporters, who are so critical of other administration policies. And the thing they seem to believe is impractical, if not crazy, is the Atlantic Federal union plan—which would build the central span on the same tested federal principles that Dumbbell uses only for the European and United States approaches to the bridge. We hope that the contrast between the two plans which our cover cartoon gives will enlighten not only the critics of the administration but our misguided friends in it, who persist in the kind of error that only the greatest minds can make.

Foreign Purchasing Curbs Are Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Allen M. Smythe, a very reputable finance writer whose columns appear in several of the Nation's large papers, has written a very timely article which appeared in the Washington Star on October 4, 1963. It deals with the subject of foreign purchases of materials and parts used in connection with U.S. Government contracts. I have for some time been interested in this matter and, as the article indicates, have introduced a bill which would curtail the amount of money that the Navy could spend for procurement of naval vessels on component parts abroad. I am inserting the article in the RECORD for the information of other Members who are interested in the matter:

FOREIGN PURCHASING CURBS ARE URGED

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Three west coast Congressmen, HAGEN and SHELLEY, of California, and TOLLEFSON, of Washington, have called upon the President to use his executive authority to modify the Buy-American Act so that fewer oversea products will be bought by our Federal agencies.

They also have introduced bills that would require the Pentagon to issue contracts on naval vessels to firms that use only American labor and materials. In this effort they have strong support from a number of industrial trade groups who are concerned about Japanese competition.

They say that the letter and spirit of the Buy-American Act is to require our Government to do what all other nations do, buy domestically for the Government's own use. Many would have the President double the present differential of 6 percent (12 percent for distressed areas) for oversea purchases.

REPORT REQUESTED

Criticism of the Buy-American Act began over a year ago when the President learned from an article in the Evening Star that the Navy was buying German steel for use in three new missile frigates. The Budget Bureau was requested to report any need for changes by last October.

However, the Budget Bureau has delayed its report, as the State and Commerce Departments fear foreign retaliation. Meanwhile Defense Secretary McNamara has been holding up all foreign bids that are more than 50 percent of the lowest American bid, invoking the "in the national interest" clause to do this. The Pentagon is also considering a new contract clause requiring a 90 percent content dollarwise of American material and labor in contracts for naval vessels and other weapons.

Members attending a recent industry conference want the Post Office and Interior Departemnts to follow Mr. McNamara's policy. They also believe that for successful American bidders the law requiring that "substantially all" the material be domestic means 90 percent. The present interpretation is 50 percent.

FRUSTRATING DECISIONS

Many frustrating decisions have been recently presented to Federal agencies. The Navy accepted the plans of a Seattle shipbuilder to modernize and lengthen two oil tankers. The entire midbody, containing 6,000 tons of steel, will be made in Japan and floated across the Pacific.

The Post Office has asked for bids on 5,100 three-wheeled motor scooters, used by mailmen in suburban areas. An importing company bid half the lowest American bid. They propose to import all the parts from Japan and have a local firm assemble them. U.S. bidders protest that the importer is not a responsible manufacturer and that it is not "in the national interest."

The few remaining U.S. manufacturers of large hydraulic pumps and turbines are about to close down. The Interior Department, ignoring the national security clause in the law, has been giving contracts to Norway and Japan.

Training of Waitresses for Jobs in Paintsville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the article by Robert Dietsch appearing on September 30 in various Scripps-Howard newspapers, including the Washington Daily News, referred to waitresses trained for restaurant jobs in a motel in Paintsville, Ky. Paintsville is in my district and I have taken the trouble to check with the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, Mr. William L. Batt, Jr. As a result, I have here a copy of a letter to the Administrator from the president of this motel, which I should like to have included in the RECORD:

PAINTSVILLE, KY.

DEAR MR. BATT: In regard to the article in the newspaper which stated that ARA paid for the training of waitresses for the Starfire Motel and Restaurant, we wish to make it clear that this training was done by the Starfire Motel and Restaurant at our own expense and that there were no ARA funds involved in our training program.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. B. H. Cox,
President, Starfire Motel and Restaurant.

The Area Redevelopment Administration has been a big help to us in eastern Kentucky and we do not like to see its efforts to alleviate the serious unemployment there attacked by misinformed journalists.

One Reason for Tax-Cut Lag Is Lack of Public Clamor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about the legislative logjam in Congress this session, especially with regard to the delay in getting a tax-cut approved. Now it is a traditional part of the folklore about Congress that it can never afford to oppose a reduction in taxes. And yet the fact remains that at this late date in the session no tax bill has cleared both Houses. Why? An editorial in the Flint Journal, of Flint, Mich., for Thursday, October 10, 1963, has put the finger on at least one major answer to this question in stating, "One Reason for Tax-Cut Lag Is Lack of Public Clamor." The editorial follows:

ONE REASON FOR TAX-CUT LAG IS LACK OF PUBLIC CLAMOR

Progress of President Kennedy's $11 billion tax cut bill through Congress has been curious at almost every stage. It never really has had the popular clamor behind it that one might expect for the most sweeping tax reduction plan in a generation or more.

True, it has passed the House. And it would very likely win a favorable Senate vote if it could get past the roadblocks of hostile committee chairmen and time-consuming civil rights legislation.

However, if the public demand had been great enough, the tax bill could well have become law long before this. That demand never developed.

Apparently the American taxpayer is not as naive about fiscal matters as Government spenders seem to think.

One can hardly believe that the idea of having more money in the pocket has lost appeal for Americans. If we are as money hungry as often pictured by our detractors at home and abroad, why hasn't there been beating on the lawmakers' doors to demand passage of the massive cut?

The answers can be only speculative.

For one thing, however, the real administration argument for the tax reduction is subtle and complex. The taxpayer, acting through his representatives, is asked to approve cuts which will materially increase the Federal deficit—in order to finance prosperity and thereby multiply jobs.

But in the mind of most Americans, it is difficult to think of deficits and prosperity going together. Obviously, the Kennedy administration hasn't yet sold this notion effectively.

There is evidence that opponents of the bill have made real progress in planting the seed of doubt about the beneficial results of the cuts in the absence of comparable cuts in Government spending.

Sophisticated specialists in public finance keep insisting that a Government budget is nothing like a family budget, and therefore that it is foolish to insist that the same kind of careful balancing is required in the public sphere.

Here again, however, the indication is that this idea is not widely accepted or perhaps understood by the general public. The fine-spun theories of public finance experts seem apart from the everyday budget realities of the average citizen.

It is difficult to understand how it is sound for any organization, large or small, which operates on a budget to continue indefinitely spending more money than it takes in.

More money to spend would make everyone happy. The thought of it is mouth-watering, especially in these high-cost-of-living days. But to a great many taxpayers, large and small, it is not realistic to expect greater prosperity if a tax cut is going to necessitate even greater deficit spending in Washington.

In the long run, they reason, it can only cost more, either in taxes or a deflated dollar.

On top of all these conjectures must be added another. There are more people working and earning higher wages today than ever before. Warnings that the population explosion soon will increase the problem of unemployment, especially among the young and the unskilled, apparently has had little effect on the millions who enjoy steady employment. To them, the whole tax cut plan may seem not only unrealistic but unnecessary.

In good times it is difficult to interest many people in what uncertainties might await around the corner. And certainly there seem to be few who are standing still for the argument that greater deficit spending today is necessary to prepare for tomorrow's uncertainties.

Somewhere amid these speculations lies an explanation for the fact that in 1963 the largest tax cut proposed in many moons has stirred almost no popular excitement.

A View of the Wheat Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend there has been speculation in the press that a partisan political issue will be made of the recent decision to make surplus wheat available for sale to the Soviet Union. In view of this speculation, I commend to my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Burlington County Times edition of October 11. This newspaper is published in Levittown, N.J. I might add that the editorial is representative of similar opinions expressed in a number of other daily newspapers published in my district.

The editorial is as follows:

A LOOK AT WHEAT DEAL

Despite the considerable number of truly significant factors that are involved, it is difficult to see how anyone can make hay, political or otherwise, out of President Kennedy's decision to allow the sale of American wheat to Red Russia and its European satellites.

It was a move which should result in a beneficial reaction on our gold reserves and our amount of foreign credit; it should stimulate our internal economy to a worthwhile extent, and shorten our surplus, and basically it was a gesture of humanitarianism which within the entire context of the Western philosophy we could not ignore.

This is not to say that it was a simple black and white proposition; there is no clear black and white in our international picture. Nevertheless, the opposing point of view was either taken care of in the restrictions the President imposed in his statement of policy or does not stand up under the light of close examination.

Basically, the President precluded resale of this wheat to either Red China or Cuba. He also indicated clearly that the Russian people will know this is American wheat. For some time now the Russians have not been jamming our Voice of America broadcasts, a fact the administration had kept somewhat under wraps until the President revealed it quite clearly.

In addition, the wheat will be shipped by the American Merchant Marine as far as is possible, a stand advocated by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, among other Republicans.

The other negative points? Mostly they revolve around an effort to win tremendous concessions from Russia in return, such as the position of West Germany's Chancellor Adenauer that the Berlin wall must tumble in return.

As the administration has stated, this is adding apples and pears. Should we demand, in return for providing hungry people with the food they need, a complete abdication by Russia, an almost complete surrender? Would this be deepening the thaw becoming all the more apparent in the cold war or would it be deepening the freeze?

An additional fundamental objection rests in the deep distrust of Russia which is completely understandable. Is this some gambit, some sort of shenanigan, some effort by Russia to get wheat and then use it in a further ploy?

There is every indication to the opposite, every indication that the agricultural problem faced by usually food-exporting Russia was real and deep. Furthermore, if there is any such possibility, surely the factor of feeding the hungry should outweigh it.

The President's decision was the only one he could make; it should have and we are sure it will have the support of the Nation and of the free world.

We Should Not Export Certain of Our Corps in Their Natural Form

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter to me from Mr. E. A. Kelloway, chairman of the board, Walnut Grove Products Co., Inc., Atlantic, Iowa.

Mr. Kelloway's father began mixing stockfeed in the basement of his home at Anita, Iowa, when "Kelly"—as we call him—was a small boy. From that meager beginning Walnut Grove Products has over a period of half a century spent millions of dollars in research and laboratory tests to determine a scientific balanced ration that produces meat at the lowest possible cost to the producer of poultry and all livestock.

I believe the records will show that Walnut Grove Products, whose main office is in Atlantic, Iowa, is one of the largest, if not the largest, processors and marketers of livestock feeds and conditioners in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, thousands upon thousands of farmers in the Middle West look to Walnut Grove Products for advice and counsel as to how to make a profit in livestock feeding, which at best is a risky business. "Kelly" is concerned about shipping abroad certain crops in their natural form. I trust our Secretary of Agriculture, and the "powers that be" in the administration, will heed the recommendations as set out in "Kelly's" letter, which follows:

WALNUT GROVE PRODUCTS CO., INC.,
Atlantic, Iowa, October 11, 1963.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We would like to express our opinion on the recent approval given by the President on the sale of wheat to Russia.

May we first state that we approve of this one transaction with Russia on wheat. However, with reference to additional possible wheat sales, we believe these should be made in the form of flour so that the resultant byproducts, such as bran and wheat middlings, would be available to our own livestock farmer for the use in the feeding of his livestock. No doubt you are aware of the critical price squeeze the livestock farmer has experienced this year.

The prices farmers have received for all kinds of meat animals have fallen 293 percent from the 1910–14 average in the month ended September 15, which is 10 points below the month before level and 32 points below a year earlier. In addition, the index of prices that the livestock farmer has had to pay for feed rose to its highest mid-September level since 1956. At 209 percent of the 1910–14 average, this is up 10 points from a year earlier. Any additional external pressure brought to bear on ingredients available to the livestock farmer becomes further detrimental to his livestock feeding program. We believe that the net working capital of the Iowa and Nebraska farmer this year, as compared to last, has decreased by some 20 percent due to losses he has absorbed in marketing this year's livestock crop. With the number of animals on feed during this coming year, the competition for feedstuffs is going to hold these prices high again without external pressures of additional sales to Russia.

Any future transaction with Russia, in our opinion, should be in the form of usable products that they may need, such as flour, edible oil, which, in turn, will leave the byproducts available to our own livestock farmer. We believe that the oil seeds should not be considered for sale to Russia in that we do not have large surpluses. In the case of soybeans, during the 1957–58 crop year, we exported approximately 18 percent of the total U.S. soybean production; this past year we exported almost 27 percent of production. With the expanding livestock industry overseas and a need for protein in the diet for the many people of the world, we already have a growing foreign demand. This picture would be drastically changed if, in addition to the current demand, a large transaction of oil seeds with Russia would force the price of soybean meal available to the livestock farmer continually up-

ward, however, if the sale consists of the soybean oil, leaving the meal to be used by our own livestock industry, we would then be in a position to have a lower meal price thus helping the price pressure the livestock farmer is now experiencing. It has been mentioned in the press that Russia does need vegetable oils, however, we understand there are rumors that they have recently been a seller of oil, possibly to reduce the world market thus allowing them to make an advantageous purchase. In that soybean oil is in surplus, estimated to be 925 million pounds in storage at the start of the marketing year, the biggest ever, any support that could be given to a movement of this oil at increased values would greatly reduce the price of soybean meal assuming the price of beans to be constant. A 1-cent-per-pound improvement in the price of oil would reduce the price of soybean meal by $4 per ton and a 1-cent move in the price of beans per bushel is equal to 9-point move on oil or 50-cent-per-ton move on soybean meal.

With the weakness in the price of soybean oil concurrently with the increased price of the soybean, which has moved 42 to 44 cents per bushel higher in the last 2 years, soybean meal has been forced to absorb the increased cost amounting to $18 to $20 per ton. The importance of soybean meal as a source of protein to livestock cannot be overestimated and is, with the increased price of meal, one of the major reasons for increased cost of feedstuffs to the livestock farmer.

In summary, we ask that you support a program on any future sales to Russia that results in the reduction of the cost of feed ingredients used by our livestock industry rather than a program that will create further competition for feedstuffs causing further price increases and increasing the cost-price squeeze to the livestock farmer who, at this time, is suffering from the most severe price squeeze he has experienced this past decade.

We will appreciate your interest and request that you bring these facts to the attention of your fellow Congressmen.

Very truly yours,

E. A. KELLOWAY,
Chairman of the Board.

Kidding the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy and the State Department have little regard for the intelligence of the American people. Proper respect for our own citizens has been woefully lacking by the Kennedy administration in pushing its policy of accommodation of the Soviet Union and the Communist nations of the world.

The impending visit of Communist Boss Tito of Yugoslavia and the attempt to kid the American people into believing that Tito is a different kind of Communist is, perhaps, the most blatant insult from the White House. Tito has made no pretense at being other than a good Communist. He has said repeatedly that his country is firmly allied with the Communist cause. A recent visitor to the Middle East was in my office only last Friday and told me that the only country where Americans are insulted in the streets is Yugoslavia where American tourists are referred to as "greedy capialists," and "imperalist warmongers." This from the people of a country which has received billions of dollars from these same Americans.

To reward Tito, to strengthen his prestige in the world, he will now come to Washington as a guest of President Kennedy. Is it not proper for Congress to ask the President, just what is his purpose in courting Communist leaders?

The following editorials from the Dallas Morning News of October 7 and October 10, put the case pretty well and I recommend their careful reading:

YANKEE, SI; TITO, NO

For 15 years, Josip Broz Tito, Red dictator of Yugoslavia, has been attempting to improve his image as a good Communist. Continued American recognition of his government and a steady flow of American aid to Yugoslavia have gone a long way toward helping Tito reach that objective. That image will be helped when Tito visits Washington as a guest of President Kennedy—to be wined and dined, given the best redcarpet treatment and quartered at the newly redecorated Blair House.

What Tito has ever done to deserve such a welcome in America—the citadel of freedom and democracy—is hard to imagine. It is especially ironic in view of the fact that only a few weeks ago he gave the same kind of redcarpet treatment to his kissing cousin, Nikita Khrushchev, when the Soviet dictator visited Yugoslavia.

Over the years Tito has made no great effort to hide the fact that he is a dedicated Communist; he has, of course, tried to hide his blood-stained hands and pose as an independent member of the Red satellite empire.

Our diplomats should know better. The record is well-known. He was one of Stalin's contemporaries. He fought with the Communists in Russia from 1917 to 1921 and with the Communists in the international brigade during the Spanish Civil War.

In 1937 Tito became secretary of the Yugoslavian Communist Party. He organized and led the partisans, or Communist guerrillas, in Yugoslavia during World War II. In October 1944, he was installed as president of Yugoslavia by Soviet troops.

After reaching the peak of power in his own country, he began to work on his international image. In 1948 he closed Yugoslavia's borders to Communist guerrillas fighting in northern Greece. This, supposedly, was his big break with Moscow.

But Milovan Djilas, who was at that time a top Yugoslavian Communist diplomat, and is now rotting in one of Tito's dungeons, stated flatly in his book, "Conversations With Stalin," that he heard Uncle Joe personally give Tito the order to end the war in Greece.

In 1946, Tito made his position on communism clear: "The capitalist forces constitute our natural enemy despite the fact that they helped us to defeat their most dangerous representative. It may happen that we shall again decide to make use of their aid, but always with the sole aim of accelerating their final ruin."

Less than a year ago, Tito was still stressing his loyalty to communism when he compared his own policies with those of the Soviets: "We aspire toward the same goal—building of a new society of socialism and communism. On the question of war and peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, liquidation of colonialism, the German question, and other problems which trouble the world today, our points of view are either identical with or close to one another."

In the U.N., Yugoslavia has never opposed the Soviets on a major issue. Its representatives spoke not a word of criticism for the Soviet butchery in Hungary after the 1956 revolt. For 15 years Tito has taken American money to strengthen his hold over his own people and to supply other members of the Communist bloc with critical materials.

This is the kind of man who will arrive on the red carpet in Washington, to have his respectability enhanced. Is his visit just another diplomatic formality? Or is it rather the return of another Trojan horse?

WHAT'S GOING ON?

We now have it straight from the President that Yugoslavia "is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy." Well, that's news to a lot of us. It should also be news to Yugoslavian President Tito who declared less than a year ago that his country and the Soviet Union both "aspire toward the same goal—building of a new society of socialism and communism."

Mr. Kennedy's naive view on Yugoslavia was given some months ago in House committee hearings, but released only Sunday. It was not designed to whitewash President Tito's red-carpet visit to Washington (due later this month), but to justify American military aid to the satellite nation.

Last year Congress passed legislation refusing military assistance to Communist nations and specifically defining Yugoslavia as one of those nations.

The President either had to ignore this specific prohibition or get around it, as he has done, by blandly writing Yugoslavia out of the Soviet bloc to make Tito eligible for $2 million worth of U.S. military assistance.

Interestingly, on the same day the President's testimony was released, statements on the foreign aid program by Defense Secretary McNamara were also made public. In them, McNamara charged that last year's cuts in foreign aid hurt U.S. security. He went so far as to claim that it would have been better if Congress had cut the defense budget instead of curbing military aid to our allies. These allies presumably include Yugoslavia.

Students of political evolution might be interested to note how a nation—without any effort on its own part—can move from a Communist satellite to an uncontrolled position within the Communist conspiracy to an ally of the United States.

In his testimony, McNamara singled out Turkey as one of the countries on the Iron Curtain border harmed by U.S. military assistance cuts. This hardly jibes with McNamara's own order, some months ago, removing Titan and Jupiter weapons and bases from Turkey. It also does not jibe with our own disarmament overtures.

Isn't it inconsistent to demand continued military aid to nations which cannot defend the United States, while we are toying with the idea of tearing down our own defenses?

The question is partly academic. For, as Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat of Louisiana, pointed out to McNamara, there is plenty of money left over in unspent foreign aid appropriations to make up for congressional cuts.

McNamara replied that this wouldn't leave enough "elbow room." Considering that foreign aid officials have not yet spent almost $7.5 billion appropriated by Congress in years past, it is fair to ask Mr. McNamara just how much "elbow room" he needs.

On top of this sophistry, we have the added insult of a proposal to send American wheat to the Communist nations. This is supposed to help solve our balance-of-payments problem—brought on in part by huge foreign aid outlays. It is also described as a humanitarian gesture.

Some might recall that more than two decades ago we engaged in a similar humanitarian gesture by sending scrap iron to Japan. That was a short time before Pearl Harbor. Should we have sent wheat to Nazi Germany in 1941?

If Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union and Hungary (included in the proposed wheat deal) have become friendly enough to trade with, why is the Defense Secretary worried about curbs on military aid to countries which share borders with these nations?

Put the other way, if we are still sufficiently worried about a military attack by these countries, why in the name of heaven are we continuing to give them American aid?

How Not To Be an "Extremist" or "Superpatriot"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the Wanderer which is a reprint from a Los Angeles Police Newsletter will no doubt be of interest to many Members of the House who have evidenced interest in the subject matter of the article:

HOW NOT TO BE AN "EXTREMIST" OR "SUPERPATRIOT"

1. Close your mind and your eyes to the ever more closely encroaching advances of communism and socialism. All this is just too unpleasant to think about. Maybe it will go away if ignored.

2. Listen hopefully and wishfully to the socialistic panaceas of the liberals, and give implict trust to their "spend, lend, giveaway, bigger Government" philosophy. After all, college men know best.

3. Don't read about or listen to anything or anyone who promotes love of country and patriotism, or anticommunism. This is all just a racket, and passé anyhow, for we are all going to be "world citizens" in the bright, new, peaceful U.N. world of tomorrow—just as soon as the leaders of the worldwide Communist conspiracy can be appeased and convinced that we mean them no harm—and won't bother them.

4. When our leaders fall into one clever Communist trap after another, don't speak out about it. And, after all, don't write to Senators or Representatives in protest—not even your own—our peerless leaders know what's best for us all.

5. Dont ever attend public meetings sponsored by patriotic groups. This would cut into your golfing, bowling, bridge, or poker—or keep you from your favorite TV show or ball game. Besides, maybe something said at such a meeting might be disturbing.

6. Don't ever actually read any report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Just take some neighbor's (or stranger's) word that this duly-constituted committee of Congress should be abolished. This will save you a lot of unnecessary bother.

7. When your teenagers or college youth come home from school or church with reports about teachers or leaders who condemn free enterprise and promote socialism, just ignore them. Young people shouldn't be interested in politics anyhow.

8. In social gatherings, when someone takes the floor and "knocks" the Constitution of the United States as an "outdated and obsolete document," don't say a word. Just let him talk. He'll influence only a few people, anyway, and these aren't really important.

9. Make it a practice never to offend anyone by anything you think or say. Always keep quiet unless you have a positive alternative to the things you read or hear about which you know are bad, and don't even question these if you are at all unsure. Avoid all controversy, particularly discussions of politics or economics. You're only one person, and what you think isn't important.

10. Always "go along with the crowd." Remember that the majority is always right. "If you can't beat 'em, join 'em" may have started out as a joke, but it has now become the only accepted philosophy. Men like Patrick Henry, Nathan Hale, and Abe Lincoln were all nonconforming "extremist-patriots," who wouldn't go along with the crowd, and you certainly wouln't want to be like them, would you?

If you consistently follow the above rules, you will never run any risk of being labeled as either an "extremist" or a "superpatriot." You will have assumed the role of those famous three little monkeys, who, sitting quietly and passively with their hands over their eyes, ears, and mouths, "see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil."

Unfortunately, however, like them, you will also "see no good, hear no good, speak no good," and do no good. In which case you may expect a warm welcome into the ranks of the California KuKus.—From Paul Jackson's column in the Fire and Police Research Association of Los Angeles Newsletter of May 1963.

Opposition to the Scheduled Visit of Marshal Tito in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from people all over the country who are opposed to the visit of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to this country.

I wish to include in the RECORD one of the letters I received which perhaps expresses the sentiments of all the people who have written to me about Marshal Tito's visit:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It is reported that Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia is scheduled to meet with President Kennedy.

We Americans, of German origin whose forefathers settled in Hungary in the 17th century and from where we emigrated before and after the two World Wars, feel that you know this beautiful country—Hungary—has been divided since World War I by the Peace Treaty of Versailles. By this treaty two new states were created out of Austro-Hungarian territory. Servia and Montenegro received Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and the Batchka, as well as the western half of Banat. These territories now make up the present Yugoslavia.

There are about 500,000 Americans of Germanic origin from Yugoslavia in the United States today. Others that remained there became Yugoslavian citizens. Many of the 500,000 in the United States are here more than 40 to 60 years, and it can't be denied that there is a tenderness in our hearts for the spot where mother rocked the cradle, as well as for the many friends we left behind.

I am sure, Mr. Congressman, you are fully aware that Tito is a Moscow-trained Communist. He also fought in the Spanish Revolution on the Communist side and, after World War II, with the help of Russia, became the absolute dictator of Yugoslavia. The very first order he gave was "round up every child, mother, father, old men and women that are of German descent and forcefully remove them from house and home." He confiscated all possessions, and whoever resisted was shot on the spot. They were herded into barbed-wire compounds like cattle with no shelter, no toilet facilities, no bedding, and hardly any food. The purpose was to starve them slowly to death. Four hundred thousand of these innocent people perished this way. We have many eyewitnesses to substantiate these ghastly and Godless crimes that this butcher of Belgrade perpetrated through careful planning. He confiscated over a billion dollars worth of property which our forefathers, through careful planning, saving, and hard work during these 300 years accumulated. They carved out of the swamp lands the breadbasket of Europe.

To this day I am wondering from where this cutthroat's strength emanated. I know Mr. Churchill liked him; his son, Randolph, visited him several times and the A.D.A. supported him for all the grants he received from us.

If this butcher of Belgrade comes here he certainly needs and wants something. We, as a group of these 500,000 descendants of Germanic origin from Yugoslavia, are against any deal with him. We are even against his setting foot on our beloved American shores. Please, Mr. Congressman, spare us all this humiliation and keep him out.

With the highest esteem and respect.

Very sincerely yours,

_____.

Address by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, Before the Propeller Club, Baltimore, Md., October 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1963, the senior Senator from Maine, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, addressed the national conference of the Women's Propeller Conference in Baltimore, Md., of my home district. I, as a vigorous advocate for an improved and expanded U.S. merchant marine, found it to be timely and of considerable interest. I believe that it is worthy of the attention of the Members of Congress and, in that belief, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. McCary, ladies of the Women's Propeller Club, and members of the Men's Propeller Club, I am delighted to be here this morning, and am very grateful for the invitation to meet with you.

Coming from Maine where everyone feels a kinship for the sea, it is natural that I would be very interested in this club's major activity, which is to sell the people of the United States on the importance of having an adequate fleet of merchant ships which will guarantee all our people free access to world markets.

I am very happy that my committee assignments in the Senate keep me in close touch with nautical matters. Even without these assignments on Appropriations and Armed Services, the fact that the State of Maine has two thriving ports, Portland and Searsport, keeps me constantly aware of the problems of harbor maintenance and improvements. The presence of the Bath Iron Works, a private shipyard, and the Portsmouth Navy Yard at Kittery, a Government shipyard, also gives me insight into the problems of workers in both types of yards. I have still another contact with the merchant marine, in that Maine has one of the six fine maritime academies producing much-needed officers for your industry. From all this you can see that I can strongly identify with the Propeller Club.

I am very conscious of the often repeated statement "that no nation with a seacoast can stay strong without a strong merchant marine and navy." I also realize that because of our high standard of living, because of stringent Coast Guard safety regulations, because the Department of Defense insists on expensive betterments on our new ships, and because we have strong vigorous maritime unions, it is impossible for the ships of the U.S. merchant marine to compete with ships of other nations whose standard of living makes it possible for them to pay their crews and shipyard workers less money, and who do not have to contend with the four items just mentioned.

I have read speeches within months which have called upon the operators of our ships to use their American ingenuity to find a way to operate our merchant ships without subsidy in the future. To believe that the United States will ever get to a point where they can operate ships in competition with the other nations of the world without a subsidy is just wishful thinking. I believe it is one of your major tasks as a club interested in promoting the U.S. merchant marine to make it plain why a subsidy is necessary and unavoidable.

This country has always subsidized transportation. Railroads could never have been built without either direct subsidies or great gifts of land. The trucking industry has been subsidized by the building of great roads all over our Nation, but the strangest subsidy that we have spent on transportation is the billions of dollars that we have given foreign countries so that they could buy our war surplus ships and build new and modern shipyards. In other words, under the guise of foreign aid and mutual security, we have been generously subsidizing our maritime competitors in other parts of the world.

Because many other maritime nations, with our aid, have shipyards as well, if not better, equipped than some of our yards, we have taken away from our merchant marine the possibility of building ships with innovations which would cut down their operational cost so that we can compete on an equal footing with the ships of other nations. A few years ago, we could hope that automation, resulting in small crews on our ships would put us in a competitive position, but it now seems that other nations will have automated ships long before we will. We should use every means in our power to minimize subsidy payments to shipping companies but we should be very careful not to curtail the effectiveness of our ships. The simplest and most logical approach to cutting down subsidy would be for our great industries and governmental departments to insist on the use of our own ships to carry 50 percent of the goods to and from this country even when it appears on the surface that a small advantage is present in the using of the foreign tonnage. Both industry and Government must be shown that by using foreign ships they are indirectly increasing subsidy payments in amounts that exceed the immediate savings.

I believe that the individual members of your club should devote their energies to convince industry and Government to use ships that fly our flag whenever it is possible.

Because many Congressmen and Senators come from States where they do not consider the merchant marine one of their major problems, you should spend considerable more time explaining to them that any belief or assumption that the merchant marine is not important to the whole country is in grave error. If U.S.-flag shigs were not providing competition to the other merchant ships of the world, foreign owners and perhaps foreign governments could dictate to us freight rates that we would have to pay, we would be virtually at their mercy, and they could use their merchant ships as weapons of economic warfare to keep us out of profitable and necessary markets.

Some of our economists have not found it hard to calculate that if the United States did not have ships on all the major sea lanes of the world, the volume of our exports could be materially decreased and many raw materials which we need would be more costly or inaccessible to us altogether. Some people have estimated that the very existence of the U.S. merchant marine adds $1 billion a month to our national wealth.

With the many facts at hand which prove the need for the United States to have a strong merchant marine of its own, there are many persons in Washington with responsible positions who see little or no need for the United States to own and operate its own merchant ships. They need to be told what is going on in the U.S.S.R.

During the last few years this Communist nation, which is dedicated to the domination of the world, has become conscious of the need of merchant ships to carry out their national policy of burying all non-Communist nations. While our merchant fleet dwindles 200,000 or 300,000 deadweight tons a year, the Russian merchant marine is increasing by leaps and bounds. At the present rate of progress for them and deterioration by us, by 1970, they will have a larger merchant marine than the United States.

Even now this country should be aware that we are in a commercial war with no holds barred. The ironic part of this situation is that many of these ships being built for the U.S.S.R. are being constructed in shipyards built with our money. I am sure you are aware that in Washington both the legislative and administrative branches of Government are very much guided by the thinking of the people throughout the land. A club such as yours, which has members from all parts of the country and in every segment of the maritime industry, could be an ideal agency to disseminate this information. Although public relations campaigns in newspapers and magazines are very effective, more could be done by pin-pointing those who are going to cast the votes or make the decisions which are going to affect our merchant marine. It would seem that a direct contact with the persons who vote and make the decisions would be the most fruitful program. I am very glad to be with you and, for my part, I will always do everything I can to help strengthen the U.S. merchant marine.

How Far Right Gets U.S. Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marquis Childs in his column of October 11 in the Washington Post discloses the President's reasons back of the Federal Communications Commission order of July 26 covering the doctrine of fairness in broadcasting.

Apparently, the administration overlooks the fact that the same income tax subsidy exists for the insidious propaganda of the doctrine of the left and extreme left. One must assume the President does not trust the public to discriminate in what is propaganda and what is truth, so that side should not be able to air its views even on paid time, but the public should be fed through broadcasting only the political theories of the left and extreme left, much of which broadcasting time is given free to the administration.

I am sure the President will find the public able to discriminate between propaganda whether coming from the left or the right in the coming election to the end that paid broadcasting will not have to be controlled.

Mr. Childs' column follows:

HOW FAR RIGHT GETS U.S. SUBSIDY

(By Marquis Childs)

To a friend and long-time associate who called on him the other day President Kennedy unburdened himself with considerable bitterness on the subject of top-bracket taxpayers and the tax exemption they use to spread propaganda of the extreme right.

The President, as the friend recalled the conversation, talked about two men, each of whom is often referred to as "the richest man in the world." One was J. Paul Getty, an oilman who spends most of his time in England where he owns a large estate and gives lavish parties. According to the President, Getty's net worth is over a billion dollars.

The second was the Dallas, Tex., oilman, H. L. Hunt, who is rated in the billionaire class. Both, according to the President, paid miniscule amounts in Federal income tax last year. These are the men, the President went on, who through various forms of tax exemption and special tax allowances are able to subsidize the ultraright on television, radio, and in print.

However exact the President's figures may have been—income tax returns are by law a closely guarded secret—there is no doubt that the rightwing view is heavily subsidized. On radio and television stations across the country free taped programs are run daily assailing the United Nations, attacking the graduated income tax, foreign aid, social security, and the other favorite hates of the extreme right.

One of the biggest tax benefits oil men enjoy is the 27½-percent allowance for a wasting asset. In the tax message he sent up in January the President proposed a sharp reduction in this benefit, which has been extended to cover a long list of minerals. The tax bill passed by the House makes a minor change in the calculation of a wasting asset.

But the reform the President proposed was largely jettisoned and along with it most of the other reforms included in the Presidential tax package. Whether the tax bill will be passed at all this year is increasingly doubtful since the House took until the 1st of October, and Chairman HARRY F. BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee is an adroit delayer.

With the 1964 election at hand the rightwing is prepared to go all out to defeat Kennedy. The question of where "education," as defined by the tax law, stops and political propaganda begins becomes all important. The most persistent critic of the use of tax exemption for political propaganda has been Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon.

She has made Hunt one of her principal targets, charging him with anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and "even anti-Protestant (the National Council of Churches) propaganda." In a Senate speech the soft-spoken lady from Oregon put Hunt's wealth at $3 billion and his annual income at "around $50 million."

"You would think," she said, "that a man with $3 billion at his disposal and an active spleen would be willing to finance his own propaganda warfare. But Hunt prefers to let the Federal Government assume a substantial portion of his poliitical crusades.

"Hunt has simply packaged his propaganda network under the head of the Lifeline Foundation, Inc., and then had his business corporations—the Hunt Oil Co. and its food-processing and canning division, the HLH Parade Co.—commercially sponsor Lifeline propaganda throughout the country. Of course, commercial advertising expenditures are treated as a business expense and deducted from the company's income before taxes. Hunt's expressed goal is to see the $11 billion which American business spends on advertising annually devoted to the sponsorship of right-wing propaganda."

At Senator NEUBERGER's urging the Internal Revenue Service has begun an investigation of tax-exempt foundations to determine whether they are straying from the "charitable and education" limits of tax deductibility into political propaganda. While this is a difficult undertaking, particularly since the lists of organizations rated eligible for exemption is as thick as a medium-size telephone book, several foundations have already been told to show why their exemption should not be removed. They have been found to be spreading propaganda rather than education.

Congress has directed several investigations at the foundations, one aimed to show they were sources of left-wing propaganda, another more recently suggesting they were tax havens. Enormous benefits to the Nation flow out of philanthropy grounded in tax deduction. It would be a tragedy if this were perverted and destroyed for selfish political reasons.

No. 16—Kentucky: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to mention to the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Kentucky, about the hold of gambling on Kentucky. Parts of this State are famed as sportsmen's paradise. Several areas of Kentucky were long havens for gamblers. The extent of gambling in Kentucky is still great even now that Newport and Covington are no longer front page open cities.

In 1962, the parimutuel turnover in that State was $58 million from which the treasury received almost $3 million in legal tax revenues. However, this is only a small part of the story. The share of national offtrack betting turnover, based on testimony given to the McClellan committee that can be allocated to Kentucky is $850 million annually. The interesting chapter of the story is the total gambling in that State. Based on the testimony at those hearings, it can be estimated that the yearly gambling turnover can reach $1.7 billion.

This type of gambling, Mr. Speaker, is the checkbook of most other criminal ventures. Every bet placed in the hands of the professional gamblers helps to subsidize the criminal activities in that State—it provides organized crime with a solid treasury.

The gambling syndicates normally hang on to 10 percent of the total turnover, which would easily place their illicit profits at about $170 million a year.

One big expense is unavoidable. Protection is necessary for illegal gambling operations and the other criminal activities they support. Moneys illegally gambled thus also go to corrupt the political process.

Mr. Speaker, legalized and controlled gambling would do away with all of this. It would undermine crime syndicates, put badly needed revenues into Government hands and, at the same time, remove a source of corruption from the governmental process.

The best and only means to accomplish this is one that has worked all around the world—a Government-run lottery.

Here's an Alternative to a Relief Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, America is truly a land of opportunity and success and happiness for those who have enough initiative and willingness to exercise their own abilities rather than to expect someone else to look after them. This great country became great and strong and free because of the initiative and independence of stout, strong-hearted individuals who had courage and self-respect enough to care and provide for themselves and their loved ones rather than looking to a welfare state for a relief handout. Here is an excellent editorial reprint from my hometown newspaper, the Odessa American, Odessa, Tex., describing a real American. I pass it on for the review and consideration of my colleagues and fellow citizens.

The editorial follows:

HERE'S ALTERNATIVE TO RELIEF HANDOUT

(By Sherman Rogers)

The never-to-be-forgotten iron-gray-haired man got on our bus at Princeton, N.J. We were bound for New York. The seat next to me was vacant and the gentleman wearing a black silk armband took the seat.

In a few moments we were in conversation, and unemployment was the topic. His story, told in an apologetic manner, was one that interested me more than any other I have encountered since Elbert Hubbard made the "Message to Garcia" famous.

"I have a small family of young children," he began, "and I met with an accident at home that incapacited me from further employment in my job in an automobile plant. After getting out of the hospital I sought work for weeks but being 50 years old with a paralyzed hand the personnel directors would not even talk to me, and in due time we were on relief. My wife wept when that relief check came in, and it was not with joy." Here the gentleman stopped talking for a moment, and then said:

"Necessity is the mother of invention. My wife, an excellent cook, finally suggested that the local supermarket might be interested in good old-fashioned homemade bread. I went right down to the store and asked the manager if he would try a dozen loaves to see if there was enough demand to justify further purchases. The store manager said, 'Deliver me a dozen loaves and we will give it a try.'

"There was real excitement in our house that night as my wife finished baking. Bright and early I delivered the dozen loaves and the manager told me to come back at 6 o'clock to take back the unsold loaves. I was there at 6 p.m., and the manager exclaimed, 'Bring me 50 loaves tomorrow. We sold your dozen in less than an hour. This bread will not be on consignment; we will pay you on delivery.

"When my wife got this news she cried again, but it was a happy flood of tears that flowed from a pair of sparkling eyes. We baked all night and made the delivery on time. Then we waited for the results. At 6 I visited the store to see what had happened to the 50 loaves. The manager told me the last loaf sold at 4:30 p.m.

"For 3 days we delivered the 50 loaves and on the third day all the bread was sold by 2:30. 'Bring in 75 loaves tomorrow,' the manager beamed.

"Well," the gentleman said, "Within 2 weeks we were delivering 100 loaves per day and it was all sold out. We then contacted half a dozen grocery stores within easy delivery distance, and my 5-year-old Ford became a valuable automobile." He talked about the details of the family's excitement and finally added, "We are making and delivering 400 loaves of bread now. We installed another range and now we have a permanent well-paying business.

"Here," he added, "was not only salvation, but genuine family security where at 50 years of age and with a maimed hand we have the best income and comfort that we have had in our lives, and," he drawled, "opportunity was not found a thousand miles away. It was in our own family kitchen, and," he concluded, "in the first 2 weeks of our limited sales we were able to reimburse the relief agency for the check they had sent us. That was a happy event."

As the bus pulled into New York I casually asked the gentleman how successful his operation really was. "Well," he replied, "we made $12,000 net after all expenses in 1961. In 1962 we netted $14,000."

Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and report which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of October 12, 1963:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: WHEAT DEAL—A SLICK PIECE OF NEWS MANAGEMENT

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—One of the slickest pieces of news management, in an

administration dedicated to news control even if it means lying to the voters, was the sale of wheat to America's enemy in the cold war.

Within the short space of 3 weeks, President Kennedy conditioned the American people to trading with the enemy before any opposition could get up a head of steam. Undoubtedly the $375 million wheat deal is just the beginning of a trade program which will go to help Russia in her decision to win an economic war against capitalism.

It all began when Canada sold 239 million bushels of wheat to Russia for about a half-billion dollars. The deal provided that 150,000 tons of flour and 240,000 tons of wheat be shipped directly to Cuba. The agreement was announced in Ottawa September 16.

At the time it was disclosed that the U.S. Government knew about the deal in advance, including the shipments to Fidel Castro, but did not protest. It can now be recognized that the United States did not protest because it had its own deal cooking on the back of the White House foreign policy stove, while the President was steering the nuclear test ban treaty through the Senate.

POSSIBLE PART OF TEST BAN PRICE

It cannot be stated with absolute authority that the wheat deal was part of the Russian test treaty prime, but it begins to look as if the wheat deal was part of the package. The test ban treaty was a surrender, although Mr. Kennedy did not acknowledge it as such, because the United States yielded on its position not to conclude a treaty unless it guaranteed inspections. The United States agreed to a treaty on the long-established Russian position of no inspections.

The administration maneuvered the treaty through the Senate as an American victory, which it was not. Then it maneuvered the wheat deal through as a victory for the American farmer and a victory for American agriculture. Whether it is a victory to feed and build up your enemy is a decision each American must make for himself.

The proposed American sale of wheat was leaked to an administration newspaper. This came on the heels of the Canadian deal. The buildup for sale of wheat began September 19. So clever and skillful was the administration's operation that by the time President Kennedy announced it at his Wednesday news conference, it was almost anticlimactic. Everybody had been led to expect it.

It was anticlimactic in fact as well as in thought, because wheat was en route to ports in boxcars before the announcement was made. The rush was on so that it is likely Russian stoves are being stoked to bake bread.

FREEMAN SAW NO GREAT SHORTAGE

Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, was in Russia during the summer and found no great wheat shortage, although he did find Russian agriculture behind ours. However, Freeman, being a sidewalk farmer, couldn't be expected to recognize wheat growing to say nothing of not growing.

Under the news management program, the White House hand was not exposed in the wheat deal until its conclusion. Time after time the White House spokesman, Pierre Salinger, boss of the news managers, gave solemn assurance—off the record—that nothing concrete was before the President.

Meanwhile, various administration men were pushing talk of the deal in the press. Administration Senators were urging the wheat sale as the practical and realistic thing to do. It was obvious that the deal was underway even in the face of the White House cautions that there was nothing concrete before it either from growers or Russia.

It isn't too great a victory to sell wheat to Russia at the world price which is well below the domestic price. And it won't solve the balance-of-payments deficit to pick up 375 million when the deficit is running at an annual rate of between 3 and 4 billion unless the President plans to sell anything and everything to Russia, possibly including nuclear bombs, which would be represented as sale of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

A SORRY ANTICLIMAX

Mr. Kennedy's widely heralded announcement about the Russian wheat deal turned out to be just what nearly everyone expected. His administration will not stand in the way of commercial sales to Russia at the world price so long as this wheat doesn't go to Red China or Cuba.

Perhaps it would have been foolish, as Mr. Kennedy said, to halt our sales to Russia when other countries can buy wheat from us and then sell it to the Communists. In addition, allies such as Canada and Australia have sold vast amounts of their own surplus wheat to Russia and even to Red China.

But the President isn't going to fool very many Americans into thinking that the Russian wheat deal represents a praiseworthy contribution toward our own fiscal well-being or the security of the free world.

It will be hard to forget that for every bushel Russia buys from us at the world price, our Government must pay roughly 50 cents in subsidies to the exporters, who must pay the higher, supported domestic price for the wheat they sell. If we sell 150 million bushels to Russia, American taxpayers will thus have contributed about $75 million.

To suggest that the wheat deal will materially reduce the outflow of dollars is to divert attention from the vastly more effective steps the Government could take, if it wanted, by trimming military spending abroad and foreign aid, for which about $7 billion in unspent appropriations has accumulated. Relatively, the Russian deal is a drop in the bucket and one which we can't count on to be repeated.

As for the cold war, it was only a few months ago that the administration was pleading for the removal of restrictions on trade with Poland and Yugoslavia on the ground that only by this help could we hope to lure them out of the Soviet orbit. Mr. Kennedy has repeatedly taken this position, as a Senator and as President; the only countries he ruled out were the Soviet Union and Red China.

Not only have we failed to lure any country away from Moscow, but we are now given to believe that we no longer need fear Moscow and that we should help the Soviet Union itself out of its own agricultural difficulties. To be sure, Red China and Cuba are still on the blacklist—but even this seems a little futile, to use Mr. Kennedy's own reasoning, when Canada and Australia are selling wheat to China and Russia is transferring Canadian wheat to Cuba.

Mr. Kennedy's decision reflects the accumulated failures of our foreign policy and the inconsistencies of his own reasoning. At best, his decision offers the Communists escape from failures of their own contrivance.

Prospects for Shipbuilders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Mr. Daniel D. Strohmeier, vice president of Bethlehem Steel Co. in charge of the shipbuilding division, before the American Merchant Marine Conference, sponsored by the Propeller Club of the United States, in Baltimore, October 11, 1963, entitled "Prospects for Shipbuilders." This address should receive the attention of every Member of the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, and all officials charged with the responsibility of maintaining a strong Navy and a strong merchant marine. It points out in clear terms the weakness in our shipbuilding program both by the Navy and by the merchant marine. It reveals the terrible risk we are taking and also points out what the Russians are doing. If this condition is being brought about by design then it is high time that our Armed Services Committee look into the matter and find out why? If it is being accomplished because of the lack of understanding as to our Nation's needs then Congress should take steps to remedy the problem. Time could be running out on us. The urgency and great need for this Nation to have a complete overhaul of our shipbuilding program is now. Before it it too late. I trust the Rip Van Winkles in the Department of Commerce and the Navy Department will wake up and start America on the road to a realistic shipbuilding program that will not only reduce unemployment but will also insure the security of these United States in the years to come.

PROSPECTS FOR SHIPBUILDERS

(Text of address delivered by Daniel D. Strohmeier, vice president of Bethlehem Steel Co. in charge of the shipbuilding division, before the American Merchant Marine Conference, sponsored by the Propeller Club of the United States, in Baltimore, October 11, 1963)

Bascially, from my view as a private American shipbuilder, there appear to be three broad shipyard groups in the world: the foreign yards, the U.S. naval shipyards, and the private American shipbuilders.

I do not propose to dwell at length on the first two groups. The foreign yards will prosper with the ebb and flow of world shipping. The U.S. naval shipyards appear to be immune from economic considerations and will undoubtedly be going strong, courtesy of the American taxpayer, long after those of us here have gone to our reward.

The private U.S. shipbuilding industry, my subject today, is by economic disadvantage stranded so far above any conceivable high tide mark of world shipping requirements that nothing short of the high water of a world hurricane will cause the flood to reach our level.

Since the war, more than 70 foreign-flag ships have been built in the United States. These orders resulted from a combination of circumstances which, in my opinion, are unlikely to be repeated. After the war, American shipyard capacity represented a fair proportion of world capacity and our cost differentials were less. Thus, the great tanker programs of 1948, 1951, and 1956, spurred on by high charter rates, spilled over into American yards. Today there is no conceivable spurt in world demand for ships that will bring any business to American yards.

Five years ago world shipbuilding capacity had grown to about 10½ million gross tons annually and was about 83 percent utilized.

Today world shipbuilding capacity is in the order of 14 million gross tons annually and is only about one half utilized.

Not only is there a widening imbalance between supply and demand but the differential between domestic and foreign costs has also widened. Where cost differentials were in the order of 40 percent shortly after the war, it has been necessary for Congress recently to raise the statutory limit for subsidies to 55 percent.

With so much idle foreign capacity and with our widening cost differential, it is little wonder then that no shipowner, whether private or government, will order a ship in an American yard, unless there is a compelling reason.

Thus, for all practical purposes the prospects for American shipbuilders depend on the demand for American-flag ships, where the compelling reason is supplied by law.

What are these prospects? Here it would perhaps be well to consider separately each of the three principal sources of shipbuilding demand; namely, the private segment, the Navy, and the subsidized merchant fleet.

The private segment means coastwise and intercoastal ships only where the trade is restricted to American-flag vessels. This means principally coastwise tankers. There may also be some special purpose vessels for the carriage of chemicals in bulk, both dry and liquid. The success of some container ship conversions may presage some eventual new construction. However, the bulk of the volume will be tankers and these are under competitive pressure from the construction of more and larger pipelines. The Colonial pipeline alone, now building, will have a capacity to deliver what now requires the equivalent of about 90 T-2's.

To maintain those 90 tankers new ships would have to be built at the average rate of about 5 per year. That means that because of that one pipeline alone, the shipbuilding industry has lost a demand for about five T-2 equivalents per year.

At present there are only seven private unsubsidized ships being built in the United States, all tankers. As in the off-shore trades, coastwise tankers are trending toward larger ships in the 45,000 to 70,000 deadweight-ton range. Simplification of design and omission of frills are helping to make these ships more competitive with the pipelines. There is some trend toward placing the bridge aft and simplifying the cargo system with fewer and larger tanks. Crew reductions will also contribute to their competitive status. There are presently about 260 active American-flag tankers. To maintain that number an average of 10 ships a year would have to be built. Since replacement vessels are larger and faster, it seems to me that there is no prospect of maintaining that number of units and so the tanker replacement rate will average less than 10 units per year.

Turning to the category of naval construction, the big question mark affecting the outlook for shipbuilding is the matter of block obsolescence of the fleet and whether this country has the will to do anything about it.

Last year a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House reported substantially as follows: There are about 860 ships in the active fleet. According to the subcommittee approximately the same number is planned for 1973, 10 years hence, but the composition will vary somewhat. Of the present fleet 598 were authorized in World War II and the average age of the fleet is 15 years. Applying the accepted 20-year life criterion, only 335 ships, built or authorized, will be assets 10 years from now. Since 1948, we have been building at the average rate of 24 ships a year. At that rate we will have only about 503 useful ships 10 years from now. Only by averaging 70 new ships a year starting immediately will the objectives be met in 1973. Programs for fiscal 1962 and 1963 included 36 and 37 new ships respectively, a 50-percent increase over the 24-ship-a-year average but only half of what it will take to meet the 10-year objective. It is obvious that at the rate we are now building our naval power is deteriorating.

Another factor affecting the outlook for shipbuilders is the changing composition of the naval fleet. The development of nuclear power, nuclear weapons, missiles, and the changing military posture of our potential adversary are important factors. In general the days of the large fighting ship seem to be numbered, with emphasis today on submarine, destroyer types with antisubmarine capability, and auxiliary vessels.

Navy work represents by far the largest dollar volume of shipbuilding available in the United States, but shipbuilders are worried that the same school of thought, or lack of it, that is permitting our Navy to lose the race with obsolescence, might not manifest itself in further reduced volume of work.

Another source of concern on the part of the private shipbuilders is the vast capacity being maintained in 11 active Navy shipyards, the same number that existed in World War II. This capacity is a menace to the private industry, already hard pressed for orders, and a very real obstacle to the investment of new funds in private shipyard modernization.

Our third category, the subsidized fleet, provides some shipbuilding but the numbers of ships offered each year are so small as to leave the shipbuilding industry decidedly undernourished. In recent years the annual programs have averaged 17 ships per year. A total of 18 shipyards have bid for these. An offering of only one ship per yard per year is what I would call a buyers' market and the prices are inevitably so low as to render this work unprofitable to the industry.

Are there too many shipyards or are there too few ships to build? Consider the following:

At the present time there are about 900 active merchant ships under the U.S. flag. Twelve years ago our participation in our own foreign trade was about 40 percent. It has gone downward steadily until today it is only 9 percent. The trend is still downward.

If we consider a 25-year vessel life, we should be replacing our ships at an average rate of 36 ships per year or double the current and projected program, just to maintain our disgraceful 9 percent.

It would appear inescapable that at the rate we are building, our active fleet of 900 ships will shrink to half that number. When that time comes, we shall look back to 1963 and wonder how we managed to carry even 9 percent.

Our national merchant marine policy is stated in title I of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. I doubt if all the combined resolutions committees of the Propeller Club, the AMMI, CASL, Shipbuilders Council, and others could even today improve on it. Let me read it:

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the U.S. flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

It would seem to me that there is a serious gap between that statement of policy and the course we are pursuing in this country. First, we are not carrying a substantial portion of our foreign trade, unless you would call 9 percent substantial. Second, we are not fostering a merchant fleet of the most suitable types. In the past 15 years the only vessel types admitted by administrative action to the subsidy provisions of the act have been berth-line passenger ships and freighters. Now, these are important segments of a balanced merchant marine but they cannot and do not carry many of the cargoes that make up our foreign trade and which require other types of vessels. Yet, legislative history of the act makes it perfectly clear that all types of merchant ships essential to our trade are intended to be covered.

Our administratively narrowed application of the Merchant Marine Act has already resulted in an unbalanced and inadequate merchant fleet.

In my opinion the outlook for shipbuilders depends on the value this country puts on seapower. With the average age of our naval vessels over 15 years and growing older, and with our merchant fleet carrying less than 9 percent of our trade and shrinking, I believe Congress and the executive branch of the Government should take stock and decide whether the low and sinking estate of our seapower is commensurate with our role in the world. In my opinion it is not.

In contrast, the Russians have belatedly given evidence that they understand sea power and have underway a tremendous program to build up both their naval and merchant marine strength. In May 1963 Russia had 236 merchant ships under construction, five times as many as our 47. Their submarine fleet already in being totals more than 400. In the great struggle between East and West, our diametrically opposite views on the importance of seapower mean that one of us is right and one of us is wrong. However, our position is the dangerous one, for if it proves to be wrong we will be in mortal peril. If the Russians turn out to be wrong, they are in a fail-safe position.

To remedy our dwindling sea power will cost money. Where is it coming from? If we have to delay our trip to the moon to divert funds to bolster our seapower, that would not be too much of a price to pay.

In the final analysis, who wouldn't swap a few years on the moon for a few more on earth?

Salute to the World's Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the great State of California has become widely acclaimed as first in the Nation. While I fully realize that many of my colleagues here would challenge this statement, I believe even my good friends from New York will have to acknowledge that our Los Angeles Dodgers have certainly broken a few records with their outstanding victory in the 1963 World Series.

The California State Legislature has formally acknowledged this feat by the following resolution, which was adopted on October 6, 1963, and which I take great pride in submitting along with the dispatch describing it:

The California State Assembly has adopted a resolution congratulating the Los Angeles Dodgers for winning the 1963 World Series, Speaker of the Assembly Jesse M. Unruh announced today.

The resolution was approved by the assembly committee on rules Friday, October 4 in San Francisco and adopted under Assembly Rule No. 16.5 on October 6.

Speaker Unruh, who authored the resolution which was coauthored by every member of the rules committee, said, "The legislators were absolutely confident that the Dodgers would be victorious; therefore we had no hesitation in approving this resolution Friday after they had won the first two games of the series."

The resolution said: "The Dodgers soundly defeated the perennial scourge of baseball championships, the New York Yankees, and shall be remembered as a team that combined outstanding pitching, good speed, and timely hitting plus competent and inspirational leadership from Manager Walter Alston and his coaching staff into a world championship.

"The people of the State of California are extremely proud of the 1963 world champions, the Los Angeles Dodgers.

"The members of the assembly wish to congratulate the Los Angeles Dodgers' organization and players on their winning the 1963 world series and wish them continued future success."

Favors Class I Base Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, S. 1915 was passed in the other body last Thursday and was sent to the House for consideration. This legislation is similar to my bill, H.R. 963, which would amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937 to allow the use of a new method for distributing returns among dairy farmers who come under a Federal milk marketing order.

I believe this legislation, commonly called the class I base plan, has the support of dairy farmers, particularly in my congressional district. An example of this support is a letter I received from Mrs. John Wold, of Route 5, Arlington, Wash.

Mr. Speaker, I believe her well-written letter as it pertains to this legislation is of interest to Members of the Congress. It is for this reason, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

ARLINGTON, WASH.,
September 18, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WESTLAND: Dairymen in the Puget Sound area got a shot in the arm today with the news that S. 1915 has a good chance of passing and we sure hope so as it is sorely needed.

We are hopeful the House will do likewise so we dairymen will have the tools to put our house in order.

We were especially cheered by Senator ELLENDER's determination to keep other farm measures off the dairy bill. Really that is the only way to approach the agricultural problem, commodity by commodity, rather than trying to lump this complex problem into one bill. I think that is why so little really does what it is supposed to do.

We dairymen are also 100 percent against incentive payments, will need every vote we can get and city folks are not going to help us if it is a giveaway deal. We farmers don't want anything for nothing. Also why should American taxpayers have to pay American farmers not to produce when our own Government is going right ahead and buying or allowing foreign dairy imports to come in? That is so much nonsense.

No butter subsidy either or no producer will ever see a penny of that—all these funds have a way of ending up with the distributor or labor and the dairy farmer gets blamed for it. Butter need not be a drug in the market. Let the butter industry stop their whimpering, and resting on their laurels and get in there and sell butter—they have been depending on the Government too long and they have grown lazy and not kept up quality. None of us dairy farmers feel that the butter industry is carrying their share of the load in promoting butter sales. Every ad I've ever seen for butter has been dairy farmer financed.

Anyhow, now you know how we feel about some things and let us hope S. 1915 goes into effect real soon and we do thank you for all you have done and are trying to do for the farmer.

Thanking you, I am,

Yours very truly,

(Mrs. John) ANN WOLD.

The Teach Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker oftentimes on Sunday morning I attend the Crossroads Breakfast sponsored by the YMCA in Washington, D.C., where Americans visiting Washington and foreigners visiting our country come to break bread together, to have fellowship, to make new friends, renew old friendships, and to listen to a speaker on current subjects which deal most often with the moral aspects of our life and living.

On September 15, 1963, Dr. Paul Smith spoke to us on "The Teach Corps." Dr. Smith is with the National Education Association and is associated with the teach corps project sponsored by this association. He speaks from wide experience, reading, and knowledge of the problems of teaching, learning, and education in general in our own country and in foreign lands. He is an able speaker. He is a distinguished citizen and he most certainly is an outstanding educational leader.

Mr. Speaker, because what he said that day was revealing, instructive, and of benefit to all who are interested in Congress, and especially the Members of Congress, I, under unanimous consent, include his remarks in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE TEACH CORPS

The Teach Corps of the National Education Association has been created to provide a new educational force in international relations. Within a flexible framework of operations the corps is composed of skilled and experienced American teachers who volunteer to work professionally with other teachers in other lands to their mutual enrichment.

If one examines broadly the outstanding developments in education in this century in the United States, he would have to choose as one of these, the founding and development of the summer school.

In 1900 Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler received a grant of $5,000 to assist in a practical way, the teachers of New York City. During the summer practical courses were offered at Columbia University for the teachers of New York. These courses were continued and developed over the years. In the 1920's, some of the State legislatures passed regulations saying that in order for teachers to be certified they must hold a bachelor's degree. Great numbers of teachers in those days held only diplomas from normal schools which were the equivalent of 2 years' work beyond high school completion.

These teachers were faced with securing a bachelor's degree. How to do it was the problem. The universities responded to their demands and summer schools came to play their role in education. Since that time the regular summer school has continued to serve thousands upon thousands of teachers; it brought with it newer and more flexible developments, such as short-term seminars and institutes, varying in length from a few days to several months.

When we asked ourselves at the National Education Association how can we help our colleagues in other countries what resources have we to use, we almost immediately turned to the summer school.

This concept, already expanding and developing was to use the reservoir of professional talent available in the United States during the summer vacation months in summer schools for teachers of newly developing nations. In many of these nations, members of the practicing teachers have not finished high school and have had no professional training. The NEA believed that, through a continuing program of summer workshops, both the quality of teaching and the status of teachers could be appreciably improved.

In 1962, we sent, in cooperation with Crossroads Africa, 36 teachers to Liberia where in 7 centers they worked with 1,500 Liberian teachers.

What a dedicated, competent, imaginative and creative team of teachers can do during a summer school was evident everywhere I went during my stay in Monrovia. The impression on me was that the 36 teachers had done an outstanding job and had made significant contributions to the teachers in Liberia. There was enthusiastic comment from every quarter.

The teachers themselves, when I talked with them, were confident that they had done well, they were not oversure, but they were confident that they had done a good job. They were experienced people who had few lost motions; they knew why they were in Liberia and what they were to do. These were old campaigners. The morale was high; no prima donnas cluttered up the group. There was an easy camaraderie and refreshing team spirit. It seemed as though each supplemented and complemented the other. It was a pleasure to be with them on the bus, at the table, in a meeting, at a reception, and better still at sessions in the dormitory when I enjoyed with the men an African exercise called the heaves or 10 up. This latter activity simply meant heaving oneself on a bed with the toes up, but the talk was stimulating as experiences were related, de-

scriptions made, and accomplishments recited.

The expertise and good will were evident on every hand. Major contributions were many; probably the most important may be summed up in the words of one of the Paramount chiefs who said, "If you have done nothing else this summer ,you have brought with you an understanding between peoples." The expertise came through in innumerable ways. Liberian teachers working in the many methods classes were exposed to a thrilling experience of learning by doing. A first grade reader was written; songs were notated; instruments made; posters prepared; local materials, seeds, beads, bamboo, reeds, hides, cassava paste, were widely used; a choral group was formed.

The officers in the Ministry of Education were enthusiastic. At a conference in Under Secretary Richards' office, the work of the summer was reviewed and warm appreciation was expressed. Dr. James Robinson, Director of Crossroads Africa, outlined possible programs for the summer of 1963 and suggested the possibility of an ambitious program covering 5 years. There seemed to be acceptance and agreement on the part of the Ministry officials. With a view toward upgrading the quality of teachers, the discussion went so far as to contemplate a study of regulations now current regarding salary, increment and promotion.

At the evaluation meeting, the Liberian officials expressed again and again their gratefulness and appreciation of the work of the American teachers noting not only the quality of the U.S. teachers' performance but their adaptability.

This group averaged 17 years of teaching experience. The youngest of the group, Cherie Newman, of Port Angeles, Wash., had taught only 7 years. You may be interested in what she had to say about her teaching in Liberia:

"We were to conduct classes in English, social studies, and teaching methods for the Liberian teachers; and I suddenly felt wholly inadequate for the task which lay ahead.

"After consuming all the material on Liberia at the local library and after 3 days of orientation, I was still unprepared for the sights which greeted my eyes as we jogged along the jungle road which led from the airport to our quarters, for words and pictures can never capture the unique and dynamic experience of actually being there. Mud huts with thatched roofs, babies bobbing along securely fastened to their mother's backs, people gracefully balancing everything from umbrellas to wood bundles on their heads, bare-breasted women diligently pounding rice with mortar and pestle, small patches of burned-off bush being scratched into rice fields with primitive implements, tattered and naked children romping about the quiet villages, everyone taking life at a slow, easy pace in the tropical sun. I discovered that here was a whole new world with a marvelous character all its own, waiting to be explored.

"Teaching commenced for the team in Monrovia, and I met the group of teachers with whom I was to work on methods for teaching primary grades. I found that my carefully prepared American-type lesson plans were quite ridiculous. These were sincere, wonderful people with a fervent desire to learn. They had never had an opportunity to receive any teacher-training. After learning to read and write at a mission or one of the few public schools, they were attempting to pass this knowledge on to others and they were doing a commendable job, for their task was enormous and often very frustrating. Most of their students spoke tribal dialects and before they could teach them to read and write English, they had to teach them to speak the language. Having few books about their country, they were using American textbooks. Imagine the difficulty of teaching a child living in a mud hut in the tropics to read by using stories about children playing in the snow in New York City.

"Teaching in Africa was a prodigious experience and a marvelous adventure. People working together come to know and understand one another, and we discovered the enormous depth of this perception * * * for instead of looking at the Africans, we were looking with them, and they caused us to see things with new eyes. 'Darkest Africa' was in reality 'enlightening Africa'."

On the basis of the 1962 project, the NEA executive committee authorized the creation of the NEA Teach Corps in October 1962.

This summer in addition to cooperating with Crossroads Africa on its Liberian project, the NEA Teach Corps served in Sierra Leone, where 14 volunteers worked in 2 centers with more than 150 elementary school teachers in a project similar to that in Liberia.

In Sierra Leone, in Venezuela, and in Bolivia, NEA Teach Corps teams worked with teachers of those countries under contracts with the U.S. Agency for International Development.

At this time assessments of the summer sessions are not easy to make. I talked with officials in La Paz and Caracas who were involved in the programs in Bolivia and Venezuela. They spoke glowingly about the results. In each case we were asked to repeat and enlarge the program. In La Paz, the Director General of Education suggested that we send two teams instead of one. Similarly in Caracas the director of the Pedagogical Institute requested that next year we supply a team for hers as well as for another teacher training center.

Mr. Wurie, the Minister of Education of Sierra Leone, sat in my office last Tuesday and suggested that the NEA begin its planning for next summer's program in his country.

The teachers also were enthusiastic about their experiences. One of the team in Sierra Leone, Alice Simondet, of Seattle, wrote:

"Once again, I should like to express my appreciation to NEA for having selected me as a member of the Teach Corps for Sierra Leone. What we actually accomplished will take years to measure. Perhaps the results will be negligible, but the important part of the entire project is that a beginning was made. I hope each member of the team will make some kind of follow-up. I am sure each one will.

"I am hoping to interest many groups in sending educational materials to Sierra Leone. I hope, also to interest teachers in making little books that can be used by teachers and children in Sierra Leone and will, at the same time, show them (teachers of Sierra Leone) how they can do a similar project. Perhaps I can interest someone in sending educational tapes or films that would be useful in Sierra Leone. I am anxious that these teachers will know that we have not forgotten them, that we are concerned about them and their problem, and that our interest in their welfare is genuine and lasting.

"Perhaps some of the most valuable ideas we left with the Sierra Leonean teachers are that one does not give up in despair just because one has little or nothing to work with; that one learns how to be resourceful and to depend greatly upon his own ingenuity and that of his students and fellow teachers; that one has respect for the ideas and personality of each of his students and his colleagues; that one opens his mind to all sides of a question but that he also learns how to analyze critically the arguments presented; that there are many ways to tackle a job and that teachers need to know many techniques, methods, and procedures in order to help children learn; that the independence of Sierra Leone depends greatly upon the work of the education."

Other reports were just as heartening: Here are two examples; the first from Jeanne Holmquist, Oakland, Calif., and the second from Rebecca Frank, of Cudahy, Wis.:

"With the risk of appearing too optimistic or boastful I must say that each of us established an excellent rapport with the teachers attending our classes, as well as with the other people, dignitaries and laymen, who we chanced to meet in Freetown and in Njala. From the written evaluations and the reactions of the students at the conclusion of the course, I left with a very humble, but happy feeling that in even a brief period of time we were able to impart much of the philosophy of American education, and a way of life. Of course, it is due to the warm reception we were given initially, and the fact that all of the educators of Sierra Leone were truly eager to share ideas and concepts with us. It would be difficult to determine just who benefited the most, but I know that I am richer for the experience."

"I am an optimist by nature, but even I am amazed at our success. I don't know of any summer that I've worked so hard and have been so tired but have felt so rewarded.

"African teachers are eager and hungry for every experience, method, and technique that will help them educate their charges. They are just as dedicated as any teacher anywhere in the United States. Their enthusiasm and creativity and hunger for education just triggered all the members to outdo our very best."

Mrs. Rita Ray states in her letter: "With all my college training and college teaching, I have never had an education to compare with this. I would not entitle my evaluation 'Enlightening Africa' but rather 'Dual Awakening.' I returned with a greater appreciation for my Government, our educational system, and all people. I have never had any prejudices, which I have always been proud of, but I find that we learn to accept things daily without true evaluation of how really great they are. I actually 'pop my buttons' when I think of what our United States of America, our NEA, and our teachers are doing not only for children, but I would like to say life. * * *"

Mrs. Lucille F. Bailey reported: "I am most appreciative of the opportunity which was afforded me this summer. Aleady, I have seven speaking engagements * * * this will be a busy year, but I hope that I shall be able to let others know about the struggles of an emerging nation. West Africa is in transition, too. I'm pleased that I could be a small part of the educational revolution."

Mrs. Helen Harriger was equally enthusiastic about her experience and wrote: "* * * It was impossible to work with those wonderful, friendly, sincere, eager, enthusiastic people without feeling that this was the most challenging opportunity and experience in my teaching career. I am so glad that NEA and AID worked out the details for making this dream and vision a reality. Through this teacher-to-teacher relationship will be achieved worldwide understanding and fellowship so sorely neded.

"I know that you and Dr. Smith would have been very proud of the manner in which each and every one of the teachers put into operation the finest and best known in teaching techniques, human relations, and international good will. I think our briefing session in Washington gave us a feeling that we were truly commissioned and that somehow, somewhere you two were with us. We were of one mind—we were determined to succeed—and I truly believe each one, in his own inimitable way did extend himself in a selfless manner."

Red Trade Impact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for the last 10 months to some Republican Members of Congress lament almost daily the U.S. deficit balance of payments and our accompanying gold loss, the prognostications of impending bankruptcy of this great Nation, and how it was direly essential that the Congress abort our foreign aid effort lest we in fact give ourselves virtually away.

The Farm Bureau has also joined in the prophecy and pointed to their desire to see American agriculture stand on its own two empire-supported feet and that Government control of agriculture was stifling a potentially competitive part of our economy that wanted free trade and further that $2.4 billion worth of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat stored was scandalous.

The United States is still plagued with chronic unemployment, depletion of shipping and railroad income, and all of the other chronic conditions of which the Republicans speak. A solution appears in sight, having a possible multibeneficial effect—a massive sale of useless wheat for worthwhile gold and dollars having economic effects as are set out by the Wall Street Journal in the accompanying article.

All of a sudden, somebody yelled "Communist" and patriotic Republicans are apparently crawling out of the rocks with musket in hand reassuring, first, the gold loss is not that bad; second, our wheat surpluses are tolerable; third, our economy is getting along all right; and fourth, besides they might shoot some of that wheat back at us and hit us right in our improved economy.

The article follows:

WHEAT SALE TO SOVIET GIVES A MAJOR BOOST TO CANADA'S ECONOMY—FARMERS SPEND MORE FREELY ON CARS, VACATIONS; DOLLAR VALUE UP—SOME SEE RISKS—HOW MUCH OF A U.S. PARALLEL?

(By Harlan Byrne)

TORONTO.—As the United States prepares for a $250 million wheat deal with Soviet Russia, its Canadian neighbors already are rejoicing in the economic impact of their own agreement to sell the Reds $500 million worth of bread grain.

The wheat sale agreement, signed last month, has reshaped Canada's economic outlook almost overnight. It's putting new life in a business expansion that had been showing signs of tiring; it's cutting sharply into a chronic deficit; it's strengthening a Canadian dollar that had been threatening to drop in value, and it's giving the Government a freer hand in setting interest rates to stimulate the economy. It may even impel Prime Minister Pearson to call a new election next year, in the hope that his Liberal Party can convert its parliamentary minority into a majority.

President Kennedy gave his approval for a U.S. wheat sale to Russia Wednesday partly because the United States hopes to reap some of the same advantages—notably a strengthening of the U.S. wheat-belt economy and a cut in the deficit the United States runs in its foreign transactions. But for several reasons it's unlikely the U.S. deal will pack as much economic punch as the Canadian sale.

UNITED STATES, CANADIAN CONTRASTS

For one thing, Canada will sell the Russians 240 million bushels of wheat, while the United States apparently will sell only 148 million bushels. And the U.S. economy is about 14 times the size of Canada's. So it would take about $7 billion of Russian money to produce in the United States the impact that $500 million of Red cash is starting to have in Canada.

Even for the wheat farmers themselves, the impact will be different. Canada's wheat growers, now winding up a record 720-million-bushel harvest, are freed by the Russian deal from any worries about a surplus. But U.S. farmers will have to cope with a big wheat surplus despite sales to Russia. Unlike the Canadians, American grain growers also face lower prices, because they rejected last spring a Kennedy administration plan for high price supports coupled with stiff crop controls.

But Americans would benefit from Canada's windfall even if there were no parallels between the United States and Canadian deals. U.S. investors, who have poured almost $20 billion into Canadian industry, share heavily in Dominion prosperity.

Much of the Russian money Canada will get is bound to spill across the border in the form of added Canadian spending for U.S. goods, services, and travel. And the more money Canada gets from overseas, the less need it has for U.S. capital to cover debts incurred on its other foreign transactions. All this is welcomed by Washington officials struggling to make Uncle Sam's income from abroad match his foreign spending.

CARS AND VACATIONS

In Canada's Prairie Provinces, the Russian wheat sale already is prompting farmers into freer spending. Customers' orders, for 1964 model Fords and Mercurys in Saskatchewan, prior to unveiling last week, were three times as high as in any previous year, says Henry Wackley, regional manager for Ford Motor Co's Canadian subsidiary. "The Soviet deal is the frosting on the cake," he says.

Kenneth Lawson, of Calgary, Alberta, president of an 11-office travel agency, reports a sharp increase in bookings for winter vacations in warmer climes, including the United States. "In the past 2 weeks our Regina office has sold 25 Hawaiian winter vacations," he says. "That's more than they sold all last fall and winter." Yet he tips his hat to a competitor who, in a matter of days after the Soviet deal, signed up 40 wheat growers for a November junket through Europe.

Though the end of harvest rarely produces farm machinery sales, Sydney Miller, a Massey-Ferguson, Ltd., dealer in Calgary, this week asked his factory for rush delivery of 15 tractors to fill unexpected orders.

NEW JOBS, TOO

The Russian wheat sale has created farm-belt jobs, too. Since 10 percent of the wheat will be delivered to Russia in the form of flour, Canadian flour mills have stepped up operations to 92 percent of capacity, from about 70 percent before the transaction was signed. Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Ltd., reopened a mill in Medicine Hat, Alberta, that had been closed for 7 years, hiring nearly 100 men.

Many Canadians expect this prosperity to spread through the nation in snowballing fashion. Canada's two main rail systems, the Canadian Pacific, and Canadian National Railways, will benefit directly. They expect to reap nearly $30 million in added revenues by the end of next July, the target date for completing deliveries to Russia; the wheat, of course, has to be moved across Canada by rail before it can be loaded into ships bound for Russia or, perhaps, Cuba.

Other companies expect indirect benefits. "We told all our managers last week to get their stores stocked for the extra business we expect this fall," says G. Allan Burton, managing director of Simpsons, Ltd., a Toronto-based department store chain. Canadian Westinghouse Co., Ltd., a subsidiary of U.S.-based Westinghouse Electric Corp., expects a flurry of orders in the next 2 weeks from western appliance dealers.

Altogether, most Canadian economists now expect the Dominion's 1964 output of goods and services to rise about 3 to 5 percent over 1963. Before the Soviet deal, most were predicting little or no change. In addition, hiring of workers by flour mills, railroads, port operators and other industries is expected to slash Canada's unemployment rate, which has averaged over 5 percent of the labor force in recent years. "I expect unemployment to practically disappear for a period next spring," when deliveries to Russia will be in full swing, declares a chemical company economist in Montreal.

Most economists also figure the Russian deal will trim $150 million or so this year from the deficit in Canada's current account foreign transactions. This would lower the deficit to around $500 million, from $850 million last year and a $1 billion average in the past decade.

Next year, as the full impact of the wheat deal is felt, the economists figure the "current accounts deficit should drop to about $400 million, which would be the lowest figure in 10 years. The current accounts ledger includes most transactions between Canadians and foreigners, but excludes the inflow of foreign capital, mostly from the United States, which usually brings Canada's total foreign income and spending into balance.

CANADIAN DOLLAR GAINS

These prospects for prosperity already are being felt in world money markets. In New York, the Canadian dollar now sells for about 92.75 U.S. cents, up three-quarters of a cent since late July. Most of the gain has come since the wheat deal.

The strength has been timely. In July and August the Canadian dollar came under heavy selling; the government in Ottawa had to spend over 200 million U.S. dollars from its reserves buying Canadian dollars to keep up their value. The selling was triggered by President Kennedy's proposal to tax Americans' purchases of foreign securities, which dried up sales of Canadian securities in the United States.

With the Canadian dollar strong again, Canada is understood to have recouped $100 million of its reserves of foreign currencies in September. In fact, monetary authorities in Ottawa now are having to guard against too rapid a build-up of exchange reserves. The Canadian Government has promised Washington it won't let these reserves (mostly U.S. dollars) rise too fast, as that would mean a flow of U.S. dollars into Canada which would worsen the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Consequently, some Canadian bankers think the Bank of Canada will soon cut the interest rate it charges on loans to other banks, perhaps to 3.5 or 3.75 percent from the present 4 percent. This would lower interest rates generally, and encourage outflows from Canada to the United States of idle funds available for such short-term investments as U.S. Treasury bills. It also would jibe with Prime Minister Pearson's desire to keep credit cheap to spur Canadian business.

POLITICAL PROSPECTS

Many politicians see another benefit in the wheat deal for Mr. Pearson. With prosperity rising, they think, he may well submit a new economic program to Parliament next spring, then call an election on the ground that his

Liberal Party will need a parliamentary majority to put the program across.

Though they have been able to govern, the Liberals fell three seats short of a parliamentary majority in last Aprils' election. And it was failure to score in the Prairie Provinces that cost them a majority; with the wheat deal highly popular they might well pick up seats there in a new vote. Mr. Pearson has given no hint of his plans, but "if he has any sense, he'll call an election for about next June," says one Canadian politician.

Some Canadian businessmen fear, however, that the effects of the wheat deal will be short lived. "I'm cynical enough to believe the politicians will fritter away the benefits," says a Toronto bond dealer.

These businessmen worry particularly that overstimulation of the economy, arising from a combination of the wheat deal, rising Government spending and easier money policies in Ottawa, will raise Canadian prices. This, in turn, would bode ill for the exports to other lands that Canada will have to depend on when the wheat deliveries to Russia end. Canadian exports got a boost from the May 1962 devaluation of the Canadian dollar, which lowered the price of Canadian goods for foreign buyers. But an insurance company economist points out that Canadian wholesale prices already have climbed back 5 percentage points on the Government index since devaluation.

Some businessmen also fear wheat prosperity will spur too much Canadian spending abroad, partly canceling the big trade gain from the Soviet sale. "This is going to mean a lot of imported Cadillacs and Florida vacation," a Montreal banker comments wryly.

Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in last Thursday's Lewiston Morning Tribune, Lewiston, Idaho, and the Parma Review, Parma, Idaho, as well as last Friday's edition of the Wall Street Journal, there appeared editorials which logically point out in very clear terms, the facts surrounding our selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

There is no reasonable argument against this decision for both the wheat growers and the American taxpayers will be the true benefactors. The failure of the wheat referendum earlier this year and the unlikely prospect of further congressional action involving this product, further demonstrates the wisdom of this move. I know it has received considerable support in my congressional district as well as reportedly throughout the Nation's Grain Belt.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert into the RECORD these three editorials with the hopes that the articles will help keep this issue in perspective and erase some of the emotional criticism of this decision now being generated in certain areas of the country.

The editorials follow:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, 1963]

THE WHEAT DEAL: STEP TOWARD TRADE

President Kennedy's approval yesterday of the sale of some $250 million worth of American wheat to the Soviet Union certainly will rekindle public discussion of the whole issue of U.S. trade with Communist nations.

The President emphasized that the wheat sale was a one-time, cash deal. However, the repercussions of the transaction obviously will go far beyond the sale itself—in one direction or another.

Expressions of opposition to the sale were relatively rare and mild during the weeks in which the administration debated the question. The extreme right wing of American politics doubtless held much of its fire until after the deed was accomplished. Its custom is to denounce President Kennedy after the event instead of criticizing a proposal before it becomes a policy. More moderate opponents of trade with the Communists did speak out against the wheat sale, but not with the vehemence which has become characteristic of public discussion of the emotion-charged issue.

Perhaps the advantages of this particular deal with the Soviet Union so clearly outweighed the disadvantages that the customary foes of trade with the Communists were reluctant to speak up. Such reticence should not be expected, however, as the Nation begins a discussion of what the next step should be.

President Kennedy did not specify, of course, that there would be any next step. He said the wheat—perhaps 200 million bushels or more than a fifth of the Nation's surplus stocks—will be sold for American dollars or gold, "cash on delivery" or under "normal commercial" terms. Private dealers will handle the sale, he said. No sales will be made to Cuba or Communist China (though it would be most difficult to police any transfer of U.S. wheat from Russia to either country, of course).

The sale will reduce the balance-of-trade deficit and provide income for Americans, the President said. It would be foolish, he argued, for the United States to prohibit direct sales to Russia when friendly countries can buy American grain, mill it into flour, and sell it to the Communist countries.

The Nation as a whole obviously would benefit from the sale, the President declared.

Even before the President spoke, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee decided to review some congressional restrictions on agricultural and nonstrategic trade with Communist countries.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the committee, said "clearly a majority" of the committee favored the wheat sale in a closed-door discussion yesterday with Secretary of State Dean Rusk. He said the committee voted to reexamine some of the barriers against trade with Red nations which Congress has imposed in the past.

The United States has carried on little trade with Communist countries for years. U.S. export to the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries amounted to $415 million in 1962, not much more than 1 percent of the total U.S. foreign trade. The U.S. imports from Communist countries were valued at $136 million in 1962.

Some Eastern European nations have been attempting to expand trade with the United States, and the Kennedy administration has encouraged the tendency to some degree. Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia have been particularly interested in negotiating a bigger trade volume.

Other free world nations have been applying pressure constantly upon the United States to relax its trade restrictions against Communist nations. The United States has attempted in turn to persuade its allies to join in a boycott against trade with the Reds. Congress even forbade foreign aid payments to allies which disregard U.S. wishes in this matter, though the legislation included escape hatches for the President to exercise his own judgment. The United States never actually has withheld foreign aid under these restrictions laid down in the 1951 Battle Act, but these and other prohibitions certainly tended to limit trade with the Communists.

However, the trend in other Western nations toward increased trade in nonstrategic goods with the Communists is forcing the United States to take a new look at its position. Trade with Cuba and Red China still is strictly avoided. The United States finds it difficult to maintain an adamant stand against trade with Russia and some of the Eastern satellites, however, when its closest allies are expanding their trade steadily.

The availability of big markets for products now in surplus supply in this country creates steady pressure on the United States to trade. So does the continuing outflow of gold. So does the more reasonable and friendly attitude of the Kremlin toward the United States as exemplified by Russia's acceptance of U.S. terms for the limited nuclear test ban treaty and the Soviets' increasingly bitter quarrel with Red China.

These pressures certainly will not lead immediately to abolishment of trade barriers. The market in the Communist countries may prove to be limited and temporary in many cases. The Soviet Union has stipulated in the past that it would seek much tougher terms for trade than those embodied in the wheat deal—insisting upon credit instead of cash payment, for example. The trade climate could change for the worse at almost any time.

However, the wheat transaction certainly will provide a testing ground for the idea of expanding Soviet-American trade. If the experiment proves successful, the United States doubtless will take some other cautious steps in the same direction. The United States should remain alert against duplicity and deception, but it will not reject without examination opportunities to turn an honest dollar.

[From the Parma (Idaho) Review]

WHEAT SALE MAY BE ANOTHER STEP

The question of whether or not the United States will sell some $200 million in wheat to the Soviet Union will be decided in the next few days. At this stage of the game it looks very much as if the decision will be made to do so.

Canada's selling grain to Russia seems to have broken the ice as far as commerce of that nature is concerned. This country has been fighting a, more or less, losing battle to keep our allies from selling various types of goods to Russia and to Cuba. Amazingly enough, however, the reaction of the general public to Canada's trade with the Red bloc has not been near as violent as one might expect.

Now there is the definite possibility that we, too, may sell grain to Russia. The advantage of getting rid of some of our large supply of wheat and at the same time improving our financial position in the world markets—the idea is to sell the wheat for cash or gold—is obvious.

There is also the more idealistic or humane point of view, rather than the political or economic. It is a fact that Russia needs wheat to feed her people and since we are opposed to the Russian philosophy of government, not her people, we should, perhaps, sell the grain for purely humane reasons.

This opportunity to sell wheat to Russia may be another small step to easing the cold war and eventually bringing about a lasting peace. Certainly all angles should be investigated to bring this about.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

CAPITALIST QUID, COMMUNIST QUO

Without wishing to be dogmatic about a difficult question, we think the President is right and his critics wrong on selling wheat to Russia.

The proposed deal appears to be about as straightforward a business as can be done with the Soviet Union. The American sellers are private merchants; the terms are cash and short-term credit. The Russians need the wheat. We can use both the payments and the reduction of the huge wheat glut; to some extent the taxpayer stands to benefit. In short, the economic essentials of sound trade seem to be present.

The fact that the price is subsidized has, as Mr. Kennedy noted at his press conference, nothing to do with trading with Russia. It would be the same no matter to whom we sold; the American producers rather than the Russians get the subsidy. That the subsidy system is wrong is not an indictment of this particular trade but of our whole misguided farm policy.

Most of the objections, of course, center on the purported political implications of the matter. Why, it is asked, should the United States aid its enemies, especially at a time when their agricultural troubles are exposing anew the failures of Communist economics?

First, we rather doubt that $250 million worth of wheat can enhance Russia's war potential. For a short war, it may be assumed the potential is already formidable; for a long war the Kremlin would presumably want far larger agricultural reserves than the United States is likely to provide. Increased trade in other goods, now under discussion, could also be safely undertaken so long as we stop short of weapons and materials directly related to military production.

As for the idea that selling the wheat somehow helps Russia conceal its farm problem, it is a contention that doesn't stand up too well. The Canadian, Australian and prospective U.S. deals have all been publicized in the world, and yesterday the Kremlin transmitted the news of the American decision to all Soviet newspapers. It can be argued that selling the wheat, thus showing that the Communists have to come to the capitalists, does more to emphasize their failures than would a refusal to sell.

At the same time, we don't put much stock in the probability of great political benefits flowing from this deal. It may be, as Mr. Kennedy suggests, that the trade fits in with the generally more relaxed East-West atmosphere. But on the fact of it, the explanation would seem to be the more simple one that right now the Russians are hard up for wheat.

In any case, so far it is best to keep fingers crossed about any new era of good feeling with the Soviet Union—without worrying unduly that trading with Communists must mean feeding communism.

Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture on the Soviet wheat transaction:

STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON SOVIET WHEAT TRANSACTION

The undersigned, as individual Congressmen and as members of the House Committee on Agriculture, regret deeply that the President has seen fit to approve the sale of subsidized wheat to the Soviet Union.

We oppose this action because we believe trading with the enemy is morally wrong.

With the President's announcement, we have destroyed our position of moral leadership. How can we hope to stiffen free world resistence to communism? How can we expect other countries to cooperate in our embargo of Cuba?

We oppose this action because it clearly is in direct contradiction to the expressed will of the U.S. Congress, as embodied in the Latta amendment in the Agricultural Act of 1961. This amendment expresses the firm opposition of Congress to the sale of tax-subsidized farm commodities to Soviet Russia.

We oppose this action because we believe the vast majority of American farmers, like the vast majority of all Americans, are unwilling to sell out a high moral principle, even for solid gold.

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania; CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Maine; DON L. SHORT, North Dakota; CATHERINE MAY, Washington; DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio; RALPH HARVEY, Indiana; PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois; RALPH F. BEERMANN, Nebraska; EDWARD HUTCHINSON, Michigan.

Anti-Communist Activities by Americans of Baltic Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the policy of the Kennedy administration is to embrace the Communist governments of Russia and Eastern Europe with complete disregard for the historical facts of life, I am pleased to note that legitimate anti-Communist activities of American patriotic groups are continuing.

I direct the attention of the Members of the House to a report on anti-Communist activities by Americans of Baltic origin which I have received from the Estonian National Committee, which I place into the RECORD at this point:

THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N.Y., September 1963.

The Estonian National Committee in the United States, as the duly elected representative body for American-Estonians in this country, a large percentage of whom are political refugees, likes to make herewith public a grievance, which profoundly disappoints Americans of Baltic origin and should be a concern for every American citizen, who treasures firm conviction that the American people, with its traditions of freedom and justice, should make the liberation of all the captive nations by any and all peaceful means a keystone of our country's foreign policy.

One of the effective and peaceful ways to keep the quest for freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain, is to broadcast them truthful information from the free world by the radio.

Therefore we strongly disapprove of and protest against the decision to discontinue all funds, provided so far by an officially unmentioned U.S. agency, for the anti-Communist radio broadcasts in Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian languages from Madrid, Spain, over the Radio Nacional de Espana. These funds have been granted and made available annually with a minimum of redtape for almost a decade now. The total sum for all three Baltic broadcasts has so far only slightly exceeded $60,000 per year. Evidently the ostensible reason for this fund termination cannot be economical, because this vital subsidy does not even transcend an annual salary of a good baseball player. One has, therefore, to assume that this move should be politically motivated, probably to appease the Kremlin masters. The Communists hate those broadcasts from Madrid, edited by well-informed and experienced editors, and therefore are always jamming their reception. Significantly enough, the watered-down broadcasts by the Voice of America to Estonia and anywhere else in the U.S.S.R. are lately not jammed at all.

In Africa and Asia—outside the Iron Curtain—we do support freedom and independence practically for every unknown village and we are spending untold millions of dollars to further this cause. We are even stretching our traditional friendship with some of our trustworthy and best allies to enforce in some instances seemingly premature independence to many underdeveloped and primitive tribes. At the same time many of ancient and civilized nations in Eastern Europe, enslaved by the Russian imperialism, have been shamelessly left alone almost without any concern of ours. Because freedom is indivisible, we should insist in its promotion everywhere, regardless of place or parties.

Some people might argue: Why should anybody be bothered with the problem of keeping Estonian broadcastings alive, this nation being so small—just little over a million people. But those "experts" forget the fact that Estonians are very closely related, also linguistically, with multiple Finno-Ugrian nationality groups all over the northern part of Soviet Russia. Furthermore, our kins in Finland and Hungary are also interested in the continuation of those Estonian broadcasts.

Our committee would very much appreciate your help, bringing these comments to the attention of proper governmental authorities and requesting that this grave matter be given serious consideration and that every effort be made for the continuance of radio broadcasts in Estonian language.

We are convinced that the continuance of these anti-Communist radio broadcasts from Madrid is in the best interest of the United States and the entire free world, who should not forget, that we all are partially responsible for the destiny of so many enslaved nations.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Dr. Romaine P. Mackie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently this House passed some legislation which will provide additional training of personnel and services for handicapped children. No program is better than the leadership at the top wants to make it. It is dependent on those who have the knowledge, the train-

ing, the experience to administer the program wisely and understandingly.

Today, I want to pay my respects to Dr. Romaine P. Mackie, who has brought wisdom and understanding to one of the agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Mackie is a national and international leader in the education of handicapped children. Since 1954 she has been Chief of the Unit on Exceptional Children and Youth in the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In that capacity she is concerned with aiding the schools of the Nation in providing suitable educational opportunities for about 6 million exceptional children of school age. These include some with mental retardation, some with physical handicaps, such as impaired vision or hearing, and others with serious emotional disturbances or social maladjustments. She is also concerned to some extent with the education of the highly gifted.

BACKGROUND

Dr. Mackie has had wide experience in the education of all types of exceptional children. In her native State of Ohio, she began her work as teacher of the mentally retarded and served as principal of a school for crippled children. Later in New York City, she conducted teacher education programs both at Teachers College, Columbia University, and at Hunter College of the city of New York. Prior to coming to the Office of Education as a specialist in 1947, she served as consultant in education of the handicapped in the California State Department of Education. Thus, she brought to the Office of Education a unique experience in State and local school systems as well as college and university teaching in the field of special education.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

When Dr. Mackie became Chief of the Section on Exceptional Children and Youth in 1954, she was the only professional person on the staff. In 1956, a specialist in the education of the mentally retarded was added. Since that time several other specialists have joined the staff. Working together, these staff members gave assistance on current and crucial issues in the field of special education.

When Dr. Mackie first came to the Office of Education, only about one-third of the State education agencies had even one specialist concerned with handicapped children on their staffs. Thus, she gave much attention to the problems of States with limited staffs or no staffs at all, at a time when State education agency programs were developing. In 1963, every State has at least one person on its staff concerned with the education of handicapped children.

During the years from 1947 until the present, Dr. Mackie and her staff, as others were added, gave consultation and provided information to the State education agencies on specialized State legislation, financing patterns, personnel qualifications, and other related matters. At the same time, she also worked with national organizations having a specialized program interest in one or more types of exceptionality, such as the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the National Association for Retarded Children.

As early as 1952, Dr. Mackie singled out as the most critical issue in special education the need for securing more and better qualified special educators. She launched and directed, with the aid of outside assistance, a massive study on the "Qualification and Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children." This was conducted with the aid of 15 national committees and about 2,000 teachers and other specialists who gave information through questionnaires. In addition, both large and small information conferences contributed to the study which resulted in the publication of 13 Office of Education bulletins. Two of these bulletins were status reports which helped to provide some of the information sought by Members of Congress in relation to pending bills which finally became Public Law 85-926, Expansion of Teaching in the Education of the Mentally Retarded. The other publications resulting from this extensive study were concerned with competencies needed by special educators such as teachers of the deaf or teachers of the mentally retarded. These reports are aimed at improving the quality of the professional standards and preparation of teachers of handicapped children. Since the beginning of this study, Dr. Mackie has continued to work closely with colleges and universities having programs for the professional preparation of teachers of handicapped children.

In the Office of Education, Dr. Mackie has helped to formulate and direct an information service on the education of various types of exceptional children which is used not only nationally but also internationally. This service includes statistical as well as descriptive and opinion information.

In recent years, Dr. Mackie has given much of her time to the development of Office of Education grant programs which aid the handicapped. The first of these was that part of the Office of Education cooperative research program pertaining to the mentally retarded. She had administrative responsibility for this during fiscal year 1957 when the apropriation provided earmarked funds for research in the education of the mentally retarded. In fiscal year 1960, she carried the major responsibility for launching the fellowship program in the education of the mentally retarded authorized by Public Law 85-926. Since that time she has recruited and supervised the staff responsible for the administration of this highly successful program. Under this program, several hundred graduate fellowships have been granted for the preparation of persons who will engage in leadership positions in the education of the mentally retarded. More recently, she has aided in the scholarship program for the education of the deaf authorized by Public Law 87-276.

INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Internationally, Dr. Mackie's contributions in her field of special education have been numerous and outstanding. During the summer of 1963, she presented a major address at an International Seminar on Special Education in Denmark, under the sponsorship of the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled. She is currently a member of the World Committee on Education of this organization. In 1960 she was a member of the U.S. official delegation to the Conference on Public Education sponsored by UNESCO and the International Bureau of Education. One of the special topics for that year was "Education of the Mentally Deficient." She has been a representative of the U.S. Government or of the Office of Education at other international conferences which took place in Puerto Rico, Stockholm, and Geneva. She went on a special mission in relation to the education of blind children to Libya and other points in the Near East. She has recently served in several capacities in formulating plans for international conferences in the United States. Examples are the Eighth World Congress of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples in 1960, and more recently, the International Congress on Education of the Deaf held in Washington, D. C., in June 1963.

AWARDS AND CITATIONS

A distinguished educator, author, and Government administrator, Dr. Mackie is listed in Who's Who of American Women. She holds citations and awards from such organizations as the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, the National Epilepsy League, and the Boy Scouts of America. From 1936 to 1939, she was awarded teaching fellowships at Teachers College, Columbia University, where she studied education of the handicapped. She is a member of Pi Lambda Theta, a women's honorary society in education, and numerous other professional organizations. She has been active in the American Association of University Women, a member of the National Council of Administrative Women in Education, and was a charter member of the Columbus (Ohio) Quota Club. Since 1956, she has been a member of the Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. She has directed conferences during the past year concerned with the implementation of the recommendations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. One of these was a conference of representatives of national organizations having an interest in at least one area of exceptionality; another was a conference of special education staff members from State education agencies.

Dr. Mackie holds degrees from Ohio Wesleyan University, Ohio State University, and has her Ph. D. from Columbia University. How fortunate we are to have Dr. Mackie as a public servant dedicated to the work of educating handicapped children. We still have much to do, but I hope that under her continuing leadership, much greater progress can be made and the lives of hundreds of thousands of children will be enriched because of her love and devotion.

Address of Hon. Douglas Dillon Before the American Bankers Association, October 8, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, before the American Bankers Association meeting in Washington on October 8, 1963.

Secretary Dillon's remarks emphasize the financial responsibility of this administration. The record of cutting unnecessary expenditures without endangering needed programs is impressive; we are still moving ahead. The tax bill will provide further incentive to business when it is enacted and the outlook is good for an improved balance of payments.

Secretary Dillon's address follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1963

It is an honor and a privilege to be with you today, as you reach the climax of this centennial year of the dual banking system. It is certainly unnecessary for me to relate the vast contributions which banking leaders and their institutions have made to the growth of our Nation. Suffice it to say that the American economy could never have achieved the amazing results of the past century, had it not been for the foresight, courage, and sheer competence that has characterized our banking leaders. Service to the Nation has always been high among your objectives, and, today, I want to pay particular tribute to the service which bankers throughout the Nation render their communities and their country in supporting the U.S. savings bonds program. On the occasion of this centennial celebration it seems particularly appropriate to present you with a formal expression of our appreciation. It is a citation which reads as follows:

"The Treasury Department gratefully acknowledges the outstanding leadership and public service support of the American Bankers Association and its members on behalf of the U.S. savings bonds program * * * and offers its congratulations upon the observance of the 100th anniversary of the dual banking system * * * Given under my hand and seal this 8th day of October 1963."

Mr. Kimbrel, I ask you to accept this token of our thanks on behalf of the association and all of its members.

And now I have an equally pleasant task—this one concerning your newly elected president, Mr. William F. Kelly. Each year it has been our custom to invite the incoming president of the American Bankers Association to serve as a special "ambassador of good will" for the savings bonds program.

Accordingly, Mr. Kelly, I am pleased to appoint you our special ambassador—in the hope that you will wish to carry on our mission wherever you may travel, in the great tradition of ABA presidents throughout the years.

We are meeting here at a time when our Nation is making critical economic decisions on both the international and domestic fronts. At home, we face the task of closing the deficits in employment, output, and in the Federal budget. Abroad, we face the problem of ending the troublesome deficits in our international accounts. None of these problems is isolated. Each impinges upon the other. It is this interrelationship that I would like to consider with you today.

The most striking characteristic of our balance-of-payments deficit is that it does not fit into the classic mold, in which a pattern of inflation and overconsumption at home brings with it a growing excess of imports over exports. Instead, we have unemployment in manpower, plant, and machines, along with stable price levels, and, in our foreign trade, a sizable export surplus.

It is against that unusual background that we have had to develop new approaches to reduce and eventually eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit while at the same time promoting domestic expansion. In so doing, we have been guided by two principal convictions:

First, that we must achieve our goals by working within the framework of a free market economy, with market disciplines and incentives providing the basic motive force. Only in this way can we arrive at solutions consistent with our own traditions, with freer trade between nations, and with the central role of the dollar as a world currency.

Second, we are convinced that a proper mix of fiscal, monetary, and debt management policies will make it both possible and practical for the United States to achieve our domestic and international goals simultaneously. Indeed, we are convinced that these goals can, and must, be mutually reinforcing.

From the very start of this administration, the central and crucial element in our approach to the payments problem has been our program to provide fresh incentives for American business through tax reductions. President Kennedy made the reduction of business taxes a first and urgent step shortly after he took office. This program was implemented last year with the 7-percent investment tax credit and the liberalized tax treatment of depreciation. These two measures together reduced business tax liabilities last year by an estimated $2.5 billion. The tax program now before the Congress would bring the total business tax reduction to almost $5 billion a year. That, together with individual tax reductions of almost $9 billion a year, will do much to spur our economy forward and will greatly increase both the profitability and the volume of business investment.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how essential the tax program is: The President has called his tax proposals the most important domestic economic measure in 15 years. Your own association has endorsed the tax cut as one of the prime prerequisites for reaching balance in our international payments by increasing business incentives and investment. Tax reduction this year has the enthusiastic support of the business community, of labor, and of our leading economists, who recognize that only by revising our outmoded tax structure and relaxing its grip upon incentives and growth, can we move decisively toward both internal and external strengthening of our economy.

To speak only of our balance-of-payments difficulty, there is no question but that the added investment that will flow from the present tax program—together with the heightened investment already created as a result of last year's tax measures—would further advance the productive efficiency of American industry. Only an efficient, expanding American industry will be capable of rapidly incorporating new technology into new plant and equipment and of maintaining our traditional leadership in the introduction of new products; of nurturing, in short, the very elements that must serve as the foundation of our export effort.

And, as we move toward full employment, with investment expanding under the twin stimuli of greater demand and greater profitability, the call on our capital markets will become heavier, longer term interest rates can be expected to rise, and savings that have been flowing abroad will once more find ample investment outlets here at home.

Only within such a framework of a prosperous and rapidly growing America can we find a sound and permanent solution to our balance-of-payments problems. No one is more aware of that fact than you here today.

You are, however, deeply and rightly concerned by the fact that the intitial impact of tax reduction will come at a time when we are experiencing large budget deficits. I would like, therefore, to deal with this question at some length.

First, may I emphasize the fact that, by generating greater economic activity, the tax cut will increase Government revenues. I am sure you remember very well how taxes were sharply cut in 1954 and within 2 years revenues exceeded pre-tax-cut levels. Not only was that no isolated instances, but it reflected the consistent experience this country has had with major tax cuts throughout this century. It reflected, for example, the experience of Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon, who said in a statement before the House Ways and Means Committee—and I quote:

"In spite of the very sweeping reductions carried by the 1924 act * * * we will collect in 1925 more money at lower rates than we collected in 1923 at higher rates."

In short, after a brief transitional period, cutting taxes means greater revenue—not less. It was so in the 1920's. It was so in 1954. And it will be so after we adopt this year's tax bill.

But if we are to take full advantage of rising Federal revenues in a more rapidly expanding economy, then both the administration and the Congress must exert a continuing, careful, and judicious control over expenditures. An intensified program of expenditure control is an integral part of the tax bill, which states, in section I, that both Congress and the President must join in "taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending," if we are to obtain "balanced budgets in the near future."

The President, Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, and the House of Representatives in endorsing their views, have all made it unmistakably clear that, by adopting the tax bill, the Nation will be choosing "tax reduction instead of deliberate deficits as the principal means of boosting our economy"—that they consider these courses mutually exclusive and will not follow both at the same time—that, in short, the tax bill represents a major decision to rely upon greater private spending rather than greater Government spending as the prime factor in our economic growth.

The President has emphatically committed the administration to a course of intensive expenditure control, not only by his repeated pledges over the past 9 months, but by his record of efficient administrative management.

Certainly the budget has increased over the past 3 years. But the great bulk of that increase is accounted for by the sharp step-up in our defense and space needs—and by increasing interest costs that are in large part the reflection of responsible debt management policies and of our efforts to stem the outflow of short-term funds.

Outside of the heavy impact of these three items upon our budget, expenditures over the last 3 years have grown only moderately, judged against the needs of our expanding population. One simple fact should make that point abundantly clear: when you in-

clude the 1964 budget as submitted by the President, and before any reductions that may occur as a result of congressional action, then—apart from defense, space, and interest on the debt—the total increase in all other expenditures during the first 3 years of this administration will be $4.5 billion one-half billion less than the increase in these same items during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961—a period during which the Government was not often accused of extravagance.

In the light of that record, we can also take encouragement from the improvement in our immediate budgetary outlook. As you know, the fiscal 1963 deficit dropped from an estimated $8.8 billion to an actual $6.2 billion. Including the effect of the tax cut as approved by the House of Representatives, we now expect the current 1964 deficit to be less than the $9.2 billion forecast last January before allowance for the tax cut—and far less than the $11.9 billion originally foreseen after allowing for the tax cut.

In addition, the President has said that, in the absence of any unforeseen economic downturn or international crisis over the next few months, he expects to submit a fiscal 1965 budget with a deficit smaller than the $9.2 billion originally forecast for this year without a tax cut. In other words, despite the fact that fiscal 1965 tax revenues will reflect a major part of the tax cut—$7 billion—the projected fiscal 1965 budget will involve a lower deficit than that originally estimated for fiscal 1964 before any allowance for tax reduction.

That much, at least, should be heartening to anyone—whether or not he agrees with every policy or program recommended by the administration. And whether or not one agrees with every cut or every appropriation the Congress has made, we can also take note of the recent prediction by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, that this year's appropriations will be held below last year's total for the first time since the end of the Korean war. Appropriations, of course, govern expenditures, as money must be appropriated before it can be spent. Therefore the true and sensible way to measure expenditure control is to look at current appropriation totals rather than at expenditure totals, which are largely predetermined by earlier appropriations.

In any given year some 40 percent of expenditures flow from funds appropriated in preceding fiscal years. For instance, last year, fiscal 1963, we spent $92.6 billion but new appropriations amounted to $101.6 billion, or $9 billion more than we spent. That is why expenditures are increasing this year to some $98 billion and why a moderate further increase is likely in fiscal 1965 even if current appropriations are held below last year's $101.6 billion level.

Expenditure control is, of course, the joint responsibility of the President and the Congress. The President must exercise it in proposing his programs and his budget, as well as in carrying out and administering programs atuhorized by Congress. He does not, however, have—as some have implied—the latitude to whittle expenditures at will to meet short-run and arbitrary expenditure ceilings. At first glance, for example, it might seem feasible to realize substantial savings through the Commodity Credit Corporation. But CCC sales and purchases depend upon farmers' decisions, the weather, the crops, and other unpredictable or uncontrollable factors. And, to take another example, it would be the worst form of false economy to cancel or delay needed Defense or other programs which involve, as is usually the case, commitments and contracts already authorized, obligated, and well underway.

The only way to assure true control of expenditures is for both the President and the Congress to join in a continuing and complementary effort. That joint and continuing effort is exactly what section I of the tax bill pledges.

We must, however, live with temporary deficits during the period when the tax cut is taking hold. While these deficits are certainly no cause for complacency, neither should we take them as cause for alarm.

I think it is now well understood by informed observers both at home and abroad that deficits need not be inflationary when there is persistent unemployment and excess capacity. That has, in fact, been our experience over the past 6 years. The rapid rise in industrial production cost that characterized the first postwar decade has come to an end. Year-to-year increases in wage rates are now within the range of productivity increases, and overall unit labor costs in our manufacturing industries have actually declined during the current period of business expansion.

But if the short-run prospect is one we can view with sober confidence, this can in no way excuse us from concern over the longer lasting monetary and financial effects of our deficits—and from pursuing with increasing vigor and vigilance policies to assure that we are not today sowing the seeds for future trouble. And that depends on how we finance the deficit. Let me cite briefly from our record.

Since January of 1961, the Federal Reserve has not supplied a single additional dollar of reserves to the banking system for the purpose of facilitating Treasury finance. Commercial bank holdings of Government securities have actually declined by almost $2 billion from January 1961 through August 1963. Over that period the entire deficit has been financed outside the commercial banks.

The total of under 1 year Treasury debt in the hands of the public has increased by only $2.7 billion, or about 3 percent, since January 1961, while the economy has grown by about 17 percent. At the same time the growth in total liquid asset holdings—including not only money and short-term Treasury debt, but also the enormous increases in time and savings funds—has been roughly in line with gross national product, as it properly should be in line with the growing needs of the economy.

Government debt maturing beyond 5 years is now more than $20 billion greater than it was in January 1961—an amount considerably larger than the total increase in our marketable debt. And our debt due in 25 years or more is now $6.3 billion greater. As a result the average length of the marketable debt has been increased from 4 years and 6 months in January 1961 to 5 years and 3 months at the present time—the highest level since mid-1956. This record clearly shows that we have succeeded in financing our deficits in a manner calculated to avoid future inflationary troubles.

We thus have every ground for pushing ahead rapidly with the tax cut in order to improve both our economic performance here at home and our balance of payments. That expanding economic activity and productivity at home is the key to solving our balance-of-payments problem—and that the tax cut is the key to both—was cogently recognized in the balance-of-payments statement of your association earlier this year. It recommended "the enactment, in this session of Congress, of an across-the-board reduction in personal and corporate tax rates designed to improve the climate for direct business investment in this country, strengthen the prospects for cost-price stability, and restrain the large outflow of private long-term capital."

Your statement clearly underscores the urgency of the tax cut as a measure to sharpen the competitive edge of American business and help expand our exports, as well as a measure to make our economy continually more attractive for both foreign and domestic investment. Of equally great importance, the tax cut will, as the President stated last week before the International Monetary Fund, "give greater freedom to monetary policy" in meeting our balance-of-payments requirements.

Your balance-of-payments statement also emphasized the need to reduce the dollar drain of Government expenditures abroad. Only a few days after the appearance of your statement, the President, in his balance-of-payments message of July 18, announced his approval of a detailed program to reduce our dollar expenditures overseas by $1 billion a year. This program is already underway and will be fully effective by the end of next year.

But these long-term efforts to achieve balance in our international payments are not enough. We must also step up our efforts to keep current deficits to a minimum. Over the past several years, as you know, Treasury debt management policies have played a major role in bringing upward pressures to bear upon our short-term rates, while still maintaining a ready availability of long-term funds. In July of this year, the Federal Reserve reinforced this policy by raising the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, regulation Q was revised to permit banks to compete more effectively for time deposits of 90 days or longer. These actions have proved decidedly beneficial in improving the relationship between our rates and those abroad, thus helping to reduce the outflow of short-term capital.

In the area of long-term capital outflows, we have proposed a temporary interest equalization tax on purchases of foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. We took this step with the greatest reluctance. But the situation was grave. During the first half of this year the volume of new foreign security issues purchased by Americans reached unprecedented levels. At an annual rate of $2 billion, that volume was well over three times the annual average from 1959 to 1961, and was almost double the 1962 figures. It accounted for substantially all the deterioration in our balance of payments during the first half of this year. And, at the time of our announcement, the volume of new issues in prospect, the large majority for borrowers in countries with strong balance-of-paments positions, was just as forbidding.

The advantage of the proposed tax is that it can achieve the required temporary lessening of foreign demands upon our capital markets while leaving the market mechanism intact. Under the tax, it is the impersonal operation of price—not any artificial or arbitrary force—that would work to curtail our long-term outflows.

This tax, as I said last week before the International Monetary Fund, is "a necessary—but temporary—expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world." It is not a long-term measure, but an interim step which we must take while our long-term measures become effective and while other industrial countries make the necessary effort to strengthen and improve their own capital markets.

There are clear signs that these two actions, higher short-term interest rates and the proposed interest equalization tax, are having the desired results. The first preliminary figures indicate that our third quarter deficit will be no more than half as large as the second quarter results. While it will be another 2 months before detailed figures, pinpointing the areas of improvement are available, only capital flows are capable of such rapid shifts.

Despite this shortrun improvement, it is still clear that eventual success in achieving a steady balance in our international pay-

ments must rest upon our ability to achieve greater industrial efficiency, to utilize more of our savings at home, and to maintain price stability. Our price performance over the past 5 years, our progress in bringing costs under effective control, and our firm resolve to maintain responsible monetary and debt management policies offer assurance against any resurgence in inflationary pressures.

We cannot, therefore, let anything restrain us from adopting the tax reduction bill this year. We cannot burden down with restrictions the very measure that will free our economy from the burdens of a restrictive tax system—we cannot dally until it is too late over a measure that we urgently need now. Our productive potential is unparalleled. The tax bill will give us the expanding economy and heightened incentives that will enable us to capitalize on that potential and achieve the still greater gains in output and productivity that we can—and must—have. With its enactment, and only with its enactment, can we look forward with confidence to solving our problems of unemployment, unutilized capacity, and budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits.

The Day They Hid $2 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, two very fine newspaper reporters from my congressional district had the privilege recently of visiting with our distinguished Speaker. During the course of their conversation with the Speaker they learned of the part that he had in the famous Manhattan project, which produced our first atomic bomb.

Bill Williams and Garland Atkins of the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette have written a most interesting article concerning their conversation with the Speaker. Their story was carried in the Gazette on Sunday, October 13, 1963.

Under leave previously granted I include their account of a very important event in the history of our Nation in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE DAY THEY HID $2 BILLION

(By Bill Williams and Garland Atkins)

Out on the floor of the House of the United States of America, a rollcall was in progress.

The question: Whether or not to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another year.

The reader of the House was polling the Members and repeating after them their desires as to how they wished to be recorded. It was not a necessarily important vote and there was considerable banter among the Members as they shuffled among the seats of the House.

JOHN MCCORMACK, House Speaker, had come down from his high position at the rostrum and had wound his way through the maze of doors and handshakers and was at the moment behind the glass-topped, polished desk in his office just across the hall.

His big hand extended a welcome to two reporters from North Carolina, "a fine State," he said, "and you have a fine Representative here." He nodded to BASIL WHITENER who had just introduced the members of the group.

JOHN MCCORMACK is a busy man, but he is never too busy to take time out to talk to citizens, not only from his home State of Massachusetts but from any of the States of the United States of America.

You look into his deep, brown eyes behind two bushes of eyebrows and you notice the almost serene expression on his face and you know that here is a man interested not only in the complex affairs of a great and complex nation but also in little poundings of individual hearts.

It is evident that he tries to leave a little of himself with everyone he meets.

To the two reporters from Gastonia and to the Congressman and his assistant, Herbert Lineberger, he left more than usual.

He opened the book of history and looked at a page in 1942 when one of the most momentous decisions in the life of this country was made. This is its first revelation. He said as much.

"It happened right here in the Speaker's office," he said. And then, with a sweep of his hand, he indicated the chairs in which the various participants of this decision sat.

"George Marshall was there," he said. "Sam Rayburn was sitting here where I am. Vannevar Bush was over there. JOE MARTIN was there. Henry Stimson was over there. And I was beside him."

At that time, Marshall was Chief of Staff, Bush was White House liaison officer, Manhattan (atomic energy) project, Rayburn was Speaker, McCormack was majority leader of the House, Stimson was Secretary of War, and Joe Martin was House minority leader.

"We had gathered here to talk about the Manhattan project," said MCCORMACK. (This was the project which developed the atomic bomb.) "It was necessary to decide on whether or not to spend $2 billion for this thing, and if we decided then we had to hide the expenditure somewhere to keep the Germans from knowing what we were doing."

The evening wore on as Marshall and Stimson briefed the other four men on the immensity of this undertaking—and on its possible effects on the war effort.

They came to the conclusion that the expenditure must be made. This decision they made in spite of the tremendous and devastating personal repercussions that would have come to each of them had the project not been successful and when the story came out—as it most certainly would have.

In the graying light of late afternoon, the decision was made. The appropriation of nearly $2 billion would be made. And it would be their secret as long as possible.

They soon discovered that this was not to be long. The Appropriations Committee smelled something unusual and began to ask questions. This committee had to be taken into confidence, and with the assistance of every member, the $2 billion was disguised under other appropriations—and few people knew the difference until the bomb had been dropped.

JOHN MCCORMACK is the grandfather type. He reminds you of a man who would take candy home not only for his own grandchildren, but the neighbor kids as well.

A messenger boy brought him a message scribbled on a piece of paper. He read it and got up.

"They need me on the floor," he said. "I guess you'll have to excuse me now."

In a moment, he was gone, taking long, loping strides down the hall of the Capitol, turning left through a door and then back right and to the floor of the House.

He climbed the steps to the Speaker's chair and took up the gavel. The hard sound of wood meeting wood crackled through the din of representatives talking.

"The House will be in order," he said. "The House will be in order."

It was time for another decision, and he would run the show while his colleagues voiced their opinions.

Twenty-three years ago, he helped to formulate one of the most important decisions of all time.

As it turned out, it was the right decision.

The Wheat Deal in the Context of the Cold War—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, in connection with brief remarks on the cold war implications of the wheat deal with the Soviet Union, I invited the attention of the House to a study entitled, "Economic Countermeasures: An Examination of the Role of Economic Power in World Conflict," prepared at the direction of the Office of Emergency Planning by the Stanford Research Institute and submitted to the executive branch in February 1962.

I believe it would be of interest to refer at this time to excerpts from chapter III of the report which are particularly pertinent to its later consideration of of the significance of food grains in cold war maneuverings for economic advantage.

It should be remembered that this report was completed in February 1962. In some respects, its observations are prophetic. In others, its data have been superseded. In offering the following excerpts, I should like to emphasize, as I did in my previous reference to this paper, that I might not subscribe fully to its recommendations, but I believe it remains a useful basis for discussion.

Excerpts from chapter III of the report follow:

CHAPTER III. THE USES OF ECONOMIC POWER

This inquiry is based on the premise that the West possesses two-thirds of the world's industrial capacity and its only food surpluses. With this immense preponderance there would seem to be little doubt that the way in which this power is used will be a major factor in determining the issues and outcome of the cold war. This premise does not affect the conviction that political and military policy expressed in a unified Western alliance and an effective military deterrent are not primary considerations. The political and military requirements are well understood. As the Herter-Clayton report said: "We assume there will be no hot war. We are thinking in terms of winning the cold one."

The fundamental issue posed by the report is economic in nature. The authors felt that, "There will probably be no shooting in Khrushchev's war. The Communists have a cheaper, shrewder way. They plan to take us alive, with all our assets intact." The military forces of the two great coalitions were, on the Herter-Clayton accounting, unlikely to be directly engaged. For the Communists, Korea was a bad precedent; Cuba was good. Korea was a costly enterprise; Cuba was acquired cheaply and effortlessly, indeed with American assistance.

"The declaration of Soviet economic hostilities against the non-Soviet world has been made. The immediate objective in this war

is the control of the contested countries, more than threescore and 10 in number. The ultimate objective is the control of the world. The struggle will be relentless, irreconcilable, merciless. The West need expect no quarter from the enemy. If Western determination is less than the Soviet bloc's, eventual Soviet triumph is assured."

* * * * *

The Herter-Clayton report may be construed to pose a new question. Was the Bay of Pigs episode—a politico-military operation—really necessary? Is it sound policy to sustain a Soviet satellite by economic measures while trying to bring it down by politico-military means? Should the West provide the necessary grain to permit Mao to maintain order among the urban population of mainland China while famine is widespread among the 80 percent of the population living in the rural areas?[1] Should Western ships carry essential products in and out of North Vietnam at a time when that country is engaged in subversive operations against Laos and South Vietnam?

* * * * *

A new set of premises must be defined if U.S. policy is to be soundly based. At a minimum, U.S. foreign economic policy must take into account the following propositions:

1. Soviet political and military objectives are unchanged. The bloc still aims at world conquest, but the road to world hegemony has taken a new course. After 1955, the focus of bloc interest shifted to the underdeveloped countries and an economic dimension was added to Communist policy, including a bloc foreign aid program.

2. The rise of the Common Market to primacy in the world trading community has created unique stresses in the Western community. The trade of the Six now exceeds that of either North America, the sterling area, or the entire underdeveloped area.

3. Japanese industrial resurgence and the industrial growth of Australia have provided the basis for a viable, non-Soviet community in the western Pacific—but only in close alliance with the West.

4. North America is no longer the main center and preponderant force in the world economy. Europe and Japan have learned the new modes of production that were so long a monopoly of the United States, while the U.S. industrial economy has been suffering from damaging obsolescence.

5. The underdeveloped countries, in contention between the West and the Sino-Soviet bloc, have never been weaker. Population growth and increasing dependence on external aid have increased political instability.

U.S. foreign economic policy must take account of at least these five basic realities of the world economic scene.

The United States is, in some degree, prepared to deal with the urgent requirements of the hot war threat—whether nuclear or conventional; it is still unprepared to deal with unconventional war, the main thrust of Soviet power, or the economic dimension of the cold war. A theory of economic countermeasures should, accordingly, take account of the two neglected areas: (1) The promotion of the conflict arising over declining supplies of food and space in the underdeveloped areas; and (2) the inhibition of Soviet exploitation of the world economic situation, in respect of intra-Western relations, East-West relations, and relations between the West and the contested countries.

The immediate objectives of economic countermeasures include at least the following:

1. To impose an economic burden or cost on the adversary;

2. To deny the availability of needed resources;

3. To prevent the transport of needed resources; and

4. To prevent the use of conventional means of payment.

* * * * *

There are three dimensions to the cold war—the political, the economic, and the military. Of the three, the United States has decisive preponderance only in the economic sector. If economic countermeasures are neglected, the underdeveloped countries—half the world's population and half the earth's surface—may well follow the course of Cuba.

In the next two sections of this report, two specific economic countermeasures have been outlined. The choice of machine tools and food, out of scores of possible alternatives, was dictated by a number of considerations. The importance of food resides, quite simply, in the fact that the United States possesses a preponderant position in the world food supply. The coercive force implicit in such a position will become clear if resolution is shown by use of other economic countermeasures, easier to apply. Food corresponds, in the ECM sector, to the ultimate weapon; it is the equivalent of strategic economic thermonuclear capability. It may also be used tactically, or diplomatically, to extract a useful quid pro quo. It will not be lightly used for strategic objectives, but it should be made clear that it is reserved for tactical or emergency use.

There should be no repetition of the postwar years, when U.S. possession of an atomic capability was unique and unused as nuclear blackmail. The effort made to establish the credibility of the nuclear threat was not successful. An overwhelming advantage was lost and a new balance of world power was established. The Santayana maxim is applicable: those who neglect the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them.

* * * * *

The conclusions that must be drawn from the economic history of the last 15 years is that: (1) the United States has not used its ultimate deterrents either in nuclear weapons, food, or technology, and (2) that the bloc has consistently benefited from this failure, while the West has suffered. The issues are only now beginning to emerge in clean, undeniable terms. The facts are accumulating. The bases for Government actions are now clear. In the light of these conditions, and in view of the need for deliberate and resolute action, the following opportunities are proposed. The West has an immense number of economic options open to it; the bloc has few or none. The West is largely unaware of these options; the bloc uses its few to the hilt.

The report chapter on machine tools, Mr. Speaker, merits consideration at another time. I should like now to include the first portion of the chapter on food grains, and I will hope for opportunity to offer the balance of the chapter later:

CHAPTER V. ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES: CASE 2, FOOD GRAINS

In any review of world economic relations, food necessarily occupies a central position. The role of food in an economic countermeasures system designed to support Western political and military policy is neglected and often misunderstood because this role is vexed by overhanging surpluses in a number of Western countries. The potential role of countermeasures in the food sector is of great importance, if only because North America and Australia are the only major areas of the earth in which there is a food surplus. Latin America is a deficit food area; Africa is a deficit food area; Eurasia, as a whole, is a deficit food area, as are the major non-Soviet peninsulas of Eurasia—Europe, South Asia, and southeast Asia.

North America and Australia now account for 95 percent of world grain exports, while before World War II these areas accounted for about half of a much smaller total. Before the war, the Sino-Soviet area was a major net exporting area, as were the less developed countries (LDC's) of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The era of continental self-sufficiency in cereal grains—which account for over two-thirds of caloric intake in the Sino-Soviet countries and the LDC's—ended with World War II, and has regressed continuously under the impact of the erupting world populations of the 1950's.

The following table shows the growth of population, compared with increases in cereal grain output for the three main areas:

Increases in population and grain output, 1935–59

[In millions]

Area	Population	Grain (metric tons)
West	90	110
Sino-Soviet	210	40
Less developed	450	50

The contrasts shown in the table are not, however, clear, or meaningful until it is mentioned that the entire increase in cereal grain output in the bloc and the LDC's came from expansion of cultivated acreage—often into arid, hilly, or otherwise unsatisfactory areas in which crop failures are frequent and often disastrous. The epic disaster of the last 3 years in China, while traceable in part to adverse natural conditions and rather more to the commune system, are nonetheless probably owing in large part to the expansion during the past decade of the cultivated area into increasingly marginal lands. In south Asia, extensive, and disastrous erosion is similarly apparent.

Accordingly, when the increases in cultivated acreage in the three areas are compared—75 and 100 million acres for the SSC's and LDC's, respectively, as against a decline of 5 million for the West—the import of the agricultural developments of the last quarter of a century becomes dramatically clear.

A comparison of per capita output for the three areas further clarifies the relation. In the West, output per capita approximated about 1,200 pounds in 1959; in the bloc, about 600 (if the unreliable Sino-Soviet data are taken); in the LDC's, about 370 pounds.

A final contrast among the areas will complete the comparisons that suffice to indicate the new role of food in the world economy. In the 25 years before 1960, Western grain yields increased over 50 percent—in the rest of the world, yields were up in only one or two of the best years of the 1950's.

In the foregoing summary (drawn from Department of Agriculture estimates submitted to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress) the preponderant role of North American and Australian grain surpluses in the world food economy clearly emerge. In effect, three nations are in position, in concert, to organize the world's food supply at the critical margins. In Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, Guatemala, and other Latin American countries, or in Pakistan, Indonesia, India, or the Middle East, and in Egypt and other African countries, the supply of cereal grains that makes the difference in the urban areas (the politically critical 30 percent of the population) between an adequate food supply and inadequacy are largely under the control of three countries.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Sino-Soviet world is not unaware of its Achilles' heel—food. Khrushchev's preoccupation with the agricultural problem is a measure of his awareness of the role of food and of the Communist failures in this sector. In his January 1961 address to the plenary session of the Central Committee of the CPSU, he stated that wheat output in the U.S.S.R. was 25 percent below and corn output 75 percent below requirements.

The termination of Chinese rice exports to the U.S.S.R. in 1959 began or enhanced the breach in Sino-Soviet relations because it was the beginning of a gross increase in the Chinese trade deficit with the U.S.S.R. Sino-Soviet trade since 1959 has become a Soviet nightmare of proportions exceeding even that of Hungary in the years since 1956. The Soviets have been able to carry Hungarian failures and deficits; they are unable to deal with the shortages of a population of 700 million.

This section considers the special food problems of the Soviet bloc area. This introductory note places the world food and agriculture situation in strategic perspective. In the final analysis, this is a production sector in which the United States, unilaterally, is able to alter world economic—and thereby, political and military—relations.

The United States, at any given time in the last 5 years, has been the only nation on earth able to export as much as 4 or 40 million tons of grain a year—the annual food ration of 20 or 200 million people. In the LDC's, the urban populations amount to roughly 400 millions, a number that compares to the urban population of the bloc area. Accordingly, the withholding of U.S. food supplies would create grave disturbances throughout the world community; Australian and Canadian grain would go to Europe and Japan—even the allied nations of the West would be in deficit. The United States, unequivocally, possesses control of the critical margin of the world's food supply.

The problem of the critical food margin is not understood in the predonderantly urban West. Persistent famine can exist for a relatively long period with a delayed threat of political upheaval only in a rural community, and this is one basis for the guerrilla warfare going on all over the world. Persistent starvation in a city, however, presents an immediate threat to the stability of the government. In the age of Maoist doctrine, rural famine is exploited and organized by the Communists to destroy governments. In the West, with its stabilized or declining rural populations and slow population growth rates, famine does not exist.[2]

World food supplies and their relation to political disturbances—in Africa, Latin America, South Asia, China, the USSR, and the European satellites (Eusats)—are better understood in the Sino-Soviet system than in the West. In the urban West, famine does not occur in rural areas, and shortages are manageable by rationing. In the USSR, which is approaching the status of a primarily urban community, shortages have been dealt with by jealously protected strategic reserves of food, and other essential resources. (As Vosnesensky observed in "History of the Great Patriotic War," in the "absence of reserves the law of value unleashes devastating effects," i.e., inflation tends to defeat controls imposed by the state.)

The existence of food shortages over large areas of mainland China has been apparent since 1959. This is evident in official ration reports which determine average yearly consumption levels per capita for grain and potatoes. In 1957 the ration was 210 kilograms; in 1959 it had dropped to 166 kilograms; in 1960 there was a further reduction to 129 kilograms; that is, in 1960 about 1.1 pounds per day, or about 1,300 calories per day from grain alone, with a total caloric intake of roughly 1,500 per day, as compared with about 1,600 calories from grain alone and about 1,900 calories per day from all sources in 1959.[3]

It seems probable that the lowest official ration was in effect for a short time, during a particularly severe shortage. If sustained over a long period, there is little doubt that the food riots prevalent in China during the last 3 years would have been more numerous, and perhaps unmanageable.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) estimates total production of all grains, pulses, roots, and tubers at 201 million metric tons for 1959, an estimate that includes other parts of Communist Asia. This suggests an average availability of somewhat less than 300 kilograms a year, only slightly less than estimated for the preceding year.[1] The circumstances are further complicated by the fact that Chinese cereal exports to non-Soviet areas amounted to about $90 million in 1959, 1 million tons or so. There were, as well, indeterminate but probably larger exports of rice to bloc countries, including Cuba.

Thus the situation in China is not clear in a statistical sense. If estimates of total output of the critical starch foods are correct, China is in a relatively more satisfactory position than in the prewar era. This is in sharp contradiction to the state of affairs indicated by official rationing orders and reports of escapees to Hong Kong. The massive import of Western grain in 1961 and the imports envisaged for 1962 may be construed as indicating a totally different situation from that suggested by USDA estimates. These imports are without precedent in Chinese history and impose heavy demands on scarce foreign exchange resources at a time when the industrialization program has high priority.

---

[1] As pointed out elsewhere in this report, grain from the West may alternatively be used to add to critically low or nonexistent reserves. In either case, Western grain supports an enemy economy.

[2] Famine is defined, usually, in highly relative terms. For our purposes, however, it will be taken to mean a persistent caloric intake at or below the accepted minimal level for a major part of a population.

[3] Wu, Yuan-li, et al. "Potentials and Projections of the Chinese Economy 1958 and Beyond," unpublished manuscript, Stanford Research Institute, 1962.

Wheat Sales to the Reds: Government by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I realize that individuals may honestly differ as to the merits of selling wheat to Russia and I have carefully evaluated arguments on both sides of this issue. I recall discussing with Secretary Freeman earlier this year, during the hearings on the agriculture appropriations bill, the effect of sales of surplus commodities abroad. Among other things Secretary Freeman stated:

Any country that seeks to make economic progress is going to need food, because they spend 80 to 90 percent of their income for food, and as soon as they have money in their pocket, they buy food. If the food is not there, they will have inflation. * * * That doesn't mean that is practical or reasonable or sensible to run a relief program for the world, far from it. Nor does any political leader I know in any country in the world want us to. Nor do they want to become that dependent on us. But somewhere in between these different motivations and these different interests, there develops a program that I think is increasingly becoming more constructive, both as a part of American agriculture and as a part of American foreign policy, and as a part of trying to add strength to the free world.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that statement I will have to assume that Secretary Freeman would be opposed to the sale of surplus commodities to Russia. It would be impossible to rationalize the sale of wheat to Russia as trying to add strength to the free world. Moreover, our Government should be preoccupied with the policy of proving to the world that the system of communism is not infallible. If Russia's agricultural practices result in inflation we can harm the cause of the Russian farmer who desires free enterprise by selling wheat to a government that has sworn to bury us. At this point I wish to include an editorial from the September 26, 1963, issue of the New York Journal-American:

GRAIN OF SENSE

To our neighbor Canada, a dollar is a dollar and nobody is fussy about the source. That is, as long as the amount of dollars is big enough. Thus we have the spectacle of a member of the Western alliance selling a half billion dollars' worth of wheat to the Soviet Union, part of which was known in advance to be earmarked for Castro's Cuba.

As a result of this deal, the largest ever for 1 year, U.S. wheat farmers, their congressional representatives and the "Let's-not-be-beastly-to-the-Communists" school have been whooping it up for relaxing our rules against selling to the Soviet.

We think selling wheat to the Soviet is a sacrifice of principle and a help to a foe who has sworn to bury us.

It would be far better to sell all the wheat possible to the Western European countries.

Western Europe, restored to prosperity by U.S. help, needs no charity and can pay the top price. These countries mostly have been trading with the Communists as they can, despite the fact that it helps the common foe. In so doing they have—ironically—acquired a lot of U.S. gold dollars which this country needs to balance our payments deficit.

The United States is a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement which prevents us from dumping our surplus wheat on the world market at this point. Since that pact makes it possible for the Canadians and such to trade with the enemy without punitive action by us, it seems logical that the United States should reconsider it when it comes up for renewal.

Not the least important aspect of the wheat deal is the proof that Soviet crop failures are much more castastrophic than the Russians admit because farmers won't produce adequately under the Communist system.

This may be the only way the Russian people can get back at their Communist masters. It makes no sense for the United States to help the tyrants off the hook.

Mr. Speaker, although some may differ as to the merits, I do not see how it is possible to differ on the legality of the sale. The Latta amendment to the 1961

Agriculture Act expressly prohibits the export or sale of subsidized U.S. farm commodities to nonfriendly nations. There can be no question as to the intent of this amendment. If President Kennedy wanted this law repealed, he should have come to Congress for approval—for article I, section 1 of the Constitution provides that—

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The ruling from the Attorney General, the President's brother, was a farce, and in the days ahead, the people of this country will come to realize that it had no basis in law. It reminds us that Attorney General Kennedy legally approved the transfer of tractors for Cuba to assist President Kennedy in his answer to Castro's prisoner bribe. It was not long, however, before the pressure of public opinion exposed that fraud on the judicial system of this country and the deal was called off.

Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. Chuck Dancey points out in his editorial of October 11, 1963, in the Peoria Journal Star, the American people are not stupid. The editorial follows:

PUTTING A GOOD FACE ON WHEAT DEAL

(By C. L. Dancey)

So we're selling wheat to the Soviet Union for the very good reason that if we don't according to the President, others will. He can back this up by the fact that others have done so in huge quantities.

Everybody knew we were going to. The delays came about in order, it would seem, to manage juggling the laws to get around them, and to put as good a face on it as possible.

Our Government is prohibited by law from such trade deals, but now they've got around that by juggling the Government-bought wheat into the hands of private traders and thence into the hands of the Soviets—who will get it for less money than our Government paid for it.

That little maneuver had to be arranged, although it wasn't too difficult for the President to get a favorable ruling from his brother, the Attorney General.

It is true that Canada and Australia have sold huge quantities of wheat to Russia, and we might as well pick up our $250 million and put a small dent in our surplus.

This thinking slides over the fact, however, that such a confession is a complete reversal of the role so impressively assumed by the President of the United States at his inauguration. He then proclaimed himself the "leader of the free world" and announced that he would be a real and effective leader thereof.

Now, we are told that the nations of Canada and Australia have compromised us and we have no choice but to follow their lead.

This situation comes less than a year after we had a row with the Conservative government in Canada that resulted in its ouster and replacement by a Liberal government friendly to U.S. policy.

The sour taste of the whole wheat situation climaxed by the wheat deal, itself, has a final sickly touch in the crude joke of the restriction against using our wheat for Cuba or China.

Obviously, with this wheat from us for their own use, the Russians can spare Canadian wheat for Cuba and Australian wheat for China.

Indeed, the way this whole thing was staged-managed, one wonders if the Russians didn't know in advance long before the President told us that they would get American wheat. For the early shipments of Canadian wheat were already directed to Cuba before he publicly anounced approval of the sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

With wheat for Russia and the satellites from the United States, they can send Australian wheat over the short haul to China more cheaply, as well as serve Cuba directly from Canada. We've just saved them from roundabout deliveries—and we present it under the cloak of a "restriction."

Why was all that fancy footwork necessary?

We had to sell the wheat as a practical matter. Everybody else is doing it. We've become such great leaders of the free world that we are now forced to fall in at the rear of the line. That is decisive enough.

Why try to dress it up, crudely, with a transparent pretense that it won't help Cuba, won't help China, and will hurt Russia to spend the money?

That is unnecessary, cheapening, and an insult to the intelligence of the people to whom it was addressed—the American people.

Some young "sharpie" was probably real proud of thinking up that bit of trickery.

Whoever it was may be a great angle-shooter, but he doesn't know much about the American people. They aren't stupid, but he obviously thinks they are very stupid indeed, to fall for that.

Help for Minority Party Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the question of adequate staff for congressional minority parties is receiving wide attention. Some of the house organs of our industrial companies are pointing out the advantage to the country which will ensue from adequate staff being provided to the minority. One such company paper is the Koppers News published by Koppers Co., Inc., industrial relations department, of Pittsburgh.

The editorial follows:

HELP FOR MINORITY PARTY SOUGHT

In order to do a professional job well, we all know it takes qualified people, and enough of them. For example, the activities of Congress require staffs of professional skills to research resolutions before they are introduced, to investigate pending bills, and to provide counsel on the worth and faults of legislation.

To the average citizen, the staff function of a political party may seem to be unimportant, yet it is a vital part of our system. It is particularly vital to whichever party is in the minority. When staffing is too heavily weighted on the side of the majority party, the necessary research and investigation conducted by the minority party is weakened.

Such a condition now exists in Washington. Professional committee staffs responsible to the Democrats outnumber similar staffs responsible to the Republicans by 11 to 1 in the House and by 12 to 1 in the Senate.

A more evenly distributed staff function is necessary, no matter which party is in the minority or in administration.

Now pending are two resolutions which suggest a 60–40 division of staffs. They are H.R. 143, introduced by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, and Senate Resolution 41, introduced by Senator WINSTON PROUTY, Republican, of Vermont.

Such a division of staff numbers and talent will provide your elected representatives with sufficient assistance to properly investigate legislation before it becomes law.

Letters written to your Congressman and Senator in favor of the proposed bills—H.R. 143 and Senate Resolution 41—may help them become a reality. If passed, the resolutions will erase the existing off-balance staffing and will assist in the needed scrutiny all resolutions should have.

What BPA Means to United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the Bonneville Power Administration have given it a secure and honored place in the economy of the Pacific Northwest, regardless of the criticism I read from time to time, both within and without the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From time to time, newspapers of differing political persuasions commend Bonneville Power Administration. The latest commendation was published as an editorial in the October 7 edition of the Portland, Oreg., Reporter. At one point in the editorial there is listed the purchases that BPA makes in many States. Some of the BPA critics live in these States. Under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD the following excerpts from this editorial:

WHAT BPA MEANS TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

During World War II many people realized that Bonneville Power Administration's Federal dams and lines made it possible to produce the aluminum which went into the warplanes over Hitler's blasted slaveland.

Ever since the war it has been more difficult to get across the national value of our regional asset, cheap Federal power. Many Americans do not even realize that the Federal projects, both dams and lines, are being paid ahead of schedule, for the present at least.

Many Americans have no idea what great contributions BPA makes toward irrigation. Not even the people of the Northwest stop to think what a different world they would live in without BPA.

Some idea of what all of the Northwest would be like without BPA may be obtained by comparing its healthy economic status to the stunted regions of Idaho which Idaho Power Co. has denied cheap power.

It is our claim that the whole country benefits from BPA's building up the Northwest. Our people are able to buy more products from all over the United States because of the prosperity Bonneville has brought here. And this region is able to offer the rest of the country cheaper and better products as a result of the boost to manufacturing that cheap power is.

BPA, itself, directly benefits the regional and national economy by doing a lot of buying of goods. During the past fiscal year BPA

bought $16,660,535 in supplies from 40 of the 50 States. It further contributed to our shipping industry, a basic one in the Columbia Basin, by purchasing in the same period $5,008,405 in supplies in foreign countries.

BPA's Oregon purchases were $2,702,846; Washington, $3,288,968; California, $3,406,-252; New York, $2,300,075; New Jersey, $677,-030; Pennsylvania, $824,833; Ohio, $603,734; Georgia, $508,842; and Michigan, $352,274.

U.S. Wheat Sale Takes Khrushchev Off Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's announcement concerning the sale of wheat to the Soviet bloc has evoked much comment. Many have voiced concern that such a basic change in our trade relations with the Communists has been undertaken by the administration without any genuine public or congressional debate. Apparently the lure of a quick deal to sell some of our wheat surplus coupled with the misty hope of a relaxation of tensions has led the administration to act in haste and without customary deliberation. An editorial in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on Friday, October 11, 1963, has cut through much of the fog that surrounds this new policy of the administration.

The editorial follows:

U.S. WHEAT SALE TAKES KHRUSHCHEV OFF HOOK

President Kennedy has announced his approval of a $250 million sale of U.S. wheat to Communist Russia. His decision had been generally expected. As had also been expected, he sought to put the transaction in a favorable light.

The President said the sale would bring obvious benefits to the United States, including the possible sale of surplus American feed grains to Russia and the satellites. Also listed were benefits to shippers, traders, and food processors as well as to farmers, and a reduction of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by the value of the wheat, flour, and other products sold.

Kennedy also said the reduction of U.S. wheat stocks would mean a savings to taxpayers of at least $200 million in storage, handling, and other costs.

So much for the advantages portrayed by the President.

But how about the possible disadvantages that cause us to share the serious misgivings of many Americans over the wisdom of the new policy approved by the administration?

Foremost among the disadvantages is the fact that the sale of U.S. wheat to Russia will help Soviet Premier Khrushchev solve a serious problem resulting from the failure of Soviet agricultural planning. And anything that takes the Soviet conspirator against freedom off the hook could make it easier for him to carry out his threat to bury the United States and other free nations.

It will be well to keep in mind the fact that the beneficiary of the wheat sale will be the Soviet dictator who not long ago made Cuba a base for missiles aimed at the heart of Amerca and the fact that the island is still a base for Rusisan troops and other military equipment.

And, of course, the beneficiary of the deal is the same Communist leader who built the Berlin wall that imprisons people held in the grip of Communist tyranny and who even now pulls the strings that are impeding access to West Berlin.

While Kennedy stresses what he calls the advantages for the United States, perhaps he could have driven a better bargain had he made, as Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, urged, the sale conditional on withdrawal of Soviet forces and military equipment from Cuba, and, as West German Chancellor Adenauer urged, conditional on the pulling down of the Communist wall that divides Berlin.

While it may seem unlikely that Khrushchev would accept such conditions, he might have if he wanted the American wheat badly enough.

Because Russia naturally will not pay more for U.S. wheat than the world price—approximately 55 cents a bushel lower than Government-supported domestic prices at present—the sale of 150 million bushels means that American taxpayers are subsidizing the Soviet Communists to the tune of more than $80 million.

While no new legislation may have been needed to clear the way for the sale of wheat to Russia, we believe that the President, instead of acting unilaterally, would have been wise to submit an issue of such importance to Congress for an expression in the form of a resolution for or against the deal, just as he submitted the nuclear test ban treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, recently cited a congressional policy statement of 1961 that subsidized sales of farm commodities shall not be made to unfriendly nations.

Threatening to bury a country is hardly an expression of friendliness.

Kennedy insisted that the Soviet sale did not represent a change in American trade policy, but if it doesn't why did it require a special Presidential decision?

In our opinion, it represents a disturbing softening of this country's official attitude toward the Communists and the threat that confronts the United States and other free nations.

We think it is the height of folly for a country which spends more than $50 billion a year for military defenses against the Communists to, at the same time, help any of them solve their problems with America's tax-subsidized wheat.

Dark Days for the Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since the American merchant marine is of vital concern to all Members of Congress, I believe they will be very much interested in the article concerning intercoastal shipping written by Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun Newspaper, and which appeared in that paper October 14, 1963.

The article follows:

DARK DAYS FOR THE MERCHANT FLEET

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

The future of the remnants of the domestic shipping fleet literally hangs by a thread. A bill now pending in Congress could wipe it out, although the bill's supporters would deny this.

Introduced by Senator NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, the bill would permit on a permanent basis the free movement of lumber from the United States to Puerto Rico aboard foreign-flag ships. If that is enacted, the maritime industry feels it is useless even to try to apply the Jones Act any longer. The Jones Act was passed in 1920 to protect domestic shipping by permitting only American-flag ships to carry cargoes between American ports and from the States to territories such as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The effect of the Jones Act was weakened last year when Senator NEUBERGER squeezed through a provision that lumber could move to Puerto Rico on foreign-flag ships for a 1-year period if American ships could not meet the low freight rate of the foreign vessels. The pending legislation has no proviso which would give American ships an opportunity even to express a desire for the lumber.

Ironically, American ships which have been converted abroad, but which are still operated under the American flag and manned by American seamen cannot compete against the foreign vessels because the Jones Act excluded them from the domestic trade.

Yet these are the only American ships—primarily bulk type carriers—which could approach the low freight rates of the foreign ships, which are built abroad, registered abroad, and manned by foreign seamen.

Once the lumber industry breaks completely through the Jones Act with the free movement doctrine, then the orange, steel, chemical, and oil companies are going to fight for their rights. Who can say that the lumber industry should have any more prefence than the others?

Shipping circles feel strongly that the administration is selling the American domestic service short—or "cannibalizing" it—in behalf of the lumber industry because of the power in Congress of the Pacific Northwest congressional delegation.

The same shipping groups point out that many of the lumbermen who are screaming that they cannot compete against Canadian lumber which moves in foreign bottoms are stockholders and part owners of many of the same Canadian lumber concerns. In other words they are competing against themselves and the domestic fleet is being sacrificed—that is the feeling in the maritime world.

Although the railroads seemingly would support any attack against the domestic shipping lines, they may well beware of some of the far-reaching implications. Competition against American-flag water transportation has been stiff and the railroads have complained. But what will it be if lower cost foreign ships are given a wide-open field in which to operate?

Great concern has been expressed by many responsible sources about the decline—from 700 ships before World War II to less than 100 today—of the domestic fleet, but thus far only negative action has taken place.

When he was running for the Presidency, the then Senator Kennedy wrote: "The depressed condition of our country's once-flourishing domestic shipping industry should be a matter of deepest concern to everyone interested in our country's economic progress and national security. Unless strong measures are taken promptly to preserve and strengthen the dry cargo fleet now operating coastwise and intercoastal, one of the great bulwarks of our Nation's defense may soon be a thing of the past."

Since that letter was written in 1960, at least eight domestic—intercoastal, coastwise, and offshore—steamship lines have suspended. Only seven are left.

Summarizing in his letter, Mr. Kennedy wrote: "If the domestic merchant fleet, so strategic to the Nation's economy and to its defense, is to be kept alive—and it must be—Government must lend a hand. Steps must be taken to insure fair treatment of domestic shipping vis-a-vis other forms of transportation. Beyond that Government has real and long-neglected responsibility to assist in the formulation of a rational overall transportation policy in which intercoastal transport has a vital position."

Among the problems cited by the deceased lines as they went out of business was that of rates—that they were unable to get rate increases approved fast enough by the Federal agencies.

At the Propeller Club convention held in Baltimore last week, former Senator John Marshall Butler, who was considered outstanding in his contributions to maritime legislation while serving on the Senate Commerce Committee, spoke on "Domestic Water Transportation and the National Interest."

He said, among other things, "Unless something is done about the ratemaking situation, a rejuvenation of domestic water shipping would be impossible, according to the experts, even if the cost of the ships were zero. It is in the area of ratemaking, on a wholly coordinated national transportation basis, that Under Secretary Roosevelt and his associates may find the real solution."

Most—if not all—of the remaining segments of the domestic shipping industry have filed for rate increases to compensate for increased costs. Some of these cases have been pending before the Federal Maritime Commission for a year—some even longer. The length of time it takes the Commission to act on a rate petition has been disturbing to the shipping industry for some time because of the mounting losses in the interim. Some lines have collapsed altogether while waiting.

Some shipping people have suggested subsidizing the domestic industry. Subsidy payments would support both the construction of new vessels and their operation. Matson Navigation Co., the biggest domestic nonsubsidized line, has taken a neutral stand on the issue of subsidy for its Hawaii freight trade. In a memorandum issued some time ago on this subject, the company said:

"As the principal carrier in the trade, it is Matson's fundamental responsibility to keep the total cost of moving Hawaii's commerce at the lowest possible level consistent with the maintenance of adequate service and a fair return to the stockholders on their investment in Matson. This responsibility does not include the determination of who is to pay this cost.

"Under the present system, the users of the service pay directly for it through freight charges. This is the normal way of doing business. Under a subsidy arrangement, part of the cost would be shifted, either to the taxpayers of the State or the Nation. Whether or not the cost burden should be shifted is a matter of public policy, to be decided by the public and those appointed or elected to serve the public interest."

More recently, Matson has said that if it could get its requested freight rate, the rate of return would put it on solid operating grounds now—without any subsidy of any kind.

Alcoa Steamship Co. has requested a freight rate boost to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and emphasized that it was urgent. That was nearly 18 months ago. The plea is still pending.

Another bill even bolder than the Neuberger proposal and now before Congress would permit foreign-built ships to be used generally on the domestic routes. Mr. Butler referred to this as obtaining ships from "bargain basement shipyards in foreign countries. This is another artifice of inert expediency, unworthy of those who resort to it."

If the argument is that lower cost foreign procurement should replace domestic shipping, he said, "you might as well suggest that we import lower salaried legislators from West Germany, Japan, France or wherever, to sit in the Congress of the United States and enact laws to bring about the complete demise of all of U.S. industry."

"This type of attitude, if not nipped in the bud, could pollinate or be catching—and might even lead to the demise of our merchant marine completely or to the demise of the domestic, legal profession—or what have you. Where then would we be with the balance-of-payments problem? Where would they find [the shipping quota] of the 35 million new jobs which the Department of Labor has warned our economy must create in the next decade?"

The Senator blamed both Republican and Democratic administrations for the sad plight of the domestic merchant marine today. Many agree that the weakness of the domestic merchant marine doesn't trace to the Jones Act, but to long-continued default of suitable action, leadership and coordination within the responsible—the executive—agencies of the National Government. No administration has made a real attempt to salvage any segment of the domestic shipping industry.

Killer From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the concluding article to the series "Air Pollution: Public Enemy No. 1":

AIR POLLUTION: PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1, CONCLUSION—FRESH AIR REQUIRES VIGILANCE

(By Ian McNett)

Persons whose allergies and lung diseases are aggravated by air pollution can escape by moving to the seashore, says a doctor who is very interested in the effects of pollutants on human health.

At the shore, he says, sea breezes blow pollutants away from the beach, back over the land.

This is an appealing solution, even for healthy individuals. But it is impractical for most of us.

The doctor's second solution is more within reach. He says use an air conditioner to clean the air that comes into the homes.

But some people can't even afford air conditioners. Only partial protection is provided by this solution anyway. A man can't carry an air conditioner on his back when he goes out for a walk or to work in his yard.

However, people can still do something to curb air pollution by themselves and through their elected representatives at all levels.

Aroused and informed citizens can move their representatives to action.

In 1956, members of Perth Amboy women's clubs formed a Pure Air League to fight for pollution regulation in the city.

Their efforts were capped in 1957 when the city commission passed the air pollution control ordinance.

The Pure Air League no longer functions. But air pollution still exists, in spite of progress in the city toward controlling it.

It seems that fresh air, like liberty, requires eternal vigilance.

Since everyone can't move to the seashore, people should ask their representatives to help bring seashore conditions to them.

One of the first things the legislature should do is appropriate more money to run the air sanitation program.

The amount of $100,000 a year for the entire State of New Jersey is ridiculously small to run such an important program. Taxpayers pay only one and a half cents per person a year to control air pollution in New Jersey.

Compare that to the $30 to $100 a year air pollution costs each person in cleaning bills, extra effort, building and materials damage, not to mention the cost to human health.

With more money, the program should hire more investigators. It now has only 8 to keep tabs on 15,000 industries and the millions of other pollution sources in the State.

These investigators are often tied up in court cases involving industries and other violators who refuse to comply with orders to stop polluting the air.

RESEARCH NEEDED

Money also should be appropriated for more research. Everybody involved in air pollution says we need more research before we can set standards. We have to set standards, they say, before we can enact new rules and regulations to control pollutants that now escape regulation.

But research is not being done at anywhere near the necessary scale. Rutgers University's sanitation department has men who could help in the research. The air sanitation program could do more research with more money.

The U.S. Public Health Service could give New Jersey a lot of help on research. This research could have been done years ago if appropriations to bring the service into the State had not been cut from the air sanitation program's budget.

The legislature should quit stalling and appropriate the money to bring the Public Health Service into the State and do the studies.

The cry for more research has become an excuse for not passing new and tough legislation. But we're not getting the research. We won't get it without paying for it.

While the legislators wait for the research, new legislation should be passed immediately to put sharper teeth into the Air Pollution Control Act. Violators should be assessed higher penalties. The $100 to $500 for each week of violation is less than many industries would have to spend to install and maintain new control devices and procedures.

STANDARDS REQUIRED

Research should be pursued with all possible speed to find what standards should be set. California has an adverse level for the entire outdoor atmosphere. Once the level is reached traffic is curbed and certain industries have to close down until concentrations sink below the level.

But we don't need standards just for the entire atmosphere.

We also need standards that each separate source would be permitted to emit. This includes factories, automobiles, and home heating units. The smoke, fly ash, and open burning, which is now controlled, contributes only part of the pollution that escapes into the atmosphere.

In Perth Amboy, a trained engineer should be hired to assist Joseph J. Soporowski, who was appointed despite an ordinance which requires that a registered professional engineer be appointed. Soporowski's training is in business administration.

However, since his appointment, Soporowski has worked hard at the job, and worked hard to study air pollution. He has taken a course in air pollution at Rutgers University. Men in the field who know him have been impressed by his drive to learn about the problems, and think he will make a good director of Perth Amboy's air pollution control bureau.

COUNTY GROUP IMPORTANT

The Middlesex County Board of Freeholders should think about setting up a countywide air pollution control office. In an area as closely packed with people as Middlesex County, air pollution respects no political boundaries.

With the exception of Perth Amboy, no community in the county has an air pollution ordinance and a man whose job it is to control air pollution.

Zoning ordinances and boards of health make some efforts to control air pollution, but more is needed.

Carteret has just started to study the air pollution problem. Carteret residents live in an industrial community. They should urge their borough council to set up a strong program.

Middlesex County's air pollution advisory group, created under the State act, has no power and meets rarely.

State law permits local governments to enact air pollution regulations. More local communities should take advantage of the law.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE's bill now before the U.S. Congress would put the Federal Government into the air pollution control picture. It would also authorize the Public Health Service to set air quality standards after making studies.

Reports from Washington indicate Senator CASE's bill is in danger of dying. Representatives in Washington should be reminded that New Jersey residents support the bill.

More efforts could be made at the local level to control fires in garbage dumps. Several months ago a fire burned in a dump along Crows Mill Road in Keasbey for 3 days, sending a pall of black smoke over neighboring homes. The fire was contained but not put out.

ROLE OF PUBLIC

People also can make a dent in the air pollution picture as individuals.

A Los Angeles study shows that a fleet of carefully maintained cars produced 85 percent less pollution than a group of cars selected at random from the motoring public.

The same principle applies to home heating units. The better they are cared for, the less they pollute the air—and they will burn less fuel for the same amount of heat.

Outdoor burning should be kept to a minimum. Most communities have trash and garbage collectors. Their service should be used.

The seashore is a pleasant place, but everybody can't live there. The shore probably will always have less air pollution than industrial areas.

People who live in industrial areas must expect to breathe some pollutants. But an effort by all levels of government and society can reduce the pollutants to safer levels.

Human health should not be damaged and human lives should not be endangered by a problem that can be cured.

The Constitution guarantees that no man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Air pollution chips away at all three.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 12, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

OCTOBER 12, 1963.

GOVERNMENT BY DECREE

Is Congress being robbed of its legislative functions by way of Executive orders? The number of Executive orders issued by President Kennedy, together with the import of his decrees, is setting up a pattern for dictatorship. How these Executive orders are becoming more and more a pattern can be shown in these facts:

1. The first Executive order issued in the United States was dated October 20, 1862. The first 15 Presidents issued no Executive orders.

2. From President Washington through President Eisenhower there were 10,913 numbered Executive orders.

3. In his first 3 years in office, President Kennedy has issued 207 numbered Executive orders. The increased acceleration is apparent when you consider President Eisenhower issued only 407 in 8 years. The unnumbered Kennedy orders are undetermined. (One source gave me a verbal estimate of 11,000, but this cannot be verified.)

Just two examples of Kennedy Executive orders indicate how constitutional power may be abused:

1. His first Executive order issued immediately after he took office in January 1961 directed the Secretary of Agriculture to buy eggs, pork, and beans for distribution to people in so-called depressed areas. The order was a clear violation of section 32 funds in the Agriculture Act and as such was unconstitutional and illegal.

2. His Executive order ending discrimination in housing clearly exceeded his authority and has actually resulted in curtailing FHA activity.

Little known, but highly significant, are 12 Executive orders which appeared in the Federal Register of February 20, 1962. Properly implemented these 12 decrees could end freedom for the people in America and establish President Kennedy as an absolute dictator.

1. Executive Order No. 10995, take over communications media.

2. Executive Order No. 10997, take over electric power, oil and gas, fuels, minerals.

3. Executive Order No. 10998, take over food resources and farms (including farm equipment).

4. Executive Order No. 10999, take over all modes of transportation, highways, seaports, etc.

5. Executive Order No. 11000, mobilization of civilians into work force under Government supervision.

6. Executive Order No. 11001, Government take over health, education, and welfare functions.

7. Executive Order No. 11002, Postmaster General operate national registration of all persons.

8. Executive Order No. 11003, Government take over all airports and craft.

9. Executive Order No. 11004, housing and finance authorities to relocate communities, to build new housing with public funds, designates areas to be abandoned as unsafe, establish new locations for populations.

10. Executive Order No. 11005, take over railroads, inland waterways and storage.

11. Executive Order No. 11051, designates responsibilities of emergency planning, gives authorization to put all other Executive orders into effect in times of internal tension, economic or financial crisis. Part I, section 101d, states director to perform additional functions as President may direct.

Congress alone can protect our constitutional form of government, the Republic within a democracy, with its separation of powers by refusing to delegate constitutional responsibility to the Executive and by taking action to override his Executive orders. Is this trend toward dictatorship of concern to the people of Dallas? What do you think?

SIGNIFICANT HAPPENINGS THIS WEEK

There were three votes against the conference report on appropriations for the Defense Department. Mine was one of the three—not because I am against adequate appropriations for defense, but because we can cut back on unessential activities without endangering our defense position. My vote was a protest against the Senate increasing the appropriations amendments earlier trimmed by the House.

I opposed the appropriation bill for independent agencies. It was political duplicity and gave Congressmen a chance to talk out of both sides of our mouths. While claiming to have trimmed $1.5 billion from the budget we increased the amount for these 26 agencies by $1.2 billion. We should establish priority in spending and so balance the budget without cutting any essential projects. On the public buildings section, I pointed out the lack of proper priority by the inclusion of certain projects less meritorious than the Dallas Federal Building.

The President's wheat deal with Soviet Russia subsidizes Russian purchase of wheat, releases Russian farmworkers to work in missile and weapons production, hides from their own people the failure of Communist planning in agriculture. I wonder how many American boys have been killed by Communists, for instance in Vietnam, who have been kept strong with American-produced food.

This Irishman Would Fence in His U.S.A.—Mr. Kirwan Goes to Congress and Stays 26 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN is a spirited, vigorous, and earnest leader born with character and natural ability. He

is the true personification of rugged individualism.

One must see him espousing a cause in the well of the House to fathom his deep sense of honesty and the warmth of his sincerity of appeal to set matters straight on the pending question.

He wields great power among his colleagues—power for good. Members of both parties seek his good counsel in legislative matters. He pursues his duties in a quiet and amiable way—but once aroused, bristles to the occasion, and with cryptic and cutting remarks, silences the opposition.

He believes in a strong government, but becomes cautious and wary when such strengthening is sought in direct conflict with the rights of the citizenry, or transgresses constitutional limits in violation of local or State authority.

He is no headline grabber, and has contributed much to the success of his party in congressional elections by promoting and concentrating on programs for the raising of funds for campaign purposes.

He is strongly partisan as a Democrat, but not narrow.

The great influence he wields to pass worthwhile legislation for the masses have earned for him a national reputation as the champion of the common man.

The following article appearing in the Chicago Tribune on his career is interesting and complimentary:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Oct. 6, 1963]

THIS IRISHMAN WOULD FENCE IN HIS U.S.A.—MR. KIRWAN GOES TO CONGRESS AND STAYS 26 YEARS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—On a bright fall day in Chicago 50 years ago, a freight train from the western wheat lands discharged a dusty cargo of nonpaying passengers.

One of them was MIKE KIRWAN, a muscular young Irishman who had quit school in the third grade to go to work in the Pennsylvania mine pits. He had been on the road for 5 years and would roam the highways of the Nation for another 5 before settling down.

KIRWAN spent the next 3 weeks in the Salvation Army barracks of the Chicago of that day. He paid 15 cents a night to occupy an enclosure separated by chicken wire from the next bed. He slept with his shoes under his pillow, having a disinclination to walk barefooted.

AN AMERICA FIRSTER

"It was the greatest educational period of my life," he now asserts. "I learned some things I could never have learned in 10 years of school. I listened to young men, some of them college graduates, who were bumming all over the country just like me.

"They told of what they found in America and I talked about what I had found. We all had a love of our country which those, who have not seen it, can never develop.

"I've been to Europe since and my State of Pennsylvania has more to offer than all Europe, including the scenery in Switzerland. If I had my way, no American could go to a foreign land until he had seen America first. I'd charge them $200 for a passport to get abroad unless they could show they'd been all over the United States first."

MIKE GOES TO WASHINGTON

This hopeless victim of nationalism eventually quit the road to acquire a steady job and a family in Youngstown, Ohio. Twenty-six years ago he came to Washington as Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio. For the last 17 of those years he has been chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, by general agreement one of the shrewdest politicians in the House.

At 76, he is a lively, earthy, humorous, and perceptive observer of the political scene. There are very few dropouts from school in Congress and KIRWAN now devotes much of his time to warning youth that lack of a college education can be a lifelong drawback. But his own lack of formal schooling, he concedes, has not been a handicap. He even capitalized on it in campaigns.

Congress has been invaded in recent years by ambitious young men who want to take over the leadership from seniors they regard as lacking in force and vision. But no one aspires to replace KIRWAN. In the cold, practical business of fundraising and vote-getting, he has few peers.

KENNEDY APPLECART NOT SAFE

When he took over the job of guiding the political fortunes of Democratic congressional candidates in the forties, Republicans enjoyed a commanding majority in the House. This sad state of affairs, from KIRWAN's viewpoint, was quickly corrected. He has guided his party to control of the House in seven out of eight national elections. Except for a slight GOP majority resulting from the Eisenhower landslide of 1952, KIRWAN has been able to celebrate on election night every 2 years.

He is the product of a political school of hard knocks which, whatever its other deficiencies, graduates men with a sure instinct for voter trends. KIRWAN professes confidence that the campaign year of 1964 will not shake Democratic control of Congress but he is disturbed about voter reaction to two issues—the racial problem and a tax cut.

"Right now," he said, "President Kennedy would be reelected. But something could upset the applecart."

RACIAL STRAW IN WIND

What, for example? KIRWAN pulled out of his pocket a well-thumbed card upon which were printed the results of a recent election in Boston which escaped national attention.

In this contest, a woman named Mrs. Louise Hicks scored a sensational victory for a school board seat, rolling up a tremendous vote, bigger than that received by the victorious mayor in the same election. The significant feature of her triumph was that she alone, of all candidates, had defied the demands of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) for an end to de facto school segregation. The outpouring of voters for her anti-NAACP stand was dramatic and unexpected.

This happened in the hometown of President Kennedy and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. If voters in Chicago, Philadelphia, and other Democrat-controlled northern cities get to feeling that the Democratic administration is more interested in the Negro minority than in the white majority, the results could be disastrous, KIRWAN knows. He was deeply impressed by the significance of the Boston election.

TAX CUT CAUSES DISSENSION

He had a novel view of the political results of a tax reduction bill—that it hurts the party in control of its passage. The Kennedy administration is pressing hard for such a measure.

"The Republican Party in the 80th Congress cut taxes and reduced the debt," KIRWAN recalled. "The voters defeated them. The 83d Congress did the same and suffered defeat.

"Nobody's satisfied with a tax cut. The big fellow thinks the little fellow gets too large a share; the little fellow resents the big reductions given the rich man. The tax bill is the main thing I'm worried about next year."

These are the practical reactions of a man who was born to poverty and spent the first 45 years of his life working at low economic level. He knows that the voter is motivated by basic impulses, usually related to his pocketbook.

GOT 3½ CENTS AN HOUR

He was born in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in 1886, 1 of a family of 12, and he went to work at the age of 9 as a breaker boy, picking slate out of newly mined coal. The pay was 35 cents for a 10-hour day. At 12, he was getting a dollar a day, driving a mule in the mines. He has been paying dues to the United Mine Workers for 63 years.

He left home at the age of 20 and during the next decade bummed his way into most States of the Union, working in steel mills, on railroads as a brakeman, in lumber camps, oil and harvest fields. World War I snatched him for 2 years of service in France.

He was 33 when he finally came to rest in Youngstown, where he obtained the best job he had ever known until then—as yardmaster in the Carnegie steel plant.

In 1931, in the midst of the depression, he was fired.

"I sat on the back steps and cried," he remembered. "I had a wife and three children and I didn't know what to do. Then, Ed Peters, who ran a blast furnace at United States Steel, said to me, 'Why don't you run for the city council.' That's how I got into running for public office."

LONE DEMOCRAT IS BOSS

KIRWAN had already been drawn to politics in his hometown and was a Democratic ward committeeman. Youngstown in those days was a Republican community but KIRWAN won a city council seat. The six other councilmen were Republicans.

Somehow, the lone Democrat emerged as the boss of the council, chairman of both the legislative and finance committees. A yellowing newspaper clipping of the day complained that "if the Republicans want a drink of water, they have to get KIRWAN's permission."

"It was simply because they were always fighting among themselves," said KIRWAN. "Actually, I had too much power. When I left 4 years later, I had a city ordinance passed to prevent the same man from holding both those committee posts, with power over both legislation and money."

DEFEATS EIGHT CONGRESS RIVALS

He left because he had won a seat in Congress in a campaign in 1936 which still evokes fond memories in the city. KIRWAN had eight opponents in the Democratic primary, seven of them university graduates, five of them lawyers. All, except KIRWAN, pounded the theme that they wanted to go to Washington "to help that great humanitarian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

At the biggest rally of the campaign, the other candidates preached this text vociferously. KIRWAN spoke last.

"Look them over, college degrees and all," he ordered the audience. "Look me over. Now, do you actually think anyone of us would be a goddam bit of use to F.D.R.? I'll tell you the truth. I want to go to Washington to help MIKE KIRWAN first, and second to help you."

UNSEATS VETERAN REPUBLICAN

The press next day fulminated about KIRWAN's use of profanity and "third grade language." But he polled more votes than all other candidates, lumped together. In the election, he defeated a Republican who had held the 19th congressional seat in Ohio for 22 years.

He has been returned to Congress for 14 consecutive 2-year terms, weathering the Republican tides which have often swept Ohio.

One reason for his success, KIRWAN says, is that he has never aspired to a higher seat—as Senator or Governor.

"When they come to me, suggesting that I try for something bigger," he said, "I tell them I'm Irish and superstitious and only two men who represented my district ever went higher. They were McKinley and Garfield and they shot both of them. I'm going to stay right where I am."

Credit Continues in an Abundance—Banks Seeking Borrowers Despite Business Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the September 29 issue of the New York Times there appears a well-written article by Mr. Edward Cowan on the present credit and investment picture. Wishing to call the article to my colleagues' attention, I will include it at the end of my remarks. Particular attention should be paid to the concluding sentence, which says:

> With a peppy business expansion in the fourth quarter and passage of the tax-reduction bill by the Senate another twist of the credit valve would not be surprising.

Mr. Speaker, I did not, and I am sure my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee did not, work for 9 months producing a tax bill only to have much of its value destroyed by increased interest rates. If the tax bill would only serve as an excuse to raise the cost of money, it desired effect would be largely dissipated, and much of the justification for continuing to push for final action on the bill is eliminated. There are far better ways to adjust the present payments imbalance than tightening the money supply, and I wish to serve notice that if Mr. Cowan's article was in any way intended as a trial balloon, there will be vigorous attempts to puncture it before it gets off the ground.

Mr. Cowan's article follows:

CREDIT CONTINUES IN AN ABUNDANCE—BANKS SEEKING BORROWERS DESPITE BUSINESS GAINS

(By Edward Cowan)

One of the remarkable things about the business upturn is that, although it has been in progress for 31 months, there still is an abundance of credit.

Commercial banks are advertising furiously—from television spots to subway car cards—for people to come in and borrow money. Mortgage loan officers at commercial and savings and loan associations are hustling to find borrowers like sophomores trying out for the varsity.

Interest rates on both consumer and business bank loans have been steady for months, although professional money market short-term rates have risen since the spring.

All of this contrasts sharply with the 1950's. Then, at comparable stages of cyclical business upswings, credit was scarce and borrowing costs were tilting upward.

The present availability of credit is all the more remarkable in light of the Government's increased reliance on interest-rate policy as a remedy for the country's persistent loss of dollars to foreign lands.

TWO MAJOR PARTS

In the 1950's, the Federal Reserve was still struggling to establish close working control of the supply of money and credit. A huge volume of liquidity had been created to finance World War II—in effect, money had been printed to pay for the war—and the economy was still awash in the overflow.

Consequently, the central bank felt obliged to step much harder on the credit brake than it does now. Now, the wartime pool of funds having been absorbed by growth of the economy, the Federal Reserve feels it has finer controls over the availability of credit.

A second important difference is that both the psychology and the fact of inflation were sizable forces in the 1950's. Now, although there have been some faint signs of price strength, as one high Federal Reserve official put it recently, the atmosphere is essentially noninflationary.

CAPACITY TO SPARE

At present, the economy has capacity to spare, both of physical facilities and labor force. The persistence of an unemployment rate of about 5½ percent has subdued enthusiasm about the business upturn, in Washington, in labor circles and among business analysts.

The failure of the economy to expand rapidly enough to reduce unemployment coupled with the difference in philosophy of the Kennedy administration vis-a-vis that of the Eisenhower administration undoubtedly has has a great bearing on the Federal Reserve.

Advocates of still easier money are a minority within the central bank. It is probable that the majority would have pursued a less generous credit policy in the absence of a highly unemployment-sensitive administration.

In short, for technical, political and economic reasons, the central bank has pursued a less restrictive credit policy than it did in earlier postwar business expansions.

High-ranking Federal Reserve officials, who tend to deprecate the central bank's powers and emphasize the role of market forces, no doubt would give greater weight to the recent huge flow of savings, both corporate and individual.

PROFITS HIGH

Corporate profits have been high. Depreciation allowances were increased last year by the Treasury. Congress further enhanced corporate cash flow by granting a 7-percent tax credit for investment.

Steady increases in personal income have fueled a brisk rise in personal savings. By the end of August the commercial bank total had reached $107 billion, savings and loan shares stood at $87,400 million and savings bank deposits were $43,500 million.

The banks' prime rate, charged the biggest and most creditworthy borrowers, has held steady at 4½ percent for 37 months.

Mortgage interest rates have weakened in some areas since the beginning of the year, although are not now believed to be soft.

LOANS ARE UP

All of which is not to say that the banks have been starved for borrowers. Nationally loans at weekly reporting Federal Reserve member banks have climbed $9,086 million in the last 12 months to $87,345 million, a gain of more than 10 percent.

The outlook is for more of the same, at least for the rest of the year. The savings inflow may be slowing a bit, but banks expect only the normal seasonal increase in business borrowing in the next few months.

If credit were to become significantly tighter and more expensive in the next few months, most probably it would result from further Government actions to curb the flow of dollars out of the country.

The administration and the Federal Reserve are deeply worried about this problem. But for slack in the economy they would have tried harder and sooner to cope with it through tight money. With a peppy business expansion in the fourth quarter and passage of the tax reduction bill by the Senate, another twist of the credit valve would not be surprising.

B'nai B'rith—Sons of the Covenant—1843–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the great American organization known as B'nai B'rith celebrated yesterday, October 13, 1963, the 120th anniversary of its founding. The name in Hebrew means "Sons of the Covenant." At the time of its organization, the then small American Jewish community, chiefly composed of immigrants from different European nations, was not only subject to disabilities and discrimination from outside, but suffered from internal disunion and disagreements. A group of public-spirited leaders among the Jewish people, headed by Henry Jones, perceived the necessity of forming a group that would unite in social brotherhood and fraternal affection, those who valued their cultural and ethical inheritance of Judaism. Even from the moment of formation, however, this organization looked beyond the fraternal benefits to accrue to its own membership, and the promotion of the interests of their fellow Jews. The stated purpose of the brotherhood in its founding was: "Uniting Israelites in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity." From that moment to this, B'nai B'rith has not faltered in directing its efforts toward the good, not of the Jewish people alone, but of all America and all the world. The current form of the preamble to the constitution is more detailed and specific, but still looks to the welfare of all humanity:

> B'nai B'rith has taken upon itself the mission of uniting persons of the Jewish faith in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity; of developing and elevating the mental and moral character of the people of our faith; of inculcating the purest principles of philanthropy, honor, and patriotism; of supporting science and art; alleviating the wants of the poor and needy; visiting and caring for the sick; coming to the rescue of victims of persecution; providing for, protecting, and assisting the aged, the widow, and the orphan on the broadest principles of humanity.

In this spirit B'nai B'rith has contributed to the great advance of Judaism in America, in the past century and a quarter. This contribution has been principally and basically in the development of the principle of unity. Jews of American ancestry, immigrants from

Portugal and Germany, Poland, Bohemia, and Austria, all found in B'nai B'rith the essential unity of brotherhood, honoring, in one another, their precious religious and racial heritage, and joining in brotherly fashion to improve their own lot and that of the community around them. One of the watchwords of American liberty is the phrase: "In union there is strength." In the history of B'nai B'rith we have a fine example of the strength of union being used in the building of the America we love. May this fine patriotic organization go on from strength to strength, through the coming years.

Gold Clique Still in There Pitching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as my good friend and neighbor, Sam Shulsky, says in the following column from the New York Journal-American of August 9, 1963, the gold clique is still in there pitching—they still want this administration to raise the price of gold above the $35 an ounce for which it is presently selling. I am pleased to note that the President is holding firm.

Mr. Shulsky also lays low some of the myths about gold in which an amazing number of people believe.

The article follows:

INVESTORS' GUIDE: GOLD CLIQUE STILL IN THERE PITCHING

(By Sam Shulsky)

Although the average American has had little to do with gold these last 30 years—either in hand, or as a factor in evaluating his currency—gold is still big business.

North of the border, in the Soviet Union, in Africa, gold mining is an essential part of the economy.

From time to time, as new crises threaten, international wheeler-dealers run for the shelter of gold. The most recent excitement came in the early days of the Kennedy administration, when speculators, betting the new President would panic and put up the price of gold, bid the price of the metal up to around $40 an ounce in London from the U.S. support level of $35. They lost their bet and a lot of money.

Ever since, and once more only a few days ago, the President wisely reaffirmed his intention not to play into the hands of speculators by raising the price of the metal.

PRESSURE CONTINUES

But the pressure for a hike in the gold price continues by those who argue it will (1) stabilize the value of the dollar at home and (2) solve our international payments deficit problem. Not to mention those who'd like to make a fast buck and those who have been misled into thinking that gold has mystic powers and that their right to own it and dabble in it are, to quote a letter, "God given."

The Northern Miner, which reports on Canadian mining stocks, echoes the same religious note in a recent article criticizing this column, saying that "rendering the almighty dollar goldless, would be as welcome to many millions of Americans as a proposal to throw away the Bible." This may not boost the price of gold, but it rates high on the sacrilege scale.

For the Bible is still the best seller in the United States but there hasn't been any gold strength in the U.S. dollar for years. (If there were, how come its purchasing power fell more than 50 percent in the years its gold content has been tied to the $35-an-ounce level?)

Internationally, we continue to lose dollars. We have simply been paying out more dollars than we have been taking in since the war, and even now—while the Europe we've helped rebuild is enjoying the greatest prosperity in its history—we continue the mainstay of the world aid program.

And so the U.S. dollar is labelled weak at the very moment it remains the chief hope of the underdeveloped world and, even more, is being spent to defend former allies and former enemies whose currencies, because of our aid, are now harder than ours. If you can buy this, you would pity a young hoodlum who had killed his father and mother because he is now an orphan.

OTHERS WOULD FOLLOW

I will not presume to argue our foreign aid program. (It seems obvious though that former allies and enemies we've helped rebuild should now use more of their own strong currencies to ease our foreign aid and military burdens.)

But it seems clear enough that if we continue to send out billions each year in unrecompensed foreign aid and in gifts of food, etc., we must face up to continued international payment deficits even if we raise the price of gold to $50 an ounce. Devaluing the dollar is certainly no way to improve its strength.

Nor would it gain us even a temporary advantage, since every other nation in the world would readjust its currency to ours overnight. (For all the talk about the weakness of the dollar the rest of the world doesn't want to forsake its leadership.)

Fooling around with the gold content of the dollar would do no more to help the Nation than would setting a value of $3,000 on the family's $1,500 car help balance your budget if you continually spend more than you earn.

OF LITTLE INFLUENCE

In the column the Northern Miner didn't like, I said I was sick of, and fed up with arguments that we could solve our international payments problems by fooling around with gold balance sheet figures and added that, in my opinion, the price of gold has proved to have as little long-term influence on our economy as has the price of shark's teeth. Perhaps in view of the record of many mining stock promotions (here as well as in Canada) in the last couple of decades, the use of shark was unkind.

But the Northern Miner has its job to do. The pages of the very issue which took me to task carried news stories about various mines in Canada. My mining knowledge is limited to a single course in Geology I. But when I find a flood of favorable stories on mining operations selling for 35 cents, 52 cents and as low as 5 cents a share (and paid advertising to suit) I feel I have the right to assume that its desire for a higher gold price goes beyond solving President Kennedy's problems.

Christopher Columbus Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as in many cities, Christopher Columbus was honored in Jersey City and Bayonne last Saturday, the anniversary of the birth of the man who discovered America. But in Jersey City, which is in my district, Christopher Columbus, of Genoa, Italy, was present in person. This latter-day Columbus was brought from his native land to lead a parade of 20,000 marchers, 40 bands and 50 beautiful floats that passed for review before nearly 200,000 citizens. It was an inspiring demonstration of the spirit that must have sustained the great navigator on his heroic voyage, a spirit which has encouraged hundreds of thousands of Italians who settled in America to succeed in their adopted land in business and in government. The contributions which the men and women of Columbus' land have made to this country are beyond counting.

In Jersey City and Bayonne the sons and daughters of early immigrants from Italy are prominent in the professions, in education, business and in government.

On a prominent site at Journal Square in Jersey City there stands a magnificent statue of Christopher Columbus, a reminder to all of the courage and perseverence that led to the discovery of this great land, a reminder to the millions who followed Columbus that these attributes are requisites for success today in any endeavor.

We were mindful as we witnessed that wonderful parade that not only did Columbus discover America, but he left a heritage of wisdom and courage that benefits mankind to this day.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

R. E. (Bob) Smith, of Houston, One of Outstanding Exemplars of Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of Texas' outstanding businessmen and civic leaders, R. E. (Bob) Smith, of Houston, was recently the subject of an interesting article in the Houston Post captioned "Live Younger and Better."

The article, discussing good health practices for men over 60, points out that Mr. Smith at 70 is in perfect health and gives some pointers on how others might follow his example. Mr. Smith is a coowner of the Colt .45's, Houston baseball team. Mr. Smith is one of the outstanding civic and lay religious leaders of Texas. He served as national vice president of the Conference of Christians and Jews.

Because of the national interest in physical fitness, a program which has been emphasized by President Kennedy and others in this administration, this article is of particular interest. Distinguished leaders, such as Mr. Smith, have much to offer by guidance and counsel to others in search of rules for good health.

I ask unanimous consent that the Houston Post article of Monday, October 7, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON'S BOB SMITH FINEST EXAMPLE FOR MEN OVER 60

(By Robert Delmonteque)

Too often the 60-year-old man gives up on his physical self, starts groping for his rocking chair and slippers. He's making a big mistake. He should substitute activity for inactivity and get rid of his aches and pains.

I wish all the readers in the audience who are 60 or older could have the privilege of meeting a man who is living contradiction to the idea that old age is a downhill ride.

To me he is the most remarkable man I have met since I worked with Bernarr MacFadden. In fact, he is a more astonishing physical specimen than MacFadden. The man is R. E. (Bob) Smith, multimillionaire Houston oilman and coowner of the Colt .45's baseball team.

Bob Smith at 70 is in perfect health, enjoying life to the fullest, and his exercise sessions would put many a 20-year-old to shame. Smith performs 100 repetitions of each of these exercises: Situps, knee outs, leg raises, and half-knee bends. Then he lies on his back and with outstretched arms pull a 50-pound weight over his head 50 times. He also walks 2 miles a day.

You can understand then why he has the body of a longshoreman.

Of course, Smith has achieved his condition over the years, but there is no reason why an elderly man cannot trade his sedentary life for a mild program of exercise that will soon have him approaching Bob Smith's pinnacle.

Long walks are the essential beginning. Three sets of 20 deeps breath during each jaunt are also necessary. Simultaneously, you can practice a simple waist reducer as you walk. After exhaling completely, tense the stomach muscles, trying to reach your backbone with the belly button, for a period of 5 seconds. Begin with 5 at the first session and increase to a goal of 10 at a time.

This muscle tensing will reduce your waist 3 to 5 inches within a month.

Next, practice Smith's pullover exercise, using two 400-page volumes or telephone books, exhaling as you bring the books overhead and down to your waist, then inhaling deeply as you bring them back to the floor behind your head. Start with 5 pullovers and gradually increase to 15.

This will add firmness to your chest muscles.

It's true you can't turn the clock back, oldtimers, but you can wind it up a little.

A Policy Statement by the Conway Chamber of Commerce, Conway, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce at Conway, S.C., and some policy statements made by the members of this very active chamber.

I wish that the people throughout the United States in every community would give the members of Congress a similar statement so all the Members of Congress would be acquainted with the thinking of the people we represent here in the U.S. Congress.

I hope the Members of Congress will take time from their busy schedule to read these statements:

Whereas the executive branch of the U.S. Government is rapidly becoming a despotic leviathan with a dynamic inherent principle of growth nurtured by the self-interest of bureaucrats rather than by genuine interest in the welfare of the people, whatever their social, racial, religious, or economic status; and

Whereas this creeping despotism has been shrouded in pious pretense of a paternal philosophy and has gathered about itself a cynical apparatus of slogans such as "interstate commerce," "equal protection," "due process," "civil right," "fair practices," and the like with which to hide the enormity of the deception by which the executive branch of the Federal Government continues to destroy the basic liberties of its citizenry, in order to gain more power; and

Whereas no asserted grievance of any segment of the American population, and no economic, social, or other interest of any group, is a sufficient end to justify resort to immoral means, such as the imposition by those in power of their vaunted self-righteousness upon the consciences of private individuals by means of such artifices as the slogans above mentioned, and by means of politically expedient bribery, extortion, harassment, imprisonment, psychiatric commitments, and other Machiavellian devices; and

Whereas governmental encroachments upon human life seem to be irreversible and further such encroachments must be halted immediately if there is to be any semblance of individual liberty and dignity left in American society, and the only remedy is to awaken the Congress to the reality of its increasing surrender to the insatiable executive lust for power: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Conway Chamber of Commerce of Conway, S.C., respectfully voices to the South Carolina congressional delegation and to the Congress as a whole its protest against the so-called Civil Rights Act, Fair Employment Practices Act, and all other legislation which attempts to legislate morals and other matters of conscience of the individual.

THE 1963 POLICY STATEMENT OF THE CONWAY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CONWAY, S.C.

TAX REVISION AND SPENDING CONTROL

Tax reform: The Conway chamber favors an income tax reduction, by cutting Government spending in accordance with the 117 ways to cut the budget as recommended by the National Chamber. The Conway chamber contends to cut taxes and continue to increase Federal spending—creating larger deficits is dangerous to sound fiscal procedures.

Control of inflation and spending: The Conway chamber strongly recommends that Congress establish a balanced budget. That a workable plan for the reduction of the national debt be inaugurated and excessive and wasteful spending be eliminated.

"Backdoor spending": The procedure of "backdoor spending" should be eliminated. Congress should have control of all Federal spending programs. We oppose "backdoor spending" of Federal money without it being presented to and passed by the Congress of the United States.

Foreign aid: All foreign aid should have constructive aims for the United States. Wasteful sending of U.S. money into foreign countries should be eliminated. We recommend this be reviewed and spending drastically reduced.

Social security tax: The Conway chamber opposed a revision of the social security tax to include a mandate medical aid program. This program is not needed, would not meet the needs of the general public and would create a heavy tax burden on the American taxpayer. The Kerr-Mills bill seems to be adequate and is working well in this State.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Wage fixing: If Government can set the minimum it can also set the maximum.

A more subtle problem due to wage fixing has been eating away at this economy like a cancer since the unions have been wage fix-

ing for the unskilled. The salary of the unskilled has been jacked up so high in comparison to those people with a trade that there is little incentive for students coming out of high school to go into a training program to learn a trade. This has also resulted in automation in some cases where it was not really necessary. Automation replaces very few skilled people.

As to equal pay to women for equal work. Who is to decide if equal work is done? Are we to have an army of bureaucrats combing the country to decide who does equal work?

The pay for women has improved steadily; it will become equalized by agreements between employee and employer.

The 35-hour workweek: One of the main arguments for the 35-hour workweek is that it will put many of the unemployed to work.

The employer will have to pay his employees time and a half or double for the hours over 35; therefore the incentive to hire the unemployed to work the extra 5 hours should be a strong economic one.

Well, this is completely ridiculous in most cases. How can you replace a highly skilled or semiskilled employee by an unemployed person? The percentages are against you; for, a high percentage of the unemployed are without any skill.

So what will happen in the event of a 35-hour week? In most cases the same people will work the same length of time, but they will receive additional pay for the 5 hours.

If we reach a point where our economy is overproducing and we need only 35 hours of work to produce the products and goods that will keep our economy healthy, then it makes sense to reduce the workweek to 35 hours.

Federal unemployment compensation: The tax to support this should appear on the W-4 employees form as a part of his earnings that has been taxed. Since this is essentially part of his income.

More stress should be put on restraining rather than extending payments. We should get the people back to work rather than keeping them on the dole.

NLRB reform: Do we really need NLRB?

Union monoply power: As long as we look with favor on free enterprise, groups that can control our economy should be looked upon with disfavor. There is no doubt that any of the major unions can bring our tremendous economic machine to a grinding halt.

There is only one way to curtail this power and that is through antitrust legislation for unions.

The union shop is a denial of the freedom and responsibility of the individual. All shops should be open. If the union in a particular shop is worth its salt, people will join out of the desire to be in a good union. It seems strange that many unions must use coercion to get new members.

Secondary boycotts are one of the most unfair practices of unions. They are not as effective against the large corporation as they are against a small business. The small businessman can be actually destroyed.

It is unjust to use labor dues money for "political education." Do the rank and file members of the union decide what is "political education"? We think not. This is done by a very few of the labor leaders. This puts millions of union member dollars at the disposal of a few men. Such a concentration of political power is to be feared in this Republic of ours.

Strike violence can become a tool of terror for either management or labor. However, to run to a paternalistic Federal Government to solve this problem is, in our judgment, wrong. This can create a more serious problem than it solves. The States must assume their responsibility or the Federal Government will move into this vacuum.

FEDERAL CONTROLS OF BUSINESS AND AGRICULTURE

Wage control: The Conway chamber is opposed to further encroachment on control of business by such legislation as extension of minimum wage. This eliminates the American system of supply and demand which regulates prices and wages.

Antitrust: The Conway chamber upholds the criminal provisions of the antitrust laws. We feel that the power of the courts to impose fines and imprisonment for antitrust crimes is proper.

Agriculture: The Conway Chamber of Commerce contends there are entirely too many Government controls and regulations in agriculture. We urge that agricultural controls be lifted or minimized wherever practical or feasible. The farmers should have every opportunity to determine restrictions and regulations under which they must operate.

Shorter workweek: We oppose legislative proposals that would provide a compulsory shorter workweek.

Equal pay: The Conway chamber opposes the establishment of legislative action to equal pay for women in similar positions as men. This will not solve a problem, but start a chain of events to create confusion in determining wage scales, also means loss of jobs to many.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN STATE AND LOCAL AFFAIRS

The Conway Chamber of Commerce maintains that State and local affairs are best handled by State and local authorities. We are opposed to preemption of local authority by Federal intervention and maintain these problems are more efficiently handled under State administration control.

We reemphasize our belief in States rights, with the Federal Government serving in the capacity as outlined in our Constitution.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

We are oposed to compulsory medicare through the social security program. We favor medical aid through private programs and the present program of Federal aid—the Kerr-Mills bill, which is working successfully in our State.

EDUCATION

The Conway chamber believes the basic responsibility for education lies within the States, counties and local districts. The educational function, policies and administration is essentially a local matter. We are opposed to regulation and control of local schools by Federal intervention.

Subjects such as subsidies, impacted areas aid, etc., will be carefully studied as the need arises and a policy recommended for each individual program.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDIES

The Conway chamber is opposed to the Urban Mass Transportation Act. This is not within the principle of free enterprise and would create a burden for all people to aid a comparatively small number.

Ruling by Federal Communications Commission on the So-Called Fairness Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the recent ruling by the Federal Communications Commission on the so-called fairness doctrine has caused much concern across the country because of the fear that this ruling would serve to suppress or have the effect of suppressing radio and television broadcasts which do not conform to the political philosophy of the administration in power.

This FCC ruling was the subject of a recent column by Miss Edith Kermit Roosevelt. In this column, dated October 7, 1963, and printed in the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., Miss Roosevelt made the point that this ruling is tagged specifically to a recommendation by Mr. Walter Reuther that conservative and anti-Communist broadcasts be restricted through the powers vested in the FCC. In view of the serious and startling facts brought out in this column, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it might be available to all Members of the Congress to study.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FCC FAIRNESS DOCTRINE STEMS FROM REUTHER REPORT

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Communications Commission has begun setting the stage for the 1964 presidential elections. If it gets away with this, television will again play a decisive role in John F. Kennedy's campaign. But this time, instead of the crucial point being a confrontation between the two candidates, it will be control over television and radio. This is being achieved through news management, a process in Government circles which has now been given the less revealing label of news coordination.

The FCC's ruling of last July 26—the so-called "fairness doctrine"—can properly be understood only within this framework. A squeeze play is being organized to eliminate television and radio broadcasts which conflict with Government line. The ruling states:

RESPONSE

"When a controversial program involves a personal attack upon an individual organization the licensee must transmit the text of the broadcast to the person or group attacked, wherever located, either prior to or at the time of broadcast, with a specific offer in his station's facilities for an adequate response."

This "fairness doctrine" is loaded. The ruling only mentions its application to programs under the labels of "Americanism," "anticommunism," and "States rights," and is silent about pro-Communist or pro-Socialist programs. The key to this one-sided interpretation of "fairness" is to be found in the memorandum of Walter Reuther, vice president of the AFL-CIO, presented to Attorney General Robert Kennedy on December 19, 1961. This memo, said to have been prepared by Reuther's brother, Victor, is entitled: "The Radical Right in America Today." By "radical right," the document makes plain, it means all those who are Jeffersonian Democrats, "conservatives," or in any way anti-Communist.

Like the notorious Fulbright memorandum and the Rostov policy paper, the Reuther document was kept secret from the public, and at first denied. These three policymaking papers represent the basis for the present administration's domestic and foreign policy. All circumvent the Congress, while being implemented as though they were law. All dovetail to an odd degree with the Red manifesto of December 1960 that came out of the conference of 82 Communist Parties in Moscow, including the American. The manifesto cited anticommunism as a major danger to the success of Red conquest of the United States. The document de-

clares, "it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anticommunism." We are witnessing this program in action.

ROSTOW PAPER

The Rostow paper was a product of this anti-anti-Communist climate. Walt Whitman Rostow, as Planning Chief in the State Department, prepared this policy paper. In it, he wrote that our policy should be based on the assumption that Soviet Russia was mellowing. It also declared that the United States must act in ways which transcend the independent powers of the nation-state, an obvious declaration for the abandonment, in effect, of U.S. sovereignty. The Fulbright memorandum was directed against cold war indoctrination of the military and public, and it laid the groundwork for the purge of anti-Communists from positions of influence, especially in government.

The Reuther memorandum was bluntly directed at the public in an attempt to discredit all who oppose these policies, as well as to eliminate anti-Communists from public forums as controversial. It plainly recommended that opponents of administration policies be described as crackpots and wild-eyed reactionaries. This can be the only meaning of the actual wording, which follows:

"What are needed are deliberate administration policies and programs to contain the radical right from further expansion and in the long run to reduce it to its historic role of the impotent lunatic fringe."

The Reuther memorandum specifically previewed the FCC ruling by stating:

"Certainly the Federal Communications Commission might consider examining into the extent of the practice of giving free time to the radical right and could take measures to encourage stations to assign comparable time for an opposing point of view on a free basis."

BOTHERSOME

Obviously, stations will not wish to spend the time or money involved in this. The typical busy broadcaster will naturally try to avoid such bothersome and costly details by simply eliminating the rightist programs. This leaves only programs which support whatever policies the administration is favoring at the moment.

Here again we have an issue which strikes at the heart of our American system of government. Whether a voter calls himself liberal, conservative, a Democrat, or a Republican, he is equally menaced. The implementation of the Reuther memorandum, now being effected, would reduce the American citizen to the role of a robot in a dictatorship.

Freedom of our communications channels must be maintained intact, and be conscientiously guarded, if the United States is to remain free.

The Guided Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, early this year I spoke on the subject of political favorites being tipped off early on Government contract awards in order to relay this information to his news media, leaving the impression that he is to some extent, at least, responsible for securing this plum for his home area.

At that time I said someone should expose this procedure for the deception that it is.

Under permission to extend my remarks I call attention of the Members of Congress to the very thorough exposé of this procedure written by William Beecher, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on October 14 under title "The Guided Leak."

Mr. Beecher's article is as follows:

THE GUIDED LEAK: HOW DEMOCRATIC FAITHFUL GET WORD ON ARMS CONTRACTS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly every morning at about 10:30 a messenger carries a sheaf of papers from the Pentagon across the Potomac River to the White House. A great deal of secrecy shrouds this daily drive. No one will talk about the route, nor the type of vehicle used, nor whether the courier is military or civilian. Indeed, many officials deny the mission even occurs; others insist "it's a matter not appropriate for discussion."

Why the hush-hush attitude? Top secret military reports for the President? Not at all. Strange as it may seem the clandestine mission has nothing whatsoever to do with national security. Rather, it is an essential gambit in a slick political strategem that seeks by employing the combined energies of top Pentagon brass, shrewd White House agents, distinguished Senators and Representatives, and powerful news agencies, to bamboozle the naive.

You see, the information carried by the shadowy courier is nothing more than advance word on multimillion-dollar defense contract awards that will be announced officially by the Pentagon later in the day. White House agents telephone these exclusive data to favorite Democrats on Capitol Hill who make headlines in their hometown newspapers by disclosing the "scoops" to reporters.

The effect, in large part, is that the Pentagon no longer announces much of its own contract news. Congressmen do, in news stories that sometimes wink at the facts by declaring that Senator so-and-so "announced" a contract award, but usually make some attempt at accuracy by confessing that the legislator "was notified" or "was advised" of the event.

This legislative legerdemain is dismissed by many as harmless politics. "This is something the White House can deliver on; they can't deliver on much else in this building," contends one Pentagon source. "As far as I'm concerned, this is the least of the available evils. I'd rather continue this than do something substantive."

HIGH COSTS OF CAMPAIGNS

Another administration official insists the real problem rests with the high cost of political campaigning. His explanation: "Every man who's running for office feels he needs to make the impression that he has influence in Washington if he's to get the campaign contributions he needs. Patronage used to be more important than it is now. What's a postmastership worth nowadays? Very little.

"If we didn't make such information available to Congress, the public would be given by other means the impression that defense contracts were influenced, but the administration would get less benefit. I'm against the impression. But if it's going to be given away, I think the administration should reap some benefit."

Though offered as a defense, this line of reasoning also stands as an indictment. For, as critics are quick to point out, the quest for credit not only introduces partisanship into the Government's immense contracting business, but can hardly help but give voters, including business-seeking corporate managers, the clear impression that the politician who announced a contract award probably influenced the decision.

The erosive effect this can have on public confidence becomes clear when viewed against a larger background. During the early days of the Senate probe into the Pentagon's controversial TFX fighter-bomber, the Kennedy administration made no secret of its indignation at comments suggesting that political considerations determined the selection of the contractor. But by playing politics on routine contract announcements, the administration every day contributes to the public notion that influence does, indeed, swing million- and billion-dollar decisions.

Too, the system is fraught with temptation. The legislator who receives inside information on major contract awards is presented with the opportunity to benefit in the stock market; or, if he is too scrupulous for that, others he informs may not be.

Today's chief critics of the political tip-off habit, quite naturally, are Republicans. Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, warned Defense Secretary McNamara in a recent letter: "Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous. * * * I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent, mink coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic."

Nevertheless, it wasn't too many years ago that some Republican legislators were criticizing President Eisenhower for not making greater use of the "scoop" technique to help the party faithful, particularly around election time. And to some extent he did; so the Republicans are not above reproach. But what the GOP did spasmodically, the Democrats now do methodically.

The fact of the matter is that Congress, not the administration in power, is the motivating force behind the system. Mr. McNamara made the point in replying to Senator WILLIAMS. "Barring some further indication that the Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice," the Defense Secretary wrote, "I am disposed to continue it."

Underlying Mr. McNamara's reply was the knowledge of a top secret conference held during the early days of the Kennedy administration. It was called by aids to several influential Democratic Congressmen; it was attended by representatives from the White House, the Pentagon, and other Federal agencies; and it was designed to firmly establish the right of Democrats on Capitol Hill to enjoy the perquisites of power by getting advance word on contract awards.

Though there's no official record of the decisions reached at that unpublicized gathering, what has evolved is a two-part operation for speeding prior notice to Capitol Hill that has all the precision of a well-planned military maneuver. The midmorning Pentagon-White House mission is a strictly partisan affair. White House aids won't talk, but it's known they pass along their exclusive data to congressional favorites as routine procedure.

A NONPARTISAN NEWS SERVICE

Thus, the favored are assured of receiving word of contracts of interest to them before noon each day. This extra-special attention to party stalwarts is an extension of a separate procedure that seeks to give politicians of both parties a smaller lead on contract news. Each of the armed services has a separate staff of congressional liaison officers that sees to it that all interested legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, get about 1 hour's notice before public release of contract awards. The legislators are notified at 3 p.m. each day, the press at 4 p.m. The Air Force delivers its information by per-

sonal messenger to congressional offices; the Army and Navy use the telephone for the most part.

Until recently, Congress witnessed the spectacle of uniformed majors and colonels, their watches synchronized, delivering confidential contract memos with split-second timing to avoid charges of leaking the "leaks" to one legislator ahead of another.

But this got to be a bit too much, and several Congressmen objected to the use of high-ranking soldiers as messenger boys. So the Pentagon adjusted its tactics; it now uses enlisted men to carry contract news unless a contract must be explained to a lawmaker. For these more delicate maneuvers, officers are still preferred.

The rationale offered to justify the one-hour news break for Congressmen is to enable them to intelligently answer press queries on contracts awarded to companies in their States. There's no mention of the fact that, since the Pentagon awarded the contracts, maybe its representatives should be the ones to reply to questions. Nor is the point made that Congressmen seldom are given any more contract information than is the press, so they can't add substance to a news story anyway.

In the final analysis, then, the entire operation—both the partisan and nonpartisan phases—boils down to nothing more than political sleight-of-hand. And quite a few Pentagon officials express the private (very private) wish that the whole procedure be abandoned once and for all. This view, not surprisingly, is heard most frequently from those officers who are required to spend hours on the phone assuring nonfavored Congressmen that the military was not responsible for contract leaks to their rivals. Sighs one harried diplomat-officer: "I'd much rather wrestle with the many complex problems of guided missiles than of guided leaks."

Tolerance in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, several weeks ago, my distinguished junior colleague, Senator HOWARD CANNON, spoke before the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Las Vegas.

He gave a very inspiring talk on bigotry as related to brotherhood and how it affects our Nation.

I believe it deserves the attention of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON, OF NEVADA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, LAS VEGAS, NEV., SEPTEMBER 26

It is certainly a great pleasure for me to participate in your annual meeting and to be afforded the oportunity to address you on the subject of the power of tolerance in action—which has been so effectively demonstrated by this group.

Every American has heard many times over that the best way for this country to keep out of war is to prepare to defend itself on such a scale that a potential aggressor would shrink from the thought of attacking this country. One of the great leaders of our century, Winston Churchill, said, "We arm to parley." What we are really saying is that a nation set upon a policy of conquest and subjugation is certain to pick on the one who is not strong enough to effectively resist. Therefore, we look to American security, in effect, to advise the potential aggressor that an attack in our direction will be at his own peril.

Most of us are old enough to remember another period in our history when so many believed that military preparedness was not the way to accomplish peace, but that the establishment of a peaceful society could only come about by a headlong rush to disarmament. This was the argument both before and after World War II, when we sought to compel other nations to follow our example merely by the force of moral persuasion.

But people have come to realize throughout the world today that military preparedness is our only road to peace, because we have learned that aggression has no off season in the contest between freedom and communism, for the powermongers of the world never sleep. They are constantly on the alert like a pack of roaming wolves, ready to pounce upon any people, any nation showing signs of defensive weakness.

In a similar vein, I think it is also clear that the hate mongers of the world, the aggressors among us, are constantly busy preparing an assault of one kind or another on this or that group, depending upon who has aroused their anger. And since this is true, there is no time when men and women of tolerant mind and spirit can relax their vigilance.

These aggressors—and I lump them together deliberately—do not respect our peaceful ideas of democracy and freedom. As a country and as individuals, we know that the forces of evil are an angry, unruly element in our society to whom the fight will never be over so long as they draw breath.

Under these circumstances, I think it proper that your organization should be working as busily and as effectively today as ever before.

I am sure that there are those who believe that we protest too much, that we denounce the villains when there are none in our midst. They tell us that Hitler is dead and that bigotry in general is crumbling here and abroad. They say that George Lincoln Rockwell has not attracted any great number of Americans to his cause of forming a Nazi party in the United States. So why don't we sit down and keep quiet?

I suppose we all have an answer to this one, and mine goes something like this: That all of the battles which persons of conscience, tolerance, and good will find themselves involved in today, are battles that have gone on in one form or another from the beginning of time. Indeed, we never win this battle, and are instead glad to settle merely for winning a round or two, here and there. If we have learned nothing from our fight for decency and tolerance, we ought to have learned at least that our foe is truly dedicated, with as much determination as we, and that they are fired by the flame of fanaticism.

These handmaidens of general ignorance, racial, ethnic and religious prejudices, never die. They ebb and flow in response to changing social, political, and economic conditions. There was anti-Semitism in Germany before Hitler, and perhaps there will be again. Because these emotions can be suddenly whipped to life by lies, poverty, hunger, or humiliation. And where these conditions exist, aggression and hate are sure to follow.

We are witnessing an illustration of these forces in the South today. The two races, white and Negro, did settle down for awhile throughout the 1870's and 1880's in a rather uneasy acceptance of the postwar status quo which followed the enactment of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. Ku Klux Klan raids did take place, and people were lynched and riots did occur, but Negroes, nevertheless, were accorded a place in the Southern political system in which they voted and held office; and for a time it did appear that reason might prevail. Integration at one time did exist in the South, even in public places; but when economic catastrophe struck in 1890, race hatred became the order of the day. Reason was washed away, progress canceled, and the Negro in the South became disenfranchised and saddled with segregation laws.

The South was not and is not an isolated, sectional case. There have been periods when Chinese and Japanese on the west coast were targets for bigotry, and virtually every minority group has had its own recurrent stories to tell. The significant thing to me is that most of these uprisings were in protest to the belief that members of minority groups were somehow, unexplainably and mysteriously, responsible for poverty and the logical recipients of physical abuse.

In these circumstances, the majority often reacts in the same kind of spirit and the panic of people aboard a sinking ship, a panic which drives many people to act in their own behalf at the expense of others.

Nor are these instances isolated to our own society. In Red China, the Chinese Government is currently coping with a race issue which is once again disproving the fiction that Communist methods are superior to Western methods in the matter of securing social justice for all. It so happens that about 92 percent of the Chinese population is comprised of persons belonging to the "Han" race, and the other 8 percent is referred to by the majority as "dogs." It has been thus throughout Chinese history, and the Communist takeover did not change this one iota.

We also have been reading in the papers lately about the Chinese hatred for the white race generally in their relations with the Soviet Union and certainly with this country. We also know that while antisemitism was officially outlawed in Russia, it continues to flourish to this day with the connivance of Soviet officials.

The important lesson for us should be that no government can of itself preach tolerance to its people, even enact laws forbidding persecution with any considerable effect. It may defend its minorities against outrageous attack and can generally protect their rights. But when all is said and done, the only force that can work effectively among the people to offset ignorance and fear is the force of the people themselves, such as the part represented by yourselves here tonight.

It is my impression in witnessing the growing influence of the national conference over the years and the decrease of bigotry in the United States, that there is a close connection between the two developments and one in which you as members of the national conference can take great pride.

As I have already implied, it is my belief that there will be no real test of how free we are from bigotry in this country until the economic picture worsens. I certainly hope that my words are never put to the test, for we want at all costs to avoid an economic disaster or serious recession. Economics alone is certainly not the only determining factor in the degree of tolerance we are able to achieve. Certainly the work of the churches is uppermost and it is they who will have to bear much of the burden of our continuing vigilance. We must further recognize the importance of guarding against the oversimplified solution to complex and difficult problems with which we are faced. In my opinion, the

hate groups, the radicals, and the extremists have been able to make headway in this country in recent years because there are some who believe there are easy, quick, and obvious solutions to the complex problems that confront us today.

Before concluding, I would like to say something concerning civil rights, an issue with which the present Congress is attempting to deal. I have been quoted in the press as stating that I believe that jobs are the key to the solution of the Negro problem in this country. I would like to elaborate. The job problem is not solvable on a racial issue. Automation draws no color line and affects people at every level, particularly the lower income groups. I do not believe that any Negro leader will quarrel with the fact that in this age of automation jobs must be found and they are found only by men and women who are skilled, educated, and in good health.

The President himself said only 2 weeks ago that jobs cannot be filled on a quota system according to race. I agree wholeheartedly. They must be filled on the basis of merit and ability. It is only through an educated and skilled America that our productivity and manpower can be fully utilized. This is a job in which political pressure and even legislation can only create a proper climate; it cannot create the education and skills that are needed so desperately by much of the Negro population.

Surely the civil rights issue will be acted upon one way or another by this session of Congress, but the basic goals and aspirations of the Negro minority, or any other minority for that matter, cannot be answered by legislation alone.

I should like to compliment this organization on its efforts in the cause of brotherhood regardless of race, religion, or country—for your efforts have gone beyond the borders of the United States.

When the national conference first came into existence, it threw its weight against the 1928 hate campaign involving the religious beliefs of New York Governor Al Smith. The national conference demonstrated then that it was willing to fight in behalf of any victim of undemocratic, unprincipled attack. In the thirties it was responsible for launching Brotherhood Week which has become a national institution headed every year by the President of the United States. In 1941 the national conference began its summer workshops for teachers, and at the same time sent speaker teams to our Armed Forces in all parts of the United States and overseas. Then, following the close of World War II, the national conference program was greatly expanded so that not only teachers but community leaders, police, businessmen, union leaders, and youth groups were enlisted.

What all this may amount to—indeed, what I hope it will amount to—is to bring to an end the cycle of which I spoke earlier—the traditional cycle, by which race hate and ethnic hate can be severely reduced when times are good but revived again when times get bad. Indeed, with the work of your organization and like organizations throughout the country, the time may soon arrive when it can be said in all truth that the great mass of Americans are able to meet their troubles—of every kind—without blaming somebody else for them, and without feeling obliged to defame their fellow Americans at this or any other time.

In the event that this blessed condition ever, in fact, develops, you, of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, will have the right to take as many bows as you wish—and it is my hope, when that happens, that I will be on hand as a witness, in order to join in the applause.

I thank you for your attention.

International Congress on Education of the Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, for almost a hundred years the dedicated educators of the deaf have sponsored international meetings to exchange ideas and gain information relating to the universal problem of educating the deaf. The first international meeting was held in 1873 in Vienna. In 1878, the first International Congress on Education of the Deaf was convened in Paris. Since then, the United States has served as host on two occasions.

In 1933, the International Congress on Education of the Deaf met in Trenton, N.J., and, most recently, the 10th International Congress on Education of the Deaf met during June 22–28, 1963, in Washington, D.C. The host institution was Gallaudet College, the only college in the world dedicated to the education of the deaf.

I know that my colleagues in Congress will be interested in reading a statement that summarizes the activities of the 10th International Congress on Education of the Deaf and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON EDUCATION OF THE DEAF ENDS ON OPTIMISTIC NOTE

How to educate deaf children better was the theme of an unusual weeklong meeting in Washington, D.C., of close to 2,200 educators and administrators from more than 50 countries and every State in the United States. The International Congress on Education of the Deaf, which started in 1878, met for the first time in 30 years in America, at Gallaudet College, June 22–28, 1963. Gallaudet is the only college in the word dedicated to the education and welfare of the deaf.

Most of those who attended are directly concerned with educating deaf children in preschool, elementary, and high schools throughout the world; but some were from allied fields, such as psychology and linguistics, and were interested in increasing their knowledge of how hearing people communicate by studying those without hearing.

More than 250 papers, dealing with testing, communications, learning, curriculum, and rehabilitation, were delivered. Subjects of particular interest discussed were: (1) Modern techniques for testing children which enable educators to make an earlier and more specific assessment of defective hearing in children, prior to 4 years of age; (2) the importance of communicating some sound and learning experiences to children at the earliest possible age—from birth to 6 years; (3) the vital role of the parent in providing learning, love, and motivation to the deaf child; (4) the improved opportunities today for manipulating signals to children so as to reach them earlier and better (by sound amplification and filtering systems); (5) the more scientific approach to the best sensory pathways for reaching the child, whether by vision or hearing or some combination of both; and (6) the need for a closer relationship between the changing job needs of business and industry, and the preparation of deaf children for their entrance into the job market.

Dr. Bernard Tervoort of the Netherlands reported on a research project he is conducting to determine how deaf children actually communicate with each other outside a classroom situation. Using telescopic cameras, he has been making pictures of 60 children, ages 7 to 12, in North Carolina, Indiana, Holland, and Belgium. He has found that when left to themselves, deaf children, using mimicry, gestures, postures, and nonphonemic sounds, fight against the auditory principles they are receiving in classrooms.

Dr. Edgar F. Waldon, audiologist at the speech clinic of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., described a new audiometric technique, the Baby-Cry Test (BCT), for testing the hearing responses of very young children. Formerly, a pure-tone signal had been used with only fair results. The BCT employs an actual cry of a 6-month-old baby. The cry is fed to an amplifier combination unit and then passed through a variable band pass filter for frequency bands. The outcoming signal is recorded on another tape. Sixty children from 1 month to 3 years old were tested by both means, and the Baby-Cry Test elicited responses in 100 percent of the cases.

Mrs. Spencer Tracy, whose son is deaf, delivered a paper on the work of the John Tracy Clinic in Los Angeles. Mrs. Tracy has found that "learning for deaf children depends primarily upon their parents—not so much on deaf children's scholastic attainments as on their attitude toward life and their parents, on their love, their support and their understanding, on their values, and their sense of what is important." She stressed that "feelings" play an important part of how a child learns to communicate, and that better parent education is one of the solutions for educating the child. In addition to working with parents at the Tracy Clinic itself, the clinic maintains a worldwide correspondence course for any parent who suddenly discovers that his child is deaf and is bewildered about his own role in helping the child.

An educator who teaches only the hearing, but is interested in studying how deaf children communicate, is Dr. Dennis Fry, professor of experimental phonetics at University College, London, England. Dr. Fry presented a paper on his work on how sounds and the brain interact in communications. He is studying the rhythm and tone qualities of sounds to determine their effect on brain waves. One conclusion reached is that most deaf people have some latent, residual hearing and, for learning to take place, it is important to reach children at the earliest possible age. Thus again the role of the parent in making sounds to the child from birth to age 6, rather than tending to avoid speech, was emphasized.

Improvements in ear surgery and in audiometric instruments such as the electroencephalograph, the use of the digital computer to show the electrical output of the nervous system in response to sound, how deafness affects the personality and one's outlook and social adjustment, were other subjects discussed during the week.

Cochairman of the Congress, Dr. Richard Silverman of the Central Institute for the Deaf in St. Louis, Mo., spoke in his keynote address of those educators who would "gear an educational program to the production of contented members of a subculture in its mores, modes of communication and opportunities for social expression * * * while others strive for complete assimilation of deaf people in the world of the hearing." He felt that a constructive combination of both ideas would be most useful.

Dr. Silverman also decried the increasing number of young deaf people, 17 to 22, who enter the labor market without any marketable skills or those that are marginal. He said that educators are faced with the perplexing problems of "vocational training for what?" * * * of preparing young people for jobs that at the time of their schooling do not yet exist. He urged the improvement of teacher training, reduction of teacher shortage, and the "elimination of a persistent parochialism that is a residue from the days when the education of the deaf was in the hands of a dedicated but professionally inbred few."

What the International Congress has meant to foreign delegates is revealed by such an administrator as Miss Kool Jong Lee, principal of the Federation School for the Deaf in Penang, Malaya. Miss Lee attended the last world meeting 5 years ago in Manchester, England. Her problem is one of adapting the new techniques and equipment she learns about to conditions in Malaya. If she orders a new audiometric device from England, for example, she is faced with an impossible repair job when the equipment eventually breaks down. She finds it difficult to apply new knowledge on communications to the languages of her own country where the children are taught both English and Malay.

Mrs. Nancy De Sa of Bombay, India, has a different problem at the school for the deaf she founded. Mrs. De Sa became interested in deaf children by watching their attempts at communication. She started a small school, the Stephens School for the Deaf in Chowpatty. Now the school is ready for its own building, but she so far has been unable to locate the necessary funds.

Mexico, the Netherlands, England, Sweden, and Argentina had large delegations attending. Others came from Brazil, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Kuwait, Israel, Lebanon, Kashmir, Ghana, Iceland, the Philippines, and most of Europe and South America. Yugoslavia was the only Iron Curtain country represented.

The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, addressing the Congress banquet attended by over 900 people, said:

"It is always a hopeful sign when people join together in working to solve a common problem. Even when a single individual finds another in difficulty and extends a helping hand, the world is made a little better—if only for the trying. When many people join together to reduce human affliction, the good that is done far exceeds the sum of the individual efforts, for each contributes to the effectiveness of the others.

"You have brought to your work still another dimension—a dimension large enough to encompass the whole family of man. For you are not only many people working together to solve a common problem—you are many people of many lands. In your combined efforts to add to the sum total of human happiness you are giving expression to the brotherhood of man in its finest form."

The Secretary told those present that "man continues to have hope for a better world. As all of you so fully appreciate in your own work hope has been the great mainspring that has made modern public health possible. Time was when parents could do little but hope when their children came down with the inevitable chills and fevers of childhood. And more often than not hope was merely a shield against despair. Now it is the other way around for an ever-increasing number of families. Worry, yes. But now, more often than not, there is hope—and confidence. And even when the worst happens there is every hope—every confidence—that the day will come when the death-dealing agent that took the life of this child will have been brought under control, so that other children may live."

"Surely we have," Secretary Celebrezze said, "an obligation to see that every child has the opportunity to go up the educational ladder as far as he wants to and can—including those who have the misfortune to be mentally or physically handicapped. This is a large order in the best of circumstances. It becomes an even larger order with young people whom fate has forced to grow up in a silent world. Every child needs a good teacher. To the child who is deaf the kind of teacher he has becomes a matter of overwhelming importance."

Secretary Celebrezze pointed out that as a result of the new program of Federal aid to colleges and universities to train more teachers of the deaf in this country, 470 qualified teachers of the deaf were graduated this year—more than twice the number graduated in any previous year. Some 2,700 children who are completely deaf or who have serious hearing impairments will, for the first time, have a trained teacher this fall. There are still an estimated 5,000 deaf children who should have special education and aren't receiving it.

"We are recommending," the Secretary said, "that the teacher-training program be broadened and improved and that it also include provisions for research on improved teaching methods. The teacher is part of a larger team in our modern work for deaf children and adults, for maximum success today depends very directly on teamwork—a team in which teachers, therapists, counselors, social workers, job specialists, and other professional staff work together on behalf of the deaf. Here, too, we are making progress. A number of Federal programs are specifically designed to train more men and women in these professions which are so important in our total efforts to bring deaf people the full benefits of modern knowledge and skills."

Near the end of his speech, Secretary Celebrezze said, "I hardly need point out that we are deeply proud of Gallaudet College and its century of fine work on behalf of the deaf. It has been said that a child's education should begin at least 100 years before he is born. For many deaf children of the world theirs did—with the establishment of Gallaudet College. This is more than an American institution—it is an international institution. This year's enrollment of more than 600 men and women includes students from Finland, South Vietnam, India, Japan, Ghana, Pakistan, South Africa, China, and Canada.

"The world urgently needs today rallying points of unity, points where men and women of different faiths and cultures can meet, define needs, and, in a great exchange of ideas across national boundaries, advance the well-being of the human race.

"More than 200 years ago, Joseph Addison said, 'If men would consider not so much wherein they differ, as wherein they agree, there would be far less of incharitableness and angry feeling in the world.'

"This International Congress is such a rallying point, such a center of unity, a meeting where the spirit of cooperative endeavors develops mutual ties of peaceful purpose—the bonds that offset tensions and the 'angry feeling in the world.' * * *

"I am grateful," the Secretary concluded, "as I know you are, to the Council on Education of the Deaf for sponsoring this International Congress. I wish you ever-increasing success in your great and difficult mission in the years ahead."

Dr. M. J. C. Buchli, of Groningen, Netherlands, and past president of the International Congress, in the "Response for Foreign Delegates'" at the banquet, named what he considered the two high points of the Congress: (1) The "From Rhythm to Rhyme" demonstration by 32 deaf and hard-of-hearing children from the Willis and Elizabeth Martin Day School for the Deaf, Philadelphia, Pa.; (2) the "Class in American Literature" demonstration by a deaf professor, Robert F. Panara, with a representative group of deaf students from the junior and senior classes of Gallaudet College. Professor Panara, a graduate of Gallaudet College, in his demonstration used all the resources of the Simultaneous Method of communication, which in his own individualized manner, included finger spelling, sign language, pantomime, and writing on the blackboard.

These two heartwarming events Dr. Buchli claimed contributed the most to the success of the weeklong meeting and made worthwhile the thousands of miles traveled by many of the delegates to attend the Congress.

Dr. S. Richard Silverman, director, Central Institute for the Deaf, St. Louis, Mo., and Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, president, Gallaudet College, served as cochairmen of the International Congress.

Mr. Lloyd A. Ambrosen, superintendent, Maryland School for the Deaf, Frederick, and Dr. Edgar L. Lowell, administrator, John Tracy Clinic, Los Angeles, Calif., were cochairmen of the program commitete.

Dr. Powrie V. Doctor, chairman, Department of History and Political Science, Gallaudet College, and editor, America Annals of the Deaf, served as executive secretary of the Congress.

The Georgetown University School of Linguistics had charge of translation into French, German, and Spanish of the papers delivered. In addition 49 manual interpreters were provided for the deaf people who attended the meeting.

The next International Congress on the Education of the Deaf will probably convene in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1968, at the invitation of the four Scandinavian countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden.

Nuclear Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of September 29, 1963:

This dangerous, authoritarian approach reached its climax in the debate on the nuclear test ban. A group of civilians in the executive branch of Government tried to bar Congress and the American people from access to facts vitally needed to make a wise decision on this matter of crucial importance to the national security.

For this reason, a magazine published in Washington, D.C., entitled Missiles and Rockets, announced in its September 16 issue that it was deliberately breaking "the highest national classification." Taking the stand that this information was being dangerously and unjustly kept from Congress and the public, the magazine revealed "top secret" information. It said the Soviets had conducted tests that disclosed the existence of a completely unexpected effect known as the electromagnetic pulse (EMP). As a result of Moscow's doublecrossing breach of the last moratorium on nuclear testing the Soviets may have developed a superbomb that can immobilize the electronic brains of U.S. missiles in their underground silos.

This discovery is of transcendental importance to the survival of the United States as a free nation, both literally and politically. The United States has already voluntarily surrendered its first-strike capability

to the enemy. This was done under the assumption that we could retaliate with such overwhelming force to destroy the Soviet Union that Moscow would never dare use its first-strike advantage. Now, if the destructive effect of the electromagnetic pulse is what the Soviet tests indicate, we have lost the second-strike power as well.

A Washington analytical report by Edward Hunter, author of "Brainwashing From Pavlov to Powers," revealed other classified data. According to him, the White House kept secret the two atomic test shots fired through space by the Soviet Union on June 10 and June 19.

"What is still undisclosed is that the Soviets 'killed' one of our satellites with one of their explosions, doing so at the precise right time in space, in a manner that could only be deliberate."

We, on the other hand, the report went on to say, accidentally knocked out two of our own satellites in one of our tests last summer.

Strange Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House of some rather strange coincidences. At a book-and-author luncheon to be held October 22 at 12:30 in the Waldorf-Astoria Grand Ballroom, and sponsored by the American Booksellers Association and the New York Herald Tribune, there will appear as guest speakers Mr. Allen Dulles, former head of CIA, Hon. Adlai Stevenson, Ambassador to the United Nations, and Jessica Mitford, also known as Jessica Mitford Romilly Treuhaft, author of a recent book entitled "The American Way of Death." Jessica Mitford is the wife of Robert Treuhaft, twice identified as a Communist in the Seventh Report of the Un-American Activities Committee of the California State Senate for 1953, at pages 260, 261, and 262. He took the fifth amendment, and so did his wife, Jessica Mitford, to avoid incriminating herself when her associations were documented. Among other things, it was shown that Mrs. Treuhaft—Jessica Mitford—was once the financial director of the Communist-run California Labor School. She was also director of the Civil Rights Congress in the Berkeley, California, area. This organization is cited as a Communist front operation by the U.S. Attorney General. She also was identified as one who attended a closed meeting of the Communist Party on January 28, 1951 at 2002 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, Calif. When questioned on this, she took the fifth amendment.

One wonders whether this information is known by Allen Dulles and Ambassador Stevenson, or if they have been made dupes to attract a large audience for Jessica Mitford to plug her new book. While hiding behind the commercial aspects of the mortician and the cemeteries and mausoleums where our dear departed friends and relatives are commemorated, she is really striking another blow at the Christian religion. Her tirade against morticians is simply the vehicle to carry her antichrist attack, and I am at a loss to know why Americans such as Allen Dulles and Ambassador Stevenson should create an air of respectability for this pro-Communist anti-American.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further advise the House that tomorrow night CBS is presenting a 1-hour documentary on the Mitford book and is giving her a national forum from which to spew her anti-Americanism.

You should also know that Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS and Mr. Richard S. Salant, president of CBS News, have been on notice for 2 weeks regarding Jessica Mitford's Communist-front activities, but they still insist on giving her 1 hour free time to advance the sale of her book, the profits from which, no doubt, will find their way into the coffers of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

It is my belief that this is a pro-Communist documentary and that some patriotic American should demand and receive equal time to expose Jessica Mitford, because you can rest assured that the left-leaning CBS will not put forth one word of identification of Mitford and her Communist front activities.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith an editorial appearing in the Valley Times, Van Nuys, Calif., on September 28, written by Mr. Ben Reddick, its publisher. This editorial deals with Jessica Mitford and her book. "The American Way of Death," published by Simon & Schuster of New York:

A HAUNTING REMINDER

The "we will bury you" remark that Khrushchev made has come back to haunt him. Recently he tried to recant the statement when he told workers in Yugoslavia that he did not mean that Russia or the Communist world would literally or actually bury the free world but that workers of the capitalist countries would engulf their "masters" with communism by choice.

Now the attack has started so that Communists may try to bury even the funeral business in the free world.

Recently members of the leftist clergy and some of the Nation's outstanding news media have joined hands in a blatant denunciation of funeral directors, morticians, and memorial parks and kindred purveyors of services at time of sadness and need.

As usual in such attacks there is a thread of truth, citations of isolated abuses, exaggerations, and downright falsehood. Trigger behind the attack is a book published by Simon and Schuster of New York. They are the publishers of "Calories Don't Count" which the Federal Trade Commission cited for false advertising.

The most recent volume is entitled "The American Way of Death." Author is listed as Jessica Mitford. Jessica Mitford is identified by her agents as Mrs. Robert Treuhaft, of Oakland, Calif. Treuhaft was twice identified in House Un-American Activities Committee reports as a Communist. He took the fifth amendment. His wife also took the fifth to avoid incriminating herself when her associations were documented.

She is known by her writings to have been the wife of a freedom fighter with Communists forces in the Spanish Civil War. This was a marriage prior to the Treuhaft merger. The Mitford woman was a native of England and among her sisters were Unity Freeman Mitford, identified as Hitler's Nordic goddess; Lady Diana Mosley, wife of Sir Oswald Mosley, British Fascist rabble rouser, and of Nancy Mitford whose novels have always acridly treated American men, morals, and standards.

Mrs. Jessica Mitford Romilly Treuhaft in her book, deals with many things which certainly are fact, many others are questionable. If she is following the Communist Party line of anti-Christ and antireligion she should have dealt somewhat with the deviations and aberrations of that society.

In Moscow is a giant tomb of red marble, set on a base of black marble close alongside the wall of the Kremlin on Red Square. This structure is the tomb that is supposed to have housed the preserved bodies of Stalin and Lenin. Stalin was removed to an inconspicuous grave behind the Lenin monument when Khrushchev undertook the de-Stalinization of Russia and the satellite countries.

Despite the fact Mrs. Mitford Romilly Treuhaft decries the worship of the dead and highly commercialized aspects of the modern funeral and burial costs, she has overlooked Lenin's enshrinement. Is this not an outstanding example of the cosmetologists art on the dead which she so decries?

In the United States of America and on huge billboards around southern California we have seen the legend "service never refused for lack of funds."

We would rather place our mortal remains, alive or dead, in the hands of any American mortician than to set foot on the soil of any Communist nation. The Mitford-Simon & Schuster book is the best acclamation we know for the term "Better Dead Than Read."

Bungling in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope all Members have had an opportunity to read the lead editorial that appeared in the New York Times, Tuesday, October 8, entitled "Bungling in Space."

In the event that Members missed the editorial, I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I should particularly like to draw attention to that portion of the editorial that suggests the importance of a congressional examination of the "pork barrel" that has sprung up around the space program.

The editorial follows:

BUNGLING IN SPACE

The execution of the space program, already under heavy congressional fire, has now been subjected to severe additional criticism by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the General Accounting Office.

By inference, NASA criticizes itself as well as American industry in the castigations of industry's quality control that mark the final report on Project Mercury. Careless and sloppy workmanship and numerous failures to meet specifications for capsules and boosters and equipment led to repeated delays, undue costs, and unnecessary risks of life.

NASA lays these faults on the shoulders of industry alone, but the General Accounting Office is more embracing in its distribution

of responsibility. Its report explicitly blames bungling and poor management by NASA, as well as poor performance by contractors, for a 2-year setback in our lunar program and a $100 million loss to the taxpayers.

All this has become regrettably familiar language in evaluations of defense and space procurement. Pentagon officials and various officers of the armed services have repeatedly criticized the standards of workmanship of many contractors and have loudly complained about heavy cost overruns.

It is true that the new frontiers of space, like the new frontiers of the ocean depths, require finer tolerances, better workmanship, novel techniques, and processes and the solution of problems undreamed of a couple of decades ago. It is true that the American space program, unlike the Russian, has had to work within the confines of limited rocket boost, which meant that capsules and equipment had to be miniaturized to a degree that compounded all the engineering problems. It is true that the best of U.S. industry has performed some prodigies of development and production in the space and military hardware program.

But the record has been marred too often by sloppiness and carelessness. Industry cannot meet the exacting challenges of the new technology by old patterns. Contracting procedures must be placed as far as possible on an incentive and penalty basis—more money for excellent performance, economical production and early delivery; severe penalties for poor performance, uneconomical production and delays.

And while criticism is being parceled out, a considerable measure should be bestowed on both the Kennedy administration and Congress itself for the aroma of the pork-barrel that they have allowed to spring up around the space program. The Manned Spacecraft Center, for example, was located near Houston under circumstances which, as described in yesterday's Times by our correspondent John W. Finney, could only make the public more cynical than ever about the whole program.

The disgraceful maneuvering to establish multimillion-dollar space projects—whether in Texas or Massachusetts—reflects on the administration, the Congress and the country and undermines popular support for the program itself. No wonder the expenditure of such vast sums has been meeting so much well-founded public resistance.

Our Fisheries Must Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who foresee increasing importance in the wealth of the seas within the framework of an exploding world population, the alarming increase in the exploitation of fishing grounds adjacent to the United States by fishing fleets of foreign nations during the past 2 years is cause for consternation and deep concern. Indulging in careless and wanton drag operations, these foreign fleets not only destroy the bottom fisheries on our Continental Shelf but damage and destroy gear of American fishermen, and thereby force them from their traditional fishing grounds.

The time has come for the United States to take strong and affirmative action to secure our national interest, while at the same time protecting the livelihood of our fishermen.

To highlight the seriousness of the situation, I point to the aggressive action of Russian fishing fleets which have been engaged in modern large-scale, subsidized operations in the process of dragging for king crab and other fisheries resources off the coast of Kodiak Island, Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to help resolve this problem by lending their weight in passing the important and pertinent legislation now pending before this House and which I have discussed in my letter of October 14 to President Kennedy. Therein I have also stressed the need for positive Executive action to protect our fishermen and fisheries resources. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: By means of this letter I urgently submit for your consideration the emphasis which I place upon a recent legislative development designed to stem the tide of foreign encroachment upon traditional American fishing grounds. I refer to passage by the Senate on October 1, 1963, of the bill, S. 1988, introduced in the Senate by my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, and cosponsored by nine other Senators, including the senior Senator from the State of Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, who states the purpose of the bill to be as follows: "First, to protect our territorial waters from encroachment by foreign fishing vessels; and, second, to preserve our marine resources on, or attached to, the Continental Shelf." The bill also defines violations and prescribes penalties.

Except for amendments adopted in the Senate, S. 1988 is identical to my bill, H.R. 7954, pending in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which committee S. 1988 has also been assigned, as well as a like bill, H.R. 8296, introduced by my colleague, Representative HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts. At the Senate committee hearings, S. 1988 was supported by the State Department, Department of the Interior, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Treasury, and was strongly endorsed by the entire fishing industry of the United States. My urgent request that House action in the form of a hearing upon this vital legislation be expedited has already been transmitted to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of said committee.

Commencing at page 17554 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1, 1963, we find strong supporting statements by many Senators pertaining to the folowing salient points:

(a) The need for this legislation is urgent because during the past summer there have been numerous incidents off both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts in which Russian and Japanese vessels have engaged in fishing activities within our territorial waters or exploited resources of our continental shelf;

(b) Our Government presently lacks statutory authority to protect both our territorial waters within the 3-mile limit and resources upon the continental shelf. At present, encroachments by foreign vessels within our 3-mile limit can be met only by boarding and a polite request to leave;

(c) The bill does not define "territorial waters" thereby leaving it open for our Government to follow the lead of Canada in establishing a 12-mile limit with straight base lines for fishing purposes. This would take the place of our present 3-mile limit and thereby match the 12-mile limit imposed and enforced by the Soviet Union;

(d) There are two bases upon which the United States may claim the resources upon or attached to our continental shelf—first, pursuant to the provisions of the 1953 Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act, and, second, provisions found in the International Convention on the Continental Shelf, which convention will take effect upon the ratification of one more nation. Twenty-one nations have thus far signed this convention, including the Soviet Union and the United States;

(e) In addition to trawling for king crab in international waters near Kodiak Island, Russians navigating fleets of modern fast vessels have ruthlessly moved through waters already occupied by Alaskan fishermen and deliberately damaged or destroyed their gear, consisting of crab pots marked with buoys. This, of course, has created an explosive situation leading to the depletion of the great Alaska king crab fishery upon our continental shelf, concurrently with driving Alaskans from one of their traditional fishing grounds and thereby—unless brought to a stop—ruining their means of earning a livelihood.

In the light of the foregoing, I now indicate my view of the great significance of the subject legislation as mentioned at the outset of this letter. The points I am about to make would, if pursued, constitute a timely supplementation to your strong stand supporting the principle of abstention as it has applied during the past 10 years to the Japanese North Pacific salmon fishery on the high seas, with varying periods of application to halibut and herring. I emphasize the triple importance of this legislation as follows:

First, it is needed as legal implementation for accomplishment by our Government of protection of our territorial waters; second, its undefined reference to "territorial waters" leaves the door open for enlargement of our territorial waters by executive assertion of American jurisdiction over the sea to the 12-mile limit, especially for fishery purposes; and, third, it provides suitable provisions for enforcement of an official claim by the United States to ownership and control over the resources on or attached to its Continental Shelf, including king crab, to be effective at such time as such claim is made.

The first objective, which is to fill the void in Federal law with respect to violations of our territorial waters by foreign vessels, would be immediately accomplished by passage and approval of the bill. The second and third objectives, however, depend upon companion action by the Executive. Therefore, I seek and urge your direction and support of appropriate steps to establish the 12-mile limit along our coasts especially for fishing, in harmony with certain historical rights of Canadian fishermen in exchange for reciprocal acknowledgement by Canada of certain historical rights of U.S. fishermen off the coasts of Canada. I further respectfully urge your issuance of such presidential proclamation as is necessary to constitute a formal claim by the United States to resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States, to be done pursuant to the provisions of the 1953 Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act without awaiting the one final ratification to the Convention on the Continental Shelf, if you foresee subsantial delay thereof.

Sincerely and cordially yours,

RALPH J. RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

Quality Stabilization and Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is anticipated that before the year is out there will be presented a measure to the Congress labeled the Quality Stabilization Act which purportedly will have the effect of artificially raising prices to a more equitable level for the retailer and a tolerable level for the consumer. I believe Dr. Lawrence C. Lockley of the University of Santa Clara (Calif.) has recently placed this issue in perspective as follows:

One of the bits of legislation which has come up quietly—so quietly that I, for one, had not been aware of it, was a bill called the Quality Stabilization Act, a new and fancy name for a new attempt to legislate what we have unfortunately called fair trade into practice again. According to a news account in the Wall Street Journal, this act is very likely to pass, in spite of opposition by organized labor and the farm organizations.

The theoretical basis of free enterprise capitalism is that those entrepreneurs and investors who seek to improve their position will have to do so by the route of competition. And in terms of the ultimate consumer, competition shows itself at the retail level. If one food store offers a popular brand of canned soup at 17 cents and another offers the same brand at 14 cents, the consumer will probably prefer to buy at 14 cents, and the store trying to sell at the higher price will have to drop its price or keep its merchandise. The merchant offering the soup at the lower price may have found a way to buy at a lower price, to retail more economically, or to do business on a lower gross margin. It makes no difference to the consumer how the retailer is able to offer merchandise at a lower price.

While retailers compete with each other by striving for preferable locations; by attempting to offer better service (such as prompt delivery, credit, easy adjustments, guarantees, trading stamps, and the like), and by advertising, the major competitive resource in competition is price reduction.

It is this type of competition which has brought the best products to the American public at the lowest feasible prices. It has helped to improve the quality of the products we can buy. It has been a major factor in raising our standard of living. But at the same time, it has been a ruthless weeder-out of inefficient retailers. The retailer who could not, one way or another, compete with his fellows, has gone to the wall. And when retailers, in any number, have found themselves in distress, they have sought relief in protective legislation. When the department store first appeared in the middle of the eighteen-hundreds, it was accused of crushing the honest small merchant because of its great size and economic wealth. It is evident that the threat was not realized. Later on, when parcel post made it possible to ship merchandise to hamlets which had never had adequate retail service, the large mail order firms were accused of throttling the honest small merchant.

Particularly in the food field, the chain store became an important factor immediately after the First World War. Once more, the honest small merchant cried out in his distress, and this time, a good many discriminatory chain store taxes were established by various States—taxes which later turned out to be unconstitutional.

Probably the biggest battle has been fought over what is misnamed fair trade legislation. Under this type of legislation, a manufacturer or even a wholesaler could enter into a contract to maintain a retail price set by the manufacturer or by the wholesaler. Law among the States varies, but it was usually enough to enter into a contract with from five to a dozen retailers to establish a so-called fair trade price, selling below which was illegal.

Fair trade legislation began with the act in California, passed in 1931, and amended in 1933, with the addition of the nonsigners' clause, by means of which an agreement made between a manufacturer and a distributor to maintain a given price for a specified product became legally binding when publicly announced by the manufacturer. So popular did this approach to protecting the small but honest merchant become that all States save Missouri, Texas, Vermont (and the District of Columbia) had fair trade laws.

The drug retailers, the liquor dealers, the booksellers, and various others have said that they could not remain in business without protection from price cutters, and that fair trade legislation was necessary to them. In the latter part of the 1930's, I made a study of the size and profitability of drug retailers in Misoeuri and in Texas, comparing them with similar groups of drug firms in States in which fair trading was practiced. Curiously enough, by whatever measures I could devise, the drug retailers were larger and more prosperous in the States where fair trading was not practiced. I am confident they were also better merchants.

In the 1950's, between the Supreme Court of the United States and the supreme courts of various of the States, fair trade legislation was almost forced out of existence. The nonsigner clause was ruled against by the U.S. Supreme Court and by various of the State courts. Two acts, by which Congress tried to maintain the effectiveness of fair trade legislation—the Miller-Tydings Act of 1937 and the McGuire Act of 1952—have either been emasculated by court decisions or have been largely ineffective.

The renaissance of interest in fair trade legislation is undoubtedly due to the growth of the discount houses, which appear to have offered killing competition to many retailers.

The Department of Justice, the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Federal Trade Commission oppose the proposed legislation. It is thought that the President himself is opposed to it. The Wall Street Journal quotes Justice Department estimates of increased retail prices in areas covered by fair trade legislation—if it is passed and applied—of from 19 to 27 percent.

The act is being pushed by a large number of retail trade associations. Many retailers are, I am confident, putting as much political pressure as they can behind the proposed bill. Unfortunately, what they are asking for treats a symptom, and does not cure a basic fault. Good and competent merchants have seemed able to survive the competition of discount stores. They have, of course, felt such competition, but have sought their own methods of attracting and holding customers. They have needed no legislative protection. It is only the inept or the incompetent merchants who have to have a legislative umbrella to shelter them from competition.

Among the forces we certainly do not need is an upward thrust on prices—a thrust certain to come if fair trade legislation comes. With our inbuilt tendencies toward inflation, any legislation which would add, not 19 to 27 percent, but more conservatively, 8 to 12 percent would be exceedingly harmful to our economy. And on the basis of the studies I have made in the past, I suspect, it would not really help the retailers who are crying loudest for help.

There is a further possibility, which should make some of the compliant manufacturers pause. We are in the middle of a trend toward proliferation of private brands, and in the middle of a period when the housewife appears to accept private brands willingly. The private brand is the property of the retail organization in most instances. Fair trading the manufacturers brands merely increases the retailers opportunities to sell their own private brands in place of manufacturers' brands. Apparently the consumer does not really object to this substitution, and certainly the retailer does not, because he usually enjoys a slightly more advantageous margin on his own private brands. That pushes the manufacturers' brands into the background and stresses still further private brands. And the small retailer, who had hoped to be able to sell more, with less effort, and with a larger margin, will find himself holding merchandise of diminishing popularity. His case is likely to be worse than before.

This situation is not new. We have seen it work out before. We have seen manufacturers, caught by the pressure of many small retailers, fair trade their merchandise, but bootleg it to price cutting retailers to get volume. We have seen retailers protected by fair trade legislation suffer and go out of business.

Why then, does this sorry piece of legislation come up once more, with enough political pressure behind it to suggest that it may be passed? The answer is easy: Fair trading offers a specific attack and a means of immediate action on what the merchant thinks is his most critical problem. Any other solution is a longer-term solution, and may involve the displacement of a good many less capable merchants—merchants who do not see their own shortcomings, and who greatly prefer a temporary legal shelter to the harsh but salutary action of competition.

Implicit in free enterprise capitalism is the salutary influence of competition. Manufacturers, processors, merchants—these vie with each other for the favor of their potential customers. Basically, competition centers around product improvement, service improvement, and price reduction.

We have tried, frequently, to protect individuals and small groups from the ravages of competition. For a good many years, we tried to protect the farmer. We tried this tactic at a time that the farmer was facing three basic changes that legislation could not divert. First was the shift from a horse and mule technology to a tractor technology. In that shift, farmers had to give up growing the feed for their own beasts of burden and grow other crops which would allow them to buy tractors and other kinds of farm machinery, and to buy the gasoline and oil to run them. Second was the long-term shift away from a national diet heavily fortified with starches as the Nation in general relied on machines more than on muscle to do the heavy work. And third was the increase in optimum size of farms which has brought about a reduction in the number of farms by nearly one-third.

The simplest way for us to have handled that situation was to have done nothing, so that farm families, as farming became less rewarding, and jobs in manufacturing and service industries opened up, could have filtered slowly but steadily to new environments. If that policy had not been politically acceptable, then some sort of subsidy could have been offered farm families to cushion their removal from farms.

Instead, we developed a system of subsidies which made it possible for farmers to continue to produce what was in surplus and allowing the continuance of an uneconomic allocation of land and labor resources.

Recently, we have apparently begun to taper off our farm controls and the accompanying subsidies because of refusal of farmers to accept some of them longer. It has taken a long time, and has required the expelling of a good many hundred thousand farmers from their farms before the wisdom of the controls and subsidies began to be questioned by the farmers themselves. Again, few people like to regard themselves as submarginal, few people like to fail in business, and few people like to lose money. If they can find an umbrella to protect them, they will try to open it, even though they object to Government intervention in business, and least in principle and for others.

Coming back to our problem of fair trade legislation, we could object to the reinstitution on the grounds that the legislation will hold an umbrella of protection over the less competent merchants, and will bring about a consequential increase in retail prices of nationally advertised branded merchandise. But again, we are facing a much broader type of change than can be described by calling it price competition from discounting retailers.

Our consumer-goods standard of living has been based in large measure on the rise of manufacturers' advertised brands. Although a few items were advertised during the 1800's, the broad rise of brands started about 1907. In a day when dependability of food products and other items of consumption was questionable, the presence of products of first quality, always branded with the same brand, widely distributed, and widely advertised, was important to consumers. Such products were a little more costly, but were well worth the few pennies more.

These products were protected by heavy consumer advertising expenditures. They were sufficently leaders in their various fields that price cutting was rarely to be thought of. A strong group of magazine publishers and a large network of newspapers offered the vehicles for the advertising.

In time, other firms came to offer merchandise of equally high quality. During the years of the great depression, the few pennies I mentioned earlier came to be important. Only when consumers were certain that the few pennies bought extra value would they be spent. Private brands came to be accepted. Somehow, between the uneven spread of labor costs, the rise in quality of the private brands, and the diminution of the price differential between private brands and advertised brands in the general rise of all prices, the strength of advertised brands diminished. We have seen some of the side effects of this trend in the disappearance of a number of formerly leading consumer magazines, and in the decrease in the number of newspapers in our cities. Costs of publishing have risen, but advertising revenues have not fully kept pace with the increases in the costs of publishing.

Retail price discounting flourishes when it can be exercised in the face of strong competition from established brands. The stronger private brands become, the less opportunity there is for discounting. We have seen a number of the discount stores getting into trouble, losing money, and even going into bankruptcy.

It is at this time that the merchant who has felt the competition from discounting stores should rethink his own competitive strategy, and move in as these stores diminish in strength.

Instead, fair trade legislation will reestablish the small but honest retailer behind the same kind of price differential which originally invited competition from the discounters, and will deny him the opportunity of taking advantage of his new opportunities.

That is a sad picture.

New Power Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the question of private power versus public power has been a very controversial subject for a long time. It is always interesting to have the sentiments of the localities in reference to various features of the same. For that reason, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert a very good editorial which appeared in the Allentown Morning Call, an outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, on September 18, 1963, on this subject. The editorial is as follows:

NEW POWER SCHEME

As Congress begins tightening up on 2-percent loans to Rural Electrification Administration Cooperatives, tub thumpers for the Federal power industry are looking for new ways to keep expanding their empire.

Latest proposal is from Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, whose principal job is to win more tax subsidies for these suppliers. He wants the taxpaying investor owned companies to merge their facilities with the tax-exempt segment of the industry to form a vast national pool that would produce, distribute and sell all the electrical energy used in the United States.

According to Ellis, a new federally chartered corporation representing all companies would interconnect all sources of supply and "plan and build the most efficient common carrier transmission grid possible." All suppliers would purchase their power from the corporation.

Publicly, the pitch is that the national interest requires such a system for progress in peacetime and in the eventuality of war. Rate reductions also are forecast. The proposal obviously ties in with Interior Secretary Udall's efforts to create a Government monopoly in long-distance power transmission by blocking private companies from crossing public lands at their own expense.

In its eagerness to take another step toward socializing the power industry, the Federal lobby overlooks the fact that the world's largest power grid already is in operation. It now extends over 41 States and is due to cover the continent in 3 more years. Efficiencies have made it possible for investor-owned companies to steadily lower their rates, in some instances below those charged by subsidized cooperatives, and still pay Federal income taxes.

Interestingly enough, the Federal power bloc is making its newest proposals just as Congress appears ready to require the Rural Electrification Administration to submit valid reasons for new loans to cooperatives and ask specific appropriations for making any in excess of $2 million. Up to this time the REA has been making these decisions independently.

Both the House and Senate apparently want to know why this agency still asks $425 million a year for loan allocations even though 98 percent of the farms and rural areas it was created to serve now have electricity.

When screws are put on one program of a Federal bureau because the purposes for which it was created have been reasonably met, it's not unusual for it to push into other areas regardless of how well they may be served under private auspices. This seems to be the goal of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the rest of the Federal power lobby.

Civic Action in Berkshire County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to pay tribute to certain civic actions within my congressional district, particularly in Berkshire County.

In view of the problems of pollution in the important Housatonic River, there has been long the need for constructive action which is now forthcoming from a number of sources.

This has been a serious problem for some time and the preventive measures undertaken by the Peter J. Schweitzer Mills in Lee, as well as the distinguished Crane & Co., and the municipal governments of Pittsfield and Dalton give distinction to the entire area. There is also indication that other industries are also interested in a most necessary cleanup project, including Hurlbut Papers in South Lee and the Rising Paper Co. in Risingdale. In all, the plans for pollution control are taking on a practical emphasis that can only benefit the community in the long run.

Certain that other Members of Congress will benefit from reading about activities such as these, I am proud to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Pittsfield, Mass., Berkshire Eagle, Thursday, October 11, 1963.

The editorial follows:

GOOD NEWS FOR THE RIVER

There is cause for rejoicing in the disclosure that the Peter J. Schweitzer mills in Lee are undertaking an ambitious program of waste disposal with a view to reducing pollution of the Housatonic River.

The big papermaking operation in Lee has long been an important contributor to the river's problem, since its wastes not only adulterate the water but consume the oxygen that enables a stream to cleanse itself. The combination of industrial wastes and domestic wastes in the Lee stretch of the river has always posed a formidable challenge to the cleanup campaign. The mills' initiative is promise that this part of the problem is on its way to a solution.

In so doing, the Schweitzer mills are giving new impetus to the long-drawn-out campaign for a town sewer system and disposal plant. The finger of responsibility is now pointed at town officials and their constituents who have summarily rejected sewer proposals in the past. The oft-heard excuse that the town need not act till the mills do, now holds less water than ever. The buck has been passed to Lee voters who will vote on a sewer system next year—and there it stops.

The Schweitzer action also affords grounds for hope that similar cleanup programs will be instituted by other industries and communities downstream from Lee. Hurlbut Papers in South Lee, the Rising Paper Co. north of Great Barrington, and of course

the towns of Great Barrington and Sheffield all add their share of wastes to the liquid conveyor belt that is the Housatonic.

Already, Hurlbut is conducting an analysis of the Housatonic and the plant's effluent in South Lee, and is preparing to take steps within the next 12 months to limit the load of waste material dumped into the river. In Risingdale, the Rising Paper Co. has complete plans for a disposal plant of its own but is delaying action until the town of Great Barrington decides on its own system. Reportedly there is a good chance that Rising will be able to effect substantial economies both for itself and for the taxpayers by joining the town system, particularly if it is decided to construct two disposal plants, one in Housatonic and one in Great Barrington.

All these programs have been contemplated and discussed for years—more years than most Berkshire residents like to acknowledge—but until lately, they did not go beyond the drawing-board stage. Now, however, the cleanup campaign is picking up force. The day is in sight when the river will attain a state of comparative purity and blessedness. On that day, Crane & Co., the Pittsfield and Dalton municipal governments and the Schweitzer mills will deserve to be honored among the leaders who brought it to pass.

The Competition of Foreign Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problems of foreign imports are causing concern in many industries. A reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that restrictions against our products and conversely a flood of imports into this country are causing us trouble in industry and in our balance of payments. Just within recent months the RECORD has contained many references to the problems in the poultry industry. Textiles and shoes have also been affected as have the steel mills and others. In the Midplains and in other parts of the country there is concern over the continuous increase in the amount of beef imports. In this connection I believe a thought-provoking editorial which was aired over WOW-TV and WOW radio in Omaha is pertinent, and I call it to the attention of our colleagues.

This entire area of imports and restrictions against our exports is one which becomes increasingly serious with each passing week, and I feel very strongly it is a problem which the Congress is going to have to consider again in view of the action taken last year in opening the gates to a flood of foreign imports, based only on hope that similar concessions will be granted by foreign countries.

The editorial referred to follows:

THE COMPETITION OF FOREIGN BEEF, BROADCAST, OCTOBER 10, 1963

Two Nebraskans have spoken out recently about the increased importation of beef and veal, with what they consider depressing effects on the midwestern livestock economy.

In a speech at Ogallala, Nebr., Fred Gilmore, president of the Omaha Union Stockyards Co., said that beef imports, mainly from Australia and New Zealand, are five times what they were 10 years ago. During the first 6 months of 1963, Mr. Gilmore said, they are up 21 percent over a year ago. He added that imported beef adds up to about 9 percent of the domestic production. Further complicating the picture, Mr. Gilmore pointed out, a record 1,250,000 head of livestock on the hoof were brought in from Canada and Mexico in 1962.

ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator from Nebraska, charges that the United States has become "a sort of international dumping ground for meat, particularly beef." Pointing to what he termed a striking relationship, Senator HRUSKA added that "prices have fallen to near postwar lows, while imports have climbed to record heights."

Most Americans now agree that world trade is vitally important to this country, and that it is, in Mr. Gilmore's language, a two-way street. If we want to sell in the world markets, we must also be prepared to buy.

Thus, the meat importation problem is inseparable from world trade and global diplomacy. We don't pretend to know the answers. We do know that midwestern cattlemen have had a bad year, and we think that increased competition from low-cost producers abroad is one of the reasons for it.

Nebraska and Iowa are making progress in developing industry, and moving toward a diversified economy. The fact remains however that prosperity on Farnam Street in Omaha is still largely dependent on the feed lots and ranches.

For all our sakes, we hope the Government will address itself to the solution of the beef importation problem.

Candor Needed on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, an important editorial appeared in the New York Times for October 4, 1963, on the subject of Vietnam. The editorial is appropriately entitled "Candor Needed on Vietnam" and it urges that the U.S. Government be more frank with its citizens.

It looks like we may have another case of news management on our hands, but whether we do or don't it seems clear that no government official or administration serves the public well by forgetting that ancient public right known as the "right to know."

CANDOR NEEDED ON VIETNAM

President Kennedy's optimistic appraisal of the course of the war in Vietnam following the return of the McNamara-Taylor mission will be verified or disproved by history. It may abate, but it certainly will not silence criticism.

There are bound to be, in so tangled a situation as that in Vietnam, major differences of opinion not only about what we should do but also about how well or badly we are doing. About one key aspect of the Vietnamese situation, however, there can be no valid disagreement. The war in South Vietnam—no matter how judged—is a long-drawn-out war of attrition, as, indeed, all counter-guerrilla or counter-insurgency wars are. In any such war, all authorities are agreed, a democratic government, if it is to have hopes of ultimate victory, must have the support of an informed public opinion.

The confusion, cynicism and frustration of the American public about the Vietnamese conflict are by no means solely due to the nature of the Diem regime or its differences with the Buddhists. The public relations policies of both the United States and the Saigon Governments have been, since the beginning, responsible for much of the confusion.

The Diem regime, in common with nearly all Asian governments, operates in an aura of secrecy. Its answer to criticism is more secrecy. But the U.S. Government should be far more frank with its citizens. During the first part of the U.S. military buildup in South Vietnam both our public relations policies and personnel there were lacking in candor. Official policy, as revealed by a House committee, was deliberately restrictive; essential facts were withheld, others distorted. It took some very high-level visits to Vietnam to correct, in part, these initial mistakes.

But, as recent events have shown, the U.S. Government's accounting to its people is still far from frank. Official spokesmen do not hesitate to gild the lily, without providing facts to sustain their statements. The vital statistics of victory or defeat—the numbers of weapons captured and lost by both sides; the defectors from both sides; the casualties, and so on—are still "classified" in Washington. Even the number of U.S. helicopters lost to hostile action in South Vietnam are regarded as "secret," though release of the actual number lost would be a tonic, not a depressant.

The support of public opinion in a war of attrition is vital to victory. The optimistic White House statement of this week will never be verified by history if the Government loses the support of an informed public opinion—as, indeed, it appears to be doing.

Family Portrait: Any Resemblance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of September 21, 1963:

FAMILY PORTRAIT: ANY RESEMBLANCE

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

The harder you chew on some problems the larger they become.

It is this way in a family, and things are no different with Government. In fact, the two are sometimes joined. What looks like a political problem is in fact but the larger consequence of a family being so adversely disposed that it wants a monopoly of goodies for itself, which makes other people feel cheated.

The family, we are told, is the cornerstone of all civilization. It's a happy thought. But there are also occasions when it looks more like a large boulder in the center of a freeway. Since that idea may sound positively vulgar, if not blasphemous, let me illustrate.

I am thinking of a particular family in politics which right now is making itself a

target for popular indignation. It is quite religious, and for this or other equally natural reasons, it is highly prolific.

About the time we think we have finished counting their noses, we hear about one more, for since it is the family disposition to love place, prominence, and power, politics is their inevitable playground, and they all seek to get into the act. We call that nepotism when the habit bobs up in a family of which we disapprove.

The bent in this family is so pronounced as to arouse fear that within a nominally free society, they are trying to install the dynastic principle. All members of the family are extremely active, which is to say that they move about and talk a gerat deal, not always wisely, so it is said. In this, the distaff side competes actively with the males, which shocks old-fashioned folk who hold that woman's place is in the home.

One of the males is a President. Two brothers are prominent in the wings, and at least one is suspected of a mean ambition to succeed to power. The President was at first hailed as a man of action and decision. He was elected largely because his look and his words implied these virtues. But as time went on, and the cares of office bore down, what men saw of him caused more disappointment than satisfaction.

He could not distinguish between a personally voiced opinion and a decision. There was great social ferment in his country and the seeds of civil strife were everywhere. Some of his programs aimed to ameliorate this condition in fact aggravated it, so people said. What worked in the North didn't seem to work in the South, and vice versa, with the consequence that sectionalism, which is the foe of national unity, became in many ways more pronounced.

The press, which thrives on raw meat, began biting at him. But those who bit did not do so with impunity. They chewed and found themselves excluded from the inner circle. The Government became more and more secretive. Correspondents were cut off from news developments which had no genuine relationship to the national security, simply because the regime was bent on haveing felicitous things written about itself, or nothing at all.

In this way, the man made enemies where it need not have happened. The right of free press gradually became withered in the name of freedom, without the principal recognizing that he had adopted the technique of authoritarianism.

But the writing people knew it, and those who had been ostracized, instead of holding to criticism which reflected truth, conspired together to even the score. They made up stories traducing him which were 15 percent true and 85 percent imagination.

With some of them it became a vendetta. So grotesque and distorted images of him got into circulation, much to the satisfaction of his political enemies, but to the service of nothing else. Shortly it became impossible for anyone distant from the inner circle to truly know what he was like.

Things had gone too far. There was no way to turn back the clock.

Inevitably his dignity was affronted. His pride but rose the more. So he became careless. When he could not have his way in all things, and his allies did not go along exactly with his formula and methods, he lashed out at other governments and spoke ill of their great men and their policies.

He even did these things when self-evidently there was no likelihood of gain to his own nation, as is generally the case in international dealings. Whatever its size, every nation objects to being beaten with a stick, and the result of trying it is to alienate another people.

To the extent that he was libeled and slandered, it became necessary by those who did it to make his opposition look positively heroic. Nothing was allowed to remain life-size. Fools became extolled as martyrs and foot-draggers were praised for their light and leading. The political nature of man seems to require this treatment of prominent personages. They must be seen as in the distorting mirror at a penny arcade. For every devil to be blamed, there must stand a saint to be praised.

Because the Communists were at the door of the country, the president was beset by military problems. Strategic and tactical decisions had to be made. It is for this purpose that governments keep admirals and generals on the payroll.

However, the man, being chief of government, too often preferred his own wisdom and cracked the whip when he didn't have hold of the team. The results, rarely fortunate, were in some instances ghastly.

Thus is completed an unfamiliar portrait of President Diem of South Vietnam, with his relatives, the Nhus, appearing only in the background as if reticent to move forward, the one part of the picture which isn't true to life. The unveiling is timely only because the subject, having many colors, can't be done justice with a tar brush, no matter how hard we try.

The last line writes itself. It's one of the cliches in this art: Any resemblance to any person living or dead is purely coincidental.

Search for a Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal:

SEARCH FOR A PURPOSE

How to counteract the antimanagement bias prevailing in many parts of the world?

This old problem was given fresh attention at a recent international management conference in New York. The burden of much of the discussion was that the free enterprise type of management must develop some higher purpose than the mere making and selling of goods.

For the bias, while nothing new, is perhaps more intense than ever. Particularly virulent in the numerous underdeveloped countries now independent, the prejudice against private management is preventing its development in places where it is most needed. Bureaucratic management, on the other hand, labors under no such handicap.

Part of the trouble, according to Prof. Charles Malik, speaking to the management conference, is that Western nations have erred in trying to pass along to underdeveloped countries merely the form and technique of management without the underlying creative spirit that makes it go; hence no transmission of basic philosophy. As Mr. Malik, a former president of the U.N. General Assembly, put it: "The West can send machines and money, and these are always welcome, but its socioeconomic-political system is not adopted by these lands."

A suggested remedy, offered by David Rockefeller, of the Chase Manhattan Bank, is that business should loan some of its top management men to the developing nations for a time. Paul Hoffman, managing director of the U.N. Special Fund, proposes a vast management training program for the same sort of purpose.

Yet, while the altruism of such efforts might have some effect, it is doubtful that they could alter the basic attitudes that seem to feed the antimanagement bias.

One aspect of the prejudice goes back to its Marxist roots. Mr. Malik observed that Marxist ideas have "remarkably swept all over Asia and Africa. Marxist-Communist habits of thought are widespread, entrenched and relentless in areas where they were totally unknown 10 or 15 years ago."

Given the failures of Communist economics and the success of free enterprise, this seems at first a puzzling phenomenon. It is the result, we think, not only of the zeal of Communist agents. It is also that the leaders of many of these new nations see Marxism as a road to quick development and, probably more important, to personal dictatorial power.

That kind of motivation is pretty hard to combat, no matter what American business managers try to do. The cause of free enterprise is not much helped, either, by our own Government's policies.

While paying frequent lipservice to economic freedom, U.S. officials often show a disturbing tendency to opt in favor of socialism abroad, particularly in the foreign aid program. Even regarding this country, there is a strong antimanagement bias in officialdom, a proneness to believe that the kingdom of heaven can be found only through submitting every human activity to bureaucratic control.

Businessmen themselves are not always without fault; they sometimes waver in understanding their own role. Managers, of all people, should realize there is nothing base or wrong in building refrigerators and tractors. If that is done well, it contributes a great deal to the world.

And here, it seems to us, is the key to the whole question of higher purpose. Management has long since developed its higher purpose; namely, the general welfare which some contend is the exclusive business of Government. Management has done so as a direct and all but inevitable concomitant of its primary purpose of making profits.

A Ford developing his assembly line did more than revolutionize automaking. In pursuit of profitable enterprise he benefited not only his own employees but whole armies of workers in other fields. A Hilton abroad contributes more to real economic growth than some grandiose foreign aid project built for show.

In this country profits have eliminated much poverty, created better working conditions, made possible the vast company insurance and pension programs, supported the Government and, for icing, produced the good works of philanthropy. If all that doesn't add up to a higher purpose, materially and spiritually, it is difficult to say what does.

It is a pity, for the sake of the emerging nations and our own, that these facts are not well understood. It might help counteract the antimanagement bias if businessmen were less defensive about the achievements of free enterprise than they occasionally are: Certainly it would help if the Government were less hostile to the philosophy of freedom in its behavior both at home and abroad.

Local "Gringo Campesinos" Leave Lasting Impression in Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend today Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Tripp, of Bethesda, Md., for their ex-

cellent good-will contribution while serving with the AID mission in Colombia. While in that country they spent their own time and money assisting the small village of Cajica in the construction of a community school and the procurement of school materials.

I include in the RECORD an article published recently in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune entitled "Local 'Gringo Campesinos' Leave Lasting Impression in Colombia":

LOCAL "GRINGO CAMPESINOS" LEAVE LASTING IMPRESSION IN COLOMBIA

The people of the small rural village of Cajica, Colombia, will long remember two "gringo campesinos" who recently returned to their home at 6504 Wiscassett Road, Bethesda.

The two Americans, Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Tripp were given their nickname by Colombians while Mr. Tripp was executive officer of the Agency for International Development's mission in Bogotá.

During their first year in Colombia, the Tripps lived in Bogatá but after a year of apartment living, they longed for green trees and open fields.

Most of Tripps' 30 years with the U.S. Government has been with the Department of Interior and he and his wife acquired their love for country living from their early days with the National Park Service at the Yosemite and Grand Canyon National Parks.

They also wanted a chance to know the rural Colombian people.

Since Cajica offered all of these things and was only 25 miles from the AID mission, the Tripps lived there during the second year of their tour and became absorbed into the community life of the village.

They adopted a school as a personal Alliance for Progress project.

Elected to the Junta de Accion Comunal (board of directors) of the one room neighborhood school Mr. Tripp initiated a fund-raising drive and the proceeds were used to extend electricity and running water to the school.

He also helped another Colombian village secure the first 10,000 pesos disbursed under the Alliance for Progress to help build a community school.

The Tripps frequently used their own financial resources to help individual Colombians.

One was a young girl they hired as a maid who was above average in intelligence and was ambitious for more challenging work.

They financed her schooling to learn English at the Centro, Colombo-Americano school and she now has a job as a clerk-receptionist in a country in which a maid has little hope of improving her social and economic status.

One of Mrs. Tripp's interests in Colombia was with a rehabilitation center for the blind and deaf for which she helped to obtain funds and equipment from oversea and local agencies.

The center awarded her a gold medal in recognition of her outstanding voluntary service.

On arriving home, Mr. Tripp said, "We have wonderful memories of Colombia's magnificent mountains, green valleys and the warmth and friendliness of its people who affectionately called us "gringo campesinos."

Mr. Tripp has been serving with the foreign aid program since 1959. He was a personnel officer and an executive officer in India and was chief of the employment division of the Washington office before he went to Colombia.

His next AID assignment will also be in Washington in the Office of Personnel Administration.

Mrs. Gaines W. Keith: Woman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Gaines W. Keith, of Carbon Hill, Ala., has been selected as Woman of the Year for Walker County by the Walker County Business and Professional Women's Club. Although she is active in every phase of the civic, religious, and community life of Carbon Hill, her selection as Woman of the Year was made largely on the basis of her outstanding record as a teacher in the Carbon Hill city school system. Ann Keith is a dedicated and exceptionally talented teacher. She has contributed much to the development of the minds and character of hundreds of boys and girls during the 16 years that she has taught at Carbon Hill. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend the other ladies who were nominated also for the Woman of the Year honor. Each in her own way has helped make my home county of Walker a better place in which to live. As part of my remarks, I herewith include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a pertinent news article which appeared in the October 11 edition of the Jasper (Ala.) Daily Mountain Eagle:

MRS. KEITH NAMED WOMAN OF YEAR

Mrs. Ann Keith, a Carbon Hill High School home economics teacher, graciously accepted the honor of Woman of the Year last night at the annual BP Club's festivities honoring the woman who had made outstanding contributions to her community and county.

Mrs. Keith has been a teacher in the Carbon Hill city school system for 16 years.

According to her principal, Morris Davis, she has always been willing to help in any way for the betterment of the school, community and county. She is active in all phases of school and community activities. She is a member of the First Methodist Church of Carbon Hill and takes an active part in many of its activities.

The wife of Dr. Gaines W. Keith of Carbon Hill, she is constantly engaged in some activity of the school community or the church. If these are exhausted, she is usually involved in helping someone in need that may have gone unnoticed by everyone else. She goes with Dr. Keith quite a bit in making sick calls and observes needs that the average person might overlook.

For years she has been very active in school activities such as preparing meals for the football team before every game and supporting them to the fullest. Any function of the school finds her in the very heart of it ever lending a hand wherever it may be needed.

In her church she is Sunday school secretary, sings in the choir, assistant organist and usually has time to lend a hand in any other of the work where she might be needed.

She is an active member of the Tuesday Study Club in Carbon Hill, and in her spare time she works in her father's drugstore.

She is part president of the Carbon Hill Teachers Association, an active member of the Walker County Medical Auxiliary, AAUW, Delta Kappa Gamma, Walker County Teachers Association, Walker County Classroom Teachers, AEA, PTA, Department of Home Economics Teachers.

Mrs. Keith's personal folder contains many, many letters from all over Walker County praising this unique individual and recommending her for the honor of Woman of the Year.

From the many warm responses to this fine lady, she will serve to the fine people of Walker County, and will add greatly to the honor of the Woman of the Year program.

Charles S. Murphy—Champion of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Charles S. Murphy, as Under Secretary of Agriculture since President Kennedy took office in 1961, has proved himself a true and effective champion of the farmers of America. He now is recognized the Nation over for his devotion to the well-being of the people who produce our food and fiber.

North Carolina, his native State, is especially proud of Charley Murphy.

This appreciation of Charley was demonstrated in a large way by the warmth of the reception accorded him when he returned to North Carolina on Tuesday, October 8, to address the annual joint meeting of the Farmers Cooperative Exchange and the North Carolina Cotton Growers Association in Raleigh.

Charley Murphy had things to say in this speech which is of interest to all of us in the House who have the well-being of farm families at heart, especially in the cotton and tobacco producing regions. He had some things to say about North Carolina which were pleasing, indeed, to all who are fortunate and proud that North Carolina is our home.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I am inserting the text of Mr. Murphy's speech, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CHARLES S. MURPHY SPEAKS

It's always good to be back home with home folks again. I was real sorry that I could not fill my engagement with you last year. But I am delighted and honored that you invited me back again this time.

Like most of you, a Tarheel born and a Tarheel bred, I have a lot of pride in and affection for this State and its people. I come back every time I have a chance, and it's always worthwhile.

I am going to talk mostly about North Carolina today, although most of what I have to say would be equally applicable to our sister State of South Carolina. And I wish to say to our friends who are here from South Carolina that I am particularly happy to have this opportunity to meet with them.

It is a great honor for me to be introduced by Congressman COOLEY. He is a great champion of agriculture and recognized and respected as such in the Halls of Congress.

Since I have been in the Department of Agriculture, he has given me much wise counsel and advice. I am most grateful for the generosity of his introduction here today.

Although I have been in Washington now for a good many years, I am still closely associated with many fine citizens from our State. It is my honor and privilege to work closely with our two distinguished Senators, SAM ERVIN and EVERETT JORDAN, and the other members of the North Carolina delegation in Congress.

I also have the opportunity to work closely with members of the South Carolina congressional delegation, particularly the two fine gentlemen on the Agriculture Committees of the two Houses—Senator OLIN JOHNSTON and Congressman JOHN MCMILLAN.

Harry Caldwell, we are proud to say, is Chairman of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, and is doing a magnificent job. Horace Godfrey is our extremely able Administrator of the far-flung Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. And there are many others from North Carolina in the Department of Agriculture that I see almost daily in Washington.

It is quite appropriate to have so many North Carolinians in the Department of Agriculture because of the very great importance of agriculture in the economy of this State and in the life of its people.

Agriculture is more than a billion-dollar-a-year industry in North Carolina, and it is possible that this State is more dependent upon agriculture than any other 1 of the 50 States.

I have been told recently that North Carolina now is one-third rural, one-third suburban and one-third city, and that the State's income is derived one-third from agricultural production, one-third from the processing of agricultural products, and one-third from other sources. Our reliance upon agriculture is underlined by the importance of tobacco manufacturing, cotton textile manufacturing, food processing and timber industries to the economy of the State.

In July of this year, there were more people working on the farms in North Carolina—678,000 workers—than in any other State of the Union.

The last census showed North Carolina had more people living on the farms—950,000 people on 200,000 farms—than any other State.

Gross income from North Carolina farms in 1962 totaled a whopping $1.354 billion.

Tobacco was, by far, the leading agricultural commodity in the State, accounting for $563 million of last year's farm receipts. Poultry and eggs brought in $185 million to the State's farmers, while meat animals sold for $88 million, and oil crops brought $71 million. Corn also is important. Cotton does not occupy the same relative position in the State's agricultural economy as it did 30 years ago when the planted acreage was over 1.3 million acres. But 72,000 farms here had cotton allotments established for 1963 and on thousands of these farms cotton is still the principal cash crop.

Right here in Wake County, farm income last year was estimated at $34.8 million, which is almost $2 million more than the estimated payroll for industry in the county, and about $2 million more than the income from State government payrolls.

Farm income in both Wake County and in the entire State, I am happy to see, is up from previous years. In Wake County, the gain in 1962 over the previous year was approximately $2 million, while statewide the increase was about $42 million.

North Carolina farms average only 87 acres in size. It is easy, therefore, to see that the family farm concept, in which we are so vitally interested in Washington, is of more importance here than in most States.

In North Carolina, as in the rest of the Nation, there is a trend toward family farms becoming larger in size. This is inevitable as farming operations become more efficient and more fully automated, and fewer and fewer people are able to produce larger and larger quantities of agricultural commodities. This process is going on at a rapid pace for almost all crops and also in livestock and poultry. For example, I am told that there are approximately 750 mechanical cotton pickers in operation in North Carolina this year.

Tobacco, however, seems to be stubbornly resisting the movement toward mechanized harvesting. As all of you know, this is really a tough problem. However, it is being vigorously attacked and real progress is being made. I hope the Department of Agriculture will soon be in a position to give added support to this effort because of its potential importance in reducing the cost of production of tobacco.

This, of course, is one way to strengthen the family farm system of agriculture with all of its social and moral values.

Another way to strengthen the family farm system is clearly evident in the two great organizations meeting here today—the North Carolina Cotton Cooperative Association and the Farmers Cooperative Exchange. For many years, you were under the able leadership of M. G. Mann and now Dewey Arndt.

Leaders such as these have made cooperatives really work. They have shown that co-ops should and can work for the farmers and not farmers for the co-ops.

The co-ops have helped the farmer get cheaper prices for the things he has to buy and better prices for the things he has to sell.

Yes, the farmers of North and South Carolina will long be indebted to M. G. Mann and Dewey Arndt for their dedicated efforts through the years. And this also goes for the dedicated farmers and agricultural leaders who have served on the boards of directors of your cooperatives.

The activities of the Department of Agriculture in support of farmer cooperatives have been strengthened considerably during the past 2½ years. We feel that there is a growing need for strong and vigorous co-ops to enable farmers to hold their own in the tough competition that prevails in the American marketplace of today. Secretary Freeman is especially interested in this field and has recently issued instructions to all the Department's agencies to assist in achieving increasing effectiveness in the cooperative movement.

Now, I would like to talk a little about tobacco. Since Flue-cured tobacco is the most important cash crop in North Carolina, we have been most vitally concerned with its situation.

To go back a little, when the 1962 Flue-cured crop began to move into the market, it became apparent that Flue-cured tobacco was in trouble. By the end of the season, this concern was confirmed. Some 237 million pounds, representing about 17 percent of the crop, was passed over by the buyers and moved into the hands of the stabilization cooperative under the Government loan program. Some of our most important foreign customers, who have long depended on the United States as their principal supplier of high quality leaf, said that they could not obtain from the 1962 crop the grades and qualities required for their products. Although some concern of a similar nature had been expressed about prior crops, the buying pattern of our foreign customers for the 1962 crop really indicated that they were practicing what they had been preaching.

Something had to be done if we were to continue to maintain our worldwide reputation for high quality tobacco. Indeed, prompt action was needed to hold our exports at current levels—not to mention our desire to share in the increased free world trade in Flue-cured tobacco.

Last November, Secretary Freeman appointed the National Tobacco Industry Advisory Committee to review existing tobacco programs and recommend necessary changes to maintain sound tobacco programs. I want to thank each member of this committee for his contribution in counseling with the Department in charting the course of actions necessary to keep our tobacco programs sound.

As a result of these deliberations, and consultations with Members of Congress and others, certain actions were taken by the Department to help improve the quality of our tobacco. I'd like to review these briefly:

1. Public hearings were held to discuss quality factors—participated in by all segments of the industry from growers to manufacturers.

2. Two additional varieties were added to the discount list.

3. Grade standards were revised to better describe the usability and desirability of the tobacco.

4. Grade loan rates were revised by increasing supports for high quality, mature tobacco and decreasing supports for low quality tobacco.

5. The Department launched an extensive educational campaign advising growers of these changes and the importance of selecting varieties and adopting cultural practices to improve the quality of their tobacco. Land-grant colleges and other agricultural groups played an important role in getting the story to all farmers.

The decisions to take these various actions did not come easily or automatically.

We found among tobacco growers and other people interested in tobacco a general understanding of the importance of maintaining high tobacco quality. We also found a general awareness of the serious problems that had developed and a realization that something ought to be done about them. When it came to the question of what specifically ought to be done, we found some very sharp disagreements.

We in the Department were in the position where we had to make the tough decisions one way or the other. We got the best advice we could, studied the evidence as hard as we could, and then exercised as best we could whatever judgment we had been endowed with by our Creator. Then we went ahead.

The responsible leaders among tobacco farmers and in other segments of the industry cooperated splendidly in the effort to improve tobacco quality. Even those who did not agree that the course we chose was the wisest one, did their best to make it work. The result was a large-scale and intensive effort toward quality improvement. I wish to compliment and thank all those who devoted themselves to this task.

Naturally, we have been awaiting the outcome of these efforts with keen interest and, I must confess, with considerable nervousness. We have been following the marketing of this year's flue-cured crop quite closely.

While it is too early to evaluate fully the combined effects of our program changes and efforts on the part of growers to improve quality, market information thus far is encouraging. High quality, mature grades are bringing a better price than a year ago, while the lower quality grades are off. Export buyers are more active on the market. We estimate a sizable increase in exports this year over last year because of (1) improved quality of the 1963 crop; (2) smaller crops and higher prices in Rhodesia; (3) low stocks of U.S. flue-cured tobacco in importing countries, principally in the United Kingdom; (4) continued gain in cigarette smoking abroad; and (5) ample gold or dollar reserves in most of the major importing countries.

The general feeling based on these facts and trade talk indicates that growers' efforts to improve quality are noteworthy. However, we must not rest on our laurels, but we should redouble our efforts and further improve the quality of our tobacco in the years ahead. This must be done if we are to hold current levels of exports and share in the increased world trade in tobacco.

One other comment on tobacco—carryover of old crop flue-cured tobacco at the beginning of the current marketing year is about 200 million pounds or nearly 10 percent above a year ago. The 1963 crop is estimated at 1,305 million pounds—some 50 million pounds more than estimated disappearance during the year. Thus, some adjustment in production is indicated for the coming year. In this connection, a public meeting to discuss fully the supply and demand outlook will be held in the memorial auditorium in Raleigh on November 14. Anyone desiring to express their views with respect to the adjustment needed should do so at this meeting.

Now, as to cotton. Like tobacco, cotton has its problems. These problems are important to North Carolina not only because of her cotton farmers, but also because of her textile mills and the thousands of people who are employed in them.

The mills suffer a particular inequity because they have to pay substantially more for American cotton than do their foreign competitors. At the same time, if the price received by our cotton farmers were to be reduced to the world price—a reduction to about two-thirds of present prices—the result would be economic disaster in the cotton-growing areas of the country. Coupled with everything else, cotton is under steady competitive pressure from man-made fibers such as rayon and nylon; and present price levels for cotton place it under a severe handicap in holding its markets.

The very difficult problem we have is trying, at one and the same time, to reduce cotton prices to domestic users, to maintain the income of cotton farmers, and to keep the costs of the cotton program to the Government within reasonable limits. This is not easy.

We have been working with Congressman COOLEY and other Members of Congress for the past year trying to find a solution to this vexing problem. Chairman COOLEY has a bill which we hope will soon be considered and passed by the House of Representatives. We believe this bill will help substantially to alleviate the problems of the cotton industry. It should result in substantially larger consumption of cotton and permit larger acreage to be grown than would otherwise be the case.

While the bill would increase the costs of the cotton program, these increased costs would be more than offset by reduced consumer prices for cotton textiles.

There are many diverse and sometimes conflicting interests among the people who are concerned with this legislation. Mr. Cooley has done a remarkable job in reconciling these various interests thus far—but if legislation is to be enacted into law, he will have to have some more help—a lot more help. The administration will help him all it can, but he will still need a lot of help from the industry. The people who are interested in cotton will have to subordinate some of their particular points of view to the general good enough to reach a common ground of agreement—and will have to work together.

Finally, I would like to talk a little about exports to other countries. This is of critical importance to U.S. farmers in general and North Carolina farmers in particular. Farm exports from North Carolina totaled more than $210 million in 1961. That means that over 18 percent of gross farm receipts that year came from exports. In tobacco and cotton, the proportion is much higher than that—nearly 40 percent. Just think. What would it mean to each of you to have your income from cotton and tobacco cut 40 percent by the loss of all our export markets. Fortunately, that is not about to happen. On the contrary, exports of both these commodities are expected to be better this year than last year.

Indications are that exports of Flue-cured tobacco will be about 10 percent above the 432 million pounds (farm-sales-weight) exported during the past season.

To maintain and expand this level of exports for the long run will require the best efforts of all of us. Flue-cured tobacco is the most important kind of leaf entering world trade. It accounts for nearly half of all tobacco moving into world markets, and is by far the leading kind exported from the United States.

We have in recent years been meeting increasingly stiff competition from Rhodesia and other flue-cured producing countries. We have been losing our share of world trade in tobacco. Our share of free world exports in 1962 was only about 28 percent, compared with an average of 38 percent in the early 1950's. I point this out not to alarm you but to emphasize the importance of producing high quality tobacco. We cannot compete with the other countries on price without drastically lowering our price structure. But we can compete with them—and beat them—on quality. If we grow the best tobacco we know how to grow, nobody else can equal it anywhere in the world. That's what we must do to keep our markets.

In the Department of Agriculture, we will do all we can to bring this about. But the ultimate results rest with the growers themselves. I urge them and I urge all of you—let's keep up the good work we started this year in restoring the quality of our flue-cured tobacco.

In the case of cotton, we expect exports to go up from last year's 3.3 million bales to 5 million. We are operating an export sales program that is keeping our cotton fully competitive in world markets. Most of our cotton exports currently are coming out of surplus Government stocks. Frankly, we would prefer for them to come out of the 1963 crop as it is marketed, and we hope this will be increasingly the case as we get further into the marketing year. However, I trust we can all agree that the most important thing is to get it exported.

As in the case of tobacco, we are meeting more and more competition in the export market from cotton grown in other countries. Manmade fibers are also competing fiercely with cotton for the textile market in other countries as well as in the United States. We can maintain our fair share of the world market only by making sure our cotton stays fully competitive. That is exactly what we expect to do.

In cotton also, competition is a matter of quality as well as price. Modern cultural practices and harvesting methods appear to be developing some substantial new quality problems. We will need to pay more attention to correcting these deficiencies, and we will want your help in that.

In conclusion, I want you as my home folks to know that I find my work in the Department of Agriculture to be perfectly fascinating. That Department is one of the great service institutions of the world. It provides the widest variety of services for the greatest number of people that you can imagine. Considering all the responsibilities it has—which range far beyond working with farmers—I believe it does an excellent job.

We have many representatives of the Department who work here in North Carolina. We are very proud of them, and I am confident that you also hold them in high esteem. Speaking for them and for myself, I promise you that we will keep on doing the best job we can.

More Managed News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker ever since the disasterous Bay of Pigs fiasco there have been recurring rumors and charges of news management by the Kennedy administration.

It is to be expected that any administration will try to put its best foot forward in public. Charges of news management however are somewhat different than the practice of good public relations.

To the charges of news management there is now added the charge of intimidation. The Washington Post and Times Herald Sunday, October 13, 1963, carried an article entitled "Pressure on Writers by Justice Charged." The column says:

PRESSURE ON WRITERS BY JUSTICE CHARGED

FRENCH LICK, IND., October 12.—Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller has implied that the Kennedy administration tried to intimidate two newsmen.

He did not mention the reporters by name. However, Earl Mazo, national political correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, said he was the newsman in one instance mentioned by the Governor.

The New York Times identified the other as Victor Lasky, author of the recently published book, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth."

The New York Governor brought up the subject at an Indiana Bar Association luncheon yesterday.

"There is a vast array of * * * investigative powers of the Federal Government which are subject to possible abuse," he said, then added:

"Recently, the author of an extensive book which is highly critical of President Kennedy has protested such investigation. The author has publicly stated that he received information that a Justice Department official made inquiry of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to see what information about the author the subcommittee had in its file.

"Another example is the experience of a national news correspondent of long experience who was importantly responsible for making the Billie Sol Estes scandal into national news.

"He reported the following: That he had gone to the Attorney General's office to ask several questions in relation to the case; that the Attorney General, with the chief of the Criminal Division present, berated and quizzed the reporter for most of 1 hour about incidents in his own career; and that during the interrogation, the Attorney General leafed through pages of what appeared to be a lengthy investigation report about the newsman, which he had on his desk in front of him.

"The correspondent construed this as a calculated effort at intimidation."

In Washington, Edwin Gutman, Justice Department information officer said, "the Department of Justice has not been and is not investigating Mr. Lasky.

"As to Mr. Mazo, there is no point in commenting on a conversation that supposedly happened 15 months ago."

Mazo said today at Isle of Palms, S.C., that the incident involving him occurred in July 1962.

He said he returned to Washington from Texas after writing about the Estes case and obtained an interview with the Attorney General.

Mazo said that after Kennedy answered his few questions the Attorney General berated him for about an hour over his handling of the story.

"The Attorney General called me names, and I called him names," Mazo said.

"It seemed funny at first," he added. "But there was something frightening about it. It was a clear attempt at intimidation."

The Times quoted Lasky as saying he had been informed by a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that an official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service had asked for any information the committee had about him. He said this was about 6 weeks ago, just before publication of his book.

Lasky said he had been told that the man who wanted the information was a close friend of Bobby (Attorney General Robert F.) Kennedy and had served with him on the McClellan committee.

"While I don't feel in any way intimidated," Lasky was quoted, "I feel such gumshoeing and use of Federal agencies in attempts at intimidation is highly immoral."

Lasky said he could think of no legitimate concern the Immigration Service had with him because he was born here.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of freedom of the press is so dear to Americans that it needs no elaboration here. The American people will not suffer an administration seeking to intimidate the working newsmen of our country who bring us the news without which democracy cannot work.

Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret that because of illness I was not able to attend today's session, however, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a significant resolution which I am sponsoring and which is being introduced today in the other body by Senator JOSEPH CLARK and 15 other Senators. I have introduced in the House this resolution which states the following:

That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

SEC. 3. The President should make such prosposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

SEC. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to intitiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

Mr. Speaker, on September 25, 1961, the President in his magnificent address to the United Nations stated:

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness.

Although the test ban treaty has been signed, the President's statement is as valid today as it was in 1961. The test ban treaty is the first step toward the day when the nuclear sword of Damocles will no longer hang over our heads. However, we must realize that, although "a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step," that journey will never be completed unless the first step is followed by many others. The road to be traveled if the world is to know peace and security is clear. It is the road toward disarmament under effective international control. As long as nations retain nuclear weapons with their capacity to destroy civilization, we will remain threatened by extinction. For, as the President so eloquently has pointed out, the danger from "accident or miscalculation or madness" will not be removed until disarmament under effective international control is achieved.

The realization that "the weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us" led to the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. This proposal, which was introduced in 1961 at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as "A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

The resolution introduced today will move us toward that goal. It is a constructive step forward toward the establishment of the only genuine security system for the United States and the world—disarmament under effective international control. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in support of this resolution.

National Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it appears that all of us take for granted those things with which we are most familiar, such as our daily newspaper. Therefore, it is right and proper that we should pause in our deliberations for the purpose of making the observation of National Newspaper Week during the period from October 13 to 19, 1963.

Newspapers are our most accepted medium to inform the people of what is happening in their own community, in their State, in their Nation, in the world, and now even of developments in the far reaches of outer space. The more informed and the more enlightened the people are, the better; and our newspapers are the society's primary instrument for mass communication. I feel that we owe a great debt of genuine gratitude to the publishers, editors, feature writers, reporters, as well as to the other dedicated men and women who make our newspapers possible, such as those who operate the presses, the linotypes, the other necessary machinery, and those who are engaged in the circulation and distribution of our papers. The world and an accounting of what is happening everywhere is brought to the very doorstep of our homes to inform and even to entertain us.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I wish to especially pay a well-deserved tribute to the newspapers of our land in that they are, in reality, a fourth estate, independent, free, and responsible. A democratic society needs a free press. Although newspapers have become large private businesses, the best tradition of American journalism has always insisted upon maintaining the press as a public trust. For this they deserve our deepest thanks.

There is also another facet involved in the newspaper industry and that is in their being a vehicle in aiding and assisting commerce and industry by means of the advertisements they carry. This brings buyers and sellers of commodities and services together and fosters trade, bringing new life to the marketplace and thereby creating employment for countless persons. This aspect of our papers should not be forgotten in our consideration of the prime purpose of the press in supplying information in depth respecting current events.

All in the great and important newspaper industry merit our salute and best wishes for successful continuance of the part they play so well in keeping the American people well informed and in stimulating the economy of our Nation.

I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to compliment the manage-

ment and employees of our two great Maryland papers, the Baltimore Morning and Evening Sun and the Baltimore News-Post and Sunday American.

Collective Bargaining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago there appeared in the Washington Post a letter to the editor by the Honorable Samuel Hofstadter, eminent justice of the Supreme Court for the State of New York, on the subject of crisis collective bargaining. Judge Hofstadter points out that "recent trends in labor-management negotiations indicate that the bargaining table has become the site for a test of sheer power and of stubborn will between giant labor and giant business, each concerned with its own interests, both indifferent to the public weal."

Judge Hofstadter suggests the creation of a permanent system of impartial tribunals—labor courts—which could be called into play after all other avenues had been exhausted.

Judge Hofstadter's letter is deserving of notice and consideration and for that reason I am pleased to insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

To the EDITOR:

The arbitration board in the railroad work-rules dispute, which could not be resolved before Congress acted to provide the means for its solution, has begun its hearings. But the sword of Damocles still hangs over the country's head. For, beset by serious labor problems with the five train-operating unions, the Nation's railroads are preparing for negotiations with 11 nonoperating unions.

The shortcomings of crisis collective bargaining are clear. Recent trends in labor-management negotiations indicate that the bargaining table has become the site for a test of sheer power and of stubborn will between giant labor and giant business, each concerned with its own interests, both indifferent to the public weal. Sporadic ad hoc governmental intervention is no longer helpful in avoiding the ominous threats of our economy posed by the power struggle waged by these titans. The bitter fruits of such intervention frequently are compromises acceptable to the warring groups at the public's expense.

Now is the time to establish workable forums for the resolution of labor conflicts in areas where the public is vitally affected. And I propose that these forums be duly and regularly constituted labor courts. What is contemplated is a permanent system of impartial tribunals composed of representatives of business, labor, and the public—authorized, competent, and prepared to resolve labor disputes. As any court, it must have the power to receive evidence, take testimony, and render a decision binding upon the disputants.

These labor courts need not impair the collective bargaining process; it should be encouraged and nourished. But, if direct negotiations and conciliation have failed and it becomes compellingly clear that the public interest is in jeopardy, the labor court would be called into play. Indeed, its very presence may so stimulate genuine collective bargaining that resorting to it would rarely be necessary.

The bargaining process may fail entirely if labor and business continue to indulge so often in brinkmanship at the negotiation table. The survival of our complex industry requires the curbing of incontinent and irresponsible industrial conflict. As President Kennedy said on signing the emergency railroad arbitration law, such a procedure "reaffirms the essential priority of the public interest over any narrower interest" and "is the firmest assurance that free collective bargaining is not being eroded."

SAMUEL H. HOFSTADTER.

In Defense of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Congress is often the whipping boy and during this extended session of the Congress, it has seemingly been the subject for more than the usual amount of criticism and attacks from all sides. Col. Joseph McCaffrey, a highly regarded Washington radio and television commentator, recently defended the Congress in an address to the Advertising Club of Washington. Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, reprinted a portion of Mr. McCaffrey's address as an editorial in its issue of October 9 last.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this excellent editorial entitled "In Defense of Congress" in the RECORD. The editorial follows:

IN DEFENSE OF CONGRESS

(By Joseph McCaffrey)

I'd like to say a few words in defense of Congress—and I'll be the first to admit that my side of the field isn't very crowded.

Everyone is criticizing Congress, never before has such a stack of words and phrases been written critical of the national legislative system.

I have collected since February a 3-foot stack of newspapers, periodicals and pamphlets containing articles pointing out what is wrong with Congress, yet no two writers seem to agree on what should be done, or how it should be done.

One of the most oft-heard complaints is that Congress is meeting too long: "Here it is October and Congress is still in session."

Well, the day of the 6-month Congress is gone.

The Reorganization Act of 1947 provided for Congress to wrap up by July 31. But many things have happened since then, to name only one: Back in 1947 there was mighty little money spent on space, yet now in fiscal 1964 space accounts for more than $5 billion in the Federal budget.

Today, we are a nation of 190 million people, the problems facing the Federal Government range from domestic to international to space and it is impossible to cope with these problems in 6 months' time.

But Congress—and the American people have never faced up to this, yet I think the day is coming—probably a year from January at the beginning of the 89th Congress when it will face up to this.

I think at that time Congress will adopt a resolution providing for a working schedule which will allow for a recess from July 15 to August 15 or September 1 and a target date for adjournment of November 1 or November 15.

There is criticism of the seniority system. Yet in my 3-foot stack of material I have yet to find one workable substitute for the seniority system.

The fact is that Congress has, is now, and will continue to operate on the basis that the longer you serve as a Member the better your chances of being a congressional mother hen. Until the day comes when there is a better way to pick congressional mother hens, the present system of picking them on the basis of seniority will stay in force.

There is much complaint, too, about the rules of the House and Senate. Yet the rules are based on control of the two Houses by the majority. If the Democratic Party had a National Democratic Party majority, then the present rules would be adequate. The trouble today—with the Rules Committee cudding committee-approved legislation and with the Senate threatening a filibuster on civil rights—is that the Democratic majority is merely a paper majority.

This, combined with the fact that Congress is the mill of the gods and grinds slowly, doesn't mean that Congress cannot, as history proves, move rapidly on new-born emergencies—such as the threatened rail strike. But on the other problems which have been political sores, Congress moves more slowly.

It is not the executive department which is the doer. Congress does not administer; Congress cannot enforce.

Strangely enough, the greatest power of the Congress is a negative power: it can slow down, it can dilute, but it cannot, of itself, administer.

Thus, when Congress is charged with not moving fast enough, Congress, actually, is exercising its strongest power.

Yet, when a clear, screaming majority of the American people demand the passage of a certain piece of legislation, the Congress is responsive.

But its real role, as it has been, is that of moving slowly, of considering, debating, halting, pondering—until such time as the mandate of the American people is shrill in the ears of the Members.

Congress is no more hesitant, no slower, nor reluctant than the constituency it represents, the rank and file of the American people.

Coup in Honduras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it was not so long ago that this country viewed with complacency the usurpation of power by military juntas in our neighboring South American countries. It is hopeful that at least we now deplore the strangling of democracy by officers trained, in many cases, at our military bases. Mr. Robert Beresford, of San Jose, a distinguished attorney and student of foreign affairs, has written a most thoughtful letter to the New York Times about the recent coup in Honduras. I respectfully urge my colleagues to read his statement. The difficult and delicate role this Government must play

in our relations with our neighbors to the South demands our most serious attention.

The letter follows:

COUP IN HONDURAS: EVENT SAID TO MAKE RE-EXAMINATION OF OUR PROGRAM NECESSARY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is too soon for an ordinary reader of the Times to understand the full significance of the ousting of President Ramon Villeda Morales of the Republic of Honduras [editorial, Oct. 4].

One does not have to be an expert on Latin America, however, to realize that the success of this uprising is a severe blow to the foreign policy of the United States and to all friends of democracy. For in a sense Honduras is a capsule of the problems, the dreams and the disappointments of Latin America.

The kindly physician-president who has just been exiled perhaps was not the model of a chief executive, but he was the first head of government in Honduras to reach his high office as the result of free elections. He seems to have been unable to achieve all the reforms he promised at the beginning of his term, so it is conceivable that no longer is he looked upon as the hero whom the people wildly acclaimed almost 6 years ago.

Nevertheless, the civilian opponents of his administration seem to be hopelessly divided, and the election of Modesto Rodas Alvarado, 43-year-old lawyer-candidate of the President's Liberal Party, was virtually assured. The election, scheduled for October 13, would have been another honest, free election, expressing the will of the voters under supervision of a team of observers to be provided by the United Nations.

SETBACK FOR DEMOCRACY

What, then, is the reason for this tragic setback to the cause of democracy in the Western Hemisphere? It would be presumptuous for me to attempt to give the answer. Nevertheless, every citizen of the United States has the right to ask for searching reexamination of our military assistance program, with special reference to our hemispheric neighbors to the south.

It is common knowledge that the armed forces of Honduras for years have been so weak that they have been unable adequately to defend territory claimed by Honduras along the Nicaraguan border. The armed forces on several occasions have been unable to prevent rebel groups from invading Honduras from Nicaragua, and on other occasions to prevent Nicaraguan insurgents from using Honduras as a base for attacks on the Somoza regime.

Also in recent years armed bands of squatters from time to time have seized with impunity large parcels of private property in Honduras owned by some of the country's great landholders. On such occasions, with painful slowness, the armed forces have gradually mustered enough strength to restore internal order.

Now these same military forces have seized control of the central government. This doesn't make sense.

The U.S. taxpayer who has financed much of the training and equipment of these military leaders has a right to learn to what extent our military assistance program has influenced the direction of this tragic event in Honduras.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND

This is not a partisan issue. Our military assistance program in the Western Hemisphere has been developed and executed under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Irrespective of what we discover from hindsight, however, the situations in Honduras, in the Dominican Republic, and perhaps in certain other nations to the south demand strength, wisdom, and resourcefulness on the part of the U.S. Government. Our Government should be relentless in its efforts to bring about restoration of civilian authority approved by the people in each of these countries.

It seems to me that all Americans concerned about the future of democracy should unite behind the Kennedy administration in this objective.

ROBERT BERESFORD.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *October 4, 1963.*

Capitol Emphysema Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and many of our colleagues recall the demonstration that took place on the Capitol grounds this past July and which was conducted by the Alabama Tuberculosis Association in cooperation with Public Health Service, the Alabama Medical Center and 31 county TB associations in Alabama, for the detection of emphysema.

Your wholehearted support of this project, Mr. Speaker made this demonstration a huge success and I am sure that it has resulted in the greater awareness of this dread disease. I might also state that Dr. Calver, the Office of the Architect, the Department of Defense, and the Public Health Service were of considerable assistance in making this demonstration possible.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, Mr. K. W. Grimley, the executive director of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association wrote an article which appeared in the September issue of the National Tuberculosis Association Bulletin which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point as I believe it gives a very clear analysis of the results of the demonstration.

The article follows:

OPERATION CAPITOL HILL

(By K. W. Grimley)

A new war cry sounded along the ancient banks of the Potomac this summer. "Take a deep breath, Senator. Now. Blast it all out. More. More. Push. Push."

Literally by the hundreds, Members of the House and Senate crowded into a large steel-framed air conditioned structure ("tent" seems an inadequate word) to participate in a test for emphysema, a condition in which air becomes trapped in the lungs, and for other lung-deteriorating diseases. They came upon the invitation of Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama, who is chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety; and of Alabama's senior Senator, LISTER HILL, to a demonstration sponsored by the tuberculosis associations of Alabama and by the Alabama Medical College.

During the 4 days that the tent—provided by the U.S. Army and the Capitol Architect—was stationed at the southeast corner of the Capitol Building, it was thronged with Members of Congress, their wives (by special request of the Congressmen), the Capitol press corps (at its request), and employees of key committees and officers of the Congress. These guests viewed exhibits on emphysema and on the Alabama emphysema research project * * * received a "flow-volume loop" pulmonary function test * * * saw demonstrations of air sampling techniques * * * and asked questions by the thousands about all phases of respiratory disease.

Each visitor was then routed through the Alabama Tuberculosis Association's emphysema research vehicle parked outside, where he received a chest X-ray. Pulmonary function equipment in the vehicle was also used to handle emergency overflow crowds.

RESPONSE AT THE CAPITOL OVERWHELMING

The response to the demonstration at the Capitol can only be described as overwhelming, clearly indicating the intense current national interest in emphysema and other respiratory diseases. The official opening on Monday morning, July 22, featuring the testing of Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK, was covered by literally scores of reporters, feature writers, photographers and movie-TV cameramen. Represented were the Associated Press and the United Press, major TV networks, several national news magazines, and Washington, New York and other eastern dailies. In Washington itself, both the Star and the Post ran three-column, front-page pictures and news stories on the event.

During the week, the public relations division of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association also produced and mailed about 500 photographs of Congressmen, together with localized news stories, to dailies throughout the country.

The demonstration resulted from an invitation from Senator HILL and Representative ROBERTS, following a meeting held in Washington in May. The meeting was called by Representative ROBERTS, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety. Among the important figures who joined in the invitation were Surgeon General Luther Terry; Assistant Surgeon General Robert Anderson; Vernon MacKenzie, Chief of the Division of Air Pollution, Public Health Service; Boisfeullet Jones, Special Assistant for Health Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Speaker MCCORMACK of Massachusetts; the Democratic whip, HALE BOGGS of Louisiana; and Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN of Alabama.

Over 200 members of the House and Senate, including both the majority and minority leaders, received pulmonary function tests and chest X-rays. Precise results were not made public, but were sent to each legislator's choice of physician. All were most appreciative of the voluntary tuberculosis movement's pioneering interest in respiratory diseases.

Congressman ROBERTS termed the project "a smash hit." "Not only was it good for Members of Congress," he said, "but it brought the whole problem of respiratory disease to the attention of the Nation."

Surgeon General Terry, who visited the operation several times, called the project "of benefit to the entire public." He stated, "On behalf of the Public Health Service, I am grateful to the Members of Congress for their splendid cooperation and to the tuberculosis association of Alabama for bringing to Washington this extremely worthwhile demonstration."

Hon. James A. Reed, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the Propeller Club of the United States has

just concluded its most successful annual convention in Baltimore. While the organization has played an important part in promoting the welfare of the American merchant marine, much more needs to be done in that direction. The Honorable James A. Reed, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury at one of the conferences held at the convention made a very important and timely statement which I believe will be of great interest to Members of Congress and which I would like at this time to have placed in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES A. REED, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE CONFERENCE, LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD., OCTOBER 10, 1963

It is a pleasure to appear before a group dedicated to the maritime interests of our country. I need hardly remind you that the Treasury Department is more than simply the depository of our national riches and the administrator of our national debt, since it also has the responsibility of supervising many other functions of our Government, some of the most important of which relate directly to maritime affairs. This responsibility evolved from the Treasury's historic connection with the Nation's seaborne trade. That connection, appropriately enough, was originally concerned with the national revenues, and continues to be so.

Thanks to Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasury, and to the First Congress, 10 cutters were built to serve as the "Revenue Marine." Their job was to insure that the duties on the imports into our young nation were not nullified by smugglers or siphoned off by pirates. From this small beginning grew not only the new nation's armed force at sea, but our Customs Service and U.S. Coast Guard. Both are still within the Treasury Department, where I have the privilege and the responsibility of supervising their activities.

The Coast Guard, as you are well aware, performs a multitude of extremely important functions in the maritime field. With equal importance, its Customs Service, along with many other complex and vital responsibilities, must assure itself that an annual invasion of some 48 million vessels, aircraft, automobiles, trucks, busses and other carriers entering our ports and airports or crossing our land borders do not carry contraband.

I am pleased to state here that many substantial changes are in the process of development, which will result, I am sure, in the Coast Guard and Customs becoming more effective, efficient and modern organizations.

But today I would like to speak about a subject which the Treasury holds as being of considerable concern: our balance of payments.

Ten years ago it seemed an adequate definition of that term to say that the balance of payments was simply the difference between what the United States—both Government and private—paid out to foreigners, and what they paid to us. Today we need to know more about it, and what to do about it.

The swift upcurve of recovery in Western Europe over the past decade, and the continued need for foreign aid and defense requirements for U.S. expenditures abroad—all have combined to place the continuing deficit in the U.S. balance of payments in the very forefront of the economic problems which demand active and creative consideration by this country.

Our military spending abroad has also been held firmly down. In his July message to the Congress, the President said that his intention was to further reduce the annual dollar outlay of our military forces over seas by $300 million a year and the reduction of purchases of foreign strategic material by another $200 million. The rate of total Government spending abroad—both by AID and Defense—will drop a billion dollars over the next year and a half.

The third area of action in our program aimed at achieving a balance in our international payments—that of international capital movements—has become increasingly meaningful. Capital outflows both short- and long-term, play a significant role in determining our deficit. Even though our exports of long-term capital bring back substantial benefits in the longer run, any broad program to improve the present deficit position must take into account measures for reducing the immediate impact of capital outflows. In this context, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve system have been carefully using the tools of monetary policy and debt management. Increases in short-term interest rates have been effected while at the same time ample credit availability has been maintained; both long-term and mortgage rates have declined.

With the increase in short-term interest rates, our banks will be able to compete more effectively in attracting funds which might otherwise leave the country.

In the long-term investment field there has been until very recently an alarming outflow of capital. As a result, new steps are being taken in this field to correct the current imbalance.

We have proposed to Congress that an interest equalization tax be placed on purchases of foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. Capital market facilities in other major countries are not adequate to serve their domestic needs, and a number of them are still subject to controls. With rare exceptions they display rate structures which are both high and rigid. The result is that the efficient New York market has become the focal point of capital demand from all over the world. We hope that the developed nations of the world will be encouraged to develop more efficient markets for mobilizing and directing their own domestic savings both for their own investment needs and for assistance to less developed countries.

In the interim, the interest equalization tax is designed to reduce disparities in borrowing costs here as compared to those in major foreign markets. However, we view this tax measure as a temporary expedient. The effective results of the tax will be to raise the interest rate for foreigners borrowing in the American market by aproximately 1 percent. It is designed to do the job in such a fashion that it will not intrude into individual negotiations between the borrowers and lenders. And it will not restrict the free use of dollars.

The administration's program seeks improvement of our balance-of-payments position in three major areas: commercial trade in goods and services, Government expenditures, and private capital movements. All are areas in which the maritime interests represented here today have a vital stake.

The first area, that of trade, is by far the weightiest in terms of dollars and cents. The United States has traditionally maintained a sizable trade surplus in the value of exports over imports. These continue to be larger than that of any other nation. Even after deducting the exports financed by Government grants and loans, we find the favorable balance-of-payments trade in 1962 to have been more than $2 billion. The commercial trade surplus continues at about the same rate this year. In our efforts to close the deficit in the balance of payments, we neither want nor intend to limit imports. Our goal is to expand exports.

This good record, however, is not good enough. We must export more. Two steps are open to us. First, we must maintain our access to foreign markets. That was the goal of the Trade Expansion Act last year, and the upcoming role of tariff negotiations in Geneva which will determine the climate in which American producers will sell goods abroad for many years to come. Secondly, in an expanding market for our goods, and particularly our consumer goods, we must compete more successfully to increase our share of exported manufactured goods. We have faith in the good reputation our manufacturers have earned, and we must bank upon those qualities to increase exports in this category to keep pace with those in the more traditional raw materials and semifinished and heavy capital goods that have in the past made up the bulk of our export trade.

Just as the trade bill was designed to help in the first phase of this effort, the Government has also moved forcefully to assist private business in the second phase. The Nation's productive efficiency is closely related to the level of investment in productive equipment. Realizing that our investments in new and modern equipment were less than those abroad, President Kennedy set an increase in such investments as a national goal. This was the reason behind the major provision in last year's Revenue Act to provide a 7-percent credit for new investment, and also for liberalizing the tax treatment of depreciable equipment. Both moves have already shown productive results.

The most important measure now which will help increase our exports is the tax bill passed by the House late last month and which is at present before the Senate. As you know, this bill calls for an $11 billion reduction in both individual and corporate income taxes. It will stimulate demand and increase significantly again the incentives to Americans to invest in our productive efficiency. It should greatly aid American private enterprise in getting a larger share of foreign markets. It is designed both to strengthen our balance-of-payments position and to be a major move toward providing more jobs and speeding economic expansion here at home.

But trade, although it is certainly one of the most important areas of action in correcting the imbalance in our international payments, is not the only one. The second area, that of Government expenditures, is also of great significance in carrying out our program. Government expenditures, under the President's program, have been so administered as to minimize their impact on our balance of payments by maximizing the portion of our foreign assistance spending which is used for buying American goods. In the last fiscal year AID tied four out of every five dollars of its commitments to the export of U.S. goods and services. That percentage is on the increase. By fiscal 1965 the portion of our foreign aid provided in the form of dollars rather than goods will be cut in half from the billion-dollar magnitudes of 1960 and 1961 to $500 million or less.

First indications of the success of the Government's moves toward lessening the loss of short-term investment funds, and in proposing the interest equalization tax were given by Secretary Dillon last week during the World Bank and Fund meetings. He credited these as principal reasons for his expectations that the balance-of-payments deficit during the third quarter of this year would be about half of that in the second quarter. He called it "a satisfactory development."

Foreign investment works both ways, of course. Investment in U.S. private securities by foreign savers fell to less than $150 million in 1962. President Kennedy pointed out that a far better climate for that kind of investment can result from the tax bill passed

by the House, but that a further stimulus is also needed. He directed that an action program be initiated designed to promote the oversea sales of securities by U.S. companies, and last week named a task force to study ways most effectively to pursue this objective. The group will operate under the chairmanship of Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Thus we see that the broad issue is not whether the large deficits of recent years in our international payments can be reduced or not—but rather how rapidly, and by what means. The means already adopted or now proposed by this Government imply primary and continued reliance on a framework of monetary stability, flourishing growth and expanding trade not only as applied to our own economy, but to a closely knit world economy. This objective of increased harmonious cooperation was stressed by Secretary Dillon at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank last week in Washington. Indeed, you will find that the President's program for dealing with the balance-of-payments problem has been and will continue to be founded on these basic propositions unfettered by controls or restrictions alien to our traditions. I believe almost all Americans are in accord with them and in which I am sure all members of the maritime and allied industries concur.

The shipping industry, which depends for its very existence on two-way foreign trade and travel, must be particularly conscious of the need for measures which have become necessary if we are to resolve this problem in ways which will promote rather than restrict or endanger the continued healthy growth of the overall volume of world trade in goods and services.

Our American merchant marine has an important role to play in this respect. Foremost is the service it is already rendering through its representatives here and abroad in assisting in the discovery and development of new markets and new customers for American goods. This service, historically characteristic of the industry, was the subject of recent complimentary remarks by the businessman's Committee on Trade Promotion Activities at the White House Conference on Export Expansion, which urged that even greater publicity be given this contribution by our Merchant Marine to the President's program. Similar important contributions are being made by the shipping industry to our Government's drive to promote tourist travel to the United States. These activities were initiated long before and will continue long after our balance-of-payments problem is solved; but the intensity and verve of the current approach of those associated with it are notable.

Because a large part of the long-term improvement in our international payments must necessarily be sought through increased sales of American merchandise abroad and because such sales are directly dependent not only on promotional effort but also on price competitiveness, the relationship of shipping costs to export competitiveness will inevitably be constantly under consideration in any examination of the shipping industry's role in our balance-of-payments problem.

Efforts to measure the direct contribution of ocean shipping to our balance of payments are complicated by considerations of accounting concepts and certain limitations implicit in the data, particularly as to port expenditures, here and abroad, which are included in the transportation account. For example, only transactions between U.S. and foreign residents actually enter into our balance-of-payments accounting. Hence, if shipments to the United States are carried in U.S. bottoms for the account of U.S. residents, the freight payments involved do not appear at all in our balance-of-payments accounts, for these are payments between Americans. Similarly freight costs for transport of U.S. goods abroad on foreign ships are not included in the balance-of-payments accounts as these are ultimately paid for by the foreign importer and thus represent transactions between two foreigners, not an American and a foreigner. By the same token, payments for shipments in American bottoms of U.S. military goods and other equipment sent to our own Armed Forces overseas do not enter into the balance-of-payments account. I am, incidentally, informed that approximately $250 million in freight charges were paid to American shipowners for military shipments of this kind in 1962.

Obviously, our balance of payments is helped by the use of American shipping (provided this does not entail pricing U.S. exports out of world markets) even though the income or expenditure itself may not appear in the balance-of-payments statistics. If that $250 million, for example, had been paid to foreign ships, it would have represented an addition to our deficit, although certain offsets would have occurred through port expenditures by those foreign ships here. These port expenditures, which comprise a variety of items including bunkerage, port use and piloting fees, advertising, chandler supplies, and personal spending by the crews, perforce are estimates at best. They have, moreover, as the Department of Commerce recently noted, been on the rise in the past decade or more, and now constitute an important, partially balancing element, minimizing large fluctuations on the credit or the debit side of the transportation account of the balance of payments.

Thus, the Department of Commerce has found that during 1962 our ships received freight revenues from foreigners approximating $600 million; while U.S. customers paid over $800 million for the carriage of ocean freight on foreign ships. This deficit reflects the declining participation of U.S. flag vessels in the transportation of foreign trade. But port expenditures constitute a partially balancing element minimizing large fluctuations on the credit or debit side of the transportation account of the balance of payments. This is illustrated by the fact that foreign ships expended $679 million in our ports, in comparison with $241 million estimated to have been spent by our ships in foreign ports. After allowing for small receipts and somewhat larger expenditures for charter hire, the net effect of these transactions was a favorable balance of $54 million in the balance-of-payments account for ocean transportation of commodities in 1962.

The Commerce Department study also points out that U.S.-flag vessels, while carrying less than 9 percent of the total imports and exports of the United States in 1962 earned an estimated 23 percent of all freight revenue generated by such ocean borne foreign trade of the United States. The higher percentage of revenue than of tonnage carried appears to reflect various considerations. Among these: a larger proportion of our export than our import tonnage is carried on ships of U.S. registry; total export tonnage carried on our liners is nearly twice our import liner cargo tonnage; higher value cargoes, on which freight rates tend to be higher as well, are more often carried on liners; and about 28 percent of U.S. exports moving on liners move on those of U.S. registry.

The relation of freight rates to the competitiveness of American exports continues under active study. The President referred to it in his July 18 balance-of-payments message to the Congress; the White House Export Expansion Conference committee of private businessmen, to which I referred earlier, urged that firms interested in foreign trade seek to determine whether ocean freight rates are discriminatory or adversely affect their ability to export. The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress is resuming hearings on this subject, and the Federal Maritime Commission's new chairman, Adm. John Harllee, announced shortly after taking office that this subject would be given top priority. I know you will cooperate to the utmost in the examination of this complex subject.

We are all engaged in critical self-examination to fortify the payments position of our country. In that spirit that same committee of the Export Expansion Conference was prompted to add that management and labor in the transportation industry should adopt all practicable methods of freight and cargo handling which can lead to cost reductions and therefore lower freight rates, thus increasing the competitiveness of American products overseas.

In summation, the administration's program to restore balance in our international accounts involves simultaneously the promotion of sound growth at home, more effective utilization of our material and human resources and elimination of unnecessary costs. These actions will result in improvement in our competitiveness, increases in our trade surpluses and reduction of our capital outflows. The first step and foremost of the measures to achieve these ends is the comprehensive tax reduction and revision legislation approved last month by the House of Representatives.

The second step outlined by the President is, like the first, significant both for its domestic as well as its balance-of-payments effects. That second step is maintenance of price-cost stability, with business and labor urged to recognize and use reasonable guideposts in the resolution of the issues of collective bargaining.

Paring of costs—governmental as well as private—stimulation of sound economic growth, expansion of U.S. exports, promotion of tourist travel to our shores, stimulation of foreign short-term and portfolio holdings in the United States, equalization of costs of long-term borrowings for enterprises of developed nations in their own and the U.S. capital markets—these in essence constitute the program for resolution of the problem of our international payments imbalance. It is a program to which the shipping industry of the United States can make, and is in fact making, an effective contribution. It is also a program which will provide direct benefits and opportunities to the industry itself. I am confident you will take full advantage of the challenge and opportunities offered by it.

New Maritime Bill Is Seen as Stabilizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable men in maritime affairs of this country is our own colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, the honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, longtime chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives.

For years he and this great committee of the Congress has endeavored to protect and promote the maritime interests of this country. This is a difficult task in these trying times of overwhelming competition from the foreign countries.

The maritime industry is beset with many problems. We need the coopera-

tion of labor as well as management if the American-flag marine is to survive.

Recently the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been considering legislation which sought some form of equitable solution to these labor-management problems which are virtually stagnating this great industry.

Chairman BONNER has written an article concerning this legislation which appeared in the October 9, 1963, issue of the Journal of Commerce. I urge the leaders of management and labor in the maritime field as well as my colleagues to carefully read the statements contained therein.

NEW MARITIME BILL IS SEEN AS STABILIZER

(By Representative H. C. BONNER, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee)

The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers & Proprietors International Union of America recently wired me to advise of its opposition to our maritime labor bill, H.R. 1897. The bill was characterized as "legislation restricting collective bargaining in the maritime industry." At about the same time, and subsequently, I received similar communications by wire and by letter from such varied union groups as the United Cement, Lime & Gypsum Workers International Union; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders; American Bakery & Confectionery Workers International Union; American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers; United Textile Workers of America; Operative Plasterers' & Cement Masons' International Association; American Federation of Teachers; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America; United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union; and others.

These communications, obviously part of a campaign against the bill, view with alarm and predict that passage of the bill would be the death knell for free enterprise and would give the Federal Government a free hand to emasculate or destroy collective bargaining.

FAVORS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

I favor free collective bargaining. Our free labor movement with collective bargaining and the right to strike has contributed greatly to our high standard of living shared by all of our citizens. But another fact having a great bearing on this discussion is that our complex economy and the maintenance of our security depend upon the proper functioning of our transportation system.

Therefore, the right to strike or lockout in any part of our transportation system should consistently be tempered by a high degree of responsibility for the welfare of the United States as a whole.

We have just passed a period of crisis when a nationwide railroad strike threatened. It was conceded by all that such a strike of any duration would have had paralyzing effect on our economy through interference with delivery of raw material and finished goods.

Mr. George Meany, the distinguished President of the AFL–CIO, said during the recent Senate hearings on the railway dispute, "I have no quarrel with the President of the United States when he says the American economy cannot stand a railroad strike. I am in complete agreement with this. A national railroad strike would be a national catastrophe."

While opposing any step that would amount to compulsory arbitration, Mr. Meany proposed that "Congress allow collective bargaining to work under the eye of Congress, and then if Congress decides that collective bargaining can't work, then let Congress take whatever action it feels it must take in order to protect the interests of all of the people of this country." He proposed that in the interim service would be continued.

Now let us leave the transportation industry for a moment. It is inconceivable that a complete tieup, by strike or lockout, of any of the industries served by the unions mentioned at the opening of this statement could ever create such national paralysis as to make such a labor-management deadlock intolerable. A nationwide strike of the bookbinders might confront us with an awful lot of loose paper; a strike by the barbers and hairdressers would make us look pretty shaggy; and even in the shipbuilding industry complete tieup could be endured for a long period without reaching national emergency proportions.

IMPACT OF MARITIME STRIKES

But the effect of even a short strike affecting a substantial segment of our maritime transportation has a crippling effect on a large part of our economy. A tieup on the waterfront not only deprives us of essential raw materials and manufactured imports, but our export trade is at a standstill. While labor and management are refusing to talk responsibly to each other and the longshoremen are idle up and down the coast, the exporters in other portions of the world have a field day with our foreign customers, many of whom do not return to our American suppliers after the strike is settled.

Similarly, a tieup by our American merchant marine of necessity causes our exporters to utilize the services of foreign-flag vessels. Many of these, too, do not return to the American-flag ships at the end of the dispute. This in turn reduces the demand for American-flag vessels and seagoing opportunities for American labor. In the end it is not only self-defeating in labor relations, but has damaged our economy and weakened our seaborne strength.

Thus, it would appear that those engaged in the maritime transportation industry, both labor and management, have a greater degree of responsibility to the public than those engaged in other industries. The very nature of their work in the very sensitive field of foreign commerce vests power in the maritime industry all out of proportion to its size relative to other American industry. It permits, and, on occasion, seems to invite the use of the powerful lever of public distress reaching national proportions in lieu of reasonable and responsible negotiations.

IMPROPER EXERCISE OF POWER

That the improper exercise of this power has an extreme effect on the welfare of the United States is demonstrated by the fact that the emergency dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act had to be invoked in the maritime strikes 8 out of the 21 times the injunctive process has been used. The eight findings of detriment to the national welfare were made by all three Presidents who have been in office since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. All of them could not have been wrong on all of these eight occasions, although most of the labor witnesses before the committee denied that the national welfare was involved on any single occasion.

Our committee held lengthy and comprehensive hearings on labor-management problems in 1955. At that time I had hopes that the mutual interests of labor and management, as clearly set forth in those hearings, would bring them voluntarily to closer relationships and improvement in the collective-bargaining processes. But, in spite of professions of cooperation at that time, five Taft-Hartley injunctions have been necessary since then.

It was my hope and expectation when I introduced H.R. 1897 that it would help to strengthen collective bargaining and would, if all else failed, ultimately protect the country against the disastrous effects of major work stoppages in the maritime industry. I felt that the provisions for final discretionary authority in the President to direct a settlement through an arbitration board was a reasonable requirement and would strengthen his hand for the national welfare. I felt that this provision would encourage the parties to reach agreement through their own efforts, and that the final step might never have to be taken.

The hearings on this bill began on March 5 of this year, and continued until August 1, during which time a printed record of 1,677 pages was amassed. We heard testimony from 69 witnesses, representing labor, management, the Government, importers and exporters, and the public generally. We received and considered a large number of communications.

EFFECT OF NEW LEGISLATION

The effect of this legislation would be to take the maritime industry to a large extent out of the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is my belief that the Taft-Hartley Act has proven inadequate to cope with the situations created by labor relations in this vital industry. The views of three Presidents with respect to the importance of the industry by our own experience and recent international events demonstrates conclusively that the machinery to cope with labor disturbances in other industries is insufficient for this one. Not only are we dependent upon incoming raw materials, but our exports are an appreciable element of our overall economy. Most importantly, we need only to refer to the balance-of-payments problem to demonstrate that the continued flow of exports is our lifeblood. Any solution that will contribute to the unimpeded flow of exports and imports is one that we can and must achieve.

I feel that my bill, H.R. 1897, is a long step on the road to that end. I further believe very strongly that through greater stability in maritime labor-management relations we will develop a climate in which further steps may be taken to strengthen our merchant marine, enlarge the fleet under our flag, and provide more employment.

Spare Parts on Sub Worth $2.4 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Allen M. Smythe that appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, October 6, 1963:

SPARE PARTS ON SUB WORTH $2.4 MILLION

(By Allen M. Smythe)

In World War II submarines cost $5 million. Today a Polaris submarine carries spare parts one-half of that value.

A conventional submarine today costs over $65 million. About $40 million of this goes to the shipbuilder. The present class of the Polaris missile firing submarines cost over $115 million. The shipbuilders' costs are around $65 million. The Navy has just ordered the last 6 of their program of 41 Polaris types.

Navy supply problems are compounded by the different classes and types of submarines. There are three different classes of Polaris submarines. There are also three types of Polaris missiles, one with a 1,200-mile range,

one with a 1,500-mile range, and one with a 2,500-mile capability.

Of the first 10 built, no one was like its predecessor. Major components within the submarine were different. This increased the spare parts problem disportionately.

Admiral Crumpacker, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, explains: "Like aircraft, every increase in size and speed of submarines in an arithmetic ratio increases the number and cost of spare parts in a geometric ratio."

He gave as an example a typical submarine built several years ago which carries 6,291 separate spare parts costing $93,171. The *George Washington*, one of the first of the Polaris submarines, carries 20,115 different spares worth $2,091,177. This is a threefold increase in items at 22 times the cost.

The class of submarines now being built with 1,500-mile missiles carry 25,833 spare part items valued at $2,453,499. The classes now being designed for 2,500-mile missiles will have much greater needs.

The average annual operating cost of repair parts for these ballistic missile submarines is $837,150.

These costs do not include any costs of operating the submarine tenders, which directly support the submarines. A tender normally carries 76,000 different items valued at more than $14.5 million.

Spare parts for a limited time of operation are bought initially from the prime contractors. Subsequent orders for storage, whenever possible, are bought under advertised fixed price bids.

Navy supply officers are proud of the fact that no patrol of a Polaris submarine have ever been suspended because of a supply deficiency.

Supply officers have some interesting data on the use of "consumable supplies" for underwater operations of their naval vessels. Detailed figure on the food used by the 150 man *Triton* on its 105-day underwater trip around the world were recorded.

Used on this endurance trip were 8 tons of frozen foods, 2 tons of fresh foods, 3 tons of tinned meat, 6 tons of tinned vegetables, 19 tons of other dry provisions and 190 dozen of eggs.

The amount overflowed the storerooms and lockers and was also stowed in the engine room, the torpedo room and in the crews quarters.

Farm Labor Facts—Part XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is a concept in the law known as proximate cause. The theory applies to the limitation the civil law places on a wrongdoer respecting culpable responsibility for his actions. The rule states that not only must a showing be made that "but for" the wrongdoer's action, the injury would not have been sustained but further there must be a showing that the injury was the proximate forseeable result of the alleged tort.

Congressional theorists have recently attempted to attach responsibility to the Department of Labor for the tragic death of a number of bracero workers in California purportedly but for their hiring contract they would not have met their demise. The liberal California Farm Research and Legislative Commitee, under the leadership of Grace McDonald, recently investigated the true causal relation of this accident and fled the following letter with the California Public Utilities Commission:

CALIFORNIA FARM RESEARCH AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Santa Clara, Calif., October 8, 1963.

Hon. William M. Bennett, President, R. J. Pajalich, Secretary, and Members, California Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: The California Farm Research and Legislative Committee wishes to once more call to your attention our deep concern over continuing accidents at private grade crossings.

Our committee initiated a joint committee to work with the CPUC and public and private bodies on October 23, 1949, following the death, September 21, 1949, of Assemblyman Samuel Heisinger at a private crossing in Fresno County.

A number of CPUC hearings to establish priorities for flashing lights and crossing gates followed months of research. Legislation was enacted in 1953 to provide the first $500,000 to assist cities and counties to pay their share of the cost of such protective devices.

We note with satisfaction in your report of December 31, 1962, that a total of $1,744,291 in allocations had been approved for these purposes for that fiscal year.

However, the death of Assemblyman Heisinger at a private crossing and the number of deaths at such crossings each succeeding year, have not resulted in effective measures to handle this phase of California toll of deaths and injuries at such crossings. In fact, according to my information, the Public Utilities Commission does not even have a list of the number and location of such crossings in the State.

The tragedy which occurred at a private Southern Pacific Railroad crossing south of Chualar, on September 17 where 32 farmworkers were killed in a bus-freight train collision, and a similar collision the following day when two men were killed and a third critically injured at a rural South Pacific crossing 1 mile north of Herndon, near Madera, call for a review of this situation and an examination of State codes dealing with the time when a warning whistle must be sounded.

It is my understanding that CPUC cannot order warning signals at such crossings nor can it change the completely outmoded section of the civil code which states that a warning whistle must be sounded one-quarter of a mile before the train reaches the intersection.

At a speed of from 60 to 65 miles an hour, the legal speed on the right of way where the Southern Pacific extra freight hit the ill-fated farm labor bus near Chualar, a warning whistle at that distance would give a driver less than a quarter of a minute to clear the track.

A checkup at the same crossing with similar freights, one traveling at a speed of 55 miles an hour and one at a speed of 66 miles an hour would allow the driver of any vehicle having to cross this track exactly 7 seconds to make a decision. This, of course, is an impossible position for any driver to be in, whether he is driving a truck or a 1963 Cadillac.

It is true that there is supposed to be an added warning in the form of the headlight on the train, but adequate protection with trains traveling 66 miles an hour for freights and 90 miles an hour for passenger trains, cannot rely on just one precaution.

Nor can drivers having to use private crossings rely on time schedules, especially time schedules for freights, and more especially extra freights.

We are aware that the lack of jurisdiction of the CPUC over private crossings leaves warning signals to the discretion of the railroad and the landowner. This results in no responsibility whatever, since all that is required is a contract allowing egress and ingress over the railroad track.

Taking the 7 miles between Gonzales and Chualar as an example, there are some five or six private crossings, completely unguarded in addition to the five public crossings equipped with either flashing lights or wigwags. Over the 24-hour period 6 passenger trains and 20 freights make this run.

When our committee was concentrating on protection at railroad intersections, we recommended that the only safe solution to the private crossing hazard was construction of a road parallel to the railroad connecting to a properly protected crossing to get from the parallel road to the highway on the other side. Here is a matter that requires a classification of private crossings by counties and hearings at the county level with boards of supervisors to determine how best to meet the existing hazard. A traffic count during harvest season should be included in material to be prepared by the CPUC for such hearings.

It is ironic that the CPUC can only step in after an accident occurs. Thus, while there is no record of the number of private crossings, there is a record of 7 deaths and 23 injuries from 66 accidents at such crossings in 1961 and 5 deaths and 19 injuries from 74 such accidents in 1962.

We are in receipt of a communication from Claude Fernandez, community services chairman of the Santa Clara County Central Labor Council in which he stated that the council was calling on the CPUC to hold an immediate hearing "on the need for properly identifying unprotected crossings in rural areas where farmworkers and or farmers and equipment personnel are required to use private crossings. Preliminary to such an investigation, the CPUC should compile a list of such crossings and a 5-year study of accidents thereon."

Our committee vigorously supports this request, with the additional proposals as to revision of the civil code to increase the distance at which the railroad whistle must be sounded, and the further proposal that county hearings be planned to consider parallel roads leading to properly protected public crossings.

Sincerely,

MRS. GRACE MCDONALD,
Executive Secretary.

Message to the Constitutional Underground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a hard-hitting editorial by Tom Anderson, nationally known farm editorial writer. He pulls no punches in stating what the Communists are doing to America, and it is well worth the few moments it will take to read and study this editorial:

MESSAGE TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL UNDERGROUND

(By Tom Anderson)

Fellow superpatriots, extremists, crackpots and members of the constitutional underground.

What are you so upset about? Even if the Communists keep on doing the same thing they've been doing and we keep on doing the same thing, according to their timetable, they won't take us until 1973. And it'll be "painless," from within.

They wouldn't dare bomb Washington and New York—they'd kill too many of their own people. And besides, they've taken 750 million people since our leaders told us World War II was over, and the big Red Army didn't fire a shot. So if you must worry, don't worry about the big Red army without; worry about the big pink army within. Remember, this is a cold war. We're cold while they war.

Are you upset merely because way back in 1930 top comrat Demitry A. Manuilsky wrote: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeois will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Are you hatemongers angry because Kennedy and Khrushchev write secret letters to each other? Haven't you ever had a pen pal? Maybe Khrushchev pledged Kennedy to secrecy on why the President refuses to build the B-70 planes ordered by Congress; and why we abandoned the Skybolt missile; and why we dismantled our 45 Jupiter ballistic missile bases ringing the Soviet Union in Turkey and Italy; and why we killed the B-58 jet bomber program and the Thor missile bases in England. Maybe part of this Kennedy-Khrushchev "I've Got a Secret" program prevents the President telling the American people and the world whether he promised Khrushchev that in case of Soviet attack on us, we would not bomb Soviet cities, but only missile sites.

Don't you flag wavers realize that our Communist allies don't really mean it? Don't take it seriously because Khrushchev has said: "We will bury you." Our leaders are burying us. The Communists are dedicated to bringing peace to the whole world, as they have brought peace to more than 50 nations like Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Ukraine, North Korea, China, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Cuba. They have surrounded us with peace. Why should you isolationists resist it?

Why are you extreme rightists so extremely right?

Are you lunatics fringing merely because Kennedy actively sponsors sale in this country of Communist merchandise? He's a born importer whose daddy made millions in liquor traffic. And besides, there is a precedent for this trading with the enemy. Didn't we send millions of tons of scrap iron to Japan in the years preceding Pearl Harbor? And didn't we get back much of it, cleverly reshaped by the ingenious Japanese?

Are you in a frenzy merely because Kennedy misled you about his Vienna meeting with Khrushchev until the Communist press reported the meeting? Or because he sponsored legislation to abolish loyalty oaths for students getting Government loans? Or because he gave military aid to Communist Cambodia despite the protest of anti-Communist Thailand?

Or because we trained Yugoslav jet pilots at Perrin Air Force Base in Texas until discovered by outraged superpatriots? Or because the Red frontier delivered our freedom loving friend, Katanga, to the enemy? And refused to let Moise Tshombe come to this country while extending a welcome to killer Kenyatta, former leader of the Mau Mau terrorists? Or because Kennedy forced a Communist coalition on Laos? Or because he took the Communist side against the Dutch and Australians in New Guinea?

Are you divisive elements excited because Kennedy keeps Chiang Kai-shek chained and prevents his effort to invade Red China? Red China will have the bomb in a few years. Then maybe Chiang and all of us can live in piece.

Why are you doubting Thomases so lacking in faith in our leaders? Are you jumping to conclusions because there is no other place to jump to?

If America is to be saved from socialism, it must be saved now. Too soon it may be too late. It must be saved by a grassroots uprising—not as a class—but by the great apathetic, unorganized grassroots majority. It must be saved not from the top down but from the bottom up; not by politicians but by patriots—by "we, the people"—for if we won't, who will? We must reassume, on the local level, those rights, privileges, taxing powers, and responsibilities guaranteed by the greatest freedom document ever devised by man: The Constitution of the United States.

The politician's major purpose in life is to stay in office. Usually, he is only casually interested in any person or problem that cannot help reelect him. He will be as conservative as the people who elect him demand and as socialistic as they will permit. Turning the clock back more than 2,000 years ago, we find that a reactionary named Plato said that one of the penalties for refusing to participate in politics is that you end up being governed by your inferiors.

We can't have Federal aid and freedom. We can't have Federal aid to agriculture and have a free agriculture. Candidate Kennedy said during the campaign, "Agriculture can't exist half slave and half free." They're now trying to enslave the other half. We can't have a socialized agriculture without having a socialized America and vice versa. We can't have Federal aid to schools and have free schools. The Supreme Court has stated that that which the Government subsidizes it may control. And I believe in that principle.

Our Government through abandonment of the gold standard, through confiscatory taxation, through deficit spending, through Government-sponsored union racketeering, through fantastic giveaways at home and abroad, through deliberate subsidization of the enemy—our leaders are destroying the home of the brave and the land of the free, deliberately. Our greatest threat is not fallout; it's sellout. Our menace is not the big Red army from without but the big pink enemy within. Our menace is the KKK—Kennedy, Kennedy, and Kennedy.

Senator TALMADGE told me a while back, "Most people I see here on the Hill think we're going to have 100 percent socialism and a a 20-cent dollar in a very few years."

In America today, one-quarter of the people are living off the other three-quarters, completely or partially. In socialist America 48 million people get regular Government checks. That's roughly—and it is rough on those of us who pay the bills and don't get any—one out of every two households in America. And it's rough on the post office too. The Whiz Kids have come up with an answer to that. They plan to integrate carrier pigeons with woodpeckers, so that the resulting pigeonpecker could not only deliver the Government checks to the home but knock on the door when it got there.

Kennedy's proposed budget and demand for more spending and less taxes is immoral, since it requires public theft, not only from us but from unborn generations.

If taxes are cut as the President desires, the deficit will doubtless run to $15 billion. This means increasing the debt limit again. But so what? As the Socialists say, "We owe it to ourselves." Lord Keynes, the British Socialist, sold this philosophy to the late Eleanor Roosevelt's late cousin-husband, and the destruction of American freedom was under way.

The Socialists now in control of our country have no intention of balancing the budget. Deficit spending has become a way of life—and, unless we have a grassroots rebellion, will become a way of death for the free enterprise system, more commonly called the American way of life. Debts and deficits are unimportant, say the Socialists. The important thing is to keep the country moving with "vigah."

And it is. Toward dictatorship.

You do as you will. But as for me, I may die in a dictatorship, but I will not live in one.

Russia, Tito, and China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, since Tito, of Yugoslavia, is shortly to be a visitor in Washington, it will probably be of interest to many people to read the following story about his identity as it appeared in the October issue of the Intelligence Digest of North Cerney House, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, England:

RUSSIA, TITO, AND CHINA

Everyone remembers the sensation caused when Russia and Yugoslavia apparently fell out. Lately, we have witnessed Khrushchev and Tito in warm accord.

What is the truth?

We suggest that at no time has there been any serious disagreement between Russia and Yugoslavia. On the contrary, we suggest that Tito is himself a member of a secret Russian supreme general staff and has at all times worked in accordance with a plan devised by that staff.

As a result of a well-publicised breach between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, Tito was able to make extensive contacts in many parts of the world which would otherwise have been impossible. He and his agents have been able to gain secret information about many countries, which would have been denied to him had he not been able to persuade the West that he was a genuine deviationist.

Moreover, very large financial aid has been given, besides military equipment and training. We suggest that this was planned by the supreme planning staff.

TITO'S IDENTITY

The question of Tito's identity is also worth fresh investigation. While it can be said with authority that Yugoslavia has at no time been at variance with Russia and that the apparent breach was carefully planned, the question of Tito's identity remains doubtful.

He is supposed to be one Josip Broz, born on May 25, 1892. The original Tito's father was a Croatian; his mother a Slovene. That, plus his military and political record, is well known.

In 1941, a man who was without doubt the original Josip Broz went to Moscow. The problem is, what then happened?

The future control of Yugoslavia was of vital concern to Russia's plans. The races comprising Yugoslavia are notable for their fierce individualism and independence. Could a Croat be trusted to act as a Soviet puppet? On the other hand, Tito's reputation as a Balkan Communist was of great value.

It has not yet been determined what really happened during the 1941 Moscow visit. The Western Powers should make quite sure of the facts before any further technical or financial aid is given to President Tito.

A STRANGE STORY

Father Vladimir Vlahovic—a Franciscan now said to be attached to the Croation Church of St. John the Baptist in Calment, Mich.—says that Tito was liquidated during his 1941 visit to Moscow and replaced by a Russian general called S. Lebeder who, having served in Belgrade in a covert capacity, had a deep knowledge of Yugoslavia.

It is alleged by Father Vlahovic that, because of his knowledge of this, his two brothers—both priests—were liquidated; one by execution and the other by imprisonment. Two persons claiming to be the brother and sister of the original Tito are alleged to have said that the President is not their brother.

It is also said that a Croation bishop who had access to certain records confirmed this objection to Tito's identity. It is alleged that the bishop questioned President Tito and found that he had no intimate knowledge of the Broz family at all.

It is suggested that the military record of the original Tito, when compared with that of his alleged replacement, is of striking difference.

A DISTURBING POSSIBILITY

It would certainly be most disturbing if, in fact, President Tito is a high-ranking Russian officer who has been used as an agent in an audacious scheme. Not only has America supplied very large sums of money to help Tito, plus jet aircraft, but Yugoslav pilots have been trained in America and Yugoslav officers have attended the U.S. Command and General Staff School.

In short, what with that and Tito's far-reaching talks with Western and Asian statesmen, there can be few secrets which he has not discovered under cover of an apparent deviation from Russia.

This service is able to say that there is no doubt at all that Russia and Yugoslavia have at all times been in complete harmony and working to a plan. We are not able to say whether or not the original Tito was shot and replaced. It is possible that we may be able to discover more about this in course of time.

It is known that lately Russia has felt that there were substantial political dangers in keeping up the pretense of disagreement with Yugoslavia; and that is why Khrushchev has lately embraced Tito. After all, the scheme has served its purpose.

Portsmouth's Proud Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, many of us are aware that the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard at Portsmouth, N.H., is a world leader in submarine technology.

The July issue of the Flying A gives testimonial to this fact through an article entitled "Portsmouth's Proud Line," which deals with the very fine work that is being done at this shipyard on flexible marine piping.

Because this article gives some excellent insights into how real quality is built into the submarines that are constructed at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, I am inserting the article concerned into the RECORD and commending it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

PORTSMOUTH'S PROUD LINE

Early last year a group of Navy specialists from throughout the submarine fleet reported to the U.S. Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth, N.H., to attend a new and unusual school—one devoted completely to the study of flexible marine piping. For a solid week they studied the identification of the many types of hose and fittings; how to assemble and inspect them properly; how to install them; and how to test them properly. Upon graduation each man received a certificate proclaiming his competence in the field of flexible piping knowledge.

The significant thing about the school is that it reveals how extensive the use of flexible marine piping has become in submarine applications. Virtually unheard of as recently as 15 years ago, and still regarded as rather experimental even 5 years ago, flexible marine piping is now used extensively, and is of critical importance in the Navy's—and Portsmouth's—relentless drive for quality in submarine construction. In fact, the flexible piping assemblies installed on a submarine now get as much engineering attention as the pumps and other equipment they serve. On a submarine every component is important, and flexible marine piping is especially so because of the increasing need for sound attenuation (reduction) and vibration control. Today's silent service has to be quieter than ever, and flexible marine piping is helping to achieve that end.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is an appropriate setting for these changes in the status of flexible marine piping, for the shipyard is a world leader in submarine technology. Almost as old as the Navy Department itself, Portsmouth was established in 1800. It has grown progressively as the Navy has progressed from sails to steam and from steam to atoms. Its proud line of submarines began in 1917 with the launching of the L-8, which was followed by eight more undersea craft in 2 years. And between 1918 and 1941, more than 30 additional submarines were built at Portsmouth, each improved as a result of lessons learned from the earlier ones. By 1941, Portsmouth had perfected a number of important submarine developments, such as all-welded steel hulls. Thus, its know-how was ready to be put to work in a big way during World War II, when employment reached 20,000 and a total of 75 advanced fleet-type submarines were built. On a single memorable day in 1944—January 27—no less than four new subs were launched.

Since World War II, Portsmouth has developed and built many pioneering submarines, such as U.S.S. *Albacore* in 1953 with its radical streamlined hull, U.S.S. *Barbel* in 1959, first of the superquiet high-speed diesel subs, and U.S.S. *Dolphin*, a research vehicle capable of diving to extraordinary depths, still under construction. In addition to many conventional submarines, the shipyard also completed the Polaris-carrying U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, in 1961, and has two others of a more advanced type of fleet ballistic missile submarines now under construction. Another leader in submarine technology is the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics in Groton, Conn. Electric Boat has also played a major role in the development of modern undersea weapons, particularly the Polaris submarines.

It was in fact the very success of the Polaris weapon system which created a new challenge for Portsmouth. The invulnerability and enormous power of Polaris posed a difficult question: Is there any practical defense? The answer was that probably the best defense against a Polaris-type weapon system at sea was a good offense in the form of a fleet of highly developed attack-type submarines. And the prime design responsibility for this weapon was assigned to Portsmouth.

All of the accumulated knowledge and experience of 40 years have been poured into the design of a new class of nuclear-powered attack submarines, whose primary function is to seek out and destroy aggressor submarines. The first submarine of this new class was built at Portsmouth in 1961; two others are already in service and several more in the class are under construction at Portsmouth.

At Portsmouth, the quality starts with quality design. An experienced, complete design engineering staff is constantly seeking new and better materials, processes, and components, to meet the challenges posed by ever-increasing operational needs.

It all began in the early 1950's when the need for sound attenuation and vibration control became critical. A noisy submarine has two strikes against it: (1) it can easily be heard by an enemy at great distance and (2) its own sound-powered detection equipment (sonar) is less efficient. These can be fatal defects.

A search for the sources of sound on submarines showed that much of it arises in auxiliary systems components such as pumps, actuators, and other rotating machinery. One approach was to mount these components resiliently; another was to add extra sound insulation. These both helped. But frequently the rigid pipes serving the components would act as vibration and sound transmitters or even worse, as amplifiers. Solution: flexible pipes. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard engineers proposed using reinforced rubber hose lines instead of steel pipe in critical systems, and the results were dramatic. There was a very significant drop in the noise levels of systems using flexible piping. Working closely with Portsmouth designers, Aeroquip engineers have learned how to provide the most effective sound attenuation in all the vital fluid systems aboard a submarine.

On the new attack submarines, flexible piping is used in many fluid systems. Aeroquip is the major supplier of flexible piping in Portsmouth designed submarines. These include pneumatic lines for the high pressure air systems, lines for lube oil, ballast tank blowing, fresh and salt water, steam, electronic cooling, and the CO_2 scrubber system. The last system makes possible long underwater cruising by continuously removing carbon dioxide from the submarine's atmosphere and replacing it with oxygen. Overall, aeroquip flexible piping on the typical nuclear submarine is called upon to handle operating pressures from high vacuum to several thousand pounds per square inch, with diameters ranging from one-fourth inch through 6 inches.

Aside from the prime design goal of sound attenuation, flexible piping offers several important secondary benefits. One benefit is that components isolated by flexible piping last longer and work better because of reduced vibration. Another is that flexible piping is often much easier to install and maintain, because it bends easily. And another, reusable fittings allow emergency replacement of hose to be made at sea without special skills or equipment.

At Portsmouth, the path of a piping assembly from the design engineer's mind to installation on the submarine is an eight-step plan

with tight IBM card control at every stage from initial planning through procurement, installation, and final inspection. This system allows full knowledge and control of every item on the submarine. Considering that the typical attack sub uses hundreds of flexible piping assemblies and many thousands of other components, elaborate and precise control is clearly necessary.

In addition to the procurement sequence, there is an overall engineering design control system. This system also uses IBM cards, with a microfilm drawing of each component on each card. When design changes occur, as they often do, it is a simple matter to locate the parts affected and update the cards. Duplicate sets of the flexible piping cards and microfilm readout equipment are maintained in the design division, the hose assembly area, the supply area, and the inspection division. Thus, complete engineering detail is quickly available and constantly kept current in all the key locations.

With the flexible piping concept fully established, the need arose for making sure that the assemblies would receive proper maintenance in the fleet. Hence the fluid piping school was launched at Portsmouth's piping shops as a special section of the shop. The shop maintains a full school curriculum and still carries out a full schedule producing assemblies for new construction and replacing of old assemblies.

The school has graduated over 50 men so far, and the rate will probably increase. In this way, the fleet is assured of a steady supply of men knowledgeable in the maintenance of flexible piping assemblies. It is another of Portsmouth's ways of assuring that the quality built into its subs at the shipyards will continue to receive quality maintenance in the fleet.

Retraining Programs Strike at Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, since the hard-core unemployed are largely unskilled, untrained, and unable to meet the increasing skill demands of a modern technological society, the most realistic approach to this serious problem lies in education and training programs.

During the past week I was interested to read three separate articles emphasizing the need for such programs to cope with our unemployment. One article, which is of particular importance, discussed a massive job training program underway in Philadelphia, under the sponsorship of the chamber of commerce. A preliminary study revealed that about 118,000 persons in the Philadelphia area were persistently unemployed, consisting largely of untrained and unskilled persons. The study further showed that area employers expressed a need for 72,000 additional workers by November 1964, especially officeworkers, service personnel, maintenance mechanics, instrument repairmen, knitting machine operators, hand sewers, and machine tool operators. In order to bring together the jobless man with the manless job, a full-scale training program was begun. Courses now underway vary in length from 4 to 50 weeks, during which time trainees receive $34 per week.

It is encouraging to learn that private as well as public programs are being developed throughout the country to strike at the roots of our unemployment problem. Unemployment cannot be cured solely by an increase in aggregate demand, as the administration continues to contend. The hard core must be broken, and this can only be done through a steady and thorough training program for our unskilled, unemployed workers.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of October 7, discussing the Philadelphia program, as well as articles from the October 5 Christian Science Monitor and the October 6 New York Times, elaborating upon other aspects of this same problem, in the RECORD at this point.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 7, 1963]

PHILADELPHIA SPURS JOB TRAINING

(By Kenneth G. Gehret)

PHILADELPHIA.—A massive job training program is underway here through the cooperative efforts of local industry and State and Federal agencies.

Organized and sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, the program is designed to place 5,000 presently unemployed persons into existing job openings within the next 12 months.

The program is expected to expand rapidly, with the training of an additional 10,000 persons in 101 job categories the following year, according to present plans.

Costs, expected to total more than $2,500,000 in the first year alone, will be met by the Federal Government under the U.S. Manpower Training and Development Act.

HARD CORE DISCOVERED

The decision to embark on such an ambitious training program grew out of a year-long study of the unemployment problem in the Philadelphia area by a committee of the chamber of commerce and a survey of manpower needs.

The study showed that local unemployment included a "hard core" of about 118,000, consisting largely of untrained and unskilled persons. Negroes and other minorities made up the bulk of this group. Training opportunities were not available to most of them, the report stated.

Counterbalancing this unemployment situation was the fact, revealed by a chamber of commerce skill survey among area employers, that 72,000 additional workers would be needed by November, 1964.

OPPORTUNITIES OFFERED

In greatest demand will be officeworkers, service personnel, maintenance mechanics, instrument repairmen, knitting machine operators, hand sewers, and machine tool operators.

The garment industry alone estimated its needs at 8,000 new workers by November of next year.

"Those presently unemployed should be given every opportunity to qualify for the new jobs opening up," a chamber of commerce spokesman stated. "We believe that many of these people can be trained for useful employment. We're going to give them every opportunity to qualify."

Present unemployment and aptitude are the only requirements for training. No preference is given because of age, veteran status, education, or number of dependents.

City-based industrial and commercial interests have much to gain through the large-scale job training program, Keeton Arnett, executive vice president of the local chamber of commerce, pointed out.

TESTS REQUIRED

"The companies that make up the chamber have a big stake in the city's future," he said. "Philadelphia has to attract new industry and keep what it has, and for that it needs to maintain an adequate supply of qualified manpower."

Here is how the program works:

An unemployed worker applies for training through an office of the State employment service. He is given an aptitude test to determine for what training he is qualified.

If he agrees to take the course of study which is recommended on the basis of the test, he begins his training on a full-time schedule. Courses vary in length from 4 to 50 weeks.

During training, the trainee receives $34 per week subsistence, if he qualifies as a head of a family.

Once he successfully completes his course of study, the trainee is referred to an employer who has indicated a need for such a person.

Trainees are prepared only for those positions which employers have available. Thus the expectation is that everyone who graduates will have a job waiting for him.

INSTITUTE UTILIZED

Most of the training takes place at the 113-year-old Spring Garden Institute in Philadelphia, which now operates under the direction of the chamber of commerce as a result of the new program. The institute has long trained technicians and skilled workers for industry.

Training for which the institute has facilities will be given there. Clerical and business courses will be offered in appropriate schools under contract with the chamber of commerce.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 5, 1963]

LESS WORK, MORE JOBS?

(By Ed Townsend)

(NOTE.—Where are the jobs in the 1960's? Labor asserts that part of the answer to the problems of high unemployment and a growing work force "must lie in greater leisure—earlier retirement, longer vacations, and shorter hours." Unions are pressing hard for tax cuts and other governmental moves to stimulate the economy and expand employment opportunities. But few labor leaders now assert that this alone will be enough to relieve present and potential unemployment problems.)

NEW YORK.—American labor sees little likelihood that faster growth in the economy will provide the millions of new jobs needed in the 1960's. Its position is that if enough jobs cannot be created, then jobs must be shared—without, however, the sharing costing today's workers any of the weekly wages they now draw.

A few weeks ago, the AFL–CIO's Industrial Unions Department, headed by Walter P. Reuther, noted that "last year the real increase in goods and services was 6 percent—yet joblessness was as great at the end of the year as at the start. Higher GNP (gross national product) alone apparently is no longer the answer."

The industrial unions department continued:

"By now, this Nation should have drawn a clear lesson from the advance of automation and electronics. New techniques are all too obviously wiping out more jobs than they create. * * * Part of the answer must lie in greater leisure," or sharp reductions in

the time now being worked by those who are employed.

The number unemployed in August was 3,857,000 or 5.5 percent of the Nation's labor force of 70,561,000. This was an improvement over the months before—but not enough of one to make those concerned over high unemployment any more optimistic.

TAX CUT STUDIED

In a union convention address, Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, forecast that President Kennedy's plan to cut taxes $11 billion would create 2 to 3 million jobs, but added that "this most important economic policy measure * * * since the postwar period" must not be considered a cure-all for the Nation's economic problems.

Tax cuts would stimulate the economy and create jobs, Mr. Heller said, but not solve all the problems of giving employment "not only to the more than a million persons who come on the labor market each year but also to the more than a million annually displaced by automation and advanced technology and (would not) absorb the roughly 1,500,000 to 2 million unemployed who must be placed in jobs to bring the unemployment total down to a goal of 4 percent or less."

The stress in all discussions of job problems in the 1960's centers sooner or later on probable impact of technological developments—including automation—on total employment. Some rough statistics help illustrate why this is:

In 1947 it took 14,700 man-hours to produce 1,000 tons of steel; now it takes about 10,900—and the total will drop significantly in the next few years. The United Steelworkers Union has estimated that some 200,000 to 300,000 of its million-plus members are idle because fewer workers now can produce more steel tonnage.

PRODUCTION SPEEDED

Also in 1947 it took 310.5 man-hours to produce an automobile; now it takes fewer than half that number, 153 man-hours.

It took 1,300 man-hours to produce 1,000 tons of coal; now only 500 are needed. The average daily production of a miner in an Illinois soft coal mine is now 56 tons, and new mining machinery will soon raise the average to 90 tons a day. The number of coal miners has dropped from 425,000 to 130,000.

On the farms, it took 340 man-hours to produce 1,000 bushels of wheat in 1947; now it takes 120.

For some time, unions have been touting a shorter workweek—a cut from 40 hours to 35 or fewer hours a week—as a prime solution for the problem of creating 5 million new jobs and providing "reasonably full employment" for those now in the labor force and those who are entering it.

Except for an occasional and limited breakthrough, the campaign has been mostly talk.

THEORY EXAMINED

In theory, reducing the workweek by, say, 5 hours would spread existing jobs out over some 14 percent more workers.

For instance, in a much-simplified example: A small manufacturer employs 70 production workers with a 40-hour week; they put in 2,800 man-hours of work weekly. If their week is cut to 35 hours, their employer will need 80 men to get 2,800 man-hours of work. Ten new jobs will be created—in theory.

The labor demand for a reduced workweek calls for the cut to be made without any reduction in weekly take-home pay. Many union officials privately concede that most employers cannot afford this. If the employer of 70 men paid them an average $2.50 an hour, or $7,000 for the 2,800 hours worked, reducing their total man-hours to 35 without reducing take-home pay would mean a raise to about $2.85 an hour. His original $7,000 weekly wage cost for 70 men would rise to $9,120 for 80.

Realistically, labor's leaders recognize that this would mean faster automation—investment in new equipment to enable the original 70 workers in the example to produce as much in the fewer hours as in their original 40 a week. Most are wary about attempting to negotiate a shorter workweek. They see it as something better set, if at all, by Federal legislation—a lower standard that would apply to every employer.

DEMANDS OPPOSED

Most employers object to union 35-hour demands as, in the words of a recent American Management Association speaker, "essentially a sad hoax."

Shortening the week with no corresponding reduction in weekly pay could "so inflate costs as possibly to bring disaster to the country," they argue.

Supporting this position, Dr. Herbert R. Northrup of the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance and Commerce told the American Management Association in Chicago:

"Dividing up work is at best a poor and uncertain palliative for declining employment—but increasing industry's costs when and where high labor charges already exist is a method hard to beat as a means of insuring that employment will decline."

The Kennedy administration—as the Eisenhower administration before it—opposes the 35-hour week at this time. It feels it would be inflationary, that it would reduce production when higher production should be stimulated, and that it would mean that many jobs would be unfilled because there are not enough workers available with the skills needed to make possible a transition to a 35-hour week.

ALTERNATIVES SOUGHT

There is doubt, too, that many workers really want a 35-hour week if it would mean more leisure instead of more overtime work or a chance for "moonlighting"—work at a second job to swell weekly income.

So other devices are being sought and advocated to spread jobs artificially. The trend in union-employer negotiations is toward longer vacations, industrial sabbaticals such as those negotiated by the steelworkers, more paid holidays, and earlier retirements.

In 1960, the average full-time worker enjoyed 155 more hours of paid leisure than he had in 1940. Of that total, 48 hours represented 6 days of paid vacation, 32 resulted from four more paid holidays, and the remainder came from shorter working hours and other factors.

Further gains have been made—and regularly are being made—in vacation time. Two, three, and four weeks off annually, the number depending on seniority, are increasingly commonplace.

PLAN OFFERED

But to the unions the steelworkers' sabbatical plan of periodic extended vacations is a major breakthrough in job-creating devices.

Under it, half of all workers in basic steel and can companies, even more in aluminum plants, receive 3 months off every fifth year. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, calls the plan a close approach to a 35-hour week, when time worked is averaged out over 5 years, and a sound plan for spreading work among the jobless.

Going back to the simplified example of the employer of 70 men under a steel-type plan, half or 35 of them would be eligible for a 3-month paid vacation every 5 years—7 of them receiving their sabbatical every year, 2 in each of the first three quarters of the year, the seventh in the fourth quarter. To replace them on production lines, two more workers would have to be added full time to the payroll. The total would rise to 72 from the original 70.

Something of the same problem is being faced already in efforts to reduce retirement ages to create more employment openings for younger people in the work force. Labor contracts generally provide that workers can retire with a pension at 65 and must at 68, but mandatory retirement at 68—or any age—is an unpopular requirement. Because of the better physical condition of workers today and the lesser demands of jobs, workers show much more preference for staying on the job longer than for earlier retirement, say at 62.

Under the circumstances, work spreading through a shortened workweek, extended vacations, and earlier retirements looks better in theory than it is likely to in practice. With union pressure, contracts are likely to be signed in the next few years reducing the work-year and work-life of American labor if not the workers' workweek. Some jobs will be created in this way. But, barring congressional action making a 35-hour week mandatory, work spreading does not now look like the solution to job problems of the 1960's.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]

TRAINEE PROJECT TESTED IN ILLINOIS: SOCIAL AGENCIES USING U.S. MONEY TO AID DROPOUTS

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., October 5.—Against the judgment of State and Federal vocational education authorities, Illinois has started a job training project that will serve as a test of the Kennedy administration's theories.

Private social agencies are using Federal funds to provide literacy training and simple job skills for 1,000 unemployed school dropouts in Chicago between the ages of 19 and 22.

President Kennedy, as part of his civil rights program, proposed that the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 be broadened to authorize basic literacy training.

Approval by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Chicago project was withheld for months. Dr. Hobart H. Sommers, regional representative and former vocational education director for the Chicago public schools, said he had doubts whether job training could be better handled by the YMCA than by vocational educators.

The Young Men's Christian Association of Metropolitan Chicago, the Chicago Boys Clubs and the Chicago Youth Centers are sponsoring the program. Bruce M. Cole, project director, referred to it as "a significant breakthrough for the private agencies in this field."

Fifty counselors of about the same age as the trainees are assisting—a preview of Mr. Kennedy's suggested Domestic Peace Corps in the big cities.

In Illinois, job retraining projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act have started at a much faster pace in Chicago and the more prosperous cities in the northern part of the State than have Area Redevelopment Administration training programs in chronically depressed southern Illinois.

During the fiscal year 1963, Illinois claimed more than double its $2.5 million allocation under the act for projects to train such workers as mental hospital attendants and auto mechanics. More than half the projects were in Chicago, where 95 percent of the trainees were Negroes.

Throughout the State, projects under the act have been approved for 10,600 trainees.

Area Redevelopment Administration classes, however, have been completed by only 457 persons, of whom 355 have been placed in jobs.

Samuel C. Bernstein, State manpower training coordinator, said the Department of

Labor had canceled several proposals for training sewing machine operators in southern Illinois. He said the International Ladies Garment Workers Union had protested the midwestern projects because of heavy garment industry unemployment on the east coast.

A committee appointed this year by Gov. Otto Kerner to study the State's unemployment problems criticized high school vocational education programs.

One-fourth the vocational students are enrolled in agricultural courses, although less than 5 percent of the job openings are in this field.

Unquestionably Qualified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) News on Thursday, October 10, 1963, pointing out that the Honorable George Edwards, police commissioner of the city of Detroit, former supreme court justice, former circuit judge of the State of Michigan, former outstanding juvenile court judge in the country, and long-time public servant, is unquestionably fitted by character and temperament to the Federal judgeship to which he has been appointed by President Kennedy.

GEORGE EDWARDS AND FEDERAL BENCH: UNQUESTIONABLY QUALIFIED

Senate Republican Leader DIRSKEN says that two of President Kennedy's nominations for Federal judgeships have drawn more protest than any others. He judges from this that the two are not popular. One of the two he has in mind is George Edwards.

Well, for Heaven's sake.

Sure, Edwards' nomination is less than popular with the local rightwing crowd who make careers of writing letters and circulating tracts which cast doubt on the integrity—if not the loyalty—of anyone slightly to the left of Dick Durant.

But if popularity be the test for the job, DIRKSEN might note that the people of Michigan twice elected Edwards to their supreme court, once by the largest margin ever afforded a candidate for State office.

And if the Senator entertains some doubt that the people were really qualified to judge, there's Edwards' popularity among his colleagues in the legal profession, demonstrated by the fact that he has three times led the field of judicial candidates in Detroit or Michigan State Bar polls. This endorsement gets to the heart of the matter: Would Edwards, on his record, make a good Federal judge? There should be no doubt on that score.

His enemies have dragged out all the presumed dead cats they can find in his past. All the objections are stale.

Edwards spent a few days in the Fort Smith, Ark., bastille in 1935, for leading demonstrations by WPA workers. Heavens to Betsy. That he was let out shortly, with no charges filed, indicates how weak that case was.

His father was "probably the best known Socialist in Texas." His father was also the best known labor lawyer way back then in Texas, at a time and place when that was a most lonely and most needed profession.

And then, there's the piece de resistance: His 30 days in the clink here in Detroit in 1937, at age 23, for leading the Yale & Towne sitdown strike in defiance of a court order. Of that, Edwards says himself that on the basis of what he knows now as lawyer and judge, he would rule as the judge did then—against young unionist Edwards.

But more to the point is the testimony of Michigan State Bar president Nathan Goodnow, bona fide Republican, whose law firm represented Yale & Towne at the time. The legal landmarks were not so clear then, says Goodnow; Edwards' leadership of the strike was justified; and finally, "we have nothing but praise for Justice Edwards as a jurist."

There's a long span of years and experience between the youthful George Edwards, fiery unionist in an era when spunk was a unionist's price of survival, and the George Edwards who went on to become a lawyer, mature party statesman, and a judge with an excellent record on every bench on which he served.

Some Senators have questioned that record. They imply that as a former UAW employee, he should not have participated in State supreme court labor cases. That's as preposterous as the notion that no lawyer who ever represented a corporatoin should ever sit in judgment, as a judge, on a case involving business.

In short, all the objections boil down to ancient political grudges, of no significance now, save as they indicate that George Edwards was, as in a different context he is now, a man of conviction and spirit. Would DIRKSEN prefer some party hack, noncontroversial simply because he never had the brains or the nerve to commit himself to anything?

The last word on the nomination of Edwards as a Federal judge should be Goodnow's: "He possesses unquestioned judicial temperament."

The Injustice of Executions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues know, I have long believed in the abolition of capital punishment. I have introduced H.R. 545 to abolish the death penalty in all Federal jurisdictions. Gov. Michael V. DiSalle is also an advocate of ending such executions. The following statement of his appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1963:

THE INJUSTICE OF EXECUTIONS

(By Michael V. DiSalle)

The debate as to whether capital punishment should be maintained as an essential element in our system of corrections has continued unabated for centuries. Its fundamental weakness continues to be its administration in the name of justice while at the same time it makes a mockery of equality before the law.

Warden "Red" Alvis, a much beloved and respected administrator of Ohio State Penitentiary, was formerly a member of the Ohio State Highway Patrol. During this period, we was an advocate of capital punishment. After many years as warden of the State penitentiary, he asked for a different assignment. His principal reason was his continuing increasing aversion to officiating at executions.

As long as he served as warden, he did not express his opposition. After being reassigned, he told a legislative committee that he had lived the last hours, walked the last mile with 57 killers who had been condemned to death and, without exception, they were poor, friendless, and insignificant persons.

In the Ohio State Penitentiary today there are 400 men who were originally indicted for murder in the first degree. In the period they have been confined, they have seen years when three or six others were executed or years when none was executed. Each of the 400 might have walked the last mile had they been tried under different circumstances.

The same crime committed in a county 60 miles away might bring death.

The difference in the community climate at the time of trial, the difference in temperament of the prosecuting attorney or judge could alter the result. The adequacy and interest of defense counsel could be the difference between life and death. The standing of the defendant or of his family in the community might bring a recommendation of mercy instead of death in the electric chair.

While serving 4 years as Governor, I never had before me an application for clemency on behalf of a person who had been sentenced to death where the condemned person had been able to provide counsel out of his own funds. All but three had been represented by court-appointed counsel.

This is not an indictment of the attorneys as such. However, many have had little or no criminal law experience; most are handicapped by the lateness of entering the case; hardly any have available or are provided funds with which to conduct necessary investigations. They are usually no match for a highly experienced prosecutor who has every investigative service at his disposal. The prosecutor has funds and time for expert testimony. The defense defending paupers usually has none.

If in our judicial system the wealthy, who are usually well educated as to their rights, can man an adequate defense and the poor, who usually are uninformed as to their rights, cannot, then our system of justice is undemocratic in its application.

If the taking of the life of the convicted killer would restore the life of his victim, we could find some justification. If we found that among those going to the electric chair, the greatest number were hired assassins, syndicated racketeers and vice lords, we could find some justification in the death penalty, even though it is not a deterrent. But this is not the case. They can afford an adequate defense. They are knowledgeable as to their rights. They have more chance of dying as a result of the guns and bombs in the hands of their lawless competitors than any risk they take at the hands of law and justice.

There can be little question that when the ultimate penalty administered by our system varies because of who, when, where the crime is committed and the defendant's economic status, we cannot afford the risk of error latent in our lack of infallibility.

Hospital Care Through Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL REC-

ORD an excellent statement by the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon, and former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, on hospital care through social security.

In that excellent statement Dr. Flemming points out how there is grave need for financing hospital care for older Americans through the social security system, and indeed, points out that this is the only intelligent and fiscally responsible method for reaching perhaps the most desperate medical need faced by all of our elder citizens.

It would appear that this calm and reasoned statement with regard to a grave need and the most intelligent way to meet it from this outstanding public servant and expert in the field of social action would have great impact.

The statement follows:

HOSPITAL CARE THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

(NOTE.—Hundreds of thousands of debaters in the Nation's high schools are turning their attention during the 1963–64 academic year to discussion of the role of the Federal Government in providing medical care to the citizens of the United States. One of the first questions for discussion is the role of the Federal Government in providing medical care for the aged, and this was the subject of a special symposium held recently in Denver, Colo., under the auspices of the Speech Association of America and the National University Extension Association. This symposium featured the first major debate on medicare as a curtain raiser for the many thousands of debates which will be conducted among the high school leagues throughout the academic year. The Denver symposium featured two of the most outstanding debaters in America—Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon and a former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the administration of President Eisenhower, and Dr. Edward R. Annis, president of the American Medical Association. At the invitation of former Congressman Aime J. Forand, Dr. Flemming represented the National Council of Senior Citizens in the debate with Dr. Annis, and supported the principle of hospital care for older Americans financed through the social security system. Dr. Flemming's opening statement in the debate is reproduced below.)

There is a general agreement that a problem does exist which our Nation must solve. Studies conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that persons 65 and over are confronted with health and medical bills each year that average twice as much as those for the rest of the population. And all of us know that the cost of medical care keeps increasing. In fact medical-care prices have risen more than other prices.

Bureau of Census data show that in 1960 the aged had to try to pay their medical bills out of annual incomes that averaged about half that received by persons under 65—from $1,000 for aged persons living alone to $2,900 for families headed by aged persons. It is clear that those whose income was equal to the national average and those who were below the average didn't have much left for the medical bills after taking care of the bare necessities of life.

Too many of the aged are unable to afford health insurance or are considered too poor a risk. In fact the number carrying some form of health insurance is just over half of the aged population. In most cases they carry hospital insurance. In many instances it falls far short of meeting the costs of illnesses.

These and other similar facts explain why a larger proportion of the aged than any other group in our population are forced either to turn to public or private welfare agencies for payment of their medical bills or to rely on free care from hospitals and physicians. And the sad thing is that many do not choose either alternative. They just neglect their health.

Surely a nation that is founded on the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being can and must find a solution to this problem—a solution that will meet the needs of this generation and will keep the next generation from confronting the problem that now confronts us.

It was my privilege on January 12, 1961, to deliver the closing address at the first White House Conference on the Aging. At that time in referring to the problem of health and medical care for the aged, I said:

"I am convinced on the basis of my own experiences that this problem cannot be resolved by relying solely on private voluntary efforts. * * * I am convinced that the Federal Government must become an increasingly effective partner if the problem is to be handled properly."

An adequate health and medical insurance program for the aged should provide them with substantial help in meeting the costs of the following items: Hospital care, skilled nursing home care, organized home care services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

If the aged are to enjoy the benefits of a well-rounded program of this kind a law must be enacted that will do the following two things:

First, inaugurate through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged.

Second, authorize and encourage those who are engaged in private insurance to join forces so that they can offer the aged a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will help cover the costs of organized home care services, surgical services, laboritories and X-ray services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

Such a law would provide the foundation for a partnership between the Federal Government and private insurance that would mark the dawn of a new day for the aged in dealing with the economic hazards of illness.

And both the Federal Government and the field of private insurance have had experience in forging such a partnership. For 28 years we have been operating under a social security program which has provided certain basic benefits for retired persons. Today we find that private insurance has worked out over 30,000 private pension plans that suplement the benefits that social security has provided. From 1940 to 1961, like insurance in force grew from $115 to $685 billion. There is no doubt that the Federal Government's old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has stimulated the growth of private insurance in this country.

Here are some of the considerations that I believe should be kept in mind in developing through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged:

1. The program should be financed by a payroll tax shared equally by both employers and employees or paid by the self-employed.

2. Receipts from the tax should be placed in a special fund and benefits paid under the program should be related to the resources in the funds.

3. The payroll tax should be fixed at a level that will make it possible for benefits to be paid to the aged that will give them a fair chance to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of hospital and nursing home care.

4. Persons who have contributed to the fund should be eligible at age 65 for the benefits provided by the program.

5. All employed and self-employed should be included in the program. It is impossible to predict, for example, what persons entering the labor market for the first time this year will have financial resources at age 65 that would enable them to get along without the protection that such an insurance program would provide.

6. The cost of providing health protection to the present aged who have not had the opportunity of participating in the social security program should be met from general revenues.

Such a program, to come from President Kennedy's February 1963 message to the Congress, "is based on the fundamental premise that contributions during the working years, matched by employer's contributions, should enable people to prepay and build earned rights and benefits to safeguard them in their old age."

But such a program isn't enough if it is left standing by itself. It is true that hospital and skilled nursing-home costs loom large in many illnesses. That is why the Federal Government should single them out in developing an insurance program for the aged through social security.

However, the services of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and physical therapists can also be costly. And Congress can help the aged deal with these costs without involving the Federal Government in any new program.

It should do it in the same law in which it establishes a hospital and skilled nursing home program for the aged.

It should declare that it is sound national policy for private insurance companies and nonprofit health plans to join forces, including a pooling of risks and offer the aged in any State a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will cover the cost of services rendered by physicians, surgeons, physical therapists, or any other costs connected with an illness.

It should then remove any legal obstacles such as antitrust laws that stand in the way of putting such a policy into effect.

In brief, in one law the Congress should establish a limited health insurance program through social security and, at the same time, clear away the obstacles that stand in the way of private insurance developing an effective program for supplementing the Government's program.

When I was called upon in August of 1958 to come to grips with the problem of health and medical care for the aged I developed a strong conviction that the Federal Government should not do anything that would block the growth of private health insurance. At the same time I quickly realized that, because of the unusual risks involved, private insurance was not going to be able to offer an adequate program at a price that would be within the reach of a sufficiently large percentage of the aged. I examined and worked on various plans under which the Federal Government would have underpinned the efforts of private insurance. None of them made or has made any headway.

I now believe that private health insurance will grow along sound lines if the Federal Government, through social security, develops an insurance program for the aged that is restricted to dealing with the costs of institutional care. This will leave the rest of the field to private insurance and relieve it of heavy risks. It should at the same time be given the right by the Congress to pool its resources. This should lead to the offering of health insurance policies at premiums that will be within the reach of the aged and also within the reach of younger persons who want to take out policies now that will guarantee them benefits at 65 and beyond. Also it should be kept in mind that some of the $475 to $525 million in purchasing power which is now allocated annually for hospital coverage of the aged will become available for payments of premiums on private policies.

In summary, I believe that a partnership should be established between the Federal Government and private insurance in the health insurance field. If it is brought into existence we will have at long last moved from the "talk" stage into the "action" stage in dealing with the problem of meeting the health and medical needs of the aged.

I recognize, of course, that even if this partnership is formed there will be a percentage of the aged whose needs will have to be met through public welfare programs. I favor the Federal Government providing generous support to the States in connection with their programs for providing medical care for persons receiving old-age assistance. I favor the Kerr-Mills law which makes it possible for the States to receive generous support from the Federal Government if they decide to help persons 65 years of age and over who are not receiving old-age assistance but whose income and other resources are not sufficient to meet their medical expenses.

But these are public assistance programs. They are not substitute for an adequate publice and private insurance program to care for the health and medical costs of the aged. Our fellow citizens do not want to sit around and wait for sickness to develop and then have their bills met through public assistance programs. They want to participate in insurance programs that will assure their ability to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of health and medical care. The time has come to give them the opportunity of participating in such programs. We insult them when we tell them that they needn't worry but that we will take care of them under old-age assistance or the Kerr-Mills program.

Let's not take pride in our ability to add aged persons to public assistance rolls because they are medically indigent. Rather let us insist on the Congress taking action that will provide our people with both public and private insurance programs under which they will have earned benefits that will safeguard them in their old age and keep them off public assistance rolls. This is the only kind of a program that is consistent with our Nation's dedication to the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being.

Closed Door to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch commenting on the refusal of the South Vietnamese Government to grant a visa to Mr. Richard Dudman, a reporter for the Post-Dispatch:

CLOSED DOOR TO VIETNAM

Refusal of the South Vietnamese Embassy in Washington to grant a visa to a reporter for the Post-Dispatch is a sharp indictment of the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem. The reporter, Richard Dudman, visited Saigon a year ago and had been assigned to return to report further on that crisis-ridden corner of southeast Asia.

But Mr. Dudman was told by the Embassy that his application had been rejected on instructions from Vietnam. He was told further that last March, shortly after his articles were published in this newspaper, he was declared persona non grata by the regime, and his name placed on a blacklist of persons to be denied entrance to South Vietnam. Embassy officials refused to disclose further information about the blacklist.

Why was the visa denied? The Vietnamese gave no reason, but obviously they were angered by some of Mr. Dudman's dispatches which, while temperate and objective, stated facts the Diem Government did not want to have published. But what Mr. Dudman said last February about the unpopularity of the repressive Diem family nepotarchy, and the problems of bringing democracy to Saigon and winning the war against the Communist guerrillas, has been amply supported by what has transpired in the last 8 months.

So Mr. Dudman (and by extension every other reputable American reporter) is being penalized for telling the truth, and this by a regime that could not exist 5 minutes if the United States cut off aid. The State Department could do no less than note that "one of the vital elements in Vietnam is the ability of newsmen to be there and to move in and out of the country and to report what is going on."

Mr. Dudman is not the only reporter to feel the displeasure of the Saigon autocrats, particularly that of Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu, Diem's sister-in-law. Reporters in Saigon have had a fierce struggle to pry the truth out and relay it to the American people. By and large they have done a splendid job in the face of great obstacles, most of them placed in their way by the regime. What we know of the wretched state of affairs in Vietnam we know through the efforts of reporters like Mr. Dudman. No wonder he is unwelcome in Saigon.

Politics as Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, for several years now controversy has raged over the possible location of expanding governmental activities in the field of environmental health. The southwestern Ohio area and the city of Cincinnati, where the Federal Government has for a long time been conducting and has recently been expanding its work in Ohio, important fields of environmental health nationally, naturally have a major interest in keeping this activity in the area and encouraging it there. The personnel and facilities for expanding this work in the area are unparalleled, and the only excuses seriously offered for failing to expand in this area are either political in nature or center around the fact that those in the Federal Civil Service feel they may be bypassed and are out of the swim if they are not in the Washington area. If this is so, it should certainly be corrected.

With regard to recent developments and pressure put on from high Government sources for one location or another, it has become clear that the hand of the White House is interferring in what should be a policy decision recommended by the experts in the area and approved by the Congress. The longer the present administration stays in power, the more we hear of political considerations in such decisions. But when these political considerations override the public interests, it is time to speak out. I would suggest to the President that enough is enough and that political patronage in the locating of major Federal installations of this sort should stop. For this reason, I am calling to the attention of the House an excellent editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of October 14, entitled "Politics as Usual," telling the sad story of inconvenience, additional expense, and delays that have resulted from a recent decision of the same nature in the southwestern Ohio area relating to the Internal Revenue Service Center. The stakes in the National Environmental Health Center matter are important and the possibility of abuse and loss is even greater.

The editorial follows:

POLITICS AS USUAL

Covington was selected as the site for the Internal Revenue Service's Data Processing Center almost 2 years ago. It was to have become operational in January of this year, and certainly by January 1964.

The hard facts of the matter are that regional processing of returns will begin next January, but only of business returns and in temporary offices in the Alms & Doepke Building in Cincinnati, not in Covington.

The IRS center story here is the story of how the injection of politics into decision-making can mess up administrative operations like a monkey wrench flung into another kind of machinery.

Covington and the Greater Cincinnati area have seen nothing of the $6 million annual payroll that the IRS Center was to bring. Construction of the Center has not even been begun. Covington is to be congratulated on its selection by the White House as the place in which the Center is to be built. But it was a political decision that put the Center there, against the recommendations of the Internal Revenue Service, the Treasury Department, and the Office of Urban Renewal, all of which favored an available site in Cincinnati's Queensgate renewal project.

Can anyone doubt that the White House threw a wrench into the IRS machinery, and that's why no data is being processed here today?

All this is water over the dam, perhaps, but the story is being repeated.

Cincinnati is a logical place for locating the proposed National Environmental Health Center, which is to cost $60 million and employ 5,000 persons. In fact, original plans called for locating the facility here.

The logic of expanding the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, where problems of air and water pollution already were being tackled, seemed to prevail. Then, as it did in the matter of the IRS Center, politics once again entered the case. Taft Center and Cincinnati were abandoned by the bureaucrats, and the Washington area became the favored location.

Three times congressional committees have ruled against putting the Environmental Health Center near Washington, but Cincinnati has not reentered the picture. Rumors now put the facility in West Virginia and in North Carolina.

Washington is doing more than ignoring the logic of expanding Taft Center. It is ignoring the logic of concentrating environmental health work in a city where so much of it already is being carried on. Cincinnati, after all, is the home of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, which showed the country the way to clean up streams. It is a leader in air pollution control. Significant research of other kinds is being carried on here.

Politics appears to be overriding logic once again, and once again the cost is delay and

more delay. The work of cleaning up the environment in which we live—work so vital that the President himself said recently the need for it posed a national crisis—remains undone. It will continue to remain undone for some time to come. The sacrifice of American health is a high price to pay for politics.

B'Nai B'rith's 120th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1963, B'nai B'rith—it means "Sons of the Covenant"—celebrated its 120th anniversary. The age of 120 has a very special meaning in Jewish tradition. Moses, by Biblical account, lived that span of years. The scope of its philanthropic ventures from its infancy gave impetus to many civic-minded groups that followed. Among all of our national organizations, only the Masons and Odd Fellows—and these originated outside this country—are older. It is interesting to note that B'nai B'rith was born before the Grange, the Salvation Army, the Knights of Columbus, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and scores of other groups which are now so very much a part of us.

It is not generally known that B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief for the victims of the Baltimore flood of 1868. It brought into being the famed National Jewish Hospital of Denver and the Leo N. Levi Hospital in Hot Springs, Ark., both nonsectarian, nonfee hospitals. Among other firsts, were B'nai B'rith's establishment of a free employment bureau in Chicago, and manual and technical schools in Philadelphia and New Orleans. It maintained orphanges and homes for the aged in more than a dozen cities. It mobilized relief drives for victims of the Chicago fire and the San Francisco quake.

B'nai B'rith was founded by 12 men who contributed $60 to start a widows' and orphans' fund. Today, B'nai B'rith will spend more than $15 million in programs of education, social service, youth activities, vocational counseling, intergroup relations and oversea aid.

Nor is it generally known that in the Civil War, B'nai B'rith conducted its own recruitment drive and outfitted a Jewish company of 106 soldiers and arranged for the care of their families. The company served in the 82d Illinois Infantry Regiment.

I think that the spirit of B'nai B'rith is best expressed in a letter which a Brooklyn corporal of Italian origin wrote home to his mother, after he had visited the Hospitality House established in Los Angeles for soldiers on leave, "B'nai B'rith," he wrote, "is a Jewish name meaning a place to rest."

It is indeed a hapy birthday for B'nai B'rith.

Judgment Day Every Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a sermon by Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, delivered on Sunday, October 6. In my opinion, this will rank as the sermon of the year, and should qualify for the Freedom Foundation Award. I commend it not only for reading, but for careful study and analysis.

The sermon follows:

JUDGMENT DAY, EVERY DAY

The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether—Psalms 19: 9.

Our God is a God of love and grace, of f rgiveness and mercy, of truth and righteousness. But the God made known to us in the Bible, who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is also a God of judgment.

He judges us by His word. He judges us by the word become flesh. He judges us by the living word. He judges us in the proc-ses of history.

When you look at life carefully you discover that judgment day is every day. However you define "sin" you must admit that moral judgment is built right into human personality. It is eternally true that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." In the processes of history nations too are judged. According to the Psalmist, "The judgments of the Lord are true and they are righteous altogether."

One of the tragic aspects of our present predicament is the ambiguity of ethical values and the diminishing respect for the moral law. Unless we reestablish a public philosophy based upon the moral law as it has been revealed by the transcendent God, it is the lesson of history that doom awaits us. For all of us who live in the 1960's, judgment day is every day.

Everywhere in our country there are signs of a moral sag. The signs of the times ought to make us aware of the impending judgment of God.

The senior editor of Look magazine, J. Robert Moskin, after a careful national survey, recently wrote:

"We are witnessing the death of the old morality. In our world of masses of people, jet-age travel, nuclear power and fragmented families, conditions are changing so fast that the established moral guidelines have been yanked from our hands.

"No single authority rules our conduct. No church lays down the moral law for all. No tribal customs and taboos define the limits of our immoralities. We are free to be prejudiced or promiscuous, to cheat or chisel. We are left floundering in a money-motivated, sex-obsessed, big-city-dominated society. We must figure out for ourselves how to apply the traditional moral principles to the problems of our times. Many find this burden too heavy."

Samuel Grafton writes about the "Tense Generation" (Look, Aug. 27, 1963) describing a segment of a generation of teenagers from "good" homes who steal, take dope, shock their parents with sexual delinquency, who wage open warfare against society. They are a section of our society who are bored by school, useless to business, and end up as human wastage.

It is not the preachers who are so alarmed about the moral lapse in America. Too many ministers are bogged down in ecclesiastical machinery or their energies are enervated by exclusive preoccupation with only one of our contemporary evils such as racial injustice. It is perceptive laymen like Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, who are seeing the handwriting on the wall and sounding the alarm—as he did some months ago to the Inland Daily Press Association convention. Mr. Jones said, in part:

"More serious is our collapse of moral standards and the blunting of our capacity for righteous indignation.

"Our Puritan ancestors were preoccupied with sin. They were hag-ridden and guilt-ridden and theirs was a repressed and neurotic society. But they had horsepower. They wrested livings from rocky land, built our earliest colleges, started our literature, caused our industrial revolution, and found time in between to fight the Indians, the French and the British, to bawl for abolition, women suffrage and prison reform, and to experiment with graham crackers and bloomers. They were a tremendous people.

"And for all their exaggerated attention to sin, their philosophy rested on a great granite rock. Man was the master of his soul. You didn't have to be bad. You could and should be better. And if you wanted to escape the eternal fires you'd damned well better be.

"In recent years all this has changed in America. We have decided that sin is largely imaginary. We have become enamoured with 'behavioristic psychology.' This holds that a man is a product of his heredity and his environment, and his behavior to a large degree is foreordained by both. He is either a product of a happy combination of genes and chromosomes or an unhappy combination. He moves in an environment that will tend to make him good or that will tend to make him evil. He is just a chip tossed helplessly by forces beyond his control and, therefore, not responsible.

"Well, the theory that misbehavior can be cured by pulling down tenements and erecting in their places elaborate public housing is not holding water. The crime rates continue to rise along with our outlays for social services. We speak of underprivilege. Yet the young men who swagger up and down the streets, boldly flaunting their gang symbols on their black jackets, are far more blessed in creature comforts, opportunities for advancement, and freedom from drudgery than 90 percent of the children of the world. We have sown the dragon's teeth of pseudo-scientific sentimentality, and out of the ground has sprung the legion bearing switch-blade knives and bicycle chains.

"Clearly something is missing. Could it be what the rest of the world's children have been given—the doctrine of individual responsibility?

"Relief is gradually becoming an honorable career in America. It is a pretty fair life, if you have neither conscience nor pride. The politicians will weep over you. The State will give a mother a bonus for her illegitimate children, and if she neglects them sufficiently she can save enough out of her ADC payments to keep herself and her boy friend in wine and gin. Nothing is your fault. (And when the city fathers of a harassed community like Newburgh suggest that able bodied welfare clients might sweep the streets the 'liberal' editorialists arise as one man and denounce them for their cruelty.)

"I don't know how long Americans can stand this erosion of principle.

"Can anyone deny that movies are dirtier than ever? But they don't call it dirt. They call it 'realism.' Why do we let them fool us? Why do we nod owlishly when they tell us that filth is merely a daring art form,

that licentiousness is really social comment? Isn't it time we recognized Hollywood's quest for the fast buck for what it is? * * *

"I think it's time we quit giving page one play to the extramarital junkets of crooners. I think it is time we stopped treating as glamorous and exciting the brazen shackups of screen tramps." So spoke a man who sees life steadily and sees it whole.

Today I am deliberately speaking in the words of discriminating laymen and not in the words of what some might call the prudish preacher. You know what I am talking about or you ought to know. The good pastor who meets people in the confidence of his private pastoral position probably knows more about human dereliction than anybody else in the community. He must be shockproof if he is to be at all useful. As God's servant, he must speak for that righteousness "which exalteth a nation." Somebody must blow the trumpet; somebody must sound the alarm or we are doomed.

You must be blind or illiterate to be unaware of what is happening to literature—or what goes by that name. It beckons the shopper everywhere. We call it "realism." The truth is your 15-year-old daughter can purchase a paperback at the corner drugstore, which in the most torrid language portrays openly a moral basis which our grandfathers relegated to the barnyard. The standard of conduct is to give gangway to your basic drives and "to hell with the 10 commandments, the public sanctions and solemn vows. What kind of character will appear when our youth masticate this putrid refuse?

What is happening in America?

It was not this way at the beginning. Although we have had our ups and downs, our tides of decadence and renewal, until now, in our heart of hearts, we have known better and always found our way back to a higher point of reference.

All the while there goes on the debunking of our heroes of the past, smearing the Founding Fathers and the blemishing of the Nation's great with all the black smudge which arises out of the author's subconscious. Patriotism is becoming a dirty word. A nation cannot be great and strong when it loses respect for its heroes and its symbols. A people who disdain their heritage or ridicule their symbols are already on the way down.

Nations have souls. The collective entity called a nation develops its own image, its own personality. When people think well of themselves they have morale and morale is the most important element in strength. To be sure, nations as well as individuals need to stand humbly before the sovereign God. But when a nation ceases to believe in itself, when its institutions are regarded with cynicism, and its heritage with flippancy, that nation will not remain great. People who seek learning without effort, school grades by theft, athletic victories by bribes, and wages without work are already flabby. When people are dominated by erotic drives and their culture is pleasure-oriented they are in trouble. When crime becomes a way of life, when vows are repudiated and homes disintegrate, when race prejudice hardens and men stubbornly withhold justice from their fellowmen, when greed and cynicism are revealed in government, labor, and business, when there is a harsh pagan disregard for the sacredness of life, a society needs to do some soul searching.

Several years ago, in their pastoral message from Washington, the Roman Catholic bishops wrote:

"An alarming parallel exists between the situation facing us today and that which faced the Roman Empire 1,500 years ago * * * barbarism on the outside, refined materialism and moral decay within. The lessons of history are evident to those with eyes that will see. The Roman Empire disintegrated from within and moral corruption was the main cause." A convocation of evangelical Christians in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church could have said that.

Subsequently the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in America delivered a message which could have been uttered in any Protestant pulpit or convocation.

"The time has come to confess," they said, "that our national ideal no longer rests upon a foundation of broad and solid popular morality. Ignorance of moral principles and the rejection of the very notion of morality are on the rise today and threaten to undermine our Nation and its most sacred traditions. * * *

"This is more serious than in any past age of American history," they said, "because many men are questioning and often denying the objective distinction between good and evil and the ability of human reason to know with certainty what is right and wrong. They are cutting themselves off completely from moral traditions. For the first time in history they find themselves without a moral law to break."

Can it be that we are in our present mood and predicament because we have abandoned first principles? Can it be we are allowing the minority secularists and the atheist portion of the population to infect, then contaminate, and finally dominate the public philosophy?

This is not the way it was at the beginning. To be sure, the people were rough but they were decent. They were certain of the absolute sovereignty of the transcendent God and the permanence of the moral law. They believed in a God who is great enough to be God, and that the moral law is as inexorable as the laws of nature. Our forefathers held to an unvarying point of moral reference. Some things were eternally right; other things eternally wrong. They knew that if you lie, cheat, steal, lust, you destroy personality as surely as bullets destroy body. The public philosophy was based upon commitment to the transcendent God and the moral law, a standard believed to be eternally true and universally applicable.

Many forces made their contribution to the founding of this Nation—the streams of the enlightenment, the great renaissance, the insights of liberal philosophers. But it was the light of the 16th century Protestant Reformation that was determinative. Its ideas were pervasive and decisive and constitutional democracy has flourished in those nations saturated with reformed theology.

Any other conclusion is to misread history.

The Nation was under God at the beginning. It was under His providence, His rulership, His judgment. These truths about man, his value and his conduct were, our fathers said, self-evident, self-authenticating. This was the classical and public philosophy. Now there is pending before Congress a bill to remove the phrase "under God" from the pledge.

The theological beliefs expressed by the Founding Fathers were not evangelical Christianity but a rationalistic reduction of Christianity to natural theology and Old Testament moralism known as deism. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, in essentials, were deists. The chief tenets of deism were faith in the transcendent God, liberty under law, and immortality of the soul.

It is this much religion and at least this amount of theology which was acknowledged at the beginning. Should not at least that much be taught and fostered in education and be part of the common culture?

Maintaining the public philosophy which we received from the central tradition of the classical and Christian world is not dependent upon particular prayers or Bible readings, as pundit Walter Lippmann reminds us. But it must be nourished by something. We cannot drift. The great moral and intellectual deficiencies in our education and in the public conscience must be met by some radical reform and some new creative actions.

The abandonment of the moral law surely must be acknowledged as one basic reason for our difficulty. But there is another reason. The example of our lives before our children has not been good enough.

Samuel Grafton notes this fact in his article: "Psychologists say that the worst thing a time-pressed parent can do is to give up his own standards. With a helpless shrug, a father okays beer at a teenager party because he wants the youngster to have a good time, to be popular, and because he's too busy to handle the situation positively and constructively. But when a father surrenders his own standards, the kids know it, and the image they have of Pop grows dimmer and more confused. Children may become annoyed at discipline, but they know it means that their parents are concerned about them. They take lack of concern as lack of love, even while they may seem to be enjoying this easy freedom. * * * If there is no authority, there is nothing to do battle against; the world becomes confused and uncertain, and the signposts dissolve. Sometimes, children literally don't know what is allowed and what is not."

The Psalmist writes a true word, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." His judgments come out of history and are rendered in the processes of history.

It is not too late to turn the tide and to be saved from the abyss. We cannot live long on an existential morality sustained too often by a subjectivistic theology. We cannot live by capricious judgments and transient standards.

There are thousands upon thousands of Americans who in themselves neither approve nor create the mood and manner of life so many see coming to the surface in America. There are enough Christians of conviction to change the tide and save the Nation. We can refrain from seeing the pictures, buying the books, or supporting in any way the movements which corrupt, defile, and destroy. We can keep own own and our family's spirial life at high tide and our moral standards sharp. A nation is sometimes saved by redeemed remnant, which will not compromise idealism or abandon faith. We can be saved from our sins by Jesus Christ. We can create a strong Church and make a vital Christian witness.

It is not like America or Americans to be morally lost or even uncertain. In our heart of hearts we know the way to moral rectitude, to integrity, to honor, to idealism.

Gilbert K. Chesterton once sent a telegram to his wife saying, "I am in Market Harborough; where ought I to be?" "Home," his wife replied, because she said it was easier to get him home and start him off again on the right track than to tell him how to get where he ought to be from where he was.

So it is with us. What we need is not direction from where we are so much as to return home to the God of our Fathers and our God, who will start us out again and keep us on His highway, if we will obey His laws and do His will.

"Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever." Amen.

Again L.B.J. Goes Out and Makes Friends for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, all of us as Americans are grateful for the great mission of friendship which the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, has carried from our Nation to the people of the rest of the world.

The visit which he, Mrs. Johnson, and their daughter, Lynda, recently paid to Scandinavia and Iceland was another milestone in the person-to-person contact which he has been making all over the world for America.

The Austin American, Austin, Tex., on September 8, in an editorial states:

Everytime he goes abroad, LYNDON JOHNSON makes new friends for the United States.

The editorial is as follows:

AGAIN L.B.J. GOES OUT AND MAKES FRIENDS FOR THE UNITED STATES

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON's visit to Scandinavia and Iceland was by all accounts a solid success in the important areas of creating a warmer atmosphere of friendship and in stimulating studies of increased trade opportunities.

Translations from the newspapers of Sweden, Finland, Norway, and Denmark which reported the doings of Vice President and Mrs. Johnson and their tall, lovely daughter, Lynda, glowed with approval and appreciation of them. More than one editorial comment suggested to the political leaders of whichever country it happened to be that they might learn a lesson from LYNDON JOHNSON in seeking closer personal contacts with the people.

JOHNSON walked smiling among the crowds at every place he visited, shaking hands, chatting, and thanking the people for their courtesies, drinking coffee with workmen and with trades people. It was, by the printed reports, JOHNSON at his best and friendliest.

The Vice President is undoubtedly the world's leading practitioner of person-to-person contacts as a method of building goodwill. He has done it on the crowded streets of three continents with the same success that he has known on the streets of America. In more than 30 countries the past 3 years, LYNDON JOHNSON has walked among people of many races and tongues, using the universal language of the smile and the handshake, and receiving full return in warm friendliness.

JOHNSON says of these hand-shaking episodes that he is representing the United States, not himself, and he is certain that the warm response is directed to his country, not to himself alone.

They are valuable reminders that in spite of the differences of national heritage and language, people are pretty much alike everywhere, most of them ready to meet friendship more than halfway whenever it is offered in the name of the Nation that is the acknowledged leader of the free world.

So sure is LYNDON JOHNSON of this basic truth that he has never hesitated to seek out the people even in places where Communist-led hostility might be threatened.

In the Dominican Republic some time ago and in Iceland Monday, he proved himself more than a match for Communist agitators in attracting a following among the people.

Everytime he goes abroad, LYNDON JOHNSON makes new friends for the United States.

It is by no means the least of many contributions he makes to the strength of this country.

Washington Post Cautions That Economic Capacity May Be Reached Without Adequate Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my view that gross national product is a highly imperfect measuring rod of economic growth and that too heavy a reliance upon it for policymaking purposes could lead to serious errors. An article by Clayton Gehman in the August 1963 Federal Reserve Bulletin discusses this problem and concludes that the apparent slowdown in our growth in recent years is highly deceptive. Gehman believes that because of the failure of GNP to measure all that it should, there may be much less slack in the economy than is commonly supposed.

A thoughtful editorial in the Washington Post of October 13 discusses the Gehman article and points out that if the economy has in fact grown more than is generally realized, at least some part of its productive capacity must be more fully employed, even though other workers and plants are idled by progress. Although the Post believes that efforts should be made to step up output, the editorial does make an important point in suggesting that "as the economy feels its way toward full employment, caution is needed lest the limits of capacity be reached without adequate warning."

The administration's economic policymakers should take note of the Post's warning in light of their repeated assertion that a vast pool of plant and manpower lies idle in the economy, waiting to be soaked up by increases in aggregate demand arising from tax cuts accompanied by higher levels of Federal spending. If the administration's view is incorrect, as many observers believe it may be, the inflationary danger of the administration's fiscal policies may imperil not only the success of the proposed tax cut, which requires price stability, but also our balance-of-payments position.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial, "Measuring Economic Growth," from the October 13 Washington Post in the RECORD:

MEASURING ECONOMIC GROWTH

Everybody knows that the gross national product is no perfect measure of economic growth. It fails to account properly for quality improvements. It leaves out much of what people do for themselves. In all these respects, the GNP understates the performance of the economy.

It may be, however, that even on its own narrow terms the GNP fails to measure all it should. In a recent article in the Federal Reserve Bulletin, Clayton Gehman of the Federal Reserve Board's staff examined the GNP piece by piece. He isolates a number of understatements that have found their way into the figures in recent years. Present statistical procedures do not take account of certain improvements that permit substantially greater output with no increase in use of resources. Such economies seem to have occurred in the use of inventories and of plant and equipment. They have hurt the demand for steel and other materials, but they have helped the supply of goods reaching the consumer. At the same time the GNP statistics have failed to catch some increases in output that actually took place, because they occurred in unfamiliar corners of the economy. Gehman concludes that the recent slowdown in economic growth has been deceptive. The economy has grown at about the same rate as in the past.

The analysis is buttressed with a wealth of detail to which other technicians ought to address themselves. If correct, the computations would suggest that there is less slack in the economy than is commonly supposed. If the economy has grown more than was realized, at least some part of its productive capacity must be more fully employed, even though other workers and plants are idled by progress. This does not mean that efforts to step up output should not go on as long as there are unemployed men and machines. It does suggest that as the economy feels its way toward full employment, caution is needed lest the limits of capacity be reached without adequate warning.

Federal Bar Association Convention, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Bar Association were host this year to the annual convention of the Federal Bar Association which was held September 24, 25, and 26, 1963.

A brief report of the convention activities is included in the following message of the chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association and the city solicitor of Philadelphia, the Honorable David Berger.

The report follows:

CHANCELLOR'S MESSAGE

Philadelphia, and particularly the Philadelphia Bar Association, extends its thanks and gratitude to the Federal Bar Association for holding their annual convention in the city of Philadelphia. Those who attended were privileged to select from approximately 33 panel discussions ranging from aviation to outer space, all of which were replete with panelists of national reputation in their field.

The programs were well arranged, and it was evident, that a great amount of work went into their preparation. Speakers from many parts of the country came to Philadelphia and gave their time and effort to make these various programs a success.

The convocation was held on Tuesday morning, where your chancellor appeared on behalf of the Philadelphia Bar Association, to welcome those who attended; and welcoming addresses were made by the Hon-

orable James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, and the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD, president of the Federal Bar Association.

Distinguished speakers were presented at each of three luncheons. We were privileged to hear the Honorable Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice; the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; and Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

At the banquet held on Wednesday, the principal speaker was J. Edward Day, former Postmaster General of the United States. The weight and impact of these addresses were extraordinary in the extreme. It would be difficult to select one over the other. The Federal Bar Association is to be congratulated on bringing so many speakers of national distinction to Philadelphia.

Present at the convention were many of our Federal judges and judges from the courts of common pleas and our county court. Present also were Senators and Congressmen of the United States.

Much is owed for the success of the convention to A. S. Harzenstein, convention chairman; Bill Duiker, vice chairman of the convention; Norris Harzenstein, Field Supervisor of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; Herman Toll, president of the Philadelphia chapter of the Federal Bar Association; Conrad Philos, vice president of the Federal Bar Association; Theodore M. Kostos, Harry Shargel, and many others.

Our association participated in the convention by presenting a symposium on space law under the sponsorship of Harold Berger, chairman of the space law committee of our association. The principal speaker was Bernard G. Segal, past chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association.

We are indeed grateful to the Federal Bar Association for presenting programs of such distinction and merit, and hope that it will soon select Philadelphia as the site for its convention.

Chief Judge David L. Bazelon will address the Philadelphia Bar Association at the October quarterly meeting tomorrow at the Bellevue-Stratford. Chief Judge Bazelon is one of America's most distinguished jurists. Renowned throughout the English-speaking world as a legal scholar, he has achieved acclaim in fields related to, but not exclusively associated with, jurisprudence. His interests have ranged far and wide. As an example, the American Psychiatric Association gave him the Isaac Ray Award for furthering understanding between the psychiatric and legal professions.

A number of years ago he was characterized by a national magazine as one of the outstanding jurists in the country.

Chief Judge Bazelon's dynamic personality supplements his brilliant record as a trial lawyer, appellate advocate, and a judge of the U.S. court of appeals. Based on present information, we will be hosts to a great assemblage of Federal and State judges who look forward eagerly to our October quarterly meeting.

The Philadelphia Bar Association is very proud to welcome Chief Judge Bazelon. We know that all who attend the lunch tomorrow will enjoy a memorable experience.

B'nai B'rith Observes 120th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the well-known and highly respected Jewish service organization, B'nai B'rith, is currently celebrating its 120th anniversary. It was founded on October 13, 1843, in New York. Only the Masons and Odd Fellows among the national fraternal organizations are older than B'nai B'rith.

In Biblical times Moses lived to the age of 120 years; hence, this anniversary is a symbolic milestone in the history of B'nai B'rith. Today, this organization proudly numbers nearly a half million members in more than 3,000 men's lodges and women's and youth chapters throughout the United States, Canada, and 40 other nations of the free world.

The history of B'nai B'rith is a history of four generations of community service and activities for their fellowmen. These services have been expanded through the years into nearly every phase of human endeavor, such as philanthropy, education, social service, youth activities, vocational counseling, intergroup relations, oversea aid, public affairs, and many others. All of this has not only created an honored role for B'nai B'rith in American life, but has established the organization as a leading and constructive force in our Nation.

I take great pleasure in paying tribute to B'nai B'rith for its many achievements, especially its efforts in working for better understanding among the religious and racial groups in our country. I salute this outstanding Jewish organization and wish for it many more years of active service for the welfare of our country and for the dignity of all of its citizens. We have a number of fine lodges in Connecticut and we are very proud of their membership and their civic interests.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an excellent editorial on the subject, "Salute to B'nai B'rith," published in the October 10, 1963, issue of the Connecticut Jewish Ledger, a very fine weekly publication in our State. The editorial reads as follows:

SALUTE TO B'NAI B'RITH

B'nai B'rith is celebrating this year its 120th anniversary. It is the oldest Jewish fraternal organization in the United States and probably the oldest Jewish fraternity existing in the world. In the course of these 120 years, B'nai B'rith has undergone many changes. These changes have always been progressive in the direction of greater usefulness, both to Jewish life and to life generally. It grew out of the need for fellowship and comradeship on the part of early Jewish settlers in this country. Gradually, it developed its program until today, B'nai B'rith is an active and creative participant in practically all phases of Jewish life and Jewish experience.

One of the significant aspects of B'nai B'rith to us, and one of its most admirable traits is, that it never became crystalized as of one moment of its history. It changed and adjusted in accordance with the changing climate of Jewish life and with the changing needs of Jews. So—from a purely fraternal organization, with sick benefits and insurance, it has had the courage and the vision to expand into other areas and today it is concentrating, it seems, on Jewish education. Through the Hillel Foundation, through adult educational programs, through camps for Jewish children in which, also, education is imparted, through youth work on several levels. B'nai B'rith is occupying an honored and useful place in Jewish life. Moreover, in its participation in Jewish defense work through the Anti-Defamation League and general participation in every aspect of Jewish life including the encouragement and the support of the State of Israel, B'nai B'rith occupies an honored position in our midst.

We salute B'nai B'rith on this 120th anniversary. We wish for it at least another 120 years of usefulness, of enlightened progress, and courageous adjustment, and we voice the hope that our successors will have the loyalty and the Jewish commitment to continue this work, going ever forward and ever deeper into the soil of our Jewish heritage.

Scripps-Howard Newspaper Joins Chairman of Federal Trade Commission in Opposing Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard Newspaper, yesterday in an editorial commended Chairman Paul Rand Dixon, of the Federal Trade Commission, for his recent testimony in opposition to so-called quality stabilization legislation now pending in the Congress.

The editorial comments: "Mr. Dixon's testimony ought to be enough to kill the bill."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD and excerpts from Chairman Dixon's testimony.

The editorial and excerpts follow:

[From the Washington Daily News]

MR. DIXON DEMOLISHES A BILL

Paul Rand Dixon is Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Government agency more concerned than any with seeing that the public gets a square deal for the things it buys. When it comes to price-fixing, the Federal Trade Commission probably is better informed than anybody—since it was price-fixing that resulted in the creation of the Federal Trade Commission in 1915.

Mr. Dixon, in the line of public service, has just done a demolishing job on the so-called quality stabilization bill pending before Congress. This is the new name for the "fair trade" legislation which has been pushed, unsuccessfully, in Congress for several years.

Some States now have fair trade (alias price-fixing) laws. In some States these laws have been declared unconstitutional. But in States where the laws still are in effect, Mr. Dixon said, it has been proved that prices are higher than in adjoining States which do not have such laws.

One of the arguments put up in favor of the quality stabilization bill is that it would protect small merchants from discount houses. Mr. Dixon demolished that claim, too. He said, on the contrary, the small or independent merchants would be unable to compete with the lower-priced brands sold by chain stores because they would be compelled, as a result of law, to abide by prices fixed by the manufacturers. So they would lose business.

The quality stabilization bill proposes to give the power of Federal law to price-fixing which the FTC and the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department are always fighting. It would tend to stifle competition, which is the essence of the American system

and the basis for all other Federal law governing business operations.

Mr. Dixon's testimony ought to be enough to kill the bill.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF HON. PAUL RAND DIXON, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON PROPOSED QUALITY STABILIZATION LEGISLATION

The Commission opposes resale price maintenance legislation, including specifically H.R. 457, on several grounds, including the following bases:

1. The effects of resale price maintenance are prejudicial to the interests of consumers. Where resale prices are fixed by suppliers, the consumer is deprived of the benfits of price competition among distributors, and denied the benefits of the incentive for distributors to lower costs and operate on smaller merchandising margins. Government studies have shown that retail prices on fair trade articles are higher in States which enacted resale price maintenance laws than in non-fair-trade States.[1]

Proponents of resale price maintenance contend that the practice does not prevent retailers from competing in services they give. This, however, begs the question. Potential customers may be indifferent to extra services, whereas they would be satisfied with the original amount of service at a lower price. It is this significant alternative which resale price maintenance stops the retailer from providing.[2]

Since the cost of distribution represents a considerable part of the consumer's dollar legislation which removes that element of the consumer price from the pressure of competition can restrict the efficient working of a competitive system and increase the cost of living. When merchants are forbidden to compete in prices, the result is money out of the consumer's pocket without necessarily any increase in the quality or quantity of the product.

2. The practice of resale price maintenance may facilitate and make more effective open or tacit horizontal agreements among manufacturers. The same distributors usually handle the products of rival manufacturers; on the other hand the manufacturer is free to enter a resale price agreement with any distributor. Effects identical with those in cases of direct collusion follow if each manufacturer establishes, in contracts with his distributors, retail prices and discounts similar to those which these distributors are bound to observe by their arrangements with other competing manufacturers. Moreover, retail price maintenance may function as an essential complement to agreements among manufacturers, since it would be useless for them to fix prices at the manufacturing level if price competition at the retail level disturbs the whole arrangement.[3]

Horizontal agreement by distributors in a market to sell a substantial part of their goods at not less than certain prices would be regarded as an illegal interference with competition. Logically, the law should apply to vertical arrangements which have the same effect of fixing irreducible retail prices. The uniformity of the price would be identical with that of a rigid horizontal price-fixing conspiracy.

3. In arresting competition in price at the distributor levels for identified goods, the bill can place the small retailer at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis the large chain. The small businessman in many retailing fields, including food or drug, will be forced to sell the branded products at resale prices fixed by the packers in competition with customers' labels (private brands) selling at lower prices set by his large competitors.

The bill is not optional in actual practice except for the manufacturer. If this bill becomes law, numerous small unincorporated retailers may be forced to accept the prices set by the owners of trademarks and brand names, usually large, integrated manufacturers. Of the approximately 2 million retailers in the Nation, about 80 percent are unincorporated, and about 80 percent have stores in only 1 location. Also, of the approximately 165,000 merchandise wholesalers, about 91 percent are unincorporated, and 75 percent have establishments in only 1 location.[4] These small businesses will not have the option to refuse to accept the prices of well-known, heavily advertised brand names, since they cannot exist selling unknown brands. The individual small wholesaler and retailer lacks the countervailing power to bargain with the big, brand-name manufacturers. The small businessman may also lack sufficient capital to stay in business over a sustained period of time if his sales drop due to consumers' initial reluctance to try lesser known brands. Consequently, the small merchant will accept the prices set by the manufacturer rather than face the loss of business.

The Commission's staff report on the "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing, Part II," scheduled for submission to Congress next month, reveals that an increasing share of total frozen food sales are marketed under customers' labels. The 10 largest chainstores sell annually over 60 percent of the total private label frozen food products sold in the United States. These chains sell only about 20 percent of the packer label frozen food total, whereas the remaining 80 percent under packer label were sold primarily to small retailers through wholesale distributors.

These statistics indicate that passage of H.R. 457 may hinder the small businessmen. Resale prices will be fixed under this bill on products sold under the manufacturers' brand by the small independents, but the large retail chains with capital to buy similar products under their own brands are left free to sell their private branded products at prices of their own choosing. The bill bars the independent from effective competition with the chain, since the independent cannot lower prices on the price-maintained items to compete with the lower prices of the chain's private brands.

4. When measures of enforcement are involved, resale price maintenance establishes a private system of law. In H.R. 457, the owner of the trademark or brand name, and not a disinterested third party, court of justice, or public authority, determines when to revoke the right of the wholesaler or retailer to resell the controlled product. Under this bill, a private concern will decide a violation of a Federal law and have the right to bring a civil action against the reseller. Paragraph (10) of the bill provides that if the retailer or wholesaler continues to effect resale of the goods after his right has been revoked, he "shall be deemed to have committed an act of unfair competition and shall be liable in a civil action for damages and injunctive relief by the owner of the brand, name, or trademark, to prevent and restrain further violations of this act."

The reseller, in such civil action by the owner, can only use, as a defense to the charge of unfair competition, proof that the owner has not used due diligence in revoking the right to all other parties in substantial competition with the reseller who are known to the plaintiff (owner) to be "committing any of the acts set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph (8)" of the bill. The phrases "due diligence," "substantial competition" and "known to the plaintiff" are involved legal terms, the conflicting interpretations of which can occupy the time of jurists for years to come. And this is the sole defense open to the many small wholesalers and retailers with neither a legal staff nor money to engage in lengthy litigation.

5. The system of fair trading employed pursuant to the McGuire Act in States with fair trade laws exempts from the Federal antitrust laws fair-trade contracts only if the product sought to be traded "is in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others." (Federal Trade Communications Act, sec. 5(a)(2).) The "free and open competition" proviso serves to prevent fair-trading manufacturers from fixing resale prices when there is no effective competition in the markets to keep fair trade prices at realistic levels. Even this little protection of price competition is eliminated under H.R. 457 which applies whenever "goods usable for the same general purpose are available to the public from sources other than the owner of such brand, name, or trademark," regardless of whether these goods are in open competition with other products.

6. State laws enacted pursuant to the McGuire Act authorized price maintenance only if the manufacturers, who fixed retail prices, did not themselves sell their goods in competition with retailers whose prices these manufacturers fixed. This protection is not contained in H.R. 457, pursuant to which, in paragraph (14) thereof, a producer with retail outlets could prevent any competing retailer from selling the same goods at a lower price.

Paragraph (14) appears designed to negate the effects of the Supreme Court's decision in *United States* v. *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.*, 351 U.S. 305 (1956). At the time of the appeal, McKesson was the largest drug wholesaler in the United States and also manufactured its own line of brand name drugs. McKesson's manufacturing division had fair trade agreements with independent wholesalers, most of whom competed with McKesson's own wholesale divisions. The Government challenged McKesson's price-fixing agreements with wholesalers with whom it competed, and McKesson claimed such contracts were exempted from the Sherman Act by the Miller-Tydings Act and the McGuire Act.

The Sureme Court held in the McKesson case that if the contracting parties compete with each other, the Miller-Tydings and McGuire Acts do not permit them to fix resale prices. Both acts contain the proscription against price-fixing agreements "between persons, firms, or corporations in competition with each other." The Court reasoned that since McKesson competes "at the same functional level" with independent wholesalers with whom it has price-fixing agreements, the proviso bars these agreements from falling within the statutory exemption. However, paragraph (14) of H.R. 457 provides that "all such rights and remedies shall be also available to any owner of a brand, name, or trademark who, in the resale of goods identified by such brand, name, or trademark, shall compete at any level of distribution, with any reseller offering such goods." It would appear that, pursuant to the bill, a manufacturer owning a brand and who is integrated forward into the levels of distribution could set prices on the goods for his wholesale or retail competitors.

The Commission reaffirms its opposition to resale price maintenance as a manifestation of a restrictive practice on a free economy. Resale price maintenance represents a real restriction on competition by private agreement and it tends to discourage economic efficiency.

The Commission shares the concern expressed in the bill's preamble regarding unfair competitive practices in the chain of distribution. The practice of bait merchandising (nowhere defined in the bill) or any loss-leader device are aggressive weapons to attract customers for a whole range of products by selective price cutting. However, legislation withdrawing from the retailer the right to make any price reduction is a costly way of reaching the loss-leader device. Re-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

sale price maintenance makes no distinction between price competition that is unfairly used to eliminate weaker competitors, and price competition in the public interest.

The Commission wants to assist, encourage, and protect small business. The burden of providing competition substantially rests on independent small business enterprises. Small business units need an equal chance to obtain supplies and to continue in business without being injured by the discriminatory prices of large rivals. Small business also needs the chance to survive without being absorbed by large firms. In large measure, therefore, remedies for the pressures on small business are found in vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The Commission is very concerned over predatory pricing in all forms. Congress, through the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Commission, through the enforcement of these acts, have taken action to prohibit and ameliorate adverse competitive effects of such pricing practices as below-cost sales and loss leaders. The Supreme Court recently has reaffirmed the constitutionality of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. *U.S.* v. *National Dairy Products Corp.* (S. Ct. No. 18; W. D. Mo. No. Cr. 20542). The Court in the *National Dairy* decision concluded that the Robinson-Patman Act prohibition on purposefully anticompetitive sales at unreasonably low prices reaches sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition.

In conclusion, the Commission is of the opinion that H.R. 457 is contrary to public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws. For the reasons stated in this letter, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be contrary to the public interest.

Now, Mr. Chairman, although I have had nothing to say about H.R. 3669, I think that these observations are in order, although, as I stated to you, our official letter will be prepared and will be submitted to this committee through the Budget Bureau in very short order, but I do think that these short observations should be made, and they are as to the fundamental differences, if any, between H.R. 3669 and H.R. 457.

H.R. 3669 does not provide that a violation, as does H.R. 457, of any of the provisions constitutes an act of unfair competition.

H.R. 3669 does have, as does H.R. 457, provisions for civil remedies and injunctive relief for violations of its provisions.

Also, H.R. 3669 exempts from its provisions drugs, medicines, and devices. H.R. 457 does not contain such exemption.

H.R. 3669 grants an additional defense to a reseller who is accused of violating its provisions, which is not contained in H.R. 457. It is to the effect that the reseller may also establish, by way of defense, that the owner of the brand name has sold goods of like grade and quality to another person similarly situated, under more favorable terms or at lower prices than that afforded to the defendant reseller.

Also, H.R. 3669 provides that, for the brand owner to have the rights and powers conferred by the bill, the products on which the brand appears must be "in free and open competition" with goods usable for the same general purpose which are available to the public from other sources.

H.R. 457 does not require the branded goods to be "in free and open competition."

I think those differences were in order to point out, Mr. Chairman, because I think that the statement I have read fundamentally has the same application to H.R. 3669.

---

[1] See, for example, hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, "Quality Stabilization," 87th Cong., 2d sess., 1962, p. 83 and pp. 394–395.

[2] Board of Trade (British white paper). "A Statement on Resale Price Maintenance," June 1951, p. 5.

[3] Committee To Study Combines Legislation (Canada), "Interim Report on Resale Price Maintenance, Ottawa, 1952," p. 68.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (statement by Mr. RANDALL), Aug. 23, 1962, p. 16268.

The Uncle of the Z-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to beat Representative ART YOUNGER to the RECORD with the latest Hoppe-ism. As a practical matter, Art's worth printing twice almost any old time.

THE UNCLE OF THE Z-BOMB

My friend, Mrs. Helen Jones, the typical American housewife, wrote in to say she was watching Dr. Edward Teller, the father of the H-bomb, on television the other night. He was, as usual, angrily defending his progeny as fathers will.

Mrs. Jones says she certainly was impressed by his thick, black brows, his penetrating eyes, and his suave central European accent. But she has a question.

"Is it true," she writes, "that Dr. Teller has a castle in Transylvania?"

No, of course not. That's a silly question. Actually, Mrs. Jones is probably thinking of Dr. Edwin Tester, known to a grateful world as "the uncle of the Z-bomb." And to his close associates as "that nut."

Dr. Tester does, indeed, have a castle in Transylvania. But due to the pressure of his work he is only able to visit it once a month. A lunar month. "One has to have a night out to howl," is the way he puts it with a friendly grin which bares his flashing white lateral incisors.

But Dr. Tester devotes the rest of his time to science. He lives simply in a home that is typically American, if sparsely furnished. For it contains nothing but a modest-sized statue of Baal, a box of his native earth on which he sleeps, and a small stone altar. "A scientist has to make sacrifices," he says with a chuckle.

The good doctor is a familiar figure to the neighbors as he hustles off to work in his secret alchemy lab each evening, astride his white stallion, his black cape swirling around him.

What goes on in the secret alchemy lab is, of course, secret. Nor is it for us to ask. For his brilliance in inventing the Z-bomb cannot be questioned, as he himself has stated on so many television panel shows.

The Z-bomb, as you know, is the ultimate anti-Communist weapon. For a single Z-bomb, properly detonated, will destroy every Communist everywhere, along with every Communist sympathizer, commie dupe and fellow traveler. Not to mention all living things.

But as Dr. Tester angrily points out to critics, the Z-bomb has no blast to depress property values, nor does it leave lingering radiation. "It is an extremely clean bomb," he says irately. "The finest that science can achieve. And it won't hurt a bit."

What makes Dr. Tester maddest, of course, is this new treaty which forbids him to test his Z-bomb. "How can we be certain that it will work wtihout detonating one?" he cries. "And what," he demands, "if the Communists invent a Z-bomb and kill off every living thing before we can strike back? America must be first," he shouts, "to save the world."

Well, you can't blame Dr. Tester for being mad. How would you like it if most people didn't care much for your offspring? And I'm sure he's a great scientist. But I don't think he's viewing this testing business with what you'd call cool, scientific detachment. In fact, I'd go so far as to say that an angry scientist is a mad scientist.

Which gets us back to Mrs. Jones. I hope I've cleared up her confusion. Dr. Teller is the one who doesn't have a castle in Transylvania.

The Responsibility of the Congress in U.S. Operations Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose, with the permission of the House, to emphasize a foremost function, responsibility and obligation of each Member of the Congress.

This is the duty of overseeing our far-flung operations abroad.

There was a day when the interest and the work of the individual Member of the House or the Senate was confined largely to the immediate problems and purposes of the people of his own district or his own State.

But now, Mr. Speaker, the United States is the world's greatest power. We are the world's principal missionary of democracy and freedom.

Therefore, whether we like it or not, the interest and the work of the individual Member of the Congress must extend to the far reaches of the earth.

Our troops and our arms are located at many stations over the globe, guarding the ramparts of democracy against the onslaught of communism.

Since the World War II the United States has expended over $100 billion in aid, first to relieve suffering and, second, to bolster the economies of those areas where the flame of freedom is unquenched and the spirit of democracy is invincible.

We have sent billions and billions of dollars worth of food to friendly peoples. Our abundance of food now is being shared, under various Government programs, with 100 millions of people in a hundred nations.

As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, my principal interest and responsibility in this worldwide complex, relates directly to the sale, distribution and use of the products of our farms. This interest and this responsibility resides primarily in the Committee on Agriculture, as other committees of this House hold everseeing responsibilities and obligations with respect to other aspects of this Nation's foreign operations.

Mr. Speaker, each Member of the Congress must vote upon appropriations to finance these foreign operations that are in our own interest and which strengthen the free world.

Thereby, we assume responsibility of seeing that this money of the American taxpayers is spent prudently, wisely and effectively.

We must know how these programs are administered and what they accomplish.

We cannot act upon hearsay information. It is essential that occasionally Members of Congress most closely associated with the programs visit the areas where they are in operation, so that the Congress may have first hand knowledge of the efficiency, effectiveness and worth of each operation.

Such studies and such investigations in the past have resulted in immeasurable improvements of various programs, and have saved the United States millions, and perhaps billions, of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that a few people seem to be totally unaware that Congress has a duty to the taxpayers, to our people, to see that no dollar is spent abroad dishonestly or squandered upon operations that do not return dividends to the United States, in building the strength of the free world to resist communism.

These people are prone to criticize, to tag any mission of a Member of Congress abroad as a jaunt or a junket, no matter how serious or how necessary the purpose.

Because some may have abused the privilege of travel abroad, the House amended its rules so that any travel in foreign countries must be approved by specific resolution of the House.

I want to express my appreciation to this body for its recent action upon a resolution authorizing me, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to appoint a subcommittee to attend the 12th biennial Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations which meets in Rome, Italy, November 16 to December 5, and to direct the subcommittee, which will be accompanied by two members of our staff, to conduct certain studies relating to U.S. food and agriculture operations abroad and to confer with the heads of U.S. missions in foreign countries. The group will report to me as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and the report will be considered by our Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations Subcommittee.

For those who may not be familiar with the purposes of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, I quote from the preamble of the constitution of that world organization:

> The nations accepting this constitution being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of: Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions; securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products; bettering the condition of rural populations; and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that our Committee on Agriculture has spent less money than any other major committee in the entire Congress, even far less than many subcommittees, and we have been able to turn back into the Treasury a substantial amount of money made available to this committee. On many occasions we have turned back more than half of the money provided.

During the years I have been authorized, by law, to make available counterpart funds to the members of our committee for travel and expenses abroad, I have authorized use of counterpart funds by various subcommittees but never on any occasion have I had any reason to believe that any member has abused the privileges granted or misappropriated any of the funds made available. At my request, important studies have been made in foreign countries and reports have been filed with our committee.

I cannot recall that I personally ever have spent one dollar of funds of the Committee on Agriculture for travel abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier the magnitude of our agricultural operations overseas. We export annually farm products valued at over $5 billion and more than one-third of this is accomplished through Government-sponsored and financed programs.

The Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over legislation and programs relating to foreign markets for American agriculture and the distribution of food among needy peoples in other nations. We have agricultural attachés stationed in all of the important countries of the world. Our Nation has a vital interest in world markets and our committee would be derelict in its duty if it did not concern itself with exports and make certain that the various programs abroad are honestly, properly, and effectively operated. Studies must be at least occasionally made on the spot if we are to obtain accurate information concerning foreign markets and the distribution of American food.

The European Common Market is a threat to American agriculture. Various countries are throwing up trade barriers against our agricultural commodities. Bilateral arrangements, preferential treatment of other producing areas of the world are adversely affecting our exports. Congress could not possibly legislate wisely, in the interest of our own commerce and our own people, without firsthand information of what is going on in other nations.

Our agriculture is the most productive in all the world. It is essential that we build new markets. Our various programs of food distribution are changing the eating habits of many people in many nations. There is a great and growing opportunity to expand our exports.

Our food abundance is the greatest stabilizing force in the economy of the free world and can be a tremendous force for peace.

The members of our committee, sometimes at great sacrifice, accept the responsibility of membership on special study groups to make investigations and to collect information essential to sound and wise judgment on policies relating to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, during the House consideration of the resolution just mentioned, one member used the occasion to criticize the Interparliamentary Union.

Certainly any intelligent person should know that agriculture is important to all of our people and should further know that the work of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is in no way connected with nor related to the work of the Interparliamentary Union, the oldest of all international organizations devoted to a better understanding among nations.

The Interparliamentary Union is 74 years old, and our Government has been affiliated with the Union from the very time that it was first organized in Paris, France. Sixty-nine nations of the world are now affiliated with the Interparliamentary Union. Recently in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, the American group, of which the honorable and distinguished Representative from New York, Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, is President, attended the largest world meeting of lawmakers ever held in all time of human history. Delegates came from around the world. Yes, the Soviets and the satellites were there, and subjects of worldwide importance were discussed and considered.

Our late, beloved Vice President, Alben Barkley, caused me to be interested in the work of the Interparliamentary Union at the end of World War II. He was then the President of the American group and appointed me as a delegate and we attended a conference in Cairo, Egypt. I have been interested in the Interparliamentary Union for the past 16 years and have been elected to the Executive Committee for two 4-year terms. I realize, of course, that many Members of Congress and the public generally are not advised fully as to the purposes and plans or achievements of the Interparliamentary Union. Every Member of this Congress is eligible and is actually a member of the American group, but unfortunately, many Members have taken no interest in the work of the Union. Certainly, no Member of the Congress has a moral right to lambaste and abuse other Members of Congress who recognize and understand the importance of the Interparliamentary Union.

I am certain that the President of the American group will be delighted to provide any Member of Congress with detailed information concerning the activities of the Interparliamentary Union and to submit for the record the resolutions adopted at the recent conference held in Belgrade.

Those of us who are interested in the work of the Interparliamentary Union are thoroughly disgusted and sick and tired of all the criticism which must be prompted by ignorance which has been leveled at the American group and at the activities of this important worldwide organization.

Most of the criticisms which have been leveled at the Interparliamentary Union by Members of Congress must be prompted by ignorance and stupidity or inspired by demagogery of the most insidious and evil type.

If the Interparliamentary Union is worthwhile we should continue our par-

ticipation in its deliberations. If there are some here who consider this great organization to be worthless, then I challenge them to offer a resolution to end America's affiliation with the organization.

Frankly, I do not believe that any Member of this House or the Senate would be so wanting in wisdom even to suggest that America should abandon the organization which came into being 74 years ago and with which we have been consistently affiliated. Intelligent people in both East and West appreciate the importance of the Interparliamentary Union and yet some people seem to believe that it is some sort of an organization which provides an excuse for junkets.

If there is any Member of this House who honestly believes that the Interparliamentary Union is a junketing organization, then I urge that Member to attend the next conference and to observe the organization in action.

The David Hall Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have called the attention of the House before to the outstanding achievements of Mr. David Hall, of Green Bay, which have merited him the honor of being named "Handicapped American of the Year."

It remained, however, for someone who knows Mr. Hall intimately to tell us about the philosophy and spiritual qualities which sustained Mr. Hall during his hours of travail and which inspired him to dedicate his life to helping others.

His minister, Rev. Charles L. Bagby of Union Congregational Church of Green Bay, has done just that in a heartwarming and well-written article in the September 5 issue of the United Church Herald magazine.

This story, while not so intended by the author, is, I believe, a tribute to the spiritual leadership of Dr. Bagby for whom I have great respect.

The article follows:

HANDICAPPED AMERICAN OF THE YEAR—THE DAVID HALL STORY

(By Charles L. Bagby)

It was a long journey for the 28-year-old man from a stretch of open road in Michigan on July 22, 1955, to the ceremonies last May 9 in the Nation's Capital.

The journey began with David and a friend taking a drive in the country. They had no worries and paid too little attention to their speed. Then suddenly it happened. A carefree holiday became a tragic nightmare. The car rolled over and over and David was thrown from the passenger's seat to spin like a top toward the side of the road.

The friend emerged without a scratch. David lay paralyzed, unable to move, feeling nothing. In fact there was so little feeling that David, conscious of everything, was sure he could get up in just a moment. The moment was more than a year and a half in coming.

Eight years later, the President of the United States, upon the recommendation of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped, named David Hall of Green Bay, Wis., as the Handicapped American of the Year.

Every detail of that moment in July 1955 comes back to David now. He has shared the shattering experience with others who had the same carefree attitude he had then: "It can't happen to me."

An ambulance came, and a doctor. Like reading braille, David is able to trace in his mind everything that was done. The doctor kept sticking him with a pin but there was no response. In the hospital he was placed in traction. They took him to surgery and drilled holes in his head. Then placed him on a stryker frame. The long vigil began.

For 3 months he was unable to move any part of his body below the chin. After that and for 6 more months his only feeling was in his arms and shoulders. Then followed a year and a half in hospitals including 1 year at the Mayo Clinic; and long difficult exercises stretching to a 4-hour period a day to put life and movement into areas where these had been lost.

COURAGE MADE THE DIFFERENCE

Slowly the muscles began to respond. David went home and continued the long painstaking exercises. Courage and determination made the difference. He improved. He learned some body movements. He finally was able to drive a car.

But what were these labored and limited victories over paralysis compared to the meaning and purpose of a young man's life? David was determined to find a place for himself, a niche in society. All this ordeal took place during the summer just before he expected to enroll as a junior at the University of Wisconsin. Such plans were now beyond possibility. What, then, could he do? He was searching for something which would give him a sense of usefulness. The very nature of his handicap was a problem in itself. Yet this problem did not defeat his determination.

First came a job; he was employed by a local TV station to check the length, repetition and timing of the advertisements. It was something, a beginning, a candle in the dark.

Then it happened: A simple invitation which expanded into a life of renewed meaning and purpose. He was invited to tell his story to the midwinter safety conference, meeting in Green Bay. The telling was climactic. It was an immediate appeal. A new life began. Civic clubs, small safety groups, and high schools began to invite David to tell his story.

David Hall's life became a living message for safety. Addressing high schools, young people heard David tell his views of safety before the accident. They looked upon him and saw the result of that attitude. But David spoke with a purpose.

Particularly was he aware of the problem driver. Many of these youths were shocked when after being asked by the high school principals to bring in the speaker they discovered they had to lift him bodily from the car, place him in a wheelchair, and roll him onstage to the microphone. In such appearances he struck home, tellingly, at the false philosophy: "I'll be lucky—It won't happen to me."

Always David concluded with his views on safety as tempered by his own experience, and his soft voice, holding his audiences attentively, reminded them "You don't get another chance."

So effective have been David's appeals for safety that a half-hour color film telling his story will be released for national showing this fall by Employers Mutual of Wausau, Wis.

As satisfying as were his new experiences these were but a beginning. David had much to give, and the world, particularly certain people, needed the inspiration he had to offer. Recognizing this, Dr. William Nystrom, director of the Curative Workshop of the United Fund in Green Bay, asked David to participate in a work demonstration project for the handicapped.

Beginning with four workers the idea developed into a major emphasis for the United Fund of Green Bay. For out of this beginning came the sheltered workshop project for the community. Using the central housing quarters of the United Fund, the sheltered workshop became an integral part of the city's program of rehabilitation.

Under David's supervision, 28 handicapped persons were employed by the workshop. They included a wide range of physically and mentally handicapped. The project was motivated by the philosophy that all handicaps should be served and serving.

CITY AND STATE HONORS

Many honors came to David. He was named corecipient of the Green Bay Jaycees Man of the Year Award, sharing honors with Bart Starr of Packer professional football fame. He was named by Gov. John Reynolds as the Wisconsin Handicapped Person of the Year.

In his unassuming, soft, yet very profound manner of speech, he responded to both awards by expressing his gratitude to his wonderful parents, whose faithfulness and invaluable sacrifices are a story equally as thrilling as his own, and "* * * to so many who have done so much for me. God and Green Bay have been good to me. God bless all of you for what you have done."

David is a member of the Union Congregational Church and is active on its board for social action. He attended the church school, Pilgrim fellowship and membership class of the church. One week before he received his award from the President he participated in a working meeting of his church board.

What are the feelings of a person who has endured such a hardship and risen above the handicap to find a meaning for life? Although David finds his work with young people very satisfying, and speaking to large groups stimulating, he feels that his more personal intimate relationships with his fellow handicapped friends is the true avenue of his service.

Here he knows, intimately, the fears, the hopes, and abilities of handicapped individuals. Without spotlighting himself but in sincerity and humility, an atmosphere of understanding, mutual sharing, counseling and hope is reached, and persons—whoever they are, whatever has happened to them—are made to feel they are significant and important as human beings.

Whenever one talks with David there is such overwhelming gratitude in his conversation that one feels a sense of thanksgiving and praise. David sums it up like this: "The one thing that helped me most came shortly after the accident, when a woman said to me. 'Don't ever wish you were dead. God has spared you for something better.' This, probably more than anything else, moved me to try and make it come true. All these things could not have come about without God's help. Perhaps in the deepest sense of faith and understanding my life is now better than if I had not been hurt."

Cheddi Takes Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak appeared in the October 14th issue of the Washington Post.

The picture these gentlemen send from British Guiana is not very reassuring, and the picture overall in South and Central America is frought with gloom.

It might be well if the Congress turned their eyes to the south for a change, as we may get a few more shocks from our Latin neighbors on a par with those we have already received in Cuba and Santo Domingo.

Communism is on the prowl in Latin America and is picking off bits and pieces here and there without too much trouble.

The article follows:

CHEDDI TAKES OVER

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

GEORGETOWN, BRITISH GUIANA.—Without waiting for Britain to bestow full independence. Marxist Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan is trying to transform British Guiana into the first Communist salient on the South American continent.

The pattern is familiar. Jagan concentrates on the strategic nerve centers—police, schools, mass communications, labor unions, commerce. Now that an anti-Jagan general strike has been broken, activists fresh from training in Havana and Moscow are infiltrating every aspect of Guianese life.

What makes this rather remarkable is that Guiana, after all, is still a British colony. It ought to be reassuring to see the ubiquitous portraits of Queen Elizabeth II and the remnants of Kiplingesque Englishmen who strike a nostalgic note in their pith helmets.

The British tommies form an elite regiment, resplendent in green jackets. Besides, the newspapers openly attack Jagan. "Jagan resign now" slogans are painted on sidewalks. How could this be called a potential Communist stronghold?

The answer: Jagan is biding his time. Overt strong-arm tactics could provoke a repetition of 1953, when Jagan frightened London so badly that it dispatched an army to resume temporary colonial rule.

Ten years later, an older and wiser Jagan is moving discreetly until independence day. For the present, a major objective of the PPP (People's Progressive Party) is destruction of the free trade union movement so there cannot be another general strike. New Jagan-controlled unions, in fact, are having some success in capturing sugar workers and civil servants from old-line, anti-Communist unions.

Their success, however, is due far less to silver-tongued organizers than to Jagan's goon squads roaming the British-owned sugar estates. There have been cases of beatings, home burnings, and destruction of worker-owned rice plantings.

Or consider infiltration of the schools. An anti-Communist educator no longer has a future here. Congeniality with communism has replaced academic qualifications as the criterion for teaching faculties, particularly the faculty of the new University of Guiana, where four American leftwingers have been imported to teach.

More ominous is the insidious infiltration of the police. Although still headed by a British commissioner the newest recruits are Jaganists, including some bully-boys straight from the PPP youth corps.

In keeping with the dynamics of Communist takeovers, there is no Communist mass movement worthy of the name in this tortured land. Jagan is blindly supported by Guiana's dominant East Indian population—as a fellow Indian, not as a Communist. He has capitalized on racial rivalry, East Indian versus Negro, to give communism a foothold.

Until the British lion exists, Jagan cannot have his own army to crush the opposition. And yet Britain is determined to clear out of this impoverished little country with its mixed population of 600,000. This frantic desire to give up the white man's burden requires fuller discussion in another column.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, Americans this year are observing the 471st anniversary of the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by Christopher Columbus, the great Italian navigator.

We take great pride in Christopher Columbus, not only for his journey of exploration into uncharted seas, but also for his bravery and his courage associated with his discovery of America. Nearly five centuries have passed since that historic discovery which inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day on in 1492, civilization has made great strides forward on the road to human freedom and human achievements.

Columbus is often described as the great dreamer of his day. Surely he must have been dreaming not only of the physical shape of the world, but also of a world at peace and of a happy mankind, living in righteousness and justice. In the perspective of history, we see Columbus as a dedicated and religious man who inspired countless generations and will continue to inspire many generations to come, as long as America remains the symbol of liberty and moral leader of a free world.

On July 18, 1963, I introduced a bill which provides that October 12 of each year be recognized as a legal holiday for the whole Nation and that it is to be known as Columbus Day. I suggested, at that time, that this day be observed as a day of rededication of the American people to strive for the kind of world envisioned by Columbus, a world of peace and justice. I suggested also that it be a day of prayer for peace and a day to honor the achievements of this great Italian discoverer.

On October 12, Columbus Day, we join with our fellow Americans of Italian extraction in paying tribute to Christopher Columbus. We also take the opportunity on this occasion to express our pride and appreciation for the invaluable role which Italian-Americans have played in the growth and the upbuilding of our country. We salute them for their loyalty and patriotism, for their civic endeavors, and for their participation in all phases of our national activities.

A Tribute to Ochi Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the expression, "That's Greek to me," usually denotes something unknown. Yet, if one were really to question the use of the word "Greek" and to apply it to our everyday life, the usage would be incorrect. Many ideas, words, and architectural designs with a Greek origin are in common use and have become an integral part of American society.

Our system of government is a democracy, which enables the individual the maximum freedom and a voice in the running of his country. Democracy, though, was not something dreamed up by our Founding Fathers. The term and embodiment of the system came from the ancient Greeks, who, under a democratic government, rose to the greatest heights then known to man.

The English language is not pure Teutonic in origin. It is composed of many languages, primarily Latin. But our technical words, such as "philosophy" and "psychiatry," those used in science, medicine, and the arts, have their derivations in the Greek tongue.

Many of our public buildings, churches, and homes, with their fluted columns and porticos, have their designs originating in the temples at Athens, Epirus, and Thebes. A perfect example is the Supreme Court Building in Washington, D.C., with its gleaming white stones, Corinthian columns, and symbolic frieze.

Mr. Speaker, a young nation, we felt close kinship with the valiant Greeks who were, in 1821, fighting for their independence from the Ottoman Empire. Hundreds of volunteers left our shores to participate in the struggle; thousands more gave freely of their time, money, and goods to succor a heritage from which we derived so much. Sparta, Athens, Troy, Ypsilanti, our numerous Greek-named cities, appeared as symbolic gestures of participation and accord.

Greek participation in the development of our country has not ended with the incorporation of just ideas and words. Immigrants from the Peloponnesus and the Aegean Isles have added to the American scene their own culture. During the first two decades of the 20th century, the Greek immigrants, driven from the homeland by poverty, brought with them the urge to achieve economic independence for their children. They succeeded in their goals. Today, their descendants are respected businessmen, doctors, lawyers, politicians, and government employees.

In San Francisco as in the other Greek communities throughout the United

States, certain festivals indigenous to the Greeks are held, commemorating a saint or historic event in their homeland. One such event honors "Ochi Day." In 1940, General Metaxas, then President of the council governing Greece, received the Fascist Italian Ambassador, who delivered an ultimatum which stated:

The Italian Government decided to demand from the Hellenic Government the right to occupy with her armed forces a number of strategic points in Greek territory. Should the Italian forces meet with resistance, the resistance will be crushed by force of arms.

Metaxas' reply was simple and to the point, "Ochi" which means "no." Mussolini's troops plunged across the border but found themselves no match for the Greek soldiers defending their homes. Within a month, the invaders had been pushed back into Albania, thoroughly defeated and demoralized.

Greek resistance, however, was no contestant to the armed might of Nazi Germany. The 3½-year occupation devastated the land, ruined the economy, and depleted the population. Yet hope survived. When the last of the German occupation forces had been driven from their land, the Greek people industriously began building again. Communist bands, however, abetted by Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, soon began terrorizing the Greek countryside. An appeal by the Government to the United States brought immediate help in the form of dollars, military equipment, food, clothing, and technical assistance. The Truman doctrine, proclaimed in 1947, inaugurated a massive assistance program which was to send to Greece approximately three and half billion dollars worth of aid and to save the country from Communist domination.

Greece today is a member of NATO and a staunch ally of the United States, as it has been throughout the years. Modern transportation, books, and communications media have brought the two nations closer together in understanding and mutual appreciation. It is only right that we in the United States, and not just our citizens of Greek origin, should participate with the people of Greece in the celebration of their festivals and independence day anniversary. As they commemorate "Ochi Day" this month, we, too, must remember that valiant refusal to bow to the dictates of tyranny and honor the defenders of freedom, democracy, and the heritage of Western civilization.

Back-Door Route to Constitutional Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Dr. Joseph F. Menez of Loyola University in Chicago which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of September 29, 1963:

THE CONSTITUTION UNDER ASSAULT

(By Joseph F. Menez)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A plan to overhaul the Constitution so radically that these United States would more closely resemble a confederation was quietly mounted last December. Its backers are using the State legislatures as vehicles for petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention—a back-door route never used before. The three proposed amendments have drawn the criticism of Chief Justice Earl Warren, President Kennedy and many legal scholars. Here, Joseph F. Menez—head of the political science department at Loyola University and a specialist in American political institutions—describes the far-reaching scope of what he terms a "troika of constitutional hocus-pocus to return the Nation to a primitive Constitution.")

Almost daily the press announces some new attempt to amend the U.S. Constitution. Each attempt is coupled with a dire warning that, unless this or that proposed amendment is speedily adopted, the Republic is in danger of disintegrating.

One of the architects of a proposed memorial to the Constitution, State Representative Warren L. Wood (Republican, of Plainfield), put it this way:

"I'm just trying to let the Old Girl operate as she was designed to operate—as I read it."

What has escaped the memorialists is that changing the Constitution is a serious business which should not be discharged wantonly or without mature deliberation. Constitutional change should only follow prolonged national reflection inside and outside the Congress. To date, however, this public discussion has been evaded in place of legislative stealth.

Under the bogus plea of returning to the "fathers of the Constitution," the current batch of memorials to Congress is a radical assault in the name of conservatism to alter the constitutional structure.

Silently and swiftly circulated from one legislature to another, these memorials to Congress would alter radically the amending clause (approved by 12 States), recall the Supreme Court's reapportionment decision, *Baker* v. *Carr* (approved by 14 States, including a disputed veto by the Governor of Nebraska), and create a Court of the Union (approved by 5 States) to veto decisions of the Supreme Court. All are an effort to bypass the constitutional balance of Congress and neutralize a lawmaking court.

Collectively, thus, these proposed amendments to the Constitution would—

1. Shift the amending initiative from Congress to the States.

2. Place the final construction of the Constitution in the hands of State-appointed and State-paid (not to mention State-controlled) judges.

3. Exempt the State legislature from effective policing by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Even Franklin Roosevelt, as the late Justice Robert H. Jackson pointed out, wanted to change the Supreme Court's composition in his "court packing" scheme and not its constitutional prerogatives. No wonder Representative ROBERT A. TAFT, JR., of Ohio, exclaimed:

"They're nuts. They're way out."

The endeavor to clothe the States' rights position as one of "dual sovereignty" is pure legerdemain. In reality, it is a slightly watered down but no less pernicious form of "interposition"—a "tower of political nonsense" as Mark De Wolfe Howe recently described it.

Flushed with victory over the adoption of the 22d amendment which limits the President to two terms (an amendment which most political scientists believe unnecessary and which two ex-Presidents believe was ill advised) and a near victory in the defeated Bricker amendment which would have required the President to conduct international diplomacy with one hand tied behind his back, the extreme conservatives wish to mutilate the Constitution in the name of constitutionalism.

What they hope, in large measure, is to weaken the Congress and the Supreme Court and to transfer national prerogatives to State legislatures. They plan, in a word, to change a Federal union into a confederation or, as Henry Steele Commager has said, they want "to form a much less perfect union." This is an old but familiar song, "turn back the universe and give me yesterday."

One would think we had not been over all this ground before. When article V was before the Constitutional Convention of 1787 a motion to insert the provision, "no State shall without its consent be affected in its internal policy," was rejected. Later in 1861, a proposed amendment provided that Congress could not interfere with the "domestic institution" of any State and this, too, was rejected.

The 18th and 19th amendments were challenged as substantively altering the nature of the Constitution but the Court disposed of this attack as not worthy of serious attention.

This troika of constitutional hocus-pocus to return the Nation to the primitive Constitution cannot stand close attention. They not only do violence to the historical record (which is pretty well known and difficult to falsify) but also violate the spirit of a libertarian constitution.

One proposed amendment to the Constitution would change article V, the amending clause. Under this article, amendments may be proposed by two-thirds of each House of Congress or a national convention called by Congress when petitioned to do so at the request of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States and ratified by the legislatures or conventions in three-fourths of the States. Congress decides which mode of ratification shall be used.

Until now, all proposed amendments to the Constitution have been ratified by State legislatures (except the 21st). Congress has never called a national convention for the reason that two-thirds of the States have not petitioned it to do so.

Article V seems easy enough to understand. It has provided for constitutional development and has worked well. It meets the test of being rigid enough to prevent easy and uncalculated change and flexible enough when necessary. There have been eight amendments since 1913 or one on an average of every 6 years. As James Madison observed: "It guards equally against that extreme facility, which would render the Constitution too mutable; and that extreme difficulty, which might perpetuate its discovered faults."

Thus, our Constitution is neither radically democratic to be changed as a mere statute nor rigidly conservative as to be virtually unamendable. It is for this reason that William Gladstone called it the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

Lord James Bryce, for many years a Member of Parliament and Ambassador to the United States, believed that, under the genius of the national temper, it "ranks above every other written constitution for the intrinsic excellence of its scheme, its adaptation to the circumstances of the people, the simplicity, brevity, and precision of its language, and its judicious mixture of definiteness in principle with elasticity in detail."

If the memorialists have their way, the remarks of Lord Bryce will cease being con-

temporary and will become historical. We will have a Constitution, no doubt, but not the one he so eloquently describes and what Woodrow Wilson called a "vehicle of life."

The memorialists seek to eliminate Congress from the amending process by providing that when two-thirds of the State legislatures propose identical constitutional amendments, the amendment would bypass Congress and go immediately to the States for ratification. This modification of article V would not only weaken the Congress in relation to the other branches of the National Government (and surely in relation to the States) but substitute obscure debate in 50 State capitals for the concentrated debate at the National Capital.

As the Association of the Bar of the City of New York noted in its adverse report, State legislatures have only a small acquaintance with problems viewed from a national perspective. They would have difficulty in ascertaining the attitudes, views and needs of other sections of the country.

By contrast, a congressional committee can obtain views from many areas of the country at a single hearing whereas the States would require 50 hearings. Moreover, the publicity engendered by a congressional committee would guarantee that the proposal was given a full hearing and not slipped through the legislative mill without publicity.

As it is, the small States have an edge in the ratification process. Nevada, with a population around 300,000 persons, is equal to New York with a population roughly 17 million. Under this stratagem, in addition, the rural-dominated legislatures of the large States would be in a position to impose their will on the rest of the Nation. As Deputy Attorney General Joseph Dolan disclosed, all sorts of weird things could happen if this memorial were adopted. "The presidency could be junked in favor of a troika. The Congress could be abolished or radically altered without any need for congressional approval," he said.

This rebellious assault, moreover, would change Congress from a deliberative body as regards the amending process to a ministerial one. Congress would be compelled to submit amendments to the States for ratification when two-thirds of the States petition it to do so. Congress, consequently, would be denied its present discretionary power as well as its power to determine the mode of ratification, since the memorial would determine this.

The 21st amendment was ratified by the convention method precisely because Congress felt that rural areas which were "dry" were overrepresented in the State legislatures. This method is more expensive since the delegates have to assemble especially for one purpose, but it is more democratic (almost in the nature of a referendum) since the delegates to the convention can be pledged for or against ratification.

Conservatives who could not beat Franklin Roosevelt at the polls understood the difference between the two methods well enough when they successfully pushed the adoption of the 22d amendment limiting the President to two terms. Unlike its more democratic predecessor, this amendment was ratified by State legislatures obviously because conventions could not have been counted on to do the proper thing.

Under article V there is a national consensus. The spotlight of debate is on Congress where all the people can witness the outcome of debate. The revision of article V, says Charles Black of the Yale Law School, not only would deprive Congress of the amending process but three-fourths of the State legislatures without the consent of any other body, could change the presidency to a committee of three, hobble the treaty power, make the Federal judiciary elective, repeal the fourth amendment, make Catholics ineligible for public office, and move the National Capital to Topeka. These are (in part, at least) cartoon illustrations. But the cartoon accurately renders the de jure picture, and seems exaggerated only because we now conceive that at least some of these actions have no appeal to anybody. Some amendments—e.g., something like the Bricker amendment—would be very likely of early passage. At present the main dangers would be to civil and political rights, to national conduct of foreign relations, and to the Federal taxing power. But (particularly since the proposed change would be obviously irreversible, 13 States being enough to block its reversal) the cartoon does not exaggerate the possibilities of the long future. A country in which the large majority would have to dread and sometimes submit to constitutional innovations appealing only to a minority could not call itself, even poetically, a democracy, and the possible tensions between consensus and Constitution would be dangerous in the extreme.

Such a radical proposal also would open up some neat questions. For instance, could Congress be forced to submit to the State legislatures for ratification such memorials? Article V says that Congress "shall" call a convention when petitioned to do so but it is unlikely that Congress, as C. Herman Pritchett notes in "The American Constitution," "would welcome such an infringement on its own prerogatives." If Congress did acquiesce it would have to provide for all the details (location, membership, rules of procedure, etc.) and since it could not be certain the convention, once in session, might not "run away" and propose an entirely new document as was created in 1787, "it is unlikely that this Pandora's box in article V will ever be opened."

The second memorial stipulates that no provision of the Constitution can restrict the apportionment of a State legislature and Federal courts have no jurisdiction over any suit relating to State reapportionment. This, of course, is a shameful attack at *Baker* v. *Carr* which allows citizens to seek relief in the Federal courts when the political districts of a State violate the 14th amendment.

Already a dozen State legislatures in support of this kind of "home rule" have submitted memorials to Congress. This Jacobin attack on the Constitution in the name of conservatism is defended by Representative WOOD, of Illinois, because the 10th amendment has been "raped twice a day for 10 years."

Under this barbarous proposal State's-rights memorialists seek to emasculate the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment and place citizens under the command of rural-dominated legislatures. If this proposed amendment were ever adopted Negro minorities would see their hard-won civil liberties siphoned off by pernicious gerrymandering. The Tuskegee gerrymander case is a stark reminder how close was this possibility.

Cecil Poole, the first Negro to be named a U.S. attorney, noted this when he told the Chicago convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

"Don't let them steal your rights. Keep the spotlight on the various proposals. * * * They are trying to change your Constitution."

Metropolitan government, too, might come to a standstill for the voting record of "downstate" or "upstate" rural politicians needs little documentation. As the Chicago Bar Association's adverse report sharply observed this proposal "does violence to the time-honored principle that people, in addition to States and Federal Government, have rights."

This proposal, finally, would violate the constitutional guarantee to every State in the Union of a republican form of government inasmuch as (1) the Supreme Court could not implement this guarantee no matter how vicious malapportionment was in any State, and (2) it is unlikely that, left to themselves, State legislatures would reapportion the States fairly.

The General Assembly of States has gone to considerable trouble to appear free of white supremacy. ("This is not a cotton-picker's dream," said Lt. Gov. Harold Chase, of Kansas.) Also the backers have sought to avoid undesirable companions (the Birch Society); soft-pedal terms such as State's rights and civil rights (substituting dual sovereignty in the sense of John C. Calhoun's discredited "concurrent majority" rather than in the meaningful sense of cooperative federalism), and to work unobtrusively with a small staff and a small budget.

The strategy is a low-key one of writing letters to legislators and making telephone calls.

However, more than mere political camaraderie brings many of these conservatives together. Many have a personal interest in arresting reapportionment because they come from districts with a relatively small or declining population. What these entrenched rural politicians overlook is that it is much too late in our history to diminish expanding freedoms under the Constitution and substitute disreputable constitutional shibboleths.

It has been 144 years since Chief Justice John Marshall wrote: "We must never forget, that it is a constitution we are expounding."

Still another proposal memoralists are urging as constitutional amendment is the Court of the Union.

Under this proposal there would be a supercolossal Court of the Union consisting of 50 chief justices of the State supreme courts who could review and reverse decisions of the Supreme Court. The Court of the Union would meet only when called to do so at the request of five State legislatures that do not have a common boundary. Its jurisdiction would be confined only to discussions involving the powers of the States or of the people and not those functions exclusively national like foreign commerce, coining money and the like. Three-fourths of the justices shall constitute a quorum and a majority of 26 justices is necessary to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court.

This is "pretty strong medicine but that is because we have a rather strong illness," said Warren Wood. Such a scheme seems destined to fall under its own weight and its own complexity, although Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS fears the possibility of a bandwagon psychology. He likens this memorial and the others to a time bomb under the American constitutional system.

Not only would such a topheavy court lack any tradition (since it would meet only sporadically) but it is doubtful whether it could function as easily as the present Supreme Court. It is unlikely that the court could issue written opinions or that the judges would have the energy, let alone the wisdom, to operate on two levels of Government (State and National) simultaneously. With an elected judiciary (for the most part), how could we be sure it would have that sort of objectivity needed and to which we are already accustomed? The present members of the Supreme Court hold their positions for life. Would this be true of a Court of the Union?

Under this proposed amendment, further, decisions of the Supreme Court would not become final until 2 years have passed—a provision, surely, that would logically bring nothing but confusion into the law. Litigants would not only not know if the decision was "final" since the State legislatures on their own initiative could resuscitate the dispute but the expenditure of time and money and energy would be excessively burdensome.

The Court of the Union envisions another radical departure in that its decisions, un-

like rulings of the Supreme Court, "shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution."

As the New York bar noted, this kind of finality is strange for the Council of State Governments that objects to the finality of Supreme Court decisions. The Supreme Court not only can overrule its own decisions (surely a public confession of error is preferable to a wrongful consistency) but Congress can frequently change the effect of decisions when it believes its intent was misconstrued.

In reality, the finality proposed by the memorialists would stifle constitutional growth rather than give it meaning. There must, in a word, be a clear-cut distinction between constitutional and statutory law. Those who want to amend the written Constitution at the drop of the hat are attempting to make the Constitution self-executing and to function automatically.

John Marshall understood this clearly when he wrote:

"A Constitution, to contain an accurate detail of all subdivisions of which its great powers will admit, and of all the means by which they may be carried into execution, would partake of the prolixity of a legal code, and could scarcely be embraced by the human mind. It would probably never be understood by the public. Its nature, therefore, requires, that only its great outlines should be marked, its important objects designated, and the minor ingredients which compose those objects be deduced from the nature of the objects themselves."

These proposals are suggested as a means of preventing the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and, more broadly, of protecting State areas of responsibility from Federal encroachment.

Would not the cause of States rights be better served, asked Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, if the memorialists devoted their energies to fulfilling the guarantees of the Constitution?

There would be no need for the Supreme Court and the national Government to lead the fight for equal protection, fair representation and due process if States were assuming their constitutional obligations.

"There can be State wrongs as well as States rights," KEATING added, "and it would be well for those who are eagerly attacking the Supreme Court to consider more objectively the gross failure of many of our States to respect either the letter or spirit of the Constitution."

As Commager shrewdly discerned, these memorials are something more than the mere recrudescence of States rights. They reflect a philosophy of no-government and of constitutional anarchy. They are not as genuinely concerned with the powers of the States as they are "concerned with nonpowers in the Nation." Rather than strengthen States, they seek to paralyze the Nation.

I am not suggesting the Constitution should never be amended as the memorialists propose doing. I am suggesting, though, that it should not be changed hastily and unnecessarily nor under the stress of political emotions. Our Constitution is an inheritance, a trust, to be wisely administered but not frequently or artificially amended, or sacrilegiously dealt with by violent and impatient hands.

These ill-conceived and ill-advised memorials to alter radically the balance of our Constitution have not met the test of a national consensus as, it seems to me, the poll tax amendment has. Not only has the ground not been laid for such national discussion, but the memorialists are bypassing the Congress where discussion should focus.

If adopted, these memorials would throw us back to the Articles of Confederation—a sad spectacle, indeed, for a great power charged with the leadership of the free world.

What Horace Walpole wrote to Sir Horace Mann a couple of hundred years ago relative to the British constitution is good advice for the memorialists who want to change the American Constitution:

"Everybody talks of the Constitution, but all sides forget that the Constitution is extremely well, and would do very well, if they would but let it alone."

The Wheat Deal in the Context of the Cold War—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on yesterday, I included a portion of the food grains chapter of a February 1962 report of the Stanford Research Institute entitled "Economic Countermeasures: An Examination of the Role of Economic Power in World Conflict," which was prepared at the request of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Because of its interest in connection with the current dealings in wheat with the Soviet Union, I now should like to quote the balance of this chapter, as follows:

ECONOMIC COUNTERMEASURES: AN EXAMINATION OF THE ROLE OF THE ECONOMIC POWER IN WORLD CONFLICT

A report from Hong Kong at the beginning of 1962 (New York Times, Jan. 9, 1962, p. 74) described the situation in these terms:

"Communist China's economic growth came to a virtual stop in 1961. The break came first on the agricultural front * * * [where] * * * by the end of 1960, food production had sagged so badly that in some areas people were forced to forage for edible wild plants and even in the cities malnutrition was not uncommon."

There is little doubt of the hunger in China. The principal question in this context is to consider the implications and relevance of the Chinese condition to Western policy and, more specifically, to economic policy and possible economic countermeasures. The implications and relevance of the Chinese situation will be basically altered if her present plight continues over a long period. If it is temporary, there will be only a brief interruption of Chinese industrialization and economic growth. If the agricultural crisis continues and economic growth is effectively choked, the West will be faced with wholly different circumstances in the 1960's.

Certain factors are basic in any examination of Chinese prospects in the agricultural sector. First, China has very small amounts of arable land; it is a rugged, mountainous country with over two-thirds of its land surface in high plateaus and mountain ranges. Arable land is variously estimated to range between 15 and 28 percent of the total area of 3.54 million square miles. In terms of cultivated land per capita, a Chinese on the average had only 0.163 hectare in 1958, compared with 1.06 in the United States, 0.94 in the U.S.S.R., and 0.416 in India.

In China, the population is increasing at roughly double that of India—about 16 million a year compared with about 8 million a year. If existing levels of supply are to be maintained, China must produce an additional 3 million tons of cereals a year in order to keep abreast of population growth. Over the decade of the 1960's, a cereal output would have to increase about 30 million tons over present minimum requirements. In the most favorable circumstances, such an increase would require the application of 10 million tons of fertilizer, or about five times the amount officially reported as used in 1957. Such a development seems unlikely for several reasons: (1) shortage of foreign exchange, (2) transport limitations, and (3) slowing of industrial development.

In effect, objective factors affecting the Chinese agricultural situation are such that major improvement in the sector is unlikely. A further consideration has direct bearing on the Chinese situation. Normally 75 percent of Chinese exports are dependent on agriculture, either directly or indirectly, e.g., textiles. In 1959, food and other agricultural exports amounted to more than $400 million and textiles to about $115 million out of a total of less than $700 million to the non-Soviet areas. Exports to bloc countries are similarly dependent on agricultural products.

A final factor, an imponderable, is the long-term effect of the Communist mode of organizing the agricultural sector. It has not been successful in the U.S.S.R. during the period since the revolution; agriculture still has priority in Khrushchev's program. The Soviet Union has recorded three major famines in 44 years of Soviet power: 1918–22, 1930–33, and 1941–45. The human costs of war and famine in the U.S.S.R. range between 50 and 80 million fatalities. The great majority were owing to simple starvation. The famine situation in China, which is without historic precedent, may dwarf the Soviet experience in a single famine cycle.

For the West, this is a circumstance with possibly fateful implications. Food, and its bearing on communism throughout the world, cannot be too carefully considered. In China, 3 bitter years will soon have become 4; the famine may extend into and perhaps through the decade of the 1960's. Chinese dependence on the U.S.S.R. for uncompensated industrialization assistance cannot be expected, especially in view of China's trade deficit with the U.S.S.R. The bloc will be unable to provide China assistance in the food sector, except in bilateral exchanges such as the rice-sugar barter with Cuba.

The rise of the agricultural crisis in China, which puts the bloc in a sharply deficit food position and correspondingly dependent on the two great continental surplus areas, North America and Australia, may provide a basis for economic countermeasures that can be used in support of Western foreign policy.

Moscow's agricultural trade continues to pose questions to Western observers. In 1956, Soviet purchases of textile fibers from non-Soviet sources amounted to $50 million, in 1958 to nearly $182 million. Cotton purchases following Suez went up more than eight times in 2 years, from $12.5 to $107.4 million, and wool purchases went up 250 percent. In 1954, Soviet crude rubber purchases were negligible, about half a million dollars; in 1955 they rose nearly $20 million; in 1959 the total had risen to $152 million.

The Soviet record on imports of non-Soviet agricultural commodities is remarkably varied and is apparently predicated on a number of factors: (1) the level of strategic reserves, (2) prices, and supply situations, (3) intra-bloc trade relations, and (4) political considerations. In 1962, five-sixths of Cuban sugar exports will go to the bloc countries; of the 5 million tons moving into the bloc, the U.S.S.R. will take 3 million tons. In the pre-Castro era, Soviet trade with Cuba was negligible to nonexistent.

In recent years, rapidly increasing Soviet imports of advanced capital equipment have led to increasing balance-of-payments deficits which have been settled in gold. These deficits have led, in turn, to redoubled efforts to gain an increased share of world markets and a higher return on exports. It is evident that the U.S.S.R. can no longer

rely on agricultural exports to obtain a significant part of the needed foreign exchange to finance its growing import requirements. The Soviet Union is moving into a net deficit agricultural position, a circumstance that is highly significant to the extent that it affects trade relations with food-importing countries. The Soviets are not in a position to supply major quantities of wheat or other cereal grains. In the late 1950's Soviet annual grain exports outside the bloc amounted to a million tons or so; within the bloc they were net importers.

The satellites, as a group, are net importers of grain in their trade with the non-Soviet countries and have been throughout the 1950's. Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia are all large net importers and more than offset the modest surplus position other satellites have in the grain trade with non-Soviet countries.

The following table shows world starch food production and population by major areas and per capita availability. The difference between food produced in the West and that produced in less-developed countries is only one of the striking contrasts.

World food production by major sectors (1959) [1]

	Population (millions)	Production (millions of metric tons) [1]	Per capita (kilograms)
West	550	334	610
United States	179	186	1,040
Canada and Australia	25	35	1,400
Communists	1,025	[2] 399	[2] 380
Lower developed countries	1,450	325	224

[1] All grains, pulses, roots, and tubers converted to metric tons of grain equivalent. These USDA figures are subject to revision.

[2] Official USDA estimates credit China with 201.4 million tons, which would indicate basic food availabilities of 286 kilograms annually per capita, a figure that does not correspond with the ration level of 166 kilograms prevailing in 1959, and in excess of prewar availabilities. European satellites are credited with 75.9 million tons, which indicates a per capita availability higher than in the Western countries; i.e., about 750 kilograms per capita. On this accounting, the European satellites as a group should be major net exporters. The U.S.S.R. is credited with 122.2 million tons, which would provide the Soviet people with per capita availabilities equal to those prevailing in the West.

It may be relevant to note that reliable evidence on the composition of the diet in Communist countries indicates that animal products represent a negligible proportion of the total diet as compared with the West. On the average, meat products require 8 pounds of grain for a pound of meat, which has lower caloric content.

In the West, average caloric intake per capita is 2,950 per day, as compared with 2,400 and 2,300 for the bloc and lower developed countries' populations.

Statistics are often misleading and Communist statistics are often barefaced frauds. Khrushchev himself has denounced this "hoodwinking," and "report padding."

The massive population of over 1 billion people in the Communist area does not have enough food. The question of balanced nutrition does not arise for 750 million people in the area; for them, the main issue is whether they will have food with a sufficient caloric content to enable them to survive. In this area, as the Chinese say only the cadres (Communist Party members) are fat. Among the billion and a half people in these LDC areas, it is doubtful whether 200 million are able to obtain more than minimum needs.

The use of chemical fertilizer has only begun to reach optimum levels in a few countries of the West—Japan and the Netherlands. Even in the United States, only 10 percent or so of the farms are using optimum amounts of fertilizer. In the rest of the world, the use of chemical fertilizer is still in its infancy, including in the U.S.S.R. (Khrushchev became aware at the 22d Congress—30 years after the fact—that the Soviet Union did not have a chemical industry.) Pesticides and herbicides are not used or available in any significant sense except in the West. They are, with chemical fertilizer, the primary factor in the remarkable growth in the productivity of Western land.

Food cannot be considered apart from population growth—except in the United States, Canada, and Australia, the only major food surplus areas. Accordingly, with the prospect of some 22 or 23 million people a year being added to the population of the Communist area, and some 30 million a year to the LDC area—500 million for the decade in these already food deficit areas—the prospects of an adequate food supply for 80 percent of the world's population is not only dim, it is unequivocally hopeless. No realistic appraisal of the prospects of this decade can yield any conclusion other than continuing and increasing food deficits in these areas, unless there are drastic (and highly improbable) restraints on population growth.

There will probably be a continuing expansion, but at a declining rate, of the cultivated area in most countries not in the Western community. This expansion will have, in many cases, the disastrous results that usually follow the expansion of cultivation beyond the natural limits. Disaster areas like the U.S. Dust Bowl of the 1930's have become increasingly commonplace with the expansion of the cultivated area beyond a natural limit.

In a world in which the "revolution of rising expectations" (the certainty of increasing hunger is the only expectation that is rising for 80 percent of the world's population) has become a commonplace phenomenon and in which social conflict in rural areas is increasingly organized according to Maoist doctrine, as modified by Che Guevara and other guerrilla chieftains, there is little doubt that civil war will be prevalent throughout the half of the earth's surface tenanted by the growing populations of the LDC's. Endemic guerrilla activities are well established in non-Soviet Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Epidemics of guerrilla war occur whenever general food shortages in rural areas cannot be alleviated by outside supplies and will continue to occur over much of this area as levels of subsistence decline.

In the LDC's as a group, North American, and primarily U.S. food, has tended to inhibit serious urban disturbances. Public Law 480 or related U.S. assistance has been going to countries—the Philippines, Indonesia, Taiwan, Vietnam, Korea, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Tunis, Morocco, and many Latin American countries—in sufficient quantity to meet the marginal requirements of the urban areas, the politically critical portion of the population. In effect, the urban population of countries with populations of nearly a billion are being sustained at tolerable levels by U.S. aid. The withdrawal of that aid might, e.g., in the case of Egypt, bring down the government. In Guatemala, the case is clear.

These circumstances pose a fundamental issue which has not been examined in terms of the food supply. Nearly every LDC country with a large population has a government that is able to maintain its position only with the marginal addition to its food supply that is provided with Public Law 480 aid. This puts the United States in a position in which it may unilaterally bring down any government which depends on the United States in any considerable part for its marginal urban food requirements. This would be a reality, however, only if the United States was prepared to put other possible suppliers in the "Trading with the enemy" community of China, North Korea, and North Vietnam. With North America able to dispose of 90 percent of the grain moving in world commerce, there is no question where the critical margin of the world's food supply arises.

The political issues abide. Canada, France, Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Argentina, Australia, and the U.S.S.R. can export grain. Even China continues to export rice to Cuba, Ceylon, and others, but only while it is drawing much greater supplies from the West and possibly other surplus areas. Therefore, although the economic margins are controlled by the United States, Canada, and Australia (with the United States in a preponderant position by an order of magnitude) the political margins lie elsewhere. The problem that is posed is to devise a countermeasures system that will enable the United States to insure that the political margins conform to the economic margins—not vice versa. Economic countermeasures, for obvious reasons, offer an alternative or supplement to difficult military decisions in most of the areas of revolutionary disorder; a careful examination of these is in order. "Food for peace" should become a term with cold war political, military, and economic content, not a rationalization of domestic political and economic conditions.

A coordinated United States, Australian, and Canadian position should be formulated to deal with the bloc and Communist subversive operations. Such a position could only be achieved, by the kind of major U.S. concessions to Canada and Australia which are rarely made to these close cultural relatives. In the absence of a coordinated United States, Australian, and Canadian position, there is little prospect of a Western position with respect to bloc food requirements. Canada and Australia should no longer be regarded as poor relations, even apart from the cold war problem. In a world of conflict in which our own culture is on the losing end, good allies are rare, and allies with resources of the order of Canada and Australia are not to be found. The failure to recognize the overriding importance of U.S. relations with Canada is perennial anomaly; this is also true, but to a somewhat lesser degree, regarding our allies down under.

They are constrained, in the stress of relations with the immensely preponderant United States, to use their main resource, food, as best they can. They will be allies in the best sense only when they are admitted to the fraternity to which they naturally belong, that of allies with immense and critical food resources. In this world there are only three, the United States, Australian, and Canadian community, in which New Zealand has associate membership. This group constitutes the "new world" still; but until it achieves economic fraternity, it is not a world which can "redress the balance of the old."

Any increase in autobahn tolls into Berlin, rail and canal charges into Berlin, or comparable nibbling would be automatically accompanied by withholding supplies or by a proportionate increase in all ocean shipping charges on commodities carried into or out of the bloc in Western ships.

This discussion has provided a brief outline of the preponderant position of the West in the food sector. United States, Australia, and Canada supply all but a trivial part of the critical supply of food moving in the world market. The United States, unilaterally (if it chose to exercise its power in this sector), might easily alter the political system of scores of countries. This is understood abroad, where hunger is a daily affair and governments stand on supplies of food that move into their ports from the United States; it is not understood in the United States.

The possession of preponderant power in the food sector, which the United States undeniably possesses, is not a condition that encourages an affectionate relation with states dependent on U.S. supplies. The United States has sought equality in a world in which equality is more of a myth than ever before. Not only do the multiplying states of the earth not possess independence; they are prehaps more dependent than ever before because of (1) the inter-

dependence of the world economy; and (2) the growing preponderance of the United States and United States, Australia, and Canada in the critical food supply sector.

Economic countermeasures in the world food sector might take one or all of the following forms:

1. Strategic denial on a United States or United States, Australian, and Canadian basis. The exploitation of the marginal supply position of the United States, or United States, Australia, and Canada, in the world food sector would require withholding Western grain from the bloc, from importers of bloc food, and from exporters of food to the bloc.

2. Competitive offerings. The shortage of food is now critical throughout the bloc. United States, and United States, Australian, and Canadian aid offerings should rest on Soviet matching offerings which necessarily would be drawn from their strategic reserves. Should they refuse to match, Soviet agricultural inadequacies would be evident and the absence of "fraternal solidarity" would be emphasized.

3. Commercial exploitation of United States or United States, Australian, and Canadian grain exports. This program would require the setting of monopolistic prices on all grain (United States, Australia, and Canada control 95 percent) sales to the bloc. Similar treatment would be extended to all food exporters into bloc areas. Finally, premium transport charges would be required on all grain going into the bloc and would be enforced by restricting transport to ships from countries agreeing to cooperate with the program. Grain to China, for example, might be sold at $100 a ton f.o.b., but would be shipped only in Western bottoms at a rate of, say, $30 per ton. Terms would be cash on the barrelhead. For nearly 80 or so countries, essential international traffic cannot move without Western shipping; their economies cannot run, except with Western food, fuel, spare parts, and new machines; and their markets lie entirely in the West. The facts of the international situation are clear; never before have so many been dependent on so few. At the same time, never in history have the few who possess the power and the resources in every sector been so immobilized.

Even if it chose to do so, the United States could not change its image easily. It possesses power in the economic sector that was undreamed of in a world in which there was continental self-sufficiency in the food sector. The United States possesses military power more than equal to that of the bloc. Politically, the United States has lost the initiative because of the failure to use its economic power. We must give increasing attention to changing our image by using more imaginative techniques. The costs of not doing so may be quite high.

The Sheepshead Bay Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following transcript of a recent broadcast made by the Voice of America.

The Sheepshead Bay Story was broadcast as part of a series aimed at putting the civil rights story into perspective. The problem that this integrated community solved was the placement of a new high school. New York City Councilman Morris J. Stein and State Assemblyman Noah Goldstein and I were happy to participate in solving this problem. Just as the residents of Sheepshead Bay cooperate in local community affairs, they do also in political matters. A Negro is an election district captain in my congressional district in an overwhelmingly white district, and vice versa, and no one has ever thought this was strange or unseemingly.

The Voice of America transcript follows:

THE SHEEPSHEAD BAY STORY

Announcer. This is "Perspective," a program dealing with the vital field of race relations in the United States. Today—"The Sheepshead Bay Story."

Narrator. Chances are you've never heard of Sheepshead Bay. It is actually a real bay—in the Atlantic Ocean—indenting the borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York. However, it is also the name of a small community on the bay, a small area of modest, well-kept one- and two-family homes only a stone's throw from the breaking ocean waters. There's a story behind the name. But it's a quiet one—the type that seldom is called big news. The majority of the inhabitants of Sheepshead Bay—some 200 families of varied beliefs and different racial and ethnic backgrounds, most of them of Italian, Irish, German, or Dutch descent—have lived there for years, side by side with Negro families constituting one-fourth of the population, without ever being conscious of the fact that Sheepshead Bay was a totally integrated community. Their way of life seemed to them simply the normal way of life. Their attitude toward each other; the normal attitude of people who are neighbors, friends, just people.

However, one day in June of this year something happened that disrupted the usual run of things in Sheepshead Bay. It started with a proposal of the New York City Board of Education to build a new high school in the southern part of Brooklyn. And the site selected was right in the middle of Sheepshead Bay.

When one of its inhabitants, James H. Jones, learned about the project, he realized that, although a new school was badly needed to care for the students in neighboring communities, its construction in Sheepshead Bay would mean the clearing of a large part of the area and a complete change of the neighborhood. So he made his decision. Mr. Jones, who happens to be a Negro, got all the members of the community together, and confronted them with the city's plan and its inescapable consequences. When the 200 families recognized that something very precious to them was in danger of being destroyed, they started to fight for it. They formed an organization called the Committee for the Preservation of the Self-Integrated Community—Copsic, for short—and did everything in their power to prevent the authorities from carrying out their project:

JAMES H. JONES. We contacted different organizations, different religious organizations. With all that assistance that we had from these different people, plus the help of the people in the community, we were able to persuade the board of education to reject this particular site and to try to pick a site somewhere else.

NARRATOR. In these simple words, spoken in his home, Mr. Jones related the happy ending of an episode which brought the 200 families of Sheepshead Bay even closer together than they had been before.

Along with Mr. Jones were six of his friends and committee members—one of them working for the department of sanitation, another one a maintenance man, a high school teacher, a television repairman, a lady active in church work, and an advertising salesman. Mr. Jones was serving cold drinks and the conversation in the living room was intense. It was, of course, the story of Sheepshead Bay.

WILLIAM VAN VOLKENBERG. It was not always an integrated community. At one time 13th Street was the street that was isolated, and it was the poor section of the town, and that was the Negro community. Gradually some of these people became more affluent, were able to buy homes on 14th and 15th Streets.

NARRATOR. The speaker was William Van Volkenberg. He lives on 15th Street, in the same house in which he was born 52 years ago. Mr. Van Volkenberg, as well as his other white neighbors, did not move out when the Negroes from 13th Street moved in * * * a process which Mrs. Florence Brown, a Negro, describes this way:

FLORENCE BROWN. It was, naturally, mostly a white area. But we were accepted. We went to school, and we may have been one in a class, but it didn't matter. We played together, the children were all friends, and at home was the same thing. Our parents were friends. We just accepted each other. It wasn't a matter of noticing what color or what nationality they were. We were just people, and we were friends together.

NARRATOR. Just people. That's what counts in Sheepshead Bay. And that's what Joseph Payne, another Negro attending the meeting at Mister Jones' home, emphasized by looking back to his early years.

JOSEPH PAYNE. I got my start through an Orthodox Jew and through a Catholic priest. They helped me when I needed help most as a youngster.

NARRATOR. And Joe Spera, a white member of the group, told about a period in his life when he needed help and turned with his troubles to a Negro in the community, Allan Haynes. And he related Mr. Haynes' answer in the form of an anecdote:

JOE SPERA. There was a man walking up the hill one day with a big load on his back. He was laughing, singing, he smiled, and helloed everybody. Everyone wanted to share his load, help him carry it up the hill. Another fellow was going up the hill, cussing, and just going on his own way, not knowing anyone. Everyone ignored that man. And Mr. Haynes said to me, "Joey, I'm going to help you carry the load up the hill."

NARRATOR. Everybody around the table had his story to tell. But, eventually Florence Brown was able to develop the clearest picture of her community.

FLORENCE BROWN. I've been living here all of my life. My family originally came from Nashville, Tenn. And the reason they came to Sheepshead Bay was the famous race track was here at that time. And in those years most of the jockeys were Negroes. And the families came and made their livelihood as best they could from and around the track.

NARRATOR. A glimpse of Sheepshead Bay in times gone by. And what about today?

FLORENCE BROWN. Years ago before the subject of integration was a problem, we were living together as neighbors, and when we had block parties that meant: neighbors, everybody come. The Italian ladies would bring their wares, their special dishes, and we would have those and sell them at the party. The Negro mothers would make sweet potato pies and cook pigs feet and the rest of the things that go with it. We weren't thinking then of an integrated group. We were just neighbors and we were all friends together. And when we had a party it meant that all our friends should be there.

NARRATOR. From the past, Florence Brown came back again to the present.

FLORENCE BROWN. Today our children go their way. Naturally, they get married among themselves and have their families. And the same with our white neighbors. We don't expect to make a social issue of it. We live individual lives. To us here it just means: Each living his own life and no one interfering.

If our children decided to get married and

invite their white friends—that's expected. If our white children get married and invite the Negroes—that's expected. They grew up together. They were friends together.

NARRATOR. This then is the story of Sheepshead Bay * * * a community of 200 families who, without any effort yet without closing their eyes to today's problems, have found and preserved their own quiet way of life.

Surrender of the Public Interest for the Benefit of a Favored Redeveloper by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I include a staff study of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia which states, among other things that—

Disposition of the 20 acres of land at an average price of $2.65 per square foot, would be a disgraceful surrender of the public interest for the benefit of a favored redeveloper who is heavily in default on his contractural obligations with the RLA.

The staff study commented on an article in the Washington Sunday Star of October 13, 1963, and I include the complete text of that article for the information of my colleagues.

The study and article follows:

STAFF STUDY—SALE OF LAND TO WEBB & KNAPP BY THE RLA

Hon. JOHN DOWDY,

Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4, District of Columbia Committee, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress:

On Tuesday October 15, 1963, the Redevelopment Land Agency propose to dispose of an additional 20 acres of land to the firm of Webb & Knapp, which considering the circumstances outlined in this report, must be considered as against the best public (taxpayers) interest.

Disposition of the 20 acres of land at an average price of $2.65 per square foot, would be a disgraceful surrender of the public interest for the benefit of a favored redeveloper who is heavily in default on his contractural obligations with the Redevelopment Land Agency.

The $2.65 land price cannot be justified either by comparable land prices in the District for similar undertakings, or by the residual land value method of appraisal which has proved out to be much too low on the Town Houses constructed by the same redeveloper.

By transferring the 20 acres of land to Webb & Knapp, the Redevelopment Land Agency is closing the door to the erection of any middle-income family housing in the Southwest project area, thus designating the area as a two-income area, high and low, with no middle, which no responsible planner can justify as being in the best community or social interest.

Attempts made to try and justify this disposition, if newspaper stories are correct, border on the ridiculous.

It was stated in Sunday's Star of October 13, 1963, that the Redevelopment Land Agency Vice Chairman, Mr. Atkinson, made the following statements which will be quoted in order:

1. "That under the memorandum of understanding entered into between Redevelopment Land Agency and Mr. Zeckendorf, the Agency was limited to negotiating only with the New Yorker for certain lands."

Take particular notice of the word "was", which is clearly past tense. Mr. Atkinson did not say that RLA "is" limited to negotiating with Webb & Knapp, or Mr. Zeckendorf, as that would have been untrue, because the memo of understanding is no longer in effect, it not having been renewed since 1957, according to the General Accounting Office. So RLA can, and should, in the Federal and taxpayers' interest, attempt to obtain a more equitable land price to help prevent a further rise in the net project cost which has already reached astronomical proportions.

2. Mr. Atkinson stated, "He [Zeckendorf] gets the benefit of coming in when the project was in the hatching stage. * * * He had the wisdom to come in when no one else was willing to, and we were glad to do business with someone."

Mr. Atkinson must know that statement is an untruth, as he has been on the Board of Directors since its inception. There were others willing to come in, and they offered more money for the land, but RLA refused to entertain any offers, using the memo of understanding as a cloak under which they kept everybody else out, which proves Mr. Atkinson's statement to be false.

3. "If we were free to negotiate now, and with other interested parties, the story would be different," said Mr. Atkinson.

The Agency is free to negotiate now, because as stated previously, the memorandum of understanding no longer exists, not having been renewed, which removes any preferential claim by Webb & Knapp.

4. I again quote Mr. Atkinson. "I'm convinced the prices we negotiated with him, in view of all the factors involved, are fair and legal."

What are the factors involved that make such land prices fair and legal? The National Capital Housing Authority has paid $4.20 and $4.93 per square foot for land it purchased to build homes for the lowest segment of the District's population, yet the Redevelopment Land Agency is selling 873,704.99 square feet for the erection of luxury apartments and other uses, for $2.65, and RLA's Board of Directors say land is too high to build middle income housing.

4. One final statement of Mr. Atkinson merits attention: "The Board is not disposed to tolerate delay in having construction start."

That statement is obviously made for public consumption. Here is a firm that is in default after default on its present contracts, and the something that has been done to overcome delays is exactly nothing.

River Park was started and finished; Capital Park is moving rapidly; Tiber Island, Harbour Square and Carrollsburg Square were not even on the drawing boards when Webb & Knapp entered in agreements and contracts, yet they are all underway, while not one Webb & Knapp project is actually under construction at this time, yet Mr. Atkinson talks of his Board not tolerating any delay. Nine and one-half years have passed, and out of the approximately 64 acres committed to Webb & Knapp, only 18 have been redeveloped.

No private organization could remain in business with that kind of operation as overhead costs would eat up its capital investment, but with Redevelopment Land Agency using Federal funds, taxpayers' dollars, the Agency does not appear to concern itself with what is or is not sound economic practice.

Further, Redevelopment Land Agency is paying taxes running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars on land being held for this particular redeveloper. Had Redevelopment Land Agency insisted on transferring the land to the redeveloper, it would have been the redeveloper, not the taxpayers, who paid the taxes. The result would have been that the redeveloper would have been forced to proceed expeditiously with the work, instead of sitting back and doing nothing other than what suits him, and what has suited him has resulted in delaying redevelopment for 9½ years, and sent the net project cost soaring up and up.

Sound business practice would demand that the Board of Directors of Redevelopment Land Agency take no action relative to the land disposition to Webb & Knapp at this time, and demand instead that the firm comply with all their contractual obligations financially and construction-wise in order to eliminate their defaults.

Mr. Milton Semer, Chief Counsel for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, told me that HHFA is anxious to get middle income family housing built, and that the Administrator, Mr. Robert Weaver, is ready to do everything possible to encourage such building, even, if necessary, to agreeing to a write-down of land cost. Even though regional funds have been exhausted for construction under section 221(d)(3), Mr. Semer has assured me that the Administrator will arrange for the transfer of such funds as may be required for building such family housing in any urban renewal project in the District.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 13, 1963]

RLA SETS LAND PRICES FOR SOUTHWEST TRACT—AGENCY TO TURN OVER BIG AREA TO ZECKENDORF FOR DEVELOPMENT

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The Redevelopment Land Agency has set prices on more than 20 acres of residential land in Southwest Washington that it proposes to turn over shortly to William Zeckendorf, the New York developer.

This will be individually the largest residential land transaction ever projected in the huge Southwest Washington redevelopment area.

The proposed prices are considerably lower than those paid in recent years by the National Capital Housing Authority for public housing sites, both on the basis of the price per square foot and on the cost of land per dwelling unit.

Nine parcels are included in the transaction. They are in four tracts adjacent to each other. All will be leased at 6 percent of the land price annually. Land for 180 townhouses, which are to be designated for sale, will eventually be purchased.

Of a total of 1,028 units projected for construction, 728 will be elevator apartment units, 120 will be walkup apartments and 180 will be the townhouses to be sold.

HEARING SLATED

A public hearing on the proposed decision to lease the land has been scheduled by RLA for 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, in its offices at 919 18th Street NW.

In a recent resolution setting land prices, the RLA Board said disposal of the parcels to Zeckendorf corporations "without solicitation of other offers is hereby determined to be the appropriate method of marketing these parcels."

The resolution called attention to a memorandum of understanding dated March 15, 1954, in which it said the Agency agreed to sell or lease certain land in project area C to Webb & Knapp, Inc.," (the Zeckendorf firm). Lease of the present parcels, the resolution said, "is considered to be in the best interests of the project."

The resolution set a price of $1.96 a square foot for land to be used as sites for the 120 walkup apartments and for the 180 townhouses.

OTHER PRICES LISTED

The price of one elevator apartment site was set at $3.40 a square foot. The price of the other elevator apartment site was fixed at $3.75 a square foot.

The 728 units of elevator apartment construction are proposed to be financed with mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration. Townhouses

and walkup apartments would be financed conventionally.

The forthcoming leasing transaction will be the third in which Redevelopment Land Agency has turned over important tracts by lease to Mr. Zeckendorf's corporations.

Previously, Mr. Zeckendorf acquired the large commercial-residential site adjacent to Fourth and M Streets SW., in which four 128-unit apartment buildings and a shopping-center building have been constructed. Additional residential and commercial development is proposed there.

In addition, the developer has acquired major office and hotel sites surrounding the proposed L'Enfant Plaza, a large square projected for construction on the 10th Street Mall south of Independence Avenue. Work on this project has not been started.

The most recent tracts which Redevelopment Land Agency proposes to lease form an irregularly shaped area extending from the Southwest Freeway to the Maine Avenue waterfront.

The eastern boundary is Fourth Street and the grounds of Amidon School. The western boundary is Seventh Street and Maine Avenue, and is adjacent to Thomas Jefferson Junior High School and a proposed site for St. Dominic's School just north of the junior high school.

The land cost for each of the 282 elevator apartments in one project would be $1,704, under the proposed pricing.

The land cost per unit in the 446-unit elevator project would be $1,878.

The unit cost of the land for each walkup apartment would be $2,172.

The lot price for each townhouse (proposed to sell for from $35,000 to $45,000) is $4,094.

LAND RATES VARY

In recent years, the National Capital Housing Authority has had to pay generally from $4.20 to $4.93 per square foot for land it purchased for public housing sites, with one transaction requiring payment in excess of $8 a square foot, based on the market value.

NCHA's land cost for each unit in the Park Morton development, Georgia Avenue and Park Road NW., including site clearance, was $4,093. These are walkup units.

For Greenleaf Gardens on M Street SW., adjacent to the Southwest redevelopment area, the land cost per unit was $2,885, including clearance. These are mostly elevator apartments.

In the case of Arthur Capper dwellings, on M Street SE., the land cost to NCHA, including clearance, was $3,223 per unit. Five-sixths of the 612 units in this project are in elevator buildings.

A spokesman for the public housing agency said land for two additional developments now projected has been acquired at a cost, including clearance, of $3,716 and $3,255, respectively, per unit.

NEAR U.S. AVERAGE

In an appearance before a House Appropriations Subcommittee last March, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, testified that the average cost of land for each public housing unit throughout the country was $3,000.

On the basis of this testimony, NCHA's land costs have been either below or slightly above the national average, though Washington is conceded to be a high-land-cost area.

The Redevelopment Land Agency is understood to feel that the prices set on the new parcels to be leased to Mr. Zeckendorf's corporations are adequate, considering all circumstances.

Richard B. Atkinson, Vice Chairman of the Redevelopment Land Agency Board, said last night: "All the prices have been justified to the Board's satisfaction."

Mr. Atkinson said the Board felt, "considering all the factors involved, that it was getting the best price possible."

The Board member pointed out that under the memorandum of understanding entered into between Redevelopment Land Agency and Mr. Zeckendorf, the Agency was limited to negotiating only with the New Yorker for certain land.

"He gets the benefit of coming in when the project was in the hatching stage," he said.

"He had the wisdom in the beginning to come in when no one else was willing to, and we were glad to do business with somebody.

"If we were free to negotiate now, the story would be quite different, but I'm convinced the prices we negotiated with him, in view of all the factors involved, are fair and and legal."

Mr. Atkinson, who has been a member of the Redevelopment Land Agency Board since its inception, said, however, the Board is not disposed to tolerate delay in having construction start.

"If he doesn't act fast, a default will be declared and we will do something about it," Mr. Atkinson said.

PLANS DISCLOSED

A spokesman for the Zeckendorf corporations told the Star it was planned to start construction of walkup apartments and town houses by next June.

Rents for walkup apartments, he said, are expected to be from $105 a month for efficiencies to around $200 for 2-bedroom apartments.

The townhouses, expected to sell from $35,000 to $45,000, would be designed by the firm of Walter M. Macomber and Walter G. Peter, Jr., well-known Washington architects.

Mr. Vinson and the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, my old friend and colleague, Pulitzer Prize winner William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the Norfolk Ledger-Star, has taken cognizance of the Gesell report which was the foundation for the directive of the Secretary of Defense putting the military in the political arena.

He has done an excellent editorial on the basis of the legislation introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Here it is. I suggest you read and weigh carefully every word:

MR. VINSON AND THE GESELL REPORT

In his quiet but methodical way, Representative CARL VINSON has rolled up his sleeves to do battle with Defense Secretary McNamara over the policing role forced on the military in the current civil rights disputes.

He introduced a bill. His bill is an answer to Mr. McNamara's Defense Department Directive No. 5120.27 of July 26, 1963, which authorizes military base commanders to declare off limits to military personnel any community where segregation exists—one of the suggestions made in the Gesell report.

Mr. Vinson's bill would not only nullify Mr. McNamara's order. It would also subject to court-martial any commander who "directs, implements, or requests the use of an off-limits sanction because of race or religion."

The struggle now building up is not solely over that part of the Gesell report that has already been put into effect by Mr. McNamara. It is also over parts of the 93-page study of discrimination in the Armed Forces ordered by President Kennedy which have not yet been put into effect. Some proposals, as interpreted by the National Observer, are:

An officer's effectiveness in ending segregation should be monitored and rated by the Defense Department as a guide to future promotions.

Negroes and whites should not be allowed to gather in separate service clubs, as is the custom on many bases.

Greater care should be taken to see that more Negro girls are invited to military social functions, and white girls who might prefer not to socialize with Negroes should be discouraged.

And, says the National Observer: "The Gesell report also urged more zealous recruiting of Negroes, renting of houses for Negro servicemen in phony names if that becomes necessary, and prohibiting servicemen from patronizing any business establishment not having the 'express approval' of the base commander. Such businesses might best be identified by a decal in the front window, the Gesell Committee said."

Mr. VINSON introduced his bill, he said, because "the role of the military, unless we act, is about to undergo a sharp and dangerous change."

It would be hard to dispute Mr. VINSON's words. If officers are to be promoted on their aptitude for effectiveness in promoting civil rights in areas embraced by their commands, then Annapolis, West Point, and the Air Academy had better look to their curriculums. Perhaps the midshipmen and cadets will need fewer lectures on gunnery and on startegy and tactics, and some instruction in their new duties by Mr. Roy Wilkins, Dr. Martin Luther King, and Congressman Adam Clayton Powell. And to be fully prepared for the really recalcitrant areas, perhaps a great deal more attention ought to be paid to courses in military government of occupied areas.

Of course, Mr. VINSON's bill will probably get no place whatsoever in Congress since it will be considered an anticivil rights bill. But its introduction is important in itself. It puts everyone on notice—from President Kennedy on down—that Mr. VINSON intends to see that the balance is redressed and that the role of the military be limited to defending the country and not broadened to policing the country's morals and customs.

For, mark you, those parts of the Gesell report the National Observer emphasized have very little to do with equal rights or equal opportunity, the reasons offered by the Kennedy administration for its civil rights bill and by the Negro leaders for their sit-ins and marches. But those parts that force intermingling have everything to do with a zealous program for moulding our society as zealots would have our society develop. It may transgress the rights of others, to be sure, but that is only unfortunate.

In the view of the Ledger-Star, all this is an entirely improper role for the military. And it is a dangerous role, for if the military is to be used as an instrument for social reform, why shouldn't it be used as an instrument for political reform? And if it ever comes to that, we are on the way to control by whoever controls the military.

In the enthusiasm to meet the present civil rights conflicts and disputes head-on, these things may not have occurred to John F. Kennedy. But you may be sure they have occurred to CARL VINSON, who has never been a strident southern advocate of the status quo with no changes.

And Mr. VINSON is a power in Washington. As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and before that chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. VINSON has helped guide the destinies of our military long and well. The last thing he will permit is a tinkering with the role of the Military Establishment. He has bested Presidents before in showdown tests of strength over military matters. We wish him well now.

Appendix

Recent Improvements in the Administration of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps no criticism of the U.S. foreign assistance program is so often expressed as the criticism that foreign aid is a good idea being badly executed—that our foreign aid program suffers from inept and inefficient administration. I myself have leveled this criticism and I know of no one who defends the examples of waste and poor planning that have occurred.

An organization as large and complicated as the Agency for International Development, charged with executing a program as complex as the foreign aid program, presents at best a difficult administrative challenge. But there are encouraging signs that this challenge is now being met by better administration.

AID was established in the fall of 1961 and given responsibility for the technical assistance activities of the International Cooperation Administration, the banking functions of the Development Loan Fund, and the Cooley loan fund lending function of the Export-Import Bank. The first problems faced by AID were those of consolidating the functions and personnel of these component groups. A complete organizational framework had to be put into operation. New personnel had to be recruited and personnel from component agencies absorbed or reassigned. Lines of authority and responsibility had to be designated. And while all of these organizational problems were being confronted foreign aid projects already in progress had to be managed. The foreign aid program could not stop while AID was being organized.

Many of the alleged administrative shortcomings of AID have been a result of the reorganizational problems of the Agency.

Most of these problems of transition and consolidation have been solved. AID has organized under one administrative roof all of the various means of providing foreign economic assistance, and of coordinating military assistance with economic assistance so that these two major elements may operate in concert.

The task now facing AID is to refine the workings of the Agency, and to iron out the weaknesses which have become apparent in the first year and a half of its existence.

A series of positive measures are being taken or have been completed in AID's continuing effort to make the Agency operate more efficiently and effectively.

To achieve clear lines of authority and responsibility, AID has divided all country programs into four regional bureaus: Latin America, Far East, Near East-South Asia, and Africa. Each bureau is headed by an assistant administrator who reports directly to the Administrator. The regional bureaus work closely with their counterparts in the Department of State.

A project is underway to coordinate foreign assistance affairs and political affairs by integrating AID specialists for each country with Department of State experts for the same country, making a joint State-AID office. This back-to-back plan has worked successfully in a pilot project involving the Latin American Bureau.

Delegations of authority have been perfected so that each regional bureau now has adequate authority to perform its responsibilities. In addition, a new method of allocating administrative funds has been instituted by which each Regional Administrator is responsible for keeping costs within the quotas for his region.

AID has recently begun modifications in its reporting and control systems, and has completed a new program development system which has been outlined in a set of guidance documents known as the Program Guidance Manual. These new programs are scheduled to be put into effect in 1964.

An agencywide program—called the implementation project—will restate and revise policies and procedural and technical guidelines. The goal of the project, which has been almost completed, is to develop a consistent set of policies and procedures which reflect the new AID organization, with its new concepts and directions. Key problems being ironed out include:

First. Criteria and procedures for processing capital loan or grant projects;

Second. Commodity assistance procedures;

Third. Policies and guidelines for drafting, negotiating and monitoring contracts;

Fourth. Criteria and procedures for providing technical assistance; and

Fifth. Utilization of foreign currencies, generated by U.S. assistance programs to stimulate further economic development in the countries.

When this project is complete, further reassessments of organizational structure and manpower utilization will be made.

AID is also examining in detail its relationship with other U.S. Government agencies to determine what work and responsibilities these agencies might perform for AID. During recent months, general agreements for interagency cooperation in foreign aid activities have been negotiated with the Department of Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Internal Revenue Service, Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Action has been taken to improve AID's working relationship with the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges in the planning and implementation of agricultural projects.

Similarly, AID has taken measures to induce more participation by U.S. private enterprise in fostering economic development overseas. This is being done through greater emphasis on investment guarantees, and on foreign currency loans—so-called "Cooley" loans—to U.S. firms and their affiliates for setting up commercial enterprises which will help economic development.

AID has established several new offices to deal with specific problem areas. The new International Development Organizations staff was created to push for more aid contributions from other industrialized countries, as well as better coordination between donor countries.

An Office of Public Safety has been organized to give special attention to internal defense problems which are a critical aspect of our aid operations in many countries.

Research into techniques of economic and social development is now being carried out by a new Office of Human Resources and Social Development.

In the Office of Material Resources AID has established a staff to work on the development of cooperatives in countries receiving aid. The staff of the Small Business Office is charged with the specific task of increasing opportunities for small American firms to participate in AID-financed procurement.

A separate office of engineering, designed to insure uniform engineering standards and to review feasibility studies to prevent poor planning and potential waste has also been established.

To maintain a constant doublecheck on mission operations, AID has organized a Management Inspection Staff composed of trained investigators assigned to carry out periodic examinations, inspections, and investigations of AID operations and personnel. These inspections supplement regular internal audits and are designed to assure prompt correction of deficiencies and provide for immediate corrective measures.

In the field of program planning, the Agency has established a Program Review and Coordination Staff to provide a thorough and continuing economic analysis of program plans and policies.

Field studies by the program coordination staff have led to the publication for the first time in the history of our foreign assistance program of perman-

ent policy guidelines for program planning and a manual setting forth firm criteria by which the needs of individual countries shall be judged. These criteria specify the importance of the country to overall U.S. objectives, the degree of political stability, the degree of economic development, and the degree to which the country will help itself.

While some of these changes required additional personnel, most were accomplished within existing personnel resources. But the increase was largely neutralized by cuts in various headquarters staff units outside the regional bureaus.

A major effort is presently underway to streamline the personnel requirements of the entire Agency. A detailed study has been made of each staff to determine personnel requirements. Strict personnel ceilings have been established for all offices. The Administrator has ordered a reduction in some staffs by the elimination of positions as they become vacant.

At the same time efforts are being made to improve the quality of AID personnel. Outstanding people are being recruited from outside Government for important positions in the foreign aid program. A special effort has been made to encourage leading business executives to take top administrative positions overseas. Twenty-seven oversea posts have been filled with high-level executives recruited from the U.S. business community.

Still other administrative improvement programs underway at AID include the increased application of automatic data processing in management control, personnel, and fiscal accounting; the consolidation of contract policy functions; the implementation of tighter manpower controls to enforce increased productivity.

Improving administration is a continuing process, and undoubtedly much remains to be done to maximize the administrative effectiveness of AID. But the Agency has made—and continues to make—significant improvements. The results of these improvements have already become apparent in the greater effectiveness with which the foreign aid program is being now carried out.

Indiana's Public Deepwater Harbor at Burns Ditch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial "The Port Gets a Boost" broadcast by WISH and WISH-TV printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial demonstrates the statewide support and enthusiasm for the construction of Indiana's public deepwater harbor at Burns Ditch.

Indiana needs the facility of a public, deepwater harbor to serve the needs of its great industrial area in Lake and Porter Counties. Lake County is today the steel capital of the world and when the new mills in Porter County are constructed the steel capacity of this area will be unrivaled in the world. It is equally important that the recommendation for a national lakeshore area be provided and the editorial properly suggests the need for additional recreation space in the Calumet. This editorial seems to capture the sentiment of the State of Indiana in support of these two great projects to realize the full potential of the Lake-Porter County areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PORT GETS A BOOST

After nearly 30 years of dreams, debate, and delay, the announcement that the White House has granted conditional approval of a compromise plan to build an Indiana deepwater port has come with surprising suddenness.

Officially endorsed in the early 1930's, but dreamed of for much longer, the controversial port plan has been the subject of too many words and not enough action for too many years. Bogged down in a partisan fight between proponents for industrial development and those for conservation interests—while weathering the political pressures of Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS—the port plan and the State have suffered interminable setbacks.

Finally, with a somewhat untimely flourish, the Federal Budget Bureau, which speaks for the President in money matters, has given a general OK to the port proposal. It has also recommended an 11,700-acre national lakeshore park be created in the harbor area of the port.

But even though long delayed, the news is welcome to WISH-TV, just as it should be welcome to the major proponents of the controversy surrounding the port. We join Governor Welsh in hailing the announcement as a distinct step forward for the port, and for Indiana.

Still, all is not yet clear sailing for the important project. According to Secretary Clinton Green of the Indiana Port Commission, the approval of the Budget Bureau is "only one of several steps required before the harbor and port terminal become a reality." So for those who would wish to oppose the compromise plan, there is still time for more debate—and more delay.

It seems inconceivable to WISH-TV, however, that any responsible group with the best interests of our State in mind will continue to further delay the construction of the deepwater port. The project is too important to Indiana for partisan bickering. Now that the compromise plan has finally received the backing of the White House, we hope that all Indiana citizens will join forces in supporting the project. Let's build that port.

Anti-Tito Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, October 10, a large mass meeting in Gary, Ind., sponsored by citizens of Serbian descent, protested the coming visit of Communist tyrant Tito. This meeting was also attended by other citizens whose motherland is now under the Communist iron heel, and whose peoples are enslaved. Yugoslavia's people are without any power whatsoever to vote or participate in a free government or to legislate for the welfare of the masses now under subjugation. This Tito protest rally was held on the 29th anniversary of the assasination of King Alexander of Yugoslavia by the Communist leaders.

At this meeting, two major resolutions were unanimously adopted. One called for our State Department to persuade Tito to allow Gary, Indiana-born Bishop Varnava Nastich to come back to his native country. Bishop Nastich was convicted at a mock trial by the Tito police and served a number of years in a Communist prison. Today, he is under constant surveillance and house arrest. He has been asking for sometime for permission to return to his native land, but the Tito government refuses to act on his application.

Mr. Speaker, I am herewith submitting copies of both resolutions which were unanimously adopted at the mass meeting protesting Tito's visit to this land of freedom, and also asking help from our Government to aid in the return of Bishop Nastich:

RESOLUTION ON TITO VISIT ADOPTED BY AMERICANS OF SERBIAN DESCENT, AT A MASS MEETING IN GARY, IND., ON OCTOBER 9, 1963

1. Tito is a Communist and has never been anything but a Communist, dedicated to the promotion of communism and the extinction of freedom throughout the world.

2. In 1946 Tito, after a mock trial, murdered Gen. Draza Mihailowich, the valiant war leader of the Serbian people and the stanchest ally of the United States of America. In the same year he shot down two U.S. planes, resulting in the death of six American airmen.

3. In June 1957 Tito stated in Stalingrad that "Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union march in time of peace as in time of war, shoulder to shoulder, toward the same goal of the victory of socialism in the whole world."

4. In the last few years the Yugoslav Communist regime has repeatedly and solemnly taken the position that the stand of Communist Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union on the most important international problems, is "very similar or identical."

5. Emboldened by our policy of weakness and concessions, Tito has now rejected any pretense of discord and conflict between his regime and the U.S.S.R. The invitation of our State Department to Tito to visit the President of the United States of America comes at a time of the most friendly relations and fullest cooperation between the Soviet and the Yugoslav Communists in promoting their common goals of the Communist conquest of the world.

6. This invitation to Tito confirms the fatal trend of our foreign policy to appease the enemy, a policy which has facilitated the Communist conquest of half of Europe, and the whole of China and has brought communism to 90 miles from U.S. shores.

7. The invitation to Tito to visit the United States is a national disgrace for the United States, it is an insult to all Americans who know what communism stands for, what unspeakable crimes it has committed and what it holds in store for America, should the Communist aims be realized. It

is a heavy blow to freedom fighters not only in Yugoslavia, but throughout the world.

8. Therefore, we emphatically protest against the invitation extended to Communist Tito, as detrimental to the national interests of the United States of America and helpful to Communist imperialist aims.

9. All those who are put in positions of power and policymaking by the vote of the American people, have the sacred obligation to defend U.S. national interests, principles and values, and promote freedom in the world, and not to promote internationalist schemes and fraternize with the Communists, mortal enemies of the United States and everything it stands for.

10. We are doing our duty as U.S. citizens today by reminding our elected representatives of the fact that Americanism and communism are absolutely incompatible and we shall do our duty at the next elections by giving our trust and vote only to those who will defend this country, watch its ramparts and work for the advancement of the cause of freedom in the whole world.

BISHOP VARNAVA NASTICH RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE OF UNITED AMERICAN-SERBIAN ORGANIZATIONS IN GARY, IND.

Americans of Serbian descent, gathered at their mass meeting of October 9, 1963, in Gary, Ind., respectfully urge you to demand that the Yugoslav authorities immediately release the American-born right reverend bishop of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Varnava Nastich, and issue him a visa to come to the United States. Bishop Nastich is now deprived of any diocese and kept under permanent police control in conditions of virtual arrest.

Bishop Nastich was born in 1914 in Gary, Ind. He is held in highest esteem by all Serbs in Yugoslavia as well as by his fellow American Serbs throughout the United States.

In view of the bold and impertinent offensive which the Yugoslav Communist regime is conducting to disrupt the Serbian Orthodox Church in the United States and Canada, the presence of Bishop Varnava Nastich in the United States, the country of his birth, would be of great value for the Serbian Orthodox Church and for the strengthening of the foundation of America.

NICK SEVER,
Chairman.

To Move a Haystack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the ingenuity of the American farmer, who has given the United States the greatest agricultural production and efficiency in the world, is illustrated by a brief article appearing in the October issue of Goodyear News.

The article tells of the invention of Fritz Lahman, of Hecla, S. Dak., whose 5-minute haystack loader has made the task of bringing hay to the feedlot a great deal easier for farmers in the northern United States and Canada.

I congratulate Fritz Lahman of my home State and ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO MOVE A HAYSTACK

Tourists may yell warnings when massive haystacks seemingly chase tractors across the farmland, but rarely does the farmer pay any attention. To him, it's all in a productive day's work.

Thanks to the ingenuity of a South Dakota farmer-mechanic, farmers in the Northern United States and Canada can take drudgery out of hauling hay from field to barn lot for winter cattle feeding.

Annually faced with winters so cold and snows so deep that their cattle cannot go into the fields for feed, north-country farmers have been forced to bring the feed to the cattle. For many years the farmers have performed the tiring, time-consuming ritual of lifting haystacks a forkful at a time onto wagons in the field hauling the hay to the feedlot and rebuilding the stack in the same manner.

Fritz Lahman's invention is in sharp contrast. His 5-minute haystack loader is backed up to a stack, the stack is winched aboard with a cable and carted away to the lot where it is winched off onto the ground. An 18 by 20-foot haystack weighing many tons is moved with no more effort than hauling grass clippings in a two-wheeled trailer.

Like many inventions, the 5-minute haystock loader is the brainchild of a man who sought a better way to perform his task. A farmer himself, Lahman has the added advantage of being a mechanic. For many years he repaired autos and trucks in a little white frame garage in the tiny farming community of Hecla, S. Dak.

In 1945, he devised a prototype haystack loader strictly for his own use from old truck parts. It worked, and the word spread.

"People came for miles around to see the thing," Lahman says. "Some wanted one just like it. I built them one at a time, provided the buyer paid me in advance."

Lahman averaged a loader per year until 1955. By then the demand was great enough that he went into full-time production, with one employee and a hodgepodge of used plant machinery collected from as far away as Chicago.

Lahman Manufacturing Co.'s first-year production was 25 haystack loaders. Last year's production was exactly 10 times that—250 machines. The company now has 35 employees, all local people, trained on the job.

Four salesmen merchandise the stack movers to implement dealers in North and South Dakota, parts of Montana, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, and most of Canada.

Lahman Manufacturing Co. makes nearly all haystack loader components. Frames, fenders, sprockets, gears—even wheel hubs for the six-wheeled vehicle—are fabricated in the plant. Specialized items such as rims, tires, chain, bearings and cable are the only ones purchased in finished form.

Completed orders are delivered to buyers in all parts of the trade area by company drivers in company-owned trucks.

Lamman's creative turn of mind has brought vertical expansion as well as horizontal. Five years ago he designed a Goodyear-mounted haystack former which is towed into a field, filled with hay and then pulled away, leaving a perfect rectangular stack. Two years ago he engineered a cattle crossing guard—a widely spaced pipe frame over which vehicles can cross, but cattle will not.

This fall another Lahman product will be marketed: a straw buncher which attaches to the rear of a combine, catching the ordinarily-scattered straw and making miniature haystocks of it.

The white frame garage is now a machine shop. Beside and behind it are five more structures, added as the need for working space increased. A sixth is now under construction.

At present, Lahman sees no particular inventions upcoming, but will continue to develop present products and take things as they come. "We plan to keep right on expanding," he says.

Lahman Manufacturing Co. is living proof that America is still the land of opportunity for people of vision—people with the creativity and drive to make those visions become reality.

Attacks on Congress Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, quite consistently, now, the so-called liberal press and many leftwingers castigate Congress as an institution and wish it would evaporate into thin air. Of course, the fact that the Constitution established the Congress as an equal branch of the Federal Government is irrelevant to these critics who would prefer socialism to our system of private enterprise.

In the October 7 issue of the Washington Evening Star, William S. White very effectively unmasked this attempt toward one-man domination:

ATTACKS ON CONGRESS ASSAILED

(By William S. White)

This country could one day face nothing less than a constitutional crisis in the incessant degrading now going on of Congress as an institution expressly charged by that Constitution to go its independent way.

This curiously uninformed and almost hysterical attack upon Congress has, of course, been going on for some years. Almost invaribly it comes from leftwing so-called intellectuals and political scientists who seem not to have the faintest notion that that thing up on Capitol Hill was deliberately set up to be no President's stooge but every President's checkrein.

Still, none of the past howling from these quarters has been remotely comparable to its present shrill volume. Members of Congress from either party who dare go onto some television panels must be prepared actually to apologize for the fact that Congress is performing its constitutional function.

PRESIDENT SATISFIED

They must actively defend the gall of the place in refusing to abdicate its sworn duties by giving automatic—and instant—assent to whatever is asked of it by the administration. Careful inquiry into this or that bill or proposal, which is the root reason for Congress very being, is presented by eager critics as blind and irresponsible obstructionism. Final and outright congressional refusal of this or that program is described as hardly short of treason to "the people's welfare."

Sometimes, indeed, the attitude of the interrogator suggests that a Member of Congress is in the dock on a criminal charge: Explain at once—as soon as you have quit hitting your grandmother with that spade—what ugly motive has caused Congress not to do such and such. Is it true that Congress is full of louts and conspirators against the good life?

Pundits and professors fill the egghead magazines, and don't wholly neglect the daily press, with automatic assumptions that Congress is invariably wrong or stupid, or perhaps actually evil, in any contest with a President—so long as he is a "liberal" President. It is only fair to say, parenthetically,

that the present President who is the intended beneficiary of the screaming, John F. Kennedy, does not welcome such juvenile support. He has read the Constitution and is satisfied with it the way it is.

The most exasperating thing of all, perhaps, is that all this nonsense comes, with rare exceptions, from people whose actual knowledge of a single reality in Congress is as patently and absurdly limited as, say, my knowledge of nuclear physics.

A whole new meaning for words—and a whole new system of unthink—would be required to grasp their approach to public affairs. When, say, a Senator votes his convictions and proper State interests, after prolonged study of the right thing to do, he is a matchless hero if he goes with the administration and a knuckleheaded cretin if he goes the other way. The more time and care he puts into his decisions the more intolerably wrong they are—for the screamers take a very dim view of "time-wasting debate." The higher his earned respect from among the most informed of all critics, his colleagues, the less respect he gets from the reformers—unless, of course, his record is agreeable to their notions of the moment.

ATTACKS GOVERNMENT

And this is in fact a pointless "unless." For, as might rationally be expected, no Member becomes a great man of Congress by spending all his time denying the proper independence of his own place in order to run after some President as a docile stooge.

At bottom, this business is an attack on no less a thing than representative government. This is so because Congress is the only part of the Government which is literally and precisely representative in structure and character.

What the screamers, therefore, are really reaching for, whether they know it or not, is a kind of people's republic where public policy would be exclusively in the hands of a President who, though quite democratically and lawfully elected, would thereafter be under no real check at all.

South Bend (Ind.) Tribune Endorses Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD, an editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of October 11, 1963, endorsing President Kennedy's decision to permit the private sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

The editorial follows:

WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

In clearing the way for the private sale of millions of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union, President Kennedy described his decision as just good business for the United States.

All things considered, it is difficult to argue convincingly to the contrary, although it will be conceded that we will be helping Khrushchev & Co. to get off the hook at home and in the satellite countries to which Moscow has supply commitments.

Domestically, of course, the President takes some political risks, for there are some who believe that the United States shouldn't trade at all with the Communist bloc.

In this case, however, it appears that selling wheat to the Soviets is clearly not contrary to the national interests of the United States.

We have wheat to sell—lots of it. If it isn't sold we have to store it, and that costs money. And there is the loss due to spoilage to consider.

If we sell it abroad, the cash that comes into the country helps alleviate the aggravating imbalance of international payments which is causing a serious drain on U.S. gold reserves.

And there is this to remember. The Russians have the wherewithal to pay for their purchases, and if they can't get the wheat they need from this country they most certainly will shop elsewhere until they find what they're looking for.

Moreover, apparently, none of the wheat which the Russians will buy in the United States is likely to find its way into Cuba or belligerent Red China. An earlier Soviet-Canadian deal provides for direct shipments to Cuba. Peiping and Moscow are hardly on speaking terms, much less enjoying good trade relations.

There is still another consideration in favor of the United States in the deal. It is rich in propaganda nutrients. For, as President Kennedy said, it advertises to the world the success of free American agriculture in contrast to the failure of the Communist system.

Certainly it lengthens the shadows of doubt concerning the ability of the Communist system to match the abundance which is the hallmark of the free enterprise system where it is permitted to work without excessive restrains.

An unknown quantity in the deal is whether it will contribute at all to improvement in United States and U.S.S.R. relations. One may speculate that it may, but no one can be sure. Time alone can provide the answer.

University of Wisconsin Student Senate on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following recent declaration of the student senate at the University of Wisconsin on the subject of civil rights:

Whereas racism and racial discrimination, with concomitant inhumane and vicious manifestations, exist in this country, both North and South; and

Whereas racism and racial discrimination directly interfere with educational processes—including opportunities for university education; and

Whereas racism and racial discrimination have been the causes of wanton murders of American citizens, primarily American Negro citizens, and including the six young Negroes murdered in Birmingham, Ala., on September 15, 1963; and

Whereas it is the expressly stated policy of the Wisconsin Student Association to press for the elimination of racial injustice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That student senate of the Wisconsin Student Association strongly reaffirms its condemnation of all forms of racial injustice in our campus community and throughout the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That student senate express sympathy for the six murdered children and their families and support for the nationwide civil rights movement by giving the official support of student senate to the sympathy demonstration which will be held on the Capitol Square by Madison citizens and students this Sunday, September 22, at 2:15 p.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That student senate urge adoption of a strong civil rights bill by the Congress and President of the United States and urge adoption of a similar bill by the legislature and Governor of the State of Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of the Wisconsin Student Association hereby be authorized by the student senate of the Wisconsin Student Association to communicate this feeling to anyone throughout the 11th session of the student senate when the president believes it is in the best interest of the campus community.

Better Than No Deal at All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, we have all become aware of an effort by the Republican leadership in recent days to label as "Soft on Communism" a cash sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. True, Republican Members from the wheat States have mainly withheld their voices from the chorus of criticism. But other Republicans have indicated they see the wheat sale as a possibly useful campaign issue for 1964.

The Los Angeles Times has touched upon this political calculation in an editorial which it carried last Friday morning, October 11. The largest newspaper in the West calls President Kennedy's decision on the sale sensible and sound.

Under permission previously granted to read this editorial into the RECORD, I would emphasize that the Times' Republican credentials have never been in doubt, and that its circulation area does not include the Wheat Belt.

The editorial follows:

BETTER THAN NO DEAL AT ALL

President Kennedy's sensible decision to authorize a $250-million sale of wheat to the Soviet Union may bring him trouble by the bushel in next year's election campaign.

When asked by the White House to express opinions in advance, many of President Kennedy's political opponents in effect abstained, even though the transaction appears to be sound not only as a measure to strengthen our economy but as a cold war tactic.

For a politician to support the deal would have been to forfeit the chance to attack it in 1964 if between now and then relations with Moscow deteriorated or if the sale for some other reason went sour. It's cynical, but that's politics.

Even so, the President is on solid ground. As a one-shot exchange of grain for cash (with perhaps some short-term credit involved), the transaction represents no fundamental precedent in our trade policy.

Nobody can deny that the sale is good business for the United States. Not only will it materially help our balance-of-payments problem, it also means saving about

$200 million in wheat storage charges, a stronger wheat market, and possibly higher farm income. Wheat is the country's major surplus problem.

In terms of our own national security, it obviously is better to have the Soviet Union use its gold and foreign exchange reserves for wheat purchases than for the strategic hardware it can buy from our allies.

President Kennedy says our wheat will not find its way to Communist China or Cuba, under the agreement with Moscow. Even if it should, our wheat surplus contrasted with the Soviet Union's wheat failure is good propaganda. And Voice of America is ready to make the most of it.

Whether the wheat sale can help ease East-West tensions has yet to be seen. Certainly unchanged in the slightest is the basic conflict between Moscow and Washington. That shows clearly today in Berlin and Germany, Vietnam, Cuba, and elsewhere.

With the power conflict not even showing a promise of ending, it makes all the more sense for the United States to advance its economy and cold war position—even if it means selling wheat to do it.

Gen. George Decker, Former Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, since the Gesell report became the subject of discussion and the Secretary of Defense issued a directive placing the military in charge of integrating communities outside military bases, there has been much speculation as to how the military people themselves feel about this unprecedented action.

I always believe in going to the source for accurate information. I went to Gen. George Decker who was the immediate occupant of the chair of the Chief of Staff of the Army to the present Chief, to find out what he thought about putting the military in the political business, contrary to its mission to defend the country.

In his typical frank and forthright manner General Decker replied and here is the letter which he wrote me. Read it and ask yourself the question: "If the military does not want to get into the business of imposing military pressure on unwilling communities, then who is calling the shots?"

Of course military advice is being less accepted every day in the Pentagon, so really the surprise and shock are not as great as it might first appear.

Here is a letter of authority from a man of authority who has received the highest honor his service could give him.

MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1963.

Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HÉBERT: In response to your request of October 10, 1963, I am forwarding herewith my views concerning the Gesell report. As I am sure you understand, my views are based for the most part on experience of the Army with which I am most familiar.

First, let me say that integration in the Armed Forces is an accomplished act and in my judgment is working well. Army experience has proven that integration of a proportion of Negroes into combat and service units is the best way to obtain maximum effectiveness from Negro personnel.

I believe that the Negro in uniform is given opportunity for assignment and promotion commensurate with his intellect and ability. Facilities throughout the Army are desegregated, as I believe them to be throughout the other services. Contrary to the Gesell report, there is a well established system for members of the military services to register and receive consideration of complaints.

While the report points out that only 8.2 percent of all military personnel is Negro as compared to 11 percent in the total population, it should be noted that the percentage of Negroes in the Army exceeds the percentage of Negroes in our population. I am reluctant to comment on the reasons that the other services have not effected integration to the same degree as the Army other than to say that integration is an evolutionary process and that if the present trends continue they will ultimately reach comparable proportions.

The report suggests energetic efforts to increase the number of Negro officers. I would concur with this recommendation provided it can be accomplished without compromising standards. It should be noted that many appointments to the military academies are beyond service control. Army ROTC units have been established for some time in several colleges for Negroes; Negroes are eligible for enrollment in ROTC units in integrated colleges and universities.

In short, insofar as activity within the services is concerned uniformed members of the Armed Forces are provided equal opportunity without racial discrimination. Human failings will result in some exceptions, but these are more a matter of administrative error or oversight than shortcomings of policy.

The attitude and practices of civilian communities toward the Negro in uniform is another matter. While discriminatory practices may be considered morally wrong, it is a fact of life that many areas in our country are by local law, by custom, or for other reasons segregated. When uniformed members of the Armed Forces are required to live in these communities, conditions attributable to segregation will in many cases have an adverse effect on morale. This is, of course, a matter of concern to the base commander but to charge him with enforcing corrective measures as recommended in the report is to impose upon him a responsibility which he is without commensurate authority to discharge.

The report recommends a regular system of monitoring, rating, and reporting on officers in achieving programs in obtaining equality of treatment and opportunity for all military personnel off base. This recommendation, if implemented, could cause serious injustice since an officer has no authority to compel a civilian community to act against its will; his only means of influence is persuasion. An otherwise unusually effective and persuasive officer may be unable to achieve any progress at all in one community owing to local attitudes, whereas a much less effective officer may be successful in another part of the country where racial tolerance is greater. Thus, if success is the only criterion the more effective officer would receive unjustly the lower rating. Effectiveness of officers has always been judged in the terms of success in discharging their military responsibilities. Duties of a base commander will, of course, involve relations with the civilian community and his performance in this field should be reflected in his efficiency rating. But it is manifestly unfair to expose him to the hazard of an adverse report based on his inability to obtain results due to circumstances beyond his control.

The report recommends that, in situations where the commander is unable to obtain equal treatment for Negroes in the civilian community, he should develop a plan under which military personnel of all races would be permitted to patronize only those facilities which receive his express approval. Aside from the legal implications of such sanctions, and there well may be many, it would penalize the white serviceman unduly.

The report recommends that the services consider curtailment or termination of activities at certain military installations near communities where discrimination is particularly prevalent. Implementation of this recommendation is impracticable by reason of financial as well as other considerations. Many military training installations are located in the Southern States where the weather and other conditions are best for year-round training. Yet it is here that segregation is most widely practiced. Even if practicable budgetwise, it would retard the training of the services seriously to relocate training establishments in areas where racial tolerance is greater but where training is severely handicapped.

Throughout the history of our Armed Forces officers in uniform have consistently refrained from participation in local political matters. Rightfully, their concentration has been on the development of the forces required for successful accomplishment of missions related to national military security. Should policy dictate that they become involved in the affairs of the local community in connection with obtaining equal opportunity for all members of the armed services, then there is the danger that some may become involved in other political matters as well. This would, in my judgment, tend to degrade the integrity of the Armed Forces to an undesirable degree.

In summary, I can readily agree with many of the recommendations of the report insofar as they relate to onbase treatment of the Negro. In fact, most of these recommendations are redundant since they are presently in effect or being implemented by the Armed Forces. However, the recommendations of the report concerning the base commander's responsibility for obtaining equal opportunity for his personnel in the civilian community concern me greatly. While the objective of these recommendations is commendable, I feel that to impose upon a base commander the responsibilities as recommended, in the absence of authority which he does and should not have, is unjust to him and may adversely affect his future career. Furthermore, imposition of the proposed sanctions could cause a schism between the military and the civilian community which would be contrary to the national interest.

I have no reason to request that my views be treated confidentially; you may use them in any way that you wish.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

G. H. DECKER.

Impact of World Trade Stimulates Thought of Shoe Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today when we are all concerned with the de-

sirability of a growing international trade on the one hand, and with the well-being of our native American industry on the other hand, American businessmen and bankers are coming up with many new ideas and new approaches on how business and industry and manufacturing can make necessary adjustments.

Along this line someone has just called to my attention an interesting article by Kurt Gardner, entitled "Retailing Held Kingpin of Profits," which appeared in a recent issue of Footwear News. The article is thought provoking and carries many implications that are worthy of consideration.

The article follows:

RETAILING HELD KINGPIN OF PROFITS

(By Kurt Gardner)

ST. LOUIS.—The domestic footwear industry will prosper again when it faces the growing reality that its major profits come from sales at retail, rather than from manufacturing. Curbs on shoe imports will merely delay a day of reckoning for manufacturers; they will not solve basic problems that cause lower volume, earnings, and employment. These are the thoughts advanced by several longtime shoe business observers in the financial community, here—men who look ahead to the investment and marketing potential of shoe companies.

With or without import quotas, these men feel that the footwear manufacturer-retailer has the best chance for continued growth. One banking executive suggested that Brown Shoe Co. has continued to report good sales earnings because the company has a clear understanding of the importance of retailing in its company. He noted that Brown's retail division, Wohl Shoe Co., probably is one of the company's greatest assets.

The banker went on to say that recent statements by International Shoe Co.'s president, M. R. Chambers, to the effect that his company's moving in the direction of marketing orientation, rather than manufacturing, show fresh awareness that shoe manufacturers must develop their retail outlets.

It is expected that steps to develop retail distribution will include programs for the company's independent accounts, as well as for its own retail subsidiaries.

While Brown Shoe Co. has maintained absolute silence on its plans for investing the net proceeds of the $39 million it is to receive if the sale of its Kinney Shoe Stores division is completed with F. W. Woolworth Co., financial experts forecast that much of it would be spent to expand remaining retail operations.

THE KEY POINT

A financial analyst who agrees that shoe imports are hurting manufacturers, believes the manufacturer-retailer should take advantage of consumer acceptance of imports and distribute them through existing retail outlets or devise other distribution methods. The point is "Get the retail sales."

International Shoe, while admitting that imports are a serious threat and should be curtailed, is, at the same time, expanding its import division. Brown Shoe Co. has not taken an individual and official stand. However, financial sources are of the opinion that top company officials would not want to market imports in the belief their quality standards do not measure up to Brown's specifications.

The plight of specialty shoe manufacturers who do not own retail distribution facilities may seem to be thrown out of focus in speculation about import curbs, one source said. He admitted that the smaller companies have a rough road ahead. But he predicts a good number of them are due for oblivion, either through merger or senility, no matter how high or low the percentage of imports to domestic production.

JARMAN EXAMPLE

Corporate profits can be maintained and increased by diversification, and almost every major shoe company has indicated its interest in exploring ways to do it. The president of one manufacturing-retailing combine mused, "Maxie Jarman of Genesco seems to have had the right idea years ago." With that in mind, his firm may try to diversify.

However, a shoe marketing expert in a letter analyzing the industry's problems asserted that "diversification * * * must come from within, as department stores add departments, new items, basement and budget shops, put branches in shopping centers; as hotels add motels, swimming pools and convention centers."

He continued, "To diversify, shoe factories could add types, constructions, features consumers want, or new things to create 'wants' among consumers. Just to be first and original in an area under present circumstances could be a diversification."

Contrary to people directly involved with shoe manufacturing, this marketing man said: "The reasons given for raising imports are mostly fiction. Their low labor can be offset with our improved fit and wear and other superiorities we have if we but market our assets." He argued that automobile makers did it and have overcome foreign small car competition with American compact cars.

He blamed shoe manufacturers for copying, advertising and otherwise promoting imports. The financial analyst added that manufacturers have made retailers and consumers aware of imports by publicizing their fears. He wondered if the consumer would stand still for import curbs which would take from him a commodity he has frequently wanted, and which has grown in importance to shoe retailing as a result of his acceptance.

In the Spirit of Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution of the Polish American Congress of Connecticut which were set forth on Pulaski Day in memory of the unwavering loyalty to the cause of freedom exhibited by this great Polish national.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, HARTFORD, CONN.

Whereas Gen. Casimir Pulaski, whose ability, courage, and unwavering loyalty to the cause of freedom, contributed largely to the establishment of the United States of America, who, to this day, stands as the symbol of man's love for freedom.

We pause to remember and remind the world and ourselves that the Polish Nation has been in 1,000 years of statehood always Christian and pro-Western and has earned justly the title given by Popes, "Polonia Semper Fidelis"—always faithful, that a free and democratic Poland is not possible in the face of Russian hegemony. We today dedicate ourselves anew, in our turn, in the cause of freedom and firmly resolve:

1. We urge the United States to make it known to all nations of the world that we will not be a signatory to any nonaggression pact or any other agreement with the Soviet Union which tends to continue Soviet domination over central and eastern European nations, which for centuries have been free and independent;

2. The recognition, de jure, by the United States, of Polish western territories on the Oder and Nysa line is a necessity for the promotion of peace. Thus, in this way, depriving Soviet Russia of an important propaganda weapon. Also the eastern Provinces grabbed by Russia after the Second World War, have to be reestablished according to the Riga Treaty;

3. We do hereby go on record as endorsing and supporting the forwarded to Congress proposed legislation, designed to revise and liberalize our existing immigration laws and eliminate the discriminatory provisions existing under the present law;

4. We vigorously protest the concerted action of the leaders of the communistic government of Poland in their endeavors to destroy the religious freedom of the Polish nation, by depriving its people of worshiping God in accordance with their tenets of their consciences and beliefs, thereby destroying their will, their human dignity, their very essence; and

5. We urge the Government of the United States to use their good office to initiate the repatriation of a million Poles still in Russia, after their forced deportation to Russian camps from 1939 in the name of humanitarianism and good will.

A President for Yale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Yale University has a new president. The election of Kingman Brewster is an exciting event. He is eminently qualified and, in my judgment, was the best possible selection that could have been made.

Kingman Brewster combines all the strength of youth, intellectual capacity, and breadth of training.

It is always exciting when a great university moves ahead.

I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an editorial on the election of Kingman Brewster as president of Yale that appeared in the New York Times of October 14.

A PRESIDENT FOR YALE

The election of Kingman Brewster, Jr. as Yale's new president, though no surprise, was undoubtedly greeted with a sigh of relief by his many supporters among the faculty and the Yale family in general. An American academic election may not have all the thriller qualities of politicking that C. P. Snow ascribes to it in "The Masters," but the behind-the-scenes nominating, screening and final balloting nevertheless carry strong overtones of personality clashes and suspense.

In the case of the presidency of an institution of Yale's national stature, the ultimate decision is by no means of mere intramural consequence. It helps to set the tone for a more general leadership in higher education. Mr. Brewster brings, in addition to

the grooming of his distinguished predecessor, the late A. Whitney Griswold, an impressive set of personal qualifications. He has left no doubt in anyone's mind that he considers the faculty the heart of the university. In order to assure that ability, rather than mere seniority, is to be the yardstick, he has unsentimentally cut through protocol to promote young and promising talent.

Refusing to be drawn into a partisan position in the futile argument between the two cultures of science and the humanities, he has, by supporting excellence in both, confirmed that a modern university cannot withdraw either from scientific productivity or from the traditional ways of scholarship.

Some academic conservatives may have had doubts about Mr. Brewster because he occasionally violated sacred channels. They may find it hard to adjust to his more personal approach to the college presidency. American university leadership has gone through many phases, from the predominantly ministerial one, which also played a large part in Yale's history, through the chairmanship by quiet scholars and, after World War II, the unhappy reliance on business executives and military figures.

Mr. Brewster represents a new generation of intellectual but decisive leaders who know that tomorrow's university, while still depending on its strong individual character, must be deeply conscious of national duties.

The Unfriendly Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist calling to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the Beverly Hills Times.

The article follows:

THE UNFRIENDLY WITNESS

(By Irwin M. Moskowitz)

Once upon a time, a congressional investigator decided to conduct a hearing into a movement called Women Strike for Peace. The movement was loosely organized and had no definite long-range plans, but it had aroused suspicion by choosing a title in which three out of four words were controversial.

It came to pass that the Congressman, who was noted for his diligent research, uncovered the fact that the idea of a women's peace-strike originated with a play called "Lysistrata." So the conscientious Congressman issued a subpena for the playwright.

You might assume that the playwright, being a citizen of ancient Athens, did not feel obligated to honor the subpena. But he was one of literature's authentic immortals, so he was able and willing to heed this strange summons of posterity.

"The witness will please identify himself for the record," began the Congressman.

"I am Aristophanes, of the tribe Pandionis and the deme Cydathene."

"Tribe? Deme? That's all Greek to me."

"An astute observation."

"Oh? Well, uh, may we have your age?"

"I was born about 2,500 years ago."

"I'll have to admonish the witness not to play the comic with us."

"I am not playing. I am what I am, a writer of dramatic comedy. Some say I am the greatest."

"Was 'Lysistrata' a comedy?"

"Of course. Nobody could possibly take seriously the idea of women joining together in a boycott of love to compel men to sign a peace treaty. Females obviously don't have that kind of willpower."

"The whole idea was only a joke?"

"Not entirely. I was serious about the underlying viewpoint, a viewpoint I expressed in play after play."

"What was that viewpoint?"

"That civilization was heading for needless destruction because two superpowers, my nation's alliance and the Spartan bloc, were each being jostled into conflict by fire-eating generals and profiteering politicians."

"What was your solution?"

"Coexistence, with the first step being that each side withdraw from positions that threaten the integrity of the other's power."

"Say, have you been talking with Adlai Stevenson?"

"You mean that fellow whose bias for peaceful negotiation was exposed by the 'Saturday evening papyrus?' No, I had the idea first. Ask anyone at the Acropolis."

"You'll probably want to take the fifth on this, but would you tell us if your writings ever got you into trouble with the authorities?"

"Take the fifth? Oh, yes, I mustn't forget your quaint American idiom. Thanks, but I feel no need for a drink at this time."

"Mr. Aristophanes, will you answer my question?"

"Certainly. Aside from a small fine for lampooning one demagog a little too vigorously, all I ever suffered was some name-calling."

"For instance?"

"Appeaser, traitor, enemy agent. I also was suspected of being that most terrifying of all creatures, a pacifist."

"You sound like some kind of leftist. Would you rather be Red than dead?"

"We Greeks have a word for such questions. It's sophistry."

"Do you deny that, in one of your plays, you have a group of women seize control of the government and install a system of communism?"

"Sir, I happen to have been a wealthy landowner, a conservative who thoroughly identified with aristocracy. The play to which you refer is actually a satire of the Communist proposals of visionaries, like Plato."

"Where can we find him?"

"Go to Hellas."

"How dare you."

"What the Zeus is the matter with you?"

"How would you like to be held in contempt?"

"That wouldn't be a new experience for me. Besides, I can't spare the time right now. The Muses are calling and I must hie off homeward. I leave you with the wish that the gods will protect your nation from the real enemies."

The witness vanished.

The congressional investigator, undaunted, began preparing a subpena for Plato.

A Factual Study: The American Council for Judaism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the American Examiner—an independent newspaper published in New York that reports the activities of the American Jewish community—has published the full text of a pamphlet analyzing the program and platform of the American Council for Judaism. The analysis, prepared by the New York Board of Rabbis, appeared in the Examiner from July 18, 1963 to September 5, 1963. I believe that it constitutes a valuable point-by-point refutation of this organization's supposed representations on behalf of Americans of the Jewish faith.

So that no one will be further misled by this group I commend the rabbis' condemnation of this organization to the attention of our colleagues, preceded by the statement of Dr. Israel Mowshowitz, president of the New York Board of Rabbis:

[From the American Examiner, July 18, 1963]

STATEMENT BY DR. ISRAEL MOWSHOWITZ, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK BOARD OF RABBIS, ON THE OCCASION OF THE RELEASE OF THE FACTUAL STUDY OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM BY THE BOARD

The New York Board of Rabbis, the largest representative rabbinic body in the world, with a membership of 800 Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Rabbis, reaffirms the position of the three major national rabbinical bodies in America that the American Council for Judaism does not represent any valid interpretation of Judaism. We repudiate its ideology and tactics as inimical and alien to the true spirit of Judaism. While we do not deny the right of that body to speak, we would fail in our elemental duty to truth and to our responsible position as the united voice of religious Jewry if we did not make it clear that the Council for Judaism does not speak in the name of our religious traditions, and that it does not speak for the religious Jewish community.

The American Council for Judaism has consistently misrepresented the Jewish people before the bar of public opinion. It has welcomed every opportunity to malign and impugn the integrity of Jewish institutions, organizations, and causes; and it has consistently distorted and caricatured the precepts of Judaism which is purports to teach. Worst of all, in the most tragic era of Jewish history, it sought to deny to Jews fleeing Hitler's Europe a haven in Palestine, and undermined and obstructed the life-giving work of rescue and rehabilitation carried on by the Jewish community.

Our factual study released today offers clear proof that the group calling itself the American Council for Judaism is neither American nor Jewish in spirit or in concept. It is revealed to be a political organization consisting, by its own claim, of less than one-half of 1 percent of American Jews which was organized in the first instance for the express purpose of denying the right of refugees fleeing occupied Europe to enter Palestine, at the very moment the Nazis were implementing the final solution.

During the 20 years of its existence the activities of the council have consisted of an assault against the United Jewish Appeal, the major lifesaving instrumentality of the American Jewish community. They have attempted to impugn the patriotism of American Jews who have, together with other Americans, shown concern for the welfare of the people of Israel. They have had as their principal aim the incitement of prejudice against the State of Israel, thus contributing to tension and unrest in the Middle East, a policy we believe to be contrary to the best interest of both America and Israel.

Judaism, we believe, has sufficient breadth and depth to embrace varied points of view, but we solemnly declare that there is no room in Jewish life for Jews whose words and deeds would result in the destruction of the State of Israel, in the weakening of Jewish religious

commitment, and in incalculable harm to the Jewish people everywhere.

We view with contempt the council's tactics of reviving anti-Semitic slanders of dual loyalties. American Jews who have served their country in peace and in war need not defend themselves against such baseless vicious charges. As Americans concerned with the survival of democratic values everywhere, we pray for the strengthening and survival of the State of Israel as a stronghold of democracy in the Middle East. It is thus in keeping with the best traditions of America to support Israel, or indeed, any other nation which strengthens the democratic and moral climate of our troubled world.

As religious leaders we are dismayed that the council's philosophy is one of complete negation: it would deny the existence of a Jewish people, it rejects traditional Jewish ceremonials, and scoffs at the basic American concept of the right of every citizen to help other peoples struggling for freedom. The council is an organization which claims to be "religious," yet it has no religious commitment. It claims to be "American," yet it misinterprets America as a monolithic structure where all cultural and spiritual variations must be obliterated. It purports to speak for Judaism, yet it is against every best interest of the Jewish community. It has no positive program of its own, but is founded on a platform of negation and hate.

The New York Board of Rabbis is confident that the American people will reject with contempt the political machinations of this small band of misguided individuals who suffer from insecurity and tragic self-hatred. Our love of God, our love of America, our religious commitment and the ties of our religious fellowship with Jews throughout the world—enjoin us to continue our efforts to save oppressed Jews everywhere, and to extend the arm of brotherhood to the people of Israel who are bound to the people of America in a common commitment to the democratic ideals which stem from our Judeo-Christian tradition, upon which both America and Israel are founded.

[From the American Examiner, July 18, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE PLATFORM AND PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—PART I

HISTORY AND NATURE OF THE COUNCIL

The American Jewish community is a heterogeneous community. Within it there are many diverse voluntary associations devoted to religious, educational, cultural, social, and philanthropic purposes.

Yet despite their differences, virtually all responsible American Jewish groups, both secular, and religious, have united in denouncing one organization, namely, the American Council for Judaism, in unmistakable terms. These groups include all of the Jewish community relations agencies; denunciations having come from the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Jewish War Veterans, and from many organizations, national, and local, that comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council. (The NCRAC is the coordinating body for six national agencies and 64 local Jewish Community Relations Councils throughout the country. Its national organization constituents: American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, United Synagogue of America, and Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.) Many other groups, both Zionist and non-Zionist likewise have spoken in the same vein.

It is most noteworthy, however, that the American Council for Judaism (which carries the word 'Judaism' in its title and therefore presumably is an organization with a religious orientation) has been strongly repudiated by each of the three national rabbinic bodies which speak for the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative Rabbinate in the United States.

The Rabbinical Council of America, on behalf of the Orthodox Rabbinate in this country, has gone on record as follows:

"Whereas the shocking conduct of the American Council for Judaism and all its members, seeking to question the loyalty of the vast majority of American Jews who support Israel, have brought disgrace and distress to our people,

"Be it resolved that the Rabbinical Council of America go on record denouncing the activities of the American Council for Judaism and dissociating them from the religious community of Israel. The American Council for Judaism is in no wise to be considered a religious Jewish group."

The Rabbinical Assembly of America, representing the Conservative Rabbinate in the United States:

"The Rabbinical Assembly of America repudiates the attempt of a small group of Jews, represented in the American Council for Judaism, to confuse the American public and Government as to the sympathies of the overwhelming majority of Jews in this country towards Israel . . . We feel it our duty to caution the American public against taking seriously those who claim to represent what they do not represent.

"It is regrettable that this small group, which calls itself 'Jews by religion only' assumes the right to misinterpret the Jewish religion so as to be completely at odds with the authoritative views expressed today by the three major groups in Jewish religious belief."

The Central Conference of American Rabbis on behalf of the Reform Rabbis in the United States:

"The Central Conference of American Rabbis reaffirms its repudiation of the American Council for Judaism and declares that the latter does not represent liberal, Reform Judaism or any other valid interpretation of Judaism." The Council for Judaism "has sought to influence the United States Department of State in a policy contrary to the best interests of both the United States and the State of Israel; and it has distorted and misrepresented the nature and meaning of Judaism."

These statements by the rabbinic bodies representing all the religious groupings of Jews in America are directed at an organization founded late in 1943 for the seemingly innocent purpose of "affirming the exclusively religious nature of Judaism." Any student of Jewish history and tradition can refute this point of view as an excessively narrow definition of Jewish reality without theological foundation. But why has the American Council for Judaism been repudiated so strongly by every respectable element in Judaism? Why has the activity of this infinitesimal fringe group, representing less than one half of one percent of American Jews, according to their own account, aroused such a tempest of indignation?

To understand the strong sentiment against the American Council for Judaism, it is necessary to know something about its history and activities from the time of its inception. At that time Hitler's plans for the extermination of the Jews of Europe had moved forward apace. Jews, fleeing for their lives, were pounding at the gates of the world and only a fortunate few found sanctuary. The Evian Conference of 32 nations, convened by President Roosevelt in 1938, to consider resettlement opportunities for those whose lives were in peril was a complete fiasco in terms of persuading countries to relax their immigration laws. And, for all practical purposes, the spirit of that conference persisted through the war.

Leaky refugee ships moved from port to port, without haven. Jews were being herded together in extermination camps. Every Jew who remained in Europe was marked for death. The one refuge to which the Jews could lay claim on historical grounds, on the basis of the Balfour Declaration and the stipulation contained in the League of Nations Mandate, was Palestine.

[From the American Examiner, July 25, 1963]

THE NEW YORK BOARD'S EVALUATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM'S PROGRAM, PLATFORM—PART 2

OPPOSITION TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

It as at that point in time, December 1942, that the American Council for Judaism was founded. In a declaration of principle issued in 1943 it proclaimed its primary political program: "We oppose the effort to establish a National Jewish State in Palestine or anywhere else as a philosophy of defeatism and one which does not offer a practical solution of the Jewish problem. We dissent from all those related doctrines that stress the racialism, the nationalism and the theoretical homelessness of Jews. We oppose such doctrines as inimical to the welfare of Jews in Palestine, in America, or wherever Jews may dwell."

In this way, a privileged handful of Jews, dwelling securely in America, sought to destroy the one hope of their brothers dwelling in the valley of the shadow of death.

By 1944, the whole world was becoming aware of the position of the Jewish remnant in Europe. The House and Senate reaffirmed a resolution passed in 1922 calling for the establishment in Palestine of a refuge and home for harassed Jews. In April 1946, the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry recommended the immediate admission to Palestine of 100,000 Jews and, as the mandatory power procrastinated, survivors sought to make their way independently to Palestine.

OPPOSITION TO JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO PALESTINE

The American Council for Judaism directed a letter to President Truman on May 14, 1946, stating: "We declare and affirm that any immigrant Jew who enters Palestine contrary to its law is an illegal immigrant."

At that point, Dr. Louis Wolsey of Philadelphia, first provisional president of the American Council for Judaism, withdrew from the organization, stating in the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent: "I very definitely believe in freedom of immigration and the unqualified right of the Jew to migrate to Palestine if he wishes, and to make it possible for him to settle there. Because of this I find it intellectually dishonest for me to retain the position of vice president of the American Council for Judaism any longer."

While Rabbi Wolsey opposed Jewish nationalism because he yearned for the ultimate disappearance of all nationalism, it became clear to him that the efforts of the American Council for Judaism were directed only against the attempts of the pathetic survivors of Hitler to find a home in Palestine.

In February 1947, the United Nations was informed by the British Government that it would relinquish the mandate the following year. A special U.N. session was called and an 11-nation U.N. Special Committee on Palestine was appointed to review the situation and recommend a solution. It handed down a majority report calling for parition of the country into separate Arab and Jewish States. On November 29, 1947, this recommendation was accepted by a two-thirds vote of the U.N. General Assembly. The U.N. partition decision was sharply criticized by the Council for Judaism for creating what Mr. Lessing Rosenwald, its president, termed

"another self-imposed ghetto." Writing in the March 13, 1948, issue of Collier's, Rosenwald declared that a homeland "is the last thing that the Jews themselves want."

From this brief history we can begin to understand the revulsion of American Jews and of the responsible Jewish leadership to the program and tactics of the American Council for Judaism. No ideological innovation could have aroused such a powerful and united reaction of opposition. This universal reaction came because American Jewry realized that the action of the Council for Judaism struck at the life of the Jewish people itself. At the moment of greatest tragedy, in a history that goes back 4,000 years, the American Council for Judaism did its utmost to prevent the United Nations, the American Government, the Jews of America and the 650,000 Jews in Palestine, from establishing a refuge and a home in Palestine for the remnant fleeing the Nazi holocaust.

It is not unfair to assume that had the American Council for Judaism succeeded, many of the Jews now alive and free in Israel, might have perished. Life is the most precious of Jewish values. He who saves a single life, says the tradition, is as though he had preserved the entire world.

OPPOSITION AFTER ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, the American Council for Judaism has been engaged primarily, as from the beginning, in an intensive program of political and propaganda activities whose purpose is to cut off American Jewish support for Israel and to influence the U.S. Government in a policy contrary to the best interests of Israel, and we believe, of the United States and world peace.

The program has aspects whose validity and practical implications we will examine:

1. Propagating an exclusively religious definition of Judaism which distorts and misrepresents its historic character.

2. Charging the overwhelming majority of American Jews with dual loyalty because they show concern for their surviving brothers in Israel. In the opinion of all Jewish community relations organizations, the American Council for Judaism utterances project an unfavorable image of Jews, which lend themselves to exploitation by hate groups and Arab propagandists.

3. Obstructing the lifesaving work of the United Jewish Appeal, which has rescued over a million-and-a-half Jews in the past 25 years, and helped twice that number to rebuild their lives.

4. Continuing a program of political action, under the cloak of religious ideology, in an effort to influence negatively U.S. policy toward Israel and block Jewish immigration to Israel, the one country willing to accept Jews fleeing Arab and Iron Curtain countries in large numbers.

Only $18,525 out of its total budget of $406,500 was allocated to religious education in the published budget for 1962, the rest to anti-Zionist and anti-Israel propaganda.

Zionism and Americanism

No one would question the right of the American Council for Judaism to propagate its erroneous interpretation of Judaism, though it does not speak for the religious community. What is deeply resented, however, are its past efforts to block the establishment of Israel, immigration of Jews to Israel, and its continuing campaign against the raising of funds for the settlement of immigrants in Israel through the United Jewish Appeal. What is most unconscionable are the aspersions cast upon the patriotism of American Zionists and friends of Israel, constituting virtually all of American Jewry.

Jews have felt at home in America as in no other country during their 2,000 years of dispersion. American Jews give their Government their unqualified loyalty, in peace and in war. It is not only that America secured their lives and their rights. The cherished ideals of America are those to which the Jew can answer a fervent amen. Americanism like Judaism is based on Biblical foundations. America has never asked Jews to deny their background or their faith nor to dam up the springs of love and compassion for their fellow Jews in lands of darkness and persecution or in the new land of Israel.

ACCUSES U.S. JEWS OF DUAL LOYALTIES

American Jews were accused of "dual loyalty" by Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive vice president of the American Council for Judaism, in a pamphlet entitled "Four Articles on the Law of Return."

"The thesis of the American Council for Judaism," wrote Rabbi Berger, "is that the Zionist-Israel axis imposes upon Jews outside of Israel, Americans of Jewish faith included, a status of double nationality."

WHAT IS THE LAW OF RETURN?

In truth, the law of return is an unprecedented humanitarian law enacted by the State of Israel offering automatic citizenship to any Jew who needs or wishes to settle there. Under this law, Israel has taken in over a million Jews—including the lame, the sick, and the aged—discharging its historic responsibility and fulfilling the expectations of the United Nations which voted for its establishment.

Lessing Rosenwald went even further, accusing the U.S. State Department of confirming this status of double nationality for American Jews. At the 10th annual conference of the American Council for Judaism which met in San Francisco in May 1953, Mr. Rosenwald asserted:

"Our Department of State has placed its American Jewish citizens in a category of Americans subject to 'dual nationality' and made them subject to 'dual nationality' regulations in connection with visits to Israel."

The most recent development of this argument introduces a new twist. Prof. W. T. Mallison addressed the 1962 convention of the American Council for Judaism in Chicago where a chapter of the brief he helped to prepare for submission to the State Department was distributed. Mallison states that it is the legal obligation of the American Government to prevent Israel from granting automatic citizenship to Jews who wish to settle in Israel in order to protect the citizenship status of American Jews.

NO BASIS FOR ACJ CHARGES

One need not be a jurist to recognize that it is impossible for Israel, unilaterally, to change the status of American Jews whose rights are defined and protected by the laws and courts of the United States. Judge H. G. Hershenson of Chicago promptly made this point saying:

"There is no basis in law for statements issued by spokesmen for the American Council for Judaism here in Chicago that alleged actions by Zionists and Israelis jeopardize the status and rights of American citizens of the Jewish faith which are secured by the Constitution and the laws of our country.

"American Jews give their exclusive loyalty to America as Israelis give theirs to Israel. The relationship between Jews in America and Jews in Israel is a voluntary one; it is rooted in love and faith and historic tradition and motivated by a shared compassion for Jews who need Israel as a haven and a home."

The Decalogue Society of Lawyers, an association of 1,600 Jewish lawyers in Chicago, said "The loyalty of American Jews to the United States has been repeatedly demonstrated. Jews who have aided Israel have done so from a humanitarian point of view to aid a struggling democracy, just as other Americans throughout our history aided freedom in other parts of the world. Such help is in keeping with the time-honored tradition of America and is not repugnant to American ideals."

JUSTICE BRANDEIS ON DUAL LOYALTY

The clearest rejoinder to the accusation of "dual loyalties" was made 40 years ago by the late Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, in an address to the Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis:

"Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his State, and of his city; for being loyal to his family and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish-American who contributed toward advancing home rule was a better man and a better American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlements in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendents will ever live there, will likewise be a better American for doing so."

Justices Brandeis, Cardozo, Frankfurter, and Goldberg—each of the four Jews appointed to the Supreme Court—have been warm friends, if not leaders, of Zionism.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 1, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM: IN PURSUIT OF ITS GOALS, THE COUNCIL MAINTAINS A CLOSE LIAISON WITH ISRAEL'S FOE—ITS STATEMENTS ARE QUOTED WITH APPROVAL BY ANTI-SEMITIC FORCES—PART 3

THE CHRISTIAN REPLY TO THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM

The council also approaches Christian personalities in the United States with the view of dissuading them from helping Israel or Zionism, on the grounds that "a number of Jewish people do not endorse the idea of allegiance to Israel which is part of the Zionist creed." The council had written in this vein to the then Governor McKeldin of Maryland who had urged Americans to purchase Israel bonds.

The Governor replied: "Your reaction excites in me nothing short of amazement. Suffice to say that Zionism as universally understood does not call for political allegiance from American citizens to the Government of Israel. I have never heard it suggested that Americans who purchased British or Argentine or Peruvian bonds created any problems of allegiance. The concern you express over the danger of a split allegiance is excessive and unwholesome, and misconstrues the requirements of true allegiance to the United States and its ideals."

Among others who rejected the American Council for Judaism line of reasoning were Dr. Coert Rylaarsdam of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, who wrote: "I am a Christian who has been an outspoken friend and supporter of the Zionist movement. I do not believe that the American loyalty of a Jew is compromised by the existence of the State of Israel, nor do I believe that it destroys the universality of the faith he professes. I am not persuaded that your council is rendering either Judaism or America a positive service. I rather feel that you are an embarrassment to Judaism and fail to appreciate the great civilizing and critical function which is the historic mission and heritage of Israel."

The Reverend Dr. John Haynes Holmes replied in this fashion: "I would adjure the Council for Judaism, and frightened souls generally, not to be alarmed. Zion has added a new chapter to the history of human freedom. It is to the greater glory of America, that, through her Jewish citizens, she has been allowed to make a contribution to the triumph of Zion's cause, just as it was glorious that, through her Irish citizens in former days, she was privileged to play a part in the heroic drama of Ireland's deliverance."

Over the years, thousands of Christian leaders throughout the Nation, including leaders in government and public affairs, have voiced similar sentiments and have seen only the fullest consonance between Zionism and America's interests. President Kennedy, in a message to the 1962 convention of the Zionist Organization of America, said: "This Nation, from the time of President Wilson, has established and continued a tradition of friendship with Israel because we are committed to all free societies that seek a path to peace, honor, and individual right. * * * In the prophetic spirit of Zionism all freemen today look to a better world and in the experience of Zionism we know that it takes courage and perseverance and dedication to achieve it. Toward this larger and greater adventure for all mankind, your energies are now summoned."

CULTURAL PLURALISM

The richness and variety of American culture results from the fact that it is made up of the contributions of many diverse cultural and ethnic groups. America does not ask us to give up our heritage, for this would be a disservice, but rather to contribute its value to America, thereby enriching the fabric of American life. Modern anthropologists reject the idea of the melting pot and prefer to think of American culture as a symphony in which diverse tones blend in glorious harmony.

JEWISH MILITARY CHAPLAINS SPEAK OUT

The Jewish military chaplains in World War II, in whose ranks Rabbi Elmer Berger of the American Council for Judaism failed to serve, stated: "In view of the defamatory statements and innuendoes made repeatedly by responsible representatives of the American Council for Judaism, impugning the patriotism of American Zionists, we the undersigned rabbis, serving as chaplains in the Armed Forces of our Nation, register our deep resentment and disapproval of such reckless and un-American allegations.

"Of the 305 surviving chaplains of the Jewish faith who responded unhesitatingly to the call of our country in its hour of need, 228 have already identified themselves with Zionism, with replies expected from many still overseas. For anyone to insinuate that Zionism tends to diminish the full measure of devotion of these 228 rabbis to America is the height of impudence.

"Such an accusation comes with particularly bad grace from an organization which numbers amongst its leadership men who did not respond to the call of the responsible Jewish commission to serve in the chaplaincy."

The council's political program and its consequences

The council carries on an intensive political and public relations program designed to weaken the State of Israel: (1) by frightening American Jews into the belief that their support of Israel will be suspect, hoping thus to reduce contributions for the absorption of Jewish refugees, and investment funds for the upbuilding of the country; (2) by attempting to drive a wedge between American Jewry and Israel so as to limit both moral support for Israel as well as cut off any spiritual and cultural kinship; and (3) by efforts to discredit American Jewry in the eyes of the non-Jewish community.

While a portion of the council's campaign is geared to some in the higher income brackets in the Jewish community, its major effort is directed to public officials, the communications media, Christian clergymen, and the academic community. In the pursuit of its goals, the council carries on a close liaison with the enemies of Israel, and its pronouncements and utterances are frequently quoted, with approval, in the anti-Semitic press. Posing as a religious organization, it is able to carry on these activities under a tax-exempt status.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS GROUPS EVALUATE ACJ PROGRAM

The major community relations agencies of the U.S. Jewish community, all of them non-Zionist, have all been highly critical of the council's program and activities. The American Jewish committee, after subjecting the activities of the council to sober, scientific analysis, came to the conclusion that "it is determined to discourage and oppose those approaches and procedures, that, far from accomplishing what is intended, project an image of the American Jew as one possessing frail and tenuous ties to his America. * * * The methods of the Council for Judaism do not serve the best interests of American Jews."

"The council publicity is replete with symbols that may well serve to crystallize certain sterotypes of the Jew," says the committee. Council literature contains frequent references to the "international Zionist conspiracy," "Zionist control of press and communications," "Zionist financial power," etc. These phrases, reminiscent of those to be found in the Protocal of the Elders of Zion and other hate propaganda, spill over to the entire Jewish population in the United States and tend to confirm anti-Semitic stereotypes.

They are applied not only to Zionist affiliates but to philanthropic supporters of the United Jewish Appeal, and most American Jews who feel positively toward Israel. The anti-Semites are quick to exploit such statements which corroborate their point of view because they emanate from a Jewish source, "regarded as all the more trustworthy."

Thus, says the committee, "the image of communism blends with that of Zionism, sharpening the picture that anti-Semites have been painting for years by using 'Zionism' as a euphemism for Jew and Judaism, and also working in the red streak of communism * * * The council provides fodder for anti-Semites. Their characterizations of the Zionists are seized upon to authenticate, ratify, and justify already existing hostile attitudes toward Jews in general."

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Congress have reached the same conclusion, as have all the constitutent organizations of the National Community Relations Advisory Council.

Says the NCRAC: "Such organizations as the Council for Judaism appear to have accepted and integrated into their own propaganda some of the most extreme and dangerous falsehoods and distortions put forth by the Arab propaganda apparatus." (The ADL has already documented the fact that Arab propagandists in this country, acting on orders from their home ministries, are helping to foster a new growth of anti-Semitism.)

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 8, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—THE POPULARITY OF THE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM WITH AMERICA'S LUNATIC FRINGE IS NO ACCIDENT, SINCE IT ZEALOUSLY PUSHES THE HATE GROUPS' PROPAGANDA—PART 4

"JEWS CONTROL THE PRESS," SAYS AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM

Rabbi Elmer Berger and the executive director of the council, Leonard Sussman, have recently reiterated the myth of Jewish control of the press in trade magazines such as "Editor and Publisher" (Oct. 20, 1962) and before gatherings of public relations people and journalists.

In an address titled "Ten Commandments for the Mass Media," carried by the wire services, Rabbi Berger renewed the allegation of Jewish domination of mass communication which is also given wide currency by Arab spokesmen. Parenthetically, despite the council's complaints about Zionist domination of the press, the Council for Judaism has managed to receive press notices out of all proportion to its small membership.

BLAMES JEWISH PERSECUTION ON ZIONIST CONSPIRACY

On numerous occasions, the council spokesmen have attributed Jewish insecurity and suffering in many parts of the world—such as the Soviet Union, north Africa, and parts of Latin America—not to any indigenous factors, but rather to an ubiquitous and powerful Zionist conspiracy which, they insinuate, either brings on or fabricates the situation. Castroism, neonazism, and threatening revolutionary rumbling in various parts of the world which menace Jewish security are never blamed on Communists, Fascist, or indigenous poverty or other factors; they are always attributed to the Zionist conspiracy.

One is at a loss to understand why the American Council for Judaism is so anxious to exonerate Communists, Arab nationalist extremists, and Fascist hooligans in order to blame Jews, an allegation that defies credibility while it reinforces the myth of international power.

One would have expected that the leaders of the Council for Judaism, as Jews, would have spoken up in defense of the right of Soviet Jews to practice their religion. Our State Department recently expressed strong disapproval over continuing Soviet restrictions on religious freedom, and said:

"In the case of Jews, these pressures are such as to prevent the normal maintenance and development of Jewish religious and cultural life." Firm voices of protest on this issue have also been raised by prominent Americans of all faiths. But the Council for Judaism remains silent on this subject.

Who more than an organization "for Judaism," claiming to believe in the universality of Judaism's teachings, should be concerned with the free practice of Judaism by Jews throughout the world? Yet, as recently as April 19, 1963, the council's executive director, Leonard Sussman, declared: "The council has never taken a position on the status of the Jews in the Soviet Union."

THE COUNCIL AND THE HATE GROUPS

It is quite evident that Arab propagandists with the aid of their anti-Jewish supporters are attempting to isolate the Jews of America from their fellow citizens, and in this effort the Council for Judaism becomes alined, regardless of motivation. Indeed, the anti-Semites applaud the council. The following citations serve as illustrations:

GERALD L. K. SMITH: "TAKE BERGER'S ADVICE"

Gerald L. K. Smith, probably the most vicious anti-Semitic demagog in the country, said: "If the Jews of America are wise, they will take the advice of Rabbi Elmer Berger, who some months ago said: 'It is time for the American Jew to realize that he must be an American first and a Jew second.'"

Smith, who in the report of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion (Department of Illinois) as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1951, has been described as "a threat to American unity," also singled out Berger for commendation in an article entitled "The Super-Ghetto," which appeared in the February 1952 issue of the Cross and the Flag: "The superghetto of all time is now being built," he asserted. "It is the Jew-Palestine state being built by and for Jews exclusively. Rabbi Berger, who is an anti-Zionist Jew, insists that the racketeers among Jews are deliberately inspiring anti-Semitism in order that Jews be scared into this superghetto which they erroneously call Israel."

Picking up the dual loyalties issue—a key theme in the council's propaganda arsenal—Jack B. Tenney, collaborator of Smith, in a pamphlet entitled "Zionist Network: A Tenney Report," writes: "Among the hundreds of American Jewish organizations flourishing in

the United States today, only one stands out clearly as basically American."

HART: "OUR ATTITUDE IS PRACTICALLY IDENTICAL"

A hatemonger whose views coincided with those of the Council for Judaism was the late Merwin K. Hart, editor of the "Economic Council Letter," a man who, the American Legion (see above) has stated, "injects anti-Semitism into his newsletters * * * by hammering against a so-called Zionist menace and a plot to destroy the Christian religion * * *." How closely Hart's outlook paralleled that of the American Council for Judaism is evident from a statement in the February 18, 1950, issue of his Letter:

"As a matter of fact, our attitude toward Zionists is practically identical with that of the American Council for Judaism under the leadership of Mr. Lessing Rosenwald."

BERGER AND ROSENWALDS: "LOYAL AMERICANS"

The late Conde McGinley, editor of "Common Sense," probably the most widely circulated anti-Semitic sheet in the United States, was also impressed with the work of the American Council for Judaism. In the February 15, 1951, issue of his publication, McGinley printed two lists of names. One list he entitled "Dupes for Zionists." It contains among others, the names of Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, John Foster Dulles, Admiral Chester Nimitz, Robert Patterson, Gen. George Marshall, Thomas E. Dewey, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Charles E. Wilson, and other American leaders. Directly beneath it is a list entitled "Loyal Americans." This list includes the names of Lessing Rosenwald and Elmer Berger.

The popularity of the American Council for Judaism with the lunatic fringe is not an accident. The judgment of the American Jewish Committee, the ADL, and others, is correct. The statements of the Council for Judaism reinforce false stereotypes of the Jew and project an image of the Jew as disloyal to America. By so doing, the council furthers the propaganda line of the hate groups.

THE COUNCIL AND THE ARAB PROPAGANDISTS

We shall not dwell here on the political issues which divide Israel and the Arab states. Conceivably, fairminded Americans could well take positions on different sides of the fence with regard to some of the issues involved. But is it not of special significance that the Council for Judaism has in every instance supported the Arab position against Israel, even on those issues where there is overwhelming American sympathy for Israel's case?

The council approves the Arab effort to cut off American financial support for Israel, and it justifies the Arab boycott of American firms who deal with Israel or who employ Jews. It has even failed to speak up against the closing of the Suez Canal to ships bound for Israel, despite a U.N. resolution calling for such action.

Over the years, Berger has expressed views strikingly similar to those voiced by Arab representatives to the United States and the U.N.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 15, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—THE COUNCIL HAS NOT ONLY DISASSOCIATED ITSELF FROM UJA'S HUMANITARIAN, COMPASSIONATE WORK OF RESCUE, REHABILITATION BUT SEEKS TO WEAKEN AND DISCREDIT IT—PART 5

The council maintains a continuing liaison with Arab officials in this country to whom they taught the efficacy of the use of the dual loyalties argument. This liaison has reached the point where the Council's speakers are frequently recommended by the Arab Office of Information to address various groups and a Council for Judaism speaker has been used as a substitute for an Arab speaker when the Arabs, for one reason or another, were unable to fill the engagement.

It is also a matter of demonstrable knowledge that a letter from the American Council for Judaism, addressed to official representatives of Arab governments, makes it possible for an American Jew who would otherwise be barred from an Arab country, to enter that country.

The Arabs themselves, and for very good reason, consider the American Council for Judaism an ally. The May 1956 issue of the "Middle East Forum," an anti-Israel publication of the alumni of the American University of Beirut, carries an article entitled "Who Speaks for Arabs?" Among those listed are the Arab Information Center, the American Friends of the Middle East, the National Association of Federation of Syrian-Lebanese-American Clubs, and—the American Council for Judaism. The article is illustrated by a cartoon of these four groups attempting to alert sleeping Uncle Sam to the dangers of Zionism.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM AND AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Rabbi Elmer Berger is a member of the board of directors and a prime mover in the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME), an organization openly identified with the Arab point of view. Representatives of Arab governments speak frequently on AFME platforms, and AFME maintains offices in all Arab Middle East countries, but not in Israel.

* * * * *

As Garland Evans Hopkins, former executive vice president of AFME has stated: "No American can 'wage peace' in the Middle East as long as our policy is largely influenced by a small minority whose primary concern is the best interest of a foreign government." AFME supports the Arab point of view 100 percent in all areas of controversy between Israel and the Arab States.

BERGER BRIEFS ARAB STUDENTS ON HOW TO COMBAT ZIONISM

On January 15, 1963, Rabbi Berger addressed the Organization of Arab Students at Earl Hall, Columbia University, saying, "Zionism is now a sovereign state claiming sovereignty over a disputed territory." Fifteen years after the U.N. decision and the establishment of the Jewish state by world community, Rabbi Berger refuses to recognize its right to exist, thus concurring with the Arab States who plan to destroy it.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM FOUNDER REPUDIATES AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM CAMPAIGN AGAINST ISRAEL

Rabbi Irving Reichert, a founder of the council, in resigning from that organization, was quoted in the New York Times of July 22, 1956: "(The council should halt) its obstructionist campaign against the welfare and legitimate aspirations of Israel and its people."

THE COUNCIL AND THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

The full horror of Germany's final solution to the Jewish problem was documented at the historic Eichmann trial. It will long be debated whether the free world, during those terrible days, did all that was humanly possible to save as many Jews as might have been saved. But this much is certain: the American Jewish community can point proudly to the magnificent work of the United Jewish Appeal as proof that it was willing to give heroically so that others might live.

One tiny but affluent segment of the American Jewish population has not only disassociated itself from this work of rescue and rehabilitation but has sought to weaken and discredit it. That group is the American Council for Judaism.

Is it because it still refuses to recognize the validity and necessity for a State of Israel, hoping to weaken it for the day of the anticipated Arab onslaught? Or is it because the council's leaders wish to disassociate themselves, on racial grounds, from their less fortunate brethren who have settled in Israel? Mr. Monroe Deutsch, an honorary vice president of the council, speaking of Israel at the organization's 10th annual conference (1953), said: "We would not feel at home in a community made up in large part of orientals and of those who are directly from Slavic lands."

ACJ AND ITS PHILANTHROPIC FUND

Sensitive to criticism on grounds of their lack of charity, the wealthy members of the Council for Judaism have, in recent years, founded a Philanthropic Fund which has disbursed relatively small amounts. Its supporters have figuratively given pennies where UJA supporters of similar economic status have given thousands.

In a fundraising letter dated February 28, 1963, circulated to its membership, the ACJ stated that it hoped to raise close to $100,000 for the relief of North African Jewish refugees in France. The Joint Distribution Committee, which is supported by the UJA, expects to allocate a total of $5 million in 1963 for the same purpose. The total fundraising goal of the ACJ Philanthropic Fund for 1963 was set at $250,000, as against a goal of $96 million set by the United Jewish Appeal.

While the amount of money raised by the Philanthropic Fund is relatively insignificant, its campaign has served as the occasion for renewed attacks upon the United Jewish Appeal and energetic efforts to dissuade American Jews from giving to the UJA.

THE ATTACK ON THE UJA

The main thrust of the ACJ attack upon UJA is twofold. It maintains that UJA money is used for political rather than for philanthropic purposes and that UJA discriminates against Jews who elect to go to countries other than Israel.

The United Jewish Appeal, whose leaders and supporters include such outstanding American Jews as Senator Herbert Lehman, Justice Arthur Goldberg, Senator Jacob Javits, Mr. William Rosenwald, Mr. Edward Warburg, and Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, has stated unequivocally that its funds go only for philanthropic purposes. Yet the ACJ continues blithely to repeat the charges.

Every U.S. President has publicly endorsed the work of the UJA: Most recently, President Kennedy sent his congratulations to the UJA on its 25th anniversary, saying: "In the continuing effort to fulfill its primary aims of rescue, relief, and rehabilitation, the UJA is adhering to the finest humanitarian traditions of our country. I understand that during the UJA's quarter century of operations its funds have been utilized to rescue more than one and a half million persons and provide direct relief and rehabilitation for more than twice that number. This is an impressive record."

The beneficiaries of the UJA funds are:

(a) The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee which has a program of relief and rehabilitation in 27 countries other than Israel and which conducts the Malben program in behalf of the sick, the handicapped and the aged refugees in Israel.

The JDC, with its nearly 50 years' distinguished record of humanitarian service, receives one-third of the proceeds of the United Jewish Appeal.

ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) receives one-third of its global budget for support of its network of vocational schools from the JDC. These schools are located in many countries.

(b) The United Israel Appeal/Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., which finances an extensive program of immigrant absorption and rehabilitation in Israel, including housing, agricultural settlement, social services, youth care and training, etc. The Jewish

Agency for Israel, Inc., is an American corporation on whose board serve some of the outstanding leaders in Jewish communities around the country.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 22, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—"WE CONSIDER IT OUR DUTY TO STATE THAT THE TOTAL ORGANIZED JEWISH COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES HAS REJECTED THE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM AND ALL THAT IT STANDS FOR"—PART 6

The third beneficiary of United Jewish Appeal (UJA) funds is the New York Association for New Americans, which gives vital assistance to indigent Jewish refugees who settle in the New York metropolitan area. The entire budget of this organization is covered by the UJA.

In addition to the foregoing, the UJA supplements the regular budget of the United HIAS Service for the resettlement of refugees in countries other than Israel.

The funds of the UJA are available (through JDC, NYANA, and UHIAS) to needy Jews who choose to go to countries other than Israel, no less than they are to Jews who migrate to Israel. Indeed, the responsible leadership of American Jewry, the same leadership which has given unstinting support to the UJA, has been prominent in the struggle for the liberalization of U.S. immigration. United HIAS, a UJA-supported agency, has worked consistently to open up immigration opportunities in other countries.

The UJA spends more money on Jews settling in Israel than it does for Jews settling in other countries, simply because immigration restrictions in Western countries are such that Israel is the only country to which Jews, in search of a haven, can go regardless of numbers, health or the financial capacity to support themselves.

More money is needed to provide a home and a job for a settler in the new country of Israel because it is frequently necessary to build the home and create the job. Moreover, a new immigrant in the United States, for example, is frequently aided by the welfare agencies of the local community.

Since 1948, UJA funds have been used to resettle approximately 1,100,000 Jews in Israel and approximately 400,000 in other countries.

OTHER ASSAULTS ON THE UJA

In its desperate and, on the whole, unsuccessful attempt to discourage giving to the UJA, the Council for Judaism has additionally sought to give the impression (1) that the UJA has stood in danger of losing its tax exempt status; (2) that helping Jews to settle in Israel promotes tension in the Middle East and is detrimental to American interests there; and (3) that Israel's policy of the "ingathering of exiles," which the UJA furthers by helping to finance the migration of Jewish refugees to Israel, jeopardizes the position of the Jews of the United States and of the Jews in all the countries where they live.

There is not a scintilla of truth in any of these charges.

KENNEDY REBUFFS THE ACJ

Many Americans are becoming increasingly concerned over the harmful effects of the ACJ program. On the eve of the 20th annual conference of the Council for Judaism held in May, 1963, ACJ leaders had solicited a message of greeting from President Kennedy. But the White House, taking into consideration recent extremist activities of that organization, viewed as harmful to American-Israel relations—and noting charges by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States that the Council had sought to "whitewash" Soviet anti-Semitism—decided to abstain from sending the customary greetings to the ACJ conference.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY SPEAKS—A SPECIAL WORD TO THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

While the objectives and minute following of the Council for Judaism are well known in most Jewish circles, it is entirely possible that our Christian friends could easily be misled as to the authenticity of that body as a Jewish "religious" group and that Christians could also be misled into thinking that the Council represents a significant segment of American Jews. Such impressions could understandably be reached as a result of the Council's aggressive publicity campaign and its attractively produced informational materials which are given the widest circulation, particularly in Christian circles.

The New York Board of Rabbis, therefore, considers it useful to enlighten those who may be laboring under any such misconception. We consider it our duty, therefore, to inform the reader on these matters so that the uninformed will come to know that the total organized Jewish community in the United States has rejected the Council for Judaism and all that it stands for.

In previous sections of this study we quoted the findings and reactions of many Jewish organizations. We cite here some additional pertinent statements relevant to this subject, some of which have been made as recently as the past few months.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE

Soon after the formation of the council and its announced objectives, the American Jewish Conference, the most representative organ of Jews ever to be established in the United States, combining both Zionist and non-Zionist bodies, denounced the Council for Judaism as a disruptive force and "repudiated the council's attempt to sabotage the collective Jewish will." The conference represented 65 national Jewish organizations as well as scores of local Jewish communities who sent delegates who were democratically elected to serve. Among the 65 national organizations were the following:

American Association for Jewish Education, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Free Sons of Israel, Hadassah, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish National Workers Alliance, Jewish War Veterans, National Council for Jewish Education, National Council of Young Israel, Rabbinical Assembly of America, Rabbinical Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, United Synagogue of America, Zionist Organization of America.

[From the American Examiner, Aug. 29, 1963]

THE RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—"THE CARAVAN OF THE BUILDERS MOVED ON," DR. SILVER OBSERVED OF THE COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM'S INSIDIOUS PROPAGANDA—"BUT THE DOGS ARE STILL BARKING"—PART 7

In previous sections of this study we quoted the findings of many Jewish organizations. We cite here some additional pertinent statements relevant to this subject:

Prof. Albert Einstein: "The American Council for Judaism is a fairly exact copy of the Zentralverein Deutscher Staatsburg Juedischen Glaubens (Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith) of unhappy memory, which in the days of our crucial need showed itself utterly impotent, and coroded the Jewish group by undermining that inner certitude by which our people could have overcome the trials of this difficult age."

Dr. Stephen S. Wise: "The American Council for Judaism has made an attempt to divide Jews between faith and people. Faith and people are not two different and separable factors. We are not going to accept a new Torah from a group of men who come to us with the readiness to destroy the democratic character and conduct of the people of Israel."

Dr. Abba Hillel Silver: "These (ACJ) Jews did everything in their power to prevent the establishment of the State of Israel. They put every conceivable stumbling block in the way. They joined forces with the enemies of Israel not of our faith. They knocked on every door to inform against their own people. Though they were themselves religiously indifferent, they suddenly discovered, as a shrewd part of their strategy, a vast devotion to abstract Judaism, under that cloak, as a council for Judaism, they proceeded to spread their insidious political propaganda. They lost out. The caravan of the builders moved on but the dogs are still barking."

Rabbi Robert Gordis, of the Jewish Theological Seminary, prominent leader in conservative Judaism: "The American Council for Judaism is not American, for it contravenes the basic principles of American democracy. Nor is the council dedicated to the cause of Judaism, for it betrays those instincts, those ideals and aspirations which have been flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone for 3,000 years."

Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein, prominent leader in orthodox Judaism: "By divorcing ourselves from this group, by denouncing its statements, by administering a forceful and effective rebuke that will be understood by Jews and non-Jews, we affirm that these men, by their statements, have placed themselves outside the pale and camp of Israel."

The Reverend Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress, said recently: "The American Council for Judaism speaks for only a small band of people whose aims are destructive, whose methods are deplorable. It would seek to deprive hundreds of thousands of American Jews of their basic right to espouse a cause which is consonant with our American democratic way of life. Its target is the negation of support for Israel on the part of Americans who feel a spiritual and cultural affinity with Israel.

"The American Council for Judaism, with its inadequate grasp both of Americanism and Judaism distorts the meaning of Zionism and the nature of Zionist devotion. It seeks to cast suspicion on fellow Jews, and even, despite pious protestations of humanitarianism, seeks to undermine the United Jewish Appeal, source of blessing and life for millions of hapless Jews throughout the world. As president of the American Jewish Congress, an organization which defends the rights of all Americans whose civil liberties are threatened, I condemn and repudiate everything for which the American Council for Judaism stands."

Mr. Label Katz, president of the B'nai B'rith Organization, in a recent statement: "The American Council for Judaism, representing an infinitesimal segment of Jews—more political than religious in their concerns—has, through its activities and pronouncements, wrought considerable harm in the area of community relations by projecting an inaccurate stereotype of the Jew as disloyal to America, merely because Jews have demonstrated a legitimate, humanitarian and spiritual concern for the State of Israel and its inhabitants.

"While we would not deny this group its right to speak, it should be known that it does not speak for any sizable segment of the Jewish community, and what it says manifests not only a distortion of the Jewish tradition, but exhibits a lack of understanding of the pluralistic, democratic nature of our American society."

Mr. Lewis H. Weinstein, chairman of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, in a 1963 statement, reaffirmed the position of the NCRAC taken originally in 1950 which "condemned the council for Judaism for its unfounded charges and in-

nuendoes on the loyalty of American Jews. Such charges are shared only by the professional anti-Semites who seize upon any pretext for fulminating against Jews. The baseless slurs of the council violate every principle of truth and decency." He further stated:

"The views expressed in 1950, as those of the overwhelming majority of American Jews, have been frequently reaffirmed during the past 13 years, and are more strongly held today than ever before."

THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS SPEAKS

"The Jewish War Veterans condemns the actions of the American Council for Judaism in supporting, aiding and abetting the Soviet-Arab ambitions, and points out that the council is acting as the instrument of the Arab bloc, and that it be revealed as a threat to the security and defense of the United States. We invite all loyal Americans of the Jewish faith to aid in negating the dangerous practices of the council and to join us in eliminating this hazard to our national safety."

Mr. Morton London, president of the JWV, in April 1963, noted that the statements of the council were being used by the Soviet Embassy in Washington and by Communist periodicals "to minimize and obscure the true plight of Russian Jews." He further said: "It is particularly ironic that an organization which has the word 'Judaism' in its title can function so cynically as a cover for Russian anti-Semitism."

JUDAISM AND THE LOVE OF ZION

The love of Zion is a constantly reiterated theme in the classic literature of the Jewish faith. The dream of the return to Zion was never relinquished during the centuries of dispersion and martyrdom. Jeremiah advised the exiles to pray for the peace of the land in which they lived. The Talmud taught that the law of the land in which Jews live is binding upon them. In this spirit, Jews are loyal to the lands in which they dwell. While they continued to serve God and man all over the world, Jews prayed for the restoration of Zion.

Judaism teaches that the whole earth is filled with the glory of God and that He is to be praised from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. Yet, the same religion which first proclaimed the concern of the universal God for all children of men, was, not inconsistently, concerned with the fate of the people of Israel and the land of Israel.

LOVE OF ZION IN THE BIBLE

And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, "Unto thy seed will I give this land."—Genesis 12: 7.

From the dawn of Jewish history, from one end of the Bible to the other, the destiny of the people of Israel is linked with the land of Israel. It was promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their children forever. Moses died on Mount Nebo, longing to enter it. There the prophets preached their imperishable message of justice and peace for Israel and all mankind; there the Psalmist sang of his love for God and God's love for man. When the prophet threatened punishment, it was in terms of exile from the land; when he spoke words of comfort and consolation, it was in terms of return to the land; and when he dreamed of the messianic age, it was an age which would witness the return to Zion as a prelude to an era of peace and justice for all the children of men.

Who can forget Jeremiah's poignant picture of Rachel weeping for her exiled children and God's promise that they shall return from the land of the enemy. Everyone who has thrilled to the rhapsody of Zion redeemed, will remember the latter chapters of Isaiah, beginning with "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak to the heart of Jerusalem." The concluding words of Amos seem to speak to us of our time: "And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel and they shall build the waste cities and dwell in them, and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof * * * and I will plant them on their land and they shall no more be uprooted from their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God."

The centrality of Zion in Scripture is so clear that it is remarkable that any have sought to deny it.

[From the American Examiner, Sept. 5, 1963]

RABBIS' CONDEMNATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM—"WHAT IS INCOMPREHENSIBLE IN THE COUNCIL'S POSITION," SAY THE RABBIS, "IS THE FALSE CLAIM OF A CONTRADICTION BETWEEN LOVE FOR ISRAEL AND UNIVERSAL JUDAISM"—CONCLUSION

More than the Bible and the Talmud, the Siddur or prayerbook was the constant companion of the Jew through the centuries of oppression and through it he voiced his sorrow and his joy, his longings and his dreams. Three times a day, wherever he was he prayed to the God of the universe, but he turned his face toward Jerusalem. Three times a day, in the principal prayer of the liturgy, the Amidah, he asked God to sound the great shofar for his freedom and to gather up the exiled ones from the ends of the earth. In spite of the rack, the stake and the crematory, he continued to believe in the redemption of Zion.

In the grace recited when his infant child was brought into the covenant of Abraham, the Jew prayed: "Build Jerusalem, thy holy city, speedily in our days." The 13-year-old Bar Mitzvah boy in the concluding blessings chanted, "Have mercy on Zion, for it is the house of our life." Under the wedding canopy the cantor sang, "Soon may there be heard in the cities of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem, the voice of joy and gladness, the voice of groom and bride."

And when the bereaved family entered the synagogue after the week of mourning they were greeted with "May God comfort you among the other mourners of Zion and Jerusalem."

The Reform Prayer book contains Psalm 12, with its prayer for the peace of Jerusalem, and Micah 4, which proclaims, "Out of Zion shall come for the Law and the word of God from Jerusalem." A new prayer on page 68 asks God to uphold "the hands of our brothers who toil to rebuild Zion," and speaks of the eternal hope for the restoration of Zion, as a living witness to the truth of God's word which shall lead the nations to the reign of peace.

UNIVERSALISM AND PARTICULARISM IN JUDAISM

It was the prophets of Israel who first emphasized the concern of the universal God for all the children of men; yet these same prophets were passionately concerned with the fate of their people, Israel, and prophesied both their dispersion because of their sins and their ultimate ingathering to Israel and redemption. Love of Israel was not inconsistent with love of mankind either in the mind of the prophet or in the mind of God.

The universal God is not a discovery of the American Council for Judaism; it is the central principle of Judaism. Generations of believing Jews read the prophets with love, and wept over the destruction of Jerusalem and rejoiced at the promise of its restoration. Only arrogance and ignorance can describe these faithful generations of martyrs as deficient in their understanding of the universal God.

What is incomprehensible in the approach of the Council for Judaism is the baseless claim that there is a contradiction between love for Israel and universal Judaism. Neither the prophets nor their descendants felt any such conflict; they "loved God, Israel and all mankind with all their heart, all their soul, and all their might."

Some 19th century Jewish thinkers, concerned for the future of a war-ravaged world whose situation they regarded as the result of nationalism, dreamed of a world made one under God in which nations, as such, would disappear. And there has always been a small band of Jews, with less exalted motives, who felt that the Zionist element in Jewish tradition might not constitute good public relations in the countries where they had so recently acquired citizenship. Others who were captivated by Isaiah's vision of a world without war, failed to grasp its full meaning. A close reading reveals that Isaiah, who was an intense patriot, saw a continuing role for the people of Israel in the land of Israel, even in the end of days.

"The word that Isaiah the son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. 'And it shall come to pass in the end of days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established as the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills';

"And all nations shall flow unto it.

"And many peoples shall go and say:

" 'Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.

"To the house of God of Jacob;

"And He will teach us of His ways,

"And we will walk in His paths.'

"For out of Zion shall go forth the law,

"And the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And He shall judge between the nations,

"And shall decide for many peoples;

"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,

"And their spears into pruning hooks;

"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,

"Neither shall they learn war anymore"—Isaiah 2:1–4.

Many noted scholars call our attention to the profundity of the prophet's thought, which does not regard the disappearence of particular peoples as a prerequisite to a peaceful world. Nationalism is not negated, but nations are required to submit to God's law of justice. "And many peoples shall go and say: 'Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord * * * For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.' " Again, "And He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide for many peoples," and finally, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

The destruction of individual nations, the super-personalities, that walk the world stage, would be an act of cultural and spiritual vandalism, reducing God's variegated world to drab homogeniety. Conflicting national interests must be resolved without violence, as conflicting individual interests are, by submission to the law of God. This is the Jewish vision of the end of days.

Some 19th century theologians seized upon one-half of the prophetic message and misconstrued the implications of prophetic universalism. These men were opposed to all nationalism. The American Council for Judaism, however, is neither so consistent, nor so benevolently misguided. It affirms its American nationalism and sympathizes with Arab nationalism. The only people whose national aspirations it assails—is Israel; it thus dishonors and distorts the universalism of the prophets.

The children of Israel were bound to God at Sinai as a "kingdom of priests and a holy people." The individual Jew serves God wherever he lives, but in a Jewish society he has the opportunity to implement more fully the social morality of his faith.

To Martin Buber, Israel represents an opportunity to recreate the holy community in an authentic relationship to God. To social idealists such as Einstein, Brandeis, and Ben-Gurion, it offered the means to make real the prophetic dream of a just society. Tradi-

tionalists like Rabbi Meir Berlin, Rabbi Alkalai, and Rabbi Kalischer, and modern American religious leaders like Dr. Stephen Wise, Dr. Judah Magnes, and Dr. Abba Hillel Silver were drawn to Zionism by a deep religious impulse.

The modern Jew sees in Israel not merely a refuge for his hapless brethren, though this is justification enough, but a cultural center and a spiritual opportunity. He gives thanks that the prayers of generations have been answered in his time because he has been privileged to see the beginning of the redemption of Israel, which his tradition teaches is the prelude to the redemption of all mankind and the establishment of a just and peaceful world.

After the holocaust of Nazi Europe and the death of 6 million Jews, we today are privileged to witness the first flowering of the redemption. This prophetic fulfillment stands as a symbol and a sign that men can, under God, achieve the ancient holy dream of a world in which nation shall not lift up sword against nation, one in which they shall not learn war anymore.

Medicare Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspapers are an important part of the backbone of our Republic. I am pleased to insert herewith a very fine editorial of the Mineola American, which appeared in its October 8 edition, regarding the problems of medical care for the aging. This editorial makes a great deal of sense.

MEDICARE TODAY

One may be justified in asking "What has happened to medicare?"—the bill for providing medical benefits of various kinds to everyone drawing social security payments.

When this measure was introduced, it will be remember, all of the administration guns were brought up in its support. No other domestic measure was pushed so hard, and administration leaders apparently scented success. The result, to use the vernacular, was "no dice." Congress, in the face of all the pressure, just said no, and no again.

Medicare is back—old bills like old soldiers, even after repeated failure, never seem to die. But the big guns are silent. Token support comes from its sponsors, but little more.

Why? The answer is that congressional coolness is the direct result of several diverse but important factors.

1. The past-65 population group is nowhere near as bad off financially as the medicare crew have asserted. By and large, taking all elements into consideration, they seem to be better off, on the average, than younger groups.

2. Medicare would give the benefits, on a blanket basis, to great numbers of social security beneficiaries who neither want nor need it. At the same time, it would have excluded millions of elderly people not within the social security framework.

3. The cost, according to independent experts, would reach unsupportable heights, many billions a year.

4. The existing Kerr-Mills bill—for providing Federal medical financial aid to the elderly in need, under a system of State administration—is working well and is being extended.

5. The voluntary medical insurance plans, offered by Blue Cross and Blue Shield and commercial insurance companies, are doing a superb job of providing protection to all who want it, at moderate cost.

6. There is a very distinct feeling in this country that we've already gone too far in welfare statism, and that medicare would take us a long step farther along the road of government domination of everything and everybody.

And that seems to be the status of medicare today.

Goldwater Right on TV Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Milburn P. Akers, a feature writer for the Chicago Sun-Times, wrote a most interesting article on presidential TV debates which appears in today's issue of the Sun-Times. I would like to bring Mr. Aker's views to the attention of my colleagues, therefore, under permission granted, I would like to have this article printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GOLDWATER RIGHT ON TV DEBATES

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has wisely declined Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's challenge to a joint discussion or debate of issues confronting the two Republican aspirants for the presidential nomination. Likewise, President Kennedy, who owes a considerable measure of his 1960 political success to his debates with Richard M. Nixon, would do well to refuse to participate in a series of 1964 TV spectaculars.

Such debates settle little other than which candidate is the more photogenic. The Nixon-Kennedy debates, which demonstrated little, if anything, as to which man would make the better President of the United States, undoubtedly had a sizable, perhaps determinative, effect upon the outcome of that election.

They were interesting productions as TV extravaganzas go. But they afforded little insight into the character and qualifications of either man; in fact, they afforded little knowledge of what either man actually believed or what he represented. But they produced effects.

A TV debate, limited in time and in scope, doesn't give a candidate ample time in which to develop a theme. They become exercises in semantics. Skill in debate and quickness in recall aren't necessarily qualifications for the Presidency. Wisdom and leadership—qualities which don't necessarily project in such encounters—are more important.

To liken the Nixon-Kennedy debates of 1960 to the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 is to show a woeful lack of knowledge of the encounters between the two aspirants for the Illinois senatorship of more than a century ago. One Lincoln-Douglas debate afforded the two forensic antagonists more time to develop their themes and state their convictions than either Mr. Kennedy or Vice President Nixon had put together in their entire set of such appearances.

As President, Mr. Kennedy should not be subjected to such debates. One slip could create an international incident. Mr. Kennedy is an experienced debater. He might not make that slip. But the chance shouldn't be taken.

Whoever wins the Republican presidential nomination should realize that fact and not press for such an encounter. There is a vast difference in a debate in which neither speaker is President of the United States, as was the case in the Nixon-Kennedy series.

GOLDWATER rejected Rockefeller's challenge to debate with the suggestion that Republicans should be seeking to build up the party; not tear down one another. Preconvention debates between members of the same party would very likely have the effect the Senator envisions. One of the two—GOLDWATER or Rockefeller—would project the better TV image, would, undoubtedly, be more glib than the other and would, consequently, have much the better of the series.

Neither the Presidency of the United States, nor a nomination by a major party for that office, should be made even partly dependent upon a TV show. If that is the proper way to decide the Presidency the Republicans might well nominate Jack Benny and the Democrats Jerry Lewis.

Solo TV appearances by presidential aspirants can contribute to the public's knowledge of a candidate's qualities. On them, minor contrasts which loom so large in a joint appearance mean far less. The fact that one man is tall and the other man short, that one man is made up well and the other is made up poorly, that one man is glib and the other a bit ponderous or that one has almost instantaneous recall and the other one doesn't mean little when the time comes to make decision of war or peace. Yet such trivialities create great reactions by a not inconsiderable portion of a TV audience. TV stars may properly be judged by their abilities to capture the affections of TV audiences. But a successful appearance in a TV extravaganza, or an unsuccessful one, doesn't necessarily indicate that a candidate is or isn't qualified for the Presidency.

Politically, GOLDWATER made the right decision in rejecting Rockefeller's challenge. GOLDWATER is far ahead in his contest with the New York Governor for nomination. Why should he risk his position? Nixon, in a somewhat similar position in 1960, made that mistake.

Politics aside, however: Mr. Kennedy, who will be the 1964 Democratic nominee, doesn't need the exposure as he did in 1960. But more important is the fact that a President of the United States, no matter who he may be, or what the circumstances are, should not risk the chance inherent in all ad-lib exchanges of making a slip which could reverberate in all the chancelleries of the world. Whoever the ultimate Republican nominee may be shouldn't expect him to do so.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of H.R. 3846, as amended, reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on October 11, 1963. This bill, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963, would serve a laudable purpose—the development of natural resources of our Nation. However, one amendment seeks to impose admission fees, including annual fees of as much as $7 for the use of

recreational areas under certain Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, my State of Georgia is blessed with great natural resources. Thousands of my constituents enjoy facilities of nearby Lake Allatoona and Lake Lanier—both under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

The taxpayers have already spent millions of dollars in providing these facilities. I think it penny wise and pound foolish now to impose on the hapless sportsman these additional charges.

I believe I am speaking for my constituents in voicing strong opposition to this provision.

Change Wheat Grade System? "No," Says GTA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the argument over changing of wheat grades as proposed by the Department of Agriculture has become a rather heated one, with sharp differences of opinion showing up in all of the debates. I was interested in the comments of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in a recent discussion of the subject. Under consent previously granted I include these comments in the RECORD, as follows:

There were a number of things at that hearing that disturbed the farmers present. There were quite a number of farmers—including directors from several local co-op elevators affiliated with GTA. One very disturbing thing was that those who want to squeeze wheat grades again and let farmers pay the extra charge, talked about the dockage in wheat as though it were some kind of noxious dirt; something unpalatable and completely unusable.

Of course that's not true at all. Actually, good wheat screenings contain about 60- to 80-percent grain and broken kernels. They make darn good animal feed.

Now, a miller in this country or overseas makes two things out of wheat: food for humans, and feed for birds and animals. All but a small percentage of the wheat makes flour for bread. The small percentage—the so-called "dockage"—mostly becomes animal feed. It's sold back to farmers at about $50 a ton.

It's an ironic twist—isn't it? The proponents of these wheat grade changes are demanding that farmers give away the wheat screenings free, through an oversized deduction in price when they sell the wheat and then buy it back again in their livestock feeds at the rate of $50 a ton. That's a sweet deal for everybody but the farmer. And don't forget that those screenings have as much or more value overseas as they do here.

It just isn't good economics for anybody to give something away, then buy it back for good money. It's sort of like a high-society rummage sale for charity, except that farmers can't afford it, and in the case of wheat screenings the ones who collect the proceeds don't need charity.

Yes, foreign material in wheat has a very definite and substantial value, and this should be, in all fairness, recognized in any grading system.

It Is the People's Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, do or do not the American people have the right to petition their Government in matters of their interest?

Personally, I feel there should not be the slightest doubt about this under a form of government that is of the people and where the Government is servant to rather than master of the citizenry.

Some interesting introspections into this important matter are contained in two articles appearing in the October 11 issue of the Bangor Daily News, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

IT IS THE PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT

Criticism was made in these columns yesterday of the anonymous high government official who complained that the Nation's news media were giving too much prominence to the visit to this country of Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu, First Lady of South Vietnam. This official seemed bent upon managing the news.

Today we are going to delve into another aspect of the paternal and dangerous father-knows-best attitude that is so prevalent in Washington these days. We have reference to the Civil Aeronautics Board's scolding of Northeast Airlines officials for putting pressure upon the Board to let the airline continue to provide service on the New York-Florida run.

Efforts of this nature "which are instigated directly or indirectly by the applicant," said the CAB statement, "are totally inconsistent with a proper recognition of the Board's quasi-judicial functions."

Just what did this pressure amount to? Actually, it amounted to no more than an urgent plea by some 2,000 or so employees concerned with losing their jobs, including seniority status and pensions. Many have spent all their working lives with Northeast Airlines. The older ones specially are going to find great difficulty in finding comparable new jobs and benefits.

Further, Northeast's employees believe the airline should be allowed to continue its New York-Florida franchise, which it has held for some 6 years in competition with Eastern and National Airlines. And so, by the way, do two of the CAB's five members.

Is it wrong to petition your own Government about such matters? Not at all. On the contrary the right to petition the Government is guaranteed under article 1 of the Constitution's Bill of Rights. This is a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." Individuals are entitled to voice their feelings, to submit their case to the Government and its various agencies.

Speaking of pressure, has any administration used more pressure—often of a whip-snapping nature—than the present Kennedy administration? The President himself is using pressure each time he goes on a national television network to argue for his programs and policies. It was not long ago that Attorney General Robert Kennedy publicly called upon clergymen to write their Congressmen on behalf of the administration's civil rights bill.

The petition movement of the Northeast employees was nothing compared with such pressures. Nor of the behind-the-scene pressures which special interest groups are constantly employing in Washington.

The Northeast employees were only pleading their case in an open and above board way and we admire their gumption. The CAB was presumptuous to criticize them. The board's statement reflects a bossy attitude.

It is an attitude that is cropping up to an alarming degree in Washington. It is an attitude which must be checked if the Government is to remain the people's Government rather than the bureaucrats'.

LABOR OFFICIAL RAPS CAB FOR ATTEMPT TO GAG NORTHEAST

BOSTON.—A Boston airlines labor official said it was inconceivable to him that a Federal agency would construe it improper for Northeast Airlines employees "to fight for the survival of the company and our jobs."

Charles F. Sinclair, president of Local 515, TWU ATD, told J. G. Adams, Director of Enforcement, Civil Aeronautics Board "we cannot allow anyone to rob us of the privileges contained in the Constitution of the United States or the Bill of Rights."

Sinclair's letter to Adams was in answer to charges by Adams that Northeast Airlines employees were in violation of the Board's "principles of practice" code in urging a reversal of a CAB decision that would suspend Northeast's long haul route from New York to Florida this year.

"Are you saying," Sinclair asked Adams, "that we may not address ourselves regarding this adverse decision, to our families, friends, business acquaintances or the press?"

"Mr. Boyd (CAB Chairman) may be able to render this company bankrupt—he may be able to curtail our life's work, but he will not, through your bureau, deprive us of our privileges under the Constitution or the Bill of Rights," Sinclair told Adams.

He said that more than 200,000 signatures had been secured on petitions which had been forwarded to the President and Members of Congress, asking for help for Northeast.

Adam's letter to James W. Austin, president of Northeast, charged that it was improper for Northeast to engage in a program designed to exert pressure on the Board in an effort to have the Board reverse its decision in the New York-Florida case.

In his reply, the Northeast president said his company had carefully lived up to every CAB regulation and that activities on the part of employees were done as individuals and without company sanction.

No. 17—Maine: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Maine, some interesting figures relating to the extent of gambling in that State.

Last year's parimutuel turnover in Maine came to over $15 million from which the State derived a little over $1 million in revenue. However, illegal off-track betting is far more important. Estimates presented to the McClellan committee peg off-track wagering in that State at almost $300 million a year. This represents only illegal gambling on

horses. By expert computations, the total moneys illegally gambled in Maine last year is in the neighborhood of $600 million.

Some 10 percent of the turnover, Mr. Speaker, sticks to syndicate hands as gross profits. After significant expenses are incurred for the corruption of governmental and law enforcement process, there is still plenty of money left in the hands of the syndicates.

Unfortunately, these profits help to finance underworld schemes of all sorts and colors—and help to provide a fat bankroll for organized crime.

Unless we wake up to the need to control the natural human gambling impulse, rather than pretend it is eradicable, the dollars gambled by the people of Maine will continue to go on subsidizing the web of dirt spun by the crime empires.

All we need, Mr. Speaker, is the sense and the courage to follow the example of virtually all of our European and Latin American allies. A Government-run lottery will undermine the foundations of crime while propping up the Federal Treasury. Is it not time that gambling dollars started to work for the public good—in Maine and in the entire Nation?

Ten Reasons for the 18-Year-Old Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, here are the reasons why I support the lowering of the voting age to 18:

First. Many young West Virginians are leaving the State. The right to vote will give 18-year-olds a voice in the kind of future they would like for West Virginia and give them a stake in building the State.

Second. When the voting age was set at 21, nearly 200 years ago, the school system was not what it is today. People at 18 today are far better educated than they were at 21 in the old days.

Third. There is far more illiteracy among people over 60 than there is among people between 18 and 21 .

Fourth. If 18-year-olds can be drafted and exposed to enemy fire in Vietnam and other trouble spots, they ought to be old enough to vote.

Fifth. Under the law, if 18-year-olds can make wills, get married, get licenses to drive, and be sued, they ought to be considered competent to vote.

Sixth. The 18-year-old vote has worked very well in Georgia—since 1943—and in Kentucky—since 1955. Any State can set the age limit for voting as it chooses.

Seventh. Medical science has enabled people to live longer and the average age of the electorate is rising; the 18-year-old vote would help balance this trend.

Eighth. By the time students reach 18, many are very much interested in current affairs; if denied the right to vote, they frequently lose interest by the time they are 21 and allowed to vote.

Ninth. To work for the Federal Government, the minimum age under the civil service laws is 18. If they are capable of working for the Federal Government at 18, they ought to be considered old enough to vote.

Tenth. The idealism and enthusiasm of young people will help raise the moral tone of Government and politics.

The Wheat Sale: More Than Meets the Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Tom Campbell, publisher of the Iron Age magazine, which appears in the October 17, 1963, edition of that publication:

THE WHEAT SALE: MORE THAN MEETS THE EYE

Let's get this wheat sale to the Communists straight. It is not a humanitarian gesture. It is not an accommodation for a friend. It is nothing but a coldblooded business deal—to save storage space.

Only storage space will be saved. The taxpayers will cough up at least 60 cents a bushel on the wheat going to the russkies. Saps like us always cough up at least 55 cents or 60 cents a bushel subsidy for wheat. But this time it goes to the Russians: Not to starving these or those.

Now that we have that straight, where do we stop? Mr. Khrushchev told us he would bury us—economically, not militarily. So their economy is all shot to hell and we are bailing them out with wheat.

Part of this selling is because other nations are doing it too. So what? They always have. And they have sold to Red China. Why don't we sell to Red China? Is there any difference between the communism of Russia and Red China?

You bet your boots there is little difference between what the Red Chinese and the Red Russians think. Maybe they are at each other's throat—temporarily. But when it comes to selling wheat, shouldn't we sell to the Chinese, too?

It was not too long ago that millions of Americans, including the farmers—and wheat brokers—were crying to the high heavens about the Russians. What has changed since then? Nothing, we think.

The Russians and the rest of the commies around the world are out to get us. As far as the gold or the dollars we get for the wheat, it won't help our trade deficit much.

Besides, we could wipe out a lot of the trade deficit if we cut out the international pork barrel for those who do not need it—and haven't needed it for years.

The fact that the President had a public relations conference (press conference to you) a la radio, television, etc., has nothing to do with selling wheat to the Reds.

Questions were answered for the administration's benefit—in view of millions upon millions. And why not, wtih an election coming up?

Let's make up our minds. Are we partners with Khrushchev or are we not?

The American Housewives Subsidy to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite convenient to have an Attorney General who is the brother of the President. In this way he can make rulings to suit his own convenience.

In the Long Island Press of October 8, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott delve into facts surrounding the wheat deal with Russia and the possibility that that nation will be extended credit because of the sale.

The article follows:

R.F.K.'S WHEAT CREDIT OKAY FOR RUSSIA JARS CONGRESS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Robert Kennedy has stuck a big oar into the politically explosive wheat sale to Russia.

He has ruled that private grain dealers, now negotiating a $200 million wheat sale, may extend credit to Russia without violating the Johnson Act of 1934.

This little-known law, as amended in 1945, prohibits U.S. citizens from making loans of any kind to any government or agency which is in default on its obligations to the United States.

Until the Attorney General made his unannounced ruling, President Kennedy had followed the "hard line" position of both the Eisenhower and Truman administrations that the Johnson Act barred any type of credit to Russia.

The new ruling, which has tremendous economic and political implications, was revealed to a joint meeting of the Senate Agricultural and Foreign Relations Committees by Undersecretary of State George Ball.

In testifying in support of the sale of wheat to Russia, Ball startled the Senators by flatly contending, "There are no legal bars against selling the grain to Russia for either gold or credit."

"Doesn't the Johnson Act bar the granting of credit to the Soviet Union?" inquired Senator J. ALLEN ELLENDER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee. "Whenever this question was raised in the past, the Justice Department has taken the position that no credit can be given to Russians."

"That is not the position of the present Attorney General," replied Ball. "He has just given an opinion to the President that the Johnson Act bars only loans, not credits. It is his interpretation that wheat can be sold to Russia on a delayed payment plan with credit extending over a number of months."

"I am sure that interpretation doesn't square with Congress' intent in passing that law," challenged Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, Republican of Idaho. "Any relaxation of this act in favor of Soviet credits should be brought before Congress."

"It is the Attorney General's position that the President has full power to make a determination on the sale and does not need additional authority from Congress," declared Ball.

"That may be the Attorney General's position," said Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, "but it may not be the right one. Before the President makes his decision to approve any export licenses for wheat shipments to Russia, he should

bring the whole matter formally before Congress. There should be full and frank debate, so that the public will know what is going on."

Another flurry of questions by the Senators greeted Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman when he stated that the administration didn't have full details of the Soviet offer to buy wheat since the Government wasn't directly involved in the negotiations.

"Who are the persons involved in these negotiations with the Russians?" demanded HICKENLOOPER. "Are they all private grain dealers? Is it true that one of the leaders in the negotiations is the husband of the Democratic National Committeewoman from Minnesota?"

Before Secretary Freeman could reply, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, jumped into the discussion, stating:

"If you are referring to Burton M. Joseph, he is the father of the husband of the Democratic National Committeewoman and a very distinguished Republican. I resent the implications of the Senator's questions."

"I am just trying to learn the identity of the persons involved in these negotiations," replied Senator HICKENLOOPER. "We ought to know who is dealing with the Russians."

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, then questioned Secretary Freeman about conditions inside Russia.

"Was the Soviet crop failure so bad that people are going hungry?" asked MUNDT.

"We have no information that anybody is starving," replied Freeman. "But they are putting some of their people on short rations."

"But why do they need so much grain?" pressed MUNDT.

"Part of the wheat will go to meet Russia's commitment to her European satellites," replied Freeman.

"If that is the case," said MUNDT, "why don't we just sell the grain to the satellites and get the full credit for feeding those people?"

Under intense cross-examination by other Senators, Secretary Freeman revealed that the United States had no information on whether Russia had a strategic stockpile of wheat or other grains.

President Kennedy has summoned both Republican and Democratic congressional leaders to a bipartisan White House meeting this week to discuss the Soviet grain deal. He decided on this move after Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, sent word to the President through Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, that he is opposed to the wheat sale.

Washington Attorney Max M. Kampelman, former administrative assistant of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, is acting as the legal adviser to Joseph. The Joseph talks with L. M. Matveev, the Kremlin's grain broker, are being conducted in a Russian suite on the fifth floor of the castlelike Chateau Laurier in downtown Ottawa.

Conrad Frederick Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, many South Carolinians were recently saddened by the untimely death of Mr. Conrad Frederick Smith. Thousands of people appreciated through the years the interesting and informative features Mr. Smith specialized in writing for the Anderson Independent newspaper of Anderson, S.C. His integrity and his devotion to maintaining the high standards of his profession made him one of the most successful and genuine writers of our time.

Fred was a close personal friend, having served on my staff when I was Governor of South Carolina. He was sincere in thought and deed, always loyal to his many friends. He will be missed by all of us who knew him and profited from his good works.

Mr. President, as a tribute to Mr. Smith, I ask that the fine editorial entitled "C. Frederick Smith: He Was an Andersonian," which appeared in the October 15 issue of the Anderson Independent, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. FREDERICK SMITH: HE WAS AN ANDERSONIAN

The unexpected death of Conrad Frederick Smith, at the age of 59, deprives the Independent staff of one of its most able and dedicated writers.

Although Mr. Smith never made his home permanently in Anderson, he loved this city and its people and we regarded him as much a real Andersonian as many people who spend their lives here.

Death due to a heart attack came to Mr. Smith at his hometown of Trenton, Tenn., where, after decades of newspaper and public relations work in New York and Charlotte, he made his home with his two sisters and his brother.

If there is consolation to be found among Independent staff members, it's the fact that Fred Smith was present at the newspaper's annual Appreciation Day October 1 and remained in our midst for several days thereafter enjoying to the fullest the Anderson Fair.

There's a cliche to the effect that some folks never meet a stranger. In Fred's case this was no cliche, for he was one of the friendliest and most genuine persons it has ever been our privilege to know.

He was a country boy at heart, and loved rural things and people especially; and his life was full of interests because everyone and everything interested him.

Conrad Frederick Smith contributed many of the finest features that have ever appeared in the Independent. He was a fine writer who possessed the virtue of an understanding heart.

We can say without reservation in extending sympathy to his family and host of friends that heaven is richer for his presence there today.

Alco Workers Send 100-Ton Greeting Card Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, constituents of mine at the Schenectady plant of Alco Products, Inc., have sent a unique "greeting card" overseas to Pakistan in an inspiring and noteworthy act of international good will and friendship.

The "card" certainly is the world's largest—a 2,150-horsepower diesel-electric locomotive, 58 feet long and weighing more than 100 tons. It bears the signatures of 1,200 Alco workers who swarmed over the giant "card" to sign their names with felt-nib pens on a plastic "cocoon" that had been sprayed over the finish paint.

It is going halfway around the world to locomotive shopworkers in Lahore, Pakistan. Its cab is loaded with gifts contributed by the friendly workers of Alco.

This locomotive is the 200th that Alco has shipped to Pakistan as part of that country's dieselization of its railroad system. I am proud that this major industrial firm in my congressional district is the leading producer of diesel-electric locomotives for oversea markets. Earlier this year, the company received the President's "E for Export" flag for its outstanding activities in support of the national program for export expansion.

Since 1947 Alco has built more than 1,800 main line locomotives—valued at more than $200 million—for railroads in Asia, South and Central America, Europe, and Australia. When Pakistan Western Railway completes the first half of its dieselization program this year, 260 of the 311 diesel-electrics in service will bear the Alco trademark.

The greeting card idea was born when Alco employees heard that the Pakistani shopworkers had difficulty in obtaining topnotch basketball equipment for their recreation program. They decided to help out by providing the equipment. Then they decided to ship it "by rail" in the cab of the locomotive being shipped to Pakistan. The finishing touch, of course, was for each man to sign the locomotive in greeting to the Pakistanis.

This type of generous, warmhearted feeling for other peoples is badly needed in these difficult times. I am sincerely gratified that it exists in the hearts of my constituents at Alco and I devoutly hope it is catching and spreads throughout the land.

My Skyscraper City: A Child's View of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, most people who do not come from Manhattan think that no one lives there. Just the reverse is true—all kinds of people live in Manhattan, and surprisingly enough many children are brought up there and are very happy about it.

In fact, in my opinion, boys and girls brought up in Manhattan are usually better adjusted than those who have the blessings of green grass and trees.

I was thrilled when one of my constituents, Katrina Thomas, aided by Penny Hamond, published a book—via Double-

day & Co.—entitled "My Skyscraper City: A Child's View of New York."

It is a wonderful book, and it is full of excitement and fun. It is a picture story of Apwick, a little boy who lives in Manhattan and who loves the city. From Apwick's point of view we see the skyscrapers, the glass wall buildings, the museums, the snow on the trees in Central Park, the tugboats on the river, the pigeons, the animals in the zoo, the streetcleaners, and the mounted policemen.

He is a very busy little boy in a very busy city, and he is doing fine.

Katrina Thomas, who also loves New York City, has given all city folk a lift by her beautiful book.

Idaho and the Lewis-Clark Trail Welcome Modern Explorers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, records indicate that Idaho was first seen by white men in 1805, when Lewis and Clark crossed the Continental Divide from what is now Montana and came down the Clearwater River through north-central Idaho. The trail they cut was again used in 1877 when Chief Joseph of the Nez Perce Indian tribe used the route to make his escape from the pursuing U.S. Army forces in what has been called one of the finest pieces of strategy every employed in Indian warfare.

The massive mountains, dense forests, and deep canyons along with the hardships of pioneering a wilderness area, discouraged the building of a suitable transporation route. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman called it "one of the worst trails for man or beast on the North American Continent."

Finally, after all these years, the area has been conquered and today modern explorers can comfortably travel down this route over a modern all-weather, hardtop highway.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following story by Malcolm Bauer as printed in the Christian Science Monitor on October 15, 1963:

LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL TO DRAW EXPLORERS

(By Malcolm Bauer)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Modern explorers of America will soon be able to glide in 20th-century comfort along the trail blazed more than a century and a half ago by Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

Representatives of the Federal Government and 10 States, meeting here, heard that plans were well advanced toward marking the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to Fort Clatsop, Oreg. The last section of highway to be completed through the Rocky Mountains in Idaho will soon be surfaced, linking transcontinental highways on both sides of the Great Divide. And nearing completion in Missouri is a towering Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Arch marking the starting point of the celebrated 1804–6 venture.

INVESTMENT WANTED

Earlier this summer the National Park Service dedicated the Fort Clatsop Memorial, just south of Astoria, Oreg., where a reconstructed stockade denotes the western end of the trail, where the explorers and their small party spent the winter of 1805–1806, the first white men to make the overland journey to the shores of the Pacific at that latitude.

The Federal Government's newly organized Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is cooperating in the effort to encourage travel both ways on the historic route. The Bureau's Assistant Director, A. H. Underhill, told the conferees here that both public and private investment will be solicited to provide tourist attractions and facilities along the 2,500 miles of highway through 10 States. He pointed out that the route already boasts many parks and historical markers associated with the Lewis and Clark expedition and has a variety of natural, scenic features.

The late J. N. "Ding" Darling, editorial cartoonist of the Des Moines Register, conceived the idea of a Lewis and Clark Memorial Trail as "a scenic avenue across America." His idea took root, and Federal, State, and local agencies have cooperated with volunteer private organizations to give substance to Mr. Darling's dream. The completed trail, marked to call attention to incidents of its first passage, will be ready for tourists in 1964.

MASSIVE MEMORIAL

The U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission is coordinating plans to memorialize not only the Lewis and Clark Expedition but also the Louisiana Purchase, which made the exploration possible. Its major project has been the 630-foot-high Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Arch nearing completion on the Mississippi River flats in St. Louis.

Chester C. Davis, a member of the sponsoring Commission, said here that massive memorial of stainless steel and concrete is "the last great work" of the late architect Eero Saarinen. The concrete for the base of the memorial, which reaches 30 feet into bedrock, was mixed with water from both the Mississippi and Columbia Rivers.

CATALYST FUNCTION

When the memorial is completed in the next few months, elevators will carry visitors to the top for a sweeping view over the Mississippi and Missouri River Basin. It will be the Nation's highest monument, 75 feet higher than the Washington Monument in Washington, D.C. Its form is what is called an inverted catenary curve. Its cost: $30 million.

Mr. Underhill told those attending the Portland meeting that, beginning next year, the Lewis and Clark Trail should serve as a "catalyst to promote tourism, recreation, and conservation along its route."

U.S. Adherence to OECD Film Code Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, many film industry employees live in my congressional district, and from time to time they have expressed to me their concern with regard to the effect on the domestic industry of the number of films produced by U.S. motion picture producers in foreign countries. The attached letter and news release from Assistant Secretary of Labor George L-P Weaver will be of interest, I am sure, to my colleagues and many of my constituents:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, October 15, 1963.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: As you may recall, the Department of Labor is seeking measures to alleviate unemployment problems in the American film industry. Part of the difficulty, according to the Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production, stems from considerable foreign production by U.S. motion picture producers.

It was the recommendation of the Joint Labor-Management Committee that if the United States should adhere to the film code of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), American filmmakers would have a greater voice in seeking fair competitive conditions for U.S.-made films abroad. Therefore, as one step to take in dealing with this problem, the United States will adhere to the OECD films provisions. I expect to announce this fact at a meeting with the Joint Labor-Management Committee in Hollywood on Wednesday, October 16. The attached press release, which will be isued at that meeting, explains in detail the significance of our OECD film code adherence.

I thought you would find this information useful.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L-P WEAVER,
Assistant Secretary, International Affairs.

LABOR SECRETARY WIRTZ ANNOUNCES U.S. ADHERENCE TO OECD FILM CODE PROVISIONS

In order to deal more effectively with international questions of governmental policy affecting trade and employment in the motion picture industry, the United States has established a closer relationship with the member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz announced today.

The administration took this step by notifying the OECD at its headquarters in Paris that the United States was adhering to the organization's code of rules for international trade and financial transactions involving motion picture films.

A Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production of the American motion picture industry had petitioned Secretary Wirtz earlier this year to help in reducing the industry's unemployment. One of the recommendations of the joint committee was that the United States adhere to the OECD film code.

The joint committee attributes much of the industry's unemployment to foreign production by U.S. motion picture producers. Subsidies provided by certain European governments help to make it attractive for U.S. filmmakers to produce films within their countries.

Adherence to the OECD film code, Secretary Wirtz explained, would permit full U.S. participation in the proceedings of this OECD forum concerning motion pictures. In this way U.S. officials may work more effectively for fair competitive conditions for American-made films abroad.

The OECD's regular consultations on trade policy and liberalization of restrictions on international financial transactions provide opportunities for frank discussions among officials of members nations about the problems they share. The OECD holds periodic meetings of motion picture experts to give effect to its program of liberalization.

The OECD's rules on films constitute an annex to the code of liberalization of current invisible operations. The OECD code

sets forth obligations to remove restrictions from current international transactions and payments. The United States adhered to the main body of the code in 1961. Article 2 of the annex to the code provides that production subsidies for full-length feature films "should be abolished to the extent that they significantly distort international competition in export markets."

The terms of accession to the OECD will involve no change in American laws or regulations affecting the use of imported films, nor will they affect the treatment to which American films are entitled under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Members countries of the 20-nation OECD include the United States, the countries of Western Europe, and Canada. Japan's accession is expected soon. The membership thus includes almost all of the world's largest producers of motion pictures.

Labor and management representatives of the American motion picture industry have held a series of meetings this year with Assistant Secretary of Labor George L-P Weaver whom Secretary Wirtz had asked to find ways for easing the industry's unemployment problems. Mr. Weaver, in turn, has brought in representatives of the Departments of State, Commerce and Treasury.

"The American motion picture industry should benefit by our country's adherence to the OECD's provision on films," Secretary Wirtz said. "We will continue are efforts on behalf of the industry."

State Department Briefings Are a Flop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to have visit me in my office in Washington members of the broadcasting industry who had been invited to Washington for a briefing by the Department of State of the United States of America. I listened with some interest to their recount of programs which were presented to them and I drew a certain conclusion. I find that John S. Knight, able editor of a column called "Editor's Notebook" which appears in the Charlotte Observer, widely distributed in my congressional district in South Carolina, gave a brillant synopsis of what is taking place. I commend Mr. Knight for his forthrightness and I include his column in my remarks at this point:

STATE DEPARTMENT BRIEFINGS ARE A FLOP: OFF-THE-RECORD CONFERENCES DEVISED TO DECEIVE PEOPLE

(By John S. Knight)

Every fall, the State Department holds a briefing in Washington for newsmen and broadcasters.

I always decline these invitations because the sessions are addressed by Government functionaries who have nothing to say, and hide behind a cloak of anonymity.

Even worse is the fact that these faceless men are either not informed as to Government policies, or deliberately mislead the more naive members of our profession.

Last year, for instance, some 800 editors and broadcasters returned from Washington convinced that Castro was helpless to mount an attack upon the United States. This was the information given them by the State Department.

Yet a Defense Department spokesman later admitted that the Pentagon learned that the Cubans had medium and intermediate range missiles while the briefing was in progress.

At this month's conference, a "high U.S. official" chided the American press for giving Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu "a triumphal reception."

The American press, radio and television representatives were told that such hospitality cuts across the Government's efforts to put pressure on South Vietnam for reforms.

This spokesman conceded that Mme. Nhu's visit was newsworthy but believed the scheduling of 29 engagements in the United States to be excessive.

According to the Associated Press, the high official may not be identified under the rules of the background conference.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS

All of which gives rise to several questions:

1. If our Government trembles every time the fiery Dragon Lady speaks, why was she permitted to visit the United States?

2. Does our Government really believe the American press has a responsibility to aid and abet its schemes to put pressure upon the leaders of South Vietnam?

3. Why would any self-respecting newsman agree to be bound by a no-attribution rule with 800 people in the auditorium?

4. Why does the press permit the State Department to get away with this insufferable nonsense, and submit meekly to absurd and unenforceable rulings?

5. Why didn't one single editor or broadcaster break the rules and tell the story?

A VERY DUBIOUS PRACTICE

All experienced newspapermen know that off-the-record conferences are devised to deceive or misinform the people.

Yet many of them agree to the arrangement, either to obtain background information or to permit a politcian or the Government to float trial balloons and see how the public reacts.

This is a dubious practice, often indulged in by the same editors who talk so bravely at newspaper and broadcasting conventions about freedom of information and the people's right to know.

THERE IS PRESSURE, TOO

Even more sinister are the pressures upon radio and television stations operating under Government licenses which can be, and sometimes are, revoked by the Federal Communications Commission.

The Columbia Broadcasting System is so sensitively attuned to its master's voice that it canceled Mme. Nhu's scheduled appearance on "Face the Nation."

CBS President Richard S. Salant explained the network's position by saying that "we feel one more appearance at this time would serve no useful international purpose."

When a major network or a newspaper begins to operate on the theory that the people cannot be trusted to form their own judgments, then we have in effect a controlled press. Controlled—that is—in the sense that timidity replaces responsibility and editors and broadcasters begin playing God.

It is reassuring that the National Broadcasting Co., is not buying this line and will present Mme. Nhu on "Meet the Press" this Sunday evening.

THEY KNOW IT ISN'T SO

One final thought: The Associated Press account of the State Department session said "the editors and broadcasters were told that the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam is not doing anything that is not known about and approved by the State Department."

What utter rot.

Every informed correspondent in Saigon knows this has not been so, but the "high official's" statement is pawned off on the American people as the truth.

What modern journalism needs, apparently, are more editors and broadcasters who understand and carry out their newsgathering responsibilities, and fewer of the impressionables who are flattered by official invitations and "beaten to death," as Ed Lahey used to say, "with ladyfingers."

Kentuckians Concerned Over Statewide Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] in his extension of remarks appearing at page A6401 in the Appendix of the RECORD—in a statement which was entitled "Kentucky: The Gambler's Paradise"—indicated that he would like to mention to the Members of the House and more particularly to the congressional delegation from the State of Kentucky about the hold of gambling on Kentucky. The gentleman states that based on testimony before the McClellan committee that it can be estimated that the yearly gambling turnover in the Commonwealth of Kentucky can reach $1.7 billion. Whether or not the $58 million in legal parimutuel betting is included within this figure, I do not know, but I assume that it is not from the connotation of the gentleman's remarks. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, hang my head in shame that my State has gotten what is apparently a national reputation for such illegal activity as the gentleman from New York mentions. I would say, in all sincerity, that I have received no indication from my own community that any illegal gambling is going on there. Perhaps, of course, this could be due to the fact that Churchill Downs, where most of the legal parimutuel betting goes on, is within my district and the necessity for an illegal operation is minimized. I would therefore assume that the majority of the illegal operation is going on in other parts of the State.

Such illegal activities as are described by the gentleman from New York are not condoned by me, and I am confident are not condoned by any of the other Members of Congress from my State.

There are certain other activities which have been brought to light in recent weeks and months that have taken place in Kentucky that are equally as undesirable as illegal gambling. I would assume that since our unfavorable reputation in this regard has travelled all the way to the great State of New York, the enforcement of the law in certain areas of our State must certainly be at a minimum. I have heard references at home to the fact that law and order have broken down in some areas in regard to gambling and bootlegging and

that a serious law enforcement problem may exist in certain areas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the gentleman from New York, and for all other Members of the House who have had occasion to read his remarks, to know that there are many of us in Kentucky who are concerned about the breakdown of law and order—who are concerned about the figures which the gentleman mentioned, as to the extent of the illegal gambling in our State and other improper activities.

I would like the gentleman further to know that I believe that citizens of Kentuckl are concerned about this to the extent that they intend to rectify the situation on November 5, 1963, by placing our State in the hands of a cleanup team dedicated to the riddance from our State of this and many other evils.

While I thank the gentleman from New York for bringing this matter to the attention of the House, I do want him to know that I have faith and confidence in the people of Kentucky that they will correct this situation in the very near future.

Government in the News Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, intrusion of the present administration into the field of news dissemination is rightly opposed by the American press, the American Newspaper Publisher Association and all guardians of the American free enterprise system against government competition.

Establishment of the Department of Agriculture's Market News Wire Service and the President's announcement of the creation of a governmentwide National Communications System bear dangerous resemblance to the Soviet Union's Tass, which disseminates government-tailored news with no private competition permitted.

Legislation is pending before this body to prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in activities of this nature. It deserves prompt consideration by the committees to which it has been referred if the constitutional guaranty of freedom of the press in our country is to be preserved.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to Members two editorials in opposition to Government news networks which appeared in recent editions of the San Diego Union and the San Diego Evening Tribune and which I include at this point:

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 10, 1963]

U.S. PRESS NETWORK

Last September 9 we mused in this space about the possibility of a government-operated federal news service which virtually would supplant the great independent news agencies by the 1970's.

The editorial was prompted by announcement that the Department of Agriculture had entered the news service business by offering a crop-and-marketing facility to anyone who would pay the telegraph tolls.

It appears now that the 1970's are far too distant a date for fulfillment of such a possibility. According to the Federal Register, President Kennedy has sent a memorandum to the heads of the executive departments and agencies. It directs them to cooperate and assist in setting up a unified governmental communications system. It is to be known as the National Communications System.

The President proposes to link together, improve, and extend, on an evolutionary basis, "the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."

The administration's efforts to manage news already are notorious. The attempts to distort facts in the administration's favor, whether they are from Washington or South Vietnam, obviously have not been successful. Now Mr. Kennedy proposes to accomplish his goal by establishing his own "Tass," patterned after the Soviet agency of the same name.

It is an ominous development in a nation where self-government is absolutely dependent on its people having all of the facts. It is a pattern all too familiar in nations where there is no intention to sufficiently inform the people in order that they can govern themselves adequately.

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune]

GOVERNMENT NEWS NETWORK: A PIPELINE OF PREJUDICE

The Federal Government, already notorious for its attempts to manage the news, is going into the news gathering and disseminating business in competition with privately owned wire news services.

It all began August 1, when the Agriculture Department started selling its market news service over a nationwide leased-wire teletype network to commercial subscribers, including newspapers and radio and television stations.

On August 28 President Kennedy directed the heads of executive departments and agencies to extend this intrusion in the news business to their own bailiwicks.

The Presidential memorandum directed them to cooperate and assist in establishing a unified governmental communications system to be called the "National Communications System" (NCS).

The new System would be estabilshed and developed "by linking together, improving and extending, on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."

This is one of the gravest threats to a free and uncontrolled press in a self-governing nation that has been proposed within our memory.

It strikes at the heart of the American people's right to know the truth about what's going on in their Government.

Such a Government owned and operated news network would become a pipeline of prejudice.

A channel of so-called information to dilute and obscure the flow of news out of the various Federal agencies by established, professionally staffed, unbiased private news agencies.

A propaganda machine for bureaucrats to make them look good and hide their mistakes.

The Russians have their governmental news agency. Its name is Tass. And it is discounted and mistrusted around the world—and perhaps most so by those captives who are forced to swallow its official line.

We doubt that the American people want an official, pasteurized, sanforized version of what Washington bureaucrats consider news fit for public consumption.

We doubt that the Agriculture Department or any other Federal agency can legally spend tax money to do this.

We know it isn't good for America and the concept of a free and unfettered press as the Founding Fathers envisioned in the first amendment to the Constitution.

They Said "Yes" to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, to encourage thought on the meaning of America and to encourage expression of patriotic convictions, I recently asked my constituents in the Panhandle of Texas to write me on the topic, "I Say 'Yes' to America."

I received a number of excellent letters from men and women and boys and girls of all ages. Reading these letters served to strengthen my conviction that our fellow Americans do indeed deeply love their country and have unbounded faith in its destiny.

In order that others may see the letters chosen as most expressive in four age categories—adult, senior high school, junior high school, and grade school—I am privileged to submit them for publication in the RECORD.

The letters are as follow:

Adult Division: The Reverend Lloyd M. Hearn, pastor, the Methodist Church, Tell, Tex.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: I say "Yes" to America. I say "Yes" to America for what she has meant to millions of men everywhere, and for what she has meant and still means to me. I say "Yes" to the high dream, daring, and devotion of her Founding Fathers, despite their failures. I say "Yes" to the flaming, faith of her marching pioneers, though some marched only for gain and some turned back. I say "Yes" to her statesmen, soldiers, singers, and scribes who held high the dream and kept the faith, while some bartered honor and glory for power and pelf. I say "Yes" to America.

How glad and proud I am that I live in the great democracy that has dreamed nobly and pursued the dream. Let me ever march with those who follow after. My prayer is that the vision may never dim, that the dream may never die * * * that there will always be "the land of the free and the home of the brave," singing "in God is our trust."

"America! America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea."

With hand and head and heart I say "Yes" to America—now and forever.

Yours very sincerely,

LLOYD M. HEARN.

Senior high division: Miss Shielda Richards, Amarillo:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: What is America? It is the singing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" before the baseball game; it is one's first view of the Statue of Liberty; it is a family on vacation viewing the Nation's landmarks; it is the students repeating the Pledge of Allegiance at a school assembly; most of all, it is the only country giving her citizens the right to govern their own lives, without accounting to any officials about their activities. Our right to individual

freedom was preserved for us by the Founding Fathers of the United States, and is being kept for us by our representatives to the present day Government.

America is opportunity. There is opportunity for happiness, success, wealth, religious faith, and fame. One must work to gain any of these, but they can be gained in America. Abraham Lincoln is our best example of a man who accepted opportunities and gained from them. He was a poor farm boy and became President of the United States. Any man or woman can run for a public office, it is his choice and he can work hard at being elected. This right to accept the opportunity for a public office is an American right.

Woodrow Wilson had faith in the American tradition and he wanted all the citizens to have this same faith. He saw America as a land of freedom, liberty, and opportunity. We should all share his faith in America; we all have many reasons to share it, after all, it is "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

America is past, present, and future. The citizens of the past preserved America for us. We must continue to keep America free and strong, not only for ourselves, but for the countless Americans that will follow us. For many years America has meant freedom, equality, and opportunity for countless immigrants from other countries. We are proud that America means this to others. It can mean even more to those of us who have been fortunate enough to be born Americans. America is our way of life; there is no other way of life that could serve us better. We in America can accomplish miracles without the Government always interfering; we know the tense feeling during an election that we, ourselves, took part in; we know the pleasure of fun and excitement at a picnic, baseball game, or family gathering.

America is good. It was founded on the principles of free government and individual rights. We still have these principles and they are being tested and proved every day of the year. We know that our Government is successful and good. Our Constitution has been in effect longer than any other constitution in history. We are proud of this. A citizen of the United States of America has more God-given rights than a citizen of any other country. He has more opportunities to succeed than can be counted. Most of all, he is a very important person for whom the Government has much respect. After all, he is one of the thousands who determine the Government.

I say yes to America; I will say it with love, respect, hope, and thankfulness. America is my country and will remain so always. The flag of the United States of America is symbolic of all that is America. Just to look at our flag makes me stand a little taller.

America is the most wonderful country of all. The opening line of "My Country 'Tis of Thee" expresses my feeling toward America: "My country 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing." Again and again I say yes to America.

Yours truly,

SHIELDA RICHARDS.

Junior high division: Miss Janice Colson, Wellington:

DEAR MR. ROGERS: I, Janice Colson, say "Yes" to America for many good reasons. The country of America is a land of freedom of rights, the people make the Government, we have freedom of worship, which some countries do not, and we have protection by armies. I will discuss some of these things that I mention above.

To me freedom of rights means freedom of worship, freedom of press, freedom of speech, to be protected by armies, and we may ask the Government to change the laws if we believe they are wrong.

America has two important documents. They are the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These documents make American people feel proud they are free.

America has many educational facilities, schools, colleges, and universities. The people of America are getting educations which will help their future ahead of them.

In America we do not believe in slavery because we are free people of America.

They have been putting out gifts of Care and many other things. They put this out to help the needy and the people who cannot afford anything. This keeps people from starving and helps clothe the people and gives them equipment to clear their land. I think this is a wonderful help to the needy people and I saw some pictures when they received these things and they were happy and full of joy.

Freedom of worship; in some countries, you cannot worship as you please. But in America you can go to any church you wish. This is a wonderful right.

I am a student going to school and I am happy that I am receiving an education. America is giving me this education.

The song "America," expresses America as it is because it says that it is beautiful and and it is a beautiful country even if I have to brag about Texas for it is the most beautiful State in the Union. I am proud of America.

America is gaining many new things which are helping. We have new weapons in case of war to protect "Our Stars and Stripes Forever."

I, Janice Colson, say "Yes" to America, a wonderful free country which I want to remain as my American home.

I say "Yes" to America.

JANICE COLSON,
Grade 8.

Grade school division: Bynum Morris, Canyon:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROGERS: I say "Yes" to America. I like my country because we are free and no other country can tell us what to do. I feel proud when I hear "The Star-Spangled Banner." I'd rather live in the United States than any other place in the world.

BYNUM MORRIS,
Age 10.

One of those who wrote to me was George (Farmer) Schaeffer, of Canyon and Happy, who stated his patriotic convictions in poetry—and I know many of you would want to see his words:

Though some seem to have given up, say we are in a mess,
I say "Yes" to America, great land of progress,
The land of opportunity, where each man has a chance
To work out his own salvation, his fortunes to enhance,
Land where no man has a master to tell him what to do,
Where sweet freedom is guaranteed, by the Red, White, and Blue,
Although at times the way seems rough, 'tis not rough as it seems,
We shall ever march forward, to fulfillment of dreams,
Ever placing our dependence on guidance from above,
Our common heritage so rich, in sacrifice and love,
In peace extending compassion, in war showing valor,
We may be ridiculed at times, but we know not failure,
We have carved a niche in this world, one that will ever stay
In the bright sunshine of success, the doubters melt away,
The scaremongers may come and go, but I have confidence
That my good country will go on, despite those on the fence.
I say "Yes" to America; what more can one say,
Shining beacon of light to all, the good old U.S.A.,
Let others loudly rant and rave, they are the mistaken,
I will ever cling to my faith, it cannot be shaken.
Hear now the bell of liberty, with its resounding peal,
We shall strive on to better things, with shoulder to wheel,
The peddlers of gloom and defeat, thank the Lord are so few,
Hark to the "Star-Spangled Banner," and the Red, White, and Blue.

Serving People Through Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, October 17, 1963 is International Credit Union Day.

Each year leaders of industry, labor, business and commerce, education, religion, and government pause to join credit union members of the free world in recognition of the splendid service rendered by credit unions.

Today I want to join those who recognize the more than 50 years of service of the organized credit union movement. Any idea which endures and continues to grow throughout more than 50 years of existence is certain to be based on a solid foundation.

In 1912, President William Howard Taft addressed a letter to the Governors of the various States relative to credit unions. A portion of the text read as follows:

> A very good law has been enacted by the State of Massachusetts allowing the incorporation of credit unions which should furnish an example to the other States. Their establishment is generally a matter of State legislation and encouragement; their organization wonderfully simple, as the European experience shows and their success is practically inevitable when the environment is congenial and where proper laws are passed for their conduct.

One by one the States followed the lead of Massachusetts and today almost every State has a State credit union act—in addition, there is the Federal Credit Union Act which Congress passed in 1934.

The more than thirteen and one-half million members in 21,000 U.S. credit unions and the 2.9 million members in 4,650 Canadian credit unions are evidence of the success of the idea in North America. This success continues to attract attention of others, for the idea is spreading to many other countries of the free world.

Operating under the principle that "it is part of our American tradition to work things out together," credit union leaders have joined with Government agencies to provide technical assistance to foreign lands. Great returns are bound to accrue to the free world for the time

and effort devoted to this fine work. We have already heard of some of the accomplishments made in Peru, and new returns will be coming from other countries such as Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Panama, Mexico, and Ireland. It is helping to create the seed of private saving and capital so vital to a free economy. Even Africa, Korea, and the refugees from Communist China have awakened to the credit union idea. The democratic principles of this excellent people-to-people program is being demonstrated in 67 foreign lands. In many parts of the world, the first vote ever cast by a citizen is in his credit union.

Recognizing the work of more than 750,000 credit union members of my home State, I point with great pride to their record of the past 32 years. Members have accumulated in savings more than one-third of a billion dollars. The impact of the 1,260 Ohio credit unions on the economy of Ohio has been felt many times because most of these dollars continue to flow back into the business stream again and again.

The accomplishments of the volunteer credit union officials over the years provide the inspiration for me to salute credit union members everywhere. Industry, labor, education, religion, business and commerce leaders can join with people in Government to recognize International Credit Union Day, 1963.

Columnist Resorts to Irresponsible Reporting To Twist Study Paper of Disarmament Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most irresponsible examples of reporting I have seen in recent months occurred in a column written by a Holmes Alexander which appeared recently in the newspapers. This column is reproduced below, followed by the rebuttal I have prepared from an examination of the document referred to in his column:

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—It's always been a wonder to me that the graves of the Founding Fathers didn't break open and emit a demonstration of angry skeletons when President Kennedy went to Independence Hall at Philadelphia on July 4, 1962, and proclaimed a "declaration of interdependence * * * with a united Europe."

It was bad enough, considering how much trouble this country had escaping from Mother Europe, for the 35th President in George Washington's line to offer to creep back into that maternal womb. But hardly 15 months later, Mr. Kennedy's madness for merging—that is, for obliterating the American identity—had extended to endemic proportions. No longer was it enough to resection ourselves to Europe (an operation, by the way, rejected by De Gaulle and the Common Market), but now the Presidential policy seems to call for a merger with the Communist bloc.

Not to speak loosely, I anchor my reference to a document which seems to be the guidebook for the ways we have gone since midsummer. If you read it, as I have, you will better understand the negotiations on the nuclear treaty, the President's proposal for a joint mission to the moon with Russia, the proposal to supply wheat and agricultural advice and assistanceto the Soviet Union, the dialogs about nuclear neutralization of space and the President's hailing of what he told the United Nations was a "pause in the cold war."

To be sure, persons are still defying death every weekend to escape from East Germany, Latin America is aflame with Soviet-supplied incendiaries and all the concessions are being made by us. But back in July there was published this document entitled, "Common Action for the Control of Conflict," prepared by a think-shop called Institute for Defense Analyses, 1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW., in Washington. It was prepared, significantly, not for the Defense Department, but for the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The motto which sets the theme of the document, and is printed at its head, is a quotation from a non-American, Lord Home of the British cabinet.

The quotation reads:

"Interdependence is the only alternative to a world that destroys itself."

The document is lengthy in urging that American salvation lies not in our strength and will to independence, but in our ability to placate, join and buttress our enemies. It recommends:

1. A parity of strength: "To shift the Soviet goal of 'catching up' * * * to a goal of matching Western patterns of use of resources."

2. Greater success for communism: "To shift the priority of resource use * * * toward consumption."

3. Further concessions to communism: "* * * to increase the probability that time will be available for constructive action."

4. Do business with communism: "To create cross-national enterprises * * * lay the foundations of great power solidarity."

5. Foreign aid to Russia: "To open the channels of trade and * * * technology in order to better satisfy the needs and desires of both peoples and to contribute to their enjoyment of life."

6. Seek accommodation: "To * * * provide a foundation for a politics of consent."

7. Become interdependent with the enemy: "Gradually to replace the policies of force by a politics of consent conducted in an environment of intricate interdependence."

8. One world: "On a pragmatic, step-by-step basis to (achieve) an inclusive, pluralistic world community."

Not many Americans, I venture, are ready for this holy state of matrimony with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, the eight points which are identified in the foregoing column purport to be direct quotations from the document. They would more appropriately be called direct deletions, for they serve to put the report in a false light. I am reproducing these quotations and am placing in parentheses the words which Mr. Alexander conveniently omitted. Just as serious as the omissions are the grossly misleading summaries to each point which Mr. Alexander has conveniently placed in such a way as to imply that these words are found in the document.

1. "To shift the Soviet goal of 'catching up' (with the United States, in terms of levels of production) to a goal of matching Western patterns of use of resources."

Comment: In no way does this statement support the conclusion that the objective is to seek a "parity of strength," as Mr. Alexander has sought to label it. To the contrary, this statement urges an objective of shifting the Soviets away from the goal of catching up.

2. "To shift the priority of resource use (away from military expenditures and) toward consumption."

Comment: With the words in parenthese resinstated in the quotation, its meaning is clarified and obviously affords no foundation for Mr. Alexander's conclusion that the objective is "greater success for communism." Even Mr. Alexander should admit that shifting Soviet expenditures away from military expenditures is in the interest of the United States.

3. "(To stabilize the military environment) to increase the probability that time will be available for constructive action."

Comment: Mr. Alexander has outdone himself here to equate this objective with an intent to make "further concessions to communism."

4. "To create cross-national enterprises (to explore and control nature for man's purposes and to) lay the foundations of greater power solidarity."

Comment: Again, leaving out the words in parentheses has changed the meaning. Beginning with the Eisenhower administration we have been cooperating with the Soviet Union in a number of ways, including participation in the International Geophysical Year, and exchange of weather information. Mr. Alexander seems at great pains to distort the simple meaning of this objective and equate it with doing business with communism.

5. "To open the channels for trade and (the spread of) technology in order to better satisfy the needs and desires of both peoples and to contribute to their enjoyment of life."

Comment: Trade and spreading technology do not equate with Mr. Alexander's characterization that this is "foreign aid to Russia." Trade is considered by most people as a distinct alternative to "aid."

6. "To (improve the means of communication and understanding to) provide the foundation for a politics of consent."

Comment: Mr. Alexander has again irresponsibily omitted the words in parentheses in order to claim that the stated objective is to seek "accommodation."

7. "Gradually to replace the policies of force by a politics of consent conducted in an environment of intricate interdependence."

Comment: This is the only quotation without some omission.

8. "On a pragmatic, step by step basis to (define and elaborate the instruments and goals of) [achieve] an inclusive, pluralistic world community."

Comment: Mr. Alexander has labeled this a "one world" goal, and in order to make the quotation appear to support his characterization of it, he has substituted the bracketed word "achieve" for the words in parentheses. The twist of the meaning is deliberate. The true quotation appears to relate to the fact that we are all on one planet and obviously therefore are necessarily already part of a world community.

Mr. Alexander does a disservice to good journalism. Whatever his personal views of international problems, he has no license to twist and distort statements in an effort to discredit others. Moreover, he conveniently omits the disclaimer in this document which states that the document does not necessarily reflect the views of any Government agency. Furthermore, the document listed these objectives to carry out the purpose "to improve the environment for the control of conflict." One can disagree with some of the stated points, but the purpose of controlling conflict bears the express approval of the American public and Congress. Mr. Alexander borders on the inane when he tells us that this document is in part the basis of a "Presidential policy for a merger with the Communist bloc."

Mr. Speaker, I hope this analysis will help to correct the misleading impressions created by Mr. Alexander's article.

The Guided Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article in last Monday's Wall Street Journal tells how deserving Democrats, under the New Frontier, are told of Defense contracts.

This practice, regardless of who is President, should be eliminated once and for all. The article follows:

THE GUIDED LEAK: HOW DEMOCRATIC FAITHFUL GET WORD ON ARMS CONTRACTS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly every morning at about 10:30 a messenger carries a sheaf of papers from the Pentagon across the Potomac River to the White House. A great deal of secrecy shrouds this daily drive. No one will talk about the route, nor the type of vehicle used, nor whether the courier is military or civilian. Indeed, many officials deny the mission even occurs; others insist "it's a matter not appropriate for discussion."

Why the hush-hush attitude? Top secret military reports for the President? Not at all. Strange as it may seem the clandestine mission has nothing whatsoever to do with national security. Rather, it is an essential gambit in a slick political strategem that seeks, by employing the combined energies of top Pentagon brass, shrewd White House agents, distinguished Senators and Representatives, and powerful news agencies, to bamboozle the naive.

You see, the information carried by the shadowy courier is nothing more than advance word on multimillion-dollar defense contract awards that will be announced officially by the Pentagon later in the day. White House agents telephone these exclusive data to favorite Democrats on Capitol Hill who make headlines in their hometown newspapers by disclosing the scoops to reporters.

The effect, in large part, is that the Pentagon no longer announces much of its own contract news. Congressmen do, in news stories that sometimes wink at the facts by declaring that Senator so-and-so "announced" a contract award, but usually make some attempt at accuracy by confessing that the legislator "was notified" or "was advised" of the event.

This legislative legerdemain is dismissed by many as harmless politics. "This is something the White House can deliver on; they can't deliver on much else in this building," contends one Pentagon source. "As far as I'm concerned, this is the least of the available evils. I'd rather continue this than do something substantive."

HIGH COSTS OF CAMPAIGNS

Another administration official insists the real problem rests with the high cost of political campaigning. His explanation: "Every man who is running for office feels he needs to make the impression that he has influence in Washington if he's to get the campaign contributions he needs. Patronage used to be more important than it is now. What's a postmastership worth nowadays? Very little.

"If we didn't make such information available to Congress, the public would be given by other means the impression that defense contracts were influenced, but the administration would get less benefit. I'm against the impression. But if it's going to be given away, I think the administration should reap some benefit."

Though offered as a defense, this line of reasoning also stands as an indictment. For, as critics are quick to point out, the quest for credit not only introduces partisanship into the Government's immense contracting business, but can hardly help but give voters, including business-seeking corporate managers, the clear impression that the politician who announced a contract award probably influenced the decision.

The erosive effect this can have on public confidence becomes clear when viewed against a larger background. During the early days of the Senate probe into the Pentagon's controversial TFX fighter-bomber, the Kennedy administration made no secret of its indignation at comments suggesting that political considerations determined the selection of the contractor. But by playing politics on routine contract announcements, the administration every day contributes to the public notion that influence does, indeed, swing million- and billion-dollar decisions.

Too, the system is fraught with temptation. The legislator who receives inside information on major contract awards is presented with the opportunity to benefit in the stock market; or, if he is too scrupulous for that, others he informs may not be.

Today's chief critics of the political tip-off habit, quite naturally, are Republicans. Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, warned Defense Secretary McNamara in a recent letter: "Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous. * * * I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent, mink coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic."

Nevertheless, it wasn't too many years ago that some Republican legislators were criticizing President Eisenhower for not making greater use of the "scoop" technique to help the party faithful, particularly around election time. And to some extent he did; so the Republicans are not above reproach. But what the GOP did spasmodically, the Democrats now do methodically.

The fact of the matter is that Congress, not the administration in power, is the motivating force behind the system. Mr. McNamara made the point in replying to Senator WILLIAMS. "Barring some further indication that the Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice," the Defense Secretary wrote, "I am disposed to continue it."

Underlying Mr. McNamara's reply was the knowledge of a top secret conference held during the early days of the Kennedy administration. It was called by aids to several influential Democratic Congressmen; it was attended by representatives from the White House, the Pentagon, and other Federal agencies; and it was designed to firmly establish the right of Democrats on Capitol Hill to enjoy the perquisites of power by getting advance word on contract awards.

Though there's no official record of the decisions reached at that unpublicized gathering, what has evolved is a two-part operation for speeding prior notice to Capitol Hill that has all the precision of a well-planned military maneuver. The midmorning Pentagon-White House mission is a strictly partisan affair. White House aids don't talk, but it's known they pass along their exclusive data to congressional favorites as routine procedure.

A NONPARTISAN NEWS SERVICE

Thus, the favored are assured of receiving word of contracts of interest to them before noon each day. This extra-special attention to party stalwarts is an extension of a separate procedure that seeks to give politicians of both parties a smaller lead on contract news. Each of the armed services has a separate staff of congressional liaison officers that sees to it that all interested legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, get about 1 hour's notice before public release of contract awards. The legislators are notified at 3 p.m. each day, the press at 4 p.m. The Air Force delivers its information by personal messenger to congressional offices; the Army and Navy use the telephone for the most part.

Until recently, Congress witnessed the spectacle of uniformed majors and colonels, their watches synchronized, delivering confidential contract memos with split-second timing to avoid charges of leaking the "leaks" to one legislator ahead of another.

But this got to be a bit too much, and several Congressmen objected to the use of high-ranking soldiers as messenger boys. So the Pentagon adjusted its tactics; it now uses enlisted men to carry contract news unless a contract must be explained to a lawmaker. For these more delicate maneuvers, officers are still preferred.

The rationale offered to justify the 1-hour news break for Congressmen is to enable them to intelligently answer press queries on contracts awarded to companies in their States. There's no mention of the fact that, since the Pentagon awarded the contracts, maybe its represntatives should be the ones to reply to questions. Nor is the point made that Congressmen seldom are given any more contract information than is the press, so they can't add substance to a news story anyway.

In the final analysis, then, the entire operation—both the partisan and nonpartisan phases—boils down to nothing more than political sleight-of-hand. And quite a few Pentagon officials express the private (very private) wish that the whole procedure be abandoned once and for all. This view, not surprisingly, is heard most frequently from those officers who are required to spend hours on the phone assuring non-favored Congressmen that the military was not responsible for contract leaks to their rivals. Sighs one harried diplomat-officer: "I'd much rather wrestle with the many complex problems of guided missiles than of guided leaks."

Appendix

Joe Gerber of Racine, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Friday, October 11, issue of the Iowa City Press-Citizen, there appears an article entitled "Joe Gerber Grew Up With Iowa Football at Racine's." The article was written by Al Grady. Mr. Gerber is one of Iowa City's and Iowa's leading citizens. He is known to thousands of our former Iowa University's students and alumni. The article is of great interest, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE GERBER GREW UP WITH IOWA FOOTBALL AT RACINE'S

(By Al Grady)

"How d'they look?"

To literally thousands of University of Iowa homecomers over the years that phrase became a byword. It was as much a part of Iowa City as was Racine's.

And if Iowa City doesn't quite look like the same old place anymore without Racine's, then maybe Racine's wouldn't have looked like the same old place without Joe Gerber.

This is a piece about Joe Gerber, and maybe it ties in well with homecoming, because there probably isn't anyone around who was so much a part of the athletic scene at Iowa for years without having officially been a part of the university in any way.

It's appropriate, too, because Joe (who's still going strong, though retired) was 75 on the 17th day of last month and this is the 75th year of Iowa football. They sort of grew up together, Joe Gerber and Iowa football.

For those who came in late, Racine's was a cigar store in Iowa City. Make that plural. At one time there were four of them. For how long? You'd have to ask some city historian. But the Racine's stores were a landmark in Iowa City from probably half a century or more, for Joe started working at one of the stores in 1913 and worked at one Racine's store or another for 45 years, the last 9 years for Chet Comer after the latter had bought the last of the original stores from Fred Racine.

When a man stops to buy a good 5-cent cigar (which was what this country needed most for a good many years), he is quite apt to become involved in conversation about sports.

And when the cigar store counter is in the same building as the hotel, where visiting teams often used to stay, the man behind the counter is apt to meet a lot of famous names in the world of sport, to know them well, to remember them, and to become a seemingly permanent part of the scenery.

That's the way it was with Joe Gerber. It just seemed like he was always there, and he'd almost always greet you with that famous catch line: "How'd they look?"

From my standpoint, first as an SUI student, and later as a writer here, I was never quite sure who they were, but I always managed the magic password, "Pretty good, Joe."

Name an Iowa football player, any Iowa football player, in the first half of this century and chances are that Joe Gerber knew him. With a lot of them, he can still tell you where they are and what they're doing today. Like a good many other long-time businessmen in Iowa City, he got to know first generation students, and then their children and then their children's children.

Joe and his wife, Albie, who have been married for more than 52 years, can recall, for instance, when Gordon Locke, all-American fullback and quarterback of Iowa in 1921 and 1922, used to eat at their house as a regular thing.

Mention a name in Iowa football history and Joe can tell you a story about him—Mayes McClain, Bill Glasgow, Nile Kinnick, Dick Crayne, Wes Fry, Dick Romey, Duke Slater, Cowboy Kutsch, Aubrey Devine, Lester Belding, Joe Laws, Fred Becker, Ozie Simmons.

Because of the fact that he worked at Racine's store on the Hotel Jefferson corner for 22 years, Joe got to know a great many Big Ten athletes, coaches, officials, and sportswriters.

He recalls Knute Rockne saying one time: "I'll tell you something, kid. In this game, if you don't have the horses you don't win." (Knute Rockne has been dead for more than 30 years and that statement is as true today as it ever was.)

Noble Kizer, a Rockne pupil who gained fame as the coach at Purdue, became one of Joe's favorites on his many visits to Iowa City. And so did the late Ed Burns, the portly sports writer for the Chicago Tribune whose favorite phrase while picking up a cigar was: "Give me the dope." And Joe likes to talk about Big Ten officials of the long ago like Jay Wyatt and John Schomer and Nick Kearnes.

Joe saw his first game at Iowa in 1899, when Dr. Arthur Knipe came west out of Pennsylvania to produce the first of two successive unbeaten teams. Joe was 12 years old in 1900 and he recalls caddying for Knipe at the old city golf course and recalls also that the team in those days dressed for the game in the back room of a laundry on Iowa Avenue between Clinton and Dubuque and walked down to the game on old Iowa field on the banks of the river.

Ask Joe his nominees as Iowa's greatest coaches over the years, and he quickly names Howard Jones and Forest Evashevski. He was a close friend of Jones for many years, both while Howard was at Iowa and later as a long-distance correspondent when Jones had all those powerhouses at USC.

"I can remember one time," Joe says now, "when a bunch of us were up at the Moose during the holiday season sacking peanuts and candy to give to the kids at Christmas. Tennessee was going to play USC in the Rose Bowl and Tennessee was favored to win. I had a few nips, and so I took out all the money I had in my billfold (it was $18) and said, 'Listen, you guys, I'm telling you Jones is going to win that game 14–0.' Nobody wanted to bet with me, but by gosh that was the exact final score. I couldn't believe it myself."

Joe recalls also fond memories of friendship with Iowa Coaches Burt Ingwersen and Ossie Solem. "When they win, they're all good coaches," he says. "And when they lose, the public thinks they haven't got it. Slip Madigan was a darn good coach, too, here during the war, but he didn't have any players. You couldn't expect him to win."

Reminisce with Joe and he recalls the day Waddy Davis kicked three dropkicks against Nebraska, the day Ozzie Simmons ran wild against Northwestern, the day Howard Jones and Iowa beat Knute Rockne and Notre Dame, and the day Nile Kinnick's two fourth-quarter touchdown passes helped Iowa end 10 years of frustration against Bernie Bierman's famed Golden Gophers of Minnesota.

Ask Joe to name the most exciting Iowa game he ever saw and he comes up with two. The first is rather unexpected, for it's a game seldom recalled by historians in recounting Hawkeye football lore. It was the opening Big Ten game of 1939 in which Iowa defeated Indiana, 32–29, with Nile Kinnick throwing two fourth-quarter touchdown passes after first one team and then the other had held the lead throughout the day.

"That was really something," Joe recalls. "I was in the press box that day and I almost fell out of it. It was like a basketball game."

I do recall that Joe's longtime friend of the press, Bert McGrane of the Des Moines Register, wrote something like this after that game. "The football renaissance arrived at Iowa today, borne on the shoulders of Nile Kinnick and a fleet-footed end named Irwin Prasse."

For his other choice as "most exciting," Joe picks the 1952 game in which Evashevski's first Iowa team upended Ohio State, 8–0, in the greatest upset of the year.

Joe Gerber recalls other scenes of football through the years, too: Homecoming decorations at fraternities and sororities, parlay cards and punchboards, bonfires, and snake dances, the first radio broadcasts of Iowa games, canvas suits and old Iowa field, trips by train, magaphones and marching bands, victories and defeats, high spots and low, great players seen and remembered as they were then.

These are quiet days for Joe, who retired in 1959, but still busy. Uptown often in the mornings, but home most afternoons. Albie is there, and the parakeet, and a granddaughter who's a senior in the school of nursing at Mercy Hospital.

If he isn't listening to a ball game, he's probably watching one, or reading about it.

Last week, he watched the world's series on television with the sound turned off and listened to the Iowa-Washington game at the same time.

"Hey, that was quite a surprise, wasn't it?" he says of the Hawkeyes' triumph over the Huskies. "Gee, I hope they can keep it up. I'd like to see Jerry Burns have a good year. He seems like such a nice guy. He used to come in to Racine's once in a while, but I never got to know him very well. I guess I know Flora and Piro about the best of the present coaches. But they all seem like nice people."

Joe didn't make it to the opener with Washington State, but he's hoping to be there Saturday for homecoming, worrying and pulling and fretting along with the rest of the Hawkeye fans.

And if you see him on the way to the game, or after, you better be ready, because he'll probably ask you:

"How'd they look?"

Address of Hon. Burr P. Harrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Burr P. Harrison, of Winchester, Va., a former distinguished Member of this body from the Seventh District of Virginia who served here with honor and distinction, delivered an outstanding address to the student body of Hampden-Sydney College at Hampden-Sydney, Va., on October 3, 1963.

Mr. Harrison is one of the outstanding lawyers of Virginia and served eminently as judge of the 17th Judicial Circuit of Virginia until he retired to become a candidate for Congress. He is recognized far and wide for his great legal ability and his keen analytical mind. When he decided to retire from this body, practically everyone here realized we were losing a great colleague and his wise counsel and advice would be missed tremendously and the Nation was losing the services of one of the greatest legislators in the Congress.

Mr. Harrison in his address points up cogently how the Supreme Court of the United States of America is usurping the powers of the legislative branch of the Government, is unconstitutionally foisting its own political philosophy upon the people of this Nation, is siphoning off the powers of the States, the freedoms of the people and is trespassing upon the rights of this Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include a copy of Mr. Harrison's address and commend it to all of the Members of the Congress and hope that the people of the Nation will read it, analyze it, and act according to the advice given therein and save this Nation from judicial dictatorship.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BURR P. HARRISON, OF WINCHESTER, VA., FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS FOR THE SEVENTH VIRGINIA CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, FORMER VIRGINIA CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE AND PRESENTLY A MEMBER OF THE VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, DELIVERED TO THE STUDENT BODY OF HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE ON OCTOBER 3, 1963

In several addresses this summer, Mr. Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., of the Supreme Court of the United States asserted that "the very survival of the Supreme Court is threatened" by criticism of the Court "based on lack of understanding." To have such understanding, the Justice said, a citizen must first read the opinions of the Court. Criticism of the decisions without such a reading is uninformed and, thereby, threatens the "very survival of the Supreme Court." As a concrete example, the Justice condemned clergymen and others for voicing criticism, without reading the 109 pages of reasoning in four separate majority opinions, of the Court decision that the provisions of the first amendment forbidding Congress from establishing a religion had been violated when school boards permitted voluntary reading of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools.

When I was a Member of Congress, supposed to be a coordinate branch of Government, it would have been helpful to me if I could have limited criticism of my votes in that body to those who read the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would have simplified my life, indeed, if I could have replied to any other critics that criticism of Congress without reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "is based on lack of understanding" and "threatens the very existence" of Congress. I am quite sure that President Kennedy, the head of another coordinate branch of Government, would be surprised if it were contended that the very existence of the Presidency "is threatened" by criticism by any citizen who had not first read all the speeches, releases and messages of the President, his Cabinet and executive agencies.

Inasmuch as the opinions of the Supreme Court at its last term alone filled over 1,900 pages of the finely printed, double-columned Supreme Court Reporter, a restriction of criticism to those citizens who manage to wade through this annual mammoth tome would confine the right to make adverse comment to a highly limited handful of the legally elite. Nevertheless, even this narrow concession of Justice Brennan emboldened me to read this paper stating six indictments of the present Supreme Court, supporting the charges of these indictments solely to the testimony of the members of the Supreme Court itself and to the Chief Justices of the State Courts, all of whom presumably have read the opinions on which they comment.

INDICTMENT I

This charge is stated, and denied, by Mr. Justice Brennan in his address at Maxwell Air Base, in these words: The Court "is charged with making social, political, economic or philosophical decisions" and that in so doing it "is a council of platonic guardians given the function of deciding our most difficult and emotional questions according to the Justices' own notions of what is just or wise or politic."

In other words, the indictment is that decisions are based on individual whim, and not on law, that they lack stability and coherence, and that a lawyer, familiar with the decisions, may advise his client only that the legality of contemplated action depends entirely upon the changing and capricious notions of the temporary majority of the Justices. In passing, it might be noted that the phrase platonic guardians was not original with Mr. Justice Brennan although he gave no indication of that fact in his address. It was first utilized in reference to the Supreme Court in a series of lectures to Harvard Law School by the late, great, Judge Learned Hand.

Be that as it may, what is the evidence upon which the charge is based?

Well, consider this:

At its last term the Supreme Court rendered 134 formal written opinions. In 42 of them, the Justices managed to lay down the law without dissension among themselves. In 10 more they agreed upon the outcome of the case but clashed with each other as to why they arrived at their common goal. In two additional opinions they divided into three camps and, in one decision, the nine Justices collided in six different opinions giving six different reasons for arriving at the same conclusion.

In the remaining 79 opinions, or in 58 percent of the total written opinions, they disagreed both as to the law and the decision. In 22 of these discordant cases they found themselves divided three ways, in two of them there were four different opinions, while in four more they quarreled among themselves in five separate opinions in each case.

In 21 of these earnest battles, six Justices said the law or the Constitution was one thing and three Justices said it was another, and, in 17 additional cases, five Justices proclaimed the "law of land" in accordance with their views while four of them earnestly asserted it was just the opposite.

Does this record which the Justices themselves made at the last term establish that the decisions are not the voice of authoritative and stable determination of the law and the written Constitution, or does it prove the decisions are will-o'-wisps merely reflecting the illusive nostrums of individual men?

If the charge of this indictment, that the decisions of this Supreme Court are based on individual caprice, rather than on settled law, is not sustained by this record there is additional direct testimony from witnesses who have read the Court's opinions.

Witness No. 1: Owen J. Roberts, then a retired Justice of the Supreme Court, who in speaking of one decision said: "It tends to bring adjudications of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, good for this day and train only."

Witness No. 2: Mr. Justice Clark, speaking for four Supreme Court Justices, said: "The Court has made a Chinese puzzle out of this simple case."[1] (All decisions to which I shall make reference were handed down at the last term unless I specifically state otherwise.)

Witness No. 3: Edmund W. Flynn, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Rhode Island, then chairman of the Conference of Chief Justices: "Law will not be properly interpreted by prima donnas who think more of their own philosophies and interests than the welfare of the Court."

Witness No. 4: Mr. Justice Clark, speaking for himself and Justices Harlan and Stewart, with reference to a majority opinion written by Mr. Justice Brennan: "The Court holds the oral recitation to be 'a written statement' * * *. It reaches this result via a construction reminiscent of the Rube Goldberg cartoons."[2]

Witness No. 5: Mr. Justice Harlan: "The Court's decision in these appeals throws the law of finality into a state of great uncertainty."[3]

Witness No. 6: The same Justice in another case: "The Court's holding surely flies in the face of history."[4]

And finally on this charge, witness No. 7, no other than Mr. Justice Brennan, himself, joined by Chief Justice Warren: "The root error, as I see it, in the Court decision is that it works an extraordinary and unwarranted departure from the settled principles."[5]

Later, in the same opinion, the same two Justices: The decision "is the result of arcane logic."

In the light of the testimony of all these witnesses, and of the overall record of the Court, a denial of the charge that the Court's decisions are based on individual notions and caprice would indeed be the "result of arcane logic."

INDICTMENT II

The charge is that the present Supreme Court is distorting and perverting the Constitution of the United States so as to destroy the Federal relationship of the States as established by the plain language of the Constitution.

Witness No. 1: By a vote of 36 to 8, the 1956 Conference of Chief Justices of State Courts declared:

"Recent decisions have departed so far from constitutional precepts that this country no longer has a written Constitution any more than England."

Witness No. 2: In a 1961 decision, in which the Court invalidated an Ohio conviction for possession of obscene literature, this was

Footnotes at end of speech.

said by Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Justices Frankfurter and Whittaker:

"This Court should continue to forbear from fettering the States with an adamant rule which may embarrass them in coping with their own peculiar problems in criminal law enforcement."

"An approach which regards the issue as one of achieving procedural symmetry or of serving administrative convenience surely disfigures the boundaries of this Court's functions in relation to the State and Federal Court." [6]

Witness No. 3: Mr. Justice Clark declared a 6-to-3 decision to be:

"An 'abrupt break' not only with the Constitution and the statute but also with its past decisions, disrupting the delicate balance of federalism so foremost in the minds of the Founding Fathers and so uniquely important in the field of law enforcement * * *.

"After today State judgments will be relegated to a judicial limbo, subject to Federal collateral attack—as here—a score of years later." [7]

Witness No. 4: In this same case, Justices Harlan, Clark, and Stewart said: "In what it does today the Court has turned its back on history and struck a heavy blow at the foundations of our federal system." [8]

Witness No. 5: In yet another case, Mr. Justice Clark, joined by Mr. Justice Black, declared: "The damage that this decision will do to the tax structure of a State is clearly revealed." [9]

Witness No. 6: In another case at this last term, Mr. Justice Clark declared: "The Court piles an intolerable burden on the States' judicial machinery." [10]

And, finally, on this indictment, witness No. 7: At a time when he was chairman of the Conference of Chief Justices, Chief Justice Flynn of Rhode Island declared: "Questions involving the States are being decided by persons who do not know what the impact of their decisions will be upon State law and constitutions."

Is the evidence to sustain the charge in this indictment made on the uninformed criticism of persons who have not read the opinions of the Court or do they convict this Court of distorting and perverting the Constitution so as to destroy the Federal relationship of the States as established by the plain language of the Constitution?

INDICTMENT III

The charge is that the present Supreme Court is arrogating unto itself the legislative functions which the Constitution imposes on the Congress.

Witness No. 1: Mr. Justice Black called the majority decision "a major statutory surgical operation" and went on to say: "If such drastic changes are to be wrought in the act that Congress passed, it seems important to me that this Court should wait for Congress to perform that operation." [11]

And then in another case, Mr. Justice Brennan, joined by the Chief Justice, is witness No. 2 when he said the majority decision contemplated "a pro tanto repeal of the antitrust laws." [12]

And witness No. 3, a new one, Mr. Justice Goldberg, who, with Mr. Justice Douglas, said: "The Court's opinion leads to what seems to me to be a wholly anomalous result plainly never intended by Congress." [13]

As witness No. 4, hear the words of Justices Harlan and Stewart:

"The Court has effectively 'repealed' a basic aspect of an Act of Congress."

And again, "There is an outer limit beyond which judicial construction of the language of a statute ought not to go, and I respectfully submit that that limit has been exceeded here." [14]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Witness No. 5 is Mr. Justice Black who in still another case during the last term was joined by Justices Stewart and Goldberg in these comments on the decisions: "If this criminal statute is to be so drastically reconstructed it should be done by Congress, not by us." [15]

Witness No. 6 is Mr. Justice Harlan, who with Mr. Justice Clark said of an opinion written by the same Mr. Justice Brennan: "The net of it is that the Court has come forth with a new section 2255 of its own which bears little resemblance to the statute enacted by Congress. And in the process the Court has even gone so far as to suggest that any tampering with its new composition may run afoul of the Constitution." [16]

Witness No. 7 is Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Justices Douglas and Stewart, who said of a 5 to 3 decision construing an act of Congress: "Today's result, I venture to say, would have dumfounded those responsible for the legislation the Court construes, for nothing could have been farther from their minds or more inconsistent with their deeply felt convictions." [17]

And, in the same case, Mr. Justice Douglas makes Witness No. 8, when he said: "The decision will, I think, be marked as the baldest attempt by judges in modern times to spin their own philosophy into the fabric of the law, in derogation of the will of the legislature. The present decision * * * grants the Federal bureaucracy a power and command * * * it never has had, that it always wanted, that it could never persuade Congress to grant, and that this Court up to now has consistently refused to recognize." [18]

Witness No. 9 is Justices Harlan's and Stewart's comment on a decision, again written by Mr. Justice Brennan: "This frustration of a manifest congressional design is, in my view, a most unwarranted intrusion upon the legislative domain." [19]

And finally, on this indictment as witness No. 10 is this comment subscribed to by four Justices on a decision written by our old friend, Mr. Justice Brennan:

"I dissent from the Court's judgment and opinion because 'statutory construction' means to me that the Court can construe statutes but not that it can construct them. The latter function is reserved to the Congress, which clearly said what it meant and undoubtedly meant what it said. * * *

"Nonetheless, the Court has rewritten the Act, sua sponte, creating a definition of 'entry' which was suggested by many organizations during the hearings prior to its enactment but which was rejected by the Congress." [20]

In the light of all these comments, I ask who is writing the law: Congress or the Supreme Court?

INDICTMENT IV

The charge is that this Supreme Court is so twisting the Constitution and the law that society cannot punish those guilty of crimes of violence such as murder, rape, and robbery.

Witness No. 1: Several Years ago, Mr. Justice Clark had this to say about an opinion of the majority: "Unless the Congress changes the rule announced today those intelligence agencies of our government engaged in law enforcement may as well close up shop for the Court has opened their files to the criminal and thus afforded him a Roman holiday for rummaging through confidential information as well as vital national secrets."

Witness No. 2: Mr. Justice Black, joined by Chief Justice Warren and Mr. Justice Douglas, said the Court's decision usurped "the constitutional function of the jury to determine the guilt or innocence of these defendants on untainted evidence." [21]

Witness No. 3: Justices Stewart, Clark, Harlan, and White in yet another case, in which they said the effect of the decision of the other five is: "to frustrate the fair and prompt administration of criminal justice, to disrespect the fundamental structure of our Federal system and to debase the great writ of habeas corpus." [22]

Witness No. 4: Four more Justices (White, Clark, Harlan, and Stewart) in yet another case about which they said: "The ruling of the Court severely limits the power of the States to avoid undue expense in dealing with criminal appeals. It places their appellate processes in an inflexible procedural strait jacket." [23]

Witness No. 5 is Mr. Justice Clark, joined by Justices Harlan, Stewart, and White, in a case in which the Court by a 5 to 4 vote completely released a convicted mail robber because they said that a discharge of a jury and the summoning of a new jury, because of unavoidable absence of a key Government witness, violated the double jeopardy provision of the Constitution. In this case these four Justices said: "The 'ends of public justice' * * * require that the Government have a fair opportunity to present the people's case and obtain adjudication on its merits, rather than that the criminal be turned free because of the harmless oversight of the prosecutor." [24]

And, finally, on this indictment I offer as witness No. 6 this statement of Mr. Justice Clark in a case in which the Court, by a 5-to-4 vote, released from custody on a technicality a murderer who had been convicted years before: "The rights of the States to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures consistent with the 14th amendment, have long been recognized as essential to the concept of a healthy federalism. Those rights are today attenuated if not obliterated in the name of a victory for the 'struggle for personal liberty.' But the Constitution comprehends another struggle of equal importance and places upon our shoulders the burden of maintaining it—the struggle for law and order. I regret that the Court does not often recognize that each defeat in that struggle chips away inexorably at the base of that very personal liberty which it seeks to protect." [25]

In the light of the testimony of these witnesses, is it true that the present Supreme Court is so twisting the law and the Constitution that society cannot punish those guilty of crimes of violence, such as murder, rape, and robbery?

INDICTMENT V

The charge is that the present Supreme Court has lawlessly rewritten the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment so as to give government approbation to the agnostic and the godless and to deprive all others of the right of freedom of expression of religious belief.

In support of this charge, I offer one witness, Mr. Justice Stewart: In the New York prayer case, decided in 1962, he said this:

"I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an 'official religion' is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation * * *.

"The Court today says that the State and Federal Governments are without constitutional power to prescribe any particular form of words to be recited by any group of the American people on any subject touching religion * * *".

After pointing out that the Supreme Court opens sessions with prayer as does Congress, Presidents take oaths on the Bible, the Star-Spangled Banner recites as a motto

"In God We Trust," and Congress recently amended the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag to add the words "under God," Mr. Justice Stewart asks if these are illegal or "is the Court suggesting that the Constitution permits Judges, and Congressmen, and Presidents to join in prayer, but prohibits schoolchildren from doing so?" [26]

At this last term, the Justices wrote five separate opinions in the same case to come up with the conclusion that the voluntary attendance of public schoolchildren during readings of the Bible in one State and the reading of the Lord's Prayer in another State constituted an act of Congress establishing a religion contrary to the prohibition of the first amendment.

In that case, Mr. Justice Stewart said:

"State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them. * * *.

"For a compulsory State educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and State-created disadvantage. Viewed in this light, permission of such exercises for those who want them is necessary if the schools are truly to be neutral in the matter of religion. And a refusal to permit religious exercises thus is seen, not as the realization of State neutrality, but rather as the establishment of a religion of secularism, or at the least, as Government support of the beliefs of those who think that religious exercises should be conducted only in private." [27]

Is it true that these decisions, as intimated by Mr. Justice Stewart, give impetus to moves to remove all traces of religion from any manifestation in public life?

INDICTMENT VI

This last charge has to do with the overall effect of what this Supreme Court is doing to America. I state this indictment in the language of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a 1962 dissent: "A massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power."

And still quoting him in that case: The Court, he said, "manifests an odd—indeed an esoteric—conception of judicial propriety."

And further about the effect of the decision in that case, he says: "The Court's uniform course of decision over the years is overruled or disregarded." [28]

Others make this charge. These are the words of Justices Black, Warren, and Douglas: "It is the Court itself, instead of the defendants, which turns 'an important constitutional principle upside down.'"

Also: "This Court alone therefore, this 14th day of January 1963, is entitled to whatever credit is due for enfeebling our Bill of Rights in this way." [29]

In 1958, as they did in 1956, 38 of the Chief Justices drafted a calm and documented indictment of the trend of Supreme Court decisions. A full copy of this has been printed by, and is available from, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government. From it I quote only this: "We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or * * * the draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court should, or would, have the unlimited policymaking powers it is now exercising."

Finally, consider this 1962 language of Mr. Justice Harlan, to which Justices Frankfurter and Whittaker subscribed: "But in the last analysis I think the Court can increase respect for the Constitution only if it rigidly respects the limitations which the Constitution places upon it, and respects as well the principles inherent in its own processes. In the present case I think we exceed both, and that our voice becomes only a voice of power, not of reason." [30]

What is the summation of this voice of power in recent years?

The summation is that these men are systematically embezzling our liberties and our system of government. The thefts are periodically made in amounts cunningly contrived to avoid public detection. It is for this reason that Justice Brennan and others are on the hustings preaching the dangerous nonsense that their doings may not be scrutinized by the average man.

At the present moment, the most earnest endeavors of the Federal judiciary are concentrated upon arrogating to themselves the power to gerrymander the districts of the elected representatives of the people. If this is successfully completed, they will effectively control the legislative branch of the States, and eventually the Federal House of Representatives, and the treasury of our liberties and constitutional system will face bankruptcy. Hence, time is of the essence.

When we come to consider a remedy for this dangerous situation, I draw inspiration from these words of Abraham Lincoln: "The people of the United States are the rightful masters of both Congresses and the courts, not to overthrow the Constitution but to overthrow men who pervert the Constitution."

"The people are the rightful masters of the courts." In that one phrase, Lincoln sweeps away the vast reams and reams of twaddle of the last 10 years which picture the Supreme Court as a god handing down law in tablets which the ordinary man must supinely accept. "The people are the rightful masters" and not the courts.

What did Lincoln mean when he said the people have the right "to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution?" Did he mean, as Thomas Jefferson once advocated, that the people should "raise their arm?" Certainly not. Lincoln made it clear many times that he opposed violence. Did he mean, as Theodore Roosevelt advocated in the early years of this century, that the Justices of the Supreme Court should be subjected to recall. Lincoln never advocated that. He recognized, as we should recognize, that during most of our Nation's history, the Supreme Court has been a bulwalk of our liberty. When the courts "pervert the Constitution," reform should not go so far as to destroy its rightful place as a coordinate branch of government under the system of checks and balances so carefully contrived by Madison and his colleagues in Philadelphia. Should the people so "overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution" as to destroy the system of checks and balances they would pervert the Constitution and their liberties would become endangered from other sources.

What Lincoln meant is illustrated by his own experience. When he made the statement I have read to you, Lincoln was out of any position of government and had just been rejected in his bid for membership in the U.S. Senate. But within a year and a half, he was President of the United States, and, entirely independent of the War Between the States, he "overthrew those who perverted the Constitution," merely by asserting his own authority as the head of a coordinate branch of government.

All that the people of today need to assert their rightful mastery is to elect one President and one Congress who will exercise the powers which are theirs under the Constitution. This, and this alone, will overthrow those who pervert the Constitution without overthrowing the Constitution.

If this is done, and done before it is too late, the people will have demonstrated that they "are the rightful masters of both Congresses and the courts" and again in this land we will have "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] *Wong Sun* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 407, 423.
[2] *Campbell* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 1356, 1363.
[3] *Mercantile Nat'l Bank* v. *Langdeau*, 83 S. Ct. 520, 531.
[4] *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 83 S. Ct. 801, 810
[5] *Pan American World Airways* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 476, 490.
[6] *Mapp* v. *Ohio* (1961), 367 U.S. 643, 81 S. Ct. 1684, 1706.
[7] *Fay* v. *Noia*, 83 S. Ct. 822, 852, 853.
[8] Id. 854.
[9] *Halliburton Oil Well, etc., Co.* v. *Reily*, 83 S. Ct. 1201, 1208.
[10] *Douglas* v. *California*, 83 S. Ct. 814, 817.
[11] *Smith* v. *Evening News Assoc.*, 83 S. Ct. 267, 272.
[12] *Pan American Airways* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 476, 490.
[13] *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers* v. *Louisville, etc., Ry.*, 83 S. Ct. 1059, 1065.
[14] *Reed* v. *Steamship Yaka*, 83 S. Ct. 1349, 1353, 1354, 1355.
[15] *U.S.* v. *National Dairy Products Corp.*, 83 S. Ct. 594, 600.
[16] *Sanders* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 1068, 1081.
[17] *State of Arizona* v. *State of California*, 83 S. Ct. 1468, 1500.
[18] Id. 1512.
[19] *U.S.* v. *Philadelphia Nat'l Bank*, 83 S. Ct. 1715, 1753.
[20] *Rosenberg* v. *Fleati*, 83 S. Ct. 1804, 1813.
[21] *Shotwell Mfg. Co.* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 448, 475.
[22] *Townsend* v. *Sain*, 83 S. Ct. 745, 768.
[23] *Draper* v. *State of Washington*, 83 S. Ct. 774, 785.
[24] *Downum* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 1033, 1038.
[25] *Fay* v. *Noia*, 83 S. Ct. 822, 853.
[26] *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 82 S. Ct. 1261, 1274, 1275.
[27] *School District* v. *Schempp*, 83 S. Ct. 1560, 1618.
[28] *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 82 S. Ct. 691, 737, 738, 743.
[29] *Shotwell Mfg. Co.* v. *U.S.*, 83 S. Ct. 448, 472.
[30] 1961, 367 U.S. 643, 81 S. Ct. 1684, 1708 (*Mapp* v. *Ohio*).

Pulaski Day Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution concerning Poland which was adopted at a Pulaski Day celebration in Wilmington, Del., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It was adopted by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress.

This resolution expresses the deep concern of Americans of Polish extraction over the preset nonindependent status of Poland. It is a concern which merits wide attention.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has to be stated once more—and we have been saying it for years—that

Poland did not regain her independence after the Second World War, but was pushed against her will into an ideological system alien to her tradition and convictions and is economically exploited by her occupant; and

Whereas the opinion has to be expressed that her's and other nations' of central-eastern Europe present political plight is not only a result of the aggressive policy of Soviet Russia, but also of the indifferent attitude of the countries of the West, which in the affairs concerning this politically important geographical region did not go beyond wordy declarations and which through some of their political concepts not only did not induce the lessening of the slavery which reigns there, but intensified it; and

Whereas the tendency to release tension in the world is understandable, this cannot be accomplished by covering with silence the problems which lie at the roots of the present conflict. An adjustment of the interests of the rival powers at the expense of others also will not bring any lasting solutions, but will undermine these principles which are an important asset in the struggle waged by our country at a global scale; and

Whereas these principles are the recognition of a right of each nation to an independent political life; the recognition of a right of citizens of an independent state to choose their own government; the recognition of the human right of every individual to be free to worship, particularly, when looking with sadness and anxiety on the encroachment by force of the Warsaw regime on the church in Poland: Now, therefore, we Americans of Polish extraction, assembled at the meeting organized by the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware and the Delaware Division of the Polish American Congress, on October 13, 1963, in commemoration of the 184th anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, at the place bearing his name in Wilmington, Del.,

Resolve—

1. It is necessary to enlarge American political strategy, so it will embrace wholeheartedly the problems of central-eastern Europe. Countries of that region with Poland as its bigger member are entitled to no less an independent life as it is given to the emerging and sometimes primitive people of Asia and Africa. This is not only a test case of sincerity of our principles, but lies also in our national interest.

2. The recognition of the present Polish-German frontier on the Oder and Neisse Rivers will not only put on move the frozen situation in Europe, but will also help Poland to liberate herself from under the Soviet domination and will undermine the German revisionism lying across any sensible solutions toward European political stabilization.

3. The Government of our country, in order to emphasize the principles on which it bases its policy in the world, can put a pressure on the Warsaw regime to stop its perfidious struggle with the church in Poland. It can do it both through its own diplomatic channels or through the United Nations Organization as a signatory of the Declaration of Human Rights: be it further

Resolved, That the copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Delaware.

CASIMIR CHETKOWSKI,
President.
ADAM J. ROSIAK,
Secretary.

Automation: A Real "A-Bomb"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, few subjects are more discussed but less understood than automation. On the one hand, we hear the promise of fabulous prosperity. On the other hand, we are told to prepare for economic disaster.

A highly intelligent examination of this paradox has just come to my attention. It is contained in an address delivered recently before the Ontario Conference on Automation and Social Change at Toronto by Al Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists.

Mr. Hayes knows something about the subject of automation. Many of the million men and women he represents work in industries where automation has been a fact of life for years.

Mr. Hayes is cochairman of the Foundation on Automation and Employment, sponsored jointly by the IAM and U.S. Industries, Inc., in an effort to deal with the human problems created by automation.

Mr. Hayes' address to the Ontario Conference on Automation and Social Change appears in the September 26 issue of the Machinist, the weekly newspaper of the IAM. I include the address in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

AUTOMATION: A REAL "A-BOMB"

(By Al Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists)

Automation presents the United States and Canada—and eventually every country—with a threat and challenge second only to the possibility of the hydrogen bomb.

In the past, there has been some tendency to underrate and deprecate the seriousness of automation's implications for mankind. For many years economists, industrialists and Government experts in the United States generally kept reassuring one another that automation was just a logical extension of mechanization and that, like mechanization, it would create more jobs, more work, more prosperity and more satisfaction for the human race.

In fact, not so many years ago, anyone who tried to warn that automation held as much threat of human redundance as of material abundance was likely to be ridiculed and even reviled.

Today, however, a lot of people are finally beginning to realize that automation is not just a new kind of mechanization, but a revolutionary force capable of overturning our social order. Whereas mechanization made workers more efficient, and thus more valuable, automation threatens to make them superfluous and thus without value.

THE WALKING WOUNDED

In the United States, the army of the unemployed—what we might call the walking wounded in the onslaught of automation—is now almost as great as the total population of Chicago and Los Angeles. In Canada, unemployment is greater than the population of Vancouver.

By 1968 the United States will have unemployment equivalent to the total population of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles.

In view of these trends and projections, it is obvious that we need not go on merely defining and analyzing the problem, or proving its existence. To the contrary, our need now, the need of industry, government and labor in both the United States and Canada, is to find answers to the very serious new questions that automation raises.

These questions are of a broad scope and infinite variety. The most immediate, of course, is how to cushion the impact of technological advance on individuals and communities in automation's direct line of march.

But ultimately we may be faced with even more difficult and fundamental problems. How, for example, shall we maintain human dignity and provide each man with the sense of personal worth necessary to all men in a technology which threatens to need very few men?

And how, also, will we insure that every family will have enough purchasing power to meet its own needs, as well as the need of industry for consumers, if automated machines take the place of the worker and deprive him of his wages in the mills, factories, mines, offices, banks, warehouses, farms, and stores?

Unfortunately we have not yet reached a consensus on even the first and most immediate of these problems. The difficulty of reaching such a consensus has been compounded by the unwillingness of some industrial managers to accept responsibility for those whose livelihood is destroyed by technological advance.

SHARING THE SAVINGS

Lest you think this is an exaggeration, let me tell you that not too long ago, I noted in the leading journal of a major industry that 76 percent of a group of corporate officials subscribed to the principle, as a basis for bargaining, that—and I quote—"The company is entitled to all of the savings resulting from the introduction of labor saving equipment."

Such a contention is, of course, patently absurd.

In both Canada and the United States, technological achievement is rooted in long established systems of public education. without such educational systems, to which all the people contribute, there would be no technological progress.

Second, in the United States—and in Canada as well—technological progress is generated by public support of scientific research and development programs in governmental, academic, and industrial laboratories.

In fact, of the $12,500 million that is being spent annually for all research and development in the United States, more than $7 billion comes directly from tax moneys that are paid by all the people.

Third, our heritage of scientific knowledge has been handed down bu succeeding generations of artisans and skilled workers and comes from the countless contributions which they have made in the workplace.

ORGANIZING ABUNDANCE

This heritage of skill and know-how belongs to the people as a whole and must be used in the national interest.

Over and beyond these considerations of reason and justice, if management successfully enforced a claim to all the benefits and

savings made possible by automation, it would commit economic suicide in the process.

In dealing with automation, the fundamental economic principle from which we must proceed is that workers are consumers, and that it is pointless to plan automated factories capable of pouring out endless streams of goods without also planning an economy in which those goods can be distributed and consumed.

Fortunately, an increasing number of employers and Government officials are beginning to see the light. One of the most enlightened, and one of the first to blaze a trail is John Snyder, chairman, U.S. Industries, Inc. His effort to get to heart of this problem through the Foundation on Automation and Employment is not only a humane approach but good economics as well.

If more employers were as concerned with men as with machines, many of the bitter disputes between labor and management, including those that have taken place this year in the longshore, newspaper and railroad industries would never have occurred.

It is freely acknowledged that these and many other expensive disputes have their roots in automation and the fear of technological displacement.

EARLY WARNING SYSTEM

If nothing else, the spread and the threat of more such expensive and time-consuming disputes have at least forced industry and Government to take a second and closer look at the implications of automation.

Recently, for example, President Kennedy announced his intention of appointing a Presidential Commission on Automation. In doing so he quoted the Presidential Railroad Commission which declared that "Revolutionary changes even for the better carry a high price in disruption that might exceed the value of the improvements."

A key figure in our House of Representatives, Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, has called for a White House Conference on Automation, saying that "the tide of industrial revolution is engulfing us."

Since the extent, seriousness and scope of the problem is now being recognized, the next question is what, if anything, can be done about it? Well, there are no easy answers but certain trends are beginning to emerge.

For example, in most union negotations today it is generally expected that the contract will contain one or more provisions relating to advance notice and consultation, reduction of the work force by attrition, transfer rights (including moving expenses), retraining, employee adjustment services, wage rate retention, early retirement and severance pay.

To some extent, through such provisions, the union can and does protect the worker already employed.

SHORTER WORKWEEK

But what about the worker without a job, especially the youngster out of school who, because of automation and high rates of unemployment cannot even get a foothold in the labor force? It is in this group that we already have our largest proportion of unemployment and one of our highest potentials for social disintegration.

Obviously, no one yet knows what the full answers are in this area, and I do not pretend to. But, in seeking to adjust to a situation where fewer and fewer people can turn out more and more goods in less and less time, it seems evident that one fundamental change we will have to make in our society is to reduce the number of hours an individual works—not merely in a day, a week, or a year—but in his lifetime.

Certainly we need a shorter workweek, and despite the roars of outrage in the conventional world of business as usual, I suggest that by 1970 the 35-hour week will be considered not too short but too long.

I suggest that in response to automation we will have to learn to schedule, and to use, more leisure time in the form of more holidays, more long weekends, more vacations and more sabbaticals for more people.

I would also suggest that eventually we must provide more and better educational opportunities for our youth. If the experience of the past is repeated we can expect that 8 out of every 10 youngsters now in grade school will not complete college.

Some will not have the inclination. Some will not have the ability. But some with both the inclination and the ability will simply not have the money. And yet it is painfully evident that a high school diploma isn't enough in a world of automated technology. The fact that millions of untrained jobless youths can be found, idle and aimless, on thousands of street corners in the United States testifies to the need for schools specially designed to bridge the gap between high school and college.

For some, such publicly supported schools would serve in lieu of junior colleges, providing basic training in the liberal arts. For others they would serve as an advanced technical institution providing kinds of formal training that are in short supply even today—training for example, in data processing, programing, computer mathematics, industrial electricity and electronic theory.

The point is that our present 12-year system of education dumps hordes of raw and unready youths upon a job market that neither needs nor wants them.

The establishment of advanced technical institutes comparable to junior colleges, offering at least 2- and perhaps even 4-year programs, would not only stem the early flood of unready jobseekers, but would provide our burgeoning technology with badly needed skills.

At the other end of the age and employment scale, we must of necessity, and before too many more years have passed, make it possible for workers to retire on decent incomes at 60 or even 55 years of age.

SHORTER. WORKING LIFE

In summary, then, much of the sting of automation can be removed both for individuals and for our society by providing adequate protections for those directly in the path of automation, and by reducing the total hours each individual works in his own lifetime.

I realize that thus far these suggestions are purely defensive, so let me say that we can also take the offensive—that we can use the added production made possible by automation to meet the many obvious needs of our society. For example, we need more and better housing, schools, hospitals, parks, playgrounds, recreational facilities, clinics, youth centers, roads and airports.

Despite automation, or perhaps even because of it, we must develop new industries, new products, and a more vigorous trade between nations.

So the future need not be entirely black. Automation has its perils. But it also has its promise.

From the dawn of human history, from the caves where men first huddled by their fires, the dream of mankind has been freedom from want. For thousands of years such freedom for the overwhelming majority was not possible. Even today more than three-quarters of the world lives in almost hopeless poverty.

But today something has changed. Man holds in his hands a set of keys with which it is possible to open one of two doors. The first leads to abundance through rational planning. The other to economic chaos.

The question is which door will we open? Unfortunately, even at this late date we do not yet know.

Strong forces continue to wage a short-sighted and suicidal fight against efforts in both the United States and Canada to meet the problems of changing technology.

It is truly ironic that so many otherwise intelligent businessmen have to be dragged, clawing, scratching, and screaming, into a world of rationally organized abundance.

PLANNING THE FUTURE

In conclusion, let me say that what I have tried to do, within reasonable limits of time, is define the nature of the problem, the nature of the solution, and the nature of those whose reaction to 20th century problems is to retreat behind a maginot line of 19th century ideas.

At times the outlook appears grim and the outcome seems uncertain. Yet, so long as we have men and governments with enough concern to plan for the future, we can hope that despite the challenge of automation we will succeed in conserving for future generations the key values of our society.

Vice President Johnson Speaks at Georgetown Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 an outstanding address was delivered in New York City by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The occasion was a dinner marking the first major event in New York in connection with the 175th anniversary of one of America's great educational institutions, Georgetown University.

A distinguished alumnus of Georgetown, Vice President JOHNSON, was the featured speaker at the dinner, which was attended by hundreds of Georgetown graduates and former students from all over the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the full text of the Vice President's address follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF SUCCESS

I am highly honored to participate in this observance. But I am honored beyond my due to be identified as an alumnus of Georgetown University. While I did attend the school of law, I earned only a B.A. degree—for brief attendance.

Georgetown and the Government of the United States both came into being in 1789. There has been a close affinity ever since—Harvard notwithstanding. Georgetown's first graduate went to Congress—but many others went up in the world. As clergymen, teachers, physicians, attorneys, scientists, and public servants, Georgetown alumni have rewarded Bishop Carroll's vision 175 years ago.

The first Catholic college in the United States, the first college to be chartered by act of Congress, the first to originate a school of foreign service, the first to sponsor its own school of language and linguistics—Georgetown University has exerted an influence far beyond its campus and classrooms upon our national life and public affairs.

The record is, by every test, a proud record of success.

For any institution, success itself is both the ultimate and most exacting challenge. Georgetown today—and henceforth— is challenged by the success of its first 175 years. In a far broader sense, that same challenge faces the Government of the United States

and the American people who are served by it.

It is of this challenge of success that I would like to speak tonight.

PECULIAR RELUCTANCE

For a people who exalt success so highly as we do, Americans are—and have always been—peculiarly reluctant to acknowledge the success of their own political institutions. John Adams in 1813 complained to Thomas Jefferson that—

"No sooner does one party discover or invent an amelioration of the condition of man or the order of society, than the opposite party belies it, misconstrues it, misrepresents it, ridicules it, and persecutes it."

If the Nation's first and second Vice Presidents could sit where I sit now—and hear the debates I hear—I am sure they would marvel at how little American politics have changed. We make our national issues, we turn our national debates, we conduct our national discussions on the premise that our Government has failed or is about to fail in every undertaking.

To the extent this reflects a healthy suspicion of government and a vigilant jealousy of our rights and liberties, this trait is good—although that is not a widely held view of the party in power.

But when the prolonged exaggerations of national debate finally come to obscure the realities of national success, the result is not healthy. A very real danger arises that such an obsession with failure will impair the ability of the people to determine what is wisdom and what is folly in their public policy.

At this season in our affairs, it is of utmost importance that we not lose this ability. In just the last year, since the grim October of 1962, there has begun an historic turning in many long-running tides of history. We cannot know—we do not pretend to know—what the consequences will be. But we can know—and we must understand—that this turning has begun as the consequence of purposeful and successful policies fashioned and implemented by ourselves and our allies.

FALSE IMAGE

The image of ourselves—the image so popular for so long—as being outwitted, outmaneuvered, outlasted by other systems and other governments has seldom been so false or so dangerous.

We have met the aggressor at every turn and stayed his march.

We have engaged him in every challenge of his own choosing and neutralized his threat.

We have, moreover, held to the initiative in the long view of history—and it is the pressure of our examples, far more than the pressure of his threats, which is shaping this century.

Nearly fifty nations have come into being since World War II. Not one has elected to join the Communist bloc. Yet many of them have elected to pattern their systems, word their constitutions and define their liberties directly after ours.

The revolution which began here in 1776 still runs—throughout the world. The worldwide drive for independence, the aspirations for development, the explosion of expectations for better health, housing, education and opportunity—all the forces which move and shake our times—have the power they do because of the example of success offered by our American system.

NOT SELF-SERVING

For an American to say this is not parochial, not myopic, not self-serving. On the contrary, it is parochial, it is myopic, it is self-serving for Americans to deny and refuse to acknowledge the success of America's works and leadership in the world.

It is parochial to preach that America's position is eroding.

Where? Not in Greece, not in Turkey, not in Iran where we took our stand 16 years ago. Not in West Berlin where Americans stand tonight. Not in Western Europe or southwest Asia. Where we have committed our support, show windows of freedom are shining brightly. Where communism has committed its support—in Cuba, in North Vietnam, and elsewhere—curtains are kept drawn on windows of failure.

It is myopic to insist that America is retreating.

Where? From none of the lines we have drawn against aggression. Yet the most conspicuous retreat of the cold war occurred only a year ago in the withdrawal of communist missiles from Cuba.

It is self-serving to argue that American assistance to other free nations has been money wasted, money down the drain.

Sixteen years ago the people of France had only two slices of bread a day. England had no coal for heating homes. Germany faced the awesome burden of 10 million refugees. Guerrillas were taking the countryside of Greece—within 20 miles of Athens. Communists dominated a 40-percent coalition from Italy's voting.

Today the countries of Western Europe, Canada, Japan, and Oceania are contributing to world development capital aid nearly equal to ours—and have 14 times more technicians in the field.

Of the 41 major aid countries under our programs, 14 have achieved growth rates over 1.5 percent yearly for 5 successive years and are receiving no assistance. Ten more have reached that rate, are cutting back assistance and will soon be off of it. Still nine others are advancing rapidly toward the designated goal.

These are achievements of a successful program. These are national successes—neither partisan triumphs nor partisan failures. But unless we can recognize our successes, unless we can accept the wisdom of our course, we shall risk the folly of abandoning the moment of opportunity toward which our national effort has been directed.

This opportunity is the opportunity to pursue peace. In our 175 years since Washington's first inaugural, we have had frequent occasions to prosecute wars. Until now, we have not had so serious, so hopeful an opportunity to pursue peace—with so full a storehouse of the strengths peacemaking requires.

SUMMIT OF SUCCESS

Our agriculture is abundant. Profits are high. Wages and income are at new peaks. We are free of the bitter conflicts that plague the world—between capital and labor, between religions. We are freeing ourselves of the burden of racial discriminations. Our technology leads the world in peaceful and practical uses of space. Our guiding programs nationally are the works of both our parties.

We stand not on a precipice of failure but at the summit of success.

If ever a people were prepared, ready, and able to pursue peace, it is we, of this generation of Americans. This is the challenge of our success. We must accept that challenge. We must keep the initiative for peace.

If we are to do this, we must turn away from those who counsel that the works of peace represent failure.

It is war that is failure, war that is surrender, war that is the final weakness of men and governments.

Communism tells us now there can be no ideological coexistence.

With that, we agree, and we accept the challenge. We shall continue the ideological offensive of freedom to the farthest corner of the world—and we shall not rest until freedom prevails among all mankind.

One hundred and seventy-five years hence, when the class of 2138 graduates from Georgetown University, Harvard may have been buried and Texas may have been silenced—although either eventuality seems remote. But freedom will not have been buried and neither the members of that class—nor any of their forebears—will have worn the chains of communism. Long before that time we can hope and today more confidently expect that the world will have come to an age of universal peace, universal justice, and universal freedom.

A Tribute to Ann Cottrell Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments today to recognize one of the esteemed members of the press, Mrs. Ann Cottrell Free, a representative of the North American Newspaper Alliance and a member of the Press Gallery.

Ann Free is a person dedicated to political aspects of conservation, animal welfare, youth problems, and environmental health. She is a founder of the Friends of the National Zoo, vice president of the Foxhall Citizens Community Association, a member of the Ecological Society of America, and active in the Audubon Naturalist Society, the American Newspaper Woman's Club and the Women's National Press Club and is also leader of Girl Scout Brownie Troop 1410.

Not only is Ann Free a personal friend but it has been my privilege to work with her for a number of years in connection with legislation coming before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of which I am chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Ann Free is one of the most dedicated members of the press and that she is a forceful and persistent person writing on matters dear to the hearts of all Americans.

Recently a book which has taken some 5 years to write and entitled "Forever the Wild Mare," was published by Dodd, Mead & Co. The author of this book is Ann Cottrell Free. It is a book to be read by children from 9 to 90 and illustrates some of Ann Free's deep feeling about the importance of a fundamental respect for nature.

It is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, to see such a publication as this in an area where the greater mass of people does not have the opportunity or time to spend in developing an understanding of animal life. However, Ann Free being a nature lover at heart, and who has spent much time in the National Zoological Park, has written a remarkable story intricately woven around a boy hero and a rare Mongolian mare and using the National Zoological Park and the Congress of the United States as a background.

For her excellent writing, Ann Free won the Dodd Mead-Boy's Life Writing Award.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to Ann Free's great writing

ability, she continues to promote projects to combat juvenile delinquency and to quote her:

It is good for young people, especially in the city, to get closer to animals and the land.

Believing this to be an important factor to help combat juvenile delinquency, she has been instrumental in promoting the idea of a junior zoo with docile young animals which she has featured in the general plan to modernize and improve the National Zoo. She has spent innumerable hours in her efforts to provide humane treatment for laboratory animals.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ann Free for her wonderful contribution to the people of this country, young and old alike.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article written by Meryle Secrest which appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, October 13, 1963, about Anne Free, her family, and her book:

RARE HORSE IS STAR OF BOOK

(By Meryle Secrest)

On the face of it, a name like Equus przewalski doesn't sound particularly romantic.

But five minutes after Ann Cottrell Free had set her eyes on the stubby, fierce rare little horse in its prosaic paddock at the National Zoo, she knew she wouldn't rest until she had written a book about it.

Five years later, the result is an excellent children's book, "Forever the Wild Mare," (Dodd, Mead, & Co.) which has already won a fiction award (the Dodd Mead—Boy's Life Writing Award) before its Monday publishing date. Audiences to the Washington Post Book Fair will hear Mrs. Free speak on November 25.

The book has brought its author to the end of a fascinating trail that has included letters from such exotic sources as a distinguished Russian professor and a Tibetan Lama.

Its hereo, 14-year-old Jebby (James Ewell Brown Andrews) is the one whose first look at the rare Mongolian mare inspires a passion to ride her and starts him off on a series of adventures with Major MacFee, Dorje Lama, and a teenage gang all over Washington—in the Zoo, Rock Creek Park, and of course, Capitol Hill.

It's a rousing good story for the youth of 9 to 90, as Mrs. Free puts it. It also illustrates some of her deep feelings about the importance of a fundamental respect for nature. As she says in her preface:

"Shakespeare reminds us of 'tongues in trees, books in running brooks, sermons in stones.' One of the lessons the trees, brooks, and stones would teach us is that man—regarded as the highest form of nature—cannot put himself forever above nature, nor inflict his will on all of nature, just because he chooses to do so. If he doesn't use a little self-control, nature will strike back and eventually destroy him."

As the wife of James Free and mother of 8-year-old Elissa says, the book is a great converging of her interests.

To begin with, her imagination has always been stirred by the remote section of Central Asia where the przewalski horse, authoritatively believed to be the ancestor of the modern horse, was discovered around the turn of the century.

"The reason the horse survived is because it was in an area in the far reaches of outer Mongolia that are far more interesting, challenging, and entrancing to me than the moon."

Then there was her own early love for the horses—she started riding (in Virginia) at the age of seven, and her life-long interest in writing—she's a well-known Washington correspondent whose byline has been seen all over the country.

Finally, there is her particular interest in the many aspects of conservation (including the political ones); animal welfare, youth problems, and environmental health, or, as she puts it, nature, animals, and politics. Like Rachel Carson, she finds mankind's indiscriminate use of the air, land, and seas around him deplorable. She is one of the founders of the Friends of the National Zoo.

A Lesson From the Royal Navy on Nuclear Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the October issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings carried an interesting recital by Comdr. James Strong, U.S. Navy, of the almost fatal delay of the Royal Navy in switching from coal to oil during the early part of this century. The situation is parallel to our own reluctance to shift from conventional to nuclear fuel for our aircraft carriers. Commander Strong wrote as follows:

Today we lay down oil-fired ships instead of nuclear-powered ships, because we can get them cheaper by a ratio of 3 to 2. One well-known admiral has pointed out that this makes about as much sense as it would to lay down sailing ships again for an even better cost ratio. Although many of the Proceeding's readers may have read and considered this well-publicized comparison, I wonder how many readers are aware of a parallel situation and the attendant public storm that blew when navies changed from coal to oil.

In 1912, the Royal Navy faced this issue. Although some smaller ships were oil fired, all the heavier ships being laid down were coal fired. Liquid fuel offered several advantages: several knots increased speed, rapid maneuvering, 40 percent greater radius of action for the same weight of coal, easier and less frequent refueling, and reduced engine-room manning. Balanced against this were two considerations which, at the time, seemed almost overriding. Oil-fired ships cost a great deal more money—you could get three coal-fired dreadnaughts for the price of two oil-fired dreadnaughts. Even more important, there were no oil supplies within the British Isles. Beside the stratgic disadvantages of tying a fleet to foreign sources of fuel were the tremendous costs of creating a fleet oil reserve with the attendant tanks and tankers.

But in 1912, the Royal Navy took the plunge, spent the money, built the ships, established the oil reserves, and the rest of the world's navies followed close behind. The performance of the oil-fired H.M.S. *Queen Elizabeth* class at Jutland justified the decision, and there has been little consideration given to coal since that time.

But was it really an expensive step to take? In 1922, Winston Churchill computed that the Government's necessary investment of £2,200,000 sterling in the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. alone had already resulted in an estimated financial profit of 1,800 percent. In his words, this was sufficient to pay "for all the program of ships, great and small of that year (1912) and for the whole prewar oil fuel installations; * * * we may not unreasonably expect that ultimately the mighty fleets laid down in 1912, 1913, and 1914, the greatest ever built by any power in an equal period, were added to the British Navy without costing a single penny to the taxpayer."

What is the lesson we can learn from this today? A complete change to nuclear power offers the Navy an increased capability at least as valuable as that which was offered by the change to fuel oil in 1912. Although it may be more expensive to build nuclear ships, this additional expense is a very economical method of developing nuclear power. Future dividends from the accelerated development of nuclear power can repay manifold today's expenditure for nuclear ships.

There may be another lesson in this yarn. The British Admiralty had built oil-burning destroyers as early as 1908, but, as Churchill relates it:

"Shocked at the expense, [they had] reverted for 2 years to 27-knot coal-burning flotillas. I was too late to stop the last bevy of these inferior vessels, but I gave directions to design the new flotilla to realize 35-knots speed without giving up anything in gunpower, torpedoes, or seaworthiness. I proposed to the board that if money ran short, we should take 16 of these rather than 20 of the others. Building slow destroyers. One might as well breed slow racehorses."

The end of the oil-coal vacillation in the Royal Navy ended the day that Winston Churchill assumed responsibility for the Admiralty. The naval profession had been unable to make the break—it had to be imposed from above. Must we wait for a Churchill to impose on us the benefits of nuclear power? Cannot we see them ourselves and seek them ourselves, whatever the cost?

Need for Wabash Basin Plan Demonstrated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, while most of the Nation has been enjoying the beautiful Indian summer, many areas of Indiana and particularly the Wabash River Basin have been suffering from a severe drought.

The severe lack of rainfall has already caused an estimated $25 to $50 million in losses to Wabash Valley residents.

According to reports the chronic dry spell has reduced the large Wabash River to the size in some areas where it is possible to wade across. This seems unbelievable in view of the normal width and depth of the river and the frequency and seriousness of past floods.

Many farmers in the area are forced to haul water for their stock and many communities are threatened with critical water shortages.

Much blame for the present severity of the drought along the Wabash River Valley lies in past failures in developing

the water resource and flood control potential for the valley.

It is no overstatement that the Wabash River Valley is today the largest undeveloped stream in America and the long neglect of projects for the stream have increased the harmful effects of droughts and floods.

The present drought dramatically highlights the need for a system of reservoirs near the source of the Wabash River to store water for the express purpose of utilization in time of drought.

These very same reservoirs are capable of handling water runoff in periods of excess rainfall, thus averting heavy flooding downstream.

Some of these reservoirs have been constructed or are under construction. Others are authorized, but not yet approved for actual construction. Still others are in the planning or theorizing stage.

Whatever the status of these upper Wabash River reservoirs, the drought in Indiana this fall offers uncontestable evidence that all local, State, and Federal agencies concerned must speed up their work, redouble their efforts, and coordinate their efforts for an early completion of these reservoirs.

It is most urgent that the Corps of Engineers speed up public works projects in the Wabash Valley, whether authorized or unauthorized.

At the same time, the Department of Agriculture must move quickly on all small watershed plans now ready for construction in the States of Indiana and Illinois.

Only with all of these various agencies assisting, can we assure adequate flood control, ample supplies of water when needed for both private and industrial uses and recreation for the Wabash Valley.

By unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the October 8, 1963, edition of the Evansville Courier in its entirety to expand on the need for accelerated projects in the Wabash River Basin:

NEED FOR WABASH BASIN PLAN DEMONSTRATED

The Wabash River is at its lowest ebb in years—possibly at the lowest autumn level in its history.

There are many places where it's possible to wade across, according to reports from the area. Sand and gravel companies are curtailing operations because their barges would be jeopardized. City water supplies are still adequate, but engineers are worried about what will happen when the sluggish stream becomes glutted with autumn leaves.

This is the reverse of a situation that has confronted the Wabash Valley several times during the past decade. On several occasions, there has been severe flooding—enough so that the loss in crops and property damage ran into the millions.

Both the floods and the present low water level are results of the same general condition—a lag in river development. The Wabash River Valley Association calls the stream the largest undeveloped river in America.

This is largely true, although there has been some speedup of flood control projects in recent years. U.S. Engineers this summer approved plans for two more reservoirs on Wabash tributaries. Both are part of a long-range plan of water conservation and flood control.

The decisive step is still to be taken, however. For over 30 years, plans for making the Wabash navigable from the Ohio River to Terre Haute have been gathering dust in Washington. This project, coupled with upstream water conservation could bring the Wabash Valley many of the same benefits now enjoyed by the Ohio Valley. Flood control, water reserves, and transportation would be the most important.

Barge traffic would let the Wabash Valley share in the economic revival the Ohio Valley has enjoyed in recent years. There would be immediate benefits to Illinois and Indiana coal and oil industries, and long-range prospects of industralization.

The U.S. Engineers are studying the feasibility of opening the river for navigation, it was revealed at a Terre Haute meeting earlier this year. The survey is expected to be completed sometime before June 1965.

It will be to the advantage of both Illinois and Indiana to marshal evidence of need for the project, and to work with the Engineers for an early and favorable conclusion.

The Right To Choose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who believes in the slogan "It Pays To Advertise" I was very interested in material received from the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD two items, an editorial entitled "The Right To Choose" which was written by the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce.

The editorial follows:

THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE

If there is any truth in the old saw that familiarity breeds contempt, then we have a possible explanation why advertising has more critics than perhaps any other industry.

Advertising is more visible in our daily lives than any other single phenomenon of our society. We wake up to a radio commercial, read a newspaper ad on the way to work, glance at a billboard as we go to lunch, look at an ad-laced magazine on our way home, check the ads that came in the day's mail, and watch commercials during our evening TV viewing. One study estimates that the average man is exposed to more than 1,500 advertising impressions a day.

By its very nature, advertising clamors for our attention, so that we are more aware of it than we are of clothing manufacturing for example, even though that industry's products are as close to us as our skin.

Little wonder, then, that advertising attracts critics in numbers and vociferousness beyond what the facts justify. Out of some 30 million published ads a year, and 100 million radio and TV commercials, we can expect a few questionable ones in this imperfect world of ours.

Indeed, the surprising thing is how few bad apples there are in the ad barrel. Of more than 1 million ads examined by the Federal Trade Commission, only 3 percent even required further study. This speaks well for the industry.

But if we find advertising a ready target when it makes a mistake, too often we overlook its positive contributions to our economy, our culture, and our free way of life.

What is it that distinguishes the American economy from others? The chicken-and-egg combination of mass production and mass marketing. We may not know which came first, but we do know that one cannot exist without the other, and that advertising is the sine qua non of mass marketing.

Advertising makes possible volume sales, which enable manufacturers to take a very small profit margin per unit and still operate their businesses successfully. Without advertising, the consumer would, in many cases, have to pay higher prices.

This is contrary to the folklore of the economically illiterate, who cite the huge $12 billion a year advertising budget of American business as if it were something taken away from the consumers. Simple division will show that if this expenditure were instead rebated to consumers, it would amount to the magnificent sum of $66 each over a year's period.

In practice, however, this would be a green mirage. Lacking the ignition of advertising, our economic engine would run at a slower pace if it didn't stall out altogether. Some of us would lose income, or jobs, valued at many times $66. And we would pay more for products as volume dropped.

We would lose other values in addition to the economic ones in a world without advertising. The magazine you are now reading exemplifies some of those values. Advertising revenue makes it possible for the publishers to bring you the cultural satisfactions of its editorial content, without charging a prohibitive subscription price. It performs a similar function in the case of newspapers, and underwrites the entire cost of your radio and TV entertainment and information.

And the most sophisticated reader of SR will, I am sure, admit that he finds personally enjoyable and useful its book and record advertising. In broader perspective, advertising by book publishers and record manufacturers can claim a significant share of credit for the cultural renaissance taking place in this country. Book sales are twice the 1955 total. A record manufacturer cites an 80-percent increase in sales of classical discs within a recent 1-year period.

Advertising can also be an important vehicle of free speech. In many one-newspaper towns, the publisher considers it his responsibility to keep the news columns open to all points of view. But in some instances paid advertising is the best means of stating a position or expressing a viewpoint, and it is often fortunate for democracy that this channel is available. You will find this especially prevalent during political campaigns.

If the enemies of advertising should concede its economic and social benefits, it is equally incumbent on its friends to concede and try to correct its occasional lapses.

There is still too much offensive and misleading advertising, and any amount of such advertising is too much. But it is reassuring that the advertising industry itself subjects such operations to a heavy and continuing barrage of criticism.

The advertising man who does his job properly is performing a public service, and can be proud of his contribution to the national economy. Advertising is an essential mechanism for moving goods in any modern industrial society—even the Soviets are spending tens of millions of dollars, or, rather, their equivalent in rubles, for advertising. As Soviet Economist S. V. Serebriakov puts it, "The gradual widening of knowledge of buyers about goods by means of well-supplied advertising renders a positive influence on the simplification of merchandising."

If advertising is necessary even in an economy where the state is supreme, how

much more vital is it to our system, where the consumer is king. Advertising widens the average man's freedom of choice, recognized as a basic ingredient of democracy when we vote at the polling booth, but not always seen in that light when we vote at the cash register.

Advertising gives Mr. and Mrs. America the opportunity to choose more intelligently how to allocate their rising income. It puts before them a choice not only among breakfast cereals, but a rich selection of nourishment for the spirit. Thanks in large part to advertising, the world's great books, good music, and even fine original works of art now exert their enriching influence on the lives of millions of Americans, not just in a few metropolitan areas, but in the smallest hamlets of our land.

Yes, advertising, more often than not has been a powerful force for both material and spiritual good in this country. Properly understood and properly applied, it can play an even greater role in enlarging our horizons in the decades ahead.

If we want the benefits advertising can bring us, I would say this to both advertisers and their audience:

"Let's use it, not abuse it."

LUTHER H. HODGES.

Another item of interest is an article entitled "Wall Street Looks at Advertising," which follows:

WALL STREET LOOKS AT ADVERTISING

"Advertising more essential now than ever before to economic growth," says A. Rhett duPont, senior partner, Francis I. duPont & Co., one of America's largest investment firms, in Investornews, a monthly financial news magazine distributed to the firm's customers.

Advertising is being attacked.

Advertising is being defended.

There are those in government and in academic life who would like to make it a highly controversial issue. If it is controversial, then it is so only in the sense that the free enterprise system of free choice in the marketplace is controversial.

Its attackers are articulate, well educated, influential, and as we all know, no defense ever has the appeal of an attack. Moreover, too often the defense of advertising has overlooked basic facts in an attempt to meet polemic with polemic. Abuses of advertising there are. But as those who are guilty of them commit their sins in public, for all to see, sooner or later they'll be caught.

It is just plain poor economics and a lack of a basic knowledge of what makes our business system work to treat advertising as some monster created by slick hucksters for a fast buck. If there were no advertising, it would have to be invented * * * to serve a major need in our consumer economy.

MYTH IN IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

America's great image in modern civilization is a land where its industry has been able to provide a standard of living far beyond anything ever before imagined by a people.

But there is something of a myth attached to that image. It is the myth that our productive ability, with Henry Ford's assembly line as its symbol, almost alone gave us all the myriad of choices of goods and services so readily available to American families. Mass production? Yes.

But the United States devised something more than a Detroit assemblyline. Right along with it, the Nation's business enterprize fashioned a system of mass distribution, too. It has been taken for granted as a factor too long.

Mass distribution, U.S. style, consists of many facets—rapid transportation, refrigeration, a competitive marketplace encouraged by law, and highly flexible and widespread selling institutions such as the food, variety, and general merchandise chains * * * but the most powerful, dynamic force is advertising.

Whatever its form; in newspapers, magazines, television, radio, direct mail, or a well-designed package on a supermarket shelf, advertising is vital to maintaining mass distribution, which in turn supports mass production.

ADJUSTMENT TO ABUNDANCE

Advertising's basic functon in the distributive role is to inform the public about the availability—what, where, how much—of goods and services. As David M. Potter, educator and author of "People of Plenty," puts it: "The only institution which we have for instilling new needs, for training people to act as consumers, for altering men's values, and thus for hastening their adjustment to potential abundance, is advertising.

How valuable is that function measured in the hard school of business economics? Much of the argument, the doubts, that swirl around advertising stem from the inability to assign dollar values to its effectiveness, as we can the worth of a machine or a laborer.

Partly that goes back to a statistical anachronism. It isn't only the self-appointed critics who are to blame. Too many businessmen and economists treat advertising, like the rest of the distribution function, as a cost purely and simply. Something; that is, which would make our companies more profitable if we could just eliminate it. The truth lies elsewhere.

No one today among economists or businessmen would consider manufacturing as simply a cost. Without it there would be nothing to sell. So, statistically, in all economic measures, the production side of business comes under the heading "value added by manufacture." Oddly, the process of getting that added manufacturing value to the marketplace where, and only where, it assumes some value is called "cost of distribution"—with advertising a part of that cost. Far more accurate, and less befuddling to our thinking, would be "value added by distribution."

Without advertising there would be no mass distribution, and without mass distribution there would be little value left in the products manufactured.

But critics of advertising don't stop simply at deploring its abuses. Nor do they say that promotion is ineffective. In fact, they claim consumers are victims of manipulation, overlooking such obvious cases as the Edsel which no amount of advertising was able to save.

OILS DISTRIBUTION MACHINERY

They go beyond that, terming advertising an economic waste on a grand scale. It is anything but that. Actually, advertising is economically superior to any other method devised to oil our distribution machinery. As H. B. Wells, president of Indiana University, points out: "The social wastes supposedly inherent in competitive advertising are small indeed when compared with the social losses caused by alternative means for achieving consumer choice."

The postwar period substantiates that basic defense of advertising. We often hear about the great American salesman, and how he is missed today; that too much prosperity has left him flabby. The fact is that the boom of the last 15 years would have been impossible if the economy had depended on salesmen alone. The costs would have been prohibitive; distribution on such a mass scale would have sent prices far out of reach of most.

Fortunately, advertising took over much of the salesworkers' function. The sales force gained only 9 percent in the 1950–60 period, when the economic bloom came into full flower. What took up the gap? The figures tell the story. Before the war advertising amounted to about 2 percent of personal consumption expenditures. By 1950 it had risen to 2.6 percent. Last year it was about 3 percent, amounting to some $11.6 billion. Estimates put the figures at $25 billion by 1970. These are big figures. But just imagine the cost if every manufacturer would have had to have a sales staff large enough to call on a sufficient number of customers to build a market anywhere close to the size of today's markets.

INCREASES TOTAL MARKETS

At present we are on the threshold of even greater economic heights as companies spend billions of dollars for research to develop new products. Only one drawback can occur: lack of markets.

The job for advertising now takes on enormous proportions. Our productive capacity, already huge, will grow as new products stream out of our research laboratories. At the same time, more and more people will be entering the job market. A growing economy, with expanding production, will be necessary to maintain the full employment that, in turn, can create bigger markets.

Thus, today more than ever before, advertising's essential function of increasing total markets as well as markets for individual brands, must be utilized to the utmost.

American Railway Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined other members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on a visit of the American Railway Progress Exposition in Chicago. The display included mechanical, engineering, communications, and electronics equipment items related to railroad transportation for today's and tomorrow's railroads.

We are very much impressed with this exposition because of the vital role the railroad industry plays in our overall transportation system. Our committee is now considering legislation pertaining to the railroads and I believe the knowledge we obtained from the display will be helpful to us in understanding the problems of the transportation industry.

The principal speaker at the exposition was our very able colleague, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable OREN HARRIS. His remarks on the character of national transportation policy and of legislation in keeping with the progress of our great transportation system are so timely and informative that I believe they should be brought to the attention of all the Members of the House.

I ask unanimous consent to have Chairman HARRIS' address inserted at this point in the RECORD.

PROGRESS IN OUR GENERATION—SPEECH OF HON. OREN HARRIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE AMERICAN RAILWAY PROGRESS EXPOSITION, MCCORMICK PLACE, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 10, 1963

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here with you this afternoon. It's a great pleasure to participate in this important exposition that gives due recognition to the tremendous progress which is occur-

ring in the railroad and railroad equipment and supply industries. I commend you for this tremendous occasion. It is a credit to your industry, the vision and ingenuity of those of you in your attempt to provide future transportation for the people of this great country.

This progress is the more notable in this era because it has been made under the American tradition of free enterprise and free competition.

I am grateful that the Dodgers and Yankees have completed the world series for while I am a firm believer in free competition, I well appreciate that too much competition coming from this exciting finish to our baseball season well might detract from our full attention today being on this railway progress.

Six years ago last Friday, on October 4, 1957, the Russians launched Sputnik I. With an unusual sense of proper timing they chose an open date when the Yankees and Braves were traveling back to Milwaukee so that this accomplishment would not go unheralded in the press.

I think that there is no doubt that the attention of the world was secured and that launching dramatically and effectively pointed out that we stand today on the threshold of a new transportation era.

Just a month later, together with other members of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its participation in the International Geophysical Year, I traveled from the North Pole to the South Pole. Our passage halfway around the world then took 2 weeks. Today we can orbit the world in 1½ hours.

In the short space of 6 years we have increased the speed of transportation fiftyfold. And that follows a fiftyfold increase in the speed of transportation which had occurred in the relatively short space of the preceding 100 years.

Man's ingenuity and skill in his efforts to maintain himself on this earth—or for that mater to obliterate himself from the earth—and to conquer the space below the earth and in the heavens above is most remarkable.

The human organism itself is very frail. Even a conditioned athlete, such as some of the big tackles you have on the Chicago Bears, working at his full capacity over a period of a day, can do about the same amount of work as a 1/10-horsepower motor. The cost of operating such a motor is approximately 4 cents even if we put a value upon the amount of heat generated by a person at rest equivalent to that of a 70-watt bulb, the total output of the human being in a day is only about 11 cents. Since he consumes at least some $2 worth of food a day, and I suppose that the Chicago Bears eat much more than that, a question naturally arises as to how man can exist when his output is so much lower than his input.

The answer is simple; the difference is supplied by his utilization and control of nature's resources for his own benefit.

In the last 50 years we have greatly increased the amount of installed horsepower per worker and if we evaluate one horsepower as equivalent to 10 times the power of a man, the average factory worker today is supported by the equivalent of 100 others working at his command. This is progress.

During the last 100 years man has increased total power available to the individual 100 times. During the same 100 years he has increased the speed of communication 30 million times. Today he can send a message around the world 7 times in a second. (It seems most unfortunate that sometimes it takes years to get the message from the outside to the inside of the human skull.)

Indeed, this very week there is commencing a conference in Geneva of the International Telecommunications Union, which our Committee is attending and following very closely, for the purpose of allocating portions of the radio spectrum for the use of communication via space satellites. It is easy to visualize that if enough allocations can be made available under our present knowledge or under developments in the future, then we can communicate not only with the various nations of the world, but directly from a given television station into every home in the world, or even telephone one another anywhere, at home or in a car, without the use of wires, all by means of space satellites.

This is progress.

Here today as we look about us at the exhibits in this great hall and we see equipment on the tracks outside, we cannot but be impressed by the progress that has been made in the field of transportation. The powerful new locomotives, the new freight cars, the special-purpose type cars, the piggyback equipment, new types of track maintenance machinery—all are revelations of man's skill in meeting the transportation requirements of a changing age.

I know that we are all proud to witness what has been accomplished just as I know we all conjecture on what may be the transportation equipment of the future.

I am certain we will have continuing progress for greater efficiency but I think we all may speculate as to whether this progress in fact may be in the field as we know it, or whether, like that of communications, the great new developments may occur in transporting freight and passengers without the use of tracks such as by the use of hovercraft or airfoil.

But I am sure that you have on your program this week others who are far more qualified to speak on progress in the transportation research and development field than I am. I assume that what you wish from me is a comment or two upon progress in the field of transportation law.

The law of itself did not bring the progress which I have mentioned in the field of communications and transportation. Progress in raising our standard of living is through research, invention, development, and production.

No law invented the telephone, or the radio, or the steam engine, the electric motor, or the diesel engine.

The purpose of the law is to permit or sponsor such progress, or to guide such progress for the benefit of mankind.

But while law cannot bring progress, law may impede progress. This progress which we have had in our physical transportation is so phenomenal that we must review and review again whether our law is in accord with a modern approach to our transportation system. Does our present day regulatory policy and pattern conform with the requirements of today? Does it allow for the expansion and progress so necessary for the progress of our Nation?

Today we have modes of transportation serving the public that are tremendously different from those of 1887. In all modes we endeavor to achieve the same purpose, namely a common carrier system in this country that can serve the people.

I think no one can question the fact that all four of the principal modes of transportation: rail, highway, air, and water—now are well grown. Now we are faced with the problem no longer of whether Government rules are necessary to stimulate the growth of certain of these modes of transportation. Our problem is whether we are going to continue to have Government rules applicable to one type of carrier which are different from the rules applicable to another type; or whether, in the public interest, we need the same—more or less—Government rules applied to all types.

A year ago last April the President undertook to document what he called basic deficiencies in our transportation regulatory system and outlined the steps which he thought should be taken to improve it. Following his message to the Congress, I introduced into the House two bills which had been prepared by the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a substantial portion of the recommendations set out by the President. Last year our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce commenced extensive hearings on the two bills and continued the hearings until the closing days of the Congress. As you know, owing to the breadth of the subject matter involved and the tremendous interest in the legislation, all persons who desired to be heard on the subject could not be accommodated and the hearings were not concluded.

Again in this Congress I reintroduced two bills prepared by the Secretary of Commerce in substantially the same form as those heard last year. Again this year we had extensive hearings on the two bills and completed the testimony from all witnesses. Next week the committee will meet in executive session to consider what it should do about the legislative proposals.

I have scheduled 3 days for executive sessions by the committee in order that the committee may have full opportunity to consider the various recommendations not only from the President and from the Interstate Commerce Commission, but those made to us during the course of lengthy hearings by the committee. I have sufficient confidence in this great committee doing a good job. I believe some progress can be made toward strengthening our common carrier system to get the very best transportation for our people in the future as we have had in the past. I am optimistic enough to think that we can improve and strengthen what we have today.

It seemed to me that the President's proposals provided a chance for constructive thinking on the part of the organized public transportation industry. However, the spirit of competition prevailed in the course of testimony presented to the committee. Up to now, spokesmen of each branch of the industry have been obdurate in their attitudes and we are experiencing great difficulty in finding a common ground on which they could meet.

I suppose that progress in this legislation so far might be characterized by some as progress is characterized on the football field. It depends on which side you are, on whether the progress of the ball is an advance or a retreat. The problem, however, is not limited to progress as viewed by the contestants, but it is progress as viewed by the spectators or progress as it can be measured in terms of what is the public interest. Perhaps in football as played within academic cloisters, the game is important only to the contestants. But in professional football, it matters not which contestant prevails in any given game, if the league does not repeatedly offer something appealing to the spectator interest, it will not survive.

I think it is time that we wake up to see what is taking place in each of these modes as they try to serve the public, because if we don't watch ourselves we are going to find the basic common carrier transportation owned and controlled by the Government. If private enterprise can't do it, you can be assured the public is going to insist on the service, and we are going to have it. If we can't have it any other way, we know what the alternative will be—Government owned and controlled—nationalization.

There are certain people in this country who would prefer that type of procedure and operation. I am one of those who do not. But I just do not believe that we have yet adequately tackled this problem of the real competitive spirit among modes of transportation to our greatest advantage.

The regulatory agencies which testified on the real controversial subject; that is, the minimum rate requirement, insisted that the

problem be met by placing everyone under their jurisdiction. Their suggestion was to provide more regulation rather than to deregulate where possible and depend on competitive forces.

I am not sure with the experience that we have had in discriminations and accompanying advantages and disadvantages to some, that the farmers, the bulk commodity operators, and those who were given such exemption in the past, are going to sit idly by and see themselves brought under regulation.

I can give you an example, the poultry industry. We tried to do something about rolling back the situation 4 or 5 years ago. There was available unregulated transportation in certain of the areas for the transportation of poultry to the market. Yet had we approved the recommendation that the Commission and certain of the modes of transportation urged at that time, the rates in the poultry industry obviously would have been increased. We would have changed the poultry industry from their present locations today because of that.

The kind of transportation needed to haul chickens to the market could be made available without being regulated. We permitted it, and it has operated pretty well since. What was asked of us at that time was to bring them within regulation, which we did not do. Just that slight difference in the cost required under regulation would have completely rearranged the industry. It would not have remained as it is and as it has developed over the last several years.

There is no need for regulation for regulation's sake, and if shipping interests and the public can be protected, and if equality of treatment of the various modes of transportation can be provided with less regulation and greater reliance upon our American competitive system, perhaps our statutes today should be so changed.

This has been urged by the railroads, and in the hearings has been opposed by other modes of transportation. They express fear that this will lead to their being put out of business.

I certainly do not conceive that this will happen, and it will not happen. I just do not think it is sound practice for a government to pursue a course of maintaining a waterways program, of building and providing and maintaining highways for motor carriers, and then pursuing a course where they cannot be used. I certainly have not been working to get navigation on the Ouachita River in my area or on the Arkansas River, through the heart of our State, for the purpose of not utilizing it.

But, if in our consideration of proposed legislation we should be able to give equal opportunity to every mode of transportation to provide service to the public—which is the only reason for their existence—it seems to me at the same time we should provide some kind of opportunity for each community to have a semblance of transportation equality with other communities.

When we are talking of discrimination, we must talk also of discrimination between communities and sections of the country. It seems to me that it is impossible in a great Nation such as ours to continue with a system where there is so much discrimination in some places over others.

During the course of the hearings, I had numerous occasions to take up with various witnesses examples of rates which had come to my attention over past years. It has seemed to me that if the railroads could justify a rate from Greenville, Miss. to New Orleans, as being compensatory, it is just as logical that a similar rate should be applicable within a general area whether or not the community was on the river. For example, it seems logical to me that a similar rate would be compensatory from Jerome, Ark. to New Orleans.

I just do not think it sound policy to say to Greenville that you are entitled to a privilege brought on by the Government of the United States, and that the people of Jackson, Miss., or Marvell, Ark., within the same general area, are not. I think we must be just as interested in developing a policy where Hot Springs, Ark., is given the same treatment as far as rates are concerned as Little Rock and Camden.

Many areas have suffered tremendous setbacks because of rate discrimination which continues in substantial part as a result of the policy of the Government. I, for one, am seeking and listening for suggestions that will mitigate this problem, even though some progress has been made over the years. I think that water carriers and motor carriers and railroad carriers must come to grips with this problem.

So far as I am concerned, I am not going to keep working, appropriating funds and building up opportunities and privileges for one area and let the other area within several miles of it suffer because they do not have the same transportation opportunities.

In this connection, while disappointed with the answers of some industry spokesmen, I was extremely gratified with the testimony of Mr. D. W. Brosnam, president of the Southern Railway, who assured us that his company "is determined to give every inland town the rate advantages now enjoyed by waterway ports"; and by that of Mr. Jervis Landon, Jr., president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, who stated that the B. & O. had exactly the same policy.

It has come to the point where under the principle of regulation there has been so much discrimination against some places over others, that it well may be the time for us to try some further adjustment to see whether this might be corrected.

I want to compliment the President of the United States, his administration, and the Secretary of Commerce for putting up the big challenge which they have issued to the transportation industry, to the regulatory agencies, and to the Congress. This challenge is that of progress in the field of legislation, progress in attaining a regulatory scheme that will meet the requirements of today's and tomorrow's transportation system. I, for one, am ready to try to meet the challenge and see if we can devise some kind of method that would improve and strengthen the soundness of our common carrier situation; and at the same time provide the transportation service to the people who are entitled to have it—for don't ever overlook it—they are going to insist on it—if they can't get it one way, they're going to get it another.

More Managed News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal performs many valuable services for Americans. It keeps Americans informed of news on Wall Street; it provides the latest information on the commodity market; and it covers important news on a worldwide basis.

To these outstanding achievements must be added a new one. I refer to the Wall Street Journal's discovery of "The Guided Leak." The Christoper Columbus of "The Guided Leak" is Mr. William Beecher who reported his discovery in the October 14 issue of the Wall Street Journal. Here is what Mr. Beecher says about "The Guided Leak":

THE GUIDED LEAK: HOW DEMOCRATIC FAITHFUL GET WORD ON ARMS CONTRACTS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly every morning at about 10:30 a messenger carries a sheaf of papers from the Pentagon across the Potomac River to the White House. A great deal of secrecy shrouds this daily drive. No one will talk about the route, nor the type of vehicle used, nor whether the courier is military or civilian. Indeed, many officials deny the mission even occurs; others insist "it's a matter not appropriate for discussion."

Why the hush-hush attitude? Top secret military reports for the President? Not at all. Strange as it may seem the clandestine mission has nothing whatsoever to do with national security. Rather, it is an essential gambit in a slick political strategem that seeks, by employing the combined energies of top Pentagon brass, shrewd White House agents, distinguished Senators and Representatives, and powerful news agencies, to bamboozle the naive.

You see, the information carried by the shadowy courier is nothing more than advance word on multimillion-dollar defense contract awards that will be announced officially by the Pentagon later in the day. White House agents telephone these exclusive data to favorite Democrats on Capitol Hill who make headlines in their hometown newspapers by disclosing the scoops to reporters.

The effect, in large part, is that the Pentagon no longer announces much of its own contract news. Congressmen do, in news stories that sometimes wink at the facts by declaring that Senator so-and-so "announced" a contract award, but usually make some attempt at accuracy by confessing that the legislator was notified or was advised of the event.

This legislative legerdemain is dismissed by many as harmless politics. "This is something the White House can deliver on; they can't deliver on much else in this building," contends one Pentagon source. "As far as I'm concerned, this is the least of the available evils. I'd rather continue this than do something substantive."

HIGH COSTS OF CAMPAIGNS

Another administration official insists the real problem rests with the high cost of political campaigning. His explanation: "Every man who's running for office feels he needs to make the impression that he has influence in Washington if he's to get the campaign contributions he needs. Patronage used to be more important than it is now. What's a postmastership worth nowadays? Very little.

"If we didn't make such informaton available to Congress, the public would be given by other means the impression that defense contracts were influenced, but the administration would get less benefit. I'm against the impression. But if it's going to be given away, I think the administration should reap some benefit."

Though offered as a defense, this line of reasoning also stands as an indictment. For, as critics are quick to point out, the quest for credit not only introduces partisanship into the Government's immense contracting business, but can hardly help but give voters, including business-seeking corporate managers, the clear impression that the politician who announced a contract award probably influenced the decision.

The erosive effect this can have on public confidence becomes clear when viewed against a larger background. During the

early days of the Senate proble into the Pentagon's controversial TFX fighter-bomber, the Kennedy administration made no secret of its indignation at comments suggesting that political considerations determined the selection of the contractor. But by playing politics on routine contract announcements, the administration every day contributes to the public notion that influence does, indeed, swing million- and billion-dollar decisions.

Too, the system is fraught with temptation. The legislator who receives inside information on major contract awards is presented with the opportunity to benefit in the stock market; or, if he is too scrupulous for that, others he informs may not be.

Today's chief critics of the political tipoff habit, quite naturally, are Republicans, Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware warned Defense Secretary McNamara in a recent letter: "Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous. * * * I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent, mink coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic."

Nevertheless, it wasn't too many years ago that some Republican legislators were criticizing President Eisenhower for not making greater use of the scoop technique to help the party faithful, particularly around election time. And to some extent he did; so the Republicans are not above reproach. But what the GOP did spasmodically, the Demcrats now do methodically.

The fact of the matter is that Congress, not the administration in power, is the motivating force behind the system. Mr. McNamara made the point in replying to Senator WILLIAMS. "Barring some further indication that Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice," the Defense Secretary wrote, "I am disposed to continue it."

Underlying Mr. McNamara's reply was the knowledge of a top secret conference held during the early days of the Kennedy administration. It was called by aids to several influential Democratic Congressmen; it was attended by representatives from the White House, the Pentagon, and other Federal agencies; and it was designed to firmly establish the right of Democrats on Capitol Hill to enjoy the perquisites of power by getting advance word on contract awards.

Though there's no official record of the decisions reached at that unpublicized gathering, what has evolved is a two-part operation for speeding prior notice to Capitol Hill that has all the precision of a well-planned military maneuver. The midmorning Pentagon-White House mission is a strictly partisan affair. White House aids won't talk, but it's known they pass along their exclusive data to congressional favorites as routine procedure.

A NONPARTISAN NEWS SERVICE

Thus, the favored are assured of receiving word of contracts of interest to them before noon each day. This extra-special attention to party stalwarts is an extension of a separate procedure that seeks to give politicians of both parties a smaller lead on contract news. Each of the armed services has a separate staff of congressional liaison officers that sees to it that all interested legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, get about 1 hour's notice before public release of contract awards. The legislators are notified at 3 p.m. each day, the press at 4 p.m. The Air Force delivers its information by personal messenger to congressional offices; the Army and Navy use the telephone for the most part.

Until recently, Congress witnessed the spectacle of uniformed majors and colonels, their watches synchronized, delivering confidential contract memos with split-second timing to avoid charges of leaking the "leaks" to one legislator ahead of another.

But this got to be a bit too much, and several Congressmen objected to the use of high-ranking soldiers as messenger boys. So the Pentagon adjusted its tactics; it now uses enlisted men to carry contract news unless a contract must be explained to a lawmaker. For these more delicate maneuvers, officers are still preferred.

The rationale offered to justify the 1-hour news break for Congressmen is to enable them to intelligently answer press queries on contracts awarded to companies in their States. There's no mention of the fact that, since the Pentagon awarded the contracts, maybe its representatives should be the ones to reply to questions. Nor is the point made that Congressmen seldom are given any more contract information than is the press, so they can't add substance to a news story anyway.

In the final analysis, then, the entire operation—both the partisan and nonpartisan phases—boils down to nothing more than political sleight-of-hand. And quite a few Pentagon officials express the private (very private) wish that the whole procedure be abandoned once and for all. This view, not surprisingly, is heard most frequently from those officers who are required to spend hours on the phone assuring non-favored Congressmen that the military was not responsible for contract leaks to their rivals. Sighs one harried diplomat-officer: "I'd much rather wrestle with the many complex problems of guided missiles than of guided leaks."

From the foregoing it can be seen that the administration not only manages the news, intimidates the news, but now it is acting like a plumber bent on sabotage. Thus is born "The Guided Leak."

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Dr. Teller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force and Space Digest magazine for October editorially paid to Dr. Edward Teller the following well-deserved tribute:

THE LONELY WORLD OF EDWARD TELLER

(By William Leavitt)

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 5.—During the initial round of test ban testimony before the Senate, James Reston of the New York Times noted in one of his Washington columns that the administration, in its anxiety for quick Senate approval, had converted what was at best a grade B production into a spectacular. Mr. Reston referred to the parade of prestigious witnesses testifying on the treaty and the consequent flood of press coverage and editorializing across the land.

This display was somewhat in contrast, of course, to the President's rather conservative first report to the Nation on the treaty in which he asked for serious debate on the merits and failings of the pact and in which he warned that peace was not about to break out as a result of the treaty.

There has been a debate, of sorts, and at this writing the treaty seems heading for Senate ratification without reservations. But out of it all has emerged a regrettable and unfair fallout—a division in the public mind of the large company of ban proponents and the small band of opponents into good guys and bad guys respectively.

Nuclear physicist Dr. Edward Teller has been cast as the chief bad guy because for himself, and for many who chose not to speak out, he articulated the military-technological risks inherent in what no one can deny was a hastily reached agreement. For his pains, a man whose record as a contributor to free world strength is unassailable has been scoffed at, harried, described as shortsighted, in some circles pictured as bloodthirsty, and, it would be hard to deny, isolated by the administration. It is disheartening to note the number of news stories portraying the physicist as thick accented, stubborn, bushy-browed, and the like. It is almost as if Dr. Teller were the archetype of a mad scientist who plots to blow up the world.

It is a peculiar and unfortunate American custom to apply black and white criteria to questions of national policy. This failing has been particularly evident in the post-test ban weeks. The treaty, which in reality cannot be described as anything more than a possible step toward the reduction of the potential problem of radioactive contamination of the atmosphere, has somehow evolved, in to much of the public mind, into a great turning point in the cold war. For example, this writer, in discussing the treaty with a knowledgeable science reporter friend, was startled to hear him declare that the reason he favored the treaty was not the fallout problem but rather his conviction that the pact really represented a first step toward the settlement of the cold war. Such a view is both naive and cynical. It is naive because it ignores the clear lessons of our past dealings with the Communists and the present realities of Communist power. It is cynical because to discount lightly the fallout question and still favor the treaty is to abandon the sole reason why anyone ought to even consider such a pact.

Dr. Teller exhibits neither naivete nor cynicism. Dr. Teller recognizes the problem of fallout, points out correctly that there is no scientific consensus on its consequences, and proposes that the nuclear powers agree to limit the amount of fallout they would pump into the atmosphere, an agreement that could be inspected in much the same way as the test ban treaty will be—by national detection systems. Such an approach, he believes, would protect the atmospheric environment, while at the same time allow us to continue needed nuclear experimentation, including the quest for clean nuclear capability.

Dr. Teller, who is the father of children he loves and who prefers that title to that of "father of the H-bomb," is no less cognizant of the dangers of fallout than any of his critics. But, at the same time, he assets correctly that there is no absolute understanding of its genetic implications. He believes that the risks of fallout must be balanced against requirements of military security in an era of rapid technological change in which weapon breakthroughs are conceivable. Indeed, Dr. Teller has been much more consistent in his views on fallout than the Government, which has for the past several years tended to downgrade and ungrade the fallout danger in line with the policy of the period.

There ought to be no good guys-bad guys dichotomy in the test ban dialogue. Instead, there ought to be recognition of the cold fact that the only possible justification for taking the military risks involved in the test ban treaty is the hope that potential biological dangers of atmospheric pollution may be reduced—if the Russians keep to their word and refrain from aboveground testing.

Those who have openly opposed the pact—Dr. Teller, Generals Power and Schriever, and the other few—have had valid reasons for doing so. Their reasons are rooted in their responsibilities and in their jobs. As commander in chief of SAC, General Power is uniquely responsible for most of the free world's strategic strength, strength which has made nuclear aggression thus far unattractive to the Soviets. If in his judgment the treaty tends to foreclose tests of his operational missile weaponry and their launch pads, then he had no choice but to oppose. In the same way, as head of Air Force research and development, General Schriever had the same kind of responsibility. Both men did their duty as they saw it—as did Dr. Teller and the other opponents of the pact.

It is to their credit that they have had the courage to do so.

A Woman President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted cleverly written comments by Ann Maher, editor, Barbara County Index, Medicine Lodge, Kans. She asks the question, "Would a woman make a good President?" and then gives a most definitive answer.

With Congress moving at a snail's pace, it takes a real stretch of imagination to even label it a do-nothing Congress, hence Members will have adequate time between now and adjournment to enjoy her comments.

As so ably stated in an accompanying editorial:

If we are to elect men who are capable, we must know what manner of men they are. But candidates are going to have to divest themselves of all the high-flown gab and start speaking "United States."

The editorial follows:

A WOMAN PRESIDENT

With an election coming up the question arose: Would a woman make a good president? Yes, I think I would. I base this assumption on a number of things. First, I don't rattle easily. Oh, I get confused over decimal points, fractions, highway directions, and any amount of money over $25, and to this day I can't figure out how to eat corn on the cob without getting one end of it in an ear, but this is all minor. Too, a black cloud coming up makes me babble like a brook but if I were President I'd be shut up in an office and not see black clouds. Or just be shut up.

One thing for sure, if you folks elected me President we'd have to spend money in smaller amount. Mathematical figures, especially if they contain sevens and nines, have almost ruined my life and are probably the reason I write stuff like this for a living instead of being a tycoon. If Congress asked me for $8 billion to build a waterway through Alden, Kans., I'd tell Congress to go jump in the lake. And if a variety of Senators wanted a lot of money to rid their State of three-eyed beetles or resurface Main Street I'd poke them in the nose. I don't understand figures in those amounts and I don't want them asking for anything over $5.

There is an erroneous supposition that a woman would not be able to handle a cabinet of men. Fiddle-faddle. Anyone who can rassle a turkey at Thanksgiving, stretch a budget to pay for necessities, and still have enough for a lipstick could manage a few men. I think what I would do is hire Jayne Mansfield for my secretary and have her go to all the Cabinet meetings with me and I'll bet we'd get bills passed on anything including garters for women in the service and none of it would cost over $5. I would also have her attend press conferences with me and the only question asked would be, "What's your phone number?"

Another matter which concerns me is that I don't golf or fish. I guess I could sit on the bank of a creek and try to catch an ordinary fish but this wouldn't look good in all the newspapers. You've got to go out on Lake Erie in a boat as big as the *Queen Elizabeth* and haul in a fish that gets its picture in the Saturday Evening Post. Frankly, folks, I'm a little scared of water. (Frankly, folks, I'm scared to death of water.) When I was a kid I use to dread Saturday night. I suppose I could plead a headache when it came time to fish but sooner or later I'd have to take a bath.

I'll have to get over my fear of planes, too. Presidents always travel by air. How would it look for me to arrive at a foreign port with all the brass there to meet me and I'd stagger out of the plane and yell for a bucket? I know I will have to learn to fly or give up this idea of being the first woman President.

Too, Presidents have to sit through a lot of speeches at banquets in foreign countries and all the languages I know are some pig Latin, a couple of German phrases that aren't too nice, and some snappy slang. I have a tendency to put my head down in the creamed peas and doze when I don't know what's going on and if I have to sit there too long I'll take a nap. It might cause an international crisis.

But, there it is folks—your chance to elect the first woman President and brag that you knew me when.

When I only had one pair of socks.

Family Doctor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this week Dr. Katherine A. Chapman, of Kensington, Md., was named Family Doctor of the Year by the Maryland Academy of General Practice. The honor is well deserved by the modest, hard-working, and charming Dr. Chapman, who worked as a typist to defray the expenses of her medical studies.

Under permission to extend my remarks I wish to congratulate Dr. Chapman on receipt of this honor which recognizes her outstanding contribution to the community of Kensington. I also include an article from the October 17 edition of the Montgomery County (Md.) Sentinel giving the interesting background of this outstanding citizen.

The article written by Sentinel Reporter Vickie Van Pelt is as follows:

FAMILY DOCTOR OF THE YEAR IS RESIDENT OF KENSINGTON

(By Vicki Van Pelt)

A charming, gray-haired woman, who rose from the position of a War Department typist to a medical doctor was named Family Doctor of the Year this week by the Maryland Academy of General Practice.

The honor went to Dr. Katherine A. Chapman, who began practicing medicine in an office in her home in Kensington in 1926.

Dr. Chapman, known as "Dockie" to generations of patients, was born in Washington in 1901 and moved to Kensington with her family when she was still an infant. She attended Sidewell Friends High School in Washington and received her M.D. from George Washington University Medical School.

Cited by her friends as "modest and hard working," Dr. Chapman looks back with delight to the days when some patients called on Dr. A. K. Chapman, not knowing a woman would respond.

She also remembers "when I entered GW a month after the term had started," and spent many weary hours making up the work. She continued to work for 2 years as a typist for 3 days a week sandwiching in her medical studies during the remainder of the week.

The petite physician, for 2½ years during her early practice, was examining physician at the Washington chapter of the Young Women's Christian Association.

She has served as examining physician at George Washington Hospital for 10 years and spearheaded several health and education projects. From 1936 to the present she has been examining physician at the University of Maryland.

In addition to being a member of the Maryland Academy of General Practice, Dr. Chapman belongs to the American Medical Association, the Women's Medical Society of Maryland, the District Medical Society, the George Washington Medical Society and the Montgomery County Medical Society of which she is past president, past secretary, and the present historian.

Although busy at her profession, Dr. Chapman finds time to be an active member of the Kensington Chamber of Commerce.

She collects miniatures, does crossword puzzles while listening with rapt attention at a business meeting and says, "I really enjoy medical meetings and traveling especially if at the end of my travels there's a medical convention."

If she could turn back the calendar to 1922 would she be a doctor again? "This I can definitely answer in the affirmative," she added.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished career of Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, ended May 31 of this year, when he died at the age of 69. Those of us who knew Congressman Walter most intimately lost a great and dear friend and the

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Nation lost an energetic and fighting patriot.

My words in memory of a valued friend, come from years of respected association with him. He was a true, longtime friend and I shall never forget the loss of his influence for good government. I shall always treasure my personal contacts with Congressman Walter. Never was he too engaged to lend a hand to me when I needed his guidance.

It was a very gratifying and rich experience for me to represent Northampton County in the Pennsylvania State Senate and to know that Northampton County was a part of Francis Walter's congressional district. I learned firsthand of his effective work in behalf of the citizens of our Commonwealth in the areas of flood and pollution control, power, navigation, recreation, and so on.

At the time of Congressman Walter's death, one Pennsylvania newspaper very appropriately stated:

> He was a fearless defender of principles and never lacked the fortitude to stand up for what he believed to be right, regardless of criticism or controversy. Francis E. Walter served his constituents, his State, and his country with extraordinary distinction.

For 30 consecutive years he served in the U.S. Congress. He possessed unwavering devotion to his duties as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Attesting to his influence in Congress and his ability as a legislator and orator was the fact that during his tenure as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, since January 1955, the House always supported his requests for the necessary operating funds. It was at Mr. Walter's suggestion that a set of rules and hearing procedures were devised that he considered fair to all witnesses.

The late Congressman not only knew our Government well, but he had great faith in our kind of government. He will long be remembered as the coauthor of the Walter-McCarran Act and it was with deep pride and conviction he upheld the merits of this law. He never flinched when criticism was handed him, nor when obstacles were placed in his appointed path. His unbroken service in the Congress of the United States since the inception of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration serves as tribute to his tenacity and integrity. He never deserted his beliefs.

We recall that Francis Walter's service in the Congress also included ranking membership on the House Committee on the Judiciary and chairmanship of its Subcommittee on Immigration and its Special Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure; membership on the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy; chairmanship of the Democratic Caucus; and chairmanship of the House Democratic Patronage Committee. He was elected Speaker pro tempore in the 81st Congress and appointed Speaker pro tempore in the 87th Congress. He had profound faith in the principles of his Democratic Party, but he was first of all a loyal American.

In the minds of many people Congressman Walter set a standard for Americanism, not only in his fight against Communists and subversive influences, but in his determination to preserve our constitutional form of government. He resolutely fought against any move which would have abandoned some of our great constitutional principles. He not only demonstrated his faith in his fellowmen, but also in the form of government which enabled him to rise to membership in one of the greatest deliberative bodies of the world. He never doubted the ability of Americans to solve their problems without forsaking their freedoms.

I shall forever be grateful for his counsel as a great legislator and as a trusted friend. It is with profound humility and honor that I now represent the congressional district served by Francis E. Walter.

International House, New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for many years the International House in New Orleans has been effectively implementing the work of our country in promoting trade and understanding between the free nations of this world.

International House, located in New Orleans, was established in 1943. As a matter of fact its articles of incorporation were signed almost 20 years ago on December 28, 1943. Since that time, operating without any assistance whatsoever from the Federal Government, it has sponsored a total of 47 missions to areas throughout the world. These missions have been invaluable, not only to International House, to New Orleans, to Louisiana, but to the whole country. Best of all these missions are person-to-person contacts with businessmen and others from International House and the countries visited.

Only recently the 47th mission of International House was completed. This mission was composed of the following people, most of whom are residents of New Orleans:

Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Molony; Mr. and Mrs. George W. Healy, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Jose Luis Banos; Mr. and Mrs. Robert Carr; Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Fitzgerald; Miss Joan Lyons; Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Meldrum; Ronald Molony; Joseph W. Simon, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Sinnott; The Very Reverend Andrew C. Smith, S.J.; Miss Kay Wainwright; Mr. and Mrs. Scott Wilson; Mrs. Raymond Jones; Mrs. William Kendall; Mr. and Mrs. Harold Meade; Dr. and Mrs. P. A. Niebergall; Mr. and Mrs. C. T. O'Connor; Dr. Joseph Robinette; Mr. Paul A. Fabry, director.

A comprehensive series on this mission was written by Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune and an officer in International House. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the series in full:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 23, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, I—IRISH INDUSTRY RISES

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

GALWAY, IRELAND.—Ireland is pushing a balance-agriculture-with-industry program that tops anything ever attempted by Mississippi or any other American State. Apparently, it is paying dividends.

First inspection made by the 47th mission of International House was of the expanding Shannon free trade zone and industrial area. Acreage of the latter, originally believed by officers of the Shannon Free Airport Development Co., Ltd., to be large enough to offer space until 1970, already is full. Additional acreage now being cleared will triple the size of the manufacturing zone.

Ireland is using national funds to build factories and lease them at attractive rates to private operators. This, of course, has been done by communities in Mississippi under its balance-agriculture-with-industry plan. However, Ireland goes beyond this. It exempts from taxation for 20 years all income made from the manufacture of goods which are exported from the island.

Shannon Airport, one of the busiest in Europe, provides the jumping off place for much of the goods, although all articles made in the industrial zone are not small. Members of the development company abroad told the IH mission that the piano factory, which they saw, is being expanded to become the largest in the world.

Operators of the factories have been attracted from Switzerland, Japan, France, West Germany, South Africa, Australia, and other nations, as well as the United States.

Development of the industrial program has slowed emigration from Ireland to a walk. Perhaps, one of the development company officers said, the United States might have another President today had the program been started earlier.

Agriculture still is Ireland's prime source of income, with tourism second. Manufacturing is moving up fast.

This development, say officials whom we met, is responsible for a rapid rise in the standard of living of the Irish people. Not so, says Willie MacEllicott, who drove us from Shannon to Ennis and on to Galway. "We're growing prosperous," he insists, "because we stopped the occupation." This "occupation," obviously, was British domination of Ireland, the end of which began in 1921.

The Irish are doing whatever comes naturally to erase all signs of the occupation. They're even reviving widespread use of the Gaelic language, the teaching of which was halted by the British. Nevertheless, a pound note on the Bank of England still is as good with the Galway shopkeepers as a pound note on the Bank of Ireland.

In addition to public officials, chamber of commerce representatives, and members of the Shannon Development Co., the International House mission was met at the airport by a Briton who probably can claim at least one distinction. Leslie Priest, a photographer for the Associated Press, who joined the mission after flying from London, is one man who made a visit to the United States from England without using either a surface or airship. He was a guest in the nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus* when she made a crossing from England to New York almost 100 percent under water.

Many of the farmhouses between Shannon and Galway were built with public funds. Some of them still are being rented on the same basis used by public housing authorities

in the United States, that is with rental rates scaled to ability to pay. Others, however, have been sold to their occupants. "A farmer who pays $1 per week for a small house," explained Willie MacEllicott, "keeps on paying rent. A farmer who can pay $1.25 eventually owns his home."

Mayor Martin Divilly of Galway and the chamber of commerce of this city extended a royal welcome to the mission. The reception included a cocktail party, a dinner, and entertainment which included the finest Irish singers and dancers. The champion double jig dancer of Ireland and the famous O'Flaherty dance teams, whose members range upward in age from 4, were part of the program.

Women traveling with the mission were presented Irish-made perfume. The men were given ties, also made in Ireland. The Very Reverend Andrew C. Smith, president of Loyola University, generously passed his on to me.

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 27, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, II—TRADE WITH EUROPE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM.—Americans in Europe are concerned seriously about prospects of other nations taking a substantial share of what now is the U.S. $7 billion of export business each year with Western Europe.

As of today, the United States is selling to free Europe 50 percent more than it is buying from free Europe.

When Germany, England, and Italy were taking American dollars to rebuild their war-devastated cities, it was no trick for American businessmen to find customers almost anywhere they turned in Europe. Not so in 1963.

Factories built in Europe since 1945, many of them financed with U.S. foreign aid, probably are the most efficient manufacturing units in the world. They are turning out consumer goods of high quality in competition with the finest goods produced in the United States or Japan. In consequence, the United States—savior and rebuilder of Western Europe—must fight to retain its commercial interests on this continent, with competition from the Soviet Union becoming a reality.

These are among the facts of life faced by the members of the 47th mission of International House, which will move on to Holland after 3 days in Belguim.

Douglas MacArthur II, nephew of the great general and Ambassador to Belgium after distinguished service in Japan, was host to the New Orleans mission for a day. He made available to the mission economic documents of the embassy and services of the most knowledgeable members of his staff.

Ability of the six nations in the so-called Common Market, or European Economic Community, to set their own tariffs and act as a unit in negotiation of trade arrangements with other nations is not considered here the greatest threat to continued lucrative trade relations between the United States and Western Europe.

Three factors, separate, and distinct from Common Market considerations, are regarded as paramount by Americans who lean on European trade for existence.

First, Government action. Businessmen with whom we have talked say that drastic increases in U.S. duties on carpets and glass were stupid. These raises, they say, led to a conflict which the United States could not win.

Government action, however, according to Americans in Belgium is not a major factor. The Common Market countries edged to eliminate tariffs by 1970 on goods which they buy and sell among themselves, expect to make many adjustments. The "chicken war" in which increases in poultry tariffs aroused enmity in several sections of the United States is symptomatic.

Labor action is considered a major factor in appraisal of international trade. There should be no expectancy that any nation whose labor force obtains wage increases which exceed increases in productivity will survive in the battle for world trade.

"We can't price ourselves out of world markets and continue as a major world power," say businessmen here with whom we have dined and talked.

The third and most important factor, in the opinion of Americans in Brussels, is the attitude of U.S. business management.

"Business and industry in our country," they say, "seem to have softened on prosperity. American machines, American ingenuity and our private enterprise system have been so successful so long that we have grown used to having people of other nations beat a path to our door. We built the better mousetrap, the finer soft drink, the superior automobile. Patronage came easy.

"In our zeal to improve the way of life of nationals of other countries we have taught our ways to friends who now compete with us. They are fair and good competitors, and their competition should better the whole world; but we cannot overlook the fact that it is earnest competition."

Commercial staff members at the U.S. Embassy are irked particularly by delays in replies by U.S. businessmen to inquiries about goods which they might sell in Belgium. One pointed out that a wholesaler in Brussels addressed, in French, an order for goods to a manufacturer in a U.S. city at the same time that he sent a similar order to a British manufacturer. The latter replied, in 10 days, in French, while the U.S. manufacturer waited 3 months to send a reply, in English, explaining that it had taken time to have the French language inquiry translated.

It was explained to Ambassador MacArthur that one of the functions of International House is to overcome language barriers.

One demand by European buyers in 1963 is for dependability. Air cargo and its impressive record of on-time deliveries have whetted the appetite of European buyers for on-time deliveries of all types of goods. Port strikes during the past year, in the opinion of American businessmen in Brussels, cost the United States hundreds of actual and potential markets. "We're too far away to say whether arbitration or government intervention should provide an answer," one trader told me, "but we definitely are close enough to know that tying up of commerce in world ports does serious injury to the country in which the tieup occurs."

Increases in the standards of living in Common Market countries have been phenomenal. Within the past 5 years real wages of workers in Belgium have increased 40 percent, compared with a 10-percent increase in the United States. The statistics are from official sources.

U.S. industry, of course, is making substantial contributions to the improved economy. As an example, General Motors Corp. assembles 250 automobiles a day in Belgium alone.

The Common Market countries, as we view them, are symbolic of a new Europe—embracing the revolutionary ideals of the United States in a manner that neither President de Gaulle, at one end of the spectrum, nor some Communist at the other can deny or belie.

This new Europe, with the traditional enmity of France and of Germany submerged by the partial voluntary surrender of sovereignty by France, by Germany, by Belgium, by Holland, by Luxembourg and by Italy, offers to the United States both a threat and a promise.

Having given substantial encouragement to formation of the EEC, the United States has—it seems to this 47th Mission of International House—a real opportunity to capitalize on the economic stability which the EEC has brought to Western Europe.

We obviously need European markets. Europe needs ours, too.

The war of 1776 was that for independence. The battles of 1963 are those of interdependence, that of the United States and of U.S.-allied Western Europe.

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 29, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, III—RISING ROTTERDAM

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

ROTTERDAM.—Whether Rotterdam is the world's No. 1 port or just a close second to New York is debatable. That it is the busiest port inspected by the 47th Mission of International House cannot be questioned.

The Hon. B. Van Walsom, burgomaster of Rotterdam, modestly says, "New York handles more cargo, for the time being. Rotterdam handles more ships."

Dependability is credited by the burgomaster for the phenomenal development of this seaport. There has been no work stoppage here since he became Rotterdam's top official, and many of the port facilities here are active around the clock.

There are marked contrasts between Rotterdam and New Orleans. Here, wharf-supported gantry cranes move most cargoes—with 98 percent of it being transferred from ship to river barge or from barge to ship. In New Orleans most cargo is moved by ships' gear—into or out of covered wharves.

Ironically, whereas most grain moving through the port of New Orleans is handled through riverside, fixed elevators, practically the entire grain movement through Rotterdam is handled by floating, moving elevators.

There seems to be two major factors behind the growth of this port from a war-devastated shambles to a modern, pulsating metropolis. Movement of goods to support American troops through the port has been heavy for more than 15 years. Establishment of the Common Market is adding further impact to import and export movements.

Officials of the Rotterdam port authority, which is responsible directly to the city council, and of the city's chamber of commerce met the International House mission on its arrival from Brussels. An inspection of the port facilities aboard a vessel similar to New Orleans' *Good Neighbor* followed immediately. There was only one disappointment on the harbor trip: Of the hundreds of ships at Rotterdam's wharves, only five flew the United States flag.

Ships from Liberia, Panama, Norway were much in evidence, but American-flag ships were few and far between. Most impressive vessel in the harbor was the Holland-American liner *Rotterdam*.

Like New Orleans, Rotterdam is not satisfied with an outlet to the sea via a natural river channel. Rotterdam has built a tidewater channely direct to the North Sea that is not unlike the seaway recently opened between the Industrial Canal and the Gulf of Mexico. Spoil pumped from the artificial channel is being retained by dikes for development as a new industrial area.

Three oil refineries have been built on part of this made land, and another is under construction.

One facility under construction in the port is a terminal for Sulfur Export Corp. To this terminal Freeport Sulfur Co. will send molten sulfur from Port Sulphur, La., just as it now sends molten sulfur by barge to terminals on the inland waterways system of the United States and by coastwise ships to American ports. Three other U.S. sulfur companies will have access to the new Rotterdam terminal, scheduled to be completed in April 1964. Edward J. McNamara, formerly of New Orleans, is pushing work on the facility.

Rotterdam is not only encouraging the building of most modern facilities for shippers; it also is making it as simple as possible for tourists and for business visitors to learn about the city and the port. When members of the International House mission reached their hotel rooms they received literature about Rotterdam printed in four languages, Dutch, German, English and French.

Earlier, at Antwerp, members of the mission were given "A Summary Guide to the Port of Antwerp"—available in six languages.

This availability of information in multiple languages reminded members of the mission that the International Relations Committee of International House is working on a project to produce a publication in a variety of languages which should fill a void in New Oreans. Support of the city, the International Trade Mart, the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area, the dock board, and other agencies is being given to this project.

Whereas Rotterdam for many years had little of interest to offer to the tourists other than its museums, its fine zoo, and its harbor, this city today has distinctive attractions.

Foremost is the privately financed Euromast, a 363-foot observation post built in 23 days as background for the Flouriade, a horticultural exhibition held in 1960. The tower rests on a foundation similar to those of the piers of the two Mississippi River bridges at New Orleans. As in southeast Louisiana, there is no rock subsurface in this part of the Netherlands.

There are two restaurants near the top of Euromast, and patronage has been heavy since the attraction was opened. Shares in the company which built the tower sold originally for $100 each. Bids of $455 per share are finding few takers.

Dividends of 7 percent per year have been paid regularly to stockholders of Euromast.

Passage, by elevator, from the base to the restaurants' level requires 23 seconds—with no vibration and little sense of movement. The shaft which supports heavy structures near the top of the tower has a diameter of 36 feet. Its walls are 1-foot-thick concrete.

Euromast probably is the city's top attraction for tourists. A close second is the brandnew Lijnbaan shopping center near the city's center. No automobiles are driven through this shopping center, all of its thoroughfares being reserved for pedestrians.

Port officials explain that Rotterdam has not been content to have natural outlets to the North Sea but has built canals both to the sea and to inland ports because control of artificial waterways is easier than control of natural streams.

Depth of the new waterway to Europort, the city's most recent reclamation, now is dredged to 39 feet. The channel later may be deepened. Part of the new waterway, or Nieuuwe Waterweg, follows the channel of the Meuse, or Maas River. Part goes through areas entirely new to water navigation. Both the Meuse and Rhine Rivers, plus many canals, connect the waterway with the hinterland.

Where the waterway meets the North Sea is a series of radar stations designed to insure safe navigation in all weather.

They seem to be needed, because it has rained much of the time since the International House mission reached here.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 30, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, IV—HAMBURG HUSTLES

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

HAMBURG, GERMANY.—Representatives of business and government of the Federal Republic of Germany questioned members of the 47th Mission of International House more than the mission members questioned their hosts in meetings here.

Sitting around the table at headquarters of the chamber of commerce in Hamburg on the eve of another railroad strike deadline in the United States, the German participants expressed themselves as puzzled about events in America.

New work rules for a railroad in West Germany which would permit an engineer to take over duties of a fireman would be welcomed here, they said, because there aren't enough workers to go 'round in Hamburg's expanding industry.

The discussion probably was purely academic, because many of West Germany's trains are pulled by steam locomotives—on which firemen are needed to stoke the fires. Incidentally, coal from America comes into West Germany on a quota basis; and the importation is scant, because the protective tariff is $5 per ton on all coal above the quota.

This particular circumstance was less discussed than what the German hosts described as discrimination against ports of the Federal Republic of Germany. Steamship conferences, including those to which carriers operating from the Gulf of Mexico subscribe, penalize German ports by requiring a 10 percent added charge for cargoes shipped to these ports, over charges to other European ports, the chamber of commerce spokesmen complained.

Dr. Richard Paulig, retired German consul general who had 3 years' duty in New Orleans, assisted in the give-and-take discussion among the International House and Hamburg representatives. He recalled that delays in the port of New Orleans, particularly in the handling of grain, had been a problem during his service in Louisiana. He said he was glad to hear from International House mission members that elevator facilities in the New Orleans area have been expanded.

Participants in the discussion on the part of Hamburg included Rudolf Berckholtz, chairman; Dr. Franz O. Disch, authority on machinery; L. Gelder, foreign trade adviser; Harald Mathies and Dr. Kurt Preiss, transportation experts, and Gunter Schonsee and Joachin Schulz, industrial representatives.

Assisting the International House group in the discussions were Paul D. McCusker, Consul General of the United States, and Dr. Paulig.

After the sessions in the chamber of commerce conference room the visitors were guests of the senate of the state of Hamburg at a meeting in Rathaus (city hall). Later in the day Dr. A. Eckardt, board chairman of Esso Germany, was host at a reception at which the International House visitors were greeted by some of West Germany's top industrialists and business people.

Some aspects of the German industrial situation seemed odd to the southerners. For instance, they were told that there is no such thing as the closed shop in industry here but that there must be representation of trade unions on corporate boards of directors.

Half of the port operation in Hamburg, the hosts reported, is handled by Government-owned facilities and half by private enterprise facilities.

Growth of employment in Hamburg, according to statistics presented at the several meetings, has been phenomenal—639,000 in September 1950 and 941,000 in September 1962. About 5 percent of the industrial employees—skilled and unskilled—are imported "foreign guest workers."

Officials of Hamburg late in the day presented members of the mission handsome books about this port, printed in four languages.

En route to Hamburg the mission members were entertained a full day in Amsterdam, where a boat trip through the city's ancient canals was arranged by VVV, the Amsterdam tourist commission.

Honored guest at a luncheon was Dr. P. J. Koets, acting burgomaster, who is alderman for education. Dr. Koets was born in Macon, Ga., where his father was a professor at Wesleyan College, published a newspaper in Indonesia and spent most of World War II in a Japanese prison camp.

He spoke Dutch at the luncheon with a distinct southern accent.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Sept. 2, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, V—BERLIN CONTRAST

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

WEST BERLIN, GERMANY.—The best thing about a visit to East Berlin is the return to West Berlin.

Riding and walking in a Communist-controlled city of 1 million people who have no freedom of movement brings little enjoyment.

Foreigners and residents of West Berlin can get into East Berlin if they are willing to put up with a lot of redtape and annoying delays at the East-West Berlin wall, but it is difficult, if not impossible, for the residents of East Berlin to move in any direction out of the city.

For all practical purposes, East Berlin is a concentration camp. There are several crude signs on the wall expressing the opinion of West Berliners to this effect.

Some of us left the 47th Mission of International House at Hamburg to make a 9-hour trip to Berlin. Even with the expert help of Jack Koehler, native of Dresden, Germany, citizen of the United States, and skilled correspondent of the Associated Press, the Very Rev. Andrew C. Smith, president of Loyola University; Jose Louis Banos, New Orleans banker, and I, traveling in a group, found getting into and out of East Berlin a tedious undertaking.

Only one of the five checkpoints between West Berlin and East Berlin permits the passage of non-Germans. This is checkpoint C, commonly called Checkpoint Charley, in the American sector of the occupied city.

Getting past the American checkpoint calls for little more than a wave to a sentry; but then the trouble begins.

A few weeks ago an East Berliner drove a tiny car under the iron gate built in the wall at Checkpoint Charley in his break for freedom. Since then the East Berlin troops or police have arranged the opening so that everyone must stop before going through. Two concrete barriers have been built in front of the East Berlin iron gates in such a way that persons trying to drive through the gates must go through a small opening at the left and then take a sharp turn to the right to reach the opening in the second barrier. After the barriers are the iron gates which won't be opened until the East German police or soldiers who man them have examined passports and contents of the automobile.

After the automobile is permitted through the first gate it must be parked while its occupants go into a hut where their passports again are examined and where they must fill out declarations giving the exact amount of foreign currency, German marks and travelers checks which they are carrying and describing cameras which they may have with them. Even with Jack Koehler's expert help, this took us about 20 minutes. Sometimes it takes 5 hours, as is generally the case with U.S. citizens who attempt to drive from West Berlin to Hamburg or other places in West Germany—officially called the Federal Republic of Germany.

Getting back out of East Berlin calls for the same procedure—plus a more thorough search of the automobile, particularly the rear trunk. The East Berlin police or troops are zealous to see that no one of their fellow East Berliners escapes to West Berlin, although there are records of some of the

police and troops going through or over the wall when opportunity permitted.

The wall itself in places resembles the flood protection wall near the French Market in New Orleans. In other places the East Germans used sides of buildings or existing walls to make a complete barrier between the two Berlins. At all places the wall is topped or backed by barbed wire.

At intervals are old wreaths, marking spots where East Berliners were shot in attempts to escape to West Berlin. With some of these wreaths are crosses bearing names of the killed and dates of the killings.

Upper story windows of buildings west of the wall frequently frame the faces of residents of West Berlin using binoculars to try to see relatives or friends in East Berlin or to obtain some message from them.

On the wall at some points are painted such slogans as "We do not accept the wall" or "The wall cannot prevail." These, of course, are on the West side.

An overwhelming majority of West Germans apparently favor reunification of Germany. On the basis of conversations in Brussels and Rotterdam, we doubt that this is the wish of some Belgians and Dutch. They seem to feel that West Germany is a good partner in the European Economic Community or Common Market but that a reunited Germany would pose a greater threat of war than a divided Germany.

For some reason that is difficult to explain, the atmosphere seems to change when you pass from West Berlin to East Berlin.

The West Germans whom we met at a fine restaurant before we made the passage seemed to have hearts that are light and gay. The East Germans whom we saw at Checkpoint Charley were grim. This applied particularly to the elderly woman, dressed in an East German army uniform, who was one of several persons who examined my passport. I tried every way I knew to make her smile, but it wouldn't work.

Immediately beyond Checkpoint Charley are piles of rubble, bomb-gutted buildings, and other reminders of war. The first new building we encountered was a handsome new embassy on Unter den Linden which is about twice as big as the White House in Washington. We learned that this is the Soviet Embassy, built shortly after the war, when many residents of East Berlin were without food or shelter.

Further along we saw rows of housing units built about 10 years ago. Much of the tile facing on these buildings has fallen off, and West Berliners refer to them as evidence of poor Soviet workmanship. Actual work on the buildings, we were told, was done by East Berliners under orders from Soviet troops.

We saw only three Russian military men. One was a lieutenant colonel on a street corner in East Berlin; the others, two Red infantrymen standing guard in front of the monument to Soviet military might in the British sector of West Berlin. This monument is surrounded by a heavy barbed wire barrier and is guarded 24 hours a day. If the guards and barbed wire were removed, West Berliners say the monument would be torn down in a few hours.

There is another Soviet monument in a park in East Berlin. Viewing it when we were there were officers and men from the U.S. cruiser, *Newport News*, which was visiting Hamburg.

We encountered two evidences of Soviet indoctrination of East Berliners with ideologies of the U.S.S.R. As we were walking down a street a boy addressed Father Smith, "I don't have to believe what you say." At Checkpoint Charley we found an abundance of Russian literature. One of the pieces deplored a "breakdown of education" in West Berlin, blamed by the propaganda on a system which permitted a teacher shortage.

It would be difficult to measure effects of this indoctrination, which has been in progress more than 18 years. That persons escaping from East Berlin to West Berlin, before and after building of the wall 2 years ago, have included teenagers who acted "on their own" hardly is conclusive evidence that a majority of the young people in East Berlin have not been swayed by Soviet indoctrination.

On the basis of less than a day's observance, West Berlin certainly seems more prosperous than East Berlin. However, the visitor who expects to find no evidence of World War II bombing and shelling in West Berlin is due for a surprise. Facades of many West Berlin buildings still bear the marks of shrapnel. Also, in some areas there are ruins of large buildings which were gutted by acts of war.

In some instances, we were told, buildings have not been replaced because officials have been unable to locate their owners. Some of these owners were killed in the war, and some just picked up and left the city—abandoning their interests in Berlin property.

We are in no position to report on the quality or quantity of food available in East Berlin, because we had no meal there. The single luncheon which we had in West Berlin was excellent—comparable with a luncheon at the best restaurants in New Orleans and in Paris.

To persons planning a trip to East Berlin, we offer one piece of advice: Take as little money as possible. Coming out through "Checkpoint Charley" you'll be required to prove that the declaration you signed when you entered was accurate. There's a booth where you will be searched, in case the soldier or policeman who examines the currency and travelers' checks which you place on his counter isn't satisfied. We apparently convinced them that we weren't holding out on them, because we weren't forced to strip. It goes pretty rough, we were told, when a foreigner, comes back to "Checkpoint Charley" with more money than he declared when he went in.

Glenn Ford, the actor, we were told, created quite a commotion at "Gheckpoint Charley" when he threw a big roll of bills on a counter to be counted. The soldier who was handling his case looked at Ford's passport and then caused everybody who was working to stop and come to his stand to see "the famous American motor car manufacturer who had come to East Berlin with so much money."

As with most bureaucratic operations of the kind, there seemed to be many more soldiers and policemen who were not working than were working—although the lines of persons waiting for service, both entering and leaving, were long.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Sept. 5, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, VI—DENMARK PROSPERS

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

COPENHAGEN.—Evidence that a Western European nation does not have to become a member of the European Economic Community, or Common Market, to be prosperous is found easily in Denmark.

This small nation, like its neighbors, has no unemployment problem. There is a need here for both skilled and unskilled labor; but, unlike the Federal Republic of Germany, Denmark has not brought in "foreign guest workers"—nationals of Italy, Spain, Greece, and other countries who are permitted to work without changing their citizenship—to meet its need.

Copenhagen continues to live up to its name "merchant harbor" and is the most active seaport in Scandinavia.

Members of the 47th Mission of International House were given ample opportunity to visit and inspect port facilities on our first day in Denmark.

As in other European ports which we have visited, there seems to be here greater reliance on machinery than on manpower for loading and unloading ships than is the case in New Orleans.

Whether Denmark's prosperity will continue if it remains outside the Common Market is problematical. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, of course, have had a kind of economic community of their own for many years.

The kingdom, paradoxically, is a democracy, but strong socialist influences are apparent. The socialized medicine program not only is geared "from the cradle to the grave" but applies before the cradle. Expectant mothers receive nine visits from midwives and three examinations from doctors, at the cost of the state, before their children are born.

Despite the strong socialist influences in the government, 45 percent of the nation's houses are owned by their occupants.

There have been many changes in Copenhagen within the past year. An inflation which appeared, to be running away in September, 1962, apparently has been arrested. Neither prices nor wages may be raised without official approval.

The traffic situation in downtown Copenhagen has been improved by the designation of the city's major shopping thoroughfare as a walking street—with no vehicles, including bicycles, permitted on its pavement. Also, many streets which carried two-way traffic a year ago now are one-way streets.

There is a building boom here, with even the Royal Theater having its face lifted.

Conferences conducted here by the mission have included a discussion by Lawrence A. Moloney, president of International House; Joseph W. Simon, Jr., executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans Area; Jose Luis Banos, vice president of the Whitney National Bank; and C. T. O'Connor, Baton Rouge industrialist, with officials of the Danish ministry of trade.

All members of the mission were guests of the Copenhagen City Council at Town Hall; and before and after the harbor inspection the group held discussions with members of the Copenhagen Port Authority, an agency which receives no financial support from either the nation of Denmark or the city of Copenhagen.

One of the visits by the mission in Denmark was to the Louisiana Art Museum, so named because the mansion which is the nucleus of the institution was the home of a Dane who had three wives, each a Louise. Arrangements for an exchange of art by galleries in Denmark and galleries in New Orleans were made by Paul Fabry, managing director of International House.

Seeing an old friend while traveling abroad is a distinct pleasure. Seeing several is a distinct surprise. As we were entertained the grand hall in Fredericksburg Castle we "bumped into" Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Hanson. He is publisher of the Birmingham News and frequently has visited New Orleans. Mrs. Hanson is a former student of Sophie Newcomb College.

Soon after the Hansons left the room it was entered by Mr. and Mrs. Angier Biddle Duke. We met Mr. Duke when he was first Secretary of the U.S. Embassy in El Salvador and were with him in Moscow when the U.S. exhibition was opened in 1959. He now is U.S. chief of protocol and is en route, in the President's plane, to Addis Ababa to arrange state visits to Washington by Emperor Haile Selassie and other leaders.

We "got together" with the Hansons and the Duke party at the d'Angleterre Hotel in Copenhagen after the chance meeting at Fredericksburg Castle.

T. Hoffman Olsen, who went to New Orleans as a young man, learned the lumber business, established a thriving firm, and then returned to his homeland in 1945, came from his farm at Thuro to greet members of our mission. He now raises fruit, principally apples and pears, on a place near the home of his daughter, son-in-law, and grandchildren.

"Danes and Americans are much alike," he said, "and I still love America. It is my hope to go back to New Orleans next year—perhaps for my last trip."

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Sept. 7, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, VII—TRADE TALK AT OSLO

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

OSLO.—This nation doesn't intend to have any "dollar gap" problems with the United States or any other nation.

One of Norway's most active agencies is its official export council, with staff of 70-plus employees giving full-time attention to maintaining the nation's favorable foreign trade position.

Members of the council received the 47th mission of International House shortly after its members arrived by ship from Copenhagen. Executives of the council remained through 2 days' ship and bus inspection of facilities of Norway's busiest port.

Frankness was obvious in trade discussions between the visitors from the Mississippi Valley and officials of the Norwegian Export Council. Two factors, said the latter, lend impetus to United States-Norway economic relations: "The merchant fleet and the American capital market." The council members acknowledge that Norway's merchant fleet, the world's second largest, "is largely dependent upon the American freight market."

Exports by Norway to the United States during the past 12 months topped $100 million—with imports from the United States running higher. However, the Norwegians who talked with members of the International House mission expressed no dissatisfaction with this situation, Norway comes out well on United States-Norway trade because most of it is handled in Norwegian bottoms.

Norwegians are outspoken in their criticism of proposed amendments to the U.S. "antidumping" statutes. They contend that instead of correcting defects in existing laws to prevent selling of merchandise in the United States at less that its fair value, the amendments would provide what would be an artificial import protection, raising an umbrella over inefficient manufacturers.

Several shipping company officials here have expressed interest in the proposed one-plane service between New Orleans and Europe. If Delta Airlines and Pan American World Airways are granted permission to interchange jet airplanes, with Delta crews flying them between New Orleans and New York and Pan American planes flying them between New York and Europe, the service would be welcomed in Norway.

There are frequent occasions, these shipping company people said, when officers and crewmen of Norwegian ships calling at New Orleans find it necessary to hurry home for one reason or another and when it is necessary to fly replacements to these ships from Norway.

Like other countries of western Europe, Norway has a shortage of both skilled and unskilled labor. Like West Germany but unlike Denmark, Norway has brought in "foreign guest workers," principally from southern Europe. They number about 70,000—or approximately 10 percent of those brought into the Federal Republic of Germany.

Tourism is becoming big business in Norway. The main source of tourists to Oslo is the rest of Scandinavia. The United Kingdom ranks high, as does the United States. The flow of tourists from Germany, which sends thousands of tourists to France and to Denmark and other European countries, still is only a trickle.

Norwegians in several walks of life with whom we talked apparently have no pleasant memories of occupation of this country by the Nazis. They insist that less than 2 percent of their fellow countrymen approved the activities of Quisling, who was tried at the end of World War II and executed for his collaboration with the Nazis.

One of the city's most imposing buildings is its city hall, completed shortly after the end of World War II at a cost of $5 million—American. An entire wall of its tremendous grand hall is covered by a painting showing abuses by Germans during occupation of Norway. One of the panels shows a Nazi bludgeoning a goddess of liberty from her pedestal.

Scenically, Norway is a visitors' paradise. Views of Oslo Fjord from a ship approaching this city are breathtaking. Views of the fjord and city from the surrounding mountainsides also are spectacular.

Incidentally, the ski jumps near Oslo suggest that competitors using them must have obtained their training jumping from low-flying airplanes. They're that high.

[From the Times-Picayune, Sept. 10, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, VIII—SWINGIN' SWEDES

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN.—If Sweden's largest city has not had a surfeit of U.S. activity within the past few days, it can't be done.

First good will mission from North America to come into this city recently was the 47th Mission of International House of New Orleans.

Then came Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and an impressive entourage.

Arriving with the IH mission and the Vice President's party was the flagship of the U.S. 2d Fleet, the U.S.S. *Newport News*, which was at Hamburg and at Copenhagen when the New Orleans mission was at those cities. Lawrence A. Molony, president of International House, asserts that the simultaneous visits were entirely coincidental and denies that the IH mission requested chaperonage.

Seriously, the visits by three North American groups have placed an emphasis on Swedish-American relations which residents here say should be beneficial to relations between the two nations.

Flags of Sweden, of the United States, and of the Vice President of the United States flew above the Grand Hotel at the same time.

Soon after the IH mission arrived its members were guests of officers and directors of Handelsbanken, Swedish banking institution which grows so rapidly that its board chairman is not certain from hour-to-hour how many are its branches.

This chairman, Sune Wetter, and his wife greeted the IH mission with Tore Browald, president of the bank, and eight other directors and their wives. All expressed an aggressive interest in trade with New Orleans.

Other hosts of the IH mission included the Swedish-American Line, which entertained at Operakallern in honor of the Mississippi Valley visitors. Earlier, the Swedish Export Association had a luncheon for our group.

Leif Janson, vice president of the Swedish-American Line, and Mrs. Janson came from Gothenburg, largest port of this country, to extend hospitality to the IH mission.

Mr. and Mrs. Janson know New Orleans well and have been guests there of the Frank Strachans.

Probably the most unusual visit by the 47th IH mission was to a satellite industrial community of Stockholm. There Arenco, subsidiary of the Swedish Match Co., has a plant which is as up-to-1963 as the moon rocket.

In its early days the Swedish Match Co., enjoying something akin to monopoly, was concerned only with the making of matches. One of its affiliates is the Delta Match Co., whose plant is on the river road upstream from Kenner.

Today's Swedish Match Co. has much broader interests. Its Arenco devises and manufacturers machines which clean and dehead fish of all kinds and sizes, which make cigars, which direct antiaircraft fire, which package remoulade sauce, which build tubes and tube filling devices which handle everything from pharmaceuticals to cosmetics.

Thomas Wasmouth, managing director of Arenco, was host to the International House group for an inspection of Arenco facilities and for a luncheon. Later, the group went to the Erik's Fair and was escorted through the U.S. pavilion by representatives of Ambassador J. Graham Parsons.

Vice President JOHNSON seemed in great spirits on his arrival in Stockholm. An amusing aspect of his visit was that when he came to this match capital of the world he brought souvenir cigarette lighters, carrying the seal of the Vice President on one side and the inscription, "Northern European trip of Vice President JOHNSON, September 1963," on the other. Obviously, Mr. JOHNSON intended no slight of the match industry, because the lighters were distributed only to members of his traveling party, as mementos.

The Swedes apparently are very proud that this standard of living has risen markedly in recent years. "Only you, in America, have higher living standards than ours," several Swedes told us.

Americans coming to Sweden with the expectation of employing domestic servants to go with them back to the United States face disappointment. There is practically no unemployment here.

In Stockholm are outstanding former New Orleaneans. Wife of the Italian Ambassador in Stockholm, the Marchesa di Capomazza, is the former Miss Betty Hardie of New Orleans. The former Miss Kathryn Gould of New Orleans is Mrs. Lars-Erik Hesslow of Stockholm.

Sailing on the *Gripsholm* for their first visit to the United States in several years are Mr. and Mrs. Brack Curry. He is the chief of Scandinavian services of the Associated Press, whose staff has been most helpful to the IH mission. Brack explained that "holm" in the name of this city and in the name of the ship on which he and his wife are traveling means island. Stockholm, in fact, like the nation of Denmark, is a series of islands.

Before the International House group reached here there were many Swedes who knew of and had an interest in our city.

For instance, the first staffer whom we met at the AP bureau asked, "Do you know Armand Hug and Al Hirt and Pete Fountain?"

When we replied that we knew all of them, plus Louis Armstrong and the late "Papa" Celestin, we had it made.

[From the Times-Picayune, Sept. 11, 1963]

MISSION NOTES, IX—HOMEWARD BOUND

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

IN FLIGHT, MID-ATLANTIC.—Traveling permits meetings with "the most interesting people."

Returning to the United States with members of the 47th Mission of International House was Capt. E. H. Hiller, master of the research vessel *Atlantis II* which sought the U.S. submarine *Thresher* almost 2 months and now is engaged in oceanographic research in the Indian Ocean.

Captain Hiller flew from Colombo to Istanbul to London before boarding the Pan American World Airways 'round-the-world plane bearing the International House mission back from Europe.

One of the demands on Captain Hiller is pinpoint navigation. An approximate position with his ship is of no value to the 30-odd scientists who usually are in its complement.

Skipper of PAWA Clipper *Endeavor* is Capt. Marius Lodeesen, who has been flying for Pan American since 1932, a veteran of the clipper flying boats.

Captain Lodeesen and Captain Hiller compared notes halfway across the Atlantic on modern aids to navigation which permit a surface captain or a jet plane officer to establish exact positions.

"Navigation instruments which require more than a minute for calculations," said Captain Hiller, with Captain Lodeesen's assent, "have no value on a plane moving 600 miles per hour or a ship which must make an exact ocean measurement."

Final days in Europe of the International House mission brought considerable opportunity to consider geographic circumstances—over and above economic conditions, which received primary study.

Thanks to the Gulf Stream, both Oslo—Norway's most important port—and Goteborg, major port of Sweden, are open throughout the year.

When ports of the St. Lawrence Seaway, further to the south, are closed by ice, both Oslo and Goteborg are receiving ocean shipping. Even the small-boat marinas of the two cities are free of ice, and winter haulouts are unnecessary. In Stockholm, on Sweden's east coast, the warm currents of the Gulf Stream do not prevail. Winter haulouts of small craft are required, as they are in Chicago and other Midwest yachting centers.

Members of the International House mission are in general agreement that: Most Europeans in the seven nations they have visited are friendly to citizens of the United States; there is a common understanding that there can be no commercial divorce of the United States and Europe; that there must be compromise on both sides of the Atlantic to continue political and economic alliances that have proved mutually beneficial since World War II; and that frequent communications between the United States and Europe are imperative.

These communications may take the form of customary interchange of ideas through normal cable and diplomatic services; through visits such as that being completed by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and the International House mission or in other modern ways.

Of one thing they are certain, that when people can have lunch in Stockholm, dinner in New York and supper in New Orleans there is bound to be a community of interest and of concern.

Opening of Carmel High School, Mundelein, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a significant event occurred recently in the 12th Illinois District which I have the honor to represent, when Carmel High School was officially opened in Mundelein, Ill.

This cooperative institution, providing high school education for boys under the sponsorship of the Carmelite Order and for girls under the sponsorship of the order of the Blessed Virgin Mary, provides a unique and much needed facility for secondary education in Lake County, Ill.

It is reported to me that Carmel High School is the first of its kind in the Midwest with its separate educational opportunities for young women under the well-known Catholic religieuses, respectfully known as BVM, and for the young men under the equally well-known Carmelites, or White Friars. The two groups combine for certain scientific and educational instruction and for the use of the library facilities which are outstanding in capacity and content.

Recently, I was privileged to present a flag to Carmel High School which had been previously flown above our National Capitol in Washington and which was accepted in an appropriate ceremony by Sister Mary Cecil, BVM, who is principal of the girls high school, and Father David J. Murphy, O. Carm., who is principal of the boys high school. Other guests attending this ceremony were Rev. Father Brian McCulloch, O. Carm., Superior Carmelite Monastery, Mundelein, Col. Benjamin Chapla, U.S. Army, Post Commander Fort Sheridan, and Lt. Gen. W. H. Arnold, U.S. Army, retired.

Also presented at this ceremony were autographed photographs of public officials including Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senators EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all members of the Illinois delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives, Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, and other elected officials of the State including Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of state. President John F. Kennedy sent a photograph with a letter wishing success to the new institution. Secretary Carpentier presented a State of Illinois flag for the library.

Members of the advisory board of the Carmel High School include some of the most distinguished citizens of the northern Illinois area: Lt. Gen. William H. Arnold, U.S. Army, retired, Messrs. Martin T. Burns, William J. Carney, Wallace E. Carroll, Michael Cudahy, Arsene J. Denoyer, Frank Flick, and Richard F. Kennedy.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the following articles to the attention of those who so avidly follow the writings of Art Hoppe and especially to those who have missed them in the past.

I believe the readers of the RECORD will find those appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle on October 6, 7, 9 and 11, highly entertaining.

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 6, 1963]

WILL VIETNAM SELL OUT? CHEAP?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Great news. Our Secretary of Defense is back from South Vietnam with a full report to our President. And a rosy one it is. With luck, he says, our boys will be out of the trenches by Christmas. Christmas, 1965.

Everybody in Washington is jubilant. Sort of. "What else," says the Defense Department defensively, "can we do?" "There is," say the State Department experts expertly, "no other course." And Mr. Kennedy just kind of mutters to himself.

Well, I still think we ought to buy it. After all, it's a pretty small country. In a run-down neighborhood. And yet we're giving it $1.5 million a day. Free. Why, at that rate we'd own it in no time. And once we owned it, we could—or we could—but that's silly. I'm sure we could think of something to do with it.

For example, we could turn it into a golf course. And if we charged high enough green fees. But then you know what Congress would say. "Foreign aid money for a golf course." That would never do.

Plowing it under might seem a good idea. Except that would qualify it for farm subsidies, which could prove most costly. Digging a hole and burying it would be cheaper. But "we shall bury you" has an unpleasant ring. It would be better to cover it up with leaves and things and hope no one would notice it. But, sure as shooting, some CIA agent would forget it's there and stumble over it in the dark. Moreover, I think the suggestion we simply tow it over here is farfetched. Where would we put it?

No sir, we must face the fact that South Vietnam is there to stay. And seeing we don't want to live in it ourselves, we'll just have to buy it for speculation.

We patch up the bullet holes, see, and sweep away the napalm bomb ashes and give the whole place a nice coat of whitewash. Then Mr. Adlai Stevenson kind of drops the word around the U.N. Like to General de Gaulle, who seems interested. "Hi, there, friend," says Mr. Stevenson. "I just happen to have what you're looking for. A cozy little country, recently redecorated and handy to the bus stop. It's yours for a mere $3.4 billion. And, honest, that's less than we've got in it."

Of course, if the war keeps up much longer, we may have to cut the price a little. Like to $1.98. And sell it in small remnants. To small buyers.

Oh, all right, then, why haggle? We could give it away. Like to—or to—actually, if we got really desperate, we could always give it to the South Vietnamese people. But only, to be sure, as a last resort.

Well, you may say it's pretty ridiculous not knowing what to do with a lovely nation like South Vietnam. I agree. But don't say so too loud. It makes our leaders in Washington crotchety.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 7, 1963]

JUST PLAIN JACK BRINGS YOU PEACE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Good morning, friends in televisionland. It's time for another visit with just plain Jack, the story of a young man who is blessed with charm, good looks, wealth and success. He also has children.

As we join just plain Jack today he is in the Brown study, studying brownly. His

little girl, like your little girl, is playing on the floor with her scissors. Clipping coupons. His little boy, like your little boy, is standing by his father's side. Crying.

JACK (shuffling papers). All right, that takes care of the gold outflow; civil rights; Junior, stop crying; nuclear tests; Junior, stop crying; Honduras; Junior, stop crying; and * * * Caroline, why is your brother crying? As usual?

LITTLE GIRL. Maybe he wants Mommy.

JACK. Good. Why don't you run and try to find Mommy, Junior?

LITTLE GIRL. Silly Daddy. Mommy's in Greece.

JACK. Be quiet, Caroline. See, Junior? You go out to busy old Pennsylvania Avenue and head east. But wait till the light turns red. And * * *

LITTLE GIRL. Daddy!

JACK. I was just teasing, ha, ha. Oh, aren't we all having fun without Mommy, ha, ha. Junior, stop crying or I'll bat you one, ha, ha. (Shuffling papers) Now, in regard to the multilingual Junior-stop-crying NATO nuclear force, we must stop crying and * * * Pee-YARE!

(Portly Pierre, the faithful family retainer, edges reluctantly in.)

PIERRE. Please, Chief, no more horsie. I'd rather play—ugh—football.

JACK. Pierre, I feel another non-political trip (Junior, stop crying) coming on.

What's my schedule?

PIERRE (reading a list). Monday, Congressional breakfast; Tuesday, please be sure to take Caroline to the dentist; Wednesday, change Junior's sheets; Thurs * * *

JACK. Those lists she leaves. Pierre, I feel I must take a long trip into the wilds. Immediately.

PIERRE. You already did that, Chief.

JACK. At this point, I'd even go somewhere to shake hands with the devil.

PIERRE. You did that last week, Chief. Arkansas. Governor Faubus. Frankly, you're traveling too much. Did you notice how the guards on the gate ask to see your identification now? It's not good for your image.

JACK (glumly). You're right, Pierre. It is up to us fathers to make our children happy. Wait, I've got it! Caroline, how would you and Junior (please stop crying) like to go to Disneyland? Real family fun together?

LITTLE GIRL (suspiciously). Alone?

JACK. Well, Daddy has to work, Dear. But there must be somebody who'd put up with Junior. Somebody who's just dying to see Disneyland. Some * * * That's it! Pierre, call good old Nikita. Tell him our representatives will meet him forthwith at the Summit. Of the Matterhorn.

PIERRE. In Switzerland?

JACK. In Anaheim. And promise him a trip to Knott's Berry Farm, too. Now, Caroline, in your nonpolitical speech be sure to mention how this administration has made the whole world happy and gay and Junior, stop crying.

Will Jack get rid of the kids? Is this any way to be a good father? Is there any other way? Tune in to our next episode, friends. And meantime, as you go down the byways of life, remember: When you think of raising children, think of just plain Jack.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 9, 1963]

YES, WE'VE GOT NO DICTATORS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Our Alliance for Progress, which aims at social reform in Latin America, is certainly making progress. In a way. Hardly a billion dollars goes by that some government down there doesn't get reformed. By its army.

I'd like to explain this phenomenon, but I'm not an expert on any of our Latin American neighbors. So I've had to invent one. It's a lovely little independent republic known to our State Department as "Cosa Nostra."

Cosa Nostra lies just south of the docks and has a population of 3,000,073. Of which 42 are peons, 41 are soldiers and the rest are bananas. For years and years it was governed peacefully by General Cosa (the Ogre) Nostra. And there was never a complaint. Not from the general, who was happy. Nor from the soldiers, who were happy. Nor from the peons. Who knew what was good for them.

But things got more and more revolting until finally the peons revolted. The army gave up without firing a shot. Mainly because their 1812 muskets all failed to go off. General Nostra fled into exile (after stopping at the bank). And a president whose name we never could remember was elected and began a vigorous program of social reform.

But then Castroism raised its ugly beard. In Cuba. Our State Department was alarmed. "We must save Cosa Nostra from Castroism!" Washington cried. The Alliance for Progress was launched. We sent 113 experts to Cosa Nostra to determine what was needed to stem the tide of Castroism.

"Well," says El Presidente Whatshisnombre, "we could use food, teachers, books * * *"

"Great, great" says our Ambassador. "But look at that raggedy-old bobtail army you've got. How do you expect to defend democracy with an army like that? We will include in our first shipment 474 tanks, 362 jet fighters and a couple of used battleships. Take your time in paying us back."

So at the bargain rate of only a billion or so, we managed to reform the Cosa Nostra army into a modern superbly equipped fighting force. And, oh, how happy the soldiers were to lay down their 1812 muskets. And pick up their brand new burp guns.

"Hey, man," cried the tank drivers in the turrets of their streamlined U.S. tanks. "Look at these hotrods go." And with that they rolled right over the presidential palace. Not to mention El Presidente Whatshisnombre.

General Cosa (the Ogre) Nostra returned from exile and took over. On the grounds he was more against Castroism than anybody. Which our State Department had to admit was certainly true. And, once again, there are no complaints in Cosa Nostra. Not from the general, who feels more secure. Nor from the soldiers, who love their burp guns. Nor from the peons. Who, after, all, don't wish to complain against tanks, jet fighters, and battleships.

So the Alliance is making progress. Every week, it seems, we produce another highly stable government supported by an awesome army—an ally strong and powerful enough to defend forever the principles of democracy. If it had any.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 11, 1963]

TEST: ARE YOU A GOOD DICTATOR?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

EN ROUTE TO WASHINGTON

I am hustling to Washington because my country needs my expert advice. On how to tell a good dictator from a bad dictator.

As you know, our State Department's efforts to spread democracy, especially in Latin America, have been producing kind of a mixed bag lately. Most of them brandnew dictators. And the State Department's getting a mite defensive. It keeps issuing statements saying: "Well, we must realize that some dictators are better than others." And we certainly must. For it's our firm policy never to give our money and support to bad dictators. Only good dictators.

But you can see the problem. Every time a democratic president is overthrown by some army colonel, the State Department must decide: Is the colonel a good dictator worthy of our largess? Or a bad dictator? What we obviously need is a simple test.

Luckily, I happen to be an expert in this field. Because for years I've read those Sunday supplement articles headed "Test yourself. Are you a good husband?" Or: "Are you a good mother-in-law?" (I find I always make a good other-in-law). So I foresee no difficulties in devising a simple State Department test for new dictators.

1. Do you wake up in the morning: (a) grouchy; (b) awfully grouchy; (c) terribly grouchy?

2. Do you tell your people you love them: (a) often; (b) sometimes; (c) never; (d) what for?

3. Do you try to hide the fact that you are a crosspatch (a) at the breakfast table; (b) at the conference table; (c) when visiting the dungeons?

4. Do you get crotchety when: (a) production figures plummet; (b) associates defect; (c) the firing squad misses?

5. Do you make friends: (a) mad; (b) into enemies; (c) dead?

6. Can you manage a pleasant smile when the waiter spills soup down your neck? And he is: (a) boiled in oil; (b) drawn and quartered; (c) shot?

7. When you make a mistake, do you blame: (a) the Yankee imperialists; (b) the Communist saboteurs; (c) so who makes mistakes?

8. When your wife dents a fender on the family tank do you seek: (a) an adult discussion; (b) a friendly talking things out; (c) a submachine gun?

9. Do you consider yourself: (a) infallible; (b) omnipotent; (c) indestructible; (d) all three?

And so forth. Oh, how happy the State Department will be to have a simple test to tell the good dictators from the bad. How easy it will be to distinguish between the good dictators we can support like Mr. Chiang, Mr. Franco and (formerly) Mr. Trujillo. And the bad dictators like Mr. Castro, Mr. Mao and (lately) Mr. Diem.

But, you will ask, How do we grade the answers to these nine questions? Well, actually, we don't. Under this bold new plan of mine, we throw those nine away and decide whether or not the prospect is a good dictator or bad dictator solely on question No. 10. Which is: "Will you do what we tell you to do? (a) yes; (b) no."

So what else is new?

Frederick's First Female Attorney Being Admitted to State Bar Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this week a 25-year-old woman, Miss Elzbieta K. Adamska, became the first woman to practice law in the city of Frederick, Md. Miss Adamska was born in Poland, educated in the Maryland schools, and received her law degree from the University of Maryland. She was admitted to the bar at the Maryland Court of Appeals in Annapolis on October 15.

In addition to her outstanding achievements as a law student and later as a legal clerk, Miss Adamska is an ac-

complished musician, and active in the community life of Frederick.

I wish to include in my remarks congratulations to this young lady upon her entry into a profession in which women are in a decided minority and to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the October 15 edition of the Frederick (Md.) Post describing her accomplishments.

The article by Sandy Stender of the Post follows:

FREDERICK'S FIRST FEMALE ATTORNEY BEING ADMITTED TO STATE BAR TODAY

(By Sandy Stender)

A 25-year-old woman, who was born in Poland, has selected this city to embark on her profession as a lawyer.

She is Miss Elzbieta K. Adamska, Frederick's first woman lawyer. Today she will be admitted to the bar at ceremonies at the Maryland Court of Appeals in Annapolis.

Miss Adamska came here in August as clerk for Newman, Zimmerman, Thompson & Wenner, attorneys at law, with offices on West Church Street. Following her admittance to the bar she will be an associate with the local firm.

She said she plans to stay in Frederick, having no plans of striking out on her own, since she prefers to be with a firm.

Previously she had been, for 3 years, a law clerk with Walter G. Finch, patent, trademark, and copyright attorney in Baltimore. She chose Frederick because she wanted a small country practice. She calls it an outside the city type practice.

Miss Adamska said that she does not like term "woman" lawyer. "I am a lawyer just like any other starting out," she said. "And it is just a coincidence that I am a woman."

She readily admits, though, that the field she has chosen is predominantly male and being a female in this profession does, at times, have its drawbacks.

Miss Adamska, who resides on West Third Street, has parents living in Baynesville in the Loch Raven area of Baltimore County. Her father, Dr. Bruno Adamska, is a chiropractor in Parkville, Baltimore County. Mrs. Adamska, a professional artist, is planning illustrator for the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Authority. Mrs. Adamska is also an expert on Polish art and culture.

Miss Adamska was born in Warsaw, Poland and educated in Cathedral School and Seton High School, both in Baltimore. She received her bachelor of arts degree in political science from Western Maryland College and her law degree from the University of Maryland School of Law. In law school she was a Moot Court finalist.

Miss Adamska is also a very talented musician and has played professionally as assistant first chair fluitist with the Gettysburg Symphony. While at Western Maryland she was secretary of the school band and was charter member, business manager and treasurer of Omicron Eta of Delta Omicron International Music Fraternity.

In school she was also business manager of Delta Sigma Kappa and in law school she received the U.S. Law Week Award.

She is a member of the Frederick Recorder Ensemble and is a flutist with the Frederick Orchestra. She will play with the orchestra for the first time November 17.

Miss Adamska has the distinction of being one of few women who qualify for two member fraternities in the Professional Panhellenic Association. She is president and director of Recorder Ensemble, Baltimore Alumnae Club of Delta Omicron International Music Fraternity, and vice president and treasurer, Alpha Delta Chapter of Phi-Delta Delta Law Fraternity.

Aside from all of these activities Miss Adamska teaches folk dancing and arts and crafts with such organizations as Polish Students Association, Polish National Alliance, Polish Women's Alliance, Girl Scouts, International Center (YMCA) and church groups.

Returning to her profession Miss Adamska said there are bound to be some people who are prejudiced and who expect more from a woman. But, it's just like in any other part of the male business world which a woman enters. She likes her profession very much and right now she is learning more and more about it. "You don't really start learning law until you come out and practice. There is a lot of law you don't find in the textbooks."

When asked what perhaps would be her greatest aspiration in the law profession, she laughed and said, "I'd like to win a case occasionally." She will probably be winning many, many cases.

The Tax Cut Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed tax cut legislation is a matter which has received much attention in recent weeks. As this matter progresses in the Congress, it is most interesting to have all information relative to the problem. In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared on October 11, 1963, in the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer, an outstanding newspaper in Bucks County, Pa., which relates to this problem. The said editorial is as follows:

THE TAX CUT PROPOSAL HAS NOT CAUGHT FIRE

The progress of President Kennedy's $11 billion tax cut measure through Congress has been curious at almost every stage. It never really has had the popular steam behind it that one might expect for the most sweeping tax reduction plan in a generation or more.

To be sure, it has passed the House. And it would very likely win a favorable Senate vote if it could, in 1963, get past the roadblocks of hostile committee chairmen and time-consuming civil rights legislation.

But if the public clamor had been great enough the tax bill could well have become law long before this. It never developed.

One can hardly believe that the idea of having more money in the wallet has lost appeal for the American citizen.

If he is as money hungry as often pictured by his detractors at home and abroad, why did he not beat on the lawmakers' doors to demand passage of the massive cut?

The answers can be only tentative.

For one thing, the real administration argument for the tax reduction is subtle and complex. The citizen, acting through his representatives, is asked to approve cuts which will materially increase the Federal deficit—in order to increase prosperity and thereby multiply jobs.

But in the ordinary mind deficits and prosperity do not go together. There is no sign the Kennedy administration has sold this notion effectively. It is easy to believe the opponents of the bill made real headway with arguments that reduction has to be linked with comparable cuts in Federal spending.

Sophisticated specialists in public finance keep saying that a government budget is nothing like a family budget, and therefore that it is foolish to insist that the same kind of careful balancing is required in the public sphere.

Here again, however, the feeling grows that this idea is not widely accepted or perhaps understood by the general public. The finespun theories of public finance experts seem apart from the everyday budget realities of the average citizen.

It is also possible that among those citizens—and lawmakers—who can follow the administration argument without difficulty there are some who just don't think it is realistic.

They may believe that the cut won't stimulate the economy as suggested. Or they may feel that the steadily rising cost of Government makes a climb out of a projected deeper deficit trough very likely even after several years have passed.

On top of all these conjectures must be added another. The hurt to the economy from persisting unemployment is neither great enough nor sufficiently widespread to affect personally more than a fair percentage of the American people. Millions and millions have steady employment. To them the whole tax cut plan may seem not only unwise but unnecessary.

Somewhere amid these speculations lies an explanation for the oddity that in 1963 the biggest tax cut proposed in many moons has stirred almost no popular excitement.

A Ukrainian Poet Gets Statue Billing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the privilege of attending the groundbreaking ceremony for the memorial statue to be erected in our Nation's Capital in honor of a great Ukrainian hero and poet, Taras Shevchenko. I am proud to have been a Member of the 87th Congress which authorized construction of this statue to such a great freedom-loving patriot and champion of liberty for all mankind.

This memorial to Shevchenko will be formally dedicated next year upon the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. Credit for recognizing its potential value as an effective weapon in our cold war strategy goes to Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, who spearheaded the movement to memorialize Taras Shevchenko in this country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by Stephen S. Rosenfeld, staff reporter, which appeared in the Washington Post on September 22, 1963:

A UKRAINIAN POET GETS STATUE BILLING

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

Next Memorial Day, if 40,000 people assemble for a ceremony on a small trianglular park, at P, 22d, and 23d Streets NW., in Washington, no one who knows Lev E. Dobriansky will be surprised.

An ordinary man—one who did not speak in the name of a small but solid ethnic minority—would never have believed that the U.S. Congress could be induced to authorize erection of a statue of Taras Hryhoro-

vych Shevchenko, a Ukrainian and a poet at that.

An ordinary man—one without a keen appetite for cold war—would not have imagined that a regional figure of the last century could be converted into the cutting edge of a propaganda campaign against the Soviet Union today.

Lev E. Dobriansky, of course, is no ordinary man. He is a 44-year-old Georgetown economics professor, born in New York of Ukrainian parents, who has energetically pursued twin careers as a dispassionate scholar and a passionate anti-Communist devoted to the Ukraine.

He is also the 14-year president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (which includes perhaps 100,000 of the estimated 2 million Americans of Ukrainian descent), an adviser on nationalities to the Republican Party, and an expert in ethnic leverage on American politics.

Add to this a persuasive intelligence and a winning manner and you have the principal reason why, next May, a 14-foot quarter-million-dollar bronze statue of Taras Shevchenko will be unveiled at a choice Washington location.

Shevchenko was identified as the Ukraine's "poet laureate and national hero" in a glowing tribute printed as a House document in 1960.

This description does him no injustice. He is not just the most—perhaps the only—distinguished poet in more than a millenium of Ukrainian history; he is a most distinguished Ukrainian.

For his poetry, Ukrainians both under and beyond Soviet rule adore him. Two non-Ukrainian Washingtonians familiar with his work speak of him as "Pushkin and more," "ah, a Shakespeare." Few others know him and there is only one incomplete American edition of his poems, published privately in 1945.

Born a serf in 1814, Shevchenko had his freedom purchased by his artist patrons in St. Petersburg at age 24. Nine years later, for his part in a society of radicals and Ukrainian patriots in Kiev, he was sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment and exile. He died, under police supervision, 4 years after that in 1861.

He belonged to the fermenting, freedom-minded Russian intelligentsia of the mid-19th century and he was an ardent Ukrainian patriot. These elements, expressed both in his life and his poetry, caught fire and made him a regional celebrity in literate circles of his time.

The Ukraine was then controlled by czarist Russia; it has known only fleeting intervals of independence from either Russia or Poland in its long history. Shevchenko sang of the exploits of Ukrainians and Cossacks against both of these nations. He also spoke for the oppressed serfs.

His poetry reflected, too, popular feelings about Jews, who had been persecuted in the Ukraine for several centuries—partially because of their enforced economic role as middlemen and their questioned loyalty to the Ukraine.

In his poems, he sometimes referred to Jews in the vernacular ("pig," "miser") and his epic "Haydamaki" glorified the Ukrainian band which murdered thousands of Jews—and Poles.

In person, Shevchenko once signed a petition against anti-Semitism, a brave act for the time. This episode, related in the House document about the poet in order to blunt possible criticism, helped reassure those Congressmen who had qualms on this score.

Shevchenko's various themes and his enduring stature in the Ukraine have since led to a vigorous contest for his spiritual kinship between Ukrainians abroad and Soviets at home.

The Soviets encouraged and then crushed a Ukrainian independence movement after the Russian Revolution of 1917. The Ukraine is now a constituent republic of the Soviet Union.

Moscow treats Shevchenko as a latent Bolshevik who strained for brotherhood with the Russian people while opposing the oppressions of czarism.

Ukrainians in the Dobriansky camp see Shevchenko as a fighter for human freedom and Ukranian nationhood, with a built-in anti-Soviet passion.

Anticipating Moscow's celebration of the centenary of the poet's death in 1961, he determined to head it off. In 1959, various Congressmen began to learn of their constituents' interest in a statue for Shevchenko.

Dobriansky was already well known on Capitol Hill for pushing through the captive nations resolution of 1959—he considers the Ukraine the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. He now became a virtual fixture.

There developed not only an awe for Dobriansky's devotion but a sympathy for the anti-Communist aims of the statue project. Even the skeptics thought it harmless and no one wished to be against it. As Dobriansky said in an interview, the goal was not just to venerate the poet but to educate Americans about communism and to use Shevchenko as a psychopolitical cold-war weapon.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and his fellow New York Republican, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, found themselves sponsors of a 1959 Senate resolution for the statue. A more florid House resolution, written by Dobriansky, was offered by then-Representative Alvin Bentley, Republican, of Michigan, in 1960.

The Senate's resolution was tabled after the Interior Department protested that there were too many statue claimants and too few policy guidelines for selection.

But Dobriansky, who gives much credit to Representative PAUL C. JONES, Democrat, of Missouri, saw the House resolution past Interior's shoals.

In June 1960, a resolution proudly submitted by Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan, authorized the House's printing of the 45-page biographical documentary of the life and character of Taras Shevchenko. Dobriansky wrote the foreword.

His monumental efforts were crowned with success on September 13, 1960, when President Eisenhower signed the House resolution into law. It authorized erection of a Shevchenko statue "on public grounds in the District of Columbia * * * without expense to the United States."

Details remained: Collection of about $250,000 for the statue; approval of Leo Mol's design by the Fine Arts Commission, and selection of the site by the National Capital Planning Commission. The NCPC balked a bit and again Dobriansky had to patiently minister to doubts.

Last July, Associated Public Relations Counselors, of 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., began to put out publicity for the ground breaking.

The publicity made much of a poem in which Shevchenko had asked for a Ukrainian George Washington to promulgate his new and righteous law. This particular passage was embellished by at least four of the speakers at the ground breaking last Saturday.

The Congressmen honored at that occasion included all those so far named, plus Senators HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania; and THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut; and Representatives MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio; RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana; and THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat, of New York.

Korth Charged in Fraud Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Des Moines Register on October 15, 1963, the day following the resignation of Navy Secretary Fred Korth.

Members of the House may remember that recently I commented in the RECORD on Mr. Korth's conflict of interest in connection with the award of the multibillion-dollar TFX fighter plane contract to the General Dynamics Corp.

The suit in court in Dallas charged that Mr. Korth, as a director of an insurance firm, was engaged in another deal that profited him by more than a quarter of a million dollars.

The White House says that the TFX contract had no connection with the Korth resignation. Perhaps this is another White House "cover story."

Either the TFX contract award with its conflict of interest, or this insurance deal should have been grounds for forcing Korth's resignation long ago.

The White House explanations of these matters and the "Dear Fred" letter should be of the utmost concern to the Congress and the public.

The newspaper article follows:

TEXAS SUIT CHARGED KORTH SHARED IN FRAUD—NAMED HIM AS DEFENDENT IN A STOCK CASE—GOT 50,000 SHARES FOR AID IN SALE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

DALLAS, TEX.—A lawsuit on file in Federal and State courts here contains charges that Navy Secretary Fred Korth was part of a conspiracy to manipulate stock in a Texas insurance company to defraud other stockholders.

Korth Monday resigned as Secretary of the Navy, telling President Kennedy he was doing so "so that I may return to private business and attend to my pressing business affairs." He leaves November 1.

THE TEXAS SUIT

The suit charged that Korth was a director of the insurance company, and was a knowing participant in alleged frauds and deceptions carried out by B. F. Biggers, of Dallas.

The suit alleged that Korth was one of the so-called insiders who obtained more than a million dollars profit from fraud on other stockholders.

Complaining stockholders stated that Korth received 50,000 shares of the stock in the insurance company, with a face value of more than $250,000, for $10,000 for his role in assisting Biggers in the alleged illegal sale and resale of the stock of the insurance company.

LINKED TO CAGE

The lawsuit charged that the little group of "insiders" who shared in the "illegal" profits were Korth and Jack Cage & Co., a firm headed by BenJack Cage, the Texas insurance and securities swindler who is now a fugitive in Brazil.

Investigators for the McClellan Senate Investigations Subcommittee have been in Dallas and Fort Worth, and have obtained copies of the documents filed in these court cases as part of a study of Korth's back-

ground in connection with the TFX investigation.

The initial suit was filed in 1961, shortly before Korth became Navy Secretary. The suit asked $5 million from Biggers, Korth, and the other defendants.

SETTLED OUT OF COURT

The case was settled without going to trial, with a judgment against Biggers, Korth, and the insurance company calling for delivery of 120,000 shares of stock (with a value of from $850,000 to $1 million) to an equitable trust.

The law suit, filed in identical form in Dallas district court and in the Federal district court at Fort Worth, named Biggers as the chief defendant. Biggers was president and chairman of the board of the insurance firm, which was organized in 1955 under the name of All State Life Insurance Co. Later it became Professional & Business Men's Insurance Co.

The petition states that Korth was a director of the firm. It charges that he allowed Biggers and the insurance firm to use his name, his picture, and his reputation as a banker and as a former high Government official in the Truman administration to promote the sale of the insurance stock.

According to the firm's brochure, Korth was Deputy Counsel for the Army and Assistant Secretary of the Army until 1953.

TWENTY CENTS A SHARE

In his answer to the law suit, Korth said he had bought 50,000 shares of the insurance company stock at 20 cents a share. He did not pay any cash down, Biggers accepting his 3-year note. The public had been told the stock would be sold at $5.25 a share.

In his reply, Korth denied personal knowledge of the complicated financial dealings between the insurance company and Cage, which was to sell the securities.

Cage fled to Brazil after being convicted in a State court. He is also under indictment on Federal charges of violating the securities and exchange law. Judgments totaling more than $200,000 are pending against him in Federal Tax Court.

Biggers is disputing Federal tax claims totaling more than $800,000 involving both personal income taxes and the affairs of the insurance firm.

NO ADMISSION

The decree settling the insurance company suit contained the statement that the judgment against Biggers Korth and the insurance company "shall not be construed as an admission by the defendants against whom the judgment is rendered."

However, the McClellan committee is interested in the full facts, because of the questions raised in Congress on the possibility of Korth being involved in a conflict of interest in the TFX warplane contract.

Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas; Senator CARL CURTIS, Republican of Nebraska; and Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota; have questioned Korth about loans that his Fort Worth bank made to the General Dynamics Corp. in the fall of 1961—a few months before Korth became Navy Secretary.

DYNAMICS LOAN

Korth has said he was president of Continental National Bank of Fort Worth, and in that capacity had approved a loan of about $400,000 to General Dynamics.

He said that when he became Secretary, he retained $160,000 worth of stock in Continental National, which then had a loan outstanding to General Dynamics.

After becoming Navy Secretary, Korth took a part in the negotiation of the contract competition between General Dynamics and the Boeing Co., and overruled his subordinates to recommend that the contract be given to General Dynamics.

Members of the McClellan subcommittee have suggested a full investigation of Korth and General Dynamics loans, as well as any other business dealings that might relate to his record for integrity.

Korth has been criticized in Congress for a conflict of interests in the TFX case. Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican of Iowa, and Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, have asked the Comptroller General for a ruling.

Senator MUNDT raised the question whether Korth, as stockholder of a bank with a loan outstanding to General Dynamics, could be completely objective.

Korth has been furious at the challenge to his integrity, and has stated that his country means more to him than a $6 billion contract for Fort Worth or the business relationship between his bank and General Dynamics.

The Senate Must Save "Alianza"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include at this point an editorial which appeared in Life magazine of September 27, entitled "The Senate Must Save 'Alianza.'"

In my opinion, it is most unfortunate that this House slashed the administration's request for foreign aid, particularly affecting the Alliance for Progress which has contributed so effectively to the Latin American countries in the past.

As expressed in the article which follows, I, too, hope that the Senate will see fit to restore these necessary funds:

THE SENATE MUST SAVE "ALIANZA"

The U.S. Senate, about to consider the foreign aid bill, has a chance to repair a grave error made last month by the House. In a mood of diffuse hostility to the continuing aid burden on the U.S. taxpayer, the House slashed the administration's request by about a billion dollars, including a 25-percent cut in the Alliance for Progress. Although no foreign aid figure should be thought sacrosanct, this particular cut was a poor idea.

The Alliance for Progress is a long-term U.S. policy based on two-way agreements with 19 Latin American Republics. Congress in 1962 endorsed the policy by authorizing $600 million a year for 4 years ahead. Both Washington and the Latin Americans have relied on this endorsement in planning the new schools, housing projects, farm-development loans, mobile medical units, food for peace, and numerous other programs which are helping Latin America try to make itself a modern democratic society. If the U.S. share is cut by $150 million, not only must many of these programs be cut back but the stanchest Latin supporters of the Alianza will feel that Congress has welshed on a long-term commitment. Castro's radio gloated over the House action, saying it proved you can't trust the U.S. imperialists.

To Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance, the cut was a particular blow because, after a slow start, he had really begun to make the Latin Americans take their part in the Alliance seriously. They have undertaken tax and land reforms and other self-help programs which do not come easy for them but are beginning to bear fruit (Life, Aug. 16). "They've had 400 years of bad practices," says Moscoso. "They need confidence in themselves, in us, in the whole Alliance program. The House action has been a blow to all this."

The Alliance is too well-conceived and strategic a U.S. policy to be toyed with like that. The Senate will, we hope, restore our commitment and the confidence of our hemisphere allies.

The AID Investment Guarantee Program Fosters Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the free enterprise system will be pleased to know that the Agency for International Development has accomplished a great deal in promoting private investment in underdeveloped countries through its investment guaranty program. This very important and well-considered activity of our foreign aid program has helped to project the activities of our private businessmen and corporations into foreign countries in demonstration of a system which has contributed much more to the strength of our own country than direct intervention of government.

An agreement recently reached with Ecuador marked the 21st investment guarantee agreement by AID in 12 months. The bilateral agreement such as that reached with Ecuador permits AID to insure U.S. investors against inability to convert local currency into dollars; against loss due to expropriation, war, insurrection and revolution, and against certain commercial and political risks of an extended nature. Fees are charged for this insurance. Since 1948, when the program was started, the United States has signed agreements with 70 countries.

The new agreement with Ecuador amends one dating from 1955 by adding protection for investors against the hazards of war, insurrection and revolution and extended risks. The previous coverage provided protection only against inconvertibility of currency and loss from expropriation.

As of June 30, 1963, AID enjoyed a profit from this insurance program. As of that date AID and its predecessors had issued $1,192,675,600 worth of guarantees to private investors. Fees collected totaled $12,417,917.88. Only three claims have been made, totaling $667,547.

No new guarantees have been issued for Europe since 1959. The current emphasis is on underdeveloped countries and dependencies. In the fiscal quarter, April 1 to June 30, 1963, guarantees were issued to 23 applicants, totaling $7,637,924. As of June 30, AID had on hand 1,137 applications totaling $4.5 billion. Of these 665 were for Latin America, representing a total of $2.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that those who have opposed our foreign aid program in the belief that its activities contravene our private enterprise system will take note of this accomplishment of AID.

Local Communities Push Retraining Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, since the Manpower Development and Training Act became law last year, local communities throughout the Nation have begun extensive retraining programs to upgrade their labor force and provide the unemployed with skills to meet the ever-increasing demands of our increasingly technological society.

One of the largest Manpower Development and Training Act projects in the country is centered in the Paterson-Clifton-Passaic region of New Jersey. According to a New York Times article of October 15, more than 80 percent of the project's initial 500 trainees have found new jobs in their hometowns within the past year. Seven hundred other persons are now enrolled or will begin classes shortly, while plans are being made to accommodate 1,300 additional workers.

Part of the great success of this particular project stems from the close cooperation with business in the area. The Barbizon Co.; for example, a large manufacturer of ladies lingerie, made available its sewing machines for retraining purposes because it was plagued by "a terribly tight labor market" and badly needed additional trained workers.

This is only one example of how effective a retraining program can be, and I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues. The key to a solution of our unemployment problem lies in an upgrading and retraining of our labor force to fill the existing job vacancies rather than by simply increasing aggregate demand in the economy.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article describing this project from the October 15 New York Times in the RECORD at this point:

PATERSON MEETS JOBLESS PROBLEM

(By Clarence Dean)

PATERSON, N.J., October 14.—A massive attack on unemployment is underway here.

For more than a year, jobless residents of the Paterson-Clifton-Passaic region have been attending classes to learn new skills and prepare them for new kinds of employment.

More than 80 percent of those who have been retrained are now working again.

"The program has succeeded far beyond our expectations," says Mayor Frank X. Graves. "We knew it had a potential, but we never envisioned this."

So far, 500 unemployed Passaic County workers have been retrained, 700 more are now enrolled or will begin classes shortly. Plans are being made to set up classes for an additional 1,300.

The program was established in 1962 under the Federal Area Redevelopment Act and Manpower Development and Training Act. The Federal Government bears all the costs, although the organization and operation are directed locally. The Paterson project has become one of the largest in the country.

The program offered so far is designed to train unemployed persons as machine tool operators, welders, nurses' aids, medical secretaries, electronic solder-assemblers, power sewing machine operators and salespersons.

Typical of those retrained was the 500th graduate, whose completion of a 6-week course in soldering and assembly was marked with a public ceremony last week.

He is Luis Elias Valcarcel, 32 years old, who came to this country from Lima, Peru, 14 months ago. He is married and the father of five children.

Mr. Valcarcel, a packer in a shirt manufacturing plant, became unemployed because of a layoff in the plant. He got a job immediately after completing the course and now hopes to attend an evening college to study accounting.

Another example is Mrs. Clara Adams, one of 15 women attending a power-machine sewing class the other day in a plant of the Barbizon Co., a large manufacturer of ladies' lingerie here. Mrs. Adams, a middle-aged Negro, formerly was employed as a domestic.

"All my life," she said, "I've loved to sew. But I've never had a chance to get a job at it. No one will look at you unless you've had experience."

The Barbizon Co., plagued by what its manager, G. M. Goodson, describes as "a terribly tight labor market," offered to make its machines available for retraining purposes.

Cooperation in the program has come from other local industries, as well as from the Paterson Board of Education, which agreed to set up special retraining classes in late afternoon and evening hours at the vocational high school.

The region's unemployment problem—the number of jobless is estimated at 12,000—arises in part from an influx of unskilled Spanish-speaking residents, as well as the decline of the textile industry.

The Wheat Deal With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the cleverest, and one of the most effective, articles on the wheat deal with Russia that I have seen was written by Ruth Montgomery and appeared in the San Francisco Examiner for October 14, 1963. By use of a parody on the well-known story of Joseph in Egypt, the author graphically portrays the meaning and implications of the administration's decision to sell wheat to the Communists. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article:

THE WHEAT DEAL WITH RUSSIA

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—And there was a famine in the land. And patriarch Nikita Khrushchev, who was not a God-fearing man, looked around for a way to save himself and his Communist clan.

Now when Nikita saw that there was wheat in America, he said unto Gromyko: "Some capitalist dreamer has been storing up surpluses against the lean years, which are now upon us. Get you down thither, and buy for us from thence, that we may live and not die."

And Gromyko said unto the patriarch: "But what if our brothers the Americans remember that you said you would bury them?"

Khrushchev spake harshly, saying he had already sold some of his favorite comrades into Siberian bondage for less backtalk than that.

SACKS OF GOLD

The patriarch then loaded Gromyko's sacks with gold, so that he could bring back that which the Communist system had failed to produce. And Gromyko took some of his comrades and went to the land of plenty, and the governor over all the land was John, the many-coated son of Joseph P.

Now this was the same young man to whom Gromyko had sold a bill of goods exactly 1 year previously by claiming that patriarch Nikita was putting only defensive weapons and agrarian reformers in Cuba. But lo, even as Gromyko spake thus, aerial spies dispatched by John, the son of Joseph P., were spotting missile installations in the island to the southward.

Now Gromyko pondered on these things as he went hat in hand to Governor John, but he did not bow down before him with his face to the earth. After all, his bags were loaded with gold.

But John, remembering the former treachery, said unto Gromyko: "Whence come ye? Ye are spies, to see the nakedness of the land ye are come."

Gromyko, maintaining an unbowed head and straight face, replied: "Nay, my lord, but to buy food are thy servants come. We are true men; thy servants are no spies."

Now John, the son of Joseph P., was a very understanding sort who realized that Patriarch Nikita did not really want to bury us, but merely to wipe us off the face of the earth.

TOO MUCH TO EAT

This wise young governor also knew that his own people were becoming restive because they had too much to eat, and were tired of storing so much plenty against a rainy day.

John therefore assembled his advisers, and although some spake in favor of punishing the Communist comrades for their previous treachery, most of them were dazzled by the exotic foreign gold.

The young governor commanded his officials to fill the Communist sacks with grain, and to restore every man's money into his sack.

And they loaded their asses with the grain, and departed thence. And one of them, opening his sack to feed his ass, espied his money and said unto his brethren: "My money is restored, and lo, it is even in my sack."

And their hearts nearly failed them, but when they returned to Patriarch Nikita and told him what had happened he comforted them, saying: "Have no fear, my comrades. This is the way the capitalist Americans do business. They subsidize their farmers to grow far more grain than they can use; then they taketh up taxes to pay for storing it and when the time is ripe and we hunger, they sell it to us at half the market price, which they call the world price."

MONEY AND GRAIN

Gromyko beamed and said, "good father, then you mean they meant to put our money as well as the grain in our sacks?"

"Aye, even so," Nikita replied. "At this price there is no further point in our trying to grow grain at home. We will hereafter use our farmers to produce missiles, and we

will feed ourselves with subsidized American produce. Prepare to return ye, then, to the land of plenty to buy also cotton, milk, butter and feed grains."

And it came to pass that a lively trade developed, and many, many moons elapsed before the American taxpayers finally realized they were supporting the Communist economy.

How NLRB Remakes Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, on October 7, 1963, I appraised the House of the fact that the National Labor Relations Board and its agents have held a series of closed meetings during the last 3 months with certain union officials concerning the interpretation and administration of our labor laws. More recently the NLRB has invited the representatives of several national business organizations to participate in similar meetings.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRB is an administrative tribunal with judicial functions to perform. It has no business holding secret meetings with any organized pressure group over whose activities it is required to pass judgment.

If meetings are necessary to provide that the Board with assistance and guidance in the performance of its functions, they should be open, public meetings with advance notice to all interested or affected parties. The public at large, the millions who do not happen to belong to unions or business organizations, have an important stake in the interpretation and administration of our labor laws.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat commented editorially upon this matter. I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

HOW NLRB REMAKES LAW

Recently, when we described in these columns how the National Labor Relations Board had ignored a Federal court order and reversed a regional NLRB office and one of its own trial examiners in a labor dispute in Jerseyville, Ill., we tacked a question mark onto the heading of the editorial.

That made it read: "NLRB Making Own Law?"

Now we no longer think the question mark was necessary.

In discussing the Jerseyville case in Congress last week, Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, coauthor of the Landrum-Griffin Act, left little doubt that NLRB had disregarded "clear restrictions" in the law against picketing in such situations.

He charged that the Board, dealing a "severe blow" to an independent union at Jerseyville, was continuing on its way toward "complete repeal" of the section of the act adopted by Congress to control "blackmail picketing."

Why blackmail picketing, which was barred by Congress, is permitted by NLRB was also made crystal clear as Mr. Griffin told the story of how it has been operating under the Kennedy administration.

The AFL–CIO and NLRB have been working in cahoots to emasculate the Landrum-Griffin Act, especially that section which prohibits a union from using picketing pressure to force unorganized workers or members of another union to join its own, usually an AFL–CIO or Teamsters' outfit.

During the last 3 months, Mr. GRIFFIN informed Congress, eight meetings have been arranged by the Board at the request of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO to discuss what its officials "like and do not like about current Board policies."

All the meetings were held in private, even conducted on an off-the-record basis. No other unions were represented nor the nearly 50 million workers in the Nation who don't belong to any union. No one was there to speak up for their rights, those of the vast majority.

But this is how the National Labor Relations Board—which, as Mr. GRIFFIN says, is "an administrative tribunal with judicial functions * * * created by Congress to hear and decide cases by applying the laws as written and intended by Congress"—chose to confer with AFL–CIO officials on what they "like and do not like" about its policies!

Is it any wonder that after eight such secret sessions, in Mr. GRIFFIN's words, "the Board's bias in favor of big league AFL–CIO unions and against smaller, independent unions has become increasingly apparent"?

What can be done about a situation so unjust and so unfair, so undemocratic and so un-American?

Apparently, nothing about the NLRB itself, as reconstituted by President Kennedy.

One can only assume his appointees are doing his bidding and that he thinks it is smarter politics to have the big league unions in his corner with an election coming up next year than the rank and file of the unorganized.

Consequently, Mr. GRIFFIN believes relief must come from Congress through a bill Representative PHIL M. LANDRUM—the other coauthor of the Landrum-Griffin Act—has introduced which would divest NLRB of all jurisdiction in unfair labor practice cases and repose that responsiblity in the courts of the land.

Having such cases decided in open court would certainly be the most effective way to put an end to NLRB's practice of remaking labor laws passed by Congress in secret conferences with AFL–CIO officials.

The First Amendment: Long May It Wave—The First Amendment Represents the Last Bastion of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the foundations of democracy set up the freedom of the press. American newspapers were at that time and have become the saviour of the past, the promise of the future, and the hope of the present.

America ultimately rests upon the truth of the press rather than the exaggeration of the administration-backed news management media.

I would like to reiterate to my constituents the ideas of our Founding Fathers. They felt that they were the personification of democracy and of our American Republic, but they have been wrong.

For the final answer is with the ideas of the people. Thanks to the first amendment, the newspapers—as personified in my district by the Rock Island Argus, Moline Daily Dispatch, Galesburg Register-Mail, Kewanee Star-Courier, Canton Ledger, and the Monmouth Review-Atlas—contain the last grain of sand and the last hope of righteousness in the battle between what is correct and what is the dream of the brothers three and the sisters two for domination of 180 million of those untrammeled by blood and unaffected by political party. All hail our press—long may they wave.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this week to testify before the Senate Commerce Committee in support of the quality stabilization bill. In order to give wider circulation to the facts about this important legislation, under previous permission, I am setting forth the text of my testimony at this point:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS M. PELLY IN SUPPORT OF S. 774 BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON QUALITY STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in favor of the enactment of S. 774, the so-called quality stabilization bill.

In this connection, may I mention my background before coming to Congress. From 1937 to 1952 I was the president and general manager of Lowman & Hanford Co. with retail stationery stores in Seattle and other similar stores in Olympia, Spokane, and Wenatchee, Wash. This experience should qualify me as a witness on this legislation. Furthermore since I no longer have any financial interest, direct or indirect, in this or any similar business, I think I can qualify further on the basis of objectivity.

In addition, for more than a quarter of a century, I was extremely active in the Seattle Retail Trade Bureau, as a board member of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce and the National Stationers Association.

Lowman & Hanford Co., for years operated under fair trade agreements, and I found that such arrangements were a protection for the consumer, but did not eliminate competition between similar merchandise lines.

It was then and still is my contention that the greatness of this country depends on initiative, integrity, and decision of the individual with an opportunity to compete and a chance to make a fair profit.

That kind of opportunity has not only been challenged in recent years, but the challengers have created a chaos that is killing the independent small retail stores of our country. A precise, simple, and fully honest bill is before Congress that can lend protection to small business through protection of the brand name. It is entirely optional and applies only where the brand name is in open competition with similar products in the market. It is called the quality stabilization bill.

In my six terms in Congress, I have never witnessed such relentless, cold-blooded blindness to fact as that of the opposition to the quality stabilization bill.

Resorting to false slogans and imaginary dragons of price increases, they consistently sidestep the recognition of fact—that there is a killing disease racing through the bloodstream of America's free enterprise system. By so disregarding the very evident disease, they therefore do not feel called upon to offer an alternative to quality stabilization. Rather, they resort to the Hitlerian plan of repeating a falsehood long enough to make it sound like fact. They ignore facts. We are here in Congress to deal with facts.

Personally, I deplore not only their continued waste of time and money, but also the very laxity that allows Members of Congress to be duped by them.

To me the enactment of the quality stabilization bill is a matter of right or wrong. In this context I believe the quality stabilization bill is right. It is simple. It does not force anybody to do anything. It takes Government out of business. It is, if studied without prejudice, meticulously written for full protection. In no way does it tend to raise prices. In every way it does tend to increase healthy competition. It is not price fixing. Rather than fair trade, it is necessitated by the failure of fair trade. It is no panacea, no attempted cure-all. It hurts no one, not even the discounter if he too wishes to compete pricewise against a brandname, not as a brand name to obscure and confuse price. It sets a standard of values by which the consumer can judge a bargain, and by his purchases cast his vote. At no time ever does it, as the opponents try to make you believe, force any price raising on competitive products in free and open competition.

A representative of the Department of Commerce appeared before House Commerce Committee hearings in opposition. He significantly did not refer to a release by his own department, stating over 395,000 business failures in the previous year, over 1,200 per day—50 an hour—10 while I am talking to you. What is right in this decadent marketing? Is it professional speculation or is it fact? What is our position in Congress? Is it to deal in a constant ping pong game of words or to recognize fact?

A few labor writers are waging a campaign against the bill which would have you think all union members are against it. Yet, at the very same time they are decrying the multimillion unemployment problem; they are right now using their lobby, the most powerful in all American history, to shorten work week hours. They are totally ignoring fact for theory by side-stepping as they criticize instead of construct. They ignore President Kennedy who says shorter work weeks will not increase employment. Are they not aware that we are in overproduction right now here at home, because an ever-increasing percentage of our factories are moving branch plants to foreign countries, there to use the same tools and dies, the same know-how and creative ingenuity, but with native labor at a fraction of the hourly cost? And can't they see those products are being sent back to the prostituted bargain marts of America for cheap, cheap pricing? Can't they possibly see that the workers of America are the largest group of consumers of foreign, nonunion, falsely advertised, cheap products? Can't they possibly understand that an economy cannot possibly hold up unless it is profitable to all concerned? After all, the high American labor standard of wages is linked with the ultimate sale of brand name, quality, and integrity merchandise.

Some of the opponents to quality stabilization here in Congress, are at the same time vehement advocates of "urban renewal." I quote here from an AP release of September 27, 1963: "Tacoma gets big urban renewal grant." Tacoma, a city in my State of Washington, is just 30 miles south of my home, Seattle. Its economy is the same as Seattle. The news report states that the Urban Renewal Administration gave a grant of $4,544,708 and a loan of $6,660,515 for quote "renewal of its central business district." Let's talk truth, not fancy.

Downtown Tacoma is today a virtual graveyard. The empty stores all along Broadway, Pacific Avenue and Commerce Street attest to failure, heartbreak, and a diseased economy. The Tacoma Retail Trade Bureau, after careful study of the quality stabilization bill, became a unanimous and avid proponent. Why?

Well, does anyone for a minute think a fancy new store front with higher rent and maintenance is going to bring the retailer back for another race to brankruptcy? Give him a chance to protect his precious brand name product, to fulfill his service pledges and he will come back—come back to build his own new store without Government subsidy. Give him a chance to compete and he will. Putting him in a more beautiful ambulance isn't going to save his life or make his death any happier. Let's be realistic. What is right? What is wrong?

Our democracy is based on equal rights for all. It is to protect minorities by giving them an equal opportunity.

What about equality protection for the shrinking minority—the independent store owner—the man who contributes to and works for the Community Chest, the man we see with his family in church, whose kids go to school with our kids, who is the mainstay of a chamber of commerce, a service club, and all the things that make society good and make America great? All he is asking is a chance—a chance to compete. He asks no subsidies. He asks for no Government help, nor for high-priced Government supervision. He just wants a chance to compete his brand name quality products against just "bargains"—to try to demonstrate to consumers that he has a better value for them. By such he can still go broke—but he won't have died economically due to misrepresentation by merchants who have neither any interest in the integrity of a brand name except as bait, nor any interest in the community except to exploit it.

The Kiplinger letter of September 27, 1963, warns against "stripped down" stores that operate on skinny margins, sell merchandise only, no service, no credit, no deliveries, no sales clerks.

The discounters themselves are accurately quoted, I am told, as predicting that within 10 years all retailing will be controlled by less than 100 companies.

I cannot believe anyone wants to do away with small business or to eliminate the small stores. The only alternative I know of is quality stabilization. Yet this is called price fixing and evil.

Price fixing? What is price fixing? By such descripition for quality stabilization it must include others.

It should include the printed price on a postage stamp. That too would be price fixing.

What do those who oppose this bill say?

Do they pay a fixed rent? Price fixed.

Do they work for unionized wages? Price fixed.

Do they carry any insurance? Price fixed.

Do they travel by cab, bus, train, or airplane? Price fixed.

Has a redcap carried your bags recently? The tip is price fixed.

Do they have a telephone? Price fixed.

Do they buy a magazine or newspaper? Price fixed.

Do they ever place any advertising in a magazine or newspaper? Price fixed.

Do they elect a Congressman or Senator? His salary is price fixed.

Do they farm? Here they are price fixed not to farm.

Do they borrow money at interest? Price fixed.

Do they pay taxes? Price fixed.

Do they have running water in their homes? Price fixed.

Do they have electricity or gas fixtures? Price fixed.

You can add to this list as long as you want. Now why don't these critics admit this? Why don't they also admit the bill asks no price fixing at all? Why don't they say it is entirely optional and only on a product price leveled by consumer acceptance in free and open competition?

The public must be protected; otherwise it would mean the right to dicker with the driver on your cab ride home tonight, or to the busdriver. Otherwise, that would mean that any one of us with an airplane could start hauling passengers for any price we could get from the rider. It would mean the end of minimum wage laws. It would mean an oriental bazaar sort of existence for everything and everyone including perhaps political candidates who might offer themselves to the voters at competitive bargain prices.

Or would it mean instead the Government taking over everything? Is that what these people want? If so, let them say so.

Millions of words have been carefully written and spoken to answer every question or accusation in comonsense and substaniated proof. It seems thus far that all has been in vain in the face of misrepresentation and totally false slogans repeated and repeated without any reason except to fool people.

The quality stabilization bill is no panacea nor cureall. It is, in simple fact, a precisely written bill of absolute fairness, and as an emergency to keep alive our way of life until at least something better is devised.

The week of October 7 saw the 62d anniversary convention of the National Electrical Contractors Association. With its objective this year being the theme "Let's All Make a Profit," more than 3,500 electrical men were in attendance. Key speaker was the Honorable Donald L. Jackson, former Congressman from California. His address titled "Challenge to Action" urged the electrical industry to consider and take prompt and effective action to meet the challenge to free enterprise hurled down by those who have little faith in the economic system but have served to make this Nation the most powerful in the history of mankind. He pointed out that the American economic system rests upon the profit motive in business and in industry and that lacking that motive, there is no foundation upon which our traditional system of free enterprise can stand.

What he said is plain commonsense. It was said in the understanding of what is right and what is wrong.

The opponents to the quality stabilization bill, I feel certain, are well intended. But I here submit that if so, they are in this case being unrealistic, are ignoring the fundamental need of this bill being enacted immediately as a salvation of our precious system and the small businesses of this Nation.

Certain union labor leaders condemning this bill is as unrealistic as were businessmen and capital in the successful fight of organized labor for decent wages and hours. If quality stabilization, in any sense, is price fixing, then so very definitely were any and all wage and hour agreements.

The agricultural argument against the quality stabilization bill is perhaps even more unrealistic—in a demand to see the independent store owner, their own counterpart in trade, go out of business—as farm interests have successfully legislated for subsidies and acreage controls to keep from growing products on their farms.

I have read newspaper editorials against this bill, but not one of them premised on

research or the fact that there is a chaotic situation in the marketplace. Such editors ignore the fact that their price and advertising rates are established and printed in Standard Rate and Data and meticulously followed. That, then, is real price fixing. Here is a bill which is mandatory on no one—allows a manufacturer of a competitive product in free and open competition to make up his own mind toward protection of the brand name in such competition. How in the name of simple right and wrong can such newspapers, living under their own price fixing call names and bite the hand that feeds them?

The majority of Congress and therefore supposedly the people of this country are in favor of protection. Doesn't that mean protection for all? Why in the name of right and wrong should the little businessmen of America be the only—I repeat only—ones left out of a protection of any kind?

It is basically right that as our country meets continually changing times, the ground rules be groomed to meet those changes. I certainly think that if our way of life is to continue, we must conform the necessary changes to the principle held sacred that there be a fair and even chance for each citizen to pick his own career and to prove himself to himself and to society, and that there be opportunity and incentive for profit to all. The entrepreneur—the man who desires to own his own business—is the backbone of such a conception that all men are born free and equal. And that is the backbone of this country.

Base predatory greed on the part of individuals has always been and under our form of government always will be a choice of the individual—like his right to pick his own career. But that greed, spread out to society, will surely be a fatal disease. Such disease is cursing the land today.

To those who oppose quality stabilization, I say—first admit to yourself that there is a weakness in our enterprise system. I urge you to read—read carefully—and without prejudice for the time it takes, this quality stabilization bill. No one has proposed any better immediate alternative, and I feel strongly it must be enacted if only as a tourniquet to stop the flow of retail lifeblood in the American streets—and until someone else has found a surer permanent cure.

To my colleagues in the Congress I say in all sincerity that herein is contained the right and wrong we learned in kindergarten and Sunday school. We will be remiss in our duties to our constituents and to our Nation and to ourselves if we do not enact this bill as an emergency measure in the interest of small retail business.

Where Is America Headed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding citizen of Alabama, Mr. Henry W. Sweet, of Bessemer, has just written an article for the Methodist Christian Advocate, a publication of the Methodist Church in Alabama, which I think presents the viewpoint of many other Alabamians and southerners. Thus, I take the liberty to call the attention of this article to my colleagues by inserting it hereunder:

WHERE IS AMERICA HEADED?

(By Henry W. Sweet)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A layman of First Methodist Church, Bessemer, and former member of its official board, Mr. Sweet has been prominent in Alabama public life for many years and was at one time docks director for the city of Mobile. The views set forth in this statement are not those of the editor of the Advocate, but it is felt that even so the honest convictions of a Methodist layman have a right to be heard.)

"Dare what conscience says is right;
Do what reason say is best;
Do with all your mind and might;
Do your duty and be blest."

Methodists, and all church groups, should provide leadership in bringing racial harmony to the South and our Nation. This leadership should be based on facts of life, and knowledge of the history of mankind. It should not come from emotional preachers and misguided laymen, who thwart the life of Christ and His teachings of brotherhood. Nowhere in the Bible does God or Christ advocate forced mixing of races. In fact, all during the life of Christ wherever he traveled to preach, He respected local customs, and nowhere encouraged intermarriage of races and tribes. Even God Almighty separated the races of men on earth, and placed them as best suited to geography and climate. It is personally obnoxious to me for some preachers and other church leaders, to base their beliefs on the decisions of the Supreme Court, rather than on the teachings of the Bible. Where were they before 1954, and why their belated stand on racial issues now?

ANSWERING GOVERNOR COLLINS

To clarify my article, I wish to say, I wrote Dr. Chalker for permission to contribute this statement for publication in the Christian Advocate, as a direct desire to answer article and editorials written by ex-Gov. Leroy Collins, of Florida, and Dr. A. E. Middlebrooks, of Athens College, in the Advocate issue of August 6, 1963. I am so tired of seeing our people, and especially the young, being brainwashed by those who distort great social issues in the name of brotherhood.

For a white man to embrace complete integration of the white and black races is, in my opinion, a worse sin against the human race than any action he could take. I am no bigot, and I do not harbor hate or prejudice for anyone. To hold that a dual civilization of separate white and black people cannot or should not exist is a stupid, factless, and distorted conclusion. Such nonsense reflects on the intelligence of our country.

SHOULD NEGROES PRACTICE SELF-HELP?

Why do we fail to realize that segregation is applicable to the white man as well as the Negro? In this practical life we all are segregated to a great extent. White people cannot sit in Negro restaurants, bathe in Negro baths, and trade in Negro stores. Thank God for people of self-respect and racial pride. I am a great admirer of Booker T. Washington who pleaded with his black brothers "to let down their buckets where they are." In Birmingham, A. G. Gaston has been a great Negro leader, and a successful businessman. He has provided motels for his colored race, insurance companies, drugstores, funeral homes, etc. All those who bellow that the poor Negro cannot eat or lay his head in rest while traveling, should instead condemn many rich and powerful Negroes for not providing these comforts for their own people. Why should the white man provide them? Why should he eat or sleep with them? Why is this a measure of your Christianity? It is not mine.

Many individual Negroes have reached the pinnacle of success, but as a race the black man is the only race on earth who is ashamed of his race. The red man, the brown man, the yellow man, are all proud of their race in whatever state we find them. In the past year I have traveled over 50,000 miles in Europe and in the Orient, visiting 12 countries in Europe, and Japan, Hong Kong, and Formosa. All these people had a real sense of racial pride. None believed in forced mixing of people, and all were progressive, intelligent, and kind. I had previously visited many Caribbean islands where the people had little or no racial pride, because of various degrees of Negro blood. They knew not from whence they came, where they were going, and cared less. Amalgamation of the white and black races is, in my opinion, a sin and any man who visits the Caribbean area and returns home preaching integration in any form, should have his head bored for the hollow horn. It always destroys both the white and Negro, and always will. In every Caribbean country, integration led to amalgamation. These facts cannot be denied by anyone, including our foolish and shortsighted liberals.

NEGRO CRIME

Surely we should be helpful, kind, and just. We can be a friend of the Negro. I have always been that in both private and public life. I have built hospitals, clinics, and schools for him. As an official, I spent great sums on his health and welfare. Yet in Jefferson County, Ala., when I had access to the records, we found 75 percent of the crime was committed by the Negro race, who were only 45 percent of the population, and most of it was against his own people. Eighty percent of the cases of syphilis was among the 45-percent Negroes. In this county 90 percent of the illegitimate children were Negro babies. I agree with these words of Abraham Lincoln, "I am not in favor of Negroes to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical and moral difference between the white and black races, which will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race." Hurrah for ole Abe.

The Supreme Court of today thinks it is good psychology to bypass Congress in this social upheaval of so-called civil rights. Congress has never enacted laws on which the 1954 school mixing decision was based. Wise men and good churchmen will protest and hesitate, before they carry their support of the Court far enough to approve its usurpation of the prerogative of the legislative branch of the Government. The blood of our forebears is blackened by the efforts of do-gooders, socialists, pro-Communists, and paid agitators. The activities of the National Council of Churches in street marches, sit-ins, riots, etc., is most unfortunate. In my opinion, the Methodist Church should withdraw support from the National Council of Churches which appears to be infiltrated with misguided leadership. As an individual Methodist I have stopped all my personal contributions to this organization.

The present agitation in America will not produce justice nor equality. For the safety of our Nation let's warn the nonthinking people of the facts and use our literature to counteract the propaganda being spread in the name of brotherhood.

Inflationary Possibilities in the Current Economic Setting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, three recent articles have discussed the possibility of a renewal of inflation in the economy during the current expansion as well as in the future as a result of a tax cut and higher levels of Federal spending. The administration's position is that inflation will not occur under its fiscal policies because idle plant and manpower will serve as a shield against it. The fact is that much of our idle plant is obsolete and much of our unemployed manpower will not be able to take up the new jobs that may open up under the stimulus of tax reduction until the unemployed have undergone extensive retraining programs.

An editorial in the Washington Post of October 13 says that recent price increases "could result in general pressures which would threaten the success of a tax cut and exacerbate the Nation's balance-of-payments problem." The Post ascribes the price increases in some industries to genuine increases on the demand side and, in others, to attempts to test the market. Stressing the importance of avoiding inflation, the editorial states that "the economic impact of the tax bill depends heavily on the maintenance of price stability."

An article in the U.S. News & World Report of October 14 entitled "Another Round of Price Increases," discusses recent price rises and presents the opinions of a large number of economists on the price picture that can be expected in the coming year. The article quotes Albert T. Sommers, an economist of the National Industrial Conference Board, as saying that the danger of inflation seems greater today than at any time since the last big move in prices in 1955–57. The Department of Labor is quoted as saying that a moderate uptrend in wholesale prices may take place in the latter part of 1963 and this will probably be reflected subsequently at the consumer level. Finally, a Labor Department economist has said:

> I think we are getting a little inflation and I think we are going to get a little more if we get a tax cut and a moderately increased budget. I think we would get at least a half percentage point rise in the Consumer Price Index in 1964 more than we are getting in 1963.

Since a 2-percent rise in prices would wipe out the stimulative effect of the proposed tax cut, an added half percentage point rise over and above the 1.5-percent rise which is apparently expected in any case, will thus offset about a fourth of the tax cut's stimulative effect.

Finally, in the Wall Street Journal of October 14, George Shea discusses at some length the Commerce Department index of 22 sensitive commodities—commodities which normally are early movers when price trends change. The article points out that substantial price increases in the sensitive commodities in recent months has taken place and this can largely be explained by credit expansion outpacing physical production.

Under unanimous consent, I include these three articles discussing inflationary trends in the economy in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 13, 1963]

PRICE PRESSURES

Although consumers have yet to be affected, the announced price increases in steel, aluminum, zinc, and glass products could result in general pressures which would threaten the success of a tax cut and exacerbate the Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

Opponents of tax reduction have harped on the theme that a rise of disposable or after-tax income will touch off an inflationary spiral. But the price increases announced over the past few months can hardly be ascribed to tax reduction, actual or anticipated.

In some of the industries, there doubtless have been genuine improvements on the demand side as reflected by rising output and the reduction of excess capacity. In others, however, boosts resulted from attempts to test the market, and they appear to be sticking in face of considerable excess capacity.

The Government has no legal power to intervene in the pricing process and its reluctance to plunge in again on an ad hoc basis was demonstrated by its acquiescence to the selected steel price increases that were announced last April. Voluntary restraint then provides the only hope for maintaining stability in industries where producers have great discretion in pricing.

In the past appeals for a measure of restraint evoked replies in the vein of "After you, Gaston." Yet if the decisionmakers can be persuaded that the economic impact of the tax bill depends heavily on the maintenance of price stability, they might be willing to go along.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 14, 1963]

ANOTHER ROUND OF PRICE INCREASES: HOW YOUR LIVING COSTS WILL BE AFFECTED

Almost every day is bringing a boost in one price or another. People wonder whether living costs are going to shoot upward. This look at prices from the raw materials to retail stores shows what leading authorities expect in the months ahead.

All of a sudden, there seems to be a new turn in the trend of prices.

Price cuts are now being overshadowed by price increases. The rising tide has caught up with a good many basic materials and products used throughout industry and by consumers—metals, textiles, machinery, tires, storage batteries, cigarettes, matches, some clothing, foods, and carpets.

On October 1 Inland Steel Co. boosted the price of structural steel. On October 2, Bethlehem Steel raised the price of steel-plate. At least half of all products made by the steel industry now cost more than they did last spring.

Also on October 2, the Aluminum Co. of America hiked prices of aluminum plates and sheets, including siding for homes and the material to make the new aluminum ends for beer cans. This was the third increase this year in the price of aluminum siding and followed a boost of one-half cent a pound in the basic price of ingots.

MORE INCREASES?

Businessmen generally are talking about greater firmness in prices. Frequently they raise the possibility that more boosts lie ahead.

The head of a large department store in the Southeast predicts that new lines of appliances will be priced a bit higher than old models, now being sold off at heavy discounts.

The executive vice president of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. says he expects higher prices for aluminum ingot, zinc and possibly lead in the coming year. All three metals have gone up in price in 1963.

The chairman of National Gypsum Co. notes that prices of cement, insulating materials and accoustical tile seems firmer now. He suggests this firming may point to some increases in prices in the future.

Ocean-freight rates are going up, adding to the cost of important products. Sugar, coffee, cocoa, wool, tin, copra and coconut oil have become more costly this year for a variety of reasons unrelated to shipping costs.

Public utilities here and there are pressing for higher rates. Among them: Consolidated Edison of New York and Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., in Washington, D.C.

With all these indications of higher prices, people are asking: Is another round of inflation getting started?

The answer given to that question by most economists in and out of Government runs along these lines:

"There probably will be price rises in the year ahead, especially if business expands vigorously in the wake of a tax cut. Increases, however, are not likely to be very significant in terms of the overall measures of wholesale and retail prices, not enough to set off a new inflationary spiral."

ONE FORECAST: LITTLE CHANGE

Dr. Jules Backman, professor of economics at New York University and a noted authority on prices and wages, predicts that "the overall change in price indexes will be almost imperceptible." Dr. Blackman gives these reasons for not expecting inflation:

There are no important shortages of materials or capacity to make things. Some price cuts are being announced. Some price increases fail to stick. Competition from abroad is becoming more intense all the time.

Another authority, Ira T. Ellis, economist for E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., says he expects no important change in price levels for the rest of this year. In 1964, he says, if there is a good rise in business "we will see some price increases, but nothing substantial." That view is not unanimous.

PRESSURES BUILDING UP

The National Industrial Conference Board, in a circular issued on September 27, notes that the consumer price index this summer staged its biggest 2-month advance in 5 years. The NICB adds: "This increase lends weight to the arguments of some economists, business executives and legislators that pressures for a renewed wave of inflation are still building up."

The NICB itself is not yet predicting inflation. NICB Economist Albert T. Sommers says he thinks the odds are against any important rise in price levels in the coming year. But, he adds, the possibility of inflation cannot be completely ruled out, and the danger of inflation seems greater today than at any time since the last big move in prices in 1955–57.

A study published by the Federal Reserve Board suggests that there may be "less slack in the U.S. economy than is generally supposed." The study goes on to say that, "if expectations became too exuberant in the process of economic stimulation, this might increase upward price pressures and encourage speculative activities."

The U.S. Department of Labor, in charge of collecting price statistics, notes in a recent

summary that, "if price changes in some areas announced by producers occur as planned, a moderate uptrend in wholesale prices of industrial commodities may take place in the latter part of 1963 which will probably be reflected subsequently at the consumer level."

WHAT FIGURES SHOW

The measure of prices paid by consumers has risen about 1.5 percent in the past year.

Prices of foods in the grocery stores, according to this index, have gone up more than 2 percent in a year's time, and rose rather sharply this past summer. Fruits, vegetables, cocoa and sugar are more expensive. Meats, poultry and fish are a bit cheaper, compared with what they cost a year ago.

Prices of other goods in the stores have been rising slowly but steadily this year and now average about 1 percent higher than a year ago. In the case of men's winter suits and coats, the increase, according to some leading merchants, is about 3 to 5 percent.

Services, following the trend in wages, are constantly increasing in cost.

Thus, the official measure indicates a slight upward tilt in the cost of living, a tilt that may be getting a bit steeper.

As the consumer price index goes up, wages also tend to rise. Nearly 2 million workers are covered by contracts that call for cost-of-living adjustments, in addition to annual increases in wages.

WHAT BUSINESSMEN SEE

When you turn to the prices that businessmen pay—wholesale prices—you find in the official indexes little evidence of any inflation as yet.

At last report, the broadest wholesale-price index stood in 100.3 percent of 1957–59, up from 99.8 in April, but below the year-ago level of 100.8.

Wholesale prices of farm products dropped sharply last winter and spring and only partly recovered this summer. Russian purchases of Canadian and Australian wheat caused prices of wheat in U.S. markets to rise in September.

Processed foods, as a group, have followed about the same course as farm prices and now average about the same as at the beginning of this year.

Industrial prices, at wholesale, have scarcely fluctuated, according to the official figures. At last report, they averaged 100.7 percent of the 1957–59 average, the same as a year ago. The low for this year was 100.5 in April.

Out of 69 groups of products in the industrial price index, 30 are cheaper, on the average, than they were in the 1957–59 period.

Thus, the broad measures seem to point to a good deal of stability in the prices paid by industry. Two things help to give that appearance.

For one thing, the indexes have not yet taken account of some important price increases posted in recent days.

REDUCTIONS, TOO

Price cuts, although they are being overshadowed by increases, are also helping to hold down the price indexes.

Generally, a motorist can figure on buying a new car for about the amount that a comparable model cost a year ago. Some prices have been raised a little, others lowered. Many are unchanged.

Gasoline, at wholesale and retail, costs a little less than a year ago.

Household appliances are still being sold at heavy discounts. Average retail prices, when last calculated by the Government, were still declining, but not as fast as they had been.

Some manufacturers are talking about higher prices for new models, but General Electric recently cut the suggested list prices of its blenders by more than 20 percent.

Prices of heavy plate glass have been slashed by about one-third. An increase in prices of thinner glass for stores and autos, posted by one leading manufacturer, was not followed by competitors.

Chemicals, a big class of materials, are at their lowest price level since mid-1953. Prices of solvents have come down recently; resins and materials for making plastics have gone up.

In short, there is no headlong rush to higher prices, but businessmen are making more of an effort to test out the market and are more optimistic about the chances of making some increases stick. Many companies are still trying to escape from a squeeze on profit margins. They note that prices of a long list of products were cut sharply or discounted in the last few years. Price boosts now being announced do not wipe out these reductions altogether. Aluminum ingot, in spite of its recent rise, still is cheaper than a year ago.

OUTLOOK FOR 1964

The price picture, however, is getting more and more attention. After a meeting at the Labor Department recently, one economist said: "I think we are getting a little inflation, and I think we are going to get a little more, if we get a tax cut and a moderately increased budget. I would say we will get at least a half percentage point larger rise in the consumer price index in 1964 than we are getting in 1963." The would mean an advance of about 2 percent next year.

Does a rise of those proportions spell "inflation"? Some economists say, "Yes"; others, "No."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 14, 1963]

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

(By George Shea)

Price increases in various industrial materials are becoming numerous enough and substantial enough to begin to show up in an index of sensitive commodities, that is, commodities that normally are early movers when price trends change. At the same time, there are indications the advances may be more directly related to inflationary monetary developments than some earlier advances.

The price increases have covered quite a large number of raw and partially finished goods, including steels and other metals, glass, and paper. However, they have not yet shown up in an increase in the general wholesale price index of the Government, apparently because reductions in other products are offsetting them. This index continues to hold just under 101 percent of the 1957–59 average, where it's been almost continuously for more than 2 full years.

But the Commerce Department's index of 22 sensitive commodities, and its subsidiary index of 13 industrial commodities have both gone up lately. The index covering 22 items is up to 95.8 percent of the 1957–59 average from 92.5 a year ago and 92.1 as recently as early September. The index of the 13 industrial components out of the 22 is up to 96.2 from 94.5 a year ago and 93.7 early in September.

One indication that monetary factors are at work comes from a comparison of banking figures with the trend of industrial production. The banking figures used here are those for total credit issued by the whole banking system (including investments in Government and other bonds), which amounted at the end of August to the huge figure of $317 billion. Bank credit rather than all debt is used because it is of different nature from other kinds of debt. When an individual or a business makes a loan the lender is deprived of the money during the time the borrower enjoys its use. But when a bank lends money there is an actual increase in the total amount of money in use, and no one is deprived during the time the borrower uses the additional funds.

Naturally, bank credit as well as other kinds is needed to grease the wheels of progress, and it is to be expected that when business rises the amount of such credit will grow about in line with general activity. In the years 1947–59, for instance, the period that embraces much of the great postwar boom, bank credit actually grew a bit less than physical production—59 percent against 61 percent.

However, in 1959–63 bank credit has grown 24 percent while industrial production has expanded only 19 percent. And in the past year alone, credit is up 8 percent while production is up only 5.5 percent. Credit expansion has been outpacing that of physical production.

Another indication is a contrast between wage trends in the two periods just cited. In 1959–63 the gross weekly wage in manufacturing industries rose an average of 2.9 percent a year, or much more slowly than in 1947–59, when the yearly average was 5.1 percent. The more recent rate is generally regarded as within the rate of annual increase in productivity in this country. And this idea is supported to a considerable extent by the fact that a monthly Government index of labor cost per unit of output has remained for more than 2 years almost unchanged, steadily between 99.1 percent and 100.2 percent of its 1957–59 average.

The conclusion from the comparison of weekly wages in the two periods is that in 1959–63 wages have done little if anything toward pushing prices up, whereas in the 1947–59 years the rise in wages was apparently a substantial factor in the price advances that took place during most of that period. And if wages are not now pushing prices up, something else must be doing it.

A third fact which points in the same direction is that the sensitive comomdities are those which contain a relatively small element of labor cost. They contain so little labor cost that during most of the 1950's their indexes declined very substantially from their Korean war highs, while everything else went up. They respond rapidly to general conditions such as inflation or war, whereas finished commodities tend to respond more to specific cost factors.

Of course, it is true that prices normally tend to move up as general business expands, as it has been doing since early 1961. This has happened in almost every substantial business expansion that has been recorded. However, that does not make price increases in such periods any the less inflationary, for business expansions are also usually accompanied by expansion of credit.

Nor should the fact that the general wholesale price index has remained steady be taken as final proof that there is no inflation. A stable price trend may conceal an inflation in the sense that without the inflation prices would be going down.

The clasical example of this situation is that of the late twenties. From 1925 to 1929 the wholesale price index declined from 67.3 to 61.9. During those years bank loans expanded 22 percent and industrial production almost exactly the same amount. But inasmuch as prices were falling, a somewhat slower growth in loans should have been sufficient to finance the growth in physical output.

When the expansion of credit stopped in the second half of 1929 prices began to collapse rapidly. The wholesale price index fell from 61.9 in 1929 to 42.1 in 1932.

How much similar inflation the present price structure contains is difficult to tell. It may be much less. But that there is some is suggested by still another fact. The present is the first period of business expansion in 15 years which at its present stage has not been accompanied by a need for commercial banks to borrow heavily from the

Federal Reserve System. That's because the System has pursued in this expansion a more generous credit policy than in years.

It will be fascinating to see how long such a policy can keep business activity growing without serious setback.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference Opposed to Mexican Farm Labor Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this House killed the attempts to revive the Mexican farm labor importation program on May 29 of this year. Efforts have been made, however, since that time to revive the program, and there is now pending a bill, H.R. 8195, which would extend the program for 1 year.

I was opposed to the original bill calling for a 2-year extension, and I am still unalterably opposed to the 1-year extension. I believe it is time to let the program expire, and to allocate some of these jobs to our own domestic farmworkers who are in desperate need of employment.

The National Catholic Rural Life Conference has been opposed to this legislation over a period of years, and at their recent annual meeting on October 10, 1963, adopted a policy statement condemning the program once again.

I am inserting at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J., director of the Washington office, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., which sets forth in full the statement approved by the conference.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1963.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROSENTHAL: Again the Mexican farm labor program under Public Law 78 is coming to a vote in the House. As you prepare to form your decision on this issue, may I ask your serious consideration of the following policy statement adopted at the annual meeting of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference on October 10, 1963:

"The National Catholic Rural Life Conference repeatedly has condemned the Mexican farm labor program under Public Law 78. This program has exploited the extreme poverty of Mexico in such a way as to place additional heavy burdens of unemployment and depressed wages on the poorest of America's poor, the migrant farmworkers.

"The conference long has been part of the unanimous voice of organized religion in demanding the end of this program.

"We, therefore, the diocesan directors of Rural Life, again urge every Member of Congress, in deciding his vote on this issue, to heed not the economic interests of a mere handful of employers but the urgent requirements of justice and human decency.

"Let us now, once and for all, end this blight on the American conscience."

As you know, on May 29 of this year, the House voted down the proposed 2-year extension of Public Law 78. We now urge you to add your vote to the effort once and for all to kill this program which has been roundly and repeatedly condemned by every responsible spokesman for organized religion.

With every good wish,
Very sincerely yours,
REV. JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.

The Gesell Report Finally Gets Editorial Attention From a New York Newspaper—And How

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a great New York newspaper has finally taken cognizance of the Gesell report which recommended that the promotion of military officers be judged on the basis of how effectively they succeeded in integrating segregated areas around military bases and also proposed that the military be used to police segregated communities around military bases and through economic sanctions compel integration. It also proposed that military bases in segregated sections of the Nation be closed down, which, of course, meant the South where the most favorable military training areas are found.

For reasons best known to itself the national news media, especially the radio and television groups, have failed to point out to the American public that the directive issued by the Secretary of Defense in July on the basis of the Gesell report has erased the traditional policy of the military to remain aloof from politics and participation therein. Despite objections from the three branches of the military services on this proposal, the Department of Defense continues to implement the directive which carries the obnoxious features of the Gesell report.

Now comes the New York News, with the greatest daily circulation in the Nation, to alert the American public to the dangers of this directive. The New York News has done a service in commenting on the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, which would negate the Gesell report.

Here is the September 23, 1963, editorial from the New York News:

MISUSING THE ARMED FORCES

Last July 26, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara issued a strange directive—by whose inspiration we know not, but can guess pretty confidently.

This directive was aimed at cities and towns near military bases. When any such city or town practices "relentless discrimination against Negroes," said the McNamara document, the base commander is authorized to declare the place off limits to servicemen.

The idea, of course, is to cut off the money the servicemen normally spend in nearby cities or towns, unless those places get and/or stay integrated.

A later McNamara directive forbids servicemen to take part, or military equipment to be used, in public events where there is any racial discrimination. A West Point, Annapolis, or Air Force Academy football team, for example, may not under this McNamara order play at a segregated stadium.

What about these McNamara directives, anyway?

There is no doubt that they are aimed at a worthy objective which is to speed integration throughout the United States. Nationwide integration is on its way, we believe, and we don't think anything can prevent it for long.

But is it wise to use the armed services to pressure the integration process forward?

Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, says it isn't wise at all.

Mr. VINSON is so opposed to the plan that he has introduced a bill to make it a court-martial offense for any serviceman to obey McNamara's July 26 directive.

If this bill passes, a serviceman—meaning as a rule a base commander down South—will be damned if he does and damned if he doesn't string along with Mac.

The bill probably won't pass; but such is VINSON's prestige in Congress that his fierce opposition to the McNamara directive is expected to make the Pentagon very wary about enforcing it.

VINSON's opposition, as we see it, is based on sound reasoning—and some important facts of military, political, and civilian life.

"This," he says, "is a direct invasion by the Department of Defense into local affairs. If it is social reform today, it may be direct participation in national elections tomorrow; if it is race today, it could be religion tomorrow."

That's bad enough, but it isn't the worst that could happen.

The present national administration favors integration, and that's good. But suppose it gets away with this attempt to have the Armed Forces bulldoze integration into some areas, and then suppose some future administration is opposed to integration. What is to prevent it from using the Armed Forces to restore the old injustices against Negroes in all areas near military bases?

START THIS STUFF—WHERE DOES IT STOP?

Or what's to prevent a zealous Methodist or Baptist President from using the Armed Forces to restore Federal prohibition * * * or a Jewish or Seventh Day Adventist President form calling out the troops to make us all observe Saturday as the Sabbath?

Or suppose some atheist should become President some day. Under the precedent McNamara is trying to establish, an atheist President would be entitled to use the Armed Forces to complete the work so solidly begun by the Earl Warren Supreme Court, and kick Almighty God all the way out of our public life—and perhaps close down all the churches and synagogues.

The long and the short of it is that in this country, from the beginning, there has been a tradition that the military must not be superior to the civil power.

We'll tamper with that tradition at extreme peril to our whole system of government and way of life, no matter how worthy the immediate aim of the tampering may be.

McNamara is engaged in such perilous tampering for a worthy objective—and Congress, the President or the people had better stop him cold if our liberties are to be preserved and improved upon.

FAA Blamed for High Cost of Navigational Aids

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have been trying to bring to the attention of this Congress and the public the mess that exists in one of our vital Federal agencies, the Federal Aviation Agency. Almost every day brings new evidence either of practices inimical to the goal of safety in air traffic or of fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Administrator of that Agency. Only last Thursday, October 10, 1963, the Civil Aeronautics Board released its report of the investigation of the crash that occurred at Idlewild Airport in New York last November. In that crash 25 persons were killed. According to the report the crash came about during the abandonment of an approach to the landing field by an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B. During the approach, the pilot of that plane was ordered not to land because of a fog condition near the runway. Enveloped in fog, the plane crashed at this point. The CAB report makes it very clear that the FAA was responsible for getting the plane into its predicament because of the faulty procedures it employed in reporting weather conditions to approaching aircraft and because of defective and inoperative safety equipment. In my judgment the FAA stands accused by the CAB report on this crash.

This type of irresponsibility naturally shows up in other areas of FAA activities, principally the way it manages the public moneys entrusted to it by the Congress. To illustrate, I would like to submit for the RECORD and I now offer the following news item that appeared in Aviation Daily on June 6, 1963, which was recently brought to my attention:

FAA BLAMED FOR HIGH COST OF NAVAIDS

The cost of navigational aids is rising sharply and most of the blame can be attributed to FAA's methods of procurement and construction, according to S. B. Poritzky, manager, navigation for ATA. In a paper delivered to the ATA's 1-day conference on "smaller city airports" on Tuesday, Poritzky pointed out that FAA costs are in some cases 10 times more than industry costs for the same equipment.

Poritzky compared FAA budgets for the installation of runway and identification lights (REIL) with costs borne by the State of Minnesota for the same equipment. FAA pays $18,200; Minnesota spends $3,000 for the lights to serve exactly the same purpose. FAA's estimate, Poritzky said, for a 75 megacycle fan marker is $25,800. The State of Nebraska estimates $3,250. The Wilcox Electric Co. markets a package for $2,413.

Poritzky pointed out that the costs of an ILS installation and system have risen from $194,000 in fiscal year 1960 to $276,460 in fiscal year 1963, an increase of 42 percent. Despite the cost increase "the curious thing is that ILS did not significantly change in the intervening years. The overall U.S. commodity price index has risen only 2.7 percent since 1960," Poritzky said.

In the field of remote control communications, a comparison between an FAA-constructed limited remote communications outlet and an AIRINC installation serving a similar function shows that FAA spends $38,000 for construction and $14,000 for materials. AIRINC pays a little less than $2,000 for construction and materials, Poritzky said.

Despite this greater cost, the operational availability of the two systems is quite comparable and, in fact, the AIRINC facility has the slightly better reliability rate of 99.4 percent compared to FAA's 99.08 percent.

Poritzky then compared FAA costs for a TVOR construction with those paid by Minnesota and Nebraska. The average cost to the States was about one-half the FAA's cost. "The major difference comes in construction material and construction," Poritzky said. "The FAA cost was $54,000. The State cost was about $10,000. The electronic installation cost ratio: nearly 2 to 1. In comparing the Minnesota average with the FAA cost, note that Minnesota's VOR's were built to FAA standards and are identical to what FAA itself has purchased. One more thing: the estimates in the FAA case are for a single station TVOR, whereas in the Minnesota facility we wind up with a dual facility."

In other comparisons Poritzky showed where Collins Radio and Wilcox Electric could provide electronic equipment and installation for a dual VOR for a slight bit more than what FAA pays for a single VOR.

Poritzky said that by "designing and contracting for buildings piecemeal with different contracts for building panels, antenna shelters, chain link fence, and voltage regulators FAA spends far more money than it needs to and needs far more people to run the show. A determined austerity program is needed to make the buildings do the job they must do and no more. A far better way and one which has been proven to work and work well would be for the Government to procure its facilities as packages, complete and ready to place on a concrete pad * * * it is the most obvious point of departure for economy," Poritzky said.

Mr. Speaker, some of this language employs technical terms and abbreviations and could stand a small amount of translation into everyday language, although the import of the article is clear: the FAA is wasting the taxpayers' money by spending many times more for equipment and construction of navigational aids than the States and private organizations are paying for the same items.

For example, Mr. S. B. Poritzky, an executive with the Air Transport Association—ATA—points out in this article that the FAA pays $18,200 for the installation of runway and identification lights, whereas the State of Minnesota pays $3,000 for the same item. In other words, the FAA is spending more than 600 percent more of the public's money for this item than it should cost. That, my friends, is mismanagement. That is waste.

Again, it is pointed out that for a limited remote communications outlet, providing radio communications to aircraft in flight, FAA spends $38,000 for construction and $14,000 for materials, or a total of $52,000. But Aeronautical Radio, Inc., a nonprofit adjunct of ATA, pays a little less than $2,000 for construction and materials of an installation serving a similar purpose. In other words, the FAA is spending more than 2,600 percent of the public's money for this item than it should cost. Somehow the words "mismanagement" and "waste" do not adequately describe the situation. And there are several other examples of such flagrant misuses of the public trust in the news story above.

As you probably know, the Air Transport Association is a private organization made up of most, if not all, of our major airlines. This organization is to be commended for bringing this situation to light. It is never easy for a group to criticize the Agency which regulates it. Accusations of this nature by such a responsible organization should never be taken lightly. Just about any governmental agency would be expected to answer a charge that it is spending $52,000 for an item that should cost less than $2,000. Such a discrepancy demands an explanation. The public is entitled to know why it has to spend 2,600 percent more for an item than a private organization has to pay. Yet the FAA has consistently refused to answer these charges since they were made last June.

In fact, similar charges were made last May by the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association in their confidential newsletter for May 1963. That newsletter states that "many FAA services were either excessive or nonessential," and recommends drastic cuts in the FAA budget requests for fiscal year 1964.

I personally invite the FAA Administrator to answer these charges. Satisfactory answers will surely settle the doubts that currently exist in many places about the activities of that Agency.

Must United States Be Spoon-Fed News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, one of the more objectionable aspects of this administration's policy of news management is that of withholding from the press and the people any information which it deems pessimistic on the progress of the war in South Vietnam. The American people have not learned of setbacks in that conflict in some cases for many weeks because the State and Defense Departments have feared their discouraging effects on the people's morale.

In a forceful article written for the Copley News Service, Mr. Herbert G. Klein says that—

A policy which assumes that Americans want only optimistic news or that they don't have the stamina to take the bad with the good is shortsighted and can be disastrous. It grossly underestimates the American people.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Klein's article at this point, as it appeared in the San

Diego Union on October 6 and the Alhambra Post-Advocate on October 8.

MUST UNITED STATES BE SPOON-FED NEWS?

(By Herbert G. Klein)

Is the Nation best served when the public is fully informed, whether the news be bad or good? Or is it better to withhold information which may be detrimental?

In general, how much information should be released to the American public?

These questions go to the heart of the debate now raging between the Moss subcommittee and the Defense and State Departments. Neither the questions nor the debate are new, but the answers which the public accepts will shape policy for many years to come.

In its most basic form the debate is whether or not the American people are capable of absorbing facts and governing themselves or whether they must be led by the hand.

The House Subcommittee on Information, headed by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, a Sacramento Democrat, has become increasingly critical of policies which have resulted in distortion or suppression of news about cold war activity. News media generally have supported the Moss committee view.

On the other side are many of the top information officials in the State and Defense Departments, who have taken the approach that full information on adverse situations may discourage the American people or may supply propaganda fodder for the enemy.

Strangely, while this guarded policy has been applied to news of interest to the American public, it has not been followed by the official Government propaganda agency, the U.S. Information Service, which has beamed abroad full details of serious domestic conflicts in this country, ranging from race riots to congressional debate.

The South Vietnam situation shows the divergence in views regarding what information should be made available.

When Arthur Syvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, flew to the besieged Southeast Asia republic with Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, it was announced Sylvester would survey information policies and brief newsmen on McNamara's findings.

During his first 2 days in Saigon, Sylvester gave newsmen increasingly encouraging reports on the conduct of the war. Though statements prior to that time had been pessimistic, Sylvester suddenly was optimistic. He said that the war can be "won in a reasonably short time."

Sylvester's troubles began when newsmen who had flown combat missions, many times narrowly escaping enemy fire, began to evaluate the Under Secretary's reports.

Finally, when the newsmen cornered Sylvester, he admitted he had been overly optimistic.

Last week McNamara said he thought it possible to defeat the Communists in South Vietnam by sometime in 1965—hardly a short time. And even that estimate is considered optimistic.

Sylvester has previously said he believes it important to lie about the cold war if doing so will help win it. He said this in defense of misinformation he gave regarding the Cuba crisis.

Prioir to Sylvester's arrival in South Vietnam, the Moss subcommittee criticized a Government press guidance directive issued last year and later rescinded. The directive ordered U.S. officials to keep newsmen away from areas where the facts might show a situation adverse to American efforts.

The Moss subcommittee report summed up the results by saying:

"In recent weeks the American public has been surprised by developments in Vietnam—developments which have been many months in the making but which the American people are just now discovering.

"The restrictive U.S. policy in Vietnam—drafted in the State Department's public relations office by an official with an admitted distrust for the people's right to know—unquestionably contributed to the lack of information about the conditions in Vietnam which created an international crisis."

The responsibility for securing information in an area such as Vietnam is, of course, that of newsmen as well as Government officials.

But a newsman alone can only report what he is able to see, to deduce or gain by talking with those who have needed information.

If the newsman's movements are restricted or if the facts he can obtain are clouded by distortions from U.S. officials, the story becomes more difficult for the reporter and for the public to understand.

From a remote area such as Vietnam, it will be difficult to sustain the interest of the U.S. public over the number of years this war will be fought, unless the Nation feels it has a clear picture of what is happening and why.

A policy which assumes that Americans want only optimistic news or that they don't have the stamina to take the bad with the good is shortsighted and can be disastrous.

It grossly underestimates the American people.

Even during World War II, when there was little good news in the early stages, adversity only made the U.S. public more determined to do whatever was necessary to win.

When this administration took office, President Kennedy gave full responsibility for public information to his press secretary, Pierre Salinger. Salinger started a series of weekly meetings among Government departments to coordinate information policies.

In view of the Moss report and other evidence of distortion of information, it would seem Salinger should reverse the disturbing trend of Government information policies.

Being on a spot is part of the business of being a press secretary. It would seem that in this case Representative Moss has enlarged the spot.

Special Report—Taxes, Troubles, and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I report to the people in my district. It appears lately that my heavy mail has been dealing with "Taxes, Troubles, and Tariffs."

The report follows:

SPECIAL REPORT—TAXES, TROUBLES, AND TARIFFS

Taxes: The administration's tax cut bill, which recently passed the House, now rests in the Senate. Action by the Senate is expected sometime in November. A great deal of criticism has been aimed at those who voted for the tax cut because they did not pass a shotgun budget cut at the same time.

Most Members of Congress would welcome an opportunity to vote for both proposals at one time. However, even the proponents of budget cuts know that they must come by piecemeal action rather than by a wholesale cut without a reasonable explanation and logic for eliminating certain services and specific governmental operations.

The tax cut bill, as it now stands, would give a worker with a wife and two children paying a tax of $877 a tax reduction of $191, depending upon the exact income and the number of dependents. Workers within the $4,000-to-$10,000 bracket would receive tax cuts ranging from $78 to $354. However, tax deductions would be generally lower within this same income bracket for workers who submit their tax returns with itemized deductions.

The tax proposal, according to the President, is designed to stimulate economic growth and reduce the Nation's level of high unemployment. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, who, incidentally, will speak in Westmoreland County on the 24th of October, said, "The tax proposal represents an approach to the problem of unemployment and inadequate growth which meets the need for greater consumer purchasing to stimulate investment and plant production."

The present tax structure was designed to raise high revenues and prevent inflation during World War II. During the Korean war it had the same purpose, and since then it has been maintained to enable us to finance our responsibilities of world leadership. The economy has grown substantially in the last 20 years. Indexes in recent years demonstrate that inflation is no longer a threat. However, the tax structure is exercising an adverse influence on the economy, holding back its growth.

In spite of arguments to the contrary, any tax cut is bound to help the economy since it will give more money to be spent in the marketplace. The only danger is that because of our idiotic trade policy, the extra dollars may be spent to buy foreign-made goods which, in turn, will not help our industries but will give an added impetus to automation so that American producers can compete with low wage products coming into the country. This in the end, will negate the tax cut benefits.

If we are to go get the benefits of this tax cut American shirtmakers will have to buy American-made cars and American autoworkers will have to buy American-made shirts. This applies to all American-made products.

Your Congressman voted for the tax cut and is only sorry that he didn't have more cuts to vote for, since he believes that taxes on individuals and individual incomes are the greatest detriment to marketplace growth. Unless the market can absorb the goods produced by labor there will be no need for production and this results in unemployment. Westmoreland County knows full well that in spite of statistics, we still have a chronic unemployment problem. The present day crop of Government economists seem to believe that production will cure unemployment. They better revise their thinking. Consumption is the key to prosperity. Production and wages, profits and investments provide consumption and consumption feeds the economy in an industrial complex.

Troubles: This Nation has spent billions of dollars all over the world on the premise that we were building good while helping other nations to become self-sufficient by providing the necessary funds for some nations to rehabilitate themselves after World War II, as well as the emerging nations being freed from the shackles of colonialism that had stifled their growth for the past centuries. We have spent something like $105 billion in this process. Only a fool would say that we have not done some good. In the main, however, it appears that so far we have not made a good bargain in building good will or a peaceful coexistence among all people.

All over the world there are flareups that are causing this Nation to be mixed up in the affairs of independent countries to the extent that every internal situation becomes our business. There are more countries in a state of internal revolution and disruption than at any time in world history. How can it be otherwise—when you take, for instance,

a nation like Liberia with a total collection of revenue amounting to $35,500,000 in 1 year—while, at the same time, this Nation puts aid into the country in all forms, amounting to $39,800,000. In many instances our money has more than equaled the amount of money in the total budget of some of these nations. In some countries the leaders keep the Treasury in their pockets.

It is even rumored that in some instances, the takeovers and coups are generated by the influx of U.S. dollars. Today we witness a situation that a few years ago, or even a few months ago, would have caused a storm of protest. However, in this day's atmosphere, American people appear to be accepting, and the newspaper editorials appear to be pressing the sale of wheat to Red Russia. It is not the sale of the wheat, but the principle behind this transaction that is disturbing.

Secretary Dillon places the entire transaction on a financial and economic footing by stating that it will help our balance of trade. Others say that it will create good will with the Russian people. All of them seem to forget what was said by officials of this country and other spokesmen over the years in this aspect of trading with the enemy, and I quote: "Doing business with an enemy that wants to kill and bury us is treason in its own right, and those who carry on this traffic should be subject to the penalties that attach to treason."

Congress passed an amendment in the late 1950's which bars this country from selling any subsidized agricultural products to any Communist nations, and yet it appears as though we intend to sell surplus wheat to all Communist nations except Cuba. Our excuse for not selling to Cuba is that it is close to our border, and we therefore plead with our friendly allies not to sell to Cuba. We seem to forget that the Communist nations of Europe are close to our allies' borders; therefore, we can't expect anything except what we are getting—our friends and allies are all trading with Cuba.

We, in a roundabout way, have also been trading with Russia over the years. Let me quote from a newspaper in up-State New York: "Ten days ago four carloads of Russian cotton crossed the border from Montreal destined for a textile concern in New Jersey. Reason for shipping through Montreal is that maritime workers in the port of New York refused to unload the stuff. They have some naive notion that when Washington says this Nation is in a death struggle with communism, something other than talk should be done about it."

One wonders if the main reason for trading with Russia is to balance our trade deficit and the balance-of-payments account. Then why don't we sell Russia any other products that they may desire. If we are trying to build good will with the Russian people why don't we mill the wheat here, (at least get the labor for our flour mills), and send them the flour in gift packages under the Red Cross to be given to the Russian people since our chances of getting paid for the wheat in cash is remote. In the Canadian deal, which is a forerunner to our deal, the President demanded and received concessions which will allow their products to be sold in Canada under the favored-nation concept. If we secretly, or otherwise make this same deal, then we will be getting Russian watches, for instance, which now have to come into the United States through Jamaica, and other free zone ports, at a price that will push every other watch off the market.

One doesn't mind so much the deal whether selling, giving, or trading wheat, except that we ought to be honest about it and admit that it is a commercial venture and that trade, as always, when broken down to its final and ultimate end, is nothing but an attempt or an effort to convert goods into cash. It is even humorously rumored that our desire to get to the moon first is to tie up a concession to sell our surplus wheat.

If we have to help the Russians live out their bad farm policies which have deprived them of their wheat crop (along with a drought) then why don't we put Uncle Sam's picture on one side of the 25 pound flour bags with our Declaration of Independence printed on the other side and pass the flour out to the needy Russian and satellite people. We should help the needy but not the greedy. We can cover up all we want but the truth is still plain to see, we're engaging in a lot of double talk when we say private vendors are selling the wheat, not our Government, who owns the wheat.

I'm sure the President took the best advice and counsel he could get on this deal, however, for those of us who have been voting against trading with the enemy, it makes little difference whether other countries deal with Russia or not. It's what we've been told over the last generation that makes this deal a little hard to swallow. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have passed very strongly worded resolutions against trading with the enemy, including wheat. Perhaps they feel that "plowshares can be forged into swords" if you don't need the plowshares.

Already the Russians are saying that they need tobacco, and the same trading profiteers in this country are now ready to sell anything to anybody, not excluding our American way of life. One of these representatives of foreign exporters had the gall to publicly state that it was our fault that the Santo Domingo fell to a military junta recently because we stopped Santo Domingo cement from being dumped into the United States, and as he put it, deprived them of a much needed market, which hurt their economy, and caused President Juan Bosch's government to fall. All we said to Santo Domingo was that they could not dump their cement into the U.S. market below their own domestic price. This U.S. profiteer wants trade no matter what price we pay in unemployment.

The grasping, profiteering group in internal trade will use any alibi, any excuse or any logic—sound or unsound—to push profiteering trade. For instance, the Japanese have just signed a new textile agreement with the United States, an agreement which your Congressman is analyzing and preparing for presentation to the Congress showing the attitude of the Japanese in their demanding position that a set percentage of our market belongs to them. Our trading profiteers in this country would have us believe that they are doing it to help the Japanese people as well as other textile producing countries and yet the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows:

"The average wage in the textile industry in the United States as of last December was $1.69 per hour. Meanwhile the average textile wage in Japan was 16 cents an hour, in Italy it was 27 cents, France 51 cents, Germany 46 cents, England 68 cents."

These U.S. export-import profiteers have the U.S. press, public, and politicians sold on humanitarianism as a basis for their free trade promotion when even a kid knows it's the almighty dollar they're after.

How can any textile plant in the United States compete with the Japanese labor at 16 cents an hour, or even the highest wages—those paid in England, 68 cents an hour—while at the same time we subsidize quota exports by selling to our competitors for $42.50 a bale of cotton less than what we charge American textile mills.

At this point I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, 1963:

"As I have pointed out before, the issue here is not trade with other nations, because the increase in trade with other nations of good will and cooperative spirit will continue to be a desirable goal of this Nation.

"The real issue is whether we conduct our foreign trade in such a way so as to harm, injure, and ultimately cause the collapse of many of our industries and the employment opportunities of millions of our fellow Americans.

"There can be no doubt that the increase in cheap imports coming into this country definitely constitutes huge, additional economic aid to the countries sending in these imports. This fact is the negation of the slogan 'Trade, Not Aid,' since under the present situation—we have every reason to believe that under present trade laws, the challenge of cheap imports undermining American industry may grow more threatening day after day and we have both 'trade and aid'—the first at the expense of the American industry and its faithful employees and the second at the expense of all the taxpayers of the United States."

Recently I received a letter from James P. Hobbs, Niland, Calif. I would like to have you read this letter to show you that the basic problem in this country, from steel to mushrooms, to tomatoes, to glass, and to every other consumer item, stems from a complete misunderstanding of the economics of an industrial complex, and I quote from the letter from James P. Hobbs:

"DEAR MR. DENT: The tomato industry in Imperial Valley is dead in all areas. This is the worst year in history, pricewise, and Mexico has complete control of the tomato market at any time.

"Today we are well aware of one thing: no American industry can compete with slave labor.

"I wish you could be here to really see this community, to see the idle land, the vacant sheds, and rusting machinery. Most of all I would like for you to talk to my people. There is where the true story lies.

"You can get a financial statement on the property loss, but the destruction of spirit and morale of these people cannot be figured. You would see a grammar school where 90 percent of the children depend on the produce business for livelihood. These children will grow up on relief. There are homes where children are being farmed out so they can eat.

"All these people have come to me, the farmer, the trucker, the union packers, in fact all people connected with this industry, to see what can be done. This area is already lost, and in the near future other communities will also go.

"As you know, I testified before you for a tariff. We were turned down because we were just a few, but now there are many.

"I want to know if there is any way for just a common man and citizen to get on one of these boards or panels that decide the fate and future of thousands of American citizens. We feel it is high time to mix a few facts with all the theory. I have a B.A. degree with a major in economics and a minor in religion. Also I think I can qualify for a Ph. D. in the hard school of experience, by fighting foreign imports of produce grown by slave labor.

"I have told my people here that Mr. Dent is a friend of labor and education, and anything you can do to help us we will deeply appreciate."

(I assured Mr. Hobbs I would keep fighting so long as I remain in Congress and had a voice.)

Incidentally, to show the doubters who disbelieve that our trade policies are the most serious threat to the economic growth of this country, let me quote from the Spinner, Pawtucket, R.I., which shows that back in 1790 the textile industry at that time was haunted by the import fallacy problem in Slater's time and is still with us.

"The imported fallacy. When Samuel Slater completed his feat of construction of a water-powered machine for spinning yarn, at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790, he made

secure in this country's history his place as the 'father of American manufacturers.'

"But immediate recognition and appreciation of the American textiles his accomplishment produced were not his from matrons of the era. They sought imported fabrics for wearing apparel. In their insistence on British broadcloth and French silk, they were not above inquiring of a salesperson, 'Are you sure it is not American?'

"So states George S. White, biographer, in his 'Memoir of Samuel Slater' published in 1836. Thundered White, in comment, that women's 'monstrous destitution of patriotism' in regard to fabrics discouraged the growth of infant textile manufacturing concerns in America.

"The shadow of the charm of the imported label, for the American woman, still hovers over the U.S. textile industry. * * *"

Every American student of economics knows that if the U.S. Congress had not passed the first protective tariff act immediately following the War of 1812 this Nation would never have achieved the status symbol of being the world leader.

"Iron Age" recently stated, and I quote from Errol Derby's article:

"* * * General recovery in steel production in this country, which slumped during the summer months following negotiations of a new union contract, is now being hampered by a record level of steel imports."

In face of all facts to the contrary, the Tariff Commission continues to find no injury to American industry by imports. This is only because they look at the picture on an industrywide basis, and on a gross national product percentage. What they fail to realize is that 5 percent of a total industry may well be 100 percent to a single manufacturer within that industry, and so when that plant shuts down in a community because of imports, it may only affect one-half of 1 percent of the total industry, however, in that community, and to the jobholders, it represents 100-percent loss. No recovery is possible in this Nation until we look at all trade the way Mr. Dillon is looking at the wheat trade; for the money that is in it. Trade is strictly a commercial venture. Charity is one thing; trade is another and "never the twain shall meet," except in a breadline.

Late flash: The Tariff Commission right now is debating this question of glass tariffs. Just a year ago an increase in tariff was granted the glass industry after 30 years of fighting and right before the vote on the tariff bill in Congress. Now the Belgians, Japanese, and other glass exporters are proving that it hurt their economies. You guessed it. We are supposed to shut our plants down, so they can open theirs.

Remarks by Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of an address by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Hon. John Bailey, delivered October 16 before a meeting of the Capitol Hill committee of the Young Democrats of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Bailey's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY JOHN M. BAILEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE BEFORE MEETING OF CAPITOL HILL COMMITTEE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA YOUNG DEMOCRATS, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 16, 1963

It is a real pleasure to be invited to this fine gathering of Young Democrats. Believe it or not, I was once a Young Democrat and a national officer and we worked hard for the victory of a Democratic candidate for President—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

So much for past history. We are now in the latter half of the 20th century—whether the Republicans admit it or not—and we are concerned with the present and the future.

I think the Young Democrats in general are doing a good job—a sound job of recruiting young people, a sound job of educating young people on the issues—and a sound job of working with the senior party on registration and get-out-the-vote programs.

You are doing more and talking less than your Republican counterparts. I am aware that a few Young Democrats out West took some positions which are not those taken by your national convention and your national leaders, but I am confident that these views are held by only a small minority of your leadership and membership.

COMPARISON OF YOUNG DEMOCRATS AND YOUNG REPUBLICANS

One way to compare the Young Democrats and the Young Republicans is to take a look at their national presidents. You have chosen a responsible and experienced leader, Allan Howe, as your national president. The Republicans elected a young man named Donald E. Lukens.

Perhaps Mr. Lukens can best be described by the words of the District of Columbia Republican Chairman Carl Shipley, who said: "We are disappointed that to be elected he had to make commitments in favor of U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations, repeal of the income tax and other extreme positions that are not consistent with Republican policy."

I would comment on that comment by Mr. Shipley. Why did Mr. Lukens have to make those statements? Was he tortured into making them? Was he brainwashed? Or did he want to make them and did the convention of Young Republicans want him to make them? And if these positions are not consistent with Republican philosophy, why don't the leaders of the Republican Party repudiate them and all who hold those views?

In my day the Young Republicans were merely young fogies serving an apprenticeship until they could qualify as old fogies and take their place in the senior Republican Party. Today they seem to be young Birchites, working hard to acquire the fears and hates and prejudices essential to full membership in the far right crank outfits.

It is fashionable in some circles to say that both parties are alike. If anybody is so blind that he cannot see the difference between the Young Republicans and the Young Democrats then he deserves to belong to the Young Republicans.

So what's new in the senior parties? The Democrats are running the country and the Republicans are running for President.

REPUBLICAN ACTIVITY

Last weekend Governor Rockefeller and Senator Goldwater journeyed to Oregon for a meeting of Western States Republicans. Why did they make this long journey? They were both there to make it plain they were not running for President. Former Vice President Nixon was not running for President closer at home. He was at Hershey, Pa., attending a party for former President Eisenhower. Political strategists consider close proximity to Mr. Eisenhower a choice spot in which to not run for President.

Governors Scranton and Romney were not running for President at home over the weekend. This was a mistake. They did not get a lot of publicity about not running for President.

I want to say to you in all nonpartisan candor that I thought this spectacle of excited Republican activity over the weekend was good for the country. It is an encouraging demonstration of the vitality of our two-party system that so many Republicans are playing the time-honored game of coy reluctance to run for the nomination. Because we all know they are really available and secretly eager for the privilege of being the losing candidate in 1964.

And lose he will and lose he must—for the good of the country. For no matter what the 1964 Republican platform may say and no matter what the Republican nominee may say in 1964, that candidate will bear the heavy albatross of the record of the Republican Party in the last 4 years.

He will carry the burden of the senseless and partisan opposition of Republicans in the Congress.

He will carry the burden of a party which has enlisted support from the kooks who call General Eisenhower a Communist dupe, want to impeach the Chief Justice and to abolish the Federal income tax.

I think this romance of convenience will come to a sudden end on November 3, 1964, when the Republicans discover that an alliance of conservatives with the rag-tag-and-bobtail of fanatics, racists, bigots, and exploiters of hate and prejudice cannot elect a President.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY DESERVES REELECTION

President Kennedy deserves reelection on his record. He has been a leader. He has faced difficult problems squarely. He has provided action and strong moral leadership in civil rights. He has put America on the move again. He has restored our military strength and our diplomatic prestige. He has done what he thought was right regardless of political consequences.

He deserves reelection for what he has done but his victory will have another bonus—it will demonstrate that there is no political gold in tolerance of and association with the far right. It will show responsible Republicans that rejection of the 20th century is not the key to survival for the GOP. It will possibly even persuade some Republicans to be for something instead of against everything.

In the meantime, our job is not the care and feeding of the Republican Party. Our job is to get ready for 1964. Our job is to get the great story of the accomplishments brought about by real teamwork between the executive branch and the Democratic majority in the Congress, and you should tell it now and not wait until the fall of 1964. Our job is to get the people who support the President and his programs registered, educated, and to the polls on election day.

The work we did in this area in 1960 may well have spelled the difference between victory and defeat. So let's work harder and win bigger in 1964.

The President has given us leadership. Let us provide him with the followership he deserves.

Leon Gavin, of Pennsylvania

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grief at the loss of a friend. LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, who so

ably represented the 23d District, which adjoins mine in New York State, is gone from this Chamber.

LEE GAVIN served in the 6th Division in the First World War. He was always a "top sergeant" who exhibited a bulldog tenacity to his principles which were so greatly admired in this House. His was a deep commitment to his district. Few Congressmen can match his record of devotion to public works. He worked tirelessly to advance the development of his area, searching out and grasping onto those ideas which could help the people of the 23d District. It was with a sense of duty, for example, that he opposed to the Area Redevelopment Administration amendments this year, and he was tortured by the necessity to vote "no" on this program which might have brought some superficial assistance but which, in the long run, he felt, was unwise.

As this House knows well, he was an energetic and dynamic proponent of the Kinzua Dam project on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania. I was against the construction of the dam until all possible alternatives were explored. LEE GAVIN was a stalwart and worthy opponent. On several occasions Congress heard his impassioned plea for Kinzua. I can hear his voice rising now in righteous indignation.

LEE GAVIN was a strong and vigorous legislator. Perhaps more important, he was an effective Representative.

To us who were his colleagues, he was a warm and generous friend, with a gentle and wry humor. He is gone but his district and this House cannot forget what he has done, and what he was.

May God give his family the strength to endure their loss. They have our sympathy. May God also grant this House more men like LEON GAVIN.

Address of Congressman Roman C. Pucinski, of Illinois, Before the Association for Computing Machinery, University of Maryland, October 17, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier today it was my great privilege to address an estimated 600 participants in a seminar on data processing arranged by the University of Maryland and the association for computing machinery.

This annual technical symposium had as its theme: "Information Processing in the Nation's Capital, 1963."

As chairman of a subcommittee which is now conducting hearings on a proposal to establish a better method of exchanging resourceful information within our scientific community, I found today's invitation to address this group particularly stimulating, for these indeed are the men and women who have as their principal responsibility, the difficult job of charting a more effective course for the exchange of resourceful information.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the text of my remarks to the Association for Computing Machinery. I hope it will make some contribution toward a better understanding of this entire difficult subject.

My remarks, Mr. Speaker, follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMPUTING MACHINERY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, OCTOBER 17, 1963

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this audience of outstanding scientists, in this distinguished institution of learning, the University of Maryland, and it is a particular pleasure to be here today in the company of men and women who are making such imposing contributions in the field of computer technology.

I am told the rate of growth of Maryland University in size and academic stature is almost comparable to the rate of growth of scientific information.

When I was asked to deliver this address, I wasn't sure if it had to be in Algol, Cobol or Fortram. Fortunately, your able chairman graciously consented to let me speak in English.

There is a story circulating in the Soviet Union about the latest Russian breakthroughs in computer application to information retrieval. You can imagine how delighted the Russian scientists must have been when the computer, after being queried on ancient Russian history, replied that Adam and Eve were Russian. This reply prompted the Russian scientists to pursue the question further. "How do you know?" they asked the computer. And the computer faithfully replied: "To begin with, Adam and Eve had nothing to wear; they had only one apple between them; and in spite of all this, they still believed they were in paradise. Therefore, they must have been Russian."

During the last several months, it has been a rich experience for me, as chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on a National Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center, proposed in my bill H.R. 1946, to learn a great deal about some of the problems and solutions associated with data processing and information retrieval.

I am sure this audience is well versed in the staggering statistics on the production of scientific data, as well as the hopeless task our scientists are faced with in attempting to secure pertinent information from the flowing torrents of scientific documents.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I am deeply concerned about the future direction of our national effort in the area of data processing and information retrieval. The reasons are obvious:

First of all, my responsibilities to my constituents make it imperative that the mounting government costs in research are, in fact, spent for new and expanded research and not for a duplicate effort contained in some document drowned in an ocean of inaccessible information.

Secondly, it is my firm belief that unless our scientists are given better, faster, and more accurate information wherever and whenever needed, their valuable training and creative energies will be diluted to the level of insignificance.

Third, the emergence and advancement of scientific and technological competition from many countries makes it crystal clear that this Nation, in order to insure its economic survival, no longer can afford to ignore the development of its most important national asset: Scientific information.

We must recognize that some of the problems with which we are faced, although formidable, are not insurmountable.

Indeed, with the vision, dedication, and ingenuity which are so characteristic of our scientific achievements in the past, we shall succeed in our effort to meet this enormous challenge and develop our most neglected assets of scientific and technological information.

It is to our great benefit that the overwhelming majority of those engaged in scientific pursuits are becoming increasingly aware that a more effective method for the exchange of research data must be found: that scientific accomplishments and significant breakthroughs must be made quickly available to the entire scientific community to avoid unnecessary waste and duplication.

There is mounting concern, both in Congress and out of Congress, about the high cost of scientific research. There are those who would impose severe restrictions upon scientific research programs. It is ironic, and may be even ominous, that in the centennial year of the National Academy of Sciences, Congress has cut the National Science Foundation appropriation almost 50 percent.

I confess that I do not consider myself capable of sitting in judgment upon the efforts of any scientist. Nor do I believe that the overwhelming majority of those in the legislative and executive branches of the Government are capable of prejudging the merits of scientific research. Indeed, to attempt to do so would, in my judgment, be to engage in a space-age Scopes trial.

Yet, the mounting debate over research expenditures is a symptom of our times. It dramatizes concern over what some would call waste in the scientific effort.

I, for one, can think of nothing more disastrous to America and its struggle for survival than to place any controls and restrictions whatsoever upon the scientific community. Instead, it is my hope, as chairman of a congressional subcommittee, to help chart through Congress a program which will establish the most efficient method possible for making all scientific data and research quickly available to any scientist in the United States and throughout the world who may wish such information.

I am convinced that when we make scientific research data readily available to every scientist, the scientists themselves will then impose their own discipline against waste and duplication. It is difficult to imagine any scientist with any respect for his own ability who would wantonly and willfully duplicate research once he has discovered that this aspect of his research has already been developed by someone else.

If, indeed, there is duplication in scientific research, it is only because the scientific community does not have at its disposal adequate means for quick retrieval of research already accomplished.

I submit this is where research data processing and information retrieval through electronic aids come into play.

As I see it, this country will sooner or later have to establish a giant network of research information services throughout the United States, each dealing with its own particular scientific discipline, and each tied together by coaxial cable, closed circuit television, facsimile and other electronic devices

to one central command post which, through the use of electronic computers and retrieval machines, will keep a constant inventory of what is being done, where and by whom, in this Nation's widespread scientific community.

This command post quickly would provide to any scientist a complete record of the scientific research being sought so that he would have at his fingertips all the work previously done in a given field. Through a highly developed system of abstracting and digesting, the information would come to the scientist in capsule form so his own reading time would be kept to a fractional minimum. He could then exert his own intellectual capability toward tying together the loose ends and exploring new concepts.

Make no mistake. What I propose here is no sport for men of narrow vision. It will be vast and perhaps costly, but its complete integration of the scientific effort will pay mankind dividends never before imagined possible.

How, then, can we accomplish this? We do not have, as yet, all the answers to this question. Nor can we wait until we do have all the answers.

Is H.R. 1946 the complete answer? Not at all. But it would provide a beginning for some of the operations, and their scope, which ultimately would be assumed by a national research data processing and information retrieval center.

H.R. 1946 is just the beginning, but as President Kennedy said recently, a journey of a thousand miles requires a first step.

Before I proceed further, let me hasten to point out to you briefly what this Center would not do.

It is not the purpose of the proposed National Information Center to carry out under one roof all the operations of collecting, processing, abstracting and coding scientific information. Clearly, this is physically impossible and operationally impractical at the present time.

For this purpose, we have hundreds of excellent documentation and abstracting services throughout the Nation, specializing in specific areas of science. As a matter of fact, our excellent network of abstracting societies gives America a clear cut advantage in the field of abstracting, digesting and codifying scientific data. It would be a tragic mistake to dump them into a single monolithic intellectual compound.

The basic philosophy behind the National Information Center can be summed up in the following maxim:

Centralization without autonomy for decentralized satellite operations is blind: decentralization without central coordination is dead.

This maxim is a synthesis of corporate history in the free enterprise system. It is the elan vital behind the concept for a National Information Center.

I wish to stress that the purpose of the National Information Center is not to eliminate any of the existing indexing, abstracting and translating services, but rather to obtain their final work products in coded or other formalized form and make them available to the technical and business community.

Thus, the Center will gather data from all existing private and public sources wherever available. It will urge their expansion where necessary. The Center will also encourage the establishment of additional satellite centers wherever a need appears to exist.

For example, there is no abstracting service now available in the United States for the science of astronomy. What is even more appalling is the fact that the Russians do have an abstracting journal for astronomy. With an annual budget of $5 billion for space exploration, we can hardly afford to be without abstracts in this vitally important science.

It is planned that there ultimately would be a single, completely integrated index for the entire body of scientific and technical literature. However, the center would begin operation with all of the diverse indices which now exist, but with the important advantage that all such indices would be located in the same place and would be readily available for documentalists familiar with all of them.

Gradually, these diverse indices will be coordinated and integrated until the ideal of one master index is achieved.

As new advances in automatic documentation take place, the National Information Center will provide a base for augmenting the evolutionary growth and capability for rendering information retrieval services to the scientific community.

It is readily apparent that modern science no longer recognizes the boundaries of various scientific disciplines. What happens in biology may be important to the theory of information, as indeed it is. What happens in physics may be important to a chemist, geologist, astronomer, or biologist.

In short, the cross applications of various scientific disciplines provides a treasure house of important information. It is equally apparent that only a coordinating center in scope and function outlined here can hope to capitalize on and capture the cross-fertilization of scientific ideas and facts.

This will be possible through permanent communications links between the National Information Center and various satellites of specialized information centers.

The communications links will constantly provide the National Information Center with the latest scientific data processed in the various satellite centers. The center, in turn, will provide various services, including: 1. retrospective searches on any specific subject, 2. current awareness profiles, and 3. copies of references on request.

I am aware that to discuss this project in its entirety, we cannot ignore the fact that much remains to be done in development of methodology for more effective data processing and information retrieval.

But this is not to infer that much already is not being done. My committee has had the privilege of taking testimony from some of this Nation's most outstanding scientists.

Dr. Emanuel Piore, vice president of research engineering for IBM disclosed to my committee the fantastic gains by scientists in this country in the computer sciences.

I was particularly impressed by Dr. Piore's unequivocal statement that the state of the art in computer development today makes possible a significant start toward a national research data retrieval systems.

I have described this central clearinghouse which would handle literally billions of bits of significant scientific data at one time or another.

Is this just a dream?

Not at all, according to Dr. Piore's professional judgment. Dr. Piore inspired the committee with his disclosure that IBM is developing storage capacities capable of handling a trillion bits of information with unheard of speed.

Mr. Lee Johnson, vice president of Univac, also gave our committee a new sense of assurance when he described a most significant breakthrough by his company in the development of a low cost, rapid intercommunications computer which, in my judgment, could well serve as an integral part of our national retrieval systems by making this compact comp . er available to each of the supporting satellite activities scattered throughout the country.

Univac demonstrated that American industry already is tying together, through computers tied together by leased lines, information scattered in various cities of the country. We saw the speed with which this information can be exchanged between the independent outposts in each city through the central clearinghouse.

Perhaps even more reassuring to my committee was Univac's demonstration of the present state of the art in associative memories.

Those two actual demonstrations, plus a tremendous volume of other information being assembled by my committee leads me to the conclusion that those who would say we are not ready to start on the establishment of a national scientific research retrieval systems are men of little faith and vision.

To stimulate greater activity in development of techniques, I have proposed the National Science Foundation make an annual award, to be known as the "Vannevar Bush Award," of $50,000 for the most important contribution in data processing and information retrieval.

This will, I hope, provide recognition and the incentive of stimulating and directing more scientific talent toward the solution of some of our most pressing problems in data processing and information retrieval.

I have described briefly some of the functions and concepts upon which the National Information Center would be based. These concepts are by no means exhaustive, nor final. But we do have to begin somewhere. We do have to mold a national image for the foundation upon which to develop our most important national resource: scientific information.

It is my fervent hope that the ACM Organization, through its exemplary pioneering efforts in the field of information retrieval will play an important role through its leadership in the establishment and guidance of the formative phases of the National Information Center.

It is my hope that other organizations, like the American Documentation Institute, Engineers Joint Council, American Federation for Information Processing Societies, and others will lend their valuable experience in a cooperative spirit to this great challenge.

It is my further hope that ACM and the other societies will actively participate in the resolution of problems in: First, referring and selecting research papers for publication in primary journals; second, publishing abstracting journals; third, indexing research papers; fourth, publishing critical review journals and perhaps even news-type periodicals and, most important, I would hope it would provide informative interdisciplinary guides and standards for authors of scientific papers.

The question is no longer are we going to do it? The question now is how soon we are going to realize it? The answer to the latter will depend on the efforts and dedication of all of us. I have no doubt that the efforts of my committee and the support and cooperation from this audience of outstanding scientists and professional societies

will make it possible to plunge this Nation into the 21st century's challenge of research retrieval at least three decades early.

If I had the omnipotent power to move mountains to permit the light to shine through, I would use it to convince our American scientific community that America can no longer delay development of a more effective national system for research data processing and information retrieval.

Virtually every major nation of the world is developing today some form of national retrieval systems—Russia, France, England, Poland, West Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Italy, India; and even in Santiago, Chile, a national information center is being built with our foreign aid funds.

Will it take another Soviet breakthrough like sputnik in 1957 to wake this Nation out of its lethargy in research retrieval?

I hope not.

Don't Stereotype Migrants From South, Three Plead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, this past week one of our most respected national news magazines printed an article on the influx of southern whites to Chicago. Since the great majority of these newcomers do settle in the uptown section of Chicago's Northside which I represent I read the article with great interest.

In their attempt to do an in-depth story of an unfamiliar situation and at the same time meet the inexorable deadline, the magazine's reporters committed several inaccuracies which causes some misrepresentation and distortion of the true picture.

In fairness to our great city and to the people who feel they were not correctly quoted in the article I would like to extend my remarks to include in the RECORD an account of the article published in our local area newspaper, the Lerner Home Newspapers, which has covered the uptown area fully and completely for many years:

MISQUOTED IN ARTICLE—DON'T STEREOTYPE MIGRANTS FROM SOUTH, THREE PLEAD

(By Sheldon Hoffenberg)

Three North Siders who work with new residents from the South are quoted in the October 14 issue of U.S. News & World Report, but one was quoted inaccurately and another incompletely, they assert.

District 2 School Superintedent Mrs. Goldia Howes and Fred Lickerman, former executive director of McCormick Boys Club, 4835 Sheridan, and now an assistant executive director of all the Chicago Boys Clubs, had complaints about the presentations of their views.

Capt. John Fahey, commander of the Town Hall police district, however, says he was quoted accurately.

The article, entitled "When Whites Migrate—From the South," attributes to Mrs. Howes these statements:

"Migrant parents seem to move four times a year, or more. The result is that children are constantly changing from one school to another. And if there is work to be done at home, the child is kept out of school, just as he was back on the farm."

"I didn't even say that these families move four times a year, let alone four times or more," Mrs. Howes told this newspaper.

"I know of no survey on the subject. I have no figures, and I wouldn't make such a statement without proof.

"And I never mentioned anything about farms. Many of the families come from cities in the South. I wouldn't single out those from farms."

Incidentally, the magazine didn't identify Mrs. Howes correctly. It called her "supervisor" of public schools in uptown. Mrs. Howes is a district superintendent.

The article, on pages 70–73 in the magazine, quotes Lickerman as saying, "They come totally unprepared. They have only summer clothes.

"They are bewildered by all new things. Getting on an elevated train, crossing a street in traffic, it all scares them.

"They have to learn about garbage cans. At home they used to throw the garbage out in the yard to the hogs.

"There are many law violators among them. But they are not crimes like holdups and murders. It's more a matter of behavior. After work, many of them like to 'jes set' with some beer or hooch, the way they did on their porches back in the mountains.

"Here, they buy a couple of beers in a tavern, sit out on the curb and drink it and sing—and get into trouble.

"There's a lot of wife beating, like at home. Pa used to beat the 'old lady' when they had a fuss, and his grandpa did it before him. The wife expected it. But in Chicago, it's a crime. The police arrest pa, and trouble begins."

Lickerman said that during his 2½-hour interview, he never used the word hooch. But he was much more concerned that the article might give the impression he is stereotyping all or most migrants.

"I want to emphasize that although the behavior problems I discussed do exist among these people, not everyone of them behaves this way. This whole business of total indictment is bad. Many of them are fine people."

The youth leader also criticized the magazine for singling out the Uptown area for its report on migrants. "I don't know why it did that. A lot of other communities in Chicago receive them."

Captain Fahey was quoted as saying, "These are fine people, and they are coming along. They don't commit any more crime than other people who are as poor as they are.

"They are just like other immigrants who used to come here from Europe—the Irish, the Germans, the Poles. At first, they had to learn to live in big American cities, too. Now the old immigrants are on their feet and have forgotten."

Captain Fahey said these are his views. He disclosed that many of the migrants assist him in police matters.

"They give me leads on others they are ashamed of."

Visit of Marshal Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the day of the official visit of Marshal Tito, the President of Communist Yugoslavia. The press reports that the public protest against this visit is not as pronounced as it was in 1957 when it had to be canceled. Whether this is really the case I do not know. I do know that there are good and sufficient reasons arguing against this visit and that they are held by many. I would like to share with my colleagues the expression of deep dissatisfaction with this visit made to me in a letter from a constituent of mine, an American citizen born in Yugoslavia. He speaks not from any vested interest but from the personal experience of his friends and relatives.

Regardless of all the speculation concerning the meaning of Yugoslavia's neutralism, it remains a pure and simple fact that Marshal Tito is a totalitarian leader. He has destroyed all free, legitimate political institutions and persecuted or liquidated those that support and defend them. In the eyes of the world an official visit represents a demonstration of normal, friendly relations, of a willingness to accept and fully recognize the leadership of a country as legitimate. While I recognize that we must not break off communications with the Communist leaders neither should we, I believe, contribute in any way to the strengthening of their domination.

If we as a nation, in our efforts to achieve a genuine and lasting peace, adopt a policy that requires the contracting of a case of moral amnesia in the hope of relaxing tensions the result may well be a setback for the cause of freedom and justice and a blasphemy against those living and dead who have courageously opposed totalitarian leadership. We must not for light or transient reasons permit that to happen.

The letter follows:

FLINT, MICH.

Hon. CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I have read in the newspaper and also seen on television that Dictator Tito is planning on coming to the United States on October 17, 1963.

We as new immigrants, as well as other freedom-loving citizens are very upset that permission is granted Marshal Tito—that he is entering the United States as a guest of the White House.

This criminal is responsible for the murder of thousands of women, children and men; as well as five American pilots who were slain in 1945. Along with all these known crimes, he holds 17 million people under subjugation.

This type of criminal doesn't deserve to come to the United States to shake hands with the President or anyone else because his hands carry the blood of thousands on them.

I beg you to do what you possibly can to stop his entry now and in the future.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

National Newspaper Week and the Hartford Courant Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, since we are celebrating National Newspaper Week I find it an appropriate time to call attention to the fact that the Hartford Courant, one of the oldest continuously published newspapers in the country, will celebrate its bicentennial anniversary next year.

The Courant was founded in 1764, at which time it was known as the Connecticut Courant. This paper has become recognized throughout the world as evidenced by the following letter which I recently received from Peru:

MAGDALENA NUEVE,
Lima, Peru, August 30, 1963.

From: Jorge Vargas Escalanta.

Mr. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI,
Representative,
Washington, D.C.,
United States of America.

DEAR MR. GRABOWSKI: For a long time I have admired earnest newspapermen, which have guided public opinion, based on saying the truth on all issues guided; and who have kept on reporting all progresses, as soon as they were made, in all endeavors of life, science, techniques, artistic, and English literature within a democratic world.

As the Hartford Courant, of Hartford, Conn., is a leading newspaper and is about to reach its 200th anniversary, thus becoming perhaps the oldest newspaper in the United States, and maybe our world, I have felt prompted to send you attached herewith a draft for a program to celebrate, in the most dignified manner, by 1964, the 2d centennial of this fine newspaper, with the cooperation of some leading American institutions.

Now, I suggest that the American Government and the first Representative from Connecticut in Washington, D.C.—with due anticipation—bearing in mind the lofty ideals upheld by the people alert and informed, to be good enough to dispose to have a special issue or issues of postage stamps made for the occasion and the design of which should commemorate the second centennial of oldest American newspaper, the Hartford Courant, of Hartford, Conn.

Trusting to hear from you in due course, I ask to remain, with my best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JORGE VARGAS.

Our country is closely joined to the peoples of the world by our newspapers which have almost immediate contact with every part of the globe.

American newspapers have played a very important role in the development of the freedoms we all enjoy today. From the time of Peter Zenger until the present, newspapers and newspaper people have continued to keep us aware of the happenings in our own country as well as occurrences around the world. That our citizens are so well advised of the news certainly indicates that the highest compliments must be paid to the fourth estate, to the dedicated men and women who provide us with information and critically examine events, for the strength of our democracy lies with an informed public.

Frederic Francois Chopin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 113 years ago today, October 17, was a day on which in 1849, Frederic Francois Chopin died at the age of 39.

I should like to call attention today of my colleagues to an excellent article written in tribute to Chopin by Mr. C. J. Olszewski, Ph. D., who is one of the Washington's most highly respected historians.

This reminder to the world's history of music is most timely. Poland is presently observing her 1000th anniversary as a nation. We Americans have learned to respect the Poles for their indomitable spirit of freedom which was so heroically displayed here in our own country by General Pulaski and Kosciuszko both of who came here from Poland to fight for America's independence in the American Revolution.

Frederic Chopin exemplified the other aspect of Poland's people; the romanticism of Poles; the rich cultural tradition developed by the Polish people during the past 1000 years.

In order to understand the Poles, one must know not only their war heroes, but their artists.

Frederic Chopin was one such Polish artist and for this reason I am most happy to call this excellent article to the attention of my colleagues on the 113th anniversary of his death.

Mr. Speaker, the article by Mr. Olszewski follows:

FRÉDÉRIC FRANCOIS CHOPIN

(By G. J. Olszewski, Ph. D.)

One hundred and thirteen years ago on October 17, 1849, a devoted son of Poland d.ed in exile in Paris. His beloved land was then dominated by the Russians and other occupying forces of the "unholy alliance," as it is dominated by the Communists today. This Polish son was not only an ardent and intense patriot but was God's chosen musical spokesman for a Poland ravaged by occupation forces. He devoted his life to the perpetuation of the spirit of freedom, liberty and independence of Polish thought and culture. For more than a century the voice of this patriot inspired and guided his tortured nation through the pangs and ignominies of bloodshed and violence. His voice was the voice of music. It was the undying voice of Frédéric Francois Chopin.

Born in the tiny Polihs village of Zelazova-Wola near Warsaw on February 22, 1810, Chopin was forced into exile in his youth by the Russians because of the revolutionary character of his music. Chopin found safe haven in Paris where he continued to live and to compose in the freedom which France has traditionally extended to the persecuted of all nations. In exile Chopin was kept informed by family and friends of the dire plight of his native land. Throughout his life a goblet of Polish earth remained in Chopin's room to remind him of his origin. He breathed into his music his undying love for his homeland.

Despite the racking pain of pulmonary disorders and financial difficulties, Chopin's genius and intense patriotism gave him no respite from the unceasing demands of creative inspiration. Although the oppressors used every means at their disposal to destroy Polish culture and to decimate the Polish people, Chopin's music spoke for Poland when that nation had no audible spokesman in the civilized Christian world. His entire life was devoted to the preservation of Polish nationality and ideals.

Throughout the intense 39 years of his life, the voice of Chopin's music rose as a hymn to liberty. It swept from his tiny cell on the island of Majorca in the Mediterranean. It spread throughout France, England, and all of continental Europe. It even penetrated the most remote corners of his native land to plague the oppressors.

The occupation forces sought to suppress the compelling, arousing voice of Chopin's music. The Germans forbade its playing; the Russians crashed his piano into the streets of Warsaw. But the jangled crashing of Chopin's piano became transmuted into the noble strains of his "Revolutionary Etude" itself. What a supreme weapon. The voice of Chopin could not be silenced for music was the weapon beyond compare. The oppressors could not grasp it; they could not silence it; they could not tear it from the hearts of a people seeking liberty, freedom and justice.

Throughout the years this vital weapon has retained its mystic potency. During World War I and again during World War II when pagan forces ravaged Christian Poland once again, it was the music of Chopin which majestically sounded the cry to battle from the Warsaw radio and triumphantly led the resistance. Throughout the bitter years of struggle which followed, Polish sons and daughters were inspired to untold feats of heroism and valor. They rose from prisons and concentration camps, from hidden caves and dugouts in the woods, from the rubble and ruins of Polish cities. They struck a last blow for Polish independence to the penetrating, commanding and awe-inspiring themes of the "Polonaise Militaire." Chopin's music symbolized the united response of a nation which resisted the onslaughts of its oppressors.

NATIONALISM AND ROMANTICISM

What were the dominating influences which molded such a significant Polish spirit into Chopin's music? How did this

frail genius succeed in portraying the vital spirit of a nation in chains? What were the driving forces of his soul? Perhaps a clue can be found in an examination of the era in which Chopin grew to manhood in Poland.

It may be recalled that the 19th century in Europe was an era of political and intellectual ferment. The success of the American and French revolutions in the last quarter of the 19th century had aroused a new spirit of nationalism which swept across Europe influencing not only the political life of the continent but also its literature, art and music.

Poland by this time had gone through the agonies of three partitions—the first in 1772 between Russia, Prussia and Austria; the second in 1793 between Prussia and Russia; and the third, or final, again between all three of this unholy alliance. By the Treaty of Tilsit of 1802, however, the Duchy of Warsaw had been reconstituted as a source of manpower by Napoleon whose star was then illuminating the European heavens. With his defeat and retreat from Moscow in 1812, Napoleon's Polish creation perished. Under the terms of the final act of the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Poland was definitively partitioned between Russia, Prussia and Austria.

In a vain attempt to win the Poles to Russia's side, Alexander I set up the congress of Poland in 1815 under a Russian constitution. Warsaw was the center of this new creation. Diametrically opposed to the nationalistic principles of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1795, however, this final act brought about a wave of intense nationalism and rebellion throughout the land. It culminated in the ill-fated Polish uprising of 1830, so brutally suppressed by the Russians. The end was now not far off. The year 1831 marked the total occupation of Warsaw by the Russians and the complete extinction of Poland as an independent political entity. In 1832 Nicholas I declared Warsaw to be an integral part of the Russian Empire.

These events were but part of a long series of attempts to subjugate the Poles. The policy of the occupying powers was the decimation of the Poles and the extinction of Polish thought and culture. In 1832, for instance, 50,000 volumes of the library of the Society of Friends of Knowledge, founded by the Polish historian, Tadeusz Czaski, and several contemporaries, was carried off to St. Petersburg (now Leningrad). Polish literature had by this time entered the so-called era of romanticism. It had been ushered in by the appearance of the great Polish poet Mickiewicz in 1822, who, together with his contemporaries Slowacki and Krazinski, formed the triumvirate of Polish thought of the period.

Chopin thus became the only world-renowned Polish composer of this era who reflected the new thought and spirit of romanticism in Poland. His development was marked by a militant spirit in his music and the evolution of new and daring styles and revolutionary techniques of his compositions. This won for him the wrath of the diehards of his day, the admiration of the concertgoer and the undying devotion of the Polish masses.

HIS SOUL WAS MUSIC

Chopin's music was, therefore, the poetic echo of the era. His subtle, passionate, at times violent, themes became the basis of his lasting musical fame. Throughout his compositions the simple folk rhythms of the Polish countryside abound. In it are found the subtle dances of the Warsaw salons. The themes of the mazurka, the krakowiak, the polonaise and of ancient Polish hymns and songs abound in Chopin's music. He gave them a dignity and hitherto unknown majesty. It was his great creative genius which enabled him to weave into his compositions a pattern which expressed the nationalistic longings of his sorrowful nation.

The militant, nationalistic spirit is, however, but one facet of the genius of Chopin. He speaks not only for the physically and spiritually oppressed of his own nation, but for all humanity. His music carries a message of spiritual tranquility to the oppressed of all nations for its appeal is varied—to some it may be emotional or spiritual, to others artistic and intellectual. But all agree, however, on its benign influence, for the power of Chopin's compositions stems from the very foundation of music which is an expression of life itself. It stems from the forces of creation and the depths of the human soul. His music lives in the breath of the wind, in the murmur of the forests, in the flow of the rivers. It flows in the very blood of our veins reflecting every sensation of joy, grief, sorrow, happiness, anguish, delusion, and ecstasy which grips the heart and soul of man. The melodies of Chopin's music flow harmoniously across the starry pathways of the sky. They ascend above the range of human speech and sweep the entire universe, they lift the hearts and mind of humanity to the ideals of creation and the harmony of the human spirit.

In pausing today to reflect a few moments on the genius of this Polish patriot, Frederic Francois Chopin, let us not overlook the contributions of two other Polish heroes, Casimir Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciusko, to our own fight for freedom and independence during the Revolutionary War. Nor should we forget the 15th century Polish astronomer, Nicolas Copernicus, whose brilliant concept of the universe has stabilized world knowledge of the planetary system, thus providing the germinating influence that has captured the minds of men and led to today's heroic achievements in space exploration. May this heritage of great accomplishments by Polish minds for the benefit of all humanity continue to guide and inspire the continued fight for the freedom and independence from all foreign yokes and ideologies of a truly Christian and democratic Polish nation.

Edwin P. Neilan, President of U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Endorses Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a statement made on October 11, 1963, by Edwin P. Neilan, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and president and chairman of the Bank of Delaware, Wilmington, praising President Kennedy and Secretary of Commerce Hodges for their decision to permit the private sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

Mr. Neilan's statement follows:

The action of President Kennedy and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges in approving the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union through private commercial channels at the world price for cash or short-term credit is commendable. It will benefit the U.S. economy particularly in the area of reducing our balance-of-payments deficit and by providing an outlet for surplus wheat which is costing taxpayers enormous sums in storage charges.

It seems to be an opportune time to explore the possibility of broadened, liberalized trade with the Soviet Union in other nonstrategic goods under the same conditions as the wheat sale. Good two-way trade cements peaceful relations.

Orange County Gains Separate Metropolitan Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Orange County, Calif., which I have the honor to, in part, represent, will be declared a separate metropolitan area by the Bureau of the Budget tomorrow. Truly, it is an honor to announce this historic new chapter in the fabulous story of Orange County's unbelievable progress. It points out once again dynamic growth of our county—growth not only in population, but also in business and industry.

Expressions of confidence such as this do not just happen. There is always a moving spirit and a well-organized effort. This case is no exception. What is exceptional, however, is the broad base of support this project had. From every segment of the Orange County scene, businessmen, civic leaders, officials, private individuals, and organizations pledged their support, and put their shoulder to the wheel to achieve our goal.

It would be impossible to mention all of those involved in the drive to achieve separate metropolitan status for Orange County. Supervisor William J. Phillips, the chairman of the metropolitan area committee, was an outstanding leader. Worth Bernard, the publisher of the Orange County News Magazine of Life, Business, and Industry, fought for many years to bring about the much desired change. He also deserves a well-earned pat on the back.

On April 29 of this year, a large delegation of Orange Countians, headed by Supervisor Phillips and including Worth Bernard, a number of mayors, councilmen, leading businessmen and industry leaders, chamber of commerce officials, and others came to Washington. This

delegation convinced the officials at the Bureau of the Budget of the unanimity of support for the change in status. Commenting at that time on the effort, Chairman Phillips very accurately stated "no civic effort has ever before gained such unanimous countywide support."

As a result of the delegation's visit, it was agreed that Frank Cisar from the Bureau of the Budget would come to Orange County to see the situation for himself, and to hold another round of meetings with local leaders.

All this work, and much, much more, has now culminated in Orange County gaining this new prestige and recognition. Certainly the result will be to stimulate greater interest throughout the country in truly "fabulous Orange County."

A great deal of credit goes also to California's fine Senators, THOMAS KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE, both of whom played leading roles in securing our new status, as did my colleague from Orange County, JAMES UTT. Naturally, I was very proud to be a part of this truly massive effort.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two brilliant, hard working men from our Bureau of the Budget. Walter F. Ryan and Frank A. Cisar deserve a very warm "thank you" from all Orange Countians. Their invaluable assistance and foresight will long be remembered by all of us.

Fred A. Orleans, a Dynamic Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article by the editor of Past Commander, a veterans' magazine published in Texas. The article is about Fred A. Orleans, of San Antonio, Tex., whom I have come to know as a dynamic American citizen and a great friend of Latin America.

The article reads as follows:

EDITOR'S COMMENT

Our magazine has featured the editorials of Fred A. Orleans for the past 2 years. For our many readers who are interested in knowing more about Dr. Orleans, we are pleased to quote in part from a newspaper writeup about him:

"Take a mixture of tenacity (of the pit bulldog type); energy (of fissionable explosive potential); ability (of rare quality in communicating thoughts and ideas)—and the sum result aptly describes one of the most dynamic personalities in Texas affairs today.

"Fred A. Orleans, past department judge advocate of the American Legion for the State of Texas, is a man with an urgent message. A message that must be delivered now, without delay—like Lieutenant Rowan delivered that famous message to Garcia deep in the mountain fastness of Cuba during the Spanish-American War. Those who know Fred intimately sense the urgency of his driving nature—a sort of monomania of enlightenment to Americans in a Paul Revere way, warning of the enemy so close at hand. Get the message through. Deliver post haste. Time is running out. It's later than you think.

"These are all cliches to some, but to Fred they are meaningful expressions denoting that time for action is right now. A well-known international attorney, economist, writer and lecturer, Fred has all the attributes of a sound, solid American. What makes him stand out among his fellow men is the campaign he constantly wages for what to him, in principle, is right. Right for America in the American tradition. His sheer logic, his clear appraisals with factual evidence ever in full view, bring to the listener or reader as keen an insight as we have today on the contemporary national and international scene.

"In between his busy work schedule, Fred turns out mountainous amounts of writings and still finds time to shoulder his full civic responsibilities. He has served as a member of the board of directors of a chamber of commerce, as vice president and member of a school board, director of Rotary, YMCA and many other organizations. Above all, as a former scoutmaster, chairman of a Scout district and present member of the executive board of the Alamo Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, he has shown a great interest in the future of the youth of our Nation. A man in motion, Fred A. Orleans, and all of that motion energized into one clear aim—the promotion of the welfare of the United States and our friendly allies."

The above writeup about Fred A. Orleans appeared in the press 2 years ago. A look at the record will show what he has done since then.

Approximately 145 articles and editorials written; insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States of 65 of his reports, studies, and articles on Latin America, recognizing him as "a well known international attorney, economist, and authority on Latin American affairs"; a book in the process of being written; numerous lectures; the first American citizen to be named a full member of the Mexican Academy of International Law; award of "La Cruz de Cultura y Derecho" by former President of Mexico Miguel Aleman and citation for "acts of outstanding friendship for Mexico and Latin America and his work for peace and respect for international law"; award of a "Good-Neighbor Certificate" for significantly contributing to United States-Mexico friendship and mutual understanding, by helping to promote people-to-people activities that strive for closer ties and cooperation between Mexicans and Americans, for fostering good will, exchange visits between Mexico and the United States by people, who best exemplify the highest ideals of democracy, free enterprise, good neighborliness, for giving encouragement and assistance wherever possible to groups actively engaged in strengthening freedom and democracy on both sides of the border through self-help programs"; receipt of a certificate of appreciation from the Boy Scouts; certificate of appreciation from the Optimists; certificate of appreciation from the Lions Club "in due recognition for promoting Mexico-United States understanding"; introduction into Mexico of a group of U.S. investors, who with Mexican associates have received a guarantee from the Alliance for Progress to construct homes for workers in Mexico.

Dr. Orleans has been referred to in the press throughout the United States as the "prime mover in bringing to Mexico the Alliance for Progress housing guarantee program which will help ease a dire housing shortage in Mexico." In conjunction with this he has on many occasions stated: "There is no better way to turn the tide of Communist agitation, propaganda, and subversion in Latin America than to make it possible for every man to own his own home."

Recently his busy schedule has taken him to New York where he joined former President Miguel Aleman and other Mexican dignitaries in celebrating the first observance of Mexico Week in that city, as well as Mexican Independence Day. A stopoff in Washington en route to San Antonio included a lengthy visit to the White House, a congressional luncheon and a State Department luncheon. Subsequently, with former Mexican Ambassador Luis G. Sevilla, he visited Fort Worth to assist Ambassador Sevilla in presenting to Congressman JIM WRIGHT, "La Cruz de Cultura y Derecho" by the Mexican Academy of International Law, for making significant contributions to United States-Mexico friendship. October 11, Dr. Orleans will be in Mexico City to assist in the ceremony for admission of U.S. Ambassador Thomas Mann and Congressman ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr., chairman of the Foreign Relations Latin American Subcommittee, to the Mexican Academy of International Law. The aforementioned only represents a part of a very busy schedule.

A recent statement by Dr. Orleans, as follows, again clearly demonstrates his insight and clear appraisal of our Nation's present foreign policy:

"The weakness in the Alliance for Progress and other U.S. international programs stems from the lack of national purpose by the United States in its dealings with other nations. We are now in a period of great crisis and stress, but what do we stand for? What banner do we hold aloft? What concepts and theories are we presenting to the world?

"A look at the past will reveal that every time the United States has faced a crisis, there was some 'cause' to espouse at the time. The Revolution against Great Britain brought forth an important declaration, the Declaration of Independence. The Civil War brought forth a proclamation, the Emancipation Proclamation. World War I brought forth an important concept, 'to make the world safe for democracy.' World War II saw the United States hold its banner aloft and proclaim to the world its determination 'to fight for the right of all mankind to enjoy the four freedoms.' Just what do we stand for today? Until this is determined, nothing can ever stop the relentless forward flow of communism."

Federal Salary Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, Clarence B. Randall, as Chairman of the President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems has made an impressive case for higher pay for top ranking Government officials in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the Federal Government.

In asking for higher salaries for our high ranking Federal officials and career employees, Mr. Randall's Committee gave recognition to the tremendous

growth in the problems and responsibilities of the Federal Government since the end of World War II.

The Committee's report compared the top Federal salaries to those paid to executives in private industry, and also, with more startling results, to those of officials of State and local levels of government. No matter from what angle the situation is surveyed, it is evident that Federal salary systems are inequitable and out of line with comparable positions in other areas of public and private life. Even within the Federal system we find the subordinates of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and many ambassadors and United Nations officials being paid a higher salary than their superior. We find the seven associate school superintendents of the city of Los Angeles have higher salaries than the President's Cabinet. This is also true of the assistant chief engineers of this same city. Further examples of such inequities are legion and many of our civic and business leaders have become increasingly aware of the need for an adequate adjustment in the Federal salary system. Such support and backing to the proposed reforms is essential if we are to provide encouragement to men and women of ability and dedication to accept appointment and enter into Federal service.

I am very pleased, therefore, to see this awareness reflected in the local press and in communications from my constituents. I would like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two good examples typifying the support for such legislation that is found in our city. One is a letter from Mrs. Joseph L. Block, chairman of Inland Steel Co., who has given his time and considerable efforts to civic and public affairs. The other is an editorial by Jack Johnston, chief of the editorial staff of the Chicago Daily News, who cogently expresses the reasons why we should bring the Federal salary system into balance with private and local Government levels.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following:

JUSTICE AND FEDERAL PAY

For about 1 percent of its annual outlay for moonshot rocketry, the U.S. Government can bring its whole top executive pay program into balance with private and local government levels throughout the country.

Clarence Randall, Chairman of the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, sets the total cost at $20 million. Simple justice requires that Congress give his report the kind of serious and sympathetic heed it gave the mililitary service pay bill.

An ironic aspect of that bill, providing well-deserved increases, is that it boosts the pay of all four-star generals and admirals above that of their bosses, the service Secretaries. The Cabinet officers are frozen at the $25,000 ceiling. The new pay rate of the Chief of Naval Operations, for example, is $32,607.

In general, the $25,000 ceiling prevails throughout the Government departments and agencies, with subordinate-level recompense scaling down from there.

In contrast, the Randall report cites these figures:

Twenty-eight positions in the city government of Los Angeles are paid salaries above those of Cabinet officers.

Five hundred and eleven principal administrative officers of colleges and universities receive $20,000 or more; 157 of these are paid more than $25,000.

The annual salaries of the Presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks range from $32,500 to $70,000. But the chairman of the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors, with policy jurisdiction over the whole System, receives only $20,500.

The contrast is even sharper, of course, with salaries at the top executive levels of private industry, where the Government must go to recruit its own executive talent.

Randall proposes that top salaries in the Government departments be raised to $50,000 for Cabinet Secretaries, scaling down to $30,000 for heads and board members of the smaller agencies and deputy heads of larger agencies.

By these means it would accomplish two goals: Establish a sound progression from top career salaries to successively higher executive pay levels, and set executive salary levels commensurate with responsibilities.

We believe such a pay scale would produce benefits far exceeding the added costs. It would tend to keep able younger men in Government who would otherwise be attracted by greater prospective rewards into private life. And it would reduce to a more bearable level the sacrifices of able executives leaving private business.

The Committee also recommends that Congressmen's salaries be boosted to $30,000 with added provision for several trips home per year. With Congress demanding virtually the full time of its Members, this is a sensible proposal.

INLAND STEEL CO.,
Chicago, Ill., September 20, 1963.

Hon. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINNEGAN: I write to urge your support for the adjustment in Federal salary systems as recommended by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems in their report of August 16, 1963.

I am sure that the principal argument which will be made against this recommendation is that it is not in keeping with the objective of curtailing Government expenditures in the light of current deficits and the proposed tax cut. Such an argument may appear sound but in my judgment it is not. Actually, it is "penny wise and pound foolish" for the only way to conduct our vast Government operations on an efficient basis is to have the most able men available in positions of responsibility and authority. Such men, in my opinion, would reduce expenditures many times more than the relatively small increases in compensation recomended in this report.

The Panel in its report states: "The total additional salary expense of the pay scales which we suggest will not exceed $20 million a year. This is a small price for correcting the inadequacies of today's compensation, which we are convinced is so low that many able people will not accept public office."

I strongly agree with their statement and urge your support of legislation to effectuate these recommendations.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH L. BLOCK,
Chairman.

Air Route Traffic Control Center, San Antonio, Tex.

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in previous statements on the floor of this House I have recounted the facts concerning a letter I sent to Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, on September 23, 1963. Two weeks after the letter had been mailed to Mr. Halaby there has been no response and it became necessary for me to bring these matters before this Congress. My letter to Mr. Halaby related to the decision of the FAA to close down and abandon a relatively new air route traffic control center in San Antonio, Tex. The decision to close the center down came only 4 years after it had been constructed. In view of the newness and operational efficiency of the center and the fact that closing it down would represent a great amount of waste of public funds as well as hardships for the employees of the center and their families, I decided to look into the matter to ascertain the correctness or wrongness of the FAA decision.

It took only a small amount of investigation to reveal the fact that the decision to abandon the center could not be justified on any rational basis. The best illustration of this is in connection with the investigation by the Comptroller General of the United States into Mr. Halaby's claim that money would be saved by this Government by closing down the San Antonio center and building a new one in the city of Houston. The Comptroller General made his investigation at my request. The results were contained in a 37-page report. The conclusion was as follows:

> We can express no opinion on the reasonableness of the estimated cost savings.

Mr. Speaker, had the Comptroller General proven me wrong I certainly would have acquiesced in the move and explained its necessity and desirability from the Government's point of view to my constituents. But this was not the case and the Comptroller General's report only urged my investigation forward.

Mr. Halaby tried to justify the move largely on the basis of the comparative costs of data processing computers which would have to be installed in ARTC centers all over the country. But in setting forth this argument he tripped himself up. The argument of Mr. Halaby was as follows: There are presently ARTC centers in New Orleans and San Antonio. If we close down the New Orleans and San Antonio centers, and construct a new center at Houston, we would only

have to install one set of computer equipment in Houston instead of two sets of computer equipment in New Orleans and San Antonio. The savings resultant from this would be in excess of $5 million, according to Mr. Halaby. The fallacy of the argument lies in the fact that if we assume that the New Orleans center is to be closed, computer equipment may be installed in the San Antonio center without the construction of a new center. This would not only necessitate the purchase and installation of only one set of computer equipment, but would also result in saving the people the cost of constructing a new center. The difference would be the costs of construction of the new center, and would mean a tremendous savings.

I exposed Mr. Halaby's argument in a speech on the floor of this House on August 13, 1962. In that speech I stated the following:

And the computer is crucial to Mr. Halaby's decision. This is the key to his manuvers. He has injected it into the situation for without it he has no case, as the Comptroller's figures clearly show.

In the justification for the establishment of an air route traffic control center in Houston, a great deal of emphasis is placed on the comparative costs of computers; specifically, the saving in cost through the operation of one computer in Houston versus two computers in New Orleans and San Antonio.

The justification for the establishment of the Houst center based on comparative savings in computer costs over a 16-year period, is completely phony.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the attempt to justify the abandonment of the San Antonio center and the construction of a new one on the basis of comparative costs of computers just as phony now as when it was put forward last year by Mr. Halaby, now Mr. Halaby himself admits it is phony. He makes this admission in his answer to my letter of September 23. In my letter I again raised this question. For almost 3 weeks Mr. Halaby did not even see fit to acknowledge the receipt of my letter, much less answer it. After being prodded on several occasions, he finally did answer my letter. His answer was received by my office on October 11, 1963, 18 days after my letter was mailed to him.

More remarkable than the delay was the answer itself. For in it Mr. Halaby blandly responds to my assertion that "reference to computer costs are meaningless in a comparison of San Antonio versus Houston," by stating "This is true."

Unabashed, the elusive Mr. Halaby then proceeds to take off on a new tack. For the information of my distinguished colleagues and the public, I am inserting in the RECORD the full text of Mr. Halaby's letter to myself and my reply to Mr. Halaby. My letter of September 23 was placed in the RECORD on October 8, 1963:

OCTOBER 11, 1963.

DEAR MR. GONZALEZ: This is in response to your letter of September 23, 1963, stating that, in your judgment, the San Antonio air route traffic control center located in your district should not be closed.

We have answered all of your earlier questions and have attempted to demonstrate several times that the consolidation of the San Antonio and New Orleans centers into a single center at Houston is in the interest of safety, efficiency and economy. Our estimates have also been investigated by the Comptroller General's staff. However, we will consider all your latest arguments on a point-by-point basis and again demonstrate that it is more economical to consolidate at Houston rather than at San Antonio. For ease in reading, we are restating your points with our comment following immediately:

1. "A net reduction in the total number of ARTC centers is accomplished, whether the San Antonio ARTC is retained, or whether the San Antonio ARTC is relocated to Houston."

You are correct.

2. "The introduction of New Orleans costs in the comparison of San Antonio and Houston is improper."

This is not so. The full system impact must be considered. However, for the purpose of this letter, we will consider only these costs that vary depending upon whether the consolidated center is located at Houston or San Antonio.

3. "The central theme is a comparison of the cost of maintaining the San Antonio ARTC center, with the cost of abandoning the San Antonio center and constructing a new center at Houston."

We accept your assumption for the purposes of this letter.

4. "A central location of an ARTC center * * * has not weighed very heavily upon the FAA in considering locations of other FAA centers."

This is false. We have indicated to you previously that, technically and economically, we would prefer to locate a center in the central portion of its area. We also stated that this cannot be accomplished in all areas when the influence of additional important aspects is considered; for example, the availability of commercial communication outlets and other required services associated with, and available near, large populated areas. These factors were overriding considertions when it was determined to retain certain other centers at their present location.

5. "Reference * * * to computer costs are meaningless in a comparison of San Antonio versus Houston."

This is true.

6. "The cost advantage claimed by FAA with respect to microwave links for remote radar fails to consider the feasibility of utilizing common links for more than one remote radar * * * the overall costs for San Antonio will be approximately the same as for Houston."

This is not correct. Your calculations confuse the physical microwave towers with the electronic equipment to make them work. As a matter of fact, we do use common paths wherever possible, but dual radar remotings over a common path still requires twice as much equipment, and additional maintenance overhead. Obviously, we save on tower construction land costs, buildings, fencing, etc., but the additional chanels are not free.

7. "The present ARTC center building in San Antonio is adequate to handle the increased activity resulting from a reapportionment of the New Orleans ARTC area."

This is false. It is necessary to consider operational, equipment, and support space when analyzing the need to establish the consolidated center. Based upon our engineering studies, the San Antonio center would require this expansion and modification.

8. "San Antonio ARTC center meets the standards of recently constructed centers."

9. "The removal of the ARTC center from San Antonio to any other location would have serious consequences on the smooth conduct of military operations from bases at San Antonio."

This is incorrect. This claim is not made by military services. Most military bases are not located adjacent to centers.

10. "The retention of the San Antonio ARTC will represent an immediate savings of $4 million over the construction of a center at Houston."

This is absolutely false. By reference to the enclosed table it will be noted that the additional capital cost of locating the center at Houston rather than San Antonio is $842,000. However, it must also be noted that the $420,000 annual recurring savings realized by the Houston location offsets this additional capital investment in slightly over 2 years. Each additional year means $420,000 savings to the taxpayer.

Incidentally, I was also given a copy of your press release of October 7, 1963, charging waste in our research and development program. I noticed that the items you singled out for comment were the data processing central and the three-dimensional radar, which were both under development by the previous administration and both of which were terminated after a thorough review of our programs by a highly qualified group of systems engineers from industry serving on a Presidential committee.

Even though I directed the termination of these projects after I became Administrator, fairness demands that I point out they provided a good base for determining the equipment requirements for the simpler and more efficient national airspace system under development and construction today.

I trust that I have answered all of your questions and that you no longer have any doubts concerning the wisdom of the move from San Antonio.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

OCTOBER 15, 1963.

Mr. NAJEEB E. HALABY,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALABY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 11, 1963.

In your letter you attempt to answer the questions I raised in my letter of September 23, 1963, regarding the abandonment of the San Antonio air route traffic control center. It was interesting, from a purely analytical point of view, that you now at this late date admit the correctness for a good many points which you have previously denied. For example, you now admit that reference to computer costs are meaningless in a comparison of San Antonio versus Houston. Yet in the letter from your office dated May 21, 1962, in which you tried to justify the move from San Antonio to Houston as an expense savings move you claim a savings of several millions of dollars "on computer planned for installation at all centers." This represents two conflicting positions on your part and a reversal of field which any would-be gridiron hero would do well to emulate when attempting to dodge the opposition. But this matter is no game. Not only taxpayers' money is involved.

While you play Chinese checkers with men and their families and ARTC centers, air traffic remains in a dangerous state of flux. These constant changes, movements, and abandonments of centers which you make and announce in the name of progress and efficiency reflect in my mind uncertainty and a failure to grasp the meaning of your responsibilities to the public. That is why

your answer on computer costs is of a special interest to me. It affords us an insight into your general attitude toward Members of Congress and the public. It is indeed reprehensible for the head of a Federal agency to maintain in writing and over a long period of time that one of the primary reasons for a decision is the cost of certain computers which will have to be installed in a facility, and then for that same Administrator to contradict himself and admit that "computer costs are meaningless." In regard to this point and in regard to the other points raised in my letter of September 23, I charge you with playing with the facts as carelessly as you play with the employees and the air route traffic control centers in the FAA. It would be fruitless, therefore, for me to raise these questions with you again, for each time I have tried to do so in a sincere effort to understand the arbitrary decision to abandon the San Antonio ARTC center I am met by your silence or your slipperiness, as when you take off into a new direction as in the instance of computer costs. You seem to abandon your own position as easily as you abandon ARTC centers throughout the country.

It is also characteristic of you to blame the boondoggling of a hundred million dollars in research and development programs pursued by the FAA on the previous administration. This explanation on your part is not consistent with your previous presentations and assurances to this Congress that the projects for which the research and development funds were being spent by the FAA were proceeding satisfactorily and nearing success. In fact, you yourself stated in 1961 that one of these projects, a three-dimensional radar, capable of portraying the altitude of aircraft, could be installed at Idlewild within 18 months. It is a particular tragedy that such a device was not actually installed prior to the crash of the DC-7B of last November at Idlewild, because if it did the things you said it could do, it might have avoided the crash. In light of the CAB report of that crash recently released in which it is shown that the FAA was responsible for numerous errors of omission at the time of the crash, I am sure you will agree.

These are the things that cause me to worry about the future safety and well-being of air travelers in my district, if you remove the ARTC center from San Antonio, inasmuch as my district is unique and unusual in this respect because of the military air traffic. Surely one does not have to be clairvoyant, or an expert, to know that the San Antonio area is exceptional and unique and that the proper standard of air traffic safety makes it imperative that the installation, or substantial portions of it be retained in San Antonio.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

Support for Prayer Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting herewith an address made by the Reverend George T. Cook, B.A., S.T.B., pastor of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church in Oceanside, Long Island, N.Y.

I am happy to say Dr. Cook is a good friend of mine and we appeared on the same program together when he delivered this address.

I am certain his remarks will prove not only interesting, but inspiring, to all those who read the words of this dedicated man of God and country:

TEXT OF ADDRESS GIVEN BY REV. GEORGE T. COOK, RECTOR, ST. ANDREW'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH, OCEANSIDE, NY., ON SEPTEMBER 22, 1963, AT A SCHOOL PRAYER RALLY SPONSORED BY THE ROCKVILLE CENTER POST 303, INC., THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK

It is a great pleasure and privilege to be able to address this splendid group this afternoon—and to be a part of a rally which supports both God and our Constitution.

I must confess to having been honored when your chairman called me and invited me to appear and protest the Supreme Court decision. I was a little puzzled as to just which decision he had in mind. There aren't more than a scant half dozen handed down over the past decade that shoudn't be disputed, mourned—and if possible, fought. The sum total of the pronouncements of this body have helped pornography, assaulted religion, hamstrung the law-enforcement procedures of our police, invaded individual rights, and given aid to the Communist criminal conspiracy.

However, this rally is, I understand, to protest in particular the decision of Monday, June 25, 1962, wherein public prayer was prohibited in public schools. It might just as well have been held to protest the equally asinine decision of Monday, June 17, 1963, in which the Court ruled out Bible readings in the schools; thereby upholding a self-styled, atheistic slob in her suit against the religious people in these United States.

The majority opinion of each of these decisions was rendered because, the allegedly learned Justices stated, they constitute a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States. As you well know, this amendment reads "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Now this is not a complicated statement. Normally, I would expect the average fifth grader to understand it thoroughly.

Actually the fifth graders in our school do understand it—and would agree with Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, who said, "The Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion—and Congress hasn't. The Supreme Court is without authority to act on the subject."

Howbeit, the Court did make it its business to act, to find and to judge; and this judgment was made on the establishment clause.

The tortuous reasoning used by the Warren Court seems strange to us, and it would have appeared equally strange to Joseph Story, a contemporary of those who wrote the first amendment, and himself a Supreme Court Justice for a 34-year term which began in the year 1811; and the author of a three volume commentary on the Constitution, which is among the most authoritative explaining its meaning.

Many today are not aware of the fact that at the time the first amendment was adopted, some of the individual sovereign States actually had an established church; and accordingly Justice Story writes in his commentary that the sole purpose of the first amendment is to exclude from the National Government all power to act upon the subject.

Nearly 70 years later, Thomas McIntyre Conley, a professor of law at the University of Michigan wrote, in his volume entitled "Principles of Constitutional Law," "By establishment of religion is meant the setting up of a state church * * * or the conferring upon one church special favors and advantages which are denied the others."

A simple, clear and plain interpretation—and one which was universally accepted and understood by everyone since the beginning of our Republic. This is the type of neutrality or indifference to which the Federal Government was lawfully bound, a neutrality which bound said government to show neither special favor nor particular disapprobation to any denomination, and which neutrality it continued to observe for about 170 years.

Now, neutrality means, by definition, being indifferent to something; as taking no sides upon an issue; and therefore it can be an admirable characteristic. Unfortunately, however, like many admirable characteristics, it may be abused, and Jesus recognized this when he affirmed in speaking to his disciples, "He that is not with me is against me."

An axiom that the framers of the first amendment well knew and, which, apparently hasn't occurred to the minds of the Warren Court is the fact that neutralism is only possible in areas where truth is not known. In science, for example, we find differing theories which are consonant with some of the known phenomena, and it is proper to be neutral among them until truth is discovered; but after this point, neutrality is impossible.

We may examine the merits of a brick house versus those of a frame house and possibly and quite properly be neutral, but there can be no such neutrality concerning the multiplication table, nor is a neutral position possible in regard to the Ten Commandments or the Golden Rule.

The ideal of neutrality toward which the Warren Court seems to be striving is not only impossible but quite frankly possessed of evil. The notion that a teacher can teach from a strictly neutral viewpoint is nothing more than an illusion. Just as soon as a teacher begins to interpret a fact—and it makes no difference whether it be historical, scientific, or literary—he must do so in the light of his principles, and these latter are either godly or ungodly. The Warren hallmark of neutrality is not possible.

I am reminded of the story of the small boy who asked his teacher, "Did God make the world?" The teacher replied, "I'll tell you this afternoon." At noon she went to her principal and asked what answer she should give.

The principal replied, "It doesn't make much difference, as long as you explain both sides."

It seems fair to say that the principal's comments would qualify him for Supreme Court appointment.

In truth, however, life is not neutral. There can be no such thing as neutrality in education. It is impossible to teach from a neutral point of view. A schoolteacher must teach either in favor of God or against God: in favor of religious principles or against religious principles, in favor of religious standards or against religious standards. Neutrality in this area is just as impossible as neutrality in regard to the law of gravity. Only where truth is not known, or where there are two or more choices, all of which are moral, can one legitimately be neutral.

Neutrality in the area of truth is not solely the characteristic of the Warren Court. For some odd reason, it seems to be rather a typical symptom of the pseudoliberal syndrome and was shockingly demonstrated by the late high priestess of pseudoliberalism, Eleanor Roosevelt.

In a posthumously published article, Mrs. Roosevelt recounted the occasion when her mother-in-law rebuked her for not telling

her children what was right and what was wrong—the late First Lady answered "Because I don't know myself. This was true; quite young I had learned that I couldn't tell the difference between what was right and what was wrong." And she couldn't. And equally apparently the Supreme Court has the same disease in trying to tell the religious people of our United States to be neutral between God and atheism. And that is precisely what the Supreme Court has done. In effect, our Government, in attempting to be neutral, has granted the right of the atheists to speak about atheism in the public schools and forbidden the religious person to speak of his beliefs. The people who believed most have been forced to give way to the people who believe least and finally to those who believe nothing. And this has all been done under the guise of neutrality.

One thing is most apparent. At some place along the line the Warren court has lost sight not only of the intent and meaning of the first amendment, it has also forgotten, if it ever knew, the fact that truth is never neutral. There are no moral neutralities. The fallacy of their neutral position is illustrated in the character of Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor. Pilate was the Roman Procurator placed over Judah. He was Caesar's representative and viceroy. What Tiberius himself was in Rome, Pontius Pilate was in Jerusalem. Now, Pilate knew that Christ was an innocent man, but he was not strong enough in character to maintain the position that right be enforced; he rather attempted to maintain a position of neutrality between right and wrong, hiding his cowardice behind a facade of neutrality. What should Pilate have done? He should have taken sides. He should have taken the right side. Instead, however, he attempted to maintain neutrality: and was carried captive by the bloodthirsty cries of the enemies of Christ and thereby demonstrated for all time the great dangers that lie in attempting to maintain neutrality in a moral crisis which demanded a choice between right and wrong and which forbade neutrality. One wonders how the learned justices of our Supreme Court have failed to profit from Pilate's example. It is possible that Justice Stewart alone has read the words of the great poet Dante, who made the trenchant affirmation that "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis remain neutral."

Unfortunately this great push for neutrality has not only infected the pseudoliberals in government, it has also epidemically spread among the foggy pseudoliberal thinkers in eccelesiastical fields. This was made manifest when the Court's decision was hailed by a small but loudmouthed group of confused clergy, some of whom had previously demonstrated their aptitude for natural foolishness by publicly opposing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by calling for the admission of Red China to the U.N.; in urging clemency for convicted spies; in urging warfare against the McCarran Act; have been apologists for Alger Hiss; have been chummy with the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship; have supported the National Council of Churches in its headlong rush toward socialism; and have urged abstention from atomic testing even unilaterally if necessary. It should be no matter of great surprise that they are wrong again in spite of the fact that at least one poll has shown that 70 percent of the people in the United States disagree with the Court's decision.

Some years ago A. A. Hodge, of Princeton, penned these words:

"I am as sure as I am of the fact of Christ's reign that a comprehensive and centralized system of national education, separated from religion, as it is now commonly proposed, will prove the most appealing enginery for the propagation of anti-Christian and atheistic unbelief, and of antisocial nihilistic ethics, individual, social, and political, which this sin-rent world has ever seen * * *.

"It is capable of exact demonstration that if every party in the State has the right of excluding from the public schools whatever he does not believe to be true, then he that believes most must give way to him that believes least, and then he that believes least must give way to him that believes absolutly nothing, no matter in how small a minority atheists or the agnostics may be. It is self-evident that on this scheme, if it is consistently and persistently carried out in all parts of the country, the U.S. system of national popular education will be the most efficient and wide instrument for the propagation of atheism which the world has ever seen."

These words have not been freshly written. They were, as a matter of fact, written shortly after the American Civil War.

It has remained for our generation to see the final exaltation of atheism by a group of six men who cannot understand history's clear lesson that neutrality between right and wrong is and always will be both disastrous and impossible.

General Pulaski, Polish-American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, on October 11 freedom-loving Americans observed the 184th anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the famous Polish-American hero of the Revolutionary War period. Each year, on the anniversary of this brave soldier who gave his life for the cause of American freedom, we acknowledge the debt we owe to his memory and we observe Pulaski Day in many parts of the country with appropriate ceremonies.

Like his kinsman Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, Pulaski left his native Poland and came to the American Colonies to assist our budding Nation in its fight for independence. He contributed much toward victory, including his own life on October 11, 1779, when he fell in battle during the siege of Savannah. He was only 31 years old at the time of his death, but during this brief period of life he proved himself a gallant fighter for freedom, first for the freedom of Poland from Russian domination, and later for the freedom of the American Colonies.

George Washington was much impressed with Pulaski's military experience and put him in charge of organizing the cavalry. Pulaski participated in the battle of Germantown and Trenton, then was attached to the main army at Valley Forge during the winter of 1777–78, and later was detailed to the southern campaign where he subsequently lost his life at Savannah.

Today, 184 years later, we pay tribute to the memory of this man who came to our shores to help us attain liberty and justice. His own homeland Poland was not free then, as it is not free in our own day. Thus, Pulaski's cause for freedom remains our cause today and the cause of all mankind. Let us hope that very soon, in our lifetime, we shall yet see a liberated and happy Poland flourishing in Europe as it did in the past.

Americans of Polish origin have made great contributions to every sphere of activity in this country. They have helped to enrich it in many ways by their culture, religion, and love for freedom. I salute them on this anniversary of the Polish-American hero Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

What REA Means to Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy left Washington last month to visit various parts of the country and to discuss the progress which is being made toward the conservation and development of our national resources.

This act of leadership by the President served to underscore the fact that this is one Nation, indeed, and that our very interdependence has helped to make us strong and productive. Each segment of our population and geographical section has a definite role to play in keeping our country dynamic and prosperous. We cannot afford to let any segment or section fall behind or be denied the opportunity to share in our advancing technology and rising standard of living.

At Grand Forks, N. Dak., President Kennedy spoke on rural electrification and what it means, not only to those rural people who were able to get electric service for the first time through the assistance of the Rural Electrification Administration, but the entire Nation. He made an effective answer to those who say that REA's job is finished.

Under unanimous consent I bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a news account and editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 25, 1963]

KENNEDY MAKES STRONG DEFENSE OF REA AS BOON TO U.S. FARMERS—IT WILL HELP GIVE THEM PARITY OF OPPORTUNITY, HE SAYS ON WESTERN TRIP

(By James Deakin)

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., September 25.—President John F. Kennedy outlined today a new goal for America's farmers, parity of opportunity with city dwellers, and said that the rural electrification program is a cornerstone of that goal.

Mr. Kennedy began the second day of his western tour with a strong defense of the rural electrification program, which has come under attack from some Republicans, including Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

In a speech at the University of North Dakota, he praised the program as a sound investment that has had a remarkable fi-

nancial success. He noted that total losses on the $5 billion lent by the Federal Government to bring electric power to rural areas have been less than $50,000.

TASK NOT COMPLETED

"There is reason to take some satisfaction from this record," he said, "but there is no reason to assume that the task of rural electrification has been completed. It is not. So long as electricity is not available at reasonable rates on our farms and in our small towns, rural areas are at a disadvantage."

GOLDWATER and other critics of the Rural Electrification Administration have questioned the wisdom of continuing Federal assistance in this program. There have been repeated suggestions that it be turned over to private power companies.

The President replied indirectly to these critics, saying that history has shown that where rural consumers are concerned, obtaining power at reasonable rates is facilitated by a vigorous, healthy, and adequately financed rural electric cooperative system.

SERVING AS YARDSTICK

"The rural cooperatives," he said, "serve not merely to provide power themselves but as a yardstick of reasonableness and a guarantor of fair treatment for all.

"There are some who say that the rural electrification loan program gives the cooperatives an advantage over private utilities.

"But the reason is that rural electric cooperatives largely serve the remote and sparsely settled rural areas largely bypassed by commercial utilities."

The President reminded his listeners that he had strongly endorsed the huge Garrison reclamation project in North Dakota and said he was "confident that it will soon be making a major contribution to the future development of this State."

The Garrison project will be the largest reclamation development in the Missouri River Basin.

From the university, where he received an honorary degree, Mr. Kennedy flew to Cheyenne, where he will change to a smaller plane and go on to Laramie for a speech at the University of Wyoming.

The President began his 5-day, 11-State tour in sunny weather at Milford, Pa., where he dedicated the home of Conservationist Gifford Pinchot as an institute for conservation studies.

When he arrived in Duluth, Minn., his second stop, he encountered overcast skies and a steady drizzle. As soon as he landed in Duluth, he switched to a helicopter for one of many helicopter rides on the trip and backtracked 75 miles to Ashland, Wis., east of Duluth.

FLIES OVER SUPERIOR

The helicopter flight took him over the Apostle Islands in Lake Superior, which have been suggested as a national recreation area. The helicopter skirted the storm area and he saw only 2 of the more than 20 islands.

From Ashland, Mr. Kennedy flew back to Duluth, again by helicopter. In Duluth, a city with a 1960 population of 106,000, he received the biggest welcome of the day. Thousands of persons lined the streets in the rain to greet him.

In an address last night before a Great Lakes regional conference on "Land and People" the President appeared to set the tone for his reelection campaign next year.

"This country is rich and prosperous; it can be more prosperous; it has doubled its income in the last 50 years," he said.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 27, 1963]

REA'S CONTINUING TASK

President Kennedy spoke to a sympathetic audience when in his speech in North Dakota he praised the Rural Electrification Administration and its accomplishments for rural America. He told his hearers no more than they already knew when he said "there is no reason to assume that the task of rural electrification has been completed" and described its objective as parity of opportunity with city dwellers for rural Americans.

But unfortunately and incredibly, there are Members of Congress who appear not to realize that REA and the cooperative distribution systems it has financed have any more work to do, as evidenced by the efforts of some Republicans headed by Senator GOLDWATER of Arizona to scrap the agency. They note that whereas only 11 percent of American farms were electrified when REA began, 96 percent now are, and they conclude it's all over but the shouting.

Is it so difficult to understand that once an electric system assumes responsibility for service it assumes the responsibility to keep its system growing with the demand, and that growth requires credit? Rural electric co-ops, being marginal operations, must depend on the Federal Government for credit; privately owned power companies, which are immensely profitable, can get theirs from commercial sources. REA is the agency that extends the necessary credit to the co-ops.

Without credit, the rural electric cooperatives could not supply the growing demands on them for electricity by heavying up their distribution lines to carry increased loads and by increasing their supplies either through purchase or by their own generation. The demands on the cooperatives are doubling every 7 to 10 years, as is consumption.

Would anti-REA Members of Congress say that when private power companies reach virtually all the available customers their credit should be cut off as no longer needed? We rather imagine not. The task of putting money to productive work is then just started, and the same is true for the rural co-ops which now serve 5,140,000 consumers.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, several times during the past few weeks, I have had opportunity to call attention to the growing support for my bill, House Joint Resolution 658, to declare 1964 as "See America Year." I have now received encouragement from 20 State travel and recreation agencies, numerous private and municipal tourist bureaus and organizations, and from individual citizens all over the country. Two recent additions to the lengthening list are the Carolina Motor Club, of North Carolina, and the Community Civic Leaders of Northern Illinois; their letters are included at the end of my remarks.

My resolution, which is aimed at lessening the effect of American tourism abroad on our serious balance-of-payments deficit, offers a noncoercive means of encouraging Americans to do their tourist traveling in the United States next year. In addition to aiding the balance-of-payments situation which is expected to be crucial in 1964, the resolution has the added benefit of urging a greater appreciation for the beauties and history of our country. It may be of some interest to my colleagues to know that favorable reports have now been received from the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Treasury and is expected shortly from Interior, and that the bill also has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

The letters follow:

COMMUNITY CIVIC LEADERS OF NORTHERN ILLINOIS AND CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA,
Cicero, Ill., October 12, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Just a note of congratulation on your fine work in the Halls of the Lawmakers.

Also at this time want to congratulate you on your efforts to have the President of the United States declare 1964 "See America First Year."

Having noticed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you have received many letters from private interest tourist groups, knowing the financial value a program as this will be to all States, but the greatest value will be to stimulate the grassroots people into wanting to see America.

Many grassroots groups in our organization covering 234 towns said they will follow the President's message of July urging Americans to learn more about their country.

And in closing will say if a tax cut comes, with "See America First" the savings will be spent all over the United States, helping all States.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. THOMAS,
Coordinator.

CAROLINA MOTOR CLUB, INC.,
Charlotte, N.C., October 1, 1963.

Hon. AL ULLMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am sure that you would be interested in the attached copy of resolution of commendation passed at the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Carolina Motor Club, in session September 14–16, 1963.

Sincerely,

T. E. PICKARD, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

"TRAVEL U.S.A. IN 1964" ENCOURAGED

Being in hearty agreement with the "Travel U.S.A. in 1964" theme proposed by Congressman AL ULLMAN, H.R. 658, introduced August 21, 1963, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the board of directors urges that the President issue the requested proclamation and that the Department of Commerce offer the program its full support.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

What Government Should Know About Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material on advertising. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert additional material on this subject which is very interesting and informative. "What Government Should Know About Advertising," by Mr. John Crichton, president, American Association of Advertising Agencies, follows:

WHAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD KNOW ABOUT ADVERTISING

(By John Crichton)

GOVERNMENT SHOULD UNDERSTAND THE POSITIVE VALUES OF ADVERTISING

It should understand that advertising provides an important consumer function—that it informs the consumer of new products, new product developments and services, and that it enormously accelerates the movement of new products, new services and new ideas into the mainstream of our life.

It should understand that advertising is a controlled sales message, directed through media to the most likely audience for a product or service. It should understand that there is no cheaper method of extending the selling functions; that, in fact, advertising is now so much cheaper than any other kind of salesmanship—including the postal card, the letter, the telephone call, or the personal call—that it has earned an ineradicable place in our whole commercial structure.

It should understand that advertising provides an important consumer benefit in the encouragement of manufacturers to build a brand name, a brand reputation, and a brand franchise. It should understand that the belief that improvements in product, in design, in product performance and durability, is basic to our whole manufacturing structure. And that the news of these improvements is funneled to the consumer through advertising.

It should understand that advertising is often a battleground of benefits. Because we are a competitive business serving a competitive business, much of advertising is the most competitive aspect of our competitive system. One manufacturer makes a product break-through, and announces it through advertising. Instantly his competition is at work, trying to match it, and hopefully to improve it, and the results of that intensified competition will be advertised. In every case, the consumer is the winner. The benefits, spurred by competition, are in his interest.

To take a case in point, consider the recent extension of warranties in the automobile business. The major manufacturers have vied with each other to extend the length of time the consumer will be protected against product failure. They have announced this extension repeatedly in advertising. If there were no advertising, how would this important consumer benefit be made known? Or, put another way, without advertising—and without its battleground-of-benefits aspect—would there be the competitive pressure to achieve these notable advances in consumer benefits?

It is interesting that behind the Iron Curtain, in Russia and some of its European satellites, advertising is being encouraged. It is being encouraged to produce these results: the improvement of products, the pride of the manufacturer in those products, a better informed consumer, greater benefits to the consumer.

It should be evident that advertising plays a certain kind of role in economics, regardless of political structure. In an industrial economy, particularly in one with a flourishing or an emerging consumer economy, advertising is essential.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT ADVERTISING IS ESSENTIAL TO OUR KIND OF FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM AND TO AN INDUSTIALIZED ECONOMY

The American economy is a complicated mechanism of two main parts: production and distribution. It is only through distribution—when buyers are induced to buy—that goods are moved, services are rendered, factories and farms are kept busy.

One of our Nation's problems today is how to move our vast and growing output through the channels of trade to the ultimate consumers. The continuous expansion of U.S. production and distribution will become more difficult—and essential—as the prospective impact of automation, the growth of foreign production, and other such factors are sustained. The responsibility for moving goods falls on the dynamic activities of distribution which stimulate buyers to buy. There are only four of these dynamic activities: personal selling, sales promotion, display, and advertising.

And of them, advertising is to distribution what the machine is to production. It is the means of greater and faster accomplishment in the least amount of time at the lowest possible unit cost. Through the application of advertising in our magazines, newspapers, and other printed media and on radio and television stations, sellers have been able to find customers for their enormously increased volume of goods and services.

The population of the United States now stands at more than 187 million and a population of 260 million is less than 20 years away. Only an industrial economy can support that kind of population at Western levels of living. To make that vast industrial economy go, America needs an aggressive, expanding consumer economy. And that is where advertising comes in.

An industrial economy is not necessarily either comfortable or esthetic. A great many people, particularly intellectuals and writers, are appalled by an industrial society, and their revulsion works its way into print. Advertising, as one of the most apparent symbols of that society at work, naturally catches a great deal of that criticism and resentment. It does so because it is the obvious and intrusive element of an industrialized society—and in many cases, it is the industrialized society, not advertising itself, to which the objection is really addressed.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD UNDERSTAND ADVERTISING'S CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC GROWTH

Our Government has placed great emphasis on increasing the growth rate of our economy. It has pinned a great deal of its political prestige on its ability to increase the rate of growth of our national product.

This is an objective which is sympathetically—or enthusiastically—regarded in business circles. In our economy, the average businessman is both an expansionist and an optimist. He is more of a contributor than a custodian. He wants to grow. Few businesses stay small through choice.

It is important to us as a Nation that this growth rate be accelerated. To meet our huge population growth, we need new industries and new jobs. Our booming population will have two distinctive aspects: there will be many young people, and many older people. We will have to provide educational and training facilities for one group, and we will have to provide medical, recreational, and vocational facilities for the other. In any case, it will be a severe test of our social inventiveness and our social imagination.

And, while we are busy at home, we will be facing a different and difficult prospect abroad.

In the European Economic Community, we will face stiff competition, and we will have to become flexible enough to join in that competition, holding our share of markets and increasing it.

In Latin America, the Orient, and Africa, emerging nations and newly industrialized nations will offer both great problems and great opportunities for marketing and growth.

All advertising men agree that advertising is an instrument of economic growth. We think of its role in the introduction of new products, of its role in expanding markets, of its missionary capacity to bring better ways of living to more and more people.

The Government is interested in this aspect of advertising. The Department of Commerce has asked the advertising groups represented on its Advertising Advisory Committee to help in answering such basic questions as:

What is the contribution of advertising to the growth of the gross national product?

What is the contribution of new products to national growth, and how does advertising help in promotion of new product introduction?

What possibilities are there of cushioning business cycles with advertising expenditures?

These are all good questions. They are also difficult, and no ready answers exist for them. The last major study of advertising and its economic effect is about 20 years old, and those 20 years have marked such a transformation in our economy as to make that study seem more dated than it perhaps is.

The committee, working with the Department, hopes to make a contribution to economic thinking on these subjects. It will be a long, slow process. No results this year, next year, or perhaps for the next 5. But if it can be achieved, the committee may have set a benchmark in advertising's relations with economists and Government which will be most helpful.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD UNDERSTAND ADVERTISING'S BASIC ATTITUDE TOWARD GOVERNMENT REGULATION

This is a thorny and difficult topic. The simple answer is that the advertising business is opposed to regulation, and that it believes self-regulation is the more desirable and more effective and more equitable alternative.

But in point of historical fact, many advertising men have not thought so, and do not think so.

Part of this dichotomy of opinion is personal. Advertising men, like all businessmen, are somewhat divided between their business views and their personal views. After all, each is a consumer as well as a practitioner of advertising; each is a citizen; each has a stake in the Government and its powers.

The financial community is frequently irked by the Securities and Exchange Commission's attitude on various questions, and they mutter about the Commission's pettifogging and nitpicking. But certainly no responsible financial people would seriously argue for the removal of SEC. Most other businessmen—as investors—have a right to be grateful to SEC and perhaps would favor a more rigid exercise of its powers.

In the same way, few advertising men would seriously advocate the abolition of the Federal Trade Commission or the Food and Drug Administration. They recognize the theoretical value and the practical good work done by these bodies. The same general view might hold for other regulatory bodies—the Federal Aviation Agency, the Federal Communications Commission, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Treasury Department. One may quarrel with a specific instance of a bureau's work; one can hardly quarrel with the utility and overall practice of these units. They are run by honest and dedicated men.

It may be useful to recall that the Federal Trade Commission was established with the support of the advertising business; that for nearly the first decade of its existence, it dealt only with unfair competitive practice, and had no advertising powers; that the acquisition of advertising authority came in 1938, with the adoption of the Wheeler-Lea amendments, and that this acquisition of power was broadly supported by the advertising business—including the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

For many years the FTC reported how many advertisements it studied during the year, how many were investigated, and how many were found to have cause for action. The number was invariably minuscule, as a proportion of the total number surveyed. Those statistics have not recently been published, and it would be helpful if they were revived, because it might be useful to the joint understanding—business and government—of what small dimensions dishonest and misleading advertising actually has.

Recently, the FTC has been seeking legislation which would broaden its powers, through preliminary cease-and-desist orders—actually temporary injunctions. AAAA and some other advertising groups opposed that legislation, not because they didn't see the need, or because they didn't believe that the powers would be applied fairly, but because they thought FTC's present powers were sufficient. In short, advertising people understood the problem, but thought that the apparatus of solution was inappropriate.

For one thing, AAAA pointed out that the Commission already has temporary injunctive power through the courts in cases involving food, drugs, and cosmetics. We pointed out that in the cases where it has invoked this power, it has a remarkable batting average—39 cases out of 42. If FTC had merely proposed to extend its rights to go through the courts in other fields, AAAA might not have been in opposition.

Also, if one looks fairly at the highly publicized cases involving television commercials in which the FTC became engaged 2 years ago, it seems impossible not to feel that in most of them the FTC has somehow become engaged in trivia. Some of these cases are now before the courts, and presumably there will be final adjudication of the rights and wrongs in each case. But one cannot avoid feeling that the power and majesty of the U.S. Government could be better employed than in a debate over the validity of a prop in a commercial where there is no indication that the public was misled as to the qualities of the product.

n summary, most advertising men believe in self-regulation in an overall, broad sense. On the whole Government has been inclined to encourage self-regulation and to be influenced by its existence or intent. At the same time, where self-regulation cannot be effective, the Government needs some instrument of correction. It has it, and most advertising men approve its use, while differing over specific applications of the power.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD APPRECIATE THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING IN BUILDING SALES, PROFITS, AND TAX REVENUES

The correlation of rising sales, rising advertising expenditures, and rising tax payments to the Government ought to interest even the most callous administrator. It would develop that the Government must have a kind of proprietory interest in good advertising which helps to produce more sales, more profits, more taxes.

"The thoughtless criticism of advertising," according to Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce of the United States, "reflects a profound ignorance of advertising's indispensable role in our economy. Without your ability to stimulate a constantly expanding demand for goods and services, our gross national product would not have doubled in the past 20 years. We certainly could not expect our GNP this year to be about $50 billion more than last year."

Secretary Hodges continued: "Most of the things we can do as a nation to increase our rate of economic growth depend upon larger capital investment—both private and public. These investments, in turn, depend directly or indirectly through taxes upon adequate business profits.

"Profits make possible the investments that create jobs and expand our production in goods and services. But to keep this cycle moving and spiraling upward, the things we produce have to be sold—potential demand has to be transformed into actual sales—so the anticipated profits can be realized, new business investments can be made, new jobs created, and productive capacity further expanded.

"In this context, advertising is not simply a competitive device. It is an indispensable instrument of our economic forward movement."

If one agrees with the Secretary's thesis, must he not also agree that any action by Government to discriminate against or to otherwise restrict advertising would retard—not accelerate—our economic forward movement?

As we see it, here is a paradox: On one hand the administration is calling for ambitious gains in the gross national product, and, on the other, Government, from time to time, considers legislation and regulatory activity that would retard economic means for realizing those gains. Government should think carefully before restricting or regulating what is so productive an indirect source of revenue.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE COGNIZANT OF THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING IN SUPPORTING OUR TREMENDOUS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Our magazines, our newspapers, our broadcasting, outdoor, transit, and direct mail facilities are much admired. They give our Nation a kind of social cohesiveness. They permit new ideas about products and services and new ways of living to be rapidly transmitted. These media act as social cement. They make us a far more homogenous country. They are superbly geared for the high speed transmission of reporting of events and ideas.

Advertising uses these facilities commercially. To the Government, they have a far different function. Those communication facilities are of paramount importance to the Government: the quick news flash, the televised press conference, the speech to the Nation, the editorial comment, the magazine article—all play an important part in the Government's plans.

They enable the Government to explain quickly and fully its position on taxation or foreign trade. The President can go on the air to explain the Government's decision on the Cuban crisis and to try to explain to our citizens and the people of the world the gravity of the issues at stake.

All of these facilities are advertising-supported. Many could exist, of course, without advertising. But they would not be so economical, and, probably, they would not be as good. In communication, the excellence of those facilities is, in large part, traceable to their acceptance and active solicitation of advertsing.

The alternatives are inferior facilities which are expensive to the consumer, or subsidized facilities. Subsidized facilties historically have lacked both confidence and competence—confidence from the consumer, who distrusts the Government-sponsored organ, and competence from the practitioner.

Advertising expands markets. It makes more goods and services available to more people. It stimulates sales. It influences our whole economy.

As a stimulus to an expanding standard of living, advertising is a natural resource which can be justified economically, intellectually, and socially.

There is no conflict between business and government on the subject of increasing the Nation's economic growth rate. There should be no indisposition in government toward advertising as a prime mover of the economy. Advertising helps bring the products of a tremendous technology to a market of unprecedented buying power—a market which has a hunger for new and better products and new and better ways to live.

By understanding the important role of this most articulate and visible portion of American business, legislators, and administrative officials can do much to assure the future effectiveness of advertising in our dynamic society.

Propaganda Films Designed To Promote the United States Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished editor of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., Mr. Thomas R. Waring, was recently in Washington to attend the State Department's briefing on foreign affairs for various newsmen across the country. During a portion of this briefing, Mr. Waring was startled to view a film by the U.S. Information Service, which film downgrades the South, and in doing so, distorts and rewrites some important

points of American history. Mr. Waring's report on this film was first printed in the News and Courier, and it has since been printed in the State of Columbia, S.C., on October 15, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USIS FILM DOWNGRADES SOUTH—PICTURE TO BE SHOWN ABROAD FULL OF INACCURACIES

(By Thomas R. Waring, editor, the News and Courier)

WASHINGTON.—Propaganda films designed to promote the United States overseas, which ordinarily are not seen in this country, were exhibited yesterday during a State Department seminar on foreign policy for several hundred press, radio and TV people from all over the Nation.

One of the films contained an item of hostile criticism directed against a minority group of American citizens. This article concerns a sequence aimed at white people who oppose integration.

In common with propaganda from other lands, the handsomely produced motion picture, called "Five Cities in June," contains some false history and some distortion of current conditions.

The false history concerns the American Civil War. The picture, a product of the U.S. Information Agency, which plans to translate it into 30 languages for exhibition all over the world, says the war "was fought and won for Negro equality."

Abraham Lincoln, the President who ran that war, said both before and during the conflict that freeing the slaves was not the reason that the Union fought the Confederacy. He said that if he could preserve the Union by keeping some or all of the Negroes in slavery, he would do so. On many occasions, he stated in plain terms his disbelief in equality of the races.

The distortion occurs in failing to suggest the dimensions of the race problem that has created turmoil not only in the Deep South, but in many northern cities. In view of these flaws, it is hard to understand why the subject was broached.

The five cities portrayed in this otherwise praiseworthy and patriotic film are Rome, during the death of Pope John XXIII and during the coronation of his successor; an unidentified city in the Soviet Union, where rockets are launched in secrecy that vividly contrasts with America's public launchings at Cape Canaveral; a village in South Vietnam being ravaged by Communists; Tuscaloosa, Ala., at the time when Federal force was exerted to make Governor Wallace stand aside for two Negroes students at the University of Alabama, and Berlin during the visit of President John F. Kennedy. Hundreds of thousands cheered him, while on the other side of the wall all was gloomy silence.

In verification of the spoken words about white Americans of the South, this text was obtained after the showing of the USIA film and is reproduced here in slightly abbreviated form:

"The eyes of the world shifted (from the blazing village in South Vietnam) to the small city of Tuscaloosa, Ala., within the Deep South of the United States of America.

"It was a familiar story. It started before the War between the States, a hundred years ago, which was fought and won for Negro equality. Negroes were taken out of slavery and their freedom was guaranteed * * * but barriers were put in front of them * * * especially within the States that had lost the Civil War * * * the States of the Southeast. The Constitution of the United States came under debate as to whether it prohibited or acknowledged such barriers. In 1954 it was made clear by the Supreme Court that the Constitution guaranteed equality for all. And so the great tests were made * * * tests that brought mob disorder and violence to the South * * * and that required Federal troops to insure the admittance of Negro students to schools other than those reserved for Negroes only.

"Though the vast majority of the United States was in sympathy with the Negro, some of the citizens were not. Though the United States Government supported the Negro, some of the separate State governments did not. And now the test of Tuscaloosa, Ala.—the last State of the Deep South to resist integration of the schools * * * it was, in effect, a single defiant governor holding with strength to the weak mores of the past, against the Constitution, government and will of the United States—both Negro and white.

"With the protection of Federal marshals, Vivian Malone and James Hood entered the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa. There was no violence and the Governor conceded. The law of the land was enforced by the Government to protect two citizens.

"This was not the end of race prejudice in the South, but the Government and people had made clear that the Negro is an equal citizen and is entitled to and shall get freedom of choice.

"Wherever free men live, their most sacred request—their most sacred right is for freedom of choice. To bypass all prejudice * * * to worship where they want to worship * * * and to go where they want to go."

The next sequence was Berlin and Mr. Kennedy's triumph. A short time later Mr. Kennedy himself appeared on the platform where the screen had stood for the projection of the USIA film. He spoke off the record.

Neither President Kennedy nor anyone else during his 2-day discussion of world problems and domestic issues made reference to the rights of white Southerners, to their freedom of choice, to their desires to live as they want to, and to worship and to go as they please, without threat of tear gas guns in the hands of U.S. marshals and bayonets of U.S. soldiers.

Tax Cuts and Higher Federal Spending Pose Inflationary Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently a large number of warnings have appeared in the press concerning the possibly inflationary situation that may be developing in our economy. In spite of the denials of the administration, the truth of the matter clearly seems to be that tax cuts accompanied by even higher level of Federal spending will be inflationary. An article in the Wall Street Journal of October 16 discusses a study made by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and published in its most recent business survey which suggests that the recent upward price trend may spread. The situation the bank says, calls for "a closer rein on Federal spending."

Although the bank does not believe that there will be any large-scale breakout of price increases, it does say that enough price rises have occurred to caution "that a more generalized price pressure may be lurking rather close to the surface of the economy." A tax cut when business activity is rising, although warranted by the long-range benefits, "carries definite risks" and calls for care in both monetary and fiscal policies, the bank says.

I include the article from the October 16 Wall Street Journal discussing the Morgan Guaranty study in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 16, 1963]

MORGAN GUARANTY SEES NO DEFINITE INFLATION IN RECENT PRICE BOOSTS—BUT BANK SAYS THE INCREASES MAY SPREAD, URGES CLOSER REIN ON GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

NEW YORK.—Recent price increases on a variety of industrial products offer "no sure sign of a new inflationary spiral," Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York said in its monthly business survey.

But the bank suggested the upward price trend may spread, and said the situation calls for "a closer rein on Federal spending."

"The present state of market forces augurs against any large-scale breakout of price increases," Morgan Guaranty said. "Enough upticks have occurred, however, to caution that a more generalized price pressure may be lurking rather close to the surface of the economy."

That danger, the bank continued, "lends added urgency to the growing insistence that reduction of Federal income taxes be accompanied by a new restraint in Government spending." It said a tax cut when business activity is rising, although well warranted by the prospective long-range benefit," is a move "that carries definite risks" and calls for care in both monetary and fiscal policies.

Morgan Guaranty described recent price boosts in several industries as "a selective upward probing of price levels," after "a long period during which the industrial price structure was distinctly soft."

"Markups on aluminum, lead, and some kinds of steel have received most attention, but increases have also been posted for quite a number of other items, ranging in diversity from terry cloth to axles for railway cars," the bank said.

Weighing the business outlook for the rest of this year, Morgan Guaranty termed the sharp September–October rise in automobile output highly promising. It noted the industry turned out 504,000 cars in September and is aiming at 810,000 this month, and said sales of the new models indicate high output will continue.

The President's Page—Tax Reduction Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the National League of Insured Savings Associations is carrying on a campaign with respect to the tax reduction bill, as reflected in the official publication of that organization in an article in the October issue, in the form of an editorial signed by Mr. Harold P. Halleen, who is

president of the National League and chief executive officer of the Bell Savings & Loan Association in Chicago. It seems to me the article is worthy of notice, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX REDUCTION LEGISLATION

One of the most important issues now pending in Congress is the question of Federal tax reduction.

Savings and loan associations have a direct interest in the outcome of the debate on taxation inasmuch as (1) the program will mean a tax reduction for all business corporations, including savings and loan associations; (2) the tax reduction as proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee could serve to stimulate the Nation's economy and help to reduce in the long run the Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

Our analysis of materials supplied to us by the Secretary of the Treasury indicates that the tax bill would help to reduce the number of home mortgage loan defaults and foreclosures and expand the housing market as the result of the stimulating effect of tax reduction on the economy.

In addition to providing a much needed shot in the arm to the American economy, the tax reduction bill would also help to provide a long-term solution to the Nation's balance-of-payments problem. A more vigorous economy would help immeasurably in attracting investment capital back into the United States as well as provide a sharper edge of competition between the U.S. and foreign manufacturing concerns in the dollar market areas.

For the foregoing reasons, the savings and loan business should vigorously support efforts to secure enactment of tax reduction legislation in 1963. I am pleased to report that members of the National League have voted overwhelmingly and almost unanimously on the tax reduction program and I am hoping that each savings and loan manager will take a moment or two to communicate their views on this matter to their representatives in Washington.

HAROLD P. HALLEEN.

Success in Apprenticeship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the publication Machinist, which is published by the International Association of Machinists, carried in its September 19 edition an excellent article on how this international union is trying to prepare young Americans for jobs in the tool and die industry.

The apprenticeship program, initiated in Chicago, is part of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

My committee recently recommended extension of this very important legislation, and I think the program started in Chicago by the Tool and Die Makers Lodge, No. 113, IAM, shows most conclusively how effective this program can be.

I believe Mr. Frank E. Thomas, business representative of the local 113, deserves the highest commendation for calling this article to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

PREAPPRENTICESHIP: NEW CONCEPT WORKING OUT FINE

A new concept in training apprentices is working out splendidly in Chicago, Frank Thomas, a representative of IAM Tool and Die Makers Lodge 113, reports. This concept is a preapprenticeship program for the machinist and tool and die trades—the first one of its kind in the trade. The program, financed under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act, was started last April with the enrollment of 11 young men at Washburne Trade School. However, the initiative for the program had been supplied 6 months before that by representatives of lodge 113 and IAM district 8. Now in full swing, 110 trainees are learning and working 6 hours a day, 5 days a week, in a 48-week course of concentrated instruction in shop practices and related classroom study. The trainees receive $20 a week subsistence allowance. A faculty of 12 is supervised by Edward G. Kasang. The course is designed to provide a foundation in the trade and consists of work normally taught during the first year of regular apprenticeship. The trainees, 18 to 24 years old and unemployed, were selected by the Illinois State Employment Service on the basis of aptitude tests, without regard to race. As it turned out, they reside in every section of the city and about a fourth are Negroes. After completion of the course, placement in jobs will be handled jointly by the U.S. Bureau of Apprenticeship and the Employment Service.

Area Redevelopment Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, while the Government is busy doing for us, it seems that some people think they need do very little for the country—or themselves.

I refer to a letter I have received from Donald L. Floan, a consulting engineer at East Grand Forks, Minn. Mr. Floan is involved in performing professional services for municipalities. It happens that Mr. Floan's area, like one-third of all the counties in the United States, is classified as a "depressed area."

Mr. Floan indicates that some Federal programs tend to rob communities and individuals of initiative to solve their own problems. Mr. Floan's letter speaks for itself:

EAST GRAND FORKS, MINN.,
October 3, 1963.

Congressman ALBERT QUIE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: As a consulting engineer with offices in a "depressed area," performing professional services primarily for municipalities which services involve design and supervising construction of sewer, water, and paving projects, etc., I would like to comment on S. 1163 which would enlarge Area Redevelopment Administration activities.

Because many ARA projects involve engineering work, it is quite natural to presume that consultants would, for selfish reasons, be in favor of expanding ARA activities.

This, however, is not the case because the ARA program appears actually to be causing problems of unemployment rather than alleviating them.

Many communities thinking that they may someday, some way, receive a grant through the ARA program, have postponed construction of projects which might otherwise now be under construction.

I sincerely ask that you do all in your power to prevent passage of S. 1163, as the ARA program, like so many other "aid" programs, does far more harm than good.

Yours very truly,

DONALD L. FLOAN.

New England Council Helps Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable work done by the New England Council in stimulating economic growth and encouraging investment in the six Northeastern States has long been known by those of us in the area. But I was delighted to learn that the invaluable contributions made by the council have not escaped notice in other parts of the country. Recently, the Kansas City Star published a very fine article outlining the history and activities of the New England Council. I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared on August 14, 1963, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL HELPS REGION

BOSTON.—If the United States had been settled from west to east, New England probably would have ended up as one State instead of six, a business leader here once pointed out. And there would have been no need for the New England Council.

As it is, however, this unusual organization has been doing a remarkable job since 1925 in directing a coordinated attack on the problems of a region beset by fears that its historic economy was fading.

PRAISE FROM ALL SIDES

The success of New England Council in its 38 years has won it such laudatory labels from national publications as "the New England conscience" and "the dynamo that is powering the Yankee awakening."

A vital clue to the secret of that success was furnished some years ago by one council president, the late Frederick S. Blackall, Jr., Woonsocket, R.I., when he described the basic operating principle of the group in its early days:

"Get things done which need to be done for New England, and get them done by the people who are best qualified for the job—and never mind who gets credit for the accomplishment. Above all, never mind whether the New England Council does."

The prophets of gloom were legion in 1925 in this heartland city of the six-State region of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire. The cotton spindles were moving south as the area's predominant industry—textiles—shifted plants to new cheap-labor locations.

A favorite thesis was that, with America's last frontiers crossed, growth had to stop in

the older parts of the Nation. The prevailing attitude of depression was worse than the economic facts justified.

CREAM OF THE CROP

In this crisis the six New England Governors, crossing political lines, summoned a conference at Worcester of such a broad and influential range of regional leaders that their actions would be certain to have effect. One authority estimated that the 600 businessmen who showed up represented $5 billion in annual volume—an impressive sum in 1925.

Substituting inspiration for derogration, these leaders organized the council, to be composed of 108 directors, 18 from each of 6 State councils. Officers were elected and committees assigned on various regional problems.

The first year's budget was $50,000 and the council wisely provided that each State council be responsible for its own quota because the State chairmen didn't want money raisers from Boston at large in their territories. Suspicion that the new group would be dominated by Boston was one of the first hurdles to be surmounted, and it was.

A former Washington correspondent, Dudley Harmon, was chosen as the council's first paid executive and served as executive vice president for 26 years.

MEET FOUR TIMES A YEAR

The 100-plus council directors hold quarterly town meetings, the annual session here in November, a March meeting in Connecticut or Rhode Island, and June and September get-togethers held in a mountain or seashore resort.

Between times council affairs are run by an executive committee made up of its officers and the chairman and vice chairman of each State group. This year's council president is Holmes H. Whitmore, president of a Springfield, Vt., machinery company.

From the first the council has worked to adjust New England business and industry to changing times and to seek adaptable new types of industry. Financing new plants required changing some attitudes. As Whiteall once said:

"The council committee on financing and ownership of New England industrial enterprises has so stirred the consciousness (and perhaps the consciences) of staid old bankers, insurance companies and other financial institutions that at long last they are really attacking the problem of providing venture capital to new business and industry in our region."

Today the council has 2,500 member firms and a $402,000 budget, of which $105,000 is for the impressive monthly magazine New Englander.

EYE ON RAIL EFFORTS

In World War II the council helped organize war production in New England. In the years since it has turned its attention to such matters as better transportation for the region and more reasonable fuel prices. Last year the council operated its own experimental feeder airline and currently it is watching proposed rail mergers which would affect the area.

A top-level research organization within the council furnishes facts as a guide to action to both the council's legislative office in Washington—which works closely with the 37-member New England congressional delegation—and to member firms.

The council also has sparked an orderly development of tourist promotion among these historic Northeastern States, maintaining offices in New York and Cleveland to boost the flow of vacation dollars into the area.

Today textiles still are big business in New England, along with machine tools, jewelry, leather goods and, more recently, electronics.

"We feel also that higher education is one of our top industries," Loren C. Dunn, council director of communications, explained.

The proximity of such institutions as MIT, Harvard, and Yale has provided a huge pool of scientific talent as a lure to aerospace industry.

And, drawing on these same schools, the New England council's research advisory committee boasts some of the Nation's mightiest brains.

Such top-level, thinking, applied in commonsense fashion to the shared problems of six States, has sparked this uniquely successful endeavor in regional cooperation for nearly 40 years now.

A Modern Parable on the Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, until now I had thought the use of parables in revealing wrongdoing was long gone. However, a recent piece of literature by Ruth Montgomery, the well-known newspaper writer, has shown me how effectively it still can be used.

The following subtle but effective criticism of the recently announced sale of wheat to Russia deserves to be read by all Americans:

FAMINE IN THE LAND

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—And there was a famine in the land. And patriarch Nikita Khrushchev, who was not a God-fearing man, looked around for a way to save himself and his Communist clan.

Now when Nikita saw that there was wheat in America, he said unto Gromyko: "Some capitalist dreamer has been storing up surpluses against the lean years, which are now upon us. Get you down thither, and buy for us from thence, that we may live and not die."

And Gromyko said unto the patriarch: "But what if our brothers the Americans remember that you said you would bury them?"

Khrushchev spake harshly, saying he had already sold some of his favorite comrades into Siberian bondage for less backtalk than that, and for Gromyko to hurry and get himself thither without further gabbing.

The patriarch then loaded Gromyko's sacks with gold, so that he could bring back that which the Communist system had failed to produce. And Gromyko took some of his comrades and went to the Land of Plenty, and the governor over all the land was John, the many-coated son of Joseph P.

Now this was the same young man to whom Gromyko had sold a bill of goods exactly 1 year previously, by claiming that Patriarch Nikita was putting only defensive weapons and agrarian reformers in Cuba. But lo, even as Gromyko spake thus, aerial spies dispatched by John, the son of Joseph P., were spotting missile installations in the island to the southward.

THESE WERE THINGS TO PONDER

Now Gromyko pondered on these things as he went hat in hand to Governor John, but he did not bow down before him with his face to earth.

After all, his bags were loaded with gold which the Communist patriarch had given him to buy capitalist friendship and grain.

But John, remembering the former treachery, said unto Gromyko: "Whence come ye? Ye are spies, to see the nakedness of the land ye are come."

Gromyko, maintaining an unbowed head and straight face, replied: "Nay, my lord, but to buy food are thy servants come. We are true men; thy servants are no spies."

Now John, the son of Joseph P., was a very understanding sort who realized that Patriarch Nikita did not really want to bury us, but merely to wipe us off the face of the earth.

This wise young governor also knew that his own people were becoming restive because they had too much to eat, and were tired of storing so much plenty against a rainy day.

John therefore assembled his advisers, and although some spake in favor of punishing the Communist comrades for their previous treachery, most of them were dazzled by the exotic foreign gold.

The wise young Governor at first thought of detaining one of the comrades as a hostage, but realizing that one more defector would make little difference in a thousand years, he commanded his officials to fill the Communist sacks with grain, and to restore every man's money into his sack.

IT IS THE WAY OF CAPITALISTS

And they loaded their asses with the grain, and departed thence. And one of them, opening his sack to feed his ass, espied his money and said unto his brethern: "My money is restored, and lo, it is even in my sack."

And their hearts nearly failed them, but when they returned to patriarch Nikita and told him what had happened he comforted them, saying: "Have no fear, my comrades. This is the way the capitalist Americans do business. They subsidize their farmers to grow far more grain than they can use; then they taketh up taxes to pay for storing it; and when the time is ripe and we hunger, they sell it to us at half the market price, which they call the world price."

Gromyko beamed and said, "Good father, then you mean they meant to put our money as well as the grain in our sacks?"

"Aye, even so," Nikita replied. "At this price there is no further point in our trying to grow grain at home. We will hereafter use our farmers to produce missiles, and we will feed ourselves with subsidized American produce. Prepare to return ye, then, to the land of plenty to buy also cotton, milk, butter, and feed grains."

And it came to pass that a lively trade developed, and many, many moons elapsed before the American taxpayers finally realized they were supporting the Communist economy.

Lord, Give Me This Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an excellent editorial from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., of October 17, 1963:

(By Ralph McGill, editor, the Atlanta Constitution)

It is written in Proverbs that a word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver.

The beauty of that simile teaches humility, especially to an advertising or newspaper-

man, whose job it is to use words. And I am one who believes (and I write as a sentimentalist about our business) that all of us, admen, reporters, publishers, owners, editors, all of us, have need of humility before the power that is in the words which we produce. I never go down to the pressroom, hearing and feeling the smooth hum of its precision speed, but that I feel humble before it. It is something like holding a seashell up to the ear and hearing in it what a poet has told is the noise that time makes as it passes by on its inexorable march. The steady, muted roar of the presses seems to me the noise that words make—all the written words tapped out on typewriters, caught in the hot lines of type, pressed into the matrixes, bolted in metal plates on the drums of the press—all of them speaking at once to produce the steady voice of the presses as they print, fold, cut, and count the pages of our newspapers, and saying "I am the power and the beauty of words."

I recall being taken to see an old editor when I was a young boy who had framed by his desk the familiar old motto:

"Lord, give me this day my daily idea, and forgive me the one I had yesterday."

There are days when all of us toiling the vineyard of words have reason for that motto—so fast do things change, and so often is that which seemed so sure yesterday, today demonstrated to be not so sure.

The fact of a free press, and the full meaning of that phrase, I honestly believe, is the chief prop of this free Nation. And God knows we bear a heavy responsibility. And truth, if it becomes trite, is yet truth. But, I say quite frankly, feeling my own guilt as I do, and pointing no accusing finger at anyone, that every publisher, every board of directors, every editor, and staff need to examine into the meaning of the phrase, "Freedom of the Press" and determine if they are using it as a tool or a cliche?

Certainly a free and responsible press, and a press which has something to say on its editorial pages, is of great value to advertisers. The ads are of more value in a newspaper where character and integrity are established.

I strongly believe that if we do not use our freedom in public service, in controversial issues, and in compassionate awareness of the human condition, we may, and should, lose our freedom.

It is guaranteed? To be sure it is. But, we are up against a fact. It is an important one for all Americans, to whom the daily paper, with its ads, its news, features, and editorials, is as much a casual part of their lives as the bottle of milk left on the doorstep; and to those of us who write and produce newspapers. It is, namely, that nothing is guaranteed except it be guaranteed in the minds of the people and their loyalties.

I recall going to Austria at the time the Germans moved there in the spring of 1938. For me it was a sort of journey on the road to Damascus. There, for the first time, I watched all rights, guaranteed in a written, published constitution, disappear because the will for them had disappeared long before. I saw men and women arrested without warrant; I watched abuses of people because of their religion; I saw books burned and I saw magazines and newspapers from outside Austria removed. None dared protest. In fact, so bad was the economic and political situation in Austria that a majority of the people cheered the changes. I have never forgotten it. I have no wish to forget.

And so, today we will continue to enjoy, and have available, freedom of speech and press only so long as the people recognize that we use it and that we deserve that freedom. It is important now, I believe, in this time of racial crisis to defend the one great American ideal—that of equality of citizenship. We Americans are a synthesis of many peoples, many races, many languages, and a diversity of religions. It is the ideal, the principle, that makes us Americans. It seems to me highly important that American newspapers play a part in establishing this principle for all Americans.

I strongly feel that to do the job of protecting freedom of press, we must become more and more like the image of our true selves which the Constitution of our country envisions. And that applies to all of us—ad men, newsmen, businessmen, professional men.

The people can understand and defend the press and the American system only if we understand and express our freedom.

The Guided Leak: How Democratic Faithful Get Word on Arms Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Sreet Journal, October 14, 1963:

THE GUIDED LEAK—HOW DEMOCRATIC FAITHFUL GET WORD ON ARMS CONTRACTS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly every morning at about 10:30 a messenger carries a sheaf of papers from the Pentagon across the Potomac River to the White House. A great deal of secrecy shrouds this daily drive. No one will talk about the route, nor the type of vehicle used, nor whether the courier is military or civilian. Indeed, many officials deny the mission even occurs; others insist "it's a matter not appropriate for discussion."

Why the hush-hush attitude? Top secret military reports for the President? Not at all. Strange as it may seem the clandestine mission has nothing whatsoever to do with national security. Rather, it is an essential gambit in a slick political strategem that seeks, by employing the combined energies of top Pentagon brass, shrewd White House agents, distinguished Senators and Representatives, and powerful news agencies, to bamboozle the naive.

You see, the information carried by the shadowy courier is nothing more than advance word on multi-million-dollar defense contract awards that will be announced officially by the Pentagon later in the day. White House agents telephone these exclusive data to favorite Democrats on Capitol Hill who make headlines in their hometown newspapers by disclosing the "scoops" to reporters.

The effect, in large part, is that the Pentagon no longer announces much of its own contract news. Congressmen do, in news stories that sometimes wink at the facts by declaring that Senator so-and-so "announced" a contract award, but usually make some attempt at accuracy by confessing that the legislator "was notified" or "was advised" of the event.

This legislative legerdemain is dismissed by many as harmless politics. "This is something the White Houe can deliver on; they can't deliver on much else in this building," contends one Pentagon source. "As far as I'm concerned, this is the least of the available evils. I'd rather continue this than do something substantive."

HIGH COSTS OF CAMPAIGNS

Another administration official insists the real problem rests with the high cost of political campaigning. His explanation: "Every man who's running for office feels he needs to make the impression that he has influence in Washington if he's to get the campaign contributions he needs. Patronage used to be more important than it is now. What's a postmastership worth nowadays? Very little.

"If we didn't make such information available to Congress, the public would be given by other means the impression that defense contracts were influenced, but the administration would get less benefit. I'm against the impression. But if it's going to be given away, I think the administration should reap some benefit."

Though offered a as defense, this line of reasoning also stands as an indictment. For, as critics are quick to point out, the quest for credit not only introduces partisanship into the Government's immense contracting business, but can hardly help but give voters, including business-seeking corporate managers, the clear impression that the politician who announced a contract award probably influenced the decision.

The erosive effect this can have on public confidence becomes clear when viewed against a larger background. During the early days of the Senate probe into the Pentagon's controversial TFX fighter-bomber, the Kennedy administration made no secret of its indignation at comments suggesting that political considerations determined the selection of the contractor. But by playing politics on routine contract announcements, the administration every day contributes to the public notion that influence does, indeed, swing million- and billion-dollar decisions.

Too, the system is fraught with temptation. The legislator who receives inside information on major contract awards is presented with the opportunity to benefit in the stock market; or, if he is too scrupulous for that, others he informs may not be.

Today's chief critics of the political tipoff habit, quite naturally, are Republicans. Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, warned Defense Secretary McNamara in a recent letter: "Any suggestion that is allowed to remain that Government contracts can be obtained through the enlistment of congressional intervention is both wrong and dangerous. * * * I am very fearful that unless a correction of this policy is made it will ultimately result in the development of a major scandal that could make the old 5-percent, mink coat operations look like a Sunday school picnic.

Nevertheless, it wasn't too many years ago that some Republican legislators were criticizing President Eisenhower for not making greater use of the scoop technique to help the party faithful, particularly around election time. And to some extent he did; so the Republicans are not above reproach. But what the GOP did spasmodically, the Democrats now do methodically.

The fact of the matter is that Congress, not the administration in power, is the motivating force behind the system. Mr. McNamara made the point in replying to Senator WILLIAMS. "Barring some further indication that the Congress as a whole desires termination of this practice," the Defense Secretary wrote, "I am disposed to continue it."

Underlying Mr. McNamara's reply was the knowledge of a top secret conference held during the early days of the Kennedy administration. It was called by aids to several influential Democratic Congressmen; it was attended by representatives from the White House, the Pentagon, and other Federal agencies; and it was designed to firmly establish the right of Democrats on Capitol

Hill to enjoy the perquisites of power by getting advance word on contract awards.

Though there's no official record of the decisions reached at that unpublicized gathering, what has evolved is a two-part operation for speeding prior notice to Capitol Hill that has all the precision of a well-planned military maneuver. The mid-morning Pentagon-White House mission is a strictly partisan affair. White House aids won't talk, but it's known they pass along their exclusive data to congressional favorites as routine procedure.

A NONPARTISAN NEWS SERVICE

Thus, the favored are assured of receiving word of contracts of interest to them before noon each day. This extra-special attention to party stalwarts is an extension of a separate procedure that seeks to give politicians of both parties a smaller lead on contract news. Each of the armed services has a separate staff of congressional liaison officers that sees to it that all interested legislators, Democrats and Republicans alike, get about 1 hour's notice before public release of contract awards. The legislators are notified at 3 p.m. each day, the press at 4 p.m. The Air Force delivers its information by personal messenger to congressional offices; the Army and Navy use the telephone for the most part.

Until recently, Congress witnessed the spectacle of uniformed majors and colonels, their watches synchronized, delivering confidential contract memos with split-second timing to avoid charges of leaking the leaks to one legislator ahead of another.

But this got to be a bit too much, and several Congressmen objected to the use of high-ranking soldiers as messenger boys. So the Pentagon adjusted its tactics; it now uses enlisted men to carry contract news unless a contract must be explained to a lawmaker. For these more delicate maneuvers, officers are still preferred.

The rationale offered to justify the 1-hour news break for Congressmen is to enable them to intelligently answer press queries on contracts awarded to companies in their States. There's no mention of the fact that, since the Pentagon awarded the contracts, maybe its representatives should be the ones to reply to questions. Nor is the point made that Congressmen seldom are given any more contract information than is the press, so they can't add substance to a news story anyway.

In the final analysis, then, the entire operation—both the partisan and nonpartisan phases—boils down to nothing more than political sleight-of-hand. And quite a few Pentagon officials express the private (very private) wish that the whole procedure be abandoned once and for all. This view, not surprisingly, is heard most frequently from those officers who are required to spend hours on the phone assuring nonfavored Congressmen that the military was not responsible for contract leaks to their rivals. Sighs one harried diplomat-officer: "I'd much rather wrestle with the many complex problems of guided missiles than of guided leaks."

Let's Not Be Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Drovers Journal, Chicago, in its lead editorial of October 1, 1963, warns Americans to keep a clear image of the Communists as the "ruthless apostles of totalitarianism that they really are."

This timely message further cautions us not to be hoodwinked by a grand Indian summer togetherness which the Communists have conveniently devised—to advance their own cause, not ours—and which our administration is so overanxious to agree to. The editorial follows:

LET'S NOT BE FOOLED

If we don't miss our guess too far, it is quite likely that Americans are about to behold a grand Indian summer rapprochement with Soviet Russia reminiscent of the great United States-Russian togetherness binge of World War II days. And if such a mood of warm good feeling develops, as it appears to be doing now, it is going to take an awful lot of individual straight thinking on the part of all Americans to keep a clear image of the Communists as the ruthless apostles of totalitarianism that they really are.

Apologists and fuzzy thinkers are already painting the big picture, trying to gloss over the deficiencies of dictatorships on the way to making them more acceptable to good Americans.

For example, a nationally respected news commentator recently noted that Russia is probably headed for a bad harvest, but that "in all fairness," much of the blame must be attributed to "the poor climate." He failed to mention, however, that the poor harvest in prospect will be the fifth in a row, and if it weren't for the opening up of new lands to cultivation, Russian agriculture could be said to be in a virtual state of stagnation.

Experts, however, are not limited to this apology for Russian farm failures. They point out that "Soviet farming is much less abundantly supplied with tractors and other farm implements, fertilizer, herbicides, fungisides, etc.—in short, with capital and modern technology," than we are. Nothing is said, of course, of the fact that the Russians have had the same 45 years that we have had to develop all these things, but they have not done so.

These and other apologies for Russian failures usually lead up to the classic general apology of all. That is that the Communists (not just Russians, but all Communists) have been really just misguided. They are like adolescent boys and are merely in "a stage" in their progress toward commonsense "adulthood." It is implied that once they see the light, they will, of course, all become free enterprisers. All it takes on our part is reasonableness and good will.

But this is utter nonsense. We know by their own statements that Communists are dedicated to dictatorship of the proletariat, which can be conveniently shortened to dictatorship, period. We know that in actual fact, privileged classes of gangsters operate Communist countries, and that these gangsters are ruthless, cunning, utterly self-serving, faithless and unreliable. And we must not fall for their bunk—especially when they talk about agriculture.

Let's not forget that the Canadians have a poor climate for raising food, too. But they have managed to come up with huge wheat surpluses. Let's not forget that the Scandinavian countries have a northern clime and a Socialist bent, yet they manage societies of abundance.

Let's not forget that the Russians have had almost a half-century to build an agricultural industry as well as a housing industry, consumer goods industry, steel industry, and armament industry, and so far they haven't matched us in any of these things. Certainly, they have had the same 18 years the Japanese and Germans have had to develop a food industry. But bread is in tight supply in huge Russia today, while overcrowded Japan is self-sufficient in rice—unbelievable as it may seem.

Let's face it and capitalize on it. Communism is a failure as a system. Democracy is a success; free enterprise is a success. Yes, we may have a thaw in the cold war, but communism is still dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, true democracy and liberty. Let's not rush to bail the Communists out of their troubles—food troubles or otherwise—unless it is to our real advantage. Let's keep our heads and remember that the last time we were all good friends, the Russians stole half of Germany, most of the Balkans, took a Japanese island, and declared they won the war by themselves. Since then, they have tried to run us out of Berlin; they have put a base at our backdoor; and have threatened us almost without ceasing. It takes more than one swallow to make a summer. It should take more than one test ban treaty and one Canadian wheat deal to make a Communist a good guy.

Alleged False Representation by National Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, numerous Protestant groups are becoming increasingly indignant over the false representation by the National Council of Churches. For years the National Council of Churches has been issuing political pronouncements and appearing before U.S. Senate and House committees supporting or opposing legislation, "speaking for" millions of Protestants. The NCC has never taken a vote among the millions it purports to represent. For this reason, a statement repudiating the NCC as a political representative was drawn up and submitted to various laymen's groups all over the country. Eleven laymen's groups and three congregations authorized Mrs. C. C. Starr to appear before any congressional committee and read the letter of repudiation.

A copy of this repudiation was printed in a letter to the editor of the Shreveport Journal on September 10, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTS GROUPS OPPOSED TO COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

EDITOR, SHREVEPORT JOURNAL:

Following is a statement which various congregational committees ignored and one which was buried at the end of the hearings on President Kennedy's civil rights bill:

"Statement Repudiating the Political Activities of the National Council of Churches in the United States of America:

"The group of Christian Laymen and Congregations appended hereto wish to make the following statement before this committee, and for the hearings record:

"The National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America may not and cannot speak for or represent 40 million Protestants on any political or legislative matters.

"As individual American voters the National Council of Churches officials may, with perfect propriety, come before any commit-

tee and give their personal, individual opinions on such matters—provided they make it clear that they are doing so as individuals, and not as NCC officials representing the membership of that organization.

"The National Council of Churches has never been authorized by the millions of members it purports to 'speak for' to appear before any congressional, State or local committees, speaking on—or to—legislation and other matters political.

"The undersigned laymen's groups and congregations categorically repudiate all National Council of Churches political and legislative pronouncements—this particular legislation or any other."

"Having polled our memberships, and received complete support for this statement, we serve notice herewith that the National Council of Churches has not, does not, and may not represent us at these, or any other hearings and/or meetings dealing with legislation or other political questions.

"Sponsoring groups: Committee of Christian Laymen, Savannah, Ga.; Methodist Laymen of North Hollywood, North Hollywood, Calif.; Southern California Committee of Christian Laymen, South Bay Chapter, Torrance, Calif.; St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Rosedale, Long Island, N.Y.; Episcopal Education & Information Council, St. Clair Shors, Mich.; Edinburg Seventh Day Baptist Church, Edinburg, Tex.; Methodist Laymen's League of Redondo Beach, Redondo Beach, Calif.; First Presbyterian Church, Duluth, Minn.; Committee for Laity Enlightenment, Nashville, Tenn.; National Committee of Christian Laymen, Phoenix, Ariz.; San Diego Patriotic Society, San Diego, Calif.; Methodist's Laymen of Chatsworth, Chatsworth, Calif.; Committee of Christian Laymen, Woodland Hills, Calif.; Women of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Shreveport, La.

C. C. STARR.

QUAKERTOWN, BUCKS COUNTY, PA.

Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a column by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the October 21 issue of the Washington Post and which I think is very pertinent and well worthy to be included in the RECORD.

The column follows:

DOUBLE STANDARD: LEFT WIELDS ITS POLITICAL PUNCH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One of the most powerful weapons in the arsenal of the Democratic Party is the double standard of political morality which has been practiced in the United States for many years—and still flourishes.

There ought, in all fairness, to be some way to address the balance.

By "double standard," I refer to the fact that when some figure on the political right is involved in an impropriety, the liberals quite properly scream to high heaven, but when some figure on the political left is involved in an impropriety, these same liberals are blandly silent.

By the same token, the antics of the extreme right get a massive going over and by the liberal politicians and commentators and then they suddenly lose their voices when confronted by comparable antics by the extreme left.

I am not talking theory; I'm talking practice. Here are examples:

When the Democratic candidate for the California senatorial nomination campaigned against Helen Gahagan Douglas on the ground that she had been following the Communist line, the liberals never lifted an eyebrow. When the Republican candidate campaigned against her using the same arguments, it became an egregious offense.

When California voters provided Senator Richard Nixon with a campaign fund to use between elections, the disclosure was greeted as a national scandal. When Texas supporters provided Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH with a campaign fund with much looser accountability, the disclosure distressed the critics of the Nixon fund not a bit.

When the Young Republicans at their national convention in San Francisco recently listened to a shocking condemnation of former President Eisenhower, showed they thought Senator BARRY GOLDWATER not adequately conservative and indicated that they would really prefer a presidential nominee like former Congressman John Rousselot, now a paid organizer for the John Birch Society, these extremist antics rightly got national attention. But when the California Young Democrats at their convention passed a whole series of extremist resolutions, these antics of the left found the critics of the Young Republicans undisturbed and uninterested.

If you think I'm exaggerating the extremism, the Communist Party lineism, of the Young Democrats in California, look at these declarations of purpose which came from them:

Immediate recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations.

Resuming trade and diplomatic relations with Castro-Soviet Cuba.

Recognition of the Communist Government of East Germany.

Withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam (an action which even the opponents of the Diem regime admit would turn that country over to the Communists.)

I am not arguing that any of the improprieties or extremisms of the political right should go unpublicized. I am arguing that the double standard which causes critics to shout at the improprieties and extremisms of the right and conveniently ignore the improprieties and extremism of the left does a grave disservice to American public life.

What brings it about? If we could answer that question, we might be nearer to ending this one-sided political dialog. I suspect that part of the answer is that many professing liberals are so confident of their own virtue that in their eyes they can do no wrong, that the end justifies the means, that liberals shouldn't be bound by the political moral standards they would impose on the conservatives.

All I am saying is that I would like to see the same standards of public conduct and criticism applied to both.

Editor Gets Short Course on Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune of October 16, 1963, carries a most worthwhile and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Editor Gets Short Course on What's Wrong in Latin America." The very point made in this editorial by Mr. V. has been made on many occasions by those of us serving on the House Appropriations Committee. I call this editorial to the attention of all Members and hope that they will give it their consideration. The editorial follows:

EDITOR GETS SHORT COURSE ON WHAT'S WRONG IN LATIN AMERICA

There is no shortage of strong men for positions of leadership in Latin America; what is hard to find is a strong man who also is honest and can be depended upon to work for the public welfare instead of personal gain.

This, in substance, is what your editor was told recently by a German-born agricultural technician from Bogotá, Colombia, with whom we became acquainted during a week's sojourn in a New Hampshire mountain resort area.

Our newfound frield (we'll call him Mr. V. for short) has spent 38 years in South America, which should qualify him to speak with some authority about conditions there and to express opinions on why the much heralded Alliance for Progress isn't achieving the results so optimistically foreseen by U.S. officialdom.

We in the United States are extremely naive, in the view of Mr. V., if we think our form of democracy can be successfully transplanted in lands where the great mass of the populace is incapable of measuring up to the responsibilities of self-government.

In Bogotá, as is true almost everywhere in Latin America, the vast majority of the people are lacking what in this country would be considered even the most rudimentary education. On top of that, according to our informant, the underprivileged masses have become so inured to their lot, generation after generation, that they show no spark of ambition to change it, unless the change can be accomplished with no effort on their part.

"Ignorance and shiftlessness aren't the ingredients from which responsible citizens can be developed," said Mr. V. "To expect such people to make democracy work, or to even understand what the term means, is ridiculous."

He admitted that conditions have improved in South America since he first went there in the mid-1920's. But the improvement has been agonizingly slow, sometimes almost imperceptible. It has been impeded every step of the way, he said, by the wealthy landowners who are determined to keep the masses in a state of serfdom. And since those who aspire to political power in that hemisphere are seldom averse to lining their own pockets, wealth usually controls government policy.

Therein, said Mr. V., is one of the big mistakes which the United States has been making in extending financial assistance to Latin American nations. Such aid, he argues, should never be in the form of money turned over to governments which are unstable at best, and in most instances are fraught with corruption.

Even when the funds are expended by a well-intentioned regime on beneficial public works, the projects are more costly and less efficiently pursued than would be the case in lands where graft is not so traditional, our Bogotá friend insisted.

It is his opinion that U.S. aid should be extended solely in the form of work projects which are engineered and supervised from start to finish by U.S. technicians. In that way, and that way alone, he contended, would the money be spent to best advantage and bring the greatest good to the common people.

Mr. V. agreed with our thought that it would be difficult to get Latin American governments to accede to such an arrangement. But he felt a "this or nothing" edict from Uncle Sam could produce the desired response.

Our friend from south of the border helped us to understand the complexities of Latin American poltics and economics somewhat better than before, and for this we thank him. Although he lives and works there as a foreign national, we sensed that he more truly recognized and interpreted the interests of the people than have many Latins who presume to speak for those nations.

Resolutions by the Wabash Valley Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two resolutions by the Wabash Valley Association, Inc:

RESOLUTION REGARDING DROUGHT IN WABASH RESERVOIRS

We, the executive board members of the Wabash Valley Association, Inc., in regular session at the Terre Haute House, Terre Haute, Ind., on this the 11th day of October 1963, do resolve and request our Representatives in Congress and our U.S. Senators to recognize the serious and continuing drought conditions of the Wabash River watershed. We point out the lack of adequate upstream water retaining reservoirs so badly needed to augment the low flow water in all our streams and that the continued lack of adequate upstream water to be released to carry away the waste, the pollution, the health hazards common to low streams, and the need of sufficient water to supply the needs of industry, of municipalities, of farm requirements continue to create great losses to human life, to livestock, to crops, to wildlife, and to property generally. We further point out that the entire watershed is today likened to a tinderbox wherein there is no limit to the potential fire damage that could suddenly explode in city and rural areas alike.

We further resolve and request that the proper agencies, the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, Louisville District; the Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; and other related Federal and State agencies expedite all presently authorized projects and set up hearings necessary to formulate plans for building multipurpose reservoirs necessary for proper water impoundment for water conservation and flood control, for low-flow stream augmentation; and that the possible site on the East Fork of the White River near Shoals, Ind. and the possible site on the Skillet Fork River in its upper reaches, in Wayne County, Ill. be included in the near-term interim report; that the comprehensive study and survey be expedited with all possible urgency.

We further resolve that the entire Wabash River Basin be regarded as a critical area until such time as adequate water reserves are established to prohibit the recurrence of such disaster as is now facing the 3 million citizens of the 33,100 square mile area comprising the Wabash River Valley.

HENRY J. WALLACE.
G. W. LETTINGER.

RESOLUTION FOR FULL DEVELOPMENT OF WABASH RIVER WATERSHED

The Wabash River is a navigable stream without navigation because of the lack of water resource deveolpment.

The Wabash serves as the main stream of the water supply for its area; as a sewerage disposal system for its people; a drainage basin for its rural and urban dwellers; a waste remover for its industry; yet it remains the lifeblood for its 3.5 million people living within its 33,100-square-mile area. It is known, too, that none of the tasks required of the Wabash River are properly accomplished because there is an inadequate management and control of its water.

The Wabash River has long been neglected through disuse and lack of interest and the land area adjacent to the river has continued to deteriorate. The people have moved away. Jobs are lost. Unemployment steadily mounts. Natural resource development is stagnated.

The Wabash Valley Association, Inc., since its organization in 1957, has constantly worked for the full and complete development of the Wabash River watershed. The potential existing along the 585-mile stretch of the river from its source in Darke County, Ohio, to its mouth in Posey County, Ind., is as great as that to be found along any river in the United States.

The Wabash has truly been the main waterway for the States of Indiana and Illinois since its earliest settlement, dating back to the early 18th century.

The Wabash is as essential to the development of the Midwest as the Ohio itself. It has more potential resource development possibilities. Yet the Wabash is and has been for years treated as one of the minor tributaries of the Ohio.

The growing and continuing needs of the people living within the Wabash Basin have become so important that it is now necessary to give consideration to the establishment of a local district office for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to develop water resources for the people.

The Wabash Valley Association, Inc., representing 8,000 members from 51 of the 92 counties of the greater Wabash River Basin, do hereby request the Congress of the United States to establish within the confines of the basin itself an office of the district engineer, U.S. Army Engineer District, Corps of Engineers, at a location within the basin charged with the sole duty of development of the water and land resources of the Wabash River Basin.

No. 18—West Virginia: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of West Virginia, about the billion dollar tax-free gambling business in that State.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in West Virginia hit $91 million from which the State derived almost $6 million in revenue. But this was only a small part of the action. Illegal gambling was the real big action.

Off-track betting alone, on the basis of the estimates presented to the McClellan committee, reached a level of more than $500 million in 1962. This figure must be doubled in order to ascertain the sum total of all kinds of illegal gambling in West Virginia. It can be estimated that illicit gambling in that State stands at a billion dollars a year.

The gambling syndicates, Mr. Speaker, hang on to about 10 percent of this loot as gross profit—$100 million. Money that could be used to rebuild West Virginia's sagging economy is being sucked into gangster coffers because of the hypocritical ignorance of those who refuse to recognize the natural gambling urge of the people. Part of these profits go to corrupt law enforcement and governmental process.

The moralist contingent has been the greatest benefactors of the State's underworld gravy train—just as the bluenose prohibitionists were the gullible patsies of the bootleggers.

I wonder if the West Virginia congressional delegation is aware of the extent to which their State's economy is being bled for the comfort of the vice lords? Many millions of dollars gambled and lost which should go into the State's treasury wind up lining hoodlum pockets.

Mr. Speaker, only a Government-run lottery can strike a lethal blow at organized crime. Government control and regulation of gambling would cut deeply into this illicit activity so that States like West Virginia would cease to be looting grounds for the mob.

Establishing a Perspective on Our Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Members of the House have been bombarded with speeches and statements blasting various parts of our country's space program as "unrealistic," "waste of the taxpayers' money" and much worse.

The Centaur space vehicle program which has had its share of troubles since its inception has come under renewed attack because of just-released Comptroller General report on Centaur's development problems.

I, for one, am confident that through the combined efforts and talents of the Centaur team led by Abe Silverstein at NASA's Lewis Research Center and G. L. Hansen, Centaur program director at General Dynamics-Astronautics, the Centaur vehicle will prove itself as reliable and as valuable to our space effort as the Atlas vehicle.

I think it is well at this time to reminds ourselves as well as the nay-sayers and hand-wringers that not too long—3 years ago as a matter of fact—ago the Mercury project was being decried. The success of the Mercury pro-

grams is now a well-documented historical fact.

To help establish some perspective on our space program I think it would be valuable to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article:

[From Missiles and Rockets, Aug. 15, 1963]

IS MERCURY PROGRAM HEADED FOR DISASTER?

(By James Baar)

NASA's Mercury manned satellite program appears to be plummeting the United States toward a new humiliating disaster in the East-West space race.

This is the stark conclusion that looms in the minds of a growing number of eminent rocket scientists and engineers as the Mercury program continues to slip backward.

These experts, many of whom are already calling Mercury "a latter-day Vanguard," contend—

The program today is more than 1 year behind its original schedule and is expected to slip to two. Therefore, it no longer offers any realistic hope of beating Russia in launching the first man into orbit around the earth—much less serve as an early stepping stone for reaching the moon.

Despite precautions and improvements, Mercury continues to be a technically marginal program that could easily end in flaming tragedy. Mercury, at best, is a technical stopgap justifiable only as an expedient. It is no substitute for what is needed sooner or later—a maneuverable spacecraft similar to the Air Force's much hampered Dyna-Soar.

Mercury originally had the supposed advantage of being cheap, an attribute that made it particularly attractive to the administration. However, Mercury has proven to be a trip down a dead-end road that U.S. taxpayers are finding themselves paving in gold. Appropriations have reached a quarter-billion to date. They may double.

Dissatisfaction with Mercury has grown each time the program has slipped. The latest snag occurred on July 29, when an Atlas booster carrying the first production model of the Mercury capsule blew up 65 seconds after it was launched.

The program fell behind 2 more months through lack of a back up.

RUMBLES ON HILL

Alarm has spread to Capitol Hill. Representative Overton Brooks' House Space Committee is considering plans for a full-scale investigation of the Mercury program. Hearings probably would begin in January.

Meantime, scientists and Congressmen are casting worried looks at Russia. The next item on the Soviet space schedule is expected to be a soft landing on the moon or the orbiting of a manned satellite. October 4, the third anniversary of the launching of Sputnik I, is considered to be a likely date.

NASA's latest secret schedule calls for launching the first manned Mercury capsule into orbit about mid-1961. But even this is considered by many to be optimistic.

Late 1961 or early 1962 is thought to be more realistic. And, if the program continues to slip as all experience indicates it will, these dates also are too early.

It is because of these dates that many experts have come to feel that Mercury already has failed in achieving the principal mission for which it was created—beating Russia into space with a manned satellite.

RESTIVE ASTRONAUTS

Even the seven Mercury astronauts are understood to be bridling under the expected odium of coming in second in the two-nation space race. Some of the astronauts are reported to have privately urged NASA to scrap much of the Mercury test program and take the much greater risk of attempting an early launching.

Such a plan would run directly counter to NASA's present policy of taking every possible precaution to insure the safety of any man launched into orbit in a Mercury capsule.

No one would agree with this policy more than technical critics of the program.

These experts, none of whom can be quoted by name because of their connection with the Government in one way or another, express gravest doubts as to chances of the Mercury system operating as planned.

As one engineer put it:

"The capsule's retrorockets must fire at the right time and the right angle for the capsule to reenter at the right angle. Otherwise the ablative material on the capsule's blunt end will fail to protect the astronaut and both he and the capsule will be cooked. This timing and angle business isn't an easy thing, either. Look at Discoverer. The Air Force has been trying to get capsule's back from Discoverer for more than a year. No luck. And another thing: The astronaut gets only one chance. If those retrorockets don't eject him from orbit the right way the first time, he has had it."

Nor is that all.

"We think of Mercury as the adventurous approach," one expert said. "If he lands in the water, he then hopes to be picked up by ship. But this isn't like a nose cone. Who knows where the capsule might land. I'd say the chances of drowning are more than fair."

Side show?—Finally, and most important, is the charge that Mercury in the end is only a detour and not the main highway into space.

NASA has consistently defended Mercury as a program designed to answer the vital question: Can a man perform a useful function in the weightless environment of space.

The only way to answer the question betion in the weightless environment of space? Mercury is designed to do just that. But it will do little more—as NASA itself concedes.

The next big step in manned exploration of space beyond the earth is the orbiting of the moon with a manned spacecraft. George M. Low, NASA's chief of manned space flight, said only recently in a paper written for the Senate Space Committee that the craft needed for such a trip would be a vehicle with aerodynamic surfaces like Dyna-Soar.

For this reason, many critics contend that Mercury is a waste of time and resources. They argue that the Dyna-Soar program will prove anything that Mercury can prove and result in a useful spacecraft as well.

A number of NASA's experts privately agree. But they also are aware of the behind-the-scenes story of why NASA began the development of Mercury and they have loyally supported the probram.

The story of Mercury begins with ARPA.

In the first months after Russia launched Sputnik I, ARPA initiated a number of studies to determine the best way to put a man in space. One main approach called for putting a capsule into orbit; the other, for a winged spacecraft.

In April 1958, Dr. Wernher von Braun, then Director of Development Operations of the old Army Ballistic Missile Agency, disclosed to Congress a proposal to send a man briefly 150 miles into space with a Redstone. The plan was part of a broad Army program that had been submitted for approval.

"We propose to separate the nose section with the man from the rest of the missile prior to reentry into the atmosphere," Von Braun said. "The man himself will be in a pressurized capsule which is inserted into the nose section. The latter is equipped with controllable airbrakes which retard the fall as it gets back into the atmosphere. I must add, however, that this program has not received official approval yet. I do not know why. ARPA knows about it, but has not yet decided on it. There is a question of money involved, I believe."

YEAR FROM WHEN?

Asked how long it would take to complete such a program, Von Braun said 1 year.

"One year from now?" a Congressman asked.

"One year from the word 'go'," Von Braun said.

How Mercury launch times have slipped [1]

Event	Original plan	Revision No. 1	Revision No. 2	Present plan
1st Redstone downrange with primate.	November 1959	March 1960	July 1960	October 1960.
1st Redstone downrange with man.	March 1960	May 1960	August 1960	December 1960.
1st Atlas downrange with operational capsule (instruments only).	January 1960	March 1960	May 1960	September 1960.
1st Atlas boosting primate into orbit.	May 1960	August 1960	September 1960	March-April 1961.
1st Atlas boosting man into orbit.	June 1960	December 1960	March 1961	August 1961.

[1] All dates are approximate. The schedule for the Mercury program has been kept "fluid" and secret since its inception.

Dr. Hugh Dryden, Deputy NASA Administrator and then director of the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, said subsequently that the Von Braun proposal was like "shooting a young lady from a cannon." He questioned whether the expense would be worthwhile.

But in October 1958, 1 year after Sputnik I, NASA opened for business and took over from ARPA and AF a study called Project Mercury.

Mercury carried Von Braun's plan only one step further. Instead of launching a man along a ballistic trajectory so that he would experience weightlessness for about 5 minutes the man would be launched into orbit.

At the same time, the Air Force was permitted to proceed with its studies for Dyna-Soar. But funding was at a low level and the program's priority was comparatively low.

Just who said what to whom at the meetings that resulted in NASA choosing the Mercury approach over Dyna-Soar has been obscured over the last few years. However, all the evidence points unquestionably to two reasons why the choice was made: Mercury appeared to be quicker and cheaper.

Cost comparison—Experts familiar with the Dyna-Soar program have said an all-out Dyna-Soar R. & D. effort could have produced an early maneuverable spacecraft by about 1963 or possibly late 1962. The cost might have approached a billion dollars.

On the other hand, Mercury originally was expected to cost only about $200 million and take well under 2 years to put a man in orbit.

Appropriations for Mercury through fiscal year 1961 have already reached $241 million. NASA officials have estimated that another $100 million will be needed. However, congressional sources expect this to be at least doubled.

These figures do not include such costs as the multimillion-dollar expense of Naval warships and planes needed for recovery and AF tracking facilities.

Mercury has slipped almost since its inception and the space programs that NASA keeps telling Congress are to follow have slipped accordingly.

NASA requested a top priority for Mercury in November 1958. The program did not get it until May 1959. This is generally the way matters have gone.

At present, NASA is still holding out a slim hope that a Redstone carrying a manned capsule can be launched downrange by the end of this year—more than a year and a half later than Von Braun said he could do the same thing.

However, the chances of NASA even meeting this new deadline are considered very slight. The result will be that the launching of a manned capsule into orbit will slip again.

But all of the Nation's hopes have been put on Mercury. And there is no backup if the program fails.

Korth Linked to General Dynamics Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the activities of Navy Secretary Fred Korth become more interesting with each passing day.

In a copyright article in the Des Moines Sunday Register of October 20, 1963, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff reveals that in 1955 Mr. Frank Pace, then president of General Dynamics, recommended a business deal to Mr. Korth which netted him—Korth—a profit of a quarter of a million dollars in terms of stock in a Texas insurance company.

It should also be noted that Pace was Secretary of the Army during the Truman administration, and Korth served as an assistant to Pace.

The subsequent award of the multibillion-dollar TFX fighter plane contract to General Dynamics, an award in which Korth participated, is well described in the article by Mr. Mollenhoff, which follows:

PACE SENT PROMOTER TO BANKER: $250,000 NET ON INSURANCE FIRM SHARES

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

FORT WORTH, TEX.—Navy Secretary Fred Korth has testified that a high official of General Dynamics Corp. recommended him in 1955 for a business deal.

That deal netted Korth a profit of more than a quarter of a million dollars worth of stock.

A 1962 deposition on file at the Federal Records Center in Fort Worth shows Korth identified the General Dynamics official as Frank Pace.

Pace was president of General Dynamics from 1953 to February 1962, and was still listed as a member of the board of directors of General Dynamics in November 1962, when the TFX warplane contract was awarded to General Dynamics.

Korth, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, and Air Secretary Eugene Zuckert have been under questioning by the McClellan Senate Investigations Subcommittee about the TFX award.

PROBE LINKS

The McClellan committee has been studying Korth's background, and specifically his relations with General Dynamics and its officials.

Before Korth became Navy Secretary in late 1961, he was president of a bank in Fort Worth, Tex., principal operating base of General Dynamics.

Korth said in his 1962 deposition that Pace called him in July 1955, and told him a man named B. F. Biggers, of Dallas, Tex., would ask him to be a director of an insurance company that was being formed.

Korth testified that Biggers called on him a short time later, and asked him to be a director. Korth added that a few days later he became a director, and also acquired 50,000 shares of stock in the insurance firm without putting up any cash of his own.

TWENTY CENTS A SHARE

Korth said he was given the stock at 20 cents a share, while it was being sold to the public for $5.25 a share. He said he put up no money in the transaction, but gave Biggers a note for $10,000 with the 50,000 shares as collateral.

The deposition naming Pace as the man who sent Biggers to Korth's office is part of the file in a suit brought by stockholders of the insurance firm that was licensed in Texas in 1955 as the All States Life Insurance Co., of Dallas. The name was later changed to the Professional Business Men's Life Insurance Co.

Biggers was chairman of the board and president of the insurance firm. Korth was a director and a member of the three-man executive committee.

The initial suit, filed in August 1961, asked for about $5 million in damages. It alleged that Biggers, Korth, and the other directors "wrongfully, unlawfully, fraudulently, maliciously and unjustly enriched themselves and obtained huge and unconscionable profits."

The initial suit did not name Korth and the other directors as defendants. It contended that Korth and the other directors were victims of frauds that were perpetrated by Biggers.

It was charged that Biggers had engaged in illegal and improper stock manipulations with the Jack Cage Co., operated by Ben Jack Cage, convicted Texas insurance swindler who fled to Brazil.

DIRECTLY ACCUSED

An amended petition filed on June 26, 1962, named Korth and the other directors as defendants. In this petition, the stockholders filing the suit contended that Korth and the other directors had full knowledge of the transactions or were involved in "gross negligence."

The complaining stockholders also charged that Korth and the other five directors in July 1960 had approved an action to ratify all past transactions by Biggers and to release Biggers from any responsibilities for illegal and questionable actions.

SUIT SETTLED

The suit was set for trial last April at a time when the TFX warplane hearings were at their height.

However, there was a quiet final settlement of the case on May 15, 1963, providing for Biggers, Korth, and the other directors to return stock worth about $800,000 to $1 million to a trust set up by the court.

Bigger was to return 60,000 shares, and 10,000 shares were to be delivered to the trust by Korth and each of the other five directors.

The settlement provided for cancellation of the 120,000 shares. That reduced the number of outstanding shares, and in this manner increased the real value of each share.

TFX SPOTLIGHT

There was no publication of the record or settlement of the case in Fort Worth or Dallas, although the TFX investigation by the McClellan committee had put a bright focus on the role of Navy Secretary Korth in the $6.5 billion warplane contract dispute.

Korth's personal relationship with various officials of General Dynamics was explored by the McClellan committee. It also studied loans that Korth's bank, Continental National Bank of Fort Worth, had made to General Dynamics in late 1961, just before Korth became Secretary of the Navy.

Korth had overruled the recommendations of top Navy officers and had recommended that TFX contract go to General Dynamics rather than the Boeing Co., of Seattle Wash.

The top-level Pentagon Source Selection Board had recommended purchase of the Boeing TFX on grounds that it would provide "superior performance" and a price that was lower by up to $415 million.

The McClellan committee questioned Korth as to why he would pass up the Boeing plane with "superior performance" and a lower price, to take the General Dynamics version.

FAIRNESS CHALLENGED

In the hearings, Korth voiced resentment when Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, asked whether Korth, former head of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, could be objective in a decision on a contract involving the largest business organization in Fort Worth, General Dynamics.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, declared on the House floor that Korth's negotiation of a $400,000 loan to General Dynamics, and his retention of $160,000 in stock in the bank after he entered the Government, represented a "conflict of interest" situation.

He said Korth should have disqualified himself from any roll in the TFX award.

"I am a man of integrity," Korth declared in the TFX hearings. He said he resented any implications that he could not be totally objective, and said the good of his country was paramount to the award of a $6.5 billion contract to his hometown or the interest on a $400,000 loan for his bank.

VISITED BY PACE

The McClellan committee asked Korth to prepare a record on telephone calls and visits from persons interested in the TFX contract. He prepared a list showing General Dynamics officials had made 19 calls on him from January 1962, to November 1962, while he had received only three calls from officials of the Boeing firm.

Most of the calls from General Dynamics officials were from men Korth characterized as old friends, who had merely dropped by his office to wish him well in the job and to mention incidentally the TFX contract.

One of these men mentioned by Korth was Frank Pace, who had been Secretary of the Army in the Truman administration. Korth said he had served as an assistant to Pace in the Truman administration, and that they had a warm personal friendship.

There was no mention in Korth's testimony of the insurance stock deal that had come to Korth on the recommendation of Pace.

DIDN'T VISIT HIM

"He [Pace] was in the Pentagon, frequently would come by and have a cup of coffee with me, ask me out to his place in the country," Korth told the McClellan subcommittee.

"I have never accepted that invitation, I might add, because I didn't feel it would probably look right for me to do so, even though he was an old friend of mine."

Throughout his testimony, Korth said he leaned over backward to avoid anything that might represent an influence that would interfere with his total objectivity.

IN 1962 DEPOSITION

In the insurance suit, Korth testified in his deposition taken in Dallas in 1962:

"Mr. Pace called me and informed me that I would probably be visited by a gentleman by the name of Biggers, who would probably ask me to become a director of a corporation which he had organized here in Texas."

"Now then did a Mr. Biggers visit you?" asked Abraham Berkowitz, lawyer for the stockholders who had sued Biggers, Korth and the other directors.

"He did," Korth said.

Then Korth explained that Biggers came to his office at the Continental National Bank. Biggers was alone, and in a brief conversation he asked Korth to become a director of All States Life Insurance Co.

GOT REFERENCES

Korth said he made no investigation of the financial structure of the firm, but asked two bankers about the honesty and integrity of Biggers.

He said he was told Biggers was an honest man and a shrewd businessman, and that on that basis he agreed to accept a directorship in the insurnce company.

Korth related that Biggers said he would sell him 50,000 shares in the firm at 20 cents a share, and that it would not be necessary to put up any cash. Korth said he gave Biggers a note for $10,000 that was not payable for 3 years, and with the understanding that he would leave the stock with Biggers as collateral.

PAID NOTE

At the end of 3 years, Biggers sold 3,500 of the shares for $14,000, which more than paid the note. The remaining 46,500 shares of stock were then given to Korth, he said.

Later 10,000 shares were turned in on the stockholders suit settlement.

Korth has said he still owns most of the 36,500 shares, except for small gifts to members of his family. The stock is now traded over-the-counter at about $7 a share. On that basis, the 36,500 shares would be worth about $255,000.

Korth remained a director of the insurance company until shortly before he became Secretary of the Navy in December 1961.

BOARD MEMBERS

Korth conceded that the stock deal involved no risk, and only entailed being a member of the board of directors and of the executive committee. He could recall only a few meetings of the board that he attended.

In the insurance suit, Korth did not deny the allegations relative to his profits on the stock or the circumstances under which he bought it. He did deny knowledge that any of the activities involved a breach of his trust as a fiduciary.

He testified he was only generally aware of loans made to the firm operated by Cage, and found nothing wrong with the operations as long as these transactions did not result in financial loss to the insurance company.

Korth has submitted his resignation as Secretary of the Navy, to take effect November 1, saying he needed to return to his business interests.

Salem EUB Church Observes 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton Standard-Speaker of October 18, 1963.

SALEM EUB CHURCH OBSERVES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The Salem Evangelical United Brethren Church, 314 West Broad Street, will observe its 100th anniversary Sunday with special services in the morning and afternoon.

The history of the church follows:

In the year 1861, a loyal band of Hazleton people joined together for the promotion of a new church. There was no church in the city in which the German language was used and these people all spoke this language. This work of building a church was started in that year and is now represented by Salem EUB Church.

In December 1861 a revival was held, during which there were 10 converts. At the annual conference of The Evangelical Association, held in Reading in February 1862, Hazleton was added to Ashland circuit and under the faithful labors of Rev. Joshua Frey, the interest increased and the congregation was organized in the home of Conrad and Ernestine Lahr.

The membership consisted of the following: Conrad and Ernestine Lahr, John and Catherine Berger, Valentine Bock, Adam Hoffsomer, Adam Hubert, George and Catherine Itter, Peter Kellmer, Elizabeth Lahr, Mr. and Mrs. William Knies, George and Margaret Outch, Louisa Ripple, John Ripple, Sr., Herman Schucker, Casper and Mary Wasserman.

The meetings were held for 2 years in the Conrad Lahr home and for the next year an a half in the schoolhouse in the east part of the borough. In 1863 this was constituted a mission and was under the charge of Rev. I. E. Kerr for 2 years. In 1863 the lot was purchased for the church building and on December 31 the lower part, or basement of the church was dedicated. The church was completed the following year, 1864, and dedicated in 1865 having a membership of 140 members.

This first church was a very modest two-story structure and served its purpose for many years.

The parsonage which stood at the rear of the church was erected in 1874. In 1879 the church was enlarged, a steeple placed on it and the grounds improved at a cost of $800. Peter Kellmer donated a bell in 1879.

The present church building was erected under the great leadership of Rev. J. M. Schlaugenhauf during the year 1898, at a cost of $7,000. A total of $6,000 of this amount had been raised by donations and offerings and in the year 1906, Rev. James E. Beam had the privilege of burning the mortgage and the church received a Reed organ, the gift of Mrs. Conrad Weigand.

Rev. F. M. Gingrich succeeded Reverend Beam in 1906 and immediately set out to have the gas lights replaced with electric lights and in 1908 the interior of the church was renovated, the improvements consisting of sheet metal sides and ceiling, painting the pulpit, new rug and small chairs for the primary room. In 1909 the exterior was painted at a cost of $167.

In the year 1911 the Sunday school room was enlarged and proposed changes made. The church installed its own heating system which they found much more satisfactory than the steam heat which had been supplied by the city.

Up to this time Sunday morning services had been conducted in German and the Sunday school was held in the afternoon and when Rev. J. J. Kreisel came in 1914, he introduced an English service also. He preached two sermons each Sunday morning, one in English and one in German, English.

During Reverend Kindt's term of service, which was during World War I, the German services were eliminated entirely and Sunday school hour was then changed to morning.

In 1930 while Rev. Norman Dettra was pastor, the primary room was redecorated with inlaid linoleum.

During the pastorate of Rev. M. S. Mumma, a pipeorgan was installed, the interior and exterior of the church painted and a new roof installed.

Many have been the sacrifices and many the hours of volunteer work have been given by faithful members down through the years. Only this summer the Sunday school was given a new look when the young adult class of the school sponsored the renovating project in which the floor was sanded and resurfaced, the walls painted and new carpet installed. All bills were met at the completion of the project.

A few descendants of the charter members are still members, they are: Miss Mary L. (Lallie) Sachs, Miss Lillian Outch, Mrs. Clark Drasher, Mr. Edward Itter, Misses Thelma and Doris Itter. Miss Sachs is a granddaughter of Conrad and Mrs. Lahr in whose home the church was organized.

In 1960 a building was purchased at Diamond Avenue and Grant Street, as a memorial to the memory of Mr. George C. Bock who in his will left the church a sum of money which was used as first payment on the property. Rev. Marvin Masteller worked more than 1,000 hours to help make this house a beautiful and up-to-date parsonage. Men of the congregation, as well as the ladies donated many hours on this project but were well repaid when they beheld the finished project. The entire cost of the project was about $25,000. There is still some debt on this, but it is gradually being liquidated.

Bananas, Dictators, and Cosa Nostra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star columnist, Arthur Hoppe, has written an illuminating article on the Alliance for Progress which I call to the special attention of Secretary of State Rusk, his handout artists in the Agency for International Development, and any others who may be engaged in casting our dollars to the global winds.

Mr. Hoppe's article follows:

Our Alliance for Progress, which aims at social reform in Latin America, is certainly making progress. In a way. Hardly a billion dollars goes by that some government down there doesn't get reformed. By its army.

I'd like to explain this phenomenon, but I'm not an expert on any of our Latin American neighbors. So I've had to invent one. It's a lovely little independent republic known to our State Department as "Cosa Nostra."

Cosa Nostra lies just south of the docks and has a population of 3,000,073. Of which 42 are peons, 41 are soldiers and the rest are bananas. For years and years it was governed peacefully by Gen. Cosa (the Ogre) Nostra. And there was never a complaint. Not from the general, who was happy. Nor from the soldiers, who were happy. Nor from the peons. Who knew what was good for them.

But things got more and more revolting until finally the peons revolted. The army gave up without firing a shot. Mainly because their 1812 muskets all failed to go off. General Nostra fled into exile (after stopping at the bank). And a president whose name we never could remember was

elected and began a vigorous program of social reform.

But then Castroism raised its ugly beard. In Cuba. Our State Department was alarmed. "We must save Cosa Nostra from Castroism." Washington cried. The Alliance for Progress was launched. We sent 113 experts to Cosa Nostra to determine what was needed to stem the tide of Castroism.

"Well," says El Presidente Whatshisnombre, "we could use food, teachers, books * * *."

"Great, great," says our Ambassador. "But look at that raggedly-old bob-tail army you've got. How do you expect to defend democracy with an army like that? We will include in our first shipment 474 tanks, 362 jet fighters and a couple of used battleships. Take your time in paying us back."

So at the bargain rate of only a billion or so, we managed to reform the Cosa Nostra army into a modern superbly equipped fighting force. And, oh, how happy the soldiers were to lay down their 1812 muskets. And pick up their brandnew burp guns.

"Hey, man," cried the tank drivers in the turrets of their streamlined U.S. tanks. "Look at these hot rods go." And with that they rolled right over the presidential palace. Not to mention El Presidente Whatshisnombre.

Gen. Cosa (the Ogre) Nostra returned from exile and took over. On the grounds he was more against Castroism than anybody. Which our State Department had to admit was certainly true. And, once again, there are no complaints in Cosa Nostra. Not from the general, who feels more secure. Nor from the soldiers, who love their burp guns. Nor from the peons. Who, after all, don't wish to complain against tanks, jet fighters, and battleships.

So the Alliance is making progress. Every week, it seems, we produce another highly stable government supported by an awesome army—an ally strong and powerful enough to defend forever the principles of democracy. If it had any.

Meddling Versus Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, after more than 3 years in power, the Kennedy administration apparently has not learned very much about handling our relations with Latin America. Newsday, on October 17, tells us why our diplomatic position and attitude toward the Dominican Republic is so wrong:

MORE MEDDLING

The junta ruling the Dominican Republic has protested alleged interference by the United States, charging that a State Department representative sought to have it yield power to a constitutional government. The U.S. representatives, Chargé d'Affaires Spencer M. King, denies he did anything more than to state the administration's attitude toward governments that gain power through military coups. That attitude is unfavorable.

Whatever King had to say, it is perfectly evident that his purpose was to meddle, as has so often, so regrettably, and so ineffectively been the case when governments in Latin America are overturned. The compulsion, incidentally, seems to be to interfere when the government is rightwing, not when it is oriented to or tolerant toward the left, as was the case with the overthrown Dominican administration of President Bosch. It is a continuing compulsion to reform.

By now this country should have learned that it does no good to attempt to reform Latin America, and that we must return to our sound former doctrine of recognizing any stable government there regardless of its ideology. The only thing our interference can accomplish is to shove such governments into the arms of Russia. The men who rule Latin America don't care who gives them their aid; if we won't, the Communist bloc will. A lot less do-gooding and a lot more enlightened self-interest is the best prescription for the vexing Latin American problem.

AFRTS Officer in Charge First Wave in Iceland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my great State of Mississippi has been first in a substantial number of ventures throughout its history. Among the many that might be named is the fact that it was the first State of the Union to set up a State owned and administered college for women. This splendid institution, now the Mississippi State College for Women, located at Columbus, Miss., is still an outstanding institution for the education of women. The first member of the military personnel to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor at the hands of the President of the United States in a joint session of the Congress, Sgt. Jake Lindsey, was a Mississippian.

The beautiful and sentimental gesture of placing flowers on the graves of the dead was first begun in Mississippi. In 1866 the women in the area of the historical Battle of Shiloh, Miss., gathered all available flowers and placed them on the graves of some 1,500 to 2,000 soldiers of both the blue and the gray. From this came our National Decoration Day.

In fact, in time of peace as well as in war, Mississippi has always made substantial contribution with outstanding leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly delighted to observe from the front page of the White Falcon, the publication for the U.S. Naval Station, Keflavik International Airport, Iceland, that a Mississippian is another first. Lt. Claire E. Brou, a native of Ocean Springs, Miss., has been selected by the Navy as the first Wave ever selected for duty in Iceland.

Claire comes from a splendid family of Mississippians. She is not only a charming, friendly person, but she is also a young woman of exceptional intelligence and character. Among her other accomplishments is that of a champion swimmer.

Because of her unique achievements and this additional honor that has come to her, I submit the article to which I have referred. The article is as follows:

AFRTS OFFICER IN CHARGE, FIRST WAVE IN ICELAND

"I feel sincerely honored to be the first Wave selected for duty in Iceland, and especially to be the first woman officer in charge of an Armed Forces radio and television station in AFRTS' 22 years of operation," said Lt. Claire E. Brou upon assuming her new duties.

Lieutenant Brou comes to Iceland from the Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.

While at Norfolk, Miss Brou served as enlisted personnel officer, women's representative, and women's barracks officer.

Miss Brou is originally from Ocean Springs, Miss. She is the daughter of Mrs. E. C. Brou. Her naval career began in New Orleans in 1948 when she enlisted for 4 years. She was honorably discharged in 1952 as a PN2. From 1952 through 1957 she was a member of the Inactive Reserve where she advanced to PN1. In September of 1957, Miss Brou received a direct appointment to Lieutenant (jg). In July 1960, she was promoted to her present rank of lieutenant.

Lieutenant Brou has served at CNO communications, at the Pentagon as Crypto watch officer, and at Headquarters Potomac River Naval Command in Washington as staff secretary to the commandant.

She attended Tulane University in New Orleans, and Louisiana State University where in 1957 she received a B.A. in speech and (radio-TV). In 1961, she graduated from American University in Washington with an M.A. in public relations.

In further comments about her new post, Miss Brou said, "What little I've seen of Iceland so far, I like; I look forward to next summer and the opportunity to visit as much of the country as possible and to get to know the people of Iceland."

In talking about her job, she expressed much optimism concerning the radio station and eagerness in the future to doing some live programs herself.

Clock Hands Moved Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the October 10 issue of the Anderson, Ind., Bulletin.

With our vast knowledge, we have within our grasp the power to either destroy ourselves or provide for the world the most positive peaceful and fruitful era we have ever known. I, for one, am grateful that the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists pushes the minute hand of the clock backward rather than forward as a result of the nuclear test ban treaty between Russia, Great Britain, and the United States.

The editorial follows:

CLOCK HANDS MOVED BACK

For the past 17 years a picture of a clock has been ticking off the minutes to the "hour of nuclear doom" on the cover of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, a nontechnical publication for the general public.

For only the second time in those 17 years, the minute hand of the clock has been retarded. From 7 minutes to midnight it has been moved backward to 12 minutes to mid-

night, as a result of the nuclear test ban treaty between Russia, Britain, and the United States.

The sponsors of the Bulletin, who include some of the most distinguished men of science in America and who are not given to overoptimism, feel that the treaty is a token of an encouraging trend in international attitudes toward nuclear weapons.

When the cover clock first appeared in 1947, a time when the United States alone had the atom bomb, its hands were set at 8 minutes to midnight.

In October 1949, the hands were moved forward to 3 minutes to midnight with the disclosure of the Russian atomic bomb. They went forward again in September 1953 to 2 minutes to midnight, with the hydrogen bomb developed by both the United States and the U.S.S.R.

In January 1960, however, the hands were moved back for the first time—to 7 minutes to midnight—because the Bulletin's editors sensed a rising tide of public opinion over the years against the military use of atomic power.

The scientists explain that their clock "is not a gage to register the ups and downs of the international power struggle.

"Instead," they say, "it is intended to reflect basic changes in the level of continuous danger in which mankind lives in the nuclear age, and will continue living, until society adjusts its basic attitudes and institutions to the challenge of science."

Apparently it is not yet time for the late, late—last show.

La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus Endorses Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an editorial in the October 12, 1963, issue of the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus endorsing the private sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

The editorial follows:

WHEAT FOR RUSSIA

So conservative an organization as the American Bankers Association gave its backing the other day to the U.S. wheat-to-Russia deal, not many hours before President Kennedy announced consummation of the sale. That the ABA would support this trade agreement is rather indicative of the consensus of the American business community, which tends to overlook ideology when good business is involved.

The wheat-to-Russia deal is a good busines deal for this country. And the arguments for it rather overwhelm the essentially emotional outcries against it, based upon a "you're helping the enemy" thesis.

Under the agreement we will rid ourselves of large surplus wheat stocks through the agency of private traders. We will be paid in gold or dollars which will help ease our unfavorable balance-of-payments deficit. The sale will bolster wheat prices, this helping the American wheat farmer.

Had we refused to sell wheat to Soviet Russia, it would not have been very difficult for the Russians to have gone elsewhere. West Germany, for example, could sell flour to Moscow after buying the wheat from us and milling it. It is not often emphasized in this country that Western Europe's trade with the Soviet bloc amounts to more than $2 billion of exports a year. The Western Europeans see no harm in mutual trade with Russia and Iron Curtain nations, no threat to their security or prosperity.

There is also the potent reason that by selling wheat to Soviet Russia we demonstrate to the whole world in dramatic fashion how much better the American agricultural system is than the Russian system. We are in position to ship many millions of tons out of the United States both as a business deal and for humanitarian purposes in the cases of countries in dire want.

Khrushchev, on the other hand, finds his agricultural system doing rather poorly even after years of ardent effort. By buying American wheat, as well as Canadian and Australian wheat, he concedes that his people have found the system deficient (coupled also with unfavorable weather conditions this year) and that they want to be better fed even if it is necessary to put less emphasis on new and bigger heavy industry, space activity and nuclear weaponry.

Selling wheat to Soviet Russia does not necessarily establish a hard-and-fast policy of more U.S. trade with Moscow, but it does illustrate the truism that trade can be mutually beneficial wtihout regard to ideology or the tussling of power politics.

Shuttlesworth: Bootlegger and Communist Fronter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Bible makes reference—in Jeremiah, verse 21—to the foolish people which "have eyes and see not; which have ears and hear not."

Among these foolish people today are those who, when confronted with reams and reams of documentation showing that the great majority of those who are fronting the race-mixing madness are members of Communist-front organizations founded and financed by the Communist Party, blindly deny that the evidence exists.

As far as I am able to determine, no newspaper, no television network or station, no radio station, nor any news magazine saw fit to make note of the 30-page CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertion of my colleague, the Honorable E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, on July 29, 1963, which lists the hundreds of Communist-front memberships and associations of the officials of the NAACP.

If the leaders of the Red Cross or the Salvation Army, the American Legion, or any other organization I can think of, had a similar record of Communist-inspired activity, the furor across the Nation would know no bounds. Too many well-intentioned citizens believe that the NAACP, however, is a "sacred" group and must not be mentioned in critical terms or else the accuser will be branded a demagog, a fanatic, or worse.

On July 29 of this year, Representative GATHINGS caused to be published in the RECORD the hundreds of Communist-front memberships and evidences of association of Roy Wilkins, Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, Arthur Spingarn, Grace B. Fenderson, A. Phillip Randolph, L. Pearl Mitchell, Bishop W. J. Walls, John Haynes Holmes, William Lloyd Imes, Dr. W. Montague Cobb, Westley W. Law, Dr. J. M. Tinsley, Dr. Harry J. Greene, Roscoe Dunjee, Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Robert C. Weaver, Lewis Gannett, Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, Judge Hubert T. Delany, Norman Cousins, Dr. Algernon D. Black, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Dr. H. Claude Hudson, Alfred Baker Lewis, Dr. James J. McClendon, James Hinton, Theodore M. Berry, Earl B. Dickerson, Benjamin E. Mays, A. T. Walden, Arthur D. Shores, Lloyd Garrison, Sidney A. Jones, W. Robert Ming, Jr., Arthur J. Mandell, Robert W. Kenny, Milton R. Konvitz, Loren Miller, Morris L. Ernst, Z. Alexander Looby, Karl N. Llewellyn, Shad Polier, Jawn Sandifer, Sidney R. Redmond, George W. Johnson, Edward P. Lovett, Louis L. Redding, Joseph B. Robinson, Dr. Edward L. Young, Viola Bernard, Dr. Russell L. Cecil, Dr. C. Herbert Marshall, Ruby Hurley, Thurgood Marshall, Clarence M. Mitchell, Henry Lee Moon, Clarence A. Laws, Robert L. Carter, and Torea Hall Pittman among others.

I would like to add to that list, "Reverend" Fred Lee Shuttlesworth, convicted bootlegger and head of the Communist-front Southern Conference Educational Fund.

The sheriff of Caddo Parish, La., J. Howell Flournoy, has dug into the background of this man and has furnished me copies of Shuttlesworth's police record as a bootlegger and the facts surrounding his Communist agitation. Though I imagine this will be ignored by the liberal press of the Nation, I bring it to the attention of the House today in the hopes that a few conservative newspapers will carry the sordid story of this criminal's past.

As documentary evidence of Shuttlesworth's bootlegging activity, I insert here the authenticated record extracted from the official documents of the State of Alabama:

INDICTMENT FOR DISTILLING—THE STATE VERSUS FRED SHUTTLESWORTH

(Hon. Robert J. Wheeler, judge, presiding)

This the 14th day of February 1941, came George Lewis Bailes, Solicitor, who prosecutes for the State of Alabama, and also came the defendant in his own proper person and by attorney, and said defendant being in open court, and being duly arraigned upon the indictment in this cause for his plea thereto, says that he is guilty of distilling as charged in said indictment.

And said defendant being in open court, and being asked by the court if he had anything to say why the judgment of the court and sentence of the law should not now be pronounced upon him, says nothing. It is therefore considered by the court, and it is the judgment of the court, that said defend is guilty of distilling, as charged in said indictment, and it is the judgment of the court and sentence of the law, that said defendant, the said Fred Shuttlesworth, be imprisoned in the penitentiary of the State of Alabama for a term of 2 years.

It is further considered by the court that the State of Alabama have and recover of the said defendant the costs in this behalf expended, including the cost, of feeding the

defendant while in jail, for which let execution issued.

And said defendant in open court, and making application for probation in this cause, and this cause being referred to the county probation officer for investigation and report; and the report of investigation of said probation officer being filed, and being duly considered by the court, it is ordered by the court, and it is the judgment of the court that probation in this cause be, and the same is hereby granted said defendant, and said defendant is hereby placed on probation, and sentence in this cause is hereby suspended, for a period of 2 years, said defendant to pay the costs of this court in this cause, all conditioned as set out in separate paper filed, as follows:

"It is further ordered and adjudged that the execution of the sentences imposed in this cause be and the same is hereby suspended until February 14, 1943 (which date is hereafter referred to as 'said date'), and that the defendant be and he is herby placed on probation until said date: *Provided, however,* That the power is hereby reserved to order said sentences executed on or before said date if the defendant violates any of the hereinafter specified conditions; and *Provided further,* That the power is hereby reserved to further suspend the execution of said sentences and to continue the defendant on probation beyond said date if the court deems it proper to do so; and *Provided further,* That the power is reserved to remit the said sentences if and when the court deems it proper to do so. The continuance in suspension of the execution of the said sentences shall be and is hereby made subject to the following conditions, namely, that the defendant shall (a) avoid injurious and vicious habits, and (b) avoid persons or places of disreputable or harmful character, and (c) make such reports from time to time to the probation officer serving this court as the said probation officer shall direct the defendant to make to him, and (d) permit said probation officer to visit him at his home or elsewhere, and (e) work faithfully at suitable employment as far as possible, and (f) remain within a specified place, namely State of Alabama unless and to the extent that he may be granted permission by the court or said probation officer to be elsewhere, and (g) pay court costs in this cause in the following manner, namely, $5 per month beginning March 1, 1941, and (h) support his dependents to the best of his ability, and (i) obey all laws of the State of Alabama, the Government of the United States, and the ordinances of any municipality in which the defendant may be, and (j) keep sober, and (k) obey all lawful instructions of said probation officer, and in general comport and conduct himself as said probation officer may lawfully instruct him, and (l) it is further ordered and adjudged that the power is hereby reserved in the court to hereafter alter, change, add to, or otherwise modify the conditions upon compliance with which, the continuance of the suspension of the execution of said sentences shall depend.

"The probation officer serving this court has on this day in the presence of the court, and immediately upon the signing of this order, handed to the defendant a copy of this order.

"ROBERT J. WHEELER,
"Circuit Judge.

"I hereby certify that I have on this the 14 day of February 1941, handed a copy of the foregoing order of court to the said defendant.

"M. M. GRANT, Jr.,
"Probation Officer serving the Circuit Court of the 10th Judicial Circuit of Alabama."

THE STATE OF ALABAMA,
Jefferson County.

As Clerk of the Circuit Court of the 10th Judicial Circuit, in and for said county and State, I do hereby certify that the within and foregoing is a true, complete, and correct copy of the minute entry now on file in my office, in a cause where the State of Alabama is plaintiff, and Fred Shuttlesworth is defendant.

Witness my hand, this 23 day of August 1963.

JULIAN SWIFT,
Clerk, 10th Judicial Circuit of Alabama.

Minute book 143 at page 125, 76631, *The State* v. *Fred Shuttlesworth;* indictment for distilling, Hon. Robert J. Wheeler, judge, presiding. "This is the 26th day of August 1942, it appearing to the court that said defendant, Fred Shuttlesworth, has probably violated the terms of his probation, it is therefore ordered by the court that a said capias issue in this case for the arrest of said defendant, and that when arrested, said defendant be retained in the custody of the sheriff pending further orders."

Minute book 143 at page 136: *The State* v. *Fred Shuttlesworth;* indictment for distilling, Hon. Robert J. Wheeler, judge, presiding. "This the 1st day of September 1942, upon recommendation of Miss Purdy of probation office and upon the solemn promise of the defendant to faithfully observe the terms and conditions of his probation, it is ordered by the court that said defendant be released from custody, and to remain at liberty under his probation pending further orders of this court."

The bootlegging of Shuttlesworth is only the beginning of his criminal record. His ties with communism and its aims is substantiated by his being rewarded for his race agitation by being named president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, which is not educational, is a cell rather than a conference and is certainly not southern in concept.

Originally known as "The Southern Conference for Human Welfare," it was founded by the veteran Communist, the late Louis E. Burnham. Its field secretary today is Carl Braden, identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party.

The full report on Shuttlesworth's work for the Communists is detailed in Jack Lotto's story from the Cincinnati Enquirer of June 9, 1963:

CINCINNATI PASTOR NAMED AS HEAD OF RED FRONT

(By Jack Lotto)

To help its readers keep on guard against propaganda, the Cincinnati Enquirer brings you this authoritative weekly report.

One of the top leaders of the integration movement in the South has been named head of a big pro-Communist front.

He is the Reverend Fred L. Shuttlesworth, 965 Dana Avenue, pastor of the Revelation Baptist Church, 1556 John Street.

The post he was elected to is president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, with headquarters in New Orleans, and active in 17 Southern States.

Both the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities have described the SCEF as an organization set up to promote communism throughout the South.

This group has a long history of activity in the South. It originally was known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. One of its founders was a veteran Communist, the late Louis E. Burnham.

When the SCHW was cited as a Communist front in 1947 by the House committee, it ostensibly went out of business.

It quickly reopened at the same New Orleans address, under the new name and with the same telephone number.

According to the Senate subcommittee, the Southern Conference Educational Fund was "operating with substantially the same leadership and purposes" of its predecessor.

Said the House report on the SCHW:

"It seeks to attract Southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. Its professed interest in Southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The field secretary for the SCEF, and editor of its publication, the Southern Patriot, is Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky. Braden, identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, recently finished serving a 1-year prison term for contempt of Congress.

New additions to the board of the Southern Conference Educational Fund included the Reverend James A. Zellner, Methodist minister in Panama City, Fla. He is the father of Bob Zellner, the freedom walker active in the student nonviolence committee and now serving a jail term in Alabama.

Another board member is Mrs. Diane Bevel, of Cleveland, Miss., active in Nashville student demonstrations, and currently working in Alabama and Mississippi.

She is jailed in Gadsden, Ala., for taking part with Zellner in a prointegration march, following in the steps of William Moore, the postman shot and killed during a one-man protest march.

Communists and pro-Communists are moving into the South to provoke friction between whites and Negroes. On the scene is James E. Jackson, a member of the four-man ruling secretariat of the U.S. Communist Party.

Jackson, who is propaganda boss in the United States for the Reds, is also the party's secretary for Southern and Negro affairs—a polite term for chief racial troublemaker.

This Moscow-trained Negro has been in the forefront of Communist organizational and agitational work in the South for years.

In 1959, he went to Russia as the representative of the U.S. Communist Party at the 21st World Congress of Communist Parties. There, he hailed the Soviet Union and denounced the United States.

And so, the list continues to fester and grow, spewing out a wretched little knot of Reds, sex perverts, security risks, bootleggers, vagrants, and the unwashed. Add one more to the long list: Reverend Shuttlesworth, bootlegger.

Double Standard: Left Wields Its Political Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, appeared in the Washington Post of October 21.

Mr. Speaker, we all have the right to an opinion of our own, but we also, it would seem, owe others the same right. It seems that since we have become a nation of spectator sportsmen, we have lost our sense of fairplay and that our favorite cheer is: "Kill the umpire."

The article follows:

DOUBLE STANDARD: LEFT WIELDS ITS POLITICAL PUNCH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One of the more powerful weapons in the arsenal of the Democratic Party is the double

standard of political morality which has been practiced in the United States for many years and still flourishes.

There ought, in all fairness, to be some way to address the balance.

By "double standard," I refer to the fact that when some figure on the political right is involved in an impropriety, the liberals quite properly scream to high heaven, but when some figure on the political left is involved in an impropriety, these same liberals are blandly silent.

By the same token, the antics of the extreme right get a massive going over by the liberal politicians and commentators and then they suddenly lose their voices when confronted by comparable antics by the extreme left.

I am not talking theory; I'm talking practice. Here are examples:

When the Democratic candidate for the California senatorial nomination campaigned against Helen Gahagan Douglas on the ground that she had been following the Communist line, the liberals never lifted an eyebrow. When the Republican candidate campaigned against her using the same arguments, it became an egregious offense.

When California voters provided Senator Richard Nixon with a campaign fund to use between elections, the disclosure was greeted as a national scandal. When Texas supporters provided Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH with a campaign fund, with much looser accountability, the disclosure distressed the critics of the Nixon fund not a bit.

When the Young Republicans at their national convention in San Francisco recently listened to a shocking condemnation of former President Eisenhower, showed they thought Senator BARRY GOLDWATER not adequately conservative and indicated that they would really prefer a presidential nominee like former Congressman John Rousselot, now a paid organizer for the John Birch Society, these extremist antics rightly got national attention. But when the California Young Democrats at their convention passed a whole series of extremist resolutions, these antics of the left found the critics of the Young Republicans undisturbed and uninterested.

If you think I'm exaggerating the extremism, the Communist Party line-ism, of the Young Democrats of California, look at these declarations of purpose which came from them:

Immediate recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations.

Resuming trade and diplomatic relations with Castro-Soviet Cuba.

Recognition of the Communist government of East Germany.

Withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam (an action which even the opponents of the Diem regime admit would turn that country over to the Communist).

I am not arguing that any of the improprieties or extremisms of the political right should go unpublicized. I am arguing that the double standard which causes critics to shout at the improprieties and extremisms of the right and conveniently ignore the improprieties and extremisms of the left does a grave disservice to American public life.

What brings it about? If we could answer that question, we might be nearer to ending this one-sided political dialog. I suspect that part of the answer is that many professing liberals are so confident of their own virtue that in their eyes they can do no wrong, that the end justifies the means, that liberals shouldn't be bound by the political moral standards they would impose on the conservatives.

All I am saying is that I would like to see the same standards of public conduct and criticism applied to both.

Never Trust the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, everything between President Kennedy and Khrushchev seems to be sweetness and light—on the surface, that is.

There is a great deal of naivete in our Executive leadership today and Henry J. Taylor, in last Thursday's Washington Daily news reminds us what has happened and what probably will happen in this regard:

ANOTHER BANANA PEEL SOON?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

President Kennedy has put our country (and himself) on a diplomatic banana peel by featuring his good relations policy with Khrushchev. It carries us inevitably into the pitfall of Soviet duplicity.

Moreover, if Kremlin performance follows its regular pattern the high point in this Washington upthrust has been passed for the time being. It was passed when we inflated the Soviet test ban consent to the height that Washington propaganda ballooned it. The Russians know they cannot top that cheeriness. By Soviet rules, now for the downslide.

None is so blind as he who will not see, and what our Washington assurance-mongers mistake as a new tack in Soviet affairs (always rationalized) is a new tack only if we bury Soviet history and refuse to read even the newspapers of the past 18 years.

At least four times in that period—about every 4 or 5 years and at least once in each President's term—the Kremlin employed the same charade that mesmerizes the White House policy today. Do we never learn anything? Must we always forget everything?

At Yalta. Promptly after the Yalta "good relations" the fist. The Iron Curtain fell in southeast Europe and within 93 miles of the Rhine. The tragedy of President Roosevelt at Yalta will haunt us for generations.

At Potsdam. There, on August 2, 1945, the Kremlim pledged uniformity of treatment of the German population throughout Germany. President Truman made his ill-fated remark about "good old Joe." By June 24, 1948, the Kremlin had blockaded Berlin and Mr. Truman had to operate the Berlin airlift to keep the free area of the city from starving.

At Geneva. The United States-U.S.S.R. chiefs of state had not met for 10 years. Russia had signed the Austrian peace treaty (a happy surprise like the test ban) and I witnessed the reassuring summit spectacle in Switzerland and, in fact, met Khrushchev there for the first time. Within 60 days the Soviet broke up the resulting foreign ministers' conference and again applied its up-down strategy—plunging us into another Berlin crisis.

At Camp David, after Khrushchev's whoopla tour of the United States, the "spirit of Camp David." Bang! The banana peel all over again. True to form, this high point was followed by the Paris crash when Khrushchev torpedoed the Eisenhower conference on the pretext of the U-2, canceled our President's visit to Russia, and plunged us again into the cold war. Can Mr. Kennedy forget that?

Khrushchev's formula remains the same today. It is to impress the idea if he gets his way he can be a very satisfactory fellow, but if not, beware, anything can happen.

As Clemenceau said of the Kaiser, Khrushchev is a man who "first takes your hand, then takes your arm, then swallows your whole body." Today we are merely rationing Khrushchev as, piece by piece, he eats Berlin by preserving that threat, eats Laos on the way to South Vietnam, eats Indonesia and heads for Malaysia in tandem with Mao Tse-tung; eats Cuba inside America's defense periphery on the way to Brazil and even eats the clear-headedness of our own officials.

The timing is always uncertain, but another banana-peel fall is due soon.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 19, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT: THE GRIM WORLD OF THE BROTHERS WONDERFUL

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Failure, broken promises, doubletalk, evasion, confusion, are the key words which describe the record of the Kennedy administration in its first 3 years in power in what has been summed up as "the grim world of the brothers wonderful." A recitation of the sorry record makes it clear President Kennedy does not understand, or chooses to ignore, the Communist conspiracy to rule the world, and on domestic issues, does not understand our private enterprise system, capitalism, or is doing his best to change it for a planned society directed from Washington.

FAILURES

1. Cuba: Dating from the Bay of Pigs fiasco, Soviet domination of Cuba has been strengthened. Subversion and sabotage throughout South America with Cuba as a base, has increased.

2. Latin America: Although millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money have been poured into Latin America through the Alliance for Progress, American prestige continues to drop and the danger of Communist takeover has increased. Six Latin American governments have been overthrown since the disaster of the Bay of Pigs—Argentina, Equador, Peru, Guatamala, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic.

The administration has expresed alarm, dismay, and exhibited more than a little bit of confusion, each time such a government has fallen. It is becoming increasingly clear that the Kennedy administration does not fully comprehend exactly what there is to be alarmed and dismayed about. They do not understand that the instability of many of these governments has been caused by the ruthless campaign conducted by Moscow through Havana to seize power in every Latin American nation. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that men decide that weak and unstable governments lead inevitably to Communist chaos and must therefore be overthrown before they are undermined by the Communists.

3. Despite solemn reassurances by the administration, the fear of possible devalua-

tion of the dollar continues to be very real as our balance-of-payments situation worsens and there is increased pressure on our gold supply.

4. Violence, heartbreak, and finally murder have been the results of the Kennedy efforts to use the civil rights issue for political expediency.

5. On the economic front Federal spending is running wild with bigger and bigger deficits, a recordbreaking public debt, and a tax bill which is going to cause disillusionment for every taxpayer.

Omnibus is the word for the New Frontier—something for everyone. The tragedy is that the people must pay for the failures and the experiments—pay in increased taxes, chaos, prehaps war, and eventually with our freedom.

STRANGE POLICIES

1. Giving respectability to the enemy: As Columnist Henry J. Taylor points out, we have given Tito, an artful, two-faced con man, $3.2 billion of the taxpayers' money, in spite of his record, one of doubledealing, backstabbing, and deceit. He has announced his total allegiance to the Communist conspiracy. He has proven his Godless attitude by banning religion and imprisoning priests. He has opposed the United States in every confrontation with the Soviet Union. For this he is rewarded by being received at the White House as the respectable head of a friendly nation.

2. Moonshot: Columnist Peter Edson reports that up until mid-September the Vice President and all the congressional administration drumbeaters were emphasizing the need to spend $20 billion to beat the Russians to the moon. Then President Kennedy calmly rejected this theory and told the U.N. we should conduct a joint moon venture.

3. Workweek: In 1960, Kennedy said the Nation had to buckle down to work. He opposed a shortened workweek. Following his nonpolitical tour, Kennedy said, "We're going to find the workweek reduced.

4. Vietnam: American boys are being killed, but the President says we are not at war. He says the CIA is following orders, then recalls the head of the mission.

THE PLAN AND THE ARCHITECTS

The Americans for Democratic Action has made no secret of its aim "to tailor our Constitution to fit its peculiar measurement of a Socialist welfare state." Members of the ADA, close to the President and helping direct administration policy, to name a few: Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; on the White House staff, Theodore Sorenson, Lawrence O'Brien, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in the State Department, Chester Bowles, Averell Harriman, G. Mennen Williams, Carl Rowan.

The choice the American people face: A leadership which will state its principles and stick to them, or the New Frontier attempting to be all things to all pressure groups by abandoning one policy after another and reversing positions to sail with the popular tide.

Mr. Schlesinger, Jr., and Tranquillity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial published in the October 15 issue of Seattle Daily Times.

This newspaper pungently points up the sharp difference between the administration's foreign policy promise and its actual performance, and even so when disguised by one of the New Frontiers most prodigious partisan political pointer-outers Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

I am happy to observe in the following editorial an example of the press not be tranquilized as to the tranquillity of the world:

NOW, WE CAN ALL RELAX

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the most loquacious of President Kennedy's inner circle of advisers, has put together a brandnew description of the administration's foreign-policy achievements.

The administration, Schlesinger said this week, has tranquilized the foreign field.

This should be a great relief to all Americans, who no longer need worry about the impossible situation in South Vietnam, the failure of the Alliance for Progress, or the deepening divisions in NATO.

All is tranquil.

Just one thing bothers us. We can understand that Schlesinger and associates might have come to feel that their long-term promise of a "dynamic" foreign policy has worn a little thin. But why throw the adjective machine completely in reverse?

From dynamic to tranquil is a pretty sharp switchback.

Future of NATO at Stake: "Gaullists" Versus "Atlantists"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following recent article by Eric Waldman which appeared in the October 13 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. Mr. Waldman is Director of the Institute of German Affairs and a professor of political science at Marquette University:

The change of administration in Germany this week, the assertion last week that France had armed some of her planes with nuclear weapons, the bowing out of Prime Minister Macmillan from the British political scene, all made more urgent the attempt of the United States to find agreement with her principal allies on new strategic concepts for the defense of the free world. The future of the most effective alliance of the Western powers—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—is threatened by the divisive influence of France and by important differences of interpretation of Soviet moves for relaxation of tensions.

The renewed harassment of western traffic to West Berlin last week by Soviet guards, including the halting of U.S. Army convoys on the autobahn at Helmstedt, made it very clear that the thaw did not extend to the west European frontier.

The heated dispute in West Germany about signing of the nuclear test ban treaty indicated the increasing difficulties the next Bonn government under Ludwig Erhard will face in dealing with future East-West moves to ease international tensions. The division among politicians and statesmen into "Atlantists" and "Gaullists" actually has split all of her four major political parties represented in parliament.

ADENAUER AND DE GAULLE

The foreign policy issue for which Erhard will have to find an acceptable solution is not really a quarrel over the desirability of relaxing of international tension nor over the continuation of a Western policy of strength. Most Germans are agreed on both, in principle, but differ on method.

The Gaullists, who share President de Gaulle's view of the futility of negotiations at this time with Moscow, are labeled by opponents as the "dogmatists of the cold war." They in turn pin on the Atlantists the dubious name of "relaxation of tension illusionists."

The Gaullists assert that Moscow's signature to the test ban and willingness to negotiate with the West on other issues of tension are only indications of a change in Soviet tactics but not in basic policy. The Atlantists on the other hand see in the Moscow treaty a beginning on the hopeful road to peace.

Chancellor Adenauer, who took great personal satisfaction in the Franco-German treaty of friendship signed early this year, appeared because of his closeness to de Gaulle and coolness to Britain to be sympathetic to the de Gaullist position. However, he insisted on retaining close ties to the United States, as the Atlantists advocate, and his foreign minister, Gerhard Schroeder, is an Atlantist. Erhard, more friendly to Britain and the United States than to France, is considered an Atlantist, and will retain Schroeder.

This dispute presently dividing German politicians is by no means confined to Germany, but has its counterpart in other NATO countries.

In the United States, various defensive alliances, including NATO, are being reevaluated.

Indisputably, the world situation has greatly changed since the founding of NATO in April 1949, under American leadership. The vital question inherent in the rethinking of the western position now in progress is whether the hopeful vision of 1949 is anything more than an illusion of fantasy in 1963.

On NATO's plus side, overt Soviet aggressiveness in Europe has been brought under control. The forces of communism have made no territorial headway on the continent since 1949.

On the other side of the ledger, however, the buildup of NATO's conventional forces was from the very start marked by a lack of wholehearted support from some NATO members. As a result, U.S. nuclear power filled the gap for many years by providing the main deterrent force for the alliance.

Even today, nearly 15 years after NATO came into being, the alliance still is considerably short of the 30 divisions plus supporting units which were considered necessary for its defensive task.

One of the most significant changes affecting NATO came with the inclusion of substantial military forces of West Germany, which have become the largest individual contribution to NATO's conventional forces. At present 11 German divisions in addition to air force and naval units are under NATO command.

Another significant but adverse change was the steady buildup of Soviet nuclear and missile forces, cutting the margin of the U.S. nuclear supremacy ever narrower. The result is often referred to as a "balance of terror," marked by the possibility of mutual destruction and obliteration.

With the increasing possibility of the destruction of American cities in retaliation for the use by the United States of her nuclear forces in the defense of her European allies against Soviet imperialism, the credibility of the solemn U.S. guarantees dwindled substantially in the minds of many Europeans.

Perhaps the Soviets were more convinced by the continuous forceful assurances given by American statesmen that the United States was determined to live up to her international commitments than were some of the western allies. De Gaulle for one vowed

to make France "secure from aggression" regardless of the cost involved, by means of her own nuclear retaliatory "force de frappe," the first units of which may just have been put in service.

CRISES OF CONFIDENCE

The discussion of new strategic concepts for NATO, of emphasizing stronger conventional forces, of abandoning the old concept of the nuclear "sword" and the conventional "shield," brought a deep sense of insecurity into the NATO alliance. Some European statesmen even interpreted these efforts as signaling an American intention to pull out from Europe altogether or to settle her differences with the Soviets at the expense of her European partners. Repeated "crises of confidence" marked the relation of the United States with her European allies in the last few years.

Whatever the practicality of the multinational nuclear force now under discussion, it was one of several efforts of the United States to restore confidence among the allies and to raise the standing of the nonnuclear powers.

Before the strategic re-evaluation could reach any decisive stage, new elements of change were introduced Moscow's split with Red China and the prolonged economic difficulties experienced within the Soviet bloc induced the Soviet leaders to move in the direction of at least a temporary relaxation of tension in an area—nuclear testing—which is of no great consequence to the immediate power relation in Europe and to the de facto division of the continent.

WHAT SOVIET MOTIVES?

Discussions with the Soviets on other issues are continuing. Since it is highly unlikely that the Soviet leaders have given up their long range objective of a world under Communist rule, the reasons for Soviet willingness to discuss nonaggression treaties and the use of inspection teams appear as an effort further to undermine western unity or to cope with current difficulties within the Communist world.

The NATO council is now working on a common western platform to be used as basis for further negotiations with the Kremlin leaders. This probably is the best forum for finding a common western basis because it includes all NATO partners. European NATO statesmen, and not only Gaullists, doubt that an effective alliance can be maintained if the United States—as she has done at times in the recent past—negotiates in effect unilaterally and keeps some of her partners in the dark as to her intentions.

NATO stands at a fork in the road: One path leads to a new and vigorous NATO functioning even more effectively as a defensive alliance capable eventually of winning significant political concessions from the Soviets, thus contributing to a genuine relaxation of tensions. The other path would leave NATO the powerless victim of Khrushchev's diplomatic maneuvers designed to use even his present weak ecoonmic and political position to achieve material victories. These are the real alternatives behind the quarrels of the Gaullists and Atlantists. The months ahead will tell the story.

The United States a Christian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in its apparent zeal to change the intent of the Constitution as it relates to our religious heritage the Supreme Court has actually limited the free exercise of religion in the United States. There is some debate as to whether or not the Court has that right. I am convinced that it does not.

Because of the current attempts by the Court to restrict the freedom of religion and because it is as timely today as it was when first delivered in 1905, I am including as a part of these remarks, an address by Associate Justice David J. Brewer who served in the Supreme Court from 1890 to 1910. Justice Brewer's address was reprinted this week in the U.S. News & World Report with an apt foreword by David Lawrence. The complete text follows:

THE UNITED STATES A CHRISTIAN NATION

(Atheism a few months ago scored its biggest triumph when the Supreme Court of the United States was persuaded to forbid prayer in public schools. Was this judicial "evolution"? Has the attitude of the American people toward the importance of the Judeo-Christian concept as a paramount factor in American life undergone any change? Are the Ten Commandments obsolete just because of the passage of time? Shall we see more "evolution" now, such as a court order to remove the word "God" from the pledge of allegiance to the flag? Is voluntary prayer by a majority in the schoolroom to be tabooed by the Court because a minority is unwilling to let other pupils pray? Congress is forbidden by the Constitution to pass any law prohibiting the "free exercise" of religion. But has the Supreme Court the right to limit the "free exercise" of religion? Such questions may be left to the reader to answer for himself after examining the extracts quoted below from a lecture at Haverford College entitled "The United States a Christian Nation." It was delivered by a Supreme Court Justice in 1905.—David Lawrence, Editor.)

(By David J. Brewer, Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, 1890–1910)

We classify nations in various ways, as, for instance, by their form of government. One is a kingdom, another an empire, and still another a republic. Also by race. Great Britain is an Anglo-Saxon nation, France a Gallic, Germany a Teutonic, Russia a Slav. And still again by religion. One is a Mohammedan nation, others are heathen, and still others are Christian nations.

This republic is classified among the Christian nations of the world. It was so formally declared by the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of Holy Trinity Church versus United States, 143 U.S. 471, that Court, after mentioning various circumstances, added, "these and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation." (Unanimous opinion, February 29, 1892.)

But in what sense can it be called a Christian nation? Not in the sense that Christianity is the established religion or that the people are in any manner compelled to support it. On the contrary, the Constitution specifically provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Neither is it Christian in the sense that all its citizens are either in fact or name Christians. On the contrary, all religions have free scope within our borders. Numbers of our people profess other religions, and many reject all. Nor is it Christian in the sense that a profession of Christianity is a condition of holding office or otherwise engaging in the public service, or essential to recognition either politically or socially. In fact the Government as a legal organization is independent of all religions.

Nevertheless, we constantly speak of this republic as a Christian nation—in fact, as the leading Christian nation of the world. This popular use of the term certainly has significance. It is not a mere creation of the imagination. It is not a term of derision but has a substantial basis—one which justifies its use. Let us analyze a little and see what is the basis.

Its use has had from the early settlements on our shores and still has an official foundation. It is only about three centuries since the beginnings of civilized life within the limits of these United States. And those beginnings were in a marked and marvelous degree identified with Christianity.

It is not exaggeration to say that Christianity in some of its creeds was the principal cause of the settlement of many of the colonies, and cooperated with business hopes and purposes in the settlement of the others. Beginning in this way and under these influences it is not strange that the colonial life had an emphatic Christian tone.

In Delaware, by the constitution of 1776, every officeholder was required to make and subscribe the following declaration: "I, A. B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ His Only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed forevermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration."

New Hampshire, in the constitutions of 1784 and 1792, required that senators and representatives should be of the "Protestant religion," and this provision remained in force until 1877.

The fundamental constitutions of the Carolinas declared: "No man shall be permitted to be a freeman of Carolina, or to have any estate or habitation within it that doth not acknowledge a God, and that God is publicly and solemnly to be worshiped."

The constitution of North Carolina, of 1776, provided: "That no person who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within this State." And this remained in force until 1835, when it was amended by changing the word "Protestant" to "Christian," and as so amended remained in force until the constitution of 1868. And in that constitution among the persons disqualified for office were "all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God."

In Maryland, by the constitution of 1776, every person appointed to any office of profit or trust was not only to take an official oath of allegiance to the State, but also to "subscribe a declaration of his belief in the Christian religion." In the same State, in the constitution of 1851, it was declared that no other test or qualification for admission to any office of trust or profit shall be required than the official oath "and a declaration of belief in the Christian religion; and if the party shall profess to be a Jew the declaration shall be of his belief in a future state of rewards and punishments." As late as 1864 the same State in its constitution had a similar provision, the change being one merely of phraseology, the provision reading, "a declaration of belief in the Christian religion, or of the existence of God, and in a future state of rewards and punishments."

Mississippi, by the constitution of 1817, provided that "no person who denies the being of God or a future state of rewards and punishments shall hold any office in the civil department of the State."

Another significant matter is the recognition of Sunday. That day is the Christian Sabbath, a day peculiar to that faith, and known to no other. It would be impossible within the limits of a lecture to point out all the ways in which that day is recognized. The following illustrations must suffice: By the U.S. Constitution the President is re-

quired to approve all bills passed by Congress. If he disapproves he returns it with his veto. And then specifically it is provided that if not returned by him within 10 days, "Sundays excepted," after it shall have been presented to him it becomes a law. Similar provisions are found in the constitutions of most of the States, and in 36 out of 45 is the same expression, "Sundays excepted."

By decisions in many States a contract made on Sunday is invalid and cannot be enforced. By the general course of decision no judicial proceedings can be held on Sunday. All legislative bodies, whether municipal, State or national, abstain from work on that day. Indeed, the vast volume of official action, legislative and judicial, recognizes Sunday as a day separate and apart from the others, a day devoted not to the ordinary pursuits of life.

While the word "God" is not infrequently used both in the singular and plural to denote any supreme being or beings, yet when used alone and in the singular number it generally refers to that Supreme Being spoken of in the Old and New Testaments and worshiped by Jew and Christian. In that sense the word is used in constitution, statute, and instrument. In many State constitutions we find in the preamble a declaration like this: "Grateful to Almighty God." In some he who denied the being of God was disqualified from holding office. It is again and again declared in constitution and statute that official oaths shall close with an appeal, "So help me, God." When, upon inauguration, the President-elect each 4 years consecrates himself to the great responsibilities of Chief Executive of the Republic, his vow of consecration in the presence of the vast throng filling the Capitol Grounds will end with the solemn words, "So help me, God." In all our courts witnesses in like manner vouch for the truthfulness of their testimony. The common commencement of wills is "In the name of God, Amen." Every foreigner attests his renunciation of allegiance to his former sovereign and his acceptance of citizenship in this Republic by an appeal to God.

These various declarations in charters, constitutions, and statutes indicate the general thought and purpose. If it be said that similar declarations are not found in all the charters or in all the constitutions, it will be borne in mind that the omission oftentimes was because they were deemed unnecessary, as shown by the quotation just made from the opinion of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, as well as those hereafter taken from the opinions of other courts. And further, it is of still more significance that there are no contrary declarations. In no charter or constitution is there anything to even suggest that any other than the Christian is the religion of this country. In none of them is Mohammed or Confucius or Buddha in any manner noticed. In none of them is Judaism recognized other than by way of toleration of its special creed. While the separation of church and state is often affirmed, there is nowhere a repudiation of Christianity as one of the institutions as well as benedictions of society.

In short, there is no charter or constitution that is either infidel, agnostic or anti-Christian. Wherever there is a declaration in favor of any religion it is of the Christian. In view of the multitude of expressions in its favor, the avowed separation between church and state is a most satisfactory testimonial that it is the religion of this country, for a peculiar thought of Christianity is of a personal relation between man and his Maker, uncontrolled by and independent of human government.

Notice also the matter of chaplains. These are appointed for the Army and Navy, named as officials of legislative assemblies, and universally they belong to one or other of the Christian denominations. Their whole range of service, whether in prayer or preaching, is an official recognition of Christianity. If it be not so, why do we have chaplains?

If we consult the decisions of the courts, although the formal question has seldom been presented because of a general recognition of its truth, yet in the *People* v. *Ruggles*, 8 John. 290, 294, 295, Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said: "The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice."

The New York Supreme Court, in *Lindenmuller* v. *The People*, 33 Barbour, 561, held that—

"Christianity is not the legal religion of the State, as established by law. If it were, it would be a civil or political institution, which it is not; but this is not inconsistent with the idea that it is in fact, and ever has been, the religion of the people. This fact is everywhere prominent in all our civil and political history, and has been, from the first, recognized and acted upon by the people, as well as by constitutional conventions, by legislatures and by courts of justice."

In *Arkansas, Shover* v. *The State*, 10 English, 263, the Supreme Court said:

"Sunday or the Sabbath is properly and emphatically called the Lord's day, and is one among the first and most sacred institutions of the Christian religion. This system of religion is recognized as constituting a part and parcel of the common law, and as such all of the institutions growing out of it, or, in any way, connected with it, in case they shall not be found to interfere with the rights of conscience, are entitled to the most profound respect, and can rightfully claim the protection of the lawmaking power of the State."

If now we pass from the domain of official action and recognition to that of individual acceptance we enter a field of boundless extent, and I can only point out a few of the prominent facts:

Notice our educational institutions. I have already called your attention to the provisions of the charters of the first three colleges. Think of the vast number of academies, colleges and universities scattered through the land. Some of them, it is true, are under secular control, but there is yet to be established in this country one of those institutions founded on the religions of Confucius, Buddha or Mohammed, while an overwhelming majority are under the special direction and control of Christian teachers.

You will have noticed that I have presented no doubtful facts. Nothing has been stated which is debatable. The quotations from charters are in the archives of the several States; the laws are on the statute books; judicial opinions are taken from the official reports; statistics from the census publications. In short, no evidence has been presented which is open to question.

I could easily enter upon another line of examination. I could point out the general trend of public opinion, the disclosures of purposes and beliefs to be found in letters, papers, books and unofficial declarations. I could show how largely our laws and customs are based upon the laws of Moses and the teachings of Christ; how constantly the Bible is appealed to as the guide of life and the authority in questions of morals; how the Christian doctrines are accepted as the great comfort in times of sorrow and affliction, and fill with the light of hope the services for the dead. On every hilltop towers the steeple of some Christian church, while from the marble witnesses in God's acre comes the universal but silent testimony to the common faith in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection and the life hereafter.

But I must not weary you. I could go on indefinitely, pointing out further illustrations both official and nonofficial, public and private; such as the annual Thanksgiving proclamations, with their following days of worship and feasting; announcements of days of fasting and prayer; the universal celebration of Christmas; the gathering of millions of our children in Sunday schools, and the countless volumes of Christian literature, both prose and poetry. But I have said enough to show that christianity came to this country with the first colonists; has been powerfully identified with its rapid development, colonial and national, and today exists as a mighty factor in the life of the Republic.

Another Banana Peel Soon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently pointed out that the way to judge Soviet response to any development of American affairs is to simply sit down and read history. Unfortunately, the bright-eyed eager men in the administration seemingly seldom do so.

Therefore, I would like to emphasize my belief by reprinting an essay, or column, taken from a recent issue of the Washington Daily News. The essay was written by Mr. Henry J. Taylor, a man who apparently does read history.

The essay, which appeared late last week, is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

ANOTHER BANANA PEEL SOON?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

President Kennedy has put our country (and himself) on a diplomatic banana peel by featuring his good relations policy with Khrushchev. It carries us inevitably into the pitfall of Soviet duplicity.

Moreover, if Kremlin performance follows its regular pattern the high point in this Washington upthrust has been passed for the time being. It was passed when we inflated the Soviet test ban consent to the height that Washington propaganda ballooned it. The Russians know they cannot top that cheeriness. By Soviet rules, now for the downslide.

None is so blind as he who will not see, and what our Washington assurance mongers mistake as a new tack in Soviet affairs (always rationalized) is a new tack only if we bury Soviet history and refuse to read even the newspapers of the past 18 years.

At least four times in that period—about every 4 or 5 years and at least once in each President's term—the Kremlin employed the same charade that mesmerizes the White House policy today. Do we never learn anything? Must we always forget everything?

At Yalta. Promptly after the Yalta good relations, the fist. The Iron Curtain fell in southeast Europe and within 93 miles of the Rhine. The tragedy of President Roosevelt at Yalta will haunt us for generations.

At Potsdam. There, on August 2, 1945, the Kremlin pledged "uniformity of treatment of the German population throughout Germany." President Truman made his ill-fated remark about "Good Old Joe." By June 24, 1948, the Kremlin had blockaded

Berlin and Mr. Truman had to operate the Berlin airlift to keep the free area of the city from starving.

At Geneva. The United States-U.S.S.R. chiefs of state had not met for 10 years. Russia had signed the Austrian peace treaty (a happy surprise like the test ban) and I witnessed the reassuring summit spectacle in Switzerland and, in fact, met Khrushchev there for the first time. Within 60 days the Soviet broke up the resulting foreign ministers' conference and again applied its up-down strategy—plunging us into another Berlin crisis.

At Camp David, after Khrushchev's whoopla tour of the United States, the spirit of Camp David. Bang. The banana peel all over again. True to form, this high point was followed by the Paris crash when Khrushchev torpedoed the Eisenhower conference on the pretext of the U-2, canceled our President's visit to Russia and plunged us again into the cold war. Can Mr. Kennedy forget that?

Khrushchev's formula remains the same today. It is to impress the idea if he gets his way he can be a very satisfactory fellow, but if not, beware, anything can happen.

As Clemenceau said of the Kaiser, Khrushchev is a man who "first takes your hand, then takes your arm, then swallows your whole body." Today we are merely rationing Khrushchev as, piece by piece, he eats Berlin by preserving that threat, eats Laos on the way to South Vietnam, eats Indonesia and heads for Malaysia in tandem with Mao Tse-tung, eats Cuba inside America's defense periphery on the way to Brazil and even eats the clearheadedness of our own officials.

The timing is always uncertain, but another banana-peel fall is due soon.

Politics and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Madison Avenue huckster campaign is underway with respect to the tax bill which, according to the President and his Secretary of the Treasury, would solve almost every ill this country suffers.

Last Thursday's Washington Daily News replies to such claims, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 17, 1963]

POLITICS AND TAXES

What is the Kennedy administration trying to do with the tax bill? Get the economy "moving again"? Or win an election?

The essentially demagogic nature of the program again is emphasized by the new testimony of Treasury Secretary Dillon before the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. Dillon urged prompt approval of the bill as passed by the House—but with one reservation. He would eliminate the provision reducing taxes on capital gains.

This is despite the fact Mr. Dillon's Treasury Department, on September 1, issued an analysis of the bill tacitly approving it as it stands, including the capital gains section. It is despite the fact President Kennedy, in an address to the Nation September 18, endorsed the bill and damned anyone who would "attach reservations."

Under existing law the maximum capital gains tax is 25 percent provided assets such as stocks have been held at least 6 months. The House bill would continue this rate on assets held 6 months to 2 years. Beyond 2 years the rate would be cut to 21 percent.

The announced reason for Secretary Dillon's "reservation" is action by a House committee to eliminate a provision applying capital gains at the death of persons holding such assets. This action, incidentally, was taken before the Treasury's approval by analysis and before the President's endorsement.

Mr. Dillon introduces a note of appeal to class prejudice in observing the gains tax provision, as it now stands, "will largely benefit our wealthier citizens." He leaves the impression that without his proposed new death taxes some capital gains entirely will escape taxation.

This is wholly false. Present estate taxes—applicable to entire holdings rather than just capital gains—exceed capital gains tax rates. They run up to 77 percent in the high brackets. To levy capital gains taxes on top of them would approach confiscation, thus tending further to dry up investment funds available for industrial expansion.

The Treasury analysis of September 1 stated that "While such (capital gains) taxes are actually reduced, the tax revenue from them will be increased because of the increased trading fostered by more liberal tax treatment. Thus, capital gains tax reduction will increase tax revenue by an estimated $295 million in 1964 and $180 million in 1965."

No mention was made in the September 1 statement of any long-term loss which Secretary Dillon now estimates at "about $140 million." Even if this estimate is accurate, the loss is more than balanced by proposed new taxes on substantially the same people—repeal of the 4 percent double-taxation credit for dividend income, estimated to produce $300 million a year.

Almost hysterical pressure for this tax bill can be viewed in the light of next year's election. The bill abandons most of the brave talk about tax reform and proposes merely a quick reduction which would put an extra couple of dollars in the low-income pay check. This likely would encourage a quick flush of prosperity lasting beyond November and the election. And sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

No tax revenues of any kind should be reduced until means are found, through spending economies and otherwise, to balance the budget. No tax bill should be passed without attempting reform of a system under which citizens with comparable rates of income pay different rates of taxes.

The Senate should not be frightened into hasty action on this irresponsible proposition. And we don't think it will.

Midwest Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, an editorial which appeared recently in the Huntington Herald Press, Huntington, Ind. The editorial points out that which has been discussed and debated in my State for many, many months.

In addition to the facts stated in the editorial, I would also like to state that the statements which say the Midwest is not producing its share of intellectuals and those trained in science and engineering are in great error. The universities in the Midwest graduate more Ph. D.'s in science and engineering than any other region. Our potential is great and we intend to develop that potential into an active program which will bring the Midwest back into earnest competition with the rest of the country insofar as the space and national defense effort is concerned.

The article follows:

MIDWEST PROBLEMS

Once the Nation's workshop, problems are now piling up for the Midwest; so much so that national attention is attracted. An article titled "What's Happening to the Middle West" in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, together with an interview with Dr. Robert C. Turner of Indiana University, presented as an expert on midwestern industry, gives the topic thorough airing.

The Midwest's changing status has not passed unnoticed by those who live in it. Secretary McNamara some time ago gave the Midwest a shock in answering a query why the region shared so unequally in defense contracts. He said midwestern universities are as good as any in the country, but the young scientists they graduate flee from the campus to the laboratories and space age industries of the east and west coasts.

The Midwest was not pleased by the Secretary's blunt retort, but that comes pretty close to the findings reported in the magazine treatment. Residents of the five States of the "old Northwest"—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin—generally think of them as the Midwest. But because of geography and similar problems, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri are added in the study.

The story of the Midwest's changing fortunes are rather inclusively expressed by these figures:

Prime military contracts for the country as a whole dropped from $34.532 billion in 1952 to $25.371 billion in 1962. The eight Midwest States dropped from $12.663 billion to $4.158 billion. Indiana's decrease was from $1.545 billion to $516 million.

In the same 10 years U.S. population was up 18.8 percent. The eight Midwestern States were up 16.4 percent. Only Michigan and Ohio exceeded the national growth. Indiana was up 13.7 percent.

Nonfarm employment was up 14.4 percent for the United States, 6 percent for the Midwest. Only Minnesota exceeded the national increase. Indiana was up 7.3 percent.

Personal incomes were up 63.4 percent in the United States, 52.9 in the Midwest. No State in the group equaled the national rise. Indiana was up 52.1 percent.

The diagnosis fits generally into the phrase that "the Midwest has let the space age pass it by." The Midwestern arsenal performed magnificently in producing heavy goods during the Korean war. The great factories reconverted to produce consumer goods, at a time when an increased share of the consumer dollar was going for services, with emphasis on travel and education.

The west coast airplane factories could not be converted to civilian production, and turned to missiles and electronic products. The east coast electronics industry began close cooperation with the universities to develop products meeting changed military demand. The Midwest lagged behind both coasts in industrial development of the discoveries of university research laboratories. Midwest universities are high in output of Ph. D.'s in science, but the newly qualified experts are attracted by the glamor industries of the two coasts.

That is the way they see it now. But it may turn out better for the Midwest than the economic scorekeepers have it marked

down now. The Midwest is getting a good share of subcontracts, which may prove better in the long run. Government business may be here today and gone tomorrow, a situation that is more perilous for the prime contractor. Midwestern conservative practices may save the region's industrial plant to serve again as the Nation's workshop.

Editorial Calls Foreign Aid "Cheapest Way To Buy Security for the United States"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the continuing congressional debate on foreign aid has produced much criticism of the aid program on grounds of economics and efficiency. An extremely able reply to these critics appears in the following Christian Science Monitor editorial of October 12.

The editorial points out that without aid funds to help settle strains and national quarreling, the United States would have to spend much more for military operations abroad. Thus, those who would have us approve of increased defense expenditures but not economic aid would unnecessarily add to our overall foreign expeditures.

The editorial follows:

ONCE MORE WE PLEAD

On every possible occasion the President and his chief colleagues in the field of foreign policy are talking up foreign aid. They are greatly concerned about the appropriation. Congress has been its usual reluctant self and most onlookers have assumed that, also as usual, it would pull itself together and restore most of the cuts.

This might not happen.

With the great coming battles over civil rights and the tax bill, with the slowdown in Congress which partly stems from the civil rights conflict, with Congress far behind its schedule and threatening to run into next year, the normal rules might not hold. Foreign aid could be badly wounded.

Otherwise the President and men like Averell Harriman would not be so plainly worried.

Let us also be plain.

Foreign aid is the cheapest way to buy security for the United States. This argument ought to appeal to the very men who are trying to block it. Some of them want economy and would have to spend vastly more for military operations if strains and quarrels cannot be adjusted by peaceful means. Some of them are men of conservative bent who always support defense expenditure but think that political and economic aid of various sorts contains too much waste.

But if it causes poverty-stricken peoples and countries to look toward the United States for help, instead of to Communist revolution, this expenditure for aid is the very smallest investment that could be made in national security and for the security of the free world.

The minimal program of President Kennedy, just like that of President Eisenhower year after year, must pass the Congress. Any damage to it in the last minute bargaining over highly emotional questions like race could lead to vastly more emotional troubles overseas which could only be slaked by sending more U.S. citizens abroad to fight.

Happily the program is being much better administered now, has less waste and makes fewer mistakes. It is about as effective as an administration of either party could make it. Its shortcomings are becoming minimal, and its usefulness remains at the maximum.

The Gesell Report and Mr. Gesell and How the Department of the Navy Feels About the Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker the strange silent voice of the infamous and vicious Gesell report, which has put the military in tailspin and has driven the morale of the forces to a new low, is that of Mr. Gesell himself.

Ever since the Gesell Report became the subject of discussion nobody has heard a word either in defense or in apology from the individual whose name the report bears.

Some weeks ago an exchange of correspondence was turned over to me by an old friend of Mr. Gesell's who was shocked to learn that his old schoolmate "had been taken in" by others.

I have a copy of Mr. Gesell's reply which I have been given permission to use as I see fit. I wrote Mr. Gesell on October 9 and called to his attention how little knowledge he had of his own report and how he had been most inaccurate in stating the Navy's position on the report.

To this date I have not even received an acknowledgment from the gentleman. I think I have given him enough time to reply, and not having received a reply, I am directing the attention of the members of the House to my letter to Mr. Gesell which speaks for itself.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1963.

Mr. GERHARD A. GESELL,
Covington & Burling,
Union Trust Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GESELL: Our mutual friend, C. Horton Smith of New Orleans, has made available to me the exchange of correspondence between you and him regarding the so-called Gesell report. He has given me permission to use this exchange of correspondence as I see fit and I am seizing that opportunity because I am somewhat puzzled about the statements which you make and which do not conform to the facts.

To begin with, I realize that you did not write the report which bears your name, but at least I thought you had read it. The indications are you did not, because you could not have made the following statement in your letter to Hort: "The Navy attitude is quite different from that which prevailed in 1946 when you were an ACI officer. Indeed, many of the recommendations in the Report including the ones I believe you refer to were already an established part of Navy policy before the Committee was appointed." Now, as a matter of fact, I don't know of anybody, including myself, who vigorously rejects and is most critical of the report, who has challenged the right of the military to make its own rules and regulations on base. The military has been integrated for years under a special executive order by President Truman, but never has the military been ordered by executive order to advocate and influence social reforms off base.

While I admit I am suspect in anything I might say because of the geographical location of my district, I do not approach my criticism of the report on the basis of segregation or integration. I criticize the report and assail it because of the misuse of the Department of Defense and its military components in putting into effect that which has not been authorized by the Congress.

Now I believe in being specific and dealing in facts, and I can say to you without equivocation or hesitation, that to the date of this writing I have not found, not only in the Navy but in the Air Force and the Army, a single officer who concurs and favors this report. On the contrary, every man in uniform that I have talked with is horrified and shaken by the use which the military is being put. I am amazed that you make the further statement: "You are mistaken in assuming that we proposed any preferential treatment for Negro members of the Armed Forces." It would be well if you would read the report and place this statement against the statements made page after page. If the proposals of the report were as you say, "simply designed to eliminate aspects of discrimination which impair the effectiveness of the military in carrying out its important mission," then I assure you the exact opposite has been the result. I have never known the morale of the military to be so affected negatively by a proposal as in this instance. It is the most destructive document that has ever been issued and its effect upon the military has been appalling.

Now as to the Navy's position which you indicate in your letter is favorable to this report, I call your attention to these facts. In the official position of the Navy submitted to the Secretary of Defense, at his direction. This report is an official report submitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower in a memorandum dated July 10, 1963, subject: Report of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, and reference: (a) Secdef memo of June 27, 1963, and it is most interesting to note that this report says:

The Navy rejects the contention that Negro officers have been discriminated against when it comes time for promotion. The Navy stated that it has been its experience that its Negro officers have achieved marked success even though the competition is stiff.

The Navy rejects any implication that officers serving on a promotion board would, contrary to their statutory oaths, practice bias.

The Navy rejects the Committee's recommendation that photographs and racial designations be eliminated from officers' records jackets. The Navy stated that such photographs are necessary, and that promotion board members are required by statutory oath to perform their duties without prejudice.

The Navy rejects the contention that new techniques be developed to assure that promotion board members are free from bias. The Navy stated that the oath required of all officers serving on selection board is all that is considered necessary.

The Navy rejects the suggestion that a detailed manual be developed for officers handling alleged discrimination grievances.

The Navy said that in view of the ready availability of policy directives in this area, little purpose would be served by the issuance of such a manual.

The Navy rejects the Committee's suggestion that special consideration for promotion and career advancement be given to officers who promote integration. The Navy stated that officers should be rated on how they manage their entire commands, and not selected segments of it.

The Navy rejects the recommendation that the history of Negro participation in the Armed Forces and the alleged problems which he confronts be made a part of the curriculum at all levels of officer and command training. The Navy stated that such an action would only accentuate interracial problems.

"The Navy rejects the suggestion that economic sanctions be leveled at offbase establishments which practice segregation. The Navy pointedly stated that public accommodations legislation is in the hands of the Congress. It added that the command-community relationship should not be abondoned for the economic boycott type action.

"The Navy flatly rejects the suggestion that curtailment or termination of activities at certain military installations be considered as an ultimate lever of force. The Navy tersely commented that base siting is based upon military requirements."

The Navy rejects the recommendation that officers be established in each Service for the purpose of handling cases of alleged descrimination. The Navy said the present staffing is considered adequate.

The Navy rejects the suggestion that personnel working toward a college degree be required to attend integrated colleges in all instances. The Navy said if a student covers his own tuition costs, the choice of colleges should be primarily his own. When the Government covers the cost of tuition, the Navy stated, it will endeavor to be responsive to the desires of the individual when it is not in conflict with the best interests of the Government.

I might add that the reports of the Air Force and the Army is consistent with the negative attitude of the Navy toward the very important proposals to which so many Americans object and which I have emphasized above with quotation marks.

I assure you that it is my intention to give this letter the greatest circulation possible because it exemplifies and clearly demonstrates the complete lack of knowledge and the misleading, inaccurate statements which have come from you whose name the report bears, and who must assume the responsibility for its contents even though not written by you.

I shall anticipate your appearance before the House Committee on Armed Services when the bill introduced by the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia negating the damaging directive, which has been issued by the Department of Defense as a result of the report which bears your name, is considered. At that time I anticipate asking you many pertinent questions which I hope you will be prepared to answer.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD HÉBERT.

Medicare Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent resolution regarding medicare by the National Federation of Grandmother Clubs of America at their recent national convention.

This is another evidence of solid citizen support for one of the most sound pieces of legislation to meet perhaps the most desperate problem faced by our citizens over 65 years of age.

The support of President Kennedy's program for hospitalization for the aged within the framework of social security again shows that our citizens support this measure and that it is sound and in the public interest in every way.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRANDMOTHER CLUBS OF AMERICA, INC. SUPPORTS PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROPOSAL FOR HOPITALIZATION FOR THE AGED WITHIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Whereas there are about 17 million persons in the United States who are 65 years of age or over; more than one-third of whom have passed their 75th birthday and one in seven of whom is over 80 years of age and most of whom suffer from some disease or disability which frequently requires long term care in hospitals or other medical institutions; and

Whereas hospital costs have risen faster than other items of medical care; in that in 1950 the cost per day of a hospital room was $15, today it is $35, and every indication is that hospital costs will continue to rise; and

Whereas aged generally have substantially less income to buy insurance protection and considerably greater need for hospital services than young people; and

Whereas half the aged who must pay an average hospital bill have their savings wiped out and must go to public welfare or charity agencies for help; and

Whereas the King-Anderson or "medicare" bill (S. 880 and H.R. 3920) provides for medical payments to all citizens over 65 who incur certain hospital or nursing home expenses, the costs for such benefits to be borne by increasing the present social security tax rate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Grandmother Clubs of America, Inc., in convention assembled, on the sixteenth day of October, 1963 at the Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D.C., urges its Representatives in Congress to act promptly and affirmatively on the "medicare" bill so acutely needed to meet the threat of crushing health costs in old age; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and to each and every Member of Congress.

Address of Congressman Edward P. Boland at Ground-Breaking Ceremonies of $2,800,000 Flood Control Project in Chicopee Falls, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, was the principal speaker Saturady, October 19, at the ground-breaking ceremonies in Chicopee Falls, Mass., for a flood control project in which he can take particular pride. For it was Congressman BOLAND who sponsored the authorizing legislation for flood protection in the Chicopee River Basin in Massachusetts after that area had been devastated by the ravaging flood and hurricane of August 1955, with the resulting loss of millions of dollars in property damages to industry and homes, and it was he who, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, shepherded through the appropriations needed for this vital project.

In his speech, Congressman BOLAND underscored his philosophy with respect to public works projects, which are so often attacked as pork barrel legislation, with these words:

As a Member of Congress that sits on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, I have been invited and have traveled to many places in the United States to join in ground-breaking and dedication ceremonies. But none have given me a greater sense of personal pride and satisfaction than those I have been invited to in the New England region, and particularly in our own community.

It has been written and said, many times, that the public works bill is the pork barrel legislation of the Congress, that it provides taxpayers money for unneeded and wasteful projects, that it is fattened by politics and that it is a gigantic boondoggle.

The programs and projects that come from public works and reclamation are an investment in America. They preserve our land and conserve our natural resources. If it had not been for these programs this great Nation of ours would be stripped bare by the ravages of storms, the rapaciousness of rivers, the savage winds, and driving rains. It would lie wasted by the ferociousness of forest fires and floods, and, sometimes too often, by the greed of man. These projects contain the elements and enable the river, the rains, the harbors, and the mountains to work for mankind, and not against mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Hurricane Diane struck with devastating force on August 19, 1955, and caused nearly $3 million in losses to the industrialized area along the Chicopee River in Chicopee Falls. Three major plants, forming the greater part of the area's economic base and representing $100 million in production annually and $60 million worth of plant facilities, were damaged. Water reached a height of 16 feet within the lower basements of some buildings. Congressman BOLAND filed the legislation necessary to authorize the flood control projects needed for future protection of the area. The Chicopee Falls local protection project was authorized by Congress in 1960. It is located in the Chicopee River Basin, the largest tributary basin in the Connecticut River system. In conjunction with the existing Barre Falls Reservoir and the authorized Conant Brook Reservoir, this local protection system will provide major flood protection for Chicopee Falls. In a recurrence of the flood of August 1955, the project is designed to prevent $2,700,000 in damages, over and above damages prevented by the existing and authorized reservoirs.

The site of the project is along the south and east banks of the Chicopee River. Dikes and floodwalls will extend from the Chicopee Dam downstream for nearly 1 mile to high ground. About 3,300 feet of channel improvement modifications will be made on the west bank at the lower end of the project. Surface

drainage will require two pumping stations with a total pumping capacity of 4,500 gallons per minute. They will be installed at Main and Oak Streets. The contractor, awarded by contract by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division, is the Daniel O'Connell's Sons, Inc., of Holyoke. The project cost is estimated at $2,800,000 of which the Federal cost is $2,290,000. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the city of Chicopee are cooperating in the project at a cost of $510,000.

Mayor Edward Lysek, of Chicopee, in his address, thanked Congressman BOLAND for the great role he played in bringing the flood control project to reality, and he also thanked the members of the State legislature and the members of the Chicopee government for their cooperation in passing the necessary State and city legislation and orders for the project. The master of ceremonies was Raymond W. Gelinas, chairman, Chicopee Industrial Development Commission; the invocation by Rev. Father Emil Majchrzak, pastor of St. Stanislaus Church, and the benediction by Rev. B. B. Earnhart, pastor of the Chicopee Falls Methodist Church. Brig. Gen. Peter C. Hyzer, division engineer, U.S. Army Engineers, New England division, also spoke and the musical selections were by the 8th Air Force Band, Westover Air Force Base, under Capt. Edward D'Alfonso, director. Telegrams from Senators Leverett Saltonstall and Edward M. Kennedy and State Senator Maurice A. Donahue, majority leader of the Massachusetts Senate, were read. State Representative Mitsie T. Kulig, of Chicopee, was present for the ground-breaking ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks in the Appendix the following news story from the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram of October 19, relating the Chicopee Falls project ground-breaking ceremonies:

GROUND BREAKING HELD FOR $2 MILLION CHICOPEE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

Credit to the industrialists and businessmen of the area in bringing about the Chicopee River flood control project, ground breaking for which was held this morning, was paid by Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Springfield, at the formal exercises held on the riverbank at the rear of the Chicopee Manufacturing Co., in Chicopee Falls.

The Second District Representative in Congress told how the directors of the Chicopee Manufacturers Association met with city officials and taxpayer group leaders following Hurricane Diane's nearly $3 million damage to this industrial area in July 1955, and set in motion a chain of events that culminated in today's start on a flood control project which will avert such costly consequences.

There were some 200 persons on hand for the exercises which were held in a large tent set up by the Army Engineers.

Telegrams to Mayor Lysek were read from U.S. Senators Leverett Saltonstall and Edward M. Kennedy and State Senator Maurice A. Donahue wishing the city excellent results from the project and regretting that previous commitments make it unable for the officials to attend.

There was only one change in the scheduled program. Rev. B. B. Earnhart, pastor of the Chicopee Falls Methodist Church, gave the final benediction instead of Rev. Robert H. Cummings, of Grace Episcopal Church of Chicopee, who was unable to be present.

Congressman BOLAND's talk was the highlight of a program attended by National, State, and local officials, representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Daniel O'Connell's Sons, Holyoke contractor in charge of the projects which will cost in excess of $2 million, as well as many interested citizens.

The flood control work is expected to be completed in 21 months.

The program opened at 11 o'clock with the playing of the national anthem by the 8th Air Force Band from Westover Air Force Base. Raymond W. Gelinas, chairman of the Chicopee Industrial Development Commission and master of ceremonies for the proceedings, gave the welcome, and the invocation was given by Rev. Emil Majchrzak, pastor of St. Stanislaus Church, Chicopee.

Following introduction of guests there were remarks by Mayor Lysek of Chicopee, Brig. Gen. Peter C. Hyzer, division engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England, and Congressman Boland.

Continuing on the reaction of the city leaders to the disaster and the effect of the consequent flood on industry and home, Congressman BOLAND said in part:

"Engineering studies were made of the damages suffered in the hurricane and of how a repetition of such losses might be averted.

"The question of building a Federal protection project, initially considered in 1936, was reviewed at my request, in the light of new evidence of its economic justification, as demonstrated by the destruction brought about by Hurricane Diane.

"The industrialists and the businessmen of this area played a vital role in securing this project. They were in no mood to endure a continuing Sword-of-Damocles existence. Floods had damaged their plants, impaired their production, and had threatened the economic life of the community.

"This community has acted wisely in asking help from the Army Corps of Engineers, which is the agency of the U.S. Government entrusted with nationwide responsibility for flood control.

"You may wonder why the Federal Government steps in on such matters. The answer is a simple one. The damages from floods adversely affect the economy of an entire region and ultimately the Nation. Thus, the benefits of flood protection spread throughout the national economy. Hence it is appropriate that the cost of flood protection should be shared by the taxpayers of the United States, along with those of a particular community.

"Shortly after the Hurricane Diane disaster, I received an urgent communication over the signatures of S. E. Harrison, factory manager, Chicopee plant of the U.S. Rubber Co.; Oliver M. Knode, vice president, Savage Arms Corp., and John F. Shaw, vice president, Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. They pointed out the severe losses sustained by their firms and asked me to consider the long history of economic stability which their plants represented.

"Even more significant, however, was an ominous reference to what the future might hold for the economic health and welfare of the plants and for the thousands of men and women who derived a living from them.

"The project we inaugurate today will be a monument to the faith of both the people in this community, and of the Federal Government in the economic future of Chicopee. I am sure that it will serve you well and that you will make good use of the stability it provides, as a foundation for further growth.

"This project will be an integral part of the flood control systems in the Connecticut River Basin, which stretches from the Canadian border to Long Island Sound and is the largest in New England.

"Here some 15 local protection systems have been completed, or are under construction or design in the basin. Just as in the case of this project, all were authorized by Congress following demonstration of their need and economic justification."

Quo Vadis, Mr. President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege frequently to call the attention of my colleagues to the threat to peace posed by the warlike actions of the United Arab Republic. I have pointed out how Egypt's Nasser has made a farce of our foreign aid and has perverted our program in that key area of the world.

In the September 30 issue of the newsletter published by the United Zionist Revisionist-Organization of America, with headquarters in my own State of New York, there is a most thought-provoking article which follows herewith on the merits of American foreign policy with respect to the Near East.

The article follows:

QUO VADIS, MR. PRESIDENT?

Americans take pride in the idealistic strivings of the country's foreign policy. Three times within this century America fought wars against aggressors, not for conquest and self-aggrandisement, but for justice and international morality. It is therefore painful to note that our diplomacy is lately discarding even the pretense of an ethical approach, and is following a line of appeasement and cynical opportunism. Moreover, it also ignores the very basis for any justifiable foreign policy, the national interests of the United States. This is particularly striking in our behavior in the Middle East.

The American people and the world at large are continually told that we abhor dictatorships and aggressors. Yet in the Middle East American diplomacy has for the last two decades, under all administrations, pursued a policy of playing up to all brands of despotic potentates and dictators, aiding brazen aggressors. This folly reached the height of absurdity under the administration of President Kennedy.

In the last few years our Government has been anchoring its Middle Eastern policy more and more to the wharf of the Egyptian dictator, Nasser. American money and diplomatic support help him to fasten and tighten his totalitarian hold on the impoverished and ignorant Egyptian people. This support enables him to indulge in all forms of aggression against his neighbors, threatening their peace, freedom, and very existence. While we proclaim our aim of preserving the peace, we aid Nasser's ambitions for conquest and war.

Our diplomats became apologists for Nasser. His repeated threats of attacks on his neighbors are pooh-poohed as merely intended for internal consumption, without any real meaning. The massive buildup of armaments, it is claimed, is for some other purpose, not to attack anyone. Our country's diplomacy repeats here the same mistakes it made regarding Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and Lenin's and Stalin's writings.

Nasser's hiring of German scientists, former Nazis, to build missiles with cobalt, poisonous radioactive gases, for the expliict purpose of annihilating Israel and her 2 mil-

lion Jews, is condoned by an administration spokesman as being better than having Russian scientists working for Nasser.

Nasser can do no wrong, as far as our Government is concerned. His military incursion into Yemen warring with its people was given diplomatic sanction by the State Department by recognizing his puppet government in Sana. The repeated reports by eyewitnesses of the Egyptians using poison gas against defenseless Yemenite villages are ignored by the State Department.

Our diplomats are justifying their policy by the claim that it is keeping Nasser out of complete subjugation to Khrushchev. But the contrary facts stare us in the eyes. The Egyptian forces are equipped exclusively with Communist weapons. The Egyptian economy is overmortgaged to the Soviets and their satellites. The Egyptian press and radio beamed to Asia and Africa follow minutely the Kremlin's policy and propaganda line, hailing Moscow and deriding Washington.

Nasser is also doing yeoman work for the Communists in Yemen, where Russian officers fly Egyptian planes, command and control bases. The Soviets have built an airport there for their large jet planes, providing them with a base and a springboard for incursions into Africa and the Western Hemisphere, and offering them an easy supply route to Cuba.

The American representatives in Yemen and Cairo are of course aware of all this, but they keep the American people in the dark in order to avoid embarrassing questions about their bizarre policies, which are contrary to both logic and morality, and damaging to the national interests of our country.

The administration continues to pose as leader of the free world. The facts, however, are that our confused and confusing foreign policy has forfeited the understanding of our natural friends and allies and has cost us the respect of the world. It is time for the American people to ask Mr. Kennedy—Quo vadis, Mr. President?

Reader's Digest Article Distorts Remarks of Eugene Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the sensationalist article Charles Stevenson wrote for the August 1963 Reader's Digest entitled "Let's Stop Sending U.S. Dollars To Aid Our Enemies" contained many distortions of fact, some of which I dealt with in my remarks in the August 12 RECORD.

Recently, a supporter of our aid programs wrote to point out that the original Digest article had severely distorted the remarks of Eugene Black, retired president of the World Bank. The article sought to demonstrate that Black opposed foreign aid, and that the aid program has not achieved any of its objectives. This was accomplished by quoting only a part of what Mr. Black had said.

An examination of Mr. Black's full remarks shows that the main point of Black's speech was that foreign aid is a "vitally essential element of our national policy" in building a "sound world economy and society which alone will let us fulfill our own national aspirations." He went on to say that even if the demise of communism occurred tomorrow, foreign aid to the underdeveloped would remain "an imperative of our time."

While concerned that our aid program should produce visible results, Mr. Black explicitly states:

As Americans, you have, I believe, an obligation to support the general concept of foreign aid.

Excerpts from the speech follow:

FOREIGN AID: DEVELOPMENT BUSINESS IS OUR GAME AND OUR HERITAGE

(Excerpts of speech by Eugene R. Black, President, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, delivered at 41st annual dinner, New York Group, Investment Bankers Association of America, New York City, October 4, 1961)

I want to advance to you, and with conviction, the following propositions:

First, that foreign aid, properly conceived, is a vitally essential element of our national policy—not for the shrill, short-term reasons usually advanced, but for the longer range objective of building the kind of sound world economy and society which alone will let us fulfill our own national aspirations.

Second, that we can only achieve the real objective of our foreign aid program if emphasis is put, not on the quantity of money provided, but on the quality of the investment made with that money—on the amount of effective development which foreign aid funds buy or induce.

And finally, I want to suggest that the financial and business leaders of this country have a much greater role to play in making our foreign aid program effective than has ever been appreciated in Washington or has yet been generally recognized by you.

* * * * *

If we are out to be popular—if we aren't thickskinned enough to hear, without rancor, critcism from those to whom we have extended aid—we had better get out of this business. And we had better get out of it, too, if we are going to consider every temporary advance of communism a defeat for our program.

But if we ever did cut out or cut down on our foreign aid for any such reason, it would be more than the loss of a battle in our struggle with Russia—it would be a defeat for the affirmative objectives of our national policy quite apart from the cold war. Indeed, if the Communist conspiracy should be totally defeated tomorrow, foreign aid to the underdeveloped world would remain, I suggest, an imperative of our time.

There are a number of reasons why this is so. For one thing, there are humanitarian and moral considerations behind our aid. We are moved by a concern for the welfare of others, by an impulse to help those who are engaged in a struggle against poverty, disease, and ignorance. We need not and should not be ashamed to recognize and indeed to proclaim this reason for our foreign aid; generosity to less fortunate peoples is an aspect of our national tradition of which we can justifiably be proud.

There are economic consideration behind the program of considerable importance to our own welfare. The only effective way to assure sources of supply for the basic raw materials we need, the only effective way to assure expanding markets for the products of our industries, is to help other countries to achieve and maintain self-sustaining economic growth.

But important and valid as these humanitarian and economic considerations are, I suggest that there are reasons for foreign aid far more compelling, for more basic, than these. We discovered many years ago in our own society that growth based on a prosperous few and an impoverished many was neither healthy nor enduring, that our Nation's system of free enterprise could expand and grow strong over the long pull only by opening opportunities to the people at large and thereby releasing their energies and initiative. This has been reflected in many different ways—in our public education and public health systems, in our fiscal regime, in our slum clearance and urban renewal programs, in our encouragement of agriculture, and so on.

Every consideration of policy which dictated our national program is reproduced on the world scene—and the world today is smaller in many ways than was the United States when these national programs were first started. The industrial countries cannot count on remaining, for long, isolated islands of prosperity. Certainly, as I have already commented, their industries cannot achieve their long-range potentialities except as they build up the markets waiting to be developed in the economically backward countries. And, even more certainly, they cannot count on the political stability they need so long as great parts of the world are smoldering with the discontent born of poverty unrelieved by hope.

The only answer I know to all this is somehow to give the peoples of the underdeveloped world the opportunity, the means—and the incentive—to produce more. That is the simple meaning of all the high-flown talk about economic development. This is the essential objective of foreign aid—to enable the impoverished peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to improve their own lot by growing more crops, extracting more minerals, manufacturing more industrial products, so that they can enjoy a better standard of living and higher standards of education, thus giving their children greater opportunities than they themselves have known.

* * * * *

The concepts and principles underlying the new foreign aid legislation are a big step in the right direction; financing in the context of carefully considered development programs, rather than for a series of isolated, unrelated projects; long-term planning and commitment of funds; special concern for countries prepared to mobilize their own resources effectively and to carry out necessary internal reforms; and administrative responsibility entrusted to a single aid agency established at an appropriately high level and as an integral part of government. The targets of the program will not be easy to achieve and, in actual administration realistic compromises will sometimes have to be made. But given the understanding support, the friendly but firm criticism of groups such as this, I feel confident that the program can be kept headed in the right direction.

But let me say again in conclusion, as I said at the start, that your support will be effective only if and to the extent that you emphasize the right issues.

We must stop asking whether foreign aid is really winning us popularity and ask whether it's really buying us development.

We must stop worrying every time the Soviets extend development assistance to one of the underdeveloped countries and concentrate instead on whether our own programs are being effectively carried out. For this development business is our game and our heritage, and not Khrushchev's or that of the Soviets.

It is our heritage which has demonstrated to the peoples of the underdeveloped world that there is an alternative to abject poverty.

It is our heritage which introduced the radical idea of self-determination and national independence.

It is our heritage which has shown the way to mass consumption and to widest participation in the fruits of economic progress.

It is our heritage which, by giving impetus to this whole revolutionary business

of development, has carried a message of hope to human beings the world over.

So let's play the game with good heart and cool head. Let's play it with vigor but without panic. Surely, we need not fear to lose if we only play it well.

Kennedy Policy in Trying To Make Deals With the Communists Fails Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are convinced you cannot make deals with the Communists. Evidently this word never got through to the White House as the President continues the dangerous policy of "accommodation" of the Soviet Union.

Every time President Kennedy makes a move in this direction he fails and the failure costs American prestige and power.

The following excerpt from the Worldgram page of the U.S. News & World Report of October 28, 1963, reminds us what Khrushchev is doing in Berlin and his contempt for any deals offered him by the United States:

KENNEDY POLICY IN TRYING TO MAKE DEALS WITH THE COMMUNISTS FAILS AGAIN

Washington is having to take a second look, a much harder one, at Soviet moves affecting West Berlin. Official theory that Communist interference with U.S. military convoys was just a misunderstanding is being quietly buried.

On the face of it, a Soviet demand for a head count of Western soldiers crossing Soviet-held territory seems trivial, hardly worth mentioning.

But when you look into these latest incidents on the road to Berlin—

Communists, you find, are trying to tighten control over West's access to Berlin. What's more, the Communists are making a little progress.

For example: Before latest incidents, U.S. stand when stopped on road to Berlin was to insist on rights of access, offer no explanations to Communist officers, keep them guessing as to what U.S. troops might do if blocked.

But this time Washington officials spelled out to Russians U.S. procedure governing military convoys to and from Berlin. Only when a "large" U.S. force is involved, Washington explained, will United States agree to a Soviet head count.

Result: United States has limited its future freedom of action, if only in a small way. Big or little, it's another Soviet gain in controlling access to Berlin.

Another thing: After 18 years of wrestling with the Berlin problem, United States and Britain and France still have no standard procedure governing military convoys to Berlin. United States has one set of rules, Britain another, France still another.

This is an open invitation to Russia to exploit Allied differences.

Notice this, too: When Soviet armor and antitank guns blocked the autobahn, the Berlin road, the United States was put in the position of having to use force to exercise its rights. It's as if the United States had no legal right of access to Berlin at all.

Khrushchev's timing is really not as puzzling as it seems at first glance.

True, Khrushchev turned tough on Berlin the very day the nuclear test ban went into effect. But on that same day Khrushchev wrote President Kennedy to remind him the Berlin problem was still unsettled, still dangerous.

Moreover, it was during this same week Russia revealed to the world very serious weakness. It had to turn to the United States for wheat. So, toughness at Berlin, where Russia is strong, might help blot out signs of weakness elsewhere.

Khrushchev ran no risk in Berlin. He had nothing to lose, everything to gain. Upshot: If anybody gained at Berlin, it was Khrushchev, not the West.

Wooing of the United States, except at Berlin, most likely will now go on as before.

Mr. Dixon Demolishes a Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of October 14, 1963, pointing out the grave defects of the quality stabilization bill now pending before the Congress.

The editorial follows:

MR. DIXON DEMOLISHES A BILL

Paul Rand Dixon is chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Government agency more concerned than any with seeing that the public gets a square deal for the things its buys. When it comes to price fixing, the FTC probably is better informed than anybody—since it was price fixing that resulted in the creation of the FTC in 1915.

Mr. Dixon, in the line of public service, has just done a demolishing job on the so-called quality stabilization bill pending before Congress. This is the new name for the fair trade legislation which has been pushed, unsuccessfully, in Congress for several years.

Some States now have fair trade (alias price-fixing) laws. In some States these laws have been declared unconstitutional. But in States where the laws still are in effect, Mr. Dixon said, it has been proved that prices are higher than in adjoining States which do not have such laws.

One of the arguments put up in favor of the quality stabilization bill is that it would protect small merchants from discount houses. Mr. Dixon demolished that claim, too. He said, on the contrary, the small or independent merchants would be unable to compete with the lower priced brands sold by chain stores because they would be compelled, as a result of law, to abide by prices fixed by the manufacturers. So they would lose business.

The quality stabilization bill proposes to give the power of Federal law to price fixing which the FTC and the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department are always fighting. It would tend to stifle competition, which is the essence of the American system and the basis for all other Federal law governing business operations.

Mr. Dixon's testimony ought to be enough to kill the bill.

Tito the Murderer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a strange phenomenon in the United States today. The President, all his Socialist advisers, and the Department of State think Tito is a wonderful guy; the American people think just the opposite.

Today's New York Daily News editorially backs up my remarks of last Tuesday when I spoke on the subject of the Yugoslavian murderer.

The editorial follows:

TEN DAYS OF SHAME

For reasons best known to President John F. Kennedy and his State Department, one of the world's most hated mass murderers now is infesting the United States as an invited guest.

This strangely honored killer, of course, is Josip Broz, alias Tito. He and his Communist mob seized power over stricken Yugoslavia in World War II, after thoughtfully murdering the Patriot Mihailovich.

He is credited with the efficient slaughter of 500,000 of his own people, including the savage murders of hundreds of Yugoslav priests and nuns.

Amazingly, he has conned and blackmailed successive gullible administrations in Washington for at least $2.5 billion in misdirected aid. Yet he still functions as a key member of Moscow's International Cosa Nostra.

We have received a plaintive letter of protest from the United American Croatians, who know Tito well. They can't understand why this bloody-handed gangster, fiercely hated by 95 percent of his captive Yugoslavs, ever was invited to dishonor the United States of America for 10 days, or even to address the supertolerant U.N. General Assembly tomorrow. Neither can we.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Role of the Federal Government in Providing Medical Care for the Nation's Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on October 6 of this year two of our colleagues—Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, and Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota—engaged in a debate on the topic of the role of the Federal Government in providing medical care for the Nation's senior citizens.

This discussion was carried over the Mutual Broadcasting System on the radio program "Reviewing Stand," which is sponsored by Northwestern University at Evanston, Ill.

Since this discussion sheds new light on an important public issue I ask unanimous consent that the text of the debate be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE TO THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES?

(A radio discussion over WGN, Chicago, and the Mutual Broadcasting System. Guests: Hon. KARL MUNDT, U.S. Senator from South Dakota; Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE, U.S. Senator, Maine. Guest moderator: Mr. Norborne Robinson, editor, Congressional Digest. Host: James H. McBurney, dean, School of Speech, Northwestern University.)

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1963

Announcer: Northwestern University, in association with WGN and the Mutual Broadcasting System, presents the Reviewing Stand, now in its 30th year on the air. Tonight's subject: Medicare and the Federal Government. To introduce tonight's guests, here is moderator James H. McBurney, dean of the School of Speech at Northwestern University.

Dean McBurney: The Reviewing Stand is pleased indeed, to join with the committee on discussion and debate of the National University Extension Association, in presenting this special broadcast. It signals the opening of the new high school debate season across the United States. Each year, the committee recommends a problem to be debated by high school groups throughout the country as the national high school debate question. Each fall, to mark the opening of the forensic season, the topic is discussed on a national broadcast by eminent speakers from public life. The Reviewing Stand is happy to present the program on the 1963–64 subject: What should be the role of the Federal Government in providing Medical Care to the citizens of the United States?

To introduce today's guests, here is our guest moderator, Mr. Norborne Robinson, editor of the Congressional Digest, in Washington.

Mr. Robinson: Thank you, Dean McBurney. In the U.S. Congress where decisions on the Federal medical policy are made, interest has for some time been mainly concentrated in the area of medical care for the aged. In 1960 Congress enacted the Kerr-Mills bill in addition to expanding a longstanding program that provides Federal contributions to State welfare programs for the needy, part of which goes for the payment of the medical bills of needy persons.

The bill established a new program. Popularly referred to as Kerr-Mills, this program is designed to help other individuals whose income or resources are deemed otherwise sufficient but who may be unable to meet all or part of their medical expenses. The program is operated by the States and financed on a joint Federal-State basis. Since World War II, a prominent proposal before the Congress would add to the social security system a program of hospital and nursing home paymnets for patients 65 or over to be financed by an increase in the social security tax. Popularly referred to as medicare, this approach has the support of the Kennedy administration, among others. It is against this general background that the controversy is waged in Washington over what the role of the Federal Government on medical care should be.

We are privileged to have with us two distinguished U.S. Senators to discuss this role. Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, a Republican, has been a successful educator, farmer, and businessman. Elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1938, he served there until his election to the Senate in 1948. He was reelected to the Senate in 1954 and 1960. Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine, a Democrat, is a lawyer. He has served in the Maine legislature and was elected Governor of Maine in 1954. Subsequently, he was elected to the Senate in 1958. Senator MUSKIE, you're on record as favoring the medicare approach. What are some of the reasons?

Senator MUSKIE. Yes, I do support the social security approach to the problem of medical care for the aged and I do so for these reasons briefly. First, I think that the problem is such as to require a broader-based effort than we are now making. The Kerr-Mills legislation which was adopted by the Congress in 1960, has not met the problem and I doubt that it can meet it. Second, the problem is not being met and I doubt that it can be met by private insurance. The question of whether or not the Kerr-Mills program or private insurance is meeting the problem, I think, must be related also to the philosophy with which we approach this problem. It seems to me that the underlying issue in the current debate over medicare is whether we should forestall so far as we can the poverty which health costs create among the aged, or whether we shall wait for poverty to occur and minister to only those who have already exhausted their own resources.

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator MUNDT?

Senator MUNDT. Well, I oppose the King-Anderson approach or the medicare approach and favor the Kerr-Mills approach which was initiated in 1960. I think it's gratifying indeed that in 3 short years that the Kerr-Mills bill has been in operation, 40 different States and jurisdictions have set up their own machinery for cooperating with the Federal Government to provide the necessary medical and hospital expenses for the indigent aged. Ten States or nine States' jurisdictions are in the process and only three States' jurisdictions, out of the 52 involved altogether, have done nothing at all.

I think that this is a most encouraging sign and it seems to me that we should recognize that medical cost of people who are aged, their dental bills, the other optical costs, and the rest of the costs that they confront are just as serious and just as difficult to meet as are the hospital costs. So I oppose the King-Anderson approach, not only because it is compulsory, and not only because it is unnecessary, but because it is woefully inadequate, and does not provide the kind of care which is available under Kerr-Mills as it has been implemented by at least 40 States.

Senator MUSKIE. I must say that my statistics on the extent to which the States have implemented Kerr-Mills differ somewhat from Senator MUNDT's and there may really be no difference if we analyzed the statistics. As I understand it, from the latest figures provided for me by the Senate Committee on the Aging, 28 States actually have operating programs in effect compared with 24 about a year ago, so that there's been a gain of just 4 States in developing operating programs, even though this year has been a legislative year in most States. Now another 10 States have programs in some shape, that is, pending legislation or authorizing legislation approval; whether or not in those States operating programs will finally be developed I can't evaluate at this point. And then, of course, there are some States which have not acted at all.

But I think, in addition to looking at the number of States which may or may not have acted in Kerr-Mills, we have to look at the adequacy of their program. There are many measures of this, of course, but the fact is that most of those programs are keyed to the needs of the indigent. For example, just to use one standard that is found in almost all of the State programs, those who earn more than $1,500 a year—in some States it goes as high as $2,000 a year—are not eligible for relief under the Kerr-Mills program. And this means, to go back to the philosophic statement I made earlier, that in those States they believe that the lower-income groups are to exhaust their resources before they're given assistance.

Senator MUNDT: I'd like to say something about that matter of adequacy, but first as to the number of States, I know that all of these figures in this whole concept of the discussion of the various programs, the compulsory and the voluntary one, you have a sort of a floating set of figures because they change. I am quoting from a report as of August 31, 1963—that's this year—issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare when I point out that 40 States have the program in effect or have it virtually completed. Nine are in process in one way or another or have made some effort and three have done nothing at all under Kerr-Mills.

Now, about the adequacy of the two programs. Let me point out that in this compulsory program of compulsory health insurance called the King-Anderson program, or sometimes called medicare, we certainly have misnamed a monstrosity because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. Now the King-Anderson program, let it be said, does provide for a certain kind

of visitation by visiting nurses and so forth after a $20 minimum deduction has occurred.

But the thing about the Kerr-Mills program which I like is that it recognizes that after you're 65 you may have any one of a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits and provides an insurance program or an insurance protection for the various kind of maladies and problems that can confront somebody in old age and who needs it. Now the reason why the program provided under Kerr-Mills can give you a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is very simple. This medicare program, by being compulsory, requires that it become available to everybody so it's available to those who are very rich and who don't need it at all instead of limiting to those people who require some kind of assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Senator MUSKIE: I'm sure that I'm not going to be able to settle in a few minutes here the exact statistical count on Kerr-Mills, but we know that it lies somewhere between 28 and 40. I'd like to concentrate for just a few moments upon this question of adequacy of care.

In the first place, the King-Anderson bill is much broader in its benefits than has been suggested by Senator MUNDT's comments. It provides hospital care for periods ranging from 45 through 90 to 180 days depending upon the options selected. Secondly, it provides skilled nursing facility care to follow hospitalization, thus making available a low-cost service for prolonged service after needed hospitalization. Thirdly, it provides for hospital out-patient diagnostic services, again to avoid hospitalization, but a service enabling older people to pinpoint their difficulty and their problems. Finally, it provides home health services of up to a total of $240 a year.

Now, by contrast, Kerr-Mills. Federal law in Kerr-Mills requires that at least two types of care, one institutional and one noninstitutional, must be covered. The only type of care common to the 28 programs to which I referred earlier, is in-patient hospital care. Only four States provide substantial coverage of the five major types of service which are hospital care, physician services, nursing home care, prescribed drugs, and dental care. Only four States provide programs which are that broad and even those States do not cover all needed care.

Now, covered care is available in eight States under Kerr-Mills only in certain kinds or degree of illness, and in some of them the illness has to be acute or chronic before the applicant can qualify. Periods for which care is available are short and in four States no more than 15 days of hospital care are available and no more than 15 days per stay in four other States, so that the care provided under Kerr-Mills is by no means as broad as has been suggested.

Senator MUNDT. On the contrary, the care made available by Kerr-Mills is much broader. Now it is true because this is a voluntary program that each State works out its own basis for cooperation in partnership with the Federal Government. And the program is still 3 years old. States are moving forward in an orderly manner but at the ultimate and the optimum arrangement, it is very obvious that Kerr-Mills does cover a great many more things than are possible at all under the King-Anderson program. My colleague suggests that under the King-Anderson program you can get a diagnostic analysis. This is true, but that doesn't cure the patient. The beauty of the Kerr-Mills program is that after being diagnosed you can also get a cure and each State can provide its own kind of medical facilities.

There are other things that I don't like about this compulsory program besides the fact that it is inadequate and that it is unneeded, because you don't have very many people left in the category of over 65 who need the particular kind of selective treatment in a hospital provided under the King-Anderson program. One thing I don't like about it very much is that it violates the whole American concept of taxation. We're dedicated in this country, I believe, to a system of progressive taxation based upon the concept that you take from people in accordance with their ability to pay. But the program which is compulsory, which adds to the social security tax of an individual, is regressive taxation because it taxes everybody alike for the first part of their income and, incidentally, makes the benefits available to everybody alike. The millionaire and the pauper get the same benefits and each is required to pay on the standpoint of his initial income the same exact tax rate, which in my opinion is not an American concept of raising revenue.

Senator MUSKIE. Senator MUNDT says that the King-Anderson bill violates American concepts of taxation. Well now, all it does is take advantage of the system that's been in effect since the midthirties, the social security system. Now, this is as American at this point as any program in this field that I can think of. For almost 30 years now, Americans have been paying the social security tax under a compulsory program to guard against the hazards of unemployment, disability, and other hazards which afflict us in modern society. Now Senator MUNDT calls this regressive taxation. Well, under the Kerr-Mills program, the responsibility is thrown back upon the States, most of which rely upon the sales tax to support their programs. Well, now, certainly, no tax is more regressive than the sales tax.

Now, Senator MUNDT has constantly referred to the social security program as being compulsory. It is no more compulsory than it is in the case of retirement pensions under the social security system, but the purpose of the social security approach, and I think that this ought to be hammered home, is that it provides a means for the average citizen to contribute during his working years to a program which will assure him that these benefits will be available to him when he reaches age 65.

Now it seems to me that you've got to make your choice. Either this is a good thing to do—that is, to save during your working years to provide for this care that you may need when you reach 65—or it isn't. Now, if we say it's a good thing to do then I know of no way to do it except on a broad-based scale such as social security provides. Now, if what we're talking about is a relief program available to people only after they have exhausted all their resources and only after they have reached 65 in whatever economic situation they may be, why then perhaps the voluntary approach which would make the program available only to those people in such dire circumstances is the approach. But I think you've got to come back to this underlying philosophy which provides the most, if you want to use that term, the most dignified kind of assistance, the most realistic, the most adequate when one reaches the age of 65.

Senator MUNDT. I'd like to say something about that "working years" concept because one of the many reasons why it seems to me the King-Anderson compulsory medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 40 years on the gamble that sometimes after they're 65 they will need some health benefits. But they get nothing during the working years and it takes out of their income money which they might better have placed into some kind of private insurance program or company insurance program. That way, if during the productive years of the young family life, the head of the family is stricken, he can get some benefits. This, after all, simply provides a bet that you provide and you'll pay your taxes under a compulsory program until you're 65 on the gamble you won't be sick before you're 65, you'll be so sure you'll be sick after you're 65 you need some Government aid. Now, it tends to destroy the initiative, the desire, and the capability of a young family to provide the kind of health insurance and the kind of protection it requires during its formative years and during its productive years. So this is another reason why it moves against the concept.

Now, my friend from Maine said that most of the States raise their money by sales tax. I point out to him that a great many average States have income taxes based on a progressive program just the same as we have in the Federal Government and that when you provide a tax compelling the poor to pay for the health needs of the rich after they're 65, this also is not compatible with our American concept.

Senator MUSKIE. The Senator complains that the social security approach provides nothing for people in their working years but only after they reach age 65. Well, the complaint that the policyholder gets no benefits until the hazard strikes could be made against private insurance as well as the social security insurance system. The very purpose of insurance is to provide for the payment of premiums to make available certain benefits and certain protections against hazards when the hazard strikes. So I see no difference between the social security system and private insurance in this respect. Now, on that point——

Mr. ROBINSON. Our time seems to be running out in this very fast moving debate, regrettably. Senator MUNDT, in closing, how would you summarize your position on the role of the Federal Government in providing medical care?

Senator MUNDT. Well, of course in the minute and a half we have for a summary, it's very difficult to even summarize the reasons why I'm against this medicare program. I'm against it for so many reasons. It leads toward socialized medicine. As I say, it compels the young working family to gamble and it has to pay a compulsory tax for the full lifetime until after 65 on the expectation and the improbable hope that nothing is going to happen to the family until after 65.

I'm against it because it's compulsory, because its benefits are inadequate. I consider it legislative alchemy because the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow is not there. It doesn't provide the medical facilities; it doesn't provide the doctors' cost; it doesn't provide for a great many things. It's regressive taxation and it's unnecessary because under the Kerr-Mills program in 3 years we've had an astronomical increase in the kind of protection made available to people who need medical attention. And it provides it in a full package and a full program so they can get the kind of medical care they require if they need it after 65. I'm against it because, after all, under our American concept, we in this country should promote the general welfare not provided for the individual.

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator MUSKIE, how would you summarize your position?

Senator MUSKIE. I'd like to touch just briefly again on this question of a compulsory program. The Kerr-Mills program is just as compulsory in the same sense that Senator MUNDT speaks of. The Kerr-Mills is supported by the general taxpayer—the taxpayer who pays excise taxes and income taxes. He has no choice about paying those taxes so he is compelled to pay taxes to support this program in the same sense that under the social security plan the payer of social security taxes is compelled to pay them. In addition, the Kerr-Mills taxpayer

has to pay State taxes and he has no choice about that.

Now, I am for the social security approach, again: first, because a broader-based effort is needed in order to meet the problems; secondly, because it is an insurance scheme which makes it possible for the average worker to contribute to his own benefits when he reaches retirement age; thirdly, because its aim is to prevent poverty and not deal with the problem after poverty has been enforced.

Mr. ROBINSON. I'm sorry, gentlemen, but our time is up. Our thanks to our guests for this evening, Senator KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, and Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine. This is Norborne Robinson in Washington.

DEAN MCBURNEY. You have just heard a special Northwestern University Reviewing Stand discussion, presented in cooperation with the committee on discussion and debate of the National University Extension Association. The topic—What Should Be the Role of the Federal Government in Providing Medical Care to the Citizens of the United States?—is to be the subject of debate and discussion in high schools throughout the Nation during the 1963–64 forensic season. Our thanks to the participants in Washington and to our guest moderator, Mr. Norborne Robinson.

Copies of this discussion are printed and made available to the public in order to further interest in such discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and 15 cents for each copy to: National Publishing Co., 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Thank you for listening. This is James H. McBurney, dean of the School of Speech at Northwestern University.

ANNOUNCER. The Reviewing Stand is produced for Northwestern University by Robert W. Thomas and directed by Gloria Werkmeister. The Reviewing Stand originates in the studios of WGN, Chicago, as a feature of public affairs.

This special program was presented in cooperation with the committee on discussion and debate of the National University Extension Association.

FURTHER READING

Anyone interested in further study of the problems discussed in the Reviewing Stand program on American medicine or in the activities of the committee on discussion and debate is referred to American Medicine: The 37th Discussion and Debate Manual edited for the Committee by Bower Aly and Charley Leistner and published in the Library Edition by the Committee on Discussion and Debate, Box 5152 University Station, Eugene, Oreg. The Library Edition presents the four quarterlies attractively bound together under a single cover. The price is $5 if billed or $4.05 postpaid if remittance accompanies order.

Additional copies of this transcript may also be obtained at the National Publishing Co., Division of McCall Corp., 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., 20036, for 15 cents per copy or $11.75 per 100 copies.

Red Plot Threatens a Soviet Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while President Kennedy is doing his best to sell the American people on the idea that Soviet Russian Communists may no longer be Communists, he ignores Khrushchev's plans for the United Socialist Republics of Latin America.

It is the Kennedy administration which is making the overtures and the accommodations. Khrushchev and company have not altered their plans to conquer the world and either rule or destroy the United States. Just look at the events of the past week. Kennedy administration officials are issuing reams of propaganda about the easing of tensions in an effort to sell their plans for accommodation of the Soviets. At the same time, evidently under direct orders from the Kremlin, Russian troops in arrogant defiance of existing treaties block the way of American and British convoys into West Berlin. Russia's Gromyko tells the press "relationships between the East and West could not be worse." The Communist Vietcong steps up its aggression in South Vietnam.

Just what is wrong at the White House? Surely the President cannot believe there has been even a slight change in the Soviet objective in face of the flagrant flaunting of power which amounts to almost an open insult to the United States. Then why does he insist on pursuing the soft line with the Communists? Why does he continue to ignore the threat to Latin America posed by Communist Cuba?

Even more startling are the facts contained in the following column by Dr. Robert Morris on Khruschev's instructions to Castro for the establishment of the United Socialist Republics of Latin America by 1968. Mr. Speaker, Congress must demand of the President an explanation for his strange policy.

DEFECTORS

(By Robert Morris)

Defectors from the Soviet side to our side in the world conflict should be an important force in our time. For many years with the Naval Intelligence and with State and U.S. Senate committees, I had the responsibility of inducing wavering Communists and people in the twilight of their Communist careers to come over to the side of the United States. I therefore know what is involved and I know what a magnificent contribution defectors have made to our understanding of the Communist conspiracy. They made valiant witnesses and the whole free world was better for their testimony.

In recent years, however, the people running our executive policy have not shown the high resolve necessary to induce defections. Many of us were shocked in 1958 when we learned that a Danish international civil servant, Povl Bang-Jensen, had been approached at the U.N. by a cluster of potential Soviet defectors who asked that he aid them to asylum in the United States. The approach had been made at the time of the crushing of the Hungarian uprising by Soviet tanks, in 1956.

These defectors told Bang-Jensen that the 38th floor of the U.N. (the top adminisrative offices) was actually under Soviet control and that the Soviet secret police had penetrated our foreign intelligence. This information was dispatched to the then head of our CIA who instead of zealously moving to acquire the vital secrets available from this important source, elected to let Mr. Bang-Jensen and the defectors cool their heels for 7 anguished months after which they were no longer available.

In this connection I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 24 of this year another startling defector story. It comes through an interview between the competent foreign editor of the Washington Star Constantine Brown and a former high official of the Communist Czechoslovak Government. The defector was able to tell Mr. Brown much about Communist future plans which we should know.

The defector left communism because he could no longer stand the intrigue involved. However since his defection he had come to realize he has joined "the losing side" because the leaders of the west, mostly in the United States and Great Britain refused to believe that Khrushchev is planning to conquer the world.

He told of a Communist plan, blueprinted and sealed during Castro's 37-day visit this summer to the U.S.S.R., that called for the success of what is called in the Kremlin—the U.S.R.L.A.—the United Socialist Republics of Latin America. By 1968 this Soviet unit is to include Cuba, Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil, British Guiana, Mexico, Chile, and Hispaniola. (This was before the overthrow of Juan Bosch.)

Castro, according to the defector is to be the leading force. But let Constantine tell the rest of the story:

"According to my informant, Mr. Khrushchev has instructed Mr. Castro to take his time and lay the groundwork without haste. It is essential, he is reported to have said, that the chances of reelection of the present Washington administration, sympathetic to socialism and dedicated to a relaxation of tensions, should not be endangered. It is also important that the British Labor Party, headed by Harold Wilson—and described by Mr. Khrushchev as a man of great intelligence and insight toward world trends—should replace the wobbly, uncertain, and tired Conservatives.

"Hence, there must be no hasty or rash moves by Fidel and his associates throughout Latin America. Quite the contrary, Mr. Castro must accept with good grace any indications for reconciliation with the United States—even at the price of some concessions regarding the confiscation of American properties.

"The Czech defector added that there are already in course such negotiations which may lead to a resumption of diplomatic relations with Washington. But he expects nothing concrete before next year. The pot will be kept simmering until the American elections. After November 1964, however, the work of creating a U.S.R.L.A. will be started in earnest."

The testimony of this defector, properly checked, should be brought to the attention of the world, not hidden away in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After all, our official policy is working night and day to bring about a merger with this country and the nations of the world under the United Nations. Under this we would be a minority but if the Latin American bloc is thus to be put into the Soviet side of the aisle, we will be almost a solitary voice in the consensus.

Waurika Multipurpose Water Project Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask that a resolution I received from the board of city commissioners, Waurika, Okla., dated October 15, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Southwestern Oklahoma is one of the most aggressive areas about which I have ever known. The people of that section are for the most part of pure pioneer stock, with the friendliness of the South and the sturdiness of the West.

The Waurika project, to which the resolution refers, is a multiple-purpose project which is estimated to cost $25,853,000, of which the local communities would repay $12,861,000, consisting of $2,417,000 for water supply storage, $9,628,000 for conveyance facilities, and $816,000 for irrigation.

The water supply would meet present and future local requirements for the cities and town of Lawton, Duncan, Waurika, Comanche, Temple, and Walters, in addition to serving Fort Sill and industries in the project area.

This project has been endorsed by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, has the consent of all of Oklahoma's neighboring States, and has the endorsement of the present Republican Governor and the former Democratic Governor, my colleague Senator EDMONDSON.

It has been recommended by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Three times it has passed the Senate after being reported favorably by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one occasion and the Public Works Committee on two other occasions.

I hope the House of Representatives will see fit to take favorable action on this project without further delay.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING NEED OF WAURIKA MULTIPURPOSE WATER PROJECT

Whereas all the officials of the City of Waurika have, without exception and with interest and concern, supported the promotion of the Waurika Reservoir since 1955; and

Whereas we have expended ourselves, our time, and our means to prepare and approve many letters, requests, statements, resolutions, and ordinances; to study and endorse all previous reports, plans, and other proceedings having to do with the Waurika Reservoir project; and

Whereas we have and do now consider this project to be vital to our economy and to our very existence; we need it for flood protection (we suffered another in 1962); we need it for municipal water (we are in the midst of a drought of major proportions in 1963); we need it for our economy; we have had a gradual decline in both economy and population because we need water (we have an abundance of good surface water near at hand that is more than a total loss, it is destructive) for our people and for industry to provide work for our people, that we may continue to exist; and

Whereas we are taxpaying, law-abiding, worthy American citizens asking from our Government, not a handout, but approval, and assistance through a loan in developing our God-given resources, and

Whereas we consider that, if the history of the past 50 years can be used as a criterion, we should not be expected to wait until national policy on development of water resources has been worked out to everyone's satisfaction; and

Whereas we consider that, if the history of the past 50 years can be used as a criterion, we should not be expected to wait until an interstate water compact can be worked out to everyone's satisfaction (our project has twice been approved by all neighboring affected States, at any rate); and

Whereas the Beaver Creek Watershed Development Association has on more than one occasion expressed an active interest in an upstream treatment program that would complement and supplement the Waurika Reservoir project; and

Whereas the Waurika Reservoir project would detain and use only Oklahoma water, originating entirely in Oklahoma from one small stream, and could not possibly appreciably affect the waters of Lake Texoma or of any neighboring State; and

Whereas the policy spelled out by the late Judge W. C. Austin, in proceedings for development of Lake Texoma, declared that the damming of Red River to build Lake Texoma would in no wise affect the rights of the States of Oklahoma and Texas to develop the waters of the tributaries of Red River above Lake Texoma; and

Whereas since our project was due a hearing in the House of Representatives, other similar projects, both from this State, and from the neighboring States, have been approved in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the Waurika Reservoir project has been planned, declared very feasible, and approved by both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers, has been approved by two Presidents from two different political parties and by those Presidents' administrations through their Budget Bureaus, three times by the Senate of the U.S. Congress, twice by many departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and twice by all the neighboring affected States and the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the city of Waurika, is presently engaged in developing to some extent a 32-acre industrial site, with bonds voted by the people (we were given no encouragement by AWP, Dallas, Tex., for any assistance); and

Whereas when we read as we did in the Daily Oklahoman, on October 14, 1963, a statement that our Government has stored up $7½ billion that are unspent, for foreign aid, although many billions have been spent on foreign aid, we simply cannot reconcile the fact that as needy, deserving, taxpaying American citizens we seem to be unable in any way to ask, plead, or beg through the House of Representatives (and we have been very patient and very humble) a loan from our Government to develop our water resources to their maximum capacity and optimum use, and in a way that we cannot possibly do by ourselves;

Now, therefore, the city of Waurika by this resolution reaffirms its endorsement of the Waurika Reservoir project as previously set forth in the Department of Interior plan for development and as set forth in the plan by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and restate our intention to participate in its development through an appropriate repayment contract with the Waurika Project Master Conservancy District; and be it further

Resolved, That the officials of the city of Waurika, Okla., through this resolution hereby appeal, not only to every member of the Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States, but to every member of both houses of that august body to give to us and to our deserving neighboring cities in this Waurika Reservoir project area; in the name of all that is right, and fair, and just, merciful, to help us attain this goal that we so well deserve, for which we are willing to pay, and that we know cannot be denied us by any man of authority without a great injustice being done us.

Adopted by the unanimous vote of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Waurika, Okla., this 15th day of October 1963.

GEORGE A. BROWN,
Mayor.

Justice Department Chauffeurs Martin Luther King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 14, 1963, Martin Luther King arrived in Birmingham, Ala., via air and was observed in Birmingham by State investigators. About 5:30 p.m. Tuesday evening, he left Birmingham with four other colored males in a 1963 blue, four-door, Chevrolet, Impala, automobile en route to Selma, Ala. He was observed until he got on U.S. Highway 31 south of Birmingham. This automobile displayed 1963 Alabama license No. 3-31463. The automobile arrived in Selma in the neighborhood of 7 p.m., Tuesday, October 15, 1963, carrying the same passengers.

Martin Luther King addressed a crowd of Negroes at a church in Selma. After the meeting he was carried to Montgomery Municipal Airport by a group of Negroes in two different automobiles bearing Dallas County licenses.

The Chevrolet automobile Martin Luther King went to Selma in was registered to Hertz U-Drive-It, their rental agreement No. 4621806. A charge card was used and said card being issued to the Justice Department, Civil Rights Division, Washington, D.C. Card No. 1969-237-0007-0-na. The car was rented on September 14, 1963, at 7:37 p.m. and was signed for by Kenneth G. McIntyre. Hertz's records disclose that the car was to be returned on October 2, 1963. Sometime between September 21 and October 2, an unknown Negro drove John Doar to the Montgomery Municipal Airport in this car. The Hertz operator was told at that time that the car would probably be returned on October 2. It has not been returned. It is still being used according to their records as of October 16.

According to my information Martin Luther King returned to Atlanta from Montgomery after the Selma meeting Tuesday night, October 15.

The two cars previously referred to, and which carried Martin Luther King to Montgomery were a blue two-door Cadillac, hardtop displaying 1963 Alabama license No. 27-2933 registered to Dr. Sullivan Jackson, 21½ Franklin Street, Selma, and a wine, four-door Ford Galaxie displaying 1963 Alabama license No. 27-14119, registered to Rev. W. T. Mimefee, 410 Sulvan Street, Selma.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the unwarranted use of Federal funds for the transportation of agitators and the use of Justice Department personnel as chauffeurs for these agitators I sent the following telegram to the Attorney General:

Reliable information has reached me that Justice Department officials are serving as drivers for Martin Luther King, Wolf Dawson, and James Foreman in Hertz Rent-a-Cars. These cars are leased or rented in the name of Justice Department officials and used in

driving these agitators in Selma and Dallas County, Ala. Such interference in local administration is unwarranted, highly inflammatory, and completely unjustified. Request you advise me as to legal authority such expenditures of taxpayers money. Your immediate order stopping this flagrant violation and illegal use of public funds should be forthcoming.

KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the continued interference by Justice Department personnel in State and local matters and assisting agitators in provoking the people of Alabama, is totally and completely unwarranted and should be discontinued immediately. Such actions only tend to incite riot, bloodshed, and turmoil. Removal of such personnel and permitting the local law officers and officials to handle these matters is essential to the establishment of peace. The objectives of the Justice Department, which I highly question, cannot and will not be accomplished through support of agitators and outside interlopers. It should be and must be stopped immediately.

Civil Rights Demonstrations in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on Thursday, October 17, the New York Times carried an editorial entitled "How Strong a Civil Rights Law?" The editorial points out that—

> Retreat before the battle is the worst way to block the campaign of southern Democrats to scuttle any meaningful civil rights legislation. There is no place for partisanship in the fight for a sound civil rights bill; but to seek unity through an approach based on the lowest common denominator of consensus arms the bill's enemies more than it does its friends.

The Times reiterated its stand in an editorial on Monday, October 21.

I am completely in accord with the position expressed in these editorials. We are fighting for the right. Let us not surrender before the battle is joined. Title III is vital to effective protection of civil rights.

The need for it is graphically demonstrated in the case of Donald Harris and those who have been imprisoned in Americus, Ga., since early August, held without bail, and facing a charge of inciting to insurrection, a charge that carries the death penalty. I have been in touch with the Department of Justice about the matter. As yet the Department has been unwilling to intervene in the case. I believe there are very strong legal and moral grounds for doing so, and I have so written to the Attorney General. This is a flagrant instance of the misuse of law to intimidate the exercise of constitutional rights. If it is allowed to proceed it will set a pattern of intimidation by law enforcement officers in many parts of the South. I believe it is outrageous that the Government should turn its back on the case, particularly at the very time that the Department of Justice argues that title III is neither needed nor wanted.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my most recent letter to the Attorney General on this case, the full texts of the editorials, and a news article in today's Washington Post appear in today's Appendix.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1963]

THE TEST ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The central issue in the congressional battle over civil rights has been pointed up by the National Council of Churches of Christ in its appeal to the Kennedy administration and Republican leaders to back the strong rights bill approved by a House Judiciary Subcommittee. "The basic issue of social justice must not be compromised," the council declares.

On at least three counts the subcommittee bill does a better job of insuring social justice than the administration's original proposals. It would authorize Federal suits to end denial of civil rights through police brutality; protect Negro voters in State, as well as Federal, elections and set up a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission. Whatever the bill's technical flaws, all of which can be eliminated through more precise language, it deserves bipartisan support. Its goal is not perfectionism; it is justice.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1963]

HOW STRONG A CIVIL RIGHTS LAW?

In submitting—at long last—his omnibus civil rights bill to Congress in June, President Kennedy said: "In this year of the emancipation centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of equality for all Americans and their posterity—not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquility—but, above all, because it is right." Now the administration finds itself embarrassed because a House Judiciary Subcommittee has approved a civil rights bill the White House considers too strong to have any realistic chance of passage.

Attorney General Kennedy has gone before the full committee to urge that some of the strengthening provisions be knocked out in the interest of attracting more support from middle-of-the-road Republicans and Democrats. That any bill finally adopted will need the backing of Republicans, as well as of northern and western Democrats, is incontestable. But its concessions to political expediency contrast sharply to the administration's previous emphasis on the primacy of the moral issue in the national struggle for full equality for every American.

The Attorney General may be right in suggesting that "unclear" language in some sections of the revised bill would give the Federal Government authority to encroach on State powers in areas totally divorced from civil rights. If so, the language ought to be, and can be, made more explicit. A similar clarification of language may be in order in other sections but always with a concern for protecting Negro rights not restricting them.

The inclusion of State, as well as Federal, elections in the bill's provisions to safeguard voting rights is a significant improvement over the original administration bill. So is the provision for a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, with power over discrimination by employers and unions. Both deserve more forceful backing than the Attorney General gave them.

Retreat before the battle is the worst way to block the campaign of southern Democrats to scuttle any meaningful civil rights legislation. There is no place for partisanship in the fight for a sound civil rights bill; but to seek unity through an approach based on the lowest common denominator of consensus arms the bill's enemies more than it does its friends.

In the appeal to conscience he addressed to the Nation a few days before his civil rights message, the President declared that this country, for all its hopes and all its boasts, "will not be fully free until all its citizens are free." That is the yardstick that ought to guide Congress in the debate now nearing a climax in the House Judiciary Committee.

FOUR JAILED IN GEORGIA TO FACE INSURRECTION TRIAL

(By Robert E. Baker)

A Georgia prosecutor said yesterday that he has changed his mind and will prosecute four civil rights demonstrators being held in the Americus, Ga., jail on charges of "inciting an insurrection."

The charge carries a maximum death penalty upon conviction.

The prosecutor, Solicitor General Stephen Pace, Jr., of Sumter County, thus set the stage for a showdown in a case that has caught the attention of Congressmen, the Kennedy administration and the civil rights movement as a whole.

The four demonstrators—John Perdew, 21, a Harvard University student from Denver; Zev Aelony, 25, a fieldworker for CORE from Minneapolis; Ralph Allen, 22, Trinity University student from Melrose, Mass., and Don Harris, 24, a fieldworker from New York for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—were arrested during antisegregation demonstrations in Americus last August 8 and 9. Perdew and Allen are white.

In an exhaustive story of the case, the October 13 issue of the Denver Post stated that Prosecutor Pace pored through the law books to find a strong law to keep the young men out of circulation.

Pace came up with the insurrection law enacted in 1871. It permits no bond. Pace said he was unaware that it carried the death penalty until after he had decided on the charge.

Last month, three members of the Colorado congressional delegation—Republican Senators GORDON ALLOTT and PETER H. DOMINICK and Democratic Representative BYRON G. ROGERS—urged the Justice Department to use its power to get the jailed men released until their trials.

The case spurred demands for inclusion of title III in the proposed civil rights bill—giving the Justice Department specific power to bring legal action in such cases.

Morris B. Abram, Atlanta attorney now with a New York law firm investigated the case for the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, a top-drawer legal group that has the blessing of President Kennedy.

Abram was retained by Aelony's parents. He promptly filed suit in Federal court challenging the constitutionality of the insurrection statute and asking for an injunction to stop Americus officials from using it.

Jack Greenberg, chief counsel of the NAACP legal defense fund, filed similar suits for the other three men.

But 10 days ago, Pace taped a radio interview for an Atlanta station in which he said he had serious doubts that he would ever call the insurrection cases up for trial.

"The basic reason for bringing these charges was to deny the defendants bond," Pace said in the interview, which was broadcast on Sunday. "We were in hopes that by holding these men we would be able to talk to their lawyers and talk to their people and convince them that this type of activity is not the right way to go about it."

But yesterday Pace changed his mind. He said he probably would go ahead with the prosecution on the insurrection charges and indicated he had been unable to negotiate a settlement with lawyers for the men.

A three-judge Federal court will hear arguments challenging the legality of the law in Americus on October 31.

OCTOBER 17, 1963.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You will recall that early in September I wrote you concerning the imprisonment since early August of Donald Harris, a recent Rutgers graduate, and three others in Americus, Ga. They were arrested, as you know, in the course of demonstrations and charged with "inciting to insurrection," a capital offense under Georgia law.

I was frankly appalled by Mr. Marshall's reply of September 20 in which he stated that "our investigations relating to any of these persons would be limited to a possible violation of 18 U.S.C. 242, sometimes referred to as the 'police brutality' statute." It seems to me unconscionable that the Federal Government should feel unable to intervene in what is patently an outrageous misuse of law to intimidate the exercise of constitutional rights. Further, I believe there is a statutory basis on which the Government can and should act.

Surely the U.S. Government need not continue to stand by helplessly while four young men remain incarcerated—in flagrant violation of the most elementary principles of law. The Georgia constitution declares that, "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted; nor shall any person be abused in being arrested, while under arrest, or in prison." The 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides, "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

How do these square with the facts in this case?

Donald Harris and his coworkers were engaged in a voters' registration campaign when they were arrested during a demonstration. In addition to insurrection charges, a number of peace bonds have been issued against them, amounting to $40,000 in each case. In any case, since inciting to insurrection is a capital offense, no bail is permitted. A writ of habeas corpus has been denied by the Georgia courts, I am informed. The grand jury to which the charges will be presented for indictment will not meet until late November. While I assume that ultimately these young men will escape the death penalty, it could well take several years of torturous litigation to free them.

Why does not the Federal Government proceed under section 1941, title 42, of the United States Code, as it did in the case of *U.S.* v. *Wood*, 295 Fed Rep. 2d 772, to enjoin the unlawful conduct of the prosecutor, the police chief and other officials in conspiring to interfere with the right of other persons to vote?

For myself, I believe the facts in the case provide ample ground for proceeding against law enforcement officials who would, under color of law, subvert the clear intent of the Constitution and the general statutes. I am particularly concerned by the failure of the Justice Department to show greater interest in this case because of your own suggestion that title III of the civil rights bill be dropped. The position of the Department has so far taken in the Harris case is difficult to understand in any event, but it is completely incomprehensible in view of the Department's position before the House Judiciary Committee that a title III provision in the pending civil rights bill is in part unneeded, in part unwarranted. I cannot reconcile this with the statement that the Department is unable to act, beyond investigating charges of police brutality, in the Harris case, which like the Wood case is essentially a voting rights case.

I urge that the U.S. Department of Justice reconsider its position, for the injustice being done to Americans in Americus cries out for remedy.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE.

Aberdeen and the H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article on the importance of the special nuclear reactor at Aberdeen to our national defense. This article was written by a distinguished and veteran science reporter, William J. Perkinson, for the Baltimore Sun of October 13, 1963.

Mr. Perkinson, in his article, outlines the reason why I, and the rest of the Maryland delegation have fought so vigorously for this atomic pulse reactor. I am delighted to add that authorization for this reactor was approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday. I ask the support of the House for the retaining authorization for the reactor in the military construction bill when it goes to conference.

ABERDEEN AND THE H-BOMB

The political cat-and-dog fight that New York Congressman are waging, successfully at present, to prevent the Department of Defense from building a special nuclear reactor at Aberdeen Proving Ground illustrates why many military commanders were reluctant to give all-out, unqualified support to the nuclear test ban treaty unless certain safeguards were met.

The military men were afraid that "a sense of euphoria," or false feeling of well-being, would sit in.

The Aberdeen fiasco indicates the fears were justified.

MAIN PURPOSE

The reactor that the Department of Defense wants to build at Aberdeen for use at present rather than some 2, 3, or more years from now is designed to help overcome some of the biggest advantages Russia has as a result of the Soviet's development of super-hydrogen bombs in the 100 or more megaton class.

In the words of Dr. Ed Minor, of the Ballistics Research Laboratory of the Aberdeen Proving Ground:

"The principal purpose of this (proposed) reactor is to simulate a nuclear burst as close as we can. The second purpose of the reactor is that by repetition of the reactor pulsing you can get a nuclear radiation source at minimum cost at a given location without expensive field setups as in major nuclear tests with actual weapons."

Other military witnesses also stated that the reactor would be used to see how both chemical and bacteriological weapons, particularly certain viruses, are affected by nuclear explosions under field conditions.

Col. Barton O. Baker, of the Army's Research and Development Section, put it this way, "The major reason for this reactor is to find out with the systems in being today what will or will not withstand a nuclear environment (the effects created by the explosions of hydrogen bombs), and if the system will not withstand it then it will bring about a redesign or a proper shielding to permit it to withstand this nuclear environment....

"The other purpose for it would be for testing bacteriological warfare agents which we know are susceptible to nuclear radiation."

BLACKOUT EFFECTS

Colonel Baker also said that the special-type pulse reactor—far in advance of anything in existence or known to have been planned elsewhere—would be used to study the "blackout effects known to be associated with super H-bombs tests."

The blackout effect—and in some cases the actually freezing of switches on some types of guided missile equipment—is thought to be due to what is called "an electromagnetic pulse" that results when large H-bombs are exploded above the earth.

According to the Army testimony, there is also good reason to believe that the "E.M.P." could literally "defuse" antiballistic missile missiles causing them to fly harmlessly through the air.

The importance of finding out whether such things actually occur or whether they are just "a theoretical probability" is the reason the Army is pressing to get started as soon as possible on a nuclear reactor that would simulate the "E.M.P." effects of an H-bomb.

President's Foreign Investment Tax Proposal Does More Harm Than Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has been discussing the President's proposal for a tax on foreign investments. I criticized the plan as "the wrong solution to a problem improperly identified."

As a part of this statement I would like to include further criticism of the program as seen by Henry Hazlitt in the current issue of Newsweek. Mr. Hazlitt's column follows:

A SHORTSIGHTED TARIFF

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The mere proposal by the President on July 18 of a retroactive tax on American purchases of foreign securities has already done great harm. It has brought about paralysis in such investment, created world uncertainty, and undermined confidence in the dollar. If the administration does not withdraw the proposal, Congress should reject it promptly.

The proposal has now received impressive criticism from many quarters, but the most thorough analysis I have seen was in the congressional testimony on August 21 on behalf of the Investment Bankers Association of America by Amyas Ames, its president, and by Andrew N. Overby, chairman of its foreign-investment committee and former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and

deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund. Let me summarize the chief points:

1. The proposed tax will adversely affect the U.S. balance of payments in the long run and will not significantly improve it in the short run.

Private foreign investment is an asset-creating expenditure. Current net capital outflows are offset by income from previous investments. From 1958 through 1962, income from all private foreign investment amounted to $15.4 billion compared with an aggregate net outflow for new investment of $16.6 billion. Moreover, in 1962 alone income amounted to $3.8 billion as compared with a net outflow of $3.3 billion.

Trade follows credit. With the dollars they obtain from U.S. purchases of their securities, foreigners buy our goods and services. Often the connection is direct. The Japanese Telephone Co. (KDD) raised $25 million through sale of securities in this country to lay a 3,000-mile submarine telephone cable from Tokyo to Hawaii. All of the money raised is being spent in America making jobs for American workmen. Apart from such examples of direct connection, our foreign investments provide foreigners with the necessary dollars to purchase our exports. If other things remain unchanged, our exports will tend to be reduced by the same amount as we reduce our foreign investments.

2. The proposed law is not addressed to the fundamental causes of the balance-of-payments deficit. The great "leakage" comes from foreign aid and other Government programs totaling $4 billion in 1962 and overseas military expenditures reaching some $3 billion. There is little hope of correcting our balance-of-payments deficit unless we reduce these expenditures substantially, improve our cost position in relation to our competitors abroad, and increase the attractiveness of foreign investment in the United States.

3. The proposed tax would be more accurately described not as a tax at all but rather as a new protective tariff to limit the importation of foreign securities. So viewed, the so-called tax represents a retreat from our longstanding policy of freedom for capital movements.

4. The U.S. capital market, and foreign economies dependent upon it, may be seriously damaged. The United States is now the only free capital market in which the amount and terms on which an issuer can sell its securities are limited only by the marketplace. This is a precious national asset. It should not be dissipated without convincing reasons of national interest.

5. The proposed tax may create fears of further restrictions. We must not impair the value of the dollar as the key currency of the world. Diminished confidence in the dollar can only have an adverse impact on our balance of payments.

6. The proposed tax is discriminatory. It selects only one aspect of private expenditure abroad—private portfolio investment—for restriction through a special tariff while leaving unaffected private expenditures abroad for tourism, direct foreign investment, and commercial bank loans.

7. The proposed tax is administratively complex.

I have only one serious reservation to this admirable analysis. I wish it had recognized more clearly that the basic cause of our so-called balance-of-payments problem is our domestic inflation, reflected through our huge past and prospective budget deficits and our cheap-money policies. We are driving dollars and investment abroad as much by holding down long-term interest rates as by holding down short-term interest rates.

"Big D" Sets the Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is always a privilege to present my native city, Dallas, Tex., the area which I am now honored to represent in Congress. You may have heard me, on occasion, extoll the virtues of Dallas and it may be that I will have more to say from time to time.

To me, Dallas exemplifies, more than any city in America, our way of life. We are a dynamic city, always looking ahead and striving to build a better community. We have accomplished this through the efforts of our own people. Dallas never hesitated to take a forward step while it waited for Federal aid. When big jobs had to be done there were always those around who had the initiative, the courage, and the muscle to do them.

On occasion there are those who, for some mean political expediency or even selfish motive, depreciate the progress of Dallas, but the history of Dallas and its tremendous growth in the 10 short years I have been privileged to serve it here in Congress, gives the lie to such efforts.

You may think I am prejudiced when it comes to extolling the virtures of Dallas. Just to show that I merely cite facts when I talk about Dallas, I would like to include an article about Dallas by a neighboring community, Tulsa, Okla. The following editorial from the Tulsa Tribune was reprinted in the Dallas Times Herald and I am proud to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress and the people of the United States:

OTHER VOICES: "BIG D" SETS THE PACE

The Dallas newspapers hailed last weekend as the greatest in its history—"A $5 Million Weekend" a headline said. More than 150,000 out-of-town people were there spending that money.

Ungrudgingly we doff our hat to Dallas for the superlative manner it entertained its guests. It deserves everything they left via the cash register. As a paper said, "probably no city this size ever was host to a football triple header of such quality—SMU-Navy, Texas-Oklahoma, and the professional Dallas Cowboys and Detroit Lions on successive days." All this was in addition to the Texas State Fair which attracted about 800,000 for the weekend.

Dallas has grown into the fine host class. There was a day when Oklahomans felt gypped at the prices they were charged for everything on this special occasion. Tulsans who were there this year—and there were hundreds of them—tell us they had no complaints. Hotel and motel space was completely reserved months ago. But hundreds of vacant furnished apartments were made available for visitors at $75 for Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. With sleeping accommodations for four or six, this was extremely reasonable.

The Dallas spirit that has made the city great is establishing a tradition, as a new book from the Southern Methodist Press emphasizes. Its main point perhaps is that Dallas never was a one-man town, which contrasts so sharply with the history of other communities in the Southwest. We've never thought of it before, but who was or is Mr. Dallas? No one there can tell you. The Dallas technique of city building has been to use the combined talents and vision of scores of men and women.

The result of this teamwork has been to build a solid city. It doesn't have the greatest airport; merely one of the busiest in the world. It has no Mayo Clinic, but SMU, Baylor, and Southwestern medical facilities that are exceptionally expert. It is no great shakes as a political center. Indeed it is losing its Veterans' Administration facities to Waco probably because it refuses to elect a Democratic Congressman, and it hasn't yet been awarded a magnificent Federal building for the same reason. But it has exceptionally good city government, having adopted the clean, nonpartisan council-manager system for its city hall years ago and retained it through numerous struggles the spoils politicians have waged to upset it. Fortune magazine once said of Dallas leadership that "They run it well, with self-effacement, not for private gain."

We're happy to pay this tribute to Dallas even though its State university team walloped us soundly Saturday. There is room in the Southwest as it grows for several Dallases. With a pattern like "Big D" has already cut, this will be quite a region if we learn our lessons.

Cooperative Credit and Consumer Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, October 19, 1963, it was my privilege to address members of the Credit Union National Association at Valle's Restaurant, Route 9, Needham, Mass., regarding International Credit Union Day. I include my address in the RECORD in order to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress the great contribution credit unions have made and are continuing to make not only in the United States but also throughout the entire world. Present at the dinner were Mr. Julius Stone, president of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., Thomas McDonald, President of the Boston chapter, which comprises of over 100,000 people in the metropolitan area of Boston, and many others who have made a real contribution towards the successful operation of credit unions throughout New England. The address follows:

COOPERATIVE CREDIT AND CONSUMER PROGRESS

I am honored to be here today at this meeting celebrating International Credit Union Day. Credit unions have been an invaluable asset in our democracy. Credit unions have encouraged thrift and self-help finance. They have stimulated our economy by providing a ready source of funds for the purchase of consumer goods. They have taught many thousands how to manage their money.

I am sure that all credit union members are proud of the fact that all but one-fifth of 1 percent of all money loaned by their credit unions has been repaid. Good character has been good collateral.

Here in Massachusetts, and particularly in Boston, the credit union movement was pioneered. As far back as 1892, an organization of employees on the Boston Globe formed an association to enable members to obtain loans at reasonable rates out of a fund built up from deposits by the members.

But the credit union movement in Massachusetts and in the United States did not really get started until 1909 when the first U.S. credit union law was passed in Massachusetts. This law was passed due to the efforts of public spirited men, especially Edward A. Filene, the Boston merchant. Mr. Filene had become interested in credit unions in 1907 after seeing similar groups in India. From that time to the end of his life, 30 years later, Filene devoted his energy and financial resources to the cause of economic democracy—to the spread of credit unions. His contribution to practical democracy was great. His concept of getting ahead with others rather than getting ahead of others is still an inspiration to us all.

Due to the work of Filene, the heart of the credit union movement remained in Boston for many years. One of the early credit unions in Boston was the City of Boston Employees' Credit Union organized in 1915 with the aid of Mayor Curley. Mr. Filene, however, felt that the credit union movement should be extended nationally and internationally. To promote their growth, he founded the Credit Union National Extension Bureau in 1921. This bureau worked hard for State and Federal credit union legislation. A trademark was developed—the now familiar drawing of the little man under the umbrella of the credit union. The little man and his umbrella have come to symbolize the alleviation of misery brought on by hard times, sickness, and financial distress.

The work of the bureau in spreading the cooperative credit idea prospered. In 1923, the first credit union of postal employees was started in Brockton, Mass. In 1925, a Massachusetts commission appointed to examine the credit union concept reported that the movement was a "splendid communal activity." States continued to pass credit union laws, and in 1934 a Federal law was enacted. Shortly thereafter the national association, Credit Union National Association, was born and the headquarters established in Madison, Wis.

CUNA and the credit union movement has gone a long way since 1934. In that year, despite the intensive organizing efforts of the preceding years, there were only 2,500 credit unions in the United States and less than 450,000 members. Today there are over 21,000 credit unions and nearly 13 million members in our country. Massachusetts has 738 credit unions with about 616,000 members—more members than existed in the entire country in 1934.

But, as you know, Credit Union National Association and the credit union movement is not and has not been complacent. Credit Union National Association has become an international organization and credit unions have a lot of pioneering to do in many countries. Low cost credit is almost unknown in many parts of the world. The theme of Credit Union Day, "Helping Hands in Many Lands," is certainly appropriate. Workers and their families in many lands need help to make the most of their meager resources. Although credit unions are functioning in 67 countries, many more are needed, particularly in undeveloped areas. I am indeed happy to see that Credit Union National Association is working with the Peace Corps and other governmental agencies to promote economic democracy in other lands. As a result of Credit Union National Association's good work, there were about 1,150 credit unions operating in Latin America at the end of 1962, of which 350 had been organized since midyear. Credit Union National Association also recently sponsored conferences in Africa to lead off a campaign to start credit unions throughout the African Continent.

There still remains a lot of work for credit unions in this country. Loan sharks still pray upon the poor and ignorant. Many sophisticated people often pay more interest than they realize, or they can afford.

The Congress recognizes the continued worth of credit unions. It recently passed a bill which will improve the operation of Federal credit unions. This bill will extend the time for the annual meeting of the membership to January, February, or March instead of confining the meeting to the month of January. This bill will also make it optional with the individual credit union whether the treasurer should serve as the general manager. As credit unions grow it is often not practical for one person to serve in both capacities. Those credit unions in Massachusetts which are chartered by the Federal Government will thus have their rules liberalized by the enactment of this legislation.

Another piece of legislation now pending which is of interest to you all as consumers and as credit union leaders is the tax reduction bill of 1963. This bill would put much-needed funds into the hands of the American consumer. It would lift a portion of the heavy burden of taxation from the American taxpayer. You who are familiar with the loans granted by credit unions must know that many people have a hard time acquiring the things necessary for a decent standard of living. They have a hard time accumulating enough resources to weather a crisis. The tax reduction bill should help lift the living standard of the ordinary American and provide a stimulus to the economy without greater governmental expenditures. Increased buying power will benefit us all individually and will benefit the Nation. The tax reduction bill is designed to help the consumer progress to a higher standard of living.

Consumer progress is, of course, constantly being promoted by credit unions. Credit unions have promoted good financial management since those early days in Massachusetts when a few idealists preached cooperative credit. The good sense of their idealism has been proven. The over $7 billion in assets in credit unions today in the United States speaks well for their practicality. Credit Union Day reminds us all of the moral and monetary assets accumulated in credit unions throughout our great Nation and throughout the world. May they continue to prosper.

Safe Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee, I am deeply interested in all matters of safety. For a number of years I have continually expressed my belief that automobiles could be provided with additional safety features.

With the ever increasing accident rate on the highways it is essential that the driving public be assured that the products on and in their automobiles measure up to safe standards.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the October issue of the National Independent entitled "RMA Rises to the Occasion, Tells Why Tire Standards Are Not Needed."

The article follows:

RMA RISES TO THE OCCASION, TELLS WHY TIRE STANDARDS ARE NOT NEEDED

The Rubber Manufacturers Association has issued (August 9) what it calls its "Seventh Draft" on "Automobile Tire Safety Standards."

The subject is important because State and Federal legislative agencies are looking with increasing sympathy at demands being made for enacting mandatory standards for tires. This turn of events is prompted by the high rate of complaints against the sale of unsafe tires, and the gross misrepresentation of tire values.

Of course, tire makers shun meaningful standards of whatever degree like the plague, as they have always done in the past. Legislation to compel inspection of tires on the road, yes. But a law to put safe tires on wheels in the first place—or give the customer an even break in choosing a safe tire—definitely no.

What does RMA have to say in its "Statement of Purpose," as signed by Ross Ormsby, president.

It says (a) "New tires are safe tires"; and (b) tires reach that point where their use is a menace to highway safety only when "the last 10 percent of a tire's tread life" is all that remains. RMA would get arguments on both points, from other knowledgeable people in the industry.

For instance, "New tires are safe tires." This broad assertion covers all tires manufactured—the whole sweep of private brands, all second-, third-, and fourth-line tires. The claim includes the tire that can be bought at nontire outlets and carried away neatly folded inside a shopping bag.

"Tire records show that 90 percent of all tire failures occur in the last 10 percent of a tire's tread life." Question: Then why do the manufacturers who approved this statement instruct their CO store managers to take such tires for tradeins? What do they do with them?

But the scope of RMA's report runs into what is labeled "Tire Safety Standards."

* * * * *

When it comes to retreaded tires (inasmuch as this part of the industry is still dominated by independents) RMA is agreeable that some form of identification "should be clearly and permanently marked ('retreads') on both sidewalls."

All in all, RMA's stand on tire standards ignores, or fails to answer, one vital question: Why are they needed?

Actions on the local retail level across the country suggest that there is such a thing as an unsafe tire; that not all "new tires are safe tires." Groups of dealers in different marketing areas have found it necessary to come together for the purpose of warning the public on this point through newspaper ad campaigns. A number of exposé articles in nationwide newspaper columns and magazines have found the subject lively enough to attract wide readership attention.

We have had our fill of industry's codes of ethics. We have risked damaged eardrums listening to the piously protested assertions that Government-sponsored regulation would impede technical progress and improvement of the product. We have heard

the manifold excuse that industrywide standards would be unenforceable. We have witnessed the annual ritual of the placating resolution.

But the question still remains: When is something going to be done about unsafe tires?

Mr. Speaker, this article only points up why I continue to bring the subject of safety standards to the attention of the House. It is a matter of great concern to the general public and I, for one, believe that the public should be protected. If the manufacturers do not take the initiative, as I feel they should, then we must legislate in order that proper standards are provided.

Property Rights a Human Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, regarding the current emphasis upon a national struggle for individual human rights, property rights, equalities, and freedoms, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial recently published in the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C. The article entitled "Property Rights a Human Right," succinctly states:

The debate in which we are now engaged is over the assertion of a new right: the right of nonowners of property to appropriate it from the owners.

The editorial follows:

PROPERTY RIGHTS A HUMAN RIGHT

One of the great rallying slogans of the power struggle of the labor unions and the advocates of civil rights long has been the battle cry of "Human Rights versus Property Rights" as if the two were entirely separate, one good and one evil.

Yet the right to own property, to protect all individuals, rich and poor, from such abuses of power by the English crown as unlawful seizure and "taxation without representation" was one of the causes of the American Revolution. They conceived of the inviolateness of the person and property as of the individual a basic human right.

Latter day champions of so-called human rights have attempted to show that the architects of the Revolution—Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, Adams, and others—were motivated primarily by the desire to protect their own property and that the Constitution is rigged to protect property at the expense of human needs.

These are the egalitarian despots who demand absolute equality at the expense of true freedom. They fail to distinguish between fundamental rights and privileges to be earned. They cannot see, or choose to ignore, the fundamental truth that absolute equality is impossible of attainment. Any attempt to confer it through laws or court decrees leads only to infringement or destruction of the freedom of others.

"Liberty, equality, fraternity" was the battle cry of the French Revolution. It failed of its purpose because it resulted in the death or exile of the best of France's leaders and producers. To achieve equality and fraternity, the revolutionists tried to reduce all men to the lowest common denominator and it ended in chaos. In destroying one form of tyranny, they created a worse one and set the stage for the Napoleonic era.

It was this that caused the great Edmund Burke, the stoutest defender of the American colonies in the British Parliament, to write of the French Revolution:

"They made and recorded a sort of institute and digest of anarchy, called the rights of man."

Apropos of this discussion were the remarks of Gov. Farris Bryant of Florida before the Senate Commerce Committee in argument against title VI, the public accommodations section, of the proposed civil rights bill. Governor Bryant said, in part:

"I have seen some suggestions that the real contest is between human rights and property rights. That is not so.

"Property has no rights. Humans have the right to own property, just as they have the right to speak, and to worship, and to travel from State to State.

"The only human rights involved are the rights of some humans against the claims of other humans.

"The debate in which we are now engaged is over the assertion of a new right: the right of nonowners of property to appropriate it from the owners. The new right is asserted in the name of equality.

"Differently stated: This is a debate between those who seek to preserve freedom in the use of property by its owners and those who would appropriate a part of the bundle of rights which make up that ownership, without compensation, to the public, in the name of equality.

"May I suggest that the proper goal for the Congress to seek is not a transfer of property rights, but freedom."

There is far more involved here than the Negro demonstrations and marches in the name of "our freedom." They are demanding equality in a way that is the very antithesis of freedom. The courts and the politicians are aiding and abetting their cause by trying to place absolute emphasis on the liberty of the individual to do as he pleases.

But what they really are doing is trying to reduce all men to the lowest common denominator. Equality and freedom are not necessarily mutually exclusive in the ideal society; but neither are they always compatible.

To create equality artificially is to risk the destruction of all liberty.

It is not evil to own property. It is not sinful to make a profit. If there is such a thing as a human right, surely the ownership of property and a fair return on one's effort and investment is one. Besides, Negroes own property, too.

Vice President Johnson Condemns Poll Tax in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the most forthright statement I have ever heard in condemnation of the ridiculous tax on a citizen's right to exercise his vote—the poll tax—was made in the Second Congressional District of Texas on September 28 by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

We believe that if a man can shoulder a gun and die for his country he ought to be able to vote for his leaders without paying for that privilege—

The Vice President declared.

I heartily agree with the Vice President on his statement and I hope that an overwhelming majority of our fellow Texans will also agree and vote to abolish the poll tax in our State this coming November 9.

(The Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise has recognized the significance of the Vice President's unequivocal statement and in an October 1 editorial made it clear to its readers that his statement and leadership toward abolition of the Texas poll tax was most welcome.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, the text of this editorial:

JOHNSON CONDEMNS POLL TAX

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON's condemnation of a poll tax that is a prerequisite for voting in Texas is most welcome.

It is as bad as he says it is. We join him in an appeal for its repeal on November 9.

The Vice President, in southeast Texas addresses Saturday and Sunday, called the levy the shame of the Lone Star State. Especially graphic was this statement:

"We believe that if a man can shoulder a rifle and die for his country he ought to be able to vote for his leaders without paying for that privilege. The fact that Texas is only one of five States left that has a poll tax is not something to be proud of."

The strong JOHNSON support of poll tax repeal reminds that Gov. John Connally and numerous other Texas leaders have been emphasizing that the movement in that direction should be a bipartisan matter, that repeal should never be looked upon as an issue pitting one group of citizens against another group.

Widest possible use of the ballot in this State will, ultimately, work to the advantage of everyone. There just can't be any argument with that point.

The Vice President told his weekend audiences that the amendment to the U.S. Constitution abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections is sure to be ratified next year, but pointed out:

"That is not enough. You must also take this chance to vote against this tax because if you don't you will still have to pay to vote for your sheriff and your Governor."

This same is true, of course, of all other balloting on State and local levels.

What Has Happened to Medicare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time the subject of medical care for the aged has been revived. At this time, we Members know that the King bill, H.R. 3920, is before the Ways and Means Committee, with no action scheduled. From all reports, the administration plans to renew the bid for medicare in 1964, rather than to push for its enactment this year. The fact that there seems to be a deep silence over the land as far as the usual or normal public statements on medicare from its supporters, would lend credence to the belief that this is indeed legislation which will

be pulled out in an election year, to drum up emotional support; that is, support not based on facts.

Recently I read an editorial which appeared in the Crawford County Avalanche, Grayling, Mich., of Thursday, October 3, 1963. I feel this editorial is a fine summary of the situation as it stands today, and it is worthy of congressional attention, as well as the attention of the general public. Certainly it bears out my feelings on the subject, as well as the majority of my constituents.

I would like to include this editorial with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

The editorial follows:

MEDICARE TODAY

One may be justified in asking "What has happened to medicare?"—bill for providing medical benefits of various kinds to everyone drawing social security payments.

When this measure was introduced, it will be remembered, all of the administration guns were brought up in its support. No other domestic measure was pushed so hard, and administration leaders apparently scented success. The result, to use the vernacular, was no dice. Congress, in the face of all the pressure, just said "No," and no again.

Medicare is back—old bills like old soldiers, even after repeated failure, never seem to die. But the big guns are silent. Token support comes from its sponsors, but little more.

Why? The answer is that congressional coolness is the direct result of several diverse but important factors.

1. The past-65 population group is nowhere near as bad off financially as the medicare crew have asserted. By and large, taking all elements into consideration, they seem to be better off, on the average, than younger groups.

2. Medicare would give the benefits, on a blanket basis, to great numbers of social security beneficiaries who neither want nor need it. At the same time, it would have excluded millions of elderly people not within the social security framework.

3. The cost, according to independent experts, would reach unsupportable heights, many billions a year.

4. The existing Kerr-Mills bill—for providing Federal medical financial aid to the elderly in need, under a system of State administration—is working well and is being extended.

5. The voluntary medical insurance plans, offered by Blue Cross and Blue Shield and commercial insurance companies, are doing a superb job providing protection to all who want it, at moderate cost.

6. There is a very distinct feeling in this country that we've already gone too far in welfare statism, and that medicare would tage us a long step further along the road of government domination of everything and everybody.

And that seems to be the status of medicare today.

Water and Colorado's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, before the Rotary International of Denver, Colo., on October 17, 1963.

We, in Colorado, are ever mindful of the proper preservation and use of water. Our colleague has shown great knowledge of the problem. He has outlined the necessity for cooperation in the State of Colorado and elsewhere in bringing about the proper development of the water of our State.

The address follows:

WATER AND COLORADO'S FUTURE

(Remarks of Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, before Denver Rotary International, October 17, 1963)

Senator, Governor Johnson, officers, members, and guests of Denver Rotary International, and, may I trespass for this particular occasion on the usual requirements and offer to all of those who qualify a second salutation which is: "my fellow Coloradans."

Chance saw to it that I was born elsewhere, but since the time that I have been knowledgeable enough to understand values, I have been proud of my Colorado citizenship—and I might say that my loyalty to the State and its people is neither hampered nor diminished by my first loyalty to this great Nation of ours.

I am personally pleased and highly honored to be requested to address at this time the members of this outstanding service organization of Denver. To be perfectly honest and frank with all of you, it is a rare privilege these days for a Member of Congress whose people live west of the Mississippi to have the opportunity to return home and visit his homeland and become reacquainted with his neighbors. This luncheon meeting affords me both pleasures. May I be a little bit sarcastic and advise you that if Congress doesn't change its way, there is likely to be the greatest crop of one-term Members that history has ever recorded.

I am very glad to be presented to this group by one of Colorado's great—the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson—legislator, executive, and dedicated public servant, whose abilities and talents have been given unselfishly throughout a long and eventful life to the best interests and welfare of his fellow Americans and his fellow Coloradans. Citizens of our State generally do not realize the contributions made by this distinguished friend of ours. I shall mention but one of his many acts of service in our behalf, and I shall mention it so briefly that if there are those of you who are left wondering or unconvinced, then I would suggest that as a citizen who wishes to express gratitude where gratitude is honestly deserved, that you acquaint yourself with the facts because if this friend of ours, while serving his third term as Governor, had not stood as firm as the rock of Gibraltar in the interest of his fellow Coloradans in the conferences which led to the Santa Fe Accord of 1956, there would have been no upper Colorado Storage Project Act. This, even without the myriad of other services, entitles him to the undying gratitude of all Coloradans of present and future generations. Once again, I thank you, Ed.

I have great affection for this city and its people. My visits here these days are all too few and too short. Eleven years of my life—school and public service—have been spent here. There is no other city like Denver. Although young in years, it is well and favorably known throughout all parts of the world. Every Coloradan is proud of the success of this, our capital city. We rejoice in its accomplishments and we sorrow in its trials and tribulations. We do our best throughout the whole State to understand its problems. Our small communities look to it as our big brother. We share in its successes. We are hurt when its ambitions for success seem to cause it to forget that its phenomenal development stems largely from the continual stream of contributions that flow from the outside areas of the State to this metropolitan area. I do not need to paraphrase because simply stated: we grow or decay together. This is the oneness of peoples closely welded together in the status of statehood.

All of my life I have lived in and worked for peoples of minority areas. As a youth, I was educated in a small school only 3 miles from a school many times as large. I have always had my home in a small community which, on all too many occasions, looked with suspicion on the activities of its larger neighbor. As a State legislator, I served a limited population which ofttimes was bothered about the activities of the more populous areas of the State. As a Congressman, I represent not only a district with a small population, but also a State and also a region of the same limitations when compared with areas of larger populations. These experiences, if they have taught me nothing else, have caused me to appreciate the value of understanding. Understanding of each other's position, not agreement, should be the first goal. Understanding is always accompanied by a desire not to hurt or destroy. Confidence in each other is the natural consequence of understanding. Out of the two will come ultimate agreement. But without the two, controversy and discord will be perpetuated.

And now to my subject: "Water and Colorado's Future." I doubt not that there are few in this audience who do not now understand fully why I have prefaced my remarks as I have. It goes without saying that second only to the air we breathe are we dependent upon this great natural resource—water. Colorado is neither a have not nor an abundantly blessed State in its possession of this resource, and yet, we are the most favored of all of our neighbors in this respect. Nature's favor has all too often brought discord and controversy among us rather than cause us to seek the best means of using every drop of this valuable resource to its fullest and best use.

As we ponder the development of water within the State, we must consider the different procedures which have been used in the past:

1. The first development and use of water in Colorado, as elsewhere, was through the efforts of private enterprise. For these builders I have only the greatest of respect. However, Colorado's geography is such that the field for the private enterpriser has always been extremely limited. Understanding legislators made it possible for private enterprise to join together in groups as irrigation companies or mutual irrigation districts.

2. More populous communities joined together and brought into the picture the municipal water district. Invariably, these organizations have served the people of their municipalities effectively and well. Denver is no exception.

3. The Federal Government, in the interest of public land settlement, soon offered the reclamation program. The people of Colorado were not well prepared in the beginning to take advantage of the benefits of this program, but today they are well on the way and are receiving their share of consideration in this respect. I need not advise those present that it is in this area of water resource conservation and development that a Member of Congress becomes involved. In practically all other areas, his role is that of the ordinary private citizen.

I should like at this time to just mention two other important events in Colorado's water history. First, the authorization by the authorization by the legislature of the forming of large conservancy districts with-

out which Federal reclamation programs in Colorado would have been stymied. Second, the authorization of the formation and financing of the Colorado Water Conservation Board without which Colorado could never have prepared herself to successfully press for water resource projects. The second service was the work of the administration of former Gov. Teller Ammons, and he, too, deserves the continuing thanks of all Colorado.

I desire now to bring to your attention a very short résumé of legal principles governing the development and use of water in Colorado. Ever since Colorado was admitted to the Union in 1876, our Constitution has provided that—

"The water of every natural stream not heretofore appropriated, within the State of Colorado, is hereby declared to be the property of the public, and the same is dedicated to the use of the people of the State, subject to appropriation as hereinafter provided.

"The right to divert the unappropriated waters of any natural stream to beneficial uses shall never be denied. Priority of appropriation shall give the better right as between those using the water for the same purpose."

Even before we adopted our Constitution this rule of first-in-time-first-in-right was the law and practice in this part of the United States. Part and parcel of it, of course, is the recognition that rights to the use of water cannot be made to depend on the ownership of land bordering on a stream. Part and parcel of it, also, is the recognition that the rightful use of water is not confined to the watershed of origin. This was decided by our Supreme Court as early as 1882 in the case of *Coffin* v. *Left Hand Ditch Co.* Colorado's law in this respect is the same as that of the vast majority of the Western appropriation States. Wells Hutchins summarizes the law on this subject thus in his book entitled "Selected Problems in the Law of Water Rights in the West":

"The use of water under the riparian doctrine is commonly limited to lands lying within the watershed of the stream to which they are riparian. Under the appropriation doctrine, however, the right of use acquired in the flow of a stream is not limited to riparian lands nor to any other lands solely because of their location; hence it follows logically that the use is not generally restricted to the watershed, subject, of course, to the rule which applies to all features of the exercise of the appropriative right, namely, that the prior rights of others be not adversely affected. An early Colorado decision [the one I just mentioned] recognized the right to divert water from a stream and to carry it across an intervening divide and thence down a different stream for the irrigation of lands lying in the valley of the latter."

The importance of this doctrine is emphasized not only in our tSate law, but by the terms of several of the interstate compacts to which Colorado is a party. The Colorado River compact of 1922, for instance, apportioned to the upper basin an exclusive right to the beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum and defined the term "upper basin" to include not only "those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming * * * from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River System above Lee Ferry" but also "all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River system which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the system above Lee Ferry." The same definition occurs in the Upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948 which apportioned to our State the consumptive use of 51.75 percent of the total use apportioned to the upper basin by the big compact.

It is worth noting, moreover, that this doctrine has served Colorado well in its dealings with other States. Our friends below us on the Colorado—in California, Arizona, Nevada, and Mexico—would dearly love to see all upper basin transmountain diversions severely limited. None of use would think of acceeding to the position advocated by powerful interests down there. And, in the Laramie River case, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1922, we were challenged by Wyoming on the claim, among others, that "the waters of this interstate stream cannot rightfully be taken from its watershed and carried into another where she [Wyoming] never can receive any benefit from them." On this subject, the Court said:

"The objection of Wyoming to the proposed diversion on the ground that it is to another watershed, from which she can receive no benefit, is * * * untenable. The fact that the diversion is to such a watershed * * * does not in itself constitute a ground for condemning it. In neither State does the right of appropriation depend on the place of use being within the same watershed. Diversions from one watershed to another are commonly made in both States and the practice is recognized by the decisions of their courts. The principle of such diversions being recognized in both States, its application to this interstate stream does not in itself constitute a ground for complaint."

The fact that our basic law permits diversions to be made from one watershed to another has, as we must all recognize, led to misunderstandings and difficulties in the past. Fortunately, we have generally been able to work out our problems amicably as they came along. Our water conservancy district law aptly expresses, I believe, the general policy of the State even though it is limited in its direct application to districts organized under its provisions: "* * * any works or facilities planned and designed for the exportation of water from the natural basin of the Colorado River * * * shall be designed, constructed, and operated in such a manner that the present appropriations of water, and in addition thereto prospective uses of water for irrigation and other beneficial consumptive use purposes, including consumptive uses for domestic, mining, and industrial purposes, within the natural basin of the Colorado River * * * will not be impaired nor increased in cost at the expense of the water users within the natural basin."

The Colorado-Big Thompson project has been, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas is being, constructed consistently with this law. In the first, our western slope and eastern slope people sat down together and, as a result of their negotiations, agreed that Green Mountain reservoir should be an integral part of the whole Colorado-Big Thompson project, that 52,000 acre-feet of its storage capacity should be devoted to "replacement in western Colorado of the water which would be usable there if not withheld or diverted" by other features of the project; and that its other 100,000 acre-feet of storage capacity should be used for the production of power and to be available, without charge, "to supply existing irrigation and domestic appropriations of water * * * and for future use for domestic purpose and in the irrigation of lands thereafter to be brought under cultivation in western Colorado." I shall not recite the other provisions of the agreement, important though they are, but shall content myself with saying that the agreement, printed in Senate Document No. 80 of the 75th Congress, was the foundation stone of the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

We are doing the same thing in the case of the Fryingpan-Arkansas diversion. Here the pertinent document, signed on behalf of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, the Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, the Colorado River Water Conservation District, and the Southwestern Water Conservation District, has been printed as House Document No. 130, 87th Congress. It sets out, as you all know, the operating criteria for the Fryingpan-Arkansas project and includes provisions for the construction of the 100,000 acre-foot Ruedi Reservoir to supply present and future needs of the people on the Western Slope.

I would like briefly to trace the development of irrigation in our State and then tell you what we can expect in the years ahead.

Irrigation in Colorado dates back to the early 1860's, when small irrigation districts were constructed along the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Canon City and Pueblo. The first major development in the Arkansas Basin occurred in 1874 in the Rocky Ford area. The first transmountain diversion project of any size was constructed by the Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Company and placed in operation in 1935—diverting up to about 45,000 acre-feet annually from the Colorado River Basin. Like other areas in the Nation, irrigation was overextended in the Arkansas Valley and has been on the decrease since 1920 because of the lack of a dependable water supply. The recently authorized Fryingpan-Arkansas project should result in stabilizing the irrigated area. The first Federal reclamation project to furnish water east of the Continental Divide was the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project authorized in 1937.

Irrigation in that part of Colorado west of the Continental Divide started in the 1880's when the Indians were removed to reservations and our valleys were opened to settlement. The Grand Valley was opened to settlement in 1881 and the Uncompahgre Valley in 1882. Private irrigation undertakings were started almost immediately in both valleys. The Grand Valley canal was completed in 1886 to serve about 45,000 acres. However, attempts by private interests between 1886 and 1902 to construct a canal to serve higher lands in the valley failed because private investors were unwilling to back the project. In the Uncompahgre Valley, after large canals were constructed around 1894, it soon became evident that the Uncompahgre River would not furnish an adequate water supply for all the lands that were intended to be irrigated.

As was the case elsewhere in the West, the early irrigation projects started as private undertakings under the illusion in many instances that a plentiful supply of water could be diverted from the rivers to irrigate large areas without river storage or control. There were numerous setbacks and failures in these early projects, and it was this factor primarily which led to the enactment of the Reclamation Project Act in 1902.

Upon passage of the Reclamation Project Act in 1902, the citizens of both the Grand Valley and the Uncompahgre Valley organized water user's associations for the purpose of cooperating with the reclamation service in developing their areas. The Uncompachgre project was authorized in 1903 and the tunnel bringing water from the Gunnison River was completed in 1909. The Grand Valley project was authorized in 1911 with the first irrigation by the Reclamation Service in 1915. The Uncompahgre and Grand Valley projects were the only reclamation projects authorized in Colorado during the early years of the reclamation program.

Since 1937, Colorado has been benefited greatly by the authorization and construction of the Pine River project in Archuleta and La Plata Counties, the Fruitgrowers Dam project and the Paonia project in Delta County, the San Luis project (only partially authorized and constructed) in the Rio Grande Valley, the Colorado-Big Thompson transmountain diversion project serving northeastern Colorado, the Collbran project in Mesa County, and the Bonny Dam on the

south fork of the Republican River in eastern Colorado.

To these existing projects we are adding or shall add in the foreseeable future those projects authorized or named for planning purposes in the Colorado Storage Project Act. Of those authorized in the act, the Paonia project and the Smith Fork project in Delta and Montrose Counties have been completed, the Florida project in La Plata County is nearing completion, and the Silt project in Garfield County should be started this fiscal year. In addition to these participating projects, the Curecanti storage project on the Gunnison River is well underway. Construction has already started on the Fryingpan-Arkansas multiple-purpose transmountain diversion project which was authorized only 2 years ago.

There are some 20 projects enumerated in the planning section of the Colorado Storage Project Act which are either ready for consideration by the Congress or should be ready within the next 5 to 7 or 8 years. In addition, the Bureau of Reclamation is continuing its study of the Narrows unit on the South Platte River and the Cache le Poudre water stabilization project on the Cache le Poudre River.

It is significant that there is only one Corps of Engineers project in Colorado and it is the John Martin Reservoir in the Arkansas River Basin.

Colorado has presently some 2,800,000 acres of land under irrigation. Of this amount, about 950,000 acres have been developed or are served supplemental water through the Federal reclamation program. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project will provide supplemental water for another 280,000 acres included in the presently irrigated lands. To the amount presently irrigated, we should be able to add approximately 300,000 new acres through the Federal reclamation program in the future, and also firm up the water supply for additional lands presently inadequately irrigated.

The Federal Government has expended on water projects in Colorado about $280 million. To finish construction of those projects authorized by the Colorado Storage Project Act, an additional amount of approximately $98 million will be expended by the Federal Government. The total expenditure by the Federal Government for the Fryingpan-Arkansas will be about $170 million. In addition to all of these, if most of the projects enumerated in the planning section of the Colorado Storage Project Act are finally constructed together with the Narrows, the Cache Le Poudre and the further development in the Rio Grande River Basin it will require something over $500 million.

What must Colorado's future in water resource development be? Mind you, I did not say what shall, what should or what could Colorado's future be in this regard. I used the phrase, "What it must be," and there is neither time nor opportunity left for waiting, for stumbling, for second guessing or for quarreling among ourselves. Assuming Colorado's share of Colorado River water amounts to 3,855,000 acre-feet, we have remaining about 1,690,000 acre-feet of committed water for use in Colorado. However, I am sure that everyone here will agree with me that this unused water is not likely to remain in the possession of our State, subject to being used by our citizens, unless we see to it that it is put to honest, wise, beneficial, and immediate use. An honest use is a use for which the water was acquired in the first place. A wise use is a use which is dominant as of the particular time. A beneficial use is an efficient use to satisfy a recognized need within the area of use. An immediate use is putting the water to work before the time limit during which the water can legally be put to use expires and before others are able to establish a use of such water. Our time to put our presently unused water to use is not unlimited.

The future development of every facet of Colorado's society will be limited by the amount of water we have and the manner in which we use it. This is a lesson of history, peculiar not alone to Colorado, but of major importance to us because we are Coloradans.

Agriculture in Colorado will reach its maximum contribution in the foreseeable future. To be sure, we have additional land areas which could be responsive to larger yields but the water is not available and it never will be. Just as agriculture is reaching that place where it can develop no further in our economy because of the scarcity of water, so shall all other parts of our economy be limited sooner or later. And, I might add here sooner, in my opinion, than many of us realize. Farms, towns, cities, industries, recreation activities, must inevitably be controlled in their growth by the amount of water at their disposal.

I repeat towns and cities cannot exist without farms, livestock, mines, timber, etc. Manufacturing cannot exist without mines and timber. No economy or civilization can exist without people. These statements are axiomatic and are referred to here only to show that in today's world, as well as tomorrow's, we must be guided by a philosophy of live and let live, or we all sooner or later shall expire because of our own selfishness, ambitions and shortcomings.

What we must have in Colorado is rational and constructive planning from a central vantage point, and that is our own State government. Recommendations from such planning agency should be forwarded to the State legislature for implementation into policy wherever desirable and acceptable to the people. There should be no deviation from such legislative enactments by area or local interest. This is the only way that the State can be welded together as a whole. And, it is within the whole State that we receive our maximum benefits and strength.

In Colorado's future, there is still room and necessity for the construction of some 15 to 20 more participating projects of the Colorado Storage project; for the construction of the Narrows project and similar projects if desired and found feasible; for the filling of Dillon Reservoir and other like reservoirs, if cooperative procedures are complied with; for the transportation of water from one basin to another when agreement is reached and honored; for the changing of an existing use to a use of a higher priority where the need is shown and due recompense is made, and for a coordination of benefits when injury to other users can and will be avoided.

Personally, I am willing to accept Colorado's existing water situation—commitments, agreements, deficits, benefits—as they are. I for one am willing to recognize the contributions and sacrifices made by those heretofore charged with the protection and development of this resource within our borders. Their mistakes and shortcomings I am inclined to overlook—but not to forget, because future dangers and pitfalls may well be avoided by remembrance rather than forgetfulness. It is my feeling that we have no time to spend in arguing what might have been if we had made some decision other than the one we made, or if we had done something or not done something which we did or which we did not do. We do not have the time for such a valueless luxury. We have our work cut out for us as of this moment. We must close our ranks. We must respect each other's position. We must strive to understand each other's needs, desires and ambitions. We must go out of our way to inform each other of plans and to become informed of the other's plans. There is no room for or need of secrecy of movement among ourselves.

As people in other areas, and other parts of our great basins, press their plans for development, let us be united—not as an eastern slope, not as a western slope, not as a Rio Grande basin, not as a North Platte basin, not as a metropolitan area, but rather as a vital and organized whole—not diminished in strength because of lack of confidence and controversy within—for the purpose of protecting that which is legally ours and without which all tendons of our economy will be unduly and prematurely weakened.

In closing, I would like to bring to you one of my favorite passages of the Scripture:

"Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

"It is like the precious ointment for the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard: that went down to the skirts of his garments.

"As the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion, for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life forevermore."

Mellon Bank Official Stresses Need for Powerful Sustaining Force of Tax Cut for Economy Rise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the long awaited "golden sixties" may now be at last airborne. So says an outstanding analyst of the economic scene, John J. Balles, vice president, Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., in a speech at Pittsburgh, September 19.

Mr. Balles notes the age of the present business upswing, which dates from February 1961, and warns of a possible vulnerability unless a powerful sustaining force steps in to prolong the expansion. The tax cut, he points out, is such a potential force.

A tax reduction program of the proposed timing and magnitude would add strongly to the prospects of the current economic upswing lasting through most and possibly all of 1964.

In view of the widespread anticipations of tax relief, a failure to pass the measure might have severe repercussions, especially in the stock market, in business capital spending, and in consumer confidence, and thus seriously weaken the economic outlook for the coming year—both as to the duration and extent of any further gain in business activity.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the economy will advance more rapidly and more generously with a tax cut than without. The golden sixties are within our grasp if we move fast enough.

Part of Mr. Balles' speech follows:

THE LONG AWAITED "GOLDEN SIXTIES" MAY NOW BE AT LEAST AIRBORNE

With the 1963 performance of the economy through Labor Day now a matter of record, the "scoreboard" for the year is becoming tolerably clear. By early 1963, business activity shook loose from the lethargy that had set in in late summer of 1962—which had generally produced a flat trend in industrial activity and even declines in a few key areas. The surge of consumer spending for new cars, along with the shortrun effects of the Cuban crisis last October, were especially important in generating a stronger tone in business activity. In spring and early sum-

mer, a strong pickup in homebuilding activity added to the forward thrust of the economy. A further temporary stimulus was provided by the acceleration of steel production, in anticipation of possible labor difficulties later in the year. Thus, from February to July, industrial production jumped over 5 percent, breaking out the long plateau which had prevailed since mid-1962. After reaching a peak in May, steel production in the Nation then dropped 32 percent by August, with a similar pattern prevailing in the Pittsburgh area. But the liquidation of steel inventories now appears to have about run its course. New orders and current output are now picking up, and a moderate uptrend in the steel industry is expected for the balance of the year.

It is especially encouraging that expenditures by business on new plant and equipment have recovered from the dip of late 1962 and early 1963. Capital spending plans of business now call for a $41 billion rate in the fourth quarter of 1963, up more than 11 percent from the first quarter low point.

Following a sustained gain in personal income, retail sales in the past 3 months have finally risen off the high-level plateau which had stretched back to the end of last year—with the renewed strength occurring mainly in consumer spending for soft goods. It seems unlikely, however, that any further gains will be registered in consumer spending for hard goods in the near future, especially since new domestic auto sales in recent months have already been running at the very high yearly rate of 7.2–7.3 million.

In the key area of residential construction, it now appears that housing starts in the balance of the year may fail to match the peak set last spring.

All things considered, present trends suggest that, during the remainder of the year, new high ground will be reached in industrial production, personal income, and retail sales. Generally, the total output of goods and services, as measured by GNP, is expected to reach a fourth-quarter rate of $590 billion or even higher, thus totalling about $582 billion for the year—up nearly 5 percent from 1962. This gives us an estimated point of departure for a preliminary assessment of business prospects for 1964.

KEY FACTORS IN THE OUTLOOK

As already noted general business activity has been rising at a moderate pace in the past year, although marked by various cross-currents in some of the large and volatile sectors. In the outlook for the coming year, there are at least three major conditioning influences which should be noted—two of which are "external" to the business cycle itself, and concerning which only a tentative judgment can be made at this time.

RECOVERY PERIOD'S AGE

(1) The first of these influences is the "age" of the present business upswing, which dates from February 1961. Considerable progress has been made in moderating economic fluctuations in recent years, but it would certainly be premature to conclude that the business cycle is dead. By yearend, the current period of expansion will have lasted 34 months—or 2 months more than the average of three peacetime cycles since 1945. While such a comparison is only suggestive and by no means conclusive, it does caution us that, on the basis of our own experience, some unusual sustaining force is generally necessary to prolong a business upswing much beyond 3 years. In fact, with the sole exception of the recovery period from the deep depression of the early 1930's, there has been no nonwar period of business expansion in U.S. history which has lasted as long as 40 months. Thus, we should now be especially alert, both as to the possibility of some identifiable sustaining force, as well as to the possibility of any potential trouble spot to which the present business expansion, being relatively old, might be especially vulnerable. As it happens, the current national scene contains an outstanding example of each.

(2) Potentially the most powerful sustaining force now on the horizon is the proposed reduction in personal and corporate income taxes. As approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, a tax cut of $11.1 billion would be spread over a 2-year period. About $7 billion of tax relief, mainly for consumers, would be made effective as of January 1, 1964, with the remaining $4 billion to take effect a year later. At the moment, however, this tax bill has not yet been passed by the House, and it must still be considered by the Senate—where it faces uncertainty and possible delay. A tax reduction program of the proposed timing and magnitude would add strongly to the prospects of the current economic upswing lasting through most and possibly all of 1964.

In view of the widespread anticipations of tax relief, a failure to pass the measure might have severe repercussions, especially in the stock market, in business capital spending, and in consumer confidence, and thus seriously weaken the economic outlook for the coming year—both as to the duration and extent of any further gain in business activity. Thus far, the main threat to the tax bill has been the unwillingness of the administration to give sufficiently binding assurances that the proposed reduction in revenues will be accompanied by some leveling off in the sharp upward trend in Federal spending. Otherwise, many observers are rightly concerned that sustained large-scale deficit financing may rekindle inflationary expectations at home and further undermine confidence in the dollar abroad. Since the tax bill now appears to have a reasonably good (though far from certain) chance of passage, a crucial assumption in the following projection of 1964 business activity is that a tax cut of the approximate size now being considered will become effective by early 1964.

(3) Perhaps the most serious economic "trouble spot" now evident is the continued failure to eliminate or at least scale down significantly the large deficit in the U.S. balance of payments—thus posing a threat to confidence in the dollar and to its role as the key reserve currency in free world trade and finance. The deficit reported for the second quarter—a $5.2 billion yearly rate—was the largest yet experienced. Among other things, it triggered a series of moves in Washington—including Federal Reserve action to further raise short-term interest rates, an administration proposal for an "interest-equalization" tax, and yet another promise to tie more foreign aid to U.S. exports, along with further steps to offset the dollar drain of U.S. military expenditures abroad. Whether the "interest-equalization" tax will be passed, and if so, whether it and the other steps just noted will be effective remains to be tested. If, unhappily, the latent threat in our international payments deficit should develop into crisis proportions, via a major speculative run against the dollar and large withdrawals of gold from the United States the defensive measures employed would most likely affect business conditions specifically through the financial mechanism—e.g., exchange controls over outflows of U.S. capital, along with sharp and sudden credit restraint. The general tendency would be to impede, perhaps seriously, any continued upswing in business activity—especially when the volatile element of confidence is considered. Thus, the balance-of-payments problem looms like the sword of Damocles over the head of the economy—and is thus one of the major imponderables in the business outlook.

SUMMARY ON BUSINESS PROSPECTS

Assuming a tax cut by early 1964 of about the magnitude now being considered, and the avoidance of a balance-of-payments crisis, the economic prospects for 1964 now appear to be generally bright. Although housing and new auto sales may show no gains or even a little slippage from the unusually high levels of 1963, there is strength in the outlook for business capital spending and for consumer purchases of services and soft goods. Higher Government spending will also add to the demand for goods and services. Thus, there is the prospect of a further gain in total corporate profits—but with widely varying trends in different industries.

For 1964 as a whole, most broad measures of production, income, and sales are expected to reach new highs. Industrial production may thus show a gain of about 4 percent over 1963. The total output of goods and services in 1964, as measured by GNP, is expected to rise to a level of $605 to $610 billion, compared with an estimated $582 billion for 1963.

Business prospects are also bright for the tristate area. This year has already witnessed a remarkable advance in economic activity in all 3 States. Indeed, 1963 is likely to be the best year on record for business in Ohio, the best year since 1956 in Pennsylvania, and the best year since 1955 in West Virginia. Based on the forecast of a rising trend of capital spending and a sustained high level of consumer outlays, 1964 should be even better.

This is the preliminary economic profile of 1964. But as noted earlier, it is not yet in clear focus. Among the important confirmations needed in the months ahead will be the clues offered by new auto sales in the fourth quarter, and the concrete evidence of business capital-spending plans for 1964, to be indicated in surveys later this year. Finally, by late 1963, it is hoped that the taxcut question will have been favorably resolved and that the balance-of-payments problem will have at least responded somewhat to recent "medicine." Thus, by this yearend, it should be possible to discern more sharply the business outlook for the yearend.

Looking beyond 1964, it could well be that the United States is finally moving out of the so-called middle years, which have been characterized by a sluggish rate of economic growth, relatively high unemployment, inadequate profits, and idle industrial capacity. Already fears of economic stagnation so prevalent during the past 4 years have largely receded into the background, while the performance of the economy thus far in 1963 has confounded many of the critics. Admittedly unemployment, unused capacity, and the persistent deficit in the balance of payments are nagging problems, but the promise of moderate but broadly based economic growth in 1964—as opposed to a speculative and inflationary boom—could foreshadow an extended period of economic prosperity and well-being. The "golden sixties," which up to this time have notably failed to soar, may now at least be airborne.

Problems Broadcasters Have With FCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there are many areas in the broadcasting field where the Federal Communication Commission has and is exercising jurisdiction which I do not

feel was the intent of Congress at the time the Communications Act was enacted in 1934.

To be sure, many changes have taken place in this field since the enactment of the 1934 act and it is possible that we should take a good look at this act to determine whether or not it should be recodified.

To indicate the problems confronting the broadcasters, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Broadcasting magazine entitled "Who's Boss," which I believe points up the problems in the clearest, most concise terms:

WHO'S BOSS?

We make the flat charge that the Federal Communications Commission is not serving the public interest, convenience, and necessity. These are the counts:

It is overcommercializing its regulation of broadcasting, to grab headlines and euchre bigger appropriations.

It is neglecting regulation of telephone, telegraph, and other common carrier services which are more important to the consumer economically but which lack the glamor of broadcasting.

It is squandering taxpayers' funds through "made work," such as the inane hearings in Chicago and Omaha on local programing, the harassment of stations on license renewals, unnecessarily prolonged freezes and other contrived devices to force stations to bow to its will.

It is defying congressional intent by seeking to arrogate control over broadcast advertising (which is really ratemaking that would transform broadcasting into common carrier status) and by seeking to impose filing fees without legislative authority.

It is spending so much time—an estimated 80 percent—on its broadcast crusades which it thinks have publicity value that many policy determinations are being relegated to the staff.

It is violating its own fairness doctrine (which is of doubtful legality) by demanding on the one hand that licensees determine their public's programing needs and, on the other, ignoring the views of elected representatives of the public; to wit, Members of Congress.

Since Chairman E. William Henry's "huckster" barrage in New York 2 weeks ago, three influential legislators have spoken. Chairman OREN HARRIS, Democrat of Arkansas, of the House Commerce Committee, Chairman WALTER ROGERS, Democrat of Texas, of the House Communications Subcommittee; and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican of Colorado, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, have challenged the FCC's authority to place limitations on advertising, and to otherwise interfere with control over programing and business management of stations.

The commercial time issue is one on which all stations, large and small, and the networks, see eye to eye. This has stimulated more activity through State associations and by individual broadcasters with Congress than any other regulatory issue in recent memory.

Two bills, introduced by Representative ROGERS—to prohibit the FCC from making rules on broadcast advertising and to prohibit it from assessing filing fees—are in the hopper. Mr. ROGERS wants hearings "as soon as practicable."

We suggest that, in the absence of immediate action by the FCC withdrawing the commercial time rulemaking and postponing indefinitely from the Jan. 1 effective date the filing fee rules, broadcasters encourage Mr. ROGERS and his committe to convene hearings forthwith.

Meanwhile, it would seem prudent for Mr. Henry and his like-minded "give 'em hell" colleagues to take a new look at the law and the congressional intent and not accept as gospel that which the staff masterminds serve up to them.

Congress created the FCC nearly 30 years ago. It can, if it wishes, abolish the seven-man commission and create a new one of three, five, or nine men. Unless the present FCC sees the light glaring red from Capitol Hill, we predict the Congress will take strong measures to bring the FCC back under control.

A Lot of Bear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the largest Kodiak bear that Alf Madsen and his hunters have ever taken weighed in at 1,320 pounds and its hide squared at 11 feet, 3 inches. That is a lot of bear.

The Kodiak bear, the largest in the world and one of the wiliest, is found only in Alaska. Hunters come from all over the world to get a shot at the Kodiak. They will get one, too, if they have Alf Madsen as their guide. He is one of the great hunters in the world; he knows as much about the Kodiak as any man alive.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the National Observer of September 9, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article gives a fascinating account of Alf Madsen's career and how he came to know so much about the largest of all carnivorous animals, the Kodiak bear.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKING AIM AT THE BIGGEST BEAR IN THE WORLD

KODIAK, ALASKA.—No hunter who faces the largest meat-eating animal on earth forgets his first encounter with an Alaskan brown bear.

Alf Madsen was 15 when he used his dad's 30.06-caliber rifle to bring down his first Kodiak bear at Uyak Bay. He did it with one shot.

Despite the passage of 35 years and close involvement with the taking of more than 500 giant bear, Madsen still can recall clearly every detail of his first successful hunt.

With sportsmen from throughout the world now arriving in Alaska for the fall big-game season, it is the promise of success on a Madsen-guided hunt that is a magnet for attracting big-game hunters to this island of the biggest bear.

Madsen follows in the trail of his father, the late Charlie Madsen, who gave up a schooner run between Nome and Siberia to settle in Kodiak and pioneer guided bear hunts in 1928. The younger Madsen bosses the largest, one of the oldest, and probably most successful outfitting and guiding businesses in Alaska.

Employing a dozen guides and assistants in his far-reaching operations, which include use of boats, planes, and camps in which he has invested nearly $100,000, Madsen is fully booked for the current hunting season.

LOOKS LIKE A BANKER

Alaska's—and perhaps America's—best-known counterpart to Africa's colorful and romantic white hunters, is a modest, unassuming man who looks more like a successful Midwest banker than a wholesale dealer in hunting thrills.

When Harry Selby, Africa's famed white hunter, came to Alaska several years ago for bear, he employed Alf Madsen as his guide. It was a well-earned tribute from one top performer to another and produced a bear skin for Selby that square at 10 feet 5 inches.

"My relationship with clients is similar to that of a doctor with his patient," said Madsen. "I never discuss the hunting abilities of my clients and never disclose any confidence which may be entrusted to me over a wilderness campfire. I am paid to produce satisfied hunters of big bear and this is the guiding principle of my operations."

Madsen's clients have included members of European royalty, ambassadors, Governors, captains of industry and finance, authors, and movie stars, all of whom wanted to pit themselves against the largest carnivorous animal.

To meet his hunters' needs, Madsen maintains five camps on Kodiak Island, which is larger than Connecticut, and has mountains topping 4,000 feet. He also has two camps on the Alaska Peninsula and one on Afognak Island.

BELIES HIS 50 YEARS

A shade under 6 feet tall and weighing 200 pounds, Madsen belies his 50 years as he pilots his 40-foot cruiser through Kodiak's tricky waters or flies his float-equipped Cessna 180 to mountain-ringed lakes.

The element of danger in the bear-hunting business is appreciated more keenly by Alaskans this fall than usual.

In the first 3 weeks of August, hungry black bear in Alaska's interior attacked four men, killing one, and serious injuring two others. And the Kodiak bear stalked by Madsen's hunters are three to four times larger than their black brothers.

In marketing bear hunts, however, Madsen plays down the danger appeal, stressing instead the acceptance of challenge and skill needed to stalk a bear.

"During the mating season a large male Kodiak may become very aggressive when disturbed and may charge anyone interfering," says Madsen. "A female with young cubs will fight viciously to drive off an intruder who may attempt to come between her and her cubs. Generally, however, most bears will avoid encounters with men and will quickly put distance between themselves and their pursuers."

Madsen discourages hunters who feel that heavy artillery alone is the key to shooting a big bear.

"The caliber of the rifle is less important than the cool nerves and steady aim of the hunter whose finger is on the trigger."

Any man who is a professional guide on Kodiak has had tense moments with the huge quarry. Madsen's report on his ticklish tangle with a bear is brief:

"The closest call I've ever had was when a 10-foot-6-inch-tall bear sneaked up on me after we had killed his mate during the spring mating season. It happened so fast I didn't have time to aim; just shot from the hip and luckily hit him in the left eye, killing him instantly. We were on a steep hillside and the dead bear rolled down nearly knocking me over a cliff. It was a bit too close."

Madsen subscribes to the theory that Kodiak's bear originally arrived from Asia on the icecap, were left marooned on the island when the ice receded. A bountiful food supply and favorable climate have produced today's superbear, in Madsen's opinion.

He says the early Russian settlers and Aleuts on Kodiak, who called the huge bruin "Ivan the Terrible," often took 500 a year.

Madsen estimates there are now more than 2,000 bear on Kodiak and neighboring islands. The average annual island kill is less than 200, and at this rate Madsen sees no danger of extinction.

The heaviest bear ever taken by a Madsen hunter weighed 1,320 pounds and its hide squared at 11 feet, 3 inches.

The Boone & Crockett Club's big game records for brown bear include a number of top contenders entered by hunters put on target by Madsen. He is especially proud of the largest Alaskan bear ever killed by a nonresident hunter. This was a Kodiak male taken by Erling Hansen of Seattle in 1961, and now ranks second in Boone & Crockett standings.

"At the time Hansen shot his giant," says Madsen, "he and one of our guides were stalking an even bigger bear.

"Many areas of the Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak have never been hunted, and I'm certain there are new world's record bear roaming the hills and valleys."

ED FORTIER.

America's 1963 Prize-Winning Highway Traverses Michigan's 10th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce to the House that Interstate Highway No. 75, which traverses the full length of Michigan's 10th Congressional District which I represent, has just been designated "America's Prize-Winning Highway." The designation establishes this beautiful highway as the Parade Scenic Highway of 1963. The selection was made by a panel of expert judges in behalf of the weekly newspaper magazine supplement, "Parade."

I invite Members of the House to come to Michigan and experience the pleasure of riding along this highway designed for driving comfort and to partake of the scenic beauties of the State's water wonderland. Interstate Highway No. 75 links Toledo, Ohio, with Michigan's Big Mack Bridge at the Straits of Mackinac. The prize-winning section is in the 10th District where this highway passes through its corridor of dark green jackpine and glistening white birch.

You will thoroughly enjoy your drive and you will see a wonderful countryside in addition.

Parade's announcement of the designation follows:

Not long ago, a motorist from Illinois drove to the office of the Michigan State Highway Department in Lansing. He was on his way home from a visit to the State's Upper Peninsula. In the process he had traversed the new Interstate Route 75, which speeds traffic through the Michigan woods from the Mackinac Bridge to Ithaca. "I just had to tell you," he glowed to department employees, "that that's the most beautiful highway I've ever been on."

Five independent, expert judges now have underscored that motorist's enthusiasm. Choosing from more than 300 entries and 14 finalists in the Parade Scenic Highway Contest, they have voted 22½ miles of Interstate 75, from Vanderbilt to Indian River, as the finest new highway of 1963. The judges declared this road the year's best example of a "motorist's highway"—a joy to see as well as to drive. They praised it for beauty, utility, safety, and imaginative design.

For building the Parade Scenic Highway for 1963, the Michigan State Highway Department will receive a commendatory plaque. John E. Meyer, chief engineer, will receive a citation in the form of a scroll. And Robert A. Palmer, a retired highway department engineer, will receive a $500 bond for nominating the prize-winning road.

Four other new U.S. highways were cited by the judges for special mention in Parade's third annual competition. They are—

Interstate Route 93, between Windham and Londonderry, N.H.

Interstate Route 84, near Southington, Conn.

State Route 279, between Moab and Potash, Utah.

Interstate Route 405, between Valley Vista and Casiano, Calif.

The judges also praised the other finalists, which included two highways in Kentucky and one each in Texas, Vermont, Virginia, New Mexico, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and New York. Judges in the contest were Jack Wood of the American Planning and Civic Association, Kermit Rykken of the American Automobile Association, John Gibbons of the Automotive Safety Foundation, John J. Ryan of the American Society of Landscape Architects, and Jack Ritter of Engineering News-Record.

In the past 2 years of the contest, two previously opened sections of Interstate Route 75 have been cited for special mention. And from the time the highway began, in 1955, it was planned that here would be a road devoted to beauty as well as utility. Chief Engineer Meyer, who was then the department's route location engineer, determined to preserve as much of the landscape as possible.

When other engineers were planning beeline highways to speed traffic, he boned up on wide center malls, elevating one lane of the highway above the other and retaining Michigan's famous trees to enhance its beauty.

To carry out his ideas, Meyer worked from aerial photographs and contour maps, also depended on the field work of location crews. Before a final line was chosen, Meyer hiked it. He was usually accompanied by a special design engineer for scenery and a State forester. Among them they chose every tree that was to stay and was to go.

One of those who worked on Meyer's location crews was Palmer, then a 29-year veteran of highway work. Like his boss, Palmer, now 74 and a part-time farmer near Lansing, was intrigued by the idea of building a beautiful highway. An inveterate traveler, he has observed scenic roadways all over the country and has been one of the most avid supporters of the Parade highway contest.

OLD HIGHWAYMAN

"So we finally made it. I knew we would." said Palmer, who refers to himself as "The Old Highwayman," when notified that his nomination had won. "You'd have to travel far to see a better one than this one," says Palmer, and he's right. The Parade Scenic Highway, as part of the Interstate System, meets or exceeds all that system's specifications—gradual curves, gentle grades, wide lanes, emergency shoulders, even 13 rest areas. Lanes are so far apart that there is almost no headlight glare.

But America's prize highway has something more than that. Another motorist, having just traveled through its corridor of dark-green jackpine and stark white birch, may have summed it up best. "This road," he said, "is the most restful road in America."

ED KIESTER.

Grower Unity Heads Off a Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, I take the liberty of inserting an article which appeared in the October issue of the Western Fruit Grower.

This article clearly demonstrates how producers and growers can obtain the necessary harvest labor supply from among our own domestic farm workers, rather than be forced to rely on so-called braceros, imported under the provisions of Public Law 78.

This is a lesson in cooperation, and most certainly can be put into practice in other areas.

The article follows:

GROWER UNITY HEADS OFF A LABOR SHORTAGE

For 90 percent of the citrus growers in California's Fresno, Kern, and Tulare Counties, harvest labor supply has ceased to be a headache. They are harvesting their crops without supplementary labor, either braceros or green card workers.

A major reason is the unusually wide diversification of crops, especially in Tulare County, which attracts and provides work for a reasonably large farm labor force just preceding the late fall and winter harvest of navels—an asset other citrus growing areas cannot boast. If one crop can be singled out as most advantageous in building to the peak labor force of 8,000 for the November–December orange harvest, olives, with harvest beginning in September, get top billing.

But wise management of this labor force has contributed materially too, and that has been achieved by growers of citrus, deciduous fruit, grape, and olive crops through a cooperative labor-alert organization called the Tulare County Farmers Association.

Putting together an organization like TCFA won't mean the end of labor difficulties for citrus growers in other areas, but the voluntary cooperation which has made it successful is a worthwhile example that can be followed widely by growers of citrus and other crops.

TCFA's most important single activity is the matching of men with jobs. Through its office in Exeter flows a constant stream of requests for workers, and referrals of workers and crews. In this process, poor workers are quickly detected, so the association's program has the general effect of upgrading the quality of farm laborers as well.

GROWERS CONVINCED

A pilot program conducted in 1961 in Tulare County to give farmworkers the ultimate working time by careful transfer from one task to another convinced growers of the need for a permanent organization to coordinate the movement of workers. By placing this responsibility in one organization and thereby assuring themselves of the workers they need at harvesttime, growers are able to concentrate on cultural and production practices to insure a better crop.

Walt Fahrney, manager of the TCFA, was hired shortly after the association was established in 1960, and is now gearing for his fourth harvest season with navels. He represents an ideal match between man and job, as a veteran of more than 20 years in farm placement work in the San Joaquin

Valley. Each year he has made a trek to northern California, and to Oregon and Washington when necessary, with a supply of handbills touting the abundance of farm jobs in the three-county area of central California.

Each year he gets increasing help from word-of-mouth news which supports the claims of his printed material. He is something of a Pied Piper, leading a procession of laborers to more profitable work areas as late summer harvest seasons end in the northern part of the State and Northwest.

The harvest of navels continues in some degree most of the spring, but the peak usually occurs about December 1. As this demand subsidies, the deciduous fruit and grape crops offer work in pruning, then various spray applications, cultivation, thinning, and finally harvest.

Housing too is a factor. The association arranges for the opening and management of several single men's camps in the area, which were set up originally to house braceros. It also keeps track of available family housing and helps workers locate it.

Holding onto the workers who harvest navels in the winter until the Valencias ripen in May is the association's chief weapon against competition from other areas for the same workers. When the Valencias are ready for picking, farm labor prospects are good in a lot of areas.

Many citrus growers are olive growers in these three counties. Also, many are growers of deciduous fruits, and some, growers of field and row crops with high hand labor requirements. Although citrus is the primary interest of the growers who first talked about organizing the association, their early conversations revealed that almost all of them were also growers of other crops. Today, most of the association's 1700 members consider themselves citrus growers, primarily. But the membership also includes 90 percent of the area's olive growers and a high percentage of the growers of other major deciduous crops.

UNION RELATIONS

The association regards itself as an organization to help get the crops—all kinds—harvested. This breadth of interest enables smoother shifting from job to job and crop to crop to provide continuity of employment for labor crews.

The association found it necessary to concern itself with the union organizing activities of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee in 1961–62 because of their potentially profound effect upon the labor supply and relations between workers and employers. With AWOC efforts apparently almost at a standstill in the Central Valley this year, the association focused its attention on labor oriented activities, tried to open channels of communication between its members and appropriate legislators. It does not maintain continuing representation in Sacramento.

When he was first hired, part of Fahrney's prescription for good labor health was a general labor relations and public relations program. "A wedge had been driven between workers and growers," he recalls. "We explained to the worker that it was his job, while we emphasized the need for growers to pay a decent wage—to meet the worker halfway.

"Growers generally were plagued by a bad reputation with news media, so we explained to the press that the association's purpose was to coordinate agricultural jobs and workers for the benefit of both workers and growers," Fahrney says. Significant gains were made during the pilot program in 1961, which became the subject of a study by agricultural economists Thor and Allee at the University of California.

In addition to its referral service for workers and its continuing program of labor relations and public relations, the association maintains a current analysis of all current labor laws and regulations which it circulates to members through a monthly bulletin or upon their request.

FUTURE PREDICTIONS

Fahrney believes that future programs will center around recruitment of workers and the general improvement of their skills and attitudes. "Expanding acreage here and the constant attempt by other areas of the State to attract our farm labor force make it necessary to keep building our supply of workers," Fahrney says.

Fahrney sees little hope for the bracero program in any acceptable form, and points to its loss as support for his prediction of future greater recruitment activities of the association. "Workers can't be moved like checkers. If Public Law 78 ends, our area will be hurt and hurt bad by the shortage of workers in other areas of the State."

Also in the future he sees a lengthening of the harvest season for both navels and valencias, and points to experiments already conducted with compounds that will hold fruit on the trees longer. Besides reducing the sharp, high peak of labor needs in a short time, holding oranges on the trees lengthens and levels out the marketing, handling, and storage as well.

The Tulare County Farmers Association is operating this year on a budget of $33,000, raised by an assessment the members have levied on themselves of $1 per acre annually for all permanent plantings of everything but field crops, for which they pay 50 cents an acre.

President for 1963 is Exeter Citrus Grower John Dungan. Except for treasurer E. F. Pinkham of Exeter, who is a grower of deciduous fruits and grapes, all five members of the executive committee are citrus growers. Besides Dungan and Pinkham they are H. L. Swarts, Porterville, vice president; A. C. Pixton, Lindsay, secretary; and Jim Hurley, Lindsay, member at large.

Fahrney admits that the dynamic action required to deal with the potentially explosive labor situation doesn't always produce instant harmony among association members. "Sometimes you'd think the roof is coming off when we meet. But when the discussion ends and the vote is taken, our members stick by it."

Passamaquoddy Power Project, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last week an important address was delivered in Springfield, Mass., by Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power Development. It deals with the proposed Passamaquoddy power project in the State of Maine.

Secretary Holum makes a very strong case for this long awaited power development which could mark the dawn of a new day for New England.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT, BEFORE THE MASSACHUSETTS COUNCIL OF THE AFL–CIO, SPRINGFIELD, MASS., OCTOBER 17, 1963

Most speakers begin their remarks by saying they are pleased to be at the particular gathering. To me, I am more than pleased. I am especially honored to meet with an organization which repeatedly and unflaggingly labors to bring the benefits of our modern society to the men, women, and children of this historic region.

I meet with you with a genuine feeling of enthusiasm and a community of purpose. Our goals are identical—the common welfare of the people of New England and the conservation of the sadly neglected water resources of this area. To paraphrase, we are tied together by a common bond—a bond which has its rich traditions and beginnings in this very State.

The Department of the Interior has—for over 100 years—been engaged in the development of the natural resources of many portions of this Nation. We know from fruitful experience that resource development is an essential key to a healthy economy and a productive society. In case after case—in California, in the Pacific Northwest, in the Tennessee Valley, in my home State of South Dakota—comprehensive water resource development has literally pumped new life into communities suffering from chronic and economic stagnation.

As Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, of Maine, so aptly puts it, it is now New England's turn at bat. For years, the people of New England—and particularly the organizations you represent—have vigorously supported the Department's resource conservation programs in other parts of the Nation.

However, we are at a turning point in the conservaion movement today. The quiet crisis of conservation, as Secretary Udall terms it, is a national problem, affecting us all, not a regional problem. President Kennedy made this point clearly and concisely when he said:

"We are not 50 countries. We are one country of 50 States and one people. Those programs which make life better for some of our people will make life better for all of our people. A rising tide lifts all boats."

Those words of the President were not idly spoken—nor viewed by my Department as mere oratory. They are the guiding philosophy of our policies and programs to assure the optimum development of our national resources on a national scale.

Yes, Senator MUSKIE was right. It is New England's turn at bat for the coordinated and orderly development of its water resource potentials. This tide of neglect in New England must be reversed—if the economic ills of this region are to be cured.

And, in reversing this tide, we must start by developing one of New England's greatest natural resources—the tides of Passamaquoddy Bay.

Quoddy is a national project of national significance. In Washington, we never say if Quoddy is built; we say when it is constructed it will light a new era in New England.

This is our conviction. And, we intend to vigorously move forward in the knowledge that this is a tremendously worthwhile undertaking. If there are doubting Thomas's in the Nation, let them heed these words of the President well:

"Any proposed resource development project must, of course, meet the national interest test. It must strengthen the economy of the whole Nation and enable America to better compete in the marketplaces of the world. I understand that, measured by the customary feasibility standards, the Passamaquoddy-St. John River project now meets that test."

"During the last three decades," President Kennedy said, "American taxpayers, through their Federal Government, have invested vast sums of money in developing the water resources of this country. These investments are producing daily dividends for our country and it is reasonable to assume that similar development in conserving the resources of New England will also benefit the Nation. It is also reasonable to assume that a New England development will stimulate more diversified industry, increase commerce, and provide more jobs."

He continues, "Harnessing the energy of the tides is an exciting technological undertaking. Each day, over a million kilowatts of power surge in and out of Passamaquoddy Bay. Man only needs to exercise his engineering ingenuity to convert the ocean's surge into a national asset. I am directing that the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers accelerate their work on the remaining studies of details. I think this can be one of the most astonishing and beneficial enterprises undertaken by the people of the United States."

I have quoted the President at some length—because I believe it demonstrates the priority which is placed on this project by the administration. The President's great personal interest is doubly underscored, as he intends to inspect the Quoddy site by air this coming Saturday.

Despite this dedication by the administration, despite the magnificent bipartisan support of Maine's Senators, her Congressmen, and her Governor, it will not be easy to obtain the Quoddy, to obtain the companion St. John River development, and to obtain the transmission lines which will transport a portion of this relatively low cost power to Boston and other New England areas.

We know this—in fact, we know it too well. But, we have embarked upon this mission with a positive sense of purpose, plus a wealth of incontrovertible technical and scientific data.

Whenever the Federal Government initiates a program for the development of water resources in almost any region, its supporters must be prepared to fight all the way—no matter how beneficial it may be to the area. Opponents raise many issues, create many smokescreens. Some come from well-meaning, but uninformed citizens—who, when explained the logic of water conservation, support us. Sadly enough, however, other criticisms are apparently intended only to obstruct, generated by those who—to quote Wordsworth—"are suckled in a creed outworn."

Let us examine more of the questions that have been raised about Quoddy:

"Quoddy is an impractical, socialistic scheme."

This old and tired argument needs little explanation—you are all familiar with its origins. Thirty years ago similar objections were raised when the great Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River was under construction. Experience has proven otherwise—as it will at Quoddy. Grand Coulee power has resulted in private economic development previously impossible, with an attendant increase in new jobs and local taxes; it has resulted in low cost power to both public and private utilities. And, it is a classic example that Federal power development creates the incentive among private utilities to improve their operations—giving lower power costs to consumers with increases in corporate profits.

"Quoddy power can be produced cheaper by other means."

To this, I ask the question, "how?" Where in New England is there an alternate site which can, at a turn of a switch, produce 1 million kilowatts of peaking power—and produces it every day of the year at anytime of day and at a lower cost? Where is there a water source as dependable, as predictable, and as constant as the tides of the seas? There are claims that new, highly efficient thermal units can produce an equivalent amount of electricity at a cheaper cost. However, we are not told that these units—which admittedly are highly efficient—are not designed to generate peaking power, that their constant use for this purpose would destroy an investment of millions in a few years. Quoddy and the new thermal units do not compete with one another. They complement the efficiency of each, and New England needs both.

"Quoddy is not needed because atomic power will be here in a few years."

I know of no atomic scientist who would testify that you could make efficient use of an atomic reactor by turning it on and off a few hours each day to produce heat for the generation of peaking power. Nor are we told that an atomic plant is nothing more than a base load thermal unit, such as I described earlier, which merely uses a fuel source which is "exotic" in the public mind.

"Quoddy would pay no taxes and adversely affect local tax bases."

The first part of the criticism is true. The latter is false. It has been the consistent experience of the Department of the Interior that Federal water resource development generates local, State, and Federal tax receipts far in excess of the cost of development. For example, some $5.1 billion in taxes have been collected in western water States since 1940—about 27 percent higher than the cost of construction of these facilities by the Department of the Interior.

"Quoddy is a strain on an already large Federal budget."

Federal law requires that every penny the Government invests in electric power facilities, generators, transmission lines, etc., must be repaid with interest. These interest rates are computed annually by the Treasury under conditions specified by Congress.

"Quoddy has been studied, restudied, and found infeasible many times."

Today, when we say Quoddy, we are not talking about the project envisioned by Dexter Cooper in 1919, nor the project conceived by President Roosevelt in the 1930's, nor even the project studied by the International Joint Commission from 1956 to 1961. We are talking about an entirely new project that only shares a common name. We have moved almost overnight into a new era of engineering technology and sustained and growing demand for low-cost energy.

If America's economy is to expand—as it must to provide new jobs and a rising standard of living—adequate power at reasonable rates is a basic and solemn obligation of the power industry—public and private alike. To have a first-rate economy we must have a first-rate power system. Potentially lower power costs are possible through adequate interconnections of electric systems, the maximum development of hydroelectric power, and utilization of revolutionary new technology. The Federal Government has a responsibility for providing leadership in this area of endeavor.

Quoddy is conceived to meet the new needs of our time. When we say "Quoddy" we are talking of the 36 million kilowatts of electric capacity which New England and New Brunswick will need in 16 short years and the 4 million killowatts of peaking power needed in 1980.

We are talking about the new axial flow generators which, only a few short years ago, were on the drawing boards. We are talking about the rapid advances in extra-high-voltage transmission. And, finally, we are talking about peaking power—the highest valued of all electricity—which can be produced more efficiently by hydroelectric development than by any other means.

New technology in generation and transmission, the known growth in power demand in New England, the knowledge that planning to date would meet only a small portion of these requirements, the necessity that New England power costs—the highest in the Nation—be reduced if industry is to flourish—all of these factors combine to make the immediate development of the hydroelectric potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and the St. John River imperative.

These are the facts that no amount of criticism from Quoddy opponents can bury. We do have a responsibility to keep our economy growing at a pace fast enough to create enough jobs, goods, and services for our expanding population. And, this cannot be done without the development of our natural resources. The furor about Quoddy has been raised in various forms about other hydroelectric projects for generations. Fortunately, for the people and our national welfare, the public interest has generally prevailed.

Water resource development contributes to a healthy national economic environment. Local payrolls are created. For each worker involved in on-site construction, economic studies show that four additional Americans are generally employed in the manufacturing and transportation of materials.

For each Federal dollar spent on construction of water projects, about $2 worth of other business transactions take place. Materials from every portion of the Nation are utilized. To cite Trinity Dam in California as an example, tractors and conveyors came from Illinois, trucks from Indiana and Pennsylvania, steel from Ohio, generators from New York, cranes, shovels, and draglines from Wisconsin—plus a myriad of products produced under contract or subcontract from the vast industrial empire of the East; Americans in many parts of the country found gainful employment because Trinity Dam in California was constructed. The same has been true of Glen Canyon, Hungry Horse, Hartwell, and all the rest. The same will be true of Quoddy.

The Quoddy project and Dickey Dam, plus the backbone transmission line to Boston will provide nearly 15,000 man-years of employment in direct construction alone—not counting the jobs created to supply the vast quantities of materials needed for these projects.

The bulk of construction will take place in Maine—in two of the most seriously depressed counties in the Nation, but the impact of a billion-dollar construction job will be felt throughout New England.

What kinds of jobs will be needed?

The list is long—transportation workers, surveyors, plumbers, pipefitters, electricians, steel construction workers, carpenters, crane and excavating machinery operators, painters, mechanics of many varied skills, warehousemen, clerks, secretaries, concrete finishers, welders, powerlinesmen, and many others.

Tremendous quantities of materials will be required and it is reasonable to assume that the factories of New England will supply—either under prime or subcontracts—much of this material as they have for many other projects across the Nation. We will need electrical and other wire products and accessories; steel pipe, tubing, and fittings; hardware; fabricated steel; cement and admixtures; building materials of many kinds; equipment and repair parts; lifting and transporting equipment; electric motors and controls; hand tools and work equipment; hydraulic equipment; and, of course, turbines and generators and transmission equipment.

Furthermore, the Quoddy-Boston transmission line—which could become an important part of an interconnected New England electric grid system in the years ahead—will require the electronic equipment and skills for which Massachusetts is famous.

To bring these benefits to Massachusetts and New England, will require the solid support of the people. Your support is vital because you form the link between the work-

ing men and women of New England who will derive the benefits of this undertaking.

We welcome support of men like George A. Curry of East Providence, R.I., who wrote us that "I am a Yankee of Irish heritage, and I am interested in anything that will provide jobs for New Englanders whether they live in Maine or one of the other five States."

Congressman TORBERT M. MACDONALD in his great interest and concern for Massachusetts has made an eloquent and thoughtful analysis of what Quoddy means to the Bay State and New England.

Power costs in New England, he points out, are 65 percent more than the national average and 181 percent higher than in the eastern-south-central portion of the country. Massachusetts, he says, offers all of the prerequisites for attracting and holding industry—except one, reasonable electric power rates.

He quotes a New England textile manufacturer who said to him, "If we expect industry to develop and grow in New England, these power rates must be brought in line with comparable rates charged elsewhere," adding, "we are almost forced to consider seriously the feasibility and desirability of remaining in Massachusetts. In fact, we are studying the relative merits of several locations in the South."

According to Congressman MACDONALD, this manufacturer would have saved 38 percent of his total power bill if he could purchase electricity at the national average rate. His power bill is 55 percent higher than in one city and an astounding 144 percent higher than in another. Over a 10-year period, this one firm could save a minimum of $240,000 and a maximum of $420,000 in power costs alone by leaving Massachusetts.

This should awaken every member of this audience—indeed, every citizen of New England who has the interest of his family and its future in his heart. But, says Congressman MACDONALD:

"With Passamaquoddy as a start, and with the New England region's additional 2.6 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydropower as future potential, we will have the tools with which to build a reinvigorated economy. With a real effort to bring electric rates down through the integration of this hydro with efficient steam generators—both conventional and nuclear—and an orderly pattern of electric transmission, we can help create the kind of economic climate which will result in new industrial growth, new jobs, and a new spirit of progress.' After all, it was the water wheels of New England which sparked our Nation's first industrial revolution. The 20th century counterparts of these water-driven generators can bring a new era of prosperity."

This is an interesting footnote on history. For, it was in Massachusetts in 1617 that the tides of the ocean were harnessed for the first time in America to turn grist mills. Today, a unique engineering marvel, coupled with an imaginative concept of electric generation and transmission, can bring new opportunity to the future generations of this historically rich region.

Growth is a never-ending process which depends ultimately on the use we make of all our natural resources. We cannot allow ourselves—and particularly in Massachusetts—to relax our efforts for the optimum development of our natural resources. A resource has no value unless it makes a productive contribution to the material or spiritual needs of mankind. Passamaquoddy offers us this challenge. And, working together with the same determination which led to the marshalling of our human resources through the labor movement, we can assure that our most precious asset—our children and the unborn generations ahead—can live and work in a happy, productive Massachusetts.

We believe there is a place in New England for all elements in the power program—Federal, cooperative, municipal, private—each has a legitimate role to play. This is sound conservation doctrine—and good commonsense.

NAMSB Names Poston Washington Director-Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I read of a recent appointment by the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. The man named, Robert R. Poston, is an excellent choice. We shall certainly miss him on the Banking and Currency Committee, where he served as general counsel in an official capacity and as a patient and ever-willing fount of knowledge to those of us who had need of him.

For my colleagues who are interested, I insert the folowing article from the September issue of the Savings Bank Journal which deals with the appointment.

NAMSB NAMES POSTON WASHINGTON DIRECTOR-COUNSEL

Robert R. Poston, former general counsel of the Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, will join NAMSB October 1 as director-counsel of its Washington office, Grover W. Ensley, executive vice president, announced.

Commenting on the appointment, Dr. Ensley said, "The Federal Government is playing an increasingly important role in shaping the future of our financial institutions both in the legislative and executive areas. We are fortunate in obtaining a man with a long and distinguished career who has a profound working knowledge of all aspects of Government."

A resident of Arlington, Va., Mr. Poston has served in various fields of Government, as well as private industry, for more than 30 years. He began his career in 1930 with the American Consular Service where for 3 years he represented the Department of State in the Caribbean area. He has been with the House Banking and Currency Committee since 1955 and formerly was with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. During his first 3 years with the House committee he held the position of chief counsel of the Subcommittee on Housing, and since 1958 has served on the full committee. He is a graduate of the State University of Iowa and received his law degree from George Washington University.

From 1950 to 1954 Mr. Poston was assistant to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency where he served as liaison officer with Congress. For the preceding 4 years he performed senior assignments in the national headquarters of the American Legion in Indianapolis. Among other duties, he was staff director of its national housing committee, as well as its assistant national adjutant and associate legislative director.

Mr. Poston's previous Government service also included an assignment with the Veterans' Administration. He is admitted to the District of Columbia Bar, the U.S. District Court and the Court of Appeals. During World War II he entered the Army as a private and was advanced to captain.

Mr. Poston will succeed William F. McKenna who is leaving to join the National League of Insured Savings Associations as general counsel following 5 years with NAMSB.

Raisins Need Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, almost every fresh fruit and vegetable industry will be affected adversely by a termination of Public Law 78—the bracero program. The raisin industry is important to every person in the United States. The following article tells their story. Every other fresh fruit and vegetable product is similarly affected. Industry-wide chaos will result if the bracero program is suddenly terminated.

The article follows:

California's farm labor supply problem is a little bit like the weather, people talk about it. But no one seems able—or at least not enough seem willing—to do anything about it.

The farmer is trying. He's doing everything he can reasonably do to recruit good, qualified, domestic workers. And, because the simple facts of life are that there just aren't enough good, qualified, domestic workers to do the job, countless allied industries and Members of Congress who also know the facts of life, are trying to do something about it, including a vigorous drive to extend the bracero program.

On the other side of the fence there seems to be interest in the problem. But the primary interest seems to be in getting the Federal Government involved in gigantic domestic recruitment programs to move hundreds of thousands of workers and their families from areas of chronic unemployment to farm areas which need workers. To California, for instance. Then it would appear they are interested in solving the countless social, economic, housing, education, and other related problems which this type of solution would bring, via more Government. Like through a Domestic Peace Corps, for example.

For this is the side which says, "you don't need braceros. There are plenty of domestic workers available. Why, just look at all our unemployed."

"Yes," we might add "we know. You don't have to flood California with hundreds of thousands more unemployed workers and their families. We've got plenty within the State already. But we're still short of agricultural workers. Qualified workers, that is."

Recently, as reported in your August 19 newsletter, agriculture once again hoped to prove this point when it asked the Mexican-American Education Committee to put up or shut up in its claims that it could "provide all of the domestic workers that were needed in California." At the time the challenge was tossed to the Mexican-American Committee, agriculture requested them to come through with the 48,148 qualified workers needed to fill that number of jobs that were then filled by braceros—or which were going completely unfilled. The committee backed down. And to date still hasn't come through.

And now we have another example of the need for supplementary foreign workers. And once again we would ask Congress to take note. Also, Mr. John F. Henning, whose local Labor Department officials apparently

don't concur that "the bracero program should be buried."

Here's the story:

The peak of California's big raisin harvest season was late this year. And, because of strange weather in a number of California's important agricultural areas, so were other crops in those areas. This caused many problems. For when the crops were ready, it completely fouled up the harvesting schedules of the domestic work force which normally moves into the raisin-producing areas at a given time of the year—usually right around Labor Day.

Other domestic workers—those with schoolchildren—and those who plan their summer vacations to coincide with various harvesting periods to help supplement their family incomes were also fouled up. For when the peak of the raisin harvest hit, they had to be back home and their children had to be back in school.

And the raisin grower was in real trouble. A crop to harvest and not near enough workers to harvest it.

Growers throughout the area did everything within reason to solve their problem. The advertised for workers. They offered the highest wages they could commensurate with such economic facts of life as total costs versus what they might possibly receive for their crop and still—hopefully at least—make a reasonable profit. And they intentionally did not ask for certification for foreign workers until the last minute. For they had hopes of doing the job with domestic workers.

When things really began to look rough, school officials in the area agreed to delay the opening of school until after the 16th of September. And while this helped, it wasn't enough. For example, in one area, on the 5th of September, an emergency call went out to the young people of the area. Only 40 indicated that they'd be on hand to go to work the next morning. Of these 40, only 22 actually reported for work. And of this 22, only 11 were on the job the second day.

In spite of the fact that the good to average workers were making from $12 to $15 per 8½-hour day with the really good workers hitting the $18-per-day category, and up. The Fresno farm labor office—California State Department of Employment—made two very thorough surveys. The one conducted September 6 revealed that 168 growers (and this doesn't include farm labor contractors who placed orders for 964 workers) reported their need for a total of 2,647 workers to harvest 2,283 acres.

The second survey—made on September 10—revealed that 182 growers had listed their need for 3,870 workers to harvest 7,150 acres.

And yet, in spite of the surveys, in spite of the advertising, in spite of wage opportunities, growers buses sent into Fresno and other day haul points came back empty, and the department of employment was able to come up with only a relative handful of workers.

Why? Because there just weren't enough seasonal domestic workers available when and where they were needed.

Although Under Secretary of Labor, John F. Henning (a Californian), has gone on record as favoring the burial of the bracero program, local officials, who could actually see and understand the problem, recognized the need for a supplementary work force of foreign workers to fill the terrific gap between the number of workers needed and the number of domestic workers available to do the job. So they agreed to emergency certification of braceros. But again there wasn't sufficient time to bring braceros into the area from the border reception center. So, the hard-pressed growers had to make do with the relatively few braceros that had already been brought in to help harvest other crops in the vicinity.

As Joe Brosmer, manager of the argicultural labor bureau of the San Joaquin Valley put it, "we only had from 76 to 285 braceros available at any one time. And while they certainly helped, not even this number of braceros could handle the work normally done by over 3,800."

What makes this whole mess even more tragic is that for years raisin growers in the area have harvested their crops strictly with domestic workers. They recognize that braceros should only be used in emergencies in the types of crops which domestics don't mind harvesting. And needless to say, by growers producing the type of crops which involve the hard, stoop, labor that most domestics avoid.

So, as they have done for the past several years, they tried to get by with domestics again this year. But it didn't turn out that way. And when it finally became evident to the growers, to the State and Federal officials who must certify the need for foreign nationals ,that there just weren't going to be enough domestic workers to handle the job, it was to late.

Who's to blame? Well, that's not for us to say. And really, blaming is neither to the point, nor will it solve the problem. The whole situation can really be attributed to an act of God.

And yet—this act of God—this freak situation caused by the weather could very definitely have been made less severe by the availability of a sufficient number of braceros who could have stepped in, when and where they were needed, to help save the situation.

There are a number of lessons that can be learned from this. And from the challenge which has yet to be answered by the Mexican-American Education Conference Committee. And here's just one: It's very easy for groups or individuals to say, "farmers don't need braceros." Or, "there are plenty of domestics available." Or even, "we can provide the growers with all the domestics they need."

But when the chips are down, theory is too often unrelated to the cold, hard facts of life. And we can only hope that Congress will recognize this by considering some of the points brought out in incidents such as these. And we hope they recognize these facts soon. For time is running out.

U.S. Hurt by Aid Cuts in 1962, McNamara Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who was opposed to the drastic cuts in the foreign aid bill recently before the House of Representatives. I am hopeful that the Senate will see fit to restore most of these reductions, and in line with those hopes I would like to set forth in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Washington Post of October 7, 1963.

In this article Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara states that those cuts in foreign aid made last year seriously hurt U.S. security. There could be a repetition of this situation this year, and we can ill afford it.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES HURT BY AID CUTS IN 1962, MCNAMARA SAYS

(By Norman G. Cornish)

Congress yesterday released closed testimony on President Kennedy's foreign aid bill in which Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara charged that cuts in foreign aid last year seriously hurt U.S. security.

"Our national defense was injured because of the cut," McNamara said during his testimony last May. "I can say it without qualification."

The censored transcript showed that the charge angered Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of a House Appropriations Subcommittee and a stanch advocate of economy in foreign aid spending. He told McNamara in an exchange that if anything the reductions made the program better "by tightening things up."

This failed to sway McNamara, who warned against similar action this year and urged that if cuts had to be made it would be better to cut defense spending rather than military assistance for our allies.

Mr. McNamara said the $175 million slash in arms aid voted by the lawmakers last year forced cutbacks in important plans to modernize allied forces on the borders of the Sino-Soviet bloc. In some cases, he said, it was not possible to replace obsolete and wornout equipment.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk also warned the House group against deep foreign aid cuts.

When PASSMAN complained that foreign aid expenditures were contributing to America's huge public debt, Rusk gave this reply:

"With full respect I would suggest the public debt of the United States is primarily a debt that has arisen out of war, and if we do not win this struggle without another war, there is not going to be any public debt or anything else to worry about because the next war is not going to give you a chance."

President Kennedy's $4.5 billion foreign aid bill this year already has had a billion dollars chopped out of it by the House. This is the authorization measure which sets the ceiling on foreign aid spending for the current fiscal year. Actual appropriations are provided in a separate bill on which PASSMAN hopes to inflict even deeper cuts.

In another foreign aid report released yesterday, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, charged that U.S. aid dollars are helping Egypt to wage war in Yemen, to foment trouble in Jordan and Saudi Arabia and to arm to attack Israel. GRUENING said the money is "being used to build a police state" in President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Egypt.

New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, next year in New York City the greatest World's Fair of all times it to be held. I think the Members in Congress would be interested in knowing some of the facts concerning this affair for their own information and that of their constituents. I have recently received a copy of Comment from the Long Island Trust

Co., of Garden City, N.Y., which sets forth these facts as well as I have seen them. It is called "The World at Our Doorstep," and follows:

THE WORLD AT OUR DOORSTEP

We plan, and we hope that you do, too, to be outdoors the evening of next April 22. We shall be there—even if it rains—unless one of our customers has an urgent problem that keeps us at the bank. It will be dark, but not for long. On that night a tremendous shaft of light—equal to the light of 12 billion candles—will stab miles into the sky above Flushing Meadows. This is something not to be seen every night, and the assorted small fry in our children's families already have been promised delayed bedtimes for the occasion.

Look upward, friend. The world will have beaten a path to our doorstep, and it bids fair to be a night of nights for Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

The shaft of radiant glory will, of course, signal the formal opening of the New York World's Fair—an ambitious project by almost any standard one cares to apply. More than 150 pavilions, representing 37 foreign countries, scores of American industries, and two dozen States, will open their doors to the first of an anticipated 70 million visitors. Daily some 7,000 workmen push concrete and steel on the 646-acre site nearer to glittering reality.

This has been labeled the "billion-dollar fair," and all kinds of statistics are in circulation. Yet, somehow or other, most of these leave us strangely dissatisfied. We have yet to see some we could put to practical use, and this could be important. If we are successfully to shepherd our gaggle of grandchildren we need to know where to park and the best way to get to the fair from Long Island communities. There are times, as we know from sharp experience, when childish trebles demand instant information. The grandfather who knows that some $120 million will be taken in at the turnstiles before the fair ends has only partial status. What he really needs to know is where one buys ice cream cones and the location of restrooms. This kind of knowledge eases the mind.

The other day, as part of our advance preparations, we dispatched a representative to run down such necessary information. He was only partially successful. The fair is still abuilding and, as Washington would say, not "finalized." Yet our operative did pretty well on the whole, and below we share with you a summary of his report:

PARKING

Most Nassau and Suffolk residents probably will travel to the fair in their own automobiles. The principal parking area will border Meadow Lake, extending almost a mile southward from the amusement area. This parking lot may be approached from Grand Central Parkway, Van Wyck Expressway, or 69th Road. Those with long memories will recall that the 1939–40 World's Fair utilized this same area as a parking lot, with entrance and exit at 69th Road.

Parking fee will be $1.50 per car, with free transportation from the vicinity of your car to the gate of the fair itself. Two other parking facilities will be provided—one at the north end of the fair (off Roosevelt Avenue); the other on the eastern border of the fair property. All told, the fair will be able to park 20,000 cars.

HOW TO GO

The Transit Authority will, of course, provide special subway service to and from the fair for New Yorkers. Our Long Island Railroad will operate a special service from Penn Station to the fair at 50 cents a head. North shore residents of such communities as Port Washington, Manhasset, and Great Neck, will be able to reach the fair on many regularly scheduled trains. For other Long Islanders who may wish to avoid a possible traffic jam on the highway, the railroad is planning hourly shuttle service between Jamaica Station and the main gate of the fair. This service will connect with regular trains from all over the island. Railroad officials are also planning to provide special through service to the fair from many communities.

Those wishing to descend as angels upon the fair may do so by using the helicopter service provided by New York Airways from the airports. Such lofty transportation will not be cheap, but the night views promise to be spectacular. If you would float to the fair, and have a boat, use the enlarged marina at the south end of Flushing Bay. This will also be available as a base for excursion boats from Manhattan.

Special bus service from Long Island communities will be available, but plans for this are still in the discussion stage.

GETTING AROUND

Greyhound will handle all internal transportation. Rapid bus service will be provided around the perimeter of the fair area, with boarding stations at the 8 entrance gates and 27 other points. The fare will be 25 cents, and a similar tariff will apply to north-south and east-west service in the grounds.

For nonwalkers there will be a sightseeing bus service. For $3 ($1.50 for those under 12) you will see 8 miles of fair. Having rested your feet, and listened to a descriptive commentary, the odds on being able to continue to sightsee will be in your favor.

TICKETS

How much will it cost to get into the fair? For the benefit of those in charge of family budgets, we list tentative admission fees below:

Adults: Individual tickets, $2; 20-ticket books, $30.

Children 2 to 12: Individual tickets, $1; 20-ticket books, $15.

Children under 2 admitted free.

Should you plan to give fair tickets for Christmas, a 10-percent discount off the above prices can be obtained by making your purchase before February 29, 1964. Volume purchases of 50 or more tickets may also be made through Leap Year Day at $1.35 per adult ticket and only 67½ cents per child's ticket. (Send check or money order to Ticket Sales Cashier, New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., Flushing, N.Y., 11380)

SATISFYING INNER MAN

Walking has been held to whet the appetite, and the fair as a consequence will feature a variety of restaurants. Some will seat as few as 50, others up to 900. Many will be operated in the various pavilions. Prices? Not easily established at this stage, but it is safe to assume that many will be on the high side. However, one company has ambitious plans to serve a full 7-course Chinese meal for 99 cents in its 600-seat restaurant. A large establishment that will operate 8 restaurants at the fair indicates its meals will start around $2.50. A view of the entire fair area can be had from the ""Top of the Fair," high atop the Port Authority's heliport. This restaurant opened October 16, and will serve patrons all winter.

FUN

The amphitheater, scene of the "Aquacade," produced by Billy Rose in 1939–40, will house a spectacular million-dollar show produced by Radio City Music Hall's Leon Leonidoff and orchestra leader Meyer Davis. A 250-foot revolving stage has been installed. Tickets will cost between $1 and $3.

Other attractions include: Swiss Sky Ride, with cable cars traveling 112 feet high over a 2,000 foot course, 50 cents. Monorail, giving a 1½-mile ride around the lake amusement area, 50 cents to 75 cents. Circus produced by John Ringling North, 75 cents to $4.

SPORTS

The final Olympic trials will be held in conjunction with the fair in 1964. At the fairgrounds: boxing, fencing, gymnastics, judo, weightlifting and wrestling. At the nearby Astoria pool: swimming, diving and water polo. At Randall's Island Stadium: track and field. Long Island's host of Met fans can take in the fair and adjourn to Shea Stadium to watch Casey's heroes strive to reach the first division. Eureka, what have we said?

HEIGH-HO, COME TO THE FAIR

All in all, it looks like being a must-see fair. Should you need any other information as April 22 nears, do not hesitate to call our public relations people in Garden City. (Telephone PI 6-5000, extension 285 or 300.) We always are at your service, and if we don't know all the answers, we will do our best to find out. If you would like extra copies of this Comment to send to family or friends out of town, we'll be glad to supply you as long as they last.

It may be chilly next April, so dress warmly and bring extra sweaters for the young ones. As for the children, all they need bring are round eyes, dreams and wondering hearts.

"Richard Nixon's Return"—An Article From Commonweal Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a thoughtful and perceptive article, "Richard Nixon's Return," from the October 19, 1963, issue of Commonweal magazine.

RICHARD NIXON'S RETURN

Mr. Nixon, we have observed, is generally quicker than most to detect political positions that are either shocking or immoral. He was shocked frequently during the 1960 campaign, as well as by the press coverage and election results. Similarly, he has uncovered so much immorality in the course of his many political speeches that some have been unkind enough to suggest that these discoveries owe less to the situation at hand than to a felt need to bolster a weak prose style and emphasize dubious points as best he can.

The latest discovery, revealed in the pages of the Saturday Evening Post, concerns the proposed East-West non-aggression pact. As so often in the past, Mr. Nixon's prose is so arranged that anyone who disagrees with him, for any reason, becomes suspect of immorality, if not treason. "It would be shockingly immoral," he wrote, "for the United States to do anything directly or indirectly which would give the impression that we accept Khrushchev's price; namely, that in return for peaceful coexistence we would draw a line down the middle of Europe and accept as permanent the Communist enslavement of 97 million Eastern Europeans." This is vintage Nixon, particularly since the subtle suggestion of disloyalty and plotting by the administration becomes more explicit when the statement is amplified: "Only the mobilization of an aroused and informed American public opinion will prevent the sellout [of Eastern Europe]."

Only the cynical would see in this article an opening salvo by Mr. Nixon in a cam-

paign to gain his party's presidential nomination in 1964. (It has been reported that in the face of the Goldwater boom, a number of Republican professionals have been led to look upon Mr. Nixon in a kindlier fashion. At any rate, if this were Mr. Nixon's intention, and if he hoped to lure support away from GOLDWATER, he could do worse than to lapse into the idiom of the far right—"sellout," for instance, particularly when applied to Eastern Europe, has for the conservative wing a special connotation not shared by the historians.) Whatever Mr. Nixon's motives and whatever the merits of his peculiar prose style, his contribution is to promote the kind of simplistic thinking that inhibits attempts to come to grips with the actual situation in Eastern Europe. His rejection of the complexities involved in meeting communism is nearly as complete as GOLDWATER'S. Confronted by Pope John's "Pacem in Terris," a document which dealt with these complexities of the cold war as they are, Mr. Nixon once again retired to simple formulas. Though addressed to "all men of good will," the encyclical was only meant for the West, according to Mr. Nixon, because the Communists cannot be considered men of good will.

Mr. Nixon once delivered a homily to a fledgling politician on the need to keep the issues simple. Like Mr. GOLDWATER, he seems to have little trouble hewing to this rule. Too often in his prose foreign policy comes through as a matter of victory or defeat, firmness or "sellout," freedom or slavery, good or evil. Here is one more sample of his thought, again from the Saturday Evening Post article: "Our goal must not be simply to keep freedom from shrinking but to make it grow, too. Our goal must be a free Cuba, a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, a free China." Does this sound as though Mr. Nixon is saber rattling? Not so. Here's his next line: "And every policy must be directed to reach that goal through peaceful means."

In other words Mr. Nixon has covered his tracks admirably. The United States, he says, must: (a) free Eastern Europe, (b) not use force to do so, and (c) not use peaceful means which would "directly or indirectly" give the impression that we accept Communist hegemony in the area, as any sort of diplomacy would tend to do. Just what he has in mind, then, is somewhat unclear. Mr. Nixon seems to be committing himself to freeing Eastern Europe without recourse either to force or diplomacy. If this sounds to readers like a rerun of Mr. Nixon's position on Cuba, we admit it strikes us the same way. Sometimes, after a dose of Nixon prose, we get to feeling so low that even GOLDWATER doesn't look so bad. Well, almost that low.

Michigan City (Ind.) Endorses Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the October 17 edition of the Michigan City (Ind.) News Dispatch endorsing the private sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

The editorial follows:

SALE OF WHEAT

The announcement on September 16 of Russia's $500 million deal to buy 228 million bushels of wheat and flour from Canada caused a reappraisal of U.S. trade policy.

Russia, once the breadbasket of Europe, is going abroad for food. Its shortage is due to disastrous weather and a lack of success in its new lands program.

The objections to reopening trade with Russia are political and emotional. Americans have in mind Cuba, the missile crisis and the Berlin wall.

On the other hand, all peoples reject nuclear war as unthinkable.

The central probem of our day is to keep peace.

The test ban treaty was one step in the right direction.

All economic consideration favors normalization of East-West trade, with understandable exceptions. Trade among the nations, to mutual advantage, is a good way to keep rivalry on a peaceful basis.

As President Kennedy said, there are obvious benefits to us. It helps our balance of payments and gold reserve problems. It helps distribute our surplus wheat and reduces our storage problem and its cost. We have always responded to peoples' needs. It will relieve their food shortage and will relieve tensions.

The President's decision is not inconsistent with our past policies and we would accomplish nothing by refusing to sell.

The Problems of Relocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today the Banking and Currency Committee is holding hearings on all aspects of urban renewal. One of the problems which continually comes up in large-scale blight removal and renewal projects is the plight of those who must move.

Mr. Robert B. Pease, executive director of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh has given us the benefit of his experience in a recent article. Mr. Pease explains that, with relatively few exceptions, they go into better housing than they previously occupied, and, in many cases, better than they have ever had.

The article goes on to caution wisely that basic problems inherent in the relocation of people are far from being solved. But, as Mr. Pease points out:

Urban renewal cannot solve, or even pretend to solve, basic economic, social, and racial problems which afflict a large proportion of our population and which have been allowed to grow in severity for many years before urban renewal came into being. It will take the whole force of the community, under aggressive leadership, to break down these fixed patterns of city living and do the total job.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a statement which all of us who are committed to better living standards and a creative, dynamic city should comprehend. I am enclosing the remainder of the article which is so seriously concerned with this goal.

THE PROBLEMS OF RELOCATION

(By Robert B. Pease, Executive Director, Urban Redevelopment Authority)

Whenever plans are announced for large-scale blight removal and renewal projects, the Urban Redevelopment Authority is immediately confronted by one overriding question:

"What will happen to all those people—where will they go?"

Today, on the basis of our operating experiences over the past dozen years, we can give an unqualified answer to that question. It is simply that, with relatively few exceptions, they go into better housing than they previously occupied, and, in many cases, better than they have ever had.

PROBLEMS NOT ALL SOLVED

This is not to imply that basic problems inherent in the relocation of people have been solved. Far from it. As a community, we have only begun to recognize these problems, and to understand their scope and severity.

Relocation is regarded by many as the problem child of urban renewal. Most certainly, a long-range satisfactory solution to problems encountered in relocation must be developed if urban renewal is to advance as it should and serve the best interests of the community.

We cannot hide from this need. Nor should we mislead ourselves into believing that a total and ultimate solution is just around the corner. First, we must consider what the needs are.

NOT A CUREALL

Urban renewal relocation deals with chronic human ills which are solidly imbedded in the community, and at this point, are inseparable from our economic and social structure.

Can we assume that through urban renewal, or any other single program, such items as excessive poverty, inadequate education, and racial segregation can be eliminated? Or that we can do away with oversized families with too little income and involved in or affected by too much crime and juvenile delinquency, vice and illegitimacy, divorce and desertion, disease and neglect?

These are conditions which go hand in hand with lack of opportunity to be properly educated, properly employed, properly housed. These are the conditions which help cause neighborhoods to deteriorate and are most concentrated in neighborhoods fallen to slum status.

Stated in other terms, the problems encountered in relocation are not the result of urban renewal. They are, in large measure, the reasons for urban renewal.

A COMMUNITY PROBLEM

While the Federal urban renewal program assumes legal responsibility for relocating residents and businesses (and was the first major reconstruction program in the Nation to do so), the responsibility for dealing with basic problems lies with the community as a whole.

If the community wants to rid itself of slums and protect good neighborhoods from the spread of blight, it has to use every resource and enterprise at its command, both public and private, in a massive attack against the basic causes of blight.

That must come eventually. In the meantime, we cannot be too timid or fearful about resettling large numbers of people within the city, if we are to provide space for new and expanded living, business, employment and educational opportunities so essential to the future of the city and the welfare of its people.

REHOUSING PROGRAM ESSENTIAL

In an old and cramped city such as Pittsburgh—with practically no vacant land left to draw upon from its 55 square miles of space—there is no other choice.

At the same time, it is essential to keep in mind that no further large-scale total clearance projects, such as that in the lower hill, should be undertaken without a clear-cut and adequate program for rehousing fam-

ilies. In the Pittsburgh program, current emphasis is on urban renewal projects which combine the clearance of blight with the preservation and rehabilitation of existing homes and neighborhoods.

A FORCE FOR GOOD

As practiced in the city of Pittsburgh over the past decade, urban renewal has not been, as some people seem to regard it, an arbitrary program "to drive people from their homes."

Rather, it has served as a positive and beneficial force in the lives of thousands of residents of Pittsburgh. This statement is supported by statistical records, which show:

That, as of April 30, 1963, a total of 3,819 families and roughly 2,500 individuals—or a population of close to 18,000 persons—have been relocated from 11 project areas in which the Urban Redevelopment Authority has been and still is actively at work.

That, as of the same date, a total of 2,846 families and 1,647 single persons—or a total population of around 14,000 persons—have been relocated from 5 federally assisted projects for which the authority has maintained, in conformance with Federal law, accurate and detailed relocation records. (The first six projects were privately financed without Federal funds, and private developers had responsibility for relocation. Consequently, current records regarding those projects are incomplete.)

That six out of every seven families relocated from the five federally aided projects to date moved into housing which met basic standards of health, safety and decency. Most of these families previously lived in substandard conditions and in nearly all cases the housing into which they moved represented an improvement in their living conditions.

That only 374 families, out of a total of 2,846, are not definitely shown in the authority's records to date as being adequately rehoused in standard dwellings.

Of those, 80 families are known to have moved out of the city.

Two hundred and thirty-five (203 from the lower hill) have indefinite status: Some literally vanished into thin air, evading all efforts to assist them or trace their whereabouts. Others ceased being a family as the result of death, divorce, desertion, and other such factors prevalent among slum dwellers.

Fifty-nine other families (56 of those from the lower hill) are listed in the authority records as having moved into substandard dwellings after persistently refusing relocation aid. In accordance with Federal requirements, the authority continues to exert effort to transfer such families to standard housing.

The authority is obligated to locate for each family a standard dwelling unit which that family can afford to rent or buy and in a neighborhood of its own choice.

FIELD OFFICES HELP

In all its federally aided renewal projects, the Redevelopment Authority has provided full relocation services under contract with the Housing Authority of Pittsburgh, which establishes a field relocation office in each project area. Field offices in the lower hill and Chateau Street west project areas have completed their functions and are closed. At present, field offices are operating in the East Liberty, Allegheny Center, and Bluff Street project areas.

SATISFACTORY PROGRAM

The coordinated relocation program here has proved to be a highly satisfactory arrangement for two major reasons:

(1) The housing authority is able to draw on its own supply of some 9,000 public housing units as a relocation resource for low-income families.

(2) The housing authority, through experience it has accumulated in the housing and property management fields, has been able to equip its field offices with competent staffs. In addition to offering assistance of all kinds, these staffs maintain complete and up-to-date listings of homes available in the private real estate market.

The staffs of both the redevelopment and housing agencies work closely together in the assembling of many types of data necessary to carry out an effective relocation program. This entails various inspections and surveys through which full information is gathered regarding the number of persons to be displaced; the condition of their present housing; income, size, social traits, and other family characteristics.

FINANCIAL AID

Federal relocation grants cover actual expenses up to $200 per family and up to $25,000 for business concerns.

Afer a family has been relocated, the authority is then required to make checks and rechecks to determine if the family's new home meets minimum standards. Those families who relocate to substandard housing remain in the authority's active workload until they have been persuaded and aided to move into standard housing.

It should be emphasized that once a family is lodged in a standard dwelling unit that family is outside the authority's jurisdiction and the authority no longer has responsibility for the family.

COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY

It is at this point where the community, through its other public and semipublic agencies, must pick up the full responsibility for keeping the relocated family in standard housing.

This requires a combination of programs and actions, such as: Effective enforcement of various municipal codes; coordinated use of social welfare and health program; encouragement of voluntary neighborhood conservation and improvement programs; joint public and private efforts to promote home maintenance and improvement on a voluntary basis; expanded education and self-help renewal through citizen participation movements.

SOME CRITICISM

It is often said that urban renewal merely transfers slums and Negro ghettoes from one section of the city to another. This criticism usually is based on early experiences in connection with the lower hill district.

Over a 3- to 4-year period, that project resulted in the displacement of over 1,500 families, two-thirds of them Negro. This came about at a time when housing in the city was in short supply, when construction of a large low-rent public housing community was delayed by litigation in the courts and when neighborhood racial barriers were more strongly in evidence than today.

As the result, many Negro families moved from the lower hill into the middle and upper hill districts. In turn, many families of higher income from those districts moved to Homewood-Brushton, aggravating its problems of overcrowding.

However, that trend already was in progress as more and more families, taking advantage of their rising incomes, sought improved housing. In almost every move, the family invloved gained improved living conditions.

HOUSING SUPPLY ADEQUATE

Today, with a vacancy ratio of approximately 6 percent resulting from the loss of some 70,000 residents in the 1950–60 period, the city has more than an adequate supply of existing dwelling units to accommodate relocated families in the low-to-middle income groups.

Furthermore, there is now both city and State legislation prohibiting racial discrimination in the sale or rental of private dwellings. Previously all-white neighborhoods are slowly beginning to open to Negro residents.

RECOGNIZE LIMITATIONS

Urban renewal has created and will continue to provide opportunities for people to raise their living standards and to escape from ghettoes. But it cannot solve, or even pretend to solve, basic economic, social and racial problems which afflict a large proportion of our population and which have been allowed to grow in severity for many years before urban renewal came into being.

It will take the whole force of the community, under aggressive leadership, to break down these fixed patterns of city living and do the total job.

Family and business summary, 1949–63

[Moved to date [1] (Apr. 30, 1963)]

Project	Total families affected	Families		Single persons	Business concerns
		Total	Nonwhite		
1. J. & L. Southside	203	203	(2)	(2)	6
2. Gateway Center	25	25	(2)	(2)	[3] 150
3. J. & L. Hazelwood	405	405	(2)	(2)	None
4. J. & L. Scotch Bottom	120	120	(2)	(2)	3
5. DeSoto	78	78	(2)	(2)	13
6. Centre-Morgan	142	142	(2)	(2)	None
Subtotal	973	973			172
7. Lower Hill	1,551	1,551	1,239	456	416
8. Chateau St. West	971	729	168	221	206
9. East Liberty (A)	365	331	175	316	192
10. Allegheny Center	413	230	3	653	226
11. Bluff St	226	5	None	1	2
Subtotal	3,346	2,846	1,585	1,647	1,042
Grand total	4,319	3,819	1,585	1,647	1,042

[1] Self-effort and use of referral services.
[2] Data not available; relocation in 1st 6 nonfederally aided projects was responsibility of private developers, and detailed records were not kept.
[3] Approximate.

Rehousing of families, federally assisted renewal projects

[Apr. 30, 1963]

Project	Total number relocated to date	Private rental (standard)	Private sales (standard)	Low-rent public housing	Self-relocated (substandard) [1]	Moved out of city	Others [3]	Number to be relocated
Lower Hill	1,551	511	244	460	56	34	[2] 203	None
Chateau St. West	729	321	311	64	3	18	12	62
East Liberty (A)	331	205	86	25		9	6	34
Allegheny Center	230	140	36	23		17	14	183
Bluff St	5		3			2		221
Total	2,846	1,177	680	572	59	80	235	500

[1] Aid refused.
[2] Status indefinite; whereabouts unknown.
[3] Includes missing families who made no attempt to use referral and other relocation services; also includes those whose family status is not traceable because of death, separation, and other factors resulting from high degree of social disorganization in concentrated slum area.

Fair Trade Law Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Mr. Richard Starnes appearing in the Rocky Mountain News, Tuesday, August 27, 1963, entitled "Fair Trade Law Before Congress."

That excellent article well points out the evil of this legislation:

FAIR TRADE LAW BEFORE CONGRESS

(By Richard Starnes)

WASHINGTON, August 26.—Lobbyists—the shadowy guerrillas of the legislative wars—are locked in an epic conflict that may cost American consumers billions of dollars.

Their battle is over passage of the most recent reincarnation of a nationwide fair trade law.

Fair trade has come to be regarded as a somewhat tarnished ideal in the Nation's Capital, however, so with an eye to euphemism that would delight any sensitive mortician, its current backers call it a "quality stabilization" act.

But its foes insist it is the same old fair trade wolf clad in granny Riding Hood's peignoir. In opposing it before the House Commerce Committee, the Department of Justice testified that consumers in States with price maintenance laws "pay from 19 to 27 percent higher prices" than consumers in States that are blessed by no such legislation.

"Projecting an average price increase of 20 percent for all sales that may be covered by the operation of a national price maintenance law," the Justice Department testified, "shows that it would cost the American consumer billions of dollars and have a powerfully inflationary effect."

In spite of this gloomy forecast, the committee approved the bill, and experts in the dismal science of predicting what Congress will do believe it has a better than even chance of being passed by the House.

The stakes in fair trade are tremendous, and both sides have enlisted experts to do battle in their behalf. Fair trade laws, which have been enacted with varying degrees of effectiveness by 45 States, permit manufacturers of brand-name or trademarked products to dictate the prices at which they may be sold.

Where effective, fair trade laws have prevented price competition, with the inevitable result that consumers pay higher prices.

Spearheading the drive for passage of the legislation is a powerful group of manufacturers and organized retailers. One of the principal groups lobbying in its behalf is the National Association of Retail Druggists. Another is an organization called Quality Brands Associates.

The National Association of Retail Druggists always paid an "honorarium" to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, a perennial speaker at NARD conventions. Senator HUMPHREY is sponsor of the Senate version of the quality stabilization bill.

Even the most ardent opponents of the bill glumly concede that it will get through the House if the Rules Committee lets it get to the floor.

Then it will be up to the Senate, and Senator HUMPHREY, who is a former druggist himself, as well as being a tireless speechmaker.

Euphoria, It's Wonderful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for short memoried, wishful thinking Americans the following editorial from the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram contains a magnificent message:

THE BIG THAW IS HERE, BUT LOOK OUT FOR FLOODS

Like Indian summer, an almost tangible quality you can feel in the air, an atmosphere of peace and good will and great expectations surrounds Russian-American relations these days. There is growing hope and belief that no genuine reasons exist for strife, tension, contention; that if we would just relax and smile and shake hands, we might, after all, live happily ever after.

The thaw is on: The test ban treaty has been signed and put into effect; the Soviets have drawn away from those bloodthirsty Chinese; the wheat transaction has been approved; there may soon be an air link between Moscow and New York; an agreement is being reached to establish consulates in Chicago and Leningrad; and between Washington and Moscow the lines are busy with new efforts to "consolidate the peace."

The fact that combat-ready Soviet troops Friday blocked a U.S. Army supply convoy from Berlin causes hardly a ripple in the sea of euphoria; for isn't this one of those things we've worried too much about in the past? Let's not worry so much.

We've been too tense.

What matters it that:

Russia is a Communist nation with the announced aim of eliminating our system.

Only 1 year ago, as part of that plan, the Soviets sent missiles into Cuba and pointed them at American targets.

Soviet troops and equipment remain in Cuba, and we've never been able to conduct an on-site inspection.

The Russians have a long record of signing treaties and breaking them without remorse.

They are friendly or hostile as suits their purpose, and they have demonstrated the patience to retreat one step in order to advance five.

They have murdered and pillaged and still hold millions of Eastern Europeans as prisoners in their own lands.

What does it matter if we can just have peace?

Yes, the big thaw is setting in, and the torrents of "peace" are flowing. Let us only hope they do not wash up over the dam and down into the valley.

Americanism Versus Feudalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an interesting column by Mr. Walter S. Farquhar in a recent issue of the Pottsville Republican:

AMERICANISM VERSUS FEUDALISM

Dr. Frank P. Graham, former President of North Carolina University, now a United Nations mediator, made a speech not long ago which reflected great credit on his State. He said in part:

"In the mist of the American Revolution * * * out of a decent respect for the opinion of mankind * * * Thomas Jefferson declared for all the American principle of equal freedom. * * * It was the first universal declaration of human rights ever adopted by chosen delegates of the people * * * these revolutionary princples went ringing around the earth, ringing down the years and are still singing in the minds and hearts of the people of two hemispheres.

"America, the haven of the disinherited of the earth and the home of a great revolutionary faith in the days of her infant weakness should not, in the time of her great power, become the home of a paralyzing fear and a destructive intolerance. This reaction would abdicate the leadership of equal freedom in a hopeful world desperately in need of the best which America has to give in this time of hazard and hope for all people.

"Rather we must make clear to ourselves and the world that the great declarations of faith and freedom for progressive fulfillment are not merely the historic and professed sources, but are the present and living sources of America's faith in America and America's moral influence and power in the world. The long unfulfilled but yet onrolling ideals of the American Revolution have progressively opened doors of political equality which had been closed to * * landless people, colored people and women.

"At the end of the 18th century, Thomas Jefferson victoriously led the people * * * against the national hysteria and tyranny of the alien and sedition laws. These laws, out of fear of the French Revolution and lack of faith in robustness of our own American freedom, sought to subvert the American Bill of Rights. Later States rights became for a time the shield of slavery in the South; and later, the weapon of exploitation of women and children in the sweatshops of great cities in the North; and today the armament of massive resistance to the law of the land for the equal freedom of all Americans.

"The present American revolution of the Negro people did not get its impulse or its impetus from Moscow but in such centers of the ex-Confederate South as Montgomery and Greensboro. Its older sources are in Carpenter's Hall and Independence Hall, Philadelphia, in the revolutionary rendezvous of the American people for equal freedom and human dignity. The youth, in their movement for the same service, in sitting down, are standing up for the American dream. They are not trying to overthrow the Republic but fulfill the promise of the Republic.

"The spiritual quality of the leadership and the patriotic spirit of the volunteer pilgrims reinforce our faith that this petition of the people will be influential in the meaning of America at home and in the image of America in the world * * * in the partnership of nations for equal freedom, justice, and peace under law and human brotherhood."

Dr. Graham's most pertinent statement, perhaps, is that relating to defeat of the alien and sedition laws, by Jefferson.

It is a matter of world history that the American Revolution inspired the French Revolution, but that Americans deplored the excesses and inconsistencies of the latter.

Nevertheless, in the few years between Yorktown and the French terror, an ultraconservative class has grown up in America which feared the very principles which had won independence. And that class knew well there wasn't the slightest chance of military invasion by the French proletariat. What they feared was invasion by the ideas expressed by foreign revolutionists.

They made the mistake of believing Americans would attempt to destroy their own Government. They maligned honest, patriotic American citizens who believed in the American dream of equal opportunity.

When it was realized that Jefferson's constituents were only honest patriots, the Nation became ashamed of its alien and sedition hysteria. It was hushed up and, to this day, little is said about it.

Nevertheless, that ancient distrust of the people has bobbed up at intervals, since Jefferson's time. That is the trouble, today. Not occupation by a foreign enemy is really feared but infiltration by foreign ideas, which never have been held by more than a mere handful of Americans.

Americans are fighting for their original ideals, not in behalf of communism, but against a return to feudalism.

That North Carolina sees the light is one of the most hopeful signs in a disturbed world.

Sino-Soviet Border Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, while the difficulties of an open society such as the United States are apparent and continually subject to international review, the many problems of both the Russian and Red Chinese regimes are easily hidden from public notice by the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Assessing the internal problems of communism and determining their impact on our country's foreign policy necessarily requires a scholarly approach if we are to make a concerted effort toward thwarting the dual thrust of Chinese and Russian branches of Communist imperialism.

There have been recent, isolated news stories detailing the border difficulties experienced in the current Sino-Soviet split. These troubles require a scholarly analysis and such a chore has been undertaken by Dr. Henry G. Schwarz, an associate professor of political science at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis.

Dr. Schwarz is one of few American scholars specializing in China's inner Asian frontiers. He spent 4 years studying Chinese at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, and at Yale's Institute of Far Eastern Languages.

He also has lived and studied in Nationalist China for a year and subsequently traveled around the world. He has a book in preparation on "China's West Under the Communists."

Because this border dispute may have continuing implications in the direction of our foreign policy as we gear the United States to face the dual evils of Russian and Chinese communism, I commend the following article written by Dr. Schwarz and appearing in the Sunday, October 6, issue of the Milwaukee Journal to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

SINKIANG: CHINA'S ACHILLES HEEL?

(By Henry G. Schwarz)

The nationalistic element of the dispute between Moscow and Peiping is nowhere more clearly shown than in the newly reported tension along the Sino-Soviet frontier in central Asia. Some 50,000 to 70,000 persons are said to have fled to the Soviet Union in the last year, and the Chinese are now attempting to seal off the border. Peiping speaks of these tens of thousands of Chinese citizens being lured across the border by false Soviet pretenses and then forbidden to return. Moscow speaks of these same citizens as refugees, streaming across under gunfire from the oppression of the Chinese regime to the freer air of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. The relative truth of the conflicting charges it is not yet possible to judge.

There have been credible reports that Sinkiang today resembles an armed camp, that Kazakhs and other non-Chinese groups in the Province have been rioting against Chinese authorities and that some Chinese officials have lately defected across the border into the Soviet Union, including the Kazakh commander of the Ili military district.

These reports have brought this westernmost Province of China to world attention. It is the currently most active sector of a border problem more extensive in time and distance.

During much of the 18th and 19th centuries, China and Russia clashed in territorial disputes ranging along the world's longest border, from central Asia all the way to the Pacific.

Relatively weak, China was forced to give up large areas; yet no Chinese Government ever renounced its claims to "China irredenta" (unredeemed). Thus it is hardly surprising to learn of the renewal of China's charges that the lost territories were forcibly seized by Russia, and of her vow to recover them.

Sinkiang is huge in area—its 660,805 square miles would cover most of the eastern United States. Its geography is dominated by three great mountain ranges. Two, the Altai and the Kunlun, mark the province's northern and southern borders. The third, the T'ien Shan (heavenly mountains), runs along the Soviet border, then turns eastward, bisecting Sinkiang. The northern part is the Dzungarian Basin, while the southern part is largely the Takla Makan, a formidable desert girded by a string of oases.

TRADITION OF REVOLTS

Two most significant facts about Sinkiang are its overwhelmingly non-Chinese population and its long tradition of revolt against Chinese governments.

Sinkiang (hsin chiang) means new territory, or new frontier. The name was coined when Sinkiang became a Chinse province in 1884. Before that time, the area's political relation to China varied with the fortunes of successive dynasties. The first known Chinese advances into Sinkiang occurred around 121 B.C., during the early Han dynasty. The next period of relatively firm Chinese control came in early T'ang times (A.D. seventh century), when men from many lands streamed across Sinkiang to the splendor of Ch'ang-an (now Sian), the imperial capital said to have had a population of 2 million.

Chinese dominance over Sinkiang did not reappear for the next 1,000 years. During much of this millenium, the Mongols under Genghis Khan and his successors controlled Sinkiang.

Unceasing tides of armies, merchants, and nomads flowing over Sinkiang have left a polyglot population. Of the estimated 7 million people in Sinkiang today, about 70 percent are Uighurs who are especially dominant in Kashgar, Khotan, and other large southern oases. Another 15 percent are other ethnic groups such as Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Mongols, Sibos, Hui, and Russians. The remaining 15 percent are Chinese, traditionally engaged in administration and commerce.

The fierce spirit of independence among the peoples of Sinkiang has been nourished by religion. Most are adherents of the Sunni sect of the Moslem religion, which has served as a force uniting the otherwise diverse groups. The several revolts since 1949 against the Communist regime in Sinkiang have aimed at the creation of a pan-Islamic or pan-Turkic state. What is most disturbing, from Peiping's point of view, is that this concept of Moslem unity extends to the kinsmen across the border in the Soviet Union.

The spirit of freedom and sense of superiority to the Chinese is also fostered by the nomadic way of life; the nomads despise the sedentary ways of the Chinese and fiercely resist attempts to settle them.

HAS URANIUM, OIL

The strong Russian and Soviet influence in Sinkiang has added to the precarious situation of the Chinese there. During much of the republican period, Sinkiang was almost independent of China. During the Ili revolt of 1944 against Chinese rule, the Soviets were believed to have supported the rebels. After the Communist takeover in China, Soviet influence continued unabated. Economic aid in men and materiel poured into Sinkiang. Soviet troops in substantial numbers held positions in Sinkiang, at least until 1955.

There is evidence that Soviet consulates, trade missions, and information centers in Sinkiang continued after 1949 to support anti-Chinese movements.

In terms of trade, close relations between the Soviet Union and Sinkiang continued after the Communist Chinese took over.

Camel transport was supplemented, after 1951, by river and truck transport. Soviet made consumer goods enjoyed great popularity. River transport carried machinery and mine equipment from the Soviet Union and large amounts of ores, presumably including uranium, from Sinkiang.

Since the Communists began their program to industrialize China, Sinkiang has played a role of unprecedented importance. Oil, uranium, platinum, copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, and other minerals are mined there. Most crucial of them is oil, of which China has a critical shortage. Since 1949, several petroleum fields have been developed in Sinkiang, notably in the Karamai area. At first, Soviet and Rumanian technicians and equipment were available, but they were withdraw in 1961 and the present state of production is uncertain.

The Peiping regime is vitally dependent upon Sinkiang's resources and therefore must maintain and strengthen Chinese control of the region. The mountain ranges afforded in the past a degree of protection, but are not an effective barrier today. Maintaining the Chinese presence in a largely non-Chinese and hostile environment has been very costly, but it would be unrealistic to assume that the Peiping regime would withdraw from Sinkiang.

JOINT RAILROAD PROJECT

The regime also faces a grave transportation problem. China must be able to transport raw materials to the east and to bring troops and weapons west quickly into Sinkiang. In 1949, there was not a single mile of railroad in Sinkiang. In 1954, Moscow and Peiping signed an agreement to build a railroad across Sinkiang and into Kazakh Republic, joining a Soviet north-south trunkline. The Soviets completed their section in 1955, but the Chinese still have not reached the Soviet border, although the target date was 1957. Early in 1963 the tracks ended at Urumchi, the Sinkiang capital, and there is no evidence that construction has been continued.

Peiping's main instrument for control of Sinkiang has been the army. The Red Chinese army that took Sinkiang was not demobilized but was reinforced by youthful volunteers and political prisoners, many units being converted into a production and construction corps. Its size is estimated at 250,000 to 400,000.

This army's tasks were to establish model state farms, to persuade the non-Chinese farmers to abandon their traditional ways and join collectives, to prepare permanent sites in the steppes for the settling of nomadic tribes and sites for Chinese settlers from the east.

The Chinese Army in Sinkiang also had its strategic functions. Troop concentrations have been placed athwart all main routes between population centers, and on routes leading to and from China proper, as in the Turfan and Hami districts. These troop concentrations not only seek to prevent the uniting of ethnic groups but also, until recently when U.S.S.R. personnel was withdrawn, kept an eye on the comings and goings of the Soviets. In the event of armed conflict between Moscow and Peiping, these strategic army centers would present the best defensive positions blocking access to the most vital areas of Sinkiang.

The Chinese have tried by several means to integrate Sinkiang into China politically. The Communist Party sought support of numerous mass organizations through a united front, with party members in each organization. To obtain cooperation of the non-Chinese, 11 autonomous areas were created for the several ethnic groups. Then, in 1955, all Sinkiang was designated the Uighur autonomous region, named for the dominant group.

The non-Chinese majority soon realized however, that autonomy was restricted to the administrative apparatus and cultural matters. The ruling Communist Party remained firmly in Chinese hands. It is significant that the most powerful post in Sinkiang has been held continuously by the same Chinese official from 1949 until today. He is Wang En-mao, an oldtime revolutionary who is first secretary of the regional party committee.

Whereas in the first 7 years of Chinese Red rule Peiping sought to combat Great Hanism—the overbearing attitude of Chinese toward the non-Chinese—it reversed its stand in 1957 and launched an allout attack against the growing anti-Chinese elements.

PEIPING'S GREAT MISTAKE

Perhaps the regime's gravest mistake in Sinkiang was to abandon its hitherto cautious attitude toward the non-Chinese majority. The attempted homogenization of Sinkiang with the rest of China in all respects, including the introduction of communes and suppression of religions, customs, and traditions, triggered a wave of revolts which still continues.

So far, the army has been able to preserve Chinese rule but there is considerable doubt that it will be able to keep the upper hand if and when the Soviets choose to lend large-scale assistance to the anti-Chinese movements in Sinkiang.

In any event, Sinkiang, the historic crossroads of nations and cultures, will continue to be the zone of contest: Chinese against non-Chinese, farmer against nomad, communism against Islam, China against Russia.

Address of U.S. Senator Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Before the 115th Annual Convention of the Hampden County Teachers Association in Springfield, Mass., October 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 115th Annual Convention of the Hampden County Teachers Association, held at Springfield, Mass., last Friday, October 18, heard an address by U.S. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY who developed the theme of the Federal Government's role in education, and the importance of good education to prepare the next generation to meet its domestic and worldwide responsibilities. The junior Senator from Massachusetts was presented to the 3,000 assembled teachers in Springfield Municipal Auditorium by Joseph P. Quinlan, of Chicopee, president of the Hampden County Teachers Association. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Senator KENNEDY's address and the newspaper account of the meeting taken from the Springfield Daily News of October 18:

HAMPDEN COUNTY TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1963

It is a privilege to be with you today at your annual meeting. I feel at home with members of the teaching profession, not only because my mother once taught school in Boston, but also because earlier this year I was in the classroom myself. I took a course in Washington in speed reading, so that I can keep up with the material that comes across my desk; and so that I can keep up with certain members of my family.

This course has been given for Senators for a few years. The trick is to read faster and still remember all you read. Last year, one of my Senate colleagues took it, and was told that he should practice the techniques 1 hour each day. So on a trip back to his State, he purchased five murder mysteries at the airport. He went through the first one, turning pages. And after a few minutes he finished the book and handed it to his assistant, who was traveling with him. The Senator said: "OK, quiz me on it."

His assistant said: "Who was murdered?"

(Pause) "I think it was the girl."

"How do you know?"

"Because her picture is on the cover with a knife in her back."

I have had the opportunity in recent months to meet with teachers throughout the Commonwealth, and to see your representatives on their visits to Washington. The Hampden County Teachers Association is an outstanding organization here in central Massachusetts. You are a united voice for progress, for better education and for all that is so important to the boys and girls of this area.

Your organization goes back 115 years. While the methods of teaching have changed greatly in these years, the role of the teacher—and her central place in our society—will never change. You have an opportunity that come to very few: You can shape the development of human beings. You can give your students a knowledge and a discipline that will be with them always. A distinguished educator once said, "Everything we may build, skyscrapers, bridges, and highways, will eventually crumble into dust. But put an idea into the mind of a child, and it stays there forever."

Last spring I had an opportunity to visit two high schools in the Washington, D.C. area. These schools had a dropout rate of 20 percent. These are considered problem schools with troubled students. And yet I was extremely impressed by the effort being made by the teachers and by the quiet manners of the students despite the difficult conditions for these children, in school and at home. Many of them are anxious to learn, and to make a real contribution to society. These schools showed me how far we still have to go to bring opportunity in education to all our children. But it also made me very proud of the job you are doing here in Massachusetts. The contribution of our teachers, over many years, has made our State a primary center of educational achievement—not just in our colleges and universities, not just in our private schools, which attract students from all over the country, but in our public schools as well. Massachusetts is sixth in the Nation in the percentage of public school teachers with master's degrees. That is a good indication of the efforts you are making to improve your skills.

I come to you today from the city of Washington where decisions are being made that will affect the future of all of us. Changes are taking place throughout the world. In the last 2 or 3 months we have seen a great division in the Communist world. We see new democratic leaders moving into power in England and in Germany; and new dictators moving into power in Latin America.

Two weeks ago we welcomed to our country the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie. This summer, in his capital city of Addis Ababa, 30 African nations met to sign a charter of African unity. If their hopes are realized, they will weld together a national force greater in population and resources than the United States: A mighty force to be reckoned with in our planning for the future.

The nations of Europe, which went their separate ways for hundreds of years, have formed the economic union of the Common Market. Their goods are now on the shelves of almost every store in America. Massachusetts workers have lost jobs because of this development. But our companies always have the opportunity to create even more jobs by selling their products in the Common Market.

No government can be effective; no nation can fulfill its responsibilities in the world unless the people are prepared for the work ahead. And that preparation can only take place in the schools and classrooms of the nation.

If we are to defend democracy abroad, our children must learn the meaning of democracy at home.

If we are to compete economically, our students must be trained in the skills they need to get jobs.

If we are to have the trained leadership we need in America, we cannot be satisfied with a situation in which only 2 children out of 10 finish college.

We are already paying the price for our failure to adequately support education in the past. Our space program is having trouble recruiting scientists and engineers. It must compete with private industry in this field. By 1970 we will need to graduate 7,500 Ph. D.'s each year in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering if we are to continue our economic growth and preserve our military security—but in 1960 we graduated only 3,000. We have unemployment in Massachusetts. Yet companies with job opportunities for skilled workers cannot find the people to fill them.

Our selective service tells us that one out of every three young men is rejected as physically unfit. A great deal has been done in the last 2 years to increase interest in physical fitness in schools. But had this been done 10 years ago, we would be better off today.

We hear complaints about the quality of the programs on television. Yet the polls show broadcasters are giving the people what they want. If we had more interest in the schools in the arts and humanities, in literature and the theater, would not popular taste be higher and television better?

The lesson of these developments is very clear: If we want to avoid difficulties in the future, we must make investments in education now. If this can be done, then future shortages and future shortcomings could disappear.

It is essential, in our educational programs, that we build better facilities, pay better salaries, and provide our teachers with the modern techniques that can make their work more effective.

There is little controversy over the fact that this job must be done. But there is much controversy over who should do it. I think the record is clear that State governments, and especially local governments, have strained to the limit of their resources in supporting education. In 1962, 95 percent of the funds for public education in the Commonwealth came from State and local government. Almost 30 percent of all our tax dollars was spent for education. To call upon State and local taxes, which are already heavy, which bear most heavily on citizens least able to afford them, would be a mistake in my opinion. New support must come from the Federal Government.

Two years ago the Senate passed a bill that would provide a billion dollars a year for 4 years, for school construction and improvement of teachers' salaries. The decision of how this money is to be spent would be made locally, where it should be made. This year the President has recommended a bill of equal proportions. No unresolved controversy over religion, or race, or local control should be allowed to further delay this vital assistance for our schools. The debate, delay and indecision have gone far enough. Now is the time for action by Congress. And you can be sure that my best efforts, as a member of the Education Committee of the Senate, will be directed toward passing this legislation which means so much to our children.

In conclusion I want to say that you are preparing your students to be not only good Americans, but citizens of the world. Last year, 12 million Americans traveled abroad—over twice as many as 10 years ago. The number of companies doing business abroad has increased remarkably, as better living standards in other nations have made them customers for American products. The Breck Shampoo Co. here in Springfield has just received an award for export expansion. The chemical paper, and machine tool industries of this area have customers in Germany, Brazil and even Africa.

We are going to see more of this, not less. By 1970, the trip from Boston to Paris will take 3 hours and the fare should be less than $100. In the world in which your students are going to live, an education that stops at our borders will not be enough.

This summer I had the privilege of assisting a group of senior high school students in Quincy with a most worthwhile project. As students in a class on problems on democracy, they had studied the careers of the leaders of European countries. Through the enthusiasm of their teacher and generosity of citizens of that area, and with the assistance of our State Department, they were able to go to Europe and meet these leaders in person. It was an experience they will never forget.

I would like to see schools here in Hampden County, and throughout the Commonwealth, explore such programs where possible.

You who teach in the schools of this county have a critical assignment. You must prepare the next generation for its responsibilities. If you succeed, the communities you live in will grow and develop the way they should. So let all of us—teachers, educators, parents, citizens—work together to do the best we can for our children, who are our most precious possession and our greatest responsibility, as a people and as a nation.

[From the Springfield Daily News, (Mass.) Oct. 18, 1963]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—SENATOR KENNEDY FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS

U.S. Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY told about 3,000 Hampden County teachers today that he supports Federal aid to education and drew loud applause when he added that local authorities should control the administration of Federal funds.

The Massachusetts Democrat was speaking before the 115th annual convention of the Hampden County Teachers Association held today in municipal auditorium.

He declared that no one seriously questions the need for higher teachers' salaries and better facilities, but noted the controversy was over whether or not the Federal Government should assist states and local communities.

He said that State and local authorities have "strained" their resources in support of education, noting that Massachusetts, on a State and local level, spent 30 percent of its tax money last year for education.

"New support must come from the Federal Government," he asserted. The Senator drew applause for the first time during his speech when he quickly added: "The decision as to how and where the money is to be spent should be locally made."

He noted that U.S. Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND, Democrat, second district, who was seated on the platform with Senator KENNEDY today, was making efforts to guide the aid-to-education bill through the U.S. House with minimum "debate and delay."

When he mentioned Representative BOLAND, who did not address the gathering, he drew applause for the second time.

NINETY-FIVE PERCENT

Senator KENNEDY noted that 95 percent of education expenses in Massachusets is being financed by the State and local communities.

He noted that the European Common Market is resulting in "displacement of opportunities" for Massachusetts workers. He cited the simultaneous need, however, for more skilled labor, and said that education must meet this challenge.

He said this country's educational programs must also meet the challenge posed by the signing this summer of an African unity treaty by 30 nations on that continent.

He said that Africa represents a region with "greater population than the United States and greater natural resources than the United States." He added: "It is a power the United States will have the reckon with."

In his opening remarks, the President's brother credited the HCTA with being "a united voice for progress and for better education." He said "the role of the teacher and its central place in our society will never change."

He noted that there have been complaints about the quality of U.S. television, but said polls show the broadcasters are "giving the people what they want." "Better education," he said, "would improve the popular taste."

He said the Nation's space program is currently in difficulty as far as recruiting scientists and engineers. He said that the country will need to graduate 7,500 Ph. D.'s in 1970 in order to preserve "our economic growth and our military superiority." He noted that the year 1960 saw only 3,000 doctorates granted.

In conclusion, he termed "inadequate" education which "stops at the country's boundaries." He declared that the "enthusiasm" of teachers is one of the greatest assets in furthering education for the Nation's schoolchildren, "our most precious possession, and our greatest responsibility."

On the platform with Senator KENNEDY and Representative BOLAND were Mayor Charles V. Ryan, Rev. Edmund B. Walsh of St. Patrick's Church, Chicopee Falls, and HCTA President Joseph P. Quinlan of Chicopee.

Prior to Senator KENNEDY's speech, the association held a business meeting in which five resolutions were adopted on voice vote without discussion or debate.

NO NEW NOMINATIONS

Officers for the coming year were elected to their posts in the same fashion with no new nominations coming from the floor.

The meatiest resolution passed proposed that school systems in Hampden County strive for a minimum of 50 teachers for every 1,000 students, a limit to the "noninstructional tasks required of a teacher," and a minimum of 25-to-1 pupil-teacher ratio in elementary schools.

Other resolves urged increased unity in the teaching profession, expressed continued support for raising certification standards, called on school departments to establish uniform, well-defined personnel policies, and recommended increased efforts to promote public understanding of education.

New officers-elect are Millicent G. Green of Wilbraham, president; John J. Sullivan of this city, first vice president; Ralph L. Shindler of Longmeadow, second vice president; Elizabeth A. Sullivan of West Springfield, secretary; and Charles B. Thompson, treasurer. Mr. Thompson is the only one who has not been an officer for the past year.

In the business session, Albert M. Johnson, Massachusetts director of the National Education Association, reminded the teachers that the goal for next year was to have NEA's

membership total 1 million. Current membership is 859,000.

PAST YEAR GROWTH

Dr. Theodore Toporowski, second vice president of the Massachusetts Teachers Association, said that MTA grew by 3,000 members in the past year to 31,000.

Alton S. Cavicchi, president of the Massachusetts Association of School Committees, said the help of teachers was needed to stem the tide of dropouts.

Kefauver: The Irreplaceable Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the death of Senator Estes Kefauver is recognized by millions of American citizens as a great loss to the average citizen and the less fortunate among us.

But there is also the realization that in the passing of the popular Senator from Tennessee, the Nation has lost one of the great men of our time and the whole free world has lost one of its most dedicated, able, and courageous leaders.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a deserving tribute to the late Senator from Tennessee written by Elmo Roper in the October issue of Freedom and Union:

KEFAUVER: THE IRREPLACEABLE MAN

Most of us have been reared to believe that there is no such thing as the indispensable man—and yet somehow words approximating those must be found to describe Senator Estes Kefauver. Certainly the phrase which all those who labored for Atlantic Union can agree to is that he was the irreplaceable man.

In writing about Estes Kefauver, it's hard to know where to begin. Perhaps one should begin with his courage. He never hesitated to take an unpopular position when he believed it was the right one. He was the first man in the Congress of the United States to take a public stand for Atlantic Union—at a time when such a view made him solitary indeed. Born in the Old South, he was uncompromisingly devoted to equal rights for Negroes. However much one might have disagreed with any of his views, I doubt if anyone can be found who would deny that most of his positions required courage of the highest order.

But one might as easily begin with his loyalty, his steadfastness. Over the years he never wavered in his support of Atlantic union, publicly or privately. Called a "nigger-loving one-worlder," in the middle of a hot political campaign, he took the epithet calmly in stride and retreated not an inch from his convictions. Everything he ever told me he would do, during the long battle for congressional acceptance of the idea of an Atlantic Citizens Convention, he did. In a profession of easy promises, he kept every one.

Yet a very good case could be made that the first thing one should mention in connection with Senator Kefauver was his vision. Many years ago he realized that rivers, mountains, and oceans, color of the skin, and religion were unnatural boundaries for governments. To let any of them assume the unnatural importance they have come to have in this 20th century was to invite—at worst—continued wars and—at best—continued costly rivalries. In a world shrunken by fast transportation and faster communications and where men know how to destroy centuries of civilization in minutes, some stronger cement was needed to bind men together. To Estes Kefauver that more binding cement was a belief in the dignity of every human being. On that foundation, he would have built a broader, more enduring government that this planet has ever seen.

Perhaps the underlying source of Estes Kefauver's strength was his ability to stand alone. During his time in the Senate, he never did anything out of a desire to become a "member of the club" nor did he tailor his views to assure reelection to that exclusive body. He was guided solely by the inner force of his own reasoning powers—which were formidable, coonskin cap to the contrary. No outer force had the power to alter his convictions—or his actions. I suppose what I am describing is, very simply, a man of complete integrity.

Yet there was nothing out of character in Estes Kefauver's walking up the streets of little towns all over America and greeting people with, "I am Estes Kefauver; I am running for the Presidency and I would like to have your support." He was in tune with the aspirations of all mankind—even though he was one of mankind's most exceptional products.

And for many of us, grief over the death of a great man is compounded by the fact that he was to our cause the irreplaceable man.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Chief Rabbi I. M. Davidson of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on the sudden passing of Chief Rabbi I. M. Davidson, which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader on Tuesday, October 22, 1963.

The editorial follows:

HE DIED AS HE LIVED: CHIEF RABBI I. M. DAVIDSON

Chief Rabbi Isadore M. Davidson's passing today on his way to Ahavas Achim Holche Yosher Synagogue on the Heights for morning worship came as he unquestionably would have wished it—in line of duty. Collapsing on the street a block from his home shortly before 7 a.m. while en route to the house of worship to commune with the God of his fathers, he died as he lived, an inspiring example of stanch Orthodox Judaism.

The entire community joins with their Jewish neighbors in mourning his unexpected departure from this earth. For more than four decades, he was as much a part of the local scene as Public Square. Not only was he an outstanding figure in his field of endeavor, but by virtue of his vocation, his extracurricular activities and his erudition, he qualified for a place among the city's leading citizens.

A native of Russia, who came to America with his parents when he was 18 months old, Chief Rabbi Davidson was reared in New York and was graduated from Columbia University and the Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University, but he fitted into the life of this community like a native son.

His entire career, except for a call to Youngstown, Ohio, after his graduation, was devoted to his adopted city, where he succeeded his late father-in-law, Rabbi David Ginsburgh, in 1921. He never grew old, ignoring the passage of time. And he was even younger mentally than physically, as his alertness and interests attested. To the end, he was the dedicated spiritual leader, the inveterate scholar, the good neighbor, living in today's world and looking forward to tomorrow.

Rabbi Davidson was tireless. Just as he was up at dawn on the last day of his life and about his Father's business, he never wasted a minute of his busy life. When he wasn't officiating at a service, making a sick call or rushing on foot to keep an appointment, he was buried in his books, arranging to attend a meeting or gathering or planning a trip to Israel which he loved. He summed up his philosophy in these words at a testimonial dinner in 1949:

"No man lives at all unless he lives for something worth while; no man lives worthily unless he lives for something great. The profession or calling of a rabbi particularly, to be beneficent and blessed, must have a high and consecrated goal and objective—to bring out the noblest and best in all facts of Jewish life in the individual, Jew and Jewess, as well as collectively and communally.

"The rabbi cannot afford to be petty and pusillanimous; he cannot even afford the luxury of smug complacency or mediocrity. Vision must be his, to see things as they should be, not as they are; knowledge must be his, to instruct and guide intelligently; dogged determination must be his, not to be sidetracked and swayed from his high goal and objective by antagonisms and tensions."

Many honors came to him as well as recognition on the basis of his personal achievements, but he took all in stride, as he did life itself. It was typical of this man of God who preferred to let his talents and accomplishments speak for themselves.

This newspaper, as well as Orthodox Judaism and the community at large, is deeply indebted to him. He was one of our editorial consultants and only last Sunday the editor conferred with him. In this connection, we recall a guest editorial he wrote on Washington and Lincoln in connection with their birthday anniversaries. He concluded the editorial with these words:

"Men of destiny cannot fail in their ordained task and appointed work."

Chief Rabbi I. M. Davidson, in our considered opinion, was a man of destiny in his own realm, so what he said about the Father of our Country and the Great Emancipator also applied to him.

On Again Off Again Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President called off our U-2 flights over Cuba and when this fact was made public, the military denied they had been called off. According to Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the Durham Morning Herald of October 22, they are now being flown under restricted control. They should be flown constantly. The American people do not trust the Communists even though the President does.

CIA RESUMES FLIGHTS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The covert "air arm" of the supersecret Central Intelligence Agency is again flying high, wide, and out of the range of Soviet ground-to-air missiles—over Cuba.

Undisputed command of all U.S. air surveillance of Cuba and along the borders of the Soviet Union has been turned over to CIA Director John McCone by the White House.

No hint of this significant development has been given the public or Congress by officials of the Kennedy administration despite its jolting implications on U.S. security.

The vital Cuban surveillance mission, shared with the Air Force and Navy since last October's missile crisis, is now being exclusively carried out by the CIA's "second-rate air force," as it is labeled by top Air Force generals.

This phantom CIA force, which is far from adequate to do the job, includes less than two dozen high-flying U-2 reconnaissance planes and about 12 "flying platforms," specially equipped long-range surveillance planes.

At present, CIA pilots are limited to less than a dozen high-level U-2 reconnaissance flights a month, with none passing directly over Cuba. Instead, the U-2's follow the Cuban coastline, staying over international waters and out of range of more than 600 SA-2 missiles that ring the island.

All low-level reconnaissance flights conducted over Cuba by Navy and Air Force pilots during the missile crisis were halted several months ago on direct orders from the White House, despite protests by the two services that the flights were necessary to check on Soviet missiles in Cuba.

HISTORY REPEATS

As before the Cuban missile crisis, all CIA air missions in the Caribbean area or near the Soviet Union must receive advance approval by President Kennedy. This air-tight control procedure was adopted to avoid CIA operations that might cause incidents between Castro and U.S. forces.

Despite vigorous denials by State and Defense Department officials, there have been periods as long as 2 weeks during which no reconnaissance flights were made in the vicinity of Cuba.

One of these self-imposed reconnaissance blackouts was put into effect during the nuclear test ban negotiations in Moscow. During a 2-week period late in July and early August, all flights were stopped by White House orders.

Hurricane Flora, the storm that hammered Cuba for 5 days this month, also grounded CIA planes more than a week. While Navy planes flying off the carrier *Lake Champlain* virtually mapped all of Haiti to obtain a complete picture of the storm damage on that island, they were banned from taking pictures of Cuba's extensive storm damage.

A YEAR LATER

Just 1 year ago, on Sunday, October 21, 1962, while the Nation went to church and watched professional football games, Navy and Air Force reconnaissance planes criss-crossed Cuba at treetop level, photographing Soviet missile base construction and jet bombers.

On that fateful Sunday, the CIA circulated an intelligence estimate that between 5,000 and 6,000 Soviet troops were on the island, despite warnings from Cuban refugees that there were "more than 20,000"—a warning that proved to be deadly accurate.

Once again there is alarming evidence that the CIA is underestimating Soviet troop strength in Cuba. Its latest estimate hails Russia's removal of her combat units—some 5,000 troops.

This CIA report is flatly challenged by the same Cuban refugees. These reliable sources have turned over information to the CIA warning that Soviet combat units are still on the island with their modern equipment stored in caves.

While just a year ago the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, N.C., was on alert for a parachute leap over Cuba, this week in Cuba nearly 10,000 Chinese paratroopers are

training in secret for action in the Caribbean or Latin America.

Basic ammunition had been issued to 82d jumpers on October 21, 1962, and throughout the day vehicles, artillery pieces, and other gear were rigged for a heavy drop. This week in Cuba the Chinese paratroopers began receiving their basic ammunition and first communication equipment.

Tension mounted at Fort Bragg a year ago. No man knew whether war would erupt. Today, no U.S. official knows how many Soviet or Chinese troops are in Cuba or why they are there. Yet there is no tension in Washington because officials of the Kennedy administration refuse to face up to these new developments, while keeping Congress completely in the dark.

Florida Sheriffs Boys Ranch Is Bold Humanitarian Venture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the Congress today to one of the boldest and imaginative programs in this Nation today, the program of the Florida Sheriffs Association and the dedicated sheriffs of Florida to bring a new meaning to law enforcement, bold and imaginative programs which these men have given and are giving countless hours to see become realities.

And these programs are paying off in the most precious of treasures, the lives of young men.

In so doing, I want to pay tribute to all of those in the law enforcement field of this Nation. Theirs is a tireless and often thankless job. The men who patrol the beats, the men who patrol the highways, the sheriffs and their staffs in the counties, and all of the others who protect the life and property of the citizens of the United States, all are due our commendation.

Recently, we in the Congress have been alerted anew to the almost fantastic incidence of crime in these United States. The testimony of Joseph Valachi before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee points to an organized syndicate that reaches into the heart of American society, controlled by unscrupulous men who delve in human misery and degradation.

We are appalled at the growth of the crime rate in this Nation, which it is estimated will cost $22 billion this year alone. Think of it, it is estimated that crime will cost every individual in these United States $128 this year. It is staggering.

Federal Bureau of Investigation's Director J. Edgar Hoover has estimated that in the period from 1957 to 1961, crime grew at a rate five times that of the population. In the decade from 1950 to 1960 there was a 98-percent increase in the incidence of crime in these United States.

Take the growth during the past 3 years, when from 1959 to 1960 crime increased 14 percent in this Nation, increased another 3 percent in 1960–61, and another 6 percent in 1961–62.

This is fantastic in a land such as ours, the richest in the history of man.

The sheriffs of Florida knew full well these facts when they conceived the Florida Sheriffs Boys Ranch. The sheriffs of Florida have not been content to stand idly by in light of these facts. In addition to the tremendous job they do for the people of Florida in tracking down and bringing to justice law violators of every conceivable decription, often at the loss of their lives and those of their deputies, but they have done much more.

They knew from their work of the thousands of homeless and neglected boys in Florida who needed a good home to keep them from drifting into lives of crime or aimless futility. They saw this need and with $5,000 and a lot of prayer, they founded the Florida Sheriffs Boys Ranch in 1957.

It was a tremendous challenge to the 67 sheriffs of Florida working through their organization—the Florida Sheriffs Association. But seldom have so few hand such vision and determination.

They began with the gift of 140 acres on the banks of the famed Suwannee River in Suwannee County, Fla., 11 miles north of Live Oak, with this fine area being in the district I have the honor to represent.

Additional land was purchased immediately by the sheriffs to bring to 737 acres the land upon the banks of this fabled stream for their dream of a home for homeless boys.

Funds came pouring in as the sheriffs told the people of Florida of their dream. Annual honorary memberships in the Florida Sheriffs Association were sought at $10 a year, and this brought the people of the State into close contact with the project. Literally thousands opened up their hearts to send in donations.

It is interesting to note, I think, that no Federal funds were sought, nor needed, as the Florida sheriffs were determined to do this job with the assistance of generous kindhearted citizens.

The first cabin, to house 20 boys, began in 1958, and in February of 1959 the first two boys came to the Florida Sheriffs Boys Ranch to make their home. An era was beginning, a dream was becoming a reality.

Today, at the end of nearly 5 years of operation, the boys making their home at Boys Ranch numbers up to 60, with the investment in the ranch estimated at over half a million dollars. It has grown steadily, but the waiting list of boys seeking admission grows too. The sheriffs of Florida are following their dream, expanding facilities as rapidly as possible, to build a ranch that will eventually house 400 boys.

As soon as funds became available, a second cottage was erected, again to house 20 boys, and then a third cottage was erected which serves temporarily as a cafeteria and library. When a permanent cafeteria is erected, it will be converted into a dwelling.

The largest single donation and a giant step in the expansion of facilities was taken last year when the Annie Barron Pentland Memorial Cottage was dedicated. This $50,000 structure was give by Col. Robert Pentland, Jr., Miami accountant and dedicated public spirited citizen, in memory of his mother.

A large gift of $28,441 was made by Mrs. Agnes A. Torrey, a Polish immigrant who lived in Monticello, and who died childless in 1960. It was applied to urgently needed expansion of the water system which is to serve as a memorial to Mrs. Torrey and her husband. A bequest of $7,000 from the estate of the late Max Weintraub, onetime Miami Beach businessman, was applied to the new Dairy Science Building, which will be a memorial to Mr. Weintraub.

The people of Hillsborough County, under the leadership of Sheriff Ed Blackburn, raised funds to build a huge vocational arts building. The people of Pinellas County were prime movers and contributors, under the leadership of Sheriff Don Genung, to build the fine Olympic style swimming pool which is enjoyed so much by the boys.

The big goal this year is a $75,000 cafetorium which will be the largest single capital outlay project in the history of the ranch. It will give the boys a permanent dining hall and allow the present temporary dining room to be converted into a residence cottage and immediately jump the capacity of the Ranch from 60 to 80 boys.

At mealtimes the building will be used as a cafeteria, but at other times will be used as an auditorium and meeting place. And a second goal for the near future is a nondenominational chapel to serve the spiritual needs of the boys. For many years, generous donors have been making contributions to a memorial fund in memory of deceased relatives and friends to build this chapel.

The Florida Sheriffs Boys Ranch is planned along lines similar to Father Flanagan's famed Boys Town. It is not a reform school or correctional institution. Instead it provides a wholesome, homelike environment for boys, who through neglect or lack of opportunity, need security, love and discipline so they can develop into good citizens.

Boys who come to the ranch to live must have been recommended by the sheriff of the county in which they live, must be between the ages of 8 and 12½ and must meet certain mental and physical requirements.

In each of the residence cottages, a married couple termed "cottage parents" reside, to give the boys a homelike atmosphere. Their daily routine is a careful balance of work, study and healthful recreation.

They attend Live Oak public schools and local churches so that they can enjoy a normal life. The basic purpose of the ranch is to give a boy a good home and future.

A diversified farming program is carried out, with the boys performing chores around the ranch which enjoys fine herds of beef and dairy cattle and a full farming program under the direction of the farm manager. A trained and competent staff ministers to the

needs of these boys under the capable direction of Harry Weaver, manager of the ranch, who was formerly a Federal parole officer.

As one who has visited the ranch, I find that it is the tenor of the place that affects you. It is a happy place. The boys are healthy and happy, they are secure, and they are finding for themselves a place in life.

They have found someone to love them and they are making a fine record in school and community youth activities. Last year, there were 67 sheriffs who symbolically walked across the stage when the first of the ranch residents graduated from high school. It was a proud day.

A scholarship program has been setup to send the boys to college or to vocational schools after their days at the ranch, and several are participating in this program at present.

And all this began as a dream, and it became a reality through the sweat and work of the sheriffs of Florida.

As you enter Boys Ranch through a huge wooden entrance, you are immediately struck by the beauty of the white board fence along the highway, backed by lush pasture and grazing cattle.

It is quiet and serene at the ranch site, broken by the normal noise of healthy and happy youngsters.

Many have been the men who have given of their time and efforts to Boys Ranch, and all of the sheriffs of Florida are to be commended.

I particularly want to mention the late Hugh Lewis, whose untimely death this year while serving as Suwannee County sheriff, was a great loss to the law enforcement profession and to the Florida Sheriffs Boys Ranch. Serving as sheriff of Suwannee County at the time of the inception of the ranch, he worked tirelessly for the success of this ranch which was so much a part of his life.

Monroe County Sheriff John M. Spottswood was president of the Florida Sheriffs Association at the inception of the idea for the ranch and he was succeeded by Sid M. Saunders of Pinellas County, who passed away in his term of office, to be succeeded by Pasco County Sheriff Leslie Bessenger.

The first cottage completed by the ranch was dedicated in memory of Sheriff Saunders.

Each of the presidents of the association since that time have given tirelessly of their time and efforts to continue this program. Following Bessenger, came Sarasota County Sheriff Ross Boyer, then Lee County Sheriff Flanders G. Thompson, followed by Levy County Sheriff James W. Turner and then Sheriff S. D. "Dave" Starr of Orange County.

Washington County Sheriff George Watts is the current president, and each of these men have made significant contributions.

Boys Ranch is sponsored by the Florida Sheriffs Association and administered and operated by a board of trustees made up of both sheriffs and private citizens with my friend and colleague, Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS, U.S. Senator from Florida, serving as a member of the board.

This board and its chairman have been truly dedicated men, serving without compensation and continually working and planning to make this dream of theirs come true.

Sheriff Spottswood was the first chairman and was succeeded by dynamic Hillsborough County Sheriff Ed Blackburn, Jr., who was tireless in his efforts to get the ranch program off the ground and was succeeded by Pinellas Sheriff Don Genung, who continued the dynamic concepts outlined at the beginning. Today Baker County Sheriff Ed Yarbrough continues this fine record of service as chairman.

Other States have become interested in this program and are planning or have built boys ranches patterned on the experiences and outline of the Florida sheriffs. We hope and pray that their dream may become a reality also, for we are dealing with a precious commodity, lives of young boys who can and will make significant contributions in the future, if given the proper direction today.

I want to point out two other significant programs of the Florida Sheriffs Association. One is their scholarship program which gives college education scholarships to outstanding students from the State reform school at Marianna. This program has not been as well publicized as some of the other programs, but it gets results. Today the sheriffs of Florida are looking forward to one of their proteges receiving his bachelor's degree at Florida State University next February. Other young men have completed junior college under this program.

Another bold aproach to the problem of juvenile delinquency is the junior deputies league. Most successful of these programs has been that of Pinellas Sheriff Don Genung who pointed out this year in a letter to parents of youngsters in the program that the FBI had noted that youths under the age of 18 accounted for 15 percent of the arrests made by law enforcement officers nationwide, with an increase of 4 percent over the previous year. These figures included traffic violations, investigations, and warnings by officers.

In an effort to reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crimes, his department instituted the Pinellas County Junior Deputies League in 1959 and has continued since that time with great success. Nearly 12,000 youngsters were enrolled last year, boys and girls.

Basic objective of the program is to build respect for law enforcement and teach good citizenship.

Sheriff Genung pointed out that tours of the county jail, courthouse, and the sheriff's office show the youngsters the workings of these offices. Instruction and talks by deputies, judges, FBI agents, and other peace officers teach the importance of leading a crime-free life, and impress the importance of not yielding to any temptation or "going along" with the wrong crowd.

Sheriff Genung has said that he believes this program has greatly decreased Pinellas County juvenile delinquency, for while the school age population of 10 to 17 increased by 61 percent, the delinquency rate dropped by 14 percent.

This fine program stimulates the interest of youth in the necessity for efficient and honest administration of the duties of law enforcement agencies with a view to enlisting youth in cooperating with and preventing youth wrongs and crimes.

This outstanding program has been successful because of the dedication and work of Sheriff Genung and his fine staff of dedicated peace officers.

Other sheriffs over Florida are meeting with similar success as they bring in this new concept to teach law and order respect among youngsters into their communities. This program cannot be too highly commended and merits my highest praise. I would urge other sheriffs across the Nation to investigate this program, and to emulate it.

This, in brief, is the story I wanted to bring to the attention of the Congress, and through them, to the American people.

These are bold and imaginative programs and concepts. They tell a story of men who are truly dedicated—the sheriffs of Florida—who are doing something about the increasing crime rate, who are interested not in arrests, but in preventing youngsters from entering into lives which would necessitate their arrest.

Who knows what value this will have to our great State? To our Nation? How much is one life spared worth?

Perhaps even Joseph Valachi might have been different had he had these advantages. Perhaps countless lives would have been saved if we could have met the source of crime at the door and obliterated it.

I think that the Florida sheriffs are due the commendation of all Americans, they are truly dedicated. And their story is not at an end. To those sheriffs who have contributed so much in the past, to those serving today so ably, and to those who will come to carry the load ably in the future, I extend for all of the people of Florida, a deep and sincere note of gratitude.

Press-Telegram, Washington Bureau Report on Euphoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 18 the Long Beach Press-Telegram, Washington bureau, dealt with "euphoria," as follows:

WORLD POLITICAL REACTION TO TEST BAN OUTRUNNING REALISM

WASHINGTON.—As had been feared, political reaction around the world to the nuclear test ban treaty is outrunning realism. It is being treated as promising more than it actually does.

An official sitting near the center of the American diplomatic network referred to the consequences of the treaty as "cosmic dust," fine particles carried over the whole world by the political winds, settling everywhere, almost invisible itself, but affecting everything it touches.

It is far from certain that this is a good result. Even if bad effects cannot be proven, the possibilities are worth examining if only to keep perspective on a major step in U.S. policy.

The trouble is that the test ban treaty is being regarded almost everywhere as having accomplished a "detente," a word now fashionable, meaning a slackening of the web of tensions between East and West, and particularly between the United States and the Soviet Union, otherwise known as the cold war.

This tends to weaken the bonds which hold the North Atlantic Treaty Organization together. It encourages NATO members in Europe to dillydally even more on their already lackadaisical performance in building up their nonnuclear forces. It tends to make Communist parties in democratic countries seem more respectable.

All of these effects are already visible. Once in motion, they can carry a good bit further.

It is interesting that President de Gaulle, who for reasons of national independence and grandeur declined to sign the test ban treaty, perceived at the same time the adverse consequences to Western collective strength the test ban treaty might produce.

Whatever one may think of General de Gaulle's stubborn resolve to restore the glory of France, there is one element of his policy which the United States must heartily endorse. That is his determination to make Germany so firmly a part of Europe that it will forever abandon the thought of choosing the Soviet Union as an alternative partner.

It is De Gaulle's belief, as it is understood here, that signing relatively easy and even relatively meaningless agreements with the Soviet Union, like the test ban treaty and a pledge against orbiting weapons of mass destruction in space, holds political and psychological dangers for the West outweighing the pleasures of greater amiability on the fringes of East-West relations.

These polite and genteel minuets between two power groups which are still essentially adversaries could, according to this analysis, lead step by step to a pattern of agreements capable of persuading German opinion that the interests of the Federal Republic have been abandoned by her postwar partners.

At the same time, the concurrent rehabilitation of the Soviet reputation in the West could serve as an encouragement to German industrialists and businessmen to expand their traffic with the U.S.S.R. without limit.

Then there would have been created conditions permitting the one thing the West wishes least to see, a teaming up between Germany and the Soviet Union.

That is perhaps a long way off. But reasonable men here are convinced it is a possibility if too much is read too soon into the current thaw.

Sale of Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the National Review of October 15, 1963:

Granted one initial premise, it all follows logically enough. When the Canadians get x million selling them their wheat, and when the Australians get y million selling theirs, why shouldn't we Americans get in on the deal? If we don't supply it, they'll get their wheat anyway from the other producers, won't they? And we've got our mountainous surplus and our shaky dollar to add special motives to the normal—isn't it normal?—wish of a man to find a market for his products. When Britain sends them chemical plants and Italy sends them steel pipe and West Germany sends them locomotives, what sense does it make for us to be so "Nice-Nellie"?

Yes, it's all logical enough if we're sure, quite sure, of just one point: that Khrushchev isn't serious when he says he is going to bury us; that a free society is not threatened by a totalitarian society, based on a state-owned industry and a state monopoly of foreign trade, and committed to world revolution.

If we are wrong on that point, we are very wrong indeed. Because then this wheat that we and our friends are sending them, the machines and chemicals, tools and ships that will follow soon enough now that the door is opening—that started flowing from our friends some while ago—cannot have any other effect than to strengthen the hand of an enemy that he may the more surely slay us. What is the meaning of the current Soviet wheat shortage that their Government is so frantically striving to fill? (We may be sure, in passing, that the shortage does not extend to the vast war reserves that the Communists have always assigned an absolute priority over stomachs.) This shortage is the expression of the silent but persistent and wonderfully effective resistance of the peasants to communism. It amounts to a general strike of the peasantry, perhaps the major obstacle on the Communists' road to the completion of the revolution. They are held back from conquering the world because they cannot conquer the farmers and peasants in the regions they have already seized. We now arrive as the strikebreakers, enabling the regime to breathe more freely, to redirect into the arms-supporting industries the energies drained—as Khrushchev quite frankly admits—by "the peasant problem."

Khrushchev isn't going to have much trouble burying us if we are determined to prove Marx right when he predicted that, from the nature of capitalism and the profit motive, we will inevitably dig our own graves.

The Law Be Damned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much troubled that Executive action by the President approving the sale of surplus wheat to Communist countries is in violation of the laws enacted by Congress. It seems to me that where such a policy involves a direct relationship to many important Federal laws that it should be done, if at all, only after consultation with and approval by the U.S. Congress.

By way of illustration of the type of legislation involved, I invite attention to an excellent editorial entitled "The Law Be Damned" from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of October 14, 1963.

This editorial is as follows:

THE LAW BE DAMNED

President Kennedy's approval of the sale of $250 million worth of surplus wheat to the Soviet Union and its satellites tripled—in a single stroke—America's trade with the entire Communist bloc. Those who object to the move—on the grounds that it amounts to an outright subsidy of Russia, since American taxpayers paid for the wheat at prices above what the Soviets will pay, and on other grounds—have raised the protest that there ought to be a law against such dealings.

That's missing the point. Not only was the wheat deal made without congressional approval, but it flies in the face of a whole series of laws passed by Congress which expressly condemn or prohibit American trade with the Soviet bloc.

In 1934, the Johnson Act—barring credit to countries which are in default of their obligations to the United States—was passed by Congress. The wheat deal and previous trade arrangements with the Communists and other nations clearly have violated this act.

The Export Control Act of 1949 placed several important controls on exports, prohibiting trade which would not serve our foreign policy objectives or national security. In 1962 this act was amended to deny export licenses for items contributing not only to the military, but also to the economic potential of the Soviet bloc. In many instances this law has been ignored, including the current wheat deal.

In 1951, Congress passed the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act—better known as the Battle Act. This law embargoed shipment of war materials and strategic goods to Soviet bloc nations. It also forbade all U.S. military or economic aid to nations which do not cooperate with the embargo.

This law has never been invoked. We continue to aid many nations which supply the Communists with war materials and strategic goods.

A decade later, in 1961, Congress passed Public Law 87-128 which prohibited the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union or other countries dominated by the U.S.S.R.

This was passed as a direct rebuff to President Kennedy who, early in his administration, had reversed a longstanding administrative policy against the sale of these products to the Reds. The wheat deal is a clear and obvious violation of this act of Congress.

Imports from the Soviet Union also have been the subject of legislative controls. In 1951 Congress denied most-favored-nation treatment to Communist nations. In 1962 Congress specifically directed the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from both Poland and Yugoslavia. For more than a year President Kennedy has ignored this order, and he has made no secret of his attempts to reverse this legislation.

The President—in the current wheat deal and other trade arrangements with the Communist bloc—has ignored, violated and reversed a string of prohibitions against East-West trade enacted by the elected representatives of the American people.

This consistent opposition to East-West trade by Congress reflects a realistic view of the world situation. Nobody would object to the wheat deal—or other similar trade arrangements—if we were not in a cold war with the Communists.

Those who have studied history know that the refusal of free countries to stop trade with Hitler or to join the embargo against trade with Mussolini helped the Fascist powers arm against the free world in the thirties. Napoleon's remark that armies travel on their stomachs should be reason enough to oppose any move which would put American wheat in Russian breadbaskets.

Fleet Reserve Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech by Samuel Rose, Chief of the central office Contact Division of the Veterans' Administration, before the national convention of the Fleet Reserve Association on Tuesday, September 17, 1963, in Phoenix, Ariz., at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY SAMUEL ROSE BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION

It gives me much pleasure to meet with you today on the occasion of your 36th national convention. It is again a distinct privilege to address such a distinguished group of dedicated Americans as the Fleet Reserve Association—composed of career enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps. Your group proudly wears a badge of courage and honor that you so richly deserve by your exploits in combat in time of war and by your contributions in time of peace.

I want to tell you about a veterans service representative that I know. He had a tough district to work in—the Tennessee mountain country. He had important news for a veteran who lived far back in those hills. He arrived at the mountain shack where this veteran resided and found only a young boy at home. "Son," he said, "Where's your pappy?" "He's up to the still," said the lad. "Well then, where's your mammy?" "She's up to the still too." So the resourceful representative said, "I'll give you a dollar if you will take me to them." The boy gazed at him suspiciously figuring that he was a "revenoo agent" and said, "OK, gimme the dollar." "I'll give it to you after we get back," my friend said. "No," said the boy, "give it to me now because you ain't a coming back."

The story has a good ending. My friend did come back and I hope that I too will be coming back to more of your national conventions.

At the outset, I would like to acknowledge with thanks the fine relationship that the VA has enjoyed with your executive staff in Washington, especially Shipmates Scanlan, Glezen, and Nolan. They reflect credit to your organization.

In front of the VA building at central office these is a quotation from Abraham Lincoln which reads, "To care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan." Abe Lincoln said this in the midst of a Civil War that tore this Nation asunder. What President Lincoln said was not just for his time; it was for all time.

Who would dispute the proposition that the United States of America has a solemn obligation to veterans who served in the Armed Forces of this country and to their widows and their orphans? Each generation of Americans has reaffirmed this credo. You gave much. America's gratitude surpasses words.

There are many things I would like to discuss with you, but for the purpose of this meeting, I should like to deal primarily with certain phases of the VA.

"The VA is giving better care to more sick and disabled veterans than at any time in its history," Administrator Gleason said very emphatically in a recent address. He also said: "We expect to improve on this already superlative record in the future."

For the first time in the history of the Veterans' Administration, funds for inpatient and outpatient care have exceeded $1 billion. Now more than 7,000 projects in VA's research program will be further strengthened. From any one of these projects may come a new cure, a new method, a new drug, that will add years to your lives and mine, and perhaps mean the difference between life and death for someone right in this room.

The VA is now paying annually about $3 billion in compensation and pension payments to more than 3 million disabled veterans.

In addition, dependents of more than 1 million deceased veterans are receiving compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, or pension in the amount of almost $1 billion a year.

Figures are important. However, the individuals we serve at VA are most important. Veterans and dependents, each and every one, justify our existence—not mere numbers.

I will not burden you with too many details. These facts you all should know. The VA is the third largest Government agency in total number of employees; it has larger expenditures—more than $5 billion annually—than all of the Cabinet Departments but three; it conducts the third largest life insurance company in the United States; it operates the largest medical program in the Nation with 169 hospitals, nearly 100 outpatient clinics and a nationwide program of hometown medical care; the VA hospitals and clinics are conducting more than 7,000 research projects in geriatrics, mental disorders, heart and blood vessel conditions, cancer and virtually every disease of man; and it administers a loan program responsible for building approximately 1 our of every 5 homes in America since the end of World War II.

The VA is the largest employer in Government of handicapped persons. With only 7 percent of the total Federal civilian employment, VA last fiscal year added to its rolls approximately 15 percent of the handicapped persons hired by Federal agencies.

Out of every dollar spent by the VA, only 3 cents is used for administrative expenses; I mean the actual costs of carrying on our business of serving veterans and their dependents. The President cited the VA in his budget message—as an example of good management—pointing out this specific instance: A dozen years ago, VA had 17,000 employees handling its insurance program. Now about 3,000 employees are maintaining 6 million insurance policies. VA strives for efficiency and economy in its operations without, of course, impairing service in any way.

You and I know full well the responsible ways in which the veterans have used their benefits to help themselves and to help America. They have made us richer and stronger at a time when we needed that wealth and power.

America is founded on the precept of Government of the people, by the people and for the people. You know the cost of war. You know the need for peace. America wants peace—its wants a just and honorable peace with full regard for the rights, liberties, and dignity of mankind everywhere.

Let me end by saying that when the history of our century is written, your deeds in war and peace will shine forth. Nothing can detract from your glory. I am certain that nothing ever will because it was won by deeds and not words.

Thank you for having me aboard.

Cheap Presidential Peep Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are now finding out that President Kennedy and his brother will do anything which they think will get votes. An example of cheap sensationalism was shown Monday night apparently, on a television show called "Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment." Even the New Frontier newspaper, the New York Times, in an article by it reviewer, Jack Gould, and editorially, blast this type of hucksterism in its issue of October 22:

TV: TOO MANY CAMERAS FOR KENNEDYS—SEGREGATION REPORT TERMED "PEEPSHOW"

(By Jack Gould)

The White House decision to permit candid cameras in the offices of President Kennedy and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy during last June's segregation crisis proved to be as thoroughly ill advised as many had anticipated.

The ensuing documentary, entitled "Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment," was belatedly presented Monday night by the American Broadcasting Co.

The cause of curiosity was served but not history or information. And the price paid was the appearance of the private deliberations of the executive branch of Government being turned into a melodramatic peepshow, with homespun family touches to lighten the tension between Federal officials and Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama.

Robert Drew, producer of the program, achieved a formidable coup: his presentation surely will stand as a prime example of governmental surrender to the ceaseless and often thoughtless demands of the entertainment world.

Last June, cameras were positioned by Mr. Drew in the Office of the President, in the office and home of Attorney General Kennedy, in the home and office of Governor Wallace, in the headquarters of the Federal officials in Tuscaloosa, and at the site of the confrontation on the steps of the University of Alabama.

The candid closeups of the President showed him looking more haggard and worn than he has ever appeared on TV. For the most part he was heard speaking only in disjointed sentences. The majority of his remarks were paraphrased by agreement with the White House. And so were the remarks of many other officials.

So what was left was not the raw substance of decisionmaking but scenes of the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach executing plans that obivously were discussed at great length far from the screen.

Which made the visual aspect of the program just that much more disturbing to watch. A viewer could not forget that Federal officials and Governor Wallace knew that the cameras were there, and under such circumstances the hour seemed an incredible bit of play acting. The preoccupation with strategy in outfoxing the Governor inevitably pushed all the deeper issues to the background.

Moreover, just before the decisive showdown with the Governor, the Attorney General was seen with his charming daughter Kerry, who had a chat with Mr. Katzenbach

in Tuscaloosa. Was a moment that to the outside world at least seemed fairly tense propitious for presenting one's youngster before the TV cameras?

The staged quality of the hour was particularly exemplified in a sequence involving Mr. Katzenbach in Alabama. With a firm display of Federal sternness, he and an aid ordered reporters and other persons away from his radio-equipped car; he must talk in private to the Attorney General—so viewers of last night's managed news film could clearly hear his words, it turned out.

If Mr. Drew promised Federal officials that he could operate discreetly without intruding on the content of the events, then he little knows the human reaction to the presence of cameras. Time after time a viewer could see for himself that the participants were conscious of the lens, which automatically raised the question of what was being done solely for the benefit of the cameras. In a moment of governmental crisis, just such a concern should not be present in the first place.

GOVERNMENT ON CAMERA

Strong editorial criticism was voiced on this page some months ago when we learned that a TV "documentary" film had been made in the Offices of the President and the Attorney General—with their approval, of course—while they were engaged in the actual decisionmaking meetings on how to handle Negro registration at the University of Alabama. We objected on the grounds that the White House was not a public place for the sake of TV "images," that propagandistic connotations were unavoidable, and that the entire subject was too serious for eavesdropping on Executive decisions.

Having at last found a sponsor, the program, called "Crisis: Behind a Presidential Commitment," was put on the air Monday night by the American Broadcasting System. Our worst fears were confirmed by the critics. With cameras and tape recorders turning, it had obviously been impossible for Government officials to ignore the fact that they were "on stage."

As those on both sides of the TV screen now know, the result was neither a true "actuality" program nor a proper way for the Kennedy administration to enlist sympathy for its own civil rights position. The point made here last summer is more valid than ever: it is improper to make a stage show of the inside processes of Government.

Some Thoughts on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year a group of executives from my district and neighboring Kings County, Calif., had lunch with me and some of my colleagues here in the House restaurant prior to their leaving for a tour of the U.S.S.R.

Several days ago I received a letter from one of the members of this group, Mr. Waldo W. Weeth, president of Weeth Ranches, Inc., a large farming operation in Coalinga, Calif. I believe his letter, which compares the two governmental systems and contains some good suggestions for promoting better relations and understanding between our country and the U.S.S.R., will be of interest to you and my colleagues and I, therefore, under unanimous consent, insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WEETH RANCHES, INC.,
Coalinga, Calif., October 14, 1963.

Hon. BERNIE F. SISK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SISK: You will recall the Kings County executive delegation to the U.S.S.R. had lunch with you gentlemen in April of this year in Washington, D.C. During and after such a trip every red-blooded American tries to lend a hand and some constructive thinking to bring about a more amiable relationship of his fellow man. We also are giving talks and travelogs of the trip to our countrymen to show the comparison of the two governmental systems.

POTENTIAL WHEAT SALE

Recently there has been considerable discussion about selling wheat behind the Iron Curtain. From our observations I feel that we should and we are pleased to hear the administration is planning on doing just that. Why? A majority of the Russian people outside of the party are friendly and also some of the party members up to a point. Also we found that some of the most elaborate cathedrals and parliament buildings of the czar period are being restored just as magnificently with goldleaf domes as during the days of the czars. These are now being converted to museums.

We would recommend the sale of wheat in return for gold bullion at world prices, on delivery, and hope it becomes habit forming in the Russian diet. We feel such sales (if any) should be applied to our national debt and the USDA and/or commodity credit of the wheat program be given due credit. Money spent for food will cramp their budget more on military expenditures.

We feel convinced the big majority of the people are friendly to the United States and we should try to maintain that friendship, and especially if the party will pay cash for their foodstuffs. However, I must hasten to say never turn your back on a rattlesnake, and after seeing their method of operating firsthand, repair and maintenance sticks out like a sore thumb, indicating the extreme weakness of their system of no private ownership. It is evident the left hand never knows what the right hand is doing in a given circle of authority of a party member. Coupled with this fact, we were told over 100 dialects are spoken in Russia. It helps to explain why there are so many border incidents of various types. Every party leader or commanding officer makes his own rules so long as he does not conflict with or embarrass his superior party officer. If he does the purge is on.

After seeing their kangaroo type officiating in action, I certainly concur with the thinking of our former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Be cordial, be damned firm, keep your powder dry, live ammo in the barrel with the hammer back and occasionally when some dodo gets completely off base don't be afraid to bust a few caps, then treat it as a trivial incident. It would make doing business between our top administration and the Soviet Union much more equitable. There is no honor among unethical atheists, so don't expect any, but they certainly know right from wrong.

INTOURIST GUIDES

We were told there were approximately 1,100 junior and senior intourist guides in Russia to serve as interpreters for tourist trade (practically all women). Russia is now becoming very anxious to cater to the lucrative tourist trade. To date Russia only has a minimum of accommodations for tourists and these are very low by our standards.

By our standards, we found their entire agricultural enterprise 30 or 40 years behind. Example: We visited one of their best dairies out of Moscow. The average annual milk flow per cow, we were told, was 8,140 pounds. As a comparison the good dairies here must be in the 12,500-pound class to stay in business.

Our recent Olympic team participants were unable to get milk to drink during the period they were in Russia. We had sour buttermilk served us twice for breakfast in place of a juice or fruit during our 2 weeks in Russia.

These Intourist guides travel more in Russia than all others and they are not only strong party believers, but they also continually spread (canned heat) stories of the capitalistic nations.

We spend millions on the Voice of America program and we cannot be sure how effective the contacts are being received. We are convinced for token money that a supplement program should be tried first on Russian intourist guides.

In order to sow some (throwback) seed, I would recommend that our Government, each year, make available first-class air transportation, hotel accommodations, bus, train, or taxi fares, meals and $300 or $400 spending money to 4 or 5 groups of senior intourist guides in groups of 50 or 60 people. This would have to be scheduled during their tourist off season. In case of married intourist guides, only one would be permitted on a trip in case both were intourist guides. Furthermore, we should make available one-way tickets to Communists here who can secure entrance requirements to any Communist nation.

If these people were given a tour through any of our supermarkets, dime stores, department stores, automotive assembly plants, fruit-packing sheds, modern cattle feeding yard, a top dairy farm, a visit to a modern housing area, etc., and then topped it off with a view of the Tournament of Roses Parade (nonmilitary) it would leave some mental wheels grinding in the U.S.S.R. It is said a photo is worth a thousand words and we will add, a good look is worth 10,000 photos.

We reap from what we sow, and as a farmer I can say when these people who are all well educated (by and for the party) returned to the fatherland they could not help but have some strong reservations about their system.

We suggested such a program to our senior intourist guide and at first she bubbled with real interest, then she stated that she did not know if the party would permit it. If not, why? Are they afraid to let their people see the outside? How can they ridicule and criticize us or our system if they have never been here.

Sincerely yours,

WALDO W. WEETH.

Dahomey's Foreign Minister Says African Nations May Turn Against United States on Racial Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, proponents of civil rights legislation have been stressing the point that unless we here in the United States resolve our

racial problems in the immediate future, we will lose the friendship of Asian and African nations, so necessary in our fight against communism. This contention has been strongly supported by a recent visitor to the United States, the Honorable Emile Zinsou, Foreign Minister of the West African nation of Dahomey. In an interview by Mr. George Eagle, of the Honolulu Advertiser, in Honolulu, Hawaii, Mr. Zinsou stated that there would be complete disaffection of his people toward the United States if the U.S. Government failed to provide protection for Negroes in racially troubled areas. Because what Mr. Zinsou had to say provides us with appropriate food for thought at a time when we are considering the President's proposed civil rights program I include Mr. Eagle's article in the RECORD at this point:

AFRICANS KEEPING TRACK OF U.S. RACIAL TROUBLES

(By George Eagle)

The Foreign Minister of the West African nation of Dahomey said yesterday he was "quite sure" that if the U.S. Government weren't protecting Negroes in racially troubled areas "there would be complete disaffection of my people to the United States."

During an interview, Emile Zinsou answered questions briefly and dryly until the U.S. racial question was broached, when he became animated.

"In each village in Dahomey transistors are giving information which is extremely carefully listened to, and those (American racial) problems are of extreme interest in Dahomey," Zinsou said. His country, which received full independence from France in 1960, has about 2 million people.

According to the State Department office here, 10 percent of U.S. citizens of African descent had their origin in the old Dahomey kingdom.

"The bomb which exploded in Birmingham killing Negro children had a very sad effect on the population" in Dahomey, Zinsou said.

"Americans are well known for being democratic in my country, and the reaction is, How can those things happen—why?

"They wonder how can America be an example to other nations if today they do not follow the examples they used to give. If the Government were not protecting the local black populations today, I am quite sure there would be complete disaffection of my people to the United States."

The people of Dahomey "appreciate what has been done already" to protect American Negroes, "but I understand 90 percent of the American people do not sympathize with (President) Kennedy's policy.

"If the policy of the Kennedy government is not followed in the next few years, my people will not understand at all the attitude of Americans and the prestige they have as far as democratic principles are concerned."

Zinsou was asked how the Dahomey Government stood in the cold war lineup.

"As minister of foreign affairs of this new republic, and also for many similar republics, we are not for or against a special group—American, Soviet or a so-called third force.

"All problems which concern peace and freedom are ones of main interest to my government," he said.

Zinsou, 46, and a party including the Dahomey first lady, Mme. Hubert Maga, are en route to the U.S. mainland after a tour of Israel and Asia. They stayed overnight at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel and were scheduled to leave for the mainland today.

The Hungarian Revolution Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the seventh anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. In Budapest, on October 23, 1956, a peaceful student demonstration in support of nationalist demands and greater civil liberties ignited into a full-scale revolution when Hungarian security police fired on the demonstrators. For more than a week, Hungarian freedom fighters battled Soviet tanks and troops; the rebellion spread to the countryside, and, on October 30, the withdrawal of Soviet units from Budapest indicated success for the freedom fighters and their leader, Imre Nagy. Success was temporary however; Soviet tanks reentered Budapest on November 2; Nagy's reforms were abolished and he had to seek asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy. He was eventually arrested and executed in June 1958.

On this anniversary it is proper that we remember and honor the 200,000 Hungarians who were forced to flee their homelands. Let us hope the Hungarian spirit, which is in the tradition of all freedom-loving people, will continue to be felt.

At this point, I wish to have entered in the RECORD the comments of Leslie P. Abonyi, of the Detroit branch of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, Inc. Mr. Abonyi gives a lucid analysis of the revolution and its consequences to date as follows:

MR. ABONYI'S COMMENTS

On the seventh anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, we are reminded of the events which transpired during and after World War II. In 1945, the Russian Army conquered Hungary; since then, the Soviet system of government and Communist ideology have been systematically forced upon the country.

The smoldering feelings of the enslaved Hungarian people finally erupted on October 23, 1956, when Hungarian students gathered to present their list of national demands to the Government. It was no coincidence that the 16 points presented by the Hungarian students and the American Bill of Rights bore so much resemblance to each other. But the demands of the students were met with gunfire and open revolt began.

On October 28, after days of bloody fighting, the U.S.S.R. represented by Mikoyan and Suslov, concluded an armistice with the Hungarian revolutionary government. On November 1 and 2, the new Hungarian Government informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the entry of fresh Soviet troops into Hungary, of the termination of Hungarian membership in the Warsaw Treaty, of the declaration of Hungarian neutrality and asked that the United Nations guarantee that neutrality.

On November 3, a Soviet delegation met with the Hungarian Government delegation headed by Defense Minister Pal Maleter and Minister of State Erdei and reached an agreement to withdraw all Soviet troops by January 15, 1957. At the same time, in the U.N Security Council, Soviet Delegate Sobolev declared that negotiations were in progress between the Hungarian and Soviet Governments in Budapest. On this basis of his announcement, the Security Council meeting on the Hungarian question was adjourned. Subsequent events leading to the murders of General Maleter and Premier Nagy are well known to the free world.

Much has been said in the past 7 years about the Hungarians and their revolution, including the remarks of the then Senator John F. Kennedy who said, "Americans will never * * * at any summit meeting, in any treaty declaration, in our words or even in our minds * * * recognize Soviet domination of Hungary."

Americans of Hungarian descent and origin remind us that Hungary wants freedom from Soviet colonial rule and the right to national self-determination which is being given to new nations. The legal Hungarian Government, in 1956, turned to the United Nations asking it to guarantee these rights, and although a series of resolutions to that effect was adopted by the U.N., to date the Soviet Union has refused to comply with them.

Hungarians demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary and free elections under international supervision so that Hungary may once again take her rightful place in the family of free nations.

American Security Council Report on Euphoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the American Security Council current Washington Report under date of October 21 deals with "euphoria" as follows:

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

(By Frank J. Johnson, editor)

The nuclear test ban is ratified and in force. An informal Soviet-American agreement to bar nuclear weapons from space has been formalized in a U.N. resolution. Consular posts are about to be established in Leningrad and Chicago. Andrei Gromyko, who 1 year ago was stoutly denying to President Kennedy any Soviet intention to place long range missiles in Cuba, has again called at the White House, this time to press Khrushchev's plea for a "second step" toward "peace." The "relaxation of tension" so eagerly sought by the Soviet Union since last June is well underway. The "truce of the bear" has begun. Inevitably, "euphoria" begins to settle over the West.

Is the truce genuine? Will it last? Is the cold war really ending, as British Foreign Secretary Lord Home suggested in his opening U.N. speech, or are we, as Richard Nixon believes "now entering a period of the greatest danger of Communist expansion in the free world since immediately after World War II."

Those who believe the cold war is now ending would do well to consider the implications of an October 1 declaration from Moscow Radio. If it is to end, say the Soviets, the West must end it, because the West began it. The statement suggests the grim reality behind the facade of the Soviet "peace offensive." The Soviets maintain, as always, that the cold war arose because of the West-

ern policy of resistance to Communist expansion. It can end, by simple definition, only when the West reverses its policy of strength. As to the Soviets, there is no change whatsoever in the ultimate goal of world communism. This much is still admitted by all U.S. officials.

But the logic which must flow from the continuing Soviet objective is steadfastly ignored in all the current peace talk. The average American citizen seems to prefer hope to reality—at least this has been the political calculation of every U.S. administration, which seems to find words of reassurance to the voters much more profitable than blunt assessments of the facts of life. (For example, the rapid rise of Communist strength in Latin America.) Realism lacks the content of idealized emotion, and those who view the world from such a vantage point may seem harsh and unfeeling. Yet far more agony and destruction has been visited upon mankind by well-intentioned men who refused to think too unkindly of their enemies than by all of the followers of "realpolitik." The latter philosophy views men and society as they are, not as they ought to be. It is often a better basis for both prediction and action.

U.S. approval of the Soviet request to purchase U.S. wheat, hard on the heels of the nuclear test ban, is a further retreat from reality. It represents a major success for the new Soviet tactic of honey rather than vinegar and signifies the utter dissipation by the United States of a tremendous economic weapon against communism. We are committing an act of folly which would be unthinkable were it not for the false appearance of peace which the Communists and our own leaders have promoted in the last few months.

The massive Communist population of over 1 billion people does not have enough food. It has never had enough, but as recently as fiscal 1962 the Soviet Union was able to export 174 million bushels of surplus wheat—mostly to its East European satellites. Canada has been selling to Communist China. Now, however, the inherent inefficiency of Soviet agriculture, combined with widespread drought, have conspired to produce a massive Soviet grain failure which Agriculture Secretary Freeman estimates has reduced production 27 percent from recent years. The "virgin lands," on which Khrushchev put so much hope, have become a great dust bowl. Some workers refuse to stay on the farms. The rest of the Soviet economy is also in such bad shape that Khrushchev is reportedly considering reimposition of the compulsory labor laws which were abolished piecemeal beginning in 1956.

This situation offers the United States a golden opportunity to exert political leverage on the Communist world. In purchasing the equivalent of about 400 million bushels of wheat Russia exhausted all other sources before turning to the United States for an additional 150 million bushels. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary also wish to buy from us. There is now no place else for them to go. It is incorrect to assert that the Soviets could get the wheat elsewhere if we do not sell to them. Besides the United States, only Canada, Australia, and Argentina can export wheat. The U.S. Agriculture Department noted on October 9 that Canada's port and delivery facilities cannot handle more than the $500 million worth of wheat which she has already sold to Russia. Australia has already sold the Soviets most of its crops. Argentina's harvest doesn't appear large enough to permit heavy exports. Western Europe—a net importer of wheat—will probably harvest 300 million bushels below last year. The Soviets have already purchased from Western Europe the equivalent, in flour, of 100 million bushels of wheat, much of it originating in the United States. Thus we have, indirectly, already furnished some wheat to Russia via Western Europe, but this source could be cut off if we chose to exert pressure, because we are the original supplier.

We are, therefore, in a position either to exact political concessions in return for our wheat or else refuse to sell and force the Communists to devote resources to agriculture which they will otherwise be free to devote to politicomilitary purposes.

But, once more, Washington takes a different view. Speaking for the administration, Secretary Freeman argued that to seek political concessions from Khrushchev would be "a deterrent toward the strengthening and the improving of relationships that were believed to be desirable." Trade relationships in "nonstrategic items" he declared, is one of the ways in which the United States can "maximize our relationship", "bring about a relaxation of tension" and "maintain a peaceful world." President Kennedy maintains that not to sell the Soviets wheat would convince the Kremlin that "we are more interested in exploiting their internal difficulties, and that the logical course for them to follow is a renewal of the cold war."

Again, these statements suggest that the cold war has ended and that we must be careful not to start it up again. In such a way the American public is being lulled into the happy belief that peace has been achieved. Accompanied by such arguments, we are giving the Soviets the wherewithal to resume the "hard" line against us when the time is right.

The wheat deal is defended, of course, on commercial as well political grounds: the Soviets need our wheat; we need the Soviet gold. What could be a better exchange? But, as Senator DODD has pointed out so well (in a Senate speech, October 1, 1963) "Gold means nothing to the Communists; wheat means everything. We do not need their gold. (Unless we solve our balance-of-payment difficulties the gold will do us little good. If we do solve the problem, we don't need it.) They need our wheat. Let them pay the price for it, not in gold bars, but in concessions to the cause of freedom."

The wheat sale is also defended on humanitarian grounds, and on propaganda ones. Can we be so cruel as to withhold food from a hungry people? What would it do to our image? However, no one in Russia will starve if we do not sell the wheat. The Soviets have some grain reserves, and there are alternative food sources. They can get by with rationing. But refusal would aggravate the general economic crisis of communism; it would constitute the employment of economic countermeasures—our strongest nonmilitary weapon against communism; it would compel the Soviets to abandon or scale down their own use of food exports as a weapon of subversion in the cold war.

For example, it might force Russia to abandon support of Castro. The recent hurricane has further ruined the Cuban economy. Massive food supplies from Russia will be necessary to maintain it. The sale of wheat to Russia may determine whether Russia will be able to give this aid. In theory, the wheat is to be used only in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and not transshipped to Cuba. But Commerce Secretary Hodges conceded (in a press conference) that there is no way to guarantee that Communist Cuba won't benefit from the sale to the Soviets.

Another possibility was suggested when, on October 14, retiring West German Premier, Konrad Adenauer told guests at a press reception that the Soviets should be made to pay for Western wheat with political concessions as well as money. He said he would have preferred to see the Berlin wall torn down before the West helped to solve the Soviet grain shortage.

The United States went to the aid of a hungry and destitute Soviet Union in the 1920's. Whatever this did to our "image," it in no way diverted the Soviet leaders from their implacable determination to "bury us." It merely preserved their power and enabled them to develop it in pursuit of their international objectives.

Lack of adequate food is a major Communist weakness. The U.S. ability to grant, or withhold, our huge food surplus is a major strength. It is to be hoped that future historians will not record 1963 as the year of the West's crowning folly in which its last advantages over international communism were thrown to the winds. So far there is scant indication that wisdom will prevail.

The U.S. Postage Stamp: A Weapon in the Cold War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, in the course of a study proposal on "Emergency Detection System for Manned Space Vehicles," Mr. Frank Ballard, principal engineer at Sperry Utah Co. in Salt Lake City, has come up with a patriotic idea that may have considerable merit. In order to give Mr. Ballard's suggestion the widest possible attention and consideration—as well as to encourage other citizens to submit ideas for fighting the propaganda war with the Communist world—I am inserting his comments in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. POSTAGE STAMP: A WEAPON IN THE COLD WAR?

During the course of a Sperry Utah Co. study to develop an emergency detection system for use in manned space vehicles an idea for space propaganda was conceived. In reality it is not an original idea but rather a countermeasure against the Soviet propaganda machine. Basically, the idea is to make use of the U.S. space program, documenting it on U.S. postage stamps as a means to identify and enhance our prestige abroad. This can be accomplished through the use of a popular mass media of communication which today goes on relatively unused, the U.S. postage stamp. It has become increasingly evident from a brief survey of foreign stamps in circulation and identified in the Scott stamp catalog, that the Soviets are using postage stamps as a means to propagandize a Soviet identity with space successes and thus create an effective prestige profile as the leader in the space race.

The United States has published only two postage stamps associated with the space program during the past 12 years. The first issue was in 1948 on the occasion of the Fort Bliss Centennial and it depicts an unglamorous rocket similar to the German V-2. The second stamp was issued in 1962 on the occasion of the John Glenn Mercury flight. This stamp had a limited circulation and is no longer available at any post office. Furthermore, most commemorative stamps honoring special events such as space flights, Alliance for Progress, etc., have limited printing and, for the most part, end up as a collectors item.

By comparison the Soviets have issued approximately 10 postage stamps identifying sputniks, atomic disarmament, and other space successes. In addition, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany have published at least eight stamps lauding the

Soviet space program. The United States generally publishes anywhere from 5 to 15 stamps annually, generally depicting an uninteresting historical event in terms of contemporary national and international interests. Whether we like it or not, the United States is engaged in a battle for survival with the Soviet Union. At the moment it is a "cold war" with each side striving for political or propaganda advantage. A propaganda advantage could decide whether it becomes a "hot war."

I merely wish to emphasize at this point that propaganda on an immense scale is here to stay and we Americans must become informed and adept in its use, both defensively and offensively, or we may find the free world in a state of confusion and losing confidence in our ability to maintain leadership in the free world.

In the face of the existing world struggle, it is imperative, even urgent, that we utilize all available media of communication to advertise the forces of democracy. The United States "stamp lag" is self-evident. We must engage in a vigorous program calculated for optimum utilization of the vast potentialities of the U.S. postage stamp. As a start, I should like to suggest a chronological documentation of the entire space program beginning with the suborbital flight through individual Mercury orbital flights, Gemini and Apollo. Also, in similar fashion projects such as the Peace Corps, Alliance for Progress, etc. These stamps should be large in size, colorful, and in mass circulation throughout the period of the program consistent with the best U.S. intelligence judgment at the time.

The judgment expressed in this study memorandum is that of the author and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Sperry Utah Co. or its personnel.

Address by Richard H. Amberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Mr. Richard H. Amberg, recently spoke before the American Railway Progress Exposition in Chicago, Ill. Mr. Amberg has taken a very candid look at some of the most pressing problems facing our country and the paradox in the American economy today. I commend his remarks to the attention of the House and certainly economic freedom must be a basis for all our freedoms:

ADDRESS OF RICHARD H. AMBERG, PUBLISHER OF THE ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT, AMERICAN RAILWAY PROGRESS EXPOSITION, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 10, 1963

It is a great honor for a newspaper publisher to be asked to speak to this distinguished gathering. I welcome the opportunity for two reasons—first, because of my longtime admiration for the railroads as the backbone of strength for America, and, second, because newspapers and railroads have, if not common problems, at least parallel ones.

At first blush, it may seem that the newspaper business and the railroad business have very little in common. Actually, our points of similarity are much greater than our points of divergence. In one area above all others, we have comparable problems—and that is that each of us has plenty of competition.

In my business, advertisers have many media of communications from which to choose. There is television, radio, and magazines. There is direct mail, billboards, and many others. Most of all, we have to compete against other newspapers in our own and neighboring communities.

By the same token, you have competition for moving passengers or freight from automobiles, airlines, truckers, buses, and barge lines.

But here the similarity ends—for we can, and do, attack our problems as best we can, operating in a free economy. The competition of the marketplace keeps our advertising and circulation rates in line.

A successful newspaper publisher is the one who maintains a sensible balance between competitive pressures, on the one hand, and a reasonable return on his investment and to the stockholders, on the other.

This law of economic survival has worked out extremely well over the years. The system of the marketplace is proven by time and is in the public interest. All phases of our vast industry have profited according to their ability to keep these forces in balance.

Railroads, on the other hand, labor under the heavy hand of Government.

In 1887, when the Interstate Commerce Commission was established, there was good reason for it. A person wanting to travel or ship goods from one city to another was virtually at the mercy of the railroads, because other means of movement either had not been invented or were hopelessly outdistanced.

Beyond this, the business morals of the last quarter of the 19th century left a great deal to be desired, and railroad magnates deserved what they properly got in the form of Government management.

Three-quarters of a century later, however, the conditions of 1887 have been entirely changed. Now you have a great number of competitors for passengers and for freight. The forces which required Federal regulation in 1887 either do not exist now or apply in greatly diminished measure, but Government regulation—like taxes—once laid on, is almost impossible to remove.

I suggest to you that the time has come for the Government to reappraise the necessity for regulation in the light of conditions as they exist in the 1960's, and to make necessary adjustments in its control over one of the great free enterprise industries in America.

I do not want you to think that I am one who resists all Government controls. Certainly, we have to have controls where monopolies are granted or businesses licensed. Where one electric company, or gas company, or water company, or telephone company, exercises a monopoly—or a virtual monopoly—it is entirely proper for the Government to protect the public interest by maintaining some degree of regulation. You can't get along without electricity, gas, or a telephone, and the relaxation of restraints might well leave the public victimized. Where monopoly exists, regulation may be required; where competition itself is a regulator, let it be:

It often is necessary to have Government regulation to set out the ground rules—for example, the FCC in allocating a limited number of channels or wavelengths, the Food and Drug Administration in maintaining product purity, bank examiners where funds are guaranteed by the Federal Government, and in a number of instances of this sort.

It just doesn't make sense to me, however, to have heavyhanded Government regulation and suppression of management in one of the most competitive of all industries—your own.

There isn't anything in the world tougher to achieve than the relaxation of Government controls, once they are imposed—and, more especially, when an administration is in power, such as we now have in Washington, which is moving continually in the direction of greater and greater Federal authority.

Correcting this evil will require a large degree of public education, but it can be done—and there is no better proof of this than you, yourselves, have supplied in illuminating the featherbedding in your industry.

A few years ago, when our newspaper first started on this subject, featherbedding on the railroads was a forbidden topic for public discussion. When it became known that the Globe-Democrat was going to publish a series on "What's Wrecking the Railroads," a number of important railroad executives—directly, or through friends—asked me to sidetrack the subject for a while for fear of antagonizing railroad labor. They said if we got them mad, you would never be able to gain an agreement.

It was our opinion at the time that you would never be able to gain an agreement anyway on featherbedding—a thesis that has been proved correct by happenings of recent months.

To your credit, the railroads finally dedecided to start a campaign to dramatize the cancer of featherbedding and what it has done to your industry and to our country. That is why you are where you are today—at virtually the last step in the long trail which will remove at least some of these murderous shackles from your hands—and, incidentally, in my opinion, provide a larger number of productive jobs in the railroad industry than the non-productive jobs which will be eliminated.

Gentlemen, if you can do it on featherbedding, you can do it on Government management—and I think you should, and must.

I would hope, too, that good citizens throughout the country—newspapers and other media, alike—not for the railroads, but for the good of America, would show the gross unfairness in the regulation picture. Where monopoly no longer exists, but has, in fact, been supplanted by healthy competition well able to regulate itself under the laws of supply and demand, for the benefit of the public and of the various transportation industries, then a system where the strong and economic survive and where the inefficient and uneconomic properly find other more rewarding roles to fill must take its place.

If free competition is to be resumed, as indeed it must, it is only reasonable to ask all contestants to start at the same starting line. Two inequalities should be removed, in the public interest. One is the inequalities in taxation, and the other is the dead weight of featherbedding in transportation and in all other industries. Let me illustrate.

Railroads pay millions of dollars in many forms of taxes every year. The truckers pay a great many taxes in mileage-ton fees, and in license, gasoline, fuel and excise taxes. The airlines pay at least some taxes in airport fees and for their navigational aids along the air routes, which are supplied chiefly by the Government.

The bargelines, on the other hand, have been operating under a philosophy as much out of date as the 1887 rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They say, and without a smile, that the navigable rivers of the United States are maintained by the Government for the passage of warships in time of war and national emergency, that inland waterways are maintained solely for the benefit of the national defense, and that therefore other users should not pay for the upkeep of our rivers and harbors—not even tolls on canal locks, or taxes to as-

sist in the maintenance of buoys and navigational aids. They even spurn fuel taxes on the theory that no "highway" needs to be retained for their benefit.

We have seen very few battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and the like, on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers near my home—and, yet the bargelines operate on these rivers, which are maintained almost solely for commerce, without paying a cent, except an occasional wharfage fee.

I believe this is almost tantamount to stealing from the public—and I think it is high time that this situation be explored by the Congress as a most fertile field for additional revenues to meet our mounting deficits.

Or, if the Federal Government wants to subsidize transportation carriers—as it does the bargelines—then the truckers should pay no use taxes, nor should you, nor the airlines. What's fair for one should certainly be fair for all—and the use of waterways without fee is a situation which cries aloud for correction.

The Globe-Democrat has taken a good cut at this one from time to time, and we intend to do so in the future—not because we want to help you, or the truckers, or the airlines, but because it seems so obviously fair and just to attempt to correct this glaring inequity to all the people.

I hope other representatives of the public will express similar interest, translated into terms of action, for the benefit of Congressmen, Senators, and others concerned in the Administration.

The two greatest menaces to a strong America today—on the domestic front, at least—are excessive governmental regulation, control and competition with private business, and featherbedding. These, it seems to me, are the twin curses of our society which should be attacked by all citizens of good will who want to keep America strong and free.

When I was a young newspaperman, I remember riding the train in western Pennsylvania in 1940 with Wendell Willkie, who kept preaching the doctrine "Only the productive can be strong, and only the strong can be free" until his voice literally gave out.

This was a credo for America—and it is even more true in the 1960's than it was in 1940.

A nation which is not productive cannot be strong, and a nation which is not strong cannot—and will not—remain free. This is why I detest unnecessary Government regulation. It stops productive strength by artificial restraints.

For illustration: Now can it possibly make sense for a government to refuse to allow the railroads to lower their rates and unmercifully clobber the steel industry when they raise theirs?

The annihilation of Big Steel and Roger Blough has almost become part of America's folklore. But, not enough people know of the July 15 decision of the ICC. This agency, in effect, ordered the Southern Railway System to raise grain rates on its "Big John" multiple cars. Southern Railways did not want, and did not need, the increase.

The ICC, however, took it upon itself to regulate the rail's right to compete. Its decision will cost the consumers and farmers of the Southeastern United States millions of dollars. This regulatory agency that was supposed to protect the consumer, is now bridling competition at the consumer's expense.

In another field, how can it possibly make sense for a government to borrow money at rates up to 4⅞ percent, and then turn around and lend it to the REA at 2 percent—just so the rural cooperatives, which pay no taxes, can compete with the private power companies, which pay a great many taxes?

There may have been a need for REA 30 years ago, when private power companies were not able to do the job. But, now that they are able to take over rural electrification at competing rates, and still pay taxes, why should the Government continue to pay your money and mine to subsidize this outmoded form of socialism?

It may have made sense almost a century ago for the Government to set up competition to the banks in postal savings accounts—but it certainly doesn't make sense now, when the banks can easily take care of this element of savings more efficiently than the Federal Government, and still pay taxes as well.

It doesn't make sense to me for the Interior Department to go into the recreation business, as it is doing on Cape Cod, or for the same department to deny right-of-way across public lands to private power lines, if that department thinks they conflict with the power marketing program of the United States. These, and many other examples, highlight the unconscionable and destructive competition of Government with its citizens.

Government can, and should, provide only those services for the people which they cannot provide for themselves, such as the Armed Forces, the post office, and the like. It should not provide services which private enterprise can well and efficiently supply.

In some areas, Government has to be like the referee in a football game. The game wouldn't amount to much, however, if the referee grabbed the ball and ran with it—yet, this is precisely what Government is doing in entirely too many cases. I think it is up to you and me, as good citizens, in our business and in our private lives, to take the lead in curbing and correcting this deplorable trend.

The situation with respect to featherbedding is even worse, as you know better than anyone. The very fact that you have done such a fine job on this shows what can be done—and I hope that your about-to-be achieved success will be a beacon light for others.

The Government complains about the balance-of-payment deficit, the loss of foreign markets, and the diminishing of some of our own industries because we can no longer compete.

A substantial, though not entire, part of the blame for this should be placed on the awful truth that featherbedding has become almost a way of life in some industries. Pride of workmanship has been replaced with pride in seeing how much the worker can get away with, and still not be fired.

I'm not talking about sweatshops or speed-ups, but simply the old-fashioned American virtue of a good day's work for a good day's pay. I am talking about pride in being an artisan and pride in doing your best.

Today, the make-work rules sap the economic vitality of our country, in your industry and in mine. The unnecessary fireman in the diesel cab is not really much worse than reproducing type and throwing it out as bogus in a newspaper shop, or the unneeded flight engineer in the jets.

Standby musicians, the unnecessary workmen beyond the reasonable requirements of a job, the prohibitions against laborsaving methods which should be available—but with the same safeguards, severance, and retraining that your industry has offered the firemen—strike at the very basis of the strength of America.

What chance do we have to be productive and to be strong in a society whose Government will tolerate longshoremen maintaining crews of 20, when only 17 are needed, and provoking an $800 million strike to perpetuate this featherbedding? Or the teamster regulation in some areas for an escort driver to the markets?

Our attempt to compete in the world market, shackled by regulation which destroys decent competition, and by make-work and unnecessary work which adds to our cost and reduces our ability to achieve efficiency and productivity, is one of the reasons for the dismaying condition which many of our industries are in today—both as to domestic competition and competing against the enormously-improved foreign industries, which are sending greater and greater numbers of their products to our domestic market.

The administration is simply skirting the fringes of the problem with its demands for a tax cut. The real heart of the matter is productivity and the elimination of regulation which unnecessarily shackles free enterprise, along with reduction of excessive Federal expenditures. I long for the day when some administration will really get the country moving again—and when it does, it must be done with character and courage, not with political palliatives.

Some of our people, after some 30 years of encroaching socialism, think that this is a way of life and scarcely resist it any longer. They accept it with complacency—perhaps with fatalism. The spirit of self-reliance which gave birth to our great Nation, and hewed our civilization out of the wildernesses, is in danger of becoming extinct.

Railroads and newspapers and good citizens everywhere need a dedication to the correction of these abuses—to the abuses of Government regulation, competition and control, and featherbedding.

It is a cause to which we might well dedicate ourselves—not for self-interest so much, but because it is absolutely essential to the survival of a free America.

If you think that these are figments of imagination, I suggest that you read Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," which details how the destruction of moral fiber, and of the will to resist the unreasonable encroachments of the state, led to the decline of the greatest civilization in the world, up to that time, even more than the perils from outside the empire. When the people became soft and lost a dedication to the ideals of self-sufficiency—and moral strength and courage, which derive from it—the entire framework of the state decayed.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, speaking in New York just last week, said: "Economic freedom is the basis of all other freedom * * *. Degrade it or abolish it, and nothing will be left but the shadow of hope. Our progress, up till now, has been in direct ratio to the degree of human freedom afforded us. Our rate of progress in the future will be determined in identical fashion."

Fighting to overcome these perils is the voice of courage and of freedom. Courage is best defined by Henry Van Dyke: "Courage is a virtue which the young cannot spare. To lose it is to grow old before your time. It is better to make a thousand mistakes, and to suffer a thousand defeats, than to run away from battle."

Gentlemen—young and not-so-young, alike—we cannot afford to run away from battle. We must fight, by whatever means are available to us, to restore commonsense to government and moral fiber to private character. It is the part of courage, but it is indispensable, if not only our industries, but—far more important—if our state is to survive.

The battles for liberty and freedom are won not only on the battlefields of Normandy, or Saipan and Iwo Jima, or Heartbreak Ridge, Quemoy and Matsu.

The battles for liberty and freedom are won in the hearts and minds of men of good will and in the determination—and the implementation of that determination—to keep America strong, and to keep America free.

Representative Fino's Imagination Makes Maine People Gambling Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], in his extension of remarks appearing on page A6483 in the Appendix of the RECORD, made reference to gambling in the State of Maine.

His statement was entitled "No. 17—Maine: The Gamblers' Paradise." While we recognize that Mr. FINO, in promoting legislation for a national lottery, is seeking to focus attention on illegal gambling in all the 50 States, I believe that reference to the Pine Tree State as a "gamblers' paradise" is injudicious and untrue.

A "paradise"—yes—for those who enjoy hunting, fishing, and outdoor living at its best; for those who have sailed along the most scenic coastline in the world; for those who ski our slopes during a brisk winter day—but I have never before heard the State of Maine referred to as a "gamblers' paradise."

Mr. FINO refers to estimates of $300 million a year in illegal gambling on horseracing in Maine and stated that according to "expert computations" the money illegally gambled in Maine of all sources totaled $600 million last year. This is a completely unrealistic estimate.

Of course I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman in his views that illegal gambling of any size or scope is insidious and breeds crimes of every nature.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] stated that—

> After significant expenses are incurred for the corruption of governmental and law enforcement process, there is still plenty of money left in the hands of the syndicates.

I assume that this was a generalization and the gentleman from New York is not making this charge in respect to Maine's law enforcement officials.

If my assumption is not true and he has any specific information bearing on the State of Maine, I would ask that he immediately make this information available to the attorney general of the State of Main, Hon. Frank Hancock.

To allow an inference like this to stand would be an unwarranted slur to Maine's law enforcement officials, State, county, and local.

The State of Maine is justly proud of its law enforcement. The Maine State Police under the direction of Col. Robert Marx is recognized nationally for its competence. Over 16 sheriffs' departments are increasingly efficient each succeeding year as more and more career deputies fill their ranks.

Maine's town and city police departments will measure up man for man with any departments of similar size in the country.

As a former Federal enforcement officer, I am well aware of the evil that illegal gambling brings to our society. However, I also believe that we must be eager to defend the reputations of honest law enforcement officials. If we do not, there will be even fewer conscientious men who will seek these positions.

The gentleman from New York might be interested in an editorial appearing in the Portland Press Herald, October 19, in reference to his remarks.

The editorial follows:

REPRESENTATIVE FINO'S IMAGINATION MAKES MAINE PEOPLE GAMBLING ADDICTS

Maine people who opened their papers on Thursday to learn, according to a New York City Congressman named PAUL FINO, that $600 million was illegally gambled in Maine last year must have been amazed to find so much loose money rattling around here.

This stupefying statistic, which is producing horse laughs all the way from Kittery to Fort Kent, is the imaginative product of Mr. FINO alone.

The gross income of Maine's million people in 1962 was roughly $1.8 billion, which would mean that a third of it passed through the hands of bookies and other denizens of the underworld. It would mean that the average family of four gaily bade goodbye to $2,400 in trying to get rich last year, and this is a lot of moolah—in this State especially.

Of course there is a method in the madness of the Bronx Congressman. With the perseverance of a birddog, he has been trying to persuade his fellow Members that the cure for all our ills is a national lottery, and the way to do it is to prove illicit gambling on a big scale. Instead of taking him seriously, Governor Reed should have wired him the single word uttered by General McAuliffe at the siege of Bastogne.

Kennedy's Space Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Aviation Week and Space Technology, September 30, 1963:

KENNEDY'S SPACE BOOMERANG

President Kennedy has dealt his own national space program its hardest blow. This extraordinary feat of political contortion was achieved with his recent United Nations speech appealing to the Soviet Union to share this Nation's effort in a joint program to land men on the moon. No matter how hard the White House apologists try to recast recent history, this speech represented a basic shift in U.S. space policy that is losing political support for the program and braking much of the technical momentum already achieved. It is also a good example of the brittle brilliance of the White House staff members who spawn scintillating ideas without much thought on their ramifications and are continually surprised by the fires they ignite.

IMMEDIATE EFFECTS

The immediate effects of the President's ill-conceived invitation to the Soviets to join the U.S. Apollo program are twofold:

First, it will provide congressional opponents of his space program with the well-sharpened ax they need to cut its fiscal 1964 budget drastically and retard U.S. space progress even more than the restrictions of technical development. It has changed the fiscal 1964 NASA budget bill from an essential instrument to achieve a top-priority national goal essential to this Nation's security and international leadership into what can easily be construed by its opponents as a Russian foreign aid bill. It also leaves the congressional supporters of the President's space program with neither inclination nor ability to defend it successfully.

Second, it will induce a psychological drag into the vast program that has just begun to build promising technical momentum. It may change the motivation of several million Americans who are involved in all phases of the manned space flight effort from a patriotic sense of extreme urgency to a routine 9–5 job in which the fruits of their labors may be retailed to the Soviet Union.

The long-term effects are difficult to perceive in detail, but there it little doubt that the manned space flight program faces the prospect of dwindling from one of the most exciting challenges ever accepted by a nation to an unimportant pawn in the cold war to be sacrificed in the first gambit of appeasement.

There are certainly many indications that the Soviets are finding the current U.S. pace in space technology a serious challenge to their present claim of international leadership in this vital area. During the period of their unquestioned leadership they were not interested in exchanging any technical data on their manned space flight programs with anybody. Now that they are feeling the pinch, they are making overtures to tap U.S. technology.

To understand just how the Soviets view technical exchanges, it is worth recalling the few experiences in the aerospace field of recent years.

Andrei Tupolev was shown the modern Convair plant at San Diego, then producing F-106 supersonic interceptors, and the Douglas plant, where Thor ballistic missiles were being built. When USAF brass visited Moscow they were shown the two oldest aircraft factories in Russia—one producing jet engines of British design, and the other, Serge Ilyushin's versions of a Convair 240 transport. Who benefited most from that exchange?

AEROFLOT VISIT

When an Aeroflot delegation visited the United States as a preliminary to negotiations for a bilateral air transport agreement, they were given a thorough look at U.S. airline operations, including inspection of a modern jet overhaul operation. When the U.S. group arrived in the U.S.S.R for reciprocity, they were denied access to any jet engine overhaul facilities and shown more opera houses and ballets than Aeroflot operations Who benefited most from that exchange?

The Soviet contributions to international space technology gatherings in recent years have been vapid and inconsequential compared with the data that they have obviously garnered from their pioneering efforts.

The shock of the President's lunar landing policy reversal has not yet been fully felt, either technically or politically. This casual act that could divert the purpose of a vast technological effort and billions of taxpayers' dollars in attempting to create a fleeting political impression must certainly cast grave doubts on the sincerity of many other phases of the Kennedy administration's program.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Copy of Second Letter to President Requesting Intentions as to Establishing Promised Test Ban Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, below is reproduced my second letter to President Kennedy relative to the vital matter of establishing the safeguards promised by him to diminish the admitted risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty. For reference, my first letter to him on this subject was reproduced in the RECORD for September 30 at page A6115:

OCTOBER 18, 1963.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My letter to you dated September 24, 1963, concerning the above-captioned matter has just been answered by Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, under date of October 17, 1963.

Dr. Seaborg's letter states your administration is seeking authorization to make the following treaty safeguards expenditures during the balance of fiscal year 1964:

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, New Mexico:	
Occupational health laboratory	$1,650,000
High temperature chemistry facility	1,435,000
Plutonium research support building	655,000
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.:	
Radiochemistry building	5,900,000
Hazards control addition	1,000,000
Plant engineering and services building	1,400,000
West cafeteria addition	255,000
Craft shop addition	200,000
Sandia Base, N. Mex.:	
Development laboratory	3,780,000
Explosive facilities	540,000
Classified technical reports building (addition)	500,000
Nevada Test Site: Control point additions	630,000
Total	17,945,000

Dr. Seaborg's letter also indicates that a request for appropriation of $5,945,000 will be made and that the remaining $12 million of the total sum of $17,945,000 will be obtained by reallocating money already appropriated for other purposes.

For the purposes of comparison, I have prepared the following table setting out the sums I have estimated are necessary to establish the treaty safeguards you have promised and sums you requested on October 16:

Action required by promised safeguards	Cost estimated in Sept. 24, 1963, letter to you	Your Oct. 16, 1963, request	Percent
Underground test site improvement and additions	$100,000,000	$630,000	0.63
Weapons Laboratory improvements and retention of topflight scientists	160,000,000	17,315,000	10.82
Readiness for atmospheric tests resumption capability	610,000,000		.00
Detection system improvements and miscellaneous	130,000,000		.00
Total	1,000,000,000	17,945,000	1.79

This table indicates a serious discrepancy between your views and mine as to the actions required to implement the safeguards, their costs and as to the permissible delay in implementing them. This discrepancy is further enlarged by my estimate that, in addition to the original investment, at least one-quarter billion dollars must be spent annually to maintain the safeguards in operational efficiency.

Inasmuch as statements by yourself and members of your administration raise no question as to the necessity for establishing the safeguards, the difference between my views and yours seem to lie in the following areas:

1. What actions are necessary to establish the safeguards?

2. How urgent is it to establish them without delay?

3. How much will they cost?

These are very grave questions concerning which I believe the American people are entitled to know your views in detail. I feel they also are entitled to reassurance that the $12 million reallocation above mentioned is not from items essential to the national security.

Dr. Seaborg's letter, I presume, indicated only a part of what you may have in mind relative to investments at the laboratories and for underground test site facilities. It was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the creation and maintenance of readiness for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing under emergency conditions. It also was wholly silent as to what you may have in mind respecting the improvement of our capability to detect possible violations of the treaty and to monitor Soviet nuclear weapons improvements.

I sincerely hope you will avail yourself of an opportunity to reveal to the Nation your thinking on these important matters, either in a comprehensive reply to this letter or otherwise.

I make this request because the amount you are presently seeking for implementation of the safeguards is such a small fraction of what many believe is needed that it raises doubts that the entire matter of the safeguards are being taken seriously by those who may be advising you in these matters.

I make this request also because there is no assurance that Soviet scientists have not already embarked on a clandestine program of secret developments aimed at overpowering U.S. capability in every category of nuclear weapons; there can be no assurance on this point until the promised safeguards are fully in being; and, until they are, an open invitation to the Kremlin is outstanding to get away with anything and everything we cannot detect or discover.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Is Medical Experimentation Cruel to Animals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in the House, like me, have received much mail on the subject of inhumane treatment of animals during experimentation for medical research purposes. I received a very throughtful article that was written by one of my constituents on this subject and submit it for the possible interest of my colleagues.

AMORY IS NEEDLESSLY CRUEL TO SCIENCE

(By Bonnie Brian Seliger)

After reading Cleveland Amory's article "Science is Needlessly Cruel to Animals" I would like the opportunity to discuss this situation from a different point of view.

In the beginning, I would like to say that I feel sure that the type of inhumane treatment of animals reported by Mr. Amory does happen. However, I would like to ask, to what percentage of the animals involved and by what percentage of the men and women involved? To say "science is needlessly cruel to animals" is a sweeping statement and to suggest Federal control seems a drastic solution. The picture must be viewed in its entirety to give it proper perspective. The incidence of sadistic activity in the science labs involves such a small percentage of the men and animals in the overall picture of the science research program that is does not warrant this move for congressional action.

By accumulating the facts of a few obscure and unhappy incidents and printing them in the front of the Post, Mr. Amory and the editors of the Post have blotted from the view of the public, the thousands of dedicated men and women who give their lives to the search for new knowledge.

The same day Mr. Amory's article appeared in the Post, our local newspaper carried the story of parents who had beaten their 6-year-old child to death for wetting the bed. Stories of such happenings are printed almost daily. Does this mean parents are needlessly cruel to children and that the Government should be brought in to control the discipline of children? Everyone assumes, and rightly so, that the vast majority of parents have enough humanity and judgement, to discipline their own children without outside interference. When a case of gross mistreatment or unkindness is found it is corrected and the guilty persons punished according to the local laws. So it should be with scientists.

My husband is doing research under a Government grant at this time. I am not at all inclined toward this type of work and much prefer to use animals just for the enjoyment a pet gives me personally, but I have seen for myself many times and in several schools, the way all kinds of research animals are treated. Their fate does not bother me, a pet lover, in the least. I have answered many strange questions people have asked me about animal research so I would like to answer some of them here.

I can't begin to count the number of times someone has asked me if they put the ani-

mals to sleep when they operate on them. It seems that logic alone would answer that question. Even if an animal could be strapped so that it couldn't move, it would be as impossible to operate successfully while it was awake as it would be on a human. The muscles would tense, the blood pressure would flare up, and bleeding would be a problem. Of course animals are anesthetized, and with the same care any surgery patient receives. These operations aren't really as much torture for the animals as your appendectomy was for you. They go to sleep without fears based on stories of friend's operations and they recover with no nervous pressure about mounting bills or how things are going at work without them.

Many of these animals are devoted to their scientists and lick the hand that takes out the stitches.

Many of the dog lovers who are backing bills for humane treatment of animals have their own pets spayed or castrated to avoid inconvenience to themselves. None of the experimental operations is more painful to the animal than this common one and surely none could horrify the pet quite as much.

Often, after the information sought in these experiments is gained, the researcher will take the animal home and keep it as a pet. These men are not animal haters.

A great percentage of the animal work does not involve surgery of any kind, but consists of tests to study the effects of new foods and drugs.

The research animals, no matter what their destiny, are usually given better care and closer attention than some children. Each man guards his animals constantly because he is a man searching for an answer and these animals may have it. To neglect them or mistreat them could give false results and tests would be useless.

Mr. Amory quotes by way of Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, a faculty member of the Oregon Medical School who said "no good research can be carried on on an animal that is not well treated." This statement is powerful testimony to the fact that most of the animals are well treated because most of the scientific researchers are dedicated people doing good work.

I have seen my husband bring home a baby rat, whose mother has rejected it, and hold it in his hand all evening to keep it warm and give it milk every few minutes. Then he'd rig an elaborate warming system in a box for the rat to spend the night in and he'd get up every half hour to offer it more food. More than once he has dressed in the wee hours of the night and hurried to the lab because he has received a call to say one of his ground squirrels looks sick. This type of squirrel hibernates in the winter, and when left free, 80 percent of them die each year. The mortality rate in the lab is not that high even though many animals are purposely sacrificed.

When it is necessary to sacrifice an animal to determine the results of a test, how is it done? The procedure is the same way the humane society does it, in the name of kindness, an overdose of anesthesia. The difference is that the humane society "puts them to sleep" if a human family does not adopt the animal in 3 or 4 days after it is considered a stray. On the other hand, the scientist puts his animal to sleep only when it is necessary to uncover one more speck of knowledge to help make life better and longer for the next generation.

Mr. Amory said "My society is opposed to cruelty of every kind under every circumstance." However, their efforts seem to be spent only in behalf of dogs. Is his group backing a bill to eliminate fishing? Perhaps they dont feel it is cruel to cover a barbed hook with food and lure a fish into grabbing it, then jerk it out of the life sustaining water. Perhaps they've never seen a commercial net haul thousands of fish out of the water and dump them to bury and crush each other while they are left to suffocate.

Perhaps these people overlook the pain and inhumanity of castrating cattle and the horrors of the slaughterhouses because of their taste for beefsteak.

The bills propose protection only for the vertibrate animals. Perhaps because they know there is no backbone involved or perhaps because they have never held one on their laps it doesn't worry them when live lobsters are thrown into pots of boiling water on the sidewalks in seaside towns. The conscience of these dog lovers does not seem to feel any pain at the thought of oysters being tortured into producing pearls, then killed to sell the pearls for jewelry. Why not a bill to wipe out the cultured pearl industry?

Mr. Amory's article would give the world the idea that millions of poor helpless animals who yearn to be free are being tortured by mad, sadistic scientists and students who experiment on them. Most of the animals were born and raised in a lab and otherwise would not exist at all. The way the word "experiment" is used makes it sound like a very undesirable, almost immoral thing. Every step of progress from fire and the wheel, to rockets and Telstar has been accomplished because a progressive person experimented with a new idea.

The most reasonable plan presented so far by this group is one for having all research work cleared through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. No Government research grant would be awarded until said Department had investigated the applicant, facilities, personnel, etc. (This preliminary checkup on each applicant's qualifications is already handled by the Department giving the research grant.) All planned research projects would have to be submitted in writing to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for approval before the work could be started. A committee from this Department would decide whether or not each plan warranted animal sacrifice.

An annual report would have to be filed by each man giving details of the number of animals used and the procedures and results in each case.

If a bill like this is ever passed it will bind the hands of scientific progress with redtape and bury the lifesaving knowledge we all yearn for, under tons of paperwork.

The funds set aside for research would have to be partially spent on buildings, office equipment, and workers to handle all the forms required.

The tragedy of the research hours that would be lost by complying with such requirements could only be illustrated by the lives lost because men of science were forced to fill in endless forms and wait. Can you visualize how many children could die of leukemia between the time a researcher got an idea that might conquer it and the time a Government committee investigated, decided upon and, we hope, sent approval of the idea?

Mr. Amory points out the five main points of the bills now before Congress as—

1. "Unannounced inspection of laboratories that use animals."

Such inspections are already made by representatives of the agencies giving the research grants.

2. "Licensing of all scientists desiring to use live vertebrate animals, the licenses revocable for cruelty."

Now if you want to drain off a little more of the money set aside for research it could be used to set up and maintain the offices and committees to give exams, issue and renew licenses and decide what is cruel and what is not. The student has already passed exams and requirements that, in the eyes of the men who head the schools, qualify him to do animal research when he is accepted as a student in such a course of study. You are bound to get the occasional sadist who manages to be accepted just as you will find the occasional dishonest cop or immoral minister. When discovered, these people are relieved of their responsibilities and replaced without involving the Federal Government.

3. "Painless killing of animals that still are suffering after an experiment."

If this rule is enforced, how will we ever discover how to relieve the suffering of people who are born with a problem, develop problems, or have accidents but cannot enjoy the same humane rule of being painlessly killed when suffering?

4. "Humane care and housing."

The animals are given all the care and housing the budget will cover. In nearly all cases this is completely adequate and very often similar to the shelters provided by humane societies and veterinary hospitals. If the members of Mr. Amory's society are upset by finding places where dogs don't get enough exercise, are in poor condition, and do not have a comfortable place to sleep I suggest they visit some of the Indian reservations I have visited and see what the children are sleeping on. Let them visit the slums in any average size city and see if the care and housing is adequate for the children there. Then they can crusade like they never crusaded before to improve the humane conditions in this country.

5. "The requirement that student work, as distinguished from research conducted by qualified scientists, be painless."

What makes a person a qualified scientist? Does having a degree insure against a man being a sadist? Does experience qualify a man? If so how does one get the experience under these restrictions? And a real scientist is always a student to the end. If the faculties of universities are not able to reasonably decide who should do animal work and to what extent, surely no Washington committee can come up with the answer.

No bill passed by Congress will change a sadist into a humanitarian. If any of the proposed bills passes into law, the results will be that the few sadists who temporarily use science labs as outlets for these tendencies will be expelled by a Federal agent rather than the university concerned. He will then buy pets over the counter, accept them as gifts from overblessed neighbors, trap wild ones or steal childrens' pets and mistreat them in his own home undisturbed by Government redtape. Or perhaps he will turn to beating his wife and children.

The dedicated men and women who will be frustrated and bogged down in their work by these rules will retire, leave the country, or follow the example of Europeans faced with the same situation and take their equipment, animals, and determination out to sea past the 3-mile limit and work on, where only God will inspect and judge.

Let's not push our country back into the days of the graverobbers and subversive science by creating one more Federal bureau or one more Federal committee that can serve no purpose but to drive the undesirable a little further underground and make science research a commodity for the black market.

Now I Sit Me Down in School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following WKRC (Cincinnati) editorial of Tuesday, October 8, 1963:

NOW I SIT ME DOWN IN SCHOOL

Although because of the Supreme Court decision it is now the law of the land that prayers are out in the public schools, there are still many parents who are trying to keep the practice continued. Right in our own area, in northern Kentucky, there is a strong movement to retain God in the classroom. In view of this and our own disposition in this matter the following poem read on the Boston radio station WEEI has a good deal of merit:

"Now I sit me down in school
Where praying is against the rule.
For this great Nation, under God
Finds public mention of Him odd.

"Any prayer a class recites
Now violates the Bill of Rights.
Any time my head I bow
Becomes a Federal matter now.

"Teach us of stars or pole and Equator
But make no mention of their Creator.
Tell of exports in Denmark and Sweden
But not one word on what Eve did in Eden.

"The law is specific, the law is precise
Praying out loud is no longer nice.
Praying aloud in a public hall
Upsets believers in nothing at all.

"In silence alone can we meditate
And if God should get the credit, great.
This rule, however, has a gimmick in it:
You've got to be finished in less than a minute.

"So all I ask is a minute of quiet
If I feel like praying, then maybe I'll try it.
If not, O Lord, this plea I make:
Should I die in school, my soul you'll take."

The Communist Wheat Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the problems eminating from our appeasement deal with the Communists are now showing up. In Monday's edition of the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times are some of the details and the probable effect on the U.S. taxpayer.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 21, 1963]

HUNGARY CANCELS TWO OF THREE ORDERS FOR U.S. WHEAT: RED NATION BALKS AT DEMAND THAT U.S. SHIPS BE USED, CITES HIGHER FREIGHT RATES—COMMERCE UNIT HINTS CHANGE

Communist-dominated Hungary withdrew two of three offers to buy U.S. wheat because American policy on shipping rules continues cloudy. The offers were for 100,000 tons each.

The third order probably will be withdrawn today if the Commerce Department continues to insist that American freighters be used to ship the wheat. President Kennedy, in announcing on October 9 that the Government wouldn't block sales of wheat to Russia and its East European satellites, said available U.S. ships must be used, supplemented where necessary by those owned by foreigners.

The Hungarians are balking because they don't want to pay the extra high freight rates charged by the U.S.-subsidized shipping fleet. These rates generally are about 40 percent higher than foreign rates. For wheat shipped from gulf ports to the Crimea, the American rate would be between $10 and $12 a ton more than that charged by most foreigners.

INTERPRETATION OF "AVAILABLE"

The Commerce Department, for its part, appeared ready to soften its stand. It hinted it may apply a broader interpretation to the word "available." To that end, the Department said its Maritime Administration is conducting a survey to determine how many U.S. ships actually are available. Presumably, the Government could rule that if the American-owned freighters are unwilling to reduce rates, the ships are in fact "unavailable" to the Communists and therefore foreign ships with their lower rates could be used.

In any case, key administration officials view the Hungarian withdrawals as mainly the result of a procedural snafu rather than as an indication the Communists have changed their minds about shopping in the United States for wheat and flour. "We have every indication," said a top policymaker, "that the Russians and the satellites need our grain and want very much to buy it, and soon."

He said the Reds, in their approaches to U.S. traders and to American diplomats have hinted strongly they wish to contract for U.S. wheat now so that the Communist countries can be assured of obtaining grain through the winter. The grain-short Red regimes have contracted for nearly 239 million bushels of wheat from Canada over the next 8 months but the onset of winter is expected to close down the ports along the St. Lawrence Seaway and severely pinch that flow of wheat.

ORDER PLACED BEFORE APPROVAL

Actually, the Hungarians placed their three orders for American wheat with three private U.S. traders even before President Kennedy gave what amounted to advance approval of sales of previously embargoed subsidized farm goods, especially wheat, to Red-dominated lands. Such sales are still banned to China, Cuba, North Vietnam, and North Korea.

Meanwhile, according to the Associated Press, some uncertainty developed about a Soviet wheat-buying mission that was supposed to have left Moscow Thursday. A State Department official said visas have been issued for the mission but that one member of the group is understood to be ill and the trip has been delayed. Presumably the mission members could come to the United States at any time and might already be on their way, although U.S. officials said they had no information on their plans from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, the Associated Press said.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1963]

WHEAT DEALS LIFT WORLD SHIP RATES: SOVIET PURCHASES AND PLANS NEARLY DOUBLE THE PRICES

(By Edward A. Morrow)

The world ship market is soaring on the possibility that the Soviet Union faces a $50 million ocean freight bill on its pending $250 million purchase of U.S. wheat.

Ship brokers report that the proposed purchase, coming as it does after substantial sales of Canadian and Australian grain to Communist interests, have almost doubled the sales prices of wartime-built Liberty ships.

Early this year the most astute ship brokers and owners had sounded the death knell for the aged 10,000-ton vessels, most of which have a speed of less than 10 knots. They were considered fit only for the shipbreaking yards.

At the end of the summer, Libertys in the best of condition were being sold for as little as $160,000. A. L. Burbank & Co., one of the leading ship brokers, reported last week that the vessels were now bringing $280,000 and it was expected that the $300,000 mark would be passed this week.

The company reported that the price of C-2 type vessels, faster and more sophisticated ships than the Libertys, jumped from their values in September of about $450,000 to $600,000. War-built T-2's, mainly suited for conversion into bulk carriers or for trade-in allowances, have jumped from $100,000 to $200,000.

PRICES LINKED TO OUTLOOK

Such ship prices are related to the earnings prospect owners foresee for their vessels. And, many owners believe, the prospects for the next year are good largely as a result of the Soviet Union's and Red China's grain requirements. The demand will be fantastic, they believe, if Europe faces another cold winter and must again, as it did last year, turn to the United States for a huge movement of coal.

However, all shipowners to some extent are gambling on the "hole card" that the Department of Commerce is holding for its coming negotiations with the Soviet Union's wheat-buying team. How much of the 3 to 4 million tons of grain the Government will require to be shipped in U.S.-flag bottoms is an unknown quantity.

President Kennedy has stated that he expects American ships to be used "when available." Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has repeated the phrase. But shipowners and operators pointed out that no one had clearly defined what is meant by "when available."

PRESSURE FROM UNIONS

The administration is under heavy pressure from American maritime unions to see to it that at least 50 percent of the wheat, or about 160 shiploads, are transported in American bottoms. Even the Committee for American Steamship Lines, which represents the Nation's 15 subsidized operators, have asked to participate in the trade.

Only four of the committee's members have subsidized trade routes that call for stops at Soviet Union ports—and none of them operate bulk carriers, such as would be needed for the most efficient transportation of the grain.

One shipping executive pointed out that the Russian transaction was "not a profound upheaval in our normal grain exports—certainly it is a handsome increment—but it's a deal highly loaded with emotional content."

NEW PRINCIPLE SEEN

The international character of the shipping aspects of the transaction were made evident late last week. On Friday the Norwegian Ambassador in Washington asked the United States not to carry out rules of freight preference for U.S. ships, it was reliably reported. This was believed to be the prelude to a joint inquiry into U.S. intentions by the world's major maritime nations.

By forcing American exports to use U.S. ships in a transaction that is not Government financed, the Government would be introducing a new principle into world shipping. The principle, the Ambassador was reported to have said, "would have far-reaching and serious consequences" throughout the shipping world.

Some sources said the deal could fall through if the United States required the Soviet Union to use U.S. ships at U.S. charter prices. As the result of being guaranteed at least 50 percent of the Nation's aid cargoes, the Department of Agriculture has to pay higher prices for the transport of those cargoes.

Where, on 1 day, the Department was able to obtain a German-flag ship to transport 9,500 tons of grain to Karachi, Pakistan, for $8.75 a ton, it had to pay an American ship-

owner $24.25, or almost 275 percent more a ton, for delivering the same amount of cargo.

This transaction is typical of the many the Department has made and balked at, but with little success. This disparity between the cost of using a foreign-flag ship and an American one has closed somewhat as the result of the recent strengthening of the ship charter market.

In early September Japanese charterers seeking a vessel to take grain from the gulf to Japan could get a vessel at less than $10 a ton. Last week they had to pay $15.

If the Soviet agency is able to get the $15-a-ton rate, its ocean transportation bill will run between $45 and $60 million. Ship brokers said that "with some breaks, the Soviet bill may be around $50 million."

PRICE RISE EXPECTED

In September the Soviet chartering agency was able to get a 17,000-ton tanker to carry Canadian wheat from the St. Lawrence to the Black Sea at $7.50 a ton. Market observers believe that the agency will not be able to get that price for the carriage of American wheat, most of which is expected to move from gulf ports.

Unlike in the Canadian deal, the Soviet Union is not expected to employ its own vessels in the U.S. trade. Each Soviet vessel that visits the United States must obtain a special clearance from the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Soviet Union is known to have quietly obtained a number of Greek and other European-flag ships under "time" charters. Under such a charter the shipowner is committed to employ his vessel over a specific period of time and at a specific rate on voyages directed by the charter.

Thus the Russians recently obtained several Greek Libertys with privileges to put them on the Cuba trade route, if necessary, at about $30,000 a month.

One of the chief questions, ship brokers and characters said, is whether American-flag shipping will be subsidized on the Soviet grain route. They generally agree that the Soviet Union will disapprove any stipulation that would have the Soviet chartering agency subsidizing the American ships.

At the same time, brokers pointed out that the large grain houses have already established substantial hedges against future rises on the ship market. Such houses as Bunge Corp., Continental Grain Co., and Cargill, Inc., which rank among the world's top grain dealers, have chartered ships for 9 to 12 months of trading operations at rates well below those that a U.S.-flag ship operator can operate profitably.

Officers Resign at a Rising Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, sharing alarm with many of my colleagues over the rising rate of resignations by our military officers, I wish to call attention to an exceptionally good evaluation of the problem that appeared in the New York Times, Monday, October 21. The article, written by Hanson W. Baldwin, is entitled "Officers Resign at a Rising Rate," and is included as an extension of my remarks today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OFFICERS RESIGN AT A RISING RATE; POOR MORALE IS BLAMED FOR DOUBLING SERVICE LOSSES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Resignations of regular officers from the armed services have increased sharply in the last year. Some observers believe the increase reflects an unsatisfactory state of morale.

Resignations of regular officers in the fiscal year that ended last June 30 totaled 1,622, compared with 787 in 1962 and 827 in 1961.

The resignations, plus early retirements from the services, are considered by some personnel experts as "bad and increasing." The resignations are considered particularly significant since men who resign, as distinct from those who retire, draw no retirement pay.

A Navy expert said one of the main reasons for the separations was lack of material incentive. He pointed out that even the recent pay increase that went into effect October 1 did not provide pay scales comparable to those of similar civil service or civilian positions.

CONSIDERS GAINS TOO LOW

Moreover, he said, promotion to high rank promises relatively little in terms of increased pay. Flag and general officers of the armed services received no increase in pay between 1908 and 1946. Raises since then, servicemen feel, have not compensated for the increased costs of living and the general increases in pay scales in comparable nonmilitary positions.

Some officers believe that the basic causes for the resignations are more psychological than material. They see a considerable gulf between them and their civilian superiors. Many believe that military judgment and professional experience is often overruled or downgraded.

It is their impression that there is very little sense of loyalty extending downward from superiors. Dissent appears to be unwelcome and in fact penalized.

All services share this feeling in varying degrees. The Air Force schism between its civilian and its military heads has been most pronounced recently. Relationships in the Navy were improved in the final months of Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth's administration, but they were not completely smooth.

Army officers who work with Secretary of the Army Cyrus L. Vance have formed a high admiration for his force, integrity, warmth and intelligence. But he has not made the same impression in the field. Resignations of Regular Army officers are higher than those of any other service.

CHANGES RESENTED

Other reasons for the high resignation rate include a prevalent impression that regulations governing promotion, schooling and other aspects of service life are changed frequently, often penalizing a man through no fault of his own. Not enough emphasis is put upon field leadership capabilities. There are far too many transfers and shifts—so many that a great many service officers feel that they never stay long enough at any one job to master it properly.

Many officers in the services, particularly those in the Army, express scorn and anger about personnel policies that they feel treat too many officers as numbers instead of men.

An informal survey made last spring of a 20-percent random sample of officers in each grade assigned to Headquarters, 1st United States Army, on Governors Island indicated that the average officer had 17 years of commissioned service, acquired 8 military occupational specialties, made 12 PCS (permanent changes of station), had 26 major assignments (not including minor additional duties), and made at least 16 moves (combat zones excluded) that required uprooting of his family.

Comparative figures on resignations, as furnished by the Pentagon follow:

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Army	[1] 469	[1] 374	343	408	255	750
Navy	158	103	167	80	93	261
Air Force	204	261	382	315	392	584
Marine Corps	32	41	39	24	47	27
Total	863	779	931	827	787	1,622

[1] Includes Regular and Reserve; no breakdown available.

OFFICER EXPLAINS MOVE

One officer who resigned recently is Marion T. Wood, a major with 13 years' service, a master's degree, and combat experience in Korea. Major Wood wrote two letters to himself last year to justify his decision. They summarize reasons cited frequently for the high resignation rate in the Army in particular and in the services in general.

"I can no longer accept," Major Wood wrote, "the gross inequities created by the 'system' and will not subject my family to them. I refuse to be used by bureaucrats in the civilian Government who have a higher regard for scientific progress, weapons, and materiel than they do for men's lives and welfare of military families.

"I am tired of having my life and the lives of my family controlled by leaders who advocate and publish policies which make a military career attractive; and yet at the same time, make only halfhearted efforts at best to implement these expressed policies."

"I am tired of broken promises and half-truths. For example even though the Army says that 'normal tours of duty' will be for 3 years, I have moved 33 times in 13 years (10 times in 9 years of marriage). Each of these moves cost me approximately 1 month's salary.

"Furthermore, I was forced by the Army and by circumstances to live several times in substandard housing at exorbitant rental."

"I want the opportunity," Major Wood concluded, "to grow personally and financially according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly, I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me."

Conrad Frederick Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, we in west Tennessee have lost a great newspaperman in Conrad Frederick Smith, of Trenton, Tenn.

Words are not at my command to express his greatness both as an outstanding citizen and a great writer.

Several years ago he wrote an article entitled "October" which was published in several newspapers in the Nation. Also following this article there was an editorial that appeared in the Herald-Register, written by one of his good friends, Richard E. Davis, who is the

editor and publisher of this fine newspaper.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the Herald-Register, Trenton, Tenn., Oct. 17, 1963]

OCTOBER

(By Conrad Frederick Smith)

Like the silent benediction at the close of a sweet and solemn service comes October. Queenly and beautiful among all the months of the year, October is for those who delight in the outward charms of nature. Its beauty is surpassed by none, excelling even the sparkling skies and the breezes of April and May when the earth is at the spring and youth is aglow with life and living.

I would not think of October and autumn as signifying death and the end of things earthly. It is only a time of transition; an interlude between summer's full-bosomed fruitfulness and the sere waste of winter's reign. Every tinted leaf that flutters from the trees and every withered flower that has looked for the last time into the face of the friendly sun but tell me that it is the time of peace in nature, the drowsiness that comes before deep slumber.

October is the time of siesta after labor. It is when we bask in the sunlight, to luxuriate lazily in the mellow goodness of the year and dream only lazily of days to come.

October holds only deep inward joy for those of us who believe that the passing of autumn means only sleep for a tired world and not death; who have seen its best days and have drunk deeply from its cup of content.

It is too much like a full and rounded life of one who has fought the good fight and kept the faith until the peaceful end. October does that and it does not beguile or disappoint. Its beauty is too deep and still, like that which flows along the sun-washed waters of the river where only hidden glimpses of more beautiful things may be seen.

For those who love October as the perfect month there is the delight of golden days and silvery cool evenings of incarnadined trees and flowers, of tawny fields and haze-crowned horizons. It contains the fruition of harvest, the ingathering of riches of the field and the outpouring of a soul's delight that all nature is glorious. Coolness and warmth are tempered with a master's hand to that indefinable sensation of goodness, so refreshing to tired bodies and burdened minds.

There is riotous color in the forest and field in October. Each tree and shrub is a canvas upon which Jack Frost has mixed the glowing pigments from his pallette with gay abandon. Carmine and magenta, wine-purple and the tint of the dawn's first blush, scarlet and pale lavender the leaves are now after autumn's warm kiss. Sumacs that one has passed unseeing now leap like dancing flames from the forest floor. White birches like slim candles are lighted to shine in the winey dusk. The roseate dogwood might be some wanton, parading her charms in front of admiring eyes. Before the somber green background of pines quivers a silver maple, her vermilion gown aglow, as tremendously excited as a bride waiting for her chosen one before the altar. And over all lies the poignantly fragrant air of October—a rich perfume of ripe apples, curly smoke from burning leaves, cured hay in the meadow, and wood mold.

After the stilly dusk the hunter's moon slips into the night to transmute each leaf and twig to silver. Riding like the royal queen she is, the lady of the night makes of each woodland glade a magic hall for the fairies to hold court in, and bathes a slumbering world with its translucent sheen.

The poet asked, "And what is so rare as a day in June? Then if ever, come perfect days." Had he lived here one glorious autumn he need never have sought another season. June possesses charms as do the other months, but what can hope to excel October?

These October days are quiet and still—like the blue skies above. There were no heralds blowing trumpets to announce their coming. They came silently and as silently lingered. They possess the calmness and repose that we associate with the face of a tired soul, which before crossing the eternal river, holds the essence of life stamped upon its features. There, is contained the mystery of the ages, far too deep for human understanding. We do not seek to understand October, but only to appreciate it.

Fair June has her peculiar beauty. She is riotous and enchanting. She comes with roses entwined in her lovely hair and her eyes are ablaze with strange lights. Diamonds are on her fingers, sweet perfumes float away to swirl the brain and enmesh the senses. Her form is voluptuous and alluring and she sets the heart to beating faster, the blood to mounting in rivulets like those after a warm rain in spring.

March is like a gay lad set loose in the wildwood to do as he pleases. April is a capricious and fickle maiden. May is a dainty lass in the meadow picking daisies and shy violets. August is like a comely matron, sedate and sure of herself. September is a young man who starts out sturdy and strong. December is an old man, withered and gray at the end of a long journey.

October is the gentle nun, serene and lovely. Her beauty is spiritual and she quiets those who have eyes to see and ears to hear. October chastens and she subdues our passions. Her voice is low and modulated. Her eyes have the tender lights of far-off stars but withal, she is bewitching and intriguing for her modesty.

And it's now October in Tennessee. Time for hunting of hickory nuts and walnuts in tall trees; time for swinging out into the sage fields for game; time for the thumping of footballs and the scurrying of feet across the gridiron. All in all, it is the most fitting and proper time of all the year in my estimation.

If all the months were girls and if they were lined up—for a beauty show with me as the sole judge, I think I'd pin the medal on and give the loving cup to Miss October. No matter if she was the homeliest one there, her name would get her by.

You can't beat Tennessee in October. Stretching out from the Father of Waters on the west to the cloud-capped peaks of the Great Smokies on the east, this State encompasses in its length a country that is filled to replete with autumnal beauty—with marsh grass and lily pads that are now turning russet and gray down on Reelfoot Lake, where the ducks will soon be gathering; with oaks and maples along the bottomlands of Gibson County; with sagebrush that is tipped with haze on some of the red hills near the Tennessee; with grass-covered hills and peaceful valleys in middle Tennessee, shot with winding creeks and rivers; with the amethystine blue of the mountains to the far east, where valley and peak are blended under the magic mist that rises from color gone wild.

Hunting dogs strain at the leash and long to be off to shoo up the first covey of quail or track the fast opossum to his den in the tall oak. Down in the cutover field, the quail whistle as they pick up loose grain that has fallen to the ground.

Pumpkins are ripening alongside the shocked corn, grinning inwardly perhaps in anticipation of a visit to the Thanksgiving kitchen. Grunting hogs muzzle corn around in the trough, their sleek sides telling only too plainly of the sausage and the spareribs to come when cold weather sets in. Squirrels chase one another through the trees and scamper to the ground to poke at ripe nuts.

Truly, it is homecoming, home-living, easygoing time in Tennessee. The goose is hanging high, the apples are in the bin, fodder is in the shed, everything is riding high and dry, the men are looking handsomer and the gals are looking prettier, for it's October.

(The closing paragraph is a column written by Frederick Smith for the Charlotte, N.C. Observer entitled "October" and reprinted in the Herald-Register October 14, 1948.)

It is in October that nature goes to sleep. Leaves curl their heads up underneath their abiding place of summer. Flowers fade away only to dream of waking again when spring touches the earth with her hand. If so be it the decree of fate that we should enter our last sleep, we should implore that our passing be as October's; that autumn wrap her veil about our tired shoulders, and we should turn our face toward the sunset west, with the light of adventure in our eyes, and walk through a valley of dreams, with the promise of spring and glorious awakening in our hearts.

WE LOSE A GOOD FRIEND

We have lost a good friend in the passing of Conrad Frederick Smith, gifted writer and man of many parts. Frederick had a pleasing manner, a good personality, a strong physique, and a keen mind. He could do just about anything he set his mind to, and his mind was ready for anything.

He could crawl under a house and repair the plumbing, dig a ditch, repair a house, cook a turkey or mushrooms, or sit in one of his houses while it was being repaired and pound on a typewriter such a gem as his essay on October, which is reprinted in this issue.

While he went to the biggest city and made good—good enough to be wanted on a weekly national television program—good enough to be chosen to present prize-winning turkeys to the President of the United States time after time, he always retained his love for Trenton, and when he was far away he retained an ambition to return to his old home.

His passing so suddenly was a profound shock to us. It was something we had never expected. He was so robust, so energetic, so full of ideas and actions that we expected him to go on and on for many years to come.

During the early years of World War II Frederick served as secretary of the Trenton Chamber of Commerce while the writer was president, and this close association revealed him to us as a good secretary and a man of ability in general.

Trenton will miss Frederick in many ways. Those who liked to read this writings will miss him, those who enjoyed a good meal with others will miss him, those who liked to hunt with him will miss him, and those who recognized genuine culture will miss him.

Utes Make Offer to Sportsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the best evidences that some of the nicest things about the old West are still very much with us—at least in my district, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times under date of September 6, 1963. It tells of a sportsmen's program offered by

some Ute Indians who are my constituents.

The article follows:

WOOD, FIELD, AND STREAM: UTES OFFER SPORTSMEN A 3-DAY HUNT WITH GUARANTEE OF TWO DEER FOR $100

(By Oscar Godbout)

You, too, can shoot with this western tribe which has come up with a scheme that leaves one lighter in the wampum department but richer in hunting experiences.

According to Arrow, Inc., a nonprofit organization working to improve education, welfare, housing and economic conditions of American Indians on their reservations, the project is a package deal for the sportsman who wants to get in some exclusive preseason big-game hunting.

For $150, a hunting guest of the Utes will be provided with transportation from either Vernal or Fort Duchesne, Utah, to somewhere in the 400,000 acres of tribal hunting land owned by the Indians. Return transportation to either of those two places is also included.

The hunter gets 3 days of hunting on the reservation with an Indian guide. He also gets horses, lodging and meals, as well as custom handling of his kill, with packaging and storing for shipment. The bag limit is two deer—mule deer—out there.

As if this weren't enough, the Utes, no novices at the stalking business, guarantee two deer to each hunter.

In addition to the $150 fee, the visiting hunter must show a Utah nonresident license, which sells for $40.

The tribe is stressing the exclusiveness of the hunt, which is available to a limited number through this month and to October 13. The regular Utah deer season begins on October 20.

Hunting guests stay at a lodge and work out of spike camps during the hunt. While the 3 days are standard, additional days are available for extra fees.

The big-game hunter should take his fishing rod along, for there is trout angling in the reservation's Weaver Reservior.

According to Arrow, Inc., the tribe also plans such attractions as packhorse trips, mountain climbing, boating on the Green River, and fishing and hunting for other game, such as the elk, mountain sheep, cougar, and bear.

But available now is a sport not found in every woodlot. "Right now," says Arrow, Inc., "anyone interested in chasing wild horses can sign up for this thrilling adventure, which can be arranged for most anytime."

The hunting enterprise, it goes on, was developed to help the Ute tribe with revenue and employment.

Reservations and information may be had by writing Chief Francis McKinley, care of Arrow, Inc., 1166 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

No. 19—Washington: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Washington, about gambling in that State. Washington is another State where hypocritical officialdom is a covert ally of the underworld.

Parimutuel betting in Washington last year came to over $27 million from which the State derived $1,371,000 in revenue. This legal activity is peanuts compared to the illicit gambling in that State. On the basis of the McClellan committee hearings, Washington's share of national off-track betting came to over $800 million last year. The immense profit derived from illegal gambling has made crime fat and sassy. The pseudo-moralist officialdom that has driven the natural human gambling urge undercover might as well write a check to the crime syndicates. Bluenose gambling laws have put crime in clover in Washington and made it a happy hunting ground for syndicate hustlers.

According to the McClellan committee, the estimates for the total illegal gambling each year in Washington may well exceed $1½ billion.

Because of the lack of commonsense to recognize and control gambling, Washington is an all-year-round open house for the mob. It is no paradox that the biggest expense of the gambling, syndicates turns on the need to buy protection from the lowest law enforcement level on up.

Like most of the other States, Washington is its own worst social enemy, and its social morality is a pawn of mob avarice. Only the institution of a Government-run lottery would cut the foundations from under syndicated gambling. Washington would cease to be a feeding trough for gangsters. Today is not a moment too soon to wake up to the financial and social facts of life.

Dr. David Starr Jordan, Educator, Scientist, and Crusader for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to join with the people of the community of Gainesville in Wyoming County, N.Y., to honor one of their native sons who made monumental contributions to our Nation as an educator, natural scientist, author, and crusader for peace. I am speaking of Dr. David Starr Jordan, who was born in Gainesville in the year of 1851 and became the first president and chancellor of Stanford University.

A memorial plaque was dedicated to him in his hometown and the people of the area have also established a memorial fund for support of education in the field of natural sciences. Creation of this special fund is certainly a most appropriate way to honor this great scientist.

Dr. Jordan graduated from Cornell University and later taught there and at Butler University and the University of Indiana. He served as president at Indiana before moving on to the west coast to join in the creation of Stanford University. Dr. Jordan also was president of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace and the World Peace Congress. His efforts for education, science, and peace brought him honors from nations throughout the world.

Mr. Harry S. Douglass, the historian of Wyoming County, has prepared a brief biographical sketch of Dr. Jordan which I would like to include with my remarks. In addition, I also, under unanimous consent, wish to include a newspaper story from the Buffalo Evening News, entitled "Dr. David Jordan: Western New York Farm Boy Who Rose to World Fame."

The material follows:

DAVID STARR JORDAN, 1851–1931

Dr. David Starr Jordan, first president and chancellor of Stanford University and internationally known for his work in science and world peace, was born in the town of Gainesville, in western New York, January 19, 1851, the fourth of a family of five children of Hiram and Huldah Lake Hawley Jordan. His death occurred at the Palo Alto campus of Stanford University, September 20, 1931.

Jordan's birthplace was an old wayside inn, unpainted, and covered with vines, which led him to remark that "I became a botanist in self-defense." He was educated in the local school and shortly after the Civil War was admitted to the female seminary in Gainesville as a special student. He early developed an intense interest in the domain of natural history, studied the plants and trees on his family farm, and journeyed to neighboring waterways to observe at first hand all forms of marine life. He studied geology with a local clergyman.

At the age of 17, Jordan was employed to teach in a school at South Warsaw, where he "held sway during a reign of blood and iron, mingled with conciliation." In March 1869, he entered Cornell University on a scholarship and with $75 in his pocket. Two years later, he published his first scientific paper on the diseases of sheep, and so adapted his energies that he received both his bachelor and master degrees in 1872, a task accomplished largely from self-support. Louis Agassiz, the eminent naturalist, strongly influenced Jordan's student days and he spent his vacations at the Agassiz Summer School. Jordan came to be recognized as one of the world's leading authorities in ichthyology and in 1883, the International Fisheries Conference at its London meeting gave to the young scientist its highest award. Thirteen years later, he headed the American division of the Joint High Commission of Investigation probing the fur seal fisheries dispute in Bering Sea. In 1879 he had made a study for the Federal Government of the marine industries of the Pacific coast, and from his investigations came conservation measures looking toward the preservation of the salmon industry.

In 1875, Jordan was appointed professor of biology at Butler University, and then 4 years later he became professor of natural history at the University of Indiana and in 1885 president of the school. His work as a scientist and educator attracted the attention of Senator and Mrs. Leland Stanford, who in 1891 persuaded him to become the head of the memorial university which they proposed to establish. Dr. Jordan threw his energies into the creation of the new school, and in spite of the disastrous loss suffered in the 1906 earthquake, Stanford University thrived and grew under his guiding genius. At heart a scientist, Jordan yearned for time to carry on his scientific

work, and in 1912, at the suggestion of Herbert C. Hoover, who was at that time a member of the university's board of trustees, the post of chancellor was created for the purpose of relieving Dr. Jordan of much of the routine administrative duties. After 1915, he bore the title of chancellor emeritus.

With his pen and voice, Dr. Jordan worked for international peace during the years before and after the First World War. In 1924, he received the Raphael Hermann Peace Prize of $25,000 for his plan to further world peace. He was named an original member of the board of trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace and was later its president. Back in 1909, he was appointed chief director of the World Peace Foundation, while 6 years later he was president of the World Peace Congress and vice president of the World Peace Society.

Dr. Jordan was a member of the American Philosophical Association, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Royal Academy of Sweden. He was three times elected president of the California Academy of Science, served as president of the National Educational Association and chairman of the American Eugenics Committee. He was an elector of the Hall of Fame and honorary degrees were conferred upon him by many American colleges and universities. From the Emperor of Japan he received the Meiji Order of the Sacred Treasure in recognition of his labors for world concord.

His writings were so influential and in such enormous quantity that a mere listing would require several paragraphs. In addition to his autobiography, Jordan wrote volumes on geography, natural science, philosophy, peace, and religion.

A lifelong friend of Herbert Hoover from his student days at Stanford, Dr. Jordan lived to see his former pupil elected to the Presidency of the United States in 1928. Of Dr. Jordan, Mr. Hoover once said he "was one of America's greatest teachers, and in that he contributed to the advancement of our country, a service not outdone by any statesman or soldier."

DR. DAVID JORDAN: WESTERN NEW YORK FARM BOY WHO ROSE TO WORLD FAME

(By Jane M. Merle)

He learned to read before attending school—from Horace Greeley's Tribune and the Atlantic Monthly.

At 17 he was teaching successfully at a rural school whose tough students had thrown out bodily the previous teacher.

He was the guiding spirit in the founding of two great American universities.

Headlines proclaimed his winning of the $25,000 World Peace Prize in 1924.

One of his students became President of the United States, and remained his lifelong friend.

His name? Dr. David Starr Jordan, educator, crusader for peace, natural scientist, and one of western New York's most distinguished sons.

Sunday a memorial plaque was dedicated to him in his hometown of Gainesville. And a fund is being established to provide a living memorial to him.

The fourth of five children, David Jordan was born on Whiskey Road (now Jordan Road) in Gainesville, in 1851.

The farmhouse which was his birthplace stood deep in the fertile rolling agricultural area of Wyoming County, and the building remained unpainted throughout his boyhood, for his parents were "saving money for the education of their children."

He was so young when he learned to read that he "couldn't remember ever not knowing how."

Very early he developed an interest in nature—especially botany.

The entire front of his childhood home was covered with a tangle of vines, and in later years Dr. Jordan used to say jokingly that he "became a botanist in self-defense."

His books on plant, animal, fish, and bird life are considered classic reference works.

He was a shy child, a boy who dreaded trips to Warsaw, Perry, Hermitage, and Castile, "noisy towns where nobody knew me."

At school he was considered lazy, because he was often more interested in the construction of an oriole's nest than in the conjugation of verbs.

Mr. John Hickey of Gainesville, whose mother attended school with David Starr Jordan, recalls her impressions of the boy.

"He was marked with greatness," says Mr. Hickey, "but they couldn't see it then. To put it plainly, David Jordan was just a big boob to most of the children who went to school with him, just an ordinary fellow."

Big he certainly was. Well over 6 feet tall at maturity.

At Cornell, from which he graduated with honors, he earned his way by a variety of odd jobs. He dug ditches, tutored fellow students in botany, shoveled snow, and waited on tables, calling the latter "the most distasteful form of work I ever tried."

When he graduated at 21 he had paid his college expenses without accepting any money from home, and had $75 in his pocket.

Perhaps the work which was always dearest to his heart was that of educator.

From the time when as a youth of 17 he took over a school at south Warsaw and taught with "a rule of blood and iron," he devoted much of his life to teaching.

Beginning at Cornell as a tutor in his undergraduate days, he taught at several small colleges. At 34 he was called to be president of Indiana University.

In 1891 he was invited by Senator and Mrs. Leland Stanford to create a university as a memorial to their son—and he was given the use of $30 million with which to do it. He became the first president of Stanford University and its guiding spirit for many years.

Although Dr. Jordan spent most of his adult life in California, he never severed his ties with western New York.

Older residents of the town remember his visits 'back East' vividly. Although Dr. Jordan was famous at the time, he remained the friendly, unassuming person he had always been.

He would wander into a Gainesville friend's barn while milking was in progress, draw up a milking stool and sally into the world of ideas, as much at home amid the odors and animals as he was behind his polished desk at Stanford.

Dr. Jordan had a number of "firsts" to his credit. He received the first scholarship to Cornell University issued to a resident of Wyoming County—the princely sum of $75.

He made the first detailed study of wildlife in western New York.

He was the first graduate of Cornell to receive both his bachelor's and his master's degree at the same time.

He wrote what was probably the first nature story for children. "The Story of a Stone."

He was the first president of Leland Stanford University.

One of Dr. Jordan's students at Stanford University was a young fellow who came down from Oregon for the first term of the infant university.

He was lacking credits, but after taking the English examination three times (he failed it twice), he became the first registered student.

Dr. Jordan was to say later, "Apart from this difficulty (in the English exam) he seemed to have all the requirements for a useful citizen. We graduated him and let him take his chances in the world."

The boy's name was Herbert Hoover.

Dr. Jordan died in 1931. His philosophy is aptly expressed in one of his favorite sayings, "The realities in life are love and action."

The Death of the B–47

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from U.S. News & World Report of October 21, 1963:

THE DEATH OF THE B–47

In the Arizona desert near Tucson—for as far as the eye can see—hundreds of B–47 Stratojet bombers are being lined up for a massive burial.

More of these nuclear bombers are being added to the vast "graveyard" almost every week. The picture on this page gives you an idea of the strange scene in the desert.

The planes are being retired from active roles in the Strategic Air Command. By mid-1966 all of SAC's once-powerful fleet of 1,400 Stratojets will have been removed from the skies.

The cost of building the B–47 came to more than $3.5 billion. That does not include the cost of general maintenance of bases, crews, and planes.

For a decade the B–47 was a mainstay of the U.S. deterrent force. Now, with nuclear-tipped missiles coming on with a rush, civilian defense officials say the planes are no longer needed.

PREMATURE BURIAL?

Among military officers, despite the onrush of missiles, scrapping of the B–47 is causing concern. Some Air Force leaders, including SAC Commander Gen. Thomas S. Power, believe that the B–47 is getting a premature burial. General Power maintains that "the B–47 in the hands of professionals could deliver weapons in the year 2000."

What bothers Air Force leaders is this: When it was agreed, in 1959, to start retiring the B–47's as obsolescent, there was the expectation that it would be replaced by other manned systems. B–52 and B–58 bombers were in production, the Skybolt missile, to be fired from the B–52's, was on the planning boards. So was the futuristic B–70 bomber.

Now the picture has changed. Production of all bombers has been stopped. The Skybolt was scrapped and the B–70 was slowed to a three-plane research program.

THE WORKHORSE AIRCRAFT

Officers call the B–47 the most dependable nuclear-weapon carrier in the U.S. arsenal. Each bomber carries a load that has been publicized as "the nuclear equivalent to all the bombs dropped in World War II." The plane is powered by six jet engines at 600 miles an hour. It will fly 8 miles high and, with midair refueling, reach any target in the world.

Officers still flying the B–47 are confident it could penetrate Soviet antiaircraft defenses. They see it as adding a measure of flexibility to the U.S. deterrent at a time when the reliability and accuracy of missiles are still in question. The B–47, officers maintain, is far superior to some bombers being kept on in the Soviet Air Force.

From civilian defense authorities, you get another view: The B–47 as a strategic weapons system does not measure up well against

Polaris or Minuteman missiles. It is costly to maintain, has other drawbacks. With a money squeeze on, officials say, something has to give.

Oversea bases for B-47's can be shut down at a saving in foreign exchange. SAC bases in north Africa, Spain, and England have been or will be closed. Some big SAC bases in the United States also will be affected. Stratojets have already been withdrawn from bases in Florida, Louisiana, and Georgia.

HALFWAY TO SCRAP HEAP

The doomed Stratojets do not move directly from the sky to the scrap heap. For the time being they are being kept on standby status—maintained in fairly good condition in the dry desert air—so they can be resurrected in case of a major emergency.

But it is just a matter of time before the entire fleet of 1,400 planes is gathered together and sent to a $3.5 billion scrap pile.

Answers to Grossly Unfair Statements About Bus-Train Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to keep my colleagues promptly advised of the developments and findings of the various agencies and committees investigating the train-bus accident in my district on September 17.

Probably 15 different agencies are investigating from local to universal. We even have reports that a committee from the House Education and Labor Committee was on the scene. Corrinne Huff, the former Miss Universe, was one of the investigators. If we are to be investigated, we are pleased that Congress sends its most comely investigators. The following is a report of the Council of California Growers:

Citing official testimony given before a State legislative investigating committee, the Council of California Growers today answered what it termed as "grossly unfair" statements made in connection with the train-bus accident which killed 32 Mexican braceros on September 17 near Salinas.

"Some of the statements reflected so adversely upon agriculture generally and upon the bracero program specifically that an answer is imperative in the interests of truth and fairness," said the council.

"First, however, let it be said that all of California agriculture was deeply shocked by the accident, and it will cooperate in supporting any measures to prevent a repetition of such a tragedy."

However, the grower organization continued, all of the investigations conducted by official agencies do not support the early strong inference that the bus involved in this accident was faulty or below prescribed standards.

"This inference was drawn from the unfortunate description of the vehicle as a makeshift bus," the council stated.

At the assembly interim committee investigation in Salinas, Capt. Francis E. Simmons, in charge of the California Highway Patrol office in Salinas, testified that, "This was not a makeshift bus. This was an especially made vehicle, designed and constructed to be used as a farm labor bus." Simmons conducted an exhaustive examination of the accident in response to special orders issued by Gov. Edmund G. Brown.

Simmons told the legislative investigators that after the accident the bus was dismantled by a "master mechanic" under the supervision of the CHP and nothing was found to indicate mechanical failure.

He added his investigation brought out universal agreement among witnesses that there was absolutely "no effort on the part of the driver to 'beat the train' to the crossing."

Robert Cripe, engineer of the freight train, testified that he saw the truck come to a halt and then start across the tracks. He said he immediately started to blow his horn and continued sounding it in short blasts until the moment of impact.

The busdriver, Francisco Espinosa, a licensed chauffeur since 1959, earlier had told investigating officers that he did not see or hear the train until the front wheels of his vehicle were on the tracks. Charges of felony manslaughter have been filed against Espinosa. He was one of the 27 survivors of the crash.

Captain Simmons said the CHP conducted simulated tests at the scene of the accident and found that a driver at this crossing would have only between 9 and 13 seconds to clear the tracks after hearing the first blast of a locomotive horn—sounded at the same point where presumably Engineer Cripe first sounded his.

The council, which had an observer at the legislative investigation, said other erroneous reports and insinuations voiced immediately after the accid nt were contradicted by evidence before t e interim committee.

Among these were:

1. That farm labor buses generally are not fit for use. George Sherman, chief of the State division of industrial safety, said that "buses seen today are a great improvement since 1958." He denied it is the practice any more of employers to buy condemned school buses. The council pointed out that buses used to transport farmworkers from camps to fields compare with those used in the military services to haul personnel short distances. For longer distances, braceros and other farmworkers are transported in passenger buses under charter with regular bus lines.

2. That the bus was overloaded. In a report to his superiors on September 19, Jerry Jefcoat of the State compensation insurance fund stated that "The capacity of the bus was 70 and it was carrying only 58 men in the passenger compartment. Accordingly, the bus was not overloaded."

3. That compensation payments totaling $750,000 to the widows and dependents of the braceros came from (a) the government, in one report and (b) from employee-paid premiums, in another report. The council pointed out that the workmen's compensation fund is dependent entirely upon employer-paid premiums.

4. That farm-labor buses are not inspected. Samuel Carrillo, compliance officer of the Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor, testified that they do inspect such vehicles and that they require a competent mechanic to certify to the conditions of the vehicles.

Concluding, the council stated that "Some opponents of the bracero program stooped to a new low in shameful tactics by seeking to exploit this tragedy to defeat the proposed bracero law extension now before Congress."

Officer Resignation Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Hanson W. Baldwin, an outstanding military expert, has written a very descriptive article in the October 21 issue of the New York Times in which he indicates low morale of officers in the Army and the dangerous rate of resignations.

With the American taxpayer paying almost $50 billion a year this problem should be dealt with immediately by the appropriate committees of the Congress so that deficiences can be corrected.

The article follows:

OFFICERS RESIGN AT A RISING RATE: POOR MORALE IS BLAMED FOR DOUBLING SERVICE LOSSES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Resignations of regular officers from the armed services have increased sharply in the last year. Some observers believe the increase reflects an unsatisfactory state of morale.

Resignations of regular officers in the fiscal year that ended last June 30 totaled 1,622, compared with 787 in 1962 and 827 in 1961.

The resignations, plus early retirements from the services are considered by some personnel experts as "bad and increasing." The resignations are considered particularly significant since men who resign, as distinct from those who retire, draw no retirement pay.

A Navy expert said one of the main reasons for the separations was lack of material incentive. He pointed out that even the recent pay increase that went into effect October 1 did not provide pay scales comparable to those of similar civil service or civilian positions.

CONSIDERS GAINS TOO LOW

Moreover, he said, promotion to high rank promises relatively little in terms of increased pay. Flag and general officers of the armed services received no increase in pay between 1908 and 1946. Raises since then, servicemen feel, have not compensated for the increased costs of living and the general increases in pay scales in comparable nonmilitary positions.

Some officers believe that the basic causes for the resignations are more psychological than material. They see a considerable gulf between them and their civilian superiors. Many believe that military judgment and professional experience is often overruled or downgraded.

It is their impression that there is very little sense of loyalty extending downward from superiors. Dissent appears to be unwelcome and in fact penalized.

All services share this feeling in varying degrees. The Air Force schism between its civilian and its military heads has been most pronounced recently. Relationships in the Navy were improved in the final months of Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth's administration, but they were not completely smooth.

Army officers who work with Secretary of the Army Cyrus L. Vance has formed a high admiration for his force, integrity, warmth, and intelligence. But he has not made the same impression in the field. Resignations

of regular Army officers are higher than those of any other service.

CHANGES RESENTED

Other reasons for the high resignation rate include a prevalent impression that regulations governing promotion, schooling and other aspects of service life are changed frequently, often penalizing a man through no fault of his own. Not enough emphasis is put upon field leadership capabilities. There are far too many transfers and shifts—so many that a great many service officers feel that they never stay long enough at any one job to master it properly.

Many officers in the services, particularly those in the Army, express scorn and anger about personnel policies that they feel treat too many officers as numbers instead of men.

An informal survey made last spring of a 20 percent random sample of officers in each grade assigned to Headquarters, 1st U.S. Army, on Governors Island indicated that the average officer had 17 years of commissioned service, acquired 8 military occupational specialities, made 12 PCS (permanent changes of station), had 26 major assignments (not including minor additional duties), and made at least 16 moves (combat zones excluded) that required uprooting of his family.

Comparative figures on resignations, as furnished by the Pentagon, follow:

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Army	[1] 469	[1] 374	343	408	255	750
Navy	158	103	167	80	93	261
Air Force	204	261	382	315	392	584
Marine	32	41	39	24	47	27
Total	863	779	931	827	787	1,622

[1] Includes Regular and Reserve; no breakdown available.

OFFICER EXPLAINS MOVE

One officer who resigned recently is Marion T. Wood, a major with 13 years' service, a master's degree, and combat experience in Korea. Major Wood wrote two letters to himself last year to justify his decision. He summarized reasons cited frequently for the high resignation rate in the Army in particular and in the services in general.

"I can no longer accept," Major Wood wrote, "the gross inequities created by the 'system' and will not subject my family to them. I refuse to be used by bureaucrats in the civilian Government who have a higher regard for scientific progress, weapons, and materiel than they do for men's lives and welfare of military families.

"I am tired of having my life and the lives of my family controlled by leaders who advocate and publish policies which make a military career attractive; and yet at the same time, make only halfhearted efforts at best to implement these expressed policies.

"I am tired of broken promises and half-truths. For example even though the Army says that 'normal tours of duty' will be for 3 years, I have moved 33 times in 13 years (10 times in 9 years of marriage). Each of these moves cost me approximately 1 month's salary.

"Furthermore, I was forced by the Army and by circumstances to live several times in substandard housing at exorbitant rental."

"I want the opportunity," Major Wood concluded, "to grow personally and financially according to my own ability; I want to be part of a stable community; I want a home; but mostly, I want my children to grow up in an atmosphere which will more adequately prepare them to face the future with confidence. The U.S. Army does not offer these possibilities to me."

Navy Clinic a Great Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had the good fortune to participate in an outstanding example of cooperation between the Federal Government and the private sector of our economy—the Pacific Southwest Navy Research and Development Clinic held in Oakland, Calif.

This clinic brought the Department of the Navy together with leading industrial representatives of the 14 Western States, in an attempt to solve technical problems confronting the Navy.

For the Navy the clinic offered an opportunity to utilize experience gained in private industry to improve current weapons systems and to develop new ones; to locate new sources of creative talent; and to broaden the base of participation. For private industry the clinic provided an opportunity to increase its participation in Navy research and development efforts. From my perspective as a participant, I think many of the objectives of all parties were being realized.

While the following news release will give many of the partinent details, I would particularly like to congratulate the Oakland Chamber of Commerce and Nils Eklund, president; William A. Sparling, general manager; Ken Moeller, managing director of the clinic; and Vice Adm. Murrey Royar, clinic general chairman; for their tireless efforts in making this clinic a success.

Industrial leaders from the East Bay and throughout the western United States participated in the Pacific Southwest-Navy Research and Development Clinic in Oakland, October 15 through 18.

Offering invaluable guidance to the business attendees were fifty technical counselors representing the Departments of Defense, Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, and Interior, plus the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Federal Aviation Agency and Small Business Administration. Major prime contractors also had counselors present. Navy Commander Frank Osequeda of the Office of Naval Material, Washington, D.C., was in charge of the counseling service.

Sparking the sponsor list for the clinic was the Oakland Chamber of Commerce under leadership of Nils Eklund, president; William A. Sparling, general manager; and Ken Moeller, manager of the chamber's Industrial Department and Managing Director of the Clinic. Other host sponsors were University of California, California State Chamber of Commerce, and California State Economic Development Agency. Navy sponsor was the Department of the Navy—Office of Naval Material.

Serving as general chairman of the clinic was Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, U.S. Navy (retired). Principals providing leadership during panel discussions attended by more than 800 industrialists, educators, and prime contractors included:

Opening general session, Wednesday, October 16, 1963, Vice Adm. Royar, master of ceremonies.

Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman, Science and Astronautics Committee, and Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN, member, Armed Services Committee, "Congressional Views on Research and Development."

Vice Adm. William A. Schoech, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Material, "Naval Problems and Advanced Technology."

Rear Adm. Edward J. Fahy, representing the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, "Future R. & D. Programs of the Bureau of Ships."

Rear Adm. E. R. Eastwold, Assistant Chief, Plans and Programs, Bureau of Naval Weapons, "Future R. & D. Programs of the Bureau of Naval Weapons."

Luncheons, Wednesday, October 16, 1963: Toastmaster, Chancellor Edward W. Strong, University of California, Berkeley; speaker, Dr. Harold Brown, Director, Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, "Department of Defense R. & D. Policies for Contractual Research."

Thursday, October 17, 1963: Toastmaster, Milton M. Teague, president, California State Chamber of Commerce; speaker, Rear Adm. Leonidas Coates, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Research, "Broad Spectrum of Basic Navy Research."

Friday, October 18, 1963: Toastmaster, Rear Adm. R. M. Watt, Jr., U.S. Navy (retired) manager, advanced planning, Kaiser Aircraft & Electronics Division of Kaiser Industries Corp.; speaker, Rear Adm. Thomas F. Connolly, U.S. Navy, Director Strike Warfare Division, Chief of Naval Operations, "What the Fleet Wants from Research and Development."

Banquet, Thursday, October 17, 1963: Principal speaker at the banquet was the Honorable James H. Wakelin, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, "Research and Development—The Foundation of Effective Navy Sea Power." Toastmaster was Nils Eklund. Also participating were John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii; Kent D. Pursel, chairman, Alameda County Board of Supervisors; the Honorable John C. Houlihan, mayor, city of Oakland; and Congressman George P. Miller.

Additional key panel participants were:

Astro-aeronautical and missile engineering panel: Vice Adm. Paul D. Stroop, U.S. Navy, commander, Naval Air Force Pacific; Rear Adm. Hazlett P. Weatherwax, U.S. Navy, Director, Development, Familities, Astronautics and Ranges Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.

Oceanography and meteorology panel: Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, U.S. Navy, Oceanographer of the Navy and Commander, U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office; Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan, U.S. Navy, chairman, Deep Submergence System Review Group.

Teenage Traffic Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, using the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a vehicle, I would like to convey to the judges of the traffic courts throughout the Nation the functional details of a system of law enforcement devised and applied by Hon.

Richard W. Davis, municipal judge for the city of Radford, Va.

Judge Davis adopts the view that any teenager old enough to enjoy the privilege of a driver's license is old enough to assume the responsibilities which it entails and to make personal recompense to society when he violates the traffic laws designed to protect society. Under the Davis system, a fine assessed against a teenage traffic violator cannot be paid by his parents. The violator's operator's license is suspended and not reinstated until he pays the fine from money he has earned during off-school hours, and as proof that the money was earned, the judge requires the violator to submit an affidavit executed by his employer.

Judge Davis is justifiably proud of the fact that since his system was inaugurated, traffic offenses by teenagers have dropped dramatically. As a private citizen, I salute the Davis system. Parenthetically, my teenage daughter who holds a driver's license joins me in this salute.

The Hungarian Revolution—7 Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in November 1956, as secretary of state of New Jersey and the representative of the Governor I was present at Camp Kilmer, N.J., when the first of more than 36,000 Hungarian refugees arrived in America. I saw the lean and bewildered faces of these men, women, and children who had fled the land of their birth rather than submit to the Communist tyranny, and I marked them well. Today at the seventh anniversary of the Hungarian revolution I reviewed these faces again in my memory, as I wish not to forget them and those who struggled so valiantly in freedom's name.

I therefore wish to have entered in the RECORD the following short article which appeared in the New Brunswick, N.J., Home News on October 20 and which contains a statement by two Hungarian groups on the present state of things in Hungary:

HUNGARIAN UNITS SEE HOMELAND STILL UNDER COMMUNIST RULE

The seventh anniversary of the Hungarian revolution isn't going unnoticed.

JOINT STATEMENT

Two groups, Hungarian Students at Rutgers University and the Hungarian Alumni Association, in a joint statement, noted that the anniversary, which occurs Wednesday, "still finds 80,000 Soviet Russia troops in Hungary, encircling cities, controlling all important walks of life, and raising rocket bases.

"With these foreign troops, all totalitarian practices are still being maintained in Hungary today, such as the one-party system, the lack of freedoms and the lack of democracy," the groups said.

They added: "We live in a world where human beings are becoming increasingly conscious of the all-embracing importance of freedom, democracy, equality and justice * * * when we demand this for all races, religions, and nations, we do demand it for the people of Hungary, too."

RED REGIME

The groups said that while recent measures have eased some aspects of life in Hungary, such as granting partial amnesty, lessening discrimination in family origin and easing traveling conditions, a Communist totalitarian regime still rules the nation.

United Nations: Effective Instrument for Social and Economic Reform, World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday we are commemorating United Nations Day. This international organization will be celebrating its 18th birthday and, once again, the season for evaluation is upon us.

The following editorial by Donald McDonald appeared recently in the Catholic Bulletin of the St. Paul Archdiocese. It is an excellent summation of the United Nations achievements and future needs. Mr. McDonald contends that criticism of our participation in the U.N. has dropped sharply, and that its value as an instrument for economic and social reform—and as a pacifying influence on international relations—is firmly established.

As the U.N. prepares for its next birthday, it has yet to achieve the goal so strongly sought by the last two Popes—Pius XII and John XXIII—the authority to prevent international aggression. We share Mr. McDonald's hope that this authority will soon be realized.

The editorial follows:

ANTI-U.N. STEAM WEAK

(By Donald McDonald)

BROOKFIELD, WIS.—October 24 is United Nations Day, and, like many days, it has its formalistic and ritualistic observance by friend and foe alike. Friends of the U.N. attend special United Nations day programs. Foes of the U.N. picket the same programs.

Friends write editorials and letters to the editor extolling the accomplishments of the U.N. Foes counter with editorials and letters denouncing the U.N. as the source of all the world's ills.

But a good deal of the steam has gone out of both the attack and defense of the United Nations in the 15 years it has been in existence.

It becomes increasingly difficult as the years go by and as the United Nations and its work become more and more familiar to millions of American citizens for enemies of the U.N. to find very many fellow-citizens who will swallow the "line" that the U.N. is an evil, sinister organization plotting to overthrow the American Government.

Nor is it any easier for friends of the U.N. to generate much enthusiasm for the idea that the United Nations alone is capable of constructing a peaceful world order.

Not all opposition to the U.N. has vanished by any means. There will still be pastors who will fulminate this Halloween against children in the parish collecting pennies for UNICEF instead of candy for themselves, despite the fact that the Holy See has for years concretely symbolized its warm regard for the humanitarian work of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund by annual financial donations. There will still be letters to the editor demanding: "Get the United States Out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States."

But the incidence of such tactics and reactions has dropped sharply in recent years, as has the number of people who pay much attention to the anti-U.N. zealots.

An objective estimate of the value of the United Nations would have to include at least these two pluses:

1. It has been an effective instrument, at times a catalytic agent, for badly needed social and economic reform, cultural vitalization and health programs throughout the world.

2. Though it has not been (and could not be) the architect of an enforceable program for world order and peace, it has had a pacifying influence on international relations.

This pacifying influence flows from the humanitarian works of the U.N. (point 1, above), and from the public forum service it provides to member nations.

To the extent the U.N. has been able to bring medicine to the world's sick, food to the hungry, education to the illiterate, it has contributed a measure of hope and psychic stability to the world's peoples without which no consistent, meaningful progress toward political order and stability could be expected.

Through its food and agricultural organization, technical assistance administration, UNESCO, UNICEF and other specialized health and welfare agencies, the United Nations has, indeed, improved substantially the social and cultural environment of the world. It has, therefore, improved the chances for the development of a peaceful world order.

And, of course, because of its use as a public forum for the airing of disputes between nations, the U.N. has demonstrated time and again that there is such a thing as world public opinion, that nations do respect it, and that even when some nations flout public opinion they do everything they can to minimize the ensuing loss of world respect and esteem.

The U.N. is still afflicted with the inherent weakness with which it was born: it has no power to curb the aggressive action of any member nation which is strong enough to defy it. Its police power, its authority to enforce the peace, is only the revocable power and authority delegated to it on an ad hoc basis by member nations.

None of the member nations have yet yielded that measure of their sovereignty which an international organization must have if it is to develop and enforce a permanent disarmament program.

The last two popes—Pius XII and John XXIII—repeatedly called for a world juridical organization which would have irrevocable authority to prevent international aggression. This may evolve from the present U.N. structure; it may be organized by the collaborative efforts of the Soviet Union and United States (both of whom are thoroughly frightened at the possibility of nuclear weapons spreading to many nations); or it may rise up from regional groupings of nations which recognize the logic of finding the ultimate political expression of the world community.

International Trade for Profit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, each passing day proves beyond a reasonable doubt that international trade has been, is now and always will be for profit until the day is reached where need and not greed motivates the exchange of goods.

Trade in the beginning was a means of exporting your goods to other countries, that needed what you had in surplus and importing the things you needed from their over abundance.

However, since the production of goods in all areas of production, farming, mining and manufacturing have become worldwide and no longer exclusive outside of a few minerals and some tropical products the motive for trade has become increasingly mercantile.

Those amongst us who profess the brotherhood of man as their aim in free trade seem to have little concept of world markets, world production and worldly greed.

One would be led to believe that when we trade with a nation by sacrificing our high economy production we do so because we create good will on one hand and we gain jobs, profits and economic well-being on the other.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The facts are to the contrary, our job ratio to population and consumption shows a decline and our balance of payments is so out of line we not only broke all past policies on trading with the enemy but we are even now considering all-out trading with Russia just as the Canadians have had to agree to, on a favored nation basis.

Without debating the merits and demerits of the wheat deal with Russia, the point I want to emphasize is that in the vast majority of our cases before the Tariff Commission for relief from the flood of cheaper produced, low waged products the Tariff Commission has found some lame crutch to lean on in denying relief to U.S. industry.

For instance under the new trade bill, which I worked against because of its lack of protection and safeguards for U.S. workers and the U.S. economy, all new charges of dumping by foreign countries into the U.S. market have been lost by U.S. petitioners.

It could not be otherwise since the Tariff Commission uses the escape clause procedures rather than the facts on dumping.

Each decision that I have had an opportunity to study simply denies the U.S. petition on the grounds that "no injury" has been caused by the foreign product. The law does have as one of the provisions of the antidumping section, title II, the question of injury, however, if the board were as interested in protecting the U.S. economy as they seem to be on wrecking it they would read this section as an escape for U.S. industry rather than for the profiteering foreign exporter and U.S. importer.

In my humble opinion this section of the antidumping provisions of the act was put there to give the Tariff Commission a leg to stand on if foreign products were sold at a price equal to their home market price it could still be judged "injurious" to U.S. industry under the antidumping law.

The facts and scorecard to date shows the opposite of this reasoning to be the rule under which the Tariff Commission operates.

When the proof clearly shows that dumping is taking place the Commission simply falls back on "one single paragraph" in the antidumping law and finds for the foreign country and against the U.S. petitioner.

This, then, is the reason for my special order today. The long suffering glassworker is again sitting beneath the sword of Damocles.

The following information on the glass industry tells its fears of adverse "assistance" under the new trade bill. It is a case of having been bit by a snake the industry fears every rope.

Both management and labor are disturbed by what can happen. Their only hope is that the voices from abroad and their mouth pieces here may be silenced by an early indication of the position to be taken by our Government in the coming round of trade talks.

This is essential and in a sense urgent. I therefore appeal to the Members of the House to come to our side and give us their support in our appeal for equitable treatment at the trade table.

What does it matter to the unemployed glassworkers to be told that they are building prosperity for other peoples by their sacrifice of a job.

The most important economic benefit that a man can get from his Government is an opportunity to earn his living, to have an earned income and to be protected in that job opportunity by his Government against privateers and profiteers both at home and abroad.

Every Member of Congress knows the long hard fight that has been carried on for generations in this Nation to protect a man in his right to work free, to better his conditions of labor, to share in the good life he helps to create with his labor.

How can we now in this generation fail to see the threat to his well-being.

Free trade is a luxury this country cannot afford, yet. There may be a day when it won't matter whether you have a job or whether you are on relief but that day has not arrived yet, I pray it never will. Until that day does come a worker needs protective covenants in our trade deals to protect his economic well-being just as surely as he needs military protection for his property and physical well-being.

To a worker out of employment for so long that he has to turn to public relief, the economic atom bomb has already struck, his family is forced to live in a different everyday world than their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the fears of the glassworkers are real, they are born of experience, they learned the hard way.

The glass industry is sitting in the hot seat of doubt and fear, the sword hangs over its head. The Tariff Commission can cut the string or the President can remove the sword. The situation is as follows:

SHEET GLASS: PRESIDENTIAL ESCAPE CLAUSE PROCLAMATION

On September 27, 1963, the Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 351(d)(1) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, released its first annual report relating to the sheet glass escape clause action taken by the President on March 19, 1962. This is the first report issued by the Commission regarding sheet glass since its supplemental report to the President of January 10, 1962.

The Tariff Commission report does not support or warrant a reopening for formal review of the President's action at this time nor any modification of the President's action. On the contrary, the reported developments establish the necessity for maintenance of the President's action to prevent serious and harmul economic effects on the domestic sheet glass industry.

I. THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION'S REPORT IS TOO SHORT A PERIOD FOR SOUND ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE INCREASED DUTIES ON SHEET GLASS, AND WAS AN ABNORMAL PERIOD IN THE SHEET GLASS INDUSTRY

The President's escape clause action has now been in effect only 15 months. The President's proclamation increasing the sheet glass duties was issued March 19, 1962, but the original effective date of April 18, 1962, was delayed and the increased duties did not go into effect until June 18, 1962. Foreign producers took full advantage of this situation by increasing their imports to the maximum amount. As a result, during the first 6 months of 1962, the sheet glass imports were abnormally high. This caused the importers to have abnormally high inventories. Furthermore, this resulted in U.S. producers' inventories being at an alltime high at the end of 1962. These huge inventories had to be used before new glass could be sold.

In addition, there was a longshoremen's strike at the end of 1962 which extended into early 1963; this strike curtailed the importation of glass into this country in the early part of 1963.

Even though imports were relatively low during the first half of 1963, they took a sudden jump in July. In fact, July of 1963 is the biggest month for imports since June of 1962—the effective date of the tariff increase. Interestingly, the Tariff Commission had originally announced June as the date for publishing its report.

All of the above factors contribute toward making the period under analysis an abnormal one.

Not only has the period been abnormal, but it has been far too short. A longer period is essential to make a proper judgment if the domestic industry has, in fact, reached a level of satisfactory operation which could be maintained in the face of the intense competition, which continues to exist under the present increased duties, and which would certainly be greatly intensified if such remedial action were with-

drawn. The question here is not if the industry along with imports shows some natural favorable response to improved economic conditions, but rather if it would again be subject to greater and more serious injury if economic conditions declined, or if the increased duties be withdrawn.

The escape clause investigation by the Tariff Commission included a study of the effect of imports into the United States for an 11-year period—1950–60—and other economic developments for a period of 6 years—1955–60. The investigation by the Commission continued over a 14-month period not including the prior intensive study under the peril point investigation proceedings. Additionally, after completion of the Tariff Commission investigation, there was a critical study by other executive departments to assist the President, lasting for a period of 60 days.

The carefully considered action, by the President, based on this long and painstaking study and evaluation of all factors involved, must not be lightly brushed aside or sought to be reexamined on the basis of the experience of such a short, abnormal period of time.

II. CONDITIONS IN THE DOMESTIC SHEET GLASS INDUSTRY, DESPITE SOME IMPROVEMENT IN THE PAST YEAR, REMAIN STILL DEPRESSED

Operations of domestic producers have been unsatisfactory during the 1960's. This is clearly shown by the indexes of operations in the industry which follow:

Trends in the U.S. sheet-glass industry

[1959=100]

Year	Production	Shipments [1]	Inventories	Production	Ratio of operating profit to sales
1959	100	100	100	100	100
1960	79	80	118	84	(2)
1961	76	81	86	80	(2)
1962	92	91	135	91	3
1963 (January to June)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	16

[1] Based on reports by companies accounting for about 80 percent of the domestic industry's shipments.
[2] Deficit.
[3] Not available.

Source: Derived from data contained in the Report to the President (No. TEA-IR-7-63), U.S. Tariff Commission.

As the above data shows, the domestic sheet glass industry has not shared fully in the economic recovery following 1960. In fact, it is questionable if the fundamental downward trend in the industry really has been reversed. Production, shipments, employment, and profits were low through 1962 while inventories were at an alltime high. Production was lower in the first half of 1963 than in the first half of 1962.

Earnings have continued to be low through the first half of 1963. Some idea of how acute this situation is can be gained from a comparison of changes in operating profits of all manufacturing industries with those of the sheet glass industry. The pertinent indexes of operating profit ratios to sales follow:

[Index (1959=100)]

Year	Sheet glass [1]	All manufacturing [2] industries
1959	100	100
1960	(3)	91
1961	(3)	87
1962	3	93
1963 (January to June)	16	95

[1] Based on reports from producers accounting for about ⅔ of domestic sheet glass shipments.
[2] See "Financial Report for Manufacturing Corporations," Federal Trade Commission.
[3] Deficit.

Notwithstanding low earnings and a discouraging level of sales the industry has probably expended well over $20 million since the beginning of 1960 to keep itself efficient. This has not only kept plants up to date but has perforce tended to increase their capacity somewhat. Low production levels, however, reduced the ratio of capacity employed in 1962 probably to less than 65 percent as compared with the not impressive level of 74 percent in 1959. In 1963 the ratio has continued to be well below the 1959 level. This continued low output, increased inventories, and increased wages and other items have resulted in overall increases in costs of production.

The recent price increases for sheet glass, which came at a time when demand was exceedingly brisk, may enable the domestic producers to recapture some of the increased costs which they have been forced to absorb over a sustained period.

III. IMPORTS HAVE MAINTAINED A SUBSTANTIAL SHARE OF THE U.S. MARKET AND RECENTLY DEMONSTRATED A SHARPLY INCREASING TREND

The Tariff Commission report unanimously finding injury to the domestic industry was issued May 16, 1961. Following its supplemental report of January 10, 1962, its findings were approved and proclaimed by the President on March 19, 1962, to be effective April 18, 1962. On March 27, 1962, the President directed that the effective date of increased duties be deferred to June 17, 1962. Foreign manufacturers and importers, therefore, had something more than a year's notice of the possible application of duties and 3 months' specific notice following the proclamation by the President giving effect thereto. This period of grace was utilized fully by them.

Reference to the monthly statistics of imports demonstrates that during this period the greatest volume of shipments in history poured into the United States. In the quarter April, May, June 1962 alone, such imports totaled 136 million pounds from reduced rate countries alone, equivalent to 30 percent of apparent domestic consumption. This tremendous import volume served to fill the distribution pipelines in the United States. Inevitably, therefore, imports volume dropped in the months immediately following the effective date of the increased duties. Recently, imports have resumed a sharp upward trend.

The table on page A6616, showing a comparison of domestic shipments, imports, and ratio of reduced duty imports to apparent consumption, demonstrates the heavy stockpiling engaged in by importers in the period immediately preceding the effective date of the President's proclamation, and reflects the resumption of an upward trend in market participation by reduced duty imports.

Every indication based on the trends evidenced by the table is that the portion of the American market controlled by imports will continue to increase under the existing schedule of tariff duties in both absolute and relative terms and, indeed, it is not improbable that such imports before long will exceed any share of the American market heretofore enjoyed by foreign producers.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE RECENT FHA RULING

The Tariff Commission has stated in its latest report that a recent FHA ruling will tend to reduce the share of U.S. consumption of sheet glass supplied by imports in 1963. This statement does not appear to take into account all existing facts.

Since April 1, 1963, the FHA has required that all glass installed in FHA-financed homes has had to meet designated minimum thickness tolerances for certain size lights of glass; moreover, the glass in most sliding glass doors has had to be tempered or laminated, or contain wire reinforcing, and all installed mirrors have had to be made of plate glass. A proper analysis of the effects of such FHA rulings demonstrates that such rulings will have almost no adverse effect upon the foreign producers.

Traditionally, the domestic producers have manufactured 19-ounce single-strength glass while the foreigners have manufactured both 18- and 19-ounce single-strength glass. In addition, the domestic producers have manufactured 26-ounce double-strength glass while the foreigners have manufactured both 24- and 26-ounce double-strength glass. Superficially, there appears to be a marked difference between the domestic and the foreign glasses, but a careful analysis clearly demonstrates that it is actually impossible to discern any difference between the domestic and foreign glasses without the aid of measuring instruments. This means that the naked eye cannot ascertain whether a piece of glass is 18 or 19 ounce or whether it is 24 or 26 ounce.

Sometimes, also, the measuring instruments are unable to tell the difference because the tolerances overlap. For example, 18-ounce glass has a tolerance of from 2 millimeters to 2.4 millimeters, while 19-ounce glass has a tolerance of from 2.16 millimeters to 2.54 millimeters. This means that heavy 18-ounce glass is actually light 19-ounce glass, even when it is measured with instruments.

The same analogy is true in regard to double strength glass; 24-ounce glass has a tolerence of from 2.75 millimeters to 3.2 millimeters, while 26-ounce glass has

Sheet glass: Domestic shipments, imports, apparent consumption, and ratio of imports at MFN [1] (reduced) rates of duty to apparent consumption

Period	Domestic shipments excluding exports	Imports for consumption			Apparent consumption	Ratio of imports at MFN [1] rates to apparent consumption (percent)
		MFN [1] rates of duty	Full rates of duty	Total		
	Million pounds					
July–September 1959	428.9	125.0	4.9	129.9	558.8	22.4
October–December 1959	404.7	101.2	4.6	105.8	510.5	19.8
January–March 1960	303.0	99.6	4.4	104.0	407.0	24.5
April–June 1960	276.6	103.6	4.6	108.2	384.8	26.9
Total	1,413.2	429.4	18.5	447.9	1,861.1	23.1
July–September 1960	322.4	99.6	6.1	105.7	428.1	23.3
October–December 1960	357.1	88.6	4.0	92.6	449.7	19.7
January–March 1961	252.7	70.7	5.3	76.0	328.7	21.5
April–June 1961	294.2	79.0	6.8	85.8	380.0	20.8
Total	1,226.4	337.9	22.2	360.1	1,586.5	21.3
July–September 1961	355.6	100.1	6.5	106.6	462.2	21.7
October–December 1961	371.8	100.2	6.8	107.0	478.8	20.9
January–March 1962	374.2	123.7	10.0	133.7	507.9	24.4
April–June 1962	305.5	135.5	6.6	142.1	447.6	30.3
Total	1,407.1	459.5	29.9	489.4	1,896.5	24.2
July–September 1962	366.3	90.7	12.7	103.4	469.7	19.3
October–December 1962	392.6	85.1	6.2	91.3	483.9	17.6
January–March 1963	317.6	68.6	2.5	71.1	388.7	17.5
April–June 1963	370.3	96.1	2.7	98.8	469.1	20.5
Total	1,446.8	340.5	24.1	364.6	1,811.4	18.8

[1] Most favored nation.

Source: Adapted from tables 3 and 4 of report to President (No. TEA-IR-7-63) under sec. 351(d)(1).

a tolerance of from 2.92 millimeters to 3.4 millimeters. Since it is extremely difficult to ascertain the difference between the thickness of domestic and foreign glasses, it will be almost impossible to enforce the new FHA ruling regarding sheet glass. Obviously, it is impractical, if not impossible, to actually measure each piece of glass that is placed in a new home with a micrometer. But even if the FHA inspectors were to measure each piece of glass some 18-ounce glass would fall within the acceptable tolerances for 19-ounce glass, and some 24-ounce glass would fall within the tolerances for 26-ounce glass. It follows that foreign 18- and 24-ounce glass will not be eliminated from use in FHA homes. Furthermore, the foreigners could solve their entire problem by merely making all of their window glass 19 ounce and 26 ounce instead of 18 ounce and 24 ounce. Such being the case, the foreign producers' ability to sell 19- and 26-ounce glass at prices sufficiently below those of U.S. producers; as suggested by the Tariff Commission, becomes solely an academic question. Their ability to do so has been amply demonstrated.

The new FHA ruling will require the useage of more tempered glass in sliding glass doors. But this ruling does not adversely affect the foreign producers because substantial quantities of foreign sheet glass have been and are now being imported into this country and tempered here. Several domestic companies, including one large domestic automotive manufacturer, are presently engaged in tempering imported sheet glass.

The new FHA ruling requires that all installed mirrors be made of plate glass. This ruling will not adversely affect the foreign producers because only an infinitesimal amount of foreign sheet glass has been utilized in the manufacture of mirrors in the United States.

V. WHAT RESULT DID THE PRESIDENT INTEND TO ACCOMPLISH BY INCREASING THE TARIFF DUTIES ON SHEET GLASS ON JUNE 17, 1962?

The action taken by the President to increase tariff duties on sheet glass was taken primarily to alleviate and prevent continued serious injury to the domestic industry. Such action was not taken, as might be inferred from representations that have been made to the Tariff Commission and to other Government agencies, to permit foreign manufacturers to maintain or increase their market participation in the United States.

Conceivably, even a somewhat smaller future participation could be envisioned as necessary to abate the continuing injury sustained by the domestic industry. Certainly, a modest decline in import volume or market participation by foreign producers—whether or not temporary—cannot be viewed as a reason for withdrawal of the remedial action. If such remedial action has, in fact, slowed the pace of expansion of foreign glass in the U.S. market, this would appear to be the least that might have been anticipated and, indeed, a reason which motivated the action by the President.

CONCLUSION

As demonstrated by all the foregoing, the sheet glass industry in the United States is still far from the full measure of recovery sought to be attained by imposition of increased duties proclaimed by the President. Foreign producers and importers of sheet glass have importuned the Tariff Commission repeatedly to reconsider its well-matured recommendation to the President which was approved and implemented by the President after long, careful, and thorough deliberation.

The zeal of foreign manufacturers for hasty reconsideration and withdrawal of the President's action indicates, perhaps, a fear that the enlarged penetration of the U.S. market indicated by the recent trend of imports might result in a competitive situation even less favorable to their claims than that which presently and transiently prevails.

Mr. Speaker, I also attach hereto a report of the Belgian glass industry proving our contention that the tariff increase did not injure the Belgian industry since the Belgian wage rates still gives their industry a great handicap in world trade in the U.S. marketplace:

EXCERPT FROM SOCIETE GENERAL DE BELGIQUE

REPORT 1962: GLASSMAKING—CRYSTAL BOTTLEMAKING—TABLE GLASSWARE

The flat glass industry in Belgium developed on very satisfactory lines during 1962.

In the external markets, the chief event of the year was the raising of the import duties on window glass in the United States. The new duties, which came into effect on June 18, 1962, are almost double the old ones. Despite this unilateral action by a country which is a big user of Belgian glass, total exports continued expanding with sales handsomely supported by continued building activity in Europe and overseas. The exports, indeed, practically reached the 1960 levels which were exceptionally high.

Our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS MORGAN, from my neighboring district in Pennsylvania has shown his concern in this situation and I ask that his letter be made part of the RECORD at this point.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my concern and to urge that nothing be done to rescind the sheet glass escape clause action taken by the President on March 19, 1962, on which the Tariff Commission reported on September 27, 1963. An examination of this report by the Tariff Commission discloses absolutely nothing that would warrant a reopening for formal review or modification of the President's action. On the contrary, the content of the report actually supports the maintenance of the President's action.

My cause for concern is an awareness of the pressures being brought to bear by foreign manufacturers of sheet glass, and importers, to reopen this matter. Requests to have new hearings and get further consideration are not warranted, and a decision to yield to such demands and hold hearings would make our domestic industry and its labor force subject to continued harassment and would create serious and harmful economic effects. My study of this problem has shown that to reopen this matter would result in costly and time-consuming preparations that could only disrupt management planning and cause labor insecurity in many distressed areas of our country.

The domestic sheet glass industry has been under continuous investigation from May 1960 to the present time. During this period the foreign glass companies presented their arguments before the Tariff Commission and the administrative branches in a complete, forceful and competent manner. Subsequent to the President's action of March 19, 1962, increasing tariff rates, the foreign manufacturers' participation in the domestic sheet glass market continued at approximately the same ratio as prior to the

increase. Recent import shipments indicate the foreign manufacturers are increasing this ratio. I have noted a statement in the Report of the Societe Generale de Belgique of 1962, which said:

"In the external markets, the chief event of the year was the raising of the import duties on window glass in the United States. The new duties, which came into effect on June 18, 1962, are almost double the old ones. Despite this unilateral action by a country which is a big user of Belgian glass, total exports continued expanding with sales handsomely supported by continued building activity in Europe and overseas."

I believe that to reopen this question for further consideration would result in eventual confirmation and sustaining the President's original action. At the same time, the apprehension and uncertainty that a reopening would inevitably bring to labor and management in our domestic industry could only result in grave economic consequences.

I wish to most strongly urge that there be an immediate decision that the escape clause action be not reopened. A prompt decision to this effect would eliminate existing tension and make it possible for management and labor to resume the necessary long-range planning and sound operations which are essential to the future of our domestic glass industry.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Chairman.

United Nations Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist Max Freedman has presented a very lucid interpretation of America's position in the United Nations. On the occasion of the United Nations' 18th birthday, Mr. Freedman feels that despite the emergence of many new nations and voting blocs, "the prospects that await American initiatives in the General Assembly are more encouraging than they were 2 years ago."

The recent achievements of the U.N. deserve the applause of the world. Its work for peace can be characterized most aptly by the double terms "without ostentation and without rest." I heartily join in Mr. Freedman's conclusion that the American people will not be mistaken if we conclude on the 18th commemoration of the U.N. "that the world organization deserves something better than a cautious cheer."

The article follows:

UNITED NATIONS' WORK FOR PEACE

Every year about this time, we are asked to pledge anew our loyalty to the United Nations as the best hope for peace. This pious exercise may do some good in awakening public interest in the world organization. Judging by our newspapers, this service is desperately needed. Except in a few papers, the work of the United Nations is treated with calculated indifference, unless a crisis has developed or some diplomats are engaged in a bruising argument remote from their delicate art.

What do we mean when we speak of honoring the Charter of the United Nations? We do not mean that the United Nations is an instrument of American policy. Nor do we mean that we are trying to mold the decisions of the United Nations by an outpouring of American opinion the way we try to influence the President or Congress by expressions of public opinion. The real test of our loyalty to the Charter will come when the United Nations rules against the United States or refuses to follow this country's lead. We are playing trivial games and have not set our hands to the serious enterprise of peace unless we realize that the United Nations may be most worthy of our respect and support precisely when the United States has been outargued and outvoted.

DIPLOMACY OF THE UNITED STATES

At present we are a long way from this mature conception. A major defeat for the United States in the General Assembly would almost certainly provoke an ugly American debate. Yet the General Assembly, swollen into an unwieldy body, impatient of restraint, and eager for dramatic results, will no longer meekly acquiesce in the guidance of America or of any of her power.

As the colonial issue loses its passion, if only because colonialism is a spent force, the Afro-Asian bloc will discover many differences among its members in outlook and in priorities. Indeed, there is evidence already in recent debates that some of these differences have begun to emerge. The supple and resourceful diplomacy of the United States, as practiced by Mr. Adlai Stevenson, gives this country a freedom of action that can never be shown by the more ponderous strategies of the Soviet Union. In short, even from the parliamentary situation, as distinct from the larger horizon of world peace, the prospects that await American initiatives in the General Assembly are more encouraging than they were 2 years ago.

RISE OF SECRETARY GENERAL

Although he lacks the personal distinction and the accumulated prestige of the late Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General U Thant has set himself the high task of maintaining the independent powers of his office. Without the constant stimulus of American support, it would never have been possible for Mr. Hammarskjold to discover this unsuspected power for executive action. This discovery was uncongenial to England, obnoxious to France, and repugnant to Russia.

The primary credit for the development of this policy in the Kennedy administration, with its reliance on the initiatives for peace open to the Secretary General, should go to Mr. Stevenson and Harlan Cleveland of the State Department. If they made any mistake at all, it was in being so candid and explicit about the new policy, instead of letting it dwell in a decent obscurity. But they have been justified by success. The enlarged authority of the Secretary General is now safely lodged in the powers and precedents of the United Nations. The full authority of his office will be used without hesitation by the present Secretary General in any new crisis.

As always, the United Nations is a mirror reflecting the decisions of governments, rather than a direct and primary influence on those decisions. That is plainly visible in this session of the General Assembly which is dominated by a search for new values in the East-West relationship. The Assembly cannot by itself find the path to easier conditions. But the United Nations continues to do its work for peace, often tedious, sometimes indispensable, without ostentation and without rest. As they prepare this week to observe another United Nations Day, the American public will be making no mistake if it concludes that the world organization deserves something better than a cautious cheer.

New Frontier Astronaut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy must be quite concerned with his prospects for reelection. According to an article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott in the Long Island Press of October 15, he is trying to ask Astronaut John Glenn to help him in Ohio next year:

KENNEDYS HITCH THEIR POLITICAL STAR TO ASTRONAUT GLENN

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is quietly maneuvering to hitch his political wagon to the soaring moon-bound star of Astronaut John Glenn, Jr.

The President and his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, have privately assured Glenn of a "bright future" if he sticks with their administration and foregoes a million dollar job offer in private industry.

The Kennedy brothers have discussed a number of very attractive job "possibilities" with Glenn, including replacing James Webb as Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or running for the Democratic senatorial nomination in Ohio next year.

While no commitments have been made by either the Kennedys or Glenn, the backstage discussions are still going on, with the final decision depending on a number of unresolved factors.

The toughest problem facing the President is how to replace Webb or sidetrack Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, without touching off a major explosion within his own party.

According to reliable administration sources, the idea of replacing Webb with Colonel Glenn is the President's. Greatly disturbed by the adverse reaction in Congress to his proposal for a joint United States-Soviet moon program, the President is said to feel it will take a space hero like Glenn to make this venture politically popular before next year's presidential election.

He reportedly believes that Glenn, as head of NASA, could overcome this opposition by devoting most of his time to "selling" the moon shot and the multibillion-dollar space program to Congress and the public with personal appearances and speeches.

Under this plan, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator, and Dr. George Mueller, new Director of the manned space flight program, would actually run NASA.

Attorney General Kennedy favors Glenn's entrance into politics as a Democratic senatorial candidate in Ohio.

With the popular astronaut on the ticket, the President's chief political adviser stresses that the President would stand a fighting chance to carry Ohio.

He also feels that the political fallout from the national press coverage Glenn would receive during the campaign would help the President throughout the Nation.

The Attorney General has a poll on his desk showing that Astronaut Glenn is a lot more popular in Ohio than the President, and would be able to run away with the senatorial race.

As in the case of replacing Webb, there is one big stumbling block. Senator YOUNG, the present Democratic officeholder, is bent on seeking reelection. He has turned a deaf ear to all offers from the White House to

pull out in favor of Glenn. One of the offers was a choice ambassadorship.

Before he began his private negotiations with the Kennedys, Colonel Glenn told his fellow astronauts that he would stay on if he could become the chief pilot in the first two-man U.S. space flight.

This flight, known as Project Gemini, is scheduled for October 1964, just 1 month before the presidential election. It involves orbiting around the earth for several weeks two astronauts in the same space vehicle.

Forty-year-old Glenn won worldwide acclaim on February 20, 1962, when he safely orbited the earth three times in his Mercury space capsule. His address to a joint session of Congress was hailed as one of the finest ever delivered to that body.

Earlier this year, C. Leo De Orsey, attorney for all of the U.S. astronauts, revealed that "everyone is after Glenn—aviation, foundations, political parties."

Prime Minister Sean F. Lemass: Distinguished Visitor from Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Sean F. Lemass, Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, has been an occasion for fond rejoicing on the part of most Americans and all the Irish. No one may question the erudition and eloquence of this great statesman. It develops that he is also something of an Irish-American historian who may well have given us the true genesis of our own CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Ranging through the Appendix the great RECORD often runs the full scale from sedition to perdition. Evidently a similar tabloid was once printed in Ireland under the title of "Volunteer's Journal." Prime Mininster Lemass has indicated that the rebellious entries in the journal were the work of one Matthew Carey who fell under the censure of an alien parliament and immigrated to the United States to become a successful publisher. Mr. Carey's specific crime was calling the particular parliament of his day "a den of thieves" and "a Gomorrah of iniquity." I hasten to assure my colleagues that while I bear the same name I would repudiate any notion that these terms, even by implication, to be referable to our great body. Rather I am pleased to note that the contentious Mr. Carey used his journal to praise the American determination to fight for freedom. One of my ancestry must use due care in genealogical exploration not to search too far beyond an ancestor of even modest renown lest one emerge of greater notoriety and greater infamy.

I am satisfied that Prime Minister Lemass has identified my namesake as one whose greatest crime was to tell the truth, shout for freedom and run the risk.

I am pleased to call to the attention of the House the address delivered by the Prime Minister at the luncheon of the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, October 16, 1963, and the pertinent editorial which appeared in the Washington Post in connection with his visit:

ADDRESS BY MR. SEÁN F. LEMASS, TAOISEACH, AT LUNCHEON OF NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1963

Ten years ago, when I held the position of Minister for Industry and Commerce in the Irish Government, I had the privilege of addressing the members of your renowned National Press Club in this hall. Today I have the pleasure of coming before you again—this time as Prime Minister of my country—a little older but, I fear, not very much wiser. I should like at the outset to express my deep appreciation of your warm hospitality and of your kindness in asking me to address you again.

In appearing at this rostrum I am conscious of the fact that you represent the press of the United States and that in your great country the freedom of the press is one of your most cherished principles. I am happy to say that in this respect, as indeed in many others, Ireland resembles the United States. The freedom of the press is recognized as one of the fundamental rights of free people and one of the cornerstones of a democratic state. It has been well said that: "Other liberties are held under government, but the liberty of opinion keeps governments themselves in subjection to their duties."

It was not always so in Ireland. In our dark days in 1784 the then rather unrepresentative Irish House of Commons in dealing with the Volunteer's Journal resolved "that the said paper is a daring, false, scandalous, and seditious libel of the proceedings of this House, tending to promote discontents among His Majesty's subjects, to create groundless jealousies between the kingdom and Great Britain, alienating the affections of the people from His Majesty's government, and to excite an opposition to the laws of the land."

The resolution was followed by an order to the Sergeant at Arms to take the printers and the publishers of the Volunteer's Journal into custody. A certain Matthew Carey was designated as responsible for the alleged libels and Carey was taken out of the hands of the courts and imprisoned by Parliament. It is reported that later he managed to escape to America where he settled down to become one of the most respected publishers in this country.

I must admit that the Parliament of the day, however unrepresentative it may have been, may have felt that it had some provocation for its treatment of the Volunteer's Journal as the latter had referred to it as a "den of thieves" and "a Gomorrah of iniquity"; and the administration of the day was described as having "in 1 month made more progress in infamy than any preceding one could arrive at in 2 years." The paper had even gone so far as to praise the Americans for their determination to fight for their freedom.

Happily those days are gone forever. You can be assured of a warm and friendly welcome if you should visit modern Ireland. For my own part, I am always very pleased to see visiting American journalists. I hope that some of you were in Ireland last June covering President Kennedy's historic visit. In those very full days I had, much to my regret, the opportunity of meeting individually only very few of the hundreds of journalists whom the President's visit attracted to Ireland, but I promise you that if you return you will always find me willing and happy to talk with you.

It is no exaggeration to say that for the Irish people the year 1963 will be remembered as the year John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, visited the country of his ancestors. For all our people—men and women, young and old, the civic dignitaries and the man in the street—it was an occasion of deeply felt emotion, of joy at the visit of the greatgrandson of Irish emigrants, of pride that their descendant was the first citizen of his country, a land which had over so many generations offered to our people the freedom and opportunity then denied them in their own.

It was, of course, a singular pleasure for me personally to welcome President Kennedy to Ireland and I am deeply grateful for his invitation to me to make this visit to the United States. It is always refreshing for me to pay a call upon our nearest neighbor across the Atlantic—now only 6 hours flying time from Shannon—and to experience once more the pleasure of visiting your great cities, of seeing your continued progress at first hand, and of meeting your leaders and the many persons of Irish stock who have achieved eminence in the fields of public and private endeavor.

It is only 40 years since the Irish Government was established and not much more than a quarter-century since it finally threw off the limitations imposed on it—a very short time indeed in the life of a nation, but that period, short though it is, has shown conclusively that the Irish people are deserving of their hard-won freedom, and that they are determined to make the utmost of it. The long struggle for independence was always seen as a means, not as an end in itself. It was fully realized that the achievement of independence would mean the commencement of a new struggle, a battle to secure the rehabilitation of our nation, to develop its economy and to strengthen its capacity to provide a decent livelihood for every one of its citizens. This, of course, is a battle which must always continue. No more than any other people, will the Irish people reach a stage when it can be said that all that is needed has been achieved, and that further effort is not necessary.

You may perhaps wish me to give you a brief outline of what has been achieved to date and an indication of our plans for the future. The short time which has been available to us since the foundation of our state to work out our own destiny has been interrupted by the world depression of the early thirties and later by World War II. It is only in recent years that we have been in a position to plan our economic development in an orderly fashion. In 1959 we embarked on a 5-year program for economic expansion which aimed, as a deliberately modest target, at a 2-percent annual rate of growth in our gross national product in real terms. In the event, the program has succeeded beyond our expectations, as in the 4 years to 1962 our real gross national product has increased by an average figure of 4½ percent per annum; external payments have been kept reasonably in balance and the decline in population, caused by excessive emigration, has been arrested and reversed.

We have been greatly encouraged by the manner in which our people rose to the challenge of the program placed before them. It is clear that there is a new spirit in the land, a conviction that because we have come so far we can go further. We are now about to embark on our second program for economic expansion, covering the 7-year period from 1964 to 1970 and aiming at a 50-percent increase in real income between 1960 and 1970. This means maintaining an average annual rate of growth of 4.4 percent between now and 1970. This program covers all facets of economic activity, agriculture, industry, forestry, fisheries, tourism, housing, fuel and power. Private enterprise will still be expected to be the principal source of new productive projects and public activity will be concentrated on productive expenditure that will help increase the national output

of goods and services capable of meeting competition in export markets.

The main contribution to growth is expected from industry in the second program—the objective is to increase industrial output at an average annual rate of 7 percent. This is an aspect of the program in which we should like to see increased American interest. We are providing very attractive tax and other facilities to manufacturers starting sound new industries, incentives which, in the words of the OECD "go further than those of any other country in Europe in encouraging export industries and in attracting private capital for this purpose."

Absorbed though we are in the many problems of economic development, we must not be thought of as a nation which has refused to interest itself in the great problems of the world today. I can say, with truth, that the record speaks for itself. Ever since we secured admission to the United Nations, following the dropping of the Soviet veto in 1955, Ireland has spared itself of no effort to become a loyal member of that organization and to contribute to its success, which is so important for the future of mankind. As President Kennedy indicated in his generous and eloquent tribute to our work in that field in the course of his address to the Irish Parliament, our influence in the United Nations is greater than our relative size. We were the first of the small nations to win their independence in this century. Our history makes us particularly conscious of the needs of countries following our path to freedom. We can thus understand and sympathize with the problems of the emerging nations of Africa and Asia. At the same time we are unmistakably European. We are thus in the position of having excellent relations with both the newly independent nations and their former masters and can be of service in circumstances where the intervention of one of the great powers might be regarded with suspicion.

During the last 2 years, 8 battalions of our Army have served in the Congo and 26 sons of Ireland have died there in the course of the United Nations peacekeeping operation in that country. Irish Army officers have served as U.N. observers in New Guinea and in the Middle East.

We have been a member of each of the two major European organizations since their foundation, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—and have participated fully and wholeheartedly in the activities of these two organizations for closer political and economic cooperation between the free countries of Europe. We have applied for membership of the European Economic Community; and when circumstances permit, it is our intention to pursue our application. We see the unity of Western Europe as dictated by the economic and political necessities of this time, and it is our hope that we may be able to make some contribution to its realization, and to see a united Western Europe working in complete harmony with the United States in promoting the peace of the world and the welfare of all nations.

By comparison with most of the world's population, we in Ireland enjoy a high standard of living and we recognize our obligation to help less favored countries. For many years past, private and public aid has been given to these countries. This will be increased as our capacity to do so grows.

We have had for many years now our own brand of peace corps in the new countries of Africa and Asia. An army of Irish doctors, teachers, priests, and nuns have been laboring quietly over the years in these two continents to improve the material and spiritual welfare of the people there. African and Asian students in great numbers are studying in Irish schools and universities. Much of this activity has in the past been the result of private initiative. In future this will be supplemented by further action at Government level to help train would-be administrators in the emerging nations in the practice and principles of central and local government administration, as this is a field in which we feel we can make a real contribution.

I have so far made no mention of what Ireland has been doing in the sphere of culture—of our poets, our writers, our dramatists. But I must not keep you from your many tasks and I know that as members of a kindred profession of the pen, you are as well informed as any about what our people have done in the field of letters. You will, I feel sure, share our pleasure at the decision of President Kennedy to cosponsor with President de Valera the new American-Irish Foundation now in process of being set up. This new development will do much to spread amongst our people a deeper understanding and appreciation of our respective cultures.

You may also have noticed that I have not, as yet, touched on our one outstanding national political problem, the partition of our country. This problem is never absent from our minds or from our hearts. Apart from our natural longing for the reunion of our people, we are concerned by the extent to which economic and social problems affecting both parts of the island may be rendered less easy of solution because of partition. We are endeavoring to mitigate this latter aspect of the problem by encouraging consulations with our fellow countrymen in the north aimed at closer cooperation in these matters. I have made known our desire to arrange such talks at any level and without political preconditions.

We have always based our case for the reunification of our country on the assertion of Irish rights in the matter—our right to sovereignty over all the national territory, our right to reject the claim of a minority to vote itself out of the Nation, and our right to have our national destiny decided by the democratic process of majority decision. We have come to realize that the reiteration of rights is not enough and that we also need to have regard to the causes of the divisions amongst our people which were used as a justification for partition. We see our task now as reuniting the Irish people as well as reuniting Irish territory. We are encouraged by the fact that there is already a considerable movement of opinion north of the border—a movement helped by world events and particularly by the developing concept of Christian unity. This movement is finding expression in a desire to promote new contacts at every level of activity within the northern counties and across the border.

While the reunification of the Irish people is seen by us as a matter for Irishmen in Ireland, partition is, of course, a political arrangement and its termination must involve the British Government by which it was devised. What we would like to see happening now would be a clear statement by British political leaders that there would be no British interest in maintaining partition when Irishmen want to get rid of it. That has not yet been said. If the belief which still prevails in some quarters—and which was probably well based at one time—that Britain wishes to maintain the partition of Ireland irrespective of Irish interests or desires, should be demolished it would be a factor of great significance and would produce an immediate and beneficial improvement in the whole situation.

We in Ireland have watched, with great respect, the British Government's acceptance of the "wind of change" blowing through their former colonial possessions in Africa and Asia, and this has encouraged us in hoping that a similar attitude of good will and elightened self-interest will insure their cooperation in the elimination of the one outstanding political problem arising between our nearest neighbor and ourselves, and thus to clear away the last obstacle to the closest and most friendly relations between us.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 16, 1963]

SON OF IRELAND

Whatever our problems with other countries around the world, there is one splendid oasis of tranquility. Never, it can be confidently asserted, have relations been so warm between Ireland and the United States as they are today. In part, this is due to a happy chance of ancestry involving our President. But even more important, few countries in the world are playing a more useful role than Ireland.

All of this is a superfluity in discussing the visit of Prime Minister Sean F. Lemass. He is in no need of an elegant green carpet; he comes as a friend who perhaps is taken a little bit for granted. Hence it was felicitous that Mr. Lemass addressed the National Press Club yesterday to remind us of a few pertinent facts.

He recalled that Ireland was the first of the small nations in this century to win independence, and that for this reason, sons of Ireland are welcome in other countries now experiencing the ecstasy—and pains—of freedom. He reminded us again that Ireland has sent eight battalions to the Congo, where 26 Irish soldiers have died. He pointed out that Ireland is becoming a green and prosperous garden after so many generations of privation. The decline of population, caused in part by excessive emigration, has been reversed. The gross national product for the past 4 years has been increasing at the rate of 4½ percent a year.

Prime Minister Lemass reiterated Ireland's hope for closer relations with countrymen in the Northern six counties. Certainly his desire to promote new contacts at every level of activity with the Irish of the North is consonant with the best interests of both. In his conciliatory approach Mr. Lemass can surely count on sympathy in a country where Ireland touches deep chords of sentiment.

United States-Puerto Rico Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today the House has passed H.R. 5945, a bill which provides for a commission "to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico." I fully support this bill as Puerto Rico's status has long been undefined and in need of legislative clarification to help it develop to its full potential.

I am familiar with the Puerto Rican people and I can attest to their decency, intelligence, and loyalty to America. They are ambitious and are sought after by industry and they have made a fine adjustment in our community despite the barriers of language. I know that the relatives and friends of these people in my district, who are in Puerto Rico, are of the same mold and would welcome a chance to improve their status.

The Honorable FERNÓS-ISERN, the Resident Commissioner, has stated that this

bill has the general support of the people of Puerto Rico, and we here today have kept our faith with them.

Come to the Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a unique program sponsored by the Southern New England Telephone Co. to help insure as many of Connecticut's young people as possible a trip to the New York World's Fair which will open in April of 1964. A similar plan might be adopted by organizations in other States:

ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS WILL SEE WORLD'S FAIR

(By Charles F. J. Morse)

The Southern New England Telephone Co. Monday unveiled to Governor Dempsey plans for a major campaign to bring New York World's Fair visitors to Connecticut and take Connecticut youngsters to the fair.

The telephone company became the first to answer the Governor's appeal for private, fraternal, service, civic and educational help to make sure as many of the State's young people as possible visit this rare show of the future.

MEETS GOVERNOR

Ellis C. Maxcy, president of the firm, met with the Governor and outlined the program. It involves letter-writing and essay-writing contests for both children and adults.

Two contests are planned, Maxcy explained. Connecticut school children in grades three through 12 will be asked to participate in essay-writing contests.

Winners in each grade will receive expense-paid trips to the World's Fair not only for themselves but also for all of their classmates, teachers and chaperones.

The second contest planned is one in which Connecticut persons will be urged to write letters to their out-of-State friends extolling Connecticut as a place to live.

These letters will be judged and the top prizes will include visits to the fair for the letter-writer and week-long, expense-paid visits to Connecticut for the out-of-State friends.

Maxcy said that details of the contests will be announced as soon as final plans are completed.

In addition to the contests, Maxcy explained, advertising is planned to extoll the virtues of Connecticut as a place to work, live, and visit.

The telephone company has already commissioned Bern Hill of Killingworth, nationally known illustrator, to design a special map featuring points of interest in the State, the president revealed.

The map will be made available to residents of the State and the telephone company will mail maps to its customers' out-of-State friends if they wish.

Governor Dempsey commended the Southern New England for the program and particularly for the interest the company is showing in giving children the opportunity to visit the World's Fair which opens next April.

"The fair will largely be a depiction of the world of tomorrow," the Governor said. "It is most important that the young people of the State, who will be the citizens and leaders of tomorrow, be able to visit the educational and instructional exhibits that will be featured there."

The Governor said he hopes other business and civic organizations will join in the effort to help give children the chance to visit the fair.

Maxcy told the Governor that some 50 to 80 million visitors are expected at the fair. "These people should be invited to visit Connecticut while they are so near," he said. "Our State can thereby realize a very positive economic benefit from the fair.

"Telephone people know what Connecticut has to offer, and we want people all over the country to know too. Our future, both as individuals and as business people, lies in the growth of our State," he said.

"We also know what the fair will mean to our young people and we want to encourage them to take advantage of this opportunity to take a good look at what the future promises. For our young people, the educational advantages of carefully planned visits to the cultural and industrial exhibits of the fair are virtually limitless," he said.

"We hope all Connecticut people will join us in our efforts to stimulate attendance by our youth," Maxcy declared.

Maritime Work Rules Longshore Manpower Utilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, on the merchant marine. In another article on October 21, Mrs. Bentley discusses the longshore manpower utilization. As in the case of the first article, I believe this will be of great interest to all Members of Congress, and therefore, I am placing it in the Appendix.

The article follows:

LONGSHORE MANPOWER UTILIZATION: MARITIME WORK RULES

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Two radically different, but equally important, studies on maritime labor are drawing to an end.

The one considered the most important in immediacy is that on work rules—manpower utilization—of east coast longshoremen, an issue that caused two strikes last year—one of 34 days duration.

The other, on offshore or seamen aboard ships, is to be a compilation and report on the complex and troublesome seagoing labor-management picture.

David Stowe, once a special adviser to President Truman, is heading up the work rules study for the Department of Labor. The actual legwork has been completed in the port of New York and in the gulf area—presumably the most irritated spots as far as gang sizes are concerned.

The Stowe team still has to visit Baltimore and a few other peaceful ports where it is expected the work can be cleaned up in a day. There have been no complaints on either side in Baltimore in regard to gang sizes.

In New York, management in the form of the New York Shipping Association claims there are too many men in some gangs and want to be able to shift men around from one position to another when there isn't any work at a particular post. In the South, the International Longshoremen's Association says there are not enough men to each gang and, therefore, the southerners can underbid the northern stevedore companies for cargoes

The Stowe group is supposed to come up with a recommendation that will say what the gang sizes should be in each port area for the different types of cargoes, and whether the dockworkers can be moved around from one job to another.

The recommendations are awaited on Capitol Hill and by all top Government officials, as well as by all industry engaged in exporting-importing, and by the shipping community itself.

Both labor and management agreed to this study as one of the terms for settling the 34-day, billion-dollar strike which ran from December 23, 1962, to January 26, 1963. Some say it was the costliest strike in the history of the United States, while others still rate the 116-day steel strike of 1959 as the most expensive. In any case, no one wants a repetition of the tieup of all east and gulf coast ports.

The agreement contains a provision that if the parties cannot settle ahead of the expiration date of October 1, 1964, a neutral board will make further recommendations to resolve any remaining differences, in a manner consistent with the facts found in the Department of Labor study and in the interest of both parties and public.

However, there still is nothing binding, nothing that would force either side to accept the recommendations of the neutral board, or of any board.

When Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, tried to have a bill passed that would provide for compulsory arbitration in the maritime industry, to prevent such expensive tieups of the country's foreign trade, the provisions in his bill were killed bit by bit in committee before the whole measure was finally tabled by a 12-to-10 vote.

Labor, of course, led the fight against the legislation. Some management groups supported this anti-Bonner bill stand, as did both the Department of Labor and Department of Commerce. The latter's positions were that no one industry should be singled out in any labor legislation.

The importance of the work study was emphasized this past week by William Rand, president of the New York Shipping Association and the United States Lines Co., when he told the Foreign Commerce Club of New York that there had to be reductions in manpower if that seaport was to flourish. And what happens in New York will determine what will happen in all the other ILA ports, as has been so clearly illustrated since 1956.

"It seems to me the evidence is clear that with improved ships and improved terminals we are simply using too much manpower in the overall," Mr. Rand said.

"The expense involved in inefficient use of manpower is a threat to labor itself. High labor costs for loading and discharging cargo coupled with surcharges and other delivery costs produce an overall freight rate that does not help attract cargo to New York, and indeed tends to discourage it.

"The factfinding study I have referred to not only will determine the future of the port of New York, but the future of the jobs which it creates and supports. Ideally, labor should be allied with us in this effort to improve efficiency. In my view, a reduction in longshore gangs and other adjustments in manpower are essential if New York is not to be priced out of the ocean transportation market. More efficient utilization of labor will give stability to the regular longshoremen and can easily be effected through attrition and less employment of casual labor."

Thomas W. Gleason, president of the East, Gulf, Great Lakes and Canadian longshoremen, often described as "the obstinate one," finds himself in a peculiar position. He has vowed that he will not permit any cuts in gang sizes and switching of men, although he has expressed a profound interest to learn what the Stowe report will say.

And yet when Teddy Gleason took over as president of the debt-ridden ILA, one of his first platform points was to swear to cut down overhead in the union by eliminating "some of the deadwood," some of the jobs such as organizers and international vice presidents who duplicate each other's work in many port areas.

Even Gleason said, laughingly, "I guess this is what the companies wanted to do to us—cut down the overhead. But I've got to do it if the ILA is to survive."

Similar words were uttered by management during the heated bargaining sessions of last fall and winter. The Stowe study now is the result.

While the Stowe group was completing its leg work in New York, the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower was hearing testimony from J. Paul St. Sure, president of the Pacific Maritime Association, and Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, on what an excellent two-way contract they achieved in 1960 on the matter of manpower.

Eastern chiders who don't like to give the west coast any credit for accomplishments sarcastically refer to the PMA–ILWU agreement as a $30 million package. The ILA critics say that Bridges sold his men down the river, and took jobs away from them.

And yet, both the PMA and the ILWU have told congressional committees repeatedly, as recently as October 8, that both are benefiting considerably from that pact, whereby management puts up $5 million a year into a "modernization and mechanization" fund to pay for the men who might be ousted from their jobs by improved handling methods. In turn, management is able to use its men anywhere on any job during the 6-hour work guarantee period.

The west coast agreement guarantees every longshoreman a 35-hour workweek. If he does not work 35 hours, the difference is to be made up. However, with the flexibility provided under the "M. & M." agreement, employers are able to use every man for at least 35 hours—usually 40. Thus far—3 years later—they have not had to draw on the fund to make up a single hour of pay to make up the guarantee.

East coast management wants what the west coast agreement provides—fewer men in gangs and the ability to place them anywhere during the time they are working. The basic general cargo longshore gang on the east coast consists of 21 men, compared to the 8 on the west coast, with additions to be made as they are needed.

Eastern longshore leaders want security for their members, and want to close the books of the Waterfront Commission so there will not be a continuing force of new men entering the limited industry.

And yet they refuse to acknowledge that the method by which the ILWU and the PMA limited the books to senior longshoremen was a good one. Now the two groups are seeking 2,000 more top priority longshoremen and are going through an elaborate screening process to find the right men to qualify and to fit into the "M. & M." program.

Under the west coast pact, when a longshoreman retires with 25 years on the waterfront, he gets a lump sum of approximately $8,000, plus his regular monthly retirement.

Bridges told the Senate committee this month that he wanted to emphasize that the 6-year agreement "was hammered out without the participation or intervention of outsiders and, particularly, I want to emphasize, without Government intervention. We believe that only in his way can a mutually acceptable and workable agreement be worked out on the issues of automation and work rules."

Secondly, he said he wanted to emphasize that "we in the union do not consider this agreement anything like a final or basic solution to the problem of technological unemployment. We recognize that our employers, like employers in all industries, introduce new machines and new methods in order to reduce costs and make more profits. We recognize, too, that the inevitable, and even the necessary, result of new machines and new methods is the displacement of workers. This is something we as a union cannot do much about; it's the way our economic system works. Our 'solution' to this problem had to take this fact into account."

The west coast longshoremen have not been on strike since 1948. The present pact provides for binding arbitration when the two groups cannot agree.

Whether the Stowe report will make any reference to the west coast pact or set-up is not known. It will be a special point to watch for once it is released.

The second study on the maritime industry will be discussed next week.

You Figure It Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona Republic, in its editorial of October 19, 1963, has drawn a comparison between the visits of Madame Nhu and Marshal Tito, which I think is worthy of some reflection on the part of the American people. As they are reported, many of the actions of the Government of Vietnam, of which Madame Nhu is at least an unofficial representative, meet with the total disapproval of the American people. However, so do the acts of Marshal Tito and his fellow Communists.

The editorial follows:

YOU FIGURE IT OUT

Madame Nhu and Marshal Tito are about as different types as you could find. One is a beautiful woman who says what she thinks and stands by her principles. The other is a pudgy male who says what he thinks his listeners want to hear, and plays both sides against the middle.

The main difference between the two, however, is that Madame Nhu is a dedicated anti-Communist whose country is conducting a shooting war against Communists. Marshal Tito, on the other hand, is a confirmed Communist who recently patched up whatever rift may have existed between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union.

These two distinguished persons were in Washington Thursday. Madame Nhu was completely ignored by the Kennedy administration. But the red carpet was rolled out for Marshal Tito and he was given all the honors that the White House could load on him.

Why ignore the one and not the other? The somewhat bizarre tastes shown in extending White House invitations cannot be blamed. Witness the invitations sent to Frank Sinatra and other members of the Hollywood rat pack. Ordinarily, the young and the beautiful get the nod at a Kennedy party. But not this time.

Can the blame really be placed on Madame Nhu's tart tongue? Have we reached the point where the administration prefers listening to someone who talks out of both sides of his mouth at the same time? Is the Kennedy policy so firmly committed to throwing Vietnamese President Diem out of office that it cannot be civil to his sister-in-law? Is the Kennedy policy so firmly committed to relaxation of tensions that it will lavish its hospitality on every Communist dictator who crosses the Atlantic?

Maybe you can figure it out. We can't.

Now Comes the Army's Official Position Against Multiple Recommendations of the Gesell Report Which Has Been Represented by the Secretary of Defense as Being in the Best Interest of Military Morale—First the Navy, Now the Army and Next the Air Force Make Pertinent Objections to Contents of the Gesell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently published a letter which I wrote to Mr. Gesell, for whom the radical Gesell report is named, pointing out to him the fact that the Navy, in its official report to the Secretary of Defense vigorously rejected recommendations to implicate the military in business which is none of its business; namely, policing local communities which do not come in line with social reforms.

The impression has been allowed to float around that military people are just as happy as larks over the Gesell report; that the military people are eager to cooperate in implementing the Gesell report; that the military morale is being built up instead of being destroyed by the recommendations of the Gesell report.

Well, there is nothing better to look at than the record, the official record of the three branches of the services themselves.

I documented what the Navy thought of the Gesell report and there has been no denial of my presentation from the Pentagon or anybody else.

I believe in being thorough and always like to back up my statements with documentations of the facts.

Today I present the Army's dim view of the Gesell report.

It speaks for itself.

It is the official position of the Army on the report, but nothing about its objections has been published by the Department of Defense nor Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, who issued the directive putting into effect the principles of the Gesell report.

Why the silence?

Why be so timid?

I am going to do everything within my power to let everybody know exactly how the Navy, Army, and Air Force feel about this business.

Today I am giving publication to the Army's objections to many of the recommendations of the Gesell report. Let the Department of Defense, Secretary McNamara, or Mr. Gesell deny that what I am presenting here is not in accordance with the facts.

They will not because they cannot.

Here are the rejections taken from the Secretary of the Army's memorandum for the Secretary of Defense in response to the Gesell report recommendations:

REJECTIONS TO GESELL REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Army rejects the recommendation that special efforts be made to find and recruit Negroes with the special aptitudes the armed services now require. The Army said this is undesirable because the initiation of a program designed solely to obtain Negroes with special aptitudes denotes preferential assignment of Negro personnel.

The Army rejects any recommendation which would compromise selection criteria or standards in order to increase Negro representation in the officer corps.

The Army rejects the recommendation which hints that special efforts should be made to appoint Negro officers to promotion boards. The Army stated that while only a limited number of Negro officers have served on selection boards in the past, this is not traceable to any racial discrimination but rather to a lack of eligibles, primarily because of rank.

The Army rejects the suggestion that racial bias has affected members of promotion boards, pointing out that since 1950 the number of Negro field grade officers has risen from 79 to 547. The Army said further efforts to insure a lack of prejudice on the part of board members might be interpreted as a requirement for special opportunity for Negroes, and negate the principal of equal opportunity.

The Army rejects as not feasible the recommendation that officers chosen to serve on promotion boards be picked from those who have had more than casual experience with Negro officers and enlisted personnel. The Army said it is completely integrated and identification is not possible of officers with "more than casual experience serving with Negro officers and enlisted personnel."

The Army rejects any move to lower promotion criteria standards to accommodate Negroes or any other group.

The Army rejects the recommendation that a special officer be designated to receive racial complaints. The Army said the present Inspector General System works well for all types of complaints, and no duplication is necessary.

The Army rejects the suggestion that a commander's efficiency rating be based on how well he fosters integration.

The Army rejects the recommendation that Negroes must be included on any command-community relations committees, whether or not the local commander thinks this is wise.

The Army rejects the recommendation that offbase establishments which practice segregation be placed "off limits." The Army succinctly stated that it is unclear what the legal authority of the U.S. Government is with respect to placing of commerical establishments "off limits." The Army further pointed out that this question is now before the Congress.

The Army rejects the recommendation that military installations in or near segregated communities be curtailed or terminated. The Army stated that to reduce or close any installation for the prime purpose of imposing an economic impact on adjacent communities "appears contrary to national policy."

The Army rejects the recommendation that it modify annual questionnaires on family housing to determine possible discrimination. The Army flatly stated that it should not be the agent for systematically exploring the extent of housing discrimination in a community.

The Army rejects the recommendation that all lists of available housing near an installation contain only units open to all races. The Army said this would create a hardship on non-Negro personnel by making it difficult for them to locate housing.

The Army rejects the suggestion that it would be beneficial to expand the nondiscrimination clause in the leasing program. The Army said its present experience is that the inclusion of the nondiscriminaton clause in leases is having the practical effect of denying housing to non-Negro personnel in some areas.

The Army rejects the suggestion that it be required to systematically send Negro soldiers out to test whether segregation is being practiced in new housing.

The Army rejects the recommendation that Negroes be given special consideration for transfers in order to obtain additional education.

The Army questions the practicality of denying Federal support to impacted school areas near military installations if such areas practice segregation. The Army, in its report, asked: "If Federal support is denied local educational agencies what is to preclude local authorities denying enrollment to non-State residents"

The Army questions the advisability of eliminating ROTC units from segregated institutions.

The Army questions the recommendation that centralized racial data be maintained. The Army said this would only tend to promote racial ill feelings.

The Army rejects the recommendation that a serviceman's records exclude racial identification.

Disgraceful Delay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Administration has spent $53 million in building the nuclear ship *Savannah* which is now paralyzed by a strike. The ship which should have been on a voyage months ago is still locked up at its port with no crew to run it. This is another example of great New Frontier leadership. An article in the New York Times gives us additional details.

"SAVANNAH" TRAINS EMERGENCY CREW—MARITIME AGENCY RECRUITING NUCLEAR SHIP PERSONNEL

(By George Horne)

An emergency crew for the strikebound nuclear ship *Savannah* is being organized by the Maritime Administration.

The Federal shipping agency, which planned and built the $53 million liner in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission, hopes to assemble and train a "backup" crew to man the vessel if her second crew fails to serve.

Under the direction of the Maritime Administration and Department of Commerce, which controls the *Savannah*, a recruiting campaign is going on among civil service employees in the shipping agency.

FIRST CREW SCATTERED

The *Savannah*'s first crew was dissipated after the ship was laid up last summer following a long series of labor squabbles.

A second group of key personnel is undergoing training at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, Long Island, but the Department of Commerce is seeking to establish a cadre of seamen, including engineers who will need instruction in nuclear reaction, to back up the second team.

In September, Donald W. Alexander, Maritime Administrator, sent a notice to all Maritime Administration employees asking for a voluntary enlistment.

A spokesman for the agency said last week that the response had been good among personnel holding merchant marine officer licenses as engineers or navigators. Some of these have joined the professionals at Kings Point.

But the Commerce Department is disappointed at the recruiting of certain other categories, chiefly radio operators.

A notice to employees last week said:

"There is still an urgent need * * * for qualified radio operators, bakers, cooks, and waiters, particularly for radio operators holding Federal Communications Commission and Coast Guard licenses.

"It is imperative and of the greatest importance that Maritime (Administration) personnel be trained for possible service on the NS *Savannah*. If you qualify you will be doing yourself, our agency, and our Nation a great service by volunteering for this training."

EMERGENCY SERVICE CITED

It is understood that Government plans for the third crew call for service only in emergency. The licensed men among them will get the same training as given the 37 engineers and deck officers who started studying the first week of September.

The unlicensed categories, however, will get a week's dockside training in Galveston, where the *Savannah* is tied up, and will take a 2-week training cruise next spring. The Government will pay the travel expenses.

Training of the 37 original students at Kings Point—there are 25 engineers and 12 navigators—is financed by American Export Lines, Inc., which has been named as the agent to operate the liner.

This group, now augmented by eight Maritime Administration personnel in the recent recruitment program, will train until the middle of winter, and then join the *Savannah* for further training.

The *Savannah* is a year behind schedule now. If the training program works out, the ship will be ready for foreign voyages in May. Her shakedown and training cruises thus far have been limited to U.S. ports.

Officials of American Export would not comment on the Maritime Administration training program.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the October 21, 1963, Washington Report, issued by the American Security Council, contains an incisive analysis of the administration's recent approval of the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries without the approval of Congress. The article, entitled "Food for Thought," was written by Mr. Frank J. Johnson, editor of the ASC's Washington Report.

I have also noticed in the news recently, Mr. President, that the United States is giving consideration toward guaranteeing the loans to the Soviet Union for the purchase of our wheat, and also that Commerce Department officials may have to back down on the President's statement that this wheat would be shipped in vessels owned by shipping interests in the United States.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanisous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times entitled "Five Percent Loan Rate Set on Soviet Wheat: Export Bank to Guarantee Grain Purchases in United States," dated October 18, 1963; an article from the Washington Post entitled "Ship Waivers Seen in Sale of Wheat to Reds," dated October 20, 1963; and "Food for Thought" from the ASC's Washington Report, dated October 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 18, 1963]

FIVE-PERCENT LOAN RATE SET ON SOVIET WHEAT: EXPORT BANK TO GUARANTEE GRAIN PURCHASES IN UNITED STATES

(By Philip Shabecoff)

The Export-Import Bank of Washington has fixed the terms on which it will guarantee loans to the Soviet Union for the purchase of U.S. wheat, according to a leading bank in Chicago.

A spokesman for the Chicago bank, which declined to be identified, said the Export-Import Bank would charge five-eighths of 1 percent to guarantee loans made to the Russians by commercial banks in this country.

Commercial banks would be expected to charge an interest rate of a maximum 4⅜ percent, the spokesman said. Thus, the effective rate to the Soviet Union would be 5 percent.

The guarantee by the Export-Import Bank would be made to the commercial banks, and the banks would make the loan to the grain traders rather than to the Russians.

COST TO BE PASSED ON

However, the traders would then pass on the full cost of the loan to the Soviet buyers. Therefore, the Russians will, in effect, be paying the 4⅜ percent to the commercial banks and the five-eighths of 1 percent to the Government agency.

The terms envisioned by the U.S. export financing agency reportedly call for a 25-percent cash downpayment with the remainder paid in three equal installments over an 18-month period.

L. M. Matveev, president of Exportkhleb, the Soviet state grain trading agency, has declared that the Soviet Union would not pay more than 5-percent interest in its proposed purchase of 4 million bushels of U.S. wheat.

Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, would not confirm or deny the reports when reached by telephone last night. He said such data on its operations were a confidential matter between the Government agency and the commercial banks and were never made public.

Mr. Linder added, however, that "it would be perfectly normal for us to guarantee all or part of a credit for an export transaction of this nature. We would do the same for France and Switzerland, for example."

He explained that the agency normally worked out reasonable risks, and consulted with the banks on money-market conditions before settling on a rate for its guarantee.

Mr. Linder reiterated that an agency guarantee on the Soviet wheat sale would fall into the "normal" commercial channels specified by President Kennedy in his announcement 2 weeks ago.

The Export-Import Bank has never before guaranteed a commercial credit to the Soviet Union, Mr. Linder said.

Grain trade circles were aware of the reported proposal to guarantee the credit to the Soviet Union by yesterday evening. Most traders expressed surprise that the Government would pave the way for the extension of credit in the sale of wheat to the Russians.

"If the Russians can't get credit they will pay for the wheat in cash," one grain merchant said. "We would be quite happy to settle for cash," he added.

According to the Chicago bank, other nations in the Communist bloc of Eastern Europe would be granted the same terms as those extended to the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union is ineligible for long-term loans from the United States under the terms of the Johnson Act, which prohibits such loans to nations with debts in default.

Meanwhile, the grain trade is still awaiting the arrival of the Soviet trade delegation to negotiate the sale. On Wednesday it was reported the delegation would arrive yesterday. Their arrival, however, apparently has been postponed.

The delegation already has been granted visas to enter the United States.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1963]

SHIP WAIVERS SEEN IN SALE OF WHEAT TO REDS

(By Frank C. Porter)

The United States may have to grant waivers on its American-bottoms-only policy to break an impasse over sales of U.S. wheat behind the Iron Curtain.

The first step in such a strategy came Friday night when the Commerce Department announced that the Maritime Administration will set guidelines for such rates.

An administration source said he believed Commerce will use these guidelines to eliminate a wide differential between United States and world shipping rates on grain.

U.S. shipowners reportedly are asking $23 a ton to deliver grain to Black Sea ports. But foreign operators have been quoting $12 to $13 a ton.

HUNGARIANS BALK

Hungarian negotiators, seeking an initial shipment of 200,000 tons, have balked at paying the higher rate although they have no objection to the use of U.S. vessels.

President Kennedy has made such sales to the Soviet bloc conditional on shipping the grain in U.S. ships where available.

New York grain traders believe the Russians, who had expressed interest in buying an estimated $250 million in wheat here to help make up for their crop failure, will take an equally firm stand against the higher rates.

Russian Embassy sources, quoted by United Press International, said a Soviet trade mission due to leave Moscow for the United States last Thursday may be held up a week or 10 days. The delay, attributed to the illness of Chairman S. A. Borisov, could mean that the Russians are in no hurry to consummate the deal, or perhaps that they are having second thoughts about it.

NEED SEEN MARGINAL

Some administration officials suspect that the Soviet Union's need for U.S. wheat is marginal. Although Russian wheat statistics are virtually nonexistent here, it is thought that the U.S.S.R. may be able to piece out its domestic consumption needs from its huge Australian and Canadian purchases. U.S. wheat could then be used to build up stockpiles depleted by several bad crop years and to fulfill export commitments to East European satellites.

But if U.S. terms prove too onerous or facelosing, the reasoning continues, the Soviet Union might be tempted to renege on commitments to the satellites and gamble on its stockpile. Later it might be able to pick up flour ground from U.S. wheat in third countries.

The deadlock over rates is sticky, Government officials say, but not insurmountable. They indicate it may take several weeks, perhaps more, to work out a solution.

GUIDELINE POLICY

Here is how the Commerce Department's guideline policy may be used to eliminate the differential, as explained by a maritime official.

The guidelines will be set between the two rates, probably closer to the prevailing—and lower—world level. If U.S. rates continue at the higher level and a potential purchaser complains to Commerce that they are excessive, the Department may temporarily waive the U.S. vessel requirement and grant an export license to the grain dealer permitting the purchaser to ship in foreign bottoms at rates close to the guidelines.

This will tend to raise the world rate and lower that of the U.S. shipowner, gradually eliminating the differential.

USED EFFECTIVELY

This technique has already been used effectively to prevent "shakedowns" by shipowners on cargoes of surplus agricultural commodities to underdeveloped nations, 50 percent of which are required by law to be carried in U.S. vessels.

Thus a precedent of using such a waiver in shipments can be cited. Officials point out that President Kennedy's condition that the

grain be carried "in available American ships supplemented by ships of other countries as required" leaves him considerable latitude. He might argue that American ships aren't really available if they're offered at higher noncompetitive rates.

The availability argument may be academic. Although the American Maritime Association says U.S. ships could carry 85 to 90 percent of projected Communist purchases, other sources say this Nation's tramps and converted tankers, which would carry the bulk of such cargo, already have all the business they can handle. Hence the high rates being quoted for Black Sea ports.

Another possibility is that the rate differential may equalize itself as world rates continue to soar under pressure of a global shipping shortage.

WASHINGTON REPORT

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

The nuclear test ban is ratified and in force. An informal Soviet-American agreement to bar nuclear weapons from space has been formalized in a U.N. resolution. Consular posts are about to be established in Leningrad and Chicago. Andrei Gromyko, who 1 year ago was stoutly denying to President Kennedy any Soviet intention to place long-range missiles in Cuba, has again called at the White House, this time to press Khrushchev's plea for a second step toward peace. The relaxation of tension so eagerly sought by the Soviet Union since last June is well underway. The truce of the bear has begun. Inevitably, euphoria begins to settle over the West.

Is the truce genuine? Will it last? Is the cold war really ending, as British Foreign Secretary Lord Home suggested in his opening U.N. speech, or are we, as Richard Nixon believes "now entering a period of the greatest danger of Communist expansion in the free world since immediately after World War II?" (Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 12, 1963.)

Those who believe the cold war is now ending would do well to consider the implications of an October 1 declaration from Moscow Radio. If it is to end, say the Soviets, the West must end it, because the West began it. The statement suggests the grim reality behind the facade of the Soviet peace offensive. The Soviets maintain, as always, that the cold war arose because of the Western policy of resistance to Communist expansion. It can end, by simple definition, only when the West reverses its policy of strength. As to the Soviets, there is no change whatsoever in the ultimate goal of world communism. This much is still admitted by all U.S. officials.

But the logic which must flow from the continuing Soviet objective is steadfastly ignored in all the current peace talk. The average American citizen seems to prefer hope to reality—at least this has been the political calculation of every U.S. administration, which seems to find words of reassurance to the voters much more profitable than blunt assessments of the facts of life (for example, the rapid rise of Communist strength in Latin America). Realism lacks the content of idealized emotion, and those who view the world from such a vantage point may seem harsh and unfeeling. Yet far more agony and destruction has been visited upon mankind by well-intentioned men who refused to think too unkindly of their enemies than by all of the followers of "realpolitik." The latter philosophy views men and society as they are, not as they ought to be. It is often a better basis for both prediction and action.

U.S. approval of the Soviet request to purchase U.S. wheat, hard on the heels of the nuclear test ban, is a further retreat from reality. It represents a major success for the new Soviet tactic of honey rather than vinegar and signifies the utter dissipation by the United States of a tremendous economic weapon against communism. We are committing an act of folly which would be unthinkable were it not for the false appearance of peace which the Communists and our own leaders have promoted in the last few months.

The massive Communist population of over 1 billion people does not have enough food. It has never had enough, but as recently as fiscal 1962 the Soviet Union was able to export 174 million bushels of surplus wheat—mostly to its East European satellites. Canada has been selling to Communist China. Now, however, the inherent inefficiency of Soviet agriculture, combined with widespread drought, have conspired to produce a massive Soviet grain failure which Agriculture Secretary Freeman estimates has reduced production 27 percent from recent years. The virgin lands, on which Khrushchev put so much hope, have become a great dust bowl. Some workers refuse to stay on the farms. The rest of the Soviet economy is also in such bad shape that Khrushchev is reportedly considering reimposition of the compulsory labor laws which were abolished piecemeal beginning in 1956.

This situation offers the United States a golden opportunity to exert political leverage on the Communist world. In purchasing the equivalent of about 400 million bushels of wheat Russia exhausted all other sources before turning to the United States for an additional 150 million bushels. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary also wish to buy from us. There is now no place else for them to go. It is incorrect to assert that the Soviets could get the wheat elsewhere if we do not sell it to them. Besides the United States, only Canada, Australia, and Argentina can export wheat. The U.S. Agriculture Department noted on October 9 that Canada's port and delivery facilities cannot handle more than $500 million worth of wheat which she has already sold to Russia. Australia has already sold the Soviets most of its crop. Argentina's harvest doesn't appear large enough to permit heavy exports. Western Europe—a net importer of wheat—will probably harvest 300 million bushels below last year. The Soviets have already purchased from Western Europe the equivalent, in flour, of 100 million bushels of wheat, much of it originating in the United States. Thus we have, indirectly, already furnished some wheat to Russia via Western Europe, but this source could be cut off if we chose to exert pressure, because we are the original supplier.

We are, therefore, in a position either to exact political concessions in return for our wheat or else refuse to sell and force the Communists to devote resources to agriculture which they will otherwise be free to devote to politico-military purposes.

But, once more, Washington takes a different view. Speaking for the administration, Secretary Freeman argued that to seek political concessions from Khrushchev would be "a deterrent towards the strengthening and the improving of relationships that were believed to be desirable." Trade relationships in "nonstrategic items" he declared, is one of the ways in which the United States can "maximize our relationship, bring about a relaxation of tension, and maintain a peaceful world." (Interview on TV program "Issues and Answers," Oct. 13, 1963.) President Kennedy maintains that not to sell the Soviets wheat would convince the Kremlin that "we are more interested in exploiting their internal difficulties, and that the logical course for them to follow is a renewal of the cold war." (In a letter to Congress, Oct. 10, 1963.)

Again, these statements suggest that the cold war has ended and that we must be careful not to start it up again. In such a way the American public is being lulled into the happy belief that peace has been achieved. Accompanied by such arguments, we are giving the Soviets the wherewithal to resume the hard line against us when the time is right.

The wheat deal is defended, of course, on commercial as well as political grounds: The Soviets need our wheat; we need the Soviet gold. What could be a better exchange? But, as Senator DODD has pointed out so well (in a Senate speech, Oct. 1, 1963), "Gold means nothing to the Communists; wheat means everything. We do not need their gold. [Unless we solve our balance-of-payment difficulties the gold will do us little good. If we do solve the problem, we don't need it.—Ed.] They need our wheat. Let them pay the price for it, not in gold bars, but in concessions to the cause of freedom."

The wheat sale is also defended on humanitarian grounds, and on propaganda ones. Can we be so cruel as to withhold food from a hungry people? What would it do to our image? However, no one in Russia will starve if we do not sell the wheat. The Soviets have some grain reserves, and there are alternative food sources. They can get by with rationing. But refusal would aggravate the general economic crisis of communism; it would constitute the employment of economic countermeasures—our strongest nonmilitary weapon against communism; it would compel the Soviets to abandon or scale down their own use of food exports as a weapon of subversion in the cold war.

For example, it might force Russia to abandon support of Castro. The recent hurricane has further ruined the Cuban economy. Massive food supplies from Russia will be necessary to maintain it. The sale of wheat to Russia may determine whether Russia will be able to give this aid. In theory, the wheat is to be used only in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and not transshipped to Cuba. But Commerce Secretary Hodges conceded (in a press conference) that there is no way to guarantee that Communist Cuba won't benefit from the sale to the Soviets.

Another possibility was suggested when, on October 14, retiring West German Premier Konrad Adenauer told guests at a press reception that the Soviets should be made to pay for Western wheat with political concessions as well as money. He said he would have preferred to see the Berlin wall torn down before the West helped to solve the Soviet grain shortage.

The United States went to the aid of a hungry and destitute Soviet Union in the 1920's. Whatever this did to our image, it in no way diverted the Soviet leaders from their implacable determination to bury us. It merely preserved their power and enabled them to develop it in pursuit of their international objectives.

Lack of adequate food is a major Communist weakness. The U.S. ability to grant, or withhold, our huge food surplus is a major strength. It is to be hoped that future historians will not record 1963 as the year of the West's crowning folly in which its last advantages over international communism were thrown to the winds. So far there is scant indication that wisdom will prevail.

FRANK J. JOHNSON,
Editor.

U.N. Loyalty Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I include an article by Mr. Edward O'Brien which

appeared in the October 19 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. The article makes reference to seven American staff members in the employ of the United Nations despite official U.S. findings that they are loyalty risks because of Communist backgrounds. I have high respect for Mr. O'Brien's reporting ability and have seen no refutation of the fact cited in this article. Mr. Speaker, this kind of information lends credit to the view that the U.N. is serving as a spy base in many countries including our own. If situations like this one are permitted to endure then those who call for our withdrawal from the U.N. are certain to gain substantial following, and not without reason.

The article follows:

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Seven American staff members are still in the employ of the United Nations and its affiliated bodies despite official U.S. Government findings that they are loyalty risks because of Communist backgrounds.

Refusal to fire the seven is in violation of a long-standing agreement between the United Nations and the State Department that no American citizen would be hired or retained without clearance from the U.S. Government.

Some of the seven—four women and three men—have records of Communist or Communist-front activities going back as far as the late 1930's. Nonetheless, they have been able to stay on the international organization payrolls for as long as 17 years.

POSTS LISTED

Of the seven, two are employed at U.N. headquarters in New York and one in Geneva, Switzerland; two at the World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva; and two at the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) at Rome.

WHO and FAO are operating arms at the U.N. The U.S. share of U.N. agency budgets is always at least 31 percent and goes up to 100 percent on some projects.

An eighth U.S. citizen who had also been given an adverse loyalty verdict quit his U.N. job last July. He had been employed there for 14 years although known to the U.S. Government as strongly pro-Soviet and hostile to the United States.

Among the remaining seven are two physicians, a translator, a reporter, a secretary, and an accountant. Their salaries, including extra allowances, range as high as almost $20,000 a year.

In every case, adverse finding has been made on the employee's loyalty to the United States. The findings, based on extensive investigations by the FBI, were by the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board, an agency of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

REASONABLE DOUBT

The board concluded from the records that there was "a reasonable doubt" as to their loyalty to the U.S. Government. These conclusions were sent by the State Department to the U.N. Secretary General and other international organization officials.

The U.N. and its affiliates have the final word on hiring and retaining staff personnel. In these cases, their decisions were to keep the seven. In 11 other cases, U.S. employees with adverse loyalty records were fired.

A 1953 understanding between the U.N. and the United States, according to Civil Service Commission officials, is that "no American national will be employed unless the American national has received an OK from our State Department."

In the seven cases where this agreement was violated, the reasons for the U.N. agency actions could not be learned. Nor could it be learned whether the State Department pressed efforts to disclose the loyalty risks from the payrolls. All seven were in their jobs when the 1953 agreement went into effect.

SECRET TESTIMONY

The U.N. agencies' insistence on retaining certain employees first became known last September 22 with release of secret House committee testimony given by John W. Macy, Civil Service Commission Chairman, on January 23. Committee members demanded to know whether adverse loyalty verdicts were being ignored by the international organizations.

Mr. Macy replied that the Civil Service Commission did not keep track of the disposition of the loyalty cases but would do so in the future. On checking, he informed the committee, without giving specifics, that eight employees had been retained despite doubts as to their loyalty.

Investigations by this newspaper showed the following, among many other facts, in their records:

A woman secretary once worked for a U.S. Government official here who was known to have surrounded himself with persons of Communist sympathies. She was active in the 1930's and 1940's in two Communist fronts.

A woman officeworker was employed several times by a Soviet organization in New York. She has also worked for a Communist front.

A man officeworker was an employee of an international relief organization where he was a member of a group that sought to favor Communist countries in the distribution of relief materials.

A physician known as sympathetic to communism was recorded in newspaper stories in the 1940's as a member of Communist fronts. Another physician belonged to a Communist political group. As an official in a relief organization, he arranged for a Communist nation to be a favored beneficiary of relief supplies.

A woman employee of a U.N. agency was called before a congressional committee in 1951 and refused to furnish information about the records of a Communist front. Another woman was active in Communist Party activities in this country and distributed Communist materials. The adverse finding on her loyalty occurred a decade ago.

Interstate Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I am sure that many of my colleagues in the Senate have been receiving the advice and counsel of their respective State highway departments concerning expanding and accelerating construction of the National Interstate and Defense Highway System. Kentucky's attitude in this respect is summarized in excellent fashion by the Commonwealth's highway commissioner, Mr. Henry Ward, in a letter addressed to me on October 15.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Ward's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS,
Frankfort, October 15, 1963.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: The experience by the Kentucky Department of Highways since the Interstate Highway System was authorized and construction has been carried forward demonstrates very conclusively that an insufficient mileage of the Interstate System has been authorized by Congress and allocated to the State by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads to provide for the building of a major system of highways that will serve the needs of this State and the demand for a major network of roads that will serve the interest of the Nation. Contact with highway officials in other States indicates conclusively that a similar situation exists in many of them.

In addition, there has been demonstrated a need for the speeding of construction of the Interstate Highway System to meet the demands of the present and to make the Interstate Highway System an effective part of the program for the development of Kentucky and other parts of the Nation. The building of toll roads in Kentucky has demonstrated what can be done in an effective way to provide modern highways now. Kentucky has built 76 miles of the Mountain Parkway and 127 miles of the Western Kentucky Parkway within 2 years from the time of beginning of construction. This has been achieved through the issuance of revenue bonds making funds available immediately for construction. This means that these modern highways can be used by traffic now and paid for over a period of years out of earnings.

There is the strongest feeling on the part of those who have an understanding of the contribution that a modern highway system makes to economic progress that the entire Interstate System should be completed as soon as possible so that it can be utilized to aid in the development of our country. This suggests that Congress would be making a major contribution to the good of the country by devising a method by which there can be an advancement of Federal funds for the construction of the Interstate System with the provision that the revenue for such expediting will be accumulated in the Federal Treasury over a period of years from the special taxes that have been levied from highway users.

I was working in Washington in 1956 when the present method of financing the Interstate System was passed. I know that at that time consideration was given to the issuance of bonds or some type of financing method which would make funds available immediately to be repaid over a period of years after construction of the highways. What I am suggesting now is that Congress review various methods of advancing funds for construction because it has been clearly demonstrated that these highways need to be finished and placed in use at a date much earlier than that possible under the present method of financing.

It is now estimated that if the pay-as-you-go method of financing of the Interstate System is followed the entire system will not be completed and opened to traffic until late in 1972 or 1973. In Kentucky this means that there will be gaps left in the Interstate System for 10 years. Obviously, the entire system needs to be brought to completion so that these highways will make a proper

contribution to the economic development of the entire State.

There are several methods under which the U.S. Government could provide for financing of these highways with the understanding that funds are to be accumulated from taxes with the payment of the advance funds over a period of years.

It is generally known that the United States could not have made the remarkable progress that it has made in industrial development except through a means of financing similar to that used in private industry. This means that industry borrows the money for plant expansion and then pays off the loan with earnings from production. What is proposed is exactly this simple method of financing of the Interstate System.

Good highways are the basis of economic prosperity in this country. In Kentucky the greatest contribution that can be made to the growing economy for all sections of the State is the development of a fine highway system. Kentucky stands ready to cooperate in a program financed by this method.

In addition to expediting construction of the approximately 700 miles of interstate highways allocated to Kentucky, there is a demonstrated need for the allocation of additional interstate mileage to build for Kentucky a network of major highways. The same is true of other States of the Nation.

Again referring to my own experience in 1956 while in Washington, I know that Congress gave consideration to an increase in the 41,000 miles allocated to the Interstate System at that time, but decided that it would not then provide for additional mileage, but await further evidence that the 41,000 mile system would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the country. I think that was a wise decision at the time. However, it has been demonstrated that the 41,000 mile allocation does not provide for the building of a modern network of highways across the Nation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that Congres authorize the Bureau of Public Roads and the States to engage in planning for an additional allocation of mileage to the Interstate System. It is my considered belief that such a study should be carried on by the highway officials rather than by the addition of mileage to the Interstate System by individual acts of Congress. What is needed is a good plan for a major network that will provide for an integrated system. The present 41,000 mile system has been arrived at through the application of criteria that were sound. The Federal Highway Agency in the States need the authorization from Congress to plan additions to this system which can be constructed as funds are made available. There is an increasing importance in this approach for future planning. Kentucky has found in conection with its planning program that it needs to know for future consideration where the Interstate Highway System is going to be or whether or not the State must plan on providing highways either through use of the regular Federad aid program or through the construction of toll roads.

Therefore, I recommend to Congress that an act be passed authorizing the Bureau of Public Roads of the State to engage in planing with a requirement that a plan be submitted to Congress for final approval. In my judgment, States and the Federal Government can develop and recommend to Congress an addition to the Interstate System within a period of 1 year.

I am writing this letter to all members of the Kentucky delegation in Congress and I asure you that the Kentucky Department of Highways will be available for consultation with you at your convenience.

Yours very truly,

HENRY WARD,
Commissioner.

Fiscal Soundness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have received a splendid letter from an outstanding banker in the great State of Michigan concerning the fiscal policies of the present administration. My address, to which the senior vice president of the Michigan National Bank, Mr. Finch, refers, entitled "The Dollar and the Balance of Payments" was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, on October 10. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me of October 15 from Lee W. Finch, Esq., of Grand Rapids, Mich., may be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN NATIONAL BANK,
Grand Rapids, Mich., October 15, 1963.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senator from Virginia,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: A copy of your address, "The Dollar and the Balance of Payments," has come to my attention and I have read it with great interest. It is unfortunate that it hasn't received more general publicity. I agree with everything you say, but more strongly.

You mention that the payments deficit adds to the pressure for sound monetary and fiscal policies. I hope so. I am more inclined to believe that the long continued unsound monetary and fiscal policies are the cause of the balance-of-payments emergency. Fiscal disciplines, not gimmicks, will correct it. If our domestic fiscal affairs were handled in a manner that justified implicit trust in the dollar there wouldn't be the danger of such holders demanding our gold. I believe that more capital is transferred because of distrust of the dollar than because of any differential in interest rates. Most individuals with capital would prefer to keep such funds at home when they can trust the monetary unit. When they can't, if history teaches us anything, no prohibitions or penalties will prevent considerable flight.

Shortly after the present administration took office Henry Alexander, president of the Morgan Guaranty Bank in New York, I suppose in collaboration, put up a trial balloon setting forth the dream that we could just as well do away entirely with the minimum gold reserve requirement for our money. The theory was that we could just as well exercise proper personal discipline, and then we wouldn't need the automatic rigid discipline of that gold reserve and it could be done away with. I wrote him at that time and expressed the feeling that he must be naive indeed if he thought that any government would substitute sufficient discipline under those circumstances. I am always amused from an economic standpoint at the inscription on our currency, "In God We Trust." I need no assurance that I can trust God. What worries me is whether I can trust either party and Congress in refraining from ruining this great economy by the steady rotting of our money. At the rate it is proceeding, Uncle Sam is becoming the greatest pickpocket that the world has ever known. The first of the paper, "Continentals," bore the engaging inscription, "The Issue Is in Doubt." Perhaps that inscription would be just as truthful now.

Whenever bad money is chasing good money into hiding, there is always an illusion of a lack of liquidity. Even gold would be available in much greater quantity for international purposes, if people could trust their respective money. When a national government wishes to tamper with the value of their money they make paper money legal tender by law. What the same thinkers would like now is an international authority able to make paper of unlimited expansion an international legal tender. For international participants who conduct their affairs properly there are ready accommodations. All they want is a new sort of credit with an unlimited expansion ratio so that undisciplined debtors can count on getting new allotments of spending money whenever they wish. It is bad enough when individual countries like Brazil, and possibly ourselves 10 years hence, wreck themselves with rotten money, but it will be a sorry day for the world when the soft-money advocates do a collective wrecking job internationally.

Sincerely yours,

LEE W. FINCH,
Senior Vice President.

The Wheat Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the membership of the House of Representatives, the sage comments contained in the following editorial from the Mount Morris Index on the administration's wheat deal with the Russians.

The sentiments expressed therein come from the heart of the great Midwest and I am confident they represent the thoughts not only of the vast majority of our midwesterners but countless millions of other Americans as well. The writer has done an admirable job in discussing in depth the true nature of what is involved. Not only is the editorial excellently written but it is also in my opinion a very honest, sincere straightforward and realistic appraisal of the relative merits of the wheat sale to the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, I share the same misgivings of the author of the editorial over the enthusiasm of the administration to bail out Khrushchev and his Communist world from the inadequacies of their rigidly controlled economy whose sole aim is the suppression and subjugation of freedom loving nations. It is indeed ironic that we should thus strengthen his hand so that he can do us more harm.

The editorial follows:

THE WHEAT DEAL

It has been obvious for a month that the United States would sell wheat to Russia and that any argument against the transaction was a pure waste of time.

Administration leaders with the help of some prominent farm and business spokes-

men conducted a persuasive campaign to prepare the people for the decision that was announced by President Kennedy last week.

They presented it in simple and logical fashion: Russia needs our wheat and we need the business; our allies already are selling wheat to the Communists so why shouldn't we get some of the business for ourselves; after all, we've been supplying wheat to Communist regimes in Yugoslavia and Poland so why shouldn't we add Russia to the list?

These are rational arguments and they were made to sound attractive to the farmers who have been fearing a sharp drop in the price of wheat and taxpayers who are conscious of the high cost of storage for our huge wheat surplus.

So it all sounds so reasonable and so much a natural part of our new policy of coexistence with the good Communists that there seemed to be no valid arguments against the deal, especially since we made it plain that we wanted none of the grain to go to the bad Communists.

We agree with all the arguments that have been presented in favor of the trade but still we are concerned about some of the arguments that weren't raised and with the claims that we made a shrewd bargain.

The facts are simple, Khrushchev announced that he was in the wheat buying business and would consider bids from any country interested in getting a part of the business.

Countries with surplus wheat lined up in a hurry—with the United States bringing up the rear. The bargaining was simple and there was no shrewdness on our part.

We simply asked the Russian wheat buyers if they would buy our wheat at the subsidized American price. They said they wouldn't. It was that simple. So we're going to sell at the world price, the taxpayer making up the difference between the domestic price and the world price—or more than 50 cents on each bushel sent to Russia.

Now we reach the main point for discussion. If Khrushchev desperately needed the grain we surely could have driven a better bargain including some visible proof that the Communist bosses no longer intend to bury us.

If Khrushchev wasn't desperate enough to grab the wheat on our terms then what is the reason for buying grain that he could have done without?

The only sensible answer is that he now considers wheat to be a weapon that can be valuable to him at home and abroad. With the food problem eased at home and in the satellite countries Khrushchev can concentrate on other business which may include new advances for the control of space or the development of new military hardware.

He also will be in a stronger position to stir up the world's trouble spots at any time he sees advantage in ending the present thaw.

The course of communism has been an inability to produce ample food supplies. This remains true in Russia after 45 years under Communist rule and it becomes true wherever communism has cast its shadow.

This pattern has been so consistent that it must seem to be a judgment by the God that the Communists say does not exist. Are we now stepping in where angels refuse to tread?

Political Status of Puerto Rico

SPEECH

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5945) to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing a bill today authorizing to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sum as may be necessary to reimburse the city of New York for the cost of the extra police protection for Marshal Tito and his party during their recent visit to that city. I think it is only fair and just when one of the most hated men of the world is invited by the President of the United States the city of New York should not have to foot the bill for this extra police protection.

Mr. GROSS. Why not let the President pay for it?

Ezra Taft Benson Favored Increased Trade With Soviets To Reduce Our Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to an Arizona man for reminding us that the current proposed sale of wheat by grain dealers to the Soviet Union follows a pattern set in 1955.

We are further reminded that the then Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, favored increased trade with the Soviet bloc as a means to reduce U.S. farm surpluses.

Mr. Benson's son, Reed, a John Birch Society official, came to Arizona last month but apparently was unable to refute these facts. Instead he chose to cry, "treason" because the present administration is going to permit sales.

Following are two articles from the Arizona Republic, Phoenix morning newspaper, issues of October 16, 1963, and October 19, 1963:

PIONEER RED TRADER SAYS WHEAT DEAL OK

(By Thelma Heatwole)

SUN CITY.—The furor over the proposed sale of wheat to Russia is puzzling to Dr. Geza Schutz, of Sun City, who is an agricultural and industrial economist.

Schutz, substantiated by newspaper clippings from the New York Times, points out that the sale of grain to a Communist nation is not new. He also said that he is personally disinterested in the political implications.

A multimillion-dollar sale of hybrid corn seeds and farm machinery to Russia took place in the fall of 1955. The sale stirred no adverse reaction, Schutz recalled.

Schutz said however, that the sale of grain in 1955 was not nearly in such large quantities as the current wheat-for-Russia proposal.

"I feel that today and in the weeks to come the wheat proposal will become one of the big election issues," Schutz said. "This is dynamite. The grain issue should be considered as a question of national interest and not as a political argument for or against one party."

He displayed clippings from the New York Times, dated November 9, 1955, in which Ezra Taft Benson, then Secretary of Agriculture, was quoted as favoring the sale of Government-owned surplus commodities to Iron Curtain countries in exchange for durable goods and dollars.

"I would like a liberalization of our national policy regarding trading with Iron Curtain countries," Benson said. "I would hope we would have as much freedom as possible to get rid of our surplus."

Schutz, 63, who received his Ph. D. in economics from the University of Geneva, and a companion, Roswell Garst, of Coon Rapids, Iowa, visited Russia in 1955.

"We were the first ones to break the Iron Curtain," Schultz said. "We were given freedom to travel the land and take colored slides in Russia, Romania and Hungary. That was when the cold war was really hot."

The purpose of the trip was to study the agriculture and food situation and for Garst to sell hybrid seed corn. As a result, great quantities of seed were sold by private American seed producers, with the approval of the U.S. State Department.

"We believed that the cold war situation was so critical," said the former Minnesota agricultural economist and grain rancher, "that perhaps through food we could bring about better relations between the two countries. Seldom, if ever, will a nation that is well fed start a war."

Schutz, who came to Sun City 2 years ago from Lansing, Mich., made a detailed report of his travels and findings and presented them with pictures to the Secretary of Agriculture. Later, when Russian, Hungarian and Rumanian agricultural delegates came to the United States, he was asked by the State Department to accompany the tours.

Schutz, who still serves as an independent arbitrator as a panel member of the U.S. Federal Conciliation Service, was chairman of the U.S. Wage Stabilization Board during the Korean war, public member of the War Labor Board during World War II, also worked with the League of Nations in 1928.

He points out that the tremendous potential of U.S. agriculture based on a free independent farming system is more impressive to Russians than military might.

In other statements, Schutz said:

"He and Garst were the icebreakers who broke down the Iron Curtain and opened the way for greater trade and cultural exchange because they did not act on instructions from their government, but as Americans who want peace and trade.

"The more effort Russia puts into modern agriculture, the less she will put into the war machine.

"Trade among all nations is the greatest force toward world peace."

RED SALE TREASON, BIRCHER DECLARES

(By Ben Avery)

The sale of U.S. wheat to Russia would be an act of treason because it gives aid and comfort to the enemy, Reed Benson, Utah State coordinator for the John Birch Society, told a Phoenix Press Club forum last night.

Benson, who was introduced by Frank Marisch, Arizona coordinator for the society, questioned a recent news report that commodities including hybrid corn were sold to Iron Curtain countries during President Eisenhower's administration, in which his father, Ezra Taft Benson, served as Secretary of Agriculture.

In other talks yesterday, Benson told audiences this country is at war with communism, and expressed belief this Nation is losing that war.

"J. Edgar Hoover told the Nation that the sooner we wake up the safer we will be," Benson declared, and he added that the Birch Society is dedicated to hastening that awakening.

Benson said the United States is losing the war because of treason and the American people's ignorance of the enemy. He named a number of former Government offi-

cials as members of a Communist cell in the Agriculture Department, and said his father was asked why he did not get rid of one of them.

"He has the ear of the President more than I do," young Benson quoted his father as replying.

Benson compared choosing between Communists to choosing between members of Murder, Inc.

"Every Communist is dedicated to our overthrow," he said. "What difference does it makes if they argue over the funeral arrangements?"

Asked if he believed President Kennedy is "soft on communism," the young Utahan declared:

"That is putting it mildly."

But he did not put it any stronger himself, despite questions about the wheat deal.

He said that it was when he was considering joining the Birch Society in 1961 that he first met Robert Welch, its founder and director. Before that, he said he obtained a copy of the FBI's report on the society. Benson said he attended one of Welch's 2-day seminars.

"Then I made a final check with the president of the Church of Latter-day Saints," he declared. He said his father at the time issued a statement approving the action.

Benson declared that Welch still is the authoritarian head of the society, and that the society has not softened.

He arrived in the State Monday and spoke in Tucson, St. Johns, and Holbrook before coming here. He spoke at Glendale last night.

He will speak at 10 a.m. today in Maryvale Park, at 2 p.m. in Scottsdale High School, and at 8 p.m. in Irving Elementary School in Mesa. The meetings are open to the public, said Marisch.

A political science graduate of Brigham Young University, Benson campaigned in Arizona in behalf of his father's agricultural program in 1956, and declared the recent wheat referendum is the best evidence of the farmers' approval of that program. He served a mission for the Latter-day Saints Church in England.

Hartke Lauds Editorial on U.N. Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the peoples of the world are pausing today to pay tribute to the one vital world organization on which hang our hopes for the bright, peaceful future of civilization. Although admittedly not perfect, the United Nations has been, in times of strife and crises, the calm, steady hand of strength and restraint which has prevented global catastrophe.

Mr. President, WANE radio of Fort Wayne, Ind., has eloquently stated the virtues and pitfalls of the United Nations in an editorial broadcast October 22, 1963, and I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS DAY

An organization which embodies one of mankind's greatest dreams marks its 18th anniversary this fall. October 24 is United Nations Day. Since its founding, many have doubted from time to time whether it could ever survive this long. But so far, it has survived * * * perhaps because it remains both a symbol and a tool of the human desire for world peace and brotherhood.

As a symbol, it represents some of man's most noble aspirations * * * to live in peace and to extend friendship and a helping hand to others. As a tool, it serves as man's first attempt on such a universal and concerted scale to take practical steps to achieve these aspirations.

As a symbol of an ideal, the U.N.'s value is undiminished. As a practical tool, it has been less effective.

At times it has brought representatives of widely divergent viewpoints and totally different cultures together in conversations which have furthered genuine understanding. At other times it has provided only a platform from which one group hurls insults at another.

The U.N. has sometimes been an effective keeper of the peace. In other times, it has been pitifully inadequate. On some occasions, too, the U.N. has stepped beyond its international peacekeeping role to meddle in the internal affairs of some of its member nations. The distinction between international affairs and internal affairs has become clouded.

But the fact that the U.N. has not been completely effective does not mean it has not been effective at all. Even if it has averted a shooting war only once, that's enough to justify its existence. Even though it often degenerates into little more than a debating society, a war of words is preferable to a war of nuclear bombs, and while men are still talking, they are less likely to fight.

The U.N., like all human organizations, is beset by the eternal conflict which divides man's soul * * * his creativity versus his destructiveness. Sometimes one impulse is dominant, sometimes the opposite. It's in the times of creativity that man establishes institutions such as the U.N. And it's in his destructive phases that he turns such institutions into mockeries. The U.N. has provided a worldwide stage where this conflict has been acted out.

The United Nations has many faults * * * because it suffers from human nature. But when we pay our respects to the ideals which it symbolizes and to the positive accomplishments it has made, we pay our respects to ourselves.

No. 20—New Hampshire: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to tell the Members of this House a few things about gambling in the State of New Hampshire.

In 1962 $82 million was bet on New Hampshire's race tracks. This legal activity brought into the coffers of its State treasury almost $6 million in revenue.

According to the McClellan committee hearings, illegal gambling may be roughly calculated as having been slightly under $400 million last year. But New Hampshire realized that this illegal gambling was nothing but a gangster's grab-bag. So it acted—wisely and courageously.

I have no doubt that the New Hampshire lottery, to become operative next March, will flourish as an example of financial and social realism. The vast revenues now buoying the underworld will be significantly diverted into public coffers, to the benefit of the people rather than a select coterie of crime bosses.

New Hampshire has sensibly recognized that gambling must be controlled as it cannot be eradicated. Human nature cannot be molded to fit bluenose dreams. If New Hampshire's commonsense can be contagious, it will spell out the end of gambling as a major form of criminal sustenance, for gambling must be outlawed to be a fruitful source of government revenues.

I am certain that the New Hampshire congressional delegation is fully cognizant of the many ways in which their State lotterly will benefit the State. I hope they will join in seeking to give the wisdom of their State national scope by supporting my fight for the establishment of a national lottery.

My hat is off to New Hampshire for taking the necessary action to change their State from a gamblers' paradise to the people's haven.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as a Senator from New Jersey, I am heartened by the support expressed for a strong civil rights bill by one of our leading newspapers, the Newark Evening News. I am in complete agreement with its view that:

It is long past time to join this battle of civil rights in the Congress. Rather than the haggling and the horse trading, let the vote begin. Let those who endorse a meaningful expression of civil rights stand and be counted against those who do not.

At some point in history civil rights must rise above politics. It could be now.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I would also like to call attention to an editorial which recently appeared in the New York Post, as well as an editorial in today's New York Times. They are a cogent expression of the urgency for bringing a strong bill to the floor and permitting all the Members of Congress to vote on all the provisions now in the House subcommittee bill. I ask that the text of these editorials also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Oct. 18, 1963]

TIME TO BE COUNTED

New Jersey's Senator CASE has blown the whistle on the familiar game of diluting civil

rights with political expediency. He fears 1963's record of accomplishment "again will have civil rights on the cover and not enough inside."

To his judgment Senator CASE brings the authority of both experience and conviction. He watched the erosive process at work in 1957 and 1960 when he helped lead the fight against rule 22 and the southern filibuster it harbors. He found dilution as frustrating then as it is now.

The Senator, better than most of his colleagues, knows the political odds in this fight. Yet his point is one on which men of conscience must agree.

At issue here are rights—rights that are imbedded in the Constitution and in common morality. They are not privileges or favors. There is a principle involved here that should not be compromised or bartered away.

The latest concessions by Attorney General Kennedy make it look as though it might be. What could be more defeatist than to accept token segregation in public accommodations to a degree that is not countenanced in more enlightened legislation enacted by such States as New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania? Or to agree that the government may join suit for a Negro's rights in public schools and polling places, but nowhere else?

To do so suggests, as Senator CASE points out, "a surrender before the battle is begun."

It is long past time to join this battle of civil rights in the Congress. Rather than the haggling and the horse trading, let the vote begin. Let those who endorse a meaningful expression of civil rights stand and be counted against those who do not.

At some point in history civil rights must rise above politics. It could be now.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Oct. 18, 1963]

A TIME OUT FOR DECISION

Representative CELLER's sudden decision to postpone further meetings of the House Judiciary Committee until next Tuesday was a play for time.

We hope it reflects the administration's awareness of the dismay and disenchantment created by Attorney General Kennedy's unfortunate attempt—in which CELLER has unhappily concurred—to dilute the strong civil rights bill adopted by the Judiciary Subcommittee. We hope that, by the time the full committee meets again, its northern members will have heard enough from the civil rights legions to reverse the retreat, and that the Attorney General will use the interval for reflection and reconsideration.

One point should be clarified promptly in the confusion generated by Robert Kennedy's testimony. He argued that the subcommittee's part III provision, essentially designed to give the Justice Department new powers to initiate suits in behalf of victimized Negroes, was so loosely drawn that it would oblige the Department to intervene in many extraneous matters. The answer is simple. If the provision was badly drafted, it can be quickly rewritten.

The spirit of the clause is clear. To condemn it for poor language is a debater's device, not a serious argument.

As Senator CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, has pointed out, the Justice Department has time and again justified its failure to come to the aid of Negroes under fire on the ground that it lacks authorization to do so. If that is true, he observed, enactment of the essence of part III is crucial.

His position is unassailable. How can the Justice Department alternately lament the inadequacy of its powers in cases of persecution that "cry out for intercession" and refuse to make a massive fight for a provision that would give it vital weapons? There is neither logic nor principle in this stand. Nor do we believe this form of perhaps well-intentioned appeasement can ever stand the test of practicality. It will instead invite news demands for some graver concessions from the rightwing coalition.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 23, 1963]

WHICH WAY ON CIVIL RIGHTS?

All the fighting over the civil rights legislation in the House Judiciary Committee is being done by the friends of civil rights—against one another. For an understanding of this bizarre battle, it is helpful to look both backward and forward.

In June, after the street demonstrations for racial equality in Birmingham and other Southern cities, President Kennedy at last sent to Congress a strong civil rights bill. Weeks of hearings and executive sessions by a House Judiciary subcommittee resulted in the presentation to the full committee of an even stronger bill—one that contains needed protections not covered by the White House proposal. Chief among these is a provision for Federal suits to prevent denials of civil rights, a broadened version of the so-called title III of President Eisenhower's civil rights bill of 1957. This title passed the House 6 years ago but was killed in the Senate.

Attorney General Kennedy, convinced that the stronger subcommittee bill had no realistic chance of ultimate passage, decided that the only way to save the civil rights cause was to work for a return to the original administration version. The unexpected and unwanted result has been confusion and conflict in the civil rights camp, to the vast enjoyment of the Southerners, who want no bill at all. Several of the Republicans, whose support the Attorney General rightly said was essential to the passage of any bill, have joined liberal Democrats in asking why it was necessary to beat a premature retreat from a measure they considered better geared to achieving the administration's stated goals than the Kennedy bill itself.

Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of the division over tactics is that it has forestalled any real effort within the committee to deal with certain language defects that do exist in the subcommitee draft. The title III provision, for example, is so broadly drawn that it might open the way for an extension of Federal power in areas remote from civil rights. Technical problems of this kind could and should have been cleared up in the committee; but now there is a polarization of viewpoint in which the committee members feel obliged to make an all-or-nothing choice between the subcommittee version and the one sent to Capitol Hill by the White House.

The upshot is a fight between the wrong people, in the wrong forum, at the wrong time. The real test for civil rights legislation will come in the Senate, where Southern filibusterers have much greater latitude for obstruction and for forcing concessions. If retreats must eventually be made in the interest of salvaging any adequate civil rights measure, that is where the showdown is bound to be. To start retreating now—in the face of objections from a majority apparently eager to support a stronger bill—is wrong in principle and wrong in tactics.

The Death of the President of the Ogden, Utah, Branch of the NAACP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, a leader from Utah in the civil rights movement has been killed while carrying out his public responsibility. His death occurred on October 18.

Detective Sgt. Marshall N. White, an 18-year veteran with the Ogden Police Department, was shot and killed while searching a home for a prowler.

Mr. White was President of the Ogden branch of the NAACP.

His life and death reflect the dual demands of American citizenship for individual rights and responsibility. Rights without responsibility is anarchy; responsibility without rights is tyranny. Mr. White gave full devotion to both.

Mr. White's life was taken while he was in the service of his fellow citizens, preserving law and order so that men and women living in freedom would be safe in their pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

His life added merit to the causes to which he dedicated himself.

Exchange of Educational TV Programs Between Japan and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on October 16, 1963, the second United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange was held in Washington, D.C. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, was a member of the U.S. delegation to this conference and made the keynote remarks. In the course of Dr. Stanton's remarks he made some interesting recommendations concerning the exchange of educational TV programs between Japan and the United States. As usual, Dr. Stanton's observations were constructive and informative.

I commend the remarks to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND UNITED STATES-JAPAN CONFERENCE ON CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL INTERCHANGE

(By Frank Stanton)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates from Japan and the United States, ladies, and gentlemen:

As I think you all know, I am substituting today for my friend and former colleague Edward R. Murrow. I am very happy to be able to tell you that he continues to make excellent progress. And while I regret that his illness is the reason for my being here, I am very grateful for this opportunity to be a part of this conference.

Yesterday the Columbia Broadcasting System and the British Broadcasting Corp. presented the first discussion broadcast in history to be seen live on two continents simultaneously. For the first time in human experience men spoke to each other—face to face—across an ocean. Three cities—Rome, London, and Princeton, N.J.—were linked by Telstar relay in this second town meeting of the world. Churchmen from Tanganyika, West Germany, England, and the United States participated in a spirited

discussion of reform, renewal, and reunion in the churches of Christendom.

More important than the cities or the nations represented are the international implications of such a link. Surely this is one of the most exciting examples of the potential television holds for bringing peoples and nations together. It is our great good fortune that communication by sight and sound through satellite relay now joins so many nations at just the time in history when an understanding of other people's culture and political institutions has become more than just a textbook exercise. Now it is a matter on which the very survival of our societies may depend.

It would be entirely impractical, however, to allow our vision of a world united by satellite communications to obscure the fact that this is simply not going to happen, except on a small and intermittent scale, for some time to come. Eventually satellite communication will play a major cultural and educational role. In due time it may become not only the most powerful, but also the most economical way for nations to share their cultural and educational experiences.

This dream is not yet reality, but we already have a most acceptable substitute for the instantaneous electronic link. In the early days of television, it was a time-consuming business to transport film overseas. Now, with jet aircraft, it has become a matter of hours. A concert performed in Lincoln Center's Philharmonic Hall can be enjoyed on the other side of the Pacific Ocean on the same day.

Unfortunately, on both sides of the Pacific, there is not always unanimity on what should be sent. On occasion the theory has been advanced in both countries that a controlling factor in the export of television programing should be the effect a program may have on the national image. The implication of this argument is that we should avoid presenting disturbing problems in our society to the peoples of other nations. It also infers that what entertains us at home may embarrass us abroad, and hence should be withheld from oversea audiences.

I deplore both aspects of this theory. We cannot embrace a policy that asks us to hide our imperfections from the rest of the world. It is far more important to show people everywhere that a free press, in every form, is free to criticize as well as to praise, free to show shortcomings as well as strengths. The same holds true for entertainment programing. To hide the fact that we are diverted by mystery dramas and westerns, Suiri Geki and the Samurai, is to conceal our true character, and to represent ourselves as something we are not. If we adopted this mischievous doctrine, we should fool no one but ourselves.

We have had heartening evidence that the open and uninhibited export policy is not only the most honest, but the most effective as well. The frank disclosure of our imperfections and diversions has in countless cases earned us the respect and affection of oversea viewers. We face difficult social, economic and educational problems in the United States, and it is important that other nations be aware of this. It is also important that they understand that a democratic society is not ashamed to expose its imperfections to the world at large, and in fact welcomes the frank discussion that only a free and courageous press can generate.

Among men of good will, regardless of nationality, exchange of programing should never be confined to any one of several categories of programing, nor confined by any outside authority attempting to draw a line between what is "good" and what is "bad" for our national image. The exchange must include, on the part of both nations, hard news, documentaries, art, music, education, sports—the entire spectrum of programing.

Both parties to this conference have urged that it not bog down in a protracted semantic discussion over what is "cultural" and "educational" and what is not. I promise to observe this injunction after this one brief footnote. I believe the best mirror of a culture, in the context of television, is the composite of all the programing we view, from chamber music to western, from Kabuki to Samurai; and I believe that only this composite, and not selected educational prizewinners or elegant showpieces will truly achieve the educational results we all seek.

In this context let us look briefly at the growing exchange of programing that is taking place between Japan and the United States. Because I have greater firsthand knowledge of my own company's activities in this area, and because time did not permit obtaining industry-wide data—I was asked to stand for Mr. Murrow only a few days ago—I shall chiefly call upon CBS experience. But in doing so I do not mean in any way to minimize the contributions of other programing distributors; these have been equally vigorous.

CBS has supplied a newsfilm service to Japan since 1955. At the present time three of the five major Japanese television networks subscribe to our daily newsfilm service, and a half-million feet of 16-millimeter film are shipped annually to these three networks. This means that each network, from just this one source, has available each week more than an hour and a half of film depicting current events in the United States and other countries around the world. An additional 10½ hours a week of American and British newsfilm is also imported by Japanese film operations.

In the last 5 years CBS alone has supplied more than 2,700 different programs to Japanese networks. These have included not only the news and public affairs broadcasts such as "CBS Reports," "Eyewitness" and "Twentieth Century," "Town Meeting of the World," and "A Tour of the White House With Mrs. John F. Kennedy," but also entertainment series like "Playhouse 90," "The Defenders," "I Love Lucy," and "Perry Mason." About one-fifth of CBS television programing purchased in Japan falls in the news and public affairs category. And this does not include the newsfilm referred to previously. Often these broadcasts—especially if they have particular immediacy—are seen in the United States one night and in Japan the next.

The volume of this programing—some 50 percent of Japanese network television during prime-time evening hours now comes from the United States—is the direct result of the removal of restrictions on how much programing the Japanese networks could accept, and how much they were permitted to pay for it.

It is true, and I would be the first to concede the point, that for the moment at least the exchange is lopsided: We export far more than we import. But I also believe that Japanese television film product will increasingly find its way into the world market. The television counterparts of such strikingly talented motion picture production organizations as Toho, Toei and Daiei, who have just begun to venture into television, will inevitably visit their own talent on the world at large. Recall, if you will, that only a little over a decade ago world manufacturers of optical and electronic components and devices never dreamed what Japanese inventiveness and industry would mean to them competitively in an astoundingly short time.

There are obstacles of course. Japanese are accustomed to seeing American programs dubbed into Japanese or with Japanese subtitles. Because English is taught in Japanese schools many actually prefer to see and hear a program just as it is shown in the United States. In the United States, on the other hand, we are not accustomed either to subtitles or to viewing in the original language, largely because of the vast amount of television programing available which crowds out foreign product. But habits, no matter how deeply entrenched, have a way of changing, and as Ed Murrow recently indicated, there "begins to be a two-way street, an exchange of cultural programs which can contribute greatly to the mutual understanding between nations."

Numerous film stories depicting current events, supplied by Japanese companies and U.S. reporters, are shown almost daily on U.S. television. During the last 4 years television programing produced in Japan has appeared both on networks and individual stations in this country. "Twentieth Century" presented "Japan's Changing Face." "CBS Reports" produced a detailed study of trade problems in the Far East. Several "Eyewitness" broadcasts have focused on Japan. Episodes depicting Japanese culture have been shown on such diverse programs as the "Ed Sullivan Show," "Playhouse 90," and "Small World." Last summer's tour of Japan by the New York Philharmonic was covered for television in the United States, and segments of the Japanese version of "My Fair Lady" were seen recently on the "CBS Evening News" with Walter Cronkite. Incidentally, if a play about the English written by an Irishman and adapted for the musical stage by an American can become a hit in Japan, then there is every reason to believe that this whole business of cultural exchange has a promising future.

We are now trying to acquire Japanese television program products for use in the United States, and to encourage Japanese producers to offer more material for such use. CBS Films has just obtained international distribution rights to "Angel in the Smoke," produced by TBS, a searching study of a young Japanese brought up in the industrial section of Tokyo and his attempt to carve a niche in Japan's new and booming economy.

Another approach is a project we launched 2 years ago, "The International Hour," in which Japan is 1 of 11 participating nations. NHK, TBS, and FUJI have all made contributions featuring Japanese music and dance to "The International Hour." Episodes from "The American Musical Theater," Eugene Ormandy's "Sound of America and American Jazz," produced by CBS, were exchanged for the Japanese programs.

The series won high critical acclaim. The New York Times noted that "the traditional Japanese forms of the theater make absorbing presentation in their transfer to the home screen * * * the larger thought suggested by [these] visits with Japanese television was the excitement inherent in application of the Japanese mastery of electronic techniques to the interpretation of their own traditions into visual arts."

Finally, a most promising venture appears to be the exchange of television personnel as well as programs. During the last 5 years more than 300 Japanese engaged in all aspects of broadcasting have visited CBS offices and studios in New York and Los Angeles. Undoubtedly they were also welcomed by many other broadcasting organizations in the United States.

While the flow of personnel in the other direction has been somewhat smaller, American management and program personnel frequently visit Japan. In addition, U.S. broadcasters maintain permanent news bureaus and business offices in Japan, just as Japanese networks do in the United States.

From all this it seems clear that this conference need not concern itself with the exchange of television programing through commercial channels. Nor do we need to address ourselves to the exchange of commercial broadcasting personnel, technological or statistical information. Broadcasters

in both Japan and the United States have developed exchange agreements in these areas which are functioning smoothly, which are productive and which hold great promise for the future.

In terms of numbers of sets and the percentage of population covered by them, the United States and Japan are the two largest television nations in the world. I think it is entirely fitting that we should share our programs, our personnel, and our expertise. Moreover, the impact of these programs is bound to be wholly constructive. In the history of Japanese-American relations perhaps no other exchange will, in the long run, contribute as much towards bringing about the mutual understanding and respect of our peoples.

As I see it, the challenge of this conference is to point the way toward overcoming the obstacles to a comparable exchange in the educational television field. There are obvious reasons for these problems, and it is just as obvious that this conference will be helpful in solving them.

One of the basic problems from the point of view of the United States is that educational television here is just getting organized. It is plagued and frustrated by serious growing pains—lack of programing and lack of financial support, for example. These problems undoubtedly have partly accounted for the shortage of educational programing suitable for export, and also for the lack of information on what is available. Other factors, perhaps, account for the same dilemma in Japan. But in both cases we know that educational television programing has been available for export, and also that no significant exchange of programing has taken place. The obstacles which have prevented this exchange will continue to do so unless they are identified and eliminated. Interestingly, both the Japanese study group and the American study group identified almost exactly the same roadblocks. And interestingly also, in no case do any of these present any impediment to the exchange of commercial television between our two nations.

To expedite the deliberations of this conference I have been asked to "list and describe the obstacles to exchange" and then to "make succinct recommendations that will be meaningful to the delegates * * * and to those able to act upon these recommendations." In my attempt to do so I hope that the distinguished delegates will not hesitate to criticize any suggestions I might offer. Only through free and uninhibited exchange of opinion are we likely to find the answers to the problems confronting us.

1. Both study groups suggest the establishment of a permanent clearinghouse in each country whose function would be to focus on educational television exchange problems. The clearinghouses would be assigned the tasks of overcoming existing obstacles to educational television exchange in their respective countries and to promoting greater exchange. They would, for example, prepare a catalog of available educational television programing, assist in the development of personnel exchange programs, and provide translation and research services; and they would, of course, maintain close liaison with each other.

Recommendation: This threshold recommendation appears eminently sound and I urge this Conference to agree in principle that each of the two nations establish such a clearinghouse. The organization and financing of the two agencies should rest, of course, entirely with the broadcasters of each country and not with this Conference. As a matter of information to both delegations, however, I recommend to the American delegation that it request National Educational Television to organize, staff, and operate, under its auspices, the U.S. clearinghouse.

2. Both study groups also identified the following as serious problems:

A. Lack of knowledge of educational television programs available in Japan for broadcast in the United States and vice versa;

B. The complexity of custom regulations and brokerage arrangements;

C. The complexity of copyright clearance procedures;

D. The cost of dubbing and substituting;

E. The lack of information on Japanese and American audience reaction, particularly school audiences; and

F. The shortage of translations of papers bearing on technical and research problems.

Recommendation: None of these problems—as difficult as they may appear—is insurmountable. They have all been faced and, generally speaking, satisfactorily solved by commercial broadcasters. It is recommended that they be surveyed in Japan and in the United States by groups commissioned by the respective clearinghouses. These groups should be composed of individuals representing both public and private organizations which have responsibilities in the specific problem areas. In the United States, for example, such organizations as the National Association of Broadcasters, the Television Program Export Association, the Customs Bureau, the several television programing exporters, the National Education Association, educational foundations and other groups would, I am confident, be most willing to bring their experience and competence to bear upon the existing obstacles to a greater and more productive program exchange.

Thank you for your considerate attention.

Independence Day of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on October 26 the Republic of Vietnam will celebrate the ninth anniversary of her independence. On this auspicious occasion, we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Ngo Dinh Diem; and His Excellency the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Do Vang Ly.

At the Geneva Conference in the summer of 1954 Vietnam was partitioned along the 17th parallel. At that time, Western observers gave South Vietnam almost no chance of withstanding the challenge of Communist North Vietnam. I think it is worthwhile remembering this fact at a time when our thoughts on South Vietnam are filled with doubts and apprehension.

The situation that faced South Vietnam after the Geneva Conference was filled with many difficulties. The years of war had destroyed almost all transportation and communication, and the econmy of the country had come to a virtual standstill. Political power was in the grip of the armed Cao Dai and Hoa Hao religious sects, the Binh Xuyen crime syndicate, and a number of other organized groups intent upon obstructing the development of a strong government at Saigon. There was the national army, but the soldiers were demoralized by recent military defeat and the very loyalty of the army was uncertain. Another major problem was the influx of more than 800,000 destitute refugees who had abandoned all they possessed in the north and fled southward from communism. On the credit side, South Vietnam's important assets were the firm leadership of Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem, the patriotism of the Vietnamese people, and the backing of the United States.

The independence of South Vietnam was officially proclaimed on October 26, 1954, but this event did not really alter the anticipation of a Communist takeover. It was considered only a question of time before the unstable south fell into the clutches of the Communists of North Vietman. Mr. Speaker, it happens that South Vietnam will celerbate the ninth anniversary of its independence. It means that for almost a decade now the Government and people of South Vietnam have been solving many of the problems that once threatened to destroy the country. Above all, it means that they have been successfully resisting the Communist attempts at aggression and subversion. It has been a long and terrible struggle, with a heavy toll in ravaged crops, confiscated livestock, burned homes, misery and death.

Since the Communists opened their all-out attack on South Vietnam, our country has increased both military and economic assistance and has repeatedly stated its determination to help the Vietnamese defend themselves. The United States sees the Communist attempt to conquer South Vietnam as a threat to our own security, because a Communist victory there might lead many people to believe that communism is in fact the wave of the future. The defeat of South Vietnam would increase the difficulty of defending the rest of southeast Asia and place in jeopardy the independent development of all free Asian countries.

The people of South Vietnam and their government have fought bravely against Communist aggression and subversion, and they have shown the world again that it is possible to stand up to the forces of communism. There are few people in the world today who have had to fight so steadfastly to preserve their freedom and independence as those who live in South Vietnam. They deserve our admiration, and I take this opportunity to salute them on the anniversary of their country's independence.

H. M. Baggarly, Outstanding Editor, Writes of Current Problems in Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, H. M. Baggarly, famous Texas editor of

the Tulia Herald, has written a discerning column discussing a facet of news management which is most interesting. Mr. Baggarly, whose newspaper writings have won him numerous awards, and who perhaps is the most quoted member of his profession by other Texas editors, presents here a column deserving of the most careful study. I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "The Country Editor" by this distinguished, award-winning Texas newsman from the Thursday, October 10, 1963, edition of the Tulia Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By H. M. Baggarly)

A vice president of the National Broadcasting Co., in our office recently, voiced alarm and almost cynicism as we discussed the "managed news" which is dispensed by the big dailies and their radio and TV voices. But he believes the readers are as much to blame as are publishers with axes to grind.

The public seldom if ever demands "both sides of the story" from a newspaper or radio-TV network. It only demands the side it wants to hear, ammunition for its cause.

It is alarming to learn that most of the mail to news dispensing agencies isn't a request for knowledge and information—it is a demand that news be withheld, that a commentator be put off the air, that a columnist be dropped from a paper.

Is this the American way?

Is it American to demand that a radio station drop a religious broadcast of another faith? Is it American to demand that men of the stature of Chet Huntley be dropped from a television network? Is it American to threaten to withhold patronage from a merchant in an effort to get that merchant to withhold advertising from a news medium that carries columnists or commentators one doesn't like?

In a democracy, expression of opinion should never be curbed. As much as we would like to do something about the dissemination of false information and slanted news, still this isn't advisable since in our efforts to dig out a few weeds, we will inadvertently dig up some of the flowers too.

Americans must understand that this sword is two-edged. Things have a way of backfiring. If we pass a law to discriminate against the Catholics, then that same law may be used to discriminate against Protestants next week. If we seek to ban an unpopular and minority religious sect today, that precedent may be used to ban our own religion tomorrow. The noose we weave to hang our enemy may be used to hang ourselves.

If we demand Protestant religious exercises in our schools today, tomorrow the required exercises may be Catholic. If we want a newspaper column deleted because we don't agree with its author, that same precedent may be used to delete our favorite column next time.

Human nature never changes, whether a person is 8 or 80. The 8-year-old school boy would like to have a 12-month vacation each year and no school. He would like to have all dessert and no vegetables.

The young housewife would like to have lots of time for club work and bridge parties and a minimum of housework and dish washing.

The conservative businessman would like to have good business, high profits, low wages to pay, and low taxes.

Man wants to have his cake and eat it too. What he never seems to learn is that we can't divorce high business profits from a prosperous working force. Business prosperity and mass unemployment can't coexist.

Big business leaders, plagued with wage problems, often eye automation with a faraway look. They long for the day they can turn labor out to pasture and replace it with machines. This is a reasonable reaction if we prefer to look no farther than the end of our noses. But the only catch is this, with labor on relief, who is going to buy what the merchant has to sell? We haven't heard of many shopping booms where laborers attempt to live off $25 a week unemployment checks.

As much as we would like to have high sales and low overhead, such a situation cannot be had.

There is also a connection, indirect if not direct, between high taxes and prosperity. That is to say that if the factors which brought about high taxes had been bypassed or evaded, not faced, then we might not be enjoying the prosperity which is ours today.

For example, had the administrations of the past 30 years ignored the agricultural problem, refused to consider any kind of an agricultural program, we might have saved a few tax dollars, but in saving these tax dollars, what would have happened to the farmer?

As we have pointed out more than once, what counts isn't our gross pay, our taxes, the size of our paycheck. It means nothing to compare the number of dollars we earned in 1933 with the number we earned in 1963. It means nothing to compare the taxes we paid in 1933 with those paid in 1963.

The only thing that counts is the relative buying power of these dollars that are left after taxes which we call our standard of living.

The fact is, the dollars we have left in 1963 are providing us the highest standard of living any nation has enjoyed in the history of the world. And from an economic standpoint, that is the only thing that counts.

But we'll always have those dear souls who want 1963 income and 1933 taxes, who want what they call a dollar worth a dollar and not 59 cents but they want that dollar in the quantity that dollars are available in 1963, not in 1933. We'll always have those precious souls who want their cake and eat it too, who want to dance without paying the piper.

And a few of these souls would like to have a price for their grain which only an effective Government-farm program could guarantee, but raise this grain in unlimited quantities.

How any American could justify attempts in a democracy to deliberately discourage large numbers of our citizens from voting is difficult to understand. These efforts to preserve Government by minority smack of medieval Europe when the prevailing philosophy was that the masses are incapable of governing themselves. They must instead have the "sound and conservative" leadership of the handful of uncommon men.

This philosophy sprang up in this country from the very beginning. It was in America that politicians advocated that only landowners be allowed to vote. It was in America that a Dallas billionaire suggested that a man should be given not one but a number of votes, the number to be determined by his wealth. (Since that man is a member of the First Baptist Church in Dallas, we wonder why he doesn't advocate the same principle in determining church policy. For instance, if a pastor was to be called, Brother Hunt could have perhaps 100 votes, while the dollar-a-Sunday student would get only 1 vote. Or if the church wanted to vote on integration of its membership, something Brother Hunt vigorously opposes, he could say "no" a hundred times instead of just once.)

It is admitted that some people are better qualified to cast a vote than others, but these qualifications are not necessarily based on whether or not one has paid a poll tax. We know political illiterates who never fail to pay a poll tax and vote. And we know intelligent citizens whose chief sin is inability to support a family of five on $60 a week. With grocery bills, doctors bills, hospital bills, and a hundred other bills all staring them in the face, they pass up that $3.50 poll tax which seems to be the only bill they can dodge.

But with all its alleged drawbacks, we have yet to find a better way to govern ourselves than rule by the majority.

Of course we seldom hear any complaint of so-called bloc voting unless the bloc votes against us. So it it that no votes are "dirty" unless they aren't ours.

H.R. 333, a Bill To Lift Antitrust Immunities From Labor Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a good deal of mail lately concerning H.R. 333, a bill which amends the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Norris-LaGuardia Act, and Taft-Hartley Act so as to lift antitrust immunities from labor organizations. By far the great majority of these letters have been in support of this bill. Yet I have received other letters which condemn this bill and similar attempts to curb union monopoly power. These letters reveal certain misconceptions about the nature and effect of my bill.

First of all, my bill would not eliminate health and welfare benefits or pension plans. International unions and brotherhoods could continue to administer such plans, providing, of course, that these benefits could not be withheld as a lever to regain control of collective bargaining activities. If the large national and international unions did not see fit to continue these benefit and pension plans, they could be taken over and administered by the local unions on the basis of contributions received from local members. All benefit, pension, and strike funds must come ultimately from the local union member anyway, and if these contributions went no further than the local union, there is less likelihood that they would be diverted to pay for marble palaces in Washington and black Cadillacs for union leaders.

By the same token, sick leave pay, vacation pay, and overtime pay would not be eliminated. These and other issues would be negotiated by the unions with each individual company, neither having an unfair advantage in size or power over the other.

It is further charged that H.R. 333 would destroy craft unions, replacing them by industrial unions. This is not true. The Landrum-Griffin Act specifically states:

It shall not be an unfair labor practice under subsections (a) and (b) of this section

for an employer engaged primarily in the building and construction industry to make an agreement covering employees engaged (or who, upon their employment, will be engaged) in the building and construction industry with a labor organization of which building and construction employees are members.

My bill does not amend the Landrum-Griffin Act, and, as a consequence, bargaining in the construction industry is not affected by H.R. 333.

These and similar attacks on my bill are merely attempts to divert attention from the central problem—the overweening power of big unions. They are red herrings drawn across the path of rational examination—see the "International Teamster," January 1963, page 25.

Union leaders, of course, deny that their power is excessive. They point to such large corporations as A. T. & T., which has net assets in excess of $24 billion, or Standard Oil of New Jersey, with $10.5 billion in assets, or General Motors, with $8.8 billion. In comparison, they say, all unions, national, international, and local, had combined net assets of only $1.3 billion—1960 figures.

Furthermore, they argue, only a third of the nonagricultural work force is unionized—unions being not yet significant in retail and wholesale trade, services, Government employment, finance, and the white-collar occupations generally.

On the surface, these are plausible arguments, yet, in a sense, cash assets and membership rolls are irrelevant to the issue of union power. A comparison of union financial assets with those of the giant corporations obscures differences in basic character and purpose. The function of the labor union is merely to represent workers at the scene of their employment and negotiate labor contracts acceptable to a reliably determined majority of them. A corporation, on the other hand, must invest in productive facilities costing billions of dollars to erect, and equip, millions of dollars a year to maintain and improve and replenish—an investment representing billions of dollars of built-in risk that must hold itself together through competitive sales and pay its taxes and expand its plants and refine its methods and pursue all manner of research in order to serve the public, its only source of revenue and perhaps eventual reward—see Maurice R. Franks, "What's Wrong With Our Labor Unions?" The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., New York, 1963, page 117–118.

Union strength, then, is strategic rather than quantitative. Union membership is concentrated in key industries: steel, coal, automobiles, construction, public utilities, communications, and transportation; and the power of such unions to disrupt the orderly processes of the economy and to damage the general welfare in the pursuit of their objectives is as awesome as these numbers suggest. The economic power of even the largest business organizations, subject as they are to a variety of legal and economic restraints, is as nothing compared to the power of the great international unions.

Unionism's power derives from the fact that the economy of the United States is a highly differentiated, complex, and interdependent system in which the cessation of only one activity or the breaking of only one link in the chain of production and distribution—if the interrupted function be a crucial one—can put a substantial part of the economy out of commission, if not paralyze it completely. Significantly, unions have succeeded in establishing control over just such crucial points in the economy. Moreover, the union rule that picket lines are not to be crossed, regardless of the merits of a particular strike, places strategic power in the hands of even the smallest union.

It is needful to point out at the same time that the strike itself, justified or unjustified, by no means represents the major harm that unions can inflict on society. It is the settlement which follows the strike, or even the settlement reached in lieu of a strike which may impose the harshest burden on society at large. Strikes end, their disruptions are temporary if severe, but the settlements which follow them may cause permanent distortions in factor and product markets yielding chronic unemployment, diminished rates of private investment and thus of growth, lessened international competitiveness and balance-of-payments problems. The occurrence of any one of these developments, and a fortiori where several are taking place simultaneously, diminishes the social dividend and contracts the economic alternatives open to producers and consumers. In sum, the community suffers a reduction both in its material welfare and in freedom.—Patrick M. Boarman, Union Monopolies and Antitrust Restraints, Labor Policy Association, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1963, pages 10–11.

Unrestrained union power, then, has an adverse effect upon the economy. What effect does it have on the individual union member?

With nationwide master contracts negotiated by the national union officers directly with their national counterparts in the corporation, it is clear that local unions in most mass-industry organizations no longer do their own bargaining on major issues. There is thus a widening gap between the rank-and-file member and the collective-bargaining process. He no longer has any significant control over the men who negotiate his wages, hours of work, and working conditions. Just as the corporation has had the effect of depriving ownership of decision-making, so big unions deprive the rank-and-file of similar privileges. My bill would correct this by providing that no union could represent employees of more than one company for purposes of collective bargaining.

H.R. 333 is not an attempt to put unions in an inferior position vis-a-vis management. It merely seeks to restore the balance which outmoded laws have tipped in favor of big unions.

Our Government prosecutes as a monopoly the A. & P., whose stores handle about 6 percent of the Nation's food supply, which must keep its prices competitive with those of tens of thousands of other stores, and which is without power to make anyone go hungry.

Yet, the Government does nothing, and it can do nothing, about the Teamsters Union, whose members handle not a small fraction of the Nation's food supply but virtually all of it; which can, without fear of substantial competition, raise the cost of food almost at will, and which has the power to shut off our entire food supply and make us all go hungry.

Clothing manufacturers may not lawfully conspire together concerning their dealings with suppliers—that is, contractors—or to fix their own selling prices on the basis of uniform labor costs, but they may lawfully conspire with a union to fix their suppliers' principal charges, to determine with what suppliers each will do business and what suppliers can do business at all, and to price their own products according to uniform, arbitrary, and even fictitious labor costs. And they do just that.

If any combination of soft-coal operators had the power to reduce the output of coal or to stop it for even a few days in order to raise prices or keep them high, the Government could enjoin them and prosecute them, even though they never used the power, and it doubtless would. If they used the power, their victims could sue for triple damages. But the Mine Workers Union may reduce output or stop it altogether. No one can move against them under the antitrust laws or under any other law for having the power. And, even when they use the power, only the Government can move against them, and it only when they have brought us to the brink of a national catastrophe.

Steel companies may not lawfully conspire together to fix suppliers' costs or prices, or their own costs or prices, or their customers' costs and prices. But James MacDonald, a labor monopolist, for reasons of internal union politics or interunion rivalry, and no other, may regulate labor costs in the iron mines, in the steel mills, and in hundreds of shops in scores of industries that use steel; and in the process he may close all the mines, all the mills, and all the shops, paralyze our economy, and force the Government to meet his terms.

Businessmen may not conspire together to put a competitor out of business, or to raise his prices, or to limit the territory in which he will sell his goods, or to exclude his goods from the market, or to use wasteful, expensive methods and techniques, or to block progress, but they may, through a labor union, do indirectly what the law forbids them to do themselves, notwithstanding that the adverse effects upon the public are the same in one case as in the other.

These oddities and others like them in our laws present one of our most important and most pressing problems if our system of free enterprise and our system of free collective bargaining are to survive. My bill, H.R. 333, represents, I think, the best approach to a solution of these problems. Such an approach has been supported by thinking people for many years. As long ago as 1950, Gustav Peck, senior specialist in labor for the Legislative Reference Service, concluded his report to Congress on "The

Application of Antitrust Laws to Labor Practices Harmful to Market Competition" in the following way:

In consequence, it would appear from this perspective that inclusion of restrictive labor practices within the scope of jurisdiction of the antitrust laws would not encroach upon labor organization and bargaining any more than upon corporate organization and bargaining in the productive process, but would prevent the monopolization of commerce, the exclusive control of supply of commodities, or the use of unreasonable restrictions upon the market. The public interest as defined in the antitrust laws would then include both industry and labor to the end that genuine competition in the market for production should prevail. (Hearings, U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, "To Protect Trade and Commerce Against Unreasonable Restraints by Labor Organizations", Feb.-Mar, 1950, p. 16.)

I believe it is time we acted.

A Weird Insult From Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is not often that I agree with editorials in Life magazine. However, in the October 25, 1963, issue of Life I was pleased to read an editorial by the editors of Life denouncing the recent award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Dr. Linus Carl Pauling. The editorial is entitled "A Weird Insult From Norway."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life Magazine, October 25, 1963]

A WEIRD INSULT FROM NORWAY

During the tensest hours of the Castro missile showdown a year ago this week, one American voice was heard in loud protest against President Kennedy's firm stand. "Horrifying * * * warlike * * * recklessly militaristic," said Caltech's chemist Dr. Linus Carl Pauling.

In previous years Pauling had deployed his great prestige as a scientist to denounce NATO, to oppose U.S. involvement in the Korean war, to rummage up the signatures of 11,021 scientists from 49 countries (2,749 of them Rumanians) to demand the uninspected stoppage of all nuclear tests. Pauling has denied under oath that he is a Communist and has occasionally criticized some aspects of Soviet tyranny. But it is hard to quarrel with the verdict of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which has called him "the No. 1 scientific name in virtually every major activity of the Communist peace offensive in this country." Says Pauling himself, "This problem of an atomic war must not be confused by minor problems, such as communism versus capitalism."

Last fortnight, in an extraordinary insult to America, the Nobel Peace Prize Committee conferred its prize for 1962 on none other than Linus Pauling. He will collect $50,000 (tax free) and another gold medal to line up beside the Nobel Prize he won for chemistry in 1954. The peace award, delayed by 1 year, seemed to honor Pauling's years of agitation for a total ban on all kinds of nuclear testing, with or without any policing, and to imply that this agitation led somehow to the Kennedy-Macmillan-Khrushchev treaty for a limited test ban. Pauling himself viewed his prize this way: "For many years it has not been respectable to work for peace. Perhaps the Norwegian Nobel Prize Committee's action will help to make it respectable." The whole structure of reasoned exercise of strength behind which the world's free institutions and scientific discoveries have prospered these cold war years is, in his opinion, not respectable.

However distinguished as a chemist, the eccentric Dr. Pauling and his weird politics have never been taken seriously by American opinion. Why should a committee of five Norwegians be so taken in, or so rude? If they really intended to celebrate the test ban, they should have reflected that Kennedy's stand on the Cuban missiles, which Pauling opposed, probably led more directly to Khrushchev's signature on that treaty than anything else.

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our friend, Arthur Hoppe, has paid a visit to Washington on his way to England. I am sure his comments while passing through Washington and his arrival and experiences in England will be of interest to many here in Congress, especially his article on Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN.

The articles follow:

CAN GREED SAVE THE WORLD?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—In our constant search for world peace, as you know we've kind of given up relying on the old standbys of love and brotherhood. While nice in theory, they didn't pan out too well. So now all we do-gooders are pinning our hopes on a far more basic, universal human emotion. Greed.

And I'm delighted to report the peace through greed program is going great guns already.

But let us add a note of caution: There are dark clouds on the horizon.

The program was officially launched by Mr. Kennedy's announcement that we would swap the Russians 4 million tons of wheat, which they are greedy for, in return for $250 million in gold, which we are greedy for. And it seemed like the rosy dawn of a new era of peace through mutual greed, in which all men would lay down their swords at last. In order to pick each other's pockets.

True, there were some complaints from midwestern Congressmen with militantly anti-Communist constituents. "How come," demanded these Congressmen whose militantly anti-Communist constitutents also grow wheat, "we are only selling the Russians 4 million tons? When our allies are selling them 15 million? What's happened to American salesmanship?"

But generally the reaction here to the peace through greed program has been favorable. After all, it's an approach our Congressmen can understand. And the only real opposition has come from our stanch friend, West Germany.

You know how virulently anti-Communist the West Germans are. And you can't blame them, living as they do in the shadow of the Berlin wall. Who knows better the horrors of communism? Who better understands the need to put the economic screws to the Soviet bloc? In hopes their evil regime will fall?

And, oh, what an impassioned warning sage old Mr. Adenauer of West Germany delivered to us before Mr. Kennedy approved the wheat deal. How, Mr. Adenauer asked with tears in his eyes, could we even think of such a thing? Would we, he demanded, all checked up, really sell wheat to the Communists? And thereby betray our loyal West German allies who have stood by our side for 15 long years? Would we, he asked, his voice rising "sell the Communists the noose with which to hang ourselves?" Would we, he summed up, rising to oratorical heights, "fatten up our own butcher?"

Oh, how moving it was to hear this old statesman put principles ahead of profit. Of course, it might have been more moving if Mr. Adenauer hadn't approved the sale of 35,000 tons of West German wheat flour to the Communists the day before. Which was part of 350,000 tons the West Germans are selling the Soviet bloc. Which is part of the $1.4 billion in annual trade between West Germany and the Iron Curtain countries. But, as I say, it was good to hear him put principles above profit. His principles above our profit.

But a speech like that kind of builds your faith in the peace through greed program. It makes you realize how overwhelming this stimulus to peace and understanding is. But I'm a little worried about the Western alliance. Can it survive this new program? Look at me. Already I'm sore at the West Germans.

I guess it's that I can't stand their greedier than thou attitude.

THE WITCH DOCTOR OF WASHINGTON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WASHINGTON.—Oh, how your blood will run cold. Oh, how the chills will play up and down your spine. Faint of heart, read not on. For I have been gathering notes for my book, "Strange Native Customs in Washington and Other Savage Lands." And I have come face to face with the most dreaded witch doctor of all the indigenous tribes.

He dwells among the solons, who occupy the strategic heights of Capitol Hill. The quaking natives of the lowland tribes—such as State, the Kennedys, and AID—look upon him with all the awe and fear that the aborigines of eastern Ubanga view their Bnumba, the Ubangan god of blood and devastation. Indeed, it is rumored the lowland parents use his name to frighten their children. "Eat your spinach, dears," they say. "Or Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN will get you." And the children cry.

So it is understandable why the lowland tribes should bear a sacrifice to him each year. It is called foreign aid. And from talking to the lowlanders, one gets the impression that foreign aid is a beautiful white virgin, flawless in every detail. And each year, Congressman PASSMAN places her on the alter of his Foreign Operations Subcommittee. And he takes a meat ax and—but oh, it's too terrible to describe.

So imagine my trepidation when Congressman PASSMAN said he would grant me an interview. "Would his horns be showing?" I wondered as I made my way through the labyrinth to his sanctorum in the bowels of the New House Office Building. "Would his garments be splattered with blood?" And, at last, there he was, behind a desk seated in a leather-covered, swivel-backed throne. Oh, how I remember his first words to me:

"Glad to see you, son," he said, "have a pen." And with that he handed me a golden

pen inscribed: "Compliments of your friend and Congressman, OTTO E. PASSMAN."

I accepted the pen, assuming correctly that this was part of some secret native ritual. And he leaned back, smoothed his graying hair, adjusted his black-rimmed glasses, and fingered the emerald stick pin in his tie. "Ask me any question you want, son," he said expansively.

Well, sir, I said, licking my dry lips, what was foreign aid really like?

Hoo—whee. It was an exciting moment. But Mr. PASSMAN controlled himself with an obvious effort, tapped his fingertips together, and spoke very, very slowly in a Louisiana drawl. (All important solons speak in southern drawls.) Indeed, he spoke very, very slowly for 12 minutes and 13 seconds without interruption. Except for interrupting himself occasionally to ask me: "You got that?"

And it turned out that foreign aid was not a beautiful, flawless vestal virgin at all. It was let's see, a raging forest fire leaping uncontrolled. Not to mention a Frankenstein of the first order. Among other things.

So really, Mr. PASSMAN was annually chipping up not a vestal virgin, but an evil monster. In order to save the Nation. (Which is a mystic goal all natives strive for but never achieve.) And thus I congratulated him.

"My temperament," he said modestly, "and I almost hate myself for having the temperament I do—forces me to discharge my duties with credit."

So you see? There is definitely a bloodcurdling, spine-chilling evilness abroad in Washington. Therefore, let me warn you all before it's too late:

"Eat your spinach, dears, or foreign aid will get you."

THE THIRD WORLD—SO WHO NEEDS IT?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

LONDON.—I'm in England to attend a 2-week conference on "The Common Market and the Third World: Economics," because that's a subject I'm desperately interested in.

True, I'll admit I wasn't always desperately interested in "The Common Market and the Third World: Economics." It used to be that whole days would go by without my once asking myself: "I wonder how the old Common Market and the Third World: Economics are getting along?" But that was before I stopped off in Washington en route.

As you know, conferences on subjects like this are very big in Washington. And everybody was terribly impressed when I would happen to mention casually: "Please pass the canapes and I am going to England to discuss The Common Market and the Third World: Economics."

Everybody who didn't know me, that is. But friends kept asking embarrassing questions. Like: "You're what?" Or, far worse, "So what's the third world?"

Really, the number of people in Washington who don't know what the third world is would shock you. Some would say, "Oh, that's General De Gaulle." While others equally adamantly held it to be the Afro-Asian bloc. Personally, I stood stanchly on the middle ground, maintaining it was obviously the world between the second world and the fourth world.

But I confess to certain feelings of uneasiness. After all, if I were going to spend 2 weeks discussing "The Common Market and the Third World: Economics," prudence dictated that I first find out what the third world was. So I went over to the State Department to ask them for language.

Now, producing language is a very vital function of our State Department. A Congressman wishes to make a speech on, say, "The Importance of the Alligator to the Overpopulation Problem in Uranda-Burundi" and he calls up the State Department. "Got any language on that?" he says. And State sends him a couple of yards of officially approved language. Which makes him astute, informed and, above all, safe.

So this nice man in Public Affairs at State said sure, they must have some language on the third world lying around somewhere. "We'll call S.T.R.," he said. S.T.R.? "The Office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations," he explained.

And S.T.R. said that was a swell question. Only they hapepned to be out of language on that. How about I. & R.? I. & R.? "That's our Bureau of Intelligence and Research," the nice man explained. "They know everything." Only they didn't.

But they were very kind. They sent around the corner for some language. To the European Community Information Service. And I got some swell language from them. It's a foot long, 3 inches thick and some of the language is even French. Which is very impressive, because I don't understand it. And nowhere does it tell me what the third world is.

So you can understand why I'm desperately interested in conferring with all my international colleagues at this high-level conference. By George, I'm going to find out what the third world is if it takes 2 weeks.

And then I'm going to call my own conference, entitled: "The Third World and Do We Need It: Or Don't We Have Enough Problems Already?"

A FOUNDATION YOU CAN FLY ON

(By Arthur Hoppe)

EN ROUTE TO ENGLAND.—I think there must be some mistake. I seem to be on my way to some place called: "Wilton Park, Steyning, Sussex." To attend a 2-week conference on something called: "The Common Market and the Third World: Economics." And I keep wondering if maybe I've been getting Mr. Walter Lippmann's mail by mistake.

But, being an ace newsman, I struck while the invitation was hot. I accepted it for the usual reasons we ace newsmen accept invitations to go abroad: (1) the opportunity to broaden my horizons; (2) the chance to depthen my scope, and (3) an airplane ticket.

Frankly, I regret it already. It's never easy for us ace newsmen. What's never easy is to pay back whoever it was that gave us the ticket.

I hope I'm not giving away trade secrets, but the traditional way we do it is to slip a few hidden plugs into our stories so smoothly you'd hardly notice them. Like:

"As our modern, up-to-the-minute East Peoria Airways trimotor biplane soared heavenward on its weekly attempt to cross the Atlantic at the ridiculously low fare of only $17.42 (ask about their bereaved family plan), I couldn't help but wonder about the Common Market and the third world: economics."

Then we follow up that socko lead by swinging into a brilliant analysis of the Common Market and the third world: economics. Or half an analysis. Because we have to break off midway so we have room to say:

"Well, I guess it's time to break off this analysis of the Common Market and the third world: economics. Because here comes our cute, hip-waggling East Peoria Airways stewardess with our gourmet East Peoria Airways 'Dejeuner dans le ciel.' Oh, I can hardly wait to sink my teeth into that mouth-watering East Peoria Airways peanut butter and jelly sandwich. How East Peoria Airways can afford real margarine at the ridiculously low fare of $17.42."

That's the traditional way. And I'm a traditionalist. But I've got problems. For I got my ticket by roundabout courtesy of the Ford Foundation.

It's an awful spot for an ace newsman to be in. I can't just say the Ford Foundation is a very nice, friendly, rich foundation and if you wish a free ticket to somewhere, be sure to see them first. I'm sure the foundation would appreciate a plug like this immensely. But it lacks subtlety. And we ace newsmen do have an image of integrity to uphold, you know.

Nor can I figure any way to work a plug in gracefully. Like: "We must ford the Atlantic on a new foundation of mutual understanding." Who'd believe you can cross the Atlantic on a foundation?

Oh, I'll be drummed out of the Oversea Press Club. For failing to uphold their finest tradition. Which reminds me, if you bump into Mr. Lippmann, you might suggest that if he gets a package from the Oversea Press Club, he soak it in a bucket of water.

I still think our mail's mixed up.

FREE SPEECH IS A REAL BARGAIN

(By Arthur Hoppe)

LONDON.—Everybody's for free speech. Couldn't be more so. And in America everybody's got free speech. Except maybe the Communists or other disagreeable people like that. But there's no question we let anybody who agrees with us say so freely.

Now in England it's a bit different. Being the home of free speech, the English give it to everybody. Even the Communists. And the English are very, very proud that anybody in England can say what he pleases.

Where they can say it, as you know, is in Hyde Park. There's a place in the park called "Speakers' Corner" where anybody who wants can get up on his soapbox and say anything he wants. In order to see how this system works, the first thing I did in London was to hustle over to Hyde Park to listen to the free speeches.

Speakers' Corner turned out to be perhaps half an acre of asphalt which contained, when I arrived shortly before 11 a.m., a refreshment stand in which three ladies sat moodily, a bum sleeping on a bench and maybe a dozen pigeons. One of the ladies explained none of the speakers arrived before 11.

Sure enough, at 11:02 the first speaker, a stocky, elderly man with an interesting face, showed up. What was interesting about his face was the fact that he had a heart tattooed on the end of his nose. Plus a heart on each cheek, a large daisy on his chin and a huge rose with trailing leaves across his forehead.

While he was setting up his podium (a 5-gallon oil can), I asked what subject he was going to speak on. "Criminology," he said. "And I'm not like these amateur blokes who come down here and shoot their mouths off about things they don't know what for. I know what I am talking about. I'm an expert. I spent 30 years of my life in prisons."

And with that he proudly produced yellowed clippings proving he was a Mr. Jacobus Van Dyn, 67, once one of the Al Capone mob. Plus a letter announcing he was still wanted for violation of parole if he ever set foot in New York. "See what I mean?" said Mr. Van Dyn, swelling his chest. "I got credentials."

Mr. Van Dyn then got up on his oil can and gave me and the pigeons a free speech on criminality. Which, if I caught his drift, he was in favor of. After half an hour or so, two other speakers appeared. One, a bearded young man, addressed himself to the bum on the bench, advising him loudly to "repent for the day of judgment is at hand." The bum, rolled over, made an unrepentant gesture and went back to sleep.

The other, an elderly lady in a long green overcoat, wasn't exactly a speaker. She was a singer. She sang "The Rose of Tralee." This free song infuriated Mr. Van Dyn, who said free speech didn't include free singing. "All that woman's singing does," he said grumpily from his podium, "is interfere with the sex life of the pigeons."

On my way out I noticed a large sign saying "the following acts are prohibited" in

Hyde Park without written permission. Including: "Making a public speech or address except in the public speaking area." Which just goes to show that even in England everybody believes in free speech. Within limits.

Nonsense. I think it's perfectly safe to let anybody say what he wants anywhere, anytime. For if there's one thing about a free speech, it's that hardly anybody will buy it.

Defensive Obligations of the United States Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, Exercise Big Lift has resulted in much discussion along the lines that the United States is contemplating a reduction in the number of American troops stationed overseas. In this regard, the Baltimore Sun, in an editorial entitled, "America Abroad," makes the point that if U.S. troops are withdrawn from oversea posts, we, nevertheless, recognize that the United States has defensive obligations around the world which will not be defaulted.

I think it is important that we give assurances to all of our allies that our military commitments will be continued and that any reduction in oversea troops should not be interpreted as reflecting a weakening of our determination to honor these commitments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "America Abroad," from the Baltimore Sun of October 23, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA ABROAD

Despite all the careful denials, there can no longer be any doubt that the United States is contemplating a reduction in the number of American troops stationed abroad. Two developments this week must be regarded as preparation for that step. One is the assignment to Europe of new weapons which will place increased mobility and greater firepower at the disposal of a smaller force. The other is Exercise Big Lift, which in ferrying 15,000 combat-ready soldiers to Germany will prove the ability of the Air Transport Service to deliver fighting men in division strength wherever they may be needed.

In all the years since the end of World War II, American service men have remained in Europe, where they are still 250,000 strong. In that time there has been a revolution in military techniques, and the American soldier stationed in Texas now is almost as instantly available for the defense of Germany as he would be in Heidelberg, living offpost with his family. If airborne defense has become as reliable as permanent stationing, the mass deployment of American troops in Europe has become an exercise this country can no longer afford.

In Germany alone the cost of maintaining American troops runs to around $1.6 billion annually and is responsible for about $700 million in the balance-of-payments deficit. Although West Germany even now is resisting any appreciable troop reduction, several years ago it balked at continuing payments for the support of American military units defending its soil. Its reasoning was that German funds were required for the buildup of the German military establishment. Besides offering relief to the American taxpayer, a limited withdrawal would hasten the creation of effective European defenses.

It is a decision which needs to be made carefully, however, for it has great diplomatic value. In return for a reduction in the number of American troops deployed in Germany, for instance, the United States ought to extract from the Soviet Union an agreement to withdraw some of the 22 Red Army divisions stationed in East Germany. To do otherwise would be to throw away a bargaining point which could lead to the solution of one of Europe's most critical problems.

If the United States should decide to withdraw in some degree from Europe, or Japan, or Korea, one thing needs to be made clear. This country's defensive obligations range around the globe, from Berlin to Tokyo; it recognizes all of them, and will not default on a single one. The United States is as firmly dedicated to freedom for all men as it has always been. Its methods may change, as the times change; its purposes never will.

Administration Resorts to Scare Techniques To Win Tax Bill Backing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration is once again reverting to scare techniques in its campaign to win acceptance of its program to cut taxes in the face of large budget deficits and higher levels of Government spending. Administration spokesmen, including the President himself, have recently warned of a recession next year unless the tax bill is promptly enacted by Congress. The same theme was heard earlier this year, but when a recession failed to materialize, it was dropped in favor of the argument that the tax cut would stimulate long-term economic growth.

As the Wall Street Journal points out in an October 23 editorial entitled "Perambulating Hypochondriasis," it is somewhat serious "when the economic doctors themselves try to frighten the public for political purposes." As M. J. Rossant said in a column entitled, "Cloudy Crystal Ball," in the New York Times of October 21—

The administration is evidently unimpressed by the strength of business, just as it is unperturbed that its earlier predictions of recession for this year were, fortunately, erroneous. It is difficult to know whether it is motivated by the desire to win a political victory, or by honest concern about the economy.

Mr. Rossant notes that the pessimistic belief that the economy will go into a recession if tax reductions are not forthcoming remains in fashion in academic and business circles even though the past performance of the economy has refuted the belief. As he points out, "the case for an imminent recession is pretty weak."

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial from the Wall Street Journal and the column from the New York Times in the RECORD, at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 23, 1963]

PERAMBULATING HYPOCHONDRIASIS

"I sometimes feel that we are becoming a nation of economic hypochondriacs," remarked Gardner Ackley of the President's Council of Economic Advisers the other day, feelingly.

And then Mr. Ackley spelled out the syndrome:

"The pulse taking and fever charting in which we engage; the scrutiny of the monthly indicators, the learned and not-so-learned dissections of gross national product and industrial production sometimes remind me of a friend of mine who keeps a thermometer in his desk drawer, a calorie chart in his vest pocket, and litmus paper in his lavatory."

But we notice that Dr. Ackley made these remarks in New Hampshire and not in Washington. And we have a feeling of our own that back in the Capital he must now be getting those wary, uncomfortable glances usually reserved for the psychiatrist at the cocktail party where the guests feel their pretensions may be seen through.

For if constant pulse taking and fever charting is a symptom of the Ackley syndrome, then Washington is the place for clinical study of economic perambulating hypochondriasis. Let there be an upturn of a fractional point in a leading index and the corridors are wreathed in smiles; let a decimal point slip, and the gloom reaches all the way to the White House.

At best this is pretentious in its solemn reliance on statistics that are not so precise or so meaningful. But while ordinarily this constant preoccupation with minute changes in the thermometer might be as harmlessly humorous as Dr. Ackley paints it, the humor is strained when the economic doctors themselves try to frighten the public for political purposes.

That is what we are witnessing right now in connection with the tax bill, and so infectious is this scare technique employed by the administration that it has been taken up by a good many business leaders who ought to know better.

There are many sound reasons for a tax cut. There are even some weighty arguments—though personally we aren't persuaded by them—for a tax cut in the face of the huge budget deficit it portends. These have been ably made by the President, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the proponents of the tax measure in Congress.

But from the beginning the administration was not content to rest its case on these. When the measure was first proposed it was also offered as a means of counteracting the recession which, last January, we were supposedly on the verge of. In short, it was proposed both as a sound diet and a pickup hypodermic.

Today it's clear that whatever economic troubles we have we don't have a recession. Most indicators show high business activity and point still higher; even unemployment, while greater than anyone wishes, is not as large as it was. Since this development has demolished one of the arguments for the tax bill, this happy state of affairs for the country has made the advocates of tax cuts politically unhappy.

So now the line of argument has shifted. Since we don't have a present recession to be got out of, we are now bombarded with dire warnings that we will have a future one if we don't quickly take the proffered hypo-

dermic needle. And in order to make this argument more effective—that is, more scary—we have to be told that this recession is so imminent the tax bill can't wait even a few weeks.

This is not only the current official line; it has been adopted by something called the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, the very name of which is calculated to suggest urgency. Just the other day this committee warned that the economy is approaching a critical juncture and that the cutoff point of prosperity may be near. So please, quick, Watson, the needle.

Well, we aren't so wise as to know where the cutoff point of prosperity is. We are pretty sure that if in the course of events there is another recession in business activity it won't be because the tax bill isn't passed in the next fortnight.

Maybe, as the good doctor says, we are all getting to be a Nation of economic hypochondriacs. But sometimes listening to the physicians it sounds as though they are trying to keep us in a constant state of nerves.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 21, 1963]

CLOUDY CRYSTAL BALL: PESSIMISM OF U.S. ECONOMISTS FOUND FAULTY IN FACE OF ECONOMY'S STRENGTH

(By M. J. Rossant)

The administration's economic forecasters are back at the same old stand. Both Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and Dr. Walter W. Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, predicted last week that a recession was in the making for next year unless Congress approved an across-the-board reduction in taxes.

These predictions echo the alarmist view voiced by the administration, including President Kennedy himself, earlier this year. Washington then had the jitters about the state of the economy. It discarded its tax revision program of reforms and reduction to concentrate almost solely on across-the-board tax cuts because of the fear of a recession.

SHOT IN THE ARM

Tax reduction did not come through, but the economy did. Now, the administration is again talking in terms of tax cuts as a shot in the arm rather than as an instrument that can help to narrow the gap between the performance of the economy and its potential.

Mr. Dillon alluded to the weakening of the economic indicators over recent weeks as the omen of a possible downturn, while Dr. Heller observed that "beyond the first few months of the year it is not easy to find enough economic steam in the economic boiler to prevent backsliding into recession."

The reversion to scare tactics implies that the economy is in delicate health if not actually ailing. Yet the latest and most sensitive barometers show nothing of the sort. The strength in demand for bank credit, construction and retail sales indicates a renewed quickening in the pace of the expansion.

The administration is evidently unimpressed by the strength of business, just as it is unperturbed that its earlier predictions of recession for this year were, fortunately, erroneous. It is difficult to know whether it is motivated by the desire to win a political victory, or by honest concern about the economy.

If it does regard a deterioration in activity as probable, it is far from alone. The pessimistic belief that the economy will falter if tax reductions are not forthcoming has enjoyed an extraordinarily long vogue in both academic and business circles. Even though the economy has refuted it, it remains in fashion.

BUSINESSMEN'S FORECAST

Last week, for example, the Business Committee for Tax Reduction for 1963, headed by Henry Ford 2d, chairman of the Ford Motor Co., and Stuart Saunders, chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, issued a letter warning that "there are indications that the economy is now approaching a critical juncture," and declaring that tax cuts were essential if the current expansion is not to be curtailed.

Tax cuts would probably help to accelerate and prolong the expansion. But, as the Business Council pointed out this weekend, it does not follow that failure to enact a tax cut makes a recession inevitable for 1964.

The fact is that the pessimistic forecast that remains so fashionable has been out of touch with reality for well over a year. If forecasters continue to stick to this line, and if Congress refuses to act, they may eventually get a recession, if only because there comes a time when the most robust and durable expansion rolls over and dies.

But the case for an imminent recession is pretty weak. Given the poor record of the pessimists, the burden of proving that the economy is headed for a downturn unless saved by tax cuts is on them.

By their reckoning, the expansion should have been dead and buried by now. Even Dr. Heller, who was clearly more bullish than most academic and business prophets and did not foresee a decline in 1963, does not appear to have appreciated the strength of the basic forces at work.

PREDICTIONS WIDE OF MARK

In a speech in Milwaukee last week, Dr. Heller blithely acknowledged that he had been wide of the mark in his forecast for 1962, when he had expected the economy to reach boom proportions. He said, however, that he had been very close to the mark for 1963.

Dr. Heller's projections were more optimistic than the majority contained in a study entitled "Business Forecasts for 1963," published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond. On this relative basis, he looks good. But considering his assumption that tax cuts would be in effect by last July, his claim of accuracy is questionable.

The council's forecast for gross national product—the market value of goods and services produced in the economy—in 1963 was $578 billion, plus or minus $5 billion. This range of $573 billion to $583 billion was apparently intended to cover all conceivable possibilities, although the council explicitly stated that it was counting on passage of the President's tax proposals.

Without tax cuts, it is probable that Dr. Heller would have plumped for a slightly lower range, from, say, $570 to $580 billion.

* * * * *

Dr. Heller's crystal ball turned out to be cloudy. Despite Congress' failure to comply with the President's request for action by mid-year, gross national product has been rising faster than Dr. Heller's most optimistic expectations.

During the first half, gross national product averaged close to $576 billion, at an annual rate. In the third quarter, it was running at an estimated annual rate of about $588 billion. The average for the year should be in the neighborhood of $585 billion, which is above the upper limit of Dr. Heller's tax reduction forecast.

It is possible that anticipations of tax cuts have helped to strengthen business activity, but evidence on this score is inconclusive. The most that can be said is that Dr. Heller may have come closer to the target than the majority of experts, but he has not come near the bull's eye.

It should be clear by now that the performance of the economy is not due to magic. It has a lot of things going for it, and there is no sign that they are fading out. All major sectors—consumers, Government, and business—are contributing to the rise.

Yet Dr. Heller and Mr. Dillon seem to be suggesting that the strong performance of the economy has been done with mirrors. They seem unable to believe that it can be kept going on its own.

The administration may be right in its skepticism about the future. But its renewed harping on the dangers of recession do not seem warranted.

Sam Houston State Teachers College Stimulates Entire Family of Six to High Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as one who attended Sam Houston State Teachers College for a time, and because of my continuing interest in higher education, I particularly enjoyed reading an article concerning six members of a single family attending that school.

It is a stirring story of an intelligent, industrious American family, with five sons and a daughter enrolled at Sam Houston State Teachers College. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Houston Post captioned "Iola Parents Proud of Their Six College Student Children" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IOLA PARENTS PROUD OF THEIR SIX COLLEGE STUDENT CHILDREN

(By Ferol Robinson)

HUNTSVILLE.—The thought of having to pay the bills of six children in college would probably cause most parents to go into a state of shock.

But it is the realization of a dream for Mr. and Mrs. Donald Hicks, of Iola, Tex. The couple has five sons and a daughter enrolled for the fall semester at Sam Houston State Teachers College.

"They haven't depended on us for everything, they do all they can and it's always a pleasure to us to have an opportunity to help when needed," said Mrs. Hicks.

The half-dozen Beenes, Mrs. Hicks' children by a former marriage, seem to want to do for themselves as much as possible. They all have jobs.

Lyndel, 22, was the first to enter college. He is a graduate student in the business school where he teaches two classes. His wife is making her contribution to the family budget by working for the Texas Department of Corrections.

Jerald, 27, a junior physics major, and Charles, 24, a senior argircuture major, help with the finances by serving as dormitory counselors.

An 18-year-old physical education major, Kenneth, has a job in the men's physical education department.

With a feeling that aid should be mutual, Mitchell, a 20-year-old junior agriculture major, goes home almost every week end to help with chores on the family farm.

The daughter, Ivy, now married to Roy Moss, worked for a Huntsville accounting firm until her husband finished his undergraduate college work at Sam Houston. He graduated in August and she entered in September as a freshman nonmajor.

Mrs. Moss isn't content to just attend college and keep house, she helps her husband

with his responsibilities as head resident of the men's departmental dormitories and instructor of physical education.

"We feel our parents deserve all the credit for our being in school, Mrs. Moss said. "They drive over almost every week to see how we are getting along and they usually bring something for us.

"When the parents come over I always try to call all the boys, as I know mother and dad come to see the entire group," she said.

"We are such a close knit family, we worry about each other quite a bit," said Mrs. Moss.

"When our father, who was Charles Beene, died, people began asking mother to let them adopt some of the children. This began even at Dad's funeral," she said.

The widowed mother was determined to keep her children, ages 1 to 10, together and went to work to support them.

She was the familys sole support until her two elder children graduated from high school in 1955. That was the year she married Donald Hicks.

Mrs. Hicks said, "Love, understanding and work are most important in bringing up a family. Keep them busy and love them and they will turn out all right.

"The children always come first. I insisted that they all attend church and I never had any real trouble with them," she said.

Mrs. Hicks admitted it was hard to see her family begin breaking up to attend college and said, "the house is a lot bigger and seems a lot emptier since Kenneth left last summer for Sam Houston."

Kenneth was valedictorian of Iola High School last year.

When the first four boys came to college they rented an apartment, brought food from home and did their own cooking. Even though all of them tried their talents in the kitchen, they said the food has been better prepared since they have been eating in the college's cafeteria.

Charles and Mitchell are rooming together and they think it good for brothers to room together because of a deeper interest in each other which causes more tolerance.

For the past two summers, three of the boys have joined a wheat harvesting crew in Oklahoma and worked until they reached the Canadian border. Even though it meant being away from the family, they said that the money earned helped with college expenses.

"The folks insisted that we call each week to let them know how we were getting along," Mitchell said.

Mrs. Moss said that the boys come to her with some of their problems. "The main problems have been girls. I have to be a counselor, but I lead them to realize that many of their 'girl problems' aren't as serious as they think."

The six college students feel that they will be together for at least 2 more years before graduation separates them. After graduation they hope to live in the same general section of Texas—not too great a distance from their parents.

As to the parents they said it would be nice to have the group living near them after graduation, but they feel that no person should expect fulfillment of more than one big dream.

The Invisibility of the Obvious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, an occasion of great educational significance to the people of my congressional district and the State of Ohio was the inauguration of Dr. Alphus R. Christensen as the 12th president of Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio, on September 29, 1963.

The board of trustees and the faculty are to be complimented for their selection of such a distinguished educator and capable administrator as president.

In his inaugural address on the subject, "The Invisibility of the Obvious," Dr. Christensen emphasized the great contribution of higher education to cultural, material and technological advancement of the Nation. He emphasized the danger that the cost of a college education may become so high as to discourage students of limited financial means, and the importance of adequate financial support for both public and private colleges and universities.

In recognition of the great contributions of the faculty and administration of Rio Grande College to the educational betterment of the people of Ohio and the Nation, I wish to include in the RECORD the inaugural address of President Christensen and the list of delegates from other colleges and universities attending the function.

The material follows:

THE INVISIBILITY OF THE OBVIOUS

President Smith, Dr. Davis, members of the board of trustees, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen—good afternoon. I approach this event with some trepidation. You see this is the first time I have played this role and I am reading my address. Although I have spoken to more than a few audiences in the last 30 years, this is the first time I have been script-bound. On occasion—in the past—I have committed to memory short speeches and segments of longer adresses, but never, no never, have I been dominated by the printed page. In my estimation, confirmed by years of listening, writing for the ear differs from writing for the eye. For the next several minutes I shall endeavor to reach your ears.

Many of you are aware that 14 months have passed since I first unlocked the door labeled "President." The prevailing winds of extenuating circumstances have prevented us from playing this scene prior to today. Frankly I am glad. Now I have had the opportunity to assay the worth of the members of the board of trustees—I have not found them wanting. I have had the opportunity to appreciate the historical accomplishments of Rio Grande College. Yes, too, I have had the opportunity to become acquainted with her problems. Fourteen months ago I would have chosen a more grandiose topic—I would have been more general and abstract. Today, I must—I must because of 14 months of additional experience, be more specific and concrete.

Risking, my friends, the possibility of disappointment I hasten to confess I do not bring to you a revelation—I do not possess extrasensory perception; however, I hope to remind you of some precepts and principles which, through the years, have been very kind to us—and through this reacquaintance with these precepts and principles—we may reassess our value-judgments. I have a feeling the obvious in our educational systems has become invisible.

For the moment, ladies and gentlemen, let us look briefly at some historical data. The Continental Congress in 1785 inserted in the Northwest Ordinance the provision that "there shall be reserved the Lot No. 16, of every township, for the maintenance of public schools." Two years later, 1787, there appeared in the ordinance a clause, which has become the dictum of American education: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education, shall be forever encouraged." Some years later, Daniel Webster, writing about this clause—chose these words, "I doubt whether a single law or any lawgiver, ancient, or modern, has produced effects of more distinct, marked, and lasting character, than the Ordinance of 1787." This was a meager beginning. We started slowly. We stumbled through the development of the public elementary school. We became more ambitious. The public secondary school caught on—and it wasn't long before public education through the high school was the rule rather than the exception. Until today, free—and I use the term advisedly—free public education through high school is available, by intent of law at least, to every citizen.

On the other hand, higher education developed in an entirely different manner. Shortly after the first colonists arrived, church bodies began to establish colleges—colleges intended for theological education. Eventually these colleges accepted the responsibility of education for medicine, law and teaching; however, for the most part education in these colleges remained classical in nature until late in the 19th century. Strangely enough the birthday of the State university movement dates back to 1787. In that year, Congress wrote into the bill of sale of the Ohio Co. the provision that "not more than two complete townships * * * be given perpetually for the purposes of a university * * * to be applied to the intended object by the legislature of the State." In fact, in most of the charters of the 21 States established before the Civil War, provisions were made for grants of land to be used exclusively for universities. I am sure none of you will be surprised when I tell you that eventually these two systems clashed—that they clashed over control. The States wanted to control the church colleges. This desire was tested in the famous Dartmouth College case. The decision—church institutions were to be free from State control. By the same token, the State-supported educational systems were to be immune from religious commitment.

A major step in the development in our system of higher education occurred in 1862 with the passage of the Morrill Act—commonly known as the Land-Grant College Act. In essence it was designed to promote "the liberal and practical education of industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." More simply—to make available quality education to anyone desiring it. From then on church-related colleges, private colleges, State universities, land-grant colleges, and teachers' colleges flourished. Flourished until now we have more than 2,000 degree-credit institutions.

This thirst for education—this quest for education has not been without its rewards, culturally and materially. Since 1900 most of the expansion of knowledge, the technological advances, the scientific breakthroughs have occurred in this country. It is no accident—may I repeat—it is no accident that with only 6 percent of the world's population—7 percent of the world's land area—we produce in this country almost 50 percent of the world's manufactured goods. Although I am not a firm believer in single causation, I cannot deny that education has been significantly responsible for all this we enjoy and have today. Think—think of all the advantages at your beck and call. Trace each advantage back to its origin. As you move along that path it will become increasingly apparent that, either directly or indirectly, the advantage is a result of education. Education has advanced man so rapidly, in certain areas, that it is difficult for him to cope with and control all his knowledge.

Historically, one of the basic differences between public higher education and private higher education has been cost. In the be-

ginning affluence was the most important prerequisite for college admission. The State-supported institutions were established to insure and increase the availability of quality education. We have long since learned that intelligence is no respecter of the bank balance. For many years the majority of college-bound students matriculated at private colleges. Just a few decades ago, this began to change; today the majority favors the publicly supported institutions.

Yes, my friends, something else is happening today, too. The cost differential between private and public higher education is decreasing. Tax-supported institutions faced with rising costs and inadequate appropriations have had to turn to other potential sources—foundations, Federal grants, industry, philanthropists, alumni, and students. The latter group, students, being available, has absorbed much of the increase. On the other hand, private and church-related colleges, being without even inadequate appropriations, have had to make greater demands on their constituencies. Thus the costs spiral while the differential diminishes. In fact, in many instances the differential is negligible. For your own satisfaction, ladies and gentlemen, visit the guidance counselor in your high school, or your public librarian, or the registrar of a local college—ask permission to examine the college catalog collection—select at random several catalogs representing both public and private—compare residential costs. You will be surprised to find the total cost at many private colleges to be less than, or no more than, many publicly supported institutions. And if you want to take the trouble to include the special fee for out-of-State students assessed by the publicly supported institutions your surprise will be even greater.

Be it public or private—education costs are on the rise. And, at the moment, the college-bound student is asked to pay the difference. Now it seems to me a reasonable question to ask is: Where does the student get his money for education? Surveys reveal that although personal savings, personal earnings, and scholarships account for some, the great bulk still comes from the parents. As if you parents didn't know the answer to that one. Well—how about you? Are the parents capable of shouldering this extra burden? According to the Census Bureau, the median family income in 1960 was $5,620—before taxes. That means that half of the families in the United States earned less than this amount—$5,620. In fact, 22 percent of the families had incomes less than $3,000. Just how many of these families can stand an annual bite of $1,200? $1,500? $2,000? With this in mind, it is understandable why Dr. Patricia Sexton reported in her recent book, "Education and Income," that of the top 30 percent of high school students, one-third of the boys and half of the girls are not taking college-preparatory courses. Also, it is easy to understand why college hopes dwindle as children grow older. A U.S. Office of Education survey found 73 percent of parents of children under 9 expect them to go to college, but only 53 percent of those with children 15 to 17. Every time a college increases its costs and asks the students to pay for it—it closes its door on a potential market. Money is the most important reason why some youngsters go to college and others do not; why some who start finish and why others drop out.

Of course, there are some who say this trend is justified. If a student wants to go to college and doesn't have the money, he should borrow it, work his way through, or qualify for a scholarship—because he is the one who benefits from the education. Now let's look at this opinion bit by bit to see how rational it is. Borrow it. It is possible nowadays to borrow some money for education; personally I do not know of any program where it is possible to borrow the entire cost, or the major share of the cost of an education. In any event, whenever a loan is made, the lender must be assured that it will be repaid—either by cosignatures or collateral—and if you happen to be in the economic category I referred to a few moments ago, the assurances are not too assuring. The popularity of installment buying is premised on using it while paying for it. In the case of a college education you are using nothing—just mortgaging a future which is uncertain at best. The young lady is really in a predicament. Her stock on the marriage market drops. How would you like to be a bride with a reverse dowry? Work his way through. Thirty years ago I know this was possible. It is possible today—but it is more difficult. The demands on students today are much greater than they were a quarter of a century ago, or even a decade ago. But let's pursue this a little further. How many should work their way through college? Ten percent? Twenty percent? Fifty percent? Now who is to pay for this labor? Due to irregular hours and shifting assignments student labor is costly. I ask the question again: Who is going to pay? The money must come from somewhere. Qualify for a scholarship. Scholarship implies academic excellence. In the first place the number of scholarships are limited. They are limited because scholarship money must come either from external sources or it must be siphoned from the tuition and fees of the other students. Secondly, stringent scholarship qualifications necessarily eliminate many worthy students. Thirdly, with this approach you are saying, "The poorer you are, the smarter you must be to get a college education."

And now the college student should do all these things because he is the chief benefactor of his education. Studies show that the college graduate will probably earn during his lifetime two to three times more than the high school graduate. What does he do with his money? Bury it in the ground? He invests it and spends it so that others have more to spend and invest. It is difficult to measure the pervasiveness of additional income, but let me cite a specific example. More than 10 million of us took advantage of the World War II GI bill. That act cost about $14 billion. A staggering sum. However, it has been conservatively estimated that this additional educational opportunity has more than paid for itself through increased income taxes—to the tune of a billion dollars a year. And, in one way or another, the effects of the GI bill will be felt as long as mankind survives. Education is for the common good. Just to refresh your memories—insulin, streptomycin, Salk vaccine, Sabin oral.

My friends, if this tuition-fee-board-room hike continues, at least two things are likely to happen—we will reverse the educational trend—educational opportunity will vary directly with ability to pay; consequently, we will lose the untold benefits of those who cannot afford an education. And we could witness the dissolution of private higher education as we now know it. Each year a number of private and church-related colleges become nonexistent: some quit, some merge, some assume other identities, some become adjuncts of a state system. This is unfortunate. Politically, I believe in the two-party system. Educationally, I believe in our dual higher education system. We need both the tax-supported and the voluntarily supported colleges and universities. They complement each other and serve as a check upon each other; they help to assure our continuing freedom of speech, of religion, of education. It is all too possible for tax-supported systems to fall before legislative and executive pressures. Witness the events of the last few years. Too often, in spite of safeguards, we find the governing bodies of tax-supported colleges and universities politically obligated. Ladies and gentlemen, the governing boards of the voluntarily supported colleges and universities are different. Varying degrees of political, religious and economic beliefs are represented. Men and women learn to understand and appreciate differing points of view. Decisions are arrived at cooperatively. In this diversity there is strength. Therefore, this diversity must be nurtured. An American businessman or industrialist cannot make a greater contribution to education or to mankind than to offer his services to the voluntarily supported college. The fruits of his efforts are always easily discernible.

Since our inception, the law, and the intent of the law, has recognized the importance of education. Our historical design proclaims the advisability of our dual system of higher education. Thomas Jefferson put it aptly when he said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." The very seed of our own destruction is imbedded in democracy. The privilege of the vote provides the practitioner with the instrument to destroy himself—seeking security he can vote away his freedoms. The best safeguard against this is education. Knowledge begets wise choices.. Tax-supported institutions must receive adequate appropriations. Voluntarily supported institutions must receive added voluntarily financial support. We need them both.

Many years ago I made a choice; it was a free choice. I cast my lot with education. I could have chosen another profession or occupation, but my choice was based on the thrill of a challenge and the opportunity of service. Fourteen months ago I made another choice. With the assistance of the Creator, the board of trustees, loyal alumni, interested friends, and a dedicated and qualified staff, I shall follow Rio Grande College to greater accomplishments. The late Robert Frost in his poem, "The Road Not Taken," exemplifies my choice:

"Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

"Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same.

"And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

"Somewhere ages and ages hence:
I shall be telling this with a sigh;
Two roads diverged in wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference."

DELEGATES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN ORDER OF FOUNDING

University of Pennsylvania, 1740: Mr. Arthur Darnbrough, Jr.

Princeton University, 1746: Mr. Richard Allan Foster.

Rutgers University, 1766: Mr. John F. Campbell.

George Peabody College for Teachers, 1785: Dr. Albert H. Shuster, Jr.

University of Georgia, 1785: Mr. C. E. Richards.

Franklin and Marshall College, 1787: Mr. John U. Druck.

University of Pittsburgh, 1787: Dr. Albert C. Esposito.

Georgetown University, 1789: Mr. John T. Canna.

University of Tennessee, 1794: Mr. Aaron Horowitz.

University of Louisville, 1798: Dr. Quentin Korfhage.
Ohio University, 1804: Mr. Paul R. O'Brien.
The University of Michigan, 1817: Hon. Carl Brablec.
University of Virginia, 1819: Dr. Arthur S. Jones.
Trinity College, 1823: Dr. John F. Groth, Jr.
Kenyon College, 1824: The Reverend Father Emmet C. Smith.
Jefferson Medical College, 1825: Dr. William L. Brown.
Denison University, 1831: President A. Blair Knapp.
Oberlin College, 1833: Dr. Gertrude E. Moulton.
Franklin College, 1834: Mrs. John F. Cady.
Haverford College, 1834: Mr. Philip C. Mann.
Wheaton College, 1834: Dr. Edith Miller.
Albion College, 1835: Mr. John W. Bader.
Marietta College, 1835: President Frank E. Duddy, Jr.
Davidson College, 1837: Dr. Harold R. Murdock, Jr.
DePauw University, 1837: Mr. Charles L. Whittington.
Marshall University, 1837: President Stewart Harold Smith.
The Muskingum College, 1837: Mr. Wallace Bower.
Ohio Wesleyan University, 1842: Dr. Charles A. Jones.
Wittenberg University, 1845: Dr. Robert G. Hartje.
Bucknell University, 1846: Mr. Edward E. Weckerly.
State University of New York at Buffalo, 1846: Miss Gertrude R. I. Linnenbruegge.
Taylor University, 1846: The Reverend Howard Ruppelt.
Otterbein College, 1847: Dr. F. J. Vance.
Rockford College, 1847: Mrs. Richard Cohring.
Capital University, 1850: Mr. James P. Shultz.
Heidelberg College, 1850: Dean Archie M. Thomas.
Hiram College, 1850: Dr. Wyman C. Rutledge.
Monmouth College, 1853: Mr. Robert F. Sympson.
Western College for Women, 1853: Dean Isabel Abbott.
Elmira College, 1855: Mrs. Frank Allen.
Michigan State University, 1855: Dr. Paul B. Koons, Jr.
Wilberforce University, 1856: Vice President George H. Valentine.
Baker University, 1858: Dr. Robert R. Huddleston.
The University of the South, 1858: Dr. Robert H. McCluer.
Whitman College, 1859: Mr. Winton A. Ticknor.
North Central College, 1861: Dr. Walter G. Hack.
Wilmington College, 1863: Mrs. Mary C. Yundt.
College of the Bible, 1865: The Reverend Joe Maffett.
University of Kentucky, 1865: Mrs. Fred L. Rice, Jr.
Purdue University, 1865: Mr. James B. Harreld.
Drew University, 1866: Mr. Stanley H. McGilliard.
University of Kansas, 1866: Dr. Leonard A. Ostlund.
College of Wooster, 1866: Mr. E. E. Davis.
West Virginia University, 1867: Mr. Samuel D. Littlepage.
The University of Akron, 1870: Mr. Carl I. Crawford.
The Ohio State University, 1870: Mr. Austin E. Ritchie.
Syracuse University, 1870: Mr. Hewett S. Wells.
Wellesley College, 1870: Mrs. Herbert S. Cook.
William Woods College, 1870: Mr. Kenneth E. Bell.
Ohio Northern University, 1871: Vice President Eugene K. Eakin.
Glenville State College, 1872: Mr. Walden Roush.
Blue Mountain College, 1873: Mrs. Eline Green Rowland.
Vanderbilt University, 1873: Mr. R. William Jenkins.
Rose Polytechnic Institute, 1874: Mr. Benjamin H. VanVactor.
Union College, 1879: Mr. Arthur W. Lanham.
Newark College of Engineering, 1881: Mr. Conrad P. Straub.
University of North Dakota, 1883: Mr. James S. Gronna.
Seton Hill College, 1883: Mrs. John J. Dwyer.
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, 1883: Mr. Henry G. Dybvig.
University of Arizona, 1885: Mr. Joseph H. Dando.
Arizona State University, 1885: Mr. Ford Ferguson.
Dakota Wesleyan University, 1885: Miss Ruth Wilcox.
Pfeiffer College, 1885: Mrs. Harry C. Vaughn.
Clark University, 1887: Dr. Leonard A. Ostlund.
Sinclair College, 1887: President C. C. Bussey.
University of Puget Sound, 1888: Mr. Howard W. Brownlee.
Salem College, 1888: Mr. George L. Cutlip.
Keuka College, 1890: Dr. Dorothy Fisher.
University of Oklahoma, 1890: Dr. Margaret J. Felsinger.
Malone College, 1892: President Everett L. Cattell.
University of Rhode Island, 1892: Mr. Wesley S. Reid.
The University of Tulsa, 1894: Mr. Robert C. Mesec.
Western Illinois University, 1899: Miss Betty M. Weaver.
Franklin University, 1902: Mr. M. G. Ice.
Western Michigan University, 1903: Mr. Thomas E. Coyne.
Eastern Kentucky State College, 1906: Mr. Ralph O. Darling.
Southwest Missouri State College, 1906: Mrs. Zelma S. Northcutt.
Marygrove College, 1910: Mrs. Raymond J. McGee.
Reed College, 1911: Dr. Jesse H. Day.
Anderson College, 1917: Dean Gene W. Newberry.
Westminster Choir College, 1926: Mr. Henry L. McDowell.
St. John College of Cleveland, 1928: President Lawrence P. Cahill.
Indiana Institute of Technology, 1930: Mr. Herman C. Goldenbagen.
Eastern Baptist College, 1932: The Reverend Ralph C. Zundel.
Kings College, 1936: The Reverend Paul Williams.
University of Dayton, 1950: Mr. Joseph A. Oths.
South Macomb Community College, 1954: Mr. John Willard Lewis.

DELEGATES OF LEARNED SOCIETIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Ohio Education Association, 1847: Dr. Kermit Daugherty, administrative assistant; and Mr. Robert L. Drury, legal counsel.

Tribute to Leonard A. Robinson, Supervisor of Services to the Visually Handicapped of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation of the District of Columbia, for His Work for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 2 years after his graduation from the Western Reserve University Law School in Cleveland, Ohio, Leonard A. Robinson became actively interested in his fellow blind. Having lost his sight at the age of 15, Leonard Robinson resolved to complete his education and practice law. His graduation from one of the country's leading schools for the blind in Philadelphia placed him in close contact with other sightless students, some of whom were attending the various colleges in that city. He was confident that blinded persons could earn a rewarding future.

In 1931, he learned of a project pending in Congress which would permit blind persons to operate snack bars in Federal buildings. His 2 years of active law practice had brought him in touch with many sightless citizens who, despite their various abilities and skills, had found it difficult to secure employment due to the skeptical attitude of employers as to a blind individual's ability to perform. Mr. Robinson realized that the Federal stand program for the blind, if enacted into law, would be an object lesson to society. Such people attending their vending stands and serving customers would demonstrate to thousands all over the country that the blind were able, businesslike, and employable.

Leonard Robinson brought his plan to me, and in 1936, legislation passed Congress and became law. The late Senator Morris Sheppard and I, then a Member of the House of Representatives, authored the bill.

Mr. Robinson was not a paid worker, but a volunteer who labored at the expense of his law practice and reportedly utilized almost $10,000 of his personal savings.

On April 1, 1938, Leonard Robinson entered the service of the Federal Government in the capacity of Assistant to the Supervisor, Services for the Blind, Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of the Interior, which was the Federal Department named by Congress to administer the legislation.

He assisted his chief in initiating the national program. It became obvious from the outset that an important phase of the vending stand project was in the District of Columbia where the most varied and numerous opportunities existed for stands in Federal buildings.

Congress made no provisions for appropriations for vending stand equipment and Leonard Robinson was assigned the task of raising money for the local program. Through the system of supervised control, a small administrative levy was charged based on gross sales. With the passing years, this method of funding became sufficient to pay the loan made to a private agency to buy the necessary vending stand equipment and to stock each stand with adequate supplies of merchandise without cost to the blind licensed operator.

In 1931, when Mr. Robinson came to the District of Columbia to make his first study of the possibilities of the Federal effort, there were 10 blind persons employed here. Four were doing library work at the National Library for the Blind, which later merged with the Library of Congress Division for the Blind; others were employed as chair caners at the Columbia Lighthouse for the Blind. Their combined annual incomes approximated $9,000.

Mr. Robinson was assigned exclusively to the District of Columbia program in August 1940. He is now supervisor of services to the visually handicapped of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation of the District government. Today there are approximately 80—77—vending stands in the Federal and non-Federal buildings in the District of Columbia utilizing the skills of 80 blind persons as the result of the Randolph-Sheppard Act. Their annual gross business during this fiscal year is estimated to be close to $3 million, with net profits to the operators of more than $600,000. It is estimated that there are at least 200 other blind persons employed in the District of Columbia whose annual combined incomes approximate $2 million. In the United States today, a total number of 2,425 operators are employed under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

All of this as the result of the Federal legislation which Leonard Robinson helped to carry forward.

Mr. President, David Krause has written an interesting article on "The Story Behind the Randolph-Sheppard Act," which appeared in the Braille Free Press Quarterly June 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of his article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY BEHIND THE RANDOLPH-SHEPPARD ACT

(By David Krause)

It is estimated that there are more than 3,000 vending stands in this country being operated by blind persons which are directly or indirectly the result of the Randolph-Sheppard Act. This Federal legislation was enacted unanimously by the 74th Congress. Very few of these vending stand operators know the facts and background which led to the passage of this legislation which has become world famous, and which has been copied by many countries whose workers for the blind have visited the United States to study its vocational rehabilitation programs and projects.

In March 1931, Leonard Robinson, totally blind, was practicing law in Cleveland, Ohio. It was during that month that he was reading the March issue of the Braille Mirror of which Mr. J. Robert Atkinson was editor and founder. In it was a five-page article about a bill in Congress introduced by the blind Senator from Minnesota, Thomas D. Schall. The bill provided for establishment of a Bureau for the Blind in the Labor Department, and also authorized blind persons to operate vending stands in Federal buildings throughout the United States. But, as the article went on to describe, there was no support for the bill by any organization for the blind. To Robinson, the idea sounded practical. He could not understand why the bill lacked support of the major agencies for the blind.

In April 1931 there was to be a World Conference on Work for the Blind in New York City. After reading the Mirror article, Mr. Robinson decided to attend this conference and find out from those in work for the blind whether this legislation was practical.

At one of the morning sessions of the conference, the matter of vending stands and small business enterprises was discussed by Joseph F. Clunk who, at that time, was in charge of this phase of the program of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, in Toronto. When the morning session was over, Robinson introduced himself to Clunk, who told him that such legislation could work out better in the United States than in Canada since each State could develop its stand program more effectively than could Canada, with its sparsely settled areas. Robinson needed no further assurance from anyone. He made up his mind there and then that the Federal legislation in the United States would be enacted.

On his way home from the conference, Leonard Robinson stopped off in Washington, D.C., where he met with Senator Schall, a man very much interested in the Federal vending stand bill but who needed public support to get it enacted. Senator Schall made it clear that he did not know all the answers regarding the practicability of the legislation, and without an active lobby or support it was useless even to schedule a public hearing on the matter.

At the aforementioned World Conference Robinson met another outstanding blind person. He was Representative Matthew A. Dunn of Pittsburgh who was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature. Representative Dunn told Robinson that if he ever got to Congress he would be glad to sponsor such legislation. In November of 1932, Matthew A. Dunn was elected to the House of Representatives from his congressional district in Pittsburgh.

In the meantime, Robinson was gathering his forces and geting support for the legislation from whatever source he could. He found a true and trusted friend in J. Robert Atkinson of the Braille Mirror whose organization formally endorsed the legislation and whose Braille and inkprint publications publicized its practicability.

Back in those days the average employer did not believe a blind person could do anything except make brooms and cane chairs in some workshop for the blind. The true abilities of the blind were not known. Robinson thought this vending stand program, if administered correctly in every State of the Union, would be an object lesson to society, and the sighted everywhere would begin to realize that blind persons, if trained to do a certain job, could do it on a par with the sighted. Blind persons selected for such vending stands would have to be carefully chosen and thoroughly trained, and the vending stand equipment would have to be of the very best in order to attract customers. He felt that good housekeeping, a good selection of merchandise, a pleasing personality in a carefully groomed stand operator would soon change this adverse public opinion that the blind are destined for sheltered employment.

January 6, 1933, was a happy day for Leonard Robinson. He was ushered into the study of President-elect Roosevelt's New York home to discuss the then pending vending stand legislation. Roosevelt told Robinson it was while he was Governor of New York that he signed an executive order permitting two stands to be operated by two blind persons in State buildings at Albany, and in both of these locations the blind stand operators had proved that the idea was sound. Roosevelt told Robinson that he favored such Federal legislation and that he would support it. That was 3½ years before the bill finally went through Congress. Robinson had merely turned the corner of the road to success. The road ahead still had many obstacles.

Soon after his return from New York City where he was encouraged by President-elect Roosevelt to continue on with the fight, Robinson called a meeting of his many blind friends in Cleveland who made up the membership of the Welfare Association of the Sightless. This association had endorsed the Federal vending stand legislation for the blind in 1931 at Robinson's suggestion. But the association could not wage this nationwide fight alone. Another Cleveland committee was formed, known as the Citizens Welfare Sightless Committee, whose sole aim was to sponsor the Federal vending stand legislation. Prominent Cleveland citizens became members of the committee, and within 12 months such national organizations as the American Federation of Labor, the Railway Labor Executives Association, the American Legion, and many others had endorsed the principle of the legislation and lent their cooperation to the committee.

Following the inauguration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in March 1933, a special session of Congress was called by the President to deal with the economic depression at that time, and it was during this special session that Congressman Matthew A. Dunn introduced another vending stand bill known as the Dunn bill. Working closely with Robinson and his Cleveland committee, Congressman Dunn was able to get the House Labor Committee to arrange for a public hearing on the bill. The hearing was well attended, and the importance of this legislation for the blind was brought to the attention of many Members of Congress who had never heard of the idea. It also had the effect of bringing to the attention of professional workers for the blind the practicability of such legislation. This led to a conference on the subject in New York City in December 1933. Many professional workers for the blind came to voice their opinions or objections. As Robinson tells the story, the conference did not specifically endorse the legislation. After two days of deliberation, during which time it was suggested that a Presidential executive order take the place of the legislation, Robinson made it clear that his committee could not accept anything short of endorsement for the legislation itself. He argued that a Presidential executive order could be terminated by another such order rescinding the first one, but if the project were brought about by an act of Congress, it would never be repealed by any subsequent act of Congress. Robinson felt that the vending stand project could and would be so successful that no Member of Congress would ever be brought to act adversely by repealing the legislation and thus deprive a blind person of a livelihood.

During the year of 1934, the Cleveland committee received hundreds of letters from all parts of the country containing endorsement of the Dunn bill, as well as constructive criticism of it. One of the criticisms was that the Dunn bill, like the other bill sponsored by Senator Schall, provided only for vending stand opportunities in Federal buildings, and that much broader employment

opportunities should be incorporated. Robinson and his committee went to work on this broadening feature of the vending stand bill. It also occurred to him that a new congressional sponsor was necessary. This idea was approved by Congressman Dunn, who also understood the psychological advantage of everything being new about the next bill.

On the many trips that Robinson made to Washington during the first few years of his one-man volunteer lobby work, he met with many members of what was then known as the Washington Host Lions Club. One of these members suggested to him that he attend the Lions International Convention which would take place in St. Louis the latter part of the summer of 1934. There he could gain national support for his legislation, and at the same time meet a prominent Member of Congress who was a Lion. This Congressman was the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia. Robinson met with Congressman RANDOLPH while in St. Louis for the convention. The Congressman was immediately impressed with the proposal that he sponsor in the 74th Congress any vending standing legislation which Robinson and his committee would present to him.

The first 2 weeks in January 1935 were busy ones for Robinson. He had come to Washington with a proposed legislative draft. His Ohio Senator arranged for the Senate Legislative Committee to help put the draft into final form, and, after 2 weeks of daily contact with Mr. Elliott of the committee, the bill was ready for introduction. Congressman RANDOLPH introduced it during the last week in January of 1935.

The companion bill in the Senate was sponsored by the late Senator Morris Sheppard of Texas, who was also very much interested in the provisions of this legislation. His life was spared long enough after its passage for him to realize that he had participated as a cosponsor in a piece of legislation which was destined to become the greatest rehabilitation project in the world for blind persons.

The purpose of the Randolph-Sheppard bill was phrased in the following language: "For the purpose of providing blind persons with remunerative employment, enlarging the economic opportunities of the blind, and stimulating the blind to greater efforts in striving to make themselves self-supporting * * *." The broader provisions of the Randolph-Sheppard bill specifically provided that the Federal department administering the legislation would make surveys of concession stand opportunities for blind persons in Federal and other buildings in the United States. Surveys would also be made throughout the United States of industries to obtain information that would assist blind persons to obtain employment.

After the introduction of the bill in the 74th Congress by Congressman RANDOLPH, Robinson's committee went into high gear. It was no longer a bill to provide vending stands for Federal buildings only, but the influence of the Federal building provision would carry over into other buildings so far as surveys were concerned. In addition, the surveys of industrial plants throughout the United States by experienced placement personnel would surely find thousands of jobs in those plants for blind persons were the use of sight was not necessary.

Newspaper support for the legislation was one of the first objectives accomplished by the Cleveland committee. On one of his trips to Washington in the early spring of 1935, Robinson met with one of the officials of the Scripps-Howard newspapers and obtained a promise that this group of papers would lend their support to the bill from coast to coast. Many individual newspapers followed suit. State legislatures memorialized Congress to enact the Randolph-Sheppard bill. National organizations of women and men endorsed the bill at their national conventions; these included the Catholic Daughters of America, the Sons of Italy, and many others. This endorsement and publicity for the bill was an expression of confidence in the soundness of and need for the legislation.

Late in 1935, the House Labor Committee arranged for a public hearing, and, as the result of that public hearing, the House Labor Committee voted it out favorably without amendments. A unanimous House of Representatives passed it in its original form in March 1936. The Senate Committee on Labor and Education took up the matter soon thereafter, but deleted the section which provided for Federal funds to be allocated to the States for vending stand equipment. Senator Sheppard confronted Robinson with the possibility of getting the bill through without the fund for the equipment. But he advised Robinson that a half a loaf was better than none at all, and they could always come back a year or two later and get this amendment for such funds if experience proved that such appropriations were absolutely necessary to carry out the intention and purpose of the legislation. The Senate acted accordingly, and the amended Senate bill was returned to the House which accepted the Senate amendments. There was no need for a House-Senate conference to iron out the difference. Time was running out. On June 20, 1936, President Roosevelt signed the bill into law.

We have come a long way in the 25 years since enactment of the Randolph-Sheppard law in educating the public as to the true capabilities of blind people. The vending stand program is still one of the best means of carrying out this educational program, but we still have a long way to go. To accomplish this, however, according to Robinson, every stand must be operated in a businesslike manner to attract customers and to maintain their patronage and confidence.

J.F.K.'s Attitude in Korth Case Irks Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling stories of wrongful influence in vital Government decisions is being written in the inquiries regarding award of contracts by the Defense Department. This matter should command the attention of all of us and I want to submit the following material as an example of the seriousness of the situation. The column by Richard Wilson appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of October 22, 1963:

J.F.K.'s ATTITUDE IN KORTH CASE IRKS FRIENDS

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Chronic apologists for the Kennedy administration continue to sweep the TFX inquiry under the rug, although it is evident to those who have studied the record that the grossest kind of favoritism was involved.

This favoritism consisted of overriding by the civilian authority of the highest technical military consensus without a factual record, then or since, to sustain the decision.

Mr. Kennedy's bland acceptance of this is very disheartening to his old associates at the Capitol. They thought that his experience as a member of the investigating subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee would insure his vigilance as President where matters of this kind were concerned.

But as it turns out, Mr. Kennedy as a Senator seeking to discredit a Republican administration and Mr. Kennedy trying to preserve the image of his own administration are two different men.

What was considered an outrage in the Eisenhower administration is considered justifiable practice in the Kennedy administration. This is what is most exasperating to Mr. Kennedy's old friends at the Capitol. They say that the President seems to think that whatever a Kennedy does is right.

Nor is it any less exasperating to Mr. Kennedy's old friends that the recent resignation of Fred Korth as Secretary of the Navy should be presented as owing solely to some sudden dispute other than TFX. For it is the conviction of Senator MCCLELLAN, the chairman of the investigating committee of which John F. Kennedy was once a member and Robert F. Kennedy was counsel, that the President knew the full extent of what the renewed TFX inquiry will shortly reveal. These disclosures were laid before high Kennedy officials prior to Korth's resignation.

The new evidence showed that the relationship of Korth with high officials of General Dynamics Corp., ran deeper than had previously been revealed.

Even the New York Times concluded that the Secretary of the Navy should have disqualified himself from taking any action in the $6 billion TFX deal because of his associations with General Dynamics, which was awarded the huge contract for a new biservice fighter plane.

The same reasoning applies with even more force to the Deputy Secretary of Defense and a man of fine reputation, Roswell Gilpatric. Gilpatric, deeply involved with General Dynamics through the law firm to which he will shortly return, should have disqualified himself from taking part in the TFX deal. He did not do so. It was a serious mistake.

Korth and Gilpatric should not have been in the picture. They should not have participated even if it could have been shown, and it was not shown, that the General Dynamics plane was superior to the Boeing model. What now makes it worse is that they did participate and a record can be made that the Boeing plane was better and cheaper.

It would be highly embarrassing to Mr. Kennedy to admit any of this in connection with Korth's resignation. If it were to be admitted this would be an indirect confession that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara was wrong. That is a confession Mr. Kennedy will never make because it would also mean that Mr. Kennedy was wrong. The record shows that McNamara did not formalize his decision until he had cleared it with Mr. Kennedy in a White House conference. Moreover, in that conference, according to the Senate record, Mr. Kennedy was not apprised of the full facts.

But beyond all that, the TFX case has taken on its biggest intragovernment significance as the imposition of the will of civilian authority over military. All considerations of fact and evidence seem to have been set aside in favor of such willful assertion. This is McNamara's basic weakness. He has transferred to the matter of national defense the practices and customs of the dictatorial structure of private corporations. It doesn't work. McNamara could not know enough to pit his judgment against the collective knowledge and experience of hundreds of military experts in the narrow field of supersonic fighter aircraft.

But he has unlimited confidence in his ability to do so. He could do no wrong. Korth could do no wrong, nor Gilpatric. This is the way corporations operate. But it is not the way the Government operates. The McClellan committee is slowly but solidly making the record that shows the shaky basis on which the TFX award was made, and the interests of those who participated in making the award. This inquiry will continue for some time.

Hon. Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner, Public Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I called attention of the House to a remarkable woman who, although with little more than 2 years of service in the national administration, already has been recognized by various organizations for her stewardship of the Nation's public housing program for low-income people. Few realize, for example, that the 540,000 low-rent public housing units owned by 2,000 communities and representing more than a $4 billion capital investment, costs the average taxpayer less than $1 a year.

President Kennedy in April 1961 entrusted this important asset—part of our national economic resources—to the care of the Honorable Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of Public Housing. She is the first woman to hold that important position. My last report to the House, June 3, on the state of Mrs. McGuire's stewardship of the Public Housing Administration told of a citation the American Institute of Architects, a conservatively minded and much respected organization awarded to this gentlewoman for her contributions to the improvement of design in public housing, and for improvements she has sponsored in relationships between public housing and the architectural profession.

That is but one of many honors accorded Mrs. McGuire during the little more than 2 years that her influence has been felt at the national level.

I enjoin my colleagues from Texas, meanwhile, to consider the importance of public housing to our great State. A total of more than 37,000 units of low-rent public housing representing an investment of more than $300 million currently is occupied throughout Texas. More than 1,000 of those units are in 17 communities in my own First Congressional District. Another nearly 200 new low-rent homes are in some stage of development in my district and about 3,200 throughout the rest of Texas.

This is not Federal housing. This is public housing, owned by the citizens of your communities. It is managed by them and maintained by them. The money borrowed from the Public Housing Administration to develop this third-of-a-billion-dollar investment was—and is being—repaid with interest.

This is truly a magnificent achievement, although but a step toward the day when no Texan who cannot afford to rent or buy a home on the private market will be denied a decent place in which to live.

Recently—September 27, 1963, to be exact—I was pleased to read in the Washington Evening Star an excellent article written by Commissioner McGuire in which she discussed in broad terms the entire low-rent public housing program. I would like to incorporate that article at this point in my remarks:

LOW-COST HOUSING IS NATIONAL AIM

(By Marie C. McGuire)

Communities all across the Nation are awakening to the need for housing families of low income, and are calling on the Public Housing Administration for assistance.

Formation of 300 more local housing authorities in the past 2 years has placed demands so great on the agency that the authorization under which the program now operates probably will be exhausted in this fiscal year.

The question arises: What then? What is the future of this housing program whose direct beneficiaries are poorer people? It should not be a difficult question to answer for a society as affluent as ours.

Basically, we must decide whether decent housing for the economically disadvantaged is preferable to maintaining slums. We must decide whether renewal and rehabilitation of some of our cities should come to a halt, a hiatus which business leaders and other civic-minded citizens would wish to avoid. Yet this would be inevitable unless provision was made for housing displaced families of low income.

Fortunately, many of these leaders regard federally assisted housing not just as a real estate operation for the poor, but as a community facility—like schools, libraries or parks—in which all citizens can take pride and from which the whole community benefits.

They are well aware, too, that the Nation cannot forsake the 18 million low-income families, of which 8.5 million live in substandard homes, and give assistance solely to those in higher income brackets.

Why, it may well be asked, are so many living in dwellings that are dilapidated or without sanitary facilities?

They are in substandard housing for different reasons. Some because they have roots in a neighborhood or are migrants from rural areas, others because of a lack of education, or physical and mental handicaps, and some because of an adverse turn of fortune beyond their control.

All have one thing in common: They cannot afford to buy or rent standard private housing. About 26 percent of these families have incomes, according to the 1960 census, under $2,000; 19 percent are in the $2,000 to $3,000 bracket; and 14 percent have incomes between $3,000 and $4,000. Almost 41 percent are elderly.

An equally important reason is the fact that try though they have, realtors, home builders and developers have never been able to construct decent standard housing within the price range these families could afford. The only way found thus far to construct any substantial amount of decent housing within their means has been through the public housing program.

Just what has the public housing program accomplished since 1937 when it got its start?

These are the tangible results:

Over the years, more than 7 million people have had opportunity to live in decent sanitary housing. Today, more than 2 million people, half of them children, are living in the 540,000 dwellings located in nearly 2,000 communities across the Nation. These dwellings have replaced an untold number in the slums of America.

Five billion dollars of improved property, owned by the communities participating have been added to the national housing inventory of standard sanitary dwellings.

It has given at least 750,000 man-years of direct work to the construction industry and comparable work to all the industries supplying the construction trades.

Cooperation of leading architects is resulting in the design of dwellings which are upgrading the appearance of whole neighborhoods.

Its tangible results are impossible to calculate, but it has enabled millions of citizens to participate in the economic growth of the United States.

And the cost to the taxpayer?

Last year, a couple with two children and net income of $5,000 put up 94 cents through their income tax to help provide decent standard housing for 2 million men, women and children.

ACEN Chairman Calls Wheat Deal Stab in the Back of Communist-Enslaved Peasants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to see how many people have not been hoodwinked by the calloused attempt of this administration to mislead the public regarding the wheat deal with our enemies, the Communists. It is a deal in which we are destined to lose in one way or another.

Mr. Aleksander Kutt, chairman of the Assembly of Captive Nations, a noble man whose every effort is directed at the eventual freedom of his enslaved brothers behind the Iron Curtain, is one of those not so easily deceived. Mr. Kutt said, in a statement released last week:

> The unconditional sale of grain * * * to the Communist-ruled countries against Soviet gold mined by forced labor is, we fear, tantamount to underwriting the consequences of Communist inhumanity, blunders, and mismanagement.

I congratulate Mr. Kutt on his continuing vigil against Communist perfidy and it is with regret that on more and more occasions it is necessary for Mr. Kutt and this fine organization to direct their criticism toward the Kennedy administration. Under unanimous consent, I include the entire statement at this point:

STATEMENT OF MR. ALEKSANDER KUTT

The Assembly of Captive European Nations strongly believes that in considering Soviet and satellite offers of wheat purchases in terms of the sellers' economic advantages only, the Western nations, Canada, and the United States above all, are missing a tre-

mendous opportunity to exercise a beneficial influence on developments in the Communist-ruled countries.

The grain deficit of the Soviet Union, Red China, and of most of the European captive nations is man made. It is, on the one hand, the consequences of forced collectivization and the attendant lack of incentive on the part of the brutally exploited peasants. It is, on the other hand, the result of a politically motivated allocation of resources. Agriculture and the consumer goods in general are neglected in the Communist-ruled countries to permit a faster buildup of the industrial underpinning of Soviet warmaking capacity.

The disastrous situation of agriculture in the Communist countries creates a God-sent opportunity for the people in the Communist-ruled countries and for the governments of the free world to press jointly for changes beneficial at once to the cause of peace and to the welfare of Eastern European peasants. The few grain-surplus countries possess now a lever of immediate effectiveness. They have the means to induce the Communist-ruled governments to increase substantially investments in agriculture at the expense of the armament industry. In so doing they would strike for peace. By their acts of commission and omission, they are furthermore in a position to lend decisive help to the peasants who still form more than half of the population of the Communist-ruled countries, in their tireless struggle against forced collectivization and for a fair reward of their toil.

The unconditional sale of grain, sometimes at subsidized price levels, to the Communist-ruled countries against Soviet gold mined by forced labor, is—we fear—tantamount to underwriting the consequences of Communist inhumanity, blunders, and mismanagement. It is an encouragement to the policy of missiles before bread. It is a stab in the back of the Communist-enslaved peasants at the very time when they could look forward to changes in their favor, to rewards for their stanch resistance to the new serfdom of the collective farms.

Aiding the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party of the United States owes its allegiance to a foreign power, the Soviet Union. Its avowed purpose is the overthrow, by any means including violence, the Government of the United States.

This is clearly understood by all Americans, by all our law enforcement agencies, certainly by all Members of Congress, the courts and the executive branch. You would think, would you not, that these enemies would be treated as enemies, that they would be subject to the law of the land and that swift justice would be meted out to them? But in the strange atmosphere of this day when it seems that the policy of our Nation is to insult and discourage our friends and aid and abet and comfort our enemies, the Communist Party continues to carry on its subversion. Its members walk the streets of our cities as free men, lying, bribing, doing their best to bring about the downfall of the United States and the final triumph of the Soviet Union.

We have passed laws against the Communists, but justice which is so swift in taking the property of an Amish farmer in Pennsylvania because he opposes social security grounds, or in handing down decisions to prohibit prayer in public schools, seems strangely slow when it comes to legitimate prosecution of the Communist Party and its leaders. I think we should be done with this farce. I think it is time to enforce the laws of this country against treason and sedition. It is ridiculous that we allow the Communists to use our legal machinery to subvert freedom and extend their activities for years as indicated in the following article from this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report:

FIVE YEARS OF GRACE FOR U.S. COMMUNISTS?

WASHINGTON.—From the annual report of FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover:

"A new trend is developing within the [Communist] Party. A number of party leaders believe they now are safe from arrests for some time. They contend there will be no more charges brought against them under the Internal Security Act of 1950 until the cases against Hall and Davis are settled finally by the Supreme Court."

Mr. Hoover's reference was to Gus Hall, general secretary, and Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., national secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who are under indictment for failing to register for the Communist Party.

Communist officials believe, Mr. Hoover said, that a Supreme Court decision on the Hall and Davis cases "may take as long as 5 years. * * * Based on this reasoning they are convinced the party can and should function more openly."

CX-4 Designed by Douglas Aircraft To Meet Defense Mobility Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, present and prospective U.S. defense requirements involve the needs to moves men and equipment at jet speeds any place in the world. To help meet that need the Douglas Aircraft Corp. has designed a mammoth new transport aircraft designated the CX-4. It is described in the following item from the Los Angeles Times of October 20:

GIANT PLANE WOULD LIFT BULLDOZERS AND MISSILES—CX-4 DESIGNED BY DOUGLAS TO HAUL VAST CARGOES OF TRACTORS, CRANES, AND TRUCKS

(By Melvin Miles)

It's called the Swing Nose Giant—a mammoth, almost incredible military cargo plane in wooden mockup at the Douglas Aircraft Division, Long Beach.

Designated the CX-4, it was developed in anticipation of military need for a transport that can airlift such outsize cargoes as Army mechanized equipment, tractors, cranes, trucks, trailer vans, and bulldozers.

The monster looks something like a section of the Second Street tunnel that can be closed fore and aft for flight at more than 500 miles per hour.

As its nickname implies, the Douglas design would be not only a giant among aircraft—it would incorporate a hinged nose-cockpit section that could be swung aside for loading and unloading.

SIMULTANEOUS ACTIVITY

In addition it would have an aft opening to permit simultaneous on- and off-loading, the movement of vehicles in the rear and out the front, or for aerial delivery of parachuted cargo.

The CX-4 mockup at the Long Beach plant, with the company number D-902, is 100 feet long in the cabin section. It has a floor width of 16 feet.

But after devoting more than 2 years of design work to the project, Douglas engineers have concluded that an even larger plane is indicated and now propose a cargo cabin 110 feet long and a floor 17.8 feet wide.

Overall the sweptwing monster would be 190 feet long with a span of 192 feet.

GROSS OF 600,000 POUNDS

It would gross about 606,000 pounds, fully loaded, and lug a payload of between 135,000 and 160,000 pounds (overload) 4,600 statute miles. A load of almost 120,000 pounds could be carried 5,750 miles, and 100,000 pounds 6,325 miles.

Powered with 6 advanced jet engines of 30,000 pounds thrust each, the Douglas design could deliver a full overload of cargo 4,600 miles, arrive at its destination with enough fuel for 1,150 miles more and land over a 50-foot obstacle in 3,070 feet.

After unloading and refueling for a 4,600-mile return flight, it could take off in 2,750 feet.

These startling performance figures reflect a major feature of the new plane's design, the capability to operate in and out of combat area airfields, not just to large bases far in the rear.

DEVELOPMENT EFFORT

The CX-4 is not yet a funded program and the extensive Douglas development effort has been entirely company-sponsored.

But the Air Force definitely wants a heavy logistics transport and both the Army and the Navy approve the requirement.

The decision will be up to the Defense Department which apparently is swinging toward authorization of a CX-4 competition in the aerospace industry, possibly next spring.

Brockway McMillan, Undersecretary of the Air Force, told the Times last week that the Defense Department's more favorable view of an outsize transport is a reversal of the opinion it held a year ago.

WIDE OPEN COMPETITION

If the CX-4 does become a formal project, companies competing probably would include Boeing, Lockheed and perhaps General Dynamics-Convair, as well as Douglas.

Need for the huge aircraft was sparked by advancing American military philosophy, emphasizing speed and flexibility and requiring global logistics, the fast, long-range airlift not only of lighter airborne units, but heavy Army divisions as well.

Of the transports available today, C-124, C-130, C-133, C-135 and even the new jet-powered Lockheed C-141 rolling off the production line in Georgia, none can carry all of the heavy, bulky, outsize equipment needed for such divisions.

The CX-4 further offers the advantage of delivering ready-to-go equipment rather than disassembled units, such as helicopters that must be assembled in the field.

Douglas designers determined that an initially contemplated floor width of 12 to 13.5 feet for the CX-4—compared with a standard width of 10 feet—would be inefficient and jumped to a 16-foot width for the

full-scale mockup built to establish and demonstrate loadability advantages of the design.

Douglas showed off these advantages with a long parade of outsize Army equipment that rumbled through the cavernous cabin.

Huge trucks, towering semitrailers, radar vans, bulldozers, a Chinook helicopter, an M-60 tank, a Minuteman missile in its special transporter rolled in and out of the mockup in an average 2.5 minutes per unit.

MAY GO FURTHER

Subsequent design studies showed that a larger cabin—17.8-foot width—would give both better loading characteristics and higher floor area efficiency. This resulted in the current Douglas CX-4 proposal called the D-906.

This is not to say, however, that any final proposal will not go to a 19.4-foot width and a cabin length of 120 feet, with a nominal payload of 165,000 pounds (not overload) and an astonishing gross weight of 720,000 pounds.

The design remains flexible and can be made larger, if desired.

Troop accommodations are provided in the D-906 design, with a probable maximum of about 126 men seated either along the sides of the fuselage, if cargo loading permits, or in a special troop area that can be fitted in above smaller vehicles and freight loads in the aft half of the cabin.

Asked about operational relationship between the CX-4 and the new C-141, Douglas engineers said the massive cargo bird (with 16 wheels on its main landing gear) would be employed in combination with the Lockheed transport.

BETTER OPERATING EFFICIENCY

A mixed force of the two aircraft, they said, would result in improvements in the operating efficiency of the C-141, permitting use of the smaller plane to the full extent of its capacity by relieving it of awkward cargoes.

A combination of the two planes, it is claimed, would minimize the total system cost required to deploy Army divisions.

A minimum of 50 to 100 CX-4 aircraft, it is felt, would be required in a mixed force to accomplish the heavy airlift job demanded by flexibility in global operations, including delivery of massive equipment—such as 60-ton cranes—that cannot now be carried by air.

The Douglas men have a pet phrase:

"For a big job—a big airplane."

Tweter: The New Sweater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, with the wonderful assistance of the Small Business Administration, we of my district were proud to welcome into York County the Huntley Knitting Mills. The mill now employs over 400 people and the citizens of York and the surrounding community are most happy to have the industry there and have welcomed the personnel and the new shot in the arm that this concern has given to the economy of York and the area.

Now, Huntley Knitting Mills have presented to the sports' loving population a new, exciting, and revolutionary sweater, called the Tweter. It is made of 100 percent Orlon acrylic in big, bold stripes, and I quote from a recent advertisement which is most attractive:

Destination: Any place that's wild and wonderful. The latest rage of the student body. An absolute discourager to winter winds in the grandstand * * * cozy "togetherness" on an evening's walk. Get hep and "in step" with the season with a genuine collegiate Tweter.

I salute Huntley Knitting Mills and its bright new inovation in casual wear. I am proud to represent a district in which the industrial effort is always forward.

I wish for Huntley Knitting Mills every success in this and other inovations.

Resolution Adopted by the Father Paul J. Coletti Council No. 5024, Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, during the great spiritual freedom march of August 28, 1963, in Washington, there were many seen and unseen helping hands. One of those unsung and unseen hands was the helping hand of the Order of the Knights of Columbus, an organization based on charity, unity, fraternity, patriotism.

The order of the Knights of Columbus, at its annual convention, appropriated a donation to the archdiocese of Washington to be used for the accommodation of participants in that great march.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to include a resolution adopted on September 4, 1963, by the Father Paul J. Coletti Council No. 5024, Knights of Columbus, the council of which I am a member, commending the worthy supreme knight of the order, Luke E. Hart, and the board of directors of the order:

Whereas the Father Paul J. Coletti Council No. 5024 has been duly informed this date, that at the annual convention of the Order of the Knights of Columbus, held in the city of Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin, during August 20, 21, 22, 1963; and that during said annual convention that the board of directors of said order did approve and appropriate the sum of $25,000 as a donation to the archdiocese of Washington, D.C.—to provide 10 hostels for the participants in the march on Washington which was held on August 28, 1963; and

Whereas the hostels provided supper and breakfast for these participants who because of distance or illness found it difficult to return to their homes the night of August 28. The hostels were staffed and directed by committees representing the Knights of Columbus, the Catholic Interracial Council, diocesan and religious priests and brothers of the archdiocese of Washington, D.C.; these hostels included the gymnasium at Georgetown University, the Catholic University, and eight Catholic parish halls in the city of Washington; and

Whereas this magnanimous action by the worthy board of directors of our order was not only in keeping with the honored fundamentals and principles of this the largest fraternal benefit society, the Knights of Columbus, but was also a Christlike act of donation and determination to keep before man's love for man, and: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the brothers of the Father Paul J. Coletti Council No. 5024 congratulate the worthy supreme knight of the order, Luke E. Hart, and the brothers of the board of directors of the order for their expeditious donation and determination to keep before our people of these United States of America, the fundamental principles on which our glorious Nation was founded, and only upon which we can survive, and: Therefore be it further

Resolved, that a certified copy of this resolution be presented to the worthy supreme knight of the order of the Knights of Columbus, in the name of the Father Paul J. Coletti Council No. 5024, by the worthy grand knight of said subordinate council, Frank DeSimone Jr., forthwith; and we brothers pray that God may grant our order health and strength for a year of progress, to even greater achievements in all the programs of Columbianism.

NAT BRUZZESE,
Recorder,

Attest:

FRANK DE SIMONE, Jr.,
Grand Knight.

Sons of the Covenant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in this period as in all past periods, there is a lot more talk than action, so far as the spirit of tolerance is concerned. Sad but true, a great many well-intentioned people are inclined to speak for justice when they are in no position to do anything about it, but when the chips are down and action is required they dare not make a move. In the words of Bill Mauldin, the cartoonist-philosopher, this is equivalent to sitting in the center of Kansas City, hurling insults at the man-eating shark. No one can hold with that kind of courage, which, in fact, is hardly courage at all.

It is therefore with mixed feelings of deep respect and great delight that men of good will regard the overall record of B'nai B'rith, the Jewish national service organization. For here is a case where the words are never known to exceed the deeds; where nobody is satisfied with merely shaking a remonstrating finger in the face of villainy; where the motto is, in effect: "Do not just stand there talking. Do something."

I would like at this time to read into the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of October 13, 1963, extolling the services of this praiseworthy organization.

SONS OF THE COVENANT

B'nai B'rith, the Jewish national service organization which celebrates its 120th anniversary today, has richly earned the grati-

tude of all Americans. Founded in 1843 to promote Jewish welfare, it has rendered invaluable service to the whole Nation. In championing religious freedom for Jews, it championed religious freedom for all. In fighting for minority rights, it fought for the rights of every free man.

Voluntary associations of this sort are a characteristic tool of free and democratic societies. In the United States, the Government is but one, and not necessarily the noblest, of the means by which men advance their social interests. Many of the community's philanthropic and civic efforts are carried forward by service groups like B'nai B'rith which play a vital role in the democratic process. We congratulate the "Sons of the Covenant" on a long and honorable history and wish them continued usefulness as an indispensable element of American life.

Educational Rhythmics for Mentally Handicapped Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, any dedicated effort to improve the lot and increase the happiness of our mentally retarded children deserves the hearty support of this body.

I have been impressed with the inspiring efforts of Ferris and Jennet Robins on behalf of these unfortunate children. Mr. and Mrs. Robins were saved during the evacuation of Dunkirk. Subsequently them came to this country and spent 22 months entertaining our servicemen for the USO. Later they became American citizens. Much of their wartime work was in military hospitals, and they were startled at the impact of certain music and dance rhythms on the mentally disturbed.

From this discovery evolved the Robins special "schools of movement," which have pioneered what has become known as "educational rhythmics" for mentally retarded children. Through the use of carefully selected music and an adaptation of classical ballet techniques and syncopated rhythms, they have created a series of imaginative body movements that come naturally to the retarded child.

They learn to tie their shoes, walk up and down stairs, brush their teeth, and perform many tasks normally beyond their capacity. The story of the success of the Robins has spread, and has created a demand for wider dissemination of their unique and beneficial methods.

The outcome has been the preparation and publication of a stirring book entitled "Educational Rhythmics for Mentally Handicapped Children," a book designed to help the parent, the teacher, and anyone else working with these children.

One of the most touching sections is devoted to 100 unposed photographs of children reacting to the Robins method. It is exciting to see photographically how the music and movements appeal to the child's natural urge to imitate and play. The pictures again and again emphasize the actual beauty of a retarded child in its joy of movement—just where beauty is least expected. The enlightenment and happiness, the satisfaction of achievement, shows in each face.

Gentlemen, this book is a distinguished volume and a landmark in the unending battle on behalf of the handicapped child. It can do untold good. I am pleased to report that it is being placed on the shelves of the Library of Congress.

B'nai B'rith: 120th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, B'nai B'rith, the first national service organization to be founded in the United States is now marking its 120th year.

This celebration with its Biblical connotations—120 years being the lifespan of Moses—underscores B'nai B'rith's devotion to perpetuating the traditional moral values that underlie our Judeo-Christian heritage.

From its earliest days, B'nai B'rith has undertaken works of philanthropy, community service and youth education. In the latter field, it met an urgent need by sponsoring the Hillel Foundations which provide religious and cultural centers for Jewish students on 247 campuses.

B'nai B'rith's work in the field of human relations and civil liberties is well known. Its Anti-Defamation League, founded in 1913, has pioneered to eliminate discrimination in employment, housing, and the like, and to promote intergroup harmony.

B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief for the victims of the Baltimore flood of 1868. It established a free employment bureau in Chicago, and manual and technical schools in Philadelphia and New Orleans, mobilized relief drives for victims in the Chicago fire and the San Francisco quake. During the Civil War, B'nai B'rith conducted a recruitment drive of its own, outfitted a Jewish company and cared for the families of the company's soldiers. B'nai B'rith began with a contribution of $60, and today it is a great service organization which spends millions in programs for youth activities, education, social work, and vocational training.

Of great significance is the fact that these accomplishments are the work of a widespread voluntary organization. Such a group has the imagination, flexibility, and vitality to adjust old causes to new needs. Our democratic society flourishes when civic and charitable work is carried on through service groups like B'nai B'rith. B'nai B'rith has rendered valuable service not only to the Jewish community, but to our entire Nation.

I salute B'nai B'rith as it celebrates its 120th anniversary this month.

The Wisdom of Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, in view of all that has been said and written about Danville, Va., in my congressional district during our current racial troubles, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial entitled "Back to Booker T" from the Register in that city. It was written by the distinguished editor of that paper, Mr. W. Marion Saunders, whom I consider one of the ablest journalists in America. The noted Negro leader of whom he refers, Booker T. Washington, was born in my district, where his words, such as those quoted by Mr. Saunders, have a peculiar meaning. It is my desire that my colleagues and others may have the benefit of his wisdom, as well as that of the capable editor mentioned.

The editorial is as follows:

BACK TO BOOKER T.

Martin Luther King, who has been engaged elsewhere, decided not to keep an appointment in Danville. King was scheduled to arrive Tuesday to lead new demonstrations against local government and business and community customs. The army of demonstrators was supposed to have been organized and trained by his advance agent, the Reverend C. T. Vivian and a staff

There was no army of demonstrators to lead and no King to lead them.

There was a rather remarkable statement, made by Vivian on behalf of King. It said that "when this city showed a willingness to hire on the basis of merit, the Negro community and Dr. King met good faith with good faith. We have word from Dr. King that he will not be here today."

That is a switcheroo.

It was for King and for his cohorts in the Danville Christian Progressive Association, an amalgamation of all the organized agitation groups with fingers in the racial pie here.

It is not a switch for the Negro community; the white community or the city of Danville.

Danville has been hiring on merit—and merit only—for some time. It hires Negroes on merit; it hires whites on merit.

Heretofore, the Danville Christian Progressive Association spokesmen have not talked about merit. They have talked about hiring Negroes. They have talked about integrating everything in the city.

Spokesmen for the Negro community who ask employment and promotion on merit will receive a hearing in almost every segment of the city's business and public institutions.

Had the busiest trio here for the DCPA—Chase, Dunlap and Campbell—sought expanded opportunities for Negroes on merit rather than demanded such on the basis of race, they would have been heard by more Danvillians with more respect.

Dunlap, for example, wanted to teach at George Washington High School (white), when, as a matter of fact, his application to the Danville School Board failed to reflect his competence to teach at any school. And this despite the fact that he has accepted a position as vice president of a junior college in North Carolina.

If the announcement on behalf of Dr. King and the DCPA means that these spokesmen are going to follow the precepts handed down

by the late, great Booker T. Washington, there surely will be less trouble and more understanding and more cooperation among whites and Negroes in Danville.

Dr. Washington, a Franklin County native and Hampton graduate and teacher before he founded Tuskegee, talked sense when the Negro really needed a spokesman. He talked sense to both whites and Negroes.

In his memorable address at the Atlanta Exposition on September 18, 1895, Washington said, among other things:

"No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top. Nor should we permit our grievances to overshadow our opportunities.

"There is no defense or security for any of us except in the highest intelligence and developemnt of all. If anywhere there are efforts tending to curtail the fullest growth of the Negro, let these efforts be turned into stimulating, encouraging, and making him the most useful and intelligent citizen. Effort or means so invested will pay a thousand percent interest. These efforts will be twice blessed—'blessing him that gives and him that takes.'

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of those privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house."

Has anybody heard more wisdom from Dr. King? From the reverends Chase, Dunlap, and Campbell? From anybody?

The greatest disservice the Negro organizations have done is to degrade Dr. Washington and his wisdom. It is good, for once, to hear Dr. King return to it.

Mathias and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article written by Mr. Bradford Jacobs, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of October 18, about our able and respected colleague, CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., and the civil rights legislation with which this Congress is struggling. It is a penetrating story, Mr. Speaker, of the issue with which we are all concerned, and it is a tribute to the quiet leadership and sincere and dedicated motives of the gentleman from Maryland.

The article follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Oct. 18, 1963]

NO, NO SOFT DRINK

WASHINGTON.—Tales of horseshoe nails and of kingdoms lost for lack of them often carry the ring of contrivance. And yet here is one, a little sounder than some, which by its homely light may bring a vast and contentious issue into clearer perspective. At one end of the story is a missing soft drink; at the other end, the civil rights struggle in which Congress is locked today.

The tale begins on a simple note when a young couple and their child, one hot Sunday afternoon, go for a drive through the Baltimore suburbs. The child, thirsty, asks for a soft drink. The parents stop at a village drugstore to get one. They are told none is available. They try again—at a lunch counter, at a restaurant, in a hotel. Still no soft drink, and the child whimpers as, the afternoon spoiled, the father turns the car homeward. They do not try it again.

The point of this mild episode is not so much the familiar one that the family was Negro, hence could get no service. It is not even that the story was told in Annapolis a few years ago on the floor of the House of Delegates by Mrs. Irma G. Dixon, a Democratic member from the fourth district. The point instead is that one attentive listener was CHARLES McC. MATTHIAS, JR., then a Republican delegate from Frederick County. Mr. MATTHIAS carried the memory of Mrs. Dixon's story with him to Washington and the House of Representatives, where he serves on the Judiciary Committee—the pressure point right now for the new bill on civil rights.

That Mr. MATHIAS' basic convictions were materially altered by the story seems unlikely. As the sort of liberal Republican the western Maryland hills frequently produce, he was for civil rights already—in principle. As what he calls a practical thing, however, the story seems to have brought home to him in a personal way the nature of Negro striving for self-respect. In addition to being a Congressman, he is also the father of two small soft drink consumers of his own.

Mr. MATHIAS has been jarred, of course, by the racial violence in the Deep South. He has also heard the loud posturing on racial questions from the big cities of the North. And yet, as a border State Representative from a largely rural district, he likes to present the situation in the everyday, family terms Mrs. Dixon used. Emotionally, as well as philosophically, he believes the civil rights movement is justified.

The story and its effect on Mr. MATHIAS have importance, of course, only to the extent that he in turn does something about it. Ordinarily, a minority party Congressman—and a still quite junior one, at that—is swallowed up and lost in the great power congeries on which the House is built. As circumstances have developed, however, the western Marylander finds himself drawn to the forefront of the civil rights battle and furnishing here and there a touch of leadership himself.

Not only is he a member of the Judiciary Committee, the body where next week the bill may rise or fall. He also has formed, with three other liberal members, a four-man bloc of GOP activists almost as independent of their own party functionaries as they are of the Democratic majority leaders. The others are Representatives LINDSAY of New York; MACGREGOR, of Minnesota; and CAHILL, of New Jersey. For a small band inside a minority party grouping, the foursome has proved friskier in civil rights maneuvers than some party elders think their right.

Two developments account for their bounciness. One is that the majority Democrats are split in the committee along north-south lines, that President Kennedy has had to call on the Republicans for bipartisan help to move the bill along. The other is that, among the GOP leaders thus appealed to, no immediate disposition to respond is apparent; some oppose the bill on principle, others acting from politics yearn to see the President stumble to defeat. Mr. MATHIAS and his friends, operating on different motives, are thus granted their opening.

They first showed their hand early in the year when, well before the Kennedy program appeared, they wrote and introduced a broad-gauge civil rights bill of their own. Party seniors like Representative HALLECK, the GOP floor leader, looked on uncertainly, but the juniors had a purpose: they were out to redeem pledges made to Negroes in the 1960 party platform. Neither party had produced a significant civil rights bill since the platforms were written. The Mathias-Lindsay group aimed to clear the Republican conscience, at least.

Other pokes followed—notably, one which nudged the constitutional underpinning of the Democratic proposal on public accommodations toward the 14th amendment, as preferred by the Republican four. Still further operations are under consideration, probably for springing at such crucial moments as a final committee vote or later during the expected floor fight ahead. In general, group efforts are directed less at liberalizing the overall impact of the President's program than at putting their own imprint on its terms. None takes kindly to legislative dominance, however benevolent, from the White House quarter.

Committee proceedings at the moment have moved somewhat away from the Mathias-Lindsay circle, this being the time for adding up votes. Attention has turned to Representative MCCULLOCH, the Ohio veteran who as the committee's ranking Republican is swingman in rounding up GOP members for the bipartisan backing the President must have. Mr. MCCULLOCH is a faintly Delphic figure who, when asked if bipartisanship was in sight, would say only—"I think so."

If this MCCULLOCH declaration falls short of ringing, the fact that he made it at all is traceable at least in part to the restless prodding of the four GOP hustlers standing at his heels. And behind the Maryland one of these, of course, stands the memory of the little Baltimore girl and the soft drink denied her one summer day.

Joint Committee on Oceanography—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy recently addressed the Anniversary Convocation of the National Academy of Sciences. A major portion of the President's speech was on the subject of oceanography, and, I was very impressed by his feeling of urgency in seeing the United States embark on a much more energetic effort in this vital field of research.

President Kennedy's remarks on the subject of oceanography were as follows:

I would call your attention to a related problem; that is, the understanding and use of the resources of the sea. I recently sent to Congress a plan for a national attack on the oceans of the world, calling for the expenditure of more than $2 billion over the next 10 years. This plan is the culmination of 3 years' effort by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, and it results from recommendations made by the National Academy.

Our goal is to investigate the world ocean, its boundaries, its properties, its processes. To a surprising extent, the sea has remained a mystery. Ten thousand fleets still sweep over it in vain. We know less of the oceans at our feet, where we came from, than we do of the sky above our heads. It is time to change this, to use to the full our powerful new instruments of oceanic exploration, to drive back the frontiers of the unknown in the waters which encircle our globe.

I can imagine no field among all those which are so exciting today than this great effort which our country and others will carry on in the years to come. We need this knowledge for its own sake. We want to know what is under the sea, and we need it to consider its bearings on our security, and on the world's social and economic needs. It has been estimated, for example, that the yield of food from the seas could be increased 5 or 10 times through better knowledge of marine biology, and some day we will seed and weed and harvest the ocean. Here, again, the job can best be done by the nations of the world working together in international institutions.

As all men breathe the same air, so a storm along Cape Cod may well begin off the shores of Japan. The world ocean is also indivisible, and events in one part of the great sea have astonishing effects in remote places.

Mr. Speaker, the study of the sea is of such importance that I am of the firm conviction that Congress should establish a Joint Committee on Oceanography. The membership of this Joint Committee should be kept to a minimum, and should be drawn from the many Senate and House Standing Committees which hold some portion of the present widely fragmented responsibility for this subject matter.

Jemison: Magic Name in Magic City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the name of Jemison has, since 1884, been indelibly linked with that of Birmingham and its great progress. It was in that year that Mr. Robert Jemison, Sr., came to the Magic City from Tuscaloosa, Ala., proposing to stay only a brief period but falling in love with the place and staying the rest of his life. The work he began in developing some of the most beautiful residential areas and some of the most handsome in-city structures has been carried on by his distinguished son, Robert Jemison, Jr. Mr. Jemison is now president of Jemison Realty Co.

The story of Robert Jemison, Jr., and his father and forebearers was beautifully told in an article appearing in the Birmingham News earlier this year, and I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues and all those who are interested in the history and progress of our great city of Birmingham.

The article is inserted as follows:

WITH UNWAVERING FAITH AND LOVE JEMISONS HELPED BIRMINGHAM GROW

One of Birmingham's great romances is 79 years old.

It has been the love of Robert Jemison, Jr., and his father, the late Robert Jemison, Sr., for their magic city.

The father organized Birmingham's first unified transportation system, binding together 13 then scattered communities which now are parts of the metropolis.

The son developed Fairfield, Mountain Brook, and other beautiful areas of the Birmingham district. Fairfield is renowned as a model industrial city and Mountain Brook is considered one of the most beautiful suburbs in the United States.

Their unfaltering belief in the future of Birmingham survived two great depressions during which some of their associates were ready to throw up their hands and quit.

The late Jemison, Senior, came to Birmingham from Tuscaloosa in 1884. He had planned only a short visit before moving to Los Angeles, but it was love at first sight as he toured the little city of 4,000 and for the first time examined its attractions and opportunities closely.

When he fell ill while visiting in the North 42 years later, he asked to be returned to Birmingham so he could die here.

Such large downtown structures as the Empire Building, old Chamber of Commerce Building, Ridgely Apartments, and Tutwiler Hotel are monuments to the Jemison name.

The son continues as president of Jemison Realty Co. He has a luxurious office, but uses it only for conferences. He sits at a simple desk in the main room of the Jemison Building, readily available to his staff and customers.

The senior Jemison had been in the hardware business at Tuscaloosa, and came to Birmingham as a merchant. However, he became interested in real estate development as he foresaw the future growth of the district.

In the middle 1880's Robert Jemison, Sr., and associates subdivided and began the development and sale of the East Lake section. They persuaded the trustees of Howard College to move the school from Marion to East Lake, promoted an athenium, and built East Lake Park with its 50-acre lake.

They built a 7-mile dummy line to Birmingham 7 miles westward. Directors criticized Jemison for buying 100-foot rights-of-way from Avondale through Woodlawn to East Lake.

"You should be criticized for lack of courage and foresight in not providing 500-foot rights-of-way," replied Jemison. "We could have sold 200-foot lots on either side of the 100-foot right-of-way."

Birmingham area commuters rode a multitude of dummy lines, electric streetcar lines, and horsecars. Jemison tackled the Birmingham district's transportation problems, and his efforts were climaxed in 1898 with organization of the Birmingham Railway, Light & Power Co.

Its lines are the cords that brought together the communities of Birmingham, South Highlands, Avondale, Woodlawn, East Lake, North Birmingham, North Haven, Smithfield, Elyton, West End, Ensley, Wylam, and Pratt City.

The depression of 1893 struck while Jemison was expanding his transportation system. During the hard times that followed, the company's celluloid fare tickets were accepted as cash almost everywhere in Birmingham. For more than 18 months the company paid off by accepting TCI store orders for ticket books and giving Jemison employees orders on stores.

Three times directors of the company voted to go into receivership, but each time their president and general manager talked them out of it.

Robert Jemison, Jr., was 6 years old when he came to Birmingham. He established the Jemison Realty Co. in 1903 when he was a young man of 25.

Where his father's principal interests had been in transportation and electric systems, the son turned to developing and building in every section of the metropolis.

In 1909 and 1910 he was the leading spirit in the development of Corey, now Fairfield. United States Steel's Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co. was building a wire mill there, and extensive additions to the industrial complex were expected.

But Judge Elbert Gary, United States Steel's head, ordered a halt in construction of the wire mill when it was 90 percent complete. Faced with a $500,000 debt and with stock selling for 10 cents on the dollar, the directors wanted to liquidate.

Jemison said that up to that time he had not been associated with any total failures or bankruptcies, and urged his board to defer any action. After lengthy negotiations, United States Steel ordered construction resumed April 11, 1913.

One of the prices demanded by Gary was that the name of the industrial city be changed from Corey to Fairfield, and with a bit of clever politicking by Jemison at a community meeting this was done.

Central Park was another Jemison development before he turned his energies to the lovely slopes of Red and Shades Mountains and Shades Valley.

Altamont Road and Redmont Park bear the Jemison stamp of tastefully designed homes and landscaped, tree-shaded estates.

In 1926 Jemison and his associates developed 250-acre Mountain Brook Estates. This was followed by the Mountain Brook Land Co., whose 2,200 acres were the foundation of the city of Mountain Brook.

When friends compliment Jemison on the development, he always tells them, "Give God Almighty the credit. All we did was disturb the natural beauty as little as possible."

When the 1929 depression hit, Jemison continued advertising his developments while other real estate men retrenched. He sold his townhouse and moved to Spring Lake Farms, the 500-acre farm that was both his country home and hobby. There he demonstrated the value of livestock, quality dairy products, pastures and fruit to the Southern farmer.

He also raised Arabian horses, and enough ponies to provide mounts for all of his grandchildren.

About 1916–17 one of the Jemison men inaugurated the "Own Your Own Home" campaign, which quickly grew to national proportions and is still in use as a sales aid.

Jemison staff members played an active part in establishment of Birmingham's 4-year medical center, and have assisted in its expansion.

Jemison was named president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce in 1906 when he was only 28 years old. He and his family have always been active in civic efforts of the city.

His father, also an active chamber of commerce member, decided after the 1893 depression that greater diversification of its industry would ease the pangs of such crises in the future. He and the late M. V. Joseph, chamber president, interested a Pennsylvania textile manufacturer in locating in Birmingham. Avondale Mills was a later result.

Father and son were named for Robert Jemison of Tuscaloosa, who represented Alabama in the Confederate Senate. This great-uncle of the present namesake also was a believer in and builder of Alabama.

Lke Robert Jemison, Jr., his confidence in the future never wavered even in the darkest hours when others laid down their arms.

Czechoslovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, October 28 marks the beginning of a most glorious period in the modern history of the Czechoslovak people. Forty-five years ago on that day the Czechoslovak National Council in Prague proclaimed the independence of the Czechs and Slovaks and the establishment of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. That historic event marked the culmination of the centuries-old struggle which these sturdy and stouthearted people carried on against the overlords of their historic homeland. This national goal was attained as the result of ceaseless determination to work for its realization and also partly as the result of devoted, wise, and persevering leaders headed by the late great Thomas Masaryk.

The rebirth of the Czechoslovak Republic soon after the First World War also highlighted most startling revolutionary changes in the heart of Europe. The polyglot Austrian empire was shattered; imperial Germany was no more, and at the time there seemed to be no danger from any direction to freedom and peace in this part of Europe. The Czechoslovak people took full advantage of this auspicious circumstance, and with the aid of their friends abroad, in a relatively short time they succeeded not only in rebuilding their wartorn country, but made it a model democracy in Central Europe where peace and freedom reigned. The country's economy was put on a sound basis, politically its stability seemed assured, and it became a prosperous, progressive state. But this happy state of affairs did not last long; Czechoslovaks enjoyed their hard-won freedom for only 2 decades, for the catastrophic events beginning in 1938 proved most disastrous to them. First, their country was dismembered, then they were robbed of their freedom, and with the beginning of the last war their fate was in the hands of ruthless Nazis. And we all know what has been their lot since the end of the war, especially since 1948, when they were forced to submit to Communist totalitarianism.

Throughout their long and turbulent history these people had not lost sight of their national goal, and they attained it in 1918. So today, even when suffering under an implacable and unrelenting totalitarianism, they are not downhearted, they are not in despair, but are confidently looking forward to the day when the chains which now hold them in check will be shattered and they will once more regain their freedom. I say this confidently because I have known many of these fine and hardworking people in my own State in California, especially in San Francisco where they have domiciled for generations and where they have proved themselves a real and indispensable asset to our community as loyal, industrious, patriotic, and gallant citizens of this great Republic. On the 45th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Independence Day, I join hands with these Americans of Czechoslovak descent and solemnly observe the anniversary of that historic event.

Lake Champlain Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, because there have appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements critical of the proposed Lake Champlain Waterway, so that both sides of the issue may be heard I have been asked to place in the RECORD the following statement by William Lathrop Rich, chairman of the New York-Montreal Seaway Committee, made during the hearings of the State of New York Joint Legislative Committee on Commerce and Economic Development held in the Senate Chamber in Albany on August 28, 1962:

LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERWAY

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Joint Legislative Committee on Commerce and Economic Development of the State of New York, honored guests and ladies and gentlemen, your chairman has invited me to participate in these hearings and to submit comments and recommendations on the proposed construction of a deep-water seaway between the State of New York and the St. Lawrence River in Canada, commonly referred to as the Champlain Waterway.

The Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway, of which I am chairman, has been advocating just such a deep-water seaway since the fall of 1956 and we have consistently recommended that it follow the historic route, used since its discovery in 1609 by Samuel de Champlain, because it was and is the shortest practical route between the St. Lawrence River in Canada and the Hudson River in New York State.

Six months after we had first proposed that this route be adequately modernized, we were informed that our recommendations were in accordance with those in a report made by the International Joint Commission in 1937, that concluded with the statement that the route from the St. Lawrence River at Sorel, Province of Quebec, up the Richelieu River to Lake Champlain and by way of the Champlain Canal to the Hudson River at Fort Edward, "is the most practicable from an engineering standpoint and the least impracticable from an economic point of view of all the five routes that had been considered."

Since its discovery, this route has, from time to time, been improved and its capacity increased but no improvements have been made upon the Canadian part since 1938 and on the United States part since 1918, that would alter its capacity.

This so-called Champlain Waterway has now become so uneconomical and obsolete that the New York State Legislature constituted a Joint Legislative Committee on the Barge Canal in 1960 to determine the future of the Barge Canal System, of which the Champlain Canal is a part. What conclusions that committee has reached are not known to us or whether it ever reached any.

It is my understanding that these hearings today are to assist your committee in your study of this proposed Champlain Waterway.

Our committee's 6 years' study of this proposed waterway has caused us to reach certain conclusions that I will now enumerate.

First, may I state that we firmly believe that the future economic expansion and prosperity of the New York State-New England section of our United States is contingent upon the building of an adequate deep-water seaway, that will connect the Hudson River in New York State and the St. Lawrence River in Canada and make available a "short cut" for ocean shipping to compete with the St. Lawrence River.

Up to the 5th of July, 1962 all of our efforts had been concentrated upon securing the updating of the 1937 survey because, without a current survey of this route, all statements pro and con about it would, of necessity, be based upon opinions and not upon facts.

On July 5 last, our efforts were crowned with success when the Department of State announced that the United States and Canada have agreed upon the text of a joint reference to the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, concerning the Richelieu River-Lake Champlain Waterway. The Governments in similar letters on July 5, 1962 requested the Commission to conduct a study on the feasibility of improving the existing waterway or developing other routes for a waterway from the St. Lawrence River in Canada through Lake Champlain to the Hudson River at Albany, N.Y.

We, therefore, have not made a detailed economic survey of this proposed seaway route, and we are of the opinion that it can be done best by the Corps of U.S. Army Engineers, by a survey similar to the one that they made for the Joint Commission in 1937.

We have heard numerous opinions as to the saving of time and money that this "short cut" between New York and Montreal would make possible, such as a saving in freight rates for newsprint from the Quebec region to the New York metropolitan area of from $9 to $10 a ton and an estimated reduction of 4 sailing days with a saving of $10,000 for a ship like the *Santa Rosa* of the Grace Line, for a round trip between New York City and Montreal, Canada, and that this saving in time and money would put such similar lines into a competitive position so that they could secure tonnage that is now not available or economically feasible for them to handle. These and similar comments are estimates and opinions and we shall have to await the completion of the new survey until we can deal in facts.

We have repeatedly asked ourselves, is this shortcut feasible, desirable, and necessary? To all of which we have concluded in the affirmative.

It is feasible because previous research studies have indicated that there are no great engineering problems involved.

It is desirable because it makes available to ocean shipping, sometimes called the salties, a shortcut from the heartlands of the American Continent also called the "fourth coast" to the ports around the world, by some few up to 2,700 miles for a round trip, with accompanying reductions of shipping costs.

It is necessary:

First, because it will be a latent factor in our national survival, which of necessity I will not detail here.

Second, because it will stimulate the economic revival of the regions through which it passes by making them more accessible and it will also make seaports possible, at any point along its route, from which direct shipments can be made to any port in the world.

We believe that the completion of this proposed seaway will result in the following benefits provided that this waterway is designed to have "adequate capacity" for the purpose for which it is intended.

Adequate capacity, to us, means capacity, ultimately, at least equal to that of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Canada, which in terms of controlled depth, at present, means not less than 37 feet deep.

It will:

1. Hasten the return of the port of New York to its former position as "the greatest seaport" in the world.

2. Provide justification for the modernization of all the facilities of the port of New York.

3. Justify the construction of the "world trade center" in Lower Manhattan.

4. Make available a fresh water supply for the States of New Jersey and New York and for Long Island and eliminate all future demands upon the Delaware River watershed for additional fresh water for this same area.

5. Stimulate the tourist trade to and from New York City and make practical the introduction of scenic tours, to the Adirondack Mountain-Lake Champlain-Richelieu River regions, to the Montreal-Quebec-Saguenay River regions, and, via the St. Lawrence Seaway, to the Thousand Islands—the Great Lakes ports and other lake points of interest, such as the great bridge across the Mackinac Straits and the new Soo locks near Sault Sainte Marie.

6. Encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States and make use of those tourist facilities to visit the heartlands of our country and Canada.

7. Stabilize the water level of the Hudson River at Albany, N.Y.

8. Make possible the development of a "steel center" in the vicinity of Albany, similar to that of the Pittsburgh area.

9. Make desirable the building of subsidiary pleasure boat plants in this same general area.

10. Reduce the number of locks between Waterford on the Hudson River and Lake Champlain.

11. Stimulate the economy and financial growth of the regions all along its route.

12. Provide jobs during its construction, the result of which will be growth of employment in all the regions through which it passes.

13. Stimulate population increase through economic expansion of all facilities and services near its path.

14. Make possible the transformation of all locations along its route into seaports.

15. Materially reduce the present industrial and natural contamination of the waters of the south end of Lake Champlain.

16. Provide a means of flood control for the Lake Champlain and the Richelieu River regions by the stabilization of the water level of Lake Champlain.

17. Result in the elimination of the annual losses in this same region due to spring flooding estimated to be more than $20 million since 1938.

18. Make accessible all these same regions to the motor and sailboat mariners, which they are now denied through lack of accessibility.

19. Benefit all transportation facilities, for movement in and out and through its regions, as well as all communication facilities.

20. Make possible the reduction of the number of locks around the Chambly Rapids in the Richelieu River in Canada.

21. Make possible the restoration of the necessary water level in the Sorel-Montreal regions, which can materially reduce the strength of the currents at the docks at Montreal and assist in the elimination of the pollution along the shores of Lake St. Louis due to the present alltime low water level of the lake.

Again I state that all those benefits can be secured by the construction of an adequate deepwater seaway.

May I now close my remarks by asking your serious consideration of the following points during your study of this proposed Champlain Waterway:

1. That the design of this proposed deep waterway provide it with an ultimate capacity, at least equal to that of the St. Lawrence River, with which it must compete to justify its existence as a "short cut" for ocean shipping sometimes called the "salties."

2. That the locks have a sill depth of not less than 40 feet; the present depth of the St. Lawrence River plus a 3-foot factor of safety. That sill depth will make it unnecessary to rebuild the locks when traffic demands that the capacity of this waterway be increased to equal that of the St. Lawrence River.

3. That the initial depth of this waterway be, at least, 32 feet between the locks. That depth is the depth that the Hudson River is now being deepened to, from New York City to Albany. Of the 450-mile length of this proposed waterway, within a short time more than half of that mileage will be 32 feet deep or deeper.

4. That provisions be incorporated in the planning that will allow the use of this passageway by small as well as the large boats.

5. That the bridges, necessary for the passage of vehicular traffic across this waterway, be of the bascule type, so as to eliminate any restrictions in overhead clearances and that their footings be placed far enough back from the banks of this waterway to permit free and clear passage of any ships that can make use of this waterway.

6. That provisions be incorporated in the design to assure the maintenance of a constant water level at both the Albany, New York, and the Sorel-Montreal, Canada, regions.

7. That the number of locks along this route be kept down to the minimum, to possibly only 2 large locks along the Canadian section, in place of the present 11 small ones, as the total lift in this section is not more than 80 feet, because the level of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Canada, is 20 feet above sea level. The New York State section may only require 3 large locks in place of the 12 small ones, because there the total lift will not be more than 98 feet. The water level of the Hudson River at Albany is only plus or minus 1½ feet, due to the tidal fluctuations. This 98-foot maximum lift, which is the lift up to the proposed level of Lake Champlain, is secured by the leveling off of the hump in the route of the present Champlain Canal, making the water level of Lake Champlain the maximum water level of the whole route.

8. That provision be made in the design layout of this waterway for the future twinning of the locks, without their rebuilding, when the increase in volume of traffic so demands.

9. That this seaway be set up as a self-liquidating project and to be so amortized that the initial tolls can be kept down to a minimum to stimulate its use as a short-cut.

10. That naval and commercial large ship navigators be consulted during the design of this seaway so that the mistakes inherent in the design of the St. Lawrence Seaway, be not repeated in this seaway project, particularly the lack of consideration given to the basic requirements for the proper navigation of large long boats through a restricted waterway.

For confirmation of that last statement, read "The Freshwater Cruise" of the U.S.S. *Macon*, by Capt. J. C. Wylie, U.S. Navy, in the April 1960 number of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. The *Macon* escorted H.M.S.S. *Britannia* up the St. Lawrence Seaway for the opening passage in June 1959.

We are aware that some interests historically oppose the use of waterways for commercial purposes, because they represent competition, but, when it can so easily be proven, that when any region is opened up and it prospers economically and financially, all means of transportation prosper and gain new business.

You ask, What is my interest in the seaway project?

1. It is to try to assure that this waterway shall have a capacity adequate to justify its existence.

2. Let all of us cooperate to assure that this seaway be so designed that it will not have to be rebuilt in the foreseeable future.

3. I have endeavored to compress the results of our 6-year concentrated study into this statement.

4. May I now end by stating that I shall be pleased to interpret and explain how we reached our conclusion at any other time at our mutual convenience and that I have attached copies of four other statements which contain additional pertinent information relative to this proposed seaway for the convenience of your committee. I thank you."

The Hazards of Noise Abatement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the September, 1963 issue of the Airways Traveler, official publication of the Airways Club, Inc., from Mr. Sheldon Shaffer, of Mansfield, Ohio. It contained a lead article which was indeed thought provoking and timely. As a frequent airline passenger myself, I had not considered some of the other fellows' problems when it comes to airline safety and the pressures which are brought to bear on the aviation industry regarding noise abatement.

This article goes a long way toward bringing about a better understanding of the dangers which are manifested when the interest of passenger safety and noise abatement are not adequately balanced in their correct proportions. I commend it to the Members of this body as interesting reading.

The article follows:

THE HAZARDS OF NOISE ABATEMENT

It is not unusual to read newspaper accounts of still another citizens' group decrying the effect of aircraft noise on public peace of mind. Many local political leaders have criticized the FAA for not exercising more stringent control over pilots.

Unquestionably property owners have many definite and inherent rights. Most of us own property and we would be most reluctant to sacrifice any of our privileges. But it is also a fact that 80 percent of the Amer-

ican population has never used air transportation and is not familiar with problems affecting safety of flight. Nevertheless the concerns of propertyowners near airports should be given consideration.

But does that consideration extend to placing the lives of airline passengers in jeopardy?

It is difficult to sympathize with people who deliberately choose to build in or move to areas near airports who then become vociferous critics of the use of the airports by aircraft.

While we are not psychologists, we do know that an interesting complexity exists in the noise abatement field. Many of the most violent complainers are not really upset by aircraft noise as much as by a vivid fear of an airplane crashing on them and their property. This fear exists even though it may not be expressly or even recognized. The terrible truth is that their relentless demands are making more certain their real fears will have substantive merit.

A recent Robert Serling article provided a fine example of the results of imagination on the conduct of the noise abaters. The FAA lined up certain citizens to report on their reaction to a sonic boom emanating from a supersonic military plane. Weather grounded the plane but most of the citizens reported they were annoyed by a sonic boom anyway.

It is growing more difficult to placate those making demands. The more extensive the concessions, the more asked. Capt. Ed Bechtold, who lost his life in a crash at Idlewild last year, despaired of ever satisfying the requirements of the noise abatement group.

The FAA is, by nature, a political organization. Its leader is selected by the President; its employees are paid out of public funds. The airline industry, in its natural desire to achieve and maintain public goodwill (and avoid conflict with controlling airport authorities) is extremely sensitive to the views of the noise abaters. These facts have created an ever-increasing acquiescence to ever-growing demands for stricter noise abatement regulations.

Some of the maneuvers now required of airline pilots are completed with but a thin margin of safety. If the trend is not checked, a planeload of passengers may lose their lives because of these insatiable demands.

Do you know that when runways 13R or 13L are in use at Idlewild, airliners are now required to fly right through the traffic pattern of Naval Air Station, N.Y., at 2,000 feet? Weekend Reserve pilots (the newsletter editor is one and there are hundreds of others) are instructed to remain at 800 feet but it is often chilling to observe how close civilian aircraft come to military aircraft. The principal reason for instituting this questionable approach was to satisfy the noise abaters.

Do you know that noise abatement procedures enforce the use of certain runways at Idlewild, even though wind and weather conditions may require takeoffs and landings in completely opposite directions?

Do you know that the FAA requires aircraft departing on runway 32L at Idlewild to make turns at 300 feet for noise abatement purposes?

Do you know that some airline pilots are required to climb their aircraft at speeds less than recommended maneuvering speeds?

Do you know that some airline pilots are required to make power reductions after takeoff at 600 feet to less than cruise power until passing over areas where the noise abaters are most sensitive?

Capt. Harry F. Clark, an airline pilot, and a vice president of the Air Line Pilots Association, has expressed his mounting concern to us about the problem. It is one thing to compile rules while sitting at a desk but pilots must try to adhere to them while in the air and while transporting thousands of passengers each day. The pilots are experiencing anxiety over practices which they consider unsafe. Unfortunately their concerns are given insufficient attention or are ignored. We don't choose to ignore them. We believe there is a greater and more natural kinship between pilots and their passengers than any other group.

Captain Clark told us, "As a result of the great amount of pressure being applied to the airline pilots, we found it necessary to recommend a noise abatement policy which is consistent with good, safe operating practices, yet will still provide considerable relief to citizens residing near airports. We want to be able to refuse to accept noise abatement procedures which require (among other things) (1) turns below 600 feet; (2) reduction of power, earlier or to a greater extent than is done on a normal takeoff; and (3) the use of runways for noise abatement when the runways are wet or when a tailwind exists greater than 5 knots.

"The Civil Air regulations state that the pilot shall be responsible for the safety of his passengers, crew members, cargo, and airplane. I can assure you that this is a responsibility that we do not treat lightly. Many uninformed groups and individuals continue to attempt to force the pilots to utilize procedures which are not consistent with good operating practices. We have opposed in the past and will continue to oppose in the future anyone who attempts to force us to operate an aircraft in a manner which we feel is not consistent with good operating practices.

"In areas of noise abatement procedures, the pilots are continually being pressured to do more. The pilots have already made great contributions to the reduction of aircraft noise. We are not asking for much, just a reasonable safety margin."

It certainly sounds like a simple and reasonable request. But no one listens to them and these unsafe practices continue. We think the situation has become dangerous. If ever a protest to your Congressman was warranted, this is it. Airline passengers are the financial and academic leaders of the country. Their lives are being placed in jeopardy, and the momentary interruption of a Saturday afternoon barbecue by a passing plane hardly commands equal significance.

A Christian College of the Pacific Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, this great Nation of ours was built on the dreams of men of great foresight. So long as Americans will continue to dream, we can look forward to a greater America in a better world.

A most inspiring story about the birth of an institution of higher learning in Hawaii is told in a circular recently distributed by the Christian College of the Pacific. In the hope that it may inspire others to dream great dreams, I offer that story for inclusion in the RECORD.

The story follows:

Hawaii, 4 years old, the youngest State of our Nation, feels its responsibility to the future.

Since statehood, Hawaii has witnessed a dynamic growth in economy and the position it holds in the Pacific.

Hawaii has a vision, a vision of greatness and the role it will play in the decades ahead—as an instrument of the United States and the free world—in leading those countries that border the great Pacific Basin to stability and hope.

Sharing in this vision are leaders of the Protestant churches in Hawaii. They believe that Hawaii should have a liberal arts college. A college to retain the vital leadership needed for Hawaii's future; a contribution to the whole Pacific Basin; to become a major factor in the cultural enrichment of the islands; cooperation with the East-West Center; and a diversity in educational approach and philosophy.

A number of studies culminated in the "Study of the Potentials for a Christian College in Hawaii," by A. J. Brumbaugh, in April 1962. With the cooperation of many church and lay leaders the need for more college opportunities for our island youth, those from the Mainland, the Orient and South Pacific, became apparent.

A coeducational, undergraduate, residential, interdenominational, liberal arts college of high standards and quality, for 1,200 students, would open the way for unusual opportunities in creative, imaginative planning, in curricular teaching, and personnel.

The dream becomes reality when factors of economic growth equate the idealistic needs.

They are equal.

There have been impressive increases during the decade 1950–60 in gross State income, family income, per capita income, bank assets, retail sales, and investments of venture capital in new developments.

Per capita income has increased by an annual average of 6.6 percent from $1,403 in 1950 to $2,274 in 1960. ($2,306 in 1962.)

Deposits in financial institutions increased from less than $500 million to more than $1 billion.

During the same decade tourism has increased from 50,000 visitors to over 300,000. (Over 400,000 in 1963.)

Hawaii's gross State product was $900 million in 1950. In 1961 it had doubled to $1,800 million.

Retail sales increased from $462.6 million to $858.6 million. ($890 million in 1962.)

Mainland and foreign insurance companies have invested $242 million in 1960 compared with $27 million in 1950. (Over $290 million in 1962.)

Manufacturing has increased from $71,600,000 in 1950 to $148,700,000 in 1960. (Over $168,800,00 in 1962.)

Construction is now over $268,500,000. In 1950 it was only $67,700,000.

Sugar and pineapple have stabilized, and are still an integral part of the total economy.

Private capital is continually being invested at an accelerated rate for the development of tourist centers on Oahu and the outer islands, in industry, and housing.

The dream to be complete must also include the human factor.

In 1950 the total population of Hawaii was 495,624; in 1960, 659,989.

In 1960, the State had 11 cities with populations over 5,000, 6 of them over 10,000; largest of these is Honolulu with 294,179.

Hawaii's population falls into six major ethnic groups:

Caucasian, Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, Hawaiian, and part-Hawaiian.

Caucasians include 32 percent; Japanese, 32 percent; Filipino, 11 percent; Chinese, 6 percent; Hawaiian and others, 19 percent.

Between 1950–60 Caucasians have shown the largest increase—77.2 percent.

Of great significance is the distribution of population by age:

43 percent under 20 years of age; 30.5 percent in the age bracket 20 to 39; 22 percent

between 40 and 64; less than 5 percent 65 or over; the median age of the population in 1960 was 24.3 years.

Hawaii's population, consisting of such a large component of youth, furnishes a high potential for growth in college enrollments.

Of 7,900 public high school graduates in 1960, a total of 2,884 or approximately 36 percent said they planned to go to college or university; 50 to 70 percent of the private school graduates planned to go to college.

There were 6,337 high school seniors in 1952; in 1962 the total was 9,510; and the projection for 1972 is 12,033. (Based on the constant retention rate of 75 percent.)

Total enrollment in higher education institutions for Hawaii was 12,553 in 1962. The projection for 1972 is 23,421. (The majority of college students are attending the University of Hawaii.)

To supplement these statistics, a group of community leaders and representatives from the Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and United Church, formed the initial steering committee. (The leaders of the church groups are: Rev. Frank Butterworth, superintendent of the Methodist Mission in Hawaii; Bishop Harry S. Kennedy, Episcopal Church Diocese of Honolulu; Rev. William E. Phifer, Jr., minister First Presbyterian Church, Honolulu; Rev. Joseph J. Bevilacqua, general secretary Hawaii Conference, United Church of Christ.)

Their task: To organize committees for the best possible site; to set financial goals; to prepare the bylaws and charter; and to give the moral and spiritual impetus to the college's inception.

To nurture the intellectual and spiritual growth, concepts and a definition of purpose had to be created—an identity. Consultations were held with a number of presidents of church-related colleges and deans, both in Hawaii and on the mainland, to further the conclusions already reached. The last being held in Honolulu, February of this year.

The Christian College of the Pacific was born.

It was agreed that this college would be a cultivation of the mind and the spirit; that a good liberal arts college must build its own quality; that the college shall have the freedom to be an educational institution—its own integrity free to carry out its basic function.

In education there would be support for interdenominational development; to expose the students to an opportunity of understanding persons of various racial, cultural, and national backgrounds; an open policy for students and the encouragement of foreign participation.

The Christian College of the Pacific must leave an inheritance to fit the needs of the Pacific world today; to complement the curriculum of the University of Hawaii; and to cooperate constructively with the East-West Center.

The Christian College of the Pacific will require a faculty of able economists, educators, sociologists, and scientists, who accept and hold to the basic ideals to which the college is dedicated. A faculty adequate, scholarly, and possessed of a great sense of their own position and leadership.

Students are to be recruited from Hawaii, the Pacific Basin area, and the mainland. They are to be a part of the living system of the college community; to be stimulated; to think; to use great ideas and develop their own research.

There will be tutoring services, self-study programs, an honor program, financial assistance for such quality students that may need it.

The site of the Christian College of the Pacific was selected with imagination—it will typify and maintain the traditions of Hawaii. It will be situated on the windward side of Oahu—across the Nuuanu Pali where one can look down at the grandeur of the campus and beauty of its buildings.

From the campus, one can see the magnificent view of the Koolau Mountains and take pride in the natural setting of its landscaping. Yet, the campus is only 15 minutes from Hawaii's capital city, Honolulu.

The college will open in the autumn of 1966, admitting only a freshman class. It will expand its enrollment year by year until all 4 years are in operation. When completed, the campus will include, 6 two-story classroom buildings; a two-story administration building; a one-story library and one-story cafeteria; 4 two-story dormitories; a one-story chapel; a one-story gymnasium; and 30 faculty housing units. There will be a minimum of 100 acres for campus development.

It has been agreed that a church-related liberal arts college in Hawaii of excellence in leadership, administration, curriculum, faculty, and student body, will make an important contribution throughout the whole Pacific Basin. It would be an asset of inestimable value to people everywhere.

The dream is becoming a reality.

Teenagers in Hawaii Deeply Concerned Over Rights of Fellow Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr Speaker, my mailbag has lately been filled with letters urging me to support legislation for a meaningful civil rights program. Among them have been letters from Hawaii's teenagers, whose mature thinking on the issue now confronting us here in the Congress is one worthy of note. I therefore include two of such letters in the RECORD. The first is from members of the Church of the Holy Nativity (Episcopal), 5286 Kalanianaole Highway, Honolulu, Hawaii, and reads as follows:

CHURCH OF THE
HOLY NATIVITY (EPISCOPAL),
Honolulu, Hawaii, October 4, 1963

Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MATSUNAGA: Hawaii has been called, "The Melting Pot of the Pacific." If this statement falls short of being the whole truth, it is conceivable it is because the Aloha State is the melting pot of the world. This is shown in our culture through our many nationalities and races living together in harmony.

Considerable faith in our population has been shown by the establishment of the East-West Center. We have been led to believe that a good portion of the world believes that we practice the fundamental ideal to which so many give lip service . . . the brotherhood of man. Although we admit our shortcomings in this respect, we do take pride in our accomplishments.

Having considered these ideals, we the members of the Youth Congregation of the Church of the Holy Nativity, respectfully request that you as a Member of the Congress should proclaim these ideals as the standard for our Nation. Further, we trust that you will declare Hawaii overtly favorable to full integration of all races and that our representatives will play a leading roll in the present struggle for social justice throughout the land.

We the undersigned, teenagers of Hawaii, deeply concerned for the future welfare of all Americans, beseech you to exert all your influence in bringing about strong civil rights legislation at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully,

Helen Crain, Sydney Cutsel, Cookie Inouye, Jack Warner, Leslie Rice, Charles G. Braden, Jr., Lawrence P. Crum, Claudia Hing, Susan Barkley, Pat Kennedy, Bill Johnson, K. Newsom, Betsy Saul, Sheri Tibbetts, Susan Warner, Laurel Dodson, Richard Evans, Susie Thomas, Jane Thomas, Nancy Kniskern, Henry Kniskern, Lou Lambert, Cleo Higgins, Reed Minuth, Daniel Pickering, Ryan King, Ken Kuniyuki, Fred Luck, Jack Tobin, Beverly Brown, Abigail Britton, Rocky Higgins, Fred Luck, Ronald Taber, Oinah Silva, Geraldyn Chun, Judith Pung, Karen Yanagida, Beverly Dung, Loraine Yamamoto, Charlotte Tanna, Lee Aguiar, Keith Matsuo, Mary McNiel, Connie Geisler, Willard Graul, Jan Hunter, Jan Gerard, William Chow, Joseph Wilhelm, Jr., Joe Barkley, Brian Guieves, Kobbie Littlejohn, Loraine Lont, Donna Lee Hart, John Fulton, Sharon Elliott, Robert Luck, Tom Evanson.

Mr. Speaker, the second letter is from members of St. Timothy's Church (Episcopal), Moanalua Road, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii, and it reads as follows:

ST. TIMOTHY'S CHURCH (EPISCOPAL),
Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii, September 29, 1963.

Hon. "SPARK" N. MATSUNAGA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The death of six young Americans in Birmingham on Sunday, September 15, in an incident of senselessly evil violence, has moved this congregation to show our concern for the conscience of the Nation and for our own responsibility during our regular Sunday worship services.

We agree with those national religious leaders of many faiths who gathered in Washington September 18 to register with Congress and the President, through the Attorney General, their conviction that this kind of incident must not occur again. We agree that every citizen of this Republic must have full protection of the laws of the United States as he exercises his rights and privileges as a citizen.

Following a period of silent mourning and prayer for the dead children, for their bereaved families, and all others besieged by sanctioned forms of discrimination and prejudice, we are writing this letter to let you know of our action, of our concern lest our mourning be empty. It is our deep hope that the Legislature of the United States will initiate and carry through to completion laws to insure that out of such dark violence social and racial justice can arise.

Members of St. Timothy's Parish:

Thomas R. Ritchie, Mrs. Robt. E. Ritchie, Edith Steele, Lucus E. Ekles, Ellen C. Hughes, Lucy M. Iaukea, Seep Lau, Mary Kirchhoffer, Laura Gonorrison, Shirley Williamson, Virginia L. Davis, Kirby Anderson, M.D., Edythe M. Turner, R. K. Hoffemer, Jocelyn Wong, Mildred Ozaki, Joe Mook, Marleney Wilea, C. H. Hedid, Jr., Roberta Williamson, Mary Anderson, Lt. and Mrs. Perry A. Beam, Mr. and Mrs. James A. Burger, Mary M. Yaeger, Angel G. Pablo, Mrs. Betsy Lei Pablo, Robert T. W. Wong, Mr. and Mrs. L. Barney McNeil, Jr., Ens. and Mrs. Frank J. Pickerel, Archie L. Stevens, George B. DeLano, Patricia E. Kerchhoffer, Diana DeLano, Patricia L. Grahovac, John Barry Grahovac, Richard Kerchhoffer, Craig Grahovac, Lou Grahovac, Miriam Blatt, Mrs. Murray Johnson, Richard A. Kerchhoffer, Jr., Vicar, St. Timothy's Church.

Constitution Day, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend in the RECORD the address given at the annual observation of Constitution Day in Constitution Town, Louisville, Ohio, by Richard H. Foltz, senior vice president of Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.

This is the 11th annual observance of Constitution Day since Mrs. Olga Weber inaugurated the program in Louisville. Mr. Foltz' address follows:

CONSTITUTION DAY, 1963: SPECTATORS OR PARTICIPANTS?

(By Richard H. Foltz)

I am delighted to be here with you today, and to have a small part in this outstanding program aimed at encouraging all Americans to better understand, appreciate, and to be inspired by the greatest freedom document of all time—our American Constitution.

I am aware of the history and accomplishments of your Constitution Day observance, and I am particularly pleased that the distinguished National School Awards jury of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge has seen fit to recognize this observance as an outstanding contribution in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life.

As one American who has a somewhat more than casual interest and participation in patriotic activities, I was especially impressed by your stated aim that this observance had as one of its goals the instilling in the hearts of all the peoples of the Nation a firm recognition of the Constitution and the role they play in government.

This emphasis upon the role that our individual citizens play in government is what I believe sets your program apart from other similarly orientated activities.

Too seldom in our busy lives do we stop and take occasion to pay tribute to the great ideas which provided us with our freedom—and, on those relatively rare occasions when this is done, too often we find ourselves orating loftily about the magnitude, ingeniousness, and awesome character of our freedom documents and their great ideas as ideas and as documents, and by this process overlooking the most essential fact: that these great ideas and great documents were the product of human personalities and that we as human personalities today must live and act in such a way as to maintain the vitality and validity of those same ideas.

It was Thomas Carlisle who, with great wisdom, defined history as "the essence of innumerable biographies." And by this, Mr. Carlisle simply points out the truth of the fact that great moments, great ideas, great civilizations and great causes do not generate spontaneously. They are the direct product of the imagination, ingenuity, dedication, and inspiration of people.

Throughout the course of history every age has been beset by great challenges. Some of those great challenges were unique to that particular age. Other great challenges are common to every age.

One of these common challenges in history has been man's eternal struggle for personal liberty. The group of men who met in historic Philadelphia on May 26, 1787, represented, in a very real sense, just one more attempt to create a governmental framework within which the burning desire to be and to stay free could be formalized.

I suppose that any body of human beings faced with the overwhelming task of formalizing a structure of freedom would enter into this exciting task with great expectations and great optimism. And, at the same time, I rather suspect that they would be awed with the formidability of their charge.

These men, in 1787, certainly could not be blamed if, in the process, they were scared too. After all, the freedom of their fledgling Republic was at best a shaky, tenuous thing, wobbling along rather uncertainly in delicate balance in the shadow of great world powers.

And, at home, among their neighbors, they could find cynics, doubters, appeasers, and even traitors. Yet, from this brewing cauldron of uncertainty and doubt, and hope, came what Gladstone has described as "the most remarkable work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

And who among us today cannot but feel that what set these men apart from others who had tried so many times before and failed so many times before was a divine spark—a divine spark igniting those minds and those hearts and those pens.

We can, of course, only surmise and we can only guess what went on in their minds. We can only assume an understanding of their thinking and their motivation. But of one thing we can be sure—these were brave men who individually and collectively met a massive challenge with a magnificent, historic response.

What they did represented a personal commitment to a great goal. Their commitment succeeded: we have our great Constitution, guaranteeing freedom of opportunity, and our Nation has progressed within this framework far beyond the greatest dreams of the people of any nations who have ever existed on the face of this earth since the beginning of time.

But in today's troubled times perhaps it is something of a luxury, though a happy one, to pause, consider, and reflect on the evolution and growth of our Nation under freedom unless, and only unless, we use these retrospective thoughts as a challenge for today and tomorrow.

Essentially, what are we as individuals going to do about keeping our constitutional freedoms and our constitutional Republic not only for ourselves but for the generations who will succeed us?

The only proper answer is personal commitment. And our own personal commitment to freedom today should be no less intense than that of those early day pioneer patriots.

Some observers of the current scene have noted with a great degree of apprehension the growth of what is sometimes called "spectatorism."

Quite simply, they are talking about the apparent increase in the numbers of people who attempt to go through life as spectators—observing, watching, seeing the course of history move about them, without actually being an active participant.

These are people who place self above service.

These are the people who are too busy to serve on a community betterment organization, to take an active role in politics, large or small, to help with the PTA, or the community charity drive, or the little league, or their church, or their Boy and Girl Scout groups, or their Constitution Day committee, to name just a few.

And, tragically, the spectator statistics also show that at least 35 percent of us do not even vote.

No, our Nation was not built by spectators. Freedom was not achieved by spectators. Certainly freedom cannot be maintained by spectators. The brave men who boldly signed their names to another of the great freedom documents in Philadelphia some years ago were not spectators. They were active participants in one of the most unique experiments and the greatest gambles taken by any people since the beginning of time. Most of them had a very great deal to lose should this experiment fail, this gamble lose.

Yet they did not stand idly by to be carried along with the slow-flowing tide of apathy and indifference. Their clear, ringing answer literally pledged to a noble cause their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Today there is certainly no dearth of opportunity for service to our country and probably at no time in the life of our Nation have we so badly needed courageous patriots and pioneers in every facet of human endeavor.

Our country desperately needs the men and women who will find and carry out the methods of eliminating bigotry and blind prejudice from the face of our land.

Our Nation urgently needs the new breed of scientist to probe the exciting and new dimensions of space and time.

Our Nation vitally needs dynamic new leadership to pilot our competitive enterprise economy to higher and greater levels of productivity and distribution.

And, our Nation certainly needs dedicated men and women to answer our vital new needs in education—to bring about greater religious and spiritual growth and understanding—to create new music, new paintings, new sculpture, new literature.

All of these challenges relate specifically and directly to maintaining the vitality of freedom in our land.

Certainly, there is no more appropriate time than this observance of Constitution Day to draw from our historic past the inspiration for our own personal dedication and personal commitment to devote a portion of our lives to maintaining personal liberty.

As each of us devotes a part of our lives to the task of maintaining and defending the basic values of our American way of life, then our Nation becomes stronger in freedom, and it becomes more certain, more sure, that this freedom will be passed along to others.

Freedom, once lost, is rarely rewon. The apathy, the indifference, and the inaction of any one single generation could destroy it for all time.

If we are to prevent this, if we are to keep our liberty, then our time and our energies and our dollars and our talents must be our personal commitment today.

Our own individual response to this challenge of personal commitment will show clearly whether we are going to be spectators or participants as our age etches its collective biography on the pages of history.

The most recent issue of your own local newspaper carries an editorial which precisely and exactly sums up my own personal views of today's program, as it said: "We are not so idealistic as to believe that some high-sounding phrases here might trigger a massive rededication to constitutional government. But we do have a suggestion that would cause a sudden awakening. We suggest that you read the Constitution."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon, recently delivered an address before the annual meeting of the National Association of Business Economists at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Cleveland, Ohio.

This address recently came to my attention. It is entitled "Perspectives on the Federal Budget" and presents many interesting points with reference to Federal expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(Address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget)

As a man who once practiced the arcane arts of economics, but who was defrocked by higher authority some 9 months ago, I perhaps ought to seek respectability in the eyes of this audience by speaking on an erudite economic topic. But while the will is present, the capacity—I must confess—has atrophied somewhat. Budgeteering, I discover, involves some economics, but also a great many other things—and it is the other things I have been trying to master since last winter.

So I propose to talk about the object of my preoccupations, the Federal Budget—that chastely-bound gray volume which is a major point of convergence of the needs, hopes, and fears of a complex, growing, and increasingly wealthy society.

As close readers of the press are aware, there has lately been some difference of opinion concerning that quality of budgets known as "tightness." There are those—including myself—who have contended that the Federal Budget which the President submitted to the Congress last January is a tight budget. Others have taken a contrary view, characterizing, the budget in terms ranging from "loose" to "profligate." I do not intend today to offer a full-dress brief in support of my position, nor am I capable of devising for public use a piece of fiscal litmus paper which will automatically identify a budget as either tight or loose. I have the much more modest purpose of offering some general reflections on the subject of budgetary tightness which have occurred to me in the course of the recent debate.

It is useful to distinguish three separate questions which are involved in this issue, and which sometimes become entangled with each other. The first is the question of what—What activities is it proper for the Federal Government to undertake? The second is the question of how much—How much money should we spend on these activities? The third question is how well—How well are we managing our activities so as to get maximum public benefit per dollar of outlay? Let me consider each of these questions in turn.

First, what activities is it proper for the Federal Government to undertake? It is this issue which typically raises the ideological dispute in its purest form—which separates the liberal from the conservative, the spender from the economizer. Let me suggest some perspectives on the nature of these differences.

In judging whether the scope of Government has been extended too far, it is useful first to consider what it actually does. I am stuck by the fact that three-quarters of our budget expenditures go to finance activities which were considered proper functions of the Federal Government as far back as the early day of the Republic—such activities as national defense, internal revenue, postal service, Justice, aid to veterans, and interest on the national debt. Have these objects of expenditure become less proper? Though an occasional voice is heard to the effect that the Federal Government took the first step toward socialism when it preempted the business of postal service, I think most people would regard this as an extreme view.

All of the remaining activities account for about a quarter of the budget. The range and diversity of these activties is suggested by a brief list: Heart and cancer research, air safety, abatement of water pollution, hospital construction and modernization, space exploration, maintenance of our national parks and forests, foreign assistance, redevelopment of depressed areas, retraining of the unemployed, school lunches, water supplies for water-short areas, meat inspection, nuclear power, college dormitories, flood control, urban renewal, weather forecasts, and protection against harmful cosmetics and drugs. And these are only a few.

We are talking here about the last 25 percent of the budget—the part, presumably, in which we should find basic disagreement about the proper scope of Government. Yet an inspection of this list, or of other representative lists, raises the uncomfortable suspicion that even here it is not easy to provoke fundamental disagreement. True, it is not impossible—at least some conservatives I know would be happier if urban renewal and area redevelopment were abolished. But on some controversial issues, like price supports for agriculture, rural electrification, and airline subsidies, conservatives may be found on both sides of the fence. On others, like space exploration, the disagreement seems to relate to the scale and pace of the activity rather than to the appropriateness of the activity itself.

Despite the common opinion to the contrary, it is my observation that a broad conservative consensus today would not really favor the elimination of Government functions representing any significant share of the budget. If this observation is correct, and if the conservative excoriation of the "Federal octopus" really relates only marginally to the present range of Government functions, then perhaps the main subject of contention is not the question of what, but the question of how much or how well? Let me turn to these.

How much money should we spend on the public business? The argument that we are spending too much usually focuses on the very large numbers which compose the Federal budget—we are spending $98 billion a year, or so much per minute, or so much for each man, woman, and child, or so many times as much as we spent in 1929, or 1939, or 1949. The argument that we are spending too litle typically focuses on problems and programs rather than numbers—our streams and air are polluted, our colleges cannot handle the expected surge of enrollment, our mass transit systems have broken down. Neither approach, it seems to me, comes fully to grips with the problem—large numbers may mesmerize, but they do not provide much illumination; exclusive preoccupation with needs ignores the hard necessities of choice in resource allocation. Let me see if I can suggest a more helpful way of approaching the problem.

It is, of course, true—and it has been so since 1792—that Federal expenditures have a way of increasing over time. Just as President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and as President Truman—with due allowance for the Second World War—outspent President Roosevelt, so did President Eisenhower in his 8 years outstrip President Truman's 8-year performance by the handsome sum of $182 billion.

Why the apparently inexorable climb in Federal expenditures? Part of the answer President Eisenhower himself provided in his 1960 budget message: "Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples of what President Eisenhower was talking about: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 5.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 11 percent; aircraft landings and takeoffs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 12 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors' insurance program will increase by 15 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 17 percent; and passports issued will increase by 27 percent.

Consider what has been happening to our population. By the end of this fiscal year, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939, we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our gross national product has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 60 percent in the last decade.

When President Kennedy took office, we had a $500 billion economy. In the very near future, we shall have a $600 billion economy. Surely this is not an irrelevant consideration in weighing the size of the Federal budget.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years.

Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program. Who in 1939 even dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of space flights, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product; in 1949, 5 percent; and in 1963, 9 percent.

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have trailed the growth of the economy in recent years. As a proportion of gross national product, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of gross national product; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of gross national product, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and displacing the State and local governments. In 1936, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the 9½ million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2½ million by the Federal Government. Since 1948, State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent.

In 1952, we had 16 Federal civilian employees for each 1,000 people in the population. By 1957, the figure was down to 14. Today we have 13 Federal employees to serve every 1,000 people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 175,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 700,000 employees—fewer than are employed in the telephone industry.

Just before the last administration left office, it issued a 10-year budget projection. It saw the possibility of budget expenditures reaching $109 billion in 1965. This was labeled the "high" projection—a characterization with which I would heartily agree. So far as 1965 is concerned, $109 billion is not only high—it is out of sight. Yet the report in question stated that the "high" expenditure projection included only programs "which individually might be termed reasonable and which will undoubtedly receive consideration in the next decade."

All of these considerations taken together do not prove that Federal spending today is at just the right level—indeed, this is an unprovable proposition. But they should, I think, give pause to those whose concerns about Federal spending have led them to fear for the future of the Republic. Reasonable men will differ on whether we would be better off with 1964 expenditures at $97, or $98, or $99 billion, but a fair perspective on recent budget trends gives little ground for the view that the size of the budget is seriously out of phase with population trends, with the growth of the economy, or with the scope of governmental responsibilities.

Now let me turn to the third of my three questions—How well are we managing the public business?

Over these last 9 months, I have been struck by the contrast between my own observations of the quality of management performance in the Federal Government and the widely held view that all government is by nature hopelessly inefficient. While I would not be so bold as to portray the Federal Government as a model of managerial excellence, I cannot fail to be impressed with the hard evidence of mounting employee productivity, the development in Government of management tools which are later adopted by private business, the problem-solving ingenuity of Government employees as manifested in employee suggestion programs, the stream of significant inventions which issue from Government laboratories, the lively professional approach of Government management officials, or, for that matter, the dramatic gains in efficiency which have occurred in the Defense Department under Secretary McNamara. While I will freely concede that I know of Government management situations which are in need of improvement, the broad picture that I see of managerial performance in Government simply does not fit the popular stereotype.

There are two reasons, I believe, for this divergence of shadow from substance. First, by deduction from first principles, it is sometimes concluded that Government could not possibly aspire to efficient performance, because it lacks the powerful stimuli of competition and the profit motive. If it does a poor job, it does not face the ultimate discipline of extinction by competitors, nor is it impelled by the prospect of profit to seek to lower costs and improve service.

The economist in me tells me—and I believe—that there is some merit in this argument. Yet I think it is overdrawn, and that there are countervailing forces at work. For one thing, competition is not absent from the Government scene; just as executives in the large corporation are moved to put forth their best efforts in their competition for recognition and promotion, so do Government officials try to make the kind of managerial showing which will help them up the ladder of advancement. Moreover, the absence of the profit-squeeze as a stimulus to cost reduction is balanced off by the presence of the ends-means squeeze, which amounts to the same thing. The manager in Government, squeezed by a workload rising faster than his budget, is driven to find economies which will bridge the gap. Necessity is as much the mother of invention in Government as elsewhere.

If the public servant lacks some stimuli which are present in the private economy, he has a source of benign discipline which is absent in the private sector. The public official must conduct his affairs in a goldfish bowl. He is acutely aware that any decision he makes may some day come under the searchlight of public scrutiny—whether by legislative committees, by comptrollers, or by the press. Even when his mistakes are buried, he can never be sure that they will not some day be disinterred. Life in the goldfish bowl can be hard on the nerves of the public official—but the ever-present prospect of having to rehearse each decision in public is a powerful force making for good management performance.

The other explanation I have encountered for the common image of Government as inherently inefficient is the impact on the public mind of what might be called the "horror stories." These are the specific examples one encounters in the press and elsewhere of gross and often ludicrous Government waste. I am sure you know the sort of thing I am talking about—ostensibly absurd foreign aid projects, apparently foolish research activities, enormous losses on surplus disposal, etc.

No one, so far as I know, has ever made a comprehensive catalog of these stories, but I have been trying in recent weeks to track down every one which comes to my attention. On the basis of this admittedly scanty and inconclusive sample, I am led to the conclusion that a very high proportion of the horrible examples are either flatly erroneous or materially misleading.

Let me take just one example from my collection. A few months back, there appeared in a number of newspapers a list of shocklingly wasteful Government expenditures. When the facts were finally assembled, each example fell apart.

Did the Government buy 1,000 TV sets for $400,000 for use in underdeveloped countries where there is no electric power? Yes, it did—they were battery-operated sets, to be used in connection with community education programs.

Did the Government buy suits for Greek undertakers? No.

Did the Government spend $62,000 to establish a colony of baboons? Yes—this was a research grant by the National Heart Institute, undertaken because baboons develop arteriosclerosis and are also subject to coronary artery disease with typical heart damage after a coronary occlusion.

Is it true that government officials in Kenya used our foreign aid money to purchase extra wives? No.

And so it goes. I do not mean to leave the impression that I think the Government's performance is flawless. If you read the audit reports of the General Accounting Office, you will find plenty of examples of fallible management. But they are usually the kind of understandable lapses which can and do occur in any large organization; they reveal managerial weaknesses and technical slips in judgment, rather than gross incompetence and irresponsibility. The GAO reports serve a constructive purpose, whereas the horror stories which have come to my attention serve only to undermine the citizen's confidence in his Government.

Up to this point, I have been offering some reflections on the three dimensions of a budget which measures its tightness or looseness. But there is another issue relating to the tightness of a budget around which there swirl both controversy and confusion. I refer to the relationship between budgetary tightness and the aggressive use of fiscal policy to achieve and sustain national prosperity. Too many people have come to associate aggressive fiscal policy and loose budgets, assuming erroneously that commitment to the former implies the latter. Let us consider what is involved.

Fiscal policy turns on the relation between receipts and expenditures, and that relationship can be varied in the appropriate direction whether the budget is loose, or tight, or somewhere in between. In a period such as the present, when both human and industrial resources are seriously underutilized, fiscal policy calls for a decline in tax rates relative to expenditure levels. From the standpoint of fiscal policy alone, this could, of course, be accomplished either through a sharp increase in expenditures or through a reduction in taxes. Fiscal policy does not require loose budgets.

Not only is a fiscal policy based on tax flexibility compatible with a tight budget, but—I would suggest—it actively encourages such a budget. The people of modern industrial nations will no longer tolerate sustained periods of heavy unemployment. Countercyclical fiscal policy there will be—and if tax policy is not used flexibly to achieve this goal, expenditures will.

In January 1958, in the midst of a recession, President Eisenhower submitted a budget for fiscal 1959 with expenditures estimated at $73.6 billion, only slightly higher than the previous year. No provision was made for antirecession tax cuts, and a budget surplus of one-half billion dollars as forecast. Actual budget expenditure for that

fiscal year turned out to be $80.3 billion—almost $7 billion above the original estimates. Receipts were $6 billion lower than estimated, yielding a $12½ billion deficit. A large part of the expenditure increase resulted from legitimate pressures for action to offset the recession—pressures which could have been satisfied, within the limits of a tight budget, by a tax reduction. I mention this, not in the spirit of criticism, but rather to point out that in the long run any government will find itself engaged in countercyclical fiscal action—if not through a flexible tax policy, then by a massive expenditure increase. All other things equal, it seems to me evident that planned variations in tax rates for countercyclical purposes lead to a better budgetary policy than hastily devise improvisations on the expenditure side.

The principle that tight budgets are consistent with proper fiscal policy has been well learned by the conservative governments of Great Britain, France and Germany. Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer hardly fit the definition of spendthrift radicals. Nor do their budgetary policies warrant such description. Yet they have all pursued fiscal policies which have maintained unemployment rates only a fraction of our own. Even mild slowdowns in economic activity have brought forth prompt changes in tax policy. Last April, for example, after the unemployment rate in Britain rose to over 3½ percent from its normal 1½ percent, the budget of the Conservative government provided for a tax reduction and a consequent deficit which, measured as a proportion of national income, was substantially larger than that implicit in the tax program now before the U.S. Congress. Indeed, our European friends are constantly amazed, and puzzled, that we find it so difficult to reduce taxes in the face of our persistently high unemployment rate.

Clearer understanding of the choices which fiscal policy offers could, it seems to me, remove a false issue from the current debate about the tax bill and budgetary policy. On the one side, conservatives ought to recognize that a proper fiscal policy can be pursued at various budgetary levels. When the current or prospective employment situation calls for it, tax reduction—even in the fact of an existing budget deficit—does not imply a "loose" budgetary policy, nor does it call for reductions in budget expenditures. On the other side of the coin, there are many liberals who could well learn the lesson that the need to achieve full employment does not of itself justify a massive increase in expenditures on projects which may yield, in themselves, low social returns.

There are enough legitimate issues between liberals and conservatives with respect to the proper role of Government in our society, without creating false ones. We urgently need tax reductions along the lines of the bill which was passed yesterday by the House of Representatives. It would be tragic if a false issue were allowed to hinder the achievement of the full employment and rapid economic growth toward which this bill is accurately aimed.

The 18th Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, October 24, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative DONALD M. FRASER, led a special order observance on the House floor upon the occasion of the 18th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. I believe that Representatives FRASER and DANTE FASCELL, Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, are to be commended for encouraging Members to commemorate this important anniversary.

If modern man is not yet obsolete, Mr. Speaker, he owes a debt of gratitude to the U.N.

The United Nations came into being under a charter that described the organization as a "center for harmonizing the actions of nations" in the achievement of common ends. I believe that, regardless of its less publicized successes in the field of economic development, health and education, the U.N. has earned its keep by its role in the Korean conflict, the Middle East turmoil and in the Congo.

And by so doing the U.S. national interest has been served.

During the 18 intervening years between San Francisco and today, the U.N. has grown in the direction of a future system of world order and peace. Flawed and imperfect as are all human institutions, the U.N. at a minimum provides a forum for disputes after other means have been found wanting. True, it cannot impose settlement of an issue. True, it is effective in the measure that its 111 member states permit it to be effective. However, in the cases I have just cited, the record is indisputable that the U.N. has often intervened in hostilities and restored order.

And its accomplishments are enhanced by the gamy enemies it has made during its lifetime.

To anyone who might cast a vote to weaken in any way or destroy the U.N., the question should be put: What is suggested to take its place? Military power in an awesome age of nuclear weapons that can literally depopulate the earth? The arrows launched by the bowmen at Agincourt struck their target with limited damage. Can any one say the same today when both the Soviet Union and the United States possess a nuclear arsenal of overkill that could kill each other's populations many times over?

As I stated during the discussion on the United Nations bond issue legislation last year, any legislative attempt to constrict the actions of this Government in the U.N. is an attempt to sabotage the position of preeminent leadership which the United States has exercised from the beginning in the political organs of the United Nations. Beginning last year there have been disquieting expressions within Congress that the United Nations should not be relied upon to deal with major matters.

In recent years both a Republican and a Democratic President have spoken out in support of the U.N.

Former President Eisenhower, speaking of the U.N. financial problems in one section, observed that "our country has played a leading role in the development of this great forum and we must not fail it now."

President Kennedy in September 1961 declared that "our dedication to the charter must be maintained. New strength and new roles for the United Nations" are required.

I suggest that on this observance we rededicate ourselves to the strengthening and improvement of the United Nations and its ancillary organs. This present crisis of confidence is caused as much by faint-heartedness on the part of some of its friends as by its implacable enemies. In this connection we would do well to seek sources of independent financing for the United Nations so that financially it would have a greater degree of initiative.

A policy of strengthening the United Nations means affording it the latitude to improve the chances that there will be no major war at all. And in so doing, we should not compile the statistics on U.N. achievements as if they were baseball batting averages. The U.N., for example, succeeded in the Congo; it failed in Goa. The percentage is 1.000, as far as I am concerned, given the historic, frightful disarray of international relations for centuries. The percentage is not .500. What was accomplished in the Congo could not have happened without an international organization. What happened in Goa would have happened without an international organization.

Already the U.N. has shown its potential for evolution—the enlargement of the Secretary-General's position to that of an operating executive, the establishment of ad hoc military detachments under the aegis of the United Nations and the adaptability of the General Assembly in the face of the veto power that all the major powers want in the Security Council. The evolution is in the direction of increasing the ability of the United Nations to save "succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

Alaska's Trade With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on Saturday, the week before last, it was my good fortune to be in Juneau, the capital of Alaska, on the concluding day of the highly successful annual meeting of the Alaska State Chamber of Commerce. The meeting brought scores of people to Juneau from other parts of Alaska and from the other States. It was highly successful.

At the October 19 luncheon, Gov. William A. Egan delivered a speech concerning the developing trade relationships between Alaska and Japan, two near neighbors across the Pacific. Governor Egan spoke about the potentials of this exchange of goods, which is bound to increase during the years, and will be beneficial to both Alaska and Japan. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Egan's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to speak to you today about one of the most interesting and promising aspects of our State's economic development. In recent years, Alaskans increasingly have looked westward across the Pacific. Japan's market and investment capital are already important factors in the development of Alaska's resources.

A warm and friendly relationship has developed in Alaska's economic dealings with Japan. Conclusive evidence of this came recently with the organization, in Japan, of an Alaskan club.

Last week I received a letter from Tadao Sasayama, president of the Alaska Pulp Co., advising me of this action. And if I may I would like to read excerpts from that letter.

"Your visit to Japan in May and June of this year, followed shortly later by the Japanese businessmen's tour of Alaska," said Mr. Sasayama, "has brought about at least one encouraging result: the birth of an Alaska club.

"The inauguration was a great success," he continued. "Keen support for the whole idea and enthusiasm for closer relations between Alaska and Japan were clearly marked.

"As you will see, so many influential people have been recruited, and I am especially pleased that all of them, without exception, gave a very willing 'yes' when they were requested to join."

The club is composed of top executives of many of the largest Japanese corporations and financial organizations. Its objective is the promotion of trade, economic and technical cooperation, and tourism with Alaska and the adjacent areas of British Columbia and the Yukon.

This action in Tokyo earlier this month is just one more section added to the strong economic bridge we all hope will be established between Alaska and Japan.

As we all know, the effort began with the large Japanese investments in the Alaska Pulp Co. mill at Sitka and in the Wrangell Lumber Co. These two facilities have had an important impact on Alaska's economy. Approximately 1,000 Alaskans are employed in the mills and related cutting firms. Last year about 40 million board feet of lumber and 118,000 tons of pulp were exported to Japan, and exports of these two companies resulted in $850,000 in wages for longshoremen. The products from the mills have been the major reason why Alaska's total exports have increased from $6.5 million in 1959 to $25 million in 1962.

Recent events indicate that Japanese industry is becoming more active in other resources and areas of Alaska. A corporation has been formed by a Japanese fisheries company, one of the world's largest, and associated companies to process and export Alaska marine resources—at the start, salmon eggs and dressed chum salmon. The first shipments of salmon eggs have been sent from Alaska to Japan. This operation will utilize Alaskan labor. This year, the Ketchikan Spruce Co. has already shipped approximately a quarter of a million dollars worth of lumber to Japan. New interest has been shown also in the so-called minor species of Alaskan timber—birch, aspen and cottonwood. Negotiations for export of liquefied methane from Alaska to Japan, which would mean a major investment in Alaska, appear to be at a conclusive stage.

It is a certainty that trade between Alaska and Japan will annually increase in volume. Foreign trade has become a significant factor in the economies of many States in our country. We all share a desire for Alaska's role to become increasingly important in this respect.

My optimism stems from developments on both sides of the Pacific. Growth of the Japanese economy since World War II has amazed the world. The Japanese Government quintupled. The amount invested in private investment in the postwar era. Between 1955 and 1961, private fixed investment quintupled. The amount invested in 1961 exceeded that anticipated by the Japanese Government in its 10-year economic plan. Manufacturing—iron and steel, electrical machinery and chemical production—has grown faster than other sectors of the Japanese economy.

The rapid growth of Japan's industry has caused an increase in her imports. Of 30-odd minerals needed to sustain its manufacturing activity, Japan can barely meet industrial demands for 12. Almost all of the oil, iron, copper, bauxite and coking coal used there is imported. Most of its crude oil is obtained from the Middle East where a Japanese-owned oil company is operating. It obtains iron ore from Malaya, Chile, Peru, and India; copper from the Phillipines and Canada; and coking coal from the eastern United States and Australia.

Alaska could supply the above-named raw materials now shipped to Japan from far-off places. It has been determined that the prices paid by Japan for imported iron ore, copper, and caking coal would provide profitable operation of some of the known Alaskan deposits. For example, last year Japanese importers were paying an average price of $17.44 per ton for Indian iron ore. Comparable ore from Alaska has been estimated by a recent report to be available in Japan for $15.40 a ton.

In the future, Japan will have to greatly increase material imports, if projections of the growth of the Japanese economy are realized. The Japanese Government's present 10-year plan anticipates an increase of 231 percent in iron and steel imports from 1959 to 1970; nonferrous metals 370 percent; and timber 148 percent. The Government is now considering revising the plan, because predicted need has been exceeded in every year since its adoption.

Another significant trend is the rise in wages of Japanese workers, 14 percent between 1960 and 1961. If this trend continues, increased imports of more finished and semi-finished products is inevitable.

The possibility of utilizing large blocks of electrical energy, either directly to plants financed by Japanese capital in Alaska or in the form of exported goods, becomes more attractive when looking at Japanese power costs as well as increasing wages. Japanese industries pay about 9 mills per kilowatt-hour for industrial power, a cost which may rise because thermal power production is expected to increase faster than hydroelectric in this decade in order to meet rapidly increasing demand.

The Alaskan side of the Japan-Alaska trade picture is also cause for optimism. One of the principal factors is the growth of our State's economy. As our population grows, Alaska becomes more attractive as a market for Japanese goods. Development of two-way trade between Alaska and Japan would reduce transportation costs because ships would not have to come to Alaska empty. During my recent visit, I called to the attention of Japanese businessmen that Alaska's population increased by more than 75 percent in the decade 1950–60 and by about 10 percent since 1960, the fifth highest rate of growth of any State in the Nation.

Progress in Alaska's transportation facilities also contributes to the attractiveness of our State as a market. The Marine Highway System presents an interesting opportunity to Japanese exporters. For example, a ship coming to Sitka, to pick up pulp from the Alaska Pulp Co. could unload products that could be distributed over the Marine Highway to all the cities of southeastern Alaska. In effect, a single market of 35,000 people has been created.

Encouraging import from Japan of certain commodities is necessary in our efforts to foster location of additional Japanese industry here. There is opportunity to import goods and at the same time greatly expand a stable labor force within Alaska.

The increasing flow of information to Japan also improves prospects of more Alaska-Japan trade. My administration regularly transmits to companies and government agencies in Japan reports covering Alaska's principal resources and the State's economy. In addition, we have made sure that Japanese industrialists receive related reports prepared by Federal Government agencies. For instance, when I was in Japan, I was encouraged at seeing a report on the market for Rampart power, prepared by the Corps of Engineers, and transmitted by my office, translated into Japanese and distributed to leading companies.

Our search for products to develop through international trade extends to resources that to the outsider might seem impractical. My office outlined a study of the potential of developing sea lion meat for the Oriental market. The report has been financed by the Federal Government and is being prepared by contract under the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Considerable interest has been aroused in Japan, as the quota for whales taken by the Japanese from Antarctica has been sharply cut. Additionally, a possible market for sea lion hides has been discovered in Europe for making women's coats and shoes. The sea lion project recently gained considerable national and international attention through a bulletin published by the consulting firm doing the study.

The importance of good factual information reaching in Japan the people able to properly evaluate and act on it cannot be overemphasized. In every firm I visited, the management asked highly detailed questions about Alaska's resources. Obtaining and disseminating such information continues to be given high priority. I was especially impressed with the interest of Japanese companies in Alaska's timber resources. In addition to a rapid rise in demand for wood products, I was told that there was a good deal of dissatisfaction with imports from Siberia. The Russians have changed the price frequently.

While Alaska's approach to Japanese industry is bearing fruit, it is an effort that requires continuing attention.

An immediate need exists for additional information on resources with which Japanese businesses are acquainted and which could compete with imports from other areas if present assumptions of quality can be confirmed. In this connection, I was pleased to learn that the Overseas Mineral Resources Development Co., which represents minerals companies and the Japanese Government, is planning to send a team to Alaska next year to do further work on copper deposits. In this field of minerals exploration, I would like to see an enlarged joint effort by American and Japanese companies and Government agencies. By deciding on areas of operation, money devoted to exploration could be better spent and all would gain.

More education on costs of doing business in Alaska is much needed. The Japanese constantly refer to extraordinarily high cost of labor and other expenses. On many occasions it was obvious the Japanese were somewhat misinformed as to actual costs in Alaska.

One way to break down the walls of misinformation is to greatly expand our visitor traffic from the Far East. Two important events in the immediate future will increase the desirability for such travel—the Olympic games in Tokyo next year and our centennial celebration in 1967. To fully capitalize

on these opportunities, we must convince our Federal Government of the need to permit stopovers in Alaska by passengers on foreign airlines that pass through Alaska.

For many years the congressional delegation and I have fought for such a decision from the Civil Aeronautics Board. We intend to continue our efforts until the Federal Government recognizes that permitting stopovers in Alaska would be in the best interest of the United States.

I would urge that businessmen become more active in seeking opportunities for trade with Japan. The Government can provide information, but only the businessman can say yes to a proposal. Also, I am sure that much valuable information on individual resource locations can be made available by those who have ownership or other personal interest in them. It would be beneficial for teams of well-informed businessmen, Alaskans or from other States who have interests in Alaska, to visit Japanese companies that import materials Alaska can supply. This year, a great many leading Japanese industrilaists and financial men visited Alaska for the express purpose of surveying opportunities here.

Japan will play a significant part in our economic future. But there is no magic or mystery in bringing this about. It will take continued research on Alaska's resources and effective dissemination of information. With the cooperation of all Alaskans interested in economic progress, I know this will be done.

Tribute to the First President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, today, on the 45th anniversary of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, I would like to pay tribute to its founder and first President, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. To men devoted to the cause of liberty, there can be no symbol out of the past more inspiring than that of President Masaryk.

He was born in 1850, poor in the material things of this world, but rich in intelligence and spiritual strength. Through hard work, he managed to overcome poverty; he graduated from the University of Prague. Fortified with a clear understanding of the Western humanitarian tradition, he concentrated his enormous energy on bringing the benefits of freedom and democracy to the Czechoslovakian people. He was an ardent patriot, pleading Czechoslovakia's cause before the nations of the world and often working closely with President Woodrow Wilson.

During World War I, the Czechoslovakian National Council, which he led, was recognized by the Allies as the de facto Government of Czechoslovakia. On October 28, 1918, he was elected the first President of the Republic, and was reelected until he retired in 1935 at the age of 85. Just before his death in 1937, he addressed a radio message to the American people, saying:

Czechoslovakia proudly accepts the ideals of Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson. Let others find a solution to their own problems, but let us not allow them to touch our most important treasures: freedom of soul, freedom of word, and freedom of race.

Although Nazi and Soviet domination have destroyed Masaryk's dream of a free Czechoslovakia, the love of liberty, which Masaryk brought to the Czechoslovakian people, cannot be destroyed.

A Confusion of Tongues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the State of Columbia, S.C., dated October 25, 1963. This editorial is entitled "A Confusion of Tongues." It raises a very important question about our national relationship with God. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONFUSION OF TONGUES

Tomorrow, October 16, has been officially designated by President John F. Kennedy as national day of prayer, and therein lies the possibility of a religious controversy involving all three branches of the Federal Government legislative, judicial, and executive.

Congress, as that branch closest to the people in point of time and distance, always has reflected the American tradition that this is a God-fearing nation. Proof of this lies in periodic congressional affirmations of faith, such as authorizing the words "In God we trust" for U.S. coins, appropriating funds for chaplains in the Armed Forces, opening sessions of the Congress with prayer, and, just a few years ago, amending the national pledge of allegiance so that it refers to "one nation, under God * * *."

The U.S. Supreme Court, on the other hand, has twice declared that government, whether local, State, or National, must maintain a position of absolute neutrality in things spiritual, granting irreligion equal standing with religion.

"Each separate government in this country," said the Supreme Court, "should stay out of the business of writing or sanctioning official prayers and leave that purely religious function to the people themselves and to those the people choose to look to for religious guidance. * * * When the power, prestige, and financial support of government is placed behind a particular religious belief, the indirect coercive pressure upon religious minorities to conform to the prevailing officially approved religion is plain * * *."

Now comes the President of the United States, proclaiming a national day of prayer. A congressional mandate calls upon him to set aside a suitable day each year, other than a Sunday, as a national day of prayer, on which the people of the United States may turn to God in prayer and meditation, as churches, in groups, and as individuals.

On his own motion, the President added: "On this day, let us acknowledge anew our reliance upon the divine providence which guided our Founding Fathers."

There are atheists, Communists, and others within the United States who deny the existence of any divine providence. By enlisting the support of the Supreme Court in their bid for governmental abstinence from all things religious, they have disrupted the spiritual customs of our schools and our public proceedings.

And where do we stand today? We have a Congress which declares a national belief in God. We have a Supreme Court which represses any official expression of such belief. And we have a President who says, on the one hand, "It is important * * * that we support the Supreme Court decisions even when we may not agree with them," and on the other, "let each of us * * * give thanks to his Creator for the divine assistance which has nurtured the noble ideals in which this Nation was conceived."

Are we, or are we not, one Nation, under God?

Of What Avail a Boycott?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following editorial from the October 22, 1963, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

[From Chicago Sun-Times, Oct. 22, 1963]

OF WHAT AVAIL A BOYCOTT?

Today's planned boycott of public schools originating in the city's Negro community is an angry, emotional reaction to the refusal of the board of education to accept the resignation of Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis last week. The boycott has been ordered to back up 13 demands on the school board; No. 1 on the list is replacement of Willis.

Taking their children out of school for a day is a foolish and futile way for parents to try to impress the school board, the City Hall or the public generally. The children will lose a day's schooling—and more, if some of the extremists renew the boycott later. The school system will lose State funds; if 30,000 children stay home, loss to the system would be about $30,000.

There is a fundamental moral issue involved. The law requires children to attend school. If parents keep them home they will be staging a mass exercise in illegality. What kind of example is this for parents to set their children?

Lawrence Landry, the chairman of the committee planning the boycott, says it will teach the children "to demand their rights, to expect to be taught to read and write, to expect a (good) teacher in their class and to expect a good education."

Even granting the charges of Landry and others that education is substandard in some schools, we cannot agree that the way to improve the situation is to teach children civil disobedience, to instill in them the notion that community problems may be solved by marches and demonstrations.

The children, however, are only pawns in the dissension over school matters that is tearing this city apart. For as vehement as the anti-Willis demonstrators are, there are large elements in the community that are as strongly for Willis. The school board, at least for the foreseeable future, has reflected the views of those who want Willis to stay on the job. What is needed now is a willingness of both sides to get together to work out—with Willis—practical solutions to Chicago's school problems, not all of which,

as this newspaper pointed out Sunday, are related to the growing needs of the Negro community.

We note that some Negro aldermen, all Democrats, are supporting the boycott. The Chicago Defender says, "Their all-out endorsement may indicate that Mayor Richard J. Daley doesn't object to a vigorous anti-Willis protest. Or now, that Willis is firmly back in the saddle, that he views it as a good way to allow the Negro community to let off steam."

If the boycott is merely a letting off of steam against the Willis retention, it should have no permanent ill effect. But persons who believe in civil rights should realize that adding boycotts to silly sit-ins as a method of influencing public policy is hardly the democratic way of handling public affairs. If those who want Willis to stay on the job were likewise to resort to boycotts and sit-ins to get their way, the result would be anarchy. As we have said time and again, the best place to solve civic problems is at the conference table.

High Tariffs Placed on American Poultry by European Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call attention to an article which appeared in the August 23, 1963, issue of Life magazine. This article discusses the high level of tariffs placed on American poultry by the European Common Market. Two of the pictures printed with the article pertain to the turkey industry in the State of Minnesota. One of the pictures is of Mr. Earl Olson, of Willmar, Minn. Mr. Olson owns the Farmers Produce Co., one of the largest turkey processing plants in the world. This is indicative of the importance of my State to the turkey industry. Thousands of people depend for their livelihood on the growing and processing of turkeys in my State. Any artificial barrier to the exports of poultry products is a serious detriment to this industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Life magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine, Aug. 23, 1963]

YANKEE BIRDS CAN'T GO TO COMMON MARKET

Cooped up by pressures of international economics, thousands of unwanted birds stayed home to roost in U.S. henhouses and turkey pens last week. In a frank declaration of economic war, the European Common Market had raised tariffs against imports of American poultry from 15 to 45 percent.

Because of new tariffs and Europe's adoption of U.S. production methods, Earl Olson—who raises chicks and is also a major U.S. turkey processor—has watched exports of his Nicholas broad white turkeys, formerly a bestseller with German housewives, drop from 500,000 2 years ago to 50,000 this year.

Near Siloam Springs, Ark., Bill Simmons kneels in the midst of 12,000 cornish white rock cross broilers, no longer destined for overseas. Arkansas, which once sent millions of chickens to Europe, is now exporting 90 percent less to the Common Market. The predicament fell heavily on Arkansas Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee and long an internationalist. He found the clucking of his constituents too much to ignore and now backs proposed retaliatory tariffs against European autos, electric razors, photographic film, and even scissors and yarn.

Multiple-Use Offers Maximum Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, for several months a study team has been investigating the North Cascades of Washington State with the mission to determine the best utilization of all resources in the area. Included in this study were hearings at Wenatchee, Mount Vernon, and Seattle, Wash. I am pleased that these hearings were well attended and that both the advocates of multple-use and the advocates of a single-use program for management of the North Cascades were able to present their views.

I have long favored the multiple-use approach in the management of our national forests and am opposed to the creation of a national park in the North Cascades. I believe the majority of people of Washington State agree with me. I also believe they agree with Virlis L. Fischer, a veteran mountain climber and outdoorsman, who testified in favor of multiple-use bfore the North Cascades study team on October 10, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Fischer's statement in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF VIRLIS L. FISCHER, OF LAS VEGAS, NEV., ON OCTOBER 10, 1963, CONDUCTED BY THE NORTH CASCADES STUDY TEAM

By way of qualification, I am a native Westerner who, from the age of 4, grew up in Oregon. I have spent two-thirds of my life in the Pacific Northwest, mostly in Portland. Although now living in Las Vegas, Nev., I have continued to spend my summers in the Northwest. As a veteran mountain climber, wilderness traveler, bird watcher, nature enthusiast, and outdoor recreationist, I am well acquainted with the North Cascades study area. Beginning with White Pass and the Cougar Lakes area on the south all the way to Mount Hozameen on the Canadian border, I have been in the area many times and from numerous access points on both east and west sides. I am a former president of the Mazamas, well-known mountaineering club of Portland, and a life-member of the Sierra Club, albeit a dissenting one. I am a member of various nationally known conservation organizations such as the American Forestry Association, the Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy, and Western Forestry and Conservation Association. For the last-named organization, I serve as a member of its Western Land Use Committee. As the name suggests, we are especially concerned with land use problems in the West, of which the subject of this hearing is a prime example.

I understand the study team was instructed to study all of the resources of the area, along with making a study of the regional economy. While I am not in sympathy with the campaign of propaganda and pressure which resulted in authorization of this study, nevertheless, I am glad that the study is to be broadly based and all-inclusive. A study of a single resource which ignored the other resources would, in my opinion, shortchange the region and the Nation. I am sure that the study will reveal a wealth of substantial, multiple resources of vase importance, and the existence of a resource-based regional economy. I am sure that these particular national forests would rank high in valuation on any list of our 154 national forests. I am sure also that these same forests rank very high in their capability of producing a continuous supply of these multiple resources in perpetuity. The seriousness of any scheme for their dismemberment for special and highly restricted purposes is, therefore, obvious. Neither can the threat of dismemberment of other national forests be ignored, if successful here.

As for the kind of management I think is in the best public interest, I am convinced that coordinated multiple-use offers the maximum combination of social and economic benefits. I, therefore, supported the Multiple Use Act of 1960 for the management of the national forests. I am also a supporter of similar legislation now pending in Congress for the management of the public domain. It is my conviction that the future will see more intensified management of this type, rather than less. Further, I think that the custodial stage of the national forests was destined for a short existence when we failed to stabilize the population and the standard of living at about 1910 levels. It seems to me that the type of thinking which today is advocating that the commercial forests of the northern Washington Cascades be put away in mothballs is as outmoded as the horse and buggy.

While I am an admirer of the National Park Service and think it does a very fine job in its field, I favor expansion of National Park Service administration only in those areas where it can be clearly shown that this type of management outweighs all other values; where a competent recreation agency is not already on the job; where protection of unique features is not being provided; where recreation development is badly needed but lacking; where the area is too large for local or State acquisition and development; and where it will make a real contribution toward increasing, not just duplicating, the number of outdoor recreational opportunities. Two outstanding recent examples are Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, and the pending Canyonlands area in Utah. When developed, both of these will make a lasting and substantial contribution toward expanding outdoor recreation in America.

But, I definitely frown on taking well-managed national forest lands away from one public agency and turning them over to another public agency for either an advertising gimmick, or to satisfy the greed of insatiable redhots. I am opposed to the loss of the multiple-use benefits under Forest Service management, and to the loss of established and potential recreation such as winter sports, motorboating, water skiing, hunting, and sport fishing on today's extensively stocked basis. The need is for more recreation, not less. We need to lengthen the season of use, not curtail it. Consequently, I look with disfavor on the raiding of the national forests for this purpose, and I think westerners in particular need to be ever on guard against these periodic conspiracies for dismembering the national forest system, even when advanced by urbanized, nonresource, oriented westerners. And, most seriously of all, as a wilderness recreationist I am opposed to regarding as fair

game the dedicated units of our national forest wilderness system, and I would deplore the loss of their identity and integrity. I am not, however, in opposition to the establishment of national recreation areas where the rules of management would permit compatible resource use, where the criteria of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation are met, and where administration would be determined by existing departmental jurisdiction.

As a longtime citizen of the neighboring State of Oregon, it is my feeling that national parks in Washington are not in the widest possible favor because of the inclusion in Olympic National Park of some 300,000 acres of what could easily be the Nation's most productive tree farm (over and above what is needed for a generous park display of rain forest). I personally think that this egregious error should be rectified before any new national parks are ever considered in the State of Washington. To do otherwise would be "compounding the felony." It would be my thinking that nothing short of an acre-by-acre trade should ever be considered, if at all.

There is one additional point that worries me, as a stockholder in America's national forests, and that is what appears to be a conspiracy to circumvent the laws of Congress, namely the Multiple Use Act of 1960. It is significant that the Sierra Club, which appears to have sparked and provided the leadership and impetus for a campaign which would maximize the acreage to be removed from the operation of this law, while it was committed to a park campaign prior to passage, nevertheless was the only conservation organization in America to oppose this law which Congress passed by unanimous vote. Shortly after passage of this act, a brochure was published by this same tax-exempt organization and deposited for distribution at the Fifth World Forestry Congress, held in Seattle in late summer of 1960, constituting such a vicious attack on the Forest Service and the concept of multiple use as to cause the Chairman of the World Congress, who also happened to be the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, to denounce it in writing as "replete with half-truths, slurs, innuendoes, and erroneous inferences with respect to the Forest Service." A copy of both of these documents is submitted herewith for the information of the study team.

Since that time, there has been an almost endless succession of obsructive tactics to circumvent the operation of the Multiple Use Act of 1960 through national park campaigns, wilderness demands, demands for public hearings, opposition to multiple use plans for specific areas, appeals, appeals of the appeal decision, demands for the inclusion of buffer zones around the boundaries of dedicated wilderness, and demands for studies and moratoriums. I think the time has come, after going on 4 years, that the implementation of the Multiple Use Act of 1960 should be the first order of business.

Thank you for listening to my views, and I do appreciate the opportunity of appearing here.

Respectfully submitted.

VIRLIS L. FISCHER,

LAS VEGAS, NEV.

The Civil Rights Crisis—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently the Society for the Study of Social Problems, an affiliate of the American Sociological Association, at its annual meeting, passed by unanimous vote a resolution dealing with the present civil rights crisis and civil rights legislation before Congress. Copies of this resolution have been forwarded to the President of the United States, Members of the House of Representatives, and Senators.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Society for the Study of Social Problems, representing almost 900 sociologists and other behavioral scientists associated with educational institutions in all sections of the United States, has a responsibility to express itself on the current civil rights crisis.

This Nation is in the midst of a critical situation, the dimensions of which call for major and immediate adjustment. Such redress is, in part, embodied in the civil rights legislation recommended to Congress by the administration and, unless this is passed, we have grave fears of resultant social dislocation and serious civil strife in American society.

The denial of full rights to Negroes and other groups is America's most serious social problem. Overwhelming evidence indicates that segregation and other forms of discrimination are psychologically, economically, and socially detrimental to those who are deprived; they are detrimental to society as a whole. The effects of racial discrimination contribute to the initiation and perpetuation of many other social problems.

It is a goal of American democracy that individuals should have the opportunity of developing their full capacities. This cannot be achieved by those individuals whose rights and opportunities are partly denied. Such achievement can come only with full equality.

Opinion polls indicate that the seriousness of the present situation is widely recognized and the desire to secure remedial action has substantial national support. The current urgent demand for an end to discriminatory practices in the United States takes place in a context of a quest for freedom which is sweeping the world. Logical analysis of recent history and recognition of the dynamics of social changes must inevitably point to the conclusion that the demand for full freedom for all in America cannot be stemmed. Unless substantial gains are achieved it may be expected that efforts to secure equal rights will be intensified and that the techniques used to bring about redress will become increasingly desperate.

Large numbers of Americans feel deeply that our Nation is on trial—and the rest of the world is watching to see if we can resolve our racial problems and match our professed ideals with deeds.

Immediate action is required to strike down discriminatory barriers on all fronts—local, State and national—by voluntary as well as legal means. Dramatic steps are called for. The present legislation before Congress proposed by the administration is such a step.

We recognize that this legislation does not solve all problems; it is only a beginning.

We call upon Congress, to pass the administration's civil rights program without delay, and in particular, the section on public accommodation. In our estimation congressional action may determine whether peaceful progress or dislocation and strife will be the fate of America.

A copy of this resolution is being forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Signing for the Study of Social Problems: Jessie Bernard, President, 1963–64; Marvin B. Sussman, President, 1962–63; and Peter I. Rose, chairman, committee on intergroup relations.

The following members served on the drafting committee:

Jessie Bernard, Pennsylvania State University.

Marvin B. Sussman, Western Reserve University.

Peter I. Rose, Smith College.

Oscar Cohen, The Anti-Defamation League.

Robert G. Anderson III, Indiana University.

Earl Bogdanaff, Systems Development Corporation.

Robert H. Bohlke, American International College.

Warren Breed, Tulane University.

John H. Burma, Grinnell College.

Eleanor K. Caplan, Western Reserve University.

Marshall B. Clinard, University of Wisconsin.

Albert K. Cohen, Indiana University.

Martin L. Cohnstaedt, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

Oscar Eggers, University of Missouri at Kansas City.

Mabel A. Elliott, Chatham College.

F. X. Femminella, Adelphi University.

Byron Fox, Syracuse University.

Jerome Himelhoch, Vermont Youth Study.

Louisa P. Howe, Harvard School of Public Health.

Frank F. Lee, Oakland University (Michigan).

Elmer Luchterhand, Community Progress Inc., New Haven.

S. M. Miller, Syracuse University.

John Mogey, Vanderbilt University.

Olga Northwood, Seattle, Wash.

L. K. Northwood, University of Washington.

John A. Rademaker, Willamette University.

Hyman Rodman, Merrill-Palmer Institute.

Harvey Seifert, Southern California School of Theology.

Walter B. Simon, Western Reserve University.

Sherwood B. Slater, Western Reserve University.

Charles E. Snyder, Southern Illinois University.

Market News Service Problems Solved by Secretary Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a number of my colleagues have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials and news stories warning of dangers in the Agriculture Department's expansion of the Federal-State Market News Service. As a member of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, I looked into this matter and I am happy to report that Secretary Orville Freeman

has agreed to solve the three problems which the press has been highlighting.

Last August Secretary Freeman announced that farm market information which the Department collects will be directly available to anyone who wishes to lease facilities from the telephone service. In announcing the new service, Secretary Freeman said the Department must reserve the right to cancel the service to any subscriber who misused it. This raised the fear of censorship if the Department could cancel the service as retaliation against a newspaper or farm organization which happened to disagree with the Department on some political issue. Because the announcement of the new service stated that various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases also would be sent on the market news wire, a number of newspapers warned that Government press releases sent over the new system would make it a propaganda function instead of an information service. Others warned that the Agriculture Department would be in competition with some private organizations which now pick up the Department's market information, edit it, add other facts, and wire the information to private subscribers.

I am happy to report that Secretary Freeman has agreed to solve each of these three problems. He explained that the right of cancellation was necessary to prevent speculators who subscribed to the news service from adding false market quotations as part of the Federal report. Secretary Freeman has now agreed to surround this right of cancellation with safeguards to prevent its use as a tool of censorship. Before any action will be taken, he said, a subscriber facing cancellation will be able to file a written statement or have a hearing on the proposed action. The proposed findings will be issued and the subscriber will have 20 days to file an answer before any ruling could be issued. Even after that, Secretary Freeman said, the subscriber facing cancellation would would have his day in court, for the Department's action will be subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act.

On the question of the new market news service becoming a government news agency, Secretary Freeman said that the various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases will only be market quotations on purchases of commodities for the school lunch and surplus food distribution programs. On the question of competition with private organizations which now disseminate farm market information, Secretary Freeman agreed that the new system will not provide specialized service which now can be purchased from private organizations. These organizations identify various products and producers, thus making it possible for persons using the services to have more detailed information on farm market facilities. Secretary Freeman said the new Agriculture Department service will not identify producers or products, but will only carry the standard market quotations which are now available in Washington and at other Agriculture Department offices throughout the Nation.

I am confident the results which I am able to report to you would not have been possible unless the Nation's press had highlighted the situation. These developments prove once again the necessity for a free press able to analyze and criticize the Government and for a continuing fight for the people's right to know the facts of government.

Following is Secretary Freeman's letter spelling out the conditions under which the news service will operate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1963.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: This is in further reply to your letters of August 22 and September 24 enclosing editorials on the expanded use of the Federal-State market news leased wire system.

As you know, the arrangement for individual use of the leased wire circuits was requested by agriculture producers and distributors who make extensive use of market information. The Department acted only after discussions with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and after a request for public comments which resulted in overwhelming approval of the plan for expanded use of the existing leased wire system.

The editorials commented on whether the Department's authority to cancel the Market News Service could be used as a device for censorship. I can assure you that safeguards surrounding the Department's authority for cancellation make this impossible.

The Department must reserve the right to cancel service to an individual solely as a safeguard against false reports being issued which are identified as official Federal-State market news quotations. This administrative remedy is needed because there is no Federal statute which prohibits the false or fraudulent use of Federal-State market news reports. For example, in our opinion, intermingling data from various sources and ascribing them entirely to the Federal-State Market News Service, if practiced by a subscriber, should be stopped or the service should be canceled in order to protect the interests of producers and marketers who rely on the integrity and authenticity of official Federal-State reports.

An agreement in effect for several years between the Department and the PAM News Corp. which distributes market news to private subscribers, requires the corporation to separate the Department's official market reports from other market information. This agreement also reserves the right of cancellation.

In the unlikely event that it became necessary to exercise the Department's authority to cancel service under the market news leased wire system, the Department would follow the established procedure for withdrawal of voluntary fee services, such as inspection and grading, which are also provided under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946. The procedure gives the respondent the opportunity to file a written statement—or, if he wishes, have an oral hearing—to show cause why the service should not be withdrawn. Next, the respondent must be served with a proposed suspension order including tentative findings and conclusions, specifying the suspension period and providing 20 days to file exceptions. Only after ruling on the exceptions can the Agriculture Marketing Service issue a formal suspension order for the specified period.

This procedure, set forth in the Department's AMS Instruction 910-1, provides administrative safeguards against any abuse of the authority for cancellation. In addition to the internal procedure the Department would follow if cancellation were necessary, the action is subject to judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act. This act provides, among other things, that the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law and shall set aside any agency actions found to be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, contrary to constitutional right, or for other specified reasons.

The editorials pointed out that the Department's announcement of the expanded market news service stated it would carry various U.S. Department of Agriculture news releases of importance to marketers. No general press releases or U.S. Department of Agriculture policy statements are carried on the leased wire circuits. We occasionally send administrative instructions during idle circuit time. The releases of importance to marketers refers to announcements giving the quantities and prices of commodities purchased for the school lunch or food distribution programs. Such information is carried as part of our market news program because they have at times a direct bearing on the market for the particular commodity.

The editorials commented on whether the expanded market news service will include identification of specific producers, thus competing with any private market information service. The dissemination of such information is prohibited by Department regulations, and it could not be made available under the new system. Section 536b (5) and (9) of title I of the Department's regulations prohibit publication of—

"(5) Information and reports furnished by dealers, manufacturers, associations, or others covering quantities of commodities processed, purchased, or sold during prescribed periods and the prices paid or received therefor."

* * * * *

"(9) Information furnished voluntarily by individuals or firms, relating to their farm or business operations, for use in making statistical analyses as a foundation for official estimates and reports."

I hope this has provided the information which the subcommittee desires. If you have further questions, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Double Standards of the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues my findings and observations concerning the obvious double standards of the New Frontier which have taken place over the last 2 weeks.

After recommending a strong civil rights bill, Attorney General Kennedy than went before the House Judiciary Committee to recommend toning down the proposed legislation in that body.

After recommending numerous tax reforms to the House and Senate, Secretary Dillon appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and completely abandoned principle by urging their support for the House-passed bill in order to get anything through Congress this session to improve the administration's image.

However, nowhere has this "in-again-out-again Finnegan" attitude been better portrayed than on my House Public Works Committee. Last year authorization was made for a $900-million accelerated public works program to allegedly attack the unemployment problem by providing neo-political jobs in areas with chronic unemployment. This year, after the program had been funded by a 228 to 184 partisan vote, the administration pleaded for an additional authorization. In urging enactment of close to $1 billion in additional funds this year, President Kennedy stated on April 6 that—

> I hope that partisan activity will not be allowed to destroy or weaken a program aimed at our unemployment program.

When the tax bill passed the House last month, the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee noted that—

> The effect of the tax reduction * * * in reducing unemployment * * * is a complete answer to the argument offered by some of increased Government expenditures in order to overcome unemployment.

Yet within 2 weeks hearings were called in my committee for the unnecessary and excess spending under the public works acceleration program.

While experts were testifying as to the merits of accelerated public works, Secretary Dillon was trying to talk the Senate Finance Committee into reporting out the tax bill by promising that accelerated public works "was not an administration bill" and that "I do not think that bill is necessary." Later in the tax hearings, Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, when asked by Senator BENNETT of Utah whether the program has the sponsorship and support of the administration said, "It does not, Senator."

This is a clear case of the administration's left hand not knowing what its other hand is doing. Mr. Gordon, who earlier this year stated that balanced budgets could be dangerous things, now piously states that some spending is not backed by the administration.

I, for one, am glad to hear this. But does the House Public Works Committee know it? Do the spending administrators in the departments and agencies downtown know it? Because my committee has had no official notice of the administration's position, I have written Chairman BUCKLEY of the House Public Works Committee with a copy to the sponsor of this legislation, Representative BLATNIK, asking that Mr. Gordon be called as a witness before the committee—not insofar as his economic theories are concerned, but merely to clear up one question—is the administration for the accelerated public works program or is it against it?

We cannot have it both ways. The administration cannot have its cake in Senate Finance and still eat it in the House Public Works.

All we wish to ask is, "Will the real priority spending legislation please stand up—will the rest please sit down for the benefit of all the American citizens?"

U.S. Army's Southern European Task Force's 110th Aviation Company Role in Recent Italian Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, judging from the press coverage of the recent tragedy in the Belluno area of Italy, I wonder if most Americans as well as my colleagues are aware of the outstanding work done by SETAF's 110th Aviation Company? Having been fortunate to read recent Italian press coverage of this most terrible occurrence, I was amazed at the extent of their involvement. Their use of the 6-ton CH-34 Sikorsky "trucks of the sky" in Longarone was essential and, all told, they transported 180 tons of cargo, laid communications wire by air, carried out over 300 different missions, carried 4,351 passengers, and flew a total of 142 hours, or 11,360 nautical miles. This company of 185 men under the command of Maj. Harvey E. Mayse deserves the thanks of the entire free world, and the entire SETAF, under its commanding general, Maj. Gen. Harrison A. Gerhardt, deserves the thanks of the U.S. Congress for their yoeman service at a time of need. I am happy to include a summary of Italian press coverage, as translated by headquarters SETAF—which includes extracts from an excellent diary of events published in the L'Arena, di Verona. The article, entitled "Testimonianze di un Giornalista Americano Nella Valle Dei Morti," was written by Joseph Congress, chief, community relations branch, of headquarters, U.S. Army SETAF, Information Division.

The testimony of this American in the valley of death is a moving story. I am proud to make it available to my distinguished colleagues in the Congress. The article appeared in the Verona press of October 13, 1963.

The article, preceded by a short foreword by the editor, read as follows:

(American newsman Joe Congress, chief community relations, SETAF, yesterday (October 12) went to the area of disaster at Longarone. He kindly placed the diary of his exceptional and touching experience at the disposal of the readers of L'Arena.)

Today I went from the land of the living to the valley of the dead. I saw Berlin in 1945, I saw Stuttgart, Frankfurt, and many other cities which had been destroyed by bombardments; there, I saw wreckage and death but nothing to be compared to what I saw today at Longarone. I have never experienced an emotion, so absurdly violent, as the one which I felt while entering the dreadful Piave Valley.

In a few seconds we were at Longarone; the landing was done so fast that I didn't notice the spot where we landed. When I alighted from the helicopter I found myself on a deserted round-topped hill. "Where is the dam?" I asked. My escort showed me a gorge on our right beyond the River Piave. I could make out the gray barrier and atop it a pile of earth. Death and destruction had come from there.

"Where is the town?" I asked looking around.

"Here" was the answer.

But "here" there was only nothing. And I kept looking around and for hundreds and hundreds of meters I saw nothing: no buildings, no trees, nothing. There was only a vast covered-with-stones slimy beach; not one wall or door or gate or window remained standing. It was then true what I had heard or read: that Longarone had been completely erased, that absolutely nothing had been left of it. But one object I did see: a chair. Out of an entire village of over 1,300 inhabitants only one chair had remained there, in the vast valley of death.

Here, there were the houses, the schools, the gardens, the railway station; the water from the Vajont had done what thousands of bombs could not do to Berlin and Frankfurt. At least, something had remained there: the debris, the gruesome skeletons of the houses, the hallucinating eye-sockets of facades destroyed by the flames. At Longarone, instead, one could only imagine that under the treaded-on terrain there were the houses and the shops and, still more tragic, there were the villagers, the men, the children * * * I went down the hill where we had landed, and in the vast, flat expense of ground I could see groups of soldiers who, in always increasing numbers, were digging and lifting stones, in utter silence, in the midday sun, in their heavy battledress; they came here by the hundreds, by the thousands, these soldiers of Italy; they came here to accomplish their humble act of solidarity, of mercy.

"What do you find?" I ask them, here and there, while walking through that despairing piece of land.

"Just fragments of bodies" was invariably the answer—simple and brutal—of these tireless lads who had been working together for 4 straight days. In fact I had not as yet seen one cadaver—I mean an entire corpse.

Colonel Formento, CofS, IV Italian Corps, allowed me to take some photographs. "There are 5,000 soldiers here," he told me "for a village of only 1,300 inhabitants."

The Italian soldiers worked with order and discipline; they were divided in teams, each in charge of an officer who gave directives as to the stretches of ground which had to be dug.

It was almost noon and other SETAF helicopters were now landing from the air. Their doors opened and some 55-liter casks of fresh milk, sufficient for 1,000 people, were immediately unloaded. The milk was then carried as far as the townhall of Longarone which is just off the center of what was the town itself. In the townhall and in the schools (namely, what remains of those buildings) all provisions are pooled for the necessities of the survivors. Police Sergeant Filippi from Vicenza is on guard duty, watching the sacks of noodles, boxes of powdered milk, olive oil casks, crates of cheese, rice, canned meat, chocolate, cocoa, all of which had been sent from Bologna, Genoa, Trieste, Milano, and unloaded by the big "trucks of the sky" of SETAF.

I had not as yet sensed the exact proportion of the appalling tragedy that had befallen this valley; I was only beginning to understand little by little, and very slowly the entire picture was forming in my mind through the elements I could pick up here and there. I was then becoming aware of the smell, the stench of corpses, something I had not noticed up to now. It is a sharp penetrating smell which makes you think of disinfectants. And I could smell it ever so

sharply while catching a glimpse of a human body carried away on a sheet by four Alpini soldiers who were passing by. They had told me that there were thousands of dead and yet I was not able to see any.

All of a sudden I was confronted with an absurd scene. I saw in front of me a notice which said: "Private Property"; all around were only stones with a half-destroyed building on a slope in the foreground. Slowly the gruesome nature of the disaster began to make itself felt, and, with it, the appalling play of death. The color of death was there in the water reflected now in the puddles as if to admire the havoc it had caused. It was a green-blue color, an innocent shade, which had nothing innocent about it: Its toll was perhaps 2,000 dead. I arrived at the townhall building, one of the few still standing in a desert. I entered together with a cameraman and a BBC correspondent. There I asked for the mayor.

"The mayor is dead," they answered.

For the first time somebody was telling me that the town had really disappeared. An old councilman took me upstairs and introduced me to some of his colleagues, an elementary teacher, a doctor.

I requested data, statistics, percentages on the disaster, information on the inhabitants, on the buildings still standing after the cataclysm. They were very kind and quite obligingly took out the municipal records trying to meet my request and satisfy my curiosity. It was only later that I learned that all of them had lost one, two, or five relatives, that some were the only survivors of their families, that they had no homes, no hometown; but their answers were given with a firm voice; they did not weep, did not shout, did not seem to be seized by despair, although their accounts could drive anybody insane thinking that the fact had happened to them, not to other people.

In this expanse of death I did not hear any cry. Everybody—men and women alike—had tears but did not utter a word. At Longarone, silence was sovereign, all the landscape had been flattened by the fury of the waters, and also the sorrow seemed to be creeping silently over those stones which concealed affections, property and memories. I saw a man enter the elementary school and look for something along the walls of the classrooms, also damaged by the waters that had penetrated everywhere. He was looking for some drawings made by his son who had attended the school together with 260 school children: only 40 had survived, together with 4 teachers out of 15. The statistics we reproduce at the end of the article are tragically eloquent by themselves. No comment is needed to explain so much horror and dead astonishment.

Women were arriving; they asked for a piece of bread in the school and away they went, a black knot of life and death.

The 5,000 Italian soldiers were still digging in the vast square that was once Longarone. They find a ladder, a door, a cupboard, a body. And every time survivors rush to the spot in the hope of locating an object and in fear of recognizing a body. They are there, going round and round like robots, in the debris, among soldiers, in tears and, same as sleepwalkers, pick up a garment, a piece of wood an alarm clock. I saw a boy digging furiously in the ground with a pick. He searched in despair among the stones that he thought were covering his home, looking for his parents, with a glassy look.

At 1600 hours the SETAF helicopters that during 3 days had lifted 200 tons of medical supplies, provisions, and people, started the evacuation of Casso, the village which is more and more threatened by the landslide. In a short time its 100 inhabitants were airlifted and landed on safe ground.

I left the valley of death late in the afternoon; only the noise of shovels and picks used by the 5,000 Italian soldiers was the metronome of sorrow and mercy. No other noise was heard; an atmosphere which was like a nightmare and only to be compared to a play with horror and silence starring. Everything disappeared on the horizon; the dam did not stand out any more, Longarone disappeared from our sight and we remained alone with memories of horror as left by those mute stones. We took off at Belluno for Verona at 1720 hours. The gentle Veneto scenery which charmingly stood out wasn't then a cause of joy but of near sadness as our memory kept going back to the scene of desolation we had just left.

The twilights of Verona welcomed us cordially, but for me they appeared absurd. Yes, I was then asking myself if what I had seen was true, if the place of the appalling disaster was a real one. No, I kept saying, that must have been a different world, a world of death which we, the inhabitants of this planet, cannot understand.

The So-Called FCC Fairness Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD I include a letter and resolution adopted by the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1:

RESOLUTION OF THE ATLANTIC AMVETS POST NO. 1, ATLANTIC, IOWA

We, the members of George S. Patton AMVETS Post No. 1, meeting in regular session this 23d day of October 1963, in Atlantic, Iowa, do note that the literal interpretation of the FCC's July 26 policy statement of the fairness doctrine would permit the Communist Party to "practically paralyze the broadcasting industry in the United States," as brought to our attention by the Louisiana Association of Broadcasters, recently; and

Whereas Public Notice B FCC 63-734, 38372, July 26, 1963, entitled, "Broadcast Licensees Advised Concerning Stations' Responsibilities Under the Fairness Doctrine as to Controversial Issue Programing," has been intelligently analyzed by Mr. W. Cleon Skousen, the author of "The Naked Communist," who points out that the Communist Party is an official agency of a foreign government and probably every radio station carries many broadcasts criticizing the Soviet Union and communism. Yet, he said, under the FCC's edict on fairness, the Communists could demand time to answer every attack—and, on free time; and

Whereas under date of September 23, 1963, it is noted that there is, "More FCC Confusion on Fairness—Rules Stations Must Air Free Replies to Paid Programs." The FCC has stated that, "A broadcast station has an obligation under the fairness doctrine to provide free time for a reply to controversial statements made on a commercially sponsored program"; and

Whereas the FCC is responsible to the people through Congress and as our leaders speak. We want them to have liberty, and we do not want these pressures and regulations to so hamstring and intimidate radio stations that they will hesitate and be afraid to carry all the news that affect our lives and liberty. The radio stations should be as free as a newspaper; and

Whereas all this has brought strong reactions from the radio stations themselves but the impact of the demands will undoubtedly eliminate many of the small stations of the country if the regulations are to be strictly enforced. In fact, radio stations at the present time do not know exactly where they do stand, and all of this in a "free America": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, assembled in regular session in Atlantic, Iowa, this 23d day of October 1963, do strongly protest, the fairness doctrine which is being pressured against the radio stations of America, as being in direct violation of freedom of speech and is strongly suggestive of "managed news from a central bureaucracy."

JAMES L. SMALLEY,
Post Commander.
CARROLL HAYES,
Post Adjutant.

The Rights Bill Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of October 24, Doris Fleeson commented on the current civil rights bill situation. In forthright fashion Miss Fleeson observes that—

Civil rights is again in the position of a mere charade and the old cliches are being mouthed with rare eloquence.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAT IS ON IN THE RIGHTS BILL FIGHT—PRESIDENT'S AIM BELIEVED NOT DISPUTED EXCEPT THAT HIS WAY IS THE ONLY WAY

(By Doris Fleeson)

Civil rights is again in the position of a mere charade and the old cliches are being mouthed with rare eloquence.

President Kennedy had pushed the issue aside in the interest of comity with the powerful southerners who command the congressional standing committees until it became apparent this summer that he needed a civil rights bill for reelection purposes.

He is now demanding that his bill be enacted as it. If a Member of Congress subtracts a word from it, he is watering it down. If a Member adds to it, he is killing it.

The rational test of floor debate is ruled out by this thesis and the actual contents of the bill now in process take second place to the story of the struggle. The flag of moderation has been hauled up by the administration as the standard to which the patriotic must repair and the definition of moderation is what the President and the Attorney General say it is.

What is happening here is that some younger and newer House Members have decided that this ain't necessarily so. They come from both parties, and they include Members of proved conviction on the issue.

They point out that they are supporting a bill unanimously approved by a House Judiciary subcommittee headed by Committee Chairman Celler. Did Mr. Celler hope, they ask, that Judiciary Republicans would oblige by cutting it back for him?

Asked if they are not willing to be moderate, they reply that the subcommittee bill includes nothing not in the Democratic plat-

form of 1960 and almost nothing not approved by Republicans that year. They insist also that the famous midsummer march on Washington meant more than many people now seem to realize.

Perhaps they are wrong about the bill. They may be naive in supposing that the House and Senate today are incapable of rational discussion and resolution of great issues when they are all gathered together in public to discuss them.

The matter has not been put to the test for a long time, except possibly in the case of the nuclear test ban treaty recently approved by the Senate. In the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, with the full cooperation of the White House and congressional leaders, the clean-cut issue has been avoided.

There is nothing the President wants so much, and President Eisenhower before him, that it can't be ironed out in committee with nosecounting and polls to help form what is delicately called the consensus. Members are on the whole spared the inconvenience of making up their own minds.

Carefully prepared tableaus are substituted, and possibly they like it that way. At the moment it seems a few do not, but the heat is on.

The President now knows that he has to have a civil rights bill, that he would be hurt by prolonging the controversy into the campaign. Labor leaders, aware of the abrasive quality of the Jim Crow issue in their own unions, want a bill now so that, as one put it, the white homeowner will know it doesn't mean he will have a Negro family moving into the houses on either side of him the next day.

The President wants the Negroes off the streets during the presidential campaign, and few would argue with that aim, including Negroes. What he lacks, really, is agreement that his is the way—the only way, to achieve his goal.

Civil Rights Backtrack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, while the urgent needs of American Negroes go unheeded, the Attorney General argues for compromise. Those who favor civil rights take a dim view of sending a watered-down bill to the other body, because in so doing we diminish our bargaining position.

Even America's poets have caught the drift of the civil rights situation along the New Frontier. Louis K. Mather, poet laureate of the Washington Daily News, has written the following poem.

I quote:

GONE ARE THE DAYS

Gone are the days
When we loved the colored man.
Gone are the days,
Though we still do what we can.

It's time to change
Or voters we may lack.
I hear the pollsters voices calling
"Backtrack, Jack."

I'm quitting.
I'm quitting,
This rough civil rights tack.
I hear the pollsters voices calling
"Backtrack, Jack."

—*Louis K. Mather.*

Business Citizenship in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Shane MacCarthy recently received the Distinguished Service Medal Award from the Cosmopolitan Club of Washington, D.C. At the time of the award, Dr. MacCarthy addressed the organization on the subject of "Business Citizenship in Perspective." Because Dr. MacCarthy is chairman of the committee which reported on the stadium riots last year, this address is of particular value to Congressmen who share the responsibility of governing the District.

The address follows:

BUSINESS CITIZENSHIP IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks of Dr. Shane MacCarthy)

There are times when silence is more eloquent than words. This such an occasion. When gratitude is given to Cosmopolitan in the name of all who worked with me on various civic projects and heartfelt thanks expressed for the honor conferred this day on my family and me, no more need be said. However, such a response would run the risk of generating misinterpretation as to some of my feelings at this moment about our Capital and its future.

I've been in Washington well nigh 40 years. To this home of mine I came in my early teens to later marry a girl who is a second generation Washingtonian and we are blessed with five native Washingtonian sons. Thus, my roots here are very deep. My hopes for the morrow are optimistic because my faith in people is solid. However, "hopes" are fragile if they remain mere words and "faith" that puts reliance on others to do good works is a deluding attribute. In Washington at this moment are many who share these hopes and this faith. But, multiplying such concepts achieves no tangible benefits for our Capital unless we as private citizens set aside the idle habit of talk and involve ourselves with all the resources at our command in a master action plan for Washington.

The focus of the world is now on Washington. This might seem like an enviable position for any one community. And to a degree it is—if those of us who live here realize our personal obligations and our opportunities. The emphasis of attention at this time however, has questionable merit. Being the site of the Government of the most important country in the world makes "Washington" a name known to every hamlet in every clime. Simultaneously, our city of renown and beauty has been attracting attention as a center of crime and irresponsibility. And we must ever remember that the honor of being a national capital does not shield and overcome the bad image emanating from this same spot. In fact, the facilities of communication are only too prone to carry the news of wrongdoing, which then becomes associated with all our customs, practices, and policies as if the be-all and end-all of our city on the Potomac is badness in every guise.

Washington, D.C., is at a perilous juncture today. While it is the center of national government, it appears unable to govern itself. This does not mean that the Federal Government should take direct administration of affairs. Neither is the comment to be interpreted as a criticism of the commission system or a plea for what is called "home rule." When I observe that Washington "appears unable to govern itself," I'm referring to my disappointment that the people who live in the metropolitan area of our National Capital are too often mute when they should speak and too often indifferent when they should be involved in responsible action.

Our great Capital City has its social, economic, educational, cultural and political problems. It's a shocking set of circumstances which makes a parent fear for the safety of children who may be molested by irresponsible scoundrels. Business is a direct loser when a husband will not allow his wife and daughters to shop after sundown. The continual influx of people—frequently children alone—into Washington is compounding its housing, health, educational and many other problems.

While these conditions do not justify calling Washington—all Washington—a city of slums, or a crime-ridden Capital, the composite environment offers a salutary warning that a continuity of what is bad will bring what will be worse and harder to cope with in the days ahead. When there are ever-widening cracks in the moral cement of a society's foundation, the structure can topple into a confused jumble of debris.

The ostrich approach of sweeping problems under rugs is sidestepping our conscientious responsibilities. Can we afford mediocrity in our living, health, and educational standards in the District of Columbia? Yes we can, to our own detriment and ultimate disaster. Thus, when we soft-pedal the facts lest knowledge of them would create embarrassment, we are allowing the image to control our decision. We are choosing our words and molding our thoughts merely to please the recipient. This is the substitution of shadow for substance and such a process will solve nothing. At this moment in Washington too much of this brand of cowardly conduct is the custom. Asking for more money, more facilities, more police, more judges, more doctors, more jobs, more recreational activities, more of everything is giving quantity priority over quality. This is the easy answer of expediency. With expanding population more public facilities of all kinds are, indeed, necessary but the quantity answer of more police does not, for example, solve juvenile delinquency. It merely means there will be more patrolmen on the beat to keep up with the delinquinet Joneses.

And, what is achieved by the availability of jobs if openings in the manual arts and service trades are rejected by those who know not the dignity of honest labor, or worse, the applicants have no vocational training to fill the needs? Additional medically proficient men and women might well explain the dangers of sex promiscuity but the inculcation of moral character demands more time, attention, and prayer. If the community conscience is so numbed that punishment for crime deliberately committed is to be too often replaced by excuse, then adding more judges is of little avail.

Thus, the time has come for more thorough, courageous, dynamic and effective solutions to the difficulties besetting the Nation's Capital.

Look at our public educational system in Washington. Today, it is far from being the model for the Nation.

Recently, I recommended to the Congress that Superintendent Hansen be given the authority and the money to have a survey conducted by an outside, impartial, objective, professional organization of which there are many in the United States, to examine and assess in depth the current educational practices and needs in our Washington public schools and to report publicly on its findings.

Administering 170 public schools is a big and complicated business. The recommendation to the Congress was in keeping with the proven precedent of all business

establishments which periodically invite outside administrative management agencies to analyze their policies and procedures with a view toward eliminating what is weak and unprofitable, improving what is already good, and installing what is required for best results. Such a survey should be done in depth to bring forth the facts—from a city-wide battery of IQ, aptitude, and achievement tests on the actual status of every boy and girl in our public school system. It is only when the human product is known that the educational method most appropriate for its fullest growth and development can be designed. This recommendation will remain on dead center unless the voice of the people is articulate in its demand.

Into an already overburdened and overcrowded school system is now dumped the complex dropout problem—with demoralizing results. Holding these unfortunate boys and girls in the classrooms is achieving only one end—keeping them off the streets. Such individuals are, indeed, a menace on the streets, with nothing to do and boredom ever beckoning badness. But it is most unfair to the teacher, to the class, and to the dropout himself, who in practically all cases needs special training, to entice him back merely to make the public image that the dropout problem is under control.

Making the classroom a youth hostel for dropouts is an indication of how we have unloaded community problems on the schools and neutralized their educational effectiveness. Safe living environment is not a police problem; sanitary living is not a public health problem; the dropout and the delinquent are not school problems; apprentice training is not a labor problem. All of these and more are community problems. Councils, commissions, and committees too numerous to name have done much research in these areas but now is the time for broad-scale community action. Shall this be by Government or by the private sector of our capital? Here's the opportunity for the power of the people to assert itself. In our midst are hundreds of business and professional organizations of all kinds promoting the sale of ideas, services or products. Regardless of their field of endeavor, now is the time for them to realize that in the hierarchy of values none can ignore their responsibility to help their Capital. If the social and civic fabric of our fair city continues to ravel then this will be no place for advancing their business endeavors.

The mistaken notion abounds that business and professional groups are concerned only with the area of "private interest," leaving the prevalent impression that only Government cares for the "public interest." This false icon must be shattered, and here in our National Capital private business has both the obligation and the opportunity to do so. An injurious view of the free enterprise effort comes into existence by default because too often private business wears blinkers and ignores its full responsibilities. This is why "exploitation," "gain" and "profit at any cost" are equated with competitive business and Government gets credit for objectivity, impartiality, honesty and working for the poor and the downtrodden. Being in Government gives a person no halo of integrity and no more ability than a private businessman to determine what is in the public interest. It is with this breadth of vision, therefore, that the private business sector of our National Capital, represented by more than 500 business and professional associations, possessing unbounded talent and specialists in numerous fields, must recognize that far beyond their own limited business objectives extends their community responsibility to fulfill the public purpose for which we all exist. With a combined conviction they must come from the sidelines and initiate a leadership for continued action so that the exemplar for all other cities to emulate will be our own Washington.

U.S. Press Network

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Union, as well as the Evening Tribune in San Diego, published excellent editorials in regard to the Federal Government entering the news service in competition with the existing services. The editorials follow:

[From the San Diego Union, Oct. 10, 1963]

U.S. PRESS NETWORK

Last September 9 we mused in this space about the possibility of a Government-operated Federal news service which virtually would supplant the great independent news agencies by the 1970's.

The editorial was prompted by announcement that the Department of Agriculture had entered the news service business by offering a crop-and-marketing facility to anyone who would pay the telegraph tolls.

It appears now that the 1970's are far too distant a date for fulfillment of such a possibility. According to the Federal Register, President Kennedy has sent a memorandum to the heads of the executive departments and agencies. It directs them to cooperate and assist in setting up a unified governmental communications system. It is to be known as the National Communications System.

The President proposes to link together, improve and extend, on an evolutionary basis, "the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."

The administration's efforts to manage news already are notorious. The attempts to distort facts in the administration's favor, whether they are from Washington or South Vietnam, obviously have not been successful. Now Mr. Kennedy proposes to accomplish his goal by establishing his own "Tass," patterned after the Soviet agency of the same name.

It is an ominous development in a nation where self-government is absolutely dependent on its people having all of the facts. It is a pattern all too familiar in nations where there is no intention to sufficiently inform the people in order that they can govern themselves adequately.

[From the Evening Tribune]

GOVERNMENT NEWS NETWORK: A PIPELINE OF PREJUDICE

The Federal Government, already notorious for its attemtps to manage the news, is going into the news gathering and disseminating business in competition with privately owned wire news services.

It all began August 1, when the Agriculture Department started selling its market news service over a nationwide leased-wire teletype network to commercial subscribers, including newspapers and radio and television stations.

On August 28 President Kennedy directed the heads of executive departments and agencies to extend this intrusion in the news business to their own balliwicks.

The Presidential memorandum directed them to cooperate and assist in establishing a unified governmental communications system to be called the National Communications System (NCS).

The new system would be established and developed "by linking together, improving and extending, on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies."

This is one of the gravest threats to a free and uncontrolled press in a self-governing nation that has been proposed within our memory.

It strikes at the heart of the American people's right to know the truth about what's going on in their government.

Such a Government-owned and operated news network would become a pipeline of prejudice.

A channel of so-called information to dilute and obscure the flow of news out of the various Federal agencies by established, professionally staffed, unbiased private news agencies.

A propaganda machine for bureaucrats to make them look good and hide their mistakes.

The Russians have their governmental news agency. Its name is Tass. And it is discounted and mistrusted around the world—and perhaps most so by those captives who are forced to swallow its official line.

We doubt that the American people want an official, pasturized, sanforized verision of what Washington bureaucrats consider news fit for public consumption.

We doubt that the Agriculture Department or any other Federal agency can legally spend tax money to do this.

We know it isn't good for America and the concept of a free and unfettered press as the Founding Fathers envisioned in the first amendment to the Constitution.

No. 22—Arizona: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Arizona, some interesting figures having to do with the extent of gambling in that State.

Arizona's parimutuel turnover, in 1962, amounted to over $21 million from which the State collected, legally and properly, over $1 million. But this was only a small part of the story.

Illegal gambling is widespread in Arizona. The share of national offtrack betting allocated to this State, based on testimony before the McClellan committee, came to $360 million last year. The total figure for all kinds of illicit gambling as estimated at $750 million annually.

About 10 percent of the illegal gambling activity sticks to the underworld's fingers as gross profit. The official hypocrisy which keeps gambling illegal is bankrolling gambling's criminal entrepreneurs to the tune of $75 million a year. Arizona is a haven for the professional gamblers.

Most countries, Mr. Speaker, have the wisdom to recognize and regulate the human urge to gamble. All of our European and Latin American Allies conduct Government-run lotteries not only as a means of raising revenue but cutting down its gambling problem to a minimum.

It is high time that Arizona and all of its sister States put a halt to its unknowing silent partnership with the mob. Like the rest of the Nation, Arizona needs Government control of gambling through a national lottery.

The Late Dr. Herbert R. Brown, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the physician who pioneered the Red Cross blood donation program, Dr. Herbert R. Brown, Jr., has died. Dr. Brown was my constituent and I am deeply saddened by his passing.

In 1948 Dr. Brown originated the Rochester Red Cross regional blood program and served as its director until his retirement in June of this year. This program provides a supply of whole blood for emergency use throughout a 12-county area of upstate New York. The success of the Rochester program led to the establishment of similar "blood bank" centers across the country.

His dedication to saving lives by assuring the availability of blood won many distinctions for Dr. Brown. Just this past May, the Medical Society of the State of New York presented Dr. Brown a citation for being "the originator of the first volunteer peacetime blood program in the United States." In 1950, the Monroe County American Legion awarded Dr. Brown its Distinguished Service Citation for "outstanding service to the community and his fellow citizens."

One of the finest tributes to Dr. Brown's memory that has come to my attention was written by Andrew D. Wolfe, editor and publisher of the Genesee Valley newspapers. In the current issues of the Brighton-Pittsford Post, Penfield Republican, East Rochester Herald, and Henrietta Post, Mr. Wolfe has devoted his "Editor's Window" column to telling the story of how Dr. Brown came to be interested in the mission which later became his life's work and what this work has meant to mankind. I take pleasure in sharing this column with my colleagues:

DR. BROWN'S RESOLVE

Photographs taken of the late Dr. Herbert R. Brown, Jr., when he was wasted by illness gave him a drawn, lugubrious look.

In actuality, his friends will remember him as a lively, animated person, his round, high-colored face quick to break into a smile. And there was a surprised, good-humored, inquisitive look to his eyes which perhaps told much about the man and his extraordinary career.

For the obituaries in their perfunctory way failed to set forth the dramatic impact of his life on this metropolitan area, indeed on the entire United States.

Literally thousands of people are alive today because of his work.

They owe their lives to Dr. Brown's belief that the ready availability of whole blood could work medical miracles. Whole blood is, of course, blood which essentially is unaltered from the way it is in human veins, whereas plasma, for example, is but one of the constituents of blood.

One has to be verging on middle age to recall the frantic, and often unsuccessful efforts in the thirties to secure blood donors for direct transfusions. Broadcaster Al Sigl in this area organized a donor organization which attempted herorically to provide a reservoir of donors. But often, by the time the donors had come to hospitals, they were too late.

Medical men dreamed of a time when every hospital would have a "bank" of whole blood, ready to be used whenever need arose.

Among those who dreamed this dream in the middle thirties was Dr. Brown.

Some 15 years ago I worked on publicity for the then-infant Rochester regional Red Cross blood program. Dr. Brown was the program's medical director, as he was until just a few months ago.

Early one evening, for some reason which I now forget, I asked Dr. Brown how he came to be interested in blood.

It was an offhand question, but it brought forth one of those flashes of light into the workings of another person's soul that one gets but rarely.

In a simple, understated way, Dr. Brown's reply was so painfully truthful and so moving that I can remember it virtually word for word.

"I was just an intern at Strong Memorial Hospital," he said. "It was a hot summer afternoon, and many of the staff were out playing tennis on the courts near the medical school.

"I was sent to the room of a young mother who was hemorrhaging badly after childbirth.

"There was nothing we could do. I just sat there by her bed, watching her die, minute by minute, and able to do nothing about it. I can remember every second of it—how hot it was and the sound of the people outside playing tennis.

"She was a pretty girl, completely healthy. If we only could have replaced her blood, she would have lived. As the afternoon went on and she gradually died, I began to think that if ever I did anything in medicine, I'd like to do something to prevent what I was watching."

Dr. Brown was hardly one for false heroics, and he spoke very simply and directly, almost in an offhand manner.

I don't know if it was a story he told frequently. I suspect not. I've never heard it elsewhere.

In any case, he went on to make hematology, the study of blood, his specialty. During World War II, he was in charge of supplying whole blood for the wounded and injured in a major portion of the Pacific Theater.

Here he could verify at first hand his instinct that extraordinary medical things could result from the ready availability of whole blood. With others, he was convinced that by overcoming effects of shock and loss of blood, tremendous new avenues could be opened for surgery.

The last 15 years have confirmed this conviction a hundred times over.

Among those who came to know of Dr. Brown's work with blood was Adm. Ross McIntire, long-time private physician to President Franklin Roosevelt and the man selected to plan a peacetime national blood program for the Red Cross.

He selected the Rochester Red Cross Chapter to launch the first regional blood program. The chapter was chosen in part because of its outstanding organizational record, and partly because of McIntire's confidence in Dr. Brown.

The confidence was not misplaced. Over the next 14 years, at enormous physical and financial cost to himself, Dr. Brown worked to build the program. The pattern he was so instrumental in establishing has spread throughout the Nation and to other parts of the world.

After the program had shown its value, I always meant to speak again with him about that long, hot, agonizing afternoon at Strong Memorial during which his resolve was forged. I never did, and I'm inclined to think it just as well. It is the kind of personal revelation that can't be repeated.

The Bar's Responsibility Toward the Local Law Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the August 29 issue of the New Jersey Law Journal carried an editorial on the bar's responsibility toward the local law schools. It deals in particular with the ambition of the Rutgers Law School to make itself one of the great law schools of the country. As the editorial points out, "The bar will be the beneficiary" of the effort now being made, not only by the Rutgers Law School, but also by Seton Hall University School of Law.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BAR'S RESPONSIBILITY TOWARD THE LOCAL LAW SCHOOLS

There are few ways in which the bar of any State can do more toward improving its own performance than by strengthening the law schools of the State. The American Bar Association did much in this regard when it joined with the Association of American Law Schools in a program calling for the rating of all law schools of the country as approved, or not approved, depending upon whether they met certain rather high standards. The New Jersey bar will have some appreciation as to what that program has meant to it if it reflects upon the striking fact that in 1933 there were over 4,000 students at New Jersey law schools, and that 30 years later, notwithstanding the increase in population, there are less than one-fifth as many. The young lawyer who has had the benefit of one of today's approved law schools comes to the bar, much better trained, with a much deeper understanding of the motivations of the law, than the young lawyer who graduated from a New Jersey school of 30 years ago. The American Bar Association is to be commended for what it did. But much remains to be done, and here the local bar has a local responsibility.

The worthy ambition of Rutgers Law School, as recently announced by C. Willard Heckel, its new dean, to make itself one of the great law schools of the country, deserves all the support the bar can give to it. Rutgers Law School has been a good school and has gained in stature. But a very large effort must be made if it is to become a great school.

The strength of a law school depends upon its faculty and student body and, to a lesser extent, upon its buildings and campus.

The stature of a faculty in turn depends in some measure upon faculty salary scales. Otherwise, able men who are making their mark in the law school world cannot be induced to come to the local school; and the young teacher of promise at the local school will naturally find it more attractive to go on to another school which by virtue of its higher salary standards has brought in a more interesting faculty. Faculty salary scales in law schools cannot be raised unless the administration of a university recognizes that faculties in law are being paid, and therefore must be paid, substantially more than academic faculties. It is said by Dean Heckel, that there are more than 20 good law schools in the country with higher salary scales than Rutgers. Rutgers cannot hope to secure for itself a place among the top half dozen of these schools without some major adjustments in salary.

In the second place, money needs to be provided for writing and research. A law teacher makes his mark in the law world chiefly as a result of his writing; and the law school in some measure rises or falls upon what its faculty does in this matter. Private funds must be forthcoming if opportunities are to be provided here. Writing can do more than anything to enhance the stature of the members of the faculty.

In the third place, and of much more importance than most persons would believe, is the necessity of maintaining a very high level of intellectual competition among the students. Very demanding standards must be maintained in all 3 years; and only the ablest students should be admitted to the first year class, with selections made on the basis not only of undergraduate marks and legal aptitude tests, but with weight also given, if at all possible, to those qualifications which indicate outstanding citizenship. Here again, money may help by providing generous scholarships, so that some of the very unusual undergraduate minds can be drawn to the local law school, away from the wealthier law schools (which offer competing inducements). A few such minds in every class can do much to sharpen classroom discussion and competition.

In the fourth place, a great law school needs appropriate buildings and library, and also a campus, if it is to bring together an outstanding faculty and student body. Rutgers Law Center is to be opened in Newark in 1965, and a new law school building is planned for the South Jersey Division of Rutgers. A plan is underway for erecting a dormitory in Newark, so as to make of it a campus school. Through a dormitory, law students come to live with the law from morning until late in the evening, instead of commuting to some other environment. The new dean's goal is a law library of 300,000 volumes, very much enlarging the present libraries of 85,500 volumes at Newark and 41,000 volumes in Camden, which are in several respects not adeqaute. We have spoken of Rutgers Law School in particular because of Dean Heckel's current statement, but what we have said applies equally to Seton Hall University's School of Law.

The bar will be the beneficiary of these goals and has a direct obligation to promote them. It must take an especial interest, and pride, in its local law schools, and the law schools for their part must find ways to enlist that interest. Driving personalities and high ambitions are needed to make a great law school. Money alone will not do. But money will do much and in all events constitutes a necessary part in the undertaking. The bar should do all it can to foster an appropriate concern in the matter and incidentally, when occasion offers itself, to solicit charitable gifts, through legacies and otherwise, for the purposes of the local law schools.

Menorah Home and Hospital for the Aged and Infirm, Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, the 19 auxiliaries of Menorah Home and Hospital for the Aged and Infirm, Brooklyn, held their 13th annual luncheon—a Bar Mitzvah luncheon—on behalf of the varied programs offered by this outstanding institution. The event did not follow the usual pattern of such functions. Rather, the fete served to give the some 1,400 persons assembled a visual description of life at the home.

The program took the form of a dramatic presentation. The actors were residents of Menorah, and they attempted to illustrate the home's philosophy in terms of the needs of older persons.

Mrs. Millie Felder, the executive director of the home, who was a principal speaker, introduced this presentation, and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am delighted to present excerpts from her talk:

Perhaps the most important quality of today's program is that it takes you, the audience, into the minds and hearts of our older men and women themselves. You will readily see why they enjoy being here at this luncheon with you. Their story of the growth and maturity of the Menorah home—their home—is more than a simple recital of facts and figures.

They do not live with facts and figures. They live with the facilities which the figures provide; their wealth is the understanding and compassion which you provide when you study the facts, and respond from your hearts; and because you have given meaning to the facts and figures, they are able to enjoy each day's comforts, looking forward to more of the same thing for many tomorrows.

As so many of these tomorrows unfold, we frequently are privileged to conduct special birthday parties for our men, which we call second bar mitzvahs. The achievement and challenge symbolized in this occasion are twin joys which we share with these 83-year-old youngsters of ours.

These men, having reached 13 years beyond the Biblical lifespan of threescore and ten, now emerge into that most special time in life when they are privileged to rededicate and reaffirm their full stature in the eyes of God; their devotion to the greatness of spirit demanded by our Jewish heritage.

Into such a happy occasion our program welcomes you today. Within the traditional bar mitzvah setting we shall hear what the home has come to mean to those who know it from the inside.

The family feeling which distinguishes menorah shines warmly through the many departments where our residents spend their days in purposeful, creative living—whatever their age. Today's presentation was prepared in our recreation department but you will soon see that it is the result of complete cooperation of our devoted professionals whose great talents and training sparkle with their affection for the men and women with whom they work.

In occupational therapy, headed by Miss Barbara Wolverton, our artists and craftsmen designed and painted the pictures, props, and other requirements of the setting; our maintenance department, headed by Mr. James Dore, designed and constructed the magnificent menorah which is the backdrop and which is already a very treasured possession.

But it is the recreation department which, naturally, is the one which most injects the daily life at the home with laughter, individualism, and the joy of achievement—with music, dance, discussion groups, games, parties—and much more.

Here, it is our good fortune to have as department head, Mrs. Yedida Staff-Nielsen. Her's is a dynamic, exciting personality whose charm and skill in the entertainment arts have won her international acclaim. But the cheers of anonymous audiences cannot bring her the human rewards she finds working here, where the appreciation and achievements of our residents far outweigh the fleeting excitement of the footlights.

The final result is a simple retelling of menorah's growth and development into an outstanding agency on the national geriatrics scene. More than that, in the very fact of its presentation, this program exemplifies the menorah philosophy: The emphasis on individuality, on self-esteem, and on warm companionship in daily living.

Let's Reason Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix an article which appeared in the October 19, 1963, issue of the Ohio Farmer. Written by Earl W. McMunn, I believe it is to the point and certainly deserves the attention of Members of this body.

The article follows:

LET'S REASON TOGETHER

WHEN VOTES ARE FOR SALE

A recent speech by Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, kicked up quite a furor in the Halls of Congress. Big reason for all the hurt feelings was probably the fact that it struck painfully close to the truth.

In his remarks on "Our Own Public Scandal—Vote Buying and Selling," Neilan declared that our moral standards have been battered into pretty bad shape. He pointed out that big government brings with it big spending and "the sale of ballots not solely for promises but for hard cash."

The immorality is not confined to either major political party, he said. "It involves voters, candidates and elected officials of both parties, but inevitably the bulk of the spending—or buying—the bribing power if you will—rests with the party in office. Controlling a Federal budget of almost $100 billion, the talented politicians who will direct the administration's campaign for reelection in 1964 have more of your money and my money to spend than in any previous election in history—and more ways to buy votes with it."

The vote buying, of course, is not in the form of a direct payment of a dollar or two to a voter as in the days of the old wardheelers. Instead, it's a matter of spending

Federal funds where it's judged the political impact will be the greatest. No one likes to admit that legislative decisions are made this way. But, stop and think a moment and you'll realize it's often the way things are decided. All lawmakers, of course, aren't guilty. But, we're all guilty to a degree in the demands we make for "free benefits" from our Government.

GETTING OUT OF HAND

How long can Congress refuse to face up to the fact that abusive use of union power is hurting our economy? The arbitration board now holding hearings may decide a couple of issues in the rail dispute. But, there's still the threat of a rail strike anytime after next February on a lot of issues, in addition to the size of traincrews and abolition of firemen's jobs.

And, that's not all. Jimmie Hoffa has set out to control the entire trucking industry of the country. He is working for a uniform contract covering all the trucking companies in the United States. Then, he wants to sign them up to a pact with a common expiration date. Already, it's said, he has 90 percent of the industry under regional contracts with a common expiration date.

Once all truckers are signed up, the national headquarters of the Teamsters Union would have vast powers. They could call a strike which would stop almost everything moving on wheels. And, who's to believe that a strike would not be called unless union demands were met?

Yes, there's plenty of evidence that unions have been granted great powers. These powers have often been used without regard to the welfare of others.

Any strike which ties up an entire industry is bound to hurt a lot of innocent people. This is true, both for the industry affected and for society in general.

In fact, it's doubtful whether "collective bargaining" can be carried on under the threat of a national strike. It's a lot more likely to become "collective coercion." This is the term one eminent authority used to describe it. Here is what he said:

"Collective bargaining has become collective coercion * * * the aim of industrial justice has become greed for industrial domination * * *. Political influence, once sought to protect fair dealing, is now sought to accomplish political goals.

"The unions are powerful, aggressive organizations that are engaged in a continuing warfare against the maintenance of a free competitive society.

"These evils will not be remedied until an overwhelming majority of free citizens realize that labor's economic monopoly and political power are preparing the way for communism far more effectively than the Communists themselves."

Perhaps you think these three paragraphs were written by some confirmed "labor hater." Not at all. They were written by the late Donald R. Richberg who spent many years fighting for the rights of labor.

Richberg was a leader in the early struggles to unionize industry. He was coauthor of the Railway Labor Act of 1926 and the National Recovery Act of 1933.

But, 20 years later Richberg was courageous enough to face up to the issues produced by the seeds he had helped to plant. He wrote a book called "Labor Union Monopoly—A Clear and Present Danger." In it he showed how unions had been given too much power without proper safeguards to protect the rights of others.

Another longtime friend of union labor is Maurice R. Franks. He has written a book called, "What's Wrong With Our Labor Unions?" He lists the three roots of labor union monopolies as compulsory unionism, industry-wide bargaining, and dictated strike action. "Weed these out of the labor movement and the labor trust will crumble like a house of cards," he says.

We all know how labor monopolies have added to the costs of goods and services we buy. "Make work" practices add to the cost of your farm machinery, an there's precious little the managers of the plants can do about it. That's just one example. The same is true for almost any other product or service you might mention.

It's also true that labor monopoly practices are hurting the very workers they're alleged to protect. A race of do-it-yourself carpenters, electricians, and plumbers has been trained because union wages have been forced to such high levels. Higher wages for less work have forced other products above the reach of many buyers. Minimum wage laws have put many less-productive workers out of jobs. They have hastened automation as well.

A monopoly is a monopoly, no matter where it is found. Abuse of monopoly power can't be justified because it's "labor," any more than it could be for industry or any other segment of our economy.

No one wants to curb the rights of labor unions. But, these "rights" shouldn't extend to include selfish privilege and complete disregard for the welfare of others. This is the problem Congress must someday face if we're to maintain our economic system. They're not facing up to the real problems by assigning a few issues to "impartial arbitration."

SKILL IN MANAGING MONEY

Everyone knows that it takes a lot more than sweat and hard work to succeed in farming. We're buying more and more of the inputs of agriculture in a semifinished form. We're combining power, chemicals, machines and a host of other things to produce the $40 billion annual gross product of agriculture.

The trick, of course, is to put together the combination of capital, labor, and other inputs which will yield you the best possible income. And, it is true that capital is being used in increasing amounts to replace labor on most farms.

This new kind of farming is bringing with it growing needs for outside financing. "It's estimated that during the first half of this century farmers obtained 78 percent of their capital through the generation of earnings and only 22 percent from credit sources. Today, it appears that earnings generate only about two-thirds of what is needed in the farming business, and about one-third of the capital comes from credit sources." This was the way Charles R. Brynteson of the A. O. Smith Corp. explained it when he talked recently to a group of farm editors.

And, he went on to explain that there is a direct correlation between the use of credit and gross income in farming. In other words, wise use of credit has become an important tool in farming. That's a far cry from the time when your chief aim was to get out of debt and to stay that way.

Yes, all signs indicate that we'll continue to use more credit financing in the years ahead: No longer is it enough to have skill in managing land, livestock and labor. Now we must learn another important skill which is managing money.

EARL W. MCMUNN.

Some Funny Business on Spy Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the October 15, 1963, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

SOME FUNNY BUSINESS ON SPY TRADE

A little squib of a news item the last few days disturbs us very much. It reveals that the heralded release of the U.S. bomber pilots by the Russians 2 years ago was, in fact, a trade. We gave them two of their spies back.

The fact in itself doesn't upset us.

What makes us squeamish is the 2-year delay in letting the American people in on the facts. In this case, there can be no question of secrecy for the purpose of keeping information away from the Soviets. The deal was with the Soviets.

Why in the world were we sharing a secret with the Russians and keeping it from the American people?

Why in the world did we pretend that the Russians were being magnanimous and seeking better relations and admitting they didn't have the goods on those pilots? Why did we pretent they were just honestly sending them back?

Nobody was misled by that maneuver, that we can see, but the American people.

The release of the pilots was headline news and a seeming triumph for a Kennedy administration which badly needed a triumph in its relations with the Communists at that time.

The belated news that we gave away more than we got back, and that what really happened was a humanitarian surrender whereby we sent them back a couple of captured spies in exchange for the two airmen they shot down and pirated over the sea.

When the Government of the United States plays games with the people of the United States for its own purposes concerning facts very well known, indeed, to the Soviets, we have reason to be nervous.

Any administration that would disguise the facts in that manner and under those conditions without any remote possibility of it being a security matter has to be suspect on its activities. If facts are juggled this badly as a matter of convenience or whim, are other facts being juggled in the same manner today?

Democracy can hardly function intelligently if it no longer has confidence in the frankness and honesty of its own officials, and if the power of censorship and secrecy is not limited to security matters of value to our opponents.

Heretofore, opponents as used in the sense of legitimate official secrecy has always referred to opponents of the United States of America in the cold war or potential hot wars—and has not applied to domestic, political opponents.

Apparently, the rules have changed.

If so, a fundamental principle on which real democracy depends has been casually thrown onto the junk heap, and scarcely noticed in the bargain.

Ozark Chapter, Association of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Association of the U.S. Army held its annual meeting here in Washington. At that time, the Ozark chapter of the association received the outstanding chapter award for having the great-

est percentage increase in membership between July 1, 1962 and June 30, 1963. Present to accept the award were James S. Beckman and Tom Futral, officers of the Ozark chapter. We are proud of them and congratulate them on their achievements. When one considers that there are 121 chapters throughout the world, this is quite an honor for the Ozark chapter.

Findley Wheat Poll Revealing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article appearing in the October 25, 1963, issue of the Chicago Tribune by Michael Pakenham:

WHEAT DEAL HIT IN FINDLEY POLL—ILLINOIS DISTRICT IS OPPOSED TO GRAIN SALE

(By Michael Pakenham)

WASHINGTON, October 24.—Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois, disclosed and took to the White House today responses to a poll of his downstate 20th District, which indicated almost 2-to-1 opposition to sale of American wheat to Communist countries.

The tabulation showed 3,291 opposed and 1,767 in favor of President Kennedy's agricultural trade program with Russia and the satellites.

Findley said that responses to 20,000 questionnairs sent last Thursday are now coming into his office at a rate of about 2,000 a day. The ratio yesterday, when half the responses arrived, was close to previous days.

NOTES PERMIT FOR HUNGARY

"I decided to make public today the figures so far because the project is getting along fast," FINDLEY said. He noted that an export license was granted yesterday for sale of almost $2 million worth of corn to Communist Hungary.

He said that he will make public additional tallies soon, and will deliver the responses to Kennedy's office, as he promised on the questionnaire.

A staff aid to FINDLEY said the reception at the White House was "very, very fine."

HAVE LENGTHY TALKS

"They showed genuine interest in the results," he said. FINDLEY and a member of the President's staff had a lengthy discussion, in which FINDLEY was asked and promised to make available further figures.

FINDLEY, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, said the figures "support my belief that the majority of American farmers, as the majority of other Americans, won't sell out a principle even for pure gold." He had made a similar statement last week, before the poll began.

The list of 20,000 persons to whom the queries were sent was picked at random from telephone books, without regard to partisan loyalties. The list, which FINDLEY has used for other surveys, is made up of persons who have responded before, but does not show the nature of their responses, FINDLEY said.

DISTRICT IS CONSERVATIVE

They are from the Illinois counties of Adams, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Greene, Hancock, Jersey, McDonough, Macoupin, Morgan, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, and Scott, which make up the 20th congressional district. The area contains 21,149 farms.

FINDLEY described the district as "generally conservative, so far as the growth of Central Government and deficit spending."

In addition to the questionnaire responses, there were counted in the total about 250 letters FINDLEY received from persons who read or heard of his interest in getting an expression of Midwest opinion, he said. The ratio of those ran about 3-to-1 against the Kennedy program, he said.

CITES FREEMAN'S CLAIMS

When he announced his intention of making the poll, FINDLEY noted that the Kennedy administration, through Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, claimed that Americans in wheat-growing areas favored the program by a ratio of about 90-to-1.

He asserted that he believed the wheat-sale decision to be "the first of a long series of commercial exchanges with the Soviet Union" which Kennedy will back, and he felt the need for the poll on that basis.

In the press conference and on the questionnaire itself, FINDLEY noted that 2 years ago the House of Representatives, in a "sense of Congress" resolution, went on record against such sales.

He said that comments on the questionnaires varied widely, but "many citizens expressed resentment over the 60-cent-a-bushel subsidy involved.

"I am sure this resentment has been magnified by yesterday's reports that ocean shipping expense too may be subsidized," FINDLEY said.

Ike Sends Salute to Ben Jensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include General Eisenhower's salute to the gentleman from Iowa, BEN JENSEN, which was printed in BEN's hometown newspaper, the Audubon Journal, Exira, Iowa, October 24, 1963.

Along with Congressman JENSEN's colleagues in Congress and many, many Americans nationwide, I join Ike in his warm salute to BEN, who is sincerely and deeply grateful to his esteemed friend, the former President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower:

His salute to BEN follows:

IKE SENDS SALUTE TO BEN JENSEN

"It has been my good fortune to learn of the dinner to honor the silver anniversary of your first triumph at the congressional polls. I am delighted to add my congratulations."

So reads the opening paragraph of a "Dear BEN" letter from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Congressman JENSEN, who is to be honored November 8 with a dinner at Council Bluffs.

The event is sponsored by JENSEN's Iowa friends and residents of the Seventh Iowa Congressional District, which JENSEN has served for 25 years. Tickets for the dinner are now available in every county in the district at $12.50. All funds above the actual cost of the dinner will be given to Congressman JENSEN.

"All of us who have served the public are aware that time and time again in the course of that service there are, inescapably, occasions of severe personal testing—occasions when one must choose principle over expediency, when one's personal fortunes must be subordinated to the national good," the Eisenhower letter continues.

"I have long noted your willingness always to stand up and be counted—your unwavering fidelity to fundamental Republicanism—your readiness on any occasion vigorously to support the principles and beliefs which you hold to be right for America.

"It is to these attributes of character that I attach the greatest significance in measuring the performance in public service of any man. Therefore, in this letter I will not recite your positions of responsibility and trust in the Congress, your leadership among your colleagues, your powerful influence in the constant struggle for fiscal sanity. I do not dwell upon these because they are the consequences of something of greater meaning—your character.

"You are rightly saluted, BEN, for splendid service to our country. I am delighted to join in the salute.

"With warm regard, Sincerely, Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Clark Mollenhoff, Washington news analyst, will be the principal speaker following the dinner. He is a native Iowan, who has been stationed at the seat of Federal Government for several years. His speech will include background as well as current information concerning Washington problems.

Black Hat, White Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the "Editor's Report" written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, dated October 20, concerning Tito's visit here and its significance.

I do not always agree with Mr. Hearst but he has expressed my sentiments completely in this article. I think it is a great mistake for our country to depend on any goodwill from Tito's Yugoslavia unless it is for the everlasting benefit of his communistic regime. I hope this editorial will be widely read because it makes sense and is factual.

The editorial follows:

BLACK HAT, WHITE HAT

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Those western films (TV or not TV) make it so simple to choose which side you are on by having all the "good guys" wear white hats and all the "bad guys" wear black hats.

Having just returned from a trip around the world, I am firmly of the opinion that what's OK in the movies is definitely not OK in foreign affairs. An American foreign policy based on good dictators in white hats and bad dictators in black hats is dangerously juvenile.

Yet that—for the most part—is what we are doing in our relations with the rest of the world.

What better example (or I suppose I should say worse) can you find than the red carpet we rolled out this week for Yugoslavia's Tito, a Commie criminal who, in the classic manner of lawbreakers, even uses an alias in place of his name?

Remember, this is the same Tito who thanked us for arms we gave him in World War II by turning them against us at Joe Stalin's orders right after the war. In 1946 he shot down three U.S. planes, killing five airmen in an unarmed transport.

The big hand for bloody-handed Tito merely rubs in the irony of two other actions the same day.

One was approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of a clause in this year's foreign aid bill, ruling out Alliance for Progress help for any government seizing power through overthrow of a "legally elected constitutional" regime (unless the President rules it necessary for our national interest).

That was aimed at military juntas in Latin American nations and it was the thinking of an "ultra-liberal" group typified by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. To them it doesn't matter whether the military may be saving their nation from Red takeover—as has happened in a few places. The juntas are "bad guys" in black hats, although it would be hard to find a case of their flirting with the enemies of the United States.

The other incident had more of a burlesque touch. There were the photos of Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, the lethally beautiful Dragon Lady with the tongue of undiluted sulfuric acid, ringing doorbells in Washington, and getting the back of the Capital's hand. You see, by the immature yardstick that guides our policy, the Dragon Lady is a bad girl in a black hat.

Do I hear voices saying: "But witch or no witch, the lady is our witch in the fight with communism? And the regime she symbolizes is fighting to stem a Red tide in southeast Asia with U.S. help?" Tut-tut, say the rationalizers of our foreign policy, that has nothing to do with the case. All black hats must go. Off with their heads.

And so, in many parts of the world, as we follow that policy, we are also cutting off our noses to spite our faces, since our noses happen sometimes to be attached to those undesirable heads. Just the way we were suckered into choosing a Communist named Castro over a non-Communist named Batista.

Bad as Batista was, he never brought Soviet missiles into Cuba to aim blackmail at our American cities. But he was a black hat and our State Department helped ease him out for a white hat who was wearing another deep red headpiece underneath.

Certainly the Dutch were never enemies we had to fear in the South Pacific, but friends. Yet U.S. policymakers helped ease the Netherlands out of their last foothold in their former East Indies empire. We actively officiated in turning the area over to Indonesia's Sukarno, a leftwing dictator and aggressive threat to the whole South Pacific. Sukarno has Soviet arms enough to make him an important power but keeps his domestic economy going by U.S. dollar and food aid.

Our Hearst Task Force looked in on this "white hat" Sukarno on our recent trip. He did the talking, and in—of all things—a black cap.

It may be possible to make an excuse for an occasional but temporarily coddling of sharpies like Sukarno or Nkrumah or Nasser or Ben Bella, etc., who openly laugh up their sleeves at us while taking aid from both sides.

It is like patting a cute little furry animal and saying nice skunky—but doing that for very long can create a smelly situation.

And it is even a worse error to buddy up with a full-fledged Commie like Tito. A phony image of Tito as an independent or maverick Communist has been based on Stalin's drumming him out of the regular ranks in 1948. On those dubious grounds, we have lavished on him every kind of aid our wishful thinkers could find—from food to weapons.

This is supposed to make a legit friend of democracy out of a dyed-in-the-blood Red, meriting love and kisses. In case you ever believed that, here's an enlightening rundown on Tito in a memo to me from Hearst Headline Service's chief correspondent at the United Nations, Pierre J. Huss, who remembers Tito "when.":

"DEAR BILL: I can never forget the 'trial of Draza Mihailovic,' the real Yugoslavian hero of World War II, which I covered in Belgrade for several weeks in July 1946. I watched that genuine patriot, a bearded man standing in the dock and facing his fixed trial with the dignity of a soldier dying on the battlefield.

"The heartbreaking fact that it was a kangaroo court in the Moscow purge trial tradition was clear to the several American correspondents who had flown from Paris where we were covering the Peace Conference. By the way, Tito's Communist government was still behind the Iron Curtain then and shooting at U.S. planes. Our plane landed with holes shot in it.

"The courtroom farce was staged to paint Tito as the hero and Mihailovic as a traitor, although Michailovic's only crime was defending his country while Tito was acting for Stalin.

"The colonel in charge of the court was a Communist commissar of Russian background. Believe it or not, Bill, the trial opened with a long reading of treason charges and the announcement that Mihailovic was guilty of virtually allying with Nazis and would have to die for his crimes.

"The commissar barked commands at the prisoner, who, as I recall, tried several times to set the facts straight but mostly repeated words put in his mouth—apparently rehearsed in prison before the trial.

"Tito's show trial naturally ended in Mihailovic's execution, which the announcement said was by firing squad. Simple assasination wouldn't have served Tito's propaganda purposes.

"I think, Bill, a comparison of Mihailovic's and Tito's backgrounds will help explain why Tito is now the kingpin.

"Mihailovic, 48, when Hitler overran Yugoslavia in 1941, was a Serbian and a colonel commanding a regular royal motorized divison. He took his troops into the woods, where with other patriots they formed a guerrilla force called the Chetniks. They were very effective against Nazi supplies and communications, and in January 1942, King Peter's government in exile made Mihailovic Minister of War.

"Instead of cooperating, partisans in the Bosnian and Montenegrin hills, led by a known Moscow agent—Josip Broz, who used the alias of Tito—attacked the Chetniks. A "Radio Free Yugoslavia" broadcasting from Tiflis in Soviet Georgia smeared Mihailovic as a Nazi collaborator.

"Stalin's pressure on Roosevelt and Churchill caused the exile government to abandon Mihailovic in May, 1944. He fought on until the war ended, then hid in mountain caves until Tito's headhunters nabbed him March 13, 1946. Then the trial.

"Now look at Tito. Seventh son of poverty-stricken Croatian peasants, he was born in 1892, an Austro-Hungarian subject. Wounded and captured in World War I by the Russians, he was converted into a full-fledged Bolsheivk by 1917 and joined Trotsky's Red Army. He married a Russian Communist girl in 1920 and took her back to Yugoslavia, under orders from Moscow to take over the local Communist Party.

"Arrested as a subversive in 1928, he was jailed 5 years. Then he returned to Moscow as part of the Communist central organization, the Comintern (Balkan section). They sent him to Zagreb and in 1936 (divorced from his Russian wife) he wound up in Paris recruiting suckers to fight against Franco.

"As Secretary General of the Yugoslav Communist Party he visited Moscow in 1938 and 1939.

"To show how he toed the line for Stalin, he convoked his party congress in 1940 to keep Yugoslavia out of the imperialist war, never lifting a finger or voice when Stalin's ally Hitler invaded his country.

"But when Hitler invaded Russia, Tito (naming himself Marshal Tito) sent his partisans into action for Stalin. In 1944 he went to Moscow and conferred with Stalin and eluded capture by the Nazis, escaping to the British-held island of Vis.

"There he was sent to Rome and direct talks with Allied commanders and Churchill. He clinched his unearned role as Yugoslav leader by another visit to Stalin in 1945.

"So compare the backgrounds, Bill, and draw your conclusions.

"PETE HUSS."

Does Tito's hat look very white to you?

No Equal Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with editorial comments in the State, of Columbia, S.C., and the News & Courier, of Charleston, S.C., on pronouncements made on last Monday by the U.S. Supreme Court in three new rulings. The editorial from the State is entitled "Trifling With Hideous Crime" and makes special mention of the remarks by three Justices who questioned whether the imposition of the death penalty for rape should be constitutional. It was printed in the October 23, 1963, issue of the State. The editorial in the News & Courier is entitled "No Equal Justice," and was printed on October 23, 1963. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Oct. 23, 1963]

TRIFLING WITH HIDEOUS CRIME

Three Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, in a dissent which in effect asked their colleagues to declare capital punishment for criminal assault unconstitutional, have again invited controversy and valid criticism of the court of last resort.

The three Justices—Arthur J. Goldberg, William O. Douglas, and William J. Brennan, Jr.—wrote in a dissenting opinion that the Supreme Court should decide whether the Constitution permits "the imposition of the death penalty on a convicted rapist who has neither taken nor endangered human life."

Because there has been rather widespread debate over the desirability and efficacy of capital punishment for any and all crimes, the suggestion by the three Justices will have the effect of obscuring the fundamental issue involved.

Obviously Justices Douglas, Brennan, and Goldberg had in mind the seventh amendment, which states, "Excessive bail shall not

be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Now it becomes important to remember that the three Justices need only convince two others in order to declare that the death penalty for a rapist violates the Constitution.

It seems indeed strange that 172 years after ratification of the Constitution a new meaning should be legislated into that amendment. Here we would have, should only two more Justices agree with the request of the three man minority, the spectacle of five Presidential appointees overturning a doctrine never seriously challenged by any Justices in the past and the duly enacted statutes of a great number of States.

What monumental egotism it would require for five, or even nine, Justices of the Supreme Court to overrule the combined Justices of other eras, plus the combined wisdom of all State legislatures which have in the past prescribed a maximum death penalty for criminal assault.

What happens to the idea of majority rule—a concept which this same Supreme Court placed on such a pedestal in the reapportionment cases?

Note, too, the weasel words involved in the dissent; i.e., the phrase "or endangered human life." Can there be a criminal assault case in which human life does not stand in danger?

This suggestion by the three-man minority that the death penalty be declared unconstitutional in criminal assault cases follows a pattern of making it progressively more difficult for society to punish those who commit crimes against it. In a recent interview, the chief of police in Washington, D.C., blamed Court decisions such as the Mallory case for the rapid rise of crime in the Nation's Capital. The doctrine now urged by the three justices would reduce the punishment of a crime which has been become much more frequent even with capital punishment prescribed.

The decision as to whether the death penalty should be imposed should be made by the people through their duly elected legislators. It should not be a legislative decision by the Supreme Court.

Would it not be just as fitting for the Court to give more weight to the right of society to protect itself—to enjoy safely life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—than to protecting the rights of criminals?

If the Constitution is to be given an entirely new meaning every time a cases comes before the Supreme Court, then the document has become as worthless as a treaty with the Russians. We no longer would have a government of laws, but merely a government by five to nine Presidential appointees who have lifetime tenure.

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., Oct. 23, 1963]

NO EQUAL JUSTICE

Two items from Tuesday's news report:

Breach of peace convictions against 373 Negroes who demonstrated in Orangeburg 3 years ago were overturned without a hearing by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Vito Genovese, reputed leader of the nationwide crime syndicate Costa Nostra, won a Supreme Court hearing on the narcotics conviction that sent him to prison.

What is a country to do when its Supreme Court develops a pattern of decisions of this sort? It is a pattern, of course. The dismissal of the right of a community to preserve the peace and the extending of new legal opportunities to a hoodlum leader are characteristic of the Warren court. For almost 10 years, States have suffered one reversal after another in cases involving their long-established rights. In this same period, the Supreme Court has stretched all the rules to give the benefits of the doubt to people who seek to destroy American society.

No simple remedy exists for this situation. We believe, however, that efforts must continue to be made to establish the proposed Court of the Union, which would be composed of the chief justices of all the States and which would be a court of appeal from the U.S. Supreme Court. The present Supreme Court is not representative of the judicial traditions of the Nation. Certainly, it pays scant attention to the letter of constitutional law. It is a small group of ideologists who exercise no restraint in the use of vast judicial powers.

Insofar as disturbances of the peace are concerned, communities must continue to arrest those who form riotous assemblies. The Court action in the Orangeburg case has not stripped the States of responsibility for law enforcement. If the States were stripped of that right, the result would be chaos throughout the Nation. The code of laws of a State offers many opportunities to law enforcement officers who must preserve the public peace. If one type of charge is ruled out by the Supreme Court, other sections of the code must be utilized to prevent community disorders.

As for the Genovese case, perhaps it will assist the American people in seeing the issue of the Supreme Court more clearly. It should help Americans understand who is favored by latitude in the Court's hearing processes.

As things now stand, if a man is a street revolutionary, a Communist or a gangster, he can expect the Court to do its utmost to give him priviliges before the bar of justice.

But if the party to a Court case is a community that upholds law and order or a State that expects affirmation of its rights under the Constitution, it can only expect an adverse ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court. Equal justice is no longer a fact in the Nation's highest Court.

Restrain the Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of October 22, 1963:

RESTRAIN THE EXTREMISTS

The administration's chief problem in getting a workable civil rights bill through Congress no longer is the southern opposition; it is the ultraliberal northern Democrats who are trying to go too far too fast. There probably is a majority in the House and Senate for greatly strengthened legislation. But the draft bill in the House committee worked out under the zealous leadership of Chairman EMANUEL CELLER is a do-everything-at-once measure that goes far beyond President Kennedy's original proposals.

It goes so far that Attorney General Robert Kennedy spoke out against it. He acknowledged that it could lead to the establishment of a Federal police system. As drafted, it could enforce racial integration on all sorts of private undertakings—such as law or medical partnerships, apartment houses, private schools, insurance firms and the like. It would give the Federal Government power to decide voting qualifications in local elections. It would authorize the Federal Government in certain instances to control local police forces.

Such a bill could not possibly get through Congress. Yet there is need for Congress to strengthen civil rights and apply some curbs to racial discrimination. Congress cannot confess it is powerless to deal with this explosive situation. Robert Kennedy who certainly is not soft on civil rights is asking for a measure far less extreme than the one proposed in the Celler committee.

He is a practical politician. He knows that no civil rights bill can be passed in the House without the support of moderate Republicans. This means that the range of civil rights must be negotiated between the liberal Democrats and the Republican moderates, both groups being civil rights supporters. The administration must stop trying to smear the Republicans with allegations of running out on civil rights and the Republicans must take some responsibility for getting an acceptable bill before Congress. In such a situation there will be credit to both parties. And in such a situation the extremists on both sides of the civil rights issue have to be left behind.

Address by President Kennedy at the University of Maine on Relations With the Soviet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the President of the United States:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE ON RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET

Governor [John H.] Reed, Senator [Margaret Chase] Smith, Senator [Edmund S.] Muskie, Congressman [Stanley R.] Tupper, Congressman [Clifford G.] McIntire, ladies and gentlemen, I feel honored to join you at this distinguished university.

In the year 1717, King George I of England donated a very valuable library to Cambridge University—and, at very nearly the same time, had occasion to dispatch a regiment to Oxford. The King, remarked one famous wit, had judiciously observed the condition of both universities—one was a learned body in need of loyalty and the other was a loyal body in need of learning.

Today some observers may feel that very little has changed in two centuries. We are asking the Congress for funds to assist our college libraries, including those in Cambridge, Mass., and it was regrettably necessary on one occasion to send troops to Oxford, Miss.

And more generally speaking, critics of our modern universities have often accused them of producing either too little loyalty or too little learning. But I cannot agree with either charge. I am convinced that our universities are an invaluable national asset which must be observed, conserved and expanded.

I am deeply honored by the degree which you award me today—and I think it is appropriate to speak at this university, noted for both loyalty and learning, on the need for a more exact understanding of the true correlation of forces in the conduct of foreign affairs.

RECALLS CLASH WITH SOVIET

One year ago this coming week the United States and the world were gripped with the

somber prospect of a military confrontation between two great nuclear powers. The American people have good reason to recall with pride their conduct throughout that harrowing week. For they neither dissolved in panic nor rushed headlong into reckless belligerence.

Well aware of the risks of resistance, they nevertheless refused to tolerate the Soviets' attempt to place nuclear weapons in this hemisphere—but recognized at the same time that our preparations for the use of force necessarily required a simultaneous search for fair and peaceful solutions.

The extraordinary events of that week and the weeks that followed are now history—a history which is differently interpreted, differently recounted and differently labeled among various observers and nations. Some hail it as the West's greatest victory, others as a bitter defeat.

Some mark it as a turning point in the cold war, others as proof of its permanence. Some attribute the Soviet withdrawal of missiles to our military actions alone, while some credit solely our use of negotiations. Some view the entire episode as an example of Communist duplicity, while some others abroad have accepted the assertion that it indicated the Soviets' peaceful intentions.

While only the passage of time and events can reveal in full the true perspective of last October's drama, it is already clear that no single, simple view of this kind can be wholly accurate in this case. While both caution and commonsense proscribe our boasting of it in the traditional terms of unconditional military victory, only the most zealous partisan can attempt to call it a defeat.

While it's too late to say that nothing has changed in Soviet-American relations, it is too early to assume that the change is permanent. There are new rays of hope on the horizon—but we still live in the shadows of war.

CALM AND CAUTION

Let us examine the events of 12 months ago, therefore, and the events of the past 12 months, and the events in the next 12 months, in a context of calm and caution. It is clear there will be further disagreements between ourselves and the Soviets as well as further agreements. There will be setbacks in our Nation's endeavors on behalf of freedom as well as successes.

For a pause in the cold war is not a lasting peace, and a detente does not equal disarmament. The United States must continue to seek a relaxation of tensions, but we have no cause to relax our vigilance.

A year ago it would have been easy to assume that allout war was inevitable, that any agreement with the Soviets was impossible and that an unlimited arms race was unavoidable. Today it is equally easy for some to assume that the cold war is over, that all outstanding issues between the Soviets and ourselves can be quickly and satisfactorily settled and that we shall now have, in the words of the psalmist, an "abundance of peace so long as the Moon endureth."

The fact of the matter is, of course, that neither view is correct. We have, it is true, made some progress on a long journey. We have achieved new opportunities, which we cannot afford to waste. We have concluded with the Soviets a few limited, enforcible agreements or arrangements of mutual benefit to both sides and to the world.

But a change in atmosphere and emphasis is not a reversal of purpose. Mr. Khrushchev himself has said that there can be no coexistence in the field of ideology. In addition, there are still major areas of tension and conflict, from Berlin to Cuba to southeast Asia. The United States and the Soviet Union still have wholly different concepts of the world, its freedom, its future. We still have wholly different views on the so-called wars of liberation and the use of subversion.

And so long as these basic differences continue, they cannot and should not be concealed; they set limits to the possibilities of agreement; and they will give rise to further crises, large and small, in the months and years ahead, both in the areas of direct confrontation—Germany and the Caribbean—and in areas where events beyond our control could involve us both—areas such as Africa and Asia and the Middle East.

In times such as these, therefore, there is nothing inconsistent with signing an atmospheric nuclear test ban, on the one hand, and testing underground on the other; about being willing to sell to the Soviets our surplus wheat while refusing to sell strategic items; about probing their interest in a joint lunar landing while making a major effort to master this new environment; or about exploring the possibility of disarmament while maintaining our stockpile of arms.

For all of these moves, and all of these elements of American policy and allied policy toward the Soviet Union, are directed at a single, comprehensive goal; namely, convincing the Soviet leaders that it is dangerous for them to engage in direct or indirect aggression, futile for them to attempt to impose their will and their system on other unwilling peoples, and beneficial to them, as well as to the world, to join in the achievement of a genuine and enforceable peace.

While the road to that peace is long and hard, and full of traps and pitfalls, there is no reason not to take each step that we can safely take. It is in our national self-interest to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere so that all of our citizens can breathe more easily. It is in our national self-interest to sell surplus wheat in storage to feed Russions and Eastern Europeans who are willing to divert large portions of their limited foreign exchange reserves away from the implements of war.

It is in our national self-interest to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space—to maintain an emergency communications link with Moscow—and to substitute joint and peaceful exploration in the Antarctic and outer space for cold war exploitation.

NO REASON TO REGRET

No one of these small advances, nor all of them taken together, can be interpreted as meaning that the Soviets are abandoning their basic aims and ambitions. Nor should any future, less friendly Soviet action—whether it is a stoppage on the Autobahn, or a veto in the U.N., or a spy in our midst, or new trouble elsewhere—cause us to regret the steps we have taken.

Even if those steps themselves should be undone—by the violation or renunciation of the test ban treaty, for example, or by a decision to decline American wheat—there would still be no reason to regret the fact that this Nation has made every responsible effort to improve relations.

For without our making such an effort we could not maintain the leadership and respect of the free world. Without our making such an effort, we could not convince our adversaries that war was not in their interest. And without our making such an effort, we could never, in case of war, satisfy our own hearts and minds that we had done all that could be done to avoid the holocaust of endless death and destruction.

Historians report that in 1914, with most of the world already plunged in war, Prince Bulow, the former German Chancelor, said to the then Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg: "How did it all happen?" and Bethmann-Hollweg replied: "Ah, if only one knew."

If this planet is ever ravaged by nuclear war—if 300 million Americans, Russians and Europeans are wiped out by a 60-minute nuclear exchange—if the survivors of that devastation can then endure the fire, poison, chaos and catastrophe—I do not want one of those survivors to ask another "How did it all happen?" and to receive the incredible reply: "Ah, if only one knew."

Therefore, while maintaining our readiness for war, let us exhaust every avenue for peace. Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must.

Let us resolve to be the masters, not the victims, of our history, controlling our own destiny without giving way to blind suspicions and emotions. Let us distinguish between our hopes and our illusions, always hoping for steady progress toward less critically dangerous relations with the Soviets but never laboring under any illusions about Communist methods and Communist goals.

DISTANCE YET TO BE COVERED

Let us recognize both the gains we have made down the road to peace and the great distance yet to be covered. Let us not waste the present pause by either a needless renewal of tensions or a needless relatxation of vigilance. And let us recognize that we have made these gains and achieved this pause by the firmness we displayed a year ago as well as our restraint—by our efforts of defense as well as our efforts for peace.

In short, when we think of peace in this country, let us think of both our capacity to deter aggression and our goal of true disarmament. Let us think of both the strength of our Western alliances and the areas of East-West cooperation.

For the American eagle on the Presidential seal holds in his talons both the olive branch of peace and the arrows of military might. On the ceiling of the Presidential Office, constructed many years ago, that eagle is facing the arrows of war on its left. But on the newer carpet on the floor, reflecting a change initiated by President Roosevelt and implemented by President Truman immediately after the war, that eagle is now facing the olive branch of peace.

And it is in that spirit—the spirit of both preparedness and peace—that this Nation today is stronger than ever before, strengthened by both the increased power of our defenses and our increased efforts for peace, strengthened by both our resolve to resist coercion and our constant search for solutions. And it is in this spirit, I can assure you, the American Eagle still faces toward the olive branch of peace.

And in the months and years ahead, we intend to build both kinds of strength—during times of detente as well as tension, during periods of conflict as well as cooperation—until the world we pass on to our children is truly safe for diversity and freedom and the rule of law covers all.

The 45th Anniversary of the Republic of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, October 28, marks the 45th anniversary of the birth of one of the great Republics of the world, the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

I rise today to pay tribute to that beleaguered nation and to its freedom-loving people.

The Republic of Czechoslovakia came into being some 45 years ago after World War I on October 28, 1918. Its first President, Thomas Garrigue Ma-

saryk, was the cornerstone in the foundation of the Czechoslovakian Republic. He had the firm support of President Woodrow Wilson and the American people who have always given a sympathetic ear and constructive support to the ideals of freedom in all portions of the world.

Many years later in 1937 President Masaryk, then in his 87th year, said, "Czechoslovakia proudly accepts the ideals of Washington, Lincoln and Wilson. Let others find a solution to their own problems, but let us not allow them to touch our most important treasures: freedom of soul, freedom of word, and freedom of race." This simple but great man epitomizes the spirit and feeling of Czechoslovakians everywhere.

A short time later Czechoslovakia fell under the heel of Nazi totalitarianism to be followed immediately by the overwhelming oppression of Red communism. Today the freedom-loving peoples of Czechoslovakia still live under this brutal oppression.

I am certain, however, that within their hearts there still beats that same glow of freedom that has been their birthright and heritage of Czechoslovakians down through the ages. On this 45th anniversary I proudly salute the people of Czechoslovakia and the Republic of Czechoslovakia I am certain that in the future course of history that once again the Republic of Czechoslovakia will regain its birthright and that the people of that country will take their place in the forefront of the great democratic nations of the world.

Do We Need a Sputnik From the Sea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, our very limited efforts and lack of knowledge in the field of oceanography has been of great concern to me for several years.

While the national effort in this science of the seas has been fairly extensive during the past few years, the bulk of our oceanographic knowledge has come from the efforts of the ocean boundary States, a few private institutions and some special ocean-related industries. Maryland has met the scientific challenge of the ocean since the founding of the State. But all of these efforts have barely scratched the surface of this most important field of inner space research.

Recent legislation passed by the House, providing for a long range comprehensive program in oceanography is a step in the right direction. We must realize the importance of increasing our knowledge of the oceans and providing trained personnel for the application of that knowledge, to our national security and future welfare.

Under permission to extend my remarks I wish to introduce into the RECORD a speech made by my Maryland colleague, Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., on October 19 before the Maryland Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. I was particularly pleased to note that Mr. MATHIAS urged the establishment of a National Oceanographic Laboratory in Chesapeake Bay. His reasons are valid and, it is my hope, that such an institution will be included in our national oceanographic program.

I recommend that every Member of Congress read Mr. MATHIAS' excellent treatise on the need for oceanographic research titled "Do We Need a Sputnik From the Sea?"

The speech follows:

DO WE NEED A SPUTNIK FROM THE SEA?

(Address by Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, October 19, 1963, before the Maryland Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, Hotel Belvedere, Baltimore, Md.)

One of the most menacing weapons at the command of Adolf Hitler at the outbreak of World War II was his fleet of U-boats.

Today the Soviet Union has commissioned, manned, and is operating a fleet of submarines more than 10 times the size of the German submarine fleet in 1939.

Our Intelligence indicates that the Russians now have approximately 600 submarines of which we believe 400 to be capable of fleet operations.

At this very moment a Russian trawler is lying off the Virginia Capes ostensibly fishing, but I venture to predict that every ship that leaves the Port of Baltimore—and all other Chesapeake Bay shipping—will be observed, logged, and reported Russian naval headquarters.

Consideration of the maritime aspect of the relationship between Russia and Cuba makes it easier to understand what has gone on in that island. A look at a map will show you how valuable it is for Russian ships to be able to extend their range by refueling in Cuba rather than making a mid-Atlantic loop from and to Russian home ports. This may explain why Russia withdrew the missiles from Cuba. What she primarily wanted in Cuba was not a missile base but a naval and maritime base.

Thus, we see that Communist Russia is achieving the dream of Peter the Great to make the Russian people into the dominant seafaring nation. Why they are doing this and how they are doing it become important questions to the American people.

Early in October I took my two small sons, Charlie and Rob, to the beach for their first look at the ocean. We stood there on the shore of our island—for that, indeed, is what our land is—an island in the midst of a gigantic ocean domain. As we stood there on that Indian summer afternoon I came to realize the sparkling sea as man's last frontier on earth—as 72 million square miles of unexplored and unexploited territory—as the giver of life as we know it on this planet and the key to our continued existence.

As a nation we have had a continuous and intimate relationship with the sea. While this has undergone cycles of emphasis and deemphasis, our ability to use the sea has turned up a governing consideration in every time of troubles. The Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, two World Wars, Korea, all saw the outcomes balanced precariously upon the success of our operations at sea. A future conflict may once again find sea-based power employed to tip the scales.

Important as our oceanic military posture has been, it is only a part of our historical maritime dependence. The Yankee traders of a former age used clipper ships to envigorate the colonies' economy. The slaves-rum-furs triangle of that day has developed more recently into a two-way exchange between our industrial-agricultural economy and the raw materials producers overseas. Virtually no technologically advanced nation is so self-sustained as to lack the need for imports of either raw materials or special manufactured goods. Once rich in natural resources, we have—and it is a sad admission—become a depleted nation and now depend entirely upon supply from abroad for many critical materials.

We have only recently—and very slowly—begun to understand the full impact of the sea upon our future. With this has come the realization that we are almost completely ignorant of what goes on in the entire area. Water covers roughly three-fourths of the surface of the earth, a feature well known to every observer of a globe—the area is immediately visible—the identity of the shoreline is well defined. But this is just a two-dimensional portrayal of the oceans. The third dimension—that of depth—is not apparent unless you examine a relief map closely. The sea averages about 13,000 feet in depth. The deepest point is roughly 35,800 feet, a hole into which Mount Everest would all but disappear. Eighty percent is deeper than 9,000 feet. The oceans contain 1.5 billion tons of water. If the surface of the earth were bulldozed smooth, sea water would cover it to a depth of 12,000 feet. Truly, the earth is the "water planet," for no other planet retains its moisture in liquid form. And it is this part of our planet that is largely unknown.

Man's activities on the planet have always included exploration. By restless curiosity alone—but more likely in search of the miracle of fabulous discovery—man has rather thoroughly unclothed the continents. To be sure, details are scanty about certain parts—whether in terms of topography, or more particularly subsurface mineral content—but about the ocean floor, man knows next to nothing. The resources of the ocean thus remain untapped.

The need for these resources, whether mineral or biological, for human nourishment is often considered a problem for the next generation—so that the urgency for immediate exploitation may superficially appear marginal. Studies are made of the economic payoff anticipated in ocean exploitation—but these are academic since little is known of what is there in the first place. We must first have charts of the oceans in terms of their physical descriptions of temperature, salinity, the presence of currents, etc.—then descriptions of the ocean floors in terms of topography and mineral content. Finally, we need to know more about fishes.

For a peaceful world, dedicated to mankind's physical and spiritual welfare, the vast expanses of the oceans hold out hope for more resources and consequent enrichment of life. But the world is not at peace. We are engaged in a struggle with an ideological camp whose announced and demonstrated objective is world domination. It is interesting to note that the Soviets have apparently recognized the sea's potentials and have begun a vigorous program of oceanography and ocean development. Can we afford to await an Oceanic Sputnik to be jarred to our senses?

Let us look a bit further at Communist interest. Here are a few significant facts:

Since World War II the Soviet Union has constructed more combatant ships, with the exception of aircraft carriers, than any other nation in the world.

Soviet and Chinese Communist merchant shipbuilding programs are as rapid as their plant facilities permit.

Soviet seaborne trade has expanded to the point that they buy or lease foreign merchant ships—I saw tangible evidence of this when I participated in several surveillance flights over the Caribbean and Atlantic waters during the Cuban blockade in the fall of 1962. I saw for myself the variety and

quality of Russian shipping which is sailing the high seas.

The Soviet oceanographic research program surpasses that of the free world.

Soviet fishing fleets have gone in for factory-ship complexes. The capabilities for other than routine fishing operations were verified by the boarding of a Soviet trawler in the vicinity of an Atlantic cable break.

The Soviet submarine forces in the Atlantic have become more venturesome, as witnessed during the Cuban blockade.

The Soviet submarine, the *Severyanka*, is conducting oceanographic research.

A Soviet nuclear-powered icebreaker is in operation.

From these operations, we can—or should—derive a picture of their plans. They are aiming for world domination—and two-thirds of the world consists of ocean.

"This is all very well," you reply. "But let's go back to something you mentioned a moment ago—the economic payoff. Even the Soviets live in an environment of supply and demand. What can be derived from the oceans that can't be had easier and cheaper from the land?"

That's a good question. To be truthful, we don't know the exact answer. So little is known—so much is there to be learned. That is the reason we need an extensive program of oceanography—to build up our basic knowledge and understanding of the sea. But a few facts are at our disposal. Let's examine some of these.

Minerals are known to exist in many places. Sea water itself has some 60 elements dissolved in various forms. One cubic mile of sea water contains about 140 million tons of salt, 6 million tons of magnesium, 4 million tons of sulphur, and 2 million tons of potassium. Aluminum, iodine, manganese, copper, lead, and zinc are there—as well as the rarer elements such as cesium, uranium, yttrium, and scandium. About 5 pounds of gold are to be found in 1 cubic mile of sea water.

At present extraction processes are very uneconomic. The sea is jealously withholding its riches. But in the not too distant future a serious problem is going to arise. We will be faced with the problem of extracting fresh water from the sea. When this happens we will have all of the solids to deal with. Suppose that a million people in the United States use an average of 1,000 gallons of distilled sea water annually—and this figure is not unreasonable in judging our future requirements. Approximately a cubic mile of sea water would be needed. Over 150 million tons of solids will become available. Of course, the vast quantities of salt and magnesium will be more than we need, but other elements will be welcome additions to our supply of raw materials.

Minerals will probably be recovered in commercial quantities from beaches or the ocean bottom long before sea water extraction becomes feasible. Many new and old beaches contain deposits of interest that have been processed nicely by the crushing and grinding action of the surf. Additional processing necessary is generally simple and inexpensive—with an adequate water supply being a big help. Diamonds, gold, tin, and silica are taken from marine beaches, while titanium, a metal of rising importance in the jet and space age, is being mined from older beaches pushed up out of the sea by the subterranean forces which cause an emerging coastline in some localities.

Tin deposits are being mined in submerged beaches off Malaya, and the Japanese have long been working magnetite sands off their coasts. Diamonds are being dredged from beach sands off the west coast of South Africa. Our own beaches are not being similarly exploited. Possibly because the minerals are not there, but more probably because adequate surveys have not been made. At the very edge of the sea we begin to draw a blank.

The minerals in deeper waters away from beach areas have long been regarded as beyond our grasp. A small amount of relatively shallow dredging has taken place—100 or 200 feet in depth—but beyond that, the ocean floor has been the exclusive realm of Poseidon's creatures. Our knowledge of these areas consists, in the main, of spotty soundings. You have probably heard it said that we have better topographic maps of the moon than of the bottom of the sea on earth. This is true. Only a very few places in the ocean have accurately plotted bottom topography. And even this is changing. The sea bottom is a restless thing, forever being washed by currents, sprinkled by sediments from above, and heaved by the equalizing forces in an unsettled earth's crust.

A few mineral deposits of importance have been located and identified in deeper waters. The delicate physical, chemical and biological balance in the ocean has caused the formation of large nodules—or chunks—of materials which average about 30 percent manganese and contain significant percentages also of aluminum, copper and nickel. These seem to have been formed by a complicated process in which the electrically charged ions of these minerals collected on the smooth surface of a shark's tooth or a whale's ear bone. It took a lot of sharks to cover the bottom of the sea with manganese nodules, but our finny predecessor did not let us down. One survey has concluded that in the central and southeast Pacific alone there is an area larger than the continental United States literally covered with manganese.

Red clay is a form of sediment that covers some 40 million square miles of ocean floor. That found in the Atlantic Ocean has an alumina content of about 25 percent. Because of this and other reasons it would probably be a more attractive source of copper and alumina than a land deposit of similar grade. Another large expanse of ocean bottom is covered with a type of sediment called globigerina ooze. It is very high in calcium carbonate and is very similar to cement rocks which account for about 95 percent of the cement rock market. Extensive deposits are known to exist fairly close to shore. Concentrations of nickel and silver are found in fish debris which covers much of the ocean floor, but so little data exists at present that their economic significance is unknown.

These have been but a few of the minerals that we know about almost by accident—through the adventurous explorations of a few inquisitive people. The information on manganese nodules in the Pacific, for instance, came from a survey conducted at the turn of the century. Today we have better instruments, tools and analytical devices—available is the technology that yearns to discover signs of life on Mars or plant man's feet on the crunchy surface of the Moon. Our Nation—yes, mankind itself—should demand that we focus some of our technical abilities on the frontier of the sea. The resources are there for the taking. Nowhere in the solar system is there a more promising source of enrichment.

The sea is presently hiding enormous deposits of oil. Man has followed oil bearing strata to the low water line of a beach only to turn back when depths have exceeded a hundred feet or so. Drilling from Texas Towers in the shallow waters of the Gulf of Mexico has been successful, and a few wells have been drilled from specially configured ships in deeper water. But the sea keeps pressing us back. Somehow, the air breathing animal that we are—is repulsed by environmental conditions beneath the sea which are far less formidable to conquer than those in outer space.

In space we have a vacuum—or a lack of pressure. Beneath the sea there is an excess of pressure. In both cases, we have to take our atmosphere along with us. The problems of subsisting man in either outer space or the inner space beneath the sea are in many ways identical to the modern engineer. We have only decided to do one and not the other. The time has come when we should reexamine our ambitions and devote proper attention to the frontiers of our own planet.

Our first need is a national policy. This should identify our goals—our objectives for the peaceful exploitation of the oceans. Notice the word "peaceful." It can be assumed that the Department of Defense is going to make full use of the oceans to enhance our military posture. We need to identify what else it is that we should try to accomplish—through what means—under whose cognizance. What steps should be taken by which agencies? What are the needs for legislation and funding? What participation should be solicited from the industrial, financial, scientific, or other communities? A well-developed and inclusive policy should establish guidelines for all elements of government. Every citizen should have it at his disposal also so that he might plan with confidence for the future.

Development of this policy has already begun because of economic and intellectual interest at the citizen level. The State of Maryland is fortunate to have the Institute of Natural Resources of the University of Maryland at Solomons Island and the Chesapeake Institute of Johns Hopkins University—both leaders in this field. In addition, a number of Maryland industries such as Westinghouse and Textron are engaged in private oceanographic research and development.

It is my firm belief that with the increased emphasis on oceanographic research and the great and pressing need for exploration of inner space, the time is now at hand—and I want to make a strong case—for the establishment of a National Oceanographic Laboratory in Chesapeake Bay. At the present time there is no oceanographic facility at a Federal level south of Wood's Hole and, I believe, the Chesapeake Bay is an ideal location for such a laboratory. It offers a ready access to the open sea and, at the same time, provides a location which would be convenient for consultation with other Government facilities and with the great universities of the Eastern States.

One of the greatest needs for the establishment of a national ocean policy stems from the general interplay of international relations. The process of interaction of peoples upon the sea has been influenced primarily by the tremendous expanses and the relatively inexhaustible richness of living resources in the oceans. Cooperative enjoyment of the oceans has been, in general, the law of the sea.

The contemporary scene, in contrast, has recently begun to be less cooperative—more studded with demands for exclusive authority of states over larger segments of the world's oceans. By far the most controversial demands are those to extend the territorial sea beyond the previously narrow limits generally accepted in international law. Claims to exclusive authority over resources in the high seas include the exploitation of fisheries and certain natural resources—principally oil at this time—found in the Continental Shelves near many coasts. These will quite probably be extended in the future to create further conflicts and controversy in the open sea not contiguous to any particular state. The technology to exploit these areas of the high seas is at hand, and it may be reasonably predicted that conflicts of interest are in the offing when technology has developed the necessary operating systems.

The U.S. Government policy should take cognizance of impending—and inevitable—undersea developments. It should recognize that commercial interests will create new situations never before contemplated under

the framework of international law. Free world development will quite probably be paralleled by nationalized projects of the Socialist camp. Inherent in these is potential conflict. We need not wait for a crisis to precipitate the formation of our national guidelines.

Two easily identifiable areas of oceanic development are apparently needed. One of these is oceanography. We simply need to know more about the ocean—to compile and digest tons of data in order that our scientific understanding of this region will be more complete. Fortunately, there is a program in existence which is actively pursuing this knowledge. The 10-year oceanographic program, under the sponsorship of the Interagency Committee on Oceanography is supported by legislation and is progressing satisfactorily. All of the State and Federal Government agencies such as the Navy, Coast and Geodetic Survey, the National Science Foundation, and others with particular interest are actively engaged as are members of the scientific community with particular contributory skills. We may expect our scientific understanding of the oceans to advance with great strides under the aegis of this program.

Another feature of ocean exploitation has not been so lively. This is what might be called ocean engineering—the application of engineering technology for the development of underwater devices and systems. For some reason we have been content to watch the slowly expanding knowledge of the sea without daring to put it to work.

The Wright brothers did not hold up their flights at Kitty Hawk because of inadequate meteorological information—they flew with what they knew. Several years later, the Naval Appropriations Act of 1916, approved March 3, 1915, authorized the setting up of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics to "supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight, with a view to their practical solution, and to discuss their solution and their application to practical questions." The establishment of laboratories to conduct research was authorized.

From the NACA sprang the great wind tunnel experiments which laid the engineering foundation for our assault upon the atmosphere. The NACA cowling and many other engineering contributions too numerous to mention assured our leadership in flight. We need now to consider what needs to be done about our engineering leadership in the oceans. The need for a similar program suggests itself when we contemplate the enormity of the task.

One thing is certain—ocean engineering is now lagging oceanography. We are learning more about the ocean, but doing less. The recent search for the ill-fated submarine *Thresher* is an outstanding example of how little we know about inner space. The *Thresher* went down in approximately 8,400 feet of water—but had it gone down in only 840 feet the results of the search would have been about the same, due to our lack of ocean engineering knowledge.

We must somehow bring the great weight of our technical and engineering abilities to bear upon this problem if we are to maintain our position—or if we do not want to risk falling behind in the development of this critical region. A national policy is needed for overall guidance—this is the job of the executive department. All of our Government agencies must accept the new challenge and make plans to get their feet wet where needed. Congress should recognize the need for ocean engineering development and see to it that an adequate program is supported with appropriate legislation.

Finally, the citizenry of this country must realize that the sea is a dominant influence in their future. A concerted effort will require participation by industry, educational institutions, foundations, associations and individual citizens. It is a program which must be approached with the adventurous spirit of the pioneer which our forefathers so ably demonstrated.

The challenge is great—the need is pressing. Let us hope that we all have the courage to carry it through.

Mission Accomplished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following editorial entitled "Mission Accomplished," which appeared in the October 13, 1963, edition of the Columbia (S.C.) State:

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

Rural electrification has come a long way in South Carolina since the midthirties, but now it seems to be taking on all the attributes of immortality.

In this State, as throughout the entire United States, the task of providing electrical service to rural areas is almost 98 percent complete. That original function of the Rural Electrification Administration has been met, yet the REA on both the national and the State levels continues to expand—as an expense to the taxpayer and as a threat to the privately owned, taxpaying utilities of the land.

In the beginning, rural folk combined themselves into electric cooperatives in order to obtain electrical service which they could not get from the utility firms. As business enterprises obligated to make a return on the invested money of stockholders, the utilities could not venture into so costly an operation as extending electrical services into the sparsely settled rural areas where power sales could not possibly equal service costs.

It was at this stage of the game that the Federal Government began making tax money available to local rural electric cooperatives at low interest rates. These loans, plus outright appropriations for administrative and other costs of REA operations, made it possible for electric service to be extended into areas which held no money-making potential for private utilities.

Thus, the REA cooperatives filled a role and provided a function which at the time seemed vital to the electricification of rural America. But as is usually the case in organizations which draw their sustenance from the central Government, the Rural Electrification Administration and its satellite cooperatives grew into a self-serving and self-perpetuating entity with strong political influence.

Not content with having brought power to rural communities and having thus fulfilled its mission, the entire REA structure today is growing into a mammoth public power agency. Genuine farmers now account for only about half of the REA customers, and three out of every four new services provided by REA are for nonfarm users.

REA co-ops are competing for the customers of private utilities. They tenaciously cling to every service area, even though many areas have long since outgrown their original rural character. Incidentally, REA statutes still maintain the fiction that they are not concerned with urban areas or municipalities with more than 1,500 residents.

The REA developed into a public power empire, with a marked tendency to continued empire-building. REA co-ops are favored with Federal loans at 2 percent interest at a time when the Government itself is paying almost 4 percent to obtain money. In some areas, REA co-ops are actually lending their 2-percent-money at higher rates and pocketing the difference.

REA co-ops pay only piddling taxes, and in almost every sense are tax consumers instead of taxpayers. The co-ops are outside the jurisdiction of State regulatory bodies, and make their own rules and set their own rates as they go along.

In recent years, with practically all farmers now receiving power, the REA co-ops have turned to the construction of transmission lines and generating facilities. Here in South Carolina, they already have erected a tremendous distribution system stemming from their power source at Santee-Cooper. Now, they have announced a $27,600,000 loan (at 2 percent) for construction of a massive steam-generating plant at Conway.

Such a plant is not justified either in economics or in free enterprise. It simply will afford the subsidized co-ops another means with which to compete with private industry, thus diminishing State, local, and Federal taxation while adding to the number of customers enjoying subsidized rates.

The three utilities which serve South Carolina have offered to buy all the REA co-ops in the State. The offer includes repayment of all outstanding loans, a reduction in rates to 80 percent of the REA customers, employment of all REA personnel, plus payment of local, State, and Federal taxes at corporate rates.

Today REA's professional spokesmen are traveling the State, bitterly attacking the offer and the utilities which made it. These REA men have a good thing going and it is understandable that they would seek to preserve their favored position.

But the solid citizens who make up the backbone of the cooperatives' membership should look hard and long at the offer. This is a rare chance to wind up a governmental function which has fulfilled its mission, to take a step away from socialism, and to strengthen the American free enterprise system.

If the utilities' offer is rejected, then the taxpaying public of South Carolina should look to the possibility of legislation which would realistically appraise the current status of rural electrification and REA co-ops in general.

Sooner or later, the taxpayers will balk at continuing the preferential treatment given to agencies which refuse to face up to the fact that their day is over.

That day of reckoning, and perhaps of rancor, can be avoided by having the co-ops phase themselves out of business—promptly and profitably—while the utilities' offer still stands.

Capt. David M. Cook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently Capt. David M. Cook, master of the stern wheeler *Mississippi* and later the motor vessel *Mississippi*, which succeeded the old river boat, passed to his reward.

As a very young man he followed in the footsteps of his father and became

employed on the Mississippi River. He advanced quickly and at his death was recognized as an outstanding pilot on the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. A man of the highest character, personality, and intelligence, he counted his friends among the thousands. Many Members of Congress had occasion to ride the *Mississippi* down the river on official inspection trips. He was informative, painstakingly careful about his duties, and a pilot who never took any chances in handling his steamer with its passengers.

The Commercial Appeal, a responsible big daily newspaper in the Midsouth, has written an editorial about Captain Cook and in order that his friends in the Congress may have the opportunity to read and appreciate this splendid writing, I am including it as a part of these humble remarks. It follows:

CAPT. DAVID M. COOK

The jaw was square and hard, the eyes sharp and piercing, and his orders were firm and positive. But when Capt. David M. Cook spoke his voice was low and throaty, and a smile always played on his lips.

He was the last of his kind, a riverboat skipper who could have followed no other career, because he was born to the purple, heir to two previous generations of rivermen. He had learned the secrets of the Mississippi and its tributaries before other boys were out of high school. In his mind was a detailed catalog of every curve and bend, eddy and ripple, snag and bar. And with a sixth sense he could sniff the constant and hazardous changes that lurk in a mighty stream.

There will be no more masters on the Texas deck of a sternwheeler. Dave Cook, master and pilot of the old *Mississippi III*, was the last, and now he is gone, just as his beloved sternwheeler is gone, replaced by a motor vessel.

Generals and Congressmen inspected the valley, its ports, and U.S. engineer projects with Captain Dave at the helm. They knew him as a perfectionist in the wheelhouse and an old-school gentleman in periods of relaxation.

Many will mourn him, but none more than that big river that always returned his affection. The eternal flow of water and silt, bearing other boats and other pilots up and down stream, is indeed a living memorial to Capt. David Cook.

Mr. Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star of October 22, 1963, paying tribute to the Honorable Conrad Wirth.

As one of his admirers and as one who feels about the National Park Service the same way he does, I view his retirement with a feeling of great sadness and loss. The very determined and firm attitude he has maintained on preservation of our great natural treasures has been perhaps the finest contribution made to this cause in our country. I insert at this point the editorial on Connit Wirth:

MR. PARK SERVICE

We have sometimes been critical, even strongly critical, of the stiff-necked attitude of the National Park Service. When it stands like Horatius at the bridge, blocking some project vital to the emerging new Washington, patience runs low.

On the other hand, if it had not been for the National Park Service, Washington might well have lost, or perhaps never have acquired, what amounts to one of the finest park systems in the world.

Since 1951, Conrad L. Wirth has been "Mr. Park Service" to us.

Connie Wirth's retirement as Park Service Director was announced last Friday, 4 days after Assistant Secretary of the Interior Carver made a speech to park superintendents that was highly critical of the organization's attitudes and contained the implication that the Interior Department high command had lost patience with Mr. Wirth.

Among other things Mr. Carver charged the Service wih resorting to a semireligious mystique to thwart Interior Department policies. He said it fostered a public-be-damned attitude and was not cooperating with the Department's new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Mr. Wirth denies that his retirement was hastened by his superiors. And Interior Secretary Udall, since Mr. Carver's speech, has taken pains to praise Mr. Wirth's record and to disavow to Mr. Wirth's subordinates Mr. Carver's implied slap. It is now clear that George B. Hartzog, who is to succeed Mr. Wirth as Director, was one of five men recommended for the post by Mr. Wirth. His selection does not presage an about-face in national park policy.

We are glad that this is the case. For to sacrifice to expediency or popular demands of the moment the basic policy of conserving natural America for generations yet unborn could have tragic consequences.

The men who fathered the park movement were zealots. They were missionaries. Without these qualities the movement never would have got off the ground. The men who continue their work must have the same basic zeal.

While we intend to continue to argue the merits of specific decisions on the use of park land, we do not believe that a soft policy concerning such use should be adopted. We congratulate Connie Wirth on 32 years of dedicated service to the Nation and especially to its Capital. If his successor does as well, we will all have been very ably served.

Good Pay for Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the need for pay legislation is well known. The gentleman from Utah, Congressman UDALL, has introduced H.R. 8716 and I have introduced H.R. 8717, an identical bill now actively under study by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. These bills provide for increases in compensation for Members of Congress, the Judiciary, executive, and career personnel.

I submit an article entitled "Good Pay for Good Government" which I personally urge you to read. This is an excellent, succinct summary of the reasons supporting adequate compensation for the members of regulatory agencies affecting transportation. The conditions justifying salary increases for the officials of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, and Federal Maritime Commission obviously apply with equal force to all other Government executives.

"Good Pay for Good Government" has been written by the Transportation Association of America, a highly responsible national transportation policy organization whose membership consists of representatives of transport users, investors, and carriers of all modes—including air, freight forwarder, highway, oil pipeline, railroad, and water carriers. I am informed that many of the members of its 113-man board of directors have rendered prior Government service and appreciate the importance of recruiting and retaining men of high caliber and integrity in regulatory positions.

I hope you will endorse the principles outlined in this article and support the authorization of appropriate increases in compensation for the persons covered by the pending bills:

GOOD PAY FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT: THE NEED TO ADJUST AGENCY MEMBER SALARY SCALES

THE NEED FOR HOLDING ON TO TOP-CALIBER TRANSPORT AGENCY MEMBERS

Transportation Association of America is concerned about keeping the 21-member positions on the Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Federal Maritime Commission filled with men who have become knowledgeable about the complex problems of transportation.

It is generally recognized that during the period since the end of World War II there has occurred a rapid increase in the problems and responsibilities assumed by the Federal Government. This trend, accompanied by the quickening pace of our national economy, has increased the demand for Federal officers with sufficient ability and experience to qualify for public service. Such excellence "will neither be obtained quickly, nor will it be retained for adequate periods, until we compensate our top officers on a basis commensurate with the complex and difficult roles assigned to them" (Randall Report to President, June 1963).

The extensive obligations and duties imposed upon the CAB, ICC, and FMC members responsible for the economic regulation of common carrier transport is apparent from the fact that in 1962 these 3 agencies decided 9,120 formal proceedings. These members were also involved in a vast number of policy problems affecting safety, legislation, litigation, research, enforcement, and economic regulations.

It is exceedingly difficult to keep these 21 positions filled with experienced and seasoned men who will exercise enlightened and objective judgment in all matters requiring decision. For example, such difficulty is highlighted by the fact that 13 of the 22 CAB members who served prior to the present incumbents occupied such positions less than 3 years, only half the 6-year term of office. Fewer than one-third of these members served to the end of their appointed terms. In brief, this abbreviated service is not good—it is not in the public interest.

THE HISTORY OF AGENCY MEMBER SALARY STRUCTURE

The Congress, in 1887, created the Interstate Commerce Commission, the first regu-

latory agency of the Federal Government. The annual salary of the Commissioners was then fixed at $7,500 per year.

During the next 30 years this salary periodically increased, reaching a $12,000 level in 1920. The ICC members' salary was reduced to $10,000 per year in 1932 as an economy measure during the depression. It was again restored 12 years later to $12,000 per year, raised to $15,000 per year in 1949, and to the present level of $20,000 per annum in 1956. This salary level also prevails today for the CAB and FMC, with the Chairman of these agencies authorized to receive $20,500 per year.

STATE, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND OTHER OFFICIALS ARE BETTER PAID

A 1963 Civil Service Commission study showed the following comparative salaries:

Over 900 Governors, mayors and city managers, administrative and professional executives, judges and public corporation officers receive annual salaries exceeding $25,000 per year—to a high of $60,000 per annum.

Five hundred and eleven principal administrative officers of colleges and universities and 143 administrators in the Nation's public school system receive salaries of $20,000 or more per annum.

The pay scales of major foundation and other nonprofit institution executives range from $20,000 to more than $50,000 per year.

A study of 14 nonprofit contractors handling Federal research and development work revealed that 186 officers, technical directors, and other staff members receive salaries ranging from $23,000 to $45,000 per year.
revealed that 186 officers, technical directors,

One hundred and twenty officers of the United Nations receive compensation ranging from almost $19,000 to over $25,000 per year.

AGENCY CAREER EMPLOYEES ARE ALMOST AS WELL PAID

In 1963, six staff members of the ICC, CAB, and FMC are receiving at least $20,000 per year, the same salary paid to the agency members. Seventeen staffers are in the $19,000–$20,000 range, 18 are in the $18,000–$19,000 range, and 23 are in the $17,000–$18,000 range. A total of 64 career employees in these three agencies alone who earn almost as much as the agency members themselves.

In 1962 President Kennedy advocated the principle of comparability between pay for Government career employees and the average pay for private enterprise work at the same levels. The adoption of such principle in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 without concurrent upward adjustment of executive pay, has further aggravated the inequitable salary scales for agency members vis-a-vis career employees.

In fact, proposed legislation (H.R. 7552) provides that grades 15, 16, 17 and 18 career employees can all earn $20,000 per year, clustering them with agency members.

RECENT CONGRESSIONAL AND WHITE HOUSE ACTION

The President, in his February 1962 message to Congress relevant to salary reform, recognized the inadequacy of existing salary levels for executive positions. Later the same year the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee urged the President "to recommend for consideration at the next session of Congress appropriate increases in Federal executive salaries at all levels.

In 1963 the President has recommended salary increases for classified employees ranging from 2 to 26 percent increases. In the meantime, he established in January 1963 a 12-man Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems to submit salary recommendations, including the appropriate levels for executive salaries. Chairman Clarence B. Randall of the Advisory Panel submitted its report on June 12, 1963, recommending substantial salary increases for Cabinet members, Supreme Court Justices, Members of Congress, and other high Government officials, including regulatory agency members.

In recommending salary increases for such positions, the Panel concluded as follows: "We are convinced that our top salary structure no longer provides positive encouragement to men and women of the highest ability, dedication, and conviction about the American way of life to accept Federal appointments in either the executive branch or the judiciary, or to seek Federal elective office with assurance that the financial demands upon them can, in most instances, be met from their salaries."

This report was transmitted to the Congress where it is now under active study by the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

ADVISORY PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AGENCY MEMBERS

Annual salaries of $35,000 per year were recommended for agency members and $40,000 per year for agency chairmen.

Additional financial benefits were recommended, including (1) reimbursement of residential moving costs to and from the seat of government, (2) per diem allowances up to $50 per day, (3) reimbursement for other legitimate expenses incurred in the line of official duty, and (4) separation pay at the termination of service up to a maximum of 3 months' pay.

ACTUAL EXPERIENCES AND REACTIONS OF PRESENT AND PAST AGENCY MEMBERS

TAA conducted a special survey of the present and past members of the transportation regulatory agencies to obtain firsthand information about the need for higher compensation. The following comments support corrective action:

"Speaking only for myself, financial considerations were almost entirely decisive in my case in leaving the only two important Federal Government positions I ever held."

"Had I not already established over a period of many years free-and-easy access to credit with two of my home State banks, it would have been financially impossible to serve out my terms. * * * Like most others, I still have a son preparing for college and I see no way on the current salary level to provide adequately for his higher education."

"I have no hesitancy in saying that many highly competent people known to me have been required to leave the Government service against their basic desires and entirely because of financial and economic considerations."

"I would have stayed in Federal service longer because of the challenge and the broad scope of responsibility, however, when you are losing cash at the rate of $6,000 per annum due to inadequate expense allowance, inadequate protection for your family either in the form of pension or insurance benefits, and on top of that losing 50 to 75 percent of your earning capability or comparable positions, 2 years is about all a person can afford to give of his time."

"As part of a team trying to recruit men for the administrative agencies, I found again and again that highly qualified younger men simply could not serve because of financial considerations. They were usually just starting into the high earnings portion of their career, they had sizable family obligations, and they were concerned not only with the diminution of income while in Washington, but also their loss of position on the promotional ladder in business or their profession."

"In my own case, service was at quite a personal sacrifice. My income was cut substantially and my personal expenses substantially increased. For a man with four young children to pick up and move to Washington, find suitable living accommodations, schools, and in general to fit into a new community is an expensive process, and of course, none of this expense is borne by the Government."

"Gave up income and practice netting $25,000, equal to about $35,000 in Washington; $5,350 extra taxes to date. Just had to remortgage house for $4,000."

COMMENTS BY INFORMED PERSONS CONCERNED WITH THE PROBLEM

Clarence B. Randall, former chairman of the advisory panel, says: "A man may have the highest and most dedicated purposes in the world, but he is also a normal human being. He may have parents to support, a home to buy, children to send to college, and a future to provide for. He must not be asked to make the full sacrifice. We on the outside must share his burden."

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has declared: "If we are to retain in Government service the highly skilled and able civilian employees who contribute so much to the Nation's strength, it is clear that certain revisions are needed in the statutory pay structures for these employees."

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, says: "Our National Government today is facing the most complex problems that man has ever experienced. * * * Therefore, the Government must be staffed from bottom to top with high-quality personnel capable of contributing to solutions of these problems in the national interest."

Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget, says: "Executive pay levels must be raised. Higher executive salaries are needed in order that we may pay what is necessary at career levels and in order that the Government may command the caliber of men needed in the sub-Cabinet levels."

Anthony F. Arpaia, former Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, says: "We do have big government and we probably do have too much government, but I think what we, as citizens, should do is insure that however much government we have it be good. And if we drive good people out of public office we are not only going to have big government, we are going to have bad government.

Robert Ramspeck, former Congressman and chairman, Civil Service Commission, and member of the advisory panel, says: "We need the best possible people who will serve on the regulatory agencies long enough to acquire the expert knowledge and judgment which such responsibilities require."

TAA SUPPORT OF INCREASED AGENCY MEMBER COMPENSATION

In 1956, because of deep concern of both carriers and shippers over the inadequate salaries paid to CAB, FMC, and ICC members, TAA joined other organizations in asking Congress to grant a significant increase. This was accomplished later that year, when Congress authorized a 33 percent boost from $15,000 to $20,000, plus an additional $500 for each chairman.

In January 1963, the TAA Board of Directors unanimously endorsed a substantial increase in present pay for such members, to be effected through either salaries or other allowances. Why? To increase attraction for and help maintain competent personnel.

TAA, in February 1963, urged the Randall Advisory Panel to recommend appropriate compensation increases for regulatory agency members concerned with transportation. TAA now strongly encourages Congress to enact this year legislation to such effect, and urges interested organizations to join in this appeal.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

1796, President George Washington: "The compensation of the various officers of the United States in various instances, and in none more than in respect to the most important stations, appears to call for legislative revision * * * It would be repugnant to the vital principles of our Government virtually to exclude from public trusts talents and virtue unless accompanied by wealth."

1963, the Randall Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems: "We are convinced that all Americans want and expect the highest competence in the conduct of national affairs. We are also convinced that the overwhelming majority of them will support substantial adjustment in executive, legislative, and judicial pay if they have assurance that more adequate compensation will provide a major incentive to our ablest men and women to serve in elective and appointive offices in the Federal Government."

Plaque Given to Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien by the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PLAQUE GIVEN TO HON. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN BY THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State on Wednesday noon, October 23, presented their annual award and plaque to a great American, Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant to the President, at the White House, Washington, D.C.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, presided at this meeting of more than 50 members of the organization who were present to honor Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Moskovit praised the outstanding work that Mr. O'Brien is doing in a most important assignment, as liaison between the President and Congress. He is one of the hardest and conscientious workers of this administration. His zeal and resourcefulness has been very helpful to our great President John F. Kennedy in his arduous daily work, and we are proud to honor him today.

Congressman JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, of the Seventh Congressional District of New York, Queens County, a member of the Affiliated Young Democrats, presented this plaque to Mr. O'Brien.

The plaque reads as follows:

"AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., OF NEW YORK STATE, MERITORIOUS CITATION TO HON. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

"In appreciation for faithful, unswerving, untiring, and extraordinary service on behalf of all the people of our country.

"Admired, venerated, and honored by our members for your outstanding assistance and guidance given to us and all young people for many years by helping us to promote the highest ideals of our young men and women, the future leaders of our city, State, and Nation.

"Given this 23d day of October 1963, at the White House, Washington, D.C.

"HAROLD R. MOSKOVIT,
"State President."

Need Federal Law To Curb Riots, Care for Domestic Tranquillity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, WILLIAM M. TUCK, some weeks ago introduced a bill in the House "seeking to curb the epidemic of racial troubles which have plagued this country." The Clarion-Ledger, published in Jackson, Miss., carried an editorial in a recent edition approving the bill.

Congressman TUCK is no wildeyed racist. He is one of the most highly respected Members of this House. He is a former Governor of the great Commonwealth of Virginia. He is a man of great ability and sound judgment.

Mr. Speaker, because of the stature of the man who is the author of the bill and the character of the paper which produced the editorial, I submit the editorial for printing in the RECORD. I hope that Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill was referred, will show the same degree of zeal for this bill as he exercises in behalf of the "civil wrongs" bill now being considered by that committee.

The editorial follows:

NEED FEDERAL LAW TO CURB RIOTS, CARE FOR DOMESTIC TRANQUILLITY

Pending in Congress is a measure introduced by Representative WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia, seeking to curb the epidemic of racial troubles which have plagued this country. His bill would bar any person irrespective of his race, creed, or color, from crossing a State line for the purpose of demonstrating in violation of law or otherwise fomenting lawlessness or inciting to riot.

The Nation vitally needs legislation of this type. Although the President of the United States and his politically minded Attorney General brother may now be concerned over the current outbursts of law violation and disorder, they seemingly have displayed a remarkable blindness as to the essential causes of such riots and acts of lawlessness incited by imported troublemakers.

For various reasons, these agitators and their organizations from afar have been stirring up people to fever pitch and are working incalculable mischief. This situation has been evident in many places. In virtually every case, the disobedience of law has been shown to have been methodically inculcated into what were ordinarily peaceful and law-abiding people.

These mass uprisings and organized floutings of law must stop, if we are to avoid major tragedy on a national scale. The best way to stop them, as Representative TUCK has suggested, is to prohibit outsider agitators from invading States where they have no business except to stir up disorder, or from conspiring to do so.

The measure introduced by Representative TUCK would have equal application to everyone. It would apply to the KKK, NAACP, CORE, and to the Communist Party and its hired agents. In short, it would apply to all troublemakers who travel in interstate commerce for their sinister purposes.

"My bill is clearly within the purview and intent of the Constitution," Representative TUCK said in introducing it," and is something that is needed to protect the great bulk of our population, the lawabiding public that bears the responsibility of our industry, our Government, and our religion. There is nothing strange or novel about my bill when viewed against the background of existing law. Since 1910, when Congress adopted the Mann Act (18 United States Code 2421), this legislative body has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence and to aid the States in law enforcement."

The Mann Act was aimed at the suppression of the white slave traffic. It prohibited the transportation of females across State lines for immoral purposes. Later, in 1919, Congress made it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce, and this was later expanded to cover other kinds of stolen goods.

In 1934, Congress enacted the Fugitive Felon Act, prohibiting interstate travel to avoid prosecution for crime. Clearly, it is sensible to penalize interstate flight to avoid prosecution and it makes even better sense to prohibit interstate travel which is undertaken with the intent of violating the law. Such a Federal enactment could have the effect of deterring wrongdoing at its very source.

Congress has seen the wisdom of this approach. In 1961 it enacted a law prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with the intent to carry on or commit any crime of violence to further any of a number of specified activities.

The bill proposed by Representative TUCK of Virginia, merely carries this approach to its logical conclusion by penalizing travel across State lines with the intent to provoke rioting or violate any State law.

The distinguished Virginia Congressman properly concludes that the States without exception are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis.

This can be accomplished if the States are protecting from vicious outside influences which snub local laws and ignore community mores, resulting in the chaos so widely prevalent in our country today.

State and local officials are entitled to exercise their police powers freely, "to insure domestic tranquility" as guaranteed by the Constitution. Such power legally and historically rests with the States and their communities.

Wheat for the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Herald of October 11, commenting on the sale of wheat to the Russians, makes two pertinent points.

There is no political issue in the wheat sale, the Herald points out, and adds that while it is a straight business deal benefiting both buyer and seller, the United States by and large does better than Russia.

The editorial follows:

WHEAT FOR THE RUSSIANS

The Republican Party should abandon any idea of making the Russian wheat sale a political issue. There's no issue there.

The deal is highly advantageous to the United States.

Wheat is now our principal agricultural surplus. The overage stood at slightly more than a billion bushels at the end of September. Disposing of 150 million bushels to the Soviets will save the taxpayers $200 million in storage and handling costs in addition to profiting dealers and producers.

At the same time the United States is running an international payments deficit of several billion dollars a year. The hard money payment which the Russians will make for the wheat will reduce the deficit by some $250 million.

It is claimed that because the wheat is being sold to the Reds at the world price, which is substantially below the U.S. price, we are somehow subsidizing the Russians. This is not true. The subsidy is paid to American farmers and would be paid whether the wheat was sold to the Russians or allowed to rot in storage.

Nor in authorizing this sale are we doing the Russians any favor for which we could exact political concessions in return. The Reds need grain because of bad harvests at home. But they are not desperate for it. If we refused to sell, they could fill their needs elsewhere and at the world price.

This is a straight business deal in which both sides gain something, but in which the United States by and large does better than Russia.

There may be a political issue in the question of extending U.S.-Russian trade generally. This would involve modification of the Johnson Act, which prohibits loans to foreign governments in default to the United States, and possibly some changes in our export licensing regulations. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is about to launch an investigation into this whole field.

But the wheat sale, as the President said Wednesday, is a one-shot deal. It commits us to nothing in the way of future trade policy. It is simply good business. And the GOP should be the last to criticize that.

Says the Miami Herald, "The Cross-State Canal: Dig"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the October 12 edition of the Miami Herald ran the following editorial urging immediate construction of the cross-Florida barge canal and clearly demonstrates that all Florida is united behind this project. The editorial deals chiefly with economic benefits and it is well to point out that in the opinion of most backers of the canal, the project has also even greater justification for its defense values.

The editorial reads:

NO BOONDOGGLE NOW—THE CROSS-STATE CANAL: DIG

In the small hours of some legislative morning deep in the fall Congress probably will come across a $1 million supplementary appropriation recommended by President Kennedy and fancied by much of Florida.

It is the beginning allocation for the cross-Florida barge canal, a project long stranded by public inertia, private interests, boondoggle watchers and some legitimate doubts that it would be a good thing for Florida.

Now that the project has moved completely away from its ship canal phase, which well might have damaged the water resources of south Florida, extensive investigation of its benefits recommends it to the Herald for endorsement.

We hope, in short, that the House Appropriations Committee will pass the initial appropriation for a project which Congress has already authorized along to the House for action at some time before adjournment.

The canal would run across the waist of Florida from Yankeetown to Palatka, thence along the St. Johns River to Jacksonville.

Is it indeed a boondoggle?

It was in the make-work period of the 1930's.

It is not so now, despite the scoffing of a picture magazine which enjoys huge mail subsidies provided by the taxpayer.

Today it would be an important link in a national waterway system that would bring the east coast and the gulf coast 650 miles closer to each other.

Within Florida, it would hasten the completion of the Sanford-Indian River Canal, the extension of the Gulf Coast Intracoastal Waterway from the St. Marks River to Tampa, and the dredging of the East Coast Intracoastal Waterway from Fort Pierce to Miami to a depth of 12 feet.

Completion of the Cross-Florida Canal would, we believe, make these improvements economically feasible. The whole State then would be served by a watery thoroughfare for barge traffic and pleasure craft.

And at the modest depth intended, with dams and locks to guarantee it, the canal would in fact serve an important flood control and water conservation role.

What about the economic feasibility of a project which may cost $145 million before it is completed?

The U.S. Corps of Engineers and the private research firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc. have returned favorable reports on its economic feasibility.

Industry as far south as Miami would benefit by cheap bulk rates for shipping.

While the 150-foot wide, 12-foot-deep canal with its system of dams and locks would flood swampland areas of the Oklawaha River valley, there is reason to believe that in time the valley must be flooded anyway for water conservation.

Cross-State has an eminent list of sponsors and an impressive pedigree.

It is supported by the Governor and the legislature. It has the active backing of the board of conservation, and a canal authority has been formed to promote it.

The Florida Waterways Association has endorsed it. After a searching study, the Natural Resources and Waterways Committee of the Florida Council of 100 gave its approval.

Outside Florida the project has the backing of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the Mississippi Valley Association and the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas.

Since Florida's future swings on the excellence of its transportation facilities, doubt ought to be resolved in favor of any project which would tend to bind the State together and join it in turn with the rest of the Nation.

The time for talk has passed. Gentlemen, let us dig.

Soviet Wheat Sale Details Grow Murky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend we received information that the Soviet Union will continue to sell wheat to Finland and other nations, despite natural doubts concerning the intensity of its crop failure and its ultimate purpose in purchasing commodities from Canada, the United States, and other Western World sources.

The massive nationwide propaganda blitz carried on by administration public relations wizards has been of such intensity during recent months that the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union has been pawned off on the public, while in reality, it is a tragic betrayal of American interests.

The Soviet wheat sale comes under the most effective scrutiny by Columnist Eliot Janeway in this morning's Chicago Tribune, and I insert this article into the RECORD at this point, since it effectively calls attention to the questionable and conflicting circumstances of this entire transaction.

SOVIET WHEAT SALE DETAILS GROW MURKY

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, October 27.—American achievements in the field of foreign affairs have an odd way of beginning as solid and defined, and then growing mistier and mistier. Now our sale of grain to the Soviets seems to be turning from an accomplished fact to a more tentative accommodation, almost as if it dealt with "technicians" who were to be shipped out of Cuba, not wheat to be shipped out of Great Lakes and gulf ports. President Kennedy, indeed, has already thought it wise to drop a hint, in his speech at the University of Maine, about the possibility of Russia spurning our offer to sell grain.

It's well to remember too that if and as U.S. grain eventually begins to move to Russia, any deals made will be subject to various provisos. It's not clear what all of them will be. For example, the Presidential declaration left the key question of credit very murky. Sales were to be for cash, but they were also to be on normal commercial terms; and the latter phrase means 18 months' credit. No one has yet explained where the credit is coming from.

PROBLEM IN SHIPPING

Another Presidential proviso applies to shipping. Mr. Kennedy has laid it down that half of any wheat sold to the Soviets in the grain trade will have to travel in American-flag ships. But, as exporters know well, there's a practical difficulty over shipping as well as over credit. American-flag ships, are high-cost carriers, certainly higher cost than Soviet-flag ships, whose crews are paid in rubles or zlotys. Besides, much Soviet shipping was acquired for no cash cost, but by bartering oil with Greek shipowners and with Scandinavian, Italian, German, and Japanese shipbuilders.

On the face of it, this Kennedy formula to protect U.S. shipping and U.S. maritime jobs in popular. (So, for that matter, is the decision to let private business handle any deals made.) The conflict arises from the fact that private business, of whatever nationality, prefers not to ship in American bottoms because they cost more than foreign-flag shipping.

There's only one basis on which we could hope to stick Russia for the high cost of American freight—if Russia were too desperate to bargain. But the Finanical Post of Toronto has already confirmed the apprehension expressed in this column on September 30 that Russia was buying more in Canada than she really needs: first, to corner the market there and freeze China out; and second, in order to resell Canadian grain to Cuba, to the European satellites, and to our own friends and allies in free Europe.

SATELLITES PULL BACK

Obviously, this isn't a desperate move, it's a smart one. And part and parcel of the smart move Russia has made in Canada is the right she has reserved to move her purchases in ships of her own choice. She can charter all that that she wants in the world market well under the cost of American-flag freighters. Now the satellites, who've really been bidding for our grain, are pulling back because American-flag shipping costs too much.

In the world as it exists today, a great power without a competitive merchant marine—or without a policy for getting one—is economically disarmed. For whatever other values or volume may stagnate or decline, traffic on the high seas is going to increase.

Partly, this will be due to the sharper competitive thrust of European and Japanese industry, which must export to prosper and, indeed, to live. But partly it is due to the expansive drive of the Soviet economy to penetrate the markets of the world and influence the economies of our allies and friends. One of the ways the Soviets have made themselves competitive internationally has been by building up their merchant marine.

There's nothing any private person or group can do to make American shipping competitive with the fleets which sail under the flags of more benevolently realistic governments. It can only be done by Government.

Of this point, John F. Kennedy could do worse than look back on the most successful single tour of duty in the governmental career of his father, Joseph P. Kennedy. In the fateful period of transition between the New Deal and crisis years, Joe Kennedy recognized the need for a Government shipping operation and he became Roosevelt's maritime administrator. Today, we need a shipping policy and a tough minded administrator just as much as we did in 1937.

Area Redevelopment Program in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the area redevelopment program has been of significant value throughout the country. In my own State of Tennessee, and particularly in my congressional district, it has proved to be a great economic boon. Three major projects, for the cities of Springfield, Centerville, and Waynesboro, were the subjects of articles in recent editions of the Nashville Tennessean. In my opinion, these articles clearly illustrate the importance of ARA projects, and I would like to commend them to the attention of my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, therefore, these articles follow:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Sept. 22, 1963]

WAY PAVED FOR 440 JOBS

(By Nat Caldwell)

SPRINGFIELD.—The Kennedy administration Area Redevelopment Administration program has paved the way for $5.5 million in new public and private facilities here, 440 new jobs, and $1.5 million in added retail sales.

Mayor Travis Price, whose estimates of gain were supported by similar estimates from the local chamber of commerce, praised both the ARA program and the accelerated public works program.

But at the same time he blasted "delays and nit-picking" by the Small Business Administration, which, under Federal regulations, must pass finally on most ARA financial transactions.

SBA's legal division has delayed for weeks, according to the mayor, an ARA purchase of 65 percent of the bonds for construction of a new dog food factory.

On balance, however, the area redevelopment program and its allied accelerated public works effort have accomplished handsomely their job-creating purpose for eligible midstate towns and counties.

From Springfield to Camden, from Centerville to Waynesboro, the dollar and cents and jobs achievements reported by local public officials is impressive.

Sprinfield's basic water system expansion financed by a $208,000 accelerated public works grant and a $208,000 APW loan kicked off the present wave of expansion.

Mayor Price said that the new water storage tower rising high in the air over Springfield's new industrial subdivision was the "final convincer" for two industrial prospects, now building new plants here.

Until the water system enlargement came through, Springfield had to talk around pressure limitations, which impaired fire protection.

With it, the new industrial subdivision soon will have three factories instead of one.

Mayor Price listed expansions underway or recently completed that hinged on the water system expansion or the general economic improvement that accompanied it:

Goddard & Goddard, new building to permit expansion of existing factory, $500,000; Nutone Corp. plant, $1 million; Tennessee Wells Corp., the dogfood maker, $1 million; new post office, $250,000; new residences, $1 million; Springfield Baptist Church, $300,000; new junior high school, $800,000.

With the half a million water system expansion, the total of new construction underway or recently completed rises to $5.5 million.

Arch Bratton, Tennessee ARA field representative, who "worked up" both the water works grant and loan and the ARA purchase of 65 percent of the bonds for constructing the doogfood plant, said:

"This general expansion is what is meant by calling the ARA and its affiliated APW program a seed money investment designed to encourage additional private and local government effort."

Mayor Price said: "We're moving in high gear now. Springfield and Robertson Counties now have raised their sights toward a new dam at Rossview on the Red River. We are going to start work on that quickly."

He pointed out that the Wells company's new dogfood plant will use as much locally produced corn and wheat as it can find to supply the chief raw material for its product.

"This means that the agricultural wealth of the county will be raised," he said.

"In my dealings with the ARA, I have found a refreshing unbureaucratic approach to the problems of timing and the problems of need," he declared.

"But once we got past the ARA participation, we ran into the same old bureaucratic dallying and redtape in SBA. This should be eliminated."

In Washington, the national administration recently started a shakeup of SBA personnel and procedures to give greater effectiveness to its ARA and accelerated public works programs.

Charles Ralph, Springfield Chamber of Commerce executive secretary, estimated that 65 new service industry jobs will be created for each 100 new industrial jobs. This assures an eventual new job total of 440 from the present wave of new industry and expansions.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Oct. 5, 1963]

BUSY WAYNE OFF ARA LIST: FAST EXPANSION OF JOBS ENDS AID ELIGIBILITY

(By Nat Caldwell)

WAYNESBORO, TENN.—Wayne County, the first Tennessee county to work itself off the Area Redevelopment Administration's eligible list, expects to be officially notified of its progress within a few days.

Mayor Joe Sevier, of Waynesboro, and County Judge James Martin both have received word from the State employment security department that job totals are rising so rapidly that Wayne's status may be changed.

Smith County went off the eligible list a few weeks alo. But start of construction on a new $40 million Federal dam and a major interstate highway project in the county were responsible for the employment boost that removed Smith County from the eligible list.

ARA, after it officially accepts State notice of rising job trends, allows the successfully redeveloping county 6 months to apply for additional ARA and accelerated public works projects.

Mayor Sevier and Judge Turner estimated that the increase in county employment, which started less than a year ago, will add at least $2 million to Wayne County industrial payrolls by the end of 1964.

New industrial job totals will reach 500 to 800 by that time.

An ARA grant of $40,000 helped to trigger the successful efforts to locate a new rainwear plant at Waynesboro and to obtain a major expansion of an existing Genesco shoe plant.

The ARA grant is paying for construction of additions to the Waynesboro water supply and a new pressure tank.

Another ARA research and study grant of $14,000 is expected to recommend a plan for development of Natural Bridge, a private park, and scenic attraction in the county.

"It's a good feeling to know that your local economy, after being stalled for years, at last is rapidly rising," Mayor Sevier declared.

"But it is painful to consider that your town soon may be ineligible for the type of assistance from ARA and related Federal agencies that have meant so much," he added.

Judge Martin suggested that some additional applications for ARA and accelerated public works projects will be made before the 6-month cutoff date.

Arch Bratton, Tennessee ARA field representative, told Mayor Sevier and Judge Martin that these Federal redevelopment programs were intended to help cities and counties get started upward.

"But when there's a local head of steam built up, it's time to help out in another less fortunate area," he said.

* * * * *

Hundreds of new factory jobs have been created at Waynesboro and the county's two smaller towns, Collinwood and Clifton.

The State already has spent $2 million and soon will spend another million widening and improving U.S. Highway 64 on both sides of Waynesboro and within the city limits.

"I think that the Wayne County advancement is what every one of the 48 counties presently eligible for redevelopment assistance should aim at," Bratton said.

He reported that ARA has in process in Tennessee eight industry projects with an overall cost of $11 million and prospects for creating 1,656 new jobs.

Also in process are three ARA public facility loans and grants totaling $776,000 which will aid in the creation of 600 new jobs.

Waynesboro's new water pressure system, which includes a 200,000-gallon tank on top of the same high hill where the new $800,000 county hospital is located, is one of these public facility loans and grants.

Four additional ARA loans for Tennessee industrial projects have been approved and there are 11 more approved loans and grants for public facilities.

One new plant has just been completed in Waynesboro's * * * and a second plant soon will be finished.

On the hill just above the industrial park, the new $600,000 Wayne County Hospital has just opened.

Between the industrial park and the town square a new four-lane bridge is being completed across Green River.

At Collinwood, 12 miles away, where Judge Martin for many years was mayor, a new garment plant that opened 2 months ago has the town booming.

Thirty new homes costing $260,000 have been built in Collinwood in the past 6 months. Three times that number have been built in Waynesboro in the past 2 years.

The State of Tennessee, according to Mayor Sevier, helped kick off the countywide development program with its rebuilding program for Highway 64. It will not be finished for another year.

But the main impetus was supplied by local civic leaders at Waynesboro, Collinwood, and Clifton.

The countywide support for new industry is illustrated by the lopsided 1,001 to 116 vote for a $110,000 county bond issue for expansion of a Clifton garment factory. The referendum was held September 23.

Waynesboro's two new plants are Hygrade Manufacturing Co., makers of rainwear and all-weather garments, and Genesco, Inc., makers of shoes. * * * Eventually, it will add 300 workers to the present Genesco work force.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Oct. 2, 1963]

CENTERVILLE GETS INDUSTRY; HICKMAN COUNTY REBUILDS TO MEET FIELD COMPETITION

(By Nat Caldwell)

CENTERVILLE, TENN.—A late-comer in the competition for industry practically needs to build a new community and that's what Centerville and Hickman County have done.

Public officials and local civic leaders said yesterday the town and the county are gaining from the improvements that helped to attract the industry as well as from the two new plants that opened recently.

A new $800,000 county hospital is under construction, a new airport, a new country club and golf course, and several residential subdivisions have been built.

The city of Centerville has extended its city limits five miles northward to incorporate substantial new territory including a new 240-acre industrial subdivision.

County Judge Ira Rich, who joined Centerville Mayor Emory Gill in inventorying the improvments, said:

"It may sound strange, but very few of these improvements were even seriously thought of as long as 2 years ago."

Hickman County since then has built two large new consolidated elementary schools, one in Centerville, and 18 new bridges with an estimated overall cost of $1.5 million.

The Area Redevelopment Administration got in the act early. At a critical point, it authorized a $40,000 loan and an $80,000 grant to the city for extending its water system. Much of this water expansion already is underway in the new four-square mile annexed area north of town.

The natural gas system also is being enlarged, streets improved, and new access roads have been built to the industrial subdivision and the new hospital.

Mayor Emery Gill emphasized that the City Planning Commission has been reactivated and that a new zoning ordinance is on its way through the City Council.

J. & H. Manufacturing Co., garment manufacturers alread is employing 175 workers and eventually may go to 750. Rivers Manufacturing Co., plastic sign maker, is employing 70 workers now and probably will top the 100 mark by Christmas.

W. B. Kittrell, president of the Hickman County Industrial Development Corp., said officials of both companies were "impressed by the fact that we got busy rebuilding our community almost from the ground up."

"After trying half a dozen times but never really coming close to getting a new plant over a period of 17 years, we needed to accomplish a lot of little things before we had a chance to do anything big," Kittrell said.

"The Jaycees sodded the courthouse lawn in grass about 3 years ago and that sort of started things moving," he added.

Publicity given Hickman County's low grade iron ore and cobalt ore 2 years ago started Kittrell and other civic leaders searching for new job opportunities in minerals. Eighty years ago Hickman County was one of the South's great producers of iron for industry.

As a result the county's newest ARA application seeks a loan for establishment of a sand and silicia extraction plant. A new company, called Hickman Industries, hopes soon to be producing the silica in sufficient quantities to supply needs of Middle Tennessee's chemical industry.

County Judge Rich is seeking a special study by State and Federal geologists to bring up-to-date all older studies of Hickman County minerals from iron ore to phosphate.

His goal: to interest private industry in restoring or expanding minerals production in several fields.

R. T. Rivers and William Askins, operators of the new plastic sign industry, both are natives of the county.

"We had a plant already at Tullahoma and we established the plant here, because it looked as if the people really wanted to go," Askins said. "They are proving that we were correct."

Mayor Gill said that "even before we have any serious new industrial prospects, we are preparing to grade and drain an additional site in the industrial subdivision."

Judge Rich pointed out that the same type of planning is proceeding at the new county hospital. "The site has been graded and utilities installed so that we can expedite construction of a county nursing home and a county health center building when funds are available," Judge Rich said.

"They need to be built adjoining the new hospital and that's where they will be built," he added.

Editorial in Iron Age Questions Kennedy Policies in Dealing With Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a great many Americans are confused as to just what kind of policy the Kennedy administration is following in foreign affairs, especially in dealing with communism, the world's basic sickness.

For a long time many of us believed that we had no policy, but as time passes and we watch the strange zigzags followed by the President and the State Department we begin to wonder. Perhaps there is a policy, a very definite policy which, in the end, will result in full acceptance of the goal of the Soviet Union, peaceful coexistence. Of course, the weakness in accepting this whole theory is that peaceful coexistence is really only a subgoal, so to speak, of the Communists, their final goal is complete victory and world domination and peaceful coexistence is merely a means of attaining the full realization of the Communist conspiracy.

Americans, thank heaven, are not asleep. In spite of the doubletalk from the White House, the management of the news, and the continued barrage of propaganda by administration specialists, most Americans have not swallowed the line that the Communists have changed their spots. The ideas expressed in the following editorial, "Soft on Communism?—Well, Now What Do You Think?" from the Iron Age of October 24, 1963, expresses what a lot of us are thinking.

When will Congress demand the President tell us and the American people his real program?

SOFT ON COMMUNISM?—WELL, NOW WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The administration may not be soft on communism—but it sure looks as if it were. If you do not think so, look around a bit—then recall what things were like a few years ago.

All this is in the name of peace. But so were past confidences in the Russians—all of which were smashed to smithereens.

While the ink is still wet on the ban-the-bomb entente, the Russians had their little party—holding American and British military units up on the way to Berlin. And what did Washington say "on the highest authority"?

They said—first that is—that it was all a mistake. Surely Mr. Khrushchev must not know what was cooking. Then later, by golly, it did look like a planned sortie to put the Americans and the British in their places.

That was quite hard for our striped-pants guys to believe after all the Russian malarky about peace, coexistence, friendship, and other tried-and-true doublecrosser sweet talk.

But what turns one's stomach is to see the President of the United States greeting the arch doublecrosser Tito. Not only is this guy a Communist of the first water, but he is playing the Russians and the Americans for fish. And if he isn't doing that, then he is in a secret deal with Khrushchev to take us for everything we have.

To see this fellow—picked by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin over free Yugoslavs—traveling in the United States as an "unofficial guest" ought to gag anyone who remembers what he did to freedom-loving Yugoslavs.

Things look mighty strange in Washington these days. We interfere with a junta in the Dominican Republic, we insult the Canadians, we put up with a dictator in South Vietnam, we row with De Gaulle, and we let politicians and idiots overrule some dedicated State Department career people.

And while we are being sanctimonious about not recognizing the military or dictators in South America, we carry Tito around in cotton bunting. We try our best to keep from hurting Mr. Khrushchev's feelings lest he be mad at us.

As for the "briefing" that the Government gave to newsmen, saying that the officials were aware of perfidy of the Reds, etc., it was so much tinsel—in view of what we are doing now. Time will prove this.

A bum is a bum is a bum is a bum—and that is about what Tito and his ilk are. Anyone who can't see that is hopeless.

TOM CAMPBELL.

Proclamation of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a proclamation of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Republic which for the last 15 years has been under Communist domination.

I join the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in the hope that freedom will return not just to Czechoslovakia but that self-determination will be achieved by all the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Certainly free men everywhere should dedicate themselves to this desperately important cause, for in freedom for all lies security for all and without the one the other cannot exist.

The proclamation follows:

THE PROCLAMATION OF THE COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA ON THE OCCASION OF THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

October 28, 1963, will mark the 45th anniversary of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic. On that day in 1918, the Czechs and Slovaks once again took into their own hands the destiny of their country, as they had done as far back in history as the ninth century. On this anniversary, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia will commemorate both the good and the bad fortunes of the Czechoslovak people. We remember the period of less than 20 years of the First Republic upon which T. G. Masaryk left the imprint of his greatness. We recall this period with sadness, for we strongly believed during these years that world developments would give us more time for a more profound consolidation of the state. We remember with horror the days of the Munich crisis, a quarter of a century ago, when we were sacrificed as a result of a great international crisis in which the world found itself, and then the postwar period during which the democracies again, after winning the war and crushing a rightist dictator, were unable to stop a leftist one. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia further remembers the uneven struggle of Czechoslovak democrats against Stalinists who, during the period of 1945–48, found allies in our ranks and whose treachery and subversion we were unable to avert in time. Finally, we commemorate the February 1948 coup which initiated the current epoch of suffering for the Czechoslovak people.

The consequences of the Communist coup and the subsequent rule by a foreign ideology, directed from a foreign country and not compatible with the tradition of our nation, can be illustrated as follows:

The Communists were able to accomplish all they strove for by means of exploiting class hatred, simultaneously, however, they failed in everything requiring love of people and love of the nation. They succeeded in whipping up production by forcing thousands of people, and mainly women, into the production line, but they failed to provide them with a better living standard, chiefly because the fruits of their work were shipped into the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the world to support Soviet imperialist goals.

The Communists destroyed all the workers' rights, and so destroyed the workers' love for work. This could best be seen in large-scale absenteeism and in the production of inferior goods.

The Communists succeeded in taking away the land from the peasants, but they failed—in spite of the technological advantage of large pieces of land—to provide the population with enough food.

The Communists succeeded in bringing the class struggle into the classrooms, reducing the caliber of teachers and the level of student education—poisoned by the indoctrination of obsolete Communist ideology—but they were unable to prevent the boiling of hatred—especially in the universities—brought about by this system, against communism among teachers and even among the most privileged class of Communist students. The Communists succeeded, under the banner of class struggle, in rewriting the history of our Nation and also the history of our literature and art, trying to eliminate all the humanitarian ideals so dear to us for centuries. In this they succeeded so well that even the most trusted Communist writers and artists finally started to rebel. These failures are, of course, generally known and it may be fruitless to elaborate further.

It is quite clear that the Iron Curtain, as it stands at the present time around the Czechoslovak Republic in the form of barbed wire and minefields, amply testifies to what the Communists themselves feel about their popularity among the Czechoslovak people.

Despite these tragic manifestations, we do not commemorate this anniversary in negative or nostalgic despair. Even President Novotny just recently was forced to admit the economic and moral bankruptcy of the class system of justice, and tried in vain, to shift the responsibility to others.

The ideology of communism has finally played itself out even among the intellectuals, educated in Communist schools; this anachronism is the target of everyday humor. The rock upon which the Nejedlys, Stolls, and Drdas—now dead either physically or certainly morally—tried to build their religion of class dictatorship, is crumbling. And this is happening at a time when the Communist power monolith is split into two hostile factions, the Soviet and the Chinese, and when a food shortage forces both Soviet Rusisa and the Czechoslovak Republic to solicit aid among the capitalistic countries.

All this points to new possibilities in the future and we must be ready for these new developments. We are calling all people of good will to be alert to these potential possibilities, be they at home or in other countries. Now is the time to forget old quarrels; a time when we must shake hands, raise our heads in the hope that Communist rule will not last forever. We have to show that we have gained from the suffering, and that we have learned from our own mistakes. We have to conduct ourselves with greater statesmanship and less selfishness. Let us learn to rely less on our friends and more on ourselves. Let us not state repeatedly that we are a small nation. A nation, in the words of poet Otakar Brezina, is a fraternity of the dead, the living and the yet unborn. We therefore belong to the fraternity of people reaching far into the past, to the arrival of the Christian teachers, Cyril and Methodius, and extending into the future beyond the range of today's perspective.

An ancient Chinese proverb, quoted recently by President Kennedy, states that, "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step." Let us, then, step forward with the knowledge that the sweet fruit of freedom is to be harvested only by people who are firm in their roots and in their awareness of their identity and goals.

COUNCIL OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 1963.*

Gertrude Robinson Smith, Founder of Tanglewood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the recent death in New York City of Gertrude Robinson Smith was a great blow to everyone who had been fortunate to know something of her remarkable life end dedication to music. Her name will forever live in the hearts of all those seriously concerned with the development of arts in the United States. Her life was a living tribute to excellence and the greatest testament to her life is the famous Tanglewood. The story of her long and happy life was admirably summarized in a recent New York Times obituary. I am happy to include this article from the Times of Wednesday, October 23. It says a great deal about a very great and gracious lady.

The article follows:

MISS GERTRUDE ROBINSON SMITH, FOUNDER OF TANGLEWOOD, DEAD—MUSIC PATRON BEGAN SERIES ON A FARM IN BERKSHIRES—AIDED WORLD WAR I RELIEF

Miss Gertrude Robinson Smith, music patron and founder of the Berkshire, Mass., music festival, a forerunner of Tanglewood, died Tuesday at New York Hospital. She had suffered a stroke a month ago. Her age was 82. She lived at 1 Sutton Place South.

Miss Robinson Smith, a summer resident of Stockbridge, Mass., founded the Berkshire Symphonic Festival, Inc., in 1934. The Boston Symphony Orchestra started participating in 1936.

"I am sure you will agree with me that there are few things artistically more enchanting than listening to a beautiful symphony orchestra on a summer evening outdoors under the stars."

With these words, Miss Robinson Smith invited her neighbors in the Berkshires to consider the possibility of a local music festival and took the first giant step toward establishing the summer event that has achieved international renown

The dream of a festival was first envisioned by Henry Hadley, conductor and composer. He spoke of it to Miss Robinson Smith, a woman of determination and much experience in getting things done. The 64 men and women, living within 40 miles of Stockbridge, eventually formed the Berkshire Symphony Festival, Inc., and elected Miss Robinson Smith president, a post that she held until the group dissolved in 1955.

FIVE THOUSAND AT CONCERTS

Miss Robinson Smith and her coworkers did not allow the festival to become bogged down in committee. Only 2 months later,

on August 23, 1934, the festival had its premiere performance on Dan Hanna's farm, just west of Mahkeenac Lake, with 65 members of the New York Philharmonic playing under the direction of Mr. Hadley. The first festival of 3 concerts drew a total of 5000 people and a small deficit of $413.30.

Miss Robinson Smith played a key role in inducing Dr. Serge Koussevitzky to bring the Boston Symphony Orchestra to the Berkshires in 1936. After negotiations had been going on for some time, Miss Robinson Smith secured a 15-minute appointment to convince the conductor that he should come to the little-known festival in western Massachusetts. They spoke for nearly 2 hours and success was practically assured.

Dr. Koussevitzky was happy about his reception but wanted a shed or a hall to enhance the acoustics of his performance and protect his orchestra from the elements. A search for a permanent location started and, shortly after, ended when Mrs. Gorham Brooks, and her aunt, Miss Mary Aspinwall Tappan, offered their Tanglewood estate at nearby Lenox.

The first concert there, in a tent, August 12, 1937, ended in a downpour that seeped through onto audience and players. Miss Robinson Smith made her way to the stage and told the audience that the storm had demonstrated the need for a shed. "We must raise the $100,000 to build it," she said. She spurred the campaign and raised $80,000, enough to build a shed in time for the 1938 season.

Since Tanglewood had become the property of the Boston Symphony, Miss Robinson Smith's group owned only the shed and this was turned over to the orchestra in 1945. The festival organization then became inactive and dissolved in 1955, turning over what money it had to the Berkshire Music Center school and to the Berkshire Community Music School in Pittsfield for scholarships.

Miss Robinson Smith was always a particular favorite at Tanglewood and on her 80th birthday in 1961, a concert was held in her honor.

Charles Robinson Smith, her father, was a corporation lawyer; her mother was a patron of the arts. The family lived in New York and Paris. Miss Robinson Smith, who was born in New York City, spent much of each year in France until a few years ago.

She was raised in the old tradition that the strongest virtue of the well to do was civicmindedness. She became president of the Vacation Savings Stamp Fund nearly a half century ago. This organization, dedicated to providing vacation opportunities for working girls in Manhattan, later became the American Women's Association, which she served as president until 1928.

In a real estate deal that the press of the day described as a good one, the group bought land on West 57th Street and Miss Robinson Smith and Ann Morgan raised $9 million to build a clubhouse for businesswomen there. It is now the Henry Hudson Hotel.

WORKED WITH EDITH WHARTON

During World War I, Miss Robinson Smith worked with Edith Wharton in war relief and helped raise $70,000 for surgical motor units sent from the United States to France.

She then organized the Ice Flotilla Committee, which gathered $100,000 for desperately needed icemaking machines at the front. Never one to rely on hearsay, she flew in rickety planes over the front and visited it on the ground as well. She was awarded the French Legion of Honor. Her love of French culture persisted throughout her life. She organized the French Theater at the Barbizon Plaza, a project that lasted until the outbreak of World War II.

Early in 1963 she was appointed to the advisory committee of the National Culture Center in Washington.

She leaves a sister, Mrs. Lyman Beecher Stowe, the former Hilda Robinson Smith.

Massachusetts Police Association Calls for Retention of the Death Penalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, October 22, 1963, I attended the 1963 convention of the Massachusetts Police Association at the Schine Inn, Chicopee, Mass. Under unanimous consent, I include a newspaper report on the convention that appeared in the Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass., Wednesday, October 23, 1963.

The news article is as follows:

POLICE SESSION VOTES TO KEEP DEATH PENALTY—STATE ASSOCIATION ACTS UNANIMOUSLY AT CONVENTION

The Massachusetts Police Association at its annual convention Tuesday at the Schine Inn, Chicopee, unanimously adopted a resolution calling for retention of the death penalty.

DOES NOT AGREE

Later U.S. Representative JAMES A. BURKE, of Milton, principal speaker at the convention banquet, said that he does not agree with the wholesale imposition of the death penalty in murder cases, but it must be retained on the books as a deterrent to the hardened criminal who has nothing to lose by using a gun.

BURKE noted that two Massachusetts policemen have been killed recently in gun battles with criminals and last week two desperados escaped from a jail near Boston. In all cases these men had nothing to lose and could have shot either a policeman or citizen.

One wonders what runs through the mind of a criminal at times like that when he probably faces life in prison anyway, he said.

QUOTES FIGURES

Quoting figures compiled by the Federal Government, Representative BURKE said that in 1961 alone, more than 9,620 policemen in the Nation were injured as the result of serious assaults and that 48 others were killed. This represented a rise of 150 percent compared to 10 years ago.

It seems the only time that policemen are respected is when they lay down their lives, but then they are quickly forgotten, he said. These men who have risked their lives are someone to be respected.

There is a need for a whole reappraisal of the police system and what they are set up for. The public should have a better understanding of the police problems.

Actually, the local police are the frontline of defense for the Nation's security and most of the Federal law enforcement agencies depend almost entirely on them for information and could not operate without them, the Congressman said.

OPPOSES CRITICS

He decried the tendency on the part of do-gooders to break down the respect for local police by attacking enforcement of the law.

Representative BURKE said that he was not calling for use of the death penalty in all cases, since each case must be judged on its merits and the recommendations of law enforcement and court officials, but that its retention is necessary as a deterrent against the hardened criminal.

The association Tuesday also strongly condemned the use of civilian trial boards to pass judgment on alleged infractions committed by policemen along the lines of racial issues, brutality and other civil rights.

Capt. Daniel J. Holland, of the Springfield Police Department, convention chairman, said that such a board was recently used in York, Pa., but resulted in a complete demoralization of police personnel and a high rise in the crime rate of the community.

RATE DROPS

When the trial board was abolished, the crime rate was greatly reduced, he said.

Also Tuesday Sgt. Bernard S. Fleming, of Brookline, was nominated unopposed for president of the association, succeeding Chief Joseph C. Wright, of Brockton. Others nominated unopposed were: Sgt. Frederick T. Lane, of Malden, secretary, and Captain Holland, treasurer. Election will be today.

More than 100 police officials from western Massachusetts attended the opening session Tuesday. The convention ends tonight.

I also include my remarks made at the banquet on Brockton's Chief of Police Joseph Wright.

My remarks are as follows:

I am very happy to be here tonight. I am happy to be here because of the position of responsibility in your organization held by your president, Police Chief Joe Wright, of Brockton. Through many years I have come to know, respect, and admire Chief Wright, both as a man and as a high police official. In his private life he has shown himself to be a person of exceptional character, genuine good will and friendly loyalty. In his professional field he has progressively advanced to the highest position within the law enforcement unit of his community. He has done so by applying a determined diligence and perservering will to the acquirement of constantly new learning and knowledge in his profession. These are the basic qualities necessary for attaining superior competence on any job and they are the fundamental marks of an individual devoted to duty. For these qualities he has our universal admiration. Throughout his professional progress Chief Wright has retained the good nature, the sympathetic understanding the friendly disposition, the cooperative personality and the quiet humility which have always characterized his personality. For these qualities he has our united respect.

The combination of these attributes produces the capacity and the impact of leadership in an individual. The recognition of his possession of leadership, spirit and drive is essentially why Joe Wright is the head of the police force in the city of Brockton and why he was honored by your organization.

The city of Brockton is fortunate indeed, to have this man in such an exacting position. Chief Wright, it is a privilege for me to be here and to extend to you my sincere congratulations for a job well done. In doing so I know I echo the sentiments of your fellow citizens in the city of Brockton, with the further common wish that the good Lord will grant you many more years of lasting good health to continue your good work on behalf of your community, your State, and your fellow man.

Explanation of Rollcall Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. On Tuesday, September 10, 1963, I was on official business in New York City as congressional adviser to U.S. mission, on United Nations Committee for Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. I would have voted "yea" on final passage of S. 1576 (rollcall No. 144) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers and for other purposes.

On Monday, October 14, 1963, District of Columbia Day, there had been no notice that there was controversial legislation scheduled. Consequently, I scheduled consultations with constituents in my Pittsburgh district office in order to save these constituents the time and expense of trips to Washington, D.C. On final passage of H.R. 5871 (rollcall No. 172) to provide for the retirement of District of Columbia court judges after 10 years of service, under the same formula for computation of annuity as under the present law, I would have voted "nay." Such pension, or pay increases, should all be considered under legislation for U.S. Government employees, studied for overall policy by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I disapprove and oppose this procedure.

On Monday, October 21, 1963, I returned from my district, Pittsburgh, to Washington, D.C., and attended the House session. At the close of the session, I was advised there would be no legislative business of a substantial or controversial nature on Tuesday, October 22, 1963. I therefore flew back to Pittsburgh on Monday afternoon, October 21, at the close of the session, and on October 22 arranged for personal appointments for constituents at my Pittsburgh congressional office, and returned for the session, Wednesday, October 23, 1963. I make these trips to Pittsburgh at my own expense in order to give more efficient and personal service to constituents of my district and make myself available for individual personal consultation with constituents on urgent or complicated personal matters that could only be handled otherwise by correspondence on a delayed basis.

On October 22, 1963, I would have voted "yea" on final passage of H.R. 8821 (rollcall No. 178) to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the U.S. Treasury. This bill was passed by a remarkable majority of 350 to 1, so obviously no controversy was expected.

Famine in Ukraine: A Warning for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent announcement that export licenses would be issued to American grain companies in order that U.S. wheat could be sold to the Soviet Union and other European Communist countries has generated a healthy review of the Communist record. The current strenuous effort on the part of Russia and Yugoslavia to depict themselves as friendly peace-loving nations has met with remarkable acceptance in the United States. In view of our past experience with communism, this American reaction to a professed attitude of friendship on the part of nations who have been our greatest enemies is, without doubt, the most positive evidence possible of the basic peaceful intent of the United States. Our reaction has been agreeing to the test ban treaty, removing the restriction on Presidential authority to trade with Communist countries, and the pursuit of further disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union. There is no question about the sincere desire of the people of the United States to remove the threat of war from the world. Communist nations could have demonstrated their good faith by positive action, such as removing troops from Cuba, or taking down the Berlin wall. There has been no such positive demonstration of good intentions.

Some nationality groups in the United States have a vivid recollection of past treatment received at the hands of the Communists. The Americans of Ukrainian descent are one of these nationality groups who experienced firsthand the inhuman treatment that can be deliberately imposed upon a proud people by a Communist government in their effort to suppress opposition.

Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak., is president of the North Dakota Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. It would be difficult to find a more dedicated American citizen than Dr. Zukowsky, and he typifies the fine quality and loyalty of the many Americans of Ukrainian descent who live in North Dakota. They are a proud people and I take pride in the fact that they are my constituents.

The present shortage of wheat in Russia calls to mind for the Ukrainians a man-made famine that occurred in the home country 30 years ago. Dr. Zukowsky calls to mind the fact that the same philosophy of government which created the famine of 1932 and 1933 in the Ukraine prevails today in Soviet Russia.

To call attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to the reaction of the people of Ukrainian descent to the proposition of selling wheat to Russia, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, under unanimous consent, a letter from Dr. Zukowski, together with an editorial from the Bismarck Tribune of October 12, 1963, and a leaflet prepared by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of North Dakota, entitled "Famine in Ukraine: A Warning for the West."

The letter, editorial, and leaflet follow:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH
OF NORTH DAKOTA.

Bismarck, N. Dak., October 18, 1963.

Hon. DON L. SHORT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHORT: May I thank you in behalf of our committee for the fine remarks on the House floor pointing up the need for a Special Committee of Captive Nations. May I also take the liberty of writing you that all over the United States, as well as in North Dakota, special manifestations were held by Americans of Ukrainian descent, to mark the tragic 30th anniversary of famine in the Ukraine, artificially created by Red rulers in 1932–33.

Thirty years ago the Russian-Communist instituted what history has recorded as the most inhuman act ever perpetrated on any nation, the famine which was deliberately started and maintained in an allout effort to break the spirit of Ukrainians to agree on collectivation of their farms.

In 1933 through the streets of Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa and many other cities, the miserable wrecks of humanity dragged themselves on swollen feet, begging for crusts of bread, or searching for scraps in garbage, that was frozen and filthy. Each morning wagons rolled along the streets, picking up the emaciated remains along the streets. The year 1933 brought death from famine to 7 or 8 million Ukrainian people.

The Russians attempted to destroy the Ukrainian nation as they did to Volga-Germans, Krymian-Tartars and others after World War II, and there has been perhaps no disaster of comparable magnitude that received so little international attention. German-Nazis were tried for their crimes but until now Russians were not brought before international court for their crimes in Ukraine, Hungary, and elsewhere.

Thirty years ago a politically man-made famine blighted Ukraine, today shortages of wheat highlight colonial Russian performance. It is truly unbelievable, that historically Ukraine alone was regarded as "The granary of Europe," but under Soviet-Russian colonialism it has not been able, along with other new areas, to feed the population. This is not the drouth, this is after over 30 years of experimentation of the Communist system of collective farming and its complete failure, which has cost millions of Ukrainians their lives.

Speaking of our blood-brothers in slavery, I respectfully request on behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota, and over 20,000 Americans, of Ukrainian descent living in our State, that you present to the U.S. Congress, this dreadful situation in Ukraine, and condemn the Red rulers of Moscow for their antihuman terror and to give hope to those people behind the Iron Curtain, who have kept glowing the flickering flame of freedom in Ukraine, in Hungary, in Poland, in East Germany, in the Baltic and Balkan states.

Enclosed please find a leaflet entitled "Famine in Ukraine—A Warning to the West" and an editorial taken from the October 12, 1963, issue of the Bismarck Tribune, "Hunger Again 30 Years After," and an article "Thirtieth Infamous Anniversary" printed October 6, 1963, in the Register, Denver, Colo.

We thank you in advance for your fine cooperation. I remain,

Very truly yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA,
State Branch of North Dakota.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Oct. 12, 1963]

HUNGER AGAIN 30 YEARS AFTER

Food shortages in Russia come on the bitterly appropriate anniversary of an historic famine. It was 30 years ago that the great hunger of 1929–33 brought death to millions in the Ukraine.

Famine then was a weapon of Soviet terrorism. The Ukraine's 60 million acres of land produced wheat for some 20 million tons of bread. It provided, between 1909 and 1913, 20 percent of Europe's grain supply.

But Ukrainians resisted the collectivizing of their country, and Moscow Communists resorted to drastic measures. They confiscated 500,000 farms, drove 2.5 million people from their homes, deported a million peasants to slave labor camps and set out to reduce the Ukraine by starvation.

An edict of August 2, 1932, forbade peasants, under penalty of death, to take any of the food they produced. They were forbidden to leave villages in search of food outside the Ukraine. All food products of the Ukraine were designated for export. While Communist militia stood guard over grain elevators full to overflowing, families died of starvation in streets and cannibalism reportedly became widespread. Ukrainians say between 6 and 7 million of their people died.

The anniversary is called to mind by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky of Steele, president of the Ukranian Congress Committee of America State branch.

Thirty years ago, famine in a food-rich land was calculated and artificial and a weapon of subjugation. Moscow is not exactly free with information as to what has produced this year's food shortages, but that they exist is known to be a fact. For some millions of persons who lived through the famine of the early 1930's, this will be a painful anniversary.

FAMINE IN UKRAINE—A WARNING FOR THE WEST

The Kremlin today dominates one-third of the world and threatens the entire free world with subjugation and tyranny. The picture of conditions in the subjugated territories and enslaved nations shows only terror, slavery, mass genocide, persecution and misery.

This leaflet is being issued upon the 30th anniversary of one of the most horrible crimes committed by the Kremlin upon its victims—an artificial famine calculated and carried out to break the will of the Ukrainians in their resistance and opposition to the regime.

Ukraine, with a population of 45 million has the richest farming land in Europe. Sixty million acres of land produce wheat for 20 million tons of bread. From 1909 to 1913 Ukraine provide 20 percent of Europe's grain supply. It was known as the granary or breadbasket of Europe.

In 1920 the Russian Communists overran Ukraine and made it their colony. They utilized the resources of Ukraine to develop their power and plans for sowing the seeds of chaos and revolution in the world. They introduced a system of slave labor in order to obtain products and goods cheaply and in this way to undermine the world economy.

In 1929, taking advantage of the economic crisis in the world, they began a 5-year drive against the peasants, forcing them into the collective farms. The Kremlin used the most diabolical methods on its resisting victims. In Ukraine, where the inhabitants by nature and tradition are most radically opposed to collectivization and state regimentation the effects were unbelievably horrible. From 1929–32 the Moscow Communists confiscated 500,000 farms; drove 2,500,000 people with their children and aged out of their homes; deported 1 million peasants with their children, wives, aged and ailing to slave labor camps into the tundras and Siberia to die of exhaustion and hunger.

With resistance still strong, Moscow resorted to extreme measures and calculated a plan of starvation. All food products in Ukraine were designated for export. By official edict of August 2, 1932, the peasants were forbidden under penalty of death to take any of the food they produced. They were forbidden to leave their villages in search of food beyond the borders of Ukraine, while throughout the other territories of the Soviet Union food was plentiful. Entire families died in the streets of the villages in the terrible tortures of starvation. Cannibalism was widespread. The grain elevators were overflowing, but they were vigilantly guarded by the armed Communist militia to prevent the people from reaching the life-giving grain—all of which was removed from Ukraine. The International Red Cross offered aid and relief to the victims of Moscow but the Soviet Government vehemently denied the very existence of famine and the need for aid. As a result of this famine between 6 and 7 million Ukrainians died.

Such methods are used by the Kremlin to Russify and subjugate the captive nations in the U.S.S.R. Even these methods, however, are not completely successful. The love of freedom is so strong and so firmly entrenched in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainians that they continue to this day to resist actively and passively, the tyranny in their land. They will continue to resist until their final goal of a free and independent nation is achieved. And these gallant people deserve the support and encouragement of every American who believes in the principles of democracy and human rights.

The suffering and misery of the Ukrainians throughout their long enslavement in the Soviet Union should serve the free world as a warning. We should not permit ourselves to be blinded to the real aims of the Kremlin by the current Russian peace offers. For the Kremlin offers the world not peace, but misery and enslavement.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA.

Hudson Dispatch Receives First Prize for General Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the role of newspapers is a role of power. It has long been recognized that newspapers—a prime source of general information to the public—are the chief molders of public opinion, a powerful influence in the lives of men. It is also for this reason that newspapers, even more now than ever before, owe its readers the ever-present responsibility of fair, factual, and unbiased reportage. New Jersey's Hudson Dispatch is one such newspaper which has dedicated itself toward achieving these ideals. Recently it was awarded first prize for general excellence among newspapers in the circulation classification by the New Jersey Press Association. In way of tribute, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Hudson Dispatch's own editorial comment on this achievement. This editorial, I believe, reaffirms the principles of good newspaper writing everywhere:

WE'RE PROUD TO BE AMONG NEW JERSEY'S BEST

As announced in our news columns on Saturday, Hudson Dispatch has been signally honored by the New Jersey Press Association in being chosen the winner of the highest award in its circulation classification—first prize for general excellence. The achievement was the culmination of years of striving to give the loyal readers of this newspaper the best all-round product that it is possible to publish. Camden Courier-Post and Red Bank Register were similarly honored in their classifications.

Gaining the top 1963 award in the best newspaper contest in the judging which preceded the 42d annual NJPA Newspaper Institute was accomplished through an all-out team effort, with especial emphasis on this paper's format, its news coverage and presentation, its readability and thoroughness, its appeal to those of all age groups and interests and its special attention to the promotion of every project that redounds to the benefit of the community it is privileged to serve.

(The newspaper that best serves the community and the Nation best serves its own interests. That is the philosophy that has directed the operations of the Hudson Dispatch during the years of its continued, progressive growth. Special attention has been paid to the importance of community service by the present editors and staff, who, to a man and woman, are very much aware that theirs is both a responsibility and a privilege.)

Hudson Dispatch in the years since it adopted the "new look" which has won it numerous honors—the current general excellence accolade climaxing our efforts to publish the most appealing newspaper possible—has devoted more time and energy than ever before to indepth news coverage in order to give its readers in objective style all sides of any given situation. This program was the result of recognition of the responsibility of this publication to the community and in the belief that our readers are entitled to all the facts presented fairly and completely.

Ever mindful that we are a home newspaper, we have conscientiously refrained from sensationalism, satisfying ourselves in presenting the day's events in conservative, wholesome fashion. Hudson Dispatch is jealous of its reputation as a home newspaper, realizing its editions are read by every member of the family from grandma and grandpa down to the impressionable teenagers.

The contents of every edition of the Hudson Dispatch are never thrown together willy-nilly simply to fill up the news, advertising, and feature columns. Every line of news and advertising can be depended upon as to authenticity. Much credit is due to our composing room for this paper's fine typography. Our columnists, our news, sports, and social reporters devote their time and abilities to presenting our readers with always the latest in happenings that concern the Hudson Dispatch family, than which there is none more loyal anywhere. Our features have been carefully selected so they provide something for everyone in the family.

We trust that we may be pardoned if we say we feel that Hudson Dispatch matches—and in some instances surpasses—the product of its contemporaries in the metropolitan area and in the State. We are mighty proud of our church, sports, social, and fashion pages; and of our political and feature columns. In addition to the principal award, our church editor received third place award in the single subject column division for "Steeple Talk."

Acceptance by the general public of the Hudson Dispatch is reflected in its ever-growing circulation and in the general excellence award given to us by New Jersey Press Association. This newspaper has been cited many times in the past but this latest tribute is the more meanginful because the distinction was accorded by those in our own profession and industry who are in the best position to judge. Because our colleagues have so honored us, we shall strive with even greater dedication and pride to maintain the high standards of excellence our readers wish and deserve.

Opinion by Judge Samuel A. Weiss in the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending quality stabilization bill, H.R. 3669, a recent opinion by Judge Samuel A. Weiss in the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa., is of special interest. In this case, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. against White Cross Stores Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 18, and 19, the judge in granting an injunction noted the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's "positive inclination to reappraise the underlying economic and legal principles supporting fair trade" and hoped that the defendants would accept this invitation to file an appeal.

Because of the logic and clarity of Judge Weiss' opinion I am recommending it to every Member of the Congress. For the purpose of ready availability I am today inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first half of this opinion, the second half of which will follow tomorrow:

OLIN MATHIESON CHEMICAL CORP., PLAINTIFF, *v.* WHITE CROSS STORES, INC., NOS. 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 18, 19, DEFENDANTS

(In the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa.; No. 3464; July term, 1963C; in equity)

CHANCELLOR'S ADJUDICATION

Weiss, J.:

The plaintiff seeks an injunction in this bill in equity to compel the defendants to cease and desist from further alleged violations of the act of June 5, 1935, Public Law 266, as amended, commonly known as the Pennsylvania Fair Trade Act. The plaintiffs are well known and reputable drug manufacturers who produce and market a wide variety of pharmaceuticals, vitamin products, and related commodities under the trademark "Squibb."

The products of the plaintiff are "fair traded" in that the plaintiff has entered into an agreement with a distributor wherein certain minimum prices are established. To sell below the minimum is a violation of the agreement, not only by the signatories thereto, but by any distributor who has notice of its provisions.

The defendants are retailers of the plaintiff's products. It is undisputed that the White Cross Stores, after having knowledge of the plaintiff's fair trade agreement, sold their merchandise substantially below the prescribed minimum price. There is no question—as the testimony of Mr. Chatfield disclosed—the goods of the plaintiff are in free and open competition with the goods of other manufacturers. Plaintiff's case in chief clearly established that it is doing business in a highly competitive field. All of the requirements which the law places upon a plaintiff in a fair trade case have thus been met (*Gulf Oil* v. *Mays*, 401 Pa. 413 (1960)).

From the admissions in the pleadings and the testimony adduced in this proceeding, your chancellor makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

First. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., plaintiff (hereinafter called plaintiff), is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Virginia, maintaining an office for the conduct of business at 460 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and authorized and empowered to carry on business in Pennsylvania, and its business consists, among other things, of the distribution and sale in both interstate and intrastate commerce in Pennsylvania, of drugs, pharmaceuticals, vitamin products, medicinal products, toilet products and other commodities under plaintiff's trademark "SQUIBB" and various other trademarks, brands and names associated with plaintiff.

2. The defendants above named are Pennsylvania corporations, each maintaiinng its principal place of business at 1408 Law and Finance Building, Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., and/or jointly and severally maintaining places of business at 613 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; 307 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; 339 Fifth Avenue, McKeesport, Pa.; 7219 McKnight Road, Pittsburgh, Pa.; 4135A Brownsville Road, Pittsburgh 27, Pa.; 816 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa.; and 330 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., which business consists, among other things, of selling at retail at the aforementioned addresses products bearing plaintiff's name, brands, and trademarks.

3. All of the defendants are owned by substantially the same persons and all of the defendants are therefore under substantially the same management, control, and direction, and each defendant, in legal effect, operates, joint and/or severally with all of the other defendants each of the aforesaid places of business.

4. Plaintiff's products, including products which are sold under its trademark and trade name "Squibb," and various other trademarks, brands, and names associated with plaintiff, are all sold in substantial quantities to wholesale and retail dealers throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and are in turn resold by retail dealers to the public.

5. Said trademark and trade name is the exclusive property of the plaintiff, being registered in the U.S. Patent Office, and is now outstanding, validly subsisting, unrevoked, and uncanceled, and plaintiff is the owner thereof.

6. The products of the plaintiff bearing the Squibb trademark and Squibb trade names are in free, fair, and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced by others.

7. The plaintiff has entered into written agreements (substantially in the form attached to the complaint and marked "Exhibit A") with numerous retail dealers throughout Pennsylvania to whom it sells its products whereby such dealers have agreed that the resale of the plaintiff's products shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Pennsylvania Fair Trade Act, and shall not be below the stipulated minimum retail price as set forth in price lists published by plaintiff from time to time; and the said retail dealers have agreed not to advertise, offer for sale, or sell in Pennsylvania products of plaintiff at prices less than the minimum retail selling prices at that time stipulated therefor by plaintiff.

8. The defendants are not signatories or parties to any of the resale price maintenance agreements of the plaintiff.

9. The defendants received due notice of the fact that the plaintiff had entered into said resale price maintenance agreements with various retailers in this Commonwealth, and the defendants were at all times material herein, fully aware of, and had knowledge of the contents of said agreements, including minimum price schedule of the plaintiff's products.

10. After having such knowledge, the defendants have continued to advertise, offer for sale, and sell the Squibb products of the plaintiff at less than the prescribed minimum prices set forth in the plaintiff's resale price maintenance agreements.

ARGUMENT

On this state of the record, this court has no alternative but to issue the injunction as prayed for; however, the defendants have seen fit to raise the most basic and fundamental defense that can be asserted against a statutory cause of action—they contend with much force that the act is contrary to the constitution of Pennsylvania and is therefore a nullity. Specifically, it is urged that fair trade violates article 1, section 1 of the constitution in that it results in a deprivation of property without "due process of law." In addition, defendants strongly contend that the law constitutes an unlawful delegation of legislative power which is without constitutional sanction.

The remainder of this opinion will be addressed to these paramount questions.

A proper assessment of the defendants' position requires that we delve into the legal history of fair trade. Often the historical circumstances surrounding the birth and development of legal doctrines provide us with the clear and broad perspective so necessary to achieve a just and proper resolution of constitutional issues.

The logical starting point is 1911. In that year, resale price maintenance contracts were held to be inoperative by the U.S. Supreme Court. It was decided that because they tended to eliminate competition at certain levels of distribution, such contracts were antithetical to the basic policy of the Sherman Antitrust Act (*Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *Parke and Sons*, 220 U.S. 373 (1911)). After 1911 the courts continued to recognize the right of a manufacturer to refuse to sell his products to one who would not maintain satisfactory resale prices (*United States* v. *Colgate and Company*, 250 U.S. 300 (1919)). But where a manufacturer employed a system of placing serial numbers on merchandise, hiring salesmen to report price cutters and urging dealers to do the same, keeping lists of undesirable price cutters, cutting of supplies to the undesirables—all designed to make its suggested price effective—the practice was held to constitute an unfair method of competition (*F.T.C.* v. *Beechnut Company*, 257 U.S. 441 (1922)).

These early efforts to secure a favorable legal climate for fair trade were spearheaded by the American Fair Trade League, an organization of manufacturers of branded goods formed in 1913. Their primary focus of attention was in the area of Federal legislation. In 20 years of existence the league was able to introduce a bill each year, but Congress failed to act.[1]

PRESSURE LOBBY SUCCESS

In the 1930's leadership of the fair trade movement was assumed by a new and aggressive group—the National Association of Retail Druggists (NARD). The NARD in conjunction with other retail and wholesale groups switched the plan of attack from Congress to the various State legislatures. They were far more successful than their predecessors. Highly organized lobbying, together

Footnote at end of speech.

with a monumental job of public relations and propaganda soon paid off in perhaps the most astounding legislative success in this century. Beginning with the State of California in 1931, within 10 years, 45 States had passed a fair trade law, all of them being essentially similar to the Pennsylvania act. Only Missouri, Texas, and Vermont failed to succumb ot the blandishments of the "fair traders."

Success in the courts was soon achieved. The Supreme Court of the United States placed its imprimatur on fair trade in the now famous case of *Old Dearborn Distributors* v. *Seagrams Distillers*, 299 U.S. 183, (1936). There the Court limited its approval to intrastate transactions, because the Sherman Act still banned resale price maintenance contracts in interstate commerce. It was to overcome this obstacle, that in 1937 the proponents of fair trade succeeded in having Congress pass the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1).

Until 1951, it was generally assumed that their purpose had been fully achieved and the prohibitions of the antitrust law had been circumvented. However, in that year the impetus which had been provided by Old Dearborn took a diametrically opposite turn. *Schwegmann Bros* v. *Calvert Distillers*, 341 U.S. 384, (1951) construed Miller-Tydings as exempting fair trade contracts in interstate commerce only between the parties thereto: as to nonsigners the Sherman Act still blocked their validity. This result was achieved by a very strict construction of the act. It was generally thought at the time that the Schwegmann decision sounded the death knell of fair trade because an enforceable nonsigner clause is a "sine qua non" of effective resale price maintenance.

One year later Congress repaired the damage and passed the McGuire Act which specifically provided that the nonsigner clause shall not be deemed in conflict with Federal antitrust laws (15 U.S.C.A. sec. 45 (a)(3)).

TWENTY-ONE STATES REPUDIATE FAIR TRADE

During this period of legislative triumph, our State courts began to scrutinize the constitutional merits of resale price maintenance. The result is well known—from 1949 to date 21 of our States have repudiated fair trade and held the act to be in violation of their State constitutions. (See vol. 2 Trade Reg. Rep., par. 6041 for a detailed breakdown.)

The legal history of fair trade, as briefly reviewed above gives rise to two striking facts:

1. The driving impetus behind resale price maintenance has been provided by retail organizations, not the manufacturers, and not the consumer.

2. The disparity between the dazzling success of resale price maintenance in the legislatures and its failure to achieve approval in the State courts.

That retail organizations (particularly in the drug field) have been the chief advocates and proponents of resale price maintenance is a well documented fact. The Federal Trade Commission has made an exhaustive study of this area and reports that—

"Since 1920, the development of new types of distributors has been rapid and the leadership in the resale price maintenance movement has been transferred from the manufacturers, of whom a small proportion, producing trademarked commodities, actively promoted resale price maintenance to distributors seeking protection in a maintained resale price" (Federal Trade Commission, "Report on Resale Price Maintenance" (1945), p. 26).

The late dean of Yale University Law School, Harry Shulman, made the same observation:

"It is common knowledge that the pressure for the passage of these (fair trade) acts, insofar as it was publicly disclosed, came not from manufacturers of other trademark owners but from distributors—first and foremost the retail druggist associations and other retail and wholesale distributors" ("The Fair Trade Acts and the Law of Restrictive Agreements Affecting Chattels," 49 Yale Law Jour. 607, 616). (See also Herman, Geo. Wash. Law Review, supra, p. 625 et seq.)

Although the significance of this strong retailer interest will be later discussed at greater length, for the moment let it be sufficient to note that if the "primary aim of the law is to protect the property—namely, the goodwill—of the producer" (Old Dearborn Distributors, supra, p. 193) then surely this is the first time in history one segment of the economy (the retailer) has expended large sums of money and effort to procure legislation favorable not to itself—but for the benefit of the manufacturer. Such nobility of impulse is rare indeed.

Turning our attention to the phenomenal legislative successes achieved by the fair traders, your chancellor is frankly appalled at the ease with which fair trade bills were passed into law. The ingenious method of the NARD has been described in a Department of Justice memorandum written by Corwin Edwards which was reprinted in hearings on H.R. 4365 before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 82d Congress, 2d session 436 (1952). In this memorandum Mr. Edwards points out that (partial attempt was made during my term in Congress, 1945):

"The so-called fair trade laws * * * were drafted and urged by lobbyists for organized retail druggists, and were enacted with practically no support from any other source. Druggists were organized under captains, district by district, to bring pressure to bear upon legislators. Care was taken, however, to describe their bill as one generally supported by the entire retail trade of the State. The bill was given the ambiguous and appealing name of fair trade law. A systematic effort was made to prevent public hearings and to secure enactment of the bill without public debate. This effort was successful. There was a public hearing on the bill is only 3 States out of the first 32 in which it passed and in one of those the hearing followed the passage. Indeed, there was so little consideration of any kind, that, although, the original draft of the bill contained a stenographic error which made utter nonsense out of one of the most important provisions, this error appeared without change in the statutes of 11 States before it was caught and corrected. Another stenographic error not quite so serious was included in the laws of 17 States."

In the light of this, it should come as no surprise that the model Fair Trade Act which was adopted verbatim in 21 States was prepared and drafted by the NARD (FTC "Report on Resale Price Maintenance." P. XXVIII (1945)). The efforts of the NARD in the field of fair trade did not escape the discerning eye of ex-President Truman. In his book "The Governmental Process," he classifies the NARD campaign of the 1930's as a notable instance of the use of the technique of restricting the size of the interested public by means of avoidance of publicity and by censorship of the communications medium (Truman, "The Governmental Process," 360 (1951)).

FAIR TRADE BORN IN DEPRESSION

No small influence in propelling the fair trade movement is the fact that it was spawned in the depths of the depression. All of us who were of mature age in that era recall that in many areas of the country, people had lost faith in the workings of our free enterprise, competitive economy. This climate, of course, proved fertile ground for a movement under the banner "Fair Trade"—with the obvious implication that those who opposed them were unfair traders. A free pricing program was loosely characterized as being synonymous with "predatory price cutting," "cut-throat competition," and "loss-leader selling," terms which easily lend themselves to emotionalism rather than logical analysis.

Thus resale price maintenance, a doctrine hitherto fundamentally repugnant to our law and economic principles was born and flourished.

DUE PROCESS

Defendants main attack is rested upon article 1, section 1 of our Constitution—the due process clause. It is pointed out in dedefendants' splendidly documented brief that most of the decisions invalidating fair trade have been based upon the due process clause or the essentialy identical reason—the arbitrary abuse of the police power (*Union Carbide & Carbon Company* v. *White River Distributors*, 224 Ark. 558 (1955); *Rogers-Kent, Inc.* v. *General Electric Company*, 231 S.C. 636 (1959)).

The cases abound with definitions of the nature and amplitude of that power:

"It has frequently been stated by Federal and State courts alike that a law which purports to be an exercise of the police power must not by arbitrary, unreasonable, or patently beyond the necessities of the case, and the means which it employs must have a real and substantial relation to the object sought to be attained * * *. The legislature may not, under the guise of protecting the public interests arbtrarily interfere with private business, or impose unusual and unnecessary restrictions upon lawful occupation" (*Commonwealth* v. *Zasloff* 338 Pa. 457, 13 A 2d 67, 69 (1940)).

Of significance to the instant proceedings is the principle announced in *Commonwealth* v. *Sun Ray Drug Company*, 383 Pa. 1, 116, A 2d, 833, 841 (1955).

"The police power may be exercised only in the public interest and may not be used a device to restrain competition * * *. The stifling of competition through an exercise of the State's police power is never justifiable except that it be done, and actually be in the public interest.

With these general legal doctrines in mind, let us focus our attention on the act itself. The characteristic most apparent is that it is a price-fixing statute. A manufacturer merely has to find one amenable distributor (never a problem) and the price of the product is irrevocably set even as to all nonsigners with notice. There are no public hearings on the economic wisdom of the price, nor is there any appeal to any official body from this edict. A capricious and arbitrary judgment of the manufacturer thus operates to deprive the owner of the goods of an inherent and fundamental property right—the right to set its price (*Gambone* v. *Commonwealth*, 375 Pa. 547, 101 A. 2d 634 (1954); *Tyson and Brother United Theater Ticket Offices* v. *Banton*, 273 U.S. 418 (1926)).

[1] For a comprehensive discussion of Fair Trade History, see "E. S. Herman, Fair Trade: Origins, Purposes, and Competitive Effects;" 27 Geo. Wash. Law Rev. 621 et seq.

Defense Activity and Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from expressions by Senators and

Representatives recently observed, that Members in both Houses have become singularly impressed with the attractive idea that, if the Defense Department and NASA would place more of their contracts in depressed areas, the Government could cut the cost of support now being given these areas through unemployment benefits and assistance programs. Not unlike many sweeping oversimplified generalizations this proposal is dazzling with an outward shell of sound judgment and good sense. Equally true of many such generalizations the more penetrating analysis raises imposing questions of the wisdom of any such course of action.

A primary basic question immediately raised is one of overriding fiscal importance. How much should and can the U.S. Government invest in broadening and proliferating its industrial defense and space performance base. That it takes a terrific capital investment to produce the plant, machinery, and manpower capability in a given place even under the most favorable circumstances is attested to dramatically by the facilities and capabilities already bought and paid for in areas which now do a substantial part of this work.

Are the gentlemen, who so vigorously plead for a remaking of depressed areas as defense activity sites, seriously representing their readiness to commit the Government tax resources to the tremendous burden of duplicating facilities, circumstances, and environment found to be so necessary in the areas already performing these functions. Has a critical evaluation of the time lag in our defense and space posture that accommodation to such preparation and phasing in of such new facility really been reliably developed? We submit that consideration of the budget aspect suggested in the first question be answered in light of the present expressions vigorously and widely espoused to the effect that in the face of the proposed tax reduction that Government expenditures should be stringently controlled. We further submit that the difficulties suggested by critical evaluation as indicated in the second question are of sobering proportions.

The recently released NASA report on the Mercury project had a small section reviewing some of the failures and some of the criticisms of performance in existing plant facilities. This part of the rather lengthy and detailed report was overemphasized in news treatment but it does point to a vital fact in both defense and space production. There must be constantly maintained a very high degree of quality, reliability and standard of overall performance. This does not come without effort and special talent. There has evolved a whole new echelon in the industry of what is called QRS, quality reliability and standards. New skills have been developed in limited quantity and new measurement tools have been devised at rather high costs. Proliferation of industrial effort all over the Nation will require that these new talents and tools be available at costs of money and time or the weapons of war and the vehicles of space will be less than desirable and failures and shortcomings will be far more critical than they have thus far been.

Mr. Speaker, we seriously urge that the full implications in terms of time, cost, and quality be carefully and critically weighed by all Members before the preliminary persuasion of suggestions that defense and space spending be used to solve the problems of pockets of unemployment or of industrial depression. It is well that we give sympathetic consideration to the genuine concern of our colleagues who represent districts that have such problems. It is also perhaps understandable that they find some political advantage in the suggestions they have made. However, in cooler, calmer, moments even these Representatives would not have us embark upon a course surely to be abhorrently costly and perhaps destructively harmful in terms of the timing and quality we are striving for in our weapons system and our space effort.

General Electric's Nuclear Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in this day and age of rapid technological development, it is difficult to keep pace with the new strides being taken by the great industries of our Nation.

One such industrial activity—namely, the atomic power equipment department of General Electric, which has an experimental powerplant called Vallecitos near Pleasanton, Calif.—has been in the forefront of the development of atomic powerplants.

Even though I no longer represent Pleasanton, Calif., due to reapportionment, I nevertheless try to keep informed about achievements at this laboratory.

Therefore, it is with pride in these developments that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a release from General Electric indicating the number of kilowatt-hours being produced by the various powerplants throughout the country which were initially pioneered at Pleasanton, Calif.:

GENERAL ELECTRIC NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS GENERATE OVER 3 BILLION KILOWATT-HOURS

SAN JOSE, CALIF.—Nuclear power is sometimes referred to as the wave of the future for electrical generation. The fact is that it makes a pretty big splash right now.

Early in September five nuclear plants powered by General Electric boiling water reactors steamed past a generation mark of more than 3 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity.

This is enough to supply the electrical requirements of a population of about 750,000 people for 1 full year, based on the average American yearly home consumption of 4,000 kilowatt-hours.

In fact, it would satisfy the electrical needs of the entire city of San Francisco for about 12 months with a few million kilowatt-hours left over for the steadily growing population elsewhere in the Golden State.

The five General Electric-powered reactors now operating on utility systems can generate 330,000 kilowatts of electricity—enough to meet the daily electrical requirements of more than 500,000 homes.

Top power producer among the five is the Dresden nuclear power station near Chicago, a 220,000-kilowatt plant owned and operated by Commonwealth Edison Co.

Next comes the Kahl nuclear power station in West Germany, a 15,000-kilowatt plant operated by RWE-Bayernwerk. Pacific Gas & Electric's Humboldt Bay nuclear unit in northern California and Consumers Power Co.'s Big Rock Point plant in Michigan are both rated at 50,000 kilowatts, though both are designed for future increased power output.

The Vallecitos atomic powerplant near Pleasanton, Calif., serves primarily as General Electric's test bed for nuclear fuel development, but also produces 5,000 kilowatts for the Pacific Gas & Electric system in northern California.

Two other power stations featuring General Electric boiling water reactors have sustained their initial chain reaction and should produce power for the first time later this year. Awaiting startup is the 12,500-kilowatt power demonstration reactor in Japan, and the 150,000-kilowatt Garigliano nuclear power station in Italy.

Plants on order or under construction, for which General Electric boiling water reactors have been specified, include a 250,000-kilowatt station in West Gemany; a 400,000-kilowatt plant in India; a 50,000-kilowatt plant in the Netherlands, and Pacific Gas & Electric's 325,000-kilowatt plant at Bodega Bay.

By 1968, when the last of these plants is scheduled to go on the line, they will have generated more than 16 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity on utility systems.

Amherst College in Massachusetts Confers Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree on President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, October 26, Amherst College, until recently in my congressional district, held a special convocation to honor the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. President Kennedy delivered the convocation address and participated in the ground break ceremonies for the $3.5 million memorial library to the late Robert Frost, one of America's great and illustrious poets and a former member of the Amherst College faculty.

Honorary degrees of doctors of laws were conferred by Amherst College President Calvin H. Plimpton upon President Kennedy and Archibald MacLeish, poet, statesman, and former Librarian of Congress, in the presence of John J. McCloy, chairman of the Amherst College board of trustees. Under unanimous consent, I include the news story from the Springfield Sunday Republican of October 27, the honorary degree citations, and the text of President Kennedy's address with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, Oct. 27, 1963]

KENNEDY IN PLEA AT AMHERST FOR AID ON PROBLEMS—PRESIDENT AWARDED HONORARY DEGREE, HELPS BREAK GROUND FOR FROST MEMORIAL

AMHERST.—President John F. Kennedy on Saturday called upon all educated men and women of the United States to join in the solution of staggering problems facing a country that has lived 150 years in isolation and suddenly finds itself in the position of leader of the free world.

DUAL PURPOSE

Speaking at a convocation called by Amherst College for the dual purpose of honoring the President of the United States and breaking ground for the new $3.5 million memorial library to Robert Frost, one of America's great poets and onetime Amherst faculty member, the President cited these problems as:

1. To find 10 million jobs in the next 2½ years;

2. To govern our relations with more than 100 countries so that the balance of power remains on the side of freedom;

3. To make it possible for Americans of all races and creeds to live together in harmony; and

4. To make it possible for a world to exist in diversity and freedom.

While the President was undisputed headline speaker of the day, it was left to Archibald MacLeish, former Librarian of Congress, Assistant Secretary of State, lawyer, and a poet in his own right, to set the tone for the day.

PRESIDENT FOUND TIME

Noting that the Nation might well forget, in the passage of time, what memorable things happened here today, MacLeish stated, however, that "the people of this community will remember for many, many years that a young and gallant President of the United States, with the weight of history heavy upon his shoulders, somehow found time to come to our small corner of the world to talk of books, and men, and learning."

Even before MacLeish spoke his prophetic words, it was quite evident that the approximately 3,000 Amherst alumni and townspeople were quite excited over the prospects of seeing the President. They began streaming in from the fog-shrouded hills as early as 9 a.m. in a constant procession, forming long lines, waiting at the doors of the Pratt gymnasium where the event was to be held, or gathering in tight little groups to chat, while youngsters and dogs cavorted on the wide, leaf-covered lawns.

Just before President Kennedy entered the building a note of excitement filled the air. Even sophisticated Amherst alumni and their wives jumped up on chairs for a better look at him. When he finally appeared and the Amherst band struck up, "Hail to the Chief" the crowd, whether they all were Republicans, Democrats or independents, roared its greeting in an ovation that lasted until Kennedy walked down the long center aisle, mounted the platform and finally sat down.

LONG LINES

Later in the day the crowd streamed in other long lines over the steep, grassy hills to the scene of the ground-breaking exercises, again loudly applauded when the President arrived in his long, white convertible on which were mounted the American and Presidential flags. When the ceremony was ended, a long line of State troopers and a couple of companies of Reserve Officers Training Corps, personnel, had difficulty in keeping the crowd from bursting through the drift fences set up for the event.

They streamed back over the hill to the baseball field and waited another half hour in the boiling sun to see him take over in a Marine helicopter.

Even as the whirlybird rose in a great cloud of dust, the crowd waved its farewell.

The Associated Press after reported that the President arrived safely at his summer home at Atoka, Va. at 3:37 p.m.

FOG DELAYS ARRIVAL

Dense fog over the entire eastern seaboard delayed the Presidential arrival for an hour and a half. Shortly after 9:30 the fog enveloping the Amherst area seemed to lift, but it returned again shortly. For a time college officials felt that the President might be obliged to come from Westover by motorcade, but the fog finally cleared sufficiently for a takeoff. The President and his official party arrived in three Marine Corps 'copters, landing on a baseball field ringed with blue-clad State troopers and ROTC Cadets. A Westover AFB crash truck and an ambulance stood by.

The 'copters came down with such a rush that they caused clouds of dust to rise from the dry playing field, forcing the waiting crowds back.

The academic procession which opened the formal convocation in the huge gym, was led by a silk-hatted, gold-vested bow-tied marshal carrying an ancient pike from which flew colored streamers. The group of visiting dignitaries, clad in their black academic gowns, accentuated by the red, purple, blue and white scarves of their respective degrees, were finally seated on the stage.

PA SYSTEM GOES HAYWIRE

Things were not destined to proceed smoothly, however. The public address system went haywire at the outset, causing speakers' voices to fluctuate madly from mere whispers to loud, raucous squawks which led MacLeish at one point to quip "I shall disclose * * * or rather, either the machine, or I, will disclose to you * * *."

President Kennedy, in a strong tribute, characterized Frost as one of the granite figures of the world. He was supremely two things, the President said, an artist and an American.

The President said that a nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers.

"In America," he continued, "our heroes have customarily run to men of large accomplishments. But today this college and country honors a man whose contribution was not to our size but to our spirit, not to our political beliefs but to our insight, not to our self-esteem but to our self-comprehension. In honoring Robert Frost, we therefore can pay honor to the deepest sources of our national strength."

Frost, the President continued, brought an unsparing instinct for reality to bear on the platitudes and the pieties of society. His sense of the human tragedy fortified him against self-deception and easy consolation.

"GAVE HIS AGE STRENGTH

"Because he knew the midnight as well as the high noon," President Kennedy said, "because he understood the ordeal as well as the triumph of the human spirit, he gave his age strength with which to overcome despair. At bottom he held a deep faith in the spirit of man."

Expressing full confidence in the future, President Kennedy said he foresaw an America which "will match its military strength with our morale strength, its wealth with our wisdom, its power with our purpose. I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great old American houses and squares and parks and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well."

MacLeish, who preceded the President, saw in the person of Robert Frost an undying greatness.

TALKS OF HONOR

Speaking with a fluency one might expect of the Librarian of Congress and a nationally recognized poet, MacLeish said, "There was something in Frost's fame that resists the fame as burning maple logs—rock maple, anyway—resists the flame. What it is, I think we know. At least there is an evening not many years ago, or many blocks from here, an evening others in this room will remember * * * which might tell us. It was his 80th birthday. Frost had been to New York for every possible honor, including some not possible, that had been paid him and on returning here to Amherst and his friends he fell to talking of what honor really was, or would be; to leave behind him, as he put it, a 'few poems it would be hard to get rid of.'

"Poems are not monuments—shapes of stone. Poems are speaking voices. And a poem that is hard to get rid of is a voice that is hard to get rid of. And a voice that is hard to get rid of is a man.

"What Frost wanted to know for himself, in the midst of all that praise, was what Keats had wanted for himself: To be among the English poets at his death—the poets of the English tongue. Reputation * * * above all, a literary reputation, is a poor thing. It rises and falls. It wasn't reputation that he was thinking about that wintery evening. It was something else * * * to be among the English poets is to be * * * to go on being. And he has."

After both President Kennedy and MacLeish concluded their talks, honorary degrees of bachelor of law, were conferred on them both by President Calvin H. Plimpton. The citations for these honors appear elsewhere in this edition.

Following the conclusion of the ceremony, the official party left the stage and proceeded to the site of the new library about an eighth of a mile away. It will be built on a hillside on the site of the Walker Memorial Library only recently razed. The $3.5 million building bearing Frost's name will house Amherst's 550,000 volumes.

It was quite evident from the outset that the law enforcement agencies were not going to take any chances with the President's life. About 150 husky State troopers lined the baseball field where the Presidential helicopter was to land, then moved up to the Pratt gym grounds nearby to guard all the approaches. Troopers even were posted on the rooftops of adjacent buildings. All were under the command of Col. Carl Larson, chief of the uniformed State police force. A large corps of secret service men, wearing only a small lapel button as identification, remained close to the President from the start to the finish of the day's program.

The only pickets—if they could be called that—were of a peaceful sort. About 50 undergraduates carrying banners proclaiming, "Mr. President, We Support Your Civil Rights Program" and "Civil Rights Law in 1963" stood patiently in the cold, damp fog for 3 hours until Kennedy arrived and waved his fleeting greeting.

It was a typical October Saturday morning in a small New England college town that greeted the President. There were some mink stoles in evidence, but mostly everyone wore sporty tweeds, flaming red dresses or jackets, and as they chatted with animation in small friendly groups, or waved excited greetings to classmates they haven't seen since last alumni day, they presented a scene that could be found in Amherst on almost any Saturday in October.

The small fry enjoyed the excitement immensely. One tyke ran all over the place on a hobby horse. Others played touch football. A brown beagle walked around with a

Mickey Mouse balloon tied to its tail. There were lean, elderly old men who looked as though they once taught at Amherst, or younger, brisker collegiate types. Girls from nearby colleges added color and grace.

Despite the long, cold wait, the crowd remained in good spirits. In the gymnasium the crowd chatted, again in small groups, until asked to clear the aisles and stop smoking shortly before the ceremonies began. The Amherst band frequently cheered things up with the rousing "Lord Jeffrey Amherst."

CLOSED TV CIRCUIT

Several hundred more persons, unable to get into the gymnasium, were able to see and hear proceedings through a special closed circuit television setup in an adjacent building.

In the press headquarters early reports were discouraging. The fog that made some roads in the area almost impassable, refused to lift and reports from Washington indicated that the President's plane would be a half hour late; then an hour; finally an hour and a half. The plane carrying the White House correspondents was delayed even longer.

All news wire services were represented by full complements of reporters and photographers.

Some of the town youths decided early to capitalize on the Presidential visit by offering parking on front and side lawns of adjacent properties for $1.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, Oct. 27, 1963]

OFFICIAL CITATIONS

These are the official texts of the citations accompanying the honorary degrees of doctor of laws conferred upon President John F. Kennedy and Archibald MacLeish, poet, statesman, and former librarian of Congress by Amherst College Saturday:

"John Fitzgerald Kennedy: A citation for the President of the United States reads more like a prayer to the heavens, for all hopes for the sanity of national and international understanding depend upon you. But while pledging our support, we can applaud your skill, admire your courage, and be grateful for your leadership. By virtue of the authority vested in me by the board of trustees of Amherst College, I confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

"Archibald MacLeish: Son of Yale, Harvard lawyer, American soldier and statesman, international poet and author. Through your efforts and through yourself you have revealed that incandescence which is the human spirit. Your interest has been deeper than morphology for you have seen into the mechanisms of the mystery in a way to give hope to the myopic and comfort to the blind. For going from man to men, from the particular to the universal in a way to enlarge understanding, we salute you. By virtue of the authority vested in me by the board of trustees of Amherst College, I confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON RECEIVING HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS, AMHERST COLLEGE, AMHERST, MASS.

Mr. McCloy, President Plimpton, Mr. MacLeish, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: I am very honored to be here with you on this occasion which means so much to this college and also means so much to art and the progress of the United States. This college is part of the United States. It belongs to it. So did Mr. Frost, in a large sense. And, therefore, I was privileged to accept the invitation somewhat rendered to me in the same way that Franklin Roosevelt rendered his invitation to Mr. MacLeish, the invitation which I received from Mr. McCloy. The powers of the Presidency are often described. Its limitations should occasionally be remembered. And, therefore, when the Chairman of our Disarmament Advisory Committee, who has labored so long and hard, Governor Stevenson's assistant during the very difficult days at the United Nations, during the Cuban crisis, a public servant of so many years asks or invites the President of the United States, there is only one response. So I am glad to be here.

Amherst has had so many soldiers of the king since its first one, and some of them are here today: Mr. McCloy, who has long been a public servant; Jim Reed, who is the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; President Cole, who is now our Ambassador to Chile; Mr. Ramey, who is a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission; Dick Reuter, who is head of the Food for Peace. These and scores of others down through the years have recognized the obligations of the advantages which the graduation from a college such as this places upon them to serve not only their private interest but the public interest as well.

Many years ago, Woodrow Wilson said: "What good is a political party unless it is serving a great national purpose. And what good is a private college or university unless it is serving a great national purpose?" The library being constructed today, this college, itself, of course was not done merely to give this school's graduates an advantage, an economic advantage, in the life struggle. It does do that. But in return for that, in return for the great opportunity which society gives the graduates of this and related schools, it seems to me incumbent upon this and other schools' graduates to recognize their responsibility to the public interest.

Privilege is here, and with privilege goes responsibility. And I think, as your president said, that it must be a source of satisfaction to you that this school's graduates have recognized it. I hope that the students who are here now will also recognize it in the future. Although Amherst has been in the forefront of extending aid to needy and talented students, private colleges, taken as a whole, draw 50 percent of their students from the wealthiest 10 percent of our Nation. And even State universities and other public institutions derive 25 percent of their students from this group. In March 1962, persons of 18 years or older who had not completed high school made up 46 percent of the total labor force, and such persons comprised 64 percent of those who were unemployed. And in 1956, the lowest fifth of the families in the United States had 4½ percent of the total personal income, the highest fifth 45½ percent. There is inherited wealth in this country and also inherited poverty. And unless the graduates of this college and other colleges like it who are given a running start in life—unless they are willing to put back into our society those talents, the broad sympathy, the understanding, the compassion—unless they are willing to put those qualities back into service of the Great Republic, then obviously the presuppositions upon which our democracy are based are bound to be fallable.

The problems which this country now face are staggering, both at home and abroad. We need the service in the great sense of every educated man or woman to find 10 million jobs in the next 2½ years, to govern our relations, a country which lived in isolation for 150 years, and is now suddenly the leader of the free world, to govern our relations with over 100 countries, to govern those relations with success so that the balance of power remains strong on the side of freedom, to make it possible for Americans of all different races and creeds to live together in harmony, to make it possible for a world to exist in diversity and freedom. All this requires the best of all of us.

Therefore, I am proud to come to this college whose graduates have recognized this obligation and to say to those who are now here that the need is endless, and I am confident that you will respond.

Robert Frost said: "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I, I took the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference."

I hope that road will not be the less traveled by, and I hope your commitment to the great Republic interest in the years to come will be worthy of your long inheritance since your beginning.

This day devoted to the memory of Robert Frost offers an opportunity for reflection which is prized by politicians as well as by others, and even by poets, for Robert Frost was one of the granite figures of our time in America. He was supremely two things: an artist and an American. A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers. In America, our heroes have customarily run to men of large accomplishments. But today this college and country honors a man whose contribution was not to our size but to our spirit, not to our political beliefs but to our insight, not to our self-esteem, but to our self-comprehension. In honoring Robert Frost, we therefore can pay honor to the deepest sources of our national strength. That strength takes many forms, and the most obvious forms are not always the most significant. The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the Nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable, especially when that questioning is disinterested, for they determine whether we use power or power uses us. Our national strength matters, but the spirit which informs and controls our strength matters just as much. This was the especial significance of Robert Frost. He brought an unsparing instinct for reality to bear on the platitudes and pieties of society. His sense of the human tragedy fortified him against self-deception and easy consolation. I have been, he wrote, one acquainted with the night. And because he knew the midnight as well as the high noon, because he understood the ordeal as well as the triumph of the human spirit, he gave his age strength with which to overcome dispairs. At bottom, he held a deep faith in the spirit of man, and it is hardly an accident that Robert Frost coupled poetry and power, for he saw poetry as the means of saving power from itself. When power leads man toward arrogance, poetry reminds him of his limitations. When power narrows the areas of man concerned, poetry reminds him of the richness and diversity of his existence. When power corrupts, poetry cleanses. For art establishes the basic human truths which must serve as the touchstone of our judgment. The artist, however faithful to his personal vision of reality, becomes the last champion of the individual mind and sensibility against an intrusive society and an officious state. The great artist is thus a solitary figure. "He has," as Frost said, "a lover's quarrel with the world." In pursuing his perceptions of reality, he must often sail against the currents of his time. This is not a popular role. If Robert Frost was much honored during his lifetime, it was because a good many preferred to ignore his darker truths. Yet in retrospect, we see how the artist's fidelity has strengthened the fiber of our national life.

If sometimes our great artists have been the most critical of our society, it is because their sensitivity and their concern for justice which must motivate any true artist, makes him aware that our Nation falls short of its highest potential. I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. If art is to flourish the roots of our culture, society must set the

artist free to follow his vision wherever it takes him. We must never forget that art is not a form of propaganda; it is a form of truth. And as Mr. MacLeish once remarked, of poets there is nothing worse for our trade than to be in style. In free society art is not a weapon and it does not belong to the sphere of polemics and ideology. Artists are not engineers of the soul. It may be different elsewhere. But democratic society—in it, the highest duty of the writer, the composer, the artist is to remain true to himself and to let the chips falls where they may. In serving his vision of the truth, the artist best serves his nation. And the nation which disdains the mission of art invites the fate of Robert Frost's hired man, the fate of having nothing to look backward to with pride and nothing to look forward to with hope.

I look forward to a great future for America, a future in which our country will match its military strength with our moral strength, its wealth with our wisdom, its power with our purpose. I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great old American houses and squares and parks of our national past, and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future. I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well. And I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democracy and diveristy but also for personal distinction. Robert Frost was often skeptical about projects for human improvement, yet I do not think he would disdain this hope. As he wrote during the uncertain days of the Second War, take human nature altogether since time began, and it must be a little more in favor of man, say a fraction of 1 percent at the very least, our hold on the planet wouldn't have so increased.

Because of Mr. Frost's life and work, because of the life and work of this college, our hold on this planet has increased.

Profits and Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said against the extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican farm labor importation program, which is due to be considered once again by the House this week.

The following editorial appeared in the New York Post of October 23, and should be added to the long list of individuals, organizations, and religious groups opposed to any further extension of this program.

I believe it speaks for itself, and for many of us:

PROFITS AND PREJUDICE

We are indebted to the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor for a revealing sidelight on the South's attitude toward Government moves to outlaw discrimination in public accommodations.

Southern Senators have been arguing that such moves would be an outrageous, unconstitutional impairment of property rights, in fact, little short of "police state socialism." Proposed restrictions on the businessman's right to serve whom he pleases, Georgia's Senator RUSSELL has said, represent "the most unconstitutional 66 words conceived by man."

It turns out, however, that the same southern legislators who challenge the Federal Government's right to protect Negroes in their use of public accommodations concede that right when the issue is protecting cheap Mexican contract labor. Under Public Law 78 Congress authorized the Federal Government to negotiate a migrant labor agreement with the Mexican Government, including an article prohibiting discriminatory acts against Mexicans in the communities (mostly southern) in which they would be working.

Apparently southern statesmen are prepared to overlook the right of a businessman to serve whom he pleases if that is the only way to recruit low-wage Mexican labor for seasonal farm work.

Despite the nondiscriminatory provisions of Public Law 78, it is a bad law and its extension should be defeated. It survived in the Senate by one vote. A 2-year extension was defeated in the House and now the agricultural lobbyists are prepared to settle for 1 year.

We hope the House stands firm. We agree with the National Catholic Rural Life Conference that the foreign contract labor program should be killed "once and for all" because it exploits Mexican poverty in a way that depresses wages and increases joblessness among "the poorest of America's poor, the migrant families."

But let the record show where the southern legislators stood when they had to choose between profit and prejudice.

Secretary Manning Replies to Ill-Informed Criticism by Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, harsh criticism of the State Department's recent foreign policy briefing conference for newspaper editors and broadcasters is contained in a recent article by John S. Knight. The article, entitled "State Department Briefings Are a Flop: Off-the-Record Conferences Devised to Deceive People," appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 16 as page A6487.

Mr. Knight assails the State Department briefings in particular and "off the record," by which he presumably means "background," briefings in general.

In fact, the State Department's foreign policy briefings have made a very useful contribution to popular understanding of American foreign policy. Their value has been reflected in a consistently favorable response from participants.

The problem of unattributed news stories and the "background" briefings from which they come has interested me greatly. Sometimes this means of communication between newsmen and officials is a valid way of informing the people of governmental news. At other times it is subject to serious abuse. Thoughtful, careful consideration of this problem is urgently needed.

At my request, the staff of the Government Information Subcommittee has recently prepared a report on current practices in giving and using nonattributable news. I am sending this report to publishers' and editors' groups and to journalism schools to obtain their judgment about canors of ethics that might be established so that officials, newsmen, and the public may employ the "background information" device without so many of the disadvantages. A publisher such as Mr. Knight might be expected to make a significant contribution to a sober consideration of the problem. His article falls considerably short of this.

Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Robert J. Manning wrote a letter of rebuttal to the Knight newspapers on October 16. A news story based on Secretary Manning's letter, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of October 19, follows:

U.S. AID REJECTS CRITICISM BY KNIGHT—LETTER DEFENDS PRESS BRIEFING

(By Peter Lisagor)

WASHINGTON.—A high State Department official has fired a rebuttal to Publisher John S. Knight's attack upon a recent background briefing conference on U.S. foreign policy for newspaper editors and broadcasters.

Robert J. Manning, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, called the Knight account of the conference unfair, inaccurate, and abusive of "decent Americans who serve their country in the foreign policy field."

The Knight column appeared in the Chicago Daily News and newspapers of the Knight chain last Saturday, October 12. (Knight is on vacation this week. His column will be resumed upon his return.)

Referring to the annual background conference held by the State Department on October 7–8, Knight said he declined an invitation to the sessions because the speakers are "Government functionaries who have nothing to say, and hide behind a cloak of anonymity.

"Even worse is the fact that these faceless men are either not informed as to Government policies, or deliberately mislead the more naive members of our profession."

Knight described a remark about Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu's visit to the United States, which Manning charged was jerked out of context and seriously misquoted, as "insufferable nonsense." The publisher demanded to know why the press submits "meekly to absurd and unenforcible rulings" against identifying the briefing officers.

Knight added: "Why didn't one single editor or broadcaster break the rules and tell the story?"

Manning, in his letter of reply, said that presumably Knight had asked this question of four of his own Knight newspaper correspondents who registered to attend the conference.

The State Department official vigorously denied Knight's allegation that the statement about Mme. Nhu was an official attempt to impose upon the American press "a responsibility to aid and abet its (the U.S. Government's) schemes to put pressure upon the leaders of South Vietnam."

Manning defended the official for reminding those editors and reporters present that their agencies and organizations had invited Mme. Nhu to some 29 major engagements and that the lady from Saigon was closely associated with the "repressive steps" taken against American newsmen in Vietnam.

He quoted the official further: "Now, that is going to make our voice in Vietnam sound like nonsense, when we say that the American people are deeply disturbed, upset and appalled by the beating up of newsmen."

Manning then asked, "Does Mr. Knight really think these remarks are not fair comment?"

The State Department official accused Knight of "the amateurish error of equating off-the-record discussions with background discussions."

He pointed out that "off-the-record" meant nothing could be printed, while "background" meant what was said could be printed without attribution. The background conference is a long-standing practice here.

Manning was especially irritated by Knight's reference to "these faceless men" in the State Department and the suggestion that they arrange such conferences "to deceive or misinform the people."

The Department official, who worked for news magazines and newspapers before coming to his present post in April 1962, said of this type of charge:

"I do not understand why decent Americans who serve their country in the foreign policy field should have to accept this kind of abuse.

"I do not understand why a legitimate effort to bring Washington legitimate newspapermen with a legitimate interest in seeing and hearing from top Government officials should be maligned as some treacherous plot to subvert the Republic.

"Fortunately the many letters of praise from newsmen who did bother to attend would seem to suggest that most of them did not see it that way."

Manning said that while others in Government—"many cool heads," he called them—had learned to ignore such attacks, he has been here "too briefly to acquire that stoicism" and a newspaperman too long to "believe that the public deserves or wants the kind of journalism represented in the "Notebook" (Knight's column) of last weekend to go unanswered."

Mr. Speaker, the full text of Secretary Manning's letter to the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte News, Chicago Daily News, Detroit Free Press, and the Miami Herald follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, October 16, 1963.

John S. Knight's "Notebook" of last weekend is astonishing for its bitterness, its opinions-in-absentia and its inaccuracies. It is unfortunate that Mr. Knight did not attend the State Department briefing conference he so thunderously, and unfairly, condemns.

A few particulars:

1. He repeats the old false charge that the U.S. Government deliberately lied to newsmen at a similar briefing conference in October of 1962.

On October 15, 1962, a U.S. official told a similar background conference that the United States did not know of the existence of offensive Soviet missiles in Cuba. That night, U.S. intelligence processed films that provided the first solid evidence of the existence of Soviet offensive missile bases and missiles. The briefing conference continued for a second day on October 16 and the subject of Cuba did not come up. The Government could have revealed on that day the dramatic new turn in events, at the expense of alerting Russia to our discovery before we had planned our counteraction. To have done so would have risked disaster. I have heard no responsible American suggest that in this critical moment the Government should have done other than it did.

Mr. Knight must by now know the facts about this one; they have been discussed repeatedly and at length. If he chooses to misrepresent them, it is perhaps his privilege and, alas, his decision.

2. He jerks out of context a remark made at the latest conference by a high State Department official concerning Madame Nhu of Vietnam, and he also seriously misquotes that same official to suggest that he was trying to charge the American press with "a responsibility to aid and abet (U.S. Government) schemes to put pressures upon the leaders of South Vietnam". The official neither said nor implied any such thing.

What the official (not myself) did was to remind his audience of editors and reporters that their agencies and organizations were in effect serving as the prime hosts for the visit to this country of a Vietnamese personage who was closely connected with the repressive steps that have been mounted against American newsmen in Vietnam. He referred to the strongly expressed desire of the American press for effective U.S. protection of American newsmen in Vietnam, and said:

"The press, both in its competitive media aspects and its organized associations, is giving Madame Nhu the most triumphal reception that any foreigner in this country has received in many years—29 major engagements. Now, that is going to make our voice in Vietnam sound like nonsense, when we say that the American people are deeply disturbed, upset, and appalled by the beating up of newsmen."

Does Mr. Knight really think these remarks are not fair comment?

3. He makes the amateurish error of equating off-the-record discussions with background discussions, though newsmen have maintained and practiced for years a sharp distinction between the two. "Off-the-record" means you can't print it. "Background" means you can print it but cannot attribute by name to the official who said it. A newspaper editor's surprise at this practice is difficult to understand.

4. He asks, "Why didn't one single editor or broadcaster break the rules and tell the story?" Presumably he has by now asked the same question of four of his own Knight newspaper correspondents, who registered to attend the conference. And presumably they, by now, have told him that (a) this is a practice of long-standing, desired at least as much by newsmen as by government officials; (b) they were able to write in full whatever the story seemed to them to be and (c) nobody at the conference had to attend, believe, print or otherwise dispose of a single word or phrase he heard at the 2-day conference.

5. He suggests that no "self-respecting newsman" would or should agree to such no-attribution rules. Where has Mr. Knight been? Most interviews conducted by newsmen in Washington and other national capitals are "background" interviews in which the newsmen do not name their sources. Courts and police usually cannot persuade newsmen to divulge their sources, though the courts sometimes try; but newsmen insist on the right to protect their sources, as they should.

As for the use of the "background" rules at this particular State Department meeting, the reason is dramatically simple: at a previous State Department conference, at which a mixture of on-the-record and background information was provided, the newsmen and broadcasters in attendance were asked to stipulate the rules under which they preferred the next meeting to be held. The vote, which determined the rules used at the recent conference in question, was four to one in favor of "background." They could have chosen full on-the-record talks or no conference at all. They preferred "background" because they felt it produced more and sharper guidance on current government thinking.

The Notebook of last weekend is vulnerable in many other respects but space, like patience, runs out. The more than 500 editors, writers and broadcasters who attended the Department of State briefing, and whose integrity and acumen Mr. Knight so bitterly attacks, can, I am sure, speak for themselves if they choose.

A few final words, however, on behalf of the Department of State and "the faceless men" who devise to "deceive or misinform the people." I do not understand why decent Americans who serve their country in the foreign policy field should have to accept this kind of abuse. I do not understand why a legitimate effort to bring to Washington legitimate newspapermen with a legitimate interest in seeing and hearing from top government officials should be maligned as some treacherous plot to subvert the Republic. Fortunately, the many letters of praise from newsmen who did bother to attend would seem to suggesct what most of them did not see it that way.

There are many cool heads in Washington, men who have learned to let this sort of thing fade away unanswered and whose final satisfaction will come from the way they have been served. I have been in Government too briefly to acquire that stoicism, however, and in newspapering too long to believe that the public deserves or wants the kind of journalism represented in the Notebook of last weekend to go unanswered.

This, incidentally, is not off-the-record, not background, and not otherwise faceless or anonymous.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT MANNING.

Cubans To Replace Braceros?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the scurrying to propose suggestions for the replacement of braceros, the opponents are unable to propose a reasonable or practical alternative. If the bracero program is terminated, many rural agricultural areas will be subjected to unbelievable chaos.

There is insufficient domestic labor with the proper skills and desire at the right place at the right time to handle the harvests.

One suggestion is for Cubans to replace braceros, as outlined in the following article from the Oakland Tribune:

California faces a massive increase in welfare costs if the bracero farm labor program is abandoned.

In sounding this warning Wednesday, Manuel R. Castro urged fellow members of the Alameda County Welfare Commission to give serious attention to prospective farm labor law legislation.

The bracero program, under which Mexican nationals enter California under special work permits to harvest crops, is due to expire December 31.

Castro said he has heard reports that there are groups who want to bring in 200,000 or 300,000 Cubans from Florida and Miami to harvest our crops for 3 months a year if the bracero program ends on schedule.

NINE MONTHS

"What are they going to do the other 9 months? * * * They're going to be on relief,"

Castro said. "If they kill the bracero program, you are going to face double welfare costs."

Castro, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Local 768 in Hayward, said his national union is the only labor group he knows that favored an extension of the bracero program which he described as the lesser of two evils.

He said since he did not expect farm labor wages to become competitive with the pay in California industry, the harvest workers probably would be imported from other States and could pose a serious problem for California.

This is not a practical or fair answer. Importation of Cubans would not help agriculture. The displaced Cubans are not experienced farmworkers. They would be soon disappointed and disillusioned if they were sent to the farms for 2 or 3 months.

Use of Cubans would not help the domestic farm laborer. In fact, the Cuban worker would take jobs from the year-round domestic worker when harvests were finished. The year-round farm worker needs protection, too. He should not be forgotten.

The Legacy of Columbus and the American Heritage of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 12, I was privileged to participate at a Columbus Day celebration at the White House. After greeting the large audience there assembled, President Kennedy discussed the tremendous importance of the discovery of America by Columbus. Commenting upon the traits of character required to accomplish such a feat, the President said:

The first voyages are the hard ones and they require perseverance and character.

The President added that the lesson that was taught by Columbus is a good lesson for all of us today as we attempt new things.

Not only did President Kennedy refer to the contribution of Columbus, but he very eloquently referred to the contribution of Americans who are proud to share with Columbus a common heritage. I was privileged to have been asked by the President to say a few words on behalf of the House of Representatives.

One of the distinguished public officials who was present at the White House celebration was the Honorable Edward D. Re, the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. That very evening Dr. Re spoke at a Columbus Day banquet in Syracuse, N.Y., sponsored by the Syracuse lodges of the Order Sons of Italy. In his talk, Dr. Re noted that the historic discovery of the New World by Columbus was the very beginning of the events which made possible our American heritage of freedom.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Re also was the principal speaker in Utica the following day at the Columbus celebration held in that city. Dr. Re, the first American of Italian origin to have been appointed Chairman of an independent Commission, only recently was reappointed by the President for an additional 3-year term as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Dr. Re's speech entitled "The Legacy of Columbus and the American Heritage of Freedom," provides inspiration for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. Re's address as a timely message for all Americans and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE LEGACY OF COLUMBUS AND THE AMERICAN HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, on this festive occasion as patriotic Americans we have assembled to commemorate and celebrate one of the greatest events of human history—the discovery of America. History, it may be truly said, is really biography since history is largely cast in the image and deeds of great men. Therefore, more specifically, we have joined together to pay tribute to the memory of a man whose faith and ideals made possible the discovery of the New World. That man, of course, is Christopher Columbus, the mariner, who, in the words of Morison, one of his biographers, "did more to chart the course of history than any other individual since Emperor Augustus."

It would be simple indeed to recount the story of Columbus. It is unquestionably a romantic story—one that captures the imagination of all—both young and old: the trials and tribulations of this great navigator, whose indomitable spirit, strength of conviction, and perseverance achieved the greatest discovery of all times, are extremely fascinating and even inspirational.

That story, particularly in its broad outlines, is well known to most Americans. What is perhaps less known and not appreciated is that Columbus' achievement was much more than a feat of navigation in sailing westward over uncharted seas. The preeminence of Columbus does not stem from his discovery alone but in hastening others along the same path by promise and example. Columbus was not just another explorer, but a man with a passion—a dreamer with an enthusiasm which swelled and carried the first generation of explorers to the New World.

To Americans, therefore, Columbus has a special significance for, in a sense, all Americans trace their origins to explorers—all immigrants to this great land. Americans are indebted to this first immigrant to our shores for the great influence that migration has exerted upon our Nation—an influence which has brought about a new concept in modern civilization and made possible the America of today.

Every schoolchild has heard of the story of the *Santa Maria*, the *Pinta*, and the *Nina*, and is familiar with the fact that, together with 86 men, Columbus sailed in search of a westward sea route to the Indies. We all know, too, that the course of world history was dramatically changed on October 12, 1492, when he first cast his eyes upon the American continent. Dressed in the uniform of an admiral of the Spanish Fleet, Columbus went ashore and in the name of his sponsors, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, named the land San Salvador.

History also records that before the Spanish monarchs agreed to finance his voyage, many of his appeals were in vain. One of those appeals made to his native city of Genoa may be of particular interest. A committee was chosen of the finest academic minds of Genoa and its neighbors to examine and make recommendations concerning the proposed voyage.

Although the committee that was selected applauded the plan, it rejected Columbus' plea for financial support. The committee report cautioned that certain preliminary steps had to be taken before plunging into the unexplored horizons. The depths and temperatures of the oceans, the tides, the weather, propulsion systems, the prevention of scurvy and other diseases that afflict the human body and spirit had to be studied, and presented problems that had to be resolved before such a voyage could be undertaken. Even the religious and political aspects of the project were discussed by representatives of church and state who also were on the committee.

A letter written by a member of the Genoa committee indicates that a member of that committee was in full sympathy with Columbus and thought that the project should have been supported. This member was referred to as "a rather rash and impetuous young mechanical engineer, lately of Florence who, though highly recommended, showed his immaturity and poor judgment by advocating the voyage itself be initiated immediately." The letter went on to say that this Florentine was "quite eccentric * * * talks of flying machines and fancies himself an artist." The man that has just been described was Leonardo da Vinci.

A superb mariner, Columbus was not one to be easily discouraged. Having learned the art of seamanship at an early age, Columbus conceived a great idea—that it would be possible to sail due west to the Orient and establish a western trade route to Asia. Even he, however, could not have imagined that what he made possible was not merely trade and commerce, but a community where people of all races, creeds, and national origin would be able to bring not only the products of their labors, but their culture and civilization, and in the process, build a land where they might live in peace, harmony, and prosperity.

It is no wonder then that Columbus has been called by Morison "the sign and symbol of a new age of hope and glory". It is no wonder that his discovery is said to have marked "the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of one of man's most enlightening eras." The achievement is of such magnitude that it can truly be said that all Americans are the beneficiaries of his faith and perseverance. "I thank God," said Columbus, "that He selected me to be the one to discover a new world where the oppressed and persecuted people of Europe can find new hope and faith for a better life."

A great deal has been written about that momentous voyage. However, I do not believe that this is the reason why we have assembled here. Rather, I am of the firm conviction that we are assembled to commemorate that historic discovery, and to appreciate, in our own modest way, the far-reaching implications of that great event. All of us, therefore, are aware of the fact that although we celebrate the tremendous achievement of Columbus, we are really commemorating, in view of its special significance to us today, the first and perhaps the greatest chapter of American history.

No American, however, must be misled by the fact that such a celebration is sponsored by any particular organization. Whether that celebration is sponsored by Americans of Italian heritage, or by Americans of Spanish heritage, or of any other national origin, the celebration retains its distinctively American character. And for this reason all Americans should be grateful to the sponsoring organization for its leadership and initiative in making the necessary arrangements that have assured the success of this important and highly significant occasion. For there can be no denial that the fruits of the efforts of Columbus have been

harvested by all Americans, of all races, color or creeds.

The discovery of the New World is the very beginning of the long course of human events that made possible the establishment of the American heritage of freedom. And it is to give thanks to God for this heritage of freedom that we assemble here on this impressive occasion. We give thanks because it is a heritage shared in and made possible by people of all races and origins. And we give thanks because it is a heritage that stands for equality of treatment and opportunity in a land dedicated to God and the dignity and equality of all men. And it is this heritage of freedom that we should offer to the world as the true symbol of our American democracy.

But is is not enough simply to be content with the achievements of our forefathers. That heritage implies a responsibility and a sacred trust. It is the solemn duty of each generation of Americans not only to guard and maintain these liberties, but to transmit them to future generations in all their force and vigor.

Let no American be discouraged by temporary discord or seeming disunity. After each such adversity and trial America has emerged stronger and more firmly committed to its ideals of justice, equality and freedom. Indeed some ideals may not be fully realized in this generation. But with these ideals constantly before us we will never lose sight of our true goals.

From the days of the early explorers America has always been a land of opportunity. It is still a land of opportunity. It is up to each of us to share the available opportunities with all our fellow Americans. Let us do this willingly and graciously. And let us do this with a sense of gratitude for the blessings and opportunities that this land has made available to us and our forefathers since the founding of our country—made possible by the discovery of Columbus, the mariner.

The 45th Anniversary of the Czechoslovak Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 45th anniversary of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic. As we look toward the future, it is appropriate to recall the liberal tradition which Czechoslovakia set as a new democracy and to which we hope she may soon again return.

Deprived of independence by the Thirty Years War, the Czech people were able, after 300 years of foreign domination, to establish the Republic of Czechoslovakia in 1918. Under the leadership of Thomas Masaryk as President, and of Eduard Benes as Foreign Minister, this new Republic built, in the uncertain interwar years, a liberal and progressive democracy.

On the domestic scene, Czechoslovakia acted decisively in numerous areas. An extensive land reform law, with compensation for expropriated property, was enacted and implemented. Special steps were taken to protect the rights of minority groups. A system of social insurance was established, to be copied by others in Europe. Unions were encouraged.

In foreign affairs, Czechoslovakia was the only nation which in 1931 protested Japanese aggression against China on behalf of the idea of collective security. Eduard Benes, Czechoslovakia's Foreign Minister and later President, was known as "a pillar of the League and the foremost spokesman of the small nations."

We are all aware of the sad history of Czechoslovakia from Mr. Chamberlain's trip to Munich through the war years to its domination by the U.S.S.R. I join today with my colleagues to express our fervent hope that one day Czechoslovakia will again have a free government which will not only reflect the aspirations of her people, but which will also reestablish Czechoslovakia's historic role of leadership in the councils of free nations.

Remarks by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, at a Dinner Commemorating the Centennial of Free City Delivery, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., October 26, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year our country celebrates the 100th anniversary of free city delivery. On Saturday, October 26, 1963, a dinner was held in Washington, D.C., commemorating the centennial of free city delivery, and we were privileged to hear an address by the Postmaster General, the Honorable John A. Gronouski.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Postmaster General Gronouski's remarks which follow:

One of the first things I heard about the postal service was that letter carriers always know what is happening long before anyone else does. The scheduling of this dinner is a case in point. The date was set months before I even knew I was going to be the Postmaster General. But the letter carriers must have known. Why else would they have set this great celebration on my birthday?

It is a pleasure to be here to help honor Bill Doherty and to commemorate the 100th anniversary of free city delivery. Free city delivery is even older than I am. And it is a lot older than Bill Doherty, even though his name has been synonymous with letter carriers in Washington for about as long as anyone can remember. But Bill is still young and exuberant.

Bill Doherty is one of the great labor leaders of this era. In his 30 years as a national officer of the National Association of Letter Carriers, he played a central role in building unions of Government employees into the influential and responsible organizations they are today.

Bill Doherty was one of the best ambassadors the postal service and Federal employee organizations ever had. The country was fortunate in getting him to put his ambassadorial talents to work for the Nation. He is the first labor leader to become an ambassador in the Nation's history. From all the reports I get he is doing a brilliant job.

Back in 1961, when he was still president of the NALC, Bill Doherty said the following about the personnel policies of the new postal administration: "The labor-management climate is practically ideal. For the first time in our recorded history, our opinions are sought and seriously considered before important policy decisions affecting us are made."

I am delighted that organizations of Federal employees have flourished under the Kennedy administration and that the Post Office Department has taken the lead in the area of enlightened labor relations. I want to reiterate what I have already said several times since becoming Postmaster General. I intend to carry forward the program of consultative management. My door will always be open to union leaders who have problems which they wish to discuss with me.

Bill Doherty managed to achieve great things without the advantage of a college education. The William C. Doherty Scholarship Fund, which will enable talented sons and daughters of letter carriers to go to college, is a wonderful way to honor him. The fund is another indication of the marvelous job organized labor is doing to open educational opportunities for its members' children. AFL–CIO unions award more than 1,000 scholarships annually, at a cost of more than $1 million each year.

I feel very deeply that every child who has the talent and ability to make use of a college education should get one. We talk a great deal about equality of educational opportunity in this country, but we do shockingly little about it. Huge differences continue to exist in the kind and quality of education available to our children.

Eight percent of our young people still fail to complete the eighth grade. One-third never finish high school. Almost half of those who do graduate from high school don't go on to college. Among them are many bright and ambitious youngsters. These young people want to continue their education, but they simply cannot afford it.

Half of the students in private colleges and universities come from families who rank in the top 10 percent of the Nation in terms of income. In public institutions 25 percent come from families ranking in the top 10 percent in terms of income.

This should not really surprise us. It costs about $1,750 to send a boy or girl to college for a year. Median family income last year was less than $6,000. In other words, it takes almost one-third of an average family's entire income to finance a year's college education for a single child. What is a family with nine children—like Bill Doherty's—supposed to do? To me, this is a terrible and depressing situation.

The postwar baby crop is now advancing to college age. College enrollment is expected to double in the present decade, reaching 7 million by 1970. To meet the minimum needs of this enrollment, we should be spending $2.3 billion a year for the expansion of college facilities. So far we are spending only $1.3 billion.

Progressive mechanization and the increasing complexity of American society demand that we sharply upgrade the educational level of our entire population. There are great gaps in the country's need for trained personnel—teachers and engineers, doctors and nurses—but there is less and less demand for people with no significant training.

When are we going to take action to meet this need? When are we finally going to see to it that gifted youngsters are not prevented by weight of economic circumstance from

getting the education they require to fill openings in technical and professional fields?

President Kennedy's omnibus education bill calls for substantial Federal aid to increase educational opportunities at every level. Included are provisions for both loans and grants for construction to colleges and universities, and for assistance to students pursuing graduate study. I urge you to get behind this program and give it all the support you can.

I want now to present our City Delivery commemorative stamp. The whimsical drawing of a 19th century letter carrier walking in the rain accompanied by a small boy and a dog was done by Norman Rockwell. We all take free mail delivery to our homes so much for granted now that it seems a little hard to believe that it began only a hundred years ago. Up until 1863, when free delivery was inaugurated in 49 cities, mail in large communities was delivered by private carriers who charged the recipient 2 cents per letter. Where the "penny post," as it was called, was not in use, mail had to be picked up at the local post office. Picking up one's mail could be an onerous chore. Lines of people often stretched out for long distances from delivery windows.

Montgomery Blair, Abraham Lincoln's Postmaster General, who instituted free delivery, believed that good service and the convenience of the public should in all instances be the primary consideration of the Post Office Department, a belief we still subscribe to. In 1887, Congress required the Department to extend free delivery to every city with a population of over 50,000, and permitted its extension to smaller communities having a population of 10,000, or gross post office revenues of $10,000. The Department now employs about 170,000 city letter carriers.

The city delivery stamp is the first commemorative to employ a phosphorescent "tagging" technique. The stamps are coated with a luminescent material that glows green under the special lamps of a new electronic mail sorting machine. Airmail stamps coated with luminescent material will glow red. The new equipment detects stamps, automatically cancels them, and sorts all the envelopes so that they face the same way. It can handle up to 30,000 envelopes per hour. The new gear is an improvement over our older facer-canceler machines which operate on a photoelectric principle. It is a part of our overall program of developing and installing the most modern available techniques in the handling of mail.

I hope that this stamp, which went on sale in Washington today, will remind Americans everywhere of the fine spirit and dedication of the men who deliver the mail.

Sing You Sinners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with all of the witch hunting that is going on, I think it is only appropriate that the liberal establishment have a battle song to use as it tramps over hill and dale in search of those elusive extremists. Actually, the song is a parody written by the California Young Republicans and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

BATTLE HYMN OF CALIFORNIA YOUNG REPUBLICANS

Mine ears have heard the horrors of the militant extreme;
I've been told about their tennis shoes and eyes that madly gleam;
They are armed and more fanatical than you would ever dream.
I'll track down every one.

CHORUS

Glory be, there goes another. Glory be, there goes another.
Glory be, there goes another. I'll track down every one.

Extremists are the people to the right of Chester Bowles,
For they don't believe in giving in to socialism's goals,
They don't even favor foreign aid to Yugoslavs or Poles.
I'll track down every one.
(Repeat chorus)

I've found them underneath my bed, I've seen them near and far;
I have spotted them at caucuses and seen them in the bar;
They control the Y.A.F. and they control the C.Y.R.
I'll track down every one.
(Repeat chorus)

They are hiding in my closet, they are always in my way;
They are lurking in the hallways—I saw 54 today;
They are spying on our meetings til my hair is turning gray.
I'll track down every one.
(Repeat chorus)

I am not afraid of Commies, for their numbers are so small,
But extremists come in millions, and each one is 10 feet tall;
Yes, extremists total millions, and are patriotic, all.
I'll track down every one.
(Repeat chorus)

Exposing them in public was a brilliant thing to do;
Now the People's World adores me, and the Nation loves me, too;
But extremists have to get their praise from National Review.
I'll track down every one.
(Repeat chorus)

Mrs. Douglas Oldest "Newsboy" in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, during National Newspaper Week, the Associated Press conducted a survey to find the oldest active newspaper carrier in the United States. To the surprise of noone, the oldest person delivering newspapers in the country turned out to be Mrs. Mary Douglas, of Brunswick, Md., aged 86.

Not only does this great-grandmother walk 12 miles every day, no matter what the weather, to deliver the Blade-Times to 76 Brunswick citizens, but she has been an active worker for the Salvation Army for 70 years.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a story from the Brunswick Blade-Times of October 24, describing the work of this amazing and outstanding citizen.

The item on Mrs. Douglas is as follows:

MRS. DOUGLAS OLDEST "NEWSBOY" IN UNITED STATES

Brunswick's own Mrs. Mary Douglas, who can be seen every week trudging up and down the local hills with the Blade-Times in a little black bag, has been acclaimed by the Associated Press as the oldest active newspaper carrier in the United States.

Last week as a feature of National Newspaper Week, the Associated Press made a survey to find the oldest carrier who turned out to be Mrs. Douglas.

A story concerning her activities was released to every AP newspaper throughout the country.

The story the AP featured follows:

"The oldest active newspaper carrier whom the Associated Press tracked down in a National Newspaper Week survey walks 12 miles every week to cover her route for the weekly publication at Brunswick.

"Mrs. Mary Douglas is also believed to be the only American with a 70-year record of active service with the Salvation Army. She is 86 years old.

"Her only rival in the AP feature story on the oldest carriers in the Nation is Robert W. Dixon, Worcester, Mass., who is 82.

"Mrs. Douglas, a great-grandmother, delivers 76 copies of the weekly Brunswick Blade-Times over a route of steep hills every Thursday. She walks about 12 miles, beginning at 9 a.m. and handing the last copy to a customer about 4 p.m.

"Why does she do it? She says she began delivering the paper 11 years ago because she liked to meet people. She describes herself as 'the grandmother of Brunswick.'

"Not only is much of her paper route uphill, but most of the homes are built at the top or bottom of steep flights of stone steps. James L. Bryan, publisher of the weekly, says Mrs. Douglas has the most difficult route in town. His other five routes are handled by teenage boys.

"Bad weather seldom bothers Mrs. Douglas who will wear a raincoat and rain hat—but refuses to be hampered by an umbrella. She carries the papers in a plastic-handled shopping bag that dangles to her ankles when she starts out.

"Mrs. Douglas describes the weekly tour of friends and neighbors as a lot of fun.

"A Salvation Army worker for 70 years, she leaves the paper route every year between Thanksgiving and Christmas to go to Frederick, Md., where she operates a Salvation Army booth on a street corner. In her absence, the Blade-Times is mailed to her subscribers and Mrs. Douglas makes collections when she returns for the first delivery after Christmas."

Address by Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, spoke to the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Highway Users Conference on October 28, 1963.

General Duke outlined some of the problems existing in the Washington area with reference to highway construction. I found his speech to be most interesting and informative, and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPEECH TO THE HIGHWAY USERS CONFERENCE BY BRIG. GEN. C. M. DUKE, OCTOBER 28, 1963

The membership list of your organization, the Highway Users Conference, is certainly a cross section of the many service and sales organizations in the metropolitan area. The role and importance of your members to the growth and development of the National Capital region are quite evident.

I'm inclined to think that too many citizens are unaware of, or may be inclined to overlook, the nature and tremendous scale of the service functions required to sustain life in a metropolis the size of ours. The same can be said of the sanitary and water services rendered by the District of Columbia's Department of Sanitary Engineering. After all, the only effort required of the recipient of such services is the simple twist of the handle on the water faucet or the flush tank. He doesn't really have to concern himself with the people and actions required to operate that service.

It is only when something breaks down that these functions become a matter of public concern. As business men you recognize the importance of insuring that the essential service chain continues unbroken. It is for these reasons that I can fully appreciate your concern with the adequacy of the region's highway network. It is obvious that the greatest bulk of your service to the National Capital region depends mainly on the sustained performance of the rubber-tired vehicles on paved right-of-ways.

I have even heard it said that your association is part of the so-called highway lobby. In fact, the name of your organization in itself would seem to suggest that the future of highway construction is rather dear to your hearts.

It is regrettable, of course, that some people improperly chose to consider the current transportation issue as a battle between highways and rail transit. It is essential at the moment that all the forces of reason and logic be heard if we are to have a balanced transportation system to serve fully all of the needs of our region.

And the needs of our area do indicate a balanced system. This gives me an opportunity to compliment Congressman WHITENER and those responsible for the recent development of the so-called bob-tailed subway system which will be so helpful in this area.

I certainly wouldn't for the world suggest that you change your name. Along this line, one of my friends told me that, in Korea, during the early days of the Korean war, a sign was placed over the doorway of a Chinese hand laundry announcing that the establishment was now dedicated to the patriotic duty of furnishing feminine charm to enhance the morale of battle weary members of the Armed Forces. The ever watchful eye of the provost marshal soon put an end to that activity. In due time, a new sign appeared saying, "No longer house of ill repute—now honorable laundry." But the provost marshal still watched the place.

I must believe that the Highway Users Conference is interested in all of the aspects and problems of our community. After all, the state of health and welfare of our citizenry is a definite measure of your success and prosperity in the business world. The annual voluntary trucking company support of the "Goodwill Industries Collection Drive" is but one of the commendable community efforts in which your member organizations participate. I'm convinced, too, that your association has sympathy for, and appreciates, the community implications of the social, economic, and aesthetic factors associated with highway development and, additionally, rail transit development. I'm not sure, however, that the general public fully appreciates your concern and your contribution in these areas.

In fact, it could well be that you could do a better job in communicating to the citizenry your sincere concern with such factors. You now serve the community in a physical sense and you have the means of contact with customers and consumers to let them know that you are sympathetic to the issues which are of such great importance to them. There always is greater objectivity and understanding on the part of an informed citizenry. Although you are admittedly motivated in large measure by a commercial motive, we must realize that even the individual citizen is not devoid of financial motives. An individual's life savings are frequently invested in his home and anything that would tend to devalue that home does indeed threaten his future security.

I know that you are all interested in the deliberations of the Policy Advisory Committee which is reexamining the need for three controversial highway projects, the Three Sisters Bridge, the north leg of the inner loop, and the Potomac River Freeway. As you know, the membership of this Committee includes quite an impressive list of public officials—at least to a newcomer like myself—the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, the Director of the National Park Service, the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Assistant Administrator of Transportation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and observers from the Bureau of the Budget. All sessions of this Committee are executive and the principals are free to unburden themselves without the worry of how their remarks would look in the next day's papers. At the moment, I don't plan to make any keyhole observations or conjectures as to the outcome of the deliberations. I can say this, however—all participants of the Committee have become much more conscious and appreciative of the many factors that must be considered in an evaluation such as this. Everything will depend on the judgment to be applied in consideration of the main factors of social-economic, aesthetics, cost, and traffic requirements. It is not easy to place evaluative scales on family displacement or on the different schools of esthetic appreciation. In the final analysis, we must answer the question as to what is in the best interest of the community at large.

You understand, of course, that the Committee is advisory to the Board of Commissioners, which has the ultimate responsibility of reporting to the President on the highway reexamination.

I am hopeful that we are enterinig a new era of improved joint cooperative planning in highway and transit development. Such development, in the best interest of the community, cannot be competitive—it must be complementary. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 forecasts improved comprehensive transportation planning because it states that no Federal aid funds will be granted to any metropolitan area, after July 1, 1965, which lacks a comprehensive area-wide transportation process. We do not have a continuing comprehensive planning process now and we must proceed to organize promptly to preclude loss of Federal aid funds in 1965. In this matter which is definitely of regional significance, I trust that the Metropolitan Council of Governments and the National Capital Regional Planning Council will work cooperatively to the same end.

I must also note the objective vein contained in the October Architectural Forum special report on "Transportation and the City." Quoting from that article, "There are still too many hardheaded transportation planners and engineers * * * and too many softheaded urban planners and architects who steadfastly refuse to face the facts of city development."

Actually, the Forum's special report proceeds to suggest rather optimistically that the transportation planners, the urban planners, and the architects are beginning to work together with mutual respect and that they will cease currently wasteful philosophical debates that are not conducive to the unity of effort required by the public interests.

At this point, I am sure that some of you are wondering what additional steps you might take to contribute to a better public understanding of the issues. It seems to me that the formation of a special Highway Users Committee to study ways of improving the public's image of freeways would be most useful. Their deliberation should include evaluation of the beneficial effects on the community that can be attained by skillful freeway design and the use of air rights. Complementary dynamic rehousing programs, both public and private, small-scale urban renewal projects, and other positive constructive measures would certainly help to erase the grim and ugly freeway image to which I suspect most residential dwellers hold. Finally, how do you get these facts to the public and in what manner?

I guess I should close in a less serious vein. So, "Don't forget to check the air in your tires."

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events for November

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following "Calendar of Events" for the month of November at the National Gallery of Art:

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale Collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener Collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: Eighteenth Century Venetian Drawings from the Correr Museum. Central Gallery. Through November 24.

Recent publication: Eighteenth Century Venetian Drawings from the Correr Museum. Exhibition catalog; 144 pages 7½ by 10 inches, with introduction and catalog notes by Prof. Terisio Pignatti, 100 illustrations. $1.50 postpaid.

New reproductions: Postcard and 11- by 14-inch color reproduction. John James Audubon, "Columbia Jay" (from "The Birds of America," plate 96). 5 cents and 25 cents each, postpaid. Christmas cards.—Folders (with envelopes) reproducing paintings, sculpture, prints, and drawings from the Gallery Collection. Five cents, 10 cents, and 15 cents each, postpaid. Free illustrated catalog available.

Concert: The concert on November 17 will be in commemoration of the Centennial of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the Public Monday through Saturday, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28 THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 3

Painting of the week[1]: Gauguin. "Fatata te Miti" (Chester Dale collection) gallery 84, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Eighteenth-Century Italian Painting," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," routnda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "English Pottery and Porcelain." Guest speaker: John P. Cushion, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Rita Bouboulidi, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4 THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 10

Painting of the week[1]: Copley, "The Copley Family" (National Gallery of Art Purchase Fund, Andrew W. Mellon gift) gallery 68, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2.

Tour of the week: Exhibition of Eighteen-century Venetian drawings. Central Gallery, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection, rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Italian bronze statuettes: "Renaissance and Antiquity." Guest speaker: Yvonne Hackenbroch, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Gordon Epperson, cellist, Anne Koscielny, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 11 THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 17

Painting of the week: Sodoma. "St. George and the Dragon" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 24, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Venus in Art," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection:" rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Monday, 1; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Art of Late Medieval Tapestry." Guest speaker, Beatrice Farwell, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, assisted by Church of the Reformation Cantata Choir and Soloists, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16 THROUGH SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24

Painting of the week: "Pisanello, Profile Portrait of a Lady" (Mellon collection), gallery 23, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2, Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Flowers in Art," rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

[1] An 11 by 14 inch reproduction with text for sale, 15 cents postpaid. (Special price this week only. Regular 25 cents.)

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection," rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Style in Art." Guest speaker: Lincoln Rothschild, author. Lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Jule Zabawa, baritone: Peggy Zabawa, soprano; Stephen Prussing, pianist. East Garden court, 8.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 26, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Oct. 26, 1963)

THE 88TH CONGRESS

This Congress has been in session 145 days since it convened on January 9. Its work could have been completed weeks ago. It could adjourn now, but it won't. Major legislation pending:

1. Seven appropriation bills.
2. Civil rights bill.
3. Tax bill.

The only legislation which Congress must approve before adjournment is the appropriation bills. Proper procedure would demand approval of appropriation bills by the end of each fiscal year, June 30. Congress brings upon itself justifiable criticism when it allows its primary function to be shunted aside while weeks are spent on controversial and political measures.

There are 12 regular appropriation bills which make available the money necessary to run the departments of the Federal Government.

1. Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices.
2. Interior and related agencies.
3. Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare.
4. Legislative branch.
5. Defense Department.
6. District of Columbia.
7. State, Justice, and Commerce.
8. Agriculture.
9. Independent offices.
10. Military construction.
11. Public works.
12. Foreign aid.

The House has passed nine of these so far with military construction, public works, and foreign aid still to go. The Senate has given its approval to only six. It must still hold hearings on some of the remaining bills. This means Congress will be in session well into December, and perhaps after the first of the year.

The two bills responsible for the long session with its tremendous cost to the taxpayers are both sponsored by President Kennedy: (1) The civil rights bill, and (2) the tax bill. It appears now that neither will be passed in this session. As they are both identified with political expediency the fight will be even more bitter next year, an election year.

In the cloakrooms and other gathering places in Washington two other reasons are often given for keeping Congress in session. First, it keeps the national press corps here where the administration holds the center of the stage. If Congress adjourns, press coverage is dissipated among the 50 States and 435 congressional districts taking the spotlights away from the President. Second, it is said many Members of Congress don't want to face their constituents knowing that the majority of the people are opposed to the Kennedy tax proposal, many of the Kennedy spending programs, the Kennedy policy of "accommodation" of the Communists, and that the people are disturbed and critical over the Kennedy failures in domestic problems as well as meeting the Communist challenge especially in Cuba.

NOMINATIONS FOR SERVICE ACADEMIES

More than 100 young men from Dallas County applied this year for appointment to the service academies. Of this group I can appoint one principal for West Point, one for Annapolis. Six are nominated for the Air Force with the Academy officials making the final selection of the principal. My procedure in making selections is designed to assure all applicants an absolutely fair opportunity. All the boys compete in an examination conducted by the Civil Service Commission. The appointments are made strictly on the grades received on that examination without regard to personal friendship, politics, social standing, or any other criteria. If my opponent's son received the highest grade, he would get the appointment. These boys make it on their own without influence or special favor. It is a tribute to the boys and to the Dallas schools that we have so many competent applicants and that Dallas appointees make such fine records in all the academies.

Nominations for entrance in July 1964, West Point: Principal, James Dale Knox, Jr.; first alternate, Robert Walter Spiro; second, Dan Morey Parker, Jr.; third, Glen Raymond Zauber.

Annapolis: Principal, Carl Amos Gaines; first alternate, John Tom Kriese; second, James Bryan Robinson; third, John Martinez Greathouse; fourth, Donald Kenneth Bailey; fifth, Donald Ralph Stewart.

Air Force: James Elbert Houston, David Russell, Wade L. Bennett, III, John S. Heggie, III, Robert Morton Gillaspie, William Patterson Evans.

Merchant Marine Academy: 10 nominees will compete on a statewide basis for appointment, Terry Morgan, Scott M. Anderson, Robert E. Howell, Bill J. Shipp, Jr., Lewis F. Boyd, Jefferson A. Stewart, Charles J. Webster, Herbert F. William, Jr., James K. Thomas, Billy Griffin.

October 22, the first anniversary of the Cuban crisis marked by the failure of President Kennedy to back his words with deeds with the result, the consolidation of Soviet power in Cuba.

October 23, the seventh anniversary of the Hungarian revolution. The administration picked this day to approve the sale of several millions of bushels of corn to Hungary.

Edward R. Murrow Addresses Federal Bar Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, 1963, the distinguished Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Hon. Edward R. Murrow, addressed the clos-

ing luncheon meeting of the Federal Bar Association convention, which was held this year in the city of Philadelphia.

Because of the informative and significant nature of Mr. Murrow's address, it will be, I believe, of interest to Members of Congress, and I am including the text below:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD R. MURROW

You are lawyers. I, today, am a propagandist. And therein lies a happy commonality. Words are the stock in trade of us both. We both deal with human aspirations, and with that point at which human aspirations are in conflict. We each seek a meeting of the minds. You speak judiciously for justice; we speak fervently for freedom. But both of us are advocates in a cause for a position. To a degree, we both submit our brief to a jury of our peers, and the decisions they reach are necessarily judgments by which we both must abide.

I feel then that I am not talking to total strangers when I mention something of what the United States Information Agency is about.

Our agency operates in a difficult, not too well-defined area. Our function is to explain the policies and practices of this Government and this people overseas. We embrace a multitude of disciplines and professions. We employ all the media of communication known to modern man—radio, television, movies, press, book publishing, exhibits, and the arts. We are involved in an entire range of problems—a press run in Beirut, an exhibition in Turin, a stage performance in Munich, and radio relays in Colombo. From a news telecast in Bogotá to a soundtracked filmstrip in Paris, to a book typeset in Manila, upon all the myriad of details we initiate, we create, we facilitate.

Even more important, we must deal amidst the intangibles—the difficult, delicate human art of persuasion. For, by word of mouth, by cultivated personal contact abroad, we seek to persuade others of the rightness of our view, and that our actions and our goals are in harmony with theirs.

We deal not only in communications but also in policy. We articulate and distribute, not advertising for cigarettes and soapsuds, but clarifications of Government policy and deeds. And we speak in many languages to many peoples of vastly differing cultures and styles, of vastly differing levels of comprehension. We must deal also with the very considerable preconditioning foreigners have had to the image and the ideas of America. We must deal with the realities of their fears, their concerns, their stereotypes (however unjustified, their existence is real), of the product we promote—the actions and the hopes of the United States.

* * * * *

Lawyers and USIA have other contact as well. The Conference on World Peace Through Law in Athens this summer past, was the subject of attention and coverage in all our worldwide media. Several participants there, Chief Justice Warren, Judge Thurgood Marshall, and Civil Rights Commission Staff Director Berl Bernhard, followed this with a tour of several countries in Africa. Reports from our posts abroad were impressive in terms of the impact on Africans with whom they spoke.

Marshall capsuled it nicely in responding to a question as to why he had come to Africa. He said they were there on a sort of educational-cultural exchange for the United States, that this country "* * * had sent Louis Armstrong to toot, Harry Belafonte to sing, and us lawyers to talk."

Mr. Chairman, I am neither a tooter nor a singer. Neither am I a lawyer. And, as I am aware that a much talking bureaucrat is like an ill-tuned instrument, I fear I may yet give you occasion to reflect on the propriety of your invitation to me.

* * * * *

Race relations, I am told, took up the conversations of these gentlemen to the near exclusion of almost everything else. Mr. Bernhard mentions, for example, that in Ethiopia Chief Justice Warren's sessions with judges and lawyers, his press conferences and public appearances, must have concerned themselves 90 percent of the time, with America's racial problem.

It may surprise you to learn that foreign peoples are so concerned with our domestic difficulty. It is no surprise to those of us who work with foreign affairs. There is no other single subject, month in and month out, that so consistently occupies the cares and curiosities of other peoples about the United States. Putting John Glenn into orbit puts his name in every headline in the world. But James Meredith may be as well known around the world, while America's space sensations rise and fall in world attention, America's race relations seem to remain in the undiminished spotlight.

It is not mere bold assertion to state that in the field of civil rights and racial relations, our Agency, speaking in behalf of the people of this country, has its greatest difficulty. Events here plague us over there. When the Hon. G. L. Mehta, the former Ambassador of India to the United States, was refused service in a Texas restaurant due to his color, it is no answer to say to Indians, that unfortunately, the Ambassador was mistaken for a Negro.

An official foreign diplomatic visitor was greeted at the Washington airport on his first trip to the United States. He gave his welcome to his host with eyes fixed firmly on the ground. When asked why he persisted in staring at a spot in front of his feet, the diplomat answered, "I am afraid I shall see a white woman. When a man of color looks at a white woman in America mobs of white people may tear him to pieces."

Or take the African cabinet minister who, with a full day of appointments in Washington, canceled everything to go to Mississippi for the funeral of the slain civil rights leader, Medgar Evers. To him that was the most important place in this country, on that day.

Or the African student who deliberately provoked having service refused him in a restaurant due to his color, so that he could have a feeling of camaraderie and understand what it is like to be an American Negro.

These, of course, relate to foreigners in our country. The responsibility of my agency is the obverse of this; lands where we Americans are foreigners, and other peoples are the hosts.

At a time not of our choosing, we have been cast as custodian of man's right to self-determine his freedom. It is not a role we have sought. Having shouldered it, we do not now shirk it.

Its import is, that in country after country, we have a responsibility of awesome sobriety. With responsibility comes renown. Privacy has become a privilege of the past. Ours is now the fishbowl world, where we become the focus of many men's attention and curiosity.

How they see us conduct ourselves, may well deeply influence how they choose to conduct themselves, in relation to us and our Communist adversary.

My Agency's responsibility is to translate the policies and practices of this Government into terms meaningful to the foreigner. But how does one pursue this task when, as occurred with one of our Foreign Service officers, an explanation to an African official was interrupted by the cutting query: "Why are you trying to kill my people in Mississippi?"

What does one do when the foreign minister of a country opens a meeting with a USIA officer by commenting that he came to America believing in our ideals and heritage of a free land, but lost that belief, on confronting the reality of racial discrimination here. He has returned to his country, in his own words, bitterly disillusioned with the United States. How well does one then continue the business of diplomacy or politics, with that foreign minister?

Or take the example of an English language teacher in a leftist African country where students week after week carpingly criticize America's racial dilemma. After some 9 months the students finally acknowledged the fact of progress as reported by the USIA teacher and commended the United States for it. The next morning headlines carried the name of James Meredith, and two men killed in the rioting in Mississippi. That very day the students quietly condemned the teacher: "You lied. We no longer have confidence in you or the United States."

All these examples occurred in Africa. But reactions to race difficulties are not a problem only in Africa. They plague us in Europe, they assault us in Latin America, they bedevil us in the Far East, they in short, mock every virtue that we tell others the United States stands for. Wherever men have ears to hear and eyes to see and read, they learn that USIA words sometimes fall short of U.S. deeds.

Put yourself in the following hypothetical circumstances. You are an American citizen serving with USIA abroad. It is Monday morning, September 16, a date recent enough for us to recall the headlines. These are some of the hypothetical things that might have happened to USIA around the world:

In Tokyo, a USIA cultural affairs officer is speaking at the opening day of a Japanese university. He talks of the dynamics of U.S. democracy and stresses that the United States, like Japan, is addressing itself to the solution of mutual problems. The students pour from auditorium to street where newsboys run toward them crying the morning lead: "Birmingham Church Bombing Kills Four Negro Children in America."

In Rio de Janeiro, a USIA press officer is conferring with a features editor of the Sunday paper. He has brought the Brazilian editor a picture layout on the improved status of minorities in the United States. The editor is interrupted by a copy boy bringing in tear sheets from the wire services with this bulletin lead on top: "Birmingham Church Bombing Kills Four Negro Children in America."

In Rangoon, a USIA exhibit is set up for the Burmese Bar Association. Its subject: "Man's Vast Future." It has the subtheme, "We Inherit the Past; We Earn the Future." Burmese lawyers are walking through observing this pictorial evidence of the brotherhood of man and the common aspirations and motivations of our two countries. A Marxist-oriented lawyer enters with a pleased expression and holds up a local newspaper headline, "Birmingham Church Bombing Kills Four Negro Children in America."

In Istanbul, a USIA radio program placed on local Turkish stations is carrying a panel discussion by three teachers and professors just returned from an exchange visit on which USIA sent them to the United States. They are talking about America's racial progress and democracy in action, when suddenly the program is interrupted by an announcer with a news bulletin: "Birmingham Church Bombing Kills Four Negro Children in America."

In Lagos, a USIA library, used by hundreds of Nigerian college students, daily has a near full house with students at every table using American books, source material, and periodicals. At a far table one student with a transistor radio quiets his comrades and turns up the volume for the whole room to hear the same bulletin on "Four Negro Children Killed in American Church Bombing."

* * * * *

These hypothetical incidents could in fact have happened to any of our USIA officers in scores of capitals around the world.

Several morals flow from them. U.S. racial violence is top news the world round. The good name and repute of this country is being blackened and defamed. To all of us, this is distressingly, inescapably true.

I should not, however, leave you with the impression that racial disturbances are deplorable because they make USIA's job abroad difficult. Difficulties, after all, are what we are sent abroad to engage, and in the total sum of how this Nation fares, the good or ill fortune of my agency is of but small consequence.

But I believe that these are testing times, and that we are being now measured against the yardstick of the very ideals we ourselves created. It is true that a curious world waits to see if a nation so constituted as we, can constitutionally solve the commitment of our constitution to equal rights for all our citizenry. But the reason we attempt racial progress, is not the opinion of peoples overseas. It is at base, the conscience of ourselves here at home, the conscience of both the deniers and the denied. We do this because we demand it of ourselves. We do it because it is right. And this is a nation where right has honor.

To the world USIA makes commentary upon where our racial concerns may lead us. Our difficulty is heightened in explaining such matters overseas by three things. There is a genuine misunderstanding of an extremely complex domestic problem, with its roots deep in the U.S. past and in the U.S. present, of economic, social, and political realities. Second, commercial news media of both this and other countries, tend to unbalance circumstances by emphasizing sensational developments. This is the principle that violence makes headlines, while nonviolence makes dull reading. Third, deliberate distortion by our enemies exploits an impression of pervasive injustice and intolerance in the United States coming from a nation which claims to champion equality and opportunity.

We are newsmen. As such we report events of racial discrimination and violence as they occur, for our audiences abroad have an understandably keen interest in such matters. But at the same time, we attempt to place such occurrences in the context of this Nation as a living democracy.

We know that this issue and its problems will be with us for a long time to come. Controversy and disorder will be its backwash. We shall not be able to undo wholly such unfavorable impressions of the United States as this will create.

So our corrective task becomes one of showing that controversy and disorder are inevitable byproducts of our national concern over equal rights for all. We do everything possible to offset the effect of distortions and misrepresentations. We seek to dispel ignorance. We aim to supplement oversimplification. We try to remedy incomplete information. Our goal is to obtain sympathetic understanding of interested nations, for what we seek to do.

Thus, we follow complete candor in recognizing the dimensions and complexity of the problem.

We detail the full and active administration support of all measures required to solve the problem.

We indicate that the very struggles now compelling worldwide attention to the problem are themselves signs of progress. Democracy in action is never quiet.

We relate constructive movements to solutions at whatever level they occur, national, regional, State, or local. We bear in mind that nationwide, more schools, hospitals, theaters, restaurants, labor unions, and housing developments are integrated than are not. Each new instance of integration adds to an already favorable balance.

* * * * *

We underline the positive response of major elements of this nation, church groups, trade unions, business leaders, women's organizations, professional association, students, and the response of all to the President's call for cooperation.

* * * * *

Do not misunderstand the intent of our agency. We are under the injunction to report the rough with the smooth, to relate unfavorable or controversial developments of resistance to the President and his program. But our purposes are to keep the broader national purposes in view, and to report our progress, however attenuated, to the national goals we have set for ourselves. And we shall do this even when other sources of information, however motivated they may be in their reporting, tend to obscure these goals.

* * * * *

The civil rights struggle will indeed be a trying time for our democracy. Our people in a real sense will be on trial. And our concern will be, not only with the ends we finally obtain, but as well how we reach those ends. The verdict is not the only truth in our national jurisprudence. Democracy is as well concerned with the style of the trial.

There will be other spectators as well, in this courtroom of international history. Two-thirds of this planet is nonwhite; they would be less than human, if they were not absorbed in the disposition we make of our own nonwhite difficulties.

They will regard us not only in their role as nonwhite onlookers, but also as bearers of the legacy of proverty. Sensing their own newborn need for a better life, they will sense also the lack of presence of a social conscience, in this, the world's richest Nation, with wealth enough to do whatever its dream commands. If we choose not to make honorable disposition of the Negro complainant in our court of history, they will know, that is was not because we were unable. It will be that we choose to do less than honor, in the face of injustice.

I am not so naive as to believe that morality alone will be the palliative for our international ills. Defense is difficult without strength to accompany morality. But neither can the judgments we now seek from other nations be commanded by force alone.

Man has not yet devised the command, to hold the head and heart, of him who dreams and dares.

Respect and confidence, like love from a woman, and loyalty from an ally, must be earned. The American people stand now as a Nation closely observed. The jury of peers has not yet been summoned to decision. But when that day arrives, let no man here begrudge the evidence, that he himself put into the scales of justice.

The 20th century can be the century of liberty and justice. "We inherit the past. But we earn the future." Let us consider our concerns of today, with due respect to what we hope that future will bring.

United Nations Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, 18 years have passed since October 24, 1945, when the United Nations was founded.

The ensuing years have been some of the most tumultuous in the history of mankind. The winds of change have blown across whole continents. Colonial empires have been broken up. Dozens of new nations have been created. Peoples everywhere have been swept along on a tide of rising expectations.

There have been grave ruptures in the fabric of world harmony. The cold war between the Communist bloc and the Western Powers has dominated our age. Scientific discoveries harnessing the power of the atom have made even minor conflicts important.

Through all these times of headlong change, of hostility between nations, of danger from nuclear destruction, the United Nations has survived. Thursday as we celebrated the 18th anniversary of the United Nations founding, we also, in effect, observed its coming of age.

That was the theme I developed in remarks to the United Nations Day dinner sponsored by the mayor's committee of Alexandria, Va., for the United Nations, held last Thursday. In the address, which follows, the past of the United Nations was reviewed, its present status was assessed and its future was scanned:

THE UNITED NATIONS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(A speech by Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, city of Alexandria, Va., United Nations Day Dinner, Thursday, October 24, 1963)

It is indeed a privilege and an honor for me to have the opportunity to speak to you this evening at this annual United Nations Day observance.

As one who has long been interested in the United Nations, I am particularly gratified when I learn of civic groups such as yours, dedicated to the purpose of better international relations and understanding.

The city of Alexandria, in creating this mayor's committee for the celebration of United Nations Day, has demonstrated an enlightenment unique among American cities. Truly, you may be proud of this community.

Each of you also is to be commended for your attendance here tonight, because it demonstrates your individual interest in international affairs, a subject of utmost importance in this atomic age.

As we are gathered here for this annual observance, the United Nations is 18 years old. To be 18 in this country is to come of age. At 18 an individual reaches—in most cases—full legal age.

Perhaps, then, we are not taking too many liberties if we say that tonight we are celebrating the coming of age of the United Nations. And while aware that the passage of time does not always bring maturity, we can assume that the United Nations is no longer an adolescent.

At such points in the life of an individual—or of an organization—it is fitting to review the past, evaluate the present, and scan the future for signs and portents. This I intend to do—briefly—tonight.

THE PAST OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations was born at the conclusion of the most terrible and destructive war the world had ever known. It was the child of the five so-called great powers which had—at terrible cost—defeated fascism.

When the U.N. was organized many believed that it would insure that World War II was truly the "war to end all wars." How naive that hope was.

For it was based on a mechanism of collective security that took for granted that the wartime allies would remain peacetime allies.

As we know, the ink scarcely was dry on the Charter signatures when the Soviet Union began the aggressive acts that propelled the world into the era of cold war.

The cold war jammed the mutual security mechanism firmly. Not only was war far from being abolished, it became a terrifying and real possibility.

But in spite of this the United Nations survived. Unlike the League of Nations, it was able to overcome structural deficiencies and early, serious problems.

Why? Because—it seems to me—the great powers did not abandon the U.N. For all the animosity that has grown up between the Soviet Union and the Western nations, neither side has quit the United Nations.

Both blocs have flung hot and angry words at each other in the Security Council, in the General Assembly, and in the various technical and social councils. But both have kept talking.

All have realized that to stop talking is to risk fighting—with all the inherent dangers of a nuclear holocaust.

You may remember that shortly before the Korean conflict broke out, the Soviet Union, with much fanfare walked out of the United Nations. When the Russian delegation returned, there was a United Nations army fighting Communist aggression in Korea and the U.N. Charter had been amended to give the overwhelmingly pro-Western General Assembly more actual power.

The Soviets' action was a major tactical error. They have never repeated it.

Subsequently, the great powers have never ceased to actively participate in the activities of the United Nations. With this continuing participation the United Nations has gained greater importance with each passing year.

The inability of the Organization to cope with the Communist subjugation of the peoples of eastern and central Europe, and of Asia, has tended to obscure its concrete achievements. The list of these is an imposing one:

The United Nations has been successful in preventing or stopping war in Kashmir, Laos, the Middle East, Yemen, and New Guinea.

It has resisted aggression in Korea and has put down civil war in the Congo.

It has expressed and stirred the conscience of mankind by condemning Communist aggression and atrocities in Korea, Hungary, Tibet, and other places.

Today, for example; a U.N. team is in Vietnam to investigate charges of Buddhist persecution.

The United Nations has endeavored to enlarge the area of the rule of law in international affairs, thereby working for the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

It has assisted millions of peoples to achieve smooth transition from dependency to independent nationhood.

On this last point, I think it should be noted that between the end of World War II and 1961, more than 20 new nations with a population in excess of 700 million came into existence. Although their transition to independence was not entirely without bloodshed, the record on this score finds no parallel in the annals of man.

The role which the United Nations has played and continues to play in this process has, indeed, been most constructive.

But beyond giving a helping hand to the nations which have emerged from the swift breakup of the old colonial empires, the United Nations offers these newly independent nations a voice in the affairs of the world.

Further, the United Nations—through agencies like the Special Fund, UNESCO, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the Children's Fund—has provided the underdeveloped countries of the world with technical, economic and other assistance. It has sought to help these nations resolve their economic and social problems, and fashion a better future for their peoples.

Those, briefly, are the past accomplishments of the United Nations. But what of the present?

THE PRESENT UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations of today bears only superficial resemblance to the organization created in 1945.

First, it is more than twice as large.

In 1962, Rwanda, Burundi, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago, Algeria, and Uganda were admitted to membership. On May 14 of this year Kuwait joined the U.N., bringing its total membership to 111.

Thus, the often-expressed goal of universal representation in the Organization is coming closer and closer to realization.

Second, the structural mechanisms that underlie the United Nations Organization have been adapted to meet the realities of our times. The Security Council—doomed to paralysis by the cold war and Russia's constant use of the veto power—is being more and more bypassed in favor of the General Assembly.

The Assembly, originally conceived as little more than a debating society, has become the principal organ of the United Nations. With a majority vote prevailing on most questions and no veto, it has been able to act effectively in many situations.

Of growing importance too has been the Secretariat. This international civil service now numbers about 5,000. As it has grown in size, so has the stature of its chief executive, the Secretary General.

Both Trygvie Lie and Dag Hammarskjold succeeded in expanding and strengthening the executive powers of the Secretary General during their years in that position. U Thant has carried on the thrust of their activities. Today, there can be no doubt that the Secretary General plays an extremely important part in building the power and prestige of the United Nations.

A recent example of this was the request by Indonesia and the Philippines that Mr. Thant determine whether elections in Sarawak and Borneo had indeed indicated the desire of those former British colonies to join the new Federation of Malaysia.

The survey conducted by the Secretariat, under U Thant's direction, proved to the world—although not to Mr. Sukarno—that the principle of self-determination was indeed realized in the forming of Malaysia.

A third change at the United Nations has been the kinds of matters discussed. With the heightened influence of the African nations in the General Assembly, cold war conflicts, to some extent, have been shunted aside. In their place have come issues of self-determination and equality of peoples and races. Portugal and South Africa have been called to accounting before the bar of world opinion.

As a member of the U.S. delegation in 1959 to the 14th General Assembly and from subsequent observations, I have noted a 4th significant change regarding the United Nations.

It is not a structural change, but rather a change in the attitudes of people everywhere about the U.N. and what it can and cannot accomplish.

There is a great deal more realism about the United Nations today than at any time in the past. Extravagant hopes that the U.N. would lead the world effortlessly to a lasting peace have vanished.

The disillusionment that replaced those hopes—a disillusionment that dismissed the U.N. as worthless—has also largely melted away.

In the place of extravagant hopes and black despair, there is today realistic knowledge of the kinds of activities the United Nations can, with success, undertake.

The new emerging nations are discovering that the world problems which seemed so simple of solution when they stood outside the international arena are, indeed, difficult and complex.

We in the United States are learning that while the vote in the General Assembly may sometimes go against us, our country, in general, enjoys the respect and support of the majority of the world's nations.

Even the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc may be learning that table thumping, troika touting, and obstructionism are not the way to win friends and influence delegates.

This new realism about the United Nations is a heartening trend. It indicates that the organization—and attitudes toward it—are reaching maturity after 18 years.

THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

But what of the future?

It is always risky to don the turban of a visionary, sit down to a crystal ball and pretend to have knowledge of things to come. But one need not be a seer to discern certain forces within the United Nations which will shape its future.

For example, we can expect a mounting campaign by the African nations to increase their representation in the major organs of the United Nations.

In 1945 when the United Nations Charter was signed there were three African nations represented. Today there are 32. With the growth of the African bloc has come pressure to reflect the increasing importance of Africa in the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council. Last May the Addis Ababa conference of African leaders unanimously insisted that Africa—as a geographical region—should have equitable representation in the United Nations. Further support for this position has come from other, non-African member nations.

In order to increase the size of the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council, the United Nations Charter must be revised.

The Soviet Union, however, has perennially refused to consider amending the Charter until its erstwhile ally, Communist China, is seated in the place of Nationalist China.

It remains to be seen what position the Soviet Union will take in the light of the mounting campaign by the African nations—whose good will it hopes to win—as against its commitment to Communist China—whose good will it seems to have lost.

There likely will be agonizing reappraisals in the Kremlin over this issue. We may be able to take some comfort from the discomfort of the Soviets.

The Sino-Soviet split will make itself increasingly felt in the future activities of the United Nations.

There was an indication of this on Monday of this week. The General Assembly, by a slightly larger margin than last year, voted to keep Communist China out of the United Nations for the 14th time, by a vote of 57–41 with 12 abstentions.

No longer was it the Soviet Union which put forth the resolution championing the cause of Red China. Instead, it was tiny Albania. Although the Soviet Union voted to seat Communist China, it refrained from praising that country's regime. There was, in addition, a similar general lack of enthusiasm for the cause among the bloc nations of Eastern Europe.

There is reason to believe that Russia may be coming around to the view of the United States that the Peiping regime should be considered an outlaw on the world scene.

Under these conditions, it is unlikely that Communist China will be seated in the U.N. in the foreseeable future. We can expect continuing success of our efforts to keep them out.

As we happily contemplate the Russians beset by new and difficult problems, let us not forget that our own role in the United

Nations will continue to be far from an easy one.

The United States can look for continued difficulties between our NATO allies who have colonies in Africa—such as Portugal and Great Britain—and the newly independent, militantly-nationalistic African states.

There may be increasing trouble as well from France as that nation, under the leadership of President de Gaulle, embarks on a campaign to increase its world influence at our expense.

France may; for example, use the United Nations as a forum to attack or harass our current policies in Vietnam.

Suffice to say that our able Ambassador, Mr. Stevenson, and his staff will be called upon to exercise their highest diplomatic abilities. At the same time, they must offer the same dynamic leadership which has characterized United States participation in the United Nations Organization through the past 18 years.

SUMMATION

In closing, I should like to point out that as a U.S. Congressman I am constantly receiving letters which demand that the United States get out of the United Nations, and vice versa. These came from John Birchers and other extremists in California, Texas, and Arizona; fortunately, few come from my own district.

The persons who write these cards and letters consider themselves anti-Communists. Yet I can think of few actions which the United States could take that would please the Communists more than having our country abandon the United Nations.

Without the United States, the Reds could make the U.N. a vehicle for their own propaganda. They could single us out as abdicating our responsibilities to the rest of the world; and they could blacken us as warmongers and imperialists without rebuttal.

It is certain that for the United States to leave the United Nations would be suicidal. It ill behooves these self-proclaimed patriots to espouse a cause which would be destructive to our Nation and its goals.

Rather, the United States must continue to work within the United Nations to build a community of nations, diverse, tolerant and genuinely independent, but bound together by a common humanity and by a common interest in peace and progress.

If the United Nations, with our help, succeeds in coming close to that goal, then we have truly fashioned a milestone in the history of mankind. If we fail—there may be no one left to write the histories of our failure.

Let us than, this evening, rededicate ourselves to the cause of international justice and understanding as expressed in the Charter of the United Nations Organization.

Our past efforts have aided the United Nations to come of age; now let us work so that nations united may come to peace.

Ohio Electric Co. and Rural Electric Cooperatives Join in New Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Ohio Power Co. and the rural electric cooperatives of Ohio are joining in a new generating project that will provide hundreds of additional jobs in our coal industry as well as the inexpensive electric power needed for continued development and expansion of Ohio industry.

The Ohio Power Co., and Buckeye Power, Inc., the latter a subsidiary of Ohio's rural electric cooperatives, will build a jointly owned, major electric powerplant.

The steam-electric station will have an initial generating capacity of 1,230,000 kilowatts and an ultimate capacity of 2 million kilowatts. Even initially, the plant would be the largest in Ohio and require an investment estimated at $125 million.

The new station will be named the Cardinal plant after the State bird of Ohio. It will be built on the Ohio River adjacent to Ohio Power's existing Tidd plant, at Brilliant, south of Steubenville.

Construction is expected to start immediately, with ground breaking to take place next Monday, and initial operation is scheduled for mid-1966. The plant will be operated entirely independently by a new corporation to be formed and jointly owned by the Buckeye group and Ohio Power.

The announcement was made jointly by Owen T. Manning, president of Buckeye Power, of Columbus, and Donald C. Cook, president of American Electric Power Co. and of Ohio Power, of Canton, in a press conference here attended by Governor James A. Rhodes. Ohio Power is one of six operating electric utilities in the seven-State American Electric Power System.

The announcement by Manning and Cook said:

> Because it encompasses new concepts in the electric utility industry, not only in its engineering and design but in the fact that here, for the first time, a major electric generating facility will be jointly owned by an investor-owned utility and member-owned electric cooperatives and financed entirely by funds obtained from the private money market. Also, plans call for the plant to be tied in to the transmission systems of six of the State's principal utilities, which will transmit, under contract, the cooperatives' portion of its power generation to the co-ops' transmission systems, substations, and load centers.

These utilities, in addition to Ohio Power, are: the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., the Dayton Power & Light Co., the Toledo Edison Co., and the Marietta Electric Co.

Virtually all of the bulk power supply needs of Ohio's co-ops today are purchased from the State's investor-owned utilities. This supply would be taken over by Buckeye Power sometime after completion of Buckeye's new plant facilities.

Howard Cummins, Buckeye general manager, emphasized that the co-op's investment in the Cardinal plant, through Buckeye power, is being financed by private sources, since their equity and net worth are now sufficient to attract private capital. The 30 co-ops in Buckeye Power serve about 135,000 electric customers in 74 of Ohio's 88 counties, according to Cummins.

Announcement of Ohio Power's proposal to the co-ops for their joint ownership and operation of a major plant was made in late 1962 and has been under study since then.

According to A. N. Prentice, vice president and general manager of Ohio Power, the new Cardinal plant will burn an estimated 3 million tons of coal or more per year in its initial two units. Virtually all of it will come from mines in eastern Ohio and the Wheeling Panhandle area of West Virginia, Prentice said, adding that this fact alone would "provide a tremendous economic impact" on the two-State area.

This supply of coal, Prentice estimated, would require the employment of approximately 500 miners, in addition to scores of other workers in the transportation and allied fields. He added that 3 million tons of coal were the equivalent of a 40,000-car railroad train extending 300 miles—or the distance between the Cardinal plant and Indianapolis.

The studies, planning, design, and negotiations for the new plant have been actively underway for close to 2 years, under the direction of Philip Sporn, retired president of American Electric Power and Ohio Power and now chairman of the AEP System Development Committee.

In discussing the new plant, Sporn described it as representing an entirely new stage of development in the history of power generation technology. It will be ultramodern in concept and design and will initially house two 615,000 kilowatt turbine-generator units, which in themselves will further advance the frontiers of the generating art. Each unit will be of tandem design, with all sections of its turbine—the high-, intermediate-, and low-pressure elements—as well as the generator, all revolving on the same single shaft 200 feet long. They will be the largest single-shaft turbine-generator units in the world. The electrical generators themselves will also be the world's largest and will be water cooled.

The units will operate under steam conditions of 3,500 pounds per square inch pressure and a temperature of 1,000° F., with double reheat temperatures of 1,025° and 1,050°.

When in operation, Cardinal is expected to achieve a new low in steam-electric production costs, brought about by a combination of the units' anticipated generating efficiency and the entire plant's projected capital investment cost of about $100 per kilowatt of capacity. At 1,230,000 kilowatts, Cardinal will be Ohio's largest power station—with a capacity about 15 percent greater than that of the present largest plant, the Ohio Valley Electric Corp.'s huge Kyger Creek Plant at Cheshire, also on the Ohio River.

The new plant will be complete in itself but will be located only several hundred feet south of Ohio Power's 220,000-kilowatt Tidd plant. The location, on the west bank of the Ohio, until recently was the site of the AEP system's 500,000-volt Tidd transmission test project, where high-voltage research was carried out during the period 1947–52 to pave the way for many of the Nation's major transmission lines of today.

The plant will be interconnected with, and backed up by, Ohio Power's six other major steamplants, as well as those of

its affiliated utilities throughout the AEP System.

The co-ops were organized in the late 1930's for the specific job of building power lines to Ohio's unserved rural areas, where only 18.8 percent of the State's farms had such service. The first pole set anywhere in the Nation by an electric co-op was in Ohio—near Piqua—on November 14, 1935.

During the intervening years, the co-ops and the investor-owned utilities have made electric service available to all Ohio farms, of which 99 percent are now served. Member co-ops of the Buckeye organization have built over 30,000 miles of lines that deliver power to approximately 135,000 customers over roughly 65 percent of the State's land area. Much of this expansion has been with the aid of 100-percent loans from the Rural Electrification Administration.

A list of the Ohio rural electric co-operatives follows:

Pioneer Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Piqua, Ohio.

Delaware Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., Delaware, Ohio.

Inter-County Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Hillsboro, Ohio.

Marion Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Marion, Ohio.

Holmes-Wayne Electric Co-op., Inc., Millersburg, Ohio.

Belmont Electric Co-op., Inc., St. Clairsville, Ohio.

Midwest Electric, Inc., St. Marys, Ohio.

Paulding-Putnam Electric Co-op., Inc., Paulding, Ohio.

Licking Rural Electrification, Inc., Utica, Ohio.

Darke Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Greenville, Ohio.

Union Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Marysville, Ohio.

Tuscarawas-Coshocton Elec., Co-op., Inc., Coshocton, Ohio.

Lorain-Medina Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Wellington, Ohio.

Morrow Electric Co-op., Inc., Mt. Gilead, Ohio.

North Central Electric Co-op., Inc., Attica, Ohio.

South Central Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Lancaster, Ohio.

Tricounty Rural Elec. Co-op., Inc., Napoleon, Ohio.

Logan County Co-op Power & Light Association, Inc., Bellefontaine, Ohio.

Butler Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Hamilton, Ohio.

North Western Electric Co-op., Inc., Bryan, Ohio.

Firelands Electric Co-op., Inc., New London, Ohio.

Carroll Electric Co-op., Inc., Carrollton, Ohio.

United Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Kenton, Ohio.

Guernsey-Muskingum Electric Co-op., Inc., New Concord, Ohio.

Hancock-Wood Electric Co-op., Inc., North Baltimore, Ohio.

Buckeye Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Gallipolis, Ohio.

Washington Electric Co-op., Inc., Marietta, Ohio.

Adams Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., West Union, Ohio.

Lake Erie Electric Co-op., Inc., Kelleys Island, Ohio.

Southeastern Michigan Rural Electric Co-op., Inc., Adrian, Mich.

Ohio's first electric co-op (Pioneer) was also the first in the Nation. It was organized in 1935, with construction started on November 14 of that year. Ohio's last co-op, Lake Erie, was organized in 1949.

Co-op lines have been financed to date by 100 percent loans from the Rural Electrification Administration. The total borrowed to date is $72,372,571. Payments on the principal amount to $30,454,299—approximately $3 million of which has been paid ahead of schedule—and the debt outstanding to REA amounts to $41,918,272.

Starting with "zero" figures in 1935, Ohio's co-ops today have: 30,000 miles of power lines in operation; 134,967 consumers receiving service; annual sales totaling 942,168,639 kilowatt-hours, and an average of 6,981 kilowatt-hours sold per consumer.

Ohio Rural Electric Cooperatives, Inc., with headquarters at 4302 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, was founded in 1941. It is similar to a trade association functioning to solve mutual problems in power supply, safety, employees' insurance, legislation, scholarship program, supply of construction materials, warehousing, membership education, power-use education, legal problems, public relations.

Its officers are: President—Foster Scott, Chandlersville, Ohio; first vice president—Frank Clay, LaRue, Ohio; 2d vice president—Lloyd Leatherberry, Carrollton, Ohio; secretary-treasurer—Howard Mosier, Haviland, Ohio; executive manager—Howard Cummins, Columbus, Ohio, and counsel—John W. King, Columbus, Ohio.

Buckeye Power, Inc., with headquarters at 4302 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, was organized in 1959, and is owned by all Ohio electric cooperatives for the purpose of generation and transmission of electric power to member co-ops.

Its officers are: President—Owen Manning, Coshocton, Ohio; vice president—Charles Wyckoff, Piketon, Ohio; secretary-treasurer—Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio; executive manager—Howard Cummins, Columbus, Ohio, and counsel—John W. King, Columbus, Ohio.

The Buckeye group's engineering consultants are Southern Engineers, of Atlanta, Ga., and Loeb & Eames, of New York City.

Ohio Power Co. is one of six major operating companies comprising the American Electric Power System.

In its 15,400-square-mile service area, Ohio Power provides electric power for 485,000 customers. This area embraces parts of 53 counties in a broad belt across north-central Ohio and a wide area in the central, southeastern, and southern sections of the State. Population of the area is approximately 1,750,000.

To serve its customers, Ohio Power maintains a staff of approximately 3,700 employees. General offices are in Canton, with division offices located in Steubenville, Canton, Coshocton, Zanesville, Newark, Portsmouth, Tiffin, Findlay, and Lima. Offices and service facilities are maintained in 31 other cities and towns.

Ohio Power operates six steam-electric generating stations on the Ohio and Muskingum Rivers. Their combined power-producing capability is 2,900,000 kilowatts. These plants, plus 10 other major plants and several smaller ones, give the AEP System a generating capability of 7 million kilowatts—largest of any investor-owned electric system in the Nation. In addition to this capacity, Ohio Power has available for its customers backup generation from 19 other utilities with which the AEP system has interconnections.

The company operates more than 4,000 miles of transmission lines ranging from 23,000 to 345,000 volts, the latter being the highest in general use in the Nation. To carry electricity from transmission substations to the customers, Ohio Power operates more than 17,000 miles of distribution lines.

Ohio Power's history dates back to 1883 when the earliest predecessor companies came into being. Throughout its 80 years of existence, the company has pioneered many technological advances which have become standards for the industry.

Ohio Power is the Nation's 10th largest investor-owned electric utility company from the standpoint of sales of electricity, approximately 14½-billion kilowatt-hours having been sold in 1962. While Ohio Power sells more electricity than any other Ohio electric company, it ranks third in revenues received from electric sales and third in the number of customers served.

To provide its customers with electric service, Ohio Power has a net capital investment of nearly $700 million. This amounts to about $1,450 for each customer served and $200,000 per employee. During the past decade, Ohio Power has invested an average of $42 million per year for the expansion and modernization of its facilities.

Ohio Power's six major powerplants, their locations and capabilities follow:

Muskingum River Plant, Beverly, Ohio, 888,000 kilowatts; Philo Plant, near Zanesville, 497,000 kilowatts; Tidd Plant, Brilliant, Ohio, 220,000 kilowatts; Philip Sporn Plant, Graham Station, W. Va., owned jointly with Appalachian Power Co., 1,100,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 816,000 kilowatts—Kammer Plant, Captina, W. Va., owned jointly with Ormet Corp., 675,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 305,000 kilowatts—and Windsor Plant, Power, W. Va., owned jointly with West Penn Power Co., 300,000 kilowatts—Ohio Power's portion, 150,000 kilowatts.

Two Years of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the November issue of the Catholic Digest contains a most interesting and concise article on the Peace Corps, written by Sargent Shriver, the energetic Director of the Peace Corps, and condensed by special permission from the July issue of Foreign Affairs. The article is entitled "Two Years of the Peace Corps," and I

include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, by previous permission:

TWO YEARS OF THE PEACE CORPS

(By Sargent Shriver)

On November 2, 1960, John F. Kennedy proposed a "peace corps" in a campaign speech. Thirty thousand Americans wrote immediately to support the idea; thousands volunteered to join.

In the early days of the Peace Corps, letters came from all over the country in "paper tornadoes." Our first two-room office received a constant stream of interested persons: Newspaper reporters, jobseekers, academic figures, and citizens offering advice. Everywhere were cameras, coils of TV cable, and commentators with questions.

We knew the Peace Corps would have only one chance. As with the parachute jumper, the chute had to open the first time. We knew, too, that suspicious eyes were peering over our shoulders.

Our ambitious name was only one reason for early doubts about the Peace Corps. Many were afraid that it might be a "second children's crusade." I was astonished that a nation as young as ours had become so suspicious of its youth. Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence at age 33. More than half of the world's population is under 26, the age of the average Peace Corps volunteer. Sixteen nations in Africa have heads of state under 45; five have leaders in their thirties.

Youthful enthusiasm had to be combined with hardheaded realism. The formula we worked out by experience has "the sweet smell of success" today, but the future was far less clear 2 years ago.

Would enough qualified Americans be willing to serve? Even if they started, would they be able to continue on the job despite frustration, dysentery, boredom?

More than 50,000 Americans have wanted to join. In the first 3 months of 1963, more Americans applied for the Peace Corps than were drafted for military service. And this even though Peace Corps volunteers are subject to military service on their return.

Selection is rigorous. We invite only one in six applicants to enter training, and about five out of six trainees are finally selected. We set no upper age limit. Our oldest volunteer is 76, and we have more grandparents than teenagers.

In our talent search we went to government, colleges, business, the bar, the medical profession, and every other walk of life where leadership was available. We recruited as many Negroes and people from other minority groups as we could for every kind of job. We knew that Negroes would not ordinarily apply for high-level policy jobs, so we sought them out. Today 7.4 percent of our higher positions are filled by Negroes, as compared to 0.8 percent for other Government agencies in similar grades; 24 percent of our other positions are filled by Negroes, compared to 5.5 percent for Government agencies in general.

One of our hardest problems is to provide adequate language training. Most of us thought that the exotic languages such as Thai, Urdu, Bengali, and Twi would be a problem, but that Spanish and French speakers could be easily recruited. The opposite has been true. The first volunteers who arrived in Thailand in January 1962 made a great impression by speaking the language. Their Thai was not fluent, but their modest achievement was tremendously appreciated. Since then, many volunteers there have become truly fluent.

On the other hand, volunteers going to Latin America and to French Africa have been criticized for their mediocre language fluency. Expectations are high in these countries, and halting Spanish or French is not enough.

We still need more volunteers, especially those who combine high idealism and special skills. Our plans are to expand from 5,000 volunteers (March 1963), to 10,000 volunteers (March 1964) and to 13,000 (September 1964).

The person with the best background for the Peace Corps is likely to be the liberal-arts student in college, the person with "human relations" interests. The developing countries need a great many Americans with this background, but they also want engineers, agronomists, lathe operators, and geologists. We cannot simply turn down requests for skills which we have trouble finding. We now have 61 engineers, 30 geologists, and 236 nurses. That's good, when you consider how easily such people can get high-paying jobs here at home. But requests still far outnumber the supply.

Half a dozen industrial nations have established their own equivalent of the Peace Corps. These programs grew out of an International Conference on Human Skills held in Puerto Rico in October, 1962. The 43 countries represented at the meeting voted unanimously to establish an International Peace Corps Secretariat to help foster the idea.

As we grow, we face difficult choices. Should we concentrate in the future on those countries where we now have programs and resist expanding to new areas? We are already committed to programs in 47 nations.

When is a particular program completed? In Nigeria the answer is relatively easy. That country's educational development plan will need 815 foreign teachers in 1965, 640 in 1966, and 215 in 1968, but none in 1970. By then, enough Nigerians will have been trained to manage their own classrooms. The Peace Corps can see the day when its teaching work in Nigeria will be done.

The answer is not so simple in Colombia. There, volunteers are working on community development in 92 rural towns. The Colombian Government has trebled its own contribution to the program. Scores of communities have learned how to transform their own future.

When volunteer John Arango set up the first town meeting in Cutaru almost 2 years ago, not one person showed up. But now, 20 months later, almost every citizen attends. The townsmen have changed an old jail into a health clinic, drained swamps, rebuilt rotted wharves on the river, cleared stumps out of the channel to make it navigable, and they are now building the first 18 of 72 do-it-yourself houses designed by the volunteer.

John Arango's Colombian coworker is equally responsible for the results in Cutaru. Host countries have in every case made voluntary contributions to the Peace Corps programs. In Africa alone, they have provided $2.5 million for the program. Three countries in Latin America plan to establish their own Peace Corps.

Life for the volunteer is not always hard. Our objective is not discomfort for discomfort's sake, but rather a willingness to share the life of another people, to accept sacrifice when necessary, and to show that material privilege has not become absolutely necessary to the American's life. The happiest volunteers are usually those with the most difficult living conditions.

Volunteers are helping to organize farmers' cooperatives in Chile, Ecuador, and Pakistan; credit unions and savings-and-loan associations in Latin America; demonstration farms in the Near East. A group of volunteers in the Punjab have begun a poultry industry, using ground termite mounds for protein feed. These are grass roots projects. Some day we will look back and wonder why it took so long to discover that people—human hands and human enthusiasms—are an essential part of being good neighbors to those abroad.

The Peace Corps is also having a good effect on our own people. The president of the State University of Iowa says, "Our faculty are having to think through old problems of education freshly and to tackle new ones (in training volunteers for Indonesia). They are learning how to teach languages in the new method, how to teach new languages, how to teach area studies better, to adapt old and to test new methods."

Ghana and Argentina have considered sending volunteer teachers to American high schools or colleges. Ghana would provide experts in African history and Argentina teachers of Spanish. Other countries may do the same.

Our own Peace Corps volunteers will be coming home more mature, with a new outlook toward life and work. I have wondered whether our contemporary society, with its emphasis on the organizational man and the easy life, can continue to produce the self-reliance, initiative, and independence than are part of our heritage. We have been in danger of losing ourselves among the motorized toothbrushes, tranquilizers, and TV commercials.

We still have our vision, but our society has been drifting away from the world's majority: the young and raw, the colored, the hungry, the oppressed. The Peace Corps is helping to put us again where we belong.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Florida's Growth Pattern Raises a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the growth and progress of the State of Florida continues to be an exciting story. An editorial published by the Florida Times-Union in Jacksonville shows that Florida has now moved to ninth place in population among the States and that our total population is now close to 6 million. Florida is indeed a favored area.

The editorial follows:

STATE'S GROWTH PATTERN RAISES A CHALLENGE

Florida's obvious population boom has now been confirmed in specific figures in an interim report of the U.S. Census Bureau fixing the State's growth between the 1960 count and July 1, 1963, at 701,000.

Florida's increase, which moved it from 10th to 9th in rank among all the States, was part of a total growth of more than 3.2 million in the 17-State area classified by the Bureau as the "South." Every State in the region shared in the increase except West Virginia, which recorded a net loss of 83,000.

Only Texas bettered Florida's numerical increase, with a net gain of 744,000, to move from sixth to fourth in rank among all States.

In numbers alone, Florida's population growth represents a tremendous impact on every phase of life in the Sunshine State, but that impact is significantly heightened when the total growth is considered in terms of continuing trends in population distribution.

That trend, a nationwide phenomenon with results readily visible in Florida, is the steady gravitation of population to the large urban centers, often at the expense of rural and less populated areas.

The development of huge urban complexes has given new impetus to study of the science of demography, and has added a new word—"megalopolis," or "great city"—to the language in recent years. It is applied to those vast and interlocking population centers which extend beyond old fixed geographical and political boundaries and give rise to problems unknown until comparatively recent years.

The movement of city dwellers to the suburbs, made possible by easy commuting, and the migration of industry and large business firms to open areas providing more desirable environment, have resulted in large metropolitan centers touching and melding into a continuous urban development. Such areas now exist in varying degrees along Florida's east, west, and gulf coasts and in the belt extending across the center of the State. Duval County alone affords a striking example in its beach communities which form one continuous population center.

This pattern of growth raises a clear challenge to long-range planning for the best, most efficient and most economical methods for cooperative solution to the problem of providing essential public services in these vast complexes which override official boundaries.

Space Program Evaluation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Needed: Space Program Evaluation," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: SPACE PROGRAM EVALUATION

Senator FULBRIGHT's attack on the space program can be answered only by a searching reappraisal which will give the American people thoroughly convincing answers to the questions he raises. Mr. FULBRIGHT is not sure a race to the moon is on, and if it is he doubts whether it is worth winning. He advanced this thesis in a Senate speech:

"The benefits of space exploration may indeed be considerable, but they are remote and incalculable. The need for schools and jobs is immediate and pressing. The space program, we are told, is important for our security and especially our prestige. This is perhaps true, but the education of our people and the growth of our economy are far more important because these are the foundations of national power."

While we find Senator FULBRIGHT's arguments impressive, we differ with him on several points. In the first place, we do not think a major policy decision such as abandoning the moon shot should be decided by a hasty congressional cutback in appropriations. The effort to put a man on the moon has been settled Government policy for 2 years and until it is altered Congress ought to pay the bill.

We are in full agreement with the Senator that more money for education and for developing employment opportunities should be high on the list of national priorities. But we are convinced that the United States is able to sustain adequate social welfare programs as well as the costs of space exploration. To say that space funds must be cut so that the Nation can do its duty by education and full employment is to accept false alternatives.

As of now, our Government has officially stated that there is a race for the moon, and that we mean to win it. President Kennedy has also suggested that the United States and Russia cooperate in lunar exploration, which makes more sense than an international race. But in the absence of agreement the United States must either continue the race (even though there are reports the Russians are easing up) or publicly proclaim a policy reversal and the reasons therefor.

The effects of the space race encompass more than the expenditure of money, as Mr. FULBRIGHT points out. The drain of scientists from the civilian economy and from the universities is one of the consequences that needs to be appraised.

But it must not be forgotten that the exploration of space is the great scientific challenge of the age. A case can be made for an intensive national space program, including a manned lunar expedition, solely on the basis of the search for knowledge. Surely expenditures made in the pursuit of knowledge are commendable, and in space exploration only the Government can make them. A society's willingness and capacity to undertake this task is one test, though not the only one, of that society's vitality.

Mr. FULBRIGHT asks this question:

"If, at the end of this decade, the Russians should have reached the moon, and we should not, but if we, instead, have succeeded in building the best system of public education in the world, in the renovation of our cities and transport, in the virtual elimination of slums and crime, in the alleviation of poverty and disease, whose prestige would be higher, who would then be ahead in the worldwide struggle for the minds and allegiance of men?"

That is certainly worth thinking about but so is another question which the Senator does not explore: If the Russians reach the moon and we do not, and if we also fail to build the best system of public education, etc.—then what?

The missing element in discussions of this nature is a suitable body of information on which debate can rest. Reputable scientists, for example, are on both sides of the question of whether landing instruments on the moon would produce as much information as landing men. It is time for a thorough and authoritative examination of the moon project in the light of the arguments advanced by Senator FULBRIGHT and world conditions as they are today.

President Kennedy, it seems to us, ought to establish a high-level commission to make recommendations on space policy. If we should drastically slacken the pace of our efforts to put a man on the moon, we should do it on the basis of the soundest advice, scientific and otherwise. Until that is available, Congress should vote NASA sufficient funds to carry out present policy.

Cruise of the Onassis Yacht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last week Ralph de Toledano, a syndicated columnist, wrote a column on the cruise taken by the First Lady and Under Secretary of Commerce and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as guests on the yacht of Aristotle Onassis, the controversial Greek shipping figure who does extensive business with the U.S. Government.

That column was to have appeared on Friday, October 25, but on Thursday all editors carrying the column received a telegram from King Features Syndicate, which is party to a pending Justice Department suit, ordering the column killed.

Rolph Fairchild, executive editor of the Ontario-Upland (Calif.), Daily Report, telephoned me and said the column was ordered killed without explanation—the first time in his many years of newspaper experience that a news column received this treatment without reason being given.

The first sentence of De Toledano's column read:

At the White House, the big hope is that this story will just disappear.

Mr. Fairchild did not run the column in accordance with the request from King Features, but his newspaper did carry the following editorial on the day the column should have appeared:

CRUISE OF THE ONASSIS YACHT

A strange aftermath has appeared in the wake of the Mediterranean cruise made by Mrs. John F. Kennedy and Under Secretary and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., aboard a yacht owned by Aristotle S. Onassis, Greek shipping magnate. Columnist Ralph de Toledano undertook to write a column giving the background of this episode. Yesterday the feature syndicate distributing De Toledano's column ordered it destroyed. No explanation was given.

Readers who questioned the good taste of the First Lady and an Under Secretary of Commerce in joining a cruise party touring the Mediterranean as guests of a foreign businessman like Onassis had good reason for their doubts. If nothing else, Aristotle Onassis now has demonstrated to the heads of every nation in North Africa and the Middle East just how much a part of the inner circle of the White House and the administration he really is. There was a fascinating story behind all this, of course.

Since the public is entitled to know that story whether it embarrassed the Kennedy administration or not, the Daily Report called Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Ohio Republican, from whom De Toledano got most of his information in the first place. After a thorough check of the basic facts with Congressman BOLTON's public affairs assistant, Richard K. Cook, plus some background research of its own, the Daily Report now can tell this background story itself.

Aristotle S. Onassis was sued by the U.S. Department of Justice in New York in 1954 for $20 million and return of 16 surplus U.S. ships which the Federal Government charged he obtained by misrepresenting his purchasing ship firms as controlled by U.S. citizens. This action was taken under U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., during the second year of the Eisenhower administration.

Ultimately, according to Congressman BOLTON's staff report, Onassis paid a penalty of more than $7 million as a result of Government civil action in court. Even this was a lot of money. Naturally, any Greek shipping magnate would hope to avoid similar difficulties in the future. It seems self-evident Onassis has undertaken to curry favor in the right places in the Kennedy administration with that in mind. That is what makes this cruise story so hot today. Yet the facts developed by Representative BOLTON do not end there.

In 1961 the Kennedy administration put through its maritime plan, whereby the Federal Maritime Board was abolished and a new Federal Maritime Commission was created to take over the old board's regulatory powers. Its nonregulatory powers were transferred to the Department of Commerce's Maritime Administration. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., is now a top figure in the Department of Commerce.

And plain fact is that after having accepted handsome hospitality aboard this yacht belonging to the Greek shipping king for this Mediterranean cruise, both Under Secretary Roosevelt and the John F. Kennedy family are under substantial obligation to Aristotle Onassis, the Greek shipping king.

All this makes the vicuna coat that Bernard Goldfine gave Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams look incidental by comparison. Yet there have been no shrill cries of possible special influence at the White House, or loud questions about possible conflict of interest at the Department of Commerce around Washington. Aside from Congressman BOLTON's comments, the silence has been almost oppressive. Why?

Onassis has made money—a lot of money—from his dealings with U.S. taxpayers. For example, explained the Congressman, Onassis controls Victory Carriers, Inc., a Delaware corporation. Although Onassis is not a U.S. citizen, this corporation ownership seemed to qualify him for an 87½-percent Federal guarantee on construction costs for merchant ships that were listed as part of the U.S. merchant fleet. Yet the plain fact is that actual ownership and control of these ships built by Victory Carriers lies abroad. To say these ships are American-owned is, as Congressman BOLTON put it, pure "legal fiction."

One ship built for Onassis under this guarantee underwritten by U.S. taxpayers was the *Mount Vernon Victory*. "Under Public Law 1017," observed Congressman BOLTON, "the owners were to have been required to have a working capital requirement of $1,435,100 by no later than January 28, 1963, or be declared in default of the mortgage. This requirement was not met." Instead, the Kennedy administration gave the Onassis firm until next December 31—almost a full year—to meet this obligation.

In all, the Onassis shipping empire has acquired four new tankers through this handy arrangement set up by U.S. taxpayers. "All this in spite of the fact that the Commerce Department assured the Congress in 1957 that there would be no financial assistance by the Maritime Administration to Victory Carriers, Inc., in the form of Government mortgage guarantees," Representative BOLTON pointed out.

It is mighty hard for a workingman who pays these taxes that have been of such assistance to this Greek multimillionaire to swallow the proposition that there is no connection between such episodes and yachting on the Mediterranean by the President's wife and an Under Secretary of Commerce and his wife. Certainly the taxpayers of America are entitled to know this whole story, and Representative BOLTON deserves great credit for having called this matter to the attention of the Congress. All the taxpayers need now is a congressional committee with the courage and sense of ethics Congressman BOLTON has displayed to open up this whole fantastic situation.

The ARA in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 26, the people of Hinton, W. Va., whom I have the honor of representing, gathered together in a neighborly meeting. The people of Hinton wanted to express their appreciation for the stimulation and uplift which the Area Redevelopment Administration has provided for the spirits and hearts as well as the economic future of Hinton.

The meeting of the people of Hinton was covered by a fine reporter of the New York Times and I should like to place in the RECORD results of Mr. Homer Bigart's findings on the scene in West Virginia in his article of Tuesday, October 29, 1963:

DEPRESSION-HIT TOWN IS BUOYANT—PROMISE OF U.S. AID FOR TOURISM ELATES HINTON, W. VA.

(By Homer Bigart)

HINTON, W. VA., October 24.—This railroad town, depressingly poor even by West Virginia standards, has talked itself into a strange state of euphoria.

One-third of the population lives on Government handouts. There is not a productive industry in the whole of Summers County and no immediate hope of getting one.

The county population, now about 15,000, declined 18 percent in the last decade and is still going down. The average per capita income is only $1,363, compared with the West Virginia average of $1,686 and the national average of $2,238.

Yet tonight the new National Guard Armory rang with the glad speeches. The Hinton-Summers Chamber of Commerce was giving an appreciation dinner for Federal and State officials. About 250 persons who had paid $10 a plate heard assurances that the local economy, seeded with Federal money, would presently fructify.

The cause of the optimism was an announcement last summer that the Area Redevelopment Administration was investing nearly $10 million to develop tourist facilities in nearby Bluestone State Park.

MORALE HAS INCREASED

Not a spadeful of dirt has been turned, but already boosters proclaim that things are looking up. The few merchants who protest that October retail sales have seldom been worse are dismissed as "crepe hangers."

"The morale of the people has had an overnight transformation," said John E. Faulconer, publisher of the Hinton Daily News.

"People have been lifted from the depths of despair to the pinnacle of optimism," he declared. "The word in Hinton is go."

He traced Hinton's despair to the sharp decline in employment at the shops of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway. The town has lost over 800 railway jobs in the last 10 years. Most jobs vanished as diesel power replaced steam engines.

The diesels required much less maintenance and overhaul than the huge, multiple-drive steam locomotives that formerly dragged coal trains up the long grades of the Allegheny Mountains. Today the railway shops employ less than 50 men.

With no other jobs available in Summers County, unemployed railroad workers migrated to industrial centers, Hinton's population shrank from 7,000 to 5,000.

DISCOURAGED AND DEPRESSED

"At first people were rather complacent, they didn't realize what had happened," said Hume K. Nowlan, manager of the chamber of commerce. "Then they became confused, discouraged, and depressed."

Frederick W. Sawyers, a lawyer, recalled, "We tried to attract industry, but it seemed everything fell on its face."

"We had 12 nibbles," Mr. Nowlan said.

"We raised $50,000 for a company that made component parts for the Navy Air Corps," Mr. Faulconer interposed. "They got to a peak employment of 60 people and

went broke. We lost everything we invested in it.

"Then Hinton got a plant that made window sashes and shutters, but some little town in Indiana coaxed it away."

"Finally," Mr. Nowland said, "it dawned on us that the crux of our difficulty was lack of highway transportation. The county hasn't an inch of Federal primary highway.

"We had one other possibility. Lacking all else, we have water."

Hinton is perched on a shelf above the confluence of the New and Greenbrier Rivers. The rivers are remarkably clean, flowing down from mountains that are forested and thinly settled.

TRIED TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY

Pursuing industries that thirst for clean, cool water, the town tried to obtain a pulp-and-paper mill. But the industry was only operating at 70 percent capacity and had no desire to expand.

Hinton's outlook became increasingly hopeless until the Area Redevelopment Association was born in 1961. The agency represented was the Kennedy administration's first attempt to deal with the problems of chronically depressed areas.

In 2 years, however, the agency has made hardly a dent in the vast and complex problems arising from persistent unemployment. Its main difficulty is lack of funds.

Congress appropriated $380 million for this year, an amount considered woefully inadequate if spread among the 1,047 areas that qualify as depressed. These areas contain about 36 million Americans.

West Virginia has received a good share of the funds. Seventy projects, representing a Federal investment of $35,876,000, have been approved. The projects are expected to provide 6,973 jobs.

Cynics say that President Kennedy owes a great political debt to West Virginia. His victory in the State Democratic primary in 1960 was crucial to his campaign for the presidential nomination. He also carried the State in the election.

FIFTY-ONE COUNTIES BLIGHTED

But the State does qualify as perhaps the most depressed in the Union. Only 4 counties out of 55 have escaped the blight of idleness and poverty.

Here in Summers County, citizens got busy as soon as the Area Redevelopment Association was established. Before a depressed area could qualify for aid, the agency required the submission of an overall economic development program by a local redevelopment organization composed of representative citizens. The Summers County plan was one of the first to be submitted.

"Our Congresswoman, ELIZABETH KEE, assembled a Federal task force to come down and look over the county," Mr. Nowlan said. "The task force told us: 'You don't have much of an industrial prospect but you do have a tremendous potential for recreational development.' "

THINKING TOO SMALL

Mr. Sawyers recalled:

"We tried to get a road down the New River Gorge from here to Prince, linking Bluestone State Park and Grandview State Park. The task force came in and said we were thinking too small. So we established the New River Gorge Development Corp. Our goal is to develop the gorge as a national attraction that will outdraw the Grand Canyon."

The agency finally approved the investment of $9,816,000 to build a 150-room lodge, a swimming pool, an 18-hole golf course, tennis courts, a dude ranch, a cable-car line, a cultural center and other facilities in the Pipestem area adjoining Bluestone State Park, on Bluestone Dam Lake, 3 miles south of Hinton.

The appropriation consists of a loan of $7,225,000 and a grant of $2,591,000 to the West Virginia State Department of Natural Resources, which is to develop the tourist project and lease it to private operators.

ANSTED SITE AIDED

The agency also approved a loan of $1,760,000 to enable the State to develop tourist facilities at Hawks Nest State Park near Ansted, a decaying coal mining town in Fayette County, that looks considerably more woebegone than Hilton.

As for Hinton, the town was overjoyed by the Federal windfall. Chamber of commerce members predicted that no fewer than 375 direct jobs would result from the Bluestone development.

The local chamber seemed totally unconcerned by the bitter attacks levelled against the agency by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The national chamber has assailed the Area Redevelopment Administration as a potential instrument of a controlled economy and is opposing a pending bill to raise its authorization to $849 million.

U.S. CHAMBER ASSAILED

"We don't want to have a damn thing to do with the National Chamber of Commerce," Mr. Faulconer said. "They ought to go out and rub elbows with the people."

Mr. Faulconer hailed the agency's investment as "the spark that ignited the town."

"Overnight we had a big upsurge of optimism," he declared. "Thinking turned from negative to positive in a minute."

"I'm getting letters from retired people who who want to come back and live here," he continued. "There are 25 to 26 homes going up in the county."

A more restrained view was provided by Robert S. Neely, Jr., executive vice president of the First National Bank.

He warned that Hinton's primary source of employment was still the C. & O. Railway shops and that further layoffs were expected there. He confirmed merchants' reports that October retail sales were the slowest in years, for which he held responsible not the unseasonably warm weather but the fear of additional job losses.

OVERALL PROGRAM URGED

"I'm not opposed to relief programs or the ARA," Mr. Neely said. "But what is needed is a comprehensive program, not just a little dribble of aid here and there. I'd rather see public money spent at three or four times the present rate, provided people were put to work on needed projects."

Mr. Neely predicted that the depopulation of Summers County would continue at an accelerated rate. He questioned the moral and economic right of the Government to "entice people to remain in areas where there is little or no chance of economic survival."

However, an official of the Area Redevelopment Administration pointed out that the day was gone when Americans could pack up and move from depressed areas in full confidence of finding work elsewhere. Displaced mountaineers are simply swelling the ranks of urban unemployed, he said—they would be better off back home shooting squirrels.

Down in Fayette County, the mayor of Ansted, William Skaggs, was not impressed when informed by Sheriff Pearley L. Elmore that the development of Hawk's Nest Park might produce 70 jobs.

"We can't feed our people on optimism," he said.

Mayor Skaggs said much of Ansted was "going to pot" because riffraff was moving into vacant houses.

"I ran a family out that didn't even have a bed," he declared. "The face of our population is changing completely."

Things got so bad, he continued, that 15 women had offered to work for 50 cents an hour in the school lunchroom.

He cited another evidence of decay: The Lions Club, which had supplied eyeglasses for impoverished children, was defunct.

At Fayetteville, the county seat, Ortie O. Crookshanks, the welfare director, reported that 16,000 of the county's 61,000 persons were on the Federal food dole. More than 9,000 are receiving welfare payments, he said.

The county lost more than a fourth of its population between 1950 and 1960 and the emigration is continuing.

Mr. Crookshanks said that not over a dozen persons now lived in a 20-mile stretch of the New River Gorge between Fayette and Thurmond—a stretch that once held six mining camps and several thousand persons.

The Fairbanks House, Dedham, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Sunday supplement of the Boston Herald of October 6. The Fairbanks House described in the article is the Nation's oldest wood-frame home and has not been significantly altered since it was built in 1636. It is the ancestral home of Charles Warren Fairbanks, who served as Vice President under Theodore Roosevelt. The Fairbanks family still owns it and has now opened it as a museum. Mrs. Forrest Freeman, a 10th generation direct descendant, is the curator and guide.

I think this article illustrates two significant points. First, we in Massachusetts have, as it states, a bumper crop of registered national landmarks, and I am sure that we have many other buildings and sites which in any other State would be recognized as such, but have been outranked in Massachusetts. Naturally, we are very proud of these many sites. We can also be proud of the fact that the Fairbanks family has undertaken the preservation and care of its family home itself, rather than appealing to the Government for assistance. This is Yankee independence at its best.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRBANKS HOUSE A COMMUNITY OF CONTENTMENT

(By Gloria Gould)

Massachusetts has a bumper crop of registered national landmarks, and one of the most spectacular is the country's oldest wood-frame house and the oldest gambrel roof house.

It stands conspicuously unrestored but well preserved at the corner of East Street and Eastern Avenue in Dedham, on a knoll which once was bordered by the Charles River.

In 1636 Jonathan Fayerbanke and his family canoed down the Charles to what was then the community of Contentment where his land grant consisted of 12 good acres, for the growing of his flax, and 4 of swamp. There he and his sons John and George built a six-room house. Ships' carpenters helped, no doubt, for the kitchen

walls show rare lapstreak paneling and there are ships' beams in the ceiling.

A valuation of 28 pounds was placed on the house in 1638 which placed it in the average-home category of the time. (Massachusetts Bay Colony homes ranged in value from 2 to 45 pounds). Twelve years later, when son John married, a wing was added, and in another 6 years the last extension was made on the house for a total of 11 rooms and 3 stairways.

Little has been changed in the house since then and none but members of the Fairbanks family have lived in the structure. Eight generations of the Fairbanks family have lived in the home continuously until 1903 when Fairbanks Family in America, Inc., was created as a means by which the home could be maintained within the family and historical memorabilia returned to the homestead.

A family reunion is annually at the homestead and this year's drew 200 members from 15 States and Canada.

The Fairbanks House is open to the public daily except Monday from 9 to 12 a.m. and from 1 to 5 p.m. The charge is 50 cents for adults and 25 cents for children and includes a 1-hour guided tour. Mrs. Forrest E. Freeman, a 10th generation descendant of Jonathan Fayerbanke, is the curator and guide.

Of special note is a private tour of the homestead tomorrow for the benefit of the Winchester auxiliary of the MSPCA. It will include a homemade brunch to be served in the old kitchen and a boutique of handmade articles. Tour and brunch time is from 10.30 a.m. to 2 p.m. and tickets at $1.50 may be purchased through the Winchester and Boston offices of the MSPCA. Tour chairman is Mrs. Gordon Sidebotham of Winchester.

Archibald MacLeish on Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last I had the great opportunity to attend the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. It was a most impressive tribute to the memory of Mr. Frost, and the appearance of President Kennedy and other distinguished citizens made it a memorable occasion. But Frost's fame, as Archibald MacLeish so poignantly suggested, "can't be added to because it is full already." And it was Mr. MacLeish who placed the entire day in proper perspective. This distinguished Pulitzer-prize winning poet, playright, and essayist, who served his country notably during World War II, and a former Librarian of Congress, made one of the finest speeches I have ever heard. With Frost's poems, it will remain as solid as those immortal elms that still remain in the Connecticut Valley.

Reputations—as well as elm trees—may crumble but there will always remain universal things—poems, if you will—that will "go on being." As Mr. MacLeish said, "Frost wanted to go on being. And he has."

It is a great pleasure for me to include the full text of Mr. MacLeish's address made last Saturday at Amherst College. With two earlier articles about Mr. Frost written by Mark Van Doren that I also included in the RECORD, this speech will add immeasurably to the literature on Robert Frost. It is a supreme tribute to a writer by one who has been for "half a Biblical lifetime" one of the finest creative writers in America. The fact that MacLeish has lived amid the "old, soft, lovely hills" of the beautiful district which I am fortunate to represent is another meaningful compliment to the part of the world where Frost wrote many of his poems.

It is my fervent hope that the MacLeish address, called appropriately enough, "Frost and Stone" will be widely read in all of the libraries of the United States where this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will circulate, and in all places where men of good will gather to speak of the poetry of Robert Frost.

The address, in full, follows:

FROST AND STONE

(Remarks by Archibald MacLeish at the dedication of the Frost Library at Amherst, Mass.)

My presence here today is proof—if any is needed in a college as civilized as Amherst—that you can't learn by experience. By which I mean that this is not the first time I have assisted a President of the United States to start a library. And that I remember the other. It was some 20-odd years ago at Hyde Park in the State of New York where a building had been constructed to house the papers of Franklin Delano Roosevelt—which was all very well except for two facts: that I was librarian of Congress at the time, having just been appointed to that office by Mr. Roosevelt, and that the Library of Congress, down at least to the date of my appointment, had itself been the usual repository for Presidential papers.

Mr. Roosevelt's invitation to me to speak at Hyde Park—if "invitation" is the word I want—was, I dare say, kindly meant: there was to be nothing personal about the affront. But it is one thing for an invitation to be kindly meant and another thing altogether to accept it in kind—particularly when it involves a speech by the director of the library to which invaluable papers ought to have gone, celebrating the opening of the library to which they are going. I made, I am told, a memorable impression. Indeed, my friend and classmate, Acheson, on whose unfailing candor I have always been able to rely whether I wanted to or not, assured me on my return to Washington that no public servant in the history of the Republic had ever appeared to better advantage with his pants firmly caught in the crack of the door.

There are differences, of course, between that day and this. I don't work for Mr. Kennedy—or if I do, it is from the private heart not from public office. And as for the Library of Congress, it has long since grown accustomed to the alienation of hoped-for papers, some having been alienated as far west as Independence, Mo. But whatever else is altered, the fact remains that a library, or the idea of a library, is here again in process of inauguration by a President of the United States and that I seem again to be part of the proceedings. If precedents still mean anything in this revolving world the probability must be very great indeed that no good will come of it.

No good; that is, to me. Amherst can be more hopeful, and so, too, can this October valley and the old, soft, lovely hills off to the west of it where I have lived for half a biblical lifetime. The people of this countryside may forget in ordinary human course what anyone says on this occasion, but they will remember for many, many years that a young and gallant President of the United States, with the weight of history heavy upon his shoulders, somehow found time to come to our small corner of the world to talk of books and men and learning.

I say "small corner" not in modesty but in Yankee modesty, which is a different thing. We may not be as conspicuous at this end of the Commonwealth, Mr. President, as some you must have heard of at the other, but we bear up. We remind ourselves that it was a citizen of this very town of Amherst who was described by a famous daughter as "too intrinsic for renown," and we like to think that even now, a century after Edward Dickinson's death, there are still men in these valley villages and up along the Deerfield, Bardwell's Ferry way and in the hills behind, who deserve the tribute of Emily's unfractured crystal of pure poetry, pure praise. But whether we are right or not, whether we and our neighbors are too intrinsic for renown or merely too remote for notoriety, we know and honor when we see one, and your presence here we take to be just that—an honor to this college and these counties and ourselves.

Not to mention Robert Frost, for Frost, of course, is another matter, as he always was. There is an old Gaelic tale of the West Highlands called "The Brown Bear of the Green Glen" which has a whisky bottle in it so definitely full that not a drop can be added, and so fabulously copious that nothing is lost, no matter how you drink it. Frost's fame is like that bottle; it can't be added to, because it is full already, and it won't draw down however it is drunk. We may name a library for him. We may go further than that; we may give his name to the first general library ever to be called for a poet in America, which is what this library will be. We may pass even that superlative of honor; we may designate as his the first general library but one in the entire world to bear a poet's name—the one being the A. S. Pushkin State Public Library in farthest Kazakhston in the U.S.S.R. We may do what we please. Nothing whatever will have happened to the bottle; it will merely continue to be full.

This, I suggest, is a phenomenon which might well concern us on this particular occasion—the secret of that bottle. Is it the mere bulk and body of the fame which keeps it so miraculously brimming? The fact that no poet in English, with the single exception of Yeats himself, had as much fame in his lifetime as Frost had at the end of his? Is it the quantity of the reputation, the number of people who knew Frost's name or recognized him on the streets or crowded into those wonderful talkings which some called readings and lined up afterward for autographs they rarely got?

I doubt it and so do you. We know a little in our time and country about fame in bulk and its effect on lasting fame. At least we know what happens when a whole new industry is established, dedicated to nothing but the manufacture, in larger and larger quantities and in shorter and shorter periods of time, of crude, bulk reputation: we have seen its fruits. (Try not to see them.) If great actresses are in short supply as they invariably are, two or three to a century being about all the natural processes can produce, the industry will assemble you a dozen assorted greatest actresses in a single season, inflate them with adjectives and launch them like blimps to float about for a year or 3 or maybe 5 or longer. But then what happens to them? Or to the greatest novels, the greatest plays, detergents, sedatives, cigarettes, laxatives which circle with them?

Or even to the greatest men? And even when they are great. For the industry processes everyone, true as well as false. Let the actual thing itself appear—Keats' seldom—appearing Socrates in fact and in the flesh—and the assembly line will multigraph him and pass him current by every mechanical means until nothing is left of the single, human fact of the man himself but his bubble reputation in as many million mouths as the new technology can activate. It takes an Einstein to survive it. And even Einstein had reason to be grateful for the isolation of his vast achievement out among the galaxies of space and mind where the copywriters couldn't follow.

Yet Frost too survived, and with no such adventitious aid. Everything about him—the seeming simplicity of his poems, the silver beauty of his head, his age, his Yankee tongue, his love of talk, his ease upon a lecture platform—everything combined to put him within easy reach * * * which still could not quite reach him. No one in my time upon this planet was so pursued by fame as Frost—so publicized in the specific sense and meaning of that word. But even now, months after his death, the public image, as the industry would call it, has already begun to change like the elms in autumn, leaving enormous branches black and clean against the sky.

Frost too, it seems, but in a different way, an opposite way, is too intrinsic for renown—too intrinsic for renown to touch. Something in the fame resists the fame as burning maple logs—rock maple anyway—resist the blaze. And what it is, I think we know. At least there is an evening, not many years ago or many blocks from here—an evening others in this room remember—which might tell us. It was his 80th birthday. Frost had been in New York where every possible honor, including some not possible, had been paid him, and, returning here to Amherst and his friends, he fell to talking of what honor really was, or would be: to leave behind him, as he put it, "a few poems it would be hard to get rid of."

It sounds like a modest wish but Frost knew, as his friends knew, that it wasn't. Poems are not monuments—shapes of stone to stand and stand. Poems are speaking voices. And a poem that is hard to get rid of is a voice that is hard to get rid of. And a voice that is hard to get rid of is a man. What Frost wanted for himself in the midst of all that praise was what Keats had wanted for himself in the midst of no praise at all, to be among the English poets at his death—the poets of the English tongue.

Which means something very different from being talked about or passed from mouth to mouth by reputation. Reputation—above all literary reputation—is a poor thing. It rises and falls. Consideration leads to reconsideration, fashions change and no one yet has heard the verdict of posterity because posterity has never come. Frost will be praised and then neglected and then praised again like all the others. It wasn't reputation he was thinking of that wintry evening; it was something else. To be among the English poets is to be—to go on being. Frost wanted to go on being. And he has.

It is this fact—this actual and not at all imaginary or pretended fact—I wish to speak of for a moment: The persistence of this man. It has a certain relevance to what we do here. On the surface of these proceedings Frost's part in them is purely passive: Nothing is asked of him but to receive the honor we now pay him and to relinquish a great name he does not own, having bequeathed it to the future—three syllables to be carved above a doorway * * * Frost and stone to age together. In fact, however, if one includes among his facts the fact I speak of, these roles are quite reversed: Like the citizens of Colonus at the death of Oedipus in Sophocoles' great play the passive part is ours. He gives: We take.

Not that Frost was Oedipus precisely—except, perhaps, in his constant readiness to talk back to sphinxes. But there is something in the ending of that myth that gives this myth of ours its meaning. You remember how it goes—the wretched, unhappy, humbled, hurt old king, badgered and abused by fate, gulled by every trick the gods can play him, tangled in patricide and incest and in every guilt, snarled in a web of faithful falsehoods and affectionate deceptions and kind lies, exiled by his own proscription, blinded by his own hands, who, dying, has so great a gift to give that Thebes and Athens quarrel over which shall have him. You remember what the gift is, too. "I am here," says Oedipus to Theseus, King of Athens, "to give you something, my own beaten self, no feast for the eyes." And why is such a gift worth having? Because Oedipus is about to die. But why should death give value to a gift like that? Because of the place where death will meet him:

"I shall disclose to you, O son of Aegeus,
What is appointed for your city and for you—
Something that time will never wear away.
Presently now without a hand to guide me
I shall lead you to the place where I must die."

And what is that place? The Furies' wood which no man dares to enter: The frightening grove sacred to those implacable pursuers, ministers of guilt, who have hounded him across the world.

"These things are mysteries, not to be explained
But you will understand when you have come there."

The gift that Oedipus has to give is a great gift because that beaten suffering self, no feast for the eyes, faces the dark pursuers at the end.

Frost, I said, was not Oedipus, and so he wasn't. But he too has that gift to give. And I can imagine some late student reading his poems in the library that bears his name and feeling, like Theseus, that the beaten and triumphant self has somehow, and mysteriously, been given him—a self not unlike the old Theban king's.

Quarrelsome? Certainly—and not with men alone but gods. Tangled in misery? More than most men. But despairing? No. Defeated by the certainty of death? Never defeated. Frightened of the dreadful wood? Not frightened either. A rebellious, brave, magnificent, far-wandering, unbowed old man who made his finest music out of manhood and met the Furies on their own dark ground.

We do not live, I know, in Athens. We live now in an insignificant, remote, small suburb of the universe. Reality, if one can speak still of reality, is out beyond us in the light-years somewhere or farther inward than our eyes can see in the always redivisible divisibilities of matter that is only matter to eyes as dim and dull as ours. Homer's heroic world where men could face their destinies and die becomes to us, with our more comprehensive information, the absurd world of Sartre where men can only die. And yet, though all our facts are changed, nothing has been changed in fact; we still live lives. And lives still lead to death. And those who live a life that leads to death still need the gift that Oedipus gave Athens, the gift of self, of beaten self, of wandering, defeated, exiled self that can survive, endure, turn upon the dark pursuers, face its unintelligible destiny with blinded eyes and make a meaning of it, self, above all else, without self-pity.

Gertrude Robinson Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the RECORD the obituary of Miss Gertrude Robinson Smith of New York and Stockbridge, Mass., which had appeared in the New York Times. This obituary accurately summarized her long and distinguished life. Recently, I read an editorial printed in the Berkshire Eagle, Pittsfield, Mass., which paid further tribute to this great woman, whose pleasures in life came from sharing with others all good things which have contributed to the artistic culture of this Nation. I would therefore like my colleagues to share with me this deserving praise of her lifelong work, spelled out so well in this editorial written in the shadow of Tanglewood, which will always stand as a living monument to her many contributions in the world of art. The editorial appeared on October 24, 1963.

MISS ROBINSON SMITH, FESTIVAL FOUNDER

Tanglewood today is such a Berkshire institution that it requires an effort of imagination to conceive of the county without it. Yet 30 years ago we had no summer music festival, and it took even more vision to conjure one up.

That vision was possessed by Miss Gertrude Robinson Smith. It was her capacity to recognize the potential in a "dream" broached to her by Dr. Henry Hadley one day in 1934 that made Tanglewood as we know it a reality.

It was Miss Robinson Smith who gathered 64 men and women to her house to hear Dr. Hadley present his idea for outdoor symphony concerts in the Berkshires. It was Miss Robinson Smith who, as president of the Berkshire Symphonic Festival, Inc., led the organization through its two early seasons at the Hanna farm in Interlaken. It was Miss Robinson Smith who negotiated with Dr. Serge Koussevitzky for the first appearance of the Boston Symphony Orchestra at the 1936 festival at Holmwood. And it was Miss Robinson Smith who spearheaded the 1937 campaign for the "pavilion" or shed at the festival's new home on the 200-acre Tappan estate overlooking Stockbridge Bowl.

After that triumph, the Berkshire festival's future was secure. Miss Robinson Smtih, who had served continuously as its president from 1934, retired from active organizational work 20 years later when the festival corporation was dissolved and the Music Shed turned over to the Boston Symphony Orchestra. From that time till her death Tuesday in New York, she stayed in the background.

Yet in these later years Miss Robinson Smith remained a Tanglewood presence, a personification of the imagination and leadership that established the festival. From time to time her advice was sought on Tanglewood problems. Occasionally she spoke out on such matters as proper dress for evening concerts (she frowned on shorts for women and tieless shirts for men).

But her crowning work had been done years before; and in a sense the great Shed and the magnificent concerts played in it every July and August constitute her monument.

House Joint Resolution 174, a Resolution To Provide for the Issuance of a Champion of Liberty Stamp Honoring Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress passed the Shevchenko resolution that provides for the erection of a statue in our Nation's Capital in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. This is Public Law 86-749. In accordance with its provisions, the statue will be erected on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW., and the historic unveiling is scheduled for May 30, 1964.

The 88th Congress has a wonderful opportunity to follow up on the constructive action taken by the 86th Congress in reflecting its support for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty stamp in honor of this East European figure of freedom and independence. It is again an opportunity for us to concretely show to the 45 million captive Ukrainian nation and, indeed, to all the captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe that the United States shall never lose sight of their captive status and the undying aspirations for freedom and national independence. Today, more than ever, Khrushchev needs this kind of reminder, and no more representative body of the people can do this than we of the 88th Congress.

I am greatly encouraged by the popular support expressed in behalf of the resolution (H.J. Res. 174) which I have introduced, providing for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth. The occasion is 1964—significantly also the year of the unveiling of his statue in Washington. To indicate this measure of support for House Joint Resolution 174, I insert the following communications in the RECORD:

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
September 23, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: May I urge your strong support of House Journal 174 special resolution calling for issuance of a Taras Shevchenko Champion of Liberty postage stamp.

I would like you to bring this to the attention of President Kennedy.

Thank you,

EARLE C. SPANN.

UKRAINIAN EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE
OF NORTH AMERICA,
East Detroit, Mich., October 4, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Our organization is writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko Champion of Liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the Champion of Liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

The U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Respectfully yours,

REV. WLADIMIR BOROWSKY,
Executive Secretary.

HOLY TRINITY CATHEDRAL
OF THE UKRAINIAN AUTOCEPHALIC
ORTHODOX CHURCH IN EXILE,
Brooklyn, N.Y., October 3, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: With all my heart and sincerity I am supporting your resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a Shevchenko Champion of Liberty postage stamp to be issued on the occasion of his 150th birthday anniversary in the spring of 1964.

Our greatest Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko spent 10 years in Siberia, just because he loved his country, Ukraine, and he wanted to see her free and independent from the Russian empire.

The Soviets are trying to make his poetry as suitable for its Communist objectives. But they will never succeed. Because Shevchenko remains forever an implacable enemy of tyranny and a symbol of human freedom, equality and justice.

I remain respectfully and thankfully yours.

REV. JOHN TKACZUK,
Assistant Rector.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Jersey City, N.J.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Voicing the concerted approval of the 700-odd members of our Svoboda Society registered at their regular meeting in New York City, I, the undersigned, heartily endorse your support of the resolution House Joint Resolution 174, which would call for the inclusion of a special Taras Shevchenko postage stamp in the Champion of Liberty series by the U.S. Government, thus honoring the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

It is fitting that such a postage stamp be included in this series to be issued by our Government, and we fully appreciate your wisdom to acknowledge this and to champion this proposal.

For the million and one-half Americans of Ukrainian descent and for the 45 million Ukrainians still in bondage in Communist Russia, Taras Shevchenko is today the inspiring symbol of freedom and humanity, for it was as far back as in 1857, more than 100 years ago, that he advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," believing that our Ukrainian forefathers then under the despotic rule of czarist Russia, would achieve their freedom and independence under such leaders as George Washington, father of our country.

Despite the Soviet Government's attempts to twist for their own propaganda purposes the poetry of the beloved bard revered by all Ukrainians, Taras Shevchenko remains to this day a symbol of freedom and independence and a beacon of national aspiration not only to these Ukrainians, but to all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Therefore, in issuing a U.S. commemorative stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, a great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth, the United States would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom the world over.

Yours respectfully,

DR. JAROSLAW PADOCH,
President, Svoboda Branch No. 194,
Ukrainian National Association, New York, N.Y.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 26, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: In behalf of our membership of Metropolitan Andrew Sheptytsky Branch 185 of the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics in America, express our profound appreciation for your interest and sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174, which provides for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth, the poet laureate of Ukraine, who was a great freedom fighter.

Since the unveiling of the Shevchenko statute is expected to be held in Washington, D.C. on May 30, 1964, we sincerely hope that the stamp could be issued at that time.

This would be a great contribution by the present administration, to show not only the 45 million Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain, but all other peoples of Eastern Europe, that great understanding and recognition that is given to freedom fighter heroes of other nations.

In deep appreciation and with warmest regards.

Sincerely,

DMYTRO CHROMEYKO,
Branch President.

MYRON BARANETSKY,
Branch Secretary.

UKRAINIAN LEAGUE OF NICETOWN, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 25, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: In behalf of our membership of the Ukrainian League of Nicetown, express our profound appreciation for your interest and sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174, which provides for the issuance of the Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth, the poet laureate of Ukraine, who was a great freedom fighter.

Since the unveiling of the Schevchenko statue is expected to be held in Washington, D.C. on May 30, 1964, we sincerely hope that the stamp could be issued at that time.

This would be a great contribution by the present administration, to show not only the 45 million Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain, but all other peoples of Eastern Europe, that great understanding and recognition that is given to freedom fighter heroes of other nations.

In deep appreciation and with warmest regards,

Sincerely,

WASYL POSPOLYTA,
President.

ROMAN BEDNARSKY,
Recording Secretary.

THE PROVIDENCE ASSOCIATION OF THE UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA,
Philadelphia, Pa. September 20, 1963.

HON. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: In behalf of our membership of over 16,000, we express our profound appreciation for your interest and sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174 which provides for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko, on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth, the poet laureate of Ukraine, who was a great freedom fighter.

Since the unveiling of the Shevchenko statue is expected to be held in Washington, D.C. on May 30, 1964, we sincerely hope that the stamp could be issued at that time.

This would be a great contribution by the present administration, to show not only the 45 million Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain, but all other peoples of Eastern Europe, the great understanding and recognition that is given to freedom fighter heros of other nations.

In deep appreciation and with warmest regards,

Sincerely,

Msgr. STEPHEN CHEHANSKY, *President.*
STEPHANIE WOCHOK, *Treasurer.*
STEPHAN SPRYNSKY, *Recording Secretary.*
TEOFIL KULCHYCKY, *Fin. Secretary.*

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *October 16, 1963.*

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
U. S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Group of American professional people Ukrainian descent Milwaukee wishes to thank you for introducing House Joint Resolution 174 calling for issuance of a stamp in honor of the 150th birthday anniversary of Taras Shevchenko in series "Champion of Liberty."

We wholeheartedly ask you to do all in your power to promote passage of resolution.

Respectfully yours,

Very Rev. Damian Olzhyn, Orthodox parish; Rev. Ivan Oleksiuk, Catholic parish; Prof. Roman Smal-Stocki; Dr. Theodor Trusevych; Dr. Alex Cybriwsky; Dr. Bohdan Davydovych; Prof. Emil Logush; Mag Wasyl Szymoniak; Col. (ret.) Kost Mansenko; Gen. (ret.) Joseph Mandzenko; Dr. Roman Biliak; and Dr. Stefan Gulay.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Flint, Mich., September 28, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: In behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Flint, Mich., we warmly express our profoundest gratitude for your strong sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174 calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko, Champion of Liberty, postage stamp in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth. You have our complete support and backing in this extremely important cultural project.

With 1964 as the occasion of the 150th anniversary of Shevchenko's birth, we enthusiastically look forward to the issuance of the Champion of Liberty stamp in his honor at the time of the statue's unveiling. Congress in its wisdom saw fit to provide for the erection of a statue honoring this great adversary of traditional Russian imperialism. We sincerely hope the present administration will similarly honor his historic contributions to national and human freedom in Eastern Europe by arranging for the stamp issue on May 30, 1964, the unveiling date. This would, by itself, be an enormous contributions to peace and understanding between our country and the 45 million people of the Ukrainian nation, not to mention millions of others in Eastern Europe.

In deep appreciation and with warmest regards.

Sincerely,

MYCHAJLO LYCHOLAT, *Branch President.*
STEFAN STEFANIW, *Branch Secretary.*

RAHWAY, N.J., *October 2, 1963.*

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to express our firm support for your House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a U.S. postage stamp honoring Taras Shevchenko.

In our opinion this great Ukrainian patriot and Europe's freedom fighter justly deserves to be so honored on the 150th anniversary of his birth in 1964.

The issuance of such a stamp in Champion of Liberty series will be deeply appreciated by all freedom-loving people and especially by the Ukrainians and the Americans of Ukrainian origin.

We thank you sincerely for introducing this resolution in the U.S. Congress.

Very truly yours,

ULANA AND ANATOLE WOWK.

Adult Education in the Los Angeles City Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, everyone is aware of the tremendous emphasis being placed on the necessity to retrain groups of men and women for new job opportunities created by automation. In addition, automation has deleted many employment openings for the untrained individuals. Education and labor departments in some States have established special divisions to equip the unemployed with the special education and special skills demanded by new jobs in the electronics and other automated industries. In the midst of this nationwide scramble to provide new techniques and new facilities for training individuals to meet the challenge in today's employment market, I am proud to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article concerning the celebration of the diamond anniversary of adult education in the Los Angeles city schools. This program has accomplished much over the years in making it possible for people to earn their own ways, by learning new and currently needed trades. The following tribute was given in recognition of the 75th anniversary of adult education in Los Angeles.

THE DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF ADULT EDUCATION IN THE LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS

Widespread realization that education, once confined to children, has become the common objective of the future without regard to age, is evidenced by the enrollment of 180,000 residents of the city of Los Angeles in 27 public schools.

Acknowledgment of the substantial achievement of the adult education program in promoting better citizenship and in equipping the individual for a more satisfying share of success, is emphasized by the observance of the diamond jubilee anniversary marking 75 years of adult education in the city of Los Angeles.

Once the fiction was accepted that when a certain age was reached, capacity for further learning was lost. Evidence to the contrary disproves this. Adult education programs recognize no barriers of age. There is abundant evidence that depth of individual experience and the balanced perspective which comes with maturity are solid factors in speeding the educational process.

In reaching after a better life, people have consciously striven for more effective methods to improve skills and to extend mental powers. Review, refresher courses, and retraining are the order of the day in an age of automation.

The rugged school of experience, from which there are no dropouts and no graduations, has taught us to regard education as the continuous development of the human being from infancy through adulthood.

In August 1962 a coordinating planning committee met to plan activites for the anniversary year. The board of education was represented by Mrs. Mary Tinglof, president; the central office by Mr. J. Richard Smith, assistant superintendent of adult education, and Dr. G. Alden Jackson, administrative assistant; the adult principal's association by Mr. Roy L. Stone, president; Mr. James Derksen, public relations chairman; and Mr. Willard H. Mann, anniversary chairman; the adult counselor's association by Mr. Maurice McGehee, president; Adult Education Association by Mr. William Johnston, president; Mrs. Dorothy Barron, anniversary chairman; Mr. Wilfred Dellquest, writer.

The adult students and community agencies have contributed greatly to the many jubilee activities during the year. Many persons attended the special exhibits in art and homemaking classes, and "open house" during Public Schools Week. Recently, as another example, eight area fashion shows, under the superivsion of Mrs. Dorothy Baughman, supervisor of homemaking and fine arts, have been a great success. Adult education supervisors have planed and assisted in apropriate anniversary activities in their subject area classes in the 27 adult schools. Local radio stations, news media, and education journals has assisted in explaining the adult education diamond anniversary. Proclamations were issued on the anniversary date, December 5, 1962, by Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Maj. Samuel Yorty, and Superintendent of Schools Jack P. Crowther. The Adult Education Association of Los Angeles held a jubilee banquet at the Riviera County Club to celebrate the anniversary date in December 1962.

In the ever changing adult education curriculum, 550 subjects in 2,000 classes, the academic subjects have increased greatly, with the high school diploma as the goal of more than 2,400 graduated this year. The June commencement exercises are an important event in the lives of many adults each year. With this thought in mind the Los Angeles Adult School Principal's Association has planned and sponsored this combined graduation at the Shrine Auditorium as the final even in the 75th anniversary year.

With the rapid growth of our city and State, the increasing proportion of adults in our society, and the expansion of the knowledge of the world about us, adult education has a challenging role in the future of the school system. The benefits of this needed and constructive work are shared by all. Over 1 million Californians who voluntarily attend adult schools annually testify

to an overwhelming belief that learning must be kept up-to-date and human minds modernized to better cope with the exacting demands of a constantly changing world. This has been the primary objective of the adult education program in Los Angeles. On the 75th anniversary, tribute must be paid to its outstanding success.

Task Forces Study Five Areas of Florida's Junior College Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Five Years of Progress in Florida," written by James L. Wattenbarger, which appeared in the October issue of the Junior College Journal. This is indeed an interesting story on the progress and growth that Florida's junior colleges have made:

TASK FORCES STUDY FIVE AREAS OF FLORIDA'S JUNIOR COLLEGE GROWTH

(By James L. Wattenbarger)

In the fall of 1962, over half of the Florida freshmen who enrolled in higher education were enrolled in Florida's public junior colleges. The percentage of freshmen enrolled in junior colleges has increased each year; the 1962 figures, however, represent the highest level to date. There were 29 junior colleges operating in 17 junior college areas located within commuting distance of 63 percent of the State's high school graduates.

Because of the great increase in junior college attendance and because of the importance these institutions hold in relationship to the total program of higher education in the State, the State junior college advisory board felt that one of its first activities should be to conduct an evaluative study to determine the progress which has been made over the 5 years since the 1957 legislature approved the expansion of the junior college program.

The board specifically set up three purposes for the evaluative study: (1) to determine the progress that has been made in Florida's junior college development; (2) to study the long-range educational planning as it may relate to the business and industrial development of Florida; (3) to develop specific plans regarding all phases of community junior college programs so that the quality and the effectiveness of the educational services of these institutions might be improved. The final report of the study is now available.

The board appointed 5 task forces which were made up of 33 members of junior college faculties. The study was also supervised by a coordinating committee whose membership was composed of representatives from the legislature, from junior college faculties, from junior college advisory boards, and from the board of control.

The time of the study extended over 18 months, at the end of which the board reviewed the recommendations of the task forces and the recommendations of the coordinating committee. From these its own recommendations were developed. These are outlined in the final report.

The study was divided into five areas: aims and purposes, students, faculty, year around operation, and legal structure. Here is a summary of the reports:

AIMS AND PURPOSES

The basic functions of Florida's junior colleges as defined in the law and as interpreted by the task force of junior college faculty members, seemed to be accepted and understood by a selected sample of citizens of the communities served by these institutions. The sample of the opinions rated the described functions in the following order of importance:

1. The college university parallel program
2. A comprehensive program of guidance
3. Technical, business, and semiprofessional programs
4. Adult noncredit courses, seminars, and institutes
5. A program of student activities
6. Occupationally oriented programs of a vocational nature.

It was interesting to note that the order in which these items were placed varied from college to college. As a matter of fact, some colleges placed technical, business, and semiprofessional programs at the top of the list, while other colleges placed importance upon these items in a different order. This fact emphasized one of the findings which the State Junior College Advisory Board listed in its report: all communities do not expect the same service from their community junior colleges. There is a degree of diversity between the communities and their expectations of their own local institutions. This diversity is reflected in the attitudes of the selected citizens in the communities as well as in the various programs that are available in the junior colleges.

In 1957, the Community College Council pointed out to the legislature that there were barriers which prevented young people from continuing beyond high school. These were described as geographic, economic, and motivational. The Community College Council suggested that community junior colleges would contribute toward overcoming these barriers. There is specific evidence that the junior colleges have done much to eliminate these barriers, and that junior colleges are extending opportunities to many citizens who otherwise would not have had an opportunity.

In a questionnaire directed to students, 48 percent of the junior college students reported that they attended a particular junior college because of its proximity to their homes; 27 percent reported that the cost was a major factor influencing their decision to enroll in a particular junior college. Over 70 percent of these young people indicated that they had achieved the highest educational level in their immediate family.

STUDENTS

Florida's community junior colleges have a varied student body. For example, the age of junior college students in Florida varies from 16 to 78. Men outnumber women students 3 to 2; the usual collegiate ratio in this regard is 3 to 1, indicating that Florida's junior colleges are being of particular service to young women who wish to continue beyond high school.

Some interesting facts about Florida junior college students' financial level were indicated by whether they work. Fifty-eight percent of Florida junior college students work while attending the junior colleges. Approximately 10 percent report that they have full-time jobs while attending junior college full time.

Another interesting point is that 73 percent of the junior college students in Florida plan to stay in Florida after they complete their education. This is a reversal of a past trend when students moved away from the State after they completed their higher education at an out-of-State institution.

The board noted that while Florida's community junior colleges served students who represent a wide range of abilities, approximately one-half of the college credit students in the State are readily admissable to the State universities under the present board of control admission policies. Over 50 percent of the junior college students scored 300 or above. In actuality, less than 10 percent of the students scored in the lowest quintile, emphasizing the fact that junior colleges probably are doing even less for this group than they are for the top group.

FACULTY

The faculty task force found out many interesting facts about Florida's junior college faculties. For example, over 12 percent of these individuals hold doctor's degrees, and an additional 77 percent hold master's degrees, leaving only 11 percent who do not hold master's or doctor's degrees. These few are teaching in vocationally oriented programs which do not require an advanced academic degree. Almost half of Florida's junior college faculty members have previous experience teaching in a 4-year college, and almost 70 percent have taught at some other level of education previous to their teaching in the junior college.

These factors, a relatively high level of academic preparation and a diversity of experience, have contributed to quality teaching. The board found that the morale of junior college faculties is high. Ninety percent reported that they were satisfied with junior college teaching as a career; only 8 percent reported that the morale of the college was below average.

The median salary for Florida's junior college faculty members for 1960–61 was only $5,800 for 10 months. This is $1,400 less than the national median for junior college faculty members for 9 months. Florida junior colleges are, in fact, going backward in this regard, since in 1957 there was an $800 differential between the National and State medians. The provision for a more nearly adequate salary is a major difficulty in continuing to employ the quality of faculty which is needed in the junior college program.

It was also interesting to note that over 40 percent of the faculty members reported that they were in favor of the principle of merit pay for teachers. However, three-fourths of the group indicated a strong opposition to the criteria currently in use.

During the 5-year period, 1957–61, Florida's junior colleges increased in number from 5 to 25; in enrollment from 5,000 to 30,000; and in size of faculty from 240 to more than 1,100. This rate of growth was unmatched elsewhere in the United States. In the fall of 1962, a continued increase was reported when 29 junior colleges enrolled 38,000 students.

The board also noted that there was a great need for year-around operation in the junior colleges, especially in relationship to the articulation with the universities. One of the strong recommendations from the study was for year-around operation of the junior colleges.

LEGAL STRUCTURE

The legal structure task force pointed up the need for continued State coordination. This becomes a more time-consuming responsibility with 29 institutions than for the 5 which were in existence in 1957. With this in mind, the junor college advisory board has recommended that the authority which had been granted to it by the 1961 legislature be described more clearly by specifying that the State junior college board (dropping the word "advisory") has this statewide coordinative responsibility acting under the control and guidance of the State Board of Education. The board specifies that the Division of Community Junior Colleges in the State Department of Education should make up the board's staff and that the entire staff of the State Department of Education should continue to provide help to the board as needed.

Upon careful analysis of the local control status and function, the board reported that no better, no more economical, no more efficient organization could be devised for Florida. Florida's junior college growth and development has resulted largely because of the extensive help and support from the local public school systems. The board, therefore, recommended that no change be made in reference to local control.

As a result of the examination of the existing problems in administrative procedures, however, a joint committee of presidents and superintendents has developed policy statements designed to improve local procedures.

The study has been an extensive one; it has provided a great deal of information regarding Florida's community junior colleges. New questions for continued investigation have appeared; more information about students who do not transfer is needed; more information about getting new programs started; more information about faculty improvement. Five Years of Progress takes its place as part of the continuing program for improving educational opportunity in Florida.

Dr. Teller, Authentic Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Cincinnati Enquirer sets forth reasons why this country should be very, very grateful for the intelligence and courage of one of its most distinguished citizens.

The article follows:

DR. TELLER, AUTHENTIC HERO

It is one of the tragic ironies of the Treaty of Moscow debate that the treaty's advocates, in their determination to demolish any vestige of opposition, have all but succeeded in making Dr. Edward Teller a national villain.

He is portrayed as a relentless foe of international communism (as if there were a crime). He is pictured as conscienceless and irresponsible.

Perhaps the anti-Teller effort reached its peak the other day when Walter Lippmann, in his syndicated column, spoke of Dr. Teller as "pseudo patriot," as though the Hungarian-born Dr. Teller's passion for freedom were a phony front for a zeal to convert the globe into a radioactive cinder.

The truth of the matter is that Dr. Teller is no villain. He is, in fact, one of America's relatively few genuine heroes. The American people—and the entire free world, for that matter—owe more to him than to almost anyone else now living.

In the days immediately following World War II, Dr. Teller was one of the relatively few men in the West untouched by the mirage of a brave, new, harmonious world. While others were suggesting that our atomic weapons be dumped into the sea, Dr. Teller was emphasizing the urgency of pressing forward to develop the hydrogen bomb.

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, whom today's Teller critics have converted into something of a national monument, was among those who were preaching that for the United States to begin the quest for the hydrogen bomb would be to commit a monstrous crime against humanity.

It is one of the most fortunate facts of history that the voice President Truman heard was Dr. Teller's, not Dr. Oppenheimer's.

Dr. Teller has spoken up on many other occasion with just as much foresight. In 1957, for example, he was warning that America had already waited too long on its missile program. A year later he was telling us that we were falling perilously behind in the training of scientists.

In 1960, he warned us against continuing the moratorium on nuclear tests. "We had hoped that by stopping nuclear tests," he wrote, "we could bring about a thaw in the cold war. Yet a few short weeks after our test moratorium started in November of 1958, Nikita Khrushchev fired his first propaganda salvo into the battle for West Berlin. Today, after nearly 2 years without testing, this particular battle is still being fought. The bitterness and peril of the cold war are, in fact, greater than ever."

Dr. Teller found no fault with the idea of a test moratorium—"if I could be reasonably sure that the Russians would not carry out very extensive systematic tests." A year after he spoke, the moratorium suddenly came to an end, and the Soviet Union began just such tests.

And now, in our passion to hear good news rather than bad, we are close to imperiling the reputation of an authentic American hero for the incredible reason that he has been right too often.

Big Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Marengo Republican News, edited and published by Hugh F. Dowell in Marengo, McHenry County, Ill., contained a significant and pungent editorial in the issue of Thursday, October 24, 1963, with reference to the pending tax reform and tax reduction bill.

This editorial poses the dangers as well as the advantages flowing from the proposed tax cut. I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of the countless thousands who daily review the proceedings of Congress:

BIG QUESTION

A tax reduction bill has passed the House. It will meet tougher going in the Senate. But the chances are that an overall Federal tax cut in the $10 billion-plus area is in sight.

Welcome as that may be, some extremely important questions are yet to be answered.

One is whether major tax reduction which is not accompanied by any reduction in Government spending will lead to more inflation. Many a recognized economist thinks it will—then the decline in the dollar's value here and abroad will more than offset any benefits.

Another is whether the spiraling costs of State and local government will eat up any dollar gains from Federal cuts, aside from the inflation problem. These costs, proportionately, have been rising faster than Federal costs in late years. If one tax collector takes from you what another tax collector leaves, you aren't gaining.

The interest of the citizen lies in how many dollars he has left after taxes, and in what those dollars will buy in the way of goods and services. That is the big unanswered question.

Star Farmer of America From Weathersfield Springs, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, New York State, the Empire State, is famed for many outstanding achievements and attributes, and not the least of these is farming. The strength and caliber of New York State agriculture was demonstrated anew recently at the national convention of the Future Farmers of America in Kansas City, Mo. On that occasion the FFA's highest honor, the designation as the Star Farmer of America, was awarded to a 21-year-old farmer from my home district of New York State.

I am referring to Robert A. Cummins of Weathersfield Springs in Wyoming County, N.Y.

We are all proud of the honors earned by this young man. He attended the Warsaw Central School, where he profited greatly from the vocational agriculture instruction there, and he has demonstrated exceptional initiative, competence, and leadership in the field of agriculture.

The Wyoming County Combination of Newspapers recently described Mr. Cummins' record of achievement and under unanimous consent, I include this newspaper article with my remarks:

WYOMING COUNTY YOUTH IS STAR AMERICAN FARMER—WEATHERSFIELD SPRINGS RESIDENT NAMED TO THIS UNIQUE HONOR AT KANSAS CITY, MO., OVER THOUSANDS OF OTHER ENTRIES

Warsaw and Wyoming County share a unique pride this year in the accomplishments of Robert A. Cummins, 21 who was named Star Farmer of America this last week at the National FFA Convention in Kansas City, Mo. This "one of a kind" award carries with it a check for $1,000 but more than this it serves as inspiration to young future farmers on the future that may lie ahead for them in the agricultural field. For leaders and officials of the American agricultural industry, it meant the future of agriculture in this country is in safe hands.

Robert to all of them, is the personal symbol of success—gained through his efforts, his knowledge from both the school Vocational Agriculture Department and good usage of Extension materials, his leadership qualities exemplified in his efforts to help others in the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Warsaw Central School Agricultural Advisory Board, and the Dairy Herd Improvement Cooperative. His ambition to be a farmer had grown since he started helping Clifford Elwell, a neighbor with his farm when Bob was still a young boy. This ambition and desire pushed him onward until today he is a full partner in the Elwell and Cummins farming enterprise in Wethersfield Springs. Using the knowledge he gained in Vocational Agriculture and with Mr. Elwell's cooperation this farm changed from potato and dairy farm, to an up-to-date dairy farm, complete with modern practices of feeding, recordkeeping, sanitation, electrification and soil conservation.

But this is not all the Bob Cummins story—the Star Farmer of America must be a good farmer, he must show leadership but

he also must have the extra quality that inspires others onward to finer achievements. We in Warsaw, can thoroughly agree with the judges that Bob possesses these qualities, too. He has never failed on any occasion to pass on to others credit in awards he has received. Without the physical opportunity afforded him by Mr. Elwell and his constant interest in Bob as a person, Bob's ambition might have failed. The constant encouragement of his Vocational Agriculture Instructor, George W. Keller of the Warsaw Central School faculty, plus the information he was able to learn and make use of from his classes, aided him in his farming vocation. In addition the help of his family, when another pair of hands was needed, afforded him more incentive.

The gold medallion signifying Star Farmer of America pinned to the FFA jacket of this young man from Warsaw is to each of us in Wyoming County an honor that we can justly be proud of—a first for a New York State Future Farmer—we, have the toast of all America, the 1963 Star Farmer of America, Robert Alton Cummins.

The 18th Anniversary of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "U.N. at 18," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N. AT 18

By the time the League of Nations was 18 years old it had, through failure to protect Ethiopia from aggression, signed its own death warrant as an effective world instrument for peace.

The United Nations was 18 years old on Thursday. It is a vital, flourishing, developing society of peoples. It has survived a divisive and bitter cold war between its two most powerful members; has steadily strengthened its capacity to keep the peace despite a paralyzing veto; and, at 18, stands on the threshold of great and growing service to mankind.

When one looks back on the turbulent infant years of the U.N., one marvels that it survived at all. Hardly had the ink dried on the charter when the great-power split between East and West effectively nullified the powers of the Security Council to enforce the peace.

Nevertheless, the U.N. managed to muster impressive world support for resistance to aggression in Korea. To fill the vacuum left by the incapacity of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat grew in influence, if not in power—thanks to which the U.N. was able to play a positive role in checking aggression against Egypt and enforcing a peaceful transition from colonialism in The Congo.

So the U.N. at 18 is very much alive. It has provided the framework for a continuing effort toward disarmament during the most dangerous arms race the world has seen. It has exerted constant pressure for the peaceful resolution of disputes and provided the means of settling some of them. It has contributed to the economic development of backward lands, advanced the solution of social problems, and raised an unfaltering voice for human rights. For an 18-year-old, the record is a creditable one indeed.

The United Nations has shortcomings, but as Ambassador Stevenson has said, they are mainly the shortcomings of the disunited nations which belong to it. The challenge for the future is to develop the U.N. as an entity with a life and will of its own. Still a society of sovereign states, it must gradually fashion, with the consent of its members, a U.N. sovereignty that will command from all the world the measure of loyalty needed to keep the peace and promote the general welfare.

The strident voice of nationalism will be raised against this, but an irrestible logic of history works n its behalf. Just as men endowed with sovereignty the nations which could do for them what city-states and principalities and confederations could not do, so they will and must, sooner or later, grant to a world organization such degree of sovereignty as is needed to banish war. The United Nations at 18 is far from qualifying for that status. But every year that it endures, every crisis that it surmounts, strengthens its capacity to take over the world's tasks as nationalism demonstrates its incapacity to discharge them.

Hon. Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to include in the RECORD a feature article which appeared in a daily paper in my congressional district, in Burlington, N.C., the Daily Times-News, concerning a former distinguished Member of this House and my predecessor of 22 years, the Honorable Carl T. Durham.

This article deals with Congressman Durham's activities in retirement. Knowing of the high regard and affection in which he was held in the House of Representatives, by Members on both sides of the aisle, I felt that his many friends and admirers would welcome news of him and his retirement activities, which include a sustained and informed interest in Government and matters of import on the national and international scene.

The feature story, dated October 14, 1963, was written by the editor of the Daily Times-News, a long-time friend and admirer of Mr. Durham and a close friend and constituent of mine, Mr. Howard White. I believe Mr. White's article captures the personality and characteristic flavor of his subject in a fashion that will be particularly appealing and interesting to his former colleagues here.

The article follows:

CARL T. DURHAM IN RETIREMENT—MUCH OF THE PAST STILL IN PROMINENCE

(By Howard White)

CHAPEL HILL.—The setting is different, but there is a striking similarity here with a former office in the New Office Building of the House of Representatives in Washington.

Until 3 years ago, Carl T. Durham held one of the prized offices in the New House Office Building. As chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee in Congress, he was given his choice of location.

It was a spacious office, and it had to be to accommodate the many files, pictures, personal possessions and mementoes which he had collected during more than 22 years in Congress as the Sixth District Representative.

Today, there is some difference here. The pictures, and many of his antiques, are on the walls and tables in a home back of his own home.

"This is where the children stay when they come home," he points out, but it is evident, too, that he spends much of his time there. He has his woodworking shop filled with tools. There is lumber which came from an old home or an old piece of furniture, and he's refinishing it to build into a cabinet or table.

In various rooms of the house are many antique furniture pieces, some of them showing that they have been untouched with moden tools and finishing liquids, and others that have been refinished. He knows the history of each piece, and tells it with a gentle reverence when it has a close family connection.

Pictures on the walls are of Presidents, Cabinet members, generals, admirals, key Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, Ambassadors, scientists, and others high in Government through the years. Almost all of them carry a personal message on them, revealing respect for the Congressman from North Carolina who moved among them for so long.

In his own home, where he and Mrs. Durham share a close association with the Chapel Hill community, there are other antiques from the Washington office, as well as novelty household items collected from trips in practically all sections of the world. The old Chinese table that graced the lobby of his office—a table estimated to be 500 years old and which he bought in Washington several years ago—is in the living room. His walking cane case is at the door; the canes unique in design and reflecting a hobby in their collection covering many years.

In the main home, too, are some precious oil paintings, pipes that show another hobby, and other items which could keep a conversation going for hours as he responds, if called upon, in telling of their background, what attracted him to them, and how he found them.

Antiques—hobbies in collecting canes, pipes, novelties—woodworking to make something worthwhile from a rare piece of lumber.

This is the setting today.

Mr. Durham shows that he is finding much happiness in retirement, away from the central point in the Nation's Government and its many responsibilities.

But the reading area of the main home shows that he hasn't left his connections with Government completely. It contains technical publications, reports on Government, background information on legislation, and originals or carbon copies of letters from key congressional leaders.

These join to show that he really hasn't left Government and that he still is maintaining close ties in an unofficial way. There are those in Government who want it that way, and he doesn't object.

Mr. Durham said 4 years ago that he wouldn't be a candidate for reelection. He had been in Congress for 22 years, and he wanted "to go home and be with my grandchildren."

At first he found an intense interest in resting by spending much time at his nearby farm. He was "away" from things.

This gradually has changed, however, to the point that he spends litle time there now. He is giving more time to traveling to various sections of the State to antique shows, attending meetings in which he is interested, and in delivering a speech occasionally.

There are numerous people who were close to him during his congressional years, too, who visit him here. His opinions on politics, and on what is good and bad for the State and Nation, still are sought, and he shows that he hasn't let current events and their evaluation escape his interests. He has a ready answer for almost any question involving Government, its present and future, and he draws on the past in giving comparisons or in providing background that may have influenced his views.

He doesn't return to Washington often, for he made up his mind upon retirement to stay away as much as possible from the active scene.

He was there during the early days of the nuclear test ban hearings. His opinions were sought—and he favored the treaty—but he didn't testify for public appraisal.

He also has been retained by the American Pharmaceutical Association as a consultant on needed legislation or proposed legislation involving the drug industry. This will consume little time, he explains, since most of his duties will be in discussion groups and in making speeches before pharmaceutical associations.

Mr. Durham was a pharmacist here before he was tapped for Congress, and he has not lost his interests in the profession.

It was his interest in science, as a part of his education, that placed him in a strong position of leadership when the atomic age blossomed for the Nation and basic organizations were established in Congress. As a member of the original Joint Atomic Energy Committee in Congress, he was then made vice chairman and later chairman. He also served as vice chairman of the House Armed Forces Committee.

When he decided on his retirement from Congress, he was urged to accept a civilian position with the atomic energy program, but he declined. He wanted to return home.

On the sidelines today, though in prominence through correspondence and other contacts that seek his opinions, Mr. Durham does not regret his decision to leave Congress.

He is enjoying his children and grandchildren as they come home from their own homes at nearby and distant points. He enjoys a more relaxed life with his friends and neighbors here, as well as in the Sixth District and other sections of the State. He enjoys his hobbies and other interests.

His health is good, except for some occasional conflict with an asthmatic condition he has had for many years, and his appearance shows that Chapel Hill and a less occupied life agree with him.

But the influences of yesteryear are not blotted from his life.

The respect in which he was held in Washington still is marked prominently in the tributes to him by inscriptions on pictures, plaques, and the many other personal possessions he has with him here.

And he, too, can still call off names and cite the family background or some other point of interest or experience of Alamance County residents today as easily as he could through the years in Congress. His district, then, was his family, and he hasn't broken his personal ties, though today he is not the slightest bit interested in votes.

My Fight for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent months regarding the necessity of passing an effective civil rights bill. This urgency has been recognized as essential for America's proof to the world that she believes in democracy.

The question of civil rights is no longer the problem of Negro people—it is the problem of all the people of the United States of America. Many fear that the United States may be finished as a great power in the eyes of the world unless she solves this problem and solves it now.

However, on November 7, 1944, when I was elected to the 79th Congress of the United States of America, I pledged myself to dedicate my efforts to the task of making democracy work. From the very beginning of my term, I introduced bills relating to underprivileged and minority groups and utilized every opportunity provided me to remind my colleagues of the importance of this issue. Now as we come to the time when Americans generally turn their hearts and minds to this all-important challenge of America, I would like to take this opportunity to review my record in this matter as evidenced by bills introduced and remarks made in the House of Representatives.

The material follows:

MY FIGHT FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

79TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Armed Forces

H.R. 2708 (Mr. POWELL): A bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of hostilities in the present war and the beginning of the demobilization.

District of Columbia

House Joint Resolution 84 (Mr. POWELL): Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

Fair employment practices

What we are interested in is a permanent FEPC—a permanent act of this Congress which will forever, in wartime and peacetime, rule out discrimination in public and private employment.

It is the cheapest and lowest form of politics to play upon any subject as delicate as is the subject of race in connection with legislation which is distinctly of a nonracial character. This bill should stand upon its own merits. It should be passed on its own merits or rejected on its own merits.

"I am opposed to this bill because it fundamentally negates the entire American tradition of the freedom of contract. I will never subscribe to the philosophy that the end justified the means. We are out to win this war, but not just another victory. We want to win a permanent, people's democratic victory. We cannot gain a moral victory with immoral means. This bill is immoral. * * * Its passage would mean that in the 'land of the free and the home of the brave' we have reverted to slavery, not just of the blacks but of the entire American working class" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 31, 1945, pp. 652–653).

Lynching and violence against the individual

H.R. 1747 (Mr. POWELL): A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching.

Poll tax and voting rights

H.R. 2183 (Mr. POWELL): A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

"This Nation will never achieve full stature until the whole South is free. The South can never start the upward march to political freedom until the chains of poll taxes are broken. * * * Two dollars is a lot of money to 6 million sharecroppers in the Southern States who average less than 6 cents per day. Two dollars is a lot of money to men who at the end of a year's work are told that they still owe the planter money" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 12, 1945, p. 5983).

Racial discrimination

H.R. 1743 (Mr. POWELL): A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Labor (antilabor legislation)

"Naturally, no American citizen wants unrest and dissension; nevertheless, this is America and among the things our men fought for were not only that a world might be made safe for democracy but also America. Democracy gives to a man the right not only to say what he wants to, when he wants, but also the right to stand together with his fellow citizens and demand the things he should have. Any attempt to take any of these things away from American workers is winning the war for Hitler."

"Generally speaking, this legislation denies the basic right of labor to strike. It will force American workers to work. It will prevent them from getting together their forces to strike if necessary.

"Put this bill in operation and American workers * * * would be chained to the wheels of economic salvery" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Dec. 11, 1945, p. 11836).

79TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

District of Columbia

H.R. 5990 (Mr. POWELL): An amendment to the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for 1947.

"*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for any agency, office, or department of the District of Columbia which segregates the citizens of the District of Columbia is employment, facilities afforded, services performed, accommodations furnished, instructions, or aid granted on account of the race, color, creed, or place of national origin of the citizens of the District of Columbia."

Public accommodations

H.R. 7220 (Mr. POWELL): A bill to assure to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States full and equal privileges with respect to public conveyances and places of public accommodations, resort, entertainment, amusement, assemblage, and institutions.

School lunch programs

An amendment to the School Lunch Act of 1946 to provide that "no funds made available * * * shall be paid or disbursed to any State of school if, in carrying out its functions under this title, it makes any discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin of children or between types of schools, or with respect to a State which maintains separate schools for minority and for majority races, it discriminates between such schools on this account.

"We should see that this bill guarantees that the health of America's poorest citizens, the people of the minorities, be protected. I am sure the author of the bill intended this; I am sure all of us who are in favor of the bill want it. It does not in any way alter the existing educational pattern of some States; it does not mean equal education, which is another subject to go into some other time. I know we do not in some States spend equal amounts of money for education, but I am sure that no one can be found to say that we would not want to spend equal amounts of money for food. We are spending vast sums through UNRRA for Europe, and we should. We can-

not do any less for our own American citizens.

"I am merely offering this amendment in the hope that we will be humane enough to see that minority races have the same opportunity in the free-lunch program as do those of the majority race.

"This is a program for the children of the United States; and the children who need it whatever race, color, or creed should have equally the rights and benefits of it" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 20, 1946, p. 1494).

Segregation in interstate transportation

H.R. 1925. (Mr. POWELL): "The Supreme Court of the United States has just handed down a decision which marks the most important step toward winning the peace since the conclusion of the war. The decision abolishes separation of races on interstate transportation. It strikes at the heart of the un-Christian, undemocratic hypocrisy of some Americans. * * * It is ridiculous that Negro veterans who have fought all over the earth for democracy, returning to the United States must ride in inferior, separate Jim Crow cars which prisoners of war from Germany are allowed first-class accommodations on all trains. It is a travesty that we can fight two wars to make a world safe for democracy in one generation and do nothing whatsoever about our own democracy here. When I say here, I mean here in the Halls of Congress. We have not passed a single win-the-peace law since the conclusion of the war. We have sat by and allowed the Supreme Court to do what we are paid to do."

80TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

District of Columbia

House Resolution 30 (Mr. POWELL): Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 805 (Mr. POWELL): To assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement.

Armed Forces

H.R. 279 (Mr. POWELL): A bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of hostilities in the present war and beginning of demobilization.

Equal employment

H.R. 3105 (Mr. POWELL): A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. Also, H.R. 806.

Interstate transportation

H.R. 280 (Mr. POWELL): A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color.

Lynching and mob violence

H.R. 278 (Mr. POWELL): A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes.

Segregation in Government cafeterias

House Resolution 143 (Mr. POWELL): Directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation with respect to (1) the exclusion of Negroes as patrons of the public portions of the restaurants and cafeterias in the U.S. Government buildings in the District of Columbia, and (2) the exclusion of Negro employees as patrons of the restaurants and cafeterias in the U.S. Government buildings in the District of Columbia.

80TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

District of Columbia

H.R. 6227 (Mr. POWELL): To provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4951 (Mr. POWELL): To assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes.

H.R. 627 (Mr. POWELL): An amendment to this bill offered by Mr. POWELL to provide a new section in the District of Columbia Charter Act entitled "Functions Relating to Civil Rights."

Armed Forces

H.R. 4952 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Poll tax

H.R. 5261 (Mr. POWELL): Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Civil rights

In a general statement about failure of the 80th Congress to act:

"Now we have come to the period of the Great Crisis. Two billion, who can either be our enemies or our friends, look askance at the kind of democracy we practice in America and are saying 'If that's what you want to force on us, no thanks.' Sure, we have the atom bomb but it cannot kill two billion people. Or maybe some of our leaders would like to try. Away with the Marshall plan, Truman doctrine, Mason and Dixon's line, the North, the South, black and white, and let the American plan have a chance. Let us practice at home what we preach abroad." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 24, 1948, p. A1871.)

Armed Forces segregation and Negro patriotism

H.R. 4952 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit racial segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"I make no excuse, when I present this amendment, for the patriotism of my people, the Negro people. Back in the beginning of this Republic, the first blood that was shed that America might be free was shed on March 5, 1773, on Boston Common by a black man, Crispus Attucks. From the days of then until the days of now Negro people have been the most loyal minority in this democracy. The Negro people will stand ready at all times to defend this Nation, but they are saying, 'We want some of the democracy here now at home that you are trying to sell abroad to other people that you ask us to go ahead and fight for. We have proven our loyalty. We are asking for democracy now'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 15, 1948, p. 4543).

81ST CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Federally financed housing

Statement in support of a civil rights amendment to the Housing Act of 1949:

"Let me speak to you very frankly as a Negro and let me tell you great northern liberals that regardless of what Uncle Tom Negroes may inform you, the Negro people would rather continue living in the slums fighting for their God-given civil rights than to have public housing and be Jim Crowed, segregated and discriminated against.

"How long will you continue to say every time a civil rights amendment is brought up, 'It will kill the bill?' How can you be so consistently dishonest by promising people civil rights at campaign time and then repeatedly defeating civil rights on this floor?" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 24, 1949, p. 12186).

Armed Forces

H.R. 23 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States.

District of Columbia

House Joint Resoluiton 43 (Mr. POWELL): Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people within the District of Columbia.

H.R. 24 (Mr. POWELL): To assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement.

Fair employment

H.R. 21 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

H.R. 4453 (Mr. POWELL): Same purpose.

Interstate transportation

H.R. 22 (Mr. POWELL): To amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color.

Lynching and mob violence

H.R. 115 (Mr. POWELL): For the better asssurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching.

Poll tax

H.R. 117 (Mr. POWELL): Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Labor relations

Statement about pending congressional action on a Labor Relations Act:

"The Taft-Hartley law was the No. 1 election issue. There were 106 Members of the House who were here in the 80th Congress who are not here now. They voted for the Taft-Hartley law. If there is not an indication of the thinking of the American people, I do not know what is. A majority of the American people sent most of us to this Congress to repudiate and wipe out the Taft-Hartley law and to give them back the kind of a law which functioned in America under the name of the Wagner Act. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Where are the 106 former Members who are not here now? They voted for the Taft-Hartley law and the electorate purged them on November 2." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 27, 1949, p. 5165.)

81ST CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Armed Forces

Statement in support of an antidiscrimination amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1948:

"Six years ago when I first came to this body I was the first to introduce legislation to abolish discrimination and segregation in the Armed Forces. At that time discrimination and segregation were rampant and rife in all branches of our military service. I have consistently kept up the fight. When this particular bill came before us in 1948 I led the movement that kept the House in session over 1 week. During the past 6 years we have seen considerable progress and today in our armed services, in the Coast Guard—which, of course, is really not a part of the Armed Forces but in time of war is a part of the Navy—and in the Navy, and to a certain extent in the Air Corps, there is but little discrimination and little segregation. In our Army, however, the President of our Nation and the committee which he appointed, * * * have come up against some stubborn opposition. The time has come now for the Congress to act.

"We are here to do that which education has not done. We are here to implement education. We are here to speed up the timetable of progress. * * * I believe the time has arrived for us to implement the educational processes which have been going along so well, because there is nothing further which can be done in the field of education. The President has spoken. The Fahy Committee report has been written and now it is up to the Congress to act.

"When we had the battle of the Belgian Bulge, Negro men who had been restricted to certain menial capacities were called up out of transportation and out of porter's work and given guns. Black and white stood together and fought for democracy. When victory came the Negroes were left in Europe and the whites paraded on Fifth Avenue. Is that democracy? Now, in peacetime, I ask that we here will do that which at least we owe to the citizens of this Nation, to our conscience and to the world, given men the right to serve side by side with their fellow citizens in all branches of our services" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 24, 1950, p. 7678).

Fair employment practices

Statement in opposition to an amendment to remove the penalty provision of the proposed FEPC legislation introduced by Mr. POWELL (H.R. 4453).

"If this amendment succeeds, then we will have nothing but a statement of policy.

"Those who are against any kind of FEPC will support the * * * amendment, then it is obvious that it is nothing but a subterfuge to kill FEPC. I can assure you that the people of this Nation who are in favor of FEPC are not in favor of the * * * substitute about which they know nothing. They are in favor of H.R. 4453 which has been before them for 6 years, since the 79th Congress" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 22, 1950, p. 2221).

Housing—discrimination in housing

Statement in support of a civil rights amendment to the Housing Act of 1950:

"It is time we took the bit in our teeth and took a positive stand on this issue. When this amendment to bar discrimination in housing came up before, it was defeated by the sponsors of housing on the ground that it would defeat final passage and that such amendments must be ruled out and brought only as civil rights bills. Since then we have voted on a civil rights bill. We know what happened, the FEPC bill was completely emasculated. We can no longer compromise. Now we must take a stand even if we run the risk of defeating final passage. There can be no compromise with wrong" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 22, 1950, p. 3877).

District of Columbia

Statement in support of an antidiscrimination amendment to the District of Columbia Appropriations Act:

"This is an amendment that I have offered for 6 years. The amendment which, if adopted will clean up our Capital.

"This amendment has been defeated each year, but I am happy to say the record shows an increasing number of yeas in support of it.

"When we consider the Capital of our Nation, and more than that, the Capital of world democracy, we should submerge these local and sectional differences and try to legislate in Washington, D.C., a capital whose atmosphere would be in keeping with the sentiments expressed yesterday on 'I Am an American Day,' a capital in keeping with the principles of government that we are trying to sell to the peoples of the world through the Marshall plan, a capital that would not be a world disgrace. All the money that we voted for today when we adopted the conference report on the Marshall plan was simply money poured down the drain, unless we prove to the peoples of the world that here in Washington, D.C., we are willing to practice what we preach. It is bad enough to practice native fascism sectionally but inexcusable to practice it right here in the Capital. The Marshall plan is nothing but lipservice to democracy unless we back it up with the practice of real democracy.

"Democracy that is dual—one way for dark and one way for white—is worse than no democracy at all, for it is a farce" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 23, 1950, p. 7543).

82D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Armed Forces

"During the 6 years that I have been in the House I have always offered an antisegregation amendment to every bill that has come before us pertaining to the Armed Forces. I rise today to state that I will not do this during the period now—the period when we are at war. The thing that is important to us now is victory, victory at all costs, except the cost of losing our civil liberties.

"During the 6 years that I have fought for the abolition of segregation in the Armed Forces, step by step we have seen great improvement; and I am happy to state today that men of my racial group are serving with great distinction and courage in the Korean conflict. Before the Korean conflict Paul Robeson said that Negro people would not take up arms against Soviet Russia. The very next morning I stood in the well of this House and said the Paul Robeson not stating the truth concerning the peoples of my group, that when the call to arms came, we would answer the same as anyone else, as they always have done. Time has proven that I was correct. * * * Segregation is vanishing in the Armed Forces.

"Before June 25, the Korean conflict, my aim was the abolition of segregation in the Armed Forces, and my record for 6 years substantiates that, but now we are at war and we must win. We must not give aid and comfort to our enemies, and on the other hand we must not lose any vestige of democracy that we have already won. In fact, we must go forward.

"Personally, during this session of Congress, I intend to press for all civil rights bills and intend to fight, by the way of amendments, for increased democracy on the home front. I intend to support during this war every single piece of legislation aimed at victory for our way of life. For the duration only, I will not offer any antisegregation bills as amendments to bills pertaining to the Military Establishment as long as progress continues and there are no violations of the order abolishing segregation.

"However, if there are any flagrant abuses, if there are any cases where segregation and discrimination do come to the forefront, then I will fight the slightest injustice, and if this injustice continues as a pattern, then I will be forced to come back to this floor and again raise the issue" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 14, 1951, p. 649).

83D CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Armed Forces

H.R. 562 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"Mr. Chairman, 9 years ago when I came to this House I introduced an amendment to abolish segregation in the Armed Forces and each time this bill or any bill concerning the Defense Department came up I did likewise. When the Korean conflict began I made a speech saying I would not introduce such an amendment during this conflict. I have introduced each year my bill which this year is H.R. 562, to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"One-half of the Negroes now serving in the U.S. Navy are serving as messmen, nothing more than manservants to the admiral clique. It is in absolute defiance of the President's orders. I am bringing this particularly to the attention of President Eisenhower. Intelligent, ambitious Negroes are boycotting the U.S. Navy because they are not interest in making the world safe for democracy by shining shoes, nor are they interested in fighting communism with frying pans. The last vestige of aristocracy in America is the gold braid of the U.S. Navy. Generals of the Army no longer have manservants. This is a modernized, 20th-century form of slavery.

"In the second place, integration is not proceeding in the Pentagon, among the civilian personnel. * * *

"One last criticism: The military does not provide any Reserve Officers' Training Corps for Negroes in three States of the Union—Georgia, Mississippi, and Arkansas. Yet from these States scores of thousands of Negroes are drafted, but none of them with any chance of being commissioned as officers. The result is that there is a shortage today or qualified Negroes for commissioned Army assignments. The military must, therefore, provide immediately ROTC training in these three States.

"Finally, I want to point out that we have segregation on the run. A new bill is coming out of my committee—the Committee on Education and Labor—next week, which will give the President of the United States complete power to integrate schools on Army posts. This bill will give this power by virtue of leaving the problem up to the base commander of each Army base."—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 2, 1953, p. 7971).

Civil rights

H.R. 2295 (Mr. POWELL): To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

District of Columbia

House Joint Resolution 71 (Mr. POWELL): Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 169 (Mr. POWELL): To assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes.

H.R. 170 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"Mr. Speaker, I am placing on the clerk's desk today discharge petitions for two of my bills, H.R. 169 and H.R. 170. * * *

"The great gap between our professions and our practices must be closed. This is the one great contributing factor to the increasing lack of respect by the American citizenry for the U.S. Congress, and of world citizenry for the U.S. leadership.

"As we plunge deeper into the second half of the 20th century, we find that not a single civil-rights bill has passed the U.S. Congress under the leadership of the Republican or of the Democratic Party, except the provision which I was successful in inserting in the Federal school-lunch program. The hour has arrived to remedy this situation for the good of our country as a whole.

"Our Nation is the least liked nation in the world today, in Anglo-Saxon Europe and amongst the 2 billion peoples of the colored races of the rest of the world. We are least liked—despite the billions that we have squandered under various aspects of the Marshall plan—for many reasons, but the major reason that I have found, as a result of many months of travel throughout the world, is that the world knows we are trying to get them to follow a kind of democracy that we are not practicing at home. * * *

"No single thing will assure the peoples of the earth that we are resuming the greatness that once was ours, in terms of the spirit and in terms of ethical values, than to let them know that Washington, D.C., is one place in America where any human being can have the right to live as a free

citizen—let them know that America is a place where each and every citizen, regardless of his color, creed, national origin or ancestry, can have the right to exercise the talents God has given him and the training that he has accomplished.

"We cannot continue to endure as a nation with loud professions and little deeds. We cannot continue as a first-class power as long as we have second-class citizens. Our foreign policy is valueless unless our domestic policy undergirds it.

"The great crusade of right against wrong demands that we do even that which individually we do not agree with, but which corporately we are certain is for the best of our land, and our world" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 23, 1953, pp. 7114–7115).

LYNCHING AND MOB VIOLENCE

H.R. 561 (Mr. POWELL): For the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes.

POLL TAX

H.R. 560 (Mr. POWELL): Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

H.R. 563 (Mr. POWELL): To amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U.S.C., title 49, sec. 3(1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE UNDER THE IMPACTED AREAS PROGRAMS PUBLIC LAW 815 AND PUBLIC LAW 874

"I am against subsidizing with Federal funds, any form of segregation. I want to point out that under Public Law 874 the sons and daughters of Negro men serving in our Armed Forces are not allowed to go to schools which Federal funds built; that only the sons and daughters of white soldiers and white officers are allowed to go.

"Under Public Law 874, there has been a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money to support separate schools on the basis of race.

"I have a number of complaints in my office from families of servicemen who are forced to send their children to separate schools outside the military posts. * * * They are serving their country in the armed services, and, as a penalty for such service, they are forced to send their children, who have never previously been exposed to segregation, to schools for colored in the communities surrounding the posts. At all of these forts, there are perfectly good schools on the posts, but they are for the white children only. * * *

"It is bad enough when segregation in schools comes about because of local boards of education, but it is infinitely worse when it is supported by action of the Congress of the United States. * * *

"The fundamental question facing Members of this body is simply this: Shall we continue to use tax money collected from the entire country to support a wasteful system of segregation in schools such as those located in Arlington County and nearby Maryland? * * *

"I believe that we should do everything possible to help out the local communities of this country so that the services provided for U.S. citizens will be uniformly high in all parts of the country, but I strongly oppose spending New York, Illinois, or New Jersey tax money to support segregated schools in Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina, or anywhere else.

"I am against squandering Federal millions to maintain prejudice and to subsidize segregation" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 18, 1953, p. 1212).

National Housing Act

Statement in support of nonrestriction by race, creed, color, or national origin.

"Communism wins only when democracy fails, and communism can win by default regardless of whether we are a great colossus with one foot in Oak Ridge and the other in Fort Knox. The idea is fallacious that communism can be destroyed by gold and by atomic bombs; it can only be destroyed by the greater idea of democracy. Democracy is the finest idea man has ever dreamed of, and it is being defeated by the worst idea man ever concocted. Democracy is being defeated by communism globally today because of our failure to put it into practice.

"'Piecemeal legislation,' you call it. All legislation is piecemeal. 'Education,' you say, will solve the problem. How long? The world tempo has been so increased that there is no longer time for education to solve our problems. We do not know what holocaust will be visited upon us within the next 30 days or the next year. We have made tremendous technical progress in America, but in terms of moral and ethical progress there is a distinct lag. Education cannot make up this lag; it is up to us, the elected Members of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, by legislation at every opportunity we have for the good of our Nation and our world that we hold up as a shining symbol of ethical and moral progress; that we let the 2 billion colored peoples of the earth know that we are not trying to sell a kind of democracy to the rest of the world that we are refusing to practice here.

"Let us have a bipartisan foreign policy backed up by a bipartisan democracy policy. You cannot have a successful bipartisan foreign policy with a bipartisan domestic Jim Crow policy" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 25, 1953, p. 1429).

83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Interstate transportation

H.R. 7324 (Mr. POWELL): Providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation.

White House Conference on Education

Statement on the value of the proposed conference and acknowledging the Supreme Court decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in public school education.

"This bill is long overdue. After many trips to various portions of the earth on committee business, I have come back to the Committee on Education and Labor and repeatedly asked that we have some type of modus operandi to arrive at a Federal concept of education, an American concept of education and the proper relationships between State educational bodies and our Federal Government.

"We have floundered through these years without any clearly defined American philosophy of education. That is why we have the conflicts, the tensions, and the irritations that constantly crop up in our land.

"This White House Conference may easily be the first step toward bringing about a harmonious working together of the 48 States, retaining their individual philosophies of education, but working together on a Federal basis. This is the most serious problem facing our Nation. It demands our best. This bill has become much more important over the weekend because of the decision of our Supreme Court. Despite the fact that there are many Members of this body whom I personally respect, you cannot call the decision of the Supreme Court unconstitutional.

"We have it. It is a fact. We must go on from here now and see what can be done to make this great shining hour of democracy a more brilliant, a more luminous hour for all our people. We should not here in this body, especially, take this shining hour of democracy and allow it to be tarnished by the oratory of a few who are still living in the 19th century * * *.

"So let us go on from here today to greater heights. Let this great body, of which I am proud to be a Member, lift up the arms of our Government, whether it be the judicial, the executive, or the legislative arm" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1954, p. 6859).

84TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Employment

H.R. 690 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

Interstate transportation

H.R. 691 (Mr. POWELL): Providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation.

Antisegregation Day

H.R. 3016 (Mr. POWELL): Making May 17 in each year a legal holiday to be known as Antisegregation Day.

Civil rights

H.R. 389 (Mr. POWELL): To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

"Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress is a 19th century body in a 20th century world. In the field of civil rights we are still conducting ourselves along the pattern of yesterday's world. Tremendous changes are taking place in our country eradicating the concept of second-class citizenship. Yet the U.S. Congress has done absolutely nothing in this sphere. We are behind the times. We are a legislative anachronism. In an age of atomic energy, our dynamic is no more powerful than a watermill.

"For 10 years, my colleagues and I have introduced civil rights amendment after amendment, civil rights bill after bill, pleading, praying that you good ladies and gentlemen would give to this body the glory of dynamic leadership that it should have. But you failed and history has recorded it.

"I am proud to be a Member of the Congress of the United States. I am proud to be a Member of the legislative branch of the U.S. Government and I know you are too. But I beseech you to transform this emotion of pride into the deed of leadership. This is an hour for boldness. This is an hour when a world waits breathlessly, expectantly, almost hungrily, for this Congress, the 84th Congress, through legislation to give some semblance of democracy in action. Our President and our Supreme Court cannot be all this by themselves and, furthermore, we should not expect it. We are derelict in our duty if we continue to plow looking backward. No man is fit for this new world, for this new kingdom of God on earth, who plows looking forward.

"I would like to serve notice that some of us intend after a reasonable time of waiting for our committees and our committee chairmen to act to use every parliamentary device we can to bring before this Congress civil rights bills of worth and value." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 2, 1955, p. 1084–1085).

District of Columbia

House Joint Resolution 22 (Mr. POWELL): Proposing an amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to provide by legislation for representation in the Congress of, and for granting the right to vote for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors to, the people of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 3457 (Mr. POWELL): To eliminate certain practices involving racial or religious discrimination in the District of Columbia.

Poll tax

H.R. 1600 (Mr. POWELL): Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Scholarship assistance to capable students

H.R. 2179 (Mr. POWELL): To increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system

of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects, to be administered by the Commissioner of Education.

H.R. 6176 (Mr. POWELL): To increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects to be administered by the Commissioner of Education.

84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Federal assistance for school construction

H.R. 7535 (Mr. POWELL): An amendment that "school facilities of the States are open to all children without regard to race, in conformity with the requirements of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions: except that if a State plan does not so provide, it shall not prevent payment of funds authorized under this act to such State for use in counties or other political subdivisions within the States that are operating their schools in conformity with the said Supreme Court decisions."

"The May 17, 1954, decision of the U.S. Supreme Court declared that segregation in public education was unconstitutional. This was followed by the May 31 order that all provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting segregation in public education must yield to the principle announced in the 1954 decision. In spite of this clear pronouncement by the Court, the Federal agencies still refuse to withhold funds which certain defiant States are using to extend segregation in the public schools * * *

"In other words, the Supreme Court drew up a great guidepost with a sign pointing 'This way to democracy through integration.' Failure of the Congress to include my amendment will place this body in the position of ignoring the clear requirements of the U.S. Constitution * * *

"One of the most ridiculous arguments made by many of my colleagues is that my amendments will hurt the Negro people. When I ask how do they know, they tell me, 'Well, we know the Negro.' This is as stupid as for me to stand up before an audience of Irishmen on St. Patrick's Day and tell them that I know the Irish, or to tell a group of Italians of the Order of Columbus that I know Italians. These men who say they know the Negro do not even know the white man. During the very week that the State of Virginia by a vote of 2 to 1 thrust education back into the Dark Ages and voted to scrap public education, the school board of Arlington, Va., voted that they would integrate.

"Negro people have waited many, many years for this hour of democracy to come and they are willing to wait a few more years rather than see a bill passed which will appropriate Federal funds to build a dual system of Jim Crow schools in defiance of the law" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 24, 1956, p. 1191, 119293).

"We have before us a series of amendments that by no stretch of the imagination can be called extremism, or punitive, but amendments that are aimed at helping the States and school districts to integrate.

"I am sure that we all agree that whenever there is a constitutional Executive order, judicial decision, or legislative action, immediately it is encumbent upon all the other branches of the Government to yield to whatever that decision, order, or law may be. We implemented the Supreme Court decision for 57 years in Plessy against Ferguson, which was the doctrine of separate but equal. We in this House and in the other body passed amendments to the draft bill, the Hill-Burton Act, the Federal school lunch program, implementing the Supreme Court decisions. Now we come to a new decision, a decision of integration, and this is the first test whether we are going to abide by the Supreme Court decision as a legislative body.

"Any vote against the Powell amendment is a vote in favor of segregation. * * *

"Now, I would just like to close with this one thought. In the last line of Elizabeth Browning's "Sonnets From the Portuguese," there is this magnificent thought: 'God's realities always exceed man's fondest dreams'. We have before us the American dream. It is a dream of one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all, and I believe that you should vote according to that American dream" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 3, 1956, p. 11757).

Civil rights

"Today marks the first anniversary of the African-Asian Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia. I was privileged to be present. I rise today to commemorate that occasion by addressing myself to the problem of how we can win the uncommitted nations.

"The Asian-African Conference was a great parliament of the world's religions. The concept of brotherhood was stressed repeatedly. One speaker said: 'If our religion, whatever it may be, does not allow us to get along with our brothers, regardless of what his religion may be, then our religion cannot be of much value.'

"We are a privileged people, privileged to live at one of the great crossroads that every now and then the force of history thrusts upon an unwilling world. Which way we should take depends entirely upon the individual choices made by American people up and down the main streets of our villages and hamlets and in our towns and cities. Capitol Hill cannot do it for us. The Supreme Court cannot be our personal witness. Individual, personal, moral witness must be made. The faith of our forefathers is not enough but the ferment of our forefathers is a deadly necessity." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 18, 1956, p. 6594, 6595).

"The world is moving with a startling rapidity that transcends not only the visual but even the imaginative. With our Yankee courage, our Madison Avenue know-how, our Christian heritage and the bulwark of the Bill of Rights, in back of us, using our 25 million colored citizens as a spearhead, we can launch a drive for peace and for full equality now in the Far East. Only through such a bold maneuver can we win. History will pass us by if we do not" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 19, 1956, p. 6598).

85TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Civil rights

H.R. 887 (Mr. POWELL): To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

"Strip the opposition to this bill of all hypocrisy, dishonesty, and subterfuges and only one reason stands out why anyone is opposed to this bill and that is because a minority in this country has made up its mind that under no circumstances is it going to allow colored citizens the right to vote—even in a Federal election. Clothing their arguments in sheep's garments of high-sounding phrases, nevertheless, the heart of their approach is one of hypocrisy and dishonesty. The tragedy is that so many Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle and from areas outside of the southern section, are susceptible to the arguments being presented" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1957, pp. 9192–9193).

School construction

H.R. 1213 (Mr. POWELL): To authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

Scholarship assistance to capable students

H.R. 5030 (Mr. POWELL): To increase the supply of scientific and technical manpower in the United States by providing a system of scholarships for college and graduate level study of scientific subjects, to be administered by the Commissioner of Education.

Supreme Court decision on public school segregation

Statement in observance of the third anniversary of the decision.

"On this third anniversary we are aware, of course, that the Supreme Court's words have yet to bear tangible fruit in some parts of our Nation. We are aware of bitterness and violence and of unconcealed defiance of the supreme law of the land. We cannot, and must not, ignore these manifestations of resistance, for the denial of his rights to even one of our citizens must be of concern to all. But neither, Mr. Speaker, should we be plunged into despair. Whatever the roadblocks, there can be no question in which direction we are moving. We are moving ahead.

"May 17, 1954, was truly a landmark in the history of human freedom. Let us salute this anniversary with pride and with renewed determination that its promise will surely be realized in our own land and throughout the world," (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 16, 1957, p. 7117).

85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

National Defense Education Act

Antidiscrimination amendments to title proposals considered under the act: title II for scholarships, title III on loans to students and title VI on fellowships for graduate education.

"I feel that the philosophy underlying this excellent piece of legislation is that we are out to aid the individual. The school construction bill we had under consideration before was to aid the States. Therefore I have designed amendments to apply at the precise moment that an individual comes forward to seek a scholarship, to ask for a loan, or to look for a graduate fellowship. At that moment the individual comes forward, then there shall not be any discrimination based upon race or color. That would include about 25 million of our American citizens, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans, American Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes.

"There would not be any discrimination based upon religion, which would include mainly our Roman Catholic brethren and Jewish brethren.

"There would not be any discrimination based upon national origin, which would include those born abroad. Two of the outstanding contributors to our nuclear physics program today are in this category. One is of Italian birth and the other of German birth.

"Lastly, there would be no discrimination based upon sex," (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 8, 1958, p. 16723).

Blind individuals

H.R. 9702 (Mr. POWELL): To protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

Civil Rights

H.R. 12536 (Mr. POWELL): To secure, protect, and strengthen the civil rights accruing to individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

H.R. 10296 (Mr. POWELL): To amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Fair employment

H.R. 9704 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

Housing

H.R. 12538 (Mr. POWELL): To provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.

Interstate transportation

H.R. 12535 (Mr. POWELL): Providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith.

Lynching and mob violence

H.R. 9701 (Mr. POWELL): For the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes.

Poll tax

H.R. 9707 (Mr. POWELL): Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

National Guard

H.R. 9705 (Mr. POWELL): To eliminate discrimination and segregation in the National Guard and Air National Guard, and to prohibit the use of the National Guard and the Air National Guard to aid or abet the violation of Federal law.

86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Economic and social development in less developed countries

H.R. 6693 (Mr. POWELL): To promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger, and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies.

Armed Forces

H.R. 5277.

"This continuous peacetime draft is a new thing in our country and one that requires a hard look at the conditions which surround our Armed Forces.

"The armed personnel in the 13 Southern States amounted to more than 43 percent of the total. Yet we know that areas outside those 13 States subject Negroes to discrimination. Also we know that colored people other than Negroes are discriminated against in some parts of this country. So I would estimate conservatively that 50 percent of the armed personnel of our Government in this country is being trained in a discriminatory environment.

"I say that the Federal Government has no right to subject citizens to such discrimination. * * *

"I hold it to be an essential duty of this Government to prevent discrimination against members of the Armed Forces. Of course, this House knows that I do not favor discrimination anywhere, but at the very least we should protect our soldiers and sailors against it. * * *

"The ignoble practice of segregation has no legitimate place in a democracy. If it still persists in some area of this country, at least those who have been raised in the freer areas should not be subjected to it by the Federal Government.

"One-half of our armed personnel is now being unfairly punished by the Federal Government because of the conditions of segregation which they must endure as a part of their military service.

"This is unfair, unpatriotic, and unwise. I call upon my colleagues from all parts of the country to support H.R. 5277 so that we may put an end to such an abuse of our young citizens.

"If they are trained in a free environment they will know better the importance of defending freedom" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 24, 1959, p. 5111-2).

The blind

H.R. 1878 (Mr. POWELL): To protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

Civil rights

H.R. 619 (Mr. POWELL): To secure, protect, and strengthen the civil rights accruing to individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

H.R. 618 (Mr. POWELL).

"The Committee on Education and Labor yesterday tentatively approved a bill-of-rights amendment to the new labor-management bill. It is unconscionable to think that any bill of rights can exist without there being included a guarantee of civil rights. There are 2,500,000 white workers in an undemocratic ghetto from which are excluded all Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, and, in some instances, Catholics. Anyone who votes for a labor-management bill that includes a bill of rights without any rights of admission guaranteed for all Americans is flirting with the label of hypocrisy. Therefore, I am offering such an amendment to remedy this anti-American situation." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 7, 1959, p. 13594).

Equal protection of the laws

H.R. 913 (Mr. POWELL): To effectuate and enforce the constitutional right to the equal protection of the laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 617 (Mr. POWELL): To assure to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States full and equal privileges with respect to public conveyances and places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, amusement, assemblage, and institutions.

National Guard

H.R. 910 (Mr. POWELL): To eliminate discrimination and segregation in the National Guard and Air National Guard, and to prohibit the use of the National Guard and the Air National Guard to aid or abet the violation of Federal law

Fair employment

H.R. 908 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

Voter Registration Commission

H.R. 7957 (Mr. POWELL): To provide for the establishment of a Federal Voter Registration Commission to provide, in certain instances, for the registration of citizens of the United States for the purpose of voting in Federal and State elections, and for other purposes.

Housing

H.R. 1053.

"Today the Civil Rights Commission started hearings in New York City, and the good people of Virginia have started desegregation. This, therefore, should be a day for sober reflection. Are we not witnessing increasing heroic honesty in the South and increasing cowardly hypocrisy in the North?

"May I say that the Powell type of amendment is just as applicable to the denial of Federal funds in New York City because of segregation there as it is in any other area in defiance of the Supreme Court. Also, I concur with the president of Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh, a member of the Civil Rights Commission, that in the North some areas practice discrimination in housing more than many areas in the South. Legislation to remedy this has been introduced by me and the number of the bill is H.R. 1053. It will prohibit discrimination prior to construction and during the lifetime of publicly financed housing by putting guarantees in the application for FHA insured mortgages" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 2, 1959, p. 1592).

Lynching and mob violence

H.R. 914 (Mr. POWELL): For the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes.

Poll tax

H.R. 912 (Mr. POWELL): Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Public schools and desegregation

H.R. 7958: (Mr. POWELL): Authorizing appropriations for the operation of public schools in the several States which would otherwise be closed by State action intended to prevent compliance with certain orders of courts of the United States.

School construction

H.R. 909 (Mr. POWELL): To authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

School construction

Amendment providing an antidiscrimination clause in the proposed school construction bill H.R. 10128:

"The school facilities constructed with the assistance of payment received under this act shall be available to students without regard to race, creed, color, national origin, or religion, in accordance with the Supreme Court."

"There are those who say this amendment will kill the bill.

"Who is going to vote against the bill if the Powell amendment is in there? Those who are opposed to Federal aid to education will. If they are in the majority we are going to defeat the bill anyway. Many sountherners have told me they do not want the bill in any form.

"In the next place there are those who say my amendment is hurting the educational future of little Negro children. I would like to say that on every visit I have made to the South, and I have made many in recent months, every group I have talked to, every group of students, for instance, I talked to, has unanimously without dissent been in favor of this amendment. Every single church organization, including the National Baptist Churches, the Council of Bishops and the African Methodist Church are in favor of this amendment. The delegations to the NAACP national convention coming from the Southern States voted unanimously last year without any dissent in favor of this amendment.

"Therefore * * * the only recourse we have to impose these conditions or to guarantee that the Supreme Court decision is followed is by adopting this amendment. A vote against this amendment is a vote against the Supreme Court. A vote against this amendment is a vote against civil rights.

"I ask in conclusion that we adopt this amendment and get on to the business of having education in compliance with the law of the land which is 6 years old already" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1960, p. 11296).

Fair employment

H.R. 13023 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

African Freedom Day

House Resolution 63 (Mr. POWELL): Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the struggle of the African peoples for independence and nationhood, and recognizing April 15, 1959, as "African Freedom Day."

Ambassadors and Foreign Ministers

H.R. 6726 (Mr. POWELL): Make it a crime punishable by a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years, or both to discriminate against Ambassadors, public ministers and their servants.

Apprenticeship program

H.R. 8219 (Mr. POWELL): Withdraws Federal support and approval from apprenticeship programs which deny individuals an equal opportunity to participate on account of race, color, or creed.

Civil rights

H.R. 1231 (Mr. POWELL): Authorizes the Attorney General to institute proceedings for preventive relief, including an application for an injunction, (1) upon the written complaint or information on oath of any person threatened with loss of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, creed, or national origin, who is unable to proceed in his own behalf, against any person or persons acting or conspiring to deprive him of the right to equal protection, and (2) upon the written request of State authorities, against two or more persons conspiring to hinder such State authorities from securing to any person equal protection of the laws.

Gives the district courts jurisdiction over such proceeding, regardless of the non-exhaustion of other remedies, and makes the United States liable for costs the same as a private person. Provides that existing rights or remedies are not impaired [amending 71 Stat. 637].

H.R. 540 (Mr. POWELL): Omnibus Human Rights Act—Makes the Civil Rights Commission permanent. Directs the Attorney General to increase the personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or Justice Department used to investigate civil rights cases.

Establishes a congressional Joint Committee on Civil Rights to make a continuing study of such matters.

Imposes a fine and/or imprisonment for any person to interfere with the exercise or enjoyment of another's civil rights. Increases the penalty to a maximum $10,000 and 20 years' imprisonment if death or maiming is the result of such wrongful conduct.

Enumerates rights, privileges (including right to vote), and due process protected. Penalizes an attempt to entice another into slavery or an attempt to sell another into involuntary servitude.

Prohibits discrimination in interstate transportation and punishes violators hereof.

Federal Equality of Opportunity Employment Act—Declares the right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry to be a civil right. Declares it to be an unlawful employment practice for either an employer, or a labor organization to discriminate against an individual because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Establisnes a seven-member Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, to investigate, hold hearings, and issue orders for the prevention of unlawful employment practices. Provides that the Commission shall have the power to petition any U.S. court of appeals or district court for the enforcement of any order and grants the court jurisdiction to proceed in a determination of the case.

Federal Antilynching Act—Declares the right to be free from lynching to be a right of all citizens. Imposes a fine and/or imprisonment on any person who is a member of a lynch mob or who instigates or commits a lynching where death, maiming, or other serious physical or mental injury or damage to property results and on governmental officers of employees who neglect their duty in knowingly failing to prevent or punish lynching. Authorizes civil actions for injury or death as a result of a lynching.

Federal Anti-Poll-Tax Act: Makes it unlawful for any person to levy, collect, or require the payment of a poll tax or otherwise interfere with any person's right to vote in any national election.

Death penalty

House Joint Resolution 64 (Mr. POWELL): Constitutional amendment—Proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the death penalty under the laws of the United States, any State, or any other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Education

H.R. 264 (Mr. POWELL): Authorizes funds for the operation of schools closed as a result of State action to prevent local compliance with desegregation court orders.

Employment

H.R. 262 (Mr. POWELL): Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act—Makes it an unlawful employment practice (1) for an employer to discriminate in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, or to obtain assistance in hiring from sources discriminating for such reasons; (2) for an employment agency to fail or refuse to properly classify or refer for employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, or to force an employer to discriminate against an individual.

Establishes a seven-member Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate (1) to prevent any unlawful employment practice; (2) to investigate charges of unlawful employment practices and eliminate same, and (3) to restrain unlawful employment practices and take affirmative action to redress persons aggrieved thereby. Prohibits Commission members filing charges from participating in the hearing or trial. Provides procedure for judicial review and court enforcement of Commission orders.

Empowers the President to effectuate the purposes of this act with regard to Government employment.

Equal protection of the laws

H.R. 547 (Mr. POWELL): Civil Rights Act—Title I. Declares it to be the intention of Congress that no one should be deprived the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Constitution because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title II: Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to assist States and local governments in eliminating segregation in public schools. Requires the Secretary to make reports to Congress on the progress made.

Provides that the Secretary shall employ specialists to assist in plans for eliminating segregation in public education. Permits reimbursement to local officials and representatives carrying out authorized functions of the Secretary for travel expenses and subsistence.

Authorizes $2,500,000 per year for 5 years for carrying out the purposes of title II.

Title III: Authorizes grants to State and local governments to assist in meeting the cost of additional educational measures undertaken in an effort to eliminate segregation in public schools.

Title IV: Provides that the Secretary shall prepare tentative plans for the elimination of segregation in public education and forward such plans to the State Governor or appropriate official for concurrence.

Provides that where State and local officials do not agree to the plans submitted hearings are to be held after which the Secretary shall prepare and issue an approved plan for the elimination of segregation.

Title V: Authorizes the Attorney General to institute for or in the name of the United States proceeding for preventive relief against State officials to enforce compliance with the approved plans for integration.

Title VI: Authorizes the Attorney General to institute for or in the name of the United States proceeding for relief against any individual who deprives or threatens to deprive persons of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII: Provides that the district courts shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted hereunder. Provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to impair existing legal rights or remedies already available.

Fair labor standards

H.R. 6887 (Mr. POWELL): Extends protection of Fair Labor Standards Act to employees of large hotels, motels, restaurants and laundries with gross sales of $1 million annually.

Great white fleet

House Congressional Resolution 66 (Mr. POWELL): Expresses the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy.

Housing

H.R. 544 (Mr. POWELL): Fair Housing Practices Act—provides that Federal funds shall not be used for financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.

Immigration

H.R. 543 (Mr. POWELL): Grants natives of British Guiana, British Honduras, the British Virgin Islands, and the West Indies Federation unlimited access to the immigration quota for Great Britain.

H.R. 549 (Mr. POWELL): Provides that individuals born in British Guiana, British Honduras, the British Virgin Islands, or the West Indies Federation shall be nonquota immigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act [amending U.S.C. 8:1101 (a) (27) (c)].

Impacted areas assistance and National Defense Education Act

H.R. 9000 (Mr. POWELL): Extends the program of aid for schools in areas affected by Federal activities for 2 years. Extends the National Defense Education Act for 2 years.

"In summary, this package carries a total for education in the United States for the next 2 years of approximately $902,992,000.

"I am extremely sorry that the Powell amendment banning funds to schools in defiance of the Supreme Court decision is not a part of the impacted areas portion of this legislation. Federal money is being spent for totally Federal projects in areas that have become impacted because of Federal work, most of them due to defense installations. It is shocking and totally inexcusable to have the children segregated in these schools. At the proper time next year, I shall press for action. I also believe that this entire phase should be carefully reexamined by my committee during the forthcoming year, because it is in danger of becoming an education pork barrel rather than really reaching the children who need this assistance; namely, school construction, maintenance, and teachers' salaries.

"I regret, too, that the forgiveness clause, as written, is a part of the National Defense Education Act because I, for one, would like to see this forgiveness clause completely changed, so that all people who obtain loans under this act and who teach for 5 years in public or private school shall be forgiven their loan. This would encourage more teachers to go into private and public teaching. The way it is now constituted, it waives 50 percent of the loan for those who go into public school teaching only.

Also, I believe that the disclaimer affidavit should be abolished; and here, the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] offered in committee an amendment which will take care of this problem without forcing our educators to be placed in an untenable position.

"I promise that during the coming year proper study and consideration will be given to both of these important portions of NDEA" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 6, 1961, pp. 17095–96).

Interstate transportation

H.R. 1229 (Mr. POWELL): Provides that all persons shall be entitled to equal privileges of any public conveyance operated by a common carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin. Subjects any person who denies or attempts to deny to any person such privileges to a fine of $1,000 for each offense. Permits action for damages or other relief in a U.S. district court without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy.

Juvenile delinquency

"I am positive there is no one in the United States today who would dispute that juvenile delinquency is perhaps the most tragic evidence of social disorder we can imagine. It is evidence that we have not given our children the stable, sensible, and meaningful society we like to think we have. For the past 15 years we have been following a pace of change accelerated every day by the advance of science and technology. We have found little room in our busy lives for cushioning the impact of change on our young. We have abandoned them to hopelessness, cynicism, and desperation, and each year we reap larger and larger harvests of mental illness, delinquency, and crime.

"It is time, indeed, we stopped applying a bandage here and there according to what part of the body politic breaks out next. It is time, instead, to take the medicine of determination that is all we really need to improve the mental and moral health of our children.

"Juvenile delinquency, of course, has its ramifications in inadequate housing, inadequate job opportunities, lack of education, and discrimination in many areas. So does any social evil impinge one upon the other. The bill before you takes no wishful look at what better housing in a better neighborhood could do, or what an adequate educational system might accomplish. The bill has framed a proposal within the reference of where we are today, not where we might be—if * * * I suggest that when we go further into this matter, we do so with our hearts; that not only our minds be attuned to this end and that we view it with not only the assent of our minds but the consent of our hearts." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 30, 1961, pp. 16459–60).

Lynching and mob violence

H.R. 546 (Mr. POWELL): Federal Anti-Lynching Act.—Defines lynching as the assemblage of two or more persons which shall, without authority of law, (1) commit violence upon the person of any citizen because of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, language, or religion, or (2) exercise by physical violence any power of correction over any person in the custody of a peace officer or charged with any criminal offense for the purpose of preventing the trial or punishment not authorized by law. Sets the maximum penalty for lynching at $10,000 fine and/or 20 years imprisonment. A State or local officer failing through neglect to prevent a lynching or to apprehend or prosecute any member of a lynching mob, shall be punished by a $5,000 fine and/or 5 years imprisonment. Any governmental subdivision failing through neglect to prevent a lynching or an abduction followed elsewhere by a lynching shall be liable for $2,000 to $10,000 in damages recoverable in a civil action. The interstate transportation of persons with a view to lynching is made subject to the penalties provided in the Lindbergh kidnapping law (death or life imprisonment).

Manpower resources

H.R. 7396 (Mr. POWELL): Provides for a program of occupational training and retraining of the Nation's labor force. Directs the Department of Labor to make studies and then develop training and skill development, programs utilizing the resources of industry, labor, educational institutions and State and local agencies. Grants weekly retraining allowances equal to unemployment compensation and relocation allowances to persons offered jobs in other areas. Provides for on- and off-the-job training and vocational training for the unemployed.

National Guard

H.R. 263 (Mr. POWELL): Prohibits a State National Guard from receiving Federal benefits if the State practices discrimination and segregation based on race, creed, or color in determining assignments or duties of members.

Prohibits units or members of the National Guard from being used to aid or abet the violation of any Federal law [amending U.S.C. 32: 108].

Narcotics

H.R. 9153 (Mr. POWELL): Authorizes the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid to States and political subdivisions thereof in order to assist in solving their narcotic drug problems. Provides special grants for posthospital addict care programs. Directs the Surgeon General to prescribe general standards for a program of posthospital care, treatment, and rehabilitation for narcotic addicts.

Poll tax

H.R. 1230 (Mr. POWELL): Federal anti-poll tax. Makes it unlawful for any State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting at a Federal election.

Public conveyance

H.R. 541 (Mr. POWELL): Provides both civil and criminal penalties for any person who discriminated against another person because of his race, color, creed, or national origin with respect to accommodation in, any public conveyance or place of public accommodation.

Servicemen

H.R. 548 (Mr. POWELL): Makes it a crime punishable by a fine of $1,000 and/or 1-year imprisonment to discriminate against members of the Armed Forces because of race, color, or creed [adding U.S.C. 18: 245].

Student aid

H.R. 4930 (Mr. POWELL): Provides for low-interest loans for medical and dental students under the National Defense Education Act. Requires such loans to be evidenced by a rate and to bear interest of 3 percent beginning 1 year after the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course.

Provides for grants to medical and dental schools of $1,000 per year for each student at the school receiving a loan hereunder.

H.R. 6762 (Mr. POWELL): Authorizes the Commissioner of Education to award 3,000 undergraduate scholarships in American institutions of higher education to certain students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Directs the Commissioner to allocate such scholarships on the basis of the higher educational needs of each nation in the aforementioned areas.

"This simple and direct legislative proposal can do much to meet some of the greatest challenges and opportunities for American educational leadership that we have yet faced in our time. This scholarship program for African, Asian, and Latin American students can provide a new beginning—and its effect can become truly massive—in the development of wise leaders and educated citizens among all peoples. * * *

"We must provide now the educational sustenance that is demanded in the name of humanity and of our common cause. The 'revolution of rising expectations' is going on all around us, and we can help make it a constructive transformation for good or we can ignore it—and someone else will help in their own way and for their own ends. What is needed now is education—that 'critical mass' of education that will permit the peoples of the less-developed areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to provide their own self-renewing leadership and education for the future. * * *

"In meeting the challenge of education for the young people and adults of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, I am convinced that very helpful insights are to be had from the experience of our own areas of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as well as from the evolving West Indies Federation. These can enhance our scholarship program for the less-developed and newly emerging nations, on the one hand, as living demonstrations of bootstrap economic development and, on the other, of intercultural communication and understanding and of the development of responsible governmental leadership. * * *

"Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would close with the observation that this Nation which values its freedom so highly that it can give away well over $23 billion in foreign military aid grants in the last decade alone, can surely find it possible to support this modest educational program that, at a cost of about $100 million a year, may be even more for freedom and progress everywhere. And let us all remember that independence is not an end in itself, but only a beginning. The revolution of freedom is always unfinished business" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 2, 1961, p. 6577–6578).

Territories of the United States

Guam—H.R. 5716 (Mr. POWELL): Provides for the election by the people of the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands of a Deputy to the House of Representatives.

Virgin Islands—H.R. 545 (Mr. POWELL): Provides that the people of the Virgin Islands be represented by a Delegate in the House of Representatives.

Virgin Islands—H.R. 5716.

Welfare and pension plans

H.R. 7234 (Mr. POWELL): Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments—Amends the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement. Makes bribery, embezzlement or false statements concerning employee benefit plans a Federal crime.

87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Equal pay for women

H.R. 11677 (Mr. POWELL): To prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination.

Manpower resources and capable students

H.R. 8399 (Mr. POWELL): Relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

"In setting H.R. 8399 No. 1 on his priority list for domestic legislation, the President pointed out that this country cannot 'countenance the suffering, frustration, and injustice of unemployment, or let the vast potential of the world's leading economy run to waste in idle manpower, silent machinery, and empty plants.' * * *

"Despite recent indications of some recovery from the recession and a decrease in the unemployment rate, there still remains large numbers of workers who have exhausted, even extended, unemployment insurance benefits—those whose skills have

become obsolete; the unskilled, especially those without high school education; older workers; minority groups; and the youth. * * *

"The fact that we are in the midst of the cold war only increases the need for the programs this bill will provide. The present struggle requires the maximum use of all our manpower, with no waste of the skills and ability to produce that are now available in the ranks of our long-term unemployed, and which can be fully exploited and utilized when these unemployed are trained for the skills needed today and tomorrow" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1962, pp. 2734–2735).

Negro history

House Joint Resolution 635 (Mr. POWELL): To authorize the President to proclaim a week in 1963 as National Negro History Week.

Public health service facilities

H.R. 10217 (Mr. POWELL): Repeals the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act which permits Federal assistance for hospitals which discriminate against persons on the basis of race, creed or color [repealing U.S.C. 42:291 e(f)].

Student aid

H.R. 9743 (Mr. POWELL): Authorizes the appropriation of $130 million for fiscal 1963 and $145 million for fiscal 1964 for making student loans under the National Defense Education Act. Repeals the limitation relative to the maximum amount of Federal capital contribution to any institution. Increases the number and amount of loans to medical and dental students and lengthens the period of repayment for such loans. Provides loans for interns.

Territories of the United States

Puerto Rico—House Joint Resolution 626 (Mr. POWELL): Constitutional amendment—proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Virgin Islands—H.R. 11709 (Mr. POWELL): Amends the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands concerning the election of senators to the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

Welfare and pension plans

H.R. 8723. "This Congress must assure the millions of men and women who are the beneficiaries of these plans, and their families, that their money is well handled and their promised benefits properly safeguarded" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 6, 1962, p. 1557).

The Moon Race: Go or Not, the Cost Will Be About the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article entitled "The Moon Race" by Howard Simons which appeared in the October 29 issue of the Washington Post.

This is a thought-provoking article which explains that any cut in the lunar program or even a slowdown will not save us money in the long run. In fact, stretching out the program will actually raise the cost of Project Apollo.

The article follows:

THE MOON RACE: GO OR NOT, THE COST WILL BE ABOUT THE SAME

(By Howard Simons)

Whatever official Washington finally decides about the moon race—to go or not to go, or to slow down—the cost will be roughly the same.

It has been estimated that the U.S. moon program will cost $20 billion.

But even before Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev took his nation out of the race—temporarily, at least—American space agency officials were telling Congress this wasn't really so. The point that National Aeronautics and Space Administration officials were making was that the manned lunar landing, itself, will cost between $1 billion and $3 billion.

The rest of the $20 billion is earmarked for big rocket boosters, launching pads, technical and scientific know-how, unmanned exploration, and tracking stations. And, these will be needed whether Americans travel to the moon's surface or not.

Doubt has been expressed in some quarters that NASA will be able to get Americans to the moon in this decade and for $20 billion.

Informed sources yesterday said that in recent weeks NASA officials have reappraised the moon program in the light of rising costs and schedule slippages. Their conclusion: the moon effort will not cost more than $20 billion and the 1970 target date still looks good.

To meet both the fiscal and the calendar goals, however, will require some program changes. These are now being made. Though the informed sources would not comment on the nature of the program adjustments, they did say the changes will be announced soon.

Unless the United States wants to abandon space exploration altogether or leave space superiority to the Russians, there seems little value in abandoning the manned lunar landing.

This is the view of many space experts who hold that the manned lunar landing, in spite of all the attention focused upon it, has been merely a symbol.

But because of this symbol, the United States is now racing to build bigger boosters than the Russians have thus far demonstrated. Unless this development continues, the Russians will continue to dominate space.

Moreover, in the view of these experts, although the pace of the U.S. space program has been set by real political needs, the ultimate objectives have always been there. Thus, there are military and scientific and practical applications of space near the earth. And beyond the moon there are the planets.

In effect, what these experts maintain is that with or without Soviet sputniks, Americans would have wanted to explore the heavens. The only question is whether to do it in a hurry.

Slowing down NASA's effort to get men to the moon within this decade brings as much horror to many space experts as does the suggestion of abandoning this goal outright. This is so because they say that it will cost the American taxpayer more to slow down than to keep on a steady pace.

NASA officials estimate that a slowdown in the sense of chopping a few hundred million from their budget request this year would raise the total cost of Project Apollo $2 billion to $3 billion. Not everyone agrees with the NASA officials.

But few persons argue with the notion that a slowdown or stretchout would cost the moon program some of its best scientific and technical talent, who would quit to seek other jobs.

Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the California State Bar's Committee on International Rules of Judicial Process which appeared in the July–August 1963 edition of the Journal of the State Bar of California.

It is a matter of pride to me that the California bar recognizes the importance to the States of the work being done by the Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, established by the act of September 2, 1958.

The Congress now has before it a bill, H.R. 7051, introduced by Chairman CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee, on June 10, 1963, which embodies the amendments in our Federal statutes recommended by the Commission in its Fourth Annual Report, House Document No. 88, 88th Congress, 1st session.

A draft Uniform Interstate and International Procedure Act was presented to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and has been adopted by the Conference.

That part of the Commission's work which will be of most value to the individual businessman engaging in the international trade which is so vital to our economy, or to the individual citizen who must prove a foreign document, lies ahead.

Identical bills, S. 2131, introduced on September 10, 1963, by Senator HART of the Senate Judiciary Committee, H.R. 8650, introduced on September 30, 1963, by Chairman CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee, and H.R. 8832, introduced on October 15, 1963, by a member of that committee, the gentleman from New York Mr. JOHN V. LINDSAY, would extend the life of this valuable Commission for another 5 years beyond its present expiration date of December 31, 1963.

The article follows:

INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCESS

To the Board of Governors:

The committee has continued this year its study of the problems of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and other countries. A meeting was held during the State bar convention in Los Angeles. The subjects of discussion were the proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 4(i) and 28(b) and the proposed Uniform Interstate and International Procedure Act. It was the feeling of the committee that the changes in the Federal rules were highly desirable. The committee's attention was, however, directed to a controversy that existed concerning the provisions of 4(i) in relation to making service in a foreign country by mail. Material on this matter has been obtained and placed before the committee for study.

As to the Uniform Interstate and International Procedure Act, the members of the

committee felt that the act would not make sufficiently important changes in the law of California to justify a recommendation that the State bar make it a part of its legislative program at this time. In coming to this conclusion, the committee had before it an analysis of California's statutory enactments in the field of international judicial assistance prepared at the UCLA School of Law. The committee did determine, however, that section 1.03 of the act relating to personal jurisdiction based upon conduct was especially worthy of further study and that it would be desirable to have the act as a whole examined in detail in relation to current California law. The committee is endeavoring to have such an examination carried out.

It was determined at the first meeting of the committee in Monterey that its most important function was to offer advice on California problems to the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure which has been established by the U.S. Congress. The Commission has continued to keep the committee informed as to its activities. The first phase of the Commission's activities has been completed and reported in a document that is in the hands of the committee. The Commission's work, conducted in cooperation with the Columbia University Law School, has resulted in the recommendations for improvements in Federal and State statutes governing practice in international litigation which were discussed by the committee at its Los Angeles meeting. The recommendations for improvements in the Federal statutes have been submitted to the President of the United States in form for presentation to Congress. The Commission has received an appropriation for interim support from the Congress and will have a bill before Congress to extend the life of the Commission for 5 years to carry out the second phase of its work which will involve a study of the practices of other countries in the field of international judicial assistance and an attempt to bring about appropriate reforms through revisions of statutes and court rules or by international agreement as may be appropriate in each instance.

Respectfully submitted.

Alexander D. Calhoun, Jr.; Joseph Choate; Lawrence F. Ebb; Alan W. Ford; Emile Karson; Leigh M. Miller; Richard M. Nixon; Charles E. Rickershauser, Jr.; Richard C. Maxwell, Chairman.

MAY 31, 1963.

South Carolina Income Growth Second High in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a statement which proves that South Carolina is on the march. You will note that South Carolina ranks second in the United States in per capita income for its employees over a 33-year period.

The economy in South Carolina is being rounded out slowly but certainly by the fine industries that have moved to our State to use up the unemployed labor where farming has been drastically reduced on account of the acreage reduction programs.

I think the enclosed article proves that even though a number of obstacles have been placed in the paths of the southern people in the past years we are coming to the front without very much assistance from the Federal Government.

The article follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA INCOME GROWTH SECOND HIGH IN UNITED STATES: 472.2-PERCENT INCREASE

South Carolina's phenomenal per capita income growth since 1929 has ranked her second among all States in the Nation.

The U.S. Department of Commerce reports that South Carolina's personal income increased 472.2 percent during the 33-year period, second only to North Dakota's rise of 506.1 percent.

The comparative study was released by the Department of Commerce's Office of Business Economics.

The growth rate in each of 16 Southern States easily topped the national average of 236.5 percent.

In South Carolina's case, the 1962 per capita income was over seven times larger than the 1929 total.

Golden Anniversary of the United Lithuanian Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD extraneous material concerning the golden anniversary of the United Lithuanian Society on Sunday, October 20, 1963. In conjunction with this celebration Zigman Poskus Square was dedicated in memory of Zigman Poskus who was killed in action in World War II. Taking part in the celebration were the Golden Rays sponsored by post 89, American Legion, clergy and town of Stoughton officials. I am attaching an exhibit consisting of a statement made at the ceremony and an article which appeared in the Stoughton Chronicle of October 24:

[From the Stoughton (Mass.) Chronicle, Oct. 24, 1963]

UNITED LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES NOTE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

At a very impressive dedication ceremony last Sunday afternoon the United Lithuanian Societies began their 50th anniversary by naming the junction of Morton and Perry Streets "Zigman Poskus Square" in memory of Zigman Poskus who was killed in action in France during World War II. After the ceremony they proceeded to the societies hall where the festivities got underway with a concert by Stoughton's own Golden Rays sponsored by post 89, American Legion, who are fast becoming a very snappy outfit. Later in the day the Montello men's chorus entertained and then the Lithuanian dancers in their native costume performed their folk dances with great talent and zest. A delicious roast beef dinner was then catered by Java Joe Caterers from Stoughton. Mr. Ladislau Jodaitis addressed the group on the need for the Lithuanian library which the United Lithuanian Societies has maintained for over 50 years. Augmenting data given by him in the golden anniversary booklet, Mr. Jodaitis claimed that by coupling the study of Lithuanian with studies of other languages, it is possible to demonstrate the common origin of the world's languages. English and Finnish are of great importance in this study. According to Mr. Jodaitis, reproduction of the pre-Biblical process used in coining the basic words used in present-day languages is possible. This process could provide the means to coin a common tongue not only for the world but for the universe. Shown in the dedication picture on the left are left to right, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen Francis T. Crimmins, Rev. Michael Vembre, Mrs. Nellie Poskus, sister of the honored veteran, and Master of Ceremonies Paul Lapenas, Jr. In the picture above the Golden Rays entertain the throng at the Societies hall. (Photos omitted.)

OUR LIBRARY

(By Ladislaus T. Jodaitis)

The United Lithuanian Clubs of Stoughton, originally known as Stoughtono Suvienytos Lietuviskos Draugystes was organized October 1913 with the purpose of providing a Lithuanian national home. A primary function of this home was to provide facilities for a Lithuanian public library. The intent of the library was not new. It was to continue the centuries of struggle to perpetuate and improve Lithuanian arts, literature, and particularly the Lithuanian language.

But why perpetuate this Lithuanian language? To the student of language, the answer is simple, because he knows that an ancient race with an unchanged ancient language has its history and culture entrapped in the words of its language. To the founders of this organization, the reason may simply have been tradition handed down through centuries from those who knew its specific values.

For some years I have been studying languages as a whole. I started with Lithuanian, English, and Finnish and branched out to include languages from many parts of the world. These studies show that the Lithuanian language was formed by men of broad cultural backgrounds. Because of this, analysis of this language must be done by scholars having a similar broad cultural background. Unfortunately the origin of facets of the background entrapped in the Lithuanian language are claimed by various national, racial, religious, mystic and other groups. To perpetuate these claims it has been necessary to prevent the Lithuanian from analyzing his language and demonstrating his rightful claim. This was done by subjugating him and depriving him of access to unbiased broad knowledge. In Europe this was accomplished by the joint effort of groups who seemingly were enemies. In these United States unbiased broad learning and free discussion was a tradition with few restrictions until recent years, but public opinion continues to be molded to further preclude full freedom in these areas.

My studies have resulted in a number of discoveries which I hope to demonstrate in writing as time permits. Foremost of these will be the demonstration that the fundamental elements of many languages of the world are sounds of nature, each with an appropriate meaning. Words are coined using these sounds and their respective meanings to express various conditions and occurrences of nature. The coining process will show a common origin for many languages from most parts of the world and will give a better understanding of what is referred to by the "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" in the Declaration of Independence. It will

also show the method of coining many English words including those with peculiar spellings, such as "height, eight, through, thorough" etc.

My greatest ambition, which I believe to be possible, but which will require much work, is to publish a book which can be read the world over by people having no common tongue. The book will start with a blank page. This will be followed by a page or two showing two or three pictographs each depicting a sound, the sound's appropriate meaning, and the similarity of each pictograph to a letter in modern alphabets. These sounds, singly or in combination would be used to coin words each expressing a simple natural condition. These words in turn would be used to explain more difficult letters and conditions. The process would be continued so as to develop much of the Latin and Greek alphabets and many words found in many modern languages. In assimilating this book an intelligent illiterate, even from outer space, could learn how to talk, read and write sufficient words to carry on an intelligent exchange of ideas. The resulting language could be used as a common language for the universe.

In my studies to date, I have made much use of Lithuanian language books particularly those printed before 1900. While most of us are not interested in studying our language, we should continue to maintain and increase the club library for use by students of languages. All sorts of books are useful, religious and secular.

THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE

(By Ladislaus T. Jodaitis)

The origin and identity of the Lithuanians is a matter of conjecture. Liguistic analyses of surviving geographical place names indicate that in the territory reaching from the Black to the Baltic Seas, Lithuanian was spoken from pre-Christian times. History records many migrations into and out of this Lithuanian homeland, each migration taking with it one of its many names and a segment of its customs and culture. In relatively recent times powerful nations, such as Russia and Prussia, chose to be known by one of its area names and claimed its previous history. Accordingly, Lithuanian history, prior to 1800, must be pieced together from histories of its predatory neighbors, particularly Poland, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, and Austria and also from religious records. Shorn often willingly of his historical and cultural background, the Lithuanian, through strife and turmoil, clung tenaciously to his only meaningful and most precious possession—his native tongue, now known as Lithuanian—the oldest living language in the world.

Catholic publications record that in the year 1413, the Lithuanians were deprived of civil rights unless they adopted Roman Catholicism and Polish. This pressure toward polinization continued for five centuries through actions of zealous converts and the church with reinforcement by the Russians. Universities of Vilnius and Cracow concentrated on Polish and Latin. Lithanians were led to believe that they were an inferior race and that their language was fitting only for a pagan people. By 1864, the Russian Government prohibited publication and distribution of Lithuanian books, except for censored religious books. This ban continued until 1904. Lithuanian books continued to be published outside Russia and smuggled in. By 1880, emigrants to the United States making use of their new freedom, enthusiastically published newspapers, books, and dictionaries in their tongue in spite of Old World pressures which continued to plague them and to disrupt their activities.

What qualities does Lithuanian possess to command preservation through the ages against all odds? Clues may be found in literature. Socrates (470–399 B.C.) in discussing the origin of languages and the theory that there is a natural connection between sound and meaning, recognizes that the Greeks borrowed from the Barbarians and speculates that the original form of words may have been lost in the lapse of ages. Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), who spoke Lithuanian fluently stated that Lithuanian possesses the key which opens all the enigmas not only of philology but also of history. Rev. Benjamin W. Dwight in "Bibliotheca Sacra" (1858) likens Lithuanian to an universal interpreter, seeming to have the gift of tongues, ringing down loud and clear from ancient times but that Lithuanian was said to be then undergoing serious changes.

My own analyses show the following. Lithuanian is an original scientifically coined language. It may well be the key language of the ancient world. It is a master creation of mental giants. Because it is relatively unchanged, it can be reduced to its basic elements. Its fundamental elements are the sounds of nature with respective consonant meanings. Starting with these sounds, words are coined to describe various phases of natural phenomena, particularly that of regeneration. Further developments tie encyclopedic omniscience to this base. These systems coin words of all types, concrete and abstract. Words coined using these or similar systems are found in languages of primitive to highly developed cultures all over the world. (English contains many basic word groups thus indicating that it is fundamentally native; not borrowed.) Gods, characters, accounts of activities and religious rituals in many ancient and modern religions are symbolic expressions of the language base. Expressions of the base are found in Egyptian hieroglyphs, old Chinese characters, and the Bible thus indicating that Lithuanian predates the aforesaid. Because of the composition of his tongue, the ancient Lithuanian began his formal education with his first word and his language was his reference encyclopedia. By its nature, the language lends itself to the use of fantastic symbolism. We must pay tribute to the truly Lithuanian clergy who concealed clues to the path back, often in seemingly simple religious writings, done so cleverly as to defy detection by both church and czarist censors.

Ironically, centuries of oppression are not as effective as two generations of freedom. We are giving up our most precious heritage. For the first and most probably the last time, we have freedom, learning and our language. If we further possess, earnest desire and unbiased reasoning minds, we have the ingredients to fully discover the mysteries of our tongue. We have been given the torch, still bearing the light from pre-historic times. Can we let this light expire?

We Cannot Afford To Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received in my office a proclamation from the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, calling attention to the 45th anniversary yesterday of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic.

The proclamation outlines the sorry history of a brave, freedom-loving people who worked hard to gain a republican form of government, only to see it trampled first by the Nazis and since by the Communists. The proclamation points out that the take-over by the Communists was made possible through the exploitation of class hatred, by destroying everything "requiring love of people and love of nation."

The utter bankruptcy of such a system is totally apparent, for Czechoslovakia is today a country controlled by barbed wire and mine fields.

Mr. Speaker, in view of many disturbing recent events, I feel compelled to say we must not forget the lesson of Czechoslovakia, nor the millions of peoples locked behind the Iron Curtain.

I want to join with freedom-loving Czechs in recognizing this day in their history, and in expressing my hope that freedom may one day come again to their great land.

New Approach to Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress will have new allies for progress next year.

Citizens in Cali, Colombia, and Oakland County, Mich., are putting the final touches on plans for a unique experiment in oversea assistance which could mean more efficient help to those in need at less cost to the American taxpayer.

The idea behind this new concept in aid is essentially a simple one. It is that economic, political, and social growth often takes place in spite of—rather than because of—central governments.

It is a means by which people can help themselves, at home and in their own communities, rather than depending on handouts from Federal governments in faraway capitals.

It is a vehicle by which communities here in the United States can give of their talents and their experience to assist an area which badly needs such help.

For more than 2 years, I have been attempting to convince the Agency for International Development of the need for this new dimension in foreign aid.

With the assistance of Mr. David Bell, Administrator for the Agency for International Development, and Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, we now have the go-ahead for a pilot program to try out this new concept.

Mr. Moscoso has assigned an able and conscientious man from the Alliance, Mr. James Boren, to assist in its development and explore its future possibilities.

Mr. Boren, former deputy mission director for the Alliance in Peru, believes in the wisdom of this approach at the local level and, in fact, has successfully used this approach in Latin America.

Why was this new approach proposed to AID and the Alliance?

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been well aware of the need for an effective and efficient foreign aid program. I realize that such a program is a vital part of the security of the United States.

But I have also been well aware of the shortcomings of many of our programs in the past.

It has been by observation that too many of our foreign aid projects and programs have been based too high.

We have funneled our funds into the capital cities of the countries we are attempting to help, and somehow these funds have failed to reach those who are most in need of our assistance.

We have had instances where our aid funds actually retarded, rather than improved, social and economic conditions. These aid funds have sometimes helped to keep the existing regime in power, of maintaining the status quo, when the last thing we need for progress is to have things remain as they are.

In many other instances, paper barriers and bureaucratic regulations have slowed the process of providing assistance almost to a standstill. By the time our funds and our know-how have been brought to bear on a crucial problem, it has grown to a point where it is out of control and our aid is of little or no value.

What must be realized is that not only are we short on the dollars to bring about necessary reforms, but we are short of time as well.

It is my belief that this new approach offers a means of bridging these obstacles to progress, of getting our assistance down to those who need help the most. Further, this approach calls for maximum participation by the people themselves and an awareness of what is being done for them to a degree which has not been possible in the past.

It can create a climate of hope, of confidence in the future, which is a necessary first step toward resolution of economic and social problems of the magnitude we face in Latin America and many other areas of the world which have not yet begun to realize their full potential in providing a better life.

It took 2 years to reach this point and a recognition on the part of the Agency for International Development that the local-government-to-local-government approach might offer some solutions to these pressing problems.

After a year of attempting to try to convince AID that it should take a look at this approach on its own, I finally proposed that Oakland County, Mich., give it a try.

Further, I proposed that Oakland County join forces with the Cauca Valley, Colombia, and its principal city, Cali, in this pilot study.

Oakland County is typical of a great many areas in the United States. Located just outside the city of Detroit, it has undergone a population explosion which has transformed the area from a predominantly rural region to an urban area. Population has doubled, and doubled again in the past few decades. It is expected that Oakland County will continue this process of growth for years to come.

The Cauca Valley is just beginning to feel the strains and stresses of a rapid increase in population. Its growth rate is one of the highest in the world, and it is expected to continue to grow at this rate for the foreseeable future.

Cali and the Cauca Valley realize that they do not have the administrative machinery, the plans, the programs necessary to cope with this growth, to provide the jobs for this influx of thousands of new residents, to build a sound community which will be able to cope with the problems it foresees in the future.

Five experts from Oakland County visited Cali last spring. They were not paid a cent for their services. Four of the group received only travel pay and subsistence, while the fifth member of the team paid his own way completely because he believed so much in this approach.

What this group from Oakland County found in the Cauca Valley surprised them.

They found the valley unbelievably rich in natural and human resources, yet the majority of the people desperately poor.

They found topsoil in the Cauca Valley ranging in depth from 10 to 30 feet, yet the people were hungry.

They found the climate so delightful that the valley has been called the "land of eternal spring."

Yet the majority of residents had no suitable place to live, no running water, no sanitary facilities, little or no fire and police protection and almost no opportunity for an adequate education.

They found the Universidad del Valle an excellent academic institution with a bright future. But they also found that of 100 children of school age, only 75 would ever attend, only 27 of the original 100 would still be in school by the end of the third grade, only 2.7 would graduate from high school and a pitiful 1.6 would go on to college.

They found a bright, alert labor force, willing and eager to learn. But they found that the average wage for a working man with a family of three or four children was only $1.50 a day in a land where the cost of living is not cheap.

They found a bright and eager business community, realizing the problems they faced, not only in their business but in their community as well. But they found that the business community, while it was anxious to help, had little idea of how to solve these problems at the local level. Instead, they would apply to their Central Government for funds or programs and the long journey through red-tape would begin, a journey which too often proved to be fruitless.

They found that property values are high and are rising rapidly in Cali. They found that a small part of the citizenry had wealth. But they also found that only 50 percent of the local property taxes were collected each year.

Of this amount, 95 percent went to pay municipal salaries, leaving little or nothing for funds to solve their own problems at home.

In its report following the inspection trip, the team from Oakland County wrote:

We found in the Cauca Valley in general and in Cali in particular an area of great potential in terms of its natural resources, its climate, and its people. We found people with a willingness to work, with a strong commitment to improve their standard of living, and particularly we found a great desire for a good education for the young people. We found a rapidly expanding industrial development and a generally attractive atmosphere for industrial growth if monetary and political stability can be achieved.

The potential is matched only by the problems—

The report continued.

In general, it must be said that the standard of living for the vast majority of people is deplorably low, that the level of income is inadequate to meet the minimum needs of the population, that housing and public health pose serious problems in the development of the area, that municipal administration is antiquated, and that education has been tragically neglected. Further we found a general lack of confidence in the political process and the governmental enterprise, a great propensity to discount the integrity and effectiveness of government, and, in fact, the talents and achievements of the people themselves.

It was the conclusion of this committee that not only could Oakland County and its experience and resources be helpful, but that it is imperative that these resources be employed as fully as possible at the earliest feasible date.

The U.S. Ambassador to Colombia, the Honorable Fulton Freeman, and AID Mission Director Charles Fossum were impressed with the diligence and the business-like approach of the Oakland County team. They suggested that a group of Colombians from the Cauca Valley come to Oakland County as quickly as possible to see for themselves the steps which the Michigan community had taken to solve its own problems.

The distinguished group from Colombia, led by Governor Balcazar of the Department of the Valle del Cauca, were impressed and amazed with what they saw in Oakland County.

They saw that local units of government can be more than simply administrative units to carry out national programs. They noted that these local units of government in our country plan their own futures, provide their own facilities and find solutions to their own problems without waiting for the Federal Government in many instances.

They approved of the active participation of citizens in their local units of government, of the cooperation between local units of government largely pioneered in Oakland County and the Detroit metropolitan region.

They determined to establish groups to implement their plans back in Colombia, similar to the Detroit Metropolitan Area Regional Planning Commission and the supervisors inter-county committee.

They want to establish the same kind of coordinated attack on their problems, in many cases similar to those which Oakland County has solved or is well on the way to solving.

On the last day of their visit to Oakland County, the group from Colombia sat down with their county counterparts and a proposed program was drafted.

It calls for Oakland County to establish a liaison office in the Cauca Valley, manned by an expert in public administration. Cauca Valley will send an industrial promotion specialist to Oakland County to inform American business of the advantages of investment and establishing new plants in the Cali area.

Scholarships will be exchanged between the Universidad del Valle and Oakland University, and plans are underway for an exchange of professors as well.

As experts in the various fields of economics, finance, engineering, planning, and public administration are needed, they will be supplied to the Cauca Valley. Most of these experts will be volunteers serving without pay, or sent by local governments or private industry.

Total cost of this program? Less than $50,000 a year. Oakland County and the Cauca Valley will pick up more than two-thirds of the total cost without Federal contributions. The remaining one-third or less will come from the Agency for International Development, mostly for transportation costs to and from Cali.

I want to pay special tribute to the Oakland County team who have given so generously of their time and money in this program. Chairman Delos Hamlin of the Oakland County Board of Supervisors had a distinguished group under his direction. They were Chancellor D. B. Varner of Oakland University; Mr. George Catlin, head of area development for the Detroit Edison Co.; Mr. George Skrubb, director of the Oakland County Planning Commission, and Mr. Mark Jaroszewicz, an associate in the architectural firm of Tarapata-MacMahon.

The Colombian group, under the guidance of Gov. Gustavo Balcazar, included Mr. Herman Borrero, manager of the Cali public utilities organization; Mr. Jorge Herrera, Cali civic action committee; Mr. Pedro Caicedo, director of planning for Cali, and President Cesar Tulio Delgado of the Cali city council. All who met this group were impressed by their sincerity and the determination to find an answer to their pressing problems.

Dr. Delgado, who was former president of the Organization of American States, termed this new experiment a major step toward correcting a previously poor relationship between the United States and Colombia. He said that the people of Latin America have felt a certain bitterness that the people of the United States show less concern for the problems of their Latin American neighbors than they do for those of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

A major task of the experiment will be to see if better understanding can be created between Oakland County and the Cauca Valley.

I think it will, and that this approach could well lead to more such cooperative efforts between municipalities in the United States and their counterparts in Latin America.

Mr. Boren of the Alliance has told me he already has been contacted by communities in five States about the Oakland County approach and that more are coming in daily.

The National Association of County Officials and the American Municipal League are cooperating in this effort and are watching its results closely.

I am more than pleased with the cooperation I have received from Mr. Bell, Mr. Moscoso, Mr. Freeman, and Mr. Fossum and their able staffs in giving this program a try.

Reducing the problems in Latin America to a point where they can be understood and attacked at the local level will be a major breakthrough in development and I feel certain that it will lead to success.

In addition to the social and economic consequences of this approach, I think its effect in promoting political stability will be even greater.

This could well provide a training ground for future leaders in Latin America, leaders firmly grounded in democracy at the local level, close to the people.

It could create a greater confidence on the part of the people of Latin America in their own abilities to solve their own problems, at home and without massive amounts of assistance either from their own central governments or from Washington.

In my opinion, this program is an integral part of the Alliance for Progress. In fact, I think its direction and scope fit it uniquely into the Alliance to a greater degree than most realize at the moment.

The alliance between the Cauca Valley in Colombia and Oakland County in the United States is a forerunner of future alliances which will have great significance to the Americas in years to come.

It puts people into our plans for oversea assistance and helps them work together toward common goals of freedom and greater opportunity.

The Gallup Poll on Wheat Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the report of the Gallup poll on October 24. It shows that the American public, by a 2-to-1 margin, supports the recent decision of the President to sell wheat to the Soviet Union. I am glad to see this evidence of support for the President. It indicates an understanding by the large majority of our citizens of the issues involved and the propriety of the decision.

The report follows:

THE GALLUP POLL: U.S. PUBLIC IN FAVOR OF MORE RED TRADE

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., October 24.—Gallup Poll returns just in from across the Nation show the public, by a ratio of 2-to-1, to be in support of the recent decision to sell wheat to Russia.

Today's survey sought to determine just how much sentiment there is for the next step of doing more business with the Soviets.

Here is the question asked and the results:

"Should the United States and Russia work out a business arrangement to buy and sell more goods to each other?"

	Percent
Should	55
Should not	33
No opinion	12

To see how the public stands on the sale of wheat to Russia, the following question was asked:

"Russia wants to buy wheat from the United States. Do you approve or disapprove of our selling surplus wheat to Russia?"

Here are the findings:

	Percent
Approve	60
Disapprove	31
No opinion	9

While Republicans are only slightly on the side of increasing trade between the two countries, Democrats and independents are overwhelmingly in favor of such an arrangement, as the following table shows:

[In percent]

	Should	Should not	Don't know
Republicans	46	41	13
Democrats	58	29	13
Independents	59	31	10

Here are the views by party affiliation on the sale of wheat:

[In percent]

	Approve	Disapprove	Don't know
Republicans	51	42	7
Democrats	64	26	10
Independents	65	27	8

The issue of trade with Russia has not always been a partisan matter. In each of seven surveys conducted during the last decade in which this same question was asked, Republicans and Democrats have seen eye to eye on the issue.

The chief basis for opposition to the proposition is a distrust of Russia and the view that we would only be helping a sworn enemy.

Prime Minister Macmillan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 11, 1963]

PRIME MINISTER MACMILLAN RESPECTED

If British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan could have chosen the moment to announce his intention to resign because of illness he could hardly have picked a better time in recent months for the sake of his reputation.

Macmillan is still basking in the glow of the nuclear test ban for which Conservative Party and the British public generally give him substantial credit.

He has weathered the Profumo scandal and though the Denning report raised questions about whether his government was sufficiently alert, Macmillan was vindicated of any impropriety.

When he leaves office, Macmillan will have been Prime Minister longer consecutively than any other man in this century. In January he would have passed his seventh anniversary.

Perhaps Macmillan's most distinguishing characteristic in office has been his "unflappability"—his refusal to panic or even get excited over the political misfortunes that befell his government.

More than once, as in the recent Profumo affair, this quality enabled the Prime Minister to maintain his hold when others were predicting disaster for him.

When he became Prime Minister early in 1957 following the Suez fiasco, Conservative Party fortunes seemed bankrupt. Yet under his guidance they recovered sufficiently for the Tories to win a third successive general election in 1959.

The choice of Macmillan was a long shot. Most speculation had been that the leadership would go to R. A. Butler, the Acting Prime Minister when the ailing Anthony Eden resigned.

But on the advice of ministers and elder statesmen, particularly Lord Salisbury, Queen Elizabeth chose the man who had been Chancellor of the Exchequer under Eden.

Macmillan's warnings to the Cabinet that he could not hold the value of the pound another day are generally regarded as having forced the government's decision to wind up the Suez operation.

In his early years in office Macmillan had a series of successes and came to be regarded as a leader with a golden touch. British economic recovery blotted out grievances over Suez, and the Conservative Party won the 1959 election with an increased majority under the slogan "Peace and Prosperity."

But in more recent years Macmillan's golden touch had seemed to tarnish. His 1959 trip to Moscow, which he was eager to use as the basis for an East-West detente, went very sour. Then came the U-2 incident which helped dash hopes for the 1960 summit meeting.

Macmillan appeared to lose some of his enthusiasm for summitry, and his aids frequently pointed out that he believed in summits only after proper preparation. Nevertheless he was still regarded elsewhere as an inveterate summiter.

Another massive disappointment was French President Charles de Gaulle's veto of the British application for membership in the European Economic Community in January of this year.

In his last 2 years in office Macmillan had hoped to become the man who took Britain into Europe. This followed his recognition that his government had missed the boat in failing to take a broader part in the formative talks for the Common Market.

Macmillan's last few months in office were marred by a series of security breaches, including the Vassall case a year ago.

Among the proudest episodes of Macmillan's tenure was his "Winds of Change" speech during a visit to South Africa. This was interpreted as condemnation of apartheid and recognition that fairer representation would have to be granted Africans throughout the continent.

Known for his courtly, Edwardian manner, Macmillan was a master of mood in House of Commons debates. Although he is not a bell-ringing orator, he can be devasting in his sarcasm. He has a droll wit and sometimes discloses his classical scholarship.

Macmillan's skill as a political operator is respected by the opposition and his own party alike. But he is essentially a tactician rather than a strategist. No one had a better feel, however, of just what the public or Parliament were likely to tolerate.

Macmillan also could be ruthless on occasion. In July 1962, he dismissed half a dozen ministers in what became known as "Macmillan's massacre."

The grandson of a poor Scottish crofter, Macmillan himself was born to wealth as an heir to the great publishing house bearing his name. His marriage to the daughter of the Duke of Devonshire, Lady Dorothy Macmillan, connected him with the aristocracy.

In his early years in Parliament, Macmillan was regarded as a Tory liberal. And when he rose to cabinet status as wartime Minister of Algiers and later briefly as Foreign Secretary before his accession to number 10 Downing Street, he continued his interest in progressive ideas.

He prided himself on his close association with President Kennedy, and has been a frequent evangelist of the Anglo-American alliance.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 11, 1963]

MACMILLAN TALLY: UPS AND DOWNS

Prime Minister Macmillan's illness, coming at a moment of crisis in his political fortunes, has brought him a degree of compassion and sympathy he has not had for a long time.

No Tory, however fond of Mr. Macmillan, would pretend any longer that all was well with the picture that conservatism has presented since Mr. Macmillan took over from Anthony Eden in 1957.

There have been many solid accomplishments, but these are overlooked by Mr. Macmillan's opponents, and are scarcely remembered by those of his supporters who have been bemused by scandal and political smokescreens, or by their own ambitions.

Events turned against Mr. Macmillan. And somehow the spirit that swept the Conservative Party to victory in the 1959 general election seemed to have gone wrong.

THE GOOD DAYS OF 1959

In 1959 he was the "You-never-had-it-so-good" Prime Minister. In those days the public did not take the phrase to mean just the boom of easy money. It reflected the end of wearisome shortages and controls that had been the lot of the Labor Government after the war.

Even the Prime Minister's bored expression, which has dampened so many enthusiasms lately, was an asset in those days.

He was good, old, imperturbable Mac, all the way from his droopy eyelids to his shuffling gait. He seemed to enjoy the cartoon image of the faintly rakish Edwardian. The identification with his country seemed close enough then.

But as Mr. Macmillan began to move Britain toward association with the rest of Europe, and to cut the old ties of empire, he started to take on an anachronistic air. His entourage of peers and squires, even his own repertoire of languid gestures, seemed out of place.

The first to lose their illusions about Mr. Macmillan were the men of the far right. They had supported him in 1957 and in the election in 1959 on the understanding that he was a man of the right who had zealously supported the British intervention in the Suez Canal dispute and had therefore established himself as a supporter of the imperial cause.

AFRICAN POLICY CRITICIZED

His policy of moving toward independence for British possessions in Africa brought accusations from Tories on the right that he had embarked on a shameless policy of surrender. Those on the left were inclined to criticize, too, when phases of the policy seemed unduly slow or ill conceived.

The Prime Minister's absorbing interest was always in international affairs, possibly at the expense of close and constant control of home affairs.

It was his task, after assuming office, to go to see President Kennedy in Bermuda to restore the Western alliance and to reestablish American confidence in a partnership that had been deeply disturbed by the Suez adventure.

But in the first year after the election in 1959, two international events hurt him badly.

The first was the disastrous heads-of-state meeting in Paris in May 1960, when Premier Khrushchev, in one violent outburst, wrecked all Mr. Macmillan's hopes of bringing about some sort of East-West detente. That happened when the Soviet leader castigated President Dwight D. Eisenhower about the U-2 spy plane incident.

THE SECOND EVENT

The second event was the election of President Kennedy in 1960. Twenty-five years younger than Mr. Macmillan and exuding vigor, Mr. Kennedy made it plain that he had no need of a middleman in his relations with Premier Khrushchev.

Even worse for Mr. Macmillan personally, the press began to emphasize the discrepancy between the American President's youth and energy and the quaint, Old World manner of Mr. Macmillan.

Early in 1961 Mr. Macmillan tried to adjust to the situation by working on a close, uncielike relationship with Mr. Kennedy. It was not always easy. Their first meeting, at Mr. Kennedy's suggestion, was in March when they shared a canteen lunch at the naval base in Key West, in Florida.

In July a new phase of British policy emerged with the twin efforts to get Britain into the European Common Market and to hold down wage and price increases. The Government hoped to build up exports and stop a serious run on the pound.

In July 1962, the policy of economic stringency was ended with the dismissal of Selwyn Lloyd as Chancellor of the Exchequer, along with him went a third of the Cabinet and even more of the rest of the administration.

Last January the Brussels negotiations for British membership in the Common Market ended when President de Gaulle vetoed that idea. By this time Mr. Macmillan's grip on public opinion was very loose.

DRASTIC ELECTION RECORD

Over a period of 2 years his government had established the most disastrous by-election record in British politics. According to the public-opinion polls, Conservative support in the country was at its lowest ebb since opinion polling started 25 years before.

Once the Brussels negotiations broke down it became obvious that the party leadership was in question. But the Prime Minister's final asset was that, as long as he chose to stay in office, he controlled the political future of his colleagues.

When, for example, Viscount Hailsham became a potential source of disaffection he was sent off to Moscow to do the preliminary negotiating on a nuclear test ban treaty.

That this tready was finally brought off remains a great credit to Mr. Macmillan and his untiring efforts to achieve it. President Kennedy sent him a message Tuesday assuring him that history would record his role in bringing the treaty about.

Other notable accomplishments that were largely Mr. Macmillan's doing included the unpopular but necessary plan to reform Britain's antiquated railway system.

New investments were made in housing and education. The Government helped the lagging shipbuilding industry. The standard of living was raised to its highest in the last half century.

Exports reached a high level. Personal savings were 20 times as high as in 1950. Unemployment was virtually ended.

Venerable Leonardo Murialdo To Be Beatified by Pope Paul VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after World War II, Mr. Louis S. Libutti, a constituent of mine, was one of those responsible for bringing to New Mexico priests of the order of the Pious Society of St. Joseph of Murialdo. The society has performed noteworthy service by establishing a boys village, high school, and seminary in Albuquerque. On November 3, 1963, Pope Paul VI will perform the rights of beatification for Venerable Leonardo Murialdo, founder of the order. Mr. Libutti has been selected by the order as an American representative to be present at the beatification ceremonies—a further recognition of the part he played in bringing this charitable group to the United States.

The following statement relates the history of Leonardo Murialdo and the order he founded:

His holiness, Pope Paul VI, has set aside the day of November 3, 1963, for the beatification of Venerable Leonardo Murialdo.

Leonardo Murialdo was born October 26, 1828, in the city of Torino, Italy. He was a very pious youth and from early days he felt the call to the holy priesthood. He was a contemporary and friend of St. John Bosco. He attended the University of Torino and received his ordination as priest at the age of 23 years in 1851. He labored long and arduously for the youth of Italy, which at that time were in need of guidance, work, and spiritual fortification. Thusly, he founded the Pious Society of St. Joseph of Murialdo on the 19th of March 1873, during a time when the education of youth was of least importance in a world concerned with political upheaval. Correction houses were full of little delinquents; and in Torino, on the shores of the Po River, could be seen flocks of rambling, homeless boys. Father Murialdo, guided by his deep love of youth, especially the very poor, modeled his religious society after the holy family of Nazareth. (His institute was named "The Pious Society of St. Joseph," and dedicated entirely, under the patronage of St. Joseph, to the education of youth no matter what the creed or nationality or rank, the poor preferred.) To attain this end, the society of Murialdo, accepts boarding schools, workshops of arts and crafts, boys' clubs, agricultural training schools, houses for priestly formation, parishes with youth centers annexed, as well as foreign missions.

The Pious Society of St. Joseph of Murialdo is established in Europe and in almost all countries of South America. Lourdes Boys' Village, High School and Seminary, and San José parish, in Albuquerque, N. Mex., are the only institutions the society has in the United States.

The fathers came to the United States after World War II. During the war an American GI, Brooklyn born, was prompted to promise the superior general of the order that he would try to bring this wonderful group of youth savers to the United States. This soldier had been deeply impressed with the simplicity and yet forceful work done by the "Giuseppini," as they were fondly known during his service in Italy. The late Archbishop Edwin V. Byrne sponsored the society's entrance to the United States. From a small acorn a mighty oak of religion, and training and guidance and love has grown. Presently, under the powerful patronage of St. Joseph and inspiration of their beloved founder, Leonardo Murialdo, the society has grown and prospered. Leonnardo Murialdo passed to his eternal reward on the 30th of March 1900. Today, there are over 1,000 priests of his order all over the world, attaching themselves to the problem of youth and training young people in the rich spirituality of the "good life."

The cause of Murialdo's saintliness and pious works are legion. His holiness of late lamented memory, Pope John XXIII, was the first to recognize his holy qualities and declared him to be "venerable," a first step to sainthood. And now, after proven miracles, his holiness, Pope Paul VI, will perform the rites of beatification on November 3, 1963.

Let's Work Together on Patent and Proprietary Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Members are aware of the apparent conflict that exists between the protection of the public interest in the development of new inventions with money provided by Government contracts, and the necessity of stimulating continued initiative in the fields of inventions and advancement of the status of the arts by private capital. A very delicate balance exists between the two.

This Member of Congress realizes the very legitimate position of the Government, but we must be very careful not to discourage the initiative provided by possible profits. This initiative is vitally necessary if we are to insure that adequate resources are allocated to research and development by firms operating under Government contract. This is most especially true in the defense, electronics, and related industries.

Because this is a subject of great current interest among Members of Congress, and others, I am going to include, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of a very excellent speech by Mr. José Rosán, president of Rosan, Inc., of Newport Beach, Calif., which he delivered before the Electronics Industries Association.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER ON PATENT AND PROPRIETARY PROBLEMS

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, a situation exists which is causing all of us a great deal of concern. The situation pertains to patent laws, patent infringements, patent protection, and Government procurement. Companies right at this moment are suing one another—other companies are suing the Government and those who have already sued found the experience very expensive.

Everyone wants a corrective measure that will alleviate the situation immediately. Many associations have taken up the banner and gone into the study and preparation necessary for the enactment of new laws and new amendments. I believe that we are not yet ready for any new laws and amendments and before going any further we should review all of our present problems.

In a survey we made, and are still making, we found that there are so many new problems involved on the patent and procurement subject that it would be impossible to cover them all with just a few new laws or amending some of the old ones. It is my opinion that we should unite in a concentrated effort to learn in detail what is going on—to retain the services of qualified attorneys and consultants that will advise and guide us, then and only then, have them prepare new laws and amendments to present to the proper authorities in Washington for their consideration and enactment.

Simultaneously we must go into an education program to make the people and the Government agencies aware of the importance of research and development in our daily lives and of the patent laws that will protect the inventor. Without this protection the inventive or free enterprise system, which has been so successful for so many years, would be lost, and we all would suffer, including our national defense program. We are so used to all of the devices that surround us in our daily life, that little or no credit has been given to those persons who gave many years of their lives to bring new and useful things to us. These people should be rewarded for their efforts and the best way to do this is through adequate patent protection. Believe me, gentlemen, a good educational program for everyone should be the most important part of our collective efforts. Another program which is badly needed is one for the better understanding among the manufacturers so that once again business can be done in a course of fair dealing, to be able to reveal our ideas without fear and in general help one another on patent protection, Government procurement practices and other important problems.

I honestly believe that a great deal of our grief comes from the manner and speed that we are forced to do business these days. Existing laws or laws that were enacted long ago cannot cope with our present situation.

As a point of illustration, I would like to describe one of the many problems that we encounter in our work. We are in the business of the design and manufacture of specialized fastenings and cater to about 3,500 firms. To protect our patent structure, we have a patent attorney that works with our engineering department; reviews all new devices developed by us and files applications for patents on all those that have merit. In our daily work we are called upon to design new fastenings for customers, and in due course the fastenings are developed, tested, and approved—all work at our own expense, then a prototype is sent to the customer and we wait for results. Now here is where the trouble begins. If the customer deals fairly, he will come back to us for additional parts. If he doesn't want to deal fairly, he will take our prototype and in many cases make drawings with the name of his firm and send it out for bids. There again two things may happen. The customer may give us the chance to bid with the others, however, our chances of getting the order are very slim, because of our development costs, our bid would naturally be higher. The second condition is that we may not even get the chance to bid on our own parts and someone else will make and supply our devices and benefit from our work and engineering know-how.

In the meantime, our patent application is in the Patent Office patiently waiting for action. It may take as long as 4 years before the patent is issued and by that time the other manufacturer has long ago reaped the benefit of our work, and frankly there is nothing we can do about it. Much worse is the probability that by that time the

fastening has been replaced by some new device and ours is obsolete.

How can all this be overcome? Simply by making the validity and protection of all patents retroactive to the filing date of the application with the Patent Office. I further suggest that all manufacturers be informed of all applications to the Patent Office and their descriptions, listing them in a weekly, or monthly publication which will be distributed to all manufacturers. In this manner inventors and manufacturers will be put on notice. Should a company desire to go into the manufacture of one or more of said listed devices, he can enter into an agreement with the applicant of the patent and therefore the inventor will obtain a reward for his efforts. If the manufacturer does not wish to enter into an agreement and continues to manufacture a listed application, then he should be requested to post a bond so that when the patent is issued and the manufacturer of the device may have gone out of business, the patent holder will be fully protected.

There are so many more problems just as important as the above. Let us unite, therefore, with the purpose of finding the solutions to many of our problems—fighting between ourselves, or "fighting the hand that feeds us," Uncle Sam, is not profitable and time wasting. United, pooling our knowledge and ability, working in peace and in a course of fair dealing, we can help ourselves and help our country continue to be the greatest in the world. Thank you.

Opinion by Judge Samuel A. Weiss in the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker yesterday I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first half of the opinion of Judge Samuel A. Weiss in the Court of Common Pleas of Alleghany County, Pa., in the case of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. against White Cross Stores Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 18, and 19, and today I am inserting the remainder of this opinion. The timeliness of this opinion is evident with the quality stabilization bill, H.R. 3669, now in the Rules Committee. Judge Weiss sketches the background of fair trade and cuts through the morass of claims by fair trade proponents to show its adverse effect on the public interest:

JUDICIARY OR LEGISLATURE

The Supreme Court of the United States was surely correct in referring to our free price policy as the "central nervous system" of the economy. *United States* v. *Socony Vacuum*, 310, U.S. 150, 226 n. 59 (1940). When a statute makes a direct assault upon that central nervous system, it is clear that a court would be derelict in its duty, if it did not subject the act in question to the closest examination in order to determine whether:

1. The act is designed to serve, promote, and protect a paramount and legitimate interest of the public at large.

2. The act in its actual operation and effect does in fact accomplish that purpose.

The greater the invasion of property rights, the more rigorously should the foregoing tests be applied. To strike down a statute if it fails to meet these requirements is not to quarrel with the wisdom of the legislature, it is rather to deny that the legislature had the constitutional power to pass the act in the first place—a time honored and sacred duty of the judiciary.

The exponents of resale price maintenance offer three separate bases as its raison d'etre:

1. The goodwill of the manufacturer, as it inheres in the trademark is protected from depreciation in value resultant from a lowering of the price at the wholesale and retail levels.

2. The competing wholesalers and/or retailers are protected from "predatory" and "cutthroat" competition.

3. The consumer is benefited because with the elimination of loss-leader selling he will not be lured into a store and ultimately pay a higher price for off-brand goods.

All of these are worthwhile interests. If the fair trade laws would in fact serve them in a real and substantial manner, I believe that a due process objection could not be sustained.

The good will theory is the oldest one, and it still has the widest currency in the opinions upholding fair trade, *Hudson Distributors* v. *Upjohn*, 190 N.E. 2d 460 (Sup. Ct., Ohio—1963). It achieved full blown status with *Old Dearborn Distributors* v. *Seagrams*, supra. The very core of the opinion is found at page 193:

"The primary aim of the law is to protect the property—namely, the good will—of the producer, which he still owns. The price restriction is adopted as appropriate means to that perfectly legitimate end, and not as an end in itself."

It appears crystal clear that the court validated fair trade simply and solely because it was sufficiently convinced that a very questionable means—price fixing—was being used to subserve a legitimate end—the protection of the manufacturer's good will. At least, in this instance, the court was apparently sanctioning the doctrine that the end justifies the means. By clear implication, however, if the actual purpose and ultimate effect of the law was price fixing and the attendant reduction in competition, it would have been stricken as being unconstitutional. The court at page 196 noted that the body of fact and opinion (in 1936) was in conflict as to whether or not the real purpose was to protect good will or to stifle competition:

"The legislation here in question proceeds upon the former and not the latter view; and the legislative determination in that respect, in the circumstances here disclosed, is conclusive so far as this court is concerned. Where the question of what the facts establish is a fairly debatable one, we accept and carry into effect the opinion of the legislature."

As your chancellor indicated earlier, in 1963, a court should indeed be reluctant to accept a legislative factual determination made in the early 1930's in connection with the Fair Trade Act, primarily because the record shows that very few, if any, legislatures bothered to make an inquiry into the facts, and secondarily, because their judgment was inevitably colored by the bleak economic circumstances prevailing. In the growing and prosperous economy of the sixties, are we to be shackled by economic concepts arising out of an earlier unhappier day?

Furthermore, if good will is the purpose to be served, why have the manufacturers, who presumably would be the most immediate beneficiaries, not led the fight to pass fair trade laws? Not only have they avoided the battle, they have, for the most part dragged their feet in trying to resist the imposition of fair trade arrangements. As proof, your chancellor cites the host of antitrust actions brought against wholesaler and dealer organizations resulting from attempts to coerce manufacturers to enter fair trade agreements or raise markups.[3]

See also 64 Yale Law Journal, page 967, et seq.

Fortune magazine (January 1949, p. 70–71) provides us with an illuminating insight into the coercion that has been used to tame recalcitrant manufacturers. In 1935 Pepsodent renounced its fair trade program. California pharmacists stored it in basements and dumped in it ashcans. The product soon vanished in drugstores around the country. Signs appeared "We do not carry Pepsodent." Thereupon Pepsodent caved in. It signed up again for fair trade and even contributed $25,000 toward a national Fair Trade Act war chest. Photographs of the check subsequently appeared in Pepsodent ads to put the Nation's druggists on notice that the company was back in the fold for good. Since then the druggists have used the boycott, or the threat of it, with impressive effect. Phillips (milk of magnesia), Barbasol, and National Distillers all balked at first, but soon saw the light and signed up.

This then is the irony to end all ironies. A law is passed purporting to aid and benefit the manufacturers—a law which it hasn't asked for, it hasn't desired, and which for the most part it has actively resisted. Such is the paradox of fair trade.

Other equally valid reasons exist for rejecting the goodwill theory. One wonders why the overwhelming concentration of fair-traded items is to be found in the drug and health and beauty aid field. Why is fair trade virtually nonexistent in food, clothing, hardware, cigarettes, heavy appliances, automobiles, furniture, gasoline, farm equipment, and other major consumer goods industries. Indeed, the American Fair Trade Council has estimated that only 5 percent of the retail trade in the United States is in fair trade sales. (44 Ill. Bar Jour. 754, 765.)

GOODWILL—IS IT?

Are we to believe that these non-fair-trading manufacturers are unconcerned with their goodwill? Are they willing to see it demolished by free pricing on the retail level, when they could preserve it by merely entering into one agreement with a cooperative distributor? Perhaps only drug manufacturers are endowed with the business acumen necessary to appreciate that price maintenance enhances their goodwill. The answer is obvious to your chancellor—the goodwill theory is pure, unadulterated nonsense, which the proponents of fair trade have foisted upon the courts and public in order to clothe their selfish motives with an aura of respectability. The reason the drug manufacturers fair trade their products is because it is in this field that the strongest dealer organizations (particularly NARD) favoring price maintenance have developed. Pepsodent to its dismay would no doubt verify this.

There are also sound economic reasons, inherent in the workings of the marketplace which belie the argument that a manufacturer's good will is diminished by price reduction. Discerning economists have ob-

---

[3] See e.g. *United States* v. *Frankfort Distillers*, 324, U.S. 293 (1945); *U.S.* v. *National Wholesale Druggists Association*, 61 F. Supp. 590 (D.N.J. 1945); *U.S.* v. *National Association of Retail Druggists*, 1947 trade case, par. 61026 (D.N.J. 1947); *U.S.* v. *New York State Pharmaceutical Assn.*, 1947 trade case, par. 61031 (S.D.N.Y. 1947); *U.S. Memphis Retail Appliance Dealers Ass'n.* 1957 trade case, par. 68704 (W.D. Tenn. 1957); *United States* v. *Retail Liquor Dealers Ass'n.* 1957 trade case, par. 68751 (E.D. Tenn. 1957).

served that it is only with high-priced status symbol goods that a price reduction has an adverse effect on good will. Such merchandise is bought to satisfy the consumer's yearning for conspicuous consumption. A reduction in price would in fact reduce the demand which in and of itself keeps the price high.[3] To illustrate, if a dealer were foolish enough to sell a Cadillac or a Lincoln for $3,000 besides selling at a loss, he would tend to diminish the invaluable "rich man image" these products evoke in the public mind. In the long run this practice would result in a diminution of demand.

The items which are fair traded by the plaintiff do not by any stretch of the imagination fit within this category. Vitamins, toilet articles, drugs, and medicinal products, are mass produced for all consumers. The lower the price, the greater the appeal—as attested by the successful merchandising practices of the defendants and other discount houses.

CUTTHROAT COMPETITION—WHAT?

The second justification for fair trade—that it prevents predatory price cutting and cutthroat competition—has been frequently offered. *Bristol Meyers Company* v. *Lit Bros. Inc.*, 336 Pa. 81, 6A 2d 843 (1939). The reason has merit in the sense that by stifling competition entirely, we surely eliminate its injurious forms. In the same manner, there would be no lung cancer if all lungs were removed. In both instances, the resultant effect upon the body and upon business in general is the same—suffocation.

It is important to bear in mind that the fair trade price is normally set high enough to allow the least efficient, highest cost dealer to make a profit. It is readily understandable that a streamlined discount store, with low overhead, can sell below the fair trade price and still make a fair profit. Consider the case of Mr. John Schwegmann, according to a Federal district judge in Louisiana: "The evidence is uncontradicted that the defendants made a fair profit in all sales of plaintiff's products below the fair trade price. The evidence is also uncontradicted that the defendants sell the products of most, if not all plaintiff's competitors below the fair trade price. The defendants are simply efficient retailers who pass on the fruits of that efficiency to the buying public in the form of lower prices. Enforcement of the Fair Trade Act would protect other retailers from this type of competition." *Eli Lilly* v. *Swhengmann Bros.*, 109 F. Supp. 269, 270 (E.D. La. 1953).

This description in the opinion of your chancellor would be equally appropriate in describing the business methods of the defendants Although high cost inefficient retailers may scathingly denounce all price cutting as "predatory" and "cutthroat," what they are really angry at is price competition per se.

In *Commonwealth* v. *Zasloff*, 338 Pa. 457, 13 A 2d. 67, 70 (1940), the court struck down a statute which proscribed healthy competition in its zeal to eliminate its sinister aspects: "Price cutting, in itself, is not an evil, on the contrary, the more intense the competition, the greater the likely advantage to the purchasing public. Indeed, there is no reason why a merchant should not make an absolute gift of merchandise to his customers, if he desires to be benevolent or thereby to advertise his business. There are many other conceivable and wholly proper reasons which might induce him to make sales without profit, as, for example, a necessity of paying importunate creditors. It is only when the object of price cutting is sinister—to destroy a competitor by suffering a temporary loss in order to gain an ultimate monopoly or to defraud the public by seducing them into the purchase of other goods at an exorbitant price—that the selling of goods at less than cost may constitute an economic or social evil. The Pennsylvania Act, therefore, is arbitrary, and the means which its employs are grossly out of proportion to the object which its seeks to attain."

Predatory competition can be eliminated by legislation much narrower in scope. The Pennsylvania Unfair Sales Act, 73 P.S. 211, would already seem to accomplish the desired end. Using the police power as a meat ax, when only a scalpel is needed, is an abuse of power which should not be tolerated.

The most patently specious argument offered in support of fair trade is that it is beneficial to the consumer. This argument has validity only in the sense that fair trade prohibits loss-leader selling, which can be used to dupe the unwary. However, since this form of selling is clearly "predatory" in that the leader is sold at a loss (*Bristol Myers* v. *Lit*, supra, p. 846) it would seem that the Pennsylvania Unfair Sales Act, cited above, affords adequate protection against this practice.

DISCOUNT STORES BENEFIT PUBLIC

For the small benefit of eliminating the loss-leader, a heavy toll is exacted. It is self-evident that where fair trade is effective, the consumer must of necessity pay a higher price. As mentioned above, the fair trade price is pegged at a level which guarantees the most inefficient, high-cost retailer a profit. "The streamlined discount store, by eliminating the frills of credit, high rent, individual customer service, and delivery service is able to effect savings which can be passed on to the consumer," 44 Ill. Bar Journal, p. 754 et seq. "One need not be an economist to realize that the fair trade wall nullifies this benefit by forcing the low-cost and high-cost retailer to sell at the same price." The corollary is equally obvious—a low-income consumer is literally forced to pay for the frills which his affluent neighbors receive when they deal at a high-overhead store.

This adverse price structure has been studied in those fair trade areas which border on free pricing zones such as Washington, D.C. (free), and Maryland (fair trade). A study of 117 branded drug items showed that 35 cost one-third less in Washington than in Maryland, 38 about 25 cents less, and 29 about one-seventh less. A comparison of free trading Missouri with fair trade Illinois shows the same story. "The St. Louis Star Times calculated that 54 fair trade drug items cost an average of 16.2 percent more on the east bank of the Mississippi than on the St. Louis side," Fortune magazine (January 1949, p. 70).

In light of this we are not surprised to learn that "consumer organizations and labor organizations speaking as consumers, generally join with department store, mail order, and other opposing dealer groups in opposing resale price maintenance," FTC report on resale price maintenance, pp. 5–6 (1945).

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION URGE REPEAL OF FAIR TRADE LAW

In the opinion of your chancellor, fair trade pricing has no effect on the manufacturer's goodwill. It does far beyond the necessities of the case in curtailing harmful competition; and it succeeds in extracting a higher price from the consumer. What then is the actual purpose and ultimate economic effect of resale price maintenance? Simply stated—"it is to fix prices," so as "to eliminate price competition on the wholesale and retail level of distribution. This is the conclusion reached by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission—the two bodies charged with protecting our free enterprise economy. Both have advocated repeal of the fair trade laws," 44 Illinois Bar Journal, p. 754; 45 Illinois Law Review, p. 391.

Those who are best qualified to know—the economist—"are in virtually unanimous agreement" that the "primary purpose and effect of fair trade is to reduce price competition," 65 Yale Law Journal, p. 24; 16 University of Pittsburgh Law Review, p. 59.

In *Skaggs Drug* v. *General Electric Company*, 315 P. 2d 967, 63 N.M., 215 (1957), the court held fair trade to be unconstitutional, and rendered what your chancellor believes to be the most well reasoned and able opinion in this area of the law. See particularly the following at p. 974:

"In substance, therefore what is the real purpose of the Fair Trade Act? No matter what high sounding terms are used such as 'free and open competition,' 'unfair competition,' and 'protection of goodwill,' it is a matter of common knowledge that it is a price fixing statute, designed primarily to destroy competition at the retail level. The high sounding phrases used with respect to the trademark owners are simply excuses and not a reason for the law."

A statute whose sole purpose and function is to relieve one relatively small (but influential) group from the price competition offered by its competitors is a clearcut abuse of the police power and should be nullified. *Gambone* v. *Commonwealth*, 375 Pa. 547, 101 A. 2d, 634 (1954); *Tyson and Brother United Theater Ticket Offices* v. *Banton*, 273 U.S. 418 (1926).

DELEGATING LAWMAKING POWER

A further brief comment is called for in answer to defendant's contention that the act in its effect results in an unconstitutional delegation of the police power. It is urged that by giving the parties to a fair trade agreement, the power to bind all nonsigners, in reality the manufacturer is exercising lawmaking powers. The argument has been accepted by several States in ruling the act unconstitutional, *Bulova Watch Company* v. *Robinson*, 252 Iowa 740 (1961); *Quality Oil* v. *Dupont*, 182 Kan. 488 (1959).

TO HOLD NONSIGNERS IS TO VIOLATE CONTRACT CONCEPT

This court concurs. In Your Chancellor's opinion, once the agreement is signed and notice is sent to a nonsigner, he is bound in exactly the same manner as if a statute had been passed. The cases which reject the delegation argument do so by means of a palpable fiction—they treat the nonsigner as one who has consented in advance to the restriction by accepting the goods. *Old Dearborn Distributors*, supra, pages 193–194, *General Electric* v. *Klein*, 121, N.Y.S., 2d 37, 50–51 is a fine example of the fuzzy thinking we encounter so often in this area:

"As pointed out in Old Dearborn * * * the statute does not attempt to fix prices, nor does it delegate such power to private persons. It permits designated private persons to contract with respect thereto but contains no element of compulsion and leaves the parties free to enter into such contracts or not as they see fit."

To consider a nonsigner as a contractual party is to torture the meaning of "contract" into a totally alien concept.[4] Because "the law should look at truth and reality through whatever disguise it may assume." Your

[3] Seligman & Love, Price Cutting & Price Maintenance, 185–186 (1937); 69 Yale Law Journal, 168, 180.

[4] It should be noted that in *Schwegmann* v. *Calvert Corporation*, 341 U.S. 384, 390 (1951), the court rejected *Old Dearborn's* "consent in advance" and realistically categorized nonsigners as "recalcitrants * * * dragged by the heels and compelled to submit to price fixing." Pennsylvania, equally aware of the realities, has held that the act sounds in tort not assumpsit. *Gillette Company* v. *Master*, 408 Pa. 292, 182 A. 2d 734 (1962).

Chancellor must agree with the defendants that an unlawful delegation of legislative power has taken place.

PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT'S RECENT CRITICISM OF FAIR TRADE LAW

In view of this blatant disregard of constitutional safeguards, together with a very shabby legislative history, (See Corwin's Memorandum, supra,) we are not surprised that 21 of our State courts have invalidated the law. It is a familiar and salutary rule that on matters of economic policy the courts should, with rare exception defer to legislative wisdom, *Max Factor* v. *Kunsman*, 55 p., 2d 177 (Sup. Ct. Cal., 1936). Your chancellor submits that this "illegitimate child of the depression" is such an exception, if for no other reason than the historical fact that the various legislatures (Pennsylvania included) passed the law with only the most perfunctory inquiry into its economic wisdom—as attested by the paucity of public hearings, committee debates, etc. Mr. Justice Cohen declared in the case of *Morris Shuman t/a Shuman Pharmacy et al.* v. *Bernies Drug Concessions t/a Bernie's Cut Rate* on January 21, 1963, 409 Pa. 539:

"Because of the inherently pernicious nature of price-fixing agreements, they have been declared invalid both at common law and illegal per se under the Federal antitrust laws. *Gulf Oil* v. *Mays*, 401 Pa. 413 (1960) *Schwegmann Brothers* v. *Calvert Distillers Corp.*, 341 U.S. 384 (1950); as Mr. Chief Justice Warren stated in the *United States* v. *McKesson and Robbins, Inc.* 351 U.S. 305–309–10 (1956).

"It has been held too often to require elaboration now that price fixing is contrary to the policy of competition underlying the Sherman Act and that its illegality does not depend on a showing of its unreasonableness, since it is conclusively presumed to be unreasonable. It makes no difference whether the motives of the participants are good or evil; whether the price fixing is accomplished by express contract or by some more subtle means; whether the participants possess market control; whether the amount of interstate commerce affected is large or small; or whether the effect of the agreement is to raise or decrease prices."

This is fundamental, and your chancellor makes it a part of this adjudication. Virtually every Justice of our Supreme Court has at one time or another been critical in their opinions of the economic soundness of fair trade laws in general. Up to 1960, the highest appellate courts of 21 States have held nonsigner clauses repugnant to their State constitutions. As Mr. Justice Cohen said: "Changing patterns of merchandising and distribution require a reappraisal of the underlying premises of fair trade legislation."

Likewise in the case of *Mead Johnson & Co.* v. *Breggar* (189 A. 2d, 866, at p. 869 (1963)), Mr. Justice Musmanno in a magnificent opinion, said: "Price fixing is, at its best, a drastic curtailment of competitive free enterprise, one of the main pillars of the support of the entire American economic structures. At its worse, it becomes a straitjacket on initiative in business resulting in monopoly manacling progress so as to serve a possible conspiratorial status quo. The very idea that a commercial entity may hold in one fettering price-fixing grasp all businessmen engaged in vending a certain product, just as a herdsman holds lassoed cattle on the plains, offends against the most elementary concept of a free and independent society."

Your chancellor firmly believes and states in language crystal clear: "Prices set under the so-called fair trade laws are, in actuality, a price-fixing scheme and always are in conflict with the Federal antitrust laws."

Fair trade laws deny consumers the benefits of price competition. The fair trade laws to your chancellor are a misnomer and recognized so by our courts.

Having said all of this, your chancellor finds himself in the same unhappy posture as District Judge Watkins (*Parke Davis* v. *G.E.M., Inc.*, 1962 trade case, par. 70196—D.C.-Md.), although being in full accord with the defendant's position, I must with great reluctance decide in favor of the plaintiff. I am so constrained because our Supreme Court has held the Pennsylvania act to be constitutional. *Burche Co.* v. *General Electric Company* (382 Pa. 370, 115 A. 2d 361 (1955)). Although the act was not critically examined in that case, as to this date, it is the law, and we are bound by it. However, we cannot fail to note that recently our highest Court has shown a positive inclination to reappraise the underlying economic and legal principles supporting fair trade, *Shuman* v. *Bernie's Drug Concessions, Inc.* (409 Pa. 539, 187 A 2d 660 (1963); *Meade Johnson* v. *Breggar* (189 A. 2d 866 (1963)).

I would certainly hope that the defendants accept the invitation by filing an appeal. Perhaps, when that reappraisal is made this lengthy opinion will be affirmed, and the decision rendered herein will be reversed.

In the opinion of your chancellor fair trade laws were born out of a depression—and the high pressure lobbies were driving a spear at the jugular vein of trade and sound economic practices. We cannot see the wisdom of a State permitting price fixing as economically and logically sound—for to attempt the same policies in interstate commerce finds one in the legal clutches of the Federal law for violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

Following the findings of fact and the arguments set forth in this adjudication, your chancellor comes to the following conclusions of law:

1. The act of June 5, 1935, Public Law 266, as amended, 73 P.S. 7, 8, is not contrary to and in violation of article 1, section 1, of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

2. Said act does not constitute an unlawful delegation of legislative power, and is in all other respects declared to be constitutional.

3. The plaintiff, as a manufacturer of trademarked goods, which are in fair and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced by others, and which are the subject of a valid and subsisting resale price maintenance agreement, is entitled to the benefits conferred under said act.

4. The defendants' conduct, consisting of knowingly advertising, offering for sale, and selling the plaintiff's goods, at less than the specified prices, constitutes unfair competition within the meaning of section 2, as amended, of said act.

5. Accordingly, the plaintiff is entitled to an injunction, wherein the defendants are and shall be enjoined from committing any further violations of plaintiff's resale price maintenance agreement, to the end that all squibb products henceforth sold by the defendants shall be at a price not less than the minimum prices set forth in said agreement.

Southern Governors Adopt Textile Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and able Governor of South Carolina, the Honorable Donald Russell, forwarded to us a copy of resolution VI on textiles adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference, August 21, 1963.

I commend this timely resolution to the attention of the President, his Cabinet, and to each Member of the Congress:

RESOLUTION VI—TEXTILES

Whereas the Committee on the Effect of Foreign Imports on the Domestic Economy has reported to this meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference that the economies of the southern States and employment throughout the Nation is heavily dependent upon the health of the textile industry; and

Whereas the President has recognized the existing need for aid to the textile industry by the announcement on May 2, 1961, of a seven-point program of assistance; and

Whereas included in this seven-point program was his recognition of the textile industry's importance to national security in that the President, as his seventh point, stated: "An application by the textile industry for action under existing statues such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act will be carefully considered on its merits"; and

Whereas an application under the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act was filed with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (now the Office of Emergency Planning) on May 15, 1961, on behalf of the combined fiber, textile, and apparel industries, asking for an investigation to determine whether textile products are being imported into the United States in such quantities and under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security; and

Whereas under the provisions of section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 no decrease in or elimination of any duty or other import restriction of the United States can be taken if the President determines that such reduction or elimination would threaten to impair the national security; and

Whereas the President in order to make his determination needs the findings and recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning with respect to said pending application; and

Whereas in recognition of the importance of said application and a recommendation thereunder, the President said, in a letter to the Honorable CARL VINSON on February 26, 1962, "Finally, there is now pending before the Office of Emergency Planning an application by the textile industry for relief under the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act. Consideration of the case upon its merits is being expedited and I am requesting the Office of Emergency Planning to make a recommendation to me without any unnecessary delay"; and whereas the United States is now preparing to negotiate the reduction of barriers to international trade under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and

Whereas our chief negotiator, the negotiating teams, and the Tariff Commission, in the preparation of the bargaining lists and in any later negotiations, would be materially aided and strengthened by a decision of the Office of Emergency Planning as to the vital importance of the textile industry to the national security; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., August 19, 1963, That the executive branch of the Federal Government, including the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, be advised that the Southern Governors' Conference urges them not to prepare bargaining lists and not to commence bargaining under the authority granted by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to any segment of the textile industry before a decision has been rendered

by the Office of Emergency Planning on the application filed by that industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Congress, and to Christian A. Herter, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

Business Citizenship in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Shane MacCarthy, prominent citizen of the Washington community and formerly Chairman of the President's Council on Physical Fitness, was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal Award by the Cosmopolitan Club of Washington.

The address Dr. MacCarthy made in connection with the acceptance of this award on October 22, 1963, was indeed thought provoking. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a copy of his remarks entitled "Business Citizenship in Perspective":

BUSINESS CITIZENSHIP IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks of Dr. Shane MacCarthy on his acceptance of the Distinguished Service Medal Award of the Cosmopolitan Club, October 22, 1963)

There are times when silence is more eloquent than words. This is such an occasion. When gratitude is given to Cosmopolitan in the name of all who worked with me on various civic projects and heartfelt thanks expressed for the honor conferred this day on my family and me, no more need be said. However, such a response would run the risk of generating misinterpretation as to some of my feelings at this moment about our Capital and its future.

I've been in Washington well nigh 40 years. To this home of mine I came in my early teens to later marry a girl who is a second generation Washingtonian and we are blessed with five native Washingtonian sons. Thus, my roots here are very deep. My hopes for the morrow are optimistic because my faith in people is solid. However, "hopes" are fragile if they remain mere words and "faith" that puts reliance on others to do good works is a deluding attribute. In Washington at this moment are many who share these hopes and this faith. But, multiplying such concepts achieves no tangible benefits for our Capital unless we as private citizens set aside the idle habit of talk and involve ourselves with all the resources at our command in a master action plan for Washington.

The focus of the world is now on Washington. This might seem like an enviable position for any one community. And to a degree it is—if those of us who live here realize our personal obligations and our opportunities. The emphasis of attention at this time however, has questionable merit. Being the site of the Government of the most important country in the world makes "Washington" a name known to every hamlet in every clime. Simultaneously, our city of renown and beauty has been attracting attention as a center of crime and irresponsibility. And we must ever remember that the honor of being a national capital does not shield and overcome the bad image emanating from this same spot. In fact, the facilities of communication are only too prone to carry the news of wrongdoing, which then becomes associated with all our customs, practices, and policies as if the be-all and end-all of our city on the Potomac is badness in every guise.

Washington D.C. is at a perilous juncture today. While it is the center of National Government, it appears unable to govern itself. This does not mean that the Federal Government should take direct administration of affairs. Neither is the comment to be interpreted as a criticism of the commission system or a plea for what is called "home rule." When I observe that Washington "appears unable to govern itself," I'm referring to my disappointment that the people who live in the metropolitan area of our National Capital are too often mute when they should speak and too often indifferent when they should be involved in responsible action.

Our great Capital City has its social, economic, educational, culture and political problems. It's a shocking set of circumstances which makes a parent fear for the safety of children who may be molested by irresponsible scoundrels. Business is a direct loser when a husband will not allow his wife and daughters to shop after sundown. The continual influx of people—frequently children alone—into Washington is compounding its housing, health, educational and many other problems.

While these conditions do not justify calling Washington—all Washington—a city of slums, or a crime-ridden Capitol, the composite envisionment offers a salutary warning that a continuity of what is bad will bring what will be worse and harder to cope with in the days ahead. When there are ever-widening cracks in the moral cement of a society's foundation, the structure can topple into a confused jumble of debris.

The ostrich approach of sweeping problems under rugs is sidestepping our conscientious responsibility. Can we afford mediocrity in our living, health, and educational standards in the District of Columbia? Yes we can, to our own detriment and ultimate disaster. Thus, when we soft-pedal the facts lest knowledge of them would create embarrassment, we are allowing the image to control our decision. We are choosing our words and molding our thoughts merely to please the recipient. This is the substitution of shadow for substance and such a process will solve nothing. At this moment in Washington too much of this brand of cowardly conduct is the custom. Asking for more money, more facilities, more police, more judges, more doctors, more jobs, more recreational activities, more of everything is giving quantity priority over quality. This is the easy answer of expediency. With expanding population more public facilities of all kinds are, indeed, necessary but the quantity answer of more police does not, for example, solve juvenile delinquency. It merely means there will be more patrolmen on the beat to keep up with the delinquent Joneses.

And what is achieved by the availability of jobs if openings in the manual arts and service trades are rejected by those who know not the dignity of honest labor, or worse, the applicants have no vocational training to fill the needs? Additional medically proficient men and women might well explain the dangers of sex promiscuity but the inculcation of moral character demands more time, attention, and prayer. If the community conscience is so numbed that punishment for crime deliberately committed is to be too often replaced by excuse, then adding more judges is of little avail.

Thus, the time has come for more thorough, courageous, dynamic, and effective solutions to the difficulties besetting the Nation's Capital.

Look at our public educational system in Washington. Today, it is far from being the model for the Nation.

Recently, I recommended to the Congress that Superintendent Hansen be given the authority and the money to have a survey conducted by an outside, impartial, objective, professional organization, of which there are many in the United States, to examine and assess in depth the current educational practices and needs in our Washington public schools and to report publicly on its findings.

Administering 170 public schools is a big and complicated business. The recommendation to the Congress was in keeping with the proven precedent of all business establishments which periodically invite outside administrative management agencies to analyze their policies and procedures with a view toward eliminating what is weak and unprofitable, improving what is already good, and installing what is required for best results. Such a survey should be done in depth to bring forth the facts—from a citywide battery of IQ, aptitude, and achievement tests on the actual status of every boy and every girl in our public school system. It is only when the human product is known that the educational method most appropriate for its fullest growth and development can be designed. This recommendation will remain on dead center unless the voice of the people is articulate in its demand.

Into an already overburdened and overcrowded school system is now dumped the complex dropout problem—with demoralizing results. Holding these unfortunate boys and girls in the classrooms is achieving only one end—keeping them off the streets. Such individuals are, indeed, a menace on the streets, with nothing to do and boredom ever beckoning badness. But it is most unfair to the teacher, to the class, and to the dropout himself, who in practically all cases needs special training, to entice him back merely to make the public image that the dropout problem is under control.

Making the classroom a youth hostel for dropouts is an indication of how we have unloaded community problems on the schools and neutarlized their educational effectiveness. Safe living environment is not a police problem; sanitary living is not a public health problem; the dropout and the delinquent are not school problems; apprentice training is not a labor problem. All of these and more are community problems. Councils, commissions, and committees too numerous to name have done much research in these areas but now is the time for broad-scale community action. Shall this be by Government or by the private sector of our capital? Here's the opportunity for the power of the people to assert itself. In our midst are hundreds of business and professional organizations of all kinds promoting the sale of ideas, services or products. Regardless of their field of endeavor, now is the time for them to realize that in the hierarchy of values none can ignore their responsibility to help their capital. If the social and civic fabric of our fair city continues to ravel then this will be no place for advancing their business endeavors.

The mistaken notion abounds that business and professional groups are concerned only with the area of private interest, leaving the prevalent impression that only government cares for the public interest. This false icon must be shattered, and here in our National Capital private business has both the obligation and the opportunity to do so. An injurious view of the free enterprise effort comes into existence by default because too often private business wears blinkers and ignores its full responsibilities. This is why exploitation, gain, and profit at any cost are equated with competitive business and government gets credit for objectivity, impartiality, honesty, and working for the poor and the downtrodden. Being in government gives a person no halo of integrity and no

more ability than a private businessman to determine what is in the public interest. It is with this breadth of vision, therefore, that the private business sector of our National Capital, represented by more than 500 business and professional associations, possessing unbounded talent and specialists in numerous fields, must recognize that far beyond their own limited business objectives extends their community responsibility to fulfill the public purpose for which we all exist. With a combined conviction they must come from the sidelines and initiate a leadership for continued action so that the exemplar for all other cities to emulate will be our own Washington.

Shipping and Its Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, another very interesting and informative article on the problems in the maritime industry has been written by Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, and was printed in the Sun yesterday. Because of the importance of this subject to our economy, I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD for the perusal of the Members:

SHIPPING AND ITS PROBLEMS—STUDIES INSTEAD OF STRIKES

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Because there are no precedents, the people conducting the two major labor studies now underway in the maritime industry are taking considerable time to complete the necessary basic factfinding and analysis, according to the two experts heading up the performing teams. One study concentrates on the problems of the seagoing unions, the other on longshore and dockers' needs.

Prof. James J. Healy, of Harvard University's Graduate School of Business Administration, and who has served on numerous factfinding boards including the current railroad work rules board, is concentrating the offshore seamen's study in New York and San Francisco, headquarters of the seamen's unions and steamship lines. The one exception has been a 10-day tour in Hawaii to study the labor problems relative to that State so dependent upon water transportation.

The prime aim of the seamen's study is to analyze the patchwork of union contracts that has grown up over the years creating the greatest competitive whipsawing in any industry. The whipsawing has arisen out of the fact there are at least nine leading maritime unions—contending against each other—and four major shipping organizations handling labor relations. Another adverse factor has been the erratic expiration dates of the various contracts. A common termination date has been described before Congress as one of the major needs to stabilize the labor picture aboard the ships.

The whipsawing among the seamen's unions works in this way. When the Sailors Union of the Pacific begins negotiating for a contract on September 15, its representatives say they want 1.2 percent more for their vacation fund because the National Maritime Union on the east coast received that on June 15. The Pacific Maritime Association—some of whose members also operate on the east coast and were part of the group granting the NMU increase—reply. "But we gave you 1.2 percent extra in pensions 3 years ago and the NMU was just coming up to that 1.2 percent." The union answer is, "that doesn't count now because the 1.2 percent we want now is in vacation fund and that is where we want it."

When the NMU enters negotiations the next time, it makes similar whipsawing demands because the SUP succeeded in obtaining a new percentage here and there.

The International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots and the National Marine Engineers Beneficial Association likewise whipsaw back and forth from east coast to west coast, and against one another on both coasts. In fact, the running battle between deck officers and engineering officers for higher recognition is one of the problems that has tied up the N.S. *Savannah* for so long. The *Savannah* is a perfect example of the sad effect of whipsawing in this industry.

As a result of this reciprocal bickering for the past 15 years, the mediators of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service often have found themselves without any background information on where this .6 percent or that 3.2 percent originated, or actually who has a higher overall package in what particular category.

A centralized collection of such information was felt to be vital to the future success of bargaining in the shipping industry—if the American merchant marine was to escape being scuttled amid labor disputes and contracts. A steering committee was set up by the Departments of Labor and Commerce to work on this pressing matter. Herbert Schmertz, then general counsel of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and now special assistant to the director, is the executive director. Members are Vincent Macaluso, of Commerce, and Joseph Goldberg, of Labor. Professor Healy was selected to make the actual study by the Maritime Administration, because of his wide background in the maritime labor field and his reputation as a labor arbitrator.

He hopes to have a tentative report together by the end of the year. The final study is to list all of the provisions in all contracts, as well as how they were attained, and appraisals of some of the principal problems of labor.

It might be well if his study included a suggested solution as to how the industry might be rescued from the pattern which has been described as strangling it to death.

Assembling the material for him are Professor Aaron Warner and Dr. Alfred Eichner of Columbia University, in New York; and Professors Ulman, of the University of California, and Hugh Folk, formerly of the same school and now with Washington University of St. Louis.

The longshore manpower utilization study moves to Baltimore this morning. David Stowe, labor arbitrator who served at the White House as an advisor to President Truman, said he is concentrating on the 10 largest ports on the East and Gulf coasts because they have 88 percent of the employed longshoremen and 68 percent of the gross tonnage.

As soon as the Stowe study team begins in Baltimore, black pins will be inserted in the gold circle now showing alongside Baltimore on the map in Stowe's office on the first floor of the Department of Labor building. On that map, small red circles denote all ports; large red ones, the ports to be studied; gold, ports in which there has been initial contact, and black pins in the gold mean the teams are there. No port has been completely finished yet, although most of the leg work is out of the way in New York.

Mr. Stowe said that if there is a specific problem in any of the smaller ports—such as loading barreled oil in Brownsville, Tex., or rice in Gulfport, La.—a team will go there to analyze that problem.

Team studies began in New Orleans and Mobile last week; and will begin in Houston and Galveston next week. Teams will also move into Boston next week; dates have not yet been set for Philadelphia, Hampton Roads, Savannah, and Tampa. Mr. Stowe has divided his study into three parts; Manpower utilization, labor force characteristics, and job security. Manpower utilization will encompass both factual data and discussions, opinions, suggestions, whys and wherefores.

The examination of labor force characteristics will be primarily a statistical analysis of pension funds, joint payrolls, the degree of labor force attrition through retirements and otherwise, the number of casual workers, amounts of earnings, types of equipments, types of piers, and kinds of ships.

Under job security, the methods of hiring and seniority rights will be considered along with severance pay, job protection, and pension plan arrangements.

Although the report will not be an elaborate one, Mr. Stowe is hopeful that the data presented will lead to a settlement next year rather than another billion-dollar tieup of the east and gulf coasts. He pointed out that there is not enough time, staff or proficiency to designate that so many men should be used on such and such a commodity; therefore, the report and analysis will be rather general, taking into account the economic situation of the industry at the time and the future trends toward automation and operation.

"We are after guidelines rather than recommendations," he stated. "We want to offer assistance in how productivity can be developed."

Another problem facing him is that the issues differ as between ports and that many ports have problems on which they have not been able to negotiate for years because of the recently enforced pattern of settling major issues on a coastwide basis and dropping the local ones. Mr. Stowe has found thus far that the local matters still play a major role in the individual ports and could present a major problem in the overall settlement picture next year.

He said a local problem in Baltimore is that of bulk sugar unloading at the American Sugar Refinery. Although such work has been going on here for at least 3 years, the picture is still rather muddled as far as the terms of operation are concerned and an active controversy exists. If pickets continue to march at the refinery during the study period in Baltimore, the Stowe teams will not try to enter or to analyze that particular difficulty. The study rules are that the teams will not work where a labor dispute is active and this will apply, even though in the instance of the Baltimore refinery, the picketing arises not out of a local problem, but because of an unsettled contract in New York.

The piers and the areas to be studied in Baltimore will be determined this week after Mr. Stowe has conferred with both the Steamship Trade Association of Baltimore and the International Longshoremen's Association.

Ohio State Employment Service Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, a shocking scandal has developed in the Ohio State Employment Service offices in Cleveland, Ohio.

Investigations started by the new director of the OSES, Mr. Willard Dudley, reveal that it was the policy of employees of that office to falsify the number of persons placed in new jobs.

Mr. Dudley is to be congratulated for his diligence in pursuing this investigation, and the Cleveland Plain Dealer is to be commended for making the facts known.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the first two articles in the Plain Dealer series:

FAKING OF JOB RECORDS BARED—OSES CLERKS HERE ADMIT FALSIFICATION

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Falsifying of public records to justify jobs on the State payroll has been uncovered in the Cleveland area office of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES).

Interviewers at the OSES clerical and professional division in the Gilman Building falsified documents to show they had found jobs in private industry for men and women who needed work. In many cases the fact was they did not find such jobs.

The Plain Dealer bares these irregularities in a series of articles beginning with two today. The stories are based in part on affidavits from interviewers admitting falsification. Excerpts appear in an accompanying article.

Sampling by State agents indicated that interviewers in the clerical and professional division improperly took credit for about one out of every three job replacements reported last May. This sampling check involved 427 cases.

Affidavits and reports of the investigation were made available to this reporter by Willard P. Dudley, administrator of the bureau of unemployment compensation (BUC), which includes OSES.

The interviewers said they were acting under orders. There was fear that the economy-minded administration of Gov. James A. Rhodes might discharge OSES staff members unless they could show they were earning their keep.

The interviewers were led to believe they had to achieve quotas in job placements. Actually, there are no quotas. Also false was a notion that the size of the OSES staff depended on the number of job placements.

Ward A. Riley, OSES chief in Cleveland until his position was abolished for other reasons, denied emphatically in a Plain Dealer interview that he had anything to do with the falsifying. He is blamed for it by a few of his former subordinates.

A key affidavit was made by Edward S. Faith, 50, of 20580 Eastwood Avenue, Fairview Park. Faith was a unit supervisor and has been working for OSES since 1947.

He said he was ordered (not by Riley) to give instructions on falsifying to interviewers in his unit.

These eight persons asserted in their affidavits that they participated in the falsifications:

Miss Elsie M. Shomer, 52, of 1385 Manor Park Avenue, Lakewood. She also was a unit supervisor. She joined OSES in 1948, resigned, then returned in 1960.

Fred Howard Thompson, 54, of 491 Karen Avenue, Berea. He was laid off September 13 but not because of the falsifying. He started at OSES in 1961.

William P. Maloney, 35, of 9157 Milford Drive, Northfield. He resigned July 15 after 2 years at OSES.

Samuel Solomon, 54, of 2014 Aiken Avenue SW. He started in 1961 and resigned 2 weeks ago.

Miss Mildred Kleinsmith, 42, of 17800 Euclid Avenue. She joined OSES last year.

Mrs. Gwendolyn Moore, 29, of 2291 East 103d Street. She has been at OSES 4 years.

Mrs. Eleanor Linneberger, 63, of 17300 Eulid Avenue. She joined the agency in 1951.

Mrs. Mary A. Jasko, 64, of 9502 Dickens Avenue SE. Her service dates from 1946.

Many who gave the affidavits assisted materially in the investigation. Faith, Miss Kleinsmith, and Mrs. Moore volunteered statements.

As unit supervisors, Faith and Miss Shomer worked for Mrs. Arline Wolf, who was a section supervisor (sales section). Mrs. Wolf, 59, of 23446 Emmons Road, Columbia Station, has been a State employee 34 years.

She ordered the falsifications, according to Faith and Miss Shomer. Mrs. Wolf denied this in an interview.

But she did tell this reporter and State investigators she was not surprised there had been falsifying. She blamed Riley for this.

Mrs. Wolf was responsible to Prentice Woodhouse, 56, of 5760 W. 224th Street, Parkview, who was manager of the clerical and professional division, and to Lewis M. Page, 64, of 2378 Euclid Heights Boulevard, Cleveland Heights, who was Woodhouse's placement supervisor.

Both are 25-year veterans of the employment service, Woodhouse earning $630 a month and Page $550 They said they were not aware of the falsifying.

They have been reassigned by BUC Administrator Dudley and demoted one grade in the civil service. But their salaries were not affected. For reasons that will be examined in later articles, these were the only disciplinary actions taken by Dudley.

Four other persons in the clerical and professional division related in affidavits or statements that they either knew of the falsifications or suspected them. They did not participate.

The four are Leslie L. Sutton, 62, of 17449 Woodford Avenue, Lakewood; Paul E. Monaghan, 45, of 13468 Clifton Boulevard, Lakewood; Elmer J. Menning, 64, of 4708 Clark Avenue SW., and Miss Celia Tachauer, 54, of Park Lane Villa.

Two unit supervisors who said they were not involved in the faslifying were Miss Mary L. Svetlik, 40, of 47 Pearl Road, Brunswick, and Mrs. Betty J. Malin, 55, of Rocky River Drive SW.

Frank B. Laurich, 53, of 14012 Lake Shore Boulevard NE., and Mrs. Jewell R. Howison, 35, of 1530 Coventry Road, East Cleveland, both interviewers, declined to make affidavits when they were asked to explain irregularities that had been found. Legally, they had a right to decline.

"We would like to emphasize that at no time was any pressure brought to bear upon any individual to make a statement or affidavit," said A. E. McCully, who headed the investigation.

STATEMENTS ON OSES FALSIFYING

COLUMBUS.—Here are excerpts from affidavits of Cleveland area employees of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES):

Edward S. Faith, supervisor of outside salesmen unit: He said falsification of documents was "going on in previous months, but in May (1963) it represented at least half of the (job) placements reported."

He said Mrs. Arline M. Wolf, his section supervisor, "would either hand me the card and ask me to have the interviewers record a placement, or go direct to one of the interviewers with the same instructions.

"Mrs. Wolf instructed me to have the interviewers look on current orders * * * to see if we could pick up some hires by changing the annotation 'N.H.' to 'Hired.'

"Mr. Solomon, Paul Monaghan, and I have discussed the practice of falsification of placements and whether we should report the practice to someone higher in the organization.

"Fear of reprisal from Mrs. Wolf and fear of losing our jobs kept us from doing so."

Miss Elsie M. Shomer, supervisor of the inside salesmen unit: "During May 1963, as a result of extreme pressure from management, there was false placement activity in Unit 37.

"Some of the placements recorded in Unit 37 were falsified. I participated in this activity by directing persons in my unit to follow instructions given me by my section supervisor, Mrs. Arline Wolf.

"In my opinion Mrs. Wolf was only following instructions from the former district manager, Mr. Ward A. Riley.

"On one occasion I overheard Mr. Riley tell Mrs. Wolf that he expected her to get placements and that quotas must be met. Reference was made to the fact that the basic unit staff might be reduced if the quotas were not attained.

"This statement was made at a May staff meeting.

"I do not subscribe to any method or practice that forces persons to resort to questionable procedures or to conform to instructions that are known to be unethical.

"I did, however, feel obliged to adhere to the instructions I received from my supervisor."

Fred Howard Thompson: "During May 1963, under instructions from my unit supervisor, Mr. Edward Faith, or my section supervisor, Mrs. Arline Wolf, I participated in the falsification of placement activity.

"I would like to make clear that I do not subscribe to this type of activity, and that I participated only to satisfy the instructions of my unit supervisor or section supervisor.

"I was told that we did not go to management above our immediate supervisor with problems without authorization. In view of this regulation, I could not find a way of reporting this falsification of placement records."

William P. Maloney: "I know that some placements were falsified. I was directed by Mr. Faith, my immediate supervisor, to participate in this activity. Mr. Faith instructed me to list hires any way I could get them.

"May 1963, was the only month I participated in this activity."

Samuel Solomon: "During May and to lesser degree before some of the placements reported were falsified. On the instruction of Mr. Edward Faith, unit supervisor, I participated in this activity to a limited degree.

"I did not report this activity to other officials in the agency for fear of reprisal."

Miss Mildred Kleinsmith: "I know that placements have been falsified in Unit 37 for several months, but more volume of such activity occurred during May 1963.

"All irregular reporting of placements on my part was a result of direct instruction from Miss Shomer or Mrs. Wolf.

"I felt this type of reporting placements was wrong, but fear of reprisal kept me from reporting this activity before. Bureau training instructions have emphasized the protocol of going through supervisory channels."

Mrs. Gwendolyn Moore: "Some of the placements recorded in Unit 37 for the month of May 1963, were falsified. I was instructed to participate in this activity by Elsie Shomer, my supervisor.

"I felt this type of reporting of placements was wrong, but inasmuch as my supervisor instructed me to do so, I felt obliged to follow instructions."

Mrs. Eleanor Linneberger: "During May 1963, I was aware of, and participated in the activity of falsifying hires.

"I followed instructions of my unit supervisor, Elsie Shomer, in participating in this activity and expressed myself as being very much opposed to such tactics.

"In fact I asked the question of my unit supervisor as to how she could justify this practice if questioned about it. I was told not to worry, that nothing would come of it.

"I only participated because I was specifically directed to do so. Fear of reprisal prevented my discussing this matter until given this opportunity to do so."

Mrs. Mary A. Jasko: "The reason I engaged in this activity is because of the constant pressure to build up or increase placements.

"I decided to engage in this form of activity after overhearing other persons in the office discuss methods they have been using in obtaining hires and thereby eliminating the pressure.

"It is not pleasant to have to work under the extreme pressure that causes one to resort to methods such as outlined here."

Leslie L. Sutton: "I was aware of the falsification of placements in unit 36 during May 1963 * * *

"I refused to participate in this activity."

Paul E. Monaghan: "I am aware of the falsification of placements during May 1963, in Unit 36.

"Mr. Edward Faith (supervisor of unit 36 during May) discussed methods being used in the unit to report more placements than was actually made, and further advised that this activity was directed by Mrs. Arlene Wolf.

"I did not participate in this fraudulent activity."

Elmer J. Menning: "From May 1, 1963, to June 10, 1963, I was absent from duty due to illness."

"In view of my illness and absence from duty I was, of course, not asked or instructed to participate in this activity of falsifying placements.

"There may have been a couple of occasions prior to May 1963, where I was told to take a hire that I did not know to be legitimate. This instruction was given by Mr. Edward Faith, my unit supervisor, and/or Mrs. Arlene Wolf, section supervisor and I assumed the instructions to be in order.

"I accept instruction from supervision and try to conform. I wish to make clear that this type of false placement activity goes against my grain."

Miss Celia Tachauer declined to make an affidavit, as was her right. But investigators reported after an interview with her:

"She stated she was suspicious of the quantity of orders at various times. She claimed to have been aware of possible activity in this area over the years at various times.

"She feels it (the investigation) should have started at the top management level. She further stated that pressure exerted on unit supervisors was extreme and unjust to create placement records."

Excerpts from other affidavits:

Miss Mary L. Svetlik, supervisor of typist unit: "Approximately 80 percent of my time is devoted to production work (interviewing, selection and referrals, etc.)

"I had no reason to suspect that any of my interviewers were falsifying placements. I am amazed with procedures used by some of my staff."

Mrs. Betty J. Malin, supervisor of secretarial unit: "I have not advocated falsification of placements, even though we do not make our quota."

In the case of Frank B. Laurich, who did not make an affidavit, investigators reported they checked supposed job placements of five applicants. In each case the employer told the State agents he did not hire the person.

"The referral action and verification of hire reflected on these records all bear the initials of Mr. Laurich," the investigative report says. "In our interview with him he states that the hires recorded are bona fide placements and should in no way be construed as falsification."

In the case of Miss Jewel R. Howison, who also declined to make an affidavit, investigators discussed with here "two orders that appear to be falsified."

One person who had applied for a job and was recorded as hired told investigators she had not been hired. Another person who had found a job said he did so without assistance from OSES, despite records to the contrary.

The investigators wrote: "Miss Howison was asked to explain these discrepancies. (She said) she would only give a written statement refuting any statement given in writing by the above mentioned applicants. In our opinion (her) attitude was very poor."

Names of job applicants—and also of employers who place orders for workers—are confidential data in OSES files.

John W. Higginson: A Good Friend Leaves the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, November 2, 1963, is going to be a sad day for many of us here on the Hill, particularly those of us who call the Old House Office Building "home," for it will be the last day of service of our beloved friend, John William Higginson. Mr. Higginson has been a member of the Capitol Police Force since 1951, and for 8 years, with only one brief recent interruption, he has hailed Congressmen and staff members alike—all by name—as we have come to work each morning via the First and Independence entrance of the Cannon Building. In fact, the mornings are going to be a little more difficult to face from now on, knowing we are going to be deprived of John's warm, hearty greeting at the beginning of each day.

Indeed, John Higginson is so much a part of the Hill life that some may not be aware of his distinguished service in other fields and other localities.

A native of Fall River, Mass., Mr. Higginson was for 29 years a member of the Fall River police force. For the last great portion of those years he was chief of the liquor and vice squad. Following his retirement in 1951, he came to Washington to be near his two children and his grandchildren and to go to work for the Capitol Police Force.

One of John Higginson's abiding interests is the young people of America. He once served as president of the Fall River Council of the Boy Scouts of America, and was a director of that organization for more than 15 years. His interest in our boys and girls is also manifested in the fact that, in connection with his membership in the Scottish Rite Masonic Order, he served as adviser to the DeMolays, an organization sponsored by the Masons for boys.

And of course I should mention that John served his country with dedication during the First World War. He enlisted in the Navy at the age of 18 and served until the end of hostilities as a chief shipfitter. His active interest in the veterans' cause continues and he is a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Though a lifelong Baptist, Mr. Higginson's marriage to the former Gladys Walker, of Brunswick, Maine, took place in the Episcopal Church of the Ascension in Fall River, Mass. Mr. and Mrs. Higginson celebrated their 40th wedding anniversary just last month. They now attend the Capitol Heights Baptist Church here in Washington.

Out of all of John Higginson's activities and interests, there is one which is obviously the most intense and most abiding, and that is his devotion to his family. Mr. and Mrs. Higginson are proud parents of a son and daughter and perhaps prouder grandparents of two grandsons and two granddaughters. Their son, John W. Higginson, Jr., and his wife have one daughter, Cynthia Louise, who is 16. The senior Higginsons' daughter, Gladys, and her husband—Mr. and Mrs. Donald Bulmar—are the parents of Donald, Jr., age 14; Steven, 12; and Robyn Lee, 1. Since their children and their families are now residing in the Washington area, Mr. and Mrs. Higginson plan to stay in the Nation's Capital after John's retirement.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can at least be thankful for that latter fact, and hope that John will come around to see us once in a while.

Meantime, I know that John Higginson's countless friends here on the Hill, both in and out of Congress, join with me in extending our warm gratitude for his dedicated service and for his friendship, and in wishing him many years of happiness to come.

Gronouski Cracks Political Whip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, of more than passing interest is Mr. Joe Young's recent column in the Washington Evening Star in which he reports a speech by the new Postmaster General, John Gronouski, calling on postal workers throughout the Nation to get into politics on an all-out basis.

According to Mr. Young, the Postmaster General told the National Alliance of Postal Workers that postal workers should insist a tax cut bill be enacted without any requirement that it be accompanied by limitations in spending, and they should also take an active part in the enactment of civil rights legislation.

Apparently Postmaster General Gronouski would toss out the Hatch Act by personal edict.

The article in the Star follows:

GRONOUSKI'S POLITICAL ACTIVITY ADVICE STIRS POSTAL UNIONS

(By Joseph Young)

Postmaster General John Gronouski wants the powerful postal employee unions to "take an active interest" in national political issues.

Mr. Gronouski said that it is equally important for postal employee unions to take active part in national political and economic issues as it is for them to look after the welfare of their members and in fostering the efficiency of the postal service.

Specifically, Mr. Gronouski, who came here from Wisconsin with a reputation as a skilled politician, urges the unions to take an active part in the current legislative battles on civil rights and Federal tax cuts.

Mr. Gronouski called for support for the Kennedy administration's civil rights bill and its bill to reduce Federal income taxes. He said the tax cut bill should be enacted without any requirement that it be accompanied by drastic limitations in spending, as advocated by opponents of the bill in its present form.

The Postmaster General declared that postal employees are directly involved, as citizens in the legislative battles now going on over tax cuts and civil rights, since failure to enact them would be a blow to this country's economic and social progress.

Mr. Gronouski's statement made in a speech before the National Alliance of Postal Employees, has caused a considerable stir among postal employee union leaders. Postal unions are strongly organized, representing an estimated 95 percent of the 570,000 postal workers.

While some of the unions have contributed to political campaigns of their key friends in Congress, they have shied away from taking direct action on political and legislative issues before Congress which do not directly affect the benefits and working conditions of postal and Government employees.

Mr. Gronouski feels that outside of the right to strike, which is forbidden to postal and Government employee unions, "the role of a union of Government employees is identical to any other union" and consequently they can join other unions in fighting for general political and economic legislation not directly linked to their own particular benefits and service.

Some employee leaders are a little uneasy as to what to do. They are aware that some opponents of President Kennedy's Executive order, which gave postal and Government employee unions official bargaining rights and the dues checkoff system, assert that the vast army of postal and Federal employees are being banded by the administration into one huge political organization.

Employee leaders deny this. But they want to avoid anything that would give further rise to this type of criticism and cause any disruption or curtailment of the President's labor-management program.

The Sergeant's Cadillac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to attach an editorial from the Tampa Tribune entitled "The Sergeant's Cadillac." This editorial compliments my very able and distinguished colleague, JIM HALEY, whose congressional district adjoins mine, for his support of a proposal to establish a watchdog committee over the Central Intelligence Agency. A great deal of interest has been evidenced in the Congress recently of legislation to oversee the CIA, partly due to developments in South Vietnam, and I know that the following editorial will be read with a great deal of interest:

THE SERGEANT'S CADILLAC

Florida Congressman JAMES A. HALEY has pulled out of a very dusty pigeonhole a proposal to establish a watchdog committee over the Central Intelligence Agency.

It was a good idea when it was first offered to Congress several years ago. It's even better now.

Congressman HALEY's action was inspired by recent events in South Vietnam. There it has been reported that the CIA was financing special Vietnamese military units—apart from those with which American military advisers are working—and apparently pursuing a policy entirely independent of the State Department.

"The CIA was established some years ago as a factfinding agency—an espionage agency, if you will—but somehow has managed behind its cover of secrecy to convert itself into a policymaking organization so powerful it can thumb its nose at the President himself," said HALEY.

This analysis overstates the case but not much.

After a review and shakeup of CIA following the Bay of Pigs fiasco which it managed, the Kennedy administration gave the impression that thenceforth the agency would stick to collecting intelligence and leave the planning and execution of foreign policy to others. But the reports from Vietnam show the contrary.

This is reason enough to revive the proposal for a joint congressional committee, like that which keeps check on the Atomic Energy Commission, to look over the furtive shoulder of the CIA.

There is an additional reason, which Congressman HALEY didn't mention.

That is the recent disclosure that some of the CIA's top-secret reports from its overseas agents were slipped to the Russians for a period of at least 2 years by an Army sergeant working at the National Security Agency at Fort Meade, Md.

The National Security Agency is under the Defense Department, not the CIA, but it receives CIA reports. If information published by the Washington Star is correct, the protection of these reports was incredibly lax.

Sgt. Jack Edward Dunlap, who committed suicide July 23 after learning he was under investigation, was listed as a clerk-messenger. Yet he had such easy access to top-secret reports that he was able to take bundles of them home at night. On a sergeant's pay he bought Cadillacs and a boat, kept girl friends, and disported himself in a way that would have aroused the curiosity of any self-respecting security agent. But it was only after he applied for transfer to a civilian job, a procedure requiring a new security investigation, that the Defense Department became aware that the sergeant not only was living beyond his means but had an earlier record of petty thievery and immoral conduct. According to the Star's report, he was paid $60,000 or more by the Russians for regularly funneling to them the CIA reports. Presumably he was doing this during the period of the Cuban missile crisis last October, when such information would have been especially valuable to Moscow.

The CIA bears no direct responsibility for Dunlap's long undetected treason. But certainly the Nation's top intelligence agency ought to know whether its supersecret reports are being properly guarded by the agencies receiving them. It is foolish to spend hundreds of millions of dollars and risk the lives of loyal men in collecting vital information only to have it so carelessly handled that a petty clerk can peddle it to the enemy at will.

It is poor policy to permit any Government agency to operate in total secrecy, beyond the critical scrutiny of outside eyes. The mere knowledge that the watchdog is there promotes efficiency and discourages arrogance.

The habitual argument raised against such a congressional committee is that it would jeopardize the keeping of the CIA's precious secrets. After the Dunlap case, this argument is no more honest than the sergeant's Cadillac.

Kennedy to Meany to Hall to Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently one of our better known U.S. Senators made some critical remarks about the attitude of recipients of our largess in the form of Foreign Aid.

All of us have been seriously questioning the amount of good will we gain with our open account checkbook to the tune of over $100 billion.

There may be some excuses for some nations to find fault with our actions, but not Canada. If ever a Foreign Nation has been treated like a long lost relative, Canada has been by the United States. The Canadians seem to forget the billions of dollars of our Government spending in Canada in this generation—$15.5 billion. They seem to forget the real concern this Nation has always had for Canadian security, prosperity, and well-being.

I am not such a devotee of our Foreign policy as to accept all its actions without criticism but I do resent the insinuation that this Nation is run by dictatorial tactics by a combination of self-seeking personal, political and family connections.

We have our faults but it comes in poor grace for our neighbors to the north to be so indiscreet as to kick open the private door of our political boudoir without at least finding out if we are prepared for visitors.

It is time all Nations learn to respect each others prerogatives without insultingly criticizing the heads of friendly nations.

In my humble opinion, the President of the United States nor any other Kennedy ordered the round of events depicted in the attached editorial from the Toronto Financial Post, October 19, 1963.

I believe Secretary Wirtz, a man of proven merit and ability, has sufficient chores here in the United States keeping our labor-management affairs on an even keel without getting into the act as described in the attached editorial.

I cannot believe any Canadian honestly believes that President Meany's job depends upon his prestige or influence in Canada. Like all American labor leaders Mr. Meany is interested in the welfare of the foreign worker, including Canadians. His interest is even more important and urgent today with the dangers involved in free trade among nations as sponsored and endorsed by this same newspaper over the years.

If American labor is doomed to a life of relief check living because of cut-

throat competition from overseas or over the border—then Mr. Meany does have a legitimate and professional duty to perform in any case where foreign labor can conceivably put U.S. workers out of employment.

I do not think George Meany will lose his job for trying to raise labor standards in competitive countries although in this instance, I believe this editorialist went way overboard in his ramblings about alliances, unholy or otherwise, between the Kennedys, the Meanys, the Halls, and the Banks. I am rather sure the four have never met and if they did they would have matters to discuss other than the elections of the head of our Government and our labor unions.

In closing, I might paraphrase the last paragraph in the attached editorial by stating that "Americans who have not taken the oath of allegiance to Canada or any other foreign country, had better protect their own markets and trade channels against the low paid worker in the low economy countries or take the full consequences of lowered worker pay and a depressed economy."

If the Canadians object to being called foreigners, just read this editorial and see who is most anxious to divorce your interest from ours and to make it clearly understood that we Americans are foreigners to the Canadians.

The rather unusual foreign editorial follows:

KENNEDY TO MEANY TO HALL TO BANKS

President Kennedy wants to be reelected next year but Canadians don't like being a punching bag in his political warmup.

The American Government is busily engaged in trying to run the affairs of dozens of countries around the world. It wears the robes and halo of sanctity. It is on the side of progress or democracy or freedom or something that sounds good.

Certainly no responsible member of the Western alliance will envy the most powerful nation on earth its responsibilities or deny its generosity or seriously criticize what the Americans stand for in the cold war.

But more and more the habit of pushing other people around is growing on the Kennedys and their clansmen in Washington.

This is frequently and amply demonstrated within the United States indeed, terrifying American citizens into behavior pleasing to the Kennedys is currently the political sport of the President's brother, the Attorney General.

Quite a few people and corporations who do not please the Kennedys are now finding that their current and past income tax returns are being reviewed.

And who is there who won't be intimidated by that even if their income reports are all clean as a whistle? This Attorney General discipline is so intimidating, in fact, that U.S. news media don't write about it.

Now, with their bullying strategy perfected at home, the Kennedys and their cohorts are using it to get what they want abroad.

Take the latest example of outrageous interference—the American pressure against the Canadian Government over the labor union war on the Great Lakes.

Belatedly, the Canadian Government stepped into this mess and the trustee scheme is about to be implemented.

But the spectacle of the White House and the U.S. Secretary of Labor and the whole weighty machinery of the U.S. Government being gassed up to tell the Canadian Government what it can and cannot do about a Canadian problem is, to say the least, unpleasant.

ALLIANCE, YES; HOLY, NO

Here is the cast of characters and here is the play.

Kennedy needs the labor union vote in his presidential contest next year. That means he needs the unqualified support of George Meany, the powerful head of the AFL–CIO.

Meany is shaky in his lucrative job. Quite a few big union leaders are gunning for him, notably Walter Reuther of the Auto Workers.

To protect his hide, Meany needs all the friends he can keep and so he will do anything to please Paul Hall, the very powerful international boss of the Seafarers Union.

Paul Hall, in turn, very much needs the support of Hal Banks—and the money Banks gets out of his Canadian union members.

So when the U.S. Secretary of Labor solemnly makes an official pilgrimage to Ottawa (nobody can recall that happening before) and when he makes public declarations telling the Canadian Government what to do, he is merely doing a chore for Kennedy who wants to do a favor for George Meany, who needs Hall, who needs the notorious Hal Banks.

From Mr. Kennedy's point of view, Canada is quite unimportant. It would, in most respects, be a lot simpler for the White House and the U.S. Government if we didn't exist at all as a separate country.

It is tragic that a man of such great endowments as Kennedy should, with increasing frequency, be revealed as having a serious defect of character. His intellect and conscience too often fail him in assessment of the appropriate and seemly exercise of power.

The proverb, "The end justifies the means" with the Kennedy clan too often becomes "The end justifies any means."

Hal Banks and John F. Kennedy will understand each other completely. As "successful" men, they have a good reason to admire each other.

Both Banks and Kennedy are good at kicking people around. Canadians who have not taken the oath of allegiance to the White House and to the U.S. Congress have very good cause for extreme distaste.

No. 23—Ohio: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Ohio, about gambling in that State.

Legal gambling in Ohio, as represented by the parimutuel turnover, came to over $138 million last year. The State Treasury benefited to the tune of over $10 million in revenue. But, far more significant were the vast amounts of money illegally gambled—much of which nourishes the manifold operations of the crime syndicates.

Ohio's portion of the national off-track betting estimates presented to the McClellan committee came to more than $2½ billion in 1962. On the basis of other estimates, total illegal gambling in the Buckeye State may have approached $5 billion last year.

In Ohio, as elsewhere, gambling's illegal status is a major bulwark of gangland prosperity. The crime syndicates thrive on gambling revenues. The 10-percent cut of the gross turnover which can reach $500 million, goes to line the pockets of the syndicate operators. This money is subsidizing every known form of crime and so long as gambling remains unchained and uncontrolled, it will continue to do so. This vast illegal gambling operation has made the people of Ohio the unwitting partners of the mob, which keeps the syndicates flush with cash.

Ohio, Mr. Speaker, will be a feeding trough for the underworld until such time as the human gambling tendency is recognized and controlled rather than chastised and outlawed. Throughout the world, government regulation of gambling by means of national lotteries has weakened crime with a hard blow to the wallet. Why cannot we in the United States demonstrate like wisdom?

Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech given by Dr. George Roberts of the Vanadium Alloys, Latrobe, Pa., in my congressional district, deserves more than passing attention.

I believe every Member of Congress knows my stand on so-called free trade legislation. I believe in free, but equitable trade agreements. I am unalterably opposed to the type of trade deals this Nation has made in which we trade U.S. jobs for the will-'of-the-wisp of foreign good will.

I believe every nation, like every family, must live within its means and that help should be given only when these means are not attainable through no fault of the family or the nation.

I am happy to present this speech for the RECORD and recommend the parts dealing with imports and so-called trade to those Members of Congress who voted for the philosophy that any American industry that cannot compete with Japan, Hong Kong, EEC, or any other foreign producer would have to go out of business.

I would hate to see the rest of our local industries go down the free trade drain; we have lost too much already.

Whether you agree with Mr. Roberts or not, you should at least read what he has to say. His address follows:

WORDS, CLICHES, AND IMAGES: A TRAVELER SPEAKS

John Steinbeck in his delightful, though contradictory, book, "Travels With Charley" reports wistfully on the lack of an English equivalent to the Spanish word "vacilar." It does not mean to vacillate. If one is

"vacilando," the present participle, he is going somewhere but doesn't greatly care whether or not he gets there, although he has direction. Thus, a journey, no matter how random in appearance, or how without an apparent day-to-day plan, has a design and, as Steinbeck says, "Everything in the world must have design or the human mind rejects it, and, in addition, it must have a purpose or the human conscience shies away from it."

Now, what can we make of this? As a businessman, trained in science and engineering, I should like to take Steinbeck for my text and "vacillar" with you through the next 20 minutes. For our direction, we shall explore man's progress economically, for our purpose we shall have enlightenment if not truth, for our route we will have none. I ask you to skip with me through the world, almost as I have done in the past 12 months, to skip through the writings of our contemporaries and learn something of the forces that have design and purpose today.

I have just returned from France and Italy. These words were written there. It was my fourth trip in 12 months to the European Economic Community which, added to two trips to a Latin American country, qualifies me to have at least a penchant for traveling and a curiosity about peoples. As a matter of fact, I love it, having learned very little while sitting behind my desk at home in the normal course of daily events. I do not speak any foreign languages as well as I should—or should like to—but by a program of schooling known as the "Roberts' Do-It-Yourself Berlitz System" have managed to be able to read newspapers in four languages. I find this fascinating, for one can learn more of the true feelings in a land, not ours, by so reading than he can by having it interpreted for him through American journals. The least accurate newspapers in the world are ours when it comes to reporting foreign news and trends, and I hope no one in Europe fully relies upon our Paris editions of the New York Times or Herald Tribune for they would be astounded if they knew or could recognize the bias involved in the words.

An ordinary European newspaper reports very little news of the United States of America except as it is affected by the interferences and threats inherent in a sabre rattling Gilpatric forcing atomic submarines on an Italy with an election only weeks away—or a Herter forcing a low tariff principle on a series of governments who have just banded together to form the world's most powerful protectionist society and want none of it—or a Kennedy forcing a U.S.-conceived, high-cost defense system on Britain when she thought and planned for something different and when her politics were shaken by the prospects of an imminent election at any rate. These and Mr. Khrushchev's antics are ably reported with bias as the paper may dictate—but by and large a European front page is like ours. Highway deaths, murders, jury divorce actions, sports (not a word on the world series, though) and domestic politics.

Now, I have mentioned domestic politics and bias. They are inseparable and transparent in the world's journalism. In our land, most newspaper owners have dropped an out and out partisan approach not only to the news but to their editorial policy. Reporters, however, are single humans, like you and me, and have a built in color which is freely expressed. If suppressed, we hear of it, but it generally is not, and we have witnessed the spectacle of a Pegler and a Lawrence appearing on the same pages as a Childs or a McGill. Not so overseas, for in these lands, where creeping socialism has crept much further than here, where bureaucracy and powerful monolithic political machines have been perfected, newspapers tend to be proud to express a consistent position and to hire only writers who will. Those who won't will find another paper to employ them in most countries, but may find limited circulation if the machine is an experienced one.

Yet, despite our so-called freedom of the press and its pretense of an analytical view of the news, do we as individuals take advantage of the existence of differing prejudices and views or do we tend to read only a fixed view, to take only a fixed position, for instance. I was shocked last year to find no pro-Gaullist views at home. The present administration has so dominated our editorial pages and thoughts with their manufactured views that here one would think DeGaulle an ogre, a maniac, a threat to the United States when, in fact, his position is strong, he wins popular elections on specific issues which we never have an opportunity to vote for in this country, and he may well turn out to be the best thing to have happened to us for a long time. Gradually, a few voices to this effect were raised in our press—yet even last week one of our national columnists said that DeGaulle had hurt us badly by keeping us and England out of the Common Market.

Now, let's set this matter straight. De Gaulle did not keep England out of the Common Market permanently, he only postponed serious discussions of this possibility until it was a more feasible suggestion. Likewise, he did not keep us out of the Common Market. No one had invited us into the club and we hadn't had a serious thought of joining. The Common Market is a new experiment between six industrial and agricultural and highly developed countries in Western Europe to lower internal trade restrictions and to raise uniformly high restrictions against outside products. We praised its beginning and encouraged its implementation. Our tax moneys, yours and mine, paid for a part of its success, its state of industrial development and its ability to improve the internal standards of material living of its people. It can exist because its participants, in fact, have a common or similar or alike heritage, custom, degree of development, wage scale and, in fact, a large total market. Within the market, political unity is talked about as a poscible future development and some experimental machinery is being set up to unify certain political functions—but it is a long way from fruition and is unimportant to today's realist who must live in, compete in, and make the market work economically. We would be led to believe that it is working perfectly—yet there are many unsolved questions—most dealing with agriculture and most dealing with French or German agricultural interests. De Gaulle did not want England to join because agricultural problems were not solvable internally at this time, let alone with the added burden of England's and the Commonwealth's intrusion at this time. He was blessed for his action by a greater percentage of Europeans than Kennedy's percentage of support in this famous 48 percent victory, and, in fact, was probably secretly admired by most Britons including many Conservatives who had their political necks bared farther than Miss Keeler's anatomy on this issue.

Now Europe is wary as they weld their society, their Common Market, with astounding energies applied through a system of strong private incentives triggered by our foreign aid to a devastated Europe. This foreign aid continues, as you know, even today with the majority of our total aid still going to Europe and to wealthy England despite the propaganda from Washington about Alliances for Progress and aid to African nations. They build with their growing low priced exports to the U.S.A. and they fear we will want to continue our exports to them. They use every restriction in the book beyond tariffs which are already more than twice ours to block our imports. The European Economic Community is a protectionist society which will not tolerate imports of things it can grow or make itself and it plans to grow and make just about everything. This is the core of the row about chickens—about grain—and now that our collegiate experimenters in planned American unemployment have a blank check in the form of the Kennedy Trade Expansion Act we will be trying to fight a rear guard action to slow the rate of decline that is inevitable in our agricultural exports by massive concessions in our own already low tariffs on our industrial products.

Is your industry on the list for this giveaway? Is your job to be threatened? Is your labor union member going to be unemployed? Sixty thousand people in steel now are because of imports. I predict it will double in the next 3 years unless something is done. Labor and management and their third partner, the saver who deferred his personal spending pleasures and invested his savings in the business (the stockholder), have an interest here that is a real common market. When they get over their set positions taken by abstract economists or politicians on both sides, they will know that their interest is together on this point. There are those who feel that even our Government has obligation to its own people. It used our money for the Marshall plan, for AID, and it should now get into partnership with industry (and industry should welcome this partnership) to help fight dumping and imports that create unemployment.

One of the world's most successful and peaceful constitutional democracies is Mexico. No free-trade principles dominate this country. They have decided to protect their own industry, to provide jobs and make many products by restrictions and tariffs. And more power to them for protecting their own. There will be an election there next year and the winner will be a new President of the PRI Party to succeed 6-year termer Mateos who cannot succeed himself. It may surprise you to know that here is a real one-party system (there are one or two other splinter groups who get snowed under in the press and by the voters) that we live next to, that nominates its next President by a political convention which is really a sham for a selection by committee or caucus. Not much different than in Russia, Yugoslavia, Cuba, or Vietnam except they haven't in recent years had to shoot the opposition and none have thought of burning themselves in, to us, un-Christian suicide to get the attention of starry-eyed idealists in our papers and State Department.

We do not insist on a greater freedom of choice for Mexico or Russia or Ben Bella's Algeria—why for heaven's sake do the American businessmen, investors, workers, and labor leaders allow us to so insist in Vietnam, in the Dominican Republic, in tens of other places where our idealistic, neo-socialist intrigue is working its little plots, to come to the fore only as tomorrow's headlines. As in Cuba, it seems if a dictator of the Right is involved we are against him. No Batista—but Tito—why? No Right—Center in the Dominican Republic but Bosch—why? Joseph Alsop recently wrote this about Vietnam: "One of the more idiotic cliches of our time is that once the Communists fix their grip on a nation that grip can never be broken. Hungary proved the contrary—for Hungarian communism was restored, after all, not by Hungarians but by Soviet troops. Yet the cliche continues to be parroted. The power of idiotic cliches has helped mightily to bring the Diem government to this passe. The central cliche is that, if a country like South Vietnam receives American aid, then its government ought to be remodeled in the image,

let us say, of the government of the State of Michigan. But this idealistic American demand for Asian democracy is doomed to be unfulfilled. The persistent application of our standards to Asian leaders, the insistent demand that Asian leaders perform in a manner more ideally American than many an American State governor, is not merely silly in itself, its underlying self-righteousness is deeply pernicious. Its pressure warps and cripples Asian leaders who might otherwise perform quite respectably, as in the case of President Diem. About an Asian government, only three questions need to be asked. Does it work? Does it serve American interests? And, is it not better, with all its faults, than the probable alternative—which in present-day Asia is quite often a Communist government like that in North Vietnam. Look at the facts. Mouth no more cliches. Down with twaddle-think. These should be the new slogans.

Remember what we did in China when George Marshall went there to form a coalition government. Remember what we did in Cuba to get rid of a one-party rule. What do we cover up by pretending that we make judgments instead of guesses? Now, if you think this is just George Roberts talking, let me quote from the press of the recent months. The propaganda made of words, cliches, and images rolls on.

The Washington Post on September 27, 1963, printed a UPI dispatch from Calcutta, India, saying President Kennedy had found a way to thwart the wishes of Congress on building the Bokaro steel mill. It said, "U.S. Ambassador Chester Bowles (remember him and the original price fixing by the Government), speaking at a press conference, said this could be done by releasing U.S. funds for smaller Indian projects that could otherwise be financed by India, which would let them use such funds to build the Bokaro plant."

Or consider from the same paper this oft-heard lament of an underdeveloped country. It speaks of Algeria's problem with its 2 million Berbers who were the original inhabitants and yet are dominated by the Arabs and who, after 12 centuries, still resent it. Doesn't sound like too much integration there. There writer says, "Their resentment increasingly has spelled trouble for the Ben Bella regime, already harried by a precarious economy and an inadequate administrative class."

Never any mention that their harassment and troubles are in any way related to the lack of a sound system of economic expansion—a system of private incentives which in America and elsewhere when used has proved superior to any other in providing the greatest goods for the greatest number. Always blame a shortage of Government planners. We hear this in many lands and you will hear it more. There are some people in Washington who should know better than say without planned national research concentrated on the civilian economy in America we are domed. More planning.

Then there is the character assassination by liberal writers on the proper signal. Do it to France, to Portugal's leaders, to the leadership of the anti-Communist revolution in the Dominican Republic. Hear what Barnard L. Collier has to say in the September 30 issue of the New York Herald Tribune: "The coup leaders are ambitious men whose violent anticommunism is genuine enough, but whose scruples about pinning a Communist label on any critic of their regime are feared to be lacking." It makes me sick. Where is the liberal writer who will worry in print about the scruples of Castro pinning an anti-Communist label on any critic of his regime. Castro shoots first and pins labels later. I could name many more disturbing examples—but let us consider just two more—

First, U.S. rice exporters are apprehensive of the European Common Market rice policy which guarantees Italian rice growers a selling price 10 percent higher and the French 35 percent higher than the U.S. price. Such guarantees would mean high duties for U.S. rice. Duties are calculated to insure preference for the community growers. High guarantees would stimulate production in the Common Market. The system of import licenses that will be introduced with the common duty policy holds uncertainties for oversea producers. In the case of grains, it has often happened that licenses are promised and later withdrawn. What do we do? If they stimulate production by high duties and license, why don't we?

Second, the National Planning Association said the United States must continue to press vigorously for greater access to the European Common Market for American farm products. The organization recognizes that domestic political pressures in the Common Market countries are in back of trade restrictions. "We must be prepared," the Committee said, "to accept compensating trading offers in other commodities—to offset trade restrictions in the grain-livestock sector imposed because of domestic political pressure within the Common Market," a cliche that, like those on Vietnam deserves to be forgotten. Domestic political pressures are people. They will not go away because the National Planning Association of the United States wants them to, nor, perhaps, should they. And note the willingness of NPA to create unemployment in industrial neighborhoods to further aid our farm economy. Western Pennsylvania—take note.

Let us vacillate—let us mentally wander but with a design, even though the end point of this design may change with time. If, as we go, it must, let it. Let us not just vacillate. Let's not just drift along. Let us be aware of changing conditions and recognize and resist cliches of old whether parroted by conservatives or liberals. Business must learn that Democrats are not all bad—that Republicans not all good. Labor must learn the reverse. Business must also learn what labor has known and made it its business to know—that just because we want it to—big government—any government—is not going to go away. We can't turn our backs and will it. We can't talk to ourselves and will it. We must turn about and be as realistic on this subject as we normally are about dollars in business. Government and others will be mouthing their words, repeating their cliches, creating their images as long as we permit them without vigorous constructive complaint.

I would urge that we all recognize the power of words. That we analyze and study the artillery of cliches and images that are thrown upon our minds today by writers, politicians, labor leaders, soldiers, businessmen and, yes, even invited speakers. I would ask only that they be given objective perusal. Sound progress will come from a sound analysis of, adaptation of and change of "principles of yore" to today's environment.

Georgetown University 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert an editorial from the Washington Post of October 20, 1963, which appeared as part of the continuing tribute being paid to Georgtown University on the occasion of its 175th anniversary.

Aside from my many contacts with Georgetown graduates in the great professions, I have more than a sentimental attachment to this great institution. One of its most loyal and devoted sons was my late brother, George Gerard Carey, who departed this life as the result of an untimely accident in his 30th year. Due to the benevolence of his estate, a deserving student in the Georgetown University School of Medicine, will enjoy the benefits of a scholarship aid from the accruals of a fund in his memory.

Especially mindful of this proud day in Georgetown's history I bring to the attention of my colleagues, in addition to the Washington Post editorial, two other articles which have appeared in connection with this historical occasion:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1963]

GEORGETOWN'S ANNIVERSARY

In the rich and varied program of events which Georgetown University has planned for the observance of its 175th anniversary year, today's convocation at which Chief Justice Earl Warren will be the principal speaker, has special significance and distinction. Universities are conservators and transmitters of the past; but they are also active participants in the present, contributing knowledge and understanding to the solution of contemporary problems.

The contemporaneousness of this venerable and great institution of learning and the broad spectrum of its interests are marked by the roster of those upon whom it will confer honorary degrees today. In addition to the Chief Justice of the United States, recipients will be Congressman J. E. Fogarty, a noted supporter of medical research; Dr. James M. Nabrit, president of Harvard University and one of the principal advocates in the desegregation cases decided by the Supreme Court nearly a decade ago; Dean Erwin Griswold, of the Harvard Law School, an exemplar of the lawyer's commitment to public service; Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia, who has rendered conspicuous public service to the whole of the Western Hemisphere; and James Cleo Thompson, a graduate of Georgetown Law School and an eminent Methodist layman and lawyer.

Americans in general, Washingtonians in particular, owe great gratitude to Georgetown University, an ornament of the Nation's Capital and a potent influence upon the Nation's affairs. Its varied schools have contributed much to the understanding of today's perplexities. We congratulate the institution and wish it continued usefulness into a long future.

[From Georgtown University Alumni magazine, September 1963]

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Rev. George H. Dunne, S.J., director, 175th anniversay program)

Georgetown University, entering its 175th year, is now engaged in the third special celebration of its founding. In 1889, the year of the university's centennial, word went out in classical Latin announcing to the academic world the completion of Georgetown's first century. Three days of celebration—February 20, 21, and 22—were climaxed by the presentation in Gaston Hall, of centennial medals to Cardinal Gibbons and President Cleveland. In 1939, the sesquicentennial year, the celebration extended for a week—May 28 to June 3—under

a theme which celebrated the "double sesquicentennial anniversary" of Georgetown and the "adoption of a Federal Constitution which still endures as fundamental law from generation unto generation."

As both the university and the Constitution mark their 175th year, Georgetown once again commemorates its past and looks forward to an expanding future. Under the theme "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World," the anniversary observance will attempt to bring into focus for the learned world the Georgetown image; to inspire the rededication of the faculty in teaching, research, and publication; to engage our students in special academic and professional programs and events; and to involve the alumni and friends of Georgetown everywhere in the excitement of the key ideas and challenges of our times.

The anniversary program has a carefully worked out slogan—in which wisdom stands for the resources of the classroom and our library collections; and discovery for research in the laboratory and the scholar's study, both being directed toward the practical necessities of professional life in today's complex world. The program has a special symbol as well, one which, without in any sense being a substitution for our revered university seal, takes the elements from that seal and rearranges them to emphasize and embody the words of the theme. Thus the stylized eagle is shown holding a book with a cross, symoblizing wisdom, in one claw; and in the other, symbolizing discovery, the world surrounded by the atomic spiral. In the background, the 13 stars of the university seal are arranged in an orbital path, to symoblize our dynamic world. The official anniversary colors are black, red, and gold, the colors of the coat of arms of the Carroll family, of which Charles Carroll of Carrollton and Archbishop John Carroll, our founder, were such distinguished members.

Our anniversary theme slogan, our symbol, and the Carroll colors will be the distinguishing marks of the programs and booklets to be issued by Anniversary House. They will be featured on the binding and dust jackets of the volumes of the Wisdom and Discovery series, to be published by P. J. Kenedy & Sons. These publications will carry the Georgetown anniversay story far beyond the boundaries of the campus, as will the pictorial history of Georgetown for which Father Joseph Durkin, S.J., is preparing the text and the special supplement to the Washington Sunday Star, to be issued next spring.

The anniversary celebration will begin on September 26, 1963, with a Mass of the Holy Spirit, at which the sermon will be preached by Father Donaghy, former president and rector of Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass. This will be followed on the night of September 28, 1963, by a dinner for all full-time professors of the university and their wives (or husbands). Father Gerard Campbell, S.J., newly appointed executive vice president of the university, will, on this occasion, be presented to the faculty and will speak on the theme of the anniversary year. The other principal address of the evening, on the role of a private university in a free society, will be delivered by Miss Rosemary Park, the president of Barnard College, New York City.

On October 12, the New York chapter of the Georgetown Alumni Association will play host to the John Carroll awards dinner at the Hotel Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. The Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON (x-law, 1938), has graciously agreed to be the speaker on this occasion. The Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S.J. (A.B., 1913, Litt. D., 1937), former president of Fordham University and author of "The Cardinal Spellman Story," will be toastmaster.

During the anniversary year which extends from September 26, 1963, to December 3, 1964, there will be five major convocations. The first of these is scheduled for October 28, 1963, and will commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Georgetown class of 1863, of which the later Chief Justice Edward D. White was a member. The principal address will be delivered by Chief Justice Earl Warren. It is hoped that as many as possible of some 35 Georgetown alumni who now sit upon a State or Federal bench throughout the country will be present and share the platform with the Chief Justice.

On March 19, 1964, Robert Maynard Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago and now president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, will be the principal speaker at our founder's day convocation. Besides Dr. Hutchins, a number of other figures well known to the educational world will receive honorary degrees.

The third convocation on June 10, 1964, besides being the regular commencement convocation, will commemorate the 20th anniversary of the invasion of Normandy, beginning the final chapter of the liberation of Europe. It will also honor all Georgetown men and women who have served their country in all its wars. We hope to have present at this convocation as many as possible of the surviving leaders of the American Army, Navy, and Air Force in World War II and to confer upon several of them honorary degrees. During the summer, there will be another convocation, on a perhaps modest scale, the weather conditions in a Washington summer not being conducive to elaborate ceremonies.

The most important convocation of the year will be that of December 3, 1964, which will bring to a close the anniversary year celebration. December 3 is the anniversary of the death of Archbishop John Carroll, the founder of Georgetown University, and we are hopeful that the principal address will be delivered by the President of the United States.

We intend to invite all living holders of honorary degrees from Georgetown University to honor this convocation with their presence. This would include all three living ex-Presidents of the United States, and would make a notable gathering.

In addition to these convocations, the year will be made memorable by a series of special events. Walter Lippmann will deliver the Gaston lecture at a date still to be set. A series of lectures entitled "The Robert Plunkett Series" and dealing generally with the humanities will include such personages as Christopher Hollis, C. P. Snow, Paul Horgan, Father William Lynch, S.J., Father Anthony Bischoff, S.J., Father Martin D'Arcy, S.J., and possibly Sir Herbert Reed, Flannery O'Connor and others.

There will be a series of 10 science lectures spaced through the year, which will bring to the campus such men as Dr. McVittie of the University of Illinois, Dr. Dobzhansky of the Rockefeller Institute, Dr. Morse of MIT, and other scholars of similar stature. Our law school has also organized a series of lectures on subjects of interest to the legal profession. Lecturers will include outstanding professors of law in various universities of the country and, hopefully, the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy.

The law school is sending a team of three faculty members to give lectures and have discussions with law school alumni groups throughout the country during the anniversary year. Also, the president of Georgetown University, Father Bunn, will visit alumni groups during the year. In addition to this, professors of the university will be sent throughout the country to speak to alumni groups.

The great interest of Georgetown University, reflecting both its own traditional ties and the interest of the country as a whole in Latin America, will be manifested in two series of lectures dealing with problems of inter-American relations. Among those who have already graciously consented to participate are the highly regarded former president of Colombia, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, Dr. Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, Dr. Antonio Gomez Robledo of the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs in the Mexican Government, and others.

Etienne Gilson will come to the university in April 1964 to deliver four lectures in philosophy. This will be one of the highlights of the year. Another highlight will be the visit of the noted economist and lecturer, Lady Jackson, better known as Barbara Ward. In the fall of 1964, the medical center proposes to bring to Georgetown Nobel Prize winners to deliver nine lectures over a period of 3 days.

Efforts are being made also to organize a series of lectures by recognized authorities in the field on the general subject of the Jesuits and fine art. In collaboration with the Institute of Contemporary Arts, the university will also present a certain number of events in the field of the performing arts. Among these will be a concert by a noted Japanese artist who plays rather rare Japanese musical instruments. There will be a dance group from northern India, a performance by a noted pioneer in the field of electronic music, and other events of the same caliber. One of the highlights of the year will be a concert at Constitution Hall in April, featuring the National Symphony Orchestra and the Georgetown University Glee Club at which an original composition composed for the anniversary by the well-known composer Richard Dirksen will be played for the first time.

Among the important events of the anniversary celebration period will be a certain number of conferences and symposia. On December 6 and 7, for example, the anniversary program will cosponsor, with the Edmund Burke Society of America, a symposium on "Edmund Burke in the 20th Century." In January there will be a conference which will attempt to come to grips with the problems of poverty in an affluent society. Among the participants at this conference will be Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, the noted New Yorker essayist Dwight Macdonald, and leading industrialists. The school of Foreign Service is sponsoring a series of three conferences involving students, employers, and educators. These conferences will attempt to explore the changing character of our country's world involvement, public and private, over the past decade and the implications of these changes for personnel requirements now and in the future.

In May, our Center for Strategic Studies will present a major conference dealing with problems of the Atlantic Community in which scholars from Europe and America will participate. It is expected that among those participating will be Jean Monnet.

The summer school, in 1964, will present an impressive program including lectures by Father Lonergan, of the Gregorian University in Rome, a special institute on scriptural studies, a writers' conference, a conference on social ethics, a symposium on international relations, a symposium by clinical psychologists. One of the major events of the summer will be a colloquium on West African nations which will be attended by scholars from Africa and Europe and which will be followed by a 4 weeks' institute on African studies. Another event next summer will be a meeting of the Pax Romana. This will be the first time in 25 years that this international students organization will have held its conference in the United States. In the fall of 1964, we are planning a conference in which we expect to have the participation of scientists, military strategists and theologians to discuss the awesome problems related to thermonuclear power. Immediately preceding the final convocation of December 3, 1964, we hope to bring together a group of

outstanding Jesuit theologians and philosophers to discuss the great question of human freedom. Among those who have already agreed to participate are Father Calvez, S.J. of the Action Populaire in Paris, Father Paul Henry, another noted French intellectual, Father John Courtney Murray, Father Robert Johann, Father William Lynch, and Father Karl Rahner. We hope also that Father Henri de Lubac will be able to participate in this conference. This conference will be followed immediately by the December 3 convocation, which will bring the year to a climactic conclusion.

Admission to most of the anniversary events—the exceptions are concerts and other fine arts programs—will be without charge, and by invitation and tickets. All Georgetown alumni, in the Washington area and elsewhere, are most warmly welcomed to these events. Out-of-town alumni who may find themselves in Washington on business during the anniversary celebration period should write or call Alumni House or Anniversary House (which is just next door) for tickets for themselves and for their guests. The anniversary program will be bringing a series of memorable events to the Hilltop, and we look forward to sharing these events with all the sons and daughters of Georgetown.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Catholic Standard, Sept. 27, 1963]

POPE PAUL SALUTES GEORGETOWN ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY—TELSTAR MESSAGE OPENS YEAR-LONG CELEBRATION

Pope Paul in a live telecast via Telstar yesterday opened the year-long celebration of the 175th anniversary of Georgetown University, the oldest Catholic college in the United States.

The pope, who imparted his blessing to the faculty, alumni and students of Georgetown and to all U.S. Catholics, noted that the university was founded in 1789, the same year that the U.S. Constitution was ratified.

"So it is that the church, ever interested in inculcating in the youth of a nation the religious and civil principles upon which society and national life are based, has been present in the noble work of education right from the beginning of your Republic," Pope Paul said.

POPE'S BIRTHDAY

Yesterday was the Pope's 66th birthday. He remarked that the day also is the feast of the North American martyrs, the Jesuit missionaries who lost their lives in the American missions in the 17th century.

The telecast was picked up from the Telstar communications satellite by the NBC network's "Today" show and by other programs.

Congratulating both the university and the Nation on the double anniversary—of Georgetown and the U.S. Constitution—the Pope noted that many Georgetown graduates hold posts of responsibility and leadership in society.

MAIN CONTRIBUTION

He emphasized that the university's "greatest contribution" has been in instilling sound moral principles in its students and preparing them for healthy family life.

Theme for the anniversary observances, which will conclude on December 3, 1964, is "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World." The anniversary colors of black, red, and gold have been taken from the coat of arms of the Carroll family in tribute to Archbishop John Carroll, founder of the university.

Mass of the Holy Spirit was celebrated on the campus yesterday to open the celebration.

DISTINGUISHED GUESTS

A program, international in scope, of conferences, symposiums, and lectures has been planned for the university. Among the invited guests are Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Senator Wayne Morse, novelists Flannery O'Connor, Laurens Van der Post, and Christopher Hollis, Economist Barbara Ward, Educator Robert M. Hutchins, Philosopher Etienne Gilson, and Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katsenbach.

Vice President JOHNSON will address university alumni at a banquet in New York on October 12. Chief Justice Warren will speak at an October 28 convocation at which honorary doctor of laws degrees will be bestowed on Harvard Law Dean Erwin N. Griswald and Howard University President Dr. James M. Nabrit.

Public Cry for Medicare—Fact or Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen and Senators this year have included in 36 polls a question asking their constituents' opinion of a social security hospital-medical plan for the elderly—the administration's proposal. These legislators are from both parties and represent all shades of political opinion and both rural and urban districts.

Thirty-one of these polls appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and five in other publications.

In 34 of these polls, a majority of voters opposed the administration's plan. In only two did a majority support it. Some of the opposition ran as high as 90 percent of those answering the questionnaires.

These results bear out a point I have long maintained—that when the American people are fully informed on the facts of bad legislation, they will stand against it. Administration propagandists have tried to sell this program by holding it up as almost a "something for nothing, pie in the sky" plan that will give all older people hospital and medical care for only 25 cents a week. They counted on the voters to swallow this thesis and start a nationwide, grassroots movement for the bill that Congress could not resist.

The so-called "Puritan Ethic" that shocked the administration regarding the tax cut bill is again evident in the Nation's stand on the medicare legislation. This country is in no mood for Federal giveaways accompanied by Federal takeaways of individual freedom, particularly when the people now know that they are the ones who do the real giving. More and more of our constituents realize this bill will be expensive and will lead to an inferior system of health care.

The Gallup poll figures have shown a steady decline in support of the measure until now a majority oppose it, according to Dr. Gallup's soundings.

Under permission previously granted, at this point I place in the RECORD the pertinent medical care questions from polls taken this year by my colleagues in this and the other body:

1963 CONGRESSIONAL POLLS RE KING-ANDERSON—APPEARING IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

FRANCE P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, March 18, page A1474: Do you favor or oppose medical care: a compulsory health-care plan financed through the social security system. Favor, 37 percent; oppose, 50 percent; no opinion, 13 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, February 28, page A1055: Medicare: President Kennedy has asked for a medicare bill which would pay a part of hospital bills for persons over 65. No doctor bills would be covered. The plan would be financed by a $1 per month increase in employees' social security deductions and a similar increase in contributions of employers. In general, would you favor or oppose a plan of this kind? Favor, 54 percent; oppose, 40 percent; no opinion, 6 percent. (Favors King-Anderson.)

E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, March 21, page A1605: Do you prefer the present voluntary medical care program for the aged over a compulsory plan, financed by increased social security taxes? Yes, 76 percent; no, 20 percent; undecided, 4 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey, March 28, page A1742: Do you favor increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65? Yes, 35 percent; no, 58 percent; no opinion, 7 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California, March 28, page A1749: Do you favor a plan managed by the Government and financed by greater social security taxes? Yes, 38 percent; no, 51 percent; no opinion, 11 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

HAROLD R. COLLIER, Republican, of Illinois, April 10, page A2208: Medical care for aged under the social security program? Yes, 35 percent; no, 56 percent; undecided, 9 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

JAMES HARVEY, Republican, of Michigan, April 11, page A2247: Do you favor placing medicare for the aged under social security and raising social security taxes in a sufficient amount to cover cost? Yes, 24 percent; no, 73.2 percent; no answer, 2 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Republican, of Michigan, April 25, page A2514: With regard to medical care for the elderly, do you favor: Increasing social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing costs for those over 65 (King-Anderson approach), 22 percent; a tax credit or Federal financing for private insurance for medical and hospital care for those over 65 (Bow bill), 24 percent; no Federal participation in this field, 32 percent; other, 8 percent; no answer, 14 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, Republican, of Illinois, May 7, page A2803: Medicare managed by Government and financed by greater social security taxes? Yes, 11.5 percent; no, 80 percent; undecided, 8.5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington, May 9, page A2928: Do you favor medical care for people over 65 by increasing the social security taxes upon employees and employers? Yes, 34 percent; no, 40 percent; no opinion, 4 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

W. R. HULL, Democrat, of Missouri, May 15, page A3061: Medicare: Do you favor bill to provide part payment of hospital costs for persons over 65, but no doctors' bill, through increase in social security? Yes, 32 percent; no, 65 percent; no opinion, 3 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

K. W. STINSON, Republican, of Washington, May 20, page 8470: Would you favor compulsory medical care for the aged under social security with the cost paid for by in-

creased taxes on employees and employers? Yes, 32.8 percent; no, 60.9 percent; undecided, 6.3 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas, May 20, page A3155: Do you favor or oppose compulsory medical care for aged citizens tied to social security? Yes, 11 percent; no, 85 percent; no opinion, 5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, May 27, page A3330: Do you favor a program of medical care for the aged under social security exclusively? Yes, 28 percent; no, 49 percent; undecided, 23 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

DAVE MARTIN, Republican, of Nebraska, May 29, page A3443: Do you favor the King-Anderson medicare bill which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security? Yes, 8.4 percent; no, 85.4 percent; not sure, 6.2 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

J. ARTHUR YOUNGER (Republican of California), June 3, A3528: Do you favor increase in social security tax to provide hospitalization for all? Yes, 21.3 percent; no, 69.8 percent; undecided, 8.9 percent. (Opposes medicare.)

DONALD RUMSFELD (Republican of Illinois), June 6, page A3675: Should the Federal Government provide some type of medical expense aid to persons over 65? If "yes," should it be accomplished by enacting King-Anderson bill (financed by increased social security taxes on employers and employees, given regardless of need)? Yes, 14.4 percent; no, 53.4 percent; no opinion, 32.2 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

THOMAS M. PELLY (Republican of Washington), June 25, page A4052: The medicare program is before Congress again. Supporters argue that retired persons need help to meet high medical costs, and that the program would use the reliable social security system. Opponents argue that the needy aged already have some help, and that the social security deduction is too high now. How do you feel about the medicare program? No opinion, 0.5 percent; very much in favor, 26.7 percent; somewhat in favor, 11.5 percent; neutral, 3.4 percent; somewhat opposed, 10.3 percent; very much opposed, 45.8 percent; total in favor, 38.2 percent; total opposed, 56.1 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

BRUCE ALGER (Republican of Texas), July 11, page A4354: Do you favor medical care for the aged by increasing social security taxes to finance such care? Yes, 5 percent; no, 93 percent; no opinion, 2 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

M. G. SNYDER (Republican of Kentucky), July 23, page A4620: Should a Federal old-age medical care program be instituted with social security taxes? Yes, 31 percent; no, 62.3 percent; no opinion, 6.7 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

THADDEUS J. DULSKI (Democrat of New York), July 30, page A4828: Do you favor a medicare plan which provides for a compulsory health program for the aged under social security? Yes, 78.2 percent; no, 19.8 percent; no opinion, 2 percent. (Favors King-Anderson.)

JACK WESTLAND (Republican of Washington), August 1, page A4909: Do you favor a voluntary medical care program for our senior citizens over a compulsory program? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

WILLIAM G. BRAY (Republican of Indiana), August 12, page A5106: Do you favor: Compulsory Federal medical care for the aged under social security as proposed in King-Anderson bill? Yes, 22 percent; no, 73 percent; no opinion, 5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

O. C. FISHER, Democrat, of Texas, August 20, page A5332: Do you favor increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home care for those over 65? Yes, 17:5 percent; no, 74 percent; no opinion, 8.5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

ED FOREMAN, Republican, of Texas, August 27, page A5490: Do you favor the administration's Federal aid for medicare proposal? Yes, 12.3 percent; no, 87.7 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois, August 28, page A5511: Do you favor hospital and nursing home care for people over 65, financed by increased social security taxes and increased Federal income taxes for those not under social security? Yes, 28.2 percent; no, 71.8 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, August 30, page A5545: Medical care (choose one): a. Compulsory health care for those over 65 financed through social security system? Favor, 36.5 percent; oppose, 49.5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, of Iowa, September 9, page A5659: Do you favor placing medicare for the aged under social security and increasing social security taxes to cover the cost? Yes, 21 percent; no, 77 percent; no opinion, 2 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, September 12, page 16032: Do you favor an increased social security tax to provide medical care for the aged? Yes, 38.7 percent; no 57.8 percent; blank, 3.5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

SILVIO O. CONTE (Republican, of Massachusetts), September 24, page A5992: Do you favor medical care for the aged: federally administered plan financed by employer and employee social security payments? Yes, 34.7 percent; no, 58.2 percent; undecided, 7.1 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

BASIL L. WHITENER (Democrat, of North Carolina), October 10, page A6360: Do you favor increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home care for those over 65 as proposed in the King-Anderson bill? Yes, 16.2 percent; no, 80.3 percent; no opinion, 3.5 percent. (Opposes King-Anderson.)

APPEARING IN PUBLICATIONS OTHER THAN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

A. S. HERLONG, Jr. (Democrat, of Florida): A questionnaire was mailed to all householders in his district in May of 1963. In answer to a question—should there be a compulsory medical care program for the aged within the social security system—7,952 voted for and 17,310 voted against, with 612 having no opinion and 314 failing to answer the question of the total of 26,188 returning the questionnaire.

JOHN M. SLACK, Jr. (Democrat, of West Virginia): 50,000 questionnaires were mailed to a selected list of this Congressman's constituents in July of 1963. Four thousands returned the questionnaire with their choices marked. Those favoring medicare under the Social Security Act represented 42 percent, while 58 percent were opposed.

CHARLES E. BENNETT (Democrat, of Florida): Do you favor an increased social security tax to provide medical care for the aged? Yes, 39.9 percent; no, 60.1 percent.

GEORGE F. SENNER (Democrat, of Arizona)—(See Arizona Republic October 3, 1963): Do you favor King-Anderson—730; Do you favor Kerr-Mills—611; Do you favor no Federal program—1,029.

WILLIAM PROXMIRE (Democrat, of Wisconsin): October 1963 Newsletter * * * a 51-percent to 49-percent vote against hospital insurance for the aged to be paid by an increase in the social security tax.

Business Citizenship in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Dr. Shane McCarthy received the Distinguished Service Medal Award of the Cosmopolitan Club. This award came in recognition of Dr. McCarthy's outstanding service to the District of Columbia.

Formerly Executive Director of the President's Council on Youth Fitness from 1956 to 1961, Dr. McCarthy took on the difficult task of investigating the unfortunate incidents at District of Columbia Stadium on Thanksgiving Day last year. As usual his efforts were marked with thoroughness, understanding, and competence.

Upon receipt of the award on October 22, Dr. McCarthy spoke briefly but persuasively on the question of "Business Citizenship in Perspective." His discussion of current problems in the District of Columbia is of interest to us all and under unanimous consent, I include his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BUSINESS CITIZENSHIP IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Dr. Shane MacCarthy)

There are times when silence is more eloquent than words. This is such an occasion. When gratitude is given to Cosmopolitan in the name of all who worked with me on various civic projects and heartfelt thanks expressed for the honor conferred this day on my family and me, no more need be said. However, such a response would run the risk of generating misinterpretation as to some of my feelings at this moment about our Capital and its future.

I've been in Washington well nigh 40 years. To this home of mine I came in my early teens to later marry a girl who is a second generation Washingtonian and we are blessed with five native Washingtonian sons. Thus, my roots here are very deep. My hopes for the morrow are optimistic because my faith in people is solid. However, hopes are fragile if they remain mere words and faith that puts reliance on others to do good works is a deluding attribute. In Washington at this moment are many who share these hopes and this faith. But, multiplying such concepts achieves no tangible benefits for our Capital unless we as private citizens set aside the idle habit of talk and involve ourselves with all the resources at our command in a master action plan for Washington.

The focus of the world is now on Washington. This might seem like an enviable position for any one community. And to a degree it is—if those of us who live here realize our personal obligations and our opportunities. The emphasis of attention at this time however has questionable merit. Being the site of the Government of the most important country in the world makes Washington a name known to every hamlet in every clime. Simultaneously, our city of renown and beauty has been attracting attention as a center of crime and irresponsibility. And we must ever remember that the honor of being a national capital does not shield and overcome the bad image emanating from this same spot. In fact, the facili-

ties of communication are only too prone to carry the news of wrongdoing, which then becomes associated with all our customs, practices, and policies as if the be-all and end-all of our city on the Potomac is badness in every guise.

Washington, D.C. is at a perilous juncture today. While it is the center of National Government, it appears unable to govern itself. This does not mean that the Federal Government should take direct administration of affairs. Neither is the comment to be interpreted as a criticism of the Commission system or a plea for what is called "home rule." When I observe that Washington "appears unable to govern itself," I'm referring to my disappointment that the people who live in the metropolitan area of our National Capital are too often mute when they should speak and too often indifferent when they should be involved in responsible action.

Our great Capital City has its social, economic, educational, culture, and political problems. It's a shocking set of circumstances which makes a parent fear for the safety of children who may be molested by irresponsible scoundrels. Business is a direct loser when a husband will not allow his wife and daughters to shop after sundown. The continual influx of people—frequently children alone—into Washington is compounding its housing, health, educational, and many other problems.

While these conditions do not justify calling Washington—all Washington—a city of slums, or a crime-ridden capital, the composite environment offers a salutary warning that a continuity of what is bad will bring what will be worse and harder to cope with in the days ahead. When there are ever-widening cracks in the moral cement of a society's foundation, the structure can topple into a confused jumble of debris.

The ostrich approach of sweeping problems under rugs is sidestepping our conscientious responsibilities. Can we afford mediocrity in our living, health, and educational standards in the District of Columbia? Yes we can, to our own detriment and ultimate disaster. Thus, when we soft pedal the facts lest knowledge of them would create embarrassment, we are allowing the image to control our decision. We are choosing our words and molding our thoughts merely to please the recipient. This is the substitution of shadow for substance and such a process will solve nothing. At this moment in Washington too much of this brand of cowardly conduct is the custom. Asking for more money, more facilities, more police, more judges, more doctors, more jobs, more recreational activities, more of everything is giving quantity priority over quality. This is the easy answer of expediency. With expanding population more public facilities of all kinds are, indeed, necessary but the quantity answer of more police does not, for example, solve juvenile delinquency. It merely means there will be more patrolmen on the beat to keep up with the delinquent Joneses.

And, what is achieved by the availability of jobs if openings in the manual arts and service trades are rejected by those who know not the dignity of honest labor, or worse, the applicants have no vocational training to fill the needs? Additional medically proficient men and women might well explain the dangers of sex promiscuity but the inculcation of moral character demands more time, attention, and prayer. If the community conscience is so numbed that punishment for crime deliberately committed is to be too often replaced by excuse, then adding more judges is of little avail.

Thus, the time has come for more thorough, courageous, dynamic and effective solutions to the difficulties besetting the Nation's Capital.

Look at our public educational system in Washington. Today, it is far from being the model for the Nation.

Recently, I recommended to the Congress that Superintendent Hansen be given the authority and the money to have a survey conducted by an outside, impartial, objective, professional organization of which there are many in the United States, to examine and assess in depth the current educational practices and needs in our Washington public schools and to report publicly on its findings.

Administering 170 public schools is a big and complicated business. The recommendation to the Congress was in keeping with the proven precedent of all business establishments which periodically invite outside administrative management agencies to analyze their policies and procedures with a view toward eliminating what is weak and unprofitable, improving what is already good, and installing what is required for best results. Such a survey should be done in depth to bring forth the facts—from a city-wide battery of IQ, aptitude, and achievement tests on the actual status of every boy and every girl in our public school system. It is only when the human product is known that the educational method most appropriate for its fullest growth and development can be designed. This recommendation will remain on dead center unless the voice of the people is articulate in its demand.

Into an already overburdened and overcrowded school system is now dumped the complex dropout problem—with demoralizing results. Holding these unfortunate boys and girls in the classrooms is achieving only one end—keeping them off the streets. Such individuals are, indeed, a menace on the streets, with nothing to do and boredom ever beckoning badness. But it is most unfair to the teacher, to the class, and to the dropout himself, who in practically all cases needs special training, to entice him back merely to make the public image that the dropout problem is under control.

Making the classroom a youth hostel for dropouts is an indication of how we have unloaded community problems on the schools and neutralized their educational effectiveness. Safe living environment is not a police problem; sanitary living is not a public health problem; the dropout and the delinquent are not school problems; apprentice training is not a labor problem. All of these and more are community problems. Councils, commissions, and committees too numerous to name have done much research in these areas but now is the time for broad-scale community action. Shall this be by Government or by the private sector of our capital? Here's the opportunity for the power of the people to assert itself. In our midst are hundreds of business and professional organizations of all kinds promoting the sale of ideas, services, or products. Regardless of their field of endeavor, now is the time for them to realize that in the hierarchy of values none can ignore their responsibility to help their capital. If the social and civic fabric of our fair city continues to ravel then this will be no place for advancing their business endeavors.

The mistaken notion abounds that business and professional groups are concerned only with the area of private interest, leaving the prevalent impression that only Government cares for the public interest. This false icon must be shattered, and here in our National Capital private business has both the obligation and the opportunity to do so. An injurious view of the free enterprise effort comes into existence by default because too often private business wears blinkers and ignores its full responsibilities. This is why exploitation, gain, and profit at any cost are equated with competitive business and government gets credit for objectivity, impartiality, honesty, and working for the poor and the downtrodden. Being in Government gives a person no halo of integrity and no more ability than a private businessman to determine what is in the public interest. It is with this breadth of vision, therefore, that the private business sector of our National Capital, represented by more than 500 business and professional associations, possessing unbounded talent and specialists in numerous fields, must recognize that far beyond their own limited business objectives extends their community responsibility to fulfill the the public purpose for which we all exist. With a combined conviction they must come from the sidelines and initiate a leadership for continued action so that the exemplar for all other cities to emulate will be our own Washington.

Our Pal Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there was considerable public attention given to the visit to this country of Yugoslav President Tito. An editorial which appeared in the Friday, October 18 issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat was typical of the nationwide comment. I insert this editorial into the RECORD at this point, and urge that the Members of Congress, with even hope that officials of the executive branch, take cognizance of views such as those expressed, and hope that the foreign policy errors of the immediate past might not be repeated:

OUR PAL TITO

The red carpet treatment accorded Tito, of Yugoslavia, yesterday brings the White House reception list to a new low. It is disgraceful that the President of the United States feels he must entertain—and, symbolically, embrace—a man who has never been on our side, never can be, and never will be.

Any views of Tito as a repentant sinner could not be further from the truth.

Tito fought with the Communists in Russia in 1917 through 1921, back in the days of Lenin, Stalin, and Trotsky. He helped to organize the party in Yugoslavia after that, and fought with the Communist brigade in Spain during that country's unhappy civil war.

In 1937, he became Secretary—generally the most important post—in the Yugoslav Communist party. During World War II, he led the Communist adherents, the partisans, in Yugoslavia.

Then, in 1944, in grateful recognition, he was installed in power by the Communists, with the acquiescence of the Allied governments, who shamefully turned their backs on the closest thing to a true democrat in Yugoslavia—Mihailovic.

Since that time, Yugoslavia has been given $866,072,000 by the United States. Today, it is the most prosperous of the Communist nations—thanks entirely to our aid. This sum, of course, comes directly out of the pockets of American taxpayers, both individuals and corporations.

As Mr. Kennedy embraced Tito yesterday, we wonder if he was struck with the irony that only 2 weeks ago this same man, Tito, was similarly embraced, including kissing (ugh), by Khrushchev.

Tito has made a career—perhaps the most successful in modern times—of playing off both sides against each other. He will get away with it as long as we let him.

To give some idea as to where Tito's sentiments lie, he has never opposed the Soviets on a single major issue of policy. He uttered not a word of protest against the savage butchery in Hungary in 1956, nor against their first breaking the 1958 nuclear test moratorium—although, in his wisdom, he did greatly criticize us for following suit several years later.

The money we have given to Tito now goes directly to Khrushchev and to other anti-American nations throughout the world—not as our gift, but as his.

Most of all, he has flatly stated that, in the event of war or differences between the United States and Russia, he would be for Russia first, last and always, regardless of any merits which might be involved.

Under these circumstances, giving Tito almost a billion dollars in aid makes exactly the same sense as paying heavy premiums for a fire insurance policy which has stamped all over the face of it the fact that it is inoperative in case of fire.

Contemplating American policy toward Tito over the past 15 years—where we have absolutely nothing to gain and an immense treasure and self-respect to lose—one might well echo Mark Antony's mournful comment: "O Judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts, and men have lost their reason."

Representative Edna F. Kelly, of New York, Successfully Opposes Effort in United Nations Committee To Open League of Nations Treaties to Accession by Red China and Other Non-U.N. States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New York, Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY, long recognized as one of the outstanding experts in the Congress in the field of foreign policy and international affairs, has further distinguished herself and brought honor upon this House by her success in presenting the U.S. position in a highly controversial issue in the United Nations' Sixth, or Legal Committee.

Mrs. KELLY—one of the few Members of the House of Representatives ever accorded such responsibility—was chosen by President Kennedy to serve this fall on the U.S. delegation to the 18th United Nations General Assembly. As a ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Europe, Mrs. KELLY brought to this assignment a fine grasp of the complexities of international affairs and an ability we have all seen demonstrated many, many times, in cutting through the window-dressing language to get to the key points of an issue.

She has now proved that this ability to push aside the nonessential elements to get to the heart of a controversy can be put to very good use in behalf of her country in the deliberations of the United Nations as well as in the Congress.

The Sixth, or Legal Committee of the U.N., on which Mrs. KELLY has been representing the United States, handles questions relating to international law, treaties, conventions, and other international agreements. In addition, she has been handling before other committees of the U.N. General Assembly items dealing with atomic radiation, outer space, and enlargement of U.N. bodies, among others.

AMENDMENT VOTED DOWN 42 TO 38

The issue on which Mrs. KELLY successfully led a fight to uphold the U.S. position, over strong opposition from the Communist bloc and others, arose in connection with the proposed opening for participation by new nations of some of the old League of Nations treaties still in effect and serving a useful purpose, such as the one on counterfeiting. An amendment was offered to permit accession by any state. This, as Mrs. KELLY ably pointed out in a speech in the Committee on October 18, would have included not only those new countries which are members of the United Nations, but Red China and East Germany or other non-U.N. states.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I am submitting the text of the remarks made by Congresswoman KELLY on this highly controversial issue. But first, I want to add that Mrs. KELLY's fight on behalf of our country to prevent Red China and East Germany to come into treaty relationships with the United States and other free nations through this subterfuge resulted in victory. The vote on the proposal was 42 to 38, in our favor with 10 abstentions. And yesterday, a new formula was adopted under which no non-U.N. state could accede to any League of Nations treaty without the approval of the General Assembly. All of us, I am sure, are proud of the manner in which Mrs. KELLY represented our Nation in this important matter, and thus I am sure there will be widespread interest here in reading the text of her U.N. address, as follows:

STATEMENT BY EDNA F. KELLY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE LEGAL (SIXTH) COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON THE QUESTION OF EXTENDED PARTICIPATION IN GENERAL MULTILATERAL TREATIES CONCLUDED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, OCTOBER 18, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as chapter 3 of the report of the International Law Commission indicates, an examination of the substance and utility of open-ended multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations is needed. Such an examination should determine which treaties are still in force and hold interest for states and what action may be necessary to adapt them to contemporary conditions. Draft Resolution L. 532 wisely calls for such a study but does not, in the meantime, delay opening for extended participation the multilateral treaties involved. Certain of the treaties, especially the Convention and Optional Protocol for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, may be of immediate interest to states and should be opened for accession. As indicated by Interpol and as proved by recent accession by the United Kingdom, the treaties concerning counterfeiting remain useful and contemporary.

Perhaps there are other multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League which are not, however, of interest to states or which are useful only if adapted to modern circumstances. The procedures set forth in the nine-power draft resolution is a simple and expeditious method of determining the usefulness and adaptability of such treaties. If they are no longer useful, no further action is necessary. If, on the other hand, certain of the treaties are currently outdated but are adaptable to contemporary circumstances by substantive amendments the protocol of amendment procedure suggest itself. In accordance with Resolution 24(I), the General Assembly, between 1946 and 1953, approved seven protocols which made necessary amendments of substance and replaced old participation clauses with clauses opening them to accession by new nations.

A substantive examination of the treaties should not, however, delay extended participation if certain States wish to accede immediately. The treaties should be opened to accession now. As the International Law Commission points out in its report, the original parties to such treaties intended them to be open for accession. The procedure for extended participation proposed in the nine-power draft resolution provides a simplified and efficient method of achieving the object of extending participation in useful treaties.

Such a procedure is not, in the view of the U.S. delegation, open to objection. The parties, by voting for the resolution, may consent to opening such treaties for extended participation. As stated before, the participation clauses of the treaties indicate an intention to make them open ended. What is involved is a simple adaptation of the participation clauses to the fact that the League of Nations has been succeeded by the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, let me turn now to the two amendments L. 533 and L. 534. The United States regrets that a highly controversial political issue has been injected into the consideration of extended participation in multilateral treaties.

The amendment proposed by Ghana and others, contained in document L. 533, would request the Secretary General to invite "any state" not otherwise eligible to become a party to these treaties to accede thereto by depositing an instrument of accession with the Secretary General. On the other hand, the amendment tabled by Australia, Greece, and Guatemala, in document L. 534, would request the Secretary General to invite "each state member of the United Nations or of a specialized agency" to accede to the conventions. The United States strongly supports this latter amendment and hopes that the members of this Committee will vote in favor of it.

The Under Secretary, Mr. Stavropoulos, has previously explained to the Committee the extremely difficult position in which the adoption of an "all states" formula would place the Secretary General. As Mr. Stavropoulos has pointed out, unless the Secretary General is given precise directions by the Assembly, he would be put in the untenable situation of having to decide which entities that are not United Nations members should be invited to become parties to these treaties. Let me illustrate his difficulty by an example which is less embarrassing to those in this room than others I could cite. Suppose we had adopted this resolution a year ago. Would the Secretary General have been obliged to communicate it to Katanga? I could multiply examples. But what I have said demonstrates that the amendment of Ghana would impose upon the Secretary General the making of a political decision of

a highly controversial and acutely embarrassing nature. The Secretary General quite rightly wishes to avoid this political function. If the supporters of the amendment proposed in document L. 533 really would like to spend some weeks discussing which entities, not members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies, are states, then they should say so. Otherwise, they should withdraw their amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this highly charged political issue cannot be decided by the Secretary General. It cannot be decided by the Sixth Committee. The Sixth Committee has no competence to determine, or business in attempting to determine that, for example, the so-called Peoples' Republic of Korea is a state. This is no more a question for the Legal Committee than for the Secretary General.

Every year, since the beginning of the United Nations, there have been proposals that all states should be invited to adhere to United Nations treaties or to participate in United Nations conferences. No such proposal has ever been accepted. The General Assembly has uniformly followed the principle that United Nations treaties and United Nations conferences are open to participation only by members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

We should follow that principle in the case now before us. The purpose of the nine-power draft resolution contained in document L. 532 is to welcome participation in League of Nations treaties by the great number of new states which have achieved their independence since the demise of the League. Those new states are virtually all members of the United Nations. They are participating here in the work of the General Assembly and in the work of our Committee. The amendment of Australia, Greece, and Guatemala will make possible their participation in these treaties if they desire to participate.

On the other hand, we doubt that the draft resolution, if amended as Ghana and others propose, would be acceptable to many of the members of the League who are represented here—and whose assent to this resolution is necessary, as stated in operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. We believe that most of these former members of the League would not be willing to accept this resolution if it implied that, whether they like it or not, they would be required to enter into treaty relations with entities which they do not recognize as states. Adoption of the all states formula would thus destroy the chance of implementing the underlying resolution. Indeed, adoption of the all states formula would effectively negate the possibility of participation by any of the newer states members of this organiaztion, and our consideration of this agenda item would have been fruitless.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we urge the members of this Committee to vote against amendment L. 533 and to vote in favor of amendment L. 534.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A Shortsighted Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a column by Henry Hazlitt in the latest issue of Newsweek makes a substantial contribution to the current discussion of the administration's proposed interest equalization tax.

Mr. Hazlitt enumerates seven major reservations against the proposal, as presented by Amyas Ames and Andrew N. Overby on behalf of the Investment Bankers Association before the House Ways and Means Committee, August 21.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Hazlitt's column in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A SHORTSIGHTED TARIFF

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The mere proposal by the President on July 18 of a retroactive tax on American purchases of foreign securities has already done great harm. It has brought about paralysis in such investment, created world uncertainty, and undermined confidence in the dollar. If the administration does not withdraw the proposal, Congress should reject it promptly.

The proposal has now received impressive criticism from many quarters, but the most thorough analysis I have seen was in the congressional testimony on August 21 on behalf of the Investment Bankers Association of America by Amyas Ames, its president, and by Andrew N. Overby, chairman of its foreign investment committee and former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund. Let me summarize the chief points:

1. The proposed tax will adversely affect the U.S. balance of payments in the long run and will not significantly improve it in the short run.

Private foreign investment is an asset-creating expenditure. Current net capital outflows are offset by income from previous investments. From 1958 through 1962, income from all private foreign investment amounted to $15.4 billion compared with an gagregate net outflow for new investment of $16.6 billion. Moreover, in 1962 alone income amounted to $3.8 billion as compared with a net outflow of $3.3 billion.

Trade follows credit. With the dollars they obtain from U.S. purchases of their securities, foreigners buy our goods and services. Often the connection is direct. The Japanese Telephone Co. (KDD) raised $25 million through sale of securities in this country to lay a 3,000-mile submarine telephone cable from Tokyo to Hawaii. All of the money raised is being spent in America making jobs for American workmen. Apart from such examples of direct connection, our foreign investments provide foreigners with the necessary dollars to purchase our exports. If other things remain unchanged, our exports will tend to be reduced by the same amount as we reduce our foreign investments.

2. The proposed law is not addressed to the fundamental causes of the balance-of-payments deficit. The great "leakage" comes from foreign aid and other Government programs totaling $4 billion in 1962 and overseas military expenditures reaching some $3 billion. There is little hope of correcting our balance-of-payments deficit unless we reduce these expenditures substantially, improve our cost position in relation to our competitors abroad, and increase the attractiveness of foreign investment in the United States.

3. The proposed tax would be more accurately described not as a tax at all but rather as a new protective tariff to limit the importation of foreign securities. So viewed, the so-called tax represents a retreat from our longstanding policy of freedom for capital movements.

4. The U.S. capital market, and foreign economies dependent upon it, may be seriously damaged. The United States is now the only free capital market in which the amount and terms on which an issuer can sell its securities are limited only by the marketplace. This is a precious national asset. It should not be dissipated without convincing reasons of national interest.

5. The proposed tax may create fears of further restrictions. We must not impair the value of the dollar as the key currency of the world. Diminished confidence in the dollar can only have an adverse impact on our balance of payments.

6. The proposed tax is discriminatory. It selects only one aspect of private expenditure abroad—private portfolio investment—for restriction through a special tariff while leaving unaffected private expenditures abroad for tourism, direct foreign investment, and commercial bank loans.

7. The proposed tax is administratively complex.

I have only one serious reservation to this admirable analysis. I wish it had recognized more clearly that the basic cause of our so-called balance-of-payments problem is our domestic inflation, reflected through our huge past and prospective budget deficits and our cheap-money policies. We are driving dollars and investment abroad as much by holding down long-term interest rates as by holding down short-term interest rates.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Address by Senator Goldwater Before Pennsylvania Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] before the Republican "Keystone Kickoff Dinner" at Hershey, Pa., on October 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF A SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN "KEYSTONE KICKOFF DINNER" OCTOBER 10, 1963, AT THE HERSHEY SPORTS ARENA, HERSHEY, PA.

If ever there has been a symbol of Republican unity, Republican hopes, and Republican victory, this meeting is it. Good men, sound programs, Republican principles, and Republican dedication—all are represented here just as they will be, successfully and resoundingly, in 1964.

This is a Keystone meeting and it has a keystone message. The crusade for good government begins in our States, in our statehouses, in our home governments, and in our citizens' homes. Likewise, the Republican Party is based firmly on principles that form the foundation of good government, clean and responsible government, from the town to the White House.

Our eyes are not fixed hypnotically on the glitter of power. Our eyes are focused on the power of principles and on government at every level which serves the people, but does not coerce them, which represents the people, but does not regiment them.

No State better shows the challenge and forecasts the victory than Pennsylvania. In the administration of Governor Scranton and Ray Shafer, we see the challenge to each of the States; to root out the corruption that breeds in Democrat machine control, to wisely restore the responsibilities of the States and end the wasteful, warping centralization of power in Washington. Governor Scranton wisely has said that the reevaluation of State and Federal responsibilities is a top priority need in this Nation. It is a need which never will be met under Democrat control. It is a need to which Republican principles are pledged.

In Senator HUGH SCOTT you have one of the great champions of another fight against executive encroachment and excess. Unlike his senatorial colleague from this State, he does not believe that Congress is the greatest stumbling block to democracy. He does not hold that the legislative branch must become a mere rubber stamp for the whims of any President. He holds, as I do, as you do, as Republican principles do, that the legislative branch is the key to an open society, that it is the people's forum, and not the Executive's plaything.

Your State chairman, Craig Truax, stands in the same mainstream of American political necessity and need. He knows, as I know and you know, that the political challenge to Republicans is to restore government to the people, to make government at all levels once again dependent upon the people, not turn the people into dependents of the government.

The pendulum of power in this country has swung far past the point where honest men once worried about an imbalance in the Federal system which was stacked against the National or Central Government. The concern today must be about a pendulum of power that has swung toward disruption of every balance in our Federal system, that today threatens to sweep away the system itself, substituting monolithic government in the name of efficiency and progress.

But what sort of efficiency? The sort of efficiency that says the planners in Washington can spend your money more wisely than you can. What sort of progress? The progress that stumbles backward toward depression-born make-work programs rather than striding forward to real jobs based upon real industrial and business expansion.

All it really means is efficiency in electing liberal Democrats and progress in perpetuating Democrat baronies in the bureaus of Washington and the boss citadels of machine-ruled cities. It is not the country that counts in that equation. What counts are New Frontiersmen and their cronies.

Perhaps the overly tolerant will say that all politicians have played this game. There are differences today, that make the situation far more grave. First of all, the liberal Democrat alliance for power today means that no Democrat candidate for office at the national level can be nominated or elected without the support of big city political bosses and their corruption-ridden machines.

This puts the hammerlock of boss rule squarely on the necks of every American, regardless of where they live. It puts the bossism of the cities into power in the seat of power itself, Washington, D.C.

There is an international implication as well. A party and an administration so beholden to the bosses must be prepared also to play precinct politics with the hopes of the whole world.

What confidence can any American have today that when an international issue is decided at Hyannis Port it will not be decided on the basis of clan politics? Your own Senator SCOTT has seen the peril of this political game that the Kennedy administration can play with the same gusto it plays touch football. He has warned that even the Cuban situation may provide the administration with a grandstand play for the 1964 elections. And the administration's reluctance to come to grips with it now, to even enforce the rigid controls that followed the missile crisis, must make millions of Americans wonder what is uppermost in the administration's planning—the national interest or the Kennedy interest?

Even the hopes of peace cannot be separated from the administration's hopes for power. How can any American be confident that the next concession or the one after that is statesmanship or just plain politicking?

Three years ago, this Nation and the great alliances it had forged stood firm and committed against Communist aggression. American power, dedicated to a world of open societies, had blunted the thrust of world communism around the world.

But today, American power, newly rededicated—not to open societies but simply to making the world safe for diversity—is frustrated in our own hemisphere, torn by failures in southeast Asia, shamed by the wall in Berlin, and helpless as the greatest alliance for peace ever conceived, NATO, drifts aimlessly on a sea of indecision, its helm loosened by a lack of consultation, communication, and purpose.

Republicans built bipartisan foreign policy for this Nation. They believed and still believe that partisan politics should stop at the ocean's edge. But where is that bipartisanship today? It has not been scrapped by Republicans. It has been scrapped by an administration that believes in bipartisanship only after the fact.

Where is the administration principles that can build such bipartisanship, that can restore strength and purpose to free world alliances? It is lost hopelessly in administration expediency. But such principles can be built by Republicans, and on Republican principles. Those principles are not secreted away in private diplomatic correspondence, they have been published and pronounced for all to know. Republican principles in foreign policy rest upon a belief that the world cannot permanently endure part slave and part free, that establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence is the essential condition for real peace.

Republican principles proclaim that an active strategy aimed at destroying the walls of communism does not increase the risk of war—but, indeed, offers the best preventive of war.

Last year, the Republican declaration of principle and policy put it this way: "By its effect on freedom, American foreign policy must be judged—and not by its effect on popularity polls or on the attitudes of neutral leaders." New Frontier Democrats, now, don't even try to match that with words, much less deeds. The vitality of American leadership in the cold war has waned to the vanishing point. The cold war seems to have ended as quietly and quickly as the 50-mile hike. Ended in the eyes of Washington, that is—hardly in the eyes of Moscow.

But how could it be otherwise? Is a party dominated by the concerns of machine politics ever likely to inspire men to great missions in great causes? Can it mobilize the hopes of the world when it must worry most about mobilizing votes?

We Republicans are concerned by the fate of the captive nations abroad. All Americans should be concerned by the capture of the Democrat Party by the political bosses here at home.

You, in Pennsylvania, have particular reason to be concerned. Many of your citizens live in political captive nations, captive to such machines as the Green machine. The great victory that you won here last year reflected the realization by your citizens of the need to smash that captivity. But one election cannot do the job. One man cannot do the job.

The mess that you inherited cannot be cleaned up completely until the cynical alliance between machine political bosses and the Kennedy machine in Washington is itself brought to an end. The Green machine is not an isolated political dictatorship, self-sustaining and self-protected. It is sustained

by its connection with the national administration, with its patronage, with its political power, with its money power. It is protected by the same connections.

The best way to whip the Green machine, to return local government to the people is to return the National Government to the people. The same is true of the situations in western Pennsylvania, in Allegheny and Westmoreland Counties. Sever the links of political corruption that bind Washington to the bosses, and decent men and women everywhere will have a chance, their best chance to clean up the messes in their cities, towns, and counties.

And always remember this: the job can only be done through the Republican Party. No matter how decent the Democrat who is elected in an attempt at local reform, the power of the machines, hooked into the socket of power in Washington, will send his hopes up in a puff of smoke. Democrats who want to do something find that they can't—not through the Democrat Party. It will take Republicans to do the job, and all who are interested in seeing the job done must vote for them.

It takes, to sum it up, Republican principles to do the job—principles that start with dedication to local government and local responsibility, principles that are not shackled to narrow interests but are pledged to national interests, principles that aim toward the revitalization of local government rather than aiming at its destruction.

This is a basic theory of government that is involved. On the liberal Democrat side there is the principle of centralized power and subordinated people. On the Republican side there is the principle of limited power and responsible people.

Republicans sometimes are criticized for regional concentration when rising new strengths in any part of the country find the voters there thinking Republican and voting Republican. Republicans should not apologize for this. They should be proud of it. The truth is that wherever industry is growing, wherever people are making new homes, wherever men and women are trying to make a good future, they are thinking Republican. It is not race or region that is forming the great new shifts in American politics—race and region are the domain of the Democrats. The Republican shift is formed of people in every class, of every race, in every region who are tired of the tired old cliches of the Democrats, tired of the planned deficits, the planned dependency, the formless goals and the goading of power.

No, it is not Republicans who are grasping at regional straws. It is the New Frontier Democrats. It is they who remain frozen in the most barren regional wasteland of all—the regions of machine manipulation and boss domination.

What is the liberal Democrat wasteland like? What is its weedy and seedy reality, the reality behind all of the glowing talk of the New Frontier?

It's the Democratic city committee in Philadelphia refusing to turn over its financial records to a special grand jury investigating city hall scandals. It's falsified requisitions to cover shortages in city funds. It's zoning applications mysteriously granted. It's judges clamping legalistic lids on probes of Democrat scandals. It's attempts to force State employees to contribute percentages of their wages to the Democrat Party. It's the forced resignation of investigators assigned to probe the mess.

It has its moments of high irony as well. Listen, for instance, to Democrat Judge Joseph Gold, as quoted in a leading newspaper, criticizing a member of his own party, Joe Clark, for suggesting that some Democrats are tied in with racketeers. How did the good judge defend his party? Let me quote him: "For 6 months prior to election day, Joe Clark, by his own confession, silently accepted the support of racketeers outside of Philadelphia. After his election, he denounced these sinister elements without whose aid he might not have been reelected."

What a typical defense. And also how typical in that it pits Democrat against Democrat in the jungle that grows just a few figurative steps behind the manicured lawn of the White House.

But look deeper into the Democrat wasteland: crime in the cities, rampaging while showcase displays of this or that hoodlum are expected to divert our eyes from the festering corruption.

Look at western Pennsylvania where a handful of conscientious policemen tried to break up a gambling complex. How did the liberal Democrat officials respond? Two of the policemen were assigned to cleaning out stables. Another was sent to pound a beat. Another was sent to supervise parking at a skating rink. Again, what a typically Democrat reaction.

And still the wasteland grows and flourishes thanks to its connection with Washington. Still, the contradictions between the big talk of the big boss and the petty, corrupt reality of his little-boss supporters. In Washington, we hear a lot of talk about helping young people. But how does this inspirational leadership work in the boss-controlled cities? Bill Devlin can tell you how. Describing the situation in Philadelphia recently, he said that "public servants are setting an example to our children of corruption instead of leadership. To children, these people have created an image and destroyed their morals."

Why haven't the Kennedys sent a Peace Corps in to clean up that sort of backwardness? The answer is obvious. They can't. They have seen the conservative mood of America wash away their support across the Nation, they see the waves of discontent lapping even at their fortress cities. They must and they will draw ever closer to the political bosses, and the bosses to them. It means their political survival and, as in any jungle, that is the highest law they know.

Principles are mere slogans in such a jungle. National interests are mere trading stamp bonuses when self-interest comes first.

Given a choice between the country and the clan, has the national Democrat leadership ever chosen the country? Will they? Can they?

When it comes to choices, their choice is clear: government of the Kennedys, by the Kennedys, and for the Kennedys.

And for anyone who would make a different choice, the course is clear: return the government to the people. And the way is clear: the election of Republicans in the towns, the cities, the States, the Congress, and the White House in 1964.

Republicans were able, once, to inspire the world with the concept of open skies—a concept which must be revived before the world is forever walled off into separate accommodations for the free and for the captive.

I say Republicans have another challenge right at home. To inspire all decent men and women, regardless of their party, with a concept of open cities; American cities open to the fresh air of political freedom, open to growth and prosperity and change, open to the energies of citizens who want to save their homes and build their future, open to safe streets, sound schools, and honest accounting.

It is not open skies that mark the Democrat New Frontier around the world. It is closed deals.

It is not open cities that mark the national administration at home; it is closed wheeling and dealing.

It is the historic task of the Republican Party in the years ahead to inspire integrity at home and rebuild the leadership now being lost around the world.

We can do this because we are a truly national party, undivided by the borders of political baronies. We can do this because we are a party united in principle, not shackled to the conformity of one man's dogma.

We can do this because Republican interests are American interests, because our faith is in freedom, and our freedom is in the people—in the sacred rights of the individual.

A Liberal Goes Off His Rocker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to present, by way of my Washington Report, an exact account of the very unfortunate and embarrassing incident created by the man from San Antonio [Mr. GONZALEZ] yesterday in his unwarranted and disgraceful physical attack upon me.

The report follows:

A LIBERAL GOES OFF HIS ROCKER (OR, AN IRRESPONSIBLE AND VULGAR HOTHEAD GETS FIGHTING MAD WHEN HIS ULTRALIBERAL VOTING RECORD IS EXPOSED)

It was 12:25 p.m., Tuesday, October 29, 1963, during a quorum call on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. I was sitting in the second row visiting with two of my colleagues, Mr. BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, and Mr. DEL CLAWSON, of California, when suddenly Mr. HENRY GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, Tex., rushed up to me and exclaimed, "I understand you called me a Communist."

I replied, "No, HENRY, I did not call you a Communist. I did say, however, that I believe your ultraliberal, leftwing voting record does a disservice to the U.S. Constitution and helps to bolster the Socialist-Communist cause."

Before I could finish my statement, GONZALEZ interrupted, "Well, I'm gonna beat the ------ out of you, in fact, I may just pistol-whip you the way we do down in San Antonio."

"OK," I said, "Get after it."

GONZALEZ, motioning toward the door into the Speaker's lobby, said, "Step out that door and I will."

I got up, walked to the door, and as I stepped off the House floor into the lobby, GONZALEZ swung [at me] with his right fist. He missed my head and hit my right shoulder. He was furious, cursing loudly and acting like a vulgar, berserk madman.

I said, "HENRY, you are unduly upset. I do believe you have lost your mind. In fact, I cannot imagine a supposedly intelligent adult exhibiting this type of conduct in the Halls of Congress—I am ashamed for you."

With this, I turned and walked back onto the House floor. GONZALEZ was still standing in the lobby with his fists doubled, shouting vulgar, uncomplimentary charges and insults.

Admittedly, it was difficult, indeed, for me to restrain myself and maintain dignity while subjected to this obscene and intemperate attack by Mr. GONZALEZ. However, I sincerely believe that most of my west Texas friends would have expected me to maintain my composure and uphold the dignity of my office rather than resorting to the savage and indecent action exhibited by the man from

San Antonio. I hope and trust that upon reflection of this unfortunate incident, Mr. GONZALEZ will exhibit the intelligence not to attempt such an irresponsible tirade again.

The hundreds of telephone calls and telegrams from across the country complimenting me on the handling of this situation have been a source of encouragement and reassurance in the intelligence and concern of Americans everywhere—Democrats and Republicans alike. It was particularly reassuring to have my colleagues commend me in the House of Representatives for my restraint and actions during this incident.

Mr. Speaker, further I include a sample of the hundreds of kind telegrams I have received commending my restraint and actions during this incident:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
October 30, 1963.

Representative ED FOREMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The citizens association deeply regret the unprincipled attack against you by HENRY B. GONZALEZ. We apologize in the name of the citizens of 20th District. Carry on the fight.

Respectfuly,

ROBERT C. MOORE,
President, the Citizens.

DALLAS, TEX.

Congressman ED FOREMAN,
Washington, D.C.:

Your dignity, character, dedication to the Government are above reproach. We're behind you.

KATHY and CLIFF GOLDSMITH.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
October 30, 1963.

Congressman ED FOREMAN,
Washington, D.C.:

Call them as you see them with best regards to you and your family.

BEV AND RAY STONECIPHER.

MIDLAND, TEX.,
October 29, 1963.

Hon. ED FOREMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. West Texans are behind you 100 percent.

JACK RUSSELL.
RAY STEWART.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, after reading recent news articles, and before Mr. GONZALEZ attacked me, I had written the following letter to the editor of the El Paso Herald-Post:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 29, 1963.

Mr. ROBERT W. LEE,
Editor, El Paso Herald-Post,
El Paso, Tex.

DEAR PETE: I was somewhat surprised to see the front page headlines and story on your paper Thursday, October 24, 1963, quoting me as calling HENRY GONZALEZ a "pinko." But I was even more surprised to read the editorial in the following day's edition, entitled "FOREMAN'S Goofs," in which you condemned me at considerable length for this misquotation. Knowing you personally, and being particularly familiar with your fine newspaper and your outstanding background of fairness and responsibility in news stories and editorial writing, this sudden barrage of news and editorial castigation of me by you and your newspaper came as quite a shocking surprise, indeed.

Apparently, one of your enterprising Washington correspondents, in his zeal to write a colorful and controversial front page story at a time when congressional news was very dull, decided to do a bit of name calling for me. Your correspondent called me, discussed the California incident with me, and asked if I thought HENRY B. GONZALEZ was a "pinko." My reply was that, in my opinion, HENRY GONZALEZ' ultraliberal, left-wing voting record does a disservice to the U.S. Constitution and helps to bolster the Socialist-Communist cause. I believe his liberal voting record and his radical left-wing actions, consistently to the left of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, speak for themselves. You can call him whatever name you wish. I am sure that sound, responsible Texans who review GONZALEZ' records are capable of placing a suitable name on the gentleman from San Antonio without my assistance.

As a conservative, I have consistently fought to reduce the size, cost, and control of the Federal Government. I am more interested in extending freedom than I am in promoting a welfare state. Therefore, not only will I work at my very best in my Armed Services Committee and on the House Floor toward this goal, but, when my committee and the House are not in session, I will continue to travel across these United States at my time and expense to work for the election of responsible conservatives, both Democrat and Republican.

I can do my job most effectively in the second instance, I believe, by pointing out the liberal voting record of those Members of Congress who are working to replace our free enterprise system with a Socialist-welfare state. I'll try to leave the name calling to the hardworking Washington news correspondents.

Sincerely yours,

ED FOREMAN,
Member of Congress, 16th District Texas.

United States in Space: Now Is the Time To Move Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a very timely and profound article by the outstanding and distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond.

UNITED STATES IN SPACE: NOW IS THE TIME TO MOVE AHEAD

(By Roscoe Drummond)

We should not make the mistake of allowing Nikita Khrushchev to determine the size of the U.S. space program.

This is a pitfall to be avoided at all costs.

Mr. Khrushchev and the Kremlin may well decide what is the national interest of the Soviet Union, but we ought not to let him decide what is in the national interest of the United States.

There may be compelling reasons for the Soviet Premier to conclude that at the present time it is impractical for Russia to plan a manned flight to the moon.

There is no compelling reason why Congress should be guided by Mr. Khrushchev's apparent withdrawal.

The first impact of the Khrushchev let's-slow-up interview is that this offers a good opportunity for the United States to slow up, too.

I suggest that what is most needed are not second thoughts on the wisdom of the space program but second thoughts on the wisdom of Mr. Khrushchev's lead.

Mr. K. is hardly a reliable source for what is good for the United States. My thought would be that we should neither accept his advice nor reject his advice; just ignore it.

Further, there is no assurance whatsoever that the Kremlin's announced withdrawal from the moon race will stick. The Kremlin's decision not to do something today does not mean it will not do it tomorrow.

Finally—and this goes to the heart of the matter—the overriding reason to keep NASA dynamically at its job and in high gear is not to beat the Soviets to the moon but to achieve preeminence for the United States in the mastery of outer space.

It was preeminence on the seas which gave Britain its unmatchable ascendancy for a hundred years.

It was allied preeminence in the air which guaranteed allied victory in World War II against Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini.

If for any reason, whether through lethargy, trickery or indifference, we concede preeminence to the Soviet Union on the way to the other planets, we will be conceding preeminence to the Soviet Union on this planet. If we do not make it our priority objective to achieve mastery of outer space, we will not be first to the moon, we will not be first in space, and the time will come when we will not be first on earth. Then the problem of the other unfinished business on the agenda of a better peace will really be secondary; then the unfinished business will be survival under the worst of all conditions.

I am not talking about denying the highways of outer space to any other nation, including the Soviets. I am talking about making sure that no other nation shall be allowed to deny the highways of outer space to the United States.

Naturally we must leave it to the consensus of the scientists and the technicians to decide whether the manned flight to the moon is the best way and the urgent next step to insure preeminence in outer space. The controlling and compelling objective is not a manned landing on the moon for its own sake, but the achievement of mastery of the element of outer space for all that it will mean to the kind of earth we will inhabit for a long time to come.

Mr. Khrushchev says let's slow down.

Isn't this the best time to move ahead?

The 120th Anniversary of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I want to take this opportunity of offering tribute to B'nai B'rith, the remarkable Jewish service organization which this month observes its 120th anniversary.

On October 13, 1843, 12 Jews of German origin met in Sunsheimer's Cafe in New York to found an organization which would unite all Jews, without regard to national origin, for the purpose "of inculcating the purest principles of philanthropy, honor, and patriotism."

In the following years, B'nai B'rith has succeeded in such magnificent measure that today it is a world-renowned rallying point for all Jews.

From B'nai B'rith, volunteers responding to President Lincoln's plea, joined the ranks of the Union Army. Since then, B'nai B'rith volunteers have served with

distinction in both world wars. During the Baltimore flood of 1868, the Chicago fire of 1871, and the San Francisco fire of 1906, B'nai B'rith members rushed to the aid of the victims. As a forerunner to the American Red Cross, B'nai B'rith has aided its fellow citizens in time of trouble without regard to religion.

The Anti-Defamation League was organized under auspices of B'nai B'rith to combat anti-Semitism in the United States.

It established the Hillel Foundation, which is a vital cultural force on campuses throughout America

The Pioneer American Hospital for research on tuberculosis and chest diseases was founded by B'nai B'rith at Denver. At Hot Springs, Ark., B'nai B'rith initiated the first important hospital center devoted to relief of arthritis. Both are non-sectarian, free hospitals for the needy.

B'nai B'rith is, in fact, the first national service organization to have been founded in America. It predates not only the Red Cross but such other organizations as the Salvation Army, the Grange, the WCTU, Kiwanis, Rotary, and even the Daughters of the American Revolution.

It has grown to include nearly 500,000 members in 40 countries and has become an integral part of the American scene.

At the age of 120, B'nai B'rith has only begun its work. To its members, I offer my congratulations and very best wishes for continued growth and success.

Remarks of Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of Public Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, my attention was directed to a signal honor paid my distinguished colleague, the gentleman who so ably represents the 19th District of the State of Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. In the 9 years it has been my honor to serve the 21st District, Congressman MIKE KIRWAN has been a continuing source of strength and inspiration.

MIKE KIRWAN was honored a week ago on October 19 by experiencing that rare thrill of taking part in the dedication of a memorial to his name and to his work. It is unfortunate that we Americans seldom honor our great men while they can witness our appreciation.

But MIKE took part in the dedication at Campbell, Ohio, near Youngstown, of Michael Kirwan homes, a 150-unit low rent, public housing development for low-income families.

Delivering the principal dedication addres was the honorable Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of Public Housing Administration and, I might add, the first woman in the 26-year history of the Nation's low-rent program to hold that distinguished responsibility.

In the 21st District of Ohio, we also are concerned with housing low-income families. In Cleveland we like to think we have at least made a good start. For example, we already have under management a little more than 7,800 low-rent homes for low-income families—none of whom could afford to buy or rent a decent home on the private market. In addition, we have under development almost 5,000 additional dwelling units for low-income families. Even with that impressive beginning, Cleveland cannot begin to meet the low-income need despite the fact that Americans currently are experiencing the greatest era of prosperity in history. While we are experiencing this affluence, what is the cost of this program to the taxpayer? An analysis of figures of the Department of Commerce shows that a couple with two children and a net income of $5,000 last year paid less than a dollar through their income taxes to help provide decent housing for the 2 million men, women, and children who could not afford decent housing in the commercial market.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to incorporate the text of Commissioner McGuire's address during dedication of Michael Kirwan homes and her special tribute to our distinguished colleague:

REMARKS OF MARIE C. MCGUIRE, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, AT DEDICATION BANQUET OF MICHAEL J. KIRWAN HOMES AND P. L. STRAIT HOMES, YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, OCTOBER 19, 1963

The dedication of low-rent housing here in Youngstown is of special interest today—not only for the good citizens of this community but for all of us in the Public Housing Administration.

In a way, it seems like history is repeating itself. It is very much like suddenly looking into a magic mirror that reflects its images back more than a quarter of a century, or like turning back the clock and visualizing those stirring moments of 25 years ago when this Nation was opening new and untried frontiers to housing. * * * And while seeing the past, we are able also to be here today, and see also 25 years of progress in this most human of American endeavors.

When we refer to the pioneers of public housing, when we reflect on that time when a daring venture in housing was to be unfolded, we focus unforgettably on Youngstown.

That city has a special place in the history of low-rent housing. For it * * * this active, industrialized, progressive and energetic city of Youngstown was among the first five cities in the United States to see in the Housing Act of 1937—the initial housing act—the possibility of making decent, safe and sanitary housing available to its low-income people.

It was on March 17, 1938—a day not only great for the Irish but for everyone who ever lived in the slums—that President Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote the first administrator of the United States Housing Authority, Mr. Nathan Straus, these words:

"Today marks the beginning of a new era in the economic and social life of America.

"I enclose my authorization to you to execute contracts for slum clearance and low-cost housing projects in the following cities: Austin, Texas; Charleston, South Carolina; New Orleans, Louisiana; Syracuse, New York and Youngstown, Ohio.

"I congratulate the mayors, city councils and local housing authorities of these five cities on being the first to take advantage of this act to do away with their slums.

"It is a special source of satisfaction to me," the President continued, "that the cities submitted to me on the United States Housing Authority list No. 1, constitute almost a cross section of the varied life and history of our country. * * * It is good to know that the benefits of the United States Housing Act are being distributed over so wide an area among cities differing in everything else but alike in being afflicted with blighted areas and slums. * * *"

Those are stirring words, and you in Campbell and Youngstown can take pleasure from the fact that with the oldest and newest of low-rent housing you have compressed here 25 years of this worthwhile program.

The Housing Act of 1937—the one under which your communities have helped set the pioneering pace for the rest of the Nation—has been changed and amended a number of times, the latest in 1961.

The year 1949 is a historic one in the process of change and improvement. The present national concern for elderly Americans, particularly the housing problems of the low-income elderly, stems from the same root as the ground swell of national sentiment which in 1949 produced in Congress the declaration of national housing policy. This was a contribution of your own beloved housing statesman, Senator Robert A. Taft, and the man you honor in perpetuity today, your renowned gift to the Nation, the honorable, the most honorable MIKE KIRWAN.

That 1949 housing policy called for "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family." There are more words in the declaration, but this is the essence, and it is based on a conviction that no American can realize the benefits of our democracy and our American way of life so long as any of us, oldsters or youngsters, are unable to live in a home and a neighborhood which safeguards our health, our privacy, and our dignity.

And so long as America remains rich and strong, with resources in materials, in industry, in initiative, and imagination, an individual's lack of financial resources is one of the poorest reasons that he or she should be relegated to a dreary back room or a decaying shack. This need not be and must not be the American scene, the American standard of life for the economically disadvantaged.

This is why President Kennedy, as a first order of business, in January 1961, urged on Congress a housing program which gave priority to the elderly, and why he asked that the remaining program authorized by the Housing Act of 1949 be made available to local housing authorities, with half of the 100,000 apartments planned for elderly persons and couples. Since that message from the President, which resulted in the first major piece of legislation of his administration, I am pleased to say that over 40,000 homes have been reserved in our low-rent program for use by the low-income veterans of life, men and women of distinguished age and experience.

Today there are 540,000 low-rent homes under management, a $5 billion asset owned by the 2,000 participating cities, towns, and crossroad communities across America. Some 1,500 local housing authorities, similar to your own Youngstown Metropolitan Housing Authority, are providing good though modest homes for more than 2 million individuals of low income.

Here in your State of Ohio, there are 19 Metropolitan Housing Authorities operating about 21,500 low-rent units. Our Chicago regional office reports that there are another 11,000 dwellings under development in your State. These figures standing alone are impressive, and they illustrate vividly the fullness of time and attention being directed to lifting housing standards here in Ohio.

There is another impressive attribute to this matter of housing, and it is evident both in Youngstown and in Campbell. It is the cooperation between your housing authority and your cities, which along with the Federal Government made possible these nearly 500 new homes which are being dedicated today. This partnership deserves a special commendation for its success in overcoming many hurdles and achieving the ideals you have set for yourselves.

The low-rent program is a three-way partnership in which the local housing authority, the local government, and the Federal Government are working together to accomplish what not one of the three could do by itself.

And so we can point with pride to the results of this partnership between the Youngstown Metropolitan Housing Authority, the city of Youngstown, the city of Campbell, and the Federal Government. Is there any better tribute to this partnership than these fine facilities we dedicate here today?

In a way, today can be a time of reflection. A reflection of the past and a reflection of what the future will bring. Depending on how you look at it, the 25 years of housing effort demonstrated here today can be a lifetime, or it can be only an instant in time.

But within those 9,000 days we have fought two wars.

We have seen, in those 9,000 odd days the emergence of such commonplace wonders as penicillin, television, jet aircraft, space flights, and we are now looking forward to the time when men will land on the moon. We have also, in these past 9,000 days, seen strong and effective resistance to attempts to raise the social and economic status of low-income families.

It is to be regretted that some people are taken in by the predictions that the use of Federal financial assistance for low-rent housing will bring disastrous results to the home-building indusrty and to the thousands of good citizens who earn their living through the sale and rental of standard dwelling units. Of course that is preposterous. It is regretted that some people are taken in by the assertion that the construction of low-rent housing will lower property values, will "glut" the private market, and will take the bread from the tables of those engaged in American private enterprise activities.

Nothing of course is further from the truth. Campbell and Youngstown should be thankful that its leaders believe there is a place and a need for low-rent housing in American communities. No one has to apologize for the fact that in Youngstown there are 1,411 units of low-rent housing, or that the Youngstown Metropolitan Housing Authority, acting for and on behalf of the city of Campbell, has accorded that community a stimulating improvement in its housing inventory. We rejoice when we look at the structures occupied by American families who until now have felt the pinch of despair, and certainly a sense of degradation.

We can point with pride when we see families for the first time enjoying such simple amenities as adequate sleeping space, clean rooms, bright and cheerful accommodations for their members. We can rejoice with those senior citizens who can look forward to living, not existing, their golden years.

So it is that the low-rent housing program does have a basic purpose and does serve a basic need. Not only for the low-income families on their way up, but also for the low-income oldsters on their way home. And here in your two neighboring cities, thanks to the adventurous and pioneering spirit so vividly shown by such men as Paul L. Strait and MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, the spirit of the Good Samaritan is portrayed for all to see, a spirit which undergirds our democracy and assures its strength and continuity.

Paul Strait, for whom a 348-unit development has been named, was a leader in this program. A stanch, unswerving man with a purpose and compassion for his fellow man. His retirement a few short years ago evoked this eulogy—so right and so well deserved—on the editorial pages of the Youngstown Vindicator, I quote, in part:

"As director of the Big Brother movement in Youngstown in the mid-twenties, Mr. Strait sought ways to improve the deplorable conditions under which many families were trying to get along. He was especially interested in the plight of so many young people. This led him to take a vigorous role in the creation of the Housing Authority. Mr. Strait can take comfort in the knowledge that his efforts in behalf of community improvement are appreciated by thousands who have benefited by his help."

While Paul Strait was unable to be here today to see the benefit of his activities—his work—his unselfish aid to those less fortunate than he—is enshrined in these homes we dedicate today.

The low-rent housing program, not only in Youngstown but in the State of Ohio, is a solid, stabilized aspect of community improvement facilities as a result of Paul Strait. He was truly a pioneer in this field, having helped organize the Youngstown Metropolitan Housing Authority long before there was Federal legislation for low-rent housing. He achieved a mark of major distinction for his efforts, and we are grateful for his foresight and his achievements in behalf of less-fortunate Americans.

MICHAEL KIRWAN, for whom the low-rent housing in Campbell has been named, is a distinguished Member of Congress and likewise a pioneer in efforts to improve housing conditions in this great Nation. He is now in his 27th year in Congress as a Representative of the 19th Ohio District, and has been a stanch supporter of low-rent housing since its inception. Mr. KIRWAN had the privilege of voting for the original Housing Act of 1937, and has maintained a close and personal interest in the program for more than a quarter of a century.

Mr. KIRWAN's abiding concern for the welfare of America's people puts him in partnership with the Public Housing Administration in another area, that of housing and caring for the Nation's first citizens, its Indians. As a member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, Mr. KIRWAN also serves as chairman of its subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies. In that role, he exercises benevolent supervision of Federal programs dealing with Indians. He has visited every single Indian reservation in the Nation, and not on what we in Washington sometimes so disrespectfully term a committee junket.

Mr. KIRWAN is personally responsible for bringing about modern new hospital and nursing care on American Indian reservations. His influence raised the once-deplorable standards of health and sanitation to more acceptable levels—although he, himself—I am sure—will admit—recognizes that much remains to be done in the health and education field.

In that regard, Mr. KIRWAN has encouraged us greatly in the infant low-rent Indian program, which is administered by the Public Housing Administration in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Interior Department. Although barely underway, we already have more than 1,600 new low-rent homes for Indians in various stages of development on 11 Indian Reservations, with some homes among the Sioux of South Dakota already being occupied. Totally, some 52 Indian reservations have requested a new public housing plan geared specifically to the Indian need.

Eventually, with work equity, many Indian families will be able to own their own homes; the new homes will replace worse than the wigwams or the teepees we still view with some nostalgia.

And so it is most fitting that the housing in the city of Campbell bears MIKE KIRWAN's name. It is located on terrain overlooking the Mahoning Valley, and the industrialization of this area is due in large part to men of vision such as Mr. KIRWAN.

We join with his many friends and colleagues in Campbell and Youngstown in extending our own congratulations to him for this signal honor. It is fitting that "homes" should be memorials to this great man, his courage, his wisdom, and his heart.

Both projects also are monuments to a vibrant city which recognizes its obligations both to its young people and to its senior citizens.

Yet, while you are devoting 1,400 dwellings to low-income people, of which 100 are designed for elderly persons, consider this:

The 1960 Census showed 2,700 elderly people in Youngstown who were heads of families with annual incomes under $1,000. It also disclosed that there were another 4,400 heads of families with annual incomes of less than $1,500.

The figures do not reveal how many of the 3,200 substandard rented dwellings in Youngtown were occupied by your senior citizens.

The 1960 Census figures also disclose that Ohio—one of the most prosperous States in the Nation—had 170,000 elderly who were heads of families and who had incomes of less than $1,000 a year and that another 264,000 elderly had incomes of less than $1,500 a year.

Think of it, there are enough elderly among low-income familities in Ohio, alone, eligible to occupy two-fifths of the entire low-rent housing units in the Nation.

And what about the Nation as a whole? In 1960, there were about 6,200,000 people over 65 years of age whose annual income ranged up to $999. Another 3,400,000 had annual incomes from $1,000 to $2,000, a disgrace to our Nation, and in this field truly we are found wanting.

A good percentage of these 9,600,000 of our senior citizens occupied some of the millions of substandard houses and apartments that still stand in the United States.

It is a sad fact that for most of these nearly 10 million senior citizens their sunset years will be filled with anxiety and loneliness. For most of them, their "earning" years are being replaced by the "yearning" years.

It is a sad fact, too, that if here in this affluent land of ours only 12 percent of these elderly were to apply for public housing today, their number would more than double the total of the Nation's public housing units.

I wish I could say that this need for low-rent housing is being alleviated for the millions of modest income. Sure, we are making some progress, but what about the future? The funds authorized in the 1961 Housing Act, for about 100,000 units, soon will be used up.

What then?

As Dr. Robert Weaver, Housing Administrator, sees it, 1964 is the year of decision for America in its housing policies. America must decide then whether it will continue this worthy program, which has made possible the homes we are dedicating today and which provides the only decent housing available to a half a million American families, or whether it will ignore the needs of the millions of low-income families who still occupy the 8½ million substandard homes.

Meanwhile, we—like you in Youngstown and Campbell—are doing everything we can to carry out the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949. And in this work, the partner-

ship between the community, the local housing authority and the Public Housing Administration will continue toward the common goal.

Despite its critics, the low-rent program is fulfilling its basic purpose. It is exemplified here today: to provide decent homes, in decent environments, for families and individuals who, because of economic circumstances cannot find on the private market decent, safe and sanitary accommodations within their means.

I feel honored that you have invited me to share this significant moment with you.

Truck Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a release by the American Trucking Associations, Inc., concerning a speech given by Goley D. Sontheimer, director of safety of the American Truckin Association, given before the annual joint meeting of the Pennsylvania and Ohio Council of Safety Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the trucking industry can, and is doing a fine job in promoting safety on our highways and I wish to commend the association for its efforts in this field.

Only this month, October 10, 1963, to be exact, Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the record the accomplishments of the Alabama Trucking Association in this field and I believe that the association deserved the fine award they were presented by the American Society of Association Executives for their untiring efforts in safety.

Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I wish to have the release referred to above inserted in the RECORD at this point:

ORGANIZED TRUCKING INDUSTRY URGED TO HELP ICC IN SAFETY ACTIVITIES

SHAKER HEIGHTS, OHIO, October 23.—A top trucking industry safety official today called on established motor carrier firms to help police the safety activities of all trucks on the road.

Goley D. Sontheimer, of Washington, D.C., director of safety of the American Trucking Associations, said the organized trucking industry has an obligation to do all it can to insure safer operations on the Nation's highways.

Speaking (at the Somerset Inn here) before the annual joint meeting of the Pennsylvania and Ohio Councils of Safety Supervisors, the safety arm of the industry in those States, Mr. Sontheimer urged that the group's road patrols assist the Interstate Commerce Commission in tracking down vehicles subject to the ICC's safety regulations.

Many trucking organizations have road patrols operating on major truck routes which observe the performance of drivers and report to their companies.

Mr. Sontheimer explained that all trucks which operate in interstate commerce are subject to the ICC's safety regulations but added that because only for-hire carriers must obtain authority to operate, many trucks are hauling interstate without the Commission's knowledge.

He proposed that road partol units make notations of these vehicles and notify the ICC so that their field inspectors can contact the owners to be certain they are aware of the safety regulations and are operating in conformity with them.

He pointed to several recent accident investigations which involved such trucks and added that the industry's fine safety record is "in danger if you do not expand your activities to be your brother's keeper."

"A truck is a truck and when one is in an accident, no one is going to stop to inquire whether it is a member of the organized industry or a gypsy," Mr. Sontheimer said.

He also emphasized that it is unrealistic to attempt to correlate truck accidents with increased size and weights being allowed by some States.

He referred specifically to Pennsylvania where increases were granted recently and added that these merely brought the State into conformity with neighboring States.

Mr. Sontheimer explained that Western States, which have had the higher limits for many years have reported better safety experience with the larger units than with other vehicles.

He also stated that reports of accident investigations made by personnel of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the past 2 years contain no indication that size or weight was a causative factor.

Mr. Sontheimer also called for increased safety efforts by all truck fleets through driver meetings, retraining and re-emphasis of the standards for professional drivers.

"We cannot accept less than the best possible defensive driving performance from the professional driver nor less than the best possible maintenance of our vehicles," he said in calling for renewed emphasis in safe operation.

The Proposed National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my great personal disappointments during this session of Congress has been our failure here in the House to pass a bill creating the National Service Corps. This program proposed by President Kennedy deserves a fair trial since it holds the promise of being one of the truly great accomplishments of this decade.

Many doubted that the Peace Corps would be a success. Now even the most vehement of its original critics have come forth to admit that it has made outstanding contributions to mutual understanding and friendship among peoples and nations everywhere. There can be no question that application of the Peace Corps ideal to the domestic scene should at least receive the chance to prove itself that we gave the Peace Corps.

The Special Labor Subcommittee has done an excellent job conducting hearings on the measure, and I am hopeful that the full Education and Labor Committee can report a bill in the not too distant future. I am also hopeful that the bill will receive the strong bipartisan support it deserves when it comes to the floor.

As a cosponsor of the National Service Corps Act and one of its staunchest supporters, I respectfully insert, under unanimous consent, the Providence Journal editorial of August 22, 1963, entitled "The Service Corps Deserves Trial," in the Appendix of the RECORD:

In approving a bill creating a Domestic Peace Corps or National Service Corps, the Senate made clear the grave reservations that are sure to be rehashed in the House version. The Senate bill gives the new corps little more than a year's life; any additional finances after 1964 must be approved by Congress. There was the unfortunate attempt to hobble the bill with an antidiscrimination rider. But the bill did pass, and the Senate showed its good faith in voting to give the Domestic Peace Corps a chance. This is what the program certainly deserves—a chance to prove itself.

To argue otherwise is to deny the Nation's slum areas, the rural deprivations, the depressed living conditions in many migratory farm labor camps a chance at improvement. It is inconceivable that some Senate Republicans quibble over methods of dispensing basic relief and assistance, claiming that it is "rather unnecessary and unwise to provide inexperienced youths to help our less fortunate citizens acquire hope." This country has lived long enough with its urban slums to know that it is the young, animated and zealous college student, inexperienced though he be, who has more often than not brought brightness and hope to darkened lives.

When the House takes up the matter, it should recognize the challenge implicit in the National Service Corps. Its sponsors are confident of their recruits. If enthusiasm is there to be tapped, Congress should give it every chance to express itself, at least on a trial basis.

Let Not the Atheists and Unbelievers Destroy Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust that the entire Nation is becoming alerted and alarmed over the obvious efforts of a substantial number of atheists and unbelievers throughout our country to destroy the spiritual foundation and basic beliefs of the majority of our people.

One of the most ardent supporters of the efforts that some of us in Congress are making to amend the Constitution so as to thwart the machinations of these atheists and unbelievers is Dr. S. McMaster Kerr, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Harlan, Ky. He is a constituent of whom I am proud and I would like to insert right here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his recent bulletin containing his voice of "one crying in the wilderness" and I certainly hope that a great chorus of American voices in all the 50 States of our Nation will join with Dr. Kerr in this great endeavor. The bulletin is as follows:

SUPREME COURT'S SOCIALIST JUDGES DESTROY OUR NATIONAL HERITAGE—COMMUNISTS AND ATHEISTS STRIVE TO KICK GOD OUT OF AMERICA

(By Dr. S. McMaster Kerr, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Harlan, Ky.)

Do you know that separate Communist-atheistic groups are now taking action through the courts to accomplish the following:

1. To forbid the singing of the verse in our national anthem which reads:

"O thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war's desolation;
Blest with victory and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation.
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just;
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust.'
And the Star Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

2. To remove from our coins "In God we trust."

3. To remove the Bible from the courts as used when a witness is being sworn.

4. To remove all chaplains from the Armed Forces of our Nation.

5. To forbid the singing of Christmas carols and the presentation of the nativity scene in our schools at Christmas.

6. Atheist Madalyn Murray announced in New York her plan to bring suit in Maryland within 10 days (October 17) against tax exemptions for religious properties. Atheist Madalyn said ample funds for the legal action were voted at a board meeting of the directors of Other Americans, Inc., which she heads.

The socialistic Judges of the Supreme Court—the National Council of Churches and its member denominations must now accept full responsibility for the situation our Nation is in for encouraging the atheistic Communists in their efforts to kick God out of America. We who name the name of Christ must take our stand before it is too late and in doing so we line up with our greatest statesmen and national leaders.

On March 4, 1805, Thomas Jefferson said in his second inaugural address:

"I shall need the favor of the Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers as Israel of old from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who hath covered our infancy with His providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power, and the whose goodness I ask you to join in supplication with me, that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils and prosper their measures that whatsoever they do shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations."

On March 4, 1833, Andrew Jackson said in his second inaugural address:

"It is my most fervent prayer to that Almighty Being before whom I now stand, and who has kept us in His hands from the infancy of our Republic to the present day, that He will so overrule all my intentions and actions and inspire the hearts of my fellow citizens that we may be preserved from dangers of all kinds and continue forever a united and happy people."

On March 4, 1853, Franklin Pierce said in his inaugural address:

"Let not the foundations of our hope rest upon man's wisdom. * * * It must be felt that there is no national security but in the Nation's humble, acknowledged dependence upon God and His overruling providence."

These quotations and countless others that might be cited, show the foundation upon which our country has been built. Because our Presidents have unashamedly acknowledged God and sought His guidance does not mean that they have served any less effectively the non-Christians among us. In fact, our country has been a much better place in which to live, for the atheist and the non-Christian, as well as the rest of us, because the majority of our leaders and our people have sought the help of God in the discharge of their duties.

If we now allow all reference to God and the teachings of the principles of the Judeo-Christian religion to be driven from our schools and our institutions, Christians and non-Christians alike will suffer indescribably as a result thereof. We cannot hope to continue as a great nation if we forget God and dishonor His name. The faith and the works of the Christians of the present and preceding generations who have developed our country are responsible for the great blessings that they themselves and the non-Christian among us have enjoyed. If the irreverent among us now succeed in destroying the foundation of our strength they shall share with us in the common catastrophe.

We employ chaplains to minister to the spiritual needs of our Armed Forces. We employ chaplains to offer prayer at the opening of both Houses of Congress and of our State legislature. We employ chaplains to minister the spiritual needs of those who are serving prison sentences. If we paid more attention to God in our schools, we would not need so many chaplains to serve in our numerous prisons.

We acknowledge God when we salute the flag. We acknowledge Him when we sing our national anthem. We pray a beautiful prayer when we sing the fourth verse of the hymn "America."

"Our fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of liberty, to Thee we sing,
Long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light,
Protect us by Thy might, great God, our King."

The Supreme Court said that we are a Christian nation. Are we now to allow a small minority of atheists and unbelievers to change the whole foundation of our country? Consider for a moment how deep and broad is the firm foundation of the United States of America which was laid in faith and service to God. Think you that we can preserve our freedom, our self-government, and our prosperity if we increasingly desert these ideals and become a secular, materialistic people? Nay. Rather we shall go the way of a score of civilizations which have preceded us.

It is plainly written in the annals of mankind that we have before us two choices: To live in accordance with the law of God or to perish.

Hon. Carl Vinson Recipient of a Great American Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hubert F. Lee, for 34 years editor of Dixie Business, has announced the 1964 recipient of that publication's A Great American Award. I am pleased to advise the Members that our colleague and the dean of this House, the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, has been selected for this honor.

Honors are nothing new to such a distinguished Georgian, whose service, spanning almost a half a century, has received justly deserved recognition throughout the world. I commend Dixie Business for its selection of Chairman VINSON, who truly deserves the title "A Great American."

Picking a Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Paul Jones which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of October 24, 1963, and which compares the situation in 1777 and 1863 with our foreign policy today.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PICKING A WINNER

(By Paul Jones)

Suppose that Vergennes, Prime Minister of Louis XVI, had sent a factfinding mission to the United States in the winter of 1777–78, to see whether France ought to continue its help to the colonists.

The French mission would have been told to look around, evaluate the military and political situation, and make a judgment on the chances for a Continental victory.

Dr. Franklin, a pet at court and among the intellectuals, was talking a good war in Paris. How would a report prepared by a cold-blooded professional soldier have read?

Between Lexington and Valley Forge, the shooting war had gone on for 2½ years. In that time, after an early success at Boston, General Washington had lost on Long Island, on the island of Manhattan, and at White Plains. Another small success at Trenton was followed by heavy defeat at the Brandywine, after which he was maneuvered out of Philadelphia, and, attempting to come back at Germantown, lost another battle. Then he went into winter quarters at Valley Forge, where he commanded only the wretched remnant of an army.

POLLSTERS' DECISION?

Half of Congress had lost confidence in Washington, and wanted to replace him with Gates, who had won a shining victory in October 1777, by capturing Burgoyne and his whole army at Saratoga.

If the members of a French mission had taken a public opinion poll among eminent characters on the colonists' side, they would have had no trouble finding men who thought Washington should be deposed, for the good of the cause. In addition, they would have heard much of the poor spirit of the militia, widespread defeatism, skyrocket inflation, and get-rich-quick corruption on the homefront.

Undoubtedly, Vergennes got such reports, but he had better sense than to base French policy on the reaction to temporary setbacks.

Taking the long view, he supported Washington and offered a firm alliance.

In 1863 France was again weighing anxiously the meaning of reports from America. Backed by Napoleon III, the Archduke Maximilian was to be installed as Emperor of Mexico, over the objections of the United States, expressed by the Government at Washington.

Everything depended, therefore, on the probable outcome of the Civil War then raging between the North and the South. If it ended with a Confederate victory, the American Republic would split up into two, three, or four minor nations. The southern confederacy might well be disposed to reach an accommodation with the new Mexican empire; in any case, exhausted by the war, it would not be a formidable opponent.

The northern objective was to hold the Union together as a powerful, controlling element in American affairs, with decisive influence far beyond its borders. Washington was already supporting Juarez against Maximilian. If the war ended with a northern triumph, France would have to get out of Mexico. Hence the consuming interest in the fortunes of Abraham Lincoln.

NAPOLEON'S MISTAKE

In the fall of 1863, it was by no means certain that the North would win, or that Lincoln would be reelected in 1864. Peace propaganda was very strong, especially in the big eastern cities. The crash programs involved in equipping and arming huge armies and an expanded navy had brought the usual corruption on the fringes. Prices had outrun wages by a wide margin; workers were discontented, and there were many strikes.

Worst of all, the administration showed complete disregard for individual civil rights. Fort Warren at Boston, Fort Lafayette at New York, Fort Delaware, and the Old Capitol Prison were full of citizens arrested without warrant and held indefinitely without trial. Meanwhile, the military situation was far from brilliant, and half the troops would go home when their enlistments expired.

This was the gloomy view of things, but it was based on facts. Napoleon III prepared his own downfall of 1870, when he wrote off Lincoln and the North as decisive factors in the Mexican situation, as of 1863–64. Less wise than Vergennes, he mistook passing difficulties for inherent weakness.

It is just this kind of basic decision that we have made in southeast Asia, by continuing our support of Ngo Dinh Diem, in spite of his present troubles, which we think must pass.

The Diem Government Should Shape Up or Ship Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thoughtful editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on the situation in Vietnam.

AID FOR WAR ONLY

If it weren't for U.S. aid at the rate of more than $200 million a year over the last 9 years (up to about $500 million this year), South Vietnamese resistance to Communist guerrillas probably would have collapsed long ago and the Diem regime would be in exile, if alive.

Since we are largely financing the war effort, we have a duty to protect the investment by insisting upon a greater effort by the South Vietnamese themselves.

That reasoning is behind the State Department's decision to cut off aid to an elite corps of Vietnamese airborne troops unless they are assigned to field duty against the Communist enemy.

This is a most sensible decision. Americans have long been rightly disturbed by the thought that their tax dollars were being used to train and support elite troops not to fight the enemy, but to suppress the Buddhist majority among the Vietnamese in Saigon.

It is long past time for a showdown. Our dollars should produce the desired results or we should cut them off. We should not continue to support persons or projects that do not help the war effort. The Diem government should shape up or ship out.

Business and Professional Women's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently, the women of Misisssippi, as well as leaders in other States, have observed with a great deal of pride their annual Business and Professional Women's Week.

This special week offers an excellent opportunity for this outstanding organization to highlight its remarkable record of civic leadership throughout the Nation.

I wish to add my special congratulations to the women of Mississippi and wish also to acknowledge the tribute paid to them in the editorial attached hereto from the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger of October 12, 1963.

I am pleased to recognize and commend the many outstanding contributions made in local, county, State, regional, and national life by members of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN LEADERSHIP PLAYING HELPFUL PART IN PROGRESS OF MISSISSIPPI

The current observance of Business and Professional Women's Week spotlight the many outstanding contributions by dedicated groups at local, State, and National levels. Prominent among these are Jackson's own Business and Professional Women clubs which rank high in progressive leadership and achievement.

The local movement started back in 1916 with the founding of the Young Women's Business Club. In 1919, after the National Business and Professional Women's organization was launched, the local pioneer group became the Jackson Business and Professional Women.

From its membership, the Capitol and Riverside Club were formed and under its sponsorship, the North Jackson Club came into being.

Among members who have attained places in Mississippi history are Lucy Howorth, Ellen Woodward and Earline White—the latter becoming National Business and Professional Women president for a highly successful term some years ago.

This year the Jackson Club is coordinating all its efforts in behalf of the fitting theme, "Responsibility for Full Partnership." In the area of youth there are several girls attending nursing school under Jackson Business and Professional Women scholarships. Some have already graduated and are in successful nursing careers.

Business and Professional Women club efforts are geared to advance the position of women in business. During this week's special observance, all men's civic clubs have been contacted to secure their help in bringing the message of membership to feminine employees.

The Jackson Club has furnished a number of able presidents for the State Federation of Business and Professional Women including Jessie Moorhead, Ferris Cotter, Bonnie Mills, and Burnette Hennington. The local organization is justly proud of the fact that no other club in Mississippi has furnished four State presidents.

We salute and congratulate officials and members of Business and Professional Women on the occasion of the nationwide observance now paying deserved tribute to a movement which has meant so much to the progress and development of communities throughout America.

Seventh Anniversary of the Hungarian Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to recall the events of the Hungarian revolution, which just 7 years ago this week, tore apart forever any remaining myths concerning the benevolence of Soviet control over the Iron Curtain countries, and which exposed anew the limitless treachery and total ruthlessness of Communist oppression.

This spontaneous bid by a proud people for a free government was lost through an overwhelming combination of lies and brute force. Thousands of patriots were killed. Nearly 200,000 Hungarians fled the country.

After assurances by the Russians that Soviet troops would be withdrawn from all of Hungary, which were given on October 28 to Premier Imre Nagy, Soviet forces in massive strength surrounded Budapest on November 1 and launched an attack on the city on November 4. They used 200,000 men with 2,500 tanks and armored cars.

Along with Premier Nagy, General Pal Maleter served as a focus of this nationwide rebellion. General Maleter was seized while attending a so-called negotiation meeting with the Communists and soon after murdered. The Premier, likewise betrayed, was seized and subsequently murdered as well. By the end of the first week of November, the Red curtain had dropped again over Hungary.

In the intervening years, up to the time the present administration took office, the United States maintained a strong position of condemnation against the Communist Hungarian puppet government. Earlier this year, the present administration regrettably reversed our country's policy and failed to challenge the right of the Hungarian puppet government to a seat in the United Nations. The issue never came to a vote and the puppet delegation was admitted. There are other signs that our Government is moving toward softer measures.

This would be understandable and desirable if the situation in Hungary had truly changed. But it has not. The government now in office is the very same regime which had to be rescued by Moscow from popular revolution in 1956. It is still the same regime which collaborated with the Soviets in their suppression of this revolution. It is still the same regime which has been condemned by the United Nations and which has continually ignored and flouted resolutions adopted by the United Nations, where it now sits with all the trappings of honor.

We cannot move closer to this regime, as we appear to be doing, without forfeiting, to the degree by which we move, our standing with our free world allies. Whether or not this is the intention of such moves, it is without question the effect of them.

Suppose we had lost our own Revolution; that it had been just as brutally crushed by the British and a puppet government installed. Suppose then that our principal ally and backer, France, had extended its hand toward the puppet government and agreed to deal with it in international councils. What would American reaction have been?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is very close to what is our present policy toward the puppet regime of Hungary and that the Hungarian people and others who are struggling to be free, must feel today as we would have felt in like circumstances.

I hope Americans everywhere will take this occasion to remember the Hungarians who fought for freedom 7 years ago and, in spite of apparent thaw between ourselves and Moscow, to remember what it is we are fighting for and honor the memories of comrades who gave their lives in the same cause.

Keeping the Faith Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, in the daily news we hear so much about civil rights and the persecuted minorities that it behooves me to call to your attention the forgotten minority—professing Christians. All over the world the 2,000-year struggle is still being waged and people who want to be followers of Christ are being "thrown to the lions" in as wanton a fashion as in the days of the Roman martyrs.

One group I want to commend which is keeping the faith in this fight is the Baptist Brotherhood of the Augusta (Ga.) Association of Baptist Churches composed of 42 Baptist churches. This group is doing something about it.

In connection with other Baptist organizations in Georgia, the Baptist Brotherhood of Augusta is sponsoring in November a Russian-born Christian, Paul Voronaeff, to tell the story of the Communistic conspiracy to overthrow Christianity.

This is certainly the time to bring again to the American people the threat to Christian beliefs. Mr. Voronaeff's appearance will be at the Curtis Baptist Church, Augusta, on November 5, and he will witness to his personal encounters as a Russian prisoner because he is a believer in Christ. As aptly expressed by the Augusta Association chairman for this appearance, Mr. David P. Smith:

If the churches can't fight communism then certainly no one else is going to carry their fight for them.

James C. Petrillo and the Recording Industries Music Performance Trust Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, future generations of musicians the world over will be repeating the saga of the incidents and accomplishments in the life of James C. Petrillo as national president of the Musicians Union and Chicago local. He had foresight, imagination, and a resourceful mind—all funneled toward one purpose: the advancement of the fortunes of his talented musicians. Their well-being and that of their families was his every thought and action of his long career. The benefits of his ideas worked into actual programs resulted in the monetary concessions from the industry that are contributing to the culture of the Nation and the livelihood of his beloved artists.

Upon his retirement as national president of the American Federation of Musicians I was honored and proud to address the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1958, page 5011—depicting his illustrious career. He wears his many honors well and merits the respect of the Nation as a great American.

I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of October 13, 1963:

RECORDING INDUSTRIES FUND DISTRIBUTES $165,000 HERE

(By Thomas Willis)

"Musicians for this performance are provided by a grant from the Recording Industries Music Performance Trust Funds, with the cooperation of the American Federation of Musicians."

Although it is likely to be set in the smallest type and hidden in the least prominent program position, the formal statement above is well worth noticing.

The Recording Industries Music Performance Trust Fund—every word in the unwieldy title is a legal necessity, however cumbersome—is 15 years old this winter.

During this period it has collected and disbursed part of every dollar spent on phonograph records made by the 3,000 record companies in this country and Canada—more than $50,000,000.

The subsidy offered live music in the attempt to offset the unemployment caused by records was battered out as final settlement in 1948 by James C. Petrillo and the manufacturers, with the approval of the Justice Department and Senator Robert A. Taft, whose Taft-Hartley law was the major stumbling block in the final campaign.

Samuel R. Rosenbaum, the industry's initial choice as trustee, has signed every check. Last year there were around 500,000. It would be difficult to refute his claim to be the largest single employer of musicians in the country, and perhaps the world.

During the 1962–63 fiscal year, about $6,000,000 was paid for free public concerts. In keeping with the original spread-the-work nature of the strike-won bargain, the money is distributed evenly over the union population, with each local sharing according to its membership.

Chicago's share—about 3½ percent of the total—last year was $165,000, with $140,000 allocated on recommendation of the Chicago Federation of Musicians and the remainder to projects sponsored by local 208, the Negro chapter which is now merging with its larger, richer counterpart.

How the money is spent is up to Mr. Rosenbaum, a Philadelphia lawyer who, at 75, spends 3 days a week in the fund offices in New York City. He has a staff of 25, but depends mostly on local union representatives to screen applications, process requests, and certify that engagements are preformed.

The tandem union-trust fund arrangement cuts down administrative overhead, Mr. Rosenbaum says. It also leads to misunderstanding. Legally, the fund has nothing to do with the union (a court decision in 1959 established this as fact). Actually local organizations wishing subsidy must work through the union.

Nationally, the fund is spent for four sorts of programs, with approximately equal amounts apportioned for each: (a) music having cultural value, (b) music in hospitals and other charitable institutions, (c) outdoor band concerts and civic services, (d) dances for young people organized by public or semipublic agencies.

But each area has different problems, the trustee says, and he shapes the allocation to fit special needs. In the Chicago area—and wherever there are capable symphonic musicians—he tilts the educational and cultural value category sharply upward.

Of the $165,000 spent here last year to pay union musicians for free concerts, more than $100,000 went for education and cultural music. About $30,000 were spent on civic services, chiefly park summer band concerts and square dances (not including the Grant Park Symphony Orchestra concerts, a park district budget item). The remaining funds went for entertainment, with a $10,000 grant to shopping center popular concerts the largest item.

The shopping center concerts, incidentally, are an experiment, Mr. Rosenbaum says. "Operators of the centers are beginning to use music as part of the community service they render. The trustee sees no objection to joining with such cosponsors who match or exceed the trust contribution, with the clear understanding that programs will be of general interest, without any specific commercial pitch."

Whether trust fund participation in the promotion and development of a shopping center's community image is justified or not—and it would see open to some question on grounds of unfair competition—it is an indication of Rosenbaum's willingness to explore new subsidy possibilities.

Southern Heroes, Heroines, and Legends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the University of Tennessee News Letter, vol. XLI, No. 4, entitled "Southern Heroes, Heroines, and Legends." This booklet was compiled by Mr. David J. Harkness, Director of Program Planning and Library Services at the University of Tennessee.

In inserting this information, it is my intention to correct a long-standing injustice and to obtain some recognition as a matter of justice to a boy who risked his own life to aid his country when it was in great peril.

The young boy was a first cousin to the late wife of Mr. A. C. Duggins of Greeneville, Tenn. Mrs. Duggins passed away in 1958. Mr. Duggins is now very active, having written a book entitled, "Lest We Forget," a story of the First Baptist Church, of Greenville, Tenn., from 1871–1960. This book has received wide acclaim throughout the United States.

Mrs. Duggins was the late Miss Clarice Henson, and one of the dormitories at the University of Tennessee is named after one of her relatives, Henson Hall.

Mr. and Mrs. Duggins had nine sons in the service, one of whom is still a captain in the Navy. They served their country with such patriotic devotion that at Mrs. Duggins' death President Eisenhower sent a special message of condolence to the family.

As a lad of only 13 years, the young boy, John T. Brown, delivered a message from General Grant to General Burnside, under great dangers and hazards, that resulted in the saving of General Burnside's army at Knoxville, Tenn., and, in no small measure, helped to determine the fortunes of the war of the rebellion.

This heroic act went largely unnoticed until just recently, and Mr. Brown received no remuneration whatsoever for his deeds because it never occurred to him to get documentary evidence of his part in carrying the message.

This story is so impressive to me that I wanted to make it available to the other Members of Congress and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SOUTHERN HEROES, HEROINES, AND LEGENDS

Still another thrilling ride was made by a boy only 13 years old. When Mary Love made her memorable ride in November 1863, carrying an important message from General Grant in Chattanooga to General Burnside in Knoxville, she got from her home in Kingston to Louisville, Tenn., a distance of 35 miles, in a few hours, partly at night. Now completely exhausted, she could not go on the remaining 15 miles. But who would carry the message at night, through country swarming with Confederate soldiers? The men were away in the army, or had fled at the approach of General Longstreet's forces. Mrs. Elizabeth Brown said her son, John T. Brown, could get through. Johnny was called and he was willing to go. Mrs. Brown went with her young son along the bank of the river. They silently scrambled through the dense undergrowth for 2 miles until they were out of the picket lines of Wheeler's Confederate Cavalry. Then the mother turned back. Johnny went on through the bitter cold and the darkness and the silent forests. At length he reached Little River, a distance of 8 or 9 miles. The river was swollen and he could not cross, so he spent the night at the home of Isaac Lebow, an old friend of his father's. Johnny told Lebow that he was carrying papers to General Burnside. Even though he was a Confederate, Lebow made no objection and no inquiry, but gave him his breakfast before daylight the next morning and started him on his way. Johnny succeeded in crossing the river and finally came to the Federal pickets. He was sent forward under the charge of a sergeant to General Burnside's headquarters several miles away. When the good news that deliverance was near at hand from the seige of Longstreet, the Union soldiers gathered around the brave boy. With strong arms and tear-stained eyes, they lifted him on their shoulders and, with cheers and shouts, carried him up and down the streets of Knoxville.

American Art Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the significance of American Art Week, being celebrated between November 1 and 7, should attract the attention of all Members of the Congress as well as citizens throughout the Nation.

Founded in 1931 by the American Artists Professional League, Inc., of New York City, American Art Week is being celebrated in various States and communities throughout the United States.

In 1962 Illinois placed second in the Nation for its activity during Art Week, and Lake County, which is in the 12th Congressional District which I represent, was the leading county in the State. Art leagues and associations in various parts of the 12th District are helping to foster appreciation of art, and many persons are being encouraged to develop and display their artistic skills.

In my congressional office I have a number of representative works of art—both oils and watercolors—which are on loan from distinguished and talented artists of the 12th Congressional District and which I proudly display to all who visit my offices.

In observing Art Week, it is well for all of us to recognize not only the value and importance of art, but also how much art enriches our daily lives—and to pause a moment to enjoy it. I invite all the Members of the House to share the beauty of the art works on display in my office, room 1630. Also, I take this means of congratulating the officers and members of the Lake County and McHenry County Art Leagues—and commend to my colleagues and to the citizens of the 12th Congressional District and of the Nation the theme of this year's American Art Week—"Observe and Enjoy American Art."

Arthur Hoppe's Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, our friend, Arthur Hoppe, is now attending a conference of Wilton Park Fellows at Wilton Park, England. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in his reaction to the proceedings and in general affairs in England:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 20, 1963]

GOOD FELLOWS GET TOGETHER

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—We have begun our 2-week international conference. And I'm glad to report the subject isn't "The Common Market and the Third World: Economics." Which I didn't understand. Fortunately, I had the title wrong. Actually, it's "Competitive Coexistence and the Third World: Economic Issues." And thank goodness for that. It has a nicer ring.

There are 24 of us who have been made Wilton Park Fellows in order to confer on this subject—23 economists, diplomats, politicians, scholars, and judges, and me. I still think there may have been some mistake. But as long as I'm here, allow me to give you the inside dope on what these high-level international conferences are like. Because, as you know, they are quite the rage these days.

First of all, these Wilton Park Conferences are sponsored by the British Foreign Office as a "British contribution to the formation of an informed international public opinion." Which is a likely story. There are a dozen or so a year, held in a 16th century castle in the south of England called Wiston House.

You arrive by train from London at a place called Shoreham-by-the-Sea and are met by a chauffeur, which is most impressive. You arrive at the 16th-century castle and are shown to your 16th-century room just down the hall from the 16th-century bathroom.

At dinner in the flagstoned dining hall, you meet your fellow fellows. And while they are all fine fellows, the ones at your table invariably converse in German or French or perhaps it's Urdu. Anyway, to show you are a regular fellow, you keep smiling politely. Which is very hard while drinking soup.

After dinner, the schedule says: "The Warden at Home." The warden, of course, is the man who runs the place, and despite his title, he's a regular fellow named Dr. H. Koeppler, O.B.E., M.A., D. Phil. (Oxon), F. R. Hist. His home is on the top floor in the warden's digs, and when he is "at home" he serves you a glass of port.

So all us fellows stood around drinking our glass of port and discussing international affairs. It's kind of like an Amer-

ican cocktail party, only you can't get drunk on a glass of port. Which is too bad. I discussed things with a nice Austrian gentleman. From his body motions we were discussing Austrian ski techniques and/or the twist. I cannot wait to try them out on the slopes and/or the dance floor.

In the morning, the sessions begin. You sit in easy chairs with a headset and a dial supposedly enabling you to tune in on either simultaneous English, French, or German translation. My favorite translation so far is one that said: "If efa and the eee-eee-see should abrogate GATT. * * *" Which I think is Urdu.

But don't worry. I'm sure 2 weeks here will promote a new era of international understanding between me and my fellow fellows.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 22, 1963]

WORSER DEAD THAN RHODE ISLAND RED

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—Our Nation, ladies and gentlemen, is at war. I am speaking, of course, of the chicken war now raging between our beloved United States, home of the free chicken, and the European Common Market, captors of the common chicken.

And after listening to my European colleagues discuss this and related problems for several days at this international conference, I feel I fully qualify as a chicken expert. Than which there is no other kind.

First of all, let's place the blame for this war squarely where it belongs. Let's blame them. The war was undeniably started by the new spirit of militant independence abroad in Europe today—a militancy which led to the great European chicken buildup. In both conventional and fresh-frozen drumsticks. With all the grave consequences this has entailed.

For years, America had enjoyed a marked superiority in chicken production. Thanks to American technology and knowhow, we could produce chickens faster, fatter and cheaper than anyone. We were the world's leading chicken power.

Indeed, in 1962, we thoughtfully sent our European friends $52.6 million worth of chicken. For which they thoughtfully sent us $52.6 million.

A fair arrangement. But was Europe content to rest its fate in the hands of American chicken strategists? No. In every European nation technologists went to work. Chicken tests were conducted in the atmosphere. The proliferation of chickens was astounding. And in the short space of 1 year, the Common Market closed the chicken gap.

Today, Western Europe is up to here in chickens. Worried about the overkill, they lowered a tariff curtain against our brave American chickens who had given their lives for our European allies.

Oh, the furor in Congress. Our chicken-minded Congressmen, most of whom have many chicken-raising constituents, bellowed for war. We retaliated with our second-strike capability, announcing we would raise our own tariff curtain against $46 million worth of Common Market goods. How the feathers are flying.

General de Gaulle is reportedly developing an independent egg-laying force so that France will have something to crow about. Britain is maintaining a strict neutrality, but is refusing to put its chickens under American control. Plans for a multilingual NATO chicken have been decried as unsound. Scientists on both sides hold out little hope for development of an ultimate chicken or even an antichicken chicken. There seems nowhere to turn.

I say: "Ban the Egg."

Oh, I know it is an idealistic course. But do you want to be buried in chicken fallout? For, I say, the inevitable proliferation of chickens spells the world's doom.

No, I say, the only way to survive the horrors of the chicken war is to be on the chicken's side. Let's think chicken. Let's act chicken. Let's be chicken. For I say the world will be saved only if enough of us recognize the dangers and have the courage to admit we're chicken.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 23, 1963]

IN BRITAIN, THERE'S NO PACE LIKE HOME'S

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—The selection of Lord Home as Prime Minister came, I must say, as no surprise to us readers of British newspapers. First of all, none of the newspapers was for him getting the job. And, far more important, neither was he.

I discovered this the day after Mr. Macmillan announced his intention of resigning and the British press was full of speculation as to who his successor would be. "Lord Home," said one daily, "would be the choice of all factions, but for the fact he would have to renounce his title."

And who, of course, would be silly enough to renounce something as important as a title merely to run the United Kingdom?

Having dismissed Lord Home from the contest, the papers settled on the only possible candidate. Unfortunately, each paper settled on a different only possible candidate. But this did make for cheery breakfast reading all week. Because no matter which paper you picked up, the only possible candidate had gained ground overnight. Indeed, it is safe to say that never has so much ground been gained by so many since the retreat from Moscow.

As an illustration, allow me to cite a typical story from the Daily Excess by Smedley Smasher, our political correspondent.

"Peter Sellers, the brilliant forward-looking Tory statesman, gained even more ground today than he did yesterday as the only possible candidate for Prime Minister. I was told by sources known only to me and the Oracle of Delphi.

"It was revealed to me by revelation that his competitors, a rummy crew, will hang themselves in despair from the Marble Arch at 2:38 p.m. tomorrow. Or maybe next week. Moreover, a high-level hospital orderly who cannot be named, told me confidentially that after seeing the arrangement of the leaves in an empty teacup standing at Mr. Macmillan's bedside that it was Sellers by 10 lengths and no question about it. Furthermore, I was assured by a mysterious stranger at the Cock & Bull that * * *."

So you can see what happened. There was Mr. Macmillan, reading all this on his bed of pain and chatting with his old pal, Lord Home.

"Ugh," says Mr. Macmillan with a groan, "Hailsham figures he has it sewn up, does he? And Butler supporters are planning a celebration, are they? A pushy lot. Terribly bad form. Look here. Home, old boy, I don't suppose you'd want a go at the job?"

"Good heavens, no," says his Lordship, shocked. "Why I'd have to give up my box at Ascot, change the nameplate on my castle and suffer the derision of the chaps at the club. For it's not a very respectable job, you know. No offense."

"Then you must have it," says Mr. Macmillan. "For if we let one of these desperate office seekers get it, we will set a bad example. Next we know, politics will attract politicians. And what will happen to our British system of government then?"

Which is why Lord Home got the job. It was his duty to preserve the British way of advancement. And if you say I'm basing all this on pure dreamed up speculation, allow me to point out that in Britain that's all we newspaper readers have got to work with.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 24, 1963]

THE DROOPING OF THE COLORS

(By Arthur Hoppe)

LONDON.—There will always be an England. True, I had doubts as the Empire shrunk. But never again. For my faith in the English future has been made inviolate by my Esher Club rugby jersey. From which hangs a tail.

We international fellows at the Wilton Park Conference were brought up to London by the British Foreign Office for a day of meeting dignitaries. And I snuck off for an hour to go buy a cricket cap. Primarily because all my life I've wanted a cricket cap. Frankly, not having a cricket cap has always given me feelings of inadequacy.

So there I was in this impeccable English sporting goods store, facing this impeccable English clerk, gathering my courage to ask for an impeccable cricket cap, when my eye fell on the rugby jersey. Oh, what a garment of splendor it was—snowy white collar and horizontal crimson stripes a good 2 inches wide, the whole thing long enough to hang to the knees.

"Esher Club colors, sir," said the clerk, meaning it was not for the likes of us non-Esher Club members. But I looked so crestfallen that he took pity on me. "Are you from the States, sir?" I confessed I was.

He seemed to think this over. Finally, after looking both ways, he leaned forward and said in a low voice: "Well, sir, I suppose it would be all right if you purchased it. As long as you never wear it within the boundaries of the Empire."

Oh, how happy I was, clutching my parcel in its plain wrapper as I hurried back to the meetings. Yet how guilty. Was that constable looking at me suspiciously? Would he search me and discover my contraband? And what on earth would I do with the package at Lancaster House, where we fellows were due next for a diplomatic reception? I would have to check it.

"Just some—ha, ha—things," I said to the checkroom attendant.

"Indubitably, sir," he said. Would he peek?

How nervous I was in the ballroom as I slugged down sherries and chatted with a distinguished-looking gentleman I took to be a Cabinet Minister at the very least. (But who turned out to be a fellow ace newsman who worked for a paper called the Times of London.) Would a footman suddenly appear, my package in hand, and cart me quietly away as an Esher Club imposter?

And, oh, how much worse it was later at dinner in the hallowed Atheneum Club where my parcel sat on the cloakroom floor. Imagine my consternation to read in the club washroom: "The hairdresser is not a servant of the club so rule XXXVIII, forbidding gratuities, does not apply to him." What rule would apply to imposters? MCCCXXVII? At the very least. Let me tell you, I hardly enjoyed my brandy and snuff.

It was all too much. I broke. After dinner, on the sidewalk of Pall Mall, I sidled up to the most merciful-looking of the Foreign Service officers, opened my package and showed him the jersey in a silent confession.

"Oh, yes, Esher Club," he said. "Very second rate socially. Quite garish colors in my opinion. But, yes, that's usually the jersey they sell to you Americans."

So you see what I mean. There will always be an England. There will, that is, as long as there are us Americans.

Texas Economy Lags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make an effort to correct a multitude of misinformation which has been appearing of late in newspapers and periodicals concerning Texas' share of Federal contracts. This misinformation has been of great concern to me, when in reality the economy of the State of Texas is lagging in this field.

Through the free use of generalities a completely erroneous impression exists in some quarters that Texas has been getting more than its proper share of Defense and NASA contracts. In reality, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, quite the contrary is true and I would like to set the RECORD straight with some specific facts and figures.

In a comparison of fiscal year 1958 to fiscal year 1962 military expenditures in California grew $2.5 billion, or 42 percent; New York, $340 million, or 11 percent; Ohio, $116 million, or 10 percent; and Texas was reduced $461 million or 30 percent. Much has been made of the award of the TFX contract to Convair in Fort Worth. It should be noted that less than one-third of the total dollars on this program will actually be spent in Texas. The balance will be spent in other States, such as New York and Connecticut, to name just two.

The Bureau of Business Research of the University of Texas in a recent economic survey showed a decline in actual employment for the State starting in 1960. Comparisons of these predictions with actuals since the survey was completed show that, even with the TFX in Fort Worth, the decline is twice as rapid as predicted. In other words, the TFX does not arrest the steady downward trend in the aerospace industry of the State. The award of additional future programs to Texas will only maintain the gradual decline predicted.

There has been much publicity on the establishment of the NASA Manned Space Flight Center in Houston, Tex. We naturally recognize the significant contributions this new Center is making and will continue to make within the scientific community of our State, but it should be pointed out that, although many contracts are let out of this center, the bulk of these contracts are let in other States with the main beneficiaries being California and New York.

In going from fiscal year 1961 to fiscal year 1963—May—California's share of the NASA budget has grown from $149 million to $448 million; New York from $44 million to $60 million, Ohio from $8 million to $20 million, and Texas from $12 million to $30 million. The $30 million spent in Texas represents only 3 percent of NASA's budget.

Texas companies will continue to bid for Defense and NASA contracts in fields where they are eminently qualified to compete. They ask only that they be given the awards when they are judged the best for the job to be done. This is all that I would ask. It would be grossly unjust, however, to have any Texas company who so qualifies lose out on any award as the result of a false impression that "Texas is getting more than its fair share."

Why Are Some Kids Good, Others Kooks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of articles, papers, and books have been written by recognized authorities and celebrated authors on every phase of child behavior and the vicissitudes of the younger generation—the beatnik swing and fire of life. Sociologists, penologists, psychologists, and welfare specialists have advanced many theories on child training, youth behavior, environmental influences pressuring the growing teenagers, broken homes and divided families, alcoholic parents, and congenitally inherited debility of character. The analyses of these influences upon the character of the young individual has been projected in social scientific study and statistical tables of comparative comparisons under similar and dissimilar conditions.

But our popular Ann Landers, realistic columnist for the Washington Daily News—Thursday, October 24, issue—in her interesting "Ann Landers' Letters" penned a terrific message to the parents of children in reprinting a letter received from a reader who appreciated the writings of an anonymous person on the interesting and complicated problem of youth guidance through simple parental attitudes and treatment:

WHY ARE SOME KIDS GOOD, OTHERS KOOKS?

(By Ann Landers)

DEAR READERS: Parents often write and ask me what makes some children turn out well and some badly. Why do some youngsters grow up to be responsible, loving, well-adjusted adults while others seem to lose their way?

There are not pat answers to these questions. Heredity is undeniably a factor but there is more and more evidence to support the theory that a child is the net result of what happens to him in his early years.

The following piece came in the mail from a reader. It was signed "Author Unknown," and I would like to share it with you.

"If a child lives with criticism he learns to condemn; if a child lives with hostility he learns to fight; if a child lives with fear he learns to be apprehensive; if a child lives with pity he learns to feel sorry for himself; if a child lives with jealousy he learns to hate; if a child lives with encouragement he learns to be confident; if a child lives with praise he learns to be appreciative; if a child lives with acceptance he learns to live; if a child lives with approval he learns to be like himself; if a child lives with recognition he learns to have a goal; if a child lives with fairness he learns justice; if a child lives with honesty he learns what truth is; if a child lives with friendliness he learns that the world is a nice place in which to live."

Primate Again Warns Reds: 250,000 Polish Catholics Defy Communist Regime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been tremendous emphasis placed by the State Department on the liberalizing influences working within the Soviet colonial zone, with special emphasis on the responsible behavior of the Communist puppet governments of Eastern Europe.

I feel it is necessary to call to the attention of the Members of the House newspaper reports of recent anti-Catholic actions conducted by the Warsaw Red government. I place into the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the October 5 issue of the Polish-American Journal, discussing the precise nature of the current antireligious practice of the regime.

I wonder if our peaceful coexistence addicts in the State Department have an answer to facts of this nature?

The article follows:

PRIMATE AGAIN WARNS REDS—250,000 POLISH CATHOLICS DEFY COMMUNIST REGIME

KRAKOW.—Some 250,000 Catholics defied the Communist government of Poland by attending the public crowning of the historic picture of Our Lady of Consolation, long venerated in the Jesuit church in Nowy Sacz, a ceremony blessed by a special decree of the late Pope John XXIII.

Six months of fruitless negotiations with the government for authorization for the gathering brought only frustrating delays and ultimately a refusal. Nevertheless, the church authorities decided to hold the coronation of the picture in the fields 4 miles from Nowy Sacz.

The sacred picture was moved secretly the night before the ceremony from the church in Nowy Sacz to the nearby village of Zawada. Brightly lighted in the summer night, it moved through a crowd estimated at 70,000. The morning sun promised splendid weather as more and more people tramped the roads and arrived on motorcycles to join the procession honoring the Mother of Christ. Five hundred priests and 300 nuns attended.

Having placed the precious crown, the gift of the faithful, on the picture, Cardinal Wyszynski preached a powerful sermon, comparing Nowy Sacz to Bethlehem, where there was no place for Mary, so that she had to seek shelter in the shepherd's field.

The Communist authorities, not daring to stop the great religious manifestation, tried to interfere with it in other ways. Buses coming from a distance were halted before reaching the village on the excuse of controlling an outbreak of smallpox at the other end of Poland. The roadside sale of food was forbidden. Private automobiles were stopped, their occupants questioned. Distractions were organized for the local population. Free tickets were offered to con-

certs, air acrobatics, and a football game; there were excursions for young people. All these Communist efforts were to no avail.

MORE CHURCH HINDERING

The Communist movement of Poland continues to harass the church in various ways. It places exorbitant taxes on church institutions which they cannot pay. To cover unpaid taxes, the government recently seized part of the buildings of the diocesan seminaries of Czestochowa and Katowice.

When the pastor of one of the parishes on the Baltic seaboard was unable to pay the tax imposed on his parish, the tax collector seized one of his two cassocks and left him only two shirts.

In Warsaw the Resurrectionist Sisters were expelled from the convent.

Two rural deans and several pastors in the Kutno district were given prison terms for illegal teaching of religion in catechetic points.

All uniformed state employees were forbidden by the government to attend church services in their uniforms.

The churches were forbidden to use outside loudspeakers.

PRIMATE WARNS AGAIN

For the third time in 3 weeks, Cardinal Wyszynski warned the government to stop its anti-Catholic activities.

Speaking at the consecration of St. Stanislaw Church in Warsaw, the cardinal said that there can be no coexistence and peace until freedom, truth and justice are respected, and declared that "neither machine nor industrial combine can enslave men who have once stopped bowing to emperors and will never again agree to becoming enslaved."

Tom Connally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the obituary on the beloved former Senator from Texas, the Honorable Tom Connally, which appeared in the October 29 edition of the Washington Post.

It was my distinct pleasure to serve in the House during Mr. Connally's tenure in the Senate. His position as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was a most important one inasmuch as the role of the United States in this most strategic field grew to tremendous proportions following World War II. His philosophies were borne out on many occasions and when he retired from the Senate it was a great loss to this Nation.

The article follows:

TOM CONNALLY DIES HERE AT 86

Former Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, whose courtly appearance and florid oratory symbolized the Senate of tradition for nearly a quarter of a century, died of pneumonia here early yesterday.

Mr. Connally, who retired from the Senate in 1954, was 86.

During his 24 years in the Senate and as chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Connally was a picturesque figure to Capitol Hill visitors with his flowing white hair, his black bow tie, his somber attire and his Texas hat.

To his colleagues, he was known as a Senator's Senator, appreciated for his old-fashioned stump-style speaking and his caustic wit and ridicule in debate.

SERVED IN HOUSE

The Texan—who served in the House for 12 years before election to the Senate—also was known as an astute political and legislative strategist. He could split with former President Franklin D. Roosevelt over the court-packing plan, then work with both Mr. Roosevelt and his successor, Harry S. Truman, in enacting World War II and postwar legislation of international importance.

The veteran lawmaker steered most of the Nation's major foreign policy laws through the Senate during World War II and immediately afterward. In his later years in the Senate, however, he became increasingly critical of foreign aid proposed by Democratic administrations.

In his later years, Connally became embroiled in a controversy over the Connally amendment, which restricts U.S. participation in the World Court. Under the bill, the United States retained the right to determine which cases involving this Nation should be sent to the court.

Mr. Connally was one of the most colorful Senators of his generation, and one of the last of the "old school" of desk-thumping, arm-waving Senate orators.

NOTED FOR ORATORY

His oratorical flights are out of style, but even now, in cold print, they have an effectiveness lacking in words so often used today.

Here's Mr. Connally, arguing that this country must join the United Nations and seeking to shame those opposed:

"They know that the League of Nations was slaughtered here in this Chamber." At this point he pulled off his glasses and pointed dramatically to the rear of the Senate. "Can't you see the blood?" There it is on the wall."

Or in defense of President Wilson:

"When the history of this republic shall be written, Woodrow Wilson's titanic figure will tower above the puny pigmies who now bark at his memory as Pike's Peak towers above the fog of an Arkansas swamp."

SQUELCHING A SENATOR

Here's Mr. Connally squashing a foe in debate:

"The Senator should approach these matters with an open mind instead of an open mouth."

Few have understood better how devastating humor can be—if timed properly.

He was a master of repartee—could hit his mark deftly or with a meat ax. One day in 1934, Senator Lester J. Dickinson, Republican, of Iowa, criticizing New Deal spending, said:

"If some one didn't help keep you Democrats straight, you'd steal the gold off the capitol dome."

"What?" cried Senator Connally, leaping to his feet. "Did the Republicans leave any gold up there when they went out?"

Mr. Connally's political career began in 1901, when he was elected to the Texas House of Representatives. From 1906 to 1910, he served as prosecutor for Falls County. In 1916 he was elected to the House of Representatives.

A veteran of the Spanish-American War, Mr. Connally reentered the Army as a captain in 1918. While he was still in the Army, he was reelected to Congress. He kept his seat in the House until 1929, when he was elected to the Senate.

He is survived by his wife, Louise, of 3025 Woodlawn Drive NW., the home address; a son by a former marriage, Ben H. Connally, who is a Federal District judge in Houston; a sister and two grandchildren.

Mayor Tate Presents Federal Bar Association First Annual Award to Hon. Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bar Association at its recent annual convention held in Philadelphia presented what it chooses to call its "Dedication Day Award." It is to become an annual award presented to persons who distinguish themselves through good citizenship and service to the Nation.

Fittingly, the first award was presented to Hon. Edward R. Murrow, the distinguished Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and the honor of presenting this first award went to the mayor of Philadelphia, Hon. James H. J. Tate. It is significant that the local chapter of the Federal Bar Association also originated Law Day, which is now so widely observed.

Because I feel Mayor Tate's remarks will be of interest to the Members, I am including them below:

This indeed is a pleasure for me, not only to share this platform with Ed Murrow, but also to have a part in honoring him.

I also want to pass along a well-deserved pat on the back to the Federal Bar Association for the splendid idea of a Dedication Day. Hopefully, it will catch on, similar to Law Day, another Federal Bar Association creation (Law Day Every Day) which, appropriately, was born in Philadelphia and has grown to be a national observance. If there is a single person deserving the title, "Mr. News," certainly it is Ed Murrow.

Since before World War II, his name has been synonymous with accurate, honest, and impartial reporting. He developed a distinctive style for highlighting the heart of the news, and a delivery which, like good window glass, permitted its essential drama to come through without color or distortion.

When the Nazis goosestepped into Austria in 1938, Ed Murrow was on the spot. His incisive reporting from Vienna helped awaken America to the dangers of Hitler's Germany. And throughout the war and after, his voice was a daily visitor in millions of homes.

With the advent of television, he turned his creative touch to this new medium. The fruits were such series as "See It Now" and "Person to Person," for which Mr. Murrow and 5 tons of equipment dropped in for informal chats at the homes of celebrities.

The list of Ed Murrow's awards and distinctions is too long, and he, too humble, to hear it now. Among these are honorary degrees from 13 colleges and universities. In addition, he was appointed an honorary officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire by King George the Sixth, a Chevalier in the French National Order of the Legion of Honor by the President of France, and an officer of the Order of Leopold by the King of Belgium.

Journalistic honors came from the Overseas Press Club and from the George Foster Peabody Award Committee, and from Radio-Television Daily which cited him for 10 successive years, 1951 through 1960.

From telling America about the world, Ed Murrow next turned to telling the world about America. In March 1961, President

Kennedy appointed him as head of the U.S. Information Agency. Since then he has been telling America's story overseas through a network of libraries, book programs, press service, motion pictures, radio and television.

We have Ed Murrow with us today so that we may present him with the first Dedication Day Award of the Federal Bar Association. The idea behind the award is that it should honor that outstanding citizen who by his conduct, courage, and achievement has demonstrated singular patriotism and dedication to our American heritage and our way of life.

The choice of Ed Murrow as the first recipient is especially fitting. No single American has done more to preserve our cherished freedoms than did Ed Murrow through his opposition to McCarthyism in that unfortunate era when anyone who disagreed with the late Senator risked being branded a Communist. Mr. Murrow's calm reason helped restore freedom of dissent as a respectable part of the American way of life.

It is my extreme pleasure at this time to present the first Dedication Day Award to Edward R. Murrow. Everything that Ed Murrow stands for—reason, humanitarianism, the liberalism which is manifest in our constitutional Bill of Rights, and just plain human kindness and good judgment, stand up and are honored with him.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the Federal Bar Association. This has been a most significant occasion, and I am grateful to have had a part.

Who's in Charge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. G. Russell Clark, chairman of the board of the Commercial Bank of North America, at the 62d Annual Convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Williamsburg, Va., on October 2, 1963:

WHO'S IN CHARGE?

I appreciate very much the opportunity to discuss with my former associates in the bank supervisory field, as well as my fellow associate members of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, some of the basic causes for the present disturbances and anxieties which are present today in our business.

It seems to grow increasingly difficult for the average banker to keep abreast of the rapidly changing, and at times contrary, winds of supervisory opinions on a multitude of banking matters. It seems as though we need more anchor and less sail.

We are concerned with supervisory regulations and opinions in many areas including chartering, branching, interest rates, examinations, etc., but one of the most widely discussed is that of the bank merger area. I should like to direct a few thoughts in that direction.

When the Bank Merger Act of 1960 with its seven tests for applicability to bank mergers was enacted, it was claimed, and widely predicted in the publications of the day, that this legislation was the cornerstone on which, at long last, positive direction would be given to bank mergers. You will recall that this act vested authority over mergers in one of three Federal agencies; i.e., Federal Reserve Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Comptroller of the Currency. The jurisdiction over national bank mergers is vested in the Comptroller; State member banks in the Federal Reserve Board, and insured State nonmember banks in the FDIC.

The latter two agencies give their consideration to merger proposals following affirmative action by the respective State banking departments. The Comptroller has sole jurisdiction over national banks and also sits as one of three members of the FDIC which has brought objection from the NASSB.

At the time of the passage of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, great debates took place as to the posture of the Justice Department in the bank merger field, and it was finally resolved by requiring the Justice Department to submit an advisory opinion on each merger before the Federal bank regulatory agency having approval jurisdiction. Such advisory opinions were also required from each of the other two bank regulatory agencies.

Substantial pressure was exerted in certain quarters to place the Justice Department in a commanding position on bank merger considerations. In the testimony preceding the legislative sessions, the then Chairman of the FDIC stated:

"No examination or review by the Department of Justice, or other agency or commission outside the bank supervisory field, of the facts of a merger transaction, can be an adequate substitute for the background, knowledge and current information which presently reposes in the supervisors."

The trend of congressional thinking on this point has been recently reflected in S. 1642, covering amendments to the Securities Act. The Senate in this bill proposed to give full and complete regulatory powers over disclosure and trading in securities of banks to the Federal supervisory agencies as against the Securities and Exchange Commission.

On June 17, 1963, a decision was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Philadelphia National Bank case which has had the apparent practical effect of removing conclusive judgments on bank mergers from the duly authorized supervisory agencies to the realm of legal decision.

This decision, expressing the views of five members of the Court, holds that section 7 of the Clayton Act applies to all bank mergers. To the mind of the average banker it means that regardless of approvals given by appropriate supervisory agencies, merger proposals involving banks shall be subject to Federal antitrust laws and that such mergers approved by the appropriate bank supervisory agencies are not immune from challenge under such laws.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, who has fully demonstrated over the years a clear and objective view on banking matters, has expressed himself as shocked by the decision, and that it "is one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down."

"I was shocked," he said, "both at the result and at the Court's casual disregard for congressional intent and purpose."

In the case at hand, the Court decided that inasmuch as the proposed merger would result in the control, by one bank, of over 30 percent of the commercial bank business conducted in the Philadelphia metropolitan trade area, section 7 would be violated. The merger would have resulted in a bank, the largest in the city of Philadelphia, with 36 percent of the area's total bank assets; 36 percent of deposits; 34 percent of net loans. It would also have resulted in making a national bank the largest bank in the area superseding the present largest bank—a State bank. It would also be able to retain this ranking even though all the remaining 39 banks in the area were to merge into the State bank.

By way of comparison, in the New York area a merger of the first and third largest banks would produce a lower percentage of all New York City bank resources than the merger discussed here would represent of all bank resources in the city of Philadelphia.

It should be mentioned here that two of the remaining Justices dissented on the ground that section 7 did not apply to bank mergers. Another agreed in part with the dissenters.

The ninth Justice did not participate in the decision.

Furnishing a partial background to this decision is the historical fact that, prior to the institution of this case, the Justice Department had taken antitrust action in only one other case—a case which was subsequently settled during the course of litigation.

To complete the background of the case in the lower court it would be helpful to quote from the opinion of the presiding justice:

"Generally, the complaint alleges that commercial banking and several of its integral parts comprise interstate commerce; that commercial banking with its integral parts fills an essential and unique role in the Nation's economy with a combination of services unduplicated by other financial institutions; that existing and potential competition in commercial banking in the Philadelphia area would be substantially and unreasonably lessened; that the merger would substantially and unreasonably increase concentration in banking in the Philadelphia area and that existing and potential competition in the commerce and industry served by commercial banks in the Philadelphia area would be substantially and unreasonably lessened. Parenthetically it may be noted at the outset that the last of these averments has not been seriously presented by the plaintiff and, for all practical purposes, has been abandoned."

From the viewpoint of the layman—and the average banker—the foregoing serves to highlight one outstanding fact: that this decision by the highest Court in the land has changed all the ground rules applicable to mergers in the banking field. In one thrust we have been placed in a position where no longer can a banker, contemplating a merger operation, look only at the proposal from the standpoint of long-range economic effect on the community or trade area in which his bank is located. Banks are now in the general position vis-a-vis antitrust statutes of any other corporate entity, inasmuch as the decision applies to all mergers, including mergers between banks. Our previous posture, under which banking has operated for so long a time, has now apparently been dissolved. Under the belief that banking has been for years closely regulated and subject to supervision and controls of governmental bank supervisory agencies, both State and Federal, we felt, perhaps overoptimistically, secure in our belief that further controls were unwarranted and unnecessary. The thoroughness of the Congress in its consideration of Senate bill 1062 in the spring of 1960 indicated crystallized opinion on the question of the agencies of Government which should be charged with responsibility for approval of bank mergers. Senator Fulbright, who with Senators Robertson and Capehart, were sponsors of the bill, said in presenting the bill for vote:

"As it passed the Senate, S. 1062 expressed the view of the Senate, for the third time, that bank mergers should be regulated by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of banking factors and competitive factors and with no single factor being in itself controlling. S. 1062 was a clear statement, for the third time, of the Senate's view that the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act should not apply to bank mergers. The

amendments to S. 1062 made by the House do not change this aspect of the bill. The House has agreed with the Senate that bank mergers should be controlled by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of both banking factors and competitive factors, and that section 7 of the Clayton Act should continue to be inapplicable to bank mergers."

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 also received the following accolade from the then Senator JOHNSON of Texas on the day it passed the Senate:

"This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permits many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

By comparison, in his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan, while saying that section 7 of the Clayton Act did not apply to a bank erger, said with respect to the Bank Merger Act of 1960, "its enactment turns out to be an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy."

In the hit show, "The King and I," the king sings a lovely song in which he expresses the thought that those who seek to protect him will protect him out of all he owns, and concludes that it is a puzzlement. So it is with the average banker as he views the judicial-legislative-supervisory fog which surrounds his objective merger. He is advised to consult competent counsel and to take advantage of the Antitrust Division's clearance procedure. Does the banker, or his counsel, first consult his primary supervisory agency; the Federal Reserve Board; the FDIC; or the Comptroller following his State supervisor; or does he commit what may be the unpardonable sin of going over their respective heads to the antitrust division?

To the layman, therefore, it now appears that the advice which the primary supervisory agency was required to seek from the Department of Justice by the intent of Congress, is now no longer to be categorized as "advisory," but rather, in the nature of a warning that if the decision reached by the primary agency is not parallel to that of Justice, then a suit may be forthcoming.

A spokesman for the division said recently that "assuming that all relevant information regarding a proposed merger has been supplied to us, and as soon as the agency having initial jurisdiction has advised us of its decision, we shall advise such agency and the parties to the proposed merger of any action that the antitrust division intends to take regarding the merger." The element of time involved in consideration of a merger is most important to a participating bank, its depositors, its shareholders, and the trade area it serves. It is to be hoped that there will be no undue delay in finalizing opinion on a merger, and if there is no action to be taken by the division it would not seem unreasonable to expect a prompt statement to that effect. In effect, it appears to place the three bank supervisory agencies in the position of the average State bank supervisor; namely, that it has only the initial veto power and any approval that it may extend may be vitiated by a nonbank governmental agency. The only criteria which Congress apparently delegated to the attention of the Justice Department in mergers was that of the competitive factor, which has now, apparently, contrary to the intent of Congress, been assigned the role of the primary and dominating factor of the seven controlling factors. The traditional banking factors have been relegated to a place of secondary importance.

It is a fair statement, I believe, to say that relatively few bank mergers do not have some elements of lessening of competition; but, conversely, favorable consideration of the banking factors may justify an agency granting approval of a merger even though it may have an adverse effect on competition.

To illustrate the wide range of terminology upon 115 mergers submitted to the Justice Department for comment, as published in the recently released annual report of the Comptroller for 1963, we read the following characterizations of the basis for Justice Department advisory opinions:

1. Favorable	0
2. No adverse effect	12
3. Not substantially adverse	37
4. Slightly adverse	3
5. Adverse effect	26
6. Significantly adverse	3
7. Substantially adverse	34
8. Substantially adverse and serious anticompetitive effect	7
9. Threat of litigation	1
Total (as shown in the report although it adds to 123)	115

On the same merger proposals, the Federal Reserve Board employed the following terminology regarding its advisory opinions:

1. Will increase competition	4
2. May increase competition	7
3. No adverse effect on competition	33
4. No serious adverse effect on competition	3
5. Will have little adverse effect on competition	21
6. Probably no adverse effect on competition	2
7. Might have adverse effect on 2 parties	2
8. Might have adverse effect on competition	6
9. Will eliminate competition between 2 banks exposing remaining banks to greater competition	11
10. Will eliminate some competition	12
11. Will eliminate substantial competition	6
12. Will have adverse effect on competition	2
13. Will eliminate present and potential competition	5
14. Will result in concentration	1
Total	115

The FDIC was concise, by comparison:

1. Enhancement of competition	1
2. Overall effect on competition would not be unfavorable	102
3. No effect on competition	2
4. No adverse effect on competition	1
5. Appears favorable	1
6. Effect would be unfavorable	8
Total	115

The report also reveals that the Comptroller approved during 1962, 110 applications for merger, including 3 emergency decision, while denying 7, and 1 was withdrawn.

During the same year, according to the annual report of the Federal Reserve Board, the Board approved 37 and disapproved 5 mergers, consolidations, acquisitions of assets, or assumptions of liabilities. This report also reflects that 94 reports on competitive factors were sent to the Comptroller and 38 reports to the FDIC.

Banks are, therefore, in a never-never land as far as mergers are concerned. It appears that the tiniest nuance of judgment on the part of any one of the agencies involved may throw a merger one way or the other. The absence of unanimity as between the governmental agencies involved as to the worthiness of a merger has beclouded the atmosphere and has led to proposals for a single Federal commission to rule on bank matters including mergers. The banker, therefore, finds himself in a most difficult position, not knowing what laws, rules, regulations, or interpretation are applicable to his proposals.

We can appropriately characterize the present situation as one where we are confused with promotional interpretations—in other words, interpretations of laws and regulations which tend to favor one group of banks under a supervisor against other groups of banks under other supervisors. This tends to create a great deal of dissatisfaction among those who are left without equalizing privileges and may cause banks to shift from State to National bank basis or vice versa, depending upon the degree of enforcement of sound and conservative banking practice or conversely, the relaxation of the same standards.

To add to your collective confusion, a thought-provoking passage appears in the district court's opinion which may have escaped your attention, and which I quote:

"The court was not impressed with the attempts of the Government to show that banking is of minor importance in the life of a community generally and of almost absolute unimportance in the business life of the community. The Government, in its attempt to establish this contention by testimony that no single particular individual industrial organization has ever entered a particular territory, because of the presence or absence of banking facilities, has ignored the industrial history of the United States. Should one ever speculate as to whether any industry would enter a community without banking facilities, the answer would be completely obvious. Historically, banking facilities have preceded industry in every community."

As bankers, we have been trained in the belief that we are, and have been by practice and tradition cast in the role of service institutions. It comes as somewhat of a shock to learn, particularly in the centennial year of the dual banking system, that, as indicated by the court, a high officer of Government evaluates our services at such a minimal level. It confirms the thought that if Federal authority ever reaches a point where it supersedes and submerges the authority of States over State banks, that will be the point of no return and will mark the demise of the dual banking system.

The greatest deterrent to this trend is the capable and efficient State bank supervisor. In spite of long experience in this field, I am not one who believes that the old way is necessarily the best way to conduct our business, either as bankers or as supervisors. As we have grown as a nation from an essentially agrarian society to the foremost industrial power in the world, the challenges and opportunities for development of our country through our banking system have required the continuing broader development of the public interest objective by bank supervisors. Yours are the standards of judgment by and under which we operate our banks. We can be helped by your awareness of our problems and we may be hindered in our progress and services if you take a position against progressive thinking.

Your appraisal of the needs of a sound and conservative banking system is the fulcrum upon which can tilt the vitality and effects of our efforts. There have been a number of proposals designed to break the logjam which seems to exist in consideration of bank mergers and chartering by supervisory agencies. It seems to me that if criticism of a system is undertaken, then a responsibility exists for suggestions to effect corrections in that system. Accordingly, I submit the following outline of a plan for a more uniform and understandable course to be followed in bank merger applications by supervisory agencies:

1. That bank mergers and charters be first considered by a district committee composed of:

(a) The superintendent of banks of the State in which the banks seeking to merge are located;

(b) The chief national bank examiner of the district;

(c) The chief FDIC examiner of the district; and

(d) The chief Federal Reserve bank examiner of the district.

In any case the representative would be the senior official of his agency in the district in which the applicant banks are located.

Approval of a merger would require a three-fourths vote of those participating as above.

If disapproved by the district committee, the application would be terminated. If approved, notice of such approval would be given to the applicant banks and to a board of review located for convenience in Washington. This board of review would be given not more than 30 business days after receipt of such approval of the district committee, to indicate its disapproval of a merger or charter application; otherwise the decision of the district committee would stand. To carry out the intentions of Congress as expressed in the Bank Merger Act, notice of the approval of the district committee would also be furnished to the Justice Department with the provision that the views of the Department on the competitive effects of the merger be furnished to the board of review not more than 30 business days after receipt of such notice.

The board of review would be composed of the following representatives appointed by their respective boards for a term of 3 years:

1. A member of the Federal Reserve Board.

2. A member of the FDIC Board, assuming that the previous legislative recommendation made in this connection by the NASSB is adopted; namely, that the Comptroller of the Currency should not be a member of the FDIC Board.

3. The Comptroller of the Currency.

Disapproval of a merger would require a two-third vote of the board of review.

I am aware that many proposals along these lines have been previously made. It is always possible, however, that perhaps from the sum of ideas represented, a gleaning by the proper legislative body of these proposals would produce a pattern which would serve to alleviate the present ferment in our industry.

It has been said that we are the victims of our own shortcomings. Avoidance of public controversy, and indeed, avoidance of contact with our legislative representatives has long been a hallmark of our behavior. We have need for a better field of understanding on the part of both segments. The leaders of our industry as well as our trade associations, acting in concert with the progressive intelligent State supervisor and legislators can contribute much at the grassroots level of each State to bring about a clearing of the uncertainty that impedes our ability to fully serve the free-enterprise economy which has made this country outstanding on the pages of history.

A Special Duty for Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of Harper's magazine an article by the distinguished gentleman from New York, JOHN V. LINDSAY, appeared entitled "A Special Duty for Republicans."

This featured report has received wide interest throughout the country, and I would like to take this means to acquaint colleagues on both sides of the aisle with this valuable article:

A SPECIAL DUTY FOR REPUBLICANS

(By JOHN V. LINDSAY)

(NOTE.—JOHN V. LINDSAY is now in his third term in Congress as a Republican Representative from New York City. In World War II, he saw action in the Mediterranean and Pacific on Navy destroyers; he got his law degree from Yale in 1948 and practiced in New York and before the U.S. Supreme Court. He is on the House Judiciary Committee and has sponsored legislation for individual rights, welfare, and education.)

As I am a member of the minority in Congress, and since the majority is large and their whips take instruction from the Executive, I am especially conscious of the minority's obligation to restrain the Government from whittling down basic individual rights and liberties. The obligation applies no matter which party is in power; no party in power has been without excesses—excess use of Government or congressional power to impinge on individual liberties. As a Republican with high respect for the philosophy of Lincoln, I see it as the special task of my party to redefine the role of the individual in our half-garrison, half-welfare leviathan state.

Contrary to the prevailing view of my party's national leadership, I believe that the real danger of increasing centralism does not lie in the comparatively modest Federal expenditures for the destitute, for education, and for health, but rather in the pervasive threat to individual liberties that stems from undue concentration of military, police, or economic power.

These liberties include the rights to speak freely, to dissent, to assemble and to petition and protest, to travel without harassment, to take up or defend unpopular causes, to receive the full benefits of due process, and to avoid the frustrations, and arbitrariness of weighty bureaucracy.

Certainly one of the functions of the Minority in representative government must be to protect such liberties from erosion by the pressures of Government. Alexis de Tocqueville commented that his major doubt about our system was "the possible tyranny of the majority." In no area is this truer than the area of individual rights. But neither the Democratic nor the Republican party is now taking a strong enough stand for the protection of these rights. The Republican record has been less than distinguished on this subject. The Democratic record is rapidly getting worse.

Massive complexes of institutional power tend to roll up individuals in their path. This is true in both the private and the public arenas. The combination can be devastating—as President Eisenhower warned in his reference to the colossal power of the military-industrial complex. Although most governments pay lip service to liberal dogma they seem unable to control the emergence of antiliberal forces in their midst. The more massive the government complex, the greater the possibility that these forces will emerge. They appear under various guises: "military secrecy," "national security," "international competition," "dominant governmental interest," or just plain expediency.

In the last Congress, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, backed by the Kennedy administration and the House leadership, tried to push through by unanimous consent a bill that went under the title of "Industrial Security." A small group of us in the House barely beat this bill down by less than a majority vote, under a procedure which requires two-thirds for passage. The bill would have given the Government summary power in effect to remove from their jobs, without due process, up to 5 million Americans employed in private industry and universities on defense contracts or on related research. The rationale of the bill was that since classified information relating to defense contracts and research is spread all over the country in the giant industrial defense system and in universities, the Government must have power to screen out from access to such information any person it believes to be a security risk. The decision not to grant a due-process hearing on some undisclosed charge could be made under the terms of the proposed legislation at various subordinate levels in the Pentagon. The bill made no provision for appeals to the courts in individual cases.

IS "SECURITY" WORTH THIS PRICE?

Three of us objected to passing the bill on the Consent Calendar. It was then scheduled for floor action under "suspension of rules," a procedure which bypasses the Rules Committee and is reserved for relatively noncontroversial bills. Only 40 minutes of debate is permitted and amendments may not be offered. However, passage requires the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Members present and voting. Six of us, all relatively new to the Congress, three Republicans and three Democrats, then went to work to muster support for an attack on the bill. We were required to overcome the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the House leadership, and the entire membership of the Un-American Activities Committee under whose direction the bill was being handled on the floor. We mustered enough "No" votes to prevent two-thirds, but we still fell short of majority. The bill therefore, presumably, will be offered again under procedures which require a simple majority for passage. Meanwhile, the Government has been operating an industrial security system by Executive order of the President but under limitations imposed by the Supreme Court. The legislation now demanded by the Government would remove some of these limitations.

I received mail from several scientists and researchers telling me of lost jobs and destroyed careers because they had not been given a chance to refute charges and hence had been denied access to information needed for their work. The immediate employer, the defense plant, or the university was helpless in these situations; the Federal Government had taken charge of the employer-employee relationship.

In May of this year the House of Representatives passed, by a vote of 340 to 40, H.R. 950 (to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950) which tosses into the ashcan any semblance of due process for accused employees of the National Security Agency, an organization which handles highly secret military and cold war operations. The bill, which was backed by the Kennedy administration and the leadership on both sides of the aisle, denied hearings and all other normal procedures which protect most Government employees discharged from the Government. It means that any employee of this large agency who is charged by an anonymous informer of having "wrong" opinions, associating with "wrong" people, or doing any other vague "wrong" thing can be summarily dismissed and remain forever tainted in Government files and records without any understanding whatever of why it happened and by whom it was caused. Repeatedly it has been demonstrated that gross injustices occur when the Government operates in this fashion, and there is no commensurate improvement in Government security.

As disquieting as the bill itself, was the procedure under which its proponents originally attempted to put it through. Despite loud cries of warning and protest from the

American Civil Liberties Union, two attempts were made to pass the bill on the Consent Calendar, a procedure reserved for uncontroversial "little" bills which are thought to have unanimous approval. There is no debate. Admittedly this particular bill presented a close question because of the sensitive nature of the agency, but personal rights are nonetheless diminished, and full debate was called for.

The Attorney General continues to press for legislation that will permit the FBI to tap wires without court orders in cases "presenting a threat to the security of the United States"—a phrase which can mean anything to all. Wiretapping is dirty business. Improperly used it is the worst kind of invasion of privacy. Modern electronic listening and eavesdropping devices have made the threat to individual rights posed by unchecked, unlimited use of this power all the more dangerous.

Recently there came to light a widespread practice in the Pentagon of using lie detectors on Pentagon personnel. There is a whole unit which does nothing but train people how to administer lie-detector tests. Some months ago, in connection with a leak to a news reporter of a nonclassified Pentagon memorandum, the country was treated to the spectacle of a few layers of brass in the Pentagon, including the Deputy Secretary of Defense, voluntarily submitting to lie-detector tests at the request of an outraged and embarrassed Pentagon security chief.

Last year, I and five other relatively junior Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee—joined later by a few junior Democrats—were barely able to hold the line against a bill which would have made it a crime to "obstruct" a Government investigator in the course of his work. Under the draft originally submitted by the Department of Justice, an irate housewife who merely administered a tongue lashing and brandished a broom because she objected to having her home invaded—or even an aggressive lawyer defending his client—could have been included.

Three years ago during the Eisenhower administration the House passed with only one nay vote—mine—a so-called antiobscenity bill, which would have given the Postmaster General summary powers to prevent distribution of books and periodicals thought by one official in the Post Office to be obscene. The measure was pressed by a Republican Postmaster General and sponsored by a Democratic Congresswoman, accompanied by flowered encomiums from the Democratic majority leader. It was a major and probably unconstitutional assault by Government on the personal right of free speech.

The bill placed the full burden of proving innocence on the mailer and attempted to exclude the courts from reviewing the merits of cases on appeal. Surely the works of Geoffrey Chaucer would never have survived if such a government tool had existed in the 14th century. The American Book Publishers Council and other organizations finally came to the rescue and the bill was jettisoned in the Senate. A reasonable proposal was then drafted by a number of us and enacted.

The House has passed by a vote of 338 to 40 a bill pressed by this administration which broadens the old World War I Sedition Act. The Sedition Act, which has been almost dormant for 40 years, makes it a crime for any person in the jurisdiction of the United States to make false statements designed to interfere with the Armed Forces, or to attempt to interfere with enlistment. Constitutional lawyers agree that this act is the most stringent curb on the personal right of free speech ever enacted in our country's history, including even the Smith Act.

Under the Sedition Act, some may recall, in 1918 an American woman was prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced to 10 years in prison for saying, "I am for the people and the Government is for the profiteers." Two years later, in 1920 when passions had calmed, an appellate court reversed this decision. A preacher, whose audience was a woman, two old men, and another clergyman, was convicted and sentenced to 15 years for causing insubordination and obstructing recruiting by preaching and issuing leaflets on the Christian duty of pacifism. He was pardoned a year later. Under a State act, modeled on the Federal act, a woman was prosecuted for discouraging women from knitting socks for the soldiers overseas by saying, "No soldier ever sees these socks."

The amendment to the Sedition Act, overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives, broadens the act to include statements made by Americans overseas. The Justice Department thinks it necessary because of our continuing military commitments abroad.

NIBBLING AT THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The bulwark of freedom is the first amendment. Of all the personal rights and liberties stated in the Bill of Rights it is the most treasured. It restrains constituted authority from interference with the rights of individuals to speak freely, to worship freely, to assemble peaceably, and to petition against grievance. But the first amendment is a dike that must continually be shored up. If neglected, it will begin to crumble, and will finally burst. Rather than pressing for legislation which will further erode the first amendment, the Government ought to be seeking legislation to empower it to invoke the protection of the amendment on behalf of individuals.

In spite of the excellence of most parts of the administration's proposed civil rights bill in this Congress, the administration omitted asking for legislation that would enable the Government to invoke the protections of the first amendment on behalf of individuals who are in no position to do so for themselves. Negroes have been attacked in the streets for gathering together in peaceable assembly in order to petition against grievances. The first amendment specifically protects "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Coupled with the 14th amendment, the protection it affords the individual applies against all governmental units. But the Federal Government cannot invoke first amendment protections on behalf of individuals in the absence of a statute. The statute has been proposed in the past—in fact the House passed it in 1957 only to have it buried in the Senate—and four of us on the minority side of the House Judiciary Committee, besides the chairman of the committee, have introduced it again. The importance of "the right of the people peaceably to assemble" has been clouded in the public mind by instances of nonpeaceable assembly, but its importance nevertheless remains. In all the discussion about civil rights there has been scant mention of first amendment rights and obligations.

A recent development is the use of Government leverage to induce people voluntarily to give up first and fifth amendment rights. Government employees, consultants, private citizens in contractual or subcontractual relationships with the Government—a large and still-growing segment of the population—are asked to sign away bill of rights protections.

Regulatory agencies increasingly have moved in the direction of demanding voluntary waivers of rights. Recently, for example, the Federal Trade Commission mailed out mass requests to small apparel manufacturers demanding that they sign carte blanche "consent orders" binding them not to engage in the practice of sharing promotional advertising costs with retailers. Few if any of these manufacturers were under any charge of any specific wrongdoing. Admittedly, many manufacturers split the cost of advertising at the insistence of the large retailers, a practice which violates the Robinson-Patman Act. But the normal method of handling allegations of wrongdoing is on a case-to-case basis—complaint, answer, proof, and hearing. By signing this consent order, the language of which was unusually vague, the manufacturer voluntarily surrendered his rights to appeal to the courts from the terms of the order. Two liberal-minded Commissioners handed down blistering dissents, charging that this devise set a new and frightening precedent.

An argument can be made for denying public schoolteachers the right to invoke the protections of the fifth amendment as a condition of employment, or letter carriers the right to strike against grievances—but the practice nevertheless diminishes the worth of the Bill of Rights, and the practice widens. Recently even the voluntary aspect was abandoned when the Department of Justice nearly succeeded in pushing through Congress a bill concerning the transportation of gambling devices which would have permitted the Department to force individuals to waive the fifth amendment in exchange for grants of immunity against prosecution.

WHO CAN VISIT ALBANIA?

Congress also seems oblivious to the narrowing of our basic rights. Bills against individuals are routinely scheduled for consent-calendar passage until an objection knocks them off onto a calendar that requires fuller debate. Often they are brought up under rules that do not permit amendments. A favorite day is Monday, when many Members are still away from the Capitol on weekend trips to their States and districts.

Last fall when a large group of women in New York and Washington assembled and petitioned against atom-bomb testing, they were subpenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee. There were four or five Communists among them, and presumably the committee's purpose was to expose this for the edification of the general public as well as of the other ladies involved. But what happened to first amendment rights—the right to assemble, to speak, and to petition—in the process? Few but the ladies seemed the least bit troubled by the point.

In the last 5 years I have spent more time than I should care to account for, shuttling between the House and Senate and the State Department in order to contest legislation or regulations designed to place curbs on the right of Americans to travel. Several years ago the Supreme Court held that Congress had not authorized the State Department to deny citizens passports without fair hearings—the fifth amendment right of due process. The State Department has been trying ever since to reestablish its authority to deny passports in this arbitrary fashion. One day perhaps the Supreme Court will declare the right to travel is surrounded with first amendment protection of free speech. How can people communicate if they can't travel, whether across a street or an ocean?

It is possible that the State Department is waking up a little. Recently, when I threatened a tirade on the floor of the House, the Department reversed its earlier refusal to validate a passport to Albania for a constituent of mine. He is an author who had contracted to travel by ship through the Greek Isles in the company of British scholars and students of Greek civilization. The port of Durres, Albania, was to be a 1-day stop to see some of the finest Greek ruins of all. The predicament of the single American on board would have presented a fine picture of American foreign policy as he stood on the gangplank—his passport surrendered to the captain on U.S. Government instructions—

while his British counterparts departed for the short bus trip, passports, and notebooks in hand.

The theory of the Department's position was that, since the United States does not have relations with Albania, it will not allow a citizen to travel in Albania, for his own protection. But the Department will make exceptions to its blanket area travel ban whenever, in its sole judgment, it finds the cause worthy. According to State Department practice, a citizen's interest in the distribution of an estate in Albania would come under the exception—which means that a legacy of rare books on Greek mythology would qualify, but a scholar's interest in seeing the original stuff would not.

THE FIRST DUTY OF GOVERNMENT

The structure of modern society, based as it is on a high degree of organization, encourages the growth of central power complexes. Today virtually nothing in the Constitution except the Bill of Rights effectively limits Government power in any field. It is the final barrier. And even here, the wall has been breached, as the pressures of national security, international competition, automation, and population expansion have brought about pragmatic compromises of very fundamental rights. What were once thought to be absolute guarantees and safeguards in the Bill of Rights have become mere weights on a scale which can be tipped the other way by the counterweights of "the competing interests at stake." Contrary to the common view, the Supreme Court has not made the protection of the Bill of Rights grow to the same extent as constitutional grants of power to governmental complexes in other areas—and yet the need for maximum protection of basic rights is greater today than ever before. This point is cogently made by Yale Law Professor Charles Reich, former law clerk to Justice Hugo Black, in a recent article in the Yale Law Journal:

"In a mass society, with access to information about what is happening in Government increasingly difficult to obtain, with increasing monopolization of all the media of communication, and with heavy pressure for conformity from the large-scale organizations for which most people work, freedom of expression and political association are easily reduced to impotence. If it is true that they are indispensable to the functions of a free society, could it not be argued that the need for maintaining maximum legal protection of these rights has been greatly increased by modern developments? The Court has weighed 18th century needs for rights against 20th century demands for power."

In those cases where the Court has "weighed the competing interests" and found the individual's interest greater than the Government's, it is strange indeed that the Court should have been attacked by self-styled "conservatives" for subverting the security of the Nation. These ladies and gentlemen should, rather, take comfort in the fact that the 18th century concept of individual liberty can be reconciled with the needs of the 20th century.

Our Government was instituted to secure to individuals their inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursut of happiness. In a society as complex and rapidly changing as ours, it is the highest function of Government to safeguard those inalienable rights so that human beings may live in self-respect and without fear. The Bill of Rights marks off a protected area in which each individual may develop himself and express himself in his own way. But even that delimited area can be restricted in the absence of a vigilant and vocal public opinion. I fear for the guarantee of the Bill of Rights for I have never known a day or heard of a time when the forces of myopia and tyranny were not at work. There seems to be little concern about the subject today. The absence of concern—and therefore of watchfulness—is an unhealthy condition. In a society increasingly given over to massive organization structures, in which individualism is either regarded with suspicion or ignored as unimportant and unproductive, the absence of primary concern over individual rights and liberties can lead to the stagnation, and ultimately the corruption, of both government, and the free system that government is supposed to represent.

Texas Redistricting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Mr. Walter B. Moore, editor of the Texas Almanac which appeared in the Dallas Morning News for October 24, 1963.

Mr. Moore writes of the complicated situation which now exists in Texas because of the recent decision of the Federal court on reapportionment. The decision is not unlike several others rendered in several other States, and the result of these decisions when reviewed and ruled upon by the Supreme Court will affect in all probability, every State in the Union.

The article follows:

TEXAS' COMPLICATED PUZZLE

(By Walter B. Moore)

Texas is plunged into one of the most complex political puzzles in its history. Immediate cause of the confusion is the three-judge Federal court ruling at Houston that Texas congressional districting is unconstitutional. But this decision (with one judge dissenting) and Gov. John Connally's refusal to call a special session to redistrict are only part of a national complication.

The need for redistricting is denied by practically no one. But conflicting Federal court decisions, strong dissents by individual Federal judges and partisan politics make it hard for legislators, State executives, and John Q. Public to know what must be done, or how to do it.

In a 40-page dissent, former Dallasite Judge James L. Noel expressed "deep concern over the consequences of the action taken (by the other two Federal judges at Houston) * * * and sincere belief grave errors of law and judicial policy have been committed." The News agrees with this grave concern in an editorial on this page today, while reaffirming the necessity for reapportionment to compensate for vast population shifts since present Texas congressional districts were established in 1957.

Intruding far into State affairs, Federal courts in the last few years have rendered decisions that make it difficult to know what to expect next. Some examples:

Tennessee: On March 26, 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Tennessee citizens can challenge the apportionment of their State legislature in Federal courts. Known as the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision, this opened the gates for other Federal court decisions.

Alabama: In 1962, a three-judge Federal court rejected the reapportionment of a special session of the Alabama Legislature, ordered immediate reapportionment and specified the exact distribution of seats among counties. (Because of failure to reapportion, and loss of one seat in Congress, Alabama's eight remaining Congressmen ran at large in 1962.)

Oklahoma: On July 17, 1963, a three-judge Federal court at Oklahoma City reapportioned both houses of the Oklahoma Legislature strictly upon the basis of population. Three precedent-breaking acts were involved: (1) A Federal court ordered reapportionment, rather than delegating this to a State agency. (2) Both houses were reapportioned. (3) Population was established as the criterion for districting in both houses.

Many other Federal court decisions, almost invariably with strong minority dissents, have added to the complications. A general fruitbasket-turned-over shuffling of Congressmen is likely to result, but few would be so bold as to predict where, when, or how.

Analysis of U.S. census data by Congressional Quarterly, however, indicates that ideal apportionment by population would result in shifting only 16 of the 435 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. Significantly, the study showed that most of the shift from rural to urban representation would be in the South, where five urban, two suburban, and one mixed urban-suburban congressional seats would be added, and eight rural seats eliminated.

Three of the changes would be in Texas, according to CQ's study. Representative JOE POOL's Congressman at Large seat would be eliminated, as would two rural seats. Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio would gain one Member of Congress each under this ideal apportionment.

No such ideal is likely to be achieved, in Texas or any of the other 49 States. But the reasons for the relatively great changes in Texas compared with other States become apparent from a look at the population shifts since 1950, the last U.S. census of population upon which the Texas Legislature based the 1957 reapportionment.

In 1950, Texas had 7,711,194 residents. As it was legally required to do, the legislature in 1957 used these 1950 figures in setting up districts. Actually, however, by 1957, Texas' population was 9,127,000. The 1960 census showed it to be 9,579,677, and by 1962 the population was estimated at 9,978,146 by the authoritative University of Texas Population Research Center. (It was 10,323,000 as of July 1, 1963.)

Practically all of this increase of roughly 2,000,000 has taken place in Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and other Texas cities. The following table compares 1950 and 1962 populations in the congressional districts including Texas' five most populous cities. (Houston has two Congressmen.)

	1950 population	1962 estimate
Dallas	614,799	1,011,718
Houston	806,701	1,347,816
Fort Worth	361,253	548,494
San Antonio	500,460	736,250
El Paso	351,710	594,568

Obviously, Texas cities are being outvoted by rural areas. Look magazine recently classed Dallas voters as among the Nation's most underrepresented, in comparison with their rural neighbors.

In fact, Representative BRUCE ALGER, the Dallas Republican, represents more voters than any other Member of Congress. Adjoining Dallas is the congressional district of Representative RAY ROBERTS, smallest in population in the United States.

But fair redistricting, even though it may not reach the absolute ideal of the CQ study, is a major operation. And, as Governor Connally has emphasized, it would be costly to call a special session and legislature's action might be repudiated quickly by another Federal court, as hapepned in Alabama.

On November 12, the U.S. Supreme Court begins hearings on a redistricting suit involving Atlanta that is similar to the Texas case and could result in a decision affecting anything courts or the Texas Legislature might do.

Out of such a muddled situation, about the only things that are certain are:

1. Redistricting is coming.
2. It will not come without a lot of partisan argument, rural-urban jockeying for power and continued litigation in Federal courts.

The Atlantic Nations Are Now at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, we all are well aware that there is an economic road, as well as a military road, to defeat or victory in our continuing struggle with communism.

Most of us tend to give our primary attention to the military aspects, quite often to the neglect of the economic competition involved.

Recently, however, Arjay R. Miller, president of the Ford Motor Co., gave a most significant talk to the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce in which he discussed the importance of a free and healthy national economy in our economic and political struggle with Russia.

He pointed out the importance of easing international trade barriers as a tool for economic development of the emerging nations as well as a means of stimulating our own economy.

And he warned that we cannot, as a country, afford to take our own economic superiority for granted.

The speech was given during a dinner marking the 60th anniversary of the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce. This year, incidentally, also is the 60th anniversary of the Ford Motor Co. and the 100th anniversary of Henry Ford's birth.

The importance of Mr. Miller's remarks, I believe, merit their inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ATLANTIC NATIONS ARE NOW AT THE CROSSROADS

(By Arjay R. Miller)

I have some difficulty making the transition from the birthday mood to the more somber tones that seem suitable to the subject of my remarks today. So let me begin on an optimistic note by saying that the cold war is not quite so grim and forbidding a subject today as it was a short time back.

Together with a lot of other things that have happened, the recent nuclear test ban agreement suggests that the cold war is changing in important ways. It seems clear, in the first place, that the military strength of the free world has made a deep impression on the Kremlin. The Russians know they cannot attempt armed aggression without risking total destruction and they are unwilling to take this risk.

But it is just as clear that they have not given up their determination to win the world for communism. We can expect the Russians to continue their efforts to communize other countries through propaganda, subversion and other methods short of war. And one of the most important of these other methods will be a strenuous attempt to prove that the Communist economic system can provide more for people everywhere than our system can.

Mr. Khrushchev has warned us again and again that communism will bury the free world under an avalanche of industrial and agricultural production. The real test of socialism, he said in a recent speech, is the quantity and quality of food, clothing and other necessities and amenities available to the people living under socialism.

"If socialism does not provide for all this," he went on, "and does not give advantages over capitalism, we shall be idle babblers and not revolutionaries."

He put the case even more bluntly in his widely quoted remarks in Yugoslavia last month. "The system which produces the most will win," he said. He then delivered one of the least expected tributes Henry Ford has been paid during this centennial year. "We learned from him," Mr. Khrushchev said, "and we are not ashamed to admit it. If we don't learn mass production methods, then no amount of curses and slogans will help us win."

If Mr. Khrushchev is really out to prove that Russian socialism can do more for the consumer, we should not take him lightly. The Russians have shown an impressive ability to do what they set their minds to do. They can produce nuclear weapons, rockets, space systems, and jet aircraft second to none. They have achieved remarkable increases in steelmaking and electrical generating capacity. And they have maintained a steady and substantial rate of growth in gross national product.

The standard of living of the Russian people is still low by Western standards. But it has improved significantly, even though Russian effort has been focused on arms production and basic heavy industry. If the Russians decide to concentrate on the consumer, their living standards will rise even faster.

I hasten to add, however, that I do not think the Russians will bury us. On the contrary, if we take their challenge seriously and if we respond properly, I am certain that our system can bury theirs.

The fact that the people of the West are both richer and freer is no mere coincidence. The Western economies are richer mainly because they are founded on relatively free markets, on the liberty of individuals and enterprises to manage their own affairs and to buy and sell where they choose. The Communist world is poorer largely because, after nearly half a century, it has still found no effective substitute for the incentives, the flexibility, the efficiency, and the discipline provided by market competition.

Let me put this point another way. In a free economy, the consumer decides what shall be produced by the way he spends his money. In a tightly controlled economy, the state decides what shall be produced. It would really be surprising, when you come to think about it, if the system that responds directly to the consumer did not meet his wants better than the system that is controlled by a central bureaucracy.

The London Economist pointed out recently that this is one of the main reasons why life in Russia is still so drab despite Russian claims that their economy has been growing by up to 10 percent a year.

"It is easy to mark up such a figure in a closed economy," the Economist reminds us, "if industry is not bothering whether it is producing the things that people most want and is not seeking sufficient improvements in quality. Soviet economists are just beginning to realize that, as their country grows richer, consumers choice is likely to become much more of a dictator of economic trends—and this is a sort of dictatorship of the proletariat with which Communist economic planning has not yet really prepared itself to deal."

In short, the West has a built-in advantage when it comes to meeting the economnc wants of consumers—the fact that we have a vigorous system of free enterprise, disciplined, sharpened and spurred on by competition for the consumer's favor.

There are two ways in which we might lose this advantage. We could lose it, first, by giving it away—by substituting more and more central planning and control for competitive forces in our own economy. To follow this path would be doubly mistaken, for we would then give up an important part of our freedom as well as an important part of our efficiency.

The other way we could lose our advantage would be exactly the opposite—if the Soviets should substitute more and more market competition for Government planning and control in their own economy. Reports from Russia in recent months have described a growing interest in finding socialist equivalents for profit incentives, market prices, interest charges, advertising, market research, and other features of our free enterprise system. To orthodox Marxists, this may be heresy, but Khrushchev himself has insisted that communism must learn from capitalism whenever capitalism has something to teach.

We in the free world should be pleased indeed to lose our advantage in this way. In fact, if we take the long view, the only way we can win the cold war is to persuade the Communists to move a great deal closer to our values and our way of life. Any step they might take toward a free economy would make them stronger. But it would also help to reduce the conflict of basic values and ideas that keeps the cold war going.

Whether we seek to protect our economic advantage over communism, or to persuade the Communists themselves to adopt some of the values and institutions of freedom, our task is exactly the same—to take maximum advantage of the inherent vitality of a competitive, free-enterprise economy.

This is an easy goal to state, but a hard one to live up to. Many of the things that make our economy less competitive, less free, and less vital than it might be also make it more comfortable, more secure, and less demanding. When it comes to a choice, we all have a tendency to pick the easy way—but the easy way is not going to keep us ahead of the Russians.

Tax reduction is a case in point. Almost everyone agrees that high Federal taxes seriously dampen the vitality of our economy and that a tax cut would stimulate business investment, economic growth, and higher employment.

The biggest obstacle to a prompt tax cut is the rising level of Government spending. Without better control of spending, a tax cut could lead us directly into a permanent policy of inflationary deficits.

Some Government programs are clearly more essential than others. Some are useless as well as expensive. The persistence of useless and expensive Government programs cannot be blamed on the extravagance of politicians. They persist, as a rule, because they have the active support of influential groups. And, if we are completely honest about it, we have to admit that sometimes those groups include businessmen. When it comes to economy in Government, we in business tend to act very much like most other people. We are all in favor of cutting Government programs that benefit some other city, some other region, or some other industry.

If we want the benefits of a tax cut without the dangers of inflationary deficits, then

we must be willing to choose the hard way—to sacrifice less essential Government programs, even when it hurts.

High taxes are not the only hobbles that reduce the growth and efficiency of our economy. We should consider how we can dismantle much of the complex structure of subsidies, regulations, and special taxes that interfere with the free operation of competitive markets and prevent full and efficient use of our national resources.

Many of these measures represent an effort to insure economic justice—to guarantee a fair shake to all. But their effect, all too often, is to reduce substantially the size of the pot and everyone's take. To give just a few examples, every American loses when our tax system works to discourage the savings, investment, work and risk-taking essential for economic growth. Everyone pays for the legally protected power of unions to block the introduction of more efficient ways of working. And everyone pays for the accumulation of decades of outmoded rules and regulations affecting industry.

Scraping the barnacles from the hull of our national economy will not be easy, for every barnacle has its defenders. A lot of people. I'm talking about all of us—ingrams that make for inefficiency and slower growth—and I'm not talking just about other people. I'm talking about all of us—including businesses that benefit from subsidies and tax breaks and from tariffs, quotas, controls and other handicaps that Government has placed on their competitors at home and abroad. Here again, we will all have to face up to some hard choices.

With respect to policies toward other industrial nations of the free world, our problem is essentially the same. Our primary goal should be the gradual removal everywhere of quotas, subsidies, protective tariffs, special taxes, monetary and investment controls and other impediments to the free movement of goods and capital.

The reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade among the United Kingdom, the Common Market, and the United States would give a tremendous boost to the economic growth of the Atlantic alliance.

We at Ford know what it would mean in our own operations because Ford companies have major facilities in all the areas that would be affected. The adminission of the United Kingdom to the Common Market would lead to immediate savings of several million dollars annually in the operations of Ford companies. And this would be just the beginning. The reduction of United Kingdom-Common Market trade barriers would permit Ford facilities in both areas to obtain parts and materials from the most efficient common sources. It, in addition, tariff barriers between Europe and the United States were also reduced, the result would be still greater efficiency and savings.

These savings—amounting in total to many millions of dollars—would be passed on to consumers in the form of better products or lower prices. We would have no choice because lower tariffs would lead to more competition as well as to greater efficiency. And this, in turn, would lead to more sales, more production, more jobs and higher living standards in every country.

I have been using the Ford operations merely as an example. The same would be true of other businesses in our industry and in other industries. I have no doubt that the total effect would be to usher in a new era of rapid economic development throughout the Atlantic alliance.

At present, however, the progress of the Atlantic community toward lower trade barriers has slowed nearly to a halt. The Common Market rejection of the United Kingdom, the discouraging progress of preliminary discussions for the forthcoming "Kennedy round" of tariff reductions, and disagreements among the Common Market countries all suggest that further progress will be difficult.

There are several reasons for this. One of them is that in spite of the enormous advantages that lower tariffs have already brought, important economic interests are reluctant to face additional foreign competition.

It seems to me that the Atlantic nations are now at the crossroads. The choice they face is again the choice between the hard way and the easy way. They can continue to move ahead by accepting the opportunities of freer trade and the discipline of greater competition. Or, they can turn aside, to stagnate behind the security of protective barriers.

Right now, as the Communists step up their economic challenge to the free world, would be the worst possible moment to choose the second course. Fortunately, our own Government is firmly committed to moving ahead by seeking substantial mutual tariff reductions under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act passed during the last session of Congress. This act had the vigorous support of the American business community, and I hope that the negotiations it authorizes will enjoy the same backing.

If our Government's support of trade expansion should waver because of strong opposition at home, the free world might well take the wrong turn.

So far, I have been talking about what can be done to strengthen the economies of the major partners in the free world alliance. If the economic cold war were nothing more than a contest to see whether the Communists or the West could provide the higher standard of living for their own people, then we could ignore the rest of the world.

But the problem is not that simple. If we want to keep other nations out of the Communist orbit, we must also be concerned with their needs and their goals. The developing nations will be influenced by what they see happening inside Russia and inside the Western countries. But they will be influenced far more by what happens inside their own countries. They insist on their right to join the modern world. They refuse to be satisfied with per capita incomes of $100 or $200 a year. Until we bring them some measure of real hope, there is always the risk that any one of them might go the way of Cuba. Here again, the principle of relying on open markets suggests some approaches.

Wisely directed economic aid from the governments of the United States and its allies can be extremely helpful to the developing countries. But even if such aid were far more effective that it has been, the capital and technical assistance available from the governments of the wealthier nations is dwarfed both by the needs of the developing countries and by the amounts available through expanded trade and private investment.

Just to put things in perspective, let me cite some figures. Through the Alliance for Progress, the U.S. Government plans to spend an average of $1 billion per year in Latin America over the next decade. This is a huge sum, but we should keep in mind that Latin America's exports last year brought in more than 10 times as much. And U.S. companies in Latin America put more than six times as much into local economies each year in wages and salaries, taxes, and payments for purchased goods and services.

The conclusion is obvious: trade and private investment contribute far more to the growth of the developing areas than government aid ever can.

The developing nations must be able to pay for substantial imports of producer and consumer goods and technical knowledge. Since exports are the principal source of foreign exchange for any country, one of the major needs of the developing countries is better access to the markets of the richer nations.

This means that the advanved nations should reduce their duties on the commodities the developing countries have to sell. They should not provide permanent subsidies or protection for the domestic production of competing products. They should not impose rigid quotas on imports of the few manufactured goods that the less developed countries can produce at lower cost. In short, the advanced nations must welcome competition from the developing countries as well as from each other.

In seeking to guide the policies of the developing nations, it seems to me that the United States should put primary emphasis on the importance of a favorable climate for business enterprise and business investment. We should support the growth of free enterprise in developing countries, not on any doctrinaire grounds, but for very practical reasons—because it works—because competition is the best mechanism yet discovered to insure efficient use of economic resources—because the opportunity to earn a profit is the most dependable incentive for the saving, the investment and the risk-taking essential to economic growth—and because the growth of private industry has done more to improve the conditions of the mass of people than government ever has.

U.S. policy has emphasized the role of government in economic development and paid relatively little attention, in words or deeds, to the role of private enterprise. As a result, we have encouraged the growth of government supervision and government ownership of productive facilities, and have discouraged the growth of private industry in developing countries.

Recently, official American statements have given much more attention to the importance of private enterprise, private investment and trade expansion. This is an encouraging trend. I hope it is followed by appropriate actions to persuade governments in developing countries that their function is not to carry out development but to provide conditions which make development possible.

Maintaining law and order, providing a reasonably stable currency, improving public education and public health services, building roads, breaking up existing monopolies and preventing new ones—these and similar tasks are essential for economic development. They can be done only by government, and doing them well is more than enough to challenge the administrative capabilities of most governments. If, in addition, governments refrain from oppressive treatment of business enterprises, they are almost sure to stimulate a substantial inflow of foreign capital and foreign technical and management competence.

Political conditions in developing countries often make it very difficult for their governments to follow such policies. On the other hand, the business climate need not be spectacularly favorable to call forth a substantial amount of foreign investment. American and European automobile companies, including Ford, are continuing to make large investments in Latin American countries that are having severe economic and political difficulties. We are willing to take substantial risks because the economic potential is so great. Any significant improvement in the political climate for business in Latin America would certainly lead to bigger investments.

But even this does not indicate the major advantage to a developing nation of a favorable business climate. The major advantage is not the inflow of foreign capital, but the stimulation of savings, investment and risk taking by ambitious members of the local population. Foreign capital can help a country to develop. It can provide the missing element that may be necessary to start things moving. But over the long haul, most of the savings, most of the work and most of the innovation must come from within.

The cold war does not demand of us any policies or programs that would not be equally desirable in a secure and peaceful world. The goal of the policies I am urging is to provide a political climate that will encourage economic growth with rising living standards and employment opportunities at home as well as abroad.

I have emphasized the need for changes in Government policies that inhibit growth in the private sector of the economy. Obviously, however, there are many things of a positive nature that Government can and should do to strengthen our economy. Government and private business are both indispensable to economic vitality. The problem is not to maximize the role of one or the other, but to find the best combination of responsibilities for each.

Surely, among the most basic of the responsibilities of government in a healthy society and a healthy economy is the support and improvement of education. We have learned that more and better education is essential to the growth of the developing countries. It is equally essential in our own country, and we have little reason to be complacent about our progress. Far too many Americans are still entering the labor force with too little education to fit them for full participation in the work and the rewards of our economy.

Among the nearly 70-million people in the American labor force, there are still half a million who have never been to school; almost 10-million who have not completed an elementary education; and more than 30-million who are not high school graduates.

As the educational requirements for many jobs go up, educational deficiencies such as this are an increasingly serious handicap. Unless we make faster progress against these deficiencies, we may have growing difficulty matching the capabilities in our labor force with the requirements of available jobs. Here, I would emphasize not only formal schooling for young people, but opportunities for adults to obtain basic education and training for new jobs.

Providing all Americans with the minimum education necessary for effective competition in the job market is a goal that deserves the highest priority. Beyond this, we face the never-ending task of improving and expanding educational opportunities of all kinds at every level. The more we do to raise the competence of our entire labor force, the faster we can raise the productivity of our economy and the incomes of our people.

In conclusion, I should like to return to my opening remarks. A new battle in the cold war has begun. It is a battle that will be won, not by building superior arms, but by providing better lives for people. The Russians are formidable adversaries in this or any other contest. We cannot take our own superiority for granted. To surpass them will take hard work and great wisdom.

But I am confident that an educated people in a free economy can meet any challenge the Communists may offer. If we build on these foundations, Khrushchev's promise to bury us will take its place among all the other idle promises of Marxist ideology.

Is the Administration Preparing the American People for Further Concessions to the Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, evidently the Kennedy administration is determined to continue its policy of following the line laid down by the Kremlin on disarmament which will lead to but one inevitable end—the disarming of the United States and the strengthening of the Soviet Union.

Up to date Khrushchev has been able to lead the White House strategists pretty well in any direction he wished. He managed to get the test ban treaty on Soviet terms which binds us, but leaves the Russians free to conduct the experiments necessary for them to catch and surpass us in the development of nuclear weapons. He has conned the the President into renewed trade with the Communists on a basis that will cover up the failure of the Communist system to produce sufficient food for its own people at the same time the food is supplied with a subsidy paid for by the American taxpayers.

For the past year the State Department has been endeavoring to prepare the way for unilateral disarmament by the United States and the eventuality of turning U.S. troops and defenses over to the United Nations. Now we see the acceleration of the softening up process in a speech delivered to the U.N. by Charles C. Stelle, Deputy U.S. Representative at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Once again, we have the spectacle of a representative of the U.S. Government selling official U.S. policy which bears the distinct brush marks of Communist conspirators.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we wake up and put a stop to policies being pursued by the Kennedy administration which are leading us into a one-world government through an organization dominated by member nations who have clearly indicated their preference for socialist and Communist systems rather than the capitalist or private enterprise system of a free America.

As a part of these remarks, I would like to include a news item from the New York Times of today's date, which reports Stelle's speech to the U.N. The article carries all the sinister implications that the United States has already committed itself to accepting the U.N. as our protector in this insecure world. All that remains is for President Kennedy to get the American people to go along and this he seems to be doing his best to accomplish.

UNITED STATES ASSERTS KEY TO DISARMAMENT LIES IN U.N. FORCE

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., October 29.—The United States declared today that progress in establishing a United Nations peace-keeping force was a "necessary concomitant" to progress toward general and complete disarmament.

Since Premier Khrushchev proposed general and complete disarmament in 1960 the United States has frequently emphasized the necessity of establishing a military force to keep order in a disarmed world.

However, the statement in the General Assembly's Political Committee today by Charles C. Stelle, who has been the deputy U.S. representative at the Geneva disarmament negotiations, appeared more a direct link between steps toward disarmament and the controversial question of a United Nations peace-keeping force.

REMINDER ON FINANCING

Mr. Stelle did not mention the fact that the Soviet Union had refused to pay its assessments for two existing United Nations peace-keeping operations—the Congo force and the emergency force in the Middle East.

However, he reminded the committee that a special session of the General Assembly decided last spring that the financing of such peace-keeping operations was the collective responsibility of all United Nations members.

France's Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville, discounted Western optimism on improved relations with the Soviet Union. An end of Soviet threats to Berlin, he said, would indicate good faith and would create an atmosphere in which the true problems of Europe could be discussed.

TROOP OFFERS NOTED

Mr. Stelle, in his speech at the United Nations, called attention to a recent offer by the Netherlands, Canada, and Scandinavian members to earmark units of their armed forces for emergency United Nations service and to an offer by President Kennedy to provide logistic and material support.

Mr. Stelle listed U.S. conditions for the establishment of atom-free zones and indicated that the United States would oppose endorsement of such proposals in the General Assembly.

He said that all the states designated for a zone must be in favor of the idea, saying otherwise it would be premature to secure outside endorsement for it from the United Nations or other external bodies.

According to reliable sources, this statement was made because no such general support has come to light in the case of the three principal proposals for nuclear-free zones. These three plans are the Rapacki, or Polish, plan, which would exclude nuclear weapons from West Germany, East Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia; the proposal by Communist China and Indonesia for Asia and the Pacific, and the proposal by Brazil and five other Latin American States covering Latin America.

In addition, the Assembly adopted a resolution 2 years ago recommending the exclusion of nuclear weapons from Africa.

U.S. approval of any plan for a nuclear-free zone, he said, would depend upon maintenance of the military balance.

He declared that creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe and in Asia and the Pacific, where nuclear weapons form part of existing security arrangements, would upset the military balance. He did not mention the Latin American plan.

In addition, Mr. Stelle said, the United States would seek adequate verification that the zone was not being abused or misused.

Gen. E. L. M. Burns, the Canadian representative, said that Canadian approval of denuclearized zones would depend upon whether formation of a zone was acceptable to the countries in it, on arrangements for verification, and on whether it was consistent with the principle that no disarmament measure should confer an advantage on any state or group of states.

Both Mr. Stelle and General Burns emphasized, however, that decisions on these and other aspects of the disarmament problem should be left to the 18-nation disarmament committee in Geneva and not debated at length in the Assembly.

The Assembly, under the wording of a resolution settled on this week by the United States and the Soviet Union, would endorse a decision by the 18-power committee to resume negotiations in Geneva a week after the Assembly completes action on disarmament and nuclear-test questions.

The draft of the resolution does not take a position on issues that are still in dispute in Geneva.

The proposal is expected to be submitted by the end of the week.

America's Shame: Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the October-November issue of the National Wildlife Federation's official publication, by Mr. Louis S. Clapper, Washington editor, describing the frightful pollution of our Nation's water and the destruction of our most precious and necessary natural resource.

AMERICA'S SHAME: WATER POLLUTION

(By Louis S. Clapper)

A crow drifts slowly down the Missouri River riding a raft of solidified grease and animal tissue held together by a binder of hog hair. Only a carrion bird could stand the smell, yet many downstream cities take their drinking water from this river.

Live viruses, dumped into our coastal waters from sewers and dirty bilge tanks, have caused hepatitis in persons who ate clams harvested from sewage-laden waters on the Atlantic coast, and oysters from the polluted gulf.

Nitrochlorbenzene, an extremely poisonous organic chemical, is detected in the Mississippi at New Orleans—and followed a thousand miles upstream past many city water intakes to an industrial waste discharge in St. Louis. No one can yet guess the damage this might do to man and wildlife.

This is only a sampling of what is happening in many parts of this country. The detailed story is much longer, equally appalling, and adds up to America's shame—the pollution of our waters.

"Water pollution in the United States is a menace to our health and an economic burden which is robbing us of water we need," asserts G. E. McCallum, Chief of Water Supply and Pollution Control in the U.S. Public Health Service. "It is a destroyer of fish and wildlife habitat, a threat to outdoor recreation, and in many communities, an esthetic horror."

Words, at least words that can be used in mixed company, cannot describe the filth we pour into many of our streams, lakes, and oceans. Sewage, slaughterhouse offal, thousands of lethal chemicals, radioactive matter—these and other of man's wastes combine to form what sanitary engineers, for lack of a better term, call "gunk." Gunk defies analysis and perplexes health authorities who are desperately trying to keep up with its harmful effects on man and other living creatures.

We are faced with some inescapably gruesome facts:

Sewage treatment plants are, at best, only 90 percent efficient with organic material—and some inorganic wastes defy treatment.

The Public Health Service has isolated polio, infectious hepatitis, and more than 30 other live viruses which may carry disease from treated sewage effluent.

Because we increasingly reuse water, chances are 4 out of 10 that the water you drink has passed through someone's household plumbing or an industrial plant sewer.

Then what prevents us all from being sick?

"The fact our water treatment plants are the best in the world," answers McCallum. So we have some of the worst pollution, but the safest drinking water, thanks to its being disinfected by chlorine and other chemicals which kill most bacteria, even though the water sometimes has a disagreeable taste and odor. But we are riding a thin edge.

The effects of water pollution are much broader than health. Industrial plants are rejecting water as unfit for their uses. Swimmers are finding beaches posted "Unsafe for swimming." Water skiing? Not when the coliform bacterial count per drop of water has reached 80 at the Detroit waterfront; 65 in the Androscoggin River; 20 in the Mississippi at St. Louis. (A count of five per drop is considered unsafe for swimming.)

Bad news for fishermen. Last year pollution killed 50 million fish in rivers and coastal waters. These are only the reported kills.

Radioactive wastes have been found in the Colorado River drainage, danger signals of more trouble to come as we enter the atomic age. Floating garbage and other filth clogs water supply intakes of many cities which take their water from open streams. Potent fumes from New Hampshire's Androscoggin River have peeled the paint from the walls of nearby buildings.

Detergent foam runs from water faucets in several States; you brush your teeth in someone else's dishwater. Acids, seeping from mines in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, have polluted streams and poisoned wildlife. Chemical pesticide sprays are lining lake and stream banks with dead fish. Unsewered septic tanks drain into underground waters, and farm chemicals are finding their way into subterranean streams. Oil spills have killed countless birds and spoiled many beaches.

Since time immemorial, water has been known as the natural purifier. Nearly all religions in one way or another use water as the symbol of purity. Yet two presidents of allegedly the most advanced nation on earth have called the pollution of American waters a national disgrace. Why?

The problem hit with run-away speed. We were using only 160 billion gallons of water daily in 1945. Today, we use 355 billion gallons. The average home uses 60 gallons daily. It takes only 3 gallons of water to wash dinner dishes by hand, twice that amount by machine. It takes 2 gallons to flush garbage down the drain, 5 gallons a minute to take a shower.

The big jump in water usage has come with industrial growth. It takes 500 gallons of water to manufacture 1 yard of woolen cloth; 320,000 gallons to make a ton of aluminum; 500,000 to make a ton of synthetic rubber.

With a fixed supply of 315 billion gallons of fresh water available today, we must reuse our water. The Public Health Service estimates that the total flow of the Ohio River is being used 3.7 times before it reaches the Mississippi. By the time the water in the Mahoning River reaches Youngstown, Ohio, it has been re-used more than eight times. That's why water pollution is so dangerous to us all.

But most citizens are blissfully unaware of where their water comes from, and unconcerned about where it goes. As a result, both cities and industry have dragged their feet. "Of all our public works projects, waste treatment facilities are the least glamorous and the hardest to sell," says McCallum.

A few industries have exerted political pressure to evade antipollution laws. One popular claim is that "the plant will have to shut down" if forced to comply with the law, thereby throwing local people (who are also voters) out of work. "To the best of my knowledge, we have yet to shut down an industry or defeat a mayor," says James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

All 50 States have water pollution laws, but enforcement is sometimes indifferent. You are more likely to be fined for throwing a candy wrapper out the car window in some States, than for dumping poisons and ruining a stream.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act passed in 1956 started the ball rolling with its powerful one-two punch: (1) construction grants to cities, and (2) threat of court action. Cities were spending less than $300 million annually on sewage treatment plants before the act was passed. But with the help of Federal grants—first $50 million annually and then nearly double that figure—cities are now building at the $600 million rate per year.

The Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control has had 25 cases since it got more enforcement teeth. Fifteen were initiated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the rest by State governors. In none of these cases was a court injunction necessary. Mere threat of Federal action caused offenders to clean up.

Dramatic progress has been made along the Missouri River where 10 years ago not one major city treated its sewage. Today, Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, and St. Joseph all have treatment plants in operation or under construction, and meatpacking plants have really cleaned up. St. Louis recently voted a $95 million bond issue for waste treatment.

Many industries have invested millions and gone to much trouble to reduce water pollution. Through the National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Wastes, organized in 1950, major industries work with the Federal Government in task groups with mutual problems.

As a direct result, the Shell Oil Co. plant at Anacortes, Wash., has installed a complete treatment system to avoid polluting the area's waters and to protect the local commercial and sport fisheries. Kaiser Steel at Fontana, Calif., reclaims integrated mill wastes with a settling and recycling system which keeps its water requirements at a minimum. The Allegheny County Sanitary Authority at Pittsburgh has a joint treatment operation in 68 communities and more than 100 industrial plants.

But despite all of these efforts, the pollution of our waters is the worst in history, most experts agree. We're making gains in some areas; in others, we appear to be losing. Our water, when doctored with chlorine and up to a half dozen other chemicals, has been about as safe as any in the world. But some responsible scientists are beginning to question: Is this safe enough?

As population skyrockets and industry expands, water intakes and sewage outlets are jammed closer and closer together. Sewage treatment plants are not the cure-all that most of us blissfully assume. A third of our cities use only primary treatment (screens and settling basins) which at best remove only 35 percent of the organic wastes. More

efficient plants use a secondary treatment (bacterial action to eat up the dissolved organic matter) which removes up to 90 percent of this material, but leaves many other pollutants untouched.

Chicago, for example, has the best treatment available. Yet they pour an effluent into the Illinois River daily that is equal to the raw sewage from a city of a million people, containing 3,435 tons of solid wastes.

Moreover, our treatment processes are out of date. They cannot remove the complex wastes resulting from manufacture of such substances as plastics, detergents, synthetic fibers, pesticides, and medicines. Some synthetic chemical wastes cause tastes and odors. A large number are highly toxic to fish and aquatic life. Many do not respond to biological treatment and persist in streams for great distances. "We do not know how to detect most of these compounds in water, or how to treat or remove them in waste effluents. Nor do we know of their long range toxic effects on man," the Public Health Service warns.

Each year increasing amounts of these wastes come into our water supply intakes. Obviously, even with chlorine cocktails to kill bacteria, we are subjecting ourselves to increased exposure to harmful wastes, including radioactive substances and lethal pesticide chemicals.

Our future water needs are staggering. By 1980—just 17 years from now—we will be using 600 billion gallons of water daily. By the year 2000, a trillion gallons. It would take a tank car train 600,000 miles long to haul it.

Unless we can find a cheap way to convert salt water to fresh, hydrologists estimate our maximum fresh water supply will be only 650 billion gallons a day. So reuse is a must. We'll need to reuse our water six times by 1980, according to some authorities.

These are the increased demands of the immediate future, yet we are barely holding our own today. "Even those States doing the best job on water pollution are doing an inadequate job," Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Quigley told a congressional committee. Last year, for the first time, we started gaining on municipal pollution, although we have a backlog of 5,831 projects which will cost $2.2 billion for treatment plants and sewers. Industry needs to build 6,000 plants. Federal institutions, too, need to clean up.

Some industrial groups have opposed the Federal program of grants to cities on the grounds that pollution is a local and State problem. The reason for this attitude, it is suspected, is that once cities clean up pollution, the finger of guilt will inevitably point to the other polluters—mostly industrial plants. Organic wastes from industrial sources are double that from cities.

Water pollution is not an impossible problem. We know that the Ruhr River, which drains the heavily industrialized, heavily populated Ruhr Valley of western Germany, is managed so well it is still safe for boating and swimming. One possible reason—there's a tax on industrial wastes.

We have three big needs in the pollution fight: More money invested in city and industrial water treatment plants. More research to develop more efficient techniques of water treatment. And better enforcement of strong pollution laws—Federal, State, and local.

How clean and pure we attempt to maintain our streams is a matter of economics and realities, and of values, both tangible and intangible. But of these things we can be certain: Pollution must be kept below the levels of significant personal health damage. Pollution must not destroy recreational and wildlife values. Users of water do not have an inherent right to pollute—they must return it as nearly clean as possible.

What can you do to help correct this shameful situation?

First, investigate personally to learn how community and industrial wastes are handled in your community.

Second, let elected officials at local, State, and Federal levels know you want strong antipollution laws, and want them enforced.

Third, through your conservation club, garden group, women's club, or civic group, join in converted actions to improve controls.

Only through a wave of expressed public disgust can we clean up our polluted waters and insure a safe, continuing supply for the many jobs water does for us.

Medicine and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of all of the Members of the House and the other body an address delivered before the 20th Congress of the International Society of Surgery in Rome in September by Dr. Alton Ochsner of the Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans, La.

Dr. Ochsner is one of the most distinguished surgeons of the world. For a long time he has felt, and I share his belief, that physicians can make a tremendous contribution to international understanding and world peace. He again emphasizes these ideas in his talk in Rome and I am, therefore, taking the liberty of incorporating it in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows in full:

THE ROLE OF MEDICINE IN THE MAINTENANCE OF WORLD PEACE

(By Alton Ochsner, M.D.)

It is a rare privilege and an inexpressible pleasure to preside at this 20th Congress of the International Society of Surgery. This organization, which was founded more than 60 years ago, is the most distinguished and venerable surgical society in the world. It indeed represents global medicine.

No one was more astonished than I when, in Dublin 2 years ago, I was elected your president. I, however, realize that it was not I but my country, because of its scientific accomplishments and support of international relations, that you honored. In all humility, I am truly proud to serve as your president, representing the 445 members of our society from the United States of America.

It is fitting that we should meet in this historic holy city, where we met once before in 1926 under the presidency of Prof. D. Giordano of Venice. One of Italy's important contributions to medicine, particularly surgery, was its development of schools of anatomy, which first placed anatomy on a sound scientific basis. The historic fundamental teaching of Celsus at the beginning of the Christian era revolutionized medicine. Medical teaching in Salerno, Bologna, and Padua was excellent. In Bologna, William of Saliceto was one of the first to bring medicine and surgery together. One of his texts, published in 1476, was the initial treatise on surgical anatomy. The names, Luzzi de Mondino, Bruno di Longoburgo, Pietro d' Abano, Gentile da Foligno, Leonardo da Vinci, Berengario da Capri, Andreas Vesalius, Bartolommeo Eustachi, Gabriele Falloppio, Antonio Maria Valsalva, Marcello Malpighi, and Giovanni Morgagni, are well known to us as great Italian anatomists who did much to advance the science of surgery. We also are indebted to Italy because William Harvey attended medical school at Padua after graduating from Cambridge.

The purpose of our society, as specified by its founders, is "to make contributions to the progress of science by research into and discussion of surgical problems." Through the years, because of its high ideals, our society has been highly respected. Its membership includes only the most eminent surgeons in the various countries of the world, who have been carefully selected because of their scientific accomplishments and integrity. The membership is limited, consisting currently of 2,968 physicians from 62 nations.

The first congress of the society was held in Brussels in 1905, under the presidency of Theodor Kocher, the great Swiss surgeon who was the originator of gentle atraumatic surgery. The subjects discussed at that congress are of little interest today, as their incidence has greatly diminished or they are easily treated. Among the topics discussed were: "Value of the Examination of the Bood in Surgery," "Treatment of Prostatic Hypertrophy," "Surgical Intervention in Noncancerous Lesions of the Stomach," "Treatment of Articular Tuberculosis," and "Treatment of Peritonitis." At that time little was known about neurosurgery, and pulmonary and cardiac operations, aside from an occasional emergency, were not performed. The tremendous advances which have been made in medicine, particularly in surgery, would have been incredible at the time our organization was founded. Imagine the reaction of the founders of our society if they could walk onto one of our modern operating theaters and witness the proficient and safe performance of open cardiac operations. Billroth, who in 1881 stated that a surgeon who would attempt an operation on the heart would lose the respect of his colleagues, would be completely disillusioned today, as would even Rehn, who first successfully sutured a cardiac wound in 1896. Trendelenburg, who first suggested pulmonary embolectomy in 1908, and Kirschner, who first successfully performed this operation in 1924, would not have been able to comprehend radical, complete removal of extensive pulmonary embolization with use of extracorporeal circulation.

Although medical advances have been unprecedented during the 61 years of our society's existence, it is probably safe to predict that in the next 60 years these will seem trivial by comparison with what will be accomplished. Infections, which previously took such a toll of lives, now represent little or no problem at all, and in spite of the fact that the incidence of cancer is increasing, largely because of certain carcinogens and an increase in longevity, great strides are rapidly being made to control this dreaded disease. With the increasing feasibility of transplantation of viscera, it seems reasonable to predict that degenerative processes will be corrected by replacement, and the medical profession will keep pace with the great technological advances throughout the world.

The medical profession, however, is beginning to assume an additional role aside from prevention and correction of disease. It is becoming increasingly more imperative that the physician take an active part in the civic and political affairs of his community and Nation, and because of his peculiarly strategic position, his role in this regard is particularly important. It is becoming more and more urgent that we of the medical profession take an active part in the selection of our Government officials if world peace is to be preserved.

The civilized world has been subjected to the ravages of two world wars within the last 50 years, both of which prohibited the convening of our congresses during the war years. Although many lives were uselessly lost and much damage was done by these devastating hostilities, recovery and rehabilitation have, until now, been possible. However, never before has there existed such global unrest as there is today, and it is terrifying to imagine the horrible consequences of a thermonuclear war. Prevention of war and maintenance of peace, although always desirable, now have become obligatory if civilization is to be preserved.

The various governments and their diplomatic representatives are urgently striving to maintain peace, but they are often hindered in their efforts because of the distrust of the negotiating representatives. This is probably due largely to adverse propaganda and lack of proper communications, the latter not being facilitated because of protocol. Apparent misunderstandings usually disappear and barriers, generally artificial, are removed when free communication is estabished between individuals and nations.

Medicine has no barriers; physicians throughout the world understand each other, although they may speak different tongues. Even though he has had no previous contact, a physician can immediately establish communications with physicians in other countries throughout the world without difficulty. In no other branch of endeavor is there such free exchange of information, because all physicians are dedicated to the maintenance and improvement of the health of the people of their respective nations. All physicians share the same problems because, although the economic and diplomatic affairs in India and Argentina may differ widely, the people of these two countries are subject to the same illnesses, with perhaps some geographic variations. Malignant disease strikes the people of both nations with equal intensity and, although the therapy used might vary slightly, the principles are the same.

The fact that we are all assembled here today for this 20th Congress of the International Society of Surgery will do much to foster better international relations, in addition to the obvious advantage of interchange of scientific information. However, is this enough? Because of the intensity of global unrest, have not we, the oldest, the most venerable, and the most respected international surgical society, the obligation to do more? Every citizen of our respective countries should do everything he can to improve international relations and relieve world tension, but for none is the opportunity so great as it is for the physician, and with the opportunity goes an obligation.

The International Federation of Surgical Colleges, is sponsoring exchange of surgical scholars which is, indeed, laudatory, and should prove most fruitful. This idea should be encouraged and expanded.

For some time I have thought that if the various countries would send representatives to the annual or biannual national medical meetings throughout the world, much could be achieved toward international peace, because a large number of representative physicians of the host country could be influenced by learning to know and appreciate the ideals of the visiting physicians. Also, the visiting physicians would learn to know and appreciate their colleagues and the other people of the host nation. The obvious advantage of this is that much could be accomplished within a short period of time. Some may question whether the International Society of Surgery should concern itself with such a movement, but I believe that we should take the initiative in such a project because surgeons are much more likely to be "men of action" than are other physicians. The surgeon is trained to think and act quickly and decisively. I would hope that we would authorize establishment of a committee to investigate the feasibility of such a plan and to devise a method for its implementation. As Napoleon I succinctly stated in 1807: "If they want peace, nations should avoid the pin pricks that precede the cannon shots."

United States in Space—Now Is the Time To Move Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an excellent article by Roscoe Drummond entitled "United States in Space: Now Is the Time To Move Ahead" which appeared in the October 30 issue of the Washington Post.

The theme of Mr. Drummond's article is that we should not make the mistake of allowing Khrushchev to determine the size of the U.S. space program.

I heartily agree with the conclusions reached in Mr. Drummond's article that this is no time for the United States to slow down with its lunar program but, as a matter of fact, is the best time for us to move ahead.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES IN SPACE—NOW IS THE TIME TO MOVE AHEAD

(By Roscoe Drummond)

We should not make the mistake of allowing Nikita Khrushchev to determine the size of the U.S. space program.

This is a pitfall to be avoided at all costs.

Mr. Khrushchev and the Kremlin may well decide what is the national interest of the Soviet Union, but we ought not to let him decide what is in the national interest of the United States.

There may be compelling reasons for the Soviet Premier to conclude that "at the present time" it is impractical for Russia to plan a manned flight to the moon.

There is no compelling reason why Congress should be guided by Mr. K's apparent withdrawal.

The first impact of the Khrushchev let's-slow-up interview is that this offers a good opportunity for the United States to slow up, too.

I suggest that what is most needed are not second thoughts on the wisdom of the space program but second thoughts on the wisdom of Mr. Khrushchev's lead.

Mr. K. is hardly a reliable source for what is good for the United States. My thought would be that we should neither accept his advice nor reject his advice; just ignore it.

Further, there is no assurance whatsoever that the Kremlin's announced withdrawal from the moon race will stick. The Kremlin's decision not to do something today does not mean it will not do it tomorrow.

Finally—and this goes to the heart of the matter—the overriding reason to keep NASA dynamically at its job and in high gear is not to beat the Soviets to the moon but to achieve preeminence for the United States in the mastery of outer space.

It was preeminence on the seas which gave Britain its unmatchable ascendency for a hundred years.

It was Allied preeminence in the air which guaranteed Allied victory in World War II against Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini.

If for any reason, whether through lethargy, trickery or indifference, we concede preeminence to the Soviet Union on the way too the other planets, we will be conceding preeminence to the Soviet Union on this planet. If we do not make it our priority objective to achieve mastery of outer space, we will not be first to the moon, we will not be first in space, and the time will come when we will not be first on earth. Then the problem of the other unfinished business on the agenda of a better peace will really be secondary; then the unfinished business will be survival under the worst of all conditions.

I am not talking about denying the highways of outer space to any other nation, including the Soviets. I am talking about making sure that no other nation shall be allowed to deny the highways of outer space to the United States.

Naturally we must leave it to the consensus of the scientists and the technicians to decide whether the manned flight to the moon is the best way and the urgent next step to insure preeminence in outer space. The controlling and compelling objective is not a manned landing on the moon for its own sake, but the achievement of mastery of the element of outer space for all that it will mean to the kind of earth we will inhabit for a long time to come.

Mr. Khrushchev says let's slow down. Isn't this the best time to move ahead?

Willis H. Warner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, word was received by my office here in Washington yesterday that Orange County has just lost its No. 1 citizen. Willis H. Warner, Sr., has long carried the sobriquet of Mr. Orange County. He served on the board of supervisors for over 25 years and was chairman of that body longer than any other man.

Willis was steeped in the history and early development of the county, leaving a hardware business in Huntington Beach to dedicate himself to a life of public service. During the difficult years of transition spanning the 1950's Willis Warner more than any one man was a stabilizing, constructive influence in extending the vital services needed to bridge the gap between a rural agricultural community, of some 200,000-plus population, and the vigorous and varied complex of industry, commerce, agriculture in a mixed population of over 1 million which now exists.

There are those who felt at times that Supervisor Warner relied more heavily on anchor than he did on sail when the winds of change blew most strongly. The strong and stable growth, the balance of the economy and the continuing bright prospects for the future should sufficiently confound his detractors.

I feel a sense of deep personal loss with the passing of Willis Warner. From the time I first served as president of the chamber of commerce for Westminster, Calif., I have had the wisdom of his counsel. As a practicing lawyer involved in matters of dispute brought before the board of supervisors, I have had his sympathetic and judicial consideration. As a State representative, I enjoyed his ready cooperation and a share of the wealth of knowledge on county affairs which was so uniquely his.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to his family, and the legion of those within Orange County that call him friend, my sincere expression of sympathy and regret.

Rightwing Reactionaries Busy in Local Election Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are interested in the local and State election contests throughout the Nation next Tuesday. Every Member knows that any strong political trend that becomes evident will have an impact on legislation before the Congress, as well as on the important elections in 1964.

What will be most interesting to watch will be the activities of rightwing extremists who are increasing their influence and power in the Republican Party throughout the Nation.

On a national level the extremists seek to create confusion, suspicion and distrust of representative government. They seek to picture our high courts, the Congress and the President as enemies of the people. On a local level where these extremists have infiltrated civic organizations, luncheon clubs, schools and churches, they seek to brand Democrats as immoral, dishonest, corrupt, and disloyal.

It is not difficult to see the connection between these local contests and the controversial legislation now before the Congress.

Republican leaders tell the people that national issues are not involved in local campaigns but among themselves they talk differently. The presence of Verne Stephens in my district, sent there from Washington Republican headquarters, is further evidence of the real GOP objective.

An editorial in a recent issue of the New Era, a Reading weekly publication, quotes a former Congressman in proving this point:

THE TOTAL PURPOSE

"We want people to become aware of our total purpose. We are not merely anti-Communist."

Those words, spoken by former Congressman John H. Rousselot, is probably one of the frankest and most honest statements ever made concerning the true goal of the Nation's extreme rightist organization, the John Birch Society.

Ex-Congressman Rousselot is the Birch Society's Western States' governor and consequently knows whereof he speaks when he says that his secret organization has a total purpose which is not confined to fighting communism.

The total purpose is finding expression in the local elections of Reading and Berks County where rightist thinkers are now running the Republican Party.

Total purpose, as applied to the John Birch Society, includes such radical proposals as doing away with social security; repealing the Federal income tax and thereby destroying the American concept of taxation according to one's ability to pay; withdrawing from the United Nations; and opposition to virtually every kind of Federal aid program beneficial to the people.

A victory for the Republican John Birchers would place corporation lawyers and big businessmen in control of city hall and the court house.

These are the same people who are promoting adoption of right-to-work legislation in Pennsylvania—legislation which would weaken or destroy most legitimate labor unions. Right-to-work laws are a form of compulsory helplessness" for workers because all forms of union security would be wiped out and employees would be helpless prey.

So here is the big link. You have big business, John Birchers, right-to-workers, antilaborites and ultrarightwingers, all joining forces in an attempt to capture the city and county in the name of Republicanism.

Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks many fine tributes were paid to the memory of Senator Estes Kefauver by Members of the House and Senate and by citizens from all over the Nation.

He has been recognized as one of the truly great men of our time. He was courageous, honest, able and dedicated. As one who was closely associated with the Senator from Tennessee I remember quite well how he was frequently the target of smears from the extreme right because of his untiring efforts for social justice, and for enactment of liberal and progressive legislation.

He was the Nation's most outstanding leader in the fight against organized crime and corruption. Yet the groups which are now pouring money into local campaigns under the pretense of fighting crime and corruption, are the same financial interests which poured gigantic sums into Tennessee to defeat Senator Kefauver in his last reelection campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include with my remarks the following articles which illustrate further the well-financed and well-organized drive of the right-wing Republicans to block social reform and national progress:

[From the Typographical Journal, June 1963]

WHAT IS THE RIGHT AND WHY IS IT WRONG?

No single definition fully encompasses the rightwing. It could be called a flock of maiden antis. But this would portray only a crowd of busybodies harmlessly nosing about in everyone's affairs. The rightwing is much more than that. It is dedicated, determined, and dangerous. It has money, manpower, and militancy.

Rightwingers basically are againsters. They set out a whole smorgasbord of spites. They fire salvos of propaganda bombarding individuals and institutons they fear and mistrust. What they are for—what positive proposals they advance—is as clear as London fog. For example, most of them would destroy the social welfare programs which cushion the hardships of old age or unemployment. Yet, they offer no alternative solution.

They package their programs in the red, white, and blue of anticommunism, but theirs is an anticommunism which weakens democracy by showering suspicion on democratic institutions and responsible leaders. They are united by a shared vision of a vast internal Communist threat. In this nightmare, they see themselves as the forces of good combating hordes of evildoers or dupes.

Let's look at the rightwing's priority list of againstisms, bearing in mind that not all extremist groups advocate the entire list, but some do, and almost all espouse most of it.

1. They are against labor unions. Along with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and National Association of Manufacturers, they would begin by enforcing a national open shop law and would clamp unions under antitrust law restrictions.

They talk in terms of right to work and free enterprise. What they really want is to butcher collective bargaining. They yearn to turn back the clock to the days when the individual worker was at the complete mercy of his employer. They deplore a system which permits workers, through their unions, to sit at a table on a par with employers and bargain over wages and job conditions. They want it ended.

2. They are against Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court. They want his head. They want him impeached (some want to impeach all nine Justices) because they claim absurdly "more than 33 decisions" by the Supreme Court under Warren's leadership "favored the Communist cause."

The decisions right-wingers attack actually defend the basic liberties of all Americans: freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of association, freedom of equal access to public facilities, transportation, and schools.

They practice a clever form of geographical selection. In the south, the rightists exploit racism and assail the school desegregation decision. Elsewhere they beset decisions which have protected citizens from unfair court punishment or congressional harassment on political grounds.

3. They are against what they call "big Government." By this, they mean strong Central Government. They mouth the word "Washington" as if they were chewing lemons. They say Washington usurps States rights, individual rights and (this is when they howl loudest) corporate rights. What they are really against are the laws which protect the jaws of the weak against the fists of the strong.

4. They are against a truly free public school system which introduces students to new ideas and different viewpoints. They claim our schools "brainwash" our children into communism. They fear and hate academic freedom just as they fear and hate free speech, and they want to crush it—because at heart they fear and hate the free democratic process.

They want to undermine the public school system—which organized labor has done so much to build up—and convert it into an indoctrination ground for future rightists. They succeed alarmingly in some areas by censoring textbooks, capturing school boards and parent-teachers' association, and gagging teachers through intimidation.

5. They are against the United Nations. They dredge up phony arguments and manufacture phony facts to show the U.N. is Communist dominated, which it isn't. They conveniently overlook the valiant peacekeeping function the U.N. has performed in many

world crises, the matchless contributions of U.N. special agencies to world health, agriculture, and education. They are blind to its unique value as a forum for all the nations of the world.

6. They are against any efforts to negotiate a just and lasting peace. They are the warwhoopers who belittle our Government's attempts to reduce world tensions. Civilian rightwingers are backstopped by a pool of retired admirals and generals who, from their armchairs, savagely second-guess political leaders.

It is the rightwingers who have tried to force the choice between Red and dead, refusing to acknowledge that Americans can endure alive and free.

AGAINSTERS

Mr. Speaker, Senator CLAIRE ENGLE, of California, in discussing these extremists in a San Francisco speech said:

They are sowing distrust for all American institutions—its schools, its courts, its government.

What do they stand for? They stand for nothing. They are against everything. They accuse everyone who disagrees with their brand of "Americanism" of being a Communist. They want to wreck the integrity of the Supreme Court. They want to destroy the American trade union movement. They stir resentment against our participation in the United Nations. They damn our tried and true social security system, as socialism. They want the income tax repealed. They villify the foreign-born and minority group Americans. They spread seeds of suspicion everywhere. They breed contempt for fellow humans and contempt for authority.

And they do this insidious work wearing masks of respectibility and labels of super patriotism.

PATRIOTISM

Mr. Speaker, the South Omaha Sun had this to say about patriotism.

Patriotism is not—as some seem to think—a matter of proclaiming one's own adoration of the flag while derogating that of one's fellow citizens. The true patriot doesn't wear his stars and stripes upon his sleeve; he doesn't say—or think—that he and he alone, or his group and his group alone, is the only reliable keeper of the sacred flame. Patriotism is of the deed, not merely the word; of attitudes, not attitudinizing; of a healthy discontent with things as they are and a resolve to do better, not the smug refusal to countenance criticism or change, not standing pat on dogma, not sitting tight on the status quo.

Patriotism, in short, is of the heart and mind, not the lungs, and so far as we can see, the hearts and minds of the American people are sound.

OSES Boss Riley Admits He Suspected Falsification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the falsification of records in the Cleveland office of the Ohio Employment Service should be sufficient grounds for a nationwide investigation of the employment service.

In the second series of articles from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which I include with my remarks today, the former district director states that falsification of the number of persons placed has "been the pattern everywhere else since about 1930."

This is a scandalous situation, and it means that thousands of the unemployed have been taken out of the active availability files of State employment services even though they had not found work, simply to make the records look good.

The second series of articles follows:

OSES BOSS RILEY ADMITS HE SUSPECTED FALSIFICATION

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Ward A. Riley suspected falsification of records in the Cleveland office of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES) but made no attempt to ferret it out.

Riley conceded this in an interview with the Plain Dealer. Until June 1 he was district manager of OSES in Cleveland and had charge of several bureau offices there as well as one in Painesville and one in Chardon.

Riley, 53, was a career man in government. He speaks bluntly and has a reputation as a competent and aggressive official.

He was questioned by this reporter about evidence of falsification uncovered by State investigators. Phony records at OSES indicated that jobs had been found for unemployed persons. Actually in these cases the applicants were still out of work. The records were falsified apparently to justify jobs for the OSES staff.

Here is the substance of the interview:

Question. Did you know about the falsification?

Answer. You'll find that in every employment office in the country. They do it in Chicago, Pittsburgh and Podunk—I don't care where it is. It applies not just to Cleveland but from Maine to California.

Question. Why would Government workers lie like this?

Answer. I don't understand it, either. It doesn't make a darned bit of sense, since they don't get any extra salary for it. But some civil service people are like that. It's a lot easier for them to take a hire than to make three or four phone calls to find out whether the applicant was really hired.

Question. Then you suspected it was happening in your office, too?

Answer. Well, it's been the pattern everywhere else since about 1930.

Question. Isn't that bad?

Answer. Yes, it could be. When we fake a hire, the applicant's card goes in the inactive file.

Question. That's bad enough, isn't it?

Answer. Sure it is.

Question. Did you ever try to get evidence?

Answer. No. I don't know what Leo Moss (Riley's deputy) or my office managers tried to do. I suggest you ask them. They should watch that sort of thing.

Question. Didn't you feel responsible as district manager?

Answer. I had every confidence in the world in Leo Moss and the managers running the offices. I expected them to check where necessary.

Question. Do you feel they let you down?

Answer. No, sir.

Question. Well, a lot of faking has been found.

Answer. They'd find it in any office.

Question. Did you ever get any tips about this?

Answer. No, sir. I was spending 99 percent of my time attending civic meetings and doing promotional work and on job development projects. I didn't have time to worry about whether Mary Lou took a hire that she wasn't entitled to.

Question. If you suspected this might be going on, what did you consider to be a tolerable limit of falsification?

Answer. I had no evidence of any falsification.

Question. Yes, but you suspected it. Therefore, did you discount any part of the job placement reports you received?

Answer. No.

Question. How could you know how correct those reports were?

Answer. I never did.

Question. Yet you made releases on them for the newspapers and sent the reports to Columbus?

Answer. Yes.

Question. But you didn't have full confidence in them?

Answer. Yes, I did.

Question. Couldn't you have initiated the same investigation that State authorities did?

Answer. You bet I could. And I would have done it a heck of a lot more efficiently and less expensively.

Question. So why didn't you do it?

Answer. I was never asked to do it.

Question. Did you ever issue orders to falsify reports?

Answer. I emphatically deny that.

Question. No matter how many people accuse you of it?

Answer. Anyone who does is a liar. I can't be any plainer. This faking was of no advantage to me—it didn't mean any money in my pocket or in anyone else's. My salary stays the same.

Question. Did you ever set any quotas for hires that your subordinates had to meet?

Answer. Never.

Question. Many of them speak about quotas in their affidavits. How would they get the idea?

Answer. They're wrong if they had that impression. I don't know how they got it.

Question. Do you think they might have faked out of fear they'd lose their jobs if they couldn't show placements?

Answer. The number of job placements had absolutely nothing to do with the size of the agency staff. We were staffed according to a formula that had nothing to do with placement.

Question. Well, then, a lot of your subordinates were laboring under a false notion.

Answer. They didn't get it from me.

(Strictly speaking, staffing is not related to placements. But it is also true that Columbus measures individual performance in terms of the number of placements.)

Riley concluded: "I would have fired anyone that I caught faking. But I want it known that we had the best employment service in the whole country when I left there June 1."

EX-OFFICIALS COMMENT ON EXPOSÉ

COLUMBUS.—The public employment falsification in Cleveland prompts this reaction from three former high-ranking officials:

Prentice S. Woodhouse: "I can't understand how so many of my people could have been faking records without someone tipping me off."

Mrs. Arline M. Wolf: "I didn't tell anyone to falsify records. But I received some innuendoes and passed them on. We knew what the score was."

Lewis M. Page: "I'm sorry, but I can't answer your questions. You'll have to check with our press relations office."

Woodhouse was manager of the clerical and professional division in the Cleveland area office of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES). Page was his job placement supervisor. Mrs. Wolf headed the salesmen section.

All three were reassigned after the falsifications were uncovered, Woodhouse and Page being demoted one grade in the civil service. They were not accused of participating in the

falsifications. Mrs. Wolf was so accused by many of her subordinates.

Here is what Woodhouse and Mrs. Wolf said when The Plain Dealer asked them for an explanation:

Woodhouse: "I don't believe I was derelict in not knowing about this because I don't see how I could have known.

"On the contrary, my office was given a clean bill in March, just a couple of months before this thing broke. A check was made by Federal and State people after they received an anonymous letter at that time, and they found no frauds.

"Sometime before that, even, Mr. Page and I checked the work of one of our men because of a complaint he had been faking. We found nothing to bear that out.

"My superiors said I should have become suspicious because of an unusual pickup in office work at the end of May. Well, the end of a month is always our busiest time.

"I have to take the word of the people working for me. The only way I could have found faking would have been to conduct the kind of investigation that Columbus made. But I had no reason to. Nc one told me about this latest tip that came in."

Mrs. Wolf: "Mr. Riley (Ward A. Riley, former OSES district manager in Cleveland) was trying to justify a large staff. If it came from a source beyond him, I don't know that.

"He didn't tell me to falsify. He didn't use that terminology, but there were innuendoes. He said: 'You know how to do this,' and I understood him. I've known him a long time.

"No, I didn't tell anyone to fake records. Emphatically no. But I did say one thing that may have caused it.

"I said: 'Unless job placements are made, there will be cutbacks in our staff.' I realize now that the staff was frightened. I shouldn't have said that.

"Another thing. My staff overheard talks between Mr. Riley and me, and they heard the same innuendoes. I read them the notes I took at a May staff meeting with Mr. Riley, and they must have got the drift.

"I don't feel that I was responsible or that I was at fault. We were running a costly department, and it was heavily staffed. This whole thing was a vicious circle."

State investigators reported they were told by Mrs. Wolf on July 23 that Riley ordered her after the elections last fall "to make a good showing on placements, by falsifying records if necessary."

MADE GOOD SHOWING: EVEN CRITICS PRAISE RILEY'S GOOD POINTS

COLUMBUS.—Ward A. Riley has the respect of one of his most important critics.

"I'll say this for him," says Willard P. Dudley. "I wasn't satisfied with his work generally. But he certainly shows a lot of personal resourcefulness and promotes himself well."

Dudley, a Republican, is State administrator of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, which includes the Ohio State Employment Service. Riley, a Democrat, was district manager of that office in Cuyahoga, Lake, and Geauga Counties.

He lost that job, which paid him $820 a month, when Dudley abolished the position of district manager in Ohio, explaining that it was "a needless layer" of supervision interposed between him and local offices in the cities.

Most of the district managers were reassigned by Dudley, but no new post was offered Riley. Dudley made up his mind to discontinue Riley's services even before he received an anonymous tip about falsification of records in the Cleveland office.

Riley told the Plain Dealer that he and a brother own electronic schools in Youngstown, Gary, Indianapolis, and Erie, Pa.

In addition, he said, he is at work on a project to standardize training programs for electronic engineers on behalf of that industry.

Riley is married and lives at 751 Warwick Drive, Sheffield Lake, Lorain County. He was born in Ellenboro, W. Va., April 26, 1910, and came to Cleveland as a young man. While serving as a machinist apprentice he attended Cleveland College and Fenn College at night.

He began his connection with public employment agencies in 1931, working his way up from a post as job interviewer. He served in Cleveland and Lorain.

He interrupted this career to take executive positions in northeast Ohio with the War Manpower Commission and National Housing Administration. He also ran his own employment service at one time.

In 1961, while heading OSES in Lorain, he was promoted to the district managership in Cleveland.

Riley is active in civic affairs in his home community. He was chairman of the Mayor's Housing Committee there, a director of the Lorain County Postwar Planning Committee and a board member of the Cleveland Area Heart Fund.

The ABC's of the Russian Wheat Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent editorial appeared in the Kansas City Star on Thursday, October 17:

[From the Kansas City Star, Oct. 17, 1963]

THE ABC'S OF THE RUSSIAN WHEAT DEAL

Several writers to the Public Mind column recently have reflected the rather widespread feeling that the sale of wheat to Russia is a form of aid. Just to keep the record straight we reiterate the main premise of the wheat deal. It is strictly business. The Government simply gave private business authority to sell wheat which is now in storage.

Private business can't afford to give away anything. It sells to make a profit. A business deal is possible only where it appears to help both parties. The Russians need wheat and apparently they think it is worth the price.

While the deal on this side is private business, the United States stands to gain from a reduction in the huge surplus. Until the surplus can be reduced to reasonable size it is bound to depress the prices offered farmers in the marketplace.

To a large degree the criticisms come from the idea that trade with the Russians is either dangerous or wicked. On this view we will recall that when Josef Stalin set up barriers to normal relations between countries, Winston Churchill charged him with raising an Iron Curtain. We can understand the emotions of people who oppose all trade with Russia but, in effect, they propose that the United States should raise its own Iron Curtain for the long future.

As the world revolves under the black shadow of atomic destructive power it must cling to the hope for eventual peace. Short of obliteration by war a settled peace can come only with a gradual reduction in the tensions that rise with deadly threat in every crisis. And the reduction in tensions can come only with communication (including trade) between peoples. There is no hope in iron curtains.

Statistics on Job Vacancies Called an Important Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1963, the Joint Economic Committee's Economic Statistics Subcommittee was privileged to hear testimony presented by Martin R. Gainsbrugh, vice president and chief economist of the National Industrial Conference Board on the subject of "Job Vacancies and Labor Demand."

In commenting upon the recommendations of the President's Committee To Appraise Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Mr. Gainsbrugh emphasized that today's measures of employment and unemployment are increasingly inadequate in the context of rapid technological change. He pointed out:

> We lack a feedback mechanism whereby the requirements of the new technology are reflected in organized knowledge about the demand for specific types of labor in the industries and geographic areas where technological advance is particularly pronounced.

Mr. Gainsbrugh stressed the point that existing data already show that severe shortages of certain skills occur even in areas where chronic unemployment is the norm. As he states:

> This further underscores the need for vacancy data on what kinds of jobs are available, as well as where they are.

As a possible solution to this shortage of statistics, he suggests a nongovernmental research organization should measure the volume and character of unfilled jobs in a particular area and relate it to an index of help-wanted advertisements and job vacancies registered with the State employment services. When a process such as this is perfected, it could be turned over to the Government for official use on a national scale.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony of Mr. Gainsbrugh represents a valuable contribution to the improvement of our employment and unemployment statistics. As the nature and requirements of our labor force change to meet the demands of a technological society, the means of measuring labor supply and demand must also change. Because of its timeliness, I insert, under unanimous consent, Mr. Gainsbrugh's testimony before the Economic Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee on June 6, 1963, in the RECORD at this point:

JOB VACANCIES AND LABOR DEMAND

(By Martin R. Gainsbrugh)

I was asked to deal with the strong recommendations made by our committee[1] for

[1] See "Measuring Employment and Unemployment," President's Committee to Appraise Employment and Unemployment Statistics (ch. VIII, pp. 199–205).

the collection of data on the availability of jobs and occupational statistics. Before doing so, however, I would like to comment briefly on one facet of unemployment our committee did not explore, and rightly so, since its charter did not specifically embrace this aspect of the problem. I refer here to the nature and attitude of the unemployed, an area which your subcommittee last year identified as "the most serious gap in our knowledge of unemployment."

We as a committee did not address ourselves to the amount and type of labor resources that remain unused at the option of the unemployed worker. In the chapter dealing with international comparisons, however, we did indicate that in the United States "the rate of unemployment is affected by the degree of option a worker can exercise in choosing to remain unemployed rather than to continue to work at unsatisfactory rates of pay or hours. 'From this point of view,' the Bureau of Labor Statistics observes, 'the relatively high wages of American workers facilitate voluntary job changes that may involve a period of unemployment, and permit laid-off workers to hold out for jobs in which they can use acquired skills and maintain their customary wage. The unemployed European worker, whose hourly wage when employed is perhaps one third to one fourth that of the American, may be pressed to find a job relatively soon, even if it means abandoning his trade and taking a cut in pay.' The Japanese worker often cannot afford to remain unemployed and accordingly continues to lower the supply price for labor until the market is cleared. * * * With high and increasing levels of wages and unemployment insurance come greater options on the part of the displaced worker as to the terms of his reemployment."

Judging from my own personal experience and criticisms that have been leveled at our report by those who do not know how narrow the charter of the report was, American businessmen are still largely awaiting information on how much of our unemployment is optional. I would commend this for further research by this subcommittee.

Our committee report emphasized that while broad measures of employment and unemployment may have been sufficient at an earlier time, they are increasingly inadequate in the context of today's rapidity of technological change.

We lack a feedback mechanism whereby the requirements of the new technology are reflected in organized knowledge about the demand for specific types of labor in the industries and geographic areas where technological advance is particularly pronounced. As the rate of technological innovation speeds up, we will need more knowledge of the job opportunities that are being created thereby as well as the overemphasized data on jobs lost.

Your subcommittee noted in the report entitled, "Employment and Unemployment," the need for more data to "illuminate the demand side of the labor market in the way the present series measures the supply of labor." Our committee built upon this in its recommendation that the Labor Department undertake the development of a program of job vacancies.

We are eargerly awaiting the initial results from the proposed research program. Meanwhile, it might be of value to take another look at the data on job openings collected by the State employment security agencies, especially after they gain further experience under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

As a contribution in the direction of obtaining more information on job vacancies, the conference board is currently revising its help-wanted advertising index. Initially, interest in this index centered upon its use as a business indicator. Now we are exploring its possibilities of contributing to our understanding of the demand side of the local labor-market equation.

At present we obtain help-wanted data from newspapers in 33 labor-market areas. This we now plan to expand to cover 52 labor-market areas—practically all of the areas with a labor force of 150,000 or more. By expanding the sample in each region we will obtain vacancy data from areas accounting for about 60 percent of nonfarm employment in the Northeast and West, about 50 percent of nonfarm employment in the North Central region, and about 35 percent of nonfarm employment in the South. We shall thus have much more information than heretofore on the changes that are developing in the demand for labor locally and can begin to match the local demand pattern against the measures of local labor supply. From this information we can determine whether unemployment is rising concurrently with greater demand for labor or the converse. Lacking such measures, we can neither confirm nor deny the contention voiced in some quarters that the total available jobs today may match if not exceed the total number unemployed.

Our present sample of 33 areas does provide some insight into this relationship between labor demand and supply locally. For example, six of the seven surplus labor-market areas included in our sample show substantially less help-wanted advertising than they did in the mid-50's. A priori, one would expect such a relationship. But in the case of Providence the rate of increase in help-wanted ads is well above the national average but so, too, is its unemployment rate. Again, the correlation is not too close for the 25 areas which fall in the C category (3- to 6-percent unemployment rate). Once we have expanded the sample, however, we shall investigate this subject further, in an attempt to see how much parallel movement there is between unfilled jobs and unemployed workers in different areas.

The existing body of data already highlights the fact that severe shortages of certain types of skills can occur even in areas where chronic unemployment is the norm. This further underscores the need for vacancy data on what kinds of jobs are available as well as where they are. Our educational authorities, too, if they are to make reasonable long-term plans for training (or retraining) programs, must receive data on labor demand which will permit them to evaluate the impact of automation and of other technological changes and shifts in demand on the occupational structure of the labor force. The intense pressures upon the Nation's educational plant make it imperative that such plant be utilized as efficiently as possible in terms of the product mix of demand, particularly in the local labor market. Organized information on present job vacancies would help in this connection—as would expectational measures similar to those developed for capital spending plans.

In summary, our rapidly changing technology is accelerating change in the labor market, and this creates a new need for current measures of labor demand. This point is recognized at least implicitly in our prevailing system of economic intelligence, but the emphasis is still primarily upon the negative aspects of the problem, namely, on the unemployment statistics. Technology's main thrust over the longer run is toward expansion of employment rather than displacement. Labor-market experts can contribute toward easing short-run disemployment by providing expanded information on present (and potential) employment demand and thereby helping to maximize the creative impact of technology on our economy.

Comparison of unemployment and help-wanted advertising, 33 selected areas, March 1963

	Cities	Labor market category	Unemployment rate (in order of severity)	Help-wanted, index 1957=100
1	Pittsburgh	E	9.4	74.2
2	Providence	D	8.2	130.9
3	Youngstown	D	7.8	78.7
4	San Diego	D	7.8	95.4
5	Philadelphia	D	7.3	96.1
6	Kansas City	C	6.1	97.6
7	Detroit	D	6.0	80.7
8	Los Angeles	C	5.9	129.9
9	Baltimore	C	5.8	93.5
10	New York	C	5.8	116.6
11	New Orleans	D	5.8	78.2
12	Seattle	C	5.7	85.3
13	San Francisco	C	5.6	110.0
14	Albany	C	5.5	107.6
15	Cleveland	C	5.5	90.4
16	Louisville	C	5.5	104.2
17	San Antonio	C	5.5	110.0
18	Birmingham	D	5.4	93.8
19	St. Louis	C	5.4	101.1
20	Boston	C	5.2	111.6
21	Knoxville	C	5.2	90.0
22	Chicago	C	5.0	75.2
23	Memphis	C	4.9	105.8
24	Cincinnati	C	4.8	75.2
25	Houston	C	4.5	110.0
26	Milwaukee	C	4.4	64.3
27	Salt Lake City	C	4.3	182.2
28	Indianapolis	C	4.3	105.2
29	Minneapolis	C	4.2	90.2
30	Nashville	C	4.1	141.7
31	Dallas	C	4.0	128.8
32	Atlanta	C	3.1	123.1
33	Washington, D.C.	B	2.6	111.2

Sources: Bureau of Employment Security; the Conference Board.

As an aside, may I mention that at our recent annual meeting a question was mooted as to whether comprehensive extension of automation may not create a demand for employees with little skill. It was argued that a vast crew may be required to perform routine maintenance and unskilled jobs such as replacing wornout transistors with new ones. Clearly such employees would not require much vocational education.

Sympathetic as one may be to the problems involved in measuring job vacancies, the present need for knowledge of the dimensions of labor demand calls for more rapid progress toward implementation than has thus far developed. Recognizing that Federal experimentation in this direction may be particularly hazardous—in that such data, even in tentative and preliminary form, may be regarded as official and, hence, to readily adopted for national policy purposes—I would venture to suggest experimentation with the collection of data at the local level under private auspices, hopefully with foundation support.

By way of illustration, a pilot survey might be undertaken (say) in the New York City area to measure the volume and character of unfilled jobs and to relate these measures to the combined index of help wanted advertising and jobs registered with the State employment service for the same area. This admittedly would be experimental but, properly conceived, it would also be developmental. Because of its experimental character such a project could best be carried out by a nongovernmental research organization. Once its feasibility is demonstrated and satisfactory techniques are established, the survey could then become the responsibility of a government office. Such experimental efforts three decades ago contributed to the subsequent development of the current reporting system on labor supply. The potential yield may be equally high for experimental measures of labor demand and job vacancies.

Canadians Will Not Be Bullied by Kennedy-Meany Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, not content with making a shambles of domestic policy and following a foreign policy which continually results in gains for the Soviet Union, President Kennedy now seems to be making a determined effort to wreck a United States-Canadian friendship which has been one of the most remarkable alliances for nearly two centuries.

President Kennedy's unholy alliance with American labor leaders in an effort to consolidate union votes has caused wholly unwarranted interference by this Government in a strictly internal labor affair in Canada. This effort is rightly resented by Canadians. The extent of their indignation and what it is doing to America's precious prestige is clearly outlined in an editorial from the October 19 issue of the Financial Post, Canada's national weekly of business, investment, and public affairs.

I include the editorial, "Kennedy to Meany to Hall to Banks," to warn my colleagues in Congress what danger lies ahead for the United States and its alliances in the unhealthy overambition of the Kennedys to rule. Unless it is sharply checked, and soon, the insatiable ambition of the Kennedy family may well lead to the ruin of not only the United States, but the whole free world which depends for its survival upon a free America.

KENNEDY TO MEANY TO HALL TO BANKS

President Kennedy wants to be reelected next year but Canadians don't like being a punching bag in his political warmup.

The American Government is busily engaged in trying to run the affairs of dozens of countries around the world. It wears the robes and halo of sanctity. It is on the side of "progress" or "democracy" or "freedom" or something that sounds good.

Certainly no responsible member of the Western Alliance will envy the most powerful nation on earth its responsibilities or deny its generosity or seriously criticize what the Americans stand for in the cold war.

But more and more the habit of pushing other people around is growing on the Kennedys and their clansmen in Washington.

This is frequently and amply demonstrated within the United States. Indeed, terrifying American citizens into behavior pleasing to the Kennedy's is currently the political sport of the President's brother the Attorney General.

Quite a few people and corporations who do not please the Kennedys are now finding that their current and past income tax returns are being reviewed.

And who is there who won't be intimidated by that, even if their income reports are all clean as a whistle? This Attorney General "discipline" is so intimidating, in fact, the U.S. news media don't write about it.

Now, with their bullying, strategy perfected at home, the Kennedys and their cohorts are using it to get what they want abroad.

Take the latest example of outrageous interference—the American pressure against the Canadian Government over the labor union war on the Great Lakes.

Belatedly, the Canadian Government stepped into this mess and the trustee scheme is about to be implemented.

But the spectacle of the White House and the U.S. Secretary of Labor and the whole weighty machinery of the U.S. Government being gassed up to tell the Canadian Government what it can and cannot do about a Canadian problem is, to say the least, unpleasant.

ALLIANCE, YES; HOLY, NO

Here is the cast of characters and here is the play.

Kennedy needs the labor union vote in his presidential contest next year. That means he needs the unqualified support of George Meany, the powerful head of the AFL-CIO.

Meany is shaky in his lucrative job. Quite a few big union leaders are gunning for him, notably Walter Reuther of the Auto Workers.

To protect his hide, Meany needs all the friends he can keep and so he will do anything to please Paul Hall, the very powerful international boss of the Seafarers Union.

Paul Hall, in turn, very much needs the support of Hal Banks—and the money Banks gets out of his Canadian union members.

So when the U.S. Secretary of Labor solemnly makes an official pilgrimage to Ottawa (nobody can recall that happening before) and when he makes public declarations telling the Canadian Government what to do, he is merely doing a chore for Kennedy who wants to do a favor for George Meany, who needs Hall, who needs the notorious Hal Banks.

From Mr. Kennedy's point of view, Canada is quite unimportant. It would, in most respects, be a lot simpler for the White House and the U.S. Government if we didn't exist at all as a separate country.

It is tragic that a man of such great endowments as Kennedy should, with increasing frequency, be revealed as having a serious defect of character. His intellect and conscience too often fail him in assessment of the appropriate and seemly exercise of power.

The proverb, "The end justifies the means" with the Kennedy clan too often becomes "The end justifies any means."

Hal Banks and John F. Kennedy will understand each other completely. As successful men, they have good reason to admire each other.

Both Banks and Kennedy are good at kicking people around. Canadians who have not taken the oath of allegiance to the White House and to the U.S. Congress have very good cause for extreme distaste.

Braceros Guaranteed More Than Domestics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Tuesday, October 22, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times. To those who contend that there is no correlation between our domestic agricultural workers and the bringing in of Mexican Nationals under Public Law 78, this article again points out very clearly the adverse effect felt by our American farmworkers:

BRACEROS GUARANTEED MORE THAN DOMESTICS

(By Ruben Salazar)

FIREBAUGH.—Stooping braceros picked pear tomatoes nearby as a $125-a-week "pusher" talked about a system which makes him a comfortable living but leaves a bad taste in his mouth.

"Of course, there aren't enough domestic workers to pick tomatoes," he said. "There's not enough idiots around, even in the sticks."

Farmwork has become so disreputable in our affluent society, he complained, that "I'm known as a 'pusher' now instead of a foreman as in the past."

Why is farmwork looked down upon?

"You see those braceros? The rate for picking those pear tomatoes is 25 cents a box. This crop isn't too good, so they're not picking more than 2½ or 3 boxes an hour.

HATE-FILLED BATTLE

"Say they work the usual 10 hours a day at this rate. They'd be making $32.50 to $37.50 a 5-day week. But because these men are braceros they're assured at least $1 an hour under international agreement.

"So they'll make at least $50 a 5-day week.

"Not the domestic, though. He's not protected by a minimum wage law and must pick this crop at 60 to 75 cents an hour. A domestic would make $32.50 to $37.50 a 5-day week on this crop—not $50 like the bracero.

"You see why the domestic will not pick these tomatoes?"

Around such arguments—and figures, of course, vary from field to field—revolve a bitter, hate-filled battle between big growers and labor unions.

But the fact remains that, unlike the bracero, domestic agricultural workers are not protected by a contract minimum. The wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act do not cover agriculture.

The Council of California Growers points out, however, that wages of California agricultural workers are the highest in the Nation and insists that braceros are not driving down domestic farm wages.

J. J. Miller, manager of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, a grower organization, says that if the agricultural workers' wages are low—and he'll debate that—it is because "the agricultural economy is not in a healthy or prosperous condition."

FARM INCOME DOWN

Testifying before the California Agricultural Labor Commission, Miller said:

"During the 10-year period between 1947 and 1957, farm wages rose 32 percent, which is approximately one-half the increase in industrial wages. But during this same period of time manufacturing income and profits rose more than 32 percent while farm income was decreasing, and the prices the farmers had to pay for all the goods and services he had to buy were increasing."

The farmer and his laborers, Miller continued, "are in the same economic boat."

"They are both victims of the depressed state of agriculture, but of the two, the laborer has fared better the past 10 years than the farmer. In that time farm wages have increased substantially while farm income has declined.

"The problem of employer-employee relations in agriculture is the problem of the farmer and of agriculture generally."

PROBLEM STILL UNSOLVED

"To try to raise the level of farm wages by organization, unionization, collective bargaining, political or economic pressure, does not solve the basic problem involved, but only aggravates it, and adds to the miseries and inequities already oppressing the American farmer."

Besides, says Miller, a "large segment of (agricultural) workers" believe "they are better off in farm work than in being herded like cattle and sheep into union corrals."

Speaking to domestic agricultural workers from Weedpatch to Stockton, a Times reporter-photographer team didn't find any noticeable enthusiasm for unionization.

Cesar Chavez, general director of the National Farm Workers union, says labor organizers are "aware of this apathy."

"But let's face it: Most agricultural workers are in the lowest educational level and don't even understand what unionization means," he said. "Many are Mexican immigrants who think joining a union could get them in trouble.

"We're now in the process of educating agricultural workers in the importance of organizing."

A member of the Emergency Committee To Aid Farm Workers added, "It cannot be denied that domestic agricultural workers have no protection at all.

"The bracero at least has a contract backed by international law," the member said, "but the domestic worker has nothing."

DESERVES PROTECTION

"Surely the domestic worker deserves some kind of protection so he can have guaranteed work for a specified period at a guaranteed minimum wage, plus transportation and housing—things which the bracero has now."

Al Green, director of the AFL-CIO agricultural workers' organizing committee, says that if there is a shortage of domestic farm workers it's because braceros are treated better than domestics.

But he denies that the labor shortage is anywhere near as acute as the farm lobby and the department of employment contend it is.

"There's no job that Americans won't do if they get paid for it," Green said. "The argument that braceros must be brought into the country because domestics won't do the work is ridiculous.

"How many braceros do you find working as floor layers, cement masons, roofers? What is worse than working as a roofer, with that hot tar stinking in your face all day, or cleaning out the sewers? But you find Americans doing this work, because they get paid well."

Address of Mayor Robert F. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the great mayor of the great city of New York, at a dinner of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in the city of New York on October 13, 1963, made an address that for its content is an outstanding statement which presents a serious problem affecting not alone my city but other large cities in the United States. It evidences great depth of feeling and understanding and I am pleased to include it as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ADDRESS OF MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT DINNER OF FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES

I am touched and honored to receive your award.

The mayor of New York, no matter who he may be, is not ordinarily in grave danger of having his head turned by too much praise. By the very nature of his job, he hears enough of the other to maintain a sense of balance. So I must say that I enjoy listening to a little counterpoint.

Very seriously, I only hope I continue to deserve your approval in the field of social concern for what might be termed the compassionate services of government.

My deep concern with these aspects of government result, I might say, from both environmental and hereditary factors. But almost anyone with a heart to feel and with eyes to see must understand the present need for these programs—and for much more than these programs—the need for the answers still undiscovered to the problems of the poor, the underprivileged, the deprived, and the human targets of discrimination.

At this point, let me tell you how pleased I was with your rather unique letter of invitation to this occasion, signed by your distinguished president, whom I am proud to claim as a friend, Irving Felt. This letter read somewhat as follows:

"You will be tempted," the letter said, "to make a speech in praise of the federation and all that it is trying to do."

Irving Felt was, of course, right. I was so tempted. The federation includes 116 agencies, many of whom are the top leaders in social services and welfare.

But your letter urged me to resist the temptation and the impulse to spend my time in congratulating you upon your achievements. Irving Felt wrote that although most of you would love to hear praise of your good deeds, you would much rather that I direct myself to some of the important issues and problems in social health and welfare that confront our city today.

So I will.

I know this is a sophisticated audience of serious-minded men and women. So my remarks will be designed not to please but to provoke your thoughts. Let me begin by emphasizing the deep feeling I know we all share for our city. We have reason to be proud of it and to be glad that we live and/or work in it. Just consider its wonderful multilingual, multicultured population. Consider its unexampled treasures in intellectual, social, cultural and natural resources. We are truly the metropolis of the world.

But New York City is no longer the richest community, per capita, in the United States. Today we are well down the list. In terms of the median wage for working men and women of this city, we have slipped substantially below the position of leadership we once held. One-fourth of our families have an income of $4,000 or less—and $4,000 is now considered the poverty line for families with children. Of course, this is, in part, the result of in-migration. But I am not going to try to analyze in detail the economic and demographic factors which have resulted in this situation. We do have a very robust, vibrant, tough and vital economy; and in this, we are more fortunate than many other cities, communities and areas in the country.

But we must not blink our eyes to the plain economic facts that we have a very great many people who live in the lower-income range, including a very substantial number who are poor to the point of grim privation.

Within the last decade there has migrated to our city a very great number—I have heard the figure of 2 million—who, to the extent that they are employed, fall into the lowest income ranges, and require outside support and assistance for either themselves or their families or both, so that they may maintain a bare minimal level of decent living.

Our city is a very great city, but its wonders are related to a great collection of problems. One of these is poverty in the immediate vicinity of great wealth. The most keenly felt poverty is that found in the shadow of relative luxury. The slums seem far worse immediately off Park and Lexington Avenues above 96th Street, than to the Lower East Side where there is no comparison with wealth. In all these as in other depressed and deteriorated neighborhoods of our city, the poor live together. Where they live, there are slums. And where there are slums, they live. Sometimes it works one way; sometimes it works the other.

In most of those areas—and I mean where the poor live—there is the highest incidence of juvenile delinquency, of narcotics addiction, of illegitimacy, of mental retardation, of theft and violence, of unemployment and also of anger, frustration, resentment, and hate.

I hasten to say that neighborhoods with such phenomena are to be found in every major city in America today—and New York City has been contending with these circumstances far more successfully than many other cities.

Thus, our crime rate per capita is well below that of most of the major cities of the country.

In these impoverished areas you can find unemployed as many as 30 percent of the out-of-school youth and as many as 20 percent of the adults.

Knock on almost any door and you will find heartbreak. But you will also find it in those same neighborhoods an ample number of families and individuals exemplifying the highest qualities of honesty, integrity, diligence, industry, and sacrifice, and the highest moral principles, living next door to the most depraved.

Many individuals and family units in these neighborhoods are the clients of public or private welfare agencies, and frequently both. I shudder to think what would happen to some of these families, and what would have happened to many, many others, if it had not been for the services of these agencies and the efforts of the individual social workers who have brought counsel and assistance to these individuals and families.

On the other hand, there is an increasing accumulation of circumstantial evidence raising grave doubt as to whether the fundamental answers to the problems presented by these areas and the people in them, are to be found in the current methods, approaches and resources of our social and welfare agencies.

I suggest to you and especially to the professionals in what I have called the compassionate services that now is the time to reexamine and revalue the basic assumptions, methods and approaches now being pursued to see whether they cannot somehow be put together in a somewhat different pattern or applied in different ways to yield greater results.

We all know that there are individuals who have been the recipients of one or another kind of public or private social welfare assistance, including public assistance all their lives, and likewise their mothers before them, and their mothers before them—the so-called second, third and fourth generation welfare clients.

I am not suggesting that to remedy the situation we ought to cut down on public welfare or on private agency efforts. I am not for letting the child suffer for the sins of the mother or the father—or forcing the helpless to shift for themselves. I myself put little stock in the easy complaint that we are coddling the disadvantaged. Those who take such a point of view are either naive or insensitive to human values. I see the matter in a far different light.

What we need is not to devote less of our resources to the solution of the problem, but more, and more effectively.

There is a hard-dollar cost for the efforts the city government has been making on the social front and I fear that we are approaching the limit of the amount that our local government can pay to contain the problems I have described.

For the current fiscal year our total expense budget is somewhat in excess of $3 billion. Of this vast sum of money, we are spending this year between $1 billion and $1¼ billion for social, health, and welfare purposes, in other words, for the expenses of the welfare department, the health department, the hospitals department, the youth board, and the component expenditures of many departments in special services for the poor, the sick, the weak, and the disadvantaged.

In addition to this, we are spending close to $800 million for education. So we are spending well over half of our budget for what might be called social welfare purposes plus education. If through the expenditure of this amount of money we were meeting the problem and making some headway against it, the price would be reasonable—in fact, it would be a bargain. But we must face the fact that the reverse is true. The problem is gaining headway against us, and we are at the outer limits of our present resources.

The question we must answer is: How can we provide more services with our present resources and how can we devote what new resources we can possibly secure to making real headway against our growing problems?

It is also a fact that a very great percentage of the budgets of most private agencies are today supplied by government through contracts, subcontracts, and grants, payments, and fees of various kinds. The relationship between public and private agencies, both fiscal and jurisdictional, needs to be reexamined.

Within recent years a new dynamic factor has been added to the situation. I refer to automation. This offspring of the marriage of science and technology at first held forth a bright promise of freeing the factory workers from the chain gangs of the assembly line. It was the assembly line that brought the unskilled workers from the hills and the cotton fields into industry. And automation was to free the factory hand from this new peonage. But alas, the effect of automation has been to condemn hundreds of thousands to unemployment and the welfare rolls.

I have heard John I. Snyder, the great pioneer industrialist in automation say that 40,000 jobs a week are being automated out of existence. This same Mr. Snyder has said, and I quote, "It is a myth that all those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money."

Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth of the University of Michigan asserts that there is a substantial amount of invisible unemployment in our country which is not even statistically recognized. These are people who have become discouraged even from looking for work. He thus puts total current unemployment in our country at 8.8 percent rather than the official figure of 6 percent.

Finally, within the last several years, still another explosive factor has made its appearance crossing all neighborhoods, city, and State lines. I refer to the uprising of the American Negro, who now stands before us in the center of the public arena, demanding full social, economic and political rights and justice—now. This social explosion is taking place side by side with the phenomenon of increasing unemployment and growing social and economic distress, and the general worsening of the running sore of poverty and disadvantage.

It is a fact that the gap between the living standards of the haves and the have-nots has widened in recent years. This is a major component of the fuel that inflames intergroup relations in our city.

It was at about the turn of the century that Samuel Gompers, the first president of the American Federation of Labor, said in militant tones, "We want more—now." Today the American Negro, imbued with the same and perhaps even a greater spirit of militancy, says, according to Martin Luther King, that "What the American Negro wants can be expressed in three words: All, here, and now."

It is in the light of this flaming spirit that we see, with special clarity, the need for a new forward surge in the treatment of the problems of those who, until recently, have been considered the concern only of the social worker.

Well, what shall we, in this city, do? In other words, what can we do that is within our powers and what shall we advocate that is within the range of reason and practicality?

I shall not pretent—nor is it required of me—to give you a full prescription to meet the situation, nor a full program to meet the problem. Instead, I submit for your consideration, and that of the public, some general approaches which, in my judgment, are necessary to start us along the way to successful programs.

First of all, we must bring to bear upon the complex of complex social problems the total arsenal of private and public resources, which must include neighborhood and community mobilization, the direct and vastly enlarged assistance of the Federal Government, and greatly increased assistance from the State government, too.

Above all, we must begin to treat the problems I have referred to, both separately and together, as related and not as separate ones.

There must be a much closer coordination of the economic and the social attack upon these problems. We must mount an all-out offensive—an all-out war—against poverty as well as against discrimination, and disadvantage.

The problem of unemployment and lack of skills among the unemployed, for instance, must be met by a coordinated Federal, State, and local effort on the vocational training front—spearheaded by neighborhood and community undertakings to motivate our young people to seek the training and to equip themselves to find a new and useful place in our economy.

Education and vocational training can and must be the atomic weapon—the Polaris missile—of our attack upon this phase of the problem. I have used this figure of speech advisedly. We must bring our educational and vocational training procedures and content up to date, and move them forward into the 7th decade of the 20th century. They are substantially behind that now.

We must seek the ways and means of providing sheltered work opportunities for young people who have never had the acquaintance with even the rudiments of work experience.

We must do much more and better than we have done before in encouraging community organizations and self-help with Government help.

We must do all this and do it soon.

With regard to money and fiscal ways and means, I believe that one change we must make is to enlarge the direct channels of communication and financial aid between the Federal Government and the localities.

To require that Federal aid to the localities be banked against the State government like a billiard ball, in order to reach local hands, introduces into the procedure just another handler, another jobber, and constitutes a source of delay and inefficiency.

The house is burning down. This is no time for an old-fashioned bucket brigade with the State government standing as a nonessential relay point in the process.

These are my rather scatter-shot proposals for action and progress. I know we must take action. We must make progress.

The forces against which we contend are dynamic. We must make headway against them, or we will lose momentum and the capacity to direct our force and forces against our real enemies: poverty, discrimination, ignorance, uselessness, hopelessness, frustration, hate, prejudice, and fear.

Against these enemies, we must sally forth, under bright and flying banners. Nor may we rest until our enemies are overcome.

John W. Higginson Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 2, 1963, our good friend, Officer John Higginson, will retire after 8 years of distinguished service as a member of the Capitol Police Force. We in the northeast corner of the Old House Office Building, will particularly miss John and the cheerful greetings in the morning that he extended to Congressmen and staffers alike.

Mr. Higginson has not only had a distinguished career on the Capitol Police Force but also as a member of the Fall River, Mass., police force which he served with for 29 years. Following his retirement from the Fall River Police Department in 1951, he came to Washington to be near his two children and his grandchildren and to go to work on the Capitol Police Force.

Throughout his life, John has been interested in the youth of America. In his native town of Fall River he has served as president of the Council of the Boy Scouts of America and has been a director of that organization for 15 years. As a member of the Scottish Rite Masonic Order, he also served as adviser to the Order of Demolay.

When World War I broke out, John enlisted in the Navy and served as a chief shipfitter until the end of the war. His interest in veterans' affairs has continued and he is an active member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I know that John Higginson's many friends on the Hill will join with me in extending our appreciation and gratitude for the fine friendly service that he has rendered while working at the Capitol, and to wish him many happy and successful years to come in the future.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Truth in Lending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the American consumer deserves to know just how much he is paying for the goods he buys. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] continues to present to Congress and the American public evidence of the need for legislation requiring disclosure of the true cost of goods purchased on credit.

Just 3 days ago, Senator DOUGLAS brought to our attention another example of the flagrant trespass of consumer rights, this time in Nebraska, where the Supreme Court held that installment loans amounting to an estimated $1 billion, had been usurious.

I want to join the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, as I have joined him in cosponsorship, in urging immediate and favorable action on S. 750, the truth-in-lending bill, and at this time commend to the Senate an article by Senator DOUGLAS, "Who's Afraid of the Truth?" in the October issue of the Carpenter, which once again clearly demonstrates why S. 750 is must legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL COST OF CREDIT: WHO'S AFRAID OF THE TRUTH?

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS, U.S. Senator, from Illinois)

Are we Americans who borrow and buy on credit entitled to know the truth about the cost of consumer credit? Those of us in Congress who have sponsored the truth-in-lending bill—which would require full disclosure of the true costs of consumer credit—believe that the borrower has the right to know what credit is costing him. So do thousands of citizens who have written to us expressing their strong support for this proposed legislation.

The truth-in-lending bill would simply require that all lenders or sellers on credit such as small loan companies, automobile dealers, commercial banks and department stores tell the customer—before the contract is signed—and tell him in writing—just how much the credit is really costing.

This written statement must include the number of months the contract runs, the amount of the monthly payment and—most important—the total amount of the finance charge expressed in dollars and cents and the simple or true annual interest rate on the debt actually owed.

Thus, if you wanted to finance a used car for 18 months, the dealer would be required to tell you that on your unpaid balance of $700 with monthly payments of $46.11, the finance charge would be $129.98 and the true annual interest rate would be 22 percent.

Or if you were buying goods on a department store or mail-order house revolving credit account, the store would be required not only to send a regular monthly bill identifying the dollars-and-cents charge for credit but also to tell you that the "small service charge" of 1½ percent per month really amounted to 18 percent interest per year.

Under the truth-in-lending legislation every borrower would know in advance—before signing on the dotted line—of the price of credit in two ways, the dollar cost and the true finance or interest rate on the unpaid balance. This would enable the wage earner and housewife to compare accurately the costs of different credit plans offered by lenders and sellers and to shop as carefully for credit as for other items in the family budget.

For the past 3 years my subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee has held extensive hearings on the truth-in-lending bill. The record of this congressional investigation of consumer credit practices demonstrates over and over again that many, if not most, consumers are either unaware, confused, or badly misinformed about the true interest rates and charges they pay for various types of credit.

In New York one witness testified that he bought furniture from a local furniture store for $389. Later he received in the mail a statement showing that he owed $588, to be repaid in monthly installments over 24 months. In other words, he was charged $199 for credit for 24 months.

We were shocked to learn that this amounted to an interest rate of 49 percent. If this witness had known that an interest rate of 49 percent was being charged him, I doubt that he would have purchased the furniture from this store.

Another witness bought a bed for $200 from another store. He was told that he would be charged an additional $76 for interest. However, his contract required him to pay back $23 per month for 2 years. We figured the true interest in this case was 168 percent.

A third witness bought a television set on credit for 30 months. We figured out the interest rate on this transaction, and it turned out to be 143 percent. We asked the witness whether, had she known the interest rate which she was being charged, she would have signed the contract. The witness replied: "Never in my life."

In Pittsburgh a witness testified that he borrowed $900 from a small loan company and was told that his monthly payments would be $58.10 for 24 months. We figured the interest rate in this case, and it turned out to be 52 percent. Would you have signed this contract if you had known that you were being charged 52 percent interest?

Of course, some of these are unusual cases, but it could happen to you. Why don't you test yourself about true interest rates and credit charges? I doubt that many wage earners are aware that:

The small monthly service charge of 1½ percent on department store charge accounts is usually a true annual interest rate of 18 percent.

The 3-percent-per-month plan of small loan companies is really 36 percent per year.

The advertised 5-percent rate on home improvement loans is not less than a 6-percent home mortgage but nearly twice as much.

The so-called 6-percent rate offered by some used car dealers is always 12 percent per year and sometimes very much higher—as much as an 18- to 25-percent interest rate per year.

The 4½-percent new car financing plan of some commercial banks is really 9 percent per year.

Credit plans for teenagers now being promoted by some retailers as only pennies per year sometimes amount to 80 percent interest per year.

These are not unusual cases but merely a few common practices involving inaccurate or misleading interest rate information. Test yourself.

Do you know what the finance charge and the true annual interest rate were the last time you borrowed money or bought on credit?

In the spring of 1962, President Kennedy sent a special message to Congress proposing a new program for consumer protection, including a basic "bill of rights" for the American consumer. These rights of the individual include, the President said, "the right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful or grossly misleading information, advertising, labeling or other practices—and to be given the facts he needs to make an informed choice."

To help guarantee this right, the President urged Congress to pass the truth-in-lending bill. Public support is widespread, but opposition in the Senate has prevented enactment of the bill. To overcome this opposition will require determined support for truth-in-lending by the individual borrower and buyer.

This should not be a partisan matter. Consumers who are Republicans need protection just as much as consumers who are Democrats.

All we who advocate truth-in-lending legislation are asking is that the consumer be told the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth—in advance—about the interest rates and finance charges he is asked to pay when he borrows money or buys an article on the installment plan.

Short-Term Economic Growth Comparisons of Little Validity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, until recently it was fashionable to cite a high level of economic growth in the Common Market in support of the argument for expansionary fiscal policies at home. It was frequently said—particularly by administration spokesmen—that the growth rate of the United States was lagging seriously behind that of the Common Market and that in order to catch up it was necessary for the United States to do as the Europeans had done and follow even more expansionary fiscal policies, including large budget deficits.

Little is heard of this argument today, and the reason is quite clear. The

growth of GNP in the Common Market has dropped steadily since 1961 in spite of the fact that budget deficits are still the rule among the member nations. For 1963 it is expected that the U.S. growth will be more than 4.5 percent or well above the expansion expected in the Common Market.

It should be clear from this experience that short-term growth comparisons as a basis for economic debate are virtually worthless. It is distressing enough when they emanate from the uninformed but doubly so when the highest spokesmen of the administration use them to push their economic theories.

Under unanimous consent, I include a New York Times article of October 27 dealing with Common Market economic expansion in the RECORD at this point:

ITALIAN GROWTH SEEN BEST OF SIX: COMMON MARKET SURVEYS MEMBERS' 1963 EXPANSION

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, October 28.—Italy is expected to show the greatest, and West Germany the least, economic expansion in 1963 among the Common Market members.

The prediction was made in a new survey by the Executive Commission of the European Economic Community.

The Commission's economists predicted that Italy's increase this year in the gross national product—the value of goods and services—would rise about 5 percent from that in 1962. Germany's rate of expansion is expected to be about 3 percent.

France, with a gross national product gain of about 4.5 percent, will run closest to the average of slightly above 4 percent that was predicted for the whole community, which comprises Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

A 3.5-PERCENT GAIN SEEN

The last three—the Benelux countries—are expected to raise their product about 3.5 percent in 1963. The Commission, which published these figures on its latest survey, "The Economic Situation in the Community," used the preceding year's prices in its comparisons of each country's year-to-year gains.

This year's rate of gain in the gross national product for the Common Market will reflect the continuing drop in the rate of economic expansion that the community has experienced in recent years.

The product for the Common Market members rose 5.4 percent in 1961 and 4.9 percent last year. The 1963 rate of expansion is expected to be about 12 percent below that of 1962.

The U.S. gross national product, rising almost $9 billion in the third quarter, is expected to exceed easily $580 billion for the year. This would reflect a gain of more than 4.5 percent, well above the Common Market expansion rate.

The value of the Common Market product in 1963 is expected to aggregate about $230 billion, not quite 40 percent of the U.S. total.

Tribute to Tom Connally

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted to revise and extend my remarks, I want to join my colleagues in lamenting the passing of our great and distinguished Senator Tom Connally. Senator Connally was one of the giants that Texas has produced. He was a giant not only in Texas but in the Senate and throughout the Nation. His long service in the House and the Senate enabled him to leave a record of accomplishments that will endure for years and years to come. He was an authority on foreign affairs, his judgment in that field always commanded the highest respect, and it was sought not only by his colleagues but by the executive branch of our Government. I want to extend to Mrs. Connally and the other members of the family my deep sympathy and understanding in their great loss. All of Texas joins them in their sorrow.

Word From the Wise: Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the free world hope and trust that we are moving forward along the path of peace. But while peace is our highest aspiration, only realistic appraisals, constantly and coldly assessing the facts, feints, and forces, of our Communist enemies will preserve our security. The telling point is that the Communists have not yielded up 1 acre of ground to freedom and constantly strive to advance totalitarian enslavement whenever and wherever a penetration is possible. It is for this reason that our Nation now bears the burden of the largest defense commitment in our history. The wisdom of this course, keeping our powder dry, is urged upon us by the former Postmaster General of the United States, Hon. James A. Farley, of New York. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point a recent speech that received favorable comment editorially in the Ramona, Calif., Sentinel:

WISE WORDS FROM JAMES A. FARLEY

We live in a time of danger—undoubtedly the greatest danger the world has ever faced, if only because of the incredibly destructive power of the weapons possessed and readied by the two great power camps. This dark fact is continually on the mind of every thoughtful American.

But are we, as a people, facing up to it as we can and must? Are we making the most of all the resources we have?

If James A. Farley, once a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, for 8 years chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and long a national figure, is right, we are not. The lead article in the July issue of the Reader's Digest, which is condensed from an address Mr. Farley made before the Executives' Club of Chicago, presents his view in an effort to remind his countrymen "* * * of the stuff they are made of."

He states his thesis in his opening paragraph: "Night and day the Kremlin's propaganda is directed toward breaking the will of the American people to resist. And, unfortunately, there are well-meaning Americans who unwittingly assist those propagandists. They argue that this is a time of greatest danger, and therefor greatest care must be taken. This is certainly true. But there is a vast difference between taking care and "taking to the woods."

Mr. Farley calls on history to supply us with the evidence of what other Americans, most of them long dead, did in times of grave and consummate danger. The roll is a long one going an agonizing way from Bunker Hill to the hell of Tarawa. Its meaning is found in Patrick Henry's immortal "Give me liberty or give me death." In Mr. Farley's phrase, "In blunt terms the message is: to stand as an American you must be prepared to fall as one."

Mr. Farley denies that, as the Kremlin repeatedly charges, we are a soft people, dedicated only to lives of as much ease as we can obtain—the story of the pioneers who made this Nation refute such charges with him. He denies too, the endless Russian claim, which has found currency in many corners of the world, that we seek world conquest. As he points out, Russia herself supports this denial. We saved Russia from Nazi occupation when she was reeling on the edge of total collapse. We asked nothing in return. And when, because of our monopoly of atomic weapons our military superiority was overwhelming, we bid for world disarmament, it was the Soviets who closed the door against it. In an unprecedented act, we spent $60 billion of our treasure to aid other nations of the world.

It is the Soviets, Mr. Farley writes, pointing to the clear record, who seek world domination. Already they have subjugated, within totalitarian states, almost a billion people and 15 once-free nations.

Mr. Farley goes on to list perils that are continually growing—perils that demand the utmost in resoluteness and courage for us all. Even where communism has not triumphed it is moving in, using every weapon at its command, from bland words to terror. So: "The map proves that we are not moving toward war with the Communists; they are moving war toward us. Each time we seek to disengage, they confront us nearer home. Today they are on our doorstep."

At the end, he sums up his thesis: "I believe the American people must face the danger and the risk involved, and meet this challenge decisively * * * I think it (is) the duty of every citizen to convey to the President that the people stand behind him in the awful risk, confident that, like the great American Presidents who preceded him, he will exert that will—only because he can do naught, else—and again prayerful that it is the will of God, in whom we trust."

The Future of Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a constituent, which I feel is well worth the attention of my colleagues. Margaret Binggels, a teacher, asks some very pertinent questions in relation to the future of our youth. Although Miss Binggels' letter deals with the "students" who went to Cuba and were subsequently brought before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I feel that her statements and queries may be applied to any per-

son, groups of persons or organization, and particularly our leaders of tomorrow who are willing to jeopardize our American freedom or take advantage of it. The letter follows:

NOVATO, CALIF.
July 21, 1963.

Subject: U.S. students in Cuba.
Representative DON CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a teacher and a citizen, I am concerned about the future of our country. I wish I were better informed and really knew what is going on.

However, it seems to me that our "laissez-faire" attitude is about to get us all into something where we shall lose our power to choose individually what is best for ourselves in the future.

The U.S. students who went to Cuba are thinkers who will wield much influence across our Nation when and if they are allowed to return to their campuses. It seems to me that they will be deemed "heroes" of a cause; in fact, they already are. On the bulletin board at San Francisco State College a couple of weeks go I saw a dittoed notice put out by the student government that they will support them on their return, even to taking up a collection to retain legal help to defend their rights to be free to travel anywhere they choose.

These people who are so vocal and aggressive about having freedom and giving freedom do not seem to realize that with rights come responsibilities. All of us cannot be absolutely free to do as we please; for if we are, we take freedom away from others. If we are free, for instance, to have anything we like, we are free to take things that belong to other people. If we are free to speed on the highways, we are free to injure and kill other people.

In giving people freedom to become indoctrinated with the virtues of Communism, without exploring the disadvantages, we are taking away the freedom of the "free" world. The Communists themselves have made no secret of the fact that they plan to rule the whole world; where will individuals have any freedom when and if they take over the world?

When these students went on this trip, did they see and experience any of the hard work which the enslaved people are doing? Did they eat the food the working people eat? Did they sleep and live in the same conditions as the workers do? When I have guests in my home for a short time, we eat better, play more, and work less than usual. Perhaps the best solution to the problem would be to let these students become permanent residents of Cuba, or at least let them stay long enough to see the whole picture. If they wanted to go badly enough to defy the State Department, let them stay long enough to want to come home just as badly as they wanted to go. Then they might give us the right perspective on Cuba.

When these students return to their communities and campuses, they will be spreading the "gospel" of communism, for as guests they have been shown the glamour of the communistic system. If we as individuals put ourselves out to impress houseguests, don't we understand that an enemy government is going to go all out to "woo" the intellectual group visiting them by showing them the advantages only of their way of living?

This has been an exciting trip for these students. There was little excitement here at home, as these students have grown up in a time when they had no real problems to solve as to the necessities of life or for most of the luxuries, either. They have experienced most of the entertainment that money can buy here. They need "new" frontiers. They are pioneers of this generation, and they are "pioneering" us fight out of the way of life that the pioneers lived and fought and died for over the short history of this country.

I hope the people who have the decisions to make will not be soft on these students; for if they are, there are thousands more who will be ready to go next time. They want excitement, too. If these students win this victory, they will win other victories. They will lead their followers back home in doing away with agencies hindering their progress, such as the House Un-American Activities Committee, so that they and all their cronies will have complete freedom at our expense.

Really, I am afraid, for I fear for the future of our country and our true freedom. People who have lived under other forms of government and who have become American citizens are really our most devoted citizens; this is proof enough to me that we have the best system.

Will you urge the people in Washington who will deal with these U.S. students when they return from Cuba not to feel sorry for them, but to feel sorry for all the citizens of the United States. Please urge them to do what is best for the future of the United States.

Respectfully yours,
MARGARET BINGGELS.

Back in the Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the prosperous new look of the American airline industry is typified by Trans World Airlines under the dynamic leadership of its president, Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr.

Symbolic of TWA's financial resurgence under Mr. Tillinghast was its decision to purchase the first American-built supersonic transport which is scheduled for delivery in 1970.

Under leave to extend, I include an article about Trans World Airlines which recently appeared in Time magazine:

BACK IN THE BLACK

The readiness of U.S. airlines to anticipate spending huge sums for the supersonics, after all they went through with jets, is one evidence of a general renewal of health in the airline business. The 11 U.S. trunklines ran into heavy financial trouble in 1961–62 because of the high cost of the new jets and the disappointingly low number of new passengers, but they have earned $27 million in 1963's first 8 months, versus a $10 million loss for the year-ago period.

All of the big four lines are now in good shape, and of the four none has greater reason to cheer than TWA. After losing $20 million in 2 years, the line has climbed back into the black, and this year expects to earn $10 million or more. President Tillinghast, 52, is so confident of TWA's good health that last week he broke off the merger agreement made with Pan American last December, when TWA's plight was still perilous.

An imperturbable New Englander and one-time assistant Manhattan district attorney under Thomas Dewey, Tillinghast took over TWA in 1961 after Industrialist Howard Hughes was forced by the airline's lenders to put his 78.2 percent ownership of TWA in trust. When Hughes began sniping at the new administration, Tillinghast tied him into legal knots with an antitrust suit. He arranged additional financing for more jets, flew the line constantly to check on service, and shifted TWA's image from that of a tourist's to a businessman's airline.

Kennedy Sees Difference Between Personal Popularity and His Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today I have come into possession of two newspaper articles from my district which indicate that the FCC may be being used as a political tool in Kentucky. According to the news articles, a ruling has been made by a Mr. Joe Rosebloom, administrative employee of FCC Chairman William Henry, which called a transcription of the President's voice in answer to a news conference question a distortion because all 22 pages of the news conference were not included. This is obviously an unreasonable, dictatorial ruling—to require the inclusion of a multitude of extraneous, irrelevant matter is obviously a political move.

For the record, the complete question and complete answer as taken from the press conference read as follows:

Question. Mr. President, a Negro leader who helped organize the march on Washington says that he feels you are greater than Abe Lincoln in the area of civil rights. Apparently a lot of other Negroes support you. The latest poll showed that 95 percent probably would vote for you next year. Now, in your opinion, Mr. President, does this political self-segregation on the part of the Negroes, combined with continued demonstrations in the North, pose any problems for you as far as the electoral vote in the North is concerned next year?

The PRESIDENT. I understand what you mean, that there is a danger of a division in the party, in the country, upon racial grounds. I would doubt that. I think the American people have been through too much to make that fatal mistake. It is true that a majority of the Negroes have been Democrats, but that has been true since Franklin Roosevelt. Before that a majority of them were Republicans. The Republican Party, I am confident, could get the support of the Negroes, but I think they have to recognize the very difficult problems the Negroes face.

So in answer to your question, I don't know what 1964 is going to bring. I think a division upon racial lines would be unfortunate—class lines, sectional lines. In fact, Theodore Roosevelt said all this once very well, way back. So I would say that over the long run, we are going to have a mix. This will be true racially, socially, ethnically, geographically, and that is really, finally, the best way.

The transcript as reportedly used on the radio is as indicated in the following

David Lawrence column which appeared in the Evening Star on October 11, 1963:

KENNEDY PUTS FINGER ON CHANCES—SEES DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERSONAL POPULARITY AND HIS ACHIEVEMENTS

(By David Lawrence)

Whenever President Kennedy completes his Government service, he can certainly expect to get a fruitful job as a political writer. It would not be based solely on his prestige as a former President but also on his astute knowledge of political trends and fundamentals.

Mr. Kennedy gave at Wednesday's news conference a good illustration of his perspicacity when he placed in proper perspective all the current talk about the outcome of the 1964 election.

The President put his finger on something which is too often overlooked—the difference between the seeming personal popularity of a candidate and his real popularity based on actual achievements in public office. For it doesn't follow that a man who is well liked or makes a spectacular campaign will necessarily win. In 1920, for instance, the Democratic nominee, James M. Cox—who had sreved as Governor of Ohio for three terms—was an excellent public speaker and made a good appearance on the stump. In fact, he campaigned from coast to coast while his Republican opponent, Senator Warren G. Harding, spoke from the front porch of his home in Marion, Ohio, and left his residence only two or three times for 1-day trips to make speeches. Yet Mr. Harding won an overwhelming victory.

The lesson of that campaign has been emphasized often since—that economic conditions are paramount. Such issues are reflected as the people vote against an administration or party in power. They did this in 1920 when they voted their resentment against a disrupted economy and blamed the Democratic administration for entering World War I after having won the 1916 campaign on a platform of "peace and prosperity." The same thing—economic discontent—caused the Hoover defeat in 1932.

President Kennedy rightly stresses the peace issue as well as the economic issue, and wisely points out that it will be easier to judge the outcome of the next presidential campaign in the summer and autumn of 1964 than it is today. He said to his news conference:

"I think we ought to make a judgment on that in 1964. * * * A lot of these matters we will have to decide—whether the United States is better off economically than it was before, and whether our position in the world has improved, and whether our prospects for peace are greater, and whether our defenses are stronger, and whether we are making progress at home and abroad. That is a matter which, it seems to me, will be argued very strongly in 1964. For example, we can't make a judgment about the state of the economy in 1964. I think if they pass our tax bill, we are going to be able to demonstrate a very successful, buoyant economy for a period of 4 years. If they do not, we will have a different situation.

"I cannot tell what our relations will be in southeast Asia a year from now. I know what results our policy is attempting to bring. But I think that result ought to be judged in the summer of 1964 and the fall of 1964, and I have hopes that the judgment will be that the economy is moving ahead."

What the President said is a sound analysis of the present situation. The same yardstick has been applied again and again in the past by this correspondent in evaluating public sentiment and in predicting the outcome of presidential campaigns.

Mr. Kennedy is well aware that employment and business are not booming in all areas today and that, in some of the pivotal States, emotional issues—such as the race controversy—as well as pocketbook issues may cause him to lose electoral votes. That's why he says candidly:

"I would say we are going to have a hard, close fight in 1964, but that has been my impression for a good many months."

Mr. Kennedy also said that he believes Senator GOLDWATER could win the Republican presidential nomination, but that the Arizona Senator "has a long road to go" and has a "trying 7 or 8 months which will test his endurance and his perseverance and his agility."

There is always a chance that a slip of the tongue may turn the tide against any candidate in either party. Right now, for instance, President Kennedy himself has cause for concern about a slip he made in his impromptu remarks at his news conference of September 12. It already has had political repercussions. In discussing in general terms the future of the racial problem in America, he declared:

"So I would say that over the long run, we are going to have a mix. This will be true racially, socially, ethnically, geographically, and that is really, finally, the best way."

Critics are beginning to ask in letters from different parts of the country whether Mr. Kennedy was indorsing the doctrine of racial intermarriage. Unquestionably, this kind of an issue can be embarrassing in a political campaign. So it is likely that the Democrats will have their troubles, just as will the Republicans, and both candidates will have to demonstrate their agility.

As for a dark horse in 1964 on the Republican side—or even a light horse, in which category former Vice President Nixon is often mentioned—there is no definite trend as yet. Unless Mr. Nixon becomes an active candidate long in advance of the national convention, which seems unlikely, the Republicans will turn to him only if a stalemate develops between GOLDWATER and Rockefeller forces, with combinations of favorite sons from various States holding the balance of power, as often happens in national conventions.

I leave it to your judgment as to whether this is a distortion—whether the intent has been changed. I think it has not.

I do not bring this matter up for any discussion of the content of the President's statement. Whether we agree or disagree with the President's position is for our own conscience. However, I am confident none of us desire to see increased Government power by an ever-increasing Federal bureaucracy used to prevent the dissemination of something because of political considerations. If the statement was a slip of the tongue by the President, as indicated by David Lawrence, the President can correct the statement by so indicating.

Private Group Trains School Dropouts in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent article in the New York Times, top industrialists, bankers, and college administrators in southern California have undertaken a program to get school dropouts off the streets and into training classes.

This program demonstrates the importance of private initiative in the retraining area as a supplement to public efforts.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the New York Times of October 13 describing the efforts of this private group in the RECORD at this point:

COAST GROUP ACTS TO HELP DROPOUTS: "VOCATIONALLY TALENTED" WILL BE SINGLED OUT FOR AID

(By Jack Langguth)

LOS ANGELES, October 11.—Top industrialists, bankers and college administrators in southern California announced yesterday that they would strive to get school dropouts off the streets and into training classes.

At a news conference at the Bank of America, Charles P. Horne, chairman of the Southern California Industry-Education Council, said that his group would seek to reach the 30 percent of students who do not graduate from high school.

"The key to the problem is motivation," said Rear Adm. Charles F. Horne, retired, president of General Dynamics Corp. of Pomona. "We've found in our past efforts that placing an unmotivated child in close contact with a motivated adult will give us motivated children in about 85 percent of the cases."

Formed 7 years ago, the council has been concentrating on superior students headed for careers in science or engineering.

Admiral Horne said that the 1,000-member council was satisfied that it had achieved results with promising students. "While the number of freshmen taking engineering and science courses has declined 2.5 percent nationally in recent years," he said, "the number has increased in southern California by 11.5 percent."

PILOT PROJECT PLANNED

With the dropout problem becoming severe, he said, the council will not attempt to devise pilot programs for vocationally talented youths.

The Bank of America's chairman of the board, Jesse W. Tapp, was represented at yesterday's conference. Also present were Dr. Stanley T. Warburton, associate superintendent of the Los Angeles City School District, Fred L. Hartley, senior vice president of the Union Oil Co.; and Dr. Gilbert L. Brown of the University of Redlands.

The council operates on an annual budget of $25,000 to $30,000, supplied by such corporations as—Aerojet General, Hughes Aircraft, International Business Machines and Southern California Edison.

Council officials said that they would have a series of local conferences in southern California to determine the industrial needs of various communities. Training programs would then be begun in those skills.

An award program for undermotivated students will also be started, together with vocational guidance interviews and stepped-up efforts to explain to students the importance of a technical education.

Tribute to Tom Connally

SPEECH

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of former Senator Tom Con-

nally also passed an era. He really had no contemporary. At the same time he exemplified the role of elder statesman, both in looks, manner, and seasoned statesmanship, he was also a man of vision and perspective. He looked into the modern future with the eyes and spirit of a young man and was usually far ahead of those considered to be his contemporaries and legislative associates. At the same time, his judgment was tempered by his long devoted service to the world, our Nation, and the people of our great State of Texas.

For as many years as many of us can remember our interest in matters politic, the name of Senator Connally was first on the list in issues both foreign and domestic. He was a household and street-corner image in many places other than the State of Texas, but especially in our State.

Many of us have lost a friend, but the world and the Nation lost an illustrious leader when he retired from the U.S. Senate.

It was common to hear, after Senator Connally was off the active scene in Washington, that if he had been in the position which he held so long, certain matters of Government would have been different. This is said in all deference to those who have since attempted to fill his role.

Many of you experience, as I do when meeting certain issues of the day, the occurrence of the name of Senator Connally, who had such a great part in formulating laws now on the books, and particularly as many of them apply to foreign policy. Most notably at the present time is the so-called Connally amendment, or Connally reservation, in the World Court. He guarded the sovereignty of our Nation in authorizing this particular legislation, and I use it as a specific example of his services, not to be forgotten.

I join my other colleagues in expressing sentiments to his memory and sympathy to Mrs. Connally.

A Brooklyn College Leads the Way in a Fine New Venture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in Brooklyn, N.Y., the borough which is becoming known as "Collegeville, U.S.A.," Pratt Institute has recently demonstrated fine community spirit through two separate endeavors.

The school of engineering and science at Pratt, will introduce to the New York area a cooperative, work-study program in engineering for the academic year of 1964–65.

President Richard H. Heindel of Pratt Institute and Dr. Charles M. Thatcher, dean of the school of engineering and science, feel that many benefits will accrue to the participating students, local industry, and the institute.

As presently envisaged, students will study full time during their first year at Pratt. They will work and study during alternate semesters including summer sessions during their second, third and fourth years. Their fifth year will again be spent in full-time study at the end of which they will be awarded a bachelor's degree.

Many students currently unable to attend college for financial reasons will be able to earn as they study while at the same time gathering practical experience that will aid them in finding employment after graduation.

A Pratt trustee and alumnus, Ralph M. Parsons, president of the Ralph M. Parsons Co., a worldwide engineering corporation, observed:

> Participating industries will have a steady pool of engineering skills upon which they can draw as well as the opportunity of training qualified students in the particular skills and abilities their industries require.

Another Pratt trustee and alumnus, Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corp. of America, commented:

> Industries will certainly welcome this pioneering step by Pratt Institute in offering to the New York area a program which has been successfully used elsewhere in the country.

At present the school has a limited cooperative program with the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard.

All engineering students in good academic standing will be eligible to participate in the new program.

In the second instance, Mr. Robert I. Queen, the director of information services at Pratt, has been appointed cochairman of a special emergency committee to help ex-New York Mirror editorial employees secure new jobs. The Newspaper Reporters Association has acted wisely by choosing a man from the academic world whose past experience in the newspaper and public relations fields make him a valuable asset at Pratt and, now, to the community. The cooperation exemplified in this instance is proof that joint ventures in this area should be encouraged. The beneficial results to both college and community are obvious.

The REA Power Grab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has provided an enlightening series of articles on the present operations of the Rural Electrification Administration—REA—including abuses which have developed since the original authorization of the agency in 1935.

These articles written by the experienced and talented Chesly Manly are both authoritative and illuminating.

Following this series, the Chicago Tribune, editorialized today on the subject of REA and its efforts at self-perpetuation through the subsidized generation and transmission of electric power to serve primarily residential, commercial and industrial customers instead of the rural community, as expressed in the congressional intent.

I commend this editorial "The REA Power Grab," to the attention of my colleagues and to the Nation:

THE REA POWER GRAB

The Rural Electrification Administration's new program of government subsidized expansion into the general business of supplying electric power in competition with private enterprise has been described in shocking detail by our Chesly Manly in a series of articles. As Mr. Manly points out, the REA has abandoned the distinction between farm and nonfarm activities, and now recognizes only commercial and residential business, and is going after both. The vast bureaucratic power empire is entering areas of operations undreamed of when Congress authorized it a quarter century ago to bring light and power to rural residents who didn't have it.

The Kennedy administration gave public power proponents the green light to expand, and they still have it, although Congress has provided some indications recently that it is getting fed up with REA empire building. In the 30 months between January 1961, and last June 30 the REA has made loans of more than $384 million for generation and transmission purposes—more than three times greater than the total of such loans in the preceding 30 months under the Eisenhower administration.

There is a distinction between generation and transmission loans and those which the REA makes to local cooperatives, which operate distribution systems for their member-owners and get 38 percent of their wholesale power from commercial utilities. Generation and transmission loans are made to super-cooperatives for the production and wholesale supply of electricity, thus putting the REA into the general utility business at the taxpayers' expense and in direct competition with private enterprise. The REA charges the co-ops only 2 percent interest for 35-year loans, using money which the Government borrows at rates of up to 4 percent.

In Indiana, for example, a 35-year, 2-percent loan of $60,225,000, largest in REA history, has been approved for construction of a 198,000-kilowatt steam generating plant and 1,552 miles of high-voltage transmission lines to serve 16 electric co-ops. These facilities are designed to link the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Government-owned power colossus, with the Great Lakes States in a proposed nationwide pool of public and private power systems.

The project is under attack in Indiana courts by three private utilities which contend, among other things, that it would be an unnecessary duplication of existing facilities and "economic waste on a grand scale."

Norman M. Clapp, REA Administrator, advocates a policy of building up the co-ops so they can serve industrial and commercial consumers and compete "on equal terms with the commercial utilities." We agree the co-ops should compete on equal terms, but not in the way Mr. Clapp has in mind.

The way to accomplish this objective is for Congress to abolish the 2-percent interest rate at which funds are loaned by the REA. The rate should be set at the going rate of interest paid by the Treasury on long-term

borrowing, plus an amount sufficient to cover REA administrative expenses and losses. Furthermore, REA financing should be shifted from the Federal Government to private sources, and the co-ops should no longer be exempted from paying Federal income taxes.

This would accomplish the additional salutary objectives of taking the REA program off the taxpayers' backs and removing the threat of socialized power in this country.

Dr. Flemming, President Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Calls for Social Security Approach to the Financing of Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, highly significant is the call by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, for the enactment of hospital care through social security. As Dr. Flemming ably states, the first step is to inaugurate through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged.

Since leaving Washington, Dr. Flemming has become the president of the University of Oregon in Eugene. This fall, the Nation's high school debaters are discussing the subject of the role of the Federal Government in health care. A special symposium was held recently in Denver, Colo., under the auspices of the Speech Association of America and the National University Extension Association to discuss this subject. Dr. Flemming, in his speech to the symposium, urged the enactment of the social security approach to financing health care for the aged.

As a member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging I am acutely aware of the critical health problems and hardships facing our retired citizens. For this reason I have joined in sponsoring S. 880, which provides health coverage financed through the social security system. This is the legislation recommended by President Kennedy, and the formula recognized by Dr. Flemming as the most fruitful approach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the thoughtful statement by Dr. Flemming in support of the social security approach to health care for retired citizens.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARION FOLSOM SAYS: "SOCIAL SECURITY IS ONLY LOGICAL SOLUTION"

(NOTE.—Marion B. Folsom has served in four Federal administrations since he helped draft the Social Security Act of 1935. He was a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration. The opinions below were excerpted from an article in the Atlantic Monthly.)

Actually, there is little or no opposition to assisting older people with their heavy medical expenses. The point of contention is how that assistance should be given.

A dramatic situation, such as the depression of the thirties, which brought about the Social Security Act, is not needed to highlight the growing urgency of some kind of plan for helping older people to pay their medical bills. About 9 percent of all Americans—some 17 million individuals—are over 65 years of age. Both the percentage and the number are increasing. Their need is pressing because of these factors:

1. The rate of long and serious illness is higher among older people than among those under 65.

2. The cost of medical care is going up. Between 1948 and 1962, the increase was 65 percent. During this same period, hospital daily service charges went up 155 percent.

3. Upon retirement, the individual usually suffers a substantial reduction in income.

Thus, more and more people are experiencing increased medical costs at the very time when they are least prepared to meet added expenses.

It is true, of course, that people in retirement have more security now than in the past. Social security benefits, growing payments from private pension plans, and greater personal savings generally enable the retired person to take care of himself in reasonable comfort—as long as he retains good health. But when serious illness strikes him or his wife, the high cost of medical care may quickly exhaust his savings and use up income needed to meet normal living expenses.

Medical expenses are not such a hazard to employed people. Most employers today pay benefits for absence due to sickness and provide group plans for insuring the wage earner and his dependents' against hospital, surgical, and, in a growing number of cases, major medical expenses. Altogether, 130 million Americans now participate in hospital insurance plans and almost as many in surgical insurance plans. So complete is this coverage by voluntary plans that there has been little agitation for Government health insurance to cover the entire population.

But the situation of retired people is far less favorable than that of the employed. Few group plans continue to cover a man after he retires, and often the higher premium rate under an individual policy is more than he can afford. A recent study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that "those with relatively low incomes are likely to have most difficulty in paying large bills and are least likely to have health insurance."

Some employers now provide medical insurance for their retired people, with the company paying part or all of the cost. But such plans are expensive and can be afforded only by well-established companies. So it may be many years before an appreciable number of retired employees will have such protection.

As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in 1955 I urged employers to induce health insurance benefits in their pension plans, with all or some part of the cost being paid by the employer. At the same time I also proposed to insurance companies that they establish a pool or underwriting group on a nationwide basis to experiment with lower cost plans for covering the aged, but nothing came of the suggestion.

Last year in New York State several insurance companies did join in an underwriting arrangement to provide medical insurance for people over 65. Premiums were reduced, but the cost is well above Blue Cross and Blue Shield rates.

The insurance companies naturally have to charge higher premiums for older people because of the higher incidence of long illness in this group. For the same reason, the growing number of older people covered at normal rates by Blue Cross has contributed to the rapid increase in Blue Cross rates. The Michigan Blue Cross lost $18 million during 1962 in its program of caring for 255,000 people over 65. Had it not been for this older group, the organization would have shown a profit of $12.5 million. It is now asking for a substantial increase in premiums from all subscribers.

The need, then, for some kind of nationwide action is generally acknowledged. The question is what kind of action?

If complete reliance for medical care of the aged were placed upon the Kerr-Mills plan, we would probably have the same experience we have had with old age assistance, as is already evident in States that have adopted the Kerr-Mills plan. The qualification tests would be liberalized, and the percentage of older people to qualify would raise steadily—especially in low-income States, which pay only 20 percent of the cost. On the other hand, wealthier States, which pay 50 percent, might tighten too much, leaving many people without the care they need.

As with old age assistance, the Federal share of the cost comes from general revenue. Before long, the result will be an extra burden of several billion dollars on Federal income taxes.

Another factor to be considered, especially by the medical profession, is that as the cost of the States' share increases, especially in the States paying 50 percent of the cost, the difficulty of obtaining revenue will probably cause these States to exercise close control over doctors' fees and hospital-room rates.

But of all the reasons why we should not depend exclusively upon the relief system, I believe the most compelling was eloquently expressed by the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, when he wrote:

"As a responsible, independent, self-respecting individual in intention, if not in fact, the ordinary citizen hopes government help, when necessary, will be available to him as a right for at least the more likely hazards he faces, without humiliating or demoralizing conditions such as the periodic investigation of his resources in order to balance them against his needs. * * * Our ordinary citizen also feels that where he contributes to the cost of his protection, or even if his employer contributes on his behalf, he has in some sense earned a right to the benefit. He wants to become a partner in the plan and not just its beneficiary."

Behind every criticism of social insurance, I am sure there is a sincere conviction that the Government is intruding in an area that can best be handled by the individual. It is a good sign when people show concern over any development which seems to them inappropriate within a democratic society. But in the case of hospital care for older people, it is clear that some plan of assistance must be provided; by one method or another, we are going to continue helping older people who cannot pay their medical bills. How can we do this in the fairest possible way?

If we do it by welfare or assistance payments, we must use a means test and we must inevitably discriminate against those judged capable of paying their own way, even though this may mean exhausting their life savings and placing a heavy drain upon their children. The indigent will be helped in every case; the provident unfairly bypassed in many cases.

A plan of social insurance, on the other hand, requires contributions and pays benefits on the same basis in every case. Because of the contributory feature, the in-

dividual feels his active participation and is entitled to benefits as a matter of right. What could be more equitable, or more democratic?

In my opinion, the only logical solution to the hardship faced by people over 65 because of rising hospital expenses is a contributory social-insurance plan.

There is a general agreement that a problem does exist which our Nation must solve. Studies conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that persons 65 and over are confronted with health and medical bills each year that average twice as much as those for the rest of the population. And all of us know that the cost of medical care keeps increasing. In fact medical-care prices have risen more than other prices.

Bureau of Census data show that in 1960 the aged had to try to pay their medical bills out of annual incomes that averaged about half that received by persons under 65—from $1,000 for aged persons living alone to $2,900 for families headed by aged persons. It is clear that those whose income was equal to the national average and those who were below the average didn't have much left for the medical bills after taking care of the bare necessities of life.

Too many of the aged are unable to afford health insurance or are considered too poor a risk. In fact the number carrying some form of health insurance is just over half of the aged population. In most cases they carry hospital insurance. In many instances it falls far short of meeting the costs of illnesses.

These and other similar facts explain why a larger proportion of the aged than any other group in our population are forced either to turn to public or private welfare agencies for payment of their medical bills or to rely on free care from hospitals and physicians. And the sad thing is that many do not choose either alternative. They just neglect their health.

Surely a nation that is founded on the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being can and must find a solution to this problem—a solution that will meet the needs of this generation and will keep the next generation from confronting the problem that now confronts us.

It was my privilege on January 12, 1961, to deliver the closing address at the first White House Conference on the Aging. At that time in referring to the problem of health and medical care for the aged, I said:

"I am convinced on the basis of my own experiences that this problem cannot be resolved by relying solely on private voluntary efforts. * * * I am convinced that the Federal Government must become an increasingly effective partner if the problem is to be handled properly."

An adequate health and medical insurance program for the aged should provide them with substantial help in meeting the costs of the following items: Hospital care, skilled nursing home care, organized home care services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

If the aged are to enjoy the benefits of a well-rounded program of this kind a law must be enacted that will do the following two things:

First, inaugurate through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged.

Second, authorize and encourage those who are engaged in private insurance to join forces so that they can offer the aged a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will help cover the costs of organized home care services, surgical services, laboratory and X-ray services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

Such a law would provide the foundation for a partnership between the Federal Government and private insurance that would mark the dawn of a new day for the aged in dealing with the economic hazards of illness.

And both the Federal Government and the field of private insurance have had experience in forging such a partnership. For 28 years we have been operating under a social security program which has provided certain basic benefits for retired persons. Today we find that private insurance has worked out over 30,000 private pension plans that supplement the benefits that social security has provided. From 1940 to 1961, life insurance in force grew from $115 to $685 billion. There is no doubt that the Federal Government's old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has stimulated the growth of private insurance in this country.

What has happened in the pension and life insurance fields can and must happen in the field of health insurance.

Here are some of the considerations that I believe should be kept in mind in developing through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged:

1. The program should be financed by a payroll tax shared equally by both employers and employees or paid by the self-employed.

2. Receipts from the tax should be placed in a special fund and benefits paid under the program should be related to the resources in the fund.

3. The payroll tax should be fixed at a level that will make it possible for benefits to be paid to the aged that will give them a fair chance to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of hospital and nursing home care.

4. Persons who have contributed to the fund should be eligible at age 65 for the benefits provided by the program.

5. All employed and self-employed should be included in the program. It is impossible to predict, for example, what persons entering the labor market for the first time this year will have financial resources at age 65 that would enable them to get along without the protection that such an insurance program would provide.

6. The cost of providing health protection to the present aged who have not had the opportunity of participating in the social security program should be met from general revenues.

Such a program, to quote from President Kennedy's February 1963 message to the Congress, "is based on the fundamental premise that contributions during the working years, matched by employer's contributions should enable people to prepay and build earned rights and benefits to safeguard them in their old age."

But such a program isn't enough if it is left standing by itself. It is true that hospital and skilled nursing home costs loom large in many illnesses. That is why the Federal Government should single them out in developing an insurance program for the aged through social security.

However, the services of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and physical therapists can also be costly. And Congress can help the aged deal with these costs without involving the Federal Government in any new program.

It should do it in the same law in which it establishes a hospital and skilled nursing home program for the aged.

It should declare that it is sound national policy for private insurance companies and nonprofit health plans to join forces, including a pooling of risks, and offer the aged in any State a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will cover the costs of services rendered by physicians, surgeons, physical therapists or any other costs connected with an illness.

It should then remove any legal obstacles, such as antitrust laws, that stand in the way of putting such a policy into effect.

In brief in one law the Congress should establish a limited health insurance program through social security and, at the same time, clear away the obstacles that stand in the way of private insurance developing an effective program for supplementing the Government's program.

When I was called upon in August of 1958 to come to grips with the problem of health and medical care for the aged I developed a strong conviction that the Federal Government should not do anything that would block the growth of private health insurance. At the same time I quickly realized that, because of the unusual risks involved, private insurance was not going to be able to offer an adequate program at a price that would be within the reach of a sufficiently large percentage of the aged. I examined and worked on various plans under which the Federal Government would have underpinned the efforts of private insurance. None of them made or has made any headway.

I now believe that private health insurance will grow along sound lines if the Federal Government, through social security, develops an insurance program for the aged that is restricted to dealing with the costs of institutional care. This will leave the rest of the field to private insurance and relieve it of heavy risks. It should, at the same time, be given the right by the Congress to pool its resources. This should lead to the offering of health insurance policies at premiums that will be within the reach of the aged and also within the reach of younger persons who want to take out policies now that will guarantee them benefits at 65 and beyond. Also it should be kept in mind that some of the $475 to $525 million in purchasing power which is now allocated annually for hospital coverage of the aged will become available for payments of premiums on private policies.

In summary, I believe that a partnership should be established between the Federal Government and private insurance in the health insurance field. If it is brought into existence we will have at long last moved from the talk stage into the action stage in dealing with the problem of meeting the health and medical bills of the aged.

I recognize, of course, that even if this partnership is formed there will be a percentage of the aged whose needs will have to be met through public welfare programs. I favor the Federal Government providing generous support to the States in connection with their programs for providing medical care for persons receiving old-age assistance. I favor the Kerr-Mills law which makes it possible for the States to receive generous support from the Federal Government if they decide to help persons 65 years of age and over who are not receiving old-age assistance but whose income and other resources are not sufficient to meet their medical expenses.

But these are public assistance programs. They are not substitutes for an adequate public and private insurance program to care for the health and medical costs of the aged. Our fellow citizens do not want to sit around and wait for sickness to develop and then have their bills met through public assistance programs. They want to participate in insurance programs that will assure their ability to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of health and medical care. The time has come to give them the opportunity of participating in such programs. We insult them when we tell them that they needn't worry but that we will take care of them under old-age assistance or the Kerr-Mills program.

Let's not take pride in our ability to add aged persons to public assistance rolls because they are medically indigent. Rather let us insist on the Congress taking action that will provide our people with both public and private insurance programs under which they will have earned benefits that will safeguard them in their old age and keep them

off public assistance rolls. This is the only kind of a program that is consistent with our Nation's dedication to the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being.

Going Awry on Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contains an appraisal of the antidiscrimination declaration submitted to the Social Humanitarian and Cultural Committee of the U.N. General Assembly. Reading it, I was struck by the application of the general arguments which were advanced against the declaration, to the civil rights proposals sent to Congress this year.

Certainly, neither the President's proposals nor the bill approved by the Judiciary Committee goes as far in seeking to promote tolerance by legal force, or in interfering with the individual's "right of free expression" in a free society as the declaration. The declaration authorizes governments to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote racial discrimination. But it does call to mind the old saying that "a journey of 1,000 miles begins with the first step." For the information of my colleagues the editorial follows:

GOING AWRY ON RIGHTS

The Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee of the United Nations General Assembly fell into a trap when it drafted an antidiscrimination declaration that is acceptable to the Communists but not to the Western democracies. The purpose behind the declaration—to encourage universal recognition of human rights without regard to race, color or ethnic origin—is admirable. But the Africans and Asians on the Committee were so emotional in their demands for strong language against discrimination that they approved some grave encroachments upon freedom.

No nation voted against the declaration, but 17 felt it necessary to abstain because of the unfortunate language that has been used. Among these are the countries of Western Europe, the British Commonwealth and the United States. This country could not have embraced the declaration in its present form without pledging itself to violate the Constitution.

Article 2 of the declaration seeks to prohibit all discrimination on racial grounds by any "state, institution, group or individual." In a free society the government cannot conceivably undertake to control or prohibit every individual act of bigotry or malice. Still more out of line with the concepts of free speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly is article 9 of the declaration. It would pledge all governments "to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote racial discrimination or incite to use violence for the purpose of discrimination based on race, color or ethnic origin."

In the debate within the Committee the United States finally acquiesced in the suppression of organizations that incite to or use violence in support of discriminatory practices. The Constitution makes a logical distinction between mere promotion of bias and resort to violence for that purpose. But a majority of the delegates fell for a Byelorussian amendment eliminating this distinction. So the declaration is made to call for the suppression of some basic rights for the sake of promoting others.

If critics fail to amend the declaration before it goes to the General Assembly for approval, the most logical course would be to lay this controversial document on the shelf and start again. In the long run the cause of human rights and human understanding is not likely to be aided by trampling on the right of free expression or by alienating the countries that have done more than any others to advance the doctrines of equality and individual dignity.

High Savings Level Said To Create Inflationary Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an article which appeared in the Washington Post of October 27, entitled "Debtors Woes Hint at Hidden Inflation," J.A. Livingston has asserted that "it is possible to have inflation and not see it." Livingston points out that the administration has repeatedly said we are not having price inflation and that we even have excess capacity and idle manpower to guard against future inflation. Livingston then asks how is inflation possible in such an economic situation.

His answer is that since 1946, "savings" in the United States have tripled to a total of $300 billion. Livingston points out that this money has to pay interest or dividends. "It is money," he says "that has to be put to work."

According to Livingston this creates an inflationary potential in the economy. Its magnitude, he says, is one reason why the Federal Reserve has been applying the brakes to easy credit. I include the Livingston article in the RECORD at this point:

DEBTOR'S WOES HINT AT HIDDEN INFLATION

(By J. A. Livingston)

Just as it takes two to make a peace, so also it takes two assumptions to create a debt.

The lender—the bank, mortgage buyer, insurance company, or finance company—assumes the borrower will pay. And the borrower confidently assumes he'll be able to pay.

Such assumptions underline the ambitious financing of the farflung, imaginative Webb & Knapp realty operations. Yet, at the annual meeting, Chairman William Zeckendorf, Sr., confessed that the company would have a "difficult time" meeting its short-term obligations next year.

Is the company solvent? By Zeckendorf's definition, yes: "Our company is worth a great deal more than it owes."

But where went the hopeful assumptions of lenders who want their interest and the debtor who's in difficulty?

ALSO WITH DIFFICULTY

And what happened also to Major Realty Corp., a corporate complex with holdings in Florida, Philadelphia, and Newark? Theodore U. Delson, president, disclosed in the anual report that the two previous interest payments on the company's $6,037,500, 7-year, 6-percent bonds were met "with great difficulty through last-minute borrowings at a high rate of interest." Now the company is working on a plan to defer interest payments.

Axiom: An assumption of debt is only as sound as the events that follow. And more and more assumptions are going p-f-f-t. U.S. Federal courts dealt with a record number of bankruptcies—90 percent personal—in the 1963 fiscal year. This was a 5-percent rise over fiscal 1962.

Again, creditors assumed the best and borrowers misjudged their capabilities. Personal incomes were cut, deals didn't come through, jobs were lost, men were put on early early retirement. Building rentals lagged behind projections. Costs exceeded architects' estimates. Who knows the mischances?

That's always the way with credit. Difficulties develop, and then we look back to see the reason why. That's what we did, and please pardon the reference, in 1930 and 1931 after 1929.

THE MONEY CHASE

When loans are made or bonds sold, all is optimism. Lenders seek borrowers. If this bank or that investment banker won't come through, another will. If a loan matures, some new creditor is found to take it over. The toilsome process of amortization, of making ends meet, of collecting enough income to offset outgo, is lost sight of in the zest of easy money and optimistic entrepreneurship. Money chases after borrowers.

What does this mean? What has it got to do with the price of steel, or the stock of International Business Machines on the New York Stock Exchange, or the prospects for continued prosperity in the United States? Just this: It's possible to have inflation and not see it.

To be sure, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Walter W. Helier, chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, have repeatedly said that we aren't having price inflation. The wholesale commodity price index has hardly moved—up or down—in 5 years.

Why, we even have excess capacity. Factories turn out steel, aluminum, automobiles, washing machines, etc., with increasing efficiency. Workers have been laid off as rapidly—often more rapidly—than new jobs have been created. Result: A reservoir of unemployed—roughly 5.5 percent of the labor force. How, in such an economic setting—plenty of supply and scant scarcity—is inflation possible?

A $300 BILLION BACKLOG

Since 1946, savings in the United States have tripled. Time deposits in commercial and savings banks, savings and loan shares, E- and H-bonds, and mutual fund shares now aggregate $300 billion versus $90 billion 17 years ago. This money has to pay interest or dividends. It's money (except for E- and H-bonds) that has to be put to work.

And this is inflation potential. Its magnitude is one reason why, of late, the Federal Reserve Board has been applying the brakes to free and easy credit and calling attention to "credit deterioration." Free reserves of all banks have been falling, and banks in larger cities have actually been "minus" reserves. Only the smaller banks have excess lending capacity—without resort to Federal Reserve borrowing. At the same time, interest rates have been helped upward—to exert a deterrent effect on optimistic entrepreneurs.

Significantly, Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, has warned savings and loan associations against raising dividend rates. One in California has gone to 5 percent. He doesn't want

the chase after money (funds to invest) to force savings and loans to overoptimistic assumptions about borrowers' ability to repay. He who anticipates "difficulty" can best avoid it.

A Matter of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert an article in the RECORD entitled "The Indian Problem: A Matter of Conscience," by Marie McLaughlin, a high school student at Annunciation Priory High School in Bismark, N. Dak. Marie McLaughlin is a great granddaughter of Major McLaughlin, an early superintendent of the Standing Rock Reservation, who was serving as Superintendent at the time of the death of the famed Sitting Bull, a lifelong resident of western South Dakota and an enrollee on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation. Marie's father is presently serving as manager of the rehabilitation program on the Standing Rock Reservation, a program made possible through the settlement for taking of their lands and properties by virtue of the construction of the Oahe Dam on the main stem of the Missouri River. The article is as follows:

A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

I am a member of the tribe of the Standing Rock Sioux Indians. I have seen how the Indian people have been treated, how their problems have been ignored by many—helped by too few. I have observed how the Indian people have neither fully accepted nor rejected their new way of life, how they have failed to make the transition into society as individuals, by contributing their talents or, as a united people, by enlarging their cultural heritage.

The American Indians of the past were a proud, actively creative and high-spirited people, selfsufficient in all ways. But many years have passed since the arrival of the white man; and civilization has progressed tremendously in all phases of life, leaving no room for a people set in ways long past and gifted with memories dimmed by time but kept alive by pride.

The Federal Government from the beginning was directly concerned with the Indian problem. It had the responsibility of removing entire tribes from their land onto reservations. Because of the poor condition of the land which the Indians received and their shortage of money, the Government often provided them with the essentials necessary to survive the harsh winters and spring months. The Government also provided schools and teachers for the Indian children and set up the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the handling of their problems.

This aid, although it has been good in itself, is producing the wrong results. Instead of helping the Indians to become more responsible, the Government has provided them with a crutch of false security to fall back on when faced with challenges. This false security rests in the unexpressed, "There is always the welfare check—why work?" The Government has evidently not had a strong enough interest in the Indian people to realize that while there are several tribes in the United States who have highly organized programs for their improvement, there are many others who need Federal help carried out by an understanding and efficient personnel.

One of the most successful tribal programs being carried out today is that of my own tribe, the Standing Rock Sioux of the Dakotas. They have utilized their several million dollars in an intensive program managed by my father, to whom I owe my interest in the welfare of the Indians. He has worked with other leaders of the tribe; and together they have organized one of the finest programs in the country for the express purpose of developing the Standing Rock Indians into responsible, independent individuals. This they are doing by challenging their desire for a higher education through tribal grants, by encouraging ranching and farming through cattle and land programs, and by stimulating community and home improvements.

Selecting only the best and encouraging the talented, they are setting high standards for the Indian children of the future—not only to the future of the Standing Rock Sioux but also of all other Indian tribes.

Accomplishments of Massachusetts State Representative Peter Assaf During Recent Visit to Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress the outstanding work accomplished by State Representative Peter Assaf, Ninth Plymouth District, Brockton, Mass., during a recent visit to his native Lebanon.

Representative Assaf succeeded in bringing about an agreement between feuding factions in his native village of Al-Akoura that has resulted in great tragedy, bloodshed, and loss to many. As an American, who is fully cognizant of America being blessed with a peaceful way of life, Representative Assaf made great strides to bring about a peaceful agreement and although the summer elections brought bitterness again to a fever pitch, it is the opinion of many that this is only temporary. In a recent letter to my office, Representative Assaf said, "I am sure that peace will come and if it is necessary for me to go back to Lebanon to bring about a formal signing of the treaty to end the feud in the long-suffering village, I am prepared to do so."

I include in the RECORD two news stories, a letter signed by Hon. John D. Jernegan, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, also a letter from Mr. Evan M. Wilson, Chargé d'Affaires at the Foreign Service of the United States of America.

The unselfish and dedicated efforts of Representative Peter Assaf are deserving of the highest praise. His devotion to his fellow man and for the cause of peace is to be commended.

The material follows:

[From the Brockton (Mass.) Enterprise]

CITY GROUP TO RAISE MONEY FOR NEW SCHOOL IN LEBANON

(By Daniel J. Doherty)

Two Brocktonians, recently returned from a visit in their Lebanon village, had good news for fellow townsmen here. They were instrumental in bringing a halt to a 15-year feud that took 15 lives and maimed scores of men, women, and children. Property losses were also heavy.

Representative Peter G. Assaf, 29 Cherry Street, and Charles Nessralla, 373 Centre Street, left Al Akoura, where they were born, with the full knowledge that peace would reign once again and they pledged to raise $5,000 for a new school among countrymen in the United States.

At the age of 5, with his mother, brothers, and sisters, Representative Assaf left Lebanon to settle in Brockton. His flight to Lebanon last August was his first return to his native country since that time, 1912.

As a charter member of the group striving to keep Lebanon independent, he made the trip to Lebanon as a followup to the national session last year in Boston.

ARRIVES IN BEIRUT

Accompanied by a group of local residents, he flew out of Logan airport and on arrival in Beirut was given a welcome befitting a person of royalty. He said the affair was mingled with happiness and sadness.

After alighting from the plane he was handed a Lebanese newspaper and on the front page was a large picture of his brother, the late John G. Assaf, who was a member of the State legislature until the time of his death.

Representative Peter Assaf succeeded his brother and his picture was below that of his brother with the captions and stories explaining this and telling of the visit of the Brocktonians to their native country.

As Representative Assaf reached Al Akoura, it was declared a holiday in his honor with the music, folk singing, and dancing in the streets and a real carnival air prevailed.

News of the existing feud and strife of his village was withheld until after his welcome was over.

SCHOOL CLOSED

"I was distressed with the news that was given me and the damage I observed at firsthand. The only school in the town had been closed for 15 years. People lived in terror due to sudden raids and taking of life," Representative Assaf recounted.

* * * * *

"The committee working in close cooperation with Lebanese emigrants in the United States, Peter Assaf and Charles Nessralla, who originally came from the Lebanese village, Al Akoura, has successfully terminated the strife among villagers." This was a paragraph in the account of the happy story of the end of the strife.

For this work both Assaf and Nessralla were complimented by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE for establishing good relations and there were similar honors from H. E. Philippi Takla, minister of foreign affairs, and E. M. Wilson chargé d'affaires of the American Embassy.

TWENTY-THREE THOUSAND RESIDENTS

Al Akoura is a town of approximately 3,000 inhabitants and is in the mountain region 5,000 feet above sea level. After a few days in his village, Representative Assaf learned there was an election pending and realized this could probably be detrimental to any efforts he might make toward ending the feud.

He called on the right people and it was not too long before he was given the news the election was postponed until after the scheduled conferences. The Minister of Interior

thought the delay of the election was a good move and so gave his permission.

Representative Assaf has been a leading light in the organizing of a Federation of Lebanese Clubs to give moral support to Lebanon to stay independent from the United Arab League. One of the initial steps was taken a year ago in Boston and Representative Assaf, for his good work was invited to attend the Lebanese World Conference in Beirut.

There was little he could recall of the village outside of the well where all the people congregated in the early part of the day to get water for their day's existence.

Representative Assaf came to Brockton with his mother, brothers, Joseph, John, and Bolis, and a sister, now Mrs. Sadie Hasham of this city. The late John Assaf died while in the legislature and a short time later Mrs. Assaf died. Dr. Assaf died quite suddenly a few years ago.

[From the Beirut Daily]

AL-AKOURA STRIFE ENDED—EMIGRANTS EFFORTS APPRECIATED

(In fulfillment of the present regime's policy of working toward national unity and solidarity among all members of the Lebanese family a committee was officially nominated to effect general conciliation among citizens of Al-Akoura. The committee comprised Mr. Nazem Akkari, Cabinet Secretary, and Mr. Fawzi Bardawil, Governor of Mount Lebanon.)

The committee working in close cooperation with Lebanese emigrants in the United States, Peter Assaf Abi-Younes and Bishara Nassarallah, who originally came from the Lebanese village, Al-Akourah, has successfully terminated the strife among the villagers.

Leading personalities and especially community leaders in Jbeil (Byblos) also took part in the conciliation efforts.

The committee held its final meeting at Mount Lebanon Government House in the presence of committee members, as well as Abi-Younes and Nassrallah, Jbeil Deputy Gabrial Jermanos and Mr. Joseph Arege Saade, chairman of the board of directors of the Lebanese Press Co.

It was decided that a general meeting for all citizens of Al-Akoura be held to formalize the already agreed upon terms of the conciliation.

The following correspondence was exchanged earlier between the two Al-Akourah emigrants and the Mount Lebanon Governor:

"BEIRUT, *August 26, 1963.*

"Head, Al-Akoura Counciliation Committee:

"We, the undersigned, Peter Assaf and Charles Nassrallah, have the honor to submit the following for your kind consideration.

"The Lebanese Government has formed a committee to effect a general conciliation among citizens of our village, Al-Akoura. And since we desire to inform our Al-Akoura countrymen residing in the United States of the results achieved so far by the committee's good offices, especially after we were told by your Excellency that the Government is exerting worthy and ceaseless efforts to terminate the strife and insure that love and understanding prevail among all members of our beloved community, we therefore, request information on the results of your conciliation efforts.

"We would like to seize this opportunity to convey to your Excellency our deep gratitude and that of our entire community for your efforts to settle the village dispute with justice and fairness to all."

GOVERNOR'S ANSWER

"MESSRS. PETER ASSAF ABU YOUNES and CHARLES NASSRALLAH.

"DEAR SIR: In reference to your letter dated August 26, 1963, I have the honor to inform you of the following:

"I first want to thank you for your zealous concern over the current efforts to effect general conciliation among our countrymen, the citizens of Al-Akoura, and want to express my appreciation for your contributions toward this end through the help you rendered to the committee officially delegated with the authority to terminate the strife among the Akoura citizens.

"I regret, however, that you will not be able to stay amongst us until the conciliation efforts materialize, the efforts which we have begun and are coming to a fruitful end. You may well know that the Lebanese Government has placed a certain sum of money under our disposal, in our capacity as conciliation committee members to compensate those who suffered damages.

"We have made the necessary contacts, and met an almost unanimous agreement that the conciliation should be completed. What remains now is for us to distribute the money and hold a general meeting to bring the citizens together, and help them forget the past and start a new chapter of harmony, brotherhood, and cooperation."

DONATION MADE

Following the formal proclamation of the conciliation agreement, Messrs. Abi-Younes and Nassrallah announced their intention to contribute a large sum of money toward building a secondary school for Al-Akoura. The announcement prompted Mr. Bardawil to declare the Government's intention to finish the school regardless of cost.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 27, 1963.

Mr. PETER ASSAF,
State Representative,
State House, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. ASSAF: I am pleased to forward to you a letter from our Embassy at Beirut commending the fine work you performed during your recent visit in Aqura, Lebanon, in mediating a longstanding feud between the Hashim and Germanos factions of that town.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. JERNEGAN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
AMERICAN EMBASSY,
Beirut, Lebanon, September 17, 1963.

Mr. PETER ASSAF,
State Representative,
State House, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. ASSAF: Congressman BURKE has called to our attention your unselfish and devoted efforts to settle the feud between the Hashim and Germanos families in Aqura. We have also been informed by the Governor of Mount Lebanon, Mr. Fawzi Bardawail, that he and the Government of Lebanon very much appreciated what you had done and that he had sent you a letter to that effect.

Unfortunately, the reconciliation effected as a result of your endeavors came undone during the heat of the municipal elections earlier this summer. We understand, however, that the two-man committee charged with restoring the truce in Aqura (Fawzi Bardawail and Mr. Nazim Akkari of the Prime Minister's office) is very optimistic as to the outcome primarily because of the favorable atmosphere created by your work. You may, therefore, take justifiable pride in having contributed substantially to peace and security (and to the reputation of the Lebanese American) in the Jebail district.

I look forward to meeting you on your next visit to Lebanon.

Sincerely yours,

EVAN M. WILSON,
Chargé d'Affaires, a.i.

Connecticut Radio Ham Is Morale Man at McMurdo Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Sound Petty Officer, Walter R. Jones, of New Preston, Conn., is performing extraordinary service to keep up the morale of the isolated officers and men of the U.S. Navy assigned to McMurdo Sound, Antarctica, and to their families on the homefront. Mr. Jones, who is known as morale man and the old man of the ice was given the task 7 days a week of establishing contact with ham radio operators in the United States to provide telephone links between the men of McMurdo and their families all over the world. This he has done during the 7 months of winter in Antarctica.

There appeared in the October 22 edition of the New York Times an interesting article written by Allyn Baum which I attach herewith:

RADIO HAM IS THE MORALE MAN TO STATION AT MCMURDO SOUND

(By Allyn Baum)

MCMURDO SOUND, ANTARCTICA, October 8—At McMurdo Sound P.O. Walter R. Jones of New Preston, Conn., is known as the morale man. To the world of ham radio operators with whom he is in contact 10, 12 and 18 hours a day, he is known as "The Old Man of the Ice."

Petty Officer Jones is a Navy man of 16 years. He has been a ham operator for 5 of those years. During the 7-month winter here he was assigned the 7-day-a-week job of establishing contact with ham operators in the United States so that telephone links might be made between the men of McMurdo and their families all over the world.

Petty Officer Jones makes about 60 radio contacts every day. Since October 1962, he has supervised some 1,750 phone "patches" between McMurdo men and their homes. His family is living at Quonset Point, R.I., Mr. Jones' home base.

A SORT OF COUNTRY STORE

To McMurdo personnel, including the Soviet exchange scientist, Dr. Gennady Tarakanov, for whom Mr. Jones has tried to get a "patch" to his wife, the ham operator is known as Walt. And his ham shack, whose call letters are KC4USV, has become a sort of country store where the men pick up the latest news.

"Why, we had the score of the last Dodger-Yankee game 4 minutes after they ended," the petty officer said.

Mr. Jones says the calls "are as much a morale factor for the wives, sweethearts, and mothers of the men at home as they are for the men down here."

"I can't tell you what it means to the men to be cut off from the rest of the world, have no mail, no newspapers, no news from home and then out of the darkness we make a radio contact with a ham who puts through a phone call and there you are, talking with your loved one."

What do the men talk about?

"Well, first of all," Mr. Jones said, "they usually ask about their cars." "Then they ask about the kids, the finances, and then the health of everyone—and just about in

that order. Don't ask me why they always ask about cars first."

Last winter, Mr. Jones had contact with the Air Force base at Thule, Greenland.

"We were both so surprised," he said. "I think we both almost fell out of our chairs. We talked about the weather and then I mentioned I was located about 830 miles north of the South Pole and the ham at Thule replied, 'Isn't that a coincidence. we're about 830 miles south of the North Pole.'"

Petty Officer Jones makes contact with more than 165 hams in the United States willing to make "patches" for the men of the Antarctic. He completes about 14 "patches" daily for the men here.

Conversations between the men and their families and friends are usually held in a private booth or over the ham operator's desk. Mr. Jones must monitor every conversation, but the contents of the calls are kept in confidence.

"I've been party to some mighty touching things," the petty officer commented, "sickness, "dear Johns,' death * * * and some mighty happy things like hearing of the birth of one of our men's babies 40 minutes after it took place and arranging a 'patch' 8 hours later so the man could talk to his wife in the hospital."

Employment Service Conference Studies District of Columbia Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia sponsored a timely conference October 28 to discuss the paradox of a lack of skilled workers even though many persons are unemployed.

A recent survey conducted by the USES showed that Washington has an extremely tight labor market and that there are no significant reservoirs of unemployed persons to fill the existing jobs. According to the survey, the city's long-term unemployed lack the necessary skills.

I include an article from the Washington Post of October 27 discussing this conference in the RECORD at this point.

JOBS FOR IDLE IS PARLEY TOPIC

Ways of resolving a serious Washington paradox—a lack of skilled workers even though many persons are unemployed—will be discussed at a conference here Monday.

The event, sponsored by the U.S. Employment Service for the District, will bring together representatives from business, labor, education, and government to consider ways of increasing the number of trained workers.

John F. Henning, Under Secretary of Labor, will deliver the keynote address at the conference which will meet at the Employment Security Building.

The basis for conference action will be a survey recently conducted by the District Employment Service, in cooperation with the Maryland Department of Employment Security and the Virginia Employment Commission.

Highlights from this survey:

Washington has and will probably continue to have the tightest labor market in the country.

There are no significant reservoirs of unemployed that can be tapped to meet this need. The long-term unemployed lack the types of skills sought by employers.

Poverty is still a serious obstacle to the acquisition of a good education by some white and many Negro youth.

The job market for Negroes here has widened greatly recently and shows every sign of widening further. But the main waste of skill potential in the Washington area results from barriers that make it difficult for Negroes to upgrade their skills.

Illinois Study Relates Unemployment to Education and Skills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems for public policy is to discover why the United States continues to have a high level of unemployment while experiencing relative prosperity and economic expansion. I believe that the cause is largely structural and reflects imbalances in the labor market. On the other hand, the administration believes that the primary cause of our high level of unemployment is inadequate demand that must be corrected through tax cuts and higher levels of Government spending.

A column by Ralph McGill in the New York Herald Tribune of October 27 discusses the problem of "Why Unemployment?" and points out that one of the major contributions to the study of unemployment has been provided by the State of Illinois. The State made a massive survey covering about 150,000 unemployed workers. The report required 2 years of study and evaluation and was issued this year. The survey and the studies revealed that in general unemployment can be identified as a problem of the unskilled workers or workers with obsolescent skills. As the Illinois report says:

Looking at the pattern of employment and unemployment one positive correlation stands out unmistakably, that of employment with education. The changes taking place in industrial organization and in industrial technology require employees capable of dealing with their growing complexity, employees whose educational skills are rising commercially.

Under unanimous consent, I include the McGill column in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks:

WHY UNEMPLOYMENT?

(By Ralph McGill)

WASHINGTON.—In this lovely city, hard by the Potomac, the stark features of our life are statistically gathered and politically explained.

The ghost at the table of our affluent society, in which corporate profits are at an alltime high, bank savings and consumer credit purchases are at a new peak, and more people are at work than ever before, is the harsh statistic of unemployment.

But what people want out of the news today is not that there are some 5.4 million unemployed, but why? (They also are not so interested—as in another generation—over news that six persons have been shot, or that the minister has eloped with the contralto in the choir. They want to know why.) A very considerable body of information now exists as to why we have so many millions unemployed. Automation, and all that is wrapped in that word, is one of the reasons. But it is necessary in today's journalism to go behind that word and ask why.

One of the major contributions in the study of unemployment has been provided by the State of Illinois. A Governor's committee made a massive survey, beginning in 1961, and actually covered about 150,000 unemployed persons in an attempt to find out, "Who are unemployed? What are their ages, sex, race, education, previous employment, skill, location, and mobility?" The report required 2 years of study and evaluation and was issued this year.

The survey and the studies contained in it each revealed that, in general, unemployment can be identified as a problem of the unskilled worker—or one with absolescent skills. The Illinois report puts it clearly.

"Looking at the pattern of employment and unemployment one positive correlation stands out unmistakable, that of employment with education. The changes taking place in industrial organization and in industrial technology require employees capable of dealing with their growing complexity, employees whose educational skills are rising commercially."

This conclusion would be applicable in every State. States such as Illinois or Massachusetts, to name two examples, have an advantage because of their long history of industrial training and the development of a large pool of craftsmen. A State that has been largely argricultural does not have as much educational advantage and even less of a tradition of skills.

Massachusetts, as the other side of this coin, had so large a supply of skilled workers derived from the Bay State's head start in precision productions that she counts herself lucky to have lost so many of her obsolescent textile mills. The State has replaced industries that left for other regions with an astounding and impressive array of electronic and computer-type manufacturing which provides larger payrolls. Their workers are making the machines and the control mechanisms that make automation possible. Industrial patterns change. Defense needs cause quick shifts to plant locations. But the State with a supply of skilled workers profits most and has less dislocations of communities.

The last half of the 20th century has brought down upon us many problems and responsibilities. Race is but one of them. Many years of neglect and of supporting a costly and unjust system that may not longer be tolerated require us to see that past failures produce a cost that is painful and high.

So it is with education. The job hunter who cannot read a simple instruction sheet or fill out an elementary questionnaire is condemned to a life of, perhaps, continuous unemployment, relief, and odd jobs. Today in this country there are more than 58.6 million adults who are over 18 years old and who have not completed high school. The number will increase 50 percent by 1970. We must answer the questions of why this is true. Here again neglect in the past is presenting a bill we cannot avoid paying.

Too many Americans become angry and resentful if asked to face the realities of the 1960's. Or, they close their minds. But the bill must be paid. There is no place to hide.

The Gruening Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, our distinguished colleague, has reported to the Senate Committee on Government Operations on his trip to 10 Near East countries. A condensation of this report appeared in Near East Report, with significant quotas from the Senator from Alaska on his observations.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRUENING REPORT

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, Alaska, has presented the Senate Committee on Government Operations with a thoroughgoing 472-page report on U.S. aid to 10 Near East countries. The report, resulting from a 2-month tour of Turkey, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt last winter, was prepared with the help of Senator GRUENING's legislative assistant, Herbert W. Beaser. It reflects the Senator's experience as a former newspaperman and editor of the Nation.

Along with scathing criticism of U.S. aid practices, the report abounds with constructive proposals for reform. It serves as a handbook on U.S. aid: whether it should be continued; how it can be improved; why it must be improved.

NEW LOOK AT EGYPT

Many visitors to Cairo return singing praise for the graciousness and gallantry of President Nasser. Not so the Senator from Alaska.

"As I stood * * * watching preparations for a major speech by Colonel Nasser * * * and saw the multitude of large posters bearing his picture and I later heard his speech with its slogans and stirring platitudes, I * * * felt that all it would take to have that government become a Communist bloc nation would be to add a few slogans and change a few pictures."

It was clear to the Senator that (1) Egypt has become a "socialist police state"; (2) Nasser seeks "his own personal and Egypt's national aggrandizement, in that order", and (3) "U.S. dollars are enabling Egypt to wage war in Yemen, to foment trouble in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and to arm to attack Israel just as surely as though they were spent directly for that purpose."

Senator GRUENING challenged U.S. aid to Egypt, charging our State Department has misjudged Nasser's intentions. He condemand the "current official suggestion" that Nasser does not really mean his deadly threats against Israel and that Nasser's radio does not really mean to beam violence and revolution into the hearts of the citizens of Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

The Senator took Egypt's ruler more seriously. "Nasser's radio," he wrote, "* * * is the only radio preaching the violent overthrow of other governments."

U.S. AIDers not only disregard this situation, they abet it. Over one million dollars has been obligated through fiscal 1963 to help Egypt build a Telecommunications Research and Training Institute.

RUSSIA AND EGYPT

"When I spoke to Colonel Nasser," writes GRUENING, "he stated that after the poor showing made by his soldiers against the English, French, and Israelis, his officers had demanded that he accept the offer of Soviet arms."

Thus, Nasser seemed to expect a U.S. Senator to believe that he, the hapless dictator, was forced by his mortified army to become totally dependent on military aid from the Soviet Union. Obviously, he felt that, no matter how clearly he reveals himself as an expert cold war fence-sitter, the U.S. would accept his explanations. Senator GRUENING did not.

SIDE EFFECTS

These are the side effects of U.S. shipments of Public Law 480 food, mainly wheat, to Egypt:

Nasser can divert labor and resources from Egyptian wheatfields to Yemeni battlefields.

Egypt can continue growing cotton to trade for Russia arms.

Other Near East states, usually prone to use U.S. aid to better effect, are forced to divert needed resources for coequal military development with Egypt.

GRUENING points out that if Nasser does not receive U.S. wheat, he will either have to grow it himself or import it from another country. It would be difficult to find a country with wheat in sufficient surplus to feed all the Egyptians who survive on U.S. shipments. Thus, GRUENING felt that the United States could exercise real influence over Nasser by means of our aid, and he postulated two conditions for its continuation:

"1. Egypt's prompt compliance with the terms of the U.N. settlement of the Yemen dispute;

"2. Egypt's reversal of her present armament policy so as to cease production of missiles, warplanes, submarines, and other implements of war clearly designed for aggressive purposes."

PAT ON THE BACK

GRUENING was kinder to U.S. AID'ers in Jordan. With U.S. assistance, King Hussein has instituted social, agrarian and administrative reforms. By 1967, Jordan expects to increase gross national product by 60 percent, reduce foreign trade deficit by $33.6 million, increase employment by 21 percent.

But GRUENING had reservations. We support development of Jordan's tourism without encouraging her to admit thousands of tourists who visit Israel every year. These tourists, potentially a substantial source of revenue, are barred once they have set foot in Israel.

LEBANON AND ISRAEL

With her high literacy rate and stable government, Lebanon has successfully utilized U.S. aid. Senator GRUENING commented that because of her farflung trading interests, her support of the Arab boycott stems more from "the profit motive than * * * feelings of Arab unity."

But, the Senator argued, like any country whose major stock is in trade, Lebanon has everything to lose from war.

"What has been said about the success of the AID program in Lebanon," GRUENING wrote, "can be said to an even greater degree of * * * Israel." In Israel, AID found cooperative officials, enthusiastic public and a national willingness to provide counterparts, in effort and personnel, to the U.S. contribution.

ECONOMIC VIEWS

GRUENING feels that countries like Lebanon and Israel, which encourage private business, are more likely to utilize U.S. aid in the spirit in which it is given.

He also felt that AID officials were trying too many projects in too many places and too often, simultaneously. To his mind, many projects initiated to stimulate economic diversity will fail because the recipient country is not prepared to follow through with them. He recommended that AID take inventory of its projects with a view to cutting their number.

NEAR EAST PEACE CORPS

The Arab refugee situation, to GRUENING, is an economic and social rather than a political problem.

"I think one of the greatest mistakes * * * was to establish an international agency staffed primarily with locally recruited personnel * * *. Most of these locally hired employees are themselves refugees. The feeling still generally prevails among the refugees and the leaders of the Arab nations that any economic rehabilitation and integration * * * would be a weakening of the political strength of the movement to return to what they still consider Palestine. Thus economic rehabilitation has been resisted by the refugees."

Tax Cut May Not Reduce Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the Washington Post of October 27, Bernard D. Nossiter examines the current debate on whether a reduction in taxes will provide substantial help in reducing the Nation's unemployment.

There is a growing body of opinion that holds that automation and other changes in our economy are transforming the demand for labor by increasing job openings for the skilled and reducing those for the uneducated and unskilled. According to those who hold this view—and I happen to be one of them—the extra demand generated by a tax cut would be spent primarily for products and services that employ the skilled. Under these circumstances, the administration's program would only make a small dent in unemployment.

One of the most persuasive presentations of this view has been made by Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth, labor-market specialist at Michigan State University. I have commented upon Professor Killingsworth's views and inserted some excerpts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower on October 2 and October 21—pages A6183–A6186, 18974.

Because the Post article provides a useful summary of the differing viewpoints on this issue, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

CUT IN TAXES HELD NO HELP TO BULK OF U.S. UNEMPLOYED

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Is the Nation's army of unemployed doomed to continued joblessness until their schooling and skills are increased?

Will a tax cut merely open up jobs for the well educated who are now in short supply?

These questions have been raised with special force by Charles C. Killingsworth, a

labor market specialist at Michigan State University. His thesis has drawn so much attention in the administration that Chairman Walter Heller of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers has himself replied to it.

In brief, Killingsworth argues that automation and the growing outlays for sevices like insurance or education have transformed the demand for labor. These irreversible trends, he says, increase job openings for the skilled and the schooled; job opportunities for the uneducated and unskilled are shrinking.

QUALITY A FACTOR

A tax cut, Killingsworth contends, increases demand generally but doesn't affect the quality of workers. The extra demand generated by a tax cut will be spent primarily on the products and services that employ the skilled. So, the professor concludes, the administration program will make only a small dent in unemployment.

Even worse, some of the tax cut's force will be dissipated, he says. This is because some of the demand it creates won't be satisfied due to a shortage of skilled workers.

For the administration, Heller readily agrees that the unskilled and unschooled make up an outsized portion of the jobless. But the key question, Heller says, is what has caused the increase in unemployment in recent years. And here the statistical evidence indicates that unemployment is not rising more rapidly at the bottom of the skilled ladder.

Between 1957 and 1962, Heller observes, the jobless rate for male college graduates doubled; the rate for those with 8 or less years of school rose only by one-half or about the same as the rise in unemployment generally.

RATE WAS SAME

Moreover, take a look at 1954 and 1962, 2 years in which unemployment was the same 5.6 percent, Heller says. If the unskilled have been losing out, the unemployment rate for the most skilled should have declined. But it didn't. In both years, the jobless rate for the highly trained professional and technical workers was the same, 1.7 percent.

On a homelier level, Heller might have pointed to Detroit. Unemployment in the Motor City's labor market was a whopping 11.1 percent in 1961; so far this year, it has averaged only 5.4 percent. The difference appears to be 2 strong auto years in a row In other words, increased demand—not a change in the skills of Detroit's labor force—shrank the jobless rolls rapidly.

Yesterday, however, Killingsworth returned to the attack in a speech at Michigan State. Heller's figures, he suggested, conceal more than they reveal. Between 1957 and 1962, the number of workers counted in the labor force with 8 or less years of schooling fell sharply and their average age increased; those with college degrees rose rapidly and their average age decreased. It is logical, Killingsworth argued, to expect that unemployment for a younger, growing sector of the labor force would rise faster than the rate for an aging, shrinking group.

As for Heller's professional and technical groups, nearly a quarter have had no college training at all. So, the average jobless rate for this sector may have held constant because the less educated found it harder to get jobs while the better educated found it easier.

INVISIBLE JOBLESS

Having disposed of Heller's statistics to his own satisfaction, Killingsworth came up with some of his own. He makes elaborate calculations for the invisible unemployed. These are the workers who don't show up in the official statistics because they are neither at work or looking for work. However, if jobs were open, they would be seeking employment.

Killingsworth estimates that there are nearly 1 million male workers in this shadow class. He lumps them in with the officially counted unemployed to calculate the changes in real unemployment. And he compares the situation in 1950 with 1962.

Here is what he finds:

Percentage change in real unemployment rates, 1950–62, for males

Years of school completed:	
0 to 4	100
5 to 7	47
8	53
9 to 11	26
12	43
13 to 15	−2
16 or more	−36

As Killingsworth sees it during the 1950–62 period, unemployment generally rose fastest among the least educated and actually declined among the best educated.

This puts the ball back in Heller's court. With the tax bill at stake, he can be expected to smash it back promptly.

Madam Nhu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, during her visit to the United States, Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu has been the object of criticism from many sources. Likewise, the Government of South Vietnam has been attacked as being despotic, corrupt, and based on nepotism. Yet no one questions the allegiance of this Government in the war against communism.

While Madam Nhu journeyed unwelcomed through the United States, Marshal Tito, an avowed Communist, was welcomed with open arms by official Washington. Marshal Tito and Madam Nhu are recognized leaders of their countries. Tito is a Communist. Madam Nhu is anti-Communist. The first was welcomed; the latter was chastised.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the reports of the situation in South Vietnam lack objectivity. The American people have not been given a sober analysis of the facts upon which they might reach their own judgment.

For this reason, I am delighted that Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, with her traditional ability, has directed her attention to this subject in an article entitled, "The Lady Is for Burning: The Seven Deadly Sins of Madam Nhu." Without emotion and without sensationalism, Mrs. Luce reviews the various charges which have been brought against Madam Nhu and puts the matter in its proper prospective. This sober appraisal of the Government of Vietnam should be must reading for every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article printed in the National Review of November 5 entitled, "The Lady Is for Burning: The Seven Deadly Sins of Madam Nhu," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LADY IS FOR BURNING: THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS OF MADAM NHU

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu, the first lady of Vietnam, who recently left our shores, is beautiful, dynamic, courageous, intelligent. And even her worst enemies do not doubt her piety or virtue. A militant Catholic, mother of four, she is a devoted and fiercely loyal (if not subservient) wife. But what makes Madam Nhu important is the great political power she wields in her country. For a moment, however brief, in history, some part of America's prestige if not security, seems to lie in the pale pink palm of her exquisite little hand.

South Vietnam, although an underpopulated country (14 million), is the latest spot in America's 17-year-old struggle to contain communism. The United States is spending better than a million dollars a day there to help the Vietnamese fight a guerrilla war. If this war is lost Asiatic communism, in the end, must gain all of Indochina.

The purpose of Madam Nhu's visit to the United States was to convince her American hearers that her country is winning that war, but will probably lose it if she and her family are undermined and thrown to the left-wing wolves. What seems to be happening to the Government in Vietnam is remarkably like what happened to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Chiang in China when the Department of State pulled the rug out from under them, and Mao Tse-tung took over China.

Madam Nhu's tour drew large crowds. But it proved somewhat less than triumphal. She was booed and hissed in her passings. And her TV interlocutors and lecture audiences (already prejudiced against her by U.S. press dispatches from far off Saigon) threw the heaviest barrage of loaded, discourteous, even insulting questions at her that have ever been addressed to a distinguished foreign figure—and an ally. By comparison, Khrushchev on his American visits had been treated like a public hero.

What is the case against this fragile little creature who has been so scornfully dubbed "the Dragon Lady"? Why was she treated as though she were a vicious enemy of our country? Why did President Kennedy slam the White House door in her pretty face, while he ordered the brass handles polished to the nines for Communist Tito's visit? Why has he ordered that shipments of surplus milk to the children of her country—our allies—be curtailed while he presses hard for shipments of wheat to Khrushchev, who still threatens to bury us?

What are the sins of Madam Nhu? Upon examination, they seem to be seven:

1. Madam Nhu and her family represent, according to their American critics in Saigon, a principle which is utterly adhorrent to all true lovers of democracy: the principle of "family rule," or nepotism.

Madam Nhu's only official positions are those of deputy in the National Assembly and chief of South Vietnam's women's movements. But her husband, Ngo Dinh Nhu, controls intelligence and the secret police, and is personal adviser and political theoretician to his brother, President Ngo Dinh Diem. Her other brother-in-law is Ngo Dinh Thuc, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Hué.

To be sure, President Kennedy appointed his brother, Robert, Attorney General (even though Bobby had never tried a case). And this powerful post put Bobby in control of our secret police—the FBI. Mr. Kennedy also engineered the election of his 31-year-old brother, Teddy, to the Senate. He made his

brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, Director of the multi-million-dollar Peace Corps program (and perhaps hopes to make him Governor of Illinois). Another brother-in-law, Stephen Smith, has handled White House patronage and other sensitive affairs of the party—in the interests of the Kennedys. The President has, of course, found ornamental Government missions for his sisters and other relatives.

Still, in America, that's democracy. But not in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

2. American newspapermen in Saigon view Madam Nhu as a political demagog who controls all the election machinery in her own district. They say she stole her last election as deputy by promising "to do more" for her constituents than any other candidate, because she was related to the President. The proof that her election was undemocratic, they claim, is that she got over 90 percent of the vote—and delivered on her promise: her constituents do get more than other Vietnamese voters and taxpayers.

NEPOTISM EAST AND WEST

Now, to be sure, a thing like that can happen here—it happened just a year ago, right in Massachusetts. And now Senator TED KENNEDY is delivering a $50 million electronic research center to his constituents who are also hopeful on the score of profitable railroad and airline mergers.

Still, in America, that's democracy. But not in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

3. Madame Nhu's American critics feel she is a religious bigot. She not only insists on practicing what her Christian church teaches, but she tries to have the law of her country reflect Christian morals on sex. She has put through laws against concubinage, prostitution, and adultery. She has made divorce unattainable, except by government permission. Her country is greatly underpopulated and is suffering thousands of war casualties: she has banned contraceptives. She has, the press reports, some mad idea that she can preserve the ancient, chaste, Vietnamese patterns of courtship. She has fought against the entrance of Hollywood films of sex and violence, and foreign pornographic literature. And—could you ask for better proof of her bigotry?—she frowns on the twist and bikinis.

It is even rumored among Americans in the "twisteasies" which have sprung up in Saigon on protest against this Asiatic bluestocking that she disapproves of Liz Taylor films, on the totally undemocratic grounds that young Vietnamese girls have not yet learned to envy and admire our American goddess' habit of breaking up homes and living publicly with others' husbands.

Now, Vietnam may be Madame Nhu's country, but democracy has just got to make room for things like that. That's what the American taxpayer is shelling out $1 million a day to defend in Vietnam. (Or is it?)

4. The U.S. press corps in Saigon seem to agree to a man that Madame Nhu has too much political power for a woman—especially one with no official position. Time says she not only has her husband's ear, but she openly orders around cabinet ministers and generals, sees to it that her favorites get jobs in government, and at all times around the clock, she is up to her neck in political wangling.

Being a mere 5 feet tall in her 3-inch heels, she has still not had an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. But that gallant gentleman has drawn himself up to his full 6 feet 3 inches and is waiting for her return to slug it out with her.

To be sure, we have had our Eleanor Roosevelt, a President's wife who for 25 years exerted more influence over the domestic and foreign politics of her country than any woman who wasn't a crowned ruler. Indeed, she was once known to have ordered up a whole squad of planes during the war to pay a visit to some favorite soldier-friends in the Pacific. And, like Madam Nhu, she also helped to select candidates for office who reflected her views. Again, like Madam Nhu, she often took a beating from pressmen who thought she meddled and was too ubiquitous.

BUT IN AMERICA—

But in America, that's democracy. The American press wants no such power in a woman's hands in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

Moreover, Madam Nhu is an inveterate do-gooder, and a feminist. She has tried to raise the legal status of women in her country, and interest them in taking an active part in politics and in the defense of their country. For example, Madam Nhu has taught Vietnamese women to shoot—the condition, that they must stand by unarmed when a village is attacked by Communist guerrillas, but ready to pick up the gun of a fallen, or absconding, Vietnamese man.

Madam Nhu, it seems, offends both Western and Asiatic male sensibilities, not only because she herself is not the geisha type, the concubine type or the clinging vine type, but because she seems to want the 7 million women of her newborn, embattled nation to behave like the kind of women who went out of style a hundred or more years ago—the pioneer women of America. It seems she has heard about our foremothers who helped their men conquer the oceans and the continent, and who were as quick on the draw as their menfolk when scalping parties suddenly put in an appearance. She seems to have heard somewhere of Molly Pitcher, Annie Oakley, and Joan of Arc. (Boy, is this lady for burning.)

To be sure, in America, we have ourselves in recent months turned a thought or two to the question of giving a break to American women.

The Commission, headed by the late Mrs. Roosevelt, on the Status of Women, has just turned in its report to the President. It shows that while 24 million American women work for wages, they are not paid equal wages for equal work. It shows that there are only 234 women among the States' 7,700 legislators; 11 Congresswomen out of 435, and 2 women Senators out of a hundred. Only two women have held Cabinet rank in all American history. In releasing the report, President Kennedy urged that more women participate at all levels in public life. In America, we want progress for our women. But not for women of Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

5. The "family rule" of the Ngo Dinhs, according to their American critics, does not have the full support of the people of South Vietnam. Although there is no Gallup poll in Vietnam, it seems that there is a newspaper in Saigon which lays on to Madame Nhu, her husband, and President Diem quite unmercifully. This paper says the Nhus must go, and hints quite broadly that a coup d'état or a revolution would be the most democratic way of getting rid of the lot. Why wait for elections?

This highly democratic view seems to be shared by some of the U.S. pressmen who pop in and out of Saigon en route to Hong Kong. And it is also shared by some "coup-minded" officials of the U.S. Embassy.

THE ELECTORATE AND THE PRESS

While this anti-Government press is not suppressed, Madam Nhu makes it plain that she doesn't like the situation. As for the Embassy, she feels that it is pretty stupid of the United States to try to throw out an anti-Communist government when all they can substitute is a military (and unreliable) dictatorship.

Madam Nhu's American critics say all this shows that she is, at heart, a tyrant and that any foreign government without the full support of all the people and the press should be kicked out.

Now, the American electorate is far from 100 percent for President Kennedy. Indeed, he got just a fraction less than 50 percent of the vote in 1960 * * * and there were even rumors he didn't get that. Nor is the press entirely for him. In fact, a lot of it is against him—and even more against his family—and quite a lot of Americans happen to agree with Madam Nhu who thinks he is lulling the United States into a false sense of security about the Communists.

However, this is America and we don't talk about "coups" and overthrowing elected governments. We believe in a democracy. You should wait for elections. But in Vietnam it's different. Why not help overthrow the Diem government in order to get rid of Madam Nhu. Isn't it our money?

Two additional charges (six and seven) remain against Madam Nhu. They are indeed serious: First, that she has pressured the Diem government into persecuting the Buddhist religion; second, that her stubborn refusal to come to terms with the Buddhists has "hopelessly" compromised the Vietnamese war effort.

How well founded are these charges? And if well founded, what will happen in Vietnam if the Nhus and President Diem are booted out? For there can be little doubt that the big boot will have to be used, since Madam Nhu, among other things, is a fighting lady.

Not long ago Madam Nhu said that Americans are "Ivanhoes" who are perpetually in love with the underdog, but confused about who the underdog really is. She thinks the underdogs that the U.S. press corps in Vietnam and the State Department are sobbing over are the Vietcong Communist provocateurs who have inflamed some Buddhists opinion. Madam Nhu believes she herself is the real underdog in the situation. Certainly the china doll-sized stateswoman from South Vietnam has been taking enough punishment from the American press to smash her into a tiny heap of porcelain scraps. Fortunately for her, and possibly for her country, Madam Nhu is not a china doll. Backhanded by the State Department, bullied and scratched at by reporters, lectured at by her own lecture audiences, Madam Nhu travels along singing her song. Chin up, eyes flashing, long delicate hands gesticulating gracefully and forcefully, she is still pretty solid on her 3-inch heels.

The charge that Madam Nhu, her husband, her brothers-in-law President Ngo Dinh Diem and Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, have "persecuted" South Vietnamese Buddhists is certainly the toughest charge she has had to meet. But meet it she did. And meet it she must, for her fellow-Catholic President Kennedy does not intend to face into the 1964 election campaign defending himself against accusations from the liberal left that he has supported a government just because it is Catholic. He can better afford to lose Vietnam than to have that calumny tied to him.

THE CHARGE OF PERSECUTION

The fact is that the charge of religious persecution against the family is pretty recent. And if indeed they are "persecuting Buddhists" this will mark the first time in democratic history that a small religious minority has successfully "persecuted" an overwhelming religious majority in a democracy.

South Vietnam Catholics number 1.5 million of the 14 million population. There are approximately 5.25 million Buddhists and the remainder of the population is made up of Taoists, Confucianists, and members of other sects. Less than one-third of the Cabinet members are Catholics; only 3 of the 19

generals. But Catholics are about half of the civil service and the assembly. The reason for this, given and accepted until a few months ago by all foreign observers in Vietnam, is that the Catholics under the French built and extensive parochial school system. Over the years this system has turned out relatively well-educated graduates with a lively interest in Western democratic government. The Buddhists have not been able to compete with these educated Catholic Vietnamese in civil service examinations. Until last May, there was no evidence of great discontent with the Diem government by the Buddhist population. On the contrary, thanks to the annual $350 million economic and military aid, and with the help of 14,000 U.S. military advisers, victory, last spring, seemed near for the Diem government, and the people seemed to know it.

Then, in the space of 5 months, the flaming deaths of six Buddhist bonzes, or priests, led to a series of public demonstrations which brought about the present political crisis in which Madam Nhu herself is also being badly burned.

FORCED TO LOSE FACE

How did these deaths come about? Were the Buddhist priests dragged by force from their homes or temples by Catholics and put to the torch—as in the not so distant past in America, Negroes were torn from their homes, or jails, and lynched or burned—by white Americans? Were the bonzes butchered as were thousands of Mao Tse-tung's recalcitrant Chinese farmers? Were they tortured, beaten, brainwashed, shot, liquidated, as millions of Russians, Poles, Hungarians were by Stalin and Khrushchev?

They were not. The saffron-robed monks were living unmolested by anyone in their own pagodas, when one by one they stole forth into public squares, where they squatted in lotus pose, poured gasoline over themselves, applied the match, and committed suicide.

In America, if a Catholic priest were to burn himself to death in protest of the Government's failure to provide free bus rides for parochial school children, or if a Protestant minister were to make of himself a living torch to express his opposition to the Supreme Court decision against prayer in public schools, we would consider them religious maniacs. And our Government would take stringent measures to prevent any repetition of such acts. This is precisely the view Mme. Nhu has taken of the self-immolating bonzes. They are slaves, she said, "if not to others, at least to their own folly." And the government of President Diem has used the police force to prevent further emulations of such follies. What, then, was the particular grievance which led these Buddhists to encompass their own cremation?

Last May, the Buddhists of Hué were forbidden to unfurl their flags, in honor of Buddha's 2507th birthday, above the flag of Vietnam. As in America, no flag in Vietnam may fly above the national flag. (In this land of many religions, separation of church and state is, of necessity, the law of the nation.) Refusal by Diem's government to permit the Buddhists to fly their flag above the national flag caused the leaders of the Hué pagoda to "lose face."

In America, self-immolation is not thought to be a useful or particularly democratic way to protest grievances or discrimination. However, an insult which might barely cause one American to punch another, could, say, in Japan, lead to hara-kiri. A Japanese who "loses face" disembowels himself with a ritual sword, often aided by a friend or a relative. In India, for hundreds of years, widows threw themselves onto the funeral pyres of their husbands: If they did not, they "lost face." Although suttee has been outlawed for a century in India, in backward villages it is still occasionally practiced.

NIRVANA ATTAINED

The Buddhist monks in Vietnam who incinerated themselves not only regained "face" for the temple, but Nirvana or Paradise and sainthood for themselves. For at least three of the monks who were over age 70, this must have seemed a rather good deal.

(Probably no American can understand the Asiatic concept of "face." This is perhaps fortunate. In view of how much "face" the United States has lost in the Orient, we would have to burn Washington to recover it.)

In our country, protestors sign petitions, picket, hire halls, or rabble rouse. Recently our Negroes (a minority) have taken to sit-ins, sitdowns, mass demonstrations, handcuffing themselves together, until the police break them up.

While we are on the subject of discrimination, it may help us to think a little more charitably about President Diem's and Madam Nhu's alleged "persecution" of the Buddhists, if we remember that despite 4 years of mass Negro demonstrations in America, the President still has not found it convenient to appoint a Negro to his Cabinet, to help elect a Negro Senator, or Governor, or even a big city mayor. And yet Negroes represent 20 percent of our population, and time and again their vote decides presidential elections.

In America, it depends on what you can get away with. But not so in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money. In Vietnam you have to be perfect.

Consequent to the Buddhist sacrifices, there have been, since May, a half-dozen demonstrations of Buddhists in the streets. In the attempt to keep order, the Vietnam police have encountered the same difficulties our police have encountered with unruly crowds of demonstrators in Alabama, Chicago, New York's Harlem, and New Jersey. And in Vietnam as in America, some people got hurt. A bomb thrown by an unknown provocateur killed several people in Vietnam. U.S. Embassy officers expressed themselves as being "shocked and disgusted" at this occurrence and at the police suppression of the Buddhist demonstrators.

The State Department no doubt failed to inform our embassy in Saigon that similar episodes were happening in Alabama, where four children were killed in a church bombing, and in the wake, two boys were killed by police. Nor did they send out over the Voice of America to Vietnam a very clear account of riots and police methods used to quell Negro-white rioters in other parts of the country.

And speaking of corruption in Vietnam, what about the Cosa Nostra operation in America? Ah, well, in America, democracy isn't perfect. But in Vietnam it had better be—on our money.

The last charge against Madam Nhu and the Diem government is that their failure to be democratic—according to the concept of an ideal democracy which their American critics carry about in their heads—will now make it impossible to win the war against the Vietcong Communists.

Is this true, or is it false? Vietnam has been at war for almost a decade. The South Vietnam population is suffering 5,000 casualties a year. Women and men, many of them Buddhists, have gone forth day after day, year after year, to meet and repulse their Communist enemies. A few months ago victory was in sight. If the United States gives firm support to Diem now, the crisis will pass and the war may still be won. If the U.S. support is withdrawn on the grounds that the United States can no longer support the Diem government because 6 men—or 16—insist on making human torches of themselves, then South Vietnam will fall and the political vacuum left by the Ngo Dinh family will soon be filled by the "Yu-No-Hu" family: the Chinese Communists.

Is the history of the liberal press in Chungking and Havana going to repeat itself? The evidence is that it is.

The Christian Science Monitor wrote last week: "The confusion (in American public opinion) stems from the fact that the United States does not wish to say, in so many words, that it is working for a revolution in South Vietnam. But so long as the Ngo Dinh family remains unbending, that is the fact."

If indeed, that is the fact, the administration will no doubt begin to boast along about 1965 that it has "relieved tensions" in Vietnam by negotiating peace with Ho Chi-minh, the Communist leader of that country. And no doubt wheat and arms will then soon be sent to him, to strengthen "the Vietnamese Tito" against Red China.

Poor Madam Nhu. The lady is sure for burning.

Post Correspondent Disputes Seymour Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the Washington Post of October 9, Prof. Seymour Harris, of Harvard University, presented the case for a tax cut as he sees it. Because I disagreed so strongly with some of his statements and allegations, I wrote a reply to the Post which appeared on October 15.

Another reply to Professor Harris has been made by Stanley Langland, of Washington, D.C., in a letter to the Washington Post of October 18. Mr. Langland makes clear that Republicans have consistently supported tax reduction under conditions of fiscal integrity and sound economic theory. Mr. Langland's letter makes a highly useful contribution to our understanding of the weaknesses of the administration's fiscal policy, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

EDUCATION IN ECONOMICS

Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University, writes (October 9) that he refuses to believe that Republicans are trying to kill the Kennedy tax program for purely partisan reasons.

Professor Harris, and all others sharing his partisan view, can look at the facts and calm their fears. Republicans have consistently supported tax reduction under conditions of fiscal integrity and sound economic theory and they do so now.

Economist John Maynard Keynes, one of the fathers of the sophiscated approach championed by Professor Harris, said governments should rely on budget deficits in order to stimulate economic growth in bad times, and then build budget surpluses when times are good. And who is it that wants now to use the Keynesian approach?

President Kennedy and Professor Harris advocate huge planned deficits now when, according to Mr. Kennedy in his news conference of October 9, "* * * profits have never been higher in history and the whole year of 1963 looks very good * * *."

Professor Harris and other partisans have fostered the general impression that Republicans are insisting on budget cuts as the necessary condition for a tax reduction.

To the contrary, Republicans have gone more than halfway and say this:

"We would like to follow Keynesian economics and hold spending down to match revenues in the present state of economic conditions because we think it makes fiscal sense. But we also see some advantages of tax reduction. And Mr. Kennedy keeps assuring us he will hold spending down, so let's limit the fiscal 1964 spending estimate to $97 billion which is actually a $4.4-billion increase in the actual spending level of $92.6 billion for fiscal 1963. And let's set the fiscal 1965 estimate at another billion dollar increase, or $98 billion."

But President Kennedy and Professor Harris evidently cannot live within these modest limitations. They are opposing a commitment to limit their increase in spending to $4.4 billion over a 12-month period.

Professor Harris in his letter further suggests that all is lost until the public and Congress "become adequately educated in modern economics."

His book, "Saving American Capitalism," which was a substantial part of this writer's college economics study, advocates public spending as opposed to tax reduction as the best of the two roads to economic growth. He warns us against an unjustified fear of deficit spending and what he calls a "debt neurosis."

On page 141 he specifically educates us as to what is wrong with the tax reduction route as he recommends that we cast off our fears of public deficit spending.

If Professor Harris wants tax reduction now, he must have changed his position since writing the book with which he would educate Congress. Or, if not that, then he wants unlimited deficit spending even more than he wants tax reduction. And this must be the Kennedy position also. It surely represents the thinking of Mr. Walter Heller.

But if this is the Kennedy position then it is in direct contrast to what Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee has eloquently stated to be the Kennedy position. He says we need to limit spending and says Mr. Kennedy agrees.

Mr. MILLS on September 24 in the House presented "the two roads the Government can follow" to economic strength. They are the same two roads Professor Harris mentions—tax reduction or deficit spending. But contrary to Professor Harris, Mr. MILLS clearly says the tax reduction road is the one to take.

Evidently an airing of this problem in a debate between Mr. MILLS and Professor Harris could help to clear up the contradictions.

STANLEY G. LANGLAND.

WASHINGTON.

Address by Hon. William J. Green, Jr., at Democratic Party's $100 Dinner, Philadelphia, on Wednesday, October 30, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure and privilege of hearing one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable WILLIAM GREEN, city chairman of the great city of Philadelphia give a speech, containing more than passing interest for the people of Pennsylvania and the good people of Philadelphia particularly.

It is always a pleasure to hear BILL GREEN and even more so when his remarks are so appropo to the situation tion. Mr. Speaker I present our colleague's remarks knowing in advance that many members will enjoy reading it.

There is also a faint suspicion that one of our Members of the other body may learn that his actions have not been ignored and he has not escaped the folly of ways scot free.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., PHILADELPHIA DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S $100 DINNER AT CONVENTION HALL, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1963

Philadelphia can be proud of many things but there can be no greater pride than the realization that here in our city a great dream was born. A great man was launched on the road to the Presidency.

When I have said that, I have said it all. Our President needs no glowing words of tribute to memorialize his brilliant accomplishments.

So I turn to a subject which can stand all the public exposure it can get. I turn to that creaking structure of hidebound conservatism, the Republican Party—a party which today is racing to meet the challenges of the future with all the speed of a two-legged turtle floundering in quicksand.

And the Republican Party in Philadelphia is mired in a swamp of futility all its own. This is a party in which leaders eliminate qualified candidates in order to scoop from the bottom of the barrel a man who has never held public office. A man who has never served in a top administrative post, not in business, not in industry. A man who has twice been rejected by the people in his ambitious quest for power. A rather peculiar man who, for some strange compulsion best known to himself, carries on a one-man war against the Philadelphia Zoo.

In all the years, I have been in politics, I can truthfully say that this is the first time I've ever heard of a candidate trying to win political advantage at the expense of zebras, bears, llamas, and penguins. This represents some kind of new low, even for Republicans. Obviously, somebody over at the union league made a horrible mistake, instead of running James McDermott for mayor, they should have run Clyde Beatty. Maybe they ought to arrange for McDermott to campaign in a cage.

And as if that's not enough, have you read in one of our local newspapers that a Republican candidate for city council thought that his leader, "5-Percent Willie" Scranton was a member of the Ku Klux Klan? Now I grant you that "5-Percent Willie" is no prize bag but even the Democrats never accused "Wee Willie" of cutting out holes in pillowcases, but maybe that's what comes of associating with the new breed of superman being merchandized by Arizona department stores these days. "5-Percent Willie's" been chasing GOLDWATER's bandwagon so hard that "Willie's" hot breath is beginning to fog the Senator's bifocals.

But we all know about "5-Percent Willie," he's like quicksilver: When you try to put your finger on him there's nothing under it. Getting "Willie" to take a stand on public issues is like trying to prop up a wet noodle. The last time "Willie" took a stand on anything was when his boss, "Harve" Taylor, walked into his office. Of course you all know "Harve" Taylor; he's the one who spends his free time kissing Scranton on the cheek.

But don't let anybody kid you, Scranton really works hard at his job. Pennsylvania's never had a Governor who signed so many new tax bills into law. Why in the first few months in office, the Peter Pan of Harrisburg signed so many tax bills he had to go to "HUGHIE" SCOTT and get the cramps in his writing hand massaged.

But nobody thinks more highly of "5 Percent Willie" than the Republican candidate for mayor. Just last summer, when Scranton was sweating overtime trying to convince McDermott to withdraw from the campaign because of McDermott's immaturity and lack of experience, McDermott phoned his local advisers and said: "If Scranton talks to me about immaturity and lack of experience just one more time I'm going to blast him and his lousy administration."

Now that's what I call real party spirit. Naturally, Scranton being the two-fisted opportunist he is took the reins of leadership firmly in his hands and beat a hasty retreat. No doubt he had visions of his presidential ambitions being kicked to pieces by the political Frankenstein which he helped create.

McDermott has made it abundantly clear that he considers politics to be the science of self-interest. However, if his talent proved half as great as his ego, perhaps his head would not be so large and his mouth might be considerably smaller. McDermott has the answer for everything and the solution to nothing. His sole qualifications for office appear to be a crewcut, three all-purpose gestures learned in speech class 2 and a pocketful of bubble gum to keep his committeemen happy.

Watching the Republican candidate's eye-rolling theatrics on television recently, reminded me of that famous line from Hamlet: "I have thought some of nature's journeymen had made men and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably."

Yet I would not say his performance was altogether abominable, agonizingly pathetic might be a better phrase. It pains me to see a grown man wail piteously in public. "Mayor Tate, why don't you debate with me?" But I suppose "Jimmy Crew-Cut" picked up that line from Rockefeller who keeps following GOLDWATER around whimpering like a puppy dog with about the same degree of success. Maybe McDermott's secretly running for a spot in the national ticket.

He certainly has as good a chance for the Republican presidential nomination as he has to become mayor of Philadelphia. Besides just about everybody's thrown his denial into the GOP ring except Eisenhower's prize cow.

But I can guarantee that on November 5 there's going to be one Republican hopeful who won't have to pose in canoes anymore or get his brother-in-law to plaster his picture all over the cover of Time magazine. I guarantee that "5-Percent Willie's" White House fever is going to be cured once and for all right here in Philadelphia. Come November 5, Scranton and McDermott are going to be buried under an avalanche of Democratic votes. By the time Philadelphia voters finish showing "5-Percent Willie" what they think of his sales taxes and his liquor taxes and his cigarette taxes and his school taxes, GOLDWATER will be scrounging around for a new running mate.

Philadelphia voters want no amateurs mismanaging their city the way Scranton has mismanaged the State. Philadelphia doesn't need any more broken promises from Republicans. Philadelphia's citizens want no part of 10th-rate candidates who, in their hysteria, find it necessary to deny that they are members of the John Birch Society. Phil-

adelphia wants no mayor who seeks to profit from bigotry and who would turn Philadelphia into a battleground by pitting neighbor against neighbor.

Philadelphia wants no part of a man who is so ambitious that he would falsify facts and figures to bolster his sagging campaign. In short, Philadelphia wants no part of the Republican Party which for 67 long, bitter years created the slums, the squalor, the industrial depression, the moral and physical decay which very nearly destroyed our city.

Today, after only 12 short years of unparalleled activity and leadership, the Democratic Party has revitalized Philadelphia. Today, the Democratic Party offers Philadelphia, as it has in the past, experienced and qualified candidates * * * men and women who worked shoulder to shoulder with Mayors "Joe" Clark, "Dick" Dilworth and "Jim" Tate to make our city truly great.

So let the empty words of a puny opposition echo and reecho hollowly down the corridors of Philadelphia's monuments of concrete and stone, and when the empty, meaningless words are gone, the deeds of the Democratic Party will live on. The city we have built, the new Philadelphia shall endure in all its grandeur and beauty beyond all debate. Philadelphia, what it is and what it shall become, this is our answer and our challenge, today, tomorrow, and forever.

To keep Philadelphia moving ahead let's endorse a Democratic city administration once more, as we have done 3 times in the past 12 years. Let's get out and work, work, work * * * to bring out a smashing majority for Mayor Tate and our fine Democratic ticket.

Autumn in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing, along with our distinguished colleagues CLIFFORD DAVIS and TOM MURRAY, the western part of Tennessee.

There recently appeared an article in the November issue of Holiday magazine entitled "Autumn in Tennessee." This article was written by Lydel Sims, an outstanding journalist.

This article is so outstanding that I thought it should be brought to the attention of the Congress. The article is as follows:

AUTUMN IN TENNESSEE

(By Lydel Sims)

(NOTE.—Three days rambling between the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers in unspoiled country made splendid by fall.)

Last year, when the autumn colors were at their peak, my wife and I set out from our home in Memphis for a backroad jaunt along the borders of West Tennessee, from the Mississippi to the Tennessee River. This area is often overlooked by tourists, including many who live there. But in 3 days of relaxed wandering we saw land rich in scenic beauty, local color, history, and folklore. We got pleasantly lost in out-of-the-way places once known to Mark Twain, Andrew Jackson, and Davy Crockett, in leaf-bright land that lay heavy for the harvest. We feasted on catfish, crappie, country ham, and fried chicken, backed by steaming platters of hushpuppies and homemade rolls. For all this we had allowed ourselves $150; the total cost of our 546-mile shunpike tour, including gasoline, came to a little less than $100.

Because we would be traveling through many counties where, unlike Memphis, the sale or possession of liquor is illegal, I insisted on a brief ceremony before we set out on a Friday morning late in October. Breaking the seal on a fifth of Jack Daniel's ($7.20), I poured myself a prudent sip of the charcoal-mellowed Tennessee sourmash bourbon made in the Nation's oldest registered distillery. My wife refused to join me, citing both the early hour and the technicality that Jack Daniel's is made in Lynchburg which is in middle Tennessee, but I explained that such a treasure may properly be claimed by all sections of the State.

So fortified, we set out by way of Memphis' Riverside Drive, pausing at De Soto Park to stand where the explorer is said to have stood in 1541 when he discovered the Mississippi. Actually, if local claims are to be credited equally, the intrepid Spaniard discovered the Father of Waters simultaneously at a dozen places, but we were not inclined to quibble. The view was a good one.

We were now on the Fourth Chickasaw Bluff, part of a vast territory obtained by an Indian treaty negotiated by Andrew Jackson, who helped lay out the town of Memphis. Moving northward along the sweeping drive, we reached Confederate Park overlooking the scene of the Battle of Memphis, a Civil War engagement which historian Fletcher Pratt called "one of the briefest, most intense and decisive naval battles in history." Certainly it was brief: it raged for less than 20 minutes before Ellet's rams laid the river open to Union traffic as far south as Vicksburg.

The park where the townspeople gathered with picnic lunches to watch the battle is interesting today only for its anachronisms. World War II guns guard its bluff, the junior chamber of commerce has installed tablets commemorating those Moses brought down from Mount Sinai, and until a newspaper campaign laughed it off the lot in recent years, the central decoration was an ersatz totem pole imported from the Pacific Northwest at the behest of the late Boss Crump.

The sun shone bright and the sky was an unmarked blue as we drove north through the bottomlands of the Wolf and Loosahatchie Rivers and continued between fields of corn and cotton to an unmarked blacktop road near the village of Mumford, where we turned west in search of a ghost town, Randolph. A service station attendant had urged us to stay on the highway until we reached Covington, where a marked State road would take us to the spot, but we felt adventurous, the blacktop road looked inviting, and we knew our destination was somewhere in that direction.

The mystery road led us through dense forest land and past bursting fields of cotton; after guessing uncertainly at three intersections, we stopped to ask for advice at a crossroads store. "Randolph?" the man said. "Well, yes, you could get to it this way, but you wouldn't. You'd just get lost and end up at Richard's Landing. Now, if you'll go back over a couple of hills and turn left." So we went back, turned left, and got lost and ended up at Richardson's Landing anyhow.

But we were glad of it, for there on the banks of the muddy Mississippi we found a U.S. Engineers casting field, where blocks of concrete are cast to form mattress units for underwater revetments to protect the riverbanks from scour and erosion. Willow mattresses were used in the old days, but now launching barges slide into position mathematically precise rectangles of concrete, joined together by the hooks in a covering fabric, to form great sheets of protective surface.

We retraced our way, took an overlooked turn, and found ourselves once more on the banks of the Mississippi, this time at Randolph itself. The town was west Tennessee's major metropolis in the 1830's, and Congressman David Crockett's plan to cut a canal in southwest Tennessee from the Tennessee River to the Hatchie, which empties into the Mississippi just north of Randolph, would have made it a great city. But the proposal died, and a variety of other factors combined to blight Randolph's growth. Today only a handful of houses, a store and a church cluster on its bluffs, but in its moment of glory it rang to the shouts of Crockett and his friends and echoed to the clangor of posses seeking the cutthroat Murrell—the man of whom Mark Twain said that, whereas Jesse James was a retail rascal, Murrell was wholesale. The handsome villain had his headquarters nearby on the Arkansas side of the river, headquarters where, many insisted, he had perfected a plan for a slave uprising and the capture of New Orleans before he was himself captured and imprisoned.

We found no landmarks of his villainy, but at the foot of a rough gumbo trail thrusting through tall willows we found another fine sight: the Engineers' dustpan dredge *Potter* busily clearing the channel at Hatchie Island Bar. Dustpan dredges operate, to modify the metaphor, like giant vacuum cleaners. A head is lowered to the bed of the river, jets of water blast loose the deposits of sand, and suction carries them along a pipeline and flings them back into the river far from the channel.

Clouds had massed above us by now and the wind off the river was chill. We drove on toward Covington, a typical courthouse-square town where we would rejoin the highway. For all the growing grayness of the day, it was a beautiful drive tinted with the mottled peach of dogwoods, the dull orange glow of fruit-filled persimmon trees, the purple of sweetgum and the red, brown and yellow of sumac along the way. The shoulders of the road were dotted with bits of cotton and we paused once to watch a mechanical picker dump its fluffy load into a wagon. At Covington and along the 38-mile stretch to Dyersburg we saw evidences of the cotton harvest everywhere—the constant blobs of cotton on the roadside, the high-piled wagons and trucks, the long lines of loaded vehicles with drivers patiently waiting their turns at gins in almost every town.

We were passing through the heart of the country where Davy Crockett campaigned successfully for the State legislature and, later, for Congress, paying many of his campaign expenses with wolf bounties, and where he killed fabulous numbers of bears. By his own claim, which no patriot would doubt, he killed 105 of them in one 7-month period.

Circling the courthouse square in Dyersburg we took State Route 78 for Reelfoot Lake, passing through rolling plains and bottomlands, with occasional hills toward the west. At the Obion River we marveled how Davy had managed to float two boatloads of barrel staves between its narrow banks in 1826—an ambitious commercial venture that ended in disaster when both boats reached the Mississippi and capsized a few miles above Memphis. Davy himself was pulled out of his flatboat cabin through an opening so small that all his clothes and part of his skin were left behind.

At Wynnburg we turned east and north to reach the shores of Reelfoot Lake, one of the Nation's natural wonders. The lake was formed during a series of shocks known as the New Madrid earthquake, which rocked the entire central Mississippi Valley in 1811 and 1812. It attracted little attention at the time, because the area was still Chickasaw Territory, but a variety of eyewitness accounts attest to its judgment day quality.

Landslides poured into the river, islands disappeared, trees 20 feet thick broke like matchsticks. Great fissures yawned in the earth, and the whole countryside rose and fell like waves on a stormy sea or, as one witness put it, quivered like the flesh of a beef just killed. Sulfurous odors added to the terror. Great waves swept the Mississippi, and boats were overturned like toys.

During these convulsions Reelfoot was formed, a shallow 18-mile-long lake covering a once luxuriant forest of cypress, oak, and cottonwood. It has been a paradise for sportsmen and naturalists ever since. Crappie, bass, bream, catfish, and gar teem in its waters; ducks, geese, water turkeys, coots, and herons visit it annually. Great snakes sun themselves on its snags; muskrat, fox, raccoons, and opossums live along its shores.

The breeze was whipping small whitecaps on the leaden water when we arrived at the lake, and no fishing boats were visible in the portion before us, known as Blue Basin. Those hardy enough to be out were perhaps working Lost Pond, Grassy Bend, Buzzard Slough, and other areas of the brooding lake. We shivered as we looked at it, then followed the shoreline to Boyette's Camp, where we were going to lunch.

The camp's dining room is a large, rustic affair with beamed ceiling, long tables, and a reputation for excellent family-style meals. It lived up to its notices. My wife had crisp hot catfish, while I chose the country ham and redeye gravy. The rest simply came: mixed green salad, french fries, fried onions, butterbeans, tomatoes, slaw, applesauce, hushpuppies, and homemade rolls, plus coffee in copious quantities. When the waitress asked us about dessert, I suggested instead that she bring us an order of crappie, the most famous fish of the region. Too bony to eat carelessly, it reached us fresh, crisp, and blessed with an indescribably delicate flavor.

After lunch ($4), we crossed the road to visit an assembly hall and a museum newly built by the State of Tennessee. One room is devoted to Indian relics, and mounted birds, fish, and animals fill the other. My wife was especially struck by a skull from which a stone axhead still protrudes, and I admired a 79-pound buffalo fish, billed as the world's largest, that had been taken from the lake.

Signs at a small airport nearby urged us to see the lake from the air at $2 a ride, but the gloomy weather made us choose instead a quick visit to the scene of another Civil War battle. Leaving the lake, we drove through sleepy Tiptonville and north on a lonely State road until we reached the great curve in the Mississippi where the Island Ten campaign was waged. The fall of the island and nearby fortifications after a bitter defense was part of a great double blow to the Confederacy; at almost the same time, Grant and Buell were turning the Southern victory at Shiloh to defeat. We drove through a cottonfield to view the scene better, then returned to Tiptonville, where the defending forces had surrendered, and made our way back to Reelfoot and upward along its eastern shore.

It was midafternoon now and the land wore a Thanksgiving look. Piles of pumpkins dotted the landscape, milo maize nodded brown tassels, and everywhere the autumn harvest continued. Cottonpickers toiled in rich fields, soybean combines lumbered over blacktopped roads, corn poured into bins. As we passed the Davy Crockett Hotel at Union City, I couldn't resist telling my wife one more tale about the great man—how he and a peglegged opponent, Adam Huntsman, were stumping the area and spent the night at the home of an influential farmer who supported Huntsman, and who of course had a beautiful daughter. In the dead of night the wily Davy arose, took a straight-backed chair, and tiptoed with it to her door. Here he set up such a rattling that the young lady screamed. Promptly, Davy put one foot on a chair rung and hobbled loudly back to his room. No one could ever persuade the farmer that it had not been Huntsman, beating a peglegged retreat from perfidy.

The road took us past Martin, home of a branch of the University of Tennessee, and thence in the gathering dusk to Paris, where Davy's son John Wesley Crockett, who followed him to Congress, is buried. We halted on the town's outskirts to buy an assortment of homemade candies at the locally noted Sally Lane Tennessee Candy Farm, then followed U.S. 79 for 17 miles to our desination for the night, the inn at Paris Landing State Park on the shores of Kentucky Lake.

The lake, one of the largest manmade reservoirs in the world, extends more than 180 miles across nearly all of Kentucky and Tennessee and is one of the TVA's major recreation areas. The State-operated inn is built against a hillside and offers a picturesque window view to every guest and a beautiful dining room whose 30-foot windows look out across the lake to the hills on its eastern shore. Forts Henry and Donelson, two other Civil War landmarks, lie only a few miles across a magnificent bridge that spans the narrow lake at Paris Landing.

It had been, we felt, a full day. We relaxed in our room a while, ate dinner in the great dining room, watched a television program in the lounge, and found ourselves too pleasantly drowsy to enjoy the nickelodeon and dance floor on the lower level.

Breakfast in the morning was southern style: melon, hot grits, country sausage, eggs, biscuits and a big dish loaded with six kinds of jelly and marmalade. The bill was $1.75. We paid for our night's lodging ($8), admired the scene from the bridge, and turned back a few miles toward Paris before returning south on another unmarked road that would lead us to our next stop, Camden.

We passed through a forest of great splendor. Tall trees grew almost to the shoulders of the winding road. Under a cloudy sky the leaf colors were rich but muted, in infinite variety: green, brown, plum, chocolate, ocher, umber, and dull reds and yellows. Hickory, cherry, sweet gum, hornbeak, dogwood, elm, pine, cedar, and many varieties of oak stood rank on rank on all sides of us, and brown grasses waved on the roadside. Now and then dazzling brilliance broke the pattern: sumacs bled red and yellow, majestic sour gums towered vermilion before us, and the most splendid of all the autumn trees, the gleeful maples, glowed lemon, pink, scarlet and orange. The drive took on a strange dreamlike quality; we went for miles without seeing other cars, passing only an occasional log cabin, a one-room church, or a neat white framehouse. At one of these we stopped to admire a particularly magnificent maple before continuing with the unreal sensation of traveling through a tapestry.

Camden shook us awake. It was Saturday morning, and the square was crowded with cars and overalled farmers enjoying the traditional "town day" of the rural South. The holiday mood was everywhere. When my wife went into a grocery store to buy two cans of rich sorghum molasses, a string band was in full cry; at the drug store where I went to ask directions, a crowd was listening as the local radio station repeated its play-by-play account of the previous night's high school football game—a game won by Camden.

We circled the square and drove east 9 miles on a narrow blacktopped road to Pilot Knob, the highest spot in west Tennessee and one providing a majestic view of lake and countryside for miles around.

Aside from its breathtaking view of autumn countryside, Pilot Knob overlooks the site of one of the Civil War's most remarkable engagements. It was here that the redoubtable cavalry genius, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, on the last of his great raids, destroyed nearly a score of Union vessels across the river at Johnsonville. Two of the most memorable commands in history came out of that raid: one, a colonel under Forrest, who reined in his horse and yelled to his men: "Halt. Dismount and prepare on foot to fight gunboats." and the other, by Old Bedford himself, who joined personally in the artillery action during its latter stages. When his first shot fell short, the general roared: "A rickety shay. I'll hit her next time. Elevate the breech of that gun lower." Here, as at the scene of the Island Ten Battle, a brief history of the operation is given on a marker, along with an excellent map of the area.

Returning to Camden, we continued southward. We had been told that none of the old-fashioned horse-drawn sorghum mills for which the area was once noted were still in operation, but suddenly as we rounded a bend in the road one appeared before us, the area surrounding the contraption lying deep in fresh silage. The woman who answered our knock at the small house beside it told us the mill had been operating only the day before.

A few miles farther, the blacktop disappeared and we drove on gravel for the first time, about 13 miles of it on the approach to Natchez Trace State Park and Forest. The park is not directly on the recognized route of the old Trace, but rather on one of its alternate routes. Near its entrance we admired a giant pecan tree, 106 feet high and nearly 18 feet in circumference, which tradition says was grown from a pecan given to one Sukey Morris by one of Andrew Jackson's men as they marched homeward from the Battle of New Orleans. Then we continued into the park itself, through thousands of acres of loblolly pine marked off into numbered areas for the annual supervised deer hunts which soon would begin. The park offers cabins and camp areas, a public lodge, and good swimming, boating, and fishing.

We drove the length of the park, left it at its southern tip, and continued through an area of rolling hills to Darden, a crossroads hamlet named for a fabulous 19th century fat man of those parts. Mills Darden towered to a height variously reported between 7½ and 8½ feet, and weighed a fraction over 1,000 pounds at the time of his death. A historical marker on the roadside noted that he is buried a few miles away near a community called Life, leading my wife to observe philosophically that in death some are in Life.

At Parsons we stopped to buy yet another can of sorghum and to watch a Saturday assembly of old men telling tales and swapping pocket knives as old men have done for generations in small towns of the region. The swapping rites are so deliberate that an entire day can be consumed in the course of one exchange; I felt a thrill when I saw one bright blade actually change hands. After this triumph we turned south again, following State 69.

The sun peeped through the clouds now and then as the winding road led us through hilly farm country in which log sheds and cabins, split-rail fences, and the virtual absence of billboards made us feel we had gone back in time at least a generation.

At the tiny community of Bath Springs we asked an aproned farmwoman how the place got its name. She said the old folks told her it came from a spring that suddenly gushed out from under a rock many years ago. When we thanked her she gave the

kindly rejoinder typical of the area: "Yours," she said, lifting her hand in farewell.

We joined U.S. 64 a few miles from Savannah and crossed the Tennessee River into the bustling little town where General Grant was resting when the attack began at Shiloh a few miles away. Savannah's chief pride today appears to be not in its historical past, but in its thiving resortlike present as the gateway to Pickwick Dam and some of the Nation's finest fishing. An industry keyed to this sport leads to its perhaps unchallenged claim to be the worm capital of the world. Worm "ranches" abound and the town's radio station uses the call letters WORM.

Creeping through the Saturday afternoon throngs, we turned south to the dam, then to our night's lodging half a mile downstream in a beached riverboat known alliteratively as the Bill Bellis Botel. Bill and Betty Bellis, the owners, came to Pickwick from Texas for the fishing years ago, and were so delighted they bought a former U.S. Engineers' quarterboat which they have remodeled to make a comfortable and colorful hotel. From his nearby boat dock Bill guides visiting fishermen to memorable catches of catfish, large- and small-mouth bass, sauger and stripers.

My wife was still so immersed in the dreamlike quality of the day that she decided to take a nap in our "stateroom" on the upper deck before dinner. I went up to the dam for a look around, and fell into conversation with a guard posted to keep visitors away from construction work then underway on a bridge over the dam. It was chilly by now and the few anglers abroad did not appear to be having much success.

I asked the guard if many fishermen claimed the free locking service to move their boats between the lake above the dam and the waters below. "A few," he said, "but it's the summer pleasure boats that keep the locks busy. They like to lock through just to say they did. But I know one cabin cruiser that won't do it again. It locked through downstream late one Sunday afternoon, and then turned around to come right back. Barges have the right of way over pleasure craft, though, and a tremendous one nosed in just ahead of the cruiser. Had to lock through in sections. Took 4 hours, while the cruiser waited."

We joined Betty and Bill Bellis for dinner at the Botel—crisp, succulent catfish, fried chicken, french fries slaw and what may well be the finest hushpuppies in the world. Betty makes them to her own recipe and they are famous throughout the Pickwick area: light, delicate puffs about the size of ping-pong balls and scarcely heavier. Even in the heart of the hushpuppy country, lightness is a rare virtue. We gorged ourselves and then sat back to drink coffee and talk fishing for an hour or so before going to bed.

In the morning I was up before daylight to try my luck. The catfishing in the boils below the big turbines—a sport that requires deepsea tackle, since many of the blue cats weigh more than a hundred pounds—had slacked off with the coming of cooler weather. But Bill hoped we might have luck taking sauger below the spillway, even though the big fall schools had not yet been reported. We ran upstream through a fog so thick nothing could be seen more than a few feet away, but he found our spot without trouble and pushed the bucket toward me. "Put on a minnie and get busy," he said. "But watch it. A sauger can scale your bait and you'll hardly feel it."

Two hours later Bill had only three fair-sized sauger and I had boated nothing but a few well-scaled minnows. The fog had long since cleared, and it occurred to me my wife might be impatient to be on the move. We returned and I waked her from what did not seem an impatient sleep, and after breakfast—the second of the morning for me—we settled our account for lodging, meals, boat and guide service ($21) and crossed back into west Tennessee for the last lap of the trip.

Shiloh National Military Park, scene of one of the Civil War's bloodiest battles, lay only a few miles downstream. We had seen it often in the spring and summer, but this was our first visit in the fall and its maples, magnolias, cedars, pines and sour gums were magnificent.

Purely from a physical viewpoint, Shiloh is one of the Nation's most beautiful battlegrounds, and the mingled senses of sorrow and pride evoked by the sight of Peach Orchard, the Bloody Pond, the Hornet's Nest, the Sunken Road, and the ravine where the gallant Albert Sidney Johnston was taken to die make a visit to the park an unforgettable experience.

A national cemetery stands just above the river landing, where the arrival of Federal troops during the darkness after the first day's fighting helped turn defeat into victory for the Union. Visitors are invited to witness a free half-hour color movie, in which amateur actors have reenacted the critical events of the battle, before following a well-marked route to the actual settings.

Overlooking the landing and only a few yards outside the park boundaries is a rustic restaurant known as the Catfish Hotel which is one of the most popular eating spots in the area. We had planned to eat our last meal on the road there, but the thought of even one more bite of catfish, however delightful, was too much for either of us. Instead, we agreed to eat a light snack at a more conventional restaurant at the parks' entrance and prepare our palates for a different sort of feast in Memphis.

For our route home we choose State Route 57, a lonely drive leading through a series of tiny rural communities including Grand Junction, hallowed to bird-dog fanciers as the home of the national field trials. A few miles begond it, as we approached La Grange, we came upon a breathtaking sight: Woodlawn, a stately two-story ante bellum mansion, gleaming softly in the fading light at the top of a sweeping rise that stretched half a mile before us. Here great parties were held in the days when La Grange was one of west Tennessee's most thriving cities; here General Sherman established his headquarters after Shiloh; and here from time to time during the war the wounded of both sides were brought for emergency hospital care.

The house was built in 1828 by a Maj. Charles Michie, a veteran of the War of 1812. In recent years the house lay vacant, its paint peeling and its columns black with holes drilled by woodpeckers until it was bought late in 1961 and renovated inside and out. Its occupants, a retired Air Force colonel and his wife, do not open it to public inspection, but a roadside marker tells its history and the sight of it from a distance is magnificent.

In the somnolent village of La Grange itself we paused before Immanuel Church, built more than a century ago by a widow from Warrenton, N.C., whose slaves made it an exact copy of the church in her former home. Then we asked directions to the abandoned birthplace of Lucy Holcombe Pickens, wife of a Governor of South Carolina, and known as the Queen of the Confederacy, a beauty whose portrait adorned many Confederate banknotes.

The large house was in the latter stages of decay, judging from exterior appearances, and I felt no qualms in vetoing my wife's enthusiastic suggestion that we try to buy and restore it. We had lingered so long at Shiloh that dusk was creeping up on us, and besides I was beginning to get hungry at last.

We reached Memphis in time to change for dinner and renew happy acquaintance with the breached bottle of Jack Daniels. The sky had cleared during the final miles, and a great full moon beamed down on us as we made our way into the heart of the city to Justine's, Memphis most distinguished restaurant, located in an antebellum mansion that once stood on a vast plantation. The French colonial decor of the old house, formerly hidden under Victorian remodelings, has been restored with taste and tireless devotion to detail.

Dayton and Justine Smith, the owners, are dedicated to the proposition that environment is as important as cuisine for gracious dining.

We began our meal with Oysters Rockefeller, one of the dishes for which the house is famous. A limestone lettuce salad with oil and vinegar followed. Diners must bring their own wines and liquors, since State law forbids their sale on the premises, but the waiter served our Beaujolais Cruse 1952 with just the right air as we turned our attention to charcoal-broiled filets with béarnaise sauce in artichoke bottoms, unforgettable spinach soufflés with hollandaise sauce, and hot French bread. Dessert was another specialty, vanilla ice cream blended with a jigger of brandy, served with demitasses in which the coffee lay black and powerful.

After it was all over Mr. Smith took us on a tour of the reconstructed wine cellars and the surrounding grounds, whose herringbone brick walls lead to an old stable with pecky cypress board-and-batten walls and authentic hardware.

We settled our check ($22), said goodbye to our host on the old marble steps, and drove home, drowsily reviewing the weekend's adventures. At last the talk of rivers, battlefields, history, architecture, and folklore languished and we both found ourselves thinking of food. "I may never eat again," my wife said with rueful satisfaction. But, as Davy Crockett once commented of a report of his death, "I knowed it was a whapper of a lie the minute I heard it."

Die Wasch an Rhein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our current studies of the problems of pollution controls and abatement, the members of the House Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power have encountered many evidences of the need for greater Federal, State, and local cooperation and endeavors toward the objective of protecting our water supplies for domestic and industrial usage.

I was very happy to note that favorable action has been taken by the Senate on a bill, S. 649, the purpose of which is to aid in preventing, controlling and abating pollution of interstate waters. I plan to file legislation for this purpose in the immediate future in the House and this action will follow my observations during recent field trips by the Natural Resources Subcommittee to Illinois, New Jersey, and Connecticut. We have not completed our studies. We are planning additional hearings and on-site inspections in other parts of the country.

I was interested during the Connecticut hearings in early October, to run across an article which appeared in the July 29, 1963, edition of the Hartford (Conn.) Courant. Only recently the Hartford Courant observed its 199th anniversary. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Courant as it approaches the 200 mark. It is the oldest newspaper of continuous publication in America which first appeared in colonial Hartford on October 29, 1764, as the Connecticut Courant. The story was written by Mr. William J. Clew, assistant managing editor of the Courant while he was on one of his recent visits to Germany.

I call Mr. Clew's story on pollution in the Rhine River to the attention of my colleagues to illustrate the point that water pollution has become an international problem. With permission to extend my remarks, I include, herewith, Mr. Clew's article "Die Wasch an Rhein" or "The Wash in the Rhine":

WASH IN THE RHINE—DETERGENT, OIL, POLLUTE GERMANY'S GREAT RIVER

(By William J. Clew)

HEIDELBERG.—The Americanization of Germany has proceeded to the point where this country's rivers are as dirty as those of the United States.

Stand on the north bank of the Neckar, across from the ruined castle on the heights that is this old university town's most romantic sight. Gaze into the rushing, foaming waters as they pour over the dam bordering the locks through which barges and pleasure craft make their way upstream. That white water does not bubble up because of the swiftness of the current. It is full of detergent.

Many a joke is making the rounds of Germany these days about "die wash an Rhein," (the wash in the Rhine.) The Neckar, running through one of the most beautiful valleys in Germany, enters the Rhine at the industrial city of Mannheim, a few miles west of Heidelberg. It pours its share of pollution into the great river, often called the lifeline of the midcontinent, the pride of Germany for thousands of years, now becoming known as the "great sewer."

HEAVY POLLUTION

About 17 million tons of factory waste is dumped into Germany's rivers each day. A few years ago a common sight along the Rhine was the bathers enjoying the river and its banks. Today it is illegal to bathe in those areas of the great river where the concentration of sewage and factory wastes is heavy.

For a decade, or ever since the resurgence of Germany's industrial economy began after World War II, there has been as much discussion on the pollution problem as there has been in America. But except for talk not much more has been done about the situation here than has been the case at home. Writing to the newspapers or action by local communities proved ineffective. It was decided that nationwide coordination was needed to save the rivers, marine life, and the health of the German population. Germany's highest court named a committee to study the problem and correct it.

NO SELF-CLEANING

A 5-year plan has been started to control pollution and clean the River Rhine. (Of course this produced more jokes about washing the Rhine). Constant checking of sources of pollution will begin next year when a floating laboratory will begin patrolling the river.

The preliminary studies have shown that industrial oils and detergents make up the worst pollution and that the increase in heavy industry makes the situation worse every year.

One thing the scientists have discovered and their findings may help demolish a fallacy that crops up in America constantly as an argument against speedy action on the pollution problem. This fallacy has it that rivers "clean themselves" every few miles as they flow onward to the sea. The Germans have found this is not so when the amount of impurities is large. They estimate that 25 percent of the waste water in the Rhine does not become cleansed.

More About the Marlboro Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, was kind enough to place in the RECORD the text of a speech I had delivered at a meeting of the Arizona chapter of the American Cancer Society on September 27 of this year.

In that speech I summarized the need for recognition of the health problem faced by this Nation as a result of cigarette smoking. I reviewed recent developments and pointed out that the major cigarette companies, taking note of adverse public opinion, had decided to discontinue their advertising and promotion campaigns on college campuses. The title of my talk was "Who Needs Enemies When We Have Friends Like the Marlboro Man?"

Last Sunday I was interested in an article in the Washington Post by Reporter Jerry Doolittle which revealed that, of all major cigarette companies formerly advertising on college campuses, only Marlboro has refused to suspend such activities. The article indicated, further, that the practice which I particularly condemned in my speech—the practice of offering prizes to fraternities whose pledges collect appropriate numbers of empty packs—was continuing, unabated, as a major Marlboro promotion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most unfortunate that this one company has marred the progressive approach so recently taken by the tobacco industry in this matter. The evidence of a link between cigarette smoking and various health problems is overwhelming, and yet the Marlboro company, alone among all major cigarette companies, believes it is perfectly proper to continue luring college students to the smoking habit. It is my hope that the Marlboro company will yet reconsider the wisdom of such a course.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I insert the article from the Washington Post at this point in my remarks:

TOBACCO, CAMPUS PAPERS PART

(By Jerry Doolittle)

The voice of the cigarette huckster, which once rasped loud over the Nation's campuses, has been throttled down to a single, sickly croak.

Most cigarette companies have withdrawn the advertising that once formed much of the income of college publications.

Announcement of the withdrawals came this spring, after a student paper at City College of New York had barred cigarette ads from its columns—and after the Illinois branch of the American Cancer Society had begun to urge Illinois colleges to follow suit.

Washington student newspapers, although hurt by the loss of revenue, have managed largely to make up the difference elsewhere. None has plans to cease or even cut down publication.

ONE CONTINUES ADS

The only major company to continue its college ads here is Marlboro. And, while the other companies have stopped the practice, Marlboro still gives out free samples to students and stages other promotions on campuses.

At the University of Maryland, the company is offering a color TV to the organization that collects the most empty Marlboro packs.

Some fraternities require their pledges to bring in a certain number of packs every day.

Marlboro boasts that it is the largest selling brand in America's colleges.

But other companies, among them L & M, Herbert Tareyton, Winston, Salem, Camel, Chesterfield, and Viceroy—have pulled out of the universities.

To Washington area college papers, this has meant a drop of some 40 percent of their national advertising. "It means that we'd be about $4,000 below our planned budget," said Sterling Schiffman, advertising manager of the Maryland Diamondback.

"But we've concentrated on selling more classified and local ads. It was quite a shock at first, but it made us look around instead of relying on the cigarette ads. We've bounced back."

LOCAL ADS HELP

Other area college papers are in much the same shape. Richard Barone, business manager of the Georgetown University Hoya, said the $30 to $40 a week net that cigarette ads once brought in has been recouped by an intensified effort to sell local ads. "We don't care that much," Barone said.

Howard University's paper, the Hilltop, had planned a switch from national ads to local ads this year anyway. In any case, it depends largely on student funds for its revenue.

Catholic University's Tower does not run ads.

The George Washington University Hatchet expects to lose about $4,000 in cigarette income—but hopes to gain it back in local ad linage.

Lewis H. Goldberg, business manager of American University's twice-weekly paper, the Eagle, said, "I thought it was disastrous at first, but now I'm not too sure."

He said the faculty is happier with the paper now that there are fewer cigarette ads—since many professors disapproved of them to start with.

New national ads are beginning to come in, Goldberg said. And, like the others, his paper has stepped up efforts to sell more local ads.

Mr. Speaker, one of the advertising practices many of my constituents have found most offensive is the use of leading sports figures in cigarette commercials. These commercials are frequently used on sports programs, which are viewed by children of all ages. The result is that impressionable youngsters are given the false impression that cigarette smoking is consistent with robust, good health.

I was pleased to read this week that something is being done about this. The American Cancer Society has initiated a

series of advertisements using some of the same athletes formerly seen endorsing particular brands of cigarettes. Only this time the message is different. Each of the athletes used in the series has discontinued smoking, and he explains why.

On Tuesday of this week the New York Times carried an article which I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues. Without objection I insert the article at this point in the Appendix:

ADVERTISING: ATHLETES IN ANTISMOKING DRIVE

(By Peter Bart)

Whitey Ford, the New York Yankees' pitcher who last year did testimonal commercials for Camel cigarettes, has started appearing in a new series of testimonials. This time he discusses the evils of smoking.

The new ads are part of a campaign initiated by the American Cancer Society and called "Athletes Against Cancer." The purpose of the campaign is to change the image of the cigarette smoker and to discourage young people from smoking.

"Young people have come to look on smokers as great successes, whether in athletics or social affairs," one cancer society official says. "This advertising campaign is designed to build the image of nonsmokers."

The athletes in the new campaign include Rocky Colavito, the baseball star; Bob Mathias, the Olympic champion; Jim Beatty and Tom Courtney, runners; Mrs. Pat McCormick and Buster Crabbe, aquatics stars; Bart Starr, professional football player, and such fighters, past and present, as Jack Dempsey, Sugar Ray Robinson, and Floyd Patterson.

One Bob Mathias ad, for example, will say: "I don't smoke. I don't think anyone who wants to be an athlete should smoke. I can't tell you not to smoke, but before you take that first drag, do me a favor. Take one long, deep breath of fresh air. Then decide."

Whitey Ford, in his commercials, will state bluntly: "Cigarette smoking is dangerous for your health. I guess we all know that science has proved it to be the major cause of lung cancer." Mr. Ford goes on to explain that he quit smoking because of this and other factors.

The athletes' testimonials will be used in a series of magazine ads and radio spots. TV commercials may follow. In addition, the society's agency, Hockaday Associates, Inc., has also developed an animated cartoon short for young children about cigarette smoking.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Jack Anderson appearing in the Washington Post today. Here is further evidence that this Nation is coming closer to a serious consideration of steps which can be taken to check the onward march of illness and death that is the certain result of increased cigarette consumption. Without objection I insert the article at this point in the Appendix:

REPORT ON SMOKING IS DEVASTATING

(By Jack Anderson)

The tobacco tycoons are doing their best to delay and dilute the long-awaited Presidential report on cigarettes and cancer, which should be ready to release by December 15.

Though elaborate precautions have been taken to make sure the report doesn't leak out before it can be edited, this column can state that the individual studies contain overwhelming evidence that smoking can cause not only lung cancer but heart, stomach, bronchial and other ailments.

These studies are now being boiled down by Dr. Peter Hamill of the National Library of Medicine into a report that should present a devastating case against the tobacco habit.

It will be submitted to pack-a-day smoker Anthong Celebrezze, the efficient, ebullient Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who hasn't concealed his lack of enthusiasm for battling the tobacco interests.

He has made it plain that he doesn't consider it "the proper role of the Federal Government to tell citizens to stop smoking."

He puts smoking in the same category as overeating and overdrinking, insisting privately: "I don't believe that the prohibition of smoking by the Federal Government would be any more effective than the prohibition of alcohol."

HEW spokesmen assured this column, however, that Celebrezze believes the Government has a duty to warn citizens against health hazards.

Celebrezze will send the report up to President Kennedy, who is even less anxious to get his fingers burned by the cigarette controversy. Certainly, he has no desire to antagonize tobacco State Senators and Congressmen while his civil rights reforms and tax cuts are still pending.

When the cigarette subject was brought up at a May 1962, press conference, the President handled it like a butt that had burned down to his fingers.

"That matter is sensitive enough and the stock market is in sufficient difficulty without my giving you an answer," he hedged. "Perhaps I would be glad to respond to that question in more detail next week."

The following week, he turned the problem over to an advisory committee and announced happily that, "the survey would take some months or go into 1963."

The loudest howls about the Presidential report are coming from the Agriculture Department, which is more concerned about the tobacco crop than public health. If the report is made public on December 15, wail the marketing men, it might hurt the December tobacco auctions.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, who smokes sparingly, is fearful that the report will reduce cigarette sales and damage an important industry.

Apprehension over the forthcoming report also is high at the Federal Trade Commission, which is responsible for regulating dangerous and deceptive advertising.

Eighteen months ago, the Commission acknowledged to Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, that it has authority to crack down on tobacco advertising. The Commission put off her demand for action, however, by claiming it needed "competent probative scientific evidence."

This should now be furnished by the Presidential Committee, thus putting the Commission on the spot. It may have no alternative but to require tobacco companies to include a warning of the cigarette hazards in all their newspaper-magazine ads and radio-TV commercials.

The advertising abuses are hit by Senator NEUBERGER in a book, "Smokescreen," just off the Prentice Hall press.

She checked on commercials, for example, depicting baseball stars Mickey Mantle, Roger Maris, and Whitey Ford as contented Camel smokers.

She found that Mantle had smoked Camels briefly, then had switched to Viceroys. But he was last reported using Bantron, an antismoking pill.

Maris also had smoked Camels, but had stopped smoking altogether a month before the commercial appeared. The only information the Senator could find on Ford's smoking habits was a sports story quoting him after a shutout victory.

"This was the best I've felt for nine innings since the first game of the World Series against Cincinnati," boasted Ford.

The reason for his improvement: "I quit smoking," said Ford.

The President's Study Committee on Smoking and Health has done little original research but has merely summed up the existing information on the tobacco problem. Several distinguished doctors contributed studies.

One of the most convincing reports was submitted by Harvard's noted statistican, Prof. William Cochran, who compiled staggering statistical evidence that cigarettes cause lung cancer, heart trouble, and other ailments.

After 20 years, for example, a pack-a-day smoker is 200 times more likely to develop bronchial adenocarcinoma, a type of lung cancer, than is a nonsmoker.

Mrs. Serafina Ferrara Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Serafina Ferrara, one of the most astute business and restaurateurs of the city of Chicago was signally honored by the Immigrant Service League of Chicago for her splendid efforts in behalf of the immigrants of the city of Chicago. As a young girl she managed her dad's grocery with great success. Upon her marriage to Salvatore Ferrara, a popular and celebrated Italian pastry expert—she managed the bakery and pastry shop and candy factory. But regardless of her position of affluence in the community, Serafina always remembered the poor and unfortunate. She was never too busy to help in any charity drive or welfare movement. To this day she is ever at the beck and call of everyone for all types of programs and promotions for charitable or civic purposes. She has been honored numerous times by organizations of both social and of a charitable nature. She was named Grandmother of the Year 1956—and was cited several times by Mayor Daley, of the city of Chicago, for her signal services rendered to the city; also for her work for St. Cabrini Hospital, Villa Scalabrini Old Peoples Home, Cardinal Stretch School of Medicine—Loyola University, The Foundling House. Several years ago for her services to the Italians in the Chicago area, she was presented with "The Star of Solidanty," by the Republic of Italy at a gala banquet in her honor, and others so cited. She is one of the few women so honored.

She is presently the proprietress of two of the largest catering and banquet services in Chicago. A series of banquet halls are always in great demand, one located at Il Chateau Royale, 5743 West Chicago Avenue, and Il Ferrar Manor, at 5600 West North Avenue.

Her son Nello, a brilliant lawyer, is president of the Ferrar Candy Co. and acted as the official of the Columbus Day parade in Chicago recently—viewed by a million Chicagoans. Her two daughters are happily married and grandmother Serafina is the favorite of their children. I am proud to present to the Congress the fine virtues and wonderful

accomplishments of this talented business woman who has contributed so much to the unfortunates who cross her path or that she seeks out. Serafina Ferrara is a credit to her Italian lineage and American heritage. May God bless her and her children for her many charities.

How the Steel Industry Now Sneaks Up Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent by now the price spiral which so many of us have feared is now in full swing. Although the Labor Department statistics indicate that consumer prices were stable during September, the big rise started in October and continues today at alarming levels.

The steel industry led the way in a quiet but determined effort to push prices upward.

The following statement by John M. Lee of the New York Times reprinted by the Gazette and Daily, York, Pa., on Tuesday, October 29, 1963, entitled "How the Steel Industry Now Sneaks Up Prices" sets forth the method of this industry:

HOW THE STEEL INDUSTRY NOW SNEAKS UP PRICES: THE GOVERNMENT IS SUCCESSFULLY HOODWINKED

(By John M. Lee)

The steel industry, which stumbled badly 18 months ago in trying to raise prices, is showing considerable deftness this year in accomplishing essentially the same objective.

In the old days, whenever the industry felt it needed a price increase, usually following a costly labor settlement, it would look most often to the United States Steel Corp., the largest producer, for price leadership.

United States Steel would look at the wage increase and would announced a $4 or $5 or maybe even an $8.50-a-ton increase, applicable to all steel mill products across the board. Other producers would follow.

The last time this happened was in April 1962. The result was a shattering collision between the steel industry and the Federal Government with the result that United States Steel was forced to withdraw an attempted $6-a-ton across-the-board increase.

This year, a new term and a new pattern came into vogue in the industry, "selective pricing."

By employing this practice, the industry has been able, without a head-on conflict with Washington, to increase its prices by something like $5 a ton on close to three-quarters of its product line.

After Washington's customary expression of concern over a new round of inflation and the effect on the ubiquitious balance-of-payments problem, the steel industry has had virtually a free hand to adjust prices subject only to the strength of the market.

MORE POLITICAL DEFTNESS

This new selective pricing policy stems not only from the advisability of acting with more political deftness than in the past but also from a more direct responsiveness to competitive factors that vary widely by product, producer, and geographic region.

Until a few years ago, the steel industry could sell almost all the steel it wanted to produce. At times it appeared not overly concerned about tying its price increases to demand.

But competition from substitute materials at home, such as aluminum, plastics, and concrete and from low-cost imports have dictated changes. Overcapacity in relation to often erratic demand has enabled steel consumers to get along with substantially reduced inventories.

This year has seen a course of action in which a single producer, other than United States Steel, raised prices on a limited group of products. Other producers followed, frequently making some alteration by widening the product area or restricting the amount of the increase, or the like. After some days of divergent pricing, a consensus developed.

The 1963 round of price changes was initiated by the Wheeling Steel Co., a medium-size West Virginia-based producer, in April. This was the breakthrough as prices went up from $4 to $7 a ton on sheet, strip, and galvanized products, accounting for 41 percent of the steel industry's business on a tonnage basis.

In August the Inland Steel Co. of Chicago reinstated a published pricelist in the Midwest for concrete reinforcing bars used in the construction business. The increase over previous negotiated prices was $5 to $10 a ton to a published price of $90 a ton.

In September the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. restored a 4-percent 1961 price cut on oil-country pipe and casing and was joined by other major producers.

THE BIG ONE COMES LAST

Then the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. opened the door on a whole new product area with price increases of $5 a ton on carbon bar products and semifinished steel. Then the Republic Steel Corp. widened the area to include alloy products.

With the price changes gaining momentum, Inland Steel raised prices on structural shapes, and the Bethlehem Steel Corp. added carbon plates, used in transportation equipment and machinery. United States Steel gave its market support to the higher prices.

The steel industry justifies these upward price changes by arguing that higher profits are essential for improved industry health.

A Calm Appraisal of Requirements in the Marketing of New Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Commissioner Winton B. Rankin of the Food and Drug Administration is a quiet-spoken Federal official who can always be counted on for a clear and objective explanation of the facts behind any controversy involving the operation of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. As he is the first to admit, the law itself is not perfect, and the human beings who administer the law are not perfect.

Nevertheless, there are often instances when various industry or professional groups are prone to mistake a proposed regulation for an actual regulation, or to misunderstanding the scope and purpose of a proposed order or an actual order—particularly in the complex field of new drug clearances which was the subject of far-reaching legislation last year.

I was therefore impressed by the calm and reasoned explanation given by Assistant Commissioner Rankin several days ago on the effects of the new drug law, and of new regulations or proposed regulations, on the premarketing testing of new drugs, and on other aspects of drug development. Mr. Rankin spoke at the Third Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy of the American Society for Microbiology in Washington, on October 28.

PROVISIONS FIRST PROPOSED IN H.R. 1235

As the first sponsor in the Congress of the kind of new drug legislation which was subsequently enacted last year as the Kefauver-Harris Act—many of the provisions were first proposed in my omnibus bill to rewrite the entire Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, H.R. 1235, introduced on January 3, 1961—I am, of course, extremely anxious that the legislation not stifle research or development of new drugs, or otherwise interfere with the steady advance in American medical progress. Mr. Rankin's statement is most reassuring on this point, and I think will be of general interest to all of the Members of Congress who joined last year in enacting the comprehensive legislation we passed on new drugs.

One of the most important provisions of new act, and one which was a particularly important provision of H.R. 1235 as originally introduced, calls for certification of the effectiveness of new drugs before they can be marketed. Mr. Rankin explains some of the steps proposed to be taken under this provision, and calmly points out the misunderstandings which arose among some doctors because of a communications problem which Mr. Rankin acknowledges that FDA must help solve.

I commend the Rankin speech to the Members, Mr. Speaker, as a worthwhile contribution by an outstanding public servant. In the meantime, I hope we can soon proceed to enact provisions of my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, which I reintroduced in this Congress under the same number as in the 87th Congress, H.R. 1235.

The text of the speech by Mr. Rankin is as follows:

RECENT LEGISLATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW DRUGS

(By Winton B. Rankin, Assistant Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, delivered at the Third Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, American Society for Microbiology, Washington, D.C., October 28, 1963)

Drug research has grown tremendously in recent years and the prospect is for further growth. You and we are concerned with the factors that influence research and its progress, and are anxious to foster the favorable influences.

This concern shows up in many quarters. The Congress is looking into the appropriation of moneys for drug research to determine whether the amount appropriated is consistent with the stimulation desired.

Teaching institutions and research laboratories are searching for qualified individuals to conduct research and for means of increasing the pool of skilled manpower that is required to expand the Nation's efforts. The drug industries continue to allot large sums to research.

We in the Food and Drug Administration have a great stake in the research picture for several reasons.

Our approval of applications requesting permission to market new drugs is based primarily upon the results of research performed by others. If this research is well planned and well conducted and well reported, it increases the speed and confidence with which we can approve the new drug, and the reliance the public can place upon that approval.

The Federal pure food and drug law was modernized in 1938 to meet a number of major deficiencies that had become apparent in the old statute. One of the improvements at that time was the inclusion of a new section which required the individual who wished to market a new drug to establish to the satisfaction of the Government that the drug was safe under its intended conditions of use. This section was written into the law in large measure as a result of an incident a year earlier in which a pharmaceutical manufacturer used a new solvent to dissolve sulfanilamide in preparing an elixir. The solvent, diethylene glycol, was not properly tested before use. It was toxic when consumed, and the solution killed over a hundred people before it could be removed from the market.

The 1938 law authorized us to establish procedures that would permit the shipment of investigational drugs for testing to determine their safety. Shortly after its enactment we issued the permissive regulations. It appeared that the people who would be engaged in testing drugs were of such caliber that the minimum controls were in order. In general, the person who shipped an investigational drug had to label it as an investigational product, had to keep records showing to whom it was shipped, had to keep a statement from the receiver that he was qualified to investigate drugs for safety. There was no requirement for reporting to the Federal Government either that a drug investigation was underway or that such an investigation was discontinued when this occurred.

Over the years, abuses began to appear. Some individuals employed the investigational provision as a cover for promoting and marketing products that had not been cleared for safety. Others employed the investigational provision as a cover for widespread initial promotion for a drug while its safety clearance was pending before the Food and Drug Administration. So our experts began drafting revised investigational use regulations designed to cope with the abuses. These were issued in the summer of 1962 and became effective this year (1963). They place tighter controls over the interstate shipment of drugs to be tested on man. They recognize that today's miracle drugs which save millions of lives and relieve untold suffering could not have been developed without going through an experimental stage; that the new drugs we hope will furnish tomorrow's cures for cancer, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, and many other dread diseases also must be developed by experimentation—including trials on human beings—before they can be accepted as safe and effective. They also recognize that medical ethics throughout the civilized world places careful restrictions around the use of man as the subject of an experiment. So the regulations require the person who sponsors shipment of a new drug for clinical trial to report to the Food and Drug Administration, before the testing starts, the facts that satisfy him that it is proper to conduct the proposed test.

The report should include, among other things, evidence that adequate animal tests have been made to show the probable effects of the drug and the ill effects that should be watched for by the investigator; evidence of adequate chemistry and manufacturing control to assure a product of uniform and desirable composition; a showing that the clinical investigator has good information about the earlier tests so that he can make his decisions as to the desirability of administering the product to man, and the conditions of administration, on a sound scientific basis. The report should furnish assurance that the individuals selected as investigators are in fact qualified to investigate the safety or effectiveness of the drug, or both depending upon the nature of the experiment. There are certain recordkeeping requirements as there has always been a need for records in connection with sound scientific work. And especially important, the report must show that there is a sound plan for the investigation to be conducted. The Kefauver-Harris drug amendments of 1962 imposed certain additional requirements, and indicated strong legislative support for strengthened control over the shipment of experimental drugs.

How will these new requirements affect research and the progress of medicine? Will they hamper research?

Let it be clearly understood that they are intended to hamper the poorly planned, poorly conducted, and poorly reported efforts that have been sponsored in some quarters in the name of science. There has been too much extremely poor investigation of drugs which cannot be justified and cannot be expected to yield worthwhile results. The basic reason this must stop is because responsible scientists, responsible legislators, and informed citizens generally were shocked and offended by disclosures of some practices that a minority of sponsors had fostered.

The new requirements are not intended to impede bona fide, proper research efforts, and we believe that when all of us have become accustomed to the new procedures, and in a spirit of cooperation and good will have developed improvements as the need for them arises, they will not do so. We are in the transition period now, and there will of course be a period of adjustment and improvement. This is always required as new controls go into effect no matter how desirable they are.

We have required cessation of certain investigations. In these cases, there was gross failure to adhere to accepted principles of medical ethics and the regulations. These were situations in which there was essentially no preliminaary animal testing to determine whether administration of the drug to man is justified; situations in which for practical purposes there was no plan of investigation and a situation in which it appeared that a drug was in fact being marketed commercially under the guise of clinical testing. In the latter case there were reports of serious injuries from uses already made of the new drug.

Clearly, measures designed to require adequate preclinical investigations, a sound plan for investigation and the use of properly trained clinical investigators by drug firms are calculated to upgrade the level of research in the United States. General acceptance of recognized procedures and curtailment of the poor or psuedo-research that has sometimes been followed will necessarily improve research on drugs to the benefit of science, the subjects of investigations, and society.

We in the FDA do not have in mind for drug testing what some seem to fear. We are just as interested in fostering sound drug research as anyone else, and will welcome the opportunity of working with scientists and physicians generally to achieve that goal.

There is one area in which the Federal control does not come into play. We regulate interstate shipment for drugs for investigational purposes but the Federal Government does not have jurisdiction over the shipment of a drug for testing within the same State where it is manufactured. Unquestionably, the Federal requirements will have an influence upon the precautions that are followed in testing drugs that do not cross State lines, but effective control measures under present law must rest with the States insofar as strictly intrastate commerce is involved.

The Kefauver-Harris drug amendments also require the person who gets a new drug approved for commercial marketing to advise the Government promptly of any reports of adverse reactions received from that drug. This provision also will benefit medical research. It has long been recognized that not even the most extensive testing program will necessarily reveal all of the adverse effects of a new drug. When a product is released for commercial distribution which may involve its administration to millions of people, reactions not revealed by tests upon hundreds or even thousands of subjects may appear.

Science recognizes this as part of the total drug research program. The prompt reporting of these reactions will allow appropriate corrective measures to be taken in a timely manner, and will contribute to the development of good drugs.

This discussion applies to antibiotics and other antimicrobials as well as new drugs generally. The same basic requirements apply to all.

The new amendments require new drugs and all antibiotics for human use to be proved effective for their intended uses—as well as safe. This will also contribute to the rational development of chemotherapeutic agents.

An antibiotic that did not have to be proved effective under the old law was marketed in the form of a sugar-coated tablet. When some question arose as to the effectiveness of the tablets we checked blood levels following their oral administration. Zero or near zero levels were obtained in a high percentage of subjects, and large stocks of the product had to be removed from the market. The requirement for proof of effectiveness would have facilitated in this case, and will facilitate in the future, the orderly and proper development and marketing of new drugs.

There are, for example, a lot of antibiotic troches which we allowed on the market for treating minor throat irritations. But some firms began offering them for other, more serious disorders. Under the new law we believed that we were obligated to ask the producers to show us the evidence that led them to believe that their products are effective for all the disease conditions mentioned on the labels. So we published an announcement in the Federal Register asking each manufacturer to submit the evidence upon which he relied, before we certified the drugs. If he did not have any evidence of effectiveness for a given claim, then he would have to drop that claim from the label in order to market the drug.

In another case there were products on the market for prophylaxis of colds and for preventing secondary infections. These contained an analgesic combined with about one-half strength of an antibiotic. In some cases the labelings advised that the products were not for treating infections.

An ad hoc committee chaired by Dr. Harry Dowling studied these products at our request and concluded that they did not have value in prophylaxis of colds or certain other conditions for which they were being used. The committee recommended that they should not be certified for these purposes. Acting on this recommendation, we published a proposal that the products should not be marketed with such claims.

Communications between Government and doctors and between Government and industry did not function well here. Some regarded the proposal as a final order and objected on this basis. Some thought we were trying to wipe out all combination antibiotics and objected on this basis. And some physicians concluded that we were trying to tell doctors what to prescribe. A number have written us indicating that they use the products for treating infections and find them acceptable.

We have no desire to tell doctors what to prescribe. If a physician wants to prescribe one-half the usual amount of an antibiotic for an infection this is his decision; if he wishes to combine the antibiotic with another agent this is his decision. But we must be sure that when we certify an antibiotic—including combination products—as safe and effective, it is just that under the labeling to be employed. If the antibiotic cannot be so certified, then the Government stamp of approval should not be on it. And the labeling must be fully informative.

The Chairman and another member of the Dowling Committee have expressed a desire to take a look at the evidence presented by those who do not like the proposal, and we will arrange for the Committee to do so after the extended time allowed for comment has passed. We will await with interest any further recommendations the Committee has to make.

Certainly we will study the communications problems presented by this case carefully to determine how we can better get the facts across in connection with our announcements. We solicit your aid and the aid of all in science and industry in keeping the lines of communication open.

It is important that drug manufacturers take care to see that the interpretations which they make of FDA proposals are factually correct, especially when they disseminate their views widely.

We are in the transition period leading from the old outmoded system of drug control to the more modern system envisioned in the 1962 enactment. It is understandable that all are concerned about the effect of the new statute and the new regulations upon their operations. We do not claim that our administration of the law will be perfect. We do not claim that the regulations are perfect. We will make improvements as the need becomes apparent.

Some of the practices that we have observed in the drug industry in past years will have to be changed too, if the public is to be protected adequately.

The relationships between the drug industry, the scientific community, Government and consumers are complex and delicate, and implementation of the 1962 drug amendments will require wisdom and judgment and a sense of responsibility by all involved. We appreciate the interest you are showing in the matter, and will welcome your advice, assistance and continued support.

The Moon Race Is Not Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in an editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Union of October 30 supporting the Kennedy administration's lunar probe project commitment, despite the fact that Soviet Premier Khrushchev announced that the Soviet Union is withdrawing from the moonshot race. The editorial sums the issue up perfectly when it states:

We may have more time to meet our commitment in a more comfortable and sure fashion, but we still have our commitment. It is to reach the moon, and to build the foundations of a spacefaring nation on the way. We cannot turn back.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire editorial, entitled "The Moon Race Is Not Won," be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Springfield Union (Mass.), Oct. 30, 1963]

THE MOON RACE IS NOT WON

The Soviet Union says the United States can be first on the moon if it wants. From this are we to believe there is no longer any race? We must not assume the race has been won because of Soviet default. There is a good deal more involved than the man on the moon.

There is, quite naturally, skepticism about Premier Khrushchev's weekend announcement. What better way to lull the United States to sleep? After all, not long ago the Soviets were ostensibly negotiating for a nuclear test ban during an agreed moratorium, and we learned later they had been preparing busily for an intensive new series of tests.

Yet there is evidence that the moon-race pressure has been hard on the Russian economy, and that other economic problems are demanding and receiving priority. Moreover, Mr. Khrushchev must be aware that Soviet prestige declines as space goals are lowered. He cannot expect to fool the world when he implies the Soviets never considered a manned moon landing as a goal. If his game were trickery, there would be less embarrassing ways to play it.

But, even assuming we are now in the race alone, the issue does not end. A look back to the beginning is enough to show the value of the momentum we have gained. The first sputnik and the first Russian man in space were tough blows to the American spirit. They were also cause for some deep probing into why we had not done it all earlier ourselves. Money and effort have narrowed the gap and put us where we can feel leadership is not lost.

Leadership is still very much involved. If the Russians are not going to the moon, a certain amount of leadership accrues automatically to us—if we go ahead with the plan. If we abandon it too, now that the challenge is gone, all that is gained is a little financial relief, and in the future there could be greater losses.

It is important to keep in mind that prestige, or national image, is only one stake in this moon venture that, taken by itself, looked zany to a lot of people to begin with. There is also involved the vast field of byproducts; not all of them are known now, to be sure, but unquestionably many of them will be important to the future of space exploration for both peaceful and military purposes. The scientific fallout of the moon project, not to mention the equipment being developed, will form the backbone of a national space technology that should be the world's foremost.

It must also be borne in mind that Mr. Khrushchev mentioned the moon race alone as being put aside. The Soviets have gone too far in space to abandon everything, and Mr. Khrushchev has his military men to deal with just as President Kennedy has his. A simple declaration that no nuclear weapons will be placed in orbit is not an excuse for us to assume that space forever will be a peaceful place. We must still make it so by building a superior space technology.

So we are not off the hook because the Soviets decline to run the moon race, either against us or with us as Mr. Kennedy recently proposed. We may have more time to meet our commitment in a more comfortable and sure fashion, but we still have our commitment. It is to reach the moon, and to build the foundations of a spacefaring Nation on the way. We cannot turn back.

Bobby the Enforcer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy dynasty is known for its ruthlessness to those who oppose it.

Another shameful example has now been revealed by Victor Lasky in a recent column.

IS BOBBY A CABINET MEMBER OR AN ENFORCER?

(By Victor Lasky)

The Chicago Tribune published an item the other day to the effect that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has launched an investigation into the background of Victor Lasky, author of the highly critical book on the President, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth."

Whereupon a reporter queried the Justice Department about the report. He was told, "no comment."

But "no comment" is not good enough. The item is either true or false. If true, then it seems to me that questions ought to be raised in Congress and elsewhere as to the propriety of the President's brother utilizing Government gumshoes and Federal funds in an effort to dig up dirt with which, presumably, to smear a newsman-critic.

Gentlemen of the jury, I, Victor Lasky, plead guilty to the charge of having written a highly controversial book on the life and times of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But I must cite the fact that one of my readers is none other than the President, himself. Mr. Kennedy, at a recent press conference, said he had dipped into the book but that the parts he had read thus far were not as "brilliant" as Columnists Roscoe Drummond and Arthur Krock claim it to be.

RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

Now, Messrs. Drummond and Krock like the book well enough. But they didn't exactly call it "brilliant." Nevertheless, President Kennedy did handle a sticky question in his usual gracious manner.

The question is, however, whether the President is aware of what brother Bobby may be up to. And until the Justice Department flatly denies the Chicago Tribune report, we must assume that where there is smoke, there is fire. That brother Bobby compiles dossiers on administration critics is an old story by now. But this critic is not an industrialist who has to keep in good with the powers that be. I believe strongly in the right of any American to criticize any President, whether his name is Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower or Kennedy. Once a critic is punished for exercising that right then the Nation is well along the road to totalitarianism.

Brother Bobby ought to be reminded by President Kennedy that he is the Nation's chief legal officer and not a Cosa Nostra enforcer. He should be told to begin acting like a member of the President's Cabinet and

not like a juvenile looking for a rumble. There are some newsmen he can't frighten.

This is not to say that, because I have written a book, I should be immune from criticism. Anyone who dishes it out ought to learn to take it. And I must confess I have certainly dished it out.

BAILEY'S REPLY

On September 16 the Honorable John M. Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was asked this question by Linton Wells, Washington correspondent of the Storer Broadcasting Co.:

"Victor Lasky has just written a book called, 'J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth.' Does that book disturb you at all?"

The transcript carries this reply from Mr. Bailey: "Well, I read that book, and let me say the book is so onesided and so obviously out to put nothing in there except excerpts from various newspapers, various writers, that are unkind to the President, that it's absolutely, as I say, so onesided that it would have no effect at all. It doesn't bother me a bit. Anybody that reads it can see that it is just propaganda, and something that the Republican Party perhaps has been getting together for years and turned over to him to put between hard covers."

Mr. Bailey's reply was not exactly unpredictable. Nevertheless, I would like to assure the chairman that the Republicans had nothing to do with my book. I did it all with my own little hatchet.

An Economic Miracle in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, Ravenswood, W. Va., was a struggling little rural town with scarcely over 1,000 people. Located on the Ohio River, 30 miles south of Parkersburg, Ravenswood was on an unpaved road, somewhat isolated from the mainstream of activity.

Between Pittsburgh and Cincinnati, many miracles have occurred along the blue ribbon of the Ohio River which winds through the hills and lowlands of West Virginia. One of these miracles has taken place at Ravenswood, W. Va., since 1954 when the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. decided to locate a huge plant in the area.

Why did Kaiser choose West Virginia? Cheap power was available close to where the coal is mined. Transportation was good and the plant site was easily developed. The human factors were important: manpower was obtainable in great quantities and proved to be easily trainable. West Virginians appreciate their jobs, and proved that they could learn quickly on new jobs.

On February 15, 1955, ground was broken near Ravenswood for the giant Kaiser plant, 1 of 32 plants which have enabled Kaiser to become the second largest aluminum producer in the Nation. The Ravenswood Works represents a capital investment of about $200 million, and employs some 3,000 people. The operation includes a reduction plant and also a fabrication plant or rolling mill.

From Jamaica in the British West Indies, bauxite is shipped to Louisiana where it is processed into alumina, and then 600 million pounds of this material is sent northward to West Virginia. There, through the electrolytic process, molten aluminum is produced at the Ravenswood reduction plant. In the fabrication plant, up to 300 million pounds annually of primary aluminum is rolled into sheet, foil, and plate products.

It takes a lot of electric power to run the electrolytic aluminum process, and over 300,000 kilowatts are used from the Appalachian Power Co.'s Philip Sporn plant. I should mention also that the alumina hauled from Louisiana to West Virginia is transported in big aluminum tank cars being manufactured by ACF Industries in Huntington, W. Va.

What happens to an area like the mid-Ohio Valley when an economic miracle like the Kaiser plant springs up in Ravenswood? The 3,000 men and women employed at the Ravenswood Works draw a payroll of $21,114,000 annually. This provides a major boost for Jackson County, once primarily an agricultural county.

A housing boom hit the area. To take care of the huge influx of workers, there was a burst of private construction activity. The Kaiser officials decided at the start that whatever happened, Ravenswood was not to grow into a company town. Housing was developed by private interests on the outside, dealing with individual employees.

As the hordes of young employees came into the area, a school problem was created—particularly at the elementary level. The problem was so acute that it could not wait for local levies and other action to solve it. Kaiser built a 20-room elementary school, and for $1 a year the school was leased to the Jackson County Board of Education. But in 1963, the problem at the high school level remains severe. There have been cases where highly qualified employees find it necessary to go elsewhere to get improved schooling for their children in an age when education is highly competitive.

In a recent address before the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va., Henry E. Cunningham, eastern regional public affairs manager of Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., cited the following statistics on economic development in Jackson County, W. Va.:

The basis of economic growth is jobs. According to a report by the Applachian Power Co., there were 50 manufacturing employees in Jackson County during 1955. By 1960 that figure had risen to 3,112 and today it is slightly more than that. Total employment in 1960 was 7,230 compared to 4,650 during 1950. We have no figures for 1962 but believe it to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 8,000.

In 1955, those 55 employees were making a total of $10,833 a month. Five years later, in 1960, the monthly manufacturing payroll had risen to $1,761,300 and today it is probably slightly more than that.

The jobs and resulting payrolls caused a fantastic jump in per capita income in Jackson County. In 1950, per capita personal income was $949. By 1960 it was $2,348. Today it is even higher. The percentage increase from 1950 to 1960 was 147 percent.

I think it is interesting to note that in 1950, 65.1 percent of the families living in the county had an income of less than $2,500. Today that figure is just under 10 percent. All because of the impact of industry.

Of course there was an increase in population. In 1950 the county boasted 15,299. At the end of 1960 the number of inhabitants had increased to 18,541. Today it is probably pretty close to 20,000. Ravenswood has about 4,200 residents and Ripley follows with some 3,400.

This new population creates effective demand. Demand for all things needed to enjoy life.

Let me cite some examples:

In Ravenswood alone, 348 new homes were constructed between July 1955, and the end of 1962. That does not count two apartment complexes, one having 94 units and the other 56. These houses represent those new homes built inside the corporate limits. There is new construction going on all over the county in new subdivisions as well as in the other villages and towns.

Telephone customers increased from 1,667 in 1955 to some 3,470 in 1960 and I am sure is well over that figure today.

Gas customers jumped from 1,840 in 1950 to 2,754 in 1960 and, of course, is still climbing.

The number of electric residential customers has increased from 2,732 to 4,574 between 1955 and 1960 and is increasing as each new home is constructed.

Retail sales enjoyed a substantial increase. During 1955, all retailers in Jackson County had sales totaling $6,431,000. During 1960 that figure had jumped to $13,399,000. That is an increase of 108 percent. Exact figures for 1962 are not yet available but will, I am sure, reflect further increases.

I think it's significant that several new retail establishments have opened in the county, the most striking being a 10-unit shopping center in Ravenswood.

Other related businesses have been affected beneficially through the advent of industry.

The average monthly railroad carloadings has increased from nothing in 1950 to 183 in 1960 and even more today. Average monthly truck loadings has increased from nothing in 1950 to 464 for the first quarter of this year.

Pulpwood production increased from 71 cords to 1,746 from 1950 to 1960. And the annual production of lumbering has increased from an insignificant figure in 1950 to some 45,000 to 50,000 board feet today.

And finally, wholesale establishments increased from 7 in 1950 to 15 in 1960.

In the area of community facilities, there has been improvement. The number of churches grew from 92 to 101 during the 10-year period and a few more have gone up since.

The miles of paved road have increased from 83 to some 159 miles.

At the present time, a 3-story addition to county court house in Ripley is nearing completion; and ground will soon be broken for a new 41-bed hospital in the county seat town.

But while great strides have been made, many things must yet be accomplished if we are to make true progress.

One of the great problems still facing the county is its school system. The significance of a good school system to the economic climate of an area can not be overlooked or overemphasized.

Growth and improvement mark the public school system in Jackson County during the past 10 years. Enrollment, at 5,015, is up 45 percent. Achievement test results show county norms up an entire grade level, bringing the county up nearly to State levels but still a full 1 year below national norms.

The foregoing is rather remarkable since it has been accomplished during a period in which increases in local county financial

support have not kept pace with that of other counties in the State and with the Nation.

Jackson County spending, at $226 per pupil, is up $44 in the last 10 years. Statewide spending, at $304, is up $131 over the same period. The national average is $394.

Our objective at Kaiser Aluminum is to work with the citizens of our county to improve this school situation, knowing full well that the lion's share of the price for better schools will be paid by industry.

The Area Redevelopment Administration in conjunction with the use of Hill-Burton funds have teamed up to help solve the problem of medical service in this fast-growing area. A new hospital is being constructed at Ripley, W. Va., thanks to sizable Federal grants and also contributions by workers and management at Kaiser.

During the past year, the accelerated public works program has brought great benefits to both Ravenswood and the Jackson County seat town of Ripley. A Federal grant of $117,000 has resulted in a $234,000 project which has enabled the old section of Ravenswood to resurface all its streets. A Federal grant of $67,000 will be matched to produce a $134,000 project for resurfacing the streets of Ripley. A $20,000 Federal grant will be used to build a fishing lake just north of Ravenswood at Turkey Run. A grant of $43,700 will be matched locally to build a water tank to improve Ripley's water resources.

All of these accelerated public works grants have enabled the two main communities in Jackson County to engaged in some active face lifting which will produce permanent improvements.

The economic miracle in West Virginia is just beginning. The tremendous boost given by Kaiser can only result in a bright future for the area.

Roses: Give 'Em While They Can Smell 'Em

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to an editorial from the Carroll County Times for October 21, 1963.

This editorial, entitled "Roses: Give 'Em While They Can Smell 'Em," is an excellent example of the Carroll County Times support of community efforts. And the voluntary contributions of time, service, and money, by the various citizens and citizens' groups commended in the editorial typify the American way of life that goes back to the custom of neighborly help in colonial days. I am honored to place this editorial in the RECORD and to demonstrate through it that the ideals of American life are still being followed in Carroll County:

ROSES: GIVE 'EM WHILE THEY CAN SMELL 'EM

Our philosophy has been one of always giving roses to the living rather than to the dead.

We like to commend those who have done or are doing things beyond the call of duty without expectations of a pat on the back or thanks for a job well done.

To Mayor J. Frank Getty, Earl Yingling, and the city council for their construction of Christmas Tree Park and tennis courts without the expenditure of one penny of tax funds. The $5,000 it took to build the park came from the sale of Christmas trees.

To the Brethren Service Group, studying conditions of the county jail, for their interest and devotion to Christian service.

To Mayor Edward L. Williar and the city council for their farsightedness in inaugurating a planning program for Union Bridge and the installation of a sewerage system for the town.

Also to the town of Union Bridge and its citizens for their cooperative efforts in building a beautiful community center for the use of the people of the area.

To Mrs. Thelma W. Shriner for donating the land, designing, and having the structure built. And to the Lions Club, chamber of commerce, Lehigh Portland Cement Co., Western Maryland Railroad, Union Bridge Athletic Association for donating materials, equipment, and labor for the project.

To Times founder, George K. Mather—on his 90th birthday, October 13—for his many contributions to the people and city of Westminster and specifically Mather Gardens, named in his honor by a grateful mayor and city council.

To the Taneytown Junior Chamber of Commerce for its varied community projects including the erection of stop, no parking, and speed zone signs in the area, saving the town of Taneytown some $300 in labor costs; for building a little league baseball diamond at a cost of $1,100; and at the request of the mayor and council will name unnamed streets and erect street markers on all streets of Taneytown; and for assisting in vaccine clinics and United Appeal drives.

To Mrs. Mabel Reese, Westminster, for her unselfish devotion to all community projects and her untiring efforts on behalf of the entire community.

To Mrs. Margaret Marsh for her courage in making a statement to the Times deploring the conditions at the Carroll County jail.

To the capital improvements commission—Charles O. Fisher, chairman—for its active administration. Although the commission's bylaws call for monthly meetings, the commission has been meeting weekly and in "shirt sleeve" fashion is accomplishing things. In five meetings it has made three major decisions.

To Joseph H. Hahn, Jr., Mrs. John W. Cable, III, Mrs. William Warner, and Mrs. John M. McCormick and their associates for their work in the 1963 United Appeal campaign in Carroll County.

Louis Farino Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular young Italo-American leaders of Chicago was honored with a plaque "Testimony of Merit" presented by Monsignor O'Malley, dean of Loyola University. The banquet was attended by 2,000 persons of Italian extraction and their friends, who were gathered together to raise funds for the Cardinal Stritch School of Medicine, Loyola University.

It was under the persistent leadership of Mr. Louis Farino that young political leaders of South American countries were approved by the State Department and the administration on an exchange basis. He received the congratulations of many important leaders in government both here and abroad for the realization of the plan of Operation Friendship. He also sought to interest the Eisenhower administration in a program, later adopted by the Kennedy administration—the Peace Corps.

And so our good friend presently superintendent of Chicago Bureau of Parking whose ingenuity has solved many of the intricate problems in this field of responsibility (especially the collection of millions of dollars) has deservedly been the recipient of a high honor from Loyola University for his conscientious effort to raise moneys for a most worthy cause—the finances needed by the Cardinal Stritch School of Medicine of Loyola University.

Unemployment: The No. 1 Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, my able colleague from Ohio, ROBERT TAFT, JR., recently delivered a speech in Philadelphia and I believe it should be brought to the attention of the House and the Nation. The speech is entitled "Unemployment: The No. 1 Economic Problem."

The people of Pennsylvania have been fighting this problem for some time and this is especially true of the people in the district I am privileged to represent, the 10 Congressional District of Pennsylvania. In our State we believe we know something about fighting the problem of unemployment and claim some expertise in the matter. In this spirit and with the hope that Congressman TAFT's discussion of the issues will be widely read and discussed, I present the speech which follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT: THE NO. 1 ECONOMIC PROBLEM

(Remarks of ROBERT TAFT, JR., Congressman at Large, Ohio, to the Union League of Philadelphia)

Recently President Kennedy ventured into deep water by mentioning the possibility of a 35-hour workweek in place of the 40-hour maximum provision presently in the Fair Labor Standards Act. He scrambled back to the beach pretty fast though, and our fearless Jack was so startled at the results that he retreated post haste behind a truly fantastic target date of A.D. 2000. But the sally

and the taking cover both reveal the growing importance of unemployment as a major issue on the economic front. Many thoughtful Americans are inquiring as to what steps we should take to correct the unsatisfactory level of unemployment at present and the even more serious threat of its increase in the future. The "Oops, I'm sorry" reaction of the President on the discussion of maximum hours reveals the high degree of sensitivity of the current administration to any general and thorough discussion of this problem related, as it must be, to longer range targets than the next election.

This year's hearings on "Hours of Work" before the Select Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee began with Chairman HOLLAND's statement,

"Unemployment, as President Kennedy has said, is our No. 1 economic problem."

Indeed, such has been the attitude of the administration and its leader since the election campaign of 1960. And yet little if any results can be shown toward solving this problem, or even checking the increase in it. This must surely be because the remedies being prescribed are not sound ones, or that the target is not being given the priority that it should have. Both are probably true. The 1964 election campaign coming up presents to the Republican Party and its candidates an opportunity to see that the American people understand the problem as well as possible and to propose for their consideration a program of more emphasis and direction toward solving it. Here in Pennsylvania I know that your Governor, and my close friend, Bill Scranton is moving with every effort to solve the problem here, and he is to be commended for these efforts. There are many aspects of the problem, however, which are more national than regional in their scope.

Before proposing any solutions, we should take a look at a few of the facts regarding unemployment today. In only 1 month in 5 years has the national unemployment rate been below 5 percent. Indeed, since the Korean war boom tapered off, it is a problem that has been with us almost constantly. At the present time, the rate stands at 5.6 percent in spite of the fact that we have a total civilian employment of over 69 million, the highest ever recorded in our history. The total head count unemployed at the present time is over 4 million. Here in Pennsylvania, as in some other industrial States which have had special problems, the present rate is somewhere under 7 percent and considerably improved from last year.

These figures, however, are not nearly so meaningful as the fact that during the 5 years of 1958 through 1963, we are adding per year approximately 780,000 persons to our labor force, and we have been creating jobs at an average of only 570,000. Based on these figures, the President estimated in 1962 that we needed to create 25,000 jobs per week. The fact of the matter may be that it is considerably in excess of this. Some of the figures relating to job opportunities eliminated through automation run as high as 40,000 per week, which gives increased emphasis to the necessary expanding job opportunities as quickly as possible. Obviously, then, the boom in population, particularly in the age groups presently about to come into the labor force, is the cardinal fact that we must recognize. Automation itself is, of course, something that must be recognized and must be viewed realistically without alarm, but also without any illusions about the readjustments it necessitates. Anyone doubting this need reflect only on the fact that the man-hours required for various products have changed between 1947 and 1962 as follows:

For an automobile, from 310 to 153 hours.

For 1,000 tons of coal, from 1,300 to 500 hours.

For 1,000 bushels of wheat, from 340 to 120 hours.

For 1,000 tons of steel, from 14,700 to 10,900 hours.

There are certain other major factors that must be given consideration in any approach to the problem of unemployment. One of these is that as a result of educational and job discrimination, a very considerable proportion of the unemployed are Negroes, and this in itself bespeaks the necessity of a fair and effective civil rights bill accompanied by a change in national attitude toward this problem. Another group in which there is an undue percentage of our unemployed is youth under the age of 22. Of course, these figures duplicate in some respect the undue percentage of Negro population, but regardless of this factor, it is clear that somewhere between 700,000 and 1 million out-of-school, out-of-work youth are handicapped in getting jobs by a lack of proper training and a lack of experience.

On the realistic side, we must recognize that we have a large and growing number of chronically unemployed, who are still a part of the labor force but who are conditioning their interest in obtaining work upon unrealistic conditions, and they are satisfied to accept unemployment and public support as a way of life. Some of these, obviously, are unemployable, but we must recognize that many of them are not and that the unemployment compensation and welfare systems that we have developed in this country are being subjected to abuse, hopefully in a small percentage only, but, nevertheless, definitely by this group.

Finally, we must recognize that so-called structural unemployment is a serious and increasing problem, which must be considered. As has been pointed out in a recent book by Mr. Myrdal, and has been emphasized by others, a discrepancy has developed between supply and demand in the labor field. Obviously this is true where we have some 4 million unemployed and some 2 million jobs which are going unfilled, seeking workers.

Against this background on the nature of the problem and recognizing that all Americans share fervently the desire to solve it, we should recognize the difference in the general philosophy of the Republican and Democratic Parties as they approach a solution. The New Frontier solution seems to lie principally in two areas. First, in spite of the rather high level of economic activity in the country at present and the favorable signs other than the unemployment situation, the New Frontier is urging an attempt to soup up the economy generally by a massive dose of deficit spending. While lipservice has been given to the idea that the stimulation must come from a tax cut, it has been quite clear from the outset that the true reliance of Mr. Walter Heller and other advisers to the President has been upon a massive deficit. If this deficit could be achieved through a tax cut, they have expressed hope that this might add somewhat more to the stimulation to the consumer and business investment factors in the economy, but they have made it clear from the outset that if the tax cut approach doesn't work, they will rely on greatly increased Federal expenditures. In fact, in their recommendations for greatly increased area redevelopment funds, the adjustment payment features of the Trade Expansion Act, and the accelerated public works bill, one may wonder whether their primary reliance even today is not upon increasing Government expenditures behind the smoke screen of a tax cut that for the average taxpayer may not amount to more than pin money of under $5 per week. Primary emphasis on such attempts to stimulate the economy colors the approach of the administration to almost all other Federal programs, including those which are intended to be rifle shots aimed at the specific problems thought to be behind the unemployment situation.

On the other hand, the approach of Republican leadership toward unemployment has been a consistent one over a period of years. Back in 1959 I served as a member of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, which studied and commented on this aspect of our national economy. In part, we stated at that time:

"The history of technological change shows that science has created—not diminished—new job opportunities, higher pay, better working conditions and more goods for our people at less cost."

We continued, indicating that it was the duty of all citizens to keep up with changing technology and to adapt to changing conditions, as well as helping each other to adjust a change. We pointed out that by 1976 we would have to have close to 95 million people gainfully employed to provide for a total population of somewhere around 240 million. We urged State and local agencies to cooperate with the Federal Government in helping areas of chronic unemployment and in finding productive uses for displaced men and plants through training and retraining programs and through better dissemination of information about job opportunities and unemployment. We also pledged ourselves to the encouragement of fair employment opportunities for all, without discrimination on account of race, age, or any other factor. Consistently, with these objectives, we have supported training under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the vocational education bill. At the same time, we have recognized that if such programs are to succeed, our economy must be kept healthy by fiscal responsibility in aiming toward a balanced budget and in maintaining the confidence of all Americans that we will not be ravaged by inflation and that we are not threatened by a loss of our economic freedom.

In addition to these philosophic differences between the approach of the parties to the unemployment problem, there are other complicating factors in the Kennedy approach to it. For one thing, no priority is given to the problem over certain other areas. There are so many different programs and approaches that all is inclined to break down in confusion. There are numerous specific examples of this.

One program, for instance, which has come under a good deal of examination by the current Congress, is the area redevelopment program. Enacted by the last Congress and given a budget of $379 million, inquiries at the beginning of this session showed that only one-quarter of the appropriated funds had actually been spent and that of those spent, a great deal had been put into projects not normally thought of by the Congress as job-producing activities. Moreover, the total number of areas that had been qualified for aid was so excessive that it was obvious no real effort was being put into the hard-core unemployment areas. In the industrial and commercial loan authorization, over a quarter of the approvals had been for the building of hotels and motels, not the type of project which Congress had in mind in attempting to solve the unemployment problem. Even at the present time, after a considerable period of operation, the maximum number of permanent jobs claimed to have been created by the program is 60,000, and an examination of these claims revealed that they were, at best, conjectural and in many instances greatly exaggerated through attribution of indirect claimed effects.

Not much better can be said of the accelerated public works program, where the temptation to interject politics into the approval of local projects such as sidewalks seem hardly related to any permanent creation of jobs.

Another program, which should be reviewed carefully with regard to the whole problem of unemployment and which seems

to threaten seriously any improvement in the employment picture in the United States in the near future, is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. As you will recall, under that measure, the President was given the authority to lower almost all of our tariffs, some by up to 50 percent, but most by up to 100 percent. Acting under that authority, the President has just last week, on October 18, given notice of his intention to act to reconsider tariffs on almost all products covered by our tariff laws. The breadth of this approach should serve as notice to the country that broad-scale tariff reductions, with the resulting maladjustment to domestic industry, must be expected. Safeguards of the peril point and court review have been removed. While there is the possibility that adjustment payments to companies and employees displaced may be made, in the present period in which we are running at a sizable deficit in our overall operations, such payments would further increase the deficit and injure the confidence of American business. About all that can be said on these hearings is to warn all concerned that if they wish to protest or be heard as to tariff reductions, they must file their notice by November 20, a very short period into the future, and they had best prepare immediately to defend any justification they expect to make of present tariffs. This is in spite of the fact that the United States already has the lowest tariff rates of any nation in the world and that imports in recent periods have upset American industry and caused job losses without giving any effect to the new authority. Indications that we are already in a state of maladjustment because of automation and other factors are apparently being ignored, and it is hard to see how unemployment levels can be improved in the foreseeable future by the activities expected under the Trade Expansion Act. Increases in world trade may, and should help to build our economy. We might have more confidence in this, however, if there were indications that the motivation of those in control was to do the best possible for American business rather than to use trade as an international grab bag in an attempt to buy friendship, not only from free nations, but also from many nations that seem headed in the direction of communism, or are already Communist.

Another area for concern in regard to future employment developments is the whole area of balance of international payments. Our tax laws and various other features have encouraged a flight of capital from the United States in recent years, and this has definitely resulted in the creation of jobs abroad and the loss of jobs that might have been created through expansion of American industry here. After these foreign plants are set up, they are then used to compete with industry here at home, and this has a further discouraging effect upon our economy and job creation.

No discussion of this area could omit a consideration of restrictive labor-management policies and practices such as restrictions upon union membership, apprentice opportunities, make work, unrealistic security provisions, and fringe benefits, which because of their lack of transferability, often freeze workers into particular areas and particular employments.

Then, too, we must be realistic enough to admit that our unemployment compensation laws in the States in which they are more liberal, as well as the various welfare programs, have had the effect with some of decreasing the desire for employment. This has tended to prevent initiative in moving to new locations and new occupations. Particularly, it has had the result of leaving unfilled job opportunities of up to 2 million. While some of the present want ads can be attribued to a lack of training, certainly not all of them can.

All of these conflicting programs and considerations paint a somewhat dismal picture. Certainly we should not close without making some restatement of the position we Republicans should offer as an alternative to the bungling and the crosscurrents presently in operation. With this in mind, I have several recommendations to offer, a few of which are new, but all of which are probably important. They are as follows:

1. We should back and make sure that effective effort is put into the administration of the various training and retraining programs such as the Manpower Development and Training Act and the various State vocational education programs as supplemented by the additional Federal funds expected to be authorized for them. These programs, I am sure, will require supervision and flexibility to avoid waste in time and effort as well as money.

2. As proposed by Congressman FRANK BOW and many others, the Congress should set up a select committee on automation, bipartisan in nature and directed toward coming up with answers as to how automation can help to create jobs as well as eliminate them. Realistically here, we have to admit that we must not block progress, but by sales engineering and imagination, we should be able to make progress. Certainly no one can say that America is yet in the position in which there is no need for better conditions of life for all of us in this country, not to mention the almost limitless worldwide needs.

3. We must attempt to cultivate new attitudes toward easier adjustment to new locations and new occupations. Incidentally, the manpower bill, as reported by the Education and Labor Committee of the House, contains a grant for pilot studies on increasing labor mobility by sharing moving expenses. Prejudices and problems in this connection exist and should be better understood.

4. Both in the United States, but even more throughout the world, man must come to a better understanding of the population problem that has been created by improved medical care and additional living resources.

5. We should at least inquire as to whether or not we might encourage an increase in single-worker families rather than families where the economic circumstances or other considerations lead to multiple employment with undesirable family and social results. Whether this is related to juvenile delinquency and its tremendous increase in recent years should be studied and determined.

6. We must take steps to strengthen the collective-bargaining process and to insure that there is a reasonable balance of power in any such bargaining process between industry and labor. As a part of the same problem, there should be a study of the complications that result both in labor relations and in overall economic effect from nationwide bargaining in transportation and other industries which vitally affect the entire economy. Such a study has been called for in Congress, and, hopefully, the Education and Labor Committee, or some other group, may rapidly proceed with such a study.

7. If we are to face up to the unemployment problem realistically, we had best stop thinking of solving it in the terms of makework projects and one-shot-public-works type projects. There is a place for a proper public works program in this country, but certainly it is no long-term solution to the unemployment problem, and the primary considerations inevitably seem to become political rather than aimed at employment.

8. And then, finally, perhaps the most vital step of all that we can take to increase the rate at which we can produce jobs is to reestablish the confidence of our own people and of the world in our economy. Embarking upon a massive planned deficit program for the first time in peacetime, we face a serious threat of the loss of such confidence. This is evidenced in many ways by the outside world, such as in the unfavorable balance of payments and the continued outflow of gold. But at home, it is evidenced by a failure to expand at what has been the normal rate of expansion of the United States over many years.

Admittedly, these proposals offer no panacea. On the other hand, they do not threaten us as do some of the administration's nostrums with inflation, with increased Government control over our lives, and with makework Government activities on an increasing scale. If we can make clear the choice to the American people, both employed and unemployed, in their commonsense they are sure to turn to sound and responsible leadership and to demand consistent policies in attacking this problem. We believe, and we submit to them, that such leadership and such policies can be found in the Republican Party.

ACLU: Defenders of Our Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the American Civil Liberties Union has established a highly commendable and vigorous record in its 43-year history. Beginning with its early efforts to prevent the deportation of aliens down through today's labors in the Negroes' struggle for equality, the ACLU has consistently been on the "frontier of social controversies." It has not hesitated to speak out on behalf of individuals and groups—no matter what their political thinking—whose basic liberties are being violated. ACLU's strong support for our Bill of Rights has helped insure that prized and important right that contributes to a dynamic and democratic nation—the right to dissent.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal reviews the history of ACLU and ably discusses its current programs in its unrelenting task as the defender of our rights.

The article follows:

CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION STIRS IRE AS IT DEFENDS VARIED GROUPS' RIGHTS: ACLU GIVES LEGAL SUPPORT TO U.S. REDS, GOVERNOR BARNETT, NEGRO DEFENDANTS IN DIXIE—THE AMERICAN LEGION OBJECTS

(By Stanley W. Penn)

NEW YORK.—Question: What does Ross Barnett, Mississippi's segregationist Governor, have in common with the U.S. Communist Party?

Answer: They're both receiving legal support from the American Civil Liberties Union.

In a brief filed with the Supreme Court, the ACLU is strongly backing Governor Barnett's request for a jury trial in the criminal contempt of court case brought against him for allegedly interfering with the court-ordered integration of the University of Mississippi last year. The organization has been equally vigorous in contending that in requiring the Communist Party to register under the Subversive Activities Control Act, the U.S. Government is denying the party

the Constitutional protection against self-incrimination.

The ACLU, now 43 years old, is a zealous defender of civil rights—anyone's civil rights. It worries not at all about whether the ideas or programs of individuals or groups it defends are distasteful to many.

SUPPORTING THE PRAYER BAN

Thus, besides going to the aid of Governor Barnett and the Communists, the ACLU has recently argued that former Venezuelan dictator Perez Jimenez was entitled to political asylum in the United States, has shown concern for a suspected cop killer and has stood up for an American Nazi's right to speak in public. In earlier actions ACLU lawyers helped the families whose protests led to the Supreme Court decisions banning formal prayers and Bible reading in public schools—decisions that were highly unpopular with a large segment of the American public.

The group frequently draws sharp criticism for its stands, sometimes because people tend to identify it with an unpopular cause whose rights it has sought to guard. The American Legion recently called for an investigation of the ACLU; among other things, the Legion is disturbed by the ACLU's demand that the House Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished on the ground it has violated the civil rights of persons it has investigated.

But the ACLU also has some impressive supporters, including many lawyers. Among them is Whitney North Seymour, a leading New York lawyer and a past president of the American Bar Association.

"As a lawyer I have sometimes differed with the ACLU's choice of cases and some of its legal positions, but as a citizen I have been glad there was a group ready to perform the often unpopular task of contesting every inch of ground in defense of basic liberties," says Mr. Seymour. Firmly entrenched civil liberties, he believes, not only preserve "our system of liberty under law" but also are "one of our most powerful weapons in the war of ideas with the Communists."

LAWYERS CONTRIBUTE SERVICES

Over 800 volunteer lawyers, working without fees, represent the ACLU in court as counsel or through briefs filed as friends of the court. The organization's budget, contributed by the more than 65,000 members in 33 affiliates across the Nation, amounted to $646,000 for the most recent fiscal year; the money goes for literature, costs of filing briefs, and salaries for a nationwide staff of 60.

A 35-member board of directors, meeting every 2 weeks at the ACLU's national headquarters here makes policy. The board includes such prominent names as playwright Elmer Rice and James Farmer, head of the Congress of Racial Equality, along with 13 lawyers. One of the lawyers is Edward Bennett Williams, of Washington, whose clients have included Senator Joseph McCarthy, Teamsters President James R. Hoffa, and hoodlum Frank Costello.

The ACLU has never hesitated to plunge into controversy. In the early 1920's it fought the deportation of radical aliens. ACLU lawyer Clarence Darrow defended John T. Scopes, a young Tennessee science teacher, in the 1925 "monkey trial"; Scopes had violated a State law forbidding the teaching of Darwin's theory of evolution.

The ACLU was active in the defense of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, executed in 1927 for the murder of two men in a payroll holdup; the defense contended they were prosecuted mainly because of their anarchist beliefs. The ACLU supported the legal effort that led to the 1933 Federal court decision admitting James Joyce's novel Ulysses to the United States, a decision regarded as a landmark in the battle against censorship.

A LIBERAL ORGANIZATION?

The ACLU doesn't like to be assigned political labels, but it's clear most people think of it as "liberal." John de J. Pemberton, a former associate professor of law at Duke University who now serves as the ACLU's $17,500-a-year executive director, hails the Supreme Court, currently dominated by a "liberal" or activist philosophy, as a "major educational force for civil liberties." The ACLU favors a stronger civil rights bill than President Kennedy has proposed. On legal issues it often lines up with the two most liberal members of the Supreme Court, Justices Hugo L. Black and William O. Douglas.

"I suppose we are on the frontier of so many social controversies that people don't think of us as conservative," observes Alan Reitman, associate director of the ACLU.

All the same, the organization does share some causes with conservatives. At the moment the ACLU is increasingly concerned, according to Mr. Pemberton, about "encroachment on civil liberties" by Government bureaucracies. He says Government agencies are growing more impersonal and often fail to provide safeguards for civil liberties.

As is evident from such stands as its support of Governor Barnett's request for a jury trial—which might make his conviction less likely than if he were tried by a judge—the ACLU is not concerned solely with the rights of liberals.

It has defended the right of the virulently anti-Negro and antisemitic National States Rights Party to hold a public meeting. The party was convicted of contempt of court for violating an Alabama State court order forbidding such a meeting. The ACLU denounced the ruling as an abridgement of free speech; similar orders, it noted, could be used to block demonstrations for civil rights. On the ground that the right of free speech was at stake, the ACLU also backed George Lincoln Rockwell, when New York City unsuccessfully sought to deny the leader of the American Nazi Party a permit to speak in Union Square.

It's true, however, that more often than not the ACLU is to be found working in behalf of causes generally thought of as liberal. Right now a major concern of the organization is aiding Negroes in their drive for equal rights in all areas of life.

The ACLU strongly backs Negroes' civil rights demonstrations as a "legitimate exercise of first amendment rights"—freedom of speech and assembly. While demonstrations may cause "inconveniences" for communities, the group has said, "this is the price that must be paid to eliminate the evil of racial discrimination." On the subject of voting, the ACLU has termed Mississippi's denial of voting privileges to large numbers of Negroes a "scandal" and urged the Department of Justice to take stern measures to rectify the situation.

AIDING NEGRO DEFENDANTS

The ACLU is also active in protecting the rights of individual Negro defendants in southern courts. At present there are three cases before the Mississippi Supreme Court in which ACLU attorneys are appealing the convictions of Negroes charged with rape.

The organization maintains the Negroes were denied fair treatment. In one rape case, for example, it charges that Mississippi Negro William Smith, Jr., was "arrested without probable cause, held in detention unconstitutionally, subjected to coercive forces until he confessed, denied counsel at a crucial pretrial juncture, denied the right to counsel for 53 days, and finally was represented ineffectively at trial by his court-appointed attorneys."

The frequent lack of adequate counsel for Negro defendants in the South has long troubled the ACLU. White lawyers in the South are often reluctant to defend Negroes because of fear of reprisals, the group believes. The ACLU is now trying to recruit competent southern lawyers willing to defend Negroes.

The problem of protecting the individual's civil rights against encroachment by law enforcement agencies is by no means confined to the South, the ACLU stresses. Executive Director Pemberton fears that the rise in public concern about the underworld is being accompanied by a "growing body of opinion that is disrespectful of fair procedure" in its desire to see law enforcement offices nab criminals.

WIRETAPPING CONTROVERSY

The ACLU is opposed to police use of wiretapping or other forms of electronic eavesdropping to trap criminals, contending such methods are illegal searches and violate the right to privacy. The Justice Department, on the other hand, is hoping that the testimony of mobster Joseph Valachi on organized crime in the United States will spur legislation allowing Federal law enforcement authorities to employ electronic eavesdropping and use the information they obtain in the courts.

The ACLU's New York affiliate was recently scolded by some editorial writers for raising questions about the fatal shooting of a murder suspect by the New York City Police. The dead man, a hoodlum named Frank Falco, was suspected of murdering two Lodi, N.J., policemen and was wanted in New York for another murder.

George Rundquist, head of the ACLU affiliate, asked for an investigation of the killing of Falco, who had been trapped in a hotel room here by several police officers. Mr. Rundquist claimed the shooting was "not unlike a Ku Klux Klan lynching party" and asked if it might not have been possible for the several officers in the room to subdue Falco so that he could have been brought to trial. The New York police retorted that Falco had resisted arrest and that the officers' action had been proper and necessary.

Reaffirmation of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in this time of confusion and mixed emotions created by the recent Supreme Court decisions affecting prayer and Bible reading in our public schools, it is refreshing and reassuring to take note of the important place moral and spiritual values continue to have in the lives and activities of those responsible in large part for the molding of the attitudes, concepts, and character of our youth.

At a recent meeting of the Association of College Admissions Counselors conducted in Philadelphia, Pa., an inspiring reaffirmation of religious faith was offered by Dewey L. Brevik, director of admissions, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

I am indebted to Miss Laura M. Trexler, director of guidance at the Northern Valley Regional High School, and an unusually dedicated and public-spirited resident of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey for sending me a copy of this blessing.

I include this indication of the feeling of those who work so effectively with our youth in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we all may benefit from its message:

Gracious God, our Heavenly Father, in this day, in this hour in which we congratulate one another on our own accomplishments and our sincere dedication to a really great cause, the guidance and counselling of our youth in decisions concerning their higher education, let there be a pause now in our hearts and minds—let there rest upon us a conviction of the real, the divine, source of inspiration and wisdom.

When men in high places may legislate against calling upon Thy name, we give thanks to Thee for the freedom which remains for us to acknowledge a deep sense of need in the discharge of our responsibilities.

Bless us now—let Thy spirit continue to move among us so that we may indeed serve Thee as we serve ourselves and others, in full acknowledgment of our weaknesses and shortcomings, but with the assurance of Thy strength and power, in this day, in this hour.

In Christ's name and for His sake. Amen.

Flagrant Abuse of REA Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article by Joe Fisher which appeared in the Rockford Morning Star on October 16, 1963. Mr. Fisher points out the flagrant abuse of REA loans. New restrictive legislation is sorely needed to spell out the intent of the Congress.

I want to commend my colleague, BOB MICHEL, for bringing to light recent loans made by REA for ski resorts and include his complete statement.

The article and statement follow:

MICHEL QUESTIONS LEGALITY OF REA SKI RESORT LOANS

(By Joe Fisher)

WASHINGTON.—Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL Tuesday challenged the legality of Rural Electrification Administration loans for ski resorts, lumber mills, and for other business and commercial purposes.

The Peoria Republican said the loans "are not authorized by law and are about as far afield as it is possible to go from the original intent of Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act of 1936."

Earlier in the day, REA Administrator Norman Clapp defended two loans for ski resorts in Pennsylvania and northern Illinois.

TO JUSTIFY LOAN

Clapp appeared before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations to justify a recently approved $110,000 loan for a ski resort on Blue Knob Mountain in Pennsylvania.

Last year, the REA approved a $23,000 loan for ski equipment for Chestnut Hills Resort, Inc. The Illinois ski resort is between Hanover and Galena.

MICHEL, who was scheduled to testify at the subcommittee hearing, was unable to attend because of other committee business. He submitted his statement to the subcommittee later in the day.

Clapp said the loans for the ski resorts were authorized under section 5 of the Rural Electrification Administration Act.

That section empowers the REA Administrator to make loans for "financing the wiring of the premises of persons in rural areas and the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment."

MICHEL said ski lifts are not agricultural implements for farm use. He said the attempt to justify industrial and commercial loans upon the definition of persons is contrary to the act.

PROPAGANDA LINE

The Illinois Congressman said Clapp's justification for the loans followed "the usual REA propaganda line" and represented "strained, tortuous, and patently incorrect interpretations of the organic legislation which governs the activities of his agency."

In the last 2 years, Clapp said section 5 loans have totaled about $4.4 million. Of that total, he said, the REA had approved 13 loans for $1.4 million for industrial and commercial purposes.

The loans are made by the REA at 2 percent interest to local rural electric cooperatives. The co-ops then relend the money, usually at 4 percent interest rates, to industries they serve. The higher interest rate is justified, Clapp said, to cover the cost of underwriting the loan by the co-op.

While Clapp told the subcommittee "we feel we are proceeding in line with the overall intent of Congress," he admitted there was "a considerable difference of opinion" on section 5 loans.

Representative CHARLES HOEVEN, Republican of Iowa, warned Clapp he was "going to be confronted with legislation" unless the intent of Congress was followed.

MICHEL also raised the threat of new restrictive legislation for the REA.

"Congressional committees and Members of Congress have warned Mr. Clapp repeatedly about going too far afield with his snow-making loans, and Mr. Clapp has been put on the alert that the law not only may be rewritten but will be rewritten to put an end to the agency's abuses of the authority vested in it by Congress," said MICHEL.

Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, submitted a statement defending the loan for the Pennsylvania ski resort.

CLARK said the potential for economic development in rural areas lies in new fields. He said while the potential varies from county to county, in some locations tourism and recreation "can be developed as a viable enterprise providing substantial employment and opportunities for additional investment by farmers and rural businessmen.

ILLEGAL REA SKI LOANS GO FAR AFIELD

WASHINGTON, October 15.—Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, charged today that Rural Electrification Administrator Norman Clapp is making illegal loans for snow-making equipment, ski lifts, lumber mills, knitting machines, and other business and commercial purposes. He said that "loans for these purposes are not authorized by law and are about as far afield as it is possible to go from the original intent of Congress in enacting the Rural Electrification Act of 1936."

Representative MICHEL asserted that Mr. Clapp's attempts to justify such actions follow the usual REA propaganda line and represent "strained, tortuous, and patently incorrect interpretations of the organic legislation which governs the activities of his Agency." The Illinois Congressman's statement was made in the wake of hearings by a subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee on a loan of $110,000 made in August to the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, of Huntingdon, Pa., to help finance development of a ski resort by the Blue Knob Development Corp., of Altoona, Pa.

"Against the advice of its most devoted friends and avid supporters in the Congress," Representative MICHEL said, "the REA since 1961 has been pushing a rural industrialization program through its section 5 loan program under the act. Congressional committees and Members of Congress have warned Mr. Clapp repeatedly about going too far afield with his snow-making loans, and Mr. Clapp has been put on the alert that the law not only may be rewritten, but will be rewritten to put an end to the Agency's abuses of the authority vested in it by the Congress."

"The Administrator apparently contends," said Representative MICHEL, "that the use of the term 'person,' as that word is defined in section 13 of the act, authorizes the making of section 5 loans for commercial and industrial purposes. The use of 'person' in section 5 defines the beneficiaries of the loans but does not purport to explain the purposes for which such loans may be made. Section 13 defines 'person' as 'any natural person, firm, corporation, or association,' and each of these entities may be a beneficiary under a section 5 loan. But this does not mean that such loans may be made for any purpose which a person, firm, corporation, or association may be authorized to operate."

Under the "strained" interpretation by REA, a loan may be made to a corporation for any corporate purpose because it is a person as defined in section 13. The function of section 13 is to define terms as used in the act, and it cannot be used as the basis for broadening the basic purposes for which section 5 loans may be made.

"The legislative history clearly shows," he continued, "that section 5 loans were to be made for wiring homes, and for the purchase and installation of electric and plumbing appliances and equipment for home and farm use." Ski lifts are not agricultural implements for use on the farm. The attempt to justify industrial and commercial loans upon the definition of "person" is contrary to the act, the legislative history, and the interpretation by REA from the passage of the act until July 11, 1961, when the administrator illegally attempted to expand the scope of section 5.

Representative MICHEL explained that the rural electrification program was conceived in 1936 as a program designed to bring the benefits of electric power to farms and rural residences which at that time were "still in the kerosene lamp age." He added:

"Senator George Norris, one of the sponsors of the original act, said that 'the lending of money for the wiring of houses and the purchase of electric appliances is nearly as necessary as the lending of money for the construction of lines' to bring power to rural areas. But the present Administrator is apparently not bound by either the legislative history of the act or reasonable interpretations of the law which his predecessors have applied to their activities under section 5 of the act. He has his own goal and he seems bent upon achieving it in the face of the history of his own agency and of the expressed warning of the Congress."

That this is true, Representative MICHEL concluded, is seen in the remarks made in Paris just this week by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John A. Baker. Mr. Baker said:

"The Department can help local people obtain new industry through section 5 loans to rural electric cooperatives. The funds are used locally to provide electrical equipment or service in plants served by rural electric cooperatives."

"If Mr. Baker's interpretation is anywhere to be found in the legislative history of the Rural Electrification Act or in any subsequent acts of Congress which relate in any way to the rural electification program," Representative MICHEL said, "I challenge him or Mr. Clapp to find it and report it to

the appropriate committees of this Congress. If such is a valid interpretation of the law, then the late and much loved Speaker of the House, Representative Sam Rayburn, and a host of friends and supporters of REA over the years have been parties to a 25-year hoax at the expense of the millions of nonfarm people who share the burden of bringing the benefits of electric power to the deserving farmers of America. If this is not a valid interpretation, I leave to the judgment of the public the determination of who is seeking to perpetrate a fraud and delusion on the American people, urban and rural alike."

Representative MICHEL said he may have an additional statement to make after he has had an opportunity to study the statement made today by Mr. Clapp before he House Agriculture Subcommittee in the hearings on the ski resort loan made in Pennsylvania by the REA.

Bill Introduced To Amend Title 18 of the United States Code

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit false statements or reports to Federal credit unions.

This is merely a clarifying amendment to remove any doubt as to whether federally chartered credit unions are to be treated the same as any other financial institution chartered by the United States for the purposes of section 1014 of title 18.

Section 1014 presently provides a penalty of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both, for anyone making a false statement or report for the purposes of influencing action on the part of a number of financial institutions such as a Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, a Federal Savings & Loan Association or—since 1956—a small business investment company.

There appears to be doubt as to whether misconduct by a member of a Federal credit union in falsifying an application for a loan, forging a cosigner's signature, and so forth, is a Federal offense. Section 1001 of title 18 provides penalties for making false statements or representations, but this section is considered by some to be applicable only to agencies or departments of the Government. There has been an attempt to limit its application to corporations chartered by the Government as Government-owned corporations. This was not the intent of Congress.

Section 1006 of title 18 relates to penalties for those who attempt to defraud a credit association. By court action, it has been limited in its coverage to an officer, agent or employee of such an asosciation. The Justice Department brought two test actions against credit union members under section 1006 involving the forging of cosigners' names and in both instances the indictments have been dismissed.

This bill makes it quite clear that the penalties prescribed by statute shall also apply to Federal credit unions as well as other federally chartered organizations.

There is no reason why any financial institution should be excluded and I hope that this legislative loophole will be closed by the enactment of this bill during the 88th Congress.

Speech by Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho, Before Republican Kickoff Dinner in Fort Atkinson, Wis., October 11, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, Senator LEN B. JORDAN, of Idaho, has done the voters of Wisconsin a real service. To be sure, his speech in Fort Atkinson, Wis., on October 11 was delivered at a Republican dinner and was political in nature. But the importance of his remarks to the Wisconsin electorate, irrespective of party affiliation or preference, lies in the clear-cut choice the voters will have at the polls in November 1964, as articulated by the Senator.

Senator JORDAN presented a comprehensive exposition of Republican principles as contrasted with New Frontier Democrat philosophy. I feel privileged to identify myself with Senator JORDAN'S remarks and to reaffirm, as I have been doing with word and vote for the past 3 years, my espousal of and adherence to the Republican principles he has so ably set forth.

To bring to the attention of as many citizens as possible the important choice they will be given in the 1964 elections, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the aforementioned speech by the distinguished Senator from Idaho:

Ladies and gentlemen, fellow Republicans, I consider it a privilege to be here with you tonight and want you to know I particularly feel at home in a State—like my own—whose name is derived from the Indian language. Wisconsin was certainly appropriately named "grassy place" by the Chippewa. If you ever doubt it, just take an airplane ride over your beautiful State. And the beauty of your farms and grasslands are only heightened by the contrast of your small towns and large industrial cities.

I am not going to attempt to tell you about your own State, but I would like to make a few comments by way of introduction.

Wisconsin is a State of contrasts as far as geographical terrain is concerned.

Wisconsin is a State of contrasts as far as its economy is concerned—your dairy industry, your farms, and your fast-growing industrial centers in your larger cities.

Wisconsin is also a State of political contrasts—and as Shakespeare would say—"Thereby hangs a tale."

Your Governor is a Democrat.

Your other major State offices are Republican and both houses of your legislature are Republican controlled.

Your two U.S. Senators sit on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Six of your 10 seats in the U.S. House of Representatives are held by Republicans while the other 4 are held by Democrats.

Now, this apparent intent by people in Wisconsin not to play favorites to either political party would by itself be interesting enough. But you have not contented yourselves with just about evenly dividing your elected offices between Republicans and Democrats—you have gone one step better.

According to the various evaluations placed upon the Congress by the several organizations—COPE, ADA, or ACA—depending upon which side you sit, you people in Wisconsin have, at the same time, in the same election, on the same ballot, elected some of the most liberal Democrats and some of the most conservative Republicans on the national scene today.

That, my friends, is quite an accomplishment.

I will admit that other States in the Union also seem to have this same ability to some degree—my own State of Idaho included. But I do believe that the people of Wisconsin have hit some kind of high when they can elect four Democratic Congressmen regarded as liberal or ultraliberal while at the same time, in other districts relatively few miles away, men of moderate or conservative philosophy are being elected as Republicans to hold the other six congressional seats.

This is a real puzzler.

There could be—and I am sure there are—many reasons for this.

If asked, each of you here tonight could give me what, in your opinion, is at least one good reason.

So, I am going to take the liberty of giving you what, in my opinion, is the main reason.

Because I have known for some time I would be privileged to be here with you tonight, I have been more than usually interested in what I could read, hear, and learn about Wisconsin and Wisconsin politics.

For that reason, I was particularly interested in a recent poll taken in your State. The poll's seventh question was this—and many of you may have filled it out yourselves—"Do you regard yourself as a Democrat, Republican, or independent?"

Statewide, the results broke down as follows:

37.6 percent of the voters in Wisconsin consider themselves Democrats;

21.4 percent consider themselves Republicans; and

41.0 percent consider themselves independents.

The answers to this seventh question were further broken down into your 10 congressional districts, with the results from your second district quite the same as the statewide percentages.

Your key lies in that last figure—the 41 percent who call themselves independents.

Ladies and gentlemen, for years both political parties have known that they must appeal to and win the independent vote in this country in order to win national elections.

That is not news.

For years it was the growing belief—started with F.D.R.—that to attract the independent voter, politicians had to offer special lures and inducements.

That is not news.

For these same number of years—and I say this with deep regret—it became more and more apparent that the Republican Party followed along on the supposition that this "bribe the people with favors" philosophy—started by the Democrats—was also

the path we as a party had to take to get the independent vote.

That is not news.

Equally apparent—to all who bothered to look—was the fact that since the Democrats were past masters at this "giveaway" philosophy, the national Republicans usually came up with what has been referred to as a "me-too" program which was not successful in winning the independents.

That is not news.

But the following is news.

Many people throughout the country more politically astute than I ever hope to be—are sensing the gathering momentum of political change. There is a growing revolt at the grassroots against the duplicity of those political leaders who would bribe you with your own money. There is an increasing awareness that what the people of this country now want is a straightforward, honest American philosophy which would dare to challenge the basic tenets of the New Frontier.

In other words, the people want a choice.

But not a choice between Santa Claus and his No. 1 helper;

Not a choice between how to get more of something for nothing;

Not a choice between candidates who are so much alike you couldn't tell them apart except for the party label.

The people want a clear-cut choice.

Now I don't mean to oversimplify the issue. There are many other aspects that come into choosing a party candidate—is he capable, is he honest, is he well-known, is he articulate, is he this, is he that?

They are all important.

But to my way of thinking, the most important is this: Does his philosophy give the people who will be voting in his city, in his district, in his State, and in the Nation a choice of philosophy?

At this point some of you may think I am advocating that Republicans all over the Nation sit back and size up their Democrat opponents and then come up with a philosophy diametrically opposed to the Democrats.

That is not it at all, and I will explain why.

Since the days of FDR, the national Democrat Party has, as I said earlier, become more and more the party of big government, including more Federal interference, higher spending, larger deficits, accompanied by a rising national debt. These are all symptoms of a headlong gallop toward a welfare state. Of course, as within our own party, there are exceptions. Some Democrats—with true Jeffersonian principles—have not gone along philosophically with their national party. Notwithstanding this split in their own party, however, the New Frontiersmen are impatiently eager to make the Democrat Party a party of liberals.

Because I believe in giving even the Devil his due, however, I must digress at this point to say this:

Yes, by and large the Democrats are on the left side of center—but the majority of them are still not so far to the left as to advocate—at least openly—what that disillusioned group of Democrat Congressmen known as the liberal project advocated in the pamphlet they sponsored: "The Liberal Papers."

That group, whose chairman was none other than your own Congressman, advocated these things:

(1) Recognition of Red China;

(2) Sponsorship of Red Chinese membership in the United Nations;

(3) Recognition of Red China's claim to Formosa and the Pescadores with a 5-year trusteeship under the U.N. to be concluded by a plebiscite;

(4) Financial aid for Red China;

(5) Demilitarization of the West German Republic;

(6) Recognition of East Germany's puppet regime;

(7) Expulsion of West Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, and France from NATO;

(8) Shutdown of American missile bases in Europe; and

(9) Invitation of Russia to plug in on our bidirectional DEW line.

I again repeat what I just said: The majority of the Democrat Party does not go so far as to advocate these ideas as party line, but the contagion of this radical liberalism has spread. Witness the resolutions passed by the Young Democrat delegations from 13 Western States meeting in Berkeley, Calif., on August 18 of this year.

These Young Democrats passed resolutions calling for:

(1) The United States to resume diplomatic relations with Cuba;

(2) The signing of a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Communist Warsaw Pact nations:

(3) The withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam;

(4) The abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

(5) The repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act.

Even the President was shocked. At a press conference he expressed general disapproval.

Now, bear in mind, my friends, that these young Democrats are just as vulnerable to the aging process as is anyone else and someday they will be old Democrats, and many of them will hold positions of influence in the party.

So, getting back to my subject, I maintain that it is not at all necessary for Republicans to purposely analyze each Democrat candidate's philosophy in order to come up with a philosophy diametrically opposed. All Republican candidates have to do—and it is as simple as it sounds—is to repudiate the New Frontier philosophy of failure—to espouse a dynamic revival of the ageless principles which made our country the greatest of all—and to apply these principles to the problems of a modern world.

There is no doubt in my mind that the majority of men and women in this Nation are in a conservative mood today. When the pendulum of that clock swings just so far one way, the undeniable rule is that it has to start the swing back to the other side.

The people of this country have seen the grand design of all-powerful Central Government turn into a redtape jungle.

They have seen the social tinkering erode individual responsibility.

They have seen Socialist and collectivist theories turn into open war against business and industry—against the jobs and wages of working men and women.

They have seen radicalism turn into class warfare.

They have seen, just last month, a President who lures votes by asking for a tax cut while stubbornly courting economic disaster through refusal to cut spending.

The conservative mood of America does not ask that both parties promise simply more of the same. The conservative mood demands a choice.

I repeat what I said earlier—the Republican Party must offer that choice—and its principles do offer that choice.

The Republican Party believes in the people of America. It believes they can use the strength and brains that God gave them to handle their own affairs. It believes that when they need help it should be the help that neighbor gives neighbor—not the backdoor solutions that big brother or little brother gives his poor relations.

We do not believe in turning back the clock to the era of the 1930's.

We do, however, believe in turning back, wherever possible and desirable, the responsibilities of home, family, and welfare to the people closest to them, to the skills most familiar to them, to the energies most devoted to them.

The Republican Party believes that Government is the servant—not the master. It believes that the job you have and hold, that the money you earn, save, invest, or spend, is the first order of business and that Government's job is to protect those things—not take them over.

But what do those advocates of big Government in Washington say about this? What do the Democrats say?

They say Republicans are devoted more to property rights than to human rights.

This is not true.

The Republican Party believes that only humans can have property rights. And we believe that people should have both human rights and property rights, and that the government which destroys either one of those rights must destroy both in the process. We believe that as a government feeds on the property of men it also feeds on the freedom of men.

Our Government was instituted to assure order among the people—not to own the people—or their property.

We Republicans believe in a constitutional tripartite system of government; in a Congress that speaks for all the people; in an executive branch that serves all the people as an equal partner—not a ruthless boss; and in a judicial branch that also is equal and independent—that interprets laws but does not make them.

The Republican Party believes that the security of our country in a troubled world is a shield for freedom everywhere and the prime target of the enemies of freedom. Our party believes that the strength of that shield is the main deterrent to war. It rejects the notion that such strength is the cause of tension in the world. It rejects the notion that the way to peace is through negotiated weakness.

The Republican Party does not seek to isolate America from its responsibilities in the world, however, and we do not advocate isolating ourselves from our allies or reneging on the promises we have made to them. Crumbling alliances and diminishing leadership in the world are the hallmarks of the present administration—as it fights with friends and fawns on enemies.

The Republican Party does not believe that the security of freedom is advanced by the strengthening of slavery. It does not seek a divided world—it seeks an open world. We hold that only in such a world is peace possible.

We hold that the walls of a divided world can be brought down by the determination of freemen everywhere—not by war, but by will and dedication—by the long struggle that will not pause to rest or to compromise until the last shackle has been broken.

I believe in those principles.

You believe in those principles.

They are Republican principles.

They are American principles.

They are winning principles.

The great issue in 1964 will be which party can most effectively advance the cause of freedom.

Which party best represents the real aspirations of the American people.

Which party best represents the real hopes of the world.

Fellow Republicans, if you want to win this district away from its present stewardship, if you want to win this district away from its present position of being a rubber-stamp for the New Frontier administration, if you want to give this district back to the people of Dane County, to the people of Dodge County, and to the people of Jefferson, Columbia, and Green Counties, I say this to you:

Go out and find a candidate who believes in these Republican principles.

Go out and find a candidate who can make the people know he does believe in these principles.

This is your first order of business.

This used to be a good Republican district—represented by good Republican Congressmen.

You can make it a good Republican district again.

You people deserve better than a Congressman who advocates what the liberal papers espouse.

You people deserve better than a Congressman who adheres to the policies of the Americans for Democratic Action.

You people deserve better representation than you are getting.

After you have chosen a good candidate to run on the Republican ticket in 1964, that is only the beginning of your responsibilities as Republicans. He, too, will have responsibilities—but if he is the good candidate he must be, he will know what those responsibilies are, and will adequately meet them.

You, too, must meet your responsibilities.

And in this next election—since it is going to be the year that will make John F. Kennedy a one-term President—your responsibilities will not only have to be met as far as your local and State candidates are concerned, but they will have to be met as far as the national Republican candidate is concerned, whoever he may be.

Even though President Kennedy has been able to talk himbself through 3 years in the White House, the Republicans can't expect to talk themselves to victory in the drive to oust him. And since your present Congressman is a pretty good talker, too, you will have to do more than just talk to get rid of him.

What we can do, if we're not careful, is talk ourselves out of any chance of victory by engaging in party feuds and divisive tactics. I've said it many times before and I say it again now:

As Republicans, we do nothing but play the Democrat's game when we chew on other Republicans.

As Republicans, we've got to get used to the idea that we have a common target in the New Frontier and in all the Congressmen who hew to its line.

As Republicans, we've got to start emphasizing our many points of agreement—rather than our fewer points of disagreement.

There are those of little faith who have decided how we can lose in 1964. They say that the Republican Party must write off some of the largest blocs of potential votes. They keep wanting to read people out of the party. We hear them say nothing as to leading people into the party. They are preoccupied by who should be kept out, but seldom with who should be brought in.

These practitioners of defeat are suffering from a purge complex. They want to purge the party until no one is left but the few who may agree with their thinking, paragraph by paragraph, line by line, word by word, and comma by comma.

This purge complex is characteristic not of free societies but of totalitarian societies. The splintering of parties into ever small factions, each with its own cherished idols and images and private fantasies, is not characteristic of American political life.

The genius of American political life has been its ability to resolve differences and permit the largest possible number of people to work together for common goals even though they hold varied views of the best way to achieve those goals.

Should we abandon this American genius now and return to systems of splintered factions and warring classes?

I say, "No," and I say that the principles of the Republican Party demand that the answer be "No."

The party bent on purges becomes a party warped by witch hunts. It spends more time looking for heresy than in proclaiming principles.

We can't be the party of victory if we insist on talking like the party of defeat.

I have heard and read, until I am sick of it, all the advice about how we can lose the election in 1964. Now I want to hear and read how we can win—because I believe we can.

We must seek unity—but not conformity.

We must seek unity of principles—but diversity of accomplishment.

The Republican Party already is a great union of strengths—American strengths. The rugged, restless strength of the growing West, the rock-solid strength of the Midwest heartland, the tall-timber greatness of the Northwest, the busy, bustling strength of the North and the East, the proud, proven strength of the South.

As a party of unity, not of exclusion, we must give those strengths principles that match their stature—not sugar-coated, wishy-washy programs to tempt their weaknesses.

But am I advocating that everyone is welcome in the Republican Party?

Am I saying that we should draw no lines, ask no questions?

No.

We cannot welcome anyone into the Republican Party who is not dedicated to America and to America's constitutional order.

But we must welcome all who, despite differing ideas at other levels, would support that Constitution, strengthen its meaning, and serve its spirit. We offer a party of opportunity to do just that.

We offer no narrow, self-seeking doctrines that say you must talk just so, walk just so, wear this color shirt or that color shirt.

No.

We salute the broad sweep of American destiny and greatness.

We offer the chance to work for principle, and we reject the admonition which says, "play the game my way, or don't play the game at all."

One voice of doom would tell us that we, as a party, cannot win the votes of union members. Why? Because we have stood for integrity and honesty in labor unions? Of course not.

That's what all decent union members stand for.

It has not been the Republican Party which has hit hardest at the rewards for honest labor. The New Frontier, with its commitment to the idea that ordinary men and women cannot be trusted to spend their own wages, has been the enemy of honest wages, honestly held and honestly spent.

The Republican Party cannot, and will not, write off the votes of union members any more than we write off the hopes of union members.

Another voice of doom would tell us we should write off the votes of Negro citizens. Why? Because we have always stood for the principle that a man, regardless of race, creed, or color, should be free to make his way to the limits of his ability? Of course not.

It is not the Republican Party that has bred racial discontent in this land. It is not the Republican Party that has dealt mortal blows to the progress that was being made between men of goodwill who know that the point of a bayonet can kill the point of a principle. It is not the Republican Party that has played politics with prejudice, both racial and religious.

The Republican Party cannot, and will not, write off the votes of any racial or religious group; for doesn't our party contain all colors and creeds? Doesn't America contain all races and religions?

Certainly they do.

I believe that the Republican Party should strive to its utmost in every part of America and among every possible group to win votes.

By votes I mean this: American votes. Not just labor votes, or just Negro votes, or just Catholic votes, or just Jewish votes.

But all votes—American votes.

And to get the largest group of American votes, we must show the people that we are the truly national party.

The only people I want to see capture the Republican Party are the American people—all the American people.

And, in turn, I want to see the Republican Party capture the imagination, the mood, and the spirit of the American people.

In 1964, I want to see the Republican Party win the White House.

In 1964, I want to see the Republican Party win a Senate seat in Wisconsin.

In 1964, I want to see the Republican Party win the congressional seat of the Second District of Wisconsin.

We are a big political party and there is all kinds of room for a difference of opinion. But in differing, we need not beat the hides off those with whom we differ.

Go out and help your candidate sell these basic Republican principles to all the people of your district—without regard for race, creed, color, economic status, and, yes, even political party.

If you can do that—because you believe in doing it.

On election day 1964, you will find that you have won the biggest prize of all.

You will have given America back to the American people.

Because we will have elected a Republican President.

A Republican-controlled House of Representatives—including a new Republican Congressman from the Second District of Wisconsin.

Americus, Ga.: A Town That Lives In Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Jack W. Germond, reporter for the Gannett News Service has just returned from Americus, Ga., which is the scene of a key battle in the campaign for civil rights. He has written with great appreciation an account of the atmosphere in Americus and of the circumstances under which four young men are being held without bond, charged with a capital offense under an old Georgia law against inciting to insurrection. This law has almost never been used. It dates from reconstruction days. It may be unconstitutional.

The events leading to the arrest of these four men occurred 3 months ago. Since then, the Justice Department in Washington has been conducting an investigation into charges of police brutality, the only charges on which the Department says it can legally intervene. The investigation is still continuing, apparently, but no report of findings is forthcoming. The Department has informed me that it has no legal grounds upon which to challenge the constitutionality of the Georgia statute. Perhaps this is so, although I find it hard to believe. In any event, I offer Mr. Germond's first article for the RECORD, as I shall offer the others as they appear. Mr. Germond

and Gannett News Service have performed a major public service in writing and publishing them.

The article follows:

AMERICUS, GA.: A TOWN THAT LIVES IN FEAR

Last August 8 in Americus, Ga., a civil rights demonstration that turned into a brawl resulted in the arrest of, of among others, three field representatives for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)—Ralph Allen, a student on leave from Trinity College in Hartford; Donald Harris, a graduate of Rutgers University, and John Perdew, a student at Harvard.

A week later, Zev Aelony, a fieldworker for the Congress of Racial Equality, was arrested at another demonstration.

In a situation without precedent in the South, all have been charged with "inciting to insurrection," a capital crime, and held without bail in the Sumter County jail for some 12 weeks. Meanwhile, "the Americus case" has become the center of controversy throughout the South and in Congress. This is a three-part series on what it has meant to the Negro in Americus, to the white and to the debate over civil rights legislation in Washington.

(First of three)

(By Jack W. Germond)

AMERICUS, GA.—The streets in the Negro section here are unpaved, and the red Georgia dust boils up in thick clouds whenever an automobile passes through.

Over the long dry summer the dust has given a surrealistic red tint to the unpainted shacks that line the streets, the warped trees in the frontyards, and the derelict cars slumped in the ditches.

A half-mile away, at the west end of the shabby five-block business district, there is a shiny, 3-year-old yellow brick courthouse and jail that boasts such fillips as pink marble interior trim and is by all odds the snazziest building in town.

The contrast seems to symbolize the relative positions of white and black in Americus after a bitter summer of racial strife.

At this point, the iron fist of the law reaching out from the courthouse has all but crushed the stirrings that had aroused the grimy Negro community for the first time in its history.

There are, however, still some signs that the Negro has not been finally defeated, only temporarily stymied.

A toothless old woman, who had been rocking on her porch long enough for the red dust to collect in her eyebrows, summed it up this way:

"The people (Negroes) in this little old town—they got more guts than I expected, yes they do." Then, with a self-deprecating cackle, she added: "Cose, we's all scared half to death."

The fear among the Negroes, who make up slightly more than half of Sumter County's 24,000 population, is a product of a policy of massive retaliation that has been employed by the white power structure to meet the civil rights challenge.

The confrontation began to take shape early this year when fieldmen for the SNCC (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee), or "Snick" as it is universally known, helped organize the Sumter County movement to conduct a voter registration campaign.

By July the young Negroes who dominated the movement had begun to press demands and criticism in new areas—store hiring policies, the segregation of the Martin Theater (the town's only public recreation other than poolhalls), the public library.

Picketing and the inevitable skirmishes and arrests followed.

The climax came August 8 when a meeting of some 250 Negroes at the Friendship Baptist Church broke up about 10 p.m. The precise truth about what happened next seems to be lost forever in a morass of contradictions and emotional recollections on both sides.

About some things, however, there is little dispute:

The Negroes moved up Cotton Avenue in loosely grouped bands, singing and chanting and clapping, until they met a force of sheriff's men, State patrolmen, and city police armed with clubs, guns, and electrically charged cattle prods.

An SNCC leader, Donald Harris, a Negro, was arrested and slumped to the ground in the now classic protest. The sheriff stood over him, worrying him with the cattle prod.

Then the brawl broke out in earnest, a wild, club-swinging, brick-throwing, head-splitting brawl. Several of the movement leaders, including SNCC's Ralph Allen and John Perdew, both white, and a handful of followers suffered cuts and bruises. A policeman's head was laid open by a brick. Windows in stores and shops were shattered.

When it was over, Harris, Allen, and Perdew and two local Negroes were in jail. More important, the three outside agitators found themselves in a situation without precedent—charged with a capital crime, inciting to insurrection, for which no bail is permitted, as well as an assortment of felonies and misdemeanors.

Today, after some 12 weeks, the three young men (plus Zev Aelony, a Congress of Racial Equality worker arrested on the same charge August 17) remain in their cells in the fancy brick jail. And, barring some Federal court intervention, they could stay there until spring.

Meanwhile, they have become the focal point of the fears of some Negroes, the resentments of others, and the embarrassment of some of the community's white citizens.

Although they are allowed no visitors except their parents and lawyers, accounts of them run through the Negro grapevine, and occasionally smuggled letters turn up in the hands of friends.

The three SNCC men—Allen, Harris, and Perdew—have been kept separate from other prisoners and in touch with one another. There has been no indication of mistreatment, and their lawyer, C. B. King, reports them in high spirits.

Aelony, however, has been thrown in with the general run of white prisoners. He has sent out word that his jailers point him out as a "nigger-loving Communist," and he is being challenged repeatedly.

Says a white friend on the outside: "Zev's not a coward, but he's afraid for his life."

In the Negro quarter, whatever apprehension Aelony feels is multiplied 1,000 times. The plight of the 4 outsiders, plus more than 200 arrests of local Negroes in protests before and after August 8, has taken much of the starch out of the Sumter County movement.

Today it is largely a group of youngsters who gather after school with the new SNCC fieldman, 20-year-old Robert Mants, an Atlanta Negro who is a strange mixture of hipster (everyone is "this cat" or "that cat"), cliches (all police activity is "southern justice") and penetrating insight ("these kids like SNICK because it's like the YMCA. It keeps them off the streets and gives them something to belong to.")

The Negroes who might command the greatest respect, the schoolteachers, have been put on notice that it's worth their jobs to take any part.

Economic pressure isn't available in a community in which most of the Negroes must scrape by on a standard that no welfare recipient would confront in the East.

And along the dusty streets, there are many who turn deaf ears to the pleas for them to register.

Said a housewife to the white reporter:

"Please don't stand here talking. The police come by, they'll think I'm making trouble and I don't aim to make trouble for nobody."

The symbol of the fear—almost universally—is Sheriff Fred Chappell, a beefy red-faced man with the massive arms that seem to be the trademark of rural law and order in Dixie.

The young Negroes speak of "Freddie" in derisive tones, but they look over their shoulders every time. One group of three youngsters danced around a reporter, chanting "Freddie gonna put you in the hole, reporter-man" over and over until they broke down in almost hysterical laughter.

After the mass arrests of July and August, the Sumter movement seems to have broken down. Demonstrations ended, and the voter registration drive—which had raised then number of eligible Negroes from fewer than 300 to more than 600—stalled.

The group stopped "because all our people were in jail, man." But it also seems that those who were out were deterred by fright and by conditions of their probation that barred any mass meetings or demonstrations and imposed a 6 p.m. curfew.

Now, however, there are new signs of stirring.

Two weeks ago pickets turned up at the theater and a foodstore. They were promptly arrested, but more are scheduled to try again.

Moreover, the voter registration campaign suddenly is very much alive. Mants and his high school students are canvassing the Negro districts daily, meeting some rebuffs, but a surprising number of successes.

Close to 200 more Negroes are estimated to have been enrolled. At the courthouse, the procedure has been revised to make it faster, and the illnesses and conflicting commitments that used to close the registrar's office are less frequent.

"I went down to register," one middle-aged Negro woman reported, "and my knees were shaking and I could hardly sign my name. But it was all right, and maybe now I can get up the nerve to vote."

Resolution Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association on October 14, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been a source of great inspiration to all of us who have been working to get a good civil rights bill on the floor, to witness the hard work and the dedication of ministers, priests, rabbis, and lay members of the various religious organizations in this country, in the struggle to truly emancipate our Negro citizens. The letters I have received, and the personal visits, have brightened many a day in these last few weeks while we labored in the Judiciary Committee to get agreement on a bill that those of good will could be proud of. We have reported such a bill. No little credit is due to the untiring efforts of such groups as the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice. So that all of you may know of their commitment to this cause, I recommend for your serious consideration, the following resolution adopted on October 14, 1963, by the Board of

Trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION ON OCTOBER 14, 1963

The Board of Trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association, recognizing the seriousness of the deep racial crisis which which has gripped the United States in recent months and weeks, and reaffirming the traditional concern of Unitarians and Universalists for the supreme worth of every human personality, the dignity of man, and the use of the democratic method in human relationships, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States enact meaningful, comprehensive civil rights legislation to redress the legitimate grievances of the Negroes and members of other minority groups.

To this end, we endorse the substance and intent of H.R. 7152 and S. 1731 to strengthen voting rights, make discrimination in public accommodations unlawful, speed public school desegregation, establish a community relations service to mediate racial disputes, extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for 4 years and give it added responsibilities, authorize withholding of Federal funds from programs that are administered in discriminatory fashion; and establish as a permanent commission the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

We urge especially that the Congress erase the humiliation which accompanies the members of minority groups when they are refused accommodations or service in hotels, motels, restaurants, business establishments, or places of amusement, and that a public accommodations law cover all establishments, of whatever size.

In addition, we urge that amendments be made to the bill to add a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission to cover hiring, firing, and promotion in all types of employment and membership in labor organizations engaged in interstate commerce. And, further, that the bill be amended to give the U.S. Attorney General power to bring civil suits in all cases where Americans are denied their constitutional rights because of race or religion.

The civil rights program before the Congress represents minimal objectives at this critical point in our Nation's history. One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation, the American Negro finds that in education, in employment, in housing, in the exercise of his rights of citizenship, he is still a second-class citizen. The Congress should therefore act this year to bring to fulfillment the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the November 1963 issue of the Progressive, Mr. James A. Wechsler, editor of the editorial page of the New York Post, in reviewing Victor Lasky's, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth," stated it seemed implausible that Lasky's book "would be viewed as anything more than an oversized Republican campaign pamphlet. But that was my mistake."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Mr. Wechsler, a well-known liberal author, has seen the importance of Mr. Lasky's book as containing a message for the liberal community as well as conservatives. I am sure Mr. Lasky's No. 1 rating continues to bear out the fact that his book is of interest to all Americans, regardless of party affiliation.

I therefore feel it is approriate to include the review of Mr. Lasky's book which appeared in the September 11, 1963 issue of Human Events. The review is comprised of 12 parts which I will insert each day the House is in session in chronological order. Under unanimous consent, I include the first part:

J.F.K.: THE MAN AND THE MYTH

(By Victor Lasky)

(NOTE.—Victor Lasky, a star reporter for 25 years, was coauthor of the bestselling "Seeds of Treason," the story of the Hiss-Chambers case. He writes a nationally syndicated column for North American Newspaper Alliance which is also published by Human Events.)

KENNEDY'S RISE TO POWER A SAGA OF FAMILY AMBITION AND WEALTH

On a warm April day, just 3 months after his inauguration as the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy rose from his desk to greet a former Senate colleague who had been invited to drop by the White House for a chat.

"What a lousy, fouled-up job this turned out to be," he said.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER could hardly believe his ears. Was this the same young man who had so passionately—and, at times, so ruthlessly—fought for the Presidency? Was this the same Kennedy who as a candidate for the highest elective office in the free world had confidently assured the Nation that he knew all the answers?

Why was Kennedy so anguished? Was it about the 1,200 anti-Castro invaders who had met death or capture in the Bay of Pigs? Or was it about the enormous damage done to the carefully cultivated Kennedy image as a knowing, sure-footed young leader? Or was it a combination of both?

SUPREMELY CONFIDENT

A few weeks before he took the oath of office Kennedy had talked with Time-Life's John Steele in the drawing room of his Georgetown home. Supremely confident, the President-elect discussed the problems he expected to face as Chief Executive. "Sure, it's a big job," said Kennedy. "But I don't know anybody who can do it any better than I can."

Nor did the President-elect's father have any doubts about his son's capacity to handle the job. Joseph P. Kennedy told a newsman that the confident decisiveness and the wide factual knowledge which Jack had displayed during the televised debates were the main requisites of the Presidency. "I've seen the President's job from the inside and I know what it requires," said the Ambassador.

The campaign charge that Kennedy was inexperienced continued to infuriate his father, who pointed out that his son, at the age of 23, had written a highly regarded book on Great Britain's lack of preparedness for World War II. "The year before that, in 1939, when the war started, Jack was working for me in the Embassy in London. When the Germans sunk the British ship *Athenia*, which had a lot of Americans aboard, I sent Jack up to Glasgow to handle the whole job of investigating the sinking and taking care of all the American survivors. He was only a boy in college at the time. If that isn't experience, I don't know what is."

GOOD COPY

The euphoria of the New Frontier was infectious. The Washington press corps, by and large, was caught up in the excitement. One reason, of course, was Kennedy's own flair for press agentry. Rarely had any politician devoted so much time to cultivating the friendship of newsmen. "That could be developed into a good Sunday backgrounder," Kennedy was overheard telling Pierre Salinger during the campaign. Not only was he adept in the use of journalistic argot—having, briefly, once been a newspaperman himself—but Kennedy has a dramatic flair which makes good copy.

To the American people, however, Kennedy came through as a somewhat paradoxical figure who radiated extreme confidence while talking of grave troubles ahead. To a nation winding up 8 fairly comfortable years under a most popular President, Kennedy as a candidate kept dinning home a message of unease, of things left undone. To a nation powerful enough to flex its muscles from Lebanon to the Formosa Straits, to fly U-2 spy planes across the Soviet land for 4 years, Kennedy talked of declining military power and prestige. And to a people sharing the highest level of prosperity in history, Kennedy campaigned with depression-like fervor for new and bigger welfare programs.

His single theme, single-mindedly propelled with little subtlety of approach, was: Elect me and I will start the United States moving again. But he was vague. On foreign policy, he called for new diplomatic initiatives, imagination, and vigor. He did specifically call for disengagement from Quemoy-Matsu and for aiding the Cuban rebels, which gave the impression of being both soft and hard toward communism—the double image.

His welfare programs were not new—they called only for more spending. Though aimed at satisfying human needs, they carried the threat of unbalanced budgets and more inflation. True, he had suggested that the extra burdens were to be carried by expanded national growth, but just how he intended to accomplish this he never quite made clear.

Kennedy managed to etch a picture of himself as a driving personality, endowed with the same charisma that his predecessor had in abundance. And, like Eisenhower, Kennedy projects a kind of sincerity and conviction even while talking of ordinary things in an ordinary way.

JUST PLAIN JACK

After the campaign, Joseph P. Kennedy said he was at a loss to explain his son's voting appeal. People just seem to like Jack, Joe said. "He'll put on a pair of old dungarees and go out and talk to the gardener or anybody. He looks just like some hayseed from Kansas."

(The Ambassador obviously did not mean to offend the Sunflower State. "Nevertheless," the El Dorado (Kans.) Times complained, "it indicates clearly the superior feeling an ultrarich man from Massachusetts has about this prairie domain in the center of the country. In additional degree, it bespoke the snobbish attitude embodied by the phrase, the 'unconscious arrogance of conscious wealth.'")

There is this about Kennedy, too: the appeal of Hollywood. But it isn't just smile and profile. For there is also the aura of royalty—the ineffable quality of noblesse—about Kennedy. All this, and American, too. Wherever he goes, they ask for his autograph more than his credo. Who could ever forget the "jumpers," those shoals of ecstatic young ladies—some not so young—whose leaping and screaming delighted reporters during the campaign? "I see him, I see him," excited girls had screamed everywhere. "Oh," their friends invariably responded, "I could die." (Kennedy hired a crowd psychologist to

analyze what such behavior meant in political terms.)

LIKES THE MECHANICS

History may well record that the most serious thing that could be said about Kennedy is that he is the product of an age in which men felt they could achieve special distinction by the techniques of super-press-agentry rather than by the espousal of serious ideas. What fascinated him, he once said, were "not so much the ideas of politics but the mechanics of the whole process."

"The political world is stimulating," he told a Time man shortly before his nomination. "It's the most interesting thing you can do. It beats following the dollar. It allows the full use of your powers. First, there is the great chess game—the battle, the competition. There's the strategy and which piece you move and all that."

Kennedy's election was one of the weirdest in American history. For with a preponderant Democratic registration and the built-in advantages of the South and the Catholic vote, Kennedy triumphed by only a photo-finish.

Kennedy's victory could be credited to such remarkable bedfellows as John McClellan and Walter Reuther, and Herman Talmadge cheek-by-jowl with Martin Luther King. The voice of the people, calling for John F. Kennedy, bore in part a Southern accent. And he would not be allowed to forget it.

Despite the narrowness of the victory, Walter Lippmann, with typical perspicacity, said it provided a "clear mandate" for enactment of Kennedy's hundreds of campaign promises. Lippmann said that "a narrow win by Nixon would have inaugurated and era of severe political, economic and sectarian bitterness." However, "Kennedy's win promises to bring on a period of effective government," what with the new administration forming "effective majorities over and above the Democratic reactionaries and obstructionists."

"'Clear mandate,' forsooth," commented Scripps-Howard columnist Richard Starnes. "It all reminds me of a line from a song in Pal Joey, which goes 'Walter Lippmann wasn't being brill-i-ant today.'"

The Wall Street Journal claimed that "the voters made one thing quite clear in this election. They have given a mandate to nobody."

The transition from Dwight David Eisenhower to John Fitzgerald Kennedy was unmarred by the personal feudism of the Hoover-Roosevelt and Truman-Eisenhower changeovers. Eisenhower and Kennedy had met for 3 hours in early December. The day before the inauguration, when they conferred again, Eisenhower pledged he would not second-guess his successor from the sidelines; but, he said, he would not hesitate to speak out publicly in opposition if the Kennedy administration sought to change U.S. policy toward Communist China.

Eisenhower also demonstrated to Kennedy the procedure for evacuating the White House in case of emergency. Ike lifted the phone and spoke a few words. Five minutes later, an Army helicopter hovered over the White House lawn. Kennedy was suitably impressed by the helicopter and was to make full use of this Eisenhower "inheritance."

Out on the portico a reporter asked, "Are you excited?" Kennedy turned to his questioner and answered reflectively, "Interested."

The next day—Inauguration Day—the Kennedys showed up at the White House earlier than the official time in order to have coffee with the Eisenhowers. During the next few hours, until John F. Kennedy took the oath, he discussed with his predecessor a book on D-day he was reading—Cornelius J. Ryan's "The Longest Day." Ike had liked the book and Kennedy said it had taught him a lot he hadn't known about the European war.

Over in the Capitol plaza, shorn of snow, the inaugural platform filled slowly with the great figures of Washington and the Nation—and, of course, the Kennedy family and friends.

The sun glared in the clear blue sky and Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN asked, "Is that Father Joe over there?" The man from Arkansas shielded his eyes with his hand. "Why," he said, "I do believe it is."

And it was.

Beaming and laughing, Joseph P. Kennedy was telling friends, "This is what I've been looking forward to for a long time. It's a great day."

For though many a doting parent has envisioned his son as growing up one day to become President of the United States, few have gone about realizing that dream with more drive and determination than Joseph P. Kennedy, of Hyannis Port, Palm Beach, Park Avenue, and Cap d'Antibes.

That today his son is indeed President is a fact about which there was little luck or happenstance. It was well planned—every step of the way.

Asked what single person had the greatest impact on his political thinking, President Kennedy once replied, "the family atmosphere * * * my mother and father." Within "the family atmosphere," however, Joseph P. Kennedy was the dominant personality. Joe Kennedy reared his children in his own image—in a family where competition is almost a way of life. Nothing mattered but winning.

"I don't think much of people who have it in them to be first, but who finish second," he explained. "If you've got a second choice, then you haven't got first choice."

Before he was stricken, Joe Kennedy was asked by a reporter what problems his youngest son, TED, could expect if he ran for U.S. Senator. "None," he said unhestitatingly. "In the Kennedy clan nothing is impossible."

Joseph P. Kennedy had once entertained White House ambitions for himself. When they were thwarted, he groomed his oldest son, Joe, Junior, to carry out this driving ambition. Young Joe died during the war—a hero's death—and the father decided that his second born son should go into politics.

"I got Jack into politics," Joseph P. Kennedy said in 1957. "I was the one, I told him Joe was dead and therefore it was his responsibility to run for Congress. He didn't want to. He felt he didn't have the ability and he still feels that way. But I told him he had to."

In recent years, efforts had been made to minimize the role played by Joseph Kennedy as the ranking clansman. Rarely had any one man made so many enemies. Liberals disliked him because he was a friend and outspoken admirer of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. And during World War II he was an ardent isolationist who sincerely believed Hitler would win the war.

Also, he had broken with Franklin D. Roosevelt (whom he had supported for three terms) and New Dealers regarded his views as reactionary, if not worse. In the postwar period he had dubbed the United Nations "a hopeless instrumentality" and had condemned lavish spending to aid foreign nations. In many ways he was a premature Birchite.

The story goes that Joe Kennedy had vowed to become a millionaire by the time he was 35. This he accomplished many times over. But he wanted something else. He wanted social acceptance. It had always galled him at Harvard that, though he was popular as an athlete, he could never make the "best" clubs—the so-called "final clubs" such as Porcellian and A.D.

Even when he began to amass great wealth, he found the best clubs in conservative Boston still closed to him. These were the places where the Yankees could still hold out against rising immigrant pressures. In fact, they were the last places.

When he finally packed his growing family off to New York, Kennedy made no bones about the fact that he wanted to live where he could be accepted as an American and not as an Irishman.

In the person of his son Jack, Joe Kennedy achieved the ultimate in social status. In President Kennedy can be seen the final product of the gradual transition from shanty to lace curtain to cut-glass Irish. One of his grandfathers may have owned a saloon, but Jack Kennedy has style, money, charm, and high connections.

Born to wealth and wedded to beauty and high social status, he is not the America of the big metropolis or of middle-class suburbia. His is the America of Palm Beach and Hyannis Port, of Choate and Harvard, of El Morocco and Le Pavillon. His is the world of dazzling women, sophisticated parties, sun worshiping and long weekends in the country. He entered the race of life with that serenity, that security from abrasive money worries, that self-confidence that only inherited wealth could provide.

"For him," the Reporter's Douglass Carter has written, "the fairytale version of life in America is, like the two best-selling books he has written, strictly nonfiction."

Both in his person and in his family, Kennedy represents the flowering of a new class. He may well be described as our first melting-pot aristocrat.

Some Angles to the Sale of Wheat to the Communists Not Mentioned by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as is his custom in selling his soft policy toward the Soviet Union, President Kennedy gave none of the background details of his proposal to sell wheat to Russia and to increase normal trade with other Communist nations including the bloody handed regime in Hungary. The following column by Frank Langston, news analyst, of the Dallas Times Herald, reminds us of a few angles to the wheat deal the President neglected to mention:

NEW ANGLES ARISE IN SALE OF WHEAT

(By Frank Langston)

There are more factors—and more issues—involved in the proposed wheat deal with Russia than at first met the eye.

But some of these matters are beginning to come to light. Others will turn up later.

Originally the deal was proposed simply as a plan to sell some of this country's surplus wheat stocks to the Soviet Union, which badly needed wheat to feed its own people and to supply its satellites. The plan was advanced as Russian agents negotiated for a large quantity of wheat from Canada.

Russia, from early czarist times, has been one of the great wheat-producing nations of the world. The Soviets in recent years have talked about their farming advances in virgin lands open to agriculture.

But the Reds now are suffering from a wheat shortage due to crop failure—partly because of the weather but due in even

greater extent to the Communist agriculture system itself.

A ONE-SHOT DEAL WAS INDICATED

The trial balloon sent up indicated the deal with Russia was planned as a one-shot affair.

It appealed to many persons as "a humanitarian thing to do—to use our bounty to relieve suffering." It appealed to some as a means of turning a profit and also of cutting the deficit in our balance of payments. It appealed to others as a way of disposing of some of the huge wheat surplus that has plagued the administration. So there were social, economic, and political considerations.

Administration spokesmen said it would not be necessary to refer the matter to Congress, despite obvious policy implications. Some Congressmen, including Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, have felt otherwise.

On October 9 President Kennedy gave a go-ahead but stipulated that exports to the Soviet Union would have to be handled in U.S. ships, if available.

Rates charged by U.S. ships are higher than those of other lines and Premier Khrushchev has charged discrimination against Russia. The U.S. Government has tried to get U.S. shipping concerns to cut their rates but the shipowners have stood firm.

Involved is a maximum of 8 million tons of wheat—generally referred to as from 100 million to 200 million bushels, depending on how much the Soviet Government actually would buy. The sales figures generally used is $250 million. Adding $10 a ton to this for increased shipping costs over what the Soviet want to pay would mean increasing the total cost by from $30 million to $60 million.

The shipowners have reasoned that since this is a deal with the Russians they also should make their part of the profit. They have not attempted to enter into competition wih foreign carriers because the deal is a Government sale and obviously not on a competitive basis.

THE SALE HAS OTHER ASPECTS

This is one aspect of the Russian wheat deal. Another is its effect on prices in the United States. Representative HENRY GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, a liberal Democrat, has expressed concern over the likelihood of rising wheat product prices.

Any deal with the Russians has to be considered as more than a simple trade involving supply and demand. The Russians do not make deals on a private initiative basis but through a state monopoly.

Out of any deal with a non-Communist nation, the Reds expect to get an additional profit to advance their Socialist cause. Three kinds of warfare they are waging are:

Propaganda or psychological warfare.

Economic warfare.

Political warfare.

By making it appear that the Americans are the ones anxious to make a deal and by shunning conditions imposed, they have placed themselves in a position to reap a propaganda benefit—perhaps even getting their people to tighten their belts when told the Americans have tried to squeeze extra profits out of their hunger.

Economic warfare is used in various fields. The Russians have made most effective use of it in the case of petroleum. They undercut a regular supplier to one country while raising prices elsewhere. Then, when the new customer is in an adverse position, they add a new price tag, frequently a political concession.

Undoubtedly the Russians expected to create a controversy in this country. The wheat deal has caused such a controversy. And regardless of the outcome of the deal itself, that controversy will be a political issue for some time.

Dr. Edward Welsh, National Aeronautics and Space Council, Analyzes Khrushchev Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, soon after Premier Khrushchev made the statement to the effect that Russia was abandoning their efforts to land a man on the moon, Dr. Edward Welsh of the National Aeronautics and Space Council made a statement in which he felt that there was nothing in Khrushchev's remarks which warranted a conclusion that Russia is giving up their lunar project. Dr. Welsh feels that there is a slowing down in their activities however.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of the transcript of that portion of Premier Khrushchev's statement and that made by Dr. Edward Welsh:

EXCERPTS FROM KHRUSHCHEV PRESS CONFERENCE WITH PARTICIPANTS OF THIRD WORLD MEETINGS OF JOURNALISTS ON OCTOBER 25

Question. Journalist Leopold Vargas of Colombia asks: "Can you tell whether a flight to the moon by Soviet cosmonauts is planned for the not too distant future?"

Khrushchev. It would be very interesting to take a trip to the moon. But I cannot at present say when this will be done. We are not at present planning flights by cosmonauts to the moon. Soviet scientists are working on this problem. It is being studied as a scientific problem, and the necessary research is being done. I have a report to the effect that the Americans want to land a man on the moon by 1970–80. Well, let's wish them success. We shall see how they will fly there, how they will land on the Moon, and, more important, how they will start off and return home. We shall take their experience into account. We do not want to compete with the sending of people to the moon without careful preparation. It is clear that no benefits would be derived from such a competition. On the contrary, it would be harmful as it might result in the destruction of people. We have a frequently quoted joke: "He who cannot bear the earth any longer may fly to the moon." But we are all right on earth. To speak seriously, much work will have to be done and good preparations made for successful flight to the moon by man.

SPACE

WASHINGTON.—An administration official said today that close study of Premier Khrushchev's recent space statement makes it clear that the Russians do intend to put men on the moon.

The official, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, said Khrushchev's remarks on Saturday have been widely misinterpreted as meaning the Russians were pulling out of the lunar competition.

Welsh is Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council which advises President Kennedy on the U.S. space programs.

He told UPI that examination of the text of Khrushchev's statement shows he said nothing to indicate the Soviets are slackening their space program.

Here, as Welsh see it, are the key sentences in Khrushchev's statement: "At the present time we are not planning flights of cosmonauts to the moon * * * we do not wish to compete in sending people to the moon without thorough preparation."

The Premier went on to assert, Welsh said, that the Soviets are continuing with research and preparations necessary for a successful landing on the moon.

His statement that the Russians are not planning lunar flights "at the present time" must therefore mean merely that they are not scheduling a moon landing now, according to Welsh.

Welsh said Khrushchev "did not say Russia would not compete with us on going to the moon." What he did say was that Russia would not dispatch men to the moon without careful advance planning, Welsh continued.

"The inference he apparently wished to leave," Welsh said, "was that the United States may be willing to go risk lives by going ahead hastily but that the Russians won't go until they are ready." U.S. critics of the Apollo moon project often denounce it as a frantic crash program. Space officials insist, however, that it is nothing of the sort but rather an orderly, step-by-step, well-thought-out undertaking.

Ireland's Economic Upswing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following interesting article entitled "Ireland's Economic Upswing" published in the Irish Echo of October 19, 1963, and written by the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States:

IRELAND'S ECONOMIC UPSWING

(By James A. Farley)

"Let's get moving" is one of the favorite expressions of President Kennedy's administration. The expression is in the tempo of the jet and rocket age. We have moved from the horse to the iron horse, the prop aircraft to jet, and, finally, the rocket. Whether this be progress only time will tell. However, it certainly is motion, and Ireland certainly seems to have picked up that motion under the leadership of Sean F. Lemass.

Ireland's industrial resurgence has taken the great courage, vision, and perseverance of Prime Minister Lemass. When all Europe was tottering and floundering after World War II, Lemass, then Minister for Industry and Commerce, refused any help from the famed Marshall plan. He coined the phrase "Ireland wants trade, not aid." As a political leader in Ireland, Lemass will not allow political atrophy to set in. He is trying his best to eradicate it from Ireland's economy and he is succeeding.

The announcement by Prime Minister Lemass of the program of economic expansion is another step in Ireland's economic climb. In the years since the first program was started, employment is up, emigration down, and the population is finally on the rise. This new program, planned to run 7 years, is aimed at increasing the gross national product, increasing employment and stemming emigration. Lemass has stated that

Ireland, by 1970, will be in full economic bloom with a very bright future. The progress of the plan will be awaited and watched in Ireland and in the countries all over the free world where Irish men and women are residing.

The committee on industrial organization has set up a section to work with industry and executives on plans for joint marketing projects in the valuable American market. The recent promotion under the auspices of the Federation of Irish Industries at the Lord & Taylor store on New York's Fifth Avenue has been a tremendous success.

The Lemass government is not standing still; they are moving ahead in the promotion of fairs and exhibitions for Irish goods all over the free world. At these specialized trade fairs, there is a meeting of buyers and potential new customers for Irish products and new markets are created.

Ireland, since Lemass became Prime Minister 4 years ago, has been participating in fairs in London, Harrogate, Paris, Lyons, Frankfurt, Nuremburg, Montreal, New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, where department stores are now carrying Irish goods in stock featuring them in window displays and advertising.

The Irish Export Promotion Board with six oversea offices in London, Manchester, New York, Montreal, Frankfurt, and Brussels has provided the exporters with trade exhibitions involving product promotion, the press, and the publicity. Ireland Week promoted by Irish International Airlines and Bord Failte has played an increasingly important part in the sale of Irish goods around St. Patrick's Day.

At a recent address before the National Productivity Committee dinner, Prime Minister Lemass said, "If we can, because of the measures we apply, succeed in going ahead more rapidly, that will be very welcome. If, on the other hand, we should find that our rate of development at any time is insufficient to realize the targets which have been set, then before there would be any question of lowering our targets we should explore the reasons for this situation and try to put it right."

I think that, in those words, we have a vivid pen picture of Sean F. Lemass, patriot, planner, pragmatist, and leader. This leadership is bringing Ireland steadily and sensibly and without sentiment along the road to real economic prosperity.

May he long continue in his fine work and may Ireland continue to prosper under his dedicated leadership.

Tax Cut in Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, all sorts of accomplishments because of tax reductions have already been made by the administration. Henry Hazlitt, in the November 4 issue of Newsweek, punches many holes as to what the bill will do.

The article follows:

TAX CUT IN WONDERLAND

(By Henry Hazlitt)

I am going to try to explain Secretary Dillon's position on taxes. His argument may be a little difficult to follow, so I advise you to fasten your seat belts.

Testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in favor of a tax cut of $11.1 billion over a 2-year period, the Treasury Secretary predicted that if this tax cut were made there would be a budget deficit in the present fiscal year, which ends June 30, of $9.2 billion, and in the next fiscal year also of $9.2 billion.

Well, you may think naively, that's a deficit of $18.4 billion over the next 2 years; so if Congress does not pass the $11.1 billion tax cut, that will at least reduce the combined deficit to $7.3 billion—and though it wouldn't exactly be fiscally responsible to plan such deficits, it would be at least something to reduce their size.

But here Dillon will set your arithmetic straight. No; if you don't cut taxes $11 billion, the budget deficits will be bigger. They will probably rise in the next fiscal year (1965) to $10 billion or $12 billion, and in the 1966 fiscal year to $15 billion or $20 billion. And if Congress does cut taxes? Then, "with good luck," the Secretary thinks the budget could be balanced in the 1967 fiscal year, and he even sees "no reason why" it should not be balanced in 1968. So the choice in the immediate years ahead is only between huge deficits and enormous deficits, and there is only a vague hope that the budget will someday be balanced again.

WIDE OF THE MARK

Before we examine the theory behind this arithmetic, let's glance at Dillon's record as a budget forecaster. On March 24, 1961, he (through Mr. Kennedy) forecast a deficit of $2.1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; the actual deficit was $6.3 billion. For the fiscal year ended June 30 last, he originally forecast a surplus of $463 million; there was actually a deficit of $6.2 billion. If his estimates, made only about a year in advance, fell so wide of the mark, what value can we attach to estimates for 2, 3, and 4 years ahead?

The theory on which Dillon's estimates rest is that only by continuous budget deficits can prosperity be assured. If we don't cut taxes, his logic runs, there will be a recession, and then we will have to have massive additional Federal expenditures to stimulate the economy.

The belief that budget deficits are necessary for prosperity and that balanced budgets or surpluses bring recession has been thoroughly discredited, again and again, statistically and theoretically. Comparisons of the 64 quarter years till the end of 1962, for example, compiled by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, show that in 51 quarter years with a rising gross national product, more than half (28) were associated with a Federal surplus and only 23 with a deficit, while of 13 quarters with declining gross national product, nearly all (12) were associated with a deficit (Newsweek, Apr. 22).

IRRESPONSIBLE

What really counts for employment and prosperity is a proper working relationship of wage rates and prices. When wage rates race ahead of prices and threaten to wipe out profit margins, there is unemployment and recession.

So, far from huge and continuous budget deficits being necessary to prosperity, they are a major threat to any sound prosperity. Nothing could do more than the administration's present planning of continuous huge deficits to aggravate the balance-of-payments crisis and undermine world confidence in the dollar.

A tax cut can permanently help business only if it accompanies a balanced budget. The tax-cut bill that passed the House by 271 to 155 is a sham. We have not earned a tax cut. The Kennedy administration has not only opposed any matching cuts in spending, but is constantly proposing new expenditures. As Congressman BRUCE ALGER put it: "The proponents of this measure almost disregard, as though nonexistent, our national debt and deficit financing over the years. We are borrowing money to cut taxes. This is morally and financially wrong."

And, one might add, the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

What Was the Air Force's Reaction to the Gesell Report?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to expose further the vicious and cynical nature of the Secretary of Defense' directive implementing the Gesell report, I have earlier inserted into the RECORD the official positions of the Departments of the Army and Navy on this report.

It will be recalled that when the Gesell report was issued, the Secretary of Defense asked the Secretaries of the three armed services to present their comments.

The Secretaries of the Army and Navy did so in a most forthright manner, and I have noted in the RECORD their numerous objections and reservations about the wisdom of implementing the Gesell Committee's recommendations.

Now, what about the Air Force official position?

The memorandum dated July 10, 1963, issued by Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert and concerning the Gesell report, is as brief as it is innocuous. And yet, no branch of the military has been as outspoken in opposition of the Gesell Committee recommendations as has the Air Force in uniform.

The Air Force's concern is understandable in view of the fact that it apparently is being used as a guinea pig for Gesell report experiments. The so-called Valdes study group last summer visited four Air Force bases—all, coincidentally, in the South—inquiring about segregation in off-base communities.

The four bases visited were Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.; Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.; Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.; and Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.

It is interesting to note what military officials at these bases thought of Gesell report recommendations. The Valdes study group reported that the base commanders expressed concern over possible excessive involvement in community problems.

The study group quoted the base commanders as stating that such involvement in community affairs would interfere with their primary—military—mission. The commanders added that they felt a lack of clear guidance on the extent of involvement in civil rights matters, and they questioned their ability to produce progress in this area.

Furthermore, the commanders of these four bases, according to the Valdes study group, registered strong reservations in the following areas:

First. They questioned the ultimate legality of placing public establishments off limits for the purpose of achieving racial integration.

Second. They questioned the wisdom of lowering standards in order to place persons of a particular race in positions of consequence without regard for qualifications.

Third. They said they believe any plan to close bases to further integration would have an adverse effect on the Air Force.

Fourth. They said they believe the Inspector General system is adequate for receiving and handling complaints regarding discrimination.

Fifth. They said they believe coercive action by commanders to further off-base integration would lower the morale of the majority of military personnel and damage the stature of the base commander in the eyes of both the military and the civilian community.

This, then, is the opinion of men who would be responsible for implementing the obnoxious recommendations of the Gesell report. This is the report of military men—not social scientists.

But there is yet another Air Force document which sheds light upon the real official position of that department.

I now refer to a letter dated July 5, 1963, directed to the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff and sent by Maj. Gen. Albert M. Kuhfeld, the Air Force Judge Advocate General.

In this letter, General Kuhfeld warned against what he termed the "questionable legality of an off-limits order" as recommended by the Gesell Committee as a sanction against segregated off-base establishments.

General Kuhfeld referred to prior decisions of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. He said:

> It is highly questionable whether an off-limits order based solely on the fact that the establishment engages in discriminatory practices against Negro personnel would be enforceable. In my opinion, such an order would be of doubtful validity.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense, in his directive, has provided for the possible use of the off-limits sanction as a weapon to promote integration.

A detailed memorandum, dated July 13, 1963, was sent to the Secretary of the Air Force and Air Force Chief of Staff, and this memorandum stated "flags of concern have been raised by the Joint Staff and the other services over the proposed use of the military in coercing compliance with civil rights edicts."

An attached paper to this memorandum contained a series of recommendations and comments about the Gesell report. The final comment is most significant:

> Finally, it must be emphasized that any such moves, as have been proposed and which the services might be called upon to make, can only serve to operate against substantial gains in community relations made over the past years.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the Air Force's reaction to the Gesell report.

There may be a very interesting story behind the reason for Secretary Zuckert's mild memorandum of "official" views. But it is no secret that Air Force military officers themselves view this tampering with civilian/military control with misgivings and alarm.

Just what arm twisting and "persuasion" took place behind the scenes to make the Air Force's "official" comments on the Gesell report vary so much from the actual reaction of the military commanders in the field?

Why are the Air Force personnel being selected and used as the "guinea pig" against the best judgment and attitudes of its personnel?

It may not be written as strongly in the "official" report of the Air Force, but the Air Force is lined up solidly alongside its sister services, the Navy and the Army, in vigorously resisting any effort to make a mockery of the role of the military in the defense of the Nation and employing its forces to inject itself into local and national politics in local communities.

Now let the Air Force dare deny the accuracy of my statements.

Chaff in the Wheat Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an editorial appearing in the October 29, 1963, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

CHAFF IN THE WHEAT DEAL

The wheat shortage is no secret to the Russians, as shown by the above cartoon which appeared in Krokodil, the Soviet "humor" magazine [not printed in the RECORD]. It shows, according to the UPI Telephoto service that distributed it, "grain hoarders" stealing out of a shop at night carrying loaves of bread in bags and huge sacks of flour on their backs. The cord used to tie the tops of the flour sacks gives the figures a bug-like appearance, and the cartoon is labeled "Cockroaches."

It would drastically reduce the pressure of hoarding, and help solve that problem far more than a derisive cartoon in Krokodil, if the Soviet Union would just tell the Soviet people that the United States is selling them millions of tons of wheat—of which we have plenty.

We are still looking for the cartoon, or whatever, whereby Khrushchev lets his own people know about this transaction.

Significantly, when he announced the wheat sale at his press conference (and on TV), President Kennedy came down with heavy emphasis in pointing out the adtages of the sale, saying that the Russian people will be told that wheat is coming from America.

Perhaps, even more significantly, however, was the lack of emphasis with which he brushed off the question which pinned him down and asked if the Russians had, in fact, agreed to label the wheat and to inform their people of the deal.

He quickly and in an entirely different manner said, "No," adding that the Voice of America isn't being jammed, and hurried to another question.

Hence, his heavy emphasis which led the listener to believe that this elementary gesture of honesty if not gratitude was included in the deal proved to have no basis except the thin and fragile reed of the speculative audience of shortwave broadcasts from the Voice of America.

If that audience is, indeed, significant, the Russian Government would be foolish to ignore this fact, and advertise as sensitive censorship to their own citizens.

They will only keep it a secret if they can effectively keep it a secret.

So far, we have seen no report of any admission by any Soviet agency of the wheat deal. So far, the Soviet citizens know nothing about it.

And the best barometer there can be as to how much we can trust the Soviet Government and its "new policies" is the extent that it tells its own people the same thing it tells us.

If it says one thing to us, or makes one deal with us, but keeps the Soviet people in the dark, we can ask, "Why?" We can be wary. We can suspect that they are still not being frank with us, and still have tricks up their sleeves.

We will never trust the Russians, and none of us should ever trust the Russians as long as they maintain such secrecy and censorship over what news reaches the Russian people themselves.

And pretending that the Russian people know by trick words in a TV broadcast doesn't solve the problem.

Assateague Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of presiding as chairman of the luncheon meeting of the Advertising Club of Baltimore, attended by about 450 outstanding leaders in the civic life of Metropolitan Baltimore and the State of Maryland, as well as high officials in government.

We were fortunate to have as our guest speaker on this occasion a member of the President's Cabinet, Hon. Stewart Udall, our very able Secretary of the Interior. Many Members of the House remember Mr. Udall as one of our former colleagues who served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Since his appointment as Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall has taken a very active and personal interest in the conservation of our natural resources. This summer he made a personal inspection of one of the largest unspoiled beaches on the Middle Atlantic known as Assateague Island in my State of Maryland.

Legislation is now pending in the Congress to authorize the acquisition and development of this island as a national seashore in our national park system. At the Advertising Club luncheon, Secretary Udall gave a very enlightening description of this proposal and I include his speech at this point in the RECORD for consideration by all Members of the House:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL BEFORE THE ADVERTISING CLUB OF BALTIMORE, EMERSON HOTEL, OCTOBER 30, 1963

It is a pleasure to be with you today, along with these distinguished Members of Congress from Maryland and your own Maryland officials. I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before this outstanding audience. The Advertising Club of Balitmore, with 1,200 members numbering not only direct practitioners of the art of advertising but business and professional men as well, is widely known across the Nation.

Your basic purpose is to communicate, a job you do well. Communication is my purpose here today. I want to communicate to you if possible the beauty I find in a priceless asset lying at your doorstep, one that affects your physical, mental, and financial well-being.

Today, I want you to take an imaginary trip with me 10 years into the future. The year is 1973. Our population has grown to 225 million. It's a beautiful summer weekend in Balitmore and we decide to take the family and get in some camping and fishing.

We leave Baltimore and head for the mountains. Mile after mile we travel in bumper-to-bumper traffic. Far up into the hills, the countryside is covered with houses and commercial establishments. The first place we stop, a little mountain hollow where we used to camp back in 1963, is a housing development now. We drive on, but when we come to the State park a sign at the picnic area says "Sorry, filled." The man over at the camping area says you have to make a reservation months ahead if you want to get into a State or Federal camping area. We know of a secluded farm back off the highway which offers camping and fishing, but the farmer regretfully waves us away. Since early morning he and his neighbors had had no more room for campers.

If we had tried to go to the shore, the situation might have been worse. It could take 4 or 5 hours even to get our car into the beach parking lot.

Our imaginary trip is not pure fantasy. This year of 1963—10 years earlier than our imagined trip—found many people baffled when they tried to find a place to picnic, or camp, or swim, or fish. Particularly near the urban centers, the facilities were simply jammed to capacity, and beyond, on the peak weekends.

As a people, we are rushing to the out-of-doors as never before, and the pressures are on the increase. Several significant changes in the way we live underlie these mounting recreation pressures. Our population is increasing. We are crowding into urban areas where the tensions of life are great. We are earning more spendable income and working shorter hours, resulting in more leisure time. Mix together our urban tensions, money to spend, leisure time, and the greater mobility which the automobile and express highways are providing and the reasons behind the boom in outdoor recreation are no mystery.

With all these pressures, it requires little vision to foresee the day when a large share of our citizens won't be able to enjoy outdoor recreation because of lack of facilities if we fail to plan and provide adequately for the needs which are certain to come. "No vacancy" signs at Federal and State areas could be the rule, not merely an occasional happenstance.

I would emphasize that outdoor recreation, particularly for the city-bound resident, is truly a serious matter. It provides essential cultural values vital to the Nation. Outdoor recreation is part of the educational process that strengthens men's minds as well as their bodies; broadens their understanding of the laws of nature; sharpens their appreciation of nature's manifold beauty; and gives meaning to that priceless possession—the spirt that transforms warmth and essence to life itself. I would add that the further we live away from the land, the more these truths hold.

One of our best opportunities to assure ourselves of adequate room to participate in the beneficial effects of outdoor recreation lies right at your doorstep here in Maryland.

Last April, the Department of the Interior proposed that Assateague Island on the Maryland and Virignia coast be acquired and developed as a national seashore. I hope you have seen Assateague—mile after mile of low-lying golden sandy beach, a barrier reef with beaches of a quality to rival the South Sea isles—and almost unspoiled by man.

A short while after the disastrous storm of March 1962, Governor Tawes and the Department agreed to make a study of the alternative uses of the island. Our Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in cooperation with the National Park Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife made a thorough study of alternative possibilities of private versus public development of Assateague Island. In order to provide an impartial analysis of the effect these two possibilities would have on the economy of Worcester County, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation contracted a portion of the study to Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., consulting economists. The essence of the findings and recommendations go to the root of the prime outdoor recreation problems which confront us at every hand:

1. We are running out of public beaches on the east coast. Only about 2 percent of the shoreline between New York and Virginia is in designated public recreation areas.

2. Assateague Island is the largest undeveloped seashore area between Cape Hatteras and Cape Cod.

3. Assateague represents one of our last opportunities to acquire a sizable seashore for benefit of all the people before it is preempted for comparatively limited use.

4. The island is not suited for residential or commercial development without substantial public subsidy for building protective dunes and stabilizing beaches. If large amounts of public funds are to be spent, all the taxpayers should benefit by having available the use of the island.

5. Providing safe and adequate water and disposal of sewage under private ownership presents serious problems.

6. Public development of the island would provide great economic benefits to the Maryland mainland.

For these compelling reasons, we believe that a national seashore should be created on Assateague Island. Almost without exception, Maryland State agencies with responsibilities related to this field have concurred in this conclusion. Under our plan, the Maryland State Park and the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge would retain their identities. The Department of the Interior would welcome the opportunity to cooperate with the State of Maryland in developing the State's part of the proposed seashore.

Senators BREWSTER and BEALL, along with Representatives SICKLES and LONG, have introduced in Congress proposals to make Assateague a national seashore. Their proposals definitely are in line with the thinking of the Department of the Interior.

Assateague Island would be developed and managed for both intensive and extensive use. Development of supporting facilities for food, lodging, and other services by private enterprise would take place on the adjacent Maryland and Virginia mainland.

Our plan calls for public acquisition of all private holdings on Assateague. Owners, of course, would receive fair market value for their property. Owners of improved property could retain the right of occupancy for up to 25 years. Total cost of acquisition and installation of dunes sufficient to protect the area for day use would be about $12.5 million.

The Department has been aware of Assateague's outstanding recreation values for many years. As early as 1935, the National Park Service identified Assateague as worthy of Federal acquisition, and the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge encompassing the Virginia portion of the island was established in 1943.

Assateague is a precious national asset. Its beauty grips the imagination and stirs the soul. And it is ideally located to serve the large cities of Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, and Wilmington. Assateague represents one of our last chances to provide for the seashore recreation needs of the several million people living in these nearby cities. Within a 250-mile radius of Assateague live about 34 million people—almost one-fifth of the Nation's total population. Public ownership and development of Assateague Island would provide seashore recreation opportunity for an estimated 3 million people annually by the year 1975. I hope you will join me in supporting legislation which will enable us to save this piece of our disappearing coastline for public use and enjoyment.

So important to the future well-being of all the residents of this area is public acquisition of Assateague that I would suggest that the venerable Advertising Club of Baltimore may wish to consider adopting Assateague as a project. This Advertising Club, renowned for its public service, could render no more important contribution than to institute a campaign of understanding to explain to all of Maryland the benefits which would come from developing Assateague as a national seashore.

As I have stated Assateague Island is the largest unspoiled section of beach in midsection of the Atlantic coast which is suitable for preservation as a national seashore. This island has been the scene of ill-advised speculation, unsound land use proposals, and short-sighted conservation planning. If we take into account the needs of the future, Assateague can become an irreplaceable playground for the people who live in this region of the Atlantic coast.

Not unexpectedly, we have seen strenuous opposition to the national seashore proposal develop on the part of Worcester County officials. Such opposition was to be expected. The whole history of the development of the National Park System is the history of local opposition at the outset, but always has a happy ending. Without hesitation I will predict today that if the advice of your State officials is followed and Assateague is added to our National Park System, Worcester County will benefit most of all. Once a long-range conservation plan is put into action under the wise guidance of the National Park Service, it will quickly win the support of those who live in the areas adjacent to Assateague. This has been the case over and over. Here are some examples:

1. Cape Hatteras National Seashore in Dare County, N.C., is not unlike Assateague. In 1950, Dare County had an $11 tax base before the recreation area got underway. By 1958, Dare County's tax base was $25 and its tax rate was reduced from $1 to 80 cents per hundred.

Cape Hatteras was preserved, and the tourist trade around the area virtually doubled in a 6-year period; bank deposits doubled; and land values multiplied in the vicinity of the national seashore.

2. The importance of location is clear for retailers who seek a share of business at or near a recreation area. An example of this effect is afforded by Teton County, Wyoming, which contains the Grand Teton National Park and is adjacent to Yellowstone National Park. In 1958, tourist expenditures of nearly $7 million produced locally a business of over $12 million, or about 71 percent of the total business generated in the county by all economic activity.

3. In 1958, nearly 3.2 million persons spent an estimated $35 million within an area extending 30 miles beyond the boundaries of Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee and North Carolina.

4. As the volume of recreation expands, it may bring about additional capital investment. This enlarges the scope of the community's economic activities. For instance, the 28,000 summer homes in New Hampshire all built essentially for recreation purposes provide a market for real estate, building, and other materials and labor.

5. Tourist expenditures are big business—a business that's getting bigger every year. Spending for outdoor recreation totals an estimated $20 billion annually. Major sporting goods are just under $2 billion a year, three-fourths for items related to outdoor recreation.

We spend an estimated $2.1 billion for boats and related equipment and services, $3 billion on fishing annually. Visitors to Federal and State parks, forests, and reservoirs spend over $11 billion annually.

Once Congress authorizes an Assateague National Seashore, it is going to take money to acquire the land. It is for purposes such as this that we have proposed and Congress is considering a Land and Water Conservation Fund bill.

This far-reaching measure would provide both needed funds for acquisition of certain Federal areas and, importantly, grants-in-aid to help the States plan, acquire, and develop outdoor recreation areas such as parks, forests, reservoirs, wildlife refuges, and other areas. The State of Maryland could use such grants-in-aid funds for needed development work at the State portion of the Assateague project.

The bill would create a Land and Water Conservation Fund from entrance and user fees at certain federally administered recreation areas, from proceeds of surplus land sales, from revenues raised by the motorboat fuels tax and from repayable advance appropriations. The revenues would continue for a period of 25 years. This is fair and reasonable financing since the pay-as-you-go revenues would be derived from the people who benefit most from use of Federal areas, the recreation users.

Upon appropriation by Congress, 60 percent of the fund, possibly $125 million in a typical year, would be available to the States on a matching basis.

I know of no proposal which could advance the cause of acquiring needed recreation resources more than the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill. The measure has enjoyed the support in principle from officials of 46 States and from numerous conservation organizations and other groups. The bill has been ordered reported by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I am hopeful the House and Senate will approve the land and water bill this year. If it does, the future for Assateague will be that much brighter. We need Assateague—all of us. I hope all of you can be present for a swim on its beautiful beaches the day we dedicate it as a new national seashore—for all Americans.

Britain Takes the Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite the persistence of the State Department to affectionately embrace left-wing dictatorships and attack as isolationists any anti-Communist governments in emerging areas such as the Dominican Republic, I am hopeful that the editorial which appeared in this afternoon's Washington Daily News will receive the attention of our foreign policy planners. Certainly, our "image" as leader of the free world has steadily deteriorated in the last 3 years, primarily due to the policy of retreating before Communist pressure and chastising loyal allies, who have anti-Communist policies.

However, as an optimist, I direct this to the attention of the State Department, and hope it will soon be reflected in our recognition of the provisional Dominican Government and in an overall change in policy:

BRITAIN TAKES THE LEAD

British recognition of the provisional government in the Dominican Republic is expected to set the example for prompt recognition by other Western nations. It certainly should.

The junta which took power after President Juan Bosch was deposed has demonstrated its ability to keep order. Its popular support is indicated by the offer of Senor Bosch's Dominican Revolutionary Party to cooperate with the new regime.

Yet the United States, the natural friend and promoter of this island nation, continues to hold back and even is reported to have pressured the British against recognition.

Whatever temporary failure of democratic processes the coup in Santo Domingo may indicate, the junta is friendly to the United States. It is firmly committed against Castro and communism, has endeavored to protect civil rights and has pledged new elections within a reasonable period.

The return of Senor Bosch, which is what our Government apparently wants, is inconceivable. The only thing that ostracism from the family of free nations might accomplish is bloody revolution to be succeeded by stern dictatorship, either of the right or of the left. Happily the British have taken a lead in ending this boycott.

Senor Bosch was kicked out last September 25. U.S. recognition has seemed inevitable since the first few days when the junta proved it was firmly in charge. When we come trailing in, reluctantly, at the end of the line, it will be with a tarnished reputation both for commonsense and for leadership in hemispheric affairs.

First Aiders Typify American Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great sources of strength for our Nation is the inspiring willingness to serve others without compensation or reward exhibited by many of our citizens. Today, I would like to pay particular tribute to the men and women of the Ridgefield, N.J., First Aid and Ambulance Corps who have performed humanitarian services selflessly and devotedly throughout the 23 years of the corps existence.

Since its inception, the Ridgefield First Aid and Ambulance Corps has responded to more than 7,000 emergency and assistance calls and as population increased in its service area has successfully coped with ever-increasing demands. For example, in 1962 alone, the corps answered the needs of 548 individuals.

Twenty-five men comprise the corps working manpower. In addition to serving without pay, these men raise the funds needed to purchase equipment and supplies required to carry out their vital work. To handle the growing number of calls, the corps is now purchasing a second ambulance with its own funds and also expects to initiate a youth squad to both assist on calls and to serve as a reserve force for filling vacancies when they occur or expanding the present roster.

The Ridgefield First Aid and Ambulance Corps will now have its own home. A new headquarters building providing facilities for two ambulances, a meeting and lecture hall with office and storage space for equipment and supplies. These facilities are also suitable for use as an emergency hospital or disaster control base. This building will be dedicated Sunday, November 3, 1963. It will be my great privilege to be a part of these dedication ceremonies.

In one of the leading newspapers in the area, the Bergen Bulletin, there appears today an editorial which eloquently pays tribute not only to these men and their organization, but also to all in our country who give freely of their time, energy, and ability on similar errands of mercy. I include the text of this fine editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

FIRST-AIDERS TYPIFY AMERICAN SPIRIT

When the Borough of Ridgefield dedicates the new headquarters building of the Ridgefield First Aid and Ambulance Corps this Sunday afternoon, it will in effect be reaffirming the spirit of volunteer services which have made our country great.

America has attained its esteemed and revered stature because of those who have voluntarily contributed their time, their efforts and ability, their resources of all kinds. The sense of neighbor helping neighbor, of always being ready to aid those in distress remains as the guiding light for Americans.

Typical of those who regularly provide such services among and for us are the many volunteer first aid and ambulance squads throughout the State of New Jersey. Volunteer ambulance corps had their beginning in this State shortly before the 1930's.

The need was recognized when it has found that private and municipal hospitals could not adequately provide all important first aid and ambulance services in the face of expanding communities and increasing financial burdens. Today, ambulance services are available throughout the State in a matter of minutes from the time the call is placed.

With the exception of a handful of hospitals, mostly municipal, county, State and Federal, all ambulance services provided in New Jersey are those of volunteer groups. Hundreds of such squads blanket the State. Many of them raise money on their own to purchase equipment and supplies not otherwise furnished.

Volunteer ambulance and first aid squads provide services 24 hours a day, every day of the year. They have established an enviable record of humanitarian services which includes saving many lives, delivering babies, peforming rescues and aiding the sick and injured. They have reduced the financial

burden on our hospitals by making it possible for these institutions to eliminate ambulance services.

Further, they have reduced the time that it takes to get a patient to the hospital. With most communities having their own ambulance, the time from receiving the call to the time the patient is wheeled into the hospital is automatically cut in half.

Then, too, when disaster strikes—such as it did on the New Jersey Turnpike October 14—it is possible to assemble an entire fleet of ambulances and rescue vehicles quickly and efficiently. In New Jersey the many ambulance corps have set up mutual aid plans covering the entire State so that mobilization of any required number of ambulances can be achieved within a remarkably short time.

Those who man these emergency vehicles are not merely volunteers in the sense that they merely give up their time. It is more than that for, each and every one undertakes courses of training in first aid and life sustaining techniques. They attend special lectures, demonstrations and schools to increase their skill in the anticipation that this additional knowledge and ability will enable them to save a life or ease the suffering of a patient.

The men and women who make up the rosters of the squads in New Jersey totals in the thousands. Thousands more like them are to be found in other States to which the concept of volunteer first aid and ambulance corps has been spreading. New Jersey is still the leader with the greatest number of such squads and personnel but that inherent volunteer spirit of Americans is coming to the forefront and someday most of the United States will enjoy these wonderful, prompt and efficient services and facilities.

In light of all this it seems fitting that the dedication of the Ridgefield First Aid and Ambulance Corps headquarters building at Shaler Boulevard and Lancaster Road, is more than a tribute to the fine record of services of the local squad. Rather, it is a public commendation to all those who give of themselves to handle the hundreds of thousands of errands of mercy each year in our State.

Such devotion and spirit of neighborliness is of the highest order and in our modern, fast-moving times it is truly unique. We all take deep pride in these civic-minded citizens and hold them up for the world to see as examples of great Americans.

Are Untaxed Co-op Surplus Funds Being Used for Profitable Investments While Co-ops Continue To Borrow From the Federal Government at 2 Percent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article appearing in the October 31, 1963, issue of the Chicago Tribune by Michael Pakenham. It points to possible abuse of the 2 percent interest rate available to cooperatives.

The article follows:

REVENUE BUREAU EYES CO-OPS—TAX OR REFUND OF PROFITS IS PROBLEM

(By Michael Pakenham)

WASHINGTON, October 30.—Untaxed and undistributed surpluses of Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, involving at least a half billion dollars across the Nation, are under study by the Internal Revenue Service, it was learned today.

If the IRS rules against the co-ops, it could force them to pay income tax on vast sums or return the money to users of electricity if they have been overcharged.

Heavy political pressures are being exerted, in opposite directions, on the Kennedy administration and the IRS by the cooperatives' lobbyists and friends, on one hand, and, on the other, by private power groups and others who oppose Government participation in industry.

ARE THEY COOPERATIVES?

Essentially, the issue is whether the cooperatives, which were formed ostensibly to provide electrical power to diffuse rural areas at cost, are allowed to make and retain profits.

D. W. Bacon, Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Charge of the Compliance Department, put it this way in a letter to Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, dated Monday:

"The issues include the question of whether the [co-ops'] operations are in fact cooperative * * * such organizations are legally limited in that not more than 15 percent of total income is permitted from investment of such reserves without loss of exemption."

Bacon's letter was in answer to a query from MICHEL about the operations of a single Tennessee co-op.

MICHEL is in possession of audit reports indicating that the one in question, the Appalachian Electric Cooperative of Jefferson City, Tenn., had accumulated reserves of $1,436,153 in 1960.

MILLION TOO MUCH

The auditor recorded the plant value of the cooperative as $3,166,629. Under a rule used by the REA that retained surpluses should not exceed 15 percent of the plant value, the auditor concluded that Appalachian held about a million dollars more than was proper.

Some of the surplus funds in this case, and it is believed to be the same in many others, have been invested by the cooperative, and are making profits. Meanwhile, the co-op is still holding loans from the REA on which it pays only 2 percent.

HISTORYMAKING CASE

A group of members of the Jefferson City cooperative—electricity users who pay the rates from which the surplus is accumulated—have sued for refunds.

A brief on file before the Supreme Court of Tennessee in the Appalachian case says, "This is a historymaking case—the first such suit filed anywhere in the United States to compel an electric cooperative to refund overcharges."

"Allowing a cooperative to overcharge, keep the money, and use it for its own profit is not equal justice to the many thousands of poor people who must struggle each month to pay their electric bills," the brief asserted.

The suit seeks an order that the cooperative return the funds to users, on a pro rata basis.

TWO AVENUES OPEN

The Internal Revenue Commissioner, Mortimer Caplin, who must make the ruling on the general policy to be followed, is in the position of letting the operations continue as they have been, or ordering that all surpluses over a certain level be regarded as corporate profits, taxable at a rate of 52 percent.

In all probability, the latter ruling would force most of the cooperatives making profits to reimburse the users, or give the funds to the Government in repayment of subsidized, 2-percent REA loans.

The national implication of the Tennessee case is found in REA testimony before the House Appropriations Committee this year, in which it was conceded that electric cooperatives had accumulated reserves of $589 million.

MICHEL has announced that he will address the House on the surplus accumulation issue tomorrow.

A New Antitubercular Substance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, at this time when a serious increase in tuberculosis cases has been noted in many areas, recent research on a new antitubercular substance by Dr. Samuel Klein of Newark, N.J., is of great significance. Dr. Klein's report on his promising studies appeared in the New Jersey Journal of Pharmacy, August 1963. The article entitled "A New Anti-Tubercular Substance" follows together with an AP story appearing in the Trenton (N.J.) Times:

[From the New Jersey Journal of Pharmacy, August 1963]

A NEW ANTITUBERCULAR SUBSTANCE

(Samuel Klein, R.P., Dr. SC., M.R.S.H.)

(This brief summary by Dr. Klein, a practicing pharmacist who finds time to do original research work, is a promising preliminary report designed to arouse the interest of other qualified investigators. The Journal recognizes the possibility of an important scientific breakthrough in the near future.)

There are many thousands of various species of algae which are found in different parts of the world, regardless of climates.

As is known, the sea weed (kelp varieties) are used by man as foods, in soups, breads, pastries, gelatins, etc., and in a number of products as thickening agents. Algae are comprised mostly of protein, fat and carbohydrates, plus vitamins and amino acids. Alga cell walls contain an agar-like polysaccharide which may prove useful in controlling gastric ulcers according to experiments still in progress. A type of sea weed has been used for centuries in the Orient as a vermifuge to expel worms in humans.

This preliminary report deals with a marine substance never heretofore documented in the published scientific literature. The substance, a filamentous green algae, division, Chlorophyta, order, Cladophorales, species, Pithophora, was discovered by the writer by chance, in his independent research on algae for use by outer space explorers as a food and supplier of oxygen. The algae was grown in special air-free containers, where it remained stable for more than a year.

The algae was supplied to Tommy Robinson, B.S., presently chief, bacteriology division, Newark Department of Health and Welfare to perform the folowing experiments:

An amount of the algae was added to a sterile saline suspension of four loops of Mycobacterium tuberculosis (var. hominis).

This mixture was identified as ATB. Specimens were allowed to set for 48 hours and then streaked on Lowenstein-Jensen media.

Four loops of the above mentioned suspension without the algae, was streaked on

the Lowenstein-Jensen media to serve as a control.

Smears of the ATB mixture were made every 2 to 3 weeks to determine acid-fast organisms, which were present, but there was a question concerning the growth of the organisms, since the typical rough, granular, white colonies were absent. Only by scraping the material from the media could smears be made and acid-fast bacilli found.

The next step was to ascertain if the marine algae inhibited the tubercle bacilli or if the organisms in some way were attenuated or if the organisms were still pathogenic.

A guinea pig was inoculated with 2 cc of the tubercle bacilli suspension to produce an in vivo infected animal, and two more pigs were injected with 2 cc of the ATB mixture. The animals were isolated from each other and observed for 8 weeks, after which time they were sacrificed and portions of culture organs were removed and slides made to note formation or absence of tubercular cells.

Sections of the spleen and liver were made for sectioning and staining, one set of the slides from each of the animals was stained for acid-fast bacteria and the other set to find out if there was any infiltration into the tissue.

Microscopic examination of the slides showed that the TB infected animal had focal areas composed of lymphocytes, epithelioid cells and occasional giant Langerhan cells in the portal spaces.

The same examination of the spleen and liver sections of the ATB mixture injected animals showed tissues to be normal and the stained tissue slides were negative showing no infiltration of the tubercle bacilli.

SUMMARY

Suspensions of the Mycobacterium tuberculosis (var. hominis) when exposed to the marine algae in vitro and subsequently injected into living animal exhibited no tubercular activity, with the result that there was no infiltration of the tubercle bacilli in the organs of the animals.

With the increase in resistance of the tubercle bacillus to the TB drugs now being used, this new algae appears to be worthy of further study in relation to its apparent inhibitory action on the tuberculum bacilli. It might also be worthy of further study in regard to other bacterial strains.

The past century has seen great strides in medicine as a result of research in naturally occurring botanical substances, most of which occur in plants growing in the soil. The investigation of marine plant life of both the higher and lower forms might also be worthy of exploration.

[From the Trenton Times]

FISH PROVIDE CLUE TO ANTI-TB DRUG

NEWARK.—A retired army officer and scientist has discovered a drug that cures tuberculosis in fish but still has to be tested on humans.

Dr. Samuel Klein, 60, a graduate of the Rutgers College of Pharmacy and the College of St. Joseph in Albuquerque, N. Mex., hit upon the drug because his brother's goldfish were sick.

The brothers—Louis is an attorney and bakery executive—share a walkup apartment.

"My brother's goldfish kept getting sick and dying," Dr. Klein explained. "We took the sick fish to an ichthyologist, who said they had consumption, a disease similar to tuberculosis in humans.

"He said there was nothing that could be done about it. So my brother, who has a tank where he keeps snails and greens, threw the sick fish in there and, lo and behold, they became healthy and hearty."

Dr. Klein said he decided to find out why the fish got better and found the answer in the green algae growth.

Dr. Klein approached Dr. Thomas Robinson, chief of medical bacteriology at city hospital. Dr. Robinson took live TB germs from patients at the hospital and control laboratory studies showed the algae derivative killed the TB bacillus.

The next step was to test the derivative on animals. Guinea pigs were injected with the TB bacillus. Half were given the algae derivative and the other half were not. The guinea pigs not given the drug developed the disease. Those given the drug remained healthy.

Dr. Klein calls the drug ATB, which stands for antituberculosis. He said he can produce 40 tons of the material from 1 acre of water.

Impact of the Tax Cut on the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star recently had an extremely interesting interview with Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board, United States Steel Corp. One of the questions asked Mr. Blough concerned his analysis of the impact of the tax cut on our economy.

I think his answer so illuminating that it merits publication in the RECORD.

The interview follows:

TAX CUT EFFECT

Question. You mentioned the tax cut as a constructive action by the administration. Do you favor it primarily as an antirecession measure?

Answer. I think, basically, I favor it for the reasons that more of the total activity of the country can be done in the private area. Let me put it this way: If the results of private activity are siphoned off in the form of taxes to a point where there isn't enough left to continue the private authority properly, then you are just as sure as shooting bound to get a certain end result.

Now this is the basic concern everywhere, that taxes are too high. High in relation to what? High in relation to what there is available to tax?

Now you can say, "Well, that is an old story," and it is. But when the total of Government, Federal, State, and local taxes get close to 40 percent of the total distributed earnings of the Nation, then you had better watch out for the machine that produces the activity—the machine we call private business.

Question. Do you feel the same urgency that the administration does for this tax cut? Do you think it should come this year?

Answer. If the inference of your question is that with a tax cut there will not be a recession and without a tax cut there will be a recession, I would have to tell you that I have no view about that. I just don't know.

If the implication of your question is that an early tax cut is more likely to be beneficial from the standpoint of the country, then I would certainly agree that an early tax cut is more likely to be beneficial than a later one.

If you think of tax cut, as I do, as trying to remedy the withdrawal from the economy of too much of the Nation's substance in the form of taxes, and to help restore some of the incentives for job-creating investment, then the sooner some degree of remedy is applied, the better. If you think of it, as some do, as an avoidance of an immediate turndown, then certainly you will have a more beneficial effect if the tax change comes sooner rather than later.

So, add it up in your own way. Either way, I would think that it would be beneficial. Now as to the viewpoint of those who are concerned about Government expenditures. They want a tax cut only if Government expenditures are reduced. I have the greatest sympathy with that point of view.

That is essentially what I am talking about, when I am talking about the withdrawal from the private economy. Because reducing Government expenditures leaves more for the private economy and likewise reduces the need for such high tax rates.

So, if you tried to say which is more important, reduction of expenditures or tax cut, I would have some difficulty. But I certainly would put holding a tight rein on expenditures, and hoping for some reduction, on a par with the tax cut from the standpoint of the importance in allowing the economy to retain enough of its substance so that it can continue economic growth.

Congratulations to Pittsburgh's 146th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Guardsman, November 1963.

We in Pittsburgh are proud of our defense team and the wonderful capability and performance of the men of the 146th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron:

AIR GUARD F-102'S FROM PITTSBURGH SWEEP TO VICTORY IN USAF WORLDWIDE WEAPONS MEET "WILLIAM TELL"

A red-hot team from Pitsburgh's award-winning 146th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron scalped the Air Force last month when it outflew, outgunned and outscored 13 of USAF's crack interceptor teams to win the overall championship in "William Tell," Worldwide Interceptor Weapons Meet for 1963.

Coming from behind in the final hours of a week-long display of dazzling rocketry, the Pennsylvanians and their four F-102 Delta Daggers ran up a score of 8,427 points to beat out the Alaskan Air Command's 317th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron, their nearest competitor, by a comfortable 294-point margin.

Concurrently, they also captured top honors in their own weapons system category, the F-102.

For their spectacular performance, the 42 Pittsburghers flew home with a cupboardful of trophies for display in their headquarters at the Greater Pittsburgh Airport. First, of course, was the RCAF trophy that goes to the team that amasses the most points overall. Then, there was the Richard I. Bong trophy, named after a wartime Air Force hero, to mark their win in the F-102 category. The latter trophy rests permanently in Washington, with the names of winning squadrons engraved on its base, but the winners took home a gleaming replica for their trophy cabinet.

In addition, each member received a silver desk set as a personal memento of their triumph.

Finally, the Air Guard team walked off with four awards from industrial concerns whose products are used by the Air Defense Command, and two of its pilots were awarded individual plaques by the Ryan Aircraft Corp. for blasting jet-propelled Ryan Firebee drone targets out of the sky.

Ground intercept radar controllers led by Capt. E. C. Morrissey, Jr., and Capt. G. G. Hunt received the RCA Vincent Trophy as the top GCI crew in the F-102 category.

The entire squadron helped earn the Hughes Aircraft Co. award for superior performance in both loading and firing the GAR 10 Falcon rocket, and the General Dynamics-Convair Cup for their first place win in the F-102 classification.

Winning the individual awards for shooting down drones were Maj. G. C. McCrory, leader of the Pittsburgh team, and Capt. A. E. Mead, his Wingman. Major McCrory, along with Lt. Col. J. W. Rogers of the second-place Alaskan team, were the only two pilots to become double aces by shooting down two of the elusive little drones.

The trophies were handed out on the final day of the meet by Lt. Gen. Herbert B. Thatcher, commander of the Air Defense Command, in the presence of a jubilant delegation of top brass from Pennsylvania and from NGB. These included Maj. Gen. Thomas R. White, Jr., Pennsylvania's Adjutant General; Brig. Gen. I. G. Brown, Assistant chief of NGB for Air, and Col. Richard D. Posey, Pennsylvania Deputy Adjutant General for Air.

William Tell is an annual shootoff pitting the top jet interceptor teams of each of the major commands against each other in competitive air defense missions over the Gulf of Mexico. Points are scored for skill in radar control, prescribed radio voice procedures, breakaway maneuvers (after firing), and armaments loading, as well as for actual firing of air-to-air rockets at the fast-moving jet drones.

Points for the actual firing are tabulated on the basis of how near the pilot puts his rocket to the speeding target. A direct hit earns a perfect score, near-misses a little less, etc.

Fourteen teams took part in this year's event, representing U.S. Air Forces in Alaska, Europe, the Far East, and the North American Air Defense Command, as well as from several Air Defense Command bases within the United States. The Air Guard, as a major command, is authorized to enter one four-plane team along with the 42 officers and men to maintain planes and armament, load rockets, direct the planes to their targets by radar and, of course, to do the actual flying and shooting.

Pittsburgh got off to a slow start when Captain Mead's first mission was scratched after the judges momentarily lost his "blip" on their radar. He refired the mission late in the matches and blasted a Firebee out of the air to put his team in the lead.

Third place overall was awarded to the Pacific Air Force's 4th Fighter Squadron, from Misawa Air Base, Japan, which posted a score of 7,597. All three of the top winners flew F-102's.

In the F-101 category, the ADC's 445th Fighter Squadron from Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Mich., captured first place with a score of 6,872. For F-106's, honors went to the 318th Fighter Squadron of McChord Air Force Base, Wash., with its 7,762 points. Neither score was high enough to put them in the running for overall championship honors.

ACCUSTOMED TO WINNING

Trophy winning is nothing new to the Pittsburgh squadron. Last year, it won the Air Guard's annual Ricks Trophy event and qualified for one of ADC's coveted A Award for superior performance of its air defense duties.

Neither is the Air Guard unaccustomed to outshooting the Air Force at "William Tell." A crackerjack Florida team fired the first perfect score in match history in 1958 to give the Guard its first win. Since then, Air Guard teams twice have taken second place, once in 1959 when an F-100 team from Arizona's 152d Fighter Interceptor Squadron represented the ANG and again in 1961 when the Air Guard entry was furnished by Texas' 182d Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

Pilots for this year's Pittsburgh team, in addition to Majors McCrory and Mead, were Capts. S. C. Lozowski and R. D. MaGill. Heading up the ground crews were Majs. L. A. Duke and R. L. Prave.

Tom Connally Helped Make History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that Texas—nor America for that matter—produces a man like the late Tom Connally.

In his 12 years as a Member of this House and his 24 years in the Senate, he attained a stature seldom equaled in the Halls of Government.

Tom Connally already had achieved greatness when many of us in this Chamber today were youngsters with our noses buried in school books. To me, and to many millions of other Americans, Tom Connally was the living personification of a Senator.

Long before we were old enough to appreciate the wisdom and statesmanship he displayed in shaping our national and international policies, we knew that he looked and acted like a Senator. With his striking appearance and old-world courtliness, he seemed to belong in the Senate. And now, after the passage of many years, I am more than ever convinced that indeed he did.

There have been and will be countless eulogies to Tom Connally, but I especially commend to my colleagues this editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of Tuesday morning, October 29:

TOM CONNALLY HELPED MAKE HISTORY

Former U.S. Senator Tom Connally lived through—and help to make—a lot of history. He was a uniformed participant in two wars—the Spanish-American War and World War I—and a Member of Congress during the two World Wars. During the second world conflict and its aftermath, he occupied the exceedingly important position of chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As such he was a key figure in conduct of the war and as vice chairman of the U.S. delegation at San Francisco in 1945 he helped to set up the United Nations.

Politically, too, he had an active role in fashioning history, in the Democratic National Conventions of the twenties and thirties. But it was not for his political activities nor even his key part in dealing with historic and far-reaching legislation that he principally was known during a 36-year career in Congress that ended early in 1953.

He was best known as one of the most colorful and articulate figures on Capitol Hill. Tall and physically striking, almost the archetype of the traditional Senator in appearance, he had a reputation as a floor debater almost without peer. Few of his colleagues relished crossing tongues with the Texas Senator, and word that he was about to take on an opponent in rough and tumble debate was enough to fill the galleries with an expectant audience.

Certainly no one has arisen since to rival him in this respect, and Capitol Hill never was the same after his departure. It is probable that his drawing power as a floor debater obscured some of his worthwhile work for the American people. It is a safe guess that many of those who now invoke or denounce the Connally amendment—limiting the jurisiction of the World Court to international matters—are little aware of the man who authored it and saw to its adoption.

Perhaps one of the greatest Connally legacies—if it is kept firmly in mind by the American people—was his declaration that "a vigorous and firm foreign policy is necessary to secure respect for our rights abroad and the security of our people at home."

ARA Is Dead for This Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable speculation in recent weeks on the fate of a new appropriation for the Area Redevelopment Administration. As one who has sponsored depressed areas legislation under two Presidents, and who has participated in the controversy over area redevelopment, I think I can judge the temper of this body and of the country on the subject. In my opinion, a new authorization for area redevelopment is dead for this session, and possibly for the next as well. Although the campaign for the new authorization bill has come to a standstill, the campaign to rationalize away its demise has only begun.

The favorite whipping boy for the disgruntled and disappointed bureaucrat is the civil rights issue. A recent article in the October 30 edition of the Wall Street Journal, in discussing the defeat of the area redevelopment authorization in June of this year states that "much of the negative reception probably was prompted by southern resentment at the President's civil rights moves, officials figure." The fact is that the number of southern votes against the bill this past year was approximately the same as when the program was offered in 1961, a year when civil rights played no possible part in the decision. This year's bill actually lost because more than half of the Republicans previously supporting the program were disgusted and disappointed with the manner in which it had been run, and its lack of accomplishment.

Another article appearing earlier in the Wall Street Journal attributed the loss of support for the modified Senate-passed version to "an antidiscrimination edict recently issued by the ARA" which "astounded" administration strategists

who "concede the bill now faces an uphill battle at best." What this new edict is supposed to be is not identified. I regularly get all releases from the ARA and I cannot find anything to this effect since our committee held hearings the end of July. At that time officials of the ARA fought tooth and nail to keep out of the bill an antidiscrimination amendment offered by my Republican colleague, ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio. It is true that in June the Area Redevelopment Administration issued orders putting into effect a Presidential order against discrimination in hiring practices on Government-supported projects. This did not keep any of the southern members of the Banking and Currency Committee from voting for the bill in committee in August.

The real reasons for defeat can be traced to the politically motivated, poorly run administration of the program, and the desire on the part of the country, reflected in Congress to hold down unnecessary spending. When the President appealed for a tax cut over national radio and television network facilities, he pledged "an even tighter reign on Federal expenditures."

No wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary government activity will be tolerated—

He said—

on the grounds that it helps employment.

Members of this House from both sides of the aisle have conceded and deplored the waste and inefficiency of the Area Redevelopment Administration. Under these circumstances, the new authorization request is as unnecessary as any could be. Yet the ARA's only justification is the dubious claim that it allegedly helps employment. Every criteria of the President is applicable. I would suggest that the Members of this House are quite prepared to help the President redeem his pledge.

The plea is now being made that if the new authorization is not voted early next year, the area redevelopment program will go under. Even now it is being described in the press as being "hobbled" by adverse criticism and lack of funds. I think it is obvious that if anything has hobbled aid to depressed areas it is the administration of the program itself. Criticism has been mounted only because of mistakes and the failure on the part of the bureaucrats to admit and correct these errors in judgment. Aid to the truly depressed areas has been hobbled also by the fact that the Area Redevelopment Administration has spent 60 percent of its money on projects in the underdeveloped areas, not those needing the help the most. Officials now admit that funds for the urban areas of high chronic employment will still be available 6 months after rural help is exhausted, though both theoretically have had the same amount of money to use.

According to the Wall Street Journal article of October 30, a great deal of soul searching is going on now among ARA officials on the question of aid to motels and hotels. If these same officials had followed the advice of both committees in Congress having jurisdiction over the program, this soul searching would have been done long ago. The assistant ARA Administrator, Harold W. Williams, is also quoted as saying that "We may want to take a very hard look at any more loans in a field where the capacity we added has pushed pretty close to giving the industry more than it can use." Critics of the program's conduct have been warning of projects that merely shift employment for months, yet it has never been admitted until now. I would be happier with this new awareness on the part of the Area Redevelopment Administration officials if it were not for the fact that it is apparently spurred by the possible loss of their own jobs, not the loss of jobs by those they are supposed to be helping.

Even this change of heart will not be sufficient to rescue the program, however. Administration leaders know that if it should be offered again this session it would lose by 20 votes or more. Their hope for this bill and for other spending measures now being held back is tied in with the tax bill. If the tax cut goes through this session, then next year they can say they have redeemed their pledge to hold down expenses in the year of the tax cut. Now, they will argue, we can afford more spending. If the tax bill is held over until the next session, the administration will be forced to make new pledges of economy or run the risk of defeat on taxes. I have the feeling that the American people will be willing to wait for a retroactive tax cut next year, if it means avoiding wasteful programs such as area redevelopment.

I include the Wall Street Journal article of October 30 as part of my remarks:

U.S. PROGRAM TO AID DEPRESSED AREAS RUNS INTO MOUNTING WOES—CRITICS SEE POLITICAL PRESSURES GOVERNING GRANTS—END COULD COME IF FUNDS AREN'T VOTED

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—A drumfire of criticism and the possibility of a death sentence from Congress are hobbling the Government's program of aid to depressed areas.

Critics accuse the Area Redevelopment Administration, which runs the show, of responding more to political pressure than to economic need. So far Congress has rejected its bid for further funds to stay in business and present prespects for approval seem dim.

Now the ARA is completely out of cash for one sort of assistance: grants to help communities build roads, sewers and other public facilities considered vital to luring new industry. The agency is rapidly running through remaining money for other purposes. The $45 million still available for loans to industry for expansion in rural areas and small towns may be exhausted around the end of January, bringing at least a temporary halt to ARA's most intensively used program. At the present rate of outgo, the $57 million still left for similar loans to business in urban areas will be used up about next June 30.

ARA officials are engaged, meantime, in much soul searching about their oft-challenged aid to recreational projects such as ski areas. And they're being more careful to avoid business expansion loans likely to draw protests from competing businessmen.

A HARD LOOK

"We may want to take a very hard look at any more loans in a field where the capacity we added has pushed pretty close" to giving the industry more than it can use, says Harold W. Williams, Deputy ARA Administrator. Fields where chances for new loans have considerably dimmed include steel, plywood, apparel and paper production, frozen potato processing and hotel building, he reports.

For fear of overcapacity, in fact, the ARA already has turned down loan applications to aid a coal mine in Kentucky, a papermill in Texas, motels and hotels in upstate New York, a wood processing plant in West Virginia and a cement factory in South Carolina.

This greater selectivity is not significantly raising the rejection rate of loan applications reaching Washington; it remains at about 50 percent. But ARA's fieldmen in each State are at least more aware of what's likely to be approved now than before as they gain experience and training, officials say, so sounder applications are reaching headquarters.

Officials don't even hope to escape all the overcapacity criticism this way, though. "On almost any project we get, the applicant will scream if we don't approve it and his competitors will scream if we do," one says. Frequently the excess capacity argument isn't valid, they counter, because the proposed spending is more for modernization than expansion, the excess is expected to be wiped out soon by rapidly growing demand, or is true for an industry nationally but not in a particular area.

CONCRETE RESULTS NOTED

Despite their troubles, ARA men aren't as pessimistic about their future as might be expected; only a few staffers have left to seek more secure jobs. Officials hope for a congressional reprieve next year. When the House turned down further area funds last June it was by only a five-vote margin, and much of the negative reception probably was prompted by southern resentment at the President's civil rights moves, officials figure. Because of the "lead time" needed to design and build factories backed by ARA loans, they didn't have many concrete results to point to them. "But now we're getting to the payoff," says Administrator William L. Batt, Jr. "We're breaking ground for plants and people are going to work."

While liberal Democrats as well as conservative Republicans have censured ARA, its most outspoken critic is Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He views its aid as naked vote buying. With "brazen, cynical gall," he said in a recent speech, this "political arm of the New Frontier already has gone through $191 million to subsidize an incredible variety of local boondoggles." Of the total, he complained, $57 million has been "squandered on what can only be called fun and frolic; happiness projects like golf courses, bowling alleys, ski resorts, fishing camps, marine playgrounds, resort hotels and motels."

ARA officials find this needling about recreational loans particularly vexing. Some of them contend such projects are the brightest long-run economic hopes for depressed areas where mineral resources may be depleted. The increasing time Americans have for travel, their rising incomes and growing interest in historical attractions all support this position, they say.

"A ski lift at a summer resort may look like a boondoggle, but it can mean the difference between summer work only or year-round jobs for all the resort's employees," one official adds. The opposition isn't entirely logical on another point, ARA men maintain. "Somehow, it's respectable to make a loan to build a bathing suit factory but not to build a swimming pool," one grouses.

But ARA officials feel constrained from firing back publicly. After their plea for $456 million was turned down by the House last June, the compromise bill substituted for it not only knocked $100 million off the

request but built in a ban on further loans to hotels, motels, and nursing homes; that could block many recreational projects. There's no early action in sight even on this measure.

While they can, ARA officials are still approving some loans for recreational ventures. One recently approved loan of $1,232,000 is to help turn a worn-down lead, zinc, and silver mine near Salt Lake City into a 10,000-acre tourist attraction rich in Old West atmosphere. Plans for a lodge, ski lift, golf, riding, and other facilities will save the jobs of 187 miners and create 144 new ones, ARA men predict. Along with the 25-year, 4-percent ARA loan, the Anaconda Co., American Smelting & Refining Co., United Park City Mines Co., and a local group are putting in $664,090, ARA says.

Whatever restraints ARA may face on types of projects, its dwindling funds is a more severe limitation. ARA can't approve any more grants to communities for public facilities such as bridges and water mains because $40 million of its original $75 million authority for this purpose has already been committed, and the other $35 million lapsed due to a slow start. While ARA still has $58 million of its original $100 million left for loans for these facilities, staff men say much of it is useless because they can't give a hard-pressed community an outright grant it would need first.

ARA has no dearth of applications for loans to industry for locating or expanding in rural areas and small towns; they total about $143 million, but it has only $45 million of unobligated funds left for this purpose. "I expect this pocket will be exhausted around the end of January," one official estimates. If the agency keeps doling out loans to businesses for projects in urban areas at the present pace, the remaining $57 million of this original $100 million authority will last until about mid-1964; applications already on hand total $70 million.

Medicare Hearings Announcement Applauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional campaign last fall, the good people of the 26th District in California repeatedly queried me on the provisions of the President's proposal for hospital insurance for senior citizens, and expressed the need for immediate legislation in this area. During those brief weeks at home and from the great volume of mail received on this subject since the beginning of this year, it is obvious that medicare is still of primary importance to my constituents, and I was, therefore, extremely pleased to hear the recent announcement of the Committee on Ways and Means that hearings are scheduled on the matter beginning November 18.

Because of its preoccupation with other measures of import, particularly the tax bill, the Committee on Ways and Means found it necessary to defer action on medicare. It is hoped the Congress will not now become so involved with other issues that this vital legislation will once more be overlooked. I applaud the committee for its announcement, and urge it to act expeditiously.

Writer Traces Soviet Advances in 5 Short Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following column by Dr. Robert Morris, "All in 5 Years." No American will read this column without grave fear for the future of our country under the policies being pursued by the Kennedy administration. While President Kennedy extols the strides he has made toward peace, the truth is that we are losing the cold war and Soviet aggression is on the march.

The column follows:

ALL IN 5 YEARS

Recently, I was invited to address the 7th anniversary observance of the thrilling 1956 uprising against Soviet bondage. Five years had passed since I had been the speaker for this annual occasion. In my opening remarks, I sketched the historical developments of the intervening years. What I found myself reviewing was most distressing.

Five years ago the frontier of the world struggle was deep in Eastern Europe, with Soviet forces there almost tottering. Africa was Western-oriented from the Mediterranean to the Cape of Good Hope. The Caribbean was a Western preserve. In South America the Communists did not have even a toehold. Khrushchev, for all his aggressions, was ringed by defensive bases in Turkey and in many other Allied countries. Laos was a Western outpost. Our Navy was without peer.

Five years is a short time in history; yet, look at what the intervening years have wrought. Cuba, lying to the west of every country in South America, is a bristling Soviet bastion. A grim Communist expeditionary force, with missiles, Migs, and tanks, is bivouacked there. Soviet submarines and "fishing" trawlers prowl the Caribbean, exporting agents and saboteurs to every country in South America. The Soviets have a base now in British Guiana, while Brazil which dominates the continent, is in hands distinctly pro-Communist.

In fact, the datelines of the world conflict are now the Florida Straits and Key West, adding a psychological advantage to the Communist gains.

Around the world, the march down the southeast Asia sector continues unchecked. The West is evacuating Africa and a whole cast of front runners for Khrushchev—the Ben Bellas and the Nkrumas—are filling the vacuum.

But, as this Soviet "locomotive of history" moves on, resistance here at home is abating. Our neglect of sea power is only one reflection of this inexplicable trend.

Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., recently made an important speech that dramatically reveals how we are gradually losing control of the seas to the Soviet enemy.

There are four strategic bottlenecks of world sea power: the Panama Canal, the Malacca Straits and Singapore, the Straits of Gibraltar, and the Suez Canal-Red Sea complex. Five years ago these were predominantly Western controlled.

Now, Soviet Cuba and Communist British Guiana strategically threaten the Panama Canal. Khrushchev's ally, Sukarno, with a navy led by a Soviet cruiser and 25 Soviet submarines, menaces the Malacca Straits. Ben Bella and Soviet technicians are now moving on Gibraltar. Nasser, the Egyptian dictator, firmly allied with Soviet power, holds Suez at the northern outlet of the Middle East bottleneck while he and the Soviets control Yemen at the neck of the Red Sea, where Khrushchev is building a giant airfield.

Instead of reacting as our Navy men insist, we are actually reducing our seapower. Admiral McCain points out that, whereas we had several thousand merchant ships at the end of World War II, we now have only 900 with but 58 building. The Soviets, starting with virtually none at the war's end, now have 1,100, with 225 building. While our Navy is declining at the rate of 4 percent annually, they will double their merchant fleet by 1970.

This decline is taking place in all phases of our seapower and is but a reflection of the retreat of the United States that appears to be underway on all fronts. Yet, ironically, expressions of indignation are reserved, not for those people responsible for our decline, but rather for the troubled few who raise their voices to oppose the trend.

Rhodes Gets Ohio State Employment Service Falsifying Clues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, continuing its expose of the Cleveland office of Ohio's Employment Service, the Plain Dealer reveals how Gov. James Rhodes received the first anonymous tips, apparently from employees of the office who had been asked to falsify records to show more job placements than had actually been made.

In addition to this article, I wish to include an article reporting the reactions of Willard P. Dudley, the new director of the Ohio Employment Service, who moved swiftly to follow up the hints of corruption, and the text of one of the anonymous letters:

RHODES GETS OHIO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FALSIFYING CLUES

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—The inside story of how records were falsified in the Cleveland area office of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES) began unfolding in the statehouse mail.

Two anonymous letters dated May 11 and May 31 arrived at the office of Gov. James A. Rhodes. They were signed "Employees of Ohio State Employment Service."

The letters named some names, told the Governor what to look for and where to look.

Rhodes forwarded the letters to Willard P. Dudley, administrator of the bureau of unemployment compensation (BUC), which includes OSES. This cabinet official sent investigators to Cleveland and later went there himself in a search for the truth.

He decided to ignore the fact that prior State and Federal inspections had uncovered

nothing and had quieted some earlier suspicions. For the most part these had been routine checks to see whether statistics were in balance.

Dudley went further, communicating on a wide front with job applicants and employers to see whether persons recorded as hired had actually been given jobs. He discovered that many of the purported job placements were phony.

The informants were pleased. Although no one knew who they were, obviously they were in a position to watch what was going on. Convinced that the Governor meant business, they sent him a third letter and more clues on June 12.

The first letter to Rhodes said: "In your commendable effort to cut down on wastage in State spending, you might investigate the Cleveland offices of the Employment Service.

"On the surface we are doing a bangup job. The truth of the matter is the State could get along very nicely with one-third of the personnel they now have in the Employment Service.

"The staffing of our office depends largely on the number of placements made. The more hires made, the larger staff we have earned." (Editor's Note: This is not true, but many OSES employees had been led to believe that it was true.)

The letter then enumerated methods used in falsifying job placement records:

DOUBLE POSTAL CARDS

These are sent routinely to job applicants. One-half of the card inquires whether the applicant has succeeded in finding work since he registered at OSES.

The second half is a reply card. The applicant indicates on it whether he is working and, if so, where.

As the replies came in, OSES interviewers took credit for a job placement, even in those instances where the applicant found work without help from OSES.

DOCTORING OF RECORDS

Notations such as "N.H." (for not hired) were erased and changed to "Hired." The informants observed: "Not only is this a false count, but the applicant is considered hired and is not considered for any job that might come in."

FABRICATION OF RECORDS

When it was learned that an applicant had found a job through his own efforts, a phony "job order" was prepared in which the employer was represented as having asked OSES to send applicants to him.

The informants told of other methods, but investigators were able to verify only the three practices mentioned above.

They explained, too, that OSES staff members were being careful not to tamper with records of persons drawing unemployment compensation. This would have interfered with payment of benefits, and recipients would quickly complain.

False reporting was restricted to cases of job applicants who had either exhausted their unemployment benefits or else were not eligible for such payments.

The informants gave Dudley a number of other suggestions. For instance, they said a five-man staff at the Casual Labor Office, 1433 E. 12th Street, was too large for the amount of work accomplished. This staff has since been reduced to two persons.

COPY OF NOTE SENT TO WIRTZ

A copy of the first letter to Rhodes was sent by the authors to W. Willard Wirtz, U.S. Secretary of Labor. Wirtz forwarded it to John L. Craig, regional administrator in Cleveland of the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security (BES).

Craig wrote to Dudley on June 3: "While ordinarily we do not give much consideration to anonymous letters, the specifics in this letter may indicate an investigation would be in order."

Craig said his staff was available for assistance, but Dudley had already started out on his own. The Federal Government is interested because it contributes all the funds for the OSES operation, although the State administers the program.

The Labor Department is worried about inaccurate reporting of job placements around the country. It even suspects fraud in some places.

This is shown by a departmental letter dated May 1, that was circularized to Dudley and his counterparts in other States. The letter said validation of job placements would henceforth be required.

It asserted: "Knowledge of the volume of activities performed in State employment offices is essential for planning, supervising, and evaluating program operations; for budgeting staff and equipment; for reporting to Congress; and economic analysis."

The letter then told how careless reporting could present a false picture to Government planners, and it warned that reporting might contain "even deliberate misrepresentation to show a more favorable picture than is actually warranted."

It called attention to a Federal law which punishes falsification of records by a 5-year prison term or a $10,000 fine or both.

This letter did not precipitate Dudley's investigation, because Ohio was one State that already had in operation a routine program that ostensibly and at intervals "validated" job placements reports.

It took the anonymous letter to show how inadequate this program was.

DUDLEY TELLS OF MOVE ON FALSIFYING

COLUMBUS.—Willard P. Dudley was asked why he took it so seriously and moved so assertively when he heard that some of his subordinates in Cleveland might be falsifying job placement records.

"Business is business, and you have to have it in government," he replied. "How are you going to know where you stand unless you can trust the reports you get?"

Dudley, 53, of Springfield, is State administrator of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, parent agency of the Ohio State Employment Service. Gov. James A. Rhodes appointed him to the post March 4.

Dudley made it known immediately that he was going to insist on a day's work for a day's pay. He began a review of his payroll, which approached $3.5 million annually, to see whether all the jobs it covered—roughly 2,900—could be justified.

Then he proceeded with a series of layoffs, brushing aside criticism that he was weakening the employment service. For instance, he abolished the position of district manager, closing 6 district offices around the State that had employed 56 persons.

Dudley had conferred with the district managers here on March 27 to apprise them of his intentions. Ward A. Riley was then district manager for Cuyahoga, Lake, and Geauga Counties.

It was against the background of this and other reorganizational moves that false reporting of work achievements by some OSES staff members in Cleveland picked up momentum.

Dudley observes: "It doesn't matter to me that the Federal Government pays for OSES operations, that I'm saving money for Washington rather than for Governor Rhodes' austerity program. After all, I'm a Federal taxpayer too."

Dudley was asked why he was so sparing in disciplinary action—why he imposed only demotion upon two executives and did not proceed against their subordinates.

"The truth is," he said, "that my bark is worse than my bite. I know I can be criticized for this, but I'm not a policeman by profession, and all I'm interested in really is running an efficient and honest operation.

"I don't have to punish these people. I've shaken things up and reassigned most of them. They know they're being watched from now on, and I'm sure this will never happen again.

"Now, if I were to punish them I'd run into complications and red tape. The higher-ups would appeal to the Civil Service Commission, and I'd get tied up there. I'd probably lose, too, on an appeal if my evidence weren't solid. That has happened.

"As to lower echelons, it wouldn't be fair to punish them, even if I had a good case against them, unless I could make it stick with the higher-ups."

Dudley laid off 19 persons in Cleveland after he finished his investigation. Most of them were not involved in the frauds. He said he selected those persons for layoffs because they were not needed and because they lacked the experience of those he had spared.

There has been grumbling about this in the Cleveland office, with the administrator being accused of unfairness.

Dudley was vice president and general manager of the Ohio Steel Foundry Co. until September 1, 1962. He joined the company 32 years before that as an accountant.

Dudley still lives in Springfield with his wife, Lillian. They have two grown sons and four grandchildren.

He has been active in Lima and Springfield in chamber of commerce, Boy Scout, and YMCA affairs.

Hon. JAMES A. RHODES,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: We as a group of OSES employees who agree with your economy measures wish to furnish you with more evidence in support of the letter we forwarded to you on May 11 regarding false figures on job placements and waste of personnel.

Again we call your attention to the fact that other things are taken into consideration in determining our staff needs such as employer contacts, referrals, new registrations, promotional telephone calls, etc., but the main function is placements made. If we don't make the placements we don't earn our staff. If a legitimate count was made on our placements the personnel in the Cleveland area OSES offices would be cut in half resulting in a terrific savings in funds.

The first part of this month we were told by our supervisors that if we did not increase our placements by May 25 (the end of the month report) more personnel would be laid off June 1. Here is what was done in the sales office which was very low in placements for the month. Open orders were checked to see if any referrals had been made. If there were referrals, but were not hired by the employer, the symbols DNR (did not report) or NH (not hired) were erased and one of those referred was marked a hire. The order was then marked "Filled and Closed by OSES" and another new order for the same employer was immediately rewritten. This would give the impression that the employer hired an applicant we sent to him and again placed another order for a job opening. This is strictly false; the real picture is that this order from the employer had been lying around on someone's desk, unfilled, for quite a while and would still be unfilled if the hire were not falsified. Not only is this a false count, but the applicant is considered hired and is not considered for any job that might come in.

Trial by Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of the Washington Evening Star contains an editorial which I think is

most significant. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of the Star's editorial:

TRIAL BY JURY

The American people might well have been shocked by the position which the Department of Justice took in the criminal attempt case against Mississippi's Governor Barnett. Evidently they were not shocked. But this at best is a tribute to the inuring effect of an age in which shock is relentlessly piled on top of shock.

The essential question is whether the Governor is entitled to a jury trial for violating a Federal court order opening the University of Mississippi to James Meredith, or whether he can be summarily tried by the judges. In a summary trial there is no indictment and no jury.

Solicitor General Cox, representing the Government in the Supreme Court earlier this month, argued against a jury trial. The thrust of his argument was that juries, at least Southern juries, cannot be trusted in racial cases, and that therefore they should be dispensed with. Contempt trials without juries, he contended, "are indispensable to upholding the rule of law" and to the safeguarding of minority rights.

This is a fallacious argument. Criminal contempt prosecutions are not designed to obtain compliance with a valid court order. That can be done in a civil contempt proceeding by putting a man in jail and keeping him there until he obeys the order. No one disputes this. The significant point is that he can obtain his freedom simply by obeying the order.

Criminal contempt is a different kettle of fish. Its purpose is to punish a man for past disobedience, much as he might be punished for committing any other crime. The difference is that in the latter situation no one would suggest that he should be denied a jury trial—even though a Mississippi jury in a racial issue might refuse to convict him.

On March 31, 1958, the Supreme Court in a 5 to 4 ruling upheld the summary trial and conviction of two Communists for criminal contempt. Justice Black was joined by the Chief Justice and by Justice Douglas in a powerful dissent. (Justice Brennan dissented in a separate opinion.) After pointing out the difference between civil contempt, designed to obtain compliance, and criminal contempt, designed to punish, Justice Black observed:

"Summary trial of criminal contempt, as now practiced, allows a single functionary of the state, a judge, to law down the law, to prosecute those whom he believes have violated his command (as interpreted by him), to sit in "judgment" on his own charges, and then within the broadest kind of bounds to punish as he sees fit. It seems inconsistent with the most rudimentary principles of our system of criminal justice, a system carefully developed throughout the centuries to prevent oppressive enforcement of oppressive laws, to concentrate this much power in the hands of any officer of the state. No official, regardless of his position or the purity and nobleness of his character, should be granted such autocratic omnipotence. Indeed if any other officer were presumptuous enough to claim such power I cannot believe the courts would tolerate it for an instant under the Constitution."

To the argument that courts surely have this summary power because they have always been thought to have it, Justice Black retorted: "There is no valid reason why they [the courts] should be singled out for an extraordinary and essentially arbitrary mode of enforcement. Unfortunately judges and lawyers have told each other the contrary so often that they have come to accept it as the gospel truth."

But back to Governor Barnett. Once again this issue of the right to a jury trial is before the High Court and the public should not be unaware or indifferent.

For our part, we would like to suggest two things. If the Department of Justice is right in its contention that juries are not to be trusted in criminal contempt cases in Mississippi, it follows as a matter of law that they are not to be trusted in any other State. Second, it is wrong to think that minority rights are served by denying jury trials in summary proceedings. The real effect is to threaten, if not to subvert, the rights of all of us.

Kennedy Tax Policies Called Irresponsible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Henry Hazlitt in the November 4 issue of Newsweek, may help to point up to some the fiscal irresponsibility of the tax proposals demanded by President Kennedy:

TAX CUT IN WONDERLAND

(By Henry Hazlitt)

I am going to try to explain Secretary Dillon's position on taxes. His argument may be a little difficult to follow, so I advise you to fasten your seat belts.

Testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in favor of a tax cut of $11.1 billion over a 2-year period, the Treasury Secretary predicted that if this tax cut were made there would be a budget deficit in the present fiscal year, which ends June 30, of $9.2 billion, and in the next fiscal year also of $9.2 billion.

Well, you may think naively, that's a deficit of $18.4 billion over the next 2 years; so if Congress does not pass the $11.1 billion tax cut, that will at least reduce the combined deficit to $7.3 billion—and though it wouldn't exactly be fiscally responsible to plan such deficits, it would be at least something to reduce their size.

But here Dillon will set your arithmetic straight. No; if you don't cut taxes $11 billion, the budget deficits will be bigger. They will probably rise in the next fiscal year (1965) to $10 or $12 billion, and in the 1966 fiscal year to $15 to $20 billion. And if Congress does cut taxes? Then, "with good luck," the Secretary thinks the budget could be balanced in the 1967 fiscal year, and he even sees "no reason why" it should not be balanced in 1968. So the choice in the immediate years ahead is only between huge deficits and enormous deficits, and there is only a vague hope that the budget will someday be balanced again.

WIDE OF THE MARK

Before we examine the theory behind this arithmetic, let's glance at Dillon's record as a budget forecaster. On March 24, 1961, he (through Mr. Kennedy) forecast a deficit of $2.1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; the actual deficit was $6.3 billion. For the fiscal year ended June 30 last, he originally forecast a surplus of $463 million; there was actually a deficit of $6.2 billion. If his estimates, made only about a year in advance, fell so wide of the mark, what value can we attach to estimates for 2, 3, and 4 years ahead?

The theory on which Dillon's estimates rest is that only by continuous budget deficits can prosperity be assured. If we don't cut taxes, his logic runs, there will be a recession, and then we will have to have massive additional Federal expenditures to stimulate the economy.

The belief that budget deficits are necessary for prosperity and that balanced budgets or surpluses bring recession has been thoroughly discredited, again and again, statistically and theoretically. Comparisons of the 64 quarter years till the end of 1962, for example, compiled by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, show that in 51 quarter years with a rising GNP, more than half (28) were associated with a Federal surplus and only 23 with a deficit, while of 13 quarters with declining GNP, nearly all (12) were associated with a deficit (Newsweek, April 22).

IRRESPONSIBLE

What really counts for employment and prosperity is a proper working relationship of wage rates and prices. When wage rates race ahead of prices and threaten to wipe out profit margins, there is unemployment and recession.

So, far from huge and continuous budget deficits being necessary to prosperity, they are a major threat to any sound prosperity. Nothing could do more than the administration's present planning of continuous huge deficits to aggravate the balance-of-payments crisis and undermine world confidence in the dollar.

A tax cut can permanently help business only if it accompanies a balanced budget. The tax-cut bill that passed the House by 271 to 155 is a sham. We have not earned a tax cut. The Kennedy administration has not only opposed any matching cuts in spending, but is constantly proposing new expenditures. As Congressman BRUCE ALGER put it: "The proponents of this measure almost disregard, as though nonexistent, our national debt and deficit financing over the years. We are borrowing money to cut taxes. This is morally and financially wrong."

And, one might add, the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

Vice President Lyndon Johnson's Remarks at the George Marshall Memorial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor and pleasure to attend the George Marshall Memorial dinner last week, and enjoyed particularly the tribute paid to this great soldier and statesman by our Vice President, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. JOHNSON's speech:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, GEORGE MARSHALL MEMORIAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 23, 1963

On this occasion, honoring the great man we do, the temptation is very strong to eulogize and memorialize. For all of us who knew him, whether as soldier or statesman or friend, our memories carry the strongest sense of respect and awe for one of the most exceptional Americans of our history—George Catlett Marshall.

In the context of eulogy, we could review his remarkable career, dwell upon the high

trusts which he held, and pay just tribute to the success of the enterprises he led and the programs he initiated in support of the cause of freedom.

But to speak of George Marshall in the past tense would be an injustice to this occasion—and to these times. Out of the historic years of the middle 20th century, other men may have written their names on the record of history with a more flamboyant hand. But as that record comes into truer perspective, the name and record of George Marshall stands forth in bolder relief as a continuing influence upon our times.

As soldier, he guided the forces of freedom to victory in the first global war. As statesman, he set in motion new forces of freedom to make that first global war also the last such conflict.

Today the harvest is ripening in the fields which were sown by this unselfish and dedicated man, and there are lessons for us to apply—lessons from both the work he pursued and the spirit of character he exemplified.

In pursuit of the victory in World War II, George Marshall offered his countrymen a living lesson of the necessity for confidence, for perseverance, for courage. He helped to teach us an indelible lesson about the necessity for allies and the equally imperative necessity for unity within a free alliance. Likewise, in his direction of our strategies, he taught much that is invaluable about keeping first things first, fixing upon our objectives and pursuing them steadfastly without distraction, division or diversion.

As statesman, George Marshall again imbued our national policies and purposes with these same concepts. While he will never be forgotten as a soldier, history will surely honor him more highly for helping his countrymen to understand that the victories of peace are to be won by those nations which pursue their objectives in a straight line of dedicated purpose—without distractions, divisions or diversion.

Two decades ago, on the very eve of our greatest national danger, George Marshall took command of an army equipped with broomsticks. No general could have had much confidence in that army's readiness. But George Marshall did have confidence in the American people—and in their political systems. On the foundation of that confidence, he persevered without despair, without deriding the system or its leaders, without doubting the people. Through the dark days of "Too Little, Too Late"—days many of us still remember so vividly from the Southwest Pacific—his unwavering confidence inspired in his countrymen the confidence indispensable for a great and successful national effort.

Only a few years later, 16 years ago now, civilian George Marshall as Secretary of State saw the nations which had been liberated at such sacrifice from one aggression lying prostrate before a new aggressor.

Europe's harvest had failed. France was free, but without food. England was safe, but without coal for heat. Italy was liberated, but a Communist coalition was within 10 percent of occupying control of the government. Greece saw guerrillas advancing across the countryside to within 20 miles of Athens. Turkey was resisting Communist claims to vital provinces.

Only 3 years after the end of the war, that great victory seemed destined to be made hollow—the sacrifices to have been in vain.

George Marshall knew how desperately men everywhere wanted peace. At that decisive moment, he instilled into our policy the simple but powerful proposition that those who want peace must be strong enough to keep peace. On that proposition, America has stood ever since—and stands tonight.

In Greece and Turkey, in Western Europe and southeastern Asia, we as a nation have held steadfastly to a straight line purpose of building strength, military, economic, and political. Because we have built it, because other freemen have joined with us in maintaining it, because together we have demonstrated our willingness to use it, we are today realizing exactly the results George Marshall foresaw.

We have negotiated and ratified the test ban treaty because we are strong, not because we are weak. We are encountering and exploring other opportunities for other negotiations and other agreements because our adversaries learned beyond all doubt 1 year ago in Cuba that we not only have the strength to meet aggression but we have the will to use that strength against any who would breach the peace in our hemisphere, or in the world.

George Marshall is gone. The great armies he commanded have been disbanded. The great plan which bore his name has long since ended. But his influence continues to shake the world in which we live tonight.

As his works live on, so the spirit of his character should also live on in our lives today. Few men of our times have made so great or so indelible an imprint of character as did George Marshall. Had he been a selfish or self-centered man, had he been a partisan, had he been less respectful of the institutions of our system or less confident of the capacity of our people, the history we recount tonight might be very different than it is.

Once, when he was asked about his politics, George Marshall replied, "My father was a Democrat, my mother was a Republican—I am an Episcopalian."

Such an answer seems inconsistent in this era when partisanship is so exalted by many as the first duty of citizenship. But a more partisan, more self-seeking man could not have accomplished for freedom and for America what George Marshall accomplished.

The lesson of this example applies to us all. Over the past quarter century, our system and our people have been challenged as never before. We have been challenged to meet new opportunities and new responsibilities by new means and methods, new policies and purposes. We have succeeded in our response because our system, our institutions and our traditions have been free of dogma and have permitted us to exercise the genius of innovation and inventions under a free and flexible system.

Today we have reached a point of new responsibility and new opportunity. We cannot know fully the forces responsible for the evidences of change within the system of communism. We realize the objective of that system for world domination has not changed—and will not change. We do not realistically expect the character of communism to be negotiated away by the representatives of communism who come to the conference table.

But we must and we shall hold steadfastly to the character and objectives of our own society. We shall not reject realistic opportunities that arise to relax tensions and promote honorable peace. We can know and believe that in a world which wants peace, the most telling pressure we can exert upon the Communist system will be a continuing pressure for peace. Peace and freedom are the points of our offensive. The free world has the offensive for peace today—and we shall keep it.

We shall keep it by maintaining both the strength of our arms and the initiative of our diplomacy—meeting new challenges as new opportunities. As citizens, let us fill our roles by exemplifying in our citizenship those qualities of George Marshall—confidence, perseverance, courage, and unselfishness.

Anniversary of Czechoslovak Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 45th anniversary of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic. All over the world free people once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant nation which has been under Communist domination for more than 15 years.

Despite oppression and brutal domination at the hands of the Communist forces, the spirit of the Czechoslovak Republic and the heritage of greatness which the free leaders of that proud nation have left behind still is enshrined in the hearts of their sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad.

Suffering under the twin disasters of 6 years under Nazi totalitarianism, the Czechoslovak people from 1948 have endured the terrible yoke of communism.

Despite the fact that the people of Czechoslovakia have been suppressed by totalitarian powers, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of that country long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my earnest hope that the people of Czechoslovakia will draw encouragement from the warm regard which our country holds for them.

American sympathy with the plight of the Czechoslovakian people has been manifest in our press and in Congress. It is evident today as we recall the 20 years following the founding of the Republic on October 28, 1918. Those years were marked by the enlightened leadership of Presidents T. G. Masaryk and Eduard Benes. The development and progress of that nation established for it an international reputation as a model of democracy in Europe.

It behooves all who enjoy the fruits of a free society to recall the tragedy which the Czechoslovakian people have been forced to endure. In the postwar period from 1945 to 1948, the fate of that country was in the balance until that fateful day in February of 1948 when a Communist coup took over the Government and initiated the 15 years of suffering for the Czechoslovak people.

In those 15 years, the failures of the Communist regime in its attempt to impose a foreign ideology on Czechoslovakia are well known.

In attempting to control the fires of freedom, the Communist regime has tried to eliminate all the humanitarian ideals so cherished by that country's people.

The mute evidence of that failure lies in the barbed wire and mine fields separating the people from the free world.

On the 45th anniversary of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic, I want to extend my best wishes to the people of that brave country and to all Americans of Czechoslovakian ancestry. I join in the prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Aggression Is Always Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartening developments in recent years is the evidence of a growing revolt among young people of this country against burgeoning statism and big government. A particularly thoughtful and lucid statement of the libertarian philosophy underlying this revolt has been written by a Georgetown University student, Mr. Craig Howell, who, incidentally, is the son of a member of my staff.

In this article, Mr. Howell quite correctly equates "aggressive actions by the state against its own citizens" with aggressive actions in international relations.

I commend this article, which was published in the October issue of the Freeman, to the attention of my colleagues.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the full text of the article:

AGGRESSION IS ALWAYS WRONG

(By Craig Howell)

When a peaceful person condemns all aggressive wars by one country against another, he is understood and applauded by the overwhelming majority of the American people. Yet when the same peaceful person condemns all aggressive actions by the state against its own citizens, he is misunderstood and repudiated by almost all of his fellow citizens.

The welfare statist invariably condemns the leaders of any nation who declare war against a small and peaceful neighbor. The same welfare statist always voices approval when his own leaders use force at home to despoil some for the alleged benefit of others.

In reality, the conventional rationalizations of the Socialists would, if consistently applied, also justify most wars of aggression by one country againt another. The libertarian, however, is against the use of aggressive force at home for exactly the same reason he is against it abroad; that is, his fundamental tenet is that no person has a moral right to initiate coercive action against another person. The libertarian is convinced that no person has any moral or legitimate right to advocate or use force except to defend himself against domestic and foreign aggressors who try to deprive him of his life, liberty, and property.

The conventional liberal, however, has no basic philosophy on the use of force. For example, examine the various plans he espouses—social security, unemployment compensation, minimum wages, compulsory unionism, subsidies to farmers, price controls, and a hundred similar schemes. Without exception, all are based on the principle of using force against peaceful persons to make them conform to the wishes of others. The primary justification advanced by the welfare statist is that these schemes are popular; therefore, they must also be morally good. But is such a conclusion warranted? Does the popularity of an action affect its morality?

Now suppose that we applied this criterion to the morality of an aggressive war. Let us say that the people in nation X overwhelmingly desire an attack on country Y—not a rare occurrence in world history. If our liberals would be consistent with themselves, they would have to say that the attack, being popular, would also be right. But, naturally, they would say no such thing; they would vigorously denounce such a war, thus admitting that morality is not to be determined by public opinion polls.

A variation of the foregoing theme is the welfare-statist assertion that if a given proposal has been duly legalized, then its ethical merits are no longer open to question. So, let us assume that the Parliament and President of nation X have legally authorized war on country Y. Does this meet their moral standards; or will the liberals again have to revise their proposition and admit that legality cannot determine morality?

A DOUBLE STANDARD

Reference to the just and unjust causes of war can be particularly valuable when we try to expose the fallacy in what is perhaps the liberals most persuasive contention: that the programs of the welfare state aim to help those who are really in need of great help. They usually do not deny that the social gains they are seeking are attainable only if the money of some is forcibly seized and granted to others. They do deny that any impropriety is involved in the process; on the contrary, they proudly announce, the welfare state merely enforces the undoubted axiom that one man's need has precedence over another man's luxury. "How noble and upstanding," exclaim many. But the danger of this principle becomes quite clear if it is utilized to judge the rightness or wrongness of an aggressive war. A single, concrete example from recent history can illustrate.

In the 1930's Japan was certainly in an unenviable spot. There was not nearly enough room or land to support its booming population. It lacked many crucial raw materials. Both industry and agriculture were comparatively backward. Able technicians and skilled workmen were still scarce. If ever a country was in desperate economic need, Japan was. Yet, very few people have gone so far as to maintain that its need fully and morally justified its chosen solution to its problems—aggressive military imperialism. And if Japan's wants gave it no right to the land or property of other nations, then whose wants would? The inevitable answer is: Nobody's. This holds true not only for underprivileged countries but also for underprivileged persons. If we really want to help them, as we should, we can contribute to various local, national, and international charities. The essential point remains, however; no one has a right to something he has not earned.

WARLIKE MEASURES AT HOME

At this juncture, let us consider exactly when liberal lovers of peace would approve of a declaration of war. We see that their standard of a just war is virtually identical to the libertarian standard of the just use of any kind of force. Only defensive wars and defensive force meet with the approbation of true workers for liberty and peace in the world. Our basic rights come from God himself. So long as we do not use our rights to violate the equal rights of our neighbors, we may exercise our free will as we see fit.

Liberals suffer a myopia, an inability to see that agressive force is used to build the welfare state. True, there is considerably less outright violence in tax collections for interventionism than in full-scale war. Big Government relies much more on the threat of force, rather than on its actual employment, to promote the payment of taxes. But anyone could easily witness the transformation of potential energy into kinetic energy—the threat into the reality—by trying to spend for himself the portion of his taxes which would go for, say, farm subsidies. Not surprisingly, few citizens have made this interesting experiment.

Returning to our basic comparison, we can now say this: the notion that coercive action is a legitimate means to attain some desired goal underlies both the welfare state and the war of agression. The fact that force is merely threatened to attain that goal does not make it any better. A country that makes unfair demands for money or land from another country is not to be commended if it obtains what it wants by threats instead of by brute strength. Intimidation may be more veiled than outright aggression; ethically, however, there is no substantial difference between the two. Most Americans do not hesitate to condemn both methods, at least as instruments of foreign policy.

Then why do we not all condemn them as instruments of domestic policy, too? There is no reason why our attitude toward aggression abroad should differ from our attitude toward coercion in our own homeland. The same principles make us realize that compromise with either practice is a moral impossibility, because of their intrinsic evil. If all upstanding citizens regard themselves as perfectly justified when they stoutly refuse to excuse any and all wars of aggression, then no one may logically assail as "wild-eyed extremists" those lovers of liberty who do not approve of any act of coercion to support the welfare state. If all righteous people accept the worth of the Ten Commandments, then no one may logically denounce as "radical rightists" those who do not tolerate wholesale violation of the one that reads, "Thou shalt not steal." There is no escaping the fact that aggression is always wrong, at home as well as abroad.

Civil Rights Legislation Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues the following correspondence from the chairman of the Los Angeles California Democratic Council enclosing a resolution in support of civil rights legislation:

CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL,
Los Angeles, October 21, 1963.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Enclosed herewith is a resolution adopted by the clubs and councils affiliated with the California Democratic Council in Los Angeles County.

We are aware of your continuing and vigorous support of civil rights legislation and thought that this resolution might be welcome as evidence of support for your position.

Please be assured of our willingness to assist you in any way possible in your efforts to have this legislation passed into law.

Very truly yours,

ROSS S. CLARK,
Field Representative for Tosby Osos, Chairman, Los Angeles CDC.

Whereas the U.S. Congress is now considering the President's civil rights legislative proposals; and

Whereas this legislation embodies the pledges upon which this Nation was founded—pledges that all are created equal, that all citizens have certain inalienable rights and are entitled to equal opportunity in the pursuit of their daily lives; and

Whereas nothing is more contrary to the spirit of the Constitution than to deny the rights of any citizen: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles CDC urges the California congressional delegation to fully support all provisions of the President's civil rights proposals as specified in H.R. 7152 and S. 1731, and we further urge support of H.R. 405, Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act as an addition to the civil rights proposals.

Adopted by Los Angeles California Democratic Council September 21, 1963.

Conventions, Expositions, Conferences, Meetings, Events Succeed in the New Pittsburgh Arena

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Public Auditorium Authority of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County has made available a most attractive brochure depicting the facilities which our beautiful new civic arena and exhibit hall has to offer conventions and trade expositions.

Renaissance Pittsburgh is rightly proud of this addition to the city's cultural, business, and political traditions and I recommend to my colleagues the reading of this brochure, excerpts from which follow:

Nowhere in America is there a more versatile setting for a successful convention, exposition, meeting, or conference than Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle.

Pittsburgh's location at the center of the northeast quadrant of the Nation is an initial advantage. Events in Pittsburgh can draw upon more than 70 percent of the Nation's population, 70 percent of its manufacturing industries, and 8 of the 10 largest cities in the United States and Canada—all within 600 miles.

Within a 50-mile radius of the arena is a purchasing area of more than 3½ million, rated the fifth largest industrial marketing area in the United States.

Pittsburgh's industrial leadership is worldwide. Its preeminence in science grows from a broad base of 116 research centers and foremost medical facilities, and universities.

Area residents include many leaders in the educational, technical, and professional fields.

Pittsburgh is easy to reach and comfortable when you arrive. Whether you come by airplane, train, bus, or auto, completely modern facilities await the visitor.

City hotels offer over 3,000 rooms, and more are building.

Pleasant shopping, excellent dining accommodations, top-notch film, sports and stage fare—all the facilities which assure visitor comfort and enjoyment are within easy access from one of the world's most versatile buildings.

This is Pittsburgh today— a compact, complete and convenient city, cordially inviting your convention.

Pittsburgh, whose dramatic postwar redevelopment program has earned for it the title of Renaissance City of America, now makes it possible to bring your convention, exposition, meeting or conference to this center of industry and learning.

Jutting out like a jewel at the edge of the central business district, the civic arena and exhibit hall is a symbol of the daring, forward-looking spirit of a community that is anxious to be host to you. Built at a total cost of $22 million, the multipurpose structure provides comfortable space for meetings of all types—large and small—as well as being the center of sports, cultural, recreational and civic events in the Greater Pittsburgh metropolitan area.

A unique feature is the vast 148-foot-high stainless steel retractable roof—largest in the world—which can be opened or closed in 2½ minutes.

Beneath the dome are the 13,000-seat arena, suitable for any indoor meeting or attraction; the 50,000 square foot exhibit hall, which can be expanded to 90,000 square feet by incorporating the arena and stage; five meeting rooms accommodating from 230 to 910 persons, and every convenience and facility which a new building can offer.

Within walking distance is the famous Golden Triangle—containing some of the most spectacular new construction projects in the world.

From the tip of the city at historically rich Point State Park to the unique civic arena, Pittsburgh's new look is a plus on the agenda of any convention or exposition group.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Dr. Shane MacCarthy Receives Significant Honor From Cosmopolitan Club of Washington, D.C., for Outstanding Service to the Community—Recipient's Address of Response Is Recommended Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 1, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Capital City of the United States is the center of governmental activity in our Nation, and is therefore a focal point of attention for observers throughout the world. Events, both large and small, occurring here are closely monitored by millions.

In a real sense, Washington, D.C. is a showcase in which are displayed the wares of democracy. Other peoples often judge America by the example set in this city; they will be disheartened if life in this metropolis does not embody the justice and opportunity propounded by our governmental system.

Recently, news media have devoted considerable attention to reports and discussions of crime, violence, and racial strife in the Washington area. We cannot deny the existence of serious shortcomings; however, it is also appropriate that we recognize those public-spirited citizens who are seeking answers to perplexing problems.

Among the dedicated individuals who are contributing to this task is Dr. Shane MacCarthy, director of community programs of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. Dr. MacCarthy, a resident of the District for nearly 40 years, was Executive Director of the President's Council on Physical Fitness from 1956 to 1961, and has held a number of other high-level positions in Government. He is a man of purpose and perseverence, and is one whose counesl and friendship I have long cherished.

Indicative of the esteem in which Dr. MacCarthy is held by responsible officials is the fact that he was selected to head the voluntary citizens' committee to investigate the unfortunate rioting which followed a high school football game on Thanksgiving Day, 1962. His initiative, thoroughness, and genuine concern were clearly revealed in the detailed factual report.

For this unusual service to the community, Dr. Shane MacCarthy was selected as the 1963 recipient of the Cosmopolitan Club's Distinguished Service Medal, presented at ceremonies October 22, 1963.

In his message of response Dr. MacCarthy commented meaningfully on the challenge which faces this city in areas of education, housing, crime prevention, and civil rights. He stated that:

The mistaken notion abounds that business and professional groups are concerned only with the area of "private interests," leaving the prevalent impression that only government cares for the "public interest."

He continued:

This false icon must be shattered, and here in our National Capital private business has both the obligation and opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I concur in Dr. MacCarthy's view that business, government, and citizens' groups must share in the task of building a more progressive and promising Washington, D.C. He is to be commended for his conscience and determination in seeking a Nation's Capital which is truely representative of the American way of life.

I request that Dr. Shane MacCarthy's address in accepting the Distinguished Service Medal be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS CITIZENSHIP IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks of Dr. Shane MacCarthy, on his acceptance of the Distinguished Service Medal Award of the Cosmopolitan Club, Oct. 22, 1963)

There are times when silence is more eloquent than words. This is such an occasion. When gratitude is given to Cosmopolitan in the name of all who worked with me on various civic projects and heartfelt thanks expressed for the honor conferred this day on my family and me, no more need be said. However, such a response would run the risk of generating misinterpretation as to some of my feelings at this moment about our Capital and its future.

I've been in Washington well nigh 40 years. To this home of mine I came in my early teens to later marry a girl who is a second generation Washingtonian and we are blessed with five native Washingtonian sons. Thus, my roots here are very deep. My hopes for the morrow are optimistic because my faith in people is solid. However, "hopes" are fragile if they remain mere words and "faith" that puts reliance on others to do good works is a deluding attribute. In Washington at this moment are many who share these hopes and this faith. But, multiplying such concepts achieves no tangible benefits for our Capital unless we as private citizens set aside the idle habit of talk and involve ourselves with all the resources at our command in a master action plan for Washington.

The focus of the world is now on Washington. This might seem like an enviable position for any one community. And to a degree it is—if those of us who live here realize our personal obligations and our opportunities. The emphasis of attention at this time however, has questionable merit. Being the site of the Government of the most important country in the world makes "Washington" a name known to every hamlet in every clime. Simultaneously, our city of renown and beauty has been attracting attention as a center of crime and irresponsibility. And we must ever remember that the honor of being a national capital does not shield and overcome the bad image emanating from this same spot. In fact, the facilities of communication are only too prone to carry the news of wrongdoing, which then becomes associated with all our customs, practices, and policies as if the be-all and end-all of our city on the Potomac is badness in every guise.

Washington, D.C., is at a perilous juncture today. While it is the center of National Government, it appears unable to govern itself. This does not mean that the Federal Government should take direct administration of affairs. Neither is the comment to be interpreted as a criticism of the commission system or a plea for what is called home rule. When I observe that Washington "appears unable to govern itself," I'm referring to my disappointment that the people who live in the metropolitan area of our National Capital are too often mute when they should speak and too often indifferent when they should be involved in responsible action.

Our great Capital City has its social, economic, educational, culture and political problems. It's a shocking set of circumstances which makes a parent fear for the safety of children who may be molested by irresponsible scoundrels. Business is a direct loser when a husband will not allow his wife and daughters to shop after sundown. The continual influx of people—frequently children alone—into Washington is compounding its housing, health, educational and many other problems.

While these conditions do not justify calling Washington—all Washington—a city of slums, or a crime-ridden Capital, the composite environment offers a salutary warning that a continuity of what is bad will bring what will be worse and harder to cope with in the days ahead. When there are everwidening cracks in the moral cement of a society's foundation, the structure can topple into a confused jumble of debris.

The ostrich approach of sweeping problems under rugs is sidestepping our conscientious responsibilities. Can we afford mediocrity in our living, health and education standards in the District of Columbia? Yes we can, to our own detriment and ultimate disaster. Thus, when we soft pedal the facts lest knowledge of them would create embarrassment, we are allowing the image to control our decision. We are choosing our words and molding our thoughts merely to please the recipient. This is the substitution of shadow for substance and such a process will solve nothing. At this moment in Washington too much of this brand of cowardly conduct is the custom. Asking for more money, more facilities, more police, more judges, more doctors, more jobs, more recreational aotivities, more of everything is giving quantity priority over quality. This is the easy answer of expediency. With expanding population more public facilities of all kinds are, indeed, necessary but the "quantity" answer of more police does not, for example, solve juvenile delinquency. It merely means there will be more patrolmen on the beat to keep up with the delinquent Joneses.

And, what is achieved by the availability of "jobs" if openings in the manual arts and service trades are rejected by those who know not the dignity of honest labor, or worse, the applicants have no vocational training to fill the needs? Additional medically proficient men and women might well explain the dangers of sex promiscuity but the inculcation of moral character demands more time, attention, and prayer. If the community conscience is so numbed that punishment for crimes deliberately committed is to be too often replaced by excuse, then adding more judges is of little avail.

Thus, the time has come for more thorough, courageous, dynamic, and effective solutions to the difficulties besetting the Nation's Capital.

Look at our public educational system in Washington. Today, it is far from being the model for the Nation.

Recently, I recommended to the Congress that Superintendent Hansen be given the authority and the money to have a survey conducted by an outside, impartial, objective, professional organization of which there are many in the United States, to examine and assess in depth the current educational practices and needs in our Washington public schools and to report publicly on its findings.

Administering 170 public schools is a big and complicated business. The recommendation to the Congress was in keeping with the proven precedent of all business establishments which periodically invite outside administrative management agencies to analyze their policies and procedures with a view toward eliminating what is weak and unprofitable, improving what is already good, and installing what is required for best results. Such a survey should be done in depth to bring forth the facts—from a citywide battery of IQ, aptitude, and achievement tests on the actual status of every boy and every girl in our public school system. It is only when the human product is known that the educational method most appropriate for its fullest growth and development can be designed. This recommendation will remain on dead center unless the voice of the people is articulate in its demand.

Into an already overburdened and overcrowded school system is now dumped the complex "dropout" problem—with demoralizing results. Holding these unfortunate boys and girls in the classrooms is achieving only one end—keeping them off the streets. Such individuals are, indeed, a menace on the streets, with nothing to do and boredom ever beckoning badness. But it is most unfair to the teacher, to the class, and to the dropout himself, who in practically all cases needs special training, to entice him back merely to make the public image that the dropout problem is under control.

Making the classroom a youth hostel for dropouts is an indication of how we have unloaded community problems on the schools and neutralized their educational effectiveness. Safe living environment is not a police problem; sanitary living is not a public health problem; the dropout and the delinquent are not school problems; apprentice training is not a labor problem. All of these and more are community problems. Councils, commissions, and committees too numerous to name have done much research in these areas but now is the time for broad-scale community action. Shall this be by Government or by the private sector of our Capital? Here's the opportunity for the power of the people to assert itself. In our midst are hundreds of business and professional organizations of all kinds promoting the sale of ideas, services or products. Regardless of their field of endeavor, now is the time for them to realize that in the hierarchy of values none can ignore their responsibilities to help their Capital. If the social and civic fabric of our fair city continues to ravel then this will be no place for advancing their business endeavors.

The mistaken notion abounds that business and professional groups are concerned only with the area of "private interest," leaving the prevalent impression that only Government cares for the "public interest." This false icon must be shattered, and here in our National Capital private business has both the obligation and the opportunity to do so. An injurious view of the free enterprise effort comes into existence by default because too often private business wears blinkers and ignores its full responsibilities. This is why "exploitation," "gain" and "profit at any cost" are equated with competitive business and Government gets credit for objectivity, impartiality, honesty and working for the poor and the downtrodden. Being in Government gives a person no halo of integrity and no more ability than a private businessman to determine what is in the public interest. It is with this breadth of vision, therefore, that the private business sector of our National Capital, represented by more than 500 business and professional associations, possessing unbounded talent and specialists in numerous fields, must recognize that far beyond their own limited business objectives extends their community responsibility to fulfill the public purpose for which we all exist. With a combined conviction they must come from the sidelines and initiate a leadership for continued action so that the exemplar for all other cities to emulate will be our own Washington.

On Pinkos and Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bernard Baruch once said:

Every man has right to his opinion but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts.

My purpose today is to set the facts straight, to clarify and briefly discuss a seemingly very interesting and disturbing for some, to say the least, subject and recent news article by a Washington news correspondent employed by the Scripps-Howard Newspapers.

Being familiar with this newspaper group and knowing of their outstanding background of fairness and responsibility in news stories and editorial writing, I was indeed surprised to see a story written by one of their dedicated and gentlemanly Washington correspondents, Mr. Seth Kantor, last week in which I was quoted as calling 20 of my colleagues in this body as "pinkos."

Apparently, in his zeal to write a colorful and controversial front page story at a time when congressional news was very dull, this enterprising correspondent decided to do some name calling for me. Pinko seemed to be a very popular and controversial name, so he wrote a story, "FOREMAN Labels 20 Colleagues Pinkos." Earlier the Washington correspondent had called me and asked, "How, or on what votes do you classify these liberal members?"

I replied:

I believe one representative grouping where you could pick out the most liberal Members of Congress was on the House Un-American Activities Committee vote, they seemed to be fairly well grouped together on that vote, about 20 of them as I remember.

The correspondent said:

HENRY GONZALEZ was among those 20, would you classify him as a pinko?

I replied:

I do not care to place a name on him or anyone else. In my opinion, HENRY GONZALEZ'S ultraliberal, leftwing voting record does a disservice to the U.S. Constitution and helps to bolster the Socialist-Communist cause. I believe his voting record and his radical leftwing actions speak for themselves. You can call him whatever name you wish. I am sure that sound, responsible Texans who review Mr. GONZALEZ'S record are capable of placing a suitable name on the gentleman from San Antonio without my assistance.

I did not call HENRY GONZALEZ a pinko or Communist. I only referred to his liberal voting record.

After this conversation, the correspondent then did take it upon himself to label these 20 Members of Congress as pinkos. It is unfortunate that this happened. I make no apology for what I said. I only want to clarify what was said. I am sure all 20 of these fine, dedicated and distinguished liberals actually, honestly and sincerely do love their country. I am sure they just vote for more government programs and bureaus and controls and costs because they believe that a welfare state is best for America.

These folks are just fine, dedicated, trustworthy American patriots whose voting record would lead one to believe, perhaps, unknowingly, they may endorse a socialist United States of America. Now, I say this in no way disrespectful at all, nor do I use the House Un-American Activities Committee vote as my only criteria. Most of these fine Americans vote for most, if not all, of the welfare programs that are introduced. I just do not happen to believe that way—that is all.

I believe that an all-knowing, all-providing, all-powerful Federal Government is contrary to the basic philosophy of our American way of life—and, I believe that any government big enough to give you everything you want, is big enough to take everything you have got.

My interest is to streamline government and try to make it more efficient, because I want to reduce its size, cost, and control. I am more interested in extending freedom than I am in promoting a welfare state. My aim is not to inaugurate new Federal programs, but to cancel old ones that do violence to the Constitution, or that impose on the people an unwarranted financial burden.

To say the least, I was surprised to read in the national wire service yesterday, where a veteran and distinguished gentleman Member of this great body "verbally spanked me" as the wire carried it, for statements I supposedly made about another Member. Yet, no reference whatever was made concerning the violation of the decorum of this House by the gentleman from San Antonio, who, during a fit of anger, threatened to "pistol whip" me as he does in San Antonio and struck me with his fist.

I believe an apology is due me by the gentleman from San Antonio [Mr. GONZALEZ] for his violent attack upon me in these Halls of Congress. This should be expected of any reasonable and sane adult who had exhibited such irresponsible, disgraceful, and vulgar conduct.

We need a few more Democrats, and Republicans, alike, who think, work, and speak as Al Smith did one January night in 1936.

AL SMITH TOOK A WALK

A quarter century and more has passed since Gov. Alfred E. Smith took his famous walk out of the Democratic Party—but his speech in 1936 sounds today as if it could be given tomorrow.

Governor Smith said on a January night in Washington:

Let us give this solemn warning.

There can be only one Capital, Washington or Moscow.

There can be only one atmosphere of government, the clear, pure fresh air of free America, or the foul breath of communistic Russia.

There can be only one flag, the Stars and Stripes, or the Red flag of the godless Union of the Soviet.

There can be only one national anthem: The "Star-Spangled Banner" or the "Internationale."

There can be only one victor.

The famed speech—which led many to believe Smith, the beloved happy warrior of New York's East Side, would lead a third party in the 1936 Presidential election—was delivered before the American Liberty League. Smith asked:

What happens to the disciples of Jefferson and Jackson and Cleveland? * * * There is only one thing we can do. We can either take on the mantle of hypocrisy or we can take a walk, and we will probably do the latter.

And take a walk Al Smith did. He went to Europe in the summer of 1936 and thus did not support F.D.R.'s candidacy. In 1940 he supported Wendell Willkie.

Smith, the 1928 Democratic Party candidate for President, had been known as an opponent to President Roosevelt, who had followed him as Governor of New York. But his lifelong party affiliation had prevented an open break. But, he told friends, the steady movement of the country toward the left was too great not to be opposed now.

He explained:

I was born in the Democratic Party and expect to die in it, but I can call upon innumerable witnesses to testify to the fact that during my whole public life I put patriotism above partisanship.

Smith, who knew the results of prejudice firsthand from his experience in the 1928 presidential election in which his religion was a prime issue, saw several dangers in the first years of the F.D.R. tenure in the White House.

He asked:

What are these dangers I see? The first is the arraignment of class against class.

The next thing that I view as being dangerous to our national well-being is government bureaucracy instead of what we have been taught to look for, government by law.

The next thing that is apparent to me is the vast building up of new bureaus of government.

Smith, a strict advocate of constitutional government, pointed out that the writers of the Constitution had seen the need for a balance of power in government:

What we want, and what we insist on, and what we are going to have, is the absolute preservation of this balance of power which is the keystone, the arch upon which the whole theory of democratic government has got to rest.

When you rattle that, you rattle the whole structure.

In concluding, Smith repeated his lifelong party advocacy and suggested a group of remedies:

Now, suggestions, and I make these as a Democrat anxious for the success of my party, and I make them in good faith.

First, I suggest to the members of my party on Capitol Hill here in Washington that they take their minds off the Tuesday that follows the first Monday in November. Just take their minds off it to the end that you may do the right thing and not the expedient thing.

Next, I suggest to them that they dig up the 1932 platform from the grave that they buried in it, read it over, and study it, breath life into it, and follow it in legislative and executive action, to the end that they make good their promises to the American people when they put forth that platform and the candidate that stood upon it 100 percent. In short, make good.

Next, I would suggest that they stop compromising with the fundamental principles laid down by Jackson and Jefferson and Cleveland.

Fourth: Stop attempting to alter the form and structure of our Government without recourse to the people themselves as provided in their own Constitution. This country belongs to the people, and it doesn't belong to any administration.

Next, I suggest that they read their oath of office to support the Constitution of the United States. And I ask them to remember that they took that oath with their hands on the Holy Bible, thereby calling upon God Almighty Himself to witness their solemn promise. It is bad enough to disappoint us.

Sixth: I suggest that from this moment they resolve to make the constitution the civil bible of the United States, and pay it the same civil respect and reverence that they would religiously pay the Holy Scriptures, and I ask them to read from the Holy Scripture the Parable of the Prodigal Son and follow his example.

So spoke my kind and type of politician. I wish we had more men who believed like Al Smith did.

Dr. Flemming, President Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Calls for Social Security Approach to the Financing of Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, highly significant is the call by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, for the enactment of hospital care through social security. As Dr. Flemming ably states, the first step is to inaugurate through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged.

Since leaving Washington, Dr. Flemming has become the president of the University of Oregon in Eugene. This fall, the Nation's high-school debaters are discussing the subject of the role of the Federal Government in health care. A special symposium was held recently in Denver, Colo., under the auspices of the Speech Association of America and the National University Extension Association to discuss this subject. Dr. Flemming, in his speech to the symposium, urged the enactment of the social security approach to financing health care for the aged.

As a member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging I am acutely aware of the critical health problems and hardships facing our retired citizens. For this reason I have joined in sponsoring S. 880, which provides health coverage financed through the social security system. This is the legislation recommended by President Kennedy, and the formula recognized by Dr. Flemming as the most fruitful approach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the thoughtful statement by Dr. Flemming in support of the social security approach to health care for retired citizens.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER EISENHOWER HEW CHIEF CALLS FOR HOSPITAL CARE THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon)

There is a general agreement that a problem does exist which our Nation must solve. Studies conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that persons 65 and over are confronted with health and medical bills each year that average twice as much as those for the rest of the population. And all of us know that the cost of medical care keeps increasing. In fact medical care prices have risen more than other prices.

Bureau of Census data show that in 1960 the aged had to try to pay their medical bills out of annual incomes that averaged about half that received by persons under 65—from $1,000 for aged persons living alone to $2,900 for families headed by aged persons. It is clear that those whose income was equal to the national average and those who were below the average didn't have much left for the medical bills after taking care of the bare necessities of life.

Too many of the aged are unable to afford health insurance or are considered too poor a risk. In fact the number carrying some form of health insurance is just over half of the aged population. In most cases they carry hospital insurance. In many instances it falls far short of meeting the costs of illnesses.

These and other similar facts explain why a larger proportion of the aged than any other group in our population are forced either to turn to public or private welfare agencies for payment of their medical bills or to rely on free care from hospitals and physicians. And the sad thing is that many do

not choose either alternative. They just neglect their health.

Surely a nation that is founded on the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being can and must find a solution to this problem—a solution that will meet the needs of this generation and will keep the next generation from confronting the problem that now confronts us.

It was my privilege on January 12, 1961, to deliver the closing address at the first White House Conference on the Aging. At that time in referring to the problem of health and medical care for the aged, I said:

"I am convinced on the basis of my own experiences that this problem cannot be resolved by relying solely on private voluntary efforts. * * * I am convinced that the Federal Government must become an increasingly effective partner if the problem is to be handled properly."

An adequate health and medical insurance program for the aged should provide them with substantial help in meeting the costs of the following items: Hospital care, skilled nursing home care, organized home care services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

If the aged are to enjoy the benefits of a well-rounded program of this kind a law must be enacted that will do the following two things:

First, inaugurate through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged.

Second, authorize and encourage those who are engaged in private insurance to join forces so that they can offer the aged a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will help cover the costs of organized home care services, surgical services, laboratory and X-ray services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

Such a law would provide the foundation for a partnership between the Federal Government and private insurance that would mark the dawn of a new day for the aged in dealing with the economic hazards of illness.

And both the Federal Government and the field of private insurance have had experience in forging such a partnership. For 28 years we have been operating under a social security program which has provided certain basic benefits for retired persons. Today we find that private insurance has worked out over 30,000 private pension plans that supplement the benefits that social security has provided. From 1940 to 1961, life insurance in force grew from $115 to $685 billion. There is no doubt that the Federal Government's old-age, survivors and disability insurance program has stimulated the growth of private insurance in this country.

What has happened in the pension and life insurance fields can and must happen in the field of health insurance.

Here are some of the considerations that I believe should be kept in mind in developing through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged:

1. The program should be financed by a payroll tax shared equally by both employers and employees or paid by the self-employed.

2. Receipts from the tax should be placed in a special fund and benefits paid under the program should be related to the resources in the fund.

3. The payroll tax should be fixed at a level that will make it possible for benefits to be paid to the aged that will give them a fair chance to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of hospital and nursing home care.

4. Persons who have contributed to the fund should be eligible at age 65 for the benefits provided by the program.

5. All employed and self-employed should be included in the program. It is impossible to predict, for example, what persons entering the labor market for the first time this year will have financial resources at age 65 that would enable them to get along without the protection that such as insurance program would provide.

6. The cost of providing health protection to the present aged who have not had the opportunity of participating in the social security program should be met from general revenues.

Such a program, to quote from President Kennedy's February 1963 message to the Congress, "is based on the fundamental premise that contributions during the working years, matched by employer's contributions, should enable people to prepay and build earned rights and benefits to safeguard them in their old age."

But such a program isn't enough if it is left standing by itself. It is true that hospital and skilled nursing home costs loom large in many illnesses. That is why the Federal Government should single them out in developing an insurance program for the aged through social security.

However, the services of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and physical therapists can also be costly. And Congress can help the aged deal with these costs without involving the Federal Government in any new program.

It should do it in the same law in which it establishes a hospital and skilled nursing home program for the aged.

It should declare that it is sound national policy for private insurance companies and nonprofit health plans to join forces, including a pooling of risks, and offer the aged in any State a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will cover the costs of services rendered by physicians, surgeons, physical therapists or any other costs connected with an illness.

It should then remove any legal obstacles, such as antitrust laws, that stand in the way of putting such a policy into effect.

In brief in one law the Congress should establish a limited health insurance program through social security and, at the same time, clear away the obstacles that stand in the way of private insurance developing an effective program for supplementing the Government's program.

When I was called upon in August of 1958 to come to grips with the problem of health and medical care for the aged I developed a strong conviction that the Federal Government should not do anything that would block the growth of private health insurance. At the same time I quickly realized that, because of the unusual risks involved, private insurance was not going to be able to offer an adequate program at a price that would be within the reach of a sufficiently large percentage of the aged. I examined and worked on various plans under which the Federal Government would have underpinned the efforts of private insurance. None of them made or has made any headway.

I now believe that private health insurance will grow along sound lines if the Federal Government, through social security, develops an insurance program for the aged that is restricted to dealing with the costs of institutional care. This will leave the rest of the field to private insurance and relieve it of heavy risks. It should at the same time be given the right by the Congress to pool its resources. This should lead to the offering of health insurance policies at premiums that will be within the reach of the aged and also within the reach of younger persons who want to take out policies now that will guarantee them benefits at 65 and beyond. Also it should be kept in mind that some of the $475 to $525 million in purchasing power which is now allocated annually for hospital coverage of the aged will become available for payments of premiums on private policies.

In summary, I believe that a partnership should be established between the Federal Government and private insurance in the health insurance field. If it is brought into existence we will have at long last moved from the talk stage into the action stage in dealing with the problem of meeting the health and medical bills of the aged.

I recognize, of course, that even if this partnership is formed there will be a percentage of the aged whose needs will have to be met through public welfare programs. I favor the Federal Government providing generous support to the States in connection with their programs for providing medical care for persons receiving old-age assistance. I favor the Kerr-Mills law which makes it possible for the States to receive generous support from the Federal Government if they decide to help persons 65 years of age and over who are not receiving old-age assistance but whose income and other resources are not sufficient to meet their medical expenses.

But these are public assistance programs. They are not substitutes for an adequate public and private insurance program to care for the health and medical costs of the aged. Our fellow citizens do not want to sit around and wait for sickness to develop and then have their bills met through public assistance programs. They want to participate in insurance programs that will assure their ability to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of health and medical care. The time has come to give them the opportunity of participating in such programs. We insult them when we tell them that they needn't worry but that we will take care of them under old-age assistance or the Kerr-Mills program.

Let's not take pride in our ability to add aged persons to public assistance rolls because they are medically indigent. Rather let us insist on the Congress taking action that will provide our people with both public and private insurance programs under which they will have earned benefits that will safeguard them in their old age and keep them off public assistance rolls. This is the only kind of a program that is consistent with our Nation's dedication to the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being.

The Revenue Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 1, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee has been meeting daily since October 15 in public hearings on the proposed tax reduction bill (H.R. 8363).

One of the witnesses, on Thursday, October 31, was Mr. Steve Stahl, representing the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council and the Investors Union of America.

Mr. Stahl addressed himself to the problem which the proposal precipitates. That problem is whether it is sound for the Federal Government, in time of prosperity, to borrow more money to finance tax reduction.

Personally, I was so impressed by Mr. Stahl's testimony before the Finance Committee, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE: H.R. 8363—THE REVENUE ACT OF 1963

(By Steve Stahl)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Senate Finance Committee, my name is Steve Stahl. I reside at 1919 Northwest 33d Street, Oklahoma City. I am the executive vice president of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council and president of the Investors' Union of America.

The Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council is a privately supported, statewide citizen organization interested in securing economical, efficient government at all levels. The Investors' Union of America is a nationwide organization of thrifty Americans, whose savings have been invested in the purchase of the tools of production; and, whose purpose is that of preserving America's free enterprise system, solvent government and sound money and to protect the investor from unwarranted government interference and competition in a free market economy.

Senator BYRD, I greatly appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you and your colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee to present my views with regard to H.R. 8363—the Revenue Act of 1963.

Certainly, there are few, if any, Americans who are not in favor of a reduction in Federal taxes and a thorough revision of the Federal tax structure which is bleeding the poor, soaking the rich, destroying incentive and braking economic growth.

On the other hand, a great many Americans—in fact, a majority in my judgment—who have been categorized as Puritans by the President's chief financial adviser, are not in favor of a tax cut financed by further Federal borrowing.

Therefore, this measure, which you gentlemen are considering, is ill-advised unless it is accompanied by a reduction in Federal spending which will insure a balanced budget and permit a planned, long-range reduction of the Federal debt.

Anything less than this is the ultimate in fiscal irresponsibility and downright dangerous to the future of our great Republic and the freedom of its citizens.

Furthermore, gentlemen, I do not believe we have any moral right, whatsoever, to charge the bill for our profligacy to our children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren.

Deficit spending by the Federal Government has developed from a bad habit into a planned policy. This constant increase in the Federal debt is destroying confidence both at home and abroad and it must be stopped if we are to avoid bankruptcy.

Just how long can we continue piling debt on top of debt and remain solvent? There must be a breaking point beyond which we dare not go. Certainly in this troubled world in which we live, economic strength is as essential as military might in the defense of our Republic and the security of its citizens.

Apparently members of the House Ways and Means Committee, the architects of this legislation, are concerned about our frightening fiscal picture. Otherwise, they would not have written section 1, which "recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending," into the bill.

The sincerity of this declaration is not questioned, but its effectiveness is subject to grave question as is the President's letter of accord.

What we need is a positive reduction in Federal spending rather than a declaration of restraint which is subject to a variety of interpretations.

When this legislation was being debated in the House, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, said, "I believe that given the passage of this bill, the President has committed himself to a course of true economy in Government expenditures. Of course, it can hardly be expected that this will affect his views on programs already sent to us."

These new and costly programs, such as Federal Aid to Education, Mass Transit, Area Redevelopment, Youth Conservation Corps, Domestic Peace Corps, and many others, if approved by Congress, will cost taxpayers or their children a conservatively estimated $7 billion. And it will increase Federal spending by that much.

The President, despite his televised pledge "to a course of true fiscal responsibility leading to a balanced budget," pleaded for enactment of all these new programs in his recent "conservation" tour.

We cannot accept this action as evidence of any desire for restraint in Federal spending.

Most, if not all, of these new programs, like so many already in operation, have built-in cost escalators which are bound to increase rather than decrease Federal spending in the future.

Even the estimated deficit of $9 billion for the current fiscal year will increase interest payments on the Federal debt by at least a quarter of a billion dollars and these payments are now costing taxpayers more than a million dollars an hour.

Further, the inflationary aspects of H.R. 8363, without a corresponding cut in spending, may well serve to substantially increase the cost of defense and other essential functions of Government.

Insofar as Congress is concerned, it is apparent that a great many Members are deeply concerned over the Federal fiscal situation which can only be described as nothing short of terrifying.

However, the truth of the matter is Congress has lost control of the Federal purse strings. The countless number of bills seeking to improve the fiscal control machinery of Congress which have been introduced in both the Senate and House since the end of World War II provide sufficient evidence of the truth of this statement.

Regrettably, most of these efforts have failed to bear fruit with the result that Congress has found itself progressively less capable of exercising the fiscal responsibility given it by the Constitution. And, this responsibility cannot be met by using the mechanics, procedure and organization designed to meet the needs of that long dead era when Federal activities were limited and Federal expenditures were less than the current interest payments on the Federal debt.

In view of these facts, gentlemen, it is apparent that the only safe and sure way of combining expenditure reduction with tax reduction is to write specific expenditure controls into the bill now under consideration.

Since the publicized purpose of this legislation is to encourage economic growth, we question the wisdom of those provisions in the bill which delay the benefits of tax reduction to corporations for a period of at least 5 years and which will increase taxation of dividends in most brackets.

It is our contention that the proposed increase in the unfair double taxation of dividends in the middle and upper income brackets will further reduce the incentive to provide the money needed for the creation of new jobs. It will, therefore, have a negative rather than a positive effect on the Nation's economy.

Further, should the Federal Government borrow the money to finance this tax reduction from the public, the primary purpose of this legislation will be defeated since taxpaying citizens will have no additional money for consumer purchasing or investment in capital expansion. If it is financed through the Federal Reserve by increasing the money supply, creeping inflation may be spurred into galloping inflation.

This, of course, would be harmful to every American and disastrous to the thrifty, hard-working American people who have scrimped and saved in order to take care of themselves in their old age. These are the people who have lost more than half the purchasing power of their retirement dollars through inflation.

These are the people who can be "pauperized" by inflation which is certain to follow a Government program of increased spending and tax reduction. We believe these people are entitled to full consideration by this committee as well as future generations whose legacy may well be a bankrupt Nation.

Gentlemen, as you all know, the President has repeatedly expressed concern for the plight of our senior citizens in his all-out effort to secure enactment of the King-Anderson bill to provide medical care for the aged under social security.

This interest is not in evidence in the provisions of H.R. 8363. Here we refer particularly to the proposed changes in dividend credits which we contend should be increased rather than eliminated.

This proposal will actually increase rather than reduce the Federal tax burden on millions of our elderly citizens now dependent on the income from their invested savings.

This fact has been repeatedly called to our attention in the volume of mail we have received regarding this bill, as you will note in the excerpts from letters which I shall offer for the committee's information.

Furthermore, we believe a great majority of American workers and professional people in the middle income brackets also will be greatly disappointed. Many may find their taxes have been increased rather than reduced.

Elimination of the deductibility of certain State taxes and the present dividend credit, together with an increase in social security taxes as proposed in H.R. 6688, provides no assurance of any tax relief for these hard-working, thrifty American people who constitute the backbone of our Nation.

In summation, we are in favor of a thorough revision of the present Federal tax structure and a substantial reduction in the excessively high Federal tax burden. However, this reduction should definitely be tied to a reduction in Federal spending which will provide for a balanced budget next year and not sometime in the distant future.

We would also recommend that the Senate Finance Committee delay final action on this legislation until the 1965 budget message is submitted to Congress. This delay will provide members of the committee, all other Members of Congress and the taxpaying public, an opportunity to add up the appropriations and spending authorizations encated this year and to analyze the spending requests for 1965.

Certainly this information is more important than hasty action on a bill which has been labelled the most important legislation before Congress in the past 15 years.

May I also express the hope that this Congress will take the necessary action to regain control of the Federal purse strings and establish the procedures and facilities which will enable you gentlemen and your colleagues to adopt a policy of fiscal responsibility in the management of Federal affairs which will tie together revenues, expenditures and debt. Historically, the National Taxpayers Conference has recommended and supported legislation to accomplish this essential need.

While a reduction in Federal taxes and spending is necessary and desirable, we are convinced that the elimination of unwarranted Federal interference and unjustified Federal competition with our free enterprise

system is equally essential to a sound, healthy growth in our economy.

Mr. Chairman, citizen-taxpayer associations from nine States—Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New Jersey, Oregon, and Utah—have endorsed this statement. Letters from the executive officers of these organizations will be filed along with this statement and I respectfully request that they be included in the RECORD.

In addition to these organizations, we have received more than a thousand letters from individuals in all sections of the Nation in support of this statement which will be made available to you.

Senator BYRD and members of the Senate Finance Committee, the opportunity to present our views on this important legislation is deeply appreciated and we are grateful for your consideration and courtesy.

Nellie Bush, of Parker, Ariz., Dies at 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the State of Arizona is saddened by the loss of one of her great ladies—Mrs. Nellie T. Bush, of Parker. As can be seen in the announcement of her death, Mrs. Bush could well have been known as "Mrs. Arizona," for her wisdom, sound judgment, and helping hands have been a part of nearly every major project undertaken by Arizona during her lifetime. Mrs. Bush will be greatly missed, but she will be long remembered and loved as a true friend and one of the leaders and builders of Arizona.

I include the following article:

NELLIE BUSH OF PARKER DIES AT 75

Funeral services will be tomorrow in Parker for Mrs. Nellie T. Bush, 75-year-old early Arizonan, civic leader and former legislator.

Mrs. Bush, who was in Phoenix to attend a civil defense training session, died unexpectedly of a kidney ailment Sunday night in Good Samaritan Hospital.

The Reverend Paul Alexander will officiate at services in Parker Methodist Church, with the Order of the Eastern Star assisting. Parker had been her home since 1915.

In chronological order, Mrs. Bush became a schoolteacher, businesswoman, mother, ferryboat and inland waterways freight boat pilot, legislator, lawyer, airplane pilot, State official, and leader in women's club activities. She also was one of the founders of the Arizona Children's Colony.

As pilot of a riverboat on the stream, Mrs. Bush played a chief role in Arizona's long fight with California over Colorado River water rights.

After one incident on the river, which involved former Governor Moeur calling out the Arizona National Guard, the Governor gave her an honorary commission as "admiral of Arizona's navy. The navy consisted of two riverboats operated by Mrs. Bush and her husband, Joseph E. Bush.

She is survived by her husband, a son, Wesley, and three grandchildren.

Mrs. Bush was named to the three-member Arizona Colorado River Commission, forerunner of the State Interstate Stream Commission.

This was during the critical years when former Gov. Sidney P. Osborn was changing the State's long policy of opposition to the Colorado River Compact seeking ratification of the compact and construction of the central Arizona project.

Later she served as a member of the Basin States Committee, the seven-State policy group that helped advance many basin projects, including Arizona's fight for a contract for 2.8 million acre-feet of main stream water. This was recently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

"With the passing of Nellie Bush, Arizona has lost one of its most devoted and public spirited citizens," Governor Fannin said. "Mrs. Bush was a true pioneer whose contributions to the State will be long remembered."

She was born Nellie May Trent on November 29, 1888, in Cedar County, Mo., and came to Arizona with her parents when she was 5.

The family settled near Mesa. At 14, she enrolled in Tempe Normal School, now Arizona State University, and was graduated in 1908. She taught in Glendale and Mesa schools until her marriage in 1912.

The couple moved to Parker in 1915 after acquiring an interest in a ferryboat business. Mrs. Bush became justice of the peace in 1918 and was elected to the State legislature in 1920, serving until 1932 when she was elected to the Senate for a 2-year term. She served a second term in the early 1940's.

While serving in the legislature, she studied law at the University of Arizona and later was admitted to the bar.

When her son became interested in airplanes during the 1930's, she bet him that she could earn a pilot's license before he did. She won the wager.

She was known as the first woman in Arizona to pilot an airplane in connection with her business.

During their years in Parker, the Bushes had developed a variety of business enterprises, including electric and water utilities, and a real estate business, along with the ferry and freight business on the Colorado River.

Mrs. Bush helped organize the Glendale Woman's Club and the Parker Woman's Club. She was president of the Arizona Federation of Women's Clubs in 1955.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Continues Record of Progress and Service in West Virginia—Morgantown (W. Va.)—Dominion-News Commends Recent Improvements in Main Line Between Clarksburg and Parkersburg—President Jervis Langdon, and Many West Virginians Have Made Notable Contributions to Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 1, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in 1838 the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad began construction of the first railroad tracks in West Virginia, building westward from Harpers Ferry. In the century and a quarter which has elapsed since then, the development of the railroad has provided significant contributions to the economy of West Virginia, and to the well-being of its citizens.

Among the responsible individuals who have been instrumental in the B. & O.'s success in the Mountain State were the late Charles W. Van Horn, of Lost Creek, W. Va., who was vice president in charge of operations for many years. Another leader was the former Governor of our State, the Honorable John J. Cornwell, of Romney, who for some time acted as general counsel of the line.

And, the concern for progress and service which was so evident in frontier days has not diminished with the years, but continues to expand and to bring forth achievement and benefit. A notable example of growth is the recent completion of important main line improvements in the B. & O. system between Clarksburg and Parkersburg, W. Va.

This improved line will provide a direct route for major freight shipments to the Southwest, through the St. Louis gateway, and correspondingly improved service to the businessmen and citizens of the Mountain State.

It has recently been my privilege to correspond with the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Mr. Jervis Langdon, Jr., congratulating his efficient organization on recent additions and improvements. I likewise pointed out the immeasurable benefit which has come to West Virginia as a direct result of the enterprise and dependability of the B. & O.

I request that this correspondence be printed in the Appendix.

Mr. President, the experienced and respected editor and publisher of the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion News, Walter L. Hart, commented meaningfully on the contributions of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad to the development in our State. In his October 31 editorial, "B. & O. Deserves Our Applause," Editor Hart stresses the importance of the new main line improvements. Further, he states that—

> We in West Virginia salute the railroad and hope, under its new management, it continues to make progressive moves designed to increase its service to the shippers of the world and in doing so become more valuable to all the areas it serves, including our own State of West Virginia.

I request that Mr. Hart's editorial be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 29, 1963.

Mr. JERVIS LANGDON, Jr.,
President, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Parkersburg, W. Va.:

Sincerely regret Senate business here prevents my participation in your program-diner today. Your company has contributed much to the economic development of West Virginia and to the well-being of the citizens of our State. It is especially appropriate that in this centennial year the old B. & O. is the new B. & O. as it meets its responsibilities for improved transportation vital to the movement of coal and other traffic across our State and throughout an important part of the country. Congratulations and please convey my greetings to all in attendance.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator.

THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.,
Baltimore, Md., October 30, 1963.
Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much for your thoughtfulness in sending the telegram to me at Parkersburg yesterday. It arrived at the end of a luncheon we held on the special train which had come over from Clarksburg during the morning.

The project, I am sure, will be a great success and I look forward to a substantial increase in B. & O. traffic not only through northern West Virginia but to and from our stations in that great State.

Sincerely,

JERVIS LANGDON, Jr.,
President.

B. & O. DESERVES OUR APPLAUSE

We join with all progressive West Virginians in congratulating the Baltimore & Ohio railroad for its great main line improvement between Clarksburg and Parkersburg.

The prosperity—or lack of it—of this important railroad is of vital concern to every West Virginian because the B. & O. is a major taxpayer and in its continued progress all of us have a real stake.

This main line improvement makes it possible to haul all major freight items on the most direct route to the great Southwest through the St. Louis gateway. This is expected to greatly increase the revenues of the railroad.

Adding this to the forward look the railroad has adopted in pioneering on unit coal freight trains and other projects designed to make the railroad a better facility for its customers and therefore a more profitable enterprise certainly is most desirable from all standpoints.

We in West Virginia salute the railroad and hope under its new management it continues to make progressive moves designed to increase its service to the shippers of the world and in doing so become more valuable to all the areas it serves including our own State of West Virginia.

Freedom of the Press Needs Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press as established by the first amendment is undergoing its greatest threat in the history of our Nation through policies and actions of the present administration.

Instances of management, censorship and withholding of legitimate news, and denying access to news by the press, have become commonplace since this administration came into being. Some of these are set forth in an editorial appropriate to National Newspaper Week which appeared in the October 16 issue of the Monrovia Daily News-Post, of Monrovia, Calif., which I have the privilege of representing in Congress.

As the editorial notes, the American press is resisting pressures which threaten its freedom but the people themselves must want benefits of a free press enough to join in their protection.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point:

FREEDOM OF PRESS PERILED

This is National Newspaper Week, an annual period in which the American press takes a look at itself, its problems and reaffirms its dedication to keeping Americans the best-informed people on earth.

Newspapers today find themselves at a crossroads. The signs along one read: "Government news management," "Government secrecy," "Federal news agencies." The other is posted with markers in the American tradition: "Factual reports," "freedom of interpretation," "unrestricted movement."

The American press is resisting with all its power Government pressures to force it down the former road. The trend became apparent shortly after the advent of the Kennedy administration.

Newsmen for the first time in history were not allowed to travel with the U.S. fleet to Laos. Correspondents were barred from ships taking part in the Cuba blockade. More recently the Government has tried to cover up the true news picture in South Vietnam.

A prime example of efforts at news management occurred last spring. Twenty-five prominent Americans, at the Government's request, issued a report on ways to increase private investment in Latin America.

The document emphasized there should be an increase in private capital outlays without corresponding boosts in public expenditures. That was not what the administration wanted to hear. A leak was made to a reporter who declared the still unpublished committee report had been "disowned by several of its members." This effort to manage news was aimed at destroying the value of the report before it was released.

The Government now has gone one step further by getting into the news dissemination business itself. Only recently the Federal Marketing Service was established at Government expense to supply crop and market news to anyone who would pick up the telegraph charges.

Mr. Kennedy also has directed department heads of various agencies to cooperate and assist in setting up a unified governmental communications system to be known as the National Communications System.

It is conceivable that such a system eventually would be competitive with, or even supplant, the great worldwide newsgathering facilities of independent wire agencies and individual newspapers.

There are 14 words in the first amendment to the Constitution that were intended to prevent such outright Government encroachment on the press: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or the press."

The press freedom guaranteed in those 14 words has been the protective base for all other American freedoms. It could be destroyed, bit by bit, unless present Government trends are reversed. An aroused public can help in bringing about such a reversal.

The people themselves must want benefits of a free press enough to join in their protection.

The Freedom of Information Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 1, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this week the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of which I am chairman has held 4 days of hearings on S. 1666 commonly referred to as the freedom of information bill.

Nineteen Senators joined with me as copsonsors of this bill. Recently the Kansas City Press Club adopted a resolution urging passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story from the Kansas City Times reporting the action of the Kansas City Press Club and the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALLS FOR OPEN FILES—PRESS CLUB URGES PASSAGE OF SENATE BILL: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AS TIE BETWEEN PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT IS EMPHASIZED

A resolution urging passage of a Senate bill that would strengthen the rights of the press and public to access to Goverment records was adopted 1st night by the Kansas City Press Club.

The bill was introduced last June by Senator EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, and would amend an existing act.

EXCEPTIONS ARE NOTED

All records would be covered under the measure except those:

Specifically covered by statutory exemptions, as in the case of individual income tax returns.

Covered by an executive order forbidding disclosure for protection of the national defense.

Defined as internal memorandums of agency members or employees related to the disposition of adjudicatory or rulemaking matters.

The areas in which secrecy would be permissible are more circumscribed and clearly delineated than under the present act.

The press club resolution commended the bill as a fine step forward in the fight for freedom of information.

NEEDED TO PRESERVE NATION

The resolution in part:

"Only a completely informed people can make the proper judgments necessary to preserve our Nation. The increasing burden of new knowledge and our Government's increasingly closer relationship to the everyday affairs of our citizens, makes most important the keeping of the channels of communication between the Government and the people.

"We urge that Congress continue to survey this need to the end that governmental affairs shall be completely understood by all citizens; and to the end that shoddy or dishonest actions by Government officials and employees cannot be concealed from public view."

A RESOLUTION BY KANSAS CITY PRESS CLUB

The Kansas City Press Club, whose nearly 300 members represent all types of news media in its region, has considered Senate bill No. 1666 as introduced by Senator EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri, and others, and believe it is a fine step forward in the fight for freedom of information. We urge its passage.

Only a completely informed people can make the proper judgments necessary to preserve our Nation. The increasing burden of new knowledge and our Government's increasingly closer relationship to the everyday affairs of our citizens, makes most important the keeping clear of the channels of communication between the Government and the people. We urge that Congress continue to survey this need to the end that governmental affairs shall be completely under-

stood by all citizens; and to the end that shoddy or dishonest actions by Government officials and employees cannot be concealed from public view.

Adopted October 3, 1963, at a regular meeting of the Kansas City Press Club, Hotel Muehleback, Kansas City, Mo.

JOHN THORNBERRY, *President.*

The President Should Answer Test Ban Treaty Safeguards Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. The following editorial of significant relevance to the national security appeared recently in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram:

NATION DESERVES ANSWERS ON TEST BAN SAFEGUARDS

During the debate on the nuclear test ban treaty, critics of the treaty recalled that President Kennedy had said only a few months previously that this Nation could not stand ready indefinitely to conduct nuclear tests on a moment's notice.

That being the case, they argued, how could the United States agree to sign a test ban treaty which the Russians might break without notice?

Without referring to any previous statements, the President and members of his administration declared that this country could and would take the steps necessary to meet all contingencies.

Mr. Kennedy, in fact, wrote a lengthy letter to the leaders of both parties in the U.S. Senate giving positive assurances that safeguards would be maintained. Nuclear testing underground would be continued, he said; facilities for the detection of possible violation of the treaty would be expanded and improved as required; and the Government would take whatever other steps that were necessary to safeguard "national security in the event that there should be an abrogation or violation of any treaty provision."

In view of these assurances, we feel it is quite proper that Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, an opponent of the test ban treaty, should inquire whether the necessary steps are actually being taken to reduce the risks and disadvantages of the treaty.

Congressman HOSMER directed such an inquiry to the President in September and recently received a reply from Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Seaborg stated that the administration is seeking authorization to make treaty safeguard expenditures totaling $17,945,000 during the balance of fiscal year 1964.

Congressman HOSMER feels that the program of safeguards is woefully inadequate. He estimates that the costs of underground test site improvements and additions, weapons laboratory improvements, retention of topflight scientists, readiness for resumption of atmospheric tests, and improvement of the detection system should total $1 billion.

The discrepancy between the administration's requests and Mr. HOSMER's estimate is most serious. He has asked the President to clarify the picture for a Nation which has been assured of safeguards. Pending clarification, Mr. HOSMER questions whether "the entire matter of the safeguards is being taken seriously by those who may be advising you in these matters."

The Congressman may well be overlooking some factors which would cast an entirely different light on the matter, but the inquiry goes to the very heart of American security. Since Russia may very well be conducting secret developments with the aim of breaking this treaty, as she has broken so many others, American citizens deserve to hear the answer to Mr. HOSMER's questions:

1. What actions are necessary to establish the safeguards?
2. How urgent is it to establish them without delay?
3. How much will they cost?

Statement of Hon. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, on the Interest Equalization Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee has been considering during the past 2 weeks the interest equalization tax bill, which is advocated by the administration as one means of attacking our balance-of-payments deficit. On October 21 Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon appeared before our committee in executive session, and presented the case for the bill. Because of the great importance of this legislation and the problem it is designed to meet, and because of the excellence of the Secretary's statement, I am sure my colleagues will find his remarks of particular interest. I therefore include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OPENING STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, ON THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 21, 1963

Before you consider the provisions of H.R. 8000 in detail, I would like to review briefly the urgent need for this legislation, developments in our balance of payments during the period since the interest equalization tax was proposed on July 18, and the ways in which the markets for foreign securities have already adjusted to this proposal.

As you know, the interest equalization proposal is for a temporary excise tax on acquisitions from foreigners of both new and outstanding foreign securities—whether debt or equity—maturing in more than 3 years. In the case of debt obligations, the amount of the tax levied on the U.S. person acquiring the security would be graduated by maturity in a manner calculated to be equivalent to approximately 1 percent in yield. As this tax is passed back to the foreign borrower, it will bring his net interest cost for capital raised in our market into much closer alinement with the costs prevailing in other industrialized countries—thereby diverting to other markets a substantial portion of the demands that would otherwise reach our market. In the case of equities—which, of course, have no fixed maturity—the tax would be 15 percent, the same as the rate applied to the longest dated bonds. Acquisitions of foreign securities from other U.S. persons would remain free of tax, as would direct investment abroad and acquisitions of the securities of developing countries.

H.R. 8000 provides that, with certain exceptions, the tax would be applied to all acquisitions after July 18, when the President first proposed this measure. Participants in the markets have thus been conducting their affairs in that knowledge for more than 3 months. I believe that experience over this period has amply confirmed our initial judgment that this temporary tax will be an effective means for assuring the needed reduction in the outflow of portfolio capital, while preserving the essential freedom of the market to raise and distribute this capital on the basis of price and other competitive criteria. A number of more or less technical amendments to the bill will be helpful in meeting certain special problems that have been brought to our attention and in clarifying the application of the tax to certain types of transactions. We are, of course, prepared to work closely with the committee in resolving these problems. But the basic provisions of the bill as proposed have, in our judgment, successfully met the dual test of effectiveness and market practicability.

At the time I testified before this committee in August with respect to the interest equalization tax, I pointed out that a sharply accelerating outflow of portfolio capital had been responsible for a marked deterioration in our overall balance-of-payments position. Purchases by U.S. investors of new foreign securities doubled between 1961 and 1962, rising from a little over $500 million in 1961—a figure well within the normal range of recent years—to more than $1 billion last year. During the first half of 1963, the outflow almost doubled again, exceeding $1 billion in this 6-month period.

Meanwhile, our balance-of-payments deficit—excluding all special intergovernmental transactions—rose by over $500 million in 1962 and by $900 million more, at an annual rate, during the first 6 months of this year. These increases, closely paralleling the steeply rising outflow of portfolio capital, brought this deficit on regular transactions to an annual rate of $4.5 billion. I wish to stress that, while there were numerous offsetting changes in the composition of our deficit on regular transactions between 1961, when it totaled $3,043 million, and the first 6 months of 1963, when it averaged $4,480 million at an annual rate, the entire deterioration is more than accounted for by the sudden and unprecedented increase in the purchase of new foreign security issues by American investors. This phenomenon totally transformed our overall balance of payments and created a situation which, if allowed to continue, would have inevitably resulted in a major crisis in the international payments system, the dangerous consequences of which for the security and well-being of our Nation and for the free world as a whole can hardly be exaggerated.

It is true that we have been successful in absorbing a portion of the dollars passing into foreign hands as a result of this deficit on regular transactions by medium-term Treasury borrowing from other countries in a strong balance-of-payments position, by prepayments of debts owed to us by our allies, and by other special intergovernmental transactions. But by mid-year it had become apparent that, along with savings in other directions, prompt and decisive action was required to curtail the enormous outflow of portfolio capital if we were to arrest and reverse the deterioration in our overall accounts, and thus assure our continuing ability to finance our deficit in an orderly manner and to protect the stability of the dollar.

That, of course, is the special purpose of the interest equalization tax, which comple-

ments our efforts to further lessen short-term capital outflows by increasing upward pressure on short-term interest rates and the measures announced by the President on July 18 to reduce Government expenditures abroad. The role of the tax is temporary and transitional, for the ultimate solution lies in other directions—in the building of a more prosperous and profitable home economy that will be more attractive to both domestic and foreign capital, and in the development of broader and more efficient capital markets in other industrialized countries. However, the urgent need for effective action to meet our immediate problem simply did not permit us to wait for those essentially longer term solutions.

Some portion of the outflow of portfolio capital during the latter part of 1962 and early 1963 reflected temporary influences—particularly the Canadian difficulties of last year and Canada's desire to rebuild its reserves by long-term borrowing in our market. But beyond these special circumstances, the ominous fact was that momentum was visibly building up for still greater demands on our capital market from borrowers in virtually all other major industrialized countries. For instance, Japan—already a sizable borrower during the first half of 1963—had apparently been anticipating dubling the rate of its flotations in the U.S. market over the remainder of the year, which would have brought the total for the year to approximately $300 million. At the same time, more and more industrial firms and municipalities in Europe were beginning to turn to our market.

These accelerating demands were reflected, for example, in the volume of new foreign corporate issues known to have been in the final process of negotiation with American interests at the time the tax was proposed. These issues totaled over $200 million, with borrowers in Japan and Europe each accounting for more than $90 million. This particular compilation, confined to corporate issues, is only symptomatic of the much greater volume of potential borrowings from industralized foreign countries other than Canada that were on the horizon, including large issues of both central and local governments. In discussions with responsible European financial officials over the past few months, we learned of many more prospective flotations.

The urgency of this situation, combined with the essential need to forestall a flood of anticipatory borrowing by foreigners and accelerated purchases of foreign issues by U.S. investors, compelled the President to ask that this tax become effective the day following his special message. Enough is known of the third quarter balance of payments to make clear that, along side the recent actions to firm the level of short-term interest rates, this proposal for an interest equalization tax is playing a key role in reducing the outflow of capital and permitting the needed improvement in our overall position. Present indications are that, during the 3 months ended in September, the deficit on regular transactions—that is, excluding all special intergovernmental payments—declined, on a seasonally adjusted basis, to less than half of the annual rate of $4.5 billion at which it was running over the January-June period as a whole. Sizable debt prepayments, medium-term borrowing from other nations, and other special Government transactions reduced the overall net deficit still further—the preliminary figure should become available very shortly.

Much of the sharp third-quarter improvement can be traced directly to a decline each month since June in purchases of new foreign stocks and bonds. A further significant portion of the decline appears to reflect a cessation of the sizable net purchases of outstanding foreign securities that occurred during the first half of the year, when such buying had resulted in a net outflow at an annual rate of $200 million. What has happened—judging from preliminary data through August—is that foreigners have continued to purchase these securities in our market in somewhat reduced volume, while Americans have sharply limited their purchases from foreigners.

It is worth noting that the substantially improved third-quarter figures includes a significant volume of further purchases of new foreign issues by Americans, amounting as nearly as we can determine today to between $150 and $200 million. In itself, this would imply purchases at a rate at or above that of the 1959–61 period, when the outflow of portfolio capital was maintained within a more sustainable range of $500 to $650 million annually. These purchases have almost entirely reflected transactions completed or firmly committed before the proposed July 19 effective date for the tax. By September the flow had practically ceased. So far as we know, no sizable new commitments have been undertaken since July 18.

Clearly, the initial impact of the tax on negotiations between potential lenders and borrowers has been exaggerated by a tendency to postpone action pending legislative resolution of the proposal. This has been particularly evident in the case of Canadian borrowers, who have refrained from entering our market even though we have proposed that the President exercise his discretionary authority under the bill to exempt new issues from that country.

It can be expected that some negotiations will be reactivated once the tax becomes definite. A few issuers have already expressed willingness to bear the higher costs that will result, and the present uncertainties concerning the tax treatment of Canadian borrowers will be ended. On the other hand, the backlog of earlier commitments has now been worked off in large part, and the clear consensus of market participants is that, once the proposed tax has become law, the renewed flow will not again approach the excessive levels of earlier months. Meanwhile, the progressive effects of measures to reduce the dollar outflow from Government spending abroad, together with other actions to improve our overall position, should assure our continuing capacity to sustain a reasonable outflow of portfolio capital in line with our experience before 1962.

While negotiation of new foreign issues has temporarily come to a standstill, active trading markets have been maintained in the United States for outstanding foreign securities held by American investors, both on the exchanges and over the counter. Beginning August 19, the date we proposed the tax should become effective for securities traded on U.S. stock exchanges, the principal exchanges introduced new procedures for identifying transactions involving foreign-owned securities which, if purchased by a U.S. investor, would be subject to tax. Meanwhile, tax-free trading in foreign securities among U.S. investors has continued in the regular way.

Total trading volume in these issues on the exchanges initially tended to contract, but as brokers and investors became accustomed to the new procedures, it recovered, although still remaining below normal levels. Trading of foreign-owned securities on the exchanges has been rather inactive, but these transactions, never before reported separately, may always have been relatively limited. American dealers have continued to arrange transactions among foreigners in foreign dollar bonds, which they may handle free of tax under the terms of the proposed bill. This trading exemption, entailing a refund or credit to dealers of the tax on securities promptly resold to foreigners, appears to be operating effectively and could reasonably be extended to other foreign bond issues.

As had been anticipated, trading in foreign securities among U.S. investors has frequently, but far from uniformly, taken place at prices above the prices prevailing in trading among foreigners in the same securities. No regular pattern has developed and, for the most part, these premiums have been small. In the case of actively traded stocks, premiums have generally varied from less than 1 percent to as much as about 4 percent, and in the case of bonds they have seldom, if at all, exceeded 2 percent. No discernible premium has developed for some of the most widely held foreign stocks and for many bond issues.

In a few special instances, however, particular foreign industrial equities with exceptional appeal to U.S. investors have traded at a premium of as much as 15 percent—the full amount of the tax—and in these cases some net purchases from abroad have continued, although apparently in reduced volume. Sizable premiums initially developed on some highly speculative gold shares as well, but demand for these stocks subsided during September and the premiums have now almost disappeared.

I should also emphasize that no evidence has developed of any significant withdrawal of foreign capital out of U.S. securities nor of flight of U.S. capital abroad. The sharp improvement in our overall accounts during the full third quarter is by itself an indication that any outflow of funds from these sources could not have been large. Moreover, the more specific data available for August indicate that, on balance, foreigners were net buyers of U.S. corporate securities in an amount greater than in most of the earlier months of this year. I should add, too, that responsible officials in Europe have both recognized the need to reduce our outflow of portfolio capital, and welcomed our proposal as a further indication of our firm intention to end our deficit and maintain the stability of the dollar.

Some concern has been expressed that the effectiveness of the tax in restraining outflows of portfolio capital will be diluted by two of the proposed exemptions—one for loans made by commercial banks in the ordinary course of their business, and the other for new issues of particular countries to be invoked only at the President's discretion when necessary to avert a threat to the stability of the international monetary system. As I indicated earlier, it is our intention to exempt new Canadian issues under the terms of the latter provision.

This Canadian exemption is designed to meet a highly unusual combination of circumstances. Canada will for some time have a need to borrow abroad enough funds to cover a sizable and continuing current account deficit. Because of the exceptionally close linkage of Canadian financial markets and those in the United States, and because of other trading and business relationships between the two countries, the great bulk of these Canadian needs have traditionally been met in our market. In addition, under present circumstances Canadian access to other markets may be too limited to meet their requirements. Under these conditions, the prospect of sharply higher borrowing costs in the United States was interpreted in Canada as threatening the ability of the Canadian authorities to maintain the stability of their currency without serious damage to their internal economy, and an exceptionally large specualtive outflow of funds from Canada raised the prospect of an immediate exchange crisis. Faced with this situation, the Canadian authorities suggested that appropriate restraints on their borrowing in the United States could be achieved by other measures of their own choosing consistent with their domestic objectives. In these unique circumstances, an exemption from the tax for Canadian new issues was clearly appropriate.

At the same time, it is vital that an important reduction be achieved in the high level of recent outflows of portfolio capital to Canada, and that total Canadian recourse to our capital markets return to more normal levels. An exemption can be justified only if consistent with that objective. The Canadians fully understand that we intend to closely watch the volume of their borrowing in this country and that, should the total appear to be exceeding prudent limits, we will recommend that the President exercise his discretionary authority to impose a limitation on the volume of their exempt borrowings. This discretionary power to limit the size of any exemption is an essential element of the exemption proposal. Without it, the proposed Canadian exemption could undermine the whole purpose of the proposed tax.

The exemption proposed for commercial banks will assure that financing for American exports will remain amply available on reasonable terms and that other short- and medium-term borrowing in support of normal and recurring business operations abroad will not be unnecessarily impeded. However, the possibility of abuse of this exemption, particularly if potential foreign long-term borrowers attempt to shift their demands to the banks, must be recognized. Therefore it is important that we follow developments in this area closely. Our ability promptly to detect and discourage any such possible abuse would be greatly facilitated by an amendment to H.R. 8000 providing the Treasury with specific authority to obtain from the banks timely reports in adequate detail on the nature of their current foreign lending activity. Existing procedures for the compilation of statistical information on the overall volume of outstanding bank loans are not adequate to meet the need for timely and detailed information on this matter. In the event that, contrary to our expectations, circumstances should arise that would require some revision of the exemption for bank loans, the kind of detailed information on the nature of bank lending to foreigners which will be provided by these reports will be of great assistance to the administration and to the Congress in determining means for dealing with this problem effectively, without damage to the financing of American trade or normal business transactions.

Since the announcement of the proposed tax, Treasury officials have been in almost daily contact with investor interests, business firms with operations abroad, and representatives of security houses, identifying with them special problems presented by their particular situations and exploring appropriate ways of dealing with them. In a number of instances, practical and mutually satisfactory solutions to these problems appear feasible within the general framework of H.R. 8000, and we will be happy to suggest amendments to this effect at the appropriate point in your discussions. However, some of the proposals presented to us for additional exemptions and exclusions would undermine the effectiveness of the tax, unnecessarily distort normal market relationships, or require for their implementation the kind of detailed administrative apparatus and surveillance more characteristic of a general system of exchange controls. Intensive review of all these considerations has confirmed our initial judgment that outstanding foreign issues acquired from foreigners should be subject to tax together with new issues, and that a general tax free switching privilege is neither desirable in the interest of equity and effectiveness nor feasible without creating serious new problems.

Exemptions of this nature would be inconsistent with our intent that the interest equalization tax work in a manner analogous to a 1 percent increase in the structure of our long-term interest rates relative to those prevailing abroad. Such a change in interest rates, in addition to increasing the cost of new foreign borrowings, would, of course, affect the relative advantages of purchasing outstanding foreign securities. The proposed tax, properly viewed as a substitute for a change in relative interest rates that today cannot be achieved directly, will and should have closely similar effects on international investment and borrowing decisions, and on flows of funds abroad.

Within this framework, the distribution of available capital will continue to be determined, consistent with normal market forces, by relative prices and other competitive criteria, without direct Government intervention in the process of private decisionmaking.

This concept is very different from that lying behind the principal alternative means that has been suggested to achieve the needed reduction in the outward flow of portfolio capital—selective rationing by some form of capital issues committee, presumably operating on a more or less voluntary basis, but under Government auspices. By its very nature, this would mean that market price would be rejected as an appropriate criterion. Instead, market forces would be supplanted by generalized criteria for "good" or "bad" types of investment or by some kind of ceiling on the holdings of individual institutions to which purchasers of foreign securities would be expected to conform.

There are many difficulties implicit in this kind of approach. When a large number of competing firms are involved, and when transactions entered into at one point in time frequently have important implications for subsequent competitive relationships among firms, there are strong market incentives to interpret generalized voluntary guidelines loosely, or to observe the letter while neglecting the spirit. In the absence of clear legal sanctions and the discipline of price, the entire system can break down quickly under competitive pressure as soon as any suspicion arises that some participants are not conforming to the intent of the program. This danger is reinforced when, as in this case, the application of general guidelines to specific circumstances would seldom be clear cut and unambiguous, for each transaction would necessarily have unique characteristics. Moreover, it would not be feasible even to attempt to cover purchases of outstanding issues by the thousands of investors involved, thus not only leaving that channel for portfolio outflow untouched but encouraging investors withdrawing from the new issues market to transfer their buying in that direction.

Past experience indicates that, to be effective at all, voluntary restraint in so complex an area will require specific "yes" or "no" decisions on many proposed transactions. In the last analysis the burden for making these decisions can only properly and practically fall back on the Government itself. The net result would be to inject the Government squarely into the process of individual decisionmaking, and thus into the whole fabric of our economic life, to an extent that this country has always found unacceptable during peacetime. Moreover, in dealing with foreign borrowing, these decisions, case by case, will inevitably be colored by our relationships at the time with the other nation involved, bringing into the negotiations considerations of foreign policy far removed from the purpose of the effort and further complicating the task of achieving effective restraint.

Government cannot, of course, escape a responsibility for identifying the nature of the problem, pointing to the main directions in which the public interest lies, and developing policies to support that interest; judgments of this kind are, of course, embodied in the bill before you. But, to pass beyond this to an attempt to direct specific private transactions would be to accept heavy and undesirable responsibilities of a very different kind. And I am thoroughly convinced that it is an illusion to believe that these responsibilities could be escaped behind the facade of voluntary program.

In conclusion, I would point out again that the effectiveness and workability of the approach embodied in H.R. 8000 has been demonstrated by the developments of recent months. The essential retroactivity feature has provided us with the necessary time to identify and appraise the special problems that have arisen, and I am confident that these problems can be dealt with effectively and equitably by your committee.

But unless the basic approach embodied in this bill is enacted into law, the gravest of risks will promptly ensue for the dollar. Certainly, capital outflows could be expected to resume on a massive scale if we, by our own actions, demonstrate to all the world an unwillingness to take those actions that are necessary to reduce and eliminate our deficit. In that event, no one could answer for the continued stability of the dollar.

I know of no substitute for the legislation before you that will adequately meet the need without turning in the direction of direct controls. Thus, it should be clearly understood that rejection of the substance of this legislation would force the United States to move, in this area of portfolio investment, to measures of direct control contrary to our traditions—measures that we must do everything in our power to avoid. For these reasons, I consider it of utmost importance that your committee take prompt and affirmative action in support of the general principles embodied in this proposal.

The Time To Cut Aid Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 1, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Ledger-Star of Norfolk, Va., entitled, "The Time To Cut Aid Is Now."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME TO CUT AID IS NOW

The foreign aid bill is in trouble, and from time to time there crosses our desk a letter from good people who want the Senate to restore the House cuts.

Among the early October letters was one from Gen. Lucius Clay, Chairman of the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, whose report had recommended reductions in foreign aid. Among the later letters was one from Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and HUBERT HUMPHREY, which included a memorandum titled "The Case for Foreign Aid."

General Clay's communication states that while the House Foreign Affairs Committee cuts, by and large, closely paralleled the reductions suggested by his committee, they were somewhat greater than the Clay Committee had in mind. The House committee reduced the President's request by $400 million to $4.1 billion. But when the bill reached the floor, the whole House reduced foreign aid by an additional $585 million

to a total of $3.5 billion. This, General Clay says, is a "threat to vital U.S. interests abroad," particularly in the Alliance for Progress and military assistance program reductions. All the same, General Clay does support some reductions from the administration bill.

Senators JAVITS and HUMPHREY call for better public understanding of the need for foreign aid. They also note that the Senate will soon be voting on the bill, and that the Senate and House will later on consider an appropriations bill as well as the authorization bill now under debate.

Now the first thing that ought to be said about the cuts in the foreign aid bill is that this is the first time any true reduction has been made by the House. To be sure, usually the House has reduced the President's request; but Presidents have a way of requesting funds with a possible cut in mind. Foreign aid has run on, year after year after year, to a sum of about $4 billion, annually, give or take a few million, for a total since the end of World War II of around $100 billion.

Those who want the cut restored will settle again for around $4 billion. But that is no reduction; for if we keep on authorizing and appropriating $4 billion, where will the reductions suggested by the Clay Committee be made? He did suggest them, we should remember: "It can be carefully and gradually reduced, barring extraordinary developments," he writes this newspaper. But this is "too great a cut in 1 year," he adds.

Well, we remain unconvinced about that. We have been told for almost two decades now that foreign aid is the fulcrum with which the United States will move ours to become a better world. Peace depends upon it (peace, in our view, depends upon our own ability to meet aggression or threats of aggression), and world stability and security, as well as our farflung alliances, depend upon foreign aid.

Perhaps we should look at the present state of all those alliances, as seen through the eyes of Mr. Max Frankel of the New York Times. On October 12, 3 days after General Clay's letter and 11 days before Senator JAVITS' and HUMPHREY'S, Mr. Frankel wrote an appraisal which appears in part at the bottom of these columns.

In brief, Mr. Frankel's summation of world affairs does not, in our view, argue for continued expenditures in foreign aid of anything near what we have been spending.

Our reasoning is this: If, after $100 billion has been spent we have so little to show for it in the way of an orderly world, whether one speaks of economics, peace, or the spread of democratic institutions, does anyone believe that if we had spent $200 billion the world would be better off? Or that if we had spent only $50 billion the world would be worse off than it is?

We think the answer to both questions is the same. The answer is no.

Everyone, including General Clay and Senators JAVITS and HUMPHREY are agreed that foreign aid cannot be permitted to continue forever. The Senators' memo states plainly: "Moreover the United States now has an end to its foreign aid programs in mind, even though the end for some countries is not clearly in sight."

But the way to begin is to begin. Foreign aid now goes, according to Senators JAVITS and HUMPHREY, to a total of 71 countries. It would be hard to convince the American people who put up the money that the security of the United States depends upon how much aid we give to 71 countries. It would even be harder to convii ce them that all will remain well if we spend $4 billion on foreign aid but that things will go to pot if we spend only $3.5 billion. We must begin reductions sometime, some place. The time, at least in our view, is now.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Tom Connally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in one of our well-known and widely read newspapers, the New Bedford Standard-Times, about our late colleague and most respected Senator, Tom Connally. It shows the regard in which he was held in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM CONNALLY

As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during World War I and its aftermath, Thomas Terry Connally became an international figure, but remained in many respects what he said he was when he first went to Congress in 1917—a "country lawyer."

He listed himself in the Congressional Directory simply as "Tom Connally." He liked to season a serious speech on foreign affairs with the homely phrases of his native Texas.

Speaking as the statesman, he said before war came to the United States in 1941 that this country should "maintain a policy of resistance to conquest of democratic countries by dictators * * *." Then, as a Texan, he put the same thought another way by adding no nation should be allowed to become "too big for its britches."

Yet he was in no sense provincial. It was Connally who gave heavily of his time for more than 4 years to promoting Franklin D. Roosevelt's dream of a world organization to keep the peace. Due in large measure to Connally's leadership, the issue of American membership in the subsequently formed United Nations was taken out of politics. He went to the San Francisco conference which in the spring of 1945 framed the U.N. Charter and helped to obtain the Senate's ratification—with only two adverse votes.

But Connally, who was a "firm believer in the world security system," who was willing to give it every chance, nevertheless was a realist as well as a stanch protector of his country's rights.

As the dreams for world peace faded before the onslaught of cold war and Iron Curtain tactics, the Texan told his Senate colleagues it was "imperative that the United States maintain an adequate Army, a superior Navy and a superlative Air Force"—for defense and for sustaining "our international rights and obligations."

In this same frame of mind, Mr. Connally was sufficiently perceptive to sense the abyss between hope and truth in international affairs. The same Senator who was a leading fighter to give the U.N. an opportunity to prove itself realized the United States required protection from foreign laws as well as from foreign tanks, if either was against our best interests.

Accordingly, he sponsored an amendment concerning American adherence to the World Court at The Hague. This restricts court jurisdiction involving the United States to those cases that the U.S. Senate decides the Court is competent to judge. Connally guided this reservation through the Senate; it bears his name and is a fitting monument to the outstanding "country lawyer" who served his country long and well.

The Vulnerability of Our Land-Based Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the October 1963 issue of Navy magazine:

The Senate has advised and consented to the limited nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union by a vote of 80 to 19. Sixty-six votes were needed for ratification.

The agreement, which permits only underground nuclear explosions, is now the law of the land. There is, therefore, only academic interest in the observation by some critics that (1) the pact might have failed of ratification if all the uneasy Senators had not voted for it on the ground that to do otherwise would embarrass the United States because the President had already signed it and (2) there would have been no treaty at all if the Senate had been asked to advise and consent to its signing before the event.

But the Senate debate focused some (alas, not nearly enough) attention on a problem of transcendent importance to the national security. This matter concerns the vulnerability of our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's), the Atlases, Titans, and Minutemen.

WE JUST DON'T KNOW

Briefly, the problem involves these considerations:

The Russians have exploded very large hydrogen bombs—up to 60 megatons or 60 million tons of TNT equivalent and American officials concede they can build them up to 100 megatons or more. We are not certain what effect such monster bombs will have on our radars, underground missiles and control and firing posts because we have never exploded weapons that large and the treaty now bars us from doing so.

Last year, when President Kennedy was explaining why we had to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere, he put it this way:

"We are spending great sums of money on radar to alert our defenses and develop antimissile systems—on the communications which enable our command and control centers to direct a response—on hardening our missile sites, shielding our missiles and warheads from defensive action, and providing them with electronic guidance systems to find their targets.

"But we cannot be certain how much of the preparation will turn out to be useless, blacked out, paralyzed or destroyed by the complex effects of nuclear explosion."

Mr. Kennedy's statement was made on March 2, 1962, before he or any other Westerner knew of the Soviet plan to build and test monster bombs later in the year. Accordingly, what he said then might be said now with the same persuasiveness. In fact, we discovered more about a phenomenon called electromagnetic pulse, a heavy surge of energy generated by nuclear explosions, in our 1962 tests. Some scientists and military men fear that EMP, as it is called, has the capability to deactivate our missiles in their silos by fusing electronic circuits and agitating the delicate electronic components. No one at the Pentagon can say for sure that it doesn't. The following comment by Missiles and Rockets magazine may, therefore, be properly in order:

"It could mean that the United States has invested billions of dollars in a maginot line of Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missiles which could be rendered harmless by the new Soviet development.

What is the Pentagon planning to do about this threat to the larger part of our deterrent/retaliatory missile force—the stuffed-in-concrete portion? According to Dr. Harold Brown, Deputy Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, the Pentagon will "design around our uncertainties." And what does that mean? Principally this: We will spend more millions for more radars, missiles, and silos and a new fire-control system which would allow us to launch our land-based rockets from an airplane.

It seems to us that there is a more sensible, less, expensive way of solving the vulnerability problem and it is distressing that the land-oriented leaders of the Defense Department haven't discovered it. (Senator HENRY JACKSON of Washington has, we are happy to relate.) It is, simply, to transfer more of our strategic missile deterrent to the security of the seas. This means more Polaris submarines. It means putting Polaris aboard surface warships—as we are asking NATO to do; it means we should develop larger warheads for new seaborne rockets.

WE NEED A "MIX" BUT—

We do not advocate that all our ballistic missiles be seaborne. We should have a "mix" of ship-based and land-based rockets although, in our opinion, the latter should be of the mobile, less-vulnerable variety.

But commonsense dictates that the far larger portion should be moving about and hidden in the 70 percent of the earth's surface that is blue water rather than embedded in concrete in the 2 percent occupied by the United States.

Despite the economic and political considerations that unquestionably enter into such matters, some day the American people, who have been told over and over again that we will not shoot first, will rise up and demand to know why we are putting so many big, juicy targets in our homeland—targets which can only draw a rain of thermonuclear death and firestorms in case of war.

We hope that on Navy Day, 1963, when many Americans will be thinking about "seapower for the seventies" and "the four-ocean challenge," that our top Defense Department civilians will ponder the map of the world,

take note of the vast areas of blue and then reconsider the composition of our strategic missile forces.

Early Supporter Now Doubts ARA's Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963 were defeated in the House in June of this year by a vote of 209 to 204. Subsequently, another bill providing further authorizations for this program passed in the other body and an amended version of the Senate bill has been favorably reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee and is now awaiting action by the House Rules Committee.

Because of the current interest in ARA, the comments and conclusions of one who is knowledgeable on this subject, who earlier supported the ARA program, but now describes it as a "futile attempt to help too many communities," should be of interest to all Members. I, therefore, include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Sunday, November 3, 1963, edition of the Washington Post entitled "Early Supporter Now Doubts ARA's Value," by Julius Duscha, staff reporter of the Post, in which he discusses the criticism of ARA by Sar A. Leviatan, research professor of labor economics at George Washington University.

The article follows:

EARLY SUPPORTER NOW DOUBTS ARA'S VALUE

(By Julius Duscha)

An early supporter of depressed area legislation has sharply criticized the program for "its futile attempt to help too many communities."

The criticism came from Sar A. Levitan, research professor of labor economics at George Washington University.

Levitan raises serious questions about the 2-year-old program in a just-completed book-length study of it financed by the Ford Foundation.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was set up by Congress in 1961 to provide loans and grants to help bring industry and jobs to such areas as southern West Virginia and eastern Kentucky where unemployment is chronic.

The $389 million depressed areas program was the first major economic legislation proposed by the Kennedy administration. It also was one of the first major pieces of legislation approved by Congress after Mr. Kennedy took office in 1961.

Last June the House defeated legislation providing an additional $455 million for the depressed areas program. Although the Senate approved the additional funds 2 weeks after the House vote, no effort to try to pass the program in the House in expected before next year.

Levitan attributes the House defeat of the legislation largely to a feeling among many Representatives that the program has been administered on a political basis.

But Levitan's principal criticism of the program is that it has spread too thin what he considers an "extremely limited * * * package of tools."

He notes that more than a third of the Nation's 3,100 counties are eligible for ARA aid. Many counties were brought into the program because of provisions put into the legislation to get votes for it from southern Senators and Representatives from States with declining rural populations.

Levitan notes that one of the original justifications for the ARA was that it would provide jobs and industry for declining communities where public facilities were going to waste and were deteriorating.

"But," he adds, "more than half of the designated ARA larger areas, with a labor force of more than 15,000, have experienced a growth in population between 1950 and 1960.

"Similarly, the population of a third of the smaller designated areas * * * increased between 1950 and 1960, despite the fact that many of these areas are predominantly rural and would be expected to reflect the sharp decline in agricultural employment."

Levitan goes on to note that "not all depressed communities can be saved."

He says "the solution for most of the unemployment in depressed areas whose resource base has been depleted may lie in equipping the unemployed with skills which would be marketable in other areas.

"Many resource-based depressed communities," he adds, "are located in isolated areas where new economic activity can be introduced only at prohibitive costs. Other depressed areas, particularly rural, have never developed an adequate economic base and the social capital invested in such areas is normally insignificant."

Levitan concludes that "a depressed area program can be effective only when the number of depressed areas is reduced to manageable proportions and only areas with a potential for development at a reasonable economic cost are made eligible to participate in the program."

He suggests that preferential tax treatment be given companies that move to depressed areas. Only in this way, he argues, will "blue chip" companies be persuaded to move to these areas.

Levitan also believes that Federal grant-in-aid programs should give special consideration to depressed areas.

Budget Makers Are Not Budget Cutters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, during debate on the tax bill, many eloquent speeches were made by proponents of the bill expressing the need for making a choice between two roads. The House and the American people were told that if we passed this tax bill we were placing our reliance on the private sector of the economy and rejecting the pump-priming operations of the public sector. In addition, we were told that the President had on at least three separate occasions joined in this Magna Carta of fiscal responsibility. To substantiate this, a letter to Chairman MILLS, of the Ways and Means Committee, signed by the President was revealed for all to see.

Apparently this much-talked-about noble pledge does not extend to the Kennedy budgetmakers. A recent article appearing in the November 1 issue of the Wall Street Journal gives all of us who are economy minded cause for alarm. The article stated:

BUDGET MAKERS ARE NOT BUDGET CUTTERS

Budget makers slyly shape spending plans to avoid wrecking tax cut chances.

They figure the tax bill will still be pending when the budget goes to Congress in January; conservatives will rebel unless spending boosts are limited. So policymakers warn agencies that big new job-creating projects must be kept out of the original budget. They promise to seek extra funds for some later on, when the tax bill is out of the way.

Kennedy men sweat as lawmakers try to pin down their stand on big new public works outlays now. Officials try to assure liberal Democrats they favor antiunemployment projects generally, but within Kennedy's promised budget hold down. The administration holds careful briefing sessions before Capitol hearings, to make sure all its witnesses get the delicate line straight.

Approach of 1964 elections promises to sharpen tax cut versus spending disputes among Congress Democrats. Kennedy strategists fear embarrassing clamor by liberals for bigger job-creating outlays.

Salute to a Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal characteristics of despotic, authoritarian governments is the secrecy in which they shroud their operations.

And a fundmental, vital trait of democratic governments is their willingness to make available to the people and the press detailed information about their operations.

In recent years, we have observed an ominous trend in our Federal Government, a trend typified by bureaucrats in the executive branch who crouch behind the public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 to withhold information from the Congress, from the press and from the people of this country.

A recognized leader in the fight for freedom of information, so essential to our democratic processes, is the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Honorable EDWARD V. LONG. Senator LONG has introduced legislation which would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to clarify and preserve the right of the public to information about their Government.

An outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, the St. Joseph, Mo., Gazette, recently paid editorial tribute to Senator LONG for his efforts to protect the citizen's fundamental right to know what his Government is doing and under leave to extend my remarks I include this editorial:

SALUTE TO A SENATOR

Hearings now in progress before a Senate committee headed by Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, are of vital interest and importance to everyone.

They are being conducted by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in conjunction with a "freedom of information" bill which seeks to establish the public right to information about governmental operations, and to set forth the means by which such information will be required by law to be made available.

This is not just a bill for newspapers. The fundamental importance of information about governmental activities often is overlooked. We have, since the start of the American system of democracy, taken for granted that the people would be told what their Government was doing. If through no other way, it has been assumed that we could learn of governmental doings through our own elected representatives to the Congress.

Of late, however, there has been a trend toward secrecy in Government. Labels of "classified" or "top secret" have been stamped across documents dealing with foreign policy, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and others which deny even those in Congress access to information.

Said Senator LONG recently in reference to the observance of National Newspaper Week, October 13–19:

"There has never been greater need for a full and free flow of information than today. * * * Since an informed public is the foundation of our system of government, and the press is the most important means by which the public keeps informed, it follows that our need of a strong and free press was never greater."

As a part of the free press of which he speaks, we salute Senator LONG with a strong and sincere commendation of his work in pushing for legislation which will provide a step away from managed news and protect the public from the dangers of secrecy in Government.

Address by Hon. Barry Goldwater Before the California Federation of Republican Women, Coronado, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican women of California were thrilled last month to present as their featured speaker our distinguished colleague from the other body, the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER. Under unanimous consent, I include as a portion of my remarks the text of his speech of October 3, 1963, before the California Federation of Republican Women at the Hotel Del Coronado, in Coronado, Calif., in my congressional district:

REMARKS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, REPUBLICAN, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN, OCTOBER 3, 1963, CORONADO, CALIF.

I am very glad to be here today and I will tell you why.

Like President Kennedy I thoroughly enjoy these nonpolitical safaris into the Far West. They give you a chance to get out and meet the people and kiss a few babies. They give you a bright feeling of being able to grind a political ax behind a smokescreen of nonpartisanship.

Of course, if you have been reading the newspapers you know that the President's tour was devoted to the cause of "conservation." Now I hope you got the word correctly. I said "conservation," not "conservatism."

And, even though there is a lot of substance that connects these two words, I think you should know that the President had in mind such things as natural resources, wildlife preserves, waterway systems, and national parks. This, of course, is commendable even though the projects mentioned are the kind that appeal to large blocs of American voters.

Now, I have been making a few appearances, too. And I must confess that my major objective these days is conservation. But it is a different kind of conservation than the one which held the President's nonpolitical attention. My interest is in conserving the basic values of American life, as well as conserving our natural resources and the like.

But I suggest that what really needs conserving today—in the most urgent and important sense—is the freedom of the individual, the military strength of the Nation and the constitutional system of checks and balances and our capitalist economic system.

In the field of foreign affairs our job right now is the conservation of our national honor and the protection of our position as leader of the free world.

In the domestic sphere, our job is to conserve the free enterprise system, protect the concept of limited Government and conserve the right of our people to run their own affairs without interference from the Federal Government.

These are the important items on the Republican conservation list. They take a lot of doing and I can tell you right now that we are counting heavily on you women to help get the job done.

You know, I always like to speak before a group of Republican women. Not only because I have an especially high regard for the female of the species, but because I know that when the chips are down in a political campaign it is always the women who pitch in and take on the tough chores. You know men are sometimes a little reluctant to do the doorbell ringing, or work on registration or handle the mailing and telephone campaigns. But never the women. They work with the enthusiasm of dedication to a great cause.

Frankly, I don't know what we would do in the Republican Party without the women who go in for political action. I shudder to think what might have happened to me in my two campaigns for the U.S. Senate if it hadn't been for the women who worked and, of course, the women who voted.

Let me say that I commend you for your efforts and I salute you for your accomplishments in the field of sound government and individual freedom. You can take it from me, if you will, that the Republican women, not only here in California but all over the country, are an indispensable adjunct to the rough-and-tumble campaign we face next year. And I believe that any one who has the good fortune to run for public office on the Republican ticket next year will find it highly comforting to wake every morning to the sure knowledge that women like you are backing him and working for him.

While traveling out here I got to thinking about the recent events in the Congress and in the Government and I became more convinced than ever that Washington is the "Wonderland of the World" under the present administration.

Since the end of World War II we've spent billions beefing up our security so that Khrushchev couldn't bury us, only to discover that in the past few weeks what the Kennedys are really working for is a Soviet-American mutual aid society.

Think it over. In less than a month the New Frontier has offered to pick up the check for half the cost of a joint shot to the moon, stop testing nuclear weapons in the air and, finally, bail out the highly vaunted Soviet farm collective with a lot of what I'm willing to bet will be tons of free American wheat.

There is an old line somewhere that goes: "If you can't lick them join them," but I for one am not quite ready to lay down and play Rover to Kremlin tunes. And I doubt if any of you are either.

I think the trouble is that within the past few years we've been getting a brainwashing on the subject of Soviet capabilities. Some of those who are pushing the hardest for accommodation with the Communists would have us believe that the Soviets are superior to us all the way across the board. They have a better educational system, some professors claim; they have better vocational schools, some planners insist; they have a better agricultural system; better scientists, and so on and so on. In fact, we seem to have been exposed to some kind of Red-painted Utopia where those who once wanted to bury us are now mellowing. We are led to believe that Americans, in distrusting the Russians, are creating world tensions that must be reduced. We never seem to hear about the world tensions which the Soviets have created. The President, in one of his nonpolitical speeches last week, insisted that under his administration Communists have been stopped.

All I can say is that if they were stopped in Cuba, if they have been stopped in Laos, if they have been stopped in Vietnam, if they have been pushed back in Berlin—then I will eat my babushka. We have, however, prevented them from landing on Miami—they are still 90 miles away.

I think we ought to be proud of America and the fact that throughout the cold war we have not been the instigators of tension between East and West. I think we ought to stick up for America, the only country in the world that I know of that goes around asking everybody what they think of us.

If your husband thought there was something wrong with him, he would probably talk it over with you and not trot around the neighborhood taking a public opinion poll on his faults. But not the New Frontier. The architects of the present administration want to know what Khrushchev's temperature is every morning. They want to know how General deGaulle enjoyed his breakfast. They want to know every last syllable of what Mao Tse-tung had to say about Russia in his latest diatribe.

At the State Department I suppose all of this international gossip is highly interesting. But what to me is vastly more important is what our sworn enemies are doing—not what they say or how they feel.

What today is actually going on in this country in the administration's dealings with foreign nations is a vast campaign to see no difference, hear no difference, and speak no difference. There seems to be a sort of quasi-official feeling that we are engaging in a love feast with the Soviets that only we can disrupt.

Along the New Frontier the idea is to conform or keep quiet. Nothing must be done to ruffle Mr. Khrushchev's feelings or lead him to think that we are superior to the Soviets in any category. We do not hear a tough note out of this administration unless it is directed at one of our tried and proven allies.

Actually the President has my sympathy. Not all of it, but some of it.

Vigor—or vigah—is now a galloping ghost. It is being expended where it doesn't count. The strength which we spent billions to build

is no longer used in the fashion that General Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles used to protect freedom against an aggressive enemy. No, today we must sign a treaty with the very people the President went on nationwide television just a year ago to accuse of perfidy in Cuba. What makes these international liars any more trustworthy today than they were 12 months ago when they sat in the President's Office and insisted they had no offensive missiles in Cuba? What makes us accept the idea that this nuclear test ban treaty is different from the dozens and dozens of other treaties which the Soviets have broken?

On the domestic front, the New Frontier is equally disappointing. In Washington right now you are passé unless you agree that Government has got to grow at the same rate as the population. President Kennedy is just as convinced of this today as he is with the idea that without him America would not be going forward.

I suggest there is no logic in trying to connect population growth with Government growth. For example, there are fewer farmers today but there are far more paid employees in the Department of Agriculture. If it keeps up at the present rate there will be a bureaucrat in Washington for every individual engaged in tilling the soil.

Not many years ago a corporation I happen to know about totaled its profits, filed its tax return, and went about its business of supplying the American public with goods and services, creating jobs in the process. Today that same corporation has to file 3,600 Government forms every year on tax matters alone. Another firm files 37,683 Government reports annually totalling 48,285 man-hours of work—labor that produces absolutely nothing except an excuse for hiring more file clerks in Washington.

I have heard that it costs the railroads $5 million a year just to file reports with the Interstate Commerce Commission. This, of course, is a sick industry and you can guess why.

Actually, you know, the Government is smothering us with loving kindness and devoted attention to our private affairs. The cost in dollars alone is phenomenal, but it is far more serious when it is counted in individual liberties.

In the first 6 months of this session of Congress President Kennedy made 207 requests for spending authority and 70 requests for additional executive power.

This, again following the population growth, is an increase of more than 100 money requests and 40 power requests over the requests to the entire session of the previous Congress.

Actually there is scarcely a corner, a niche or a cranny of our lives that isn't covered by some real or proposed edict of government. I don't see how we take it and I hope that, with your help, we won't have to take it much longer.

I say to you that the way to keep this country great is to give it the freedom to breathe, to stop laying hands on our people every time a new child is born, to stop the Government from peering over our shoulders at every juncture of human endeavor.

Sometimes we're inclined to forget that nothing was leaning over the shoulders of our Founding Fathers but loaded muskets when they put together a new governmental experiment in human freedom.

Inventiveness, free enterprise, and a willingness to work and grow in our own way led to the building of the most productive Nation the world has ever known.

The same things will keep it growing, if our people have a chance to display these virtues.

In California you've got problems. We all have problems and we must seize the chance to solve most of them ourselves because unless we keep the door bolted and the windows fastened, somebody from Washington will be out here trying to solve them for us—and at double the local cost.

And, of course, when Washington moves in on a local problem, we get far more than help. We get tons of advice and counsel and beneath the well-modulated suggestions will be the mailed fist of centralized government.

Now there are cures for these problems. Republican cures. And if we don't foul up the medicine with our own rancor I'm sure the American people will find the remedies palatable.

You know, as Republicans we wear a pretty proud label. But it sets us apart from our fellow citizens of different political persuasion only in that what we believe we have consistently believed.

Our word is good. We can still spell thrift, honesty and dedication.

We've never had to apologize for what we've tried to do for America, and we never will.

With this much going for us I don't see how we can lose. And we can't lose if we'll just take a raincheck when the arguments start about what kind of a Republican one or the other of us happens to be.

I'm a Republican right down to my gizzard. I always have been and I will continue to be.

I'm not going to read anyone out of the party. But I will read anyone into the party that I can get my hands on. If they can get to the polls in the right frame of mind we need them. And I doubt that a single one of them could pollute our party or strain our integrity after the many years we have stood for what is right and just and honorable for our beloved country.

Republicans do not have to be told what will happen to America if we continue down the road the administration is traveling. It is a road that leads to ruin, and you know it as well as I do.

It's a historic road, littered with the bodies of dead governments and wrecked freedom.

It's a road that goes nowhere but downhill.

In my mind it's almost a sin when vigorous, intelligent, and economically independent people turn to the Federal Government for aid and succor in solving most of their community and State problems when they can be solved close to home.

There is a place for the Federal Government in our lives—a big one.

It was conceived by our Founding Fathers as an instrument to raise the militia and the money to support them to protect us from aggression.

That is a function it can do and it is a function Americans respond to with patriotic willingness.

The blame for our failures in confining the functions of the Federal Government lies not alone with the President or the Presidents who preceded him. Congress must bear an equal burden in creating the climate of centralism that has engulfed us.

I say to you here today, that the remedy is not half as drastic as the disease. The remedy is to elect Republicans in large numbers to the House and Senate next year as you choose a Republican President.

The only pain and suffering will be on the other side, and it will be enlightening to handle the whole problem on an out-patient basis.

Let me repeat, that as Americans we need not offer any apology to any other humans on the face of the earth. Woodrow Wilson said that "only free people can hold their purpose steady to a common end, and prefer the interest of mankind to any narrow interest of their own."

We have for decades held that purpose and continue to do so.

We have, however, reached a point where we are obligated as a free people to hold to the purpose of our own way of life.

It is a purpose that is the marvel of the world, the call of freedom to the enslaved, the beacon of eternal hope to the oppressed.

It is American and I love it. I am proud of the chance to work for it, to try and make it a better country for us all.

Television Coverage of Matters Involving Executive Decision Can Tarnish National Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of October 27, 1963:

BEHIND CLOSED DOORS—TELEVISION COVERAGE OF MATTERS INVOLVING EXECUTIVE DECISION CAN TARNISH NATIONAL DIGNITY

(By Jack Gould)

When the New Frontier took office it was no particular secret that one of the strongest voices against excesses in broadcasting was that of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Not only did he have a decisive influence over the selection of new members of the Federal Communications Commission but also, in informal conferences with network executives, he made clear his special concern over the quality of TV programing offered to young people.

At the same time, however, few men in public life have more keenly appreciated the importance of television in the political arena. The part played by the televised debates in the election of his brother to the Presidency spoke for itself and since taking office the New Frontier has consistently welcomed intensified TV coverage of its activities.

Such awareness of the desirability of open communication between the highest echelons of government and the viewing citizen in many ways has proved highly effective. The impromptu television conversations between President Kennedy and network reporters have added a new dimension to public comprehension of the problems, opportunities, and limitations of the Presidential office. Mrs. John F. Kennedy's delightful tour of the White House immeasurably enhanced the set owner's sense of personal identification with government and its traditions.

REDUCING REMOTENESS

Indeed, President Kennedy frequently has done remarkably well in reducing through television the feeling of remoteness between Washington and the individual home. Where there might be a complaint is in his failure to use the small screen sufficiently to mobilize support for his legislative proposals. On this count it could be suggested that he has confused the underexposure of the issues that really count with fear of overexposure of his own personality.

If ambivalence has attended the White House use of television it is in part, of course, a reflection of the larger Presidential concept of practical leadership, a question more political than electronic. But it also reflects in some degree the tantalizing temptation that TV holds for public figures. Sooner or later, it seems, mere accommodation of the repertorial TV medium gives way to a yearning to participate in the actual production of a program. And always there is the enormously human conceit of non-

professionals that they can put on a TV show and still be just themselves.

In the Eisenhower administration the example came in a simulated cabinet that was supposed to introduce the viewer to the inner workings of government. Last week it was the Kennedy administration's turn when it invited the set owner to eavesdrop on Washington's handling of last June's integration crisis at the University of Alabama.

INTO THE TRAP

Ironically, it was Attorney General Kennedy who walked straight into the trap, momentarily demeaning government through a careless flirtation with the entertainment business. Robert Drew, documentary producer, and the American Broadcasting Co., provided the bait with the suggestion that cameras could be set up in offices and homes of the protagonists without intruding on the substance of events.

Yet the bizarre nature of the venture quickly asserted itself. For the Attorney General to tolerate cameras in the privacy of his home during the height of a national crisis of itself borders on the unbelievable. To a matter of utmost seriousness there was imparted a feeling of play acting that seemed wholly out of place.

Mr. Drew's program offered nothing new of legitimate public concern. One saw the President looking more haggard and worn than he has ever appeared on TV, but one heard only a paraphrase of this conversation in the White House. The deliberations over what should be said in his speech committing the administration to full equality of all citizens were not related.

Instead, there was primarily only a visual play-by-play account of the Attorney General and Gov. George Wallace preparing for a showdown. By concentrating on the mechanics of ousting the Governor from the doorway of the university the emphasis was on a game of strategy, with the good guys winning over the bad guy.

In considerable measure the program only distorted the Alabama crisis. That Governor Wallace defied the courts of the land and finally gave in was of secondary importance. For the viewer the dominant impression was of extremely bright young men in the Justice Department relishing the massing of huge forces to bring down an individual.

The managed theatricality of the documentary was evidenced in an episode involving Nicholas Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, in Tuscaloosa. In the best jutting jaw style of fearless Dick Tracys, Mr. Katzenbach and an aid sternly ordered bystanders away from a radio-equipped car offering direct communication with Washington. Secrecy had to be preserved. So TV viewers later could hear everything.

The dilemma of the citizen is that he never will know what may have been said or done for the benefit of the camera. The uncertainty will exist no matter how vehement any denials, which was the original flaw in the program's concept. And eyebrows are bound to be raised when it happens that a program totally dependent on the cooperation of the Justice Department dutifully portrays its operatives in a most flattering light.

WORLDWIDE CIRCULATION

Of even more fundamental importance is the matter of giving worldwide circulation to private remarks made in periods of tension and emotion. When a viewer hears Attorney General Kennedy suggest that Governor Wallace be treated as a second-rater who was merely wasting everyone's time, the effect is to detract from the essential honor with which the administration conducted itself in its difficult relations with Governor Wallace. Outward reserve is not unbecoming to a country's leaders.

The modern world's propensity for wanting to be on the inside of the inside is matched only by the eagerness of so many others to perform in a fishbowl. But surely in matters of delicate Executive decision there is much to be said for the wisdom of total privacy, of complete avoidance of any compromises that might tarnish the actions of a government which is being scrutinized the world over. Not all countries have made the commitment to television; many still respect national dignity.

Where Is the Initiative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following article by David Lawrence which will appear in the U.S. News & World Report of November 11, 1963:

WHERE'S THE INITIATIVE?

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy's speech delivered at the University of Maine on October 19 deserves careful reading. Adroit in style and rhetoric, it emphasizes the President's palpable effort to do business with the tyrants in the Kremlin.

Mr. Kennedy says the American people can "recall with pride" their conduct of a year ago when they witnessed the "military confrontation between the two great nuclear powers." He adds that, while "well aware of the risks of resistance," this country "refused to tolerate the Soviets' attempt to place nuclear weapons in this hemisphere," but that it was nevertheless necessary at the same time to search for "fair and peaceful solutions."

The President today seems satisfied with the "solutions." Yet, for the first time in our history, we have allowed a hostile European power to establish and maintain a military foothold in this hemisphere. This is still an ignominious fact. We continue to speculate about the number of Soviet troops and "technicians" who remain in Cuba. And we seeming acquiesce in the acts of subversion plotted there against our neighbors. The last year has witnessed the overthrow of several governments in Latin America resulting from widespread turbulence inspired by Communist subversives, helped with Communist funds and munitions, and directed in large part from Cuba.

The President asserts that we didn't win a victory a year ago nor suffer a defeat—that, while the Cuban missile episode was to some observers evidence of "Communist duplicity," the outcome has been regarded by others here and abroad as an indication of the "Soviets' peaceful intentions." But why have we glossed over this flagrant act of aggression in our hemisphere? Why has the President emphasized instead a search for some more or less irrelevant agreements, even as he admits that "we still live in the shadows of war"?

Mr. Kennedy explains that "all of these elements of American policy and Allied policy toward the Soviet Union are directed at a single, comprehensive goal—namely, convincing the Soviet leaders that it is dangerous for them to engage in direct or indirect aggression, futile for them to impose their will and their system on other unwilling people, and beneficial to them, as well as to the world, to join in the achievement of a genuine and enforceable peace."

But why are we dealing solely with the "leaders" in the Kremlin? What has become of the heroic principles first enunciated by President Wilson in World War I and reiterated in World War II, as American and Allied youth gave their lives to save people—not to perpetuate autocratic governments?

The only force which can assure peace in the world is not the Kremlin but the people of the Soviet Union and of the Communist-bloc countries.

The President uses often the phrases of resoluteness, but they are accompanied always by the plea for talk and more talk with the Soviet rulers. He says:

"Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must. Let us resolve to be the masters, not the victims, of our history, controlling our own destiny without giving way to blind suspicion and emotion. Let us distinguish between our hopes and our illusions."

This reflects an indecisiveness and disregard of basic principles that has again and again frustrated Western governments and brought war to Europe. This not the way to become the masters of our history but its victims. For we cannot ignore our main hope—an eventual alliance with the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. This can be initiated by reaching those very people with the story of freedom and the promise that the United States is willing to help in every way to sustain them when they choose the path of freedom.

Have we no voice with which to speak to the Soviet people? Is the "Voice of America" to be anesthetized by official instructions from the White House and the Department of State not to create tensions or say anything that might possibly offend Khrushchev and his clique? Do we really think that the few agreements we have obtained, or those we may get in the future, will prove to be anything more than a sop to our vanity and pride—a means of lulling us into continuing our "relaxation" while the Soviet Government strengthens its hold on the peoples of Eastern Europe and infiltrates Latin America?

How should America fight the cold war—or any other kind of war? By letting the other fellow pick his own battleground, even as we hold back our real force, the power that is built by the voice of truth? For we must by day and by night keep reminding the Soviet people that in the overthrow of their tyrannical leaders lies their only hope and our only hope of world peace. What has happened to our initiative?

Senator Hartke Calls Attention to Prayer by Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I visited recently with a friend, the Reverend Herman H. Heine, of the St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church of Kendallville, Ind. On this occasion he called to my attention a prayer written by Thomas Jefferson for his country. These thoughts are as significant and true now as they were in Jefferson's day and I know my colleagues will share my interest in this. I ask unanimous consent

that this prayer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRAYER OF THOMAS JEFFERSON FOR HIS COUNTRY

Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners.

Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues.

Endow with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the editors of the Richmond News Leader have performed a great service to the readers of this outstanding and outspoken newspaper in printing the text of a declaration on the elimination of racial discrimination as recently approved by the Social Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. In addition to printing the text of this declaration in the October 21, 1963, issue, the editors of the Richmond News Leader have also carefully and incisively analyzed this document so that the dangers of various aspects of this document might be more easily understood by the public. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this declaration, together with the editorial from the Richmond News Leader entitled "The Exchange" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXCHANGE

The U.N. Declaration on Racial Discrimination, printed in full below, is a historic document. Adopted on Monday by the U.N.'s Social Committee, it could, if enforced, destroy many of the rights guaranteed to U.S. citizens by the U.S. Constitution. On Tuesday, the U.S. delegate to the Political Committee repeated a demand for a U.N. peace force, with the power and independence to enforce world disarmament. The two proposals together involve a simple exchange. We would give up our constitutional freedom, and get peace in return.

The declaration on discrimination was passed with hardly a whimper. Eighty-nine nations approved it in committee, including the Communist and uncivilized lands where freedom is a joke. The United States argued briefly before the Social Committee that the document would violate the U.S. Constitution; and to show American opposition, the United States abstained from voting. Sixteen other Western nations, fearing the worst for their legal systems, also abstained.

The U.S. delegation objected in particular to one provision that would "outlaw organizations which promote racial discrimination," even though the U.S. Constitution guarantees free speech. Yet there are at least a dozen ways that the document, in the mean disguise of humanitarianism, violates the fundamental freedoms embodied in the American constitutional system. It might be well to list some of them:

(1) It holds that racial injustice—the internal problem of sovereign nations—is an obstacle to international peace.

(2) It forbids discrimination by State, institution, group, or individual; the Constitution rightly forbids discrimination action of the State only.

(3) It forbids police action to "support" discrimination; police would be helpless to protect citizens from an angry mob in a racial disturbance.

(4) It forbids discrimination in "access to citizenship," overturning the right of Congress to establish our immigration laws.

(5) It controls private decisions in religion, employment, occupation, and housing.

(6) It controls "every place or facility intended for use by the general public," whether this place is private property or not.

(7) It directs governments to revise public policies, laws, and regulations "which have the effect of creating and perpetuating racial discrimination." Neither the Constitution nor the Supreme Court's interpretation of it requires integration in every circumstance—much less the elimination of racial imbalance.

(8) It grants "the right to participate in elections through universal and equal suffrage." No nation today has any such sweeping grant of suffrage; the provision makes no allowance for American laws of State and local voter qualifications and residence, age, literacy, sanity, and moral character.

(9) It demands "independent national tribunals" for race questions, destroying the delicate balance between the State and Federal judiciary.

(10) It condemns propaganda at the same time that it demands "propagating the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations."

(11) It makes incitement to violence a punishable "offense against society." The Anglo-American tradition of law is based on justice to injured persons. A whole new body of law would be set up in which it would not be necessary to show that a defendant had libeled, robbed, raped, or murdered anyone. The necessity of proving corpus delicti would be thrown out.

(12) Finally, the right to peaceable assembly and freedom of speech and the press would be denied, as the U.S. delegation itself told the U.N.

The legal status of this declaration is at the moment ambiguous. In many respects it is similar to the so-called Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved unanimously by the U.N. a decade ago. The treaty form of the Universal Declaration was never approved by the U.S. Senate.

One of the weaknesses of the U.S. Constitution is that international treaties are seemingly given precedence over both the Constitution and laws passed pursuant thereto. If the Declaration on Discrimination were approved in treaty form, every conflicting provision of the U.S. Constitution would be set aside. Furthermore, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights would be approved implicitly, because of article 11 below.

With the overwhelming support which the Declaration on Discrimination received in the Social Committee, it is certain to be passed by the General Assembly, whether the United States likes it or not. In point of fact, Ambassador Stevenson has already promised strong U.S. support for everything except article 9.

Even though it is a dim possibility at the moment that an unconstitutional antidiscrimination treaty would get through the Senate, the administration has pledged U.S. honor to a document which, if enforced, would destroy American freedom. At the same time, the administration is urging the United States to surrender to an all powerful U.N. peace force which could enforce U.N. dictates. A body which has already decided that internal racial problems are a threat to international peace could hardly be asked to respect the captious legalisms which distinguish declarations from treaties.

It is a long step from the belief that discrimination is wrong to the assumption that the naked power of the state should be used to correct it. As our best legal traditions dribble away, American leaders, debased by the wretched humanitarianism of liberalism, stand paralyzed. It is not a fair exchange.

TEXT OF U.N. RACE PROPOSAL—NEW DECLARATION WOULD BIND MEMBERS TO END DISCRIMINATION

(NOTE.—On Monday of this week, the Social Committee of the United Nations General Assembly approved the text of a Declaration on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. This document now goes to the floor of the U.N. Assembly, where it is certain to be approved overwhelmingly. Then it will go to member nations for formal acceptance as a treaty by their legislative bodies. The text of this declaration follows. Editorial comment above.)

The General Assembly.

Considering that the Charter of the United Nations is based on the principles of the dignity and equality of all human beings and seeks, among other basic objectives, to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set out in the declaration, without distinction of any kind, in particular race, color or national origin,

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims further that all are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection against any discrimination and against any incitement to such discrimination,

Considering that the United Nations has condemned colonialism and all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith, and that the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples proclaims in particular the necessity of bringing it to a speedy and unconditional end,

Considering that any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous, and that there is no justification for racial discrimination either in theory or in practice,

Taking into account the other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the international instruments adopted by the specialized agencies, especially the International Labor Organization and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in the field of discrimination.

Taking into account the fact that although international action, and efforts made in a number of countries have made it possible

to achieve progress in that field, discrimination based on race, color, or ethnic origin in certain areas of the world nonetheless continues to give cause for serious concern,

Alarmed by the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas of the world, some of which are imposed by certain governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures, in the form, inter alia, of apartheid, segregation and separation, as well as by the promotion and dissemination of doctrines of racial superiority and expansionism in certain areas,

Convinced that all forms of racial discrimination, and still more so governmental policies based on the prejudice of racial superiority or on racial hatred, besides constituting a violation of fundamental human rights, tend to jeopardize friendly relations among peoples, cooperation between nations and international peace and security,

Convinced also that racial discrimination harms not only those who are its objects but also those who practice it,

Convinced further that the building of a world society free from all forms of racial segregation and discrimination, factors which create hatred and division among men, is one of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations—

Solemnly affirms the necessity of speedily eliminating racial discirinmation throughout the world and in all its forms and manifestations and of securing understanding of and respect for the dignity of the human person,

Solemnly affirms the necessity of adopting national and international measures to that end, including teaching, education and information, in order to secure the universal and effective recogition and observance of the principles set forth below, and

Proclaims this declaration:

ARTICLE 1

Discrimination between human beings on the grounds of race, color, or ethnic origin is an offense to human dignity and shall be condemned as a denial of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations and as a fact capable of disturbing peace and security among peoples.

ARTICLE 2

1. No State, institution, group, or individual shall make any discrimination whatsoever in matters of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the treatment of persons, groups of persons, or institutions on the grounds of race, color, or ethnic origin.

2. No State shall encourage, advocate, or lend its support, through police action or otherwise, to any discrimination based on race, color, or ethnic origin by any group, institution, or individual.

3. Special concrete measures shall be taken in appropriate circumstances in order to secure adequate development or protection of individuals belonging to certain racial groups with the object of insuring the full enjoyment by such individuals of human rights and fundamental freedoms. These measures shall in no circumstance have as a consequence the maintenance of unequal or separate rights for different racial groups.

ARTICLE 3

1. Particular efforts shall be made to prevent discrimination based on race, color, or ethnic origin, especially in the fields of civil rights, access to citizenship, education, religion, employment, occupation, and housing.

2. Everyone shall have equal access to any place or facility intended for use by the general public, without distinction as to race, color, or ethnic origin.

ARTICLE 4

All States shall take effective measures to revise governmental and other public policies and to rescind laws and regulations which have the effect of creating and perpetuating racial discrimination wherever it still exists. They should pass legislation for prohibiting such discrimination and should take all appropriate measures to combat those prejudices which lead to racial discrimination.

ARTICLE 5

An end shall be put without delay to governmental and other public policies of racial segregation and especially policies of apartheid, as well as all forms of racial discrimination and separation resulting from such policies.

ARTICLE 6

No discrimination by reason of race, color, or ethnic origin shall be admitted in the enjoyment by any person of political and citizenship rights in his country, in particular the right to participate in elections through universal and equal suffrage and to take part in the Government. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

ARTICLE 7

1. Everyone has the right to equality before the law and to equal justice under the law. Everyone without distinction as to race, color, or ethnic origin, has the right to security of person and protection by the State against violence or bodily harm, whether inflicted by Government officials, or by any individual group, or institution.

2. Everyone shall have the right to an effective protection and remedy against any discrimination he may suffer on the ground of race, color, or ethnic origin with respect to his fundamental rights and freedoms through independent national tribunals competent to deal with such matters.

ARTICLE 8

All effective steps shall be taken immediately in the fields of teaching, education, and information, with a view to eliminating racial discrimination and prejudice and promoting understanding, tolerance, and friendship among nations and racial groups, as well as to propagating the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

ARTICLE 9

1. All propaganda and organizations based on ideas or theories of the superiority of one race or group of persons of one color or ethnic origin, with a view to justifying or promoting racial discrimination in any form, shall be severely condemned.

2. All incitement to, or acts of violence, whether by individuals or organizations, against any race or group of persons of another color or ethnic origin shall be considered an offense against society and punishable under law.

3. In order to put into effect the purposes and principles of this declaration, all States shall take immediate and positive measures including legislative and other measures to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote racial discrimination or incite to or use violence for the purpose of discrimination based on race, color, or ethnic origin.

ARTICLE 10

The United Nations, the specialized agencies, States and nongovernmental organizations shall do all in their power to promote energetic action which, by combining legal and other practical measures, will make possible the abolition of all forms of racial discrimination. They shall, in particular, study the causes of such discrimination with a view to recommending appropriate and effective measures to combat and eliminate it.

ARTICLE 11

Every State shall promote respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and shall fully and faithfully observe the provisions of the present declaration, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

Hartke Cites Importance of World Travel Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of glowing reports concerning the very significant and highly successful 33d world travel congress sponsored by the American Society of Travel Agents which completed its week of deliberations in Mexico City, October 26.

The American Society of Travel Agents, familiarly known as ASTA with its more than 6,000 members, is the world's largest body of professional travel counsellors and representatives of all facets of the gigantic industry, which in 1962 recorded a total of almost $3 billion in foreign travel alone. ASTA is working closely with the U.S. Travel Service in energetically promoting the stimulation of tourism to the United States from abroad and its contribution to this program will be reflected in the reverse dollar flow.

The importance of the 33d world congress, with its theme "Promise of the Future," is best indicated by the fact that it was opened by His Excellency, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, President of the Republic of Mexico, who personally addressed the delegates. Messages from the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada were delivered by their respective Ambassadors.

Of particular significance, because of its pertinency and its grasp of the problems of world tourism, was the eloquent address at the opening session by our colleague, the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

Senator MAGNUSON's exposition covered the complex problems involved in the extension of freedom to travel with minimal restrictions as a major contributory factor in achieving peace through understanding among peoples.

He gave special emphasis to the need for legislation recommended by the American Society of Travel Agents, now under committee and agency study, which would curb the unconscionable activities of "blue sky" travel promoters. These fringe operators, by taking advantage of laxities in the regulations, defraud the public through fraudulent offers of cheap charter transportation and then leave the unsuspecting travelers stranded far from home.

Senator MAGNUSON pointed out to the ASTA congress that it is "the primary duty of the U.S. Congress and of the Committee on Commerce to protect the

public against such malpractices through punitive legislation."

A major accomplishment of the Mexico City congress was the decision to sponsor a conference of national organizations of travel agents to create a greatly needed world body of travel agents.

ASTA's decision to take this important step followed an address by the Honorable Milton A. Marks of Dayton, Ohio, president of the American Society of Travel Agents.

Mr. Marks described the worldwide demand for the creation of an international body to solve the urgent needs for order and cooperation created by the constantly increasing complexities of a constantly expanding international tourism in which our own Nation has become an important participant.

Among the basic tasks confronting such a world body of travel agents is a solution to the existing chaotic conditions created by conflicting national rules and regulations impeding the orderly flow of travel and the adoption of a code of ethics to which all reputable and professional travel agents shall not only subscribe but adhere.

Mr. Marks reported that ASTA repeatedly has been designated as the logical instrument to assume the formidable responsibility of serving as the catalytic agent in the creation of such a world body.

I am sure that all of us wish ASTA success in this essential enterprise.

Because of the unquestioned economic importance of tourism and its vital contribution to international understanding and thus to the cause of world peace, I ask unanimous consent that the complete texts of these two important addresses be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, AT 33D ANNUAL WORLD TRAVEL CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS, INC., AT MEXICO CITY, OCTOBER 21, 1963

The impressive attendance of more than 2,000 delegates from approximately 60 nations at this 33d World Travel Congress is indeed a tribute to the American Society of Travel Agents, and to the ever-increasing importance of the travel agency industry.

It is gratifying also that you have chosen to hold this Congress in the beautiful capital of our great neighbor to the south, Mexico City.

I have heard Mexico City described as the "Paris of the West" which I am sure was intended as a compliment, but to me its architecture, its culture, its vision and vitality are distinctively American.

This does not mean that in any way I am detracting from the famous European city on the Seine. Everyone who can do so should visit both Paris and Mexico City, Rome, and Washington, London, and of course Seattle, particularly Seattle and the other great cities of the Pacific Northwest.

The American Society of Travel Agents means a very great deal to the Pacific Northwest in all seasons of the year, as it did to my home City of Seattle during its World's Fair last year.

Your society also has meant much to me personally and in the success of some of my legislation in the Congress of the United States.

I am especially grateful for the support which you gave me and the Senate Commerce Committee in furthering the International Travel Act of 1961 and the establishment of the U.S. Travel Service.

And I am happy that ASTA, through participation in the Advisory Committee of the U.S. Travel Service, is maintaining a sound and continuing effort to stimulate tourism to the United States.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, I was gratified also to receive ASTA's support of my position in the controversy a few months ago concerning transatlantic air fares.

The policy of ASTA, as expressed in the telegram from its President Milton Marks to me on May 15, when our committee was holding hearings on this issue, called for a broadened base of international travel through reduction of airline rates based on air carrier efficiency.

This position coincides precisely with my own on this important question.

ASTA likewise has given strong support to my bill, S. 1540, which would give U.S. authorities certain controls over the level of international fares for flights to and from the United States. This bill was reported favorably by the Commerce Committee and is currently on the Senate Calendar.

There is perhaps no group more aware of the tremendous importance of international tourism than those of you assembled here today.

You and the world travel congresses which have been held in the past have had a major role in the great expansion in international tourism which has taken place during the last decade and which, in turn, has made and is making a substantial contribution to world peace and understanding.

Of equal or greater importance, it has been a factor in stabilizing the economies of a substantial number of friendly governments.

Nations which encourage citizens of other lands to visit their countries and to travel widely within their countries, who receive such visitors with hospitality and good will, invariably benefit both economically and in their international relations. It is good for the host country and it is good for the visitor.

I think you will agree with me that those countries which discourage travel, or which restrict travel within their borders are usually at or near the bottom of the economic escalator.

Fortunately, the number of such countries is decreasing. Even those behind the Iron Curtain are beginning to show increased interest in the tourist dollar, pound or peso, although I doubt that the general tourist will find as much freedom of movement in those countries as he would like.

But the time will come, I am convinced, although it may be far distant, when freedom of travel will be universal.

Only then will there be a complete absence of international tensions. Only then will we arrive at an era of worldwide tolerance, good will, and a full realization of the brotherhood of man.

This era, as I stated, is still far distant, but at some distant day, when the futility of prejudice and the poverty that accompanies insular seclusion is apparent to everyone, worldwide freedom of travel will be achieved and the entire human family will gain thereby and prosper.

All of the Western Hemisphere—with one unfortunate exception—is travelminded. One reason for this is that the ancestral roots of most of us are in the Old World. Much of our culture springs from the Old World and we are drawn to the early homelands of our ancestors and to its monuments, art, and historic landmarks.

But there are amazing cultures in the New World too, both ancient and modern, magnificent works of art, unparalleled scenic attractions, and dynamic cities. All of these are combined here in Mexico City, and in many other cities in the Americas, North, South, and Central.

The enlightened traveler will not be content until he has visited both hemispheres, and I look for the day when tourist traffic from the Old World to the New will equal that from the New World to the Old.

Then both our financial and cultural exchanges will be in balance, an accomplishment the travel agents of the world may well be proud of.

The travel deficit which disturbs the United States and many other Western nations will disappear. The U.S. deficit is still running between $1 and $1.4 billion a year.

In 1962, U.S. citizens spent $2.9 billion on foreign travel, of which $990 million was for transportation and the remainder for other purposes overseas or in other nations on this hemisphere.

Of this amount $395 million or more than 20 percent was spent here in Mexico, and I predict that this percentage will continue to grow as those of us who visit this beautiful country return to praise its manifold charms.

For the world as a whole, in 1962, travel was the largest single item in international trade, representing expenditures totaling $7.5 billion.

The United States, as you know, has been a very late country in promoting what I would call reciprocal tourism, that is the mutual exchange of travelers between other countries and our own.

Our Government began its formal effort in this field only 2 years ago when the U.S. Travel Service was established. Funds for the operation of this agency are not extensive. The 1962 budget for the Travel Service was $3.35 million, while the tourist offices of foreign governments in the United States are expending over $30 million annually to encourage U.S. tourists to visit their countries or areas abroad.

The $3.35 million that our Travel Service spent, combined with the efforts of our non-Government travel agents and offices, helped earn more than 10 times that amount for our country.

During 1962, in my home State of Washington, we had, thanks to you who are assembled here from all parts of the world, a most successful Seattle World's Fair. This fair attracted more than 9 million visitors from all across the United States and from many areas throughout the world.

In April of next year, as you all know, the New York Fair is scheduled to open, with the expectation that 20 million will attend it. Many of you—I hope all of you—will visit this fair, and encourage your clientele to do so also. Your cooperation will assure its success, as it did the World's Fair in Seattle.

From the standpoint of travel time the world is constantly growing smaller, and as it becomes smaller the greater becomes the facility and ease of travel between nations and continents.

Within the lifetime of many of us the airplane has twice shrunk the oceans, first with prop planes and then again with jets. In a few years from now supersonic air carriers which will transport twice as many passengers three to five times more swiftly will again shrink the oceans.

A question that intrigues me, as I know it does you, is whether international air fares will be scaled to improve efficiency and economy of operation or will be arbitrarily set at amounts which impede transocean air travel instead of encouraging it.

The subject of international air fares has just been discussed by the International Air Transport Association in Salzburg, Austria.

Ie behooves all of us to watch these conferences with great interest.

I know that I am interested, the Committee on Commerce is interested, Congress is interested, and I feel that the traveling public of my country is equally interested in what is done at this conference with relation to international air fares which has been the major issue at Salzburg.

On May 8, 1963, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, in discussing this problem, I stated:

"Our carriers operate efficiently and profitably at current fares. If foreign carriers cannot compete at these levels perhaps some soul searching as to the need for their continued existence would be in order. In any event, American citizens are not to be denied choice of lower fares which our carriers are willing and able to provide."

As a matter of fact, it is my opinion that most of the air carriers of nations other than the United States, can substantially reduce their international fares, as can the carriers of the United States, and that they can do so with profit, shuttling back and forth across the oceans with full or almost fully loaded planes instead of, as frequently now occurs, planes half or two-thirds empty.

U.S.-flag carriers of the International Air Transport Association know this and have indicated clearly that they favor substantial reductions in the level of scheduled rates.

This would, I am convinced, be a boon to travel agencies around the world. If there is a realistic cut-back in air fares available to all members of the traveling public, the vast untapped market existing in the many countries represented here at this meeting will find new encouragement and incentive to patronize your agencies and book passage on fast modern jets to other parts of the world.

Air carrier capacity during the past 3 years has increased faster than the gain in passengers. From 1959 through 1962 capacity across the North Atlantic increased 20.1 percent while the average traffic increase was 12.8 percent.

To encourage increased travel some airthere is a realistic cutback in air fares in accordance with IATA's policy which requires participation by a select segment of the traveling public as a prerequisite to a fare reduction. This is a discriminatory, diversionary and irrational policy which, in my opinion, can only serve to defeat its purpose.

I am in complete agreement with the American Society of Travel Agents and the Civil Aeronautics Board when they advocate the principle that only those fares which are available on a nondiscriminatory basis and thus allow participation by all members of the traveling public are equitable and beneficial to the industry.

It is encouraging to note in this connection that Chairman Boyd of the Civil Aeronautics Board has endorsed the principle of basic charter rates and has intimated that the Board will not indefinitely continue to approve affinity tests in the granting of fare reductions.

The Senate committee of which I am chairman also is concerned with the increasing number of parties that have been stranded on charter flights during the past season.

From the reports of these strandings which have come to us, it is apparent that the fault does not lie with the responsible and reliable members of the travel agency industry and the airlines industry, but with fringe operators who prey upon an unknowing and unsophisticated public.

In some respects they resemble the "blue sky and bucket shop" operators of the past who unloaded worthless land or stock on the gullible until their activities were curbed by legislation.

The primary duty of the Congress, and of the Committee on Commerce as I see it, is to protect the public, and it is for that reason that the committee is presently contemplating legislation which would ban the fraudulent sale of air transportation.

Members of the committee staff are consulting with the American Society of Travel Agents, the Civil Aeronautics Board and other agencies of Federal Government, and with the industry on appropriate legislation which will assure performance with the purchase of air transportation. You will be happy to know that we are making good progress toward perfecting this proposed legislation.

In conclusion, let me express my appreciation for the opportunity to participate in this 33d annual convention and world congress, and to thank the good citizens of Mexico and its national city for the friendly hospitality they have shown to me.

The theme of this congress is "Promise of the Future." The promise of the future, as all of you here attending this conclave know, is progress.

To me it applies not only to the future of national and international travel and tourism, but to the progress of my own country, our delightful host country, and to all countries of this hemisphere which are dedicated, as I know ours is, to progress with freedom.

Freedom is the key to promise and progress as all nations should know who fought their way out of colonialism as did the United States, Mexico, and most other nations of this hemisphere.

And one of the great freedoms—as I mentioned earlier—is the freedom to travel—the freedom to go and come when one chooses—a freedom that does not exist when a country is under foreign domination, no more than it exists today in Cuba.

Freedom to travel is in many ways kin to those other freedoms we are so proud of—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of peaceful assembly and petition.

They have their origins in the same aspirations, and when one falls all fall together, as this generation has witnessed behind the Iron Curtain and in one unfortunate western island.

It is my hope that the delegates to this 33d World Travel Congress, when they return home, will pledge themselves to fight valiantly to preserve this fifth freedom—the freedom to travel.

Attainment of this freedom throughout the world will be truly the promise of the future. Thank you.

SPEECH BY MILTON A. MARKS ON A WORLD BODY OF TRAVEL AGENTS MEMBERSHIP RELATIONS SESSION, OCTOBER 25, 1963

By its very nature a trade association—such as ASTA—necessarily resembles a living organism. It was created by human beings and like a human being it has its periods of depression—enjoys its moments of triumph—but most important of all, it is the instrument through which it achieves its own hopes and aspirations for something beyond business success.

ASTA has experienced the trials of infancy and the tribulations of adolescence. Now, here in Mexico City at its 33d convention, we have been meeting in the strength and wisdom of maturity.

Quite naturally, because of our preoccupation with details of programing and consideration of society problems, it is difficult for your officers and directors to properly evaluate the effectiveness of this convention. We have sought not only to give you a report of our stewardship but have been frank in our own self-criticism.

Through sessions such as this, you have told us of your views concerning common problems and thus have given your management the benefit of your experience and wisdom.

Spokesmen for the industries have described their plans. This convention has provided the necessary and vital forum for an exchange of ideas, the renewal of old and creation of new friendships.

You are the sole judge of whether we have, even in a small measure, been successful in our undertaking.

But, I want you to know that all of us—our headquarters staff, your officers, your directors, and your hosts, have given their best to make this convention a memorable occasion.

But now we are 33—no longer are we stumbling children, no longer can we remain youths preoccupied alone with the problems of day-to-day existence and the struggle for survival.

We must look beyond this. If it is for us here to build together so that future generations of members will be able to say—and say proudly—that those who formed this society built well—thought of the future and were not concerned solely with selfish aims.

We have been presented with an opportunity—not of our own seeking; not of our own creation—to build an entity which will be of service to travel agents and thus to people everywhere, in every country, and on every continent.

Through our efforts we can successfully initiate a task which will raise further the ethical concepts and practices of our industry brethren everywhere.

To us, in ASTA, has been given the challenge—to us, in ASTA, is entrusted the assignment of initiating an undertaking which eventually may prove to be the single greatest accomplishment of this convention.

All of you, through the years, have heard talk—much talk—concerning the desirability of a world body of travel agents which not only will stimulate the desire for individual excellence but serve as its common, strong-voiced spokesman.

This task was not of our seeking.

It is not the idea of a single individual.

It is the natural reaction to the basic fact that the travel agent, by virtue of his day-to-day occupation and the role he plays in the international economy provides the best catalytic agent for the realization of the universal desire of people for friendship and understanding.

Because we are businessmen, because we are believed to be hardheaded and practical, we are not beguiled by fancy words or subject to the intoxication of slogans and catchwords.

We have been presented with a practical opportunity to achieve this objective. We, in the travel agency industry, can provide a powerful instrument—can be an important channel to facilitate humanity's common purpose.

ASTA was presented with the challenge by innumerable distinguished representatives of national and regional organizations as a result of the United Nations Conference on Tourism in Rome.

All urged that some group, someplace, take the initiative in arranging a conference where the idea for a world body of travel agents represented by their own national or regional associations—and not—and this I cannot emphasize too strongly—and not a world body of individual travel agents but bona fide, genuine groups possessing stature and reflecting united interests. For, they said, no individuals but only such bona fide, genuine national associations can speak with potent force and honestly represent all.

Time after time, spokesman after spokesman stressed two basic points as requisite to success:

No world body can be composed of both national organizations and individual travel agents.

Success can be achieved only through a new start—a fresh approach based upon complete disentanglement from the old, im-

potent, self-serving and statureless organizations who presume to speak for worldwide travel agents.

Each one urging the creation of a new world body specifically pointed to the need for a fresh start. They told how, after World War II, this was achieved by deliberately abandoning the old, existing, nonfunctioning League of Nations and creating the United Nations. It is the pertinent—the historic example.

All wanted a new vehicle which would adequately represent the best interests, the highest ethical concepts of the professional travel agent.

But who or what was to be the instrument through which this could be accomplished?

It is with pardonable pride that I report to you that it was ASTA—your organization—that was repeatedly designated as the logical instrument to undertake the initiatory task.

While obviously flattered by this tribute to your society's reputation for ability and recognition of its stature in the world community of travel agents, I frankly stated that I, as an individual, could not presume to make any promises or take a position until I had a consensus of your officers.

I conferred with your officers—obtained their frank expressions as to the desirability of such an undertaking—and made a careful and detailed study of all the pros and cons.

We had as a strong warning the dismal record of failures of the past and woeful consequences of permitting the existence of a vacuum which served as an invitation for sterile, self-serving bureaucrats.

The organization of a functioning worldwide body calls for greatness—the placing of the common good above personal ambitions and salaried sinecures.

It demands comprehension of local and regional problems; of dedication to the highest and most worthwhile objectives.

We recognize that the demand for an international organization does exist.

That the time for effective action is now and if we are to realize the promise of the future.

As a result of this decision, ASTA—on October 15—sent letters to 45 national and regional organizations of travel agents inviting them to attend a meeting early in 1964 to consider the organization of a World Body of Travel Agents.

Each letter was accompanied by a questionnaire soliciting their preferences as to the time and location of such a meeting.

To assure that no such group would be overlooked, ASTA requested that the recipients of the invitation suggest names of other bodies which should be present.

Because of the recency of the invitation, it is impossible—on this occasion—to report the number of acceptances; however, all indications are that there will be widespread response.

This is a formidable task which ASTA has undertaken.

It requires limitless patience and a comprehensive catalog of talents and skills far beyond the capabilities of any one individual.

Fortunately for our purpose and assuring success, ASTA is the repository of such qualifications.

To serve as ASTA's World Body Advisory Committee, ASTA has called upon its elder statesmen—its veterans who not only are wise in experience but animated by understanding and dedicated to the welfare of all.

This is a committee which will include five of our past presidents: R. F. Kerr, R. W. Hemphill, T. J. Donovan, Dr. L. C. Tombs, and Newell Grinnell.

For the information of our more recent members I need but highlight their services to obtain your enthusiastic support for this committee.

Dick Kerr's experience has been worldwide. English born, he began his travel career with Thoms Cook & Sons. During World War II, he performed acclaimed services as San Francisco's representative of the Australian Government. He is owner of Kerr Travel Service, in Beverly Hills, Calif.

Bert Hemphill is known as the most widely traveled man of this generation. He served in the Navy during World War I and in the Air Transport Command in World War II. Through his visits to more than 190 countries and territories he has a firsthand knowledge of regional and local problems. He has kept in intimate touch with these through Hemphill Travel Service, Inc., of Los Angeles which specializes in unusual travel.

Tom Donovan, president of Cartan Travel Bureau, Chicago, possesses an almost unequaled knowledge of international travel problems with specialization in the successful operation of escorted tours. His legal background will prove of great value.

Dr. Tombs, president of Guy Tombs, Ltd., Montreal, not only has the distinction of having been a member of ASTA's board of directors when we last met in Mexico City, 14 years ago, but has served almost for the same period as Consul General for Finland in Montreal. He long has been dedicated to the idea of an international body and his services as general chairman of the first ASTA World Congress in Paris in 1951 were outstanding.

Newell Grinnell has a detailed knowledge of international affairs through his continuing experience in solving the problems of ASTA members in their relations with hotels everywhere. As president of Kalbfleisch Travel Agency of Rochester he is an acknowledged expert on a wide range of problems.

Thus you can see we have chosen well.

We recognize that we have presented them with a task formidable in complexity and difficult of successful conclusion because of the myriad of national and international problems.

Their task is compounded by the existing rivalries and jealousies.

We recognize that the path will be long and complex.

ASTA has only one point upon which it is adamant. The world body must be a democratic institution with one vote for each national association which adheres to the charter when and if it is adopted.

ASTA was faced with an inescapable decision in agreeing to the insistent worldwide demand for order and cooperation in the travel agency industry—made even more important by the complexities of a growing international tourism in which our own Nation is participating.

There must be an end to the present chaos.

There must be a code of ethics to which all reputable and responsible travel agents shall not only subscribe but adhere.

Only through such a functioning world body can the problems and the contributions of the travel agent receive the serious consideration which his services warrant.

Animated by a consciousness of the importance of our undertaking, ASTA shall exert every effort to reach this goal.

Raising the Limit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial that appeared in the Newark Evening News on Saturday, November 2, pretty well states the case, I believe, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

RAISING THE LIMIT

The legal ceiling on the national debt is no longer the immovable limit to Federal spending it once was. Rather it is, in effect, an adjustable "false" ceiling which merely reflects congressional raids on the Treasury. Instead of accommodating spending to the statutory limit, the reverse is true.

It's time to make another adjustment—upward, of course. Accordingly, the House Ways and Means Committee has obligingly approved an increase from the current limit of $309 billion to $315 billion. Unless Congress acts before December 1, the ceiling will descend automatically to the "permanent" $285 billion level. With the national debt currently at $307 billion, the Treasury needs more headroom.

Whether or not the administration overcomes Republican resistance as it did in this year's two other debt ceiling battles, the fact remains that raising the limit has become a deceptive procedure.

Its proponents argue that the limit has psychological value as a reminder of budget deficits. But it's more realistic to say that the higher the ceiling is set, the greater the temptation to Congress to reach it in spending.

Baptists and the Vatican Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for insertion into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Baptists and the Vatican Council" by W. Barry Garrett, which appeared in the October 31, 1963 issue of the Maryland Baptist publication. This article should be of great interest to everyone who has been following the second session of the Vatican Council which is now meeting in Rome. Mr. Garett, the author, is an outstanding Baptist journalist and I commend this report from Rome to everyone's reading. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAPTISTS AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL

(By W. Barry Garrett, Baptist Press staff writer)

(The second session of Vatican Council II is now in progress in Rome. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C., has a Baptist journalist, W. Barry Garrett, on the scene for eyewitness reporting to the Baptists of America. The following introductory article explains why Baptists are concerned about developments within the Roman Catholic Church.)

Baptists, if they are to be effective witnesses for Jesus Christ, must understand the major developments among other Christian communions throughout the world.

What other Christians are doing has a direct bearing on Baptist strategy and planning for the implementation of their own obedience to the great commission. This is especially true if major changes are in the

making in the Roman Catholic Church that claims a constituency of 50,176,000 in North America and a grand total of 550,356,000 which is more than half of all the Christians in the world.

For the first time in nearly 100 years the Roman Catholic Church is engaged in an ecumenical council in which all the bishops of the world are invited to participate. (Vatican Council I was held 1869–70.) When Pope XXIII was asked to explain his purpose in calling the council, he opened a window and said, "To let some fresh air into the church." This was his dramatic way of saying that the Catholic Church was too burdened with medieval encrustations and that if it is to win its way in the 20th century and the centuries to follow it must make a new approach and must make itself relevant to the new age into which the world is emerging.

RENEWAL

The most often heard expression of the purpose of Vatican Council II is that it is convened "for the renewal of the church." This means that there are many "reforms" needed within the life of the church. Although no one expects any changes in the basic doctrines of the church or any new pronouncements on dogma to come from the council, there are being proposed many basic changes in attitude, structure, and approach to other Christians and to the world. These are among the items which Baptists must understand and evaluate.

One of the items on the agenda of Vatican Council II of major interest to Baptists is "religious freedom." This problem has caused concern to Catholics and non-Catholics alike through the years. Catholic theologians are struggling with the old idea that "error" has no rights and must be suppressed. Likewise, the old theory that where Roman Catholics are in the minority, they ask for religious freedom, but when they are in the majority, they oppose external freedom of other religious beliefs, is being challenged within the inner circles of the church.

WAIT AND SEE

The entire world is waiting to know how the Vatican Council II is going to implement and interpret Pope John XXIII's views on the right to worship God according to one's own conscience as set forth in his encyclical "Pacem in Terris." He said, "Every human being has the right to honor God according to the dictates of an upright conscience, and therefore the right to worship God privately and publicly."

It is significant that the American bishops are at the forefront in the insistence on serious consideration of the problems of religious liberty. They are aware that Catholic restrictions on Protestants in Spain, Colombia, and other so-called Catholic countries are an embarrassment to the church and are a hindrance to the growth of Catholicism in the world.

INTERMARRIAGE

A liberalization of the church regulations on the marriage of Catholics to non-Catholics has been proposed to the Vatican Council II. These restrictions and requirements have been a source of sharp tension between Catholics and others. Baptists will watch developments along these lines with intense interest.

The reunion of Christianity is a matter of top concern for Vatican Council II. One of the ways the Catholics state the purpose of the council is that it is "to renew the church and prepare for the reunion of separated Christians." Although the bishops are under no illusion that the "return" of the "separated brethren" is to be expected in the foreseeable future, they think in terms of centuries and they are confident that the time will come eventually when the Body of Christ will be reunited.

Baptists are not uniform in their response to the ecumenical movement. Some have refused to become involved in the discussions and in membership in national and world councils. Others have joined the councils and participate in the discussions. Regardless of one's personal opinions on the subject and regardless of the position of any one denomination of Baptists, it is imperative that Baptists know and understand the ecumenical movement. Most certainly what the Roman Catholic Church does in this regard in the decades and centuries ahead cannot be ignored by any responsible group of Christians.

Full Life of Admiral Standley Rendered Service to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune of October 28, 1963:

FULL LIFE OF ADMIRAL STANDLEY RENDERED SERVICE TO AMERICA

A little over a year ago Adm. William H. Standley, U.S. Navy, retired, said to a Copley News Service writer interviewing him:

"I have lived a full life."

In light of the Admiral's long and distinguished service to the Navy and the Nation, this was an eloquently understated epitaph.

Last Friday the words fell into final place.

William Harrison Standley, the first California born full admiral, onetime Chief of Naval Operations, former Ambassador to Russia, died in Naval Hospital. He was 90.

Few patriots have been privileged to serve America so long, so well.

Admiral Standley was born in 1872 on a cattle and sheep ranch near Ukiah, Calif., the son of Jeremiah M. and Sara Jane Clay Standley.

Riding the range as a cowboy, young Standley dreamed of becoming a medical doctor. Then he was successful in a Naval Academy entrance examination. He was graduated in 1895. And there began a career as naval officer and diplomat that was to span nearly half a century.

He served aboard virtually every type of warship. During World War I he trained midshipmen at the Naval Academy. He was Chief of Naval Operations from 1934 to 1937. In 1936 and 1937 he was Acting Secretary of the Navy.

But a mere cataloging of assignments and honors does not capture the essence of the full life of Admiral Standley, impressive though the list may be.

It misses the frankness, the bluntness, the righteous anger that he could call forth when the occasion required.

It misses the thoughtfulness, the considerateness of the man as well, when those qualities were in order.

Here was a man who stood his ground before more than one Chief Executive, from American Presidents, to Japanese militarists, to Communists and would-be appeasers.

An incident in Moscow shortly after he was appointed Ambassador to the Soviet Union in 1942 by President Roosevelt illuminates a striking facet of the Standley character.

The Russians were virtually denying that American aid was keeping them alive and were deriding or minimizing the United States-British role in the fight against the Nazis.

To the horror of diplomatic Washington, Admiral Standley dared to lecture the top Soviet leaders.

"I told the Russians that the American taxpayers were footing the bill for war aid," he later recalled, "and the Russian people have a right to know it. Stalin was conducting things like the Russians were winning all by themselves."

And old dictator Joseph Stalin backed down in the face of the American admiral's indignation. The following day Radio Moscow admitted to the Russian people that American aid was playing a major role in Red successes.

It was not the only time Admiral Standley took a firm stand against the Communists.

He stood practically alone with Britain's Sir Winston Churchill in the balmy days following World War II in condemning communism while most of the world was singing Russia's praises.

In 1950 he took issue with those who were hopeful for an accommodation with communism, and urged that Communists be registered.

He supported Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the general's contention that American forces should destroy the Communists in Korea.

All this, and so much more * * * "I have lived a full life," Admiral Standley said to the reporter a little over a year ago in his modest green cottage at 862 G Avenue, Coronado. "Now I'm just thankful to be alive."

It was indeed a full life, sir. And America is proud you lived it.

The NLRB Must Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues two more editorials expressing deep concern over the recent decisions and actions by the National Labor Relations Board. One was printed in the Richmond News Leader of Richmond, Va., dated October 29, 1963, and it is entitled "The Orangeburg Laboratory." It was subsequently reprinted in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on November 2, 1963. The other editorial was originally printed in the Florence Morning News of Florence, S.C., and has been reprinted in the November 2 issue of the Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, S.C. It is entitled "The NLRB Must Be Curbed." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORANGEBURG LABORATORY

The case down in Orangeburg, S.C., started like any other attempt at union organization by the AFL–CIO. The drive was held among machinists at the Utica-Herbrand Tool Division of Kelsey Hayes Co. The NLRB came into supervise the election. The machinists easily voted the union down, 245–171. Management made no attempt at intimidation. Yet the machinists' decision recently was thrown out by the NLRB upon the union's appeal.

The exceptional thing about the Orangeburg case is the novel principle invented for the occasion. The election results were discarded because prominent citizens in the community, newspaper editorialists, elected officials, and the radio station, exercising what used to be the rights of free speech, had publicly taken a stand against the union's organizing activities. They pointed out that a unionized Orangeburg would lose much of its attractiveness to new industry, with consequent economic loss to everyone—workingmen and businessmen together. According to the union's complaint, this constituted "allowing and encouraging influential people in the community to conduct a reign of terror immediately preceding the election."

In finding an unfair labor practice, and voiding the election, the NLRB made no findings of conspiracy between Utica-Herbrand and the Orangeburg leaders. In fact, the NLRB admitted that "much of the conduct described [by the union] was not attributable to the employer." Nor did the NLRB pass any judgment on the validity of the arguments and facts put forth by the community. The mere fact that these leaders spoke up at all resulted in "destroying the laboratory conditions deemed necessary in the conduct of board elections."

Now we have watched with eyes agape at a number of decisions by Mr. Kennedy's version of the NLRB. The board lately has been motivated by a queer theory that it is an unfair labor practice for a union to lose a representation election. The NLRB has bent over backward to cut management's time to state its case to a minimum; yet if the employees believe anything management says, then an injustice has been done.

But the new reasoning goes even further. Now if any member of the community exercises his constitutional right to comment on a controversial public issue, then the minds of the workers are beclouded. Thus the NLRB ignores other cogent reasons why a man might vote against a union shop.

It might be that the workers oppose a union on its own demerits. It might be that the workers are sincerely worried about the effect of their decision on the community. They might believe the community is wrong in its propaganda, but still think that it's better to keep the community's good will.

No man is an island, and no union is either. The community has a perfect right to express its opinions because community opinion is one of the elements which the men in the shop must take into consideration. And above and beyond all this, it places an intolerable burden on the employer to make him responsible for the free actions of other men.

There can be no laboratory atmosphere for either side in an NLRB election. No elections take place in a vacuum, except in the heads of the members of the NLRB.

THE NLRB MUST BE CURBED

Within the past 6 months, attempts have been made through the National Labor Relations Board to set aside four union elections in South Carolina. Aiken, Anderson, Orangeburg, and now Florence, have been the cities involved.

The grounds upon which the validity of elections has been challenged are the same; namely, the laboratory conditions during the election were such as to prevent freedom of choice.

Senator STROM THURMOND charges, and the evidence tends to support his charges, that the efforts are a studied attempt to weld together huge labor voting blocs. The charge is also made of an attempt, sanctioned by administration forces, to retard industrial expansion of the South where the political climate does not favor the views of liberal politicians.

The most recent case is that of the Florence Electro Motive Manufacturing Co. where a union election was held in August which the union lost by an overwhelming 383 to 5 vote in favor of the company. The NLRB regional director at Winston-Salem, N.C., has recommended that this election be set aside because statements made in behalf of the company created an atmosphere which was not conducive to freedom of choice, and further, that certain employees were allowed to vote who in the opinion of the regional director were ineligible.

In the case of the Orangeburg election where the union lost 245 to 171, the regional director charges that "influential people in the community" were "allowed and encouraged * * * to conduct a reign of terror immediately preceding the election" which intimidated the employees through newspaper ads, house calls, handbills, and radio programs," and further, that the company "allowed and encouraged the editor of the local newspaper to make statements and write editorials that prevented a free choice by creating confusion and fear of reprisals among employees."

What is noticeably absent from these charges is that no objection is taken to any means used by union representatives to win the elections. No attempt is made to investigate what was said at union meetings or any criticism directed at union propaganda to influence the vote of employees, nor is any consideration given to the fact that an overwhelming vote of 4 to 1 against the union, as at Electro Motive, was prima facie evidence that laboratory conditions were not unfavorable to a free choice. The evidence points in only one direction; namely, that the union is unhappy about losing the election and isn't willing to accept the verdict.

As to the Orangeburg case, the objections attacking the validity of the elections constitute a denial of the legitimate interests of a community in what transpires within that community and an attempt to coerce community citizens into silence. The objections are also an attempt to suppress the press and deny freedom of the press and freedom of speech as guaranteed by the Constitution. Whatever the truth about the reign of terror it describes, the NLRB attempts to employ the same practice it condemns by intimidating a community into silence.

This is a very serious matter and should not be passed over without the strongest and most determined protestation. Why should the cards be so stacked against management that it cannot employ means for presenting its case to employees and the public in the same manner as union representatives plead the union cause? Why should management or the community be denied available media for protecting what they consider their best interests when unions are given free rein? And which constitutes a greater reign of terror, a community asserting itself when its interests are involved or a National Labor Relations Board using the authority of its position to silence public opinion? The very essence of our freedom is the freedom to speak and the freedom to write. To deny it is to establish a real reign of terror.

Even more disturbing than this is its meaning in the larger context of what appears to be a determination in administrative circles to force unionization upon the South even where it is against the wishes of employees. It is precisely this attitude, combined with political implications involved, that led Representative LANDRUM of Georgia to introduce a bill in the House of Representatives to deprive the NLRB of jurisdiction over labor matters as provided in section 9 of the Taft-Hartley Act. That section gives to the NLRB broad latitude of administrative discretion in union elections and sharply limits the opportunity for review by the courts. A similar bill has been introduced in the Senate.

The South does not fear the union movement so long as fair practices are followed. It is not opposed to responsible union activities. But what it does fear, and deeply resent, is the sinister combination of powerful forces which stack the cards against management—forces which are so determined to obtain their ends that trumped up charges are made to throw out elections which were held in good faith.

It is a peculiar set of circumstances that the NLRB makes no protest against elections when the unions win, but that in South Carolina within the past 6 months, four elections which the unions lost have been protested and recommendations made to declare them invalid.

The situation calls for determined corrective effort.

Stand Up for Freedom No Matter What the Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago criticism of an outstanding American and former Cabinet officer was voiced in an attempt to discredit and silence his patriotic appeal for an awakening to the dangerous road now traveled in our foreign and domestic policies. The speech of Ezra Taft Benson, former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, delivered in Los Angeles on September 23, 1963, constituted a statement of principles that deserve the attention of all Americans. Portions of the speech selected by the news media failed to make his principles and his warnings known to the public.

Recognizing this failure, the Freedom Press on October 9, 1963, for the first time in its history, published the complete text of a speech stating that "Benson's moving and powerful speech will long be remembered as one of the great messages that have inspired men to action." Under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the speech as contained in the Freedom Press:

(By Ezra Taft Benson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of space limitations, the Freedom Press has never heretofore published complete texts of a speech. We feel that Secretary Benson's moving and powerful speech will long be remembered as one of the great messages that have inspired men to action. For that reason it is included in this issue in its entirety.)

Humbly and gratefully I stand before you tonight—grateful for patriots such as you—humbled by the magnitude of the task before us.

I am here tonight with the knowledge and consent of a great spiritual leader and patriot, the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, President David O. McKay.

As an introduction to my remarks and a fitting tribute to our honored guest I quote the following from Edmund Burke:

"How often has public calamity been arrested on the very brink of ruin, by the seasonable energy of a single man? * * * I am as sure as I am of my being, that one vigorous mind without office, without situation, without public functions of any kind, (at a time when the want of such a thing is felt, as I am sure it is) I say, one such man, confiding in the aid of God, and full of just reliance in his own fortitude, vigor, enterprise, and perseverance, would first draw to him some few like himself, and then, that multitudes, hardly thought to be in existence, would appear and troop about him."

I speak to you as a fellow citizen of the United States of America, deeply concerned about the welfare of our beloved country.

I am not here to tickle your ears—to entertain you. I will talk to you frankly and honestly. The message I bring is not a happy one but it is the truth, and time is always on the side of truth. "Truth must be repeated again and again because error is constantly being preached round about." (Goethe, 1749–1832 quoted in the Freeman, July 1958.)

I realize that the bearer of bad news is always unpopular. As a people we love sweetness and light—especially sweetness. Ralph Waldo Emerson said that every mind must make a choice between truth and repose. Those who will learn nothing from history are condemned to repeat it. This we are doing in the Americas today.

George Washington stated, "Truth will ultimately prevail where there are pains taken to bring it to light." To bring the truth to light is our challenge.

Lincoln said, "If danger ever reaches us it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide. Our real problem is internal—here at home.

Today we are in the midst of continuing international crisis. The outlook for world peace and security is dark indeed. The gravity of the world situation is increasing almost daily.

The days ahead are sobering and challenging.

All over the world the light of freedom is being diminished. Across whole continents of the earth, freedom is being totally obliterated.

Never in recorded history has any movement spread its power so far and so fast as has socialistic communism in the last three decades. The facts are not pleasant to review. Communist leaders are jubilant with their success. They are driving freedom back on almost every front.

It is time, therefore, that every American become alerted and informed about the aims, tactics, and schemes of socialism and communism which are essentially a war against God and the plan of salvation, which is based on freedom of choice.

The fight against godless communism is a very real part of every man's duty. It is the fight against slavery, immorality, atheism, terrorism, cruelty, barbarism, deceit, and the destruction of human life through a kind of tyranny unsurpassed by anything in human history. Here is a struggle against the evil, santanical priestcraft of Lucifer.

Yes, the days ahead are sobering and challenging.

Three years ago a beloved spiritual leader delivered an inspiring prayer at the dedication of a temple near London, England. I quote a short paragraph from that memorable prayer:

"Next to life, we express gratitude for the gift of free agency. When Thou didst create man, Thou placed within him part of Thine Omnipotence and bade him choose for himself. Liberty and conscience thus became a sacred part of human nature. Freedom not only to think but to speak and act, is a God-given privilege."

"Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath?" (Thomas Jefferson, Works 8: 404.)

Our heritage of freedom is as precious as life itself. It is truly a God-given gift to man. Since the time of the Council in Heaven—and it is my faith we are all there—the fight of liberty-loving people for freedom has continued.

Free agency is an eternal principle vouchsafed to us in perfect law of liberty—the gospel of Jesus Christ. Freedom of choice is more to be treasured than any earthly possession. As a U.S. citizen I believe it is guaranteed in our Heaven-inspired Constitution. Yes, freedom is an inherited, inalienable, divine gift to men.

When the Savior of mankind wished to impress on His hearers the fruits of His teaching, He used these words: "The truth shall make you free" (John 8: 32).

We are moral agents with freedom to choose between right and wrong.

Past material advances have been the fruit of our freedom—our free enterprise capitalistic system—our American way of life—our God-given freedom of choice. Progress of the future must stem from this same basic freedom.

Because our forefathers—yours and mine—fought for the ideal of freedom; because our fathers preserved that ideal through our free competitive enterprise system under our God-given free agency; because they were willing to make religion the vital force of daily living, all of us have climbed through the years to new heights of well-being and inner strength.

But it is not only in the moral choice of right and wrong that man is free. Among the relentless quests of human history is the quest for political freedom. When the American patriot, Patrick Henry, shouted his immortal, "Give me liberty or give me death," he did not speak idly. When at Philadelphia in 1776 the signers of the Declaration of Independence affixed their signatures to that sacred document, they, in a very real sense were choosing liberty or death. Not one of them but knew full well that if the revolution failed, if the fight for freedom should come to naught, they would be branded as rebels and hanged as traitors.

The inspired Founding Fathers formulated a system of government with checks and balances protecting the freedom of the people. But even this was not enough. The first order of the new Congress was to draw up a Bill of Rights—10 amendments guaranteeing for all time the fundamental freedoms that the American people insist are theirs by the will of God, not by the will of government.

Yes, the founders of our country, bequeathed to us a heritage of freedom and unity that is our most priceless political possession.

But to be enjoyed, freedom must be won continually.

It is high time we realized the dangerous threat of creeping socialism and its ruthless comrade, atheistic communism. When socialism is understood, we will realize that many programs advocated, and some of those already adopted in the United States, fall clearly within the category of socialism. What is socialism? It is simply governmental ownership and management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods.

For 30 years we have aided the cause of the atheistic-socialistic conspiracy by permitting socialists, Communists and fellow travelers in high places in government; by giving away vital military secrets; by squandering much of our material resources; by recklessly spending ourselves to near bankruptcy; by weakening our free enterprise system through adoption of socialistic policies; by wastefully bungling our foreign affairs; by ever-increasing confiscatory taxation and by permitting the most insidious infiltration of socialistic-Communist agents and sympathizers into almost every segment of American life.

Our freedoms were not achieved, and they cannot be maintained by simple shortcuts that attempt to bypass basic economic principles. These economic laws are immutable just as much so as the moral laws, the laws of nature, or the Ten Commandments.

The paramount issue today is liberty against state slavery. Both communism and socialism would destroy our economic system and replace it with socialism.

"In dealing with the treacherous Red Kremlin and its satellites, the road of appeasement is not the road to peace. It is surrender on the installment plan"—J. Edgar Hoover, American Legion convention, Miami Beach, Fla., October 18, 1960.

Some timid, vacillating political leaders proclaim that communism is something we will have to learn to live with—whether it is Khrushchev, or some other leader. Peaceful coexistence they gullibly call it. The present Communist system, they declare, will continue because there is no alternate system to replace communism. The policy of increasing power, of pushing the system outward and using the Communist part they say, will go on.

Such a negative attitude writes off the hundreds of millions behind the Iron Curtain as a lost cause. Surely no courageous, liberty-loving citizen will treat the Communist secret combination as something we will have to learn to live with.

There is a more courageous and sounder point of view. I say to you: "Men wil be free. There is no freedom under socialistic communism. Sooner or later the people will rise against it. They cannot oppose the fundamentals of civilization and of God. They can't crush their people always. Men will be free"—President David O. McKay.

Daniel Webster has said:

"If the true spark of religious and civil liberty be kindled, it will burn. Human agency cannot extinguish it. Like the earth's central fire, it may be smothered for a time, but at some time or other, in some place or other, the volcano will break out and flame up to heaven."

There are those who recommend that the clash between communism and freedom be avoided through disarmament agreements. Abolishing our military strength and adopting an unenforceable contract as a substitute to protect us would go down in history as the greatest mistake freemen could make in a time of peril.

Thank God for a great, courageous, patriotic organization which has taken the position that it is both immoral and stupid to enter into any treaty with criminals who have no respect for treaties.

"The Communists say that promises, like pie crusts, are made to be broken; that they enter into treaties only for the advantages to themselves, and with no expectation of abiding by such treaties. And they have proved by their actions, in violating dozens of solemn treaties before the ink was hardly dry, that they are just as unscrupulous as they claim to be.

"Amid the infinite confusion around us today, the only safeguard is the moral standard. The important question about any proposed action by a man or by a nation, is not, is it smart but is it right? Entering into the test ban treaty with the Soviet murderers is morally wrong. And for that

very reason it is assuredly unwise." (John Birch Society press release September 1963.)

That statement has the ring of statesmanship, not vacillating weakness which today imperils freedom.

I concur with President McKay when he said:

"I would not deal with a nation which treats another as Russia has treated America. It is a condition which cannot be permitted to exist"—Church News, August 6, 1952, page 2.

President McKay also declared:

"Force rules in the world today; consequently, our Government must keep armies abroad, build navies and air squadrons, create atom bombs to protect itself from the threatened aggression of a nation which seems to listen to no other appeal than compulsion"—Gospel Ideals, page 304.

This statesmanlike declaration parallels the historic statement by George Washington when he vigorously warned:

"There is a rank due the United States among nations that will be totally lost by the reputation of weakness. If we would avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we would secure the peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

The conspiracy to weaken the United States involves attacks on many fronts. To weaken the American free-enterprise economy which outproduced both its enemies and allies during World War II is a high priority target of the Communist leaders. Their press and other propaganda media are, therefore, constantly selling the principles of centralized or Federal control of farms, railroads, electric power, schools, steel, maritime shipping, and many other aspects of the economy, but always in the name of public welfare.

The paramount issue today is liberty against state slavery. It is in this spirit that President McKay stated:

"Communism is antagonistic to the American way of life. Its avowed purpose is to destroy belief in God and free enterprise * * * the fostering of full economic freedom lies at the base of our liberties. Only in perpetuating economic freedom can our social, political and religious liberties be preserved." (Excerpt from inaugural address for Dr. Henry A. Dixon, president of USU, delivered by President McKay at the USU fieldhouse, Logan, Utah, Mar. 8, 1954.)

It is significant to me that 120 years ago the Prophet Joseph Smith after attending lectures on socialism, made this official entry in church history: "I said I did not believe the doctrine." ("History of the Church," vol. 6, p. 33.)

No true Latter-day Saint and no true American can be a Socialist or a Communist or support programs leading in that direction. These evil philosophies are incompatible with Americanism and the true gospel of Jesus Christ.

In the Old Testament we read: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge" (Hosea, the prophet).

As in Old Testament days we need knowledge today. We need to know our enemies. We must assess clearly and accurately the perils that face the free world as we enter the missile age.

The power of communism depends to a large extent on public ignorance. Knowledge is a dangerous thing—to totalitarian states; but knowledge is strength to a free people.

Internationally, communism seeks to isolate us from the rest of the free world. Here at home, communism ceaselessly pursues the disintegration of the American way of life. It strives to use education, science, literature, art, even the churches, to undermine our free society.

I was delighted to see recently the Committee for the Monroe Doctrine reprint excerpts from the famous memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine written by President J. Rueben Clark. For years I served with this noble man in the governing councils of the "Mormon" Church before his recent passing. As early as September 1923, he warned us at a religious service in the Salt Lake Tabernacle about certain communistic trends which have now transpired. Later in 1949 he stated:

"The paths we are following, if we move forward thereon, will inevitably lead us to socialism or communism, and these two are as like as two peas in a pod in their ultimate effect upon our liberties * * *.

"We may first observe that communism and socialism * * * which we shall hereafter group together and dub statism—cannot live with Christianity, nor with any religion that prostulates a Creator such as the Declaration of Independence recognizes. The slaves of statism must know no power, no authority, no source of blessing, no God, but the state. The state must be supreme in everything * * *. For if men are free in belief about God, they will finally assert their God-bestowed rights, and this would be fatal to statism. So under statism God must go, and with Him goes freedom of conscience and of religion, the first two of our liberties named in our Bill of Rights." (J. Rueben Clark, Church News, Sept. 25, 1949.)

Recently the Supreme Court handed down another one of their tragic decisions which brought forth the comment from President McKay that the Court is leading this country down the road to atheism.

The only threat to the liberty and independence of the American people from abroad is the threat of world communism spreading from its base in the Soviet Union.

But the best authorities are confident that the Soviets will not provoke a major war. Their economy would not support it.

Lenin said, "The soundest strategy in war is to postpone operations until the moral disintegration of the enemy renders the normal blow possible and easy."

Commenting on Lenin's statement the Indianoplis Star adds: "'Where then does the real danger lie? It lies with us—the American people."

"Other great civilizations have died by suicide. The first free people, the Greeks, died thus.

"And why did Greece fall: 'A slackness and softness finally came over them to their ruin. In the end more than they wanted freedom they wanted security, a comfortable life, and they lost all—security, comfort, and freedom.'

"It is the same with Americans today. The danger that threatens us is an internal danger.

"It is our own ignorance—ignorance of our own history and our heritage of liberty that threatens us. * * * Our lack of faith in freedom and ourselves, our own lack of confidence in the greatness of America and all that she stands for morally and materially is what puts us in mortal danger.

Too many of us are afraid—afraid of atomic war, afraid of the disapproval of our allies or the neutrals, afraid of the threats and boasts of the bloated tyrants in the Kremlin, afraid to offend others by taking action to defend ourselves.

"We must never forget that nations may—and usually do—sow the seeds of their own destruction while enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

"If we lose our freedom it will be because we did not care enough—because we were not alert enough—because we were too apathetic to take note while the precious waters of our God-given freedom slipped—drop by drop—down the drain.

Heaven forbid that this should come to pass.

Let us remember that we are a prosperous people today because of a free enterprise system founded on spiritual, not material values alone. It is founded on freedom of choice—free agency—an eternal God-given principle.

The Founding Fathers, inspired though they were, did not invent the priceless blessing of individual freedom and respect for the dignity of man.

No, that priceless gift to mankind sprang from the God of heaven and not from government. Yes, the Founding Fathers welded together the safeguard as best they could, but freedom must be continually won to be enjoyed. We must never forget these facts.

This is America—the land of opportunity. A land choice above all other lands. Let us keep it so.

My own political and economic creed is a simple one. I commend it to you.

I am for freedom and against slavery in any form.

I am for social progress and against socialism.

I am for a dynamic economy and against waste.

I am for the private competitive market and against unnecessary government intervention.

I am for private ownership and against governmental ownership and control of the means of production and distribution.

I am for national security and against appeasement and capitulation to an obvious enemy. May I comment on this last item.

Just a short time ago Fidel Castro broadcast to the world his boastful confession that he had been a hard-core Communist all of his adult life. He gloried in the fact that he had been able to confuse and deceive many people simply by saying he was not a Communist. And because there were people in this and other countries who believed his false assertions, he was able to establish a Soviet beachhead only 90 miles from our shores. Americans must face the cold hard fact that Fidel Castro was encouraged and supported in his seizure of Cuba. Why? Simply because many Americans were led to believe the falsehood that he would resist Soviet influence and restore the basic freedom of the Cuban people. Others were consciously aiding the conspiracy.

A few of us, including Robert Welch, issued early warnings based on unimpeachable evidence. Two U.S. Ambassadors repeatedly warned that Castro was part of the Communist camp and that he was working for the Communist conquest of Cuba. These voices went unheeded.

This is merely a repetition of the same deceitful pattern which was used after World War II to have us tolerate revolutionary Communists in China, to accept them as so-called agrarian reformers and allow them to seize and enslave some 450 million people on the Chinese mainland.

This is the same deceitful pattern which we have been asked to accept in the Congo, in Laos, in British Guiana, etc. In fact, everywhere the Communist conspiratorial machinery is preparing for a seizure of power, we are assured there is no immediate danger from communism. We are told that the high political officials in these countries, who surround themselves with known Communist advisers are merely trying to reconcile the various political factions and make their governments more representative. Later, after each country is taken over by the Fidel Castros, we are then assured that these men "betrayed the revolution." Research subsequently reveals that these men had been hard-core Communists for many years. Those who believed them once more lament, "I wonder how they deceived us?"

To me, the important question is, "Are we going to let them deceive us any longer?"

To the true Communist, nothing is evil that is expedient. Being without conscience or honor, he feels completely justified in using whatever means are necessary to achieve his goal, force, trickery, lies, broken

promises, mayhem, and individual and mass murder.

Let us have no illusions about them. Their leader has told us bluntly their purpose is not alone to enslave us—they want to bury us.

What we face today is not just a cold war, not just a struggle for the control of land, sea, air, and even outer space, but total competition for the control of men's minds. Unless we meet it and defeat it, we shall almost inevitably one day face the loss of all that we hold dear.

In less than half a century this evil system has gained control over one-third of mankind, and it is steadily pursuing its vicious goal of control over all the rest of the world. Since World War II people have been brought under the Communist yoke at the rate of more than 6,000 per hour, 144,000 per day, 52 million per year.

Latin America does not believe that suppression is the road to freedom.

Less than 15 years ago communism was not a powerful force in Latin America. Today it is not only strongly present, there as an enemy to be reckoned with—it is openly allied with a government located on as island only about 90 miles south of Key West, Fla.

The only political party now functioning in Cuba is the popular Socialist Party—the Communist Party under another name.

Cuba is being used as a funnel through which Communists are infiltrating the other American Republics.

We are dealing with a cunning opponent in Premier Khrushchev. He is a master of deceit. It is he who won in Cuba recently. Premier Khrushchev had taken a tactical "one step backward" by promising to remove Cuban missiles, but this had been followed by the prescribed "two steps forward" when he obtained the claimed promise of the President of the United States that the so-called blockade would be removed * * * and * * * most important, that no one would invade the Cuban islands.

And now, in our latest move, we pay $53 million in goods—plus $2.9 million cash in dishonorable tribute and ransom blackmail to a lying, godless Communist dictator.

Why do we, the greatest power in all the world, pay tribute to an unprincipled tyrant on an island 90 miles away? Why do we bow and scrape to a blustering godless murderer who heads up a freedom-destroying world slave system that is in deep trouble everywhere? Why?

And now close to home—after the ransom and tribute deal—what next for Castro and Cuba? As Americans will we still go gullibly on our complacent way seeking to escape from reality?

The President of the United States said to the Cuban freedom fighters:

"It is the strongest wish of the people of this country, as well as the people of this hemisphere, that Cuba shall one day be free again."

All true Americans share the President's wish—but it will take much more than wishes to achieve this freedom.

It appears that legally and diplomatically, Cuba has been abandoned to communism—and all of Latin America threatened with this insidious evil.

And now we imprison patriotic exiled Cubans who would fight to deliver their own people from human bondage. This action has sent a chill of dismay through the hearts of freedom loving people everywhere.

With our national prestige at or near an alltime low, when will we act like men of courage? Why this continuing policy of softness toward communism? When will we begin to take positions based on what is right and then stand firm? The language and action of firmness will be respected and is the only safe course for our great Nation to pursue. When will our national leaders mention at least, the Monroe Doctrine?

Grassroots thinking in America cries for strong, courageous leadership. The American people are aroused in their hearts. They are far ahead of Washington. They oppose their Nation making concessions to Russia. They do not want to be lulled to sleep. The American people are convinced that a firm stand against the Communist masters is the best protection against war. They want to know the truth without bluffing.

The American public is entitled to the facts. They will actively follow sound, courageous leadership. Our people know in their hearts that the opposite of victory is defeat, whether you call it "coexistence" or "compromise" with a godless tyranny. We are at war and we must win the war. It's time to go on the offensive. Let's stop helping the enemy of all we hold dear. Let's stop half measures such as were used in Cuba. Let's be sure we're right and then mobilize sufficient strength to win. Let's have no further blind devotion to the Communist-dominated United Nations. For a change let's try victory.

I have great faith in the American people. When fully informed they will make wise decisions. They will stand up and be counted for what is right. This I know.

I recognize that it is not popular in some circles to be called an anti-Communist, but I consider communism a political and economic disease. I do not believe an American citizen can be patriotic and loyal to his own country and its God-inspired Constitution of freedom without being anti-Communist—anti-Socialist.

Now I know that Moscow has ordered that all anti-Communists are to be attacked and discredited in every way possible. I know the Communist Party of the United States has issued a similar mandate. This does not disturb me at all. It should be expected. Meanwhile, we should pursue a calm and steady course. The path of education to alert and inform our people "about the methods, purposes and progress of the conspiracy is the right path. * * * We must be carefully certain that all we say is the truth, and as restrained as circumstances will permit in how we say it. But to spread the simple child-like truth, about the monstrous fabrication and falsehoods which makes up the very environment of our lives, is a duty to God and country and family which each of us must assume. (J.B.S. Bulletin, September 1963). We are battling against apathy, blindness, opportunism and propaganda directed brilliantly by masters of deceit.

We must expose to the light of public inquiry those forces which would destroy our country and our way of life. We should pay no attention to the recommendations of men who call the Constitution an 18th century agrarian document—who apologize for capitalism and free enterprise. We should refuse to follow their siren song of concentrating, increasingly, the powers of government in the Chief Executive, of delegating American sovereign authority to non-American institutions of the United Nations and pretending that it will bring peace to the world by turning our Armed Forces over to a U.N. worldwide police force.

"Why do we tear to shreds the historic Monroe Doctrine which for nearly 140 years has been a cardinal policy of the United States" (U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 15, 1963).

This Nation needs a revival of patriotism. "Patriotism," said Theodore Roosevelt, "means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country.

"It is patriotic to support him insofar as he efficiently serves the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country.

"In either event, it is unpatriotic not to tell the truth—whether about the President or anyone else—save in the rare cases where this would make known to the enemy information of military value which would otherwise be unknown to him."

Today as never before, as one courageous patriot has said, "We want good people, able people, informed people, determined people, who will live and work and die for what is right, despite all the misunderstanding and ridicule which such a course may bring upon them; confident and civilized people, who are tolerant of all honest opinions and purposes of others, but eternally intolerant of hypocrisy and cruelty and all the faces of evil. We want men and women, of all races and religious creeds, who believe in the dignity and freedom and responsibility of the individual; who are aware of the follies and crimes of collectivist tyranny; and who are dedicated to man's divinely inspired, ageslong, often frustrated, but ever recurring dream of making this a better world" (J.B.S. Bulletin, July 1963).

On my desk in Washington, D.C., for 8 years as a Cabinet member, I had these words:

"God gave us men with a mandate higher than the ballot box."

My heart is filled with gratitude as I witness an ever-increasing group of Americans voluntarily joining together:

1. To combat more effectively the evil forces which now threaten our country, our lives, and our civilization.

2. To prevail upon our fellow citizens to start pulling out of the deepening morass of collectivism, and then climb up the mountain to higher levels of individual freedom and responsibility than man has ever achieved before.

3. To restore with brighter luster and deeper conviction the faith-inspired morality, the spiritual sense of values, and the ennobling aspirations on which our Western civilization has been built ("A Brief Introduction to the John Birch Society," p. 8).

I rejoice as I see courageous American patriots stand shoulder to shoulder for "less government, more responsibility, and a better world."

God grant that in this blessed land there will arise "a righteous force, of such mighty strength and such direction that neither the Communist conspiracy nor any other agency of Satan can possibly withstand it."

In the worldwide conference of the Mormon Church in April 1962, President McKay quoted J. Edgar Hoover as follows:

"There is no place here in America for part-time patriots. This Nation is face to face with the greatest danger ever to confront it, a sinister and deadly conspiracy which can be conquered only by an alert, informed citizenry. It is indeed appalling that some members of our society continue to deplore and criticize those who stress the Communist danger. Public indifference to this threat is tantamount to national suicide. Lethargy leads only to disaster. Knowledge of the enemy, alertness to the danger, everyday patriotism are the brick and mortar with which we can build an impregnable fortress against communism."

Too often in recent years, patriotic symbols have been shunted aside. Our national heroes have been maligned, our history distorted. Has it become a disgrace to pledge allegiance to our flag—or to sign a loyalty oath, or pay tribute to our National Anthem? Is it shameful to encourage our children to memorize the stirring words of the men of 1776? Has it become opprobious to state "In God We Trust" when proclaiming love of country?

What we desperately need today is patriotism founded on a real understanding

of the American ideal—a dedicated belief in our principles of freedom and a determination to perpetuate America's heritage.

No matter what coloration is put on it, the fact remains that international communism has established a base 90 miles from our shores, from which it is organizing against the United States throughout Latin America.

This contest in which we are engaged is as old as man and as young as hope. This issue is over the God-given eternal principle of freedom—free agency, the right of choice. In this struggle it is not enough to be right—we must put strength and action back of that which is right. In war there is still no substitute for victory.

In the conflict with the worldwide conspiracy we must have patience, courage and wisdom. We must also have friends. Russia has hostages—we have friends—millions of them in temporary slavery back of the Iron Curtain, and millions more to be mobilized throughout the free world. In Russia people are unable to challenge the despotic godless dogmas forced on the people. We must take greater risks for freedom. We must dramatize "American might and Soviet myth."

There are some people who hesitate to get into this fight for freedom because it is controversial, or they are not sure if we are going to win.

These people have two blind spots.

First, they fail to realize that life's decisions should be based on principles—not on Gallup polls.

There were men at Valley Forge who were not sure how the Revolution would end but they were in a much better position to save their own souls and their country than those timid men whose major concern was deciding which side was going to win, or how to avoid controversy.

After all, the basic purpose of life is to prove ourselves—not to be with the majority when it's wrong.

We must discharge responsibilities not only to our church, home and profession, but also to our country. Otherwise we do not merit the full blessings of a kind providence.

There are people tonight all over the world who in their own courageous and sometimes quiet way are working for freedom. In many cases we will never know until the next life all they sacrificed for liberty. These patriots are receiving heaven's applause for the role they are playing, and in the long run that applause will be louder and longer than any they could receive in this world.

Which leads me to the second blind spot of those who hesitate to get into the fight. And that is their failure to realize that we will win in the long run, and for keeps, and that they pass up great blessings by not getting into the battle now when the odds are against us and the rewards the greatest.

The only questions, before the final victory are, first, "What stand will each of us take in this struggle?" and second, "How much tragedy can be avoided by doing something now?"

Time is on the side of truth—and truth is eternal.

Those who are fighting against freedom may feel confident now, but they are shortsighted.

This is still God's world. The forces of evil, working through some mortals, have made a mess of a good part of it. But it is still God's world. In due time when each of us has had a chance to prove ourselves—including whether or not we are going to stand up for freedom—then God will interject himself and the final and eternal victory shall be for free agency. And then shall those people on the sidelines, and those who took the wrong but temporarily popular course, lament their decisions.

To the patriots I say this: Take that long eternal look. Stand up for freedom, no matter what the cost.

It can save your soul—and maybe your country.

Yes, this is a choice land—choice above all others. Blessed by the Almighty, our forebears have made and kept it so. It will continue to be a land of freedom and liberty as long as we are able to advance in the light of sound and enduring principles of right. To sacrifice such principles for momentary expediency—often selfishly motivated—is to endanger our noble heritage and is unworthy of this great American people.

With all humbleness I love this great Nation and have traveled abroad just enough to make me appreciate rather fully what we have here. To me this is not just another nation. It is not just one of a family of nations. This is a nation with a great mission to perform for the benefit and blessing of liberty-loving people everywhere. It is my firm conviction that the Constitution of this land was established by men whom the God of heaven raised up unto this very purpose. This is a part of my religious faith.

The days ahead are sobering and challenging and will demand the faith, prayers, and loyalty of every American.

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light"—Romans 13: 12.

May God give us the wisdom to recognize the threat to our freedom and the strength to meet this danger courageously.

Our challenge is to keep America strong and free—strong socially, strong economically, and, above all, strong spiritually, if our way of life is to endure. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation.

God grant we may resolutely follow this course in humility and faith, I humbly pray.

Okakok Writes of Whale Hunts and Happiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Eskimo citizens of Alaska lead a life far removed both in time and space from us here in Washington. It is a life of hardship, with great dangers and basic pleasures.

Recently an article was published in the National Observer written by Guy Okakok, a citizen of Barrow, most northern city in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Okakok writes with dignity and charm. His article will be of interest and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DAY TO REMEMBER IN AN ESKIMO VILLAGE

(Note.—This ingenuous account of an Eskimo whaling expedition was written for the Tundra Times (Fairbanks, Alaska) by Guy Okakok, an Eskimo who hunts for a living and writes in his spare time. Times Editor Howard Rock, a distant relative, supplied this information about the author: "Okakok is about 60 years old and writes for Tundra Times when he finds time. Sometimes, hunting trips delay his writing. He is an all-round hunter, and has been known as one of the better whale hunters on the Arctic coast.")

Many years ago, in the time of my grandfather, spring drew near and eyes watched the sun rise earlier and earlier. People seemed to go about the houses more often, visiting in the Eskimo village. Whaling season was near.

The old rotting oogruk skins and sinews on the umiak (boat) frames were cut away. New ones that had been saved during the winter were spread out. Harpoon heads were fitted on shafts, new lines were tested, fur clothing was stitched, then tried on.

Several men bent over a long drifted timber, chopping, carving, smoothing, with tools of stone and ivory. They worked the slab down to a new keel.

A village grandfather stood nearby and advised: The curve should be marked just so and a line should be drawn straight along this length of timber. Did he not tell them many times to watch for the change of current that will bring the ice floe into the shore? That the oogruk, or bearded seal hides, were to be taken to the largest igloo?

Seven of them, the exact number, saved from the very best of the catch, were laid out on the floor. A woman, whose husband owned the new umiak, looked at them again and nodded yes. She, along with other women, began to sew carefully—a break in any seam could mean a husband's life when a crew is far out from shore.

SUN DRIES AND BLEACHES SKIN

After the women sewed the hides together, the able-bodied men took over. They laid the skin over the umiak frame and stretched it, then lashed it to the frame. After they finished, they took the newly covered skin boat to a rack so the sun would dry the skin, bleach it until it was white.

Around in April, men appeared from their igloos—men in mukluks and long fur parkas. They gathered in groups of seven or eight. A umiak was lifted from a driftwood rack and put on a sled. They loaded it with their whaling equipment and shoved off.

Men placed themselves on each side of the canoe and harnessed themselves with an oogruk rawhide thong and pulled until they were on the edge of the water. They placed the canoe on the ice, then cut snow blocks for shelter where they could gather whenever the got hungry.

Watchfulness came next. After they finished building the snow block shelter, they chose two or three men from the crew as watchmen.

Soon one of them near the umiak seemed to grow stiff. Eyes watched a point on the bay. A great bulk emerged from the near side of a pinnacle of ice across the water. Cold sea water poured from its body. Slowly the great shadow swam toward the camp of sleeping men.

TIME FOR THE HUNT

A whale, a whale. Men watching now hurried toward the sleeping men. They kicked each person with their feet, told them there was a whale swimming toward them. The sleeping men rolled out, and in no time at all, they were all around the umiak.

Already one man knelt at the bow of the umiak, harpoon in hand. The others were tense and erect around the umiak. Their hands gripped the top railing.

One man watched the whale, muttering instructions calmly to the others. Once the whale sounded, the men remained stone-faced—no smiles, no frown crossed their features. Closer now, where the dark waters tossed before them, the whale reappeared.

Again the water rolled off the great body. Slowly, from its head, a long, straight geyser rose in the clear, cold morning. Then the swimming whale came in line with the umiak. The waiting figures have turned to stone.

One man who stood apart shouted a signal and the bowman braced his body. He regripped the harpoon, raised it. At a signal, the men lunged and the umiak moved for-

ward. It plunged across the top of the ice and shot onto the water. White foam rippled from the bow.

TRACED A PATH ON THE WATER

The skin boat slipped over the cold water toward the whale, then the raised harpoon plunged into the whale. Red blood spurted across the splashing graw waves. The bowman threw the walrus line fastened to the inflated seal pokes that bobbed up and down among the waves. The pokes traced a path on the water and then they were dragged under.

Already the bowman knelt in the umiak. His eyes closed as he seemed to watch the empty water where the whale had been harpooned. Then his lips moved as his sing-song chant echoed through the still morning, an old song that asked to bring the whale to the surface again. The final words died into the cold air. The bowman dipped a paddle into the rolling water. The umiak nosed toward the shore.

As the skin craft touched the ice, a replacement crew quickly clambered in, but the bowman remained. Now the waves slapped against the umiak as it nosed easily out to sea. The fur-clad figures paddled with a steady rhythm. The umiak followed the line the seal pokes made before they were pulled beneath the water. Swiftly, their umiak nosed nearer and nearer the swimming whale.

Again the bowman stood balanced in the bow. He raised his harpoon and plunged it deep into the whale's body. This time, warm, red blood clouded the cold, gray water. The whale lunged forward and then it was still. Water rolled over the black skin as it turned turtle.

THEN THE WORK BEGINS

The line was stretched out from the umiak to the dead whale, fastened, and the slow tow toward the shore ice began. At last on the ice, an ancient system of walrus lines in a rig, anchored from the ice to the whale's body, raised the great bulk of the whale part way from the water. Working from the edge of the ice, men began cutting the whale. Piles of blubber and meat on the ice grew larger. A floating remnant left from the great bulk was dragged onto the ice.

One man pointed across the ice, smiling. The others turned to look. Already, word had reached the village and the women were coming with sleds and teams. Small, thin, sharp knives, ulus, all of bone and ivory, tore and sliced into the remainder of the whale.

Finally, the whale was cut up. The blubber and meat had risen into great masses on the ice. The disjointed skeleton lay on the white snow. Fragments and sheets of tough skin were rolled and stocked nearby. A great, jagged smear of frozen blood was spread over the ice where the cutting was done.

The sleds were loaded and the women headed back to the village. As they approached, the lagging dogs ran with their tongues rolling. The women spoke happily and stopped near the sod houses. Several children tumbled from the brown-colored sod dwellings.

They turned their dark eyes toward the meat piled hgih on the sled. Smiles flashed across the women's faces when they saw the children. The children then struggled toward their homes, after the women gave them some muktuk. Next the women took the meat to their meat cellars, where it was frozen to be kept fresh throughout the summer.

THE BIG CELEBRATION

After the whaling season is over and the meat all stored, what next?

The owner of the uniak that killed the whale gave a big celebration. Already, the walrus-hide toss blanket was stretched above the ground, stout lines running from each corner.

The men and many villagers walked to the blanket and encircled it. A name was called and many voices took up the name and repeated it. Then a girl with a lovely parka jumped into the blanket. The men heaved and she was tossed into the air. Still laughing, she bounced against the skin—and again they tossed. She rose higher and higher, screaming and giggling. She was tossed over and over, far above the heads of the watching people:

Women brought in slices of meat and muktuk and gave them to all the people. Wooden plates were passed from hand to hand. After the people had their fill, they lowered the blanket.

Native dance followed right after. Again a name was called. The owner of the umiak that caught the first whale leaped from the crowd out in the encircled dance area. His wife and relatives joined him and many others came to join them. Men danced and their women bobbed among them. Dancing men and women moved with strong steps. All night they danced until they were ready to fall.

When all had finished dancing, the drummers laid the drums down carefully and the leader of the dancers put the drums into a sack.

The people all went home happy and weary.

GUY OKAKOK.

Secretary Dillon Speaks in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 1, 1963, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, spoke before the Second Arkansas Federal Tax Institute at the Hotel Lafayette, Little Rock. He made a masterful address explaining the tax situation which confronts the Nation today and the problems before the Congress concerning tax legislation.

In the address he paid high tribute to our friend and colleague, WILBUR MILLS, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is one of the best informed men in the House of Representatives on tax legislation. He also paid tribute to Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, who is a member of the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the address in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks, because in a few days we will be considering a bill to raise the debt limit:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE SECOND ARKANSAS FEDERAL TAX INSTITUTE AT THE HOTEL LAFAYETTE, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1963

I am extremely pleased to be here today in this vigorous State which is engaged in such an intensive effort to breed and attract new industry and to expand its economy.

I have the good fortune to be extremely familiar with the great contributions to our national well-being of two of Arkansas' most illustrious citizens—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, whom I have come to know well both in his capacity as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as a stalwart member of the Finance Committee, and my good friend WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Today I particularly want to pay tribute to WILBUR MILLS. I am constantly impressed with the skill, the wisdom, and the understanding that Mr. MILLS brings to any issue before him. It is due to his brilliant and inspiring leadership that the President's tax bill has moved successfully through his committee and the House of Representatives.

That tax bill as it now stands—with the single exception of the proposed reductions in capital gains rates—is a sound bill, a fair bill, an effective bill. It provides for two-stage reductions in both individual and corporate income tax rates: cutting individual rates from the present scale of 20 to 91 percent to a sharply lower range of 14 to 70 percent, and dropping the overall corporate rate from 52 to 48 percent while the rate on small business falls all the way from 30 to 22 percent. These rate reductions are the single most important reform in the bill. They are vital, not only because they release more than $11½ billion into the private economy, but also because they provide a permanent and substantial increase in incentives to work harder and to invest more.

The bill also includes a substantial number of reforms that provide major improvements in the equity of our tax system. They are, to be sure, only a beginning, but don't let anyone tell you that they are not a significant beginning. Revenue-raising reforms in the present bill, plus those contained in the Revenue Act of 1962, total nearly $2 billion. When one considers that the total revenue increases from structural changes in all other revenue acts since 1940 have barely exceeded $600 million, the magnitude of the present accomplishment becomes clearer.

The structural reforms in the present bill contribute markedly to the equitable distribution of the tax reductions. Without those reforms, the tax reductions would unduly favor upper income taxpayers. The minimum standard deduction, for example, channels more than $300 million in tax relief directly to those in the lowest income groups, and avoids the large overflow into other brackets that would accompany the increased exemption approach that is sometimes proposed. The income-averaging provision would remove the present inequitable tax treatment of bunched income. New deductions for moving expenses would improve the mobility of labor and thus ease the problem of structural unemployment. The repeal of the dividend credit, as well as the tighter rules governing the tax treatment of stock options, depreciable real property, the aggregation of unrelated oil and gas properties for depletion purposes, multiple surtax exemptions and others, would help rectify existing inequities, broaden the tax base, or offset what would otherwise be excessive tax reduction for privileged groups.

The tax bill, therefore, represents a good start toward greater simplicity and equity in our tax structure—toward the kind of reform that Chairman Mills and I would like to achieve. If it is not all we would like, that is because the economic urgency of immediate tax reduction must override our desire for thoroughgoing revision of our tax structure.

Nothing should delude us into thinking that tax cuts are no longer as important as they were 6 or 9 months ago. True, we are now enjoying moderately pleasant economic weather, and the current upturn demonstrates that there are basic strengths in our economy. But we cannot be so blinded by the bright spots around us that we fail to see the pitfalls that lie ahead.

The fact is that this year's upturn, as well as the entire recovery since 1961, have failed to make adequate inroads into the persistent and serious problems that have plagued us ever since 1957—long-range problems that

the tax cut is designed to alleviate. For the past 6 years our unemployment rate has been much too high. We have been unable to reduce it at all over the past 12 months, a period in which gross national product grew by $32 billion or 5¾ percent. If we do not greatly improve our performance, and soon, then the sharp increase in our labor force over the next few years will result in more and more unemployment, followed closely by irresistable pressures for ever greater Government spending. This is just one of the critical problems that brings into bold relief the undiminished urgency of the tax bill as a balanced stimulus to more rapid and more durable economic growth.

In addition to its rate reductions, the tax bill would improve 1962's investment credit by restoring the provisions originally approved last year in the House of Representatives. It would eliminate the requirement that the depreciation basis of new investment must be reduced by the amount of the investment credit—thus removing the difficult accounting complexities that flow from the current statute. In addition, repeal of that requirement would almost double the present incentive of the credit and would give substantial additional encouragement to more rapid modernization and expansion of plant and equipment.

The 48-percent corporate tax rate, when added to last year's investment credit and revised depreciation guidelines, would reduce corporate tax liabilities by a total of $4.5 billion annually. An when you add to this the proposed liberalization of the investment credit, the after-tax profitability of new investment would be increased by more than one-third.

I do not have to emphasize to you here in Arkansas how vital such tax incentives are to greater industrial growth and expansion. Few States are more intensely concerned with industrial progress than Arkansas. Few can match your recent achievements. From 1957 to 1962, for example, Arkansas per capita income grew by 31 percent, or by almost double the 16-percent figure for the Nation as a whole. Even more revealing in terms of your industrial development program is the fact that—as a percentage of total civilian personal income from productive activity—income from manufacturing in Arkansas rose by 2 percent from 1957 to 1962, while for the Nation as a whole, such income declined by 2 percent during the same period.

Figures such as these demonstrate how successful you have been in making Arkansas an extraordinary attractive magnet for new and greater industrial investment. A number of other investors from various parts of the Nation have made known their intention to expand into Arkansas when the time is propitious. That time will come when the removal of repressive wartime tax rate opens the way to more buoyant and sustained economic growth and sharply increases the incentives for expanded investment in plant and equipment. These major increases in the incentive to invest at home, rather than abroad, are also, of course, an essential and highly important part of our program to achieve balance in our international payments.

Expanded investment will flow not only from the large direct tax stimulus to business that I have just described, but also from the substantial boost in consumer demand that will result from the individual tax reductions. Nearly $9 billion of the overall tax reduction will go to individuals. Well over 90 percent of that money will be spent, setting in motion the familiar economic process in which money circulates throughout the economy and ultimately increases consumer spending by several times the amount of the initial tax cut. That strong and sustained rise in consumer demand—and thus in markets for industry—will further bolster the direct tax incentives to investment.

Without this kind of balanced stimulus to both consumer demand and investment incentives, we will not have the expansion in all sectors of our economy that we must have if our overall growth is to be both strong and durable. Those who suggest that the tax reductions are too heavily weighted in favor of either consumer demand or investment, simply do not understand that fact. Similarly, those who suggest that the individual tax reductions favor the upper income groups forget that, by the very nature of our steeply progressive tax rate structure, equivalent percentage rate reductions in the lower and upper brackets inevitably mean much greater increases in after-tax income in the upper brackets—particularly if the reductions in the upper brackets are not somewhat offset by basebroadening reforms. To achieve equal percentage increases in after-tax income would simply require total abandonment of any thought of reducing our current excessively high rates.

The fallacy in the after-tax income approach as a measurement of tax reduction is clearly shown by the following extreme example: Suppose we reduce the present bottom rate of 20 percent all the way down to zero. That would increase a taxpayer's after-tax income from $80 to $100, or 25 percent. Now look at our highest bracket, 91 percent, with 9 percent left after tax: An increase of 25 percent in after-tax income at this level would be 2¼ percent, or a total after-tax income of 11¼ percent, giving a top tax rate of 88¾ percent. Thus almost any reduction in our top individual tax rates is bound to give a greater percentage increase in after-tax income to today's 91-percent taxpayer than to the present 20 percent-taxpayer.

Under the current bill, when you consider the total effect of rate changes and structural reforms, nearly 60 percent of the overall individual tax reduction goes to those in the under-$10,000 income group, with their share of the total income tax load being slightly reduced from 50 percent to 48 percent.

Let there be no mistake: The tax bill this Nation needs and—when you eliminate the capital gains reductions—the bill this Nation now has before it, is not a bill to make the rich richer. It is a bill to make this Nation richer, stronger, and more productive in jobs, in investment, and in Government revenues. It is a bill that has the support of the AFL–CIO as well as the chamber of commerce, of academic economists as well as business economists. It is a bill that has the support of citizens in all occupations throughout the land.

One great concern of many citizens—a concern fully shared by the President and by the Congress—is that tax reduction be accompanied by strict and careful control over Federal expenditures. There is neither time nor need to cite the wealth of evidence that the administration and the Congress are not only committed to a firm program of expenditure control, but that such a program is already well underway. Let me simply emphasize a few major points:

First, the President, Chairman MILLS, and the House of Representatives, in endorsing their views, have all made it unmistakably clear that, by adopting the tax bill, the Nation will be choosing, in Chairman MILLS' words, "tax reduction instead of deliberate deficits as the principal means of boosting our economy," that they consider these courses mutually exclusive, that, in short, the tax bill represents a firm decision to rely upon greater private spending rather than upon greater Government spending as the prime factor in our economic growth.

Second, the fiscal 1963 deficit dropped from an estimated $8.8 billion to an actual $6.2 billion, and two-thirds of that decline resulted from lower expenditures. The largest single factor in those lower expenditures was the administration's policy of substituting private for public credit, a policy the administration intends to continue in the future. Fiscal 1964 expenditures are currently estimated at $1 billion below last January's estimate. Partly responsible for that decline is the fact that, as Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee, has pointed out, this year's appropriations are being held below last year's, the first time that has been done since the end of the Korean war. Also responsible is the extremely prudent management of Government personnel instituted at the President's direction. This program has enabled the Federal Government, during the past 12 months, to meet the needs of our expanding population while at the same time actually reducing the number of its regular civilian employees.

Third, the President has said that in the absence of any unforeseen crisis, he intends to submit a fiscal 1965 budget with a smaller deficit than the $9.2 billion originally forecast for this year before any allowance for tax reduction, despite the fact that during fiscal 1965, tax revenues must absorb more than $7 billion of the tax cut.

Fourth, more than 70 percent of our budgetary increase from fiscal 1961 through fiscal 1964 occurred in the area of defense, space, and interest on the national debt. Excluding these items, the overall record in all other areas of Government over the past 3 years has been markedly better than that of the preceding administration. Our expenditure increase has been some $1.2 billion, or nearly 25 percent, lower than the $5 billion increase in those very same items over the 3 preceding years, fiscal 1958 through fiscal 1961. And as Budget Director Kermit Gordon pointed out last week in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, the need for continuing expenditure increases for defense has just about ended and will soon begin to taper off on space programs.

Why is it, then, that one still encounters doubt and confusion in many quarters? The answer, it seems to me, is failure to understand how our Government in Washington actually works. In effect, we have two budgets: One, familiar to all, records of expenditures as we meet our bills. The other and far more impotrant budget is probably known to only 1 out of every 1,000 Americans. This is the budget of new appropriations from which all spending flows.

In our private lives, the proper way to cut spending is not to refuse to pay our old bills, but to stop incurring new ones. It is just the same in government. Once the Congress appropriates funds for previously authorized purposes, the President, with one important exception—permitting him, as Commander in Chief, to refuse to undertake defense expenditures for purposes which he deems to be unnecessary or unwise—has no clear authority to refuse to spend those funds.

While Government agencies are responsible for the prudent management of their operations, the power to arbitrarily eliminate congressionally approved programs is simply not available. Only if he were clothed with such power could a President carry out significant reductions in congressionally approved programs outside the area of defense. This would require that Congress entrust the President with the right of the item veto—a right that Congress, in defense of its own prerogatives as a coordinate branch of government, has consistently refused to turn over to the executive branch.

Thus, once the appropriation budget has been adopted, expenditures are sure to follow—but only on a delayed basis. Since many of the dollars in appropriation bills go for such things as public works and complex defense or space hardware, the bills

often do not come due for several years. For instance, only about half the money we will pay out this year, fiscal 1964, will come from this year's appropriation bills. The rest will come from moneys appropriated in earlier years.

Now, just what does all this mean when we look at expenditure control in the context of today's situation? It means simply that we should pay continuing and close attention to new appropriations instead of merely watching the current level of expenditures. I venture to say that there are few among you who realize that during the fiscal year that ended last June, a total of $101.5 billion in appropriations was approved—$9 billion more than was spent. That is why expenditures during the current fiscal year will rise by about $5 billion from last year's level of $92.6. And even if we succeed, as Congressman CANNON hopes and expects, in holding this year's appropriations to last year's $101½ billion level, fiscal year 1965 expenditures, which include the costs of many programs and projects approved in previous years, can be expected to rise somewhat above the 1964 level as a natural response to the lingering effects of earlier appropriation budgets.

However, to the extent we level off appropriations, our future bills—and hence our future expenditures—will also level off, but only after the usual and necessary time lag of about 2 years. To those who say that we should not cut taxes and increase expenditures at the same time, I say simply this: Look at the record being written today in new appropriations instead of merely concentrating on the level of expenditures required to meet old bills. When you look at this year's appropriations and compare them with last year's, you will see a clear example of firm expenditure control—a record that will show up in the spending level of future years.

Therefore, there is simply no reason for undue delay on the tax bill. It will not only give us expanding economy that will generate the greater Federal revenues we need to balance our budget, but it will also increasingly enlarge the role of the private economy in meeting our economic needs.

No one knows for certain what our immediate future holds. What is certain is that we cannot afford to be so shortsighted—or so forgetful of our postwar economic history—as to assume that because we are doing relatively well today, we are doing anywhere near well enough to simply let matters proceed as they are into the future. Outside of the prospect of a prompt tax cut, starting next January 1, there is nothing in our present economic situation or in our past history that permits us to expect that we can ride out 1964 on a continuing upswing. By next April 1, it will have been 37 months since the end of the last recession. If we are still in an upturn, it will be the longest peacetime recovery in this century, with the single exception of the 1933–37 pullout from the great depression. And a downturn, even of the relatively mild magnitude of our last two recessions, could easily cost us between $5 and $10 billion in Federal revenue. It would also bring soaring unemployment, which in turn would inevitably lead to greater Government spending. The result would be a deficit that could range a high as $15 or $20 billion—a deficit accompanied by unnecessary suffering and privation, and far larger than any we foresee with tax reduction.

The more we delay on the tax cut, the more we risk losing the opportunity now before us of choosing, decisively and firmly, to expand the role of the private sector in achieving economic growth and in meeting national needs. We risk, as well, foregoing into the far future the single best hope for ending our chronic budgetary deficits, and for reinvigorating the incentives for increased effort and investment.

We could not be in a better position to adopt the tax bill than we are today. We know that our economy is still on the way up. We also know that beyond the first few months of next year, its course is uncertain. We can pass the tax bill this year, and let the current upturn serve as a springboard toward the more rapid and sustained economic growth that we can and must achieve. Or we can fail to pass it and cast our entire economic future into doubt. I do not see how our choice could be clearer or more important.

Cultivating an Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 28, 1963:

CULTIVATING AN IMAGE

(By Richard Wilson)

SNICKERS GAP, VA.—This improbably named place is in the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia, a locality to which the prudent repair from time to time for enjoyment of the more simple and durable aspects of life in the Washington area.

Here it is possible to enjoy the autumn foliage and reflect upon such immutable events as the hibernation of the woodchuck and the copperhead. This can be done at a residence called Ball Alley, artfully contrived from an old log house set amidst mountain scenes of gentle beauty, the kind of America that Audubon saw.

In this virginal atmosphere, the hand often falls on back copies of magazines, especially since the mistress of Ball Alley is a dedicated horticulturist who would never wittingly discard a copy of the Flower Grower, a publication devoted solely to this serious-minded purpose.

In a late summer issue the Flower Grower outraged many of its readers by stepping beyond the bounds of horticulture to devote a major illustrated article to John F. Kennedy's remaking of the rose garden at the White House more to his taste. It was a magazine exclusive.

But many of the readers of Flower Grower did not accept this journalistic enterprise in the sense it was intended. They wrote to the magazine, and are still writing to it, to notify the editors that they do not wish politics or personal publicity to befoul the serious avocation of growing flowers.

They were sick and tired, they said, of seeing every national publication, and now the beloved Flower Grower, used for Kennedy promotion. Not a few declared they were canceling their subscriptions, though it is questionable if many did so, owing to their really overriding interest in horticulture.

Flower growers, like fishermen and conservationists, are not to be overlooked in what the President calls our pluralistic political society. It must be concluded that the projection of the Kennedy image into this esoteric area was, nonetheless, a failure.

But the Kennedys are not daunted, particularly as the election of 1964 approaches.

President Kennedy has already appeared in the Gentlemen's Quarterly, a haberdashery magazine and Attorney General Kennedy has written an article for Brewer's Digest.

In one sweep of the board, President Kennedy has given an exclusive interview collectively to seven magazines called in the trade "women's service books," making the point that women ought to be better informed and write more letters to their Congressmen to insure world peace.

No media is too large or too small for a Kennedy exclusive, and even Mrs. Kennedy, sometimes balky on publicity for her children, has joined in by permitting the use of some of her charming, if naive, sketches on Christmas cards.

No doubt there soon will be more nationally published picture layouts of the Kennedy family and more articles about the intimate Kennedy circle. Like those who wrote to Flower Grower, people are annoyed, puzzled, or just plain curious about this. Are the press, radio-TV, and the magazines deliberately publicizing the Kennedys and falling for the propaganda from the White House?

In one sense, the answer is yes, they are. In another sense, it cannot be denied that there has long been a public hunger, or at least a public market, for stories and articles of an intimate nature about high public officials and their way of life and work. Slowly over the years the resistance to this by officials, as not publicly acceptable, has been breaking down.

Now, in the Kennedys, have been found an official family who are willing to satisfy the market for the intimate story on negotiated terms calculated to serve their best interests.

Perhaps there would be no harm in this, if the same attitude did not carry over into public information of a nature vital to the well-being and security of the people of the United States. But it has carried over into that field.

It is seen in the handling of information on Cuba, and on the racial demonstrations, and in other vital fields. There are many contrivances behind the scenes such as the deals to permit face saving in public shows by Southern Governors.

It may just be that the flower growers of the Nation, made wise by their cultivation of nature, have intuitively perceived a major fault in the Kennedy image.

Resources and the Rebirth of Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 29, Assistant Secretary John A. Baker spoke before the Fifth American Forest Congress. This congress, sponsored by the American Forestry Association, meets every 10 to 15 years to revitalize forest conservation in America and to chart a new course.

Assistant Secretary Baker's speech is a highly significant statement that outlines some of the most pressing challenges and opportunities facing Americans interested in resource conservation. It relates how the new rural areas development program of the Department of Agriculture can be used to become a dynamic force in natural resource conservation and in revitalizing rural America.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I submit the following for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOURCES AND THE REBIRTH OF RURAL AMERICA; RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT IN ACTION

(Address by John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the Fifth American Forest Congress, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., October 29, 1963)

I read your "Platform for American Conservation" with extreme interest. I believe it to be a comprehensive approach to many of our resource problems. I commend the American Forestry Association for leadership in designing that platform and for calling this Fifth American Forest Congress to consider it.

The American people are truly indebted to your association—this country's oldest citizens organization devoted to conservation. You pioneered many basic resource conservation concepts, including the establishment of our national forest system, the preservation of primitive and wilderness areas, enactment of effective mining and timber legislation, sustained yield practices, cooperative forestry programs and multiple-use principles. Noteworthy in recent years has been a broadening of your influence to embrace the whole spectrum of natural resources effort—land-use adjustment, soil and water conservation, watershed protection and management, wildlife and outdoor recreation.

American Forests magazine has become a forthright, fearless, yet fair voice on issues and programs concerning forestry and related resource development and wise use. It enjoys a high place among the best of communications media dedicated to informing readers on the significance of the realistic interdependence of land, water, and people for the lasting good of all.

This congress is another milepost in your progress. In it we will do well to pause and take stock; discover our weaknesses; bolster our strength and redirect our sights to the challenges and opportunities ahead.

This Nation has come a long way in the conservation and wise use of our natural resources. Forest exploitation is no longer a national disgrace and soil erosion is no longer a national menace. Since the 1930's we have been diligently refining and broadening our conservation aims to meet the new challenges of the time. But conservation is a never-ending job. As we progress, the pressures on our resources increase. With each new technical and scientific advancement, with each new child added to our surging population, the challenges seem to become more and more formidable.

It is safe to assume that the problems of the future will be no easier to solve than those of the past. It is clearly more important now than ever before that we accelerate the development and use of our resources to serve the needs of all the people.

This is an enormous task. It involves human as well as natural resources. It must deal with both private and public lands. It must support a major segment of the Nation's economy—the forest industries, large and small. The goal should be sufficient profit to sustain employment and stabilize communities, made possible by virtue of well-managed renewable natural wealth. The task directly concerns rural America—its soils and woodlands and wildlife—and the 90 million people who live there on the farms, in the villages, towns, and small cities. Resource conservation, in the broad and meaningful sense, is more than a challenge in dealing with the physical and biological influences and values; it embodies social and economic challenges as well. How well we meet these challenges—how quickly we act to meet them—will have a profound and lasting bearing on the future of this Nation.

Rural America has much to offer. The resources are there in its people, land, water, forests, grasslands, and wildlife.

The Department of Agriculture, in furthering the platform for American conservation through a high priority emphasis, is providing its facilitating services and resources to the nationwide rural areas development effort. This effort has as its basic concept the blending of all resources and programs—local, State, and National—to be used by local leadership in creating new economic opportunities in rural America. If I read the aspirations of rural America correctly, the aims of the RAD can be stated in these eight points:

1. To increase the income of people living in rural America and to eliminate the causes of underemployment.

2. To improve the family farm system of American agriculture.

3. To expand job opportunities through loans, grants, technical services, and training programs that create new factories, stores, recreational enterprises, crafts, and services of all kinds.

4. To promote outdoor recreation opportunities on privately owned and public lands—recreation that provides a new source of income for the farmer and rural businessman and at the same time services the needs of our growing urban population.

5. To readjust land use, nationwide, to meet national needs and to bring the use of every acre in line with its capabilities.

6. To provide appropriate technical services and adequate financial support for the protection and development of our soil, water, forest, fish and wildlife, and open spaces.

7. To improve existing rural community facilities and institutions, and where needed to build new ones so that people in our rural areas are assured safe water supplies, first-rate schools and hospitals, and other services that are standard in a modern community.

8. To make continuous and systematic efforts to eliminate the many complex causes of rural poverty.

This effort received new impetus from the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 which gave the Department broadened authorities in the fields of resource development, credit, watershed development, cropland conversion, recreational development, and rural renewal. Coupled with the Department's going programs, we feel that rural areas development will have a very real impact on improved conservation use and development and higher incomes in rural America.

The RAD self-help approach has assisted local people to encourage industry to build new plants in rural America, creating an estimated 52,000 new jobs—primarily in the commercial and industrial field.

During the past year 10,000 soil conservation district cooperators developed income-producing recreation enterprises on their land. Another 9,000 have indicated they plan to develop recreation facilities in the near future. Some 2,800 farmers in 138 counties in 34 States have signed long-term agreements to divert 140,000 excess cropland acres to other more economic uses, including recreation, grass, and trees. The accelerated public works program during the past year created more than 216,000 man-months of employment in our rural areas, mostly in forested country. In addition to the temporary employment, there will be long-range benefits from the development of our natural resources both for pleasure and future profit and to prevent floods.

The small watershed program has been expanded to include development of water-based public recreation areas and extra water storage capacity for future municipal and industrial use. Sponsors of 49 watershed projects in 23 States have received tentative approval of recreation areas within their projects. In the past 2½ years, USDA has advanced more funds for rural housing than in the previous 11 years of the rural housing program's existence. These housing loans, since January 1961, have resulted in 85,000 man-years of employment and have had a total economic impact of adding about $2 billion to the rural economy. It has created a growing demand for lumber, for plumbing, heating and electrical equipment, for construction items such as concrete, masonry, millwork, plaster and paint, and for furniture.

Deposits in country banks in the farm States are up 8 percent since 1960. Local people have organized RAD committees in two-thirds of the Nation's counties, and they are actively working on area economic problems, creating new jobs, better community services, and developing our natural resources to serve the needs of all the people.

Constructive forestry contributes directly to prosperity in rural America.

Fire protection: Although we did pretty well last year, the drought in the East convinced us that we cannot relax in our drive for more complete and more intensive protection. In 1961, 6 million additional acres were put under protection. However, the number of fires on protected State and private lands jumped to 95,000, an increase of 22,000. The burned area went from 500,000 acres to 1,600,000 acres. The year 1961 demonstrated to us, once again, that since we cannot control the weather there's no "taking it easy" where fire is concerned. We all realize that fire protection will become even more important as the national movement to develop private recreation enterprises for profit on rural lands takes hold. The great investment in these businesses—many of them in woodland settings—will call for greatly intensified fire protection. Here is a challenge that we must gear up to meet, starting today.

Rural fire defense: Rural America occupies a vital position in our national defense. In the event of nuclear attack it may be called upon to defend itself against fallout, and fire, and to feed and harbor thousands of refugees from the area of attack. This is not a pleasant situation to contemplate but in this coldly realistic world nothing must be left to chance. Therefore, as a result of the nuclear age, forestry finds itself with still another job—a task that might well be a matter of life and death—the job of protecting the resources and people of rural America against fires in the event of attack.

Forest pest control: The never-ending fight to protect America's forests from insects and diseases goes on. Forest pests extract an annual toll in trees killed, deformed, and stunted that exceeds the damage caused by all other destructive forces. The Forest Service, other Federal land-managing agencies, State and local governments, and timber owners are all involved in the continuing struggle to reduce insect and disease losses. All insect control projects are carefully planned and precautions are taken to guard against danger to human population and losses to fish and wildlife.

Tree planting: Tree planting has been of great interest to Americans. Yet, last year, shipments of trees raised by State forestry nurseries under the cooperative State-Federal program were the smallest since 1956. Planting stock was adequate but the demand was off, although there were shortages in some States. Tree seedlings are important to any meaningful forestry program. We will continue to need nursery facilities, including seed stocks, to meet continuing demands for seedlings. In light of the dynamic effort toward rural areas development we must be prepared and should continue to keep

our forest tree nursery facilities in a state of readiness.

Small watershed program: The small watershed program makes a positive contribution to rural areas development. As of October 1, 1963, 1,995 applications for Federal assistance in planning Public Law 566 watersheds had been received by the Soil Conservation Service. Assistance for planning was authorized on 920 of these watersheds, and installation of improvements was approved on 498. Construction has been completed on 95 projects.

Of the approved watershed projects, 386 include forest land, with 281 of them requiring special forestry measures. Of these, 266 will require joint Forest Service-State Forester participation.

River basin planning: Forestry has an important part in river basin planning. The Forest Service is responsible for planning the forestry phases of the studies. In fiscal year 1963, the Forest Service participated in the study of 18 basins or sub-basins, some of it contracted out through the States. The fiscal year 1964 budget provides for Forest Service participation in 24 river basin studies. We should remember that the entire approach to comprehensive river basin planning is, as it should be, under close scrutiny, particularly the scope and cost of the work. It is imperative that Federal and State Governments work as a team to get the maximum value out of every tax dollar spent.

Cooperative forest management: Most of you are familiar with the cooperative forest management program or as it is more popularly known, the farm forestry program. Here is a program with a powerful RAD potential because it provides technical forestry service to America's small woodland owners. Conducted by the State Foresters of America, fiscal year 1962 saw 91,000 family forest owners helped, more than in any previous year. The States contributed $3 million and the Federal Government $2.3 million to this work. About 650 farm foresters are on the job. It is encouraging to note that a long step forward was taken last year in this work when Congress amended the Cooperative Forest Management Act to raise the authorization from $2½ to $5 million.

We are fortunate to have the State foresters and their 650 farm foresters on the job. It is to them that we are turning, in many circumstances, to carry forestry's share of the load in the many new programs. And it is to them, along with forestry-trained people of other agencies, organizations and private industry, including consulting foresters, that we must turn in the drive to bring multiple use for profit to America's family forests.

The forestry phases of the agricultural conservation program are usually serviced by farm foresters.

State employed farm foresters continue to play a key role in assisting soil conservation districts. In 1962, there was a total of 1,000 written agreements between State foresters and soil conservation districts and the State foresters were actively cooperating in 2,300 districts.

You already find America's farm foresters working on the small watershed program. Soon they will be called upon to carry the forester's share in the new programs being developed under the Agriculture Act of 1962. I am speaking particularly of the cropland conversion program under the leadership of the ASCS, the rural renewal projects directed by FHA, and the resource conservation and development projects and income-producing recreation programs under the leadership of the Soil Conservation Service.

The national forest: From their very inception in 1905, one of the prime goals of the national forests has been multiple-use management of their resources to help sustain the local economy. This contribution to the local economy has been growing with the passing decades. For example, last year there was an all-time high harvest of 10 billion board feet of timber from the national forests for which the Government received $134 million in stumpage. This timber, from stump to end product, provided about 514,000 man-years of work.

Let's look at it another way: For each dollar's worth of timber stumpage, an average of $24 more value is added to the original worth of the wood by the time it reaches the ultimate consumer. This accumulated wood-based value, triggered by these 10 billion board feet of stumpage, amounts to $3.3 billion. These dollars went out as wages for workers and income for companies and contractors engaged in harvesting, processing, fabricating, transporting, and distributing forest products. These rapidly circulating dollars are RAD tools of the highest order.

The national forests, and their influence, inject many additional dollars into the rural economy. For example, in 1962 there were 113 million recreation visits to the national forests. When you consider that 2 dozen tourists a day for a year equals the spending power of an industrial plant with a $100,000 annual payroll, those 113 million recreation visits take on new meaning for hundreds of rural areas in or near the national forest environs.

Today, outdoor recreation is a $20 billion a year business. We will continue to expand recreational facilities in the national forest; State and National parks are being improved. But the need for new outdoor recreation facilities cannot and should not be met on public land alone. It must be met in large part on the privately owned farms and ranches within easy driving distance of our major cities. This recreation activity can be a leading factor in revitalizing rural America.

I am sure you are familiar with the many other local and national benefits that national forests provide—hunting, fishing, grazing, and water. However, I point out that in hundreds of communities across America the national forests are an important cornerstone of rural areas development. The job facing us all is to make the private forests—especially the small forest ownerships—equally as important.

Forest service research: Research in management, protection, and utilization of the forest resources continues to pay dividends. For example, research at the Forest Products Laboratory has laid the groundwork for many new forest industries. A case in point is the development of a new use for the rapidly growing southern pines—the manufacture of plywood from this species. Plans are underway for industrial development that would use, annually, some 100 million board feet of this abundant timber species. In the process, the new use would create 750 new jobs with an estimated annual product output worth $12 to $15 million. Viewed through the eyes of rural communities those 750 jobs and $12 to $15 million are big jobs and big dollars. Rural America needs more of them.

Change brings new challenges: American forestry, caught in the swirl of a rapidly changing world, is on the brink of many great new things. The agenda of your Congress is a reflection of the awareness of this fact. Today, there are new challenges to be met; there are new opportunities to be realized; there are problems, both old and new, to be solved and there are numerous questions to be answered. How alert are we to the fluid situation in which we find ourselves? Are we flexible enough to adjust? Are our professional resource managers prepared to handle the tremendous task that faces us in land use adjustment? Are they ready to apply the principles of multiple use for profit from rural lands? What about our schools and colleges? Can they train their students in these concepts; if not now, when? What are we—you and I—ready to do now to speed the day when forestry and the forest resources will contribute their full share toward a better life for all Americans—rural and urban?

As we move forward I see some challenging but greatly rewarding tasks ahead:

We must prepare for and hurry the day when the idea that scenery is a commodity that can be profitably sold will be generally accepted; the day when there will be a great demand upon us for help in developing private outdoor recreation enterprises as a source of income to landowners and communities.

We must strive for the day when the rural land use plan will become a total multiple-use-for-profit plan—a conservation plan in which the family forest ceases to be an afterthought and becomes a full partner in producing farm prosperity.

We must prepare, and soon, for the time when the woodland owner will no longer be satisfied with a forest management plan that tells him only how to grow, harvest, and market his timber. He will be satisfied with nothing less than a plan that is geared to profitable management of his particular woodland—one that harmonizes the needs and desires of the owner with all the potentials and limitations of his entire farm or other unit of land. This means full multiple use made possible through good forestry, soil and water conservation, and necessary land treatment and practices.

We must hurry the day when forestry and multiple use of resources will bring more opportunity to rural areas so that our young people can find rewarding work at home. Without their energy and their drive, rural America cannot be stable and prosperous.

We must join in bringing more of our senior citizens into rural areas development work. The unlimited talents of retired leaders from business, agriculture, commerce, and the professions who live in rural areas should be fully enlisted in the RAD movement. They have the know-how and a readiness to serve. But you've got to ask them. They're ready, if you are.

We, at this congress, and all others interested in people and resources should never rest until we have reversed the sobering and regrettable relationship between depressed areas and forests. Let's vow to get full multiple-use value out of forest lands so that America's timbered areas become areas of prosperity and opportunity instead of want and distress.

I believe that we, who concern ourselves with natural resources and with rural people, must adjust to the fact that civil defense is an integral part of everyday living. It is a necessity in a world of conflict and tensions and that ours, like the whole world, is a wide open country. This means preparing for the worst and hoping for the best. We cannot afford to leave the vast area of rural America and its people and resources unprepared to defend itself against nuclear attack; against fire, and radioactive fallout; against biological and chemical effects. The time to prepare is today.

In this era of pressures against our natural resources, of competition for space—land space and water space—a paradoxical situation develops. Witness the fact that a higher percentage of the total land area of many States grows trees than was true a half century ago. Surprising to some people this is the case in such States as Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and my own native State, Arkansas, among many others—abandoned farmland reverting to trees or perhaps just brush. Such lands are too often indicators of depressed areas and depressed people. Too often they are burdens on local government and local economy. All this in the face of hunger for more open

spaces among crowded people often living nearby. These areas are not needed for the production of food and fiber under our modern system of agricultural production efficiency. They cannot compete in that system. In many of them conventional timber production may not be feasible. Yet there must be other values in them—hunting, fishing, and other forms of recreation, summer home sites, rural industry, and so on. A tremendous opportunity for the professional forester, the land-use specialist, conservationist and resources planner is to find those values, and through the local leadership RAD approach, see to it that they are fully realized.

The local soil conservation district with its modernized and updated program of work is a most effective local unit of State government operated by landowners themselves for undertaking the land use adjustment, treatment and practices needed—with the technical services of agencies, organizations and individuals in a position to assist.

I see ahead of us a greater understanding and a better meshing of interests between rural and urban populations. A city family on a farm vacation cannot help but leave impressed with the amount of work that goes into caring for, let's say, just one farm animal. The two peoples are interdependent. Neither can flourish without the other. But, and I see this day coming—when the producer and consumer interests of both are meshed together and pointed toward a common goal there can be but one result—greater opportunity and greater prosperity for both. This will benefit the whole Nation.

The overriding element in the progress of rural America will be information and education for both city and rural people to meet the needs, problems and opportunities in the country and to create a better understanding of the interdependency of rural and urban residents. I feel certain that our colleges and universities will tool up in this day of rapid change to meet the new challenges that confront them in teaching multiple use management of rural lands for profit. But this is not enough, let's also ground our young people in the techniques of resource use, management and protection even earlier. I'm thinking in terms of vocational education in our elementary and high schools and of education through 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America, extension work and public service programs. And while we're at it, let's include the young adults who have not had this training, whenever possible.

As a final word, whatever we do, let's never forget that with rural areas development, cooperative forest management, watershed management, soil and water conservation—no matter how you term it—you can only move as fast and as effectively as the local leadership is willing to move. I hope that you, the members of the American Forestry Association, will join with us and do your very best to keep your local leadership informed; keep it inspired; help it over the rough spots. This is rural areas development of the highest order; this is public service at its best.

Thank you.

Administration Spokesmen Are False Prophets on Analyzing the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, I would like to include an editorial from the Dallas Morning News of November 1, 1963. The editorial makes clear that the Kennedy administration and its spokesmen have proven to be false prophets in analyzing the national economy. We had better keep this in mind when voting on the administration demand to increase the debt ceiling.

The editorial follows:

DEBT CEILING

For the third time this year, and the fifth since he moved into the White House, President Kennedy has asked Congress to raise the ceiling on the temporary national debt. Today that ceiling stands at $309 billion, with the actual debt amounting to about $307 billion.

With another big deficit year in prospect, the President has requested Congress to lift the debt limit to $315 billion, an increase of $6 billion. Undoubtedly Congress will have to do something about the debt limit, for on November 30 the ceiling automatically reverts to the permanent limit of $285 billion. If Congress does not act, the Government will be unable to pay its bills.

But why does the limit have to be raised by $6 billion? Even House Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS thinks the administration is exaggerating the need for an increase, but the committee approved it Wednesday.

If the President and his advisers would spend less time dreaming up new ways to spend money they don't have, the debt could be held in check. Certainly there is little chance that spending will be curbed if Congress continues to authorize regular increases in the debt ceiling to permit administration spenders to unload their responsibilities on future generations.

It should be obvious by now that Congress must put an economic straitjacket on the Kennedy administration if the debt is to be held in check.

At the end of President Eisenhower's last fiscal year—which included the first 6 months of the Kennedy administration—the national debt stood at $289 billion. Today the debt is $307 billion, and by the close of the current fiscal year it will approach the newly requested debt ceiling of $315 billion.

In other words, President Kennedy will have increased the Nation's debt by nearly $26 billion—almost 10 percent—in just 3 years. President Eisenhower, who wasn't the greatest economizer, added only $23 billion to the debt in his 8 years in office.

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, who appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to request the new boost in the debt limit, had one encouraging statement to make: The deficit for the current fiscal year probably won't be as bad as had been anticipated.

Last January, Mr. Dillon and the President estimated that the year's deficit would come to $11.9 billion. Today Dillon estimates that the deficit will amount to only $9 billion. Though this should not win Dillon any medals for accurate forecasting, at least it partially evens the score. In the previous year, Dillon and the President predicted a balanced budget but wound up with a deficit of $7 billion.

Curiously, Dillon explained to committee members that one of the major reasons for improvement in the deficit picture this year is the fact that Congress has so far refused to act on the President's request for a tax cut. He confessed that if Congress had granted the tax cut in July—when both he and the President wanted it—the deficit would be larger than it is today.

Maybe Congress can learn something from this strategic admission by the Treasury Secretary. Already Members of Congress should know that Mr. Dillon is not a reliable forecaster. Now they should know that by not relying entirely on his advice on tax matters they have saved the country from greater debt.

United States Steel and the Birmingham Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, what I consider unjustifiable criticism has been lodged at Mr. Roger M. Blough, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., as a result of comments he made in a press conference held in New York on Tuesday, October 29, in which he discussed the role of business in race relations, with particular reference to the Birmingham situation. Some misunderstanding has arisen as a result of this criticism and I feel that, in all fairness to the United States Steel Corp., Mr. Blough, and the people of Birmingham, the record should be clarified. For this purpose, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a verbatim transcript of Mr. Blough's press conference of October 29.

I want to especially call the attention of the Members of Congress to Mr. Blough's comments regarding whether business should attempt to apply economic sanctions to a community in order to further so-called social or moral reforms. Mr. Blough states that such effort by business is repugnant to him and his company, and I think I speak for the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Birmingham in applauding his firm and forthright stand. For any enterprise, Government or private, to attempt to exert economic pressures on the people of any community to bring about social changes is truly repugnant to the American way of life.

We in Birmingham are proud of the contributions that United States Steel's TCI division has over the years made to the economy of our city and look forward to continued cooperation for our mutual benefit in the future.

The press conference follows:

Following is a verbatim transcript of United States Steel Chairman Roger M. Blough's replies to questions put to him on the Birmingham situation at a press conference following release of the company's quarterly earnings report in New York on Tuesday, October 29:

Question. Mr. Blough; on another tack, United States Steel is the largest employer in Birmingham, and there has been some criticism of the corporation for not using its economic influence for trying to take a leadership role in the community, and I was wondering if you could give me your comment on this criticism, what you feel your role there should be?

Mr. BLOUGH. I think in response to your question, I could mention one or two things, United States Steel has had a policy of nondiscrimination in employment for a long time. This policy, we believe, is being lived up to everywhere. In substance it states that United States Steel will seek and employ the best qualified personnel in all of

its facilities, and at all of its working locations, will provide equal opportunities for the advancement of employees, including upgrading, promotion and training, and will conduct these activities in a manner that it will not discriminate against any person because of race, color, creed or national origin.

I think you all know that we have employees of the colored race in substantial numbers. I would believe that upwards of 10 percent of all of our employees would be Negroes. I can also tell you what you may or may not know that we have a number of Negroes in skilled trades, some are professional, some are clerical, and some have supervisory assignments.

I think it would also be useful to mention the provisions of the labor agreement with the United Steel Workers of America. That agreement says, "It is the continuing policy of the company and the union that the provisions of this agreement shall be applied to all employees without regard to race, color, religion, creed, or national origin."

Now, with specific respect to the Birmingham situation, I suppose that nearly 30 percent of United States Steel's employees in Birmingham are Negroes. During the recent racial disturbances in Birmingham, a great deal of progress was made and accomplished peaceably in bringing about further integration of seniority lines, and in broadening the promotional opportunities.

Question. In the plant?

Mr. BLOUGH. That is in the plant. None of the Birmingham tensions so far as I know were reflected in on-the-job relationships at the TCI mills, and I think it is noteworthy that during these periods of tension, the employee attendance at our Birmingham plants was maintained at a normal level.

Now, there is one point that I approach with some diffidence because there may be, shall I say, a slight difference of judgment with respect to it. Before approaching this point—and that goes to the question of what any business unit may do in a community—in connection with a matter that affects the entire community and in connection with a matter which is as fraught with emotions as the civil rights question. I don't know whether you gentlemen know it or not—perhaps some of you do—but the present president of TCI, of our division in Birmingham, is Arthur Wiebel, and he has been there since 1946. While he was still vice president down there, he accepted appointment to the board of trustees of Jefferson County Coordinating Council of Social Forces, and that organization, as I understand it, coordinated the efforts of all major agencies working for civic and social improvement.

Question. When was that? Was that in the 1940's?

Mr. BLOUGH. 1949. He served on that council with a number of individuals, including the superintendent of education, and Mr. A. G. Gaston, who is a prominent Negro Birmingham businessman who, I believe, has been mentioned a number of times, and various other community leaders.

In 1951, an interracial committee was formed within this coordinating council, and Mr. Wiebel was a member of that interracial committee, and he tried as best he could to help build understanding and strengthen communications between the races; he had associated with him in that committee a number of the people who were greatly interested in improving the lot of the Negroes in many fields: health, sanitation, business, housing, cultural and recreational opportunities, police and fire protection.

I don't know whether you know it or not, but that committee of which he was a member in 1951 recommended and made a formal request to the then three-man Birmingham City Commission that it employ nine Negro policemen. Now, this was in 1951. Since that time, Mr. Wiebel has done a lot of work in connection, for example, with a housing project for the construction of what is known as an upper middle-class Negro residential subdivision, and is considered as attractive as any in that economic range in the Nation.

Question. Excuse me, this was?——

Mr. BLOUGH. I think it was called Honeysuckle Hill.

Question. This is in 1951?

Mr. BLOUGH. No; it is some time after that, but I don't know the exact date.

Also, he was helpful in getting Negro insurance companies and investors in the Birmingham district to make home mortgage money available for Negro home buyers.

From 1953 to 1961, Mr. Wiebel served as a member of the board of trustees of Tuskegee Institute. I think you all know that it is one of the fine institutions of higher learning for Negroes. He was a member of the senior citizens committee in May when the racial problem occurred in Birmingham, and he devoted, I suppose, as much or more time and attention as anyone there to try to have this matter resolved. I think you will recall at that time the difficulties in connection with the legal problem in Birmingham when they were confronted with changing the commission form of government to the mayor-council form.

More recently, Mr. Wiebel has cooperated with General Royall and Colonel Blaik, and has spent a great deal of time in connection with their work in Birmingham.

Some of you may not know that on Sunday, October 6, an ad was signed by 90 citizens of Birmingham appealing to the mayor and council to give consideration to the employment of qualified Negroes on the police force, and that this ad was followed by one appearing on Monday endorsing the first ad, and this latter ad was signed by 44 business and industry leaders, including Mr. Wiebel.

Now, I won't attempt to go into all of the other civic responsibilities that Mr. Wiebel has performed down there, including the United Fund, which also supported Negro welfare activities. He, of course, worked with the Red Cross for about 5 years as a member of the board of directors and finance committee of the Jefferson County chapter; he has been a member of Birmingham's Committee of One Hundred since it was formed in 1951 for the purpose of bringing new and diversified industry to Birmingham, and I believe that in more ways than I have mentioned or can mention, Mr. Wiebel has been very helpful in the community and has tried to carry out what is our overall United States Steel policy of being a good citizen in the community in which we live.

Now, the criticism that United States Steel hasn't used what some people refer to as economic—I don't know what the language is—

Question. Influence?

Mr. BLOUGH. Economic influence, which I presume to mean some kind of economic force to bring about some kind of change, is I think an improper matter upon which to criticize either Mr. Wiebel or United States Steel. I think I would have to take considerable time to fully explain this point, but very briefly, I'd like to say this, that I do not either believe that it would be a wise thing for United States Steel to be other than a good citizen in a community, or to attempt to have its ideas of what is right for the community enforced upon that community by some sort of economic means. This is repugnant to me personally and I am sure it is repugnant to my fellow officers in United States Steel. I doubt very much that this in principle is a good thing for any corporation to follow. When we as individuals are citizens in a community, we can exercise what small influence we may have as citizens, but for a corporation to attempt to exert any kind of economic compulsion to achieve a particular end in the social area seems to me to be quite beyond what a corporation should do, and I will say also, quite beyond what a corporation can do.

Question. Do you think then that you have done all that you should do or can do in this area? What you have been doing is meeting the responsibility in this area and you reject the criticism, do you not?

Mr. BLOUGH. I would put it this way, that we have fulfilled our responsibility in the Birmingham area. Whatever responsibility we have as a corporation or as individuals working with a corporation, because after all, a corporation, is nothing but individuals.

A Salute to the Textile Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, in the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N.C., of Sunday, November 3, 1963, a very fine article appeared about the fine work men and women are doing in the textile plants of North and South Carolina. These are the finest citizens in the world, the most patriotic and give the best service for the wages of any laboring people anywhere. I salute them and include as part of my remarks the article from the Charlotte Observer which is as follows:

TEXTILE WORKER: DEDICATED TO JOB—HE TURNS THAT RAW COTTON INTO A BEAUTIFUL PIECE OF CLOTH

(Special report by Conrad Paysour, Observer, Gastonia bureau)

There's more to the textile industry than than the controversy over two-price cotton, the threat of foreign imports and the profit squeeze.

These are the things you read about in your daily newspaper, but there's an important element at the heart of the textile industry that is often overlooked—the textile worker himself.

The textile worker. He sometimes works while you are asleep to make it possible for this country to be the best clothed nation on earth.

The textile worker. He is the backbone of the South's greatest industry.

The textile worker. He is a magician. Instead of pulling a rabbit out of a hat, the textile worker turns raw cotton into a beautiful piece of cloth.

How does he accomplish this magic?

First, somebody like Bernard Reid who works in the "opening room" of Cramerton Mills at Cramerton, a Burlington Industries unit, takes a bale of cotton. He peels back the burlap and runs a comb through the outer layer of cotton.

"This takes out the dirt," Reid explained.

The cotton goes through an "opening machine" where it is cleaned and restored to its original fluffy state.

After going through several other processes, it emerges as a "sliver or a ropelike form. This rope is then reduced in size to prepare it for the next process—spinning, which turns the cotton into yarn.

At Cramerton Mills, Mrs. Welch Moore operates a spinning frame. She is proud of her job.

"I'm one of only two people in here who can operate the Piedmont frames," she beams. "You have to stay on your toes."

Mrs. W. T. Foster works in the quilling department at Cramerton, where she prepares yarn to be woven into cloth.

When Mrs. Foster is not working, she keeps house. Like most textile workers nowadays, she and her husband own their own home. Her husband works for Cramerton Mills also.

Fred Mason of Lowell operates a slashing machine, which starches and waxes yarn to make it strong enough to go through other processes without tearing or breaking. Mason, with Burlington Industries for 16 years, likes to fish in his off time.

In the weave room, where the yarn becomes cloth, James G. Rowland has worked for 13 of his 29 years. This is the noisiest place in the plant.

Each time a shuttle—which interlaces the threads to make cloth—clacks together, it sounds like a pistol shot. When hundreds of these machines are operating, the noise is almost deafening.

But the ingenuity of the textile worker has solved this problem.

"A lot of times, I read a person's lips when we are talking," said Rowland. "Also, if you talk under the noise instead of trying to talk too loud, it is easier to hear.

What comes out of the weave room is known as "gray cloth" or "gray goods," so called not because of its color, which is a creamy off white, but because it is still unfinished and not yet ready to be made into things like sheets or tablecloths or shirts.

A finishing plant is where the gray cloth goes to be bleached, dyed, printed with patterns, preshrunk, made waterproof, and many other things specified by the ultimate manufacturer.

The biggest cotton finishing plant in the world is the Rock Hill Printing & Finishing Co., 25 miles south of Charlotte in Rock Hill, S.C.

Skilled textile printers at "the bleachery," as the plant is called, use giant presses to turn bleached cotton cloth into print material for dresses and curtains, tablecloths, and American flags.

Harry A. Givens, a 30-year veteran with the company, is one of the specialists in charge of a complex printing machine at the Bleachery. He takes the same pride in his work as that of an artist working on a canvas with oil paints.

L. B. Knox's job is operating a forklift, with which he moves printed cloth from the agers and soapers department, where the printed colors are developed and set, to succeeding processes in the finishing operation. Knox is a former semipro baseball player who now is an expert hunter.

J. M. Threatt, with 25 years of service with the company is a hooker operator.

This onetime manager of a State championship Little League baseball team gives finished cloth its final inspection, then hooks it off into a flat, folded bundle for packing and shipping.

These are the textile workers of the Carolinas—the people who at one time had some part in producing the cotton shirt or dress you are wearing as you read this.

WORKING CONDITIONS IMPROVE—THERE HAS BEEN A BIG CHANGE

There was a time when workers in many textile mills virtually owed their souls to the company store.

A textile worker lived in a mill village owned by the company. He bought his food from a store owned by the company. Often, he even purchased his water and electricity from the company. He lived from day to day, from hand to mouth.

The textile worker was sometimes called a lint head, because the mill was dirty and when he left work, his hair was filled with cotton.

There is, of course, still some of this. A few mills still own mill villages. Some mills are still dirty, dreary, and unbearably hot. Some jobs in all mills are still monotonous.

But much of this is changing.

The sweeper—at one time the lowest form of labor—is being replaced by vacuum cleaners traveling on overhead rails. The vacuum cleaner sucks up lint and dirt as it makes the rounds through the mill.

Some jobs in many textile mills still are low paying. But the Federal minimum hourly rate is now $1.25. Most jobs pay more than this. The pay even for textile jobs not considered highly skilled can run above $1.90 per hour.

When a man and his wife both work, which is often the case, their combined incomes make it possible for them to live on a high level.

As likely as not, today's textile worker in this part of the country owns his own home, has a television set in the living room, a nice car in the garage, and maybe even a boat on the Catawba River.

Many textile workers send their children to college—something almost unheard of before World War II.

There are still some unpleasant aspects to textile work, of course. No machine has been developed that can do away with the "graveyard shift," from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. Somebody has to be working when other people are sleeping. Then they must try to sleep through the noise and summer heat of the daylight hours.

The other two shifts in most textile plants run from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m.

Perhaps the changing life of the textile worker can be summed up by something a Pittsburgh steelworker said after he visited a Gaston County textile mill.

"I've always heard about how hard off textile workers are in the South," he said. "But man, after visiting this place, I wish my working conditions were as good as these."

Ghana Newspaper Terms the Peace Corps "a Godsend"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Ghana News, of August 6, 1963, which appear under the headline "The American Peace Corps 'a Godsend' ":

THE AMERICAN PEACE CORPS "A GODSEND"

For the 45 American Peace Corps Volunteers who have left Ghana after a 2-year teaching assignment, Tuesday, July 9, 1963, will always be a memorable day in their life. On this day, they were not only afforded the rare opportunity of meeting a President of the country—in this case, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah—to shake hands with, chat with and even demand his autograph, but also learned officially that the Government of Ghana has been highly appreciative of their contribution towards the development of education in the country.

In April 1961, shortly after American President Kennedy had made his views on the Peace Corps project known to the world, Ghana became the first nation in the world to ask for their services.

Most of the 41 American youths who came to Ghana in August 1961, were paying their first visit to any part of Africa, to live in conditions which they were unused to, to teach and simultaneously learn from the people with whom they have come to live.

For 2 years the volunteers have been teaching various subjects from mathematics, English, French, and history to the "twist." In addition to their normal teaching work, they were expected during holidays to work on a constructive project such as working in hospitals and laboratories and other extracurricular activities.

Within this short period of its existence in Ghana, the Peace Corps has won nothing but praise. The Minister of Education, Mr. A. J. Dowuona-Hammond, talking of it recently said: "The Peace Corps scheme has been a Godsend, because we need more teachers than are available locally." Pupils and headmasters have not only been impressed by their zeal but also by their eagerness to help, their friendliness, and above all, their simplicity of living.

The volunteers have not only been teaching but have also been learning. Said Frank Guido of Pennsylvania, who prior to coming to Ghana, was doing graduate work in microbiology in Philadelphia, "I have enjoyed my stay in Ghana very much. The pupils are very cooperative and eager to learn.

"The headmaster was very sympathetic and I have also learned a lot from the students. One thing I have mastered while here is the 'highlife' (Ghana's popular dance)."

Mr. George Carter, a Peace Corps representative in Accra, disclosed that 25 percent of the first batch of volunteers had asked for their tour to be extended to another year. This, he explained, had been impossible in some cases because the Ghana Government now requires only teachers of mathematics, science, and French.

With well over 120 volunteers all contributing fully toward educational development of the country, the Government and people of Ghana are really appreciative of this effort and look forward to playing host to the next group of 58 volunteers who are expected to leave for Ghana early in September.

Mr. Speaker, on the return of the Peace Corps volunteers and at the invitation of Milton Shapp, Chairman of the Peace Corps Service Organization of Philadelphia, Ambassador M. A. Ribeiro of Ghana attended a reception held at Congress Hall, Philadelphia, on July 31 for a group of Philadelphia Peace Corps volunteers who recently returned from overseas. Among the returnees was Ray V. Spriggs who taught at a high school in Ghana.

Ambassador Ribeiro in brief welcome remarks paid tribute to the organizers and members of the Peace Corps for their contribution to the development of Africa. He assured the organizers that the Ghana Government highly appreciate the services that the Peace Corps has been rendering in Ghana. He averred that the Peace Corps venture would have greater and more lasting effects on U.S. relations with the developing countries than any of her other foreign aids.

To the returnees he said:

It is not possible to estimate now the value of your work, but there is one thing you can be sure of now and that is, you have in your own small way contributed toward the building of a new nation and more than that you have helped in laying a foundation for enduring friendship and cooperation between the future leaders of your country and the countries of Africa and Asia where you worked.

He concluded by saying that their work was not finished and that they now have the bigger task of educating their own countrymen about the newly emergent nations and thereby help correct some of the misconceptions in this country about these nations.

Cuba, Plus 1 Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Mr. William S. White, editorial writer for the Star, entitled "One Year After Cuban Crisis." I believe Mr. White to be a most forthright writer, and his columns are most penetrating and thought provoking:

ONE YEAR AFTER CUBAN CRISIS.

(By William S. White)

Another October finds an immense change in the American mood from that October of a year ago when we stood at the brink of nuclear war over Cuba. Determination and sensible fear sensibly suppressed—but determination above all—these were in the American mind.

The new October has arrived with anxiety largely gone and a new and understandable but also largely unsupported hope and optimism hanging over most of the Nation.

We were right a year ago to stand fast as a country in settled resolve to meet unavoidable peril in the spirit of men prepared to die rather than surrender, even though happily the dice of history turned our way instead of against us. But we are wrong now, as it seems to me, in having rushed over, in a single 12 months, from the thick but not ably rational gloom of October, 1962, to the very nearly irrational, best-of-all-possible-worlds attitude prevalent in October 1963.

THE WHEAT SALE

The partial nuclear test ban with the Soviet Union, though a defensible enterprise and though just possibly some herald of a true easing in the cold war, has not yet either ended that war or given any assurance whatever of the identity of its eventual winner.

From much that is happening now, however, one might suppose that if the worst was not already past then a good bit of the worst was in sight of being over. So we talk happily of wheat sales to the Russians—an appealing notion no less to hard-line conservatives than to soft-line liberals, for conservatives are traders and trade is an honorable underpinning of the very capitalist system itself.

We talk of cutting back on our multi-billion-dollar space program—and this is good to hear by both sets of different reasons. The conservatives naturally would like to save the money. The liberals have long been resentful at those billions being set aside for the moon when it all might be spent on dozens of earthy welfarist schemes hatched or in incubation.

But wheat deals with the Russians, no matter how momentarily helpful to our farm surplus problem, would nevertheless undeniably strengthen the Russian where they are weak. Have we waited for 17 years for this weak spot in order now to dash in to fill it—and without, apparently, demanding anything in return except the price of the wheat itself?

And should we really reduce the space appropriation even though it is quite true that the President has renewed suggestions that we might cooperate in space research with the Soviet Union? Surely not, if we remain aware of the towering central fact that the power which in future is first in space will be first as well in this world we live in.

What the President said, at any rate, never meant we should lessen our own exertions. It only restated an old American policy in offering certain cooperative ventures to the Soviet Union, as we have offered so many others, if, as and when the Soviet Union might like really to cooperate.

WISE APPROACH NEEDED

We still intend to be first in space, as Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON has just pointed out in behalf of the administration. Nothing will change that, unless Congress and country insist upon heedlessly withholding the means to do it. And a little cooperation from the Russians—in the unlikely event it was given—would do no harm to our central purpose.

But even greater than the need for a wise, calm-minded approach to all these specific questions is the need for a national spirit which rejects any notion that the game has about been won.

Some say we need as well to shun the opposite notion that no concessions whatever should be made in the cold war. To this the proper answer is "yes"—but. It is "'yes," wherever such a concession is clearly matched by Soviet concession and wherever refusal would be mere hysterical reflex. It is "no" wherever concessions are made simply in some vague notion that we could thus, in some iffy way, somehow improve the international atmosphere.

What Happened to President Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage" in Korth Case?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the veteran correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Krock, writes as follows in that newspaper on November 3, 1963:

At Wittenberg College, October 17, 1960, Presidential Candidate Kennedy promised that if elected he would impose "a single, comprehensive code on conflicts of interest * * * drawing a clearer line between propriety and impropriety * * * protecting the public against the unethical behavior * * *. All America seeks a government which no man holds to his own interest * * *. The next President must set the moral tone, and I refer not only to his language."

At his press conference on November 1, 1963, President Kennedy was asked these questions:

Question. Mr. President, do you think the letters that Secretary of the Navy (Fred) Korth wrote made his resignation advisable, and was requested?

Answer. I think the letters which Mr. Korth and I exchanged, I think, explain the situation as I would like to see it explained.

Question. Mr. President——

Answer. Mr. Korth, I think, worked hard for the Navy and he indicated his desire to return to private life and I accepted that decision. But I think he worked hard for the Navy.

Later in the same press conference, the questioning on the same subject was renewed as follows:

Question. Mr. President, Navy Secretary [Fred] Korth had some correspondence which indicated he worked very hard for the Continental National Bank of Forth Worth while he was in Government, as well as for the Navy, and that during this same period of time that he negotiated, or took part in the decision on a contract involving that bank's—one of that bank's best customers, the General Dynamics firm. I wonder if this fulfills the requirements of your code of ethics in Government, and if, in a general way, you think that it is within the law and proper?

Answer. In the case of the contract, the TFX contract, as you know, Mr. Mollenhoff, that matter was referred to the Department of Justice to see whether there was a conflict of interest and the judgment was that there was not. That is No. 1.

No. 2, the amount of the loan to the company, that bank was one of a number of banks which participated in a line of credit and it was relatively a small amount of money, as bank loans go. So in answer to your question, I have no evidence that Mr. Korth acted in any way improperly in the TFX matter. It has nothing to do with any opinion I may have about whether Mr. Korth might have written more letters and been busier than he should have been in one way or another.

The fact of the matter is, I have no evidence that Mr. Korth benefited improperly during his term in office in the Navy, and I have no evidence, and you have not, as I understand the press has not produced any, nor the McClellan committee, which I would indicate that in any way he acted improperly in the TFX. I have always believed that innuendoes should be justified before they are made, either by me and the Congress or even the press.

What has happened to the Kennedy "Profiles in Courage?" What has happened with respect to his bold and reassuring words as spoken when he was a candidate for the presidency; when, for political purposes, he was pointing a finger at the Eisenhower administration and the Sherman Adams-Goldfine episode?

As Mr. Krock says:

As soon as he learned of Korth's lapses from this code of official ethics, the President conveyed the word to his Navy Secretary that immediate resignation was in order * * *. But by his words at the press conference he strangely diluted his very creditable deed.

Mr. Speaker, at this point and for the information of my colleagues, I submit for printing in the RECORD the entire article as published in the New York Times on Sunday last:

THE KORTH CASE: KENNEDY'S EXPLANATION OF THE NAVY SECRETARY'S RESIGNATION EXAMINED

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 2.—President Kennedy expressed a desire common to occupants of his office whom a subordinate has embarrassed when asked at his news conference if he thought certain letters written by Navy Secretary Korth made the resignation of this official "advisable" and if the President had requested it. "I think," he replied, "the letters which Mr. Korth and I exchanged are the—explain the situation as I would like to see it explained."

But whether or not Mr. Kennedy's choice of words was inadvertent, no predecessor has arrayed himself with such candor on the side of the proposition that the press should not explore the background of official explanations of events in Government that, on their face and in the attendant circumstances, are plainly a coverup of the actual situation. For the letters the President referred to (which were not, of course, the letters his

questioner described) are excellent examples of deliberate concealment.

Secretary Korth's October 11 letter of resignation to the President gave as his only reason the need "to return to private business to attend to my pressing private affairs." In his prompt reply (October 12) accepting the resignation, Mr. Kennedy made no comment on the reason for it given by Korth, confining his composition to generous—and deserved—praise of the Secretary's "advancement of national security interests," and said these had put "the Nation in your debt." Therefore, the explanation supplied by this exchange, the one the President said he "would like to see" deemed sufficient, stands in the official record merely as this:

Secretary Korth resigned only because the pressure of "private affairs" overcame his dedicated desire to continue to support the leadership of our national defense by the President and Secretary McNamara. * * * Mr. Kennedy's estimate of Korth's service was high and without qualification.

If the press had accommodated the President's stated preference, and let it go at that, the subject would not have been revived by a question later in the news conference. Perhaps the detailed nature of this second inquiry persuaded Mr. Kennedy he must go beyond the official record he previously had said he would like to have accepted as an adequate explanation. However, go beyond it he did, condoning in words a breach of the ethics to which he pledged his administration in the campaign of 1960 that he had already redeemed in action.

SPEEDY RESIGNATION

As soon as he learned of Korth's lapses from this code of official ethics, the President conveyed the word to his Navy Secretary that immediate resignation was in order. In so doing, Mr. Kennedy acted with firmness and promptness in highly favorable contrast to the performances of two previous administrations in comparable circumstances. But by his words at the press conference he strangely diluted his very creditable deed.

The amount of the subscription to TFX loan to General Dynamics by the bank from which Korth had come to public office, said the President, had, after all, "been a relatively small amount of money as bank loans go;" so there was "nothing improper" in the Navy Secretary's participation in the decision to give the contract to General Dynamics. And, as for Korth's letters on Navy stationery, including an offer to the bank to include some of its "best customers * * * in a little party" on the Secretary's official yacht *Sequoia*, the President dismissed them by saying: "This [TFX affair] has nothing to do with any opinion I may have about whether Mr. Korth might have written more letters and been busier than he should have been in one way or another.

WHITE HOUSE ATTITUDE

That part of Mr. Kennedy's news conference comments furnishes only another illustration that the stern ethical attitude of presidential candidates is prone to undergo a softening process when they enter the White House.

The admirable quality in President Truman that evoked greater intensity in his friendship when his friends got themselves in trouble was supplemented by his fierce protective instinct for his party when some of these friends got his administration in trouble, too. And President Eisenhower long and stubbornly justified acceptance of gifts by Sherman Adams that engendered the public disapproval which finally persuaded Adams he was seriously injuring the President by retaining his most influential White House post.

On June 18, 1959, 3 months before Adams' resignation, President Eisenhower gave a news conference his views on the ethical issue involved, of which the following are the pertinent excerpts:

"A gift is not necessarily a bribe. One is evil, the other is a tangible expression of friendship. * * * Anyone who knows Sherman Adams has never had any doubt of his personal integrity and honesty. * * * But * * * in not being sufficiently alert in making certain that the gifts of which he was a recipient could be * * * misinterpreted * * * as attempts to influence his political actions * * * to that extent he was * * * 'imprudent.' * * * Personally, I respect him because of his personal and official integrity. I need him."

ETHICAL CLEARANCE

The sponsors of the "shakedowns" for presentation portraits to judges and campaign funds via testimonial dinners, etc., that have attained a peak of frequency in Washington ask no better ethical clearance than this.

At Wittenberg College, October 17, 1960, Presidential Candidate Kennedy promised that, if elected, he would impose "a single, comprehensive code on conflicts of interest * * * drawing a clearer line between propriety and impropriety * * * protecting the public against the unethical behavior. * * * All America seeks a Government which no man holds to his own interest. * * * The next President must set the moral tone, and I refer not only to his language."

This was the part of the pledge which Mr. Kennedy failed to serve by excusing, in words, the official actions he had, by deed, certified as inexcusable.

Full Text of Chicago Press Conference With Nyasaland's Prime Minister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the coverage in the University of Chicago magazine of October 1963, of a press conference in Chicago with Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, Prime Minister of Nyasaland:

Question. Dr. Banda, is this the first time that you have been back to the United States since your student days?

Dr. BANDA. No, I was here 3 years ago after I came out of jail. You know that I was in prison for 13 months. After I came out it was the American Committee on Africa who invited me here.

Question. Were you happy when you were here as a student?

Dr. BANDA. I was very happy. I was very fortunate when I was here as a student in that I had friends both among colored and white here in this city and elsewhere where I lived. There was a family which claimed me as their adopted son, as long as I lived here.

Question. What was your favorite place when you were here as a student?

Dr. BANDA. Well, Washington Park. You see, I lived at 5925 Indiana Avenue and as a poor boy I couldn't afford to ride the street car. So I would walk through the park to the University of Chicago and that was quite a distance. And when you reached the university, there was a big stone carving. (Dr. Banda here refers to the Lorado Taft sculpture and fountain, at the end of Washington Park where the Midway begins—Ed.)

Question. Dr. Banda, what steps could we take to have better relations as regards racial questions in this country?

Dr. BANDA. I don't think you should drag me into that. All I can say is that I am greatly encouraged to see that the President, his brother, and many other people in this country are doing what they are doing. Remember that during the time I was here as a student things were not as they are now. I am staying at the Palmer House now. I was in the Winter Park Hotel in Washington, I was in the Hilton-Statler in Boston. I couldn't have been in those hotels when I was here as a student. Today what do I read—white boys, white girls, white men, white women march side by side, shoulder to shoulder, with Negroes fighting for the rights not of the white man, not of the white woman, not of the white boys and girls, but of Negroes. The Government is taking a hand to the point of using Federal troops to enable a Negro to go to a university. That didn't happen when I was here before. I believe that things will continue to improve. But of course I stress that I am expressing a personal opinion. I have no intention of interfering in your internal politics.

Question. Dr. Banda, is there a unique role that you feel Nyasaland can play in Africa's evolution?

Dr. BANDA. I think so, I believe in a policy of negotiation when negotiation can work, but of course when negotiation does not work you have no choice. Therefore my role in Nyasaland and my role in Africa is to try to be a mediator where there is conflict. I believe in negotiation. I don't believe in bitterness and that is why I like the British. Now, some people say the British Commonwealth is being dissolved. I say people like that [the British] will maintain their Commonwealth in one form or another for a thousand years to come because they know when to retreat, when retreat is the best policy.

Question. Dr. Banda, do you think that turbulence among the emerging nations of Africa would have occurred in any case, or could it have been avoided by the colonial powers * * *?

Dr. BANDA (emphatically). It could have been avoided. It could most certainly have been avoided by the colonial powers. Any colonial power which refuses to recognize the right and demands of Africans for self-government and independence is the one that is selling the white man down the river. Communism would have come to Africa if Britain and France had refused to yield to nationalism. The only place I know now where communism is organized as a party at all among Africans is in South Africa. That's because of the policy of apartheid. That is why I would like to see the United States and Britain exercise any kind of pressure on South Africa to change her policy. Because there is where you have danger in Africa. Explosive situation.

Question. Do you mean that South Africa is in danger of going Communist?

Dr. BANDA. I say that the apartheid policy is the breeding ground for communism or any kind of upheaval. Allowing the Africans to organize their own governments is a sure guarantee that there will be no communism. Not only that, but white men will not be driven out of Africa.

Question. Do you regard Nkrumah of Ghana a Communist?

Dr. BANDA. Definitely not. Kwame Nkrumah is not a Communist. He has been accused of that and of being a dictator. He is not. I have known Kwame Nkrumah since 1945, and I don't mind telling you that he is my personal friend, but I am not saying nice things about him because he is my personal friend. I am just speaking the truth. He is not a Communist. He is not a dictator. Remember there was another candidate for the presidency. He lost. When

it comes to that, I have been accused of being a dictator, of Nyasaland of being a one-party state. Well, Nyasaland is not a one-party state; I am not a dictator. At the election in 1961, there were three parties: The Malawi Congress Party, which is my own party, the United Federal Party which is Wellensky's party, the Christian Liberation Party T.D.T., the party of another Banda who was opposing me. But the people chose me. * * * If Nkrumah is a dictator, he is a dictator, of, by, and for the people. It is the people who are keeping him there.

Question. How about Kenyatta, Dr. Banda?

Dr. BANDA. I know him, too. I have known Kenyatta since 1945. Both he and Kwame came to my house in London when I was practicing medicine in London. They have accused Kenyatta of all sorts of things.

Question. Well, he's a murderer, isn't he?

Dr. BANDA. That's what you say.

Question. I don't say so, that's what I read.

Dr. BANDA. In my view, if Kenyatta had not been sent to prison there would have been no so-called Mau Mau. There was so-called Mau Maus simply because Kenyatta was imprisoned. When Kenyatta was out of the way, no one could control the people so that in my view it was wrong to jail him.

Question. What is the population of Nyasaland?

Dr. BANDA. If you would look up the (British) census, they will tell you 2,800,000 but we are many more than that; close to 4 million.

Question. Why the discrepancy, sir?

Dr. BANDA. Many, many reasons. The people who take the census don't count everybody and secondly, my people are polygamists. This will amuse you: If a man has three or four wives and he knows that if the government knows he has all these wives he has to pay taxes for every one of them, he wouldn't want to give the number of all these wives. It's a form of tax evasion.

Question. What is the white population of Nyasaland?

Dr. BANDA. About 8,000.

Question. What is the prospect of an African alliance?

Dr. BANDA. I have just broken one. I can't talk about another alliance while I'm still disentangling myself from the first one.

Question. Dr. Banda, what will the economic future of your country be?

Dr. BANDA. Briefly, agricultural development. Also manufacture, of course. For example, we grow a large amount of cotton, yet there is no textile industry. We have plenty of sugar cane, and yet we buy sugar from Southern Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa. There are many oranges rotting about, and yet we buy orange juice from other countries. All along the line, we want to improve our facilities for processing. In other words, secondary industries.

Question. You are not opposed, sir, to foreign investments?

Dr. BANDA. Oh, no. I welcome that. If you know any millionaires, tell them I would like to have them in Nyasaland tomorrow. We want foreign investments. We want someone to come and dig up our bauxite, for example.

Question. Sir, what are you doing about a highway along the lakeshore?

Dr. BANDA. Yes, yes. We have a beautiful 360-mile-long lakeshore. The lake is 68 miles wide at some points. I want to plan a highway from the southern end of the lake right up to the northern end. I want you to drive along that road; I want you to admire the beauty of that lake. At the same time, tourism could be important. I would like to build hotels. Tell Mr. Hilton.

Question. Dr. Banda, many people are concerned with this nation's image in Africa. Just what do Africans think of us?

Dr. BANDA. Well, I am speaking for myself. I can't claim to speak for all Africans. Up to 1960, I think it is correct to say that the feeling in Africa was that the United States was siding too much with the colonial powers. Since 1960, there has been a gradual change; the United States has not always supported colonial powers. And in the case of the Congo, we, as African nationalists, admired the stand which the United States took. The United States sided with us. We did not want Tschombe. We were, therefore, very heartened to see that the United States was siding with us.

Question. Doctor, do you think there is danger of too many small nations in Africa?

Dr. BANDA. No. After all, you've heard my friend, Kwame Nkrumah, speak of the United States of Africa, and at Addis Ababa, they agreed on that. One day, of course, it will be all one nation, but at this stage things will go as they are. After all, Switzerland is a small nation. Look at Luxembourg. They're doing very well.

Question. What would you say is the major problem facing Africa today?

Dr. BANDA. Economic development. The difficulty to avoid any new form of entanglement. I don't care where it comes from.

Question. Dr. Banda, would you like to invite some of the young people in this country?

Dr. BANDA. Very much so. Take the Peace Corps, for example. I would like to see many, many more. We have about 40 now, young men and young women, and they are doing excellent work as teachers. If you have any influence with some of the young people, tell them.

Question. What can the Western Powers do to help the development?

Dr. BANDA. They must help us with development loans. They must send us men who have the technical know-how and, at the same time, train our own men. They must allow us to send our boys and girls to their country, to their universities, and help us organize our own universities and technical institutes.

Question. Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister.

To the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Whether intentionally, or not, the latest exploit in space of the Soviet Union has, in my opinion, served as a warning to all of us that we should look behind Mr. Khrushchev's statement of last weekend that the Soviet Union was withdrawing from from the moon race. The following editorial from the Sunday edition of the Star points this out.

TO THE MOON

Russia's newest venture in space has come at exactly the right time. Although not so intended, it pulls the rug from under those among us—such as economizing Congressmen and excessively zealous scientists like Linus Pauling—who have been clamoring for an end to our country's program to place Americans on the moon by 1970.

These people, with much naivete (to use a polite word), have attached an extravagant degree of importance to Premier Khrushchev's recent remarks vaguely suggesting that he may be withdrawing the Soviets from the lunar race. Actually, as President Kennedy observed at his Thursday news conference, the remarks were so "very guarded and careful and cautious" that he himself "would not make any bets at all on Soviet intentions." Instead, as he proposes to do, he would carry out the American moon program as fast as possible and without letup. He would do this not just for prestige purposes, but because the whole awesome undertaking has a vital bearing on national security. Further, it holds out the promise of great intellectual and material rewards to be wrested from the exploration and exploitation of what might be called the heavenly seas, the boundless oceans of the universe around us.

Certainly, if Moscow has not exaggerated, the new Soviet spatial experiment spectacularly supports Mr. Kennedy. For the vehicle involved is extraordinary in the sense that it is said to be maneuverable in all directions—horizontally, to the left and right, and perpendicularly, up and down—so that it can make vast and swift orbital changes at command from the ground. If the Russians really have achieved such maneuverability in space, then the United States has a lot of catching up to do. More specifically, their latest space shot plainly, and disturbingly, indicates that they are well ahead of us with the kind of rendezvous capability that is essential to efforts to place men on the moon and bring them back safely. This is one of the many reasons why all Americans should share in the President's strong doubt that Mr. Khrushchev has even the slightest intention of withdrawing from the lunar race.

Clearly, we must run this race as swiftly as we possibly can. D. Brainerd Holmes, former chief of our lunar project, has summed it all up rather well: "If we do not make these efforts, we will not be first on the moon, we will not be first in space and, one day soon, we will not be first on earth. With the support of the American people, and with the help of God, we will not be second."

President Kennedy obviously feels the same way. That is why he has warned against the shallow and potentially dangerous views of people like Dr. Pauling. As a nation, we must keep on going forward, to the moon and beyond.

Chicago University Welcomes Back a Famous Alumnus, Prime Minister Banda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years it has been my good fortune to number among my close African friends the present Prime Minister of Nyasaland, a graduate of the University of Chicago. Our association started on the occasion of his visit to Washington some 3 or 4 years ago, and was warmly continued when our paths crossed on Independence Day in Tanganyika, and recently we met again when he visited with the African subcommittee of which I have the honor to be the chairman.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the University of Chicago magazine of October 1963:

AN ALUMNUS RETURNS

(NOTE.—Wrote Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda to this magazine from Her Majesty's Prison Gwelo, Southern Rhodesia, on October 14, 1959, somewhat wistfully: "One day, when things are different, I shall visit the States and my university, to see some of my fellow alumni, some of my former teachers and a host of friends.")

On Friday, October 11, 1963, the Honorable Hastings Kamuzu Banda, Prime Minister of Nyasaland, arrived at the University of Chicago at 11:50 a.m., in a whirlwind trip, having concluded final plans for complete independence of his nation in London a few days earlier. His 36-hour visit to Chicago had already covered an airport reception which included a welcome by James M. Sheldon, Jr., representing the president of the University of Chicago, Adlai Stevenson III, representing Gov. Otto Kerner of the State of Illinois, Harold R. Harding, executive director of the alumni association, as well as members of the British consulate and a host of friends, including Mrs. Corine Sanders, in whose home the Prime Minister had lived when a student at the university. Behind him also lay a welcome by Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley and a special press conference. Still to come was a luncheon at the university hospitals, a quick tour of the campus, a formal reception and dinner given by President and Mrs. Beadle, a major address in the law school auditorium after presentation to Dr. Banda of the prized Alumni Medal and finally, a late evening private reception with friends. As the day progressed, the Prime Minister seemed to thrive on a schedule which left his hosts and entourage somewhat breathless.

It is not every 13-year-old boy who will set out on a thousand-mile hike, in search of an education. When this hike becomes a trek through African jungle lands, braving searing heat, chilling, lonely nights, privation and the dangers of unfriendly tribes and even less friendly wild animals, one must look with awe upon the youth. "But I was an ambitious boy," he would recount years later, as Prime Minister of the land from which he had set out.

The different languages spoken by tribes along the route from his native Nyasaland would make communication difficult. This, in turn, would invite hostilities. Young Banda thus decided always to stop long enough to become familiar with language and customs of each new tribe ahead, gaining the confidence and help of villagers along the way.

Two years later, arriving near Johannesburg, his skills were quickly discovered by his employers in the mining fields. He was used as an interpreter with the lonely, frustrated, often despairing villagers who had left their homes to work in the mines, laboring under totally strange, often poor conditions, frequently unable to communicate with superiors and even their fellow workers. Their shocking plight made a lasting impression.

Reading and studying whenever he could, he was befriended by an American bishop and in 1925 the young man was able to travel to the United States, first gaining a high school education at Wilberforce Academy in Xenia, Ohio, followed by undergraduate work at Indiana University and the University of Chicago, where he received his Ph. B., in 1931. He received his M.D., at Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn., in 1937, followed by special studies at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh. He qualified as a licentiate of the Royal College of Surgeons in Edinburgh and was also appointed an elder of the Church of Scotland.

Unable to return to his own country because of the war, Dr. Banda began practice of medicine in England. Most of his patients were white. Living at the center of empire politics and intrigue in London, it was not long before he was thoroughly involved in the struggle concerning Africa and his homeland. In protest to the new federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1953 he left Great Britain for the Gold Coast (Ghana as of 1957), maintaining constant political attack against British rule. Called to Nyasaland in 1958 to head the Nyasaland African Congress he was arrested on March 3, 1959, and placed in Gwelo Prison in Southern Rhodesia. The Nyasaland Africa Congress was forced underground, only to emerge, stronger, as the new Malawi Congress Party. Dr. Banda's release a year later heralded final steps toward free elections, dissolution of the federation and self-rule for Nyasaland. Dr. Banda has expressed his intention to keep Malawi (new name for Nyasaland upon independence on July 6, 1964) within the British Commonwealth.

Introduced by President Beadle to an overflow audience in the law school auditorium, Dr. Banda received a standing ovation as Alumni Vice Presidents Mrs. Calvin P. (Fay Horton) Sawyier and Richard J. Smith presented him with the distinguished alumni medal. Said Mrs. Sawyier: "* * * May it be a symbol of the heritage of freedom which we at this university share * * *."

Dr. Banda: "Mr. President, distinguished guests, fellow alumni: At dinner the president said that the university has had many men of distinction in different fields. About 100 presidents of universities in this country at least have either been students of the University of Chicago or faculty. But as far as he knew, I was the first prime minister. It is my turn to say that so far as I know, I have never heard of any president of a university being a Nobel Prize winner, except my own president."

Reviewing his quest for learning from the days when he left his own village, he stressed his interests and studies beyond the field of medicine. "I did not want to be one of those doctors who knows everything about medicine, but the minute they are taken out of that they are absolutely helpless. I wanted to be an educated doctor and not a trained artisan."

Dr. Banda then traced the history of Nyasaland back to 1891, when local chiefs, persuaded by missionaries, placed themselves under the protection of the British Crown as a protectorate, to counteract thrusts toward Nyasaland by German and Portuguese colonizers. Describing the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, imposed by Britain in 1953, he went on: "* * * Instead of being governed by Britain direct from London through the colonial office we were being governed by the federalists of Southern Rhodesia from Salisbury, whose ideas about the Africans were in no way different from those of the white settlers of the Union of South Africa."

He termed this a reversal of all previous understanding which had always stressed eventual self-government for Nyasaland. "I left London bitter, angry."

Detailing his continued struggle from the Gold Coast (Ghana as of 1957) and his return to Nyasaland in 1957: "Within 4 months I had the whole country on fire, politically."

Arrested by British authorities, upheavals in Nyasaland intensified. Becoming convinced that he was the key to peaceful negotiation, the British Government finally decided on his release. "And here is where I admire the British. Many people think the British have no logic, but, believe me, they know how to muddle through. And so I came home. That was on April Fool's Day, yes, April 1 (1960)."

"* * * What is the future of the white man in Nyasaland? I am here to tell you that my quarrel was not with the white man or the British people but with a system of government which to me was unjust. There is a future for the white man in my country, but on the understanding that they accept the fact that the Africans are in the majority, and that being the case, we must rule. Any white man who abides by it is welcome in Nyasaland whether he is a businessman, a missionary, a trader, or any other occupation. But the other kind of white man, the South African kind of white man, apartheid white supremacy, that kind of white man, I say to them: Pack up and go home now. We mean to be our own lords and our own masters in our own home, in our own country, in our own continent of Africa.

"Now that we have won our political battle, the real battle, even harder, begins. The battle against poverty, ignorance, and disease. And to fight that battle, Mr. President, I need your help. Nyasaland is essentially an agricultural country. No mines, no industry. But it is not poor. It is only neglected. We have excellent soil there. We can grow tobacco, corn, peanuts, sugarcane, coffee, tea, cotton. We need development loans. We need technical know-how. To me a nation without a university is a body without a soul. We can't afford not to afford a university. Mr. President, I depend on you, I depend on fellow alumni, to help me to find teachers for my university, the University of Malawi. Secondly, my country is essentially agricultural, but our farmers use primitive methods. I want to teach them modern methods. To do that, I have organized them into cooperative societies. But I need loans for my cooperative societies so that they can buy tractors and other implements of agriculture. I want you to invest in Nyasaland processing industries. We grow cotton, and yet we don't produce a single shirt. Cornflakes we buy from here. Not that I have any objection to buying cornflakes from Mr. Kellogg (but) why can't Mr. Kellogg produce cornflakes in Nyasaland? I want him to do that. And so all along the line.

"Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, fellow alumni, this is my story. I feel greatly honored that I, a boy from nowhere in Central Africa, no rich parents, no rich friends, to be honored by being given this medal given to only few. You do not know how I feel. Thank you very much."

Salute to the Careerists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, November 3, 1963, edition of the Washington Post carried an excellent editorial entitled "Salute to the Careerists." This editorial comment gives just and well-deserved praise and public recognition to those unsung heroes whose constant but unpublicized efforts constitute the cornerstone of success for the organizations for which they work. All too often the dedicated chief of staff or the tireless deputy director gives of himself unstintingly, making a major contribution for which his chief must necessarily receive the public recognition.

As chairman of the Subcomimttee on Rivers and Harbors, it has been my pleasure to have worked with one of the recipients of this year's Public Service Awards, Eugene W. Weber of the Corps of Engineers. I have personally witnessed Gene's contribution to the Na-

tion's water resources program over the years and am delighted that this honor has been conferred upon him as he typifies the dedicated public servant which the award is intended to honor.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD, the Washington Post editorial entitled, "Salute to the Careerists":

SALUTE TO THE CAREERISTS

Bliss Carman's line that "Success is in the silences," might well be applied to the five winners of the 1963 Rockefeller Public Service Awards. The names of these men are seldom in the headlines. Although well known to their associates and in the expert circles in which they move, they carry the burdens of government without fanfare or histrionics. Yet they are the real professionals who spell the difference between bureaucratic routine and dedicated public service.

Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, has given 31 well-rounded years to the development of science and technology and to the wise guidance of hundreds of colleagues working in the same fields. Carl M. Marcy, chief of staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has won recognition as an able adviser and an expert in international affairs. Henry Loomis, Director of the Voice of America, brought a broad experience in government to one of its most difficult tasks. Eugene W. Weber, Deputy Director of Civil Works Policy for the Corps of Engineers, has rendered eminent service in the water resources program. Gabriel O. Wessenauer has worked his way up through numerous difficult assignments to the position of Manager of Power for the TVA.

In addition to the Rockefeller award, these men have earned the thanks of their country. They are representative of a large body of talented and faithful officials who keep the wheels of government turning smoothly. Their achievements are certain to inspire many other careerists who have decided to make government their life's work.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part two of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963 issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book, "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth."

KENNEDY'S FIRST FALTERING STEPS IN POLITICS GUIDED BY FATHER JOE

President John F. Kennedy launched his political career on the basis of a misrepresentation. The episode occurred in 1946 when Kennedy, then 29 years old, decided to run for the congressional seat vacated by James Michael Curely, the grand old man of Massachusetts politics.

To enter a Massachusetts primary, a candidate is required to submit the names of 250 party supporters. On April 2, 1946, John F. Kennedy presented such a list to the office of the registrars of voters and election commissioners of the Commonwealth.

There was one thing wrong, however. John Kennedy himself was not an enrolled Democrat. The law clearly provided that while a serviceman could register to vote by mail, he must appear in person to enroll as a member of a political party. Jack Kennedy had not done so.

The last filing day was April 30. To be eligible to file, a candidate would have to be a certified party member for not less than 30 days before that date.

Kennedy's oversight was discovered on April 2. The following day—27 days before the filing day—he quitely slipped into city hall where he registered as a Democrat. He did this despite the fact that the law permitted no exceptions.

A small, inconsequential technicality? Perhaps. Yet, as Ralph G. Martin and Ed Plaut put it so delicately in their friendly book, "Front Runner, Dark Horse." It was "an embarrassing moment that would have been fatal to anyone whose name wasn't Kennedy."

TAKES OVER FROM BROTHER

Joseph Kennedy had originally envisioned his oldest son, Joe Jr., as the politician in the family. Tall, handsome, outgoing and robust, young Joe—the photographs show—was his father to the life. They were also alike ideologically. At Harvard Law School he helped organize a keep-America-out-of-war group and made speeches decrying U.S. intervention in "foreign wars." In one speech he declared the United States would be better off dealing with a Nazi-occupied Europe on a barter system than engaging in total war on the side of Great Britain.

Young Joe launched his political career in 1940 as an anti-Roosevelt delegate at the Democratic National Convention, pledged to support James A. Farley for president. The episode provided another chip of ice in the cool expanse that eventually divided the Kennedy and Roosevelt families. Four years later, Joseph Kennedy, Jr., died a hero's death in the European war. And it was foreordained that, as the next in line, John F. Kennedy would take his place and carry on for the family.

"I thought everybody knew about that," Father Joe once said to author Joe McCarthy." Jack went into politics because young Joe died, young Joe was going to be the politician in the family. When he died, Jack took his place."

WHO'S JACK KENNEDY?

At the outset of the 1946 campaign the voters wondered who this handsome, seemingly shy outsider was. He didn't live in Boston and was a newcomer to politics. True, his parents were born in the district and his grandfather had controlled its votes. But he had grown up elsewhere, and he knew little about the area he wanted to represent in Congress. Later he observed that the only person whom he really knew there at the time was his grandfather Honey Fitz, the former Boston mayor and veteran of many political wars. He was then 83 and living in retirement at the Hotel Bellevue, a political hangout adjacent to the State House on Beacon Hill.

But in politics, money atones for many deficiencies.

The problem of a legal residence was quickly solved. A suite was rented for Jack at the Bellevue Hotel, and in filing his papers as a candidate for office he used it as his official address. Actually, until then, his legal residence was Palm Beach, the home of his father. Later he acquired as his official residence a three-room apartment at 123 Bowdoin St., across from the State House on top of Beacon Hill.

(Bobby and TEDDY, along with their wives, have also used the Bowdoin Street apartment as their legal address. The truth is none of them ever used the apartment for any length of time. The apartment serves one purpose only: to give the Kennedy brothers a political residence. In March 1960 some Massachusetts Democrats moved to bar Bobby from going to Los Angeles as a convention delegate on the grounds he was not a Bay State resident. Bobby, it was then pointed out, lived on a palatial Virginia estate, and at one time considered making the Old Dominion his political base. The only time in recent years Jack used the Boston flat was for an Ed Murrow "Person to Person" TV appearance with his wife.)

CHUMS—AND PROS

It was in the 1946 campaign that Jack Kennedy first employed the techniques that were to bring him electoral success after success. First, he had gotten off to an early start. Long before his rivals bestirred themselves, he was campaigning. Then he began building his own personal organization composed of college chums, wartime shipmates and Ivy Leaguers. Some were Republicans, and most were uncommitted ideologically. But all pitched in to help out Good Old Jack. There were, for example, Lem Billings, Jack's roommate from Choate, in from Baltimore, and "Red" Fay who, having served with Jack in the PT squadron, flew in from San Francisco. Then there was Timothy (Ted) Reardon, one of Joe Jr.'s buddies, who was to be part of the Kennedy entourage all the way to the White House.

But Joseph P. Kennedy was taking no chances with the likes of these. He brought in a phalanx of seasoned ward heelers. The Ambassador had the final word on who was to be put on the payroll.

The Ambassador brought in Francis X. Morrissey, once secretary to Gov. Maurice Tobin, as campaign manager. (By 1961, Morrissey—a municipal court judge, thanks to Jack Kennedy—was shepherding TED KENNEDY around the State, getting him to meet the right folks, just as he had done with Jack in 1946.)

To teach Jack politics, the Ambassador brought in his first cousin, Joe Kane, a 40-year veteran of the Bay State's political wars. Kane provided young Jack with an insight into the mechanics of political infighting. "In politics," he drummed into his protege's head, "you have no friends, only co-conspirators." It was Kane who suggested that Kennedy avoid announcing for office until almost the last minute. The idea was to keep political opportunitists from jumping into the primary—an old Boston custom—hoping for payoffs to remove themselves as candidates.

Finally, on April 22, 1946, 8 days before the filing deadline, Jack Kennedy formally announced his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Representative from the 11th Massachusetts District. "The temper of the times imposes an obligation upon every thinking citizen to work diligently in peace, as we served tirelessly in war," he declared.

RAN ON HIS WAR RECORD

Kennedy ran on his heroic war record. According to the private polls financed by his father, this is what the people were interested in—the story of how he won the Navy and Marine Corps Medal in the South Pacific. And Kennedy, with appropriate modesty, would tell and retell the story before campaign audiences, usually referring to himself in the third person ("The commanding officer of the PT 109, believing it to be a Japanese destroyer, turned the bow of his PT to make a torpedo attack. * * *")

Then he would describe the death struggle that lay ahead between collectivism and capitalism, winding up with this stock exhortation: "We in this country must be willing to battle for the old ideas which have proved their value, with the same enthusiasm that people do for new ideas and creeds."

One critic noted it sounded more like Joseph Patrick Kennedy than like Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As the campaign progressed, Kennedy's Ivy League advisers proposed changing the tenor of the speech. While there was nothing wrong with patriotism as a gimmick, they pointed out that the 11th district had some serious bread and butter problems. A new speech was evolved by a sort of brain-storming, one that discussed such issues as price and rent control, more and better housing, higher minimum wages, jobs, etc.

At first the rest of the candidates laughed Kennedy off. Then, as the campaigning progressed, the taunts changed to outraged indignation. Charges were voiced that Old Joe Kennedy was trying to buy the election for his "carpetbagger son"—charges that were to ring in Jack's ears throughout his political career.

Once Mike Neville, Kennedy's rival in the primary, walked into the statehouse pressroom with a $10 bill hanging out of his breast pocket.

"That's a Kennedy campaign button," he said.

COMES THE CLAN

Meanwhile, flying in from everywhere were other Kennedys—thus setting a pattern that was to be repeated in future elections. (In later elections, however, they were to be supplemented by wives and husbands and were to be regarded by many Bostonians as foreigners. "As soon as the last vote is counted," one newsman said, "the Kennedys and their wives and husbands are hurrying to the airport to catch the next plane out of town. They don't even wait until the tents are taken down.")

Kennedys swarmed into the wards, going from house to house, ringing doorbells, cradling babies, and telling thousands of voters what a wonderful brother Jack was. His sisters helped organize neighborhood house parties. Kennedy sometimes went to half a dozen of them in a single evening. The Kennedy organization supplied everything—coffee, cookies, china, silverware, flowers. At campaign headquarters a careful record was kept of everyone who attended the parties. Later, they were asked to talk to their neighbors about Jack.

How much was spent? Only Joe Kennedy could possibly have known. His first cousin, Joe Kane, said later it was "a staggering sum." But Kane contended most of it was unnecessary: "Jack could have gone to Congress like everyone else for 10 cents."

Then why did his father spend so much?

"Because," said Kane, "he was taking no chances on any possible slip-up. Everything his father got, he bought and paid for," he added. "And politics is like water. It takes three things to win. The first is money and the second is money and the third is money."

Primary day—June 18, 1946—finally rolled around. This was the day that counted. The victor in the primary would be the next Congressman.

And to no one's great surprise, when the votes were counted, Jack Kennedy's name led all the rest. He received 22,183 votes, almost double that obtained by the closest rival Mike Neville.

It was for the clan Kennedy a sweet victory, indeed. For "Old Honey Fitz," it was proof positive of the political virility of Grandson Jack. So stirred was Grandfather Fitzgerald that he climbed onto a table at campaign headquarters that night and danced a stiff-legged Irish jig and sang in a cracked voice "Sweet Adeline." It was the swan song of the old colorful and rascally breed of Boston Irish politics. A new breed of politician was about to take over.

Files "Lost" in Ohio State Employment Service Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the next installment in the Plain Dealer exposé of mismanagement in the Cleveland, Ohio, employment service office, including a story on Mr. Willard P. Dudley, Ohio service State director, whose diligence uncovered the facts:

FILES "LOST" IN OHIO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE INVESTIGATION

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Public records began disappearing in Cleveland after State agents moved in to investigate falsifying of job placement reports.

The documents vanished in the Gilman Building offices of the clerical and professional division, Ohio State Employment Service (OSES).

A. E. McCully, of Youngstown, the chief investigator, reported on June 25:

"During the first week of our assignment in Cleveland, most of the ES-511's (job application cards) were located, and personnel were willing to discuss the problem and sign affidavits.

"During the second week, more and more ES-511's could not be found. Personnel began to use the excuse of not knowing the proper procedure and denying, outright, any knowledge of improper reporting."

McCully's intention was to take a sampling of 85 job placement reports from the miscellaneous clerks unit and to check them for veracity. But he had to settle for a sampling of 59.

"Twenty-six of these cards could not be found," he related. "This is much higher than missing ES-511's in other units. The 14 instances where we found improper reporting, 11 (applicants) did not go to work at all; three were working but not referred by OSES."

Despite snags such as this, McCully was able to substantiate that job interviewers were taking more credit for their efforts than they deserved. Affidavits quoted previously referred to a quota system of placements to assure OSES employees of their own jobs.

McCully's sampling of 427 cases in the clerical and professional division showed 141 instances (roughly, one out of three) where placements were reported even though the elements of what officially constitute a placement were lacking.

This was explained in some cases by ignorance on the part of the interviewer, carelessness or deliberate attempts to deceive. McCully obtained affidavits from several interviewers who admitted participating in falsifications.

The elements of a legitimate job placement are (1) receipt of an order from an employer, (2) selection of an applicant to fill the order, (3) referring the applicant and (4) verifying that he has been hired.

Here is McCully's breakdown of the performance of the clerical and professional division last May:

Unit	Cases checked	Placements improperly reported
Professional	56	10
Managerial	8	2
Secretarial	64	10
Typists	80	30
Miscellaneous clerks	59	14
Outside salesmen	74	38
Inside salesmen	86	37

Two other major bureaus of the Cleveland area OSES office are the industrial and service divisions. McCully looked for falsification here but was unable to establish it to his satisfaction.

However, he and his men did find what they termed "improper reporting" in 49 of 178 cases in the industrial division and in 25 of 120 cases in the service division.

Prentice S. Woodhouse was manager of the clerical and professional division. Lewis M. Page was Woodhouse's job-placement supervisor. McCully wrote about them:

"We found no evidence to indicate they were participants in falsification or were aware of the practice. Due to the extensive falsification, however, it is hard to understand how such practice could be conducted if management and supervision were on their toes.

"For instance, the log of orders for unit 36 (outside salesmen) for May showed a relatively uniform number being entered daily until the 23d and 24th of the month.

"For the first 3 week about four orders per day. On the 23d there were 16 orders entered, and on the 24th there were 27 in the logbook. Such a decided increase should have alerted someone to do a little checking.

"The unit reported 10 placements the first week, 7 the second week, 6 the third week, and 51 the last week. In unit 37 (inside salesmen) 30 placements were reported the first week, 31 the second week, 21 the third week, and in the last week it kicked up to 68.

"We are aware that at the end of the month a big effort is made to have as many placements as possible, and that effort would have increased the placements referred to.

"However, each supervisor and manager, in making fullest utilization of management tools, should have done a little checking in a situation such as this."

OSES PROBER TELLS WORK HERE

COLUMBUS.—"I am positive we did not find every case of fraud or irregularity that existed. But we did find enough to know that it was going on and to institute corrective measures."

This is the way A. E. McCully sizes up his work in Cleveland as chief State investigator of false job reporting in Ohio State Employment Services (OSES).

McCully, a Democrat, was given the assignment by his Republican boss, Willard P. Dudley, State administrator of the bureau of unemployment compensation (BUC), which includes OSES.

The prober is an OSES veteran. He joined the agency as a job interviewer in 1939 and worked his way up to district manager in the Youngstown area.

Dudley abolished the position of district manager but kept McCully in the organization. Ward A. Riley, McCully's counterpart in Cleveland, was not retained.

McCully took temporary charge of the Cleveland office after he wound up his investigation. He will remain there until a reorganization is completed.

"We couldn't possible have looked into every case in every division of the Cleveland office," McCully told the Plain Dealer. "That would have taken months and months and

would have involved a much larger force than I had. From the standpoint of feasibility, we restricted our spot checking to the month of May.

"That does mean, of course, that all the statistics reported by Cleveland for a long time before remain suspect. I don't know how this can ever be cleared up."

McCully added: "I can't help wondering how such a large staff could have been hired for Cleveland with so little training. We're trying to make up for that now.

"In September we invested 1,500 man-hours of training in the staff, giving instructions on what constitutes a proper job placement and how to record it.

"Complaints from the public have caused us to institute other changes. There was a lot of tardiness and a lot of goofing off on coffee breaks. We've put a stop to that.

"Also, we've had to ask a few employees to stop having beer or whisky at lunchtime. They'd come back in the afternoon, and you could smell it on their breath. Then they would get loud with job applicants.

"I think we have a darned good staff here now. I don't think you can blame the lower echelons for what happened."

EXCERPTS PRINTED: OSES CHIEF PROBED REPORT FIXING HERE

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Willard P. Dudley made several personal trips to Cleveland to ask his staff pointblank about manipulation of records in job placements by the Ohio State Employment Service.

Minutes were taken at these meetings and subsequently they were made available to this reporter. Excerpts appear here.

Dudley is administrator of the bureau of unemployment compensation (BUC). The Ohio State Employment Service (OSES) is an arm of this agency.

Dudley opened a meeting on July 17 with these words:

"This is not a pleasant task. There is a little bit of a mess here. I do not think I made it. It is up to me to clear it up. Going down the line, I would like each of you to make a statement."

Leo J. Moss was the first to reply. He is in charge of OSES in the Cleveland area. His immediate superior used to be Ward A. Riley, who headed both the BUC and OSES operations in Cleveland.

Moss asserted: "I can say that honestly I was surprised to hear that anything like this was going on. We ran an evaluation in November and another in March. That seemed to give us a clean bill."

Prentice E. Woodhouse, manager of the clerical and professional division, said: "I want to state also that I had absolutely no knowledge of any falsification or dishonesty.

"We had a team from the Federal men and men from Columbus in March, and they found only minor discrepancies.

"I feel also the cause of all this goes back to the time when these offices were given quotas to meet. Federal and regional representatives set the quotas that must be met to justify staffing."

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Federal and State officials deny that any quotas existed for finding jobs for the unemployed.)

Lewis M. Page, Woodhouse's placement supervisor, put in: "I had no knowledge or way of even thinking that anyone was reporting anything that was dishonest."

Mrs. Arline M. Wolf, supervisor of the sales section, asserted: "I think everyone in the organization is basically honest, but frankly, we have been brain-washed with quotas and pressure for placements. Enough placements to justify staff.

"The sales division happened to be one that Mr. Riley operated some years ago. He felt we should reach tremendous placements. He would use old figures and throw them in our teeth."

Dudley: "You say this pressure for quotas, and you have implicated Mr. Riley, was from the central office? Would you care to comment as to whether you passed that pressure on to those under you?"

Mrs. Wolf: "We had meetings and told them what we were expected to do. Mr. Riley was greatly disturbed about the placements in our unit."

Dudley: "Do you have knowledge of your own that there perhaps was definite falsification of records in your division?"

Mrs. Wolf: "I cannot name any names."

Dudley: "You disclaim knowledge of discrepancies?"

Mrs. Wolf: "I have had suspicions. I have no confirmation."

One week later Dudley said at another meeting: "Up to now the information volunteered has not been very helpful. If you folks haven't told all your story, then tell it now."

Miss Elsie M. Shomer, supervisor of the inside salesmen unit, said: "We were told that we had to get placements to meet our quota."

Dudley: "Mr. Woodhouse, would you concur? Was pressure brought to you that you had to meet a quota?"

Woodhouse: "As of February or March we were going to be held accountable. Up to this time the staff wasn't based on this, but from now on it was. Further, in May, when we laid off six people, it was based on accomplishments of the preceding month."

Miss Mildred R. Kleinsmith, a job interviewer, said: "We were all under the impression that every unit was taking false hires during May, not just our unit."

Another interviewer, Mrs. Gwendolyn R. Moore, was asked at one point: "How did you know there was pressure on your supervisor?"

She replied: "After a meeting they would immediately come back and put pressure on us."

Mrs. Eleanor Linneberger, another interviewer, said: "Miss Shomer came to my desk and asked me to pick up some hires in the active file. She changed three to hires."

Miss Shomer: "I didn't."

Mrs. Linneberger: "Well, someone did."

Edward S. Faith, supervisor of the outside salesmen unit, asserted: "Mrs. Wolf once stated we have to get more hires or they will abolish the department. In November of last year I felt there were things going on which I couldn't prove.

"I asked for a transfer because, if I didn't, someday I might be blamed for this. Finally, I said I would be willing to take a demotion to take this transfer.

"I never had any type of pressure in the West office under Mr. Moss or Mr. Woodhouse. At one time you took a hire whether you know he reported on the job or not. I tried to avoid this very type of thing in which I am involved now."

Dudley: "Do you think a supervisor has the right to ask you to do something morally wrong?"

Faith: "In civil service you do things against your grain and schooling. I know this does not excuse you because you are responsible for your action. If we were in private industry we would not have done it."

George W. Winningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine, Mr. George Winingham, of Mexia, Tex., a former member of the Texas Legislature, who will be 74 years of age on November 6, has set to print several verses of his. I would like to share this work with my colleagues, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include three of such verses:

THE FOOL

The fool has said in his heart there is no God.
He sees the handiwork of God,
The trees, the plants, the climbing vines,
The soil in which they have abode,
The fruits they bring
Each fleeting spring,
Yet doubts assail and fears incline
His troubled mind
His soul to blind.

He looks upon majestic hills
Whose topmost peaks are crowned with snow,
Geart rivers fed by tiny rills,
The surging sea
So wild and free
And still he says he does not know
God sits His throne
In worlds unknown.

He sees the rainbow span the skies,
The sun, the moon, the stars above,
Each in its place the truth supplies,
The paths they trace
Through endless space,
And still his soul, though touched by love,
Yields no abode
To truths of God.

GOD IS NOT FAR AWAY

Upon the barren mountain peaks,
In the valleys far below,
Across the sun-scorched desert sands,
'Mid fields of frozen snow,
Through simple faith by love sustained,
I know, I know, O soul of mine
God is not far away.

When wild winds pound and madly beat
Against my cottage door
And cups containing grief are passed
For me to sup once more,
If Hope through heavy hanging clouds
Cast not a single ray,
I cannot doubt, I will believe
God is not far away.

If friends forsake me and abuse
And kindred on me frown,
E'en though I wear upon my brow
A cruel thorny crown,
From deepest depths of shame and woe
My soul with joy will say:
I know, I know in spite of all
God is not far away.

When I embark for ports unknown
Across death's turbid sea
The unfamiliar scenes that pass
Will hold no fear for me,
O soul of mine, the rugged cross
Has blazed and paved my way—
In life, in death, I know, I know
God is not far away.

I KNOW GOD UNDERSTANDS

He holds the world and restless seas
Safe in the hollow of His hand;
He guides the stars through empty space,
And knows each grain of desert sand,
Each pebble and each blade of grass,
The birds that fly and those that fall,
The life, the soul He's given me,
I know God understands it all.

He rides the ceaseless surging waves
Which beat against the shore;
He's present in the swirling storms
Whose wrath upon the earth outpour.
He lives in ev'ry breath we breathe,
No other pow'r His pow'r exceeds,
He gives and takes, destroys and molds—
I know God understands my needs.

He sends the seasons in their turn,
The winter snow and bitter cold,
Spring sunshine and the leafy trees
And autumn with a wealth of gold.
Each dewdrop knows His loving touch,
Each pair of cooing turtle doves—
O soul of mine, fear not the storms,
I know God understands and loves.

He leads through unknown paths of death
As surely as He marked life's way;
He beckons me to follow Him
As gloom enshrouds the waning day,
Lead where He will, I'll follow on
And storms of death will not appall,
Gladly I'll go to walk with Him,
I know God understands it all.

Democrats and Republicans Oppose Suggestion Advanced by Politician To Sell TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently pointed out that a certain presidential aspirant believes strongly that the Tennessee Valley Authority should be sold to private enterprise. The proposal to sell TVA has met with strong and united opposition not only from the Democrats of the Tennessee Valley area, but also from members of the Republican Party.

The Nashville Banner, in a recent story, has pointed out that Tennessee's three Republican Congressmen have come out in direct opposition to this proposal by a member of their party to sell TVA, thus placing every Member of the Tennessee congressional delegation, along with many others, against a sellout of TVA.

Mr. Speaker, I submit press reports containing statements opposing any sale of TVA for the RECORD. These statements follow:

STATE GOP CONGRESSMEN OPPOSED TO SALE OF TVA

Tennessee's three Republican Congressmen, Representative HOWARD BAKER, Knoxville; Representative WILLIAM BROCK III, Chattanooga, and Representative JAMES QUILLEN, Kingsport, have declared they would be against any consideration of the sale of the TVA as discussed by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER earlier this week.

BROCK, a conservative and an ally of GOLDWATER, said that although he endorsed without qualification the principle of maximizing free enterprise, he did not think it would be feasible to turn TVA power operations over to private industry. The freshman Congressman said he would actively oppose any such move.

QUILLEN said "TVA has been with us for many years, and in my judgment, it is not feasible or workable to sell it—as much as I believe in the free enterprise system.

"The functions which TVA exercise in respect to flood control, conservation, navigation and electric power production are so interrelated that, in my opinion, they could not economically be divided and operated separately," QUILLEN stated.

"Flood control and navigation are the functions of the Government, and TVA, in the area which it serves, is assuming the leadership in these fields, particularly flood control. TVA must accelerate its leadership in this field, and I am assured that this is their plan," he added.

BAKER said he is unequivocally opposed to the suggestion that TVA be sold to private industry.

He stated TVA was created by Congress to comprehensively develop the Tennessee River and "is a model for watershed developments throughout the world."

Tennessee's two Senators have strongly opposed this sale. Senator ALBERT GORE stated:

I am completely opposed to any proposal to sell the TVA. The idea is wholly impractical and contrary to the public interest.

Senator H. S. WALTERS stated:

Recent suggestions that the sale of TVA to private industry would be to the benefit of Tennessee and the Nation is certainly without any basis of fact.

We in the Tennessee Valley are proud of the fine work of TVA and it would be folly to seriously consider the disruptive suggestion put forth by someone unfamiliar with the people and the economy of the seven-State area served by TVA.

From press reports others comment:

Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Memphis, said the proposal to sell TVA "is absolutely ill-founded, unwise, and will never happen in this country."

DAVIS said that even the private power people in this country admit it [TVA] is efficient and well managed."

"I wholeheartedly disagree," said Representative JOE L. EVINS, Smithville. "He [GOLDWATER] doesn't even have the facts on what TVA means to the Nation."

EVINS, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, called GOLDWATER "very shortsighted and provincial in opposing TVA."

While the Arizona Senator is doing this, EVINS said, he often comes to the committee with requests for reclamation projects for his arid West.

Representative TOM MURRAY, Democrat, of Jackson, said of the proposal to sell TVA: "Certainly not—not at all.

"It's operating fine now. We should continue it."

Asked in what areas it is operating fine, MURRAY answered:

"All over."

He called it perfect.

Representative ROBERT A. (FATS) EVERETT, Democrat, of Union City, said, "It seems that Senator GOLDWATER should see the benefits that TVA has rendered to the valley before he capitulates to the private power lobby.

"I certainly think the people of the valley appreciate the benefits that have been afforded them from an agency that is paying its own way."

EVERETT said that had it not been for TVA and the Rural Electrification Administration, young men and young women would never have remained in the farm areas to make the contributions they are now making.

"Either Senator GOLDWATER is misinformed," EVERETT said, "or he cares not for the people of the valley."

Tennessee's other Congressmen agreed Saturday that TVA should not be sold, most of them vigorously defending the agency.

GOLDWATER made his statement to FULTON after the fifth district Representative had inquired of the Senator if he was correctly quoted in a magazine article about selling the valley agency.

Representative RICHARD FULTON, Democrat, of Tennessee, said:

During the previous administration TVA was referred to as a form of creeping socialism. It is regrettable that this successful Government service which is of great benefit to a great number of people must come under this attack.

Representative ROSS BASS, Democrat, of Tennessee, said:

I am shocked that a man who is supposed to have the basic concept of Government and the intellect to be President of the United States would make such a proposal, to slash up, divide, and destroy an institution that is so important not only to the seven-State area that it serves as a power producing and distributing agency but to all the Nation. To deny the great service it performs to all the people of the United States as a means of determining the actual cost of producing power; to stop the TVA from providing a yardstick for this purpose for all power-producing agencies in the United States, would be wasteful and foolhardy.

BASS also said:

It is providing a great service to all the Nation in the area of power production, cost analyses, and the yardstick for power cost to all of the citizens of the United States.

Congressman ROBERT E. (BOB) JONES, Democrat, of Alabama, said:

I can think of no more preposterous proposal than to sell TVA to the private power trust.

In view of Mr. GOLDWATER's long anti-TVA record, it is obvious he is really proposing the death of our most successful model of a free people's cooperative effort with the Government.

Mr. GOLDWATER certainly demonstrates clearly that he is no friend of the South. What he is advocating is that the average TVA power user, who pays slightly less than 1 cent a kilowatt-hour as compared with the national average of 2.4 cents, have his power rates increased.

In other words, he offers more of the same old discrimination against the South which has been so true of his party over the years. This is what he means by conservatism.

JONES, who has been a chief sponsor of TVA legislation during his 17 years in Congress, also said:

Before TVA, the Tennessee Valley was called the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. It has been TVA which not only harnessed the Tennessee River and provided flood control, navigation and power, but promoted the well-being of those in this region as well.

Should TVA be sold to private interests, its numerous services—such as navigation and flood control—would be left high and dry.

He explained that TVA's payments in lieu of taxes to State and local governments are about the same as the taxes paid by other utility systems and that TVA pays no Federal income tax because it makes no profits, just as private industry pays no Federal taxes when it makes no profits.

TVA and its contract distributors have paid more than $210.7 million to State and local governments in lieu of taxes. The agency is required by law to repay to the Treasury in the next 50 years all of the funds appropriated to it for power purposes.

Alabama Congressman CARL ELLIOTT said GOLDWATER's opposition to TVA is hard to understand when it is remembered that he is now sponsoring legislation (S. 1658) for a $1.1 billion public water and power project—a sort

of western TVA—for his own State of Arizona. He said:

Apparently the junior Senator's position is that if you spend $1.7 billion for a public power project to serve seven Southern States, that is socialism. But, the spending of $1.1 billion for the same purpose in one State is enlightened conservatism—if that State just happens to be Senator GOLDWATER'S.

In a personal letter to GOLDWATER, the Alabama Congressman said:

Since you come from a section of the country 2,000 miles removed from the region served by TVA, it is possible that you are not aware of the extraordinary progress and growth that has been engendered by the great Tennessee Valley Authority.

For your information, Senator, the Tennessee Valley Authority in just 30 years has transformed what was a depressed and eroded valley—the Nation's most urgent economic problem—into what is now one of the most productive and progressive sections of our common country.

The TVA has stimulated the private investment of almost $1 billion on the Tennessee River shoreline, and is providing job opportunities, directly and indirectly, for tens of thousands of Alabamians and other southerners. The great network of 31 dams which make up the Tennessee Valley Authority has tamed and harnessed rivers which once flooded their banks and ran berserk through our region, leaving behind devastation, despair and incalculable human misery and suffering.

I am sure, Senator GOLDWATER, that upon reflection, you would not consider these accomplishments as socialistic, or as a hoax.

From a news clipping we read:

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, said the Arizona Republican's idea came as a surprise, "because he hasn't offered anything like that in Congress."

"I don't think," COOPER said, "it [sale of TVA] is going to happen whoever is elected President. There are a number of Senators who have opposed the TVA, but I've never heard of anyone—including GOLDWATER—offering a bill to sell the TVA."

COOPER said he had made the first proposition to require TVA to finance its facilities, and he added, "It is now financing them and is repaying its advances from the Government."

"Utterly ridiculous," said Representative PAT JENNINGS, Democrat, of Virginia, of the Goldwater suggestion.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, called it entirely impractical and said it would do a great disservice to the taxpayers of the United States. He added he doubted GOLDWATER would gain any supporters for his proposal, especially in the TVA area.

Representative FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Democrat, of Kentucky, called the idea "the most asinine, stupid suggestion I've heard since I've been in Congress."

"The TVA," STUBBLEFIELD said, "is the greatest thing that ever happened to the South. I note that GOLDWATER is promoting the central Arizona project, which will cost $1.1 billion. Let him take care of Arizona; we will take care of the TVA area."

Congressman GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., Democrat, of Alabama, stated:

The proposal to sell TVA is among the most preposterous that has come to my attention in a long time. For the Government to lose this great asset would certainly not be in the best interest of our country. The sooner the thought is dispelled the better.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this unsound and unwise proposal, I suggest, is costing the distinguished presidential aspirant thousands of votes, as thousands are leaving his banner because of this one unwise and erratic suggestion.

President's View on United States-Soviet Relations Challenged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's optimistic view of how the United States is gaining the initiative in the world struggle against the Communist conspiracy is not supported by the facts.

The disturbing fact is that the administration's soft line in dealing with the Soviet Union is being met with renewed arrogance and increased demands by Khrushchev. The victories seen by the President have more often been dismal failures of Kennedy policy. These can be counted off and are well known to all Americans and the whole world—Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, the Berlin wall, normal trade with the Communists, aid to Tito, the bewildering policies followed by the CIA, and on and on.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the text of the President's speech at the University of Maine on October 19 as it was reported in the U.S. News & World Report of November 11. Also included is editorial comment on the President's view by David Lawrence. I hope these insertions may give many Americans cause for concern as to just what purpose the President has in mind in constantly ignoring history in explaining the cold war. If it is because he does not understand communism and the Communist conspiracy then in this ignorance there is even a greater threat to the security of the United States:

WHERE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA STAND NOW—THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

(Text of the section on foreign policy contained in a speech by President Kennedy at the University of Maine, October 19, 1963.)

One year ago this coming week, the United States and the world were gripped with a somber prospect of a military confrontation between the two great nuclear powers. The American people have good reason to recall with pride their conduct throughout that harrowing week. For they neither dissolved in panic nor rushed headlong into reckless belligerence. Well aware of the risks of resistance, they nevertheless refused to tolerate the Soviets' attempt to place nuclear weapons in this hemisphere, but recognized at the same time that our preparations for the use of force necessarily require a simultaneous search for fair and peaceful solutions.

The extraordinary events of that week and the weeks that followed are now history—a history which is differently interpreted, differently recounted and differently labeled among various observers and nations. Some hail it as the West's greatest victory, others as a bitter defeat. Some mark it as a turning point in the cold war, others as proof of its permanence. Some attribute the Soviet withdrawal of missiles to our missiles, to our military actions alone, while some credit solely our use of negotiations. Some view the entire episode as an example of Communist duplicity, while some others abroad have accepted the assertion that it indicated the Soviets' peaceful intentions.

While only the passage of time and events can reveal in full the true perspective of last October's drama, it is already clear that no single, simply view of this kind can be wholly accurate in this case.

While both caution and commonsense proscribe our boasting of it in the traditional terms of unconditional military victory, only the most zealous partisan can attempt to call it a defeat. While it is too late to say that nothing is changed in Soviet-American relations, it is too early to assume that the change is permanent. There are new rays of hope on the horizon, but we still live in the shadows of war.

Let us examine the events of 12 months ago, therefore and the events of the past 12 months and the events of the next 12 months in the context of calm and caution. It is clear there will be further disagreement between ourselves and the Soviets as well as further agreements. There will be setbacks in our Nation's endeavors on behalf of freedom as well as successes. For a pause in the cold war is not a lasting peace—and a détente does noe equal disarmament. The United States must continue to seek a relaxation of tensions, but we have no cause to relax our vigilance.

A year ago it would have been easy to assume that all-out war was inevitable—that any agreement with the Soviets was impossible—and that an unlimited arms race was unavoidable. Today it is equally easy for some to assume that the cold war is over—that all outstanding issues between the Soviets and ours can be quickly and satisfactorily settled—and that we shall now have, in the words of the Psalmist, an "abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth."

The fact of the matter is, of course, that neither view is correct. We have, it is true, made some progress on a long journey. We have achieved new opportunities which we cannot afford to waste. We have concluded with the Soviets a few limited, enforceable agreements or arrangements of mutual benefit to both sides and to the world.

But a change in the atmosphere and in emphasis—not a reversal of purpose. Mr. Khrushchev himself has said that there can be no coexistence in the field of ideology. In addition, there are still major areas of tension and conflict, from Berlin to Cuba to southeast Asia. The United States and the Soviet Union still have wholly different concepts of the world, its freedom, its future. We still have wholly different views on the so-called wars of liberation and the use of subversion. And so long as these basic differences continue, they cannot and should not be concealed; they set limits to the possibilities of agreements; and they will give rise to further crises, large and small, in the months and years ahead, both in the areas of direct confrontation—Germany and the Caribbean—and in areas where events beyond our control could involve us both—areas such as Africa and Asia and the Middle East.

In times such as these, therefore, there is nothing inconsistent with signing an atmospheric nuclear test ban, on the one hand, and testing underground on the other; about being willing to sell to the Soviets our surplus wheat while refusing to sell strategic items; about probing their interest in a joint lunar landing while making a major effort to mas-

ter this new environment; or about exploring the possibilities of disarmament while maintaining our stockpile of arms. For all of these moves, and all of these elements of American policy and Allied policy toward the Soviet Union, are directed at a single, comprehensive goal; namely, convincing the Soviet leaders that it is dangerous for them to engage in direct or indirect aggression, futile for them to attempt to impose their will and their system on other unwilling people, and beneficial to them, as well as to the world, to join in the achievement of a genuine and enforcible peace.

While the road to that peace is long and hard, and full of traps and pitfalls, there is no reason not to take each step that we can safely take. It is in our national self-interest to ban nuclear testing in the atmosphere so that all of our citizens can breathe more easily. It is in our national self-interest to sell surplus wheat in storage to feed Russians and Eastern Europeans who are willing to divert large portions of their limited foreign-exchange reserves away from the implements of war.

It is in our national self-interest to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space, to maintain an emergency communications link with Moscow, and to substitute joint and peaceful exploration in the Antarctic and outer space for cold war exploitation.

No one of these small advances, nor all of them taken together, can be interpreted as meaning that the Soviets are abandoning their basic aims and ambitions. Nor should any future, less friendly Soviet action—whether it is a stoppage on the autobahn, or a veto in the U.N., or a spy in our midst, or new trouble elsewhere—cause us to regret the steps we have taken. Even if those steps themselves should be undone by the violation of renunciation of the test ban treaty, for example, or by a decision to decline American wheat, there would still be no reason to regret the fact that this Nation has made every responsible effort to improve relations.

For without our making such an effort, we could not maintain the leadership and respect of the free world. Without our making such an effort, we could not convince our adversaries that war was not in their interest. And without our making such an effort, we could never, in case of war, satisfy our own hearts and minds that we had done all that could be done to avoid the holocaust of endless death and destruction.

Historians report that in 1914, with most of the world already plunged in war, Prince Bülow, the former German Chancellor, said to the then Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg, "How did it all happen?" And Bethmann-Hollweg replied, "Ah, if only one knew."

My fellow Americans, if this planet is ever ravaged by nuclear war, if 300 million Americans, Russians, and Europeans are wiped out by a 60-minute nuclear exchange, if the pitiable survivors of that devastation can then endure the ensuing fire, poison, chaos, and catastrophe, I do not want one of those survivors to ask another, "How did it all happen?" and to receive the incredible reply, "Ah, if only one knew."

Therefore, while maintaining our readiness for war, let us exhaust every avenue for peace. Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must. Let us resolve to be the masters, not the victims, of our history, controlling our own destiny without giving way to blind suspicion and emotion. Let us distinguish between our hopes and our illusions, always hoping for steady progress toward less critically dangerous relations with the Soviets but never laboring under any illusions about Communist methods or Communist goals.

Let us recognize both the gains we have made down the road to peace and the great distance yet to be covered. Let us not waste the present pause by either a needless renewal of tensions or a needless relaxation of vigilance. And let us recognize that we have made these gains and achieved this pause by the firmness we displayed a year ago as well as our restraint—by our efforts for defense as well as our efforts for peace.

In short, when we think of peace in this country, let us think of both our capacity to deter aggression and our goal of true disarmament. Let us think of both the strength of our Western alliances and the areas of East-West cooperation.

For the American eagle on the presidential seal holds in his talons both the olive branch of peace and the arrows of military might. On the ceiling in the presidential office, constructed many years ago, that eagle is facing the arrows of war on its left. But on the newer carpet on the floor—reflecting a change initiated by President Roosevelt and implemented by President Truman immediately after the war—that eagle is now facing the olive branch of peace.

And it is that spirit, the spirit of both preparedness and peace, that this Nation is stronger than ever before—strengthened by both the increased power of our defenses and our increased efforts for peace—strengthened by both our resolve to resist coercion and our constant search for solutions.

And it is in this spirit that I assure you that the American eagle still faces toward the olive branch of peace.

In the months and years ahead, we intend to build both kinds of strength, during times of détente as well as tension, during periods of conflict as well as cooperation, until the world we pass on to our children is truly safe for diversity and freedom and the rule of law covers all.

WHERE'S THE INITIATIVE?

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy's speech delivered at the University of Maine on October 19 deserves careful reading. Adroit in style and rhetoric, it emphasizes the President's palpable effort to do business with the tyrants in the Kremlin.

Mr. Kennedy says the American people can "recall with pride" their conduct of a year ago when they witnessed the "military confrontation between the two great nuclear powers." He adds that, while "well aware of the risks of resistance," this country "refused to tolerate the Soviets' attempt to place nuclear weapons in this hemisphere," but that it was nevertheless necessary at the same time to search for "fair and peaceful solutions."

The President today seems satisfied with the "solutions." Yet, for the first time in our history, we have allowed a hostile European power to establish and maintain a military foothold in this hemisphere. This is still an ignominous fact. We continue to speculate about the number of Soviet troops and "technicians" who remain in Cuba. And we seemingly acquiesce in the acts of subversion plotted there against our neighbors. The last year has witnessed the overthrow of several governments in Latin America resulting from widespread turbulence inspired by Communist subversives, helped with Communist funds and munitions, and directed in large part from Cuba.

The President asserts that we didn't win a victory a year ago nor suffer a defeat—that, while the Cuban missile episode was to some observers evidence of "Communist duplicity," the outcome has been regarded by others here and abroad as an indication of the "Soviets' peaceful intentions." But why have we glossed over this flagrant act of aggression in our hemisphere? Why has the President overemphasized instead a search for some more or less irrelevant agreements, even as he admits that "we still live in the shadows of war"?

Mr. Kennedy explains that "all of these elements of American policy and Allied policy toward the Soviet Union are directed at a single, comprehensive goal—namely, convincing the Soviet leaders that it is dangerous for them to engage in direct or indirect aggression, futile for them to impose their will and their system on other unwilling people, and beneficial to them, as well as to the world, to join in the achievement of a genuine and enforceable peace."

But why are we dealing solely with the leaders in the Kremlin? What has become of the heroic principles first enunciated by President Wilson in World War I and reiterated in World War II, as American and Allied youth gave their lives to save peoples—not to perpetuate autocratic governments?

The only force which can assure peace in the world is not the Kremlin but the people of the Soviet Union and of the Communist-bloc countries.

The President uses often the phrases of resoluteness, but they are accompanied always by the plea for talk and more talk with the Soviet rulers. He says:

"Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must. Let us resolve to be the masters, not the victims, of our history, controlling our own destiny without giving way to blind suspicion and emotion. Let us distinguish between our hopes and our illusions."

This reflects an indecisiveness and disregard of basic principle that has again and again frustrated Western governments and brought war to Europe. This is not the way to become the "masters" of our history but its victims. For we cannot ignore our main hope—an eventual alliance with the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. This can be initiated by reaching those very people with the story of freedom and the promise that the United States is willing to help in every way to sustain them when they choose the path of freedom.

Have we no voice with which to speak to the Soviet people? Is the Voice of America to be anesthetized by official instruction from the White House and the Department of State not to create tensions or say anything that might possibly offend Khrushchev and his clique? Do we really think that the few agreements we have obtained, or those we may get in the future, will prove to be anything more than a sop to our vanity and pride—a means of lulling us into continuing our "relaxation" while the Soviet Government strengthens its hold on the peoples of Eastern Europe and infiltrates Latin America?

How should America fight the cold war—or any other kind of war? By letting the other fellow pick his own battleground, even as we hold back our real force, the power that is built by the voice of truth? For we must by day and night keep reminding the Soviet people that in the overthrow of their tyrannical leaders lies their only hope and our only hope of world peace. What has happened to our initiative?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter of November 2, 1963:

DALLAS—PROUD, COURAGEOUS—TRULY THE HOME OF THE FREE AND THE BRAVE

Dallas is second to none as an American community standing for all the highest ideals of Americanism. Its people are the finest type of citizens—courageous, courteous, determined, daring, industrious, kind, patriotic—possessing all the qualities which set apart those who founded this Nation and the pioneers who began its development. Through the years Dallas leaders have been unselfish, forward-looking, builders with giant ideas and giant abilities. Dallas has now, and has always had, one of the most effective and respected police forces anywhere in the world. Dallas has enjoyed capable, hard-working, successful administrations.

Dallas is America. Its people are Americans remembering and inspired by the tradition of the Alamo. Dallas contributions to business, industry, art, culture, have been an integral part of the greatness of America.

IS SELF-CRITICISM BECOMING ACTUAL CHARACTER ASSASSINATION?

Why should there be any discrediting of Dallas? Why should all of its people be subjected to abuse because a few express intemperance? Why are good people, with good intentions, taken in and assume a feeling of guilt where no guilt exists, and apologize for a community that has done no wrong?

LET'S TAKE A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE CURRENT ATTACKS ON DALLAS

Dallas—What it is—What it stands for

1. Dallas is a community of people who believe in the individual and capitalism.

2. No city in the Nation can outstrip Dallas in growth figures, in job opportunities, in new car registrations, in home building, in tackling slum problems, in rejuvenating its blighted areas, and all on its own through private, individual initative.

3. Dallas has never had racial demonstrations, violence against minorities, bombings, race riots that have plagued so many other communities in both the North and South without apology.

4. Dallas peacefully integrated, quietly and through its own efforts.

5. Dallas citizens of all races, religions, and economic status have joined their talents and their efforts in creating a great, beautiful, dynamic, free community.

Because Dallas is now in the headlines over the United Nations, let's appraise that organization.

1. The original purpose and Charter of the U.N., supported by all peace-loving, freedom-loving peoples, has been subverted by the Communists, the godless, the imperialistic Soviet Union, the purveyors of hate, revolutions and destruction of freedom everywhere.

2. The money of U.S. taxpayers has been used to subvert the United States and to strengthen its enemies. We pay 40 percent of the total cost and have 1 vote. The Communists refuse to pay legitmate costs and have many votes.

3. The sovereignty of the United States has been threatened by attacks upon our system of government and the steady attempts to impose the will of the U.N. on the American people, to replace our own Constitution and national institutions. United Nations conventions (agreements) supersede our Constitution.

4. The military head of the U.N. is always a Communist even though the enemy fought by the U.N. has always been Communist supported.

Is it any wonder some citizens verge on intemperance with pent-up concern? One thing the citizens of Dallas and the representatives of the U.N. have in common—they are people. People make mistakes. People disagree. People become intemperate. These are among our human failings. Being people does not excuse nor permit us to condone discourtesy, violence, intemperance, and the suppression of the right of all to express their beliefs.

WE MUST KEEP EVERY SITUATION IN PERSPECTIVE

The vehemence of the attack on Dallas as a city because of the recent incident involving the U.N. Ambassador may be causing some to lose perspective and to forget that many people are fed up with the U.N.

Dallas is not disgraced by the action of an individual, nor even a group of people. The Dallas record for courtesy, for fair treatment, for freedom is all too well known. But by getting the people of Dallas to assume blame for something of which they are not guilty, by having the press and wire services and the commentators castigate Dallas and its people, the real issue is befogged and the cause of the intemperance is not remembered, and the enemies of the United States are encouraged. This all fits in with the Communist objective.

However badly their feelings were expressed, to whatever ungentlemanly and un-Dallas acts to which these feelings led, the basic fact is that the American people are deeply disturbed over the course this Nation is following and the activities of the U.N.

The U.N. is not keeping the peace. There have been 60 wars since it was founded. There are at least a half dozen wars going on at this moment when the Secretary General of the U.N. says the world is at peace.

In too many cases the U.N. itself is fomenting war.

It is not bringing about better international understanding, but its member nations are undermining free governments everywhere and imperiling our own country.

Imagine the absurdity of the U.N.-run Korean war in which 133,000 American men were killed and injured by Communists while a Communist headed the U.N. military operation.

Can we refuse to forgive the actions of a young man (not a Dallasite by the way) who lost his head because of his resentment against the U.N. that threatens his freedom and his country's freedom, and yet forgive the actions of the U.N.?

Must Dallas hang its head in shame because of the hotheaded actions of a few and yet condone U.N. actions in Katanga, in Laos and Vietnam where American boys are dying? Do you believe that Dallas must apologize as a city for an unhappy and regrettable incident, but accept the brutal facts of Hungary and the glossing over by the U.N. of the murder of men, women, and children there by the Red Army? Do you approve the U.N. buying Russian jeeps with U.S. money to give to Castro? This happened. If you disapprove vocally of such things, are you to be called intemperate?

Dallas will always regret intemperance.

Dallas will always glory in its reputation for courtesy and hospitality.

Dallas will continue to fight for the American way of life.

Dallas, the whole city of Dallas, should not accept unjust criticism because of the isolated actions of a few.

Dallas will continue its endeavor to present a welcome to any visitor, afford him the opportunity to be heard and will protect the right of those who disagree to do so within the bounds of good conduct.

Dallas and its people, however, must not be throttled, nor discredited, nor made a party to their own self-destruction by being afraid to stand up and sound off when we feel our city, our State, and our Nation is in danger. We remember well the warning of Abraham Lincoln that, "If destruction be our lot we ourselves must be its author and its finisher."

The real issue—the U.N. today is engaging in many actions harmful to peace, to the Communist captive people, and to U.S. sovereignty.

Dallas must never be discredited.

Remarks of Mayor Robert F. Wagner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert at this point a speech delivered by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City, at the 19th annual dinner of the Liberal Party, on October 15, at the Americana Hotel in New York.

I commend it to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT DINNER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

It is good to be here. I have been coming to these dinners every year, for many years now. I expect to keep coming, as long into the future as I can see.

As I look around me and see all these familiar faces, I am moved to reflect on what has changed and what has not, in our long political association across the years—the association which culminated in 1961 in the formation of what we called the coalition of decency. And let me say at this point, with a full heart and with a keen recollection, that as in the past we fought side by side against the forces of evil, so we will fight again side by side, as necessary—against similar forces and for progress and advance.

There have been many changes in the course of all these years, but our basic principles and goals have not changed. They are timeless. These include social and economic justice for all, equality of opportunity and participation for all; a better life for every man; and in general, practical progress under law for the achievement of all our social and economic purposes. There can be little argument with regard to these goals. But how do we reach them, at what pace, and with what means?

Tonight I want to try to translate these goals into the terms of the specific problems we face in our cities, and specifically in New York City. I consider that these problems—and they are to be found in all the big cities of the United States today—constitute one of the major challenges of this generation.

The city which is the cradle of all civilization can also be its grave—unless we see the danger and concentrate our energies and resources to overcome it.

This is, I know, a political occasion. But in thinking through my speech tonight, I found myself thinking in quite nonpolitical terms. If I need to apologize for this, let me do so in advance.

I am a practical man. I have to be, because I have a practical job to perform. The streets cannot be cleaned nor the refuse collected by a generalization or abstraction, no matter how profound.

Concrete decisions must be made involving, for instance, capital outlays of roughly $600 million a year, in addition to $3 billion of current operating expanses. The decisions are concrete ones, but they are directly related to issues, programs, and challenges of the most profound and critical nature, immediately related to the principles I enumerated at the beginning of my remarks.

Thus we are confronted with a wide range of questions involving our schools. These include: (1) The additional amounts of money we must spend in order to get the kind of schools that will equip our young people for the demands of this day and age; (2) and the special arrangements we must make to counterbalance the effects of segre-

gation, that will heal the deep wounds of discrimination, and overcome the grave handicaps of social and economic disadvantage.

These needs present us with a challenge of cost, but not of cost alone. Also involved is the delicate need for handling the deep antagonisms in many neighborhoods where the move for school integration is deeply resented or deeply desired, as the case may be.

There is also the challenge of housing; of the slums; of what to do about 43,000 old law tenements built in the last century and 50,000 more built in the early years of this century, which provides shelter for a million New Yorkers and constitute the heart of our slums.

The people who live in these houses are poor people, many of them desperately poor. If all these buildings are to be demolished, where will these people go? How can they pay the rent in new buildings, the cost of whose construction has risen astronomically in recent years?

What is to be done about the fact that many people living in the slums do not wish to move; they cling desperately to their slum streets and neighborhoods because of the cheap rent and because of their attachment to the local institutions—the church, the school, the club, the corner store, and the local merchants.

Above all there is the overriding challenge of racial tensions and the demand for long, overdue racial justice—not just in general, but in particular—in regard to jobs in particular industries and enterprises; for instance, in the construction industry in which the number of available jobs is, of course, limited.

It is almost a cliche to say that the intergroup tensions in our city today are of explosive potential. They are. Yet, we in New York City have less than any comparable city, because we have been pioneering in civil rights for many years. But we have no time for satisfaction nor occasion for comfort.

Poverty, privation and personal maladjustments stalk our city as it does every other. Two million newcomers have entered our city within the past 2 years, mostly from rural areas in the South and from Puerto Rico. This in-migration has produced grave social problems. Nor is our city alone in this. Fifty years ago, 60 percent of the Nation's population lived on the farms or in rural areas. Today only 10 percent live on the farm and another 10 or 15 percent in rural areas. The rest have moved into the metropolitan areas, and the poorest into the central cores of the cities.

Of all the challenges facing our country today, this is one of the gravest.

Striking into the midst of this situation, almost like a bolt of lightning, is the phenomenon of automation. Ten years ago this was, in the classic phrase, "a cloud no bigger than a man's hand." Today it is a growing and dominating circumstance, underlying our social, economic and even racial problems.

Today, 40,000 jobs a week are being automated out of existence. The people who held those jobs have been and are being added to the unemployment rolls and to the welfare rolls and to the centers of unrest and tension and trouble in the cities.

Jobs for the unskilled are now the scarcest in the labor market, and the number of unskilled jobs, is of course, decreasing almost by the hour.

We must meet this and the other problems I referred to. But where are we to get the money to do all of the things that need to be done, to pay for all the services that need to be provided, to make all the changes that need to be made?

What new major sources of revenue can we tap? Our city budget is bound to increase just by dint of progressive increases in wages and salaries. If every city employee received a salary increase of $2 a week, it would mean more than $25 million a year more in the city budget.

How then, and from where are we to obtain the very substantial amount of money we will need to keep city employees satisfied, to attract new ones, and above all to provide for new and expanded services that must be provided to meet our problems?

To resolve this problem and the other directly related problems, we must provide some radical answers and drastically new arrangements.

These must include the following:

1. A much greater degree of fiscal home rule for our major cities.

2. There must be a prompt and drastic reapportionment of the State legislature, granting us and other cities and suburban concentrations a fair proportion of the representation, so that we can focus on the real problems of the people.

3. The Federal Government must contribute vastly greater financial support to the cities, and some of it must go directly to the cities and localities, without diversion to the State government.

4. There must be a greater concentration of responsibility within the Federal Government for urban and suburban problems through the creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

5. General public acceptance must be won for new forms of subsidies for the housing of the poor—not only through the construction of new housing, but in present housing which must be rehabilitated and made decent and livable.

6. Segregation as well as discrimination must be outlawed; social as well as economic prejudice must be placed beyond the pale of both legality and propriety.

7. Finally, the increasing gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" in our society must be narrowed. The economic floor on which the impoverished and the disadvantaged now live must be raised by a supreme effort.

These, my friends, constitute the challenge of 1963. There are the practical, specific, and realistic directions in which we must move if we are to translate our principles into performance, and advance toward our goals in the light of the present day.

Should we do otherwise, in my judgment, we stand in deadly peril. In other words, we have no alternative but to go forward—and fast.

Hon. Tom Connally

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the death of former Senator Tom Connally brings personal sorrow to those of us who were inspired in our own lives by his long career of public service.

Senator Connally had retired from the Senate 2 years before I entered Congress. But he was a famous Texan and I, as a Texan who had chosen to enter politics, was early aware of his many contributions to his State and his Nation.

Tom Connally was a man versed in statesmanship, a public official who rendered vast service to his Nation in peace and war, and a gentleman of the old school in the best and highest sense of that term. This earth is the poorer for his having gone from among us, and richer for his having lived and served.

Why Should Moon Flight Be National Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William J. Coughlin, editor of the Missiles and Rockets magazine penned an article for his September 30, 1963, edition in which he set forth, as he saw it, the reasons why man's first flight to the moon should be a matter of national competition. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this article:

THE REASONS WHY

(By William J. Coughlin)

The President of the United States has asked a series of questions of which the most basic is:

"Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition?"

We propose here to answer those questions and to give the reasons why. But let us first look at the record. Let us first make certain we understand just what President Kennedy proposed in his speech before the United Nations on September 20. He stated, in the course of that speech:

"Finally, in a field where the United States and the Soviet Union have a special capacity—in the field of space—there is room for new cooperation, for further joint efforts in the regulation and exploration of space. I include among these possibilities a joint expedition to the moon.

"Space offers no problem of sovereignty; by resolution of this assembly, the members of the United Nations have forsworn any claims to territorial rights in outer space or on celestial bodies, and declared that international law and the United Nations Charter will apply.

"Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition? Why should the United States and the Soviet Union, in preparing for such expeditions, become involved in immense duplications of research, construction, and expenditure? Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending someday in this decade to the moon, not the representatives of a single nation but the representatives of all our countries." Those were the words of our President. We are told that earlier drafts of the speech included no reference to the lunar effort, that this proposal for a joint expedition was a last-minute insertion.

Therefore, before replying to the questions, let us examine some of the earlier statements which Mr. Kennedy himself has made in regard to Apollo.

When the President proposed to Congress in May 1961, that the Nation embark on the multibillion-dollar project to place an American expedition on the moon, he suggested it might be the key to our future on earth.

With congressional approval, this Nation set out on a determined effort to land a team of astronauts on the moon in this decade—and to accomplish that feat ahead of the Soviet Union.

As recently as July 17 the President declared that the capacity to dominate space was "essential to the United States as a leading free world power." He called it an area which could affect the national security and again emphasized U.S. determination in regard to the lunar effort.

Suddenly, the urgency has vanished, the interest in the national security has been swept aside, the race has been abandoned, and we find the President asking:

"Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition?"

We offer these answers:

1. Because it is important to the survival of the United States that we develop the science and technology which give us the capacity to send a manned expedition to the moon and back.

2. Because there is national prestige at stake. Do not believe for a moment that achievement of a successful lunar landing by either the Soviet Union or the United States will not immeasurably bolster the political status of that nation.

3. Because it is important to our military security. We are in complete accord with the administration position that weapons of mass destruction must be kept out of outer space. In order to assure that this ban is carried out, we must possess the capability to operate in space, to detect, intercept and inspect the space vehicles of other nations.

4. Because we are engaged in an economic war with the Soviet Union. Mr. Khrushchev, acknowledging the futility of nuclear war, has made it abundantly clear that he believes the Soviet Union can defeat us in the economic arena. His famed "we will bury you" statement was made in reference to economic competition, not military combat. Given the gross national product of the two nations, the lunar effort is a far more crushing burden to the Soviet economy than to ours.

5. Because we believe in finishing what we start. Obviously, a $20 billion lunar project becomes something of a liability for an administration proposing extensive tax cuts. But we do not accept political expediency as an excuse for a stretchout. This richly endowed Nation can afford the financial burden of the moon program.

There can be no question at this stage of any extensive joint Soviet-American effort on lunar hardware. In addition to the security problem, the projects are too far along from an engineering standpoint for such cooperation to be practical.

NASA Administrator James E. Webb explained in Houston last week that President Kennedy was referring basically to an exchange of information, with perhaps agreement on a common lunar landing site. Mr. Webb said there has been some misunderstanding about the President's proposal and that Mr. Kennedy has not changed his earlier views.

We find this hard to square with Mr. Kennedy's question of why the flight to the moon should be a matter of national competition, with his question as to why the United States and Soviet Union should be involved in a vast duplication of research, construction and expenditure. And with his suggestion that we might send to the moon in this decade "not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all our countries."

We favor cooperation and an exchange of information with the Soviets in this field, but we reject such a naive internationalist approach to the lunar project. It can only harm the U.S. effort to the benefit of the Soviet Union.

Almost Everyone at Bowen High School Knows the Name of Secretary of State Rusk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Miss Helen Gallagher, principal of the Joseph Warren School, for a copy of the Bowen Arrow of October 25, 1963 containing an article by Richard Aron, who was graduated from Miss Gallagher's school to the Bowen High School.

Bowen High School is in the district on the South Side of Chicago that I have the honor to represent. Naturally, I am proud of its outstanding achievements and the high quality of its faculty and student body.

Mr. Aron reports in his article on the results of a survey he has taken among his fellow students. He found that among the students he canvassed at Bowen High School 91 percent knew the name of Secretary of State Rusk. This compared with 60 percent familiar with the name of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and 59 percent who knew the name of the Secretary of Defense. But 14 percent were acquainted with the name of their Congressman, which is probably a high percentage since the multiplicity of representative offices—aldermen, ward committeemen, State senators, and State representatives as well as Members of Congress—adds to an understandable confusion.

But the fact that more than 9 out of 10 know the name of Secretary of State Rusk is remarkable and it is significant as indicating the position of preeminence foreign policy has in the thinking of the young men and women in our high schools. I doubt that 1 out of 10 would have known the name of our then Secretary of State in my own high school days. Certainly the name of the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Agriculture would have been much more familiar. The world beyond the seas then was very far away, and domestic affairs monopolized the interest of our people.

Nothing could more forcibly pinpoint the heights our country has reached in world leadership than the fact shown by Mr. Aron's survey that today in a high school in midland Chicago less than 1 out of 10 was not familiar with the name of Secretary of State Rusk. It is well for our country and an assurance for its future that our young people in the high schools are as deeply interested in foreign policy as Mr. Aron's survey would indicate.

I commend Mr. Aron for making this survey and compliment the student body of Bowen High School on the unusually high degree of political knowledge on its part the survey has revealed.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include Mr. Aron's article, as follows:

WE MUST KEEP OURSELVES INFORMED

(By Richard Aron)

We are constantly reminded that democracy is a responsibility. We are told that unless we take an active interest in our democracy, it will fail. Unfortunately, we often tire of hearing this warning and therefore ignore it—and that's a dangerous proposition. The truth of the matter is that we have grown lax in supporting democracy, that we don't inform ourselves of the vital issues facing our country today, that we weaken the Nation by our complacent attitude.

Recently I took a survey to determine approximately what percentage of our students do take some interest in the issues that concern our Nation. The survey consisted of identifying well-known public figures who should be familiar to us all. They are people who have been in the news constantly in the past weeks.

Only 91 percent of those questioned were able to identify Dean Rusk, U.S. Secretary of State. While 91 percent may appear high, it's not a good thing that many of our students can't identify Mr. Rusk.

Only 60 percent were able to identify Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Fifty-nine percent identified Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense. BARRY GOLDWATER, U.S. Senator from Arizona and presently the leading contender for the Republican nomination for President, was known by a scant 56 percent.

Two men on the list were recognized by less than half of those questioned. Governor Brown, of California, the man who defeated Richard Nixon for that governorship, was identified by just 47 percent. BARRATT O'HARA was known by only 14 percent. BARRATT O'HARA is in the House of Representatives; he's a Congressman—our Congressman. How anyone in our community could not identify Congressman O'HARA is unfathomable. Everyone identified Liz Taylor correctly. This only illustrates how ill informed we are. As further evidence, it should be noted that three-fourths of those polled are participating in the honors program.

Some will laugh at the survey and disregard it even as they scorn the importance of keeping abreast of current events. I hope, though, that others will consider the results of the survey and resolve to become better acquainted with the people and issues which have such an effect on our country.

Let's all make a determined effort to learn more about our position in the family of nations and the domestic issues facing the country. In this way we can strengthen democracy and insure a progressive, prosperous future.

Birmingham's Image—Editorial From the Alabama Baptist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting and thought-provoking editorial from the October 24, 1963, issue of the Alabama Baptist, edited

by Dr. Leon Macon. I commend this editorial from one of our Nation's outstanding church newspapers to the careful study and attention of the Members of Congress:

BIRMINGHAM'S IMAGE

We do not care too much for the over use of the word "image" but it seems appropriate here in reference to what other people think about Birmingham. It seems the publicity all over the Nation, including the religious press, has made it appear that the streets of Birmingham are dangerous to walk on and it is even dangerous to drive through the city. We were talking to a fine layman in Mississippi and he wanted to know how he could avoid Birmingham on a trip he was making to the east coast. We asked him why he wanted to avoid Birmingham and he said he did not want to get in any of the mob violence here. We told him it was safe and as quiet as the city in which he lived and which had never been stirred by the racial situation.

A prominent Negro leader in Birmingham told a prominent white Baptist leader that a Negro woman had visited him from Chicago and he wanted to take her out driving to see the city. She wanted to know if he could actually drive around town freely. He told her, "Why, of course," and after they had seen the city she said she was going back to Chicago and tell the people there that the things they heard and believed about Birmingham were simply not the truth.

These two instances serve to show how damaging an overplay in the news outlets can have on what others think about one of the finest cities in the country.

We have had one or two instances of demonstrations which were provoked by outsiders but these were over with when they were stopped and there has been no real aftermath of friction between the races as a result of these occurrences.

THE ROLE OF OUTSIDERS

The disturbances caused by white people in Birmingham have been minor and the grand jury indicted six of the leaders in these disturbances and four of them were from outside of Alabama. Two were from Atlanta, one from Pittsburgh, and one from Canada. When the people in Birmingham say that outsiders are causing their difficulty, it can be believed without question. We do have some radicals in our midst, both Negro and white, but they are not the controlling factor at all in the creation of the events which have led to so much national comment.

The white citizens of Birmingham formed a committee to raise funds to bear the hospital, funeral, and other expenses of those killed or injured as a result of the bombing of the 16th Street Negro church. The response by the white people to this appeal resulted in more money than was needed. The bombed church was insured for $100-000 and professional estimates of the damage done was $40,000. The insurance companies are paying this entire amount. The white citizens have given over $70,000 as reward money for the perpetrators of this crime.

The attitude of the white people toward the bombings in Birmingham is one of appall, protest, and complete disgust with the guilty parties. That these crimes could have been caused by outsiders is seen in the fact that 25 FBI men could not solve the problem or point their fingers to the guilty ones. Our law enforcement officers have been firm, calm, and efficient, and humane in their treatment of those creating demonstrations, both white and black. They have done an excellent job in spite of some reports that our law enforcement in Birmingham is poor.

As to the tensions between the races, we cannot locate or feel any of these, except that the outside interference has caused a falling off of the warm fellowship which once existed between the races. We feel this same personal relationship exists but is cowed down by threats of violence to any of the Negroes who do not cooperate with the designs of some who seem to be profiting by their unwise interference in the local matters of our city.

No one knows who has done this bombing but there is one thing sure: the vast majority of Negroes and whites had no part in it, nor has it made the streets of Birmingham dangerous to walk on. Everything moves along in all areas as quietly as ever before and we sincerely hope that the people who have been enraged against Birmingham by the effects of reporting about the situation will believe us when we say that we still have our communications and that the situation could be completely solved if left to the people who have been raised together here.

We in no wise seek to justify violence, wrong, or lawbreaking in any form. There are many who would urge the church to get out and lead in this predicament but we find nowhere in God's Word where the church is to be used as a political or social instrument to solve these civil problems. We believe the church's responsibility is to win people to Christ and then train Christian people to perform their civil duties in the spirit and character of Christ.

Columbus and the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, former lieutenant general of the Air Force Ira C. Eaker, now retired, has written an article concerning our space program. It appeared in the San Diego Union for Sunday, September 22, 1963, and I commend it to my colleagues here in the House.

The article follows:

COLUMBUS AND THE MOON—DEBATES ON VOYAGES ARE SIMILAR

(By Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired)

Nearly 500 years ago a great debate raged among the intelligentsia and the leaders of Spain. An Italian navigator had arrived, by way of Portugal, asking authority and funds for a voyage to the West across the feared Atlantic Ocean, to find a new route to India, discover new lands, and prove the world was round.

The skeptics vigorously opposed this mad scheme for many reasons. It was dangerous. He would sail right off the flat earth. It was expensive. The money squandered on this foolish enterprise would build a new cathedral. It would detract from the war. After all, the Moors were laying siege to Grenada.

THREATENS TO PAWN JEWELS

Eventually Queen Isabella, whose support had been won through her priest, in tears, threatened to pawn her jewels to fund the voyage. Then, King Ferdinand, as husbands still do, gave in. He signed the authorization and put up the money, less than $10,000. Admiral Columbus sailed and America was discovered.

Today in our country there is a heated debate, engaging the interest of our leaders and our people. Shall we enter and win the race to the moon? Our people are choosing sides. Ring Lardner would have called these two teams the Ferdinands and the Isabellas.

REMINISCENT ARGUMENTS

Against the space effort, arguments strikingly reminiscent of the opopsition to the Columbus scheme are heard with increasing frequency and fury.

The Apollo program, our man-to-the-moon effort, will cost $20 to $40 billion. This money, put into medical research might discover a cure for cancer. Put into education it would solve our school shortage; it would adequately supply and pay our teachers.

Of course, this is like saying that if Great Britain had not spent money for a great navy, millions of Irishmen would not have died in the potato famine. The Irish starved to death because the people of England did not know of their plight and the government did not care. The moon program and eleemosynary proposals are not in conflict.

LAG IS FEARED

Others fear that our preoccupation and effort with space exploration and the peaceful uses of space, including the moon program, may lead to a lag in the development of weapons in space.

Here again the moon program need not delay our securtiy effort in space. Our failure to get on with our military program in space is not because of conflict with NASA. As one military leader put it, "our space security program is not opposed by NASA, it is stuck in the Pentagon."

The Apollo program is expensive. More than $3 billion have been appropriated for it this year. It will cost every citizen of this country $20 a year for 5 years to put men on the moon.

MERCURY COST TOLD

The Mercury program, the man-in-orbit NASA effort just concluded, cost every citizen $5 a year for 3 years. But I got my $15 worth when I saw Col. John Glenn ride the nose cone of a missile safely off the test range at Canaveral, and again when I heard the dramatic radio dialog as Major Cooper, whose automatic controls had failed, hand-piloted his fireball to a safe landing in the Pacific last spring.

Some critics profess to fear that too many of our scientists are being drafted for the Apollo program with consequent and dangerous delays in other important scientific effort. Actually, but 6 percent of our total scientific manpower is engaged in the space programs. The contribution NASA will make in education and training during the space effort will far surpass any current drain on scientific manpower.

Some have charged that the moon program was conceived in haste and is being executed in haste, and with consequent waste.

The facts are that no national program of similar importance has ever been so carefully scrutinized or so thoroughly examined. James Webb, the capable NASA director, and Dr. Hugh Dryden, his able deputy, and their staff of 20,000 scientists and technicians, spent years putting it together.

FISCAL SOUNDNESS TESTED

The Bureau of the Budget tested it for fiscal soundness. Vice President JOHNSON'S Space Coordinating Committee gave it searching examination. The Space Committees of the House and Senate held thorough hearings, as did Representative "Tiger" TEAGUE'S Space Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

The President and his Cabinet support the present space program, Congress has approved and funded it by overwhelming majorities. It turns out that those who know most about the moon project are its most ardent supporters.

COURAGE, VISION CITED

I believe that the race to be first on the moon is one of the tests to see whether we as a people have the courage and the vision for continued world leadership. If we fail

this trial, the United States will soon be a second rate power on the way down and out. Not because we did not win the race to the moon, but because we did not have the sense and the will to try.

After considering all the available evidence for many months, I am now an Isabella man. I cannot agree with the fearful Ferdinands.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Jim Markham, Editor, Publisher, Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 17, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a fine American died in Minnesota the other day. He was Jim Markham, former publisher and editor of the Hennepin County Review.

H. O. Sonnesyn, editor and publisher of the North Minneapolis Post, has written a tribute to Jim Markham that speaks for all of us who knew and respected him. Because the influence of Jim Markham has had such deep and lasting effect on Minnesota and on our country, it is fitting that Mr. Sonnesyn's excellent article appear here in the RECORD:

JIM MARKHAM

(By H. O. Sonnesyn)

There are some people you meet during this earthly life you never forget. James L. (Jim) Markham, former suburban publisher and editor at Hopkins, who died last week, was one of those individuals. He was colorful because he talked exactly as he wrote for his newspaper. He was a courageous writer for the cause of liberalism when that subject was not even popular in his hometown of Hopkins. He displayed the same courage in his private life as he did in his writing. A form of arthritis wracked his body and month by month weakened it. An optical nerve snapped one day and left him totally blind in one eye and with only 25 percent vision in the other one. There was not a day during the last 25 years of his life he did not suffer physical pain. Jim Markham was not the type of individual prone to complain. He was thankful to God that He had left him with a 25-percent vision and a clear mind in spite of the other misfortunes which which had been his lot. Because he was an avid reader, Markham was probably one of the best informed editors in the State. His constant fear was that he would some day lose his entire vision. The specialists attending him never imparted the fact they had the same fear. Blindness to Markham would have been a tragedy. And yet we believe he would have accepted the further affliction without any criticism of the way God was treating him along physical lines. Although it was Jim's lot to suffer, God never impaired the mentality of Markham and that was another reason he was content. That sharp mind of Jim Markham was efficiently operating until just a few hours before his last final illness removed him from this earth.

Jim Markham was probably more responsible for the first election of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY than any other individual in the State. Minnesota's senior Senator was at that time a university instructor. He was not well known throughout the other parts of the State. He was ambitious and young, but these two characteristics do not always elect a person seeking office. Markham knew every newspaper editor in the State. He knew the key men in the Democratic Party. They were obligated to him. Other influential people in the State were personally acquainted with Markham and admired him because of the positive stands he always took. The supporters of Senator Joseph Ball had more money to support their candidate than the voters who wanted to see HUMPHREY elected to the Senate. It was an easy triumph for Senator HUMPHREY. We personally know that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY even today admits the inspiration he received from the man who wrote, "From the Grumble Seat," first started him up to the powerful position he occupies today in the U.S. Senate. He knew that during that campaign Jim Markham's column was quoted statewide and that it even was quoted nationally. Backing from such a colorful writer probably meant a great deal more to Senator HUMPHREY than even if he had received the financial backing which he so badly needed. We know Senator HUMPHREY grieves with the rest of us over the death of Jim Markham.

We came to this area on Labor Day in 1937. We were a complete stranger in the community and all we knew about Hopkins was that it was some town in Minnesota. It meant no more to us when Hopkins was mentioned than if someone had said something about Red Oak, Mont., if there is such a town. We began reading our exchanges so that we might learn the thoughts of some of the men who were to be our future colleagues. About all we learned from reading some of the editorials was that motherhood was sacred and government in Washington was controlled by a group of autocrats. There was nothing in any of the editorials that we had not read before in other newspapers. We finally came to, "The Hennepin County Review," and saw it was printed at Hopkins. We turned to the editorial page and noticed a column that had the heading, "From the Grumble Seat." We do not remember on what particular subject Jim was expounding, but we do recall it was on something that was wrong with local affairs in Hopkins. After we had read the column, we began wondering if it was being written by someone who hated not only his own hometown but everything else in the world. We looked at the masthead and discovered the column was the product of the editor and publisher. We began speculating on whether advertisers would give their patronage to a newspaper that wrote in such caustic terms about local affairs. We began studying the advertising contents and discovered the newspaper was well patronized by the advertisers.

It was several weeks before we met Markham personally at the first meeting of the Hennepin County Newspaper Association, which no longer exists, that we attended. It was at the same meeting that we met Eugene O'Brien. The introductions were barely over before Markham turned to us and said:

"So you are the new editor John Suel has hired. I don't know if you would be interested in my theories about how to run a suburban newspaper, but in a few weeks you will probably hear about the kind of fellow many people think I am. I have the heart of an angel and the skin of a rhinoceros. Many people do not even believe I have a heart. After reading your first few editorials and columns, I received the reaction you love your work. That's the way I also feel about being a newspaper editor. I love it. My theory about editing a newspaper has always been that you should take a positive stand on all issues. It may not make you the most popular individual in the community and the chances are you will never be elected mayor or to the city council. There is one satisfaction I derive. After I have offered my opinions, I can live with my conscience and to me that is very important. Sometimes we lose advertising because of my views, but they eventually come back into our newspaper." It seems but like yesterday that Jim Markham made those comments to us. We know Jim Markham is dead. As we write this column it seems as if he is sitting across the desk from us repeating the statements he made when we first met him 26 years ago.

We shall never be sorry we met Jim Markham. We have probably never been more sincere in writing a column about some person than we are today as we comment on Markham's death. We loved the man. He will always occupy an important part of our fond memories of people we have admired and respected.

Made in the Image of Baal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I continue to be impressed with an outstanding publication called Christian Economics which is published weekly by Christian Freedom Foundation, Inc., 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. I, therefore, recommend to the Members of the Congress the reading of this publication because of the soundness and eloquence of the articles printed therein. The editors of this publication state on the masthead that "we believe in the free market and the faithful application of Christian principles to all economic activities."

The principal article published in the October 29, 1963, issue of Christian Economics was written by Dr. H. Russell Grow, professor of economics, Culver-Stockton College. It is titled "Made in the Image of Baal." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, another article printed in this issue of Christian Economics titled "Strategy for Power" and written by Monty Ray.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADE IN THE IMAGE OF BAAL

(By H. Russell Grow, Ph. D., professor of economics, Culver-Stockton College)

Moses came down from the mountain bearing tablets of stone on which were written the commandments by which God provided

us with the rules for His way of life. This was one of the major events in the history of mankind, for it established the rules of law that require all human beings to live in conformity with the highest spiritual principles ever given to mankind. As Moses approached the camp of his people bearing the law, he heard singing and shouting; when he was near enough to see them he discovered that they were dancing around a golden calf that they had made for their god.

The golden calf, made in the image of Baal, was a visible, material representation of a fertility deity that probably came closer to the moral and ethical level of the people than any other religious symbol of that day. For they had been born and reared in bondage in Egypt; their minds, bodies and souls were those of slaves. The things that they desired most were the fleshpots of Egypt, the wild abandon of the primitive dance, and the satisfaction of their bodily urges. In these elementary animal drives they were united as a herd and sought the image that best symbolized their inner state of being. The gold calf, a Baal, was an entirely adequate symbol of the conscious and unconscious drives within them.

Moses offered his people "the law," monotheism, and a new freedom that mankind has blindly sought from the beginning of time, all of which was on the noblest level possible. Yet his people were quite willing to deny themselves personal and spiritual freedom and to accept the corrupting and degrading worship of Baal in the place of the lofty position offered them in the vision of a people of God. Perhaps it was too much to expect slaves to be anything but slaves. Certainly, it became necessary for them to continue their wandering in the wilderness until a new generation of freeborn men could be raised up to the standards required of a chosen people.

We see in Moses and his people the age-old conflict between the god and evil that has destroyed individuals and nations throughout history. Inspired leaders, men with the divine drive to the truth, have experienced the sense of defeat that must have overcome Moses when he found his people worshiping the golden calf.

Today, it is not the golden calf that reaches down into the innermost being of man and brings into consciousness the corrupting worship of material gods, but it is the worship of autocratic power in the state. It is the urge to achieve at all costs social, political, and material possessions, without paying for them. It is worship reduced to formula, form without substance, and majestic church buildings with little spiritual life to make them adequate symbols of Christianity. It is the worship of collectivism and materialism, the Baals of our day, that will destroy us if we do not arise to the nobleness of living required by "the law" of Moses and the sacrifice of Christ.

Collectivism is an indication of mental disease among those who espouse it. It represents the desire of those who have lost the spiritual meaning in life to lose themselves in the masses. Collectivism is not a trend toward community of spirit; it is a denial of the spirit. Those who practice it tend to reduce themselves to the level of the grain of sand on a vast beach. Communist theory requires the complete submergence of the individual in the mass, so that each is indistinguishable from the others who make up the Communist state.

In the Communist state or society human personality is destroyed. The citizen is required to deny his own personality and that of others. He is not permitted an opinion concerning any vital question; his opinions are given to him by the dictators who control the state. The kind of mind that creates the autocratic state of the Communists is a sick mind, for it has concluded that man is an animal that must give unyielding obedience to the state, that he is incapable of thinking, and that he cannot be trusted to make decisions. This is a slave state; communism is its golden calf. It will destroy us if we do not combat it successfully. The worship of Baal is thriving in our day.

Our national economic policies are completely materialistic. Power has become the end, not the means to desirable ends, that we seek. We try to buy good will among nations by giving them huge grants in aid, while we endanger our own solvency by increasing our debts to astronomical levels, beyond all reason and our willingness to pay them. We dance and sing in the night clubs, encourage gambling, and permit gangsters to divide the Nation into areas of influence, as if they were legitimate business people. Our dramatic arts, as exemplified by television and motion pictures, feature productions in which sexual perversions are presented as art, in a fashion that would have embarassed the temple prostitutes of the ancient fertility cults. The golden calf of materialism and perversion is our god.

Our noble religious ideals, as provided in the Laws of Moses and the teachings of Christ, have been rejected by the majority of our people. Humanism, the do-good government, without the guiding and illuminating life of the inner spirit, denies God and man made in His image. Liberal religion centers its attention on social welfare, with little or no interest in the power of the Holy Spirit to redeem man. The forms and rituals of worship have lost their sense of relationship to their Divine source and are performed mechanically as a means of subduing conscience. The observance of the law has been reduced to knowledge of its meaning. We are a lost people wandering in the wilderness of paganism and materialism.

Too much of our educational practice has been based on the Freudian pleasure theory as the dominant drive in human nature. In Freudian theory morality is externally derived; this reduces the human being to a slave of the sexual drive and infantile wish fulfillment. On the other hand, Adler emphasized the drive for power as the basis for individual self-affirmation. Man is more than a sense-receiving mechanism directed by the will to pleasure or the will to power. He seeks to arise above the primitive materialism of his unconscious life into the life of consciousness and understanding. He progresses by using his primitive and biological drives as means to the spiritual end. The pleasure principle is a means to an end. To regard it as man's goal is to regard him as a clever animal struggling for supremacy. History is filled with the evidences of tragedy and terror generated by men dedicated to power as an end in itself.

Man struggles primarily not for pleasure, not for power, but for higher meaning to his existence. There is in each of us the basic urge for individual understanding of the meaning of being, so that we as individuals should be free to achieve it in light of our individual need for it. We cannot gain self-affirmation from the collectivist state, because from birth, if we develop properly, we must, if we are to be free, develop differently from all other people. In this we achieve personality. The collectivist state denies human personality. Our struggle for meaning leads us to the spiritual height to which every person has the right to aspire and the achievement of which represents the final meaning of life.

Christ gave us the perfect example of self-affirmation and life in its highest meaning. He faced the cross; He did not avoid or refuse it. He rejected His crucifixion, He would have rejected His Divine self-affirmation and the cross would have had no meaning for Him or for us. If we are to reject the worship of the golden calf, if we are to accept Divine guidance and truth as the highest meaning in existence, we must face and overcome the evils of pleasure and power, not avoid them. The cross of Christ then becomes a symbol of the highest meaning in human existence by which we face and overcome the evils inherent in the materialism of our day and win for ourselves and mankind the spiritual victory that has been promised us. The Law of Moses will then be effective and the sacrifice of Christ on the cross shall result in victory.

Strategy for Power

(By Monty Ray)

The Fabian Society was founded in 1883, and for its first few years numbered only a small handful. Today, its members form the ruling class of Britain; its converts are the leaders in America (2,000 are said to be among the upper administrative officers in Washington), and its colonial members, such as Tom Byboya of Kenya, are the powers of many new states.

A small handful of men made Fabian socialism one of the most powerful influences of the modern era. Its influence is felt in virtually every political party of the Western World, including anti-Socialist parties. In philosophy it is implicitly anti-Christian and explicitly positivist (let's try it and see if it works). Yet, it has become a major force in church circles. Although a different school of socialism than that of Marx, it can claim Lenin as a Fabian. Lenin, in the nineties translated (Beatrice and Sidney) Webb's books into Russian and his "New Economic Policy" was Fabian strategy.

How was this done—this Fabian rise to power?

First, the intellectual climate of the late 1800's was favorable to the Fabian goal. The anarchistic, anti-Christian liberalism of the day was moving intellectually toward socialism, as witness John Stuart Mill. The utilitarians held that the greatest happiness or good for the greatest number was the valid social goal. As the Darwinian view of faulty, imperfect, and evolving nature gained control of the minds of men, a new mechanism was needed to accomplish this "greatest good."

That new mechanism of social perfection became the state. Just as nature had supplanted God in the minds of intellectuals, now the state supplanted nature as the agency of perfection and fulfillment. The new god was thus the state, as the Fabians recognized and were quick to serve it, and there is no possibility of defeating this new god without a stronger one.

Historically, only orthodox Christianity has been able to destroy or overcome in any era of history the monolithic power of statism. The issue is theological, and fabianism provided the theology of the state.

Second, the Fabians concentrated on the heart of the matter, socialism, and refused to be involved in the Socialist interparty battles on methods.

Open hatred of Christianity was argued against; rather, Fabianism sought to kill the churches with kindness. The Education Act of 1902 was seen as a triumph of Fabian penetration. School boards were abolished, all support of voluntary or church and other nonstatist schools was transferred to the state, and religious instruction retained to please the Christians.

As George Bernard Shaw described this step in 1948: "The Fabian policy was to support and take advantage of every legislative step toward collectivism, no matter what quarter it came from."

Third, as is already apparent, Fabianism was pragmatic in its approach. Its philosophy has been described as gradualism; it is best described as "opportunism." "Practical possibilities" is the Fabian way. As a result, while Fabians from the start aimed

at full socialism, it made its initial practical goal two things: first, municipal socialism (i.e., local municipal ownership of utilities) and, second, state control of the conditions of labor (a very reasonable goal to which all men could give assent without seeing the barbed hook in the bait).

From the start internationalism and Socialist world government have been a goal, but with none of the belligerence of Marxist communism. (In terms of this goal, nationalistic and imperialistic policies were often advocated—as a step toward internationalism. G. K. Chesterton, an ex-Fabian, wrote: "There is only a thin sheet of paper between the imperialist and the internationalist; and the first Fabians had the lucidity to see it.")

Fourth, Fabianism, while talking of democracy, believed in a dynamic democracy governed by the socialist elite—a brain trust. Only that which the elite produced was socially good. Thus, profit-sharing plans and welfare projects on the part of employers consisted of fraud and love of power; but, free baths and lockers provided by the state through a labor government constituted equality.

Fifth, the Fabians saw the growing power of government bureaucrats. They aimed at providing bureaucracy with a philosophy as well as data for furthering its own goals. Thus, the Fabians quickly endeared themselves to bureaucrats of all persuasions. In this way it found itself in power, no matter who won at the polls. (It was an early champion of city planning, whereby an unelected government increasingly governs in the face of any elected governments.)

Consideration should be given to some of the practical instruments used by the Fabians in their rise to international power. These are of inestimable importance:

1. From the very beginning, they brought forth a steady stream of publications presenting the Fabian position. These publications were of two sorts: popular essays and tracts for general use and, second, research reports for scholarly use. A research bureau was established to keep both politicians and scholars dependent upon Fabians for basic research.

2. The London School of Economics was founded to fill the need to influence the academic world. (President John F. Kennedy attended that school in 1939–40.) At times, clearly, it matters more who says something than what is said and the academic mind has often resisted truth and ideas from nonacademic sources.

3. A student movement was begun. In America, the influence of this aspect of Fabianism has been phenomenal, and the Intercollegiate Socialist Society alumni include a great number of prominent educators, university presidents, politicians, churchmen, writers, economists and businessmen.

4. These, and other activities, were established in terms of a common faith rather than a common board of directors. Fabians have never limited themselves to one party or to one socioeconomic group. Despite their penchant for a collectivistic, one-party state, they practice decentralization and enterprise when it comes to expanding the influence of their own cult.

5. Activity on the local level was emphasized. It was felt that basic socialism had to control the local unit to endure.

6. Special summer schools and seminars were started, using men active in writing, teaching, politics, etc., to reach many persons of prominence as well as those with leadership potential in all fields.

7. Series of lectures were arranged at locations where the greatest good could be accomplished. Speakers were made available to interested groups anywhere, anytime.

8. An international bureau was established to further Fabianism in Africa and Asiatic countries, and to reach the students of those areas.

The Fabian path to power was quick, but not smooth. Fabians were often inept and bumbling, jealous of sharing power, jealous of superior men and apt to prefer inferior men. They did have, however, two great things in their favor: a basically strong strategy, and a lack of organized or philosophical opposition. Secular thought tended in their direction, as did defective Christianity. They could afford a show of tolerance while practicing a subtle intolerance. (Reprinted from the California Spokesman, June 1, 1963.)

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have received from a 16-year-old constituent, Rick Cannon of Elwood, Ind., a rather remarkable short essay on the U.S. Constitution, which won the Nathan Hale Youth Award in Indiana and also the Freedoms Foundation George Washington Medal and $100. Rick Cannon is typical of our youthful future leaders, president of both the junior class and the student council of Wendell Willkie High School, a member of the cross-country team, basketball center, and a second-place winner in the State American Legion oratorical contest last year. He also represented Indiana here in Washington last April in the National Catholic Welfare Conference oratorical contest. His essay is an expression of faith which should inspire other and older citizens and reassure those who are concerned about the quality of American youth. I ask unanimous consent that this essay, "Our American Heritage," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Rick Cannon)

Do you have a family heirloom in your house? One that you have treasured through the years, perhaps an old uniform your grandfather wore at Gettysburg, or maybe a tarnished helmet from World War I, or is it a faded Bible with a record of family milestones, its yellowed pages worn at the edges through years of use.

You know that as an American citizen you share a priceless heirloom with 190 million other Americans—our Constitution of the United States of America.

Just what is this Constitution of the United States? It is the great imperishable credo that built the strong, united, proud America we live in today. It had its beginnings in many lands in the hearts of your ancestors and mine when they dreamed of leaving their children a secure future. And they willingly gave of themselves to insure it.

Nothing can triumph unless it has met a challenge successfully, or righted a violation. Our Constitution has met challenges and righted violations not once or twice, but hundreds of times. And each time it has triumphed, it has become more treasured.

But too often the Constitution of the United States is considered just a code of laws, remote and impersonal, lying in the Archives in Washington. And the phrases we hear "Guarantee of freedom, bulwark of strength, hope of the Nation," these are impersonal, too.

Actually the Constitution is simple and direct and personal. Yes, our Constitution is a credo of freedom for every American from all time and for all time—freedom that can be best compared to the air we breathe. Only when we are deprived of it do we realize that it is the essence of life.

In a day this freedom may be lost for centuries. Or without our noticing, it may be slowly nibbled away. Neither Congress, nor the Supreme Court, nor the President of the United States can preserve our national heritage for us. This is the precious right and privilege and duty of every American.

I am a teenager who has never known the horrors of war or depression. I am soft. I live in a prosperous nation in a comfortable home. And I am not unusual. There are millions of young adults like me.

One of the most critical problems facing America today could well be, "How can our teenagers preserve the Constitution?" We must learn to study to evaluate, to think beyond ourselves. This is the first step.

I grew up hearing over and over how the Constitution was founded—how great it is—how strong it is—but I had never thought of it as being alive and belonging to me personally. But I do now. And I am grateful to groups like you who encourage student research and thought. You are challenging us teenagers to think beyond ourselves, and this is the first step toward our growing into responsible adults.

Dangers of Inflation Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the rising concern about the possibility of a new wave of inflation is given substance by two articles which recently appeared in the press.

In the Wall Street Journal of November 4 it was reported that of all the purchasing agents queried in October, 56 percent reported higher prices of the materials used by industry. This is the largest figure of agents reporting higher prices in 5 years. It reflects the fact that the October list of price increases was the largest in 2 years in the monthly survey made by the National Association of Purchasing Agents.

A column by Joseph R. Slevin in the October 8 New York Herald Tribune cites the close attention being paid by the Federal Reserve Board to the inflationary possibilities in the economy. According to the column, the Board is "keeping an anxious eye on daily price changes." Mr. Slevin quotes Frank R. Garfield, economic adviser to the Board as saying there is no conclusive evidence of a widespread advance of prices, but that there are grounds for concern about the future.

In view of the inflationary potentialities in the administration's program to cut taxes and increase spending, under unanimous consent, I include the two

articles in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 4, 1963]

PURCHASING AGENTS SAY PRICES ROSE DURING OCTOBER: PERCENTAGE REPORTING GAINS SETS 5-YEAR HIGH—LIST OF GOODS BROADEST IN 2 YEARS—BUSINESS OUTLOOK CALLED GOOD

NEW YORK.—Prices of materials used by industry rose on a broad front in October, the National Association of Purchasing Agents reported. Of the agents queried in the group's monthly survey, 56 percent reported higher prices, the largest figure in 5 years.

The latest figure was up sharply from the 24 percent who reported higher prices in September. Only 3 percent in the latest survey reported lower prices, down from 6 percent in September. The rest said prices held at September levels.

"There can be little doubt that testing of the market on a selective basis has become a popular game of chance, and just how many will ultimately choose to take part is not known," the association said.

The October list of price increases was the group's largest in 2 years. Carbon steel, especially bars, plates, pipe, and structural, was most prominently noted, the agents said.

Other prices increases were reported in aluminum, lead, carbon steel, tin, zinc, cadmium, electric motors, soybean oil, sugar, phthalic anhydride and plasticizers, coal, paper, and tires.

Lower prices were reported for stainless steel and butyl acetate. Cadmium was in short supply.

PURCHASING AGENTS CONFIDENT

Despite the indicated rise in commodity prices, purchasing agents remain confident about the general business outlook, the association said. " 'Good' is the word most commonly used by purchasing executives in their October report to describe the current business picture, and remarks would indicate that they expect it to remain so for the balance of 1963," the group reported.

New order and production figures remained near September levels. There were 41 percent reporting an increase in new orders, down from 45 percent, and 10 percent reporting a decrease, down from 16 percent. New orders remained the same in October, according to 49 percent, up from 39 percent the month before.

Better production was reported by 42 percent, down slightly from 45 percent; 12 percent said production was worse, up from 10 percent; and 46 percent said it was the same, up from 45 percent.

"The automotive industry is the unquestioned leader in the present advance, pulling steel and others in its wake," the agents said. "However, study of the figures indicates that the broader base noted in earlier reports is still very much in evidence."

INVENTORY LIQUIDATION INCREASED

Liquidation of inventories increased in October, but the purchasing agents' report indicated it was "largely unplanned and considerably influenced by the jump in new order and production figures noted last month." Of the agents queried, 31 percent reported lower inventory levels, up from 26 percent in September; 14 percent reported higher stocks, down from 17 percent.

Only minor changes in forward commitments were noted in October, the agents said, adding: "Several comments from members indicate a fairly good level of capital spending with reasonable expectation of continuing improvement."

Employment continued to show improvement but at a slower rate than in September. Some 20 percent reported higher levels, down from 23 percent, and 14 percent said they had fewer employees, up from 12 percent. This was the 8th consecutive month, however, in which more agents reported higher levels than lower.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 8, 1963]

NEW INFLATION ROUND DUE?

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—Is the American consumer going to be hit by a new round of price inflation?

The Federal Reserve Board isn't saying "Yes." But it isn't saying "No." And it is keeping an anxious eye on daily price changes.

The continuing rise in steel prices is worrying the central bank. Last spring's so-called selective price increases have spread to a host of additional steel products in recent days and are showing signs of becoming an across-the-board movement.

Steel is a bellwether. Higher steel prices only slightly increase the cost of an automobile, or a refrigerator, or a machine tool, as the steel companies like to point out.

But they do add to the cost, and steel price movements have a potent psychological impact, too. When the steel companies lift their prices, other firms in other industries immediately start thinking that it may be time that they raised their prices.

The aluminum producers recently announced higher prices. Tire prices have gone up. So have the charges for clothing, carpets, paper products, cigarettes, sugar, and soft drinks. Most of the increases have ranged between 1 and 4 percent.

The Federal Reserve Board is revealing its inflation fears in a special 30-minute look at the economic situation that its crack economic staff is offering at 4 p.m. each day to commercial bankers who are here to attend the American Bankers Association convention.

The Federal Reserve is the agency that has the prime responsibility for protecting the value of the dollar. It regulates the money supply. Of all the Government agencies, it is the one that is most sensitive to inflation threats.

The central bank economists are making it plain that the Board wants to see more evidence before it concludes that a general price advance is underway.

They are noting with satisfaction that many prices are changing little, including automobile list prices.

Some prices even are coming down. They point to hides and leather, rubber, cement, plastics, stainless steel, and radio and television sets.

The broad Government price indexes are not rising as yet, but the Federal Reserve considers that its job is to start worrying before the barometer readings change.

The economists are reminding the bankers that the industrial price average has gone up, sometimes sharply, in other business upturns, but so far this time it has not.

It has been more than 5 years since prices last climbed rapidly in the United States, a record that everyone from President Kennedy on down would hate to see spoiled.

Wholesale prices now are only three-tenths of 1 percent above their average during the 3 years that ended in 1959. Consumer prices are up just over 7 percent, but they have been influenced more by the costs of services than by the prices of goods.

The administration and the Federal Reserve think price stability is important, not just to maintain confidence in the dollar at home and abroad, but to bolster the competitive position of U.S. merchandise against foreign products. They are counting on bigger export sales to help eliminate the multi-billion-dollar balance-of-payments deficit.

Frank R. Garfield, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, sums up the experts' views at the end of the daily talk and tells the bankers that the economists are not making a prediction about future price trends.

He says they do not regard the firming in numerous markets as conclusive evidence of the beginning of a widespread advance. But he adds that there are grounds for concern.

Mild Fall Favors Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the October 11 issue of the Hungry Horse News, one of Montana's better newspapers, carried an article which points out quite vividly what the accelerated public works projects are doing in Montana's Glacier National Park for the people of Montana and for the Nation as a whole.

The article entitled "Mild Fall Favors Construction," outlines the various projects constructed or now under construction in the park starting with the new 180-unit Fish Creek Campground and ending with the recently completed Lake McDonald Lodge.

These projects, totaling over half a million dollars, are not only creating jobs for unemployed Montanans, not only stimulating the construction industry and our lagging Montana economy, but are creating facilities which will serve visitors to this area for many generations to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN GLACIER PARK MILD FALL FAVORS CONSTRUCTION

WEST GLACIER.—Glacier National Park favored by mild fall weather has had a half million dollars in construction projects underway, reports Supt. Harthon L. Bill.

There will be a definite gain for park visitors, commented Superintendent Bill. The mild weather is permitting completion of the new 180-unit Fish Creek Campground and the new 50-unit campground at Bowman Lake. Rising Sun Campground with 80 family units that has been under construction this summer will be ready for visitors next summer.

Park Engineer Max Edgar pointed out that the mild fall is making possible construction at high elevations in Glacier.

On the Continental Divide at Logan Pass, Hefte Construction Co., Spokane, has a $135,414 contract for the new 4,500-square-foot visitor center. The contract is 60 percent completed, and employing up to 24 men.

UP AT SPERRY

Also near the Continental Divide at Sperry Chalets, Earl Gray Co., Great Falls, has started a $126,379 contract that includes new water and sewer systems and comfort stations at Sperry and Granite Park Chalets. There are 14 men working at Sperry.

The following contracts have October completions at the new Fish Creek Campground: Mountain Construction Co., Missoula, $72,202 for surfacing; Hefte Construction Co., Spokane, $21,598 for the ranger station duplex,

and $62,603 for eight comfort stations. Completed earlier this year was the $92,623 contract held by Kalispell Plumbing and Heating Co. for water and sewers and $5,089 for power service at the new campground.

Matelich Construction Co., Kalispell, is 50 percent completed with a $28,340 contract for the Fish Creek Amphitheater seating 375 persons.

Nearly completed is the Lyford Plumbing & Heating Co. $12,810 contract for the Bowman campground water supply and $25,613 for roads.

RISING SUN COMPLETED

Fedco Co., Spokane on September 13 completed the $55,987 road surfacing contract at Rising Sun campground.

In the windup stage is the Roy L. Shelby of Cut Bank contract for $19,825 providing utilities for the new Two Medicine entrance station. Contract for construction of the station is scheduled for award this fall.

Shelby has completed the $12,414 extension of utilities contract for the new St. Mary Visitor Center. Contract for the building is to be awarded this fall.

Montana Builders, Kalispell, is 60 percent completed on a $48,837 contract for an eight-unit seasonal apartment building at park headquarters. Mountain Construction, Missoula, this month completed the $35,022 contract for surfacing roads and parking as well as sidewalk construction at the new administration building.

ROBINSON CONTRACT

About 85 percent completed is the $126,528 contract held by N. D. Robinson, Missoula, for the 12-mile clearing of the new road between Apgar and the Flathead's North Fork. A bid call for the North Fork Bridge is expected before next spring.

Completed August 19 was the $484,917 contract held by Naranche and Konda, Butte, for the 8-mile road into Two Medicine.

These are all Mission 66 projects to improve Glacier for the increasing number of visitors.

Last of the accelerated public works projects in Glacier finished this fall was at Lake McDonald Lodge where Sentry Automatic Sprinkler Co., Tacoma, had a $19,909 contract.

World War I Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each year, the pressures brought to bear upon Members of Congress by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., for their primary legislative objective has been increased. By the same token, however, their tactics have come to the attention of the press, and day by day on an increasing basis, editorials have appeared throughout the country serving notice on elected officials of the inherent dangers of such a pension program.

Such an editorial appeared recently in the Holyoke Daily Transcript, of Holyoke, Mass., for October 31, 1963:

THE HAND IS OUT AGAIN

A parliamentary tactic that barely missed last year is being used again by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., to pressure Congress into an unwise pension bill.

The tactic is the discharge petition, a seldom-used device to bypass a congressional committee. If a majority of the House of Representatives signs the petition, the bill is taken from committee and acted upon by the House.

In 1962 the petition needed only eight signatures to succeed. It missed because several influential Congressmen removed their names when they saw how close the dangerous piece of legislation was coming. They had signed the petition originally on the erroneous assumption that the sponsoring pressure group could not possibly get enough signatures.

The bill that the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., want action on is H.R. 2332, a billion-dollar grab that would provide a monthly pension of $100 for veterans of at least 90 days' service in the First War, with very liberal income limitations—$3,600 for single veterans and $4,800 for those with dependents.

The bill is the first that would not tie veterans' benefits to need. Degree of disability, whether or not service connected, has no bearing on eligibility. Those already on the pension rolls with a far greater need than the many thousands who would benefit from H.R. 2332 would not be helped in the slightest. Yet this monstrous giveaway that doesn't do the right job would cost $1.3 billion the first year, and the cumulative cost over the next 35 years is $20 billion.

The Kennedy administration, like the Eisenhower administration before it, opposes this all-inclusive approach to veterans' pensions. Not only is the bill economically unfeasible, it introduces a new and unsound basis for pensions that ignores the need factor.

We reiterate our support for pension help to the disabled and those in need. But we cannot go along with the idea that Uncle Sam in Washington ought to provide something for everyone who had the privilege of serving in uniform during World War I or any other war, for that matter.

Congressmen BOLAND and CONTE will do their country a service if they refuse to knuckle under the pressure that will be brought by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs Helps Give Nation Defense in Chemical and Biological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, from the Atlanta Journal of November 3 I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent statement about the work of Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, a great leader who has helped immeasurably to give this Nation a modern capability and defense in chemical and biological warfare.

The article follows:

"BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATORS" GOAL OF CHEMICAL WARFARE

(By Darrell Garwood)

WASHINGTON, November 2.—Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, a young 57 despite his white hair, doffed his uniform last week with a goal almost realized.

The goal, associated ironically with the deadliest weapons in a division of warfare known as chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR), is to make possible a war in which no one would be killed or seriously injured.

Stubbs, a 1929 West Point graduate and native and resident of Superior, Nebr., headed the CBR effort during 5 years in which its budget was doubled, then doubled again to a level well over $100 million a year.

He filed for retirement from military service effective October 31. But the CBR effort is wrapped in such a thick veil of secrecy that even as he stepped into civilian clothes he could not discuss it in detail.

Reliable information, however, confirms these aspects of the big push in chemical warfare which the $100 million appropriations suggests:

Around half of the expanding budget has gone into research on "benevolent incapacitators." These would sleep or render him temporarily witless.

Within 2 years, this research promises to advance to a point where the United States could present a plan for giving the Nation overwhelming superiority in benevolent weapons.

For a total outlay of about $10 billion spread over 5 years, equaling only one-fifth of the U.S. military budget for 1 year, these might provide the answer to everything except nuclear weapons. And there is growing belief that, in the interests of self-survival, the latter might not be used.

"The main thing at the moment is to pursue our research as vigorously as possible, with the aid of all pharmaceutical companies and all the technology on which we can lay our hands," Stubbs told UPI in a farewell interview.

"I myself think there are important developments just over the horizon. They won't mean that there will be no deaths from the byproducts of war, because war is always going to be hell and there will be some loss of life. But the weapons themselves can be completely harmless."

Perhaps as important as the scientific developments in the realization of Stubbs' goal would be a change in public attitude and an untangling of international law to make it acceptable to the Western and neutral worlds.

Because they are lumped with poison gas and germ warfare under the general heading of CBR, the United States is now considered to be committed against the use of incapacitators, including laughing and tear gas, except as retaliation in kind, while reserving the right to use its biggest city busters.

Actually, the United States is not a party to any treaty banning chemical and biological warfare. But a declaration by President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the start of World War II is considered to be the binding policy of the Government until it is changed.

Thus, a simple statement by President Kennedy could change the policy. This could take the form of a declaration continuing the ban on nonretaliatory use of deadly agents while reserving the right to use benevolent incapacitators.

The Russians have shown an equal interest in incapacitators, according to their open literature, and are equally free from a policy standpoint as far as the United States and its allies are concerned. In the mood of the nuclear test ban treaty, military leaders believe they might join in making such a distinction.

The Soviets signed the 1925 Geneva protocol outlawing chemical warfare at a time when this was thought of in terms of mustard and phosgene gas, but attached a qualification voiding the protocol in the case of nonsigners and their allies. The United States never ratified that agreement.

A continuation of the ban, such as it is, against deadly chemicals could be strongly based on the fact that these are far more lethal and practical than those known in the last use of gas in World War I.

Stubbs said a single cubic centimeter of the German nerve gases which the United States and Russia have both stockpiled, releases enough fumes to kill 600 persons. A centimeter is less than a half inch. The stuff vaporizes rapidly when dropped or released from a missile or shell as a solid. The nerve gases are sudden death—within 2 or 3 minutes. They paralyze the nerves, contract the muscles, and prevent breathing. But a similar appearing pellet, or a few thousand of them, might put a community or an army to sleep for whatever length of time it took to move in and take over.

There is one respect in which chemical and bilogical weapons are not comparable to nuclear types. They require an element of surprise, because a forewarned and industrially advanced enemy could be prepared against them. This puts a premium on secrecy concerning new developments.

The chief elements in defense is the ordinary gas mask, costing about $5 each, which will screen out all known gases and many germ agents. Steps by a nation to equip its citizens with gas masks might be the first indication that the CBR warfare was to be expected.

South Bend-Mishawaka Labor Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for several years the South Bend-Mishawaka area has been pictured as a bad labor area, largely because of an unfortunate record of 94 labor stoppages occurring in 1957 among the 49 major industries of the area. Although the number dropped to 39 the next year and for the first 6 months of 1963 reached a low of only 6, the image of bad labor relations has haunted the community, presenting barriers to industrial growth and economic development.

The mayors of South Bend and Mishawaka established a nonpartisan labor-management commission whose findings have been recently released. They show that the bad labor area image is false and that today, in fact, South Bend-Mishawaka is fully as good in this respect as other industrial centers and better than many. The commission survey covered 49 industries with more than 25,000 workers, 4,700 members of the Teamsters Union, and more than 3,700 members in 20 unions of the St. Joseph County Building Trades Council. In 6 years the record of these nearly 35,000 workers showed that man-days lost because of work stoppages amounted to only nine-tenths of 1 percent for nearly 53 million man-days of employment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summmary of the South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA LABOR RECORD

SOUTH BEND, IND.—South Bend and the rest of St. Joseph County have made spectacular advances in labor-management relations in the last 6 years, especially in the last 3, to reverse what once was called a bad labor area image.

The report was documented by the South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission after a detailed analysis of both labor contract-authorized and unauthorized work stoppages in 49 industries employing the bulk of factory workers in the area.

The commission further cited South Bend and Mishawaka, with a combined population of 180,000, as "one of the most productive industrial centers in the Nation."

The study led to these findings:

1. The 49 principal industries in 1963 to date reduced their combined work stoppages by 93.6 percent in comparison with figures in 1957, selected as a base year for the survey. They employed 25,780 hourly rated workers.

2. The six largest industries in the area reported an even better experience, a reduction of 95.5 percent between 1963 and 1957.

3. Thirty of the 49 firms did not record a single work stoppage in some 8,944,000 man-days of work in the 1957–63 period. The 30 firms employed an average of 5,504 hourly rated workers.

4. Of the 19 firms that reported work stoppage experience since 1957, 11 employers told of only 1 work stoppage each in the 6 years.

5. Teamsters Local 364, representing an additional work force of 4,700, reported only 14 work stoppages and a total of 97 negotiated work agreements since 1957, with only 4/100 of 1 percent of man-days lost out of the total worked.

6. The St. Joseph County Building Trades Council, made up of 20 local unions with a membership of 3,741, recorded only 80 man-days lost because of work stoppages out of 6,546,750 man-days of work since 1957.

The survey covered an annual average of 34,221 hourly rated workers represented by the St. Joseph County AFL–CIO Council, the Teamsters and the building trades council. It excluded thousands of persons employed in salaried and administrative job classifications.

Man-days lost because of work stoppages in the more than 6 years covered in the survey amounted to nine-tenths of 1 percent of the 52,836,248 man-days of employment.

Economists Question Wisdom of Administration's Fiscal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in an article in the November 4 New York Times entitled "Cracks in the Tax Wall," M. J. Rossant has pointed out that a growing number of economists are having second thoughts about the administration's fiscal program of tax cuts accompanied by higher levels of Federal spending. Among those whom Mr. Rossant cites are Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, former Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers and professor of economics at Barnard College; Prof. George Stigler, of the University of Chicago; Prof. William Fellner, of Yale University; and Prof. Rendigs Fels, of Vanderbilt University.

Dr. Fellner has pointed out, for example, that the administration's plan to cut taxes while increasing spending may "have inflationary consequences." While Dr. Fellner is not opposed to some reduction in tax rates, he does feel that the administration has "overestimated the sluggishness of the economy considerably."

Both Dr. Fellner and Dr. Fels question the wisdom of trying to decide now what cuts should be made in January 1965. In questioning the wisdom of the administration's decision to cut taxes on special dates in the future regardless of intervening changes in economic conditions, Dr. Fels says the administration may miss the chance to time tax cuts when they will do the most good and runs the risk that it may aggravate a boom rather than counter a decline. Dr. Fels also questions whether a tax reduction can head off or postpone a recession.

Under unanimous consent, I include the M. J. Rossant column from the November 4 New York Times in the RECORD:

CRACKS IN THE TAX WALL—TOP U.S. ECONOMISTS JOIN DISSENTERS IN EXPRESSING DOUBTS ON KENNEDY BID

(By M. J. Rossant)

Cracks are appearing in the allegedly solid front erected by economists in support of the Kennedy administration's tax reduction program. Most academic economists are in favor of tax cuts as the best means of stimulating, and sustaining the expansion of business activity.

They agree with the administration's view that a reduction in the tax burden would help reduce unemployment and give the monetary authorities greater freedom in their battle to stem the outflow of dollars.

But there are dissenters. A number of liberal economists, who were all for public spending a few years ago, would prefer to combine tax cuts with increases in Government outlays. Forced to choose between the two, some would undoubtedly still favor stepping up spending in the public sector.

OTHERS HAVE DOUBTS

Liberals, however, are not the only ones who may have doubts about the Administration's tax program. Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers in the latter days of the Eisenhower administration, was an early and outspoken opponent of both a rise in spending and a big cut in taxes. Prof. George Stigler, of the University of Chicago, has also adopted an iconoclastic attitude toward tax reduction.

They are no longer the only academic voices in the wilderness. Prof. William Fellner of Yale University, for example, criticizes the administration's tax proposals as "oversized" in the latest issue of Challenge magazine.

Another attack, much more veiled in nature, by Prof. Rendigs Fels of Vanderbilt University, appeared in a recent issue of the Review of Economics and Statistics.

The only common feature in the comments of these academicians is their skepticism about the Kennedy administration's program. Dr. Fellner points out that the administration's plans reveal "an inclination to play safe in a single direction—against deflation." He feels the size of the proposed tax cuts coupled with some spending increases, may "have inflationary consequences."

Dr. Fels is more concerned about the administration's argument that its tax cuts provide recession insurance. He thinks that

part of the future cut should "be reserved to take place at the time that the next downturn has been recognize," because "heading off a reecssion requires a delicacy of timing and accuracy in forecasting turning points that are quite impossible."

Their arguments may lead to fresh desertions in the ranks of the academicians. As yet, they have not been answered by either the administration's economists or those in the universities who have spoken out for tax reduction.

In making his case, Dr. Fellner favors some reduction in tax rates in order "to make it easier for the economy to rise to higher levels of resource utilization." But he insists that reductions must be moderate if the Nation is to avoid "aggravating our balance-of-payments problems and * * * stimulating inflationary pressures."

The administration, according to Dr. Fellner, has "overestimated the sluggishness of the economy considerably." Business activity is now rising rapidly, so the stimulus of tax cuts and continued deficit spending could lead to excesses and distortions.

Dr. Fellner suggests that the administration either reduce expenditures or reduce the size of the first stage of tax reductions for individuals. He adds that "we should not try to decide now whether in January 1965 further cuts in individual rates may be necessary."

In making this suggestion, Dr. Fellner arrives at the same conclusion as Dr. Fels. But their reasons differ.

Dr. Fels' major point is that the Kennedy administration has failed to recognize some of the most important economic facts of life in the formulation of its tax program.

He is convinced that the timing of tax reduction can have an important influence on the course of business activity. Bad timing can nullify its impact, or even exacerbate existing conditions. Good timing, as he sees it, can stimulate business or moderate declining tendencies.

Dr. Fels cites the experience of past recessions and recoveries to back up his contention that "at one stage of the business cycle, namely shortly after a turning point, it is possible to predict business conditions well enough to base policy decisions on the prediction."

He goes on to claim that "turns can be identified with certainty 3 to 6 months after they occur," adding that "the economy has a built-in mechanism that keeps it going in the same direction once it has fairly started."

If these assumptions are correct, then it is difficult to dispute Dr. Fels' observation that the administration's decision to cut taxes "on specific dates in 1964 and 1965 regardless of intervening changes in economic conditions is to miss the chance to time them when they will do the most good and to run the risk that one or the other will aggravate a boom instead of countering a decline."

WAIT FOR TURNING POINT

In Dr. Fels' estimation, it would be far wiser to wait until a turning point has arrived before deciding on what measures are needed. He questions whether tax reduction can actually head off or postpone a recession, pointing out that there was a decline in economic activity in 1949 even though taxes had been reduced the previous year.

There is always a risk that waiting until a recession strikes may result in policies that are both too little and too late. Dr. Fels, though, disagrees.

Since it takes considerable time before the economy returns to full employment, he observes, "there is opportunity to take action to combat a contraction without running too great a risk of contributing to instability."

Freedom of Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am concerned over the recent ruling by the Federal Communications Commission on the so-called fairness doctrine, which is to be applied to broadcasters in deciding whether their broadcasting licenses should be renewed by the FCC. As I have studied this ruling, it appears to be designed primarily to serve in implementing the Reuther Memorandum of 1961. In that memorandum, the Reuther brothers advised the Attorney General that pressures should be brought to bear against broadcasters in their use of programs and materials which reflect the conservative political point of view. This constitutes a most dangerous threat to freedom of thought and the right of the public to have more than just the left wing point of view presented over our Nation's airways. This is another attempt to get our Nation to speak with one voice—the voice which preaches economic and social equality over personal liberty.

The public is already subjected to a constant barrage of left wing broadcasters by the three major radio and television networks. If this so-called fairness doctrine is to be applied by the Federal Communications Commission with fairness, it would be well to begin applying the doctrine with the broadcasts of the networks because of the monopoly which the networks have on national broadcasting.

Mr. President, one of the broadcasting programs which has already felt adverse effects from FCC intimidation of local radio stations in accordance with the new interpretation of the fairness doctrine is the Manion Forum which is broadcast weekly over a few hundred radio stations across the country. I have been impressed with the Manion Forum broadcast of October 27 in which the producer of this program, Dean Clarence E. Manion, former dean of the Notre Dame School of Law, discussed the application of the fairness doctrine and its effects on his and other conservative broadcasting programs.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this broadcast by Dean Manion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO YOU WANT FEDERAL CENSORSHIP FOR YOUR LOCAL RADIO STATION?

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

What I plan to say to you today requires some background information. These weekly broadcasts of the Manion Forum have been on the air for more than 9 years. Our broadcast time is bought and paid for by our sponsors and supporters. Hundreds of distinguished men have shared this microphone with me from week to week. None of us has ever been accused of using it for libel, slander or misrepresentation of fact.

Through the years, our broadcasting network has grown from the original 29 stations to more than 300 at the present time. Millions of people listen to the Manion Forum program every week. However, during the past month we have been told by one radio and television station after another that its management is finding it impossible to continue to broadcast this program because of new and confusing directives from the Federal Communications Commission.

If these stations are correct in their interpretation of this new approach by the FCC, then our country is facing a dangerous blackout on the freedom of speech. For that reason, this broadcast will deal with your basic right to hear it, as well as those that are scheduled to follow it during the weeks to come.

What I have to say concerns the station to which you are now listening. I know that many of these stations are profoundly alarmed by this new development but under the circumstances they are unable to speak for themselves. This broadcast is pertinent to every program that you hear on the air at any time during the day or night.

If you object to any of these programs, please remember that the most appropriate and effective censor of anything heard on the radio is the person who listens to it. You can accomplish that censorship by the simple expedient of turning your dial to another station.

The listener is the customer at which every program and every so-called commercial is aimed. The listener's acceptance of these offerings is essential to their maintenance on the air and to the profit and progress of the station that uses them.

When you object to any program, or to the system or sequence of programing, the station will hear about it sooner or later whether you register that objection in writing or more simply by turning the dial on your radio set. As soon as your objections are reflected in the radio ratings, the station obliges you with appropriate changes.

The simple law of demand, supply, and survival requires every privately owned and privately controlled radio station to cater to your wishes. This adds up to local self-government for radio and television, and that is exactly as it should be.

You undoubtedly know that every radio and television station operates under a special license granted by the Federal Government acting through the Federal Communications Commission. This official permission for the exclusive use of the designated air channel puts certain basic responsibilities upon the licensee.

All of its broadcasting programs must be decent and decorous. It must not give scandal, distort facts, nor permit its facilities to be used for the defamation of any person, group, or institution. Within these moral and legal limitations, the radio station is expected to speak out for good and against evil and to provide a fair forum on reasonable terms for the discussion of public questions.

In this context today, a free radio is just as essential to the public good of our free society as a free press. From the very inception of radio broadcasting in this country, the day-to-day execution of this responsibility has been left to the judgment of the individual licensee, with the understanding that its conduct will be subject to review by the Commission at the end of each 3-year period when the license is required to be renewed.

This principle of conscientious self-government was recognized by the Commission in its official report made in June 1949 (docket No. 8516). This became known as the fairness doctrine. It stated in part:

"It should be recognized that there can be no all-embracing formula which licensees can hope to apply to insure the fair and balanced presentation of public issues. Different issues will inevitably require different techniques of presentation and production. The licensee will in each instance be called upon to exercise his best judgment and good sense in determining what subjects should be considered, the particular format of the program to be devoted to each subject, the different shades of opinion to be presented and the spokesmen for each point of view.

"In determining whether to honor specific requests for time, the station will inevitably be confronted with such questions as whether the subject is worthy of consideration, whether the viewpoint of the requesting party has already received a sufficient amount of broadcast time, or whether there may not be other available groups or individuals who might be more appropriate spokesmen for the particular point of view than the person making the request."

NEW DIRECTIVE CIRCUMVENTS ORIGINAL GUIDELINE

The radio broadcasting industry has operated under this formula for its station-by-station local self-government for 14 years. In the extended and firsthand experience of the Manion Forum, this self-governing formula has worked very well indeed. It is true that certain stations have refused, arbitrarily, to sell the Manion Forum any radio or television time, but while these refusals are annoying and probably unlawful, they are, nevertheless, exceptional.

This evil must be balanced against the inevitable alternative and the alternative to station-by-station self-government is uniform Federal control of all radio and television programing.

Such complete Federal control is precisely what the new July 26, 1963, Public Notice of the FCC is calculated to bring about.

Remember now, that in 1949 the Federal Communications Commission stated, "There can be no all-embracing formula which licensees can hope to apply to insure the fair and balanced presentation of public issues."

Now, however, the FCC has come up with such a formula. Its July 26, 1963, public notice says this:

"When a controversial program involves a personal attack upon an individual or organization, the licensee must transmit the text of the broadcast to the person or group attacked wherever located, either prior to or at the time of the broadcast with a specific offer of his station's facilities for an adequate response."

There is more, but consider that directive for a moment. Literally interpreted, this language means that if a Manion Forum broadcast attacks Khrushchev and Castro, each of our 300 stations must get the exact language of the attack to both of these characters wherever they are located, prior to or at the time of the broadcast—with an offer of free time (note that), for each to reply.

Yes, the FCC has said in another public notice (B), dated last September 19 (Rept. No. 4800), that the station cannot reject an opposing viewpoint "and thus leave the public uninformed" merely because the person or group attacked—in this case Castro and Khrushchev—cannot get anybody to pay for or sponsor their rebuttal.

By the same token, it must now be assumed, that if a radio sports reporter declares that the St. Louis Cardinals are superior to the Los Angeles Dodgers, free time on the offending station must be made available for an adequate reply by and for the Dodgers. Or, if the B Tobacco Co. pays for a commercial which alleges that its package contains the mildest cigarette on the market, all competing companies can demand free time for their respective answers.

The July 1963 notice of the FCC goes on to say:

"When a licensee permits the use of his facilities for the presentation of views regarding an issue of current importance such as racial segregation, integration or any other issue of public importance, he must offer spokesmen for other responsible groups within the community similar opportunities for the expression of the contrasting viewpoints of their respective groups. In particular, the views of the leaders of the Negro and other community groups as to the issue of racial segregation, integration, or discrimination * * * must obviously be considered and reflected."

How many free replies are contemplated by the above directive? The radio stations would like to know. Meanwhile, they will be inclined to avoid all discussion of these or any other issues of public importance.

EXAMPLES OF FAIRNESS DOCTRINE INTERPRETATION

Particularly they will avoid programs that criticize policies of the Federal Government. The risk to the station which depends upon the grace of the FCC for an early renewal of its license is very grave indeed.

A few weeks ago, the "Manion Forum" presented a broadcast by Mr. John C. Satterfield, a past president of the American Bar Association, who pointed out dangerous features in the administration's proposed and pending Civil Rights Act (Manion Forum Broadcast No. 468). To my knowledge, this 15-minute program was the first nationwide coverage that any extended criticism of this proposed legislation had received, and this in spite of hours of free television and radio time that had been extended to proponents of this legislation and particularly concerning the memorable march on Washington.

Nevertheless, the NAACP demanded free time to reply to Mr. Satterfield's address and an undetermined number of our stations complied with the demand because they believed that they were required to do so by the language of the new FCC fairness doctrine that I have just quoted.

Last August, when the "Manion Forum" initiated a series of broadcasts opposing ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty, that agreement had been praised, plugged, and defended on radio and television almost hourly by a bevy of its supporters, including President Kennedy.

In fact and truth, these "Manion Forum" broadcasts were our attempts, with purchased time, to make at least a token reply to the roaring volume of protreaty broadcasting that had reverberated on the Nation's airwaves for weeks.

Nevertheless, when our first broadcasts on the subject were made by Adm. Chester Ward and Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, a new organization suddenly appeared which called itself the Citizens Committee for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and demanded free reply time from all of the stations that had aired the "Manion Forum" and antitreaty broadcasts.

Because of the FCC's 1963 refurbished directive concerning the fairness doctrine, a number of these stations felt obliged to give the new citizens committee free time for their rebuttal.

What the FCC has done by its July 26, 1963, public notice is to require every broadcaster who wishes to be fair, either to expose himself to unbearable sanctions by the Commission or to cease expressing or broadcasting views on controversial subjects. This means that a "cease and desist" order has been made against all local programs which criticize the policies of the Federal Government.

To the already established policy of Washington news management, the FCC now adds a new policy calling for a radio news blackout at the level of the local community. Of course, it will not interfere with the approved liberal line that flows in constantly over the three big networks, and the President's "command performances" on radio and television in support of his proposals will continue as usual. But it does mean that what you will hear over the air when the new rule is fully effective will have been approved by the Federal Government.

This is centralized censorship in its most reprehensible form. It violates the Federal Communications Act which created the FCC and which says "no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the Commission which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communication." (47 U.S.C.A. 326.)

If you want the truth "jammed" as it is now being jammed behind the Iron Curtain, that is one thing. But if you want a continuation of free speech on the airwaves—then send this broadcast to your Congressman and tell him to ask for an investigation.

Hard Work Making Youth Conservation Camp a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on September 22, 1963, in the Indianapolis Star there appeared an article entitled: "Hard Work Making Youth Conservation Camp a Success." The article described the new youth conservation program inaugurated recently by the Governor's Youth Council. The camp in scenic Harrison State Forest is located about 5 miles west of Corydon, Ind., and has 90 boys in its program at present.

The program of the camp, geared along military lines, is designed for young men who have dropped from high school or are unable to get steady jobs. In addition to providing hard physical work for city boys, the camp has an educational program aimed largely at vocational education and developing basic skills.

The article gives an excellent account of the Youth Conservation Camp, a very essential part of the maturation of these boys. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Indiana Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEARED ALONG MILITARY LINES: HARD WORK MAKING YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMP A SUCCESS

(By Richard E. Cady)

CORYDON, IND.—Hard work and determination on the part of some 90 young men are helping to make Indiana's fledgling youth conservation camp a success.

The 5-acre camp in scenic Harrison State Forest about 5 miles west of Corydon, is geared on a rigid work and study program which has been accepted enthusiastically by youths participating in the experimental project.

And, camp officials say, most of the campers are city boys, strangers to the camp's lumberjack regimen.

Many of the youths were either flaccid and flabby or thin and pale when they arrived at the camp. But after 2½ weeks of hard work and study they are beginning to shape up.

Designed for young men who have dropped from high school or are unable to get steady jobs, the camp is on the site of a former Civilian Conservation Corps camp vacant for two decades except for brief use by a 4-H club.

Although the program is geared somewhat along military lines, it is by no means strictly all work and no play.

Actually, the emphasis is on education, particularly vocational education, according to National Guard Col. Walter B. Fries, of Indianapolis, and David W. Bowell, of Carmel, codirectors.

With 22,000 acres of forest around them and assisted by trainees from the Department of Conservation's Forestry Division, the campers have a long and rigorous day.

Reveille is at 6 a.m. and after dressing, the youths take in 15 to 20 minutes of calisthenics, then have chow, typically bacon and eggs, toast, milk, and coffee.

About 7:30 they leave for the field. Workers are divided into 10 crews of 8 to 10 men with a Conservation trainee leader or sergeant.

Seven of the crews work in the forest while the rest stay in camp to work on renovating the worn camp building.

After lunch the campers have a brief free period for rest, reading or writing letters home.

Then it's back to work until 5 p.m. and supper.

Evenings are devoted to classwork and studying until about 9:30, Bowell, a former school principal and former principal director of a Youth-for-Christ camp in Muscatatuck State Park, said.

School emphasizes development of basic skills through the aid of vocational and aptitude tests. Reading, basic arithmetic, and other courses are given, with a special reading program designed by Skill Center Inc. of Chicago, since a reading handicap is the campers' largest problem.

Most of the campers are school dropouts. "We try to teach as much as we possibly can in the short period of two months we have," Bowell said. "We do everything we can to help them find jobs, then encourage them to return to school."

Some of the campers admit they have given no thought about after the program ends, but others said they will really get down to business once they return home.

Classes are divided according to ability. The average pupil has a reading ability of eighth grade, 6 months.

Besides aiding reading skills, good personal habits are emphasized, and each camper is taught to cultivate self-discipline.

Beds are made every morning, and clothing is hung properly. "I used to just throw my clothes on the floor at home," said a Gary youth, "but now I put them in the right place."

Of the original 100 campers, Colonel Fries said, 10 had to be returned home, due to improper screening which failed to detect physical or mental handicaps.

Ample meals: Steak, mashed potatoes, peas, tossed salad, and apple cobbler was on the lunch menu last Tuesday; are prepared by campers assigned to kitchen work.

And some campers actually have asked to be assigned permanently to KP, Colonel Fries said.

A home touch and supervision is provided in the mess hall by Mrs. Floyd M. Beanblossom and Mrs. Cecil W. Travel, both of Corydon.

Recreation includes various sports; they have some exceptional wrestlers, and a television set occupies a place of honor in the recreation hall, which also doubles as a classroom.

Use of an 8½-ton Army amphibious "duck" has provided some lively moments, and the protuberant vehicle also serves as ideal transportation for the campers when they go into Corydon on Sunday, which they have to themselves, for church services.

Training in first aid, firefighting, and civil defense is given with the aid of movies. Noneducational films also are shown.

Lights go out about 11 p.m.

Sponsored by the Indiana Youth Council, Conservation Department, National Guard, Employment Security Division, and Department of Public Instruction, cost of the camp is estimated at $50,000 for 2 months.

Campers, who are between 18 and 23 years old, cannot have criminal records. All were unemployed when they were accepted for the camp by applying through the Employment Security Division.

They are paid $75 monthly plus room and board. Of the salary they are given $25 monthly and the remaining $50 is put aside until the program ends.

Many of the campers have found group living new and have taken well to the supervision of the conservation trainees, who act in a capacity similar to that of YMCA counselors.

Altogether, 28 conservation workers—14 each month—are participating in the program under the direction of John M. Wood.

Senator BIRCH E. BAYH, JR., Democrat, of Indiana, has called the camp a model for the United States, which he hopes can be continued through executive legislation.

And from the way things are shaping up—it is no longer a lark to some campers who had expected a less rigorous program—it may well become just that.

A Tax Cut Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the prepared testimony of a witness before the Senate Finance Committee relating to the pending tax bill. The witness that I refer to is Mr. William Stix Wasserman, a respected investment counselor, economist, and businessman.

The observations of Mr. Wasserman relating to H.R. 8363—the tax bill—and the Federal budget merit serious consideration. He speaks from many years of experience in fiscal and monetary matters. I ask unanimous consent to have the testimony of Mr. William Wasserman printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. WILLIAM STIX WASSERMAN BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

My name is William Stix Wasserman. For the past 40 years, I have been actively engaged in business—first as a manufacturer and then as an investment banker. During this period, I represented the United States as the American delegate to the World Economic Conference held in Berlin in 1932, as an employer's delegate to the ILO in Geneva, and as chief of the first U.S. lend-lease mission to Australia during the Second World War.

I believe in the free-enterprise system as the best approach mankind has yet devised for solving his economic and social problems. At the same time, I must point out that economic systems must evolve with the times, and that attempts to prevent necessary and essential changes court decay. This tax bill, H.R. 8363, is in tune with today's necessities. It presents an enlightened new approach to the problem of the business cycle. It is the first attempt our Government has ever made to forestall a cyclical downturn before it occurs. In essence, the central problem of our times is to maintain a high rate of employment and full usage of our plant and material resources so that we can successfully compete with the growing economies of the free world. At the risk of oversimplyfying, let me point out that this tax bill will cause a chain reaction which will result in both increased employment and a solution of our balance of international payments problem. By putting increased purchasing power into the hands of the public, our lagging capital goods industries will be revitalized. This will produce a period of full employment and prosperity which, in turn, will attract foreign capital and bring about a decrease in the export of American capital as new investment opportunities develop at home.

Those who object to the passage of this bill on the grounds that it will create a budgetary deficit so inflationary as to cause a further run on our gold supply are laboring under a misconception as to the true nature of our present economy.

An unbalanced budget, in and of itself, is not inflationary so long as there is an overabundant labor supply and unused plant capacity. With the exception of the inflation of the first Truman administration, when there were actual shortages, such inflationary price rises as we have had have been the result of a wage-price spiral created by a tacit agreement between big labor and big business to pass along to the public, in the form of higher prices, the cost of increased wages and profits. As a result of these agreements, the normal forces of supply and demand became inoperative and even in times of severe unemployment and great overcapacity, prices rose.

It is high time we realized that the budget of our Government has nothing in common with that of a housewife. It is much more realistic to compare it with that of a large corporation that is expanding its plant in relation to the population growth and increasing demand for its product. Such corporations always have two budgets: a capital budget and an operating budget. It is essential that the operating budget be balanced at all times by operating income, including the debt service of any moneys borrowed for capital expansion. But corporations rarely attempt to pay for their capital goods expansion out of a single year's profits. Similarly, we as a nation should divide our budget into a capital budget, where moneys spent on actual capital goods should be allocated, and an operating budget, where moneys spent on Government operation should be allocated. This is the policy of practically every major European country whose governments have not been frightened by the periodic cries that we hear from the distressed and ignorant public that we are living beyond our means. So long as our money is being spent for the useful enrichment of the Nation, so that for each dollar of debt there is a tangible asset, we need not worry about our budgetary deficits in times of abnormal unemployment, provided we cover our operating costs by current taxation. This does not mean for one moment that I am advocating a program of foolish public expenditures or boondoggling or public spending solely for the purpose of spending. I am merely stating that after giving private in-

dustry strong incentives to expand—and this bill gives industry these incentives—the Nation could profitably put to work the remaining resources, both human and material, in such public works as the Nation requires, provided that in so doing we do not stretch our capacity to the point of inflationary stresses that a program of overspending might induce. As a practical yardstick of restraint, we might well put a limit on the growth of the public debt, except in periods of emergency, by restricting its expansion to the rate of population growth or the rate of increase in our national income.

Finally, one more word about debt. Our debt becomes burdensome only when its servicing requires too large a proportion of the national income. In the old days, we cured the excess of debt by letting the economy "go through the wringer," but then almost everybody was self-employed or on a farm. Employees made up only about 10 or 15 percent of the population. Today, about 85 percent of our people are dependent on weekly paychecks, and if they are laid off, they have no farms to return to; as for their "savings," they are to a large extent in the form of durable goods which could not readily be sold under such circumstances.

Under these conditions, it has become essential to our own survival to see to it that the economy be kept going at a sufficient momentum to keep employment at a high level. We have learned the imperative of governmental interference if we are to preserve our free enterprise system against the hazard of a massive depression which would surely destroy it. It is for this reason that the more sophisticated European economists and bankers heartily endorse the administration's tax bill—because they realize that prosperity in this country is essential not only to the stability of the dollar but also to their own industrial well-being. Therefore, those people who oppose the tax bill on the ground that it would weaken the dollar clearly demonstrate that they do not understand what governs the value of our money or the true facts of our international balance of payments. Money throughout the free world consists primarily of credit, namely, bank deposit money. Between 90 to 95 percent of the business of this country is done by check, and the money that we use in these transactions is bank money, or bank credit.

This credit is under the strict surveillance and control of the Federal Reserve Board. It is within their power to increase or decrease its volume in relation to needs arising out of our business, the growth of the country, and the necessities of keeping our money stable in value. Gold has long ceased to be a major component in our money system. In fact, the world should have learned this lesson prior to the Second World War, when, despite predictions by economists that Germany could never wage war because she had no gold, Hitler restored Germany to prosperity and built the greatest war machine in the history of mankind. Dr. Schact had convinced him that production alone was the real source of wealth and that as long as the volume of credit was intelligently controlled, gold was superfluous. Conversely, in the depression of the 1930's, we experienced the greatest period of unemployment and industrial stagnation in our history at a time when our central banks and Treasury were bulging with gold.

And yet in spite of this, the old economic myths still hold sway over the minds of a great many of our businessmen and the public in general. They fail to realize just how strong the dollar is, or that our loss of gold reserves has in fact strengthened our economy rather than hurt it. The gold we have lost was used in part to purchase and develop a large part of the oil resources of the free world; we have built refining plants, distribution stations, and pipelines throughout the free world, all of which are returning to us a substantial profit on our investment. We have invested in the automobile factories of the free world, so that today we own approximately one-third of them. We own a major share of the communications facilities and manufacturing plants of the free world. Never was gold better spent. We have invested wisely and productively. In fact, for my part, I would be very happy to see the balance of our gold reserves traded for similar profitable investments in the full knowledge that the value of our currency was much more soundly based on the ownership of productive assets and the productivity of our people than in the sterile hoarding of an idle metal. As a matter of fact, to be hamstrung in the expansion of our economy and in our taxation and trade policies because of the whims of an Arab sheik, the sale of Russian hoards, or the production of South African semislave labor is the strange situation in which we, supposedly the most civilized nation in the world, now find ourselves. This, however, is the subject of another discussion.

In the long run, the dollar is worth what it can buy, and what it will buy is the result of the relation between production on one hand and the amount of money outstanding on the other. That amount, as I have said before, is subject to the control of the Federal Reserve Board, which has it in its power to regulate the volume of credit through the control of bank reserves. As long as this Nation sells more than it buys abroad, which it now does, and is the world's greatest creditor Nation, and as long as the dollar will buy what it does currently, the value of our money in the long run would not, in my opinion, be affected if we did not have a single ounce of gold with which to back it up. In fact, the shoe is on the other foot—the thing that makes gold valuable is the fact that it is exchangeable for usable currency. Today the dollar will buy more per unit of currency than any other currency in the world. It will buy more oil, more coal, more food at a cheaper rate than you can find anywhere else. In spite of the fact that our labor rates are double and triple those of our foreign competitors, most of our great mass-produced goods are still obtainable at competitive prices. This is because we have been able to substitute, to a greater degree than any other nation, horsepower slaves for manpower hours. If we are to maintain this competitive advantage, we dare not permit our large resources in manpower and plant capacities to remain unused. I say again and again, the tax bill is the key to that usage.

As we create more employment and fuller usage of our productive capacity, we will automatically increase volume, which will tend to reduce our costs to the point where we become more competitive with the world at large. By reducing taxes in the higher brackets, we will dramatically increase the incentives for risk investment which is essential to our free enterprise system. And finally, by creating greater prosperity in the United States, we will, in a sense, massage the economies of the whole free world.

The State of the Union: Congress Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not often put in the RECORD speeches I have made. However, because of its timely subject matter, and because I was forced to give it by telephone due to the legislative business before the House that day, I am including it in the RECORD at this point:

THE STATE OF THE UNION: CONGRESS CONTRIBUTION

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of St. Louis County, Mo., at the annual meeting of the Associated Industries of Missouri, Statler-Hilton Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., Wednesday, October 30, 1963)

"It must be made clear to the public that much, if not all, of the stimulating effect of a tax cut might be nullified if it were accompanied by a reduction in spending, by a balanced budget, or by tax cut reforms which aim solely at redistributing, rather than reducing, the total tax burden on the economy."

This quotation comes from page 17 of the first report of the Consumer Advisory Council appointed by President Kennedy in mid-1962, published October 1963, and just made available to the public October 8.

The report was made to Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which he transmitted to the President on October 1, 1963. The quotation I have just read is a clear expression of the economic-political philosophy of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and is the basic theory which underlies President Kennedy's message to the Congress urging the Congress to reduce Federal income taxes.

This is the economic-political theory that led President Kennedy in his Yale speech to refer to balanced budgets and an abhorrence of Government debt as worn out, useless and dangerous shibboleths. It is this economic philosophy that lay behind Dr. Heller's statement in his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee that we needed to educate the public away from its Puritan ethic.

President Kennedy in his nationwide television and radio appeal to the people to support the proposed Revenue Act of 1963, then pending in the House Rules Committee, stated that this proposal was probably the most important measure to face the Congress in the past 15 years. The President stated that without this tax reduction bill we might face a serious recession. Both he and Secretary of Treasury Douglas Dillon have referred to this tax reduction bill as the answer to the unemployment problem, the balance-of-payments problem, the problem of economic growth, and the problem of operating on balanced budgets.

In his earlier Yale speech President Kennedy had asked that there be a nationwide debate on the subject of fiscal and economic policy so that the public would understand its backwardness in failing to grasp modern economics.

Some of us in the Congress who are in basic disagreement with the President and with Dr. Heller on this theory which we think is not new, but old, have sought to conduct such a debate. We say this is the old discredited economic theory that cheap money brings prosperity, dressed up in the new sophisticated language of the Neo-Keynesians economists who promote it. May I say that those who asked for the debate have run away from it, including the President?

In order to overcome the opposition of many of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives of a tax reduction bill in the context of massive Federal debt and continued deficit financing which would create further debt, the President abandoned a basic part of this novel planned deficit financing theory, at least in words. In his radio and television speech on nationwide hookup, he stated that we would impose even tighter controls on Federal spending.

Query: Have the controls that have been imposed in the past on Federal expenditures by President Kennedy been tight controls? The record shows expenditure increases have jumped from the $1.3 billion per year average of the Eisenhower administration—which was bad enough—to over $6 billion increase a year under President Kennedy. In other expressions since then, the President has sought to convey to the Congress and the people that he agrees with his opposition, that in order for tax reduction to be economically beneficial it must be accompanied by Federal expenditure reform. Furthermore, the President agreed to the last minute amendment to the tax bill to save it, stating that it was the sense of Congress that there should be Federal expenditures control. The President has made no effort to disassociate his thinking from the arguments advanced by Congressman MILLS and the other Democratic Congressmen who spoke during House debate against the Republican proposal to establish specific expenditure figures for the 2 fiscal years covered by the tax bill. These arguments accepted the premise that expenditure reform was essential if the tax bill were to have a beneficial economic effect, but alleged (1) it was wrong not to trust the President's statements that he was going to cut back on expenditures, and (2) that anyway Congress should assume the responsibility by cutting the appropriation requests and not pass the buck to the President.

Not a person supported the economic philosophy of planned deficit advanced by Dr. Heller and President Kennedy during the House debate.

I stated in my remarks during the debate, "How are we to conduct a national debate on whether we should abandon the Puritan ethic if those who advocate this course run away everytime we meet in a common forum?"

Although the administration will not engage in straightforward public debate on this subject, let us not be misled. It has not abandoned its efforts to push through its tax program minus expenditure reform. Regretably, the tactical defeat the neo-Keynesian economists and politicians have experienced in the congressional and other public forms where equal time and honest debate can be conducted has only resulted in increased efforts in the use of indirect methods.

It is one thing to abandon a basic theory and course of action deliberately after full public debate. It is quite another thing to abandon it without debate on a false assurance that it is not being abandoned.

The Kennedy administration states in words that it believes in a balanced Federal budget, but its deeds belie the statement. It seeks to go beyond the acceptable economic theory that the budget need not be balanced on a yearly basis, to argue that it no longer need be or should be balanced upon the basis of a business cycle. According to the new theory, the budget should be balanced only when unemployment reaches a certain percentage of the labor force. The percentage selected is 4 percent—which in itself should be the subject of far-reaching study and discussion.

It is argued that when the economy has full employment (not more than 4 percent unemployed) the gross national product will increase to a point which will provide the tax base necessary to produce the revenues to cover the governmental expenditures and, hence, produce a balanced budget.

This syllogism presupposes that our employment and unemployment statistics are sufficiently accurate to enable the policy decisions and the judgments necessary to be made intelligently. I know of no student of economic statistics who claims such a refinement for our economic statistics.

The base of this sophisticated economic theory goes back a few years to the model on economic growth prepared by Dr. Otto Eckstein, of Harvard, for the Democratic members on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee. This model propounded the novel theory of an economic gap between the potential growth in our economy and its actual growth which, along with the missile gap, became the base of Senator Kennedy's campaign for President in 1960. The validity of this economic model of Dr. Eckstein was challenged as soon as it was enunciated in the very document, the Joint Economic Committee report, in which it was first presented, by the Republican members of the committee.

Since that time the gap theory has been demolished time and again by many notable economists, among them Dr. Arthur Burns. In spite of this fact, the Kennedy administration has continued to push its economic and fiscal policies based upon this discredited theory.

The gap theory presumes, rather than establishes as a fact, that the economic growth rate has been inadequate since—well, really since President Eisenhower took office. It is argued if we had full employment and full plant utilization during those years the growth rate would have been 5 percent instead of 3 percent. Furthermore, if we had had the economic growth we should have had, the gross national product would then have been sufficient to produce the Federal revenues necessary to pay for the expenditures of Government. In other words, we would have had a balanced budget. Ergo, these theorists argue, plot out a course for the future based upon attaining a growth rate of 5 percent and we will have full employment. The fact that from 1860 to 1960, a period of more rapid growth than probably any society, has experienced in history, we grew at a rate of 2.9 percent a year, not 5 percent, doesn't seem to phase these theorists at all. Like King Canute's courtiers they would whip the seas if the tide continued to ebb and flow.

In order to have this growth rate the Kennedy administration argues we must increase total purchasing power in the society. Dr. Heller says he prefers to stimulate private purchasing power first rather than government expenditure to do this job. But he warns (and this is echoed in the President's state of the Union message to the Congress this January) if the private sector does not respond to the governmental prodding, or the Congress fails to follow his wise advice to prod the private sector (through tax reduction) then Government will have to move in by massive Federal spending. This is a threat none of us who believes in the private enterprise system should ignore.

Hence, it is basic to the Kennedy-Heller theory that Government expenditures not be cut at the same time we cut taxes to increase private spending because total purchasing power—Government plus private—will be dampened.

This is the only logical explanation for the President's refusal to accept the very modest proposal of the Republicans that specific dollar expenditure amounts be set out in the tax bill in lieu of general expressions of intent, such as "tight controls" and "expenditure reform."

The President's budget, submitted in January this year, calls for an expenditure rate for fiscal 1964, which begins July 1, 1963, of $98.8 billion. Secretary Dillon testified just a week before the tax bill was debated on the House floor that the President had cut back this expenditure rate to $98.2 billion. The Republican proposal was to cut this rate back to $97 billion.

Let's get these expenditure figures into context. The revised expenditure rate for fiscal 1963, which ended June 30, 1963, submitted in the January 1963 budget statement (containing the proposed budget for fiscal 1964) was $94.6 billion. Actually, the expenditure rate turned out to be $92.6. The expenditure rate for fiscal 1962 was $87.8 billion. For fiscal 1961 it was $81.5. So you see we are talking about rates that have been increasing rapidly, over 20 percent in just 3 years.

Now, why would the President quibble over a less than 2-percent cut in expenditure when he said he was going to apply ever "stricter expenditure controls"? Let's look at the second part of the Republican motion. It limited the expenditure rate for fiscal 1965 to $98 billion. Many of us think the President had, and still has in mind, an expenditure rate for fiscal 1965 of around $105 billion, so this would be a 7-percent cut. Furthermore, this cut would begin June 30, 1964, and go through November 1964, a very crucial period for those who are thinking of reelection. But surely an expenditure rate of $98 billion, which is $17 billion more than the expenditure rate of the 1960 election year, should not be objectionable to anyone who plans to exercise—I quote: "Even tighter expenditure control."

I was quite unhappy with the amendment to tie expenditures to a $97 billion figure in fiscal year 1964 and a $98 billion figure in fiscal year 1965. In my judgment, this is entirely too high for the kind of expenditure reform needed to make a tax cut of $11 billion economically helpful to our economy, overburdened as it is with both high taxes and high debt. The minority views of the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee, published in early February this year, recommended holding expenditures to $94 billion for both 1964 and 1965, to justify a tax cut. The study of the Tax Foundation committee, just published, recommends holding expenditures to $95 billion for these 2 fiscal years if the tax cut is not to cause damage to our economy.

Before going further I must point out some congressional fiscal procedural facts that are all too little known by the public and, if I may say so, by Congressmen themselves.

Congress has never established the machinery necessary to produce a legislative budget. The only true budget we have is the Executive budget, prepared by the President with the help of the Bureau of the Budget, as required by the Budget and Accounting Act. The only authority Congress has retained for itself in the field of Federal expenditures is over the President's request for new obligational authority to spend. It is the grant of new obligational authority to spend that we refer to as an appropriation bill.

For fiscal 1964, for example, the President requested additional new obligational authority to spend of $108 billion. Only about 40 percent of this amount is scheduled to be spent in that fiscal year; the bulk of the authority is scheduled for expenditure in the ensuing fiscal years.

As of July 1, 1963, the beginning of fiscal 1964, the President's budget presented in January estimated there would be a carryover balance of unexpended previous obligational authority to spend amounting to $87 billion. Inasmuch as the expenditure rate for 1963 set forth in this budget was lowered from $94.6 to $92.6, there should theoretically be another $2 billion authority to spend added to this $87 billion. So the total authority the President would have to spend, if the Congress granted to him his full request of $108 billion, would be $197 billion.

It is from this pool of $197 billion authority to spend the President has said he would spend only $98.8 in fiscal 1964 (possibly revised to the $98.2 billion Douglas Dillon told the Ways and Means Committee).

The Congress has retained little or no control over the yearly expenditure rate. The President can freeze programs, accelerate them, decelerate them; do just about what he pleases within the limits of the basic legislation.

This is where the tax debate lies. The Congress seeks to limit the President's total expenditure levels for the next 2 ensuing fiscal years to a figure that in congressional judgment would reduce the amount of Federal bonds that would have to be sold to make up for the revenue loss resulting from a tax cut to a size that would not destroy the economic gains that a tax cut would otherwise produce. The President doesn't want his power to fix the level of expenditures each fiscal year controlled by the Congress.

And now, a word about the increase in the debt ceiling the President has again asked the Congress to grant to him. This so-called debt ceiling is merely the Liberty Loan Act of 1917 as amended from time to time. It limits the total amounts of bonds the Federal Government may have outstanding. $309 billion is the the present ceiling. It is insufficient with our insufficient tax revenues to provide the cash to enable us to pay the expenditures to which we already have committed the full faith and credit of the United States. Regardless of the fact that the Congress will probably cut around $5 billion from the President's $108 billion request for new obligational authority, this is insufficient to even come close to a balanced budget. We are operating close to $1 billion in the red each month and the tax cut, without expenditure reform, would push us over the $1 billion a month rate of deficit.

Once the Congress gives the President the authority to spend, and he does spend, the Congress must authorize the sale of bonds to get the money to pay the bills if our tax revenues are insufficient to meet them. Our tax revenues are still insufficient to meet our bills.

However, the President has been warned by the Congress in the previous bills increasing the debt ceiling that if he does not cut back on his spending plans in an orderly fashion and present to the Congress a schedule revising the expenditures downward, Congress will force him to do so by not giving him authority to sell more bonds. This is strong medicine and, like castor oil, it may make the Nation mighty uncomfortable for awhile.

However, the President can still get around Congress' attempt to use the debt ceiling to impose expenditure reform by selling off capital assets and using the proceeds to pay bills, instead of selling more Government bonds. This is exactly what he did this year.

Congress could stop this if Congress would. However, for the time being I am reconciled to have the Federal Government get out of some of the investments it has, rather than to tax more or print and sell more bonds. However, we are reaching a point where a good bit of the readily marketable capital assets have been sold. Pretty soon the only course open to the President will be to exercise real expenditure reform.

How like the profligate son who inherited vast wealth from his parents this situation is. He does everything he can think of to avoid cutting his high style of living, even to the extent of cashing in a part of his patrimony. Selling off capital assets of course, brings the day of reckoning closer, but the brunt still may be borne by his children, rather than by himself.

And how like the profligate son the administration spokesmen have become. They answer criticism by arguing that debt isn't really bad, that this high spending is really a good thing. Don't worry about debt, they say.

1. It is a less ratio of GNP than it was in 1946.

2. It hasn't gone up as much since 1946 as State and local debt, or as much as private debt (if I am bad, Johnny is worse).

3. Federal debt is an investment in the future like private debt.

4. We owe the debt to ourselves, so it doesn't make any difference.

The errors and downright chicanery of these four arguments need to be hit hard and often. Why are these arguments advanced, if it is not to allay the legitimate fears our people have about excessive debts, so that these politicians can continue to spend and build a bigger Federal debt? If these people really believed in a balanced budget at any time, why do they take the trouble to attack those who oppose deficit financing with such vigor?

What are the flaws in these arguments that debt is really not bad? What has the year 1946 they pick as a bench mark to do with all this? Is this the year we should choose for establishing our optimum ratio of the Federal debt to GNP or to State, local, and private debt? Hardly so. Far from the optimum year, it is the worst year we could possibly pick. It is the year immediately following the greatest period of Federal deficit financing in our history—deficit financing we indulged in to win World War II. But surely we expected to pay off on that debt and get back to a more economically beneficial peacetime ratio as soon as we could. Our optimum peacetime ratio should be below 30 percent. We are still at 54 percent 17 years after the war is over and 70 percent of this decline was the result of the damaging post-World War II inflation, hardly an economic and fiscal course to boast about or to emulate. The peacetime ratio of Federal debt to local and State debt should be well below 50 percent. It is still over 70 percent.

Private debt, both business and personal, is related to capital assets and earning power. So is most State and local debt. However, the reverse is true of the Federal debt. The Federal Government spends primarily and overwhelmingly for national defense. Defense spending, whether for tanks, missiles, aircraft carriers, or whatever, does not produce capital or earning assets. It must go on the books at $1. We sell, each year, about $8 billion of surplus military property and realize only about 4 cents on the dollar. Very little of the Federal debt is related to economic assets and where it is, as in TVA and CCC, here lies a good bit of the national debate of our day as to whether these are proper or efficient functions of the Federal Government in the first place.

Finally, we do not owe the Federal debt to ourselves. Seventeen billion dollars of the Federal debt is owed to foreigners. Eighteen billion dollars is allocated for retirement benefits under the social security system, about $80 billion for other private pensions, insurance, and retirement programs. Billions are set aside in savings to build homes or provide education or to expand a business to provide more jobs for our people.

This last argument demonstrates the full extent to which the mischief inherent in the theory of deficit financing would lead us—it is the destruction of the private enterprise system, based as it is, upon the ownership of private property.

In only one sense has President Kennedy understated his case and that is when he said the tax bill was the most important measure to come before the Congress in 15 years. The tax bill serving as a camouflage for the discredited theory of prosperity through cheap money, if it were enacted without amendment requiring expenditure reform, would radically change the basic fiscal policy this country has followed since the disastrous experience with the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation. Now is the time for the people to come to the aid of their Congress and back it in its defense of the Puritan ethic.

Changed Labor Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 5, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the South Bend-Mishawaka area, in St. Joseph County, Ind., has become a fine example of an industrial center with good labor-management relations.

The merits of the area are carefully and comprehensively illustrated in a brochure titled "The Changed Labor Picture," which was prepared by a commission created by the mayors of the two municipalities.

I ask unanimous consent that this pamphlet be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that my colleagues will understand the achievements of this important industrial center.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHANGED LABOR PICTURE IN THE SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA AREA—AN ANALYSIS AND REPORT BY THE SOUTH BEND-MISHAWAKA LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

A detailed analysis of both labor contract-authorized and unauthorized work stoppages in the South Bend-Mishawaka area shows dramatic gains in labor-management relations in the past 6 years, especially in the last 3 years.

The analysis, reported by the South Bend-Mishawaka Labor-Management Commission, was conducted in the 49 principal industries employing the bulk of the blue-collar workers in St. Joseph County. It included all of the major manufacturing firms in the county employing more than 20 hourly rated workers. Eighteen international unions were represented in the local unions in the industries studied. Employees in manufacturing firms mostly are represented by the unions affiliated with the St. Joseph County AFL-CIO Council. Findings of the study follow:

1. Work stoppages in St. Joseph County's 49 principal industries have been reduced 93.6 percent since 1957, peak year of the study. In 1957, the 49 industries experienced 94 work stoppages. In the first 6 months of 1963 the number of work stoppages has been reduced to six.

Improvement in the South Bend area's labor-management relations began showing in 1961, when its 49 principal industries had only 38 work stoppages. From 1961 through the first 6 months of 1963, work stoppages have been reduced by 84.2 percent. The fact that the 49 principal industries had only 6 work stoppages during the first half of 1963 shows that the improvement is continuing.

2. The six largest employers in the area reported that, from 1957 through the first 6 months of 1963, their combined work stoppages have been cut 95.5 percent. This is even more significant in view of the fact that these 6 firms employ an annual average of 17,485 persons, or 67.8 percent of the total annual average of 25,780 hourly rated employees working for the 49 firms in the study.

Improvement in labor-management relations is shown by the fact that work stoppages in the plants of the area's 6 largest employers declined from 36 in 1961 to 4 in the first half of 1963, a drop of 88.9 percent.

3. Thirty of the forty-nine firms had no work stopages in the more than 6 years from 1957 through the first 6 months of 1963. Of the other 19 firms, 11 had only 1 work stoppage during the 6½-year period.

4. Teamsters Local No. 364, representing an additional work force of over 4,700, reported 14 work stoppages in the 6½ years during which time it negotiated 97 labor contracts.

5. The St. Joseph County Building Trades Council, made up of 20 local unions with a total membership of 3,741, reported only seven work stoppages during the 6½-year period.

6. The hourly rated industrial employees of the South Bend-Mishawaka area, together with those firms whose employees are represented by the Teamsters union and the St. Joseph County Building Trades Council, provided a combined total of 52,836,248 man-days of work in the 6½ years. Lost man-days of work reported in manufacturing industries, building trade firms and those employing Teamsters members in the 1957–63 period totaled 521,411, or nine-tenths of 1 percent of the total man-days worked. Excluded from this annual average of about 34,221 union-represented workers are thousands of persons employed in salaried and administrative job classifications.

The nonpartisan labor-management commission which made the study observed that the area documentation was conducted in more depth than any labor-management study in the area's history. Its analysis included work stoppages of all types, both labor contract-authorized and unauthorized. There is no comparable data for Indiana, the major industrial regions of the Nation, or for the United States as a whole. Computations by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, for example, include only legal strikes and do not take into account work stoppages that are not sanctioned by labor agreements.

"The South Bend area labor-management picture as a whole has changed," said a commission spokesman. "The facts show that South Bend, Mishawaka, and St. Joseph County today, and especially in the last 2½ years, form as good or a better area for labor-management cooperation than anywhere else in the United States. In fact, the South Bend-Mishawaka area is one of the Nation's most productive industrial centers."

The labor-management commission which conducted the analysis consists of George C. Hupp, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, chairman; T. Forrest Hanna, Indiana Department of Labor, and Chester E. Ralston, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, vice chairmen; Eli D. Miller, Chamber of Commerce of South Bend-Mishawaka, secretary; Stanley J. Ladd, St. Joseph County AFL–CIO Council; Norman C. Murrin, Teamsters Local 364; Roy B. Root, St. Joseph County Building Trades Council; C. M. MacMillan, Studebaker Corp.; Louis A. Tiedge, Bendix Corp.; John A. Toth, Torrington Co.; and Kenneth M. Burch, Chamber of Commerce of South Bend-Mishawaka.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Supp. 2).

Appendix

Tributes to Senator Yarborough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently in the great State of Texas one of our esteemed and distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH, received an outstanding testimonial, not only in the form of an outpouring of Texas support and friendship, but in the form of strong endorsements for his reelection from a number of distinguished Americans.

The President of the United States sent a message on film to the October 19 testimonial dinner for Senator YARBOROUGH, which I commend to my colleagues.

The Postmaster General, John A. Gronouski, delivered the principal address at the dinner and his message to those congregated in Senator YARBOROUGH's honor was a heartening and encouraging one.

Among other vivid statements in support of the senior Senator from Texas was a salute to Senator YARBOROUGH by Texas' most distinguished man of letters, J. Frank Dobie.

Mr. President, I know that every friend and admirer of Senator YARBOROUGH—and his friends are legion—will rejoice in the sentiments expressed by the President, by the Postmaster General, and by Mr. Dobie. They are typical of the feeling that is widely shared here in the Senate for this warm, good man, whom we confidently expect will be returned to the Senate next year with an overwhelming vote of confidence from his fellow Texans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the message from the President of the United States to the friends of RALPH YARBOROUGH at Austin, Tex., October 19, 1963; the remarks of Postmaster General John A. Gronouski on that same date; and the text, "Salute to Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH" by J. Frank Dobie of Texas.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY'S MESSAGE ON FILM TO THE FRIENDS OF RALPH YARBOROUGH'S STATEWIDE TEXAS SALUTE, AUSTIN, TEX., OCTOBER 19, 1963

I am delighted to have this opportunity to join all of you in paying tribute to our mutual friend RALPH YARBOROUGH, the senior Senator from the State of Texas. RALPH YARBOROUGH speaks for Texas in the U.S. Senate, and he also speaks for our Nation, and he speaks for progress for our people.

I could talk about some of the things that RALPH YARBOROUGH has done, about his work in education, education for all Americans, for veterans, for hospital care under social security, for an income tax cut to stimulate our economy and provide jobs for our people, for the nuclear test ban treaty, a step toward peace for human liberties, for the goals that bind Democrats together in this State and all over the Union.

But I shall mention two items which you might remember.

The first is my recollection of September 1961 when Hurricana Carla struck Texas. Before the tidal waves receded RALPH YARBOROUGH was at the door of the White House; before the winds died down, he was walking in the debris of the battered cities and towns on the gulf coast of Texas, asking, "What can I do to help?"

Second, I remember his fight for the bill to establish a national seashore recreational area on Padre Island. It's a shocking fact that this Nation, this great country of ours with over 60,000 miles of seashore, has only a few hundred miles of shoreline actually available for the enjoyment and the use of most of our people—for the general public. That's why I took such pleasure on September 28 of last year in signing into law the bill establishing the Padre Island National Seashore Park, and I took pleasure, also, in handing one of the pens to RALPH YARBOROUGH.

My fellow Democrats, this is a time when all of us who believe in government for the people, who believe in progress for our country, who believe in a fair chance for all of our citizens, who believe in the growth of Texas, who believe in the development of the United States, who believe in a strong United States as a great bulwark for freedom, who believe in a United States which is second to none in space, on the sea, on the land, a United States which stands for progress—all of those—I think RALPH YARBOROUGH stands with them.

And it's a pleasure to salute all of you who are working with RALPH YARBOROUGH to make a better State and a better country.

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE APPRECIATION DINNER FOR SENATOR RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, AUSTIN, TEX., OCTOBER 19, 1963

It is a pleasure to greet so many fellow Democrats at this great salute to my friend, RALPH YARBOROUGH.

Even though Im a still new in my job as Postmaster General, and have a lot to learn and do in Washington, I wanted to be a part of this testimonial to RALPH. I have known and admired Senator YARBOROUGH's work for a long time. RALPH YARBOROUGH is a big man in a typically Texas way—dynamic, generous, a tireless worker, and tenacious fighter for his constituents.

Our country is fortunate in having great Texans in Washington contributing to the welfare of our Nation. Vice President JOHNSON has been a magnificent ambassador of good will to the many nations in which he has traveled all over the world. At home, he has provided dynamic leadership in the Nation's space effort. And under his guidance as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities, enormous strides have been made in the field of human rights.

The British philosopher, Edmund Burke, in a classic statement on the functioning of a representative of the people in a democracy, said: "It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents."

That describes RALPH YARBOROUGH. I doubt there is any man in Congress who maintains a closer communication with his constituents and who gives their business more undivided attention. Even after the busiest weeks of Senate work, he is back down here in Texas on weekends talking to people, listening to their views, and finding out their problems.

RALPH has lost none of the interest in the underdog, or in the needs of the economically or socially disadvantaged, which he demonstrated in his years as a teacher, lawyer, and judge. He is never too busy to give his time and attention to an individual's problems.

RALPH makes up his own mind. He has never been swerved by pressures or special interests, once he has concluded what is best for Texas. He has, however, never been narrow or parochial in his interests. He has judged each issue in the context of the whole Nation's welfare.

RALPH has been one of the Senate's most vigorous fighters for progressive legislation and a steadfast supporter of President Kennedy's programs.

I know of RALPH's excellent work on matters relating to the postal service through his position on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He has worked hard for legislation to attract the most highly qualified workers to the Federal Government. He has also worked for Federal pay scales more in line with those paid in private industry and to improve the Federal employees retirement program.

It would take all evening to mention the many significant contributions RALPH has made during his service in the Senate. I shall mention only a few of the most important. He was author and chief proponent of the law which created Padre Island National Seashore Area. He was coauthor of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which has expanded the educational opportunities of thousands of young Americans.

RALPH was also one of the leading sponsors of the recently enacted Medical Education Act, which provides funds for medical and dental school construction and loans to medical and dental students.

He has been a leader in the Senate on veterans' affairs. Some 15 laws bearing his name have been enacted in behalf of veterans. He has been a legislative leader in programs for soil and water conservation, rural electrification loans, and agricultural research.

Obviously, Senator YARBOROUGH is a man who is doing things, and who is accomplishing things. He has not let the complex and often baffling problems that face us in the latter part of the 20th century dismay him. He is giving Texas hard work and solutions, not slogans and ballyhoo.

This is in the great tradition of the Democratic Party. We Democrats belong to the oldest political party in the world. I think that our party has lasted so long, and is filled

with strength and vitality today, precisely because its political philosophy has always been to look forward. Thomas Jefferson wrote: "I like the dreams of the future better than the history of the past."

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that throughout our history the two political parties have always been divided into a party of hope and into a party of memory.

The Democratic Party has always been the party of hope. Today it is still the party of men like RALPH YARBOROUGH, who have confidence in the future. People who appreciate the rapid pace of events in the modern world, who realize the need for strong, affirmative, imaginative action, still look to the Democratic Party for leadership. And they have good reasons. They have not been disappointed.

President Kennedy promised to get this country moving again. He is making it move again. When this administration came into office, the Nation's spirit and economy were both sagging. Today they are revitalized.

We are in the 32d month of economic expansion, one of the longest sustained peacetime booms in our history. Employment now exceeds 70 million people. The Nation's income and output are both at an all-time high. For the first time in our history, the average wage of factory workers now exceeds $100 a week. Inflation has been held in check, so that larger pay envelopes represent a real increase in purchasing power.

These achievements have not come about easily. As you know, there are powerful men and interests in this country who always reject social progress, who reject every proposal directed at the general welfare, who stand ready to fight any new gains for the average working American and his family.

Let me read you a few familiar arguments:

"1. It should be left to private enterprise, since public coverage would remove the enterprise and competition of individuals;

"2. If public funds are utilized, political bureaucracy will be rampant;

"3. A scheme of universal tax-supported coverage at the expense of the state is socialism;

"4. Universal tax-supported coverage will destroy initiative and ambition, and there will thus be a premium for comparative idleness, to be taken out of the pockets of the laborious and conscientious."

Are these arguments that were used against social security in 1936? Are these arguments that were used against medicare or against Federal aid to education in 1963? They might have been. They sound familiar. But in actuality, all of these statements were made 132 years ago by opponents of tax-supported public schools. They appeared in the Philadelphia National Gazette in 1830.

Unemployment relief, wage and hour laws, the abolition of child labor, the Social Security Act, and the Federal Employment Service were originally met by the same hostility, the same false slogans, the same specious arguments that are being employed against President Kennedy's progressive programs today.

Let me point out some of President Kennedy's dramatic accomplishments here in the past 2½ years:

The minimum wage was raised to $1.25 an hour and the minimum wage law extended to cover 3½ million additional workers. It was the first time since 1938 that new workers came under the protection of the minimum wage law.

The social security system was improved with increased minimum benefits, broadened coverage, and the optional retirement age for men set at 62.

Unemployment benefits were extended for 2.8 million workers who had exhausted their regular benefits.

The Housing Act of 1961, the most comprehensive and far reaching housing program in congressional history, was passed. It provides major expansion of urban renewal, public housing, aid to local mass transit, and larger low-interest loans to stimulate home improvements.

The 1961 omnibus farm bill expanded the use of marketing orders, extended the school milk program, increased food for peace, and provided the first wheat and feed grain programs since World War II.

The Area Redevelopment Administration was created to help bring new industries and new jobs to depressed areas. The ARA is now working in 1,000 urban and rural areas and has already made 85,000 jobs possible.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was passed to retrain men and women whose skills have become obsolete through automation. Since last August, more than 1,800 training projects for 66,000 unemployed or underemployed workers have been approved.

The $900 million accelerated Public Works Act, which will provide jobs to half a million Americans.

As a result of these and other measures to provide jobs and stimulate the economy, the gross national product has grown at an average rate of 5.5 percent under President Kennedy as opposed to a rate of 2.1 percent under the former administration. In the last 2½ years gross national product has gone up nearly $80 billion. Industrial production is up 18 percent. Total personal income is up $50 billion. Labor income is up $38 billion.

Despite these remarkable achievements, much remains to be done. Our economy's performance still does not measure up to its full potential.

Right now, some $30 billion of annual production potential is going unused. Ten percent of our industrial plant capacity lies idle. Although most of us are prosperous, almost 4 million of our fellow citizens were unable to find work in August—5.5 percent of the entire work force.

A disturbingly high portion of these unemployed are teenagers. The postwar war-baby boom is now coming of age. During the mid-sixties, the labor force will have to absorb nearly 3 million young people each year, a million more each year than in the midfifties.

The direct costs of unemployment last year—including such things as unemployment insurance, railroad insurance, employment services, and the like—have been put at $4.7 billion. Its indirect costs were equally high. I have no need to tell you that the terrible human cost in tragedy and travail, in drained morale and broken spirits is the highest cost of all; a cost that cannot be calculated.

President Kennedy's tax bill, which calls for both an $11 billion cut in taxes and tax reform, is designed to help end this terrible human idleness and material waste. Its purpose is to bolster the economy and stimulate employment. It will benefit every family and aid every community in every section of the Nation. I urge you to give it your fullest support.

The brilliant advances made in the past 2½ years have not been restricted to economic gains. We have recaptured the initiative in international events. Concrete forward steps have been taken in the difficult road to an honorable, just, and sound peace.

In recent weeks two important agreements have been reached with the Soviet Union. One is the so-called "hot line," a direct line between the Kremlin and the White House to be used in emergency situations. This is an important device to prevent miscalculation or fateful misunderstanding in a fast moving or dangerous situation, such as last year's Cuba crisis.

The second is, of course, the test ban treaty, which bars nuclear tests in the air, in space and on the water. It has been hailed all over the world as a historic step in lessening tensions and in preserving humanity from the unknown dangers of nuclear fallout. It has provided an opportunity and pause during which, in President Kennedy's words, "both sides can now gain new confidence and experience in concrete collaborations for peace."

The President has made clear that while we will continue to take every step to break down the walls of hostility, we will at all times maintain our guard. In Cuba last year, the President demonstrated that he can stand up to any Soviet threat or bluff and that we shall tolerate no interference with the rights and interests of this Nation.

In all these matters the President has had RALPH YARBOROUGH's unswerving support. RALPH was an influential supporter of the nuclear test ban, of the Alliance for Progress, and the food-for-peace program. He was also a cosponsor of the Peace Corps, one of the most sensational successes of this administration. The Peace Corps will have 10,000 volunteers working in 37 countries by the end of this fiscal year. It has captured the imagination of the world, and brought the image of American idealism to the newly emerging nations.

Among the superb achievements of the last 2½ years, none has been more impelling than the American feats of space exploration. During this time the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has launched more than 80 space vehicles. They have included not only the dramatic manned-orbital space flights, but weather and communications satellites and deep space probes, that have brought with them invaluable scientific discoveries and data. As a result of better quality control measures and experience, the success factor in launching has increased sixfold since 1960. The Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, initiated by this administration to achieve an early manned-lunar landing, is an example of the brilliant scientific teamwork that has gone into the space effort.

All these steps have been taken over the violent and emotional opposition of the reactionaries. The radical right in this country is noisy, powerful, and well financed, and in many places it seems to be in the ascendancy. Theirs is essentially a negative and hysterical reaction to everything about them. It is a nostalgia for a simpler time, in a society that never was. It is not an attempt to solve problems, it is a desire to wish them away.

The members of the lunatic fringe are masterful at oversimplification. They talk much and loudly about patriotism, but willfully ignore the great complexities and terrible dangers of the modern world. They think that foreign policy is best conducted by rattling sabers and threatening nuclear disaster.

If they ever should gain power in this country, they would bring on vast chaos and disorder, and threaten us all with annihilation. "Foreign policy in the modern world," President Kennedy said last month, "does not lend itself to simple black and white choices of good or evil. * * * The purpose of foreign policy is not to provide an outlet for our sentiments of hope or indignation; it is to shape real events in a real world."

The American people will not be fooled by the radical right's brand of fraudulent patriotism. RALPH YARBOROUGH's views are the direct antithesis of theirs—liberal, democratic, for people. He deals with "real events in a real world," not in demagogic cold war emotionalism. That is why they would so much like to drive him out of the Senate. Let us pray that they do not succeed.

I wish RALPH many more years of success. With your help he will be able to continue his magnificent work for the people of Texas and for his country.

SALUTE TO SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I salute RALPH YARBOROUGH not as a liberal nor as a conservative. It is not enough that the elected representative of liberal-voting

citizens be liberal; it is not enough that the representative of conservative-voting citizens be conservative.

While the great Edmund Burke was in a race to be elected from Bristol to the House of Commons, he said, in effect, to the voters: "My opponent promises that if elected he will vote according to your will, as you choose. I can only promise to inform myself on issues and to vote as an informed conscience directs." A thoroughly informed conscience is a rarity.

I have known RALPH YARBOROUGH as friend and man for many years. He is perhaps the best read man that Texas has ever sent to Washington. His cultivated and disciplined mind is always seeking information on subjects that Government must act upon. Like other individuals, he travels in a certain direction, but his mind is not closed to facts and conditions warranting a change of mind. The power of intellect to weigh knowledge and to judge justly is his.

We are all for gain. I myself should not always promise and vote as Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has promised and voted, but mark this: The only gain he has ever sought, consistently or inconsistently, has been public gain. He does not try to milk the public for private profit. He seeks the good of people. Nor is his consideration of humanity provincial minded.

Every man and every woman is judged by his or her sense of values. Whenever the majority of others in any democracy have a high sense of values that country will have become a Utopia. When values of life—values beyond money, values that express civilization, enlightenment, and justice for the human race come up, we can count on Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH to stand for those values.

I salute him for his sense of civilized values, for his sense of justice, for his enlightened intellect, for his decency as a human being, and for his integrity.

The Turn in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the November 4, 1963, edition of the Wall Street Journal:

THE TURN IN VIETNAM

Whether the forcible overthrow of the Diem regime bodes good or ill no man can now say. What it does do is leave a lot of important questions unanswered about southeast Asia and U.S. foreign policy in general.

At the moment, Washington seems pleased at the turn of events, despite the apparent assassinations of President Diem and his brother. And it is at least moderately encouraging that the military leaders in South Vietnam are pledged to turn the Government over to civilians under more democratic auspices than prevailed under Diem, and to prosecute the war against the Communists more forcefully.

But let no one, including Washington, forget that this is a military coup, in defiance of a solemn constitution, the very thing which Washington bitterly deplores when it occurs in Latin America. Moreover, the U.S. Government was heavily involved in it, whether it engineered the overthrow or not. At a minimum, the U.S. Government used its pressures to encourage an uprising.

We do not say this is necessarily avoidable, South Vietnam would long since have fallen to the Communists were it not for the deep U.S. commitment of troops and money. If that is the kind of thing we must do, then it only stands to reason that we must use our force not only against the Communists but to insure, as best we can, that political chaos does not sabotage that effort. Indeed, one of the more hopeful prospects is that perhaps now we and Vietnam can get on with the main business.

What is less edifying is the draft which we have permitted for years in southeast Asia. We gave up in Laos, which is understandable in the circumstances, but the U.S. Government didn't have to try to fool the people by calling it a sound settlement.

In Vietnam the United States couldn't seem to figure out what it was doing. It is at least conceivable that a more adept diplomacy, plus the same kinds of pressures used in the present instance, could have softened the Vietnamese political troubles and hence averted the coup. In retrospect it appears as though our Government had never heard of Buddhists until they started rioting last May.

That is the dismaying thing, not only about Vietnam but almost every other foreign policy matter. The Government seems to be constantly taken by surprise by events, even when it may have been partly instrumental in bringing them about.

The State Department can't seem to understand De Gaulle until he starts acting as many predicted he would. The United States constantly confuses Europe with policy switches and the only conclusion is that the U.S. Government itself is confused, even with all its resources of money, intelligence gathering and political leverage.

We profoundly hope the Vietnam coup will turn out to be a victory for the Vietnamese people and the struggle against communism. It is difficult to see it as a manifestation of a farsighted American foreign policy.

Stockpile Ruckus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stockpile Ruckus," which was published yesterday in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKPILE RUCKUS

After more than 20 months of noisy complaints, a Senate subcommittee has produced a bill theoretically designed to make some sense of the Government's enormous stockpile program.

This program was begun after World War II in an avowed effort to assure that in event of a new war the country would be supplied with critical materials—instead of having to scrounge desperately for its war needs after hostilities had begun.

The idea was sound, but like so many good ideas it ran into excesses. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, who headed the investigation sparked by President Kennedy, emphasizes charges of what the President called unconscionable profits. But the President also complained that the stockpile had an excess supply, worth $3.4 billion, which he said "astonished" him.

The latest report of Congress Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures covers the stockpile program for last June. It shows that in this month the overall stocks were slightly reduced.

But in the same month, according to the Joint Committee, the Government bought more aluminum, bauxite, bismuth, chromite, industrial diamonds, fluorspar, graphite, lead, mica, tantalum, thorium, tungsten, and zinc—although all of these materials already were in excess.

If the stockpile excesses were as astonishing as the President and Senator SYMINGTON have been saying, how is it this situation is being corrected by making it worse? What goes on here?

Some Pertinent Questions on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, many questions remain unanswered on the events of recent days in Vietnam.

Although press accounts are now supplying us with more information on the coup which ousted the Diem regime and subsequent takeover by the military junta, the extent of U.S. involvement has not yet been clarified by the State Department and other interested Federal agencies.

On Monday I asked some questions on the Vietnam situation in a speech on the floor of the House. Today I wish to suggest additional questions which require answers.

Was the advisability of a coup against Diem and the U.S. role in such a development the subject of high-level discussions subsequent to the August 20 raid on Buddhist pagodas?

When the decision was made to curtail U.S. economic and military assistance to the Diem regime, was consideration given to the effect such action might have in encouraging the military to perpetrate a coup?

How can our policies toward the ruling junta in South Vietnam be spared with our policies toward ruling juntas in the Dominican Republic and Honduras?

Is it not the policy of the United States to extend asylum to save those whose lives are in danger. Why was Ngo Dinh Can surrendered to the military after the Diem-Nhu experience?

Did Ambassador Lodge go to Vietnam with any instructions which might have made him sympathetic to a coup attempt?

What effect will these developments in Vietnam and U.S. involvement in the coup have on our allies in SEATO, in Europe, and most particularly in Central and South America?

Is there any evidence that the CIA and the DIA might have been working at cross purposes, with one of the agencies

favoring a coup, and the other opposing? Does there not seem indeed to be a need for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence to look into these matters?

It is my hope that Members of Congress and the Nation will soon be given the answers to these questions in order to restore faith in the executive departments.

Mr. Joseph Alsop, in two recent columns, has raised some interesting questions and made some pertinent observations on the coup in Vietnam. I commend the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Alsop's columns of November 4, "Farewell to Diem," and November 6, "Blood on Our Hands?"

The articles follow:

FAREWELL TO DIEM

(By Joseph Alsop)

What happened in Saigon was bound to happen, for the tragically simple reason that Ngo Dinh Nhu finally lost all grip on reality, while President Ngo Dinh Diem though sane enough himself, nonetheless saw the outer world through the half-mad eyes of his brother.

Even in Washington, halfway around the world, it is easy to imagine the climate of the last days and weeks of the Diem regime. As long as 2 months ago, when this reporter was in Saigon, the army leaders were already beginning to rally around Gen. Duong Van Minh, because they had already concluded that President Diem's government was no longer viable.

Even then it was clear that if Diem did not take the "needed steps to make his government viable once more," the army leaders would eventually take steps to find a new government. From that time until the grim climax, the preparations for the coup d'etat went forward without interruption, spurred onwards in recent weeks by the cuts in American aid to Vietnam.

The tension must have been all but unbearable in the last fortnight or so. For by then Ngo Dinh Nhu, of course, knew that something was afoot, yet dared not strike preventively for fear of causing a counterstrike; while the coup leaders, of course, knew of Nhu's knowledge, yet neither dared nor desired to turn back. So each side continued without flinching, like mere automata in the hard grip of fate, until the final roar of tank artillery.

This is a sad end. The fashion, nowadays, is to forget the debt owed to Ngo Dinh Diem. Yet Diem alone had the guts to put down the gangster "sets" that the French had used as allies in the Indo-China war. And Diem alone had the sturdiness and determination that assured South Vietnam's survival in the first chaotic years. Without Diem, indeed, Saigon today would almost certainly be ruled from Hanoi. The Communists themselves for years expected South Vietnam to fall to them automatically, like a ripe fruit. They only launched the present civil war when Diem left them no room for doubt that their happy expectations would never be realized.

In those early days, when this reporter was also in Saigon, Diem, the brave nationalist, was the hero of the breastbeaters, and the target for the breastbeaters' indignation were the wicked French colonials, who then hated Diem. But as breastbeaters always need someone or something to be indignant about, and as the French faded from the scene and only Diem was left, the breastbeaters naturally turned on Diem at last.

In truth, the breastbeaters played a major role in this tragedy, not least because they strongly influenced the first American reaction, when the Communists finally gave the signal for a full-scale civil war. As a sample of the futile twaddle talked in the U.S. Embassy in Saigon at that critical moment, it is only necessary to record one fact.

When the war began in bloody earnest, President Diem decided to arm the civil guard, whose members have suffered more casualties by now than any other force fighting the Communists. Yet for months on end, this decision of Diem's met with angry, obstinate American resistance, on the singular ground that an armed police force did not conform with the best and highest principles of Asian democrary.

The recent tragedy was directly rooted in that time before President Kennedy imposed more order and realism on U.S. policy in Vietnam. Ngo Dinh Nhu, in particular, was permanently warped by his memories of the earlier period. He could never take advantage of the new opportunity that was offered to him in 1961, because he could never quite believe the opportunity was real in view of what had gone before. In the conduct of the war, the team of Ambassador Frederick Nolting and Gen. Paul Harkins made great progress. But in the politics of Saigon, and in his dealings with the United States, Nhu plunged onward from folly to folly, always dragging Diem behind him. And so the end came at last for both Nhu and Diem—the end which might well have been averted by more practical commonsense at the outset.

The question now, it must be added, is whether practical commonsense or the outcries of the breastbeaters are to prevail in Washington. As was unavoidable, the Diem regime has been supplanted by a military junta. Procuring efficient, honest, energetic government from a military junta is not easy at the best of times.

This difficult task will be rendered all but impossible if Washington uses its vast leverage in Saigon to satisfy the breastbeaters, by seeking to stage a virtuous comedy of civil government. Creating a workable civil government in Vietnam is simply not feasible in the midst of civil war. Let the war be won first, as it can be won, and let the Vietnamese settle their own political affairs thereafter. These are the practical rules to follow, whatever the breastbeaters may say.

BLOOD ON OUR HANDS?

(By Joseph Alsop)

The American role in the bloodstained but purgative coup in South Vietnam is a subject demanding serious inquiry, if only because so much bosh is sure to be talked about it unless the facts are understood.

Beginning, then, at the beginning, the American Government was of course aware that the leaders of the Vietnamese Army were talking with one another about ways and means of displacing President Ngo Dinh Diem. Indeed, there was no way to avoid being aware of this.

As long as 2 months ago, when this reporter was in Saigon, he was taken into the confidence of one of the most active organizers of the coup. This member of the future junta listed the other generals who had already placed themselves under the leadership of Gen. Duong Van Minh; he said the coup would come soon; and he actually asked that the information be transmitted at once to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

Long before the coup occurred, therefore, it was quite clear there was trouble ahead. The expectation of early trouble in fact led Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to send his personal plane to Saigon, so that Ambassador Lodge could make his planned visit to Washington without the extra days away from his post required for travel by the commercial airlines.

That simple fact in turn reveals another aspect of the story. While aware that trouble was brewing, the U.S. Government was in no sense a party to the preparations for the coup. Otherwise, the plan would never have been made for this Lodge trip to Washington, which was so abruptly forestalled when the coup took place.

Until the very eve of the coup, moreover, Ambassador Lodge continued his fruitless effort to persuade President Diem to set his house in order. His last attempt was made on Sunday, October 27, when Diem invited Lodge to join him on a visit of inspection in the countryside.

The long day with Diem gave the Ambassador the opportunity to discuss both the state of affairs in Vietnam, and its effects on United States-Vietnamese relations, in detail and at great length. He offered a list of modest but significant steps which Diem could take to relax the tension in Saigon, and to improve the climate in Washington. Every item on the Lodge list was categorically vetoed by Diem.

Lodge then asked Diem whether he had any suggestions of his own about possible means of escape from the impasse. Diem merely gave the Ambassador "a blank look and changed the subject," as Lodge subsequently reported. Yet on Monday Lodge returned to the attack with Diem's intelligent and flexible Minister of Defense, Nguyen Dinh Thuan.

Thuan, who described the program pressed by Lodge on Diem as "extremely moderate," promised to go to Diem and see whether his persuasions would have any effect. His first report was decidedly encouraging. But the second report from Thuan, the next day, was a gloomy, final negative. Diem's brother, the all-powerful and half-mad Ngo Dinh Nhu, had had his say in the interval.

In short, there was no way to save Diem and Nhu from themselves. Or rather, there was only one way. It was indicated to Secretary McNamara just before he left Vietnam by the able Englishman, Prof. Patrick Honey, who is the unusual expert on Vietnam without a personal ax to grind.

"You must understand," Honey told McNamara, "that the Diem regime will surely be destroyed by a coup unless the U.S. Government makes a ringing reassertion of confidence in Diem and support for his government as soon as you get back to Washington."

McNamara gave Honey's judgment to President Kennedy as his own judgment. But no reassertion of confidence in the Diem regime was possible, simply because the U.S. Government had quite rightly lost confidence in the Diem regime.

Such are the facts. They constitute an interesting moral problem. On the one hand, the U.S. Government had foreknowledge that a coup was being considered. In addition, the U.S. Government could have forestalled the coup—by stultifying itself. But the U.S. Government refused to stultify itself. Diem refused to put his house in order. And so the coup took place.

Resolution Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association on October 14, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, the board of trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association on October 14 adopted a resolution urging that Con-

gress approve a strong civil rights program.

I take this opportunity to insert the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The board of trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association, recognizing the seriousness of the deep racial crisis which has gripped the United States in recent months and weeks, and reaffirming the traditional concern of Unitarians and Universalists for the supreme worth of every human personality, the dignity of man, and the use of the democratic method in human relationships, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States enact meaningful, comprehensive civil rights legislation to redress the legitimate grievances of the Negroes and members of other minority groups.

To this end, we endorse the substance and intent of H.R. 7152 and S. 1751 to strengthen voting rights, make discrimination in public accommodations unlawful, speed public school desegregation, establish a Community Relations Service to mediate racial disputes, extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for 4 years and give it added responsibilities, authorize withholding of Federal funds from programs that are administered in discriminatory fashion; and establish as a permanent Commission the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

We urge especially that the Congress erase the humiliation which accompanies the members of minority groups when they are refused accommodations or service in hotels, motels, restaurants, business establishments or places of amusement, and that a public accommodations law cover all establishments, of whatever size.

In addition, we urge that amendments be made to the bill to add a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission to cover hiring, firing, and promotion in all types of employment and membership in labor organizations engaged in interstate commerce. And, further, that the bill be amended to give the U.S. Attorney General power to bring civil suits in all cases where Americans are denied their constitutional rights because of race or religion.

The civil rights program before the Congress represents minimal objectives at this critical point in our Nation's history. One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation, the American Negro finds that in education, in employment, in housing, in the exercise of his rights of citizenship, he is still a second-class citizen. The Congress should therefore act this year to bring to fulfillment the promise of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Halleck Didn't Sell Out on Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an article by Roscoe Drummond, taken from the Washington Post of Monday, November 4, which I think will be of considerable interest to my colleagues in the House:

FAITHFUL TO PARTY: HALLECK DIDN'T SELL OUT ON RIGHTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The story is going the rounds that on the sunny morning after he had done so much to rescue the civil rights bill and assure it Republican support, House minority leader CHARLES HALLECK found an odd gift perched ominously atop his desk: A big black umbrella a la Neville Chamberlain.

Whether the incident is real or apocryphal, the meaning is the same—that someone is accusing HALLECK of selling out to the Democrats, of throwing away an opportunity to harass the Kennedy administration by stymying civil rights.

The implication of this Munich-esque charge is that HALLECK in giving his backing to the bipartisan civil rights bill is deserting Republican Party policy.

Such a charge is inaccurate, untrue, and unfair. HALLECK is implementing Republican policy. His politics-at-any-price Republican critics are not.

The Republican record in Congress, the Republican commitments in its 1960 national platform and the majority views of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives all prove that HALLECK, far from shoving civil rights down the throat of his party, is in fact acting faithfully in behalf of established party policy. Here is the record:

On the passage of the first civil rights bill in 80 years—in 1957—House Republicans voted 151 for, only 15 against. (The Democratic vote was 128 for, 82 against.) On the same bill Senate Republicans voted 37 for, none against. (Senate Democrats voted 23 for, 15 against.)

The next civil rights bill was in 1959. This time House Republicans voted 80 for, 8 against. (House Democrats voted 141 for, 73 against.) On the same bill, Senate Republicans voted 28 for, 1 against. (Senate Democrats voted 43 for, 17 against.)

HALLECK is acting in accord with this party record.

The 1960 Republican national platform committed the party as follows: "We pledge the full use of the power, resources, and leadership of the Federal Government to eliminate discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin."

HALLECK is helping his party to carry out this pledge.

Early in this session of Congress—in January, well ahead of any action by the White House—42 House Republicans took the initiative to jointly introduce a wide-ranging civil rights bill. In June, still ahead of the White House, 31 House Republicans added a further civil rights measure.

Last week Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee, and GOP Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, salvaged civil rights from hopeless deadlock by negotiating the terms of a strong bill capable of winning decisive bipartisan support.

It was this bill to which HALLECK gave his indispensable support. From the whole record it is obvious that he is not acting to impose a civil rights position on a reluctant party but is responding to Republican initiative.

The Republican actions cited above not only solidified the Republican Party at this session, but helped to encourage and stimulate the White House to pursue a more active course than was visible before the antidiscrimination demonstrations. Since then Mr. Kennedy has boldly galvanized his own party in Congress.

The result: A bipartisan agreement which puts the welfare of the Nation ahead of party maneuver.

Pay Raise Bonanza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the pay of high-ranking Government officials does not match the salaries of many corporation executives has been cited as justification for enactment of pending legislation to provide lush pay increases for the top brass of the executive and judicial branches of Government and Members of Congress.

The absurdity of this argument is illustrated in an editorial in the November 1, 1963 issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

GOVERNMENT NEVER WILL MATCH PRIVATE SALARIES

A pay raise bonanza for all Federal executive officials and Members of Congress has been voted out of the House committee.

This bill would increase the pay of Supreme Court justices from $35,000 to $45,000.

It would raise the pay of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House from $35,000 to $45,000.

Pay of cabinet officers would be increased from $25,000 to $35,000.

Members of Congress would receive $32,000 in place of the present $22,500.

It can be demonstrated, of course, that the pay of top governmental executives does not match that paid to corporation executives. Some school superintendents and college presidents are paid more than cabinet officials with much greater responsibilities. Some union international presidents are paid more than Members of Congress.

But there is another side of the story. Justices of the Supreme Court are appointed for life and earn a guaranteed salary until retirement age without penalty for declining mental or physical capability. The record does not show that any outstanding jurists have turned down a Supreme Court appointment because the salary was inadequate.

Likewise, the Government has been able to obtain the services of many top executives from business without offering them a comparable salary. The Secretaries of Defense under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations were formerly top executives in the automobile industry.

It would be wrong to remunerate these men inadequately simply because they are willing to accept a Government job as a public service. But it is unlikely that the Government would ever pay a salary commensurate with what they could earn in private business. Even with the big salary increase proposed, such men could be recruited only because of their desire to serve the public and because of the prestige involved.

There is no objective yardstick of what a man is worth. The only basis for determining salaries is what must be paid to get competent men and women. If we are to judge the fairness of Government salaries in relation to income in the private sector of the economy, then the President of the United States should be paid as much as Paul Getty or other multimillionaires.

This indicates the absurdity of basing Government salaries on such a comparison. If pay is the only way to get competent men in Government service, then the Government is always going to be out-bid by monetary opportunities outside Government. This is not necessarily an argument against Government salary increases but it is an effective

argument against the comparisons being cited as justification for the salary increases proposed.

The Vast Amount of Money Gambled Every Year in the 24 States That Have Parimutuel Betting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, I have brought to the attention of the Members of this Congress the vast amounts of money gambled, legally and illegally, every year in each of the 24 States that have parimutuel betting.

I have discussed in a series of 24 statements inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the panorama of gambling and crime in these States and how we have, because of our stubborn refusal to open our eyes to the bold print of commonsense, turned this Nation into a gamblers' paradise.

We have, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the hypocrites and the bluenose moralists, helped the underworld crime syndicates to fatten themselves from untapped gambling revenues and allowed them to expand their illicit activities into a nationwide web of dirt. We have permitted gambling in the United States to grow into a gigantic tax-free $100 billion a year monopoly which has supported and will continue to support, unchained and uncontrolled, every filthy ramification of underworld activity.

We have, by permitting this tax-free business to fall into the hands of the crime syndicates, heavily subsidized the forces of organized crime which, in turn, has corrupted the processes of law enforcement and government.

We have paid and will continue to pay a steep price for the foolishness and blindness of those who refuse to recognize and control the natural human urge to gamble. We have made America the playground of crime syndicate operations.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for our hard-pressed taxpayers to understand our Government's sanctimonious attitude about gambling when we know that gambling is a $100 billion a year industry which is the chief source of revenue to the underworld. Our entire ostrich-like attitude is beyond human comprehension.

Only a Government-run lottery can legally satisfy the American thirst to gamble—only a Government-operated lottery can shut off this tremendous flow of billions of dollars to the underworld mob—only Government regulation and control of gambling through a national lottery can cut into these billions of dollars now siphoned off by the crime syndicates.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to exchange our rose-colored glasses of wishful thinking for the more accurate lenses of financial and social reality. Just as repeal of prohibition brought an end to the bootleg era and tremendous new revenues to our Treasury, so would the end of hypocrisy in our treatment of gambling strike a lethal blow at organized gambling and pump a substantial part of these moneys into our Government coffers.

In 1962 24 States, listed below, enjoyed a total parimutuel turnover of $3.7 billion which brought into State treasuries legally, over $288 million. According to the testimony before the McClellan committee, 16½ times as much money is wagered off the racetracks on horses as is bet on the tracks. The total national offtrack betting turnover allocated to these 24 States is estimated at over $28½ billion. This, according to the McClellan hearings, represents only 42 percent of the total illegal gambling in these States. It can be estimated therefore, that the total illegal gambling in all 24 States approaches about $60 billion. Out of these funds, almost $6 billion—10 percent of the total turnover—goes right into the filthy pockets of the gambling crime syndicates.

How much longer are we going to continue to subsidize the forces of organized crime? How much longer are we going to keep the crime syndicates fat and happy? How much longer are we going to continue to make America the gamblers' paradise? What are we waiting for?

Tabulation on gambling in 24 States

State	Parimutuel turnover, 1962	Estimate off-track betting in 1962	Illegal gambling estimate	10 percent profit to crime syndicate
		Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*
1. Arizona	$21,454,342	$360	$750	$75
2. Arkansas	24,112,950	495	1,000	100
3. California	522,046,261	4,360	9,000	900
4. Colorado	16,013,019	490	1,000	100
5. Delaware	97,666,216	125	250	25
6. Florida	157,796,388	1,375	3,000	300
7. Illinois	342,620,765	2,795	5,600	560
8. Kentucky	57,920,587	845	2,000	200
9. Louisiana	45,572,223	905	2,000	200
10. Maine	15,332,728	295	600	60
11. Maryland	160,674,147	860	2,000	200
12. Massachusetts	109,499,421	1,425	3,000	300
13. Michigan	120,721,673	2,190	5,000	500
14. Nebraska	$41,626,636	$390	$800	$80
15. New Hampshire	81,659,975	170	350	35
16. New Jersey	324,105,214	1,680	3,500	350
17. New Mexico	36,693,249	290	600	60
18. New York	1,127,023,764	4,650	10,000	1,000
19. Ohio	138,349,642	2,695	5,000	500
20. Oregon	11,360,370	495	1,000	100
21. Rhode Island	95,026,350	235	500	50
22. South Dakota	4,409,922	175	350	35
23. Washington	27,088,502	790	1,500	150
24. West Virginia	90,689,481	520	1,100	110
Total	3,669,463,825	28,625	59,900	5,990

U.N.: Soviet Spy Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the recent apprehension by the FBI of two members of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations as participants in a spy plot offers further evidence that Russia uses the U.N. headquarters in New York primarily as a center for espionage.

In this regard, I desire to include an excellent editorial appearing in the November 1, 1963, issue of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier:

A new high in arrogance was reached this week when two Soviet diplomats, attached to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, were apprehended by the FBI for participation in a spy plot.

"The conduct of the FBI agents was very rude," Yuri A. Romashin, third secretary of the Soviet U.N. mission, declared.

This, we assure you, does not bring tears of shame to our eyes. Imagine. The FBI agents were rude. They were so crude as to believe that an official who enjoys diplomatic immunity should not abuse the privilege.

Hardly less insolent was the remark of John William Butenko, the naturalized American engineer who is accused of turning over defense secrets to the Russians. He complained about the photographers who appeared at the arraignment before the U.S. Commissioner. "If they keep on taking pictures they're going to ruin my life," he declared. We doubt if the photographers were overcome by remorse.

Extensive evidence that most if not all Soviet personnel with diplomatic immunity at the U.N. are engaging in espionage raises questions about the hazards of having the United Nations located in this country. For the presence of U.N. headquarters in New York means that the Soviet Union has a reason for keeping far more diplomats in this country than could otherwise be justified.

The United Nations is useless unless the participating governments use it as a means of resolving differences. The Russians are using it largely as a spy center.

Groggy Lumbermen Face New Cost Hike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in my State of

Washington is almost 6 percent. In fact, the figure runs as high as 8½ percent in my congressional district which depends heavily upon logging and timber products. According to the State of Washington Employment Security Department the increase in unemployment during the last week of October was due to layoffs in lumber manufacturing because of a shortage of logs.

Well, anyone who wants to look at the waterfronts of Everett or Bellingham can see logs stacked high for export. Most of these logs come from Forest Service sales. Our own mills, however, cannot afford the increasingly high prices they must pay for logs.

While unemployment increases, the Forest Service hikes the price operators must pay for Government stumpage. This price increase is the result of the Forest Service escalator clause which requires the purchaser to pay more than what he bid if there is an increase in the selling price of the finished product. Under the formula, saw log prices jumped a minimum of $2.65 a thousand because the price of lumber and plywood gained in the third quarter. Unfortunately, the $80 a thousand some plywood manufacturers received during the quarter because of a shortage has dropped to around $64. This means the "gypo" must pay more for his stumpage at a time when he gets less money for his saw logs.

I recently returned from my district where mills have had to shut down because the operators can't afford to pay the increased price forced upon them by the Forest Service. It seems to me it is incumbent upon the Forest Service to work out something to give people logs at reasonable prices so that this tremendous increase in unemployment, to which I referred earlier, will discontinue. It is an inopportune time for the Forest Service to raise prices.

Mr. Speaker, an article by Gerry Pratt in the Oregonian on October 4, 1963, explains what is happening. This article is aptly titled "Groggy Lumbermen Face New Cost Hike." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in the RECORD:

GROGGY LUMBERMEN FACE NEW COST HIKE

(By Gerry Pratt)

First there was the lumber strike, 29,000 men out of the mills, and it lasted 72 days and it hurt the industry in its pocket book, where the pickets struck.

Then there was the settlement; $3 a thousand it cost the lumber operators with a comparable increase in plywood and the producers wondered how they would get that extra dollar out of an already tight market.

But now, before the mills have had a chance to go chasing their losses, the U.S. Forest Service is moving in for its share of the strike booty.

The Government, is cut in on the strike because of the Forest Service "escalator" clause in national forest timber sales, a clause that reflects the price of lumber and plywood in the preceding quarter.

In the third quarter, which was the last quarter, the strike shut down close to half the industry capacity. Plywood prices quoted by those mills that stayed in action, climbed from a $60 market to a high of $80 a thousand. Lumber too took nice gains, where the mills were still in business.

So now the Forest Service price index is to reflect those prices in this quarter's timber sales and the results appear disastrous for the national forests, some of the industry, and most of all the loggers. Saw logs, following the Forest Service pricing formula, will go up a minimum $2.65 a thousand, and in the tightly pressed lumber market, that can mean more than your profit, it can mean a loss.

BUBBLE POPS FAST

Plywood logs will reflect even greater price gains than lumber, and the peeler log prices will increase an estimated $10.76 a thousand, thanks to the escalator clause of the sale contracts. But the industry can't pay an extra $10.76 a thousand for peelers in a market that is close to a break-even price, even for the good operators.

It is history now that the moment the strike ended this summer the plywood price bubble popped in less time than it takes a buyer to hang up the telephone. The $80 price vanished to $64 and to $60 before more than a few of the mills could even get an $80 price list out, if any ever did. Lumber also lost no time in finding a realistic adjustment.

So suddenly the industry finds itself back to what many have bitterly called profitless prosperity, full production that forces prices right down, plus the additional saddle weight of the new wage increases, and now the Forest Service increase in national forest timber prices. To make the situation ever more bitter, many of the operators facing the new price squeeze were shut down by the Lumber & Sawmill Workers Union or the International Woodworkers of America and never got in on the gravy the few operating mills enjoyed.

Nobody is taking the Forest Service price increases calmly. Three Portland-area mills, Multnomah Plywood, Dwyer Lumber & Plywood, and Linnton Plywood are all reportedly looking to other sources for their logs in this fourth quarter; some going to inventory, some to private sales or Bureau of Land Management sales, and some to State timber. Some will probably curtail logging operations, a move which could cut back 200 or more logging jobs in the Portland area alone.

Under a Forest Service contract a buyer can stall a quarter or two, as they will now, to miss the price reflecton of the strike months. The prices of the fourth quarter are certain to reflect the current soft market and lower the index on Government timber in the early part of next year.

In the Industrial Forestry Association, the organization that handles timber matters for the industry, Bill Hagenstein, the executive vice president has one recommendation for a cure to the situation.

LAYOFFS WILL HURT

Hagenstein feels it is a certainty that the loggers will soon feel the pinch as the mills cut back on their Government timber cutting. "Those layoffs will be a serious economic setback to our communities, and it will ultimately affect employment in the sawmills and plywood plants," he warned. "This is the season when log inventories are normally built up for winter production when the weather prevents logging in the Cascades."

In addition to this headache, Hagenstein said, there is the heavy blowdown still on the forest floor from last year's Columbus Day storm. There is a need for rapid salvage, he insisted, much of it in the national forests.

"The purpose of Government timber is to provide a firm economy for the community that depends upon national forest timber," he contended. "It takes a steadily operating industry to keep people employed and to yield the taxes from profitable business to run the Government."

Hagenstein's answer to all this is addressed to Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture. "Freeman," he said, "must recognize the Forest Service's responsibility to the stability of the communities dependent upon national forest timber. What he must do," he insisted, "is adjust the stumpage prices to allow continued operations and steady employment during the fall and coming winter."

If Freeman does not, the timber industry's strike will be felt again this winter, in a manner the unions and management are only now beginning to foresee.

Soft on Communism?—Well, Now, What Do You Think?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the October issue of a publication entitled the Iron Age.

This editorial was written by Tom Campbell, publisher, and I think it worthy of the attention of Members of Congress.

The editorial follows:

[From the Iron Age, Oct. 24, 1963]

SOFT OF COMMUNISM?—WELL, NOW, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The administratoin may not be soft on communism—but it sure looks as if it were. If you do not think so, look around a bit—then recall what things were like a few years ago.

All this is in the name of peace. But so were past confidences in the Russians—all of which were smashed to smithereens.

While the ink is still wet on the ban-the-bomb entente, the Russians had their little party—holding American and British military units up on the way to Berlin. And what did Washington say on the highest authority?

They said—first that is—that it was all a mistake. Surely Mr. Khrushchev must not know what was cooking. Then later, by golly, it did look like a planned sortie to put the Americans and the British in their places.

That was quite hard for our striped-pants guys to believe after all the Russian malarky about peace, coexistence, friendship, and other-tried-and-true doublecrosser sweet talk.

But what turns one's stomach is to see the President of the United States greeting the arch doublecrosser, Tito. Not only is this guy a Communist of the first water, but he is playing the Russians and the Americans for fish. And if he isn't doing that, then he is in a secret deal with Khrushchev to take us for everything we have.

To see this fellow—picked by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin over free Yugoslavs—traveling in the United States as an unofficial guest ought to gag anyone who remembers what he did to freedom-loving Yugoslavs.

Things look mighty strange in Washington these days. We interfere with a junta in the Dominican Republic, we insult the Canadians, we put up with a dictator in South Vietnam, we row with De Gaulle, and we let politicians and idiots overrule some dedicated State Department career people.

And while we are being sanctimonious about not recognizing the military or dictators in South America, we carry Tito around in cotton bunting. We try our best to keep from hurting Mr. Khrushchev's feelings lest he be mad at us.

As for the briefing that the Government gave to newsmen, saying that the officials were aware of perfidy of the Reds, etc., etc., it was so much tinsel—in view of what we are doing now. Time will prove this.

A bum is a bum is a bum is a bum—and that is about what Tito and his ilk are. Anyone who can't see that is hopeless.

Metrical-Choral Version of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Mr. Albert Charles Norton, a historial and educational specialist, has sent me a copy of his metrical-choral version of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. This piece, arranged for musical setting and choral rendition, is particularly appropriate in this month in which we observe the anniversary of that famous address.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Norton's material printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the composition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—SET TO METRE AND RHYME FOR CHORAL RENDITION

(By Albert Charles Norton)

Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought to birth
A nation on this continent, ordained to bless the earth;
A land conceived in liberty, and dedicated all
To one great proposition: men are equal, great and small,
And now in civil war engaged, we here must prove our faith—
That this our land, with such a stand, survive the toll of death.
We meet upon a battefield, a place to dedicate
To those brave men who fought and fell to save our country great.
But we can never hallow, never bless the sacred soil:
The brave, the living, and the dead, have done this with their toil.
The world will little note nor long remember what we say,
But it can ne'er forget the meaning of that fateful day;
It is for us, the living, rather, here to dedicate
Our lives to that unfinished work they strove to culminate:
That from these honored dead we take increased devotion's pride
In that great cause for which they gave full measure when they died!
That we here highly now resolve these dead died not in vain;
That this our Nation, under God, no more endure such pain,
But have new birth of freedom, and that government henceforth—
Of, by and for the people shall not perish from the earth!

Selection of Bernard M. Baruch and Representative Carl Vinson as Great Americans for 1963 and 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Editor of Dixie Business, a magazine published in Decatur, Ga., has added to its list of Great Americans, Bernard M. Baruch and Congressman CARL VINSON. Also, Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, who was largely responsible for the development of the Polaris missile, was named by the magazine to its Hall of Fame for the Living.

The magazine and its editor and publisher, Hubert F. Lee, are to be commended for these selections, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lee's news release and accompanying endorsements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECATUR, Ga.—Bernard M. Baruch and Representative CARL VINSON today were named a Great American for 1963 and 1964, respectively, by the editors of Dixie Business magazine.

Hubert F. Lee, of Decatur, Ga., for 34 years editor of Dixie Business, said that Mr. VINSON was announced a year in advance as he will have served a half-century of "distinguished public service" in the Congress in 1964—the Lord willing—an alltime record.

Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, U.S. Navy (retired), who was responsible largely for success of the Polaris missile, was named to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, the honor group of 200 living leaders from which the "Man of the South" is elected each year. Texas-born, Oklahoma-reared, Admiral Raborn is now vice president-program management for Aerojet-General Corp., El Monte, Calif. Mr. Baruch has been on this honor group since 1953.

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, was the Great American for 1962. Others have included Dr. Charles F. Kettering (1955), Cecille B. DeMille, Helen Keller, Tom D. Spies, M.D., Senator Lister Hill, Oveta Culp Hobby, and R. Manton Wilson, M.D.

Pfc. Hubert F. Lee, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, stationed at Camp Lejeune, N.C., is honorary chairman of the "A Great American" awards committee.

Mr. Baruch, in a letter, wrote Lee:

"Thank you so much for the honor you bestow upon me by naming me the 'A Great American' for 1963. As I look over the list I feel very pleased indeed, particularly to be between two such fine men as Colonel Glenn and CARL VINSON. VINSON has been a wonderful American, especially in the last trying years."

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, the "A Great American" for 1959:

"MY DEAR HUBERT: I commend you on your selections of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch and Hon. CARL VINSON as the 'A Great American' for 1963 and 1964 and would be glad to help in any way I could."

Pfc. Hubert F. Lee, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps honorary chairman of the A Great American Awards Committee and publisher-designate of Dixie Business: "One nice thing about naming Mr. Baruch for 1963 and Representative CARL VINSON for 1964, nobody will have to ask 'Who is he? or What has he done to deserve it?' "

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia: "Congressman VINSON, who has served so long and so statesmanlike in the House of Representatives, is most deserving of this recognition, and I commend you on your choice. In my opinion, it would be most appropriate for a national committee to honor Congressman VINSON next year as he marks a half century of dedicated and outstanding public service.

"With reference to Mr. Bernard Baruch as the "A Great American" for 1963, I am in complete accord and endorse your selection of him for this honor."

Dan Haughton, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (Born in Alabama and on the South's Hall of Fame honor group):

"I was glad to see Admiral Raborn added to the 'Hall of Fame for the Living' and added to the list of nominees for 'Man of the South.' He is a wonderful person and his Navy career was certainly one of dedication and service to our country.

Representative CARL VINSON is an outstanding choice as 'A Great American' for 1964. His lifetime of service to his State and country makes us all proud we are Americans. Mr. Baruch is a great American in any year also."

John J. McDonough, president, Georgia Power Co., "Representative VINSON is a great American and a great statesman. You do well to name him the 'A Great American' for 1964. Mr. Baruch is a grand selection for the 1963 'A Great American' Award."

Gov. Carl Sanders, of Georgia: "I certainly agree that Mr. VINSON has provided his State and his Nation with half a century of distinguished public service. I consider the honor very appropriate, and know he will be delighted to receive it. (It was my pleasure to name you and Hubert, Jr., to my staff as lieutenant colonels.)."

Congressman PHIL M. LANDRUM, Democrat, Georgia. "I think the Honorable CARL VINSON is an excellent selection for your 'A Great American' award for 1964 or any other year."

Congressman CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, Democrat, Georgia. "I think your idea of naming Mr. VINSON as your 'A Great American' for 1964 is an excellent one. His service to our country and to our State certainly is worthy of note."

Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, in reply to letter re Admiral Raborn:

"There is no doubt that Admiral Raborn is a great American—one whose contributions to his country and to the preservation of its security will long be remembered.

"I am sure Admiral Raborn would be honored by his addition to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living honor group.

"I certainly would be proud to recommend him for any honor which citizens of our great country might desire to pay him."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri (first Secretary of the Air Force and himself one of the leaders considered for the A Great American Award):

"There never was a better American or a more able one than Vice Admiral Raborn."

Rear Adm. E. M. Eller, U.S. Navy, retired, in letter dated August 30, 1961:

"I notice with interest your Hall of Fame for the Living. If the ballot can be extended I recommend you add Admiral Raborn, father of the Polaris ballistic missile submarine: one of the greatest steps forward in the security in history."

Congressman J. L. PILCHER, Democrat, of Georgia: "I am sure that Congressman VINSON will be delighted with this show of appreciation on your part for his fine service to America and the U.S. Congress."

Don Carter, managing editor, the National Observer, former city editor of the Atlanta Journal: "I applaud your selection of Mr. VINSON. He has certainly made an outstanding record for Georgia."

Brig. Gen. William R. (Bill) Wendt, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, National Chairman Marine Corps Affairs Committee of the Navy League of the United States:

"I am also of the belief that Gen. David M. Shoup, U.S. Marine Corps, CMC, and his designated successor, Gen. W. M. Greene, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, deserve serious consideration for the honor in the immediate years ahead.

"Accordingly, I hereby nominate them seriatem for A Great American in 1965 and 1966." (General Shoup was among the top seven for this year's "A Great American" for 1963 selection—editor's note.)

Emeline Nollen, assistant to editor in chief and founder 40 years ago of Time magazine, Henry R. Luce, another of the top seven for "A Great American" for 1963 award:

"Mr. Luce has asked me to thank you for your letter and for the honor that you almost bestowed upon him.

"Of course, the honor of being thought of in the company of Mr. Baruch and the other names you mentioned is a signal one in any case."

Education Under the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles on the Alliance for Progress.

These articles, which appeared in the Wabash, Ind., Plain Dealer and in the Peru, Ind., Tribune, describe some of the many successes which the Alliance has already scored in Latin America. At the same time, these articles make us aware of the magnitude of the task confronting us in Latin America.

Education is but one facet of the total problem confronting most of our neighbors to the south, but in the long run it may be the most basic. It is thus encouraging to note that the Alliance has participated in projects such as Operation Children, the Mexican National Commission for Free Textbooks, and the rural teachers program in Bolivia.

We often tend to evaluate aid programs in terms of our own experiences. But, the problem in most of Latin America is not a shortage of classrooms, not a need for college facilities, not a need for scientific equipment in the classrooms, but a need for people to learn simply how to read and write. In Mexico, the problem is not whether or not to include such alleged "frills" as shops and gymnasiums in the schools, but how they are going to be able to build even the most rudimentary one-room schools.

The Alliance, as these articles show, is a success in many ways. But, we must not allow these achievements to blind us to the overwhelming magnitude of the task confronting our neighbors to the South. We must also ask ourselves again and again just how our aid can be most effectively channeled, how it can do the most good, and how we can be sure that it actually serves its purpose of bettering the lot of the average man.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer, Sept. 17, 1963]

MEXICO DEVELOPS PREFAB SCHOOLS TO BE USED IN LATIN AMERICA

WASHINGTON.—Some 7,419 new schools have been erected cheaply and rapidly under Mexico's prefabricated rural school construction program. Mexico is now offering to teach its techniques to other nations under the Alliance for Progress plan.

Each building can be put up in 36 hours with community labor. Local citizens put down the platform and erect the prefabricated materials. They are directed by truck-drivers and regional supervisor who deliver the building parts. Materials available locally are used for flooring and walls.

Using the theme "every home a school and every Bolivian a literacy instructor," the Government has inaugurated a national literacy campaign. In keeping with the Alliance for Progress objectives in education, some 6,000 primary and secondary students in LaPaz organized into approximately 100 literacy brigades have pledged themselves to teach at least 1 illiterate how to read.

Five members of the Oakland County (Mich.) Commission have arrived at Cali, Colombia, to initiate the first phase of a people-to-people exchange program between the two areas under the Alliance.

The master plan for Cali's future development includes an exchange with Oakland County of professionals, students, administrators, engineers, architects, economists, and educational and agricultural specialists.

Two Alliance for Progress loans will help the national tin mines of Bolivia return to profitable levels of production. The U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) will lend $5 million; and the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) will lend $4.86 million to Corporacion Minera de Bolivia, which operates 15 tin mines and mills employing more than 24,000.

Fifty small farmers in La Granja, near Santiago, Chile, have formed a new agricultural cooperative whose long-range plans call for membership to 1,000 farmers, with production goals of some 3 million kilos of peaches, 500,000 eggs, and 500,000 kilos weight of young pigs.

The Esso Research & Engineering Co., under a contract signed with the Pan American Union, will conduct research on new types of building materials and techniques to help ease the housing shortage in Latin America. The U.S. company, which will center its research at CINVA, the OAS-administered Inter-American Housing and Planning Center in Bogotá, Colombia, announced that it will investigate the use of petroleum-based products ranging from asphalt to plastics.

One of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress is the elimination of a serious housing shortage in Latin America. Two to three million homes per year are needed.

Colombia is now producing sufficient fertilizer so it will become an important exporter. Both private enterprise and Government are taking part in this Alliance project, intended to reduce Colombia's dependence on foreign sources of fertilizers and strengthen her balance of payments.

A contract has been signed for construction of 2,000 houses in Cali, Colombia.

Twenty members of the domestic Salvadorean Peace Corps received technical instructions in community improvement this summer at the University of Oklahoma.

Passenger air transport is growing faster in Latin America than any other world region. In the last 10 years, the number of air passengers has increased from 6 to 11.4 million.

Uruguay will improve her educational facilities under a 3-year program with Ohio State University under an AID agreement.

Over 30,000 Bolivian children per year will benefit when 1,000 rural teachers complete a year of training under an AID agreement for training 4,500 Bolivian teachers. The program includes 8 weeks of classroom, plus laboratory instruction and on-the-job supervision. AID previously provided $202,000 to begin the program, and will advance $125,000 more this year. Bolivia and the United States will supply some $52,000 to cover local expenses.

Colombia will expand Sugamuxi College in the town of Sogamoso with a $1.5 million AID loan to the Education Ministry. Sugamuxi is the most important educational center in Sogamoso.

A young U.S. engineer, William F. Luce, has enabled 4,000 Guatemalans to move from unsanitary huts in slums into homes built of concrete blocks with tile floors. The homes cost: $640 to $700, including lot, paved streets, running water, electricity, and sanitation. New owners pay $100 down payment, and $16 a month for over 4 years.

Luce began his nonprofit program 2 years ago. What he earns in other housing and engineering programs permits him to carry out this program in Guatemala. He has built 600 low-cost homes and is continuing with about 50 a month.

Forty villages in Panama will receive Alliance aid for construction of 125 classrooms, the first phase of a 3,000-classroom program to be completed by 1967. Panama's Ministry of Education will provide an initial $50,000 and AID $255,000.

Brazil's Volta Redonda Steel Mills broke all records in 1962 with an output of 1,150,000 tons of ingot, against 1,120,000 in 1961.

The Chilean Agrarian Reform Corporation has delivered some 171 new houses, each located on a family farm, to their new owners.

An Export-Import Bank loan for $4.3 million will help an Argentine steel firm expand. Siderurgia Campana, S.A., will be able to purchase thermoelectrical generating equipment and an oxygen unit for installation at a steel ingot producing plant in northwest Buenos Aires.

An Alliance for Progress inspired laboratory-to-farmer campaign, to promote scientific farming in the world's developing agricultural areas, has been launched throughout Latin America as a privately sponsored venture by Cyanamid International, a private U.S. firm. Aim of the coordinated feed-health program for animals is to the output of meat production per dollar invested in livestock.

[From the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer, Sept. 16, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IS HAVING AN IMPACT ON LATIN AMERICANS

WASHINGTON.—The face of Latin America is changing as new lines are drawn in the transportation networks of every Alliance country.

New road, rail, and waterway systems are linking capital cities with provincial towns, speeding the movement of farm produce to the cities, and enabling industry to move from congested areas to newly accessible regions.

More than half a billion dollars in loans and credits from various Alliance agencies, plus substantial local government funds, have been allocated to expansion and upgrading of Latin America's transport complex.

Mexico is building and renovating 8,900 miles of highways; a batch of new diesel elec-

tric locomotives are a key element in modernization of the national railway system.

Central America and Panama are engaged in a transport revolution which is linking areas in each nation, connecting nation with nation, and weaving the whole pattern in the pan-American highway system.

Colombia has begun the final stage of an all-weather highway system connecting her important cities. She is modernizing her regional rail lines and tying them into the new Atlantic Railroad which runs down the Magdalena Valley to the Caribbean. The 480-mile Atlantic line interconnects five existing lines and reduces freight time from 10 days to 12 hours.

Four Andean nations—Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile—have united key shore areas with the high plateaus and the once-isolated reaches on the rim of the Amazon Basin.

Major transport programs are also underway or already completed in Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Paraguay, Venezuela, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

A $150 million Alliance project, designed to double the incomes of more than 250,000 persons, is under study for the Dominican Republic.

The Alliance's second anniversary was celebrated throughout the Americas.

Dr. Jose A. Mora, OAS Secretary General, noted that the close of the second year "sees the participating nations moving forward, perhaps more slowly than we could wish, but with increasing sureness and resolution; by the end of this year," he said "some 18 million Latin Americans will be benefiting from Alliance projects."

Colombia's President Guillermo Leon Valencia said the Alliance has been "good and generous," that Colombia is about to adopt a rigorous tax reform program and is pressing agrarian reform and other development efforts.

The anniversary was the occasion for announcing several major projects. In Caracas, AID officials presented the first installment of a $30 million loan for low-cost housing. AID also announced four new loans for Bolivia.

Operation Children, a food-for-peace school lunch program, is a cooperative action on two key Alliance goals—improved health and education.

Twelve months ago, the program reached about 4 million boys and girls. In the past school year, the total climbed to 9.3 million in 18 Alliance nations; by August 1964, an estimated 11.5 million Latin American children—or nearly 1 out of 3 of primary school age—will be benefiting from the program.

Highlights of last year: more than 3 million Brazilian children received a daily milk ration; absenteeism in the Puno Department of Peru dropped from 40 percent to practically zero after introduction of school lunches; Bolivian absenteeism also dropped sharply; Colombia established 10 nutrition centers to serve school-age children.

Operation Children is a truly cooperative program in the spirit of the Alliance. The United States provides the food and pays transportation costs (total value $28.6 million last year). Latin nations make a variety of contributions (totaling $13.2 million last year) such as cash payments, paid personnel, locally available food supplements and equipment, warehousing facilities. Nine nations are conducting their own separate child-feeding programs—Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Venezuela, and Mexico.

Education: Mexico's National Commission for Free Textbooks this year is distributing a record 25 million free books to schoolchildren, raising the number of textbooks distributed to 85 million since the program began in February 1959.

One serious Latin American education problem is the lack of university facilities outside capital cities. Chile is providing such facilities through a rapidly expanding chain of regional colleges. Three colleges, at Temuco, La Serena, and Antofogasta, are already in operation; two more are under construction at Osorno and Talca. When the latter two have been completed, Chile's present annual output of college graduates will double to 4,000. Like all education in Chile, the 2-year institutions are free to qualified students. The regional system was entirely devised and developed by Chileans; provincial governments provided land, and in some instances labor and materials, to build the new facilities. The program also received support from two international agencies: the Inter-American Bank lent $2.3 million for the schools now under construction and Ford Foundation is supporting study grants in the United States for Chilean teachers who have volunteered to teach in the new schools.

[From the Peru (Ind.) Tribune, Sept. 19, 1963]

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS MAKING ITS LONGEST STRIDES IN MEXICO

MEXICO CITY.—The Alliance for Progress is taking perhaps its longest strides in Mexico, following in the footsteps of a social and economic development program which has already made this country a showcase for its goals.

Mexico considers that it is leading rather than following.

"The Alliance represents a continental extension of the ideology and realizations of the Mexican revolution," said the Government in summing up the accomplishments of 2 years of hemispheric cooperation.

In its own country, however, the incoming loans and credits are helping Mexico to refocus attention on the rural population which won the first fruits of the revolution in the postrevolutionary land economic growth.

National industrialization has showered its benefits on the cities.

That is where the new middle class has taken shape, brought into being by modern factories now producing most of the consumer goods and many of the heavy manufacturers that the country used to import.

While city workers are moving from slums into adequate housing, the farm populace still lives for most part in the adobe-hut misery.

While city children go to new schools, protected by social services including social security, there are rural villages with no schools at all.

City industrial workers eat well-balanced diets, but the typical peasant family barely survives on the corn and beans it can coax from drought-parched land.

Alliance for Progress loans are one way to improve this bleak rural panorama.

A $20-million guarantee fund will soon begin moving credits out to small farmers through the private banking system. Campesinos farming either private tracts or ejido tracts distributed by the government can apply for 5- to 10-year loans to make improvements on their farms.

The loans are intended to finance everything from digging a well to buying a piece of farm machinery, a new cow, or a brood of chickens, anything that improves productivity.

Another $70 million is pumping into irrigation, land improvement, and community development projects in a dozen different rural states.

In Tabasco, where rivers run wild through the coastal jungles, a vast new farming colony is taking shape with some of the money. The land is being drained and flushed of salts for conversion into 25-acre farms to grow bananas, cocoa, rubber, and food crops.

The new farming community is also to receive housing and school finances by the Alliance for Progress.

Mexico's own federal irrigation and electrification projects around the country (including the huge dam on the Grijalva River which used to flood the coastal lowlands of Tabasco) have been drawing on big development loans from the World Bank.

Together with industrialization loans from the Export-Import Bank and peso stabilization credits from the Eximbank, the U.S. Treasury, and the International Monetary Fund, almost $700 million has been made available to this country through the Alliance for Progress.

Mexico's basically sound management of its own economy (including tax reforms) is making almost every peso count, in the opinion of U.S. observers.

If there have been any failures, they are failures of time. Time is running out in the hunger bowls of rural Mexico. There is a natural delay in planning. But Mexican planners are determined to spend the money where it will do the most good.

"This program," said one of them, "is for the people who need it most, not least."

Verdict Comes Before Proof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I criticized some comments by a gentleman in the other body which implied that consumption of dairy products was a direct cause of heart attacks, paralytic strokes, and so forth. Mr. Tom Ellis, farm editor of the Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press, has made some further studies on this subject and has compared the consumption per person of fats from various countries with deaths from heart disease in those same countries. The figures show quite clearly that hasty verdicts about the relationship between dairy products and heart disease were ill advised. I commend the article to the attention of the other Members whether they be from dairy producing areas or from areas where consumers benefit from the productive efforts of our dairy industry.

The article follows:

VERDICT COMES BEFORE PROOF: BUTTERFAT'S GUILTY

(By Tom A. Ellis)

There is no doubt that the cholesterol scare of recent years keeps many Americans from consuming all the dairy products they'd like—most probably, from consuming all their good health requires.

A few years ago, it was discovered that many heart patients had abnormally large quantities of cholesterol in their blood, and the first evidence pointed—or was said to have pointed—to milk and dairy products as a probable cause.

Some doctors immediately took up the gage of battle in an attack on milk and dairy products as damaging to health. The majority were more cautious, pending more conclusive evidence.

The clamor was enough to arouse public alarm. Per capita consumption of milk and milk products fell sharply in America. A multimillion-dollar food industry was built around the safe fats, chiefly vegetable oils.

Time went by without unearthing the facts to build a credible case against dairy

products; certainly not a conclusive one. In fact, the evidence began to point the other way.

There are probably some doctors in every community of any size who still fear the use of dairy products as cholesterol builders. Yet the Journal of the American Medical Society felt it its duty to point out that this was unsubstantiated and that doctors actually might be doing their patients real dietary harm in advising them not to consume dairy products.

Illustrative, a couple of weeks ago, Representative DURWARD HALL, Seventh Missouri District Congressman and himself a medical doctor with years of experience, rapped the knuckles of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, for a speech on the dangers of cholesterol in dairy products.

"As a physician and a vascular surgeon," HALL said, "I can assure him (DOUGLAS, former economist and college professor) that more health problems will result from the absence of dairy products in their diet than from their use."

The accompanying charts, above and below, would seem to bear out Dr. HALL's contentions. Certainly they raise questions that the cholesterol-fearing, anti-dairy-products medical men have yet to answer before they can build a valid case against the abundant use of milk and dairy products in the daily diet.

Why, for example, does France enjoy the lowest heart disease death rate of any of the 16 nations shown above—the best-fed nations in the world, it should be observed? The French consume more than twice as much butterfat as Americans, have only a fifth the heart disease death rate.

New Zealand, on the other hand, is the largest consumer of butterfat with a per capita consumption six times that of America's, yet with a heart disease fatality rate only two-thirds as great as ours. And Belgians, consuming 2½ times as much butterfat per capita as Americans, have only a third our rate of deaths by heart disease.

Or turn the case around: The United States, the United Kingdom, and Sweden have the highest heart disease death rates among the better-fed people of the world, and the United States leads the world in consumption of other fats (almost certainly leads by a large margin in the consumption of these new-fangled, fad food industry—enriching polyunsaturated fats, whatever they may be). Sweden and the United Kingdom, both with high heart disease rates, aren't far behind in nondairy fat consumption.

Wouldn't it be a more logical assumption, then, to say that nonbutterfats are the real cause of heart disease? But that, of course, would be an unscientific jump at conclusions—something we leave to a few doctors.

Which calls to mind a story clipped from some publication a few years ago, now dug out of the files to illustrate the point:

A GRIM FAIRY TALE

Once upon a time there was a very poor country where nobody had enough to eat and the average expectation of life was 24 years. There was also a very rich country where everybody had plenty to eat and the average expectation of life was 64 years.

In the very rich country, people used to save up milk and butter and cream and eggs and send them to the very poor country where they were distributed, especially to the children who otherwise would have had none.

In this way, the expectation of life in the very poor country was raised from 24 to 27 years.

Meanwhile, the expectation of life in the very rich country was rising, too, and went from 64 to 67 years. Then everybody who didn't die of cancer of the lungs from smoking too many cigarettes died of coronary thrombosis.

Then someone discovered that coronary thrombosis was due to eating and drinking milk and butter and cream and eggs. So people stopped eating and drinking milk and butter and cream and eggs in the very rich country and sent it all to the very poor country so that the expectation of life in the very poor country might be raised high enough for them to start dying of coronary thrombosis so that they, too, could stop eating and drinking milk and butter and cream and eggs.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the annual debate concerning pros and cons of our foreign aid program is still underway, but without question the pendulum of public opinion is swinging in the direction of a sharply reduced foreign aid program because of the many, many examples of waste and complete ineffectiveness. A real grassroots opinion is set forth in an editorial by John Boyer, Scott City News Chronicle, Scott City, Kans.

In my opinion, Mr. Boyer objectively discusses the present temper and feeling of the American public and properly concludes that now is the time for a hard look. The taxpayers will no longer be pacified by Congress delaying the day of complete reckoning.

The editorial follows:

SMOTHER FREEDOM WITH MONEY

U.S. foreign policy was recently likened to a long hospital corridor, lined with rooms with "Do Not Disturb" signs. "Do Not Disturb the Russians in Cuba"; "Do Not Disturb Nasser in the Middle East"; "Do Not Disturb the Vietminh in Laos"; "Do Not Disturb Indonesia's Playboy, Sukarno."

Unless foreign policy doctors can get past the "Do Not Disturb" signs, the corridor will look more like a mausoleum, because behind each of these doors, freedom will die.

Our State Department says it has been doing its very best for these "patients" throughout the world, and that if they do not respond, the fault is not with our prescription.

The prescription seems to be that if we don't know what else to do with a world problem, we throw money at it. When one stops to think of all the billions of good American dollars that have gone down foreign drains, it makes one ill. And thoroughly disgusted with a stupid Congress which has let such a thing grow and flourish. Now, it seems that our Congress is beginning to realize that the whole thing is a failure, but it doesn't know what to do about it—so is prepared to throw more money at it.

The movement to stop this terrible waste started at the grassroots—and the grassroots is going to have to see that it is carried out. We as voters should call every Congressman and Senator who votes blindly for the enormous foreign aid budget on the carpet to account for his actions.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has passed out more than $120 billion in U.S. tax money to more than 100 countries. There doesn't even have to be an excuse. In some instances the recipient countries had to be talked into accepting the money, which they did not need. Nations receiving aid are not required to have either sympathy of respect for the ideas of freedom, or for the United States. Billions have been given away to Communist and neutral countries.

Yes, we all have heard that American dollars are all that stand between freedom and communism. But this is getting worn a little thin. For instance, Indonesia was at one time a Western colony, then became a pro-Western independent country. After receiving almost a billion dollars in U.S. aid, it now is a pro-Soviet nation. Laos, after receiving $500 million in U.S. foreign aid, can now be chalked up to the Communists. Cambodia, whose economic lifeblood came from our foreign aid, is slipping away.

Cuba, which received $66 million in aid, now is a base for Communist arms, and is the greatest single threat to Western freedom. This in itself should show that dollars do not fight anything, as such.

We have been sending our money abroad, but not our ideals. What good does it do to build a school in a foreign country, to teach the children to read, if all they have available for reading is Communist material?

Perhaps the United States is the leader of the Western world; perhaps we should help poorer countries. But we can do it best by showing them first how democracy works, and what it is for. And we can accomplish more with our dollars as loans, which can be controlled, than by gifts.

A long, hard look at foreign aid is indeed far past due. It must be done now—not next year.

What We Need To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, since our Nation has reached a new level of growth in homebuilding, it is not expected to match the skyrocketing pace of the past 15 years. It is a very good time for us to take stock and to determine the assimilation, the balance, and the health of our past growth. No where in our economy has the dynamics of this growth been more vigorous or more dynamic than in the advances made by our financial institutions in general and our savings and loans industry in particular.

We can all join in the praise rightly and fittingly bestowed upon these excellent institutions, which in cooperation with well-founded and directed public programs, answered so well the challenge and demand for funds to finance our fabulous 15 years of homebuilding.

However, all has not been sweetness and light. The very incident of rapid growth provided an environment which sometimes outstrips available judgment based on sound experience and prudent practices. Further and just as impartially, such sound judgment and prudent practices can be diluted by new influences and personalities which invite less care and less caution. Such influences frequently impinge themselves into economic and financial competition at times of accelerated growth. Unfortunately, not all of the "smart money" that anticipates and participates in such growth are mindful of the proud heritage

of practices born of the past, hard, tough days of the business. Nor do all entertain and observe deep concern for a continuing heavy responsibility to the public and to the future of the industry. The new ideas, the vitality and energy new participates bring and encourage are to be welcomed but equally true, the new risk, questionable practices, and sharp dealings are to be guarded against.

In appreciation of the importance of this period which can be so constructively used to assess our advances and adjust for a healthy maintainable growth. We have long been urging a critical appraisal within the saving and loan industry. It is with pleasure I now include the excellent remarks of Chairman Joseph P. McMurray. I congratulate the chairman for the wisdom of his critical attitude and commend the industry for sober and serious consideration the suggestions he has set forth.

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

(By Joseph P. McMurray)

If any industry can claim a remarkable and successful development in a brief period of time, it is the savings and loan industry. At the end of World War II, this was indeed a small business as you well know. Today, with over $100 billion in assets and well-developed services, your industry is at the forefront of financial activity. The record that the savings and loan industry has made will be long remembered. It is a record of which many are envious and that attracts criticism for that reason as well as for others. Yet, careful examination of this record demonstrates that the savings and loan industry as a whole has provided a most satisfactory place for the small saver and, to some extent, larger savers to invest funds on which they were seeking a reasonable rate of return and a high degree of safety. Part of your success has been your ability to marshal these funds and then to channel them to homebuyers, builders, and others, primarily for the development of the housing stock of this Nation.

In the course of these developments, the industry has acquired a structure which, in general, provides a basis for confidence. For example, the total reserves and surplus of your industry are in excess of $7 billion. Furthermore, you hold close to $10 billion in cash and U.S. Government obligations. The reserves and surplus of your industry, therefore, amount to about 8 percent of the assets to which we may assign the term "risk assets."

Of course, this term itself is misleading because risk is quite a variable thing. Primarily, the assets we are referring to as "risk assets" consist of your mortgage portfolio. Even within that mortgage portfolio, not all of the assets really can bear the label of "risk" to any meaningful degree. About $11.5 billion worth of those so-called "risk assets" are insured or guaranteed by the U.S. Government because the mortgages are either FHA or VA.

Even among the $75 billion of conventional loans, which do not involve Government insurance or guarantees, the risk is probably minimal in a very substantial percentage of the cases.

We know that a loan made on a reasonable downpayment, after 5 years or so, provides such a margin of safety for the lender that only a cataclysm could provide any real hazard for the lender. Because of the large volume of real estate turnover and the growth of your industry, not a very substantial percentage of loans on your books would be beyond the 5-year category. However, even if we look at loans that are 3 years old and over where there has been a meaningful downpayment, the risk to the lender begins to fade rather sharply. It would appear from our statistics that at least half your loans would be at least 3 years old or over.

What I am saying, therefore, is that the average risk with which we might be concerned applies primarily to about half of your conventional loans. The remainder of your assets lie clear of even average risk. May I say, too, that the average risk to which I refer is not a severe one and should not be in the case of financial institutions of your type.

The risk is not severe because, if you follow good appraisal practices and the strictures of law and regulation covering downpayments and maturities, the risk is sharply limited.

The main point we should bear in mind is that the industry is sound, firmly grounded and, in general, is in a position to resist even the most severe ravages of economic decline. The savings and loan industry is a strong, well-developed set of financial institutions which has served the public well and which is in a position to continue this service.

We should bear in mind certain things, however. First, that the industry's development, while a hallmark of success, also creates problems. Second, that the rules and regulations under which you operate, in many cases, were designed for an industry that was struggling to recover from the ravages of the great depression and which had problems quite different from those you face today. Third, some of the good results that are apparent today are, in part, enforced by factors other than management decision or regulatory practice. Finally, the fact that the industry as a whole is well grounded should not blind us to the fact that practices exist and institutions engage in them which pose a hazard for the industry as a whole. Before proceeding further, I would like to make it clear and I think you should understand, as should anyone who hears or reads these remarks, that pointing the finger at a few who may engage in unsound practices does not change the basic position that the industry as a whole is in a sound and effective position.

A brief examination of the problems created by rapid growth in your industry will prove interesting I am sure. During the first 10 to 12 years of the postwar period, the growth and demand for mortgages was so great that there were clearly times when that demand seemed insatiable.

Interestingly enough, while dividend rates rose, until 1957 or 1958 they remained in a rather moderate relationship to earnings. As recently as 1957, only about 75 percent of net earnings were being paid out in dividends. Although mortgage demand has continued to grow in recent years, it has grown much more slowly than it did in the early postwar years. However, institutions have been accustomed to rapid growth in savings and there has been a tendency, varying in degree from place to place but fairly evident in general, to regard growth as the measure of success. Consequently, one of the things that has happened is that dividend rates have risen more sharply in the period when loan demand has slowed than they did in the period when loan demand was rising quite rapidly. Today, as you may know, instead of paying out about 75 percent of your net in dividends, you are paying out between 80 and 85 percent in dividends.

The dividend rate practices are a symptom and should not be looked at only in the narrow context of a payout as such. The desire for growth, which has been evidenced by the increased dividend payouts, has created problems in some areas. Since dividends were raised in order to maintain a former position with reference to growth of savings, a contradiction has developed. Savings are more plentiful in some areas than are really needed to sustain an adequate level of housing and related real estate activity. In these areas some institutions, not all, have pursued risk in their lending to a greater extent than might be considered advisable. Again, some of these institutions and not even all of those who pursued the greater risk have recently shown performance results that we cannot accept with equanimity. By we, I mean the Board and you as the industry generally. Continuation along these paths will inevitably lead to difficulty for a sufficient number of institutions so that the entire industry may be embarrassed if not weakened.

In the main, the present position is not a threatening one but to wait until it becomes threatening seems to me to be a restraint of commonsense. We must act in the incipiency of such developments.

The second point I made is that the rules and regulations are somewhat antiquated. In particular, our reserve allocation requirement is based on earnings at a time when the industry was growing slowly and, perhaps, not at all; this was a very sensible requirement. But its continuation and prolongation in recent years can hardly be justified as providing adequate protection for the industry and the institutions.

You may ask, therefore, how come I was able to cite relatively favorable reserve ratios from the industry as a whole. Not all of the good which is visible represents conscious acts by the industry or by the Board. Institutions have been encouraged to accumulate reserves and surplus partly because of management considerations, but also because the tax law put a premium on accumulating reserves by leaving them largely untaxed. It might be idle speculation to try to estimate what would have happened if the revenue acts under which you operate had been somewhat different. Nevertheless, it is sufficient to note that reserve building has been encouraged by the structure of our tax laws. That benign influence may not always be with us. Consequently, the Board has to take cognizance of this in an era when practices, risks, and even tax conditions are changing.

The last point I mentioned was unsound practices. Now it is possible that even the best institution will at times engage in an unsound practice to some minor extent. The unsound practice may be nothing more than a temporary aberration in management's judgment. If this happens one in one thousand times, or even one in one hundred times, and if management learns from these mistakes, we are merely going through the ordinary course of human learning.

This kind of incidence of so-called unsound practices is not something that we need to be concerned about though I should say we need to be aware and on the lookout for those conditions. There are generally two types of practices which are obnoxious and dangerous.

The first type is one which we have witnessed in a large metropolitan area that will momentarily be unnamed. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has had to pick up the assets of several associations recently where management was culpable to a degree that is shocking. It was not a simple case of unsound practices, but a case of deliberate attempts to use the resources of the associations involved to enrich insiders. This type of practice has to be excised as soon as we see it. While there are statutes on the books which do make some of these actions criminal or civil violations of the law, there are some that are not covered by present statutes applying to savings and loan associations even though most other financial institutions would be protected by the law. This is one of the reasons that we ask you to endorse and support and work for the passage of S. 1799, and its

companion H.R. 7404. Should practices of this type continue, the day might come when the resources of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation could be strained. That Corporation exists to protect the saver and, indirectly, you. Without the confidence that the insurance corporation provides the public, your industry could not have flourished as it did in the past.

Fortunately, these cases are limited in number. There are a set of practices that are less reprehensible but perhaps in a different sense more dangerous. Here I refer to the institutions who pursue growth for the sake of growth find themselves with funds that are difficult to invest in clearly sound assets and, therefore, under the weight of the remaining funds rationalize their position and seek riskier assets than they should.

To some extent this is evident in areas where there has been an overbuilding and where associations have had to foreclose on builders picking up large amounts of real estate owned in the form of empty houses.

Another practice induced by a pressure of funds is to refinance existing properties on terms that, while they may comply with regulation, may be more liberal than solid judgment would permit. You must remember that the regulations are general outer limits and that within the regulations each institution has to exercise judgment as to the validity of each loan on its own merit. I can tell you now that there are a number of metropolitan areas which show rates of foreclosures that are not consistent with economic conditions. Perhaps I should emphasize that these metropolitan areas are a minority, a small minority indeed, but they are sufficient in number that we must take cognizances of their existence.

Thus, while the industry generally is sound, we are beginning to develop evidences of unsound practices that could plague us. I should like to emphasize that what we are directing our attention at is not a general condition of such scope as to require concern on the part of the investor. It is, however, a condition which requires your concern as well as ours. The real danger of the second type of practice is that under the pressure of competition for funds even the sound operator, if this type of situation is permitted to continue, may be tempted to move into rather deep water.

I should now like to sketch very briefly for you what I consider to be the main escape hatches in our regulatory environment so that I may proceed to discuss with you the steps that we are about to take to close those loopholes. One problem of which you all are aware is that associations which engage in the practices that I have talked about rely on free income to support their dividend rate or their reserve allocation.

Those institutions that do not amortize fees are, in effect, taking into income amounts that have not yet been earned. The payment of dividends based on this kind of accounting is undesirable.

If the fees are above the market, they are clearly a payment for risk, and since they are not earned until the loan is repaid, the use of a risk premium to support dividends or reserve allocations is, in effect, the practice that is both inappropriate and unsound.

A second difficulty is that an association bent on growth can raise its dividend rate without running to any rigorous tests. If it can support the dividend rate based on fee income and has only a moderate reserve allocation to make, then it can accept growth with equanimity at least insofar as its accounting obligations are concerned. The fact that it may be acquiring funds that it cannot use efficiently and safely does not concern it because, as I mentioned earlier, growth has become the test of success.

Still a third factor is the use of Federal home loan bank advances. While we have some rigorous tests in terms of the quality of the assets offered as security for the loans, we have not, in general, applied quite as rigorous tests to the financing practices of the institution in general. Those who are attempting to push their growth find present access to Federal home loan bank advances a convenient way to reinforce other practices. The margin of earnings on Federal home loan bank advances tends to support the dividend rate they feel is essential to give them the kind of growth that makes them happy.

I would like to say that we are not attempting to control dividend rates per se, what we are trying to do is to control the soundness of the practices of institutions.

The dividend rate is a symptom in those cases where it is used to induce a rate of growth that requires the other practices that I have discussed. What all of this amounts to is that the institution that wants to play a game, or is induced to play a game by its competitors, has several open ended avenues which it can now pursue in being a participant in this exercise.

These avenues must be closed. This is what we are about to do. I would like to commend to you that you listen to what I have to say from here on rather carefully because it will affect quite a few institutions, some of them soundly operated, as any general set of rules must. We are, however, prepared to be flexible where flexibility is indicated, as my subsequent remarks will show.

First of all, we are issuing on notice a regulation requiring deferment of fee income. In doing so, we recognize that there is certain acquisition costs associated with loans. We are willing to allow a 1-percent fee to be taken into current income in the year in which the loan is made on new or existing property, and a 2-percent fee on construction loans. Our reasoning here is that the construction loan requires a substantially greater amount of supervision and other related acquisition costs and the assocation would reasonably be entitled to such a fee in the first year.

The remainder of the fee must be deferred for a period of 8 years, including the year in which the loan is made. Thus, during the first year of the loan, you could take in another one-eighth of 1 percent of the remaining fee into income. We have reviewed, rather generally, the structure of fees around the Nation and it is our opinion that, in many areas, this schedule of deferment will affect only a minority of institutions. In areas where fee income is a high proportion of gross income, however, a very substantial number of institutions may come within the purview of this regulation and have their current income significantly reduced.

This regulation will provide an income figure that is much sounder and realistic than that which has been recorded in a good many cases up until now. We are aiming to make this regulation effective January 1. We think that everyone should take note of this and be cognizant of it. It will affect the ability of some institutions to pay dividends and we do not want the excuse offered to us that the institutions were not on notice about our intentions.

The second step that we consider quite critical involves reserve allocations. At the present time, the 10 percent of net income (before dividends) requirement is really not very helpful if an association grows much more than 10 percent a year. In fact, at the 10-percent level, the allocation is not always completely satisfactory, but below 10 percent it is quite good. Also, institutions which grow 10 percent or less do not pose the same types of problems as more rapidly growing institutions and, therefore, we are not planning to change the regulation for such institutions at this time.

I think a few figures would be helpful to you. If an institution earns 5 percent before dividends, but after expenses and taxes, on its average assets, a 10-percent reserve allocation would provide a 5-percent reserve ratio against 10 percent of growth. It would provide a 10-percent reserve ratio against the first 5 percent of growth. While we are not entirely satisfied that a 5-percent reserve ratio against growth is desirable, we are willing to accept it for the slower growing associations because they present few of the risks and problems that we are attempting to reach.

However, the 10-percent reserve allocation for an association that grows 20 percent gives you a reserve ratio against growth of only 3.3 percent. For the association that grows 30 percent, the reserve ratio behind the growth drops to only 1.7 percent. You can see that a 10-percent reserve allocation permits associations that grow rapidly to develop a deteriorating reserve position.

My next few comments are of critical importance to each and everyone of you and to each member of the industry. We have developed a plan that would work approximately as follows. Associations less than 20 years old would have to put only 10 percent of net income into reserves until they pass a particular size. Once they pass that size, and once they exceed the 20th anniversary, we would have an additional set of rules which would require that, in addition to the 10 percent of net income, an association would have to put in 8 percent of its next 10 percent of growth and 9 percent of all the growth over 20 percent into reserves. Now this has a very strong effect on the funds available for dividends. Let me illustrate my point rather carefully. If an association has savings capital at the beginning of a year of $100 million, grows 10 percent, has a net yield on its average savings capital of 5 percent, it will have a net income of $5,250,000. Under the proposed rules, it would have to put $525,000 into reserves as is now the case. That institution could pay a dividend of up to 4½ percent without any difficulty.

Taking the same type of institution with the same type of yield on assets but having it grow 20 percent creates some new problems. The 20-percent grower would have net income of $5.5 billion; he would have to put in 10 percent of net income to cover his first 10 percent of growth, that's $550,000. However, on his second 10 percent of growth he would have to put in $800,000, which gives him a total reserve allocation of $1,350,000. There are two things I would like to point out to you about this case. First, if we confine this case to only 10 percent of income he would be supplying reserves relative to growth of only 2.75 percent. Our new formula would make him put in 6.75 percent. This association, however, could not even pay a 4-percent dividend because he could not margin his growth.

Now before you express shock and consternation, permit me to point out that there are relatively few associations who have as low an earning rate as 5 percent and grow as much as 20 percent. The average association grows by less than 15 percent in a given year and at 15 percent, without bothering to recalculate the figures, this association would have no trouble with a 4-percent dividend and probably not with a 4¼-percent dividend either. Furthermore, the Board is reserving the right in the regulation to set standards based on the quality of assets, the existing reserve ratio, the quality of management, expense ratios, and other pertinent factors by which it would grant either waivers or postponements in whole or in part for institutions who get into difficulty.

I should say at this point that many institutions would not even be eligible to apply for a waiver because they are engaged in practices which would make them clearly outside the intended standards for granting of waivers or postponements.

I use the 5-percent case because it is an average case. But it is not the most realistic case in terms of the type of problems with which we are are concerned. Let me turn to a more extreme situation. Let's look what happens to an institution that grows 30 percent but has a net yield on its assets of 7 percent. You may regard this net yield as inordinately high but it is a yield that is approached and exceeded in some places in the United States.

The $100 million institution that grows 30 percent and has a net yield on assets of 7 percent would have net income of $8 million. This institution would have to put $800,000 into reserves to cover its first 10 percent of growth, it would also have to put in $800,000 to cover its second 10 percent of growth, and $900,000 to cover the growth above 20 percent. This would give it a total reserve allocation of $2,500,000. This institution could pay a 4½-percent dividend and it could even pay a 4.8-percent dividend. However, if it had to defer any significant amount of fee income, even as much as $30,000, it would immediately be in trouble with a 4.8-percent dividend.

Given what we know about institutions in this category who would run afoul of this new regulation, we would not grant such institutions a waiver based on the standards that I have mentioned to you. In fact, the standards would be so constructed and the Federal home loan banks would be so instructed that these institutions would be told in advance that they would be ineligible for any waiver of or postponement.

If this regulation strikes you as being harsh, let me assure you that it is not. All it is designed to do is to prevent deterioration of reserve positions for rapidly growing associations and the loss of the protection against risks which the reserves should supply.

In the last case I cited, the 10 percent of net income alone would only give you a margin against growth of about 2.7 percent whereas the revised allocation would give you a margin against growth of about 8.3 percent, not significantly different than that of the average reserve position for all associations at the end of last year. The Board has determined that a rapidly growing association should not be excused from maintaining the same degree of safety as that which applies to all associations and that we should have rules and regulations which induce associations below the 8-percent level to move in that direction and those above the 8-percent level not to fall too sharply, and, in any event, not below the 8-percent level. This formula will probably keep institutions in and about that range over a period of time.

It is our estimate that the overwhelming majority of institutions will have no difficulty living with this new regulation.

We are making a test now which suggests that only about 10 percent or thereabouts of all institutions would have any problem. A good number of those would not be eligible for a waiver, though we believe that the majority might qualify for a partial waiver or postponement based on the standards we have mentioned.

It should be clear, however, to all that the average involvement of 10 percent of the associations can be a deceptive figure. There are areas in the United States where rates are high and fees are high, where 25 to 50 percent of the associations may be involved. We want to address ourselves specifically to those associations and tell them that they had better take this regulation into account immediately even before we issue it because we intend to issue it and have it be effective January 1 or as soon thereafter as possible.

We should also advise the associations who might run into the mesh of this regulation that it will require a semiannual reserve allocation and that growth will be computed each 6 months but at annual rates. This is a regulation that is going to bite into many cases where rapid growth has been pursued and fees have been used extensively to support dividend and reserve allocations. We cannot be too strong in advising the associations that fall into this category to take heed and act, and act promptly, so that they will be able to comply with this regulation next year. The Board will put in this regulation a requirement that any association which cannot meet the strictures of the regulation and is not eligible for waiver or postponement will not be permitted to announce or pay a dividend for the ensuing dividend period without the Board's permission.

As a final step, the Board is planning to issue a policy statement introducing fairly specific standards for granting advances.

Here the performance of the association, in terms of the success of its lending practices, will be taken into consideration. We are working on a set of standards which will take into consideration the relationship of slow assets to reserves. As slow assets relative to reserves rise above a certain point, the borrowing privilege for expansion will be reduced proportionately. It is our opinion that this step will also dampen down the ability of associations who seek rapid expansion to rely on outside financing to generate earnings to support the type of promotion that is essential to the rapid expansion. The details of this policy statement will be apparent within another week or two.

Let me say again that even though we are taking this action, we are convinced that the industry generally is safe and sound. The measures we are taking are to protect those of you who have worked long and hard to build successful institutions from the encroachments of a few who cannot resist temptation or must aggrandize themselves by growing. Without these actions, you and the public might someday wonder where we were when all of this was in its incipiency.

I should like to repeat a statement that I have made before, neither I nor my colleagues took our oath of office to preside over the liquidation of an industry that Congress has sponsored as a matter of national policy for more than 30 years. We do not feel that the liquidation of this industry would be in the best interest of the American public. We feel that the most certain way to induce that liquidation would be to ignore the conditions about which I have talked with you today. In a speech even as lengthy as this one, it is not possible to paint precisely all of the details of each of the steps that we are taking, but I think enough has been presented here today so that you can see the general outline and judge it pretty well for yourselves.

Before you adopt the position of fear that this may affect the innocent bystander, I suggest you examine the regulations when they are published and address your inquiries to us at that time. In the long run, the measures we are taking will be of invaluable help to you and the industry as a whole.

Nor have we abandoned the other programs which we have been working on with considerable effort for some time. It is still our intent to pursue, as we have in the past, improvement in the lending power and investing power of savings and loan associations, improvement in the general regulatory framework under which they must operate, and improvement in their position in the marketplace. The record of the Board since I have entered into office speaks for itself. Lending territory has been expanded and the authority to make multiple-family dwelling loans has been increased. In other respects, too, the ability of associations to compete in a reasonable fashion, has been improved. The existence of these two programs, side by side, is not an inconsistency. Both of them are essential if the savings and loan industry is to perform the functions which Congress originally foresaw and which our evolving economy has made essential.

Another "Hope" Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an item that recently appeared in the Mitchell Daily Republic of Mitchell, S. Dak., which concerns itself with one of the finest and most effective projects conducted by Americans in the foreign field. The white hospital ship SS *Hope* is on its way to Ecuador on another mission of mercy. The overall effect of a visit by the SS *Hope* to a country has been demonstrated in Indonesia, South Vietnam, and Peru to be much greater than a usual mercy mission. The reasons for this good effect are accurately detailed in this news story and are worthy of note by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER "HOPE" MISSION

After productive and much appreciated visits to Indonesia, South Vietnam, and Peru, the white hospital ship SS *Hope* is getting ready to begin a medical mission to Guayaquil, Ecuador. Invitations to Project Hope were extended from three continents, but Ecuador was selected because there was an intense desire on the part of their physicians for a Hope visitation, said Dr. William B. Walsh, president of the project.

Ecuador expressed the need for medical trainees to have the opportunity to work in the atmosphere of an American hospital. As on previous missions, American professionals will be working closely with their local counterparts who eventually will be teaching others—a multiplication of Hope's services.

Project Hope is a nonprofit, humanitarian undertaking sponsored by the People to People Health Foundation, Inc. Medical volunteers staff the hospital ship for an extended visitation to a needy nation desiring to improve its standards of health. In its brief existence, Hope's medical staff of physicians, dentists, nurses, and paramedical personnel have trained some 1,700 local doctors and nurses in the three nations visited to date, performed more than 4,000 major operations, and examined or immunized nearly half a million persons.

Objectives of the Ecuador mission, which will get underway in November, include:

Upgrading of medical education, with a stress on training laboratory and X-ray technicians, physical therapists, and administrators.

A strong dental program.

A rotating system for local medical students through Hope's various services, offering experience in the medical team concept.

To give further training to graduate and and auxiliary nurses.

A public health service in underprivileged areas, highlighting preventive medicine, immunization, and public health techniques.

A demonstration of the willingness of U.S. citizens to teach the self-help concept to

those who demonstrate a willingness to help themselves.

A demonstration of the multiplier effect which can result in a better health and economy for Ecuador.

Project Hope is able to take its programs overseas from its offices at 1016 20th Street, Washington, D.C., through contributions from groups and individuals across the country who believe that American good will can be spread effectively through health-giving works.

Tax Cuts Raise Austria's Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Tax Cuts Raise Austria's Income," written by Sylvia Porter, and published in the Washington Evening Star of November 4, 1963, dealing with reductions in income tax rates by Austria, and the effect upon the Government's tax collections.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX CUTS RAISE AUSTRIA'S INCOME

(By Sylvia Porter)

In the last 10 years, Austria has reduced income tax rates four times. The reductions have cut the rates on low-medium income families by more than 50 percent.

As a result, the Austrian Government's tax collections have almost tripled since 1952.

Spending by the Austrian people has more than doubled. Simultaneously, savings are at an all-time record. While the pace of Austria's economic expansion has slowed recently, her overall economic growth since the 1950s has been astounding.

Can it be that the U.S. Government will collect more in taxes after it puts through tax reductions totaling $11 billion a year? Repeatedly, skeptics ask this question and understandably. There does seem an upside-down logic in the claim that the Treasury's tax take will be higher after rates are reduced than before.

Yet, Austria's answer to the question is "Yes."

Reinhard Kamitz, president of the Austrian National Bank, summarized the situation thus:

"Austria's record is proof for the correctness of my opinion that public revenues primarily depend on the volume of economic activities—much more so than on the height of tax rates.

"Economic expansion is much more dynamic at low tax rates than at high tax rates."

Of course, our economy can't be compared with Austria's—in size or in diversity, in stage of development or in living standards. Nevertheless, the story of Austria's economy after each tax cut is so striking that it demands study—and particularly by Senators who insist that tax reductions will dangerously reduce tax revenues and thus swell our budget deficits.

Austria's first tax cut became effective January 1, 1954. As an illustration of its size, it reduced the tax on a married couple earning $3,600 a year to $1,128 from $1,453.

In 1955, Austria's tax collections were 12.4 percent higher than in 1954. The increase in gross national product was 14.7 percent.

The second tax cut became effective January 1, 1955. As an illustration of its size, it reduced the tax on that $3,600 a year couple to $987.

In 1956, the Austrian government's tax collections were 8.7 percent above the previous year's totals. Gross national product reached 10.1 percent.

The third tax cut became effective January 1, 1958. This one reduced the tax on that $3,600 a year couple to $844.

In 1959, the government's tax take was up 6.8 percent from the year before. Gross national product climbed again, by 6.2 percent.

The fourth tax cut went into effect July 1, 1962. It reduced that married couple's tax to around $800. Figures on its impact are not yet available.

While the timing of Senate action on the tax bill remains uncertain, passage of a bill generally along the lines of that approved by the House in September appears likely with the cuts to begin taking effect in 1964.

It would be unrealistic to hope that the tax cuts will so spur the economy that tax collections will improve immediately. They won't.

But the tax cuts will leave more money for spending. They will help to create new jobs and new paychecks. They will increase "the volume of economic activities" and this volume, as Mr. Kamitz says, is what determines tax collections.

American Forests and the Public Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, on October 29 it was my privilege to hear Mr. John H. Hinman, honorary chairman of the International Paper Co., review his concept of sound forestry practices gained during 50 years of active leadership in one of the Nation's foremost industries. The occasion was the Fifth American Forest Congress sponsored by the American Forestry Association here in Washington, D.C., October 27 to 30.

Mr. Hinman's remarks will, I know, be of interest to all persons interested in our forest industries; hence, I am introducing them to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Hinman's address follows:

AMERICAN FORESTS AND THE PUBLIC INTERESTS

(By John H. Hinman)

Ladies and gentlemen, first let me thank you for your invitation to join with you tonight as you approach the conclusion of the Fifth National Forestry Congress sponsored by the American Forestry Association. I congratulate the members of your committees and your staff who have worked together over the months to prepare a comprehensive statement of a national forestry policy, a "Platform for American Conservation."

It is very fittting that this Fifth National Forestry Congress should be held in our Capital. I am delighted that so many Members of Congress as well as officials of Federal and State agencies involved in questions of land use and forest policy have been able to take part in your meetings. The voice of 35,000 members of the American Forestry Association will be heard in Washington. Your statesmanlike program, designed to secure the maximum sustained contribution from forest lands to the American economy and to the health and spiritual well-being of all citizens will, I predict, bear a strong, positive influence on the direction of official thinking over the years ahead.

You have rendered a real service to your country. Your work will not go unnoticed or unappreciated.

I stand here this evening approaching the end of a long, interesting, often exciting career in the forest industries. My lifetime has spanned the period when such concepts as forest management, sustained yield, trees as a crop, and multiple use have become part of the everyday thinking of all of those working with the forests at every level—both in the public and the private sectors of the economy.

I have seen these changes arrive. Many of the men who brought these concepts to reality were friends or acquaintances of mine. In some degree, I have played a part in the development of this broad modern concept of the role of the forest in our economy and our society. I am immensely gratified at the things I have seen become accepted as part of the everyday way of planning a forest management program.

I also knew forestry before these concepts were accepted. Just the other day I was thinking about an old friend from the days when I was running a woods operation for Champlain Realty Co. in my home country of northern New Hampshire. Champlain is now defunct but in those days before 1920, it was the land management arm of the International Paper in that area.

Jigger Johnson was one of the best camp foremen I ever had. His language wasn't always respectful and he was apt to be a little rough with the men but he was fiercely loyal and he had a very clear idea of his job—it was production. Logs. The best camp and the best foreman put the most logs on the landing. He was the best. It was as simple as that.

Jigger and I got along well. I would have to say that my idea of a good operation and Jigger's were pretty much the same in those days. As woods boss it was my job to see the job was done right. I used to move around from camp to camp on inspection tours. I'd try not to give too much warning to the local camp foreman when I expected to visit him. Jigger once said to one of his friends, "that John Hinman don't talk no more than an Indian, but he's hell on snowshoes." I guess he was paying me a compliment.

I'd go into a logging operation like Phillips Brook in northern New Hampshire and find my foreman. We'd talk about whether or not the cook was getting into the vanilla extract and how the men were getting on. Then if it was winter, we'd snowshoe out to look at the job. I can remember standing in the middle of newly cutover areas where you could look from one side to the other and hardly see a stick of wood standing. That was a good job by the standards of those days. We couldn't afford to leave any marketable wood standing. We were working on very narrow margins. It was not a question of good forestry or bad forestry. It was a matter of cutting wood to suit the conditions and the economics of the times.

I don't suppose Jigger Johnson understood this—and I'm not so very sure I did either. We cut wood the way people had always cut wood.

From time to time someone would show up who claimed to be a forester. Generally he was pretty fresh out of forestry school and his job was primarily to survey lands and evaluate timber stands. In those days none of us had any idea of timber management, as we know it today. No company, then

could have afforded a management program. In fact we didn't need one. There was plenty of timber. Forestry, in the sense of sustained yield management of large woods areas had to wait until the value of land and the value of timber on the stump, had enormously increased.

Incidentally, by today's standards the clear cutting job we did at Phillips Brook might be questioned. But even so, the results in terms of the forest condition today are superb. I don't know of a healthier, better-stocked timber stand. There have been continuous cutting operations there for more than 100 years. Lately we have been using the area as an experimental forest. Many of you visited there in 1951 when we entertained your fall meeting with a bean-hole luncheon.

Some years before I started in the woods, the Brown Co. hired Austin Cary to map and cruise some of their New England woodlands. Cary had this modern concept of forest management and he set a lot of folks to thinking about long-range planning, selective cutting, and protection of their woodlands. I don't know whether Jigger Johnson ever met Austin Cary or whether he ever heard of him. If he had heard of his ideas he would probably have snorted and passed him off with a typically profane comment.

Of course, the idea of forest conservation was not new. The philosophy had been in the air ever since the American Forestry Association was first founded in 1875. Your first National Forestry Congress in 1882 spoke out on this subject for all Americans. But looking back from our vantage point today, I think we can agree that this idea, this concept that has become so important in the mid-20th century, was ahead of its time in the days of Jigger Johnson.

The fact of the matter is that forestry, the broad concept we know today, had to await the pressure of economics.

Such farsighted men as Gifford Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, Colonel Greeley, and others were right, of course, when they raised a call for conservation and for forestry practices that would look toward the future. But the time for their great idea did not come until the economic conditions were right. Then and only then could forestry become the dynamic, living concept it is today.

I believe very firmly and I have said before—economics have done more for forestry and for foresters in the last 50 years than any other influence.

Actually, it was not until the thirties that the concept of forest management on a commercial scale was instituted and became a reality. What really changed the outlook for the forests in the years just before the thirties was the development of a dependable market for an annual wood crop. It began with the rise of the pulp and paper industry. A few figures may help to put the impact of the pulp and paper industry's growth in focus. In 1910, the entire U.S. industry consumed only 4 million cords of pulpwood. In 1930 this consumption had not quite doubled—it stood at almost 7,200,000 cords. In the next 10 years consumption doubled again and by 1962 it totaled 44 million cords—more than 10 times our consumption in 1910.

This explosive growth of the pulp and paper industry just had to have an impact. And you must remember the pulp and paper industry, with its vast, fixed investment in mills and machines, could not cut and move on as the early lumber industry had done. When a mill was built it was fixed and somehow, there had to be wood available for the mill, year after year. The concept of growing trees as a crop to be harvested on a sustained yield basis was the only possible answer.

Nothing on earth, it has been said, can match the power of an idea whose time has come. With the arrival of the pulp and paper industry as a major industrial force, the time was right for large-scale business interest in protection, planting and tree farming. Colonel Greeley recognized this fact very early when he predicted that the paper industry would be the first to practice forestry. Of course, he was right.

An an illustration, let me cite two recent developments the paper industry has pioneered. Both of these significantly affect both forest management practices and our Nation's long-range goal of conservation of its timber resources. I use the word "conservation" in what I consider to be its most meaningful sense—that is to say, wise use.

The first of these practices is the increasing use of sawmill chips as a raw material for the pulp and paper industry. You are all familiar with this development. Today all over the country sawmills are equipped to process the slabs and edgings formerly burned as waste. On the west coast, for example, nearly 70 percent of the fiber used by the pulp and paper industry comes from this source. The chips from these waste materials are now a substantial part of the overall fiber source for the pulp and paper industry and this use is growing every year. Not only are we conserving formerly wasted fiber and relieving the pressures on growing stocks—the lumber industry now realizes a good profitable return from a byproduct which used to be completely wasted.

The first slab barking and chipping operation I know about was done on a hand lathe by the Lacroix Lumber, Ltd. in 1929. I purchased seven or eight cars of chips a day from their mills at Carelton and Restigouche, Quebec.

The other important development has been the expanded use by the paper industry of hardwoods as a raw material for pulping. Not too long ago, hardwoods that could not be used for lumber or veneer were considered weed trees. Countless hours of research and very sizable expenditures by the paper industry were required to develop pulping techniques that would permit the use of these common tree species. The results have been worth all the time and effort.

In the first place, the industry's ability to pulp hardwoods has relieved the heavy pressure that was being felt on our softwood timber resources. The ability to use more of the total timber in a given forest area has increased the efficiency of forest management operations and provided hundreds of private tree farmers with an income from the harvest of trees for which there used to be no economic market.

Our ultimate objective, of course, is the complete utilization of the forest crop.

What a difference from the days when I was young. When I was a boy we burned the finest yellow birch and maple in our stoves and fireplaces—the very best veneer logs today. And visiting a lumbering operation you would often find great tops of pine or spruce trees lying near stumps 3 to 4 feet in diameter. Only the first 20 feet or so, up to the first branch, had been taken for clear lumber. There was no market for the rest—it had been left to rot on the ground.

But again we're talking about economics. None of these developments came about because the industry wanted to improve its forestry practices or more fully utilize the timber from our harvests. The rising value of wood dictated these changes in our practice. They were good changes, because in a free country, such as ours, what is sound economics is very likely to benefit the entire community in the long run.

We must always remember that in this country, in the framework of our free enterprise system, the profession and practice of forestry must rest on a profitable base. All of us here tonight share an interest in the health and welfare of the forests of our Nation. What we have heard and seen here this week reassures me—and it confirms my belief that the forests of our country have been well served by the operation of our free enterprise system. The profit motive, one of the strongest motivating forces in our society, will continue to work for progress in the practice of forestry—if we permit it to operate freely.

Now as we look ahead to the long-range future there are two major influences that bear on the forests of tomorrow and the forest industries of tomorrow. The first is the continuing development of our forest technology. I am convinced that the striking progress made in recent decades will continue under the stimulus of a system that encourages progress and individual enterprise.

But the second factor is more complex and, I believe, more troublesome. This question involves matters of public policy and decisions affecting millions of our citizens. This is the broad question of land use. With the limited amount of land available to us today in this country, how can we best serve the many varying needs of our expanding population while we continue to produce the annual crops of food and fiber our standard of living demands.

Following your intensive discussions this week there is no need for me to attempt to state the prospect for the years ahead in terms of our requirements for food, clothing, and shelter as opposed to the ability of our available land resources to supply these essentials. Let me simply remind you that while we know we will have more and more people to feed, clothe, and shelter, we will not have more and more land.

No gift of prophecy is required to see that somewhere in the future two lines are going to converge. One, the rising line represented by multiplying our millions of people by their needs—and the other, the descending line that represents our shrinking land resource. The day they cross is the day our living standards begin their sad decline.

But they need never meet. It seems quite clear to me that if all of our public and private purposes are to be served, if our living standard is to continue to be supported at today's levels of consumption of food and fiber, if our related needs for water and recreation are to be met, there must be wise, long-range planning for the long pull.

We have talked a great deal in recent years about the need for establishing sound policies of multiple-use management. We agree multiple use should cover as much of this Nation's forested lands as possible, public as well as private. I do not propose to argue again, and before this informed audience, the very compelling reasons supporting this concept of multiple-use forest management.

It has been part of our national goal since Gifford Pinchot first headed the U.S. Forest Service. Multiple use as a stated objective was made the official policy of the Forest Service in 1960 under the terms of Public Law 86-517. Multiple use has been adopted almost universally by all of the industries engaged in large-scale land management programs. It is the policy of State-supported forest management programs. Increasingly, tree farmers and other private landowners are accepting the principle of multiple use in their own interests.

Clearly, most informed and thoughtful people, active in the field and who are concerned with the long-range contributions the forests can make to the economic, social, and spiritual lives of our Nation, support this approach to the question of forest land use.

And yet we continue to hear sincere but emotional cries for the wilderness—for sweeping Federal laws that would remove vast areas of land from the production of timber and almost every other public pur-

pose, to be set aside as wilderness preserves—huge, decaying museums, if you will.

A wilderness cannot support good forest management. In fact, it is against forest management. It is a return to the old days of neglect and waste, rather than a step forward. It destroys the economic base upon which good forestry and the health of our forests for the future must rest.

I think there is an answer to this perplexing problem. The answer that appeals to me has been tried. It promises much of what the wilderness advocates seek without imposing the untold penalties of a sweeping wilderness bill on future generations.

You have recognized the validity of the answer I propose tonight in your award to Laurance Rockefeller for his distinguished service as chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This is a significant and richly deserved honor.

I suggest to this Congress that the problems of land use which confront this country are no less demanding and call for an imaginative approach of the scope and determination characteristic of this commission.

I suggest that the pattern for this approach has already been clearly established in the work of the Commission. The first step should be a detailed investigation of this Nation's land-use policies today and an informed projection of our requirements over the years ahead. We should analyze, as best we can, the demand that our land resources must meet—in terms of quality as well as quantity. This is a task that will challenge the very best brains in government, industry and among those who have devoted their lives to study of this problem and to the conservation—wise use—of this Nation's irreplaceable land resources.

A bill to accomplish this first step is now before Congress. The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, introduced the bill last August. Mr. ASPINALL called for the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States.

Chairman ASPINALL has stated that it is his hope and belief that the program he has outlined "will result in the use and disposition of our Federal Public Lands and all the resources thereof in the highest tradition of the conservation movement of the United States as symbolized by the Roosevelt-Pinchot era. * * *" He believes that we should dedicate our lands and the resources thereof to accomplish the maximum good for the maximum number of the longest period of time.

There are answers to the perplexing problems of land use. But they must be logical answers—not answers arrived at through emotion and the sentimental search for bygone days. They must be today's answers, answers as comprehensive as the answers arrived at by Laurance Rockefeller and his commission. These answers must also reflect the realities of today—our economy, our growing population, our steadily rising standard of living, our growing needs for wood, water and other resources and products of the land, our increasing demand for high-quality recreational opportunities. In short, the needs of tomorrow. For all of these reasons I agree with those who feel that a Public Land Law Review Commission should not only represent government but should also have public and industry representation.

In my opinion the weakness of the wilderness idea will become more and more apparent as this decade moves along. Most of the objectives of the wilderness can be achieved better in the economically strong, well-managed forest than in the neglected forest of the wilderness.

We can look to the State of Maine for a first-rate example of the point I want to make. There, as we all know, the Department of the Interior has proposed that a substantial part of the 100-mile Allagash River be federalized as a national waterway. This proposal could effectively block off an additional 1 million acres of productive forest land from economic use by Maine industry.

The effect of such an extension of Federal control would inevitably be to limit the growth of local forest industries. This is an important matter in a State where the forest-based industry forms the most important segment of the economy.

No one argues that the present ownership is not doing a good management job on the Allagash—quite the contrary. In fact, the Department of the Interior in one of the publications they have released supporting their Allagash proposal has stated: "The Allagash has experienced several periods of logging, yet has survived to an astonishing degree as a wilderness unity * * * there are few places left where one can live in, study and enjoy the earth in its natural design, and there is only one Allagash, one such resource of its character and magnitude left in the East."

The hard fact of the matter is that the present private ownership is doing, and will continue to do, a magnificent job on the Allagash—where regular timber harvesting operations have been carried on for over 100 years.

We think that the record in Maine under private management has earned the confidence of the country. These landowners deserve the right to be entrusted with the future management of the Allagash for full multiple use of its adjoining forest areas.

Actually isn't the Allagash problem a Maine problem—one that the people of the State are taking effective steps to solve in their own interests. The Allagash River Authority, established by the Maine Legislature, is already constituted and embarked on its preliminary studies. I can only speak for International Paper but our company, at least, has every intention of cooperating with the authority. We are convinced a Federal takeover might actually destroy much of what the proponents of this legislation claim they want to preserve—the unique primitive aspects of the area.

The Federal proposal for the Allagash anticipates that canoe travel on the riverway would be encouraged. Campsites and canoe launching areas would be built. Their proposal is based on a contemplated maximum use of this wilderness riverway by some 90,000 persons a year. Basing this use, as they do, on a 90-day season, 1,000 people a day would have to enter the river at the launching area. Normal time for the 100-mile white-water trip, from Telos Lake to Allagash Falls is about 10 days. This would mean that there would be 10,000 people on the river at one time. I have canoed the length of the Allagash River and I have been connected with it for over 50 years. I have a strong affection for that part of the country.

I hate to think of 10,000 people canoeing and camping along the riverway at one time—yet this would be necessary under the Departments' projection. The crowds would be comparable to those in Yellowstone and Yosemite on a fine summer weekend—hardly the wilderness experience I associate with the Allagash.

In my judgment, private control of this area, in close cooperation with a duly established State authority, is the answer. This isn't just a question for the State of Maine—this is an important test case. Whatever is done in Maine will establish a precedent of Federal encroachment for every other State with unique recreational or scenic values. There are already more than 60 comparable waterway proposals in 35 States on the Federal list. Albert Nutting, dean of the University of Maine's Forestry School, has stated the case very simply—"It seems to me," says Dean Nutting, "folks should give the State of Maine a chance to show what it can do."

Whatever may be the outcome of the Allagash controversy, the pressures on the forest are going to increase—this we know. If the public interest, the real public interest, is to be served, we must seek balanced policies that truly represent these interests. We must study and evaluate these interests. And in a dynamic society such as this, we must assess the changes that will occur in the stream of our society as we grow and progress in the years ahead.

I remind you again, that economics has served the cause of good forestry well in the past. If the forests of the future are to be strong and healthy, it will be because they have a strong economic base under them.

I call on all the able and intelligent, forestry-minded men and women here tonight; those in industry, in government, in colleges and universities, and in other groups committed to the conservation and development of our national forest resources: I call on you to support a program of prosperous healthy forests in perpetuity.

Newer Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in recent days a number of additional revealing articles as to the value and operations of the Area Redevelopment Administration have been published. These articles, I believe, further question the wisdom of continuing this program. Today I would like to bring to the attention of other Members three articles. One is entitled "What's Back of Fight Over ARA," published in the November 1963 edition of the magazine Nation's Business. Another is an editorial from the November 6, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal, "Trouble in the Happiness Agency." The third one is from the October 8, 1963 edition of the Dallas, Tex., newspaper, the Dallas Morning News, under the headline "ARA Project at Crockett Fizzles Out." All are well worth the time to read:

[From Nation's Business, November 1963]

WHAT'S BACK OF FIGHT OVER ARA—CONTROVERSIAL AGENCY USES TAXPAYER FUNDS TO CREATE A DEMAND FOR MORE

Whatever the New Frontier has done for employment generally, it has solved the unemployment problems for dozens of economists, financial technicians, and technical research experts.

So says an economist who ran a year-long Ford Foundation study of the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Federal agency trying to treat chronic unemployment with easy money and advice from Washington.

The effort has created work for the new agency itself, for employees of other departments working with it, and for a zealous ARA sales force whose promotional successes are credited with creating demand for much more in low-cost Federal loans than Congress authorized.

A close look at the 2-year-old agency—some of its policies, procedures, and people—is in order as it seeks to expand operations amid national debate over its performance.

To compose a picture of the agency, Nation's Business went to sources within and outside of Government, including Harold L. Williams, Deputy Administrator of ARA, and Dr. Sar Levitan, of the George Washington University, who heads the $57,000 Ford Foundation study.

What emerges helps to explain why Dr. Levitan, a longtime supporter of depressed area legislation, is often critical of the agency, and why even Deputy Administrator Williams says Government should move very cautiously before launching itself much deeper into redevelopment efforts.

ARA has its roots in the Employment Act of 1946, which declared it a responsibility of the National Government to pursue policies tending to stimulate economic growth and full employment.

It took considerable footwork, Dr. Levitan points out, to jump from that essentially passive role of Government to a program authorizing $200 million in commercial and industrial loans, $100 million in other loans, and $75 million in grants for public facilities, $4.5 million in technical assistance, $10 million for job trainees, and $4.5 million for their training.

The agency is headed by Redevelopment Administrator William L. Batt, Jr.

A dedicated New Dealer impressed with President Roosevelt's depression-born welfare programs, Mr. Batt began his career on graduation from Harvard as a staff member with the Temporary National Economic Committee.

In the years since, his career has included a staff post with then Lend-Lease Administrator W. Averell Harriman, an unsuccessful race for Congress, business in Philadelphia, and the job of special assistant to the Secretary of Labor. There Mr. Batt worked on problems of high unemployment areas and coauthored the Executive order placing defense contracts in labor surplus areas.

Besides these and other Government jobs, he was executive secretary to the Toledo Industrial Development Council, then returned to Pennsylvania as secretary of labor and industry—his official biography lists the job as "Secretary of Labor."

COMMITTEE PLAYS A PART

Mr. Batt and his top officials are assisted by a National Public Advisory Committee whose members feel that they, unlike those of many other advisory committees set up for mere window dressing, have a real influence on their program.

The committee includes a liberal representation of union officials. It also includes Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, of Detroit, a reliable congressional witness for ARA from an area which is receiving $3,679,000 in loans, including $1.9 million for the deluxe Pontchartrain Hotel and $1 million for a motor hotel.

Another member is Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Mr. Ellis, along with a spokesman for the American Public Power Association, recently urged President Kennedy to back a TVA-type authority for the area embracing nine States in the Appalachian area.

Another is C. Benton Musslewhite, of Lufkin, Tex., who has been active in State Democratic politics, serves as campaign assistant for the Democratic National Committee, and tried to unseat incumbent Representative JOHN DOWDY in the Democratic primary (before his appointment to the committee.

Congressman DOWDY expects a return match, claiming that Mr. Musslewhite appears to be using ARA as a vehicle in diligent politicking back home.

Still another member is a retired banker and businessman, Reuben H. Levy, who was recommended for the job by Pennsylvania's Democratic Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

The program in their care covers roughly 1,000 areas that are eligible for Federal money because of varying degrees of unemployment. This is, of course, far from the 79 or so areas envisioned by Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, when he was pushing, back in 1955, for a Federal program aimed at the worst pockets of unemployment.

It's easy to criticize this overextension of the program's coverage, says Dr. Levitan, an old hand in Washington, but it's questionable whether a more selective program could have gotten through Congress.

A former ARA official puts it more bluntly: "Can you imagine all those Congressmen voting funds for 79 urban industrial areas?"

WHEN ARA COMES TO TOWN

Here's how the program operates once a community makes the list—which requires no local action and in some cases happens over the community's protest:

To participate, the community must first establish what the Senate Banking Committee describes as "A broadly based local organization representing a cross section of all elements of the community to assess the economic conditions of that area and to act as the local coordinator for redevelopment activities."

As a second step, this group must draft an overall economic development program (OEDP) as a guide for community action. The program must be approved by State and Federal officials before a loan application will be considered.

This initial process is cited by partisans of ARA as a primary benefit of the program, on the theory that it galvanizes depressed communities to forge a cooperative effort, stimulates local initiative, and brings about long-needed self-appraisal of problems and prospects.

How has the system worked up to this point?

In many cases the plans are "practically meaningless," says Dr. Levitan, who points out that in one State the process consisted simply of an agency's cranking out plans for every county in the State.

Consultant John Fletcher Wellemeyer, who was hired by ARA to evaluate a batch of these plans to determine whether they were geared to local labor force conditions, adds further evidence.

Asked by Nation's Business how the planners erred in considering the manpower question, he replied: "The most common type of deficiency was that they didn't mention it at all."

The more sophisticated planners did throw in a section on manpower, says Mr. Wellemeyer, but this was largely based on figures from the local office of the State employment service.

Elsewhere, says Dr. Levitan, there is generated a "real community dialog," although the most promising process often must take years. Business needs a long time to plan efficiently, he adds, and government possibly even longer.

Any application for a loan must satisfy State and Federal officials that the applicant and the project would conform to the plan.

The local economic development committee, whatever its guiding role on paper, may have little or nothing to say about an application—which can come from outside the community involved—an ARA has no requirement that members be consulted.

Nor is there any requirement as to membership on these committees, either in terms of numbers or segments of the community represented.

The local committee members, in practice, are consulted 75 to 80 percent of the time, says Deputy Administrator Williams, but he has received complaints from some committeemen that they were ignored.

By this point, the community will doubtless have seen a great deal of one of ARA's field men, whose chores range from drumming up interest in the program to actually helping fill out applications.

"Every Federal agency has a responsibility to make its programs known to the people who can benefit from it," explains Mr. Williams.

Yet Mr. Batt, in asking Congress for more staff money, leaves the impression that his field men have enough to do keeping up with requests that are based on local initiative.

"It is essential that we provide a sufficient staff to be able to respond to the communities' calls for assistance," he says.

At any rate, Mr. Williams denies widespread charges that the agency's field men are dumping the program on unwilling recipients and claims no one has "stepped over the bounds of propriety" except for an instance or two of "overzealous individuals."

He concedes, however, that some Federal men occasionally take the tin god attitude with local communities that "this project has got to be approved by me," a failing of which he says State and local functionaries are guilty as well.

BACKGROUND OF ARA SALESMEN

The ARA field representatives, whose salaries are in the $12,000 range, include men with experience in business and finance, industrial development work, armed services community relations, farming, municipal government, and Federal agencies.

They also include men who have held State appointive jobs, and former administrative assistants to Congressmen, elected city officials, State legislators.

The agency can hire consultants to do field work, but officials have assured Congress that they have no more like Warren P. Cleary, their man in Michigan's Upper Peninsula for a time.

A member of a politically well connected family in Escanaba, Mr. Cleary returned to his home district for ARA after several years in the Foreign Service.

He spent several months on the scene—Mr. Williams says he did a "bangup job"—then resigned to become the Democratic nominee against veteran Republican Representative VICTOR A. KNOX, a strong foe of ARA.

Despite a slugging campaign in which Mr. Cleary pledged, among other things, to promote economic development of his district through tourism, he was defeated and returned to a Washington job in the Post Office Department.

The agency's field men are "better than you might suspect, on the whole," says Dr. Levitan, who calls them dedicated though not unanimously overendowed with sophistication.

A more critical assessment has been made by Daniel L. Goldy, who served as Deputy Administrator of ARA before taking over as head of the Commerce Department's Business and Defense Services Administration.

Mr. Goldy, who has had long experience in the lumber industry, told how ARA's enthusiastic operatives, pursuing their mission to "unlock resources," went overboard at the sight of a most readily apparent resource—trees—and proceeded to unlock timber resources heedless of the overproduction problems of the industry.

A special tabulation run by the agency showed that, as of June 15, loans in the lumber and wood products industries totaled more than $12 million out of the $69.7 million approved for all commercial and industrial loans. This was second only to loans

for projects in recreation and tourism, which accounted for $14.2 million.

When an application is finally completed, it is sent to Washington where, as Administrator Batt told Congress, "We are already alerted to it because in many instances our field coordinator has helped the applicant fill out the application and made him aware of the provisions of the act."

Then the application enters what Dr. Levitan calls a maze of administrative complexity.

In a clear-cut case, the application will go to a project review committee within the agency and, if cleared there, on to the Small Business Administration for checking of financing and engineering by the SBA regional office.

Depending on the type of project, however, the application might be referred for recommendation to any number of other agencies. In one case, the Rural Electrification Administration passed on a clay products project.

Major payments by ARA to other agencies in fiscal 1963 were $3.7 million, including $1.5 million to the Agriculture Department, $1.3 million to the Labor Department, $400,000 to the Department of the Interior.

ARA's contracting within Government prompted Democratic Representative JOHN ROONEY, of New York, chairman of a House Appropriations Subcommittee, to comment to Mr. Batt: "Apparently your agency has entirely too much money, with the result [that] you are soaking up everything in the various departments of Government with which you are concerned."

Mr. Williams says the agency normally follows the recommendations of sister agencies that review applications.

But, as Mr. Batt has told Congress, he retains final approval authority over applications, a situation which has given rise to reports of political considerations influencing decisions.

Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges has conceded that his Department has been embarrassed by project approvals being leaked and exploited for political purposes.

The entire borrowing process can take months, which apparently accounts for the approval of a $1.6 million loan for a resort hotel last April and a $2.5 million loan for another hotel in July, both for an area of Puerto Rico which ceased to be eligible July 19, 1962.

It is ARA's policy that a project, if underway when a community's eligibility status is lifted, can proceed although no new applications are accepted.

Despite all the checking, things can go wrong.

Mr. Williams reports that by mid-September there were five projects (representing $600,000 in Government loans) that were delinquent in repayments.

Ten others, representing $2.5 million in loans, were said by an agency spokesman to be "closely observed for varying degrees of financial or management difficulty."

Total loan disbursements at that time were $33 million.

All 15 projects involve manufacturing industries, says Mr. Williams, and are new ventures rather than expansions of going concerns.

Principal difficulties are lack of adequate working capital, and management deficiencies which Mr. Williams describes as planning mistakes, disputes among principals, and—in rare instances—general inexperience.

Part of the problem he attributes to errors in judgment on the part of our people who did the analysis.

ARA stands ready with technical assistance to clients in trouble, he says, has granted additional loans in some cases and would see the management of a faltering project replaced before letting the enterprise fold.

"We've certainly written off nothing yet," says the Deputy Administrator, adding that the Federal loans are amply secured.

VIEW ON KEY QUESTION

In an interview with Nation's Business, Mr. Williams was asked to explain ARA's policy justifying loans for projects involving branch plants of well established firms that would have no trouble raising their own capital. Economists consider this a key question, since this sort of expansion holds the best prospects for real economic growth and stability.

The loan money goes to local development groups, Mr. Williams says, to improve their ability to compete in bidding for desirable plants against more prosperous communities with more resources at their command.

Another policy described by Mr. Williams permits the applicant for an ARA loan to contribute funds himself to the local community group, raising its 10 percent as required by law.

Mr. Williams has no figures on the number of applicants who have done so because ARA does not require this sort of information.

Technical assistance grants, another aspect of the program, can be initiated by request of a community, a consultant who gets an idea, or from within the agency itself.

Such projects can range from preparation of a community development plan to a $299,000 grant for a University of Pittsburgh study of economic development of the Appalachian region.

They get into aid to education, such as a grant to establish graduate research facilities at a university in Pennsylvania to enable the institution to bid for Government and private research contracts.

One item costing taxpayers $123,000 is listed as a demonstration project for multicounty economic development in the Michigan Upper Peninsula. This went to the economic consulting firm of Robert R. Nathan, a national leader of Americans for Democratic Action.

Since these projects need not be requested by the community involved, one member of the Advisory Committee points out, they can serve to help generate interest in loan projects and support for the overall program.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, which now has a staff of 388, mostly in Washington, wants to add another 74, with a few more in the field than at headquarters.

Out of its operating budget of $12 million comes a flood of pamphlets and booklets, a film narrated by news commentator Chet Huntley, and periodic directories of approved projects.

One $10,000 study listed as "community experience and impact of ARA program on redevelopment areas" proved to be a study of community development activities undertaken before the agency was created.

Mr. Williams and his aids argue that the agency is still a baby, and has never yet operated on a budget estimate based on operating experience.

When asked how far ARA should go, he replied that it could live with the increased staff funds and aid authority it is seeking now.

Beyond that, he points out that the Federal role in this area has not been definitely resolved and that while State governments should step up their efforts, the Federal Government should move ahead very cautiously.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 6, 1963]

TROUBLE IN THE HAPPINESS AGENCY

Edward P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, is no man to speak softly of the Area Redevelopment Administration. With "brazen, cynical gall," he declared the other day, this "political arm of the New Frontier already has gone through $191 million to subsidize an incredible variety of local boondoggles."

The ARA, which funnels Federal funds to selected distressed areas, might shrug off this attack—if it weren't hearing much the same thing from Congress. The House, in fact, was so disturbed some weeks ago that it voted to let the ARA expire. No Government agency takes extinction lightly so the ARA, hopeful of a reprieve, is reappraising some of its endeavors.

Take the agency's financing of recreation ventures, which Mr. Neilan calls "happiness projects like golf courses, bowling alleys, ski resorts, fishing camps, marine playgrounds, resort hotels, and motels." Some Congressmen regard these enterprises as strange targets for Federal aid, so the ARA, though it still thinks they're a good idea, will soft-pedal them for a while.

More important, the agency plans a new approach to its loans to more conventional businesses. More than once in the past, the ARA has helped finance factories in areas where production capacity exceeds demand. Thus the agency seems likely either to have helped take sales away from existing businesses or to have poured Federal funds into shaky firms. In either case, an odd way to increase total employment, its avowed goal.

Now, however, the ARA proposes to be more careful. Its economists will analyze the current capacity and future sales prospects of each industry before it steps in with a subsidy; in this way, the reasoning apparently goes, excess capacity will be avoided and employment will always be increased. Whatever else may be said about this approach, it assumes that the ARA somehow will be able to amass an astonishing amount of information about the complex world of American business.

Meantime the agency has nothing to say about some of its other foibles. Such as its proclivity for declaring an area distressed when most of its residents think they're pretty well off. Or its habit of winning business from private lenders with its subsidized low interest rates.

All in all, a reappraisal of the ARA is surely overdue. In fact, with its new interest in economic analysis, the agency might properly reappraise itself out of existence. When it comes to bungling and boondoggling, Washington would still have lots of excess capacity.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Oct. 8, 1963]

ARA PROJECT AT CROCKETT FIZZLES OUT

(By Fred Pass)

CROCKETT, TEX.—A Federal Government effort to finance an electronics manufacturing plant in Crockett has fizzled, the Dallas News learned Monday.

Upon query by the Washington Bureau of the News, the Area Redevelopment Administration reported it received a letter October 1 from J. Paul Dawson, president of Audio-Electronics, asking withdrawal from the ARA project. The company was to have constructed a $589,000 plant under the program.

ARA spokesmen said Dawson wrote he had been unable to get patent rights to the equipment the company had planned to make.

Audio-Electronics had been the pride and joy of ARA officials in Texas who have been working hard to get the so-called depressed areas to build industries with Federal loans.

Another industrial firm, the Huntingburg Furniture Co., of Indiana, chose Crockett as the site of its southwest plant and has started constructing a building with private funds.

When To Investigate and When Not To Investigate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in last Friday's issue of the Long Island Press, Messrs. Allen and Scott told us about a probe involving a foreign aid official about whom the Attorney General is charged with dragging his feet.

If this be true, this is a very serious charge. I believe the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House owes this body an immediate investigation to prove the truth or falsity of this accusation.

The article follows:

NEW PROBE INVOLVES FOREIGN AID OFFICIAL

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, the "one-man investigating committee" whose caustic charges led to the sensational "Bobby" Baker probe, is zeroing in on another potentially equally explosive case.

It involves a high foreign aid official with an assortment of bank accounts, one of them in Canada, and the strange reluctance of Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Foreign Aid Administrator David Bell to do anything about this official despite a critical FBI report.

This extraordinary affair is being thoroughly explored by Senator WILLIAMS in preparation for following his course in the mushrooming Baker exposé—making the facts public in a blistering Senate speech.

He will have a lot to reveal. Every aspect of the case is exceptional, as follows:

The FBI investigation of this foreign aid official was made at the request of Administrator Bell. Certain information had come to him regarding this assistant's financial relations with a company that had been given millions of dollars in contracts in an area over which the official has considerable authority.

Bell particularly asked the FBI for a thorough scrutiny of reputed trust and pension arrangements the official made with the firm before joining the foreign aid agency.

The FBI completed its inquiry in May and submitted a comprehensive report to Attorney General Kennedy.

It has been gathering dust on his desk ever since.

In striking contrast to the zeal of the President's brother in vigorously pressing the "Bobby" Baker exposé, he has been strangely apathetic about acting on the FBI report on the foreign aid official. Six months have passed and he is still dragging his feet on it.

Most remarkable aspect of this remarkable affair revolves around the official's mysterious bank account in Canada.

The FBI ascertained he has three bank accounts; two in the United States and the other in Canada. This is a sizable holding—more than $160,000. The FBI learned that through indirect sources.

When the G-men asked the official for access to his Canadian bank account, he admitted its existence but balked at allowing it to be examined—except on one curious condition.

He said he would grant permission if ordered to do so by Secretary of State Rusk. Attorney General Kennedy and Administrator Bell were informed of this. Neither has yet said one word to Rusk about the matter. Whether he has heard about it in some other way is not known.

In any event, nothing has been done about the mysterious Canadian bank account.

There is no clue so far as to the reason for this strange inaction.

Senator WILLIAMS has been told it is due to the foreign aid official's "powerful influence in the United States and abroad." What and who they are is conjectural.

The official is still holding his high-ranking job, and outwardly is apparently unconcerned about the FBI investigation and its possible reverberations.

These may extend beyond Senator WILLIAMS' renowned crusading potency. Three committees are envincing interest in this unusual affair—the Senate Appropriations Committee, headed by Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat of Arizona; the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, headed by Senator JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi; and the House Foreign Aid Appropriations Subcommittee, headed by Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat of Louisiana, longtime militant foe of large-scale foreign aid spending.

All are looking into the case, and Senator WILLIAMS may get a lot of help in blowing it wide open.

Love nest: More sex is due to rear its scandalous head in the "Bobby" Baker investigation. The FBI is investigating a clinic owned by Washingtonians in Puerto Rico. One of the "playgirls" who was on familiar terms with Senate employees gave the FBI considerable information about this clinic. She involved a well-known Capital doctor.

It's getting so, that it's almost necessary to keep a chart on who is investigating whom. Illustration: State Department security officials are quietly probing the backgrounds and activities of staff members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which is investigating the State Department. Two members of the State Department's security staff have been assigned to checking up on staff members of the Senate committee. Newsmen, lawyers, and others are being questioned about them.

Hope for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ithaca, N.Y., Journal concerning the latest voyage of the SS *Hope*, operated by the People to People Foundation. This ship and its fine work deserves the strong support of all of us.

The editorial follows:

[From the Ithaca (N.Y.) Journal, Oct. 1, 1963]

SS "HOPE"

The hospital ship, SS *Hope*, will begin its third voyage in November—a medical mission to Quayaquil, Ecuador.

The *Hope* was once a U.S. Navy hospital ship. Now it is an instrument by which the American people, through voluntary contributions, carry the message of better health to other nations around the world.

Project Hope is a nonprofit organization with headquarters in Washington, D.C. In the three nations visited since the project was started in 1958, the SS *Hope's* volunteer physicians, dentists, nurses, and paramedical personnel have trained some 1,700 local doctors and nurses, have performed more than 4,000 major operations, and have examined and immunized nearly 500,000 persons.

The *Hope's* work is a demonstration of the willingness of the people of the United States to teach the concept of self-help to those who are willing to help themselves.

It is also a demonstration of the "multiplier effect" which brings changes in hospital organization, administration, and teaching techniques, resulting eventually in a better health and economy for the nations visited by the *Hope*.

The Price Fixers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial comment appearing in the Public Employee, the official publication of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, of October 1963.

That excellent editorial entitled "The Price Fixers" points out the great evils of the so-called quality stabilization legislation.

That bill in which the word "quality" appears only in the title would gouge consumers of billions of dollars a year and would destroy little businessmen by denying them the right to conduct their own affairs and to sell merchandise they have purchased in a way which is fully proper and lawful save for the unwise meddling of this iniquitous legislation.

The editorial follows:

THE PRICE FIXERS

A financial genius has been described as "a man who can make money as fast as his family can spend it." There are few, if any, financial geniuses in our union. Not with the take-home pay of the average public employee.

As though things aren't bad enough already, Congress is considering a bill that would cut that employee's spending power by another 20 to 30 percent. The measure is a sneaky one—you could never tell by the title that's what it would do. The title, in fact, sounds like something that's designed to protect the consumer. It's called the "Quality Brand Stabilization Bill."

QUALITY IN TITLE ONLY

The title, however, is the only place where the word "quality" is mentioned. It doesn't appear in the bill at all. The reason for this is that the bill really has nothing to do with quality. What it really is, is a price-fixing bill.

If the bill is passed it will become illegal for a store owner to charge less than manufacturer's list price for brand name drugs, toiletries, appliances, jewelry, books, furniture, shoes, and many other items.

Some States already have such a law. They are usually called "fair trade laws," the name under which this bill has come up in Congress in the past. Surveys by the Justice Department show that in States having "fair trade" laws prices run from 19 to 27 percent

higher on these items. Experts predict that if the Federal bill is passed it will raise prices in non-fair-trade States by 20 to 30 percent.

ADD BILLIONS TO BUDGET

The home consumer is not the only one who would be hurt by this legislation. The Defense Department believes that passage of this bill would add billions of dollars to the country's defense budget for the 1964 fiscal year.

The AFL-CIO has testified against the bill, pointing out that it would cost consumers $14 billion a year.

Other groups that have come out against it include the National Farmers Union, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the Chamber of Commerce, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Trade Commission, the Commerce Department, and the State Department.

It seems almost incredible that the House Commerce Committee has already approved this bill, and the Senate Commerce Committee, now holding hearings on the measure, may do the same.

Dozens of newspapers throughout the country have carried editorials condemning the inflationary effects of this price-fixing bill, but none we have seen puts it more succinctly than the New York Herald-Tribune which said:

"When corporate executives get together in a smoky hotel room and agree not to undercut one another's prices, that's called a conspiracy and the executives are sent to jail. When they attempt to do the same thing by law—and require everybody to go along—that's called fair trade. When Congressmen seek to disguise 'fair trade' as 'quality stabilization' that's called politics. Though consumers—and that includes all the voters—might be excused for using earthier terms."

We call it "stealing"—from the consumer's pocketbook.

Diem's Last Interview

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, Ngo Dinh Diem, the late President of Vietnam, has gone to his eternal rest. His death—especially the tragic circumstances surrounding it—should grieve us deeply. In his passing, we have lost a true and loyal friend. And the free world, whose distant ramparts he had defended in that remote forefront of the bloody, physical struggle with communism, has lost a proven ally and a champion.

Nine years have passed since the day when Ngo Dinh Diem, returning from political exile, took over the reins of the government of the newly created state of South Vietnam. With a firm hand and steady purpose, with dedication seldom matched in current history, and with fervent nationalistic zeal which transcended considerations of personal gain, he struggled against overwhelming odds to weld the divergent elements of the Vietnamese population into a nation, to create an effective central government, to rid his homeland of the sores of Communist infiltration, and to hold back the tide of communism moving persistently from the north. In an area of the world beset by centuries-old problems, rendered by repeated invasions and partitions, sapped by ancient rivalries and weaknesses, he alone—and then his infant nation—stood firm on the side of freedom, striving to attain in South Vietnam that degree of internal security which is necessary for the free exercise of human rights.

It was because of these qualities of Ngo Dinh Diem, and because our national and free world interests in that part of the globe coincided with his goals, that the United States sought to assist Diem in his struggle. We have provided his country with massive aid—aid which produced results as one area of Vietnam after another became cleared of Communist guerrillas. And we looked with hope, and anticipation, to the day when the Government of Vietnam would become sufficiently strong to carry on, successfully the fight against the Communists, and our aid could be terminated.

Last weekend, these hopes and expectations suffered a sudden reverse. The military coup d'etat, the barbaric murder of Diem and his brother Nhu, and the reported demand from the military junta for a sharp increase in American aid, raise serious questions regarding the future course of our relations with Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the whole civilized world was overcome with a feeling of revulsion at the act of barbarism which accompanied the rise to power of the self-proclaimed defenders of human rights in Vietnam. The murder of Diem and his brother, the cruel, clumsy attempt to cloak the deed with a label of a suicide, fill one with horror. I believe that our Government must think long and deeply about any commitment to a group of people who would rise to power in this manner. I further believe that the people in and out of our Government should also search their souls and consider to what extent, if any, their words—the intemperate criticisms of the Diem regime, the distorted reports from that area, the biased editorial comments—to what extent these words and deeds, or lack of them, contributed to the tragedy which took place in Saigon last weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our Government to delay extending recognition to the military junta in Vietnam until a thorough review and reassessment of our policy with respect to southeast Asia is accomplished. We must consider what effect our continued aid to Vietnam will have on that entire area. And we must decide anew whether American aid—particularly aid on such large scale—is warranted in the light of recent events. Our resources, surely, are not inexhaustible. They must be used in a manner, and in places, where their use will contribute most to the attainment of the overall goals of our foreign policy: the establishment of order, and of peace with justice and freedom, among peoples who seek the same objectives. It is only under those conditions that the expenditure of our public funds can carry forward the work begun with the sacrifice of American lives and the lives of others who, like Diem, believed in working for and fighting for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Journal of November 5, 1963, entitled "Diem's Last Interview," which was written by Bob Considine. I ask, Why did Ambassador Lodge portray the views expressed in paragraph 4 contradicting the facts found by the Hearst task force? I ask, From what source did he receive these views?

The article follows:

DIEM'S LAST INTERVIEW

(By Bob Considine)

President Diem's last interview was with the Hearst task force, just a little over month ago.

The resident correspondents in Saigon, most of whom had not been able to get in to see him, badgered us a bit before we saw him.

"Good luck," one said. "With any kind of a break you should be able to get out of the palace in 4 hours. Also, you'd better go to the bathroom before you start. There won't be any breaks. And if you expect a drink, forget it. You'll be lucky if he serves you tea."

Ambassador Lodge took a dim view. He said we'd find him an old and beaten man who had lost his grip on the situation, uncertain of his future course and all that sort of thing.

We had to wait a bit for Diem in Gia Long palace, now a battered ruin. An aid said that the president was momentarily tied up, putting the finishing touches on a speech he was to deliver later on Confucius. When he bounced in to greet us, he brimmed with vigor. He was everything Ambassador Lodge had said he wasn't.

Diem spoke to us in French, except for one sentence. Suddenly restless with the game of languages he turned to Bill Hearst and spoke a sentence in perfect English.

The early phases of the interview had to do with his sister-in-law's most recent interview, the one in Rome where she was reported as blasting the younger American officers serving in Vietnam as military advisors. We expected him, somehow, to come forth with a full-breasted endorsement of the American aid effort.

Instead, Diem seemed to hedge a bit. Sorry he had not read the text of Madame's remarks in Rome, and therefore could not comment, could he? Frank Conniff said that was sensible, but how did he, Diem, feel about our men. But he ducked that a bit, too.

"The American officers I've met are good ones, on the whole," he said.

"Did you ever tell her to keep quiet?" I asked him.

Diem shrugged. "She was in Rome this time," he said. "I didn't know what she was going to say. But, remember, she is also a deputy. She can speak for herself; just as your Congressmen do."

"But don't you see how bad that sounds to dependents of the men concerned, the mothers and fathers of them, their wives and kids?" Frank pressed him.

"I have always spoken of our foreign friends in a friendly way," Diem answered solemnly. Then the strong bronzed face beneath the shock of raven black hair burst wide open with sudden and radiant laughter.

"It is because I am not married that I have all these troubles."

Once started, Diem was a hard man to turn off. At least a dozen times one of us would say, "Thank you, Mr. President."

But Diem would brush aside the phrase that Marriman Smith of UPI patented and plunge on. But finally we were outside. Two palace guards, probably dead now, beck-

oned our car up to the front door of the palace. Frank and I got in and sat there for about 10 minutes while Bill Hearst gabbed at the door with Diem's press chief, a Saigon editor. Occassionally, we'd yell for Bill to come along, and in time he did.

"I was telling him," Bill said, "that his boss ought to think a little more about better public relations."

It didn't seem very important as we drove away in the rain.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert in the RECORD the following paragraph taken from an article in the New York Times of November 6, 1963, written by David Halberstam:

The Buddhist centers of worship, the pagodas, then became centers of political as well as religious unrest.

Here is an admission that the Buddhists were involved in political activities. I ask, Should the action taken by the former Diem regime be attributed to religious persecution when the houses of worship of the Buddhists were used for political activities against a common objective—a war against the Communists? I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that President Diem had built for the Buddhists over 1,100 pagodas during the last 8 years of his regime. Do you call that religious persecution?

May I bring to the attention of my colleagues my remarks which appeared in the RECORD of August 15, 1963. I hope the Members will reread this address and compare those statements with those which are now appearing in the press.

I am sure that no matter what my Government does, it is our earnest hope that we can assist in winning the war against the Communists for the people of Vietnam so that one day they may be able to select a government of their own choosing.

So-Called Working Cruise in the Caribbean by Nine State and Federal Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial broadcast by Mutual Radio:

According to the New York Herald Tribune, nine State and Federal legislators recently went on a 7-day so-called working cruise in the Caribbean. Yesterday they returned and, says the Trib, at least three of the lawmakers, all of whom were accompanied by their wives, admitted all their expenses had been paid by the New York State Savings Bank Association.

Most of the lawmakers, in one way or another, are concerned with legislation directly affecting savings banks. Most, when asked by Tribune reporters, denied any wrongdoing, and also denied their votes on banking legislation would, in any way, be affected by their cruise, even though they were accompanied by some 925 savings bank executives, their wives, and guests. This may, and probably is, true.

However, the public would have every right to raise its eyebrows at such behavior. It unfortunately places the recipient of such gratuity under a vague cloud of suspicion, no matter what his motives may have been. In politics and government, one can never be too careful or too prudent.

Knifing the U.S. Lunar Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith an article by the well-known columnist, William S. White, entitled "Knifing the U.S. Lunar Project."

Mr. White points up the fact that the Nation which becomes first in space will undoubtedly become first on the earth and goes on to call Khrushchev's recent statement concerning the Soviet lunar efforts "one of the most successful of all Soviet propaganda strokes."

The article follows:

KNIFING THE U.S. LUNAR PROJECT

(By William S. White)

One of the most successful of all Soviet propaganda strokes has been Nikita Khrushchev's theatrical withdrawal from the race to the moon. The American space program, is, in consequence, in grave trouble.

In Congress and among the people—many of whom Mr. Khrushchev is plainly fooling most of the time in this matter—there is a clearly diminished interest in pushing that program, even though never has so vast and so potentially rewarding an enterprise been open to mankind. But would it not cost many billions? Of course, it would; but so did the development of the airplane, of atomic energy, of radio, and television.

Mr. Khrushchev's reasons for his alleged retirement are endlessly debated. But not often has there been a more irrelevant debate, as has been pointed out by one of the most trustworthy experts in this field, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas. For it does not really matter why Mr. Khrushchev has done what apparently he has done. And, parenthetically, if he really has done it, it probably is in simple acceptance of the basic fact that the Russian economy is vastly inferior to that of the United States.

UNDERCUTS U.S. EFFORTS

What is truly and desperately important is the danger that we are about to be talked out of that maximum American effort which is the most vital need of the 20th century and perhaps even of the century to come.

To begin with, the nation which becomes first in space will undoubtedly become first on the earth we inhabit, probably in position to begin to control the weather and possibly even to begin to dominate some part of the infinity which has thus far lain beyond man's understanding.

And, to proceed with the obvious, the effort to reach the moon—as only the current symbol of man's search into these outer mysteries—is already showering out collateral benefits in science which are in themselves beyond price.

Grand and seemingly gradios schemes of this kind, though easy to attack with the jeering slogan of unlettered cynicism, almost invariably produce returns which a few years later we learn we could not have lived without. Often, these returns are wholly unexpected.

For a relatively small example: The assigned mission of the Eighth U.S. Air Force in England in the Second World War was to destroy German industry with daylight bombing raids. A par of this job was done; but a far more immediately vital and quite unplanned thing was done, too. This was the virtual destruction of the counterattacking German fighter air force—a bonus that may well have saved our D-day invasion from disaster.

AIDS ANTILUNAR BLOC

Mr. Khrushchev's claim that he is getting out of the moon contest has reduced the drama of the thing—which too many people in any event had seen as a kind of high school footrace. But, more damagingly, it has greatly assisted the old coalition against the moon attempt. One of the strangest coalitions we have ever known, it is made up of some conservatives whose proper desire to save money is sadly misplaced here, and some liberals who can rarely lift their minds above welfarist plans for spending every dollar at hand "right here on earth," to use their happily demagogic phrase.

Nothing will change the minds of these liberals. The conservatives, however, ought to ponder what they are about here. For apart from the almost indescribable strategic and scientific significance of this program, there is the bottom fact that it is already nearly indispensable to the American economy and may later become indispensable in the absolute sense.

Automation, when fully launched, will create huge pools of unemployables. Politically, these must and will be cared for, under any foreseeable regime, Republican or Democratic. Is it not better to spend the money for space than to speed the day when all this money and more will have to be thrown about for the most gigantic—and also permanent—leaf-raking schemes in the world's history?

The space program is the precise opposite of economic crackpotism. It is sensible conservatism's greatest future weapon against just such crackpotism.

United States Cuts Off Aid to Honduras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has two standards: an anti-Communist overthrow by the government is met with coolness and disdain but when an anti-Communist government is overthrown President Kennedy wants to give immediate recognition. A case in point is the immediate cutoff of aid to Honduras, one of our allies.

A very disturbing article by Dan Kurzman in a dispatch from Honduras follows:

CUTOFF OF U.S. AID A BLOW TO HONDURAS

(By Dan Kurzman)

TEGUCIGALPA.—The U.S. decision to cut off aid to Honduras in the wake of the military coup is likely to have a drastic effect on the Honduran economy.

Whether this effect will, as the United States hopes, generate sufficient pressure on Honduran militarists to permit early resumption of constitutional rule remains to be seen. The other U.S. hope is that the cutoff will be a lesson to potential coupmakers elsewhere in Latin America.

So important a man as Gabriel Mejia, an industrial magnate who is widely believed to have been involved in the conspiracy against the democratic government of President Ramon Villeda Morales, told me:

"We could go without American aid for about 3 months. Then public works would have to be cancelled, throwing thousands out of work, and business would drop steeply with the loss in public purchasing power. I guess all we could do would be to advance the date of new elections so we could get aid again."

The military has up to now indicated uncertainty about when elections will be held. Col. Oswaldo Lopez Arellano, who heads the military government, said they may take place in about a year, but coup leaders are believed to favor holding on to power for at least 2 years, perhaps indefinitely.

Since the Alliance for Progress was inaugurated in 1961, the United States has committed about $18 million in aid to Honduras, of which $11 million has been disbursed. The remaining $7 million will be withheld. This sum includes $2½ million for economic development projects and $2 million for budgetary support.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Continues Record of Progress and Service in West Virginia—Morgantown (W. Va.)—Dominion-News Commends Recent Improvements in Main Line Between Clarksburg and Parkersburg—President Jervis Langdon, and Many West Virginians Have Made Notable Contributions to Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in 1838 the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad began construction of the first railroad tracks in West Virginia, building westward from Harpers Ferry. In the century and a quarter which has elapsed since then, the development of the railroad has provided significant contributions to the economy of West Virginia, and to the well-being of its citizens.

Among the responsible individuals who have been instrumental in the B. & O.'s success in the Mountain State were Charles W. Van Horn, of Lost Creek, W. Va., who was vice president in charge of operations for many years. Another leader was the former Governor of our State, the Honorable John J. Cornwell, of Romney, who for some time acted as general counsel of the line.

It is noteworthy that Charles R. Van Horn, the son of Mr. Van Horn, is now Washington representative for Government affairs of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

And, the concern for progress and service which was so evident in frontier days has not diminished with the years, but continues to expand and to bring forth achievement and benefit. A notable example of growth is the recent completion of important main line improvements in the B. & O. system between Clarksburg and Parkersburg, W. Va.

This improved line will provide a direct route for major freight shipments to the Southwest, through the St. Louis gateway, and correspondingly improved service to the businessmen and citizens of the Mountain State.

It has recently been my privilege to correspond with the president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Mr. Jervis Langdon, Jr., congratulating his efficient organization on recent additions and improvements. I likewise pointed out the immeasurable benefit which has come to West Virginia as a direct result of the enterprise and dependability of the B. & O.

I request that this correspondence be printed in the Appendix.

Mr. President, the experienced and respected editor and publisher of the Morgantown (W. Va.) Dominion-News, Walter L. Hart, commented meaningfully on the contributions of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad to the development in our State. In his October 31 editorial, "B. & O. Deserves Our Applause," Editor Hart stresses the importance of the new main line improvements. Further, he states that—

> We in West Virginia salute the railroad and hope, under its new management, it continues to make progressive moves designed to increase its service to the shippers of the world and in doing so become more valuable to all the areas it serves, including our own State of West Virginia.

I request that Mr. Hart's editorial be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 29, 1963.

Mr. JERVIS LANGDON, Jr.,
President, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Parkersburg, W. Va.:

Sincerely regret Senate business here prevents my participation in your program-diner today. Your company has contributed much to the economic development of West Virginia and to the well-being of the citizens of our State. It is especially appropriate that in this centennial year the old B. & O. is the new B. & O. as it meets its responsibilities for improved transportation vital to the movement of coal and other traffic across our State and throughout an important part of the country. Congratulations and please convey my greetings to all in attendance.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator.

THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD CO.,
Baltimore, Md., October 30, 1963.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much for your thoughtfulness in sending the telegram to me at Parkersburg yesterday. It arrived at the end of a luncheon we held on the special train which had come over from Clarksburg during the morning.

The project, I am sure, will be a great success and I look forward to a substantial increase in B. & O. traffic not only through northern West Virginia but to and from our stations in that great State.

Sincerely,

JERVIS LANGDON, Jr.,
President.

B. & O. DESERVES OUR APPLAUSE

We join with all progressive West Virginians in congratulating the Baltimore & Ohio railroad for its great main line improvement between Clarksburg and Parkersburg.

The prosperity—or lack of it—of this important railroad is of vital concern to every West Virginian because the B. & O. is a major taxpayer and in its continued progress all of us have a real stake.

This main line improvement makes it possible to haul all major freight items on the most direct route to the great Southwest through the St. Louis gateway. This is expected to greatly increase the revenues of the railroad.

Adding this to the forward look the railroad has adopted in pioneering on unit coal freight trains and other projects designed to make the railroad a better facility for its customers and therefore a more profitable enterprise certainly is most desirable from all standpoints.

We in West Virginia salute the railroad and hope under its new management it continues to make progressive moves designed to increase its service to the shippers of the world and in doing so become more valuable to all the areas it serves including our own State of West Virginia.

Hawaii Sugar Workers Still Best Paid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the floor last Thursday, in speaking against the extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican Bracero Importation Act, I mentioned the high wages which sugar workers in Hawaii receive. According to comparative figures for 1962 recently released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Hawaii's sugar workers are still the highest paid sugar workers in the world. Workers in Florida, the next highest paid, receive only half as much.

Hawaii's field hands last year received an average of $21.89 a day, including $16.02 in cash wages and $5.87 fringe benefits.

Cash wages in other domestic sugar areas ranged from $4.80 per day in Puerto Rico to $9.48 per day in Florida, where workers also receive a maximum of $1.52 per day in fringe benefits.

Hawaii also led in sugar yield per acre, getting more than three times as much sugar per acre of cane as Florida, the next most productive.

Hawaii's sugar crop is a 2-year crop while others are 1-year crops but, even if cut in half, Hawaii's yields outstrip all others, the statistics showed.

The average daily earnings including both cash wages and fringe benefits, based on an 8-hour day were as follows:

Hawaii, $21.89; Florida, $11; the sugar-beet areas, $10.80; Louisiana, $8.19, and Puerto Rico, $6.32.

We in Hawaii are proud of the fact that while our sugar workers are the highest paid in the world, we are still capable of maintaining a competitive position in the sugar market.

Congress Not a Group That Can Be Hurried

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, in the book, "History of the House of Representatives," by George B. Galloway, House Document No. 246, 87th Congress, the chapter on "Relations with the Senate" opens with the following:

There is a legend that Thomas Jefferson, after his return from France, once asked Washington at breakfast why he had agreed to a second Chamber in Congress. According to the story, Washington asked him: "Why did you pour that tea into your saucer?"

"To cool it," Jefferson replied. "Just so," said Washington, "we pour House legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

And is further said in this authority:

The founders intended that the Senate should serve as a council of revision in relation to measures passed by the House, and as a forum where the States would be equally represented.

My home town newspaper, the Athens (Ga.) Banner-Herald, wisely calls attention to the intent of the framers of the Constitution in an editorial on September 29, 1963. I am glad to have it inserted here in the RECORD in the hope that irresponsible critics will be aware that due deliberation is one way we Members of Congress discharge our duties to the country.

CONGRESS NOT A GROUP THAT CAN BE HURRIED

It is well for the country that the U.S. Congress, except in unusual and extraordinary circumstances, acts with the greatest deliberation. In fact, it is well for the country that Congress in many instances refuses to act at all.

There is the matter of the tax reduction bill, for instance. The Congress has been flirting with that proposal, which came from the White House, for nearly a year. Up to this time the measure has cleared only the House of Representatives. The Senate is yet to act upon it, and the bill, if it is finally passed, may not become law before the new Congress meets next spring.

Then, too, the action by the Senate on the nuclear test ban treaty is another illustration. There were weeks of debate before it received approval. Every Senator, every social, political, or economic group, was heard from in great detail before a final vote was taken.

Surely this is democracy in action. The Congress rarely acts in haste, for to do so often leads it to repent at leisure. It is far simpler to enact a law then it is to repeal one. The prohibition law, for instance, was enacted in a burst of frenzy and high pressure on the part of dry groups. The country realized that it would not work long before it was possible to have the law repealed.

One writer in a financial magazine has expressed his disgust over what he calls "slow motion personified" on the part of Congress. He wants the tax measure and the Kennedy social reforms either made into law or thrown into the wastebasket without further ado.

Surely this is a short-sighted and unthinking attitude to take. Often a bad law can be sidetracked through delay and a good law made more palatable by prolonged debate. Congress may irritate some people because of its pokey ways, but we are glad that it is not easy to stampede.

United States and Russia To Cooperate in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, if there are two diametrically opposed systems in education they are the one in Soviet Russia and the other in the United States, yet according to Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in the October 31 issue of the Long Island Press, President Kennedy wants to join the Soviet in a study of education. How foolish can we get?

The article follows:

J.F.K. WANTS UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA TO JOIN IN STUDY OF EDUCATION

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is seriously considering proposing a new joint undertaking with Russia.

Unfazed by Premier Khrushchev's brush-off of a cooperative moon venture, the President is deliberating still another joint effort—this time in the field of education.

Under this yet-to-be disclosed plan, "joint studies of the educational processes in the two countries would be undertaken."

As expounded in a position paper prepared for the President by key foreign policy and disarmament advisers, the basic aim of this joint educational plan is to "Improve the environment for the control of crises and conflict between the United States and the U.S.S.R."

Also under contemplation is a project for "expanding interaction with the Soviet people in areas such as art, games and tourism."

This concept is still in the formative stage. It has been discussed at several White House conferences, but only in general terms. No details have been submitted and acted on.

But consideration of the joint educational idea is far advanced—to the point where decision has been made that the President launch it in a major speech. The time and place are still undecided, but the address will most likely be forthcoming some time in the next several months.

As spelled out in the position paper, the joint United States-Soviet educational studies initially would be in such fields as anthropology, psychiatry, social psychology, and comparative historical and political research.

Later, if these cooperative ventures proved fruitful, other and broader studies would be undertaken.

The highly significant position paper, titled "Common Action for the Control of Conflict," presents at some length the reasoning behind this unprecedented project. Revealing highlights are as follows:

"The United States, because it holds the keys to man's freedom, must take the initiative in devising the programs needed to begin to span the divided world. The United States can undertake such programs with prospects of success because of its present resource superiority. The primary purpose of these joint ventures is to improve the environment for the control of crises and conflict between the United States and U.S.S.R.

"Joint studies of the educational process in the two countries should be attempted.

"Persuasion had best begin with the identification and understanding of areas of similarity between the United States and U.S.S.R. The quest for similarity ought to be pursued across the whole of society, not as an end in itself but as a moral and psychological preparation for discussing differences and how they may be resolved.

"At first, joint studies should be undertaken in specific fields of educational development and research. Later, broader studies of the entire approach to education and development should be tried.

"Education in a modern society is an amalgam of its social history which links the present with the past, of its art which provides a vision of its future, and of the state of its technology whose needs must be met if its progress is to continue.

"It is of utmost importance for the future that the way in which the needs of the individual and the society are conceived and the manner in which their reconciliation is being attempted by means of education should be thoroughly understood and compared across national boundaries. This is of particular significance for two great powers such as the United States and the Soviet Union at the present stage of world history.

"The suggestions of Sir Julian Huxley, for example, that joint discussions be held on the relationship of education to human ecology, to society, and to world development, provide the seed for the beginning of a dialog which would be of immense importance in mitigating conflict over the longer run."

Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, is quietly pressing a compromise that may clear the way for enactment of the $1.9 billion measure for a 5-year program of Federal grants and loans for the construction of college buildings.

The legislation has been stalled for weeks in a deadlock between the Senate and House over explosive provisions voted by each Chamber.

Under MCCORMACK's backstage plan, they would give ground as follows:

The House would agree to limit Federal aid for private colleges to construction of science, social science, language, and engineering buildings. The Senate, in turn, would drop its hotly controversial amendment under which any taxpayer could institute court action against Government aid to private schools.

This provision, opposed by the administration, was written into the bill by a 45-to-33 vote with 22 Senators abstaining. The amendment was sponsored by Senator SAM ERVIN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Among those voting for it was Senator TED KENNEDY, brother of the President.

Initial discussions indicate there is a good chance MCCORMACK's compromise may be adopted. Leaders of both sides appear favorable. However, other promising overtures have fallen through, so only time will tell how MCCORMACK's fares.

If it is accepted, and the $1.9 billion measure is finally approved by Congress, that would greatly improve the chances of three other long-pending educational aid bills—for vocational schools, areas with large numbers of Federal employees, and loans to col-

lege students under the National Defense Education Act.

But the outlook is still gloomy for another long-stymied educational measure—Federal aid for the construction of grade and high schools and teachers' salaries. There is no hope for that this year as it has been shelved by congressional leaders. They've washed their hands of it, and so has the White House—authough neither is saying so publicly.

East-West Understanding Through the Medium of the Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, when Congress elected to establish the East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange in Hawaii 3 years ago, it probably never envisioned the program that is to be launched on December 4, 1963—an effort to bring about East-West understanding through the medium of the theater. This commendable and forward-looking experiment is described in an excellent publicity release written by Hazel Cunningham, and I include it here in the RECORD:

THE EAST-WEST THEATER—AN EXPERIMENT IN UNDERSTANDING

(By Hazel Cunningham)

The State of Hawaii and the Federal Government this fall quietly began a unique experiment designed to further East-West understanding through the medium of theater.

Few persons outside of Hawaii (and, for that matter, relatively few in the islands) are aware that the Congress of the United States has appropriated more than a million dollars to establish in Hawaii a facility where the rich theatrical traditions of Asia may blend with those of Western civilization.

That will be remedied on December 4 when a Japanese Kabuki play presented in the traditional manner formally opens the East-West Theater, a compelling structure of concrete which seats 710 and is equipped to present oriental as well as Western drama. (The theater was built by Federal funds along with five other East-West Center buildings on the University of Hawaii campus. The State and university supplied the land, furnishings, theatrical equipment and operating staff, boosting the total figure for the theater past $2 million.)

Invitations to the gala, black tie "first night" presentation of "Benten Kozo" or "Benten the Thief" are being issued to Asian as well as U.S. Government and theater notables.

The Japanese play will be followed on successive nights by "Hamlet" and the musical "Of Thee I Sing." Repertory style, the three productions can be seen any night except Monday and at weekend matinees until December 22.

"Benten Kozo" was written in 1862 by Kawatake Mokuami, the last of the great Kabuki playwrights. It was prepared for English production by Dr. Yukuo Uyehara, professor in the university's department of Pacific languages, and Dr. Earle Ernst, drama department chairman who also is the play's director.

This Kabuki play differs from the historical type in that it is a "living" domestic play. It runs about 3 hours in length and even for a Kabuki is considered spectacular in staging, costuming, and choreography.

Onoe Kuroemon, member of a distinguished family of Kabuki actors, will arrive in Honolulu in mid-October from Tokyo to work with the cast of 40 on the traditional stylized movement and dance. Kuroemon, who speaks English, will not act in the play.

The cast was chosen from the community at large. Members will be costumed in garments imported from Tokyo's foremost Kabuki theater, the Kabuki-Za. The Kabuki curtain to be used also is an import—a gift of the West Tokyo Rotary Club to the Center.

The musical score has been prerecorded on tape in Japan.

Sets for Benten and the other productions will be designed by Richard G. Mason, former art director for the San Francisco Opera House. Mason also has had considerable on-and-off Broadway design experience and also was associated with Stuttgart, Germany theater.

The opening night will hold special significance for Dr. Ernst who is America's foremost authority on the Kabuki. In 1947 Ernst translated, adapted, and staged in Hawaii the first postwar Japanese play to be performed outside Japan—"The Defeated." In 1949 he directed "The House of Sugawara," the first complete Kabuki play to be performed in English. In 1953 he directed and adapted for the stage "Benten the Thief."

It is largely through the efforts of the department of drama and theater that the 710-seat auditorium, as it was designated in the original East-West Center plans, became an intimate theater with interior walls of warm, glowing Burmese teak, designed in a manner to mount standard and not so standard Western theater and various forms of Asian theater. (One of these innovations is a hanamichi, or trapped runway, used extensively in Japanese Kabuki plays.)

Ernst is quick to point out, however, that December 4 will not merely mark the opening of a new theater.

"It's much more than that," he says. "The East-West Theater presents a unique opportunity to bring people together for an unparalleled experiment in theater—and international understanding.

"It could happen nowhere else. Historically, we here in Hawaii are prepared for it. The university's drama department has presented both contemporary and classical plays of the East, Noh and Kabuki, Peking Opera and contemporary Indian plays.

"It's one thing for an Asian interested in theater to go on a tour of the United States and sightsee our centers of drama," he says. But where, he asks, will he find the opportunity to get in and work in it?

The East-West theater presents that opportunity—and more—for those scholarship students now attending the Center.

In addition, Ernst also has played an important part in the recent establishment of an East-West Center "technical theater trainee" program which to date has brought 10 talented young Asians to Hawaii for a year of on-the-job training in all aspects of modern production—design, staging, lighting, costumes, makeup, rehearsal, theater management.

Four trainees are from Japan, three from Indonesia, two from Taiwan, and one from Thailand. They were personally selected by Ernst without regard for their educational background or competency in English. Ernst sought only those who show promise of influencing the development of the theaters of their respective countries.

Ernst said the program was established as there is at present no place in the Orient where an Asian theater worker can learn modern methods of production.

"If the modern theater in the Orient is to develop there has to be some place where these people can learn lighting, how to build scenery, and make costumes and sets," he says.

"The contemporary theater of Asia, as opposed to the traditional native theater, had its origins in the theater of the West," explains Ernst, pointing out that until after World War II, "modern" theater in Asia consisted almost entirely of translations or imitations of realistic Western plays.

"In the last decade or so there has been something of a movement throughout the Orient to abandon this slavish imitation of Western theater and to attempt to develop distinct native forms of realistic expression.

"In general, this movement has been neither commercially nor ideologically successful; even in Japan, which has made the greatest efforts to establish a modern theater, only a handful of actors and directors are able to make a living at it."

Ernst notes that the modern theater of Asian countries continues to be based on the Western conception of realistic theater in which the validity of the production is dependent upon an illusion of actuality.

"It took the West from the Renaissance to the end of the 19th century to perfect this form; Asia has attempted to adopt the form in a period of 50 years," Ernst says.

Since very few oriental theater workers have had direct experience of this kind of theater, their mounting of modern plays is based principally upon the use of techniques borrowed from their traditional theaters, he says.

"The result is neither good Western nor good traditional oriental staging, and this accounts, to a significant degree, for the extremely limited appeal of the productions."

Ernst, whose background in theater and fluency in Japanese made him the Allies' choice to serve as censor of Japan's legitimate theater during the occupation, says he has seen this at firsthand in a number of Asian countries.

"I have been assured by both Asians and Americans that the situation prevails everywhere in the Orient. The most perceptive Asian theater workers are convinced that their modern theater will not advance beyond its present hole-in-corner insignficance until those who work in it are trained in modern methods of production."

The East-West theater plant is admirably suited to giving the trainees a wide range of theater experience. The main theater will acquaint them with the most advanced methods of production, utilizing the latest equipment, and the small laboratory theater in the rear of the main stage will give them experience in working with flexible theater space (including arena theater) and with forms of staging and production that can be duplicated, economically, in their countries.

The trainee program also represents "interchange" as Ernst chose only people who had done appreciable work in the theaters of their countries and thus brought with them a store of information.

More on Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, November 5, 1963.

Three years after its adoption the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged is proving a meager answer to financing care for elderly persons too poor to pay their own hospital and medical bills.

The report of a Senate subcommittee indicates that only 2 percent of the Nation's 18 million aged received aid under the program in any part of the last fiscal year. Even this tiny proportion is an exaggeration, since many thousands were persons who had received care under public relief programs before the Federal system of matching grants for the "medically indigent" was enacted.

Only 28 States have yet put plans in operation; the duration and types of benefits vary widely; stringent eligibility tests and the humiliating means test discourage participation, and the great bulk of the funds go to the wealthiest States. Administrative costs eat up much of the Federal allocation, partly because of the newness of the program but even more because of the complexity of the rules governing enforcement.

The concept that a combination of Kerr-Mills and private health insurance will give America's older citizens adequate protection against the economic hazards of ill health is plainly an illusion. Until the Kennedy administration makes a real fight for its program of hospital care for the aged under the social security system, tens of thousands of the elderly will lack the safeguards they need and should have. This has become one of the great forgotten issues of 1963. It cannot stay forgotten in 1964.

Civil Rights Crisis in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Society for the Study of Social Problems, an affiliate of the American Sociological Association, at its annual meeting, passed by unanimous vote a resolution dealing with the present civil rights crisis and the civil rights legislation before Congress. I am pleased to bring this resolution, which was carefully considered by many eminent behavioral scientists, to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

The Society for the Study of Social Problems, representing almost 900 sociologists and other behavioral scientists associated with educational institutions in all sections of the United States, has a responsibility to express itself on the current civil rights crisis.

This Nation is in the midst of a critical situation, the dimensions of which call for major and immediate adjustment. Such redress is, in part, embodied in the civil rights legislation recommended to Congress by the administration and, unless this is passed, we have grave fears of resultant social dislocation and serious civil strife in American society.

The denial of full rights to Negroes and other groups is America's most serious social problem. Overwhelming evidence indicates that segregation and other forms of discrimination are psychologically, economically and socially detrimental to those who are deprived; they are detrimental to society as a whole. The effects of racial discrimination contribute to the initiation and perpetuation of many other social problems.

It is a goal of American democracy that individuals should have the opportunity of developing their full capacities. This cannot be achieved by those individuals whose rights and opportunities are partly denied. Such achievement can come only with full equality.

Opinion polls indicate that the seriousness of the present situation is widely recognized and the desire to secure remedial action has substantial national support. The current urgent demand for an end to discriminatory practices in the United States takes place in a context of a quest for freedom which is sweeping the world. Logical analysis of recent history and recognition of the dynamics of social changes must inevitably point to the conclusion that the demand for full freedom for all in America cannot be stemmed. Unless substantial gains are achieved it may be expected that efforts to secure equal rights will be intensified and that the techniques used to bring about redress will become increasingly desperate.

Large numbers of Americans feel deeply that our Nation is on trial—and the rest of the world is watching to see if we can resolve our racial problems and match our professed ideals with deeds.

Immediate action is required to strike down discriminatory barriers on all fronts—local, State, and National—by voluntary as well as legal means. Dramatic steps are called for. The present legislation before Congress proposed by the administration is such a step.

We recognize that this legislation does not solve all problems; it is only a beginning.

We call upon Congress to pass the administration's civil rights program without delay, and in particular, the section on public accommodation. In our estimation congressional action may determine whether peaceful progress or dislocation and strife will be the fate of America.

A copy of this resolution is being forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Signing for the Study of Social Problems: Jessie Bernard, president, 1963–64; Marvin B. Sussman, president, 1962–63; Peter I. Rose, chairman, committee on intergroup relations.

The following members served on the drafting committee:

Jessie Bernard, Pennsylvania State University.

Marvin B. Sussman, Western Reserve University.

Peter I. Rose, Smith College.

Oscar Cohen, the Anti-Defamation League.

Robert G. Anderson III, Indiana University.

Earl Bogdanaff, Systems Development Corp.

Robert H. Bohlke, American International College.

Warren Breed, Tulane University.

John H. Burma, Grinnell College.

Eleanor K. Caplan, Western Reserve University.

Marshall B. Clinard, University of Wisconsin.

Albert K. Cohen, Indiana University.

Martin L. Cohnstaedt, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

Oscar Eggers, University of Missouri at Kansas City.

Mabel A. Elliott, Chatham College.

F. X. Femminella, Adelphi University.

Byron Fox, Syracuse University.

Jerome Himelhoch, Vermont Youth Study.

Louisa P. Howe, Harvard School of Public Health.

Frank F. Lee, Oakland University (Michigan).

Elmer Luchterhand, Community Progress, Inc., New Haven.

S. M. Miller, Syracuse University.

John Mogey, Vanderbilt University.

Olga Northwood, Seattle, Wash.

L. K. Northwood, University of Washington.

John A. Rademaker, Willamette University.

Hyman Rodman, Merrill-Palmer Institute.

Harvey Seifert, Southern California School of Theology.

Walter B. Simon, Western Reserve University.

Sherwood B. Slater, Western Reserve University.

Charles E. Snyder, Southern Illinois University.

The Advantage of Thinking Small

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in Skyline magazine, a North American Aviation publication, a very excellent article which I will submit for the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

This article, Mr. Speaker, points out once again the large number of firms and geographical areas that may benefit from subcontracting for a prime contractor. When a major contract is awarded to a prime contractor, many people look no further. If they did it would soon become clear that smaller firms all over the Nation eventually realize a share of the benefits.

As I said in my remarks of September 18:

Smaller firms can succeed in the defense business * * * by finding out what the problems of the prime contractor are and by showing him the best way to solve those problems. Hundreds of subcontractors all over the United States are doing just this. There has come, through such efforts, a quicker, a better solution to the problems and a superior product turned out for our national efforts.

The article follows:

THE ADVANTAGE OF THINKING SMALL: ABOUT 12,000 LITTLE COMPANIES WITH SPECIAL SKILLS GOT BUSINESS FROM NORTH AMERICAN LAST YEAR

In Waco, Tex., the demands of the defense program have nearly quadrupled the manpower of Bill Trice's OK Machine & Tool Co.—to 21 employees.

Trice speaks of his success with the candid remark "we do good work and get it out on schedule." But since the days of World War II, North American has depended on OK and companies like it to fulfill contracts with the specialized and valued capabilities peculiar to small business.

Hidden behind the walls of small business firms and shops throughout this Nation are a variety of skills. No big engineering venture could succeed without dipping generously into that pool of talent.

North American has done just that. In the past fiscal year the company spent nearly one-third of a billion dollars with small business firms. In return it received material, supplies, and services that went directly into industry-pacing products like the A-5 Vigilante weapon system, the F-1 rocket engine, the SNAP atomic reactors, the Hound Dog missile, the Apollo moon modules, the SINS Polaris sub guidance system, the Minuteman ICBM guidance system, and the XB-70.

There were nearly 12,000 small business firms that participated in North American's activities last year.

They supplied everything from cans of paint to sheets of hammered metal; from 17-ton lead reactor shields to tiny matchhead-size igniters for missile-separating explosive bolts.

There were some who had been only a few months on board with North American; others, like OK, could trace an association back to the company's pre-World War II days.

The quest for quality products and on-time delivery leads to contracts in every part of the Nation. Recently two different North American operations, the Atomics International Division in Canoga Park, Calif., and Space & Information Systems Division's Tulsa, Okla., plant, reached into Canton, Mass., (population 13,000) for two important contracts. One, from Atomics International, went to the Instron Engineering Corp. Its value was $16,000. The other from the Space Division's Tulsa plant, went to Emerson & Cuming, Inc. Its value was $280,000.

Rulon Nagely, North American vice president, material, calls the small business operation a two-way street.

"We share the views of Congress," he says, "that it is essential to the Nation's economy that a fair proportion of contracts be channeled to small business. On the other hand, North American needs small business. We need their special capabilities, their products, their services. We do business with them because it helps us to stay competitive."

C. P. Kish, corporate small business administrator, is direct in his appraisal. "If a small businessman is equipped to do a job for North American, we know we'll get a quality product from him, and one that represents a savings over other sources."

What constitutes a "small business"?

It depends upon the kind of "business" a company is in. A construction contractor, for example, is small if his annual sales averaged over a 3-year period do not exceed $7½ million. Recent changes to small business criteria for manufacturers use the number of employees. Depending upon the product manufactured, the small business size standards may be 500, 750, or 1,000 people.

UNITED STATES NEEDS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Recognizing that the economy of the country depends a great deal on private enterprise, the Government, and North American, have taken certain steps to champion its cause.

Department of Defense contracts with the company divisions spell out Government policy that "a fair proportion of the purchases and contracts for the Government be placed with small business concerns."

Division purchase orders issued to suppliers contain a clause in which suppliers agree to place a maximum amount of business with small business concerns, consistent with efficient performance.

Purchase orders which exceed $500,000 and which offer substantial subcontract opportunities contain a clause which requires suppliers to establish a small business subcontracting program.

Surplus labor areas are recognized and come in for special consideration in DOD contracts exceeding $5,000. Company policy provides that every reasonable effort will be made to award purchase orders to labor surplus area suppliers who have demonstrated technical capabilities and other qualifications necessary for selection as a satisfactory source of supply.

They must also be competitive in price.

DIVISIONS REPORT TO SBA

All purchasing orders or subcontracts exceeding $100,000 which appear to offer subcontracting opportunities are immediately reported by each division to the regional office of the Small Business Administration and to the approrpiate armed services small business specialist.

Accompanying these reports is a suggestion that officials notify their counterparts in areas affected by the contract so that the information may be published for the benefit of small local businesses.

North American engineers like to do business with their counterparts in smaller companies. "In a small business," one of them said, "more people have a direct contact with the product. Their lines of communications are shorter. They can call everybody into the act in a minute." Small businessmen have a vigorous appreciation of their role in national defense and space efforts. Says Bill Arrasmith, president of Radar Rely which furnishes electronic equipment for North American's F-100 Super Sabre, the T-39 Sabreliner and the mach 3 XB-70:

"The advantage of being a small business is the agility you can achieve. We can talk with North American engineers in the morning and start making parts in the afternoon of the same day."

LOW OVERHEAD; LOW PRICE

"We've got low overhead; we can quote low prices. We can move faster. For one of the major aircraft programs we designed a switch on a Saturday afternoon; had a prototype in 1 week. As a result we received a substantial volume of business."

Bob Gardner, general partner in Gardner Products Co., suppliers to Rocketdyne of the metal bellows in the J-2 liquid hydrogen engine main line ducts, reviewed his first approach to the division:

"We had only been in business a few months and, frankly, we were too small. We just couldn't give Rocketdyne the assurance that we could come through on an assured delivery date in a tightly scheduled program. When we came back to them 2 years later we were able to demonstrate that ability, and we got the first order."

Whenever specification requirements are involved, such as in Gardner's contract with Rocketdyne for J-2 metal bellows, the small business firm is given a "formal survey" by North American division teams from manufacturing, quality control, procurement, and engineering. Of the survey Gardner said, "Didn't bother me at all. I knew we had to qualify in order to participate. And I do the same thing with firms I subcontract to."

The need for rigid quality control in components which will go into man-rated modules is taken for granted by small businessmen. Bill Dickie, president of Space-Ordnance Systems, which supplies explosive bolts for separating the Apollo command and service modules being developed by the space division said, "We've got a top-notch setup on quality control—else we wouldn't be able to do business with North American and NASA."

North American Vice President Nagely fostered a company small business program in 1951. Its objective, then, as now, was to increase competition by insuring small firms an equal opportunity to bid.

"We know the small firms cannot handle total manufacturing of complex weapon systems," Nagely says, "but they can do a good job on many of the system's components."

INGENIOUS BUSINESSMEN

"North American has always believed in the ingenuity of the small businessman. The contracts between the North American divisions and any outside company, large or small, are arrived at on a commonsense basis: how the best product can be obtained at the lowest possible cost.

"Our association with more than 12,000 small business firms is a testimony that we are convinced they can help North American and the national defense and space efforts by quickly, ably, and economically fulfilling subcontract needs."

One of the problems of the small businessman in dealing with some firms is getting an answer to the questions, "Where do we go with our product? To whom do we talk?"

The problem can be a tough one. Last year more than 59,000 businessmen went to the lobby of the Rocketdyne Canoga plant alone. For those who were visiting for the first time there was a decision to make—which 1 of the 85 buyers should he speak to? If he made a wrong choice it was quite possible he could waste an entire day trying to get word of his capabilities, his products to the right person.

PROBLEM SOLVED

But North American solved this potential problem a long time ago. The small business representative in each division and major facility is a procurement analyst, a channel between the buyers and first-time small business visitors.

The latter are channeled quickly from the lobby to the small business representative. He analyzes their product, their capabilities, and arranges an appointment, either on the same day, or at a later time, with the correct buyer.

Not every visit results in a contract, but every first-time visit can result in a worthwhile preparation for future possibilities. The visitor is requested to complete a supplier questionnaire form that will increase North American's knowledge of his firm. The questionnaire, together with all pertinent brochures, catalogs, and financial reports, goes into a supplier source library. The library is consulted by buyers when new contract needs develop, and new bidding lists are prepared.

To the small businessman, landing a contract with North American offers an opportunity to keep up with advanced engineering design and production techniques. It also provides exposure to the latest quality and reliability techniques and generates new sales contacts and new product ideas.

CONTINUED PROGRESS

Many small firms have kept pace with North American, producing new hardware as new needs arise. Many that start as small businesses, find after a series of successes they themselves have become "major."

Others have found new markets for products due to widened contacts with Government agencies, other aerospace firms, and even foreign contractors and licensees. An outstanding performance while participating on one program produces requests for work on others.

Company-sponsored symposiums to discuss programs and products are another aid. Participating firms are furnished information about new ideas and technical know-how. Many an attending small businessman has departed with a firsthand view of program requirements and current methods and then returned with an improved design and a more reliable, lower cost product.

Prior to contract, North American may perform a quality control survey, offering its own experience in the increasingly demanding area as a guideline to the new contractor.

During production, the participating company may be given additional information and assistance.

Division contact men often visit suppliers, recommending production changes if contract performance is in danger. Additionally, engineering, manufacturing, tooling, or quality and reliability experts may be brought in if the situation requires it.

Many small businesses are performing work of North American design, which in itself provides valuable experience. In the long run, experience pays.

But the greatest benefits are being reaped by the Nation itself. The hundreds of thousands of small business firms in America are a bulwark of the Nation's defense.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding programs of the Mutual Network is the weekly Big Lie series conducted by veteran Commentator Philip Clarke. For many years now Mr. Clarke has been carrying out a useful effort to expose the lies poured out by Communist propaganda. On the occasion of the recent Captive Nations Week he contributed importantly to the initiative of the Congress in instituting annual observances. He appropriately titled this one program "Lest We Forget." I trust that my colleagues would be interested in the following excerpts from his script:

The Communists have never been able completely to crush the spirit of national independence, the will for freedom of the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe. The workers revolt of 1953 in East Germany attested to this. So did the revolt for bread and freedom in Pozan, Poland, in June 1956. So did the revolt of the Hungarian nation in October and November 1956—a revolution broken only by the full, brutal force of the Red Army. Nearly 7 years have passed since that heroic struggle for liberty died in the blood-red streets of Budapest. But man's quest for freedom, for a national identity, endures as does life itself behind the Communist wall. However passive the resistance, it is still resistence. By word and deed, restive millions in the captive nations still defy the dictates of their Communist rulers, keeping alive those sparks of independence they still hope one day will burst into the full flames of freedom. It is these flickering sparks of freedom that haunt the Kremlin. Desperately it tries to stamp them out, to smother them with massive Communist controls. But it is to the free world, to the United States of America, that the captive peoples of Europe still look—for help and for hope. This, also, troubles the Kremlin. Now, once again, Soviet Premier Khrushchev seeks to lure the United States into signing a treaty that would write off the independence—and the hopes—of the nine captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Khrushchev calls it a nonaggression treaty, to be signed by the NATO alliance of free Western nations on one hand and by the Communist-ruled satellites of Soviet Russia on the other. In reality, however, Khrushchev's treaty is but a cunning device—a device aimed at getting the United States to formally recognize the permanent Communist subjugation of the nine once-independent nations of Central and Eastern Europe—plus East Germany. The effect of this would be to give American acceptance to the Soviet absorption of all nine nations with the Kremlin's expanding empire. Just as the Kremlin now proclaims the once-independent Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, provinces of the Soviet Union, so, inevitably would it dissolve the last vestiges of nationality in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania.

Whether this happens, or does not happen, depends largely upon the United States, and upon the dedication and understanding of the American people. To aid in this understanding, it is necessary to know—to know what the nine nations once represented, to know how and when they lost their freedom, and to measure their importance in the worldwide struggle between freedom and communism.

Mr. Brutus Coste, secretary general of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, participated in this program. His concluding remarks might be worth recording:

"Let one one say that war is the only alternative to accommodation with the status quo (which the people directly concerned reject today as resolutely as they did when it was foisted upon them 18 years ago). Accommodation will never prevent war or surrender. It will rather foster it.

"The true alternative to war or piecemeal surrender is victory in the cold war which, regardless of what the West is doing or not doing, communism is waging—and must wage if it is not to disintegrate from within—on all fronts and by all means short of war. I am confident that sooner or later the West will be compelled to face the fact that for Khrushchev coexistence is not live and let live. It is but a maneuver to place the vulnerable territory of the Soviet empire out of bounds for Western political action while preserving for Moscow the right to conduct unlimited political warfare in the non-Communist lands. I am equally convinced that from this realization the West will come to draw the logical conclusion that totalitarian communism cannot be persuaded, helped, or bribed into yielding. Communism thrives on success and wilts on failure. Denying it success and inflicting upon it setbacks by unremitting pressures from within and from without is the only way to bring it to reason first, to defeat eventually."

Adenauer Blames Kennedy Administration for Berlin Wall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, something that has long been suspected by the majority of the American people but never actually said by anyone in authority was the fear of Khrushchev as demonstrated by the Kennedy administration in its failure to act during the building of the Berlin wall by the Soviet Communists.

In the November 1 issue of Newsday, in a copyrighted story by Marguerite Higgins, former Chancellor Adenauer, who should know, blamed the Kennedy administration for backtracking and being unavailable during the critical 60 hours after the Berlin wall started to go up.

We all recall that it was after this policy of inaction that Khrushchev started making trouble in Cuba.

The article follows:

ADENAUER BLAMES UNITED STATES FOR WALL

(NOTE.—Marguerite Higgins, who recently joined Newsday's staff, says her interview with Konrad Adenauer is a continuation of a conversation with him that began in 1945, when he was introduced to her as an "up and coming politician" in the dark days at the end of the war. More of her story of the interview will appear tomorrow. On November 25, the Pulitzer Prize-winning correspondent will begin a three-times-a-week column for Newsday.)

(By Marguerite Higgins)

BONN.—Dr. Konrad Adenauer, who has retired from the West German chancellorship but emphatically not from the international political fray, charged yesterday that America showed itself "too much afraid" of the Communists at the time of the erection of the Berlin wall in August 1961.

As a result of American fears, the Chancellor said, Bonn-Washington relations reached their lowest ebb in history at that time. Speaking out frankly on matters on which he had kept silent while still in Germany's highest office, Adenauer recalled in an exclusive interview that "for 60 hours after the Berlin wall began to go up, the mayor of Berlin could not get any response out of Washington * * *. Perhaps if some sort of protest or action had been taken at once, the Russians might have backed down * * * but for 60 hours absolutely nothing happened * * * even though the Russians had broken their treaties and erected the wall, the Americans put up with it * * * the Americans even tried to tell us it was a good thing because the flow of refugees was stopped * * * the German people were horrified. It was a tremendous success for Moscow. The Americans were too much afraid * * *. You cannot imagine the despair of the German people."

Adenauer was asked whether the success a year later of the Cuban confrontation did not in effect even the score, more or less, with the Russians. Crisply Adenauer countered: "Was Cuba really a success?" He went on to remark that the Russians still seemed to be in the Caribbean. Nonetheless, Adenauer said he had "hopes" that the United States would in the future react firmly to any attempted Soviet encroachments. He repeatedly emphasized Germany's dependence on America's military shield and he was sure that the United States would never knowingly make a deal with the Russians at the expense of West Germany.

"I believe," said Adenauer, "that Americans see clearly that Germany is the key to Europe. If that key falls into bad hands, it will be bad for Europe." In addition to revealing fascinating bits of history, the 88-year-old statesman and architect of modern German democracy gave some peppery judgments on the present plus fascinating predictions of things to come. The 2-hour interview was the first granted to an American newspaper since he relinquished his position as Chancellor to Ludwig Erhard.

Times have changed since he took office after World War II but not Adenauer. His spare, austere appearance is only slightly different and his vigor astonishing. He remains of course an important power in the land as head of the majority Christian Democratic Party and also serves as a member of Parliament. Adenauer is now ensconced in two modest rooms in the House of Parliament. The interview had these highpoints:

Adenauer revealed that as early as 1955 Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev spoke to him frankly of fears that one day Russia might find itself at war with Red China. This is the first time Adenauer has made known that actual warfare between the two Red giants was mentioned. The conversation occurred during the former Chancellor's official visit to Moscow in 1955. He expressed the conviction that "Russia cannot afford war." He supported this contention this way: "So long as the United States realizes that it is the main target of the Soviet Union and that its interests in resisting Russian encroachments are identical with those of Europe, then there will not be a war."

"Khrushchev is a clever, unscrupulous man," said Adenauer. "I have told President Kennedy many times not to trust him * * * Khrushchev emphasizes peaceful coexistence because things are going badly for the Rus-

sian people. He needs to say these things to deceive his own people."

TO SHOW HE HAD POWER

Khrushchev, in the German leader's opinion, ordered the recent 60-hour hold of American convoys on the autobahn to Berlin "to show that even if he did not have wheat he had power." He scoffed at the idea (disseminated by the State Department in Washington) that the incident had been "a genuine misunderstanding."

The former Chancellor doubted that Khrushchev would take any meaningful steps to lessen the cold war because this would only come about "if this became necessary in order for Russia to get what it needs." And unfortunately, said the Chancellor, the West is giving Khrushchev what he needs in the way of wheat and chemical factories, for example, without asking anything in return by way of lessening tensions. Adenauer had an intriguing observation to make on the controversial issue of whether or not a lag might occur in use of Western tactical atomic weapons to counter Soviet military moves—conventional or otherwise—as a result of the necessity of referring the matter back to Washington. Adenauer seemed to suggest that there might not be any such referral necessary. The former Chancellor said:

"President Kennedy has told me that he he had taken every conceivable precaution to insure that the order to use tactical weapons would be given at the right time. This may imply that the President has actually given the authority for making that particular decision to the NATO commander on the scene. I don't know." It was made plain during the interview that Adenauer's retirement has not shortened his workday. "I have not had even time to take my daily walk," he complained. The former Chancellor indicated he intended to continue to do his best to influence affairs of state through speeches, parliamentary activity, and the giving of advice. "I will give the advice," he said with a philosophic smile, "and perhaps they will listen and perhaps they won't."

When this correspondent left the great man's office at 6:30 p.m., there were ministers still waiting to see the retired leader.

Dr. Galo Leoro Addresses Armed Forces Chess Tournament Awards Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Thomas Emery awards dinner for the fourth annual Armed Forces Chess Tournament was held October 19, 1963, here in Washington.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been pleased to note the increasing interest of our military men in the historic, intricate, and intellectual game of chess.

Addressing the awards dinner this year was Dr. Galo Leoro, counselor, Ecuadoran delegation to the Organization of American States.

Dr. Leoro succinctly stated the value of chess and its discipline, and I am pleased to insert the text of his remarks into the RECORD:

REMARKS OF DR. GALO LEORO, INTERIM REPRESENTATIVE OF ECUADOR TO THE OAS, AT THE THOMAS EMERY AWARDS DINNER

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege for me to say a few words on this occasion in which so many distinguished personalities have gathered here tonight to lend their prestige to the conclusion of the 1963 Armed Forces chess championship at this Thomas Emery Awards Dinner. It is due to the kind invitation of Mr. James G. Dunton, the Washington representative of the American Chess Foundation that I am joining you in this celebration, made possible largely through the generous sponsorship of the foundation and the farsighted cooperation of the Department of Defense and the U.S.O. and U.S. Chess Federation. I want to thank Mr. Dunton for having thus rendered to me this opportunity that may be explained only as a deference to my country, Ecuador, a member of the Organization of the American States, linked to your great Nation in so many common and noble aspirations.

I will not deny, of course, that my enthusiasm for chess gives me an added pleasure of being with you. Although not so popular yet ,chess is a game that has gained high esteem in Ecuador, for all its subtleties and endless possibilities; for all its logical process and universal appeal. I am proud, therefore, to mention here that an outstanding Ecuadorian diplomat, our former Ambassador to the United States and presently Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country, Dr. Neftalí Ponce-Miranda, became the 1937 Washington, D.C. chess champion, and that after a long absence he again played with us, at the first board of the Pan American Chess Club, of this Capital, until a few months ago.

Chess has been a subject so ably described, praised and encouraged with such fine and adequate words, as those we have heard tonight, that it seems hardly possible for me to add any new point of view to this game, rich in intricacies, demanding always discipline and intellectual exercise. Let me only emphasize the inevitable affinity with which the terms chess and Armed Forces strike us immediately. It seems, as a matter of course, that chess and strategy, may look as more natural allies in military men, trained to grasp those apparently invisible factors that in a complex and difficult situation should be favorably exploited in order to avert failure and insure victory.

I do not mean to say that in chess the goal must be necessarily to win. For in chess what counts most is to see more and deeper, or at least try to do so at a moment when one's opponent will display precisely the same qualities, and when becoming fully aware of these qualities, we have awakened in our minds as well as in our hearts, the respect for the other man's abilities and determinations. Discipline, talent and respect for others, in its amplest sense, are virtually the elements of a chess player who pursues the game and tries to reach the highest levels of accomplishment.

I am sure that, to a great extent, considerations like these would have prevailed when first this gallant competition was organized in the Armed Forces. But aside from that, there is always in chess a beauty of its own, an unsurpassed harmony not destroyed by the tension of the game for those who play it as a pastime, without the determination of trying to overcome all its competitive challenges. That is why it is of universal appeal, that is why men of all walks of life, from every corner of the world see in chess a friendly and rewarding game. That is why, ladies and gentlemen, a foreigner like myself, without deserving this honor, may unreluctantly accept to say a few words, and join with you and share the recognition of those members of the Armed Forces who are to receive tonight the Thomas Emery Awards for their chess talent and perseverance.

Let me, finally, express the admiration that Ecuador, my country, has for the United States of America and its Armed Forces, for what they represent in the embattled world, for the great human values they fought for in the past, fight for in the present, and will ever fight for in the future. Thank you.

That Wheat Deal: J.F.K. Flouts Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an article by Edith Kermit Roosevelt appearing last week in the Newark Star Ledger:

J.F.K. FLOUTING OF LAW IRKS CONGRESSMEN

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Congressmen are beginning to speak forcefully about violation of law by the White House. They cite additional cases in which the intent of Congress is circumvented or ignored by the President.

While past history contains many instances of the literal wording or the spirit of a law being violated by the Chief Executive, this never reached a point where it seemed almost routine.

A headline in the usually staid CONGRESSIONAL RECORD October 23, over a statement by Representative LOUIS C. WYMAN, Republican, of New Hampshire, a former State attorney general, reads: "The Law Be Damned." He declares himself "very much troubled" over Executive actions that run counter to many important Federal laws."

In relation to the President's decision to offer wheat for sale to Soviet Russia, Representative WYMAN said that a whole series of regulations and laws were being broken. In 1961, Congress passed Public Law 87-128 to forbid the sale of subsidized farm commodities to Soviet bloc nations. The Johnson Act of 1934 bars credit to nations in default on their debts to the United States. The Soviet Union is the foremost one, of course.

The Battle Act—or Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act—passed in 1951, places an embargo on shipments of war material and strategic goods to Communist countries. U.S. military or economic aid to any land that violates this embargo is specifically forbidden. Countries receiving American aid are engaging in constant trade with Red Cuba. The President ignores this.

Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, declared on the House floor on October 14 that the President was evading the Latta amendment to the 1961 Agricultural Act, which forbids subsidized farm commodities from being sold to Communist countries. He had his brother, the Attorney General, issue a ruling that "was a farce," MICHEL declared. Citing article 1, section 1, of the Constitution, he protested that if Kennedy "wanted this law repealed, he should have come to Congress for approval."

A law passed in 1962 specifically instructs the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from Poland and Yugoslavia. The President has defied it for the past year, while urging the law's repeal.

Another violation of law by the executive branch concerns the ban on foreign propaganda mails reinstated by the Congress last session after President Kennedy had can-

celed it by Executive order. At a hearing of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee, on June 20, Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, declared that this new law was being sabotaged by the administration. "You have certainly not carried out this law, and you are looking for loopholes," he told a Government official.

New bureaucracies with extensive powers are being set up virtually by Executive fiat. The Peace Corps was organized originally without statutory authority. It operated on taxpayers' money out of a Washington headquarters before Congress was told about it. Then there is the new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, an outgrowth of the Interior Department.

Whether the regulations and laws involved really need changing or not, the administration has no right to arbitrarily violate them when it suits convenience or fits into its sociological thinking. The example this sets for American society, and especially our youth, is distinctly unhealthy.

Basic to American governmental procedures is the right of the Congress to obtain the information it needs for legislative purposes. Title 5, section 52 of the United States Code, passed in 1948, declares that any member of the classified civil service may furnish information to Members of Congress without being subject to penalty. In 1958, Congress concurrently resolved that loyalty to country should be placed above any other loyalty in Government.

Farmers Home Administration in the State of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the work done by the Farmers Home Administration in the State of Florida can scarcely be overestimated. Unfortunately, few people other than those directly affected realize the wide range and the important scope of these activities. From Mr. William T. Shaddick, State director, I have a summary on 1963 fiscal year's operation by the Farmers Home Administration in my State, and I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this impressive listing.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, STATE OF FLORIDA

During fiscal year 1963, 1,806 loans totaling $11,790,478 were made to Florida farm families and rural residents and a total of $6,563,151 in principal and interest was repaid on loans previously received by Florida residents.

During the past year the following loans have been approved:

1. Soil and water loans: 11 for $141,250. This includes loans to 10 individual and 1 association. The association loan was for financing a domestic water system for the community of Esto in Holmes County in the amount of $50,000. This water system is now under construction. Since the end of the fiscal year, another association loan for a water system for the town of Wahneta in Polk County has been approved in the amount of $195,000.

2. Farm ownership loans: to buy, develop, or enlarge their farms and to refinance debts—were made to 135 farmers totaling $1,607,070. (The amount of $243,020 was provided by private lenders.)

3. Rural housing loans: Rural housing loans and grants were made to 606 Florida farmers and rural residents in the amount of $6,004,183 to build or improve their houses and service buildings. Of the 606, 13 were senior citizens housing loans totaling $94,350, and 27 were grants totaling $22,915 to deserving Florida families. The 13 loans to senior citizens were made under the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, which authorized loans to individuals over 62 years of age to build or remodel housing for themselves. Two loans totaling $173,000 were made for labor housing in Palm Beach County. Since July 1, 1963, three additional farm labor housing loans have been approved in the amount of $470,000. Loans made to date will provide housing for approximately 1,200 laborers.

4. Operating loans were made to 987 Florida farmers in the amount of $3,282,010 to provide funds for purchase of equipment, livestock, fertilizer, pesticides, feed, tractor fuel, and other necessary supplies for operation of their farms.

5. Ninety-four emergency loans totaling $778,880 were made to assist Florida farmers in maintaining normal farming operations following disasters such as the freeze last December.

Farmers Home Administration loans are made available to applicants who are unable to obtain credit from conventional lenders. County supervisors have been cautioned to be extremely careful to guarantee that the Farmers Home Administration does not come into competition with the conventional lenders. During the past year some county supervisors have been upgraded to provide the technical advice necessary for each borrower.

Various new programs have been added to the responsibilities of the Farmers Home Administration during the past few years, including the rural renewal program authorized by the 1962 Agriculture Act, rural housing for the elderly, authorized by the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, farm labor housing and rural housing repair and improvement grants. The rural housing program has changed from a farm housing to a rural housing program to meet the needs of far more people. This has meant a great deal to rural people in small towns and particularly in north and west Florida, where there are many small towns and villages, that were not previously eligible for housing loans under either the Farmers Home Administration or the Federal Housing Administration.

Although the workload has more than doubled in the past several years, personnel strength has remained about the same. It is hoped that some help will be forthcoming to meet the heavy workload.

Since the inception of the insured loan program, the following real estate loans have been made in Florida.

Farm ownership loans (to March 31, 1963), to improve and purchase farms:

1,473 loans totaling	$12,405,031
Unpaid principal balance Mar. 31, 1963	7,327,211

Rural housing loans (to January 1, 1963), to provide new homes and improve or remodel old homes for rural residents and farmers:

2,289 loans totaling	$20,951,869
Unpaid principal balance Jan. 1, 1963	16,620,738

Soil and water development and conservation loans (to January 1, 1963):

398 loans totaling	$2,375,800
Unpaid principal balance Jan. 1, 1963	794,017

A total of 4,160 real estate loans for $35,732,700 have been approved and the principal balance outstanding as of January 1 or March 31 as shown above is $24,741,966 for the 2,843 loans remaining unpaid.

During the past 3 fiscal years 2,910 loans have been made for operating purposes totaling $18,982,550. At present, 1,169 operating loan borrowers owe an outstanding principal balance of $5,454,590.

During the past year, 413 farm families in Florida completely repaid their Farmers Home Administration loans in full, including both real estate and operating loans.

There are 23 full-time county offices and 16 part-time offices to serve Florida families and rural residents, and help them improve their standards of living by providing suitable homes in which to rear their families and to help them become established farmers.

Also recently established is a Rural Renewal Project with headquarters in Chipley, with a project leader assigned to help raise the economic level and provide help and guidance in Washington and Holmes counties.

In addition, the Farmers Home Administration has maintained a high degree of interest in the activity of the rural areas development program throughout the State. Farmers Home Administration personnel have attended 75 rural areas development county meetings; conducted 176 technical action panel county meetings; and as the agency designated as chairman of the State technical action panel, conduct four meetings on the State level. These State technical action panel meetings were attended by representatives of: All USDA agencies, the State Agricultural Extension Service, the Florida Development Commission, the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, and the State Forest Service.

Through the rural areas development program, overall economic development plans have been prepared for the following counties and submitted to the State technical action panel for review: Calhoun, Franklin, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Liberty, Pasco, St. Lucie, Sumter, Suwannee, Walton, and Washington.

In addition to the above, overall development plans are in various stages of completion in five additional counties.

Preliminary plans for rural renewal projects in Washington and Holmes counties have been prepared.

As of June 30, 1963, 22 project proposals had been reviewed by the county technical action panels and 11 by the State technical action panel. It is estimated that these projects have created or will create 75 jobs for rural families, 15 of which are FHA borrower families.

Maj. Gen. Victor H. Krulak Nominated for Three-Star Rank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest fighting men in the Marine Corps has just been made commanding general of the Fleet Marine Force Pacific. He is Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak who, despite his diminutive size, is known for his ruggedness of character and spirit. He goes by the nickname of "Brute" which really does not do him justice, but does indicate that here indeed is an unusual leader of men.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial and two articles from the San Diego Union as a portion of my remarks:

GENERAL KRULAK IDEAL LEADER

The Marines always have been a force set apart. They are elite fighting men, but, unlike the professional soldiers of history, their esprit de corps springs from the heart of their country.

President Kennedy's nomination of Maj. Gen. Victor H. Krulak for promotion to lieutenant general, and his assignment as commanding general of the Fleet Marine Force Pacific can bring to the leadership of 70,000 men a marine's marine. Service to General Krulak is not duty but patriotism.

San Diegans became well acquainted with General Krulak while he was commanding general of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot from 1959 to 1962. He entered into local community life with the same enthusiasm and sincerity he displayed in shaping callow youths into fighting men, who, in his deep conviction, would have the great honor of wearing the uniform of a U.S. marine. His World War II and Korean service were exceptionally demanding and he won his first stars with great commendation.

In the last year the general has been on duty in Washington with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in charge of planning and developing special American counterguerrilla forces. He recently accompanied the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to South Vietnam, for a reappraisal of that trying situation.

In a time when ordinary military service is largely obligatory and, therefore, too often resented, and when military counsel is questioned or subjugated to political considerations, the Nation is fortunate that the Krulaks of all the services have pushed aside the temptations of civil life and remained in uniform.

Usually a soldier is not a hero until the shooting starts. But in these times a force in being is everything and we are engaged in a different kind of war.

General Krulak is one who understands the cold war, and that it is just as dangerous and just as demanding of patriotism as a hot war.

In an article published in the San Diego Union on October 6, General Krulak referred to a Chinese general who said that "to win 100 victories in 100 battles is not the acme of skill. To subdue the enemy without fighting—there is the acme of skill."

General Krulak then went on to describe a war without shooting or a war with little shooting—"in short, the war we and our friends around the world today." It is war going on in a hundred places, and no two battles are the same, some are quiet and some are noisy, but the stakes never vary.

The loss of little wars, or the loss to communism of lands rich in resources or productive capacity, would be a grave hazard, the general warned, "a hazard we cannot accept."

General Krulak would command in the Pacific the largest of Marine Corps operating forces that makes up the spearhead of any action which must be taken quickly and effectively. The wisdom to use such a force, at the right time and in the right way, must come from others. And, in nominating General Krulak, the President is making sure that the training of our Marines will not be ignored nor their patriotism wasted.

KRULAK NEW HEAD OF FLEET MARINES—EX-COMMANDER OF SAN DIEGO RECRUIT DEPOT ALSO NOMINATED FOR THREE-STAR GENERAL

WASHINGTON.—Maj. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps, the Pentagon's highest ranking military adviser on guerrilla warfare, was designated yesterday to take command of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force.

At the same time, President Kennedy nominated Krulak for promotion to lieutenant general.

Also nominated for three-star rank was another 50-year-old marine, Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., who will succeed Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene as Marine Chief of Staff, January 1, when Greene becomes corps Commandant.

No date was set for Krulak to replace Lt. Gen. Carson A. Roberts, the current Pacific Fleet Marine Force commanding general. A marine spokesman said Krulak will take over when Roberts retires early next year.

Spokesmen at Marine headquarters here said the new orders for Krulak and Chapman will be issued after their promotions have been confirmed by the Senate. Senate approval is expected to be routine.

Krulak, a much-decorated veteran of 29 years' service in the corps, has been serving as special assistant for counterinsurgency and special activities to the Joint Chiefs of Staff since February 1962.

He took that post after turning over command of the San Diego Marine Corps Recruit Depot to Maj. Gen. Sidney S. Wade, who will be Krulak's deputy at Fleet Marine Force Headquarters in Honolulu.

Krulak has served four San Diego County tours, culminating with his 26-month assignment as MCRD commanding general. A 1934 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, he served from 1936 to 1937 at the old San Diego Marine Corps Base, from 1942 to 1943 with a special amphibious force in San Diego, and in 1949 as a regimental commander at Camp Pendleton.

Krulak's decoration include the Navy Cross, the Bronze Star, the Air Medal, and two Legions of Merit with combat V.

He was awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism in October 1943, when he led a battalion of Marine parachutists during heavy fighting on Choiseul, one of the Solomon Islands.

He received one Legion of Merit for his part in planning and executing the World War II Okinawa campaign and the second during the Korean conflict. The Air Medal was awarded for his flights over Korea from August 1950 to July 1951.

Krulak won the Bronze Star in the last days of World War II for helping negotiate the surrender of the Japanese garrison in Tsingtao, China.

The selection of Krulak for top command was praised by his fellow Marines.

PROMOTION PRAISED

"The promotion speaks for itself; it tells the esteem in which General Krulak is held," said one high-ranking officer.

In his role as a guerrilla warfare expert, Krulak has made two visits to South Vietnam, where the Communist Vietcong are employing guerrilla tactics in an undeclared war against the government. In September Krulak accompanied Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on an inspection tour of Vietnam.

Chapman, the other marine selected for 3-star rank, is also no stranger to San Diego.

Like Krulak he served as a young officer from 1938 to 1940, at the San Diego Marine Corps Base. From July 1952 to August 1953, he commanded a 3d Division regiment at Camp Pendleton.

His decorations include the Bronze Star, the Navy Commendation Ribbon with combat "V", and the Legion of Merit with combat "V," all won during World War II service in the South Pacific.

Chapman began his military career in the Army, with a 1935 ROTC commission from the University of Florida. A few months after graduation he switched to the Marines.

Chapman has been assistant chief of staff for logistics at Marine headquarters since November 1, 1961.

BEGAN CAREER HERE

Wade, 54, began his career as a Marine when he reported to the recruit depot in San Diego 33 years ago for boot training. A year later he won an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy from which he was graduated in 1933.

In 1958, Wade commanded the 6,000-man Marine Task Force that landed in Lebanon during the Middle East crisis. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for exceptionally meritorious service there.

He assumed command of the recruit depot February 15 of last year.

Wade and his wife, Doris, have two children, Sidney S. (Scotty), Jr., 17, and Mrs. James E. Page, the wife of a marine officer.

ONE OF FINEST: KRULAK EXTOLLED BY SAN DIEGANS

(By Hal D. Steward)

Maj. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, U.S. Marine Corps, was described yesterday as a man who had made a permanent mark for the betterment of San Diego.

Gen. Holland M. (Howlin' Mad) Smith, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, Krulak's World War II commander, described him as "the most brilliant officer I've known in my 58 years in the Marine Corps."

President Kennedy yesterday nominated Krulak for promotion to lieutenant general and assignment as commander of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force.

"He [Krulak] has no physical fear; he is strong in his convictions and he is one of the finest officers I have ever known," Smith added.

Krulak served under Smith as a lieutenant colonel in the South Pacific during World War II.

"One day he was wounded twice and refused to be evacuated," Smith said of Krulak. "He's a man of tremendous courage."

Smith said Krulak was "one of the most beloved commanders we've ever had at the recruit depot. He did a magnificent job of public relations and he was an extremely civic-minded officer."

CIVIC ACTIVITIES WERE INSPIRATION

Dr. Ralph Dallard, city superintendent of schools, agreed with Smith on Krulak's civic activities.

"His presence here was an inspiration to the community," Dallard said of Krulak, who commanded the San Diego Marine Corps Recruit Depot from December 1959 to February 1962.

"While he was commandant of MCRD he spoke on patriotic duties to every high school student body in the city.

"He took his personal time to do this," Dallard added, "and he had a quality of sincerity that made his speech an inspiring thing to youngsters."

Dallard said Krulak's promotion "is no surprise to me. I'm delighted to see he has been given further recognition."

The school superintendent also recalled Krulak's program on the history of the American flag that was "presented to hundreds of school groups."

While stationed here, Krulak was active in the Kiwanis Club, which sponsored a civic testimonial for him on his departure from the MCRD command. He also was active in the American Red Cross, the United Community Services and other community activities.

Krulak, 51, earned a Navy Cross and Legion of Merit with combat "V" for heroic action and outstanding service in World War II. In the Korean war he received a second Legion of Merit with combat "V" for outstanding service.

Since leaving San Diego in early 1962, Krulak has served as special assistant for counterinsurgency and special activities to the director of the staff of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, D.C.

HAS SERVED ON DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS

In recent months this job has taken him on military-diplomatic missions to Central America and southeast Asia.

He attended an anti-Castro meeting with Central American governments in Managua, Nicaragua, in April. The U.S. delegation was headed by Deputy Attorney General Nicholas de Katzenbach.

In September Krulak went to South Vietnam for an on-the-spot inspection of activities there with Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The mission to South Vietnam forced him to cancel vacation plans for a visit to San Diego with his wife, Amy.

It is expected when General and Mrs. Krulak arrive in Hawaii, the headquarters of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force, they will have a reunion with one of their three sons. Victor Krulak, Jr., 25, who was ordained an Episcopal deacon early this year in Berkeley, and is stationed in Hawaii. Another son, 2d Lt. William Krulak, is stationed at Camp Pendleton. The couple's third son, Charles, is a cadet at the Naval Academy who will graduate next year.

Is There a Deal?—Will There Be Another Pearl Harbor in Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in a very disturbing article which appeared in the Long Island Press yesterday, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott tell us of the Soviet jet buildup in Cuba.

I wonder if President Kennedy will again accuse those who warned him previously about increases in Soviet strength of being warmongers.

The article follows:

A SECRET BUILDUP?—MORE SOVIET JETS IN CUBA

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Russia is again baffling U.S. intelligence authorities with some strange military moves in Communist-ruled Cuba.

In recent weeks, the Soviets have quietly doubled their jet fighters and fighter-bombers on the island while at the same time withdrawing around 3,000 combat troops.

The latest U-2 photographs, showing increased numbers of Russian planes on or near Cuban airfields, have forced U.S. intelligence experts to raise their estimates from 150 to "more than 300" Soviet planes in Cuba.

In sharp contrast to this sinister buildup, U.S. aerial surveillance of Russian troop camps and departing ships has caused the intelligence experts to reduce their estimates of Soviet military personnel on the island from 11,000 in July to "approximately 8,000" by the end of October.

This new CIA estimate which is being hotly challenged by Army and Navy intelligence, reports that 14,000 Russian troops have left Cuba since last year's missile crisis.

At the peak of the United States-Soviet confrontation, CIA put the Soviet troop strength in Cuba at 22,000. The Defense Intelligence Agency estimated the Russians at between 25,000 and 32,000.

With the Central Intelligence Agency again in undisputed command of all U.S. intelligence on Cuba, the CIA now takes the cautious position that it is impossible to estimate the number of Soviet troops still there. The reason: Lack of hard intelligence from inside Cuba.

To add to these conflicting estimates, reliable Cuban refugees are warning that most of the Russian troops have not left the island but have only taken off their uniform. The refugees' most recent estimate is 18,000.

The surprise appearance of more Soviet jet fighters and fighter-bombers in Cuba has touched off a new debate in the administration's intelligence community over whether the additional planes represent an offensive threat.

One group of experts, comprised mostly of intelligence officials from the CIA and the State Department, stresses that the new buildup is "defensive," since most of the planes are single-engine Mig-2's, Mig-19's, and Mig-17's.

These intelligence experts emphasize that the planes have an out-and-back range of 300 miles, which greatly limits their use as bombers against the United States.

Another group, made up of intelligence experts from the three military services, claims that a buildup of this size presents an "offensive" threat.

These Pentagon veterans point out that more than 150 of the Soviet jets could be converted into 900-mile-range nuclear bombers in a matter of hours. This offensive capability could be attained by equipping the MIG's with additional fuel tanks and a new-type A-bomb rack.

Still unsolved is the growing mystery surrounding heavy Soviet construction in the mountainous central region of Cuba.

Cuban refugees say the Russian technicians are building huge underground missile silos, although no big rockets have so far been sighted in the underground hideaways.

This finding is disputed by the CIA. Its agents report that the Russians are preparing large underground storage facilities with huge cement covers and air vents on top, and not missile silos.

Since neither the refugees nor the CIA have penetrated the silos, it is doubtful that the United States will find out what Khrushchev has in store for us until he decides to lift the covers.

As reported in a previous column, CIA pilots are limited to less than a dozen high-level U-2 reconnaissance flights a month, with none passing directly over Cuba. Instead, the U-2's follow the Cuban coastline, staying over international waters and out of range of more than 600 SA-2 missiles that ring the island.

Hurricane Flora, which lashed Cuba for 5 days in October, flooded a number of underground silos, according to Cuban refugees. This God-directed storm set back the Soviet's construction program by more than 6 months. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of President Kennedy's top aids on Latin American affairs, is urging more contact with the Castro government. He favors giving U.S. surplus farm commodities to Cuba. To push his project, Schlesinger recently cleared the way for four U.S. citizens—all Quakers—to fly to Cuba last week to arrange the distribution of an airlift of relief supplies to Cuban victims of the recent hurricane. The supplies, valued at $30,000, were flown from Philadelphia over the weekend. Exile groups are still pressing the White House to help overthrow Haiti's President Francois Duvalier. So far, President Kennedy has been unwilling to use the Central Intelligence Agency to get rid of Duvalier because he is afraid that its participation would leak out. President Kennedy's continued nonrecognition of the military junta in Honduras is slowly weakening that new regime.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part III of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth.":

"WHERE'S JOHNNY?"—HEARD OFTEN IN KENNEDY'S EARLY DAYS IN CONGRESS—PART III

Kennedy himself has acknowledged that his record as a Congressman was not the most distinguished. He had worked hard for a job he really had not wanted; and he found himself voting on issues about which he couldn't care less.

"After all," he later told a biographer, Ralph Martin, "I wasn't equipped for the job. I didn't plan to go into it, and when I started out as a Congressman, there were lots of things I didn't know, a lot of mistakes I made, maybe some votes that should have been different."

During this period Kennedy suffered occasional attacks of malaria; and his face had a yellowish tinge. His back hurt too, but he refused to curb the strenuous life to which the Kennedys are addicted. He sailed, swam, and played touch football. Evenings he went to the movies, dating various girls around town.

Kennedy settled down in a rented Georgetown house on 31st Street with his sister, Eunice, who was then working at the Justice Department. Joseph P. Kennedy had assigned as housekeeper and general factotum his cherished cook Margaret Ambrose who, as the ambassador was wont to observe, had "prepared feasts for royalty." George Thomas, a Negro valet previously employed by New York Times columnist, Arthur Krock, was hired as Jack's gentleman's gentleman.

SIDED WITH ECONOMIZERS

It takes a long reach of memory to recall that in his congressional years John F. Kennedy frequently sided with the House economy bloc in efforts to curtail excessive Fair Deal spending.

In 1950, for example, Kennedy departed from the Democratic leadership to support a proposal by Congressman John Taber, the Grand Old Party's watchdog of the Treasury, for a $600 million across-the-board cut in Federal spending.

"How long," Jack then demanded of the House, "can we continue deficit spending on such a large scale with a national debt of over $285 billion?"

But no one took Kennedy very seriously in those days. Not even Kennedy himself, according to Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Most of his colleagues considered him a pleasant young man merely voicing his father's views.

"Sometimes we didn't have the pleasure of Jack's company for months at a time," recalls a fellow member of the House Education and Labor Committee. "We used to tease him a good deal about his frequent absences; but, frankly, we were not as much critical as envious."

On one occasion Kennedy's absence from Washington did visibly exasperate a fellow solon—and an important one, to boot. This occurred when a group of Congressmen sat down to discuss a housing bill. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the powerful House majority leader, looked around for his fellow Bostonian. Then, holding aloft a Boston newspaper headlining a Kennedy demand for action on the housing front, MCCORMACK loudly demanded:

"Where's Johnny? Where's Johnny?"

Where "Johnny" was that day no one ever did find out. Not that, in itself, his whereabouts was of any great importance. What was important in retrospect, however, was whether Kennedy—in the words of another former colleague—"really gave a damn about housing or anything else for that matter."

ATTACKS CHINA POLICY

Kennedy couldn't get up his vigor over his House duties. As he himself later noted, there were 434 other Members of the House at the time. "We were just worms over in the House—nobody paid much attention to us nationally."

On January 25, 1949, Congressman Kennedy did attract some attention. Just as the invocation was completed, he arose to request unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute. Speaker Rayburn nodded his approval and a somewhat nervous young Kennedy began to read from a sheet of paper:

"Mr. Speaker, over this weekend we have learned the extent of the disaster that has befallen China and the United States. The responsibility for the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East rest squarely with the White House and the Department of State.

"The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming, unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government.

"So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers, the Lattimores and the Fairbanks, with the imperfection of the democratic system in China after 20 years of war and the tales of corruption in high places that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China.

"Our policy, in the words of the Premier of the National Government, Sun Fo, of vacillation, uncertainty, and confusion has reaped the whirlwind. This House must now assume the responsibility of preventing the onrushing tide of communism from engulfing all of Asia."

There was high indignation in the United States over the sorry prospect in China. Anti-Communists raised a hue and cry. "Who lost China?" they asked. "Who, in high places, were responsible?" they demanded.

And Congressman Kennedy echoed their demands. In his speech at Salem, Mass., on January 30, 1949, he declared that those diplomats and their advisers who were responsible for the China debacle should be searched out and spotlighted. And he concluded: "This is the tragic story of China, whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our strong men have saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away."

Kennedy's friends, who speculated about his motives in challenging his President and party leader (along with General Marshall), suspected the hand of Joseph P. Kennedy, by then a bitter foe of the Fair Deal and all its works.

WAR AGAINST TRUMAN

However, Jack Kennedy's personal revolt against the Truman administration—going full blast in his third term in Congress—may also have been inspired by higher political ambitions. Kennedy was well aware (thanks in part to the findings of the pollsters financed by his father) that President Truman's policies, particularly in the foreign sphere, were becoming unpopular in Massachusetts. And his political ambitions called for total disassociation from Harry S. Truman.

"I never had the feeling I needed Truman," Kennedy said later.

Consequently, Kennedy opposed many Truman programs and made no secret of his virtual contempt for the man in the White House. In February 1949, he opposed a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. (When recommittal failed, he reversed himself and voted for final passage.) But his original opposition was an attack on one of the programs most sacred to the Democratic Party—the reciprocal trade policies launched under the New Deal.

Party loyalty meant nothing to him when it conflicted with his political ambitions. "I'm certainly worried by the revelations of corruption in the executive department," he told a "Meet the Press" panel in 1951. "I don't think the Democratic Party should win an election unless it does clean up. And if it doesn't do it then I don't think we deserve to win the election."

During the Korean war, Kennedy took one of the strongest positions in Congress for a balanced budget, advocating even higher excise taxes and increased levies on personal and corporate incomes. He repeatedly took President Truman to task for failing to head off what Kennedy dubbed "a galloping inflation."

FOE OF TVA

Congressman Kennedy was opposed to various Federal aid programs on the premise that most of them were doing New England much more harm than good and that they invariably favored other sections of the country.

Thus he voted regularly against Federal appropriations for various flood control, navigation, and atomic power projects around the country. His most significant vote—in view of his later ambitions—was one in 1952 in favor of slashing $14 million from appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority. "We are in danger of losing two basic industries, textiles and shoes, to the South," he explained to the House.

On foreign policy, Kennedy frequently talked like an isolationist. Reporting on an "inspection trip" he had made to Asia, Kennedy told the Boston Chamber of Commerce on November 19, 1951:

"We cannot reform the world. * * * Uncle Sugar is as dangerous a role for us to play as Uncle Shylock. * * * The $30 billions we are spending in Europe have yet to prove that they have made for self-defense in that area; but whatever is true there, to repeat such a procedure in Asia or the South Pacific is impossible * * *.

"We cannot abolish the poverty and want that for centuries has characterized this area. There is just not enough money in the world to relieve the poverty of all the millions of this world who may be threatened by communism * * *.

"The vision of a bottle of milk for every Hottentot is a nice one, but it not only is beyond our grasp, it is beyond our reach."

WHICH IS REAL J.F.K.?

Subsequently, Jack Kennedy had a change of heart about supporting foreign aid programs.

"He told me with a rather sour grimace," Ralph Blagden wrote in the Reporter in September 1952, "that we are now so deeply extended in Europe that we might as well continue our present policy. British and French colonialism worry Kennedy considerably. Yet his vigorous support of Franco's Spain raises the question of whether he is concerned so much about the enslaved as over the identity of the enslaver.

"Somehow," continued Blagden, "such retreats and advances, such reservations and contradictions suggest that Kennedy has not yet achieved very solid convictions. Is he a parvenu in world thinking who will find sure footing, or will he develop into a reservationist,' whose reservations could represent the margin of failure?"

These questions were to be raised again and again as Jack Kennedy moved up the political ladder. They are even being raised today.

Nikita Ferreting United States Out of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to a recent editorial in the New Orleans (La.) States-Item which warns our people and our Government to beware of Premier Khrushchev's declaration that the Soviet Union is abandoning its principal ambitions in space. I for one do not believe the United States can afford the luxury of reducing our efforts in the exploration of space, particularly in light of Khrushchev's words on the Soviet Union's alleged intentions.

If we slacken our efforts in space exploration, the result could be our loss not only of preeminence in space but also of the mastery of our destiny on earth. Most assuredly, Khrushchev would like nothing better than to have his declaration produce lethargy and complacency in our country's space program and to force our Government to reduce its efforts to reach the moon and other planets because the Congress has been encouraged to make drastic cuts in the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I think Congress would be foolish to be guided by Khrushchev's claims; certainly we know that he is not now, and never has been, serving the interests of the United States or the free world. It appears that he is in economic trouble in Russia, particularly in agricultural production, and his announcement could well be only a temporary withdrawal from the field until such time as Khrushchev feels that huge expenditures for space exploration can be justified again.

In the Congress itself, what puzzles me is the fact that some of our people who are against the test ban treaty—despite the several safeguards that are explicitly spelled out in the treaty—are in some cases the same people who are calling for a reduction in our space program and asking for cuts in appropriations for NASA.

In the wake of Khrushchev's allegations of disinterest in the space race, I think this is the very time when the United States should push forward with our own space program at the same steady rate as we have previously planned. I am confident that the benefits which our Nation can realize on earth from the conquest and knowledge

of space and other planets will be well worth our monetary investment, not only in terms of the strength and safety of our country, but also in terms of the peaceful rewards which can redound to mankind.

In this same vein, the States-Item in my home city of New Orleans has written a thought-provoking editorial, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. The editorial of October 31, 1963, follows:

NIKITA FEINTING UNITED STATES OUT OF SPACE?

Premier Khrushchev says Soviet Russia isn't interested in going to the moon.

Immediately, critical voices questioning U.S. expenditures in the space race rise with renewed gusto.

And it's suddenly both discouraging and humiliating to realize that a characteristically cunning little man, sitting thousands of miles away in the Kremlin, may well have tugged on the right string to determine U.S. policy in a critical field.

Premier Khrushchev expects Americans—or, at least, the gullible but influential ones among us—to believe his country has washed its hands of long-range space ambitions.

Here in his statement, which has sent antispace advocates into a frenzy of new critical efforts in this country:

"It would be very interesting to make a flight to the moon, but I cannot say when it will be possible to achieve this. At the present time we are not planning flights of cosmonauts to the moon."

"The present time" being open to rather loose definition, it will be noted that the Premier has not yet said Russia is ruling out lunar acquisition.

Then he adds: "Soviet scientists are working on this problem. They are studying it precisely as a scientific problem, and they are conducting the necessary research."

To even the most inept students of semantics, it will be apparent Premier Khrushchev does not rule out the possibility that his research might well "produce encouraging results" next month or 6 months hence and that the Soviet Union will then once more declare for a space race.

If, by then, the United States will have materially backed down on its space effort, it won't be the first time this country was thrown entirely off balance by a crafty and calculating Soviet feint.

That the Russians should toss in the space race towel at this moment subscribes to no degree of logic.

Not when their rocket power still exceeds ours.

Not when they were the first to perfect the intercontinental ballistic missile and space rocket, orbit a satellite and send animals into space.

Not when they boosted the first men into orbit, took the first closeup reconnaissance pictures of the lunar surface and landed the first payload thereupon.

Not when they can send more men into space for longer periods to conduct more intricate maneuvers than can the United States.

Not when it is generally conceded that the Soviet Union could most probably send a crew of cosmonauts on a circumlunar flight within the next year.

If the United States should begin stinting in the space race merely on whimsical or intentionally misleading cue from the Kremlin, it would be an incredible kettle of fish.

What the Lunar Probe Really Means for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's proposal to put America into the lead in space exploration by making a lunar probe in the 1960's has been praised and criticized from many quarters. Now comes Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev with a hint that the Soviet Union may withdraw from the moonshot venture and leave this exploration to America alone. The distinguished columnist, William S. White, has written that: "Premier Khrushchev's theatrical withdrawal from the race to the moon is one of the most successful of all Soviet propaganda strokes, and the American space program is, in consequence, in grave trouble."

Mr. White sets in perspective the scientific and economic benefits that will accrue to the United States through leadership in a moon probe. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to have the entire column by Mr. White, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Friday, November 1, included with my remarks in the Appendix.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 1, 1963]

KNIFING THE U.S. LUNAR PROJECT

(By William S. White)

One of the most successful of all Soviet propaganda strokes has been Nikita Khrushchev's theatrical withdrawal from "the race to the moon." The American space program is, in consequence, in grave trouble.

In Congress and among the people—many of whom Mr. Khrushchev is plainly fooling most of the time in this matter—there is a clearly diminished interests in pushing that program, even though never has so vast and so potentially rewarding an enterprise been open to mankind. But would it not cost many billions? Of course, it would; but so did the development of the airplane, of atomic energy, of radio and television.

Mr. Khrushchev's reasons for his alleged retirement are endlessly debated. But not often has there been a more irrelevant debate, as has been pointed out by one of the most trustworthy experts in this field, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas. For it does not really matter why Mr. Khrushchev has done what apparently he has done. And, parenthetically, if he really has done it, it probably is in simple acceptance of the basic fact that the Russian economy is vastly inferior to that of the United States.

UNDERCUTS U.S. EFFORTS

What is truly and desperately important is the danger that we are about to be talked out of that maximum American effort which is the most vital need of the 20th century and perhaps even of the century to come.

To begin with, the Nation which becomes first in space will undoubtedly become first on the earth we inhabit, probably in position to begin to control the weather and possibly even to begin to dominate some part of the infinity which has thus far lain beyond man's understanding.

And, to proceed with the obvious, the effort to reach the moon—as only the current symbol of man's search into these outer mysteries—is already showering out collateral benefits in science which are in themselves beyond price.

Grand and seemingly grandiose schemes of this kind, though easy to attack with the jeering slogan of unlettered cynicism, almost invariably produce returns which a few years later we learn we could not have lived without. Often, these returns are wholly unexpected.

For a relatively small example: The assigned mission of the 8th U.S. Air Force in England in the Second World War was to destroy German industry with daylight bombing raids. A part of this job was done; but a far more immediately vital and quite unplanned thing was done, too. This was the virtual destruction of the counterattacking German fighter air force—a bonus that may well have saved our D-day invasion from disaster.

AIDS ANTILUNAR BLOC

Mr. Khrushchev's claim that he is getting out of the moon contest has reduced the drama of the thing—which too many people in any event had seen as a kind of high school footrace. But, more damagingly, it has greatly assisted the old coalition against the moon attempt. One of the strangest coalitions we have ever known, it is made up of some conservatives whose proper desire to save money is sadly misplaced here and some liberals who can rarely lift their minds above welfarist plans for spending every dollar at hand "right here on earth," to use their happily demagogic phrase.

Nothing will change the minds of these liberals. The conservatives, however, ought to ponder what they are about here. For apart from the almost indescribable strategic and scientific significance of this program, there is the bottom fact that it is already nearly indispensable to the American economy and may later become indispensable in the absolute sense.

Automation, when fully launched, will create huge pools of unemployables. Politically, these must and will be cared for, under any foreseeable regime, Republican or Democratic. Is it not better to spend the money for space than to speed the day when all this money and more will have to be thrown about for the most gigantic—and also permanent—leaf-raking schemes in the world's history?

The space program is the precise opposite of economic crackpotism. It is sensible conservatism's greatest future weapon against just such crackpotism.

General Clay to Berlin?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable for this Nation to advocate a policy of coexistence with that which is

evil and wrong. We should reconsider test ban treaties and wheat deals in the light of cold reality—the stark naked reality of Communist designs for world conquest as manifested in the recurring Berlin crisis.

The following timely and excellent editorial appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch this morning, November 6:

CRISIS OVER BERLIN

Those who fondly imagined—as many did—that our test ban treaty with Soviet Russia would usher in an era of sweetness and light in our relations with the Kremlin, had better think again. We suggest consideration of the fact that the Communists have now thrown up their fourth blockade within recent weeks of U.S. troop convoys on the highway to West Berlin.

It was a tense moment as the two armed groups faced one another. Events could have happened at any time to cause a grave international crisis—perhaps something even worse. No wonder President Kennedy held a hurried conference yesterday afternoon at the White House.

The naive notion, expressed by official Washington at the time of the first blockade last month, that the episode was due to a bit of misunderstanding on the part of the local Soviet commander has long since been discarded. From President Kennedy on down, it was realized that this series of confrontations on the road to Berlin was "a very serious matter," as Secretary of State Rusk put it.

It was almost certainly more than a dispute over the tailboards of trucks—which is what Sir Alec Douglas-Home, British prime minister, appears to think it was. The series of roadblocks also would seem to signify the sad and dismal end of what the British refer to as the "Spirit of Moscow." Their assumption that such a "spirit" was abroad, after the test ban treaty was signed, was never much more than wishful thinking anyway.

What it all boils down to is that the Soviets were making a desperate effort to grab new authority over access to the divided German city, with the hideous Communist-built wall cutting across its face like a scar. Divided Berlin is still a "bone in the throat" for Comrade Khrushchev, who has just been making his latest attempt to remove that "bone."

Fortunately, the United States, the British and the French are showing a solid front in this crisis. They did not yield an inch.

If Gen. Lucius F. Clay could be flown over to Berlin at once, and stationed there for the duration of this tense business, many Americans would breathe more easily. General Clay's magnificent leadership at the time of the airlift which saved West Berlin in the late 1940's has not been forgotten on either side of the Atlantic.

Similar firmness is called for now, for, as always, the Soviets understand nothing but force. If it comes to a showdown, and they again refuse to allow U.S. convoys to pass, the convoys will have to be ordered to shoot their way through. Any show of weakness by us will be the most fatal thing of all, in this grave situation.

John A. Gronouski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Postmaster General John A. Gronouski at a dinner October 26 commemorating the centennial of free city delivery.

Mr. Gronouski presented significant ideas and statistics in support of President Kennedy's omnibus educational bill, and I would like to identify myself with his remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT A DINNER COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL OF FREE CITY DELIVERY, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 26, 1963

One of the first things I heard about the postal service was that letter carriers always know what is happening long before anyone else does. The scheduling of this dinner is a case in point. The date was set months before I even knew I was going to be the Postmaster General. But the letter carriers must have known. Why else would they have set this great celebration on my birthday?

It is a pleasure to be here to help honor Bill Doherty and to commemorate the 100th anniversary of free city delivery. Free city delivery is even older than I am. And it is a lot older than Bill Doherty, even though his name has been synonymous with letter carrier in Washington for about as long as anyone can remember. But Bill is still young and exuberant.

Bill Doherty is one of the great labor leaders of this era. In his 30 years as a national officer of the National Association of Letter Carriers, he played a central role in building unions of Government employees into the influential and responsible organizations they are today.

Bill Doherty was one of the best ambassadors the postal service and Federal employee organizations ever had. The country was fortunate in getting him to put his ambassadorial talents to work for the Nation. He is the first labor leader to become an Ambassador in the Nation's history. From all the reports I get he is doing a brilliant job.

Back in 1961, when he was still president of the NALC, Bill Doherty said the following about the personnel policies of the new postal administration: "The labor-management climate is practically ideal. For the first time in our recorded history, our opinions are sought and seriously considered before important policy decisions affecting us are made."

I am delighted that organizations of Federal employees have flourished under the Kennedy administration and that the Post Office Department has taken the lead in the area of enlightened labor relations. I want to reiterate what I have already said several times since becoming Postmaster General. I intend to carry forward the program of consultative management. My door will always be open to union leaders who have problems which they wish to discuss with me.

Bill Doherty managed to achieve great things without the advantage of a college education. The William C. Doherty Scholarship Fund, which will enable talented sons and daughters of letter carriers to go to college, is a wonderful way to honor him. The fund is another indication of the marvelous job organized labor is doing to open educational opportunities for its members' children. AFL-CIO unions award more than 1,000 scholarships annually, at a cost of more than $1 million each year.

I feel very deeply that every child who has the talent and ability to make use of a college education should get one. We talk a great deal about equality of educational opportunity in this country, but we do shockingly little about it. Huge differences continue to exist in the kind and quality of education available to our children.

Eight percent of our young people still fail to complete the eighth grade. One-third never finish high school. Almost half of those who do graduate from high school don't go on to college. Among them are many bright and ambitious youngsters. These young people want to continue their education, but they simply cannot afford it.

Half of the students in private colleges and universities come from families who rank in the top 10 percent of the Nation in terms of income. In public institutions 25 percent come from families ranking in the top 10 percent in terms of income.

This should not really surprise us. It costs about $1,750 to send a boy or girl to college for a year. Median family income last year was less than $6,000. In other words, it takes almost one-third of an average family's entire income to finance a year's college education for a single child. What is a family with nine children—like Bill Doherty's—supposed to do? To me, this is a terrible and depressing situation.

The postwar baby crop is now advancing to college age. College enrollment is expected to double in the present decade, reaching 7 million by 1970. To meet the minimum needs of this enrollment, we should be spending $2.3 billion a year for the expansion of college facilities. So far we are spending only $1.3 billion.

Progressive mechanization and the increasing complexity of American society demand that we sharply upgrade the educational level of our entire population. There are great gaps in the country's need for trained personnel—teachers and engineers, doctors and nurses—but there is less and less demand for people with no significant training.

When are we going to take action to meet this need? When are we finally going to see to it that gifted youngsters are not prevented by weight of economic circumstance from getting the education they require to fill openings in technical and professional fields?

President Kennedy's omnibus education bill calls for substantial Federal aid to increase educational opportunities at every level. Included are provisions for both loans and grants for construction to colleges and universities, and for assistance to students pursuing graduate study. I urge you to get behind this program and give it all the support you can.

I want now to present our city delivery commemorative stamp. The whimsical drawing of a nineteenth century letter carrier walking in the rain accompanied by a small boy and a dog was done by Norman Rockwell. We all take free mail delivery to our homes so much for granted now that it seems a little hard to believe that it began only a hundred years ago. Up until 1863, when free delivery was inaugurated in 49 cities, mail in large communities was delivered by private carriers who charged the recipient 2 cents per letter. Where the penny post, as it was called, was not in use, mail had to be picked up at the local post office. Picking up one's mail could be an onerous chore. Lines of people often stretched out for long distances from delivery windows.

Montgomery Blair, Abraham Lincoln's Postmaster General, who instituted free delivery, believed that good service and the convenience of the public should in all instances be the primary consideration of the Post Office Department, a belief we still subscribe to. In 1887, Congress required the Department to extend free delivery to every city with a population of over 50,000, and permitted its extension to smaller communities having a population of 10,000, or gross post office revenues of $10,000. The Department now employs about 170,000 city letter carriers.

The City Delivery stamp is the first commemorative to employ a phosphorescent tagging technique. The stamps are coated with a luminescent material that glows green

under the special lamps of a new electronic mail-sorting machine. Airmail stamps coated with luminescent material will glow red. The new equipment detects stamps, automatically cancels them, and sorts all the envelopes so that they face the same way. It can handle up to 30,000 envelopes per hour. The new gear is an improvement over our older facer-canceler machines which operate on a photoelectric principle. It is a part of our overall program of developing and installing the most modern available techniques in the handling of mail.

I hope that this stamp, which went on sale in Washington today, will remind Americans everywhere of the fine spirit and dedication of the men who deliver the mail.

Handicapped Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the handicapped worker has proved himself uncountable times to be a good, safe, and productive part of modern industry. Training programs are in existence everywhere to teach the handicapped and disabled to do jobs for which they are fully qualified, and companies all over America are using these citizens in their plants and organizations.

The Bendix Corp., in both of its New Jersey plants, and the Reliance Picture Frame Co. in Dover, N.J., both have adopted as a common policy the hiring of handicapped and disabled workers, with mutual satisfaction and success as a result. "Disability," says one supervisor at the Bendix plant, "disappears when the right worker is able to find the right job."

New Jersey Business, a magazine published by the New Jersey Manufacturers Association, carried two articles in its September edition concerning Bendix and Reliance and their handicapped workers. Also in September, the Morning Call of Paterson, N.J., devoted an editorial in praise of the policy of hiring the handicapped, and expressed satisfaction at the formation of President Kennedy's national committee on the problem.

I feel that this problem cannot be overemphasized, nor can it be solved too quickly. These articles are excellent demonstrations of what can be done, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From New Jersey Business, September 1963]

(First article)

THEY HIRE THE HANDICAPPED: NOT MERE ALTRUISM—BUT SOUND BUSINESS PRACTICE IS THE REASON THESE TWO NEW JERSEY FIRMS EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED—THEY STATE THAT THE ADVANTAGES ARE REAL AND MANY

Handicapped workers are not only the equals of normal ones—they can be vastly better. Ask anyone at the Eatontown plant of Bendix Corp. who knows John Warren.

When he was a boy at work on his father's farm, Warren, now in his thirties, lost a leg in an accident. Some 13 years ago, fitted with an artificial limb, he applied for a job at Bendix.

Warren now oversees the work of 15 persons in the plant's armature winding unit and earns over $3 an hour. He still has his artificial leg—his wife insists that he wear it when they go out—but he prefers a lightweight, aluminum pegleg that he made himself. He plays shortstop on the company softball team and boasts that he can outrun all three of his children.

John Warren is one of almost 100 handicapped workers among some 1,500 employees at Bendix Corp. plants in Eatontown and Red Bank.

SO-CALLED "HANDICAPS"

Handicapped people? Yes, in terms of a specific physical disability or shortcoming. Definitely not, with respect to productivity or ability to carry out certain job assignments. "Disability," says one Bendix supervisor, "disappears when the right worker is able to find the right job."

It is a policy of the Bendix Corp. to hire the handicapped and this policy is implemented at Bendix's two New Jersey plants by general manager, Edward F. Kolar.

"There is little doubt," says Kolar, "that even the seriously handicapped person is en route to becoming an accepted worker in industry. And, to a large extent, this is made possible by the growing diversity of specialized jobs and the highly technical nature of today's production-line techniques.

"Until recently, employees were ordinarily classified as machine operators, machinists, mechanics, millwrights or office workers, and they usually performed a wide range of work within their classification.

"Today, however, work at the Bendix plants is much more specialized. Jobs require a high degree of proficiency * * * but within a limited range of skills and abilities. Thus, a given job opening may be filled by hiring an employee who can do that particular job well, while unable to perform almost all others. A handicapped applicant, when matched to the requirements of a specific job, can fill it as well as anyone."

Among the handicapped employees at Bendix are deaf mutes, persons with impaired vision, amputees, and diabetics. But also included are the more severely disabled and several with corrected emotional conditions. Among the former are a paraplegic, three epileptics, a victim of multiple sclerosis, and a number with cardiac conditions.

Contributing to the effectiveness of the company policy toward handicapped employees is the cooperation of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, to which all shop workers belong. Wheelchair employees are permitted to park their cars inside the gates, where fellow workers are always available to help them negotiate the sidewalk step into the one-story plant.

SAME WAGES; NO FAVORS

At work, the handicapped are scattered among many units with specific production responsibilities. They are given no special consideration—in fact, according to the union shop chairman, Joseph R. Mahon, they would resent it—and they are paid the prevailing wage rate for the job.

Deaf mutes work in a number of units, and, surprisingly, a great number of their coworkers have learned enough sign language to be able to communicate with them. In a group that includes an epileptic, alert coworkers report early indications of a seizure to the plant nurse, who has a complete medical record of all employees. There is no interruption of normal shop routine.

Paul Brown, director of industrial relations for Bendix at Eatontown and Red Bank, notes that "one of the challenges a handicapped worker faces is the need to meet normal levels for employees as a whole. By this I mean the normal levels for such things as job responsibility, attendance, workmanship, and compatability.

"Generally, the limited worker does this very well. In fact, his work production and quality and his attendance performance are among his special assets.

"Another challenge," Brown continued, "concerns his relationship with fellow workers. Here he will find that it is not enough to be friendly and cooperative, but he must, most emphatically, do his own share of the work. Assistance from others may be offered—in fact, always will be—but it must not be expected.

"An area which can affect the handicapped worker is collective bargaining. Where such an agreement is in effect, the handicapped person often faces a problem that is beyond his or the employer's control; namely, a mandatory reassignment to work which he cannot do. Such reassignments occur when the work force expands or contracts, and it is necessary to move employees from one job to another under seniority provisions."

Sometimes union cooperation can help resolve knotty problems of this type through a special transfer. In one recent case at Bendix, special arrangements permitted the company to transfer a young worker with severe arthritis to another job when production in his own unit was curtailed.

THEY VALUE SAFETY

Handicapped workers are quite understandably safer workers. According to Herbert Sweet, Bendix director of safety and plant protection, company records confirm that handicapped workers are far less accident prone than normal workers. They observe safety rules and regulations and do not take unnecessary risks.

Although in an area where available labor supply is abundant, Bendix Corp. has found, nevertheless, that it is good, sound business practice to give equal consideration to the skills and capabilities of the physically handicapped as well as the emotionally rehabilitated.

(Second article)

Then years ago, Robert Harris, then 9 years old, was threatened with the loss of his sight as the result of an accident. His father, Philip A. Harris, executive vice president of the Reliance Picture Frame Co. in Dover, was grateful when doctors were able to save the vision in one of the boy's eyes. He became interested in the problems of the blind and decided to hire a blind worker for his plant.

What started primarily as a humanitarian venture has developed into a personnel program that Harris describes as fundamentally sound for both our business and for the community. Among its 230-odd employees, Reliance now includes four blind workers, a one-armed shipping room foreman who, according to Harris, "does more work than any two men," an epileptic, two diabetics, and three persons with cases of arrested tuberculosis.

Reliance also employs three mental retardates and several parolees. The company will usually find a place in its office or production line for an applicant in the older age group.

STANDING ORDER

"Send us any of your handicapped people who are looking for work," Harris has told David L. Sheppard, manager of the State employment office in Dover. "As long as they have two good hands, we will find jobs for them." Steps and other architectural barriers make it necessary to exclude wheelchair cases.

New employees serve a 30-day probationary period and then—if they are productive workers—become members of Local 3127,

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL-CIO. They contribute to a welfare fund that takes care of hospitalization and other needs.

All production workers receive union wage rates which, for nonsupervisory personnel, range from $1.15 to $2.20 and more an hour. The average hourly wage for disabled employees is $1.81. With the exception of the blind workers, who are grouped at a specific machine operation, the handicapped work side by side with the nonhandicapped.

A highly mechanized operation, Reliance is believed to be the largest picture frame factory in the world, turning out between 18,000 and 20,000 units per day. Its product is sold in chain, department, and variety stores throughout the Nation. Since establishing its Dover plant in 1937, the company has expanded to five times its original size.

APPRECIATIVE WORKERS

"There is no question that the handicapped worker, when given a job suited to his capabilities, performs as well as the nonhandicapped or maybe better," said Harris. "They are grateful for the opportunity to earn a livelihood and this is reflected by a feeling of loyalty to the firm and a desire to prove themselves worthy of confidence. They want no special favors or consideration.

"We have less absenteeism and far less turnover among our disabled workers and they present little in the way of compensation problems. About the only lost-time situations we encounter is when one of our blind operators happens to pick up a splinter from handling a frame, and this is only a brief interruption."

Because of the wide variety of jobs at the plant, layoffs due to temporary production curtailments cause only minor problems.

The union requires close observance of seniority rights and there is no difficulty shifting a man to another operation when necessary.

Involved in numerous community activities, Harris is also a member of the Dover Committee To Employ the Handicapped.

"I'm convinced," he said, "that the handicapped person, when properly placed, can prove to be an asset to any firm. I just hope we can get this message across to other employers in this area.

[From the Morning Call, Sept. 16, 1963]

HIRE THE HANDICAPPED

In these days when we hear so much about job opportunities, based upon merit, and without regard to race, color, ethnic origin or religion, it is fitting also that we call special attention to the need of our physically handicapped, in the matter of employment. President Kennedy has appointed a national committee to emphasize the importance of hiring our handicapped, which committee is headed by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, who is a veteran of the Marine Corps and is now blind. He points out that our Nation's strength and prosperity depend upon the utilization of the skills and abilities of trained workers—without prejudice to qualified workers who happen to be handicapped. Handicapped workers have proven their ability by achieving equal or superior records for production, stability, concentration and safety.

What is asked is that employers adopt employment policies providing that an individual's ability, and not his disability be the first consideration in determining his capacity for employment. Furthermore, employers are asked to install adequate safety measures which protect all employees so that persons with physical limitations are assured safe working conditions.

Many Patersonians still remember the late Edward D. Levy, who for many years was president of a local smoking pipe manufacturing company. Mr. Levy contacted the State department of institutions and agencies and as a result, many severely handicapped persons were released in his custody. After a short training period, Mr. Levy's work force was almost entirely made up of men and women who prior thereto were thought to be unfit for anything except institutional care. In a matter of weeks these so-called "unfortunates" were earning good wages and the State was relieved of considerable expense for their care. Mr. Levy was delighted with the results and was requested to appear on a national television program to tell his story.

The campaign to hire the handicapped is supported by many outstanding leaders of labor and industry, such as Edward K. Foster, vice president of the Bendix Corp.; J. W. McGovern, past president of the National Association of Manufacturers; Richard Wagner, chairman of the board, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; George Meany, president, AFL-CIO; and Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Employer—if you need able and loyal workers—hire the handicapped.

World War I Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Chairman OLIN TEAGUE, of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has earned the respect and gratitude of all of us who believe in a sound fiscal policy.

Chairman TEAGUE, in opposing the pension bill for all World War I veterans, regardless of income or amount of accumulated wealth, is really fighting to protect all benefits to our elderly people. The surest way to wreck the carefully planned programs for our aged is to pass this type of legislation.

I commend to the attention of the entire Congress the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on November 5:

PUTTING THEIR NECKS OUT

Economy-minded Members of the House have a good opportunity to demonstrate the courage of their convictions. Once more an outrageous pension grab is moving toward a point of critical decision. If all the legislators who have expressed concern over excessive spending will join hands with those who believe that tax funds should be spent for only legitimate public purposes, this raid can be scotched before it reaches the floor.

The bill in question was courageously rejected by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE is chairman. But an organization known as Veterans of World War I of the U.S. Army is conducting a high-pressure campaign to discharge the committee and force a vote on the bill on the floor. This is the third time that the group has sought to bypass the committee with a phony appeal to individual Congressmen.

"Help the sick, needy World War I veteran," is the cry of the bill's sponsors. Actually, according to Mr. TEAGUE, this measure (H.R. 2332) would give "little or no help to most low-income veterans and widows. Its principal purpose is to pay a tax-free pension to those with incomes well above the national average for their age group." The benefits would not be restricted to the disabled, the unemployable, or the destitute. But many veterans with incomes up to $4,800 a year could claim tax-free pensions of $1,200 a year. Passage of the bill, says Mr. TEAGUE, "would result in 23 million taxpayers in the low-income brackets being taxed to pay a non-service-connected pension to veterans with incomes higher than their own."

The case against the measure seems to us conclusive. It is perhaps the most reckless spending device before the present Congress. Its cost would be $1,266,247,000 in the first year and nearly $20 billion by the year 2000. The spenders who are willing to stand up and be counted for this unwarranted handout will have their necks out a yard.

The Candid Customer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the following article entitled "The Candid Customer," written by Margaret Dana and appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Monday, August 19, 1963. I was particularly interested in this article because on January 17, 1963, I introduced H.R. 1998, the purpose of which is to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products to which the article alludes. The article reads as follows which I know will be of interest to the Members:

THE CANDID CUSTOMER

(By Margaret Dana)

There are at this moment several bills before congressional committees whose purpose is to require that all woods and simulated wood products be labeled accurately as to exactly what they are.

The reason for this legislation, of couse, is the very simple one that today imitations of wood surfaces are so well done that it is impossible, without the maker's label, to tell whether a piece of furniture or paneling is solid, veneer, plywood, hardboard, cardboard, plastic, or something unknown entirely.

To the hundreds of women with whom I have discussed this situation over the past few years, it seems reasonable and important to have all these materials properly labeled. Consequently it astonishes them to find that the proposed labeling law is being opposed so bitterly by segments of industry.

Opponents say that to label true woods by their correct names—such as cherry, walnut, etc.—and to label simulated wood surfaces by the their correct names, and to stop calling a variety of native Philippine woods "Philippine mahogany," which they are not, would give the true woods an unfair advantage. It would, they say, downgrade other simulated woods in the eyes of consumers, and consumers would be fooled into thinking a genuine wood is necessarily better than simulated wood.

At a recent hearing on this bill before a congressional committee, a member of the committee bluntly asked a witness, "Do you mean to say if your industry told the truth about its products people would stop buying them?" The witness answered frankly, "Yes, that's just what we mean, because consumers would be confused."

This idea that women are confused by the truth, and unable to make a sensible

judgment of value on the basis of facts, is one of the dearest folktales of those who sell to women. It is quite true that consumers cannot always detect the facts from the fictions, but it does not mean that they are satisfied with substitutes for facts. As one consumer witness said, "It is not a question of whether one material is better than another; it is a question of whether we have a right to know what we're buying." A good many women are wondering if Congress cares about the consumer's right to know.

Use of Taxpayers' Money and Facilities of Agencies of the Executive Branch To Advance Political Fortunes of the Present Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran I was deeply disturbed upon reading a news story in the November 2, 1963, Knoxville Journal of Knoxville, Tenn., headed "Vote Hunting Ad in Franked Mail Draws Ire of Residents." The story is critical of a recent innovation in the veterans' benefit program.

Through a cooperative arrangement between the White House and the Veterans' Administration, upon the death of a veteran, a certificate bearing the signature of President Kennedy is mailed to his next of kin. According to the language of the certificate, it is awarded in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of mankind in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Not content, Mr. Speaker, with forcing this certificate upon the bereaved next of kin of those who now die, the administration is also soliciting the next of kin of those who died many years ago. Next of kin of deceased Civil War veterans and the Indian wars of the 1800's are even being solicited. The facilities of the Veterans' Administration, of course, are utilized in this great public relations campaign.

In a communication addressed "To the Next of Kin of Honorably Discharged Deceased Veterans," the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, J. S. Gleason, Jr., says:

> President Kennedy holds in such high esteem those who have served our country in the Armed Forces of the United States that he has inaugurated his Presidential memorial certificate program. Under his program a certificate bearing his signature is furnished to the next of kin.
>
> We in the Veterans' Administration help in the President's program by identifying next of kin eligible to receive the certificate.
>
> If you have not received a certificate and would like one (illustrated below), you should complete the enclosed card and mail it to the President.

This letter is accompanied by a return address card to be sent to the President at the White House by those desiring the certificate. Approximately 1.2 million of these solicitation letters will be mailed to next of kin this year.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that even after several readings of this communication, I was left with the distinct impression that this is the President's personal program financed by personal funds. In truth, however, it is a Federal Government program financed by the Nation's taxpayers.

In a letter of instruction to managers of Veterans' Administration regional offices, the Veterans' Administration's Chief Benefits Director says:

> I know I can count on your full support and that, recognizing the significance of the President's program, you will exert every effort to insure the utmost accuracy in this program, not only in furnishing the full and correct name of the deceased veteran, but the correct name and address of the next of kin entitled to the certificate.

Just what is the significance of the President's program? Could he possibly mean the political significance of this program? I rather think so.

Now, this project seems to be a nice gesture to a bereaved mother or widow. It may give one a warm friendly feeling toward our President which may even carry over to the next election. But seriously, Mr. Speaker, this project, playing as it does upon the emotions of a veteran's loved ones, is in extremely poor taste and quite objectionable and unnecessary.

Certainly the finest memorial that a grateful Nation can provide in recognizing devoted and selfless service is a sound structure of veterans benefits—adequate compensation or pension payments to disabled veterans and the survivors of deceased veterans; education for the children of the service-connected dead; and a hospital system providing care and treatment for those who were fortunate enough to survive our Nation's war's.

Approximately $60,000 of the Veterans' Administration budget for the last fiscal year was devoted to the distribution of the President's certificate. Undoubtedly this will be increased substantially during the current fiscal year. Now, $60,000 these days doesn't seem like a lot of money, but take a look at what it will buy in essential service to veterans.

For $60,000, the Veterans' Administration can pay 1 year's compensation payments to 20 totally disabled service-connected veterans. Educational benefits for 1 year can be given to 45 children of veterans who were killed in action. Thirty-eight widows of men who died in service could be paid death benefits for 1 year.

In the average Veterans' Administration general hospital, 73 veterans could be hospitalized for a period of 30 days. Nursing type care, a service urgently needed in the Veterans' Administration program, could be provided for 6 months for at least 18 aged veterans now occupying beds designed for acutely ill patients.

These are but a few of the things, $60,000, well spent, can accomplish. Mr. Speaker, if this project is indicative of the administration's effort to include in their fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs or if this project represents the efficient and frugal conduct of the public business, both promised in the budget message, then I suggest we are being deceived.

Equally alarming, Mr. Speaker, is the fact this project seems to be a part of a pattern—a pattern in which the taxpayers' money and the facilities of agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government are being used to advance the political fortunes of the present administration. Let me illustrate.

Soon after this administration assumed office, the Veterans' Administration announced that the 1961 dividend due on Government life insurance policies would be paid early. This in itself is commendable. Included with the dividend check mailed to all policyholders, however, was an insert labeled "Important Notice." The first sentence reads:

> The VA is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on Government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy.

The propriety of advertising the President's program in this manner at taxpayers' expense is certainly questionable.

During the 87th Congress, a bill increasing the rates of compensation for service-connected disability was enacted into law. Now, normally you would expect the insert accompanying the monthly check to contain an impersonal message advising the veteran that an increase had been authorized by public law. Well, here is how the first line of this commercial reads:

> President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans.

Certainly, a paid political announcement could expect no better results than this type of advertising.

Under an administration where managed news has become a household word, it is certainly no surprise to see this policy extended as outlined above. However, it is tragic that the energy devoted to creating the most favorable image for the President and his brothers, Bobby and Teddy, could not be used for something other than the political perpetuity of the Kennedy family. One of our major service organizations has the motto "To Honor the Dead by Helping the Living," and with this thought in mind perhaps someone in the Veterans' Administration or in the executive branch of this administration might delay their public relations efforts long enough to assist ex-Marine Noble Frank Smith, a Bataan death march survivor now married and the father of five children in his difficulty with the State Department. According to recent news reports, the State Department has asserted that Mr. Smith's wife and son owe the U.S. Government $1,421 for emergency war relief given to them while Smith was in a Japanese prison camp and they were interned in Shanghai for 2 years.

I include herein a breakdown of costs of the mass memorial certificate mailing monstrosity along with a copy of the memorial certificate and copy of the self-serving notices veterans received with their 1961 insurance dividend and a copy of the notice disabled veterans received with their first increased compensation check following enactment of a

bill by the 87th Congress, not by the President. I would also like to include the news story from the Knoxville Journal of November 2, 1963:

Presidential memorial certificate program

Unit cost of processing:	
Stamp	$0.04
Certificate	.085
Clipboard insert	.004
Envelope	.0136
Unit cost total	.1426
Salary costs of 8.4 employees annually:	
Minimum for 1 GS-5	4,565
Minimum for 1 GS-4	4,110
Minimum for 6.4 GS-3 at $3,820 each	24,448
Total annual salary costs	33,123
Total costs fiscal year 1963 (187,318 certificates were processed and mailed):	
187,318 multiplied by $.1426 per unit equals total processing cost	$26,711.55
Processing cost	26,711.55
Salary cost	33,123.00
Total cost of program during fiscal year 1963	59,834.55

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that this cost estimate is based upon the actual cost of the certificate and its processing. It does not include the cost of the 1.2-million solicitations being mailed during the current fiscal year.

The United States of America honors the memory of _____

This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of mankind in the Armed Forces of the United States.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States.

THE 1961 SPECIAL DIVIDEND

The enclosed check or statement is a special dividend on your Government life insurance policy. This dividend is an extra one being paid in 1961, and represents your share of gains and savings in the insurance fund.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

Always keep your choice of beneficiary up to date.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The VA is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on Government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy. These advance payments are made on the assumption that your premiums will continue to be paid for the remainder of your policy year. If premimums are not so paid, this dividend will constitute a partial overpayment which will become an indebtness against your insurance.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

NOTICE

President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans. The increase is included in the enclosed check. This check also includes a retroactive payment equal to a 3-month increase as provided by the new law unless special action is necessary. In that case you will get your adjustment check in the near future.

The table on the back of this notice shows some of the new wartime rates. Compensation based on peacetime service is paid on approximately 80 percent of the amounts shown.

Degree of disability	Old rate of payment	New rate of payment [1]
10 percent	$19	$20
20 percent	36	38
30 percent	55	58
40 percent	73	77
50 percent [2]	100	107
60 percent [2]	120	128
70 percent [2]	140	149
80 percent [2]	160	170
90 percent [2]	179	191
100 percent [2]	225	250

[1] The amount payable for all checks received after the 1st one.

[2] Veterans disabled 50 percent or more may receive an additional allowance for dependents. The law does not change the amounts paid for dependents.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would appreciate having a memorial certificate honoring the memory of:

Please print _____
(First name) (Initial) (Last name)

Please mail the certificate to me at the following address:

Please print _____
(Your name)

_____
(Number) (Street)

_____
(City) (Zone) (State)

[From the Knoxville Journal, Nov. 2, 1963]

VOTE-HUNTING AD IN FRANKED MAIL DRAWS IRE OF RESIDENTS

Several Knoxvillians complained yesterday of President Kennedy seeking votes by enclosing advertisements in checks mailed to survivors of war veterans by the Veterans' Administration in franked envelopes.

The vote solicitation comes in the form of a letter offering the next of kin a "Presidential Memorial Certificate" over the signiture of J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The letter states: "We in the Veterans' Administration help in the President's program by identifying next of kin eligible to receive the certificate." It came in checks for widows and children of war veterans which arrived in Knoxville Thursday and Friday.

The vote soliciting apparently went out in checks mailed throughout the United States.

A Chattanooga lawyer, Joe M. Parker, said one of his clients, a veteran's widow received one yesterday.

He accused Kennedy of trying "to exhume the memory of deceased veterans in an attempt to solicit votes of surviving widows and orphans."

The letter offered the memorial certificate if the next of kin should complete the enclosed form and mail it to the President.

This is undoubtedly an absolute low in an attempt to influence votes," Parker said. It used to be $2, a pint of whisky, or a cigar. Now it's an autograph."

Hungarian Revolt in 1956 (Seventh Anniversary)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in late October of 1956, the Hungarian people tried to shake off the inflexible Soviet tyranny imposed upon them by the Kremlin. They rebelled against their oppressors, rose in mass revolt throughout the country, and, judged by their initial success, they seemed on their way of regaining their freedom. The Soviet garrisons in the country, even where they were of considerable size, surrendered to the rising forces of revolt, and new democratic leaders at once overthrew the Communist government in Budapest. For more than a week freedom reigned in many parts of the country.

In this hasty turn of events favoring freedom and independence, Hungarians expected quick and effective aid from the West. If this were not forthcoming, they feared that their own efforts would be doomed to failure against any serious Soviet effort to take over Hungary once more. This is exactly what happened. Most unfortunately, Hungary did not get the expected Western aid; Soviet forces were regrouped, and within a week most of the country was in the firm grip of the Red Army. By November 3, Communists were back in power in Budapest, and then they began their horrors of oppression, persecution, and terror. Thousands upon thousands of innocent and helpless people were victims of the biggest postwar terror perpetrated by the Kremlin. Once again the Hungarians were subdued and cruelly held down, and all freedom seemed vanished from Hungary. They paid heavily for their courageous and righteous deed of late October 1956, and to this day they are being punished for their effort to free themselves from Communist totalitarianism.

Today, in observing the sad anniversary of Communist terror in Hungary, we honor the memory of those brave Hungarians who, in defiance of ruthless communism, fought and died for Hungary's cause—freedom and independence.

Popular Support in Behalf of House Joint Resolution 174, Providing for the Issue of a Stamp Honoring Taras Shevchenko Upon the Occasion of the 150th Year of His Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 86th Congress passed the Shevchenko resolution providing for the erection of a statue in our Nation's Capital in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of the Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. This is Public Law 86-749 and in accordance with its provisions, the statue will be erected on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW., and the historic unveiling will take place on May 30, 1964.

This Congress has a wonderful opportunity to follow up on the constructive action taken by the 86th Congress in reflecting its support for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of this East European figure of freedom and independence. This will be another opportunity for us to concretely show to the 45 million captive Ukrainian nation and to all the captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe that the United States shall never lose sight of their captive status and the undying aspirations for freedom and national independence. Today, as never before, Khrushchev needs this kind of reminder, and no more representative body of the people can do this than we of the 88th Congress.

I am very encouraged by the popular support expresed in behalf of my resolution (H.J. Res. 174), providing for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko upon the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his death. The occasion is 1964—significantly also the year of the unveiling of his statue in Washington.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communications in the RECORD indicating support for House Joint Resolution 174:

WARREN, PA.,
September 26, 1963.

Congressman THADDEUS DULSKI.

DEAR SIR: I was present during the groundbreaking, banquet and concert for the Taras Shevchenko plaza in Washingington. I felt quite at home when I heard your eloquent speech at the Mayflower. It was like having someone from home since Buffalo, N.Y., is only 90 miles to the north of us and we frequently go to Buffalo. I saw and heard you speak during the visit of President Kennedy on Pulaski Day last year in Buffalo.

I am writing to you, urging you and other congressmen to pass the resolution for a Shevchenko liberty stamp.

God bless you.

Thank you.

THEODORE BLEECH.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
September 12, 1963.

Hon. T. J. DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As American citizen of Ukrainian descent, I would like to express you my deepest gratitude for introducing House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a special Shevchenko postage stamp in commemoration of the Ukraine's greatest poet and universal freedom fighter.

Most sincerely yours,

M. MYCHKOVSKY.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: In behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes, I am writing to you in order to tell that we are fully supporting your resolution, House Joint Resolution 174—concerning the issuance of a Taras Shevchenko Champion of Liberty postage stamp.

To all the Ukrainians of the world, as well as to other nationalities, Taras Shevchenko has come to be an outstanding poet, national prophet, humanitarian, fighter for freedom and "George Washington" of the Ukraine. Just as our "father of the United States" worked endlessly to bring about our independence, so too, Taras Shevchenko spent many years amidst despotic rule of Czarist Russia, striving to gain freedom for his people. His never forgotten works and his national spirit still lives in each one of us, Ukrainians, whether here in America, or far away in the native land behind the Iron Curtain. No one, particularly the Communists could ever wipe that spirit which will live forever in Ukrainian hearts.

Therefore, we are very grateful to you for having introduced such a resolution and furthermore, the United States Government would greatly aid toward the cause of freedom in all enslaved nations of the world, not only in Ukraine, if such a "Champion of Liberty" postage stamp would be issued in honor of one of the greatest fighters for freedom in the world, Taras Shevchenko.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL PAWLIW,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.

JULIAN BACHYNSKY,
Secretary.

RICHMOND, VA.,
September 21, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

DEAR SIR: Now American citizens of Ukranian descent, we, the undersigned wish to support the House Joint Resolution 175, introduced by you early this year, calling for the issuance of a postal stamp of the United States in the series of Champion of Liberty in honor of the 150th birthday of Taras Shevchenko in 1964.

The issue of the stamp in honor of the Ukranian national poet Taras Shevchenko would be very important because of many reasons, particularly the following:

1. Because the stamp, calling to mind the Champion of Liberty Taras Shevchenko, would be influential with regard to national interests, considering the permanent support of all Americans for liberty for themselves and for all the nations of the world;

2. Because the stamp would be important in international relations stressing the will of Americans to support liberation of Ukraine, the nation now submerged under Bolshevist occupation; this stamp will encourage all the oppressed nations in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Therefore, in accordance with the two aims of this stamp, it would seem good to issue the stamp in two qualities: (a) 5-cent value for interior use; and (b) 15-cent value for international use (air mail stamps). It would be desirable, that the two issues would be produced in the Ukranian national colors: yellow and blue.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. OLGA DUBROWSKY.
Mr. VASYL DUBROWSKY.
Mr. JAROSLAV DUBROWSKY.

KANSAS CITY, KANS.,
September 14, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Our organization in Kansas City, Kans., the branch of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, are writing to you in support of your far-sighted resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the champion of liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet and national prophet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. In 1857, more than a century ago, Shevchenko advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," in a belief that the Ukrainian people, then under the despotic rule of czarist Russia, would achieve their national freedom and emancipation under such leaders as was George Washington, father of our country. Shevchenko remains to this day a beacon of national aspiration and a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45-million Ukrainian nation now in bondage of Communist Russia. The Soviet Government, knowing how deeply Shevchenko is revered by the Ukrainian people, has been trying unsuccessfully to slant his poetry so as to suit its political propaganda, and to make him a "proletarian and anti-imperialist" poet.

But for the Ukrainians in their homeland and for those American citizens who come from Ukrainian ancestry Taras Shevchenko remains an inspiring symbol of freedom and humanity.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of the great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Sincerely,

BOHDAN MUZYKA,
President of the Branch of U.C.C.A.

WARMINSTER, PA.

Congressman DULSKI.

DEAR SIR: I have read what Dr. Harris has to say about your resolution. And correct me if I'm wrong.

Your resolution is to create a stamp dedicated to a man who tried to help Ukrainia in her fight against Russia; to make his people feel as though they should get up and tell Russia to go back to where they belong.

If your resolution is passed it might help FLOOD to pass his resolution to form a special committee to investigate the Ukrainian problem.

Yours truly,

CAROLANN GROGAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
October 18, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We Americans of Ukrainian descent wish to thank you for introducing House Resolution 174 on the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp in 1964.

We support your resolution wholeheartedly and hope that it will be passed in the U.S. Congress in the near future.

Cordially yours,

(Signed by 23 persons.)

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Jersey City, N.J., October 6, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: The Jersey City, N.J., branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, wishes to express its sincere gratitude to you for your strong sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174 providing for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp honoring Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We sincerely hope that through your efforts and the votes of your colleagues in the House of Representatives as well as the Mem-

bers of the Senate, a champion of liberty postage stamp will be issued on May 30, 1964, honoring Ukraine's great patriot.

I extend to you the sincere thanks of the Ukrainian people of Jersey City, as well as my own personal gratitude.

Sincerely and respectfully,

WALTER BILYK,
President.

WARMINSTER, PA.,
October 21, 1963.

DEAR SIR: I am a student in world geography. I urge the support for the Dulski resolution, House Joint Resolution 174 calling for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp.

Yours truly,

CAROL THIEROLD.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BRANCH OF AMSTERDAM, N.Y.,
Amsterdam, N.Y., October 29, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
U.S. Congressman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: The various Ukrainian organizations in the Amsterdam, N.Y., area circulated petitions supporting House Joint Resolution 174, which you had introduced, and the signed petitions have now been forwarded to our area congressional representatives, Senator KENNETH KEATING, Senator JACOB JAVITS, and Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

The American citizens of Ukrainian descent who belong to these organizations in the Amsterdam area are indeed grateful to you for your wisdom and foresight in proposing the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We thank you for your noble efforts and are hopeful that the resolution will be adopted by the U.S. Congress at a very early date.

Respectfully yours,

SIMON L. HNATKOWSKY,
President.

R. W. Leo Lischynsky, Dmytoo Olymys, Woyl Lyszynski, Stefan Farervispr, Farkay Ikyskyz, Olka Lala, Faroslaw Dulysz, Wesyl Jaremyszyn, Hyrhayeo Krgz, Joseph Bazocrnishi, John Inandro, Teodor Kokorudz, Anton Szyjkir, Tymosej Lahor, Joseph Paszezah, Saman Kohut, Anna Kohut, Nikolos Wokgzynsky, Stefanni Paszczyah, Nicholos Zeobrowski, Hnort Babak, Mary Nrycw, Peter Zesuci, Anno Wikozynsky, Olga Weresnski, Mychajlo Krekewyez, Theodosro Krywrelycz, Wyrojkyz Krynlyes, Myeos Yfoman, F. Tlymuris, Wasyland Mary Trufyar.

Petro Marok, Maria Marok, Rev. C. J. Muchlio, Kohcuwhi Kriuh, Cocpia Frianpi, Olga Ylipalawsky, Theodore Fedasch, Maria Fedasch, Michael Bobisk, Stefanio Bobisk, Amsterdam, N.Y.; Jeoan Kaminsky, Anna Kaminsky, Hagaman, N.Y.; Bosuiro Manerik, Csabko Kobasi, Cmeepanie Kobasi, Twiseyken Bocush, Thessuyki Hokio, Miwslav Gurchak, Stefania Faremissya, Mytrhow Melcsikio, Wolodymyr Werrshona, John Paeternac, Michalino Wurched, Olena Werrshone, Dmytro Rymoruk, John Zelosko, W. Weresiuk, M. Surolersky, D. Surolersky, Maria Dulysz, Lesia Paszczak, Amsterdam, N.Y.

Paul Wojciechowsky, Emily Wojciechowsky, Anton Sryjko, John Hrycіue, William Peretz, Catherine Peretz, Mary Von Stetino, Myron Bucjal, John J. Von Stetino, Michael Waishona, Peter Babaler, Annie Rsjmarick, Mupocraba Wuuka, Anna Mopia Zeriur, Doris Finigan, Irene Bishko, Peter Fedasch, Jerry Fedasch, Michael Babala, Michael Fedasch, Benny Wojciechowsky, Igor Bishko, Stella Kohut, Bohdan Semegen, Maria Warshona, Wasyl Seledec, Oksana Dulysz, Eugenia Dulysz.

BALTIMORE MD.,
October 30, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Please, accept my deep gratitude for your sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174, which provides for the issuance of a Champion of Liberty postage stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his birth in 1964.

I sincerely hope that the present administration will approve the issuance of this special Shevchenko postage stamp and in this way it will openly manifest before the whole world that it still today stands for the same ideals, which this great country of ours was offering to Taras Shevchenko 100 years ago. In honoring Shevchenko this way, we shall honor our own democratic institutions in which he so firmly believed, and we shall help the enslaved Ukrainian people for whom Shevchenko still is a father and national prophet.

You have my complete support and backing in this extremely important project of yours.

Very respectfully yours,

OSTAP CHARCHALIS.

The Philippines Honors the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, over a relatively brief span of time since the Peace Corps was launched several years ago, the impact of this new organization has been directly beneficial to the successful conduct of this country's foreign policy.

The benefits accrued to this country and the obvious additional benefits to other countries where our Peace Corps is now operating can be seen in many places such as the Philippines.

This year, Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian countries received the Award for International Understanding from the Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation.

As an article in a recent issue of the Manila Chronicle Sunday magazine concludes:

The impulse of sacrifice and service which the Peace Corps stands for has happily passed on commended and noticed by a large bulk of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article from the Manila Chronicle as a vivid documentation of Peace Corps success to my colleagues. As the writer states:

Perhaps they did not come to save the world from ruin or to fight the cold war for us, but one day people will know that when they journeyed thousands of miles to teach or dig a ditch, they were in reality standing up for the best traditions of the aged democratic dream.

THE PEACE CORPS IN THE PHILIPPINES

(By F. P. Makabenta)

"The problem of achieving peace amidst the tensions and dangers of a nuclear age occupies the mind of much of the human race, yet few within it discover a useful way to contribute. In reaffirming the essential community of interest of all ordinary people, regardless of creed or nationality, the Peace Corps volunteers belong to that small but growing fraternity who by their individual efforts do make a difference"—the board of trustees, Ramon Magaysay Award Foundation.

With the above citation, the Ramon Magsaysay Award Foundation last August 31, presented its Award for International Understanding to the Peace Corps volunteers in 11 Asian countries including the Philippines. While the award cited specifically the achievements of persons in Asia the board of trustees of the award foundation aptly took note of and commended Peace Corps volunteers serving in the Near East, Africa and Latin America. The citation read during the presentation ceremony at the Philamlife auditorium singled out the role played by the Peace Corps in easing tensions in our times through "contribution to understanding among people and services to the cause of peace and humanity in a direct and personal way."

A BRIEF FOR A WIDER PERSPECTIVE

The wide Asian perspective covered by the Magsaysay Award may be visualized from a glimpse of even a part of it. For what Peace Corps volunteers have been doing in the Philippines for the past 23 months is what Peace Corps members have been doing elsewhere.

The U.S. Peace Corps formally began on-the-spot operations on September 15, 1961 when a young American introduced himself in a Ghana classroom. Less than a month later, on the morning of October 12, 1961, 128 Peace Corps volunteers landed on Philippine soil by plane, marking the commencement of Asian activity.

The Peace Corps program in the Philippines drawn up by American and Filipino officials found ready acceptance in the local educational system for it evoked pleasant though vague memories of the first American teachers (the Thomasites) who set its foundations. It was made clear, however, that the new volunteers would supplement not supplant Filipino teachers as elementary teacher's aids, making the role of the new contingent several shades different from that of their predecessors. Yet their motives for coming could scarcely be different. As then education secretary Jose Tuazon said upon their arrival, "Now you have come again to us, this time not as teachers, but (still) to give us a little more of that way of life we have learned to cherish and at the same time to hope on our part that what you can give to us we can reciprocate in kind."

The Philippine government's initial choice of a Peace Corps project concerned with education was spurred on by the fact that English is the language of the Filipino school, the government, and the local cultured class—a language undoubtedly linking our Nation to other Nations of the world. It was felt that specialized teaching of English and science would "speed up development processes at all levels." Specifically the project sought "(1) to facilitate and upgrade the English skills of the Filipino youth, (2) to improve mastery of English teaching skills of Filipino teachers, (3) to upgrade the teaching of general sciences at the elementary level, and (4) to achieve effective application of science teaching and other aspects of school curriculum to the problems and needs of the individual community." The Peace Corps, volunteers, it was hoped, would accomplish all these and, of course, more.

THE MAKING OF PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER

The Peace Corps selection process is based on merit alone, measured against the particular requirements of each project. Every candidate is required to fill out a searching

questionnaire and to take a placement test. These two are designed to give a comprehensive idea of the Peace Corps candidate: who he is, what he wants, what he knows, and why he wants to join the Peace Corps.

If a candidate is found promising after this initial scrutiny, an invitation to train for a project is sent to him. The intensive training usually lasts from 8 to 10 weeks and takes place often at an American university, where the Peace Corps bureaucrats keep their eyes open for oversea-worthy volunteers. Sixty hours of each week are regularly spent in classes while additional time is allotted to outside training and study. Part of the study materials covered are the history, the customs, and the language or languages of the country for whom the project is planned.

Throughout this training, the volunteer is made to understand that Peace Corps work is essentially a mission of service under conditions of hardship both in life and work so he may not have illusions about his job and a few frustrations avoided.

Upon completion of the training, the successful trainee is then scheduled for an assignment to the project and its host country. Commencement and conclusion of the training does not, however, occur in the university campus during the 10-week sojourn there. It begins in the university, college, or trade school where the volunteer has received his degree or degrees and ends in the host country where a 2-month orientation to his job and to the ways of its people is conducted for volunteers.

INITIAL PROBLEMS OF THE VOLUNTEER

As so often happens, all the training and preparation suffered by the volunteer is not adequate enough to cope with the real circumstances. A training can at best tell someone what to expect and perhaps show how to deal cards when such and such a problem appears. But it cannot show the nuances attendant upon the individual problem.

Differences of languages, customs, and living habits contributed their usual share of problems to the foreign teacher's aids. The peculiar sensitivity of the Filipino to criticism inhibited the natural frankness of the volunteers. The discomforts of small town life, as always, proved deplorable, however decided the volunteer was beforehand that they were tolerable. But for the first contingent which was assigned to the Bicol and Negros regions, the main problem surprisingly registered in the limitation and ambiguity of their role as teacher's aids. In a missionary work where you watch classes, and do only occasional translation for the Filipino teachers, little enthusiasm can be elicited from the volunteer with an enthusiasm to teach and do things. On the whole, the officials responsible for planning the initial Corps program here failed to set definitions on the work of the educational aid.

Doubtless it was this which has given Time magazine reason to say: "The Corps largest program * * * in the Philippine Islands, where there are 600 'teachers' aids * * * has also been one of the least satisfying—at least to volunteers." The statement though foisted as a general comment must be seen for what it is—true only of a particular segment of the entire Peace Corps program here in our country. As early as June of 1962, new Peace Corps projects had been undertaken, branching out to secondary schools where volunteers serve as coteachers, to community development projects in Mindanao and even to colleges where freshman English could stand a lot of rehashing.

In these relatively new projects, the volunteers have expressed time and again satisfaction regarding their work and confidence that they are accomplishing what they set out to do. The country folks with whom they live and work primarily would be the last to contradict them. From them perhaps have emerged the needs of the Peace Corps myth. With regard to the high school project particularly, many school officials and teachers believe that with the marked superiority of the Peace Corps method of approaching science and mathematics subjects, eventually Filipino teachers will be using the same intuitive approach to such fields and consequent upon this a slight change in school curriculum.

Evident also is an attempt to improve the Peace Corps program in the elementary schools where the whole talk of dissatisfaction started. Volunteers have been promoted to coteacher status, which means that the PCV and her Filipino colleague take turns courting the imagination of wildeyed Filipino children.

Nonetheless, even under the most favorable conditions, tangible results may only be seen in an increase of enthusiasm on the part of the volunteers. No palpable and measurable results can really be found by way of a student's growth in learning unless seen in a perspective of years. As one volunteer has expressed it: "The important thing we are doing here is not that which can be measured with a camera. People in other projects can photograph a bridge they've designed or a road they helped build. But who can photograph the mind of a child? Our rewards in a project like this come with the satisfaction of seeing a child's face light up when he has learned to say 'fish' instead of 'fees' or 'hot' not 'hat.' We have had to learn and must continue to learn to accept an intangible gratification."

THE LIFE OF THE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER

Most, if not all, of the volunteers need no introduction to this intangible gratification in their work. For most satisfaction comes mainly from the wealth of experience they get while teaching and while living the Filipino way.

A consideration of the life of a Peace Corps volunteer reveals a creditable attempt to fit him into the life of his average Filipino counterpart. The volunteer receives P210 monthly allowance and, as often as not, he has the good or bad fortune (depending on the way you look at it) of living in the typical Filipino house, i.e., nipa thatches et al. A typical schoolday opens with waking up, wanders on to breakfast and a bicycle ride to the town public school. There begins the long repetitive pursuit of the muse for things that are of the mind. And then evening, of course, and finally another day and then another. On weekends if he is lucky and willing he might catch the showing of an ancient Bette Davis picture at the neighborhood theater. If he is not, well he can roam the countryside and catch winks of Filipino life in the fields or in the sea.

A dull life? Perhaps. No earthly life after all can stay forever amidst a clang of music, and in the small town and barrios of course, boredom and loneliness are more easily captured. The majority of the volunteers from the youngest who is 20 to the oldest who is 72, nevertheless, are not so eager to escape the consequences of their earlier choices. Free to return home when they want to, only a few have so far taken issue with their freedom. Many on the other hand have even devoted their yearly summer vacations to 52 additional and different projects ranging from camp counseling and agricultural work to summer theater. Earning special note for magnitude and resounding success were the following: Camp Brotherhood at Mambucal, Negros Occidental, where some 700 indigent teenagers gathered together and indulged in creative recreation; the special summer school conducted jointly by PCV's and Filipinos in Negros Occidental College; and the children's day camp initiated by volunteers in Naga City.

UNFORTUNATE INCIDENTS AND ACCIDENTS

Of course, the Peace Corps in the Philippines, as in all other countries, has had its share of unfortunate incidents and accidents. Only recently a Peace Corps returnee from the Philippines has been quoted in Miami, Fla., as saying that generally, Filipino students cheat and worse, Filipino teachers condone their act. This is doubtless a serious charge and one that knocks at the heart of Philippine education. Few Filipinos will admit that. It is quite possible, however, that the statement which is but a part of an article would mean differently if read in context. We can only hope that such is the case.

Misconduct in some measure has sent some volunteers home. One volunteer in Leyte has been flown back pregnant. Some say the Filipino culprit was much too persistent, the poor girl had no choice. So also Peeping Toms prowling Peace Corps homes have annoyed many girl volunteers in villages where split bamboo flooring is the architectural fashion. What can we say except that the PCV's have certainly reasons to be mad and that whoever are guilty should go out and hang themselves.

Tragedies, too, have taken their toll of the Peace Corps volunteers. David Mulholland died in June of 1962 of amebic dysentery. Two others, Philip Marquardt and Nancy Boyd, met their death during an airplane crash.

Considered, however, side by side on a balance sheet, the misfortunes are forgettable in comparison to happier events. Aside from the fact that the record of achievement of the Peace Corps here is, if we may use so strong a word, remarkable, little things like marriages for instance have helped light up the vicissitudes of Peace Corps work. There have been around 40 Peace Corps marriages according to the latest statistics. Eleven of these have been to Filipinos (six were male PCV's) while another 11 has been strictly Peace Corps volunteers' affair. The rest were to foreigners residing in the country.

In the same manner, the 20 volunteers from the first and second contingents who have chosen to extend their tours following the termination of their 20-month service is a happy occurrence particularly reassuring to Filipinos who are beginning to feel their country and their fellow men unlovable.

Viewed as a whole, there can be no doubt that the Peace Corps program has been a success devoutly to be wished by everyone. It has proved forever the reality of the suspicion that a direct and personal approach can do a lot more by way of peace and understanding among people than billions of dollars and U.S. foreign aid. The impulse of sacrifice and service which the Peace Corps stands for has happily passed on, commended and noticed by a large bulk of the free world.

For each of the volunteers, from whom all that has been done drew its sustenance, there is materially around $1,800 waiting for him at home in order that he can start getting settled again in the United States. Happily there is more, that they can call their compensation for the years of sacrifice and service. In the words of President Kennedy: "They will have acquired new skills and experiences which will aid them in their future careers and they will have returned better able to assume the responsibilities of American citizenship as with greater understanding of our global responsibilities."

Provocation by Reds in Germany Strictly in Keeping With Soviet Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago President Kennedy, officials of the State Department, and the newspapers across the land were hailing "the thaw in the cold war," and the "new intentions of the Soviet Union to seek peace with the West." Those of us who warned that Soviet intentions had not changed were ridiculed by the President and it was even hinted that we were warmongers, that we would be willing to sacrifice the lives of our children in some horrible war if we questioned the honesty and motives of Khrushchev as we begged him to sign a test ban treaty which he wanted in the first place.

The President got his way and we approved one more step in making it easier for the Communists. What has been the result in even this short period? Renewed arrogance by Khrushchev. A tougher attitude on Berlin which has resulted in stopping our military convoys to meet Communists rules. The past 2 days we have seen another attempt to make the United States bow to Soviet will.

It is true the convoy was at last allowed to move. The President has not yet told us if he made more concessions to Khrushchev in order to bring this about. Certainly there was no show of U.S. might or determination to bring an abrupt end to this humiliating procedure.

Now the news stories are changing. The press is daring to question Soviet motives as exemplified in this news item from today's Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Speaker, the amazing statement in this article is that a "high ranking U.S. authority said, 'what disturbs me is that it doesn't fit in with what they are trying to do at the top level.'" This is exactly what is wrong—high ranking U.S. authorities at the White House and State Department just do not understand communism or they are deliberately ignoring the true objective of the Soviet Union.

The action in halting our convoys in Germany fits in completely with the Soviet aim which is to win the cold war, destroy the United States, conquer the world. Thy do it by the steady process of creating incidents, then winning concessions from us to settle the incident they created, thus weakening us and strengthening them. We see this pattern repeated time after time as it was in Cuba last year, as it was in Laos, as it has been every time the Soviets stirred up trouble and then we gave in.

The article from the Wall Street Journal is a damning indictment of the failure of the Kennedy administration to meet the Communist threat. It should be clear to President Kennedy, as it is certainly clear to the majority of the American people that we must stop retreating before Soviet threats, that we must recognize once and for all the Communist objectives of world domination and that they will lie, cheat, steal, murder, make treaties, break agreements, disavow honor, all for the sake of victory.

The article follows:

END OF A THAW?—REDS' BERLIN SQUEEZE DIMS OUTLOOK FOR NEW EASING OF THE COLD WAR—ALLIES SEE CONTINUING PATTERN OF PROVOCATION, MISREADING OF WEST'S UNITY, RESOLVE—WORRIES DESPITE A BACKDOWN

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—Though allied authorities were breathing easier last night with the lifting of Russia's blockade on the Western Autobahn, the West's Soviet specialists were hastening to hedge, if not radically revise, some of the rosier recent readings of Kremlin mood and intent.

Russian permission for a U.S. troop convoy to proceed to Berlin from the East-West German border, after a stoppage of more than a day and a half, did little to dispel underlying doubts among students of Russian doings. Further Red nibbling at the exposed Western position in Berlin is fully expected.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev, most of these experts still agree, is beset by deep economic difficulties, weakened by political strife with the Red Chinese, chastened by last year's Cuba confrontation with the United States. He may even yearn genuinely for cold war "detente."

But his definition of "detente" clearly dosen't preclude strong-arm tactics to chip away at allied access rights to West Berlin, by way of trying to force a Berlin settlement on Soviet terms. Nor can it be argued that the lesson of last fall's Cuban missile crisis has greatly reduced Mr. Khrushchev's capacity for miscalculating Western will.

The result, as most Kremlin-watchers now see it, is that Mr. Khrushchev's supposed unreadiness to risk nuclear war with the West must now be rated as somewhat less reliable premise for Western policy. The Cuban missile crisis looks less and less like the "historic turning point" away from Soviet brinkmanship that many thought it to be. And prospects for a cold-war thaw, going much beyond last summer's partial atom test ban, must now be marked down as decidedly dim.

PUZZLED REACTION

Surprise, alarm and the usual measure of mystification characterized the reaction to the Russian squeeze yesterday among specialists on Soviet affairs both in and out of Government. "Extraordinary," said one allied official, adding "It's quite out of keeping with everything else." Commenting independently, a high-ranking U.S. authority voiced almost identical thoughts. "What distrubs me," he declared, "is that it doesn't fit in with what they are trying to do at the top level." Secretary of State Rusk, who briefed congressional leaders, was pictured afterward as "frankly puzzled" and the White House reported profound Presidential concern.

The cause for the concern lay less in the nature of the Russian action than the context. Similar Soviet interference with allied convoys last month could be written off as a one-shot affair and credited to low-level misunderstanding; that, in fact, was Washington's official line. But since then the allies had found occasion to state quite precisely their position on the seemingly petty procedural issue at stake: Whether the Russians have the right to demand a head-count of allied troops moving along the autobahns. Both orally and in a written memo, Russia was told a week ago that convoys carrying fewer than 30 troops, not counting drivers and their assistants, would not submit to a count. U.S. spokesmen yesterday insisted the convoy involved in the latest Russian blockade met this stipulation and therefore need not be counted.

Thus the latest Russian blockade became, in its way, almost as flagrant and frightening a test of Western will as the Soviet move to slip missiles into Cuba in the face of a clear warning that the U.S. could not tolerate such a move. And because Berlin by its nature as a Red-surrounded Western outpost is potentially the most explosive point of East-West contact, many experts could only conclude that Mr. Khrushchev still harbors alarming misconceptions about Allied unity and resolve.

WHO MAKES ACCESS RULES?

Right up to the blockade-lifting moment, the allies were standing firm, on public record against giving ground, and just as resolute in private talking, too. As allied strategists see it, the real question posed by Mr. Khrushchev is nothing so picayune as whether allied troops should dismount for a nose-count enroute to Berlin, but the basic issue of who makes the access rules. While the allies have retreated in a host of little ways on this question ever since the lifting of the big Berlin blockade in 1949, they still stand on the fundamental right to roll through Berlin on their own terms. "What the Russians are saying is they intend to make the rules," said one U.S. diplomat yesterday, and "this is intolerable."

If the West had not already given way a bit on this very point, by agreeing to the 30-man figure, it might have been easier to find a compromise way out of the latest impasse. But late yesterday, the allies were huddling among themselves, President Kennedy was meeting urgently with top advisers, and most of the emphasis was on possible resort to "contingency" plans for demonstrating the alliance's determination to have its way. While the planning was top-secret, the possibilities ranged from dispatching more allied troops to the scene to application of economic or other pressures on the Russians in points possibly quite remote from Berlin. All involved the danger of rapid "escalation" of the affair toward actual use of force.

Even though Mr. Khrushchev did back away last night, most experts see emerging quite plainly a pattern of provocation on the autobahn that points to continued tension-raising Russian pressures for some early break in the long stalemate over Berlin. And this is enough to throw into deep doubt some popular conceptions about the cold war's future course.

Assuming nothing more dire results, one upshot is certain to be less American eagerness to plunge into new understandings or agreements with the Russians. And an ironic byproduct may be something of a tonic for a host of ills now sapping alliance solidarity.

Some skeptics, dubious from the beginning about prospects for a real detente, are almost prepared to welcome a reminder from Russia that some crucial cold war questions remain to be solved—so long as the Berlin squeeze leads neither to shooting nor to allied concessions. The "Spirit of Moscow" conjured up by the Kremlin out of the Moscow test ban pact, these officials fear, threatens serious damage to allied cohesion and morale, encouraging interallied bickering, cutbacks in defense spending, and general euphoria.

Revival of the Berlin crisis as a live threat to Europe, this reasoning goes, could improve the climate for a number of pending measures for strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These include: A broad U.S.-backed plan for closer coordination and more equal sharing of the cost of NATO defense; a campaign to prod lagging

NATO partners to fulfill their troop obligations, and a program for a multilateral nuclear surface fleet armed with Polaris missiles and manned by mixed crews from a half dozen or more nations.

But if this is indeed the likely upshot of renewed Berlin tension, what's in it for Mr. Khrushchev?

Perhaps the simplest explanation the experts put forth is that, in the words of one, "the Russians are not always as cagey as we give them credit for being." The Kremlin, by this argument, may think it can sow more allied dissension by re-posing the Berlin threat; though there was no sign of dissension yesterday, past experience does suggest that a Berlin crisis does at least usually stir dark West German suspicions of an allied "sellout" of Berlin and of German reunification hopes.

More than possible Soviet misjudgment is almost certainly involved, however, according to the Kremlinologists. Though most now believe Mr. Khrushchev is in firm control, many see him under increasing pressure from Russian generals, fearful that the Soviet economic strains may bring defense cutbacks or just generally leery, as are some U.S. military men, of rushing headlong into a phony cold war truce.

The Red army press, experts note, has never been as enthusiastic about the test ban as the regular Soviet press. Some authorities picture Soviet military men as giving Mr. Khrushchev a heavily slanted view of Western military developments—citing the big airlift of U.S. troops to Berlin, for example, as evidence of Western belligerence calling for some of the same from the Soviet.

Another theory is that Mr. Khrushchev wishes to give West Germany's new Chancellor Erhard an early demonstration of what he's up against on the Berlin question or else to test whether he is as resolute as his predecessor, Konrad Adenauer.

But perhaps the most common explanation is simply that Mr. Khrushchev wants a tighter hold on Berlin, leading ultimately to total control over that Western outpost, and believes the time for Western concessions may be ripe.

One reason he might think so, say some Soviet specialists, is the enthusiasm of many in the West for the idea of a cold war thaw. This may have led Mr. Khrushchev to think the West won't want to jeopardize the outlook by making a big fuss over a seemingly slight issue in Berlin. "It's completely consistent for the Russians to try to take advantage of a thaw in this fashion," says one leading academic expert on Russia.

Others claim Western talk and action may have encouraged Russia to believe the West will always make concessions to avoid a Berlin blowup. Last month, it's noted, the West officially circulated the line that the brief blockade then may all have been a mistake made by low-level subordinates rather than a calculated Khrushchev plot.

Going back further, Berlin veterans recall that the big blockade did not really start in June of 1948 with a total clampdown, but in January of that year, with harassment comparable to the current moves. Not until the blockade was total did the West set out to break it with a massive airlift.

Resolutions Adopted by Delegate Assembly, Santa Clara County, Council of Churches, October 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Clara County Council of Churches represents 80 member churches. At its fall meeting in Los Altos, Calif., the assembly of the council passed two resolutions bearing on matters of great importance to this country. Dr. Albert M. Reynolds of the department of social education and action for the council, was kind enough to send me copies of the resolutions, and so that you may all have the benefit of the humane and responsible position they have taken on these two matters, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, OCTOBER 18, 1963

RESOLUTION ON SALE OF WHEAT TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Being motivated by the moral obligation to provide food when available to those in need; and

Ackknowledging that several Communist countries have requested to purchase U.S. wheat; and

Believing that the sale of U.S. wheat to Communist countries will provide still another step beyond the test ban toward reducing tensions and toward reconciliation between the nations of the world, the Assembly of the Santa Clara County Council of Churches endorses the recently negotiated sale of U.S. wheat to Communist countries and commends the President of the United States for his action in this matter.

RESOLUTION ON NEGOTIATIONS TO PROHIBIT NUCLEAR WEAPONS FROM ORBITING SPACE VEHICLES

Whereas the agreement negotiated by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union by the U.S. resolution, to prohibit the orbiting of nuclear weapons in space vehicles represents another step beyond the test ban toward controlling the arms race and reducing international tensions: Be it

Resolved, That the Assembly of the Santa Clara County Council of Churches commends and supports the negotiations by the U.S. Government of the agreement with the Soviet Union to prohibit nuclear weapons from orbiting space vehicles.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Carlisle Havelock Morrissett, Virginia's Tax Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia has earned worldwide respect for the fiscally sound operation of its government. This outstanding reputation has resulted from the work of many men—Governors and legislators who have demanded a balanced budget, administrators who have perfected their policies, and dedicated citizens who have accepted the fact that services cost money and that money must be raised through taxes.

For the last 44 years one of the great contributors to this reputation has been Virginia's present tax commissioner, my good friend, C. H. Morrissett. Mr. Morrissett's service to his State was the subject of a column in the October 31 issue of the Richmond News-Leader by the veteran reporter and columnist, Charles "Mike" Houston. I commend the column to you as an outstanding report of dedicated and faithful government service:

PAST FUTURE STILL ROLLING

(By Charles Houston)

Carlisle Havelock Morrissett is an affable enigma whose real influence on Virginia's way of life may never be accurately assessed.

"My future," smiles Judge Morrissett (who cackles and smiles even at unfunny things), "is behind me, I think."

Many who know Virginia best doubt that his future will ever really cease to unwind in Virginia.

Virginia's Tax Commissioner is a great deal more than merely that. In one capacity or another, he has served his State under a dozen Governors—Davis, Trinkle, Byrd, Pollard, Peery, Price, Darden, Tuck, Battle, Stanley, Almond, and Harrison—for 44 years.

He has become a beaming, bowing legend, self-effacing in a way, but always close and more or less anonymously at hand when a major decision is to be made, a major law to be drafted, or a major speech to be composed.

Only he and the principals can say certainly, but there was a time when the wise ones would listen to a politician in oratorical action and wink and say: "The voice is the voice of Mr. Big, but the words are the words of Morrissett."

A LEGISLATOR'S FIRST LESSON

I've watched generations of legislators confront this always-smiling little man—"5 feet, 5½ inches in my shoes"—with innocent confidence.

And they'd, as often as not, come away after a calm encounter bewildered, like a playful puppy backing off after a too familiar session with an experienced old cat.

The judge before his name originated in jest during the moot courts of law school days (LL.B. W. & L. 1914), but it lingered to evolve into an honorific epithet that seems to fit exactly.

Say something to him, and he'll disarm you with smiles and bows, and, on occasion, with a clapping of his hands and chuckles. You may think you're winning an argument hands down, but it isn't necessarily so. Trying to pin him down against his will is like trying to plop your finger on a skittering glob of quicksilver.

He doesn't win all his battles on the first attempt. There was the 1960 sales tax push, for instance. But he comes through unruffled.

Does he ever become angry?

"I find," he says, "that restraint is the better part of valor."

For 31 years, since its inception, he has been a member of the State compensation board, which keeps an eye on the salaries and expenses of former fee officers—sheriffs, treasurers and commissioners of the revenue. It is supposed to be the key to Virginia's organized political power—a big stick, as it were, that seldom has to be used.

Be that as it may, Judge Morrissett's soft words have an electric effect on local officials, like the crack of the ringmaster's whip on a circus horse.

In 1944 (for instance) he smilingly berated his commissioners of revenue in a 5-hour session. Grossly inefficient assessment of real estate at the local level, he said, was to blame for an annoying State political issue—a howling demand by localities for more State money for schools.

They'd make more friends, he said, by insisting on collecting all taxes that were just and due. Effective collection was not, he said, political suicide, but a way to salvation instead.

ON THE NATURE OF TAXPAYERS

It is natural, he told them, for people to avoid taxpaying as long as possible, but they're not angered when brought to taw.

"The commissioners," he said the other day, "have improved much in diligence, but there's still room for improvement."

Have his ideas of government changed much?

"I subscribe, generally, to Jefferson's idea, that the Government that governs least governs best. But we must keep up with the times, and times have changed since Jefferson."

He judges the future like Patrick Henry, by the past, and concludes that governments at all levels experience need for more revenues. A further conclusion: if a government does not respond to the people's needs, the people will soon replace it.

A government must expend its revenues wisely, and what is wise is a subject for everlasting debate.

Social security, for instance, seemed bad to him at first, but now he sees its benefits—"which goes to show," he says, "that we can change our minds."

Judge Morrissett is 71. His present term runs to 1966. Another tax commission (the Stanley study) wound up its work yesterday. Another general assembly is due in January to look to him for guidance.

Once upon a time he took leave as teacher of the Tom Hundley Bible Class at the Seventh Street Christian Church whenever the general assembly was in session, and I used to kid him that not even he could mix politics and religion.

When the latest study began, I asked if he was on leave. He was pleasantly apprehensive that this one might be enough to make him lose his religion completely.

Judge Morrissett has no hobbies. Taxes are his business, and the main body of the law is his recreation.

He still reads a lot—three newspapers, some magazines, and keeps up with Dick Tracy, Orphan Annie, Mark Trail, Judge Parker, and Mandrake. He uses television "temperately," the radio hardly at all.

Judge Morrissett has made but one little concession to the passing years. He goes to bed at 10 now, instead of in the wee hours. But he's still old fashioned enough to go to his office every Saturday.

Walter Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in the November 2, 1963, issue of the Washington Post, there appeared an article by Bob Addie entitled "The Pitcher and the School."

The article concerns the great Walter Johnson, of Weiser, Idaho, who is best known for his career as a pitcher for the Washington Senator's baseball team from 1907 to 1928, and the high school in Washington, D.C., that has been named in his memory.

The Walter Johnson High School stands as a great tribute to one of Idaho's outstanding citizens. As Mr. Addie has pointed out in his column, although the Walter Johnson High School was not completed until 1957, it has already become one of the finest in the country scholastically. I am sure that the citizens of Idaho join me in the pride we share in the naming of this fine school.

I ask that the full text of Mr. Addie's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PITCHER AND THE SCHOOL

(By Bob Addie)

There are high schools named for poets, statesmen, authors, educators, inventors, military heroes, and saints, but, as far as I know, there is only one ever named for a baseball player.

That would be Walter Johnson Senior High School in Bethesda out on Old Georgetown Road. It is a beautiful edifice and, like most schools throughout the country, already is being expanded.

Walter Johnson High was finished in 1957 but the population boom out that way has been tremendous. Years ago, when Walter Johnson, the man, was Washington's great pitcher, "the Big Train," as he was called, decided to settle out in the country.

He lived off Old Georgetown Road about a mile from the site of the high school named for him. Later on, he bought a 553-acre farm in Germantown, Md., and intended to spend the rest of his days there.

It perhaps was instinctive for a Kansas farm boy to return to the soil which nurtured him. Johnson was born in Humboldt, Kans., on November 6, 1887, which would have made him 76 next week.

He died on December 10, 1946 and was buried on a dark, dreary, rainy day. It occurred to practically all the sportswriters who wrote his obituary that even the skies wept for the decent man who enriched baseball with his records and his gentlemanly approach.

It's possible that some day St. Louis may name a school after Stan Musial, cut from the same nice-guy mold as Walter Johnson. Maybe it won't happen. Some people recently tried to name a street in St. Louis after Musial but the residents balked.

There was no objection to naming the new school out on Old Georgetown Road for the man who was discovered in Weiser, Idaho, by a disabled catcher named Cliff Blankenship on a scouting tour.

Blankenship had broken his finger in the summer of 1907. Never one to keep a fellow on the payroll idle, the Washington club sent Blankenship to Idaho to look at the young "phenom" who had been touted by a Washington traveling salesman.

Johnson was signed and joined the club immediately. His debut came on August 2, 1907, and he lost to the Detroit Tigers, 3 to 2. He left the game trailing in the eighth by 2 to 1 but his fame was assured.

Years later, a testimonial dinner was held in Washington for the modest pitcher. Each man at the banquet wore a white ribbon with the inscription: "I saw Walter Johnson pitch his first game."

Of course, not many did. The crowd was estimated at 5,000 on the day Johnson broke in. Oddly enough, the man who was to set the alltime strikeout record of 3,497, struck out only 3 in his debut.

Sir Walter pitched for 21 years and compiled a record of 416 victories to 279 defeats. Appropriately enough, he was among the first five selected to the Hall of Fame in 1936. The others were Babe Ruth, Ty Cobb, Honus Wagner, and Christy Mathewson.

It is possible that the high school named after Johnson will be more enduring than the niche he enjoys in the Hall of Fame. Certainly, Walter, a humble man, would have been proud that a great high school (Walter Johnson High already is among the finest in the country scholastically) should be named for him.

There are many evidences of the baseball heritage of Walter Johnson High and it's nice to report that the authorities aren't a bit ashamed that they've been "saddled" with the name of a baseball player instead of a poet, statesman, et cetera.

As you come into the main entrance of the high school, there is a waist-length portrait of Walter showing him in his Washington uniform. A spotlight shines on the placid features of the self-effacing farm boy who became a national sports hero.

Underneath the portrait are two scuffed baseballs, each bearing the neat signature of Walter Johnson.

There are other evidences of the high school's tribute to the baseball hero. The yearbook is called "The Windup." Students are urged to "make a pitch" for various clubs and activities.

The students are constantly aware of their "patron saint" and seem to take delight in their uniqueness.

Perhaps the deeds of Walter Johnson have been "writ on water," but his fame is engraved in the hearts of the young people forever. Walter Johnson remains ever young with the young in heart. No man could have asked for a better epitaph and no man was more deserving.

Youngest Army Pilot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, a young native of Greenfield, Mass., is, according to reliable sources, the youngest pilot in the U.S. Army. It is always an interesting news story when a young man is the first in his chosen profession, or the youngest. An interesting article from the Greenfield, Mass., Recorder Gazette recently summarized the life and interest of James Sterling Neal, a flight officer in the Army aviation program, who will soon join the 11th Air Assault Division at Fort Benning, Ga. With many residents of the First District of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in the accomplishments of this young man. The article follows:

NEAL YOUNGEST PILOT IN ARMY

Greenfield can now boast that one of its natives is the youngest pilot in the Army.

M. Sgt. Mike Cascone, station commander for Army recruiting in the county, today announced appointment of James Sterling Neal, 21, son of Mrs. Rosamand T. Neal, of 65 Harrison Avenue, to warrant officer W-1 in the Army aviation program as flight officer.

The first appointment from this area also makes Neal the youngest Army pilot.

A 1960 graduate of Greenfield High School, Neal was a member of the varsity tennis and football teams 3 years.

In September 1962, he enlisted in the guaranteed warrant officer's Army aviation program for 2 years, in the flight training program. He completed 8 weeks of basic training at Fort Ord, Calif., was sent to Fort Wolters, Tex., completed 4 weeks of preflight schooling and training. Then he successfully completed 27 weeks in the flight training rotary wing school and 16 additional weeks of armed helicopter tactics at Fort Wolters, with another 4 weeks of such training at Fort Sill, Okla.

On October 18, he was appointed a warrant officer and given his flight wings. Neal started in a class of 120 candidates which graduated 46.

Prior to entering the Army, he was an actor with Henry Wilson's Agency, of Hollywood, Calif. He is home on a 30-day leave visiting his mother and will report to Fort Benning, Ga., as a pilot in the 11th Air Assault Division.

Cascone said the warrant officer Army aviation program is open for a 2-year enlistment period for high school graduates who can meet the prerequisites. Open in this program are rotary wing training—38 weeks of training and schooling—and fixed wing training which consists of 42 weeks of training and schooling.

"Individuals spend thousands of dollars to learn how to fly in either fixed wing or rotary wing aircraft," said Cascone. "Here is a program in which young men can learn to fly, fulfill their military obligation, and become a warrant officer in the Army's aviation program with an unlimited earning potential, including 30 days paid vacation yearly. Where else can one top that?" asks Cascone, whose office is located at 27 Federal Street.

National Honor Society Incentive to Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, next week, November 10–16, is National Education Week. It was fitting that the House approved the Conference Report on the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 in advance of the observance. It is also fitting to take note of the fine job that is being done by our high schools in preparing students for college. One key to continued interest in school and perhaps one of the keys to the dropout problem is recognition of able students at the high school level. This job is being done by the National Honor Society. Founded 42 years ago, the National Honor Society today boasts 11,000 chapters in 50 States. Consistently high standards have contributed to the respect with which the society is regarded by teachers, parents and students. A fine article outlining the history and purposes of the National Honor Society appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle Tribune on October 31. Under unanimous consent I insert the article by George J. Gelineau in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NATIONAL HONOR SOCIETY INCENTIVE TO STUDENTS

(By George J. Gelineau)

"Tremendous. A real asset to the process of education and a true incentive for work in today's classroom."

Generally speaking, educators hereabouts feel this just about sums up their regard for the National Honor Society.

A few are even more explicit. They see membership in the organization as the challenge necessary to stimulate a peak effort by college-bound students—a graphic comparison to the increasing high school dropout rate.

The society was founded 42 years ago to promote high scholarship, constructive leadership, purposeful service and worthy character. In pursuing these objectives the National Association of Secondary School Principals has seen more than 11,000 chapters established throughout the 50 States with membership drawn from the 3 years of senior high schools. In addition there have been established over 2,500 chapters comprising 9th and 10th grade pupils in junior high schools and those from grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 in 6-year high schools.

Over the years, the society has administered a scholarship fund amounting to close to $350,000 and has provided scholarship awards as well as certificates of merit to outstanding students going to college. The association feels these identify most promising school youth annually and thus encourages them through scholarship to continue their education.

MEMBERSHIP RESTRICTED

High school membership is restricted to a scholarship average of B or 85 percent,

or its equivalent. This level of achievement must remain fixed. With this average as the focal point, the student then is considered on service, leadership, and character. Election is by a chapter council comprising the principal and members of the faculty.

Members who fall below standards that were the bases of election are promptly warned. If a member fails in the next marking period, the case is referred to the faculty council and he is dismissed from membership.

With this background in mind, let's see how the society has been received throughout this area. Of the Greater Lawrence public high schools, this city is the sole nonaffiliate. The majority of parochial secondary schools have formed chapters. The students themselves react favorably.

One comment typifies their general feeling: "Athletes always were recognized for their ability. The brainy student never was made to feel that he or she was something special. The National Honor Society is the answer to the pride a school should share with pupils who hit the books instead of hitting the line on the gridiron."

INGALLS ENTHUSIASTIC

Let's turn to the educators to see how they feel. Superintendent Walter B. Ingalls of Methuen is highly enthusiastic. He echoes the thoughts of the students. "Athletes gain glory on the field of play but not much of anything was ever done for the real pupil," he says, as he points out that the National Honor Society has filled that void.

The Methuen system even goes further. It awards a special pin to students on the honor roll for two consecutive marking periods. "An added scholastic incentive," comments the superintendent. "This pin and the society are inspiring our kids to greater scholastic heights."

LAWRENCE PROGRAM

In Lawrence, the picture is different.

There are some facets that did not appeal to a study committee charged by the school board to look into the possibility of inaugurating the program for local students. Supt. James F. Hennessey, Asst. Supt. James A. Griffin and Headmaster Daniel F. Sullivan considered the National Honor Society and the Pro-Merito Society, generally recognized as the top national organizations carrying status for students accepted to membership.

The subject was discussed pro and con for some time before the three men proposed a pin award through which Lawrence high students now are honored for their achievements. Instead of membership in a society, the pupils are presented with an L pin which, school officials hope, will carry as much status and give them as much deserved recognition as the L award does for star athletes.

CITE DRAWBACKS

The National Honor Society, though recognized as an outstanding organization by the local school administrators, has several drawbacks they felt placed it behind the L pin as far as an ideal award for local students was concerned.

The three men were chiefly bothered by such items as the following: A charter fee which could be changed at the discretion of the national chapter (the amount); local units must conform with all rules and regulations of the national organization * * * all pins, certificates, membership cards, rings, charms, and so forth for distribution to students must be purchased from the national headquarters * * * the organization sets up a percentage quota for membership, thus limiting the number of students who can qualify though they might have a top scholastic achievement. (L award affords more students an opportunity for recognition). Overall, the three-man committee felt because of the interest shown by the faculty and students, the award was one that would go further in affording recognition for deserving boys and girls.

GREAT INCENTIVE

"A mark of distinction and a great incentive for good scholarship." North Andover's Supt. Douglas A. Chandler sums up his thoughts thusly.

And, he adds: "Anything to encourage scholarship among students is to be desired and achieved."

In Andover, Superintendent Edward I. Erickson finds that the National Honor Society contributes a great deal to the life and stimulation of the student." It is meaningful and tiptop in every way," he says.

These are the thoughts of Greater Lawrence's foremost educators. They agree that recognition for outstanding students is a must.

The National Honor Society is the answer in three of the four systems hereabouts.

Bloody Road to Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the bizarre and shocking developments in South Vietnam in connection with the overthrow of the Diem government by force should cause every Member of this House to pause and reflect on the moral character of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. In our striving to gain friends and influence around the world, we have always avoided practices which might resemble the Kremlin's brutal enforcement of its influence in the Soviet satellite nations.

An editorial which appeared in the November 4 issue of the Chicago Daily News entitled "Bloody Road to Power," sets forth appropriate and timely subjects for the administration to ponder in this dark hour.

I am calling this editorial to the attention of my colleagues, the administration, and others who are reflecting on this most recent development in South Vietnam:

BLOODY ROAD TO POWER

If the Communists had overthrown the regime in South Vietnam, murdered its rulers, and launched a day of pillage and destruction, there would have been honor and mourning throughout the capitals of the West. Because this coup was led by Buddhists and the military, there was something close to rejoicing.

This double standard is offensive to the moral principles we profess to be upholding in Vietnam. The odds are heavy that the revolt had the approval, if not the active encouragement, of American officials. The memory of Cuba's Battista is too recent to permit any confidence that this bloody game necessarily produces favorable long-run results.

Viewed in the harsh realism of world power, however, it is probable that our immediate objectives in South Vietnam will proceed with more dispatch. Nevertheless, many Americans will experience the revulsion that sometimes comes when one who's fond of roast beef happens to visit an abbatoir.

We are fighting a political war in South Vietnam, and the Diem regime had lost the support of the people. It was Diem who ousted the playboy Emperor Bao Dai, and defied Ho Chi Minh, the Vietnamese Communist leader. Three years ago, Diem defeated an attempted coup by disgruntled military and civilian elements. He gained from the Parliament the right to rule by decree, which advanced into tyranny. His apparent dedication to the prosecution of the war won the high approval of U.S. military leaders, and our policy became one of standing or falling with Diem.

Recently, however, the diplomatic corps headed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge came to the conclusion that removal of President Diem was essential to victory. Thereupon began the economic and diplomatic pressures upon him which made it clear to his opponents that a successor regime could have the prompt recognition of the United States. One of these pressures was to stop paying the élite corps which Diem used as a palace guard, and to insist that these troops be used against the Communists.

The smoke has not blown away sufficiently to reveal whether the new regime will have to carry the onus of having been contrived by the United States. It will surely be so labeled by the Communists and by Diem's supporters, too, as Mme. Nhu has already made clear.

Perhaps it should be recalled that we are engaged in Vietnam because of our conviction that our interests would suffer grievously if Communist hegemony were further extended in southeast Asia. But since we took over the burden the French were carrying in Indochina there has been one phenomenal change in the world political outlook.

That is the demonstration, through the growing hostility between Red China and the Soviet Union, that world communism does not necessarily speak with one voice and pursue identical objectives. It is just possible that Bertrand Russell was right all along, and that the ferment in Asia was far more pro-Asian and antiwhite than it was pro-Communist.

It would be a fearful political risk for President Kennedy to speculate out loud on the possibility that we are committing 15,000 troops and a half-billion dollars a year in Vietnam in quest of an unattainable end, namely, nations emotionally committed to Western politicoeconomic ideas.

But if the new regime in Vietnam achieves no more success than the old one against the Vietcong, some fundamental reappraisal will be in order. It is pointless to get so involved in the game that we lose sight of the stakes. And it is self-defeating to grow so avid in advancing our interests that we do not care how dirty our hands get in the process.

To Sell Wheat or Not To Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, if it has done nothing more, the proposed sale of wheat to Russia has precipitated a great controversy among those with the greatest interest—the producers.

The following reprint which appeared in the November 5 issue of Wall Street Journal raises some rather pertinent questions:

UNCLE SUCKER?

Many Americans apparently have convinced themselves that no harm will be done by

selling wheat to the Russians at the present time. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman is said to have discovered through unofficial polls that three out of four farmers favor such sales to the Communists. A lot of other people have dug into public thinking on this, too, and they have discovered that farmers and others favor sales (1) to reduce the surplus, (2) to get some Red money, and (3) because someone else will sell wheat to them anyway, and it might as well be us. All of these are good capitalistic motives * * *. But they do overlook all political consequences of trade with the Communists, and that is dangerous at best, disastrous at worst.

There is at least one farmer we know who hasn't overlooked the political repercussions stemming from wheat sales to the Soviets. Such repercussions occurred amazingly right on his farm on Tuesday, October 1, 1963. That was the day that bread rationing was begun in Moscow. It was the day that Khrushchev made a speech, and it was the day our farmer acquaintance decided to sell his soybeans (not wheat). How all these things got linked together in a way that made our friend fighting mad is something every American farmer should think about.

First of all, the farmer called his local elevator and asked what it was paying for beans. The answer was $2.48 a bushel. The farmer said, "I'll be right in with a load, and pay my bill, too."

In Moscow, U.S.S.R., about that time, Premier Khrushchev told his people: "If we use bread economically, the resources we have will be sufficient for the normal supply of the population." This word, passed along like lightning to American grain traders, meant to them that U.S. wheat might not be needed at all. It scared them so much, in fact, that those contacted by our friend's country elevator withdrew all their bids on soybeans. By the time our friend got to his elevator, asked for instructions to dump, his elevator wasn't buying any beans at any price. Not one bushel could he sell them. From the time he left his farm to the time he got to town, his market had evaporated.

"Why?" he demanded.

"Khrushchev says he doesn't want our wheat," was the reply.

And so, logically or illogically, depending on how you view it, the supersensitive soybean market momentarily went all to pieces. Our friend trucked his beans home, where he waited for the market to recover. He still wants to sell beans but is not one bit inclined to sell wheat to the Communists.

"It's not that simple," he says. "If we sell them wheat in a regular manner, it would be all right. But every time we do something with those Communists, they make monkeys out of us. They made a monkey out of me on Tuesday. They're making monkeys out of our Government people right now. And the next thing you know, we won't be giving them permission to buy our grain. No, sir, we will be begging them to buy it. And then they will make it look as if they did us a big favor if they take it.

"Khrushchev planned the whole thing. He knew after four crop failures, he couldn't stand a fifth without buying free world grain. He did us the favor of signing a test ban treaty to soften us up. He dangled a wheat dollar in front of us and bought what he needed first in Canada. Next, like a smart buyer, he said he didn't want it anyway. Now, when he permits us to sell him some wheat, we'll let him have it at a 20-percent discount and pay for it like a new car over 18 months. Khrushchev then will effectively have control of our farm markets, and grain dealers will dance at his command. Deal with the Communists? Not me," he said.

What our friend was saying, in other words, is that Communists use economics as a political weapon. Every trade serves a dual purpose if they can make it do so. If we ignore or take lightly the political consequences of trade with Communist Russia, Uncle Sam will be Uncle Sucker again. It has happened so many, many times. Does it have to happen again?—Drovers Journal (Chicago).

Art Hoppe in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of our favorite columnists does get around the world and makes noteworthy observations wherever he may be.

I believe the readers of the RECORD will find his comments during a recent visit to England of interest and quite amusing:

WILL OXFORD LOSE ITS FACULTIES?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

OXFORD, ENGLAND.—The Labor Party, which is favored to win next year's elections, is vaguely thinking about abolishing Oxford and Cambridge as the peculiarly British institutions they are and making them into "more normal universities." Like "Oxford Normal" and "Cambridge Normal," I suppose.

So naturally I hustled up here to see what was going to be abolished. And after a day's tour my sympathies lie with the Labor Party. Or at least with the Labor Party official who might have to come up here to abolish the place. I can see him now, a plain-talking Yorkshireman probably, as he marches into the offices, say, of the president of Magdalen College.

Official: "Nice college you've got here, sir. Bit of a shame to see old Magdalen go."

President: "We pronounce it 'Mawdlin,' old boy. And the demies will be sorry to hear of your plans. We've got about 50 now, you know. All topnotch scholars."

Official: "All studying hard in their classrooms now that the Michaelmas term has started, eh?"

President: "'Mikklemuss.' And we don't have classrooms. None of the colleges do, including All Souls. Which doesn't have any students either."

Official: "Odd bit, that. Well, if you'll kindly call the presidents of the colleges together——"

President: "You mean the 21 old colleges, probably; sorry, but only 4 have presidents. Two are run by masters, two by rectors, three by provosts, four by principals, one by a dean and five by wardens, including Wadham (pronounced 'Waddum') which is run by the wahden of Waddum. Of course that does not include the three new foundations, five permanent private halls, five societies of women students and Nuffield College, which was only founded in 1937 so we haven't figured out yet what it is precisely."

Official: "Now look here, sir; enough of that. We plan to abolish this here university and——"

President: "Oh, the university. You're in the wrong place, old boy. You'll want to see the bedels."

Official: "The beetles?"

President: "Righto. The bedels of the Hebdomadal Council. I suppose you might say they run the university."

Official: "Now we're getting somewhere. We'll have the beetles demolish the colleges and——."

President: "Oh, you can't do that. The university has no control over the colleges. It merely provides lecture halls and laboratories through the faculties, which in turn——"

Official: "Never mind, sir. I've decided to go abolish Cambridge first."

President: "Good. But hold off until they celegrate May Week, won't you? After all, that doesn't come till the middle of June."

So I think Oxford and Cambridge are safe. They have that enduring quality of all British institutions. Which endure, if you ask me, because nobody can understand them well enough to abolish them. Including the British.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 29, 1963]

WE AMERICANS ARE UNQUESTIONABLE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—It's high time I got back to telling you what an international conference is like. And you'd like it. It's a lovely life.

We have breakfast at 8:30; read the newspapers; have tea; attend a 2-hour morning session; eat lunch; chat, stroll, or play tennis; have tea; attend a 2-hour afternoon session; eat dinner; attend a 2-hour evening session; and chat and drink until 11. It's not only pleasant, but stimulating. Because if you've never attended an international conference before, you've got a lot to learn.

Like how to ask questions.

Nothing's more important. You see, they send these truly brilliant experts down from London for each session—ministers, scientists, economists, and the like. The expert opens the session with an hour-long extemporaneous address. And then the warden of Wilton Park, Dr. H. Koeppler, who is kind of our den mother, invites us to ask the expert questions. And while our warden is not only a highly intelligent but very kindly man, he dearly loves us to ask questions. Or else.

Unfortunately, when his eye lights sternly on me, the only question I can think of putting to the expert might be phrased: "What, Lord Curmudgeon, in hell were you talking about?"

This would be very bad form. It's not so much the question. It's the way I put it. The proper method is to begin by telling the expert what you think. Or, more accurately, what a lot of other people think. Like: "There is a considerable body of opinion in East Peoria, Sir Jocelyn, as confirmed by 16 Gallup polls, a WCTU survey, and the entrails of a love-sick sheep, that * * *." And so forth. And if you go on for at least 10 minutes, you can then ask him what the hell he was talking about. Because nobody will be listening. Including the expert. Who will use his turn at the microphone, anyway, to make a point he forgot to make in his speech. Such as the increased egg production in western Oxfordshire.

Of course, how you ask your 10-minute question depends on your nationality. If you are Spanish, you must include a defense of Spain's economic development. The Portuguese are different. They must include a defense of Portugal's colonial policy.

The Italians just get emotional and never, ever mention statistics. The French are precisely the same except they're very belligerent about it. The Germans, on the other hand, must do nothing but cite figures in their 10-minute questions. Which invariably take 20 minutes to ask, due to the length of German verbs and the requirement that any public statement in German must be soporific. As for the British, they don't care what they say as long as they phrase it properly.

That leaves us Americans. Well, we just kind of bumble along, asking brief questions out of naive curiosity and usually uninten-

tionally offending one group or another. Honestly, with the way we conduct ourselves at these international conferences, I can't understand how we Americans could possibly have a friend left in the world.

And yet every night at the bar after the sessions, our European friends gather warmly around us. Such surprisingly forgiving people. Really, it's a privilege to keep on buying them drinks.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 30, 1963]

A FIENDISH NEW COMMUNIST POLICY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—Oh, that Mr. Khrushchev is a sly dog. He's one-upped us again. Remember how Mr. Kennedy magnanimously suggested United States-Soviet cooperation in the moon race? So it would end in a tie? At last we have Mr. Khrushchev's answer: Nyet. The proud Russian people, he says proudly, will settle for nothing less than total defeat.

"We do not want to compete in sending people to the moon," he now says blandly. And as for the Americans $40 billion effort to get there first: "We wish them," he adds politely, "luck."

There goes peaceful coexistence. We are faced, fellow Americans, with a far more fiendish Communist policy: competitive unresistance.

Oh, it strikes at the one weakness in the American character. For while we are imbued with the will to win, we can't stand licking somebody who isn't trying. Competitive unresistance, let me warn you, will sap our will to resist.

And if there are skeptics, let me merely point out that already our Congressmen are saying we must stop trying so hard to get to the moon. If the Communists aren't racing us, they ask, why should we go? So already, by conceding us victory, Mr. Khrushchev has thrown our whole moon program into grave danger.

This initial smashing success of competitive unresistance is bound to lead the Kremlin on. First, of course, they will give up competing with us for the loyalties of the poor countries. At a stroke, they will knock off Soviet aid to 47 nations from Aardvarkia to Zululand.

You can imagine the reaction of our Congressmen: "And I want to say, gentlemen, that if this here Aardvarkia ain't good enough for the Commies, it ain't good enough for us." And there goes our whole foreign aid program.

Eventually, in self defense, we would be forced into trying to beat the Communists at their own game. Just as we always have. Oh, I can see the press dispatches flowing in now:

MOSCOW.—Premier Khrushchev today announced the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East Berlin. "So who," he said in a major policy statement, "needs it?"

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy retaliated tonight by abandoning West Germany and tossing in France. "My only regret," he said with a brave smile, "is that we have but one General de Gaulle to give for our country."

MOSCOW.—Soviet troops marched home from the Balkans and Cuba today. A White House announcement giving up Mississippi was expected momentarily. Meanwhile, the dismantlement of Russian rockets continued at a feverish pace and * * *.

Oh, there's no question about it. This new Kremlin policy of competitive unresistance will cripple our whole foreign policy. For, as you know, we do absolutely nothing in the world today unless it 'aids in the fight against communism." And if they won't fight?

Of course, we could do some things for other reasons. Like maybe feeding people because they're hungry. Or reaching for the moon because we believe the future of our race lies in the stars. But would Congress buy that? Nonsense. It's unrealistic.

So I say we must meet this new Soviet threat head on. We must abolish our moon program, knock off foreign aid and do our utmost, fellow Americans, to make our Nation a second-rate power. But cheer up. I'm certain we can count on Congress.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 31, 1963]

OUR SCANDALS ARE A REAL SCANDAL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

LONDON.—What a lucky break. Here is this high-level Government sex scandal breaking in Washington. And here I am in England, mother of parliaments, cultural center of the English-speaking world, and home of the high-level Government's sex scandal.

Being an ace newsman, my first thought was, naturally: "An analytical piece." And my second, of course: "Miss Christine Rice-Cristies." Who is, undeniably, a leading expert on the whole subject. With incredible luck I managed to catch Miss Rice-Cristies alone in the salon of her mews house. Between appointments with her lawyer and her publisher.

"What can I do for you, Love?" she asked, sinking into her Louis Cinq sofa and crossing one scantily clad knee over the other. "A magazine series? A Sunday supplement article?"

No, I said, I was seeking her expert analysis of this big sex scandal in Washington involving this beautiful German girl and * * * "What did she do?" inquired Miss Rice-Cristies, showing interest. Well, I said, nobody seemed to know, but she was denying it vigorously.

"A shame that," said Miss Rice-Cristies. "A denial always hurts book sales later. And who is the Cabinet Minister involved? War Ministers are best. But I supposed even an Under Secretary would do in a pinch."

Well, I said, we did not exactly have a Cabinet Minister involved. But the name of Mr. Bobby Baker was cropping up. And he used to be secretary to the Senate majority leader.

"Really?" she said, suppressing a yawn. "Pretty small potatoes, if you ask me. But go ahead, love. Tell me the parts about the girls in the pool and the whippings and the nude man in the mask. I am sure you Americans must have come up with something new."

Well, I said, very hangdog, there was not much of that so far. But we had hopes. Mr. Baker's secretary was once named "Miss Peace." And we ace newsmen had dug up incontrovertible evidence proving his chauffeur was arrested last year for speeding. But other than that, I admitted, the scandal seemed mostly over financial deals.

"Oh, simple corruption," said Miss Rice-Cristies with a sniff. "Is not that just like you Yanks? Really, no offense, but you have no talent at all for a proper scandal. Lack of tradition, I suppose. Now when you look back over a thousand years of English history, think of the glorious names that leap from the pages: Lady Hamilton, Nell Gwyn, Lady Castlemaine * * * I say, how is that for a title? 'Me and Nell Gwyn.' Do run along, love. I have to write."

Alas, it is true. And you can not blame the British for looking down their noses at our lack of cultural traditions. But we keep trying. And as a patriotic American I can only hope this current Washington scandal will blossom passionately. Can we not link Mr. L. B. What's-his-name with Madame Nhu? Or something?

For while I love the British dearly, at the moment they are insufferable. Oh, I do not mind a whit their superiority in manners, dress, and language. But if there is one thing I cannot stand, it is their sexier-than-thou attitude.

Soviet Inhumanity to Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, every American citizen who today breathes the air of freedom is truly indebted to Haym Salomon, whose great financial assistance to the cause of the American Revolution left his family practically penniless at his death in 1785.

Were he alive today, Salomon would undoubtedly be in the forefront demanding that the persecution of his Jewish coreligionists in the U.S.S.R., along with the oppression of the other captive states, be publicized and acted upon in the United Nations. He would also have found it ironic that the nation which he helped to establish would later condone by silence and inaction a program of persecution similar to the one he fought and detested.

The following two items graphically illustrate just one aspect of Soviet oppression against the Jewish people. The letter to the editor of the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel and the news item from the Urbana (Ill.) Jewish Chronicle, should be thoroughly digested by all those who favor the sale of wheat to Russia, while at the same time remaining strangely silent concerning the persecution of the Jewish, and other captive, peoples.

To help publicize this program of Soviet inhumanity to man, I include the following items in the RECORD:

WHY PLACE BREAD IN THE MOUTHS OF THOSE WHO WON'T GIVE US MATZO?

DEAR EDITOR: For the past few weeks the American press has made headlines over the probable sale of wheat to the Communists. All seem to forget the Russian drive to bury us. The most successful plan of burying the Jews spiritually, culturally, and ethnically in Russia may give further comfort to anti-Semites here and abroad.

Should we as Jews in the United States sit back and condone the placing of bread in the mouths of Communists who condemn Jews to jail sentences for buying a piece of matzo? Buying matzo or a Jewish religious book earns the buyer a sentence of 10 years; but will Khrushchev and his fellow party members get a sentence to Siberia for buying wheat from American speculators? Absolutely not.

If there is one thing that oppressors hate, it is that of being constantly exposed. Put the pressure on. Write the Agriculture Department in Washington. Tell the administration what you think. This is not a case of beating a dead horse. The Communists will give ground only if you show sufficient opposition. The Jew who is a libertarian for everybody else surely owes it to himself in terms of self-respect to rise up in wrath.

Sincerely your,

MEYER WIDREVITZ.

MOSCOW COURT UPHOLDS CONVICTION OF JEWS FOR HOME-BAKED MATZOTH

LONDON (WNS).—Three Russian Jews who were sentenced last July to prison terms ranging from 6 months to 1 year for selling home-baked matzoth had their appeal turned down by the appeals court in Moscow, ac-

cording to reports reaching here from the Soviet Union.

The convicted Jews were Golko Bogomolny, a Jewish ritual butcher, who received a 1-year penalty, 52-year-old Klavdia Blykhman and 59-year-old Mrs. Malka Brio, who each got 6 months. The Soviet Union had forbidden bakeries to bake matzoth for Passover, but there were semiofficial intimations that Jews could bake in their homes. In fact, the chief rabbi of Moscow so stated in one of his sermons in which he said Jews would not remain without matzoth since they could bake their own. It was believed among Moscow's Jews that the chief rabbi would not have made that statement unless it were previously cleared with authoritative sources. The three convicted Jews denied they were selling the matzoth, claiming they baked the matzoth for distribution among Jewish neighbors. During their trial, their lawyer called the court's attention to the fact that Christian religious groups in the Soviet Union were treated less harshly in their religious observances.

The three Jews, it was reported, are planning to carry their appeal to the Supreme Court of the Russian Federated Republic.

Foreign Policy Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the New York Times and is dated September 24, 1963.

The letter is written by former Congressman Hamilton Fish, who served on the Foreign Affairs Committee during his term of office.

The letter is timely and shows Mr. Fish's continued interest in the foreign policy of our country:

NEW YORK, N.Y.
September 24, 1963.

FOREIGN POLICY ASSAILED

To The EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

President Kennedy admits the responsibility for the tragic fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, but does he admit his responsibility for destroying the Monroe Doctrine and permitting thousands of Russian soldiers, contrary to its traditional principles, to organize Cuba into a fortress, build submarine bases and headquarters for Communist propaganda in South and Centeral America?

Does he admit the responsibility for the shambles in South Vietnam, where gangsters in the pay of the CIA are waging a religious war and undermining the will in the people to fight communism?

Senator Robert Taft issued a public statement just before he died warning the United States against sending American soldiers into Southeast Asia, where we would be vastly outnumbered by Communist guerrillas who could live on a handful of rice in the jungles but were grave fighters and could trigger a rifle.

The time has come for an agonizing reappraisal of our spending over $1 million a day, 10,000 miles away in South Vietnam, while 12,000 Rusian soldiers help build communism into a powerful military and propaganda weapon at our very doorstep.

Why does not the administration demand that all Russian soldiers and technicians be withdrawn from Cuba by the end of this year, and in case of refusal by the Soviet Government openly arm and equip Cubans in Florida and in Central American countries and organize a powerful force for the liberation of Cuba from the cancer of communism?

President Kennedy is a young man of many words and more alibis. The American people are watching and waiting, and their patience is nearly exhausted.

HAMILTON FISH.

(NOTE.—The writer of the above was a Republican Member of Congress from 1920 to 1945.)

Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Association of Artists for Freedom:

CHRISTMAS

We believe in Christmas, because it is the birthday of the Prince of Peace and brotherhood; the birthday of the Christ who chased the moneychangers from the temple; who said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," who said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, for such is the Kingdom of Heaven." This is the Christ we will celebrate; the great Jewish carpenter-philosopher who was born in a manger in Bethlehem.

Thousands of atrocities committed against humanity and the Negro people from slavery to the present time, have gone unpunished. And now we are mocking the Prince of Peace; throwing bombs in the Holy Place of God; blasting the brains of His children against the high walls of His tabernacle in Birmingham; turning His day of days into a sabbath ritual of blood and destruction. We are guilty. Not only those who planted the bomb, but those who condone injustice and segregation and thereby give it sanction; those who profit from it and those who do not work to eradicate it. We are all guilty. And who among us can participate in life as usual, in business as usual, or even Christmas as usual?

Let us celebrate Christmas this year in a way that will bear witness to the life and the love of Jesus. Let us recreate from His life that image including all the Adams and Eves and their countless generations. Let us repent this most recent of our crimes against humanity and God; the murder of or tender six of Birmingham, with the fervent determination that it will never be 60, or 600, 6,000, or another 6 million.

This year we will give our children the profoundest gift of all; the gift of truth, which is the gift of love. And we will have the duty to tell them that Santa will not come this year because he is in mourning for the children of Birmingham, who will get no gifts this year or the next year or the next. And for the children too young to understand we will make gifts and toys with our hands from boxes and cans and string and last year's toys and paste and paint and wood and love.

To the sellers of trees and trains and pins and pianos, we urge you to understand and to pledge with us, that this Christmas shall come from our hearts and minds, not from our pocketbooks. To the ones who must give something, notwithstanding, we urge you to give to the organizations and institutions working to build and strengthen the moral and religious fiber of our Nation.

It is in this spirit that we ask all Americans of all colors, creeds, and religions, to join us in this determination to put Christ back into Christmas and His great life back into moral and religious perspective.

JAMES BALDWIN,
OSSIE DAVIS,
RUBY DEE,
ODETTA GORDAN,
JOHN O. KILLENS,
LOUIS LOMAX,
Association of Artists for Freedom.

Changes in Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the view of the American public is often quite distinct from the mental atmosphere existing in Washington, and is clearly evident by adverse public reaction to the cleverly glamorized domestic and foreign policy schemes of the administration.

The Blue Island Sun-Standard, an independent community newspaper serving the south suburban area of Cook County, Ill., in a timely and scholarly editorial sums up the public appraisal of the general Washington legislative scene. I feel it is especially appropriate, dramatizing as it does public approval of congressional independence of the executive branch. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point:

CHANGES IN THINKING

The tortuous progress that the administration's tax reduction bill has been making toward eventual enactment provides a significant and interesting example of changes in thinking that have been taking place in this country, and in Congress.

The tax bill is at the very heart of Mr. Kennedy's economic program. It is, he argues again and again, the essential force needed to stimulate economic growth, to provide more goods and services, to create more jobs, to increase the general standard of living, and to strengthen the Nation all along the line.

The President and his advisers would have had good reason to believe that a tax reduction bill would make its way through Congress with much less difficulty than in the present case. In the past, tax reduction has offered about as sure-fire an appeal as anything could. Bills have gone through with next to no debate. Here is the most tangible of all ways, Congress has felt, to make the folks back home happy.

It is very different now—not because tax reduction isn't wanted. It is. But there is grave concern over how best to achieve it without creating new and formidable dangers.

It is argued, for instance, that balanced budgets are a shibboleth, and that deficits can be almost a way of fiscal life for a nation without undermining its economic strength and stability. In other words, in effect, this theory holds that a nation is not comparable to a business or family. It is something to which the usual rules do not apply. But this theory has not been tested, and a great many people believe that the

policy which would follow its acceptance could be absolutely disastrous.

There is strong feeling that any tax cut should be accompanied by a proviso that Federal expenditures also be reduced, and that the administration pledge itself to hold spending during coming fiscal years to a stated amount. An amendment to this end was defeated in the House, but by a comparatively narrow margin.

There is also the belief that even an $11 billion overall tax cut would not mean a great deal to the average family, and would not materially spur spending and purchasing. A corollary here is that the whole tax system needs drastic overhaul, and that this should come first.

The tax bill—considerably amended—has passed the House. But it is due for some rough manhandling in the Senate, where Senator BYRD is chairman of the all-important Finance Committee. There is a good chance, perhaps even a likelihood, that no action will be taken this year. And, now, Senate priority has been given to civil rights legislation.

Actually, very little of the administration's domestic legislation program has gone anywhere at all. Parts of it—such as medicare and aid to education—seem absolutely dead, at least for the time being. Other parts, such as the training plan for young people and urban mass transportation, are in a sickly condition.

Some of the administration's most dramatic ideas are finding the reception cool, too. The man-on-the-moon project is one. A price tag of some $40 billion has been tied to it, though no one can really know now just what the cost would be, or if it is practical at all. In any event, more and more opposition is appearing, on the grounds that the gains would be tenuous at best, and that this is no time to devote so gigantic a sum of money and resources to it.

In sum, the mood of this long-sitting Congress can be fairly said to be one of growing caution. "Make haste slowly" comes pretty close to being its motto.

The Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the proposed tax cut is a matter of interest to the people of my district. For this reason I have made the proposal the subject of my October newsletter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include my newsletter, as well as the paragraphs entitled "As I See It" in the RECORD:

THE TAX CUT

In your replies to my annual questionnaire, 47 percent of you said we should cut taxes only if spending is reduced, 39 percent said we should balance the budget and reduce the national debt, and 14 percent said to cut taxes regardless of a deficit.

Well, the House of Representatives has done the latter—but not with my vote.

We have passed a tax cut bill (300 pages) in the amount of $10 billion with almost a built-in guarantee of a deficit of $9 billion for each of the next 2 years.

Now maybe it makes good economic sense to some people to reduce income and at the same time to increase spending, with the idea of achieving prosperity—but, not to me. I think it's the quickest way to bankruptcy.

I've written to you before about the loss of our gold, the loss of confidence in the dollar among foreign creditors and have indicated the steps I thought necessary to correct this situation. Spending money we haven't got for things we don't need isn't one of them.

I believe that taxes are too high. I believe they should be reduced, but I also believe Government spending must be reduced or at least held in check, at the same time.

When this bill was up for consideration we tried to do just that. We offered a proposal which would require the President to assure the Congress that Government spending would be held to $97 billion this year and $98 billion next year. It seemed to me this would leave plenty of room for all necessities and in no way could be called a "frugal" or "austere" budget. But, when this proposal come to a vote there were 199 "for" and 226 "against."

Sure, a letter from the President was read which stated he was all for economy and would hold down spending, but at the same time this letter was being read, the President on his "nonpolitical" tour of the West was suggesting new programs which, if authorized, would add up to more than $2 billion.

I hope the Congress and the President will hold Government spending in the next 2 years and that we can spend less than we take in. You can be sure I'll help. I hope you will too.

Sincerely yours,

Congressman JACK WESTLAND.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Washington, D.C., is well known as a city of conventions. This past week we have had around 8,000 bankers attending the American Bankers Convention, including my older brother, Mr. John F. Geis, senior vice president of the First Security National Bank of Beaumont, Tex. He took time during the convention to play golf, once at Columbia Country Club and once at Burning Tree Club. At Columbia he was honored by being given the use of former Vice President Nixon's locker and at Burning Tree former President Eisenhower's locker. This is what he had to say: "It was rather interesting to me to note that in Nixon's locker all I found was a bottle of Pepto-Bismol, and in Eisenhower's locker there was a little book titled "How To Play Golf."

Also during the banker's convention, we met Mr. Bentley Hahn, brother-in-law of a banker and a career officer in the U.S. Post Office Department. He was introduced as the originator of the ZIP code, which he says will save the Government $15 million in the longrun. This caused comment by a banker who had just become the grandfather of a little girl. The parents picked out a name for a boy, so the grandfather wrote her a letter giving her a number, until she got a name. He also gave her his ZIP code number, and said he wanted her to remember that she came from a highly respected, original ZIP code family.

Donna Waugh: Heroine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, in the waters of St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands last spring a young lady of 25 provided a display of raw courage that will stand alongside other great acts of bravery that have marked our country's history. Donna Waugh swam into the surf of Magens Bay to pull a friend—a 6-foot Navy ensign—away from an attacking killer shark. For her "extreme daring and heroism" Miss Waugh was recently presented with the Nation's highest lifesaving award, the Treasury Department's Gold Medal. To give her brave act the widest possible recognition, I am inserting in the RECORD this report of it from the November 1, 1963, issue of Time magazine.

THE HEROINE

Donna Waugh and John Gibson met last spring in the Virgin Islands. Both were 25; she, a blonde, blue-eyed Wall Street market analyst on vacation, and he, a 6-foot Navy ensign taking underwater demolition training.

On April 21, John had the day off and went with Donna to St. Thomas' Magens Bay. As he swam 100 feet from shore, she strolled leisurely on the beach—until she heard John scream. Around him the water frothed and reddened sickeningly; he was being attacked by a killer shark.

Without a moment's hesitation the 5-foot 4-inch, 110-pound girl ran into the surf and swam to John's side. "Get out of the water. Get out of the water," he pleaded with her, even in his agony. Donna ignored his cries, pulled him toward shore with the aid of another swimmer. The shark followed, still in a murderous frenzy.

On the beach, one arm mangled, a hip gone, and his legs mutilated, John Gibson died. Donna was not with him. She had gone for help.

Last week, for "extreme daring and heroism," Donna Waugh received the Nation's highest lifesaving award—the Treasury Department's Gold Medal—at a brief ceremony in New York. Said she quietly: "There's no doubt that I would do the same thing if it occurred again."

Colorado Steel Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under a proclamation issued by Hon. John A. Love, Governor of Colorado, we recently celebrated Colorado Steel Week in our State. I am very proud to have the Pueblo plant of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. located in my district. Steel has played a most important part in the growth and development of Colorado.

Mr. Ralph C. Taylor, one of our leading writers of Colorado, has written an article entitled "Colorado and Steel Round Out First 100 Years." This article is of general interest and contains some important facts concerning the steel industry. I include the same in my remarks:

COLORADO AND STEEL ROUND OUT FIRST 100 YEARS

(By Ralph C. Taylor)

Colorado is the steel State. It was born at the same time as steel, a century ago. In those 100 years the everyday life of the

American people has changed more than that of any people during any similar period in world history. We passed from one form of civilization to another, from the iron age to the steel age.

The principal element of growth and progress in America has been steel. Colorado has played a special role in the drama of steel, because it is the home of the West's first steel industry, which today is the ninth in rank among the Nation's producers of steel. Colorado steel has taken the lead in building, not only Colorado, but all of the Western States.

Iron has been utilized by man since 1300 B.C. The Egyptians found meteorites that the heat of flight had refined into almost pure iron. They learned that this metal from heaven could be duplicated by cooking certain kinds of ore in a hot fire. Primitive men discovered they could shape iron into useful things that made life less complex. Self-preservation and protection always being one of the first thoughts of human beings, it was not surprising that a decorated iron dagger was found in the tomb of King Tutankhamen, who was buried about 1,350 years before the Christian era. Twenty-six hundred years later iron still was so precious that the cooking pots and frying pans were kept with the royal jewels in England.

STEEL BROUGHT WORLD POWER

China and India developed iron from ore, supplanting bronze. Iron weapons first were used by the Hittite Army about 1300 B.C. India had a method of making steel in 350 B.C. and produced surgical instruments. Steel from India was used in Syria to make the historic swords of Damascus. Iron and steel, especially in weapons and armor, made it possible for the Romans to become a world power.

Crude charcoal furnaces of masonry were used in European iron making in A.D. 1350. The English introduced the use of coke in 1619. Sir Walter Raleigh found iron ore on an island near the North Carolina coast in 1585, but no iron was produced until 1643 at Saugus, Mass. Virginians built a furnace at Falling Creek in 1622, but the day the ironmaking was to begin Indians wiped out the colony and destroyed the furnace.

America's few blast furnaces produced 1 to 6 tons of pig iron each a day until the 1850's, when larger furnaces were built. In the 1880's, when the first iron was made in Pueblo, Americans proudly boasted of blast furnaces that turned out 100 tons of pig iron in 24 hours. Today many blast furnaces produce 1,500 tons a day.

Although steelmaking was known 2,000 years ago, the crude methods were so costly that steel could be used only for making knives, axes, razors, swords and armor. Layers of iron bars and charcoal were packed in small furnaces and after three or four days of burning the metal reached 2,000°. The red heat was maintained for 7 to 12 days. Two-percent carbon steel resulted.

The iron age ended about 1860 with the beginning of the steel age. The experiments of William Kelly, starting in 1847 in Kentucky, and Henry Bessemer, beginning in 1854 in England, disclosed that a blast of cold air could help produce a greater heat in making steel. The bessemer type of converters were used extensively through the first decade of this century.

FIRST COLORADO RAILS IN 1882

A bessemer converter was used by the Colorado Coal & Iron Co. on April 12, 1882, when Colorado dignitaries watched the rolling of the first steel rails in the West. This took place in what today is Pueblo. At that time the small community near the new steel mill was called Bessemer in honor of the Englishman whose steelmaking process was being used.

The open hearth method of making steel, invented by Englishman William Siemens, was introduced in the Pueblo mills in 1902. Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. was among the Nation's first steel companies in building oxygen converters 2 years ago—reducing from hours to minutes the time required to make steel—and at the same time producing a higher quality product.

In 1860, the birth year of the steel age, America was an agricultural nation. It was a second-rate manufacturing nation. Colorado's settlement had begun only the previous year with the discovery of gold. There was practically no metal in the State. It is ironic that the gold rush brought men to the Rockies seeking wealth from gold, but the digging of that metal could only be done economically by devising equipment of iron and steel.

For more than half a century gold and silver were generating wealth for Colorado, but it had to be converted into steel and iron for the building of an empire. While Eastern States moved slowly after their founding, they entered the accelerated steel age with swaddling Colorado. American industries emerged from the handicraft, small shop and blacksmith stage into the first factories.

This was the beginning of the great industrial expansion which quickly enabled America to surpass Great Britain in manufacturing. In three decades this Nation was producing goods double the value of England's.

The most pressing need of industry had been met—an abundant supply of metal as cheap as iron, but stronger and more durable. This was steel. In doing this America invented mass production which has brought economical prices to practically all areas of manufacturing. This, of course, not only provided employment for an expanding population, but steadily has raised the standard of living of Americans to the highest level of any nation.

The steel and iron industry had its beginning in Colorado in 1860 when Langford & Co. set up an iron foundry on Blake Street in Auraria (West Denver). The firm collected old stoves, discarded stamp mill machinery and other odd pieces of iron that pioneers had brought across the plains in covered wagons. The metal was melted and cast into items needed by the gold miners.

The first iron ore was located by Joseph M. Marshall along South Boulder Creek and nearby a deposit of coal was discovered. The combination induced Langford & Co. to build a furnace, from which the State's first iron was smelted.

One of the first items made from native Colorado iron was a small cannon that was fired to celebrate Independence Day in 1861. The little cannon now is in the State museum in Denver.

Marshall, who was associated with Langford & Co., later built a furnace near the South Boulder ore deposit. Unfortunately, Marshall's enterprise failed and within a short time it was abandoned.

Among those who built the first railroad into Colorado, the Kansas Pacific, was Gen. William J. Palmer. He organized the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad and started building a narrow gage line from Denver to El Paso and Mexico. The Leadville, Aspen, Creede and San Juan mining districts diverted his line westward from Pueblo and Walsenburg and it never got to Mexico.

GENERAL PALMER A FOUNDER

General Palmer became an important leader in the early development of Colorado through his Denver & Rio Grande Railroad and associated companies. He founded South Pueblo, Colorado Springs and other towns. He organized the Central Colorado Improvement Co. By 1879 this and several other companies were merged into the Colorado Coal & Iron Co. which today is the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp.

Palmer's Colorado Coal & Iron Co. produced its first iron, September 5, 1881, in Bessemer from a blast furnace with a daily capacity of 80 tons. The first rail, weighing only 30 pounds to the yard, was rolled April 12, 1882, ending the delays and high costs of getting rail from eastern mills. The first iron ore came from Fremont and Chaffee Counties, but today iron ore is from Wyoming and Utah. Ore deposits were depleted years ago on Iron Mountain on Grape Creek between Canon City and Silver Cliff; Calumet and Whitehorn northeast of Salida; Orient near Mineral Hot Springs; Placer near Russell, and from the Trichera.

Veterans Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Piekarczyk, of Hammond, Ind., who has been active in veterans affairs over the years, forwarded the following reminder of his personal observations and experiences in defending our great Nation.

Monday being Veterans Day, his thoughts are indeed very timely:

NOVEMBER 5, 1963.

Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MADDEN: In connection with the coming of Veterans Day, enclosing you herewith a most worth article entitled "Reminiscences of World War I." I am quite certain you well remember that conflict which ended 45 years ago.

Yes, Congressman Madden, since that war the remains of those of our men who were left in France have been gathered into many cemeteries, where they lie in precise rows under the shadows of our own flag within the sacred limits of their small bit of America.

Most of these spots mark the field of valor where they fell and each has become a shrine where devoted comrades and countrymen may come in remembrance of American youth who consecrated their lives to a sublime cause. It has been a great remembrance for the head of the commission to erect suitable monuments in our cemeteries and on our battlefields, through which a grateful people may commemorate the heroism of their sons.

But no matter what else we may to do beautify the hallowed ground where our dead veterans lie buried, nothing can ever take the place of the white marble crosses and the stars that mark their graves. These will always stand a memorials of sacrifice and as symbols of our faith in immortality.

The following tribute is dedicated to our fighting men who have fought in all the American wars:

On the patriotic honor rolls shines their heroism without regard to such paltry distinction as rank or state. Among them are no officers, no privates in the bivouac of heaven—they are all alike immortals. Such are our American fighting men who are now at the head and above us. Let us give these gallant defenders our appreciation commensurate with their valor. As a simple memento to our heartfelt solicitude for the commendable and glorious cause for which they so nobly gave up their pleasures of happy homes.

In the lonely cemeteries their remains will live forever and they will never be alone. The angels of patriotism will hover and guard them forever. May they rest in everlasting tranquillity.

Most sincerely yours,

JOSEPH PIEKARCZYK.

REMINISCENCES OF WORLD WAR I

NOVEMBER 5, 1963.

Congressman RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Once again on November 11, we will observe Veterans Day. Call it what you will, to me it will forever be Armistice Day, a day shrouded in mysticism, a day devoted to the memory of the men who fought and died in World War I. No matter what Congress or the Veterans' Administration or the American Legion or anybody says, this is their day. Yes, it was an awful war in mud and blood where 116,516 Americans died.

World War I was a war of trenches and cooties, of itchy wraparound leggings, and our men fought valiantly and encountered trenches, mortars, howitzers, barbed wire, machinegun nests, brutal artillery, and death at such places as Catigny Woods, St. Mihiel, Chateau Thierry, Belleau Wood, Aisne-Marne, Picardy, Meuse-Argonne, Montdidier-Noyon. It was a war fought by young American dandies who got tough the hard way. They learned to wear wristwatches, smoke tailor-made cigarettes, speak bad French, fire the Springfield 1903 rifle, and fly airplanes held together with piano wire. They also learned to cuss, drink wine spiked with cognac, delouse each other, act tough, and show their true feeling by singing such lachrymose songs as "My Buddy" and "Roses of Picardy."

For them the Great War began April 6, 1917. Before that the war had pounded on the fields of Europe for 3 long years. But it was somebody else's war. In April 1917 Congress passed a joint resolution charging that the Imperial German Government had "committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States." "War With Germany," headlines screamed.

In the months that followed, the sale of blazer jackets and skimmer strawhats dropped sharply in the men's stores of America. A new device called "the draft" began to catch up with some young American men that summer. Others rushed up and some of them goaded into doing so by recruiting posters. One of these I recall depicting an angry Uncle Sam pointing his finger at you and saying, "I Want You." So, instead of skimmers, the Nation's young men put on garrison hats by Stetson and soupbowl helmets made by United States Steel. Instead of blazers, they put on high-collared uniforms—with Sam Brown belts for officers. So garbed, the reformed dandies marched off to the many training fields of our country and learned to sleep in mud puddles and fight with bayonets. ("Oh, How I Hate To Get Up in the Morning," by Irving Berlin, was the song of those camps.)

In those early days, German submarines ruled the Atlantic. Almost nobody believed we'd ever get our troops to Europe. But the reformed Dandies were marched on to tall, angular troopships and they went to France singing: "Pack Up All Your Troubles in Your Own Kit Bag," "Goodbye Broadway, Hello France," and "Over There." Some of the other songs were "Where Do We Go From Here," "Smiles," "K-K-K-Katy, Beautiful Katie," and the "Long Long Trail."

Our Dandies picked up a tune from the British "It's A Long Way To Tipperarary" and "Waltzing Matilda" from the Australians. While in France they still sung "Mademoiselle From Armentieres."

Yes, they left behind a nation in a fever of Liberty Bond sales and sweat of patriotism. Those were the days when you could get in trouble with your fellow American by eating meat on meatless days designated by a young food administrator named Herbert Hoover, a man noted for his high collars. Motorists were not allowed to drive on Sundays so as to conserve gasoline.

In France, the ex-Dandies, now called "Doughboys," marched down muddy lanes and saluted their commander Gen. John J. Pershing. Yes, the men revered him, if they didn't love him. They took orders and called him "Black Jack."

"Do you want to live forever?" a sergeant screamed when his men faltered. They plunged onward to gangrene-ridden hospitals, to Flanders Field, where the poppies grow today and death and victory came on Armistice Day, November 11, 1918.

At 11 a.m. on that day people will stop whatever they will be doing and face east for a minute or two. If you were a kid or a young person, during these 2 minutes your mind will go over the nearly sacred words of "Flanders Field," while your memory provided background music—"My Buddy," you felt like crying.

Maybe you didn't know it but maybe some of the desire to weep was because the men of World War I and their children could never be innocent or naive again.

The following poem was memorialized by a poet:

"March on, Expeditionary Forces
March over the Hills
Of sunny France
March through the flaming
Town of Picardy
Up the shell swept
Slopes of Lorraine
Through the gas filled
Forests of Argonne
On to Everlasting Glory."

—JOSEPH PIEKARCZYK.

Job Training: What Is Being Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in March of last year Congress passed what is perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1964. This was the Manpower Development and Training Act, proposed by President Kennedy as a necessary measure to train the hundreds of thousands of workers who are jobless because they do not possess the skills required by our constantly changing economy. In the short time it has been in operation, the program has proved its worth in many parts of the country, and is contributing to the economic health of the entire Nation. To illustrate its success, under unanimous consent, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a feature story published in the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, October 26, 1963, entitled "Job Training: What Is Being Done":

JOB TRAINING: WHAT IS BEING DONE—ILLINOIS NEAR TOP IN PROVIDING AID

(By Betty Flynn)

Forty-year-old James Harris pushed the brown leather cap back on his head and spread his arms across the back of the threadbare gray couch in his second-floor front room at 814 East 45th Street.

"Used to be, when the stockyards were here, all you needed to get a job was strength," he said, lifting his year-old son, Jimmy, Jr., off the bare wooden floor.

"Now you have to have some kind of special education. You just can't get any kind of job without some education."

Harris, a short, husky man, is the sole breadwinner for his wife and 12 children. He had been jobless for 8 months before his selection as a trainee in a Manpower Development and Training Act project.

He was supporting his large family on a $370 allotment from county ADC-U—Aid to Dependent Children with an unemployed father in the home.

His monthly check averaged less than $1 a day per person in his family.

His work record had been unsteady, sporadic, for the last 15 years. Between jobs as a theater usher, shipping clerk, and night watchman, he spent long periods dependent on relief or unemployment checks.

"When I got up in the morning, I'd feel low. I'd mark down those want ads, but the chances were I'd come back jobless like I went out.

"I knew if I couldn't get hold of a job pretty soon, I'd be locked up in jail. I had to get some money for the family."

CAUGHT IN WHIRLPOOL OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Harris reflects the desperation of many of the 116,000 jobseekers in Chicago, the 180,000 in Illinois, the nearly 4 million in the United States.

He represents the grim, huge totals of faceless people caught in the whirlpool of unemployment because of limited education and skills, because of automation, and the resulting shrinking job market.

These people have become the focal point in the last year of expensive, intensive job training programs on the Federal, State and county levels.

The goals of the Manpower Development and Training Act are "to train the unemployed and upgrade the skills of persons whose work provides only marginal subsistence * * * to reduce hard core unemployment * * * and to provide additional skilled manpower in vital occupational categories."

Another Federal act—the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961—provides some money for retraining workers in chronic unemployment areas, such as parts of southern Illinois.

However, its main purpose is to attract new industry to depressed areas by providing low-cost loans to these firms.

The ARA has provided $570,000 for 18 projects in southern Illinois so far. Fewer than 500 persons had finished training as of September 1963.

The MDTA projects have cost considerably more money and are aimed at many more persons.

In its first year of operation, Illinois ran neck and neck with New York and California in a race to get the multimillion dollar MDTA program into operation.

Illinois was allocated $8,500,000 in Federal money and had trained 1,196 persons as of September 1963. Some 2,544 more persons are currently in training.

State MDTA officials estimate than 70 percent of these 3,740 persons—about 2,500—will eventually be placed in jobs as a result.

Those who do not complete their training or who fail to get jobs after finishing training will fall back on relief support or get jobs below their potential skill levels until places in industry open for them.

BOOSTS ACTIVITIES IN JOB TRAINING

Independently, on a local level, the Cook County Department of Public Aid, under the direction of Raymond M. Hilliard, has increased its activities in the field of job training in the last year.

It started two special programs in cooperation with the local service industry—a drivers training program with Yellow Cab Co. and a gas station attendant course with Shell Oil Co.

Basic literacy classes to upgrade reading and writing levels of thousands of illiterate reliefers were continued by the county, in cooperation with the Chicago Board of Education.

James Harris is typical of the trainees selected for MDTA classes. He is Negro, he is 40, he has a high school education, he has an unstable work record.

He was referred to the training program by the Illinois State Employment Service, and has been attending classes for automobile parts counter salesmen at the Washburne Trade School, 3233 west 31st Street, since last March.

Except for a tool and die apprentice class, all MDTA classes at Washburne are conducted in an annex of the main building. The MDTA classes have no connection with the regular trade and apprentice program at the school, which has been criticized sharply for excluding Negroes.

Harris goes 5 days a week from 8:30 a.m. to 2:45 p.m. During the 48-week course, he will learn names of automobile parts, methods of keeping inventories, personal appearance, courtesy, and how to deal with the public.

As the head of a household who has had at least 3 years' work experience, he qualifies for the $40-a-week training allowance. This income is supplemented by $231 monthly from the county.

"My main ambition," said Harris, "is to get completely off relief. The fact is I don't want anyone telling me how to live, how to budget my money and how to spend it."

The Manpower Development and Training Act—designed to help just such people as Harris fulfill their ambitions to become self-supporting—was signed into law by President Kennedy in March 1962.

The following August, Congress approved funds. Projects began in September, with a $435 million allocation for a 3-year period to train 700,000 persons.

Since then Congress has chopped $80 million off the first 2 years' budgets, and cut the trainee goal to 400,000 by 1965.

GETS $2,750,000—THEN $3 MILLION MORE

Illinois originally was given $2,750,000 for the first fiscal year. But an additional $3 million—from a reservoir of unused funds from States who lagged behind in setting up training programs—was channeled to the fast-moving Illinois projects, raising the first 9 months' expenses to about $5,800,000.

This fiscal year, which began July 1, Illinois expects an allotment of at least $5 million, which may be increased to as much as $10 million with the use of other States' unused moneys.

Allen Brimm, State director of the manpower program in the Illinois Department of Labor, said classes should enroll from 8,000 to 10,000 additional people.

"The reason Illinois is among the top three States in the Nation in money spent and number of persons trained is because of Chicago's highly diversified manufacturing area," he said. "We've just got more potential."

He said the Chicago metropolitan area receives a healthy 75 to 80 percent of total programs for Illinois. But additional downstate programs have been conducted at Moline, East St. Louis, Dixon, Mattoon, Peoria, Decatur, Galesburg, De Kalb, Champaign, and Rock Island, among others.

Surveys of employers to determine which areas needed what types of jobs were made before MDTA classes were set up.

Courses range from relatively simple training in shirt pressing and food handling (4 to 8 weeks in length) to the more skilled training demanded by apprentice tool and die making, auto body repair and electronics lab technicians (48 weeks).

Currently, the classes in session include power sewing machine operators, stenographers, and arc welders. Classes for cooks, pantrymen, and housekeepers for mental institutions are planned for the near future.

"We give an 8-week course for the relatively simple job of food server, including both cafeteria work and waiting table," said Brimm.

"But this course includes personal appearance, speech, simple arithmetic, safety laws, and regulations involving food, in addition to the knowledge of food and its preparation."

Brimm said course content is determined by asking employers what they desire in ideal employees.

The first MDTA class in Chicago was graduated in February 1963, when 87 clerk-typists finished a 20-week course at Dunbar Vocational, Hyde Park, Englewood, and Cooley Vocational high schools.

Many of the programs are held in public facilities, but at least half are operated in private schools, all of which must be approved by the Illinois Department of Registration and Education, Brimm said.

About 60 programs are currently underway in Illinois, with some 50 more planned for 3,700 additional people throughout the State.

Fourteen programs have been completed, with a little over 1,000 persons trained. Of these, 650 were placed in jobs related to training.

EIGHT THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED TRAINED DURING FIRST YEAR

Nationally, 8,800 persons were trained during MDTA's first year, with about 6,000 placements. Every State, with the exception of Louisiana, is participating.

The Federal program is jointly administered, with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare directing the major portion of training programs done in public and private institutions.

The Department of Labor has charge of on-the-job training programs, which currently number 223 nationally for 4,000 persons at a cost of $1,652,018.

Five punch press operators, whose 13-week training at Ada Metal Products, Inc., 3515 West Touhy, was financed by MDTA funds, were recently graduated into $1.80-an-hour jobs at the company.

The youths—all previously unemployed and between the ages of 19 and 29—comprised the first of four on-the-job project classes approved so far in Illinois for a total of 360 persons and at a cost of nearly $100,000.

About one-third of all MDTA trainees are youths—under 22. The act provides a $20-a-week allowance for young people in training, who would not otherwise qualify as household heads for money allowances.

However, the act provides that only 5 percent of all money set aside for training allowances may be allotted for youths.

In September 1963 a special combination literacy-job training project entitled "Jobs Opportunities Through Better Skills" (JOBS) began in Chicago with more than $1 million in MDTA funds.

The program—aimed at 1,000 inner city, unemployable youths—is being conducted by the YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago, the Chicago Youth Centers and the Chicago Boys Clubs.

Although Chicago high schools provide evening vocational classes for 14,000 adults—half of them enrolled in business courses—Brimm said this type of education does not answer the problem of job training.

"We're 20 years behind the times in vocational education," Brimm said. "Both equipment and methods taught are often obsolete, and persons usually enroll to learn an avocation, not a trade."

SPECIAL CABDRIVERS TRAINING COURSE

While MDTA programs were being set up, the Cook County Department of Public Aid began a special taxicab driver training course in October 1962, in cooperation with the Chicago Urban League and the Yellow Cab Co.

A similar filling station attendant program with Shell Oil Co. followed in April 1963. Other short-lived, small classes for such occupations as housemaids, yard helpers, and food and kitchen helpers also were conducted.

Under these special local job training setups, more than 500 relief recipients received short-course training in these limited skills.

More than 300 former recipients are currently earning their own living as a result of the training and are still off relief, according to county records.

The Yellow Cab Co. program put 379 men into training. Of these 312 finished the course and were hired. Nearly 250 are still on the job.

A survey by the County in June 1963, of the first 206 drivers trained and hired showed that only 35 had left the company. Of these, 13 were fired and 22 left for other work.

Mrs. Vivian Sosin, CCDPA supervisor who set up the training program, said most of the men who did not complete the program had criminal records and thus did not qualify for chauffeurs' licenses, could not read and write sufficiently to get through training or got sick.

She said only 17 of the men who completed training are now back on relief. About 120 more reliefers are currently in training on the taxi program.

Shell has trained about 50 men, 47 of whom are still on the job. About one-fourth of these already have been promoted to shift managers, Mrs. Sosin said. Seventeen more are in training.

The courses—which last from 2 to 3 weeks—include lectures on safety, courtesy, personal appearance, simple arithmetic and inventory keeping, as well as both sales and driving techniques required for each job.

"We urge trainees to wear a white shirt and tie, to get haircuts regularly, to be careful of personal habits," said Mrs. Sosin.

"We tell them to be polite, not to be gabby but to answer questions, to smile, open doors, etc."

One lecture in each course, which both the men trainees and their wives attend, is devoted to running a home budget.

"Remember that many of these people have been unemployed for a long time," Mrs. Sosin said.

"We warn them about quack credit buying. We tell the wives they must get used to their husbands not being around to assume some of the family responsibilities, like grocery shopping and watching the kids.

"We urge them to help their husbands get to work on time, to get a good breakfast, to have meals ready when they get home."

Lee Welch, 32, of 540 East 36th Street, has been off relief and self-supporting since he finished the Yellow Cab training course 10 months ago.

"Now I can sit down and say I am supporting my own family," said Welch, father of three. Welch, a native of Arkansas, had completed only the eighth grade before joining the Army.

When he was discharged, he was off and on relief—mostly on—for 8 years before he underwent the taxi training.

Jimmie W., 51, father of eight, was one of the few Shell trainees rejected for employment. He was let go after a few days on the job because he couldn't read or write well enough to take catalog orders or make inventories.

"My bookwork just wasn't up to it," he said. He had gone to the sixth grade in public school in Louisiana.

Jimmie W. is now enrolled in an evening literacy class for reliefers, another county method to "combat the bedrock of unemployment—illiteracy," according to Hilliard.

The classes are conducted at 10 local high schools and 1 South Side church. They were begun in March, 1962, when Hilliard said there were 50,000 able-bodied persons on relief—16,000 men and 34,000 ADC mothers—who, if educated, could become employable.

The program has more than 7,000 persons enrolled. More than 1,000 have thus far received eighth-grade diplomas or "refresher certificates," enabling them to take high school courses.

Eight persons have received high school diplomas as a result. Hilliard said his department hopes to increase the enrollment to 20,000 by 1964.

The Chicago Board of Education footed the bill of $100,000 for the first 9 months of the program. In January 1963, the State took over the costs as a welfare expense at the rate of about $40,000 monthly.

Hilliard estimates the cost will increase with enrollment at the rate of $5.50 per student per month. Hence, 20,000 enrollment would cost the taxpayers an estimated $110,000 monthly.

Group foster care classes, in which reliable relief women would be trained to care for groups of ADC children during the day while the other mothers attend literacy classes or work, will soon get underway, Hilliard said.

The CCDPA also operates an industrial training center at its welfare rehabilitation service center at 1327 West Washington. About 600 reliefers each year are trained in simple assembly line job skills and placed in jobs.

However, training here is aimed primarily at establishing job habits, such as getting to work on time and taking orders from a supervisor, rather than at developing craft skills.

The WRS claims 12,000 job placements a year. However, no extensive job training is accomplished. Work counselors there say more than half the 12,000 placements are temporary jobs, which may last from 1 day to several weeks.

STILL, THERE ARE CRITICISMS

While the job training concept has been cited as one of the most realistic ways to deal with the unemployment problem by public officials and welfare agencies, there have been criticisms—particularly of the MDTA. Some of the criticisms:

1. It's too expensive. Averaging the costs of the first year of results—650 people placed of 1,052 trained, 2,633 in training and 2,300 more ready to begin—the average cost per person would be more than $2,000.

The county, which last year placed more than 300 persons in paying jobs as result of special training programs, averaged less than $200 cost per man.

"The MDTA organized a crash program and didn't take a good look around to see what free facilities were available," said Thomas Nicholas, employment specialist at the Chicago Urban League who helped organize the county Yellow Cab program.

"Yes, it does sound expensive," said Brimm.

But he defended the expense on the premise that it reduces long-term relief costs by getting people off relief with skilled training, and that income tax from the new workers will pay back training costs within a few years.

Brimm's office figured an average of $1,166 per person as average training cost. However, he said this average has not been adjusted to exclude costs for those who drop out, or those who have not yet been placed in programs.

The cost of the county's special job training programs averages less than $200 a man, including administrative costs, salaries of workers and relief payments to trainees.

2. Workers are being trained for jobs in the Chicago area that won't exist in the future because of automation and plant relocation in outlying areas.

The Northeastern Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission reported recently that jobs in the area of manufacturing and wholesale trade in Chicago are lessening at the rate of 1 percent a year.

Brimm said it was "a possibility" the MDTA programs are training workers for jobs that won't exist—or at least won't be within their reach without relocating.

3. The MDTA is not aimed at the right group of people—those who lack basic reading and writing skills.

A national survey of MDTA programs in June 1963, showed that of 269,000 applicants for the training, only 27,000 were referred to programs after careful screennig.

About 60 percent of these had finished high school or gone beyond. Only 10 percent had not attended high school at all.

One Illinois State Employment Service department manager in charge of referring people to MDTA programs complained. "It doesn't train the persons in greatest need."

He said a bill is currently before Congress, which, if approved, would provide $235 million for the sole purpose of conducting classes to raise literacy levels.

4. Relatively low placement rates, despite preprogram surveys by MDTA administrators to determine where the need for trained workers exists.

Only 7 of every 10 trainees who finish courses have been placed in jobs relating to training. Brimm explained:

"People move away after they complete training. Some of the women marry or get pregnant during training. Some take employment not related to training or get jobs on their own.

"We just don't have the staff to keep an accurate count of their doings," he said. As a result, there is no way to determine how many wind up back on relief.

He said the employer's situation, which had originally been surveyed, may change because of business conditions, and trained persons would have to wait for openings in their new fields.

Of the 700 dropouts in the first year's programs, Brimm said most left because of financial difficulties.

Only 30 percent of Illinois MDTA trainees are eligible for the head-of-household allowance.

About 25 percent—including some of those who receive the $40 weekly allowances—are also on relief. The others must provide their own support during training.

Many trainees—even those who get the $40 weekly—drop out to take temporary, unskilled, but higher paid work.

"You just can't convince them that the immediate sacrifice is worth it in the long run," Brimm said. "Then again some really can't afford to stay in training."

COULDN'T SUPPORT FAMILY ON ALLOWANCE

Typical is David W., 41, a high school graduate, married with one child.

He left after 8 weeks in an auto parts counter sales class because he said he could not support his family on the $40-a-week training allowance. He took a temporary $70-a-week job as a laborer for a few weeks, then was laid off. Now he is out of work again.

Family obligations—women who marry or find they have too many household chores—men with family problems and as a result are unable to concentrate on classwork—are another primary cause of dropouts.

Florence R., 34, an ADC mother with 3 children, had to drop out after 3 weeks in a clerk-typist refresher course because a neighbor who had volunteered to care for her children moved away. She was unable to make other arrangements for child care and dropped out of the course and back—perhaps permanently—on relief rolls.

"And of course we have that small group, despite our screening and testing beforehand who just don't care," Brimm said.

Racial discrimination remains a stumbling block in the path of any effective job training programs, according to both county and State officials.

"Discrimination can nullify the good effects," said Hilliard. "But more and more doors are opening for Negroes.

"A lot of the present tumult has resulted in the hiring of Negroes," he said. A "subtle form of discrimination"—in which firms hire Negroes for jobs low on the totem pole and keep them there despite higher ability—takes its toll.

One ISES official told the Daily News that job orders fell off 50 percent after the ISES closed neighborhood offices in July 1962, and centralized its employment service at a Loop office at 321 South State.

Before the consolidation, employers could assure themselves of racial preference among workers by placing their job orders at ISES offices that served all-white or all-Negro areas.

The ISES has a ruling that no racial preference may be written on any job order.

"Some months we've had to turn away as many as 200 'white only' orders on this basis," the officials said, "although we may have had Negroes to fill the jobs."

Said Brimm: "As expected, the majority of our people in training are Negroes. And it is difficult to get them jobs, despite the Fair Employment Practices Commission, despite our training programs. There is just a limited number of jobs available to Negroes."

Brimm called MDTA and similar programs "the first approach we've ever had to conserve human resources. Even if it costs this much money, it's worth it.

"These programs were never intended to cure the Nation's unemployment situation," he said. "But we are hoping to make at least a small dent."

Country Cousins With a City Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of October 15, 1963:

COUNTRY COUSINS WITH A CITY HEART

The Regional Plan Association gathered in annual conference here today, is constantly concerned with good planning for worthwhile goals in the tristate metropolitan area. For despite all the practical difficulties in regional cooperation, it must seem indisputable that all the parts of this expanse are more or less interdependent. The problem, as always, is to get people to work together.

In recent months the RPA has carefully surveyed the attitudes of 5,600 people in this New York area.

And what do almost all of the 5,600 participants want more than anything? Improved public transportation, they say, even if it means more subsidy. They favor a tristate agency, better subways, and Hudson tubes, rehabilitated suburban railroad service. What's more, a large majority supports increased Federal and State involvement in metropolitan planning and investment to deal with all the great problems of swelling population.

If this is what the people are genuinely thinking, our politicians haven't caught up with public opinion. There is far more appetite for hard planning and great concepts than the skeptics have ever allowed.

The citizenry is clearly ready and willing for leadership. The time is here for con-

solidated action on the principle that the tristate region is more than a haphazard conglomeration. Our three Governors ought to be in the forefront.

Congressman Warns of Apathy in Wake of Nuclear Test Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our ratification of the test ban treaty does not mean that we can afford to drop our guard against the continuing efforts of the Soviet Union and Communist China to "bury us" by any and every means available. It is imperative at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the United States provide new safeguards to counter the incessant nonmilitary thrusts which I believe will be increased by the Sino-Soviet bloc in the cold war. Certainly, the Kremlin leaders now have recognized that there would be no victor in a full-scale nuclear war—that the devastation unleashed on mankind would annihilate millions of people on both sides of the Iron Curtain, and communism could not possibly advance amidst the resulting ashes.

I am particularly wary about any allegations or protestations of good intentions which might be made by the Kremlin. Now is the time we should be ever alert and ever ready to provide new safeguards for our people and those of the free world.

Thus, I would like to see our country adopt stronger counterthrusts to the nonmilitary tactics employed by the Sino-Soviet agents. One thing I believe we can and should do to counter Soviet and Red Chinese propaganda, and to defeat the infiltration, subversion and espionage of their agents, particularly in the developing nations, is to establish a Freedom Academy to train both veteran Government employees and private citizens in all manner of nonmilitary, economic and psychological counterattack against communism. A bipartisan group of Congressmen in both the House and the Senate are sponsoring legislation to establish this Academy as a new weapon in the cold war arsenal of the United States.

One of the finest Catholic archdiocesan newspapers in our Nation—the Clarion Herald which serves the people of the city of New Orleans and 10 other parishes in south Louisiana—has published a recent article of mine on the freedom academy in its issue of October 10. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. The article follows:

CONGRESSMAN WARNS OF APATHY IN WAKE OF NUCLEAR TEST TREATY

(By Congressman HALE BOGGS)

WASHINGTON.—With its constitutional authority and responsibility to render advice and consent on all proposed treaties with other nations, the U.S. Senate has ratified by overwhelming majority the nuclear test ban treaty to prohibit the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water.

This is an historic, positive step—albeit a small one along an arduous journey—toward safeguarding the world from the horrors of nuclear devastation. To date, more than 100 countries have signed this important treaty, and all Americans, I know, hope that its acceptance will prove to be permanent, and that it will lead toward further concrete steps for achieving and maintaining world peace.

However, I believe that this positive action to prevent a nuclear holocaust should, at the same time, engender from our Government and our people new and renewed efforts to provide further safeguards, and counterthrusts, too, against the nonmilitary threat of the Sino-Soviet Communist bloc.

Why do I suggest that America needs a renewed effort to counterattack the nonmilitary offensive of the Soviet and Red Chinese governments—an offensive designed to drug men's minds and imprison them in the Communist orbit?

The leaders in the Kremlin today are cognizant of the superior military strength of the United States and its allies, and also of the sweeping potential of the nuclear weapons which their country and ours now possess for instantaneous use.

For these reasons, the Communist-world leaders, still bent on world domination by the best available means, can be expected to step up their nonmilitary tactics to expand their control over the globe. The test ban treaty by no means will lessen the Communist offensive in the cold war; on the contrary, their weapons of propaganda, infiltration, agitation, subversion, espionage, plus all manner of economic and psychological attacks, undoubtedly will be increased. In short, the United States should expect and prepare for, an intensified drive of total political warfare.

Today the Soviet Union is operating an estimated 6,000 special schools to train Russian Communist Party members and Communist agents from nations around the world in the tactics of infiltration, propaganda, subversion, sabotage, and other means. Approximately $5 billion a year is being spent to train these Communist agents to engage in all kinds of political, nonmilitary warfare, in all parts of the world. The Soviets are old hands at political warfare, and today graduates of their special schools are staffing some 75 Communist parties in nations throughout the non-Communist world.

Let no one deceive himself that the leaders in the Kremlin and in Peiping will be satisfied to maintain the status quo of so-called peaceful coexistence.

To increase our country's vigilance and to provide a concentrated avenue of counterattack against the nonmilitary thrusts of the Communist conspiracy, I am sponsoring legislation before the Congress to establish a Freedom Academy, designed to train Americans from both the public and the private sectors to learn and utilize the tactics of total political warfare in order to defeat the Communists at their own game.

Such a Freedom Academy would be an independent agency of the Government and would provide to trainees research, development, and practical application in all nonmilitary conflict techniques.

The unique advantage of this Freedom Academy over any existing governmental training schools is that it would give this specialized training not only to governmental personnel from the various agencies, but also to private citizens of our country and from throughout the free world. The students at the Freedom Academy would be trained not only to defeat Communist offensives of all kinds, but also to replace their tactics with positive substitutes to obtain our own political objectives and to establish free societies wherever possible.

As I view this legislation, one of its most important assets is its recognition of the need to give the American people a greater awareness and understanding of communism and its goals, and further, to utilize the much-neglected private sector of our extensive human resources. Like the tax cut bill which has now passed the House of Representatives, my bill to establish a Freedom Academy will engage actively the private citizens of our country in direct participation against the Communist conspiracy. In the private segment of America, as opposed to the public or Government segment, there is a large reservoir of unused talent, ingenuity, and wisdom which can, and should, be harnessed for active service in the continuing cold war.

Today in New Orleans, a prime example of making constructive use of our private citizens in the ideological and psychological struggle against communism is found in the Information Council of the Americas (INCA), headed by Edward Scannell Butler of New Orleans.

Under the leadership of Mr. Butler, INCA was established in New Orleans in early 1961, with the aid and support of some of the city's leading citizens. Since then, INCA has waged an incessant campaign of anti-Communist and prodemocratic information through all communications media—radio, television, newspapers, magazines, leaflets, lectures, speeches, and other means.

Particularly have INCA's truth tapes radio programs been directed effectively to the peoples of Latin America, especially those in Cuba under the Communist heel of Castro's regime. Members of INCA include businessmen, professional men, educators, farm leaders, journalists, and others from throughout the United States; they have provided solid support for the half-hour truth tape programs which feature Cuban refugees who have escaped from the oppression of Castro's dictatorship, and noted sports and entertainment personalities. These loyal Americans present in their broadcasts proof of lies to be found in Communist propaganda and Communist actions.

On his staff, Mr. BUTLER has utilized the services and talents of journalists, entertainers, engineers, technicians, and others in INCA's counterthrust efforts against the spread of communism in Latin America. From both the governmental and private sectors of our community, Mr. BUTLER has received cooperation and support, and by his work he has proved the validity of using the energies and talents of private citizens of our country to combat communism, particularly in the Western Hemisphere.

As proposed in my bill, the Freedom Academy will be under the direction of the Freedom Commission, to be composed of six members and a chairman. The commissioners will be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and they will serve for terms of 6 years. Furthermore, no more than four commissioners may be members of any one political party.

This legislation to establish a Freedom Academy also outlines general guidelines and regulations for selecting both private American citizens and foreign students to attend the school, and provides for proper security checks for both commission employees and students. The bill provides for the hiring of a qualified general manager for the academy, as well as for other professional and administrative personnel.

The uniqueness of such an academy will be that it will provide a single center at which all nonmilitary tactics and techniques against Sino-Soviet communism can be developed and utilized to the fullest extent throughout the free world. It will give both

public and private citizens a direct opportunity to join in the cold war with vigor, imagination, and skill.

I am proud to note that this legislation has widespread and bipartisan support in the Congress. Congressman A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR., of Florida, has joined me in sponsoring this bill in the House. In the Senate, 13 Senators who are members of both political parties also are sponsoring this legislation: CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey; THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut; PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois; HIRAM FONG, of Hawaii; BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona; BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; KENNETH KEATING, of New York; FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio; JACK MILLER, of Iowa; KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota (principal sponsor in the Senate); WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; and GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida.

The creation of a Freedom Academy also has received support from throughout our country from various civic and governmental organizations. Thus far, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings this year on the legislation, and I am most hopeful that the 88th Congress will act on this important bill so that a new bulwark for freedom can be provided for the United States and the free world.

Space Development and Moonshot Project Should Go On as Scheduled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, Premier Khrushchev may well be lulling us into a sense of false security as he has stated that Russia is very much in the race to the moon as well as stating that Russia has called it quits for the moon shot for the time being.

Several years ago the Pentagon made an awful mistake in downgrading the original missile program which could have been disastrous and when Russia launched the first sputnik, this country suffered the greatest military and psychological setback in perhaps all of our history, only losing a hot war could have been worse as far as the rest of the world and our military defense was concerned.

While all of our space projects are most expensive and are a severe strain on the U.S. Treasury, nevertheless, I think the vast majority of the American people want to see whatever money is necessary is expended to protect ourselves militarily and spacewise, and thereby get all possible advantage in future space development.

The Morning Advocate, an outstanding daily newspaper of Baton Rouge, which is the largest city I have the privilege and honor of representing, had a very excellent and effective editorial on this very matter which reads as follows:

IS THE SPACE RACE OFF?

Quite suddenly and unexpectedly, the race to the moon has been called off.

Or has it?

Premier Khrushchev says that Russia is not at present in a race to the moon with anybody and that if the United States is first to get there, Russia will study and learn from our achievements. And it may be, as some people believe, that Russia is finding it absolutely necessary to cut back her investments in space exploration in order to invest more in her lagging farm production program.

If we accept this proposition, which is supported by a considerable amount of evidence, including the recent large wheat purchases by Russia, we then must ask what effect Russian retirement from the space race will have on our moon project. There are two points to be considered before that question can be answered.

In the first place, although Russia may not be officially in any race to the moon, it is possible that some morning Russia might announce, quite casually, that in the ordinary course of business, without strain and without being in any race with anybody, she has landed a man on the moon. Or could it be that Russia still is in the race to win and that Premier Khrushchev is merely seeking to offset the psychological shock of a possible loss of that race, as some of our spokesmen have done?

In the second place, space exploration is not merely a matter of competition and national prestige, regardless of the extent to which either consideration may have influenced the execution of our space program. It is a scientific venture of stupendous importance to the future of mankind, a venture that will lose none of its significance and none of its true urgency even if Russia actually should withdraw entirely. Columbus did not call off his voyage because he found no one to race him to wherever he was going.

Statement of Julius C. C. Edelstein on Behalf of Mayor Robert F. Wagner, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Julius C. C. Edelstein, executive assistant for policy and program planning to the mayor of the city of New York, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, made a statement on behalf of the mayor on October 29, 1963, before the temporary State commission on low-income housing, in which he detailed the necessity for more low-rent public housing.

I submit this for the attention of the Members of the House to the end that due consideration be given thereto in the comprehensive housing bill which undoubtedly will be submitted shortly. I expect that the measure will include recognition of the need for more low-income housing and suggest that this statement be used as further evidence of this great need.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER BY JULIUS C. C. EDELSTEIN BEFORE THE TEMPORARY STATE COMMISSION ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING

Judge Delany and distinguished members of the temporary State commission on low-income housing, my name is Julius C. C. Edelstein. I am the executive assistant for policy and program planning, to the mayor of New York City. I am also his personal representative on the housing policy board and the housing executive committee. I appear here on behalf of Mayor Wagner and as a spokesman for the housing executive committee.

Were it not for matters of even greater time urgency, Mayor Wagner would have come here in person this morning to express his overriding concern with, and commitment to, doing everything and anything that is necessary to meet the need for public housing for low-income families.

There can be arguments as to the shape, size, form, and distribution of public housing for low-income families * * * whether such housing should be geographically concentrated or scattered, or whether it should be superblock or vest pocket. These points can be argued. But there can be no argument, as far as Mayor Wagner is concerned, over the naked need for this housing.

On a recent occasion, Mayor Wagner said: "The present role of low-rent public housing in the total housing program is more critical and urgent than ever. Today there are a minimum of 200,000 ill-housed, low-income families in New York City whose only prospect for improving their housing consists of low-rent public housing. Over 100,000 of these are actually on the waiting lists of the housing authority.

Mayor Wagner instructed me to emphasize to this commission that the creation of appropriate authority and financing for additional amounts of low rent public housing is a must. He said it is an unavoidable obligation of the State administration to move promptly to provide the necessary authority and financing, to enable New York City to proceed with its public housing program.

The responsible officials of the city's various housing agencies, all of whom are members of the housing executive committee, will present to this commission the details of the justification for a continuation and expansion of the program of State-aided public housing for low-income families. But the mayor wanted it specifically said in his own behalf that in his judgment it would be a tragic act which would work incalculable mischief if the conventional public housing program for low-income families were to be abandoned in favor of new and untested devices.

The mayor is in favor of new approaches, new pilot projects, new demonstrations, and new ideas in the public housing field * * * and in the special field of housing for low-income families. But he instructed me to submit in his behalf the following simple stricture, and I quote:

"At the present juncture, in the current crisis of need, the people must not be offered an unproved gimmick in the place of tested housing. Progress in our entire housing program—and surely in urban renewal—depends upon the continuation and expansion of the present public housing program for low-income families. I hope that the temporary State commission will recommend not just the $300 million of increased authority we asked for last year, but $500 million—which is closer to the amount of actual need."

Mayor Wagner refers to those whom he has called the forgotten men, women, and children of the housing program who are also, he said, the forgotten people of many of our social and economic programs * * * fellow Americans who have been left stranded by the general economic advances of the past 20 years.

The mayor urges your commission to pay sensitive heed to the needs of these people, and to recognize—in your recommendations—the necessity to press forward with the program that has proven itself over a period of 25 years, a program that can meet at least a part of the need, even if you also make recommendations for new and different

approaches that might possibly also help meet the need.

Of course, there are very heavy problems in connection with public housing for low-income families. Chief of these is the problem of rising costs. It is a matter of urgent need to find a formula of public subsidies so that we can provide decent housing for low-income families that can rent in the range of $10 to $14 per room per month. This is the top rent that many of these low-income families can afford to pay. We must find a way of supplying the necessary housing at these rentals. We have no program ongoing or in immediate prospect to meet this need. We are looking for one. But the answer to this need is certainly not to scuttle the program we already have.

The mayor points out that we simply cannot afford to be caught without the authority to build the kind of public housing that we know how to build—in the widest possible range of variations—so as to be able to provide clean and decent homes for people now forced to live in dire and fearsome squalor.

It was the mayor's wish that you hear these general views, while his commissioners will, of course, give you the specific testimony which will prove most useful to the achievement of your important mission.

Of course, if you have any questions, I will do my best to answer them, in the light of the mayor's views and policies.

Suit Filed Over USDA Market Wire Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Agriculture is being challenged in court for its August 1 action broadening the Department's market news service. The USDA's private competitor, PAM, claims it is being "seriously and irreparably injured."

The following article is from the Tuesday, November 5 issue of the Journal of Commerce:

COURT ASKED TO HALT U.S. FARM WIRE

WASHINGTON, November 4.—The Federal courts were asked here today for an injunction halting a farm market wire service that the Department of Agriculture has been distributing commercially since August 1.

The action was brought in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia by PAM News Corp. which operates a market wire service out of New York City. PAM said it had been "seriously and irreparably injured" by USDA's decision to offer its market service gratis to anyone who would pay the wire charges.

DEFENDANTS NAMED

Named as defendants in this civil action were USDA itself, Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman, and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which distributes the USDA service to private citizens.

Among other things, PAM maintained that the USDA service and the manner in which it is instituted via A.T. & T. wires violated a number of sections of the Federal Communications Act, the Administrative Procedures Act, and the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Prior to August 1, USDA's farm wire was an internal service between the Department's Washington offices and more than 200 branch offices throughout the country. It only became a matter of controversy when the Department arranged with A.T. & T. to distribute the service to private customers who would pay the wire charges. USDA itself makes no charge for the service.

This move was strongly protested by PAM, by the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and, editorially, by many newspapers throughout the country. It was protested first to USDA, then to the Federal Communications Commission, which disclaimed jurisdiction over the activities of another Federal agency. Then the case was taken to the courts.

One charge brought by PAM is that in extending the new USDA-A.T. & T. service, the defendants violated a temporary restraining order entered by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on July 31, and an interlocutory injunction issued by the same court on September 27, in connection with the so-called Chicago meat packers case. While FCC had refused to block the USDA-A.T. & T. arrangement PAM maintains that its order and decision in this case were "effectively enjoined by the aforesaid restraining order and injunction issued by the court of appeals."

TAXPAYERS' MONEY

PAM's assertion is not only that the USDA is using taxpayers' money to drive a commercial service out of business, but that the Government service was established illegally and is operating illegally. In many ways the two services—USDA's and PAM's—are similar, though the former is limited to Department of Agriculture reports and the latter is both more detailed and more comprehensive.

PAM's attack was launched specifically against the following phases of the USDA service:

1. While PAM must collect from its customers an 8-percent Federal excise tax on its own service, USDA's customers are not being required to pay any such tax, any more than they need pay USDA for the service. PAM maintains this violates the tax laws.

2. A violation of section 313 of the Federal Communications Act is charged with respect to the exclusive nature of the USDA–A.T. & T. arrangement. The plaintiffs pointed out that the service cannot be obtained via Western Union nor the systems of any other communications network.

3. A.T. & T. itself is charged with having failed, in offering this service, to publish and file with FCC tariffs showing the rates, regulations, practices, and classifications as required by section 203 of the Federal Communications Act.

4. Notwithstanding PAM's concern with the exclusive nature of the USDA's arrangement with A.T. & T., the plaintiffs have hinted strongly that A.T. & T. and Western Union have themselves entered into a hands-off agreement covering such Government services.

EXCLUSIVE MARKET

The actual wording in this explosive section of the complaint is as follows:

"Defendant A.T. & T., on the one hand, and the Western Union Telegraph Co. on the other hand, as competing communications common carriers, have entered into agreements and understanding, expressed or implied, that A.T. & T. may have as an exclusive market the furnishing of its part of the above-described new news service and that Western Union will not compete with A.T. & T. for a participation in such service in return for A.T. & T. permitting Western Union to participate in other services, all in violation of the aforesaid section 313 of the Communications Act of 1934."

No immediate comment was forthcoming either from A.T. & T. or Western Union on this allegation. Spokesmen for both companies said their attorneys want to study the complaint first.

Another charge by PAM is that in setting up the Government service USDA and Secretary Freeman violated section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act "by failing to give plaintiff adequate notice and opportunity to be heard prior to inaugurating the new services and by failing to publish the terms or substance of the rules governing the new services in the Federal Register.

PAM took special note of USDA's reservation of the right to cancel its service at any time to any customer it might judge to be abusing it. It charged this restraint is an abridgement of the freedom of the press, and violates the first amendment of the Constitution. The plaintiff also maintains that the manner in which the USDA service was established deprived PAM of business without "due process," thus violating other sections of the Constitution.

VIOLATED ORDER

How badly has P.A.M. itself been hurt by the USDA service?

The plaintiff said, in this connection, that it "has been and is continuing to be seriously and irreparably damaged. Specifically, since August 1, 1963, plaintiff has lost subscribers to the new A.T. & T.-USDA communications news service.

"Moreover," the complaint continues, "unless such news service is enjoined, plaintiff will continue to lose other subscribers as well as the prospect of obtaining new subscribers and will ultimately be put out of business."

PAM, which has been operating its own service since 1946, disclosed in the course of its complaint that it has about 300 subscribers located throughout the United States and Canada. Each of these customers are supplied with a printing telegraph machine. The service is distributed over the high wire telegraph network of Western Union on lease basis.

PAM also disclosed the identity of at least one of the USDA's private subscribers. It is PAM itself.

The Poetry of Joseph Langland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to call attention to the publication of the second volume of poetry by Joseph Langland, of the University of Massachusetts English faculty in Amherst, Mass.

Langland, who has been publishing poetry for the past decade in the best literary quarterlies, appeared originally in the "Poets of Today" series edited by John Hall Wheelock. His second collection, "The Wheel of Summer," gives positive indication of his stature as an outstanding American poet. Although not a native of the First Congressional District, Langland has joined many outstanding creative artists who have called Amherst home, and who have lived amid the stately elms of that historic town.

It was just a short while ago, Mr. Speaker, that I attended the groundbreaking ceremonies for the new Robert Frost Library at Amherst College, where Frost taught. It is reassuring to know that poets such as Langland will con-

tinue the tradition of outstanding poetry in the United States. He is a former recipient of the Ford and Amy Lowell Traveling Poetry Fellowships, and besides his teaching at the University of Massachusetts, he is also a poetry editor of the highly regarded Massachusetts Review.

He was recently coeditor with Paul Engle of "Poets Choice" and is considered a leading student of American poetry. But more important than all of the awards he has received is the highly sensitive and meaningful verse that is among the best being produced at this time.

It is a great honor for me to have received permission to insert in the RECORD a complete poem—copyright—by Joseph Langland, which was inspired by hearing 300 children singing in Northampton but the kind of poem, given Langland's unique talent, that could have been written elsewhere. It could not have been written, however, by any other poet:

UPON HEARING 300 CHILDREN SINGING—IN JONATHAN EDWARD'S CHURCH, NORTHAMPTON, MARCH 5, 1961

I heard 300 children singing sweetly together,
Cleanly in robes, their bright eyes looking at heaven,
And their voices floating out of their innocent faces
Under the nave. High under the chancel windows
They met the rainbowing sun, and they sang together.
I heard 300 children marching along together
With hearts all gay and their shapely mouths all smiling,
And over and under and through them the great bass organ
Ground out processional laws in the modes of their sermons,
Delivered in chorus before all their mothers and fathers.
Three hundred children, all singing under those shadows,
Admonished the devil, and all in the clearest soprano
Roaming the vales of our tears with a jubilant leisure
Under the stern director. But under the shadows
The pipes blew faintly in the forests beyond their meadows.
Hearing 300 children singing so sweetly together
I remembered that once I was singing, so many together,
And the sanctifications were lost in a fable of Sundays
And fabulous Mondays; and yet I was glad to be chanting
In such casual guises as now I am nevermore singing.
I heard 300 children ascending the hymns and carols
While fathers and mothers sat in the dark rows, smiling,
And thought: how delightful, innocent, charming and proper
It is for our children to sing, who must walk through shadows
And the long long valleys upwards to mothers and fathers.
I heard 300 children communing at decorous altars.
I forget what they sang (maybe something as glossy as morals)
But their faces shone in their songs, and I dreamt that evils
Foregathered among them and stalked around in their singing,
But still they sang on to sons and their sons' generations.
I heard 300 children wound in the wisdom of ages
And all of them cheery about the dark words they were chanting,
Yet clever enough for their words. Oh, their minds so clearly
Moved with the music and sun I forgot they were singing,
Being father and son and grandson and greatgrandfather
Hearing 300 children at play in the heavenly chancels
And 300 children at song in the blossoming meadows
And Adam at morning out walking with Eve by the apples.

Meet Our Medical FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, no group of men and women serve their fellow citizens with greater devotion and more effectively than the officers of the U.S. Public Health Service. These physicians have forsaken the assurances of a remunerative private practice in order to undertake a difficult, sometimes hazardous and always very modestly paid job of fighting epidemics, discovering new cures, and eliminating practices that cause disease. Their reward is the knowledge that each of their successes saves not one life, but often thousands, and the satisfaction that comes from playing a challenging and exhilarating part in the fight against disease.

One aspect of this fight is described in Parents' Magazine this month in a lively and interesting account of the work of the Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service entitled, "Meet Our Medical FBI." The article is adapted from the book "To Save Your Life," a selection of the Junior Literary Guild, authored by Natalie Davis Spingarn, executive assistant to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Mrs. Spingarn's article will interest adults as well as youngsters and will also give foreign readers understanding of the zeal, dedication, and concern for fellow men that makes the Public Health Service exemplify the finest traditions of our Government and of our people. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET OUR MEDICAL FBI: THEY ARE THE SLEUTHS FROM ATLANTA WHO FIGHT EPIDEMICS FROM COAST TO COAST

(By Natalie Davis Spingarn)

There were over 100 cases of infectious hepatitis—inflammation of the liver—in Clearfield County, Pa. Most of the sick were children and young adults. They lay abed feeling awful—tired, weak, fevered, achey. They suffered loss of appetite, nausea, vomiting, and sore stomach. Some passed brown urine and whitish or grayish stools. Some itched uncomfortably all over. All had yellowed skin or jaundice.

To make matters worse, local health authorities didn't know whether the disease was being spread from person to person or whether it was caused by a common source and, if so, what the source was.

Some epidemic diseases—like diphtheria outbreaks—may be fairly simple to find and deal with. But when a mysterious epidemic breaks out or an obscure disease baffles local health people, our national "disease detectives," headquartered at Atlanta, get a quick emergency call.

What the FBI is to crime, the Communicable Disease Center of Atlanta, Ga., is to epidemics. The Center, which is part of the U.S. Public Health Service, helps track down and stamp out outbreaks of disease wherever they erupt. Its importance may be measured by the fact that 1 out of every 4 deaths among people under 35 years of age in our country is due to a communicable disease. Each year about a million and a half cases of notifiable diseases are recorded, but perhaps five times that many are not.

The job of the 1,500 men and women at the Communicable Disease Center is not so much to treat disease—though they sometimes do—as to help the States (and other parts of the world, too) fight disease. In battling an epidemic, for example, CDC tries to find its pattern—which groups in the community it is striking, for example. From these clues, the CDC recommends ways to stop it.

When the cause of the epidemic is obscure, the Center's experts function as real "private eyes" as they look for the culprits in medical whodunits—or whatdunits.

When the hepatitis epidemic struck Clearfield County, for example, the Communicable Disease Center's Epidemic Intelligence Center got an emergency call. The Center, in turn, contacted one of their "disease detectives," Dr. James Mosely, who was especially knowledgeable about hepatitis, to determine what was causing the yellow faces in Pennsylvania.

Just 48 hours after the S O S from Atlanta, Dr. Mosely and his wife, Ann, arrived in Clearfield, which was to be their home for 3 months.

It was late March. The hepatitis epidemic was taking its toll in a town of 3,000 in which the disease was concentrated. There were no clues as to what had caused the hepatitis which made these young people look and feel so miserable. But Dr. Mosely was trained to find out and he set out swiftly to do so.

His first stop was the county health department offices in Clearfield. Here he met the clerk, five nurses and the county health officer he would be working with most closely. They were pleased to see him; the doctor who was county health officer had responsibility for the health of a dozen towns and for his own family, some of whom were sick with hepatitis.

To begin with, Dr. Mosely decided on interviews and complete questionnaires for everybody in families in which someone was sick. At the same time, he ordered gamma globulin shots for all people who had been in contact with sick patients who had not already had such shots. In that way, he hoped to curb the epidemic while trying to find out what caused it.

Early that afternoon Dr. Mosely visited the school nurse, the first person in town to suspect an epidemic.

"I first decided this was an epidemic of some kind early this month," she told the doctor. "You see, I'm in charge of the health of the youngsters not only at this school but at all five schools in town." A good many youngsters had come to her office with fevers, chills, and upset stomachs. At first she had thought it was grippe or a virus. But then her own son had become ill.

"I sent him home and put him to bed. Four or five days later his skin had turned yellow, and the whites of his eyes had a sort

of yellow tinge. In my office, I heard about others who had the same symptoms. I called the county health department. We've got an epidemic of yellow jaundice on our hands, I told them. All the local doctors had been phoning to tell them the same thing. So they called the State health officials, who, I gather, called you."

She drew out a map she had made of the town. At the site of each house where there was a patient sick with hepatitis she had made a cross with a red pencil.

To Dr. Mosely, this was a first clue. On the eastern side of town, the crosses were thick; there were only scattered crosses elsewhere. This meant the disease was centered in one part of town. It was unlikely, he felt, that the source of the epidemic was something the whole town was eating or drinking.

Two weeks later, Dr. Mosely studied a larger, more complex version of the map the school nurse had given him. The red crosses at the site of each hepatitis case had been changed to black pins, and there were 129 of them stuck in the map—mostly still on the east side of town. But there were some pins scattered in the west and even outside of town.

During the preceding 2 weeks, Dr. Mosely had been to see everyone in town who was in any way associated with the epidemic—doctors, patients, nurses, the superintendent of schools. He had gathered all the information he needed.

"The fact that there have been no new cases reported for 3 whole days settles one thing in my mind," Dr. Mosely reported. "The sick people got hepatitis from a common source—from one thing or place—probably not from each other." When an epidemic of hepatitis is spread from person to person, through close contact, the epidemic lasts about 6 months. That's because the disease has an incubation period of about a month. In other words it takes a month for a person to get sick after he's been exposed. So the disease is spread out over a longer period than when everyone is exposed to the germs simultaneously.

In addition to the time factor, there were other clues. There was the age factor: the disease had chosen as its victims mostly high-school youngsters and young adults. When germs are spread from person to person, most of the victims are young children who catch things easily. And there was also the geographic factor: the people who were sick outside of town were all children who came there to school and grownups who came to work. But most cases were actually in town and on the east side, as the nurse's map told the doctor his first day on the job.

All clues, therefore, pointed to the epidemic coming from one source. To find that source, however, was a complicated problem.

The water supply had been considered at first. But the town had only one large reservoir for drinking water. When it was tested, it showed no trace of contamination. What's more, if the reservoir water had caused the epidemic, it would have been more scattered. As for food, there had been no common place where all the sick people had eaten. Most people ate at home, not in restaurants. Milk and canned foods were also investigated. But the sick people drank milk from all three dairies in town, not just one. And they had eaten no one canned or bottled food.

The source of the epidemic, Dr. Mosely concluded, had to be a common gathering, such as the district wrestling meet which attracted the right age group, or the monthly basketball games. But not enough sick people had attended any of these functions.

It suddenly occurred to Dr. Mosely that the sick people were at the age for going to the movies—and there was just one movie house in town.

At this point, things began to move fast. Dr. Mosely called the sanitary engineer who was responsible for the local water system. The engineer and his assistant accompanied the doctor to the theater. When Dr. Mosely sighted a water fountain, he asked the manager where the plumbing for it was. If there was a cross connection, a place where the fresh water and sewage pipes crossed, they might really be on their way to finding whatdunit. There was.

Back in the office, Dr. Mosely asked the district engineer for an approved map of the sanitary and water supply systems. He studied it a few minutes, then let out a low whistle.

He had considered the water supply as a possible epidemic source at the very beginning, but dropped the idea when he learned the whole town drank from one reservoir and most of the sickness was on one side of town. Now he saw that in the hills above the town were two springs he had never heard of, and from these springs ran a fresh water supply pipe no one had told him about—right into the east side of town where the epidemic centered and where the movie theater was.

Up above and parallel to the town was a pretty little stream near an underground spring which fed the pipeline to town. The municipal water system was privately owned and the previous summer the owner had gotten complaints from his customers on the other side of the hill that they didn't have enough water pressure in their faucets. So he simply ran a pipe from the little stream into the main pipeline. If a surface stream is used for water supply, it should be chlorinated. But no one had been up to check on the spring for 5 years; it was no wonder that the spring house, which should have been watertight, was broken down and leaking.

What's more, the man who owned the water system also owned a summer cabin right below another spring which was supposed to be cut off and opened only in emergencies such as fire. But he needed more water for his cabin. So he had opened the cutoff.

The water from this spring, then, was also running into the main pipeline. And up the dirt road were houses which emptied their septic or sewage tanks right across an open field into the spring. In January a man who lived in one of those houses had come down sick with hepatitis. A girl who lived in another house had gotten it in February. So their sickness had spread through the spring, through the wrongly opened cutoff, to the whole eastern side of town.

As a result of this revelation, the pipeline was overhauled and brought up to proper health standards, and the source of the disease eliminated.

There are many other dramatic instances of the quick work done by the Center's disease detectives.

A team from the Communicable Disease Center and Baylor University, for example, rushed off to British Guiana shortly before Christmas last year to fight a polio epidemic. By setting up mass immunization clinics and assisting in essential vaccine administration, the group scored a double success. Not only did they stamp out the epidemic, but they also did much to counter anti-American propaganda in British Guiana.

And a year ago last summer, CDC's investigators went to St. Petersburg, Fla., to aid the local and State health authorities in controlling an epidemic of encephalitis in the Tampa Bay area. Scientists suspected a mosquito known as *Culex nigripalpus*, which was common in this area. After exhaustive tests, it was found that this mosquito was indeed carrying the virus of St. Louis encephalitis. This made possible a mosquito control program, specifically directed toward the control of this particular species and eradication of the disease.

Again, a mysterious ailment struck down 43 young school children in a small southern town. Psittacosis was suspected because the children's classrooms each contained a pair of parakeets. But the blood samples which were taken during the investigation by a team of Communicable Disease Center investigators, proved the disease to be histoplasmosis, a lung fungus disease which resemble tuberculosis, and which is transmitted by pores which form in dust. Here, too, tracking down the cause of disease was the essential first step to its treatment and cure.

The Communicable Disease Center is an arm of the Public Health Service, which is a vast enterprise geared to keep disease from happening and from spreading if it does appear. Its workers strive to keep as many people as possible in as good health as possible, for as long as possible.

Through such agencies as the Communicable Disease Center, and its fast-moving, fast-thinking detectives, the Public Health Service is able to offer services that individual doctors cannot. Contagious diseases can spread like brush fires unless there are skilled people on guard to find them, then stamp them out. Your medical FBI is your family's partner in a vast health enterprise whose mission is simply stated—to advance the health of all of us.

The Lady Is for Burning: The Seven Deadly Sins of Madam Nhu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article, appearing in the last issue of the National Review, is written by our former colleague, Clare Boothe Luce.

The article on Madam Nhu is one of the most interesting pieces on the lady to appear in our press. Mrs. Luce has done considerable research into the questions she discusses. She has courage enough to state her views and she has intelligence enough to back them up with reason and logic. She also unveils some of our own hypocrisy and the better-than-thou attitude of some in high places:

THE LADY IS FOR BURNING: THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS OF MADAM NHU

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu, the First Lady of Vietnam, who recently left our shores, is beautiful, dynamic, courageous, intelligent. And even her worst enemies do not doubt her piety or virtue. A militant Catholic, mother of four, she is a devoted and fiercely loyal (if not subservient) wife. But what makes Madam Nhu important is the great political power she wields in her country. For a moment, however brief, in history, some part of America's prestige if not security, seems to lie in the pale pink palm of her exquisite little hand.

South Vietnam, although an underpopulated country (14 million), is the latest spot in America's 17-year-old struggle to contain communism. The United States is spending better than a million dollars a day there to help the Vietnamese fight a guerrilla war.

If this war is lost Asiatic communism, in the end, must gain all of Indochina.

The purpose of Madam Nhu's visit to the United States was to convince her American hearers that her country is winning that war, but will probably lose it if she and her family are undermined and thrown to the left-wing wolves. What seems to be happening to the government in Vietnam is remarkably like what happened to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Chiang in China when the Department of State pulled the rug out from under them, and Mao Tse-tung took over China.

Madam Nhu's tour drew large crowds. But it proved somewhat less than triumphal. She was booed and hissed in her passings. And her TV interlocutors and lecture audiences (already prejudiced against her by U.S. press dispatches from far off Saigon) threw the heaviest barrage of loaded, discourteous, even insulting questions at her that have ever been addressed to a distinguished foreign figure—and an ally. By comparison, Khrushchev on his American visits had been treated like a public hero.

What is the case against this fragile little creature who has been so scornfully dubbed "the Dragon Lady"? Why was she treated as though she were a vicious enemy of our country? Why did President Kennedy slam the White House door in her pretty face, while he ordered the brass handles polished to the nines for Communist Tito's visit? Why has he ordered that shipments of surplus milk to the children of her country—our allies—be curtailed while he presses hard for shipments of wheat to Khrushchev, who still threatens to bury us?

What are the sins of Madam Nhu? Upon examination, they seem to be seven:

1. Madam Nhu and her family represent, according to their American critics in Saigon, a principle which is utterly abhorrent to all true lovers of democracy: the principle of family rule, or nepotism.

Madam Nhu's only official positions are those of deputy in the National Assembly and chief of South Vietnam's women's movements. But her husband, Ngo Dinh Nhu, controls intelligence and the secret police, and is personal adviser and political theoretician to his brother, President Ngo Dinh Diem. Her other brother-in-law is Ngo Dinh Thuc, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Hué.

To be sure, President Kennedy appointed his brother, Robert, Attorney General (even though Bobby had never tried a case.) And this powerful post put Bobby in control of our secret police—the FBI. Mr. Kennedy also engineered the election of his 31-year-old brother, Teddy, to the Senate. He made his brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, Director of the multimillion-dollar Peace Corps program (and perhaps hopes to make him governor of Illinois). Another brother-in-law, Stephen Smith, has handled White House patronage and other sensitive affairs of the party—in the interests of the Kennedys. The President has, of course, found ornamental government missions for his sisters and other relatives.

Still, in America, that's democracy. But not in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

2. American newspapermen in Saigon view Madam Nhu as a political demagog who controls all the election machinery in her own district. They say she stole her last election as deputy by promising "to do more" for her constituents than any other candidate, because she was related to the President. The proof that her election was undemocratic, they claim, is that she got over 90 percent of the vote—and delivered on her promise: her constituents do get more than other Vietnamese voters and taxpayers.

NEPOTISM EAST AND WEST

Now, to be sure, a thing like that can happen here—it happened just a year ago, right in Massachusetts. And now Senator TED KENNEDY is delivering a $50 million electronic research center to his constituents who are also hopeful on the score of profitable railroad and airline mergers.

Still, in America, that's democracy. But not in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

3. Madam Nhu's American critics feel she is a religious bigot. She not only insists on practicing what her Christian church teaches, but she tries to have the law of her country reflect Christian morals on sex. She has put through laws against concubinage, prostitution, and adultery. She has made divorce unattainable, except by Government permission. Her country is greatly underpopulated and is suffering thousands of war casualties: she has banned contraceptives. She has, the press reports, some mad idea that she can preserve the ancient, chaste, Vietnamese pattern of courtship. She has fought against the entrance of Hollywood films of sex and violence, and foreign pornographic literature. And—could you ask for better proof of her bigotry—she frowns on the twist and bikinis.

It is even rumored among Americans in the "twist-easies" which have sprung up in Saigon on protest against this Asiatic bluestocking that she disapproves of Liz Taylor films, on the totally undemocratic grounds that young Vietnamese girls have not yet learned to envy and admire our American goddess' habit of breaking up homes and living publicly with others' husbands.

Now, Vietnam may be Madam Nhu's country, but democracy has just got to make room for things like that. That's what the American taxpayer is shelling out a million dollars a day to defend in Vietnam. (Or is it?)

4. The U.S. press corps in Saigon seem to agree to a man that Madam Nhu has too much political power for a woman—especially one with no official position. Time says she not only has her husband's ear, but she openly orders around cabinet ministers and generals, sees to it that her favorites get jobs in government, and at all times around the clock, she is up to her neck in political wangling.

Being a mere 5 feet tall in her 3-inch heels, she has still not had an eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation with Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. But that gallant gentleman has drawn himself up to his full 6 feet 3 inches and is waiting for her return to slug it out with her.

To be sure, we have had our Eleanor Roosevelt, a President's wife who for 25 years exerted more influence over the domestic and foreign politics of her country than any woman who wasn't a crowned ruler. Indeed, she was once known to have ordered up a whole squad of planes during the war to pay a visit to some favorite soldier friends in the Pacific. And, like Madam Nhu, she also helped to select candidates for office who reflected her views. Again like Madam Nhu, she often took a beating from pressmen who thought she meddled and was too ubiquitous.

BUT IN AMERICA—

But in America, that's democracy. The American press wants no such power in a woman's hands in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

Moreover, Madam Nhu is an inveterate do-gooder, and a feminist. She has tried to raise the legal status of women in her country, and interest them in taking an active part in politics and in the defense of their country. For example, Madam Nhu has taught Vietnamese women to shoot— the condition, that they must stand by unarmed when a village is attacked by Communist guerrillas, but ready to pick up the gun of a fallen, or absconding, Vietnamese man.

Madam Nhu, it seems, offends both Western and Asiatic male sensibilities, not only because she herself is not the geisha type, the concubine type of the clining vine type, but because she seems to want the 7 million women of her new-born, embattled nation to behave like the kind of women who went out of style a hundred or more years ago—the pioneer women of America. It seems she has heard about our foremothers who helped their men conquer the oceans and the continent, and who were as quick on the draw as their menfolk when scalping parties suddenly put in an appearance. She seems to have heard somewhere of Molly Pitcher, Annie Oakley, and Joan of Arc. (Boy, is this lady for burning.)

To be sure, in America, we have ourselves in recent months turned a thought or two to the question of giving a break to American women.

The Commission headed by the late Mrs. Roosevelt on the Status of Women, has just turned in its report to the President. It shows that while 24 million American women work for wages, they are not paid equal wages for equal work. It shows that there are only 234 women among the States' 7,700 legislators; 11 Congresswomen out of 435, and 2 women Senators out of a hundred. Only two women have held Cabinet rank in all American history. In releasing the report, President Kennedy urged that more women participate at all levels in public life. In America, we want progress for our women. But not for women of Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money.

5. The family rule of the Ngo Dinhs, according to their American critics, does not have the full support of the people of South Vietnam. Although there is no Gallup poll in Vietnam, it seems that there is a newspaper in Saigon which lays on to Madam Nhu, her husband, and President Diem quite unmercifully. This paper says the Nhus must go, and hints quite broadly that a coup d'etat or a revolution would be most democratic way of getting rid of the lot. Why wait for elections?

This highly democratic view seems to be shared by some of the U.S. pressmen who pop in and out of Saigon en route to Hong Kong. And it is also shared by some coup-minded officials of the U.S. Embassy.

THE ELECTORATE AND THE PRESS

While this antigovernment press is not suppressed, Madam Nhu makes it plain that she doesn't like the situation. As for the Embassy, she feels that it is pretty stupid of the United States to try to throw out an anti-Communist government when all they can substitute is a military (and unreliable) dictatorship.

Madam Nhu's American critics say all this shows that she is, at heart, a tyrant and that any foreign government without the full support of all the people and the press should be kicked out.

Now, the American electorate is far from 100 percent for President Kennedy. Indeed, he got just a fraction less than 50 percent of the vote in 1960 * * * and there were even rumors he didn't get that. Nor is the press entirely for him. In fact, a lot of it is against him—and even more against his family—and quite a lot of Americans happen to agree with Madam Nhu, who thinks he is lulling the United States into a false sense of security about the Communists.

However, this is America and we don't talk about coups and overthrowing elected governments. We believe in a democracy. You should wait for elections. But in Vietnam it's different. Why not help overthrow the Diem government in order to get rid of Madam Nhu. Isn't it our money?

Two additional charges (6 and 7) remain against Madam Nhu. They are indeed serious: First, that she has pressured the Diem government into persecuting the Buddhist religion; second, that her stubborn refusal to come to terms with the Buddhists has "hopelessly" compromised the Vietnamese war effort.

How well founded are these charges? And if well founded, what will happen in Vietnam if the Nhus and President Diem are

booted out? For there can be little doubt that the big boot will have to be used, since Madam Nhu, among other things, is a fighting lady.

Not long ago Madam Nhu said that Americans are "Ivanhoes" who are perpetually in love with the underdog, but confused about who the underdog really is. She thinks the underdogs that the U.S. press corps in Vietnam and the State Department are sobbing over are the Vietcong Communist provocateurs who have inflamed some Buddhist opinion. Madam Nhu believes she herself is the real underdog in the situation. Certainly the china doll-sized stateswoman from South Vietnam has been taking enough punishment from the American press to smash her into a tiny heap of porcelain scraps. Fortunately for her, and possibly for her country, Madam Nhu is not a china doll. Backhanded by the State Department, bullied and scratched at by reporters, lectured at by her own lecture audiences. Madam Nhu travels along singing her song. Chin up, eyes flashing, long delicate hands gesticulating gracefully and forcefully, she is still pretty solid on her 3-inch heels.

The charge that Madam Nhu, her husband, her brothers-in-law President Ngo Dinh Diem and Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc, have "persecuted" South Vietnamese Buddhists is certainly the toughest charge she has had to meet. But meet it she did. And meet it she must, for her fellow Catholic President Kennedy does not intend to face into the 1964 election campaign defending himself against accusations from the liberal left that he has supported a government just because it is Catholic. He can better afford to lose Vietnam than to have that calumny tied to him.

THE CHARGE OF PERSECUTION

The fact is that the charge of religious persecution against the family is pretty recent. And if indeed they are persecuting Buddhists this will mark the first time in democratic history that a small religious minority has successfully persecuted an overwhelming religious majority in a democracy.

South Vietnam Catholics number 1.5 million of the 14 million population. There are approximately 5.25 million Buddhists and the remainder of the population is made up of Taoists, Confucianists, and members of other sects. Less than one-third of the Cabinet members are Catholics; only 3 of the 19 generals. But Catholics are about half of the civil service and the Assembly. The reason for this, given and accepted until a few months ago by all foreign observers in Vietnam, is that the Catholics under the French built an extensive parochial school system. Over the years this system has turned out relatively well-educated graduates with a lively interest in Western democratic government. The Buddhists have not been able to compete with these educated Catholic Vietnamese in civil service examinations. Until last May, there was no evidence of great discontent with the Diem government by the Buddhist population. On the contrary, thanks to the annual $350 million economic and military aid, and with the help of 14,000 U.S. military "advisers," victory, last spring, seemed near for the Diem government, and the people seemed to know it.

Then, in the space of 5 months the flaming deaths of six Buddhist bonzes, or priests, led to a series of public demonstrations which brought about the present political crisis in which Madam Nhu herself is also being badly burned.

FORCED TO "LOSE FACE"

How did these deaths come about? Were the Buddhist priests dragged by force from their homes or temples by Catholics and put to the torch—as in the not so distant past in America, Negroes were torn from their home, or jails, and lynched or burned—by white Americans? Were the bonzes butchered as were thousands of Mao Tse-tung's recalcitrant Chinese farmers? Were they tortured, beaten, brainwashed, shot, liquidated as millions of Russians, Poles, Hungarians were by Stalin and Khrushchev?

They were not. The saffron-robed monks were living unmolested by anyone in their own pagodas, when one by one they stole forth into public squares, where they squatted in lotus pose, poured gasoline over themselves, applied the match, and committed suicide.

In America, if a Catholic priest were to burn himself to death in protest to the Government's failure to provide free bus rides for parochial schoolchildren, or if a Protestant minister were to make of himself a living torch to express his opposition to the Supreme Court decision against prayer in public schools, we would consider them religious maniacs. And our Government would take stringent measures to prevent any repition of such acts. This is precisely the view Madam Nhu has taken of the self-immolating bonzes. They are slaves, she said, "if not to others, at least to their own folly." And the government of President Diem has used the police force to prevent further emulations of such follies. What, then, was the particular grievance which led these Buddhists to encompass their own cremation?

Last May, the Buddhists of Hué were forbidden to unfurl their flags, in honor of Buddha's 2507th birthday, above the flag of Vietnam. As in America, no flag in Vietnam may fly above the national flag. (In this land of many religions, separation of church and state is, of necessity, the law of the nation.) Refusal by Diem's government to permit the Buddhists to fly their flag above the national flag caused the leaders of the Hué pagoda to lose face.

In America, self-immolation is not thought to be a useful or particularly democratic way to protest grievances or discrimination. However, an insult which might barely cause one American to punch another, could, say in Japan, lead to hara-kiri. A Japanese who loses face disembowels himself with a ritual sword, ofted aided by a friend or a relative. In India, for hundreds of years, widows threw themselves onto the funeral pyres of their husbands; if they did not, they lost face. Although suttee has been outlawed for a century in India, in backward villages it is still occasionally practiced.

NIRVANA ATTAINED

The Buddhist monks in Vietnam who incinerated themselves not only regained "face" for the temple, but Nirvana or Paradise and sainthood for themselves. For at least three of the monks who were over age 70, this must have seemed a rather good deal.

(Probably no American can understand the Asiatic concept of "face." This is perhaps forunate. In view of how much "face" the United States has lost in the Orient, we would have to burn Washington to recover it.)

In our country, protestors sign petitions, picket, hire halls or rabblerouse. Recently our Negroes (a minority) have taken to sit-ins, sit-downs, mass demonstrations, handcuffing themselves together, until the police break them up.

While we are on the subject of discrimination, it may help us to think a little more charitably about President Diem's and Madam Nhu's alleged persecution of the Buddhists, if we remember that despite 4 years of mass Negro demonstrations in America, the President still has not found it convenient to appoint a Negro to his Cabinet, to help elect a Negro Senator, or Governor, or even a big city mayor. And yet Negroes represent 20 percent of our population, and time and again their vote decides presidential elections.

In America, it depends on wthat you can get away with. But not so in Vietnam. Not, anyway, on our money. In Vietnam you have to be perfect.

Consequent to the Buddhist sacrifices, there have been, since May, a half-dozen demonstrations of Buddhists in the streets. In the attempt to keep order, the Vietnam police have encountered the same difficulties our police have encountered with unruly crowds of demonstrators in Alabama, Chicago, New York's Harlem, New Jersey. And in Vietnam as in America, some people got hurt. A bomb thrown by an unknown provocateur killed several people in Vietnam. U.S. Embassy officers expressed themselves as being "shocked and disgusted" at this occurrence and at the police suppression of the Buddhist demonstrators.

The State Department no doubt failed to inform our Embassy in Saigon that similar episodes were happening in Alabama, where four children were killed in a church bombing, and in the wake, two boys were killed by police. Nor did they send out over the Voice of America to Vietnam a very clear account of riots and police methods used to quell Negro-white rioters in other parts of the country.

And speaking of corruption in Vietnam, what about the Cosa Nostra operation in America? Ah, well, in America, democracy isn't perfect. But in Vietnam it had better be—on our money.

The last charge against Mme. Nhu and the Diem government is that their failure to be an ideal democracy which their American critics carry about in their heads—will now make it impossible to win the war against the Vietcong Communists.

Is this true, or is it false? Vietnam has been at war for almost a decade. The South Vietnam population is suffering 5,000 casualties a year. Women and men, many of them Buddhists, have gone forth day after day, year after year, to meet and repulse their Communist enemies. A few months ago victory was in sight. If the United States gives firm support to Diem now, the crisis will pass and the war may still be won. If the U.S. support is withdrawn on the grounds that the United States can no longer support the Diem government because 6 men—or 16—insist on making human torches of themselves, then South Vietnam will fall and the political vacuum left by the Ngo Dinh family will soon be filled by the "Yu-No-Hu" family: the Chinese Communists.

Is the history of the liberal press in Chungking and Havana going to repeat itself? The evidence is that it is.

The Christian Science Monitor wrote last week: "The confusion (in American public opinion) stems from the fact that the United States does not wish to say, in so many words, that it is working for a revolution in South Vietnam. But so long as the Ngo Dinh family remains unbending, that is the fact."

If indeed, that is the fact, the administration will no doubt begin to boast along about 1965 that it has relieved tensions in Vietnam by negotiating peace with Ho Chi-minh, the Communist leader of that country. And no doubt wheat and arms will then soon be sent to him, to strengthen "the Vietnamese Tito" against Red China.

Poor Madam Nhu. The lady is sure for burning.

Some Call It Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Tom Pugh, the Peoria-Journal Star's man in

Vietnam, has been reporting regularly on the situation there and has had the opportunity to talk directly to newsmen, American military people and other U.S. agents in that country. Mr. Chuck Dancey has evaluated his reports, resulting in the following editorial which appeared in the November 5, 1963 issue of the aforementioned paper. Under unanimous consent I include the editorial at this point:

VIETNAM VERDICT: U.S. GUILTY

The administration has publicly announced that the U.S. Government is "not responsible and will not accept any responsibility" for what has happened in Vietnam.

It may be that the folks in Washington have the slightly queasy sensation shared by many Americans today that we have somehow reached a new low in these revolutionary times that finally destroys something basic to this land of ours.

The iron facts will not go away, and without a shadow of a doubt our Government cannot escape responsibility for what has happened in Vietnam. The fact that we are so eager to dodge it is revealing in itself.

Our pious statements about the assassinations of Diem and Nhu in cold blood ring hollow, indeed, in the light of our actions of recent weeks.

A month ago, the U.S. policy was so crystal clear that we editorialized then on the question of whether we had anybody in mind to take Diem's place, since we obviously were set on getting rid of him.

We wrote then of the clear invitation the U.S. Government had plainly issued to the Vietnamese Army chief to disown and replace Diem.

It didn't work immediately, but the United States took several steps since to cut off aid to Diem's "special forces" while continuing it to the army forces who ultimately attacked them.

The record is a clear as clear can be, as Tom Pugh succinctly itemized it, immediately, in Saturday morning's paper, having just returned from Saigon where he heard the open talk of newsmen, American military people, and other U.S. agents.

We wanted to get rid of Diem. We set the stage for it. And we succeeded.

It may have been necessary. It may have been wise policy for the future of Vietnam and the successful conclusion of the fight against Vietcong.

But, among all the black spots on our national record, there has never been a case where we stooped to assassination or murder as a legitimate tool of politics, and a means of dominating in the way we think best a tiny foreign land.

Perhaps, we did not intend assassination, but it was as built in to this situation as murder is built into an armed robbery—if death result. We can't escape the terrible moral responsibility.

Diem's police beat up American reporters. We don't like that. Diem ruled by force. He was a dictator. He was also the man who saved Vietnam when the whole world thought its situation hopeless 8 years ago.

Whatever he deserved, it was something better than being yanked out of a church and shot down like a dog.

We find ourselves pulled down to his level, and below it, in using force for political desires.

And while it may help the situation from an American point of view in Vietnam, it will exact a price from the United States, too, in many other places.

Will any other leader of any underdeveloped or threatened land ever again be willing to put himself so completely at the mercy of America? To let the United States pay his troops, and scatter 16,000 of our own troops throughout the Armed Forces with an "adviser" at every single army headquarters?

Will the Latin American countries, who have long had an emotional reaction to American "intervention" and "imperialism," be strengthened in support of the Alliance for Progress, the Organization of American States, and combined action (led by the United States) against Cuba?

Or will the neutralists and the non-Communists and the Peronists who scream against U.S. designs on their countries, and Yankee imperialism be strengthened throughout Latin America?

Platitudes and pious statements will not suffice to change this problem, for they can see the harsh facts clearly, and the platitudes from Washington merely sound more corrupt and coldblooded and dishonest than the situation would be without them.

Indeed, it is this lie that condemns us. We have used force before, openly, and for a purpose we frankly and openly considered made it necessary.

But a sneaking, secondhand putsch, followed by these wide-eyed protestations of innocence, puts us in a new class, and gives us a new image before the world.

Whatever else the world has thought of us, it has thought of America as naive at times, but also as different, as having moral inhibitions.

Today, we stand alongside every other ruthless, frightening monstrous power on the world scene, now or historically, and smaller nations cannot help but fear and draw back from us.

The thing that now gnaws at so many of us is that this is not only the case—but that, now, we deserve it. We feel guilt deep down in our insides.

C. L. DANCEY.

"Mim" Daddario Honored on Unique All-America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hartford Courant of November 6, 1963:

"MIM" DADDARIO HONORED ON UNIQUE ALL-AMERICA

(By Bill Lee)

EMILIO QUINCY DADDARIO, Representative in Congress from the First Connecticut District, is 1 of 25 winners of the Silver Anniversary All-America Awards of Sports Illustrated.

The Hartford man, called "MIM" today as he was when a star back at Wesleyan 25 years ago, is one of the winners of unique award given not for superiority on the football field, but rather for what the men have accomplished in business, professional, and political life in the intervening years.

DADDARIO is one of the finest football players Wesleyan has had, a halfback and quarterback who was outstanding for 3 years in Little Three games.

PANEL OF JUDGES

Nominated for the award by Wesleyan University, Daddario was selected by a panel of judges including Dr. Leland J. Haworth, director, National Science Foundation; L. B. Worthington, president, United States Steel Corp.; Dr. Henry Putney van Dusen, president, Union Theological Seminary; Gov. William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania; David Packard, president, Hewlett-Packard Co.; Lee A. Iaccoca, vice president, Ford Motor Co.; Mills B. Lane, president, Citizens and Southern National Bank; E. Roland Harriman of Brown Bros., Harriman; Austin T. Cushman, chairman, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; W. L. Lyons Brown, chairman of Brown-Forman Distilleries; and Col. Earl Blaik, executive committee, Avco Manufacturing Co.

WITH HARTFORD BLUES

"MIM" DADDARIO, besides an excellent college player at Wesleyan, played for and coached the Hartford Blues, a semiprofessional team formed here by Lou Viscusi, which achieved outstanding success just before World War II. DADDARIO led the Blues in a big game at the Polo Grounds, New York in 1940.

DADDARIO was an officer in the OSS in Italy during the war and was given the Legion of Merit. He returned to active duty during the Korean conflict. After the war he was elected mayor of Middletown and subsequently was a judge in municipal court. He has been U.S. Representative from the first district since 1958.

Two other Connecticut men were among the 25 named to the 1963 Silver Anniversary team. They are Robert L. Green Jr., nominated by Harvard, where he was captain and Herman L. Weiss of Case Institute, now executive vice president of General Electric. Mr. Green is rector of St. Marthes' Parish in Wilton.

Also named is Gilbert W. Humphrey of Ohio, former Yale player and father of the 1963 Yale captain, George Humphrey.

The 25-man team includes Allie P. Reynolds, Oklahoma oil executive and former New York Yankee baseball pitcher; Dr. William T. Osmanski, onetime Holy Cross College and Chicago Bear player; Marshall Goldberg twice named to the All-America when he was a Pitt football player; Davey O'Brien of Texas Christian and the Philadelphia Eagles; and Jerome (Brud) Holland, twice All-America at Cornell.

Winners of the silver anniversary award by States, with colleges which nominated them:

California: Vic Bottari, University of California; Don McNeil, Southern California.

Connecticut: Emilio Quincy Daddario, Wesleyan University; Robert Green, Jr., Harvard; Herman Weiss, Case Institute; John Hlavacek, Carleton College.

Illinois: Marshall Goldberg, Pittsburgh; Fred Heitmann, Jr., Northwestern; Dr. William Thomas Osmanski, Holy Cross.

Indiana: Ray H. Montgomery, DePauw.

Louisiana: Dr. Charles C. Sprague, Southern Methodist.

Maine: Dr. Daniel Francis Hanley, Bowdoin.

Massachusetts: Howard L. Jones, Colgate.

Minnesota: Robert Wellington Gibson, Dartmouth.

Missouri: Edward J. Bock, Jr., Iowa State.

New York: Dr. Martin F. Hilfinger, Hamilton College.

Ohio: Gilbert W. Humphrey, Yale.

Oklahoma: Allie Reynolds, Oklahoma State.

Pennsylvania: Raymond T. Frey, Lebanon Valley; Frank Rabold, Lehigh.

Texas: V. Earl McCaleb, Abilene Christian; Robert David O'Brien, Texas Christian.

Virginia: Brig. Gen. John William Dobson, U.S. Military Academy; Dr. Jerome Holland, Cornell.

Wisconsin: Robert J. Greenebaum, University of Chicago.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part IV of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY'S SECRET CONTRIBUTION TO DEFEAT HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS—PART IV

"On November 10, 1950," began the New Republic article published nearly 2 years later, "a young Massachusetts Congressman told an informal gathering of Harvard University students and professors—of which this writer was a member—that (a) he could see no reason why we were fighting in Korea; (b) he thought that sooner or later we would 'have to get all these foreigners off our backs' in Europe; (c) he supported the McCarran Act and felt that not enough had been done about Communists in Government; (d) that he rather respected Joe McCarthy and thought he 'knew Joe pretty well, and he may have something'; (e) that he had no great respect for Dean Acheson or indeed almost any member of the Fair Deal administration; (f) that he personally was very happy that Helen Gahagan Douglas had just been defeated in California by Richard Nixon."

The young Congressman was, of course, John F. Kennedy. The article was authored by John P. Mallan, then a Harvard teaching fellow and more recently a professor at Smith College.

Kennedy's liking for McCarthy seemed to be on a personal basis, as was his feeling that Mrs. Douglas was "not the sort of person I like working with on committees."

GAVE $1,000 TO NIXON

So aroused emotionally was young Kennedy against Helen Gahagan Douglas that he made what could well have been a disastrous slip in terms of his later ambitions. In 1950, John F. Kennedy made a personal contribution to Richard M. Nixon in his Senate campaign against the California Congresswoman.

"The check, of course, is of record," according to Robert W. Richards, chief of the San Diego Union's Washington bureau. Like any other contribution it was turned over to the Nixon Senate Campaign Committee in California.

Fortunately for Kennedy, the Richards dispatch, published on July 20, 1960, soon after his nomination for President, did not obtain wider circulation.

As Richards told the story: "The new Democrat standard bearer's pop, Joe, who masterminded son Jack's climb up the money tree to the party's presidential nomination, also liked Nixon as a warrior against communism. But the check which Jack Kennedy, then in the House, brought in person into the Nixon office—the Vice President also was serving his second term in Congress—was signed not by his father, but by himself and drawn against his own account."

There had been published reports that Joseph P. Kennedy had contributed liberally to the Nixon campaign because he considered Mrs. Douglas "too far to the left." But the Richards dispatch was the first to disclose that Jack Kennedy had personally helped Nixon out with a four-figure contribution.

All this happened during the bruising Nixon-Douglas contest, the repercussions of which were still being felt a decade later during the 1960 presidential campaign. Ironically, anti-Nixon sentiments nurtured in 1950 were to be capitalized upon by the Kennedy forces. As Richards wrote of the 1950 episode:

NIXON NEVER DISCLOSED IT

"Shock-haired Kennedy strode into the Nixon House offices to ask if the Congressman was available. He was informed that Nixon was out. Jack then suggested that he'd like to see Nixon's confidential secretary privately and was turned over to William Arnold. Pulling the check for $1,000 from his pocket the Boston House Member said he wanted to offer it to help out Nixon's campaign against Representative Douglas.

"He didn't need to spell out to the Nixon aide that it might be embarrassing if a Democrat Member of Congress was known to be giving cash to the campaign of a Republican senatorial candidate.

"Nor has Nixon ever betrayed the Kennedy campaign gift to this day."

Richards' "unimpeachable sources," who, he said, was neither Nixon nor any of his staff, had revealed the story only because Kennedy, in his speech accepting the presidential nomination, had struck some "low blows" against his Republican rival.

For one thing, Kennedy had asserted that before Nixon deals, "someone had better cut the cards." Such statements according to Richards' informant, "were paradoxical in view of what had happened only a decade ago" when Kennedy sought the defeat of Mrs. Douglas. "Perhaps," observed Richards, "it is one of those swings of the pendulum that politics imposes on the ambitious."

OUTLINES CAMPAIGN

How the pendulum swung for Kennedy in terms of his Senate ambitions, was described by the Mallan article. It was in the fall of 1951, during another Harvard appearance, when Representative Kennedy disclosed his intention to seek election to the Senate the following year. And, without characterizing his remarks as off the record, he outlined the kind of campaign he intended to wage against the Republican incumbent Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., promulgating what could be termed the theory of the "visual contrast." (This, of course, was before the term "image" had entered the language.)

Dr. Mallan continued: "Lodge, said Kennedy, is young, as I am. He is a veteran of World War II, as I am. (He might have added that both men were decorated for bravery.) I cannot disagree with him on foreign policy. There is no way, in short, that I can create a 'visual contrast' between myself as a young reformer bringing change and Lodge as a crusty representative of the old guard. One thing remains: I must attack Lodge on domestic issues. I must attack his record on housing, on price control, on labor, on the St. Lawrence Seaway and economic aid for New England. I must, in brief—Kennedy might have added—become a New Dealer."

Actually, Kennedy has been running for higher office even before his first term as Congressman was over. This was one of the reasons why his record of absenteeism in the Congress was the worst of any of the 14-member Massachusetts delegation. "Indeed," wrote the Reporter's Ralph Blagden, "Kennedy's on-the-record percentage for the entire 82d Congress was 57, placing him among the bottom four Members in the whole Chamber."

M'CARTHY ISSUE TABOO

Some liberals in the '52 race were concerned about Kennedy's "failure to address himself to the menace of McCarthyism." So Gardner "Pat" Jackson, an old-line New Dealer, prepared a high-level pronouncement citing Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH'S "Declaration of Conscience," and a manifesto "on the twin evils of McCarthyism and Communism" signed by 99 Notre Dame faculty members.

Kennedy was willing to sign the statement provided House Leader John McCormack would do likewise. McCormack agreed. The idea was to publish it as a newspaper advertisement.

"So I took the statement up to Jack's apartment the next morning," said Jackson. "The place was a hubbub of activity. Jack had his coat on and went dashing out just as I arrived."

Sitting at a card table in the center of the room were Joseph P. Kennedy; Frank Morrissey; and three Kennedy ghostwriters—James Landis, John Harriman and Joseph Healy.

"I read them the ad at Jack's request," continued Jackson, "and I hadn't gone two sentences when Joe jumped to his feet with such force that he tilted the table against the others.

Storming over to Jackson, he shouted at the top of his voice, "You and your (sheeny) friends are trying to destroy my son." Not only was he not opposed to Joe McCarthy, but, he thundered, he had contributed to Joe's campaign. Again and again he charged that the liberals, the labor people and the Jews were out to destroy his son. Moreover, he stormed, his son had gone too much down the labor union line to suit him. He shouted obscenity after obscenity. (Editor's note: Joe Kennedy is said not to be anti-Semitic but is prone to use derogatory ethnic terms—for all races and nationalities, Irish included.)

"And what's more," he yelled, "this statement will never be published."

As, in fact, it wasn't.

"I can't estimate how long he poured it out on me," Jackson later recalled. "It was just a stream of stuff. * * * No one has ever shouted at me that way in my life."

GAVE $3,000 TO M'CARTHY

The McCarthy problem was a particularly thorny one for a candidate seeking the votes of both militant supporters and militant foes of the controversial Wisconsin Senator. The great fear in the Kennedy camp was that McCarthy might come to Massachusetts and endorse Lodge.

Joseph Kennedy managed to solve the problems in familiar style. He contributed $3,000 to McCarthy's reelection campaign and the story circulated he did so in order to keep the Wisconsinite out of the Bay State.

Throughout the 1952 campaign, Jack Kennedy managed to avoid the McCarthy issue like the plague. Once, however, he did criticize the Senator's record on some economic issues. ("That's like being against Khrushchev because of his farm program," commented "Pat" Jackson.)

Once the name of Joe McCarthy was raised to an embarrassed silence. This was the occasion when, according to Reporter Murray Kempton, Harry Truman came to Boston "to address a wondrous wake of Irish professionals and fairly spat the names of Jenner and McCarthy." Kennedy had preceded the President on the rostrum with "a delicately carpentered speech built around alliterations about 'the Capeharts and the Cains,' which could outrage no one within line of sight." It was a speech in which Kennedy warned that a GOP victory would give Senate committee chairmanships "to the Brickers, Capeharts, and Cains, truly a murderers' row of reactionism." But the candidate uttered nary a word about the liberals' principal bete noire of the season—Joe McCarthy.

In seeking to outflank Lodge from the right, Kennedy appealed for votes from conservative Republicans with the argument that he was far closer on foreign policy to Senator Robert A. Taft—Mr. Republican himself—than was his distinguished opponent.

"Kennedy has been an outspoken critic of many elements of the Truman administration's foreign policy," began a study circulated by Kennedy's campaign headquarters. "In this respect, he has been much closer to the position of Taft than has Lodge. Indeed, the latter has been riding at the head

of the so-called foreign policy parade since 1947."

THE KENNEDY MONEY

Essentially, the 1952 campaign came down to a question of personalities.

And money.

The biggest laugh of the campaign was over a begging letter from Kennedy headquarters that began, "Believe it or not, Jack Kennedy needs money." No one had any doubt that the Kennedy campaign was more than adequately financed.

Senator Lodge had money; but not that kind of money. He began to complain he was in a "battle to buy the senatorship." Ultimately the six Kennedy election committees reported a total expenditure of nearly $350,000, a new high for on-the-record spending for political purposes in the Commonwealth. What was spent off the record was another matter. Following the election, Kennedy told the Saturday Evening Post he would never have been able to compete without the family bank roll.

When the votes were counted, Kennedy was the only Bay State Democrat to survive the 1952 Republican landslide. While Eisenhower carried the State by some 210,000 votes, Kennedy managed to beat the tide and defeat Lodge by 70,000 votes.

"It was those damned tea parties," exclaimed Henry Cabot Lodge by way of explanation. A friend offered this consolation. "Don't take it too hard. You only lost by 9,500,000 cups of tea."

Republican National Committee Wasteful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is sincerely hoped my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle will accept in the spirit of fun intended the following letter I have just forwarded to the Republican National Finance Committee:

NOVEMBER 7, 1963.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FINANCE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Having been the recipient of your Kennedy retirement fund letter, I feel it proper to respond even though I am not contributing to your fund.

One of the problems of the Republican National Committee is that it wastes money; e.g., sending a letter for contributions to Mrs. Roosevelt and me. I have been told that you are receiving many serious replies from citizens informing you that they believed the Kennedys were financially secure and did not need a retirement fund. I am not surprised by this reaction from some Republicans, for I realize there is a political requirement which is lacking among some of my Republican friends, and that is a sense of humor.

Finally, I believe your letter to be false advertising because it carries the implication that the so-called retirement fund will result in President Kennedy's retirement, and I am sure that the Securities and Exchange Commission would never allow a public offer on any investment which has so little chance of success as this one. Perhaps my Republican friends will forgive me also if, in this instance, I am happy that it is the Republican National Committee which is defrauding the Republicans.

Incidentally, I've been awaiting a declaration of policy from the committee that it vigorously opposes the crackpots who want to impeach Earl Warren as Chief Justice.

Yours for fairplay,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Fiftieth Anniversary in the United States of Mr. Morris Masin, President of Haym Salomon Home and Hospital for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening last, November 3, 1963, I had the distinct pleasure and high honor of addressing over a thousand charitably minded people who are vitally interested in and who were in attendance at the annual dinner dance of the Haym Salomon Home for the Aged at the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Commodore in New York City.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House I include my remarks made on this occasion:

Chairman Lou Berkley, Mr. Harry Haber, my respected friend Rabbi Isadore Gruen, comptroller of the city of New York, the Honorable Abraham D. Beame, the borough president of the Borough of Brooklyn, the Honorable Abe Stark, distinguished members of the judiciary, Miss Claire (Miss Haym Salomon) Fox, members of the family of the late Louis Blumenstock, ladies and gentlemen, almost 200 years ago, a Polish immigrant advanced $658,007.43 to finance our war of independence. As you know, subsequently the Revolutionary War was won. But as you may not know, Haym Salomon, financier-philanthropist, died penniless and proud of it.

Today, in fitting memorial to him, the Haym Salomon Home and Hospital for the Aged at 2300 Cropsey Avenue rises six stories high in Brooklyn, facing the Atlantic Ocean. This $2½ million institution, completed in the fall of 1958, represents a heart-warming victory in a different type of war—the war against a solitary and anguished old age. Humanely, handsomely, the home and hospital provides comfortable, qualified, and compasionate care for its aged and sick occupants.

The head of this institution, its president, is my friend Mr. Morris Masin, the man we honor this evening upon the occasion of his 50th anniversary in the United States.

Morris Masin is a patriot in the Haym Salomon tradition. A man of works, not of words. Good works. Works of loving kindness and service to his fellow man.

Morris Masin was born in Vilna, Poland, a city of scholars and scholarship. At the age of 15 Morris came to the United States of America and became a toolworker in the brass industry. Diligence and dedication to his work were the tools that made him first a foreman, then a production manager. It was not many years before he established his own company, the United States Brass Turning Co., Inc., manufacturing brass goods. Today he employs over 400 people in his thriving enterprise on Wythe Avenue, Brooklyn. I am proud, indeed, to have this factory in my congressional district.

Morris Masin is proud of his adopted country and of the business he built with his very own hands. But he is even prouder of his home and hospital—the Haym Salomon Home and Hospital for the Aged where old folks can spend their sunset days in dignity and pleasantness and peace.

Permit me to say that brassworker Morris Masin, spiritual grandson of Haym Salomon, has proven himself "top brass."

He manufactures articles of brass that will no doubt wear for many, many years. But he also manufactures good deeds, which will live on forever.

The Haym Salomon Home and Hospital for the Aged is not the only humanitarian institution of which he is the outstanding benefactor. At the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital in Brooklyn, he has endowed the "Bessie and Morris Pavillion," a four story research institute where valuable contributions to medical science are already being made.

When Morris Masin lost his only son, Irving, in 1944, killed in the service of our country, the father's grief took a constructive humanitarian form. He built a trade school in Israel in the name of his son.

For half a century this modest man has dedicated himself to the service of others, regardless of race, religion or national origin. This evening we dedicate to him. For this is the spirit that made our Nation great. This is the spirit of America.

May Morris Masin continue to serve America and his fellow men for another half century.

In the Sad Passing of James K. (Jim) Lindsey, Louisiana Loses a Great Athlete and Distinguished Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is saddened by the loss of a great athlete and one of our old time "greats" in baseball, in the passing of James K. (Jim) Lindsey, age 64, a native of Greensburg who played major league baseball for years and pitched for the St. Louis Cardinals in two world's series. His baseball career included service with the Cardinals during the days of the famous "Gashouse Gang" and Dizzy Dean, when Lindsey pitched several innings in two different games in the 1930 world's series against Connie Mack's club, Philadelphia. Before his retirement from baseball, he also pitched for the Brooklyn Dodgers and the Pittsburgh Pirates.

Since his retirement from baseball, 13 years ago, he worked as farm manager for the East Louisiana State Hospital and he was a member of the Jackson Methodist Church.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Carlotta Matthews Lindsey, one daughter, four sisters, and two brothers, three grandchildren, and several nieces and nephews.

James K. (Jim) Lindsey will be greatly missed but long remembered in the hearts of all America's baseball fans and enthusiasts and his name will be held high in baseball history and hall of fame.

Jim played the game of both life and baseball with a great determination to win at both—and he succeeded.

Russia Is Still Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the public has been led to believe by our State Department public relations operation that the Communists have started to mellow and peace is just around the corner. Events in the last few days in Europe and Latin America indicate the contrary.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial of Wednesday, November 6, directs public attention in a very practical fashion to the true facts of international life. I insert this article into the RECORD at this point:

RUSSIA IS STILL RUSSIA

The detention of an American troop convoy enroute to Berlin on the autobahn by Russian troops is a serious incident in a world not secure on its axis.

This deliberate act of provocation, coming as it did on the heels of a late summer and fall that has been productive of considerable progress in the abatement of cold war tensions, underlines a basic fact that must never be forgotten. The aims and ambitions of world communism have not changed. The target is still the domination of the world by communism.

Premier Khrushchev has publicly recognized that to openly risk a nuclear war would be suicidal for Russia. He has promised his people that ideological and political victory could be won over the West by using the weapons of the West—production and trade.

Toward that end Russia has made a number of significant moves. The nuclear test ban treaty, the easing of tensions within the United Nations—and most importantly—the announcement that on January 1, 1964, a central bank will be established to service the Soviet bloc countries in the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance with a convertible ruble that will have a gold content of $1.11.

This is the first time in Soviet history that an effort has been made to put the ruble into international commerce. It promises to enable Russia to engage in international business competition with the West for the markets of the world.

Russia is determined to conquer the West with its own weapons. Speaking at Arden House on October 26 W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and the negotiator in the test ban treaty talks, warned the American people against the dangers of euphoria that could follow the test ban talks.

Harriman said: "Both the Soviet and the Red Chinese are determined to achieve their objectives of world communism and we should not be misled by the test ban treaty nor the euphoria which followed it."

That has been said on this page preceding, during and after the nuclear test ban treaty signing. The fact of the signing of the test ban treaty was encouraging. It was and is a small step forward on a long road to eventual world peace. That the course to that desired end will be difficult has been illustrated once again by the insolent blockade on the autobahn.

With the specter of nuclear holocaust a deterrent to outright aggression, Russia hopes, by a combination of unrestrained economic competition and unrelenting pressures in other areas, to challenge and weaken the resolve of the West to stand firm against communism.

That challenge must be met.

Dr. John Otto Reinemann Speaks at Dedication Services of Youth Forestry Camp No. 2 in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, while serving as a member of the Pennsylvania General Assembly a few years ago, it was my privilege to be one of the sponsors of the forestry camp bill. Therefore, the dedication of the new Youth Forestry Camp No. 2 at Hickory Run State Park, in Carbon County, Pa., on Friday morning, October 11, 1963, had particular significance for me.

One of the founding fathers of the forestry camp program in Pennsylvania was Dr. John Otto Reinemann, distinguished director of probation, the County Court of Philadelphia. Dr. Reinemann delivered the major address at the impressive dedication services of the Hickory Run Forestry Camp. Believing that his remarks may be of interest to all members who are vitally interested in the youth of our country, I am including them below:

ADDRESS AT DEDICATION EXERCISES OF YOUTH FORESTRY CAMP NO. 2 AT HICKORY RUN STATE PARK, OCTOBER 11, 1963, BY DR. JOHN OTTO REINEMANN

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Adams, Secretary Goddard, Mr. Caruso, Mrs. Horting, Commissioner Anderson, members of the judiciary, Reverend Clergy, my colleagues and friends, especially Ajax Moody and his staff, boys of the camp, and guests; I am most grateful for your invitation to speak at such as inspiring occasion. These dedication exercises represent an important milestone in the development of the youth forestry camp program in Pennsylvania. These new buildings which are utilitarian, as well as architecturally pleasing, are symbolic of the progress which this Commonwealth has made in the training and treatment of youngsters in trouble. They are light and roomy and allow space for activities—educational and recreational—which were severely handicapped in the previous cramped quarters. Most of all, they permit the admission of more than twice the number of boys than could heretofore be accepted in the camp, thus highlighting the concern of the State Government for the great need of additional facilities for boys who can benefit from the kind of experience which they find here.

I. THE FORESTRY CAMP IDEA

These dedication festivities prompt me to reflect on the past and to look into the future. Pennsylvania was not the first State to establish forestry camps for youth rehabilitation, and the road towards the accomplishment which we are celebrating today has not been easy. The history of forestry camps goes back to the thirties. Although the Borstal system in England has had some camps attached to its program for many years, and the State of California had passed enabling legislation for the creation of forestry camps for boys already in 1935, the real impetus for the movement came from the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression years. There were needs to be met by the New Deal administration of hundreds of thousand of young men who lacked shelter, clothing, work, money, and even food, and who had lost self-confidence and hope for the future. CCC which was acclaimed by people across party lines as a great and successful experiment, fulfilled these needs through team spirit and the performance of work benefiting the whole country, thus raising the sights of the young men, and giving them again the will and the strength to live and to carry on.

It seems worthwhile to note that during the 10 years of CCC's existence, 2,600,000 youths were enrolled and that they worked in many fields including structure of camp buildings, lookout towers and shelters, soil erosion prevention, forest culture and protection, and landscaping. In so doing, they learned plumbing, painting, baking, taxidermy, electric welding, surveying, machine operation, map making, carpentry, auto repairing, masonry and woodworking. CCC gave $1.75 billion of value in work on public lands to the Nation.

When war preparedness ended mass unemployment at the beginning of the forties, CCC was not needed any longer. It was then that California not only started to utilize the physical sites of the CCC camps, but also the human and psychological experiences which this program had provided, for the establishment of forestry camps for boys and young men who had gotten into trouble with the law. Having started early, the Golden State today has the most comprehensive system of forestry camps, including junior probation camps operated by counties, for boys 13 to 15 years of age, which emphasize education and also provide work opportunities on a part-time basis, probation forestry camps for boys 16 to 18 years of age which are work-centered but also offer academic programs at night, especially basic remedial classes, and finally forestry work camps administered by the California Youth Authority for young men up to 21 years of age, some of which I visited in the summer of 1949.

California's example was soon imitated by a number of Western and Midwestern States. In 1944 the Federal Government established a forestry camp at Natural Bridge, Va., in an abandoned CCC camp in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains. But it was not until the 50's that the Eastern States began to follow these examples. Today, our own Keystone State, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York, Ohio, and West Virginia have camp programs. In New Jersey, Governor Hughes recently announced the setting up of work camps in the near future. Some States included forestry camps for young adult offenders in their correctional system.

II. PENNSYLVANIA'S FORESTRY CAMP PROGRAM

Pennsylvania, eminently qualified for, and greatly in need of, this type of open-type facility, joined the ranks of about 20 other States of the Union in 1956. It seems fitting to briefly recall the legislative efforts which laid the foundation for the Commonwealth's forestry camps of today. Sponsors of the bipartisan bill which was introduced in the 1955 legislature, and which authorized the establishment of forestry camps for the rehabilitation of boys 15 to 18 years of age, were 3 State representatives, Herman Toll, now a U.S. Congressman from Pennsylvania's Fourth District; Mrs. Mary Varallo,

now a councilman in Philadelphia; and Thomas H. W. Jones, from Montgomery County, member of the house for many years. It was a great personal satisfaction for me to be associated with many of my colleagues in the promotion of the forestry camp idea, and to be able to arouse strong public support on the part of numerous professional, religious, and civic organizations on behalf of this bill, and to obtain the fine cooperation of all the mass media of communication. There were months of hope and disappointment, and hope again, while the bill wound its tedious way through the house committees, the house itself, the senate committees, the senate, and at last the conference committee. Fortunately, this was one of the longest legislative sessions on record, and it was only in the final weeks of this assembly that the bill was passed almost unanimously by both Houses. Senator William Z. Scott representing Carbon County in which this camp is located, greatly helped in the passage of this law. It was a great experience to be present when Gov. George M. Leader on May 29, 1956, signed house bill 1073 into law, which became act 599. The main features of the bill call for cooperation between the State department of public welfare and the department of forests and waters, in the fulfillment of the purposes of this act. The department of forests and waters is responsible for making available, and for maintaining the campsites and the necessary buildings, and—in cooperation with the fish commission and the game commission—for the planning of useful projects of conservation, recreation, dams or flood control in State forests and parks, and to supply personnel to supervise the work. The department of public welfare is charged with the selection of the boys and provides counseling and training for them. It is important that as a rule the boys are transferred to the camps after a stay in a youth development center (or, according to an amendment to the law of 1961, any other institution) following appraisal by the institutional staff as to whether a boy can be expected to benefit from a period at camp. Such careful selection has proven to be a principal reason for the camps' success.

With the signing of the bill, however, all troubles were not over. There were problems of site selection, of staff recruitment, and recurrent financial worries. I recall a visit from a boy in my office in September 1959, 2 years after Camp 2 at Hickory Run had opened. When this young man was about ready for return to Philadelphia, the counselor had brought him to see me and I asked him to report to me from time to time after his final release by the judge. On this particular visit his first question was whether the forestry camps would have to close, since he had read in the newspapers that sufficient funds had not been appropriated; he was pleased to hear from me that the crisis had luckily been overcome.

III. THE CAMP AT HICKORY RUN

Since the opening of Hickory Run Camp, I have paid several visits here, got to know the staff and the boys, many of whom I saw again upon their return to Philadelphia. It has become a great privilege to become closely associated in this endeavor with the directors of the camp, Otis R. Danforth and Ajax Moody, two of the most dedicated and knowledgeable persons I ever met, and with many of the counselors who are equally devoted to their task. I have seen the projects which the boys completed, and I have observed them during their leisure time.

I also remember on one occasion, a young soldier surrounded by the boys who were listening to his stories about military life. He had spent several months at Hickory Run and after his release, had enlisted in the Army. That day, he had hitchiked to the camp from Fort Dix where he was stationed, being on leave for a few days prior to his transfer to another military installation. His parental home was in the big city with a mother who did not care, and a stepfather who disliked him; rather than go there, he had chosen to come to the camp to spend his furlough with the boys and the counselors; here he had found affection and understanding—this was his real home. (This episode impressed me so much that I included it in an article about this camp which I wrote for a German professional magazine.)

Through all these contacts with the camp the value of the following features emerged most clearly:

1. In spite of the cramped and utterly unsatisfactory quarters, now happily abandoned, the spirit of staff and boys was high.

2. The understanding and the cooperation of the forest personnel have contributed essentially to the success of the camp, and I salute Dr. Goddard, secretary, and his associates for their great and unstinting efforts in this joint endeavor. (On many occasions "Dutch" McGinley, the custodian and forester of this park which he loves so much, told me of his enthusiasm about the boys' work performance; he also said that there are many more projects waiting for many more boys.)

3. The work completed by the boys through forestation and timber stand improvement, through building of firebreaks and trails, cleaning out underbrush, construction of fountains and draining ditches, setting of markers at the boundary lines, improving the picnic areas and the camps for girl scouts and crippled children, not to speak of their occasional assistance in firefighting, has done exactly the same thing for these boys as the CCC camps did for that generation. It has instilled work habits and a sense of achievement through work as a team, in the open air and close to nature, as hardly any other type of therapy could have done. It also has substantially benefited the State and the community. In 1962 alone 95,000 hours of work were devoted to the projects with a value of $118,755.

4. A most gratifying feature of the camp program is the acceptance of boys and staff by the neighboring communities. Churches and civic groups have welcomed their presence and participation in religious services, and in competitive sports with local youths, as well as their musical entertainment, including performances over the radio. This attests to an able job of interpretation on the part of camp staff, and to the exemplary behavior of the boys. Good relationships with the surrounding communities help to overcome the feeling of isolation and remoteness from which camp life in the middle of the forests might suffer.

5. From the vantage point of the juvenile court, I would like to say that the cooperation between the camp staff and our probation department has been excellent starting the day the first boy from our county entered the camp. Frequent contacts between the two staffs have succeeded in ironing out problems and in deepening mutual understanding for the work and the function of either agency. A few months ago all male probation officers of the juvenile division of the county court of Philadelphia visited the camp and termed this the best and the most rewarding of all their field trips to institutions. No definitive study of the success of Pennsylvania's forestry camp program has as yet been undertaken, but empirically I would not hesitate to say that the success rate has been high; this, of course, is partly explained by the thoroughgoing screening process by which boys who show good promise of adjustment in the camp are so assigned.

IV. A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

What does the future hold? Today's official opening of the new buildings marks the eventual increase of the number of boys to 50. The two other camps in the central and western parts of the Commonwealth are about to expand their capacity in a similar way. All this has been brought about by the great interest in the philosophy and the practice of camp training on the part of three successive Governors and their administrations, the appropriation of funds by an understanding legislature, and the fine cooperation between the departments of public welfare and forests and waters, and the General State Authority, represented here by Secretaries Arlin M. Adams and Dr. Maurice K. Goddard and Director A. J. Caruso.

Those of us who are engaged in youth service work day in and day out, and who are looking at the forestry camps throughout the United States as one of the most promising tools for the reclamation of young lives, like to think of Pennsylvania's forestry camps as a brilliant stone in the mosaic of its training and rehabilitation program for youth.

There is dire need at present, as Secretary Adams, commissioner of the office for children and youth, Dr. Wilson Anderson, and my other friends and colleagues in the department of public welfare—Richard Farrow, Dan Bernstein, Norman Flachs, Irving H. Korsgen, Louis Rubin—so well know, for additional space in the State's youth training facilities. Who better than Judge Theodore O. Spaulding of the Philadelphia County Court, who is with us today, and who hears juvenile cases practically every day, can attest to the truth of this statement? It is anticipated that in the proposed expansion of the State's institutional program, additional forestry camps will be included. There is no dearth of reclamation projects in the forests and parks of this State which is named after the woods of its founder, William Penn. There is many a boy who can be helped to adjust as was the youthful soldier from Fort Dix, and the many boys who wrote to the camp counselors after being home awhile, such as this quote taken at random from one of these letters: "I have been so busy these past few months working, trying to be more intellectual, but most of all trying to make myself a new man, a man who has something to live for and a goal to be achieved * * * to be liked and wanted in society. How are things in the forestry camp? Good, I pray. I would appreciate your writing me a long letter. Letters mean so much from the friends you leave behind."

A report on the forestry camps of Pennsylvania, which I prepared for Congressman TOLL early this year, was inserted in the proceedings of the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Education, in connection with the Federal Youth Conservation Corps which President Kennedy has strongly proposed. The Senate already has passed the Youth Employment Act which would set up such a program, but the bill is still pending in House committees. Thus history has come full circle within one generation. The CCC camps of 30 years ago nurtured the forestry camp program in the various States. Today, the experiences and accomplishments of these States, including Pennsylvania, may help to stimulate interest in, and—we hope—readiness to pass legislation for a Youth Conservation Corps on the national level which would enroll thousands of young men who are out of school and out of work in this era of automation, for healthful outdoor training and work projects.

V. CONCLUSION

Here at Hickory Run we have witnessed, during the first 6 years of this camp's existence which may be called a time of experimentation and adjustment—that the reclamation and conservation of human resources and of natural resources is closely intertwined. If there is any one thing these two have in common, it is the concept of growth.

Tree and bush have been nurtured and helped to grow through the work of the boys. The hundreds of boys who have been in this camp since the fall of 1957 have been helped to grow and mature through their living, working, learning, and fellowship here. The camp itself has grown too, not only in size, but through a day-by-day living experience in cold and brisk winters, warm and lovely springs, sunny and brilliant summers, and glorious and colorful falls.

Today, on this wonderful day, we dedicate Youth Forestry Camp No. 2 in Hickory Run State Park, Carbon County, in its new surroundings, on a new site, with new buildings, and with an enhanced potential for program and service. Humbly we dedicate this new camp with high hopes and great aspirations.

Christian Faith and Racial Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, a recent sermon by the Reverend John O. Faulstich of the Garden City Community Church of Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., contributes much toward promoting a better understanding of the relationship of the Christian faith to the current struggle for racial justice, and I wish, therefore, to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

It follows:

SERMON DELIVERED ON SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1963, BY THE REVEREND JOHN O. FAULSTICH

"And he charged them to tell no one; but the more he charged them, the more zealously they proclaimed it."

This line from the Gospel of Mark reads like a public relations man's dream. An event occurred that made people so enthusiastic that not even specific instructions to keep it quiet could dampen their enthusiasm and prevent them from spreading the news quickly and excitedly. This is the kind of treatment usually reserved for bad news or gossip. It seems much easier to keep good news quiet, somehow * * * but this was good news that not only leaked out * * * it just poured out of the mouths of those who knew of it, and the more they were told to keep it under their hats, the more the word got out. It was zealously proclaimed by everyone who knew.

A relatively simple event had occurred. One man was cured of deafness and of a speech impediment. The magic formulas typical in those days for curing these kinds of ailments were followed * * * the Healer placed his fingers in the patient's ears; the Healer spat and touched the patient's tongue * * * the Healer commanded, "Be opened." And according to the accounts, the patient's ears were opened, his tongue released, and he spoke plainly. We may be skeptical about the procedures employed by the Healer, but they were simply the time-proven methods as far as the people of Palestine during the Roman era were concerned. And apparently they worked. Then why get so excited about it? Why, indeed? Why ever get excited when those who have been silent begin to speak and those who have been deaf begin to hear * * * and when God is at work making men whole again! It's no wonder not even Jesus could get the people to keep quiet about it.

Now it's not immediately apparent why this little story in the Gospel of Mark is very significant. As we read it, we may pause long enough to wonder why Jesus didn't want this healing to get any publicity, but we are quickly satisfied by the explanation that Mark wanted to make it quite clear that Jesus was the Saviour, and not just another showman. Jesus never healed to prove anything about himself, but simply because He was confronted by human need and responded to it with compassion. And so Jesus didn't want this simple healing to be made into a big thing, but it was a big thing, and the people proclaimed it zealously, and when Jesus told them not to publicize the event, that just made the people talk about it more and with greater zeal than ever.

No, it's not immediately apparent why this little story has such great significance. And it wouldn't have much meaning if the events which make up this little story had occurred only once, but century after century has gone by since the day of that healing and its impact on the people, and century after century has seen recurrences of the essential elements of that story: men who could not speak being enabled to speak by the power of God, men who could not hear being enabled to hear by the power of God, and the word being zealously spread by those who felt the impact of this power.

We can go back to Moses. When the call of God came to Moses, one of the many excuses he used to try to get out of leading his people from slavery was that his tongue gave him trouble. "Oh, my Lord," Moses says to God in the fourth chapter of Exodus, "I am not eloquent, either heretofore or since thou hast spoken to thy servant; but I am slow of speech and of tongue." And even when the Lord promised to tell Moses exactly what to say, Moses still pleaded, "Oh my Lord, send, I pray, some other person." But there was no out for the reluctant Moses. "Is there not Aaron, your brother, the Levite?" the Lord asks. "I know that he can speak well; and behold, he is coming out to meet you, and when he sees you he will be glad in his heart. And you shall speak to him and put the words in his mouth; and I will be with your mouth and with his mouth and will teach you what you shall do." Obviously, when the Lord makes up his mind to do something, there's no stopping him, and his power enabled Moses to lead his people out of the house of bondage to the land of the promise. The power of God changed the course of history by working through a tongue-tied and reluctant man. And the Hebrews never stopped talking about that event with zeal.

Or look closely at the young church in action. The day after the crucifixion they were a small group of deeply disappointed and defeated men. They were weak * * * they were bitter * * * they were crushed. Then came the resurrection. Days later they were out on the street corners and in the marketplaces, crashing services of worship to deliver their message, standing up to the immense powers of the established political and religious institutions. And though to proclaim their message of Jesus Christ as Lord meant prison and death for some of them, their ears had been opened. Their tongues had been loosed. And nothing in the world was able to stop them from zealously proclaiming their message because the spirit of God burned within them.

Listen to the vibrant account of one exciting event as it is translated by J. B. Phillips. The day after Peter and John were arrested for having healed a man and for having taught that in the case of Jesus there had been a resurrection from the dead, the two apostles were hauled before the high priest and his advisers. They were asked, "By what power and in whose name have you done this thing?" At this Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit, spoke to them, "Leaders of the people and elders, if we are being called in question today over the matter of a kindness done to a helpless man and as to how he was healed, it is high time that all of you and the whole people of Israel knew that it was done in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. He is the One whom you crucified but whom God raised from the dead, and it is by His power that this man at our side stands in your presence perfectly well. He is the stone which you builders rejected, but now he's the cornerstone. In no one else can salvation be found. For in all the world no other name has been given to men but this, and it is by this name that we must be saved."

When they saw the boldness of Peter and John, who were obviously uneducated and untrained men, they were staggered. They recognized them as men who had been with Jesus, yet since they could see the man who had been cured standing beside them, they could find no effective reply. All they could do was to order them out of the Sanhedrin and hold a conference among themselves.

"What are we going to do with these men?" they said to each other. "It is evident to everyone living in Jerusalem that an extraordinary miracle has taken place through them, and that is something we cannot deny. Nevertheless, to prevent such a thing spreading further among the people, let us warn them that if they say anything more to anyone in this name of Jesus it will be at their peril."

So they called them in and ordered them bluntly not to speak or teach a single further word about the name of Jesus. But Peter and John gave them this reply: "Whether it is right in the eyes of God for us to listen to what you say rather than to what He says, you must decide; for we cannot help speaking about what we have actually seen and heard."

And this is just one incident from those days in which the church was being born when men's ears were being opened * * * and tongues were being loosed * * * and nothing could stop the people from zealously spreading the news about the power of God.

Neither will history be able to forget the courage of Martin Luther as he faced the Holy Roman Emperor and his court when charged with heresy at the Diet of Worms. There was a large hall. It was so jammed with the princes of the world and the princes of the church, that only the emperor himself had a place to sit. Martin Luther stood alone in the center of the hall. Standing near the emperor and facing Luther was Archbishop Eck of Trier, conducting the examination. Eck chided Luther for thinking he alone understood the scriptures. He thrust the challenge to Luther, "Would you put your judgment above that of so many famous men and claim that you know more than they all? Have you no right to call into question the most holy orthodox faith. I ask you, Martin—answer candidly and simply—do you or do you not repudiate your books and the errors which they contain?"

Luther replied, "Since (then) your majesty and your lordships desire a simple reply, I will so answer. * * * Unless I am convicted by scripture and plain reason—I do not accept the authority of popes and councils, for they have contradicted each other—my conscience is captive to the Word of God. I cannot and I will not recant anything, for to go against conscience is neither right nor safe. Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me. Amen." Once again, the world was thrown into the ferment of revolution by the power of God, loosening the tongue of a man * * * opening ears * * * and filling people with zeal so that no power on earth could stop them.

And this has been the course of the history of the church throughout the ages. The past century and a half has seen the power of God at work in the lives of daring men and women, who have left everything behind so that they might spread the gospel message in the farthest reaches of the world,

sacrificing their lives so that people who had walked in darkness might see a great light. And throughout the world, the word has been proclaimed * * * and ears have been opened * * * and the zeal of these new Christians is new evidence of the power of God.

And in our day God's spirit is still at work with no less power. There are many evidences of it, but I speak now especially of the movement for human freedom and justice and equality in our land. There is a revolution going on and it is the work of God. * * * and he is calling His church to be in the midst of that revolution. We cannot turn a deaf ear. We cannot choose to be God's mutes. There is a social revolution (abroad) in our land which promises to complete the revolution which formed our Nation but which we have now come to realize was unfinished. And the issue at stake in this peaceful revolution of the 1960's is not simply civil rights * * * or racial integration. The basic issue is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which sets all men free from selfish preoccupation. And ultimately both we, who have discriminated, and those who have been the victims of discrimination need to be set free from the bondage of self-interest.

The church can begin by letting God open its ears so that it can hear the voices that call on it for its ministry. The church can begin by letting God loosen its tongue so that it can proclaim the love of God which makes men whole. The church can begin by confessing that it has been deaf to the cry of injustice and silent in proclaiming its own gospel of love. And those who need to begin this confession are the church's ministers.

Now some of us participated this week in the march on Washington for freedom and jobs. It was a magnificent experience for us all. Perhaps you caught some of the spirit and some of the power of that historic moment in our Nation's life. You had the feeling that you were at a massive church picnic * * * there was the beautiful day and the picnic lunches and the singing and the speeches * * * and everyone was being neighborly with everyone else even when you stepped on one another's feet in the press of the crowds. And you came away deeply thankful. You were thankful that our wonderful Nation's Founding Fathers had guaranteed the right to free assembly * * * and you were thankful that the leaders of this revolution in our time were men of deep Christian commitment and that their peaceful methods are being followed as much as they are. And you were deeply thankful that the Church of Jesus Christ was present there, allowing God to open its ears and to loosen its tongue. And though you had been there to march, you came away knowing that you had taken the hesitant step of a little child.

And now the call of God to zealously proclaim the gospel of love has come directly to the church. It came very clearly in the words of James Reston in Friday's Times, when he wrote: "The first significant test of Wednesday's march on Washington will come in the churches and synagogues of the country this weekend. It is no good waiting for a political reaction in Congress, for if there is no effective moral reaction out in the country, there will be no effective political reaction here. This whole movement for equality in American life will have to return to first principles before it will overcome anything. And as moral principles preceded and inspired political principles in this country, as the church preceded the Congress, so there will have to be a moral revulsion to the humiliation of the Negro before there can be significant political relief."

Reston goes on to say, "Too many preachers, like too many Congressmen, are not leading, but following their flock, perpetuating rather than destroying illusion and prejudice. They are passing by on the other side. And their parishioners, even when they want to be participants instead of spectators, have lost faith in their power to influence great events. Nothing, however, is more fallacious in American political life than the popular idea that Congressmen pay no attention to letters from their constituents. For while the politicians here are not saying much about the march, they are listening. And if such a mammoth demonstration, dramatizing the basic religious concept of equality, does not get an impressive response even from the churches Congress could easily conclude that the Nation was indifferent or worse."

Well, the church has already begun to respond. I have here this morning's New York Times (Sept. 1, 1963). The front page has the report of the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in Rochester. Yesterday this group of leaders of the World Church adopted this statement: "We acknowledge with deep shame that many Christians through hesitation and inaction are not engaged in this struggle, or are on the wrong side of it. We therefore repeat, with all the conviction at our command, what the assembly said in 1954, that any form of segregation based on race, color, or ethnic origin is contrary to the Gospel and is incompatible with the Christian doctrine of man and with the nature of the Church of Christ.

"Whenever and wherever any of us Christians deny this by action or inaction we betray Christ and the fellowship which hears His name. We plead with every church in every place to search its inner attitude and its practice, to insure that its fellowship includes all who believe, without discrimination and in full love, and to take every step to strengthen all whose witness is weak to speak and act with courage."

This is a difficult challenge. But we can face this challenge if we will talk together and pray together. We can be confident that this challenge will not fall on deaf ears. We can be confident that God will overcome our fears and our reluctances as He did with Moses. We can be confident that God will inspire the church to preach the gospel of love with zeal as He did the Apostles. We can be confident that God will give courage to those who face overwhelming odds so that they might say with Martin Luther, "Here I stand." And we can be confident that neither black nor white, rich nor poor will win the social revolution of our time * * * but that God will win it, reconciling all men to Himself and all men to one another through His love which knows no bounds. We need fear this revolution only if we become deaf and silent. But God's power is making us whole, breaking down the walls of race and nationality which separate us from our brothers.

If those who witnessed a simple healing of a deaf and muted man could zealously proclaim it everywhere, then surely today we who are witnesses to God's power can zealously proclaim the Gospel to our world * * * that Christ has made us all brothers, that racial or national bigotry and injustice must be overcome by love and the striving for freedom and justice. The church must not only proclaim the Gospel, it must act it * * * that all the world may know that Christ died so that we might no longer be separated from each other but that we may be made one with Him. And nothing will be able to stop the Gospel from being proclaimed. Amen.

Remarks of Vice Adm. W. A. Schoech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Vice Adm. W. A. Schoech, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Material, at the Pacific and Southwest Research and Development Clinic held in Berkeley, Calif., on October 16, 1963, and I commend its reading to my colleagues of the House.

Under the organization plan now in effect in the Department of the Navy, Admiral Schoech holds a key position. He is a dedicated officer and an efficient servant of our Government.

The above mentioned follows:

REMARKS OF VICE ADM. W. A. SCHOECH, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL, AT THE PACIFIC AND SOUTHWEST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CLINIC, BERKELEY, CALIF., OCTOBER 16, 1963

Admiral Royer, Governor Brown, Congressman Miller, Congressman Cohelan, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, naturally it is a great honor for me to appear on the same platform with such a distinguished group as we have here today.

As the Chief of Naval Material, I am proud to be the commander of the naval organization that sponsors this important meeting.

And, as a naval officer who is always looking for newer and better weapons for the fleet, I am hopeful of the constructive outcome of such a well-qualified collection of scientists and otherwise talented people.

These research and development clinics, which we sponsor from time to time in different sections of the country, are tremendously useful to the Navy. This particular one bids fair to be the biggest and best that we have ever participated in. I wish you all every success in your endeavors here.

All of us, no matter what sector of the American society we come from, have a direct vested interest in the scientific progress of the Nation. This is true for many reasons, but primarily it is valid because our continued existence as a Nation depends upon it. We are able to cope with our adversaries in the cold war only if we can deal from strength. That strength is directly based upon military applications of advancements in the physical sciences. As the cold war thaws and freezes, and as the opposition first tacks and then runs before the wind, we, in the business of national security, must never slow our efforts. We are unquestionably for peace, but we are certain that the best way to insure peace is to constantly make progress in the tools of war. I am sure that this research and development clinic will greatly aid in this progress.

Certainly one way that such a conclave as this can add to our progress is in the several areas of communications. By communications in this particular context, I mean the interchange of information between various segments of the military, scientific, and industrial communities. Our fields of interests and endeavors have become so broad in scope and so detailed in application that it is very difficult for us to have a wide knowledge of what others are doing in different but interrelated areas.

We need good communications between the various scientific branches because in modern military applications, the products of several branches may apply to a single weapons system. We need a continuing dialog between the users, the producers, the developers and the researchers in order that the efforts of all are responsive to the needs of the user. And further, this communication must be two-way in order that the user can be aware of the developing capabilities of all the people contributing to his support.

In addition to the very real limitations of money and material resources, there is a very finite limitation in research and development talent. We should not waste material. We must not waste money. But most importantly, we simply cannot afford to waste our research effort and talent.

I can't think of a better place than California to have one of these meetings. This is not at all because California needs any assistance in becoming a leading research and development center in our country. It is already that. It is good to have a clinic here because the people in California appreciate the importance of this kind of endeavor; because it has the capability of furnishing a great deal of talent to such a conclave and because the pleasant surroundings add further inducement for people outside of the State to come and learn more about the Navy's research needs.

It is my hope that we will answer three questions in our meetings here.

First, we should address the question of just what fields of research the Navy is interested in.

Second, we should explore just how research in these particular areas can best benefit the Navy.

And third, we should deal with the question of how those who do research for the Navy can be adequately paid for their efforts.

Future sessions of this clinic will deal with these questions in detail, but I would like to touch on them in a general way here.

First, then, the Navy's interests: In an environmental sense, we are interested in technological advance in every accessible medium of operation. We have interests in space, in the atmosphere, on the surface of land and sea, and finally, in, as someone has called it, the "inner space" under the surface of the sea. We seek to know as much as we can about the characteristics of these operational media. Consequently we study, among other things, geology, meteorology, hydrography and the physical characteristics of extra-atmospheric space.

Then, within each of these environments we are interested in many functional categories. A brief list would include navigation, communications, reconnaissance, electronic welfare, propulsion and guidance, and, of course, destructive weapons.

Just as the environmental spectrum joins, and perhaps overlaps a little, in horizontal layers, these functional interests can be thought of as a vertical spectrum of activities superimposed on the earth's subsurface, surface, its atmosphere, and the space beyond.

Take navigation for instance. Not only must the Navy concern itself with the accurate passage of its ships and aircraft, but it must also guide its weapons. Some of these weapons, such as Polaris, may travel through all four of the elements, beginning their journey under the sea and arcing outside the atmosphere while on their way to target. Further, each of the four operational media is used in navigation, and each may furnish navigational inputs. First, the shape and content of the ocean floor may contribute; second, the temperature, salinity and current of the sea water can be important navigational factors; third, the winds, clouds, temperature and humidity of the atmosphere impinge upon navigation; and fourth, the stars of outer space have been a guide to nautical navigators from the earliest time.

More recently, man-launched satellites have given us our first really overall look at this oblate spheroid we have called a globe; they have contributed advances in the field of geodetics that have sometimes been as surprising as they were important. In addition, carefully positioned satellites furnish important inputs for precision navigation—they are manmade stars by which the modern voyager may guide himself, whether he journeys in the sea, on the earth's surface, or over it. These new stars give navigational reliability to peaceful carriers of commerce, and precision to the weapons which guard the peace.

Closely linked to navigation is communications, and in this context we mean, of course, the rapid exchange of not so much abstract ideas, but of useful operational information.

The Navy has always been a pioneer in all kinds of communications, being concerned as it is with isolated units, such as ships at sea, and great distances. But despite enormous recent progress, there remains much to be done in this category. For instance the rapid, reliable, accurate, and secure communications between submarines and other stations in all four of our operational environments is an urgent necessity: between submarines, between subs and surface vessels, between subs and aircraft, between subs and distant shore stations, and finally between subs and navigational vehicles in space.

This is not the only place that communications can be improved; it is just an example. The speed, reliability, accuracy and security of all military communications is subject to substantial improvement, especially in the field of transmitting reconnaissance information.

This brings us to the third functional category of research interest: reconnaissance.

And it is a subject which could occupy all of the time scheduled for this clinic, and still not finish, for it is a topic of great complexity and considerable sensitivity. While navigation and communications are important elements of a naval commander's capability, they rank second in importance to "recco." The field here is wide open; reconnaissance is never good enough. Detecting, identifying, localizing, tracking and contacting submarines, ships, aircraft, missiles and space vehicles is a multiple task with countless solutions.

This is so because it is a game of device and counterdevice, of tactic and countertactic, of thrust and riposte, of continuous technical competition for the upper hand.

Overlapping reconnaissance is the fourth functional category: electronic warfare. Here, to an even greater degree than in reconnaissance, we are limited by time and sensitivity in discussing it.

Just as with reconnaissance, electronic warfare operates in four environments, and likewise its effects are felt in all environments. It has come to mean, without stretching the literal sense of the words "electronic warfare," the countermeasures used against an enemy's navigational aids, his communications and his reconnaissance. Further, it has grown to include countermeasures against the guidance and sensing elements of guided missiles of all kinds, and finally against the destructive elements in weapon systems themselves. In short, it is an area in which we can hardly have too much superiority, where progress must be rapid and constant, and where new departures are the lifeblood of success.

And finally, we are interested, naturally and inevitably, in means of controlled movement—that is propulsion and guidance—and controlled destruction: the responsive weapon.

These are obvious fields of endeavors for a military organization since mobility and firepower are the ultimate tools of war. But if they are elementary in concept or principle, they are certainly not any longer simple in construction or operation. The nuclear reactors which give us heretofore unheard of speeds under the sea, and fins, wings, and hydroplanes that support and guide our vehicles; all of these are far from simple or elementary. Further, a modern weapon system itself can be a combination of elements which operate in all the functional categories. A weapon can now be self-propelled. It can search, communicate, navigate, and carry out its own countermeasures. But whether an existing weapon depends on nuclear or chemical power for propulsion or destruction; whether it flies or swims, or both, it still can be, and must be, improved.

It is clear, then, that the Navy's interests are both wide in scope and inclusive in environment. Certainly in this age of extraterrestrial travel, it has become entirely clear that no military commander safely can be limited to a single environment.

Attack comes from every element, and to survive, every commander must at least be prepared to meet and defeat all probable opposition.

This brings us to our second major point: how can research best serve the Navy.

Much has been said on this subject and I do not plan to add much more in a quantitative sense. But I would hope to remind you that weapons are to be built, maintained, serviced, and used by ordinary men. They must, in addition to being advanced in concept and sophisticated in ability, be inexpensive in production, sound in principle, facile in service, and reliable in operation. Examples come readily to mind of good weapons which failed because they lacked one or more of these essential characteristics.

In military planning we apply three tests to a plan before we consider it sound. These are: suitability, feasibility, and acceptability.

In brief, a weapon system is "suitable" if it accomplishes within its time frame, an operationally useful task better than any other weapons system. Or, if it is about equal to another available system, then it is suitable if it does the job less expensively.

A weapon system is "feasible" if it is reasonably within the states of the arts it uses. In this age of billion dollar programs, we cannot afford to go into large scale production on an experimental device. Once a new military application has been decided upon, then and only then should research be translated into large-scale production. The five basic steps of research, development, test and evaluation were devised to provide an orderly procedure for reaching the production phase with "feasible" weapons systems. To bypass them is to invite trouble.

And finally, a weapon system is "acceptable" if, other things being equal, we can afford it. In war, the final limitation is in the finite categories of material, manpower and brainpower. Today we may not be in a shooting war, but regardless of what it is called—peaceful coexistence or cold war—it is a contest involving all of our resources.

Just as in the hottest of wars, resources are the ultimate limitation. Money can't buy more technical manpower than is inherent in our population. There is a national limit to certain scarce, or difficult to produce materials. And finally, there is a finite limit to the burden of military expenditures our economy can bear.

Wherever each of us fits into the spectrum of research effort—in basic research, exploratory development, advanced development, engineering development, or operational system development—as we make our contribution along the line, we must bear in mind these basic tests of "suitability," "feasibility," and "acceptability." Even in basic research, these three tests should be a subconscious attitude underlying all our efforts.

As to the third major concern of the clinic, we are all concerned, in one aspect or another, with the ways that research is paid for. If, in no other way, we are interested because the long-suffering American taxpayer is not an inexhaustible well of funds.

Whereas there are others to follow with the details on how contracts are let and how payments for research are made, let us briefly consider the subject in broad terms.

Ours is a capitalistic society, and we feel very strongly that the capitalistic system is responsible for our unquestioned strength. The profit motive must continue to operate, as it has so well in the past, to provide the incentive and the reward to those whose genius and labor contribute to the common good.

We are spending more and more money for research every day, but the rules are changing. The systems that are used to contract for research, or to repay research costs on independently produced items, are constantly being modified to meet new conditions, to improve them and to make them more responsive to the needs and demands of the situation.

The whole fabric of our society, the most successful yet devised by man we believe, is woven of the warp of individual and collective integrity and the woof of conflicting interests justly compromised—of checks, and balances, and safeguards.

Whereas the Communist theory is, "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," we question who is to decide those abilities and those needs.

We know that man is imperfect—he is improvable, and capable of great sacrifice and achievement—but he should never be allowed too much uncontrolled power. As the old Romans put it "quis custodiet ipso custodies"—"who shall guard the guards?"

In the realm of payment for research for military applications, a similar system of justly compromised conflicts of interest—of checks and balances and safeguards—needs also to apply. This system is still being perfected. It is a complicated problem, and every legitimate interest must be justly served.

I believe our present strength is ample evidence of past success. I have some personal knowledge of this since not too long ago I served in the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics as Assistant Chief for Research and Development.

As fleet commander of the 7th Fleet recently, I was a consumer of our own products, and so my evaluation of necessity had some degree of objectivity.

Now I am back on the producer side of the house, and as part of my catching up with what has gone on while I was happily employed as an operator, I have been refreshing myself on developments in the field of procurement. In so doing I came across two qualifications which I thought might add substance to my rather general remarks on this subject.

The Armed Services Procurement Regulation issued by the Department of Defense, in the revision issued on August 15 this year, has this to say about profits: "* * * low average profit rates on defense contracts overall are detrimental to the public interest. Effective national defense in a free enterprise economy requires that the best * * * capabilities be attracted to defense contracts."

Another portion of the regulation sets forth the following specific policy for research and development:

"A fundamental mission of research and development programs is to maintain scientific and technological superiority requisite to promote and advance the effectiveness of military operations. The accomplishment of this mission requires the broadest possible base of contractor and subcontractor sources including the optimum use of manpower and resources. It is essential that the best technical competence be located and fully utilized. The departments shall continually search for and develop information on sources (including small business concerns) competent to perform research and development."

Of course these aren't the only considerations. The interest of the Government must be protected—that is profits should not be too high. And the interest of the consumer must be protected—that is performance must be assured. But within those obvious limitations, our free and competitive society must be served.

As the Chief of Naval Material, I am vitally concerned with supporting the commendable philosophy embodied in those two quotations.

It is certainly an honor and a pleasure to be with you here today.

I wish you the greatest success in your endeavors here in the clinic.

What Does Vietnam Coup Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is great concern in the United States over the coup in Vietnam, which had the approval of President Kennedy.

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star, William S. White gives us his analysis of the seriousness of the situation.

WILL THE COUP AID WAR ON REDS?

(By William S. White)

A long night of worry for the future in South Vietnam has settled in for high American policymakers. If any jubilation was initially felt here among junior officials at the destruction of the government of Ngo Dinh Diem—with which Washington had long been having trouble—nothing of that sort is anywhere discernible now.

Instead, there is a morning-after mood. In part, this is produced by genuine regret at the assassination of a man our people would, in fact, have liked to see remain in power if only he would have got rid of his erratic brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu. Ironically, American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge had prepared a cable reporting that Mr. Diem seemed to be moving a bit more our way on the very day the insurrection was mounted.

In larger part, however, the air of concern is caused by these new fears:

1. That "super patriots" attached to the revolution of the 20 generals which deposed Mr. Diem may go on killing and thus further stain the new regime and raise questions of its capacity to govern in decency.

2. That one or two among the generals might conceivably not be so reliably anti-Communist as the great majority is, and so begin what above all else is to be feared. This is some under-the-cover negotiation with the Communist invaders of South Vietnam so long fought off by the Diem government backed by 15,000 American troops.

3. That the new provisional government of the generals, with Nguyen Ngoc Tho as provisional President, might become politically ambitious rather than solely concerned with the war against the Communists.

TWO U.S. HOPES

Mixed with all this are two strong American hopes. One is that there may now be an end to the exploitation of religious differences in Vietnam—no more talk of who is a Catholic and who is a Buddhist. Mr. Diem, himself a Christian, was endlessly accused of unduly repressive action against the Buddhists. It was this charge that brought him down. Most of the generals of his staff—Christian as well as Buddhist—became convinced that religious turmoil—no matter who was to blame for it—was endangering the war. In this connection, some comfort is taken officially here in the fact that all three of the top Catholic generals joined in the uprising.

The second American hope is that the new regime wil be in no hurry to order popular elections. Washington is not interested in seeing a political campaign, with all its inbuilt divisiveness to a country at war, sweep over Vietnam. The United States would be quite content to see the new outfit maintain its provisional character—with power diffused among the generals. For Mr. Diem's fate established the inherent danger of having all power concentrated in one or two pairs of hands as it was with Mr. Diem and Mr. Nhu.

WILL WAR EFFORT BE AIDED?

But all this is mere prelude to the crucial question: Will the war against the Communists now be promoted or retarded? If it is promoted all, of course, will be well. If it becomes bogged down by disunity in Saigon, twin disaster will lie ahead.

Any failure of the American military effort there would not only lay all southeast Asia open to creeping Communist aggression. It also would bankrupt a wise American strategy to halt such aggressions by limited commitments of our own forces cooperating with full commitments of local forces. The alternatives to this policy would be to submit to local aggressions or to face major war on the Korean scale—or beyond.

Moreover, a collapse in South Vietnam could quite simply, destroy the Kennedy administration. Careful and persistent inquiries have convinced me, for one, that the United States neither ordered nor directly participated in the bloody ouster of Mr. Diem. But nothing can alter the fact that Washington long had been deliberately shaking his regime—not to smash it, but in the hope of thus forcing him to make accommodations with his Buddhist-led opposition to permit the war to go full tilt. Since America has helped, if indirectly, to push him down, the administration's responsibility will be frightful if the new regime ever abandons the war on communism.

J.F.K. on Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of Tuesday, November 5, 1963, entitled "J.F.K. on Price Fixing," in which President Kennedy rather clearly pointed out the probability of a Presidential veto for this most destructive legislation.

In view of the President's comments it would appear well for the Congress to devote itself to more fruitful and useful legislation which will not wind up a wreck on the rocks of a Presidential veto.

The article follows:

J.F.K. ON PRICE FIXING

The proponents of the so-called "Quality Stabilization Act," a bill which would diminish competition in retail trade through the Federal enforcement of resale-price agreements between manufacturers and retailers, derived little comfort from the re-

marks made by President Kennedy at his last press conference.

When asked about his position on the bill which is opposed by all departments of the executive branch, the President replied:

"I've never been for the quality stabilization bill. I have to look at the bill when it finally comes in the form it's in. I quite obviously can't comment on legislation before it finally comes to the desk of the White House, but the administration witnesses have spoken my view."

The President's reluctance to comment in greater detail was doubtless prompted by the fact that a number of leading members of his own party have been so foolhardy as to sponsor legislation which would infringe upon the right of the retailer to set prices at competitive levels. The bill would saddle the American consumers with an enormous burden.

With a backlog of unfinished business that runs the gamut from the budget for the current fiscal year to tax reduction and civil rights legislation, Congress should not waste precious time on a bill which so clearly violates the spirit of free enterprise and stands so small a chance of Presidential approval. Time will be saved and embarrassment avoided if the Quality Stabilization Act is allowed to die stillborn.

National Day of Fast and Prayer To Protest Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Dr. Julius G. Neumann, chairman of the board of governors of the National Information Bureau of Jewish Life, Inc., of which I am honorary president, has just concluded a one-man 3-day fast to dramatize to America the oppression, persecution, and tyranny of the Soviet Union toward Russia's 3 million Jews. An extension of Rabbi Neumann's protest is planned for Monday, November 25, when a national day of fast and prayer will be observed to protest Soviet anti-Semitism.

Having made numerous and serious efforts to bring this situation to the attention of the administration and the American people, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the statement made by Rabbi Neumann at the conclusion of his dramatic protest:

NATIONAL DAY OF FAST AND PRAYER TO PROTEST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

As pledged and in all accord with rabbinical teachings, I have concluded an individual 3-day fast. I abstained from food and drink on Monday, October 28; Thursday, October 31 and Monday, November 4 as a protest against Soviet anti-Semitism and to dramatize to all Americans the tragic plight of Russian Jewry.

For Americans of all faiths to know—that persons are being condemned to death and executed for minor economic offenses, charged with committing criminal acts if they sell matzohs, that kosher meat is not available, that Yiddish books may not be printed, and that Jewish dead may not be buried in a Jewish cemetery; to learn—that in the Soviet Union synagogues are closed, prayer books and religious articles are unavailable; Jewish instruction banned; Yiddish theaters, books and culture prohibited; Jewish lay organizations barred; families separated and reunion thwarted; equal rights for Russian Jews openly denied, all this midst a violent anti-Jewish press campaign—to do nothing about this spiritual genocide is just as sinful as abetting such atrocities.

At times, the Soviet Government has been shown to be cognizant of world public opinion. If the crescendo of international protest mounts, there is hope that some amelioration of the oppressive treatment and tyranny meted out to Russian Jews may be obtained.

Therefore, after consultation with many religious and lay leaders of all faiths, I urge the last Monday in November to be set aside as a "National Day of Fast and Prayer" to protest vigorously the persecution of the Jewish minority by the Soviet Union.

My congregation Zichron Moshe will join me in a 1-day 24-hour fast beginning at sundown, Sunday, November 24, and continuing until sunset, Monday, November 25. On Sunday evening, a special prayer service will be held in the synagogue at 8 p.m. on behalf of the 3 million Russian Jews.

Furthermore, the National Information Bureau for Jewish Life, Inc., of which I am chairman of the board of governors, has contacted 77 community leaders in various cities in our 50 States of the Union who we expect to participate in joining this 1-day fast for November 25 and arrange for special prayer services on the preceding Sunday evening in houses of worship of all faiths in their respective cities. The bureau in New York City and the surrounding metropolitan area are reaching more than 1,250 institutions of spiritual guidance to cooperate in this public demonstration of solidarity against Soviet discrimination.

I trust that my humble one-man, 3-day fast will be transformed into a thunderous 3 million, 1-day fast which will reverberate to the very rooms of the Kremlin. Let 3 million Americans stand up and be counted as each a brother of 3 million Russian Jews.

Will We Ever Wise Up?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will We Ever Wise Up?" from the Lusk (Wyo.) Herald.

The editorial contains pertinent comment on the proposed sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. which I believe will be of interest to Members of the House.

WILL WE EVER WISE UP?

We Americans just don't seem to be adept at playing the cold war game.

Somehow the makeup of Americans is such that we can't deal with the Russians. Our usual error is that we think the Communists of Russia are honorable. Time and again this thinking has been proven erroneous, but we keep trying. Just take a look at the recent happenings.

On the afternoon of October 9 President Kennedy said he would sell 4 million tons of wheat to the Soviets. The following morning, as a display of gratitude, the Soviets prevented a convey of U.S. troops from using the autobahn to Berlin, despite the fact that America had in a treaty with Russia the right to use the autobahn.

While the Soviets held up the American troops President Kennedy was entertaining Gromyko, Russia's Foreign Minister, in the White House.

Then too, the wheat deal doesn't smell exactly good. In answer to our inquiry Senator MILWARD SIMPSON reports the sale of wheat to Russia is in essence about a 50–50 credit cash deal. In other words Russia is going to, if the deal goes through, pay about half of the world market price (usually between $1.75–$1.80). American wheat farmers will get about $2.03 per bushel.

Can you imagine charging anything to Russia when they already owe $11 billion to the United States?

Doctors Opposed to Medicare but Take $2 Million in Public Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Enginemen's Press on October 25, 1963 pointing out very well that West Virginia doctors, whose State and National medical associations are violently opposed to hospitalization for the aged under the social security program, are not in the least opposed to socialized State and Federal funds, of which they collected more than $2 million last year for treating patients too poor to pay.

One physician, I assume a stanch supporter of the AMA and its position, received $44,391 in socialized State and Federal funds for treatment of certain West Virginians.

Another doctor contrived to receive $40,596 worth of socialized State and Federal funds to confer, according to AMA, $49,596 worth of socialized medicine upon a number of other unfortunate West Virginians.

It strikes me that there is brazen hypocrisy abroad in the land when the American Medical Association would engage in violent opposition to "socialized medicine" and measures to responsibly meet the need of people of this country, and at the same time support other programs like Kerr-Mills, which is fully as socialized but which does not, according to recent findings of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, do the job for the vast number of people 65 and over.

The article follows:

DOCTORS OPPOSED TO MEDICARE BUT TAKE $2 MILLION IN PUBLIC FUNDS

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—West Virginia doctors who with their counterparts in other States decry "socialized" medical care, collected more than $2 million in State and Federal funds last year for treating patients too poor to pay.

One physician, the Charleston Gazette reported, received $44,391 in State payments—presumably in addition to the fees he received from noncharity patients. Another doctor managed to see enough charity pa-

tients to bill the State for $40,596. Three other physicians collected more than $25,000 each. All told, 76 doctors were paid more than $5,000 each for treating indigent patients during the year.

The problem isn't new. More than a year ago, poverty-hit West Virginia tried to correct abuses which were draining its medical-aid-for-the-aged fund. The State cut the schedules of fees to doctors and attempted to stop bill-padding abuses—such as that by one doctor who prescribed so many medicines for one patient that the person would have had to take 143 pills daily to follows the doctor's orders.

The result was a short-lived—and successful—"strike" by doctors who refused to participate further in the program unless their full fees were restored.

An angry West Virginia newspaper columnist, Thomas F. Stafford, of the Gazette, wrote recently that "while doctors gasp publicly at the mere mention of Government intervention in their professional activities, no single group in America has a more ravenous appetite when it gets to the public trough."

Stafford suggested that unless tighter controls are put on payments to doctors, "they will soon own the gold on the statehouse dome. When a single doctor is paid for an average of 36 visits a day from welfare patients and collects many thousands of dollars in fees, it is time for new regulatory measures."

Watertown (Mass.) School Committee Resolution Concerning Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court speaks in accord with its responsibility as a seperate and distinct branch of this Government, with a defined duty, then all law-abiding citizens are obliged to accept such ruling even while they earnestly differ with it and even doubt its wisdom. Thanks to the Almighty we, as loyal Americans, have the right to differ and express any such differences even with respect to our highest Court, our Congress, or our President. A responsible citizenry will, of course, adhere to a court's decision even while, in conscience, they follow the legal and legislative procedures legitimately leading to their differing objective.

Few, if any, edicts of the Supreme Court, have aroused such concern and interest among our people as the decision banning the formal recitation of prayer in our public schools. A great many of our loyal American citizens conscientiously feel that the decision of the Court, in this instance, was not in accord with our historical tradition nor the best national interest. There are, at this time, many measures, introduced by various Members of Congress pending before the Congress designed to amend the Constitution so that the recitation of prayer, with due protection of the rights of the individual, may be restored to our public schools.

In connection with these pending amendments a resolution relative to religious devotion in the public schools was presented, at a recent meeting, to the Watertown, Mass., School Committee by Mr. John J. Carver, chairman, and the resolution was unanimously approved.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to include the school committee resolution, and it follows:

RESOLUTION BY WATERTOWN, MASS., SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States of America were God-loving and God-fearing men who created the most nearly perfect instrument by which people may govern themselves; and

Whereas our Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence by their references to "Nature's God," "Creator," and "Divine Providence" clearly indicated their belief that this Nation's foundation and survival were dependent upon the will of a Supreme Being whose intercession could be obtained by prayer; and

Whereas every Congress, by its legislative actions has asserted a belief in the presence and influence of a Supreme Being; and now

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has decreed that prayer and/or the reading of Sacred Scripture may not be part of a public school exercise, ceremony, activity or assembly: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, we, the members of the Watertown, Mass., School Committee in session assembled on July 23, 1963, go on record as requesting the Congress of the United States of America to so amend the Constitution of the United States to allow the reading of Sacred Scripture in public schools and to create for recitation in public schools a fitting prayer calling upon the assistance of God without offending or intruding upon the religious beliefs of any individuals.

A Congressman Inspires Poetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all have, at one time or another, been impressed with the effective work performed in Congress by our distinguished colleague from California, my good and valued friend, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER.

Congressman MILLER has labored tirelessly in behalf of his constituents and the appreciation of one group will, I believe, be of interest and satisfaction to all Members.

I enclose the story of this most fitting tribute which appeared in the Alameda Times Star of Alameda, Calif., on October 29, 1963:

MILLER AID TO NAVY GROUP INSPIRES POET

Writing your Congressman can pay off.

Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER said today he has been successful in clearing up a pay problem brought to his attention by 1 of 30 Navy Reserve wives involved.

The problem involved a financial mixup in which the Navy attempted to require reservists to pay back money to which they were entitled as accumulated leave pay.

"Earlier this year," said Congressman MILLER, "I was contacted by Mrs. Curtis E. Miller, 15018 Beatty Street, San Leandro, concerning a misunderstanding over benefits extended to her husband and 29 other reservists stationed at Alameda Naval Air Station."

After some checking Congressman MILLER was advised that the Comptroller General of the United States decided members of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve who extended their enlistments are entitled to lump-sum leave settlement.

Congressman MILLER not only received a letter from the Navy Department, thanking him for his interest, but the following "thank you" in the form of a poem from Mrs. Miller on behalf of her husband and the other reservists concerned:

"Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D.C.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER:

"It was on May 15 just 5 months ago
That I wrote to you of our troubles and woe.
Your reaction was fast and showed great concern
For the moneys they were taking that we did earn.

"There were letters and controversy and many other things
That a problem of this kind always brings.
But knowing you were with us from the very beginning
A feeling of confidence did this fact bring.

"We thank you for your help in this important matter
For now our paychecks are back to being fatter.
And now that it's over and everything is just fine
Thirty families are deeply grateful, especially mine."

Bulldozers and Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article on urban renewal by Mr. Wolf Von Eckardt as it appeared in the September 14, 1963, issue of the New Republic magazine. This is the first in a series of six articles on the subject. During the 3 months he was preparing these articles, Mr. Von Eckardt visited Boston, Providence, New Haven, Hartford, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

Mr. Von Eckardt is an architectural writer and editor.

The article follows:

BULLDOZERS AND BUREAUCRATS: URBAN RENEWAL AND THE CITY—PART 1

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

From the elegant offices of the Boston Redevelopment Authority on the 11th floor of the city hall annex the heart of Boston looked as if it had been bombed. Years ago decay and neglect had turned the area around Scollay Square into a semislum of flophouses and burlesque theaters. Now urban renewal had turned it into a huge, yawning crater. A seemingly aimless bulldozer crawled lazily in the raw earth.

Edward J. Logue, Boston's renewal director, abruptly swiveled his chair toward the window. "Two or three years from now we'll see a brand new city down there," he said in

his debonair manner. "It's a damned miracle."

There are, by recent count, about 1,400 of such federally assisted damned miracles taking place in 700 cities and towns across the country. They are wrought by title I of the U.S. Housing Act of 1949, as frequently amended—also known (with equal justification) as "urban renewal," "urban devastation," "Negro removal," and "dehousing." Some urban renewal projects should, indeed, be damned. Some, however, promise new vitality and perhaps even beauty for our cities.

The new Government Center which will rise on the crater that was Boston's Scollay Square, along with Baltimore's Charles Center, San Francisco's Golden Gateway, New York's Lincoln Center, and Washington's Southwest, surely promise urban renewal, and auspicious renewal at that. But Boston's West End project, just a few blocks away, is typical of the now scorned but still prevalent "urban devastation" approach. Beginning in 1958 an entire residential neighborhood, predominantly Italian, was bulldozed. To the renewers, as to most of us, it was a disgraceful slum. But our disgrace was also home and refuge for the people who lived there. Furthermore, 5 years after these people were "relocated," as the official term has it, their neighborhood is still a 48-acre wasteland. On its edge have risen only two of Architect Victor Gruen's forbidding luxury apartments, and a handful of drab townhouses looking for occupants.

When title I was drafted 14 years ago, its aim was simple and plausible. The slums were to be cleared with the Government's power of eminent domain and replaced with "decent, safe, and sanitary" housing. Nobody who counted was then worried about rehabilitating downtown commercial property. Title I enabled the Government to sell the cleared land at less than cost to private developers. The idea was (and is) to attract free enterprise into the slum clearance business and to let private capital provide housing for the multitude. "No more slums in 10 years," was the slogan. Unfortunately, it has not worked out that way.

If the location seems attractive, the developers respond with alacrity. But they are not able to provide new housing for the predominantly poor and predominantly Negro slum dwellers the title I program displaces. This is due, of course, to the fact that it costs a great deal of money to build even the drab, wire-fenced monuments which are the usual fruits of the public housing dream. The slum dweller just cannot afford "decent, safe, sanitary" housing of recent vintage unless someone else pays part of the bill. And as Charles Abrams, a New York lawyer who has been in the thick of the battle for decent housing since the New Deal, says puffing through his cigar, "The housing we need requires more subsidies than mere land write-down." The Federal Housing Administration further complicates this problem by imposing middle-class standards for such things as front yards, electric outlets, and plumbing. Only if these standards are met will the FHA guarantee a construction loan. Its outlook is that of a glass-eyed banker whose mother never scrubbed him in a washtub. The best estimate is that of all the housing FHA has financed, only one-half of 1 percent has been for people with an annual income under $5,000. These are, of course, precisely the people whose dwellings urban renewal bulldozes.

So despite the congressional prescription of 1949 for "a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family," the slums remain with us. But that is not all. Since the early fifties, we have become aware that the ills of the city are bigger and more terrifying than the slums. We have begun to see that the whole central city is decaying physically and economically. Downtown business moves to suburbia, and decay spreads its blight over the once neat rows of middle-class houses, turning them into semislums or gray areas. Only the outer city, hopscotching further and further into the country, is considered a desirable habitat for the growing American middle class.

There has always been, of course, outward movement. The happy cycle sociologists call upward mobility has constantly lured Americans out of the city as soon as they had the carfare. Their old city homes were taken over by poorer and more recent immigrants. The Italians followed the Irish and the Jews followed the Italians, until each became affluent. As the cycle progressed, apartments came to house two, three and even five times more people than they were built for. It might have gone on forever. But when the Negroes and Puerto Ricans arrived, upward mobility and the American dream seemed to have come to an end.

THE RICH, POOR, OLD, AND PECULIAR

In-migration, the automobile and Government-insured mortgages have suddenly accelerated this happy cycle and turned it into a vicious circle. The automobile and FHA loans have brought within reach of millions the dream of a house all one's own (in a lily-white neighborhood) with a lawn in front and a swing for the kids in back. These young, white, ambitious Americans are fleeing the rundown and congested cities, taking their business with them, depriving the city of both tax income and leadership. The men come back only on weekdays from 9 to 5, demanding many of the old amenities, plus highways and parking (for which they pay no taxes). The immigrants require more welfare and education than the emigrants, and have less taxable income to pay for it.

With greater demands on a dwindling tax base, the city is further run down, and more middle-class residents flee, until, as someone observed, the city is left to the rich, poor, old, and peculiar. Between 1950 and 1960 New Haven lost 8 percent of its population. Washington and Boston lost 10 percent, etc. The figures are about the same for most larger cities. Yet the Negro population has increased in most of these same cities. Chicago, for instance, in the last census decade, gained 65 percent in Negroes and lost 13 percent of its whites. The American city is rapidly becoming a Negro ghetto—and not a voluntary ghetto either.

No wonder, then, that the urban renewal emphasis has shifted from slum clearance per se to reconstructing the urban tax base by bringing business and the affluent back into the city. Alarmed downtown businessmen's associations, in particular, now want elegant apartments, office buildings, and cultural attractions, not just for art's sake but for the cash register. And everyone hopes vaguely, that the benefits will trickle down into the ghetto.

Urban renewal's concern for downtown has diverted it from its original aim of providing good housing for all. And the renewers are aware that the situation is currently muddled. Mostly, as a result of the Housing Act revisions of 1961, the Federal Government is encouraging cities to set up priorities for community renewal. There are now elaborate efforts to ease the pains of re-location. The Federal Urban Renewal Administration now allows additional subsidies to cities which wish to sell cleared land at less than cost for buildings for people with moderate incomes. There is an effort to restore rather than demolish declining neighborhoods. All these programs and others are, however, still experimental. It is too early to assess their effect.

Furthermore, Federal activity in this field still moves in many contradictory directions at once. There is again talk of trying to pull all Federal activities together into a Cabinet-level Department of Community Development, but there is every reason to suppose Congress will reject this, just as it earlier rejected the proposed Department of Urban Affairs. In the meanwhile, the direction of urban renewal remains in the hands of William Slayton's Urban Renewal Administration (URA), with some 150 employees. URA is a part of the Housing and Home Finace Agency (HHFA), headed by Dr. Robert C. Weaver.

The legal mechanics of URA's title I program are simple. Its formula is based on the ancient, sovereign right of the State to appropriate property for public use (whether the owner consents or not). Our fifth amendment requires "just compensation," which is determined by independent real estate appraisers and, if necessary, the courts. In the past this power has been exercised for "public use," such as military installations, public works and, more recently, public housing. Title I gave the States the right to exercise the power of eminent domain for "the public benefit" as well, i.e., urban renewal. In 1954 the Supreme Court (*Berman* v. *Parker*) upheld this power. "It is within the power of the legislature," the Court said, "to determine that the community shall be beautiful as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled." Forty-five of fifty States (Idaho, Louisiana, South Carolina, Utah, and Wyoming excepted) have taken up this offer, empowering their communities to certify buildings and areas for redevelopment. The local government then purchases the properties, clears them of buildings and resells the land to private developers who will fulfill the new purpose.

If the local redevelopment program is deemed workable by Federal standards, the Federal Government contributes up to three-quarters of its net expense. The definition of what is workable fills a heavy tome, to which new directives and regulations are constantly added. They aim to assure that the local communities asking for Federal assistance are willing to undertake a long-range program of slum prevention, enforce their housing and building codes, relocate displaced people in a humane manner, and do their planning and rebuilding with the participation and approval of a representative citizen's advisory committee.

Renewal, as its Federal administrators keep emphasizing, is thus entirely initiated, planned, and executed by the local community. Not all the projects cooked up in the political quagmire where the "grassroots" flourish necessarily deserve Federal support. Many a high-cost and high-rise apartment project in our cities has been developed with tax money solely to stop Negro encroachments into some alderman's district.

A good deal of federally assisted rebuilding and rehabilitation is, in fact, originated not in city hall but in private neighborhood meetings. The impressive rehabilitation of Hyde Park-Kenwood, adjacent to the University of Chicago, is one of many examples.

It is a challenge to rebuild cities on the quicksands of local politics, in the labyrinth of municipal government, and in the sway of the hot emotions of people who stand to lose their home or gain their fortunes. And the challenge attracts an unusual number of competent people. In visiting a dozen cities, I encountered plenty of sullen, defensive bureaucrats and slick, public relations-minded types, but more often I was impressed, with calm and knowledgeable idealism in all ranks of the urban renewal effort. I found men like Ed Logue in Boston, Richard Steiner in Baltimore and Justin Herman in San Francisco who had not only mastered the jargon of economists, architects, builders, planners, and social workers but had made themselves at home with mayors, aldermen, and citizens committees too. I was particularly glad to find many Negroes among the most impressive renewal workers in important positions.

Ed Logue's work in Boston is not, perhaps, typical, but it is instructive. Logue had been assistant to Chester Bowles; then he was director of Mayor Richard Lee's urban renewal program in New Haven. He came to Boston in 1961, when the misconceived demolition of the West End had put all urban renewal in bad odor. Indeed, this fiasco still haunts him. Yet, he drew up a bold 10-year renewal plan to cover a quarter of the city. For a combined city and Federal expenditure of $90 million and, of course, many times that amount in hopefully expected private investment, several downtown areas, the historic Beacon Hill district, the waterfront, and a number of residential areas will be restored to health.

WHO WILL RENT TO A COLORED FAMILY?

Logue is especially proud of the effort to rehabilitate Washington Park out in Roxbury. Washington Park was once a ritzy Carpenter Gothic suburb for well-to-do merchants. Its old trees now conceal what is in part an eerie, rural slum such as you'd expect to find in Mississippi rather than Boston. With the painstakingly solicited participation of the area's inhabitants (all of them Negroes but of varying economic status), the old Charles Addams houses will mostly be repaired and renovated. The hopeless ones will be replaced by new dwellings, new schools, or community facilities. The streets and parks will be spruced up. "We are going to have a beautiful new neighborhood," Washington Park residents told me.

Such neighborhood rehabilitation, in active cooperation with the residents, is a much nurtured new trend in urban renewal. It is far more complex and often far more expensive than the old cataclysmic kind. Logue was one of its pioneers at Wooster Square in New Haven. Chicago's Hyde Park-Kenwood and Baltimore's Harlem Park are other examples. Even in those rehabilitated areas people must be evicted, for rehabilitation means eliminating the five-to-a-room apartments.

Evictions are the main point of departure for the attacks on Logue and, for that matter, on all urban renewers. Not that all those evicted love the rat-infested crime-ridden areas from which they are being uprooted. But where are they to go? Who would rent an apartment to a colored family on relief with a blind father and 14 children, 2 of whom are in prison and 1 of whom is on probation for shoplifting?

Public housing won't have them. More often than not there are long waiting lists, even though families displaced by renewal have priority. Furthermore, public housing, partly because of legal restrictions and partly in fear of more harassment, is a cold-blooded real estate operation. It does not accept people whose children lack birth certificates, whose morality is otherwise found wanting, or who have ever owed a landlord. Our slums are full of such people. If you want to tone up a neighborhood, removing them is sometimes helpful. But they mostly just move across the street.

"What is disturbing to me," HHFA Administrator Weaver has recently said, "is the opportunity missed by communities to seize this moment of relocation to bring about the social rehabilitation of the family. For it is just at the moment that a family has been uprooted, has been provided through relocation with the means of establishing a new home, and has been brought into contact—some for the first time and many for reacquaintance—with the social agencies of the community, that miracles can be accomplished."

Boston and other communities are trying hard now to seize the moment. Even home economists are added to the relocation staff. They help families to rebudget their finances: pay less for a car, perhaps, and a little more for new housing. In Baltimore, people are visited by social workers—"given the social work saturation treatment," Dick Steiner called it—as long as a year before they must move. The social workers try to uncover what family problems there are, attempt to solve them, and try to teach them better mores and manners—how to repair furniture, not to fatten rats or throw garbage into each other's yards, and even to sew better clothes—so as to make them more welcome in their new quarters. "Hell," said a young renewal official, "what right do we have to tell people how to behave and keep themselves clean? We set out to renew buildings and here we find ourselves trying to renew people. Urban renewal spends far less than the city welfare department. Yet urban renewal is always blamed for neglecting the human element."

SATURATION TREATMENT

Under Weaver's and Slayton's New Frontier regime the blame is less and less justified. Yet, even now, when relocation has become urban renewal's foremost concern, it can help only a few of the poor to substantially better quarters and a better life. Statistics are hard to come by since people are always moving about. The law requires that every person displaced by urban renewal be located in standard housing, up to $200 moving expense paid. In the initial panic caused by rumors of impending demolition, however, many people move before a relocation worker ever reaches them. Others, whose vocations or habits give them an excessive sense of privacy, quietly slip away after the first contact. And those who are officially helped, "social work saturation" or not, are just moved somewhere into the vast gray areas of the city where they can afford the rents. Furthermore, renewal displacement accounts for only half of all displacement due to government action. Forty percent is due to highway construction, 10 percent to sundry public works, such as schools or firehouses. Those in the path of a highway get only 30 days' notice and nothing more, although in a few cities the mayor has lately asked the urban renewal relocation workers to take care of the victims.

It is thus questionable how standard the new homes of the displaced are, and how long they will remain standard after more people are crowded in. But there is no question that as long as we keep the suburbs closed to Negroes and build no new low-rent housing, we just keep pushing the slums around.

This indignation has caused increasing opposition to urban renewal. Conservatives who have discovered the slums for the first time, and liberals who have discovered that urban renewal "takes land from the poor to sell it to the rich," have formed an odd alliance against it.

In Chicago, an urban renewal bond issue was soundly defeated in April 1962, and stopped all new programs. Similar, though less important bond issues, have gone down in other cities. Mayor Lee of New Haven, who once aroused his whole city to urban renewal, now prefers to talk of other things when facing the voters. No mayor has yet been elected Governor on his city's renewal effort. Richardson Dilworth, whose Philadelphia record was splendid, will readily confirm this.

Only the downtown projects, like Boston's Scollay Square Government Center, remain comparatively popular for they involve little relocation. Indeed, it is startling how successful and daring the renewers have been downtown. Extending over 22 of Boston's oldest streets, the now devastated Scollay Square-Haymarket area will be transformed into an elegant plaza, framing a new city hall and framed itself by a carefully laid-out array of 14 public and private office buildings with shops and parking garages. The scheme was conceived by architect-planner I. M. Pei on a scale and grandeur approaching the Piazza San Marco. Its detailed design, on Logue's insistence, will be supervised by a panel of some of the country's leading architects. The design of the new city hall, a startling, high-legged, Le Corbusieresque adventure in somewhat brutal architectural commonsense, was the result of a national competition.

Yet, much of what the new Government Center might do to pump new life into downtown Boston is likely to be undone by the rivaling Prudential Center, a privately financed affair in the Back Bay, dominated by a monstrous 52-story office tower. Under its front yard will run an equally monstrous toll road, courtesy of the crafty William F. Callahan, whose last hurrah is the chairmanship of the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. A well-functioning organism can have but one heart and cannot be pierced by eight lanes of speeding motor automobiles.

The Back Bay folly illustrates an as yet unacknowledged dilemma of urban renewal not only in Boston but around the country: the almost total lack of effective overall planning in our cities. Almost everywhere the new downtown centers, waterfronts, luxury apartments, rare and experimental low-rent housing developments, rehabilitation areas and industrial parks are arbitrarily grafted onto the old city tissue. Privately financed construction, furthermore, follows the vagaries of real estate speculation rather than any grand strategy to restore order and efficiency to the city. The downtown expressways follow only the whims of the highway engineers and sometimes of politicians, slashing and girdling the city. Only Philadelphia has a working master plan worthy of the name. It was drafted by Edmund R. Bacon, the only American planner who is also an artist.

I asked Ed Logue what, in the absence of a workable vision, all the digging and building would in the end add up to. He leaned back in his chair. But he is never long lost for an answer. "We can't try to play God," he said. And as I left him the urban renewal bulldozers kept crawling below as they keep crawling all over urban America. Indeed they must, if we hope to break the vicious circle that now grinds down the city. There is no alternative.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of critical essays written about those dedicated advocates of civil rights legislation who worked so long and hard to obtain the excellent bill recently reported by the Judiciary Committee. Many of these articles were both derogatory and inaccurate.

The following editorial from the New York Post is a useful corrective to these gibes. It sets the record straight and points up the valuable contribution made by this bipartisan group:

THE FIGHT THAT DIDN'T FAIL

The civil rights bill finally voted by the Judiciary Committee is an improvement over the administration's original proposal. It vindicates the fight waged by Democratic and Republican liberals for a stronger measure. It offers the basis for a new, massive effort to achieve legislation truly responsive to this crisis.

The fight took courage. Joseph Alsop and other pundits denounced the Kastenmeier-Lindsay group in savage terms. By insisting on a tougher bill than the original adminis-

tration draft, Alsop charged, the liberals were endangering the chances of getting any bill. They were doing so, he cried, because of a "fatal fondness for empty, competitive posturing."

Now that a strengthened bill not only has been voted by the House Judiciary Committee but has emerged with the official backing of both the Republican and Democratic leadership, there should be orchids for the liberals who refused to give up and a dunce cap for their detractors.

The most important respects in which the original administration version has been strengthened is the inclusion of provisions for an FEPC and a limited authorization to the Justice Department to intervene to protect Negro constitutional rights. The final version of title III, while not as strong as civil rights forces sought, nevertheless could be of some help in curbing police brutality against the freedom movement.

A further dividend from the liberal fight was to get the Republican House leadership, more strongly and publicly committed to civil rights legislation than had been thought possible. President Kennedy played a key and meritorious role in that effort.

Now, if the bill can be blasted out of the Rules Committee and passed with a sweeping House vote, the stage will be set for the crucial struggle in the Senate, where, as Senator CASE notes, "we will start not from a position of weakness [but] * * * from a strong position."

There are still defects in the measure. There are large battles ahead. But the lesson of this episode so far is that faint heart rarely prevails on Capitol Hill.

Resolutions Adopted by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Minnesota Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Ukrainian organizations of the Twin Cities, sponsored by the Minnesota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, recently met and adopted a number of worthwhile resolutions.

These resolutions enumerate the beliefs of these people of Ukrainian descent that their homelands can and must emerge from behind the Iron Curtain and again take their places in the world as free, independent, and peaceful nations, free of the indignity of Communist slavery.

I introduce, Mr. Speaker, for the consideration of all Americans and all public-spirited individuals, groups, and free nations everywhere, the resolutions of the Ukrainian organizations of the Twin Cities:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, MINNESOTA BRANCH, OCTOBER 19, 1963, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., OBSERVING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNIST-PROVOKED MOST INFAMOUS FAMINE IN UKRAINE

We, the members of various Ukrainian organizations of the State of Minnesota, assembled at the mass meeting, sponsored by the Minnesota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, dedicated to the memory of over 7 million Ukrainians, who perished in the deliberately planned and ruthlessly carried out gruesome manmade famine by the predetermined measures of the U.S.S.R. Government in the years of 1932–33 in Ukraine and adjacent areas, in recalling the inhuman suffering of our kinsmen, we express our heartfelt feelings of profound sorrow and highest respect for the innocent victims of that cruel treatment by the Russian Communist regime of its own citizens, we unanimously pass the following resolutions:

"Whereas the government of the Communist colonial empire in its designs of territorial aggrandizement had overpowered the free and sovereign Ukraine by unprovoked military aggression and had organized and imposed its own communistic regime on the Ukrainian territories by sanguine dictatorial methods against the will and consent of the Ukrainian people; and

"Whereas the Moscow Communist regime deliberately planned and staged the infamous famine by forceful collectivization and confiscation of all private land, livestock, and property as well as all of the grain from the new harvest in 1933, requisitioning of all food from peasants in order to subdue the freedom-loving Ukrainians into the Communist system; and

"Whereas the Moscow Soviet regime by its official decrees, armed forces, and police action forcibly prevented the starving people from obtaining even the smallest amount of any food in city markets or in the adjacent area of Russian ethnic territory, which was free from famine, and

"Whereas the Moscow Government of sinecure self-perpetuating clique of Communist commissars in its criminal intentions perpetrated mass genocide upon the Ukrainian population, and premedetatively denied the news that had permeated into the free world about the truth of an existing famine in Ukraine; and

"Whereas the Moscow Communist government refused to accept relief or any organized efforts of help, offered by the humanitarian and charitable organizations from abroad to alleviate the suffering of the starving Ukrainian population; and

"Whereas there are some Communist leaders still living, who are presently at the helm of the Russian Communist colonial empire, who participated in that ignoble action of deliberate planning or enforcing the execution of those gruesome crimes, and who at present either deny the existence or any knowledge of that shocking famine, which, however, in spite of great secrecy, has now become well known as an established fact, even by the admission of some of the principal perpetrators of that greatest crime in modern history of man: Be it

"Resolved—

"1. In our devout tribute to the memory of deliberately starved and perished 7 million of our kinsmen, we observe this solemn occasion of sorrowful 30th anniversary of manmade famine in Ukraine wtih profound sympathy and grief.

"2. We vigorously denounce the inhuman methods at the command of the Russian Communist government used in the process of subjugation of conquered people of Ukraine into Russian colonial empire, and we believe that the 7 million Ukranians have not died in vain, because their supreme sacrifice will always be a reminder as a symbol of the national will and determination for freedom and national sovereignty of Ukraine.

"3. We empower the executive committee of the Minnesota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America to take appropriate steps through the governmental agencies of the United States and those of the United Nations organization as well as in the International Court to use their offices and facilities for proper investigation, finding, and disclosing the guilty individuals of these perpetrated crimes and to bring them to the International Court of Justice for the acts committing genocide, just as it was done for the crimes of the Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese leaders or for the destruction of 6 millions of the Jews during the Second World War. There should not be discrimination in such matters.

"4. Genuine peace is sincerely desired by all peoples of the world, but only peace with justice, human dignity, liberty, and national sovereignty of the emancipated peoples to their national statehood can endure.

"5. We respectfully request the Government of the United States and all governments of the free world to take appropriate peaceful action toward the liberation of the non-Russian peoples, including that of Ukraine, now living under the colonial regime in the U.S.S.R., and to help them to freedom and to their national sovereign statehood. This is the most essential step for the prevention of the world conquest, which is being promoted by the Russian Colonial Empire under the cover of Communist ideology.

"6. We must sound a warning to the American Government and people that the present wheat deal may be extremely harmful to the United States and the free world. Ordinary people will not get that food. It will be used to strengthen the Communist regime and its propaganda abroad. Much of this grain will be stored or diverted for the future war purposes against American interests. The Communist regime has repeatedly used food as a political weapon against its own people. In 1933, Russian Communist government exported the confiscated grain in order to obtain funds for development of heavy industry in preparation for the Second World War, while people at home were starving. If wheat help is to be given, it should be delivered and distributed directly to the constituent republics of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites under controlled American supervision.

"7. We again declare that the Ukrainian Nation is the best ally of the free world. With free Ukraine the Soviet Russian Empire, deprived of rich Ukrainian natural and human resources, will not be able to wage aggression against the freedom of the world. The liberty-loving nations should remember that neither slavery, suffering, famine nor death will stop the Ukrainian people in their struggle for human liberty with dignity and national sovereignty of Ukraine."

For the resolution committee:

A. A. GRANOVSKY.
SERHIY YERMOLENKO.
DMYTRO JANKOVSKY.

Religion in the Public Schools—And at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the National Jewish Monthly, June 1963, issue.

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS—AND AT HOME

It is very significant that the United Presbyterian Church voted overwhelmingly to oppose religious practices in the public

schools. The same action had previously been taken by the Methodists. Most leading Jewish organizations feel the same way.

Like the Methodists and the Jews, the Presbyterians feel that religion should be taught in the churches and synagogues, and in the homes and religious schools. In public schools, it is not only a divisive factor, but the bloodless ways in which it must be presented, in an effort to be acceptable at all, actually militate against its having any constructive effect on the children, and in some cases even produce an unfortunate effect.

Of course, as President Kennedy has indicated, those who demand that religion be kept out of the public schools and nurtured in the homes, churches, and synagogues, also have an obligation—to nurture it in those places.

Ohio State Employment Service Here Victim of New Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have two additional installments in the story of the Cleveland office of the Ohio Employment Service and wish to call attention particularly to the first which relates the remarkable bureaucracy created in Ohio at the insistence of the U.S. Employment Service.

The articles follow:

OHIO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE HERE VICTIM OF NEW BUREAUCRACY

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Falsifying of records to justify staff jobs occurred in the Cleveland area office of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES) after a huge new bureaucracy was established there.

State officials say the growth was so large that it produced the seeds of its own corruption. Federal officials disagree and insist the bureaucracy was needed.

This issue is at the heart of the public employment situation in Cleveland. But it is not just a local squabble. Every major community in the State and Nation has come into possession of a similar bureaucracy, financed by Federal money.

Is Cleveland the only place where falsifying was going on? No one can be sure. It would take exhaustive checking to find out, and the Federal Government has not started.

Complexities of the bureaucracy present a fascinating study. It is known nationally as the "Metropolitan Plan," and Congress has appropriated nearly $50 million for it in the last 2 years.

In Ohio this money had been translated into 240 new postions on the OSES staff, 88 of them in the Cleveland area office. Those were authorized in the hope that a larger OSES staff could eventually find more jobs for 20,000 applicants who are seeking work.

The Federal Government planned the program and pays for it. State officials operate it.

A stanch defender of the "Metro" plan is John L. Craig, regional director in Cleveland of the U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security (BES).

Craig says: "We knew that these 88 new people in Cleveland wouldn't immediately have enough work to earn their keep. They might be sitting around and worrying about it. But we are building a potential, and you have start somewhere.

"Unemployment is one of the most serious problems that this country faces. To lick any problem you have to spend some money. The job of those 88 new people was to build up the capacity of OSES to deal with the unemployment problem."

Around the country, as in Ohio, local employment offices shared quarters with unemployment compensation offices, and the staffs of the two operations were intermingled.

The "Metro" plan separated the two functions. This was necessary, according to Craig, because in times of crisis personnel would concentrate on paying benefits rather than finding job openings.

"The emphasis was all wrong," Craig asserts. "The separation, of course, increased the overhead. Where you could get by with one receptionist, you now needed two. But ultimately placing more people in jobs would reduce the need for benefit payments."

The separation in Cleveland resulted in OSES staffers pulling out of neighborhood offices where they had shared a roof with compensation personnel.

The OSES people were brought downtown and concentrated with the 88 recruits in new offices in the Gilman Building, at 799 Rockwell Avenue NE. and in other places.

At the same two new concepts were introduced as part of the "Metro" plan. In governmental jargon they became known as "span of control" and "unitization."

"Span of control" grew out of an assumption that a larger OSES staff required more supervisors on it. It was felt that 20 persons, say, could not effectively be supervised by 1 person.

So a supervisory post was created for every six or seven persons on the payroll. This was the "span of control." Many of these supervisors were supposed to share in the work load of their subordinates.

"Unitization" meant specialization of the OSES staff, and this in turn meant the creation of several little bureaus.

Each bureau had a unit supervisor. Each cluster of bureaus had a section supervisor. The section supervisors were responsible to division heads.

The OSES clerical and professional division in Cleveland had professional, clerical, and sales sections. In the next echelon were the following units: outside salesmen, inside salesmen, miscellaneous clerks, typists, secretarial, managerial, and professional.

The industrial division had two sections and five units, and the service division two sections and seven units.

Inflating of job placement records has cost these units their separate identities. Many of them have been consolidated by Willard P. Dudley, State administrator of the bureau of unemployment compensation (BUC), which includes OSES.

Dudley has instituted a simpler table of organization to assure, as he says, greater efficiency, and more honesty. Federal officials are not happy with Dudley's drift away from the "Metro" plan.

The plan is in effect in 48 metropolitan centers in the United States, including—in Craig's regional jurisdiction—Detroit, Toledo, Akron, Cincinnati, Dayton, Columbus, and Louisville.

A "second tier" of some 70 cities, including Canton, and Youngstown-Warren, are supposed to come under the plan later.

A preliminary evaluation of the "Metro" program was made in 1962, and Labor Department officials evidently were pleased. A followup evaluation was to be made a year later.

Purpose of the new study would have been to size up achievements of the program and to determine whether there was too much or too little staffing. But because of the falsifications in Cleveland, it has become impossible to make this determination.

Craig says: "We had a pretty good operation going on there—on paper. We can't tell what the paper is worth."

STATE OFFICERS DENY RILEY WAS TOO BUSY

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Was Ward A. Riley too concerned with top-level duties to take notice of record falsification by his staff?

Riley said in a recent Plain Dealer interview that he was so preoccupied. But reports by his superiors contradict this statement. They said he dealt too frequently with trivia.

Riley was district manager of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation (BUC) and its Ohio State Employment Service (OSES) in Cuyahoga, Lake and Geauga Counties.

Commenting on false job placement records, apparently made to justify OSES jobs, he told this reporter: "I was spending 99 percent of my time attending civic meetings and doing promotional work and on job development projects. I didn't have time to worry about whether Mary Lou took a hire she wasn't entitled to."

He added he depended on Leo J. Moss, his deputy in charge of the OSES operation, to be on the lookout for improper reporting.

However, documents in the State investigative files charge that Riley interfered with Moss and did not permit him to discharge his responsibilities.

On October 30, 1962, Don A. Heineman, then in charge of local office operations, wrote Riley from Columbus. He asserted that Moss must be allowed to devote full time to his OSES obligations and was not to be treated by Riley as a general assistant.

Heineman told Riley: "Your prominent participation in so many of the relatively routine activities in Cleveland's employment service renders Mr. Moss'—or your—job useless. This is a matter of great concern to me."

Riley was ordered to "divorce yourself of all but top-level administrative tasks."

On August 12, 1963, Willard P. Dudley, State BUC administrator, received a report on this subject from Arthur E. Day, his director of personnel. Day wrote:

"Mr. Moss has always been a strong Republican in the Polish group in Cleveland, and his political philosophy was opposed to that of his superior, Mr. Riley.

"As a result of some privately expressed opposition to Riley's methods and operations, Moss was relegated to a situation of no responsibility and consequent ineffectiveness."

Day continued that the late J. N. Shepherd, former manager of the Cleveland OSES clerical and professional office, "was dominated by Ward Riley, and he [Riley] 'rode' the placement employees in that office.

"Mr. Riley frequently visited the C. & P. office, contacting supervisors and employees directly on many occasions with orders to show a continued increase record in placements under penalty of severe disciplinary action or dismissal if the reports did not indicate a volume of placements."

When Prentice S. Woodhouse succeeded to Shepherd's post in 1962, Day wrote, "Riley frequently bypassed him to deal directly with employees and supervisors in the office.

"After the State administration changed, rumors of district office abolishment were circulated.

"The employees were subjected to an intensified campaign of making the records show many placements. Even during this period Moss was under orders from Riley to stay in the district office and not 'interfere' with the activities in the local offices."

Moss is 70 and lives at 29420 Lansing Drive, Westlake. He joined OSES in 1919, after his graduation from law school.

Appendix

The Montana School of Mines—The "Orediggers" of a Great Technical School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in Butte, Mont., is located one of the great technical schools of the Nation and of the world. The Montana School of Mines is so recognized, not only by the Senator from Montana, who happened to have been a student there some years ago, but also by the entire engineering profession.

This reputation is a source of great satisfaction to all the people of Butte and to all the citizens of Montana. We take pride, too, in the football team of the school, which is affectionately known as the "Orediggers." A year ago, Mr. President, I happened to be in Butte, in attendance at a game from which this outstanding team emerged victorious. It was the first time the team had won a game in 10 years. The victory broke a 44-game losing streak. This year, I was again present at a game in which the "Orediggers" triumphed. This time, they won after they had lost only five games in a row.

I wish that I could claim some credit for these somewhat unique victories, but I do not see that I can in good conscience claim anything more than coincidence, for the fact is that when I was a student at the Mines, I was a member of the football team; and, in all honesty, I must admit that I was rated 16th on a squad of 16; and when confronted, at times, with a desperate substitution, the coach was inclined to "in" himself, rather than send me.

When I speak of this team as being outstanding, despite a rather consistent tendency to lose games, I want to assure the Senate that I am being neither facetious nor ironic. It is an outstanding team in the best sense of the word, and the reason for this characterization is clearly set forth in a letter from Prof. John G. McCaslin, which appears in the November 5 issue of the Montana Standard.

Professor McCaslin notes, among other things, that—

> If a football player (of the Orediggers) is being congratulated on Monday, it is probably for making an A on a calculus or thermodynamics examination, as well as for the fine play he made on Saturday.

He notes, further, that—

> In this day when paid athletics are the rule, rather than the exception, the ability to keep sports in proper perspective is rare. These, however, are rare young men at Montana School of Mines. It has a tradition of graduating only men of the highest caliber.

Further, Professor McCaslin noted that—

> None of the players receive board, room, or—good heavens—spending money to play football.

Mr. President, we are often accused of cluttering up the RECORD with matters of local interest only. The Orediggers football team may, indeed, be of great local interest to the people of Butte. But I want to say that in what it stands for in the way of decency among the young people of the Nation, what it stands for in the wise relating of education and sports, is not of local interest only; and in the consistent understanding which its loyal supporters give to this team of young men and in their ability to put winning and losing in wise and humorous perspective, there is a profound meaning for all of us, wherever we may be in the Nation. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I commend Professor McCaslin's letter to the attention of the Senate. It would be my hope that the RECORD will always contain occasional statements, such as this one, which serve as a kind of tonic for the spirit and a replenishment of hope for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montana Standard, Nov. 5, 1963]

NO SPENDING MONEY FOR PLAYING FOOTBALL AT MONTANA SCHOOL OF MINES

DEAR SIR: In a Thursday, October 31, editorial you stated, and I quote:

"For many reasons, some readily apparent and others requiring some fathoming, the Mines team is held in high esteem by Butte fans."

This is natural, since it is in the American tradition to sympathize with the underdog.

However, the pride that Butte fans feel for our college football team goes much deeper. Many of these boys are well known here; 25 of the 35 members of the squad are from Butte.

Butte fans also know that none of the players receives board, room or—good heavens—spending money to play football. I suspect that fans from anywhere but Butte would find it hard to understand why any young man could want to play football simply because he happens to like the game and never worries about "What's in it for me?"

In many of the larger colleges, Saturday's football hero is the "big man on the campus" for at least the following week. On our campus, if a football player is being congratulated on Monday, it is probably for making an "A" on a calculus or thermodynamics examination, as well as for the fine play he made Saturday.

He may miss practice on Wednesday, not to pose for press photographers but to finish an experiment in a laboratory.

In this day when paid athletes are the rule rather than the exception, the ability to keep sports in proper perspective is rare. These, however, are rare young men at Montana School of Mines. It has a tradition of graduating only men of the highest caliber. These young men cannot help upholding that tradition when they leave our campus.

You will find another interesting aspect of the Mines team if you watch the statistics. The Mines players consistently lose fewer yards from penalties than their opponents. I have never seen a Mines player ejected from a game for poor sportsmanship. Could it be that good sportsmanship is more important than winning games here at Mines?

The Orediggers also have a rather unique way of "hanging the coach in effigy." At the recent homecoming dance, the coach received a beautiful plaque, inscribed:

"To Coach Simonich, in appreciation of long standing dedication to School of Mines athletics. Our thanks. M Club, 1963."

The M Club is a campus organization of students who have won letters in athletics. However, this plaque reflects the gratitude of the entire student body as well as the faculty and alumni. I repeat:

"We still have the best amateur football team in the United States."

I will stick my neck out again: Mines will beat Carroll by at least six points.

JOHN G. MCCASLIN,
Associate Professor, Montana School of Mines.

Thanksgiving, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, most Americans enjoy so many blessings today that the real meaning of our Thanksgiving observance is all too often forgotten.

Thanksgiving was first observed, as every child in grade school can tell us, as an expression of gratitude by the New England Pilgrims for the bounty of their first harvest. These early colonists, who had come to a strange new land seeking freedom, had suffered severely during their first winter from a shortage of food and adequate shelter. After a summer of opportunity to build and plant, when the good Lord had seen fit to provide favorable conditions for crops to grow and mature, the Pilgrims gave thanks to Him who had made their efforts fruitful. They had tried their best, by working hard, to do their part in providing for themselves. It is worth remembering that these independent, self-sufficient people who had been successful in producing a bountiful crop to harvest, set aside a day to give thanks to God for His help.

In reading the November issue of the American Cattle Producer, official publication of the American National Cattlemen's Association, I was impressed with the observations on Thanksgiving

by Mrs. J. W. Tyler of Bismarck, N. Dak., president of the National Cow Belles. Mrs. Tyler is a credit to our State in the work she has done for the benefit of the livestock industry and for a better understanding of livestock people. I am proud to call Marie Tyler and her husband, Jim, my close personal friends.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mrs. Tyler's article with my remarks, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today:

WORLD IN WHICH ALL MAY SEEK HAPPINESS

Greetings: November, the 11th month, brings a realization that the year is nearly spent and that we must apply ourselves diligently if all the unfinished projects are to be completed before the final curtain closes.

Fruits of our 1963 harvest have been garnered. If we have sown well, our larders are full, and thanks should be given to the Almighty God for the many blessings He has bestowed. The importance of this gratitude is acknowledged in our setting aside one day, Thanksgiving, on which families and friends gather in companionship to give thanks and praise to Him, to create within us a true gratitude that shall make this day of Thanksgiving one of rededication, when we shall think not of how much we can eat but of how thankful we ought to be.

So may we, across this land, act as recipients of God's richest mercy and bountiful blessings, as we share with others. May we, in true gratitude, get on with the job of creating not only a nation but a world in which all men shall have the right to seek happiness. Help us to make this dream come true in our homes day by day, in streets, offices and schools, so to live that He shall be able to bless us and bless the Nation for which we pray.

Even though 1963 is nearing an end, we can with little effort do much not only for ourselves but for others. Remember, if you want to do what you have to do, make an extra effort.

The U.S. Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the U.S. Information Agency does most of its outstanding work for consumption overseas. Seldom do Americans have the opportunity to see and appreciate the high quality of the work done by this necessary Government Agency.

Thanks to Donald M. Wilson, Deputy Director of the USIA, a group of reporters were recently given the opportunity to view two of the Agency's films. Editor Lloyd Armour, of the Nashville Tennessean, was among this group and wrote a column praising the films and thanking Mr. Wilson for providing the opportunity to see them.

Mr. Wilson is a New Jersey man, I am proud to say. He left behind him a record of 11 years of international reporting for Life magazine when President Kennedy appointed him to his present post in 1961.

I feel that both the USIA and Mr. Wilson deserve the high praise offered by Mr. Armour's column, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT MOVIES FEW AMERICANS WILL EVER SEE: NEITHER WAS MADE IN THE CELLULOID MILLS OF HOLLYWOOD, BUT THEY WERE EXCELLENT

(By Lloyd Armour)

I saw a movie last week—a couple of movies in fact—that few Americans will ever see.

In a way, it is regrettable, for they were superb examples of the art and skill of Americans. As exhibits of a particular purpose, most citizens would have found them interesting as well as enlightening.

One was called "Five Cities in June," and it had all the color, movement, sweep and pageantry anyone could ask. The other was called, "The New School at Rincon Santo."

In theaters all over the world, tens of millions will see both movies and, I think, they will be impressed by them, and take something from them.

Neither was made in the celluloid mills of Hollywood. Instead, they were produced for and under the direction of the U.S. Information Agency's film division. In plain language they were propaganda films, although they made their points with all the subtle skill of the cinemaphotographers arts.

"Five Cities in June" was a simple, but magnificently depicted story of five world cities and the events there. One was Rome where the death of Pope John was told, the succession of Pope Paul and the simple effect on people. The other was an unnamed city in Vietnam, where the Communists came to the villagers making promises of the better life, and returned to burn the village to the ground.

Another was the city of Tuscaloosa, Ala., caught up in the emotional problem of admitting Negro students to the university. The theme was handled with tact and with understanding, and its point was that America is trying to do something about its problems of inequality.

Still another unnamed city was in Russia where cosmonauts were launched and it was explained that only a little film was made available by the Russians. Interspersed between Russian space shot pictures which showed little, were those from Cape Canaveral, made in the open, free to the world's hosts of newsmen.

A final city was Berlin, where the camera visited the wall, peered into the drabness of East Berlin, and then switched back to the massive and thundering crowds who were greeting the President of the United States.

As a somewhat cynical watcher of films which peddle a point, I was impressed, and moved with a sense of appreciation and pride for the "Five Cities." Purely as a work of art, it could hold its own or outstrip other offerings at any film festival.

Although its propaganda touch was delicate, I doubt if the most dense viewer in the remotest region of the world would miss the point.

"The New School at Rincon Santo," was a simple story of a remote village in Colombia which had always longed for a schoolhouse for its children, but had thought it was impossible.

The dreams of the villagers were told through the comments of mothers, by the play of the children. Rincon Santo got its schoolhouse, and its villagers built it, brick by brick, shingle by shingle, pane by pane. The message was one about self-help, the keystone and underlying thought of the Alliance for Progress.

For the many Americans who wonder just what the USIA is doing—what kind of films it is producing for the millions all over the world who want to know something of the story and the aims of this country, both films would prove very enlightening.

It is for a very clear reason, however, that only a few will ever see such films. The Congress prefers, and makes its obligatory on the USIA that its products are made for consumption elsewhere, not in the United States. After all the USIA is a vast communications media itself, and the implied fears of Congress are that if it were enabled to turn its full output on Americans as well as others, it might be tempted to do some "brainwashing" at home.

It is not an unreasonable trepidation when one thinks about it for a while, even though USIA has no such interest and, in fact, no reason for directing its energies anywhere but outward to the world.

Nevertheless, on an occasion, the American taxpayers might like to have a look at the product they are paying for. If the "Five Cities" and the "The New School" are fair samples of the task USIA is doing in films, these taxpayers should be gratified. And it would seem the USIA would have some less difficulty in getting its appropriations through Congress.

Those who attended last week's foreign policy briefings in the State Department auditorium in Washington had a chance to see the film, thanks to Mr. Donald M. Wilson, deputy director, USIA.

From the applause, the hundreds of editors and broadcasters were very much impressed with the two films very few Americans will ever see.

Independence of Cambodia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, November 9, the Kingdom of Cambodia will celebrate the 10th anniversary of her independence, and on this occasion we take opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Chief of State; and His Excellency Nong Kimny, the Cambodian Ambassador to the United States.

This small country in southeast Asia is located between Thailand and war-torn Laos and South Vietnam. It is situated in a very troubled part of the world, and yet, for a decade now the people of Cambodia have lived in remarkable tranquility.

If there is one individual responsible for this happy state of affairs it is Prince Norodom Sihanouk. At one time the King of Cambodia, Prince Sihanouk abdicated in March 1955 in favor of his parents, King Suramarit and Queen Kassamak. The reason he left the throne was that he wished to participate more actively in the political affairs of the country. He immediately established his own political movement and later that year became the Prime Minister when his party won a sweeping victory at the polls.

When his father died in 1960, Prince Sihanouk made a decision not to resume the throne. The National Assembly adopted an amendment to the constitution stating that in special circumstances

the Assembly could confer the powers of Chief of State on a person chosen by a national referendum. Subsequently Prince Sihanouk was unanimously elected Chief of State by the National Assembly after the Prince received overwhelming popular support in a nationwide referendum.

Cambodia's leader has made a unique and determined effort to establish personal contact with the people. He has explained his policies to them and has succeeded in winning their full support. He has continued also to enjoy the great respect which the Cambodian people have accorded him as King and as the leader who secured the country's independence.

Cambodia has emerged as one of the important states in southeast Asia. Prince Sihanouk's government has adopted a position of neutralism in the cold war. Cambodia's neutrality is described as being neither complaisant nor surrendering to anyone, but a genuine attempt to maintain an equal balance between the blocs and to eliminate any pretext for aggression. This attitude of the Cambodian Government has been respected by the United States. The policy of our own Government toward Cambodia has been based on the simple precept that we would like to assist Cambodia to remain free. The United States has considered it to be in its own national interest to help in the economic and social advancement of Cambodia. Through its programs of assistance, the United States has endeavored to help the Cambodian Government maintain the independence of the Kingdom and promote the welfare of the Cambodian people.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute the people and the Government of Cambodia on the 10th anniversary of the Kingdom's independence. I know that many other Americans join me in this gesture.

Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer Presents Reasoned Editorial in Support of Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my views on the need for quality stabilization and restriction of the more predatory competitive practices of our distributive economy have not altered significantly since I cosponsored legislation on this subject in the Senate in 1961. Since then I have twice gone on record in support of its principles by joining colleagues in reintroducing the measure in perfected form. I have also testified for quality stabilization before congressional committees, as I did again on June 5, before the Senate Commerce Committee.

The measure has been examined and reexamined by committees of Congress and it is particularly gratifying that last year, though the bill was not brought to a final vote it received favorable reports from three separate committees. It is most deserving of enactment by this Congress so it can go to work as a helpful economic force.

On August 6, 1963, the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer printed an effective commentary on quality stabilization and its implications. The reasoned editorial approach of this leading West Virginia newspaper is in refreshing contrast to illogical, and in many instances, intemperate editorials in opposition to the proposal.

The Intelligencer pays deserved tribute to the leadership of Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of Califorina, in the cause of the consumer. Likewise, it is appropriate that we take note of the fact that the Senate assistant majority leader, the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, introduced S. 774, and that the Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL, assistant minority leader, is a cosponsor. Some nine other Senators, including myself, are also listed as cosponsors of the measure, and proponents are seated on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I concur with the view propounded by Senator HUMPHREY in a recent speech. In describing tactics employed by opponents of the quality stabilization bill, the articulate Democratic whip stated:

> They've set up a "strawman" and then proceeded to knock it down again. In other words, they invented a mythical quality stabilization bill and then tore it to pieces.
>
> The trouble is, their quality stabilization bill hardly resembles the legislation that 10 other Senators and I introduced in the Senate.
>
> So there are really two quality stabilization bills—ours—the real one—which will give a measure of needed protection to the small business community gainst unfair competition, and theirs—the phony one—the mythical bill invented by predatory price cutters and some editorial writers and newspaper cartoonists to muddy the genuine issues.

I request that the editorial "Buyer Beware" in the August 6, 1963, issue of the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUYER BEWARE

Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, presented the case for the defense, briefly and tersely, in answering charges that the quality stabilization bill, of which he is a cosponsor, ignores the interests of both the consumer and the small merchant.

The Intelligencer recommends a careful reading of Mr. HOLIFIELD's statement. It and the legislation in behalf of which he speaks deal with a subject close to the heart of every shopper in the land.

As a basic proposition it is difficult to quarrel with the proposition that once a merchant acquires an article from a manufacturer it is his to do with as he pleases. The corollary that to deprive the merchant of that right not only invades his freedom, but stifles competition and tends to encourage consumer gouging, while by no means as compelling, is sufficiently persuasive to bring into disrepute the whole idea of reposing in the manufacturer the authority to fix the retail price of his product. Thus the general tenor of court decisions has been to outlaw so-called fair trade laws, and the disposition of the public to applaud this judicial thinking.

Unfortunately, this is not an all-white or all-black area of public policy. The issue is not one of which it can be said with assurance this way lies public welfare, that way group interest. There is something to be said for both points of view. For its part, the Intelligencer has been disposed to side with those who recognize the producer's proprietary interest in a brand name to which he has given meaning, and who feel that on balance the consumer loses if the right to protect this interest is denied by law. It does not profess to know whether or not the legislation Mr. HOLIFIELD and his associates propose is the best answer to this perplexing question. It confesses to a nagging fear, however, that if no way is found in the law to protect the integrity of brand names, the marketplace will become a jungle in which the shopper will be deprived of the benefit of the familiar signposts which have served him so well in the past.

Top Award Goes to Sig Sakowicz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our good friend Broadcaster Sig Sakowicz was signally honored by the combined veterans association of Illinois as their "Man of the Year." Sig was chosen because of his unselfish services to the community, State, and Nation. He has given of his time, money, and talents to every civic, fraternal, and veteran program of any importance in Chicago. His mellifluous voice can be heard at every veterans' parade, march, announcing the units and VIP's passing the reviewing area. To be so honored in this instance is also an honor to the entire Chicago area, where Sig is loved and appreciated. We of the Illinois delegation are proud to claim him as our own. May the blessings of God be his and upon his darling family Mrs. Dee and his five children Christine, Gregory, Pamela, Adrian, and Marya Roberta.

The following article appeared in the Stars and Stripes:

[From the Stars and Stripes, Oct. 31, 1963]

TOP AWARD GOES TO SIG SAKOWICZ

The combined Veterans Association of Illinois, composed of 10 major veteran groups in the State have unanimously chosen radio-TV personality Sig Sakowicz as their "Man of the Year." The choice was made because of his "unselfish help for his community, State and Nation." A beautiful plaque was presented to Sig at a dinner, October 22, at the Park Ridge VFW Post, Park Ridge, Ill. The CVAI is composed of top echelon members of the AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled War Veterans, Marine Corps League, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans' Association and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

ACTIVE SINCE WORLD WAR II

Sig's activities with the military dates back to World War II when he corresponded with over 2,500 GI's all over the world. Bound volumes of his work are found on the shelves in the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. He corresponded with several hundred servicemen during the Korean war.

In 1956, he traveled on military bases in Frankfort, Wiesbaden, Berlin, Paris, and London and brought back over 50 taped interviews. In 1958, he attended the jet age conference in Washington, D.C., interviewing Gen. Thomas White, Gen. Curtis LeMay and the late Capt. Ivan Kinchole. That same year he also made a special trip to Cape Canaveral to view and tour the missile center and interviewed C. C. Base Commander Gen. Don Yates. In June, he visited McGuire Air Force Base and viewed SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment). In July, he was invited to review the Illinois Air National Guard at Alpena, Mich.

TOURS GREAT LAKES

In August, he was escorted on a tour of Great Lakes and in September, toured the various Nike, Ajax, and Hercules installations in the Montrose Beach area. A trip to the U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., in October wound up a busy year. In September 1959, Sig covered the Air Force Association convention in Miami Beach.

The highlight of 1960 was Sig's trip to Puerto Rico where he covered "Exercise Big Slam"—more interviews here with Adm. Dan Gallery and Maj. Gen. Jim Westmoreland.

In 1962, Sig narrated the Marine Raider's "Mock Invasion" of the McCormick Place Pavillion and emceed their banquet that evening. Also that year, he again visited the Air Force Academy and with the assistance of Maj. Gen. Francis P. Kane, Sig helped raise funds for the GAR flag fund.

In July of 1963, he tape interviewed Navy and Marine personnel at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, including Rear Admiral Davis.

HOSPITAL SHOWS

During these many years, Sig has been putting on shows in the various VA hospitals. He has been serving with the U.S. Savings Bond Division, Treasury Department, for over 20 years putting on various variety shows.

Sig serves as official parade announcer for the American Legion and each year, emcees annually the GAR parade, the ROTC parade and the Armed Forces Day parade.

"Sig's Show" is currently heard via WGN, Monday 11:05–11:55 p.m.; Saturday, WGN 7:05–7:55 p.m., and daily via WTAQ, 12:30–1:30 p.m.

He resides in suburban Park Ridge with his wife, Dee and their five children, Christine, Gregory, Pamela, Adrian, and Marya Roberta.

Banquet committee members of the CVAI included Illinois past commanders including: Chairman, Lincoln Tamaraz (AMVETS); Joe Pudlo (PLAV), Waukegan; Gerald Zider (JWV), Sidney Bick (JWV), and Art Mueller (VFW).

Representative Karth Urges United States To Sell Boosters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the magazine, Missiles and Rockets, the distinguished Representative from the Fourth District of Minnesota, the Honorable JOSEPH E. KARTH, made a provocative suggestion that the United States might market its boosters in advanced space systems to the developing European space programs—a development which might well assist in the problem of gold outflow, and which might lessen the persistent unemployment problem in the United States.

I wish to commend to my colleagues this suggestion by Representative KARTH, and I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Representative KARTH Urges United States Sell Boosters," appearing in Missiles and Rockets of August 26, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRESENTATIVE KARTH URGES UNITED STATES SELL BOOSTERS: HOUSE EXPERT SAYS SALES WOULD MAKE JOBS, EASE GOLD PROBLEM WITH NO RISK TO U.S. SECURITY

(The U.S. space industry has a fantastic future market for boosters and advanced systems in the developing European space programs. Exploiting this market will bring financial profit to U.S. companies, help stem the worrisome flow of gold out of the country, and lessen the persistent unemployment problem. In giving these opinions to Missiles and Rockets, Representative JOSEPH E. KARTH, Democrat, of Minnesota, draws from his 4 years' experience as a charter member of the House Space Committee and his current chairmanship of its Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Advanced Research and Technology. He also tells how the United States can sell Atlas, Centaur, and Saturn to foreign countries with no security problem. This interview with KARTH was conducted by Missiles and Rockets senior editor, William Beller.)

Question. Mr. KARTH, you have expressed the belief that the United States should do more to tie in with the emerging space programs in Europe. Why is that?

Answer. I feel this is a good area for us to explore because we are suffering from persistent unemployment, excessive outflow of gold, and an imbalance-of-payments problem. I am mindful that the President on quite a number of occasions has expressed deep concern about these matters.

In many areas, boosters for example, where we have gone through the extremely expensive research and developemnt phases—these are the areas we should now exploit with the friendly foreign countries. We should see if we can sell some of this great technological development. It may prevent them from developing their own and therefore lead to a fantastic future market.

Question. So far only Scouts and Thors have been available to European countries. Could they get the Atlas?

Answer. I would say so, under these conditions:

1. That they pay for the vehicle—I don't think we should give it away.

2. We would need to launch it for them. They don't have the launching pads and probably can't get into the tremendously expensive launching pad, gantry, electronic-type setup that goes with the launching of a major booster system for some time. But eventually they would, because they are serious about their own space programs.

3. Whatever secrecies surround the launch vehicle and/or other devices, all of this would be handled by U.S. personnel.

Question. Why should foreign countries pay for boosters if NASA is willing to provide them free for programs of mutual scientific benefit?

Answer. That's the catch. In my opinion, other nations are not as interested in advancing scientific exploration as they are in embarking on programs to advance their own economic position. And in this instance I say it's fine for us to cooperate by selling to them a booster or whatever other paraphernalia they need.

As these countries become more involved in space programs, it may be they will be desirous of buying Saturns or Centaurs. We don't necessarily need to stop at Atlas. I think the whole high-thrust field of boosters is a tremendous market with great potential.

Question. How could such sales be handled, government-to-government?

Answer. My first opinion is we should do this through an agency of the U.S. Government, probably through the Defense Department or NASA. Whatever profit might be involved does not go to NASA, does not go to DOD—it goes to private industry, to those who make the Atlas or the Saturn or Centaur. This money gets back into the economy. It provides jobs. It stimulates the U.S. gross national product, causing our overall economy to grow and expand.

So I don't really think it makes too much difference whether or not sales of our space capabilities to foreign interests are made through an agency of our Government. However as a matter of convenience or protocal—or a requirement, from an international standpoint—this may well be the best if not the only procedure.

It would merely be an agency of the U.S. Government making available to the foreign country under prescribed conditions, a booster or a space system or whatever it may be. Then these countries would contract for this work in terms of dollars and cents with the U.S. manufacturer, whoever that might be, through the U.S. Government.

Question. Could a foreign country—or U.S. industry, for that matter—now proceed to design a project about a large U.S. booster and feel that there is a high probability that under proper security measures it could get such a booster? Would there be anything against U.S. policy?

Answer. Nothing that I know of, if the proper security precautions are taken. The missile or the launch vehicle would not leave this country. It isn't a matter of shipping it to a foreign country where they could tear it apart and see how it is made, and gain whatever information might be held secret in the United States.

No, I don't see any laws or rules or regulations that would be violated if we merely made our space capabilities available to foreign countries, with all the proper secrecy precautions taken, for the purpose of launching one or a dozen or 5 dozen of their space systems.

Question. This means, then, Mr. KARTH, that General Dynamics—for instance—could try to sell its launch vehicles directly if it got the blessings of the requisite agency in the United States?

Answer. If it involved launch vehicles around which there are no matters of security; yes, sir. Certanly, they could, and I would hope they would.

Question. But even if there were matters of security, couldn't the companies sell boosters if the vehicles were launched in the United States, with proper security measures?

Answer. Yes, I don't see any reason why they should not or could not.

Question. Would it be necessary for the United States to have any control over the payloads a foreign country launched with U.S. boosters?

Answer. I think this could be established by a predetermined set of standards. We had better take these things on a piecemeal basis, examine them carefully and one at a time.

Certainly we wouldn't make available to a foreign country a booster to launch an

atomic bomb just to further develop that country's technology in the development of nuclear energy. Of course not. In this instance we would say "No. We won't sell you one under any such condition." So I say we would have to give our assents on an individual-project basis.

Question. Mr. Karth, is there now any effort to sell our heavy-thrust booster capabilities abroad?

Answer. I know of no one who is looking into the proposition of selling them. That doesn't mean it isn't time we started thinking about it—and I intend to talk to people about this proposition and would hope that our Government would give it serious consideration and weigh all the pros and cons.

Question. Where do you feel the initiative lies to start a program of selling our space systems abroad? Should it be industry, NASA, Congress, the White House?

Answer. I feel very strongly that some serious consideration should be given to it. I think maybe the administration should first go through the exercise of looking into the merits and demerits. And this need not take forever.

This could be done by appointing a very select committee of NASA officials, Department of Defense officials, State Department officials. I think industry should be represented on this board too, or on this select committee * * * call it what you like. And, of course, the administration directly. And then some people from the scientific community, in general, could be called on for contributions.

Question. How would we react if a nation wanted our boosters to launch its own system of communications satellites?

Answer. If they are really serious about becoming engaged in this kind of a program, they are going to do it with or without us. I'd rather they did not develop all of these technologies themselves, but depend upon us to supply them. Nevertheless, if they want boosters for peaceful purposes, we ought to sell the vehicles to them as long as we can.

Here we are in a position to capitalize on our capabilities over a long period of time—probably for a decade or two decades—and I think we're acting like the ostrich with its head in the sand. When you've got an opportunity, I think you've got to exercise that opportunity, and here is an area where I think we have it. Here is an area where I think we should not go down the road of archaic-type thinking.

Good grief, we've never gone to the moon before either, and if our thinking is that we shouldn't do anything we haven't done in the past—well, I guess we really wouldn't have a space program.

This is why I'm interested. It means jobs for American workers. It could mean a more favorable balance of payments. In fact it may be just what we need. And this means that a good deal of our outflowing of gold could be stopped. If these things are important, I see no reason why we can't embark upon selling our technology to those people who want to participate in a broadly based space program.

ARA: The Seed for Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, until the last 20 months or so, there were times when I wept silently over the apparent hopelessness of the economic prospects for the people in my district, and for all of West Virginia, for that matter. Until the latter part of 1961, we were all preoccupied with despair brought about by economic change and technological innovations that made some of our natural resources less important as job-creating factors—a despair and bitterness sustained and fed by the absence of any new program that might offer new paths for economic growth and new employment.

By the early part of 1962, however, West Virginians came to appreciate the role of the Area Redevelopment Administration in providing that kind of program.

The full gamut of ARA's tools have been put to use in southern West Virginia: Industrial loans for new or expanding companies; public facility loans and grants for water systems required by industrial establishments; retraining of unemployed men and women for new skills in good-paying jobs; technical assistance for the discovery of new ways of utilizing the natural resources of an area in order to create new job opportunities.

I would like to tell my colleagues about one concrete train of events resulting from ARA's technical assistance program in my part of West Virginia. This technical assistance consisted of a feasibility study to discover the possibilities of converting the current liabilities of the New River Gorge are into future assets for the ever-expanding tourism-recreation demands of Americans, especially those on the eastern seaboard who are competing with each other for space and activity areas in their leisure time.

The results of the feasibility study were positive, and immediately following on that, the State of West Virginia developed concrete proposals for the implementation of the technical assistance recommendations. By the end of June, of this year, ARA was able to process and approve a multimillion-dollar tourist and recreation project.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge any critic of ARA to go down to towns in, say, Summers County, W. Va., and make one single uncomplimentary comment about that agency before the citizens of that county. I dare such antagonists of the ARA program to stand up in Hinton and accuse ARA of being incompetent and political.

While I challenge and dare, I cannot assure any critic that he would get a cordial reception.

I wonder how he would be received by the publisher of the Hinton Daily News, Mr. John E. Faulconer? I raise this question because of Mr. Faulconer's description of the electrifying effects of ARA's mere announcement of the approval of that project—a description which I would like to insert as part of my remarks here today.

In a letter dated July 24, 1963, Mr. Faulconer provides us with just some of the insight into the meaning of ARA's action last June:

First, he points out that many years ago, a few creative citizens of the county came to the conclusion that prosperity cannot be based on only one industry—and that a dam at Bluestone would mean the reconstruction of that area's basic economy. Because power associated with such a dam is not yet a reality—

> Local citizens * * * then went to sleep. No industries came into the area, but the dieselization of the C. & O. Railway, the county's main industry, resulted in the loss of hundreds of jobs.

But more recently, after overcoming many obstacles, the four counties around Bluestone were able to obtain a grant and loan from ARA to implement the New River Gorge study.

What this announcement has done—

Writes Mr. Faulconer—

is unbelievable.

> The morale of the people has had an overnight transformation that has lifted them from the depths of despair to the pinnacle of optimism and to borrow a word from our astronauts: the word in Hinton now is "Go."

The entire area is now buzzing with an atmosphere of confidence that has proven to be the second trigger for an upsurge of economic activity—things like the local retail establishments modernizing their facilities and hiring more employees; an increase in newspaper advertising; a rise in banking transactions with the result that more bank employees are being put to work; and the banks themselves modernizing; a local dairy plant expansion; national restaurant, motel, and gasoline service stations are scouring the immediate vicinity of the State tourist project area to find the right site to meet the needs of the thousands upon thousands of tourists expected to "invade" the four counties.

These are only a sampling from Mr. Faulconer's letter. More of them are cropping up even now.

And here is one of the morals to be drawn from this one decision of the Area Redevelopment Administration:

> No ARA funds have been requested for any of these local projects. They were all initiated as the result of the tourism project which provided the seed for the economic growth of the county.

"The seed for economic growth." That term symbolizes the purpose and spirit of ARA. Ask anybody in Summers County, or Wyoming County, or Fayette County in the Fifth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

The 100th Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the port of Kenosha, midway between Milwaukee and Chicago, this week welcomed its 100th and 101st foreign ship of the 1963 sailing season on Monday of this week.

Kenosha, through foresight of its city council, harbor commission, and its sizable industrial complex, has provided its own $3 million dockage facilities.

We in the Congress should acknowledge that foresight by voting approval of a $7,000 harbor-dredging project now included in the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964. By authorizing American participation in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, the Congress told the world that foreign ships would be welcomed at and able to reach our many fresh water seaports. But shallow water prevents some from going into Kenosha.

The Congress has an obligation to enable those foreign ships to dock at all of the first-class ports. Kenosha has exported 5½ times the goods it has imported. It is a defense cargo port.

In the first rank of longtime supporters of the Kenosha Harbor is the Kenosha News, which this week printed an editorial hailing the arrival of the 100th and 101st foreign ships and looking ahead to a 250-ship season.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Kenosha News' editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 100TH SHIP

They said it couldn't be done. But it is now history.

Yesterday, the port of Kenosha welcomed its 100th ship. This represents an achievement that was considered a virtual impossibility by "practical" men only a few years ago. In 1958 Kenosha welcomed four vessels that took on just over 200 tons. This year approximately 120 ships are expected to call and exchange more than 90,000 tons of freight.

Why this progress? Because foresight, determination and need combined to propel Kenosha into the markets of the world. The cooperative efforts of city council, the Endee Co., the harbor commissioners, labor, and local industry brought the dream to reality.

Capt. Vanden Bergh, master of the *Prins Alexander*, the 100th ship, sounded a note of optimism when he stated that he hoped to pilot the 250th ship into our harbor in the next few years.

It is interesting to note that on the same day, the *Solta*, a Yugoslav vessel, also docked at our port. This is the first time that an Iron Curtain ship has put in at Kenosha. We welcomed its captain and could not suppress the hope that the roots of international understanding might pierce the Iron Curtain through the trade of things as well as thoughts.

For all its success, the problems of progress still beset our port. If Kenosha is to realize its full potential, the port must be deepened so that ships that are partially loaded at other ports of call will not scrape bottom when they reach Kenosha. Some progress has been made in this respect, but we have yet to obtain the dredging appropriation from Congress.

Yesterday Kenosha recorded another high-water mark in its history. It was a gratifying occasion for Casey Schmitz, chairman of the harbor commission, and for many others who have tirelessly devoted their time and talents to the pursuit of the impossible that didn't just happen. They made it happen.

Living With the Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1963:

LIVING WITH THE FEDERAL BUDGET

It takes a certain foolhardiness for a new Budget Director to stand up before a room full of newspaper editors less than 4 months after his appointment and only 4 days after his listeners have mailed off their income tax returns. For, if all the newspaper editorials assailing the Federal budget were gathered together in one place, they would fill the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—as indeed they have. When my distinguished predecessor as Budget Director moved over to the Agency for International Development, a Washington columnist said that he had been promoted from the least glamorous job in Washington to the most unpopuar—but I have had frequent occasion in the last 4 months to wonder whether the job he vacated does not merit both of those distinctions.

It was not many years ago that the mere mention of the Federal budget could be counted on to produce a deep soporific effect on any audience. But times have changed; there exists today—to put it mildly—a lively interest in the subject. I propose to capitalize on this new attentiveness by communicating the reflections of a new Budget Director on the chastely bound gray volume which has been put in his charge.

The Federal budget is a formidable document. Compounded of Arabic numerals and latinized prose, it reflects the needs, hopes, and fears of a complex, growing, and increasingly wealthy society. It is the point of convergence of forces as diverse as an outbreak of hog cholera, a Chinese attack on India, floods in eastern Kentucky, juvenile delinquency on our city streets, a successful Venus probe, and an easing of mortgage money. But all of these vital and diverse forces must, of necessity, be transformed through the budgetary process into the cold common denominator of dollars. So it is dollars we must talk about.

The President's administrative budget for fiscal 1964 calls for expenditures of 98.8 billion. Let's look at this number from two points of view: First, what are we buying with it? Second, are we spending too much?

Of each dollar of expenditures in the administrative budget, 55 cents goes for national defense. For this expenditure we are buying a defensive shield, a retaliatory force, and a research and development program which is the principal bulwark of world peace. We have greatly strengthened both our conventional forces and our nuclear capacity since President Kennedy took office. Our national defense rests today on a foundation of 2,700,000 men under arms, an increase of about 200,000 since the end of 1960. We now have 16 combat ready divisions—up 5 over January 1961; 210 intercontinental ballistic missiles in place—up 200 over January 1961; 10 Polaris submarines—7 more than 2 years ago; 21 Air Force tactical air wings—5 more than 2 years ago; and a naval fleet of 836 ships—up 40 over January 1961. And we are steadily increasing the efficiency with which we are spending our defense dollars.

Four cents of every dollar goes for our space program. This is the minimum rate of spending which is necessary to achieve the goal of a manned lunar landing in the decade of the 1960's. With this 4 cents, we are buying a mobilization of science and technology to make the United States first in space and to unlock the secrets of a vast and mysterious scientific frontier.

Ten cents of every dollar goes to pay interest on the national debt—80 percent of which was incurred during the two world wars and the Korean conflict. These interest payments go directly or indirectly to every person who owns a Government bond, an insurance policy, or a bank account—which means that they go to nearly everybody.

Six cents of every dollar goes for veterans' medical care, disability compensation, pensions, and other benefits to veterans and their survivors.

Four cents of every dollar goes to strengthen the military security and spur the economic growth of other nations whose stability and progress are important to the security of the United States.

These programs together account for 79 cents of every dollar. The other 21 cents goes for what are loosely referred to as domestic welfare programs. With this 21 cents we buy every other service and function which is included in the administrative budget. Among the services we buy for this 21 cents are heart and cancer research, air safety, abatement of water pollution, hospital construction and modernization, maintenance of our national parks and forests, the redevelopment of depressed areas, the retraining of the unemployed, school lunches for our children, water supplies for water-short areas, meat inspection, college dormitories, flood control, urban renewal, weather forecasts, and protection against harmful cosmetics and drugs. And these are only a few.

Of this 21 cents the Federal Government uses 14 cents to finance its own activities and turns over the remaining 7 cents to States and localities to help them provide better public services. Looking at the same 21 cents another way, 16 cents goes for current outlays, while the remaining 5 cents is used to acquire physical and financial assets—hospitals, airports, hydroelectric dams, mortgages, etc.

This, very briefly, is what we buy with the $98.8 billion we spend. Now let me turn to the question, Are we spending too much?

It is a certifiable fact that Federal spending has been increasing steadily. As President Kennedy said last year:

"It is true that in recent history each new administration has spent much more money than its predecessor. Thus, President Roosevelt outspent President Hoover, and with allowances for the special case of the Second World War, President Truman outspent President Roosevelt. Just to prove that this was not a partisan matter, President Eisenhower outspent President Truman by the handsome figure of $182 billion. It is even possible something of this trend may continue."

But to ask whether we are spending too much implies a comparison with something. Simply to compare dollar expenditures in 1963 with expenditures in 1923, or 1953, or even 1962, overlooks the fact that we are today a different Nation than we were in any of those years. Our needs are constantly changing, our resources are constantly changing, and even the unit of measurement has changed from earlier years.

This fundamental point was put effectively by President Eisenhower when he said in his

1960 budget message: "Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of our Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities."

Here are some examples: Between the fiscal years 1962 and 1964, the number of tax returns will rise 2.5 percent; the volume of mail will grow 6.4 percent; visitors to our national parks will increase by 7 percent; the number of veterans or survivors receiving pensions will rise by 10 percent; aircraft landings and takeoffs at airports with Federal towers will go up by 11 percent; beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program will increase by 16 percent; the number of patents granted will rise by 20 percent; and passports issued will increase by 25 percent.

Consider what has been happening to our population. We are now debating the 1964 budget. By the end of that fiscal year, there will be 10 million more Americans than there were the day President Kennedy took office. This means that we will add to the United States in this short period a number of people which is more than half the population of Canada. And since 1939, we have added to our population a number of people substantially greater than the present population of France.

Consider, also, the growth in our output of goods and services—our gross national product. Measured in the same current dollars we use to count Federal expenditures, our gross national product has increased more than fivefold since 1939. It has increased 57 percent in the last decade.

Finally, each Federal expenditure dollar buys less today than it did in earlier years. Though we have had relative price stability for the last 5 years, our price level has more than doubled since 1939 and is about 10 percent above its level a decade ago.

The single most important fact about the trend of Federal expenditures over recent decades is the vast expansion of our national defense program. Who in 1939 ever dreamed of atomic energy, of missiles, of space flights, of a cold war with 2,700,000 servicemen in uniform during peacetime and defense research budgets of $9 billion? Our defense budget in 1939 was 1 percent of gross national product, in 1949, 5 percent, and in 1963, 9 percent.

But apart from national defense, Federal budget expenditures have been tightly contained in recent years. As a proportion of gross national product, they are substantially lower today (at 7 percent) than they were before the war in 1939 (at 9 percent) or after the war in 1949 (at 10 percent). Even including national defense, Federal budget expenditures in recent years have been remarkably stable as a proportion of gross national product; during the latter 1950's, they averaged about 16½ percent of gross national product, and that is where they are today.

Nor do the statistics give much comfort to the common view that the Federal Government is eclipsing and eroding the State and local governments. A quarter of a century ago, nondefense expenditures in the Federal budget were just about equal to total State and local expenditures; today, these Federal expenditures are about 60 percent of State and local expenditures. Of the more than 9 million civilian employees of governments in the United States today, about 7 million are employed by State and local governments, and 2,500,000 by the Federal Government. Since 1948, State and local employment has risen by 81 percent, while Federal civilian employment has risen by 22 percent—or by less than the rate of growth in the population as a whole.

In 1952, we had 1.6 Federal civilian employees for each 100 people in the population. By 1957, the figure was down to 1.4. Today we have 1.3 Federal employees to serve every 100 people.

Let me add that, of these 2,500,000 Federal civilian employees, 1 million are employed by the Defense Department, about 600,000 by the Post Office Department, and about 200,000 by the Veterans' Administration. Everything else that the Federal Government does is accomplished by 650,000 employees, and this number is substantially smaller than total employment in the telephone industry.

But what about the trend of expenditures in the budgets of the Kennedy administration? The 1964 administrative budget calls for a $4.5 billion increase in expenditures over 1963. The whole of this increase—indeed, more than the whole of the increase—is accounted for by expenditures for national defense, space, and interest. All other expenditures, taken together, will actually decline from 1963 to 1964.

If all three Kennedy budgets—1962 through 1964—are looked at together, they tell essentially the same story. The great bulk of the increase—actually 70 percent of it—has been in the defense, space, and interest category. Over the 3-year period from 1961 to 1964, budget expenditures for all other purposes taken together will increase by $4.5 billion. This compares with an increase of $5 billion in the same category over the preceding 3 fiscal years.

These figures lend little support to the assertion that the budget is out of control. On the contrary—and I am free to say this because I joined the Budget Bureau too late to have a part in the process—the achievement of reducing 1964 expenditures below the 1963 level for all activities other than defense, space, and interest, seems to me a noteworthy accomplishment in budgetary discipline.

But what of the future?

The President's program for tax reduction and reform—designed to spur the expansion of our economy and the achievement of full employment—has major implications for our future budgetary policy. The President has pledged that, as the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the increased revenues generated by economic expansion will be applied to the reduction of the deficit. This declaration commits the administration to a policy of sustained expenditure restraint. Our work on the 1965 budget, which is already underway, is moving along lines consistent with this policy.

This does not mean a freeze on new programs—a moratorium on prudent planning by the Federal Government to respond to the changing needs of a growing country. It does mean—and it means emphatically—that vigorous efforts will be made to find economies in existing Government programs, in order that the net impact of new activities on the Federal budget will be held to a minimum.

We have only begun to appreciate the enormous contribution which improved efficiency in Government operations can make to budgetary control. Better management and cost reduction can make a major contribution toward resolving the conflict between expanding public needs and the need to limit total expenditures.

Any doubts as to the great potential of management improvement should be resolved by the spectacular accomplishments—realized and prospective—of the Defense Department's procurement and logistics cost reduction program. The program was announced last year by Secretary McNamara. It will produce nearly $2 billion of identifiable savings in this fiscal year. Savings are estimated at $2.7 billion in fiscal year 1964 and $3.5 billion in fiscal year 1965. The program is not a vague estimate of future economies; it is fully in effect today, and it is reshaping procurement and management practices in the Department of Defense.

The magnitude of the Defense economy program can be grasped more readily if it is compared with the future costs of the legislative proposals in the President's current legislative program. For example:

Closer calculations of procurement needs and fuller use of excess inventory in place of new procurement will save more in the next 2 fiscal years than the cost in these years of the proposed increase in the pay of our Armed Forces.

The shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement, and the shift from cost-plus-fixed fee to fixed or incentive price contracts will save more in 1964 and 1965 than the total cost of the President's omnibus education program—including aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, college facilities, library and graduate school grants, student loans and fellowships, and adult and vocational education.

The elimination of "gold plating" in procurement specifications—that is, redesigning items which are fancier or more capable than they need to be to do their job—will save more in 1964 and 1965 than the cost of the President's youth employment opportunities program.

Improved equipment maintenance through better management will save as much in these 2 years as the entire cost of the President's mass transit program.

The closing or reduction of unnecessary installations in the Defense Department will save more than the total cost in 1964 and 1965 of the Presidents' program for hospital construction and aid to medical education.

To put the comparison in its most striking form, Secretary McNamara's cost reduction program will realize savings in the next 2 fiscal years which will exceed the total cost of the legislative program which the President has proposed to the Congress this year.

The drive for better management in the Federal Government extends far beyond the limits of the Department of Defense. Efficiency in Government is not an issue between the parties. Many management gains were accomplished by the last administration and this administration has sought to maintain and accelerate the momentum. Let me describe briefly some of the major efforts which are underway today to get the public business done more efficiently, more speedily, and more economically.

The U.S. Government was the first user of automatic data processing equipment and is today the largest user in the world of electronic computers. If you buy a postal money order, the transaction will be recorded on the ADP equipment. If you carry Veterans' Administration life insurance, your account will be serviced by ADP. If you apply for a driver's license in any one of 46 States, your application may be processed by an electronic computer in the Bureau of Public Roads to determine whether you have ever been denied a license in another State for drunken driving or involvement in a fatal accident. If you inquire about the status of your social security account, the information will be supplied speedily by an ADP system. If you answer a census questionnaire, the information will be processed by ADP.

These are just a few of the many uses of electronic data processing systems in the Federal Government which have provided better service for the taxpayer and saved him money. For example, each employee of the Insurance Service of the Veterans' Administration serviced about 350 policies in 1950, 1,500 policies in 1960, and 1,700 today. Over this period, the Veterans' Administration has reduced the number of employees

required to handle its 6 million policies from 17,000 to 3,000.

The Federal Government has one of the most extensive and productive employee suggestion systems in the country. Last year, Federal agencies adopted more than 100,000 suggestions submitted by employees. These suggestions yielded measurable savings of nearly $65 million, for which employees received cash awards of nearly $3 million. For example, an engineer in the Navy's Bureau of Ships saved the Navy over $5 million by devising an ingenious method to enable drydocks to accommodate vessels of deeper draft—thus eliminating the need to excavate the floor of the drydock. Another engineer—this one in the Corps of Engineers—redesigned certain turbines used in hydroelectric power projects, improving the efficiency of the units and thus allowing smaller units to be utilized. Savings realized from this improvement aggregate $21 million so far.

Substantial savings can be realized simply through better organization and management of the Government's activities. In July of 1961, the Federal Power Commission had a backlog of 116 natural gas pipeline rate cases, some dating back to 1954, which involved potential refunds to consumers of $1 billion. The Federal Power Commission instituted a new settlement program, emphasizing the disposition of cases through conference rather than in lengthy formal proceedings. By January of this year, the backlog, including new cases, had been reduced to 48, and the Federal Power Commission had ordered refunds to consumers of $350 million and reduced rates by $62 million a year.

I do not wish to leave the impression that the administration is suspended in a state of euphoria with respect to the outlook for efficiency in public management. Utopia is not that close. I will freely confess that I know of management situations in the Federal Government which need correction—though I am not going to name them. My point is that we have made encouraging progress, and that we have proved that the Federal Government can face up to change and take the route of cost reduction without any sacrifice in the quality of the work it does. You are going to hear a lot more about cost reduction efforts in the Federal Government. We will not let up in pursuing opportunities to modernize and improve Government operations, to save manpower, to lower overhead, to take some risks if necessary in trying out new ideas and practices, to shake up systems and procedures that have long been taken for granted, and to search out and bring into question longstanding programs or services that may no longer rate the priority they deserved when they were initiated.

There is, of course, an alluring shortcut to economy in Government which simply bypasses these difficult matters of detail. It is a method often urged—the method of indiscriminate, across-the-board cuts. But I believe the record shows that this method has not in the past made a lasting contribution to the cause of Government economy—nor would I expect it to do so in the future.

The harder road, but in the last analysis the more rewarding one, is to weigh each public program and expenditure category on its own merits and against the merits of others; to decide what must be done now and what can wait; to pursue cost reduction, assess user charges more broadly on those who benefit from special Government services and privileges, cut out unneeded installations even though it may cause some pain and recrimination, and keep at it. This, I submit, is the responsible road to Government economy. It has the further merit that it works, and it is this framework within which the budgets of this administration will be shaped.

Communist Subversion of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with the insight evidenced by three articles on Latin America by Charles Keely of the Copley News Service, dealing with the subject of "Communist Subversion of Latin America."

This is a subject with which I have been concerned for some time.

It has been my opinion that the policies of the New Frontier have not been sufficiently anti-Communist in the Western Hemisphere to prevent this continuing buildup of communism in a number of countries in Latin America and that it is about time we completely reviewed the entire Latin American situation and the Alliance for Progress, generally, toward the goal of using every available weapon to stamp out communism in this hemisphere.

"Communist Subversion of Latin America—Part I," follows:

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

(First of three articles)

(By Charles Keely)

WASHINGTON.—A year ago Russia took one step backward and withdrew missiles from Cuba. Since then, the Communists have taken a dozen important steps forward toward their goal of a Red takeover of Latin America.

The steps are documented. They reveal that Premier Fidel Castro's Cuba is a launching pad for subversion of the Western Hemisphere.

Today, 10 schools of guerilla warfare and subversion are operating at full capacity in Cuba. Last year, according to Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone, 1,500 Latin Americans received such training in Cuba. More schools are being built.

Inteligence sources estimate 20,000 secret Red agents can be trained this year in Cuba's subversion centers.

In essence, McCone told Congress last February, "Castro tells revolutionaries * * * 'Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage and in terriorism. We will see that you get back to your homeland.' "

Travel bans have not hurt Cuba's subversion school attendance, an Organization of American States security committee reports.

"Despite limited means of transportation to Cuba today," the OAS said, "Trips to that country have been increasing in number during the current year."

Many of the students reach Cuba by slipping across the British Honduran border into Mexico, the Cuban Student Directorate (DRE) has revealed. From islands off the Yucatan Peninsula, they are taken in small boats to a sea rendezvous with Castro's "fishing fleet."

The Latins are then taken to the port of La Coloma, in Cuba's Pinar del Rio Province, and transported to the different training camps. Others fly or sail into Cuba from Communist countries.

Castro's clumsy and unsuccessful efforts to invade and subvert neighboring Caribbean countries during his first 9 months in power have been given professional guidance by trained "technicians" from the Soviet bloc.

The State Department's Sterling Cottrell says that Reds from satellite nations today outnumber Russians in Cuba. Cottrell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, told Congress August 13 that "Czechs, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and others" are in Cuba to train Latin Americans in the arts of modern guerrilla warfare and subversion. The threat to the United States of Soviet troops in Cuba is secondary to the use of the island as a base to export revolution, said Cottrell.

"Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly," CIA's McCone explained. "In its professional tradecraft it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc including veteran Spanish Communists."

One Spanish Communist, Gen. Alberto Bayo, created the "Revolutionary Commandos for Latin America" (CRAL) to train Latins to instigate insurrections against their governments. To strengthen CRAL, DRE claims Soviet Col. Jarslav Valensky instituted an International Military Command to control the widespread net of Communist front groups in Latin America.

A supreme command for Latin American guerrillas has been set up in Cuba by the Soviet Ministry of Defense, according to exile intelligence sources. Its headquarters are in Santiago de Cuba where guerrilla operations throughout the hemisphere are masterminded and coordinated.

Enrique Lister, another Spaniard, runs the Minas del Frio subversion school in Oriente Province. Lister, a graduate of the Soviet's Fruntze Military Academy, is assisted by former Guatemalan President Col. Jacobo Arbenz.

At the Julio Antonio Mella School near Havana, Communists are training Latin labor leaders. Military personnel receive instruction at the El Cortijo School in Pinar del Rio, the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba reports. The San Lorenzo School in Oriente specializes in guerrilla training. Subversion centers are spread across the island.

The 30th Anniversary of the Artificial Famine in Ukraine, 1932-33

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, history clearly refutes the arguments which the administration may offer for its desire to embrace the Soviet Union and other satellite countries in a spirit of coexistence.

As a reminder of historic Communist treachery, I submit resolutions adopted by the Ukrainian-American Committee at its rally on October 13, in Chicago, commemorating the 30th anniversary of the Artificial Famine in Ukraine, 1932–33:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN RALLY COMMEMORATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARTIFICIAL FAMINE IN UKRAINE, 1932–33, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 13, 1963

The Communist empire of the Moscow dictators came into being, grew, spread, gained power, existed and continues to exist by terror, genocide, and injustice, violating

God's Commandments and trampling the rights of man, enslaving, subjugating and destroying entire nations.

Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev—different names but the same rule—different persons but all pledged to the same methods of merciless dictatorship, an uninterrupted chain of crimes against mankind, based on relentless physical terror and mass murder.

Recalling these facts and—

Whereas in the years 1932 and 1933 during the great famine, over 6 million Ukrainians needlessly perished; and

Whereas the Famine was deliberately created by the Moscow-directed regime to permanently suppress Ukrainian nationalism and Ukraine's right and desire for self-determination; and

Whereas Moscow's rulers forcibly confiscated all privately owned properties and jailed countless thousands of Ukrainians who refused to submit to the dictates of colonial expediency; and

Whereas during the 30-year period since the famine, Russia was directly responsible for the death of thousands of Ukrainians at Vinnitsa, thousands of Poles in the Katyn Forest, thousands of Hungarians in Budapest, and countless East Germans in Berlin, all of whom were the unwilling victims of the Muscovite regime; and

Whereas the world still remains indifferent to the menace of Russian Communist imperialism which threatens to enslave the free world; and

Whereas this indifference has cost the United States thousands of American lives in Korea, Laos, and Vietnam; and

Whereas all these facts are overwhelming evidence that Russian Communist imperialism continues to threaten human dignity, freedom, and democracy leaving no room for compromise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Ukrainian-American community gathered at the National Guard Armory in Chicago on Sunday, October 13, 1963, do hereby:

1. Condemn the famine of 1932–33 in Ukraine as the greatest crime known to man;

2. Appeal to the free nations of the world, especially the United States of America, to use whatever means are available to force Moscow to abolish all forced labor camps, and to cease the practice of mass deportation which are both directed against the vital interests of Ukraine;

3. Demand that the Soviet Government immediately withdraw all of its occupation forces, dissolve the puppet Ukrainian regime, and permit free elections under the jurisdiction of the United Nations;

4. Appeal to the United States to introduce the problem of Russian colonialism in the United Nations and the problem of Russian genocide in Ukraine (1932–33) International Court in Hague.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, may I briefly recount the history of the Ukraine famine so that the full import of Soviet treachery may be realized.

Ukraine, with a population of approximately 45 million inhabitants, boasts one of the richest agricultural areas in all of Europe. Between 1909 and 1913, Ukraine accounted for 20 percent of Europe's grain supply.

During the Russian Revolution of 1917, Ukraine, along with a number of other non-Russian nations within the Russian Empire, declared its independence, an act which resulted in the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. Unable to sustain itself against the overwhelming odds of German and Polish interference, Denekin's White Russian army, two Bolshevik invasions, a poorly equipped army, disease, and economic chaos, Ukraine succumbed to the third and final Communist onslaught of 1920.

At first the Bolsheviks proceeded with caution in their takeover of Ukraine, hoping to win the Ukrainian population over to the Communist cause. When Ukrainian resistance continued, however, the Communists decided to resort to extreme measures to bring Ukraine to heel.

Between 1929 and 1932, 500,000 farms were confiscated, 2½ million Ukrainians were driven from their homes and transported to other regions of the Soviet empire, and another million Ukrainians were packed off to Siberian slave labor camps.

On August 2, 1932, Moscow issued an edict ordering Ukrainian peasants to turn over all of their crops to Moscow's food collectors. Resistance to the edict brought about forced food collections, the isolation of entire areas by armed troops who prevented anyone from leaving or entering, and the actual destruction by bombardment of villages where resistance was strongest. The result was mass starvation.

Ironically, Ukraine's grain elevators remained full, protected by the Soviet army, and Moscow continued to export grain and other foodstuffs to the outside world. Barring all Western observers from Ukraine, the Communists vehemently denied the existence of a famine and refused all offers of aid from the International Red Cross. Late in 1932, Ukraine was opened to selected newsmen and American and foreign newspapers were filled with stories outlining all of the brutal details of the mass starvation. Although estimates vary, reliable sources have placed the number of those who perished in the famine at between 6 and 7 million.

The Lonely Warrior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the October 14, 1963, issue of Aviation Week there appeared an editorial by Robert Hotz entitled "The Lonely Warrior." This editorial pays a high and deserved tribute to Trevor Gardner, who died a short time ago, for his major contribution to the strategic power and technical progress of our country in this last dangerous decade.

I ask that the full text of Mr. Hotz' editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONELY WARRIOR

(By Robert Hotz)

In the fierce technological struggles that determine the fate of modern nations, most of the critical battles are fought in faraway corners of a bureaucratic maze, often in the cloying atmosphere of committee-infested conference rooms and always cloaked by deep secrecy. The issues and odds in these battles are always the same. A minority fights hard to initiate action because its technical perception is clear enough to see that survival depends on it. A well-entrenched, inert majority can always marshal against them an apparently impressive fiscal and technical justification for doing less later.

The warriors who wield the most effective spears in these struggles are seldom known, either to the politicians who eventually use the power created or to the citizens of the nations this power protects. Such a lonely warrior in the technical wars of our time was Trevor Gardner, who died recently at the age of 48. Only a handful of people alive today truly know the vital role he played in routing the forces of technical timidity at a critical juncture in this Nation's history, and how much he was responsible for creating the bristling new military technology on which the security of this Nation and its allies now stands.

Trevor Gardner was born in Wales but received his technical education including a doctorate at the University of Southern California in his adopted country. As part of his education, he also learned to play water polo skillfully enough to be a candidate for the Olympics. Water polo is a game of few rules, and sparse but significant scoring. It requires enormous stamina, agile use of elbows and knees, and a capacity to stay afloat under extremely adverse conditions. When Trevor Gardner, at the age of 38, arrived in the midst of a fermenting U.S. military technology in the significant year of 1953, he found that his experience with water polo supplemented his technical perception to provide unique qualification for the bureaucratic struggles that lay ahead in the Pentagon.

The technical revolution spawned during World War II by supersonics, rocket propulsion and nuclear fission was about to take another giant stride forward that would shock and baffle the military traditionalists, and astonish even those with a more flexible outlook. Trevor Gardner perceived that the pieces of this new phase of the revolution were lying around the country—in San Diego where Convair was struggling with its own money to design an intercontinental ranging rocket; in the far Pacific where atomic tests had shown the first glimmer of breakthrough into relatively lightweight thermonuclear warheads; in the burgeoning avionics industry where new guidance techniques became feasible; and above all in the fertile brains of American scientists and engineers. He, more than any other single man in this Nation, was the catalyst that brought all of these elements together to create the ICBM of which the Convair Atlas was the prototype. He worked at this task with a ferocity that astonished his associates and a sense of urgency that baffled less technically perceptive officials. For he understood from the start that the ICBM would be a revolutionary weapon that would give its first possessor enormous strategic leverage in international power politics. He upset traditional patterns of Pentagon procedure, corporate prerogatives and weapons development to forge a new organization capable of developing this revolutionary power. He gathered a small but equally determined band of allies in this march, and made a new crop of enemies as every step trod on traditional toes. He did it all from the relatively lowly rank of a special assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force, relying on the force of his arguments rather than the weight of his rank to penetrate the bastions of decision.

As he plunged deeper into the ICBM problem, he was appalled at the lack of U.S. intelligence on what the Soviet Union was doing in this field. He was perhaps the first to apply the modern technologies to intelligence gathering. He rescued the U-2 program from a series of military vetoes and pushed it at top priority into operating as

an instrument to penetrate the Iron Curtain. He seized on then-new radar developments to fashion the now-famous Turkish radar installation on the Black Sea coast at Samsun, which enabled U.S. technicians to see electronically most of what was going on at Kapustin Yar, the Soviet's chief ICBM test site. He was also one of the prime architects of the DEW line. He also fought successfully to give research and development a stronger voice, more funds, and a broader program both in the Air Force and Defense Department.

When the electronic tapes from the Turkish radar provided solid evidence of an acceleration in the progress of Soviet ICBM development, Gardner's incisive impatience made him a nuisance to more complacent superiors.

"I am getting paid by the taxpayers to be continually unhappy with the status quo," was his rejoinder.

When a slowdown in the ICBM program was threatened in 1956 by superiors who could not interpret the trends as accurately as Gardner and his associates, he fought with every trick in his repertoire to forestall it. Finally, he determined to sacrifice his own official position (he had then been elevated to Assistant Secretary of the Air Force) and risk his economic future to tell the American people what was really at stake. Since his financial stake lay in a company whose fortunes could quickly reflect the displeasure of the top level of Government, he was painted a vivid picture of the economic reprisals in store if he persisted in his determination to resign and carry his case to the public. Yet resign he did, and he used every available public forum to argue the issues in the ICBM race. While the administration he abandoned remained in power, the economic reprisals were severe, but he refused to be silenced.

When the initial phase of the ICBM race was over, it was apparent that the United States had barely gained a tie. Even his bitterest contemporary critics now concede that without Gardner's ruthless, unorthodox ramrodding of the Atlas and its successors while he held office, and his penetrating, barbed criticism thereafter, the Soviets would have won the race by a significant margin.

A lesser man might have subsided into licking his wounds and concentrating on repairing his economic fences. But Gardner continued in the fray, fighting and serving wherever he could to keep U.S. technology rolling at maximum pace in significant new areas that inevitably appear on the scientific frontier. He headed an Air Force study to explore the potential of military space operations, served as a trustee of the Aerospace Corp. He played a major role in establishing the Disarmament Agency, served on its advisory committee and was a leader in exploring the technological backup required to make any form of arms control effective. At the time of his death, he was actively participating in Project Forecast, aimed at charting the technical and operational future of the Air Force for the next decade.

No medals were ever pinned on his chest, nor were stirring citations ever read on his behalf. Yet few men have contributed more than Trevor Gardner to the strategic strength and technical progress of this Nation in the critical period of the last decade, when this country faced the most dangerous challenge in its history.

Now, when a premium is placed on conformity and the technical fashion is to assume that there is little new under the sun, the lesson of what this driving, unconventional force that was Trevor Gardner accomplished on his country's behalf should not be ignored nor allowed to become blurred on the pages of history.

FPC Does Not Have Jurisdiction Over Rural Electric Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the 370,197 consumer-members of the 116 rural electric cooperatives in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois have gone on record in support of my bill which spells out the fact that the Federal Power Commission does not have jurisdiction over rural electric co-ops.

In a resolution adopted at the region 5 meeting of the National Rural Electric Co-op Association, delegates from these cooperatives urged Congress to "expedite passage of the bills now before it to establish once and for all that the Federal Power Commission has no legal or moral basis for extending its regulatory jurisdiction over rural electric cooperatives which are consumer owned and operated utilities." I have received similar resolutions of support for this legislation from the Colorado Rural Electric Association of Denver, Colo., and the Rushmore Electric Power Cooperative of Rapid City, S. Dak.

Congressional action in this area has become necessary because some members of the Federal Power Commission and its staff are seeking to empire build at the expense of the electric cooperatives. On July 22 of this year, the Commission ordered three electric co-ops to show cause why they should not comply with the FPC's regulation on rate schedule filing, accounting, and reporting. One of the cooperatives ordered to appear at hearings on this subject is Dairyland Power Co-op of La Crosse, Wis., which furnishes wholesale power to 19 distribution cooperatives in Wisconsin and 9 co-ops in Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee and its Conservation and Credit Subcommittee, which holds hearings on REA bills, I am thoroughly familiar with the Rural Electrification Act and the Rural Electrification Administration. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration and Congress gave REA its statutory existence in 1936, neither one divided or watered down the sole responsibility of that Agency for fostering and financing the electrification of rural America.

The Rural Electrification Act makes no reference to the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Act is equally silent in regard to consumer-owned, nonprofit, cooperative electric associations financed by loans from a sister agency, the REA.

Nothing in the legislative history of either act indicates any change in the position of Congress that the FPC does not have jurisdiction over the electric cooperatives. On the contrary, Congress has reaffirmed that it did not and does not intend for the responsibility for the rural electrification program to be divided between the REA Administrator and the Federal Power Commission. This was done by defeating legislation introduced in the past which would have extended FPC jurisdiction over the cooperatives.

Mr. Speaker, the rural electric cooperatives are owned and operated by their consumer-members, who have a built-in protection for their interest as consumers by their vote as members. In addition, the rural electric co-ops have financed the construction of their systems through loans from the Rural Electrification Administration, which does a very fine and conscientious job of regulating the co-ops through the loan contracts and mortgages which the cooperatives must execute.

In my home State of Wisconsin, our 30 rural electric co-ops are not under the jurisdiction of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. If the State of Wisconsin does not feel that electric cooperatives properly come under the regulatory powers of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, I do not see how it could be construed that they come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

The hearings ordered by the FPC as a test case impose on the cooperatives involved the sizable and unnecessary expense of proving through lengthy hearings and litigation something which is already clear—that they are not subject to FPC jurisdiction.

For this reason, I have introduced the legislation to dispel any lingering doubts in the minds of FPC members and staff about this matter. A similar measure is being cosponsored in the Senate by my Wisconsin colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Minnesota Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and EUGENE MCCARTHY, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon, Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, and Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the resolution concerning this legislation which was passed by NRECA's region 5 delegates, plus other resolutions that they adopted at their 1963 annual meeting:

RESOLUTIONS OF NRECA REGION 5 DELEGATES

FPC JURISDICTION

Whereas public utilities are by nature monopolistic in their operations and consumers served by profit utility corporations have repeatedly expressed desire for protection from these monopolies; and

Whereas utilities operated by cooperative and municipal corporations are owned and controlled by their consumers, with the result that there is no need for outside regulation of the rates fixed or facilities furnished by the electric cooperative, or municipally-owned utilities; Be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress to expedite passage of the bills now before it to establish once and for all that the Federal Power Commission has no legal or moral basis for extending its regulatory jurisdiction over rural electric cooperatives which are consumer owned and operated utilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend Senators HUMPHREY, NELSON, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, YOUNG of North Dakota, MCGOVERN, and BURDICK and Representatives JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and LANGEN for introducing bills to establish that FPC has no jurisdiction over rural electric cooperatives; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our appreciation to Dairyland, Minnkota, and South Central cooperatives for their actions in fighting the FPC show cause order served on them, and urge all cooperatives to join in supporting this fight.

AFBF

Whereas the American Farm Bureau Federation and some of its affiliates have shown concern over the organization and operation of our cooperatives: Be it

Resolved, That we invite them and anyone else who may be interested to learn more about our cooperatives and what has enabled these co-ops to operate successfully for more than a quarter of a century in attaining the goals of modern electric service to all rural areas on a nonprofit basis, at the lowest cost and with full member-ownership and control.

MEMBER SERVICES

Whereas the member-owner is the heart of the rural electrification program and his understanding of and participation in the affairs of his system is basic to the success of the program: Be it

Resolved, That we commend REA for its "5-star member services program" aimed at helping rural electric systems to evaluate their own member programs so as to direct all phases of their operation toward maximum member benefits which in turn will help create a better image of the rural electrification program; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all systems make use of this REA service to evaluate their own programs and broaden their activities in member services; and be it further

Resolved, That we support the proposed regional member services task force program which offers closer relationship between systems on common member services problems and an opportunity for combined action programs and a better, more complete exchange of information; and that every encouragement be given to member services staff members to attend State, regional, or national meetings which give them an opportunity to participate in these member services task force units.

EMPLOYEE EDUCATION

Whereas co-op employees are our full-time ambassadors with the membership and the public: Be it

Resolved, That programs be adopted to enable employees to learn more about current issues and their effect on rural electrification, that each system be urged to provide each employee with information, including the State paper, Rural Electrification magazine, and the Minuteman newsletter.

WOMEN'S ACTIVITIES

Whereas the future of our rural electric systems and the purpose for which they were organized and developed depends in large part on the support of all members, both men and women: Be it

Resolved, That we endorse the principle of intensive, coordinated efforts of rural electric women in developing effective public relations activities at local, State, and National levels; and that we urge cooperatives and State associations to give individual support to the objectives of the women's program as adopted by the national board of directors.

RAD

Whereas every rural electric system, being the service organization of its member-owners, has a special concern in the welfare of its community and in the area development program: Be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our support of RAD programs which already show impressive results in revitalizing rural communities, but which continue to be needed in the decline of rural America's economic and social institutions is to be reversed; and be it further

Resolved, That we reaffirm our position in support of the principles that REA should continue to make section 5 loans which meet all legal and administrative requirements and when such loans contribute to the economic well-being of the service areas of rural electric systems.

MEETING THE BIG OFFENSIVE

Whereas the commercial electric utilities of the United States and their allies have mounted the most intensive and antirural electric campaign in history, and have made it unquestionably clear that their objective is complete domination of the electric power industry in this country; and

Whereas this propaganda is aimed at denying the right of rural electrics to generate their own power, the right to continue to serve areas pioneered by rural electrics which now appear profitable to the commercial power companies, and the right to integrate with other cooperatives, public and municipal power supply sources for the benefit of all consumers: Be it

Resolved, That we carry the facts about the rural electrification program to the entire Nation through our TNT program and expanded public relations activities; that this program be planned, organized, directed and promoted for the greatest effectiveness with the funds made available; that such materials be prepared for use by the local systems as would help them to carry the facts to the people in their local areas; and that the program be supported by voluntary annual contributions of 10 cents per member on a 3-year pledge basis from NRECA member systems.

SOUTH CAROLINA SELLOUT OFFER

Whereas three South Carolina power companies in a grandstand offer recently sought to eliminate all the electric co-ops in the State by offering to buy them at book value: Be it

Resolved, That we urge the Justice Department and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate to investigate the South Carolina rural electric sellout sought by the power companies of that State; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the 150,000 South Carolinians who now own and operate the rural electric co-ops of the State to stand fast against this scheme to take their organizations away from them.

INVESTIGATIONS

Whereas studies indicate the power companies are overcharging their consumers hundreds of millions of dollars a year; and

Whereas these same companies have acquired vast tax subsidies, the latest of which is the 3-percent tax credit and they are now seeking legislation to make it mandatory for them to pass this tax credit bonus on to their stockholders rather than to their consumers: Be it

Resolved, That since regulatory agencies either do not have the authority or the will to do anything about reducing the power company overcharges and tax subsidies, we urge the Congress to investigate and pass appropriate legislation to curb these abuses.

EXPORTING THE REA PATTERN

Whereas since the signing of the AID contract in President Kennedy's office on November 1, 1962, rural electric personnel have participated in developing rural electric cooperatives in 10 Latin American countries and very soon will do the same in 6 other Latin American countries: Be it

Resolved, That we commend the rural electric men and women from our various systems who have participated in this program to spread the principles of cooperation so that men of the free world may learn to work together for greater social and economic development and may know a better way of life which will strengthen the security of our country, improve the image of the rural electrification program and also enable those who participate to broaden themselves and bring back to their cooperatives new ideas which will strengthen the operation of their systems; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge every system to contribute to this program through permitting their managers and key employees to make themselves available for periods of oversea service and to determine material which they have outgrown which may be made available to these rural electric cooperatives in the newly developing countries of the world.

SUPPORT

Whereas recent experiences in the legislatures and the Congress demonstrate that our friends who fight for our program are under increasing attack from our opponents; be it

Resolved, That co-ops in each State and district begin to explore what may be appropriately and effectively done through political action to support those who back our program.

APPRECIATION

Resolved, That we commend our region V State directors, Harold S. Huey, Lawrence C. Cole, and Herbert Moeller; NRECA General Manager Clyde T. Ellis and his staff for the fine work they have done in the past year and give them a vote of confidence for the next year.

Resolved, That we express our sincere appreciation to all who have contributed to the success of this meeting—the many individuals, associations, organizations, agencies, the press, the hotels, and our host, the Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives.

Back to Righteous Path

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, in this day when the news is filled with communistic propaganda and many persons are becoming alarmed as to the position this country is taking with respect to fighting communism, I feel it quite timely to call to the attention of the Members an editorial which appeared in the Rock Island Argus under date of Monday, November 4, 1963. This editorial very succinctly points out one of the things many of us have been trying to say here in the Congress that some consideration should be given to bring to the attention of the American people the effect of the Supreme Court ruling with respect to prayer in our schools. There is presently pending in the Congress a proposal to revise the Constitution so as to permit prayer and Bible reading in public schools. The distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman BECKER, has on numerous occasions brought this matter to the attention of the Congress

and I am pleased to lend my support in his efforts to bring about the adoption of his resolution so that this amendment to the Constitution might be submitted to the respective States for their approval. I congratulate this progressive newspaper for the stand they have taken.

The editorial follows:

BACK TO RIGHTEOUS PATH

The main underlying purpose of most of the legislation in Washington is to make this country strong against communism. Yet a sure proposal for doing this, by directing the Nation along the righteous course charted for it by our forebears, has aroused little interest.

It is a proposal to revise the U.S. Constitution so as to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. Adoption of an amendment would require approval by two-thirds of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

Religion was knocked out of the schools last year by the Court's ruling that religious reading violated the principle of church and state separation. This was a tortuous interpretation of the Constitution, which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Drafters of the Constitution were devout men, who repeatedly called on God for guidance. Their intent could be carried out by adoption of an amendment stating: "Congress shall make no law respecting the recognition of an established church of any denomination, sect, or religious association."

The significance of religion in the training of young Americans is brought home forcefully by Bella Dodd, prominent New York attorney and educator, in the November issue of Guideposts. A former leader of communism in this country, she saw how the want of religious principles drove Communists to their destructive tactics.

"Our school years are our most impressionable," she says. "Eliminating the concept of God from education leaves the student with no basis for determining right and wrong. * * * American youngsters between 7 and 21 spend more waking hours at school and school activities than they do at home and church combined. They need more—not less—emphasis on spiritual values in school."

People who agree with her should write their Senators and Representatives in Washington. Let's get this amendment moving. Let's get the country back on the righteous path charted for it by the Founding Fathers.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part 5 of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY SWITCHES VIEWS ON IKE'S KOREA VISIT—PART V

On January 3, 1953, after taking the oath of office as a U.S. Senator, John F. Kennedy took his seat in the very last row behind the Democratic contingent.

Six weeks later he began to complain.

"There is nothing lower in Washington than a young member of the minority party in the Senate," he said.

The fact that he had scored a truly sensational victory over Cabot Lodge, one of Eisenhower's stanchest lieutenants, in the face of a Republican landslide was clouded by charges that his father had bought him the Senate seat.

In his first statement following his election, Senator-elect Kennedy pledged a continued fight against communism both at home and abroad. In addition, he praised President-elect Eisenhower's decision to visit Korea—a decision which during the campaign Kennedy had faulted as a propaganda stunt. In fact, he had said that Republican promises to end the Korean war would inevitably lead to a Communist attack on Alaska and World War III.

Now, Kennedy said he was glad Eisenhower was going to Korea because, after a firsthand study, the new President could decide on the desirability of using Chinese Nationalist troops and perhaps even Japanese forces against the Communist forces. (In Paris, several weeks later, Kennedy urged the United States to take "the risk of permitting Japanese rearmament.")

SNUBS TRUMAN

This was a period in which Kennedy repeatedly and publicly sympathized with Eisenhower in the numerous problems the President had inherited from the Truman administration. Moreover, he took the line that the Eisenhower landslide was inevitable what with the Democrats having been in power for 20 years. "However partisan you are," he told a Baltimore Democratic dinner in March 1953, "you cannot deny that it had to come to the Democrats."

Invited to address the Kansas Democratic Club at Harry S Truman's invitation, Kennedy couldn't find the time. "I have felt being new to the job that I should confine myself completely to it," he wrote to Truman. And Truman replied that he understood. But still, some people thought, a new Senator should not have been so peremptory about rejecting an invitation from a former President of the United States.

It was another of those little things which Harry Truman would not forget when Jack Kennedy came calling for help in obtaining the presidential nomination.

It was not all work for the tall, tanned and handsome lawmaker—at 35, one of the youngest elected to the august Senate. What with his numerous—though casual—dates, the gossip-hungry society columnists were having a field day speculating on the identity of the future Mrs. Kennedy. "Many women have hopefully concluded that Kennedy needs looking after," according to an article in the Saturday Evening Post. "In their opinion, he is, as a young millionaire Senator, just about the most eligible bachelor in the United States—and the least justifiable one."

COURTSHIP OF JACKIE

However, the "gay, young bachelor" was already courting his future wife. Kennedy had first met Jacqueline Lee Bouvier at a Long Island wedding in 1948. But things only got serious when they were invited to dinner at the home of Charles Bartlett, Washington correspondent for the Chattanooga Times. This was in 1951 and the courtship—what with Jack running for the Senate and all that—was, in Jacqueline's words, "very spasmodic."

The cameo-faced beauty was born July 28, 1929, in Long Island's Southampton Hospital—a fact duly noted in New York's society columns. Her father John Bouvier III was a darkly handsome stockbroker who cut a dashing figure around New York and, because of his year-round suntan, was known variously as "Black Jack," "the Black Orchid," and "the Sheik."

The Bouviers were rich, Catholic, socially impeccable and so Republican that Jacqueline Kennedy once confessed that all through her childhood she confused Franklin D. Roosevelt with the devil. In 1939, the assured, secure pattern of the Bouvier girls was shattered when their parents called them in to tell them, sadly, that they had decided to separate. The following year they were divorced. Two years later, Janet Bouvier married Hugh D. Auchincloss, a Washington broker. "Black Jack," who died in 1957, never remarried.

Fresh from his senatorial victory, Kennedy resumed his courtship with vigor. For 6 months Jack campaigned tirelessly for Jacqueline's hand, in and out of dinner parties, art theaters and movie houses and at hunt breakfasts up and down the east coast.

On September 12, 1953, John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Jacqueline Lee Bouvier were married by Boston's Cardinal (then Archbishop) Cushing in a picture-book extravaganza in Newport that, thanks to the society columnists in attendance, was well publicized as the social event of the year. There were 700 guests at the nuptial mass, ranging from Marion Davies to Alfred Gwynne Vanderbilt, and 900 at the reception. All of Kennedy's colleagues in the Senate had been invited.

Life with Jack was not all orange blossoms. Naturally enough, Kennedy was utterly absorbed by politics. He ate politics, drank politics, and slept politics. And he was always traveling. "I was alone almost every weekend while Jack traveled the country making speeches," she once recalled. "It was all wrong."

Then there were the Kennedys themselves. She had had a taste of life with the clan in the period before her marriage. There was touch football at Hyannis Port; loud pronunciamentos from Joseph P. Kennedy; and blissful sails on Jack's sloop *Victura* with her fiance—accompanied by a Life photographer.

BRUSH WITH DEATH

Jacqueline nearly lost her husband in the first year of their marriage. Kennedy's back had begun to hurt more and more. "That metal plate they had put into his spine after the war had never healed over," a close friend said. "You could look into an open hole in his back and see it." In the final months of the 1954 session, he hobbled around on crutches.

In October 1954, the Senator entered Manhattan's Hospital for special surgery, where Dr. Philip Wilson headed a medical team that performed a double-fusion on his spine. A second operation— the details of which were never officially made public—was performed near a kidney. Twice his entire family was summoned to his bedside because it was feared he was near death; twice he rallied. Just before Christmas he was flown—flat on his back—to his father's home in Palm Beach. In mid-February 1955, he was back in the hospital for another operation. Again he received the last rites of the Catholic Church, and again members of his family prayed for him outside the operating room. This time, the plate was removed successfully.

According to Paul Martin, Washington bureau chief of the Gannett newspapers, the Kennedy case at the time was described in the American Medical Association's Archives of Surgery, Volume 71, 1955, in an article called "Management of Adrenocortical Insufficiency During Surgery." Written by four New York doctors, including Dr. Wilson who performed the surgical operation, the article reported:

"A man 37 years of age had Addison's disease for 7 years. He had been managed fairly successfully for several years on a program of desoxycortcosterone acetate pellets of 150 milligram, implanted every 3 months and cortisone in doses of 25 milligrams, daily orally.

"Owing to a back injury, he had a great deal of pain which intefered with his daily routine. Orthopedic consultation suggested that he might be helped by a lumbo-sacral fusion together with a sacroiliac fusion.

"Because of the severe degree of trauma involved in these operations, and because of the patient's adronocortical insufficiency due to Addison's disease, it was deemed dangerous to proceed with these operations."

A team of doctors versed in endocrinology and surgical physiology was assembled to help in management of the patient before, during, and after the operation. The AMA report concluded:

"This case is noteworthy because desoxycorticosterone provided a checkrein on the tendency to develop salt loss and arterial hypertension. Desoxycorticosterone, it will be recalled, is an adrenocortical-like steroid that permits reabsorption of salt in the kidneys so that urinary salt loss is minimized.

"Though this patient had marked adrenocortical insufficiency, though the magnitude of his surgery was great and though complications ensued postoperatively, this patient had a smooth postoperative course insofar as no Addisonian crisis ever developed."

PROFILES IN COURAGE

This was the blackest period in Kennedy's life. As he lay flat on his back, not knowing whether he would ever walk again, Jacqueline did her best to cheer him up. She was forever bringing fresh surprises—from balloons which he could shoot down with a popgun to Grace Kelly herself, in person. On February 25, 1955, he left the hospital to fly back to Florida. His convalescence was slow, painful, and marked by intermittent depression. His mental state began to worry his aids and family.

It was then, Kennedy later recounted, that he got a letter from a 90-year-old bedridden woman in Cape Cod who told him "not to waste away feeling sorry for yourself, young man. Keep busy. Do all the things you've never had time to do."

It was this letter, Kennedy said, that prompted him to write Profiles in Courage. With the help of a steady stream of books from the Library of Congress during his convalescence, memorandums and advice from several historians including Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Jules David, and the "invaluable assistance in the assembly and preparation of the material" by his "research associate" Theodore Sorensen, John F. Kennedy had a Pulitzer Prize winning best seller on his hands.

Challenge to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department dismissal of Otto F. Otepka, its Chief Security Evaluations Officer, is a serious blow to the internal security of the United States. It is also a direct and grave challenge to the authority of the Congress.

Although this action is the outgrowth of Mr. Otepka's appearance before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the other body, it would be the ultimate in naiveté to suppose that the House of Representatives is merely a mildly interested bystander.

The threat to the investigative prerogatives of the House Committee on Un-American Activities implicit in the State Department action is undeniable. For that matter, the threa to the investigative activities of any committee of Congress in any area of legislative or oversight responsibility is equally obvious.

In this connection, I recall the pledge given by the President of the United States in his first state of the Union message, January 30, 1961, in which he declared:

For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact or report, past, present or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and hazards.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

WILL SENATE FIGHT?

The State Department has shown its contempt for the prerogatives of the Senate and its indifference to security risks within its own ranks by dismissing its chief security evaluations officer. It did so in the face of a direct warning carried by a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to Secretary of State Rusk.

The victim of the purge, Otto F. Otepka, is a veteran of 27 years of Government service. For the last 10 years he has been the man who gives security clearances to State Department employees. So well and efficiently did he perform, that in 1958 he was awarded the State Department's meritorious service award.

But, as Senator DODD, of Connecticut, has said, in the topsy-turvy world of the State Department, the idea is to catch the cop and not the culprit. So charges were brought against Otepka for having engaged in conduct unbecoming a diplomatic officer—namely, in collaborating with the Senate Security Subcommittee. He was accused of having disclosed secret Department documents to Senators.

In the Department it was said that Otepka "is out of step with the times." A spokesman remarked, "We are not witch hunting any more. We have no security risks, and he knows it." The Senate subcommittee's reaction is one of skepticism. Its investigation of Department wirepulling to picture Castro as the liberator of Cuba and not as a Communist hardly persuaded it that there's nothing kinky in the Department.

It has since been trying to evaluate the security practices, or lack of them, in the Department. It was hampered by a Department order, issued under the cloak of "executive privilege," directing that State Department officials remain away from the subcommittee and give it no information. Otepka freely cooperated with the subcommittee.

Chairman EASTLAND of the subcommittee commented, "The powers of Congress are at stake, and I intend to protect Mr. Otepka by every means at my command against accusations which complain, in effect, that he told the truth when asked to do so by a Senate subcommittee."

There can be no doubt that this case reflects an intention by the Kennedy administration to conduct a purge of patriots. The subcommittee feels that the often misused doctrine of executive privilege can be claimed only by the President, not by any bureaucrat who feels like thwarting Congress. We trust that the Senate will press this central point, for if it lets the issue go by default, Congress will soon find itself hamstrung by the bureaucracy in looking into any facet of public business whatsoever. It would be salutary if it invoked its powers to punish for contempt.

Meanwhile, it should exert its utmost efforts to safeguard Mr. Otepka's career through avenues of appeal which ultimately permit reviews of his case by Secretary Rusk and President Kennedy. We have no great faith that there will be sympathy for Mr. Otepka in any of these quarters, for it is obvious the administration was out to get him, and did. These are the kind of rewards a loyal American can expect from a crowd which can always find excuses for Khrushchev or Tito, but none for a vigorous anti-Communist.

Clarence Adler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the noted pianist Clarence Adler recently celebrated the 50th anniversary of his participation in the musical life of New York and the United States. A pianist, teacher, and composer of outstanding ability and distinction, who has appeared with major American and European orchestras, he has taken his musicianship beyond the concert stage in order to enhance public appreciation of the fine art of chamber music and enriched its development. His devotion to the service of bringing good music to the people has provided a notable contribution to the musical life of New York City and has won him the respect and affection of all who have known him. For the occasion of this anniversary, a book of tributes to Clarence Adler has been published. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD from this book the tribute by the renowned writer, Fannie Hurst, entitled, "A Sketch of Clarence Adler."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SKETCH OF CLARENCE ADLER

(By Fannie Hurst)

Musically speaking, Clarence Adler has many faces. Over a period of 50 years of achievement in related fields his name, to coin a word, is written into "musicana" as outstanding pianist, musicologist, and teacher.

In this age of narrowing specialization, it is not given to many to rise to three-pronged eminence both at home and abroad.

In not one of the fields in which he excels has he proved a flash in the pan.

The Adler story begins in Cincinnati, Ohio, where his virtuosity won him a scholarship at the Cincinnati College of Music at the age of 11, no mean accomplishment in a city with a long and erudite history of musical appreciation.

After 3 years at the College of Music, his story quickens. Young Adler appears frequently in recitals and as soloist with orchestras. Then on to Berlin in 1905 to study with Leopold Godowsky. A few weeks after his arrival, American-boy-making-good finds himself participating in the Silver Jubilee Concert of renowned cellist Anton Hekking, an occasion destined to become his gangway to a 5-year stay in Europe instead of the 12 months his funds would have permitted. Two years later he was to succeed Arthur Schnabel as pianist of the Hekking Trio, achieving the tour de force of mastering in one season 20 chamber music works, all of them unfamiliar to him.

Then back to his hometown, but by now it is boy-into-man, and after 3 years of

development in the Midwest city of his beginnings, back to New York and opportunity to identify himself with the great Rafael Joseffy.

In 1913 by the rule of hard work and relentless tenacity, Adler makes his chamber music debut (a field in which he was to excel), with the Kneisel Quartette; next in line his orchestral debut under the baton of Walter Damrosch, then on to the piano faculty of the Institute of Musical Art, later to become the Juilliard School of Music.

The chronological telling of the brilliant progress of a young man out of the Middle West reads glibly, but does not reveal the behind-the-scenes application, intensity, and dedication that energized Adler, or the compulsion that has lived with him through 50 years of achievement.

If the fanatic sometimes goes overboard, it should be borne in mind that it is the fanatic who makes the world go around and who has never swerved from the vision and the dream.

By that definition, Adler is like that, tenacity of purpose stalking beside him every toiling mile of the way. I doubt if he ever had time to speculate on the role this thing called luck may have played in his destiny. Those who for one reason or another have loitered too long on their way to their goal, or who have tried and failed, find solace in the philosophy of luck.

"If luck is with you, and you know the right people, you're in."

I doubt if Adler ever reckoned with luck, although he did enjoy one stroke of what might be termed very good luck, his capacity for a 10-, 15-, of if need be, even 24-hour workday. Obviously he has been able to pass along this torch of dedication to the job, as attested by the number of his pupils who are nationally and internationally known. It requires a piano teacher of fortitude and more, to have presented a group of his pupils in performance of all the Mozart piano concerti for 28 consecutive broadcasts.

His career adds up to one such tour de force after another. A recognized authority of Mozart, he played all of the great portfolio of 28 concerti over radio, Eddy Brown conducting also 14 of the same series at Town Hall, conducted by Leon Barzin, thus evoking a public response that highlighted a mass hunger for music by the masters, interpreted by masters of interpretation.

Even this add-up of honors, honorary degrees, pianistic, and teaching eminence, somehow fall short of conveying the whole man. There is a fourth prong to the Adler success. Adler, the human being. He is a generally liked as a man as he is admired as an artist.

A man against the background of his home can be even more revealing than an artist on the platform. Adler's home reflects just what it is, the warm and genial background of a long and happy marriage, a lovely wife, their only child Richard, a successful light opera librettist and composer.

The ink flows easily when writing of a good life in the 50th year of teaching, concertizing, and "that something more."

Relocation or Renewal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 15, 1963, edition of the New Republic. The tragic cultural, economic, and social consequences of an ill-advised urban redevelopment plan have been repeated over and over again across the Nation. To drive the lower economic groups from substandard areas in our cities does not solve problems, it just removes them to another section of the city. We cannot continue to ignore the fact that human beings are living in these areas.

Miss Colebrook, the author, is a Boston social worker and has had much experience in dealing with those who become dislocated due to urban redevelopment. Slums are as much a condition of mind as they are geographic areas; our job must include changing this condition of mind along with its location.

The article follows:

PEOPLE OF THE SLUMS

I. RELOCATION OR RENEWAL?

(By Joan Colebrook)

(NOTE.—Joan Colebrook was born in Australia and is the author of two novels, "All That Seemed Final" and "The Northerner." She now lives in Cambridge, Mass., where she has been engaged in social work.)

This is being written in Boston, where $225 million of public funds has been earmarked for urban renewal, and where the wrecker's balls are swinging to and fro, battering at unwanted walls. We can be sure that buildings will fall, but the many-million-dollar question remains—what kind of city will rise in their stead? How is this demolition to bring life to a slum? And where is the idea which will shape such a great opportunity?

In one Boston area slated for immediate demolition and eventual renewal, everything has proceeded according to plan: alarming statistics have been quoted, public hearings have served their purpose, the area has been declared "decadent and substandard," notices have been sent out to tenants that the city is now their landlord. Like scared and bewildered animals, the dispossessed are being flushed out of their holes.

One can see how necessary it was, for it is as if a sharp knife had sliced off the front of the blocks of houses. Sagging stairways are revealed, desolate hallways redolent of dirt and urine, mysterious rooms kept by seldom-appearing tenants and locked by huge padlocks. The houses have been cut up into inadequate apartments. Plaster is cracked, window sashes are rotting, heat is inadequate, rats abound. The repair man from the tenant office (each area slated for demolition has an office set up to receive tenant's rent) has had to go out twice in 1 day to see what he can do about a flooded basement apartment, where Mrs. Alice Lacey, the half-blind Negro woman who exists on disability, is still crying, a patch of dirty cloth screwed up in her hand. Down the street comes "Sweet Betsy"—who lives in a nearby attic and whose private traumas are new the public property of us all. Large, unbuttoned, her rope of greyish-brown hair hanging down her back, she seems to have thrown an old coat over her nightgown and rushed out into the street without pausing to think, gathering up on the way a package of cream cheese and a handful of saltines. She is eating as she walks—"I didn't even have breakfast," she tells me reproachfully, and her large vague eyes express a primitive terror, a fear not quite explained by her complaint that the pipes have been leaking in her bathroom.

"I'll get a house—don't worry," she declares defiantly, "oh, I'll get a house. That place is not fit to live in. Not a moment's rest to be got, dear." Her face crumples up, and one knows that her endless story will go on and on—the leaking pipes, the frayed window ropes, the stopped-up bath, the delinquent boys at the mailbox. But there is always that sudden shift. "See this pulse in my throat?" she questions tearfully, pulling further open her already gaping coat. "I showed it to them in there. 'They' could see it," ('They' are the employees in the tenant office); "it's beating too fast, dear." She nods mournfully, as if now that we see the full significance of her need, some action must be forthcoming.

Urban renewal means that we are to tear down, along with most of the buildings in th demolition area, the house which "Sweet Betsy" complains of. But at the same time it means that we are to get rid of—"relocate" is the word—"Sweet Betsy" herself, whose constant trips to the rent office to speak of pipes, rats or baths are really motivated by a long-dead hope that somebody cares about her. This old Ophelia of the slums is constantly on the verge of senile confusion. But through this confusion there has penetrated, like a ray of light, the certainty that her lot will be bettered. She tells the social workers that she has found, alone and unaided, the "perfect" apartment. She reports that it has a refrigerator (at present she has none, and she keeps her food in an unsanitary condition on the kitchen shelf), and that it costs $80 a month (Betsy's total income per month is $115). We, the social workers, point out that if she pays $80 a month for rent and something for medicine and fares to the hospital, she will have little more than $5 a week for food—but she counters this by saying that she already pays extra for electricity. It is clear that each trip to the rent office and the relocation staff, has little to do with her apartment; rather it is the temporary coming-alive of one of the "disadvantaged" (Planner Catherine Bauer Wurster's phrase).

We have many "disadvantaged" in the core of our cities. The slum pattern is worsening in almost all of our major urban areas. This is partly because middle-class whites are flocking to the suburbs (Paul Goodman's deadly dormitories), and southern Negroes, Puerto Ricans, poor whites and unemployed are taking their place in the heart of the city. These in-migrants who cannot fend for themselves, psychologically, culturally or financially are susceptible to illness, crime, exploitation and government aid, so that they swell the hard core of problem families already in the area. This has been well publicized and documented, as has the consequent swelling of the racial ghetto and the creation of new ones. Buffalo, N.Y., saw 13,000 whites move out to the suburbs, even while 14,000 Negroes moved into the city. In Boston, during the last 10 years, the Negro population in the two major ghetto areas, Roxbury-North Dorchester and the South End, has increased until it is half the entire Negro population of the States. In these areas, sometimes slapbang-up against the civic centers, juvenile delinquency is endemic, crime and prostitution increase, the health situation is poor, embattled schools report a constant turnover and increase in dropouts. The slums are not only getting bigger, they are getting tougher.

The solution is said to be urban renewal, and it is true that urban renewal tends to bring new high-income housing and new business into the city. But this is only one of its tendencies. With the decision to renew an area and the subsequent human upheaval, immense social problems are laid bare, problems which are not on the agenda and do not fit neatly into the calendar set up by the authorities. Although the declaration of the national housing policy of the 81st Congress clearly stated its pur-

pose—to remedy the serious housing shortage, to eliminate substandard housing through the clearance of slums, to provide a suitable environment for every American family—these noble aims seem to have been lost in the shuffle.

Farewell to community

Henry James described American cities in 1910 as "heaped industrial battlefields" and he worried about their lack or organic social relations. From that time on, the dwarfing of the individual proceeded far beyond the architectural. The impersonality of the gridiron block was quadrupled by the high-rise apartment and intensified still further by the breakup of the family, the disorganization of the community, and the mobility of the population. That which conserves and nourishes in cities became so rare that whole generations failed to experience it. Perhaps it is this arbitrary disappearance of community, which explains the delinquency Attorney General Robert Kennedy says will become almost unbeatable" by 1970.

Environment is obviously the crux of the matter, but we must ask ourselves to what extent urban renewal can deal with this question of environment, and to what extent it is simply pushing problems around, rearranging them in the wake of new highways and million dollar schols. It is admirable that the public conscience has determined to eradicate these gray areas, but it is wise to be skeptical as the forces of change struggle with the Herculean task. Housing and social health cannot be separated. In these grim and unattractive slums, consolidated as they have been over the last 20 years, social and educational aid is now needed upon a large and imaginative scale, not only to be in keeping with democratic values, but to save upon an immense social loss. Welfare agencies, with inadequate funds, and inadequate concepts, have long worked against heavy odds, and have almost too great an investment to realize that they are trying to socialwork what has already been socially worked. For beyond the bad housing, the crime and the pathology, these areas have been cut off from the lifegiving flow of world ideas, from leadership, from the source of movement which is so important a part of the city picture. Here in the cultural ghetto there is an enormous and vast ignorance—an ignorance which canot be dispelled by a handful of unsupported social workers. In such areas we find few professionals, few teachers, few skilled workmen and few self-educators. Ideas do not circulate. Civic inertia abounds and civic know-how is limited. No traveler comes to these slums (as he comes to the university communities) intent on lecturing, sharing experiences, leaving behind fertilizing ideas. Newcomers here are generally bewildered strangers, hiding alcoholics, criminals in flight or the needy relatives of residents. There is a dearth of bookshops, a dearth of decent places to eat, a dearth of flourishing business enterprise—but likewise a plethora of liquor stores, pool rooms, rescue missions, secondhand shops.

At the Settlement House, a little girl of 6 is having an art class and she paints innumerable dark houses, running wet scarlet into them and explaining that this is "blood vomited up by old men who sleep on the stairs." A promiscuous teenage girl tells her counselor that her seducer has seduced her two sisters before her. Fatalistically she sees her own seduction as inevitable. A boy who broke the legs of a Puerto Rican with a baseball bat explains to the worker that the cop didn't press him because the cop didn't like spics either. In all three cases the narrow knowledge becomes truth, the credo quia absurdum of the slums. Doorways are not just doorways; they are places where old drunks creep to sleep at night. Seduction is familial. Racial prejudice is as much a part of the policeman as of the teenager.

If this heathen-like darkness is to be combated, it would be cheaper and more effective to try to do it by implanting in the environment varied intellectual and human resources than it would be to change the whole physical face of the slums. The urban renewal law expressed a determination to provide a decent environment for every American family, yet it is only too evident that commercial interests, real estate groups and big contractors have found a ready source of profit in the physical changeover, and that the idea of urban renewal (in the real sense of "renewal") has been subverted. It is not that new housing should not be built, but rather that the renewers should so concentrate upon an area as to have some reasonable hope of solving problems where they stand. Instead of getting rid of the troublesome human elements, the chronic problem families, the drifting alcoholics, and the anonymous poor, the planners should plan around them, and import new residents to balance them. Unintelligent dispersal inevitably means that the more helpless relocatees contribute to bad housing elsewhere, whereas holding this element in their neighborhoods would mean that substandard housing could be, if gradually, eliminated. That a slum might grow slowly into health by spotbuilding and by the infusion of curative and educational elements is a concept opposed to laissez-faire dispersal; but it is a concept which has not yet been tried out. No single slum area in the country has so far been subjected to such an experiment.

New ghettos for old slums

One thing seems to have been forgotten, and this applies as much to American cities in general as it does to slums: However, varied the patterns suggested by planners—the galaxy, the dispersed, the core, the star, the ring—the requirements of living must remain somewhat the same. Citizens need adequate leadership, protection by law, material supplies, intercommunication, cultural advantages, and a manageable world. This last most of all, for the cult of bigness oppresses. Part of the yearly trend toward the suburbs was to search for the small village again, for the community in which the human being could play an effective role. In the slums where the social picture is one of disorganization, the people are more than ever separated from the factors which control their destiny. "Planning," while it provides us with buildings, is apt to do away with what little social organization exists, rather than to strengthen the concept of neighborhood.

Our Government has voted millions for slum clearance and for the elimination of substandard housing, and not only have new slums developed but new ghettos also. Charles Abrams commented in the January 1963, issue of Commentary that, "With the advent of urban renewal after 1949 * * * racial discrimination with Federal blessing took on an additional form in the wholesale eviction of Negroes from footholds they had established in the cities. Negroes constituted more than 70 percent of those displaced from their homes to make room for more expensive housing, and a high percentage of the remaining 30 percent were Puerto Ricans, orientals, or other minorities."

In most cities the dispossessed low-income and minority families have had no recourse but to move into nearby marginal areas. An excellent example of this forced moving was found in Woodlawn in Chicago, when an area built for 25,000 residents suddenly found itself bulging with 82,000. It is symptomatic that in the present exodus from Washington Park in Boston, Negro families are already beginning to give new directions to the North Dorchester ghetto, and in New Haven, supposedly the "pride of planning," the old ghetto at Oak Street has been born anew at Dixswell Avenue. The Rhode Island Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights says in its annual (1963) report that discrimination against Negroes in Rhode Island is worse than it has ever been, while urban renewal programs have much intensified Providence ghettos. Although it must be recognized that the reason behind all this is more than racial, it may be considerably harder to disperse the new ghettos than to disperse the old slums.

In general, low-income and minority families have been displaced without adequate choice of new housing. As one example among many, the West End renewal project in Boston displaced 3,075 families who paid a median gross rental of $43 monthly. Although the authority stated that the families displaced would have first preference in the new dwelling units, rentals for the new apartments were $175 to $250 a month.

In the specific local situation (Boston), 5,300 families and 3,800 lodging house residents, and 2,300 business firms will be moved (Boston's urban renewal progam is described as the "biggest and boldest" in the country). In Boston's Washington Park, 1,200 of the 1,689 families to be dislodged will be Negro; in the South End also, nonwhites will be numerous among the relocatees (2,000 families and 3,000 roomers). Since these two areas comprise some of the worst housing and lowest incomes in the city area, rehousing will be an immense problem. In Castle Square—a demolition area in the South End of Boston—50 percent of the families want rentals from $25 to $50 a month, and only 28 percent of these "relocatee" families have incomes of more than $70 a week.

Can one seriously feel that to remove the poor, the minorities, the insecure, without adequate low-income housing for them to inhabit, will cut down on welfare costs, school dropouts, delinquency, racial hatred? Especially since their wanderings are unlikely to cease with one relocation?

Through June of 1960, almost 1 in 10 displaced families in the Nation (13 percent of nonwhite families) was officially reported relocated in substandard housing. More than half of the displaced families were found eligible for public housing and only 18 percent were so relocated. Although experience in Boston is limited so far, the evidence to date indicates that many displaced families have either relocated in substandard housing or in areas designated for redevelopment. Some families have already moved two or three times. No comprehensive study of the housing market in the Boston area has been made in recent years, but recent U.S. Census data has been evaluated by Helen Kistin in an appendix to a brief to the Supreme Court, January 1962: "There is a severe shortage of sound, low-rental housing * * * the gross rental vacancy in the city of Boston in 1960 was extremely low. * * * In 1960 there were 3,600 State-owned and 9,844 federally aided housing units in Boston. Of these only 14 percent were occupied by nonwhites. The public housing authority reports that the average number of certified applicants for public housing from 1955 to 1960 has been 4,600. The turnover was only 1,990 units in 1959—so that one can see that it would have taken 2 years to place current applicants."

Yet the Boston Redevelopment Authority has not requested—except for the elderly—any new low-income housing, and it is known that local real estate interests are opposed to such building.

Apart from what lies behind these facts and figures, however, there is a lamentable lack of concept operating in planner's circles. What has happened is that everyone sees or has seen in "urban renewal" what they most want to see—the politician sees politics,

the builder buildings, the socially conscious, social action.

For instance Boston's Mayor Collins has chosen "planning with people" as his slogan; yet neighborhood groups in Allston, Cambridge, Charlestown, and Winthrop have rejected the kind of planning offered by the redevelopment authorities. This makes for complicated politics. Builders naturally are out to get hold of cheap city land, and in some cases (for instance that of Allston) the renewal project seems to have been dreamed up for the builder's convenience. Social workers see social action in urban renewal. They hold constant conferences about "delinquency," "housing," and "alcoholism"—yet they too are forced to fit their plans to the Procrustean bed built by the planners. Obviously they cannot help clients who are to be scattered to the four winds.

Some urban neighborhoods contain almost all of the minorities, all the indigent aged, all the fatherless families on government aid, all the alcoholics. Similarly there are neighborhoods, rich not only in stable families but in educators, leaders, and professionals. One might argue that in a private enterprise system one cannot forcibly balance and integrate neighborhoods. If this is so, then neither can we forcibly "relocate." The one power suggests the other. But is it so? The concept of "real" renewal is exciting enough to stimulate the imagination of both planners and neighbors, and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that if creative leadership were found, the wall of the cultural ghetto would fall of its own weight.

An outline for action

Perhaps some kind of brief attempt should be made to outline here the possible action which would spring from an honest desire to eliminate slums. A rough chart might be made as follows:

1. A process of leisurely renewal, nonthreatening to the residents, involving guarantees of housing in that same community to a large majority of those displaced, and at rents they could afford.

The principle emphasized here would be that of dealing with the neighborhood "as is," although with a conscious effort to implant new leadership, new sources of employment and training, and new education. This negates the idea that the planner has the right to displace residents at will, or to dispose freely of neighborhood land. A process of leisurely renewal would naturally allow not only for some kind of community-controlled housing, but also could crack down (perhaps by rent control) on the host of speculators who flock to urban renewal's rich banquet. It would give the community time to set up, with the Government's help, permanent community funds, and would undoubtedly cost less than the present grandiose but ineffective methods. It would return confidence to those fearful of final ejection, so that they would continue to rehabilitate their houses. It would assist the education of local leadership, reform of voting districts, enforcement of civil rights, and improvement of education. Above all it would give the country an opportunity to see what is being done, to look at it, and to criticize it sanely.

2. Dispersal. Setting up citywide publicity in all areas to concern the Nation with accepting and welcoming a certain percentage of minority groups and a certain percentage of those groups (for instance, old age groups) which would normally go into public housing.

If communities could be convinced that their neighborhoods were not going to be swamped by minorities, some progress might be made. If the President's new nondiscriminatory housing order were fully implemented in public projects (many of them are blatantly lily white) this would help disperse minorities. Dispersal should include also the building of halfway houses for ex-prisoners, alcoholics, and delinquents, in order to try to control the constant merry-go-round between slums and nearby prisons. During the process of urban renewal, these individuals and families often relocate themselves voluntarily in the nearest anonymous rundown housing, thus helping to create new slums and removing themselves from social aid.

3. Safeguarding and implanting diversity. We could give present business in renewal areas an option to stay and develop afresh, but making it possible for them to do this by long-term loans, encouragement, and advice.

Many of the businesses swept away by urban renewal are small and humble and therefore need protection. The spearheading of new small businesses which would involve themselves with the community in some way—for instance movie houses, coffee shops, ethnic eating houses, clubs, halfway houses, small industries, specialized markets—would be a valuable aid to community building. The reconstituted community should be a place where noncommercial enterprises could pay small rents.

Such an outline leaves out much of what is now taking place; for instance, unnecessary demolition, new highway construction which neither solves the traffic problem nor helps the neighborhood, the building of supermarkets, huge shopping districts, superhospitals, superuniversities, and superagencies. It also leaves out the wholesale inhuman removal of people .

People live there

It is not enough to build better hospitals, if these strengthen the hospital world but weaken the community by eating up community space and putting up "Keep off the grass" signs. The hospital should build its clinics and student houses within the community, and share its knowledge and its curative processes. It is not enough to build more settlement houses or gymnasiums if no change is made in other civilizing factors. It is not enough to have special health departments in our cities if, in an area with a high rate of venereal disease, the department staff does not have access to the high school students, and if attempts are not made to change the sexual mores. The whole scope of educational reform in deprived areas needs to be imaginatively enlarged. We no longer live in the time of Jane Addams when social workers went into the slums to light tiny lamps of hope and courage.

Contrary to the general impression, slums are full of people with potential. Such failing citizens as "Sweet Betsy" are balanced by others such as "Maggie" and "Maria." Maggie, a sturdy old lady, leaves her grimy room, dominated by its big iron stove, at 6 a.m. First she goes to Mass, then she makes a tour of the neighborhood. She nurses the bedridden, shops and brings mail for the crippled and gives psychological aid to the depressed. Without fanfare, without salary, Maggie serves society as a social worker. Maria is a different type. Ebullient, exalted, narcissistic, she has a limp which has earned her disability, and made it possible for her to use her time for her chosen work, which is a kind of sharing out of the loaves and fishes. As she expresses it herself, she is "lucky with God." Maria collects old clothes and discarded furniture, and takes it to those who need it. She also collects and buys food and distributes this likewise. Sometimes she cooks delicious pies and cakes and arrives unheralded at a stranger's home, or takes it upon herself to sweep the snow off some neglected doorstep, never knowing who is thereby benefited. Maria is part of a whole complex we call a slum, and which planners with a certain naivete feel should be swept away. One thing that is right about any kind of living area, is that here human beings, even the most deprived, play a role in society, a role which we upset at our peril. Maria and Maggie and their prototypes may be worth more than the new building which is to take their place, and they may be forced, in the faraway project to which they are transported, into sterile idleness. To the settlementhouse worker, their departure is a cause for grief.

It is by no accident that our modern American hero wanders under eerie bluish lights, down long impersonal streets, past huge apartment houses, isolated fenced-in strip parks, bewildering supermarkets and highways along which rush silent coffin-like automobiles. His cry for recognition is strangled in his throat. "I felt so awful," said a young woman after a recent urban renewal hearing, "we were told that we would have a chance to speak, and then they heard the representatives of all those organizations first, and when we tried to speak at 11:30 they told us to sit down. * * * I was so ashamed."

To sum up: Urban renewal is trying to force the American lower classes to turn middle class or to get out; it is building housing for middle incomes and not lower incomes; the slums and the ghettos are being consolidated rather than thinned; great social and educational opportunities are being missed; the feelings, rights, opinions of the people are being overridden.

"There is a difference between renewal and redevelopment," said Mrs. Murphy from the Temple area project in Los Angeles, "and that's where we confuse the words * * * we are not against renewal, we are against redevelopment, and kicking the present owners out for profiteers to come in and land grab. * * * Renewal is fixing up what is usable; in redevelopment they bulldoze you down and build all new."

Perspectives on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by Mr. Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development, provides what I consider to be the most concise and illuminating presentation of the reasons for foreign aid, the changes in our programs and objectives, and the various forms of assistance now in operation.

This significant panorama of our aid programs and accomplishments deserves the careful study of all Members of Congress who seek a perspective from which to evaluate our current foreign assistance efforts. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks:

REMARKS BY MR. HERBERT J. WATERS, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR MATERIAL RESOURCES, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CORN MILLERS FEDERATION, OCTOBER 24, 1963, CHICAGO, ILL.

It is a great pleasure for me to be here to speak to you at your annual convention.

As Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development, it is my job to see that AID's responsibilities under that program are carried out.

And so, I would like to discuss with you today, some of the specifics of these and other foreign assistance operations.

But first, let us examine the underlying reasons for our foreign assistance programs and how they have changed in recent years.

In 1840, the French historian-statesman, de Tocqueville, wrote, "It is strange to see with what feverish ardor the Americans pursue their own welfare."

Perhaps he was right—in 1840.

But, his implied criticism of American selfishness—does not apply in the 20th century—to you—to me—or to any American.

Our foreign aid program is proof of this—and has been through three national administrations. It is proof of American sensitivity to—and concern for—the world around us.

We haven't forgotten that when we were a struggling new nation—a band of little colonies—asserting our independence—we were the recipients of foreign aid.

We haven't forgotten that when 18th century Americans started boldly to prove that freemen and free institutions could create an effective society of economic and social justice—we were the recipients of foreign development capital.

We haven't forgotten that the Old World provided the technicians and the tools to the people of a newly emerging nation—a semi-wilderness, far removed from the centers of world trade and political power.

Now a growing number of developing nations need help and guidance—and we are responding. We are helping others—but not only because it is the right thing to do but because, it is the wise thing to do—for political security and for economic progress in our own country.

We are not just repaying past kindnesses. We are concerned with our own safety in this troubled world—a world in which the status quo is doomed—a world in which the frustrations of centuries are sparking to flame the most dynamic social, political, and economic upheaval in history.

With our help, this energetic explosion can be channeled into democratic political forms, with social justice for all—with a chance for every man to share in the fruits of his labor. Without our help we can only expect chaos—the environment that nurtures communism.

And, the Communist threat is real; it is insistent. Repressive measures against Communists terrorists alone are not enough. Poverty, disease, illiteracy, antiquated economic structures, incentive-stifling systems of land tenure; these must be alleviated, too, if the Communist threat is to be thwarted.

Our foreign policy—since the end of World War II—has acknowledged these threats to peace and stability in the world and has been predicated on the proposition that the national security of the United States is promoted by the development of independent, self-supporting nations—nations achieving political and economic progress through free institutions.

And so, our foreign aid program is both a humanitarian effort to help underprivileged people and an ideological war against communism. But it is even more than these. It is also a bold market development effort opening the way for the greatest trade expansion the world has ever known.

The untapped potential for expansion of our export markets are the nations to whom we are now providing economic assistance. These countries will have an ever-increasing impact on foreign trade. We must not overlook the fact that they contain more than 50 percent of the population of the free world. This is an enormous market potential when we consider that the European Common Market and the United Kingdom combined comprise only 10 percent of the free world population.

These, then, are the reasons—the unchanged reasons—for our foreign aid efforts. But, while they have remained constant, our programs—their content, thrust, and objectives—have not—even though so many Americans seem to have the notion that our aid programs have gone along—year after year—without change. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Ten or twelve years ago, the great majority of our assistance went to Western Europe and Japan. Today the great bulk of it goes to the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

A decade ago, the United States was the only nation providing assistance to others. The provision of assistance is today, however, a matter for many nations, not just one. The Western European countries, Japan, and Canada, together are providing as much assistance in relation to their national incomes as we are.

Today, half a dozen more countries are following in the footsteps of Europe and Japan: Greece, Taiwan, Israel, Mexico, Venezuela, the Philippines—all are achieving substantial economic progress—and approaching the end of the need for economic assistance. Some of these countries—such as Israel and Taiwan—are themselves beginning to offer technical assistance to less-developed countries.

Today, the bulk of economic assistance is going to a dozen or 15 countries—India, Pakistan, Nigeria, are examples—countries which are making solid progress in mobilizing their own resources—countries that are applying sound economic and fiscal policies while building the basic institutions needed in a developing society. Economic aid will be necessary for these countries for sometime to come, but we can see marked progress.

Furthermore, the program today is mostly in the form of loans, repayable in dollars. In the Marshall plan days—it was mostly grants.

A few years ago most foreign-aid appropriations were spent abroad. Today most of them are spent in the United States. Of today's appropriations, over 80 percent will be used to purchase goods and services right here in the United States.

Finally, we are placing far greater emphasis on drawing into the foreign-aid program resources from the private sector of the American economy. This includes private business resources—of skill and know-how as well as of capital. But it goes far beyond business resources. We are drawing on the competence of cooperatives, of universities, of savings and loan associations, of State and local governments. In short, we are seeking more and more to use the many faceted skills of the American society to help other countries achieve economic development.

I have mentioned the reasons for foreign aid, and the changes in our programs and objectives.

Now, let us examine how we accomplish our purpose.

We assist each aid recipient country to mobilize, increase, and apply its own resources in strengthening its own economy. To this, we add additional resources in a joint effort to achieve stability and economic growth.

Our assistance takes many forms. It may be the trained experts we send who give technical advice—technical assistance. Or, we may provide the foreign exchange needed to buy capital equipment or consumer goods. It may be surplus agricultural commodities.

Technical assistance programs cover the wide range of modern public and private enterprise—from public administration and tax collection, to agrculture, education, and homebuilding—from the introduction of health services to the building of dams.

Impressive and diverse as our efforts are, they are not limited to technical assistance.

Development loans enable many of the emerging nations to proceed with development hitherto stymied by the lack of foreign exchange. These loans provide capital for investment or for supplying imports essential for economic growth.

They are classified as either project or program loans. Project loans are directed to the development of key facilities—power, communication and transportation, education, and the like. Program loans help finance general import requirements.

Program loans offer distinct benefits for the American business community. A recent survey provided conclusive evidence that in 32 countries receiving about 80 percent of all AID assistance between 1957 and 1962, total imports from commercial sources in the United States rose four times as fast as total economic aid.

We help in other ways, too.

Our farm abundance—unprecedented in history—is, as President Kennedy stated in his farm message, "An increasingly important tool of American foreign policy." We are turning our agriculture abundance away from a surplus disposal problem into a broader and brighter objective—economic development and the elimination of human hardship and suffering.

I would like to cover briefly the solid accomplishments under those aspects of the food-for-peace program for which AID has administrative responsibility.

We Americans can take pride in the fact that during the past fiscal year 100 million undernourished people have shared in our agricultural abundance. They included refugees fleeing persecution and disaster victims uprooted by flood, earthquake, and drought. Forty million school children—many of whom were too hungry to attend classes previously—received approximately 1½ million tons of food in classrooms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In some areas attendance has doubled since the inception of the school lunch program. Almost 4 million institutionalized people were fed. More than 26 million poverty-stricken families in areas of chronic hunger and malnutrition received direct food assistance during this past year.

The school lunch program has special significance, because of its immediate and dramatic impact, because of its lasting impression on a whole new generation; a generation helped to maturity by American generosity and concern demonstrated in tangible terms.

This pamphlet, for example, written in Spanish, contains recipes calling for the use of cornmeal in the preparation of such foods as bread and rolls. It is to be distributed under the food-for-peace school lunch program to more than 150,000 Latin American schools receiving American cornmeal—schools where more than 8 million schoolchildren—25 percent of that continent's school age population—are growing up—becoming accustomed to eating American-style cornmeal products.

Food is also providing an incentive for many self-help community development projects around the world. In 19 countries, an estimated 585,000 laborers are earning food as part payment of wages. Including their families, the total number of recipients of food under this program exceeds 3 million people.

The economic development contributions of this food-for-wages program are particularly noteworthy.

Gainful employment is being given to idle hands in a constructive economic development effort having a direct impact on the people in their own villages.

For instance, in the Somali Republic, 4,500 people are receiving food earned by road construction work—in Free China, more than 25,000 persons are being fed for labor performed in rural reconstruction and resettlement, flood control, reforestation and

road construction projects. In Dahomey, cornmeal is being used as partial payment of wages in a program to resettle young farmers.

Unemployed youths—engaged in government-sponsored reforestation programs in the Philippines—are assisted by the donation of American cornmeal to supplement their diet.

School construction, land reclamation, farmers' cooperatives—an almost endless variety of economic development projects are being carried on—using food instead of dollars, to pay labor component costs.

And cornmeal played its part in these development projects. During fiscal year 1963—almost 550 million pounds of American cornmeal was granted or donated under these food-for-peace programs.

Another signficant contribution is being made to our aid efforts around the world through the title I and title IV sales programs in which the food moves through regular commercial channels of trade. The Department of Agriculture determines the commodities that are available for programing, and in consultation with other agencies, notably AID, determines the commodities to be included in specific sales agreements.

Since the inception of the program in July 1954, 358 sales agreements have been entered into with 46 countries for the sale for foreign currency of more than $13 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities. The program of long-term sales for dollars under title IV did not start until 2 years ago—but it had already reached the $145 million mark as of last July.

While it is impossible to estimate the millions of recipients aided by this huge input, these sales programs have prevented inflation causing food shortages in many underdeveloped areas of the world. At the same time, they have generated the billions of dollars worth of local currencies used by AID to grant or lend back to the purchasing countries for a vast array of economic development programs.

Portions of the local currencies generated by these sales have also been made available as loans to private investors for industrial development abroad. Disbursements have been authorized for investment loans in newly developing countries for such enterprises as low-cost housing and mining projects as well as paper, glass and pharmaceutical manufacturing plants.

And food-for-peace agreements have made available additional millions for U.S. Government uses—including embassy costs abroad, market development promotion for American agriculture, financing of our cultural exchange program and translation of books and periodicals for the U.S. Information Service.

Quite often, we hear displeasure expressed by those who expect aid recipients to be obedient and in complete agreement with us in every matter. But shouldn't we expect disagreements and some problems with truly independent nations? We are not trying to build American satellites.

And, some are dismayed by the high cost of foreign aid. Questions are raised as to whether we can afford the cost of these programs.

Foreign aid accounts for less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product. It accounts for less than one-twelfth of our defense budget—and for less than one twenty-fifth of our total budget. By this I do not mean to minimize the investment—but I do suggest that we can afford the cost.

Despite the examples I have given, you may still wonder about the overall success of the foreign assistance program. You may point to the fact that only within the past year, democracy has been successfully challenged in Latin America.

It is true that there have been some reverses. The recent military coups in Latin America are discouraging.

But is it not reasonable to expect some setbacks?

We are attempting to overcome formidable barriers to the achievement of economic progress and political stability. We are faced with obstacles interposed by hunger, ignorance and disease—hampered by deep-rooted obstructions built by archaic political and social institutions—delayed by barriers erected by ancient tribal or national rivalries.

But, we can point with pride to the fact that—of the 46 countries which the United States recognized as becoming independent since the midpoint of World War II—not one has chosen a Communist form of government—nor have any been lured behind the Iron Curtain.

Western Europe and Japan are free and prosperous. Venezuela, Mexico, Israel, Greece, and Free China are rapidly approaching a condition of self-sustaining growth. In a relatively short time, our programs will phase out in these countries. And, hopefully, the others, too, will reach their development goals with encouragement and assistance from the more prosperous countries of the free world.

Lord Russell Could Learn From Roy Wilkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 7, 1963:

LORD RUSSELL COULD LEARN FROM ROY WILKINS

More than 200,000 Negroes last week proved, with as much precision and logic as Bertrand Russell ever employed in the full power of his reasoning, that the famous British philosopher is an ass.

He branded the freedom march on Washington as an indication of a sick nation. The Negroes, who were welcomed to the U.S. Capital in the spirit of a government that has traditionally regarded petitions for the redress of wrongs as a sacred right, revealed that the mind, heart, and conscience of America are sound.

The Russell who once goaded and inspired men by a massive intelligence and faultless argument is now a shadow of his former self.

For Lord Russell the soul of America is George Lincoln Rockwell and the Klu Klux Klan. He pictures the country as a place where a Negro can still be shot down at will, where a black man's casual glance at a white girl can send him to the gas chamber, where the number of Negroes who have died through torture, lonely murder, and systematic maltreatment in the course of the last 300 years without doubt is in excess of those killed by the Nazis during their unparalleled barbarism in Europe.

On what does the eminent philosopher base this unqualified judgment? On figures? He offers none and, indeed, there are none to substantiate this baseless and unconscionable charge.

Authorities estimate that up to 1860, when the slave trade in the United States ceased, some 800,000 Negroes were imported. There are differing estimates as to the number who died on the way and no reliable statistics on the extent of the death rate from maltreatment in the South.

Trying to arrive at a correct mortality figure is a grisly business. Undoubtedly the facts, if they could be determined, are shameful.

But how can they be compared with the Nazi death toll of more than 6 million, not counting the military casualties? This slaughter was accomplished by the design of the Nazi government. But the powers in Washington did not order the seizure of Africans. Most of the slaves were smuggled into the United States after 1808, when the nefarious trade became illegal under the Constitution.

Has Lord Russell forgotten the Civil War, which was fought and won because the majority of the American people would not tolerate the disregard of human dignity and freedom? How cavalierly he dismisses the fact that it is the present administration in Washington which has taken the leadership in the civil rights issue, that integration is backed by the highest Court in the land, that the Washington march was not simply a Negro demonstration but an expression of the aspiration of America, black and white, Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jew.

As a fellow-traveler, Lord Russell's view is tainted by admiration of the system fashioned out of Moscow and Peiping. Well, let him take note of the response of Roy Wilkins, director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, to the message from Red China on the occasion of the march on Washington:

"May the day come where 100,000 strong will march to Peiping for the redress of grievances and be welcomed as the Negroes are welcomed in Washington."

Business Magazine Criticizes Slashes in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's leading business magazines, Forbes magazine published in New York, has recently criticized the slashes made in the foreign aid bill on the House floor and by the Senate Committee. In an editorial entitled "Cut or Slash Foreign Aid?" this outstanding publication, known for its coverage of business news, said that the "sudden abandonment of foreign aid support" which would result from these cuts "would have catastrophic consequences."

While recognizing that some cuts needed to be made, and that improvements need to be made in the foreign aid program, Forbes magazine said:

The foreign aid program in past years has been sustained by its evident overall success. The economic recovery and prosperity of Western Europe demonstrated it. The fact that, with one notable exception, communism has not been able to subvert through internal machination other lands friendly to the West or neutral in the struggle between freedom and slavery demonstrated it.

The soundness, the pluses of this oversea investment in our own security still exist.

I commend Forbes magazine, known for its hardheaded, businesslike approach to national and international problems, for this excellent editorial, and I also commend the editorial to my colleagues.

CUT OR SLASH FOREIGN AID?

When Gen. Lucius Clay's Kennedy-appointed committee studying foreign aid recommended reducing this year's appropriations from $4.5 to $4.1 billion, it was received with almost unanimous enthusiasm. Traditionally bitter opponents of any aid whatsoever applauded the recommendation of a cut. Those who believe in the soundness of foreign aid applauded this sensible attempt to knock out questionable undertakings which were jeopardizing congressional support for the overall program.

In subsequent hearings, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee lopped off $380 million. Amendments from the floor before House passage knocked out $585 million on top of some $430 million cut by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. And it is widely predicted that Congressman OTTO PASSMAN'S House Foreign Aid Subcommittee will knock off $700 million more.

The Clay Committee recommendations were for a cut. The actions of the Senate committee can be considered a further cut. The floor vote and the anticipated PASSMAN action are not cuts. They are really slashes with a meat ax.

What has happened?

It has always taken wisdom, foresight, leadership, hardsell, and political courage to support our huge foreign aid effort. But the program in past years has been sustained by its evident overall success. The economic recovery and prosperity of Western Europe demonstrated it. The fact that, with one notable exception, communism has not been able to subvert through internal machination other lands friendly to the West or "neutral" in the struggle between freedom and slavery demonstrated it.

But as our allies have prospered, they have been unwilling to lend much of a hand in the succoring of newly independent, undeveloped lands. Despite growing free world prosperity the amounts asked for foreign aid have not diminished. The recipients have often come to look on dollars from Uncle Sam as their due, and these presumptions have become increasingly irritating to overtaxed Americans.

One irritating example: Algeria's Ben Bella announcing that his support of Castro was "costing" him multiple millions of American aid. He gets "only" $1.8 million in aid and around 300,000 tons of food a year. Another: the Indian Cabinet member who declared that if we don't give them their $1.5 billion steel plant, they'll build it themselves. Or Madame Nhu in Vietnam in effect telling us to go jump in the lake despite the shedding of American blood along with the spending of $3 billion in support of Vietnamese independence.

The combination of ever-increasing amounts requested for foreign aid; some inevitable waste and corruption in the spending of it; the presumption and gall on the part of a number of condescending accepters of it; plus our evermore dangerous gold imbalance, have all built up to the point where much of the public—hence the Congress—is fed up.

Unfortunately for the national weal, it looks more and more as though the Republican leadership is determined to exploit the popular temper on a purely partisan basis for the first time since Harding, former Senator Gerald P. Nye and Pearl Harbor.

It was indeed high time—past time—to begin cutting down on foreign aid. The Clay Committee cut was sizable. The Senate committee's recommended bill had more enormous reductions. But the action on the floor and the Passman prospects don't constitute reductions. If carried through, they would cut the program virtually in half in one fell swoop. The soundness, the pluses of this oversea investment in our own security still exist. The sudden abandonment of foreign aid support would have catastrophic consequences. I hope a majority of the Congress will resist the temptation to gut the program by cutting it to the extent Congressman PASSMAN desires. They are to be applauded for reducing but will not be applauded for wrecking.

Communist Subversion of Latin America—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of a series of articles on the Communist subversion of Latin America, by Charles Keely, of the Copley News Service, providing a valuable insight into this subject, about which I have been deeply concerned:

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

(Second of three articles)

(By Charles Keely)

WASHINGTON.—Cuban Maj. Maximo Canales left San Julien airbase in Cuba with five Venezuelan terrorists trained in Premier Fidel Castro's guerrilla warfare schools, and flew over the San Andres Islands off the coast of Panama.

The men parachuted into the water and were picked up by a small fishing boat which took them to Maracaibo, Venezuela. Later they joined a guerrilla force of the pro-Castro FALN organization to wage war against President Romulo Betancourt.

Subversion has replaced sugar as Cuba's top export.

Many of the thousands of Latin Americans receiving training in Cuba today are being parachuted back into their homelands. Others return to Mexico in "shrimp boats," and then go home.

According to Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone, Fidel Castro tells these trained subversives, "We will keep in touch with you, give you propaganda support, send you propaganda materials * * * secret communications methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

Venezuela, says McCone, is Castro's No. 1 target and FALN's sabotage "is the work of experts (using) advanced types of explosives."

McCone told Representative ARMISTEAD SELDEN'S (Democrat, of Alabama) Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin America that more than 200 Venezuelans received training in Cuba in 1962. He said the number is increasing this year.

The 1,500 Latin Americans who were trained in Cuba last year, according to McCone, took courses ranging from 4 weeks to a year.

They include "intensive training in sabotage, espionage, or psychological warfare."

No country in the Western Hemisphere is immune to the cancer of Castro-inspired terrorism. On November 17, 1962, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in New York City smashed a Castro-Communist plot to launch a series of terrorist attacks on department stores. The FBI reported that members of Cuba's U.N. delegation were training "a corps of Cuban Communists in the use of explosives."

The United States and its Latin neighbors have met the Communist challenge with limited success.

The Selden subcommittee recommended to President Kennedy that the United States "should be prepared to act with military force" to help any nation in danger of being overthrown by Communist subversive aggression.

The Organization of American States (OAS) has passed numerous resolutions dealing with means to counter the Castro offensive.

Yet, day by day the Cuban-trained terrorists nibble away at this false front of anti-Castro hemispheric unity.

"These wolves in sheep's clothing are the greatest danger ever to threaten the country," explained Colombian President Guillermo Leon Valencia on September 25.

On October 2, Radio Havana warned the Nicaraguan Government "to take care." Broadcasting from Cuba, a woman identified as Blanca Sandino, daughter of the late Nicaraguan rebel bandit, regularly incites Nicaraguans to rebel and join pro-Castro guerrillas whom she says already are operating in the country.

The Cuban Student Directorate in Exile claims that 100 instructors, trained in Cuba, have organized a Colombian guerrilla force of more than 1,600, broken into 13 groups in five territorial areas.

Tony Varona, former Cuban Foreign Minister and leader of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, told Congress that the international Communist movement is enlisting volunteers in all 19 Latin countries. The objective, he said, is to build a people's army of 400,000 men, 100,000 women, and 200,000 reserves to "defend Cuba in the event of aggression."

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, House Joint Resolution 800, to establish a World War I Commemorative Commission.

This Commission would plan appropriate observances of our entry into World War I and our eventual victory. In addition, it would seek to stimulate and encourage scholarship concerning the causes, conduct, and effects of the war and to expand public knowledge and understanding of the goals of the war and the extent to which they were realized before more years slip away and the facts become colder.

With another global conflict endured in the intervening years since the First World War, and with the ever-present threat of another catastrophic war, a little time to study and consider the first struggle to "make the world safe for democracy" should be time well spent.

There is still another reason that I propose this Commission at this time. More than 4,355,000 Americans served in our Armed Forces during World War I. During the war, 126,000 died and hun-

dreds of thousands have passed away since that time.

The majority of World War I veterans still remain, however, and in commemorating the significant events of the war upon their 50th anniversaries we have a rather unique opportunity to do honor to the brave men and women who defended us while they are still with us. It is certainly appropriate that we observe those to whom we owe so much by various ceremonies honoring the dead; in noting the forthcoming anniversaries of World War I we can pay particular homage to the thousands of veterans still among us, and through them honor their comrades who have gone on.

It is not too early to be planning these observances.

We entered World War I on April 6, 1917, the 50th anniversary of which is 3½ years hence. An appropriate observance of that anniversary would require public notice of some of the events which preceded it. To adequately plan and prepare the schedule of events and related programs, the Commission should be under full steam by mid-1965.

Rather than have the Congress in any way "buy a pig in a poke" I would further suggest that the Commission begin with preparing a preliminary plan, so that it can then return to the Congress with its specific proposals and an indication of what funds it will require.

To allow adequate time for this plan to be prepared and to be submitted to the Congress by mid-1965, the Commission should be established during 1964. With a view to allowing adequate consideration and deliberate progress through the various committees and the Congress, and in the hope of seeing it enacted during the next year, I am submitting the bill at this time and bringing it to the attention of my colleagues.

I have heard some say that we are going to extremes in celebrating various historic occasions; and that some of the observances planned are far too elaborate and involved. In offering this proposal, it is my hope that the Commission would show appropriate restraint in the type and number of programs it undertakes, in keeping with the great, sad dignity of the events it honors.

A carnival is not the appropriate observance of the carnage of the battlefield. A circus does not properly mark the suffering of a great war. The conflict of great nations and great ideals is not fittingly noted with Sunday afternoon skirmishes.

"Lest we forget" has become the common reminder of our obligation to remember our honored dead. In truth it is a privilege to recall the sacrifice and devotion of this Nation's defenders, living and dead, for what greater proof could there be of the great worth of this Nation, in which we all share.

Only at our great peril could we forget or ignore them. What greater bulwark is there for us today than the remembrance of those brave countrymen who risked their lives in defense of our freedom. We need the inspiration and rededication which the memory of their devotion gives us.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will give earnest consideration to this proposal and that it will move promptly toward enactment.

Punish Guilty in Ohio State Employment Service Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the closing items in the Plain Dealer exposé of falsified records in the Cleveland employment service office. I agree entirely with the Plain Dealer editorial which demands punishment of the guilty parties.

PUNISH GUILTY IN OHIO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE MESS

Plain Dealer revelations of falsification of records in the Cleveland office of the Ohio State Employment Service should bring action from the Federal Government on two fronts.

Those guilty should be prosecuted for falsification of public records.

Conditions in other public employment services should be investigated to determine whether there has been similar faking.

The Federal Government is involved because it pays the OSES budget and because its policy of encouraging the overbuilding of staffs in OSES offices seems at the bottom of the mess here.

It is difficult to understand the attitude of the Federal official under whose jurisdiction the local office falls. Quite evidently, according to his remarks quoted in the Plain Dealer today, he is not going out of his way to investigate the possibilities of faking anywhere else, and he is not going to take the initiative in attempting to punish any who violated the law here.

It is clear that the Government's metropolitan plan, which built unnecessarily large public employment staffs on some kind of bureaucratic vision that perhaps they would be needed someday, was a tempting invitation to cheating.

Some people in the Cleveland office concluded that the way to maintain the extra staff was to make believe it was necessary to show that jobs had been found for applicants when they had not been.

The situation here was a perfect example of how Government bureaucracy builds on itself. The aim is to spend, not to conserve; to enroll more Indians so there can be more chiefs.

While the prime responsibility for action lies with the Federal Government, State officials should consider again the possibility of pressing civil service charges against principals in the falsification.

This serious matter must not wind up with no punitive action against public employees who cheated at work.

OHIO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE CASE PROBE PLANNED BY CORRIGAN

(By Sanford Watzman)

COLUMBUS.—Cuyahoga County Prosecutor John T. Corrigan asserted yesterday that public employees who falsified records of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES) in Cleveland apparently violated a State law.

"My position is that I'm committed to prosecute whenever the law is broken," Corrigan said. "All I know of the situation now is what I have read in the Plain Dealer. But I expect to get official information soon."

Corrigan's reaction was the first from any State or local enforcement official since the Plain Dealer disclosed in a series of articles that records were manipulated to justify jobs on the State payroll.

Eight persons employed by the OSES in the Gilman Building have made affidavits admitting that they falsified job placement records. Several others conceded that they knew this was going on, and one person said he gave orders that the records be altered.

Corrigan, in a telephone interview, cited section 2913.06 of the Ohio Revised Code. It prescribes a penalty of 3 months in prison or a $300 fine (or both) for doctoring public records. Corrigan said it was his opinion that this law could be used as a basis for prosecution.

He had his staff make a search of the statute books after he read the Plain Dealer series. Earlier, the office of the State attorney general checked the code informally and reported there was no State law to cover the situation. The section cited by Corrigan was overlooked.

The prosecutor said he expected the bureau of unemployment compensation (BUC), parent agency of the OSES, to send him findings of its investigation. If he does not hear from BUC this week he will ask the agency for the data, he added.

Willard P. Dudley, BUC administrator, told the Plain Dealer here: "I will not take the initiative, but I will cooperate with Mr. Corrigan or any other enforcement official and supply whatever information is required. I've already said that my primary interest was to stop the falsifying, and I've done that."

What the Federal Government intends to do is still not clear. Merle M. McCurdy, U.S. attorney in Cleveland, has said he asked for a report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

The U.S. Labor Department has warned OSES offices around the country that false reporting would be an infraction of title 18, section 1001 of the United States Code, which carries a penalty of 5 years in prison or a $10,000 fine, or both.

The Federal Government pays for public employment programs, with the States acting as administrators.

FBI ASKED FOR REPORT ON OHIO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

U.S. District Attorney Merle M. McCurdy told the Plain Dealer last night he had asked the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a report on falsification of public records in the Cleveland office of the Ohio State Employment Service (OSES).

The report, McCurdy said, "is to determine whether there were Federal violations."

The Federal Government provides the budget for OSES. A Plain Dealer series by Sanford Watzman of the Columbus bureau detailed how OSES workers here falsified records to show more job placements than were actually obtained.

Title 18, section 1001, of the U.S. Code prescribes a penalty of up to 5 years in prison or a $10,000 fine or both for falsification of public records.

McCurdy said last night information he had on the OSES records limited to what he had read in the Plain Dealer. Based on that, McCurdy said, he did not think there were Federal violations, but there appeared to have been State violations.

He said he should receive the report from local FBI officers "in a few days."

Smoking Death Toll Climbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 7476, which would require that cigarettes be labeled as being dangerous to health. The Family Economics Bureau of the Northwestern National Life Insurance Co. of Minneapolis has furnished me with a copy of an article indicating that emphysema now kills more people than tuberculosis and that this dread disease is tied to cigarette smoking. I feel duty bound to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

EMPHYSEMA NOW KILLS MORE THAN TUBERCULOSIS—DEATH TOLL CONTINUES CLIMB; TIED TO GROWTH IN SMOKING

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—A sneaking, rarely seen disease half a century ago, it has rocketed into the ranks of major killers in the past few years. Its rapid rise is unmistakably tied in with the spectacular increase in cigarette consumption over the past several decades, says a report from the medical department of Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.

The new contender for a killer championship rating is called by the formidable title, "pulmonary obstructive emphysema." In this disease, the air sacs of the lungs are gradually destroyed; its victims actually die of slow suffocation.

In 1961 emphysema caught and passed tuberculosis as a cause of death. U.S. Government mortality statistics record it as the cause of eight times as many deaths in 1961 as in 1950. All indications are that its ominous rise will continue.

Why this sudden emergence of a new menace to life and health?

Until the past 20 or 25 years, emphysema was caused almost entirely by the aftereffects of previous asthma, healed tuberculosis, and other respiratory diseases. Today those causes by themselves account for only about 6 percent of the cases of emphysema coming to doctors' attention. They contribute to perhaps another 10 percent of cases in combination with lung irritation from various air pollutants such as tobacco smoke, smog, and industrial wastes.

For the overwhelming remainder—about five out every six cases of emphysma detected and studied today—by far the greatest and generally the only traceable cause is lung damage from tobacco smoke.

Clinical records covering large groups of emphysema patients reveal that it takes some 20 years of pack-a-day cigarette smoking to develop the average case of full-blown emphysema. Most of its victims are men of 50 or over.

Nine out of ten emphysema patients are long-time smokers. Three out of four smoke a pack or more of cigarettes per day, compared with one man out of three in the general population over age 50 who smokes that much.

Some part of the huge statistical increase in recorded deaths from emphysema is undoubtedly due to improved recognition and medical classification of primary causes of death. For example, emphysema is being recognized as the underlying cause of an increasing number of heart deaths, and is being recorded as the primary cause. Since this progress in recognition still has some distance to go, number of deaths caused by emphysema was almost certainly considerably greater than the 10,269 reported on death certificates in 1961, and the disease will continue to be understated for some years to come.

Recent large-scale medical studies, however, have piled up massive evidence that in the accelerating rise in emphysema cases and emphysema deaths since 1950, we are watching essentially the cold, factual results of 20 to 30 years of heavy cigarette addiction by millions of people, added to customer lists as cigarette consumption zoomed more than 700 percent from 1920 to 1950.

Following are some of these typical published studies:

The extensive Auerbach post mortem studies of lungs from smokers and nonsmokers who had died from various causes revealed that the smokers had developed definite thickening of the walls of the small arteries, thickening of the walls of the arterioles, and thickening of the walls of the alveoli (air cells), in proportion to the amounts smoked. These are the characteristic changes which gradually develop into chronic emphysema. There were very few instances of any thickening in the lung structures of nonsmokers.

A 1959 study of 221 persons normal except for smoking habits, made by a University of Minnesota group of physicians, found noteworthy deterioration in the lungs of all subjects who smoked a pack of cigarettes or more a day.

A later similar study by Texas doctors was made of two groups of formerly rural residents now living in Dallas. The subjects had no history of exposure to air pollution other than cigarette smoke. The study found the effects of smoking far reaching in the population. It found that most smokers have some degree of diseased condition in the lungs or bronchial structure. It found that none who had smoked a pack of cigarettes a day over a long period of time had lungs which functioned normally.

A 1962 study of emphysema patients, nearly all males over 50, treated at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., found that 94 percent were smokers compared to 49 percent of male smokers in that age group in the general population. Very few of the emphysema patients had any record of previous respiratory disease or other causative factor except long-continued smoking.

A study of emphysema patients by a Boston group of doctors in 1955 found that 77 percent of the male patients (all over 50 years of age) smoked a pack or more of cigarettes a day. A recent study of smoking in the general population by another team of doctors has reported that only a third of the males over 50 in the general population average as much as a pack of cigarettes a day. After extensive study of the patients and their records, and subsequent observations of additional emphysema patients, the report of the Boston study concluded: "The evidence indicates that in the New England area and in the age group over 50, smoking is the major cause of emphysema."

A group of doctors at Loma Linda University School of Medicine in Los Angeles in 1962 checked records of emphysema deaths among California Seventh-day Adventists, exposed to approximately the same air pollution as other Californians, but who, as a matter of religion, rarely smoke cigarettes. Had the Adventists been subject to the same death rate from emphysema as the general California population, 22 deaths would have occurred in the period studied. Instead only four deaths occurred among Adventists; of these, three were longtime cigarette smokers; the habits of the fourth could not be ascertained. Another 51 deaths in which emphysema was a contributing cause would have occurred among them had they been subject to the general California population death rate in this classification; instead only 14 such deaths were recorded among the Adventists; most of these victims were longtime cigarette smokers.

In 1962 a University of Iowa physician investigated 10 cases of advanced emphysema which were diagnosed at the unusually early ages of from 29 to 39, and found that none had any history of other previous lung disease but all had smoked for 10 years or more.

Communist Subversion of Latin America—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, this is the third of a series of articles on the Communist subversion of Latin America, by Charles Keely, of the Copley News Service, providing a valuable insight into this subject, about which I have been deeply concerned:

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION OF LATIN AMERICA

(Last of three articles)

(By Charles Keely)

WASHINGTON.—On September 12, Cuban-trained Colombian rebels kidnapped wealthy cattleman German Mejia Duque and held him for $250,000 ranson.

During the 6 days he spent in the insurgents' camp before his rescue by army troops, Mejia said a Cuban plane flew over the area and dropped weapons, propaganda, and other material to Premier Fidel Castro's look-alike guerrilla leader Federico Arango Fonnegra.

The bearded Arango told Mejia that Castro recently had sent him $20,000 with a warning that this would be the last financial support he would get if his terrorists did not "accomplish a decisive operation" against the government.

Colombian Interior Minister Aurelio Camacho Rueda said Castro is openly intervening in Colombia by "sending arms and money from Cuba to the bandits and the offering of scholarships to Colombian students to study guerrilla warfare and terrorist techniques in Havana."

Twelve tons of Communist propaganda is discovered monthly by Panama's customs authorities, according to Central Intelligence Agency Director John McCone. Another 10 tons comes into Costa Rica.

"Castro is strengthening his position" in the wake of last October's missile crisis, says Costa Rican Preisdent Francisco Orlich.

"I expect continuous, increased attempts at agitation here."

Former Guatemalan President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes charged last February that since late 1959 Russian submarines have been reaching the Central American Pacific and Atlantic coasts to unload men and arms.

Cuba has clearly become an open floodgate for a torrent of terrorists. They flood a politically parched Latin America, sowing seeds of subversion.

When Castro can't finance them, they turn to other sources of income.

Peruvian guerrillas, teamed with "ordinary criminals," robbed a Lima bank last year of $100,000 and split the loot 50–50, McCone told a congressional subcommittee several months ago.

Venezuelan pro-Castro terrorists robbed a bank last February of $25,000.

"The principle that guerrillas must be self-sustaining has obviously been applied to finances," McCone explained.

But he added that there are also involved bank transfers by which Cuban money eventually reaches Latin American Communist-front groups.

One such example was outlined here several weeks ago by British Guianese Sen. Anne Jardim, who revealed documents showing the transfer of $1 million from Russia through Cuba to Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan, the Communists' best friend in South America.

Castro sounded the keynote for Cuban subversion on July 26, 1960.

"We promise to continue making Cuba the example that can convert the Cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the American continent," he said.

He has restated this goal on countless occasions, with the full blessing of Moscow and Peiping.

Intelligence sources say Castro's subversive pipeline to Latin America today is his growing "fishing fleet."

With the help of the Japanese, Castro has built an estimated 169 fishing vessels, though Hurricane Flora reportedly sunk 39. These vessels carry their subversive cargoes between Cuba and Latin America.

An Organization of American States (OAS) security committee has reported that this Communist advance in the Western Hemisphere is due mainly to the lack of information regarding its true aims.

Col. Jose Luis Cruz Salazar, Guatemalan politician and soldier, told Congress February 27 that the Communist menace is not speculation.

"It is a reality, and we must open our eyes to it," he said.

Letter to Editor Explains United States Steel's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, 1963, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a verbatim transcript of Mr. Roger M. Blough's press conference of October 29, in which he stated very forthrightly his concept of the role of business in race relations, with particular reference to the situation in Birmingham, Ala.—hometown of United States Steel's TCI Division. It seems to me that every thoughtful American will agree that Mr. Blough and his company are applying the right policy in answer to recent suggestions that business enterprises level economic sanctions against local communities in order to work so-called social reforms.

I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter Mr. Blough has written to the editor of the New York Times newspaper and which was published in the Times in its issue of November 7, 1963. This letter further clarifies United States Steel's policy in its relations with local communities and I particularly applaud Mr. Blough's statement that:

Any attempt by a private organization like United States Steel to impose its views, its beliefs, and its will upon the community by resorting to economic compulsion or coercion would be repugnant to our American constitutional concepts.

I urge all Members of Congress to read Mr. Blough's letter.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 7, 1963]

LETTERS TO THE TIMES: UNITED STATES STEEL'S POSITION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

From your October 31 editorial "Corporate Race Relations" it would appear that you are under considerable misapprehension as to what I said in my press conference of the previous day concerning the policy and actions of United States Steel in Birmingham. For example, you said:

"Mr. Blough feels that United States Steel has fulfilled its responsibilities by following a nondiscriminatory hiring policy in Birmingham, and looks upon any other measures as both 'repugnant' and 'quite beyond what a corporation should do' to improve conditions."

Quite to the contrary, I recounted in some detail the efforts of United States Steel management to use its influence in Birmingham to promote better communications and better understanding between the races—not just during the recent crises but over a period of many years.

Unfortunately, the able representatives of the Times who attended that press conference made only casual reference to this part of my remarks in their stories. For your information, therefore, and for the information of your readers, I should like to summarize the specific statements I made on this point:

The present president of our Tennessee Coal and Iron Division, Arthur Wiebel, has been working since 1946 toward developing understanding and strengthening communications between the races in Birmingham.

In 1949 he became a trustee of the Jefferson County Coordinating Council of Social Forces devoted to civic and social improvement.

REMARKS MADE

In 1951 an interracial committee of this council, with Mr. Wiebel as a member, was formed to improve the lot of the Negroes in many fields: health, sanitation, safety, business, housing, and cultural and recreational opportunities. That same year the committee made a formal request that the Birmingham city government employ Negro policemen. That request was denied.

Mr. Wiebel worked, for example, for a Negro upper middle class housing project considered as attractive as any in that economic range anywhere in the Nation. He helped get Negro insurance companies and investors in Birmingham to make home mortgage money available to Negroes.

From 1953 to 1961 he was a trustee of Tuskegee Institute, an outstanding Negro institution of higher learning.

As a member of the senior citizens committee, last May when serious racial problems occurred in Birmingham he devoted as much time and effort as anyone there in trying to resolve this matter. More recently he has worked in cooperation with General Royall and Colonel Blaik, and was 1 of 44 business leaders endorsing a recent public appeal for the employment of qualified Negroes on the Birmingham police force.

COMPANY POLICY

Mr. Wiebel has also been active in the United Fund, which supports Negro welfare activities, and in the Red Cross. He is a charter member of the Committee of a Hundred, devoted to bringing new industry to Birmingham, and in more ways than I can recount he has tried to carry out what is our overall United States Steel policy of being a good citizen in the community in which we live.

I also said that as individuals we can exercise what influence we may have as citizens, but for a corporation to attempt to exert any kind of economic compulsion to achieve a particular end in the social area seems to me to be quite beyond what a corporation should do, and quite beyond what a corporation can do.

To recapitulate, then, let me make our position perfectly clear:

I believe that United States Steel in its own plants should provide equal opportunities for all employees, and that it does so in Birmingham, as the Times recently reported.

I believe that United States Steel management people, as citizens, should use their influence persuasively to help resolve the problems of their communities wherever they may be—and that they are doing so in Birmingham.

I believe that while Government—through the proper exercise of its legislative and administrative powers—may seek to compel social reforms, any attempt by a private organization like United States Steel to impose its views, its beliefs, and its will upon the community by resorting to economic compulsion or coercion would be repugnant to our American constitutional concepts, and that appropriate steps to correct this abuse of corporate power would be universally demanded by public opinion, by Government, and by the New York Times.

So, even if United States Steel possessed such economic power—which it certainly does not—I would be unalterably opposed to its use in this fashion.

We shall, however, continue to use our best efforts in Birmingham to be as helpful as possible.

ROGER BLOUGH,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
United States Steel Corp.

NEW YORK, *November 2, 1963.*

Resolution on Narcotic Addiction—A Medical Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the Indiana State Medical Association on October 15, 1963:

Whereas the problem of narcotic addiction is annually becoming more widespread, involving not only human derelicts and degenerates in search of oblivion, but also teenagers seeking thrills and who are willing to listen to a pusher who has an economic interest in procuring victims; and,

Whereas the present policy of the Bureau of Narcotics in treating narcotic addiction as a criminal rather than a medical problem has produced notoriously poor results, in that it has furnished organized crime a huge captive market for the sale of narcotics at fantastic prices, and has established for this most unsavory segment of society a profit motive for the dissemination of narcotics to anyone who can be induced to succumb to their use; and

Whereas narcotic addiction is clearly an illness and as such is properly within the province and responsibility of the medical profession for management and treatment in the individual and for study and research of the disease in general; and

Whereas a changing attitude in regard to narcotic addiction has been recently apparent in statements from the American Medical Association and from certain Federal health agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Indiana State Medical Association, That:

1. That the Indiana State Medical Association shall convey to the American Medical Association and to all Indiana Representatives and Senators in Congress its concern about the growing problem of narcotic addiction and its firm conviction that progress toward the control of this problem will come only upon its recognition as a medical problem and the removal of a profit incentive from the distribution of narcotics.

2. That this association offers its full support and cooperation to the American Medical Association and other health agencies in the study of this problem, with a view to the revision of existing laws and administrative rules and attitudes.

3. That the individual members of this association are encouraged to lend their support to the study and solution of this problem by exerting their influence as doctors and citizens in their local communities.

The Staff of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is strange but when all the chips are down, the world awakens to the simple but forceful truth. After all the bombs, propaganda, tensions and tumult, life still depends upon the needs of the human body and wheat becomes a symbol of these needs as bitter antagonists in the world of power politics sit down to a peaceful deal for the sale and the purchase of this most basic of all human needs, food.

One may applaud the gesture on our part as humanitarian except for the attempt to justify trading with the enemy by placing this wheat deal on purely an economic base.

How much better for the conscience of America, the propaganda of our friendly allies, and the pages of history, if we met the need of our competitor for world leadership and supremacy, for wheat, and added this to our long list of charity, giveaway, foreign aid, mutual assistance or what have you. We continue to hide behind our sagging balance of payments in trade, our disappearing gold reserve and our unbalanced budget, our continuing and vexing wheat surplus and plainly our inability to face up to the truth. We cannot seem to make up our minds as to whether we have convinced our peoples or not, on the justification for this extraordinary deal.

For myself, as a citizen not a lawmaker, as an American, not as a citizen of all countries, this deal leaves me cold. I have been taught, I have been scheduled to the point of no return in hatred of communism and all its related evils. I find no room in my normal feelings toward others when it comes to the Communist nations.

Dealing with, associating with, trading with Communists have been taboo in our American way and I find little to cheer me up in the statements of our leaders that take this transaction in about the same light as they do any deal involving profit, convenience and new cover all; accommodation.

I have been led to believe that profits, political expediency and even tolerance are not to be given consideration when dealing with the deadly foe, communism.

Our generation of Americans have been led to believe and have become convinced—I thought—of the deceit, the trickery and the brutality of communism.

I have listened but I have not been convinced by the following arguments. These are the reasons given for this wheat deal:

First. We will benefit by reducing our deficit balance of international payments.

Second. We will save the storage on a half million tons of wheat.

Third. If we do not sell to the Russians our friends and allies will.

Fourth. After all, it is humanitarian to sell the wheat, they had a bad crop and the little people need food.

Fifth. This will ease the cold war and we can cut down on our billions of defense spending.

Sixth. The Russian people will appreciate our big heartedness and our unselfish attitude.

Seventh. Cuba will not get any of this wheat.

Eighth. It will cut our surplus and cut our national deficit.

There may be more so-called grounds for our action but this much I know, none of the above reasons can be given for open trading with Russia and the satellites. Does anyone doubt the next step in our trade deals?

We have surplus or surplus capacity and surplus labor in any and all products produced here from apples to airplanes so all the above reasons are just as valid if and when we start trading in all other goods. There has to be another reason or two for the sudden trade deal because all the reasons mentioned above have been present a long, long time.

Do not get me wrong. I am no expert on this type of trading. All I ask, is that somewhere along the line someone ought to tell one when the Russians are bad and when they are good. When do we start building our bomb shelters or when do we start tearing down the shelters already built, is the $64 question.

Just a few weeks ago Congress was convinced that we needed shelters and passed an act to help build public shelters. Maybe we can save this money now.

There is only one sound Christian and logical reason for giving wheat to Russia. We will help to feed her people if they are hungry.

We can excuse the deal only on the humanitarian base and none other so far as conscience is concerned. To say they could buy it elsewhere does not qualify the sale since they buy many millions of dollars worth of goods elsewhere that we can supply. Does this open up free trade with communism?

Flour should be given as a gift of charity to a needy human being not on the basis of dollars or other benefits for propaganda. We have put $108 billion into our efforts to lead the world and to create a peaceful coexistence, what is a couple of dollars more?

Do not forget that this talk of selling through private exporters is only to cover up the fact that Congress forbids the sale of subsidized agricultural products to Communist nations. The only way you can sell wheat is if the Government sells it to you. So we close our eyes and say it is not Government selling. Who owns the wheat?

This means that the handful of licensed wheat brokers who have no wheat except Government subsidized wheat are all of a sudden placed outside of the congressional ban on trading with the enemy in forbidden fruits.

It also means that approximately 60 cents on every bushel sold to the Communist nations comes out of the pockets of American taxpayers. Every bushel of wheat sold outside the United States costs the taxpayer about 60 cents.

Do not believe the story of reducing storage costs because this year's crop or next spring's will more than fill the hole left by this sale. If you don't cure the cause of the surplus you will never stop it with a one-shot cut price wheat sale.

The real cut in surplus will come from the defeat of the wheat referendum by the farmers since many large farmers will cut back. Next year, unless the Russians have another crop failure, or worse if they decide it is cheaper to barter with us for wheat to free their economy for more war material, the surplus will be right back where it started if our farmers do not cut back their planting. They will, since the easy money is from subsidy.

This deal reminds me of the story of the young Irish Patriot who when captured by the British was sentenced to be hanged publicly. Right before the trap was sprung he was offered his life if he would disclose his comrades and their hiding places.

He asked only one question. He said "You give me my life, for how long?" Since they could not answer the question he died with his pride and patriotism.

In closing I have this to say to my fellow Americans. I would be the last to condemn giving food to the needy no matter their color or creed or political persuasion. But I would give the wheat, not sell it. I would give it in paper bags, ground into flour with a picture of Uncle Sam on one side and a copy of our Declaration of Independence on the other.

Certainly the Russian people would get the food and the message.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I call to your attention a news story printed in the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada, October 19, 1963.

It appears that our friendly neighbors to the North appear displeased by our wheat action. One wonders why it is that "trade" can stir up the wrath of people and nations quicker than any other endeavor.

Is it because trade with anybody friend or foe, is only a commercial venture and when we boil out the propaganda and double talk it is the profit involved that stirs the emotions.

Our Canadian friends are not a bit backward about their position and appear a bit miffed by ours.

I pray we do not gain a sale and lose a friend.

Former President Harry Truman is reported to have once remarked that we should give wheat to needy China. Regardless of their position in other matters, people are people, and hunger is a universal appeal for help.

The only real danger in a commercial act of charity is the false pretense and the danger of being lulled into a condition of carelessness and lowering our guard by piling deal upon deal with a nation as yet not proven to be sincere in their efforts for peaceful coexistance.

Lenin is supposed to have said that "The capitalist world would be willing to sell to the Communists for profit, the rope with which the Communists will hang the capitalists."

I would hope we are not in this category of capitalist nations but rather a nation motivated by the concept of live and let live in all our endeavors.

It is hard to condemn a deal whether it is with Russia or anyone else when you sincerely want to believe it is done for reasons best for our Nation and our people. This we must believe.

The Canadians may be right but I doubt the prosperity of their critical news which our peoples who as yet have not fully understood the transaction. The Canadian report follows:

THE LATEST CRISIS IS THE WHEAT EXPORT FIGHT—AND THE UNITED STATES IS ACTUALLY ARGUING IN DOUBLETALK

(By J. K. Edmonds)

WINNIPEG.—When the Americans complain about the price at which Canada made its latest sale of wheat to Japan, what's really bothering them is not our pricing system, but their own.

The United States is on the special hotspot reserved for countries which have a two-price system for a commodity traded on the world market and have accumulated a large volume of surplus in store.

U.S. domestic price for its wheat is more than 50 cents above the world's. The U.S. Government supports the price by buying surplus stocks which it sells for blocked currencies, gives away, or sells on long-term credit.

Commercial sales of U.S. wheat carry a subsidy which represents the difference between the support price and the world price. When the wheat is given away to an underdeveloped country, the U.S. taxpayer feels a warm glow of generosity. When it is sold to Russia, he wonders why he should subsidize the Russian consumer. The more the volume of sales, the higher the total subsidy.

This, more than cold war politics, is what held up the Russian-United States wheat deal. Washington has been ready since the beginning of wheat sale talks to sell to Russia at the domestic price—but Russia wouldn't pay it.

Washington would have been off this spot if the world price had risen to equal the U.S. domestic price. The price was moving upward rapidly. The Canadian Wheat Board has been announcing advances in its offering price at frequent intervals since the Russian sale, even though in practice it was not selling any wheat, pending assessment of stocks, shipping probabilities, and requirements of regular customers.

With the Wheat Board out of the picture, there was some unofficial (but legal) trading in wheat at prices 10 to 12 cents above the Board's price. The prices applied to small quantities held in private hands (as a result of previous purchases from the Board) and sold to purchasers who had gambled on availability of wheat to load vessels already in transit when the wheat sales were cut off.

Washington may have expected the Wheat Board price to move up to meet the unofficial price. They charge that the Board refused to allow the forces of supply and demand to push up the price of wheat.

Whether there's anything in the charge depends on the assessment of the forces of supply and demand. What's really holding down the price of wheat is the surplus stocks in U.S. hands. If they didn't exist, or if they could be held off the market, the price would be rising faster than it is.

But the U.S. surplus stocks hang over the market for wheat at present levels of demand and prices, just as much as they did when the price of wheat was lower and dropping in August.

If the Americans had decided they'd rather give away the wheat than sell it to Russia at the world price, chances are it would still have reached Russia.

The underdeveloped countries to whom it is shipped might resell it to Communist countries in exchange for badly needed gold or foreign exchange reserves. If Washington had decided to keep the wheat in storage rather than sell to Russia at the world price, the taxpayer still would have had to pay the cost of storage, and also cope with the surplus problem next year, when the Russian demand may be much lower.

Canada has had none of these problems in dealing with Russia because we have only one price for wheat: the price announced daily by the Canadian Wheat Board. There is no Government subsidy.

This price is intended to meet or beat the price at which customers can buy equivalent grain elsewhere. This is the only price at which Canadian wheat is traded. When Russia made its big purchase, Russian traders wanted a quantity discount—but didn't get it. They bought at the market price on the day of the sale. So did Japan.

Canada does tend to lean against the market to try to iron out short-run movements of wheat prices, because the board is interested in maximizing revenues over the whole crop year, not in profit on any single sale.

The Canadian price is ordinarily slower to move than the price at Chicago or Liverpool. The board occasionally has been charged with missing chances to move wheat faster by failing to cut prices quickly enough. During the rest of this crop year, the board probably will move slowly in raising the price, because it can't afford to give long-time customers the impression it is eager to gouge them. In this sense, there may be something in Washington's complaints.

Ottawa knows how it feels to be on the spot now occupied by Washington. A few years ago, Canada was selling butter to Czechoslovakia at a price below the domestic support price in Canada. Consumer organizations and newspapers in Canada were highly critical of the government for selling butter to Communist consumers at prices below those paid by Canadians for the same stuff.

Canada also knows how it feels to be trying to hold large stocks of wheat off the market in an effort to influence the price—we tried to do it in the early 1930's.

Underlying the whole problem of competition in grain sales between Canada and the United States: Canada has exactly the same advantage in exporting wheat that the United States has over Canada in exporting automobiles—an efficient industry with high volume and low unit costs.

The effect of the U.S. price support has been to hold in the U.S. grain industry farmers whose costs are so high they can't make money at the world price. This is what handicaps American commercial sales.

It's not superior virtue that puts Canada in this position. Our grain industry is a low-cost one partly because of climate and geography, partly because the wheat land of western Canada was settled later than the farm areas of the Midwest United States, with larger units of production and lower fixed costs.

Secret CIA Sessions With Congress Units Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in the form of House Joint Resolution 211, that if enacted by Congress would provide for a joint congressional committee to serve as a "watchdog" over the activities of the CIA and our other intelligence and information agencies. Several of our colleagues have introduced similar legislation, and have expressed their concern over the lack of congressional scrutiny of our intelligence community. The public has joined in our fight for this needed legislation, and I would like to insert an article from the November 4 edition of the Evening Star that describes Congress present too limited role in overseeing the activities of the CIA:

SECRET CIA SESSIONS WITH CONGRESS UNITS HIT

The agents from the Central Intelligence Agency take their places outside the door in a lobby of Congress.

Their Director slips in. A few of his aids follow. Then come a handful of Congress Members and a single committee staff man to help them.

But no one else goes by.

The Director, John McCone, briefs the Congress Members on CIA activities. He and his aids then field questions for 2, perhaps 3 hours. No one keeps a record.

The session ends, and the Congress Members hurry back to their offices, their new knowledge locked to themselves.

This procedure, repeated perhaps two dozen times a year, is the one through which Congress keeps its eye on the vast, varied and secret operations of the CIA.

Representative LINDSAY, Republican of New York, who is not a participant in any of these sessions, is not satisfied with them. "We are working in the dark," he says, "or at least in the semitwilight."

Mr. LINDSAY and some colleagues have proposed that Congress create a joint Senate-House committee, with a full staff, to supervise closely the activities of the CIA.

But other Members of the Congress, especially those who attend the sessions, say the supervision is adequate. And they add that the CIA is far too secret and sensitive an operation to have Congress constantly peering over its shoulder.

What is the present supervision like? Does Congress look long and hard enough? How many hours? Who does the job?

Some aspects of Government surveillance are almost as hush-hush as CIA operations, but here is the partial picture pieced together from congressional sources:

Three congressional subcommittees have jurisdiction over either the operations or appropriations of the CIA.

The Senate has a six-man subcommittee made up of members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. The House has two subcommittees, one made up of 10 members of the Armed Services Committee, the other of an unknown number of members of the Appropriations Committee.

The House Armed Services Subcommittee on the CIA is headed by Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, and includes Representatives L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina; HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana; PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois; CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida; HUDDLESTON, Democrat, of Alabama; ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois; BRAY, Republican, of Indiana; BOB WILSON, Republican, of California; and OSMERS, Republican, of New Jersey.

Representative NORBLAD, Republican, of Oregon, who was a member of this subcommittee several years ago, recently told the House "We met annually, one time a year, for a period of 2 hours in which we accomplished virtually nothing."

But a present member of the subcommittee, who would not allow his name to be used, said the group now meets at least once a month with Mr. McCone and has "Frank, open, and wide discussions" lasting as long as 3 hours.

He said the subcommittee does not go into every detail of CIA operations but surveys the significant activities.

No stenographic record is kept at these sessions, which do not touch on specific appropriations for the CIA.

This is left in the hands of the Appropriations Subcommittee, which hides the CIA appropriation—believed to be more than a half-billion dollars a year—among the appropriations of various other agencies so neither the rest of Congress nor the public can know exactly how much money the Agency gets.

WON'T REVEAL NAMES

The House Appropriations Committee refuses to reveal which of its members belong to the CIA Subcommittee and how many times they meet a year.

But it is a safe guess that it meets with Mr. McCone about the same number of times as the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and that its membership includes at least Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the full committee, and Representatives MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, and FORD, Republican, of Michigan.

The members of the Senate's CIA Subcommittee are Senators RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia; HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia; STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts; HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, and MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota.

The least number of times they have met with the CIA chief in a year has been two; the most, six.

On occasion, some committee other than the three CIA subcommittees moves into the CIA act.

Just recently, for example, the House Foreign Affairs Committee had a session with Mr. McCone and John Richardson, the former head of CIA operations in Vietnam.

Khrushchev Denies Quitting Race To Put First Man on Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the enigmatical Mr. Khrushchev is like a pendulum. He swings back and forth from light to dark.

In the Washington Post of yesterday appeared the story which is below.

It is less than a week ago that the papers were carrying stories to the effect that the Russians were not going to the moon and many of those who do not understand the moon program and some who do not want to understand the moon program hailed this apparent decision by the Russians. I would like to again state that this country is not in a moon race with Russia or any other country.

In the exploration of outer space, we use the moon as a steppingstone, and the techniques which we are developing to go to the moon and to rendezvous vehicles in space are invaluable in the further exploration of space. These techniques will be invaluable to our defense effort.

Before the pendulous Mr. Khrushchev swings back to his alleged position, let us disavow completely his phony leadership.

It begins to look as if the whole setup was one to confuse and lead our people astray.

The article is as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV DENIES QUITTING RACE TO PUT FIRST MAN ON MOON

Moscow, November 6.—Premier Nikita Khrushchev denied today the impression of a U.S. businessman that the Soviet Union had given up plans to put a man on the moon.

Kendrick R. Wilson, Jr., chairman of the board of the Avco Corp., who was one of 20 Americans visiting the Kremlin, asked the Russian leader:

"Why have you given up the idea of going to the moon? Was it for economic reasons?

Khrushchev disclaimed any such thought.

"We have never said we are giving up our lunar project," he said. "You're the ones who said that.

"And when we talk about the technical possibilities of doing this, and when we have complete confidence that whoever is sent to the moon can safely be sent back, then it is quite feasible, quite possible. When, I don't know.

"As for the economic difficulties, you keep on expecting us to give up our (moon) program. Well, gentlemen, I say give up such hopes once and for all and just throw them away.

"The economic situation within our country is excellent today * * * and in the future it will be still better."

The exchange was a sequel to publication by the Government newspaper Izvestia October 26 of a statement by Khrushchev that the Soviet Union was not racing to be first to land on the moon.

This was subject to various interpretations in the West, though Khrushchev made it clear Russian scientists were pursuing research for a lunar landing. As quoted by Izvestia, he said:

"At the present time we are not planning flights of cosmonauts to the moon. Soviet scientists are working on this problem. * * * I have read reports that the Americans want to land on the moon by 1970. Well, we wish them success. * * * We will study their experience."

The American visitors asked Khrushchev how long it will take the Soviet Union to achieve a rendezvous in space.

"We have no calendar program, no definite date for a rendezvous in space," Khrushchev said.

Veto in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington, D.C., Daily News of November 5, 1963, entitled "Veto in Sight," warnnig simply that the comments by the President at his press conference the other day with regard to the so-called quality stabilization bill indicate that a veto threatens any such legislation of this kind that Congress should pass.

It would appear plain to all that Congress should simply disregard any legislation so unwise as this and so dangerous to the consumer and the small businessman in view of the certain veto facing this legislation:

VETO IN SIGHT

Since late July, the House has had on its calendar the so-called quality stabilization bill. This is the renamed price-fixing scheme for drugs and other brand products.

According to the flossy language which goes with this legislation, the bill would wipe out cut-throat competition in the retail business, get the consumers better products and lower prices, save the "small" businessman from extinction and in other ways benefit the general welfare and prosperity.

But the aim of the bill is still the same—to fix prices, up.

It attempts to do on a national scale what some States have done, at a high cost to consumers, and which other States tried, only to have the laws declared unconstitutional by their courts.

Any manufacturer, under this bill, who puts out a product with his name on it could lay down the law to any retailer who offered the product for sale. The retailer would charge the manufacturer's price, or else. And the U.S. Government would help him enforce his edict.

The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission and other branches of the Government are opposed to the bill. President Kennedy says the officials who have testified against it "have spoken my view."

He coupled this statement with a remark that he couldn't "comment" on any legislation until it gets to his desk. But in the name of consistency, he would have to veto it. It conflicts with the spirit of all the antitrust, anti-price-fixing laws now on the books, and with the general policies of the Kennedy administration.

This should mean that the bill now on the House Calendar is merely an exercise in futility. Every consumer will hope so.

The Heritage of Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the deeds accomplished by Gen. Casimir Pulaski in our country during the Revolutionary War are remembered each year during Pulaski Day celebrations.

At this year's Pulaski Day commemoration in Milwaukee, Wis., a student from Don Bosco High School delivered an address which is remarkable for its lucidity and is an excellent summation of Pulaski's heritage.

As the student, Alexander Sklenarz, points out, today, more than ever, we need the virtues which motivated Pulaski—unselfishness, indomitable courage, readiness to sacrifice, and patriotism.

The heritage of Pulaski, who was quick to fight against oppression on any soil and continent, can be remembered here in the United States where his participation in the American Revolution is an example of his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following speech delivered by this student in Milwaukee on October 19 to the attention of my colleagues:

We are gathered here to commemorate a hero of two continents, the great soldier of liberty, who died in the American Revolution to establish the liberties which we cherish today. Casimir Pulaski gave his life for the cause of American independence. He was one of those rare souls whose selfless devotion becomes a symbol for lovers of freedom everywhere.

Born to wealth and privilege, he sacrificed both in the struggle for the freedom of his native land and of America. He always fought for principles and ideals. He sought no personal advantages, no rewards and he found none. His life is a story of reverses, defeats, privations, and disasters.

From the pages of the 18th century history of Poland, comes a picture of a troubled and unhappy land. Gone were the days when Poland controlled the whole of Eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Black Sea. Gone were those days when the Polish cavalry under King Jan Sobieski at Vienna had delivered the crushing blow against the Turks and thus freed Europe from the menace of Islam. Due to an unfavorable geographic position and unfortunate political circumstances, the Polish King Stanislas August Poniatowski and his government became mere pawns in the hands of the Russians, who under the pretenses of a friendly interest, introduced their armies into Poland. There were Russian garrisons in Warsaw and in other principal cities of the country. Nobody can deny that history repeats itself. Only then it was Empress Catherine not Khrushchev, but the pretenses were the same, the same foreign power, the same terror, and the same violation of all Polish liberties.

It was during these times that Casimir Pulaski appeared in public life to again bring glory upon Polish arms, to defy Russian oppression, and to unfurl the banner of real freedom and independence.

By the time he was 21, he was to defeat the Russians in several battles and by the time he was 24 he was to have a European reputation as a sincere patriot and a hard and resourceful fighter. The noble Confederation of Bar under the banner "For the Faith and Liberty" could not save Poland against the overwhelming power of Russian armies, stationed in Poland, but the heroic battles raging from the eastern parts of Poland at the Castle of Okopy to the holy shrine of Czestochowa—again awakened the patriotic spirit of the nation and the hope that Poland would be free from foreign domination.

On the night of May 31, 1772, Casimir Pulaski was forced to leave Poland and fate willed that he was not to see his beloved fatherland again.

Three years later in 1775, the first shots of the Battle of Lexington reached him in France. They were followed by the tale of Bunker Hill, by the calling of the Continental Congress, and by the beginning of a full-sized war. Here again was a war against tyrants and Pulaski heard and understood the battle cry.

His passionate love of freedom, his desire to fight against oppression on any soil and continent, brought Pulaski to America with a letter of recommendation from Benjamin Franklin to George Washington.

It was here at the Battle of Brandywine that Pulaski, at the head of a small cavalry detachment, won his first laurels in America and on September 15, 1777, Congress voted to commission him as a brigadier general and commander of the horse. It was a path of fame which took Pulaski with the legion of his name to South Carolina and his later death at the siege of Savannah at the head of French forces and American cavalry.

Thus Casimir Pulaski sealed his devotion to America with his life and his blood. He was dead at the age of 32 and he died as he would have wished—in the thick of battle for liberty, for those ideals which had doomed his father and his brother.

He had finished his course and he left behind him a noble memory in two countries separated by the ocean but bound by the common ties of love of freedom. Perhaps no tribute was greater than that of his foe, King Stanislas August Poniatowski: "Pulaski has died as he lived—a hero—but an enemy of kings."

Casimir Pulaski by his heroic life and deeds on the field of glory left a great heritage to both the Polish and American nations.

It was not for the last time that Poles fought outside Poland against tyrants and against oppression. After the partition of Poland the unbounded love of freedom attracted thousands of Polish soldiers to the banners of General Dabrowski in Italy. They carried a proud motto on their banners: "For your freedom and ours." And on their epaulets a sentence, "All freemen are brothers." It was amidst their ranks that the immortal Polish national anthem was born.

It was again after the uprisings of 1830 and 1863 that Polish freedom fighters were forced to leave Poland and fought in the ranks of other nations.

An American, Paul Super in his book the "Polish Tradition" says in that respect: "In what army of what nation seeking liberty have the Poles not fought? What war for freedom has their sacrifice and death not hallowed? In what land have Poles not died for this to them dearest of all rights? No important soil of Europe but covers their bones, while their part in the American war for national freedom is known to every American schoolboy."

But the greatest exodus happened in 1939 when a large Polish army, reborn outside of Poland like Phoenix from the ashes, numbering over 100,000 men, with a Polish Air Force and a Polish Navy joined the Western Allies in the mortal struggle against Hitlerism. On all theaters of the war the Polish forces took part in the famous and decisive battles at Narvik, Tobruk, Monte Cassino, Bologna, and Falaise. Thousands of Poles fell in these battles and sacrificed their lives in the vain hope that Poland would regain full freedom.

But today, like in the days of Casimir Pulaski, the government in Warsaw takes its orders from Russia. Only the name of the Russian Ambassador in Warsaw has changed and it is no more Catherine but Khrushchev who imposes his will upon the Polish nation.

In the arsenal of each nation virtues are the most important and decisive weapons. This is the wealth of our heritage; this is our stockpiled arsenal of spiritual strength. We Americans have a long history of struggle; each page of our history is full of heroism. From Lexington to Iwo Jima, there has been interwoven a red thread of blood which like the thread of Ariadne has led the American Nation through the labyrinth of times of confusion, trial and hazards.

Today the whole world is looking toward us and we are acclaimed the champions of freedom. In the gigantic struggle between two ideologies, which encompass the whole world and all fields of human activities: political, economic and cultural—we must constantly be on our guard and always ready to fight for the ideals on which our Western civilization is founded. Today more than ever we need the virtues which motivated Pulaski: unselfishness, indomitable courage, readiness to sacrifice and patriotism.

We are looking confidently into the future because we know and firmly believe that only love of freedom breeds patriotism—only patriotism assures victory.

ALEXANDER SKLENARZ,
Don Bosco High School,
Milwaukee, Wis.

False Assumptions in the District Crime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the House approved the District crime bill. At that time a great many Members voiced their objections to that bill on both policy and constitutional grounds.

Even were it possible to dilute the Constitution by statutory enactments, still, the case made in behalf of a change in judicial policy is not well grounded. It erroneously assumes the existence of certain causal relationships between court procedures and the commission of crimes.

The District has a fine police force; they are not to be blamed for the present crime rate in the District. Police officials rightfully resent being made the scapegoats in these situations; why do they then engage in the same tactic by castigating the courts and the law?

These points were explored more fully by Prof. Yale Kamisar, of the Minnesota Law School, in a paper prepared for delivery at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, in August. Professor Kamisar makes the incontrovertible point that civil liberties are not incorporated in our Constitution only to be bent to the expediencies of the

moment. Rather, it is when the need to be expedient reaches its crest that the steadfast application of our constitutional guarantees become most imperative.

I offer for consideration excerpts from his paper.

ARE THE RULES OF EVIDENCE SPAWNING CRIME WAVES AND CRIPPLING LAW ENFORCEMENT?

(By Prof. Yale Kamisar, University of Minnesota School of Law)

Police-prosecution-minded critics of the judiciary none too subtly suggest that Supreme Court decisions have spawned crime waves and worked an alleged reduction in law enforcement efficiency. This reflects a populistic mentality, an attitude which collides with the rule of law. This type of criticism, as Prof. Edward A. Shils of the University of Chicago has observed, is characteristic of "a disposition toward ideological enthusiasm and political passions, which proclaim great crises and announce their disbelief in the capacities of ordinary institutions and their leaders to resolve them." This current of thought and sentiment, which also manifests itself in the claim of military necessity, overlooks a point recently made by Chief Justice Warren:

"Our Nation at the time of the Constitutional Convention was also faced with formidable problems. The English, the French, the Spanish, and various tribes of hostile Indians were all ready and eager to subvert or occupy the fledgling Republic. Nevertheless, in that environment, our Founding Fathers conceived a Constitution and Bill of Rights replete with provisions indicating their determination to protect human rights. There was no call for a garrison state in those times of precarious peace. We should heed no such call now."

Police-prosecution-minded critics of liberal decisions in the constitutional criminal procedure field freely invoke the public welfare, the public interest, and public necessity. As an astute political scientist, Stephen K. Bailey, has pointed out, these phrases are "society's most effective analgesics," they are "anchor rationalizations for policy-caused pain." Without such concepts, he observes, "most Presidents, Congressmen, Governors, commissioners, managers, and mayors—and, I should hazard, commissars, premiers, and generals—would become unnerved." And he notes, too, that "the most discouraging aspect of totalitarianism is not the power lust of its leaders, but the ease with which people adjust to losses in political freedom when that loss is explained in terms of public necessity."

In the area of police interrogation, the Mallory case of 1957 has drawn much fire. The so-called McNabb-Mallory rule (although Mallory was viewed by some critics as a radical departure from reason and precedent, actually it reaffirmed the 1943 McNabb case) operates to exclude from Federal prosecutions all confessions or admissions elicited during a period of time when a suspect is being unreasonably and illegally detained, instead of being brought before a magistrate, as Federal law requires, so that he may be advised of his rights to remain silent and retain a lawyer.

In his 1957 testimony before a House subcommittee, Robert Murray, chief of the District of Columbia's Police Department—and the District bears the brunt of this rule—stated flatly that "if the Mallory decision stands, it will result in complete breakdown in law enforcement in the District of Columbia."

The 1957 Mallory decision did stand. Yet, as police officials themselves later testified, in the years immediately following Mallory, "viewed in its relationship to the long-term trend in this city and nationwide, the present rate of crime in the District is * * * favorably low"; the percentage of solutions of major crimes in the District not only remained at nearly double the national average, but actually increased a percentage point or two.

Chief Murray has been somewhat piqued by the contention that the District's clearance rate refutes his claim that his men are overly restricted by court rules. The Chief's answer is that his police force's excellent record has been achieved principally by dint of a great many unpaid hours of overtime work. I cannot improve on the following editorial rejoinder by the Washington Post: "This suggests strongly that the police force ought to be enlarged and that pay ought to be provided for those who work extra hours. But it does not suggest that the police force ought to be allowed to cut legal or constitutional corners."

True, crime has been going up year after year after year. But until the summer of 1961, the courts of half our States let in illegally seized evidence. Were these admissibility jurisdictions undergoing "crime waves" too? Or were the exclusionary States running well ahead of the national average?

Take, for example, the District of Columbia and its surrounding Maryland and Virginia suburbs. Until Mapp was handed down in the summer of 1961, Maryland admitted illegally seized evidence in all felony prosecutions; Virginia in all cases. On the other hand, the District's law enforcement officers are not only "handfuffed" by the Federal exclusionary rule in search and seizure cases but weighed down, too, by the McNabb-Mallory rule—the dread "ball and chain" which hampered no other police force during the 1950–60 period. One would expect the District, then, to set the pace in crime acceleration, certainly far to out-distance Virginia and Maryland.

The "facts" that fellows like me are not supposed to want to talk about reveal that the District's incidence of rapes, aggravated assaults and grand larceny was lower in 1960 than in 1950. On a per 100,000 population basis, the overall felony rate increased a puny 1 percent in the District, but a redoubtable 69 percent in the three major Maryland and Virginia suburbs for which generally complete figures were available.

Washington's crime rate, compared with that of other cities is about average. Of the 15 largest cities in America it ranks 8th—right in the middle—in crimes per capita. These statistics are, of course, small comfort to the citizens of the District. But there is no need to make the Supreme Court the scapegoat.

As Fletcher Knebel pointed out in a recent Look magazine article, in the city's public schools, "discipline is a mocked word. The dropout rate, 39 percent, runs above the national average. * * * It is a city where illiteracy increased slightly in the last decade, while declining in all the States. * * * One principal reported that only 13 percent of her kindergarten, first and second grade pupils have anyone at home when they return from school."

The Nation's Capital leads all other large cities in the rate of illegitimate births—20 percent of all live births in 1961. Few other cities show a rate even half that high. Girls in the city's public schools, ages 12 to 15, gave birth to 265 illegitimate babies during the last school year. Who is going to blame this on the Mallory rule? In the age group 15 to 19, the venereal disease rate is more than 10 times the national average. Who is going to blame this on the Supreme Court?

He who links crime waves with rules of evidence is a bold man. Bolder than Oliver Gasch, former U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, who dismissed this suggestion as "much too speculative." As Justice Frankfurter has noted, "he must be a bold man indeed who is confident that he knows what causes crime. Those whose lives are devoted to an understanding of the problem are certain only that they are uncertain regarding the role of the various alleged causes."

A few moments ago, I mentioned an alleged "burglary wave" in Minneapolis. Burglaries did increase 10 percent in the first quarter of 1963. When these figures were released in May of this year and the police asked, why? one detective explained: "The burglars had a lot better weather this year; no snow."

Bank robberies in the Nation's Capital almost doubled in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. Why? J. Edgar Hoover explained that every one of the 22 bank robberies which occurred in the past fiscal year in the District had taken place at a branch-type facility. He pointed out that branch banks are much more vulnerable to robbery; they "have fewer security features and less police protection"; the escape routes from the branch sites are more easily accessible and better concealed.

Why, on some occasions, do the police offer such unsensational, plausible reasons for the increase in these crimes? I venture to say as a matter of self-defense. They fear the public will blame them.

As students of the crime problem have pointed out, "whenever the newspapers carry a sensational headline about the rising tide of juvenile delinquency nationally, or about some shocking youth-gang depradation locally," the question "likely to be raised in countless American homes" is: "Why don't the police put a stop to it?"

A little clear thinking about the role of the police office in our society will show that he is not to blame. Not any more than the courts. The great irony is that the police, who deeply resent—who rightly resent—being made the scapegoats for crime waves, have few qualms about making judges the scapegoats.

In a recent speech, one in which he voiced grave doubts that the public can live with the exclusionary rule, Supt. O. W. Wilson of the Chicago Police Department expressed dismay at the persistent increase in crime. The fault, he suggested, lies with the courts. But in the very same speech, indeed, in almost the next breath, Superintendent Wilson then pointed out that a major source of antagonism against the police is "a tendency to blame [them] for a high incidence of crime instead of recognizing that there are many crime causes, such as slum conditions, narcotic addiction, lack of parental responsibility, unemployment, cultural inequalities, and other social factors over which the police have no influence or control."

Hasn't the Superintendent missed something? Hasn't he overlooked the fact that the courts have no influence or control over any of these "social factors" either?

III. THE "POPULISTIC MENTALITY" AND THE "RULE OF LAW"

In his provocative book, "The Torment of Secrecy," Edward A. Shils engages in a penetrating discussion of "populism" and the "rule of law." Although he nowhere specifically considers the hostile reaction to Supreme Court decisions in the field of constitutional-criminal procedure, I believe his observations shed much light on this criticism of the judiciary:

"Populism proclaims that the will of the people as such is supreme over every other standard, over the standards of traditional institutions, over the autonomy of institutions, and over the will of other strata.

* * * * *

"Populism seeks substantive justice. It cares not at all for the traditional rules in spheres of life outside its own immediate

sphere. It regards the legal system as a snare for the guileless, a system of outdoor relief for lawyers and judges.

* * * * *

"Populism acclaims the demagog who, breaking through the formalistic barriers erected by lawyers, pedants, and bureaucrats, renews the righteousness of government and society. Populism is impatient of checks and balances; it is restive under the restraints imposed by the separation of powers.

* * * * *

"The rule of law is a delicately balanced affair and it must withstand battering from many sides. The populistic mentality, when it has full sway, denies the claims of autonomy * * * of the judiciary which it views as the resistant custodian of a law which sets itself above the will of the people."

The populistic mentality crops up in much of the criticism of the exclusionary rule and other "liberal" decisions. Listen to the head of the Los Angeles Police Department:

"Lincoln referred to a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people." The police are the servants of the people and it is contrary to public welfare to * * * hamper the police in the conscientious performance of their duties, through the gratuitous imposition of the exclusionary rule. * * *

"We feel obligated to * * * speak of how [the exclusionary rule] affects our ability to protect you against the criminal army. We would do the same and you would expect the same if, instead of police officers, we were medical doctors, attorneys, or engineers discussing a law that affected efficient performance in any of those fields. * * *

"We hope the people will listen and respond to the honest assessment of the social dangers created by the rule. We hope the State legislature will hear the voice of the people and enact remedies. We hope the cost in life and suffering and property imposed upon the citizenry by the rule, will soon be eliminated."

Listen to the head of the Chicago Police Department:

"I have said that the police can live with the exclusionary rule. The real question is—can the public live with it? * * * I plead only for the rule of reason. Let the police have the authority to do what the public expects them to do in suppressing crime.

* * * * *

"The process which results in an appellate decision is markedly different from the legislative process. * * * The court ponders the alleged infringement of the rights of the convicted person as a legal abstraction and feels obliged to consider the question as it would apply were the individual innocent. * * * The desires of the general public for some reasonable measure of security and for a redress of the wrong done to the innocent victim of the criminal are not made known nor are they readily available to the court. * * * Statesmen representative of the people seem better qualified to make fair appraisals of public needs than appellate judges who, by virtue of their positions, are not so responsive to the desires of the public."

I must confess that I am astounded by what I think amounts to criticism of appellate courts for failure to pay sufficient attention to the public's demand for vengeance when considering the alleged violation of a constitutional or statutory right; criticism of courts for viewing a claim that a procedural right has been violated as a legal abstraction. This is the whole idea. This is what procedural rights are all about. This is what appellate courts are for.

As a great State judge, Walter Schaefer of Illinois, has pointed out, one of the principal advantages of judicial review is that the reviewing court is removed from the local atmosphere; is that the reviewing court is better able "to set apart the question of the guilt or innocence of a particular defendant and focus solely upon the procedural aspects of the case."

Many men have made the point: "We do not have one Bill of Rights for nice people, and another one for bad people." "Although the defendant may be the worst of men * * * the rights of the best of men are secure only as the rights of the vilest and most abhorrent are protected." "The simple truth is that you have to be for the Bill of Rights or not; you can't be for the Bill of Rights for yourself and your friends; it's all or nothing."

The Honorable Leon Gavin, of Pennsylvania

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock to me to learn of the sudden and unexpected passing of my longtime friend and colleague, the Honorable LEON GAVIN, of Pennsylvania.

It is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to him. He long will be remembered in these Halls of Congress for he was, indeed, a man of deep convictions, a man of courage and determination. As second ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services, he continually worked for the welfare of the enlisted men of the U.S. Armed Forces.

LEON GAVIN's life was dedicated to public service. The people of his district, of his beloved State of Pennsylvania, and of the entire country will surely miss the able leadership of our departed friend. To his wife, his sons, and his daughter, I extend my heartfelt sympathy upon their great loss.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Japan on Side of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative article by Robert Morris, former counsel of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, who is now touring the Far East, was published in the July 26, 1963, issue of the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News.

The indicated article follows:

JAPAN ON SIDE OF FREE WORLD

(By Robert Morris)

TOKYO.—Here the world struggle is being fought along conventional lines and at a conventional pace. The pressing urgencies of the test ban and of disarmament, which are driving Western statesmen, notably our own, into emergency behavior, seem far off here. The 94 million people of Japan know the war is being waged, but there is a feeling of remoteness about it that leads to a potential pacifism.

Red China is nearby, but it is not the threat. The Japanese realistically understand that Red China, while it is a nonnuclear power, has not the present strength to challenge Japan, much less the United States, the latter's ally.

The Soviet Union is the villian here. Every poll shows that the United States is the most popular power, while Khrushchev's U.S.S.R. is conspicuously last in public esteem.

This does not mean that the Soviets do not have a powerful apparatus here. The Japanese Communist Party is led by Nosaka, whom U.S. States Department officials imported from Communist Yenan at the end of World War II. It is concentrated in the universities, in the schools, in the labor unions, and to some extent in the press.

The oversea Chinese, numbering about 45,000, apparently pose no security problem and are loyal to free China. The 650,000 Koreans, however, are different. Far too many, surprisingly, look toward North Korea.

The Socialist Party is not the conventional Socialist Party but the counterpart of the left wing of the British Labor Party. This party has disproportionate strength, holding almost a third of the seats in the Diet, the legislative branch.

In 1960 when Communist activity reached its most conspicuous effort—the demonstrations against President Eisenhower's visit—the leaders were able to put into the streets only two or three hundred thousand youths, and then by paying many.

The new Japanese Constitution forbids the country from engaging in war or resorting to the use of force. For the first 5 years after its defeat in 1945, Japan was completely disarmed. But when General MacArthur had to draw American security forces from the islands to send to Korea, he asked Foreign Minister Yoshida to set up a national police reserve of 75,000 men and a maritime force of 18,000. Thus the self-defense forces, as they are called, came into being.

Today this defense force numbers about 265,000 men. They serve voluntarily and there is no conscription. There is a 5-year expansion program underway, mostly to raise the qualitative standards of weapons. F-86 Sabrejets, for instance, will be replaced by F-104-Super Starfighters.

This strengthening of the defense potential is the focus of leftwing activity. The objection usually takes the form of a constitutional challenge to the existence of a military force of any kind in view of article 9 of the Constitution. Sometimes it expresses itself in a demonstration against the installation of the early warning system or the arrival of an American nuclear submarine.

Japanese leaders have a sense of responsibility. They are embarking on a dutiful first-aid program that is based on realism. They recognize the Republic of China as China. All in all there is hope here in this land of the rising sun.

Veterans Day Address by Gen. David M. Shoup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made on yesterday, November 11, at Arlington National Cemetery, by Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps. In my opinion, General Shoup, a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, is a marine's marine; and what he has said is well worth the attention of the Senate and the people of the country.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, NOVEMBER 11, 1963

Americans and their friends, good morning. When the designation of Armistice Day was changed to Veterans Day in 1954, we stopped celebrating the signing of a truce, and began paying honor to those men and women who have served America in the Armed Forces.

Why do we have Armed Forces? Because, with bowed heads we face the disheartening and distasteful fact that after many centuries of so-called civilization, man has been unable to prevent the killing and maiming of men, women, and children in war.

Man has learned the secret of the atom. Man has penetrated space. Man plans to explore the universe. In many areas science has lifted the load from man's back. In the United States we have developed the highest standard of living the world has ever known. But man has not yet learned to live in enduring peace with his fellow men, and follow it must that—we cannot practice the deception that somehow, without alertness and conscious effort on our part, an everlasting panacea may develop which will abolish for all time man's oldest plague—war.

But for past wars, these heroic veterans would not lie here. They served their country well. They earned their place in history. They are enshrined in the heart of free America.

These hallowed graves in this national cemetery are mute but constant reminders that there are countless American graves throughout the world—on land and beneath the seas. All are symbolized here by the Tomb of the Unknowns. Our Commander in Chief has just placed a wreath at this tomb. By this act he has expressed for all Americans, past and present, their deep gratitude to those who have made great sacrifices so that we can be here today, physically and mentally free.

The freedom we cherish, the Constitution we support, the rights we hold so dear, we owe to them. So that future generations may say the same to us, we must respond to the vexing challenges of our time with an unswerving steadfastness.

Should such response require man to again engage in mortal conflict, let us remember, that it is what Americans stand for and what Americans are willing to fight for that has made America great.

In America the individual is important. He has inherent rights. He has a voice in his Government. He can speak without fear and has a right to be heard. He enjoys religious freedom. And side by side with these rights he has solemn responsibilities—responsibilities to his Creator, to his country, and to his fellow man.

These responsibilities are, in a sense, what America stands for:

To respect the liberty of others

To further the welfare of the community

To protect the security of the United States

To be intelligently unselfish with the great assets of our Nation.

The millions of veterans we honor today have fulfilled these responsibilities. In so doing, many thousands of them paid the supreme sacrifice.

I believe that gathered here today, watching intently and listening carefully, are the invisible spirits of these thousands of gallant Americans. Their presence may be unseen, but they shall not be unheard. Someone must speak for them. What do they want mankind to hear? Many, many things, of course, but I believe that most of all they want the hopes and fears of their endless years to be expressed in: an admonition, a hope, and a prayer.

They admonish:

(a) You must strive for peace, but not peace at any price.

(b) Do not give up one bit of the priceless heritage of liberty which we helped to preserve.

(c) Accept and discharge your responsibilities to serve as unreluctant leaders of those who are willing to fight to protect this liberty.

Their hope: "That some day there will be a meeting at the summit which shall become as everlastingly important to humanity as the Sermon on the Mount."

Finally, the spirits of these living dead pray: "Please, God, may our Ship of State sail on and on in a world forever at peace."

Thank you.

Talk by Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., at the Annual Meeting of the North Dakota Soil Conservation District Supervisors at Fargo, N. Dak., November 4, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an address given November 4 at the annual meeting of the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts at Fargo, N. Dak., by Hollis R. Williams, Deputy Administrator for Watersheds, Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. Williams, a native of Arkansas who for many years was SCS State conservationist in our State, and a man of whom we are quite proud, made several points in his address that are worthy of the consideration of the Members of the House.

He paid eloquent tribute to soil conservation districts, crediting them with significant achievements in the past quarter century and urging them to broaden the scope of their activities to meet today's expanded and changing needs.

He pointed out how small watershed projects have enabled people of town and country to join hands in bringing about full use of their land and water resources for the economic benefit of the entire community.

He cited the valuable results of the Great Plains conservation program, presently restricted to designated counties in the 10 Great Plains States.

Mr. Speaker, we should familiarize ourselves with the merits of the Great Plains conservation program. Because this program accomplishes a total conservation job—and does it permanently—many of us believe serious consideration should be given to extending its benefits beyond the Great Plains area. Indeed, we would be most anxious to take advantage of this program in Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this thoughtful and informative address to the Members of this House, and I include it in the RECORD:

TALK BY HOLLIS R. WILLIAMS, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF WATERSHEDS

I am proud to be in North Dakota, land of the prairie, land of the Peace Garden, land of Garrison Dam.

I am proud to be in North Dakota—the Flickertail State—land of the Sioux, of Sitting Bull, of Old Fort Lincoln, of the Prairie Skyscraper.

I am proud to be in North Dakota, home of Moses Armstrong, John Miller, Lynn Frazier, James W. Foley, Bill Langer, and Colonel Lounsberry.

I am proud to be in the State of the Elkhorn Ranch and Teddy Roosevelt and his Rough Riders, in the State of the Badlands, and of Dr. Edwin F. Ladd—the State of your congressional delegation that gives such fine support to soil and water conservation and water resource development, Senators YOUNG and BURDICK, and Congressman DON SHORT, member of the Agriculture Committee, who is so helpful in the review of our small watershed projects as a member of the subcommittee—and of Lyness G. Lloyd, our State conservationist, for surely he, too, is putting his mark on it.

Yes, I am proud to be here—in this great State and with this great group. Among you are the pioneers and their immediate descendants who have made North Dakota great, for this is a young State. You, especially the younger among you, are the people who will keep her great. For the purpose of your presence and the purpose of a large part of your daily lives—the protection, improvement, and development of soil and water resources—is the rock upon which the future will be built, the very foundation stones of tomorrow.

By now it is probably obvious to you that I was not raised in Minnesota or Montana. Yes, I do come from the South—from Arkansas. But as I have said this is a great and wonderful State too—even if you don't serve grits for breakfast.

Most of my 28 years as a professional in soil and water conservation have been spent in the Southeast and the Southwest. And even though I have been working at the national level for the past several years, I've had little opportunity to study this part of America at first hand.

Thus I am grateful for the opportunity to visit with you. I never go anywhere without learning something about our job—yours and mine. This occasion will be no exception.

I have attended many State soil conservation district association meetings, but never one to compare in attendance with this one. It is a measure of your dedication to the task at hand.

I am devoted to the soil conservation district and the men who run it, and have been for many years—all of my professional life, in fact. To emphasize my deep respect and admiration for you and for the work in which you are engaged, let me preface my talk by paying tribute to the soil conservation district and its supervisors in these words:

There is no more essential unit of our free government than the soil conservation districts, surely no set of public servants so unselfish and so dedicated.

"Supervisor" has become an honored title.

No scandal has been attached to it. No selfish purpose has corrupted it. Money can't buy it.

It knows no party. No knows no favorite.

It is honorable and dignified and exemplifies, more than any title I know, the good qualities of public service.

The supervisor is a man of the soil, but he is distinguished by his vision and his willingness to assume leadership.

He is a good citizen and a considerate neighbor.

His face is bronzed by the wind and the sun and his hands are rough from a life of toil, but in his heart is a love and concern for his fellow man.

To him, conservation is a profession as well as a duty.

Neither the doctor nor the lawyer, the teacher nor the minister, surpasses him in the unselfishness of his devotion to the well-being of his community, and of the human race.

He has listened to the warning of Jeremiah, the prophet, whose vineyard was laid waste by those who should have been its caretakers * * * and he has had the understanding of this bit of history to know its bitter lesson.

And he has taken to heart the words of the Psalmist who told us that the land is the Lord's and he has stood guard for the Lord.

Yes, the supervisor is somebody very special. We who are well-fed and well-clothed and who see opportunity spread out before us for ourselves and our children are forever indebted to him.

That is my tribute to the soil conservation district and its supervisors.

As leaders of the soil and water conservation movement in North Dakota, you have performed, and are continuing to perform, a lasting service in guiding the farmers and ranchers of your districts toward operations consistent with the principles of conservation land use.

Particularly I would commend you as supervisors of soil conservation districts, and as an association of soil conservation districts, upon your achievement under the Great Plains conservation program. This is doubly appropriate under the circumstances, for it was a cooperator with the Stutsman County Soil Conservation District in North Dakota who fixed his name to a complete Great Plains conservation program plan on December 19, 1957. He was a livestock producer named Berthold Sackman and his action in entering into a contract with the Secretary of Agriculture on that date gave him justification for claiming the distinction of being the first to enter the program. I am told that Mr. Sackman's unit, with the plan now complete, is a splendid example of the soundness of the plan that he developed and of the wisdom of the designers of this special program for a region.

Sixteen hundred North Dakota landowners have followed the example set nearly 6 years ago by Mr. Sackman, 1,600 complete conservation plans in 30 of your districts, all firmly based upon the capabilities of the land resources involved.

These plans are bringing the principles of sound land use—conservation land use, if you please—to 2 million acres. The proprietors of these resources have become conservation farmers and ranchers in the truest sense, devoted to the principles of sound land use and aware of the risks involved in agriculture in the Plains and of the diligence required of the operator in good years and bad.

The supervisors of soil conservation districts were called upon to lead the way in this program, and lead they did. Here in North Dakota, the names of Fred Ehlers and Robert Ellsworth stood out among those who devoted countless hours and untold energy to the launching of the program. If there was hesitancy among other landowners for a time, it soon vanished; and there are nearly 13,000 farms and ranches, many with the work completed, to attest to the wholehearted acceptance of this program. These contracts involve more than 30 million acres in 383 Plains counties, and nearly $50 million has been obligated or paid in cost-shares with the owners supplying an equal amount or more.

Conversion of cropland to grass or trees, one of the major objectives of the program, has reached almost a million acres, 23 percent of the cropland involved. Nearly 200,000 acres of this is in North Dakota, and one-third of the Federal funds used for cost-sharing in the program in this State has been used for this purpose.

In the drought which you experienced in 1960 and 1961, the farmers and ranchers of North Dakota reaped substantial benefit from their investment in soil and water conservation, particularly in the Great Plains conservation program. The dependable stockwater—in the form of dugouts, wells and springs—repaid their cost many times. The conservation rangelands and the cropland protected by crop residues yielded further returns.

In North Dakota the Great Plains conservation program has made heartening progress toward its goal of stabilizing land and

putting the operating unit on a sound economic basis. This kind of stability quickly finds its way into the channels of trade in the entire area. One operator put it this way: "This has changed me from a 'maybe' income farmer to a 'sure-fire' income farmer."

Principles proved in the relatively short but useful life of the Great Plains conservation program have found their way into newer programs made available by the Department of Agriculture—in the cropland conversion program which is winning hearty acceptance in McHenry and Benson Counties in North Dakota and in the conservation resource and development program which also is in a pilot stage.

I would like here to applaud the North Dakota State ASC Committee and the ACP development group for their recent step in making agricultural conservation program payment for stubble mulch tillage dependent upon the use of supporting practices in the form of stripcropping or windbreaks.

I congratulate you district supervisors on the progress the conservation forces of North Dakota are making in the drive against wind erosion. This may be more important than any of us now realizes, for again we are entering a winter season without having had the moisture we have learned to hope for.

Soil conservation has come a long way during the past quarter century. The main reason is the leadership of soil conservation districts, of men like you and your counterparts across the land.

It is not surprising that soil-conservation districts have become a permanent part of the American scene, for they are in the tradition of pioneer America. They are conceived, nurtured, and managed to maturity and usefulness by local people who recognize their own problems and wish to be masters of their own fate in dealing with them.

Since the mid-1930's, the concept of resource conservation has broadened tremendously. The soil-and-water concept has come to mean protecting land against all forms of soil deterioration, rebuilding eroded and depleted soils, building up soil fertility, stabilizing critical runoff and sediment-producing areas, improving grasslands, woodlands, and wildlife lands, conserving water for industrial and municipal as well as other uses, proper agricultural irrigation and drainage, and reducing floodwater and sediment damage for benefits to the public as a whole.

Modern soil and water conservation includes planning and treating complete watersheds as resource units. This means coordinating the management of crop, range, and forest lands, and the treatment of watercourses in the upper watersheds to minimize the damage of floods and sedimentation and to improve the quality and regularity of water supplies.

Indeed, it is safe to say that today's soil and water conservation job bears little more resemblance to that of 20 years ago than the 1964 automobile does to the 1942 model. Only the basics are the same.

As soil conservationists we all have a continuing, vital role to play in these changing times. If we are to be effective, our efforts must change with the changing times. The essence of our kind of conservation is concern for the future—not preserving the past.

Soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service must look ahead, not backward. We must scrutinize our programs and our techniques to see that they are up to date, that they meet today's needs and conditions. We must be alert to new ideas. We must continually bring new blood into our organizations and be stimulated by their thinking. Above all, we must clearly see the woods and not just the trees. We must see the whole picture and not just what appeals to us most or what interests us most.

Soil and water conservation in the United States will be what we make it, today and tomorrow. If we lack vision, so will our program. If we are old fashioned in our approach, in our attitude toward what needs to be done; if we see today's job in the same setting as we saw it say 10 years ago or even 5—then our work will be old fashioned; it will be inadequate to meet today's new needs; it will be considered out of date and perhaps unnecessary or certainly not worth major attention.

We have become an urban nation. Whether or not we shall have the will and the facilities to cope adequately with our resource problems at the local, State, and National level is largely in the hands of the urban people.

The urban people must understand that our national standard of living, our strength as a people and as a Nation, our future greatness in the world society—all these and more are wrapped up in our American land and its soil and water resources.

If the urban people, who hold this key, are to achieve the understanding that is essential to decisive action, it will come about only through leadership of soil conservation districts. You are the voice of local responsibility in resource development and management. You must accept the challenge of informing and enlisting the aid of the nonfarmer. He must understand his stake in resource protection and improvement as a citizen.

A major resource activity that brings together town and country in common cause is the small watershed project. Here is a golden opportunity for multiple purpose, for attention of all aspects of water management including agricultural, municipal, industrial, recreational, and wildlife developments. The development of a project plan offers an unexcelled opportunity for town and country people to work together to bring about full use of their land and water resources for the benefit of the entire community.

We attach great importance to multipurpose planning in watershed projects. We know that multipurpose watershed projects are practical and effective. Many communities have demonstrated they can protect and improve their agricultural lands, stop destructive floods, supply water for growing municipal needs, and that they can attract new industries and improve recreational facilities.

Do not overlook the opportunities offered by small watershed projects as you plan your conservation actions to meet the challenge of the 1960's.

Do not overlook your soil and water conservation needs inventory as a major source of data for your plans for the future. Use these data as you revise and update your individual district programs and work plans, as you have been asked to do by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in February 1962.

I'm happy to report that since the Secretary made his offer more than 700 districts across the land have updated their work programs. North Dakota will be one of the first States to complete the job in all of its 71 districts.

I know you are at work on this in North Dakota and that you will push ahead with it. Let me emphasize one thing about these updated work programs. I urge you to strive for quality programs—programs that fully reflect all the present and longtime resource needs of the community.

By all the resource needs I mean all; not just the agricultural land needs; not just the watershed protection and flood prevention needs; not just the farm and ranch needs and problems. I mean all—truly all—of the community needs. I mean municipal and industrial water supply now and for the future. I mean parks and playgrounds and recreation areas. I mean swimming and boating and fishing and other water-based tourism. I mean new local industries that improve the economic welfare of the community. I mean those things that directly concern all citizens in all walks of life.

Each district must become a great deal more than an erosion control or a water conservation district, operated mainly by farmers and for farmers. It must broaden its scope to include activities that interest and benefit every member of the community, rural and urban alike.

For nearly 27 years soil conservation districts have given magnificent leadership in achieving their objectives on farmlands. That is still a basic part of the job. But the need today is for so much more—so very much more.

At this moment in time every district has an unparalleled opportunity to become the resource development leader of every community in the land with wider powers to make decisions and to act. But this will not "just happen." It will take work—hard work. And the place to begin is with a quality updated work program.

I believe you can strengthen districts and broaden their scope and purpose by inviting the leadership of nonagricultural conservation interests to participate with you in your activities at the local district level and at your State association level.

I don't mean invite these people to an occasional board meeting, or give them a place on the program now and then at your State association meetings. What I do mean is to make them a working part of your organization. Get them on your committees. Take advantage of their experience. Seek their advice. Consult with them. Make them familiar with your program and your objectives. Give them jobs to do that is within their field of interest and will aid and abet your program as well as theirs.

This job is so big that there is room for all. You might be surprised to learn how much other organizations and unattached citizens want to help if they but knew how and if they knew that you wanted them and could use them. You might also be surprised to learn that other organizations not organized under State law, as districts are, envy your status and your authority and would be delighted to have you help them with projects of theirs that should be in your overall work program anyhow. Conversely, some organizations have authorities you do not have but can get the advantage of by working with them closely—by making them a part of your family.

Now and then you hear some misguided and uninformed person say that resource conservation is a waste of money in times when we have surpluses. You and I know that this sort of thinking is ridiculous. Protection and development of our natural resources is not a rainy day job, or one for depression periods. It is a continuing job for it is vital to our future welfare, to our survival as a Nation.

Even though our capacity for food and fiber is greater than current demands, at least for a few commodities, there is no rationalization to indicate a lack of necessity for aggressive soil and water conservation. Soils must be kept in place in the fields and the forests; water must be banked in the soil or in useful ground or surface reservoirs; and streamflows must be regulated by proper land use and manmade devices.

There is a job in this for everyone. Our conservation needs are great enough to challenge the best efforts of us all. Whatever reliance we place on improving technology to meet the food and fiber needs of the future, we must have the soil and water resources on which to practice the modern methods and use the new machines and chemicals. And two-thirds of our land still needs basic conservation treatment.

Soil and water conservation districts hold the key to the future of our land and water resources. Our best hopes rest upon your leadership and vision, your ability to make and carry out long-range multiple-use programs for land and water, and your initiative and persuasiveness in enlisting the support and active participation of our urban people.

I believe that the natural resources of this great Nation—which are its true strength—are in good hands, in safe hands. I have faith that we shall meet the challenges of the 1960's head on; that we shall accept them not as a burden or a hurdle, but as an opportunity; that we shall not fail ourselves or those who come after us.

Someday we may be able to stand on high ground in any soil conservation district in the country and in every direction as far as you can see, the land will be protected. Trees will grow on the steep slopes. On the flatter lands, protected by graceful terraces, strips, and waterways, cultivated crops will stand in all their glory. Recreational areas will abound and water will be available in abundance for thriving farms and industries. Man and nature will be in harmony as God intended.

Justifying Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the editorial writer of the Newark, N.J., Sunday News in the issue of November 10, 1963, has taken a very objective view of some of the differences between the administration and the Congress in relation to the foreign aid program.

Emphasis is placed on our responsibility and some of the failures of the program are highlighted, with constructive suggestions for improvement.

It makes good sense to me. Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby place this fine editorial in the RECORD:

JUSTIFYING AID

A sound case can be made for sustaining this Nation's foreign aid program in amounts substantial enough to be effective. But President Kennedy does not contribute to it by accusing Congress of succumbing to "petty irritation and frustration" or of playing partisan politics in its efforts to lower the tab.

Whatever irritation does exist, it is not the creature of Congress. Rather it reflects the mood of constituents back home, something Congressmen are better able to assess than the White House.

After 17 years and the expenditure of $100 billion there is substantial agreement with the Clay committee's conclusion that the progress has been "attempting to do too much for too many" and perhaps could accomplish more with less.

Responsible persons do not expect American dollars to make the world over to our liking. They do, however, want more evidence that the aid we provide is reaching the people we are trying to help.

This is not apparent when foreign aid funds support military dictatorships whose rule is inimical to our constitutional principles. A dozen examples from South America to Korea could be cited.

It is not apparent when foreign aid is diverted to shoring up currencies of nations that refuse to come to grips with inflation. Brazil is an outstanding example.

It is not apparent when foreign aid creates personal fortunes and fails to reach the bloodstream of the recipient nation's economy. Indonesia, Ghana, and Vietnam under the Diem regime are random examples.

If there is irritation over these diversions, it is neither petty nor partisan.

As custodians of Federal appropriations, it is the duty of Congress to see that the funds are used judiciously and effectively. This does not endow Congress with the power to legislate foreign policy. And in this respect, both Secretary Rusk and President Kennedy correctly object to blanket prohibitions that restrict their ability to deal with changing situations abroad.

But the executive branch must be accountable to Congress for its conduct of foreign relations. In the process, the case for foreign aid in the amount requested is better supported by evidence of accomplishment than by intemperate charges of petty irritation against those who raise objections.

Heritage of Three Generals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Richmond, Va., of Monday, November 11, 1963, entitled "Heritage of Three Generals."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERITAGE OF THREE GENERALS

Virginia's close relationship to the three ranking generals of World War II—Marshall, MacArthur and Eisenhower—is a noteworthy one.

Gen. George C. Marshall, top U.S. commander in the global conflict, was not only a collateral descendant of John Marshall, but a VMI graduate who later settled in Leesburg, and whose papers have been assembled at VMI, where a memorial arch has been named in his honor. The first volume of a three-volume biography of General Marshall has just been published.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose mother was Mary Pinckney Hardy of Riveredge, the family home across the Elizabeth River from Norfolk, calls himself "a Virginian." An elaborate memorial to him is being completed in Norfolk and will hold his papers and his war mementos. He has requested that he and Mrs. MacArthur be buried in Norfolk.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's mother, the former Ida Stover, was born in Mount Sidney, on the Staunton-Harrisonburg Road. As a girl she moved to Kansas, where she later married David Eisenhower, and became the mother of Dwight Eisenhower.

Interesting light on General Marshall's career at VMI is shed by the just-published "George C. Marshall: Education of a General, 1880–1939," by Forrest C. Pogue, director of the research center of the George C. Marshall Foundation at VMI.

As "first captain" in his final year at the institute, the austere Marshall frequently "ran the block," i.e., went AWOL after hours from barracks, to see his sweetheart, who later became his first wife. She was Elizabeth Carter Coles, of the prominent Coles family of Albemarle, called "Lily" for some reason. Fortunately, George Marshall was not caught in any of these escapades, which could easily have led to his expulsion.

He played on the varsity football team his senior year, although weighing exactly 145 pounds. VMI tied Virginia, and Marshall's "tackling" was credited with helping to achieve that exceptional result. His tackling was again cited as contributing to VMI's 5-to-0 victory over VPI.

Marshall did not graduate with high scholastic rank from VMI, but he showed great military aptitude. He always felt that the training he received at the institute was important in shaping his later career.

"George C. Marshall: Education of a General" is a well researched and interestingly written contribution to our understanding of one of the three greatest U.S. military figures of World War II. It is good to reflect that each of the three drew inspiration from his Virginia heritage.

Foot in the Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, many of us are concerned at the broad implications of the President's determination to permit the sale of wheat to Russia. This is well set forth in an editorial by Mr. Henry E. Willis in the Steuben Republican, Angola, Ind., which I include herewith:

FOOT IN THE DOOR

Now that the test ban treaty has been signed with Russia, there is some feeling among citizens of the United States that all is love and roses and that the big, bad Russian Bear is now just a playful cub. How foolish can we be.

The test ban is only a means of slowing down one line of attack while another Russian move is made to take over more and more of the free world. It is this quiet, apparently friendly attitude that must be watched, for, like a cancer, it can spread its roots into all parts of our country before it is detected.

One of the first symptoms may well be the move to buy wheat in Canada. American merchants, and some farmers as well, anxious to get their part of this large world purchase, eliminate some of our surplus and at the same time bolster the wheat market, are anxious to drop the restrictions and hurry to trade with Russia. But this, as we see it, is just what the Russians want. They are attempting to use trade as a means to break apart the NATO alliance, the free world friendships, and eventually all resistance to Russian domination. Here is how it works.

The United States, not to be outdone by Canada, decided to sell surplus wheat. This, they argue, is a humane move to relieve suffering and hunger and cannot be used as a possible military move. But what is the next move to purchase surplus coffee from Brazil. Still not a danger, one says.

Now other nations want to get in on the act and get some of this good Russian trade. But they do not have foodstuffs, so they trade what they have in surplus and it may be oil, steel, rubber, tanks, planes, or other

items that definitely are war materials. Now the United States begins to see the picture and tells its NATO friends, "Do not sell these war items to Russia. This trade with Russia endangers the free world security."

But our friends say in reply, "But you have been trading with Russia. What difference is it if we do, also. We don't have wheat but we do have steel, oil, machinery, planes in surplus. Sure, these are war materials, but isn't food listed as one of the most vital of all materials needed by an army? Why can you sell Russia and we cannot."

This move to start trade with Russia is the first move, a cunning move, to start the break in a solid front by the free world nations. It is much more dangerous, more far reaching than that simple loaf of bread to the hungry which it is presented to be.

Conservative Party Is Key Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a free world is a community of interests in what develops in one part effects the rest. Therefore, we cannot be disinterested in political developments in Britain. The recent column by William S. White, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star, well expresses the importance to the United States of conservative party leadership in Britain. Here is the text of Mr. White's article:

CONSERVATIVE PARTY IS KEY ALLY

(By William S. White)

The most important election campaign to the people and Government of the United States save one—our own presidential test of next year—has now been opened in England.

The issue is whether Britain is to remain in control of the Conservative Party of such men as Winston Churchill, Harold Macmillan and Sir Alec Douglas-Home, or is it to be turned over to a Labor Party headed by the erstwhile ban-the-bomber and quasi-neutralist, Harold Wilson.

Among the elaborate fictions theoretically maintained in international affairs is the genteel pretense that what happens politically in one country of the Western Alliance is no business of the others in that alliance. The simple truth is that this is invariably a lot of precious moonshine and that in this particular case it is also dangerous moonshine.

DANGEROUS SEARCH

For the repudiation in England of the Conservative Party newly led by Sir Alec, in succession to the tired and gallant Macmillan, would create profound shock all over the Western World precisely at a time when that world, under American leadership, is groping, in a risky way, for some basic accommodation with the Soviet Union. "Dangerous" is the word for this search. There is legitimate cause for concern that already the West has made too many concessions in this attempt at a more stable international life.

Even the British Conservatives have been ready enough to press the United States into overtures to Nikita Khrushchev. The mind shudders to think how very far a Labor Government under a Harold Wilson would insist, upon going in trusting the intentions of Moscow.

In a word, it is obviously in the highest interest of the United States that one set of British politicians which has urged us on to concessions to the Russians is not succeeded by another set far more inclined in this direction.

The distinction between the two sets cannot be measured so much by public attitudes as by private and personal qualities. The Conservatives, while ready to trust Moscow to a point and only because they think they must, are not and never will be ready to leap into that glad, evangelical buddy-buddyism which is the tendency of the Wilson leadership in England.

Again, the Conservatives like and support their association with the United States as the very foundation of their foreign policy—even though at times they get annoyed as the devil with us and we at them. But powerful forces among the Laborites—though not perhaps Wilson himself—neither really like nor really trust the United States. An alliance with them could never sustain the old intimacy and easy mutual confidence with which these two great Western nations have so long confronted the outer world while conservatism has ruled in London.

There is, moreover, a very human issue involved here. By and large the Conservative Party in Britain stands for the conservation, among other things, of old values and traditions whose loss would be a great pity—if not a moral catastrophe—in a West already far too infected with a vulgar, two-bit, cynicism and a spirit of rejection of such ancient concepts as duty, manners, and responsibility.

ARROGANT ARISTOCRATS

Already the Labor Party is signaling that it is preparing to run a campaign of demagogic class splitting against the Conservatives on the claim that these, the Tories, are cold and arrogant aristocrats, and so on. The new head of the Tories, Douglas-Home, is, indeed, an aristocrat, but in the old and good sense of that term.

Though he cannot deny having been "well born"—which is perhaps not yet a punishable crime—no man against him can fairly deny that being well born in his English sense means being trained from babyhood to do his duty, to avoid the cheap and easy way to success, to live in fairness to those about him, and to die, when the time comes, in honor but without suggesting that his sacrifice is unique among all mankind.

And, after all, who but the "well born" have again and again saved England, from the Battle of Hastings to the Battle of Britain.

Followup Procedure of General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by Comptroller General of the United States Joseph Campbell on the procedures of his office in following up on reports made on activities of the Federal Government.

I feel that this information may also be of assistance to other Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 1, 1963.

The Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: This is in further reference to your letter of October 15, 1963, requesting information as to the followup procedures of our Office for ascertaining the action executive agencies take as a consequence of findings and recommendations in our audit reports. You also asked as to whether our reports are brought to the attention of individual congressional committees and their practice in dealing with such reports.

The information you requested is furnished below in three categories: The followup procedures of the General Accounting Office, those of the Bureau of the Budget, and those of congressional committees.

FOLLOWUP PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

As part of our auditing and reporting processes, it is our policy to give current attention to the corrective actions taken on findings and recommendations previously reported to the Congress and to the agencies concerned. The nature and extent of our followup effort depends considerably upon such factors as the materiality of the deficiency, complexity of the matter involved, the reaction of the responsible agency, and the time necessary to complete and evaluate the corrective actions.

Most of our recommendations for corrective action are addressed to agency officials. In fiscal year 1963, we issued 337 reports to the Congress or its committees and 481 reports to agency officials. Recommendations to the Congress for action to correct deficiencies in agency operations are relatively few and are usually in the form of legislative recommendations. Accordingly, most of our followup activity is directed toward ascertaining and evaluating the corrective actions taken by the agencies concerned. Our followup work includes discussions and correspondence with agency officials concerning the progress of corrective actions, reviews of agency regulations and instructions issued to correct the deficiencies, and reviews of other internal documents evidencing correctice actions. When the significance and materiality of a finding warrants it, the adequacy of the corrective action is evaluated in a special followup review or as part of a subsequent review of the area or activity involved. When necessary, followup reports are addressed to the Congress particularly when we believe corrective action is inadequate or too slow.

In addition, the results of our followup work are disclosed in annual reports to the Congress. The annual report of the Comptroller General of the United States contains the significant findings and recommendations reported during the previous fiscal year including those on which corrective action has not been completed. Also, we furnish annually to the Congress a compilation of findings and recommendations made during the current fiscal year and those made in prior fiscal years on which the agencies have taken corrective actions during the current year.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

A copy of all of our audit reports to the Congress are sent to the President of the United States and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In Circular No. A-50 of April 1, 1959, the Director established a uniform policy and procedure for the consideration and follow-up by agencies of the executive branch of the findings and recommendations in audit and investigative reports of the Comptroller General. In brief,

this circular requires the head of each executive agency to provide for systematic consideration of all General Accounting Office reports on the work of his agency and when such review indicates that action would be appropriate, such action should be promptly initiated. Each agency head is to report to the Bureau of the Budget within 60 calendar days after receipt of a report by the Comptroller General giving his views on the report and the status of actions taken or planned to be taken as a consequence of the report. The report of the agency head is required to cover the following points:

(a) If specific recommendations to the President, to the Congress, or to the Bureau of the Budget are included, the agency head should indicate his views on them and state what events, if any, have taken place with respect to the subject concerned since the time the report was prepared.

(b) If the report contains financial statements which are accompanied by a qualified audit opinion, or a disclaimer of opinion—as distinguished from an unqualified opinion—that they fairly present the financial position and results of operations, the agency head should explain the steps he is taking to remove the difficulties insofar as they are within the power of the agency to correct.

(c) If the report indicates a violation of law, the agency head will explain his views, and if a violation of law is established, he will state what is being done to prevent recurrence. If additional agency action is required (as in the case of violations of the Antideficiency Act, sec. 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended), the agency head will include comments on the status of his action in this respect.

(d) If the report contains significant findings or recommendations to the agency, the agency head will give a brief statement of his views on them and the current status of the matter. It will not be necessary to cover those findings where the report itself indicates that sufficient corrective action has been taken.

A copy of the Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-50 is enclosed.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate establishes the Committee on Government Operations as one of the standing committees and, in part, (j)(2) of that rule states:

"Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(A) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the Senate as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;"

The Rules of the House of Representatives provide for 20 named standing committees, one of which is the Committee on Government Operations. Rule XI sets forth that committee's jurisdiction and provides, in part, as follows:

"8. Committee on Government Operations—

"(c) Such committee shall have the duty of—

"(1) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports;"

In the last several reports on its activities, the Senate committee states that the reports by the Comptroller General to the Congress, which were referred to the committee, were reviewed by the staff of the committee in order to determine what action, if any should be taken by the committee to insure compliance with the recommendations of the General Accounting Office. Where these reports reflected a possible violation of law or an improper use of Federal funds or property, they were referred to the staff of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations for further study and recommended action.

In the latest report on it activities, covering the 87th Congress, the House committee explained that, in discharging its responsibility, all reports of the Comptroller General received by the committee are studied and analyzed by the staff. When deficiences in agency operations are noted by the Comptroller General, the committee normally requests the affected agency or agencies to report to it the corrective actions which have been taken or which are planned. Both the Comptroller General's reports and the agency responses are referred to the subcommittee of this committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter involved.

Periodic reports are made to the chairman on the action taken on these reports by the various subcommittees and the current status of all reports received by the committee. In appropriate instances, the subcommittees have requested and received followup status reports from the administrative agencies involved as to the corrective action taken with respect to the General Accounting Office findings and recommendations. In a number of cases, the reports are used in each session of the Congress as a basis for committee investigations, culminating in public hearings and reports of findings to the House. See, for example, House Report No. 1858, 87th Congress, "Illegal Actions in the Construction of the Airfield at Fort Lee, Va."

As far as we know, other committees of the Congress generally do not have regularly established procedures for following up on the legislative recommendations made in reports of the Comptroller General. However, our records show numerous instances of actions by the various committees based on our reports and recommendations. We furnish copies of our reports to the Congress directly to the legislative committees concerned with the subject matter of the reports and copies of all reports are furnished the Appropriations Committees. The actions taken by the legislative committees on these reports depend on the committees' appraisals of the importance of the subject matter and the committees' interest in relation to their legislative programs. Our staff maintains a constant liaison with the committees to furnish information to the members and staff on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations in our reports.

At the request of its chairman, we have, since 1954, made an annual report to the House Appropriations Committee of selected significant findings developed in the course of our audit work during the preceding year. The findings included in these reports relate, for the most part, to matters on which it is believed that administrative action, and, in some cases legislative action, is required to achieve greater economy or efficiency in Government operations. The items selected for inclusion in these reports, all of which having been included in previous audit reports, are those which we believe should be of particular interest to the committee during the appropriations hearings for the following year. Pertinent extracts of the reports are sent to the various agencies and departments concerned so that they may prepare to answer the committee's inquiries during appropriations hearings.

Our review of the printed appropriations hearings discloses that the committee makes extensive use of our reports during its hearings. On occasion, members of our staff are requested to confer with committee members or members of its staff to assist them in preparing appropriate lines of inquiry.

While no special general annual reports are made to the Senate Appropriations Committee, a perusal of the hearings of that committee discloses frequent references to reports of the Comptroller General. From time to time, members of our staff, upon request, have met with subcommittee members and staff to advise on matters of interest to the subcommittee and assist in developing productive lines of inquiry.

At the beginning of each session of the Congress, members of our professional staff concerned with our work in the Department of Defense meet with staff members of the Defense subcommittees of both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to advise them of our findings in this area. Based on these discussions, specific items for inquiry are identified.

During the 87th Congress and the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the following committees held hearings on subjects arising from our reports:

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior.

Armed Services, Special Investigations Subcommittee, Subcommittee No. 3.

Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Education.

Government Operations, Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Government Activities Subcommittee, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Military Operations Subcommittee.

Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 2, Subcommittee No. 4.

Post Office and Civil Service, Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics.

Public Works, Subcommittee on Roads, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

SENATE COMMITTEES

Agriculture and Forestry, Special Subcommittee on Watershed Projects.

Armed Services.

Government Operations, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

JOINT COMMITTEES

Joint Economic Committee.

Officials of the General Accounting Office appeared at all of these hearings to give information about our findings and conclusions.

It is our policy to furnish copies of reports on specific activities or operations to all Members and Senators representing the districts or States in which such activities or operations are located. Also, over the years, we have developed fairly extensive distribution lists under which certain Members and Senators are furnished copies of reports dealing with subjects of particular interest to them.

We hope that the foregoing information is fully responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Recipient of the Cardinal Gibbons Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, along with a number of my colleagues, I was privileged to attend the dinner on November 2, 1963, when our distinguished and beloved Speaker was presented the 1963 Cardinal Gibbons

Medal awarded to him by the Alumni Association of the Catholic University of America at the Shoreham Hotel. He delivered one of the most inspiring and challenging speeches I have ever heard him deliver, and, in my years in the House, I have heard him make some excellent ones.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including the statement made by the board of governors of the alumni association when they met last June to choose the recipient of this year's Cardinal Gibbons Medal. It is so expressive of his contribution to his Government, the Catholic Church, and the Catholic University of America that I am asking that it be included as a part of my remarks, together with this splendid speech delivered by the Speaker:

STATEMENT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS

When the board of governors of the alumni association met last June to choose the recipient of this year's Cardinal Gibbons Medal, which is established to honor one who has made an outstanding contribution to either the United States of America, the Catholic Church, or the Catholic University of America, it unanimously chose a man eminently qualified on all three points. Little need be said about a man so well known and so well loved and respected throughout the United States as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Born in South Boston, JOHN MCCORMACK was educated in the Boston public schools, became a lawyer, and served in World War I. He served in the House of Representatives of his home State of Massachusetts during the early twenties and in the Massachusetts Senate for 4 years, from 1923–27, the last 2 years as Democratic leader.

During the 70th Congress, he came to Washington, D.C., to fill the unexpired term of the late James A. Gallivan. He served in the following nine consecutive Congresses, and in the 81st and 82d Congresses he was majority leader, and in the 83d Congress was a Democratic whip. He served as a Member of the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, and the 1st session of the 87th Congress he was again majority leader, and was Speaker for the 2d session of the 87th and the 88th Congress.

He has been awarded honorary degrees of LL.D. by a host of famous colleges and universities, including the Catholic University of America, and, he has had an impressive number of honors awarded him. His memberships include the Order of Malta First Class; Knight Commander, Order of St. Gregory the Great; Grand Commnader of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, with Star; and many others too numerous to mention.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN W. MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Toastmaster, right reverend, very reverend monsignors, reverend fathers, reverend sisters, my dear friends and distinguished colleagues of the National House of Representatives, the great American who has dedicated his entire life, both in war and in peace, to the best interests of our country, General Gruenther; distinguished and invited guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very conscious of the honor that has been bestowed upon me by the Alumni Association of the Catholic University of America in presenting the 1963 Cardinal Gibbons Medal to me. It is true that a man in public life can become the recipient sometimes of many honors, and equally true that these must naturally fall into some gradation of importance assigned by the individual himself. May I assure the members of the Catholic University Alumni Association that this present award, combining as it does the distinction of being honored by the National Pontifical University and the memory, still fresh and still impressive, of so great a Catholic churchman as James Cardinal Gibbons was, brings me a feeling of great humility and deep appreciation.

The Cardinal Gibbons Medal, as the president of your association reminded you, should be awarded to a person who has made a contribution to the church, the Nation, or the university. Any man in public life hopes to be able to make some contribution, however small it might be. It is never as great as a man would want it to be. But I am grateful to all of you for considering me for this award, and I am all the more closely touched by it because of the man whose name it bears.

The honor that comes to me through this award is all the more valued since it bears the name of one of the truly great Americans of our time. Less than a half century ago we were living in the "age of James Gibbons," and the impress of his life of deep faith, of his remarkable personality and farseeing leadership has left many a monument.

This great university, a landmark of Catholic education throughout the Nation, is to a considerable extent the legacy of his foresight. As the first chancellor of the Catholic University of America, he played a significant role in guiding its early years. In fact, what is there in the Catholic Church in this area—indeed in the entire Nation—that does not bear the mark of his genius? How much did the great papal encyclicals on labor owe to the cardinal's unfailing championship of the American workingman? How much does the splendid patriotism of American Catholics, tested in so many trials and conflicts, reflect the outspoken love of country that was a hallmark of the great cardinal?

And not only this, but James Cardinal Gibbons was a man far ahead of his times. He is perhaps the first great ecumenist in the hierarchy of the American church. He possessed extraordinary courage, the courage of action, and when advisable, the courage of silence. Above all, what Cardinal Gibbons stood for was genuine and complete Catholicism in entire harmony with a genuine and complete Americanism. He would have been very much at home with Pope John, very much at home with Pope Paul. He saw his role as a national figure in the light of his own great charity for all races, for all nations, and for all religions. The Ecumenical Council meeting in Rome this very week would find in him a great spokesman for its pleas for an ecumenical spirit and for universal brotherhood. It is a special honor to receive this medal which bears his name.

The Catholic University of America is this year celebrating its diamond jubilee. The University of the American Bishops has a right to be proud of its contributions to the church and the Nation during the past 75 years. One of the very first of the universities organized by the Catholic Church and the only one in the Nation of pontifical status. It has blazed a bright trail through the educational history of the United States. Outstanding scholars have always found the university as a congenial home and the history of the church in America has been influenced greatly by the administrators, faculty, and alumni of this great institution.

The clarion call of this university, as indeed of all Catholic education has been the insistence of the preparation of the well-rounded man. The university has firmly rejected the idea of education which focuses on the technician as a human machine rather than as a human person, even as it has also rejected the notion that the liberal arts today can prosper in a heavily technical world by ignoring the great contemporary movements in science, much as an ostrich with its head firmly planted in the sand.

The Catholic University has given evidence of its forward thinking, and as well of its balanced judgment concerning the needs of education today. Your university was one of the very first to obtain a nuclear reactor, one of the pioneers in establishing a department of the space sciences, one of the most forward thinking of the engineering schools in the country. And, I know, the Catholic University stands ready even today to meet the challenging opportunity of a world in scientific transition.

On the other hand, the Catholic University has never lost sight of the humanistic and spiritual values that must go into the process of formation of the whole man. Alongside this new technological growth, the university has kept pace in the field of arts and letters. Your splendid plans for a new university theater, the thriving bureau of social research established a short time ago, the continuing excellence of the departments of humane studies which was crowned last June by the award of more Woodrow Wilson fellowships to your students than to any other university in the area; finally, the insistence on graduate studies where Catholic University makes its unequalled contribution to American higher education—all these are indications that you are still moving forward in both the scientific and the humanistic components of the well-balanced education.

And such forward progress is the hallmark of American education today. As this Nation makes incomparable strides forward in its scientific knowledge, as it reaches out literally to grasp the moon within the arms of its technical comprehension, it must move forward with equal steps toward a broadening and a deepening of its cultural and intellectual life. No one who faces the future can deny that scientific know-how and technical appreciation of new forces must be one of the keystones of national greatness. This Nation cannot afford to slow down in its quest, already well begun, to master the forces of nature in a nuclear age.

On the other hand again, many of us, especially those of us who are responsible to a small or great degree, for the policy and the progress of this Nation, see that there is only disaster in closing our eyes to the arts as we concentrate on the sciences. This has been the lesson taught by the Catholic University, and by every institution of higher learning in the United States today.

When the House of Representatives passed its bill providing for assistance to institutions of higher learning, these thoughts were in our minds. They provided the motivation for the bill which would have given aid to all types of higher education, including the arts and the humanities, and not restricted to the scientific and technological. Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut, himself a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in pleading for the House orientation of the education bill from the floor of the Senate last month, did not hesitate to prefer the broader purposes of the House bill, saying, "Higher education needs support in all fields. It simply cannot be argued that funds should be used to aid the teaching of physics, but not the teaching of foreign languages, to aid the teaching of biology but not the teaching of economics, to aid the teaching of botany but not the teaching of history" (RECORD p. 18509).

Educators throughout the country have seen the need of expanded support for education which would include as equal sisters, the fields of arts and the humanities. Senator PROUTY of Vermont, in defending the House bill several weeks ago in the Senate, called the attention of that body to the fact that he had received messages from hun-

dreds of college and university presidents on this issue, 96 percent of them being in favor of unrestricted aid that could be applied to the arts and humane studies as well as to the strictly scientific. He went on to warn: "Downgrade the arts and humanities and you downgrade America. If we downgrade the arts and the humanities, American education will be flying on one wing."

Monsignor McDonald, your own rector, made a plea of great importance at the Catholic University's June commencement, this year. He called for a national foundation based on the National Science Foundation, which would provide aid to outstanding young men and women who choose the arts and humanities as their field of graduate research; similar financial support as is today given to those who dedicate themselves to research in the sciences. I welcome the thoughtful suggestion of the rector of the Catholic University of America. It is a most constructive suggestion, worthy of every consideration.

The battle for the future will be, as has been said before, a battle for men's minds. To the nation with the greatest understanding of the truth—of the whole truth—of the truth in science and the truth in culture, to this Nation belongs tomorrow. And today's struggle is to prepare the minds of our young men and women with a grasp of knowledge and understanding which is balanced enough to meet the challenges of an evolving science without losing its roots in a culture that still appreciates the value of the human person. I commend the Catholic University of America for its never-flagging dedication to this ideal. It captures my imagination, and I commend highly your right reverend rector for advancing these constructive proposals.

We are living in an important and trying period of the world's history. As you and I are present this evening, history is being made. Despite the cooing voice of peaceful coexistence, the forces of evil are bent on world domination.

While we must be powerful militarily, we must also be strong spiritually; all persons everywhere who believe in God and His law. For deep faith is the affirmative strength that could well be the difference between victory and defeat.

One of the great events of history is taking place now in Rome; instituted by Pope John and followed and emphasized in his own right by Pope Paul; the Ecumenical Council.

This is not only a great event in the history of the Catholic Church, and more broadly, of religion, but it is one of the historic events of mankind. For from it will flow great beneficial results.

It is evident to everyone that the Ecumenical Council is affirmative and positive. The growth of the ecumenical spirit throughout the world has already strongly evidenced itself. The religious understanding and spirit is stronger today than it has been for generations, and that understanding and spirit will grow stronger in generations that lie ahead.

While military power is necessary as a deterrent to Communist aggression, the ecumenical spirit everywhere is necessary for a future world of peace. For in a sense, military strength is negative; responding to the law of self-preservation; to deter, and in case of attack and war, to win and survive. In the world of today it is absolutely necessary. And our country has great military strength and power. But it is the word of God in the minds of men and women that is our real strength, our affirmative strength, animating their thoughts and actions, and looking forward with faith and confidence to a world of peace.

As we project our minds into the foreseeable future, the results that will flow from the work of the Ecumenical Council, makes it one of the most notable events of world history.

As Cardinal Cushing recently and so well said, "The present Ecumenical Council will accept the challenge of those who contend that we are on the threshold of an atheistic era."

It is in the spirit of James Cardinal Gibbons, who in America many years ago, preached and practiced the ecumenical spirit, that I accept this year's award of the Cardinal Gibbons Medal.

Plea for the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the emphasis placed today on the importance of science and technology in our colleges and universities, and the encouragement offered our young people to become engineers, physicists, mathematicians, chemists and other types of scientists have aroused concern among educators lest we fail to give comparable support to the arts and humanities.

The weeklong hearings on my bill, S. 165, and on Senator HUMPHREY's bill, S. 1316, which call for the establishment of a U.S. National Arts Foundation—1316 also calls for an Advisory Committee on the Arts—recently conducted by the Special Subcommittee on the Arts of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare heard significant testimony on the importance of developing our Nation's resources in the arts as an essential factor in national strength. There was considerable emphasis on the need to give more attention to the arts as part of our children's education in the public schools and to improve teacher training in art education in order to have competent teachers. A bill to establish a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities within the Office of Education was introduced in the House last year by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, and by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, but was not acted upon by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Reference to this proposal is made in a recent address by Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the board of International Business Machines Corp. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by Mr. Watson entitled "The Case for Balance," delivered before the 46th annual meeting of the American Council on Education, held in Washington, D.C., October 3, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR BALANCE

(Address by Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of the board, International Business Machines Corp.)

I can't begin to tell you how delighted I am to be here tonight. When I was invited to speak to you, I accepted at once because I knew the distinction of this group and because by associating with outstanding educators, I have always been able to learn something myself.

I have a great faith in education. Along with an affirmation of that faith tonight, I want to express a concern about the current course of education—a concern which has come to me both as a citizen and as a representative of an industry which is involved in some of the rapid changes now taking place in our 20th century world.

That concern has its origin just 6 years ago tomorrow. It was the day that the Soviet Union put Sputnik I in orbit. Do you remember the thoughts which flooded in on us that day? Thoughts of embarrassment—dismay—concern.

To be sure, there were lots of ways of explaining away the Russians' lead and many of us wanted to do that. We could say that they had captured outstanding German rocket scientists in World War II; that for years after the war they had been working on rockets of great thrust while we had done little or nothing; that they could not make atomic bombs compact enough to go into small missiles and therefore had to build powerful engines which were also convenient for putting space vehicles into orbit.

We could even try to say that satellites were just stunts, that sputnik was a silly hunk of iron. But try as we would to whistle in the dark, Americans finally had to reach the conclusion that the Russians had outdistanced us at least temporarily in the exploration of space, a pursuit which in our century might well become as important as the exploration of the oceans had been in the time of Columbus and Magellan.

So what happened? You know the answer well.

As sputnik circled the earth, a great change began to take place in our country. We began a large national effort to scrutinize our resources, to see where we were falling short, to make sure that in the intensifying competition between us and the Soviet Union, we would not end up in second place.

That effort has given the world another example of the greatness and the power of the democratic system of the United States of America—another historic example of how this great cumbersome country of ours, when confronted with a serious problem, pulls itself together, makes decisions, and takes vigorous steps toward correction.

We reorganized the Department of Defense, cut down interservice rivalry, and strengthened the control of the President and the Secretary of Defense over military operations and research on missiles and rockets.

We established a new National Aeronautics and Space Administration and through it have already produced weather probes, Telstar and intercontinental television, and the flights of the astronauts.

Closer to your own professional area, we wrote into law a National Defense Education Act designed to improve the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The act also encouraged promising students to enter careers in science and engineering.

Under this act and through the leadership of such organizations as your own and the National Science Foundation, a massive effort has been underway to drive forward in the teaching of science, mathematics, and engineering from first grade through college.

I need not further detail these extensive and exciting advances. You know them well—you helped bring them about. And let me add that I should be the last person to deplore them. As you might suspect, we in the IBM company tend to have a good opinion of computers. We make and sell as many as we can, here and overseas. Scientists and engineers are vital to our success.

We employ as many able ones as we can find. Our livelihood depends on their explorations.

But having said this, I want to also say that these events of the past 6 years have had an impact on education which should concern us all—educators, businessmen, and citizens. You know this impact well: It has thrown the sciences and the humanities badly out of balance.

In the blazing light of manmade comets, the continuing need for an appropriate balance between science and the humanities has been blotted out.

When a balance existed there was rough equality of opportunity in technical and humanist careers in universities and in the business world. Students are very practical and impressionable young people. Most good undergraduates tend to aim in the direction of greatest opportunity in and out of the university. Today a youngster in high school or college can see a striking contrast between the rewards in science and those in the humanities and arts.

One recent survey shows that in employment outside the academic world, nearly all natural scientists expect to earn $5,000 a year or more immediately upon receiving a Ph. D. In contrast, fewer than one-half the humanists expect to command such salary. Graduate students in the natural sciences expect, by the age of 45, to be able to earn more than $13,000 a year; the humanists hope for less than three-quarters of that amount.

The spread is smaller inside the academic world, but there the humanists, as you know, still have to resign themselves to longer hours of teaching and supervisory work in return for less money. And they can expect few of the fringe benefits which come the way of the scientist—Federal stipends for summer research, Federal postdoctoral fellowships, and even corporate consulting contracts.

We live in an increasingly technological world and it is natural that the people who are immediately concerned with bringing this progress about become more important in our scheme of things. However, we cannot afford to let the importance of the technical make us forget the very great importance of proper emphasis on the humanities and arts.

My own university received more than $1½ million from the Federal Government for engineering last year. By contrast, history got $16,000.

In the fiscal year of 1961, of all Federal funds for basic research, the physical and biological sciences got 97 percent.

It is quite natural that the Government has been emphasizing the technical side of education and research in its support programs. Any other course would have been most unwise. We know that the Soviet Union has been emphasizing this side of their education for years with impressive results. To have not responded to their challenge would have been the height of folly.

When we look at the number of new teachers we shall need in this decade, we have to face this inescapable fact: that we are not producing enough Ph. D.'s in English, in foreign languages, in the fine arts; not even enough college graduates trained to teach English in high school.

Such evidences of decline in the humanities and arts are not new to you. Sputnik intensified them. And, I believe, the time has come to arrest that decline.

There are many traditional reasons for reemphasizing the humanities—which today are more important than ever.

In the first place, a thorough grounding in the humanities is vital training for many phases of leadership—for the preparation of leaders who can wisely manage people as well as sufficiently manage machines. This need exists in universities, in public service, and in business.

Secondly, as our planet continues to shrink, we will more and more have to become citizens of the world. We must acquire a better understanding of the language, history, and culture of people of other lands. With present day mass-destruction weapons, this understanding is not just desirable—it's vital.

Finally, the greater our skills in the humanities—in literature and the arts—the greater our capacity for a constructive use of leisure time, which is bound to increase as machines lift old burdens from men's shoulders and minds.

The argument for the humanities, however, does not end there.

To my mind, their most compelling justification is simply this: That without the humanities we cannot adequately solve the most crucial problems we face, either as a society or as a member of the world community.

Let's get down to cases. Consider the headlines in any typical metropolitan daily newspaper. What questions lie behind the foremost news stories of these days:

What policy should we follow in South Vietnam?

What should we do about our hundreds of thousands of unemployed teenagers, and about our millions of grown men and women who for months have looked for work without finding it?

How can we best wage ideological competition with the Communist world?

Or even one as simple as: Do we now ship grain to the Russians?

No one of these problems can be solved by the application of scientific knowledge alone. Good answers to these questions require valid assumptions about ethics, about the responsibility of a state to its citizens, about the rights of an individual within the state, about the nature of Buddhism, about the differences between the ideology of the Marxists and the ideology of the free world of the West.

American solutions must come from background steeped in the philosophies of Paine, Jefferson, Madison, John Adams, John Marshall, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and countless others who have contributed to the wide ranging and free mind of the well-educated American.

Let me add that computers can contribute little to the solutions either.

As a manufacturer of computers, I feel both shocked and alarmed whenever I hear the prediction—and I hear it often—that one day "the machines will take over" and give us the answers to everything.

A computer is a machine and a machine is a tool—a means to an end—nothing more. To be sure, the tools of today will far outstrip those of the past. We live in an age when machines can do things they have never done before—can, for example, take orders, design manufacturing specifications, set rates of production, give data on purchasing, and order stock for warehouses.

Machines can even do a little scholarly work. It is just a beginning, but machines can now begin to do a little useful translation of foreign languages.

But whatever we teach computers to do, the machines will still be only a means.

Let me give you a specific example. Just assume we were using an electronic computer to try to determine what we should do about civil rights in the United States.

First we might ask the computer questions like these: Do Negroes have the right to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly? Do they have the right to vote? Do they have the right to go to college? Do they have the right to enter the professions?

To each of these questions—the machine would flash back the answer "yes." In fact, if not programed properly, it might even conclude that we had no civil rights problem at all.

But, in fairness, we would then have to ask the machine other questions such as these: Have many Negroes in fact voted in recent elections State by State? Has a reasonable percentage of Negroes actually been able to go to college? Have a disproportionate number dropped out of grade school? Have many reached top managerial and professional jobs?

To these questions the machine would have to answer "No." And then go on to inform us that a problem certainly does exist.

But, after having identified the problem, the machine could not then type out a solution. It could not because the solution to a problem such as this would require the exercise of a value judgment. Until somebody—some human being—inserts a value judgment into the machine, it has no preference whatsoever for racial harmony over racial violence or for brotherhood over bloodshed. It has no conscience.

Most important of all, to resolve the fundamental issues we face today, it is not enough to know the right. What we need over and above knowledge of the right is an inspired will to do the right as individuals and as a society. Such inspiration, even in an age of the most advanced thinking machines we can imagine, will continue to be the province of the humanities, of literature, philosophy and the arts.

As Wordsworth wrote, poetry is not just truth, but "truth carried alive into the heart by passion."

The imbalance in American education is evident.

The need to restore the humanities and the arts is clear.

What specific means should we pursue?

Each of you probably has a better and clearer answer to that question than I. You may even think it a presumption that I elect to talk on the subject. I do so with humility, but with the knowledge that while advancing technology has paid my salary in business for 26 years—I have been inspired to work through imagination and ambition gained from the humanities and the arts.

So to presume further let me make a few very simple suggestions.

As you know, in 1950 the Congress of the United States established the National Science Foundation.

I believe the time has now arrived to establish a National Foundation for the Humanities and Arts, which will accomplish for this area what the National Science Foundation has accomplished for the sciences. As many of you doubtless know, legislation proposing such an institution—within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—has been introduced in the Congress. Many educators have supported this bill, though some would prefer a different approach such as the creation of an independent agency, like the National Science Foundation itself.

I am less concerned with the location of such a foundation than with its early establishment. And I am not arguing that its budget match that of the National Science Foundation. But I am arguing that we do something at once to arrest the decline of the humanities. We cannot afford to let it continue.

Action will not come, however, without the biggest single need of all: a fighting case for the humanities.

We confront the unfortunate habit of many Americans to consider an idea of Thomas Jefferson as something less real than a missile in its silo, to regard a concept of civil rights as something less real than a computer, to think of the arts as frill, not substance. On this sixth anniversary of the flight of sputnik, we can be sure of one thing: no second sputnik will come along to jolt us into action, and do for American education in the humanities what the first sputnik did for American education in the sciences.

That job must really be done by you. If you are in general agreement about the

problem and if you will attack it as you have other educational problems of the past, the imbalance will soon be corrected.

Science and technology give us the tools and make us the machines, but the humanities, above all, dictate the job we will do with those tools and machines, and inspire us to do it. That job has never been defined better than it is in the sentence inscribed in marble around the inside of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson here in Washington: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

To the extent that we fail to renew our acquaintance with such ideas, we forget what the United States is.

To the extent that we forget the disciplines of humane learning, neglect scholarship in literature, history and philosophy, and diminish our capacity for handling ideas as well as we handle implements, we shall fail to arrive at balanced and intelligent solutions to our toughest current human problems.

And to the extent that we cut ourselves off from the inspirational power that is the unique characteristic of the humanities, we shall fail to do the right, even though we know the right.

And if we fail in these things as a nation, we fail absolutely.

But we shall certainly not fail.

For each of us in this room tonight knows that we can as a society recall and relive our supreme inheritance from ancient Athens handed down through more than 2,000 years of humane learning—that, above all, happiness is not in the possession of property but in the pursuit of wisdom—and in action which accords with virtue.

Economist Suggests Tax Cut May Be Inflationary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, another economist, B. H. Beckhart, professor emeritus of banking, Columbia University, has added his voice to those who believe that the President's program of tax cuts accompanied by higher levels of spending may be inflationary. Citing the well-known article by Clayton Gehman entitled "Measuring and Analyzing Economic Growth," which appeared in the August Federal Reserve Bulletin, Professor Beckhart says that the carefully prepared and detailed article greatly weakens if it does not destroy the arguments of those who advocate a tax cut on the ground that it is essential to promote growth.

In the light of the conclusions of the Gehman article, Professor Beckhart also concludes that the tax cut may not only be unnecessary, but that it carries the threat of inflation. Under unanimous consent, I include a letter from Professor Beckhart which appeared in the November 3 New York Times in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TAX CUT OPPOSED AS INFLATIONARY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

A significant article appeared in the Federal Reserve Bulletin for this past August which has not received the attention it deserves.

In this article entitled "Measuring and Analyzing Economic Growth," the author, Clayton Gehman, points out that economic growth has not slowed down in recent years in the United States. On the contrary, it has been proceeding at close to long-term rates. Unemployment has resulted not from slackening of growth but from increased productive efficiency.

The widespread impression that the rate of growth has slowed down has resulted from the use of statistics which are not wholly representative, which in certain cases do not reflect recent technological change and which are deflated by price indices with an upward bias.

In conclusion, the author states that there is less slack in the American economy than is generally supposed and that attempts to accelerate the rate of expansion may result in upward price pressures.

This carefully prepared and detailed article greatly weakens if it does not destroy the arguments of those who advocate a tax cut on the ground that it is essential to promote growth. If there has been no retardation in the rate of growth, as the author demonstrates, a tax cut at this time is not only unnecessary but carries the threat of inflation.

B. H. BECKHART,
Professor Emeritus of Banking,
Columbia University.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., *Oct. 31, 1963.*

Federal Communications Commission Interpretation of So-Called Fairness Doctrine in Connection With the Use of Radio Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues several articles which discuss the Federal Communications Commission's recent interpretation of the so-called fairness doctrine for the purpose of stifling the conservation political viewpoint on the airwaves of America.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the following articles be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. They are:

First. A column by Mr. John Chamberlain as printed in the News & Courier, of Charleston, S.C., on November 5, 1963, and entitled "Fairness, Ad Infinitum."

Second. An article from the November 1963, Report to America by the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies of Washington, D.C., and entitled "Now Comes Muzzling the Radio."

Third. A news article from the October 21, 1963, issue of Broadcasting magazine entitled "Fairness Caught Between Reuther Brothers Report on Radical Right Calls on FCC To Aid in Curbing Rightist Growth."

Fourth. An editorial from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated November 5, 1963, and entitled "Boils and Corruptive Tissue."

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Nov. 5, 1963]

FAIRNESS, AD INFINITUM

(By John Chamberlain)

The Manion Forum of South Bend, Ind., which specializes in giving voice to good conservatives on its radio and TV programs, is very much worried about the new fairness doctrine being emphasized in a recent ruling of the Federal Communications Commission.

The doctrine, so Mr. L. F. Reardon, a vice president of the Manion Forum, fears, will be invoked to badger all sorts of rightwingers and keep them from telling their side of the story in their broadcasts.

Well, it's taken long enough for the conservative movement in the United States to make a comeback after the ideological debacle of the 1930's, and one can see why conservatives should have gotten into the habit of looking apprehensively over their shoulders. But just how much does the FCC fairness rule menace conservative broadcasters? Can't some swift and effective counterremedy be found?

The new "doctrine," as Dean Manion's Vice President Reardon puts it, "attempts to enforce an unlawful rule that equal time be given to those who oppose any point of view expressed over radio or TV. This rule, in practice, has been applied only to conservatives * * * leftwing extremists of every ilk are clamoring to answer our program."

Everything that Mr. Reardon says may be true insofar as it applies to his own predicament. But if the conservatives limit themselves to the defensive in this matter of protesting the fairness directive, which was issued on July 26, they are bound to lose the fight.

It seems to this columnist, who listens sporadically to both TV and radio political programs, that for every conservative on the air, there are at least three liberals, to use the word in its contemporary sense. Now, obviously, if the fairness criterion is to be applied with any fairness by the FCC Commissioners, this means that conservatives would have the opportunity to cash in on a ratio that is 3 to 1 in their favor.

What they should do to combat any adverse application of the equal time policy is to organize a domestic monitoring service comparable to the one maintained by Radio Liberty for keeping tabs on what is being said on the air inside Russia.

Every time a conservative individual or organization is mentioned in a derogatory way by a liberal commentator, the monitoring organization could tip somebody to complain loudly and at length.

The demand for equal time would absolutely swamp the liberals since they have more programs going for them anyway.

Just think of the ensuing chaos if the fairness doctrine were enforced to the letter of a crazy law.

Any time the Birchers are decried by somebody, the chief of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch, could demand the right to answer.

The New York Conservative Party, in its effort to field the attacks made on it over the air, would have a 24-hour job in its hands. But it would also have a 24-hour opportunity to get its own publicity. And the U.S. Congress, to back up the ruling of the FCC, would have to legislate a change in the calendar to put 48 hours into every official radio or TV day.

The way to have any palpably absurd ruling or law taken off the books is to campaign for its complete and impartial enforcement.

If conservatives will only get on the ball about this, they can have the FCC sprinting to take cover.

If nobody can mention a person or an organization on the air without guaranteeing equal time for reply, how could the Messrs. Huntley and Brinkley ever put on a show? How could Walter Cronkite say anything pertinent?

How could Howard Smith operate?

The FCC ruling is particularly silly coming in a year when various political parties and personalities are reviving up for their campaigns. Before November of 1964 is here everybody will be mentioning everybody.

There simply aren't enough airwaves or hours to go around to permit a just enforcement of the fairness doctrine.

[From Report to America, American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Washington, D.C., November 1963]

NOW COMES MUZZLING THE RADIO

We have long been aware of managed news, muzzling of the military, left-wing slanting of news reports, and of the overwhelming number of columnists serving the Establishment and their preferential treatment. We know too that our right-wing platforms have been taken from us by left-wingers on the plaintive plea, "Of course you want to hear both sides, don't you?" We do think there are two sides to the issue of preserving us as a Nation under the Constitution of the United States—or what is left of it.

But now comes an intensified drive to silence the small independent and other radio stations carrying programs of conservatives like Dean Manion of the Manion Forum and 20th Century Reformation Hour of Dr. Carl McIntire.

Through the Federal Communications Commission, the administration has unearthed an extra-legal fairness doctrine first published in 1949. The doctrine—merely an opinion—attempts to enforce an unlawful rule that equal time be given to those who oppose any point of view expressed over radio or TV. This rule, in practice, has been applied only to conservatives—station managers have been badgered to remove these broadcasts from the air while liberal programs go unmolested.

Already the Manion Forum and the 20th Century Reformation Hour have felt the sting. Broadcasting, weekly publication serving the radio world, September 2, 1963, wrote, "There's deep concern in high administration circles over use of radio (and some TV) by rightwing groups such as H. L. Hunt's Life Line, John Birch Society, and Rev. Carl McIntire, of Collingswood, N.J., * * * President Kennedy reportedly made mention of 'Life Line' at his August 22 luncheon with 19 prominent broadcasters."

Dr. McIntire, in a recent release, quotes from a letter to him from one of his radio station managers which says, "The Federal Communications Commission has come out with a new ruling stating that 'When a controversial program involves a personal attack upon an individual or organization, the licensee must transmit the text of the broadcast to the person or group attacked, wherever located, either prior to or at the time of broadcast, with a specific offer of his station's facilities for an adequate response. The quotation is from Public Notice—B, FCC, 63-734, 38372, July 26, 1963, entitled "Broadcast Licensees Advised Concerning Stations' Responsibilities Under the Fairness Doctrine as to Controversial Issue Programing."

If this new regulation is to be applied, then it is necessary for either the station or the speaker to supply 500 or more stations with copies of the talk, also to each individual or organization mentioned and probably to the Communist Party so its spokesmen can have free time to reply. Many small broadcasters would thus be trampled to death. As a practical matter such regulations cannot be carried out for lack of funds, clerical help, and time. Since the stations do not know how the FCC will appraise these matters in specific instances, their license may be in jeopardy at the time of renewal (every 3 years) and therefore they will be content to serve the public by spot commerical announcements and an increased diet of hillbilly music. Listeners know that invitations for rebuttal of the facts presented are often issued by the speakers, but seldom find any takers.

All of this constitutes an attack on free speech. Radio and TV should be as free as newspapers. Dr. McIntire points out that he pays for his radio time; that the National Council of Churches spokesmen have been granted free time by the networks which they use to discuss the most controversial religious questions of the day—civil rights, the one-world church, the United Nations and other issues—but NBC has turned him down to make replies. NBC says they are not controversial.

The legislative branch of Government is still our best hope for redress of wrongs. Protest to your own Members of Congress, but also seek out your local radio station manager. Urge that he carry or continue to carry the programs you like; help to find him sponsors.

If this directive is made to stick (and the Manion Forum and Dr. McIntire will fight it with your help) let us use this two-edged sword to demand equal time of the stations that champion the leftwing international socialist one-world position and find speakers to present the pro-American constitutional position. There are plenty of them.

[From Broadcasting magazine, Oct. 21, 1963]

FAIRNESS CAUGHT BETWEEN—REUTHER BROTHERS REPORT ON RADICAL RIGHT CALLS ON FCC TO AID IN CURBING RIGHTEST GROWTH

The FCC and its fairness doctrine have become involved in the controversy developing over a memorandum on "the radical right" that Walter and Victor Reuther submitted to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy 2 years ago, but has only recently come to light.

The Justice Department says the document has been gathering dust in the files. But the right-wing groups say the memorandum constitutes a blueprint for eliminating conservatism in the United States.

The memorandum describes the growing strength of the right-wing movement, warns of the danger it poses for the Kennedy administration's domestic and foreign programs, and recommends measures for combating it.

Among other things, it suggests enlisting the aid of the FCC. The memorandum says the Commission should investigate the extent to which radio and television stations give free time to representatives of the "radical right" and suggests that the Commission "encourage" broadcasters to give free time for reply to spokesmen of opposing points of view.

Walter Reuther is vice president of the AFL-CIO and president of the United Auto Workers. His brother Victor is in charge of international affairs for the UAW. At the time the memorandum was submitted, he also headed UAW's legislative and citizenship activities programs.

GOLDWATER TO WELCH

The document describes the "radical right" as being bound "on the left by Senator [BARRY] GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, and on the right by Robert Welch," head of the John Birch Society.

Besides discussing the FCC, the memorandum recommends that steps be taken to end the tax exemptions given foundations supporting right-wing movements, and to prevent the "misuse" of corporate funds for political propaganda.

It also urges the administration to silence generals and admirals "who have lost faith in democracy," to add right-wing groups to the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations and to put the domestic Communist problem "in proper perspective for the American people" and thus expose "the basic fallacy of the radical right."

Officials at Justice acknowledge receipt of the memorandum, which, reportedly, was submitted on December 19, 1961. However, a spokesman said the document was unsolicited and that "nothing" was ever done with it.

FCC officials last week said they didn't even know the Reuther memorandum existed until receiving inquiries about it earlier this month. They also said that, to the best of their knowledge, Justice representatives never discussed the memorandum's proposals with the Commission.

RIGHTWING VIEW

Despite these disclaimers, some critics of the Commission's fairness doctrine, and the July 26 statement "clarifying" it, see a connection between FCC actions in this area and the Reuther memorandum.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, a severe critic of the July 26 statement last week inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper column by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, syndicated columnist, that sought to make this connection.

Miss Roosevelt, declaring that the FCC "has begun setting the stage for the 1964 Presidential elections," wrote that "the key" to the July 26 statement "is to be found" in the Reuther memorandum.

She said stations would not want to comply with "the costly and bothersome details" of providing free time for reply to conservative broadcasts and, therefore, would simply eliminate "rightist programs" from their schedules. She said this would leave on the air only those programs favored by the administration.

HARGIS BROADCASTS CITED

In discussing the FCC, the Reuther memorandum referred to the free time it said 70 radio stations were giving at that time to Billy Joe Hargis' Christian Crusade. "Certainly," the document said, "the Federal Communications Commission might consider examining the extent of the practice of giving free time to the radical right and could take measures to encourage stations to assign comparable time for an opposing point of view on a free basis." The memorandum also recommended that a check be made to determine whether FCC rules have been violated.

FCC officials, however, say the Reuther memorandum could have had no effect on their deliberations since it was never submitted to them. Furthermore, they note that the fairness doctrine, under which stations are obliged to present all sides of controversial issues, has been in existence since 1949, and a part of the Communications Act since 1959.

They also said that no across-the-board inquiry into the free time made available to rightwing groups has ever been made, nor is one contemplated. They said the only broad-scale studies the Commission has made involved political broadcasting in general, and resulted from congressional reports.

The memorandum, expressing concern with what it said was the growing strength of the rightwing movement, urged efforts to dam the flow of funds to rightwing groups. It noted that some organizations it characterized as rightist have a tax-exempt status and said that corporate funds are used to put "radical right" views on radio and television for political rather than business reasons.

"LIFE LINE"

It cited the case of the "Life Line" radio program, which appears on over 300 radio stations. H. L. Hunt, the Texas millionaire, is the largest single sponsor, acting through several of his corporations. But local busi-

nessmen throughout the country sponsor it also. The memorandum suggests that the Internal Revenue Service determine whether such sponsorship can be written off as a legitimate business expense for tax purposes.

This has also been a matter of concern of some Members of Congress. Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, recently criticized what she said was Mr. Hunt's practice of letting the Federal Government assume a substantial portion of the cost of his political crusades.

The IRS, reportedly at Senator NEUBERGER's urging, is investigating tax-exempt foundations to determine whether they are using their funds for propaganda rather than charitable and educational purposes.

The first public mention of the Reuther memorandum is believed to have been in the book "The Far Right," published early this year by McGraw-Hill. Its authors are two newsmen, Bernard Eismann, of CBS, and Donald Janson, of the New York Times.

Copies of the document began circulating outside the Justice Department at least as long ago as July, it was learned last week. Since then, conservative groups have been disseminating it among their members with the notation that the memorandum represents a plan "on how to destroy the conservative rebellion within the United States."

The Justice Department has also sent copies to Senators and Congressmen who have made inquiries about specifics of the document.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Nov. 5, 1963]

BOILS AND CORRUPTIVE TISSUE

Hail, Caesar.

What a plague of boils and corruptive tissue the Federal Communications Commission has wished upon the radio and television stations of the country.

In a uniquely timed decision, the FCC has told the Kentucky Broadcasters Association that stations would not be required to carry political advertisements detrimental to President Kennedy because of "an apparent distortion of facts."

The association had asked for a ruling on a political announcement mailed to Kentucky stations by a Louisville agency. Contained was a tape recording from a Presidential news conference which, in the judgment of the FCC, constituted "an apparent distortion of facts."

Hence, said the FCC, its rules concerning "false or misleading information" about the basic facts of a controversy are applicable.

The rule says that "no discussion of the issues involved in any such controversy can be fair or in the public interest where such discussion must take place in a climate of false or misleading information concerning the basic facts of the controversy."

Some radio stations felt that they had to carry the announcement because of a section of the Communications Act that forbids stations from censoring material broadcast by a candidate for public office.

The decision of the FCC should be a mite frightening to station managers and owners, whose license renewal depends upon the small group of willful men who run the FCC.

For example, what should a station do about an allegation that American wheat sold to Russia will wind up, by direction or indirection, in Cuba? A Republican candidate (as Senator GOLDWATER did in Massachusetts) might charge that the wheat will go to Castro and include a tape recording of the President denying that such will occur.

Is there in this allegation "an apparent distortion of facts"? Of course not. Any sensible observer knows that Russian wheat released by U.S. sales could be dispatched to Castro.

But would the FCC decide that this was an "apparent distortion" and tell radio and television stations that no such advertisement need be taken?

Or—let us assume that the Democrats would use a film clip or a tape recording of Senator Goldwater circa 1961 in a speech on some aspect of domestic or foreign affairs. A subsequent expansion of the Senator's position could make the earlier pronouncement only a partial truth or an untruth, regarding his present thought. Would Democratic use of this clip or recording constitute an "apparent distortion"?

Or, one more—suppose the President errs and uses the same technique on medical care for the aged that he utilized in 1960. There is adequate evidence that a patent piece of duplicity was practiced, not just an "apparent distortion." But the stations, at the time, were unaware of the misuse of the truth.

How, in the name of reality, can station managers and owners be expected to separate the wheat from the chaff? Shall they ask the FCC in every case?

Boils and corruptive tissue.

Hail, Caesar.

The Average Telephone Subscriber in Washington State Paid $70.98 in 1962 in Hidden Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the tax bill which Congress has been considering this year, the record indicates strong differences of opinion. The witnesses for labor organizations, for example, urged that individuals in the low wage brackets be given the major tax reduction in order to increase consumer buying powers. Business organizations, on the other hand, urged a substantial reduction in the corporation rate so as to stimulate expansion of industry.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there are areas for a tax cut, especially hidden taxes, which have been overlooked by both labor and business. The recent editorial from the Bainbridge Review, a weekly newspaper in my congressional district, points up one kind of tax that should be attacked by every consumer and business organization alike. Here is a kind of tax which only bureaucrats and big-spending advocates favor.

The editorial reads as follows:

EXPOSING A FEW OF THOSE HIDDEN TAXES

We long have held to the firm belief that we would create overnight several million militant citizens—citizens with an abiding interest in politics, elections and governmental issues of the day—if we would require each and every taxpayer to compute and pay his own Federal income tax. This take-home-pay attitude of ours, this miserable payroll deduction system of collecting a man's taxes from and for him is the greatest contributor we have to citizen apathy.

That being our attitude, we always welcome the annual frank statement of the Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co. about who really pays most of the horrendous taxes it is called upon to contribute to various county, State, and Federal governments through the year.

Thee and me, of course, are the ones.

In 1962, says the company, the average customer in Washington State paid almost $71 ($70.98, to be exact) in taxes as a basic part of his telephone bill.

Putting it another way, the company figures that out of every dollar we paid in 1962 to the telephone company, more than 29 percent went for taxes.

These are hidden taxes, of course. They are hidden into every dollar we spend, whether that dollar is for a man's suit, a loaf of bread or a bottle of booze. But we usually regard things only in the grumbling sense of griping about the "high cost of living." We vent our spleen on the tailor, the baker and the booze maker for pricing things so high.

We don't like the high price of our telephone bill, either. But we do like the company's frankness in exposing some of those hidden taxes.

Water: A Precious Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Georgia is extremely fortunate in that it is blessed with an abundant supply of water, which has contributed to the growth of such great cities as Augusta, Atlanta, Savannah, Columbus, and other areas throughout the State. The importance of water to our economy and general well-being, of course, cannot be overstated.

Radio station WGAC, of Augusta, on November 1 broadcast a splendid editorial written by A. D. Willard, Jr., giving thanks for the plentiful water supply in the Augusta area. Mr. Willard is eminently correct in stating that man's progress can be measured in terms with his concern with water.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Willard's editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL—WGAC RADIO

(By. A. D. Willard, Jr.)

We believe that, the unparralleled industrial development of eastern Georgia and western South Carolina has been due in greater measure to an abundant supply of water than to any other factor. Few sections of the country are as blessed as ours with respect to an abundant supply of water.

The sprawling billion-dollar atomic plant south of Augusta, for example, would not have been possible except for the prodigious water supply afforded by the Savannah River. It has been said that this plant alone uses more water daily than all of the metropolitan area of New York. The steady and dependable flow of water to that plant has in turn been made possible through the gigantic dams erected by the Government at Clark Hill and Hartwell.

The importance of water, even sufficient for man and beast, has been strikingly emphasized in recent weeks through a lack of rain all the way from Florida to Maine. Even a great city like New York, with its vast Catskill reservoirs, has virtually had to ration

water in recent days. The situation has been close to that of an emergency.

Hereabouts, though, there has been no great concern with respect to water, regardless of the dry weather. Industries and powerplants have operated on a normal basis throughout the dry spell. Vast manmade lakes have made this possible.

In the foreseeable future growing cities such as Athens, Augusta, Greenwood, and Anderson may have to turn to these lakes as a dependable supply of water that could be readily piped into their midst. Civilization itself has been built around water. Someone has said that you could write the story of man's growth in terms of his epic concern with water.

The next time you motor by one of these huge lakes in our area it might be well to remove your hat in a gesture of thanks that they are there for our economic use and enjoyment.

The Other Side of Bob Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. We have seen a great deal in the press about how bad conditions are in Washington, D.C., but we do not often see articles telling what is being done to improve them, particularly what is being done for the youth of Washington.

The Attorney General is one of many persons in the administration and in Congress who is taking an active interest in helping our young people, not only in Washington but elsewhere.

An article by Bonnie Angelo of the Newhouse papers describes what the Attorney General has done. It is an inspiration to all of us and shows one man's commitment to our young people, especially here in the Nation's Capital.

The article follows:

THE OTHER SIDE OF BOB KENNEDY: LOBBYIST FOR KIDS

(By Bonnie Angelo)

WASHINGTON.—His detractors call him ruthless and arrogant. His enthusiasts see him as straightforward and tough.

But the kids whose lives he touches see another side of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

He's a friend, a man who comes among them and says, "you matter; we care."

Bob Kennedy's concern for children, all ages, all breeds, is seemingly boundless. Between the multiple pressures of office, he finds time for foreign students, congressional offspring, handicapped youngsters, but time most of all for those who are nobody's children, the legions of forgotten boys and girls who don't even hope for a place in the sun.

Why does he do it? They can't vote, they have no power. The Attorney General's associates say that his work as Chairman of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency relaxes him, gives him an outlet for creative, positive action, a change from a job which is primarily punitive.

Bob Kennedy himself shuns this kind of armchair psychoanalysis. After thinking for a long moment, he had a simple answer. "Basically, I just like young people." He elaborated, picking his words carefully.

"We were fortunate as we were growing up, and a lot of people aren't. I think that we should do something to help them. So much more could be done—young people could do so much more with their lives if extra effort was made to help them help themselves."

To help them, he turns up all over town, doing all kinds of things—throwing out the first ball at a Little League game, fielding tough questions from skeptical foreign students, addressing a 4-H conference, praising the indusrious newspaper carriers, inducting new scouts at a rally, dispensing concern and encouragement at a benighted school.

On his way to the airport he may swing by a banquet of the Junior Stonewalls, a group organized by a streetsweeper who spends his free time working with capital slum boys; on his way home to lunch he may stop his car to talk with high school boys working at part-time jobs made possible by the Attorney General's determination.

But these are surface things. His greater concern is with the basic causes, which are the Nation's crucial problems—education, unemployment, civil rights.

One of the Attorney General's first missions after taking office was to visit New York's East Harlem to talk with the kind of kids he is most concerned about.

A member of the Viceroys gang reported, "he looked like a bop himself, sitting there on the curb, with his coat slung back over his shoulder." The tough Harlem kids found him easy to talk to. "He sounded like he really wanted to do something about it," one marveled. "He spoke nice and had good manners."

When his own brood of eight is summering on Cape Cod, Kennedy turns over the swimming pool of his Virginia estate to underprivileged children, scheduling groups on regular days and furnishing soft drinks for them. This gives him special pleasure.

"Adults forget how much little things like a chance to go swimming mean to kids," he explained.

Thousands of other Washington youngsters owe the chance to go swimming to Bob Kennedy. When he learned that two pools in Washington's teeming Negro sections had been closed since 1954 for lack of operating funds, he rounded up the money from Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish groups—and hundreds of children who would have roamed the streets flocked to the pools daily.

The same kind of swift, cut-the-red-tape action resulted when Kennedy, driving through a blighted neighborhood, spotted a vacant lot filled with impounded cars. The next day the police department was busy moving the cars, and a project was launched to convert the lot into a showplace recreation area with such imaginative assets as a surplus jet plane, harbor tug and Army tank.

Professional youthworkers say the Attorney General has a gift for communicating with young people. His direct approach and intense interest, with no pandering, no talking down, can change sullen apathy into enthusiasm.

One recent morning at a predominantly Negro school here, Kennedy spoke sternly to the students, warning them that dropouts jeopardize their futures, urging the students to take responsibilities, "to have respect for your school, your teachers, but mostly for yourselves."

When he asked for questions, a shy silence followed—so instead he asked questions of them. After a few rat-a-tat questions—"How many of you read the front pages? Who's the Governor of Maryland? Who are the Virginia Senators?"—a student's hand went up tentatively, and then a flood of questions followed. His answers showed that he understood the financial pressures, the frustrations experienced by the students, old beyond their years.

Finally, pressed for time, he left, cheered and mobbed by eager students as he made his way out of the auditorium. "They will remember today all their lives," said a teacher. "These are forgotten children; it's hard for them to believe that somebody, somebody important, cares."

Aware that education is the key to a better future for these youngsters, Kennedy has been the driving force behind a concerted effort to stop school dropouts. A program of summer jobs was undertaken to give the teenagers the money to buy bus tokens, lunches, shoes, and through the Attorney General's effort 1,100 jobs were turned up, mostly in Government agencies.

Handicapped children, in addition to generous financial help from the well-filled Kennedy coffers, get Bob Kennedy's personal attention. At a ceremony promoting a fund drive, he invited a little crippled boy to "come see me, and bring your friends." And so he did—bringing 15 friends in wheel chairs and braces to the Attorney General's office. There they climbed on the big stuffed tiger, patted the even bigger and live Newfoundland dog Brumus, and talked with the President on the telephone.

Children in need are not the only ones who find a friend in the Attorney General. He is fascinated by foreign students as tomorrow's leaders. Each Christmas he entertains hundreds from all around the world in his cavernous quarters at the Justice Department, and throughout the year meets with smaller groups, giving them tough, fast answers to often hostile questions.

In his Far East good-will trip, he concentrated on students. Heckled at the University of Tokyo, he stood his ground, won his point—and wowed the audience. The hefty profits from his book, "Just Friends and Brave Enemies," went to scholarship funds at universities in Tokyo, Indonesia and West Berlin.

Even the well-cared-for children of Government officials have their innings with the President's brother. "In Washington everybody goes to parties except children," he said one day, and forthwith did something about it. He grilled hamburgers and hotdogs in his office fireplace for the teenagers, and later brought clowns, puppets and ponies (borrowed from his own children) into the Justice Department courtyard for the little ones. He picks up the tab, of course, for all the gatherings.

With his unflagging interest in the rising generation, there's a basis of an admirer's summary of his role: "The guy's a lobbyist for kids."

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interviews by the Atlanta Constitution on October 22, 1963, and the Atlanta Journal of October 21, 1963, with Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Oct. 22, 1963]

GOLDWATER NOT IN YET, FARLEY BELIEVES

(By Ted Simmons)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is running way ahead but he still has a long way to go in the race for the Republican presidential nomination, James A. Farley said here Monday.

And, said Farley, GOLDWATER wouldn't be running anywhere near as strong as he is

except for the recent divorce and remarriage of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

But regardless of who gets the GOP nod, President John F. Kennedy is a sure bet for reelection and "he won't lose any of the States he carried in 1964," Farley said.

The 75-year-old elder statesman of the Democratic Party, who ran the 1932 and 1936 presidential campaigns of Franklin D. Roosevelt, is in Atlanta on a weeklong business trip. He is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Co., which he joined in 1940 after resigning as Postmaster General.

Appearing as hale and vigorous as a man half his age, "Big Jim" talked on a number of political subjects Monday afternoon. Among the opinions he expressed were:

Richard Nixon is not an active aspirant to the Republican nomination in 1964, but he is "standing in the wings hoping that lightning will strike."

ANTI, NOT PRO

Most of the so-called Goldwater sentiment in the South is more anti-Kennedy than pro-Goldwater.

President Kennedy is bound to get a tax bill through Congress before the first of the year, and the GOP will be forced to support it because if they don't "they'll be over a barrel."

There is no "greater tide of conservatism moving now than there has been for a long time * * * there's just a lot of conversation" about it.

Concerning President Kennedy's opposition next year, Farley said, "There isn't any doubt that Rockefeller has lost ground because of his divorce and remarriage.

MAY BE TOO FAR

"GOLDWATER may be running too far ahead for anybody to catch," he said. "With Mr. Roosevelt, our strategy used to be to get him as far out front as we could, and take our chance in the stretch.

"But some people who say they support GOLDWATER now may find it harder to do next year."

There is also the possibility that the Republican convention will come up with a platform that would be hard for GOLDWATER to run on.

President Kennedy will be stronger than he was in 1960 because the "religious issue as an issue has been substantially lessened" and because he has the bread and butter issues of peace and prosperity.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Oct. 21, 1963]

FARLEY PREDICTS J.F.K. VICTORY IN 1964, WITH SOUTH'S AID

(By Jim Clotfelter)

President Kennedy will be reelected in 1964 with the probable support of a subdued South, former Postmaster General James A. Farley said Monday.

The civil rights issue which has cut into the President's strength in both North and South will have calmed, he said, and Kennedy will win on a "peace and prosperity" ticket.

Mr. Farley, who masterminded the campaigns of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, was in Atlanta for a gathering of Coca-Cola officials. He is chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

Mr. Kennedy will campaign on two issues, "the bread and butter issues in every campaign," Mr. Farley said—a strong, international position which has maintained the peace, and an improving domestic economy.

The Democrat said Republican candidates for the Presidency "are running in a vacuum now * * *. Kennedy will let all these fellows talk their heads off. He will wait until the Democratic convention in August 1964, and then blast them."

Mr. Farley said Mr. Kennedy would defeat any Republican candidate, but he declined to comment on either Senator BARRY GOLDWATER or Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, the two GOP front runners.

The former Postmaster General declined to get into specifics about Mr. Kennedy's chances in the South. But he said, "I would think the Southern Senators and Congressmen * * * who are running for reelection * * * would support Kennedy."

A number of southern Senators, including Georgia's RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN E. TALMADGE, have indicated they might remain neutral in 1964, and not back the President.

The votes which Kennedy will lose on civil rights, Mr. Farley said, will be offset by the votes he will gain on the other issues. The religion issue won't cost Kennedy as many votes as it did in some sections in 1960, he said.

The Republicans will have to take a stand on civil rights and other controversial issues in 1964, Mr. Farley said, and this will discourage many "who might be in the frame of mind to vote against Kennedy" because of his unpopular stands on these issues.

In the 23 years he has been with Coca-Cola Export Corp., Mr. Farley has spent much of his time traveling abroad. Some of his opinions on the international scene are: The "ugly American" described in the best-selling book never existed. The U.S. foreign service has no "ugly American"; the United States should further withdraw foreign aid from nations with strong economics, particularly in Europe. These nations should bear a greater share of the cost of American Armed Forces overseas, and foreign aid.

The Moon Race—Cost Is No Object

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, when the House Committee on Science and Astronautics reported the fiscal year 1964 authorization bill, the report of the committee and especially the additional views of certain members including myself emphasized that the national security is not a matter of outer space exploration or landing a man on the moon. Instead, military priority should be allocated to the conquest of "inner space" which is the point of an editorial which appeared in last week's Life magazine which follows:

A MOON RACE WITH OURSELVES?

Was it sour grapes or a horse laugh? Premier Khrushchev says he is taking the U.S.S.R. out of the race to put a man on the moon, and wishes our moon program success. Assuming he means it, we welcome his surrender and hope it will mean a better life on earth for the Russian people. At the same time it prompts a fresh look at our own space program, on which the supposed moon race has had a grossly distorting effect.

When President Kennedy put the United States into this race shortly after the first Russian cosmonaut successes, Congress and the country generally went along with him in a cost-is-no-object mood. But the costs have piled higher and higher until Project Apollo (a manned moon landing by 1970) looked as if it would eventually soak up $20 to $40 billion. The target subordinated the whole space program to the moon race and added an estimated $8 billion to the cost. As Fortune relates in its November issue, "Because of the frantic speedup, NASA made time the governing consideration. * * * North American was awarded the prime contract for Apollo ($400 million) without even knowing what mode would be chosen for going to the moon. * * * Grumman Aircraft was awarded a $390 million contract to design the lunar landing module without having the foggiest notion what kind of surface it would be required to land on."

Well before Khrushchev's statement last week, the pressures were mounting on President Kennedy to reshape the space program in realistic terms. Some scientists informed him that instruments could explore the moon more effectively than men for years to come. Military men argued that earth-based missiles were more reliable than moon-based. Other critics urged that the money could better be spent on schools, hospitals, backward countries, and so forth—or even returned to the taxpayers. This fall Congress whacked $600 million out of Kennedy's $5.7 billion space budget. The President, addressing the U.N., further deflated the popularity of Apollo by proposing a joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. moon venture.

The United States needs a reasoned and balanced space program that is more than a series of jumpy reflexes to things Khrushchev may or may not be doing. The first priority is not the moon. It is the conquest of inner space (up to 500 miles high), the true military high ground from which our world can be photographed, weather surveyed, perhaps atom policed. Beyond that lie vast challenges in the quest for knowledge of space, where the moon is only one way station. The challenges must be met, the United States must be a space-fairing nation; but at a rate and in an order set by our own capacity and deliberation.

Message From the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, November 11, was the 45th anniversary of the Independence of Poland, commemorating the reestablishment of the Polish nation.

The legitimate President of the Republic of Poland, Mr. H. E. August Zaleski, issued a dramatic message to Poles all over the world on this occasion. Under leave, I place it into the RECORD at this point. The message speaks for itself, and is direct evidence of the determination of the Polish people and their legitimate leaders once again to see the restoration of freedom to their oppressed homeland.

The message follows:

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND TO THE POLISH NATION ON THE OCCASION OF POLAND'S INDEPENDENCE DAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1963

Two countries which, together with already defeated Russia, had committed the crime of partitioning Poland, capitulated on November 11, 1918. Poland regained the liberty for which she had waged a struggle lasting over 100 years.

The overjoyed Polish nation had to cope with the enormous task of rebuilding the Republic of Poland under exceptionally diff-

cult conditions. The reborn state formed by reuniting the three zones of partition had no central government or administration; each of the three zones had been part of a different economic and communications system; five different codes of law were in force upon its area; Poland's frontiers had not been fixed whilst she disposed of only the relatively small armed forces which had fought for the country's freedom since the beginning of the First World War under the command of Józef Pilsudski, who, since the fall of the 1863 insurrection, was the first to raise the banner of armed struggle for independence.

Thus it was that the nation looked to him when the time came to rebuild a free, united, and independent Poland. The nation began the work of organizing the Republic under his leadership. But barely had this commenced when Poland was forced to take up arms: in defense of Lwow, the western provinces, Upper Silesia, and the eastern frontiers. The most desperate and bloody fighting was against the hordes of Communist Russia, who true to her age-old imperialistic traditions, sought to impose her rule upon the Poles.

With his formations reinforced by General Haller's army formed in France, the forces from western Poland under General Dowbor-Musnicki and by a large volunteer force, Marshal Pilsudski won resounding victory in this war.

Hence, proclaiming Independence Day, the Polish Parliament linked the anniversary "for all time with the great name of Józef Pilsudski, the victorious leader of the nation in the struggles for our country's liberty."

Rightly is this day also the official anniversary of the military order of Virtuti Militari, whose device in accord with the wish of Marshal Pilsudski is "honor and country." Every Pole should be inspired by the profound inner meaning of this device.

It was only after the Russian invasion was victoriously repelled that Poland could betake herself to the work of reconstruction from the very foundation. We Poles could carry on this work for barely 18 years as a new Russo-German compact despite heroic resistance again overwhelmed our country and flooded it with savage crimes perpetrated by the invaders.

When we look back today, 24 years after this latest loss of freedom, at the enormous labors effected by the Polish nation within such a short period in spite of the difficulties which reared up when independence was regained, we should be proud of these achievements.

We know that now likewise, although its freedom has been lost, the Polish nation is still indefatigably laboring under the direct conditions to rebuild the country laid waste by its enemies. We cherish the hope that God will in His mercy restore to us a free Poland and that we will be enabled to join in this work with the nation liberated from alien occupation.

AID Head Discusses How Foreign Aid Helps U.S. Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished head of the Agency for International Development, the Honorable David Bell, who is rendering such outstanding service as the Chief of the foreign aid program, delivered an address at the University of Pittsburgh on October 23 in which he discussed among other things the contribution of the foreign aid program to American business and to improving the U.S. balance of payments.

Mr. Bell points out that 80 percent of foreign aid dollars are now being spent in the United States for U.S. goods and services. This means that only 20 percent of the foreign aid program affects our balance of payments problem. The outflow of dollars under foreign aid is estimated by Mr. Bell at $500 million, which is roughly one-fifth the amount which is being spent overseas by U.S. tourists.

Mr. Bell also points out that cuts made by the House in the foreign aid bill will have very little effect on our balance of payments. The major items that were cut by the House are already tied almost entirely to U.S. procurement. The main effect of the House cut, therefore, would be to reduce U.S. exports, not to reduce the balance of payments deficit.

Another important point made by Mr. Bell is the impact of U.S. procurement under the foreign aid program on U.S. exports. In 1960, before the new program came into being, only 11 percent of the iron and steel financed by foreign aid came from America. For the first 9 months of 1963, 87 percent was purchased from U.S. mills. For fertilizer, the percentage rose from 17 percent in 1960 to 97 percent in 1963.

Last year, one-third of all U.S. exports of fertilizer and of locomotives, and one-fourth of all U.S. exports of iron and steel were paid for by foreign aid.

The way in which foreign aid is helping to develop better markets overseas for U.S. business was also touched on by Mr. Bell, who points out that our exports to Europe doubled between 1950 and 1962, and our exports to Japan have tripled during the last 10 years.

This is a significant address, which I am sure all of my colleagues will want to read:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

It is a great pleasure to address this fall assembly here in Pittsburgh. This community's industrial and human resources have contributed materially to the foreign assistance program over the years. And this university has increasingly participated in international activities—as evidenced by the presence on your campus of students from many countries, and the presence of Pitt faculty members in Ecuador, Nigeria, and Chile under AID-Pitt contracts.

I should like to take the opportunity of being here in Pittsburgh—one of the major American industrial cities—to make a few remarks about the relation of our foreign assistance program to the U. S. economy. And then I shall conclude with some broader comments on the state of the U.S. effort to help achieve peaceful and democratic progress in the less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I

It is not yet as widely understood as it should be that since late 1959 a drastic change in procurement policy has taken place regarding the expenditure of our foreign aid funds. With few—and diminishing—exceptions, we now limit the use of our foreign aid appropriations to the procurement of U.S. goods and services. This chance was made to minimize the impact of the foreign assistance program on the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

The resulting figures speak for themselves. Of the $2.4 billion of economic aid committed in fiscal year 1963, $1.9 billion, 80 percent of the total, will be spent directly in the United States, for U.S. goods and services.

With respect to individual commodities the effect of the changed policy is very plain. For example, in 1960, before the new policy took effect, only 11 percent of the iron and steel products financed by foreign aid appropriations came from American steel mills; for the first 9 months of 1963, 87 percent was purchased from U.S. producers. In 1960, 11 percent of the nonferrous metals financed under foreign aid came from the United States, for the first 9 months of 1963, 92 percent were purchased in the United States. For fertilizer the percentage rose from 17 to 97 percent. And similar figures could be given for many other products.

Furthermore, the restriction of foreign aid spending to U.S. goods and services means that a substantial share of U.S. exports in some lines is now financed by our foreign aid program. For example, in calendar year 1962, one-third of U.S. exports of locomotives, one-third of U.S. exports of fertilizer, and 21 percent of U.S. exports of iron and steel products were among the commodities purchased under the foreign aid program to assist the economic development of countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Under these new policies, the foreign aid program today accounts for a relatively small and declining element in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. The outflow of dollars under foreign aid next year is estimated at about a half billion dollars—far smaller than the $2½ billion spent abroad each year by U.S. tourists, or the nearly $3 billion invested abroad each year by U.S. business.

I do not believe these facts are as well understood in the Congress as they need to be. Some Members of the House of Representatives who voted several weeks ago for a substantial cut in this year's foreign aid bill apparently did so in the mistaken belief that the cut would reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by an equivalent amount. In fact, the major appropriation items that were cut by the House—Alliance for Progress lending, development lending elsewhere in the world, and military assistance—are tied virtually 100 percent to U.S. procurement. The main direct effect of the House cut therefore would be to reduce U.S. exports, not to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

The facts I have cited thus far demonstrate that the U.S. foreign assistance program today has a major effect in financing U.S. exports of goods and services, and a relatively small and declining effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Foreign aid today in overwhelming degree takes the form of U.S. goods and services—not U.S. dollars—going out to help the underdeveloped countries. And in the process, according to a private planning group's estimate, American assistance to the developing countries is responsible for at least several hundred thousand American jobs.

II

Impressive as these statistics are, they tell only part of the story of the impact on the American economy.

Our foreign aid programs include a series of measures designed to encourage and assist U.S. private investment in the underdeveloped countries. We strongly believe that U.S. private capital and know-how can make a major contribution to economic develop-

ment, not only in Latin America but in Africa and Asia as well.

Over and above the immediate impact on U.S. exports and foreign investment, the aid program, in the process of helping in the economic development of peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, is acquainting them with U.S. goods, opening up markets for U.S. businesses, and establishing favorable conditions for U.S. private investment abroad.

Our biggest present export customers are the developed countries of Western Europe and Japan, whom we assisted in the 1940's and early 1950's and where aid financing is no longer necessary. In the period from 1950 to 1962, our exports to Europe doubled. Our exports to Japan have tripled in the past decade.

In the developing countries, AID-administered economic assistance programs are now playing a major role in introducing U.S. products, and paving the way for an economic growth that will surely lead to expanded markets for U.S. exports.

There are already signs that in some developing countries, trade is beginning to follow aid, as it did in Europe. As examples, over the past 5 years there were increases in U.S. commercial exports (not aid-financed) of 14 percent to Taiwan, 28 percent to Colombia, and 76 percent to Israel.

I cite these figures not as a justification for foreign aid. Its justification rests on broader grounds. But I bring them to your attention to show that the cost of foreign aid is not the drain on American gold supply, economy or taxpayers that it is sometimes pictured to be. The President requested for fiscal year 1964 a program costing $4.5 billion. This is a large sum of money, but it should be kept in perspective. It represents seven-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product and 4 percent of the Federal budget. Our economy has been operating in recent year with $35 to $40 billion of unused capacity; total mutual defense and assistance expenditures are only about 10 percent of that unused capacity. It surely cannot be argued that this amount constitutes a serious strain on our national resources, nor can it be argued that it is an excessive burden for the wealthiest nation in the world.

III

But the United States has not carried out a foreign aid program since 1947 because of its benefits to the American economy, nor has that program been without cost to us.

The fundamental reason why the U.S. Government provides economic and military assistance to less-developed countries is to help them establish themselves as independent, self-supporting nations, able to make economic and social progress through free institutions. This is in the interest of the countries we help. But it is also in our own vital interest, for only in a world community of free, self-sustaining nations can our own Nation progress and prosper.

The importance of these objectives has been recognized and pursued by the administrations of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. And the Congress, each year since 1947, has appropriated substantial sums for foreign aid despite the apparent lack of domestic political appeal of such a program, and the many frustrations inherent in it.

Incidentally, to emphasize the importance to U.S. national security of the objectives of our foreign aid program is not to deny that other interests will also be served by the economic, political, and social progress of less developed countries. We certainly have a profound humanitarian concern for reducing the hardship and improving the living standard of the world's people who are hungry, poor, illiterate, and sick.

Our economic interest, as distinct from our security and humanitarian concern, is also served not only by the gains to be anticipated from larger international trade and investment, but by increasing the rate of scientific and technical innovation and by enlarging the scope for the creative vigor of the free economic system. But, I repeat, the fundamental reason for our foreign assistance programs is that it is in the national interest of the United States to help the less developed countries achieve economic development, political stability, and social progress under free institutions.

I continue to see comments and questions in the newspapers to the effect that our aid programs have accomplished little. This surprises me very much, because it seems to me there is ample evidence of very substantial progress in many places. Not only are Europe and Japan strong and independent as a result of U.S. aid, but a half dozen more countries—Greece, Taiwan, Israel, Mexico, Venezuela, the Philippines—are all achieving substantial economic progress and rapidly approaching the end of the need for economic assistance. Indeed, some of these countries, such as Israel and Taiwan, are themselves beginning to offer technical assistance to other less developed countries.

Moreover, our foreign aid is heavily concentrated on those countries where there is effective leadership and action toward economic growth. These countries—for example, India, Pakistan, Turkey, Nigeria—are making solid progress in mobilizing their own resources, setting priorities for their use, following sound economic and fiscal policies and building the basic institutions needed in a developing society.

Certainly there are plenty of places in the world where things are not going as we would like to have them. Obviously the risks are high, the dangers are great, and the outcome is uncertain in a number of countries, particularly in southeast Asia and in Latin America.

But these are reasons for conducting ourselves sensibly, for running the most astute and prudent program we can devise—they are not reasons for quitting in the middle of the game, for abandoning the struggle for peace and freedom. No matter how difficult the circumstances, we could not excuse ourselves if we gave up the field to the Communist movement. The President put it well recently when he said that we must be guided by our interests, rather than our indignation.

I fully accept the necessity for drawing on the best of our past experience, and continually improving the effectiveness of our assistance programs. I believe we are making headway in this direction. We are, for example, stressing more and more heavily the importance of self-help on the part of the countries we are aiding. This concept lies at the heart of the Alliance for Progress. In spite of obvious setbacks, the first 2 years of the Alliance have indeed brought in a substantial number of Latin American countries strong advances in self-help—and correspondingly a strong basis for our help to be effective.

Another improvement we are making in our foreign aid program is to do a better job of mobilizing the resources and talents of American society to contribute to the developing countries. The role of the Agency for International Development has become increasingly one of a catalyst to organize the expertise, the skills necessary to help create capital plant, organize human and material resources, and provide administrative knowledge for a modern economy. Private resources in the American economy that exist in our industries, farms, labor unions, banking institutions, cooperatives, business concerns, savings and loan associations, professional groups, State and local governments are being drawn upon to help other countries to achieve economic development. The University of Pittsburgh's affiliation with the Central University of Quito under the Alliance for Progress, the program for improving the curriculum and instruction in the schools of engineering in Chile, the university assistance program in Nigeria are examples.

We are also making considerable progress in achieving a broader sharing of the costs of economic assistance among the advanced countries. In 1962, the flow of aid from Europe and Japan to the less developed countries was just about as large, in relation to their national incomes, as ours was. Some individual countries in our opinion can and should provide more, and we think a number of other countries ought to liberalize the terms on which their aid should be made available, but it is clear that the provision of economic assistance is today a matter of many nations, not just one.

We should not exaggerate the speed or magnitude of the progress that is possible. In India or Pakistan, for example, present per capita income is around $70 per year. Suppose that, through their own efforts plus substantial outside help, India and Pakistan were able to raise their per capita income at a rate of 3 percent per year—a rate somewhat higher than the United States has achieved over the last 50 years. In 25 years at such a rate, per capita income would double. In absolute terms, the results may seem discouraging. Per capita incomes in India and Pakistan would have risen from $70 to $140—after 25 years of steady effort. (During the same period, incidentally, the U.S. income per capita is expected to rise from about $2,500 per capita to more than $4,000 per capita. Even allowing for the well-known difficulties of such intercountry comparisons, the differences are obviously enormous.)

If we translate the absolute figures into real terms, however, we can get a more accurate impression of their significance. Doubling the per capita income of India and Pakistan would mean that instead of half the children of primary school age being in school, all could be. It would mean that diseases like malaria, typhoid, smallpox, and cholera could be virtually eliminated. And it would mean that what economists call the process of self-sustaining growth could have been achieved—the process under which a country through its own institutions generates the saving and investment, the skilled people and the technological advances, the incentives and attitudes which will yield year after year an increase in per capita production and income.

This, it seems to me, is the heart of the matter. It is this process of self-sustaining growth, rather than the level of per capita income, that makes a country truly independent. And the process of self-supporting growth depends principally on building the skills and institutions which permit people to understand and to solve their own problems. This is why we stress so strongly the self-help measures that the underdeveloped countries must take. Only if they take strong self-help measures can outside assistance contribute to solid progress.

I do not minimize the difficulties. Rapid population growth, Communist subversion, repressive military dictatorships, poverty, and ignorance are formidable difficulties. To suceed, we must be strong, tenacious, enduring. We will continually be advised to give up the struggle as too costly, too exhausting, too risky.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected such despairing advice last week in reporting out a foreign aid authorization this year of $4.2 billion. The full Senate will have a similar opportunity to do so this coming week, when the aid bill reaches the Senate floor.

All our interests and all our instincts as Americans tell us not to give up. We are striving for all is best in our own heritage—giving help to those who will help them-

selves—spreading education and health to more and more people—preserving our own freedom and expanding free institutions around the world. With these values at stake, I believe we must and will continue to accept the challenge.

Veterans Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the community of Brunswick, Md., paid tribute to the veterans of all wars, living, and dead, with appropriate ceremonies on Sunday, November 10. It was my privilege to be present at these services and I wish to publicly commend Mayor James E. Cummings and the Brunswick Post of the American Legion for an outstanding program honoring our American service men and women.

The address by the State commander of the Department of Maryland, American Legion, Thomas McCall, was an inspiration and I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

The full text of Commander McCall's address follows:

Forty-five years ago on November 11, America's gallant fighting men of the AEF struck the shackles of bitter trench warfare as victory blessed their long and arduous struggle. World War I was over. The bloody hand of the god of war was lifted from the earth—mankind walked once more in the bright light of peace—Armistice Day was born.

For the next 20 years the men who fought that war, banded together under the banner of the American Legion, fought yet another battle to perpetuate the memory of their departed comrades by having Armistice Day proclaimed a national holiday. This effort too was crowned with success when, in 1938, the Congress of the United States acted to declare November 11 a national holiday.

Over this period of two decades since the cessation of hostilities in World War I and official recognition by our Government of the sacrifices that had been in freedom's name and in the name of decency in the relationships between men and nations, America's fighting men had not forgotten. On every November 11, in every city and hamlet throughout this land where an American Legion Post existed, fitting ceremonies were conducted by Legionnaires commemorating Armistice Day.

No, my friends, America's fighting men had not forgotten for their experiences were unforgettable. Yet, other Americans had forgotten, and even as Armistice Day become an official American holiday, new war clouds were hovering over the face of Europe.

The battlefields of two decades earlier, American military cemeteries near those battlefields where our comrades slept the eternal sleep in the arms of glory and of God, were shadowed by those clouds. The ominous warnings of yet another world conflict already were being sounded.

That conflict too has come and gone, and World War II left even more devastating effects on greater areas of the globe and greater portions of the earth's population than did the First Great War. The Korean conflict, too, is history, and Armistice Day no longer is Armistice Day, but Veterans' Day. The Nation on this day now honors the heroes of all her wars, and by the grace of God—who has blessed this country and sustained her people—in war and in peace, we still are free to observe this day, and to exercise our rights as free men in a free country.

The American Legion has taken this day each year, not only to remind Americans of their history but to speak to them of our destiny as leaders among freemen throughout the world.

This is a day of sadness, this is a day for rejoicing, and it is a day for combining these two extremes in the gamut of human emotions with a new and firm resolve on the part of all Americans that the blessings of citizenship which we enjoy today, largely as a result of the sacrifice of those who have gone before, shall never be wrested from us by any power on this earth.

This is a day of sadness, for it is a day when we recall the suffering and death of many who once were near, and whose memories still are dear to us. It is a day of rejoicing, for Armistice Day as originally conceived, marked the end of a period of trial and, for the moment, of man's inhumanity to man. It is a day for rededication to the principles of justice and of freedom and democracy. For the human race, in spite of the price it has paid, has not learned its lesson too well and these principles still stand in grave jeopardy today.

Speaking on the second anniversary of the end of the First Great World War, the late Frederick W. Galbraith, Jr., then national commander of the American Legion, spoke these eloquent words:

"Victories such as Armistice Day commemorates are not solely of clashes of flesh and steel. They have a finer quality than that. They are the triumphs, as well, of an unconquerable spirit.

"No victory, however complete, long can survive the spirit that conceived it. The annals of mankind are replete with example: splendid triumphs in behalf of splendid causes that have gone for naught because the spirit that made them ceased to endure. * * * Succeeding generations will acclaim Armistice Day. God grant they shall always acclaim in the spirit that made it; and that this spirit, like the day, shall be imperishable.

"With this prayer in our hearts let us renew each year our vows of fealty, repledge and keep unshakable our faith in the high ideals, the lofty purposes, the unselfish aspirations, and exalted, holy hopes that fired the hearts of Americans in 1918 and made ours a land whence crusaders came, with souls aflame, worthy of their victory."

On two occasions since Frederick Galbraith spoke those words, America has proved to be "a land from whence crusaders came," for the spirit of which he spoke had survived—enabling America's fighting men in 1945 to quench the hellfire of war that threatened to destroy the world, and in the 1950's to stem the tides of aggression in Korea before they too could erupt into world conflict.

Some 7 years later, the late Edward Spafford, yet another national commander of the American Legion, spoke perhaps even somewhat more prophetically than did his predecessor.

Allow me to quote a few passages from an Armistice Day message of Commander Spafford, as follows:

"We came out of the World War not to celebrate an enduring peace, although we were told when we entered the gigantic struggle that it was a conflict to end all wars. We came out of it simply to celebrate a victory at arms, a cessation of hostilities, nothing more."

He proceeded to say: "With the World War was born the hope for permanent peace. It was a faint and uncertain hope, and that is all it is today. History and facts show it to be nothing more. The treaty that was signed following the Armistice was a gesture toward permanent peace, and our own national desire is advancing the world toward such an objective, yet we must not be fooled by it, nor lulled into a false sense of security because of it. The World War was the worst blow to humanity since the flood or the glacial period, but when Armistice Day arrived, it was only another war out of the way for the start all over again of peacemaking."

Commander Spafford proceeded to predict that the last war had not been fought because all men do not honor the same ideals. "Each nation," he said, "is willing to fight—to the death—for those ideals which are peculiar to itself. We of the American Legion who fought the great war realize the horrors of conflict as no one else can do. Yet we would again face those horrors rather than see the ideals and principles of America submerged by foreign hordes or propaganda."

He then wove into his message that strong thread of continuity that has typified every American Legion Armistice Day and Veterans Day message from that day to this—a reminder of the past, and a suggestion for the present and for the future.

"We believe," he said, "by keeping ever before the people of this country the sacrifices of life and treasure in the past that we may in the future lessen the chances of similar needless loss of life," and he further stated that the objective of the Legion was to do everything possible to promote a better understanding, and to keep our own Nation prepared to maintain the peace.

The theme of the American Legion is peace through preparedness, and if this seems to be a rut into which our Armistice and Veterans Day messages have fallen, the American Legion makes no apologies for it. The validity of such an admonition has been proven time and again through the 4½ decades of the Legion's existence, and it is as valid today as it was the first moment it was uttered.

Look at our situation today and judge for yourselves. If the paper tiger, which the Chinese Communists believe us to be, did not have the nuclear teeth, which the Russian Communists know we have, can you honestly believe that the peace of the world—uneasy as it may be at times—would have been maintained?

Do you believe that without the awesome nuclear deterrent which this Nation possesses—which, thank God we have not been forced to use, and which we pray we may never have to use—that the forces of communism would not have been even more aggressive in forcing its will upon other free nations of the world, yes, even upon America herself?

Does anyone think that Russia would have acceded to U.S. demands to withdraw offensive missiles from Cuba if the demand had not been backed by the might to enforce it?

Who believes that we have a bona fide partial nuclear test ban agreement when one of the signers of that instrument is Soviet Russia, which has an outstanding record of ignoring treaties, when the terms of such agreements no longer suit their purposes?

These are but a few of the threats to freedom and world peace today. Indeed, they are threats to our own security and survival, and we must be prepared to meet these and any other menacing gestures of the Communist conspiracy in any area of the free world.

The message of the American Legion, to our members and to all Americans on this Veterans Day, 1963, and our solemn pledge to those whom we honor this day may be summed up briefly as follows:

The American Legion reaffirms its insistence upon a strong and secure America, and we reaffirm our vow that we as a people shall

not be permitted to forget the price of freedom and the horror of war.

Benjamin Franklin once said: "There never was a good war or a bad peace."

My friends, despite our magnificent victories in all of our Nation's wars, the greatest victory of all is a will-o'-the-wisp that still eludes our grasp, and that is the winning of a just and lasting peace.

To achieve that objective will require the very best effort that every citizen has to offer. Our debt to the past and to those who have fought and died to make this Nation what it is today will never be fully repaid until we can be assured that we shall bequeath to our children the rich American heritage which they so nobly created and perpetuated for us.

Four Illusions That Beset Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the September 22 New York Times Sunday magazine section carried an excellent article "Four Illusions That Beset Us." The article, I believe, throws in relief the misconception that many of us have in foreign affairs. Our problems grow increasingly complex and insusceptible of quick, simple, and effortless solutions.

Charles Frankel's views are well worth considering:

FOUR ILLUSIONS THAT BESET US: WHY ARE U.S. INTENTIONS AND POLICY SO MISUNDERSTOOD ABROAD? BECAUSE, SAYS ONE OBSERVER, WE ARE INFLUENCED BY NOTIONS ABOUT THE WORLD THAT OTHERS DO NOT SHARE

(By Charles Frankel)

(NOTE.—Charles Frankel, a professor of philosophy at Columbia, is the author of several books, including "The Case for Modern Man.")

American moods about foreign policy are notoriously variable. There are times, such as the Indian summer days that followed the Cuban crisis last year, when the American mood is high, and the feeling is in the air that the United States is in command of events. But there are other times when the mood is a mixture of resentment, surprise, and pessimism. We find ourselves asking—as we are asking now about Vietnam—how we got into the fix we are in and how we can get out of it. And we find ourselves wondering at such times whether there is any relation between our policies and the facts of the world—indeed, whether there is any relationship between the principles that, we believe or hope, govern our policies, and the strategies, some amateurish, some Machiavellian, which we adopt to serve those principles.

Nor are these perplexities confined to Americans. The Nation has astonished and pleased its friends, and given its adversaries pause, by the decisiveness of its reactions to events such as those in Cuba last autumn. At other times, it has left both its friends and its opponents doubtful about the clarity and realism of its policies and the firmness of its national commitment.

Both at home and abroad, persisting through passing successes and failures, through shifts in mood and through changes in administration, there has been a constant and nagging question: What is it about the American posture that makes people elsewhere less certain than we are about the clarity of our policies, the decency of our motives, or the strength of our national commitment? What is it that leads to the recurrent accusation here at home—no matter what administration may be in power—that American policy is essentially passive and defensive, doing little more than nibble at the fringes of events?

A large part of the answer, I venture to suggest, may lie in the fact that our policies are influenced by notions about the world that others do not share. Illusions which our conscious minds probably know to be untrue still dominate our first, spontaneous interpretation of events. They make our approach to the world defensive, negative, and anxious, and they take the breath of coherent and explicit ideas out of our policies. It is these illusions, I suspect, which are responsible, as much as anything else, for our habit of making mountains out of everyday dangers like Cuba while ignoring the mountainous, persisting emergency that produces such dangers.

The first of these illusions might be called the illusion of words. It shows itself in a tendency to treat certain words as things in themsevles, and to deal with problems by throwing such words at them rather than by looking at the facts.

Congress provided a good example last year. The growing conflict between different centers of power within the so-called Socialist camp is today plainly visible. Yet Congress, bemused by the phrase "international communism," chose to act on the assumption that international communism is tightly unified, and limited the discretion of the Executive in dealing with such countries as Poland and Yugoslavia. More respect for Communist professions of undying unity could not be shown by the most unthinking follower of the official party line. Such action suggests that the word "communism" is the enemy, and not the complex phenomenon which the word actually designates.

Even when our war with words seems to produce nothing but verbal fireworks, the consequences are often serious. The influence of the illusion of words is shown in the subjects that serious men spend time discussing, and in the absurdities that sensible men have to bother to refute. For example, the Under Secretary of State had to appear before a committee of the last Congress and explain, in the most solemn terms, that the cold war is not like a game, that you cannot add up points and keep a score, and that the slogan "no win" is a slogan without meaning.

Similarly, a continuing issue in the present Congress has been the demand that more forceful action should be taken toward Cuba. But while the critics making this demand are certainly audible enough, they have not yet succeeded in spelling out the precise ways in which they would change the fundamental policy of the administration.

Nor do we throw up this verbal smoke screen only where international affairs are concerned. The United States is the only nation in the Western Alliance without a strong Socialist Party, yet more fear of socialism is expressed every day in the United States than in any other country. The same tendency to see ghosts is displayed in the discussion of other domestic problems. From aid to education to the Supreme Court's decision on prayer in the schools, and from resistance to desegregation to a contest for the governorship of California, we can count on someone to announce that the fundamental issue is the Communist conspiracy.

This free way with words brings a quality of unreality to our public discussions. It makes some people think we are hysterical; it leads many of our kinder critics to think that if we are not hysterical, we are certainly rigid with logophobia.

Happily, despite our apocalyptic political language, most American governments have been moderate and circumspect, and have not normally moved precipitously or without calculating the consequences. Nevertheless, this is rather small consolation.

It is a mistake to think that words have no influence on our actions. The tone of voice of radio and television reporters is regularly excited; newspapers too often inflate and inflame the events they report; commentators and workaday politicians, eager to demonstrate that things are simple to men of clear moral vision, reduce the awful tragedies and surging hopes of this century to the terms of bad melodrama. Their immoderate words unnerve our friends, make it difficult for our opponents to know when to believe us, and deflect our attention and energies to false issues.

The hypnotic power that words have over us, however, is a sign of other illusions. Among the most powerful of these is the illusion of stability. The American form of government has an unbroken history from the birth of the Republic. With one very large exception—the problems of slavery and of relations between Negroes and whites—our constitutional processes have served as the framework within which Americans have successfully solved most of their problems and regulated the vigorous struggles between individuals and groups in our society. Against this background of experience, it is natural that we should take orderly political processes for granted, and that we should believe in the efficacy of democratic methods when employed in good faith.

But this experience has also created a quasi-instinctive assumption that stability is the normal order of human affairs. At worst, this leads to the view that violent upheavals are the work of men who are too ignorant, too impatient or too ruthless to work for their goals in a legal way. At best, it leads to a preoccupation with the immediate causes of instability, and to neglect of the long-range problems involved in achieving a degree of stability that is in fact quite unusual. For it is a mistake to imagine that once tyrants are removed, or the economic conditions in a troubled area are improved, the subsequent course of events will automatically bring peace and democracy.

Probably, we really know better. The Civil War and our present difficulties with desegregation suggest the limitations of this instinctive attitude. But if we do know better, we know it only fitfully and regretfully. Our initial reaction to the whirling world in which we live is still one of surprise, and our public debate betrays bewilderment, nostalgia and a wistful hope for some quick and easy way to make things hold still again.

Still another, closely connected illusion is the illusion of a classless society. In America, the boundaries between social classes have always been loosely drawn. To be sure, we have sharp differences in the distribution of wealth and income; there are barriers against marriage and free communication between members of different groups, and inherited advantages and disadvantages certainly affect the chances in life of different individuals. Still, whether correctly or not, Americans, for the most part, do not regard any of these differences as insurmountable. They assume that able and ambitious individuals can generally find their proper levels in society by using natural talents and energies. And certainly there are in the United States fewer outward signs of social deference than are present in most other societies.

All this leads us to misunderstand or ignore one of the most important aspects of most revolutionary movements. We can understand a political revolution, which is an attempt to install one form of government in place of another. With somewhat

greater difficulty, we have come to understand that revolutions may also have economic aspects, and that they are brought about by people who want a better standard of living and changes in the distribution of wealth and opportunity. But we do not as yet quite perceive or conceive of the phenomenon of social revolution.

In a social revolution, those who have been on the outside looking in, those who have been treated as second-class and second-rate, are struggling to get some of their own back. They do not want simply a change in the form of government or a better standard of living. They want a change in the status of the group to which they belong. They want to move in places where they could not move before, to walk along fashionable streets, perhaps even to break a few fashionable windows. They want to put their own people in—or those they think are their own people—and drive the others out.

It is not impossible to carry out such a revolution peacefully, but it is difficult. Efforts by the United States to help the developing countries are unlikely to succeed, therefore, unless this bitter, social aspect of revolutionary movements is taken into account. Our frequent failure to do so is another reason why American political thinking so often seems to others to be above the battle and not quite to the point.

Finally, there is a special and curious illusion which, I believe, even captures some of the shrewdest and most energetic of our policymakers. It would call it the illusion of the practical.

It consists in the tacit assumption that a series of resolute and ingenious tactical operations is all that there is to a foreign policy—that the capacity to meet emergencies and to deal with them successfully is the be-all and end-all. Ingenuity, a capacity to improvise, a distrust of established doctrines, and an ability to marshal resources and act decisively in moments of crisis have had much to do with the conquest of our continent and the development of the American economic and political system. Perhaps this is the reason why we find it hard to develop a firm policy on any particular issue until an emergency arises.

There are those who believe that this preserves us against the abstract plans, programs, and theories that have seduced so many other societies. The actual issues that have to be met when emergencies arise, these antitheoretical theorists point out, are always more complex, more prickly with unexpected contingencies than any plan or policy can foresee. Only a program forged in the furnace of events, and not a program formulated for hypothetical circumstances, can deal with such emergencies.

But while this is true, a number of other things are true as well. In the first place, it need not be assumed that planning and policymaking consist only in preparing for emergencies. In the second place, the absence of ideas for systematically realizing definite objectives means that we are reduced entirely to responding to events; we can never make our own contingencies or take steady and consistent initiatives that may help move events in the direction we desire. The notion that policy is made in emergencies means that policy will only be focused on emergencies. This may have made sense when the world was a friendlier place and we could expect that the normal flow of events between emergencies would be favorable to us, but a somewhat less optimistic view seems called for today.

A program like the Alliance for Progress, for example, requires more than resources, dedication, and diplomatic skill. It requires some guiding ideas about the processes of modernization and the evolution of democracy, so that conscious and studied decisions about social priorities can be made.

Ideas are not, of course, magical formulas that will resolve all problems or make events lie down and behave as they are told. But ideas are present, nevertheless, even in the policies of men who distrust ideas, and long-range decisions about social priorities are often made by men who imagine that they are dealing only with an immediate emergency. One of the simplest reasons for having a carefully wrought policy is to make it plain to such men that they have such ideas and are making such decisions. The illusion of the practical tends to hide this from them. And it deprives American policy of the sense of meaning and purpose, and of the excitement, it might otherwise have.

There is always a kind of undertone to our foreign policy—a desire for action and an indisposition to sit still. This has its manifest dangers, but properly disciplined and directed, it provides one of the elements that can make American policy successful. If an American Government could make its program for the more distant future clear and affirmative enough, and if it could pursue that program vividly in the here and now, the American desire for action might be marshaled for the long pull and not just for fitful explosions of energy at moments of crisis. Such a program would probably not cost more in money nor would it be more dangerous than the quasi-policies we follow now. But it would require a willingness and capacity to be candid about fundamentals, to use words with respect for their meaning, and to imagine the condition, hates, and hopes of people whose experience has not been like our own.

Most difficult of all, it would require an encounter with ourselves. To stabilize and to refresh the approach of our Government to the international scene, what is desirable here at home is a critical awareness of our own habits of mind, and an effort to break free from protective illusions that damage our power to act in the world as it exists.

Price Fixing Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Thursday, October 10, 1963, entitled "Price Fixing Again."

That excellent editorial points out the vices and evils so richly inherent in the so-called quality stabilization bill now pending before the Congress.

If the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States pass legislation raising consumer prices as much as this bill would do, there certainly will be some changes in the membership when the next Congress convenes.

The article from the World-Herald follows:

PRICE FIXING AGAIN

For nearly 40 years, some retail merchants who do not like competition have tried to persuade Congress to pass legislation which would, in effect, require every store to charge the same price for the same product.

Congress never has gone that far, but 30 years ago, it amended the antitrust laws to permit State legislatures to pass price-fixing bills, euphemistically called fair trade laws. Busy lobbyists then persuaded legislatures in 45 States to pass price-fixing laws. But in most States, including Nebraska, they eventually were killed by court rulings that they violated State constitutions.

Now the price fixers are back in Washington, pushing a "quality stabilization bill" which is price fixing pure and simple.

It has been opposed by every Government department which has reported on it, by major farm organizations, labor unions, and consumer groups, which estimate that it would cost consumers $5 billion a year. Yet according to word from Washington, Congress is expected to pass it.

The only reason the bill has a chance of passage, we think, is that its backers are superbly organized, and opponents are not. But a strong showing of grassroots opposition might be effective. We suggest that our readers who believe in free enterprise write their Senators and Representatives, and tell them they don't like price fixing, under whatever name.

Bethesda-Chevy Chase Veterans Day Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the annual Veterans Day observance held at the Bethesda-Chevy Chase War Memorial was attended by Gov. J. Millard Tawes and many other Federal, State, county, and local officials. Special guests also included Montgomery County's Medal of Honor holders, representatives of the area veterans' groups, and clergymen of all faiths.

This was an impressive ceremony featuring the Old Guard Fife and Drum Corps from Fort Myer, two high school bands, an all-services color guard, a firing squad, bugler, and a flyover of U.S. Air Force jet fighter aircraft.

The remarks of William Prescott Allen, publisher of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Tribune and founder of the Veterans Day observance in this community, had a poignancy and simplicity which touched the hearts of all present.

Mr. Allen's remarks were as follows:

Forty-five years ago today we Americans observed our first Armistice Day. Our armies had been victorious in a great war fought "to make the world safe for democracy." Today we observe Veterans Day. In 1954 Congress so designated November 11, the original Armistice Day, to remind us how much our Nation owes to those who fought and died that we might be free—our veterans.

Gratitude is a noble emotion; forgetfulness a very human one. And while we are eternally grateful to the veterans of wars—big and little, hot and cold, wars that have been called brush fires, police action, technical assistance, but wars just the same—it is so easy for us to forget our debt to the men and women, who have served in our Armed Forces.

But we must not forget—and we owe it to our children to tell them how this Nation achieved greatness by obstacles overcome, by

battles fought and victories won, by an awareness that peace is not achieved by base surrender to fearful odds—but by a willingness to work and sacrifice for those ideals for which brave men fought and died.

It is a tribute to your remembrance, your gratitude, your patriotism. A noble virtue we should nurture in young hearts. It is a tribute to you here present, that so close to a national shrine—to Arlington and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier—you, nevertheless, have come to this community observance.

"Universities and Public Service," an Article by Max Freedman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a most interesting article by the distinguished columnist, Max Freedman, entitled "Universities and Public Service."

Mr. Freedman made his comments on universities following a visit to the University of Notre Dame, in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

The article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, of October 30, 1963, follows:

UNIVERSITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICE: MANY SCHOLARS WHO GO TO WASHINGTON ARE FOUND TO CEASE TO ACT AS SCHOLARS

(By Max Freedman)

SOUTH BEND, IND.—Perhaps Notre Dame is not the best place from which to survey the role of universities in modern life. This great university has never had any doubt about its purposes or its values. It has set its tradition of scholarship in a context of moral continuity. But its detachment from the ordinary rivalries of academic life gives it the chance to take a rather larger view than other colleges and universities. After all, Notre Dame does not depend on huge contracts for scientific research awarded by the Federal Government.

In talking to members of the faculty at Notre Dame, one finds two recurrent themes that dominate the conversation. The first is a plea for higher standards, for the freedom of all universities to follow studies whose importance cannot be measured by the marketplace, and for the right of a university to have its life determined by its own community of scholars instead of by business administrators or State officials. This classic view of the function of a university would be endorsed by authorities on education from Plato to Newman, from Whitehead to Hutchins. But it is not the principle which controls most universities in the United States.

Many universities are so eager to be the servants of their community that they forget their higher loyalty to academic ideals. A true university is neither a trade school nor an ivory tower. Sometimes it is serving the deepest needs of the Nation when it withdraws from the clamorous debates that divide the public. This principle, which would be accepted without argument at Yale or Harvard, is held as a matter of urgent conviction at Notre Dame. But all too many universities would reject this principle as an inconvenient ideal, and many Americans would feel that no instiution should escape the test of practical utility. The American university will fall short of its high destiny while these rough standards impede its research and lonely scholarship.

These opinions fell with double force on one fresh from Washington where people think they are taking a long view when they ask themselves what a problem will look like 6 months from now. The pressure for making quick decisions makes it necessary for all governments to act with improvised wisdom. But there is a small expediency about these decisions of which one becomes conscious when one places them against the philosophy and traditions of a noble university.

All this led naturally to the second theme—whether it was a good thing to have so many people leave the universities to work for the Kennedy administration.

It was pointed out, with scholarly precision, that very few senior positions in the administration were, in fact, being filled by professors or university officials. The public has formed a different impression because it has concentrated on men like McGeorge Bundy or Arthur Schlesinger in the White House, or Walt Rostow and Harlan Cleveland in the State Department. By far the largest number of academic people now working in Washington are engaged on problems roughly similar to those which held their attention while they were still in the classroom. In addition, many of these people intend to return to the university after their tour of duty in Washington. Presumably they will return with their academic knowledge enriched by this practical immersion in the problems of Government. A university can feel all the more secure in pursuing its own independent work, remote from the latest fashionable trend, when it knows that some of its members will go to Washington for varied periods.

The criticism, in short, was not that scholars went to Washington but that so many of them ceased to act like scholars once they got there. The scholar sank into the official and disappeared. All the bustling little airs of office were soon learned and paraded. Men who in the past had prided themselves on their gift for challenging encrusted prejudices now shrank from asking the disturbing question and went along with the prevailing orthodoxy. Above all, these transplanted scholars murmur impatiently about the restraints imposed by practical politics when a new idea or an old ideal is mentioned. Would not these professors be greater public officials if they retained the integrity and freedom that belonged to them as independent scholars?

One left Notre Dame wondering how it could know as much about the inner discontent of the scholar in Washington.

Racial Discrimination in Washington, D.C., Barber Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Post of November 11, 1963, contains a very interesting article which I feel merits the attention of all of my colleagues as they prepare to consider the so-called civil rights legislation. The article is entitled "Barber Rule Seen Delayed by Rights Bill." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARBER RULE SEEN DELAYED BY RIGHTS BILL

The White House, apprehensive about passage of its civil rights bill, has asked the District Commissioners to hold off on eliminating racial discrimination in Washington barber shops.

The Commissioners held a public hearing August 16 on the proposal, and regulations to effect it has been drafted by the city's legal officers.

Many white barbers complained that they were not trained to cut Negroes' hair; Negro barbers and civil rights groups argued that the technical problems involved in cutting Negro hair are not insuperable.

The regulations were initiated by complaints from African diplomats that they were refused service in local barber shops. The measure was strongly supported by the State Department.

But now the administration apparently feels that raising even this relatively minor issue at this time might sway a few Congressmen to vote against the civil rights bill.

And so the White House has reportedly made a confidential request of the Commissioners to delay passage of the regulations until the rights bill is disposed of.

Why I Like America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the child speaks with greater clarity and feeling than those of us who are adults. Mrs. Helen L. Burkart, who teaches the sixth grade of Bippus School, Bippus, Ind., recently sent to me several essays written by some of her students expressing their gratitude for living in America. I am including these sincere and heart-warming expressions in the RECORD hoping that others might be moved as I was when I read them. I am grateful to these wonderful young men and women. Their strong and abiding love of country makes me feel more confident for America's future:

WHY I LIKE AMERICA

Well, I like to live in America because you have many nice civilized people. I like the beauty and I love it very much. There are so many places to see like New York, and the beauty of Kentucky. Well of course I live in Indiana so I think it's beautiful. I love my flag and the people who fought for it. I like America because we try to have peace. We are clean and try to help others. I think it is very nice for the Red Cross, Salvation Army, and CARE to help others. I'm glad we have President John F. Kennedy for a President. I think we have a very strong Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force. We have nice schools and nice teachers. In our country we are free to do what we want. In Russia just the smart ones get to go to school. The others work and that isn't fair. We have a right to vote for President, Vice President, and all government officials. In America we have very good

lawyers which I want to be. And I would like to play football. We have lots of good scientists. We have very nice high schools, and we have olympic teams. We have better chances of going to college and I want to go to Ohio State University. We have scientists all over the world. That's why I like America.

STEVE ANDERSON.

I like America because it is free. If I lived in East Berlin there would be a wall. If you got a D or F on your report card you get kicked out of school.

In the newspaper you read of people getting shot trying to escape. Many people escape from the East to West. Sometimes they escape but not very often.

I'm glad I live in America.

SHARON HARRIS.

I'm glad I live in the United States because we have good warm homes and plenty of good food. We have the four freedoms that we have fought for in wartime. Boys and girls do not have to train to fight until they are 18.

JAN LYLE GRIGGS.

I am glad to live in America because you have rights and freedom. No one can tell you what to do. You can vote for who you want instead of voting for a certain person. We have a good Capitol and State. We keep this country clean and healthy. I hope that I can go to Washington someday; I would like to see the White House. Best of all I would like to see the cherry trees. I would like to see the rivers and oceans. Maybe I can just dream until I get there.

CATHY HUTCHISON.

I like to live in America because it is free. You can go all over the world. You can go to the school in your township. The dumb children can go to school, too. You can do any kind of job you are capable of doing.

In Russia you have to stay behind big high brick walls. You cannot do things free. You have to go to the school they tell you. Only the smart children can go to school.

ROGER CARROLL.

I like America because you are hardly ever forced to do anything. We can choose our own profession. We are not forced to stay in the United States. We can vote for our President, Vice President, and so on. You have a good choice of religion. The children that go to school in Russia have to wear uniforms so they are dressed alike. American children do not. Only the smart children get an education in schools. The unsmart children are put to work. America is a very free country and it has many beautiful places like the Grand Canyon, Niagara Falls, and others. America has plenty to eat and drink. Americans are able to speak what they believe.

BECKY PULLEY.

Report on Kerr-Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on October 30, 1963, regarding the report on the Kerr-Mills medical-assistance-to-the-aged program. It has been found that the Kerr-Mills program is wholly inadequate and proves the necessity of passing legislation to provide health benefits under social security:

REPORT ON KERR-MILLS

The report released recently by the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly evaluates the 3-year record of the Kerr-Mills medical-assistance-to-the-aged program and finds it wanting.

Subcommittee Chairman PAT MCNAMARA, Michigan Democrat, says that the findings prove that Kerr-Mills cannot solve one of the most persistent and frightening problems confronting millions of older people—"the problem of assuring economic access to adequate medical care on a decent, self-respecting basis."

Among the findings: the program is not national and "there is no reason to expect that it will become one in the foreseeable future"; only 28 States, Washington, D.C., the Virgin Islands and Guam now operate a program.

Benefits vary widely from State to State. Only four offer comprehensive coverage. Pennsylvania is not one of them. This State denies coverage for visits to a doctor's office, doctor's services to in- or out-patients at a hospital, dental care or prescribed drugs.

Administrative costs are too high in most States. Five States exceed 25 percent for operation, while Tennessee's ranges up to 59 percent. A few wealthy States receive the majority of Federal funds.

Republican Senators DIRKSEN, GOLDWATER, and CARLSON state in a minority report that the subcommittee has made "a premature judgment based on inadequate evidence."

We don't know what they would accept as adequate evidence, but we are concerned that this haphazard and phlegmatic program will become so entrenched as to prove ineradicable.

The subcommittee's report is a strong indictment of the Kerr-Mills program in operation. It should help to persuade those who are not blinded to the issue by self-interest or contempt for the public welfare of the growing need for health care of the elderly under social security.

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that a number of Members of Congress, like myself, have been expressing concern over the trend of the executive branch of our Federal Government to control and manage the news.

In this connection, some of my colleagues might be interested in an article I wrote on this subject for the Argus, a weekly newspaper published in Seattle, which under permission to do so I offer for printing following these brief remarks:

MANAGED NEWS

In time of national stress, such as has existed for the past 30 years, there is a natural trend of Government toward authoritarianism. This is in addition to the inherent human tendency of individuals personally to gather power. As a result, there exists in Washington, D.C., today, a constant and growing threat to the delicate balance between the coequal branches. In this connection, a new threat of oligarchic control is beginning to manifest itself.

When President Kennedy was caught fibbing in his "Medicine Square Garden" speech, antimedicare forces and Republicans chortled with glee. This was the reference to a Massachusetts Congressman who could not send his children away to school because of the burden of paying hospital bills for aged parents; whereas, a subsequent check proved the only Representative in Congress filling the Kennedy description had his two children in a posh private school and the parents' medical expenses were being cared for by private insurance.

This revelation was exploited and was all in good clean political fun. The press and Republicans enjoyed the incident thoroughly.

FIRST STEP

However, the question of distortion, evasion, and failure to give the public the truth was not viewed in an equally light vein when Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Information, Arthur Sylvester, said, in October of 1962, that an administration had a right to lie. In time, however, the public and the press shrugged off this remark and gave Mr. Sylvester the benefit of the doubt.

Now, however, many thoughtful persons are beginning to wonder. The use by the Attorney General of the FBI in a 3 a.m. Gestapo-like raid on a news reporter's home, to browbeat him out of details of a story, hasn't been forgotten—especially when it appears the news managers are prepared to go a step further.

The first step seems innocuous. It is the opening up of a Department of Agriculture news service, in competition with a private service already in the field. Naturally, when the taxpayers are paying the salaries of bureaucrats who are supplying and disseminating the news, private industry hasn't a chance of competing. The wasteful practices of bureaucracy just don't work in the business world. In spite of congressional objections, the Department of Agriculture has gone stolidly ahead, set up this news service, and now is not only generating, but distributing its version of what's happening in agriculture.

Who can expect honest reporting from bureaucrats whose desire for perpetuation of their jobs and the function of their bureau supersedes everything in their minds? What adverse developments will be overlooked? What juggled statistics, a favorite bureaucratic weapon, will be foisted off on a gullible press through the Agriculture Department's twisted version of the news?

Hardly had the New Frontier taken over farm news—lock, stock, and barrel—but Lee Loevinger, a member of the Federal Communications Commission, said in a speech at the University of Nebraska that he believed the broadcasting industry should have a new wire service to compete with the Associated Press and the United Press International. The broadcasting industry had voiced no demand for such a service.

MISUSE OF AUTHORITY

It was strictly the idea of Loevinger. The dangerous part of this concept is that the regulatory agencies have a great deal of power over individual members of the broadcast field. Their licenses are totally dependent on the whims of the FCC Commissioners. It does not take much deep thinking to realize that if the FCC decided to set up its own wire service, and if it suggested to each license applicant that it take the new service rather than AP or UPI, that the station would sign up, lest it be cut off the air. Mr. Loevinger said, "it is obvious that the power to grant, withhold, and renew broadcasting licenses enables the Commission to exert a powerful influence, if not actually to require action.

"However, it is surely better for all if the Commission is not forced to take action to compel the broadcasters to fulfill their responsibilities." This is flagrant misuse of the authority of the regulatory agency as it was established by the Congress.

A czar of the communications industry under the function of regulation could lead to a reign of thought control over all broadcasters.

For example, William Henry, new Chairman of the Commission, conducted a so-called hearing of the television industry in Omaha, Nebr., last year. This inquisition was supposedly designed to measure accurately the degree of service being given by Omaha television stations. However, during the course of the hearings, which it is said were carefully rigged so that only critics of Omaha's TV stations were given full time to testify. Henry said he was there not so much to learn if the public was satisfied with the television they were getting, but whether or not the stations were performing in accordance with FCC standards. Such "public be damned" attitude of the FCC is typical of the brash leadership in Government.

It seems to me that Congress has a clear-cut duty here to delineate the role of Government in the news field. It is apparent the regulatory agencies are not to be trusted with this responsibility and are disseminating propaganda at an alarming rate.

Another example of managed news, just off the press, is the first edition of a new quarterly banking journal called the National Banking Review, published by James Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency. National banks will be assessed to pay for this publication, which they can buy for $1 a copy, or $4 a year.

Mr. Saxon said he recently hired a bunch of new economists, so the new magazine is an outlet for his new staff. President Kennedy says he wants the all-Government hookup to promote maximum efficiency and minimum cost.

ANOTHER MANIFESTATION

Saxon said the publication is intended to afford a medium of expression to those who are concerned with public policies in the field of money and banking. Again, there are many private publications in this field, affording independent expression of views on money and banking.

Another manifestation of the trend was in the Federal Register of August 28 in a directive from President Kennedy which ordered establishment of a "unified governmental communications system." It is to be called the National Communications System and will be established by linking together, improving and extending on an evolutionary basis, the communications facilities and components of the various Federal agencies. It is to meet the "communications needs of all Government agencies and to provide communications under all conditions." The Government has 19,000 miles of leased wire services, which now become a massive executive branch grid. An administration directive can be dispatched everywhere in the United States, trotted to local papers by faithful bureaucrats, and become a factual part of the news before the regular press has had an opportunity to determine its veracity, or fathom its motivation.

NATIONAL NEWS AGENCY

Members of the press who have been playing patsy with the administration at the moment don't seem too concerned, but an independent and free press is absolutely essential under our system.

The camel's nose under the tent has been excused by the administration on most logical grounds. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman says that his Agriculture news service promotes "free flow of news." This is a euphemism for "free flow of pro-Freeman propaganda." This should be clear after his attempt to influence the wheat referendum.

Pretexts for expanding Government intervention in news dissemination have aroused strong objections from the American Newspaper Publishers Association. It contends that once the communications facilities of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and other Government departments become unified, it is but a short step to a national news agency of the type that totalitarian nations employ. It is to be hoped that a vigilant press and the Congress will not allow an overly ambitious administration to federalize the news. Otherwise, Government by the people under our Constitution will quietly fade into the pages of history.

Exploitation by Communists of Negro Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Chronicle-Herald, of Augusta, Ga., dated November 3, 1963, carried a long and eloquent editorial which provides proof that the Communists are bending every effort to exploit Negro demonstrations and riots in this country.

This is a point, Mr. President, which has been made over and over again by me on the Senate floor and in the Commerce Committee and also by others in the Commerce Committee, when hearings were being held in that committee on the subject of the so-called civil rights legislation.

This editorial from the Augusta Chronicle-Herald reports on a recent high level meeting of the Communist Party, U.S.A., where plans were formulated to increase Communist participation in and exploitation of civil disobedience actions by various Negro groups agitating for enactment of so-called civil rights legislation and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial from the State of Columbia, S.C., dated November 5, 1963. This editorial discusses a recent news article which reported that a Negro lawyer had withdrawn from defending a Negro race agitator who is a member of a Communist organization, adding in his comments that he was convinced that the disturbance in which his client participated was Communist inspired.

This is a very interesting editorial, Mr. President, and I commend it to the attention of all of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Nov. 5 1963]

CHARGE FROM THE INSIDE

Charges that some of the demonstrations plaguing the Nation these past several months might be getting a few assists from the Communists in this country were greeted with scoffing and derision from the White House family, liberal legislators, and even clergymen.

Negro organizations likewise reacted in the same vein. Now there may be some red—or perhaps we should say flushed—faces around the country.

In Philadelphia, the killing of a Negro by a white policeman was followed by 2 nights of race rioting. Negroes threw rocks and bricks, smashed store windows, and indulged in wholesale looting.

And guess what? A fellow who should know charges that a man who is a member of a Communist organization stirred up all this rioting and that the disorders were Communist inspired.

Making this charge was an individual who is neither a racist southerner nor a radical rightist. Making this charge that the riots were Communist inspired was Cecil B. Moore, a lawyer. Moore is also chairman of the Philadelphia chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

This charge has some of the characteristics of a two-edged sword. By making the accusation, the NAACP tries to avoid any responsibility for demonstrations which turn into riots—but it also makes it a little more difficult to maintain the position that the NAACP has been totally untouched by Communist infiltration.

Until Wednesday, October 30, Moore apparently thought the man he now assails as a Communist was all right. Moore was to defend the now alleged Communist on an old charge of inciting to riot.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle-Herald, Nov. 3, 1963]

PROOF OF RED EXPLOITATION

We are not among those who have argued that the Negro movement in this country has been Communist inspired, or that the Negro leadership as a whole is affiliated with communism.

Our position, however, has been—and continues to be—that communism breeds on unrest and violence. We are of the opinion that the behavioral pattern of the Negro in recent months has been an open invitation to Communist infiltrators. We have held that they could be expected to exploit the current social upheaval to the fullest and, where able, to bend the cause to their own ends.

Now we have proof that our appraisal and prediction were well taken.

It lies in the reports that were made and the plans that were discussed during a week-long meeting of the national executive committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which was held in New York City the first week of October. The session, in fact, was given over almost in its entirety to the Negro movement.

Unimpeachable information that has come to us reveals that the dominant theme of the meeting was that the Communist Party, U.S.A. must play a stronger role in the so-called civil rights effort, underscoring the fact that the Communists in this country see the movement as a class struggle, rather than a racial one as it is viewed by the rank and file of Negroes.

The two principal speakers at the meeting were Communist Party, U.S.A. General Secretary Gus Hall and the party's national secretary, Benjamin Davis. The former gave his report on how best the Communists may continue their exploitation of the Negro effort, advising the committee that some 20 million Negroes—and many whites—are ripe for Red use.

Davis dealt with specifics, citing the necessity for stirring the more militant forces in the Negro movement and thereby provoking more and more racial incidents throughout the Nation.

Our point, that the Reds would bend the Negro's cause to selfish ends, gains credence

in the charge made by all that the Communist Party should strive to play a principal role in the effort and to undertake a campaign designed to obtain participation by the bulk of U.S. citizens.

Hall found hope for the party's future success in establishing unity of the white and Negro races in this country gaining thereby class unity, the goal of communism. He suggested that his fellow Communists grasp the "civil rights revolution" as the wedge they need to advance the party's ends turning all their efforts on the Negro struggle, the economic issues involved, and, as another aim, the establishment of world peace, with the nuclear test ban treaty as the foundation.

There is genuine cause for alarm in the report delivered by Davis Firebrands within the Negro movement, he said, are prepared to undertake a civil disobedience campaign throughout the country, and he listed the following as possibilities:

General work stoppages.

Steps to create a breakdown in all modes of transportation in Birmingham, effecting this by staging sit-downs in rail terminals, in the highways leading into the city, and on the city's airport runways.

Interruption and disruption of telephone service into the city by keeping circuits tied up.

Refusal by these militant Negroes, no matter where they reside, to pay either their State or local taxes.

As might be expected, and as we had predicted, Davis called for the Communists to help this militant force within the Negro movement, using the party's full strength to see that the Negroes do not give up their fight, that they will continue their street demonstrations, and that they must strive to gain mass support.

He suggested:

Arrest of Govs. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi, and George Wallace, of Alabama.

Impeachment of Senators STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, and JAMES EASTLAND, of Mississippi.

Stationing of Federal troops in Alabama.

Abolition of the Ku Klux Klan and White Citizens Councils, at the same time arresting their leaders.

Punishment of those States which deny Negroes their rights by reducing the number of their congressional representatives.

Sending a petition to the U.N. in protest of the "treatment" accorded Negroes in this country.

Adding still greater credence to our position was the fact that Davis cited the "influence" that the Communist Party, U.S.A., has had on the civil rights campaign. He foresaw that the party could do even more in the future to direct the effort of the Negroes.

To accomplish this, the Communist secretary said, members of the party must move into the South, infiltrating every organization associated with the Negro movement and furnishing leaders who may effect a new "left center" that will unify the Negroes in their common cause. The Kennedy administration would be used to the fullest.

As we said at the outset, we do not believe the rank and file of the Negroes in America are Communist-inspired or interested in the success of communism. Our knowledge now of what transpired at the executive committee meeting of the Communists in New York does not alter our thinking.

Nonetheless, so long as demonstrations are encouraged and undertaken, so long as the Negro leadership is unwilling to seek advancement of its cause through legal means and in an atmosphere of mutuality and goodwill—even though there may be areas in which such methods will take longer to implement—the Communists are going to get in on the act, to discredit and disadvantage of the loyal American Negro.

The Red Party's intent is obvious.

Gil Green, another speaker at the New York meeting, saw the current Negro struggle as the key which will open the door for the Communist Party, U.S.A., and said the party must exploit the opportunity in every way possible, not just ride along with it.

What the American Negro must be encouraged to understand is that the Communist Party in this country sees the civil rights struggle as a social revolution which can lead to the communization of the United States. Its members said so at the executive committee meeting.

We do not believe the average Negro wants to see that happen.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part 6 of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY SAVED FROM OBLIVION BY LOSING NO. 2 SPOT IN 1956

Despite his lack of major achievements, John F. Kennedy came within a whisker of walking off with the Democratic nomination for Vice President.

As it turned out, however, his narrow defeat in the wildest second-place brawl ever staged by the Democrats was the best thing that could have happened to him politically—except, of course, being born into the House of Kennedy. Had he been nominated over Estes Kefauver, he would have been carried to defeat with Adlai Stevenson in that year of Democratic disaster.

"And they would have pinned the blame on Jack because he is a Catholic," his father, Joseph P. Kennedy, said "That would have made it much more difficult for another Catholic in years to come."

Actually, Jack's major attraction for the No. 2 spot was precisely because of the fact that he was a Roman Catholic. For once, a candidate's strongest asset to his ticket was his religion. The Democrats were desperately seeking to recapture the Catholic voters who had defected to Dwight David Eisenhower in 1952.

WORTH FIGHTING FOR

The Vice-Presidency had become worth fighting for. No longer could it be said in jest that the party leaders merely grabbed the last man out of the convention hall for the job. Eisenhower's heart attack and the major role Richard Nixon was playing in policymaking had given the Vice-Presidency an importance it rarely had before.

The Kennedy boom had been launched soon after the Senator, then 38 years old, had returned to Washington following an 8-month leave of absence necessitated by several serious operations nearly costing him his life. And it was almost a hero's welcome that greeted him when he limped into the Senate Chamber on May 24, 1955. In his office, room 362 of the Senate Office Building, a large basket of fruit awaited Kennedy. "Welcome home," the tag read. It was signed "Dick Nixon."

On March 8, 1956, Kennedy announced in Washington he would support Stevenson for the Presidency. Not only was Stevenson the best qualified of all the Democratic aspirants, but—said Kennedy—he was "beholden to no group or section" and he belonged "neither to a leftwing nor a rightwing."

On Monday, August 13, 1956, the convention opened in Chicago's huge International Amphitheater with the usual band music, circus atmosphere, and oratorical blasts.

The big story, however, was going on behind the scenes. As usual, at a Democratic convention, it was about civil rights. Reports from behind closed doors indicated a row had been precipitated by northern liberals who insisted on a strong plank.

TOSSED A BONE

At 1 p.m., Wednesday, August 15, Kennedy was summoned into Stevenson's presence. Stevenson said he might want to have the Senator make the nominating speech for him the following afternoon. It all depended on the outcome of the civil rights fight. If the South were humbled, then Stevenson said he would be forced to call upon a southerner to nominate him in the interests of party unity.

It was a stunning blow for Kennedy. Was he being tossed a bone as a consolation prize for not being selected as Stevenson's running-mate?

At 2 a.m., Thursday, Stevenson's aid, Bill Blair, called to say a compromise on civil rights had finally been worked out after a weeklong battle. While it did not satisfy the northern liberals, what really counted was that it did not touch off a southern revolt.

"You're it," he told Kennedy. "Go to it."

At 11:30 a.m., after working through most of the night with Sorenson on a nominating speech, Kennedy hopped a cab to the convention hall. With him was the Boston Globe's Tom Winship who observed Kennedy rehearse his speech during the cab ride. Clenching his fist, Kennedy kept whispering to himself, "Go! Go! Go!"

THE "LOW ROAD"

The speech was well received. The biggest applause-getting line—one that had been provided by Arthur Schlesinger Jr.—was an attack on Nixon: "Our candidates will be up against two of the most skilled campaigners in history—one who takes the high road and one who takes the low road." (Needless to say, few of the wildly cheering delegates could have known that Jack Kennedy had once helped finance Nixon's travels along the so-called "low road.")

As expected, Stevenson was nominated that evening without any trouble. Unexpected, however, was his refusal to appoint a running mate. He had decided, he told party leaders, to throw the nomination up for grabs, to permit the convention to select his fellow victim.

"It's the damnedest fool thing I ever heard of," shouted convention chairman Sam Rayburn.

Jack Kennedy, on hearing of the turn of events, was infuriated. "I remember," said Newton Minow, "Jack coming in and telling Stevenson, 'It's a fixed convention. You've set it against me.'" (Four years later, the tables were to be turned with Stevenson supporters claiming that Kennedy had "fixed" the 1960 convention against the "Man for Libertyville."

The night that followed was one of the most frenzied in recent campaign history. Senators Kennedy, Kefauver, Gore and Humphrey, as well as Mayor Wagner, stumbled into each other as they shuttled bleary-eyed between the various delegations in downtown hotels seeking support. "At 5 a.m.," reported the Associated Press veteran correspondent Jack Bell, "I came across Kefauver doing a television recording in a corridor of the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Kennedy, rushing to another meeting, tripped over the power wires and almost fell into his rival."

Kennedy people hit delegation after delegation, chanting the same theme: "It's either

Kefauver or Kennedy; and you don't want Kefauver, do you?" The argument hit home; many southerners didn't want Kefauver because of his liberalism, while some northerners didn't want him because of his anticrime investigations had uncovered too many links between racketeers and big city Democratic machines.

CRYING JAG

Looking back on the rollcalls of that Friday afternoon, it was such votes as Louisiana's 24 and Georgia's 32 on the first ballot that gave shape to the surprising news that Kennedy, and not Hubert Humphrey, was Kefauver's leading opponent.

As the second ballot began, HUBERT HUMPHREY, weary and stunned at the surprise turn of events, sat with some close friends in Sam Rayburn's private room in back of the convention platform. Michigan's Gov. G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams, along with his State chairman, Neil Staebler, were there pleading with Humphrey—almost on bended knees—to throw his support behind Kefauver in a stop-Kennedy move.

"Even while they talked," as a participant later recounted the scene to Kennedy biographers Martin and Plaut, "Kennedy kept gaining and Soapy and Neil were just begging Hubert and somebody else was saying, 'Stick it out, Hubert * * * we can make it on the third ballot, stick it out, we can get Texas and Rhode Island. * * *'

"Eugenie Anderson was there, too, shouting at all of them, 'Leave HUBERT alone. * * * He's got to make his own decision, so leave him alone. * * *' And everyone was crying. Eugenie was crying and I was crying and the tears were just pouring out of Staebler."

About the only thing TV Commentator Martin Agronsky can still vividly recall of the 1956 convention is that lachrymal scene: "HUBERT was crying, really sobbing, and so were some of his friends." When Kefauver entered the tear-sogged room, he still had to do considerable pleading: "HUBERT," he said, "you've just got to help me * * * you've got to help me, * * * please." Now Kefauver had begun to cry. "In fact," a witness said, "everyone was crying, grown men all crying. I'll never forget the water gushing in that room."

NOT JACK

Jack Kennedy, however, wasn't crying. Sprawled on a bed in his shorts in room 104 of the Stock Yard Inn, he was watching the television coverage of the dramatic second-place race. The first ballot had shown Kefauver with 483½, Kennedy 304, Gore 178, Wagner 162½, and Humphrey 134½. Needed to win were 686½ votes.

On the second go-round, the first important break came when Arkansas' Orval Faubus declared his State for Kennedy. (Faubus had been personally won over by Kennedy during the night.) Then New Jersey declared for Kennedy. The clerk droned on, calling the names of the States. Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas.

Sarge Shriver poked his head in the door to say that, in view of the turn of events, the manager thought it advisable that Jack move to a larger, air-conditioned suite. Protected by a solid squad of Chicago police, Kennedy dashed down the hall in his shorts to await the call.

There seemed no stopping Kennedy. His total kept moving up to 600, 610, 630. Adlai Stevenson, Jr., came over to congratulate him on his all-but-official victory. He also suggested that Kennedy get ready to cross the street to accept the nomination, Kennedy thought so too. He took a quick shower.

There was one dramatic moment when Kennedy was so close to the nomination that the shift of a single delegation might have turned the trick. At that moment, LYNDON JOHNSON dispatched an emissary to attempt to convince Oklahoma Gov. Raymond Gary to give Kennedy the necessary votes to go over the top.

TIDE TURNS

"No," said Gary, "we're not going to do it. Kennedy voted against the farm bill. We need a man in Oklahoma who is for the farmers and Kefauver is our man."

Oklahoma thus led the farm-State swing to Kefauver. The Kennedy upsurge had subsided.

It was Missouri Chairman Tom Hennings who sent Kefauver over the top.

Turning away from the television set, Kennedy said, "That's it—let's go."

It had been Kennedy's first major political defeat; and he took it hard. Exhausted, tense, and depressed, he flew off the next day to France to be with his father. Jacqueline Kennedy, also exhausted, tense, and depressed, flew to Newport to be with her parents in her final weeks of pregnancy.

At Val-sur-Mer on the French Riviera, Clare Boothe Luce, U.S. Ambassador to Italy had been visiting the Joseph P. Kennedys. The Wiley Buchanans—he was then protocol chief of the State Department—were there too, and they recall Mrs. Luce remarking to the senior Kennedy, "You must be very proud that Jack came so close to getting the vice presidency."

The Buchanans nearly fell off their beach chairs when Kennedy replied, "Yes, I was, but it would have pleased me a lot more if he had run on the Republican ticket."

Speech Before the Hi-Twelve Club in Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, quite often some of us who support what we believe are basic constitutional principles are accused of being negative. In response to this accusation, I recently spoke to the Hi-Twelve Club in Louisville, Ky., and would like for my colleagues who often pose the questions hereinafter mentioned to have my response.

The speech follows:

CONGRESSMAN M. G. SNYDER'S SPEECH BEFORE THE HI-TWELVE CLUB, LOUISVILLE, KY.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to come to speak to you for a few minutes today. I appreciate it particularly, because of the fact that if the people of the Third District of Kentucky had not voted as they did last November I suspect that I would not have received the invitation, so that you can see that my appreciation is perhaps just a little bit selfish in this respect.

Today I would like to talk to you a few minutes about some of the things that I am for. You know some of my liberal friends and colleagues quite often ask me such questions as, "What are you going to be against today?" or, "Why are you so upset?" or such questions as, "Are you against everything?" and make such statements as, "You have never had it so good" or, "Tell me something you are for." Well, my friends, a year ago during the campaign you were kind enough to ask me to come and speak to you, and I did, and I appreciated that opportunity so very much. And a year ago you will remember that I was upset, during that campaign, because I was worried about creeping socialism, but let me assure you that today I realize how much in error I was a year ago. It's not creeping socialism I've found out, it's galloping socialism. Today I am upset, because of the rapid rate at which we are going down this road—when a year ago, I thought we were just creeping down it. Yes, a year ago when I spoke to you, I was concerned that my then 2-year-old son might not have a free America in which to raise his children, but today I am concerned, not about that, but I'm concerned that I might not have a free country in which to raise that same child. And what am I for? Well, I'm for a lot of things. I'm for the Constitution, for capitalism, and for America. I'm for a foreign policy directly opposed to coexistence with history's most despotic, atheistic, mass enslavers. I'm for foreign aid that is directly toward helping the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain—when they rise in revolt. And after they win, I am for their own Nuremburg trials to convict and hang murders like Khrushchev, Mao Tse-Tung and even Marshal Tito. I'm for Tito staying out of this country. I'm for J. Edgar Hoover who can catch Communists as fast as the Supreme Court can turn them loose. I'm for the right to vote for all of our citizens regardless of race, color or religion, and I'm for the right to pray and read from the Holy Writ. Yes, I'm for the Griffin amendment of 1962 that didn't pass, that says that the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture shall never exceed the number of farmers. I'm for Bobby Kennedy and the Supreme Court moving as fast in the Communist cases as they do in some others that they think will perhaps buy them a few votes. I'm for nonconformists, as long as they break no law. For the individual, for human values as distinguished from socialism. I'm for spending whatever it takes to protect this great country from attack, either from within or without. I'm for an investigation as to why we cater to our enemies and insult our friends. I'm for everybody standing up and being counted on the issues of the day, doctors, lawyers, teachers, businessmen, laborers, and even to face up to the great catastrophe that "it might hurt my business if I stand up and get counted." Yes, I'm for freeing the farmer from oppressive controls. And you know, I'm for the Kennedy's, and the Roosevelts, and the "Soapy" Williams and the Adlai Stevensons—and yes, the Nelson Rockefellers, and the other superrich, built in guilt complex, do-gooders sharing their own wealth with their leftwing schemes, but not yours and mine that we worked so hard for.

I'm therefore for taxes as a means of raising revenue, but not to redistribute the wealth as is now advocated by some of our political planners in Washington. I'm for section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law to let the States choose whether or not they want right-to-work laws. I'm for the equality of man under the law, realizing that economically equal men are not free and free men in a free republic will not remain economically equal. I'm for our country having the finest education system in the world, bought, paid for and controlled locally.

I'm for more expensive teachers and professors and less expensive school buildings. I'm for separation of church and state rather than the separation of God from state. I'm for practically everything that the socialistic liberals of the Americans for Democratic Action are against, and against practically everything they stand for. I'm for keeping Red China out of the United Nations, and I'm for a balanced budget, and for paying on the national debt. I'm for a tax cut if tied to rigid spending restrictions. I'm for this guy from Prospect who always writes to the "Point of View" column in the Courier-Journal and Times, going on down to Cuba for good if he thinks Castro is so great. I'm for the Monroe Doctrine. I'm for this country giving assistance to the Cuban freedom fighters, so they can free their homeland, and for the downfall of Castro before October 1964. I'm for a President who won't make a deal to take our missiles out of Turkey and Hungary to get

the Communist missiles out of Cuba. And I'm for a President who won't sell military supplies by Executive order to Communist Yugoslavia in direct violation of the law passed less than 1 year before—and have the file classified to keep it a secret—as was revealed within the past month, and I make reference to section 109(a) of the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1963, which reads, "No assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based on communism for arms, ammunition, implements of war or any articles, materials supplies, etc." Yes, I'm for a lot of things. I'm for the reinstitution of the ban on subsidized cutrate delivery of Communist propaganda through the U.S. mail that was suspended by another Executive order, if you please. I'm for outlawing the sale of Communist-made merchandise in this country. I'm for Jack Kennedy paying the 57-cent-per-bushel subsidy on wheat sold to Russia, rather than the taxpayers being required to pay for it. I'm for letting Cuba, Yugoslavia, and other Communist countries pay their own United Nations debts, rather than the American taxpayers being required to pay for it. I'm for government by laws properly enacted and not government by man-made edicts. I'm for the tripart system of government; that is the division of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial, and each of these branches operating within their own sphere, as was the intention of our Founding Fathers when they made this Government. Yes, I'm for an Attorney General who has tried a lawsuit, and Supreme Court justices who have had judicial experience.

I'm for tightening the laws to prevent the sale and distribution of obscene literature, photographs, movies, records, and TV programs. I'm for recognizing the fact that Moscow could destroy us, but Washington is more likely to.

I'm for every American reading the State Department's publication entitled, "Arms Control and Disarmament," which outlines their plan to do away with our military forces and to subject this country to an increased United Nations army. I'm for replacing politicians who vote as they are instructed by some political machine with a mechanical device to accomplish the same purpose for economy's sake. And while I've gotten some comfort from the wheat referendum, I'm for letting the farmer decide what the farm progarm will be only when we let the Reuthers brothers decide what the labor program will be, the oil companies decide what the depletion allowance will be, and magazine publishers decide the postage rate.

I'm for a notation on the Louisville Courier and Times editorials telling how they scored on a lie detector test for that days column, and for another newspaper in Louisville, knowing that that like many of these other things I'm for will be quite awhile in coming. And there are many other things that I am for. I could enlarge upon this list without too much difficulty, but I am confident that to do this would spoil the day for so many that feel that I am not for anything. Thank you.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of November 9, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT: BIG SPENDERS CONTINUE FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER of Texas)

The foolish fiscal policies of the Kennedy administration were given another boost this week in a close vote to increase the debt ceiling to $315 billion. The bill, H.R. 8969, passed 187 to 179.

Some Members, of which I am one, are tired of picking up the tab for the big spenders who vote for the appropriations and against the debt ceiling. We consistent opponents of such spending may encourage a more statesmanlike approach to Federal spending by refusing to support continued increases in a high level debt ceiling.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED

1. The demand by President Kennedy for a $315 billion debt ceiling shows clearly that he has abandoned every effort to reduce expenditures.

(a) When the tax bill was before the House, the President and his spokesmen, promised Congress and the people that a tax cut would be supported by responsible restraint on spending. Since that promise was made and the tax cut bill passed by the House, the administration has asked for increased spending in every bill presented to Congress.

2. President Kennedy and the Democratic leaders have increased yearly spending to the point where by fiscal 1965 it will be $23 billion above the level for fiscal 1962 and they have increased the public debt by $25 billion in the same period.

3. The administration has demanded three increases in the debt ceiling this year.

4. The $315 billion debt ceiling implies a spending level in fiscal 1964 of $99 billion, which is entirely too high.

These brief facts prove that Federal spending is entirely out of hand. Yet the proponents of the debt ceiling increase tell us we must not try to control such spending, or the rate of spending, by use of the tools at hand. A realistic debt ceiling has a place in spending. Indeed, it is the only statutory limit on Federal spending, but it is meaningless if we spend without regard to the ceiling and continually increase the ceiling to cover spending irresponsibility.

A PRACTICAL METHOD FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

My own proposal for fiscal responsibility and protecting the peoples' money:

1. An annual balanced budget (Alger bill H.J. Res. 7): Congress should not adjourn any year until such a balance is reached.

2. An agonizing reappraisal of spending priorities. All nonessential spending should be eliminated and public works programed only within the limits of a balanced budget.

A TOUGH DECISION

Legislative processes are far from simple. There are few instances in casting his vote that a Congressman is faced with an issue clearly outlined in black and white. There are always large gray areas. A good case in point was the vote in the House this week on the conference report on H.R. 6143, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

When this bill was first presented to the House I fought it with all my energies. I am opposed to Federal aid to education and this measure was a part of the whole program to put the Federal Government in the field of education. In spite of the efforts of those who opposed the bill on principle, the House passed it and it was sent to the Senate where it was drastically changed. This meant the bill then had to go to conference to work out a version acceptable to both bodies.

At this point it is imperative to note the difference between original House legislation and a conference report.

The fight for principle must be made in the debate and vote on original legislation. Once the bill has been acted upon by the House the fight for the principle involved has been won or lost at that time.

A conference report is a procedural matter. It is voted up or down, not on the principle involved, but on whether or not the House believes its conferees did a good job of representing the House position on the particular bill at issue.

On the conference report on the Higher Education Facilities Act, the House conferees did maintain the House position and the Senate conferees receded. That was the issue. I voted "yes" in support of the House conferees. Such a vote is not a vote for Federal aid to schools.

The lesson to be learned by many of us in this is that the fight for good legislation must be made when bills first come before the House. Many times, good conservatives will compromise on original legislation on the theory that it can be improved later when it is returned from conference. Legislative processes just don't work that way. The principle of the bill is established at the time it is first passed and any subsequent action will be merely on disputed points, not a vote involving the principle of the legislation.

Pressures on Business Concerns Because of Conservative Political Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have received in my office a letter from Mr. T. D. Sedberry, president of Steel Forgings, Inc., at Shreveport, La., on the subject of the recent decision to discontinue publishing Farm and Ranch magazine. Mr. Sedberry attached to his letter a copy of the last column written by Mr. Tom Anderson in Farm and Ranch magazine. He asked that I have this printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After reading Mr. Sedberry's letter and also the column by Mr. Anderson, I feel that I should print both the letter and the column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the letter confirms my concern that Farm and Ranch had to be closed up because of the pressures that have been brought to bear on business concerns which place their advertisements in publications which promote a conservative political point of view.

I regret, Mr. President, that Farm and Ranch magazine is no longer being published, and I hope that if pressures from the Federal Government are responsible for the decision to discontinue publication of this excellent magazine, the American people will bring the necessary counterpressures to assure that freedom of thought and the right to make vigorous dissent in our country will be preserved inviolate.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both the letter from Mr. Sedberry and the column by one of the most able writers in this country, Mr. Tom Anderson, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL FORGINGS, INC.,
Shreveport, La., October 28, 1963.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senator for South Carolina, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: More than 1 million farmers in the South and Southwest subscribed to Farm and Ranch because they liked the conservative editorial policy of Publisher Thomas J. Anderson.

In considering such a publication advertisers have feared reprisals from eggheads in control of the Federal farm program. As a result, Farm and Ranch was forced to discontinue publication with the November issue.

Here is Tom J. Anderson's editorial from that last issue of a publication that had its beginning in 1869 when farmers were free men. I consider this one of the best and most timely editorials ever written by any man. Undoubtedly if you were to read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gesture would be appreciated by millions of erstwhile readers of Farm and Ranch, and patriots generally.

Sincerely,

T. D. SEDBERRY,
President.

STRAIGHT TALK

(By Tom Anderson)

The following appeared in a magazine called the Saturday Evening Post, published in a city called Philadelphia. The Post's editorial:

"We read a column by a man named Tom Anderson, who proclaimed that 'the enemy is at our gates. In fact, the enemy is helping tend the gates * * *.' Mr. Anderson suggested that there is a way to put the 'enemy' in his place. 'Why not hold treason trials?' he asked * * *. We wonder about these self-appointed saviors of America who are always knocking our country and its elected leaders. We wish they could understand the damage they do by sowing seeds of doubt and suspicion wherever they go. We also wish they knew how they complicate the task of the FBI, whose job is to track down spies and other real Communists, and how they do themselves and the cause of conservatism harm by seeing red every time anybody disagrees with them."

I might sue the Post (founded by Benjamin Franklin and grounded by Wally Butts) except I don't like to stand in line. I cannot disagree completely with the Post's editorial policy, because I don't know what it is this week.

I do know what the editorial policy of Life, Time, Look, and Newsweek are, and I wouldn't buy a copy of any of them for a nickel if I could get a copy of U.S. News & World Report for a dollar.

The Communist conquest of 40 percent of the people and 25 percent of the land mass of the world has been accomplished largely with American money, American resources, American idealists, fools, fatheads, and American traitors.

How did we come to the brink of slavery? By relentless brainwashing and systematic betrayal. Americans eat breakfast over their white tablecloths and pink newspapers and end the day propped up before their boob tubes which slyly undermine every form of religion and patriotism. The world watches America and America watches TV.

Losing football coaches are hung in effigy. Shouldn't people who coach us into slavery be hung in something? If these treason trials are illegal (like the Nuremburg trials we conducted) shouldn't we do something to make amends to Benedict Arnold?

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of Kennedy's left-hand men, has openly favored Socialism, advocates that Communists be allowed to teach in universities, promotes the welfare state, says Thomas Jefferson's ideals are irrelevant and in general scorns our republican form of government. Asked recently to repudiate such statements, he replied: "I neither withdraw nor apologize." He is the same man who wrote, "American workers as a mass too often believe in patriotism and religion." I guess he thinks the good American is an unpatriotic atheist.

He further writes: "Even freedom-loving Americans look wistfully at Russia." As a freedom-loving American, I too look wistfully at Russia—as a place to deport Schlesinger to. I was in Russia several years ago and wistfully decided on the inscription I want on my tombstone: "I'd rather be here than in Russia."

Three of our former Ambassadors to Cuba have testified under oath before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that Castro and communism were brought to power in Cuba with the indispensable help of our State Department. Castro and communism are kept in power by our State Department. I heard a former American Ambassador to Latin America say that most Latin and South American countries are on the verge of going Communist now—and that in almost every case our Government is on the wrong side. Just as in China and Cuba and around the world. Am I "sowing seeds of doubt" when I print this fact?

The Communist Lake, formerly known as the Gulf of Mexico, is now red. Latin America turned red at the Bay of Pigs when Kennedy turned yellow. The ailment which struck Kennedy suddenly was not back trouble, but frostbite. John Kennedy is not a yes-man. When Khrushchev says "No," he says "No," too. Kennedy looks like Dennis the Menace, talks like Churchill, and acts like Chamberlain.

Don't think for a minute, friends, that our State Department merely fails to understand the nature of the Communist enemy. William Wieland, one of the State Department officials who helped depose our friend Batista and helped install Fidel Castro as "the George Washington of Cuba," is an expert on communism. Wieland was with the Communist forces in Spain during the Spanish Civil War.

Wieland, now in charge of Latin American affairs for our State Department, was described by former Ambassador William C. Pawley as "either one of the most stupid men living or he is doing it intentionally." Robert C. Hill, former Ambassador to Mexico, told the same congressional subcommittee, "I did not regard him (Wieland) as a competent officer or a man who could be trusted." Colonel Glame, an Air Force attaché, outraged by some of Wieland's statements, is reported to have called Wieland to his face, "either a damn fool or a Communist."

So Wieland was promoted to a job in which he helped revamp the supersensitive office of Security of the Department of State. When Wieland was attacked, President Kennedy gave him all-out support and endorsement. Space, and lack of time and money to fight lawsuits, prevents my telling you about Yarmolinsky, Rubottom, and others who have reemerged from the State Department woodwork.

When Khrushchev, during his American visit, was shown a CIA report, to impress him with our efficiency, he cracked: "I read these before you do." I believe it.

One of the top State Department policymakers, Walt W. Rostow, in his book, "The United States in the World Arena," urges, on page 549, that America destroy her national sovereignty and existence as a nation. Rostow contends that since the Soviets are "mellowing," we must aid and strengthen them by dropping our silly and ineffective embargo on unlimited trade with Russia; withdraw the rest of our troops from abroad as we have in Turkey and Italy, and turn over our entire defense to the United Nations. All one-worlders are not Communists, but all Communists are one-worlders.

Yes, I'm for treason trials, even though those of us in the constitutional underground who are working to save our Republic are probably the ones who would now be tried.

"Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?

"Why, if it prosper, none dare call it treason?"

Remember, none of this would be happening if we had an honest, informed and courageous Congress—and that depends on you.

As the American general said to his men during the battle: "We are surrounded. Don't let them get away."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Aid to Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, radio station WDIX, which is owned and operated by Mr. Frank Best in Orangeburg, S.C., is a strong and influential voice for the preservation of American freedoms and responsible government. I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding editorial which was broadcast over the facilities of WDIX on November 4, 1963, entitled "Aid to Whom?" In view of the fact that the Senate is currently debating the subject of foreign aid, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO WHOM?

This (last) week the U.S. Senate heard an 18-year-old bureau that has spent $100 billion, argue against an appropriation cut. President Kennedy supported the foreign aid department's claim that it must have $4.2 billion if the United States is to hold back the Communists. Today, the people of the United States have a national debt of $309 billion. This debt is $25 billion more than all the other governments in the world combined. Yet, we are asked to hand out $4,200 million next year to 101 countries who owe $25 billion less than we owe. (Paul Harvey.)

The U.S. taxpayer is not against foreign aid. The U.S. taxpayer is for foreign aid. The U.S. taxpayer welcomed the Marshall plan and gladly paid the bill. But, the originators of the Marshall plan never dreamed that there would be 101 countries with their hands in the U.S. taxpayers pocket, to stop the Communists who have not been stopped. A 30-year-old Congressman from Texas—the youngest Member of the Congress—ED FOREMAN, won his campaign on the issue of foreign aid. In a nationwide broadcast on the Manion Forum, October 6, the 30-year-old Congressman recited just a few of the reasons why the Congress wants to reduce foreign aid money. Congressman FOREMAN said "Brazil has received almost $2 billion in foreign aid. Brazil is on the brink of communism. And in Cuba, after $52 million in aid, this country is a Red satellite, which has stolen over a billion dollars in U.S. property. In Indonesia after $670 million, this country is under an armed pro-Communist dictatorship, bent on the conquest of the free nations and her economy is completely wrecked. In India almost $4 billion of U.S. taxpayer aid has gone in there, and India stands with Russia and against us on nearly every issue. In Yugoslavia, $2½ billion in U.S. aid has served only to push this Communist country deeper into the Soviet orbit. I think these examples point out better than anything else the failure of this kind of a program." Congressman FOREMAN concluded, "I'll point out another example. In Saudi Arabia, one of the richest little countries in the world, in the past few years we have allowed some $72 million in aid to King Saud. Right now, you know, King Saud is in Vienna with his 90 wives on vacation; and it's costing him $24,000 a day to put his wives up and to enjoy the kind of luxury that the American taxpayers cannot afford."

After 18 years and four administrations under both Democratic and Republican leadership, we should no longer advocate foreign aid as a means of defeating communism. The Communists have gotten fat on that diet. The Congress is asking today, "Foreign aid is aid to whom?"

The Vice President Assails Obsession With Failure of Irresponsible Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, every responsible Member of this legislative body is deeply concerned with the highly vocal fringe in our Nation which continuously sounds the false alarm of imminent national disaster. We are concerned because well-intentioned and innocent citizens can become innoculated against a genuinely healthy and active interest in our Government by being disillusioned through the redundant and hollow cries of "wolf" by professional crepe hangers.

Our Vice President, Mr. Speaker, has spoken very candidly in identifying this type of irresponsible criticism and its accompanying obsession with failure, and the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise has recognized the importance of the Vice President's point.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial comments published in the October 20, 1963 edition of the Enterprise on the Vice President's speech at the Georgetown University anniversary dinner in New York City in the RECORD so that each of our colleagues has an opportunity to read these judicious comments:

IRRESPONSIBLE CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT

Displaying the statesmanship and desire for service that have been hallmarks of his public career, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON has struck out at irresponsible criticism of the American governmental system, warning that such a course is endangering the pursuit of world peace.

We commend this Texan's effort to rouse a greater sense of reason and responsibility among his fellow countrymen, and we would include in that group of human termites eating away at the national foundations Americans who make political sport of questioning the patriotism of a public official just because he disagrees with them on policy or politics.

The same goes for those who try to tailor the patriotism of a neighbor to conformity with their own pattern of prejudice and distrust and defeat. Participants in this witch hunt, which extends all the way from Washington to the crossroads, feverishly seek to ferret out the "friends" of communism and a million other monsters.

The Vice President, speaking in New York at a Georgetown University anniversary dinner, especially deplored readiness to discount our achievements in national and international affairs, asserting that Americans are quick to exalt success in almost any field except that of their own Government. Wading into this gloom, he stated: "We make our national issues, we turn out national debates, we conduct our national discussions on the premise that our Government has failed or is about to fail in every undertaking."

Commendably, the Vice President recognized the value of healthy discussion, close checks on Government, and vigilant jealousy of rights. Equally commendable is his contention that the result is not healthy when an obsession with failure obscures national success.

We must, as the No. 2 man in Washington emphasized, stand firm in the knowledge and conviction that our form of government is one that has been predominately successful. And we should call a halt to a lot of the foolish prattle about leaders or institutions who want to sell our fair land down the river.

Too many people, of course, have a tendency to judge the state of the Union by their personal or political like or dislike of someone in the saddle.

A fellow townsman telephoned us to say, after objecting vigorously to an editorial, that he had sunk to such depths of disgust with the Federal Government, particularly the Kennedy administraton, he was about ready to leave the country.

We extended sympathy over his state of depression, wished him greener pastures in Australia, or wherever he was headed.

But we are glad to tell you the conversation ended on a happier note. Instead of permitting the politicians to drive him from his homeland, this reader decided to come up and have a good argument with us instead.

We'd bet he comes by the bank.

Excellent Race Relations in the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in Rear Adm. E. Alvey Wright, U.S. Navy, commander of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, we have a naval officer who has an excellent understanding of how to maintain harmonious racial relations

among a working team of thousands of employees.

The Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard employs a unique work force composed of a number of minority racial groups, there being no single majority race. As Rear Admiral Wright points out in the November 1, 1963 issue of the Shipyard Log, which is the weekly publication of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, the people of many and varied racial and cultural backgrounds have lived and worked together at Pearl Harbor in remarkable harmony. However, even in an atmosphere where nondiscrimination has been a tradition, he cautions that it is necessary for all persons to take affirmative action to guard against discriminatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I take this means to congratulate Rear Admiral Wright for his keen insight in the different matter of race relations, as set forth in his excellent message, which reads as follows:

EXCELLENT RACE RELATIONS IN THE PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD

Hawaii, traditionally, has been a land in which people of many and varied racial and cultural backgrounds have lived and worked together in comparative harmony.

In keeping with this tradition of racial tolerance and intermingling, this shipyard has enjoyed a remarkable freedom from discrimination complaints. Many persons have taken this as a matter of course. However, freedom from discrimination—as all freedoms—must be won; once won, must be jealously guarded.

A general spirit of apathy or lack of interest can result in the loss of this freedom. Because our shipyard work force is composed of large numbers of persons of different racial, cultural, and national backgrounds, we do not in reality have a single majority group. Rather, we are composed of a number of minority groups.

The existence of these many groups has been an important factor in achieving the freedom from discrimination we have enjoyed. However, their existence also multiplies the possibility of discriminatory practices and should act as a spur to intensify our desire and efforts to maintain a tradition of nondiscrimination.

It is the firm and positive policy of this shipyard that all qualified persons shall be assured equal opportuity in all personnel and administrative actions. Discrimination of any type on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin is prohibited and, when discovered, shall be immediately corrected.

I charge each member of this shipyard, both military and civilian, to take an active part in preserving equality of opportunity.

I expect each of you to take affirmative action to guard against discriminatory practices. Only by such affirmative action can we hope to maintain and increase our freedom from discrimination.

Tom Connally's Six Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Norfolk (Va.) Ledger-Star entitled "Tom Connally's Six Words."

It was my privilege to serve in the Senate for many years with the late Senator Tom Connally, for whom I had a high regard, and I was a strong supporter of the Connally amendment designed to preserve the sovereignity of our Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM CONNALLY'S SIX WORDS

Senator Tom Connally, who wore his hair long and his temper short, has passed on now as have many of his companions of 20 years or more ago.

The Texan was a power in the Senate in the days of some others who stood tall on the world stage—Taft and Vandenberg and George and John Foster Dulles, who was even then grooming himself to be Mr. Dewey's Secretary of State in the government that never came to pass. Senator Connally was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the days when in the Senate's hands rested the fate of the United Nations. Connally was a workhorse for Mr. Roosevelt's dream of a world organization to keep the peace.

In November 1944 he said, in words that were typical of his support of the U.N., "If we are to secure the preservation of world peace—and that includes our peace—we must be willing to pay the price. That price is our cooperation with other nations of a similar mind."

And less than a year later, he said: "I am a firm believer in the world security system. In the words of Briand, the great Frenchman, 'there is not one peace for America, one peace for Europe, one peace for Asia, but one peace for the whole world.'"

But Tom Connally also knew that there were borders beyond which the United States should not pass. He, like Vandenberg and Taft, feared to turn over to any world organization a power that might impinge on U.S. sovereignity or the U.S. Constitution.

The great question of the surrender of sovereignty resulted in the inclusion of six words in the document before the Senate by which the United States agreed to accept jurisdiction of the World Court. The six words were added to a paragraph which denied the Court jurisdiction over strictly domestic affairs. The wording first read: "Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." Senator Connally's amendment or reservation, as it is sometimes known, added these six words to that language: "as determined by the United States."

There are those who see these words as a restriction on the World Court and upon hopes for peace they think will come through a "higher" government. But others see them as a safeguard to the Constitution, which lays upon our own Federal Government, through the Congress, restrictions that safeguard individual freedoms. Without such restrictions on government, rights are meaningless. Without the six words, all manner of nations could decide that a domestic issue was not our business but theirs, and all manner of harassments could be created by our enemies.

Tom Connally labored so long in the field of foreign relations for his Presidents that he lost touch at home. He did not run for election again in the early 1950's. He died the other day at 86, almost overlooked in this generation's cut and thrust of world affairs.

Yet the advice of his days of power still guide us in our conduct of world affairs. He spoke of the necessity of sovereignty and of the necessity to control our own affairs. Six words, sometimes held to scorn by those who seek the best of all possible worlds in the illusion of world government, mark his passage across the world stage: "as determined by the United States." They are words of advice we will discard at our peril.

An Intolerable Dilemma for the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Intolerable Dilemma for the Public Schools." The editorial was published in the Arkansas Gazette on November 9, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTOLERABLE DILEMMA FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Little Rock School Board has run squarely up against what is an increasingly troublesome question in educational policy these days: To what extent can and should local schools cooperate in the specialized Federal aid programs that are available for education? The board was considering offering training at the vocational school for business machine operators, a program to be heavily subsidized by the Federal Government.

The essence of the problem reflected here is that, while the Congress has been unable to agree on a general aid to education bill, it has committed Federal funds to a wide variety of specified educational purposes. The Federal Government provides funds for vocational agriculture, for science equipment, for training of teachers in mathematics and science (to a lesser extent in other subjects), for school lunch programs and, more recently, for vocational education. The number and variety of the special programs has been growing.

Administrators at the public school level are facing problems now that the colleges have wrestled with since the days of World War II. Defense contracts have given many a college or university an artificial imbalance in curriculum: A physics department, for example, bloated by Federal support, side by side with a budget-starved English or history department: Feast and famine under the same ivy. The poor dean or president is at some loss to deal with a department head whose program draws special status from the Federal funds it brings the college.

Now, the same pattern is imposing itself on the public schools. The vocational aid bill, laudable in its purposes, imposes on the Little Rock schools (as upon all others) an intolerable dilemma: Bend curriculum and local expenditures to obtain maximum Federal funds, or undermine the purpose of the Federal programs. In a State where fiscal policy seems largely dictated by a determination not to lose a single dollar of Federal matching funds (except the special bonus offered States banning billboards from the new interstate highways), the problem is especially severe.

What is now emerging is a huge irony: Even as the Nation debates the dangers of

Federal control in a general aid-to-education bill, a more subtle, yet perhaps more severe control is emerging. The Federal Government is now greatly influencing, by offering aid for certain specified programs, the curriculum content, balance and quality at all educational levels. It is the same sort of rule that State legislatures impose on the schools when they require a long list of special courses such as State history, driver education or anticommunism. Whether it comes from the legislatures or the Federal Congress, it is damaging to the larger purposes of education.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT and State Education Commissioner Arch Ford have argued for a general education bill on the grounds that it would end this kind of control. With the comprehensive aid bill ensnared in the church-State controversy, such an argument has been largely academic. Pending the resolution of that issue, however, we would suggest that the Congress needs to be more attentive than it has been to the cumulative implications these special programs are having for American schools.

Reaction to Spending Is Widespread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there is more and more evidence that Federal spending has about exhausted the taxpayers' patience.

It was interesting to read the comments of the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman HOMER ABELE, in the Sawyer News, in the First District of Kansas. In addition to pointing out needless waste of taxpayers' money, the writer, Mrs. Carl Terry, gives a suggestion for halting some of the foolishness by stating:

If you don't write at least four letters a year to Congressmen, you aren't an informed, interested citizen of this good old U.S.A.

Congressman ABELE is to be commended for calling attention to a few of the many ridiculous examples of Federal spending, his forthright attitude, and his consistent efforts for economy in Government and a reduction in needless Federal spending.

The Sawyer News, its editor and publisher, Byron E. Blair, and the writer, Mrs. Carl Terry, are believers in sound, conservative government. It is a privilege to represent those who will express their views and are also willing to sound the alarm.

REACTION TO SPENDING IS WIDESPREAD

(By Portia Terry)

If you weer amused or disgusted at the item in this column 2 weeks ago that gave the amount of money the Federal Government had spent to find out the average size of a man's rear and the pressure it exerts; let me add a few more items just as silly that your tax money is being spent for.

This list was made up by Representative HOMER ABELE, Republican, of Ohio, and if this doesn't boil your blood, man you need blood.

Let's spend—

$17,500 for modification of alcohol preference in rats.

$15,200 for a study of society and demography in ancient Babylonia.

$36,800 for the social behavior of ants.

$2,100 for behavior patterns of the barrenground caribou.

$16,800 for social behavior of termites.

$2,600 for communication signals in birds.

$16,900 for revision of the classification of earthworms.

$13,700 for social structure in Madgascar.

$29,300 for mamual faema of the highlands of Ethiopia.

$65,400 for behavior and ecology of the wandering albatross.

Congressman ABELE is to be commended for having ferreted out these truly shocking instances of wild extravagance. Anyone who has ever attempted to plough through the voluminous, intricate, and coverup phraseology of the Federal budget knows that it really takes patience and expertise to spot the flagrant spending abuses.

If you approve of your tax dollars being spent thusly. Do nothing. If you are a poor struggling taxpayer like me, write Representative ABELE and encourage this type of vigilance.

If you don't write at least four letters a year to Congressmen, you aren't an informed, interested citizen of this good ole U.S.A.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following citation conferred by Dr. L. H. Foster, president of Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala., on the occasion of the presentation of the honorary degree of doctor of laws to the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. at the university on October 26, 1963:

JAMES ALOYSIUS FARLEY

He who would measure or practice the art of politics on its highest and most honorable level would do well to read the lines of your life. In them he would find inscribed a record of unremitting loyalty and energy placed in the service of the Nation through its political structure; a chronicle of efficiency coupled with unsurpassed organizational skills; and the narrative of an enormous sense of political realism and practicality without which theoretical considerations seldom achieve substance. Success at the local level of politics in Stony Point, N.Y., led to swift advancement and recognition at the State level, in association with Gov. Alfred E. Smith, and this in turn to your long collaboration with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. For each of these political genuises you were a font of astute counsel, resourceful trailblazing and solid inspiration. It was one of your greatest achievements—before, during, and after those dramatic years—that at no time did you vitiate with expediency your loyalty to or support of either man or party, nor did you ever compromise your widely heralded integrity. It has been your creed to place party over men and to exalt Nation over party. You have at all times been a man renowned for devotion to whatever organization you have chosen to build, but at no time have you been an organization man.

No less spectacular or sustained have been your successes in the world of business. From your earliest days, when you were a worker in the family business and a devoted helper to your parents, to the chairmanship of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., you have evinced the same qualities that ensured success in the political arts—organizing abilities of the highest order, dependability, and unquestioned honesty.

In recognition of your many contributions to public life and to your distinguished possession of the private personal virtues, I take great pleasure in conferring upon you by authority of the board of trustees and our faculty, the honorary degree of doctor of laws, with all the rights and privileges appertaining thereunto.

Ohio Accepts the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the prevailing policy in Washington, the survival of our great Nation depends upon determined and vigorous action on the part of our citizens as individuals and upon enhancement of the free enterprise system, rather than stifling it.

Ohio has long recognized that the dignity of the individual and his self-reliance provide the spring from which flows the incentive to greater productivity and fuller employment. Ohioans do suffer from the "Puritan ethic" and do subscribe to the philosophy that problems are better overcome if tackled at the local level. They readily see the fallacies of Federal handouts with accompanying Federal controls. Ohioans do not subscribe to the philosophy that profit is a dirty word. But, to the contrary, the recognize that profit makes for better performance, for better living conditions. Whether it is a large corporation trying to do better by the stockholders or an office boy doing an extra special polishing job on the handle of the big front door, it is profit or the hope of profit that makes for quality in products and services—quality and progress.

Those who today boast of being liberals operate on the theory that equality is more desirable than quality. They are not true liberals at all. There is nothing liberal about them. Rather, they would put everyone in a mold and the result, which has been proven over and over again, is that those individuals who are more ambitious, more able, more talented, are dragged down to the level of the rest. It just will not work. To put forth their best efforts, people must have incentive. Profit provides that incentive.

Accepting this challenge that it is the free enterprise system with its promise of profits and the dignity and self-reliance of the individual that makes this Nation great, the State of Ohio, under the leadership of a Republican adminis-

tration, has set about to put its fiscal house in order and make the State attractive to new industry. Under this leadership, the State is operating on a balanced budget and has made arrangement for payment of obligations incurred by the previous administration, yet still providing the essential services to its people.

Mr. Speaker, under this leadership, Ohio has added still more proof of its sensitivity to its peoples' wants and its responsiveness to the problems of industry by overwhelmingly voting a $250 million bond issue to provide the necessary scientists, physicists, chemists, and trained personnel to meet the needs of industry, and to provide the necessary training to its citizens to help ward off unemployment. This was all done, Mr. Speaker, without increasing taxes, but instead, will have the effect of reducing production costs by eliminating welfare payments and unemployment costs.

Mr. Speaker, this is the story of Ohio and how it proposes to meet the problems of the future. In support of this statement, Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a recent advertisement that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, November 7, 1963. I am proud to include this advertisement in my remarks, and call my colleagues' attention to it as continuing proof of the attitude of the people of Ohio:

OHIO VOTED FOR YOU TUESDAY

Voted for you in a big way. Voted to give you the physicists and chemists, mathematicians and metallurgists that you as a new or expanding Ohio industry will need. Voted to make possible 11 technical institutes capable of turning out 10,000 crack technicians a year. Voted to expand Ohio's supply of college-trained men and women to meet the growing needs of this growing industrial State.

You see, there's a new attitude in Ohio these days, a spirit that says "profit is not a dirty word." And one more proof was added to the growing body of evidence to this effect Tuesday. This was the day Ohio voted through a bond issue designating that $175 million be spent for classrooms and laboratories for Ohio's already excellent State-supported colleges and universities. This expanded school system, working under the guidance of Ohio's new board of regents, intends to be fully responsive to the needs of industry.

For instance, if you're involved with ion engines and the more exotic aspects of this space-age economy, you can look to Ohio for the theoretical scientists who will push your company's future further starward. If, on the other hand, your profit comes from metals or plastics or foodstuffs, you'll be interested to know that Ohio will be graduating not just Ph. D.'s in astrophysics, but people who can turn willing and creative minds to practical and applied research; trained people to meet the needs of industry. That's what we have in mind as a return on this $175 million.

There are two good reasons: first, Ohio wants to be as attractive to new and expanding industry as the efforts of State government and the concerted action of its citizens can make it. Second, we're determined to give Ohioans marketable skills that will eliminate future unemployment crises before they happen. And this, of course, means less of a drain on the State (and eventually your corporate pocketbook) in terms of welfare handouts.

One more important point. None of this $175 million will come from increased taxes. Ohio neither plans nor needs additional taxes. The $175 million is part of a $250 million bond issue supported by continuing a simple penny-a-pack tax on cigarettes sold in Ohio, a tax first voted into existence in 1955 for similar higher education capital improvement purposes. We think this kind of financing goes a long way toward creating a business climate in which you can make a profit.

You see, Ohio is gearing itself to become the Union's No. 1 industrial State—a State sensitive to its people's wants, responsive to the problems of industry, and so confident about tomorrow that it's planning now for the needs of companies who will someday move or expand here.

Maybe you should be one of them.

For details, write George E. Wilson, Director, Development Department, the State House, Columbus, Ohio, or call collect: 614-224-1370.

"Profit" is not a dirty word in Ohio.

Eulogy to Indian Creek Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, last September the Indian Creek Church and burial ground was rededicated. Located in southwestern Butler County, in my district, this is the oldest church in the county and it had fallen into a bad state of disrepair. The restoration of the church and burial grounds was led by the Historical Society and the Butler County Park Board and was culminated in the rededication ceremony.

At the conclusion of the rededication service held on September 8, 1963, Dr. Bernie Smith, pastor, Fellowship Chapel, delivered the eulogy. It was so well received and caused so much favorable comment that I feel it will be of general interest. Here is the eulogy as printed in the October 6 issue of the Sunday Sentinel, a local newspaper serving Hamilton, Fairfield, and Butler Counties.

EULOGY TO INDIAN CREEK CHURCH, DELIVERED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE REDEDICATION SERVICE HELD SEPTEMBER 8, 1963, BY DR. BERNIE SMITH, PASTOR, FELLOWSHIP CHAPEL

We have met today on hallowed ground. About us are the footprints of faith. Before us is a church—a monument of pioneer faith in the hearts of men and women who found the spiritual antibiotic for the bacteria of doubt. This church gave them inner strength to meet the outer strain. As they made their way here, the Sabbath was free from toil and care and brought to them spiritual refreshment.

They who worshipped here knew not of atomic power, but they had atomic faith. As they sat in these pews they knew not of appalling conditions or apparent catastrophe—but an appealing Christ. This church meant as much to them as did the tabernacle in the wilderness to the children of Israel or the Temple of Solomon. Here they learned what held the world together—not how to blow it to pieces. Here they learned the alphabet of life—not the alphabet of death.

Pioneer preaching in this pulpit was popular with the populace. Here they were told that they could not climb to heaven on a spider web, but they needed the sterner stuff called faith. The fact that they raised this church in the wilderness proved that faith is what miracles are made of.

Let us paraphrase the words of one who has traveled that brief journey from the womb to the tomb—one whose stature still stands as a mountain peak above a prairie—one who was born only 1 year before this church was organized—Abraham Lincoln.

Sevenscore and 13 years ago there was built in Reily Township a church, which was dedicated to the proposition that all people need to know our Heavenly Father.

Now we are engaged in a service to honor those pioneers who, by their faith, proved that any individual so reared and so dedicated will forever endure.

We are met on that sacred soil where they sang hymns and prayed unto God.

We have come to honor them and their church. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But in a larger sense, we cannot honor, we cannot eulogize, we cannot properly speak of so great a cause and so great a faith.

The example of faith they instilled in hearts, living, and dead, has honored them far above our poor power to add or detract.

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but may it never forget what they did here.

It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which these spiritual pioneers so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead, we take increased consecration to our Christ, for whom they gave the last full measure of devotion.

And that we be here well assured that these pioneers did not live nor die in vain, and highly resolve that this church shall inspire all churches, and that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of true Christian religion, and that consecration of the people, dedication by the people, and inspiration for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Behind the Headlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday I had inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Augusta Chronicle-Herald of Augusta, Ga., dated November 3, 1963, reporting on a recent Communist Party strategy conference in New York City. Today my attention has been called to another report on this meeting in the form of a report written by Mr. Paul Harvey, the distinguished news columnist and broadcaster. This column was printed in a recent issue of a Fort Lauderdale, Fla., newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

(By Paul Harvey)

Communist conspirators in the United States have held a major strategy conference in New York City.

Their national executive committee decreed that Communists in the United States

must further aggravate race restlessness, that Communists must "take advantage of the Negroes' angry mood."

National secretary, Benjamin Davis, outlined recommendations for a "more militant" participation in the civil rights struggle. His recommendations unanimously accepted by all present were:

1. Refusal to pay State and local taxes.
2. The organizing of general work stoppages.
3. Disruption of all transportation to Birmingham, Ala., by sitdowns in railroad stations, on the highways, and on airport runways.
4. Continuous telephone calls in order to tie up communications lines and thus isolate Birmingham.

Davis said (and what he said, approved by the executive committee, became the "party line" which all Communists in the United States are to follow) that Communists must sponsor continued mass activity, must urge the Negro people to continue to take to the streets, must continue to "lead Negro leaders."

Davis said that Negro organizations need a catalyst to hold them together and that the "Communist Party must infiltrate all the organizations within the Negro movement" particularly in the South.

General secretary of the conspiracy, Gus Hall, observed:

"There are 20 million Negroes and countless white persons who will not accept promises and want action now."

He said directing and participating in the Negro struggle must now get priority over all other Communist objectives in the United States, "ahead of the economic struggle and the regrouping of peace forces."

Gil Green called the present Negro movement the handle which will "open the door for the Communist Party, if we grasp it."

He said the Communists must plan carefully how to cash in on the civil rights restlessness, not just ride with it.

National committeeman Antol Krchmarek urged linking the trade union movement with the Negro movement.

Irving Potash, labor secretary for the Communists, urged agitation to give priorities to Negroes in the hiring of new employees.

It was obvious to the undercover observer who was present and supplied me with the "minutes" of that last meeting—as it must now be clear to responsible members of the Negro community—that the Communists' objective is not the "civil rights" of the Negro.

Rather, the Reds in our midst, as they traditionally always have, will seize upon this social restlessness, aggravate it, encourage differences, disrupt domestic tranquility. * * *

And otherwise seek the ultimate enslavement of us all.

Gen. John R. Hodge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of one of our great World War II combat heroes, Gen. John R. Hodge. I had the pleasure to know General Hodge while serving on active duty and knew him as a possessor of all of the soldierly qualities as well as those of the statesman.

After World War II he was the first U.S. field commander in Korea and a real expert in the terrain and politics of this country. His forthright stand in defense of American principles, policies, and ideals probably cost him the command of the 8th Army in 1950 when U.S. Forces first entered the battle. It is significant to note here that we did not use our best and most experienced ground commander with a detailed knowledge of the terrain and enemy because of a disagreement 2 years previously with the Korean President—and a parallel situation seems to be developing in Vietnam at the present time with another great American soldier.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Times of November 13 concerning Gen. John R. Hodge:

GEN. JOHN R. HODGE DIES AT 70; A LEADER IN PACIFIC CAMPAIGNS—WORLD WAR II COMMANDER WAS WOUNDED IN SOLOMONS WHILE DIRECTING TROOPS

WASHINGTON, November 12.—Gen. John R. Hodge, a leader of the Pacific fighting in World War II, died today in Walter Reed Army Hospital, where he had been a patient since last Wednesday. He was 70 years old.

General Hodge, who retired in 1953, had made his home at Fayetteville, N.C.

He will be buried with honors tomorrow at 3 p.m. at Arlington National Cemetery.

Survivors include his widow, Mrs. Lydia Parsons Hodge; a daughter, Mrs. E. Cody Hall of Anniston, Ala., and three grandchildren, John, Randy, and Mary Hall.

HANDLED DIFFICULT TASK

Frequently called the Patton of the Pacific in news dispatches during World War II, General Hodge handled some of the Army's most difficult assignments against the Japanese. He was assistant commander of the 25th Division, which relieved the Marines on Guadalcanal and consolidated the American hold on that island.

A stocky, vigorous commander, General Hodge preferred to go close to the frontlines to keep in touch with the action. As a result, he was wounded during a Japanese counterattack around the Bougainville airfields in the Solomon Islands.

During the fighting on Leyte, in the Philippines, General Hodge was sleeping in a foxhole inside a tent when a Japanese bomb hit a nearby ammunition dump. A shell fragment tore a hole in the tent, but he was not injured.

While on Leyte, he used to fly in a small observation plane almost daily over the Japanese lines. Although the plane was hit several times by enemy fire, General Hodge was never wounded. He received the Air Medal after the war for having participated in these reconnaissance missions.

John Reed Hodge came of a military life by choice. He was born at Golconda, Ill., on June 12, 1893. His early interests were directed towards a career in teaching, and at the age of 19 he entered Southern Illinois Teachers College, where he studied for a year.

In May 1917, after having attended the University of Illinois for a brief period, he went to the Army Officers' Training School at Fort Sheridan, Ill. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry reserve and joined a unit at Gettysburg, Pa.

IN ACTION IN WORLD WAR I

The next February he was sent overseas to France, where he participated in action at St. Mihiel and in the Meuse-Argonne drive. He was named a first lieutenant when the war ended. After returning to the United States and serving at several military camps, he was promoted to captain. In October 1921, he joined the faculty of Mississippi A. & M. College as professor of military science and tactics.

General Hodge began an intensive advanced training program in April 1932, which led to his studying at many of the leading Army staff schools. He spent a year at the Army War College in Washington before becoming a major. Then he was sent to the Air Corps Tactical School at Maxwell Field, Ala.

For 5 years, General Hodge worked on the War Department's General Staff developing military plans in case the United States should be drawn into a European war. During this period, he was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

But with the entry of the United States into World War II after the attack on Pearl Harbor, General Hodge became Chief of Staff of the 7th Army Corps, destined to serve in the Pacific.

In July 1943, General Hodge, then a major general, succeeded to the command of a division that had been in continuous action against the Japanese in New Georgia for 30 days and had suffered heavy casualties. Under his direction the division began a new drive that proved successful.

DECORATED FOR LEADERSHIP

General Hodge received the Distinguished Service Medal for this offensive. The citation noted that he had "inspired his troops by his constant presence at the front and was primarily responsible for the forward drive of the division which brought the entire operation to a successful conclusion."

General Hodge then assumed command of the Americal Division, which was assigned to hold off the Japanese on New Caledonia. The only American division organized overseas in the Pacific, it was officially distinguished by name instead of number. Americal being a combination of America and Caledonia.

With the end of the war, General Hodge was named head of the occupation forces in South Korea. He served there until it became a republic in 1948. Friction between General Hodge and Dr. Syngman Rhee, first President of the Republic, led to the general's recall to Washington.

After his return to the United States, he served at various posts until President Harry S. Truman named him Chief of the Army Field Forces on June 11, 1952. He held this post until his retirement the next year.

Not socially inclined, General Hodge preferred to spend his evenings working or reading. He liked to rise at 6:30 a.m. every day and begin tackling the paperwork that was always before him. He managed to keep his door open to callers, no matter what their rank.

In addition to the Air Medal, General Hodge held the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Service Medal with two clusters, the Navy Distinguished Service Medal, and the Purple Heart.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part VII of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events contain-

ing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY BEGAN PRESIDENTIAL DRIVE LIKE TRUE SON OF CONFEDERACY—PART VII

It was amid the debris of Stevenson's electoral disaster that John Kennedy launched his own drive for the presidency. He had good reason to lift his eyes, as he put it, "from the VP to the P." For when the Senate convened in January 1957, he returned as one of the Nation's better-known political figures.

In 1957 Kennedy made some 150 appearances throughout the country. And he was spending a good deal of time in the South where his close convention loss to Estes Kefauver had made him a hero. Before the year was out Kennedy had become known as "Dixie's favorite Yankee."

"Southerners were damned nice to me at the convention," Kennedy told columnist Bob Considine. "And before that and ever since, I couldn't ask to meet finer, higher-minded people than I met speaking recently in Virginia, Georgia, and Louisiana."

Kennedy had become so popular below the Mason-Dixon line that in December 1957 the Christian Science Monitor's Bicknell Eubanks was able to report "a growing feeling throughout the region that the Bay Stater may be the one to head a third party in Dixieland."

Though Kennedy criticized Eisenhower's role in Little Rock, not once did he suggest how he personally would have handled that explosive situation.

Only when pressed would he uphold—"without applauding," as the AP put it—the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation.

"Whether we favor the decision or oppose it," he said in November 1957, "it is going to be carried out. It is the law of the land; there is no appeal from it." (Aside from its noticeable restraint, the statement was not entirely accurate. The fact was—law of the land or not—the decision, in its specific applications, was being appealed.)

On the eve of his arrival to address a Democratic dinner in Jackson, Miss., the Republican State chairman challenged Kennedy to state how he felt about Little Rock.

The next night, Kennedy found 1,500 pair of eyes staring at him expectantly. "I have no hesitancy," he said, "in telling the Republican State chairman the same thing I have said in my own city of Boston—that I accept the Supreme Court decision as the supreme law of the land. I know we do not all agree on that issue—but I think most of us do agree on the necessity to uphold law and order in every part of the land."

No response from the audience.

Then Kennedy attacked: "And now I challenge the Republican chairman to tell us where he stands on Eisenhower and Nixon."

The remark, probably the non sequitur of the year, brought down the house. And his audience let loose with rebel yells when Kennedy observed that the then GOP National Chairman Meade Alcorn bore the same name as one of Mississippi's more unpopular Reconstruction Governors. For this remarkable display of erudition, Kennedy then and there won the presidential blessings of Gov. James Coleman.

In 1958 Governor Coleman again endorsed Kennedy for the presidency. "The South likes Kennedy," he declared at the Southern Governors' Conference. And judging from what others were saying about Kennedy at the conference, the Associated Press reported: "You would think that he was Dixie-born, a descendant of Robert E. Lee and a man who eats hominy grits and corn pone three times a day."

Just as Kennedy's cuddly relations with southern segregationists would tarnish his liberal image in years to come, so has the Kennedy profile suffered from his refusal to turn his back on Joe McCarthy.

The trouble with writing a book like "Profiles in Courage" was that it opened up the whole subject of Kennedy's own courage.

The test was over McCarthyism. And how Kennedy faced this test demonstrated much about his character, integrity, responsiveness and—as Eleanor Roosevelt put it—his "convictions," and—as Westbrook Pegler put it—his "moral courage." Or as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., put it, "Kennedy's misfortune was that, by writing the book, he invited particular attention to his own circumspection in the McCarthy period."

But the test was also one for Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and his fellow liberals. And most of them failed it as badly as did Jack Kennedy.

For among liberals, the one thing that had long separated the good guys from the bad guys was the issue posed by the Senator from Wisconsin. To the Schlesingers et al. this was the unbridgeable gulf. Anyone who refused to make known his unequivocal hatred of McCarthyism, or to speak of the "unspeakable" McCarthy in any terms other than those of total abuse, was automatically declared persona non grata.

There could be no exception.

Yet an exception was made in the case of Jack Kennedy, even though he refused to utter the ritualistic phrases condemning McCarthyism. And in making the exception, the liberals brought into question their own principles.

Perhaps the answer can be found in the historic words uttered by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in Harvard Yard in March 1960: "I guess I'm nostalgically for Stevenson, ideologically for Humphrey and realistically for Kennedy," and quickly added that he would gladly work for "any two-legged liberal mammal who might beat Nixon."

The liberals, in other words, were quite willing to swallow John Kennedy—McCarthyism and all—in the name of beating Nixon at all costs.

WHY THIS NIXONPHOBIA?

But why were the liberals so emotionally—and, at times, so irrationally—opposed to Nixon in the first place? The usual reason given was Nixon's conduct in the 1950 Senate race against Helen Gahagan Douglas in California.

It was indeed a rough campaign on both sides; but not as rough as the mythmakers have made it out to be, particularly when compared with Kennedy's tactics against Hubert Humphrey in the 1960 presidential primaries.

Assuming the most horrendous version of the Nixon-Douglas contest to be true, why did Schlesinger, in his campaign book, so magnanimously concede that l'affaire Douglas was perhaps not "germane to whether [Nixon] should be elected president?"

Was it because Jack Kennedy himself had made a substantial contribution to Nixon in the 1950 campaign? Was it because Kennedy had announced at Harvard how "personally happy" he was that Mrs. Douglas had been defeated by Nixon because, as he then put it, she was "not the sort of person I like working with on committees"?

RED-BAITING DAYS

Anyway, it was opposing McCarthy, not Nixon, that required the courage Kennedy had written so eloquently about. And yet Kennedy was practicing McCarthyism long before Senator McCarthy established his own practice.

As a young Congressman he had flailed the Truman administration for the "sellout" of China to the Communists. He had demanded that the White House "search out and spotlight" those responsible for the tragedy, "the diplomats and their advisers." And he himself spotlighted Professors Owen Lattimore and John K. Fairbank. This was a year before Senator McCarthy mentioned the gentlemen's names and also demanded that their roles in the China debacle be proved.

Despite liberal opposition, Kennedy supported without criticism the activities and contempt citations of the much-abused House Committee on Un-American Activities. In 1950 he voted against statehood for Hawaii. (The chief opposition had come from House Members who contended that Hawaii was in the grip of Harry Bridges and the Communists.)

Indeed, Senator McCarthy, a most convivial soul, had been on friendly terms with the entire Kennedy family. He was a frequent visitor to Hyannis Port, where in more recent years Kennedy had entertained such liberal worthies as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and John Kenneth Galbraith.

And who could ever forget the spectacle of Senators Kennedy and McCarthy playing croquet on the lawn overlooking the Atlantic?

These days it takes a long reach of memory to recall that Robert F. Kennedy first came to national attention as a lawyer on McCarthy's staff. His chores included the investigation of homosexuals in the State Department and a somewhat more celebrated probe into relations behind foreign shipping firms and the Chinese Communists.

PULLS A GROMYKO

Though it is a memory which he now would eagerly efface, the fact is Bobby was an impassioned McCarthyite. So much so that once he walked out of a dinner of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce rather than listen to Edward R. Murrow deliver the major oration.

This was in 1955 when Bobby was named by the chamber as 1 of the 10 outstanding young Americans of the year. Only after the TV personality concluded did Bobby return to his seat, telling all within earshot he had no use for the blankety-blank Murrow, after what he had done to his good friend Joe McCarthy.

McCarthy's best friend in the family was the head of the clan, Joseph P. Kennedy, to whom—unlike his sons—the claims of friendship invariably took precedence over caution.

"In case there is any question in your mind," he told one interviewer, "I like Joe McCarthy. I always liked him. I would see him when I went down to Washington and when he was visiting in Palm Beach he'd come around to my house for a drink; I invited him to Cape Cod."

Why had he liked McCarthy?

"He was always pleasant; he was never a crab," replied the Ambassador. "If somebody was against him, he never tried to cut his heart out. He never said that anybody was a stinker. He was a pleasant fellow. He went out on my boat one day and he almost drowned swimming behind it, but he never complained."

The moment of truth for Jack came on December 2, 1954. That day the Senate voted to censure McCarthy. But Kennedy did not vote. He was in a New York hospital where he had undergone spinal surgery. The only other Senator unrecorded on the issue was Alexander Wiley, Wisconsin, who had the excuse of protocol.

Nevertheless, Kennedy could have gone on record either for or against censure by pairing his vote with that of another absent colleague who held an opposite view. Even after returning to the Senate Kennedy refused to make known how he would have voted.

"I was out in the hospital about 9 to 10 months, and I had a bad year," he explained on TV in mid-1956. "Now, if you can give me back that year, I will be glad to tell you how I would have voted."

But critics wondered why, if Kennedy was able to write a book, he could not have taken the trouble of recording his position on censure.

Address of Baltimore Mayor McKeldin Honoring Mrs. Mary Harrington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, for many years a group of Baltimoreans which calls itself the East Baltimore Boys, because they were born and grew up in that section of Baltimore, has held an annual dinner to honor a former East Baltimorean, or someone who has done something outstanding for that area of the city. As far as I can remember, the person so honored in the past has been a man. However, this year, in its wisdom, the group selected as East Baltimorean of the Year, Mrs. Mary Harrington, for many years a supervisor and school principal in East Baltimore public schools, and one who has been very active in civic affairs in the city. At the dinner held last Wednesday, Mayor Theodore McKeldin was scheduled to bring greetings to Mrs. Harrington. However, due to an illness which confined him to the hospital, his remarks were delivered by the president of the Baltimore City Council, Thomas D'Alesandro III. The chairman and cochairmen of the dinner were Reuben H. Levenson, Frank G. Roberts, and Christian P. Sorensen, respectively.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the address of Mayor McKeldin, prepared for that occasion:

I greatly regret that doctor's orders prevent me from attending the annual dinner of the East Baltimore Boys for it is always a delightful occasion; But on this evening my regret is doubled because honor is being paid to a woman with a distinguished record in the public school system, and I regard the teachers as our first line of defense against barbarism; finally, my regret is multiplied again because this particular teacher is married to a man who also has a distinguished record in public service. It is unusual indeed to find a couple who in different ways have served the people of Baltimore so well.

Mrs. Mary Harrington, a product of the Maryland institute, the Johns Hopkins University, and Pennsylvania State College, is more than merely a schoolmistress, more than a supervisor and principal, although as the head successively of schools 82, 51, and 2 for 25 years, it is as a principal that most people know her. But as a member of the Women of Civitan, she has been active in civic work apart from the school system; and as a member of the advisory board of St. Francis and St. Elizabeth school for children with mental retardation, she has assisted the advance of educational science in a most difficult field.

It is a pleasure to remember that even as she is a teacher, but more than a teacher, so the man she married is a lawyer, but more than a lawyer. Burton Harrington, a product of Loyola College and the University of Maryland Law School, in addition to his practice of the law, has given distinguished service to the public in many capacities: as assistant attorney general of Maryland, as deputy U.S. attorney, as speaker of the house of delegates at Annapolis, as chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, and he is still serving as chief judge of the municipal court of Baltimore City.

As I understand it, one of the chief objects of this annual gathering of the East Baltimore boys is to render honor to whom honor is due. Never, I feel sure, has that purpose been better served than it is tonight. But let me add that it is not only Mrs. Harrington and her husband who are being honored here. We honor ourselves when we pay tribute to those who deserve it; and I feel that we honor ourselves especially well when we express our admiration for people whose success in life has been not the accumulation of great wealth, or triumph in some contest against others, or in the attainment of personal glamour, but in unselfish devotion to the common good.

I congratulate Mrs. Harrington on receiving the sweetest of all praise, the praise of neighbors. For strangers can sometimes be deceived as to the value of one's services, but the neighbors know, and their praise is praise indeed. But at the same time I congratulate the East Baltimore boys on having chosen this woman to receive their honor; for to single out and bring to the attention of the world merit that too often is neglected and forgotten is itself a public service. For it causes others to remember that much of the finest work in the world is not rewarded by wealth and power, but by the respect and esteem of the intelligent and patriotic which is a garland more precious by far than the most glittering decoration awarded by kings.

Business Committee Has Dual Objectives of Tax Reduction and Expenditure Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the position of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963 has been frequently cited by the administration in support of its program to cut taxes. While the administration and press have played up the Business Committee's belief that a tax cut is desirable now, less attention has been paid to the committee's belief in firm Federal expenditure control.

I am happy to see that the cochairmen, Stuart T. Saunders and Henry Ford II, have unmistakably linked the need for a tax cut with expenditure control in a statement before the Senate Finance Committee on November 4.

As Mr. Saunders said in his opening paragraph, speaking for himself and Henry Ford:

> We are here to support the dual goals of this organization—prompt, across-the-board tax reduction for individuals and corporations, and restraint in Federal spending.

Mr. Saunders went on to say that in order to obtain the benefits of tax reduction:

> Strict control of Federal expenditures and appropriations by both the executive and legislative branches of Government is essential.

He also pointed out that the executive committee of his organization on May 28 called for a reduction in the 1964 budget and said that it "believes that there is no situation foreseeable which would necessarily require the 1965 and 1966 budgets to increase over that proposed for 1964."

This precise statement of the Business Committee's policy will, I hope, clear up once and for all the confusion that has been created by those who stress the committee's desire for tax reduction and largely ignore its position on Federal spending.

Involvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Richard B. Kozelka, minister of the Park Hill Congregational Church, Denver, Colo., delivered an excellent sermon on racial justice on October 27, 1963. Under unanimous consent, I include this sermon in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

INVOLVEMENT

Some of you have been around some of our discussions in this church the past year about how to get more of our people more involved in the program of the church.

I confess to you that this subject never comes up at planning conferences or deacons' meetings, but what I think of the cartoon of the glamorous octopus with all her arms waving. Nearby is a male octopus and his male friend, which between the three of them makes a lot of arms waving. The male octopus is saying, "She's lovely, but I don't want to get involved."

When we talk about the whole complex of issues which are comprised by the phrase "racial justice" now, I have the sense that many persons among us are grateful that we are not, as they see it, involved as much as we might be. No one living in Park Hill or coming to this church could be under any delusion that the issue of racial justice is one we can be completely apart from, but I have this sense about our involvement, an unspoken but fairly general viewpoint that might go this way:

"Fortunately, we are not involved, in our church and neighborhood, in the more violent expressions of the struggle for racial justice.

"No one has been slugged.

"There have been no riots.

"We have not had a major split in the church about this.

"No minister has been asked to resign.

"We've had no major cancellations of support.

"We've had no church members in jail."

And then I think of the cartoon about the octopus: "It's important but I don't want to get that much involved or get the church that much involved."

1. The fact is that we are very much involved in the more violent aspects of this issue.

Every Sunday morning in this church we have given some money to voter registration programs and bail bonds for demonstrators because we have given to Our Christian World Mission, and part of that work includes these things.

We have suffered abuse in this cause. Every time someone says to you, "Do you still live in Park Hill? Aren't you planning to move soon?" you take some abuse, because you aren't planning to move and see no need to. Every time someone says to me, "Your church is having such a hard time with this race thing." I feel abused, because I don't happen to think we're having such a hard time with this "race thing".

We have in fact had a split in the church over this, and we have had cancellation of support. Some of those who hastened to Parkview Church in Aurora. Some of those who moved south (not all, but some), giving every plausible reason except the real one. This has not always been as overt as the note I received typed on the bottom of my own letter to all of you about this morning and our program, the note to the effect that this would be the authority to remove that paricular family from our membership list, with a check attached to pay up their pledge account.

We have suffered discrimination—for the we of this church now includes both Negroes and whites, and no one can say we about this church without recognizing that we have experienced injustice in housing, we have been mistreated in social contacts, and we have marched in demonstrations.

We have also gone to jail—that part of us which is at our Congregational College in Tougaloo, Miss.

We have been dismissed from our pastorates—that part of us which was in the ministry not in the South but in Illinois and Ohio, where one man in Ohio was out because he invited an African exchange student into his home, and another in the Chicago area was out because he suggested that the church extend a welcome to minority families in the neighborhood. (You may not feel this involvement as keenly as I do.)

We have gone to the FBI, in the person of Truman Douglas of our board for homeland ministries and asked for help for abused students and faculty at our church-related colleges, and we have been turned down.

We have been slugged and beaten in the persons from our board for homeland ministries staff working with a citizenship-education program in Mississippi.

This is we—not somebody else—not somebody we have no connection with or from whom we can disassociate ourselves. And again, we in this church as in this denomination includes now both Negroes and whites, so we are always on both sides of this struggle (and the sides don't always line up according to color, but often according to conscience).

2. Surely we do not need to hear again, in this place, any urging of the importance of this struggle. Surely we do not need to hear again what attitudes any Christian ought to have about this issue. Surely we can go beyond first steps here, and stop entertaining pros and cons, and talk about what part we shall have in this most important fact in this Nation in this century.

This issue of racial justice will not work itself out automatically without our involvement, as if somehow—if we could just stay clear of it for a few years—it would be resolved without any personal discomfort on our part. This will not happen this way.

We are involved now, and the question is how we shall make our contribution to this issue. Let me tell you something about how we are working even now toward a worthwhile contribution:

There are, as you know, many organizations and many programs in both South and North. It would be impossible for any church to have a program entirely its own. How we make a contribution is by strengthening positive programs of certain kinds.

There are many groups in the South trying to encourage the registration of Negro voters. We are a part of this—only a part, for even this is too big for us as one denomination. But there are certain places in Georgia and Mississippi where we have people, we have contacts, we have an access which permits us to give money and staff and counsel for this positive work of registering voters.

For every incident of physical violence we hear about in the press, there are many others that go unreported. In most of these cases there is need for concern, for legal aid, for emotional support and, not infrequently, financial support. (It costs money to go to jail, whether you are guilty or not.)

There are too many of these incidents for the United Church to mount a program to help all the victims. But we are stepping into situations where we have particular access: Where some students and faculty of one of our southern colleges were dragged from stools in a public lunchroom, thrown to the floor and kicked and beaten. (When the president of the college arrived at that lunchroom he found at least a dozen of the town's policemen standing on the sidewalk watching the attack through the window.)

We have heard much about the bombing in Birmingham; we haven't heard of the other bombings, including two bombings of the home of Attorney Arthur Shores, a member of our church there and an officer of one of our national church boards. Where we have this kind of access we try to provide a community of support: spiritual, legal, financial, whatever we can do.

In these and other ways we of this church are adding to the constructive forces at work. We did not just begin this in July when the General Synod created the special Committee for Racial Justice now. The work had been going on before that. But the possible work has recently become such that it needs a group who will give it their special attention on our behalf, and will be able to do more than regular budgets allow.

Now, I know that most of us didn't plan a special offering of this kind in our finances for this month. Our church didn't plan, 6 months ago, to enter this kind of an appeal to underwrite this additional program.

In the same way, some of us didn't plan to go to jail this year, or lose our jobs this year, or get slugged this year, or get involved this year. Arthur Shores didn't plan to have his home bombed this year. Edward King didn't plan to be beaten up at a lunch counter this year. Southern Union College didn't plan to lose some essential support from its community this year.

3. Neither did the people of Israel plan to hear from God what Amos said to them about the day of the Lord for which they had been waiting and praying.

They had thought that when the Lord spoke, it would surely be a word of approval for their faithfulness in worship, a word of commendation for their generosity in sacrifice, a pat on the back for their discipleship in the holy days. But what they heard, if we can bring it up to date, was—

"Why would you have the day of the Lord? I hate, I despise your meetings and resolutions, and I take no delight in your cultural improvement programs. Even though you offer me your time-and-talent cards and your monthly board meetings I will not accept them, and the distribution of your surplus income I will not look upon. Take away from me the noise of your comfortable churches; to the melody of your pious discussions I will not listen. But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream."

In spite of the differences of personality and point-of-view among us here (and some of those differences are valid), I think we all know what God says about justice and righteousness and reconciliation where there is now injustice and unrighteousness and antagonism.

We may be trying to avoid what he says, or delay acting on what he says, or excuse ourselves from becoming directly involved in what he says. But I think we know what he says to us as citizens of this Nation and as members of the Church of Jesus Christ.

The New York Times writes:

"The real issue is not whether the Negro, as a Negro, has certain rights and privileges. It is whether any citizen, of any race or any creed, can be deprived of such rights and privileges. The question must not be whether group recognizable in color, features, or culture has its rights as a group. No, the question is whether any American individual, regardless of color, features, or culture, is deprived of his rights as an American.

"If the individual has all the rights and privileges due him under the laws and the Constitution, we need not worry about groups and masses. We are all Americans. If all Americans are not free, then not one of us is safe. In this principle we are all allies and friends, all of the same color, all of the same religion, all of the same race."

What Paul is saying, in this passage to the church in Galatia with all its analogies of law and faith and children and heirs, is that at one time we were all involved with the willfulness and immaturity and having to be managed which separate mankind into different races, different cultures, different conditions of servitude.

This is true. At one time we were identified, through our history and our grandparents, with slave or free, Negro or white, ingroup or outgroup, native or immigrant, rulers or ruled. But we are no longer so identified, except residually as my name identifies me as former immigrant and someone else's color identifies him as former slave.

For we are now involved with Christ. We are identified with Christ. We are what we are because of Christ.

We are no longer children, whose best bet is to make excuses for themselves and wait to see if some adult will make them do what they ought to do. We are now sons of God by His act in Jesus Christ. He has claimed us, and we have responded to that claim.

Let us then live accordingly:

With risk, where it involves risk—and it will.

With cost, where it involves cost—and it will.

With obedience, where it involves obedience—and it does.

With courage—for it does involve courage.

Let us pray: Almighty God, who hast made us the persons we are because a man died on the cross, we remember before Thee those joined with us in the community of suffering and grace.

Heal those who are wounded by injustice, who have lived with indignity and oppression.

Strengthen those who seek to balance in themselves the demands of love and justice, the tensions of retaining orderliness and seeking wholeness.

Sustain with Thy spirit those who suffer for righteousness' sake.

Forgive the weakness of spirit in those who seek rather to flee than to struggle, rather to criticize than to build, rather to withdraw than to risk.

Deliver those whose conscience is in conflict and who must break free of themselves in order to be wholly themselves.

Renew our own discipleship.

Accept our gifts of hand and heart and mind.

Unite us in the company of the committed and in the convictions that it is always the right time to do right, that justice too long delayed is justice denied, that Thy kingdom and Thy righteousness are the first goal of life and the sole source of peace. Amen.

Civil Rights Advocates or Revolutionists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a favorite pasttime of today's liberals is to warn against the "extremists on the right" and to rail against those who believe in constitutional government as dangerous enemies of the United States. These same liberals are strangely silent about the extremists on the left. In fact, some of those who are openly advocating revolution in America and openly praising Communist goals are looked upon with respect and cast as heroes by some of our national leaders.

Perhaps it is time, Mr. Speaker, to decide just who are the enemies of the United States. Are they the people who are proud of our American heritage, who believe in the spirit and letter of the Constitution, who advocate a government of law, not of men, who support capitalism, private initiative and the right to private property? Or are the enemies those who decry American virtues and look to the Soviet Union for inspiration, who preach disobedience of law, who ridicule American motives, who preach hate against our most sacerd institutions and who call for whatever extreme measures it may take to overthrow and demolish our system of society?

An interesting discussion of the extremists on the left, including two who are prominent in the so-called civil rights fight, Bayard Rustin and James Baldwin, is given by Ken Thompson, editorial writer for the Dallas Morning News.

The article follows:

RIGHTS GROUP HAS EXTREMISTS

(By Ken Thompson)

Anyone who would like to have a better idea of what some of the more militant civil rights leaders are planning and thinking could profit by picking up a copy of monthly magazine published in New York called Liberation. Its editor is Bayard Rustin, leader of the August Negro march on Washington.

Though the magazine's first concern is with civil rights, its interest is by no means limited to this field. Its editorial board is sprinkled with the names of pacifists, world federalists and leftwing fanatics.

In the October issue, an editorial demands admission of Red China to the United Nations, and bemoans the fact that some "peaceworkers" are ganging up against China in the much-ballyhooed Sino-Soviet split. Another editorial sobs about the recent overthrow of Red-leaning President Juan Bosch in the Dominican Republic. A news item notes that the magazine joined hands with the Catholic Worker and the War Resistors League to demonstrate in New York against U.S. support of South Vietnam. At the back of the magazine appears a letter from one of Liberation's avid readers blaming the Western countries for the danger of war and maintaining that Russia and China are in favor of disarmament and peace while the United States is not. The letter writer was England's Lord Bertrand Russell.

Do these items sound like strange entries in a magazine devoted to the civil rights cause? Perhaps it is because some strange people have attached themselves to that cause.

On the civil rights question are two main articles in the October issue of Liberation. One, "The Meaning of the March on Washington," is by Bayard Rustin, and the other, "We Can Change the Country," is by James Baldwin.

Rustin writes that the Washington march "forced people to see the necessity for masses in the street. It pointed the way to massive civil disobedience." This theme is becoming more popular with Negro leaders who have become impatient with carrying their battle to the courts and Congress, but few are as brazen in their advocacy of lawlessness as Rustin.

"Our need," he writes, "is to exert our own power, and the main power we have is the power of our black bodies. We need to use these bodies to create a stiuation in which society cannot function without yielding to our just demands. We need to make things unworkable. We need to go into the streets over the country and to make a mountain of creative social confusion until the power structure is altered. We need in every community a group of loving troublemakers who will disrupt the ability of the government to operate. There must be masses in motion."

James Baldwin is hardly more moderate. His article begins by urging all Negroes to boycott Christmas, "because we have lost the right * * * to be called a Christian nation." He claims that the Negro in this country is not "in the position of someone in the Congo or someone in Cuba." By this, however, he does not mean to imply that the Negro here is better off, for he quickly adds: "That is, we cannot take over the land."

"This is not a free country," Baldwin continues, asking the reader to walk up to 125th Street in New York City where "it looks like a concentration camp. I mean the police walking two by two and three by three." Baldwin apparently hasn't taken the time to consider that perhaps the presence of numerous armed gangs makes it necessary for the police to walk "two by two and three by three." Ironically, there is an article elsewhere in the same issue of Liberation about the New York street gangs, entitled "One Word Can Start a War."

Taking up where Rustin left off, Baldwin suggests that, among other things, Negroes might refuse to pay their rent. "We have to begin a massive campaign of civil disobedience. I mean nationwide. And this is no stage joke. Some laws should not be obeyed."

Is the civil rights move a campaign for justice and equality under law or a revolution? Sometimes it's hard to tell.

The more responsible leaders of the civil rights campaign must move—and quickly—to disassociate themselves from the kind of leadership offered by the likes of Rustin and Baldwin. Failure to repudiate this leadership and to speak out sharply and strongly against the advocates of lawlessness can only hurt the cause of civil rights.

Boxing Commissioner Kenneth C. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, with all of the competent, trustworthy men available for appointment, it is beyond understanding why it is necessary to make appointments of individuals who bring dishonor to Government service.

All of the facts listed in George Clifford's column, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on November 7, were available and known at the time Mr. Kennedy's appointment was made to replace a very capable and deserving man who has served the District well as Boxing Commissioner.

Mr. Clifford's column follows:

THE MAN AND THE MYTH

(By George Clifford)

Boxing Commissioner Kenneth C. Kennedy is involved in more interesting bouts than have been seen in the ring here in some years.

At the moment, Kennedy—who is a real estate broker—is in dutch with the Real Estate Commission. He is charged with failing to return $1,000 to a client within a reasonable length of time, and demonstrating "such unworthiness or incompetency to act as a real estate broker as to endanger the interest of the public."

That puts him in the doghouse of two District Commissions. The other one is the Boxing Commission. In just 4 months as a member of the Commission, he has demonstrated rather incredible naivete.

When Kennedy was appointed to the Commission, a number of people assumed that he was the chairman. The assumption may have been a natural one. Kennedy succeeded Jocko Miller, who had been chairman, and who succeeded Heinie Miller, another former chairman.

On the day Kennedy was appointed to the Commission, there was an election. Kennedy admitted he knew very little about boxing, and disqualified himself. Norvel Lee was an unanimous choice to be chairman. The selection was a wise one. Lee is a former Olympic boxing champion, and nurtures hopes of the sport being made wholesome.

At any rate, the belief that Kennedy was the chairman persisted, and although there is nothing to suggest that he was responsible for it, it is certain he did little to dispel it.

Goldie Ahearn was one of those who thought that Kennedy was boss. Washington's favorite—and only—fight promoter was quick to invite Kennedy to Goldie's Charcoal Pit Restaurant. There Kennedy was wined and dined in high fashion.

During one of the sessions of entertainment, Ahearn mentioned that he was planning to promote a fight in October between Bobby Foster, the Washington lightheavyweight, and one Sixto Rodriguez. All of this was to be for the benefit of the NBC movie cameras, which have been making a film on Foster.

Kennedy's exact words were not recorded, but he told Goldie in effect, "Go right ahead. Anything you want to do is just dandy."

With this blessing, Ahearn did go right ahead, making plans to lease Capitol Arena, firming up the commitment with Rodriguez, giving Foster the hope that someone would fight him, setting up camera crews from the network.

Although there was no official announcement, the word that boxing would be staged here again spread quickly. It even reached the Boxing Commission, which, strange as it may seem, had not been consulted.

The Commission summoned Ahearn for a meeting. It had serious doubts, he was told, that Rodriguez would be a suitable opponent—last year Goldie matched Foster with a genuine mystery man—and more important, the Commission was certain that Capitol Arena was not a fit place for boxing.

Ahearn was chagrined. He demanded to know how the Commission could persecute

him so. After all, he explained, he did check everything out with Chairman Kennedy.

It was then that the Boxing Commission broke the sad news. Kennedy, it was pointed out, was not the chairman. He was just one of three members.

Despite the efforts of Lee and the police department representatives on the Commission, to make fist fighting somewhat respectable, the sport suffered another black eye.

Lee was asked if, in light of the Real Estate Commission's charges, he would ask Kennedy to resign.

"That is up to the District Commissioners," Lee said. "They appoint the members of the Boxing Commission. I don't know anything about the Real Estate Commission. (In fact, Kennedy maintains he is innocent.)

"I don't think Kennedy did anything really wrong as far as the fight goes," Lee said. "He was new on the Commission and it seems someone was trying to take advantage of him. When we had our hearing, he did agree with us that the plans for the fight were improper.

"I do know this, though," Lee added. "I have eaten at Goldie's restaurant and I have always paid the check myself. It seems to me that when people give you something for nothing, they expect something in return."

There can be no doubt that Lee is exactly right.

Panama Gathers Data on Suez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions in statements to the House, I have emphasized that the Republic of Panama, in the conduct of its policy with the United States as to the Panama Canal, is following the leadership of Egypt, which in 1956 nationalized the Suez Canal. The two projects are not comparable, especially with regard to the underlying legal foundations under which they were constructed.

The Suez Canal was the result of a concession by the Egyptian Government to Ferdinand de Lesseps, a private individual. The Panama Canal was undertaken by the United States only after the grant of sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for its construction and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

In order that the people of the United States may know what the Panamanian Government is doing in these regards, I quote an informative article from the June 19, 1963, edition of the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama:

PANAMA GATHERS DATA ON SUEZ IN PREPARATION FOR U.S. TALKS

The Panama Government has obtained information on the operation of the Suez Canal in preparation for negotiations with the United States on a sea level waterway on the isthmus.

This was disclosed Monday night by Eloy Benedetti, counsel for the Panama Foreign Ministry, in the Public Opinion Forum program carried by television channel 2. Other officials on the program were Foreign Minister Galileo Solis and Dr. Octavio Fabrega, Panama's members on the joint Panama-United States Commission reviewing treaty matters between the two countries.

Benedetti said he visited Ismalia, headquarters of the Suez Canal Authority, and Suez and Port Said on instructions of the Foreign Office to obtain information on the sea level canal operations.

He told his audience that what most impresses a Panamanian visiting Suez is that there is no canal zone in the country. As a result of this, he added, the bulk of the revenue received by the United Arab Republic from the operation of the canal comes from tolls collected from transiting ships.

Benedetti pointed out that Suez Canal tolls are paid in gold and therefore are not affected by devaluations of the U.S. dollar and the British pound sterling.

Since the Egyptians nationalized the Suez Canal, Benedetti reported, operating expenditures of the waterway have been reduced to a minimum. The fabulous salaries and other benefits which the former Suez Canal Co. paid to is British and French employees have been eliminated, he stated.

Egypt at present is collecting a net income of approximately $150 million from Suez Canal operations, Benedetti declared.

Referring to the replacement of the present Panama Canal by a sea-level waterway, Benedetti said that Panamanians should forget the traditional thinking that the main benefits from a waterway result form services to ships, crewmen, or to employees.

"It's time that we get used to the idea that a sea-level canal cannot be a source of substantial direct revenue to Panamanian industry, trade, or labor," he declared.

He urged that in any negotiations for a sea-level waterway, Panama should demand a hand in the fixing and collection of tolls, as well as in the administration of the canal to avoid low tolls and unnecessary expenditures.

Benedetti said that in his opinion Egypt's administration of the Suez Canal is much more efficient than of the Panama Canal by the United States. North Americans, he added, have turned the Panama Canal into a means for subsidizing merchant marines and into a source of juicy salaries for U.S. citizens. Thus, Benedetti declared, the Panama Canal is not returning economic benefits.

Foreign Minister Solis and Dr. Fabrega reviewed the treaty talks undertaken with the United States a year ago. Both voiced the official Panamanian viewpoint that the joint Commission has not lived up to its "high level" status because the North American representatives—U.S. Ambassador Joseph S. Farland and Canal Zone Governor Robert J. Fleming, Jr.—were not clothed with full powers to handle the fundamental issues raised by Panama. Instead, they said, all questions had to be referred to third- and fourth-class clerks in the State Department.

Solis said the joint commission would cease functioning in July and that pending issues would be taken up through normal diplomatic channels. He declared that any new treaty for a sea-level canal would be negotiated on bases quite different from those of the 1903 treaty covering the present canal.

Dr. Fabrega emphasized that in any future negotiations with the United States, Panama should be guided by three points:

1. That all negotiations be conducted with U.S. representatives fully empowered to deal with all questions.

2. That Panama's demands be brought to the attention of high-level officials of the State Department and the White House.

3. That Panama undertake some sort of lobbying activity in the U.S. Congress to prevent action unfavorable to Panama by U.S. legislators.

Civil Rights: Dr. Haldane Reviewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a segregationist colleague of mine from Texas inserted material a few weeks ago into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pointing up his opposition to civil rights legislation on the basis that men are only equal in the eyes of God and that civil rights legislation is erroneously premised on the basis that all men are physically identical in ability and intelligence. Prof. J. B. Haldane is the authority cited supporting the basic thesis that races are different and unequal.

With the major civil rights bill expected to reach the House floor the first half of December, I thought I would make a further effort to see if we could not get our facts straight before the debate.

PROFESSOR HALDANE REVIEWED

I researched Dr. Haldane's 1938 work on heredity and politics. He there points out very clearly that on most intelligence tests the Asiatic peoples do as well as Caucasians. On the other hand, the averages of Indian and Negro peoples are below. Haldane points out that it is obviously nurture or environment and not nature or heredity that accounts for the difference. He points up that in the Army intelligence tests, Negroes tested below Caucasians in both the North and the South, but on the average northern Negroes tested equal to or higher than southern whites.

Haldane concludes:

> My own view is that probably there would be slight differences found in the results of intelligence tests if all peoples were brought under a precisely similar environment, but I would hesitate to say in which direction they would be found, except to suggest that as the intelligence tests have all been devised by whites, they would be likely to show a certain superiority of whites over Negroes * * * it is quite likely that Negro examiners could design tests on which their own race could beat the whites.

Haldane suggests that we could learn something from the racetrack where horses of many colors are rated exclusively on their performance.

This week Capt. Edward Dwight, command test pilot, graduate aeronautical engineer cum laude, boxing champion who nearly tied the world 100-yard track record—a Negro American—was named to the exclusive astronaut club. On this man we will pin our hopes—black and white—for national prestige in the lunar probe.

Nobody means to say that all Negroes are astronauts—nor whites—and perhaps percentagewise there is scientific evidence to infer that potentially more Caucasians possess this inordinate ability. The Germans and the Swedes might on the average outperform the Italians and Latins. Reasonable men of

goodwill, however, do not conclude that you accentuate these differences by educating, employing, housing, and accommodating only the very able.

RIGHT EQUALITY NOT IDENTITY

The American Anthropoligical Association at its 1962 meeting, I believe, enacted a resolution which should lay this issue to rest:

Be it resolved, That the American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, and reaffirms the fact that there is no scientifically established evidence to justify the exclusion of any race from the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The basic principles of equality of opportunity and equality before the law are compatible with all that is known about human biology. All races possess the abilities needed to participate fully in the democratic way of life and in modern technological civilization.

I will support the bipartisan civil rights legislation among other reasons because I think it basically unjust that counties like Jefferson County, Miss., with a census population of 1,666 white persons and 3,540 Negroes have a voter registration of 1,643 white—98.6 percent—and zero Negro; and like Greene County, Ala., having a total of 1,649 white persons and 5,001 Negroes with a voter registration of 1,979 white—120 percent—and 275 Negroes—5.5 percent. The pending legislation is not aimed at establishing identity of races but merely equality of legal rights.

Compassion and simple fairness dictate that the sovereign States of Mississippi and Alabama yield to the interests of a better America on this issue.

Kennedy Administration Good for Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, one need only to follow the daily press to see how the economy of the Nation has progressed under the administration of President Kennedy.

I submit to the attention of the House the views of Mr. Sam Dawson, business analyst for the Associated Press, as expressed in a recent column which appeared in newspapers throughout the Nation.

The article follows:

CORPORATE EARNINGS ON THE RISE

(By Sam Dawson)

NEW YORK.—This is going to be the best year yet for the pocketbooks of the Nation's stockholders.

Dollar totals of dividend payments, already well ahead of last year, are sure to hit a new record as the yearend outlays sweeten the take.

And lucky holders of favored issues that have shot up on the stock exchanges will have sizable capital gains if they cash in, or paper profits if they hold on.

Corporate earnings seem likely to set a record high. They're running well ahead of last year and the present quarter prospects are good. Even profit margins, pinched since 1957, are on average back to the level of 5 percent of the sales dollar.

Many companies seem in the mood to pass along the good times to the shareholders. General Motors' decision to pay out more than a billion in dividends this year, some $424 million of that a yearend bonus, is the biggest but not the only example. Many other companies are expected to extend seasons greetings in a like, if a bit more modest, manner.

For one thing, many corporations have ample cash on hand—GM has $2 billion in cash or marketable securities. They've been able to take care of more growth financing by themselves without going to the money markets. So yearend dividends can be paid without embarrassing the company treasurer's standing at the bank.

The outflow of dividends will help many small stockholders in planning their own yearend spending. Many look upon an added payment as an extra goodie to be spent at once. And retailers won't frown on that.

But much of corporate dividend payments will go to institutions of various sorts.

Veterans Day Address by Ted Mallow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the Veterans Day celebration of American Legion Post 79 of Burlington, Wis., I had the privilege of hearing an outstanding address appropriate for the occasion. It was given by Ted Mallow, first district commander, American Legion, of Hartland, Wis. It was one of the finest veterans speeches I have yet heard, and feel it is worthy of the attention of the Members of the Congress. Mr. Mallow's message follows:

Forty-five years ago, on November 11, the men of the American Expeditionary Forces struck the shackles of bitter trench warfare as victory blessed their long, hard struggle. World War I was over.

For the next 20 years the men who fought that war, banded together under the banner of the American Legion, fought another battle to perpetuate the memory of their departed comrades by having Armistice Day proclaimed a national holiday. It was 1930 before their efforts were crowned with success when Congress declared November 11 a national holiday in accordance with their desires.

Since that time two more bloody conflicts have come and gone and Armistice Day is no longer Armistice Day, but Veterans Day.

Why do we remember this day? Why do American Legion posts throughout the land conduct fitting ceremonies in every city and town where such posts are located?

Certainly not because the men and women engaged in these conflicts have forgotten, for their experiences are unforgettable. Yet other Americans have forgotten, and our youth have little if any idea of the ravages of these bitter wars.

The American Legion has taken this day each year, not only to remind Americans of their history but to speak to them of our destiny as leaders among freemen throughout the world.

We of the American Legion know that wars are fought because not all men honor the same ideals. Each nation is willing to fight—to the death—for those ideals which are peculiar to itself. We who participated in these great conflicts realize the horrors of them as no one else can.

Yet we would again face those horrors rather than see the ideals and principles of America submerged by foreign hordes or propaganda.

We believe that by keeping ever before the people of this country the sacrifices of life and treasure in the past that we may in the future lessen the chances of similar needless loss of life. It is our objective to do everything possible to promote a better understanding and to keep our own Nation prepared to maintain peace.

The theme when Armistice Day was born is the same as it is today—"Peace Through Preparedness." And if this seems to be a rut into which our Veterans Day messages have fallen, the American Legion makes no apologies for it.

The validity of such an admonition has been proven time and again through four and a half decades of the Legion's existence, and it is as valid today as it was the first moment it was uttered.

Look at our situation today and judge for yourselves. If the paper tiger, which the Chinese Communists believe us to be, did not have the nuclear teeth, which the Communists know we have, can you honestly believe that the peace of the world—uneasy as it may be at times—would have been maintained?

Do you believe that without the awesome nuclear deterrent which this Nation possesses—which, thank God, we have not been forced to use, and which we pray we may never have to use—the forces of communism would not have been even more aggressive in forcing its will upon other free nations of the world, yes, even upon America herself?

Does anyone think that Russia would have acceded to United States demands to withdraw offensive missiles from Cuba if the demand had not been backed by the might to enforce it?

Who believes that we have a bona fide partial nuclear test ban agreement when one of the signers of that instrument is Soviet Russia, which has an outstanding record of ignoring treaties when the terms of such agreements no longer suit their purposes?

These are but a few of the threats to freedom and world peace today. Indeed, they are threats to our own security and survival, and we must be prepared to meet these and any other menacing gestures of the Communist conspiracy in any area of the free world.

The message of the American Legion, to our members and to all Americans on Veterans Day, 1963, and our solemn pledge to those whom we honor, may be summed up briefly as follows:

The American Legion reaffirms its insistence upon a strong and secure America, and we reaffirm our vow that we as a people shall not be permitted to forget the price of freedom and the horror of war.

My friends, despite our magnificent victories in all of our Nation's wars, the greatest victory of all is a will-of-the-wisp that still eludes our grasp, and that is the winning of a just and lasting peace.

To achieve that objective will require the very best effort that every citizen has to offer. Our debt to the past and to those who have fought and died to make this Nation what it is today will never be fully repaid until we can be assured that we shall bequeath to our children the rich American heritage which they so nobly created and perpetuated for us.

Kermit Roosevelt's Questions on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 1, 1963, Mr. Kermit Roosevelt, son of Theodore Roosevelt, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California, relative to our foreign policy.

Mr. Roosevelt is at the present time vice president of the Gulf Oil Corp. and a summary of his remarks follows:

KERMIT ROOSEVELT'S THREE QUESTIONS ON OTHER GOVERNMENTS: (1) DOES IT WORK? (2) DOES IT SERVE U.S. INTERESTS? (3) IS IT BETTER THAN ALTERNATIVE—WHICH MAY BE RED?—FRIDAY FLASHES—NOVEMBER 1

For years past we have been approaching local Middle Eastern problems which have a national significance to the United States on a very fallacious basis. We try to understand basically different areas in terms of our own experiences and standards, even our own social and political institutions and practices.

Not only do we do this in the Middle East, but in other areas also, as in Vietnam.

Translated into policy, this too often results in the feeling that if a country receives American aid, then its government ought to be remodeled along American lines and conform to American standards.

U.S. POLICY SELF RIGHTEOUS

As Columnist Joe Alsop observes, writing of Vietnam:

"The persistent application of our standards to Asian leaders, the insistent demand that Asian leaders perform in a manner more ideally American than many an American State governor, is not merely silly in itself. In addition, the underlying self-righteousness is deeply pernicious. Its pressure warps and cripples Asian leaders who might otherwise perform quite respectably, as in the case of President Diem. Worse still, American policy itself is also warped and crippled by the same pressure."

Friendly critics of the present administration, concerned with foreign affairs, increasingly contend it is asking the wrong questions about foreign governments with which we are associated.

These critics suggest there are really only three questions which need to be asked about such a government, whether it be in Asia, the Middle East or Latin America: First, does it work? Next, does it serve American interests? And, finally, is it not better with all its faults than the probable alternative—which is all too likely to be a Communist-controlled government?

YEMEN POLICY IDEOLOGICAL

Consider our policy on Yemen, for example. An examination of the premises and results suggests that our policymakers have been approaching the problem in ideological terms which largely ignore Arabian Peninsula history and current stage of development—and the nature of the vital American strategic interests in the area.

In September a year ago, shortly after the death of the old Imam, a revolutionary coup took place. Announcing that the new Imam had been killed, the revolutionaries proclaimed the Peoples Republic of Yemen which received immediate military help from the United Arab Republic. There is more than a suggestion that the revolution had not surprised Colonel Nasser.

The Imam had not been killed, but established himself with the tribes of the northeast and rallied considerable support.

At first there was almost universal support for the revolution because the old Imam had been a ninth century tyrant. No modern state could defend his rule.

True, the new Imam, and particularly those of his family that rallied to his support, had very different views and programs. Many had been jailed or exiled for opposing the old Imam's policies. This was not a simple choice between a 9th-century autocrat and a 20th-century military junta.

We were not the only ones to miscalculate; Nasser was even worse. He thought in black and white, like many of our policymakers, that except for a few creationaries, the population would swing immediately to the new government.

The only flaw anyone could see was that Saudi Arabia took the position that they were bound by alliance with the new Imam and public opinion would prove on the side of the royalists.

FAISAL PREDICTED ROYAL VICTORY

Prince Faisal, who was in effect ruler of Saudi Arabia at the time, told me in New York a year ago that the royalists would eventually win because only Egyptian forces could hold the revolutionary government in power. "And after Egyptian forces have been in Yemen a comparatively short time. Yemen will be, to a man, anti-Egyptian." The record shows his judgment was sound.

Nasser started by sending in a comparative handful of soldiers but ended up with at least 28,000 Egyptian troops in Yemen—still unable to defeat the guerrillas.

NASSER WANTS ARAB OIL

Our national interests are not seriously affected by what happens in Yemen itself. But Saudi Arabia thought this was a deliberate effort by Colonel Nasser to establish himself on Saudi Arabia's flank so that a move on Saudi Arabia would be politically and economically feasible.

Saudi officials believe, as do foreign affairs experts here, that Colonel Nasser's ultimate ambition is control of Arabian peninsula oil.

Our own policymakers said our concern was to protect the regime of Saudi Arabia. This, as was possible to understand, made Prince Faisal quite furious because he was being told that he must be a good prince and stop this dangerous course with the royalists in Yemen which would undermine his kingdom.

He would say, "Now look—I know more about my country and about Yemen than you do and I say this is exactly the reverse of the situation. Let the Egyptians establish themselves there by my deserting my allies and natural friends, and who will believe me in my own country? I will have betrayed myself and shown a lack of ability to defend the interests of my family and Saudi Arabia."

I said to him, "You do believe, don't you, that the State Department is trying to act in your best interests?" He said it reminded him of the old Arab proverb: "Allah, I can protect myself from my enemies but please protect me from my friends."

FAISAL PROVED RIGHT

He has been remarkably patient and (contrary to our State Department's expectations) his preditcions remarkably correct. Clearly Nasser's military operations in Yemen are proving onerous and Nasser would like a face-saving way out.

What the State Department hopes the U.N. will do is find a compromise government substantially acceptable to both groups of tribesmen, with withdrawal of Egyptian troops and cessation of outside meddling of any kind.

It might result in a process not exactly of orderly and free elections, but the tribes would get together and handle the problem as in the past, by reaching a concensus, and in the process several people might be scragged. But this has happened before and probably will continue in that area.

What we want in the main are probably a degree of order with elimination of Yemen's threat to the peace of the area. We do not want to continue to risk warfare on a broader scale between Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic. This would be a blow to the Government's Middle Eastern policy so far based on the theory that Nasser does represent forces for progress in the area.

U Thant has reported that the Saudis have ceased their assistance to the royalists, but that the United Arab Republic, while withdrawing 12,000 men, had sent 6,000 back, leaving an effective force of 22,000.

When you realize that the whole royal force of Yemen is probably under a thousand, you will recognize that this is quite a military presence.

RUSSIAN PRESENCE SUBSTANTIAL

Actually the Russian presence there is now very substantial, including combat assistance to the Egyptian forces.

It is an axiom of this administration that the forces of reaction are the Communists' best friends, though it is somewhat difficult to understand why we favor military coups in the Middle East, and, as automatically, oppose them in Latin America.

It should occur to our policymakers that, in a 9th or even 14th century situation, an 18th century "benevolent despot" who looks to the United States for help might be considerably more desirable to U.S. national interests than a 20th century Castro-type "man on a tank" who looks to the Russians or the Chinese Communists.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (Hilary H. Crawford): "Did President Eisenhower err in helping to stop France and England in Suez Canal crisis?"

Answer: "United States was not the only element. British planning and execution were irresolute, secretive, and militarily ineffective. They thought a show of force would lead to an uprising against Nasser. But when Israel's attack was followed by great power attack Egyptians united behind Nasser. He became hero in Arab world. After the British had gone overlong and not accomplished their objectives, the Russians stepped in vigorously. Britain had no defenders in the U.N. Given the facts, the way in which they developed and the fact that Eisenhower was nettled by British and French deceit, I don't think you could have expected the United States to take any other course."

Question: "Do you think ultimate union of all Moslem states is possible?"

Answer: "Not short of world government."

Administration's Tax Program Threatens Large and Continuing Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration believes that its program of tax cuts and higher Government spending will eliminate the so-called gap between what our economy can produce and what it actually produces and, at the same time, eliminate the chronic deficits in the Federal budget. This hope is

based upon the belief that an $11 billion tax cut would increase output and investment by between $30 and $40 billion.

A critique of the administration's multiplier-accelerator analysis has been submitted to me by Mr. Hy Wijtyla, of New York City. Mr. Wijtyla suggests that the combined multiplier-accelerator effect would be considerably below the administration's figure, and he clearly points out his reasons for this belief. While Mr. Wijtyla believes that the economy requires a revision in its tax structure, he says that a tax cut that is not matched by a reduction in Federal spending is likely to result in very large budget deficits which would offset the beneficial effects of tax reduction. Under his analysis, the tax cut would result in additional revenue amounting to only $4 billion, thus leaving a permanent deficit of $7 billion resulting from the administration's $11 billion tax cut proposal.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Wijtyla's study in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE REAL GAP IS IN THE BUDGET

Because of the administration commitment to the belief in the existence of a chronic gap between the actual and potential output of the American economy, the administration has proposed to the Congress an $11 billion tax cut, $2.3 billion in tax relief for corporations, and $8.7 billion in personal income tax relief. At the same time Government expenditures are to be kept at their current levels or increased so that the tax cut will enlarge the Federal deficit by this same $11 billion. In the Economic Report of the President for 1963 the gap was put at $30 to $40 billion. The administration claims the $11 billion tax cut would close this gap through the combined effects on output and investment; that is, through the combined multiplier (output effect) and accelerator (investment effect) of approximately 3.7 times. Thus a cut of $11 billion in taxes would cause an increase of about $40 billion in gross national product. (Throughout this paper I am following administration terminology and manner of presentation.)

However, the derivation of this effect seems very questionable.

In regard to the output or multiplier effect which is put at 2.5 times, the use of a savings rate of only 7 percent, which is crucial to the magnitude of the multiplier effect, appears clearly inappropriate.

The Treasury offered the following breakdown of the proposed $8.7 billion cut in personal income taxes by gross income classes:

[In millions of dollars]

Adjusted gross income class:	*Amount of tax reduction*
Under $2,000	255
$2,000 to $4,000	815
$4,000 to $5,000	690
$5,000 to $6,000	725
$6,000 to $7,500	1,325
$7,500 to $10,000	1,750
$10,000 to $20,000	1,940
$20,000 and over	1,210
Total	8,710

Savings-income ratios according to a Michigan survey research center budget survey made in 1960–61 were as follows:

Personal saving-personal income ratio

Personal income:	*Percent*
Under $2,000	5.2
$2,000 to $3,999	3.9
$4,000 to $4,999	6.2
$5,000 to $5,999	8.8
$6,000 to $7,499	11.6
$7,500 to $9,999	13.6
$10,000 to $14,999	19.8
$15,000 and over	23.8

Applying these average savings ratios to the tax reductions indicates that a minimum approximately 14 percent of the tax reductions would be saved. But since the tax reductions are in reality increases in income—that is, they are additional income, a higher rate than the average would surely apply as indicated by the steady increase in savings rates as we ascend the income scale. Generally a 1-percent increase in income is accompanied by an increase in savings of 2 to 4 percent. People may save twice as much or more out of additional income than they do out of their total income. The savings ratio on the tax reduction then might well be 30 percent greater, and not the 7 percent suggested by the administration. (The 7-percent rate is the rate for the total population, clearly not the same as the population receiving the tax reductions.) This 30 percent rate may sound high, but on a $400 billion total disposal personal income an increase in savings of 30 percent on $8.7 billion amounts to about 0.6 percent of total DPI. The actual savings rate on DPI in the 1963 first quarter was 6.9 percent and would rise to 7.5 percent as a result of a 30-percent savings rate out of the tax reductions. The variations in the savings rate on DPI over the last 3 years by quarters are as follows:

	Percent
1960:	
3d quarter	6.6
4th quarter	6.5
1961:	
1st quarter	6.9
2d quarter	7.5
3d quarter	8.0
4th quarter	7.9
1962:	
1st quarter	7.6
2d quarter	7.8
3d quarter	7.7
4th quarter	7.3
1963:	
1st quarter	6.9
2d quarter	7.5

Taking 30 percent, then, as a more likely savings rate based on the savings habits of the people who will actually benefit by the tax reduction, results in a multiplier of about 1.3 times and on the proposed $8.7 billion personal income tax reduction an increase in GNP of $11.3 billion.

The administration has further estimated that a $21.8 billion increase in GNP ($8.7 billion tax cut times the 2.5 multiplier) would result in about half again as much investment, or some $10.8 billion each year after the full effects work themselves through the economy (with a turnover of money of four times a year this would take for all practical purposes between 2 and 3 years). The investment would be in housing and other types of construction, inventories, and business equipment. Now, the average age of the capital produced by this investment varies from hundreds of years for some types of construction, to about a hundred years for some buildings, to 50 years for others, to 7 to 10 years for equipment, to months for inventories. The average might be 30 years. If it were, the capital created by investment of $10.8 billion a year for 30 years would amout to $324 billion to support an increase of $21.8 billion in output, a fantastic ratio of 15 times and nowhere near the 2 to 2.5 times sometimes estimated.

The administration contention, however, might be that the investment would be concentrated in manufacturing where the average age of capital is rather reliably estimated at approximately 10 years so that the increase in capital required would be $108 billion (10 years times $10.8 billion investment a year). But in manufacturing, the ratio of capital (including inventories) to output is only 0.7 so that an increase in output of $21.8 billion would require additional capital of $15.3 billion—not the $108 billion the administration estimate of investment implies.

How much investment would change as a result of this need for an additional $15.3 billion of capital would depend on the bunching over time of the investment in the additional capital. If all the capital were put in place in 1 year, investment would rise by $15.3 billion in that year and drop by $15.3 in the next, and if the capital had a a life of exactly 10 years, no more and no less, $15.3 billion would be invested every 10th year thereafter. If the additional investment were spread out over 3 years about $5.1 billion of investment would be generated for each of those 3 years and in the fourth year investment would drop back by $5.1 billion. Spread out over 10 years, $1.5 billion a year in additional investment would be required each year and after 10 years would still be required each year to replace the capital as it wore out.

But, as demonstrated above, only $11.3 billion in additional GNP would be forthcoming as a result of the multiplier and so the increase in capital required through the accelerator would be about $7.9 billion (assuming the requirements for additional capital are confined to manufacturing) and the additional investment would be $2.6 billion a year if spread out over 3 years and $0.8 billion a year if spread out over the life of the capital. Assuming the latter we find that the administration's proposed personal income tax reduction of $8.7 billion would result in $12.1 billion total additional GNP each year, a combined multiplier accelerator effect of 1.4 times (as against a $32.6 billion increase in GNP on a combined multiplier accelerator of slightly more than 3.7 times as estimated by the administration). Again we are stretching a point by including the full accelerator effect because an increase in capital requirements of $7.9 billion is less than 3 percent of present capital, and with manufacturers operating at about 85 percent of present capacity they might prefer to increase their percent of capacity operated than to increase their capacity.

The 3.7 combined multiplier accelerator effect is crucial to the administration's program not only for closing the so-called "gap" in the economy but also for closing the very real gap which would be opened in the budget by the tax cut.

The administration asserts the $32.6 billion in additional GNP they estimated will be forthcoming will bring in additional revenues which will more than make up for the cut in taxes and eliminate the deficit. Taking the rate of Federal taxes to GNP as one-third (which it has been suggested is much too high and may be closer to one-sixth, but be that as it may, using the administration estimate of one-third), a $32.6 billion increase in GNP would mean about $11 billion in additional revenue which would not only cover the deficit from the cut in personal taxes of $8.6 billion, but would cover the deficit from the total tax cut including that on corporations, of $11 billion.

But if GNP increases by only $12.1 billion, the additional revenue would amount to only $4 billion, leaving a permanent deficit of $7 billion resulting from the administration's tax cut proposal combined with the unreduced level of Federal expenditures.

This would be in addition to the deficit of $7 billion estimated for the current fiscal year. The combined deficit of $14 billion would be at fairly high levels of output. Any mild recession such as we have experienced in the postwar period could add another $8 to $10 billion to this.

A permanent deficit of $14 billion a year if monetized by the Federal Reserve Board would require a 9-percent annual increase in the money supply, whereas the more normal requirements of the economy are no more than 4 percent per year. The remainder of the increase in the money supply would eventually show up in increased prices and surely this would mean a further worsening of our balance of payments position,

not to mention the adverse reactions it would have on those abroad who hold dollars.

If the Federal Reserve Board did not monetize the entire deficit, but attempted to divert savings from private outlets into the hands of the Federal Government, it could only do this through some pressures on interest rates entailing restraints on the private sector of the economy which might have adverse effects on business sentiments and private investment and bring on a worse gap than any the tax cut was designed to avoid.

The above is not meant to leave the impression that the economy does not need a revision in its tax structure, even the revision proposed by the administration. The economy undoubtedly does need revision of its tax structure, and the effects of the tax reduction on incentives might well in the course of time unleash substantial forces for growth and innovation. However, such effects take some time to work themselves through. If the tax cut is not matched by reductions in Federal expenditures the very large deficits in prospect would swamp the incipient beneficial effects with their large immediate adverse effects.

Puerto Rico's Governor Holds Really Tight Rein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Jones, Carribean correspondent for the Indianapolis Star, has written a provocative and interesting story concerning Puerto Rico.

I am not personally acquainted with Mr. Jones, nor have knowledge of the authenticity of affairs in Puerto Rico which he portrays, however, in view of the recent discussion in the House on Puerto Rico, I believe the article will be of interest to my colleagues and possibly evoke their comment on affairs in that area.

Under unanimous consent, I request the following article from the November 5, 1963, edition of the Indianapolis Star be printed in its entirety:

PUERTO RICO'S GOVERNOR HOLDS REALLY TIGHT REIN

(By Robert Jones)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The American flag flies over one of the tightest authoritarian regimes of any Latin American country which can be termed a democracy. The regime is that of Puerto Rican Governor Luis Muñoz Marin, who is probably the hemisphere's loudest opponent of strong man rule.

Few mainland Americans are aware of the iron grip which Muñoz has clamped on his small island. Yet, no American political boss has ever dominated a city or State with such control as Muñoz has over Puerto Rico.

The Muñoz political machine, the Popular Democratic Party, is, as the San Juan Star recently commented, "an all-powerful institution whose retaliatory power is absolute by virtue of its dominance over all branches of the government, by authority to appoint, because it doles out patronage, and for its influence on individual careers."

DISCONTENT MOUNTS

Puerto Ricans are, however, increasingly restive under the Governor's machine rule. Discontent is mounting against the island's top-heavy bureaucracy and its control of virtually every phase of Puerto Rican life.

Muñoz is responding to the rising resentment by promising to take a "fresh look" at his administration. He has announced plans to reform some 20 government departments.

The Governor's opponents are not impressed. They point out that overhaul of government bureaus means little as long as the Popular Democratic Party wields the real power in Puerto Rico. Final authority rests not with the official government critics charge, but with the party and its "commissar" system.

DISTRICT BOSSES POWERFUL

The "commissars" are local party bosses who hold complete sway over their districts. If your son gets in trouble, you go to the "commissar." If you want to apply for a government loan or scholarship, you talk to the "commissar." And if you want a government job, you have to have the "commissar's" blessing.

The result has been a virtual fusion of government and party.

Puerto Rico, with a population of little more than 2 million, has no less than 100,000 public employees. Several hundred thousand other Puerto Ricans are dependent, directly or indirectly, on government spending. It is estimated that one out of three Puerto Rican families is supported in one form or another by the Muñoz regime.

Muñoz and his lieutenants make no secret of the fact that the island's civil service is little more than an extension of the Popular Democratic Party. Even Muñoz' opponents no longer bother to make an issue of the fact that the party organization is the real government of Puerto Rico.

CENSORSHIP IS INDIRECT

The Puerto Rican press rarely dares to publicize facts which cast doubts on the purity of the island's democracy. For all practical purposes, Puerto Rican newspapers are under government censorship.

No official censors are needed to keep the press under control. Puerto Rican editors are well acquainted with the party line. They know they will lose the bulk of their advertising revenue if they openly attack the Governor.

The Muñoz regime is by far the biggest advertiser on the island. Page after page of Puerto Rican newspapers are devoted to ads paid for by various government "authorities," such as public works, tourism, port, development, and others.

Cancellation of the official advertising would be enough in itself to bankrupt most Puerto Rican newspapers. Editorial docility is also assured by the fact that most private firms simply would not dare to advertise in an anti-Muñoz medium; businessmen know they are highly vulnerable to government reprisals, particularly in regard to taxation. Puerto Rico's unique system of taxation places most firms at the government's mercy.

It is such tactics as these, many oppositionists concede, that guarantee that "democratic leftist" Luis Muñoz-Marin will be Puerto Rico's strongman for years to come.

Do We Need the Draft?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1963, I testified before the House Committee on Armed Services on the subject of military manpower utilization. At that time I stressed the need for a revised method of military manpower procurement procedures by repealing the draft law, and reinstituting the voluntary service in the Armed Forces. Some of the alternatives to the present draft law were the subject of a recent article in the New York Times magazine.

In the New York Times magazine of October 20, there appears an article written by John C. Esty, Jr., who does a good job of examining the tenets behind the peacetime draft, as well as the disruptive effect it has upon our youth. One of the points he brings out is that of the 1.3 million young men who will turn 23—the usual age when a young man is drafted—only about 80,000 of them will actually be inducted. Some 600,000 will fail to meet the physical requirements. The 80,000 who are inducted represent only about 6 percent of all 23-year-olds, but all have to suffer the uncertainty involved.

A further point brought out by Mr. Esty, is that those called to duty view it as an imposition or a stroke of bad luck. Those who are in college plan their careers so that they can continue on to graduate school, thereby keeping their deferment status, even though it makes no sense educationally. Many are paralyzed for effective planning of their lives because they cannot figure where the draft fits in. Mr. Esty concludes, and I agree, that the present practice makes a mockery of the original intent that every able-bodied young man serve his country.

The article points out that a Presidential commission could be appointed to investigate new concepts and new alternatives to our present military manpower procurement practices, one which would be more suitable to our changing needs.

In view of the deleterious effect that I feel that the present draft law is having on the developing of the potential of our youth, under unanimous consent I include the article from the October 20 New York Times magazine in the RECORD:

THE DRAFT: MANY THEATENED, FEW CHOSEN—OUR SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM IS SO SELECTIVE, SAYS A CRITIC, THAT ONLY A MINORITY ACTUALLY SERVES, AND IT IS TIME WE DID SOMETHING ABOUT ITS INEQUITIES

(By John C. Esty, Jr.)

(NOTE.—John C. Esty, Jr., headmaster of Taft School, was for 10 years associate dean at Amherst, where he developed a special interest in the draft while counseling students about it. He served in the Air Force, 1951–53.)

When President Kennedy exempted married men from the draft a few weeks ago, it was evident from the news stories that many reporters and readers did not fully comprehend what was going on. Yet the raction to the President's announcement was typical of the shallow understanding which has characterized most reports about the draft for the past 12 years. It is unfortunate that a national policy that affects so many lives does not yield more readily to simple exposition.

In this instance, it was announced that the manpower pool now contained 1.7 million eligible men available for military service. Since draft quotas for the coming year

are expected to average about 7,000 per month, there was obviously a vast oversupply for a limited demand. The solution seemed reasonable enough: defer the category with the greatest claim to an uninterrupted life. Thus, married men, who comprised 3 out of every 10 draftees, and 340,000 of the 1.7 million men on the waiting list, are free.

These were the facts, and the only real news interest seemed to be the possibility of a rash of precipitant marriages. A few polls were taken, a few interviews were sought, and everyone seemed to agree that two years in the Army was better than a lifetime of KP with a wife you didn't love.

This kind of oversimplication obscures the fact that the Executive order is just the latest in a series of jerry-built measures designed to remove some of the inequities, some of the inadequancies, some of the strains and some of the ridiculous internal inconsistencies in our present manpower procurement system. There are alternatives to the Selective Service System, but we seem too attached to this faithful old machine—held together with baling wire—to consider seriously some other way to man our cold war garrison.

In order to understand the present weakness of the draft mechanism and consider new solutions intelligently, it is necessary first to understand how the system works and what its impact is on individual young men.

By act of Congress, every American male is required to register with his local draft board on his 18th birthday or within 5 days afterward. If he is away from home, he may register with any convenient board, which will then forward his papers to the home board. Usually within a year, he receives a classification questionnaire, from which his board learns of his occupational status and his immediate plans. At this point most young men are classified 1A—meaning available for service—unless they are clearly deferable by virtue of the fact that they are engaged in essential industry or farming, are ministers (or studying to become same), are in medical school or, in some cases, in other schools or colleges. One's classification doesn't matter, anyway, until he approaches his 23d birthday, at which time his status is examined again to see if he is deferable. If he is not, he is ordered for preinduction physical and mental tests. If he passes these, he is inducted into the Army in about a month.

There is a priority of draftable categories established by Executive order. Local draft boards have been required to exhaust all men in each of the following categories before moving to the next:

1. Recalcitrants and draft dodgers.
2. Volunteer—in the order in which they volunteered.
3. Nonfathers between 19 and 26—oldest first.
4. Fathers between 19 and 26—oldest first.
5. Men over 26, whose liability has been extended because of a previous deferment.
6. Finally, those between 18½ and 19.

Currently, half the draft quotas are filled by volunteers (the period of service is the same) and the remainder has come from nonfathers from age 26 down to age 23. When draft quotas were sharply increased during the Berlin crisis of 1961, the additional men came from category 3 down to age 22½. The new Executive order splits up category 3 and promotes bachelors ahead of married men. Since there will now be fewer men (just bachelors) in the third category, the age of vulnerability, 23, will certainly drop—perhaps to 22½.

The priority chart shows some of the ways to avoid being drafted: marry or turn 26 or don't turn 19. It doesn't show the possibilities of deferment for other reasons, and it doesn't indicate how many men are involved in each group. To get this information we must take a different approach and examine what will happen this year to the men who will turn 23. The following figures are only approximate, but they do indicate the order of magnitude. The projection is based on the situation existing before the new order deferring married men:

1,300,000 men will reach age 23.

650,000 of these will not qualify on physical and mental grounds.

400,000 will have served or be serving in the Armed Forces by virtue of a previous enlistment.

130,000 will be deferred as students, teachers, or for other reasons.

80,000 will be drafted.

40,000 will be in uncertain status.

About 3 in 10 draftees recently have been married, so the new order will defer about 24,000 of the 80,000 men who would have been drafted. There will probably not be enough qualified bachelors among the 40,000 23-year-olds in the "uncertain" category to make up the difference; hence the need to move to a younger age level. A projection similar to the one above, for the age group from 22½ to 23 suggests that this age group will produce at least 60,000 qualified bachelors. With less than half that number actually needed, we can predict that the new age of vulnerability will probably be around 22 years and 10 months. The only clarity that really emerges from these figures is that every physically and mentally qualified bachelor who reaches his 23d birthday will be drafted, unless he has reason to be deferred.

The reader who has had the patience to study these figures (and part of the problem is that very few do) will begin to see why many are threatened but few are called. Of the 1,300,000 men who will turn 23 this year, only half will qualify for the draft and a quarter of these will not have to serve. By the time this age group reaches 26, only about 40 percent will have served in the Armed Forces. But the major implication of the figures is that only 80,000 men out of a potential of 1,300,000 (less than 10 percent) will actually be drafted.

The new Executive order will not alter this incredibly low ratio; it will serve mainly to remove uncertainty from the lives of the married men. To make matters worse, the number of men who turn 23 each year is dramatically increasing, so that if draft quotas remain about the same, the ratio may drop well below 1 in 10. The inequity is obvious.

Even though many of his peers actually have served in the Armed Forces (by earlier enlistment), the average draft-eligible 23-year-old sees only a majority of his friends getting deferred because of a personal situation which differs only slightly from his own. One friend happens to have found a girl who will marry him. Another has enough money to go to graduate school. Another happens to incline to medicine or the ministry. The inevitable result is that he wonders why he should be the one to get "hooked." I am afraid that a young man today, instead of feeling guilty about not serving, feels somewhat inept if he can't work out a way to avoid the draft.

This observation is corroborated in the report of a 10-year study by the conservation of human resources project at Columbia University. According to the director, Eli Ginzberg, "Most young Americans grow up without the understanding of military obligation, with the consequence that if and when they are called to duty they view it as an imposition, an annoyance, or a stroke of bad luck that they should get caught while so many others escaped." Professor Ginzberg concludes that the present attitudes of American youth toward military service are an "invitation to national disaster."

Moral erosion and confusion in one's sense of duty are not the only negative effects of our highly Selective Service System. As more and more deferment categories are set up to drain off the manpower pool, more and more youthful decisions are influenced by the chance to escape the draft. After 10 years of counseling college students on military service, I have seen this effect firsthand.

A student chooses his major field because it leads to a job in an essential industry. A senior plans to keep his student deferment by continuing on to graduate school, even though it makes no sense educationally. A career field is chosen arbitrarily just because it will mean an automatic deferment. Some students are paralyzed for effective planning of their lives because they can't figure out where the draft fits in.

And now, I suppose, the order deferring married men can't help but affect the thinking and planning of a great many young couples. It strikes me as ironic that with all the current concern over Federal control of education and interstate eating places, Selective Service may well exert a far more invidious and subtle form of control than we have ever suspected.

It has been necessary to renew the current selective service legislation every 4 years since 1951, but congressional debate has typically been desultory. The act has passed each time by overwhelming majorities mostly because of powerful bipartisan support from the House and Senate Armed Forces Committee.

With the responsibility of raising an army for the cold war, these men have not been willing to take the risk of trying new approaches to manpower procurement, and they cannot admit that the situation may now be too complex for old answers. The principle of present needs has always overwhelmed the principles of constitutionality, universality and equity. Unfortunately, the principles back of our military conscription have not been fully explored since the 1951 hearings.

Confusion over principle is obvious from the fact that the Selective Service System is used to implement the Universal Military Service and Training Act of 1951. Present practice makes a mockery of the original intent that every able-bodied young man serve his country. Our current difficulties arise from the strain of maintaining a semblance of universality while armed service needs dictate greater and greater selectivity. The time has probably come when we can no longer reconcile these opposites and must choose between them. At this point new possibilities and proposals emerge rapidly.

If we determine—as a matter of principle—that every young man is needed in the service of his country, then we need only to expand our concept of national service to achieve universality and fairness. Clearly only a few will serve by carrying a gun. Some sort of Civilian Conservation Corps could be created with a therapeutic division for erstwhile 4-F's. The Army's famous literacy courses could be invoked for the illiterates. The Peace Corps—both domestic and international—could count for national service, as could work in hospitals or social agencies. Perhaps, too, public school teaching for 3 years might be equivalent to Army service for 2.

Surprisingly enough, this scheme is only the logical extension of what is going on now with all the kinds of deferments granted by local draft boards. It would require only a slightly broader vision of how a young man might serve his country.

On the other hand, it might be more feasible to develop a completely voluntary military establishment and forget about compulsory service altogether. Here again we are not so far from this extreme as one might think.

The annual replacement need for our present establishment of 2.7 million men is about

600,000. The Army could well get along without its 80,000 draftees, who aren't around long enough to train for any significant jobs and whose reenlistment rate is less than 15 percent, compared with an overall rate of 54 percent. The draft mainly exists to pressure those other half-million men into enlisting, but no one is exactly sure how many would fail to enlist if there were no draft.

We have a new military service pay bill, and jobs are scarce in many sections of the country. Constant efforts to make service life attractive and professionally rewarding have steadily pushed up the reenlistment rate. Just a few more moves in this direction might well enable the Armed Forces to compete with the civilian economy for their manpower.

If we must continue with our present system, there are still a number of devices which would help to reduce the uncertainties and redress the inequities.

Mental and physical tests could be given at the time of initial registration so that the half of each age group who are destined to be disqualified would not have to wait 5 years to find out. The GI bill (which is constantly before some committee, but never seems to be reported out) could be reinstated as partial compensation to the few who get called. Since the Armed Forces would much rather conscript men under 22, the age of freedom might be lowered from 26 to 22. This would mean that many more men would escape the draft, but they are now, anyway—except that now they don't know it until they are 26.

None of these proposals makes any sense if one views the draft as operating satisfactorily, or as the best answer we have to the manpower problem. But no one who has listened to the young men whose lives are involved can accept those premises. Even if the present inequities and inadequacies are accepted as sacrifices to expediency, it must be understood that they can only worsen in the future. As the Selective Service System strains and creaks under its impossible task, it must be understood that each stopgap measure to keep it working has sociological and psychological implications far beyond the immediate problem.

In 1959, an amendment to the draft act was offered, which would have extended the law for only 2 years. A Presidential commission was to conduct a full-scale study of all aspects of manpower procurement and report back within that time. The amendment was defeated because there wasn't time to ask such fundamental questions.

Now we have three and a half years before the present act expires. A Presidential commission could be appointed now to reestablish the principles on which we base our military manpower procurement. It could explore the wider effects of our present system, and devolop new concepts and alternatives more suitable to our changing needs. Then Congress would be in a better position to produce legislation sufficiently free from ambiguity and inequity to rekindle a concern for national service. Perhaps then it would not be considered slightly odd for a young man to ask what he can do for his country.

Salute to Sunny Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, many persons have extolled the wonders and virtues of that beautiful State—Florida. While it is true that Florida holds something for everyone, I am continually amazed by the fact that every individual who has lived there or visited Florida sees it in a different light.

Recently, one of my constituents, Harry Leon Zalph, put his thoughts on Florida in writing. In sending me his narrative on Florida, he said:

At my age, a man's fancy likely turns to affection for his grandchildren (five young boys, all Florida born). My hope—to leave them an honorable memory of Grandpa.

What finer heritage can a man hope to leave his grandchildren than a fond memory of his love and affection for them and a full appreciation of the beautiful blessings nature has bestowed.

The narrative follows:

FLORIDA: A PARADISE ON EARTH

The lovely gulf breezes sooth the nerves like harp music, when it touches off the palm fronds and relaxes the soul like the caress of a sweetheart.

There is something that one can see on a Floridian's smiling face—a pleasant greeting, a friendly exchange of views or bits of gossip, leisure visiting and relaxing on lawn chairs or hammocks, under the shade of the almond, citrus, or rose apple trees surrounded by flowers and multicolored shrubberies. Also the free and easy way of relaxed dressing gives the impression that one and all are enjoying a picnic in the park, and it makes one feel that every city, town, and hamlet is set in a park.

A walk through residential sections shows healthy, mischievous children dancing, playing, and laughing amid beautiful flowering plants that in your mind's eye are hard to separate one from the other, for the plants, too, look like lovely children. The smaller plants, such as lilies, zinnias, gladiolas, bulrush, and Moses' cradles look like young children that Mama just washed, dressed, and set out of doors to play. The medium ones such as crotons, jasmines and ixoras represent teenagers shampooed, perfumed, and dressed in their best, ready for the prom or first party date. The oleander, bougainvillea, and hibiscus give the impression of young students of art bedecked in flowery jewelry displaying their artistically designed costumes on display.

The Creator was very kind to Florida. He adorned it lavishly with beautiful flowers in a setting of charming shrubberies, surrounded by georgeous trees, all taken from the Garden of Eden. It makes one feel that he is visiting a great art gallery; an exhibition of natural beauty. You can hear the heavenly music of the datura, beaumontia, herald's, and angel trumpets, also allamanda bells.

The banyan trees gather to spread a canopy, while the royal poinciana is spreading an artistic welcome carpet of petals for all God's children.

The Bursting of the Kennedy-Khrushchev Grand Reconciliation Bubble—"The Truth of It All"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the highest responsible officers in President Kennedy's administration recently expressed surprise and shock over the attempted Soviet blockade of U.S. troops moving into West Berlin. The leftist and pro-Communist elements in the news media field are frantically seeking explanations for the apparent bursting of the lovey-dovey bubble that has exploded the politically inspired "peace with the Communists at any price" campaign in this country.

To those who are familiar with the Lenin concept of political conquest and its strategies and tactics, these recent Soviet actions are not a surprise. It is shocking, however, to note the surprise on the part of U.S. officials. The kindest thing we can say about this administration is that is suffers from a total lack of comprehension of communism. In fact, anyone who knows and understands the Communists and communism, would be inclined to ascribe the administration's emotional reactions to a politically inspired attitude, aimed at winning the "peace at any price" votes in the 1964 elections.

It is most disappointing that our leadership, entrusted by the American people with the responsibility of maintaining world freedom and the survival of this Nation, have completely failed to distinguish between the basic strategies and objectives of the International Communist army of fellow-travelers, dupes, and Communist Party members. The "carrot and stick," the "soft and the hard," "the friend and enemy" tactics of Khrushchev and the Soviet-Communist forces have been repeated hundreds of times over the past 30 years since the U.S. diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Government.

The masterminds of the State Department, for 1964 election purposes, recently conceived the nuclear test ban treaty, the Kennedy-Khrushchev hot line telephone, and the sale of wheat to Russia, as master political strokes to portray President Kennedy as an apostle of peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Communists.

It is pathetic to see the advocates of the grand design for reconciliation with Soviet Communists, now attempting to rationalize and to justify the nuclear test ban treaty, the Kennedy-Khrushchev hot line telephone, and the sale of wheat to Russia and its Communist satellite nations.

This Nation is most fortunate in having a large corps of sound, realistic citizens who understand communism and Communists, and who recognize the pro-Communist line that is so often successfully promoted in this country under the cloak of liberalism and peace.

The United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York is an organization of dedicated citizens who are doing an outstanding job in combating the influence of communism and procommunism in the Buffalo area.

Mr. Walter V. Chopyk, is the committee's director of public relations; Mr. Albert J. Weinert, is director of the speakers bureau.

On November 1, 1963, Mrs. Edith Hyder, a distinguished speaker and writer, of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, addressed a meeting of the United Anti-Communist

Action Committee of Western New York, on the subject of "The Truth of It All."

Mrs. Hyder's address emphasizes the psychological tactics of Khrushchev and the Communist parties. It warns the businessmen of this Nation and Canada not to sacrifice the security of the free world for Communist gold or business profit.

Mrs. Hyder's address follows:

THE TRUTH OF IT ALL

"The Truth of It All"—my title for this address must come to life. Since speaking to you in February almost all my predictions given (then) have now become full realities. I said that Khrushchev would (if he had great economic need) try—the soft approach. He is so doing and very successfully. I said—that Castro would try to take over the islands in the blue Caribbean and—if possible the Central American countries and he has tried. I said that—Tito would (after consultation with Mr. K. of Moscow)—would come to America and hope to help the softening process by—the "thankful for favors," friendly approach. He came—he saw but did not quite conquer everyone yet—will get most of what he wants I am convinced. I said (last February) that we would be mollified—and start to trade more with the Soviet and Red China and you have—the "truth of it all" today in recent Canadian sales of wheat to both Red nations in a mammoth way and now—of new American ones. Not only wheat have we sold but—from Canada we now send processed—meat, butter, butter-oils, powdered eggs and dry milk and so on to—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and to most all of the Reds—satellite countries. There has been little or no ballyhoo about these other type sales (and here—I speak only of Canadian varied trade practices at this time) because—"the truth of it all" is (I'm afraid) that most officials in my Canadian Government don't want to further antagonize voters or the citizens—primarily our new ones from most of these now collectivized Soviet-controlled, East European countries. You know the old saying—"business is business" well—never was it more so than at this critical, fluid hour. Right here I'd like to clearly say (as well) that Socialism which most thinking, freedom-loving citizens abhor, is slowly seeping in to our so-called, free democracies almost in cases—unnoticeably so. Every time you say—"let the Government do this and that"—every time the Government extends Government arbitrary powers, pays Government subsidies in a bigger way even (as in America for not growing too much wheat or other grains) so socialism "creeps" in stifling our incentive, curbing individual advancement and—finally increasing all taxation. Did you ever think of these things? We must—my friends or a—real democracy as we know it will most certainly—perish. Here I recall Nikita Khrushchev's brozen statement made in June on the 26th in 1961. It was recorded in your CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so is—the truth as he saw it. I quote: "We cannot expect Americans to jump from capitalism into communism but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake—to find that—they have communism." And further—Mr. K. of Moscow said away back in 1955—"We value international trade least of all for economic reasons but most for—political purposes."

Surely the truth of it all is—that these statements should be quoted time and time again in our press, also via radio as a warning to all our people and their representatives that—trade with the Reds is but placing an instrument for our own destruction in their hands. Though I, like so many thousands even millions of others, do not want war, do not want bitter animosity to exist and be nurtured between the West and the Soviet bloc I still remember (and so must each one of you) that—the aim of the Soviet is and will remain—to conquer the world through revolution or any means they can use to gain this end. Haven't all changing events since 1948 benefited (not the West and its Allies) but Red Russia in the major? We could ask—how stupid can we get? And—when will our intelligent, hardheaded citizens wake up to this fact? The fact that the old Soviet aim has not changed.

Here I must say that communism uses many subtle ways, beside a blasting war, to ruin any nation marked for conquest. Though today we know that we must keep our people on this continent ever at work, the truth of it all is that—we cannot continue to permit unprincipled, Western businessmen and callous politicians to endanger this continent by further trading with the Soviet or loaning them great capital funds, thus strengthening the Communist nation, now plotting the complete ruin of America, Canada and all yet-free in this world. Some of these business first—patriotism second Western businessmen could be very close to our Government policymakers in both Ottawa and Washington and—the truth of it all is—that they greatly influence Government heads by insidious pressures and advice on—we can do business with the U.S.S.R. and not endanger our countries. Santayana, the philosopher, once said—"those, who ignore the mistakes made before their time are condemned to repeat them and will live to regret it." My friends—as this is a united anti-Communist organization created to alert Americans to be on guard I can therefore speak openly and forcefully.

Communism is never so deadly as when it pretends to be friendly or tolerating a nation it is methodically strangling and all set to ruin. Remember—I pray you these words and further know that freedom and communism cannot coexist amicably or breathe the same political air. Their objectives are absolutely different—one is for full control of all human and material resources—the other is for liberty and the use of resources for people in general. Lenin once said—and we all should know it for the protection of our Nation—Lenin stated: "The existence of the Soviet Union side by side with the capitalist nations for a long period is unthinkable. One or the other must capitulate and it will not be the Soviet Union." How often do we hear this quoted, my friends?

Now—back to modern times—the truth of it all is that we have not learned hard lessons from old mistakes and today actual developments leave no doubt that many Western actions have strengthened the Soviets and weakened us. Our current trade deals with the Reds are perhaps the most blatant of our indiscreet actions and with each trade shipment I verily believe that we draw another clear line in a "blueprint for ruin" for Western practices and so possibly endangering our security.

Many ask me, wherever I go, is there still a Red threat now existing to our way of life? The answer can be given in one word: "Yes," and it stems primarily from our lack of interest in what our elected representatives are doing—daily and from our own noninterest in a big way in what is happening outside in the world. Everyday decisions are being made in Ottawa, London, and Washington, the free bloc, which affect the lives of our millions yet—in these free lands, people seldom question these decisions loudly nor protest when they deem Government actions to be wrong. Your own Ezra Taft Benson once said and I quote: "How much we need today a leadership which will tell the truth to our people and will walk straight to what is right. Not to what is expedient or advantageous to business yet dangerous to our free way of life. We need today, men who will ignore predicted consequences and will tell the truth and take a long chance with God's help."

I say he is right and I add that leadership comes not only from high places but from all levels of our life. To wit—from teachers, students, the professions, ministers (orthodox and Catholic), from good parents and from just average-level people and all of us need now to join a crusade to "serve God and save freedom" as we know and live it. Organizations such as this one are not fanatical, moneymaking, smearing groups as often they are labeled, but they give leadership today and are a force for the preservation of freedom in any community. I think, to be safe, we all should study communism, study socialism, and what both mean in operation so we can recognize the influences and threat of each. Some indicate that it is not popular to be anti-Communist, but I believe that one cannot be a good American or Canadian citizen, loyal to one's country, without being anti-Communist. In simple words, the truth of it all is that if you are anti-Communist you are for the freedom of individuals and against any kind of slavery. It seems, scanning the global pictures, that now is the time to have great courage, to exercise our rights as citizens in a free land, and to dramatize American might—combined with Canada's help—as against Soviet myths.

To be practical now: From an Eastern European source the following statement was forwarded to a new Canadian and subsequently came to me. It read, "the entire Soviet bloc is in an incredible economic mess. The clay feet of the Red colossus are crumbling and collapse could be near—economically. Its rescue is to a considerable degree in Western capitalist hands."

As I read this I thought, first we in Canada bail out Mao Tse-tung, and now combined we bail out Mr. Khrushchev. Yet not one strategic concession have we demanded from these enemy governments. Why did we not demand greater rights of inspection in Cuba? Why did we not demand concessions for the captive nations before we rushed to consummate deals in trading with the enslavers? If we had been adamant before trading on any of the points mentioned, it would have been a real step forward to a new and freer world order and would, as well, have thrown communism into reverse. Why didn't your diplomats and my ministers in Canada do something godlike and decent when, for Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, the chips were down? Or was the chase of the almighty dollar the thing that hypnotized these men? Meanwhile, the truth of it all is, that the Soviet Union builds up her own trade with our wheat, grains, etc., to nations she wants next to enslave, and Mr. K., laughing, no doubt, pays us with dollars he got from speculating with U.S. gold, selling at at inflated prices on the world's free market. Even this Red move brings us much nearer to a foreign-exchange crisis. Facts must be faced, and these are a few to observe.

My friends, your citizenship is many things—a heritage, a privilege, but most of all it is a responsibility. You cannot discharge this responsibility unless you are concerned in all your Government does; in who is there to represent you, and this applies to government on eevry level. The truth of it all is that this hour demands your action—everywhere. Do something, but do it now.

Contribution to Community Development by the People of Decatur, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I admire and respect the poeple of the Tennessee Valley in north Alabama. I admire and respect them for a variety of reasons, but perhaps the foremost reason is because they get up and do things unselfishly for their communities. I represent an area which stretches across the top of north Alabama and every foot of this area is growing, growing because people go out and work for their communities.

In this instance, I would like to cite as an example the contribution to community development of the people of Decatur. Decatur is a prospering city right in the heart of the congressional district which I represent. I am proud of Decatur and its record of growth and of the people of Decatur who, through their energy and dedication, have made this city what it is today.

The percentage of families with income above $10,000 in Decatur in 1960, according to the 1960 census, was 13.1 percent, fourth in our State, a percentage exceeded only by Montgomery, Mobile, and Huntsville.

In the percentage of population growth, 1950–60, according to the 1960 census, Decatur ranked third in Alabama with a growth of 46.3 percent, exceeded only by Mobile and Huntsville.

In median family income, according to the census, Decatur was at the top of a list of 12 outstanding Southern cities with a median family income of $5,261, leading such cities as Montgomery, Atlanta, Birmingham, and Memphis.

Now why is this so? It is because of people with love of community in their hearts, people with tremendous pride in accomplishment, people who have time and again molded themselves into a "selling team" in behalf of the community and their fellow men and who desire to improve their own positions. That is why 12 of the largest industrial firms in the United States, firms which annually record more than $500 million in business volume each year, have located branch plants in Decatur, each diversified, each making a different product, each capable of standing on its own feet in good times or bad.

I recall that when one of America's great industrial firms was seeking a location for a branch plant, its site selection team considered 274 towns in 11 States and when all the facts were in the choice was Decatur, Ala. The difference was people, people who were so sold on their own community that they could not help but sell others.

The people of Decatur not only sold their faith in their community and in the future to industrial prospects but they also sold hard, irrefutable facts. For one thing, they sold the advantages peculiar to the Tennessee Valley, advantages which in large part stem from contributions of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Yes, the people of Decatur and TVA represent a happy marriage. Each owes a debt to the other.

I would like to underline this tribute to the people of the Decatur area by including in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. R. H. Davies, chairman of the board of Eltra Corp., a letter which clearly defines the energies and capabilities of the people of the Tennessee Valley. The letter follows:

OCTOBER 28, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: We welcome this opportunity to express our feeling about our Prestolite plant at Decatur. A friendly industrial climate was one of the major factors that caused us to announce in June 1960, that the then Electric Autolite Co., now Prestolite Division of Eltra Corp., was to build a multimillion dollar manufacturing plant at Decatur, Ala. We announced also that the plant, now valued at between $6 and $7 million, would employ 400 to 500 persons engaged in the production of regulators, distributors, solenoid switches, relays, governors, condensers, and other automotive electrical products.

While we investigated many communities, we were immediately impressed by the fine efforts and enthusiasm of the Decatur people to have this new industry join their growing list of major manufacturers. They had the hometown approach and their sincerity was readily apparent.

The manufacturing was unlike that of any other industry in town, but with the exception of supervisory and technical personnel we were able to employ nearly the entire work force from the Decatur area. Certainly the other Decatur advantages—railroads, plenty of water and splendid river transportation, a network of modern highways, the Nation's second cheapest electrical rate, a sound economy, and adaptable labor—all made this "Great Lakes region of the South" attractive to us.

Like other companies establishing new facilities, we had our growing pains, but they were fewer and less severe than we had anticipated. The labor force grew rapidly and now totals just under 800, far above our original estimate.

Besides being adaptable, our Decatur employees are eager to learn and, as their experience on the job increases, they are becoming highly proficient workers, capable of making the highest quality products. It was this skill that prompted us to move additional manufacturing to our Decatur plant, including that of our Prestolite spark plug line.

The plant is now engaged in the manufacturing of electrical items for many industries, including the automotive, marine, farm equipment, aircraft, heavy industry, and the military. Important from a defense standpoint is the fact that the Decatur plant is a major source of ignition equipment for military vehicles. The Prestolite personnel are well trained and are aware that only top-quality production meets the demanding needs of the military. As the national economy expands, we look forward to an increase in our Decatur facility.

In closing we feel that the Decatur plant offers many opportunities for the mutual benefit of the community and Prestolite.

We appreciate your present and past expressions of interest in creating a favorable atmosphere in which to do business and are looking forward to continuing the relationship that has developed over the past 2 years.

Yours very truly,

R. H. DAVIES.

Captivated Capitalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the ironic developments that stems from well-organized visits of groups to the Soviet Union is the consistent effectiveness with which Americans are brainwashed by Soviet authorities.

This unfortunate pressure repeated itself last week when a group of touring corporation leaders were hypnotized by Mr. Khrushchev. Obviously, corporation executives are so blinded by red carpet treatment, so naive as to the international facts of life—that they succumb to Soviet doubletalk.

An editorial in the Tuesday, November 12 issue of the Chicago Tribune dramatically labels these men as "Captivated Capitalists" and effectively discusses their reactions and views. I submit the editorial for the RECORD at this point.

CAPTIVATED CAPITALISTS

We were puzzled by the comments made by most of the 20 American industrial and business leaders after they had visited the Kremlin and talked at length with Nikita Khrushchev. For the most part they seemed to have forgotten that Khrushchev had promised to "bury" them and the system under which they have thrived.

Some of their comments were that Khrushchev was so able, so intelligent, so cool, so brilliant that, in the United States he might take their jobs away from them if he were in business, or, if in politics, that he would be at the top, as he is in Russia.

We wonder how intelligent men can be so naive. Perhaps the explanation is that they assumed Khrushchev to be a man like themselves, with their standards of morality and integrity. They accepted what he said at face value, as if they had forgotten that deceit and treachery are admired by the Communists.

The tycoons were very gentle in the questions they addressed to the genial host. One untactful visitor did mention the embarrassment of the Berlin wall and asked why communism felt obliged to lock its victims in. But he retreated in confusion when Khrushchev rebuked him for "overstepping the boundaries." The dictator said if hedgehogs were planted under him, he would plant porcupines under his guests.

The American capitalists took this meekly, as they did Khrushchev's assertion that the Soviet Union would be out in front of the United States economy in 7 years.

That Khrushchev is tough and ruthless we do not gainsay. You have to be to rise to the top of the communist heap on the dead bodies of the victims of innumerable purges. You have to be to undercut your political rivals and exile them or execute them. You have to be to slaughter the freedom fighters of Budapest who revolted against tyranny. You have to be to survive the infighting that constantly goes on in the Communist Party.

But this does not signify that Khrushchev is the kind of man the American people would be happy to choose in a free election as their President. They fall for phonies at times, but they seek men of dignity and character whom they would be willing to trust. Khrushchev's authority rests on no popular base. Russians vote a one-party list, drawn from members of the Communist Party, an infinitesimal fraction—some 3 per-

cent—of the population. The dummy organs of government pick the bosses, and Khrushchev does the picking.

If the vast flop of Soviet agriculture, the shelves bare of consumer goods, the inflated prices for something as simple as a pair of shoes or trousers (assuming they are even available) are any indication of Khrushchev's managerial prowess, he would not be the man we would choose to run any business enterprise in which we were interested.

Congressman JOHANSEN said in the House that he wonders what explains "the foolish fascination" which takes American businessmen to Khrushchev's door to hear him insult the United States, capitalism, and themselves.

Some of the business leaders appraised Khrushchev as tough, a pragmatist, but a man with a sense of humor. We do not know whether proof of the sense of humor was found in his statement that the blockading of an American troop convoy by the Russians on the autobahn to Berlin could have led to a shooting and a nuclear war which would incinerate him and his guests. That's not our idea of a real boffo.

Mrs. Murphy's Private Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from a recent issue of America by Father William J. Davis, S.J., on the public-accommodations section of the civil rights bill:

Of the many witnesses to come before the Senate Commerce Committee, testifying against the public-accommodations section of the President's civil rights bill, perhaps none was more eloquent or forceful than Gov. Farris Bryant, of Florida. In a packed Senate caucus room, he told the Senators that he came "to argue the case for freedom."

Customers are free to trade where they please, but this civil rights bill would deny owners a like freedom. If a customer can walk into a store, look over the owner or the merchandise, and then decide not to buy, for any reason whatsoever, or even for no reason at all; if he can base his decision even on the looks of the store owner—then "the owner of the property ought to have the same freedom." So runs the argument of Governor Bryant, and so runs the argument in the minds of many reasonable men who seem genuinely concerned about Federal interference with the rights of property owners.

To resolve the apparent conflict between civil rights and property rights, it is necessary to take a second look at our traditional view of private property. Just what rights, for instances, does the now famous Mrs. Murphy have in the running of her boardinghouse?

For Mrs. Murphy, and for Americans generally, the right of ownership is an unassailable absolute. "I earned this property. It's mine. I can do with it as I please." Some such expression of absolute ownership, including use, rises spontaneously to the lips of most Americans. Even those who cannot justify this right philosophically know that it is somehow guaranteed as God-given and inalienable, and the presumption is one of absolute independence in the ownership of property. The defenders of Mrs. Murphy contend that she (or her family) built her establishment independently and that she therefore can expect to do as she pleases with it. They decry Government interference as an infringement on her right to own and dispose of her property freely.

Their argument begins with the fact that this property was gained by private initiative. Was it really? Did the Murphys mill the boards that built it? Did they smelt the steel that fashioned the tools that drove the nails? While the building was under construction, who grew the wheat and ground the flour and ran the railroads and provided the thousand and one other services that the Murphys used? And even more fundamentally, who settled the land and built a society and maintained law and order, so that this building could be constructed? "Private" initiative, in any absolute sense, is a myth.

But if Mrs. Murphy could not originally acquire her boardinghouse without the aid of society, neither can she now maintain it privately. How can she keep it safe from thieves? How can she be assured that the commodities she needs to run it will not skyrocket beyond her means through the action of monopolists? How can she be assured that the food she buys for her guests will not poison them? And finally, how can she be secure from those today who have sworn to "bury her"?

The point is obvious. The individualist's exaggerated view of private endeavor is one of the greatest hoaxes ever to slip into the stream of conventional wisdom. No one owns a boardinghouse, or anything else for that matter, without being in partnership with a tremendously complex, cooperating, interrelated organism known as society. Like it or not, we are interdependent. And if property cannot be gained independently or maintained independently, then neither can it be used in total independence.

To say that owners have the right to do whatever they please with their property, irrespective of society, is simply false. St. Thomas Aquinas, while defending the right to acquire private property, makes it very clear that this right does not carry with it the right of indiscriminate use. The disposal of private goods must be in accord with the primary destiny of all goods—service of man. As Ambrose Farrell, O.P., puts it: "Ownership of every kind is a stewardship carrying with it social obligations."

Traditionally, we have emphasized the fact that man's very nature demands a measure of independent ownership. But what we must bear in mind, while insisting on this natural right, is that man's nature is a social nature and demands a concern for society even in his ownership. It is not as though man has independent rights to which are added a few social riders. The fact is that the right itself is essentially colored by man's social nature.

The social character of private property, therefore, is not a sort of afterthought of only relative importance. It is of the very essence of private property. Review the traditional arguments for private property and you will find that they all reduce to one: private property is the best way to make our God-given fund of material goods serve the common good of all mankind. The truth is that the social character of property is absolute; its private character is relative.

This is not to say, as Saint-Simon, Comte and their camp followers said, that society is the real owner of all property. Individuals are true owners, but society has a vested interest in their ownership. Especially those private businesses that draw constantly from the public must, in turn, recognize the rights of the public. If they do not, then public authority must intervene.

Some might object that government intervention is bad. In a sense it is; it's too bad. In fact, in a sense, it is tragic, because it is an indication that we as individuals have not recognized and fulfilled our social obligations. Because of our failure, government intervention becomes necessary and its desirability is no longer the question. And if there is danger involved (as there admittedly is) in such intervention, we have no one to blame but ourselves for failing to act on the individual or local level. We cannot hide behind an irrational hostility to public authority when we ourselves have necessitated the expansion of that authority.

Exaggerated individualism has traditionally blasted all social reforms with bromides about freedom from interference, private rights, private initiative, and creeping socialism. But the ironic truth is that no one makes social reforms more necessary than does the individualist. Numerous social problems, calling for government regulation, are the direct result of his laissez-faire principles. Granted, for instance, that I can do as I please with my property, then naturally enough I can shift the location of my plant without regard to employee dislocation; I can hire and fire without regard for collective bargaining; I can engage in rack-renting, in real estate speculation, and in a host of other activities that result in social harm. Discrimination against Negroes cap a long list of abuses resulting from the liberalist view of "the sanctity of private property."

In fact, even the various forms of collectivism, which the individualists so universally fear, frequently follow from this same false premise of the absolute nature of private property. Given the assumption that ownership carries with it the right to use things as the owner pleases, then the only way to correct misuse is by a change of ownership. And so the various collectivist systems conclude that the state must become sole owner if society is to benefit properly from material wealth. Even Catholic writers sometimes leave the impression that the only solution to the problem of injustice is some impractical equalization of ownings, and, in so doing, neglect to stress the social obligations of those who are owners.

In correcting abuses, however, we must not make the mistake of the collectivists. Government intervention must itself be controlled by strict limits. The day will never come when the right of ownership will be justly absorbed by the state. Private property will never become obsolete. It will remain as long as man is man. The forms that ownership takes may need constant readjustment by social authority to bring them in line with their essential purpose; but that authority cannot swallow up the basic right.

Obviously, if individuals and lesser organizations realize their responsibilities, the state need not and ought not to step in; but when we on the lower level fail, then it is the responsibility of the government to see to it that community rights are not trampled on by individuals. In Quadragesimo Anno Pius XI insised, while reiterating the warning to leave to subordinate groups as broad a control as possible, that public authority has not only the right but the duty to make adjustments in the matter of ownership. His words bear quoting at length:

"It follows from what we have termed the individual and at the same time social character of ownership that men must consider in this matter not only their own advantage but also the common good. To define these duties in detail when necessity requires and the natural law has not done so is the function of those in charge of the State. Therefore public authority, under the guiding light always of the natural and divine law, can determine more accurately, upon consideration of the true requirements of the common good, what is permitted and what is not permitted to owners in the use of their property (sec. 49)."

A Catholic can hardly deny the right of the state to intervene in the use of property

for the common good, as indeed the state already does by a number of accepted practices, such as lawsuits to redress injuries, zoning laws and eminent domain.

The attitude we should take toward such intervention was well expressed by Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., testifying before the Senate Commerce Committee in favor of the civil rights bill. Asked about Federal intrusion into businesses in his city, he replied that such Government actions as child-labor laws, certain labor laws themselves, wage-and-hour acts and the like can hardly be considered intrusions since, for the most part, they have been for the benefit of most of the people of the country.

Finally—and this question brings us back to Mrs. Murphy—when should the Government act? Obviously, too much Government interference will create more evils than it corrects; but too little is equally harmful. When the state moves, it must keep all aspects of the common good in mind. Property has a social aspect, but it also has a private aspect. The state must preserve both. When a business is small and relatively more private, as we will presume is the case with the Murphy boardinghouse, the state should not interfere directly, even though Mrs. Murphy may be unjustly drawing profit from the public without realizing her social obligations to that public. But in the case of those businesses that substantially affect the common good, the state can and should interfere whenever there is serious abuse.

And how to decide what is a "Mrs. Murphy" boardinghouse and what is a substantial business? Reason and prudence must decide. Although we hate to give these factors a place in this world of scientific exactness, there is simply no substitute for them in human affairs. They guide us in interpreting what is substantial in the Clayton Act and in other acts; they must likewise guide us in the present matter. Perhaps, as has been suggested, the Murphys can be separated from the non-Murphys by the $10,000 gross-income level. Some division point must be agreed upon to preserve both privacy and public good. And while $10,000 is an arbitrary figure, it does not seem an unreasonable one. If someone thinks otherwise, he can advance reasons why the division point should be moved up or down, but he ought not to attack the very principle of the government's right to regulate.

In conclusion, therefore, let me return to the problem posed by Governor Bryant. He has shrewdly appraised the civil rights issue as a struggle "between conflicting demands for freedom." But are the demands for freedom equally justified on both sides, or are owners demanding freedoms that were never theirs? Those who make private property an unassailable absolute stretch property rights beyond reason. And if they have their way, they will not only destroy an important civil rights bill; they will strip social authority of the very possibility of effective reform. They will hack away from free society its strongest bulwark—its capacity for self-adjustment and reform.

There is no solution to "the conflicting demands for freedom" if we accept the individualist assumptions about the nature of ownership. The solution Governor Bryant suggests—to allow the owners the freedom to continue to make errors—is intolerable when so large a portion of the public, indeed, when the whole Nation, is suffering from those errors. The Communist or Socialist solution—to make the state the sole owner—is likewise intolerable in view of man's nature. This conflict can be resolved only by admitting that our right of ownership bears within it social responsibilities which should be promoted by the reasonable, controlled, and limited intervention of social authority.

Spain and Portugal: Red Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, serious students of military history have long recognized the strategic importance of the Iberian Penninsula consisting of Spain and Portugal, and how this area has served as the location for decisive stages in wars.

An informative article in the July 20, 1963, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., by Constantine Brown, distinguished geopolitical analyst now residing in Rome, Italy, gives the latest developments in plots to overthrow the Governments of Spain and Portugal.

The article follows:

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL: RED TARGET—LEFTISTS SHIFT PLOTTING CENTER IN ITALY, AND MOSCOW MAKES OIL OVERTURES

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—Communist and democratic groups plotting for the overthrow of the Governments of Spain and Portugal recently have received a new impetus. The main center of their activities has been transferred from Milan to Genoa.

The reason is that it is easier to ship men, arms and propaganda from a seaport than from an inland city. Since relations between France and Spain have become very friendly, the underground, which in the past moved from Yugoslavia and Italy to Spain through France, can no longer be used.

The Soviet Union and other anti-Facist governments are reported to be assisting these groups, which are composed mostly of Spanish and Italian Communists. But strangely enough, at the same time Moscow has begun flirting wth the Madrid government and suggesting better relations.

A delegation of Soviet labor union leaders is reported to have received visas from Madrid to attend an international labor meeting there this summer.

On the other hand the Soviet Government is reported to have sounded out the Spanish Government concerning some arrangements about the $800 million which Madrid accuses Moscow of having stolen from Spain in 1938 when the Loyalist government realized it had lost the battle.

At that time the Loyalist government transferred to Odessa the entire treasury of the Spanish Government for safekeeping. After the Loyalists fell and Generalissimo Franco became the undisputed head of state, demands were made to Moscow through neutral embassies for the return of the gold. The Russians answered that there was no such gold available. It was true they admitted, that a quantity had been shipped to the U.S.S.R., but that amount was due Russia for the military equipment purchased throughout the civil war.

Now the Russians appear to admit that there is a balance due to the Spanish Government—about $650 million—and that under certain conditions they are willing to discuss its return. There is no possibility, of course, say the Russians, that the actual gold will be returned to Spain. But if the present Madrid government were willing to discuss economic relations, Moscow might consider shipping to Spain crude or refined oil representing the amount involved.

Spain lacks oil; it has to purchase it from the United States and British companies at prices considerably higher than those of the U.S.S.R. The Russians are reported to suggest that the gold of the Spanish treasury be repaid in oil over a period of 5 or 6 years, according to the needs of Spanish industry. The proposition, which appears on the surface acceptable—no one as yet has had time to look under the rug—would deprive the American and British oil producers of an important market, especially at this time when Spanish industry has begun to boom in earnest.

The fact that Madrid seems inclined to consider economic discussions with the U.S.S.R. is attributed to gentle pressures from Washington for further democratization of the present Spanish regime.

Generalissimo Franco and his top counselors in the cabinet are being urged to liberalize Spain by permitting the creation of a Spanish Socialist Party. So far these gentle hints from Washington have had no effect on the Spanish Government and are unlikely to be received favorably by the Spanish people. The Government and the bulk of the Spaniards remember that Spain had had a Socialist government before the outbreak of the civil war. It started with moderate socialism, but eventually became infiltrated. The net result of the experience of the thirties was a civil war which brought, besides total economic ruin to Spain, casualties amounting to more than 2 million dead.

Spain, after years of unbelievable hardships caused by the unofficial economic embargo imposed by the West from 1945 to 1949, at present is moving up fast. Everybody in Europe speaks of the "Spanish miracle," comparable to that of Germany and France. Although only 10 years ago Spain had less than $100 million gold or hard currency in its treasury, it possesses today close to $1 billion.

The creation of a "Socialist Party," Washington is being politely told, might eventually get things back to where they were in 1936. And Generalissimo Franco and his cabinet, for the sake of their people, cannot accept such a risk. They point out that the present shaky situation in Italy—both political and economic—proves what a government to the left can do to the welfare of a country.

Al Reid, Newspaperman With a Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Al Reid, distinguished writer and correspondent of the Home News & Times in Yonkers, N.Y., has been leading a worthwhile effort to help the Cross Country Hospital in Yonkers and the Lawrence Hospital in Bronxville.

He calls this effort "Operation Trading Stamps." Under this charitable plan, people send their trading stamps to Al Reid who then uses them to buy items such as toys and games for the two hospitals.

Al Reid says, "I licked every stamp." To date, this amounts to over 50,000. This is certainly a highly original idea. Moreover, it is one that other communities can use in order to bring comforting items to the children and adults in our hospitals.

Activities of this type are making Al Reid known as "the newspaperman with a heart."

A Tax Bonanza for the Well-To-Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Tax Bonanza for the Well-To-Do," written by Bernard D. Nossiter and published in the November 1963 issue of the Progressive magazine, dealing with House bill 8363, the tax measure passed by the House.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TAX BONANZA FOR THE WELL-TO-DO

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

(NOTE.—Bernard D. Nossiter, economic affairs analyst for the Washington Post, is the author of a forthcoming book, "Myths, Mythmakers, and the Modern Economy." His articles have appeared in Harper's, the Reporter, and the New Republic.)

Talking to business leaders a few weeks ago, President Kennedy claimed that the tax reduction bill he has embraced will help cure nearly everything but fallen arches. It would, he said, stimulate investment, excite economic growth, redress the imbalance of payments, insure against slump, end chronic budget deficits, create more jobs, relax racial tensions, shrink juvenile delinquency, and soothe labor unrest. About the only point he did not make was one his audience appreciated already: They and the other upper-bracket citizens will be the prime beneficiaries of the big tax cut.

H.R. 8363, as the measure passed by the House is formally styled, contains 310 pages of legalistic jargon. Nearly every page adds feathers to the nests of the most affluent in this partly affluent society. The bill is usually described as a tax cut of $11.1 billion, with $8.8 billion for individuals and $2.3 billion for corporations. These numbers have a pleasant, democratic ring. They suggest that John Q. Citizen will get nearly $4 for every $1 going to business. The Treasury Department has zealously cultivated this image in a 140-page book of pro-tax-cut arguments distributed to the press. The book, for example, shows that a family of four earning $5,000 would get a 26 percent tax cut while the $100,000 family would get only a 14 percent reduction. What could be fairer?

But a closer examination of some unpublished Treasury data reveals a somewhat different story. Indeed, the bill promises to provide the most massive redistribution of income in the United States since World War II—and in precisely the opposite direction of that great income equalizing experience. Coupled with last year's $2¼ billion tax relief for business, the 1963 measure adds up to a tidy bundle for the upper brackets. The Kennedy tax program—H.R. 8363 and the 1962 investment credit and accelerated depreciation allowances—makes the milder Eisenhower measures aimed in the same direction seem positively Populist by comparison.

It is impossible to explore in this space all the tax boons for the well to do which are hidden in the less publicized paragraphs of H.R. 8363. But some of its more generous features deserve mention. The bill reduces the Treasury's take from individual income tax rates by $9.5 billion. (The difference between this and the $8.8 billion mentioned above is based on two peculiar and dubious assumptions. One is that the Senate will retain some so-called structural changes that nick a broad array of taxpayers for some more money. The other is that the measure's provisions for taxing stock market profits are so generous that speculators will be encouraged to cash in more of their holdings and thereby pay some tax that would not have otherwise been collected.)

Of the total $8.8 billion of net tax reduction for individuals, the wealthiest 1.2 million taxpayers—those with incomes of $20,000 or more—will get $1.9 billion. But the 20.2 million persons with the smallest taxable incomes, those under $5,000, will divide up only $1.4 billion. Put another way, the 5 wealthiest persons in a group of 200 taxpayers will collect nearly one-quarter of the pie. The 80 taxpayers at the bottom of the group—the two-fifths with the lowest incomes—will share less than one-eighth of the tax savings.

A little more arithmetic drives the point home. The richest 200,000 taxpayers, those with incomes of $50,000 or more, will enjoy an average cut from rate reductions alone of $3,550 each. The poorest 20 million taxpayers will have a tax saving of about $70 each.

The millions who pay no income taxes at all because their earnings are too small receive nothing, of course, from a tax cut, so that H.R. 8363 does nothing directly to increase their buying power and their influence on the demand for goods.

Leon Keyserling, the consulting economist who once served President Truman as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has prepared this table to show how the bill would affect families of four who take the typical deductions for their income class:

Taxable income	Proposed tax in H.R. 8363	Percent rise in after-tax income
$5,000	$223	1.6
$7,500	576	2.1
$10,000	994	2.3
$15,000	1,865	2.7
$20,000	2,875	3.2
$25,000	4,063	3.8
$50,000	12,369	6.2
$75,000	21,399	7.1
$100,000	31,442	8.3

In other words, the wealthier the taxpayer, the more the bill increases his after-tax income.

Now suppose we look at that $2.3 billion lollipop for the corporations, a confection created by the lower tax rates they would pay. Corporations, of course, are fictitious persons but they are owned by real people. These real people, otherwise known as stockholders, benefit from reduced corporate taxes in two ways. Companies may use the extra cash to pay out bigger dividends, a direct premium for the stockholders. Or, the cash may be kept and invested, swelling the values of the owners' shares.

Who benefits from this depends on who owns the stock. To the surprise of virtually no one, ownership of corporation shares is heavily concentrated in the upper brackets. In a classic study, Prof. Robert Lampman, University of Wisconsin economist and consultant to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, calculated that the wealthiest 1 percent of all adults own three-quarters of all stocks. A newer study by Irwin Friend, of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, indicates a somewhat broader distribution. He credits those with incomes above $25,000 with about half the shares. In either case, the point is clear: What is good for the corporate balance sheet is best for the well-to-do. And it must not be forgotten that this $2.3 billion tax reduction for the corporations comes on top of a nearly equal amount of tax cutting for business just last year. Because stock shares, then, are owned in such large measure by the well-to-do, this total $4.5 billion in corporate tax savings provides a double-headed lollipop for the upper brackets.

To be sure, the affluent can't eat higher stock values. Wall Street is fond of scoffing at "paper profits." But you can sell the stuff. And the profits you realize are called capital gains. Capital gains, as might be expected, are largely reaped by the well-off. As a sampler, the Treasury examined tax returns in 1959. That year, the Government found that more than 35 percent of the reported $12 billion in capital gains went to the fortunate few with incomes of $50,000 or more. An equally large slice went to the much larger group between $10,000 and $50,000. The richer you are, the more you channel your income into capital gains because the income tax laws treat them with such loving care. Thus, the typical Federal tax return in the $5,000 to $10,000 bracket showed less than $2 of every $100 of income flowing from capital gains. Persons between $50,000 and $100,000 got nearly $19 of every $100 of their reported income from this route; those in the $500,000-a-year-and-up class received nearly two-thirds of their money from capital gains.

The nice thing about capital gains under present law is that you can keep so much of them. The taxpayer is offered two tax choices, and the privilege of selecting the one more advantageous to himself. He may add 50 percent of his gains to taxable income and be taxed at whatever bracket in which that lands him. Or he may report the entire gain and pay no more than a 25 percent tax ceiling on it.

H.R. 8363 improves on this considerably. It requires stockholders to report only 40 percent of their profits if they choose to include them with ordinary income, or pay a top capital gains tax of only 21 percent, provided they hold their shares 2 years. In other words, if you are well enough fixed to make stock market profits and are not too impatient, the amount on which you pay capital gains taxes is slashed by one-fifth and your maximum tax rate is reduced by about one-sixth.

How much all this will mean to the wealthy, only their accountants will know. Neither the Treasury, Keyserling, nor anyone else can estimate the increased income that will flow from more lightly taxed capital gains. That depends to a large extent on the fluctuations in real estate, stock, and other markets. But the healthy slice in the personal tax rates of the rich, the generous provisions for the corporations they own, and the more tender treatment of their capital gains adds up to a glittering package for those living in the penthouses of the economic pyramid.

The new tax bill is flyspecked with other changes. Some chip a few flakes from the golden calf, others add gold trimmings to it. For example, one amendment to last year's investment credit allowance would pour an estimated $725 million more into corporate treasuries by 1973. No matter what the Senate does with the House-approved tax bill (and the Senate's past record shows that it is much more likely to fatten than pluck the affluent) the final version will have no relation to "tax reform." A "reform" is supposed to make the code simpler and provide a more equitable distribution of income. H.R. 8363 does exactly the reverse.

Under these circumstances, it should come as no shock to learn that the Kennedy administration's most passionate allies on behalf of the bill are Roger Blough of United States Steel, Henry Ford II, David Rockefel-

ler, and the heads of General Electric, General Motors, Morgan Guaranty Trust, and other corporate luminaries enlisted in the Business Committee for Tax Reduction.

Somewhat harder to grasp is the enthusiasm of George Meany who calls the bill "desirable and necessary." To understand the reasoning of the AFL–CIO's top man we must turn to the administration economists. The franker ones acknowledge that H.R. 8363 is something less than a model of equity. But they contend that this is a realistic price to pay for the longer run benefits that are sure to follow. Along with the overwhelming majority of other professional economists, the President's experts have concluded that the economy is a hobbled giant, prevented from reaching higher levels of employment and faster growth by the present mix of Federal spending and taxes. This mix operates as a brake on the economy, creating budget surpluses that drain away purchasing power before high levels of employment are reached. The brake could be released by reducing the tax take or by increased Federal spending. Since enlarged outlays for everything but the military and space programs face congressional resistance, the realistic alternative is cutting taxes. Even if this means pushing a disproportionate share into the hands of the well-off, the administration argues that the country as a whole will gain from the increased output that the extra buying will stimulate and the jobs it will create.

This is a powerful arugment and one that cannot be dismissed out of hand. Most of the assaults on the tax bill have not really come to grips with this contention. The simple-minded notion that budget deficits are somehow bad in all seasons, need not detain us here. If only the less literate business men who promote it ever realized that the Nation's monetary structure rests on Federal debt, and that if this debt were paid off the economy would be paralyzed more helplessly than it was in the depths of the depression, perhaps the discussion could be carried on in more meaningful terms.

A somewhat more sophisticated attack against tax reduction rest on the fear of automation. This is the argument that a tax cut will not create jobs and will simply stimulate investment in labor-saving machinery. But surely some portion of the tax cut will be spent by consumers for goods and services in industries that should have to hire more men to satisfy the enlarged demand. As for the new investment the cut will generate, this too will mean extra employment—at least short term for those who build the machines. The notion that these machines will erase more jobs than they create simply cannot be supported by available evidence. Technological change certainly goes on. But there is little evidence, in my judgment, that it is proceeding at a pace faster than that achieved in earlier periods, the 1920's for example, and not a shred of evidence to suggest that it is moving at a fantastic cat-eating-tail pace with respect to jobs.

A much more serious question about the tax cut has been all but ignored. Proponents of the measure make the crucial assumption that prices will remain more or less steady, that price rises will not wipe out the benefits of the increased demand that the tax cut creates.

The administration contends that there is no need to fear a price rise because there are so many unemployed men and plants. In a perfectly competitive economy, this argument makes sense. But ours is far from a perfectly competitive economy. In many broad areas, marked by concentration, the dominance of a few huge companies permits them to raise prices because they are freed to some extent from competitive restraints. Already there are some signs that the tax cut has encouraged large corporations to raise their prices. Since the increase in April by steel, a scattering of markups has broken out in paper, glass, aluminum, and other product lines.

For the first time in nearly 5 years, the price index for wholesale industrial goods and materials has been creeping up. In a $550 billion economy, it takes only a 2 percent rise in all prices to wipe out the pump-priming effect of an $11 billion tax cut.

In other words, if the large corporations push up prices enough in the next 2 years so that only 2 cents is added to the price of each dollar of goods sold, the jobmaking power expected of the tax cut will be almost nullified. Instead of creating more demand for increased output and jobs, the tax savings will be spent merely to buy the same volume of higher priced goods.

When the Kennedy administration first took office, it recognized this problem and made some feeble stabs at holding the large corporations in check. But it became so panic stricken in the aftermath of its 1962 victory over Big Steel, that it has been in retreat ever since. In short, the failure to come to grips with the pricing power of the large corporations threatens to render important the job-creating potential of the tax cut.

There is still another and subtler danger. The tax cut is designed for, and will surely succeed in, either raising or sustaining substantial corporate spending on plants and machinery. Corporate treasuries are now so flush with funds that they are looking for outlets to put them to work. The bill would add considerably to this reservoir of investment capital. Moreover, as one or two companies in a concentrated industry begin to enlarge capacity, the others are likely to follow just to hold on to their potential share of the market.

But this investment will not be prolonged year after year unless there are customers to buy the fruits of the increased output. The tax bill pumps relatively more purchasing power into the hands of the well-off, the more nearly sated, and relatively less into the hands of those with the greatest need for more goods. This maldistribution of buying power threatens to catch up with the enlarged corporate investment and growing plant capacity at some point in time. The customers for the enlarged stream of goods could fade away; investment in new plants and machinery would be drastically cut back in the face of excess capacity; a recession would follow.

Such a prospect is no mere fantasy. Something like this happened in the Eisenhower era when tax changes were made to promote investment. Outlays for plant and equipment boomed and a prosperous flush spread through the economy. But this investment could not be sustained because of a lack of demand, and it was sharply cut back. The deep recession of 1957-58 followed and the economy's growth has been sluggish ever since.

The tax bill, then, represents a large gamble. It sacrifices equity in the name of more jobs. But if this goal is to be realized, postwar economic history will have to be reversed. The large corporations must exercise a measure of restraint over prices, a restraint that has hitherto been conspicuously absent. And the new inequities in the distribution of income must still somehow leave the structure of demand by ordinary customers strong enough to clear the markets of a great potential increase in the output of American industry.

Georgia-Pacific Rebuts Pollution Claim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, early in October, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries accepted testimony concerning the problems of pollution as it affects the shellfish industry.

During these hearings, the Georgia-Pacific Corp. Mill at Bellingham, Wash., in my district, was accused of the pollution of Bellingham Bay. Recently, I received a copy of a letter in which Mr. L. Turcott, vice president of Georgia-Pacific takes issue with this testimony.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Turcott's rebuttal in the RECORD.

GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORP.,
Bellingham, Wash., October 17, 1963.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation on October 2 and 3 in Washington, D.C., I quote from the testimony presented to the committee insofar as it relates to our company and its operations in the Bellingham, Wash., area.

"In the Bellingham area, Georgia-Pacific has recently acquired the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. mill, which started in 1925 as a 25-ton-per-day production and today is producing 500 tons of sulphite pulp per day. It discharges approximately 45 million gallons of waste water into Bellingham Bay daily, which has a population equivalent of 1 million people. Surveys of Bellingham Bay and surrounding water areas indicate that sulphite liquor in excess of 500 parts per million within a mile of the mill are common, the maximum concentration being about 4,500 parts per million with minimum dissolved oxygen 0. Concentrations as high as 48 parts per million have been found over oyster beds more than 10 miles distant. The oyster industry of the area has been practically wiped out resulting in heavy economic losses and unemployment. Numerous fish kills have been observed in the area and experiments with live fingerling salmon result in 100-percent mortality of the fish within 3 minutes. Sludge beds requiring periodic dredging are formed and marine life in the vicinity of the mill has become extinct.

"This mill has consistently bought installation of recovery facilities and has refused to acknowledge pollution of the waterways. It announced several days ago a $3 million expansion of its pulp making facilities—increasing its production by another 80 tons of chemi-groundwood pulp per day."

I wish at this time to set the record straight as to many of the statements made which are false. They are as follows:

Item No. 1. The mill in Bellingham produces 460 tons per day rather than 500. The mill has increased in size less than 10 percent in the last 20 years. Instead of fighting recovery facilities the mill has been a pioneer in the development of waste recovery facilities. We have invested over $6 million in this process and today are recovering 35

percent of our solids heretofore discharged. The amount of recovery has increased each year due to increased recovery facilities. The wastes recovered are converted into useful products.

The relation of water discharged equivalent to 1 million population we do not understand. After all 98 percent of the so-called effluent of 45 million is water which would naturally flow to the bay from the Bellingham water supply and for the use of which we pay the city of Bellingham.

The presentation also states that a new pulp making facility of 80 tons of chemiground wood pulp is being installed. This is correct but the presentation makes no statement that in an operation of this kind of pulp there is recovery of 90 percent and in the permit we have received to operate this plant we have agreed that no additional discharge of wastes will be made into Bellingham Bay.

Item No. 2. The presentation indicates that sulphite liquor in excess of 500 parts per million within a mile of the mill are common and that concentrations of 48 parts per million have been found over the oyster beds. This is an easy statement to make but there is nothing to back it up. Many studies of Bellingham Bay and Samish Bay where the oysters are located have been made by technical staffs from universities and independent consultants. In a joint study by the State of Washington Pollution Commission and the mill there is no indication of this range of quantity of parts per million indicated. These studies are available and do not show anything like the statements presented to the committee.

Item 3. The presentation states that numerous fish kills have been observed in the area. This is wholly untrue—we never have had a complaint of fish kills in the area in our 35 years of operation and I believe this could be confirmed by the Washington State Pollution Commission.

Item 4. The presentation states that the oyster industry has been practically wiped out resulting in heavy economic losses and unemployment. It is perhaps true that, at times, the oysters in the area mentioned have not been prolific but we firmly believe that this cannot be blamed on the pulp operation. The oyster industry as indicated in the presentation is misleading. It is a very small one and it is operating today and advertised as a going concern. No less than 3 years ago in the close proximity of the pulp operations apparently climatic and water conditions were favorable and there were oysters all over Bellingham Bay in very large quantities.

Item 5. In 1942 our company was sued by the oyster people by a company then known as the Pioneer Oyster Co. for $2 million and the judgment was entirely in favor of the company completely refuting their claims as to damage.

I would say that the whole statement in the presentation conveys an erroneous impression of our industry.

Our company belongs to the Northwest Pulp & Paper Association which is mentioned in the presentation as having vast power politically and otherwise. This is a gross misstatement and I have a copy of a letter addressed to you by the secretary-manager which indicates the activities of the mills in the area who are not only spending a lot of money on these problems but who are continually improving their operations and I believe all of the mills are to be commended for their approach in improving water conditions all over this State.

If we can furnish further information we will be glad to do so.

Yours very truly,

L. TURCOTTE,
Vice President.

Address by Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the House a very noteworthy address delivered by my good friend, Charles H. Silver, at this year's Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner. Mr. Silver is executive assistant to the mayor of New York and is chairman of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. I believed that the Members of the House will find his remarks most interesting.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER

This annual gathering does honor to the memory of democracy's Happy Warrior who rose from the obscurity of an East Side street to seek the highest post in our Government. He was pushed aside by the same powers of blind prejudice that are still responsible for bloodshed and barbarism in many parts of our Nation.

The bigotry and injustice he battled in his time remain a vital concern in ours. The present seeds of discord and conflict would have harvested his wrath in a mighty summons to "look at the record."

This we do, certain in the knowledge that ours is—and must remain—a society where men are free to speak their minds as they strive for progress.

Recently, some spoke out against the nuclear control in which our Nation has joined. The pact is signed. Now, let us be vigilant in seeing that it is faithfully honored by all parties involved.

The awesome threat of the bomb has constituted this frightful power for destruction as, perhaps, our greatest guardian of peace.

Who would want to fire an inescapable boomerang of universal suicide?

Certainly we should join to control the bomb—but there is something more to be feared than atomic fission.

Who is to control the minds and conscience of men and nations?

That is where brotherhood and morality mean more than megatons. That is where the church and school and even the family must do their part—and that, I am sorry to admit, is where our controls have become the weakest of all.

For it is the ethics learned in the home—at the dinner table—in the house of worship where we face our Creator—in the school where the guiding spirit of the future is being fashioned. These are the things. These are the places where control was never more needed than now.

We have come to know a fearful truth that we can pass on to those who will mold our Nation's future. We know now—to our shame and sorrow—that it does not take anything quite as big as an atomic bomb to bring civilization to a sudden, shuddering halt.

Ten sticks of dynamite tossed into the basement of a Sunday school have done the job just as thoroughly.

The savage bundle of death that blasted the head from a little girl's shoulders and ripped apart the bodies of her three companions at their prayers has stamped a degrading stain on our national conscience.

It will not soon be wiped away—not from our own torn hearts—or the opinion of other nations—or the all-seeing eyes of a grieving God.

We can no longer say: "It cannot happen here." But we can say—as a mighty vow before The Almighty who created all men equal—"It will not happen again."

If the memory of Al Smith still means anything at all, it must stand for a genuine and effective love of neighbor, particularly of the underprivileged.

It is this spirit that will enable us to solve the most tormenting problem facing our Nation today.

I am an American—the son of an immigrant. I am as typical of this land of ours as my forebears and yours. Many of them sailed steerage into New York Harbor and beheld, with a surge of hope welling in their hearts, the torch of liberty over freedom's bright horizon.

They did not need to deny their dignity, or scale down their hopes, or settle for less than the full benefits of citizenship.

Now, the tide of events puts to the test our love of the common man, our willingness to grant freedom and recognition to all, to declare race or color of no consequence, and to affirm forever that there are no second-class Americans.

What is called into question is not the granting of equality to those who have come after us, but to those who, for the most part, were here before us.

Many of them came to these shores as slaves—yet they have proved their devotion and willingness in hours of peril to die for this God-loved land.

They have carried on their struggle with determination and with decorum, with resolution and with amazing restraint. It is a miracle that so massive a movement is advancing—at least on their part—in an atmosphere of nonviolence.

The achievement of this peaceful revolution, in the face of almost constant provocation, is proof—if any were needed—that these people merit an equal place in the sun, in the classroom, on the job, at the table and in every area of our national economy.

A wall still stands in Berlin—but now is the time to make sure that no wall of prejudice divides us here.

We will be false to our American ideals if we do not support the struggle to win equal rights for others just as our fathers fought to win them for us.

This must be our solemn purpose, beyond mere lipservice: to be worthy of the precepts of our faith and the principles of democracy—to secure freedom for all—and to preserve this precious freedom against those who are hoping to see it destroyed—and helping us to destroy each other.

These observations have been borne out by the experience of one among us tonight who lived through many dramatic events when race-hate and tyranny swept over an entire continent. He knows that civilization's duty—our highest duty—is the preservation of the dignity of man * * * I refer, of course, to our distinguished guest of honor: His Majesty, King Humbert II, of Savoy.

In these desperate hours—let us determine to be honest with ourselves and our moral obligations.

We have living inspiration in the dedicated life of service to God and man personified by that prince among the guardians of humanity—Francis Cardinal Spellman.

It is he who uttered these moving words:

"In other lands, and, unfortunately, also in our own, violence has often been the companion of change. That is not the right way in America. That is not the American way.

"We must accomplish what has to be done, working together, as one people with a common ideal, working calmly but with determination to make our ideals a reality."

Thus, Cardinal Spellman has shown us, as have other great souls of our time, and of all time, that—if we do not falter in our efforts to find the way together—we can look forward to peace and harmony in the still unwritten pages of our country's history, consecrating—with God in our hearts—our mutual purpose to protect the future of all mankind—safe in the heart of God.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, probably when the results of the presidential election are in next year, we will find that no small part of the vote was influenced by Victor Lasky's "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth." Already at the top of the list of bestsellers, I venture to predict that Mr. Lasky's book will be read by millions of voters before next November.

Because of the book's importance to the national scene, I include as a part of these remarks, the following review written by Ken Thompson for the Dallas Morning News:

A PROFILE IN PRAGMATISM—"J.F.K.: THE MAN AND THE MYTH" BY VICTOR LASKY

(By Ken Thompson)

One of the most skillful political writers and analysts of his time, Victor Lasky has far surpassed his earlier works with his current critical biography of the President. It is an extraordinary book about an extraordinary man—covering the life of John F. Kennedy as it has never been fully revealed before.

From the outset, the reader will find it extremely difficult to put the book down, and will find himself discussing many of its revelations and conclusions for months to come. There are 600 pages of heavily documented material and literally thousands of quotations from every conceivable source. Yet the book reads like a novel.

Arranged in chronological order, the book begins with the story of the Kennedy clan, its rise to prominence in business and politics. The book-within-a-book biography of "Papa Joe" Kennedy is one of the most interesting sections and certainly important as an insight into the factors which have influenced the son.

The President's youth, education, and early development are all covered in detail. His entry into politics, his career in Congress, his major campaigns and, finally, his performance as Chief Executive are carefully scrutinized.

Hundreds of little-known, but fascinating facts are brought together for the first time. How many people, for instance, know that Jack Kennedy made a $1,000 personal campaign contribution to Richard Nixon's senatorial campaign in 1950? How many know that the President's grandfather, "Honey Fitz," was expelled from Congress on the grounds that his election was fraudulent? Or how many know that Joe Kennedy contributed $3,000 to Joe McCarthy's campaign to keep McCarthy from coming into Massachusetts to endorse his son's opponent, Henry Cabot Lodge, in the 1952 Senate campaign? Or that Joe Kennedy made a $500,000 loan with no strings attached to the now-defunct Boston Post shortly before the Post made an extremely unlikely and unexpected endorsement of Kennedy over Lodge in 1952?

These and a myriad of other facts were not discovered by Lasky, but they have been compiled into a single volume for the first time. Most of the book's conclusions, in fact, are not Lasky's either. They are mainly the conclusions of hundreds of other observers—both Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, friends and enemies of the President alike.

If Lasky has any central theme or purpose of his own, it is to demonstrate that, throughout his career, John F. Kennedy has attempted to be all things to all men. Instead of presenting a profile in courage—establishing for himself a record of principle and consistency—Mr. Kennedy has left behind him an image which Lasky might describe as a profile in pragmatism.

John F. Kennedy is and always has been a master politician. Lasky charges that Kennedy has taken a stand on both sides of practically every major issue of his time, and he uses the President's own public statements to prove it. The ease with which Kennedy has been able to reverse himself over and over again as the political winds have shifted is truly amazing. The reversals have been almost as frequent as—and according to Lasky have caused no more trauma than—the routine of changing shirts.

This is a book which every intelligent voter should read. It could become one of the most controversial books of the year. Admirers of the President will not agree with the portrait painted by Lasky, but they will not be able to ignore it and will have difficulty refuting it. J.F.K.'s detractors will find plenty of ammunition in the book to bolster their opposition, and to use against him in the coming campaign. Those rare few who may have formed no definite opinion on the President before reading the book will find it extremely difficult to cast a ballot for Kennedy in 1964.

The Cotton Bill: A $500 Million-Plus Gain for American Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, November 8, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative FINDLEY, charged, in a statement entered into the RECORD of the House that H.R. 6196—the cotton bill—provides multimillion-dollar payments to textile mills. He contended that the bill provides for such payments as subsidies to the mills. I ask the indulgence of the House to set the record straight.

H.R. 6196, now awaiting action in the House, does not subsidize domestic cotton mills. It simply makes American cotton available to our own mills at the same price as American cotton is sold to foreign mills, and thereby removes a Government-imposed cost disadvantage under which our own mills have been agonizing since 1956.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest benefactor under this legislation will be the American consumer. Americans will enjoy lower prices for American-made cotton goods, at savings amounting to more than $500 million a year.

Moreover, the legislation will revitalize the whole cotton industry, in which more than 10 million Americans are associated in the production of cotton on the farms, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

This legislation will protect the livelihood of the millions of people who work with cotton.

Mr. FINDLEY is a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and accurate information is available to him. For some reason unknown to me he has chosen to oppose the cotton bill, and has refused to avail himself of the facts or to attempt to understand the purposes upon which this legislation is proposed.

He apparently has not read the committee report.

Had he listened to the testimony before the committee and had he studied the report it would be evident to him in a way that denies contradiction, that the American consumer of textile goods—not the textile mills—will be the great beneficiary in bringing the cost of raw cotton to American mills down to the price that is paid for American cotton by competing mills in other countries.

For it was shown to our committee that a rise or fall in the cost of cotton is almost invariably and completely accompanied by a rise or fall of the same degree in cotton cost prices. The Department of Commerce established this as a fact in the hearings of our committee.

I am not addressing my remarks today particularly to the farm problem, because we all know that a reduction in consumption of cotton in the United States means contracting acreage allotments and disaster in the cotton growing areas of the country. I am directing my remarks primarily to what it means to consumers and to all of those people in the highly populated areas of the country who are dependent upon the textile industry for their livelihood.

Our price support program has resulted in American cotton being higher priced than foreign grown cotton. To preserve our export markets, the Government since 1956 has made American cotton available to foreign mills at prices far below the domestic price. Currently, cotton is sold for export at $42.50 a bale less than it can be bought by domestic mills. The American mill must pay one-third more for American cotton than its competitor in Hong Kong or in any other foreign land. Since 1939, American mills have been prohibited from buying foreign grown cotton in excess of 30,000 bales a year—less than the amount consumed by U.S. mills in 1 day.

What will H.R. 6196 do to correct this situation? It will make cotton available to American mills at the same price it is made available for export to foreign mills. It is beyond me to see how any fairminded person could possibly object to giving the same treatment to an American industry which we accord to its foreign counterpart. It is absolutely impossible for an American mill to be competitive with foreign-made goods when it is forced by its government to pay one-

third more for its raw material on top of a substantially higher wage scale.

Laws, which the Congress of the United States passed, have created what President Kennedy so aptly has called this unique burden. The President himself has asked for the elimination of the grossly unfair cost disadvantage which has been legislated on this American industry. H.R. 6196 would do away with the cotton cost difference between U.S. and foreign textile producers.

A subsidy to the textile industry. This is utter nonsense. Such a charge is completely irresponsible. Mr. FINDLEY's statements in the RECORD purported to show how much money some of the larger firms would receive.

A private research firm conducted a study of the relationship of the price of cotton to the price of cloth. Its findings are on pages 8, 9, and 10 of the committee report. I urge you to read it all. I especially urge Mr. FINDLEY to read the report. Over a period of 38 years—including war and peace—depression and prosperity—cotton cloth prices have gone up and down with raw cotton prices. Let me read to you just one sentence from the report:

> When consideration is given to the long span covered, the varying political and economic conditions during this time period, the great and minor depressions, the two wars and the two postwar periods, this record verges upon the unbelievable.

Certainly those of us who believe in the private, competitive, free enterprise system will agree that competition among the 5,000 companies which manufacture textiles in the United States will force an immediate and comparable reduction in cotton cloth prices when the price those companies pay for cotton is reduced.

Any person who says the textile industry will be subsidized or receive a windfall under H.R. 6196 either does not know the facts or refuses to accept them.

H.R. 6196 in addition to great benefits to consumers and millions of off-form wage earners will do the following things directly for cotton:

First. On the domestic market it would remedy a price disadvantage which is largely responsible for a competitive loss of 1,700,000 bales in annual rate during the past 3 years—a loss which is now continuing with no end in sight.

Second. It would eliminate the two-price system and thereby remove the main cause of rising cotton textile imports which have reached the equivalent of 693,000 bales in annual rate during the first 7 months of 1963. These imports are delivering our domestic market to foreign cottongrowers and, in addition, they are generating powerful opposition to the export subsidy upon which our whole export market now depends.

Third. It would remove the necessity, otherwise inevitable, of reducing the statutory minimum acreage allotment below 16 million acres, possibly even in the next Congress. This season, even under the optimistic offtake estimates of the Department of Agriculture, the minimum allotment is producing 1.2 million bales more than can be sold, and the carryover will reach 12.4 million bales next August 1.

Fourth. It would protect the income of the farmer.

Fifth. It would remove such imminent risks as the following:

The loss of a great source of foreign exchange;

The creation of new depressed areas all over the Cotton Belt;

The impact of acres diverted from cotton upon the markets of other farmers;

Conversion of more cotton plants to synthetic fibers, and construction of large new rayon plants, by managements which are now waiting to take their cue from the decision of Congress on H.R. 6196.

Address at Parkersburg, W. Va., by Hon. Thomas P. Gill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, the featured speaker at the Fourth Congressional District seminar in Parkersburg, W. Va., was the gentleman from Hawaii, THOMAS P. GILL, and under unanimous consent I include the text of Congressman GILL's excellent, analytical address:

Your good Congressman, KEN HECHLER, may come to regret the wide license he gave me this evening. I have interpreted his instructions broadly, but I hope not vaguely. I am going to try to give you a small report on the progress of Democracy recently in this country—and we will spell it with a big D.

I don't really think I could get away with vague talk in West Virginia. In Hawaii, I know I would be in trouble. In my State, people call vague political bombast a "muumuu speech," meaning, of course, that it covers everything but reveals very little.

Seriously, it is good to talk to Democrats about our party—and to talk as specifically as we can. We know that our party is no better than its workers. Your knowledge, as workers, of State and National issues sets the measure for the party leaders. Your ability to distinguish a fact from a phony has a remarkable effect on the quality of your elected officials.

I would like to reemphasize this point—it is central to what we have to say tonight: A political party that defines the issues, recognizes the problems they raise, and deals squarely with them on the basis of facts is, in my mind, the only kind of political party worth having.

A political party needs "heart," and our party has kept its sense of concern for human values; but a party also needs a "head," and this is not always as easy to maintain. This essential combination of "heart" and "head" is what gives the people of this Nation a feeling of confidence in us as Democrats. We not only want to do what is best for the average man; we also know how to do it.

Let's talk for a moment about the "heart" and the "head" in three areas of great importance to all of us today: the economic progress, the growth of education and training, and the opportunities that must exist for us and our children.

When we talk economics, heads usually begin to bob; it is hard to brighten the dismal science.

Let me approach this by first talking about some current American folklore—some myths to which both parties are prone.

First, some Democratic myths.

As Democrats, we are inclined to worship at the altar of "ever increasing production." It sometimes seems we consider increased production of goods and services as a virtue in itself.

We may be getting lost in a myth. Shouldn't we question both the side effects of production and the real value of the goods produced?

We can agree that our gross national product, now soaring to the $600 billion mark annually, must continue to rise. It should rise at a faster rate if we are to continue to increase the creature comforts of our people.

However, let's watch that we don't just believe in "production for production's sake."

One aspect of our special myth is that production is always good, regardless of side effects. We need more and better roads; but where the roads begin to cover our fertile fields with concrete and tear the hearts out of our cities, we should pause and think. We need more cars and appliances; but do we need them in tremendous profusion—engineered to go out of operating order as well as fashion every few years? Need all those appliances when some money could go to better schools? We need new factories, new jobs, new products; but in the process of building, working, and producing, is it wise to poison our rivers and the air around us? We need the coal in the ground and the trees that grow on it; but in gathering these riches, should we destroy the hills, streams, and fertile countryside?

To some, these are ethical questions. I suggest they are both ethical and practical.

Certainly, it is not right to willfully destroy and waste the bounty that nature has given us. But there are also some very practical reasons. The more we pollute our rivers, the more we must spend for drinking water. The more we destroy our mountains and fields, the more it costs us to support the people who used to live off their bounty. The more we poison our air and mar our cities, the more they repel our children and people from other areas who might want to work and spend their money with us.

Production is good; increasing production is necessary. But some production may be useless; some may destroy far more than it gives. Let's distinguish the fact from the myth.

Another aspect of the myth of production for production's sake is well known to the people of West Virginia. You certainly know that an overall increase in national productivity doesn't necessarily help all of us. We do have what the economists darkly call structural unemployment. The pockets of despair exist in many parts of this country; there are many communities that suffer poverty in the midst of general plenty.

This dark star holds a special place in our economic sky today. Whether we be employers or workers, we cannot either ignore automation, or try to lock arms to prevent it. We may want our children to live and work nearby, but we can't deny the fact of a mobile labor supply. We may think we have learned our trade, but new jobs need new skills which, in turn, demand new training.

While we are still discussing myths, let's look at one with a particular Republican stamp. This is the myth that surrounds the great goddess of the ever balanced Federal budget. As the myth would have it, the handmaidens to this goddess are the twin horrors, deficits and inflation.

This myth is rapidly being built into an issue for the next campaign. Government finance is so complicated that few understand it.

Here the Republican Party has fallen into the tempting trap of baiting ignorance with fear. They would shout black and white

solutions for black and white problems when the real world shows little but gray.

The Republicans tell us that an unbalanced budget is always evil; that the national debt will crush our children; that all this means inflation which will rob our old age. This is poppycock and the brighter of them know it. However, they will try to sell this line and we must know the answers.

The mere fact that we unbalance a Federal budget either by a tax cut, or by careful spending programs, or a combination of both, in order to jolt the private economy into greater productivity, doesn't mean that such a deficit is bad. And it doesn't have to mean inflation. In fact, it may be the sensible way to speed up the economy, increase Government income, and thus prevent an almost permanent deficit.

The fact that the national debt is over $300 billion today is no cause for panic, or for ill-founded anxiety about our grandchildren. Our national debt is not a mortgage which will be foreclosed at a given day unless we pay it back in toto. It is a great mass of different obligations owed by all of us to all of us. Our credit to ourselves, in a real sense, depends on our confidence in our ability to meet the payments as they come due. The key measure of our ability as a nation to carry debt, like that of an individual, is our earning power.

In 1946, our publicly held national debt was about equal to the value of goods and services we produced each year; since then our debt has risen about 12 percent; but our income has risen much more and now our debt equals only about half our annual production.

At this point, let's borrow a leaf from the Republicans and talk Government finance in household terms. Suppose you, individually, in 1946 had debts totaling $5000 and an annual income of $5000; suppose today you have debts of $6000 but your income has risen to $12,000. Are you better off today or in 1946?

In a very crude sense, this is what has happened to our country's debt and income since the Second World War.

So much for myths; what about answers?

If we are to be a responsible party, we must not only distinguish the problems from the folklore, but we must also provide answers. Not the one line, grade school type answers that some would peddle today, but complex, sophisticated answers that meet the needs of a difficult civilization.

What are some of them?

We spoke of the need to conserve our resources and the face of our land. The Kennedy administration, under the direct stewardship of Interior Secretary Udall, has moved strongly to encourage conservation, to develop new recreation areas for our teeming cities, to clean our rivers and skies.

This Democratic administration has not been hypnotized by the myth of production for the sake of production. It has moved against the soft spots in our economy with the ARA, with accelerated public works, with manpower retraining, and with broader education programs. These laws and programs have also served to channel our country's money into more essential types of production, such as the building of community facilities basic to future growth.

As a general stimulus to the economy, the President has taken the rather daring step of proposing a planned deficit, through a substantial tax cut, to stir the roots of the private economy. This is an expression of faith in a free economic system far deeper than any given by the recent Republican administration.

In short, we are saying that new purchasing power, freed by the tax cut, will surge through the marketplace and give us the new jobs and production we need.

However, we should be aware of two counter movements to this administration attempt to move the economy. The congressional opponents of the tax-cut approach have tried to cripple it by cutting deep into spending. There is also the danger that segments of the economy, particularly those areas where prices are capable of being "managed," will try to sop up the new purchasing power with price increases rather than with more production.

Let's move from the economy to the second great area in which we, as Democrats, should show "head" as well as "heart." This is education.

There are few educators in the Nation today who deny the crushing burden that has fallen on our school systems. In some fortunate States, with thriving economies and good tax systems, they come closer to meeting the need. In many States, the educational needs have long since run away from local resources.

The majority of the people of this Nation, and a vast majority of the educators admit the need for Federal aid to education.

As Democrats, our hearts tell us that there can be no greater legacy than the trained minds of our children; and our heads tell us the same thing. Today, a high school diploma is next to useless as job insurance. To have less than a high school education is to court disaster; to have more is to have a fighting chance at a decent future.

This Democratic administration has proposed a number of far-reaching education bills. Strangely enough, this supposedly slow and fumbling Congress may well be recorded as having done more for education than any other in our generation.

The President's education package will not emerge intact, but many of the parts may come out better than submitted. The conference committees are working on a far-reaching, job-oriented vocational education bill, and on an improved measure to aid universities. Aid to medical education, both for students and structures, has passed. An improved library services act waits in the wings. Impact aid and the NDEA will probably be continued this year and improved the next. We have reported out of committee a strong new manpower training act, and it waits its turn.

I am particularly glad to report our progress in education because I know of the deep interest here of your Congressman, Mr. HECHLER, and your Governor, Mr. Barron.

One tough educational problem we will not crack this year is the basic one of Federal aid for primary and secondary schools. The great dispute over support to private and parochial schools has created a legislative impasse. On this issue, we should all ponder.

The third and last area I want to briefly mention is opportunity—not for some but for all.

Opportunity is the gateway to the future. But in our country, opportunity must be for all, not for just some. Our heads tell us that every man or woman is entitled to make the best of his or her native talents and energies. Our heads tell us that to deny opportunity to some creates an economic and social drag on the rest.

Our heads tell us that the basic law of this land holds all men are created equal and that this should apply regardless of the color of our skin. Our hearts should tell us this, too, for it is right, but here our hearts are often silent.

I do not intend to speak at length on civil rights—enough is being said everywhere today. However, I think it is a fact that in this year of 1963, there is no more crucial problem in this country than the brotherhood of man. The leading elements of our party must continue to stay in the front of the drive for equality of opportunity for all Americans.

It will mean little to raise living standards and production when one out of 10 of our people is denied the right to fully participate. It serves us little to improve education, and tax all our people to pay for it, when large numbers of our children cannot share in the benefits only because they were born with different pigment in their skin.

The promise of America is the promise for all. As Democrats, in our heads and in our hearts, we must know this.

There is a place for philosophy in a political party. A party is not just to win elections. A party is to form issues, to teach, and to lead. The political party should be more important than the men and women in it.

It is true that in most areas we need attractive candidates to win elections, but I think it is fair to say that a political party based only on personality cannot survive for long. Men come and go, and they change. The sparkling crusader of yesterday may flounder in the bog of privilege or apathy tomorrow.

I hope, as Democrats, that we will continue to have the "heart" to know the right, and the "head" to make it so. If we believe in the basic reasonableness of man, we can give the voters a clear picture of the problems of our time. Further, we can give them humane and rational answers to those problems. We must say what we can do, and deliver.

As loyal party people, there is no greater service than this; as Americans, today, we cannot do less.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Pride, Comfort, Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wheelock Whitney, one of the leading citizens of my district, recently visited the headquarters of our Strategic Air Command with a group of 30 Minnesota businessmen. After returning to Minnesota from that trip, he wrote an article entitled "Pride, Comfort, Terror" describing the SAC trip and what the things he saw and facts he learned meant to him.

Mr. Whitney is a veteran of World War II, and was a crewman aboard a plane which inspected Hiroshima shortly after the first atomic bomb used against man was exploded there.

He is currently chairman of the board and chief executive officer of J. M. Dain & Co., Inc., a Minneapolis investment firm. In addition, he is now president of the Minnesota Investment Bankers' Association, chairman of the Minnesota Taconite Action Corps, and mayor of Wayzata, Minn. He is also one of the people most responsible for the Minnesota Twins coming to the Twin Cities.

The following article has been published in more than 50 Minnesota newspapers and periodicals, and was described by Col. Donald C. Foster, U.S. Air Force, Director of Information, Strategic Air Command, as "an excellent article of great interest. It is factual and admirably expresses the philosophy of the Strategic Air Command."

The article follows:

PRIDE, COMFORT, TERROR

(By Wheelock Whitney)

Pride, comfort, terror. These are the emotions 30 Minnesota businessmen brought back from a recent inside look at the Strategic Air Command, most powerful military force in the world and America's "big stick" in the event of nuclear war.

We felt the kind of pride in those 280,000 straight-backed professional warriors that comes with hearing a marching band play "The Star-Spangled Banner"; the kind of pride that made Gen. Robert E. Lee say it is fortunate war is so terrible, else men would love it too much.

We felt comfort in the hair trigger readiness of the sleek war machine; the kind of comfort a caveman might feel by a warm fire with a boulder rolled securely in front of his door.

And we felt terror—terror at the knowledge each SAC bomber and missile crew controls more destructive force by itself than that released in all the wars in history including the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the kind of terror a lone mountain climber might feel as he hangs on an icy rope over a yawning crevasse.

PARADOX

It seemed paradoxical at first, that 30 Minnesota executives should be invited to examine the inner workings of SAC headquarters at Omaha, Nebr. Most of us were veterans of World War II or Korea, and had firsthand knowledge of the secrecy which has been a fetish with military organizations since the first rock was thrown by one man at another.

The extent of the information released to our group—locations of missiles, numbers of planes, destructive power—was even more startling until it was explained: "We want the Russians to know."

SAC PHILOSOPHY

Very simply, as SAC Commander in Chief Gen. Thomas S. Power put it, the SAC philosophy is based on two premises: (1) that the United States is overwhelmingly the No. 1 nuclear power in the world, and (2) that this power is worthless as a deterrent to war unless any would-be bully knows just how tough we are.

After a thorough inspection of SAC headquarters, it was abundantly clear to even the most civilian minded of our group, we are plenty tough.

DESTRUCTION

At present the United States, with more than 90 percent of the nuclear destructive power in the free world, has the unquestioned ability to blow the Soviet Union—or any other aggressor nation—almost literally off the face of the earth. Even after absorbing an all-out nuclear surprise attack, the United States could still strike back with explosive power sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union. If this is an awesome and frightening reality to Americans, it is equally so to our enemies.

PRIDE

As our group entered the underground labyrinth which is SAC headquarters, the first twinges of pride began to assail us, and we felt our posture reflexively straighten to match the ramrod stance of the SAC sentries. They are a curious mixture of formal military stiffness and American casualness. They wear berets and carry bone-handled heavy-caliber Colt revolvers slung reverse style on wide leather belts. Their conventional military shirts are worn open at the collar with white silk neckerchiefs and their belts sport a broad silver buckle. The buckles are decorated with a mailed fist grasping the twin symbols of lightning bolt and olive branch, and bespeak a growing tradition built around the motto, "Peace is our profession."

THE MEN IN SAC

From Commander in Chief Power on down, the men of SAC are hardened professionals who know their trade long before they become part of the Air Force. SAC is no training school. The average time in service for the combat crew of SAC is 12 years.

About half the men in combat crews are World War II or Korean veterans with an average of 20 combat missions each. Forty percent hold university degrees and 80 percent have had some college training.

NOT CHEAP

While the salaries of SAC combat crewmen are extremely low by civilian standards, American taxpayers have a tremendous investment in them.

For example, the crew of a B-52, which splits about $40,000 a year six ways, cost more than $3 million to train. An airman second class with a wife and child whose $240 a month is less than the maximum unemployment benefit in some States, costs $69,000 to train.

COMFORT

Despite their low pay, however, the men of SAC are a dedicated group of volunteers who have been accurately described as a "military priesthood." You don't get drafted into SAC.

The combat crews, often in the air for as long as 24 hours without sleep, regularly spend up to 7 days at a stretch on runway alert. This means eating, sleeping, and living next to their planes.

Frequently they are separated from their families for long periods while they serve on "reflex alert" at foreign bases close to the Iron Curtain. Approximately 90 percent of the SAC combat crews are married and have children, contrary to the joke passed among crew members that "If SAC wanted you to have a wife they would have issued you one."

Since 1946 SAC crewmen have compiled a total flying time approaching 2,000 years, keeping a good portion of their planes in the air at all times. To make certain crewmembers don't get bored or lose their razor edge of sharpness with such long hours of flying, a system of group responsibility has been set up so that outstanding performance can earn spot promotions for the whole group. Likewise, a goof by just one member of the team can drop the whole team back in rank.

It is this sort of constant pressure, enforced by "standardization teams" which appear from nowhere to carry out tough unscheduled inspections and drills, that eliminates the ulcer types from SAC crews early in the game.

Much of SAC's 24-hour, 365-day preparedness is the work of Gen. Thomas S. Power, New York born head of SAC since he took over from Gen. Curtis LeMay in 1957. Like his teammates in SAC, Power is an experienced professional who knows his trade and has no neurotic or emotional reservations about it.

Power led the first large-scale firebomb attack against Tokyo and was himself over the target for more than 2 hours. As Deputy Chief of Operations for U.S. Strategic Air Force in the Pacific, he was among the planners of the A-bomb strikes against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He also played a leading role in the Bikini A-bomb tests, and later served as chief of the Air Research and Development Command before returning to SAC as commander in chief.

Like the SAC crew members, Power is constantly on the alert and ready to go to war. He eats, sleeps, and plays golf with a telephone at his elbow, and is literally within seconds of reaching all SAC units throughout the world.

This sort of "instant" communications is almost as important a part of SAC as its weapons, for, as Power himself says, "Without adequate communications all I could command would be my desk, and that's not a very lethal weapon."

TERROR

The Strategic Air Command was created with the avowed purpose of achieving military and political victory anywhere in the world if the United States should be attacked. That this victory would be a hollow one in a war which could have no true

victor is a harsh reality which every man in SAC and in America must face.

At present the U.S. capacity for retaliation includes: approximately 1,300 nuclear bombers plus supporting tankers, 126 nuclear-tipped Atlas missiles, 54 Titan I missiles, 144 of a scheduled 650 submarine-based Polaris missiles, and a good percentage of a scheduled 950 "instant-firing" Minuteman missiles. Most of these more than 1,800 missiles are or soon will be "hardened" in underground concrete silos, or are even more invulnerable as they move about beneath the sea.

Despite its motto, "Peace Is Our Profession," there is no doubt that SAC would unleash this awesome destructive force if the United States is attacked.

SAC was founded on the assumption that supreme military capability is the most potent deterrent to war. It was also founded on the assumption that it will have failed in its mission if that capability is ever used.

Oldest Gold Star Mother Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the Members of the U.S. Congress to an article which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger of Tuesday, November 12, 1963, with regard to Mrs. Mary Connors, who is believed to be Massachusetts' oldest Gold Star Mother. Mrs. Connors is 101 years old and a great-great-grandmother, and she has certainly made her contribution toward making this Nation the great country that it is. President John F. Kennedy sent Mrs. Connors a personal letter of congratulations on the occasion of her 100th birthday from the White House. His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing is a close personal friend of Mrs. Connors.

The article follows:

OLDEST GOLD STAR MOTHER HONORED

QUINCY.—Mrs. Mary Connors, believed to be the State's oldest Gold Star Mother, received a Veterans Day bouquet and visit yesterday from Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Milton, and William Villone, Quincy director of veterans services.

LIVES WITH DAUGHTER

The 101-year-old great-great-grandmother, who lives with her daghter, Mrs. Catherine Sullivan at 19A Pierce Street, North Quincy, lost a son, John, in World War I.

Three of her grandsons fought in World War II.

Mrs. Connors is in good health and spends much of her time listening to the radio or watching television. She especially likes religious programs.

She will celebrate her 102d birthday on December 3.

In addition to raising her own eight children, Mrs. Connors helped to raise seven grandchildren whose mother had died. She has two daughters, Mrs. Sullivan and Mrs. Agnes Cavanaugh of Dorchester.

Mrs. Connors also has 29 grandchildren, 68 great-grandchildren, and 10 great-great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Connors was born in Galway, Ireland, and came to this country more than 80 years ago. She has lived in Quincy for more than 40 years.

Electric Co-ops Without the Crutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the Hoover Commission, commenting about the expansion of the Rural Electrification Administration and its co-ops, stated in a final report:

It is our belief that the time has arrived for the reorganization of the Rural Electrification Administration into a self-supporting institution securing its own finance from private sources in a manner similar to that of other agencies. Moreover, the operations of Rural Electrification should be made subject to the Government Corporation Control Act in order to secure the advantages of more efficient organization under that act.

The REA bureaucracy still fights that recommendation; still borrows millions of dollars from Uncle Sam at a ridiculously favored rate of 2 percent—though Government itself pays 4 percent or more in the open market; still gets nearly half a billion dollars of appropriation each year, though its legal job is at least 98 percent completed.

The foolishness of this continued pampering—and its utter needlessness today—is well demonstrated in the story of a new venture in Ohio, which was told a few days ago in an editorial in the Washington Daily News of November 8, saying:

WITHOUT THE CRUTCH

Congressmen who have been getting increasingly critical of the Rural Electrification Administration's expansion are not likely to overlook the implications of the big powerplant that's being built at Brilliant, Ohio.

There, 30 rural co-ops have formed a super co-op called the Buckeye Power Co. It in turn is joining forces with a subsidiary of the investor-owned American Electric Power Co. to set up a new $125 million generating plant.

Now if the co-ops followed the usual pattern, they would arrange to pay for their share of the project by letting the Government lend them the money at about 2 percent, which is a lot cheaper than money can be borrowed in the capital market. Indeed, it's a cheaper rate than the Government itself has to pay to borrow the money it lends to electric co-ops.

But instead of leaning on a Government subsidy, these Ohio co-ops are planning to raise their share from conventional sources such as insurance firms and other institutional leaders. As seen by the opponents of further rural co-op expansion with Federal aid, this is a highly laudable development, but it is a bit embarrassing for the REA's supporters.

For the latter would like people to believe that rural electric co-ops are too weak and poor to compete with big private companies unless they're protected under the Government's subsidy shelter. All the while, however, the co-ops have been expanding in every direction and competing grimly with private companies for nonfarm customers, suburban and even industrial. In the process a lot of them have considerably increased their net worth.

The Ohio venture makes it abundantly plain that there are plenty of electric co-ops that have long since outgrown any need for the Federal crutch of cutrate loans. And it ought to suggest some interesting questions for Congress to pursue, not only about the REA's expansion but its continued existence.

Losing No Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Camden Chronicle, of Camden, S.C., has published in its November 11, 1963, issue an editorial which is addressed in part to the U.S. Senate. It is concerned with the recent news items from Moscow reporting that the Soviets have been displaying their new antiballistic missile weapon. This timely and important editorial makes the point, Mr. President, that the Soviets have their antiballistic missile developed and produced; whereas, the leaders of our Government are still procrastinating as to how soon we should complete development and whether we should ever undertake production of an antiballistic missile system.

I commend the editor of this outstanding triweekly publication, Mr. William Calk, on presenting this vital question to his readers. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial entitled "Losing No Time" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOSING NO TIME

Now that the U.S. Senate has ignored the warnings of our more courageous military men and ratified the treaty that prohibits us from nuclear testing beyond what can be done in a hole in the ground, Khrushchev has paraded what is claimed to be the antimissile missile that he told American newspapermen last year could "hit a fly in the sky."

The appearance of three of these 50-foot two-stage rockets in the 46th anniversary parade marking the Bolshevik revolution rolled onto the scene before the Lenin (formerly Lenin-Stalin) tomb in Moscow's Red Square to provide a grisly exclamation point to the annual saber rattling of the Soviet Defense Minister, Marshal Rodion Malinovsky. The Marshal had just told the throng in the vast square that their country is "now the most powerful in the world" and is now equipped to deliver a "crushing retaliatory blow" to any aggressor. As a possible hint in comprehending the Russian idea of aggression, Malinovsky made the point that we weren't helping to reduce tension by irritating the Soviet in Cuba.

If the new weapon is what it is claimed to be—and our military men ought to know—it has no counterpart other than our $1.2 billion Nike-Zeus system which experts told the Senate back in September would require testing to reach full development. And it would be dangerous to assume—in view of the belief expressed at that time in a perfected Russian antimissile missile—that the Reds were parading mere mockup of what they hoped to achieve.

The gravest question before the world, then, is how much closer have we moved since the test-ban ratification toward the day when our enemy will be satisfied he can demand our capitulation without serious risk to himself?

The View of One Detroit Mother Viewing Aid to Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, aid to dependent children has received, perhaps, more publicity than almost any other welfare program. Since this program comes from the Committee on Ways and Means, I have been particularly alert to its problems.

For whatever value it may have to others I am pleased to extend in the RECORD an unbiased factual account of one Detroit aid to dependent children mother, written by Jean Sharley of the Detroit Free Press:

"When I tell people I'm on aid to dependent children, I feel dirty, as if I had committed a crime."

Mrs. Carla Gianino, 47, of 14935 East Warren, is one of 13,000 Detroit aid to dependent children (ADC) mothers. Her son, Franke, is 12.

"I take the charity because of him," Mrs. Gianino said. "And I hate it. It's less than a handout. It's a burden on the city, on the taxpayers—and a weight on my heart."

Completing a study among 93 ADC families, Wayne State University Professors Charles N. Lebeaux and David Wineman recently labeled the city's ADC minimums as "absurd, emptybelly shams," with ADC families suffering "social starvation."

"It's true," Mrs. Gianino said. "We exist because we borrow and never pay back. Former neighbors paid my moving bill. The milkman gives us free milk.

"We swallow our pride. But after a time is it too much to have to say 'thank you' so often."

Mrs. Gianino married her Detroiter husband when he returned to Germany after World War II. They came to Detroit in 1951.

"I came with such faith," she said. "I love the people. Even now, I'd rather be miserable here than to go back. But I hurt when the misery touches my son. I do not understand the worth of such help."

Gianino left his family in July 1960. There have been few support payments. When $45 did come in October, Mrs. Gianino's monthly ADC check dropped below $100.

She receives $143 a month less any amounts which she reports to the ADC office.

"I earned $3.60 sewing 1 month and reported it," she said. "They subtracted it from my check. So I stopped sewing."

She spends almost half her ADC check—$70—on a small, clean, white-painted flat over the Democratic headquarters of Congressman HAROLD RYAN.

"I saw places with less rent but they were pigsties," Mrs. Gianino said. "I'm not going to bring my child up over a beer garden.

"I was told I should sell our television set and our few pieces of furniture and live in a furnished apartment.

"This I will not do. If the boy has nothing else, he has to have a home life. He has to have this security. This little furniture, the old things he remembers, are part of it."

The apartment is clean, cheerful, with plants and bright pillows. The kitchen shelves are almost empty of food.

Mrs. Gianino had a $1 bill, two quarters and a dime, her only funds for the next 4 days.

"In the mail today, I received a dental bill for $86 for Frank's teeth," she said. "They told me to take him to the dental school. I have tried that. When the months of waiting for a turn are gone, so are the teeth."

ADC mothers make three choices. They live pitifully with the money they have, depriving their children. They cheat and do not report the money they earn or are given.

Or—as Mrs. Gianino is doing—they get the teeth fixed and beg or borrow the money. Or trust that an understanding dentist, as hers is ,will help and wait.

Mrs. Gianino received medical allowances in her first ADC checks. In 1961, she had major surgery at Detroit Memorial Hospital. She required a special diet.

She weighs 95 pounds, is still under a doctor's care, must take antibiotics.

She owes $279 to the doctor. She has been able to pay him only $16. He, too, is kind.

"I would much rather work," she said. "But what would I do when the boy's school vacation comes? Leave him alone in the city?

"And how much money could I make? Enough to hire someone to care for him? What if I should become sick again?

"I'm stuck. I cling to the monthly money, fearing that I will lose it. If I should find a job, what if I lost it? It takes months to get back on the lists.

"There is no security except in that little check. So I cling."

She talks about the ADC program as "morale sapping."

"Why do they bind you this way?" she asks. "Why don't they give you a security amount for your rent, a realistic amount for food and light and essentials?

"Why don't they allow you to work a little so that you can repay your debts? There is no allowance for betterment in the program. When you are used to a different way of life, you can't take it."

Mrs. Gianino is close to tears talking of her son * * *.

"He asks for a little favor and I have to say no. He is always on the fringe. His friends go here, go there. They have this, they have that. He has nothing.

"He has no rubbers. He wore gym shoes all winter. When friends ask what they can do, I ask them for clothes for him.

"I let him play out as much as possible because it is all I can give him. The biggest thing last winter was skating. Now the skates are too small again. His old bike was stolen. The dream of replacing them is impossible.

"He needs a haircut. How can I buy him a haircut?

"I want him confirmed, but he has no suit.

"In high school, how will I pay for his books? The ADC monthly school-expense allowance for my child is 50 cents."

She divides her remaining $73 a month among food, clothing, light, heat, water, school supplies, medicine.

Frank's piano lessons were stopped and his piano sold when the mother and son lost their home. But his old piano teacher and the old Montclair Avenue neighbors still help.

"They say, 'We'll bring the food and you cook.' At least he has never gone hungry.

"But we have stopped thinking or talking about what might be a pleasure. He is a brave boy and understands when I must deprive him of the things he wants."

"People tell you how to make hamburger stretch. I know how. Who buys the hamburger?

"My caseworker suggested that I go to the Detroit Art Institute for stimulation."

"How," asked Mrs. Gianino, "do I get the 60-cent busfare?"

H.R. 333, a Bill To Amend the Sherman Antitrust Law and Make It Applicable to International Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Hoffa within the last few days has announced that he is starting negotiations on December 1 with the trucking industry for a one-package nationwide contract. He is demanding for the first time one contract with all of the Nation's 16,000 trucking companies which, of course, would end on the same date. Heretofore, regional contracts were written, each separate and with different dates. This kind of a new frontal attack gives Jimmy Hoffa the power to completely tie up the economy of the country within a matter of hours. It gives Jimmy Hoffa the power to put thousands of trucking firms out of business. If management were to conspire to put a competitor out of business, the Government would step in; but if a union does exactly the same thing, nothing is done. Why? Because there are no laws on the books to control the power of the unions.

The International Teamsters magazine of November 1963 predicts that the 16,000 trucking companies in the United States today will shrink to 100 in the next decade. Why? Jimmy Hoffa and his nationwide contract will either force these companies to the wall or to consolidate. He has already brought ruin to many companies throughout the country by his ruthless tactics, and this latest demand will bring the entire industry and the economy of the country within his grasp.

Jimmy Hoffa stated that the proposed contract would cost over $600 million in the next 3 years and that higher rates would be needed in order to pay this amount. Among other things, the contract will require that all operators pay $5 into the Teamster pension fund for each truck trailer piggybacked by the railroads. This is outright featherbedding and, yes, even blackmail. No service is performed for the $5, but yet it is demanded under threat and will be paid under fear. This—in the United States which, under our Constitution, guarantees freedom to each individual.

Mr. Speaker, this master contract will complete a monopoly for Jimmy Hoffa in the trucking industry. Rather than wait until an emergency arises—such as we had in the railroads this year—it is imperative that the Congress now consider legislation in the field of industrywide strikes and come up with some sound work in this field without an emergency hanging over its head. If we

are to enact constructive legislation in this field, now is the time to move forward. Now is the time to consider the consequences of the proposed action by the Teamsters Union.

My bill, H.R. 333, goes to the heart of this problem. It would amend the Sherman antitrust law and make it applicable to international labor unions. It would prohibit industrywide strikes, it would prohibit featherbedding, not only in the transportation industry but in all industry. This is one of the most serious problems which this country faces today. If we are to protect the welfare of our citizens from the greed and lust for power by some of our labor leaders, we must enact legislation in this field. The hour is late and immediate consideration of this grave problem is a must. The American citizen and the rank-and-file union member must be protected.

What Investment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Area Redevelopment Administration continues to show unusually high interest in the resort business of our Nation. The ARA is providing the lion's share of the loans necessary to construct a proposed resort area near Hill City, Minn., which will cost more than $650,000. This, of course, really is not too unusual. But, Mr. Speaker, I do believe it is remarkable that because of the ARA, a State redevelopment loan and a third loan, the owner-developer of this new resort needs only $22,892 to start this business with brand new facilities for skiing, swimming, a stable of riding horses with ponies for children, a golf course and other sports. I am certain all Members will agree that this is a real bargain in such a grand and high-scale enterprise. I am including the story on this new development, as reported in the October 23, 1963, edition of the Minneapolis Star, Minneapolis, Minn.:

ALL-YEAR RESORT TO BE BUILT NEAR HILL CITY

Plans for a 1,100-acre year-round resort area with facilities for skiing, riding, swimming and other sports near Hill City, Minn., 145 miles north of the Twin Cities, were announced today.

Total cost of the project, according to officials of Quadna Mountain Corp., the owner-developer, will be more than $650,000.

Of this, $429,757 will be provided by a Federal Area Redevelopment Administration loan and $132,234 by a State redevelopment loan.

First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Grand Rapids, Minn., will loan $66,117 and the remainder will be invested by principals of Quadna Mountain Corp.

Thomas O'Fallon, Watertown, Minn., former personnel and purchasing director of Magnetic Controls Co., is president of the corporation. Edward C. Wortman, 5536 South Vincent Avenue, Minneapolis, is vice president. He was formerly building manager at Magnetic Controls.

O'Fallon said construction will begin immediately.

CHALET AND LODGE

Plans call for a ski hill with runs more than 2,000 feet long and a vertical drop of 300 feet. Two T-bars will take skiers to the summit. The ski facilities are scheduled for completion by midwinter.

A two-story ski chalet with restaurant will be erected at the foot of Quadna Mountain. A two-story, 48-room lodge with dining area, cocktail lounge and swimming pool is planned on the shores of Hill Lake.

Convention facilities will be able to accommodate groups of up to 150 people.

O'Fallon said skiing conditions will be assured by installation of snowmaking equipment capable of laying a 10-inch cover over all runs in 24 hours.

A nine-hole golf course will be ready for play by the fall of 1964 or spring of 1965. An additional nine holes is to be completed by the following year.

A stable of riding horses with ponies for children is also planned.

O'Fallon said all sports activities will be supervised by qualified instructors. When completed the project is expected to employ more than 40 persons.

A Mere Question of Constitutionality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as the author in the House of an amendment which would have made it possible to have a judicial review of Federal grants-in-aid to church related institutions, I was particularly disappointed when that amendment was defeated on the floor of the House. When the other body undertook to insert a provision for judicial review in the version of a college aid bill that it passed, I was satisfied that its action was correct and should be sustained. Therefore, the action of the Senate-House conferees in striking this section of the bill providing for judicial review of Federal grants to church oriented schools comes as a deeply disappointing action. I am pleased to note that the editorial column of one of this country's most distinguished and independent newspapers, the Christian-Science Monitor, for November 12, 1963, reflects a similar concern at the unwillingness of the proponents of grants of Federal money to denominational schools to submit their case for this kind of aid to the test of judicial review.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the action taken by the conferees on the college aid bill represents a serious breach in the wall of separation between church and state. Where, I wonder, are the voices of those who ought to join us in a chorus of protest against the erosion of this important constitutional principle? I think that the following editorial asks a very searching question that demands a better answer than it has received thus far:

A MERE QUESTION OF CONSTITUTIONALITY

Conferees between the Senate and House of Representatives agreed to omit an important provision from the $1,195 million college aid bill. That section would have permitted court review of the constitutionality of giving large sums of taxpayers' money to private, church-oriented institutions for classroom buildings.

Without such a clause it may be difficult for an individual or organization to show sufficiently direct interest to obtain standing in court. But the House has passed the conference bill and the Senate may do so soon unless a floor fight prevents.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers has reaffirmed its view that Federal funds should be used only for publicly controlled, tax-supported schools. This is a widely held conviction, seemingly as applicable to colleges and universities as to elementary schools. Are the proponents of indiscriminate grants to denominational as well as public institutions afraid that a judicial review would upset their plan?

Senate Probers Scrutinize Korth Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. K. W. (BILL) STINSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate hearings on the TFX contract award will resume soon with possible conflicts of interest a central issue. One of the witnesses expected to be called is former Navy Secretary Fred Korth. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to insert the following article from Aviation Week & Space Technology which provides a summary of the controversial letters Mr. Korth wrote while Navy Secretary.

SENATE PROBERS SCRUTINIZE KORTH LETTERS—OUTGOING NAVY SECRETARY'S CORRESPONDENCE SEARCHED FOR POSSIBLE TFX PARTIALITY AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

(By George C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—Fred Korth's letters to his friends while he was Navy Secretary are being analyzed by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee to determine if they suggest any conflict of interest or partiality in arriving at his recommendation to give General Dynamics the F-111 (TFX) tactical fighter contract.

Korth, who resigned as Navy Secretary effective November 1, will be asked to testify about the letters and his financial dealings with General Dynamics when he was president of the Continental National Bank in Fort Worth. General Dynamics/Fort Worth won the $7 billion F-111 contract over Boeing. The subcommittee hearings are expected to resume late in November with the letters Korth wrote before and after he became Navy Secretary January 4, 1962, a central issue.

On October 19, Korth released many of the letters the subcommittee is analyzing, and said they would put these rumors to rest about his resignation being requested. The Justice Department has said Korth was not guilty of any conflict of interest. A central question is whether Korth's activities violated the standards of conduct President Kennedy issued in 1961. "Even though a technical conflict of interest may not exist," the standards state, "it is desirable to avoid the appearance of such a conflict from a public confidence point of view."

Korth stressed that letters about banking to his friends did not conflict with his official

duties, and that letters concerning procurement proposals were handled on an official basis by the Navy. Following are excerpts from the correspondence that Korth himself released:

Gen. Lauris Norstad, U.S. Air Force, retired, was requested to have a branch of his corporation deal with the Waxahachie (Tex.) Bank & Trust Co. In a "Dear Gus" letter written March 9, 1963, on Navy stationery to G. E. Holmstrom, senior executive vice president of the Continental National Bank, Korth said: "In connection with some correspondence I have had with General Norstad, who is now president of International Division of Owings-Corning Fiberglass (sic) Corp., I understand that the corporation recently announced plans for building a new plant at Waxahachie. I am sure that folks down there are aware of this but if I can be helpful to the bank's friends in connection with General Norstad, let me know."

Holmstrom wrote Korth March 18, 1963, that Continental had contacted Lynn B. Griffith of the Waxahachie Bank & Trust Co., who "advises they have been busy working on this account for some time and that any help you can give them by talking to General Norstad will be greatly appreciated. They have promised us great things if they can get the account," Holmstrom concluded.

General Norstad, in a "Dear Fred" letter to Korth, April 15, 1963, said, "your friend, Lynn B. Griffith, has been very helpful to Owens-Corning Fiberglas in the preliminary studies, site selection and other activities connected with the development of the plant in Waxahachie. This fact and your interest will be major factors in determining the company's banking associations in that area * * *." General Norstad signed the letter, "Sincerely, Larry."

C. F. Scarbrough, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. treasurer, on July 3, 1963, wrote Korth that his firm had selected the Waxahachie Bank & Trust Co. for the depository of the firm's new plant there. "We appreciate your recommending this bank to us," Scarborough wrote. "I told Lynn that his bank had been strongly recommended by a number of his friends, including you."

Holmstrom on July 19, 1963, wrote Korth: "We had impressed upon Lynn Griffith your participation in obtaining the account of this company for his bank, and he has reciprocated by increasing his balance with us but not to the extent we would like to see it. He has an average balance of about $30,000, but of course his main account is in Dallas.

"As a bit of information, practically every individual I have talked to and at every meeting I have attended this week, invariably the big part you are playing in the investigation is brought up and the fine job you are doing in answering the many foolish questions the committee seems to be asking."

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

Guy R. Hudson, a junior official with the Bank of Nevada in Las Vegas, wrote Korth on June 26, 1963: "Pan American Airways will be a prime contractor on space projects in the Las Vegas area. I, along with Mr. A. M. Smith, president of Bank of Nevada, would be grateful for any information or assistance which you could render in helping us to establish their local account with us * * *." On July 3, 1963, Korth wrote William J. McEvoy of Pan American that "I will appreciate your doing what you can consistently do in assisting Mr. Guy R. Hudson in securing the local account." Korth described Hudson in the same letter as "a young friend of mine." Pan American had opened an account with another bank—the First National Bank of Nevada—before the carrier received the letter from Korth.

LING-TEMCO-VOUGHT, INC.

J. E. Standefer, nuclear technology manager of Chance Vought Corp.'s aeronautics and missiles division, asked Holmstrom to help persuade Korth to attend a briefing at the plant March 30, 1963, on the Slam nuclear ramjet missile. When this request was denied, Standefer, on April 10, 1963, wrote Holmstrom asking him if Korth could visit the plant within the next 45 days or if representatives of the firm could visit the Navy Secretary in Washington. On March 29, 1963, Korth wrote Holmstrom that he was "somewhat puzzled" as to why the company went through Holmstrom. In another letter April 15, 1963, Korth reasserted his puzzlement, but said: "I was by Chance Vought about 6 months ago and had a rather complete briefing on the ramjet situation, but I'll be happy to if it would be helpful to you to go by and have them brief me again * * *."

PHIL REGAN'S $50,000 DEPOSIT

Korth, in January 1963, entertained Phil Regan, an actor who runs a human relations firm in Palm Springs, Calif., by taking him and his wife out on the Navy yacht *Sequoia*. At that time, Korth evidently talked to Regan about depositing money with Continental, for this was in the letter Regan wrote to Korth January 21, 1963: "Upon my arrival home the first thing on my agenda is the deposit I promised you. Enclosed you will find a check payable to the Continental National Bank in the amount of $50,000."

Korth evidently felt free to use the *Sequoia* to entertain bankers. On August 13, 1962, he wrote Holmstrom that it would be "nice" to entertain his friends from Continental on the yacht, and also the bank's "extra good customers."

NEIMAN-MARCUS ACCOUNT

Leon Jordan, vice president and comptroller of Continental, wrote Korth on September 14, 1962: "I note on today's new account list that you have secured a $25,000 account from Neiman-Marcus for us and only a few days ago another $25,000 savings account the name of which I don't recall at the moment but suffice it to say that this is probably more business than the people who are primarily responsible for new business have gotten in the past 2 or 3 months * * *." On September 15, 1962, Korth wrote Stanley Marcus: "I am of course appreciate [sic] of your favoring my former connections."

INSIDE INFORMATION

Kenneth M. Fleet, assistant vice president of Continental, March 19, 1962, asked Korth for "firsthand information" about the Navy's intention to purchase Laguna Shore, a Wherry housing project in Corpus Christi, Tex. On March 21, 1962, Korth replied: "I have advised JIM WRIGHT that the Navy proposes to purchase this project and has recommended such purpose [sic] to the Department of Defense. A decision by the Department of Defense has not yet been passed on to me." Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr., Democrat, represents the Fort Worth area.

OPPOSITION TO NEW BANKS

Fred Holland, president of the Merchants and Planters National Bank of Sherman, Tex., wrote Korth on November 7, 1962, that a group was trying to get a national charter for a rival bank nearby in Grayson County. "We must have assistance from friends like you if we are to effectively oppose this application," Holland wrote. "I have assured Gus that if we are successful in our efforts that we shall certainly make it worthwhile to his bank." Korth responded November 9, 1962, that "I shall do everything I can consistently to assist you in blocking what I consider an improper application. I will discuss this matter with the proper people."

John Q. McAdams, president of the Winters State Bank in Winters, Tex., June 29, 1963, wrote Korth: "Want to thank you as sincerely as I know for the assistance you gave in defeating an application for a national bank in our town * * *. If the opportunity is ever presented for me to show my appreciation for this favor, it shall be my intention to try with determination * * *." Earlier, on April 29, 1963, Holmstrom notified Korth that McAdams "has increased his account with us substantially, and I am convinced now that if the application for the national charter at Winters could be declined, we would probably get all of his business. Thought you might be interested in having this information."

BANK UNCERTAIN ABOUT KORTH'S RETURN

WASHINGTON.—Spokesman for the Continental National Bank of Fort Worth said there is no commitment on either side for Fred Korth to return to his job there when he leaves the post of Navy Secretary November 1. Korth was president of the bank until becoming Navy Secretary January 4, 1962.

After acknowledging to Aviation Week & Space Technology that Korth in the past had said he would return to Continental, the spokesman said: "There has been no recent comment from Mr. Korth that he plans to return." If Korth does want to return to the bank, the spokesman said, the request will have to approved by the Continental board of directors.

Favors Korth did for Continental while he was Navy Secretary are being cited by many Kennedy administration officials as the real reason behind his resignation. Korth has denied this. But administration officials are refusing to confirm or deny publicly the reports that Korth was asked to resign because of the letters he wrote.

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, is demanding an official explanation for the resignation. Korth's Navy friends have been distressed about the refusal of the administration to corroborate his explanation.

Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee also plans to ask Korth about some of the letters he wrote before he became Navy Secretary, to show his close ties with General Dynamics, winner of the $7 billion F-111 (TFX) contract. One such letter was written by Korth January 11, 1960, to Lambert J. Gross, financial president of General Dynamics. After thanking Gross for doubling General Dynamic's deposit in Continental, Korth said: "I will, of course, continue my best efforts for the Convair-Fort Worth plant and am planning to be in Washington this weekend to talk with some of the Members of Congress in the hope of being helpful to the B-58 program."

Double Standard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Observer of Greenville, S.C., is noted for its outstanding and outspoken editorial comments. I have been impressed with an editorial printed in the Observer dated November 7, 1963, and entitled "Double Standard." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBLE STANDARD

The Kennedy administration's plan for prompt recognition of the new government

in South Vietnam is fresh evidence of its double standard.

Only a few weeks ago, military revolts also overthrew the constitutional governments of Honduras and the Dominican Republic. Leaders of the respective coups were anti-Communist military officers. They said they were acting to prevent weak civilian rulers from permitting fresh Communist footholds in the Western Hemisphere.

The U.S. State Department refused to recognize the new Latin American regimes. U.S. aid has been cut off.

The public may well ask: Why is instant recognition given Vietnam generals and not Dominican and Honduran generals? Could it be that the Kennedy administration believes or hopes that the new regime in Saigon will be leftwing whereas the Latins are known to be rightwing?

Much more needs to be learned about the overthrow of the Diem government and the character of its successors. It may be that they are stanchly anti-Communist and will vigorously prosecute the war against the Reds. But the new regime had a bad beginning when it broadcast word that President Diem and his brother had committed suicide.

The dead men were Roman Catholics. It was unreasonable to suppose that they would depart from their faith and choose self-destruction. Now it is known that they were killed by rebels. Resort to a lie was an inauspicious beginning for the new regime.

The Kennedy administration may disclaim responsibility for the coup, or for the killing of President Diem and his brother. But it has been repeatedly pressing Vietnamese opposition elements to overthrow the legal government. This pressure must be contrasted with the Kennedy administration's intense opposition to anti-Castro exiles and its absolute ban on refugee attacks against Red Cuba.

Another curious aspect of South Vietnam is the ouster of a government led by Christians. Will not Christianity now lose face in the Orient?

We strongly suspect that emergence of a new Buddhist government will prove to be a major setback for Christian missionary effort in southeast Asia. The determination of the Kennedy administration to supplant Christians with Buddhist rulers is all the more strange in light of its refusal to help Christians persecuted in Cuba by an atheistic government.

Perhaps all will work out for the best in South Vietnam, so that the free world may not suffer another reverse. But application of the double standard and abandonment of Christian anti-Communists in southeast Asia suggest that the Saigon revolt may turn out as badly as the invasion of Cuba, which the Kennedy administration botched at the Bay of Pigs.

Amending the Peace Corps Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9009) to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, lest there be any possible misunderstanding of my own position, I feel that this is a deservedly popular program. It deserves our continued support. For that reason I rise in opposition both to the Gross amendment and to the Thomson amendment.

The Gross amendment, I think, would be particularly undesirable. It would imply not only that we disapprove of what we have been doing, but that we feel the existing level of volunteer effort should be cut back.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think a program that has proven as valuable as this one to our own country, and to the countries where we provide our help should be cut back.

Mr. Chairman, a more serious question is the Thomson amendment, which I believe also should be opposed. This amendment would provide money sufficient to maintain only 9,000 volunteers, instead of an amount sufficient to support 11,300 volunteers. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is a real possibility that we can find as many as 11,300 well-qualified volunteers. I think a cut of over 20 percent from the amount requested would be undesirable. It would be an indication that we have our doubts regarding the selectivity which will be used hereafter, even though we must generally concede that a good job has been done up to this point.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I think we should oppose any cut in the authorization. We should positively oppose both amendments.

Jacksonville (Ill.) Jaycees Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has achieved worldwide recognition for its many examples of public service. One of the most significant of its new projects was inaugurated by the Jacksonville (Ill.) chapter of the Jaycees on Memorial Day, 1961.

On that day the organization, under the leadership of its president, Bill Carl, established a highway safety service on Highways 36 and 54 in Jacksonville which received nationwide recognition. The group established a rest stop for the convenience and safety of motorists on that day of busy traffic. Motorists were invited to park for a few minutes, have the windshields of their cars cleaned off, receive free refreshments in the shade, travel information, and a packet of literature and other items to make their journey more pleasant.

This event was highly successful and so widely praised by motorists that it received nationwide publicity. Since then the Jacksonville Jaycees have continued the rest stop each as a feature of the July Fourth and Labor Day holidays.

The new president of the group is Keith Schuman, and on Tuesday, November 26, the chapter will receive a special award from Illinois Secretary of State Charles F. Carpentier, himself nationally known for his effective work in promoting highway safety.

To me it seems a significant occasion on which to recognize the initiative and constructive good work of the Jaycees.

CAB's Information Policy on Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board bears important and difficult responsibilities for the regulation, development, and safety of aviation. Its role in investigating aviation accidents is a particularly critical one, because of the loss of human lives and because of the many and varied interests concerned with these unfortunate developments.

The need and demand for early information about aviation accidents has traditionally presented vexing and difficult problems for the CAB; as a result, the Board has recently formulated a set of guidelines for making information on crash investigations available to all interested parties, including the general public.

Mr. Jack Yohe, Chief of the Office of Information of the Civil Aeronautics Board, discussed these procedures in a recent address before the aviation and space writers at the Oversea Press Club in New York City. Because of the wide interest in this problem, I include Mr. Yohe's address with my remarks:

ADDRESS BY JACK YOHE, CHIEF OF PUBLIC INFORMATION, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE AVIATION AND SPACE WRITERS, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1963, AT OVERSEA PRESS CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, ON CAB PRESS PROCEDURES

It is a pleasure for me to be here at this meeting of Aviation Writers and have the privilege of talking to you who have a truly important role and responsibility in a dynamic industry.

You influence and mold the thinking of many. So therefore you are in position to do much for this dynamic industry.

What can you do to help?

There is only one way and that is by reporting what is happening in this industry—the good and the bad—accurately. As the news source of the Civil Aeronautics Board I must share this same responsibility.

First I think it is important to tell you that I too was a working newspaperman, covering all desks for almost 20 years on a Pennsylvania daily and later a Washington daily prior to becoming a congressional aid.

I strongly share your views that the public has a right to know what is going on in a Government agency.

I could never defend or uphold any form of suppression of information which the press, the public, and the Congress have a right to, and should be given in the interest of good government.

We who are on the public payroll should be accountable to the public for what we do—and they can only know what we're doing through the press.

The great bulk of aviation news is highly technical engineering detail replete with complicated mathematical formulas, or eco-

nomic analysis weighing complex equities and objectives and all the elements of public interest.

Obviously the bulk of aviation is outside the experience of the average person. That is psychologically why aviation accidents hit the headlines.

The majority of economic decisions don't, unless the CAB's press office translates the technical and legal Board opinions into what I hope is plain English.

Of all aviation news that comes from the Civil Aeronautics Board, accidents strike the public most dramatically.

People can understand accidents.

Whenever an accident happens, most good working newspapermen try to get out the first news flash first.

They also try to get a human interest angle, and so obviously they talk to people.

These are newspapermen doing their job.

Unfortunately most aviation accidents are not so simple that most observers can tell immediately what happened.

In the good old days of simple aircraft and less congested airways, you would get such simple causes as a wing spar failing and the wing coming off.

Or possibly an engine caught fire and destroyed the plane.

Now there are all kinds of probable causes. Maybe it is a seal on a booster pump that operates the auxiliary gadget that starts a chain reaction with more complex equipment toward the probable cause of the crash.

This produces what at the moment appears to be a conflict of viewpoint between the aviation reporter who wants a story immediately and the CAB press office personnel, who want to prevent misleading information, or information that may be false or immature, from being widely distributed.

So when this happens, don't think we are trying to be bureaucratic. We are just trying to make sure that the real facts come out.

At the time of the crash, we usually don't have the facts, because sometimes it takes months to find them.

As soon as there is an airline crash there is born a need for a rapid flow of information.

The airline involved is faced with many diverse problems. What does it tell the customers?

How does it respond to public opinion concerning both the carrier and the aircraft type involved?

There also is concern as to whether there are any peculiar circumstances which would indicate a need for voluntary or involuntary grounding of the aircraft or other emergency measures.

The aircraft maufacturers also are interested in early details for essentially the same reason.

The public's first knowledge that an aircraft accident has occurred is usually when he picks up the daily newspaper or has his radio or TV program interrupted with a spot news announcement of the tragedy.

As a potential passenger, he has somewhat more than an academic interest in this news.

He may wonder if he should cancel his airline transportation plans and travel by some other means.

If he still intends to travel by air, he wonders if he should secure reservations with another carrier or at least travel on a different kind of aircraft until the cause of the accident is determined. So his voice is added to those in the industry who are in search of immediate information.

If the accident occurs within the city limits or appears to involve the local airport or any of the facilities associated with it, the municipal officials are directly concerned with early information since they in turn are being asked a lot of questions.

Many times the firefighting department and local county, city or State police agencies are needed to assist in preservation and recovery of the wreckage.

The people thus involved also have a need for early information.

In order to maintain friendly community relations the city, county and State officials must be provided with as much factual information as possible—as early as possible—to allow them to answer questions directed to them by people in their sphere of influence.

While the dissemination of information in these circumstances is at best a difficult job, it is compounded by desires of the various news media to provide their patrons with news while it is still news, and each has a particular problem in satisfactorily meeting its various deadlines.

When all the "need-to-know" and "desire-to-know" requirements meet, the problems incident to demands for information reach staggering proportions.

The steady stream of TV and other cameramen, photographers, newspaper reporters and others can create an almost constant demand upon the CAB investigators' time for interviews, personal appearances and photographs.

Other problems also are sometimes encountered in the zeal for early information.

For example, in the Electra accident at Tell City, Ind., photographers were constantly at the edge of the crash crater to photograph the recovery operations.

In the process they were often in the way of the power shovel being used and the operator feared that one of them would be knocked into the crater. He refused to continue excavation unless persons not directly involved in the recovery activities were removed from the immediate area of the operations.

The investigator in this instance solved the problem quickly. He had a caterpillar tractor mound up a platform of earth from which the newsmen could watch without interfering with the investigation.

By multiplying this kind of illustration you can see what we're up against in the early release of accurate information on all the facts of the accident. While it is the Board's desire to provide factual information as rapidly as possible, the task of satisfying all concerned is at best difficult.

A considerable part of the problem is that information obtained in the early stages of an investigation requires careful and scientific confirmation, correlation and evaluation before it can be used in cause determination.

For example, such an apparently simple task as determining the exact time of the accident, in order to provide a precise way of determining the flight path, may require days of investigation.

The Civil Aeronautics Board cannot give out information which may be inaccurate or unsubstantiated.

It may lend weight to premature speculation in the news, and inject controversy into the investigation outside of the realm of objective factfinding.

Speculation by an investigator as to cause, without adequate substantiation, can result in irreparable damage to the professional standards and economic position of individuals, organizations, and products.

In the process of factfinding we have learned many lessons which have demonstrated the wisdom of our policies regarding premature disclosure of information.

Deviation from these practices would automatically reduce public confidence in the CAB—the only Federal agency charged by law with the determination of the probable cause of aircraft accidents.

There is a somewhat different, yet closely allied problem in the release of information, and that is, the wrong interpretation by people not knowledgeable in aviation matters.

By way of illustration, the Board issued a press release in connection with the accident involving a Vertol 107 Helicopter at New York International Airport on October 14, 1963, which noted that a quill shaft had failed due to fatigue.

Following this release by the Board various newspapers and other news media reported this information as the cause of the accident.

No mention was made of the continuing investigation to determine the cause of the metal fatigue which in the final analysis was the real cause of this accident.

Unfortunately, the public has now been led to believe that the Board already determined the probable cause of the accident when in reality there are probably months of painstaking investigation activity required before the true probable cause is disclosed.

Associated with this problem also is the failure of the news agencies to follow up the release of preliminary information—because the accident is no longer news—with the amplifying or additional information subsequently uncovered.

This paints an entirely inadequate if not erroneous picture in the public mind.

Again by way of illustration, in the accident involving Eastern Airlines Flight 512 on November 30, 1962, here at New York International Airport, information relating to the apparent inoperative condition of certain facilities such as the ILS middle marker compass location and the precision approach radar was released immediately.

This was presented to the public in a manner implying that the failure of these facilities was associated with the cause of the accident.

Continuing investigation, however, revealed that all of the necessary aids were in operation and that the radar was not a primary reqirement, but only a back-up for the type of instrument approach being made.

Again, unfortunately this subsequent information was not conveyed to the general public in the same manner as the original information and a misconception will be forever present in the minds of many persons who have only a part of the story.

Many may keep suspecting that the ground support is unreliable.

As a result of these many problems brought on by the demand for release of information, the Board has established a procedure. This procedure will on the one hand provide all interested parties with appropriate information, with the least possible delay, and on the other hand concurrently conserve the time of the various skilled investigators who are directly involved in finding the facts.

This procedure provides in essence for the release of appropriate information and establishes the official channels through which it can be secured as follows:

1. Information of a purely factual nature only will be released as it is obtained. No information will be released concerning doubtful situations until the doubt or ambiguity has been resolved.

2. Tape recordings of air traffic control communications will be transcribed and made available as soon as possible.

There are, however, certain problems inherent in producing copies of the communications tapes and the associated transcriptions.

Certain safeguards must be observed, and some mechanical problems overcome before this information may be made available. Specifically there is the age-old problem of misinterpretation of the spoken word which must be guarded against.

In order to prepare a transcription, the original tape must be played back and recordings made for the FAA and CAB.

Once these two records are made, the original tape is impounded by the CAB and

not again played back unless absolutely necessary in the conduct of the investigation.

The tape is then played back and a laborious process begins of copying and evaluating the source and content of each transmission on this recording.

In order to complete a rough draft of a 15-minute period of communications it is often necessary to spend 4 or more hours checking and rechecking this tape.

Then and only then can this document be prepared for free use by investigators for dissemination to the public.

There may be a large number of tapes which must be handled in this manner, thus multiplying the time involved.

We have found many times in the past, where this process has been short-cut, it has been necessary to issue a number of corrections to the transcription.

Naturally, if the rough data had been released to the world, the corrections would not be properly disseminated.

We have found also that these tapes upon occasion contain messages entirely extraneous to the case under investigation, such as signals induced by electronic maintenance technicians on the frequencies being recorded. These must be evaluated prior to the unrestricted release of these tapes.

Where it is not possible to resolve the identity of a voice or clearly understand a word or words on a recording by aural means, we count on the services of technical laboratories to perform sonographic analysis of the sounds in order to determine their source and meaning.

As you can well understand this also takes time and it would be unfair to all personnel concerned to release this unevaluated raw data too soon.

The actual release of the tape for playback incidentally is a function of the FAA, and our approval is based solely on our needs as investigators.

3. Release of the foregoing information at the scene and the arrangements for interviews, photography, or personal appearances of CAB personnel will be only through the CAB investigator in charge and the CAB public information officer assigned to the accident investigation. These are the only persons on scene who will have all of the available information and who can speak officially on matters concerning the conduct of the investigation and the facts found.

4. When conclusive information is available it may be released at the accident locale by the public information officer, either directly to the news service or by means of a press conference.

Many of you may recall that this was done in the case of the accident involving bird strikes on a United Air Lines Viscount near Ellicott City, Md., on November 23, 1962, and in the instance of the bomb destruction of the Continental Air Lines Boeing 707 near Unionville, Mo., on May 22, 1962.

In other instances the information may be issued by means of an official Board press release as was the case in the accident involving the New York Airways Vertol 107 helicopter at New York International Airport about 3 weeks ago (October 14, 1963).

There will always be problems with the Board providing early factual information. However, we believe the procedure that we have established and which I have briefly outlined for you, will reduce the difficulties. Our provisions of on-scene information, and the early press releases of the Board, should provide the widest distribution of knowledge gained in an accident investigation as rapidly as it becomes available and verified.

In conclusion, I hope that you who are working newsmen can get out the news quickly and accurately. At the same time, we who represent the Government Agency responsible for the investigation of accidents have a serious task in being accurate, fair, and objective to the traveling public and to all who are involved in air transport. And so, let us all try to keep in mind the other fellow's viewpoint as we each go about our daily job.

The "Bear of Oakland"—A Gallant Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, when the barkentine *Bear of Oakland* sank beneath the waves of the North Atlantic, while she was being towed to port, Rear Adm. Richard Blackburn Black, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, composed a poem to that gallant ship, which, for so many years, served in the Alaskan Bering Sea patrol.

While I hesitate to insert verse in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe that this poem is of sufficient merit, in saluting the memory of a great ship, to warrant its inclusion, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BARKENTINE BEAR"

(By Richard Blackburn Black, rear admiral, U.S. Navy Reserve (retired) Advanced Planning Division, Office of Naval Research)

If wooden ships have hearts of oak,
And I believe they do,
I know of one whose stout heart broke!
I'll tell the tale to you:

The *Bear*, an ancient barkentine
Whose years topped eighty-nine
Was limping southward, old and green,
Upon a tow-tug's line.

Her destination? "Shame!", she cried,
I'm going to be a pub,
A rest'rant!-(Chicken? Stewed or fried?)
A gin-mill! There's the rub!"

She lay back on the cable then
And dreamed of all her past—
Of gales and ice and shouting men,
Taut canvas in the blast,

The shriek of wind, the sting of sleet,
The green seas sweeping back,
The clinging seamen with their feet
Braced on the foot-rope track,

With bellies pressed against the yard,
Chilled fingers clutching sail,
And elbow movement slowed and hard
By wind on raincoat's tail.

She thought of evenings still and bright,
Locked in Antarctic pack—
Ice-blink ahead, and blue-black night
Behind her in her track,

When Byrd and English paced her deck
With anxious eyes ahead,
While Ben Johansen said, "By heck,
Ve'll push trou or ve're dead!"

Then Cruzen—(now it's forty-one)—
Fought through to Biscoe Isles
To free the men on Stonington.
One hundred forty miles

Of ice-locked sea *Bear* could not break,
So in a patched up plane
The East Base men—a chance to take—
All reached the ship again.

Her thoughts then flew back sixty years
To Bering Sea Patrol,
Her fights with poachers, British jeers,
And heavy whale-ship toll,

Her years of aid to Barrow town
And starving Aléuts,
And murderers at her yard-arm
A-hanging in their boots.

Now, back to present, and the gale
Off Nova Scotia's shore:
The seas run high, the tug men pale,
"Old *Bear* can't take much more!"

Old ships have souls, some sailors say,
And some have died of shame,
I'll not contend this, either way,
And I will place no blame.

But tell you just what seamen saw
Aboard that towing ship;
The *Bear* heaved back, began to yaw,
Her bow commenced to dip.

Then with a muffled, mighty sigh
Her seams all opened wide,
And with her colors gaff-tip high
She plunged beneath the tide!

"West Over Sea," the Vikings said,
When funeral was planned,
With chieftain lying midships, dead,
Full armored, sword in hand.

I'll always feel, as some will voice
Who worked that ship with me,
That she went down by her own choice—
The *Bear*—West Over Sea!

Dr. von Braun Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the well-expressed editorial about an outstanding American citizen, Dr. Wernher von Braun, which appeared in the November 11 edition of the Huntsville (Ala.) Times.

The editorial refers to Dr. von Braun's appearance before the House Space Subcommittee, in which he emphasized that America cannot afford a second-rate, stop-and-go science program.

I need not stress to my colleagues the authority with which Dr. von Braun speaks, for all of you know him as a learned expert on the subject of man's probe into the mysteries of outer space. We in Alabama are proud of Wernher von Braun, who now is Director of the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville. And I commend this editorial from this fine Alabama newspaper to the careful study and attention of the Members of Congress:

DR. VON BRAUN SPEAKS OUT

This Nation simply cannot afford a stop-and-go approach to financing science. And Congress must recognize that.

In our own minor voice, we have been saying it for months. Now somebody has said it, out loud and firmly, to a House space subcommittee. And the Times is pleased that the scientist who has done so is none other than Dr. Wernher von Braun, the director of Huntsville's own Marshall Space Flight Center.

Dr. von Braun was not a lone voice at the recent subcommittee hearing. Other top scientists present also expressed concern that many people believe that billions of dollars are being spent on theoretical studies. This isn't entirely true, they said. Of about $100 billion spent in the past 10 years on research and development only $9 billion went into basic research, which forms the basis for advances in science and technology.

Most of the billions being appropriated go into development, mainly engineering programs which become more costly with each step in the program.

The scientists participating in a roundtable discussion with the House subcommittee said basic research may suffer as a result of indiscriminate budget cutting.

The House, for instance, wants to cut almost in half the National Science Foundation's 1964 budget. Yet basic research, said Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, former science adviser to President Eisenhower, "is an investment in our future—very much like a family setting aside some of its earnings for a prosperous future."

Furthermore, as the scientists said, it's almost impossible to get a limit on the amount of basic research that can be done. As they cautioned, basic research can be overdone, and its growth must be balanced against availability of skilled manpower. But as the scientists agreed and explained, without sufficient basic research this country can degenerate into a second-class power.

"What weapons systems we'll need 10 to 15 years from now, no one can say today," said one scientist. "But we need people to cope with new problems as they arise."

Dr. von Braun said the United States is "ahead of the rest of the world in most areas of science and technology, and can stay ahead." But we can't afford a now-and-then approach to financing science, he emphasized.

Von Braun fortunately, chose to add that Congress should not get too involved in tracking down possible duplication in research, since "no self-respecting scientist would knowingly duplicate the experience of another sometimes duplicate approaches may be desirable. "But I agree that better communications channels are needed between researchers." He suggested increased use of electronic computers to keep track of new findings and old data.

"Scientists are no magicians," he said. "They have no crystal ball and they shouldn't be expected to predict results of their research any more than Congressmen can predict the course of history."

This get-together of scientists and the House subcommittee occurred a few days before the Saturday night release of a report by the Center of Strategic Studies at Georgetown University. We wonder how some subcommittee members felt (and if they recalled the von Braun statements) when they mulled over the Georgetown report.

Russian scientists, that report suggested, probably are seeking a breakthrough in the field of "antimatter." It would take a particularly obtuse Congressman to pretend that antimatter doesn't matter. For even Congressmen must occasionally ponder (at least around election time) what annihilation implies.

Tribute to Congressman Tom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, November 9–10, 1963:

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN TOM

Although the 1,300 persons gathered Thursday night to honor Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS included virtually all Republican leaders of the area, it was not a mere political soiree. It was a sincere public testimonial to TOM CURTIS, veteran, hardworking Representative, probably the most distinguished Congressman Missouri has produced.

Mr. CURTIS is highly respected among confreres of both parties. He is a tenacious advocate, a tough opponent in debate. Congressman CURTIS comes to every problem steeped in facts; he does his homework thoroughly. Probably no Member of the House GOP is more often quoted by newspapers, magazines, columnists unless it is Minority Leader HALLECK.

Congressman CURTIS is a leader of the party on Capitol Hill, a most wholesome influence in major legislation. His thinking and a homespun voice, which belies his background, dig beneath the surface of controversial bills to the core issues. He can bore through propaganda. Whether his fellow legislators agree with him or not, none ever questions his integrity.

Mr. CURTIS has been a pillar of sanity in national affairs, a fine public servant for Missouri. The Globe-Democrat adds its tribute to the merited honor paid by fellow citizens to Congressman TOM.

Indianapolis' Halloween Night Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation will not soon forget the horror with which it received the news of the ghastly disaster in Indianapolis this Halloween past. The impact of the explosion which rocked the coliseum, stunned the entire population, and the grim details of death and injury that followed shocked and horrified the people.

Mr. Speaker, nothing that we can say can relieve the suffering of those who were touched by this tragedy, but it is well for us to note that the nightmare had its uplifting aspect, namely, the immediate and spontaneous response of men and women who could, and did, provide the help needed so desperately by the injured and the families of the dead. The courage and compassion exhibited by these volunteers through their prompt arrival on the scene and the quick and efficient dispensation of their services deserves our admiration and our thanks. These men and women are heroes, many of whom will never be known by name, and others who already have been singled out for recognition. Such were the funeral directors of the Indianapolis area, who responded instantly to the news of the disaster without waiting for an official call for help. The part these men played in the aftermath of the explosion should be noted and is the subject of the following article by Joe Jarvis of the Indianapolis News:

THE INDIANAPOLIS STORY—THE HALLOWEEN NIGHT DISASTER

(By Joe Jarvis)

When a violent gas explosion shattered a packed grandstand during the finale of an ice show at Indianapolis, Ind., Thursday night (Oct. 31), funeral directors up to 60 miles away reported to the disaster scene with ambulances and station wagons so quickly that they have been singled out for special recognition.

"They undoubtedly saved many lives," according to Virgil Sheppard, longtime director of the Indianapolis chapter of the American Red Cross. "It was the fastest job of removing injured persons in an emergency that I have ever seen."

One of the remarkable aspects of this response by the funeral directors is the fact none waited for an official call for assistance but raced to the explosion scene just north of the center of the city as soon as they received word of the disaster.

For most of the funeral directors, word came from radio and television stations moments after the disaster occurred.

And disaster it was—worse in the city's history and equal to the 1918 train crash in northwestern Indiana which, until now, had ranked as the State's greatest tragedy.

In a matter of seconds, 54 persons were dead and 385 others injured—more than 100 of whom were in critical condition. As the hours passed, the death toll rose slowly to 68 by Sunday morning.

All rescue efforts were concentrated at once on locating and removing the injured. Of utmost importance was the means of transporting these injured immediately to the various hospitals in the city.

Because of the fast response by the funeral directors, by the time the first injured were ready to be sent to hospitals, ambulances and station wagons were available.

To be sure, there was other transport that night, including five ambulances operated by the county-owned Marion County General Hospital, privately owned vehicles and a couple of buses. However, most of the privately owned vehicles did not arrive at the explosion scene until about 30 minutes after the blast while the funeral directors for the most part took less than 10 minutes to get there.

Because of the prompt start, removal of the 385 injured persons, practically all spectators at the ice show, was completed in less than an hour—outstanding testimony to the precision of the rescue effort.

The Indianapolis Red Cross director had more to say:

"Our experience in disasters shows that it is impossible to send out calls for assistance and obtain so quickly the strength of the turnout at the Thursday night explosion. Obviously, by not waiting for calls, the funeral directors saved many precious minutes. They did a marvelous job of getting the injured to hospitals."

Other praise for the funeral directors came from Charles R. Broderick, civil defense director for Indianapolis and Marion County.

"They deserve tremendous credit for their quick response—without even waiting to be called—because they made it possible for the injured to get hospital attention in record time," Broderick stated. "When I arrived at the scene about 25 minutes behind the explosion, a majority of the injured already had been removed. Private ambulances and station wagons operated by the funeral directors were lined up for their second or third loads."

Ambulance service wasn't the only thing provided by funeral directors that horrible night. After it was determined all of the injured had been evacuated, the grisly task of identifying bodies began.

A number of funeral directors and their employees helped by doing what ever was necessary. For a while, a number of dazed friends and kin of those injured or killed

wandered about the explosion scene. Funeral directors and a number of ministers helped comfort the survivors and helped make arrangements for them to stay in the city overnight in cases where this was indicated.

Those with embalming experience (several funeral directors brought their entire staffs with them) helped police and the coroner examine bodies, some of which were burned and mutilated, for evidence of surgical scars, deformities, birth marks or anything that might provide clues to identities of the dead.

The bodies were laid out in two rows on small platforms on the northside of the big ice arena inside the Coliseum, largest structure on the Indiana State fairgrounds on the city's northside. Moments before the explosion, the 125 skaters in the cast of the "Holiday on Ice" revue were preparing to start the finale of the opening night performance of the show.

Precisely at 11:06 two mighty reports stunned an audience of 4,327 persons who, up to then, had been enjoying a gay Halloween program. Tongues of yellow flame leaped 40 feet into the area over a south grandstand.

Simultaneously, spectators, including men, women, and children, chunks of concrete, pieces of auditorium seats and fragments of steel flew upward. Some of the spectators fell into a 20- by 50-foot crater caused by the explosion and were covered by debris. Others were tossed out onto the ice.

Because of the relatively small crowd and a few cool heads among members of the Murat Shrine, which was sponsoring the performance, there was no panic.

The fire burned for nearly 8 minutes while firemen tried to get through the crowd outside the Coliseum to hook their hoses to fire hydrants. Smoke filled the six-story-high building which was built in 1939 by WPA labor of brick, concrete and steel, costing $1,200,000. Heat in the crater was terrific. The injured, trapped in the crater, wailed in pain from severe burns.

Word of the disaster reached fire and police authorities within less than a minute, the records show. Mobilization of rescue workers and equipment got underway immediately. Radio and television stations in the Indianapolis area interrupted their broadcasts to flash news of the disaster.

Funeral directors known to have raced to the Coliseum include Fenney & Kirby, Shirley Bros., George Herrmann, Moore & Kirk, Little & Sons, Royster & Askin, Flanner & Buchanan, Hisey & Titus and Harry Moore, all of Indianapolis, and, from out in the State, Hopkins, Greencastle; Baker Bros., Anderson; Hathaway, Columbus; Solar & Baker, Lafayette; Carmeny, Shelbyville; Meeks, Muncie; Sleeth, Shelbyville; Jacobs, Kokomo; and Moster & Sons, Rushville.

Among the injured were Mrs. Frank Moore, wife of the Rushville funeral director, and Mrs. Orval Wisler, wife of Moore's embalmer, Marvin Stewart, Monon funeral director; his son and wife. All were spectators at the show.

As the night wore on, two new emergencies developed: The hospitals ran out of fresh blood for the injured and funeral directors were hard-pressed for help in removing bodies from the Coliseum.

David R. Gerber, director of the Indiana College of Mortuary Science at Indianapolis, rounded up many of his students who reported either to the hospitals, where they gave blood, or to the Coliseum where they helped the funeral directors.

Again, the industry demonstrated how its real-life image differs so completely from the images described in two national magazine articles and a recently-published book by three professional critics.

In the hours following the disaster, funeral directors and embalmers from one coast to the other telephoned offers of assistance to Indianapolis and nearby mortuaries to expedite the completion of funeral arrangements.

Casket manufacturers stood ready to ship in by air whatever might be needed. So did suppliers of other mortuary equipment.

Don Keller, vice president of Flanner & Buchanan, said voluntary help from nearby funeral homes enabled the Indianapolis mortuaries to cope with the situation.

There are 40 mortuaries in Marion County and 45 in the seven surrounding counties. Additionally, these firms operate 23 branches in the same Central Indiana area.

Herbert R. Wald, executive secretary of the Indiana Funeral Directors Association, has been involved in many disasters over the past 55 years—first as a photographer for the Indianapolis News and later as a funeral director.

He is extremely proud of the performance of the funeral directors at the Coliseum disaster—all voluntary.

"They were there so fast, I was never asked to set our mobilization plans in motion," Wald explained. He said he can, in an emergency, alert every one of the State's 715 funeral directors by making only 15 telephone calls.

Wald said the manner in which the funeral directors responded to the Indianapolis disaster shows the industry is in a position to assume new and broader responsibilities under proposed realinement of civil defense functions nationwide.

Under present CD programs, funeral directors are placed under the direction of medical rescue authorities. Plans, now in the making at the Federal level, would give funeral directors primary responsibility for removal of the dead in the event of disaster and, perhaps, secondary responsibility in removing the injured to safety.

Undoubtedly, the response of the funeral directors at Indianapolis will be studied both locally and at the Federal level. The first of several critiques on the handling of the disaster was held Tuesday (November 5).

Indianapolis Chief of Police Robert E. Reilly, echoing the words of other keymen in the disaster combat force, emphasized that the singling out of the funeral directors for special praise was not intended to reduce in any way the role of other groups and individuals in the disaster.

Chief Reilly pointed out that during such a hectic affair as this, it is hard to arrive at a relative evaluation of the contributions of this individual or that group compared with other individuals and groups.

"I know I saw, however, ambulance after ambulance pull up, load and drive away—and most of these were private ambulances operated by morticians," the chief recalled. "Removal of the injured was fast and efficient."

But Reilly said he wasn't too amazed by the performance of the funeral directors.

"It's an old story to me," the veteran policeman added. "It has been my lot many times to seek the specialized kind of transportation that only an ambulance can provide for persons unable to pay for the service. And, every time it has been provided by local funeral directors promptly and without reference to the cost."

Reilly said, "the humanitarian attitude of our funeral directors has been confirmed once again."

Hartke Calls Attention to Commentary Published by Indianapolis Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a recent edition of the Indianapolis Star there appeared an editorial which has direct bearing on the deliberations now underway here on the Senate floor. I call this to the attention of my colleagues. There are thoughts here well worthy of their consideration. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE WANTED TO DO IT

Former Ambassador George F. Kennan talked when he might have listened. The onetime envoy of the United States to Yugoslavia was particularly bitter about congressional failure to accept his advice.

An ardent supporter of foreign aid for Yugoslavia, Kennan complained that Representatives and Senators simply were not qualified to judge such matters. His statement left little doubt that George Kennan considers George Kennan to be the most capable man in this field. Apparently, he would be satisfied only with unanimous approval of his ideas. For one who represented a representative form of government, that's an unusual notion.

For those who support foreign aid, such as President Kennedy, the timing of Kennan's statement is unfortunate. For those who oppose foreign aid, Kennan's comment offers another line of attack. One of the criticisms of the aid program has centered about the way in which diplomatic representatives have tried to hold themselves above advice or direction from the Congress. Kennan's views support the claims of those who criticize the aid program.

While his individual brilliance in some instances is a matter of record, Kennan has lost sight of the fundamental system of American government. No official, no matter how competent, can set himself above question or criticism by the people or their representatives.

Kennan's position shows the dangers that arise when men think government becomes more important than the people it is created to serve. His lament is that of many other bureaucrats who think they know exactly what to do, if only other people wouldn't get in the way.

It is just as well that he resigned a few months ago.

Shevchenko Champion of Liberty Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 86th Congress we passed the Shevchenko resolution providing for the erection of a statue in our Nation's Capital in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of the Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. Under the provisions of Public Law 86–749, the statute will be erected on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW., and the historic unveiling is scheduled to take place on May 30, 1964.

This Congress has a wonderful opportunity to follow up on the constructive action taken by the 86th Congress in reflecting its support for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of

this East European figure of freedom and independence. This is another opportunity for us to concretely show to the 45 million captive Ukrainian nation and to all captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe that the United States shall never lose sight of their captive status and the undying aspirations for freedom and national independence. Today, as never before, Khrushchev needs this kind of reminder, and no more representative body of the people can do this than we of the 88th Congress.

I have been very encouraged by the popular support for my resolution (H.J. Res. 174), providing for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko upon the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his death.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communications in the RECORD indicating support for House Joint Resolution 174:

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
September 19, 1963.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: I am solidly behind your resolution calling for the printing of a postage stamp to honor Ukraine's great freedom fighter and poet laureate, Taras Shevchenko.

Yours truly,

FEDIR ISKALO.

WARMINSTER, PA.,
October 25, 1963.

WILLARD S. CURTIN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I share the feelings of our Ukrainian fellow Americans and am in support of the Dulski resolution calling for the issuance of the Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp.

Sincerely,

Miss EILEEN WATSON.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BRANCH OF YOUNGSTOWN AND VICINITY,
Youngstown, Ohio, October 28, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: In behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch of Youngstown, Ohio, we wish to express our sincere and deepest appreciation for your proposed House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of the champion of liberty postage stamp in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter, Taras Shevchenko.

We fully support your resolution and anxiously are looking forward to the issuance of such a postage stamp on May 30, 1964.

Taras Shevchenko to this day remains a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million Ukrainian people now in bondage of Communist Russia.

To us American citizens of Ukrainian descent this commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth, will bring a ray of hope for the eventual freedom.

With best wishes we remain,

Very truly yours,

Michael Yurchison, Chairman; Myroslawa Lischak, Secretary; Eugene Woloshyn, Vice President; Dr. Roman Stachua, John Lischok, Julia Woytovich, Wasyl Prokopyk, Peter Lischols, ——— ———, Mykolo Lewyk, Stephen Wosyleeoych, Kazymyr Bulwan, Alice Lenyk, Mary Sawycky, Marie Hewko, Emilia Suchac, Lisa Hratin, Ann Suchac, John Hewko, Ray Kucaloba, Basil Hewko, Youngstown, Ohio; Greg Kowal, Niles, Ohio; Mike Kucaloba, Jerry Terlecky, Youngstown, Ohio.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
October 27, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: I, the undersigned, am writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko Champion of Liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

I fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the Champion of Liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet and national prophet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. In 1857, more than a century ago, Shevchenko advocated a Ukrainian George Washington, in belief that the Ukrainian people, then under the despotic rule of Czarist Russia, would achieve their national freedom and emancipation under such leaders as was George Washington, father of our country. Shevchenko remains to this day a beacon of national aspiration and a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million Ukrainian nation now in bondage of Communist Russia. The Soviet Government, knowing how deeply Shevchenko is revered by the Ukrainian people, has been trying unsuccessfully to slant his poetry so as to suit its political propaganda, and to make him a proletarian and anti-imperialist poet.

But for the Ukrainians in their homeland and for those American citizens who come from Ukrainian ancestry Taras Shevchenko remains an inspiring symbol of freedom and humanity.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Sincerely yours,

LUKE N. SHMORHAY.

BRONX, N.Y.,
October 22, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI:

I would like to let you know I support your House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a "Shevchenko Champion of Liberty" postage stamp in 1964.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. O'CONNELL.

WARMINSTER, PA.,
October 22, 1963.

Mr. THADDEUS DULSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: Our instructor in our class of Pennsylvania and world geography, has made known to us of your resolution, the "Shevchenko Champion of Liberty" postage stamp. I feel that you should strongly support it for the good of the people.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

LOIS SUMMERS.

DEARBORN, MICH.,
October 28, 1963.

Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached are signatures who support your House Joint Resolution 174 calling for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp in 1964.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL LUKOW.

We the undersigned urge the passage of Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI'S House Joint Resolution 174 calling for the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp in 1964.

Alex Kuchopsky, Mary Peltz, John Peltz, Paul Hlady, Nick Namhew, John Hurak, Charles W. Polka, Michael D. Goy, Helen Husak, Paul Gerry, Alice Gerus, Mary Jane Husak, Sophie Kauihow, Stefan Kraft, Rev. John I. Pokoporych, Michael N. Petrovich, George Saupp, Catherine Saupp, Sophie Petrovich, Stella Harrington, James A. Bremer, John Soroka, Peter Kozack, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Smockay, Konstantin Orlyn, Mrs. Joseph Smuk, Denny Melick Lincoln, Ann B. Smuk, Davie D. Smuk, Nick Copriel, Walter H. Worcheck, Walter Boyler, Bohdam Proc, Madeline Husak, Walter Husak, Eva Swantko, Irene Dimond, Peter Burek, Helen Paluha, Roman Stefaniuk, Michael Lukow, Louisa M. Lukow.

SOUTHAMPTON, PA.,
October 23, 1963.

Congressman THADDEUS DULSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I am a student of William Tennent High School. At my geography teacher's suggestion I am writing to strongly support the issuance of the Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp.

Yours truly,

RUTH SNYDER.

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PEASANT PARTY,
Chicago, Ill., October 18, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Now American citizens of Ukrainian descent, we, the undersigned wish to support the House Joint Resolution 175, introduced by you early this year, calling for the issuance of a postage stamp of the United States in the series of "champion of liberty" in honor of the 150th birthday of Taras Shevchenko in 1964.

The issue of the stamp in honor of the Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko would be very important because of many reasons, particularly the following:

1. Because the stamp, calling to mind the champion of liberty, Taras Shevchenko, would be influential with regard to national interests, considering the permanent support of all Americans for liberty for themselves and for all the nations of the world;

2. Because the stamp would be important in international relations stressing the will of Americans to support liberation of Ukraine, the nation now submerged under Bolshevik occupation; this stamp will encourage all the oppressed nations in their struggle for freedom and independence.

Therefore, in accordance with the two aims of this stamp, it would seem good to issue the stamp in two qualities:

(a) Five-cent value for interior use; and

(b) Fifteen-cent value for international use (airmail stamps).

It would be desirable, that the two issues would be produced in the Ukrainian national colors: yellow and blue.

Sincerely yours,

O. MASLOWSKY,
Secretary.

W. NOSENKO,
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Peasant Party.

AMBRIDGE, PA., BRANCH,
UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE,
Ambridge, Pa., October 30, 1693.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN T. J. DULSKI: Our organization in Ambridge, Pa., is writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such postage stamp in the champion of liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko remains to this day a beacon of national aspiration and a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million people of the Ukrainian nation now in bondage in Communist Russia.

The U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom in Ukraine and elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukranians, but for everyone now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, by issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Respectfully yours,
MICHAEL SZYBINSKY,
President.
ZACHARY KOWAL,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., HAMTRAMCK AND NORTH EASTERN DETROIT BRANCH,
Detroit, Mich., October 18, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: In behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Hamtramck and North Eastern Detroit Branch, we are writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government, in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We are profoundly grateful for your strong sponsorship of this resolution and are eager to convey to you the appreciation of our membership. Your wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the champion of liberty series, issued each year, will contribute immeasurably toward the cause of freedom. By recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko through the act of issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in his honor, the U.S. Government would offer hope for the eventual but imminent freedom of other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny.

In view of the constant efforts of the Soviet Government to utilize the revered poet in its political propaganda by slanting his works, the issuance of this stamp will create a frustrating obstacle. It will permit the great Ukrainian poet, national prophet, outstanding humanitarian, and fighter for freedom to remain a beacon of national aspiration. But more than this, he would become an inspiring symbol of freedom and independence not only to the 45-million Ukrainian nation, but also to the remaining peoples now in the bondage of Communist Russia.

With deep appreciation we remain,
Respectfully yours,
WALTER TUSTANIWSKY,
Chairman.
MARIE C. PODGURSKA,
Secretary.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
October 27, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: We, the Ukrainians of Indianapolis, Ind., are writing to you in support of your resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

It is fitting and just that Taras Shevchenko be included in the champion of liberty series, for Shevchenko, though he gained fame as a poet, was a humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. He worked tirelessly for freedom and emancipation of the Ukrainians under Russian tyranny. Shevchenko, through his efforts, has become a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million people in the Ukraine.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Alesander Hetemo, Maria Hetemo, Oksana Petrunai, Fedir Emma Taran, Wasye Taran, Mykola Karmozyn, Katarynia Kormazyn, Anastasia Slieva, Janine Slieva, John Osadsynky, Josef F. Slieva, J. B. Petruniw, T. Petreicz, and J. Petriecz.

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN YOUTH ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Syracuse, N.Y., October 30, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Our organization is writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukranian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the champion of liberty series which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet and national prophet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. In 1857, more than a century ago, Shevchenko advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," in a belief that the Ukrainian people, then under the despotic rule of czarst Russia, would achieve their national freedom and emancipation under such leaders as was George Washington, Father of our Country. Schevchenko remains to this day a beacon of national aspiration and a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million Ukrainian nation now in bondage of Communist Russia. The Soviet Government, knowing how deeply Shevchenko is revered by the Ukrainian people, has been trying unsuccessfully to slant his poetry so as to suit its political propaganda, and to make him a "proletarian and anti-imperialist" poet. But for the Ukranians in their homeland and for those American citizens who come from Ukranian ancestry Taras Shevchenko remains an inspiring symbol of freedom and humanity.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

_____ _____,
President.
_____ _____,
Secretary.
_____ _____,
Treasurer.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
October 16, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We Americans of Ukrainian descent wish to thank you for introducing House Joint Resolution 174 on the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp in 1964.

We support your resolution wholeheartedly and hope that it will be passed in the U.S. Congress in the near future.

Cordially yours,
(Signed by 10 persons.)

ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA, THE PROVIDENCE WILLIMANTIC BRANCH,
Willimantic, Conn., November 4, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Our organization is writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution, House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the Champion of Liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet and national prophet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. In 1857, more than a century ago, Shevchenko advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," in belief that the Ukrainian people, then under the despotic rule of czarist Russia, would achieve their national freedom and emancipation under such leaders as was George Washington, Father of Our Country. Shevchenko remains to this day a beacon of national aspiration and a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million Ukrainian nation now in bondage of Communist Russia. The Soviet Government, knowing how deeply Shevchenko is revered by the Ukrainian people, has been trying unsuccessfully to slant his poetry so as to suit its political propaganda, and to make him a "proletarian and anti-imperialist poet."

But for the Ukrainians in their homeland and for those American citizens who come from Ukrainian ancestry, Taras Shevchenko

remains an inspiring symbol of freedom and humanity.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

REV. ANDREJ NARAREWYCZ, *President.*
WASYL SHULEWSKY, *Secretary.*

Canada and United States: Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps a 5-minute ride from downtown Detroit, Mich., U.S.A., to downtown Windsor, Ontario, Canada. As a result, Detroiters have more than passing interest in Canada.

Recently, a seminar was held in Windsor attended by Detroiters and Canadians. The idea of a common market for the United States of America and Canada was discussed. I am pleased to include Detroit News Writer Michael Parks' article on this subject:

(By Michael Parks)

A common market for Canada and the United States was under informal discussion Saturday at a seminar in Windsor.

Participants in 3 days of talks at the University of Windsor, ending Saturday, included Paul Martin, Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Joseph A. Greenwald, Director of the U.S. Department of State's Office of International Trade.

Martin outlined two possible long-range goals:

Elimination of tariff barriers between the two nations.

A common currency and treasury for the United States and Canada.

HOPES FOR BOTH

The first, he told the fifth annual Seminar on Canadian-American Relations, "is naturally a lot closer than the other—but both are closer than many people in either country think."

Other participants in the private talks were Jack Warren, Greenwald's Canadian counterpart as Assistant Deputy for Trade and Commerce; L. Dana Wilgress, a special adviser to Canada's Department of External Affairs on International Trade, and a number of American and Canadian businessmen.

The arguments for an economic union are growing stronger, said Warren. He cited the recent heated exchange between Washington and Ottawa over Canada's export policies, including the sale of grain to Communist countries.

FEAR MARKET LOSS

Opposition, he said, seems to come from some Canadian businessmen who fear loss of their protected markets.

At present Canada is like two nations in one country and dependent on a third for livelihood, seminar speakers said.

Arguments for economic union are centered on five concerns. These, they agreed, are Canada's geography and population spread, her tariffs, soundness of money, deficits, and culture.

Artificial trade patterns resulting from about 19 million people living in a narrow belt stretching across 4,000 miles preclude logical economic development, Wilgress declared.

SYSTEM IS COSTLY

This, he said, has created uneconomic and unnatural rail, pipeline and other communications systems.

"Producers have to go far afield to find outlets when a rich, convenient market is only a short distance south of us," he said.

An example of what businessmen called Canada's confusion in this respect was in the country's latest move to bolster her industry, particularly the large auto industry.

Canada now proposes to rebate tariffs to the extent that the Canadian auto industry expands its exports.

In the case of the 25 percent tariff on automatic transmissions, imposed last year, output of the item has increased in Canada, Warren said. "However, as most of the automakers in Canada are American subsidiaries, the producers are caught in the middle," he added.

U.S. FIRMS HIT

Greenwald contended that "this same drive to increase (Canadian) exports, mainly in the United States, has placed more than 1,000 American firms in a quandry."

Emphasis on the auto industry, of particular interest to Detroit, is caused by the trade figures for last year. Canada imported $642,077,000 in automotive goods in 1962. By comparison, Canada exports only $61,740,000 of such goods.

Canadian businessmen favoring economic union at the seminar maintained that the competition for markets puts their country at a disadvantage.

UTILITY TAKEOVER

The resultant frustrations often "lead to political experiments such as nationalization of industry, as in the case of power utility takeovers in Quebec recently," said Herbert Lank, American-born but now a Canadian and president of Du Pont of Canada, Ltd.

A. H. Cameron, a Canadian economist attending the seminar, is one of the more outspoken proponents of economic union.

He contended that tariffs are but a method of subsidizing industry and such overprotected enterprises usually become a drag on the economy. He argued:

"I believe economic union would benefit the average man, whose pocket has suffered from the Canadian East-West trade pattern.

CYNICAL REVOLT

"Nationalistic slogans have less mileage among several million postwar arrivals now getting the vote in Canada. They care little about bloody shirts from the last century; even native Canadians can get cynical, too."

With the free movement of commerce across the border, Canadian industry would have a market of 200 million customers. Lower wage costs in Canada—70 percent of that in the United States—would provide the cushion during transition, Canadian officials said.

Jean Luc Drummond, of the Bank of Montreal, supports his advocacy of a single currency by reciting what happened at the last devaluation of the Canadian dollar. He said he believes that whatever the strength of each dollar, a single unit would be stronger.

VALUES DROPPED

The Canadian dollar was devalued in May 1962, to 92.5 U.S. cents after being pegged, artificially, some thought, at more than the American dollar.

To foreign investors in Canadian industry this meant that holders of $1,000 worth of property found it valued at $925.

This devaluation, along with Canada's giant deficit in international trade, was cited by Martin as reason enough for abandoning separate financial systems by two countries so closely entwined.

Warren and Wilgress, specialists on Canada's international trade, termed the deficits unavoidable.

CULTURE BIG "HURDLE"

Arnold W. Heeney, former Canadian Ambassador to the United States and now Canadian Chairman of the International Joint Commission, said he believes that the chronic Canada trade imbalances will continue "just as California's will because both are importers of capital and are underdeveloped areas."

American proponents of economic union said they believe their biggest hurdle would be culture.

"While businessmen may quote from Thomas Jefferson and say that 'merchants have no country' and that the spot they stand on does not constitute so strong an attachment as that from which they draw their gains, nationalism is a more difficult challenge," commented Rufus Z. Smith, political counselor at the American Embassy in Ottawa.

Wilgress summed up Canadian signs of the future in this area:

"National sovereignty is on the wane. If this last election putting in the Liberal Pearson government proves anything, it proves that anti-Americanism is finished as a political issue. We have cast our lot with this continent for better or for worse and the people know it.

"The world is reassembling itself into larger units, and I doubt if we could escape the tide even if we wanted to.

"We have eagerly accepted the American way of life—lock, stock, and bauble—whenever it has been profitable, comfortable, or amusing to do so.

"Thus we find ourselves part of the Western-American social unit and if we are to achieve our distinct identity, we must do so within the unit and not outside.

"This doesn't mean we have to become the 51st State. It does mean that we have to become a junior partner, perhaps one of several, in a new kind of larger fraternity which finds the United States, for the present at least, in the senior position."

Congress Needs More Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in these days when Members of Congress come under constant and unceasing blows of criticism of all sorts, deserved, and undeserved, it is refreshing and even astonishing to find printed in current newspapers an article like that written by the esteemed columnist, William S. White, which recently appeared in the Oklahoma City (Okla.), Times.

Mr. White's comment probably will not change the climate presently with us in Congress to cause adoption of such proposals, but his words are a bouquet that I am sure my fellow weary colleagues will find soothing in these hard and heavy days. It is good reading, if for just the mere sake of change. His article follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS MORE PAY

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON—A bipartisan congressional committee has at last had the courage to recommend a bill for an increase in the salaries of Members of the Senate and House from $22,500 to $32,500 a year.

It is not an adequate raise; the minimum should be $50,000 a year, which would be, perhaps, a 10th of the annual take of one of the junior glamour girls of Hollywood. But, perhaps understandably, everything being considered, not quite enough guts is to be found in any congressional committee to propose what really ought to be done.

For even the suggestion for this very modest increase in the pay of the men who collectively hold the life and honor of this Nation in their hands is meeting a howling chorus of complaint from two sets of critics.

One set is made up of economizers whose horizons are so pinched and small that they honestly believe a Member of Congress should be content with less pay than can readily be earned by a good wholesale salesman, say, cosmetics, or beer. Of this set, no more will be said in this column, for their opposition is in good faith, however wrong it may be.

But the second set of critics is made up of people who know perfectly well that in today's world and at today's cost of living it is absurd to maintain so pennypinching an economic ceiling on men chosen to write the laws of this country. These fellows, in short, are not really concerned with saving tax money. Instead, they are tirelessly concerned with cutting down Congress, as an institution and as the sole truly representative forum left in this Nation, by every means that comes to hand.

These are the two-bit cynics who demand "reforms" which would in fact slowly destroy Congress and finally elevate the bureaucrats as our undisputed masters. These are the ones who cry up every real or alleged "scandal" involving Congress, without waiting to hear a word of the evidence.

These are the professional moralizers—about the supposed poor morals of Congress—and the professional finger-pointers at somebody else's human weakness. These are the self-righteous prigs whose compassion for themselves—especially when it comes to taking care to see that their own incomes are always more than merely adequate—is so all-consuming that they have no time for compassion for others.

To starve out Congress—to keep in constant economic anxiety Members whose record for high public service is an unarguable part of current history—would well suit the book of this set of critics. And current congressional pay literally means near-poverty for all save the Members of independent wealth or separate income.

To put congressional pay at the level where men there could go about their high jobs free of financial fear—and free of financial temptation, for they are human, too—would be the best and soundest investment the people of the United States could make, even if it cost double or triple what the present proposal would cost.

Veterans Day Address by Miss Sharon Elkins, of De Land High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on last Veterans Day I was privileged to be in De Land, Fla., at a Veterans Day program in the city's Memorial Park. On this occasion I was privileged to hear a most extraordinary and outstanding speech by a young high school senior from De Land, Fla.

This young lady is Miss Sharon Elkins, and she will be 17 years old on the 16th of this month. She is an honor student in the senior class of De Land High School and is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Chauncey S. Elkins. Dr. Elkins is on the faculty of John B. Stetson University, which is located in De Land.

Because I felt this was such an exceptionally good address, I asked her for a copy of it so that I might put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and so that it might receive wider circulation. I commend this speech to you for your thoughtful reading:

"Bowed by the weight of centuries he leans
Upon his hoe and gazes on the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face,
And on his back the burden of the world."

In this poem, "The Man With the Hoe," Edwin Markham portrays a man symbolic of the world's masses; a man who, as he goes on to say, is "dead to rapture and despair, a thing that grieves not and that never hopes, solid and stunned, a brother to the ox." This man, however, is not the average American. What is it that keeps the American man from being like this "man with the hoe?" Our American Government, a government which our forefathers spent years in forming, is the reason Americans are different from this man.

The men who founded our Nation formed it on a religious concept; namely, that every man is endowed with a soul which is sacred to an Almighty God. Assuming this immortal soul was a reality, they concluded that man needed a government which freed him from carrying "on his back the burden of the world." They decided on two basic theses for such a government.

First, they concluded that since God was a moral Being and since man was created in God's image, man, like God, had the power to distinguish between right and wrong. Since man had this attribute, he should be allowed to exercise it. They decided that if each citizen would listen to what his fellow citizens said and then weigh the matter carefully in his own mind before forming his conclusion, he would probably make the correct decision. Whatever judgment the majority of these sacred beings expressed would probably be right. Vox populi, vox Dei.—The voice of the people is the voice of God.

The second idea concerned the inalienable rights—such as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These founders of our country decided that since man was a being sacred to God, each individual should be guaranteed these rights which they felt were inherent in any idea of a God-like being; and he should further be insured that the government, whether it was controlled by a king or the people of the majority party, could never take them away. No matter what the majority said the individual must be allowed these rights.

Markham continues:

"Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave
To have dominion over sea and land;
To trace the stars and search the heavens for powers;
To feel the passion of eternity?
Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
And marked their ways upon the ancient deep?"

Yes, our forefathers agreed with Markham that man deserved better things than being a "brother to the ox." After they agreed that man needed these two requirements to have a good government, the problem arose over how to combine these opposing principles into a workable, durable government, for one said the will of the majority was always right while the other stated that no matter how the majority felt, the individual had certain rights. Although a democracy where everyone was given an equal say in the government came to mind, it was discarded for in all of history a pure democracy had never worked. As John Adams said, "There never was a democracy that did not commit suicide." Therefore, the representatives decided on a republic where the individual would have his say as well as representatives, who guaranteed that minorities would be protected, thus making this the first country where the wishes of the minority as well as the majority were listened to.

How has this Government, which our forefathers spent so long in forming, worked out? There was one basic prerequisite for our Government being successful and that was that the individual must take upon himself the responsibilities of running the Government. The forefathers could not even conceive the idea of people not wanting to rule themselves. As Lord Macaulay, a famous British historian, said, "Our rulers will best aid the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties—by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the state. Let the government do this—the people will assuredly do the rest." Yes, all the great men felt that if only given a chance, the citizens would gladly take upon themselves their own governing. They felt this so strongly that they made our Government such that without this one basic provision it would fail. William Penn realized the reliance of the Government upon its people for he said in the preface to Pennsylvania's Forum of Government, "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined too. Wherefore governments rather depend on men than men upon governments." Truly our government is founded on the principle that the people will take part in their own ruling.

Are these responsibilities being met today? Too many people want all the benefits of our society with none of the duties. Dr. Harold Walker, an American minister, tells that when he was trying to teach his three boys how to play baseball, they decided to give the smallest brother four strikes to his brothers' three to help make up for his shortness of stature. This one-strike allowance remained in effect for several months until the boy had grown in size. When the others in the family decided to remove this advantage, the smaller boy protested but finally grudgingly gave in. Surprisingly enough, he did as well with three strikes as he had with four.

Dr. Walker concludes, "Our country today seems to be full of people who want four strikes to everyone else's three. The labor lobby in Washington wants four strikes for labor against three for industry. Farmers want four strikes against three for the consumer. Renters want four strikes against three for the owners. Manufacturers want three strikes for foreign competition against four for themselves. The trouble is that the four strikes have become a vested right. Nobody wants to play the game on even terms anymore." What Dr. Walker suggests is that everyone wants something for nothing. Is this fulfilling our responsibilities?

Markham asks in his poem:

"How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Touch it again with immortality;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild in it the music and the dream?"

How will we "straighten up this shape?" How will we keep these rights if apathy is apparent everywhere in our country: We still have hope, for our veterans, living and dead, fought that this country might continue to exist; they fought that we might keep these rights guaranteed us. The veterans have fulfilled their responsibilities, they have done their part—and much more.

However, to continue to keep these rights, we, the youth and the adults, must take upon ourselves the responsibilities that go with our rights. Then we can answer the questions Markham asks about this man:

"O masters, lords, and rulers in all lands,
How will the future reckon with this man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake all shores?
How will it be with kingdoms and with all kings—
With those who shaped him to the thing he is—
When this dumb terror shall rise to judge the world,
After the silence of centuries?"

Only by following the veteran's example, by fulfilling the responsibilities that go with our rights, can we keep the "upward looking and the light, the music and the dream," and only then—yes, only then—may we continue to serve God and liberty.

Good News for All People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I ask inclusion in the RECORD today of a sermon delivered in my State on September 29, 1963, by the Reverend Lawrence S. Jones. Not only is the sermon an eloquent statement of Christian principles in civil rights, but it also touches on specific aspects of racial relations in Hawaii.

Members of Congress from Hawaii have made clear many times their support for strong and effective civil rights legislation. We have also made clear that we do this not from a "holier than thou" attitude toward racial difficulties. We admit to having been more fortunate than many States in solving problems arising out of different racial strains in our people; we are proud to have been able to make Democracy work in a situation where it might have foundered; we hasten, however, to recognize the need for continued and greater efforts, not only in other States but also in our State as well.

Reverend Jones explores his concept of need in personal terms we can all understand. I am happy to include his remarks in the RECORD:

GOOD NEWS FOR ALL PEOPLE

(Sermon preached by Rev. Lawrence S. Jones at Kamehameha Schools, September 29, 1963)

Texts: Numbers 12: 1–10; Luke: 2: 8–20.

I'd like to think with you this morning about an issue which is on the heart of every American these days. The Negro revolution. Perhaps you feel I have chosen strange texts for such a theme. Yet both of them are right to the point. The first, you will remember, is from Numbers. It is the story of how Miriam and Aaron criticized Moses for marrying a Cushite (that is an Ethiopian or Negro) woman. And as a result of that criticism Miriam is stricken with leprosy. As Rabbi Rosenberg of Temple Emanuel recently pointed out in a letter to our Honolulu newspapers, anyone who tries to defend racial segregation or even attack interracial marriage on the basis of the teachings of the Bible does not understand the clear import of this text. As I think nearly all of us here in Hawaii know, God does not punish people for marrying across racial lines. He blesses them with the kind of richness of culture and personality and even good looks which characterize most of you here and the majority of the people of our State.

My second text is from the well-loved and familiar Christmas narrative in Luke. Now, you say, that does seem like a strange text for a sermon dealing with the Negro revolution. And it's not even very near Christmas, either. But you remember that was the text used by Hiram Bingham when he preached the first Christian sermon in Hawaii in 1820 at the spot where now stands Kawaiahao Church. And that was not Christmastime, either. It was springtime. But, you see, the Christmas story is the story of God's coming to dwell with men, right where they are because He cares about everything man is and does. And so he comes to his stables, his farms, his factories, his schools, his homes. He comes to be wherever man is in order to give away his love wherever and whenever man needs to be loved. (And do you know any time or any place where man does not need to be loved?) You see, the Christmas story is the Bible's way of saying that God came into the world to love it firsthand. And the Easter story is the Bible's way of saying that once He had entered the world, God never left it * * * that He is still here and still at work and still aching to share His love wherever men hurt.

And so the angel sang, "Behold we bring you good news which shall be to all people." And today the Christian conscience has to ask itself, "But is the good news for all the people? Is God's love being made real for all the people regardless of the color of their skin?" And it's a question which has stabbed the heart of a conscience-stricken America and a conscience-stricken church until now we can no longer ignore it.

Think for a moment of that tragic bombing of the 16th Avenue Baptist Church in Birmingham just 2 weeks ago this morning. And while white congregations all over the United States were worshiping, so was a black congregation in that church. Little children were in Sunday School. And while segregated prayers were rising all over the land to the God who has made of one blood all peoples, a Negro Sunday School was dynamited. Not dynamited with the power of the gospel of love, but dynamited with dynamite. And Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, wrote a few days later, "A Negro mother wept in the street Sunday morning in front of a Baptist Church in Birmingham. In her hand she held a shoe, one shoe, from the foot of her dead child. We hold that shoe with her."

And we do. We hold that shoe with her and we weep with her. And as Christians we know that this is crucifixion * * * that this is the hatred that killed and kills our Lord. What great symbolism there was when the newspaper reported that one stained glass window in that church remained intact. It was a picture of Jesus and the little children. But the face of Jesus had been blown out.

Well Jesus' face is blown out every time we shut our ears to the angels' song which says that the good news of love is for all people. Yes, the Christmas story of God's coming into a world of anguish and sin with a life of love, is an appropriate text for this theme. Because this is our gospel, and this is our world, and this is our Nation, and the darkness and pain that have now been laid bare before all of us is our darkness and our pain, too. America's racial struggle is our struggle, too. If for no other reason than that we have heard the angels' song, "Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people."

II

Yes, but, you say, even if the text is not so strange isn't Hawaii a strange place to preach this kind of message? But, you see, we cannot dismiss this concern because we are in Hawaii—for two reasons. First, because it is primarily a moral issue, not only a legal issue.

Dr. Martin Luther King, whom every American knows now, has said, "I have heard numerous religious leaders of the South call upon their worshipers to comply with a desegregation decision because it is the law, but I have longed to hear white ministers say, "Follow this decree because integration is morally right and the Negro is your brother." I have heard so many ministers say, "Those are social issues which the Gospel has no real concern" and I have watched so many churches commit themselves to a completely other-worldly religion.

But ours is not an other-worldly religion. It is first of all a this-worldly religion and that's just the meaning of the Christmas story—that God came into the world. That God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son.

So this is our struggle, because it is our God who, as in the creation story, broods over the chaos and longs to bring order. This is God's chaos that afflicts America now. And it will be God's order that will come as freedom for all people comes. It's God's chaos and God's order and, therefore, it is our chaos too, and we must brood over as our God broods over it.

As a recent Time magazine editorial stated, "If all Americans not convicted of crime are not free, then not one of us is safe." Freedom cannot be for some of God's people or it is not freedom. And our freedom even in Hawaii means nothing so long as some of God's people do not share it. If one man is enslaved, we are all enslaved.

III

But this is our struggle for another reason, too. Not only because the Gospel demands our involvement in the concern of all other men, but also because the disease of suspicion and mistrust and prejudice is the same disease whether it is in Birmingham or in Honolulu, Kentucky or Kapaa. Prejudice is the same disease however it started wherever it came from and regardless of the degree to which it has spread. Typhus fever is no less typhus fever if it is a mild case than if it kills a man. The typhus germ is still there and it is still a deadly germ. So it is with prejudice.

That is to say, then, that every one of us here today, if he is honest, knows he is not immune to the germ of prejudice. None of us have been inoculated with enough love that the prejudice disease cannot hit us, too. Therefore, we do not stand in a position of pride, looking down with scorn on the narrowminded southerner. We know that we stand with him and that we share his sin, too. And we share his need for forgiveness.

I think Hawaii is the greatest place in the world to live. And I know I say that as a coast haole who has only been here 7 years, but I say it with meaning, nevertheless. But my heart aches for Hawaii when I recognize the germ of prejudice in my own soul. My heart aches for Hawaii when I see prejudice in the soul of any haole. My heart aches for Hawaii when haole businessmen talk about their integrated companies, and yet I see only haoles on their board of directors or in

the top executive positions. My heart aches for Hawaii when I hear my Chinese friend say, "I don't have any prejudice, but I sure can't stand those Portuguese." My heart aches for Hawaii when I read classified ads which state, "A.J.A.'s only." My heart aches for Hawaii when my Hawaiian friend tells me he voted for a certain haole candidate, not because he believed in him, but because his opponent was Japanese and he didn't want to vote for a Japanese. My heart aches for Hawaii when I see how long our racial churches, which started racially out of language necessity, continue to be 95 percent of one racial group even though the language barrier is broken down. My heart aches for Hawaii when I hear a leading State government employee, a fine man, say that we ought not to discuss the race question in Hawaii because we are so well integrated already. In fact I've heard enough people say that recently that it's beginning to sound like children who don't want to talk about what they did wrong because maybe then they can pretend that they didn't do anything wrong.

You see, I'm not so sure that the high degree of interracial sharing we have in Hawaii today is because we were all cut out of better material than the people in the South. I think, instead, that it's because we have come through a different history. We became interracial in a different way and under entirely different social conditions. And that's not, even in the slightest, to say that southern segregation is not a dastardly sin against God and man, it's only to say that we ought to be very humble about our own life and be honest about our own sin, too.

One of the great things we can do in this racial crisis in America is to be honest enough to be free from any hypocrisy about ourselves. In his recent book entitled, "The Fire Next Time," James Baldwin, that fiery Negro novelist, says he has pretty much given up on the American church out of which he came because of its racial hypocrisy. He writes, "whoever wishes to become a truly moral human being * * * must first divorce himself from all the prohibitions, crimes, and hypocrisies of the Christian church. If the concept of God has any validity or any use, it can only be to make us larger, freer, and more loving. If God cannot do this, then it is time we got rid of Him."

But, of course, we cannot get rid of him. And the truth of the matter is he will make us larger, freer, and more loving, if we are honestly open to him.

IV

Let me conclude by saying then, that there are several important things we can do in Hawaii to share in the solution to America's racial crisis. First we can make certain we ourselves treat all people as persons and not as members of a group. People are not first of all Pake, or Budda-head, or coast haole, or kanaka, or Portugee. They are first of all persons, children of God, human beings. And that's how we must meet all people. As human beings, knowing that in the sight of God no group of people is better than any other group of people. God doesn't judge people by groups. He judges them as persons, and we better make certain we do no less or else we stand under his judgment too.

Secondly, we can do everything we can, and you young people especially, to see that the Christian church is not hypocritical about its faith at this point. Dick Gregory the comedian has said, "Religion has failed all of us. I'll march in Birmingham, but I won't kneel in a church and pray for Bull Connor. On Sunday morning, I can take you to 20 churches in Chicago where they'll turn me away, but there are few taverns where I can't get a drink. It makes you wonder which one the cross should be on." Sometimes the church doesn't deserve to have a cross on it. And that can be true in Chicago, or Atlanta, or Honolulu. And we have to help see, now and in your coming generation of leadership, that the church does deserve to have the cross on it, because it has removed all of its hypocrisy.

Third, we can each stand out against any form of racism in Hawaii. It is clear that we must continue to work for more opportunities in education and economic improvement for Hawaiians and Filipinos especially. It is also clear that we must at the same time, treat every group equally both in opportunity and in requirements for leadership. I think no group, the Negroes included, want preferential treatment because they are Negro or Hawaiian, or anything else. What they want is equal treatment—the same opportunities and the same high requirements of excellence and ability. Only then does equality mean anything. We must all be a part of a transition in Hawaii where any remnant of racism is broken down.

And finally, we can do everything we can to urge the U.S. Congress to pass a strong civil rights bill in this session of the legislature. Bill 7152 which will soon be before the House of Representatives guarantees equal voting rights, equal access to public accommodations, desegregation of all public education, establishment of community relations groups to help resolve racial issues, strengthening of the civil rights commission, guarantee nondiscrimination in any federally assisted program, and prevent discrimination in employment and hiring practices. There are Congressmen who want to vote for this bill (and incidentally all our Hawaii legislators are strongly behind it), but many northern Congressmen want to vote for it but are afraid of complaints back home. You can help by writing and having your parents write to friends in those areas asking them to contact their Congressman and assuring him that they are behind him in his yes vote for civil rights.

In this way you can have a direct part in the solution of America's greatest current sin.

Some say the pulpit is not the place to speak in favor of specific legislation. But I must honestly say that I believe this bill to represent the will of God for our time. If I am wrong I stand under God's judgment and plead for his forgiveness.

Today the Negro's song is, "We Shall Overcome." It's a great song of passion and hope. For the Christian our song is always the angels' song, "Behold, I bring you good news of great joy which shall be to all people." And that is God's will and his word. Good news for all people.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part VIII of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

"OPERATION KENNEDY" GOES INTO HIGH GEAR—PART VIII

In June 1958, the Republicans began to pay attention to Kennedy. Meade Alcorn, the national chairman, said: "Since the presidential bug first bit the junior Senator, he has undergone some amazing changes. He has flip-flopped completely on some issues, on others he has compromised."

It was a booming discordant note in what otherwise had been a generally favorable reaction to Kennedy's White House ambitions. And it came as the Senator was preparing to run for reelection. Part of Alcorn's criticism was based on the fact that Kennedy, after voting in behalf of flexible farm price supports advocated by Secretary Benson, had the previous month voted to freeze those supports.

"If I were Kennedy's opponent in the upcoming election," said Alcorn, "I would ask about his farm price 'freeze' vote over and over again. I would also put the spotlight on his curious flip-flop on the civil rights bill in 1957."

Which was precisely what Kennedy's GOP opponent, Vincent Celeste, tried to do that fall. He accused Kennedy of opportunism in his farm vote and of having given aid and comfort to the Faubuses and the Eastlands in catering to the South on civil rights.

Relatively unknown, and with little financial backing, Celeste also pictured himself as a man of the little people and Kennedy as a scion of great wealth.

"I'm running against the millionaire, Jack Kennedy," he repeatedly told folks on his handshaking tours.

Celeste kept pouring it on. He charged that Kennedy had severely hurt the port of Boston by voting for the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, and that the Senator was playing Walter Reuther's game by supporting a labor bill dictated by the United Auto Workers (UAW) leader. But he always turned to the theme of the Kennedy family and their huge fortune.

RECORD MARGIN

Aware that he had to rack up an impressive majority in 1958, Kennedy left nothing to chance. He and his top strategists realized that winning was not enough. The Democratic kingmakers would not be impressed by a narrow or a middling victory—particularly against a small-time opponent. Kennedy had to win—and win big.

Jack spent election night with his father listening to returns in the latter's hotel suite. This time he won with the extraordinary margin of 874,000, the largest margin ever obtained by any candidate for any office in the State.

One of the booby traps on the road to the White House had been defused.

Casting his Croesus-like shadow over the proceedings, Joseph P. Kennedy was present at a meeting between Jack and his top lieutenants at which final plans for Operation Kennedy were devised. The date was October 28, 1959; the place, Robert F. Kennedy's summer home in the family compound at Hyannis Port. A little more than a year later this was to be the Kennedy command post on election night. But there was a lot of work to be done before that. Planning, far in advance, was always central to the well-ordered march of events in Jack Kennedy's political life.

Others present included brothers Bobby and Teddy (Bobby had just resigned his Senate committee post); Ted Sorensen, anchor man on the Kennedy team; Senate probers Kenneth O'Donnell and Robert Wallace; Hy Raskin, silver-maned advance man for Adlai Stevenson's two unsuccessful campaigns; Larry O'Brien, a public relations man and compiler of a manual titled by insiders "How to Get Kennedy Elected to Anything."

Also present were Louis Harris, a public opinion pollster; John Bailey; Kennedy's brother-in-law Stephen Smith, who helps manage the family's business interests in New York; Marjorie Lawson, in charge of Negro work; Dave Hackett, an old family

friend; former Rhode Island Gov. Dennis Roberts; John Salter, administrative assistant to Senator Henry M. Jackson; and Pierre Salinger, a refugee from the defunct Collier's magazine, in charge of press relations.

CARD CATALOG MINDS

It was a raw, blustery New England day. Standing with his back to a roaring fire, John F. Kennedy proceeded to analyze the political situation from top to bottom, from Kennebunkport to Ketchikan. He spoke for 3 hours without a note or chart or map.

"We had not only the best candidate there," Sorensen said later, "but the best campaign manager, too. He knows the facts, who likes him and who doesn't, he knows where he should go and where he shouldn't, he has this incredible memory of places, names, dates, who should be written to and who shouldn't."

Since September 1956, Kennedy and Sorensen had traveled spearately and together, over a million air miles—studying Democrats, districts, election laws, local peculiarities. Gradually there was accumulated a card index of some 30,000 influential Democrats across the country—all punched into addressograph plates for speedy action.

Another card file contained the names of every delegate—how he should be addressed (as Jack, or Doc or Senator), his biography and a résumé of any correspondence he might have had with the Senator. Meanwhile Messrs. O'Brien, O'Donnell, Wallace and Bob and Ted Kennedy had taken to the road to recruit people for local organizations.

Hy Raskin was assigned to woo Stevenson supporters. By the time they mét at Hyannis Port, there was a trusted Kennedy lieutenant in every State and the beginnings of a full-fledged organization in the key primary States—Wisconsin, Oregon, West Virginia, Nebraska, Indiana, and New Hampshire.

In Washington a suite of nine rooms had been quietly rented in early 1959 at the Esso Building, a quarter of a mile from the Senate Office Building, and brother-in-law Steve Smith was placed in administrative charge. Also installed there was Pierre Salinger, who—in addition to handling press inquiries—began stockpiling a formidable array of Kennedy photographs, press releases, film clips, bumper strips, lapel buttons and tons of a Reader's Digest article on Jack Kennedy's war heroism.

Operation Kennedy smacked of money—big money.

DI SALLE SURRENDERS

Senator Kennedy got off to a fast start in his race for the nomination when Gov. Michael DiSalle personally—and surprisingly—handed him Ohio's 64 delegate votes 6 months before the convention. DiSalle had never demonstrated any pro-Kennedy sympathies before; in fact, he had talked about running as his State's favorite son candidate. But in a secret meeting in a Pittsburgh hotel room, Kennedy showed DiSalle a Lou Harris poll which indicated that if the Senator opposed him in the Ohio primary the Governor would take a drubbing in his own State.

The Kennedy strategy for the primaries had been laid out with shrewdness and resourcefulness. At first it stressed Kennedy's position as an underdog. For a long time the Kennedy people encouraged feverish speculation about the Senator's Wisconsin intentions. Would he go in? Wouldn't he go in? Brothers Bobby and TEDDY let it be known that they had advised their brother not to enter the race. After all, Wisconsin was HUMPHREY's backyard.

This did not quite square with what Kennedy's full-time pollster, Lou Harris, was discovering as he roamed around the Badger State. Not only was he coming up with nothing but Kennedy victory findings, but he discovered that the Senator from Massachusetts was a far better known personality in Wisconsin than was the Senator from neighboring Minnesota.

According to columnist Ron May of the Madison Capital Times, Wisconsin Gov. Gaylord Nelson had been shown a private Kennedy poll in January 1960 wherein the Massachusetts Senator was leading his Minnesota rival by 63 to 37.

Still protesting about the risks he was running, Kennedy finally announced he would enter the Wisconsin primary. And he warned his suporters that a defeat might finish him off altogether. From the first, it was obvious that HUBERT HUMPHREY didn't stand a chance.

The personal vilification was unabated. Kennedy man charged that the Humphrey campaign was being fueled by tainted Teamster and Texas money, the latter coming from oil-bloated billionaires who wanted to stop Kennedy so that Senator LYNDON JOHNSON would have a chance for the nomination.

HOFFA BUGABOO

Bobby Kennedy made it more specific. He informed horrified audiences that teamster boss, Jimmy Hoffa, was coming to Wisconsin to support HUBERT HUMPHREY. HUMPHREY denounced Bobby for raising the issue. And he questioned the right of the Kennedy brothers to pose as racket busters. He said it was one thing to serve on a Senate committee, as Jack Kennedy did, and another to fight rackets as mayor of Minneapolis, as HUBERT HUMPHREY did.

What made the campaign particularly frustrating for HUMPHREY was that he was being forced to compete in what he dubbed a popularity contest.

Kennedy was greeted everyhere as a celebrity making a personal appearance rather than as a politician making a serious speech. HUMPHREY, of course, was greeted as just another vote-seeking politician.

LIKE EDDIE FISHER

As D-day approached, Kennedy imported the entire clan, with the notable exception of Joseph P. Kennedy. Three sisters, Mrs. Peter Lawford, Mrs. Stephen Smith and Mrs. Sargent Shriver—with the Senator's mother—and his two brothers, along with assorted in-laws and friends, were crisscrossing the Badger State.

The voters in small towns received what looked like engraved invitations from Kennedy to come to his meetings (the lists prepared in advance from the telephone book). "There they find the cover-boy in person," reported James Reston, "not only glamorous but intelligent, well-informed, earnest and literate. Maybe it's all a show, like Eddie Fisher and Liz Taylor coming to town but the politicians don't think so, and the new polls coming up show Kennedy gaining. * * *"

WHY NOT COMPARE RECORDS

"Why don't you ever refer to HUMPHREY's voting record?" one reporter asked casually.

Kennedy recoiled as if from a treacherous attack.

"Voting record" he snapped. "Why should I bring up his voting record? Then he'd bring up mine. What good would it do for me to chew him up or for him to chew me up?"

Nevertheless, when the final returns were in, Kennedy won, with a decisive 478,901 votes—56 percent of the Democratic vote that took 6 of the State's 10 election districts, 20½ of the 31 delegate votes at the national convention. HUMPHREY obtained 372,034 votes, 4 election districts, 10½ delegate votes. Adding up the returns, the pundits and the politicians made them come out just about any way they wished.

But there was an unmistakable conclusion to be drawn; it was that an attractive, hard-campaigning Catholic candidate could count on a powerful Catholic vote cutting across labor union loyalties, the farm problem and even—to a lesser extent—party lines.

Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, for generations we have depended heavily on the sense of dedication of those who teach our children. Hopefully, we will continue to do so because effective teaching, like the ministry and certain other occupations in our society, requires a special and personal interest on the part of the teacher—it requires a "calling" if you will.

However, there is no good reason why we should take advantage of this special dedication of some of our citizens and deprive them of their just share of the material blessings of our civilization just because they are teachers.

For many years, we have concentrated on raising teachers' salaries as a means of giving these essential skills the return they deserve. Salaries are still far too low in most parts of the Nation so the battle must continue. However, real salary levels are determined not only by the money paid but also by the amount of time and degree of physical effort required to earn those dollars.

Even on a purely dollar basis, a salary increase of, say, 10 percent coupled with a workload or workday increase of 50 percent is not a real increase in pay. Further, and equally important, heaping longer hours and a greater workload on teachers already overburdened makes for exhaustion and less effective teaching.

The House Committee on Education and Labor has and is wrestling this many faceted dilemma; many other bodies and groups are also concerned with it.

For these reasons, it is with pleasure that I include in the RECORD research done by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director of the American Federation of Teachers on this general problem. I think Dr. Reuter's analysis deserves thoughtful consideration by all of us.

IMPROVING SOCIETY VIA REDUCING HOURS OF THE SCHOOL DAY

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

Many political leaders in Illinois have expressed concern as to whether the members of the legislature will be required to run at large in 1964. As a person trained in political science, I can appreciate this concern. On the other hand, however, I believe it might be wise to have such an at large election for the legislature in 1964, because it would insure that one party would win practically all the seats and this would be good regardless of the party.

For too many years, the two parties have been so close as to membership in the legislature that neither had a working majority. This is bad. Let's postpone establishing new districts until after 1964 and thus pave the way for real majority leadership and progress. If the leadership fails, the people can vote them out in 1966 for another group. We need this experimentation.

For the same reason I am advocating this idea, I favor a richer, fuller life for all mankind, and I thus am seeking ways to achieve these principles through experimentation.

I was recently impressed with the AFL-CIO study entitled "Shorter Hours: Tool To Combat Unemployment."[1] It is well written and it presents a valid case in favor of the reduced workday and workweek. This inspired me to do a study concerning teachers and students entitled "The length of the schoolday."[2]

CURRENT DEFINITIONS

The "Dictionary of Education"[3] defines the schoolday as existing when "a school (is) attended by the pupils during a part of the day." This is entirely too abstract and must be clearly defined. Smith[4] touches on the ending phase of the schoolday by stating: "The teacher also has explicit responsibilities for the closing of the school. Although he is responsible to the principal for all required work, his familiarity with the classroom and pupils place him in a position to implement the principal's work and to share in the total responsibility for the smooth cessation of educational activities." Finally, Mayer[5] establishes the challenge between the abstract and the concrete: "We all have the choice of slumbering or being awake. Conventional education strengthens our intellectual slumber. Creative education brings about an abrupt awakening." The purpose of this study is thus dedicated to the analysis of the defined schoolday.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE AFT

The American Federation of Teachers in convention assembled established the following policy:[6] "That the school day shall not exceed 5½ hours of assigned duties for teachers. Extra compensation should be paid for services, at rates negotiated by the locals, outside this defined school day. Teachers shall be privileged to decline without prejudice any extracurricular activity."

The AFT Research Department reviewed existing conditions some months ago[7] and reported how extensively the defined school day was reported by the locals:

"How extensively the defined school day has been adopted is shown by this questionnaire:

"1. Do you have a defined school day beyond which administrators cannot require teacher services? Yes, 39; no, 59.

"2. Can teachers decline without prejudice assignments beyond the defined school day? Yes, 38; no, 55.

"3. Is extra compensation provided for all assignments beyond the defined school day? Yes, 10; no, 88.

"4. Is extra compensation provided for major assignments beyond the defined school day? Yes, 66; no, 31.

"5. Is there any top administrative check on building activities beyond the defined school day? Yes, 30; no, 55.

"The essential purpose of a defined school day is to put limitations on overzealous principals who believe that they should provide school services 24 hours of the day.

"There are only two bright spots in these findings. The first is that extra compensation is provided in the majority of the school districts studied. The second is the fact that there is not a clear check to determine if the directives are executed. There are, however, discouraging points expressed in these figures because there is essentially a denial of academic freedom involved."

Finally, several years ago, the Research Department of the American Federation of Teachers outlined desirable working relations for teachers[8] and suggested as 1 of 26 conclusions: "A schoolday not to exceed 5½ hours of assigned duties."

CURRENT RELATED THOUGHTS

There are several current thoughts that are related to our study. While some of these thoughts are harmless on the surface, they may develop into dangers. Because quality education is a cornerstone of the future, it is thus important to examine some of these thoughts and encourage those with merit and oppose those that would hinder the educational product. Below are several of the current thoughts:

"1. It may not be possible to identify a 'best' practice that will fit all field situation.[9]

"2. Teaching load is generally understood to include all the time and energy a teacher must spend in fulfilling duties and responsibilities relating directly or indirectly to the task of teaching.

"Unless specifically defined in the contract or in school statutes, a teacher's instructional load is not determined by law.

"Teaching load is usually measured in terms of one or more of the following: (a) average class size, (b) student-teacher ratio, (c) number of classes per day (in high school), (d) total enrollment in classes taught, (e) total credit hours in courses taught (in college), (f) number of different subjects taught, and (g) total clock hours. These measures all present an incomplete picture because they do not take into account numerous factors which influence the time and energy devoted to the cumulative effects of the various tasks which make up teaching.

"The various regional accrediting associations have issued statements of policy regarding teaching load. These are similar in many respects, usually specifying a desirable maximum number of daily classes and maximum student-teacher ratio, and recommending special provisions for unusual conditions such as remedial classes.

"Although the teaching load is probably heaviest in small schools the evidence is not in complete agreement on the point.

"The demands made upon the college teacher are so different in nature that it is difficult to analyze the subject as a factor in the teaching load."[10]

3. "The attitudes toward education held by teachers * * * have markedly influenced the school curriculums of their day, as well as that which has evolved into today's curriculum."[11]

4. "The curriculum can no longer be regarded as a fixed set of course."[12]

5. "In addition to observation of pupils' behavior, it is also possible to reach an assessment of the social climate of a class through teacher-pupil interaction analysis."[13]

6. "The teacher is a major functionary in the total pupil personnel program."[14]

7. "Many people in our society today sense a dreadful isolation. Discouraged, hopeless, overwhelmed by powerful forces around them, in conflict with themselves and their world, they have withdrawn because withdrawal is the only refuge they see."[15]

8. "The critical role of economic and ethnic factors in school matters appears to be a national pattern."[16]

9. "That the public should be informed of the actual need for classrooms and teachers based on a class size ceiling of 25 students per classroom."[17]

10. "That the American Federation of Teachers encourage member locals and State federations to initiate legislation that will guarantee teachers a continuous and daily duty-free lunch period of at least 30 minutes."[18]

11. "That the American Federation of Teachers still considers it to be unwise educationally to extend the traditional school year through the summer months and/or establish a four-quarter school system."[19]

EXAMPLES OF THE SCHOOL DAY

The defined school day is a major issue in American education at the present time. With various groups working for shorter hours, it seems inconsistent for teachers to be assigned longer school days. The idea of increasing the school day regardless of the opinion of the teachers and the students is dangerous and undemocratic.

In order to be as objective as possible, the presidents of representative locals of the American Federation of Teachers were asked to supply data for the school year 1962–1963, and this includes a sampling of districts in all areas of the Nation. Below are the findings for the hours teachers and students spend in the classroom. Be careful to remember that both teachers and students devote many hours to their work over and above these classroom hours.

TABLE I.—*Teachers*

Eastern States	6.39
Connecticut	6.31
Massachusetts	6.32
New Jersey	6.00
New York	6.25
Pennsylvania	6.43
Rhode Island	7.01
Central States	7.27
Illinois	7.08
Indiana	7.19
Iowa	7.05
Kansas	6.30
Michigan	7.19
Minnesota	7.23
Missouri	6.01
North Dakota	8.00
Ohio	6.27
Wisconsin	6.34
Southern States	7.00
Kentucky	6.46
Maryland	6.18
Texas	7.15
Western States	7.02
Arizona	7.00
California	6.52
Colorado	7.06
Hawaii	7.01
Montana	6.15
New Mexico	7.30
Oregon	8.00
Washington	7.13
National average	7.22

TABLE II.—*Students*

Eastern States	5.50
Connecticut	5.10
Massachusetts	5.20
New Jersey	5.35
New York	5.07
Pennsylvania	6.20
Rhode Island	6.02
Southern States	6.04
Kentucky	6.35
Maryland	5.00
Texas	5.56
Central States	5.39
Illinois	5.38
Indiana	5.53
Iowa	5.17
Kansas	5.57
Michigan	5.32
Minnesota	6.12
Missouri	5.06
North Dakota	5.40
Ohio	5.16
Wisconsin	5.20
Western States	5.53
Arizona	6.00
California	5.26
Colorado	5.11
Hawaii	6.03
Montana	5.10
New Mexico	6.23
Oregon	5.06
Washington	5.41
National average	5.52

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the length of the school day is a major issue in American education at the present time.

2. That some school systems are exerting pressure to increase the school day for students and teachers.

Footnotes at end of speech.

3. That there is evidence that the school day is too long at the present time in many classes, based on psychological and sociological opinions.

4. That there is evidence that some conceal selfish motives behind the drive to lengthen the school day.

5. That there are inequalities in the length of the school day at various grade levels.

6. That the school day not to exceed 5½ hours of assigned duties for teachers is to the best interest of the teachers and the students.

7. That there should be extra compensation for services beyond 5½ hours of assigned duties.

8. That each teacher should have the privilege to decline, without prejudice, any extracurricular activity.

9. That for every hour a teacher spends in class, it requires 2 additional hours of preparation, hence the teacher's workweek is entirely too long at the present time.

---

[1] American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, "Shorter Hours: Tool To Combat Unemployment." Washington, 1963.

[2] George S. Reuter, Jr., "The Length of the School Day." Chicago: The American Federation of Teachers, 1963.

[3] Carter V. Good, "Dictionary of Education," second edition. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959, p. 155.

[4] Edward W. Smith, Stanley W. Krouse, Jr., and Mark M. Atkinson, "The Educator's Encyclopedia." Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961, p. 60.

[5] Frederick Mayer, "Man, Morals and Education." New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1962, p. 51.

[6] The American Federation of Teachers, "Policy Book of the American Federation of Teachers." Chicago: 1962. "School Days."

[7] George S. Reuter Jr., "Evaluation of Personnel Practices in Selected School Systems," revised. Chicago, American Federation of Teachers, 1963, pp. 12–14.

[8] George S. Reuter, Jr., "Personnel Relations for Teachers." Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, 1959, p. 26.

[9] Daniel R. Davies, "The Internship in Educational Administration." Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962, p. 93.

[10] Chester W. Harris, "Encyclopedia of Educational Research," third edition. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960, pp. 1496, 1497, 1499, 1500.

[11] Walter T. Petty, "The Language Arts in Elementary Schools." Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962, p. 1.

[12] Merl E. Bonney and Richard S. Hampleman, "Personal-Social Evaluation Techniques." Washington: The Center for applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962, p. 93.

[13] Paul L. Dressel, "The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education." Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963, p. 98.

[14] Donald G. Ferguson, "Pupil Personnel Services." Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963, p. 27.

[15] Theron Alexander, "Psychotherapy in Our Society." Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963, p. 3.

[16] William M. Dobriner, "Class in Suburbia." Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963, p. 121.

[17] George S. Reuter, Jr., "The Limitation of Class Size." Chicago: The American Federation of Teachers, 1961, p. 18.

[18] American Federation of Teachers, op. cit., "Duty Free Lunch Period."

[19] George S. Reuter, Jr., "The Defined School Year," revised. Chicago: The American Federation of Teachers, 1963, p. 15.

The Multiple Use Mining Law—A Progress Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Deputy Chief of the Forest Service, Mr. A. W. Greeley, made an excellent progress report on the multiple use mining law before the Fifth American Forest Congress held here in Washington.

The problem of wise utilization of Federal land and utilities is, of course, of major importance to the people of these United States who are so dependent upon our natural resources. Therefore, I thought this progress report extremely appropriate. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Greeley's report in the RECORD:

Far too few of the resource-conscious people of this country realize that up until July of 1955 the Government lacked authority to take the steps required for managing the surface resources of an estimated 24 million acres in mining locations on national forest land. This acreage amounts to about 15 percent of the national forest land in Alaska and 11 Western States. One out of every 7 acres of national forest land in these States was subject to mining location rights that made it impossible for the Forest Service to make surface resource management decisions. These acres were subject to the control of individuals who had complied with the formal steps of making locations under the mining laws—whether the property was ever developed for minerals or not.

Thanks to action which the American Forestry Association was instrumental in helping to initiate, there is now well along toward completion a program which has reduced from 24 million acres to about 80,000 the area of national forest covered by mining claims on which the Forest Service does not have surface management authority. This planwise program of surface rights determination on old mining claims on the national forests will be largely completed in another 2 years. We estimate the program will regain for the Government the right to make resource management decisions on land bearing some 50 billion boardfeet of merchantable timber and other resources of comparable proportions. When the program is completed, the area within the national forests remaining in the uncertain status permitted by the 1872 mining law will be reduced from the 15 percent just mentioned to less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

A more limited program has been carried on by the Bureau of Land Management, and as additional problem areas are identified they will be processed as necessary for administration of the public domain.

The Forest Service is proud and happy to acknowledge the instrumental role played by the American Forestry Association and the American Mining Congress in helping to obtain passage of the 1955 legislation which launched this surface rights determination program. We are equally glad to acknowledge the full partnership role played by the Bureau of Land Management in working with us to make this program effective on the national forests. We have had substantial help from that Bureau. At times we have nearly swamped their hearing examiners. And we know that the work remaining will have an impact on BLM people for several more years.

The law which Congress enacted in 1955, known as the multiple use mining law, provided for three things:

1. That common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders would not be locatable under the mining laws.

2. For all claims filed after July 23, 1955, the United States would have the right to manage and dispose of the vegetative resources, and to manage other surface resources, provided that such management and disposal does not materially interfere with the miner's prospecting, mining, or processing operations.

3. For claims filed prior to July 23, 1955, there was established a procedure by which certain claims could be brought under the act and made subject to the same conditions as those filed after July 23, 1955.

This 1955 act came from efforts of the American Forestry Association and others to do something constructive about widespread abuses of the mining law which resulted in Government-owned land being used for purposes other than mining and in unnecessary interference with proper management of the surface resources. Sampling studies in the West showed that about 1,200,000 mining claims had been located on national forest land since those forests were established. At 20 acres per claim, the acreage in mining claims on national forests thus totaled about 24 million acres. There were many examples of claims ostensibly located for minerals but actually used for extracting the value of timber growing on the claim, or for business use of the site, or for a summer home, or for blocking someone's access. This situation defeated the obligation of the United States to manage national forest lands in the public interest.

When the multiple-use mining law was passed, the main interest of other resource groups was in the portion dealing with the procedure for bringing under the new law claims located prior to July 23, 1955. The steps that the law provides for are initiated by the Federal agency responsible for administering the public lands on which the mining claims are located. It involves a field search to determine what claims are active, followed by publication of an appropriate notice that a determination of surface rights on the mining claims in a particular area will be made. The public notice gives each claimant 150 days in which he may do one of three things: (1) He may file a statement asserting the validity of his claim predating passage of the law, or (2) he may execute a waiver of such surface rights as are not allowed by the new law, or (3) he may disregard the notice.

Claims for which a statement asserting validity is filed are considered by a qualified mineral examiner and may be given a field examination. If the Government believes the claim is valid, it may stipulate to that effect with the claimant, in which case the claimant retains the same rights he had before. If the claimant decides not to press for rights under the old law, he may withdraw the statement he filed. Otherwise the matter goes to a hearing before a Bureau of Land Management hearing examiner, with the hearing conducted according to the established rules of the Department of the Interior. The Bureau of Land Management then makes the decision as to the validity of the claim.

When the act was passed, the Forest Service informed Congress that 10 years and about $1 million a year would be needed to complete the determination of surface rights on national forests. We estimated that about 144 million acres would have to be searched. To June 30, 1963, we asked for and used about $4,700,000 for this work. Up to that date, field search had been completed on 141 million acres out of the 144 million to be studied. Areas totaling 139 million acres have gone through the process

as far as publication and filing. Hence, we know for sure what the situation is on all but 5 million acres of the area needing examination. On these 139 million acres, which we believe originally contained about 1,100,000 claims, statements asserting validity have been filed for about 21,000 claims. Experience to date indicates that slightly less than 20 percent of these claims will be of such a nature that the Forest Service will stipulate with the claimant for him to retain the same rights regarding surface resources he had prior to July 23, 1955.

Our experience is that most of the other 80 percent will be withdrawn. Something like 1 percent will be contested and will go to a hearing. If these speculations turn out to be about right, the surface area within the national forests for which claimants will retain rights under the old law will be between 70,000 and 75,000 acres.

This brief account can only hint at the human side of this fascinating story. There was the courage of mining industry people who felt this could be a step backward for that industry but finally were willing to give it a try. There was understanding of a difficult problem by members of the congressional committees involved. There was the recruiting and training of a corps of specialists to do this work. There were months and months of field examinations all over the West, men on foot, men on horseback, men in jeeps, and 'copters, and ranger boats. There was support from miners, and objection from them, and many who did not at first understand what was involved. This part of the story needs telling just as much as does the listing of the cold figures. Space does not permit it here.

Where does this effort stand, and where do we go from here? The field-search phase on the national forests was virtually completed within the past month. There remains a large load of claim examination, followed by whatever action is appropriate to complete the steps subsequent to examination. We have found some nonmining use and a lot of structures, probably as many as 10,000, located on mining claims in the national forests. Many of the structures are not being used in connection with valid mining operations. All of these require follow-up action, and those not used in connection with such operations will have to be validly authorized or discontinued. This will involve a long, tedious, unpopular job of clearing up occupancy trespass.

Even with all this good work, difficult problems remain. It is not too early for interested parties to start defining and seeking a constructive solution to the next major problem that has not been tackled yet. In my opinion, this problem is the ease with which use of other surface resources may be disrupted by persons prospecting or developing a claim regardless of the relative public values for the uses involved. As time passes, this will become a critically severe public problem.

Responsible members of the American Forestry Association should find real satisfaction in knowing that this group's foresight and initiative helped to identify and develop a successful solution to this public land use problem which 10 years ago, seemed to have no satisfactory answer.

What Will We Have Left?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, brevity is often a virtue. I submit for the RECORD at this point the briefest and certainly most timely, penetrating editorial I have seen for some time, as it appeared in the Palos Regional on November 7, with reference to Federal spending.

WHAT WILL WE HAVE LEFT?

This is one apparently popular myth that should be exploded once and for all. It is the belief that the enormous increase in Federal spending in late years, and the enormous increase in the public debt that has resulted, are generally attributable to the needs of defense.

Listen to what Senator BYRD says: "In the 10 years since the end of the Korean war, we have had seven deficits; the Federal debt has gone up nearly $40 billion, and the annual cost of the Federal Government has been increased by approximately $20 billion, or more than 25 percent. Of the $20 billion increase, $17 billion has been for strictly domestics-civilian programs, projects and purposes, and interests."

And a very substantial number of these programs, with all their concurrent costs, have been of a welfare state variety, based on the philosophy that the Government should do just about everything for just about everybody.

What will the end be, if this philosophy continues to rule? Here is Senator STROM THURMOND's grim view: "If our Government continues in the direction it is headed, we had all better enjoy our freedoms of today and all the extra spending possible, because there may not be much of either left over for the future, for us or our children."

Staten Island Barracks No. 2524, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Staten Island Barracks No. 2524, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. and to compliment them on their outstanding Veterans Day services which were held on Monday, November 11, 1963, at Ocean View Cemetery, Staten Island, N.Y. Judge James C. Crance was the principal speaker, and did great honor to their members who so valiantly defended the cause of democracy in 1917–18.

The Staten Island Barracks is one of the most active barracks of the Veterans of World War I of U.S.A. and I would like to join hands with them on Armistice Day in saluting all of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my message to the Staten Island Barracks No. 2524, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.:

Once, in the very recent past—only yesterday, really, in this ever swifter march of time—Armistice Day was a unique holiday. On the one hand it was a day of solemn homage to those who, as Lincoln so movingly put it, "Gave the last full measure of devotion" to their country's cause. And on the other it was a day of rejoicing that those gallant men of the AEF had not died in vain. On that fateful November 11, 1918, we believed in our hearts that we had heard the last shot fired in anger, that the battle flags had been furled for all time. The war to end war had run its bloody course, and the world had been made safe for democracy.

Tragically, we were wrong. From the seeds of World War I we reaped the deadly whirlwind of World War II, a war, which, in reality, has never ended—only the enemy or, more precisely, the ideology, has changed. The Communist tide that inundated Eastern Europe in the wake of Germany's collapse sent it waves into remote Korea, which, too would be inundated but for a living dike of watchful young Americans. This evil tide now laps hungrily at South Vietnam, where still more young Americans fight and die in a skulking silent war to protect another threatened outpost of democracy. And so it goes, round the world, from Berlin to Okinawa, from the Arctic Circle to the Panama Canal. Everywhere there is war or the threat of war.

So, on this 46th Armistice Day, we have neither peace nor armistice with our resourceful and remorseless foe, communism This being true, why are we gathered here today? Is it simply to pause, briefly, in remembrance of the silent 600,000 who laid down their lives in all our wars? Is it only to momentarily wave the banner of freedom and half listen to a flood of patriotic oratory that is forgotten when the final echo is wafted away? No. It must not be. This must be a day of rededication for us, the living, if we are to honor the dead.

In these times it is temptingly easy to slip into shrugging cynicism. We read of our hard-earned tax dollars being siphoned off into vague and seemingly insatiable projects in misgoverned and frequently ungovernable lands; we read of fiascos in policy that set back the cause of freedom in our relentless struggle against Communist imperialism; we read of price rigging in industry, of connivance in labor, of graft in politics, and of corruption in high places; we read that Khrushchev will bury us, that the doom of individual freedom and enterprise is inevitable, and—more and more frequently—that the image of America as a dynamic symbol of human attainment is shattered beyond repair. Under the weight of this catalog of woes—more apparent than real—too many of us retreat in cranky indifference, convinced that to look forward is both foolish and futile.

But in doing so we dishonor those to whom we pay homage today, the silent 600,000 who made the ultimate sacrifice to preserve our citadel of freedom. Now, you may ask: In view of what we read, is there any real justification for pride in the immediate past and hope for the future? The answer is a ringing "Yes." Somehow, the credit side of our national ledger gets scant attention; criticism, as we all know, commands a wider audience than praise. In our country's ebullient youth, boasting of its prowess and progress was a national trait; undoubtedly we overdid it, but even so it was done in all faith and honesty. But now we are suddenly sophisticated, and expressed patriotism is considered quite unfashionable in some circles. Who today in public life, for instance, would dare voice Stephen Decatur's notable toast—"Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right, or wrong." In some quarters he would most certainly be denounced as a primitive, a man blind to world opinion, a rabble-rousing flag waver, and possibly even a war monger.

I am not saying that we all should make Fourth of July orations. But I am saying that we should renew our faith in ourselves and in our country by quietly considering the credit side of our ledger. Let's brush away the carpers, the cynics, and those of little faith, and look for a moment at what the ledger has to tell us. Our part in the two World Wars is too vividly remembered for me to dwell upon at length here, but I

would like to point out one historical factor that is often overlooked: Neither of those wars would have been won without us; and in World War II the United States became the only country in the history of the world to successfully fight a massive, two-front war and simultaneously maintain a full economy at home.

Now let's turn back the clock briefly to 1945. Hitler's evil conspiracy had been crushed, and Germany with it. Militarism had been struck down in Japan. The world was weary of war, and we were busily disarming ourselves with a haste that we were to regret later. Europe was prostrate, a political vacuum open wide for the onrush of communism. England, once the guardian of freedom in her own sphere of influence, was badly stricken and unable to stem the advance of Red tyranny from the East. We alone had the resources to battle this new enemy, and we alone were called upon to shoulder the burden despite our hopes of going back to the pursuits of peace untroubled by grave new responsibilities. It would have been easy to put down the burden; after all, we had poured 4 years of blood and treasure into the war; why not let Europe pull itself up? But we did not. Instead, we cheerfully accepted a continuing drain on our economy so that the economy of the free world would be strong enough to resist the steady pressure of communism. And what has been the result? Directly because of our sacrifices, the economy of the free world—Europe in particular—has never been healthier. On all fronts, we have either defeated or contained the Reds; militarily in some areas, economically in all.

Keep that in mind—and speak out—when you hear that we as a nation are faltering, that we no longer have the will and the vigor to lead the free world. We have missed opportunities, certainly; we have made policy mistakes, and we have taken wrong turns. But let us not forget that, on balance, we have been far more right than wrong. It is communism that has been rolled back, not freedom; it is the Communist economy that is sickly—and here let us remind ourselves how galling it must be to Khrushchev to come asking us for wheat—and not our own; it is communism that is on the defensive, not individual liberty and free enterprise; if Khrushchev is to bury us, he must find himself a new shovel; we have broken his old one. And let us not forget, either, that we have paid a high cost in blood, as well as treasure, to push back the forces of enslavement. More than 30,000 of our young men gave their lives in Korea; others are dying now in South Vietnam; undoubtedly still others will die in places not yet known before this struggle is concluded. So, today, let us honor these men, the silent 600,000 who wrote our history in blood from Bunker Hill to Belleau Wood, to Berlin, to Inchon, to Vietnam, by pledging ourselves to keep the faith that they so gallantly bore for us. Let us keep green in our memory the eloquent appeal of Poet McCrea in "In Flanders Fields":

"In Flanders Fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard among the guns below.
We are the dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders Fields.

"Take up our quarrel with the foe;
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders Fields."

Let us not break faith. Thank you.

Basic Free-Trade Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in the feverish activity of recurring legislation there is often little time or inclination to examine the philosophical foundations of positions long and sometimes stubbornly held by proponents or opponents of particular legislative proposals.

An example of this was the trade expansion bill of 1962. The trade question has been before Congress for generations; in fact, since the early days of the Republic.

Over the years economic theory has claimed the attention of university professors of economics in this country. They have usually been disciples of Britain's Adam Smith so far as the principles of international trade are concerned. Smith is still highly honored as the father of free trade in contrast with the "mercantilistic" practices adhered to by the trading nations up to that time, even though he wrote in the era of our Revolutionary War.

Adam Smith elaborated his theory of free trade in a relatively simple and static world so far as the technology of production is concerned. It would seem safe to say that many professors of economics in this country became deeply imbued with his philosophy and so passed on to thousands of students of economics the views expounded by this renowned English economist in his great work, "The Wealth of Nations."

The inclination in the academic world is to baptize certain theories as "laws"; and once these laws are accepted, they are no longer subjected to ruthless challenge as they should be. In the field of trade the law of comparative advantage is such a hallowed theory. Let me hasten to add that there is nothing wrong with the theory as such. It may even be a law. I do not want to get into a discussion on this point.

I do think that we sometimes obey some theories as if they were immutable laws when they are nothing of the kind or in any case are so beset by exceptions that they actually help very little as guides to action even if they can qualify as laws.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great arguments used by those who advocate free trade or even liberal trade policies is that furnished by the law of comparative advantage, which I have just mentioned.

According to this so-called law, each country should devote its economic resources to the production of those goods for which it is best adapted, and should import from other countries the goods in which it has less advantage and in the production of which other countries are at their best.

In other words, we should allow the tropics to produce topical products and the Temperate Zone to produce the goods that do best in that zone. This is also called international division of labor or specialization. It permits specialization of the same order as we find in the division of labor when we observe carpenters, weavers, tailors, and so forth, pursuing specialized trades.

Obviously the theory presents a beautiful ideal of production in a pastoral or agrarian society, where fertility of soil, climate, and so forth, are highly suitable to some crops and not to others. The Temperate Zone should not insist on growing bananas and coffee but should devote its energies to wheat, wool, and so forth, at which its application of effort would be much more productive, and trade these products for coffee, bananas, and so forth.

Actually there can be no quarrel with this concept. The trouble lies in its seizure by economists today as an instrument for freeing trade in a world that is far removed from the agrarian economy and beset by highly complicated and shifting processes of production, wherein advantages and disadvantages bear little relation to soil and climate. Modern technology has greatly transformed the factors that earlier conferred advantages based on location, fertility of soil, rainfall, heat or cold, and so forth, and we may expect yet greater independence of these factors.

More and more the bases of international competition also are transformed. Productivity of labor and relative wage rates come to assume much greater importance. Once technology among the trading nations becomes equal so that productivity will also be equal, wage levels will be the predominant factors in determining ability to compete. In recent years we have learned the truth of this at first hand. Low foreign wages have put many of our industries at an insuperable competitive disadvantage.

The law of comparative advantage is wholly beside the point. Low wages combined with modern technology have made the law inapplicable and worse than useless as a practical guide to legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks a brief study of the so-called law of comparative advantage. It treats the subject in fundamental terms and since this law is basic to much of the philosophy underlying the current trade policy of this country as reflected in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I hope that Members will take time to read this statement. It was prepared by O. R. Strackbein, who has devoted much study to the subject and many years to legislation in this field. It is high time that we took a closer look at the philosophical and economic underpinning of the trade policy that has already done such great damage to a number of American industries and bids fair to hurt severely and cripple many more.

Mr. Strackbein's analysis follows:

THE TARIFF AND THE LAW OF "COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE"

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, Trade Information Service)

The basic theory of free trade comes to rest on the law of comparative advantage.

This law or rather concept, usually cited by economists as the gospel, is really very simple, and not difficult to understand, as economists would have us believe. It is merely hard to swallow as an item of practical diet.

According to its rules, each country should devote its resources of climate, capital, land, labor, etc., to those economic pursuits that provide the greatest return and not waste them, so to speak, on those to which its resources are not so well adapted It would obtain these other goods from the outside, i.e., from countries that in turn are best fitted to produce them.

Thus not only our own but the whole world's resources would be utilized to the greatest total advantage. These are many examples that can be used to demonstrate the force and logic of this proposition.

Why, for instance, devote acreage in North Dakota to coffee and bananas when wheat does so much better there? Why not let Brazil and Central America provide us with coffee and bananas in exchange for our wheat?

While this is an extreme example it does illustrate the principle. Another example, not so extreme, might be found in wool. Australia does better than we in producing wool at a low cost. Why should we then insist on protecting the wool-growing industry in this country? Turning to industrial products, why should we devote capital and apply labor to the manufacture of cotton goods when Japan can do it so much cheaper, even though that country does not have a superior climate nor even produces raw cotton but imports much of it from this country? Beyond that the skill of her labor does not surpass that of this country's workers. What then gives Japan her advantage?

Turning to minerals, is it not folly to keep our coal mines in operation when imported residual fuel oil, a byproduct of petroleum refining, can be laid down in this country at a price that easily undercuts coal?

Or, using another example, should we insist on making sewing machines in this country when the American housewife can save money by buying a machine made in Japan, Italy, or Germany, even though we are no less adept and indeed perhaps better at manufacturing these machines here?

The law of comparative advantage would require that our providers of capital vacate those industrial, mining or farming activities in which other countries can outdo us in point of the factors of production and leave the production to them. From these pursuits our capital and land and labor should be diverted into channels that will give a higher return—such as, well, perhaps electronics or plastics or antibiotics, or possibly poultry raising.

The very best use of our money and resources could no doubt be achieved if we could turn the whole aggregate into that one pursuit at which we are the very best—if such a pursuit exists. Then we would be assured of the very highest return from our productive processes. All else we would obtain from other parts of the world.

Immediately, however, we see great difficulties in the way. The idea is good but suffers from ashortage of realism.

Unfortunately, for example, there may not exist any product that would bring such happy results. The automobile, however, comes to mind. Let us try out the theory and see how it fits not only our own economy but the rest of the world.

If we could produce enough automobiles, assuming that we could do this not only better than any other country but better than we can produce anything else in this country, thus exhibiting an "absolute advantage," it becomes immediately apparent that we would find it necessary to build a considerable number of automobiles each year. We would need enough to provide adequate income to buy from abroad everything else that we need such as sugar, corn, shoes, oil, fish, housing, clothing, etc.

In 1961 we expended in this country $197 billion for consumer goods, durable and nondurable, including automobiles. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962, table 423.) It would indeed require the exportation of a quite large quantity of automobiles, in the magnitude of 100 million, in fact (i.e., at about $2,000 per unit), if we were to rely on the production of automobiles alone to bring us enough money for imports, to feed, shelter, move, and clothe us.

Obviously this example represents a reductio ad absurdum but is nonetheless again illustrative of the principle.

Let us move away from the extreme then and say that we were also supreme in producing wheat in relation to other countries and that we could get the highest return from our farmland in yield per acre by planting nothing but wheat, i.e., we enjoyed another absolute advantage. Wheat growing would then share with automobile production the most productive use of our resources. We could then as a people at least ride on the highways and eat bread but we would still find it necessary to import everything else.

To be yet a little more realistic we could add cotton growing to wheat, considering the range of our climate, and homebuilding to automobiles, as other highly productive pursuits. We might even suppose that our advantage in all four of these products was "absolute." This is to say our returns from cotton growing might be equal to that of wheat; and we might be no less efficient at homebuilding than at building automobiles; and better at all four than any other country.

We would not have four great lines of production and would begin to achieve diversity of production and division of labor. Yet our productional economy would remain relatively simple.

Up to this point we would not have entered the magic field of "comparative advantages."

This zone would be entered only when we ran out of industries and farm operations at which we were in the forefront among the countries of the world as well as at home. Once having run out, however, we would have to choose among possible additional industries to fill out our economy. We might still have an advantage in these additional industries but it would be only "comparative" and not "absolute" as in wheat, automobiles, etc.

If we could not find other industries as advantageous to us as these four we should, under the principle, devote all our productive resources to the four; but, of course, we would still run into trouble, as we shall see. We might find it necessary to manufacture only 50 million automobiles instead of the 100 million previously needed, since we now had three other products to help bring our purchasing power to the $197 billion level through exports.

Now, instead of the 1¼ billion bushels of wheat we presently produce and the current 14 million bales of cotton, we would no doubt find it necessary to produce about 25 billion bushels of wheat and 100 million bales of cotton to make up for the cut in automobile production from 100 to 50 million. As for houses—we would encounter some trouble because we might find it difficult to export the surplus; for instead of $10 to $12 billion in new housing units per year we would need to build in the magnitude of $50 billion or more.

Unfortunately, the world consumption of wheat falls far short of what our output would be and in the case of cotton amounts to only half as much cotton as we would produce under this assumption. We would therefore be afflicted sorely with a surplus disposal problem, much worse than anything we have contemplated in actuality.

Very well, it is very clear that even though we would enjoy (in the example) an absolute advantage in the four products mentioned we would encounter at least two great difficulties. (1) The world market could not absorb our surplus of wheat, cotton, automobiles, and houses. (2) Even if other countries had a lesser advantage in producing these goods they would nevertheless not relinquish their production to us, (a) because of refusal to be thus dependent on us and (b) because they or some of them were already producing these items since the economic world did not grow up under the guidance of free trade.

Since we would then find it necessary to produce many more items beyond the four in order to avoid accumulation of hopeless surpluses, let us proceed in the knowledge that the principle of comparative advantage would require that we select first only those crops and industries in which we were better than the one next down the line in this country in point of efficiency and not sufficiently below any other country to make imports attractive. After cotton in the agricultural sphere, for example, we might find corn the next best; then oranges, hay, soybeans, tobacco, etc. (This is purely and shockingly hypothetical, and the Department of Agriculture itself might be hard put to it to make such a selection.) With respect to industry we might add telephone equipment, electrical appliances, office machinery, airplanes, electronic computers, farm machinery, again hypothetically. It is doubtful that the Department of Commerce could establish a sequence based on comparative efficiency. Nevertheless the selections must be made if we are not to "waste" our resources.

As we would become more self-sufficient in step with our diversification it would be unnecessary to produce such large quantities of each product, i.e., we would become less dependent on exports. Possibly 25 million automobiles would now be enough. Wheat production might be reduced to 15 billion bushels and cotton to 50 million bales.

Obviously these quantities would still be too large as measured against world consumption, except with respect to cotton. The 50 million bales would approximate present annual world production. We would, of course, expect to supply the whole world since we were the most efficient producer. Russia, however, might not listen to our theory. With respect to the other items we would still be overproduced in relation to world consumption.

We must therefore seek yet other industries, in each case making sure that every additional selection represented a line of production at which we would be more efficient than other countries of the world and also more efficient than in the production of any other possible product in this country not yet utilized. It would be a serious error to select a product at random, simply hoping that its production would be justifiable or even profitable. The risk that we might not be investing to the highest remaining advantage would be too great. But who would tell us? The government?

Very well, finally, let us say, we will have found a hundred industries and 50 farm products in which we would enjoy either an absolute or a comparative advantage. Such an assumption, it must be clear, presupposes another assumption, i.e., omniscience. Where does this reside? In the Government, particularly the State Department, which does our tariff cutting?

Of course, the theory of comparative advantage would look to the free play of market forces as a substitute for omniscience. This would assume unfettered competition, however, and no governmental interference with prices and wages; no control over out-

put; no import restrictions, no subsidies and no immigration limitations. The market must be free; the mobility of labor must be unhampered throughout the world; and no artificial props or favors must be supplied to any factor of production. Otherwise the operation of the theory would be faulty to an incalculable degree.

Interferences such as those represented by minimum wage and maximum hour laws, acreage controls, and price supports, tariffs, immigration quotas, control of interest rates, monopoly, etc., would be taboo. Such intrusions into the free play of economic forces would upset the natural balance and mock the free-trade principle. Inefficiencies might be shielded and perpetuated.

In the world as it is and as it developed, innumerable interferences have nevertheless in fact been instituted and exercised.

Countless varieties of controls, prohibitions, regulations and licenses, differing in many instances from country to country, have proliferated over the landscape of history and the end is not yet. More and more, economic planning is being substituted for the free market forces. These numerous and far-sweeping interferences make determinations of relative industry and agricultural efficiency a hopeless excursion into the deep fogs of dubious economics.

How then determine which industry or farm crop enjoys either an absolute or a comparative advantage, free from bias, distortion, political favoritism, or artificial support?

What the economic planners overlook is that we can no longer look to the free play of market forces to assure a "more effective allocation of resources" because the hand of Government has interfered too extensively with these forces. Therefore the benefits of the law of comparative advantage would devolve upon the felicitous exercise of good judgment by the planners rather than the automatic operation of free market forces. And there is the rub.

The economic world has grown up in international compartments, many of them on different levels. The degree of insulation has varied, but the international free play of economic forces is a myth far removed from reality. Political interferences have been varied and extensive. In other cases barriers of a score of varieties have been utilized to prevent uncushioned foreign competition.

In this country our tariff (with such exceptions as a tariff for revenue only, as when in the past we levied a duty on coffee) has generally recognized the principle of absolute advantage in foreign production by the provision of a liberal free list. Coffee, bananas, cocoa, tea and other products that we could only produce at a distinct disadvantage, have been imported on duty-free basis for many years. Also, such minerals as tin, copper ore, asbestos, ores of gold, silver, iron, nickel, platinum, chrome and cobalt; uncut diamonds, chalk, coal, asphalt, plaster rock, sulfur, etc., are admitted free of duty.

Beyond that certain raw materials such as hides and skins, raw silk, raw furs, wood pulp, pulpwood and newsprint, logs, cork, crude rubber, sisal, jute, essential oils, tanning materials, etc., are treated in the same manner. Tuna fish, shrimp, lobsters, shellfish, agricultural implements, typewriters, needles, shingles, barbed wire, are other items on the free list.

Today some 40 percent of our imports represent items on which we levy no duty. Moreover, we have reduced the average duty on dutiable items by some 80 percent since 1934. The average duty is now about 11 percent on dutiable items as against 50 percent before that year.

The industrial and farm products on which we do maintain a duty face different degrees of import competition. It is assumed by the free trade advocates that if the duty on all these products were removed the law of comparative advantage would automatically root out the less efficient industries.

The industries at the bottom of efficiency would be driven out of business and as a result our capital, land, and labor would be devoted to the remaining more efficient ones.

As an exercise in blissful theory such reasoning is unassailable. If, however, we are cruel enough to measure the theory by the yardstick of economic and political reality it assumes a different aspect. Several rough boulders lie in the path of the theory and they are well imbedded and not easily moved.

Were it possible to unwind the economic reel back to the beginning of economic time and then rewind it under circumstances of laissez faire, thus leaving the market forces to do their work freely, protecting nothing and no one against the rudeness of those forces, it might be possible to assess the value of free trade and its fruits.

This must, of course, forever remain impossible because we cannot unwind history and then rewind it to suit our fancy.

Therefore the fact is that even though industry and agriculture in this country developed under relatively free market conditions, both nevertheless were either the beneficiaries or victims of various interferences, such as the tariff (throughout our history as a nation), immigration restrictionism (since the early decades of this century), land grants to railroads, various specific subsidies, etc. Then there were interferences in the form of regulations, such as antitrust laws, to assure that freer play of market forces; for experience with monopolies had demonstrated that free market forces themselves could be used by competent manipulators to control other market forces. Therefore to preserve free market forces, the Government stepped in to protect the innocent market forces against market forces that were cannibalistic or at least regarded as predatory.

This was followed in the past three decades with far-reaching interferences by the Government to the point where we can no longer claim to have a free market. We have freedom within rather rigid limitations, with some segments or areas enjoying more freedom than others.

How conceivably unravel the relative degree of efficiency and inefficiencies within and among our industries today? Some industries are highly concentrated and so great in size that individual companies within them are as large as half a dozen smaller whole industries combined. (Compare the automotive industry with book manufacturing, cutlery, luggage, wire, pottery, wallpaper, etc.) Other industries count among their companies huge ones alongside of those classed as medium and others that are small. Yet these "small" ones may be larger than the large ones of other smaller industries. Yet other industries, because of the limitation of the whole market, can boast only of relatively small companies; for example, makers of clothespins.

Where then is a yardstick of efficiency to be found? Efficient or inefficient compared with what? Should a small company in the textile industry be compared with General Motors or Du Pont? Or should it be compared with a small company of another industry?

But what if the two industries, measured by the law of comparative advantage, are not of the same level of efficiency? May not a small company in an "inefficient" industry in fact be more efficient (in the sense of management and progressiveness) than another company of the same size in an "efficient" industry?

Strangely enough the economists who speak of "inefficiency" of an industry do not provide a bill of particulars. Oh, they may say that management is inefficient, but to say that is only to utter so many words. Wherein is the management inefficient? In finance, administration, production, advertising, sales, storekeeping, accounting, and in what specific operations in any specific department? The economists would rather be much more general in their indictments.

Let us say, for example, that the industry dedicated to handmade glassware is inefficient in the economic sense, i.e., it has not adopted or discovered the technological methods that would bring it to the forefront. Is it not possible that individual companies in the industry could be as efficient managerially as another company that operates in the manufacture of electronics? Obviously this not only could be possible but may be expected to be found in more instances than one.

Yet, without any investigation the glassware industry would be classified as inefficient. By that measure every industry was at one time inefficient. This was true of the cigarette industry, of the carriage industry, the pretzel industry and hundreds of others. Then, not by any schedule but by the magic chance of invention someone discovered a revolutionary mechanical principle and the inefficient industry was sprung to the forefront of "efficiency" in the sense of jumping into the technological vanguard.

Had such industries been condemned to die in a naked combat with imports before technological invention lifted them out of the list of inefficient industries we would have lost them to our economy. Yet today there are many other such industries that would be unseasonably condemned to death and our economic diversity would suffer.

When will table glassware be made by machinery? It is already so made. Yet there is a consumer demand for the more artistic workmanship and individual design that only handicraft can supply. The same can be said of certain items of pottery and other consumer products. Should industries of this type be doomed, thus sacrificing the skill and artistry that not only add to the choice in household decoration but also give far greater satisfaction to the working artisans than turning a screw or pushing a button? Moreover, other countries continue to make glassware and other products of this type. Are they then more efficient economically than our producers merely because they can undersell us? Evidently not, because they are also technologically in the backwaters. Are they then more efficient as artisans, as skillful workers?

How measure this? The only present effective measure is the price at which they can lay down their products in this country. The theoretical economist will jump to the unjustified conclusion that if the domestic industry cannot compete with imports it thereby convicts itself automatically of relative inefficiency. Can this be a proper verdict? The least that could be demanded would be a showing of the relative hourly output of the domestic and the foreign artisans. Unquestionably it would be found that the American artisan would at least equal his foreign competitior.

The principal difference then would be found in the price of labor; and it is here that the American industry would reflect the higher cost. The American worker receives from 3 to 10 or more times the wages of his foreign counterpart (Canada excepted).

Should American industries of this type be sacrificed on the altar of comparative advantage? Must we vacate industry after industry (1) because our wages are higher than the foreign pay even if our artisans are as efficient as their foreign competitors but are condemned as "economically inefficient;" (2) because for the time being modern technology has not yet erased the demand for the more artistic, warmer, and more equisite product of skilled craftsmen;

and (3) because our labor must not waste its time with antiquated methods but should be retrained for advanced jobs for which many other workers are already waiting and panting in the pool of futility?

Application fo the principle of comparative advantage in practice would, as already hinted, impose a superhuman burden. The American coal industry, already mentioned, is the most efficient in the world in point of output per man-hour because of its behemoth machines developed in recent years. The output per man-hour has doubled in a little over 10 years and the number of mineworkers more than cut in half. Yet the industry is counted as inefficient in the economic sense because petroleum and natural gas and residual fuel oil are less costly to produce. Therefore, by the theory of comparative efficiency or advantage, the coal industry should go the way of the dinosaur.

Yet, should the industry be abandoned, it would release more than 150,000 coal miners and much capital and machinery. Railroads that haul coal would suffer, etc. Moreover, the competitive fuels are not inexhaustible. In a decade it might become necessary to reopen the coal mines, and that would indeed be a costly undertaking.

Yet such is the imperative of the theory that these risks would have to be run if we are to be true to it.

What then is the worth of a theory that crumbles if it is touched by the fingertips of reality? Oh, it acts as a guide on a path that cannot in most cases be followed.

The slavish devotion of the free-trade economists to their theories only underlines nothing more clearly than their separation from reality.

Considering the rapid movement of modern technology, it should be very clear that the law of comparative advantage would have only temporary validity in many fields. Yet it is the very cornerstone of the free trade structure. Did not Japan enjoy a great advantage in silk production? What happened to this circumstance? Was not our own southern cotton king for many years? Where does it stand today? Did the law of absolute advantage save it? What happened to Chilean nitrates? Where in the industrial ranks is crude rubber today? How long can Australia expect to rest so much of her economic dependence on wool? Yet here were products in which forward advantage once resided not so long ago. How would free trade have preserved them?

Today we find it necessary to subsidize raw cotton at 8½ cents per pound in order to export it. Where in the scale of comparative advantage does our cotton culture stand today? Where is the economist's prescription? Is the doctrine of free trade not becoming irrelevant in the technological world?

Today it is possible that an American industry may be ruinously menaced by imports of products of a crassly inefficient foreign industry that may enjoy very little of the true economic advantages demanded by the principles of free trade. Such a foreign industry might in fact be hard put to explain its competitive advantage on any ground other than lower wages. This is not an economic advantage of the kind contemplated by Adam Smith. The foreign industry might have less advanced machinery, operate under antiquated methods, and adhere to a more pedestrian pace of production. Should it pay the American scale of wages, it might be hopelessly out of the competitive race. Yet an American industry unable to compete with such a foreign industry would be condemned as inefficient.

If the principle of free trade were indeed honestly applied, the laws of economics would in reality be violated if such a foreign industry were permitted to subdue the American producer. The law of economic progress would be set back. The very incentive to progress would be smothered, and the laurels would go, not to the deserving contestant, but to the economic laggard.

When such unequal competitive forces are thrown against each other the reason must be political or anything but economic; it cannot be justified by the law of comparative advantage or any good principle of free trade.

Such justification is a pernicious practice since it drapes the mantle of supposed respectability over the shoulders of a program that is fast becoming indefensible.

The free market, such as we had of it was good. It was under its dispensation that this country easily gained the industrial leadership of the world; but we cannot restore it by undoing the tariff while binding down free enterprise in other vital sectors, thus making it less competitive.

The visible result of ignoring this fact may be seen in the reluctance of domestic capital to venture at home, preferring in many instances the foreign soil. By confronting our producing enterprises on a broad front with rising import competition that will contest any expanded market for increased domestic output with us, thus pinching down the profit incentive, we are lowering the horizon of our economic growth and enhancing displacement of workers by machinery. The latter theoretically should lead to greater eventual employment but will not do so when industry cannot reap its own reward but is doomed to see its hope of profit dissipated in an uneven battle with imports advantaged by wage rates that would be illegal in this country.

Why we insist on weighting down our producing industries with handicaps that award the greatest cost advantage, namely, lower wage costs per unit of production, to their foreign competitors, is a question that could only be answered by a psychoanalysis of the governmental free-trade doctrinaires.

The law of comparative advantage has already been buried beneath a mesh of economic controls. It has been rendered impotent as a usable guide in a world in which technology renders yesterday's advantage obsolete, or springs a chronic laggard industry into the front ranks tomorrow. Why play as if the law still had a meaning outside the field of theory when bushels of domestic legislation contradict its very foundations every year? And when political considerations keep it handcuffed and tethered by a short leash?

This rock on which free trade rests should be sent to a museum as a curiosity of classical economics and as a handy pawn used by pragmatic economists for purposes of their own.

The Kennedy-Supported Coup in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that President Kennedy has two standards for military juntas. If they are anti-Communist, he delays recognition but if the junta has assassinated six anti-Communists of the previous government, he immediately recognizes them.

With all the managed news in the United States, regarding the situation in Vietnam, it is refreshing to submit herewith an editorial which appeared in the Tablet on November 7, an article from yesterday's Washington Daily News by William F. Buckley, Jr., and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of November 7.

The editorials and articles follow:

[From the Tablet, Nov. 7, 1963]

A FAITHFUL ALLY MURDERED

The American people, we dare say, do not share the satisfaction of many Washington officials and their political mouthpieces over the coup which destroyed the Diem regime in South Vietnam. Aside from the foul murder of Diem and his brother—outrageous crimes which the new regime contemptibly called suicide—it must not be forgotten that the United States owed a tremendous debt to Ngo Dinh Diem.

It was this murdered ruler who from 1942 to 1950 in World War II fought the Japanese occupation of Vietnam, opposed the continuance of French rule and spurned an alliance with Ho Chi Minh, the Vietnamese Communist leader. In 1952, threatened by both French and native Communists, he left his homeland, lived in exile in the United States until he could return to Vietnam in 1954. Then by public demand—and on the insistence of John Foster Dulles, U.S. Secretary of State—he accepted the premiership under the playboy Emperor Bao Dai. He fought for the liberty of the people, destroyed the private armies oppressing the populace, and on October 23, 1955, by courageous leadership, achieved a popular referendum. He won; Bao Dai was exiled; South Vietnam became a republic, and Diem became the head of state.

In 1960 he defeated disgruntled military and civilian elements who sought to destroy democratic rule. In 1961 he called for an election so that the people could exercise a voice in the running of the government, and he was overwhelmingly reelected for a second term.

Six months later, October 19, 1961, Diem cited the Communists as a rising menace to South Vietnam, and received power from the national assembly to rule by decree in order to maintain national security. In December of 1961 he received military support from President Kennedy and large financial help from the United States. In February of 1962 he defeated an attempted coup.

That is the written record of the man who was betrayed last Friday and murdered by individuals whose lives he saved and whose liberty he protected. Well, indeed, and to his credit, U.S. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, majority leader, uniquely asserted: "I am shocked and grieved to hear of the death of President Ngo Dinh Diem, an old and valued friend. He was a man of great integrity and great patriotism. It is sad, indeed, that such a man should be the victim of an atrocious crime."

Unhonored, unsung and scarcely mentioned by official Washington was the man who singlehandedly rallied Vietnam to the free world's side, after the great powers had cynically written it off to communism, as far back as the 1959 Geneva Conference. He rendered the world a great service in the fight against the Red pestilence, and should have been applauded for his moral, courageous and intelligent leadership.

Diem had his faults. In recent years he made enemies. His judgment at times was open to criticism. His brother, it is said, made his path difficult and gave his opponents issues over which to assail him. However, it is sad but undoubtedly correct to state that the present administration in Washington, through a frequently blundering State Department, was not an innocent bystander in last Friday's coup. This was not a united movement to destroy Diem for, while some U.S. officials maintained the war in Vietnam was going badly, others—Gen.

Paul D. Harkins, commander of the 16,000 "American advisers" in that country—asserted the day before the coup that victory was only months away. In addition, Secretary of Defense McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, after a survey on the scene asserted that by the end of 1965 the Communist Vietcong guerrillas would be defeated. None of these men said Diem, or his family, was an insuperable drag upon military success. Despite this expert testimony, however, the following chain of events was effective in helping to pull the rug from Diem's feet:

1. Liberal correspondents in Saigon carried on a continual war against the Vietnam regime and the family of the chief of state.

2. The upper level of the U.S. State Department, the Saigon offices of foreign aid and the U.S. information agencies, and even the White House itself, engaged in the disparaging campaign.

3. The drive picked up speed with the first self-immolation by a Buddhist in Saigon. A cry of religious "repression" was made. The Vietnam regime insisted it was a local disturbance, based on politics, to discredit the government.

4. On the nights of August 24–25, the U.S. State Department officials sent a cable, which was broadcast by the USIA, assailing Diem and extended to the people of Vietnam an invitation to oust the government.

5. On September 2, President Kennedy, in his television interview with Walter Cronkite, censured Diem and hinted at the need of changes in personnel in the regime.

6. Twenty-two U.S. Senators, most of them professed liberals, signed a manifesto demanding the end of all American aid to the Diem regime unless it reformed, and other groups, taking the cue, printed anti-Diem statements and advertisements in U.S. papers—most of which were based on bigotry.

7. Mme. Nhu came to the United States to plead the government's cause. A brilliant and patriotic woman, she was ostracized by the administration and harassed by Government mouthpieces all over the country. Her father was induced to resign his diplomatic post in Washington, and her sister was enlisted to join the campaign to discredit her and the Saigon members of the family.

These various actions of U.S. officials created not only an unfriendly climate and antagonistic atmosphere but also pressures which had plenty to do with creating an uprising.

It was, to put it politely, a shabby business, and it is not made understandable when one reads of the administration denouncing the military coups in Santo Domingo and Honduras, and refusing to recognize the new regimes there, while on the other hand there is talk of immediate recognition of those responsible for the coup in South Vietnam, including the accomplices in the murder of the President and his brother. It will be recalled the lives of the rulers of Santo Domingo and Honduras were spared by the leaders of the coups in those countries.

The American conscience is stirred by what has happened in Vietnam, and it will live with us, as well as with people all over the world, for many years.

At the same time all of us hope the new regime in South Vietnam will carry on the war continually and successfully against the Communist enemy, as Diem did, for that is not only the hope of all of us but the primary plank in the platform of the new regime.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 13, 1963]

AMERICAN WAY OF DEATH

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Mr. Diem is dead, and Mr. Nhu; and there is dancing in the streets of Saigon and, as a matter of fact, in the streets of New York and Washington, and other centers of civilization. If the dances were a little inhibited, perhaps it is because Mme. Nhu still lives—if she too had been murdered, the joy would have been unconfined.

As it is, she was alive when it happened, in Los Angeles with her daughter, at the end of a grueling tour of this country during which she tried to make two points to the American public, namely (1), that the Diem regime's iniquities were largely fabricated, and (2), that the Diem regime's survival was central to the success of the anti-Communist operation in southeast Asia. Then at one stroke she lost her husband, her brother-in-law, her home, her mission. Time marches on, what?

The Widow Nhu charges that her family and regime were killed, actually, in Washington. The lady must be allowed poetic license. She does not mean to say that American bullets killed her family—I should say, American executioners: the bullets undoubtedly were made in the United States—but rather that her family was killed as a result of American policy. The genteel way to put it was of course formulated by the New York Times. American activities, said the Times, "helped to prepare the psychological atmosphere for the coup."

Madam Nhu keeps insisting that her family was the administrative soul and spirit of the fight against the Communists, and the prosecutor counters by saying: How can that be? Considering that the people of South Vietnam danced in the streets at the news of their downfall? But one might answer, such are the ways of the people. They dance at the revolution, and they dance at the restoration. They danced in the streets of Peiping when Chiang Kai-shek was driven away by the Communists. Well, but surely we will now have stability in South Vietnam, a stability which we can harness into effective anti-Communist action without the distractions of a despot who kept outraging world opinion.

Are we indeed so sure? That is what they said after Syngman Rhee's ouster from Korea—do you remember him? He, too, like Mr. Diem, was revered as the George Washington of his country, but he, too, grew despotic and corrupt, and was finally ousted. And what happened? In the succeeding 5 years there have been three different governments in South Korea, and the current one is giving us most trouble of all.

There are two ways of looking at the Diem regime. The one way focuses exclusively on its sins (as measured according to the Western code). It remains a mystery just exactly what they are, though if Mr. Diem did not sin he probably would be the first ruler since St. Louis who hasn't. Take the version most scarlet of his sins, and even then he cannot compare in venality with such other despotisms—Ceylon's, Burma's, Indonesia's, to name three countries in the immediate area—against whom no hue and cry is raised.

The second standard calls for focusing on the relative performance of Mr. Diem. As to that, listen to the majority leader of the Senate of the United States, the Democratic Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, who said of him the day after he had died that he was "a courageous man," a "man of integrity," a "great patriot."

But that is not enough these days in the court of public opinion. He was something else again quite utterly disqualifying. He was a relentless, undeviating, acting, fighting anti-Communist. That is the besetting sin of our time, and few can survive it. Anti-Communists who unflinchingly support American programs tend to end up (Diem) with bullets in their heads; or (Rhee) exiled; or (Chiang) puppetized; or (Salazar) beleaguered. In international politics, a strong and purposive friendship for this country and its international purposes tends to lead to what one might call the American way of death.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Nov. 7, 1963]

REMAINS TO BE SEEN

With a line of reasoning almost too convoluted to be comprehended, a claque of commentators has been hailing the coup in South Vietnam as a great and shining triumph in the field of American foreign policy. Maybe so, but we doubt it. We think this is a situation in which everybody would be well advised to keep in mind the overworked but quite useful phrase about how it remains to be seen.

It remains to be seen, for example, whether the new regime will actually be as effective as that of the late President Diem in fighting the Communists. One must hope that it will be, but there are no absolute assurances on that score. What also remains to be seen is how the so-called Buddhists—the ones who are far more political than religious—will cooperate with the "revolutionary" government in Saigon, which has brutally disposed of Mr. Diem and his brother, both once hailed as heroes in our official literature.

What remains to be seen, too, is how the Chinese Communists will exploit the South Vietnamese mess. There are disquieting indications that they are bent on using Buddhism—which is based on a belief in God—to support Red atheism by stirring up further strife in places like Laos, which seems to be verging on the edge of disintegration. Peiping, in any case, has been playing host to a gathering of "Buddhists" from all parts of Asia, and this gathering—harshly anti-American in tone—has made noises suggesting that "monks" and "priests" will be used to advance communism's cause.

What is ironical about all this is that the Chinese Communists, during their rape of Tibet a few years ago, destroyed over 1,000 Buddhist monasteries. Accordingly, to put it mildly, the "Buddhists" who are now playing Peiping's game in Vietnam and the rest of Asia need to be given a very hard look. Beyond that, we must reckon with the fact that a lot of people over there, seeing how we have dealt with the Diem regime, must feel just a little bit uneasy about cooperating with us. To that extent, despite the enthusiastic commentators, what has happened in Saigon seems something less than a development our country can gloat over or feel proud of.

Tired of It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the November 10 issue of the Sunday Star sets out the sentiments of a great many Americans, including myself. I am inserting it in the RECORD for the information of those Members who may not have seen it:

TIRED OF IT ALL

President, Kennedy, in accepting a distinguished service award from a Protestant group, got in the following plug for his foreign aid program:

"I think the American people are willing to shoulder this burden * * *. Some say they are tiring of this task, or tired of world problems, or tired of hearing those who receive our aid disagree with our diplomacy.

But what kind of spirit is that? Are we tired of living in a free world? Do we expect to make it over in our own image? Are we going to quit now because there are problems not yet solved?"

The implication here is that the American people (who have been lugging the foreign aid load for 17 years) are ready, willing, and happy to keep on lugging it. Some other President, 17 years in the future, may be saying pretty much the same thing. But we dissent.

It is our belief that the American people, or most of them, are sick and tired of foreign aid. They are fed up with doling out billions in American tax dollars to people who couldn't care less about what we in this country like to speak of as the American way of life. They are bored to tears with the threadbare argument that the Communists will take over the world unless we pay the bills for countries which don't know or care which team they are playing on, assuming that they are willing to play on any team. Mr. Khrushchev can't even feed his own people. Why not let him try this foreign aid load for size?

To sum up, we think the American people, as far as foreign aid is concerned, have just about had it. And we haven't the slightest doubt that it is this more than anything else which underlies the attitude of Congress—an attitude which the President either can't or won't understand.

This Congress, of course, will pass a foreign aid bill. But the appropriation will be sharply cut back. And it should be. The 88th Congress will go down in history (with applause) if it begins the quick phasing out of foreign aid. And we do not believe that the rest of the world, without the Yankee dollar, will go either to pot or to the Communists.

Our Underpaid Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, recently gave its editorial support to increased salaries for Federal judges as provided by H.R. 8716 and H.R. 8717.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

OUR UNDERPAID FEDERAL JUDGES

All of us pay heed to the vast slums earmarked for foreign aid. We raise our voices in disapproval. All of us pay heed in the vast sums earmarked for military outlay. We tacitly approve this protection of our homeland and our own self defense. But we are prone to disregard Federal salaries here at home that long have been disregarded.

An outstanding instance of underpaid posts are Federal judgeships. The last increase granted U.S. judges was in 1955. At that time the increase only partially corrected the salary imbalance then existing. Today those salaries are completely out of line with the economic and official needs of those serving in our judiciary branch of Government.

Congress is being urged to include Federal judges and Members of Congress in the pending legislation to raise the pay scale for postal workers and classified civil service employees. Congressman MORRIS UDALL, Arizona Democrat, and Congressman JOEL BROYHILL, Virginia Republican, introduced omnibus bills (H.R. 8716 and H.R. 8717) last month urging this inclusion.

The proposed judicial salary increases would raise district, customs and tax court judges from $22,500 to $35,000 annually. Judges of the U.S. circuit courts and other appellate courts would be raised from $25,500 to $40,500. Associate Justices of the Supreme Court would receive $50,000 yearly instead of the present $35,000. The Chief Justice, who now receives $35,500 would receive $50,500.

We want our judicial system to be the finest possible. To have this we must have good men in high judicial posts. Men of legal stature deserve comparable remuneration. Yet we see highly qualified, highly competent men leaving private practice to accept Federal judgeships that pay them a salary below the worth of their educational ability. Five Federal judges, one in eastern Missouri, come quickly to mind who left private practice in the $65,000 bracket to accept Federal judgeships.

If we are to retain the best minds in Federal judgeships we are going to have to pay them their worth. The public should support the measure before Congress to secure better salaries for our Federal judges.

Should Military Operations Be in Charge of Career Military Officers or Temporary Civilian Appointees?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Vice Adm. L. S. Sabin, U.S. Navy, retired, during his active career conducted with great brilliance the evacuation of French Indo-China and several other touchy military operations at remote overseas locations. He acquitted himself and the Nation with honor. He had been trained for this work throughout his lifetime in the service. That, in fact, is what the Nation has, in the past, trained its military officers to do. No matter what today's so-called defense intellectuals say, there is no substitute for mature judgment and decisive action at the scene of a crisis. If this Nation is to continue to be a winner, it must continue to adhere to those techniques which have proven successful. In a communication in the November issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, Admiral Sabin eloquently argues this point as follows:

The career military officer is in a highly specialized and very complex profession. Years of education and training have gone into making him a flag officer, and during those years he has probably been subjected to the most rigid selectivity in the world. The civilian Secretaries come and go. For a transitory Secretary of Defense or his equally transitory civilian assistants to qualify themselves as military operational experts in the few years they hold office is not only nonsense—it is dangerous nonsense. The fact that a man has made a successful career out of directing the business of a large corporation no more qualifies him as an expert in military operations than does a successful military career qualify an officer to direct the affairs of a large corporation.

The ridiculous bugaboo that it is necessary to crack down on the generals and flag officers to remind them of our National tradition of civilian control over the military is just so much fantasy. To use this as an excuse for the increasing intrusion by the civilian secretariat into the field of military operations is equally fantastic. The military of this Nation are not now nor have they ever been a threat to the proper and legal control traditionally exercised by their civilian political masters. Quite to the contrary, they are and have always been the most ardent supporters of this wholly proper concept of Government. It makes good news copy to report that a certain general or admiral has been "put in his place" by his civilian boss. But more often than not it does not make good sense as far as national security is concerned. The concept of civilian control over the military was never intended to extend to operational authority over the combat forces except as legally vested in the President of the United States. And I cannot recall any President who has ever tried to fight a battle from the White House.

Many of the silly administrative requirements imposed on the operating forces stem from the Pentagon and result from decisions made by transitory self-styled military experts who had little or no military operational experience when they assumed office and who will vacate their political offices in a few years at most having become operational military experts by commanding a large mohagany desk with an occasional side trip to the operating services. This is no reflection on those dedicated men, such as James Forrestal, who knew what their responsibilities were and discharged them with great credit to themselves and great benefit to the Nation.

It used to be that the War and Navy Departments existed for the support of their operating forces. Now it would appear that the operating forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force exist to support a colossal administrative organization in the Pentagon, in which respective service departments have been submerged to the point of anonymity. I have the sad—and somewhat frightening—idea that in the maze of administrative and technical matters which consume so much time in the Pentagon, there seems to have been a loss of memory as to the purpose of armies, navies, and air forces. They appear to have forgotten that it is the operating forces who must win wars, when and if wars are fought. Perhaps they should be reminded that if it were not for the operating forces there would be no need for a Department of Defense. As the hirings and firings of top military officers who dare to express their considered military judgment continue, the law of averages is bound to take over. Sooner or later an amenable service chief will be found who is willing to sacrifice his professional judgment for his job. And when that happens, the security of this Nation most certainly will have it.

Whose Quality?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in Food Field Reporter of October 21, 1963, entitled "Whose Quality?" pointing out the dangers of the quality stabilization bills, H.R. 3669 and S. 774, to merchandising and to the consumer:

WHOSE QUALITY?

Unpopular laws have been enacted many times in Congress and local legislative bodies, but seldom has a law come through the lawmaking machinery with wider potential unpopularity and less justification than the quality stabilization (fair trade) bill that will soon come before the House Rules Committee.

We say wider potential unpopularity because most consumers (who would feel the bill's effects directly) would be violently opposed to quality stabilization if they knew about it. They don't know about it, and undoubtedly this was behind the gloriously inspired euphemism of quality stabilization—to keep the general public from being aware that quality stabilization is what Federal Trade Commission Chairman Paul Rand Dixon said it is—fair-trade and price rigging.

In the food industry, of course, the notion that quality stabilization is connected with price stabilization is ludicrous. The whole idea of the supermarket and mass merchandising was to bring quality products to consumers at the lowest possible price—not the highest price that would insure a profit to all retailers regardless of their ability to market competitively. Where is it written that all retailers, big or small, should be guaranteed a profit? Even Mr. Dixon—the champion of small business—can't buy that.

Indeed, it is hard to see who is for such an all-pervasive fair trade law, except very specially interested groups. One of those groups couldn't be consumers—since it would be difficult to convince them that the quality of a washing machine goes down with the sale price if they find it for less at a discounter than at some other retailer. It would be hard to convince a consumer that the quality of a baby's milk formula diminishes when she buys it at a supermarket or discount store for less than at the corner drugstore. Hard indeed.

Curiously, the one group who should be most interested in fair trade or quality stabilization is manufacturers. But they show little interest in trying to enforce fair trade even where and when it has existed. Most manufacturers well recognize the burden and expense of enforcing and policing fair trade agreements even when they are permitted. Gillette Safety Razor recently announced that it was withdrawing from its fair trade agreements across the country. Gillette has been a strong supporter of fair trade and traditionally made every effort to enforce its agreements. This decision will hit the quality stabilization supporters hard, or as one commentator put it: "it will hit them right in the drugstore."

Gratitude From Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when the test ban treaty was signed, the diplomatic rover boy, Averell Harriman, told the world what a great thing we had done. Of course, the gratitude we have received from Khrushchev since then was predicted by many of us.

In the November 8 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, David Lawrence tells us how useless thus far the hot line between President Kennedy and Khrushchev has been:

TODAY IN WORLD AFFAIRS—TRIGGER ON THE AUTOBAHN: WHAT KHRUSHCHEV MEANS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—A most sensational revelation has just been made by Premier Khrushchev. He tells the world that at any moment a war could break out between the United States and the Soviet Union, inasmuch as the Russian military commanders on the Berlin highway can decide for themselves to open fire on allied troops and vehicles.

This state of affairs would normally be protected against a dangerous climax by diplomatic intervention, but Mr. Khrushchev apparently has given discretion to subordinate officers to shoot if they construe existing regulations about access to Berlin to be challenged. He indicates that, irrespective of the facts, he will blame the U.S. forces for having provoked the fighting.

The Soviet Premier permitted an unedited verson of his remarks to a group of American businessmen to be released without any modification of his extreme statement. This is unusual. One of the visitors asked:

"Are you saying that if we cannot agree over procedure on the autobahn, that you would give an order that would result in shooting and possible war?"

To this, Mr. Khrushchev replied as follows:

"No, we gave no such order but there is an established procedure * * * it is a matter of a soldier being a soldier. He has operational instructions and if someone wants to break through, then it is in the natural course of things that force will be met by force.

"It is something that is based on standing orders. A soldier is not a foreign minister. He cannot enter into negotiations and he has to carry out his orders. That is the law both for our soldiers and for yours.

"They [the Americans] made an attempt to ignore the established procedure. Thus our armored trucks came out of concealment to bar the way and then the Americans and British agreed to observe the established procedure.

"It is difficult to say what would have happened if they had not agreed to that. It is possible that you and I would not be here today. We would not have yielded and they would have had to move over our dead bodies."

The American version of the autobahn incident is that it was the Soviets who departed from the established procedure. This is the kind of argument that normally is threshed out by the foreign offices and the diplomats, but the Khrushchev statement indicates clearly that the Soviet troops are under "operational instructions" to shoot whenever they themselves wish to deviate from the customary procedure and the Allied forces in response attempt to maintain their own rights.

No more dangerous setup could be devised to bring on a war. If shooting starts, there will not be time to argue afterward just who departed from the established rules. But now everybody knows that the Soviet military forces have been told to shoot when challenged. Mr. Khrushchev's policy appears to be to seek gradually to impose more and more restrictions until the Allied forces have been driven out of the Berlin area altogether.

Mr. Khrushchev views it as a test of nerves. He says:

"Evidently it must be a test of nerves on your part. When you decided to test our nerves, we decided in response to put our armored cars across the autobahn to test your nerves and see if you would start shooting or not. And we were glad you didn't."

It seems incredible that the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States have reached a point where any instructions have to be issued to the respective military forces of these two countries to test nerves. Meanwhile, the United States, France, and Great Britain have explicitly charged in a formal note that the Soviet commander deviated from the agreed-upon regulations for control of the autobahn.

The whole episode comes as a big surprise to many people who had been led to believe that the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty and the prospective sale of wheat to the Russians had established a kind of euphoria, or at least a spirit of mutual understanding or restraint.

Today the remarks of Premier Khrushchev stand before the world as a disclosure of the strategy and tactics of the dictator in the Kremlin. His latest words will be widely construed as an effort to bluff the United States into getting out of Berlin. He may have come to believe that nuclear war is feared so much in America that almost any step which could possibly become an involvement in war will be avoided and that concessions will be made to the Communists.

Recently a hot line was installed between the White House and the Kremlin to permit instantaneous communications in a crisis. But if the Soviet troops have been given orders to fire without getting in touch with the Kremlin itself, it is conceivable that bloodshed will occur before any hot line could be put to use.

It would appear that nothing is more important now for the U.S. Government than to have a clear-cut understanding with the Soviet Union as to what it intends to do in the area around Berlin and to ascertain whether Khrushchev has actually instructed his military forces to fire upon American forces whenever the latter do not act in accordance with procedures established unilaterally by the Soviets. It would seem desirable, too, to set up a machinery for immediately resolving any conflicts in understanding about established procedures.

Food for Peace: The Art of Stretching a Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix an article by C. L. Sulzberger published in the New York Times of September 2, 1963.

This article describes one aspect of our foreign aid program known as food for peace.

The article follows:

THE ART OF STRETCHING A DOLLAR

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

ATHENS, September 1.—One of the most successful inventions of American capitalism is the food for peace program which grew out of Public Law 480, enacted in 1954 by the Eisenhower administration. Public Law 480 represents the acme of what President Eisenhower used to call enlightened self-interest.

This program derives from two initial impulses, widely removed in time and motive, one selfish and linked to internal politics, the other charitable and linked to foreign policy. One motive was to reduce enormous

grain stocks with costly carrying charges accumulating ever since President Roosevelt started the Commodity Credit Corporation. Another was to feed hungry communities abroad.

Using Greece as a test tube, one can discern the evolution of an ingenious and astonishingly inexpensive combination of self-help and philanthropy. Tiny Greece has received comparatively small shares of Public Law 480 disbursements. Yet, if one analyzes how the food dollar has been spent here, one discovers widespread ramifications.

In 1959 Greece and the United States signed a bilateral agreement under Public Law 480. Broadly speaking, the formula works like this: Washington, as before the food-for-peace program, buys $1,000 of grain from an American farmer and stores it under the farm support system. Then, under Public Law 480, with another $1,000 the Government purchases the grain from itself to feed hungry Greeks. The cost to the U.S. taxpayer initially appears, to be $2,000.

But no such amount is finally disbursed. Greece takes possession of the $1,000 of wheat and pays the equivalent amount in drachmas, the local currency, to the account of the U.S. Treasury in Greek banks.

PAYING LESS FOR MORE

Of this drachma sum, 42 percent ($420 in each $1,000) is allotted to pay U.S. expenses here—rental on embassy buildings, supplies, salaries of Greek employees. Another 13 percent is held available for loans to affiliates of American firms or business development. The remainder can be loaned to Greece, subject to annual interest payments, for public works projects, or used for special emergency or disaster grants.

In a bookkeeping sense, the American taxpayer would seem to be spending $2,000—$1,000 to support our farmers and another $1,000 to feed Greeks. In fact, he pays much less and accomplishes much more. It costs 12 percent to store surplus wheat in the United States. Thus, for each $1,000 shipment to Greece the U.S. Treasury saves $120.

Then, under the 42 percent allotment for U.S. use of drachmas furnished by Athens to pay our official expenses here, there is another $420 annual saving. Otherwise unused grain is taken out of costly storage to pay for services dollars would otherwise have to finance. Finally, under the loan clause, Greece pays 4-percent interest each year plus 3-percent repayment of principal. In theory, should all loans eventually be repaid, the United States would have spent virtually nothing for the $1,000 in grain removed from American silos to feed Greece.

This is certainly stretching the dollar for effective low-cost charity. And at the same time drachma funds held in U.S. Treasury accounts can be spent to further our National interests such as aid to American schools here. Greece benefits; so do we; and the ultimate cost to U.S. taxpayers is negligible.

Of course, Public Law 480 doesn't always function so well, especially in vaster, poorer lands where huge stocks of local currency, put up by recipient governments, simply cannot be spent by Washington. Nevertheless, far more is being accomplished than the mere feeding of famished foreigners, and carrying costs of our own farm aid program are commensurately reduced. Because our farmers favor this means of siphoning off excess production, this aspect of U.S. foreign aid encounters relatively little congressional opposition.

The complex bipartisan schemes that became food for peace evolved slowly from the New Deal to the New Frontier. By gradual improvisation it has stretched this particular dollar far beyond its budget value. Otherwise siloed grain feeds friends while paying U.S. oversea expenses; and internal political convenience is married to foreign policy requirements.

Some More Kennedy Administration Lies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is so disgusting to see the State Department try to worm its way out of the lies in the Otepka case. We can all imagine what would have happened if Mr. Otepka had been charged with pro-communism instead of anticommunism.

In the November 11 issue of the New York Herald Tribune and in yesterday's issue of the Washington Evening Star, David Lawrence and Richard Wilson searchingly expose this disgraceful episode:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 11, 1963]

THE DAGGER IN THE CLOAK—AND MR. OTEPKA'S BACK

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, has achieved a reputation for independent thinking. When he says that the Department of State, in dismissing its director of security, used methods that are highly questionable, the country naturally becomes interested, especially since Mr. DODD himself at one time served in the Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover.

The Connecticut Senator told the Senate Tuesday, November 5, that a "serious challenge to responsible government" occurred when Otto Otepka was dismissed by the State Department simply because he had "testified honestly before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security on matters relating to security in the Department of State." He quoted the existing statutes which say that "the right of persons employed in the Civil Service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with."

Senator DODD declared that, by its action in the Otepka case, the State Department "has in effect, nullified this statute" and has issued a warning "to all employees that cooperation with the established committees of the Senate, if this cooperation involves testimony considered unpalatable at higher echelon, is a crime punishable by dismissal."

Then came a sensational development. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee released on November 9 letters filed by three State Department officials asking that the record of their testimony be amended and conceding that an eavesdropping device had been placed on the telephone wire in Mr. Otepka's office. Senator R. L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, thereupon demanded that the State Department consider dismissing the three men who, he said, had misled the Senate. Immediately after Mr. HRUSKA's statement, two of the same three men—who have been the principal accusers of Mr. Otepka—were placed on administrative leave for the time being by the State Department.

Senator DODD, in his initial speech, pointed out that the significance of the Otepka case, "cannot be overstated" and added:

"Mr. Otepka was the last old-line security officer holding a top position in the Office of Security. He has been an employee of the U.S. Government for 27 years. He has served as Deputy Director of the Office of Security and officer in charge of evaluations. His efficiency ratings have always been excellent. In 1958 he received the Meritorious Service Award from Secretary of State Dulles. But suddenly, for some strange reason, certain people in the Department decided that Mr. Otepka had to go.

"And so, they began first, to restrict his functions. Then they installed a tap on his telephone. Although a State Department official has denied under oath that this was done, the Subcommittee on Internal Security has proof that the tap was installed. Then they began to monitor Mr. Otepka's burn basket. Then they locked him out of his office and denied him access to his files, although no charge had yet been brought against him.

"No one suspected of espionage or disloyalty has to my knowledge been subjected to such surveillance and humiliation. But Mr. Otepka was not suspected of disloyalty or espionage. He was suspected very simply of cooperating with the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and of providing it with information that some of his superiors found embarrassing or objectionable."

In many respects this is more important than the alleged scandals that are being investigated on Capitol Hill in domestic affairs, for the whole question of giving security clearance to individuals employed in the Department of State now has been raised in a sensational manner. Senator DODD concluded:

"If the dismissal of Mr. Otepka is permitted to stand, it will become impossible or exceedingly difficult to elicit any information from employees of the executive branch that bears on disloyalty, malfeasance, conflict of interest, or other wrongdoing by their superiors."

The Department of State has not made public its detailed reasons for the dismissal of Mr. Otepka, nor has it given a satisfactory explanation to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. But wherever the question of security arises, Congress is naturally on the alert. For there have been too many instances in which employees in the executive branch of the Government have been given security clearance and later turned out to be indiscreet in passing out to friends and acquaintances information which eventually reached the Communist side.

In a vast organization of employees such as the Federal Government maintains today, it is natural that there should be instances of questionable security. But the system which the Department of State has for years maintained is one that has created in Congress confidence in its procedures. The Otepka case has shaken that confidence. And the fact that the current fight for better security is being led by a Northern Democrat, who himself is an expert in security matters, is accepted by other Senators as an indication that the problem is being handled by the Senate in a wholly nonpartisan way.

The administration has the responsibility of answering to the Senate and to the public just why the methods complained of by Senator DODD were used to remove a competent official from the delicate and difficult post of handling security matters in the Department of State.

THE FIRING OF OTTO F. OTEPKA—SECURITY OFFICER CALLED FOE OF TRICKINESS AND LAXITY AND HIS DISCHARGE SHABBY

(By Richard Wilson)

Otto F. Otepka, who has been fired by Secretary Dean Rusk, is described as the last old-line security officer holding a top position in the Department of State. In other words, there has been a housecleaning of personnel security officials in the Kennedy administration to remove the last traces of the tougher policies of previous administrations.

Mr. Otepka was a Government employee for 27 years, pursuing the perilous career of in-

vestigating and evaluating the loyalty, stability, and integrity of applicants for Federal employment. He was rated "excellent" by those who judge the efficiency of Government employees. He received the Meritorious Service Award from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

Mr. Otepka was fired for telling the truth to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on sloppy and tricky practices in the enforcement of personnel security regulations in the State Department. He undercut his superiors, the unforgivable sin of Federal bureaucracy.

This he did under the protection of United States Code, title 5, paragraph 652 (DC), which states that the "right" of a civil service employee to give information to Congress "shall not be denied or interfered with."

Without guile, Mr. Otepka, frankly and openly and in defiance of his superiors, cooperated with counsel for the Internal Security Subcommittee to furnish further support for the subcommittee's conclusion that the enforcement of personnel security in the State Department is lax and dangerous.

For this, Mr. Otepka was accused of giving the subcommittee secret or restricted information—information, by the way, which was so innocuous and trifling in its security content as to be laughable.

To pin the goods on Mr. Otepka, his associates in the State Department tapped his telephone. They locked him out of his office and denied him access to his files. They riffled through his wastebasket and explored his "burn bag," a container into which telltale scraps of paper must be dumped for burning. He was openly humiliated before other employees.

Mr. Otepka got worse than he ever gave to any applicant for Federal employment, for he was widely known as rational and careful in this highly sensitive business.

The conclusion cannot be escaped that the worst offense this rational and careful employee committed was to have been connected with the more strictly applied security regulations of the past. He was connected with former officials whose memory is hated in some State Department quarters. And when he saw laxity and trickiness developing in personnel security he would not be stilled by any fear of losing his job or the condemnation of his superiors.

Mr. Otepka denies the specific charges brought against him, mainly of clipping off the classification stamps on the documentary evidence he supplied the Senate subcommittee.

He did not do it, he says, and it will be very hard to prove that he did, for the evidence as presented is flimsily circumstantial. What Mr. Otepka does not deny is that he testified before the committee in response to its request and helped counsel for the committee frame questions that would show the lax practices of his associates and superiors.

In the process of getting rid of Mr. Otepka, one State Department employe is accused of higher venality than Mr. Otepka himself. This employee is charged with lying under oath in denying the tapping of Mr. Otepka's telephone.

The whole business is unsavory and shabby in some of its aspects, and no more so than in the basic doctrine behind Mr. Otepka's discharge. For this, and little else in the Otepka case, Secretary Rusk must bear responsibility. He placed the matter of employee loyalty, operating through channels and "playing on the team" ahead of the more important matter of the efficiency and effectiveness of Government policy.

Now there is to be a transparently meaningless process of appeal on Mr. Otepka's discharge in which Mr. Rusk and President Kennedy will pass on their own decisions.

The Otepka case probably never will become a flaming public issue, and this is too bad because it so aptly illustrates the Kennedy administration technique of diversion and counteraction when it comes under supported criticism. This was the case in the Billie Sol Estes scandal, in the TFX investigation, in the resignation of Navy Secretary Korth, and now once again when a strong case has been made against the personnel security policies of the State Department.

No Alliance and No Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with great publicity and political fanfare the Alliance for Progress was orbited 2½ years ago as the New Frontier's solution to all problems in Latin America. There are those who impolitely ask if the Alliance has ever caused a ripple, and if so to the betterment or detriment of the overall economic, social and political structure in the lands to the South.

The failure of the Alliance, and with it complete failure of the administration's foreign policy, was dramatized this week at the Alliance for Progress Convention in Brazil.

The Chicago Tribune in an editorial which appeared this morning discusses the matter in realistic and effective fashion, and I submit it for the RECORD at this point:

NO ALLIANCE AND NO PROGRESS

The economic report offered Monday at the Alliance for Progress Conference in São Paulo, Brazil, would have been gloomy enough without the cynical sound effects contributed by the Presidents of Argentina and Brazil, the two largest countries in South America.

Argentina's prelude to the Conference was its annulment of the contracts under which American and other foreign oil companies have invested about $200 million in Argentina in the last 5 years. President Illia said that the contracts had been awarded illegally by the Frondizi government and that the tax concessions included in them were therefore invalid. This means that when the companies are nationalized, as they will be soon, they will be lucky if the compensation awarded to them exceeds the amount of back taxes claimed in return.

It was Brazilian President Goulart's turn next. He opened the Conference in São Paulo with an eloquent address in which he did not mention the United States, and mentioned the Alliance for Progress only to say that it is not a valid or an adequate solution to Latin America's problems. Instead, he urged his neighbors to unite and solve their own problems without foreign help.

Brazil has received $2 billion in Government aid from us since World War II—more than twice as much as any other Latin American country—and Argentina has received $700 million, $110 million of it in the fiscal year 1962.

Yet Brazil tells us, in effect, that our help has been futile, and Argentina throws out the very companies on which it must count for the private investment which it needs and which, indeed, is fundamental to the Alliance for Progress.

President Goulart has perhaps decided that he has little to lose and can afford to be candidly insulting because we have already suspended much of our aid to Brazil as a result of his inability or unwillingness to resist inflation.

The cost of living has doubled in Brazil in the last year. Because of inflation and political unrest, Brazil's rapid growth rate of recent years has come to a vitual standstill since the Alliance for Progress came into being. In Argentina, the gross national product actually declined by 3.4 percent between 1961 and 1962.

Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, told the Conference that in Latin America as a whole the rate of growth has not only failed to meet the 2.5 percent called for by the Alliance for Progress, but has not even reached 1 percent. Instead of progress, he pointed to "a greatly deteriorating situation throughout Latin America."

Averell Harriman, the chief of our delegation, could only sit on his hands and reflect on the rewards of a rejected Santa Claus. Only a day or two before, he had failed magnificently in an effort to persuade President Illia to change his mind about the oil companies.

The Alliance for Progress is based upon idealistic dreams. It has not even got off the ground because the average Latin American politician knows that it is unrealistic and does not want to be associated with it. It is politically easier to fall back on inflation and nationalistic economic policies which nullify anything the so-called Alliance may achieve. If Mr. Goulart wants to lead a "do-it-yourself" movement in Latin America, we're all for him. Only when he and his people learn from experience how badly they need investment capital will they be willing to take the steps necessary to attract it.

The Battle of Cold Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in this period in which we observe the centennial of the bloody and bitter war that gripped the States 100 years ago, I think it is appropriate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carry the story "The Battle of Cold Harbor" as recently written by William H. Lang, Jr., of Reform, Pickens County, Ala.

William H. Lang, Jr., descendant of forebears who were in Pickens County from its very beginning, writes feelingly about the great Battle of Cold Harbor in which his great, great uncle, David Lang, was killed.

I think William H. Lang's story has a place in our literature of the Civil War. His story follows:

THE BATTLE OF COLD HARBOR

I have chosen one specific battle of the war to write on. I did this because I had a great, great uncle killed in it. His name was David Lang, born in Pickens County in 1840 and killed by a cannonball in Henrico County, Va., in 1864. Our family still has the rifle he was carrying when the cannonball hit the side of his head, tearing the left side off and blowing the stock of the gun off. He was 24 years old at the time. Later his family received a letter written by him the night before he was killed.

First, let us come up to date on the reason for the Battle of Cold Harbor.

Up until 1864, the northern army wasn't united and fought without a head. But in 1864, President Lincoln placed Gen. Ulysses S. Grant in command of all Union armies. Grant divided the northern army into three groups to make three attacks on the South and end the war. One, under General Sherman, was to move on Atlanta and capture it. The second was directed by General Banks against Montgomery from New Orleans, joining with Sherman in Atlanta. The third, the one we are concerned with, was commanded by General Mead and was to defeat Lee and capture Richmond. Grant chose to accompany this army and headed into the wilderness—a name tagged on the northern part of Virginia, because of its entangled forest.

Grant with 115,000 men marched into the woods, where cavalry and artillery were of no use. Grant's plan was to turn Lee's right flank, but General Lee had other ideas. Lee marched to meet him with only 75,000 men. The Battle of the Wilderness was a bloody one with heavy losses on each side. The woods caught on fire, killing the many wounded who weren't able to get out of the raging flames. But, even with heavy losses, Lee had stopped Grant on the first attack.

Stubbornly, Grant moved left toward Richmond and Lee again pursued to make a fight of it. The two met at Spotsylvania Courthouse on May 8 and another costly battle took place with the South losing 9,000 men and the North 10,000.

Here Grant telegraphed Washington saying "I propose to fight it out if it takes all summer."

Again Grant moved left toward Richmond and on June 1, 1864, Lee met him at Cold Harbor. If there's ever been an inappropriate name for a place, this was it because there wasn't anything cold about it.

Lee was outnumbered 2 to 1, yet made ready for the fight. On the afternoon of June 1 Grant made his move. He charged his whole frontline. Even though it was a violent battle, it only lasted one afternoon. Both sides were quiet on the morning of June 2 and and only a few small fights occurred in the afternoon. That night a welcome relief from dust and hot sun came with heavy rain. The next morning Grant, fed up and out of patience, made his move. He sent all his brigades head on in a direct frontal attack on the long Confederate lines. Grant's impatience must have gotten the best of him for it was a short bloody battle with the North losing 6,000 men in less than an hour and the South losing only 1,500. The Bluecoats reached the Southern lines in one place on the right flank, but everywhere else they were stopped before they got to the lines. Grant, knowing he couldn't make another costly mistake like that changed his tactics. Grant had lost 55,000 men in 1 month.

The army of northern Virginia was split up into two groups. One, Lee's army, stretched around Richmond to the James River; the other group, under General Beauregard, reached from the south side of the James River to Petersburg, the railroad capital of the South. Lee's army held this line with only one or two biscuits to eat each day until April of 1865. At this time Grant's well-fed army achieved its objective by turning Lee's right flank and compelled Lee and Beauregard to abandon Petersburg and Richmond. Lee hurried westward trying to reach Johnson's small army, doing all he could to stop Sherman from meeting Grant. But before Lee could make it, Grant cut him off. Lee, seeing that continued fighting meant a waste of lives, asked Grant for a peace conference. Grant, in a mud-spattered private's coat, met Lee, dressed in a spotless uniform, on April 5, 1865, at Appomattox courthouse, and they signed a truce.

Bleeding Hearts, Please Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has adopted a policy of being ashamed of our strength and seldom uses it for our benefit. This is one reason—the lack of respect for us—why the so-called Alliance for Progress is not progressing very well.

In yesterday's Evening Star, William S. White in an article, and an editorial both give us reasons for the present debacle and outline ways in which we can regain the leadership which President Kennedy is fast losing:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 13, 1963]

SHOWING SOME STRENGTH TO LATINS

(By William S. White)

The Alliance for Progress, the most generous program for the safety and health of Latin America ever to come from the mind of man, is rapidly becoming instead a gaseous fraud.

It is not succeeding. It is not halfway succeeding. It is not quarterway succeeding. It is, in fact, a dead dream—this proposal for the expenditure of 20 billion American dollars in the next 10 years to shore up the economy and the physical security of our neighbors to the south.

In return for all this we have asked not 1 foot of anybody's territory; not one dime's worth of anybody's favored treatment in trade; not 1 ounce of anybody's special loyalty to the United States. We have asked only that the recipients of this American largesse make honest efforts to end both rightwing rich-bossism and leftwing Castroism in Latin America. But while the Latins are willing to take our money they are not willing to take either our advice or the bare minimal preconditions we have laid down for this proposed outpouring of the wealth of the United States.

INTERNATIONAL THIEVERY

That the dream was fading had long been apparent in the sour snail's pace in Latin America toward any fulfillment anywhere of Latin America's part of the bargain. That the dream has now actually died has been made perfectly plain in two developments in the two most powerful countries in South America.

In Argentina, the government of President Arturo Illia proceeds to the repudiation of oil contracts in which U.S. companies have tied up $300 millons in a brilliant restoration of a national oil industry. Now that it is restored, it is to be taken over by Argentina in brazen international thievery. (And this is the country which, along with all others in Latin America, had so long clamored for "the help of American investment.")

In Brazil, President Joao Goulart covertly sneers at the Alliance for Progress, in the very meeting called to consider its work, and neglects even to mention the contributions of the United States to Latin American stability. Instead, he calls on the Latin countries to unite among themselves—which rather leaves us out—to promote their own trade and aid.

If what is now undeniably happening in Brazil and the Argentine will not convince our reformers at home that we are on the wrong track in Latin America—and long have been—surely nothing will. Four successive American administrations—Roosevelt's, Truman's, Eisenhower's and now Kennedy's—have proceeded on a fatal assumption based upon exaggerated past American guilt for a long vanished era of "American gunboat diplomacy" in that part of the world.

Because a lifetime ago we did, indeed, sometimes push the Latin Americans around, it has been concluded that we must pay and pay and pay for these old sins even unto the second, the third, and the fourth generation. Essentially, American policy has been this: Since Latin America is poor and backward, the United States is exclusively to blame. Ergo, we must shovel out aid and yet more aid. But we must never demand much for it in return, not even a decent respect from the beneficiaries.

So we have gone on, year on year, swallowing Latin insults and Latin ineptitude; and, in Cuba, swallowing the establishment in this very hemisphere of an armed and hostile Communist state. Why? Because, having tireless regard to our past sins, we must never, never "intervene in the affairs" of the countries to the south.

GETTING ONTO RIGHT ROAD

How, then, do we get off the wrong road and onto the right road? Well, we begin by considering our own interests, in awareness that Latin "liking" for us is vapidly worthless until it is preceded by Latin respect for us. We begin by cracking down on seizures of American investments made in good faith. We proceed by insisting upon our right and our unavoidable duty to lead this hemisphere, not merely to bankroll it like some soft, indulgent good-time Yankee "sugar daddy."

This is the only way that can end in strength and honorable candor in this hemisphere. And it is the only way that could, just possibly, end at length also in the defeat of the forces of political disunion and economic chaos that are playing into Soviet hands.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 13, 1963]

PROGRESS?

The inter-American Alliance for Progress seems to be retrogressing at a speed faster than the eye or mind can follow. Two events, among others, point up the situation with astonishing and depressing emphasis.

First, down in São Paulo, Brazil's President Goulart has delivered an extraordinary welcome to the hemispheric delegates—including Under Secretary of State Hariman—meeting there at the Alliance's second annual conference. In effect, Mr. Goulart has sneered at the Alliance. And he has been almost ostentatious in failing to mention the aid his country has been receiving from the United States—aid that has been squandered by his government's failure to check inflation and carry out economic, industrial, and agricultural reforms.

Second, to add to the gloom that has descended upon the nonprogressing Alliance for Progress, Mr. Harriman apparently has had a poor experience with President Illia of Argentina. Dr. Illia—a rural-type medical man who actually knows little about the intricacies of the issue—appears to have listened intently to some far-left advisers. At any rate, he has given Mr. Harriman the impression that the Argentine Government is determined to be less than fair and less than honest in canceling its contracts with American oil companies.

This, of course, is only part of the hemispheric picture. But it is enough to illustrate why the Alliance for Progress is in trouble and why the Congress—reflecting the views of the American people—is getting slightly fed up with the business of foreign aid.

Vietnam Postscript

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a column by Michael Padev, as it appeared in the November 8, 1963, issue of the Indianapolis Star.

UNITED STATES WOULD EULOGIZE DIEM IF HE WERE RED

(By Michael Padev)

WASINGTON.—What do you think would have happened if the savagely murdered president of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, had been a Communist or a leftwing socialist or a pro-Communist "Neutralist."

First, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, with a sad face, trembling voice, and almost tears in his eyes, would have made a solemn television statement denouncing indignantly the murder as a "crime against civilization," which had "shocked the conscience of the world." In case you have forgotten, this is exactly what Mr. Stevenson did when the Congo political leader, Patrice Lumumba, was assassinated some 2½ years ago.

Lumumba held no official position when he was killed; he was no friend of the United States, he was a near-Communist and "neutralist" adventurer, who was also a drug addict and a convicted thief. But the Communists, pro-Communists and "neutralists" simply loved him and, hence, "the conscience of the world" was easily aroused.

Second, the Communists and the "neutralists" in the United Nations would have passed a resolution demanding a full investigation and a U.N. Assembly debate on the Diem overthrow. The United States, mindful of "world public opinion," would have sided with the Reds and the "neutralists," and the U.N. Assembly would have heard many speeches glorifying the memory of Diem.

This, in case you have forgotten, was exactly what the U.N. did about Lumumba.

SHOCK AND HORROR

Third, White House and State Department spokesmen, including President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, would have publicly expressed their "shock and horror" and "heartfelt indignation." They would have made it clear that a military junta which came to power by such violent unconstitutional means would not be recognized as the Government of South Vietnam unless it "guaranteed" free elections, "rapidly returned to civilian rule," etc.

It would have also been announced that the United States would suspend all aid to South Vietnam "pending the restoration of democratic order."

In case you have forgotten, such was the attitude of the Kennedy administration toward several military coups undertaken in several Latin American countries against leftwing governments of one sort or another.

Last, but not least, the liberal establishment would have risen immediately and vociferously in protest against "police repressions" in South Vietnam. Prof. Lionel Apalling from California (Nobel Prize winner) and Prof. Allen Schmelinger of New York (Pulitzer Prize winner) would have headed a nationwide, bipartisan committee for a free South Vietnam. The New York Times would have carried a full page ad demanding that "those responsible for the horrible crimes against humanity in South Vietnam" be apprehended and punished.

RIGHT WING EXTREMISTS

The Washington Post would have published an indignant editorial pointing out that "rightwing extremists," in South Vietnam as well as in France, in the United States, and in Timbuktu, are a danger to world peace.

Well, all these things would have happened, had Diem been a Communist, or a pro-Communist neutralist, or a leftwing socialist. But Diem, instead, had the misfortune of being a militant anti-Communist, heading a regime which was, on the whole, quite popular.

Diem also—unlike the Communist and pro-Communist heroes of "world public opinion," had a decent respect for the democratic and parliamentary institutions of his country. His regime was not, of course, a model democracy, but, comparatively speaking it was a representative regime, based on free elections. In addition, under Diem, South Vietnam enjoyed considerable freedom of the press.

One can understand why the Communists considered Diem as their No. 1 enemy in Vietnam, as well as south Asia. But can you understand why the "liberals" treated Diem the way they did?

Can you understand why "liberals," in general, behave the way they do? I can't.

Publisher Horvitz Reports on White House Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the report of Harry R. Horvitz, publisher of the Mansfield News-Journal, regarding a recent visit to the White House as the guest of President Kennedy. This article appeared in the November 10 issue of the News-Journal, one of the outstanding papers in my district.

I was particularly interested in one very perceptive remark which Mr. Horvitz made. He said:

He [the President] was articulate on all subjects—including politics. He is fond of Barry Goldwater personally, although he recognizes the basic philosophic differences. His characterization of the major differences between himself and Nelson Rockefeller was right to the point, the only difference being that Rockefeller was out and Kennedy in.

What an accurate statement. The only differences between President Kennedy and Governor Rockefeller being that the President is in office and the Governor is not. I call this firsthand report on a White House visit to the attention of the Members of this body.

PUBLISHER REPORTS ON WHITE HOUSE VISIT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Along with 19 other newspapermen, the publisher of the News-Journal was a guest at the White House last week. Here is his report of his visit.)

(By H. R. Horvitz)

I had lunch last Wednesday in the State Dining Room of the White House just one seat away from President John F. Kennedy.

The invitation came to me in the form of a telegram, "I would be most pleased to have you as my guest." Even Barry Goldwater's mother could not refuse an invitation like this.

Following the instructions of the telegram, I walked to the northwest gate of the White House. After proving my identity I was allowed to proceed up to the front door. There gracious servants took my coat and ushered me to a table on which was a silver bowl and seating chart of the dining table. I drew a card from the bowl, a lucky draw indeed for it determined that I would be seated just one seat away from the President.

Before going into lunch the group of 20 Ohio editors and publishers, who had been invited, gathered in the historic Red Room. Here drinks were served and the Presidential Press Secretary, Pierre Salinger, arrived to put us all at ease.

Suddenly there was complete silence—everyone stood erect and the President of the United States entered. He shook hands and said a few words of welcome to each of us. We were at ease immediately.

John F. Kennedy is a strikingly handsome man. He is very tall and well built. His complexion was so healthy that it looked as if he were wearing makeup. Today he did not need a haircut. I was glad our wives were not present for he is easily as good looking as any movie star and I'm afraid we would all suffer by comparison.

He suggested that one of us should lead the way to the dining room, but we all deferred in unison, "But, Mr. President you are the leader."

The table was set with lace-edged doilies and the official gold plated silverware, and Lennox china. Each of us had a handsomely gold lettered placecard and printed menu at our place.

The food was delicious. First, shells filled with crabmeat thermidor. Then sirloin steak with waffle potatoes and green peas. Dessert was a mocha Bavarian mousse topped with whipped cream. Red wine was served with the meal and demitasse afterward.

SHARP ATTIRE

I was so close to the President that I could not help noticing his very sharp attire. He wore a two-button blue suit with narow trousers and sleeves, white shirt french cuffed and a dark blue tie. He ate with great relish, even enjoying the rich dessert. Afterward he smoked a thin cigar, the first of three during the afternoon.

The President steered the luncheon conversation away from the important problems of our day but he did tell us of some of the great decisions which he faces. For example, many of the portraits of former Presidents are so poor that he is most anxious to choose the proper portrait painter for himself. His portrait should be painted before he leaves office, but of course Mr. Kennedy wouldn't say what that exact date would be.

The service was excellent so the meal was over in a half hour. For 1½ hours afterward we discussed various political and economic problems. Everyone was relaxed, probably made so by the President's wit and informal attitude.

He was articulate on all subjects—including politics. He is fond of BARRY GOLDWATER personally, although he recognizes the basic philosophic differences. His characterization of the major differences between himself and Nelson Rockefeller was right to the point, the only difference being that Rockefeller was out and Kennedy in.

His unhurried and leisurely manner, his obvious enjoyment of the luncheon and his ease in handling each question was most impressive. He was most diplomatic in hear-our demands for a balanced budget but not to the exclusion of a few favorite projects for Ohio.

As the luncheon meeting drew to a close, the President made a masterful political move. He offered to autograph the menus for the benefit of our children or grandchildren at home. Then after a cordial handshake, the President went back to his work.

As I walked down the White House steps out into the rain, I could not help thinking what a remarkable country this is when the President is willing to take time from his busy schedule to invite newspaper peo-

ple, some from very small papers, to have lunch with him. But as long as our President must run for reelection, it is obvious that the views of newspapers or any other voters are very important indeed.

Kennedy Administration Aid for Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago we were about to be blasted off the face of the earth by Russian missiles in Cuba. Now, according to an article by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, in the Long Island Press of November 8, we are to give emergency aid to Cuba. When will we wake up?

The article follows:

EMERGENCY AID PLAN FOR CUBA IS BREWING

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—There is something afoot on giving hurricane-ravaged and Communist-mismanaged Cuba emergency relief in the form of surplus U.S. farm commodities.

The project is very hush-hush and shrouded in tightest secrecy. But the following is definitely known:

Influential United Nations sources have put out feelers to the State Department on hurricane aid for Cuba. These backstage overtures have been made with the knowledge and approval of puppet Dictator Fidel Castro—despite his violent diatribes against accepting help from imperialists.

The little-known interdepartmental Committee on Principles for Cuba, headed by Secretary Dean Rusk, is exploring the possibility of increasing contacts with the Castro regime.

A Central Intelligence Agency report, submitted to President Kennedy, states that the 5-day hurricane that ravaged Cuba last month inflicted "catastrophic" damage on its main crops. Sugar was slashed by an estimated 1.1 million tons; virtually all of the wheat crop in Oriente Province, which produces about 90 percent of this grain, was destroyed and more than 50 percent of the rice and tobacco crops were lost.

CIA estimates Cuba's total sugar output this year will be less than 2,250,000 tons. That is approximately one-third of the 6-million-plus tons averaged between 1957 and the Communist takeover.

It is also more than 2 million tons less than last year's production, which was 1 million tons under the previous year. Since the Reds have ruled Cuba, there has been a steady decline in sugar output. The same is true of every other export commodity.

Last month's massive hurricane destruction compounded the already high crop losses due to mismanagement, incompetence, waste, and bungling.

Congressional leaders have gotten wind of the undercover move to extend hurricane aid to Cuba, and are keeping a close eye on the matter. They are particularly aroused because of the bitter battle raging in the Senate over the President's multibillion-dollar foreign aid program.

Prior to the hurricane, Cuba had shipped several hundred thousand tons of sugar to Red China in exchange for 100,000 tons of rice. To help meet Cuba's serious shortage of footwear, Red China has sent a large shipment of shoes made of cloth and rubber, and North Korea a quantity of used military boots. The Cuban freighter *Puerto de Nuevitas*, which sailed from Port Mariel with tanks, artillery, and ammunition for Algeria, switched names in mid-Atlantic. Port Mariel is used by Russia to unload most of its military supplies and personnel.

Secretary Dean Rusk has a simple stratagem for ducking disconcerting congressional questions.

With unusual candor, the State Department head disclosed this during a private meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He had been sharply grilled on the embattled foreign aid bill, and Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, chided him for being evasive.

"Senator, when I was a young member of the State Department and was down in this part of town," replied Rusk, "I was advised that when I got a question that I couldn't answer, to answer another one."

Wheat Sale Concern Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, the wheat deal with the Soviet Union continues to cause concern among many citizens. There is wonderment that our Government seems so determined to accomplish this transaction that it is willing to plod forward in negotiating terms in the face of repeated Soviet threats and blackmail, such as the harrassment of our military convoys on the autobahn and the arrest on spy charges of an American educator who apparently has not seen fit to view Soviet communism as the ideal way of life.

In this connection, I include an editorial which appeared recently in the Northern Virginia Daily, a responsible daily newspaper published in Strasburg, Va. The editorial follows:

CALL OFF THE WHEAT SALE

We see no good reason why our Government should continue the cat and mouse game we have been playing with Soviet Premier Khrushchev. One moment we are the friends of the Russian people and the next we are their enemies, on the verge of a shooting war.

The mutable politician in the Kremlin can turn it on or off faster than any man in modern history—today professing warm friendship for the United States and tomorrow busily probing for our weaknesses.

In Moscow Wednesday, Mr. Khrushchev implied to a group of American businessmen that the convoy incident on the autobahn Tuesday could have ended in nuclear war. And he indirectly served notice that future Western convoys on the autobahn will be held up unless they bow to what he termed established procedure. Which, of course, is a unilateral premise based on a blatant and illegal disregard for Western rights of access to and from West Berlin.

While the Soviet delegation is in Washington negotiating for the sale of American wheat, and threatening to call off the entire deal unless their stipulations for shipment of the wheat are met, we are literally being challenged in Berlin. Not only challenged, but threatened as well.

Our responsibility to the civilized world requires that we negotiate on a diplomatic basis with the Soviets, in a continuing effort to find formulas for preserving the peace of the world.

Frankly, we were also one of those who were inclined to look favorably on the $250 million wheat deal with the Soviets, as a practical way of reducing our wheat surpluses and at the same time improving our dollar balance in Europe.

But, we do not have to do business with them, and under present conditions we should not. We don't like being bullied. We don't like being threatened. Every time our relations with the Soivets take a turn for the better, or the worse, we have the strangest feeling we are getting a Judas kiss from the man in the Kremlin. In other words, to use a modern, but trite expression, we are being had.

Our present judgment is that in view of the complicated structure of our relations with the Soviets, in which it is difficult if not impossible to divorce the economic from the military, and in view of the belligerent attitude they are now showing, the wheat sale negotiations should be called off.

Nor should they be resumed until such time as there is definite proof, of a permanent nature, of improved relations.

Tito's Brand of Communism Puts Yugoslavia Ahead of Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Yugoslavia, while a relatively small nation, has played a very large part in the great post war power struggle.

I believe that history will point to the independent nature of Yugoslavia and its assertion of this desire for independence against Russia as having played a very significant role.

In the hope that greater understanding will be brought to Yugoslavia and its relationship with the United States, under permission previously granted, I insert the informative article by Robert H. Estabrook that appeared in the Washington Post:

TITO'S BRAND OF COMMUNISM PUTS YUGOSLAVIA AHEAD OF NEIGHBORS

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

BELGRADE.—To understand what independent communism has come to mean in Yugoslavia, the Western visitor really ought to travel first through Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union.

Contrasts between conditions in Communist-bloc countries and the feverish activity here are so great that they almost make Yugoslavia seem a citadel of free enterprise.

It is not free in the Western sense, but it has rewards for individual initiative found in no other Communist country. Yugoslavia has developed a market economy with a supply demand price system and a wage range of individual incomes.

Belgrade, until recently a Serbian small town, has begun to look like a capital. Even in the last 18 months its face has been changed by new skyscrapers, some of them with imaginative use of glass. An imposing array of government buildings across the Sava River at Novi Beograd has touches of Brasilia.

Americans would find the layout of department stores and the display of goods familiar. There are even phonograph record departments—and some popular records have sold more than a million copies.

Belgrade television carries commercials, including shots of workers puffing away on Yugoslav-made cigarettes. Socialized enterprises pay for advertisement as a business expense.

The leading newspaper publishes substantial Western and world news along with Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse. It has several pages of classified and some institutional advertising.

Most employees are paid basic salaries with additional increments for extra work of good quality.

Workers receive a share of the profits based on increased productivity after funds have been set aside for reinvestment. Some enterprises, after discussion with employees, also construct apartment buildings for worker housing.

Farmers receive guaranteed minimum prices plus the benefit of any excess in market prices. Although 15 percent of the arable land is in collectives, collectivization has not been pushed. The new Constitution permits private ownership of up to about 25 acres, but the average holding is 10 acres.

In fact there are so many departures from typical Communist practice that one needs to remind himself that this is still a Communist country. Marxist theoreticians may worry about overreliance on incentives, but these continue for the simple reason that they work.

Some of the appearance of prosperity, nevertheless, is superficial. One Western analyst notes that in Moscow people have money but few goods; here goods are plentiful but the populace is comparatively poor.

The economy is expanding again and incomes are rising slowly after a pullback last year because of overspending, but there also are inflationary tendencies.

The average total real wage is about 23,000 dinars a month, or $31. A doctor may earn 60,000 dinars, and the manager of a large enterprise may get 200,000 or more.

Unlike the ostensibly higher wages in some Communist bloc countries, these figures reflect true rates of exchange. Still, such incomes hardly permit many luxuries even when the general price level is low. Somehow, though, people find money to buy cars and Belgrade has a genuine traffic problem.

Behind the market economy and incentives the apparatus of Communist power remains in firm control. President Josip Broz Tito and his colleagues consider themselves at least as good Communists as those in the Kremlin. That was the root of the Yugoslav break with Moscow in 1948.

In insisting on his own right to interpret Marx, Tito was the first revisionist. Nikita Khrushchev has now embraced Titoism. But despite the new Soviet-Yugoslav understanding and the fact that Tito sympathizes with many Soviet objectives, Western diplomats do not expect Yugoslavia's nonalined position to change.

In effect Tito has the best of both worlds. He has received help from both blocs without entangling commitments to either. Most of Yugoslavia's trade, however, is with the West, and she is eager to expand good relations. Officials place much hope in continuation of the most-favored-nation clause in American tariffs.

Yugoslavia is not now a police state, although there are little incivilities to testify that the police are still present. But it is not a Western-style democracy, either.

Discussion and criticism are relatively free so long as they are not regarded as endangering the regime. But Milovan Djilas, Tito's onetime disciple and more recently his foremost critic, is still in jail (though there are rumors that he may be released).

Yet restraints on the exercise of power exist. Tito and his high associates live like nabobs, but Yugoslavs say that as a national hero he is unique and that no one after him will have so much power because it will be split between Communist Party and government. Even Tito does not always get his way.

One constant restraint is Yugoslavia's federal nature. It is composed of six constituent Republics, each with its own jealousies. Decentralization is considered imperative.

A practical illustration is the reconstruction after the Skopje earthquake, in which details have been left to local Macedonian officials. Some Western observers complain that there is not enough federal planning and that Skopje has become a disorganized frontier boomtown.

Moreover, the worker councils established originally as educational devices to interest workers in productivity and profits have become a real force. In a showdown the party would win, but in many situations the councils determine action.

Finally, the five-chamber Yugoslav Parliament is more than a mere rubberstamp, although members are elected on a single list. Unlike the Supreme Soviet which assembles occasionally to ratify actions already taken, the Yugoslav body meets in prolonged sessions. Expert committees advise the Government and actually influence policy.

The Yugoslav system, in short, is still evolving, and though it is within the framework of Communist theory the architects are more experimental than doctrinaire. This pragmatic effort to devise new forms can be an encouragement to other independent approaches by Yugoslavia's Communist bloc neighbors.

Award to Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next Monday will be a day in history. It will be the 80th birthday of the Honorable CARL VINSON, a great son of Georgia, a great and towering son of the United States.

Hubert F. Lee, for 34 years editor of Dixie Business, published at Decatur, Ga., has beaten the gun by declaring our beloved colleague the Man of the Year 1964. The editorial staff of the Dixie Business magazine has made a Great American Award since 1955, when Dr. Charles F. Kettering was so designated. In 1962 the award went to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

The following announcement has just been made by Editor Lee:

Bernard M. Baruch and Representative CARL VINSON have been named "A Great American" for 1963 and 1964, respectively, by the editors of Dixie Business magazine.

Mr. VINSON is announced a year in advance as he will have served a half-century of "distinguished public service" in the Congress in 1964.

Mr. Baruch, in a letter, wrote Lee:

"Thank you so much for the honor you bestow upon me by naming me the 'Great American' for 1963. As I look over the list I feel very pleased indeed, particularly to be between two such fine men as Colonel Glenn and CARL VINSON. VINSON has been a wonderful American, especially in the last trying years."

To all of which CARL VINSON's colleagues in the House will join in a chorus of "Amen."

VFW Supports Strong U.S. Anti-Communist Policy in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important decisions of the postwar period has been President Kennedy's determination to meet the challenge of Communist aggression in South Vietnam. This courageous policy has blocked carefully laid Communist plans for the takeover of South Vietnam as a necessary steppingstone for further Communist aggression through all of southeast Asia.

The decision to stand fast against Communist expansion and subversion in South Vietnam is based upon the recognition of the crucially important strategic role of that war-torn country.

A more widespread appreciation of South Vietnam's strategic importance would, in this country and elsewhere in the free world, go far toward answering questions as to why the United States has faced up to the challenge of Communist aggression there.

Consequently, it was with real satisfaction that I noted the article "South Vietnam—The Strategic Hinge" in the September 1963 issue of the VFW American Security Reporter. This article, by Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, VFW national security and foreign affairs, and a distinguished and outstanding officer, is an accurate and thoroughly understandable analysis of why, from the standpoint of free world survival, South Vietnam must be defended against Communist aggression.

The VFW American Security, as Members of this House are aware, is published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, under the supervision of Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Incidentally, as a longtime member of the VFW, I would like to point out that Commander Lombardo is a member of the department of New York and previously served as department commander.

Joe, as he is affectionately known to his many friends throughout the country is recognized as a student of Communist objectives and techniques. His speeches and press statements on these matters reflect his research and personal on-the-spot observations of Communist aggression.

I believe that this article, "South Vietnam—The Strategic Hinge" will make an important contribution to a better understanding of why our Nation is correct in pursuing a policy of support-

ing the Vietnamese Government in its war against Communist aggression. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article from the VFW American Security Reporter.

SOUTH VIETNAM—THE STRATEGIC HINGE

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, VFW)

Communist strategists picked their target well when they launched their attack against South Vietnam. That country occupies one of the most important strategic positions in the protracted conflict which freedom is waging for survival. South Vietnam's critically strategic role is based on several factors:

The outer defense line of the United States in Pacific Asia now extends from its northern anchor in South Korea, southward to Okinawa, Taiwan, the western Philippines, and then to South Vietnam, which is the southern anchor of the line. Thus, a Red takeover of South Vietnam would, strategically, leave the southern flank of our outer defense line in the Pacific Basin "in the air," thus exposing the Philippines, Taiwan, and, eventually, Okinawa and Korea, to increasing pressure from the south.

Should this outer defense line in the western Pacific be flanked, it would mean that our "retaining wall," against a Communist breakout from the mainland into the fringing islands of Pacific Asia would be destroyed. If this line is broken, there is no fallback position short of Guam and Hawaii.

In addition to being the southern anchor of our outer defense line in the western Pacific, South Vietnam is a strategic key to continued Communist conquest of the southeast Asian peninsula. South Vietnam, in anti-Communist hands, prevents the flow of Communist power southward from Red North Vietnam along the Pacific rim of the southeast Asian peninsula. Consequently, as long as South Vietnam is controlled by a government friendly to the United States, the Red strategists are largely blocked from linking up mainland communism with the vast network of islands, which, in turn, stretch eastward from the southeast Asian peninsula.

Thus, South Vietnam on the southeast extremity of the peninsula would constitute, if in the Red orbit, the "strategic hinge," linking the southern Pacific islands to Red land power, thrusting outward from Eurasia. These islands of the southern Pacific are, in the strategic sense, closely placed steppingstones which, if in Red hands, would carry communism step by step toward Australia.

There is abundant evidence that communism long ago set its sights on Indonesia and the neighboring islands. Also, if the southern arch of islands, extending thousands of miles seaward from the southeast Asian peninsula, were in Red hands, it would, in time of war, present a serious obstacle to United States access to Singapore, to the Straits of Malacca, entrance to the Indian Ocean and the approaches to India from the Pacific. In this context, the Red bandit war in South Vietnam involves far more than simply the control—as important as it is—of South Vietnam. This is because South Vietnam is a key to the larger strategic issue of control of southeast Asia, the island approaches to Australia, and access to Singapore as well as the waters of the Indian Ocean.

Within the strategic framework of the southeast Asian peninsula Communist emphasis upon South Vietnam is equally understandable. If the Reds can control South Vietnam, the position of neighboring Cambodia, already joined with Red China in a pact pledging Cambodian support of Taiwan's return to Red China, will openly be that of a Red puppet government. With Red control of this central and eastern tier of peninsular countries—Laos, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and South Vietnam—Thailand's entire western frontier would be opened to Red infiltration, subversion and even attack. In such a predicament only a major U.S. military commitment could preserve Thailand from determined Red aggression. Burma and Malaya, under such circumstances would be in dire jeopardy.

Thus, the long land road to Singapore would be under heavy pressure. Also, India already threatened by renewed Red invasion from the north, would be further endangered by Red control of the southeastern Asian peninsula, India's eastern land flank.

All of which illustrates that Communist control of South Vietnam would set up a chain reaction of disaster for the forces of freedom.

But the importance of South Vietnam has psychological, as well as strategic meaning. South Vietnam is, in the eyes of the Kremlin, as well as Red China, a clear-cut example of what Khrushchev calls a "war of liberation." This is communism's terminology for wars of aggression through guerrilla action and subversion. In a very real sense, communism is using South Vietnam as a testing block of U.S. determination to oppose Communist wars of liberation. If the United States does not stand up resolutely in South Vietnam, utilizing whatever military forces and economic assistance is required to whip communism in this test, then the Red strategists will conclude logically, from their standpoint, that Red aggression by such means will not be opposed elsewhere. Thus, the Red aggression now pressing so cruelly against the pro-U.S. forces in South Vietnam, will be duplicated and unleashed in other non-Communist areas throughout the world. Again, the broad implications of what may appear to be a highly localized action, gives that action strategic importance of truly global scope.

The wisdom of committing U.S. power, economic and military, to resist Red aggression in South Vietnam should be obvious to all with even a casual understanding of the high stakes involved. But, this decision to resist must be matched with a major will to presevere. Like in so many instances where Red aggression clashes with freedom, the battle is also one of opposing wills.

Communism uses every type of military effort to advance its forces as well as every kind of propaganda to undermine the determination of the United States to continue its war through to victory over the Red aggression. These are the weapons, military and propaganda, which communism is now utilizing in South Vietnam.

Kennedy Administration Assures High Coffee Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House considered the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963, which, in my opinion, will result in higher coffee prices for the American housewife, in the guise of helping the economy of Latin America. Actually, the poor, coffeepicking peasant will not get any richer but the rich coffee grower will become even richer.

The enlightening editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of November 3 expresses concern for the American housewife. I wish the President of the United States would also be concerned.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 5, 1963]

HOW TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER

Sometimes the Government seems to have rather peculiar ideas about protecting the consumer. The International Coffee Agreement is a case in point.

Congress will soon vote on legislation setting up machinery for running the pact, which the Senate ratified 6 months ago. It would establish annual coffee export quotas for producing countries, and a good many lawmakers fear the result will be to raise U.S. consumer prices instead of stabilizing them.

There is so much concern, indeed, that President Kennedy sent what was intended as a reassuring letter to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee. The administration, he wrote, proposes "to protect fully the interest of the American consumer." He describes "safeguards" in the agreement's system of balloting. Producer and consumer parties to the pact each have 1,000 votes; as the world's largest coffee consumer, the United States has 400.

Those 400 votes, "plus those of any other single consuming country," the letter says, "are sufficient to insure that export quotas will not be set below the level of estimated demand." In other words, no price-raising artificial shortages.

That's all very nice, though the explanation underscores what a clumsy rigmarole it all is. And there can't be much reassurance in any such scheme, which may well stimulate even more overproduction instead of encouraging economic diversification in Latin America.

Even though coffee is in surplus, a major aim of the pact, as Mr. Kennedy's letter itself concedes, is to bring about "a beneficial and progressive increase in the coffee earnings" of producing countries. That certainly sounds like an invitation to higher prices.

We don't think consumers need this kind of help. In this and other cases, what they need is not protection from the market but from Government flings at market rigging.

On Smothering Military Initiative With Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 24, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on a recent occasion I had opportunity to observe the proliferation of forms and paperwork which plagues the operating forces of our military services. Verily, a substantial fraction of the Pentagon's budget must go to buy paper for useless reports from the field which nobody reads. It recalled to me a letter written by the Duke of Wellington in 1810 to the Secretary of State for War in London. At the time Wellington was in the field attempting to pursue and subdue diverse of his Majesty's enemies. Apparently the Secretary was attempting to pursue and subdue the Iron Duke with paper. The letter is as follows:

MY LORD: If I attempted to answer the mass of futile correspondence that surrounds me, I should be debarred from all serious business of campaigning.

I must remind your Lordship for the last time, that as long as I retain an independent position I shall see that no officer under my command is debarred, by attending to the futile driveling of mere quill-driving in your Lordship's office, from attending to his first duty—which is, and always has been, so to train the private men under his command that they may, without question, beat any force opposed to them in the field.

I am, my Lord, your obdient servant,

WELLINGTON.

Even the White House Tours Are Rigged Along the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to see the pettiness and partisan spite of this administration. Never has this been brought home more demonstrably than in an incident which happened this morning. As everyone knows, a limited White House tour is available on a reservation basis for constituents of Congressmen. Reservations can be made 30 days in advance for this special tour.

It is now obvious that the White House has a blacklist of Congressmen who will not be favored with constituent tours. For the past 3 days, my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Representative DONALD C. BRUCE, has made calls at 10 a.m. in the morning, right on the button, for reservations a full 30 days ahead, the maximum. In each instance he has been turned down. He told me of his problems this morning at 10:18 a.m. and I said, "Don, they're lying to you and we prove it. W only need tobitabody ine can prove it. We only need to bait the trap." Less than 10 minutes after the gentleman from Indiana, Representative BRUCE's request was turned down, three nonexistent people were granted this tour on December 14, the same date requested by the gentleman from Indiana, Representative BRUCE, simply by giving the name of a liberal Democratic congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I do not care about being on a Kennedy blacklist. I would not want to have his support in 1964. This is not the point. It is a good indication just how this bunch operates. Deceit, favoritism, and blacklisting are the order of the day. It is not a question of whether the gentleman from Indiana, Representative BRUCE and myself would like to make this tour. It is not even a question of whether or not we support the President. The White House is owned by the American taxpayers, not the Kennedys. This means that it is owned by our constitutents whether they be Democrat or Republican and it is typical of the shabby abuse of power that we see along the New Frontier when the office of the President is used in such an arbitrary and dishonest manner.

GROW: Grassroots Organization of Women—A GOP Blueprint for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Elly M. Peterson, recently appointed assistant chairman of the Republican National Committee and director of women's activities, spoke today at a luncheon in Concord, N.H., in my district. I am pleased that her first official appearance since her appointment was in the Granite State and my district. Mrs. Peterson was the featured speaker at a "Win With Women Power" luncheon sponsored by the New Hampshire Republican Women's Division under the leadership of New Hampshire chairman of the Republican State Committee, Mrs. Rose Boivard.

National interest is focusing on New Hampshire, where the first in the Nation's presidential primaries will be held next March. Mrs. Peterson's thoughtful and forceful remarks are evidence of the fact that the Republican Party is on the move at all levels. Believing as we all do in the importance of the two-party system, with good, vigorous campaigning at all levels to develop the issues of the day, I thought my colleagues would be interested in Mrs. Peterson's remarks, which follow:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY MRS. ELLY M. PETERSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S DIVISION, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, BEFORE LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY WOMEN'S DIVISION, NEW HAMPSHIRE REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE, NEW HAMPSHIRE, HIGHWAY HOTEL, CONCORD, N.H.

It is a great pleasure for me to bring you the tidings of victory for the Republican Party as evidenced in the results of the recent November elections around the country. The results of the election should give you great encouragement and assurance of a Republican victory in 1964. We know full well that victory is never easily won—victories represent tireless effort and complete dedication—working and pulling together to win.

MICHIGAN EXAMPLE

Let me review for you, a moment, the near demise of the Republican Party in the State of Michigan. In 1947, a Democrat Governor was elected with the help of the UAW-CIO. At that time a blueprint for action was issued by the UAW-CIO in which they told of their plans, using Democrat Williams, to take over the political machinery of the State.

In 1950–52 we saw further Democrat victories but the tragic part of the victory was that the Republicans continued to talk about organization—and do nothing. The Republicans talked about year-round staffs and year-round work—and did nothing. The Republicans talked about widening the base of their fundraising and party participation, and did nothing. And it was not until 10 years had passed and Republicans had lost every seat in the executive branch of government, including the boards of controls of all our colleges—and almost our entire majorities in the legislature that the Republicans awoke that something had to be done.

It isn't easy to come back after you have allowed the opposition 10 years to build—for they built as we talked about building—they took their positive areas first, and in 10 years we allowed them to move out of the cities, which held their strength, into our rural areas where in many instances there were never any Democrat tickets, and we watched the growth of Democrats in county courthouses, in county precinct organizations, all across the State.

And so when realization finally came to the party that if they did not build year-round organizations they could not win—the road upward was long and hard and winding, and after 7 years of blood, sweat, and tears, or I should say blood, sweat, and volunteers, we in Michigan still do not control the administrative board of the executive branch, or the Supreme Court (and we painfully realize this every time a partisan decision can be handed down).

DON'T DELAY NEW HAMPSHIRE

And so the message I bring to New Hampshire is simply this: Don't delay—don't put off what needs to be done thinking that someday someone somehow will take care of you, that organization isn't really needed—that precinct work isn't really necessary, that somehow people will realize the failures of the Kennedy administration and act accordingly.

For the cold, hard truth is: My friends, they won't.

And yet you have something going for you in New Hampshire—just as Republicans have all over the Nation—and that is anxiety or maybe you would call it lack of confidence or maybe you would call it this: People are just plain scared at the programs and the lack of plans and the broken promises of the Kennedy brothers.

Let's just think about this for a moment: Now, I am an ordinary, run-of-the-mill American housewife and if you were to ask me about the flow of gold or the Common Market, I could give you perhaps some canned words and music I have read, but frankly, I don't completely understand the ramifications of this kind of program.

But I do understand this: I understand that unemployment is not what the Kennedy brothers promised us that fall of 1960.

I understand that the cost of Government is going up, up, up to almost astronomical proportions, and that the savings effected by President Eisenhower over 8 years were wiped out within a matter of months.

I understand that the deficit goes on and on—that budgets are never balanced, and that sooner or later someone is going to have to pay. And I understand that as mothers and fathers, we are saddling our children and their children with our debts.

BROKEN PROMISES

I am just an ordinary run-of-the-mill businesswoman who couldn't describe for you the ins and outs of the Montary Fund but can, in minute detail, describe the feelings abroad today about the broken promises of the Kennedy administration and I can describe the feelings of southerners whose regard for the Kennedy boys approaches complete frustration.

FOREIGN POLICY

We can sit together today and remember that the Berlin wall has been built during this period when the Kennedy boys had planned to stop the advance of Communism. We can remember that on September 12, 1960, he said within 3 years he would wipe out communism in this hemisphere and we can recall, with shame for our Nation, the Bay of Pigs, and see the growth of Castroism as it takes over not all of Cuba and its people, but spreads outward to other Latin American countries.

We citizens—not just Republicans—but all citizens—can remember the downgrading of our national prestige, by the Democrat speakers during the fall of 1960 and we can

view now with discouragement and frustration the complete lack of faith the Asian people have with us after Vietnam and Laos, and the fumbling efforts of our aid program.

And we read with added feeling of shame about the new government of Peru wanting to buy hand tools for their people to use—and our Government so big, so bogged down with redtape offering instead to send bulldozers and heavy road equipment.

Yes, most of us are just plain everyday Americans, but we are concerned for our country, and we are concerned for the world and we are concerned for our future and that of our children.

The question is, however: What are we going to do about it?

ACTION

We have our greatest chance to strike against the cancer of growing government interference and dependence on bigger government during the 1964 elections, we have a chance to quit picking at the symptoms and effect once and for all—a cure.

If—and this is the greatest hazard of all, the greatest barrier, the mightiest wall.

For the if stands between the Republican Party and accomplishment.

And the if depends upon each one of you as individuals and working together.

In 1960 after the loss of the Presidency by only 112,803 votes, a committee was formed by the Republican National Committee to investigate the loss, and it was determined that our greatest loss and the cause of our failure was simply because we had failed to reach out for new people.

On March 9, 1963, a National Republican Women's Committee on Special Activities, composed of Republican women Members of the Congress as an advisory committee, the women officers and members of the executive committee of the Republican National Committee as a steering committee, and 14 Republican women leaders from all parts of the country who are especially knowledgeable and experienced in political activities who form a planning committee, met in Washington, D.C.

GROW

The purpose of this committee is to reach out to the 22½ million women who failed to vote in 1960, to welcome them into the Republican Party and its activities, to persuade them (and the thousands of the other women who are now independents or disenchanted Democrats) to register Republican, vote Republican and, in turn, reach out to their friends with a cordial invitation to join in our victory drive. This is our GROW program—Grass Roots Organization of Women.

Somewhere, sometime, someone reached out to you and asked you to join our Republican ranks. Do you remember who it was—and when? Was it a relative, a friend, a candidate's wife? Was it in person, by phone, by mail? Most of us are not selfstarters when it comes to volunteering for a job—big or small. Long ago, or maybe just recently, someone asked you to help with a job they had undertaken—and then you had an investment of time, talent and a little cash in the Republican cause. With the investment, you watched the result of your work and did not have to be reminded to vote. Have you tapped anyone on the shoulder recently and asked her to help you? Was it this week, this month, today? All around you are women still belonging to the honorary association of bystanders because they have not been asked to join the Republican Party.

Ask them now.

You hear your neighbors complaining about the way their country is being run. Did they vote in 1960? If they did not, the mere fact that they looked the other way actually affected the outcome of the election. If they voted Republican, did they bring a friend in to do the same?

THERMOMETER OR THERMOSTAT

There are really two kinds of people in America—or in the world. Some are like thermometers, merely registering the fact that the climate is not perfect, that it is too hot, or too cold. Others, and they are the ones who bring us the victory we must have, are like thermostats. They note that something is wrong and immediately set about doing something about it. Are you a thermometer or a thermostat?

It is up to you to reach into every precinct in every county in New Hampshire, to find the neighbors who need to be told how vital it is for them to join our vast chain of Republican workers. Time is growing short. It is never too early to make another friend.

Let's not have any if in our campaign in 1964. Let's have a victory because we did our very best every minute to bring in every possible vote. Election night is a great thrill, but it is what we did in between elections that pays off.

The GROW program is for the inbetween—from this day until November 3, 1964. Reach out for new voters, new volunteers, additional leadership, new prospective candidates. Invite them to your meetings, to join your clubs, to help in headquarters. Get them to invest their time, their money, their talents in Republican political participation. It will be the best investment you ever made.

Today more than ever before Republicans have a cause. We have a crusade to carry forth, but we must bear in mind that we should not—must not—lose the war in the heat of winning a battle. We Republicans should affirm—and reaffirm—our faith in our own dynamic principles of free enterprise, of less Government intervention, of Government closer to the people.

And quit doing battle with each other. If I were to bring forth two words we need to engrave on our hearts and on our minds it would be these two—unity and amity.

For you have learned in New Hampshire, and we have learned in other States, we cannot win as a divided party, and I say to you that any candidate—any candidate—the Republicans choose on their ticket at the presidential or at the State level will be better for you personally and for your family, for your State and for your Nation than the Kennedy dynasty.

And I would say to you—go into your primary for the man of your choice and talk to your friends and your neighbors, but be big enough if you happen to lose, to join together in the common cause we have to return State government and National Government to a position of strength and of dignity.

And so there is but one conclusion we can reach:

What will you do to contribute toward total victory in 1964?

Will you decide that attendance at Republican meetings is all you can contribute?

Will you feel that if you send a check you have contributed your all?

Do you believe that if you vote you will have done your part?

Or—

Do you feel so deeply about the future of your country that you are willing to make an extra sacrifice of your time, your energy, your devotion to do what must be done before 1964?

Will you agree that you can give time to the organization of your precinct, or your ward, to the recruitment of friends and neighbors, and yes, your relatives, and pledge yourself to decide that 1964 is our year, and that you want to be a part of it?

I would like to offer what might be an appropriate guilding slogan for New Hampshire Republican women in the months ahead: If not me, who: if not now, when? To repeat, if not you, who? If Republican women—able, civic minded, intelligent, aware of the state of the Nation don't take the time and the effort to lead this great crusade, then who will?

And if you don't do it now, when—when do you think you may be given another chance?

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, George Marshall Memorial Dinner, Washington, D.C., October 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an outstanding address by the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, at the George Marshall memorial dinner in Washington, D.C., on October 23, 1963.

At this event, which was sponsored by the Association of the U.S. Army, Vice President JOHNSON spoke inspiringly of the magnificent contribution which Gen. George Marshall made to the security of the United States and to the cause of human freedom.

The Vice President's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AT THE GEORGE MARSHALL MEMORIAL DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 23, 1963

On this occasion, honoring the great man we do, the temptation is very strong to eulogize and memorialize. For all of us who knew him, whether as soldier or statesman, or friend, our memories carry the strongest sense of respect and awe for one of the most exceptional Americans of our history—George Catlett Marshall.

In the context of eulogy, we could review his remarkable career, dwell upon the high trusts which he held, and pay just tribute to the success of the enterprises he led and the programs he initiated in support of the cause of freedom.

But to speak of George Marshall in the past tense would be an injustice to this occasion—and to these times. Out of the historic years of the middle 20th century, other men may have written their names on the record of history with a more flamboyant hand. But as that record comes into truer perspective, the name and record of George Marshall stands forth in bolder relief as a continuing influence upon our times.

As soldier, he guided the forces of freedom to victory in the first global war. As statesman, he set in motion new forces of freedom to make that first global war also the last such conflict.

Today the harvest is ripening in the fields which were sown by this unselfish and dedicated man, and there are lessons for us to apply—lessons from both the work he pursued and the spirit of character he exemplified.

A LIVING LESSON

In pursuit of the victory in World War II, George Marshall offered his countrymen a living lesson of the necessity for confidence, for perseverence, for courage. He helped to teach us an indelible lesson about the necessity for allies and the equally imperative necessity for unity within a free alliance. Likewise, in his direction of our strategies, he taught much that is invaluable about

keeping first things first, fixing upon our objectives and pursuing them steadfastly without distraction, division, or diversion.

As statesman, George Marshall, again imbued our national policies and purposes with these same concepts. While he will never be forgotten as a soldier, history will surely honor him more highly for helping his countrymen to understand that the victories of peace are to be won by those nations which pursue their objectives in a straight line of dedicated purpose—without distractions, divisions, or diversion.

Two decades ago, on the very eve of our greatest national danger, George Marshall took command of an Army equipped with broomsticks. No general could have had much confidence in that Army's readiness. But George Marshall did have confidence in the American people—and in their political systems. On the foundation of that confidence, he persevered without despair, without deriding the system or its leaders, without doubting the people. Through the dark days of "too little, too late"—days many of us still remember so vividly from the Southwest Pacific—his unwavering confidence inspired in his countrymen the confidence indispensable for a great and successful national effort.

Only a few years later, 16 years ago now, civilian George Marshall as Secretary of State saw the nations which had been liberated at such sacrifice from one aggression lying prostrate before a new aggressor.

Europe's harvest had failed. France was free—but without food. England was safe—but without coal for heat. Italy was liberated—but a Communist coalition was within 10 percent of occupying control of the Government. Greece saw guerrillas advancing across the countryside to within 20 miles of Athens. Turkey was resisting Communist claims to vital Provinces.

Only 3 years after the end of the war, that great victory seemed destined to be made hollow—the sacrifices to have been in vain.

THAT DECISIVE MOMENT

George Marshall knew how desperately men everywhere wanted peace. At that decisive moment, he instilled into our policy the simple but powerful proposition that those who want peace must be strong enough to keep peace. On that proposition, America has stood ever since—and stands tonight.

In Greece and Turkey, in Western Europe and southeastern Asia, we as a nation have held steadfastly to a straight-line purpose of building strength—military, economic and political. Because we have built it, because other freemen have joined with us in maintaining it, because together we have demonstrated our willingness to use it, we are today realizing exactly the results George Marshall foresaw.

We have negotiated and ratified the test ban treaty because we are strong, not because we are weak. We are encountering and exploring other opportunities for other negotiations and other agreements because our adversaries learned beyond all doubt 1 year ago in Cuba that we not only have the strength to meet aggression but we have the will to use that strength against any who would breach the peace in our hemisphere—or in the world.

George Marshall is gone. The great armies he commanded have been disbanded. The great plan which bore his name has long since ended. But his influence continues to shake the world in which we live tonight.

As his works live on, so the spirit of his character should also live on in our lives today. Few men of our times have made so great or so indelible an imprint of character as did George Marshall. Had he been a selfish or self-centered man, had he been a partisan, had he been less respectful of the institutions of our system or less confident of the capacity of our people, the history we recount tonight might be very different than it is.

Once, when he was asked about his politics, George Marshall, replied "My father was a Democrat, my mother was a Republican—I am an Episcopalian."

Such an answer seems inconsistent in this era when partisanship is so exalted by many as the first duty of citizenship. But a more partisan, more self-seeking man could not have accomplished for freedom and for America what George Marshall accomplished.

A FREE AND FLEXIBLE SYSTEM

The lesson of this example applies to us all. Over the past quarter century, our system and our people have been challenged as never before. We have been challenged to meet new opportunities and new responsibilities by new means and methods, new policies and purposes. We have succeeded in our response because our system, our institutions and our traditions have been free of dogma and have permitted us to exercise the genius of innovation and inventions under a free and flexible system.

Today we have reached a point of new responsibility of new opportunity. We cannot know fully the forces responsible for the evidences of change within the system of communism. We relaize the objective of that system for world domination has not changed—and will not change. We do not realistically expect the character of communism to be negotiated away by the representatives of communism who come to the conference table.

But we must and we shall hold steadfastly to the character and objectives of our own society. We shall not reject realistic opportunities that arise to relax tensions and promote honorable peace. We can know and believe that in a world which wants peace, the most telling pressure we can exert upon the Communist system will be a continuing pressure for peace. Peace and freedom are the points of our offensive. The free world has the offensive for peace today—and we shall keep it.

We shall keep it by maintaining both the strength of our arms and the initiative of our diplomacy—meeting new challenges as new opportunities. As citizens, let us fill our roles by exemplifying in our citizenship those qualities of George Marshall—confidence, perseverance, courage, and unselfishness.

Legislation To Promote Greater Safety in River Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1962, I introduced, by request, a bill to promote greater safety in river transportation by requiring the inspection and certification by the Coast Guard of diesel-powered towboats, and licensing of certain personnel.

The bill was an outgrowth of a long series of exchanges of correspondence which I engaged in with members of the legislative committee of Local 28, International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, AFL-CIO, of St. Louis. I became convinced safety legislation was required.

Following the introduction of my bill, which was H.R. 9700, in the 87th Congress—H.R. 942 in the 88th Congress—the Coast Guard asked for an opportunity to complete its own investigation of the need for this legislation before any action was taken on it.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has now sent to the House a draft of a proposed bill to close the safety loopholes at which my bill was directed, and I have therefore introduced the new bill today as H.R. 9130. It is, I understand, an even broader bill in some respects than my original proposal, and is based on a Coast Guard study which revealed in general that operation of diesel-powered towing vessels involves as great a hazard as operation of those propelled by steam and should therefore be subject to similar Coast Guard safety standards.

MANY ACCIDENTS COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED

When I introduced the original bill on January 16, 1962, I expressed the hope that it would serve as the vehicle for obtaining a full review by the executive agencies and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of this whole question of safety in river transportation. Many of the vessels, which are not subject to periodic safety inspection, are manned by personnel not licensed or otherwise shown to be qualified for the tasks they are performing.

For instance, while the number of towing vessels has increased 20 percent in the past 10 years, the number of casualties has increased by 120 percent, to an average of 559 casualties per year. A large percentage of these casualties occurred on uninspected towing vessels, and it is the opinion of the Treasury Department that many of these were of a kind which could have been avoided or minimized if well-qualified personnel were aboard.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this matter to the river transportation industry and its employees, I am herewith placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under unanimous consent, the text of the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker transmitting the draft of the bill which I have now introduced.

Following that, I am also inserting the Treasury Department's report on my original bill, H.R. 942. After the interested groups have had a chance to study the new bill carefully, I shall ask for hearings in the committee so that we can proceed to solve a serious safety problem in river transportation.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION

The text of the letter to the Speaker is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to require the inspection of certain towing vessels.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to bring towing vessels propelled by means other than steam under inspection by the Coast Guard.

Section 4427 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 405) presently requires the inspection

of "every tugboat, towing boat, and freight boat." This section is part of an extensive statutory pattern to insure high standards of safety on merchant vessels through regulation and inspection by the Coast Guard. Although phrased in broad terms, section 4427 has been interpreted by the courts as applying only to vessels propelled by steam. As a result, motor propelled towing vessels are not presently subject to inspection unless they are seagoing vessels of over 300 gross tons.

The anomaly whereby steam towing vessels are subject to inspection and motor towing vessels performing practically identical services are not has long been recognized. This anomaly has becoming increasingly apparent with the increasing dominance of the diesel towing vessel as compared to the steam towing vessel. At the present time, steam tugs have been almost completely superseded by diesel towboats; figures show that in 1962 there were 5,016 diesel tugs in operation compared to 84 propelled by steam.

The present interpretation of section 4427 of the Revised Statutes results in another inconsistency in that barges or self-propelled tank veseels carrying hazardous liquid cargoes on inland waters must be inspected and meet Coast Guard safety standards while motor propelled tugs towing such barges are not required to be inspected. Considering the ever increasing traffic in dangerous liquid cargoes and the fact that collision is a major source of marine casualties, an obvious potential hazard is involved in permitting such cargoes to be towed by vessels which at present are neither subject to the requirements for safety inspection nor subject to the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

During 1962 the Coast Guard made a comprehensive study of towing vessel operations. The study showed that of 5,100 vessels documented for towing service only 103 were inspected and certificated by the Coast Guard. The remaining vessels were not subject to inspection under existing law.

The data obtained during the study also shows that while the number of towing vessels has increased 20 percent in the past 10 years, the number of casualties has increased by 120 percent to an average of 559 casualties per year for the period from 1960 through 1962. During 1962, for example, 530 towing vessels were involved in casualties serious enough to be reported, which is an average of 1 out of every 10 towing vessels in service. Detailed casualty figures for that year reveal that while no lives were lost due to casualties on inspected towing vessels, 15 lives were lost in casualties involving uninspected towing vessels. The figures further reveal that less than 3 percent of the inspected vessels were involved in reportable casualties compared to 10 percent of the uninspected vessels. During fiscal year 1962 estimated monetary damages due to casualties involving towing vessels were over $9 million.

Analysis of the casualty figures for towing vessels for the past several years leads to the conclusion that operation of diesel towing vessels involves as great a hazard as operation of those propelled by steam, and that this hazard could be reduced by requiring these vessels to comply with Coast Guard safety standards. In brief, the Department has concluded that motor propelled towing vessels should be brought under the statutory inspection scheme. The proposed bill would, therefore, amend section 4427 of the revised statutes to provide for the inspection of towing vessels regardless of the manner of propulsion.

The Department believes that the smaller towing vessels are not a sufficient safety hazard to warrant the increased administrative difficulties and costs which would result if they were subject to inspection. Therefore, the bill would exclude those towing vessels which are less than 15 gross tons and 26 feet in length. This would eliminate from inspection the smaller vessels which engage in limited operations.

The casualty statistics also show that a large percentage of the casualties which have occurred on uninspected towing vessels are of a type which could be avoided or minimized if well qualified personnel were aboard. For example, during fiscal year 1962 almost 60 percent of the reported casualties involved collisions while another 12 percent involved groundings of the tug or tow. To minimize the hazard to life and property from operation of towing vessels by unqualified personnel, the proposed bill would contain authority to prescribe regulations regarding the manning of towing vessels and the licensing and certificating of their personnel.

The Department, of course, realizes that there are large numbers of vessels to which the strict application of the inspection and manning requirements would not be appropriate for one reason or another. In some cases it is not possible or practicable to bring the vessel into strict compliance; in other cases to do so would result in severe economic hardship or loss of employment. Therefore, the proposed bill would require the Secretary to take into account the various factors which might appropriately require a lessening of the inspection or manning requirements as to certain vessels. It would also give him authority to exempt additional vessels from the inspection requirements if necessary in the public interest. These provisions are intended to provide sufficient flexibility in administration to enable the Secretary to tailor the inspection requirements more closely to the circumstances of individual vessels. With this authority it should be possible to achieve the maximum safety on towing vessels consistent with the least economic hardship and disruption to the industry. This authority would also permit the gradual application of the requirements to existing vessels to insure an orderly transition period with minimum interference to towing vessel operations.

The proposed legislation would require increased expenditures for inspection and clerical personnel since an additional 4,300 vessels would become subject to inspection. The Department estimates that an increase of 55 officers and 20 civilians would be required. This would result in additional costs of approximately $650,000 per year.

There is enclosed a memorandum which contains in summary form the results of the study made by the Coast Guard of the operation of towing vessels. There is also enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the House of Representatives. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the President of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT ON ORIGINAL BILL

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department report on my original bill, H.R. 942, containing suggestions and recommendations for the new bill, H.R. 9130 which I have just introduced, is as follows:

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HEBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 942, to require the inspection and certification of certain motor vessels known as towboats.

The bill would require the inspection and certification of every domestic towboat, however powered, which (1) is designed and used for the purpose of moving barges; (2) is of 480 horsepower or more; and (3) operates on the navigable waters of the United States. Inspection and certification requirements would extend to design, construction, repair, stability, accommodations for crew, lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, manning, and other matters.

In September of 1961 the Coast Guard initiated a comprehensive study of towing vessel operations with a view toward determining whether marine inspection and licensing laws now applicable to steampowered towing vessels should be extended to other classes of towing vessels. That study has been completed. It revealed in general that operation of diesel towing vessels involves as great a hazard as operation of those propelled by steam and that this hazard could be reduced by requiring those vessels to meet Coast Guard safety standards. The Treasury Department has drafted legislation, based on the findings of this study, which is being submitted to the Congress separately.

Although the bill drafted by the Department is similar to H.R. 942, it is broader in scope since it would subject to inspection all towing vessels which are over 15 gross tons or 26 feet or over in length. This results from the findings of the Coast Guard study that vessels over 26 feet or 15 gross tons constitute a definite safety hazard which can be reduced without excessive administrative costs.

Other differences in the two proposals result from the Department's belief that the law governing inspection of towing vessels should follow the existing statutory pattern of title 52 of the Revised Statutes. This would permit a considerable simplification in language. The Department's draft also contains fewer specific statutory requirements and relies more on administrative rulemaking power.

The Department notes that section 5 of H.R. 942 would authorize a penalty twice as great as that provided for violations of the inspection laws by other vessels. While the Department agrees that the penalty provision of existing law should be increased, it does not seem fair to increase the penalty against only one class of vessels. The Department is, therefore, studying the whole question of penalties for violations of the inspection laws. Meanwhile, it recommends that the existing penalty be applied to towing vessels.

In the circumstances, the Department recommends favorable consideration of the legislation relating to towing vessels which it is submitting in lieu of action on H.R. 942.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

G. D'ANDELOT BELIN,
General Counsel.

Who Is Telling the Truth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, since the so-called blockade of Cuba, in Octo-

ber of 1962, President Kennedy and his spokesmen have given the impression to the American people that Khrushchev pledged to remove his troops from Cuba. According to yesterday's New York Times, in a United Press dispatch, he denies ever having said it. This again brings up the question to the American people—who is minding our store?

The article follows:

MOSCOW DENIES IT GAVE U.S. PLEDGE TO REMOVE TROOPS IN CUBA

Moscow, November 12.—The Government newspaper Izvestia said tonight that the Soviet Union had never promised the United States it would withdraw all Russian troops from Cuba.

It said the question of Soviet troops in Cuba "is a problem between the Soviet Union and Cuba" and no one else.

An Izvestia article signed "Observer" referred to a statement attributed to W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs. Mr. Harriman was reported to have said that Premier Khrushchev had promised that all Russian troops would be pulled out of Cuba.

"It is difficult to say with whom this version originated," Izvestia said, "with Harriman himself or the New York Herald Tribune which quoted him."

The Soviet newspaper appeared to be referring to a Washington column by Joseph Alsop in the October 30 issue of the New York Herald Tribune and other papers. It said in part:

"When Gov. Averell Harriman was in Moscow, Nikita S. Khrushchev twice assured him that all Russian troops would eventually be brought home from Cuba. 'Why should we keep them there?' Khrushchev asked, and added that the men of the Red Army did not like being there either because of the steamy Cuban climate."

Izvestia said Premier Khrushchev had made no such pledge to Mr. Harriman when Mr. Harriman asked him in the summer about the troops. Izvestia said Premier Khrushchev had replied with an involved parable.

"The Soviet Union will continue to extend every possible help to brotherly Cuba," Izvestia said. "The problem of stationing troops in Cuba is a problem between the Soviet Union and Cuba. Mr. Harriman and other statesmen should not butt into the business which does not concern them. If they do, that would mean interference in the internal affairs of other states and violation of their sovereignty."

The Soviet Union would consider withdrawing its troops if the United States removed its forces from foreign territories, Izvestia said.

CAPITAL KNOWS OF NO PLEDGE

WASHINGTON, November 12.—The administration said today it had no knowledge of reports that the Soviet Union had pledged to withdraw all of its troops from Cuba.

Ever since last year's crisis, which resulted in the removal of Soviet rockets from the island, there have been persistent reports that Premier Khrushchev promised Mr. Kennedy that the troops would also be recalled.

Since most of the exchanges between the two leaders have been secret, officials have been reluctant to discuss them.

State Department officials said, however, that they were unaware of any promise by the Soviet Union beyond suggestions that a substantial portion of the troops will be withdrawn.

The latest administration assessments place the number of Soviet troops in Cuba at 5,000, against 22,000 estimated to have been in Cuba at the height of the crisis. There are no combat units remaining on the island, administration sources said.

Changes Needed in Oil Import Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, at its annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., on October 29, 1963, adopted a statement on the oil import program which embodies 10 recommendations for improvement on the program.

Every day since I came to Congress, and before, I have become more aware of the increasing hardship the current import program is inflicting on the domestic petroleum industry. The facts speak for themselves in this matter. As the IPAA statement points out, oil exploration and development has continued to decline by every measure. The present program of import control is not adequate to prevent further serious declines in a vital industry.

I have pointed out to my colleagues on numerous occasions the importance of the oil industry from the standpoint of our national security. In case of a war, or another situation like the Suez crisis, we must have a domestic oil industry capable of supplying all our petroleum needs. The current import program is giving us just the opposite, a domestic oil industry which continues to decline. This is a matter which deserves our attention immediately. I sincerely request that my colleagues take the time to read the statement which follows, and to join me in trying to correct the problems:

STATEMENT ON IMPORTS BY THE INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, ANNUAL MEETING, DALLAS, TEX., OCTOBER 29, 1963

The Government's mandatory oil import program has been in effect almost 5 years. Without an import program there would have been complete deterioration of the domestic producing industry. The program, however, has not accomplished its basic objectives of maintaining a healthy domestic industry, capable of supplying our future peacetime and emergency requirements.

By every measure, exploration and development in the United States have continued to decline. Exploratory crew activity has been reduced by more than 50 percent. Wildcat wells show a decrease of more than one-third. The number of rotary rigs in operation has decreased by more than 40 percent. There has ben a decline of about 25 percent in the total number of wells completed per year in the United States. Employment and earnings in domestic petroleum production are down substantially. There have been serious adverse effects on the economy of the oil producing States.

Imports are a major factor affecting the health of the domestic petroleum industry. In order that the import program achieve its basic objectives, the Independent Petroleum Association of America makes the following recommendations:

1. The ratio of imports (excluding residual fuel oil) in districts I–IV should be reduced. For 5 years under the import program these imports have been generally stabilized at a relationship between 12 and 13 percent of domestic production. The continuing declines in U.S. exploration and drilling are clear evidence that imports have been at an excessive rate in relation to domestic production. Reductions in this ratio should be made so that a proper balance is reached that will encourage the necessary expansion of U.S. petroleum resources.

2. The level of district I–IV imports (excluding residual fuel oil) should be based on actual domestic production during the corresponding period of the previous year—as was done under the program for the first half of 1963—rather than the present method of using estimates of future production.

3. The quantity of overland imports for each allocation period should be based on certifications from importing companies, rather than estimates by the Interior Department.

4. Finished petroleum products now being imported into the United States for military uses should be supplied from domestic sources.

5. Pending proposals to exempt the asphaltic content of imported crude oil should be rejected as an unnecessary action that would undermine the import program.

6. The district V program can be improved and strantghened. Present excess shipments to district I–IV that serve to increase imports by increasing demand should not be included in the calculation of district V demand for import quota purposes. Calculation of supply should be based on the full availability of domestic supplies from all U.S. areas, including the maximum capacity of pipelines into district V. The program should serve to encourage the expanding use of domestic oil produced in district V and should operate so as to increase the movement of oil from other domestic areas of oversupply into this deficit area.

7. Imports or withdrawals from bonded warehouse for fueling commercial aircraft should be included within the maximum allowable import level. These imports, particularly jet fuel, have been increasing.

8. Imports of light finished products are unnecessary and should be supplied by domestic oil. These imports should be phased out of the import program.

9. In the interest of equity, imports should continue to be allocated to all refiners, and historic allocations should be progressively reduced until eliminated.

10. All actions to circumvent the intent and purpose of the oil import program should be opposed, including (a) misclassification of imports as "overland" when tankers are used from foreign sources, (b) there should be no provision for the importation of unfinished oils which developed as a means of circumventing the voluntary import program, (c) the import program should be administered so as to prevent increases in imports of light finished products from Puerto Rico.

The association is gravely concerned as to the rapid expansion of natural gas imports. These imports constitute a potentially serious threat to the markets for both domestic oil and domestic natural gas. The officers of the association are directed to maintain close surveillance of this problem in order that the association may pursue policies that will prevent excessive expansion of gas imports relative to domestic petroleum production.

These recommendations are designed to serve the best interests of national security through the maintenance of a healthy, expanding domestic petroleum industry.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Senator Hartke Praises Projects of Buddha, Ind., Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the women of Buddha, Ind., have come up with a program of progress for their town which I like to think is typical of Hoosier ingenuity and industriousness. Not content to live a life of leisure and inactivity, they have taken it upon themselves to improve their homes and their community with a number of projects. By doing this they have not only eased the burdens of the Buddha menfolk but have increased their own health and happiness.

The Petticoat Construction Co. is well described in an editorial appearing November 10, 1963, in the Hammond Times. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO-IT-YOURSELF GIRLS

Some 24 miles below Bloomington, home of Indiana University, is Bedford, and about 5 miles southeast of Bedford is the community of Buddha. It is a place little known now, but if a movement that has sprung up there spreads, Buddha may become famous all over Indiana, or indeed, throughout the entire United States.

Calumet region housewives know how boring is the average round of daily existence. Once the husband and father is off to work and the children are off to school, the housewife settles herself to the completion of her routine round of household tasks.

In this day when the average household is so full of labor-saving servants—electric sweepers, automatic washers, machine dryers, power dishwashers, etc.—as to resemble an automated factory junior grade, the routine tasks are quickly out of the way.

Then the housewife finds time hanging heavy on her hands. It is only for so long that the average woman can look at television, converse on the telephone, consume dozens of cups of coffee with similarly situated homemakers, and read the latest novels. After a few weeks of this routine, once the kids are back in school, the average housewife is, frankly, bored with her lot. "There's nothing to do," she complains.

Well, down in Buddha the housewives of the community have found a constructive, satisfying solution to this problem of housewife ennui. They have banded together to go into the do-it-yourself business.

Every woman knows there are thousands of little improvements that could be made around the house, if the husband and father of the family could only find the time to do them. But the poor guy, worn out from a day in the slabbing mill or the control house of the petroleum still, is usually too tired out at the end of a day's cares to do more than pick up a bowling ball and go off to uphold the honor of the pinsplitting aggregation which happens to claim a hold on his loyalty.

And weekends, he's too busy supervising kid football, basketball or baseball, or putting up storm windows, or operating the power mower, to have much time for those other little improvements.

As a result, they go undone, in most places.

But not in Buddha. There, the housewives, no longer bored, have banded together in the Petticoat Construction Co., which has as its purpose the improvement or repair projects husbands never seem to have the energy or time for. They meet every day at the home of their hostess, help clean up the dishes, and then pitch in to carry out various desirable projects—such as building concrete patios, laying bricks for walls and garden paths, constructing and putting up shelves, and so forth.

They are no longer bored. The work on the creative projects gives them a personal satisfaction of a job well done. Their time is no longer spent in entertaining but relatively time-wasting pursuits. Best yet, they find their general physical well-being so stimulated that they are not tempted to insidious nagging of their well-intentioned but busy husbands, for jobs undone.

Besides, the cause for nagging is no longer there—the little jobs are done, and done to their own personal satisfaction.

It seems to us that the women of Buddha have hit upon something that should spread to all corners of the State of Indiana and the Nation. There's no greater satisfaction than personal accomplishment, particularly if it improves family relations.

Remarks of Gerald L. Phillippe at Financial World Dinner, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 15, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on October 30 it was my pleasure to have addressed the Financial World dinner in New York City, during the course of which the General Electric Co. was singled out for honors.

Mr. Gerald Phillippe, president of the company, accepted the award, but his words included some very timely advice to all business in the form of questions. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS IN ACCEPTANCE OF GOLD OLAR AWARD FOR BEST ANNUAL REPORT IN ALL INDUSTRY, FINANCIAL WORLD DINNER, NEW YORK, BY GERALD L. PHILLIPPE, PRESIDENT, GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., OCTOBER 30, 1963

We are honored indeed by being voted this award for the second year in a row. While I felt before coming here that the judges had exercised extraordinarily good judgment in making their selection—after observing the display of excellent reports in the adjoining room—I am not now so sure of this conclusion. Moreover I have gained an even heightened respect for the enormity of their task and am therefore all the more appreciative of the honor bestowed on us.

In my brief remarks tonight, I would like to direct your attention to accomplishment of an objective which I think is worthy of our combined efforts—the personal involvement of a greater portion of our society in the private enterprise system—to have a greater number of our citizens become card-carrying capitalists, so to speak. We know the great advantages that accrue when individuals become infused with a sense of personal involvement in the survival and growth of a community. In our economic society personal involvement is achieved through ownership—ownership of private property. And just as home ownership promotes a sense of the citizen's responsibility in the community in which he lives, so the ownership of shares advances the citizen's sense of a personal stake in the larger economic community.

Perhaps one reason for the appeal of socialism in other lands has been its deceptive promise of what it calls "public ownership." The promise proves hollow precisely because the Socialists' so-called "public ownership" brings no real sense of individual responsibility and involvement. Quite the contrary—it holds out to the individual the enervating notion that things will be taken care of for him.

We know these things—they are part of the working philosophy of all those in this room. Yet in the face of this awareness, the fact that 17 million Americans own shares in our private enterprise system is less a source of satisfaction than of realization of work yet to be done, of opportunities not yet realized—and even a sense of urgency about getting on with the job.

I'd like to leave six questions with you to ponder and after reflection take what you or your company considers to be appropriate action.

1. Are we making enough use of modern opinion research techniques to find out more about the private investor—exactly who he or she or it is, what motivates him, what are his real wants and needs? Responsible opinion research organizations have developed the methods and sharpened the tools, but they are still used only superficially and sporadically. We of General Electric can attest to the benefits of "listening" to share owners in the same way that modern marketing is based on sensing customers' changing needs.

2. Have we done anything we can cite with pride to help broaden the public's understanding of financial matters, to strip away the mystery that surrounds accounting, taxes, depreciation, the risks and rewards of investing, the fundamental concepts of our economic system? I participated in an earnest discussion of this very question at the recent annual meeting of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and there was agreement on the long road still lying ahead.

3. Are we doing enough to educate young people so that investments in our private enterprise system become a natural and understood part of their mature lives? The stock exchanges and leading investment

houses have youth programs. Some companies have shown the way in adapting their annual reports for classroom use. But these efforts only light the way for the broader effort that we in industry should make.

4. Are we making sufficient progress in broadening the understanding between shareowners and corporate managements? Roundtable discussions with groups of our shareowners this year point up the fact that many shareowners approach corporate annual reports with skepticism, expecting management to "put its best foot forward," to "make a pitch." We all have much to do to overcome these attitudes and develop a real sense of healthy shareowner participation.

5. Who of us has taken steps to begin the long, hard job of promoting understanding of private ownership elsewhere in the free world? Some companies have translated their annual reports into foreign languages. Other companies have opened up investment opportunities in their host countries. But this is an enormous job we are only beginning to approach.

6. Finally, what are we doing to develop the really professional teams of people who can handle these challenging assignments? Good investor relations requires the kind of organizational strength which is typified by the team effort involved in writing a good annual report.

You have honored several of us from General Electric by inviting us here on the dais tonight. But I want to pay special tribute to two members of the General Electric team whom I'll ask to stand as representatives of all the artists, writers, accountants, printers, distribution experts and others whose talents produced the report which Financial World has so greatly honored. These two gentlemen are J. Hervie Haufler, who heads the responsibility for planning and editing our annual report * * * and Richard L. Young, who directs the assembly and presentation of financial information. They and all their associates join me in thanking you and in pledging our continued efforts toward keeping more than half a million General Electric shareowners well informed as to the progress of their company and more broadly to promote broader understanding of the workings of our private enterprise system.

Address by the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at a Convocation Celebrating the 175th Anniversary of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., October 28, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, at a convocation celebrating the 175th anniversary of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.

The address was delivered by the Chief Justice on October 28, 1963.

Chief Justice Warren discussed on this occasion the contributions to our country of one of the students of the class of 1863 at Georgetown University, the ninth Chief Justice of the United States, Edward D. White.

The address of Chief Justice Warren follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT A CONVOCATION CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 28, 1963

The celebration of the birthday of a great university is always an important event, but the celebration of one here in Washington that came into being the same year as the Constitution of the United States arouses exciting thoughts concerning the past, present, and future, not only of the university, but of the Nation itself. These thoughts run the gamut of climax after climax, successes, failures, and all our hopes for the future.

The theme you have chosen for your anniversary, "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World," is also productive of such thoughts because in every phase of modern life, we are in an age which cries out for discovery through wisdom. The natural sciences and technology have made discoveries that have profoundly changed our way of life and the changes cry out for social adjustment to keep them in harness. In the political world, strange and bitter authoritarian ideologies have attempted to stop the march of freedom, and those who believe in the dignity of man and his right to live at peace in freedom are challenged to discover and effectuate the means of accomplishing this great objective.

New nations are rapidly coming into being after centuries of subjugation. They are looking not only for independence but for freedom and respect. In these circumstances we must even rediscover the elements of freedom and make them effective both at home and abroad. We are still paying the price of the slavery our Nation practiced at the time this university came into being, and we must discover the way to make meaningful in every respect the great principles that are symbolized in the words, "all men are created equal," and "equal protection of the laws." A materialistic world has faced us with the challenge to rediscover through the Good Book the real meaning of "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" in the light of present-day conditions. I am sure those are the things you had in mind when you dedicated this anniversary to "Wisdom and Discovery for a Dynamic World." And wisdom it will take—all the wisdom we can muster.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

I congratulate Georgetown University on the contribution it has made to such wisdom throughout the life of our Nation. Ever since George Washington selected the site for the Federal City of Washington in 1790 and construction of the Capitol was started in 1793, Georgetown has contributed men of high principle to the Government of the United States—hundreds of them—Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet officers, judges, and other Government officials who often are not widely known, but without whom our Government could not have become great. These people have served well in every crisis through which our Nation has passed. Our Nation was born in crisis, and it has been our lot to pass through many of them to the one we face today. Of all of them, the worst was the War of the Rebellion. At that time, Georgetown was a thriving university.

There were students here from all parts of the Union. When the drums of war rolled, hundreds of students left these halls of learning to enlist in the Armed Forces, some in the Army of the United States, others in the Army of the Confederacy. Georgetown never forgot her sons, but on the contrary, after the war sought to reunite them in a spirit of unity and in loyalty to the Union which had prevailed. Today we all celebrate the centennial of one of those wartime classes—the class of 1863. Among the members of that class was one who was destined to exemplify that unity in an outstanding way. He was Edward D. White, later to become Chief Justice of the United States. He was but 16 years of age when the war broke out. He was a Louisianian by birth, the son of a Governor of that State, a Catholic by faith, and the product of Jesuit teaching. Once home, he ran away without the family approval, and enlisted as a private in the armed forces of his State. Later, as a lieutenant he was captured by the Union Army at Port Hudson and was eventually paroled home. Sick and racked by fever, he wended his way home on foot to the point of utter exhaustion. He collapsed on the side of the road, and while he laid there it is said that a good Samaritan came along, took off his own blue overcoat and put over the boy's shoulders. It was at that moment he later stated that the future Chief Justice decided to devote his energies to a reconciliation between the North and the South. After the war, he became a lawyer and entered politics in the tradition of the family. He served successively as State legislator, a trial judge, member of the Louisiana Supreme Court, and U.S. Senator. Then in 1894, White took his seat as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States under appointment by President Cleveland—a recognition of his outstanding service to State and Nation. In 1910, upon the death of Chief Justice Fuller, President Taft, at the request of all the other members of the Court, took an unprecedented step. He appointed Edward D. White to be the ninth Chief Justice of the United States. He thus became the first and with one exception the only man on the Supreme Court ever to be appointed Chief Justice. In that capacity he served with great distinction for the remainder of his life.

CHIEF JUSTICE EDWARD D. WHITE

White's 27 years of service on the Supreme Court were eventful ones in the development of our Nation. In this period, marked by two wars, America became a major world power. Domestically, the epoch saw enormous industrial and commercial development, and an increasing role by the National Government in the country's affairs. Inevitably, the social and economic problems of the day were reflected in the litigation before the Court. White viewed the Constitution as an expanding document, flexible enough to respond to conditions not envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Rather than a "barrier to progress," he said it was "the broad highway through which alone true progress may be enjoyed." Though a devoted son of his native State and a proud warrior for the Confederacy, he realized that the survival and growth of a strong America required a National Government with powers adequate to meet foreign and domestic problems effectively. More than 4,000 cases were decided by the Court during his tenure. Of these, he wrote more than 700 opinions on almost every phase of the law, many of them of great importance.

But the most important contribution White made to the Nation was the spirit of unity which he engendered on the Court and the reconciliation which he fostered throughout his long public career after the war. It was, indeed, a tribute to him, a former Confederate soldier, when all his colleagues asked the President of the United States to appoint him Chief Justice, something that as far as we know never happened in the history of our country. On the Court at that time was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Striking, indeed, was the friendship between these two. Both of them had known the rigors of the war, the one fighting for the Union, the other for the South. Holmes had been five times wounded and was discharged as a Brevet colonel. White had almost died as

he made his way homeward across a war-torn land. And yet these two, during clement weather, used to stroll frequently, arm in arm, from the Capitol toward White's home. Theirs was an abiding friendship.

CHIEF JUSTICE WHITE AND THE NATION

Perhaps more remarkable was the fact that White came to see that the greater values of the Constitution had to be preferred to the cause he had loved and fought for. This was touchingly demonstrated when in 1914 he said:

"Now with the mists of the conflict of the Civil War cleared from my vision, as my eyes fall with tender reverence upon that thin gray line, lo, the invisible has become the visible and the Blue and the Gray, thank God, are one. I see it [peace and brotherhood] illustrated in that flags that stands behind me. * * * In the clarified vision in which it is now given to me to see it, as I look upon its azure field, it is resplendent with the luster of the Southern Cross, and as I contemplate its stripes they serve to mark the broad way for the advance of a mighty people blessed with the plentitude of liberty tempered with justice and self-restraint essential to the protection of the rights of all. And thus again I see, although the stars and bars have faded widely and forever, the fundamental aspirations which they symbolized find their imperishable existence in the Stars and Stripes."

What a profession of faith in the lasting unity and brotherhood of our Nation. He conquered his early prejudices and felt free to admit that the secession had been both unconstitutional and unwise. "My God," he once said in anguish, "My God if we had succeeded."

And his action fitted his words. When the Southern States attempted to avoid the proscription of the 15th amendment to the Constitution which guaranteed the right of every American to vote without regard to "race, color or previous condition of servitude," he stood squarely for the words of the Constitution. Some of the States, in order to prevent Negroes from voting provided in substance that all persons were eligible to vote if their grandfathers had been eligible prior to 1866 to vote. That was the year after the Constitution, through the 13th amendment, prohibited slavery forevermore. This, of course, would have disfranchised all the Negroes because their grandfathers had been slaves who had no voting rights. In the famous case of *Guinn* v. *United States* in 1914, known as the grandfather clause case, he wrote the opinion invalidating the practice as being contrary to the Constitution of the United States.

SPIRIT OF UNITY

When Chief Justice White wrote this opinion, he was not only making manifest his own strong and generous character, but he was reflecting the principles of this university and the teaching that he received here in the troubled days of the class of 1863. He was reflecting the spirit of unity that had guided the destinies of this school for generations. He was reflecting great credit on his university, and I am sure that everyone connected with it is today happy to celebrate the anniversary of his class and the anniversary of the abolition of slavery at the same time that you are celebrating the 175th anniversary of your founding.

We need the spirit of unity and reconciliation now as much as we did in his day. The world is divided by bitterness, and that bitterness has found its way into segments of our national life. Unrestrained by our better natures, it can do us untold injury. We are in another crisis as grave as that which brought the Constitution of the United States into being. It is a world crisis, and how long it will last we cannot know. It is a crisis that is born of bitterness and it is axiomatic that bitterness begets bitterness.

We do know that if we are to play a noble part in the affairs of the world, we must be a united Nation; united in spirit and united in action. It is the spirit of unity that has made us a great Nation, and nothing less than unity will sustain us as such in the future. If Chief Justice White and Mr. Justice Holmes, and many others like them, could cast aside their earlier differences and resulting prejudices and work together for the strengthening of the Union after having fought on opposite sides in a divisive war, certainly Americans of today should be able and willing to submerge their differences and irritations for the common good. Nothing less will serve the cause of America.

"UTRAQUE UNUM"

Immediately after the Civil War, Georgetown as a symbol of unity adopted the colors of blue and gray. It again brought together students from all parts of the land. For the last 100 years, they have come together here under those colors to the great enrichment of our country. It thus became in the educational world a symobl of unity as the United States became in the political world. As it projected its established principles, ideals, and traditions to uphold our common heritage it combined religious and ethical values in a scientific and humanistic culture. These values are implicit in your motto "Utraque Unum," signifying that spiritual and ethical values are at one with the scientific, cultural and political ideals of mankind. In such a tradition one can find the wisdom needed for this age that is upon us.

I congratulate you on your 175th birthday, and I join you in honoring the memory of one of your students of the class of 1863, a great American, the ninth Chief Justice of the United States, Edward D. White.

Senator Hartke Praises Voter Turnout in Town of Battle Ground, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I point with pride to the town of Battle Ground, Ind., which just this month turned out 93 percent of its voting population in the municipal elections. Certainly, this is one of the finest records in the country and an inspiration to all of us who seek to promote freedom and the democratic system of government. I join with the Lafayette Journal & Courier in saluting the residents of Battle Ground and ask unanimous consent that remarks published by the Journal & Courier be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTSTANDNG TURNOUT

The town of Battle Ground is entitled to a salute from Uncle Sam and everyone else for its outstanding turnout of voters in Tuesday's election.

When 93 percent of the registered voters trek to the polls, that's democracy in action, and something to entitle all Battle Ground citizens to hold their heads high.

Only 28 of the 402 registered voters failed to exercise their birthrights, and it can be assumed that illness or absences from the community prevented many of the 28 from casting ballots.

Voter turnouts were good in other Indiana communities including Lafayette, but almost every municipality will have to take a back seat as far as Battle Ground is concerned.

Battle Ground citizens have shown all of us the way it should be done.

Functions of Civil Defense—Executive Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, November 15, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, an idiotic mimeographed leaflet is being circulated misrepresenting the purpose of certain Executive orders promulgated by President Kennedy and distorting the functions of civil defense. Recently some of these sheets were passed out in Hardin, Mont., and the following editorial from KHDN was read over the air.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the leaflet that inspired it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and leaflet were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHDN EDITORIAL, OCTOBER 31, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, I have just come into possession of one of the most vicious pieces of literature, if this tripe can be called that, that has ever been my misfortune to read.

It isn't often that anything I read gets under this thick hide of mine, but this time they not only got under it, they hit the quick. Before I go any further, let me make myself absolutely clear. Having been in radio for more years than I care to confess to, I have no politics. I favor neither the Republicans nor Democrats. I'm just as apt to pick a fight with one party as the other, often have, and probably will again, so politics do not enter into my feelings in this matter; not one iota.

This article I have reference to is apparently being circulated by hand, with the caption "pass on and alert another American." From the text of it, I am sure Khrushchev would love to have a copy, too.

The article points out various executive orders, by number, signed by President Kennedy on February 16, 1962, and deals with what is to be done in case of a national emergency. Under these executive orders, the President has the right to assume command and control of all communications. This includes radio and television broadcasting stations. It also includes control over all airports and aircraft, the takeover of all health, education, and welfare functions, take charge of all food resources, electrical power, petroleum, and gas, and designates the Postmaster General to register all persons.

Now who in the name of tunket should have this authority in case of national emergency? Without such authority and its accompanying planning we'd be running around like chickens with our heads cut off. Everyone would be trying to hide his head in the sand and there just isn't enough sand to accommodate us all at one and the same time.

This article further advocates the abolishment of all civil defense agencies, and claims that the widespread race riots have been incited by our politicians and were deliberately

planned as part of an "operation takeover" in order to set up a dictatorship in this country, "more rigid than has been experienced by the Russian slaves." I have heard a lot of ridiculous statements in my life, but this takes the cake.

I can understand criticism of our country, its leaders and its politicians, and the bureaucracies in our Government, but this is not criticism, it's downright dangerous. The article points out that Oregon has abolished its civil defense system and that all America should follow suit. One small item overlooked by the perpetrators of this vicious article * * * according to information handed me, Oregon replaced its civil defense system with an even tougher one giving absolute police powers to its State police system with even more stringent controls on all the things I've mentioned plus many more. Having lived in Oregon and having met Senator WAYNE MORSE personally, I can believe almost anything happening in that otherwise wonderful State.

This inflammatory article goes on to point out that in case of a national emergency the Government can take over your business, your job, your personal property, and your person. In case of such an emergency you had better hope someone is left around to do just these things. Dollars to doughnuts, personal property will be the last thing you'll be thinking about in the haste to find a hole big enough to hide in. Without city, county, State, and Federal governments helping out, we might just as well forget the entire thing and start figuring ways and means to make our living in the next world, because that's where we'll be.

Nowhere in this article is there one little word as to what should be done about the safety of this country and its populace once we have abolished civil defense and the Presidential powers set up to protect us, not one word. We must assume, then, that we are to fend for ourselves, and the few of us who are left will probably kill each other off trying to find ways and means to hide ourselves and our families—if we have any families left to hide.

Can you imagine the slaughter on our highways alone if there were no controls? As for radio and television, if left to themselves you'd probably get most any kind of a report you wanted by just dialing, one to another. You would have absolutely no warning of an impending attack because all of us would be afraid to trigger a disaster for fear it might not be the real thing. I recall the tragedy caused by a performance of Orson Wells some years back when he did a radio show called "An Invasion From Mars." It's hard to believe, but it was realistic enough to cause people to kill themselves by diving out of windows, driving off cliffs and bridges, and by gun and poison. That was before the atom and nuclear bombs; imagine what would happen now if someone were to touch off an untrue report of impending doom.

It's a wonderful thing to live in a country where we can openly criticize its government, its leaders, and even its Constitution, but this is ridiculous. I don't know who is circulating this piece of junk so I cannot impugn their character or their good intentions, but according to the way I see it, they are about the world's most misguided souls, not to mention the most unthinking group ever to come up the road. The very fact that this article is unsigned is, in itself, enough to make a person wonder as to its origin and its purpose.

There are other items in this so-called "manifesto of the people" but it would take more time than I care to devote to it. Suffice it to say that unless someone is given authority to take charge in case of national emergency and particularly in time of attack, what happened in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and a few other erstwhile nations in this world were just child's play compared to what could happen right here in our own country. I, for one, would far rather give up a few temporary rights and privileges in the hope my country and I might be able to survive to fight back.

Among the supporters of this article are undoubtedly many fine Americans and it is to these people I point this request. Give serious thought to what you are proposing. Don't jump off the dock unless you are able to swim, without help, back to shore. If you want to take issue with something, be prepared to offer a substitute plan that is both workable and feasible. If you really believe your rights are being violated, speak up but don't be afraid to back up your views, criticisms, thoughts, suggestions, and ideas with your signature. That's the American way and the way to democracy in government, be it Republican or Democratic Party, I thank you.

PASS ON AND ALERT ANOTHER AMERICA—EXECUTIVE ORDERS FROM THE FEDERAL REGISTER DESCRIBING GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER

The Federal Register, record of all laws, Executive orders, and Executive proclamations, which bypass Congress, can be read in Seattle Public Library, 4th Avenue and Madison Street, Seattle, Wash. This series of Executive orders was signed by President Kennedy on February 16, 1962:

Executive Order No. 10995: Take over of communications media.

Executive Order No. 10997: Take over of all electrical power, petroleum and gas, fuels and minerals.

Executive Order No. 10998: Take over of food resources and farms (including all equipment for farming.)

Executive Order No. 10999: Take over of all modes of transportation and control of highways, seaports, etc.

Executive Order No. 11000: Mobilization of all civilians into working forces under Government supervision.

Executive Order No. 11001: Government take over of all health, education, and welfare functions.

Executive Order No. 11002: Designates Postmaster General to operate a national registration of all persons.

Executive Order No. 11003: Government takeover of all airports and aircraft.

Executive Order No. 11004: (This is now being done under urban renewal)—Housing and Finance Authority to relocate communities; build new housing with public funds; designate land areas to be abandoned as unsafe; and establish new locations for populations—(complete integration will be enforced hereby under J.F.K.'s latest Executive order against discrimination in housing built with public funds.)

Executive Order No. 11005: Government to take over railroads, inland waterways, and public storage facilities.

On September 27, 1962, Kennedy issued Executive Order No. 11051, "Prescribing Responsibilities of the Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President." This order authorizes the President to put all other Executive orders into effect.

The civil defense board of your city is the enforcing agency of these orders. On the occasion of any crisis, real or manufactured, a Presidential decree can enable immediate enforcement of a dictatorship—the chain of command being through our State Governors, the mayors, and the civil defense boards. The State and Federal Governments take over your business, your job, your home, your personal property, and your person. You could be rounded up and transported in trucks and buses to areas which they designate. You could be ordered to work at tasks which they determine. There would be no going back. Your homes could be razed and rebuilt by the Government under the pretext of clearing a "dangerous area"; housing thereafter would be under Government control.

Kennedy's orders outline a plan, not for protecting the American people from suffering and death in the event of disaster, but for seizing absolute control of every aspect of human life in the United States. He could establish a more rigid dictatorship than has been experienced by the Russian slaves.

If you value your freedom, address your Congressmen and demand the rescision of these Executive orders (and all other Executive orders) in their entirety. Demand that they enact specific legislation to preclude any legislation by Executive order.

Oregon has abolished its entire civil defense system. California is rapidly awakening. Let's follow the example of Oregon and abolish the city, county, and State civil defense boards.

The widespread race riots, incited by our politicians, were deliberately planned as part of "Operation Takeover," and are rapidly developing the required emergency to justify the planned dictatorship.

Newspaper Week: Reminder of Journalistic Career of Nicola Lo Franco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 31, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the recent directive by the President declaring the week of October 13 as Newspaper Week, recalls to my mind the distinguished journalistic career of Nicola Lo Franco—deceased—director of L'Italia, the Italian newspaper of Chicago, founded in 1886. His son, the talented journalist and attorney, Ari Lo Franco, succeeded his illustrious dad as editor and publisher upon his death November 11, 1951, Armistice Day.

It is proper and fitting that Nicolo Lo Franco, on the 12th anniversary of his death, receive this fitting tribute for his untiring efforts in behalf of his fellow countrymen to advance their social, economic, and political status through brilliant editorials stimulating and exhorting greater Italo-American accomplishments at every level of American life. He was a vibrant fighter in defense of Italian leadership whether it be in politics, labor or business. The logic of his writings in answer to the prejudicial forays emanating from the American press were irrefutable, and informative articles depicting their contributions to the strength and sinews of American industry, many of which appeared in the American press.

Nicola Lo Franco enjoyed the close companionship of the leaders active in Italian affairs. And so he practiced his profession in possession of reliable information. Although he was a fine writer, his greatest attribute was knowing and evaluating men and understanding fundamental issues. He was a student of the life of the Italian community. He never acted on a rumor—just wrote a story coming from reliable sources, and kept the rule of confidence whether the information was on or off the record.

Nicola Lo Franco played an important part in the molding of the Italian-American image in the State and Nation. His association with all types of humans gave him an insight into judging these worthwhile men and issues to pursue and to recognize the phony shams and sordid aims of ambitious leadership promotion. He knew all men in their false disguises and their secrets and made himself more or less serviceable—getting in exchange a reporter's advantage—advance information for a good story.

He was loyal to his friendships and could recognize some good in every man regardless of the public acceptance of the individual. At heart he was a happy man, although few persons ever witnessed any outburst of his reaction to humor. And let us remember that the life of a newspaper correspondent in the early days was not an experience to gloat over—long hours, short pay. Also, the sadness of his early life in Italy—being a freedom fighter for the rights of the individual was no picnic. He had to play a hide-and-seek game—with the odds all against him. Naturally, an individual living under these critical social conditions develops a personality seeking the shadows of silence and its somber influence upon the character of a man.

Nicola was a genius of his time in the early years of ethnic journalism—he enjoyed the confidence and appreciation of the Italo-Americans in Chicago, and its environs. Any other man would have been a cynic under the conditions that he found in his work. But he believed in human nature and found real leadership and helped develop those men whose names he made immortal, never to die in the history of the Italian colony in his city. He has left us as of yesterday in keeping alive through his writings the old traditions of our people and their leaders—the pioneers of Italian stock that have contributed so much to the advance of the new generation of Americans to carry on in their stead for a greater America.

Nicola, not forgotten, lies restfully in the moss-covered marbled sacred acreage knowing he left a worthy offspring in Arizona who carries on in his father's tradition—respected and admired.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Time for Long, Hard Look at Operation Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. foreign aid program continues to come under attack and criticism from many sources for lack of proper administration and for gross waste. Included among the programs of which many are urging a reappraisal is the Alliance for Progress program. This program, certainly noble in idea but far from perfect in reality, also demands closer scrutiny and perhaps readjustment of certain Alliance programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner, in a recent editorial, calls for a "hard look" at the foreign aid program and particularly at the Alliance for Progress, which the editorial points out seems to have had less than the desired effect in Brazil and Argentina and other major important Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR LONG, HARD LOOK AT OPERATION HANDOUT

Disconcerting as it may be to find a sort of Berlin wall building against U.S. assistance to the Latin lands, it hardly comes as a surprise—and it should occasion on Washington's part a long, hard look at the realities before plunging ahead with any program of indiscriminate outpouring. In the case of Brazil, for instance, and Argentina, the outstretched palm has converted to the clenched fist.

President Joao Goulart, of the former, has initiated his own "Checkpoint Charlie," proposing to resist multilaterally the good offices of Uncle Sam on a mission of charity And Argentina's incumbent regime is proceeding with confiscation to drive out U.S. investors, uncompensated for the properties dispossessed.

Thus does the so-called Alliance for Progress collide with the very obstacles of entrenched political obstructionism it was designed—ostensibly—to modify if not remove. Latin stewardship on the far left has notified the benefactor, in so many words, that it will play by its own rules, and regards these billions of handout as almost a conspiracy of "Yankee imperialism."

The interpretation is an affront to the Nation whose already overburdened taxpayers, sacrificing to meet their own bills, have been tapped to defray the added surcharge of global charity. And it compounds the offense when solicited, additional investments, made in good faith, are grabbed in a totalitarian concept indistinguishable from that which carried Cuba across the threshold into communism.

Since July 1, 1961, the Alliance for Progress has lent or given Brazil more than $1 million a day.

During this period, Brazil has renewed diplomatic relations with Russia, defended Cuba's rights in the Organization of American States, passed a law severely limiting profits abroad by foreign companies operating there, and begun to negotiate purchase of all foreign-owned utilities in the country.

The United States now is giving assistance to Argentina at the rate of $170 million per year, and in recent years has made big loans to help that country out of difficulties left over by the Peron regime.

The current study by these inter-American delegates at São Paulo is not, surely, the first confrontation of disturbing facts; nor is the policy distrust engendered wholly on one side.

It is understandable that smaller Latin countries are bewildered by the double standard of Kennedy policies toward junta rule establishment. On the one hand, they see diplomatic relations severed—and aid suspended—when it is a Latin land ousting a government that way; and on the other, as in Vietnam, the junta revolution swiftly taken to Washington's bosom. It is difficult to know the score, and ascertain—even if they wish to comply—exactly what it is this administration wants.

The confusing picture, respecting objectives, wasn't helped at the launching of Operation Handout, with policy fulminations at the State Department's Latin Affairs desk. The amateur handyman, Richard Goodwin, and others who succeeded him, were obsessed with it as more a lever for political and social reform than the economic uplift described as its aim.

Unquestionably there were reforms to achieve—addressed to the long-range objective of enabling Latin America to stand, taller and with constituent sharing of its welfare, on its own feet. But it was fantastic to imagine that a ticket to utopia was purchasable by a purse, bestowed free, of any dimensions. The complications now encountered are simply those of avarice on the part of politicians there, and it hardly can amaze that they propose to use those bounties to advance and entrench their own regimes.

While yapping for financial help, many of them have resisted attendant national responsibilities for a turn at self-help.

The turn of events is of significance to the taxpayers of the United States—profoundly conscious of the fact that even as this obstacle arises, in contemptuous challenge of enlarged handout, the administration is making the Senate ring with its cries against a reduction in foreign aid, a terminal point for it anywhere down the road, and any suggestion that it be limited to nations strictly on our side of a struggle for world survival.

It is time, indeed, for a new hard look at the realities, including the Alliance for Progress. Any gauntlet laid down for Uncle Sam should be run strictly with his eyes open; not dictated by wishful thinking and guesswork. What we are buying isn't safely to be left to chance.

Tax Cut in Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr Henry Hazlitt, entitled "Tax Cut in Wonderland."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX CUT IN WONDERLAND

(By Henry Hazlitt)

I am going to try to explain Secretary Dillon's position on taxes. His argument may be a little difficult to follow, so I advise you to fasten your seat belts.

Testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in favor of a tax cut of $11.1 billion over a 2-year period, the Treasury Secretary predicted that if this tax cut were made there would be a budget deficit in the present fiscal year, which ends June 30, of $9.2 billion, and in the next fiscal year also of $9.2 billion.

Well, you may think naively, that's a deficit of $18.4 billion over the next 2 years; so if Congress does not pass the $11.1 billion tax cut, that will at least reduce the combined deficit to $7.3 billion—and though it wouldn't exactly be fiscally responsible to plan such deficits, it would be at least something to reduce their size.

But here Dillon will set your arithmetic straight. No; if you don't cut taxes $11 billion, the budget deficits will be bigger. They will probably rise in the next fiscal year (1965) to $10 billion or $12 billion, and in the 1966 fiscal year to $15 billion to $20 billion. And if Congress does cut taxes? Then, "with good luck," the Secretary thinks the budget could be balanced in the 1967 fiscal year, and he even sees no reason why it should not be balanced in 1968. So the choice in the immediate years ahead is only between huge deficits and enormous deficits, and there is only a vague hope that the budget will someday be balanced again.

WIDE OF THE MARK

Before we examine the theory behind this arithmetic, let's glance at Dillon's record as a budget forecaster. On March 24, 1961, he (through Mr. Kennedy) forecast a deficit of $2.1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; the actual deficit was $6.3 billion. For the fiscal year ended June 30 last, he originally forecast a surplus of $463 million; there was actually a deficit of $6.2 billion. If his estimates, made only about a year in advance, fell so wide of the mark, what value can we attach to estimates for 2, 3, and 4 years ahead?

The theory on which Dillon's estimates rest is that only by continuous budget deficits can prosperity be assured. If we don't cut taxes, his logic runs, there will be a re-

cession, and then we will have to have "massive" additional Federal expenditures to stimulate the economy.

The belief that budget deficits are necessary for prosperity and that balanced budgets or surpluses bring recession has been thoroughly discredited, again and again, statistically and theoretically. Comparisons of the 64 quarter years till the end of 1962, for example, compiled by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, show that in 51 quarter years with a rising GNP, more than half (28) were associated with a Federal surplus and only 23 with a deficit, while of 13 quarters with declining GNP, nearly all (12) were associated with a deficit (Newsweek, Apr. 22).

IRRESPONSIBLE

What really counts for employment and prosperity is a proper working relationship of wage rates and prices. When wage rates race ahead of prices and threaten to wipe out profit margins, there is unemployment and recession.

So, far from huge and continuous budget deficits being necessary to prosperity, they are a major threat to any sound prosperity. Nothing could do more than the administration's present planning of continuous huge deficits to aggravate the balance-of-payments crisis and undermine world confidence in the dollar.

A tax cut can permanently help business only if it accompanies a balanced budget. The tax cut bill that passed the House by 271 to 155 is a sham. We have not earned a tax cut. The Kennedy administration has not only opposed any matching cuts in spending, but is constantly proposing new expenditures. As Congressman BRUCE ALGER put it: "The proponents of this measure almost disregard, as though nonexistent, our national debt and deficit financing over the years. We are borrowing money to cut taxes. This is morally and financially wrong."

And, one might add, the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

Keep the (Cotton) Ball Rolling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, few bills before Congress this year have received such unfavorable publicity as H.R. 6196, the Cotton bill. The Wall Street Journal in an editorial, November 11, says of Congress and the bill:

It's merely adding yet another big subsidy strand in the feeble hope of partially offsetting the existing ones.

The way to untangle the ball is "by gradually lowering price supports to the going world price and eventually returning cotton to a free market."

To keep the tangled cotton ball rolling and rolling for the sake of politics is a "goofy" sport, states the Journal.

The editorial is as follows:

OUR OUT-OF-DATE DOLLARS

The Government's cotton program has grown into such a big ball of—well, cotton that the lawmakers seem to have about given up trying to untangle it. They just keep winding more skeins around it.

Under present legislation, the Government guarantees growers a price which is 8.5 cents a pound above the world price. Thus domestic mills have had to pay more than foreigners. The latter, knowing a good thing when they see it, have been buying American cotton at the lower world price, processing it and sending it back to the United States at highly competitive prices.

None of this, naturally, has made domestic mills particularly happy or brought down domestic prices, which might encourage more cotton consumption and help reduce the huge Government-held surpluses. Indeed, favorable weather and farmer ingenuity have increased yields per acre so much that it now appears the number of bales entering the Federal price-support shelter this season will exceed the record of 1955–56.

So for months now, congressional committees have been discussing ways of correcting these egregious failings. All that's emerged is a plan providing a Government subsidy so that domestic mills could buy American cotton at a price near or equal to that paid by foreign mills. Whatever Congress as a whole does about this proposal, it's merely adding yet another big subsidy strand in the feeble hope of partially offsetting the existing ones.

To be sure, a few have ventured to suggest that the way to untangle is to start untangling, by gradually lowering price supports to the going world price and eventually returning cotton to a free market. But they get short shrift.

After all, in politics you have to keep the ball rolling—and rolling. No matter how goofy grows the sport.

Ernie Pyle: Son of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Ernie Pyle was one of Indiana's greatest contributions to the national effort in World War II. As chronicler of the soldiers' lonely battle, he played on the heartstrings of all America and described the ghastly entanglement of world politics and weapons in human terms. He will not be forgotten. Just recently, the South Bend Tribune remembered him in a moving tribute on the occasion of Veterans Day. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SON OF INDIANA

"I saw him get killed," said Irving Schwartz of Brooklyn. "There was no action. Just as he was getting out of a jeep, a Japanese sniper put a bullet through his head."

Mr. Schwartz was one of a group of men who gathered in New York City early this week to observe Veterans Day, 1963, and to recall an event they witnessed on April 18, 1945, on the tiny Pacific island of Ie Shima in the Ryukyus.

What these men witnessed that day, so long ago and so many miles away, was the death of Ernie Pyle, son of Indiana, chronicler of the "little guys" who fought and won World War II.

The veterans of Ie Shima, gathered this week in New York, held a memorial service. Then they retired to a brownstone building that houses the 77th Division Association, and they talked.

They talked about Leyte and Guam and Okinawa. They talked about their dead. ("You would be talking to a guy," one veteran remembered, "and 5 minutes later he would be killed.") They talked about exchanging machineguns or a few cases of beer with Dutch troops on Guam.

They talked about Ie Shima on this Veterans Day, 1963. And they talked about Ernie Pyle. The saw him die.

Soviet Transgressions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from Dale E. Belles, Jr., editor and general manager of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, truly reflects a yardstick of public opinion throughout the Nation on the arrest of Dr. Frederick C. Barghoorn, of Yale University, by the Soviet police. President Kennedy has again demonstrated the success of his policy in demanding immediate revocation of their inexcusable international transgressions:

AN OUTRAGEOUS ACTION

President Kennedy has acted properly and promptly in canceling the negotiations with the Soviet Union, scheduled to start next week, over a new cultural exchange program.

Perhaps that is what the Soviets have wanted. If so, they could have found no better a way for getting the talks dropped than by their arrest of Dr. Frederick C. Barghoorn of Yale University. It had been known the cultural talks were not going to proceed easily; the Soviets were seeking to arrange exchanges without going through the U.S. Government while, of course, keeping full control over their end of the bargain.

The arrest of the Yale professor in itself was certainly lacking in any justification. He is a distinguished political scientist, and it is impossible to conceive that he was serving as a spy for the U.S. Government. If he is held to be guilty of espionage, this Government could hardly approve travel in the Soviet Union by any American scientist or technician. The situation reminds of the era of Joseph Stalin when counting the number of cars in a freight train could lead to an accusation of spying.

Even more astounding than the arrest of Barghoorn was the manner in which it was handled. Officials of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow were not notified for many days that he had been taken into custody. Yet he was not an ordinary tourist; he has been a member of the U.S. committee handling the placement of Soviet students in this country. The Soviets should have recognized more than their normal obligation to notify our Government that one of its nationals had been arrested.

If the cultural exchange talks eventually are renewed, the circumstances of the arrest should react to keep the Soviets from achieving one of their main goals. That is the sending of increased numbers of scientists and technicians here to get a closeup look at Western industrial development.

They have been much more interested in this type of exchange than has the United States. Our Government has been promot-

ing the exchanges with the hope of giving the Russian people a greater understanding of the American way of life, of installing some windows in the Iron Curtain.

It is possible the Barghoorn arrest was in retaliation for the recent espionage case in New York, in which one Soviet citizen without diplomatic immunity has been held. Possibly the Kremlin has thoughts of arranging a spy trade.

It seems more probable, however, that the cultural negotiations were involved. If it had been merely a matter of an arrest in Moscow to retaliate for the arrest in New York, the Kremlin would not have been likely to select a man such as Barghoorn in view of the scheduled exchange talks.

As the State Department noted yesterday, the Soviet group that arrived in the United States Wednesday night is not "an appropriate organization for the conduct of exchanges." Its members quite evidently were selected because of their value as propagandists.

One way or another, early release of Barghoorn should be expected. We cannot believe the Kremlin intends to keep him in a cell. But the reverberations from the case will continue long after he has been returned to the United States and restored to his duties on the Yale campus. More than just Soviet-American cultural relations have been impaired.

The Giant Sleeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously granted, I insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by the president of the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association entitled "The Giant Sleeps" which contains facts, figures, and information on beef imports, which every Member of Congress should read, study, and digest.

The address is as follows:

THE GIANT SLEEPS

Our program today is geared to the theme of "Expanding Western South Dakota's Cattle Industry." As president of the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, I have looked forward to being with you today. This is the third year the association has helped cosponsor this series of four 1-day meetings. I think it is particularly appropriate we share our ideas in facing the challenge that is ours, and the challenge we all face is change.

About the time South Dakota came into the Union, Samuel Foss wrote:

"Bring me men to match my mountains
Bring me men to watch my plains;
Men with empires in their purpose
And new eras in their brains."

And I want to suggest to you that the kind of determination, and imagination this poem is about might be needed more now than when our State was settled.

Why?

Because today we have only to stop and look to see that we have mountainous problems to be solved and rugged opposition to overcome every step of the way.

Let me illustrate just one—the present cattle market and the amount of beef being imported into this country.

Today 1 pound of every 10 of beef going on the American table was produced in a foreign country.

This year the United States is importing 25 percent of the total quantity of meat moving in world trade.

U.S. tariffs are among the lowest in the world and our import restrictions among the most modest.

In the first 6 months of this year compared with the same period in 1962 the increase in imports of meat to the United States was 21 percent on beef and veal, 18 percent on mutton and 95 percent on lamb.

Prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products. However, in the last 5 years the value of livestock exports is considerably below those of imports reaching a deficit in 1962 of approximately $879 million.

U.S. production of beef and veal in terms of consumption, came to about 90 pounds per person last year and is expected to reach 93 pounds this year. With imports of beef and veal at 8.9 percent of domestic production, it means 8 pounds of additional product per person are offered in our domestic market from foreign sources. If we were to suddenly increase in 1 year our domestic production, 8 pounds per capita, we would have serious repercussions in our market.

Economists tell us that at our present rate of population growth and using demand for beef we can build cattle numbers in this country at the rate of about 1 to 1½ million head of aditional slaughter a year. Any thing more than that is going to be price disruptive. If these estimates are correct the long range picture is one of expansion. However, with the present production cycle and the tremendous influence from imports we are running ahead of the demand.

Does this mean I think we should curtail our production here in South Dakota No, I don't. For if we are going to compete with other sections of this country who have more favorable cost of production figures than we do—we have got to compete on the basis of volume and efficiency.

The last low point in this country's cattle production cycle was in 1958, when we had a cattle inventory of 91.2 million head. We now have had increases for 5 years, and we are told cattle numbers in 1963 in the United States may reach 106 million head.

For some time we have lived with the belief that our capacity to produce cattle is a temporary problem or could not exist because of our demand created by consumer spending for beef and our population growth. It seems clear now that with this country's and State's capacity to produce, the problem of imports is not temporary and simply waiting a few more years will not solve the problem.

As you know well, the production costs faced in ranching continue to rise and stay far ahead of production costs in foreign countries.

Actually 60 to 65 percent of all the goods now imported into this country are not produced here, about 30 percent are raw materials needed in manufacturing and 2 percent of our total imports compete directly as does the red meat that we import.

Starting December 2 of this year our national cattlemen's organization and many States are going to bring this case before the Trade Commission and the Trade Information Committee set up under the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1962. Our purpose in my appearing before those groups will be to point out the economic importance of a growing, healthy, and expanding cattle industry in South Dakota and the effects of imports on the State.

Since the passage of the act, at least 11 various commodities have petitioned the Tariff Commission and received hearings—all 11 have received adverse decisions from the Tariff Commission.

The original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act passed in 1934, gave the President the power to negotiate trade agreements with foreign countries. The last change in the tariff on cattle was made in 1947 when they were reduced and the last change of many made in the Reciprocal Trade Act was in 1962.

One of the changes we must face is the attitude in this country on imports. It used to be the industrialists who wanted a high tariff and agriculture who wanted a low one. Today many of our leading businessmen in automobiles, oil, and machinery want cheap foreign raw materials and agriculture—and more particularly livestock agriculture that must have time before it can compete in a freely competitive world market.

In a large part of agriculture today we are faced with a production running ahead of our demand at a reasonable profit. We, as cattlemen, must look at today's situation as it is. The basic use of feed grains is in meat and livestock production and the large surplus we have built up of feed grains must be looked at as a potential livestock surplus at reasonable profit levels.

Let me say I think we have alternatives to the problem. We can protect our cattle industry by flexible tariffs and quotas, and negotiate sound trading competition. And we can look at a whole range of things like efficiency, modernization, cost of production, and our tax policies.

I am an optimist about our import problem because many people are beginning to be aware of the problem—organizations, publications, political leaders in the Senate and the House of Representatives, and Economists are taking a hard look at the problem—as a matter of fact our own State college expects to release a report about January 1, of next year pointing up this problem and its effect on livestock agriculture in South Dakota.

Obviously if most of us are in this business of raising cattle and realizing close to 5 percent return on our investment and about 10 percent of what is being sold into consumption today is produced in a foreign country we have rugged competition.

South Dakota cattlemen are faced with the income problem of being able to expand and produce more than the market will absorb at cost of production prices. This problem must be resolved at the national level, largely I believe, by taking a realistic look at the price-depressing effect imports have on the cattle industry.

And of course the tariff has been an important problem of public policy in the United States for years. And the question of trade of course is tied in with this country's foreign policy.

Which means that while today the staff and people you are hearing from are offering the latest in scientific knowledge in working with our day-to-day management problems, the matter I have drawn to your attention is one of national policy—and one that concerns our ranch operations just as directly.

And of course there are many questions of public agricultural policy that affect us directly. Some you are familiar with are the Brucellosis program, the proposed dual grading program, public lands use, the proposed feeder grades of cattle, taxes, the feed grain program, the subsidized grazing of soil bank land, and incomplete information used to help push programs.

Can we really afford to overlook the fact that government has come to be—in one form or another—one of the most important factors in our business today?

The trend toward "letting the Government do it" has been encouraged by a large part of the public that does not believe in self-reliance and individual initiative—but rather believes in something for nothing.

I think we all should bear in mind that whenever we drift to a place where the Government controls our economic life—we will have changed and put to an end our American competitive free enterprise.

Cattlemen of this country have a proud record of achievement in terms of helping set public policy, but what worked yesterday may not work so well today.

Today its not quite enough to testify before committees in Pierre and Washington, and to write letters, and to make calls by a limited few of our industry leaders.

Let me suggest that if the cattlemen of South Dakota and the country for that matter—are going to have to become thoroughly familiar with the massive machinery of our government on the county, State, and national level and become involved in every possible way to be effective.

Isn't it logical that as big and powerful and important as our Government that livestock men should concern themselves with what Government policies should be?

George Washington put it this way: "You will get death and taxes under one government as well as another. What I fight for now is a dream—something that has never been on this earth since men first worked it with their hands—something that has never existed, and will never exist until we can make it and feel it here—the right of freeborn men to govern themselves, and to make decisions, and to organize their lives in their own way."

So to conclude, let me say to you—you are the men our day and time calls on to match the mountainous problems we have.

The Outlook for Timber Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, timber resources are of vital importance to the growing economy such as we have in this Nation. One of the Nation's finest experts in the field of timber development is the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Mr. Edward P. Cliff.

A short time ago Mr. Cliff spoke to the Fifth American Forest Congress of the American Forestry Association here in the Nation's Capital on the basic question of the outlook for our timber resources. This statement is an excellent summary of the situation and at this time I would like to include Mr. Cliff's remarks in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

THE OUTLOOK FOR TIMBER RESOURCES

(By Edward P. Cliff)

It is a privilege and a pleasure to speak at this Fifth American Forestry Congress. The "Platform for American Conservation," which we are considering here constitutes an impressive summary of the many constructive actions this Nation has initiated to conserve our natural resources. It is also an effective charter and a challenge for expanded efforts to insure an abundance of resources for a future America.

My remarks today deal primarily with the production and use of timber crops. The platform considered here has, however, appropriately and specifically recognized that timber production is only one—although an extremely important one—of the multiple uses of our forest heritage.

The kind and amount of action needed with regard to timber depends basically on the status of our present resources, and the outlook for future timber supplies and demands. Over the years the Forest Service with the assistance of cooperators has made appraisals and issued public reports on the timber situation at fairly regular intervals. Timber Resources for America's Future—commonly referred to as the Timber Resources Review—was based on data gathered primarily in 1952. For the past year and a half we have once more been reviewing the timber situation with the objective of developing 1962 figures and a new look at the future. The basic work has been completed, as has much of the compilation and analyzing of results. It will still be several months before we have completely finished the job and are in a position to make a final and detailed report. However, on the basis of preliminary figures that are still subject to rechecking, I would like to review some of the highlights of the timber situation as we now see it.

This latest review of our Nation's timber situation is the first to be based on essentially complete coverage of all States by the forest survey. For some parts of the country we also now have one or more resurveys. Many agencies represented here, including State forestry departments, forest industries, and others, have participated directly or have made substantial contributions to this work. We have also been working with the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture and with members of both the wood-producing and wood-consuming industries in the appraisal of timber markets.

A full summary of trends in our changing and complex forest situation is of course impossible. But here are a few general findings from this new study:

1. Commercial forest land has increased during the past decade by some 8 million acres to a total of more than 500 million acres. This is a net gain—total additions from cropland abandonment and conversion have been substantially larger but these have been partly offset by continuing land clearing for homes, agriculture, roads, reservoirs, and other uses. The land gained will ultimately add to our timber supply. The losses of forest land have generally included both land and timber.

In addition, an increasing part of the land classed as commercial forest is being used primarily for recreation or other purposes, and in many cases the timber on it is not available to industry. There have been some increases in industrial acreage in the past decade and some decreases in public forest land.

2. The Nation's total inventory of growing stock in cubic feet has increased since 1952 while sawtimber volumes have dropped slightly. The cubic-foot volume of eastern softwoods is up nearly one-fifth. Total hardwood inventories are up about one-sixth. The total cubic-foot volume of western softwoods is down slightly. In terms of softwood sawtimber, additions in the East and reductions in the West nearly balanced, with a net reduction of about 3 percent. Hardwood sawtimber inventories increased about 10 percent.

3. Growth of both softwoods and hardwoods is now significantly higher than in 1952. Growth of softwoods is up about one-sixth in both cubic feet and board feet. Total growth of hardwoods has increased nearly a tenth and growth of hardwood sawtimber is up approximately 5 percent.

These improvements in growth are partly a result of increasingly effective forestry programs—notably fire protection which has resulted in extensive natural restocking and a wave of young trees now reaching the minimum size to be counted in the timber inventory. Some of the increase in growth reflects reductions in the amount of timber cut in some regions, and in the West, a gradual replacement of old growth by younger trees.

4. The total growth of both eastern softwoods and hardwoods is now substantially in excess of the cut, both for total growing stock and for sawtimber. While this is true for all eastern regions combined, there are wide differences in conditions in different localities. In the West, timber growth still falls short of the cut, as is to be expected in this area of old-growth timber concentration. The harvest of timber for industrial wood products has been rising in the past decade or two, but the total cut of timber has declined as a result of sweeping reductions in the use of fuelwood and miscellaneous products.

5. In contrast to these recent trends leading to a buildup in total timber inventories, we are facing increasing problems of cost and merchantability. The cut of timber substantially exceeds growth in the larger tree diameters where quality is concentrated, both for softwoods and hardwoods. Most of the cutting is limited to preferred species.

As a result of these trends, less than 10 percent of the total hardwood inventory, for example, is now in trees above 15 inches in diameter in those species having established markets. (This includes select red and white oaks, yellow birch, hard maple, cottonwood, sweet gum, yellow-poplar, ash, black cherry, and walnut.) Moreover, only a portion of this 10 percent is top-grade material. Today we import nearly half of the wood used in hardwood plywood and veneer—a forceable reminder to look to the quality of our timber growth and inventory rather than to volume alone.

In addition some of the better remaining timber, of both hardwood and softwood species, is so widely scattered as to be economically unavailable. Some timber is in holdings where owners hold the land for recreation or other nontimber purposes. Part of the allowable cut on public lands in the West is inoperable at today's cost and price levels.

This matter of timber size, quality and operability is of major importance from a cost and market standpoint. We have been accumulating a large volume of low-grade small hardwood timber, for example, but this is of little or no significance to a sawmill operator dependent on Douglas-fir logs, or to a contractor in New York who uses construction grades of softwoods. In short, not all of our timber inventory can be classed as merchantable material either now or in the decades immediately ahead.

6. Much of our forest land is producing at only partial capacity. For example, the recent survey of Georgia showed that only 30 percent of the forest area is occupied by "desirable trees," that is, the kind of trees forest managers aim to grow. Somewhat more than a third of the land supports other trees that are classified as growing stock—although much of this is of limited merchantability because of species or defects. The remaining third of the areas is currently nonproductive—i.e., occupied by cull trees, shrubs, or other nontimber cover.

7. Projections of prospective timber growth increase rather substantially to the year 2000. Total growth for all species combined rises from about 17 billion cubic feet in 1962 to roughly 21 billion cubic feet by the year 2000. The projection for softwoods rises from 9.6 to roughly 13.0 billion cubic feet. Projections of hardwood growth rise from about 7 to more than 8 billion cubic feet.

In terms of sawtimber, growth is projected to rise from about 57 billion board feet in 1962 to roughly 80 billion board feet by the year 2000. Softwood growth increases from about 38 to 53 billion board feet. Hardwood growth rises from about 19 to 26 billion board feet.

These projections are based on the assumption of an increasing timber harvest that rises from the actual cut of about 10.3 billion cubic feet in 1962 to a balance with the projected growth of about 21 billion cubic feet in the year 2000. This cutting assumption, defined as the "available" cut, represents the harvest of logs and other

products that could be achieved in the future if most of the timber growth on private lands plus the allowable cut on public lands were cut. It is also assumed that forest management practices will improve in line with recent trends. Since timber growth is highly responsive to cutting and to management, it is apparent that other assumptions regarding the trend in cut or the intensity of management might result in quite different projections of future growth.

Also, I want to emphasize that these initial figures on prospective growth and available cut are in terms of all sizes and qualities of all species, and without regard to location or marketability. No allowance is made in these estimates, moreover, for possible losses of forest land and timber inventories to other uses, although by the year 2000 such losses in our expanding economy could be substantial.

8. Projections of prospective demands for timber products also show substantial increases during the next few decades. Consumption of pulp, paper, and board, for example, may roughly triple by the year 2000. Use of plywood and veneer may more than double. Per capita use of lumber is assumed to drop further, but with a large assumed increase in population total use is projected to increase by as much as 60 to 70 percent by the year 2000.

This long-range outlook for expanded use of timber products might seem optimistic. But these projections assume a slower rate of growth in demand for wood products than for competing materials. Of particular importance, we are looking forward to a vastly bigger national economy than we have today.

The recent comprehensive report by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, for example, and various other studies all indicate that we may have as many as 350 million people by the year 2000. This is nearly double today's population. Our gross national product is considered likely to quadruple, per capita income double, and materials use increase nearly threefold by 2000. These basic economic projections are in line with trends of the past four or five decades. I do not believe we would be planning responsibly unless we took into account the possible effects of such future national growth on our resource base.

9. Prospective timber supplies appear sufficient to meet these projected demands for most timber products without too much difficulty over the next couple of decades, although increasing supply problems can be expected for veneer logs and high-grade saw logs.

By the year 2000, with present trends in management, projections of available supply are roughly equal to these preliminary projections of demand—in terms of total cubic feet. The most critical projections, however, are for softwood sawtimber, which now supplies nearly two-thirds of our total timber harvest. These show a prospective supply that is substantially less than the projected demand.

If timber were homogeneous and 1 cubic foot of wood was as good as another, we would thus foresee few problems, at least before the year 2000. But there are serious long run imbalances of supply and demand in prospect. A surplus of poor hardwood timber can hardly supply products that can be sold to the construction industry, for example, in competition with other materials. Small trees and undesirable species cannot yield high-quality veneer and plywood or quality lumber at competitive costs. Nor can scattered and inoperable timber be used effectively.

There are two ways of meeting this situation. One is to depend upon new technology to find means of using whatever materials is at hand. Another is to grow better raw material for the timber industries. I believe we need to do both.

Research efforts to improve forest management practices, reduce production costs, develop new or better products, and achieve more effective marketing can be of major importance in aiding the forest industries to make further adjustments to the available raw material. Efficient processing and effective merchandising also will be necessary to achieve market potentials.

We could also augment available supplies of lumber by closer utilization of plant and logging residues. Imports of pulp, paper, softwood lumber, and tropical hardwoods can and probably will be increased. But it seems evident to me that we must also do a better job of growing usable supplies of timber. The primary place for action to produce salable material lies in better harvest cutting practices, stand improvement, planting, and protection in the forests of this Nation.

It is apparent from our preliminary figures that forestry in America to date has in many respects been a dramatic success story. We have made sweeping progress in protection and in related forestry efforts. In other respects, we still have a long way to go to make sure that our forests provide salable wood materials that can be efficiently processed and used in competition with other materials. We have serious problems of quality. There is still some 35 million acres in the nonstocked category occupied by vegetation other than usable timber. There is an additional 75 million acres of poorly stocked forest land.

Timber stand improvement, including thinnings, offers many promising opportunities for increasing usable growth. This is especially true on the half of our total forest land that is now controlled by hardwood cover. Much of this land can be recovered for production of preferred softwoods by eliminating of cull or other undesirable trees. In other areas growth can be concentated on superior hardwoods of select species. The total stand impovement effort in recent years has covered about a million acres annually—a substantial effort but a small part of the total job.

Our planting programs to date have been impressive and plantations now represent a highly productive part of our forest inventory. In many localities they will increasingly become the critical factor in the support of timber industries. But successful plantations today occupy only 3 percent of our commercial forest land.

I believe we need to strengthen our efforts in timber stand improvement work and in planting, as well as improve harvesting and protection. And in these programs I would stress the importance of concentrating efforts where they will produce the most results. The best of our forest sites yield perhaps 10 times the amount that can be grown on the poorest sites. Some lands are better located for intensive use than others.

We can produce better forests. We can reduce mortality from destructive agents. We can increase efficiency in the production and marketing of wood products. By such means we can help attain a greater role for timber in our economy and from these improved forests assure for our country an inceased flow of benefits from all of their multiple uses.

The platform of the American Forestry Association contains a number of measures aimed at increasing the production and use of our timber resources. In my judgment aggressive action should be taken to achieve the timber production measures set forth in this platform. In this way we can help assure a stronger America in the century that lies ahead.

Expansion Above All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the leading editorial in the Wall Street Journal of November 15, 1963, is entitled "Expansion Above All." It discusses the subject of sound expansion based on sound economic policies, and it comments on an address made recently by Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, who was Chairman of the Economic Advisers to former President Eisenhower.

The information and views expressed in the editorial are timely and significant, and I think their publication for the record would be useful at this time for both Members of Congress, and the general public.

For this reason I ask unanimous consent to have them published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPANSION ABOVE ALL

A good many people are so enamored of "economic expansion" that they tend to overlook costs and consequences. They want a big new charge-account expansion, even though the charges are stiff enough as it is.

Thus expansion is a major argument for the $11 billion tax-reduction bill. Not only Government officials but businessmen and others say we must have these cuts either to avert an actual recession next year or to keep the expansion from tapering off. Faster, faster is the cry, as though there were far too little life in the old economic mare.

Yet right now, without tax cuts, expansionist pressures are strong indeed. Prof. Raymond J. Saulnier, former President Eisenhower's chief economic adviser, mentioned some of them in a recent speech, and they made a formidable, even rather a frightening, list.

Among the existing pressures: Rising Federal spending. Continuing, heavy budget deficits. Significantly expanding money supply. Rising consumer and home-mortgage debt. Rising consumer-price index. Increasing utilization of "excess" capacity, in part reflected in rising prices of industrial materials.

Even the present unemployment estimates, widely considered the very hallmark of a slack economy, show such pressures under careful analysis. As Mr. Saulnier observes, the unemployment rate among married men—that is, "the bulk of our experienced and continuing labor force"—has been trending downward for a couple of years.

Tax cuts, of course, are expected to heap yet another sizable expansionist pressure atop this already impressive pile. Dr. Saulnier happens to believe the expectation of reduction is now so general that it would be unwise to halt the drive toward lower levies. But he sees clearly the dangers of reducing taxes without exercising restraint on other components of Federal economic policy.

Specifically, if the Government is indeed committed to tax reduction, then the logic

of the economic process simultaneously commits it to a genuine check on Federal spending. It also commits Washington to debt-management and monetary policies under which "a distinctly closer rein will be held on increases in credit and in the money supply."

Otherwise, speculative excesses will all too likely develop in the stock and other markets, inevitably requiring a deflationary correction. There would be the risk of serious cost and price inflation. Along with all its other evils, this would worsen the Nation's position in world comeptitive markets and hence aggravate its chronic international-payments deficits.

And because such cost and price increases would be reviewed as unacceptable, the Federal Government would be encouraged to involve itself still deeper in the economy. Excessively expansionist policies, Dr. Saulnier warns, "do more than invite inflation; they invite direct controls."

Unfortunately there is as yet no inkling that the present economic policymakers would impose the other restraints required by tax cuts. On the contrary, in their overemphasis on a "slack" which has been disappearing, they seem to think the economy is somehow invulnerable to inflation, even though the United States has suffered severe bouts of it and new inflationary forces are plainly in the making.

In such complacency lies the real trouble, rather than in merely lowering tax rates which everyone agrees are too high. Sound expansion is feasible with sound economic policies, and charge accounts can be wonderful devices up to a point. That point is passed when commonsense departs and instead we get a full-speed-ahead fascination with expansion regardless of cost, quality, or results. Or, as Mr. Saulnier puts it:

"If you see an aggressively expansionist policy of this kind developing I suggest that you hold your hats."

Spies, Swaps, and Chumps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial entitled, "Spies, Swaps, and Chumps," appearing in the Peoria Journal Star of Friday, November 15, 1963, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPIES, SWAPS, AND CHUMPS

When we traded a senior Russian spy for U-2 Pilot Powers, it was a bad deal, but it was, at least, a legitimate deal.

When we secretly traded Russian spies to get back two completely innocent American fliers, shot down over international waters, we made a mistake.

When we traded Russian spies for a student tourist we really made a mistake.

The problem of an occasional American seized by the Soviets is far from new, and our Government has wrestled and argued with them ever since World War II in order to obtain the release of a long series of such people.

The day we started trading spies for tourists we invited a hopeless situation with which we are now faced.

Whenever we now catch a Russian spy in this country, they just grab the handiest tourist and toss him in the clink and set up another trade.

We asked for it, and now we've got it, and Professor Barghoorn is the latest victim of a soft U.S. policy that invited this very kind of seizure and swap.

Hard on the heels of catching a group of Soviet diplomats and U.N. personnel and a member of a trade mission engaging in an espionage coup directed against one of our most vital military secrets, specifically, what do we do?

1. Send some of them back because of diplomatic immunity.

2. Face the seizure of one man, a Yale professor, a 30-day tourist, as a probable trade for the hard-case spy with secrets of our military communications network in his briefcase.

3. Open up wider areas of the United States to travel by Soviet personnel, removing former restrictions.

4. And negotiate about more Soviet consulate and trade missions around our country.

Under these conditions, they have everything to gain by intensive espionage activities, and nothing to lose—not even the spies.

Will President Smith Be a Presidential Candidate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, all of us anxiously are awaiting Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH's announcement on December 5 as to whether or not she will be a candidate for the presidential nomination on the Republican ticket.

It is my considered opinion that Senator SMITH unequivocably has the highest qualifications for this high office. And Senator SMITH would certainly reflect high honor on both her State of Maine and her Republican Party were she to make this historical effort.

All of this is indeed an exciting and fascinating prospect, being widely discussed in our various news media throughout the land. I insert into the RECORD two articles appearing in the November 14 issue of the Somerset Reporter, the Senator's hometown paper. They present some interesting comment on Senator SMITH's prospects as a presidential candidate.

WILL SENATOR SMITH BE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE?—CANDIDACY WOULD HAVE TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON NATIONAL POLITICAL SCENE

It took our breath away—the speculation last Friday that Skowhegan's own lady Senator, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, may declare herself to be a candidate for the top political office in the world: the Presidency of the United States of America.

No one remembers exactly when her political supporters in Skowhegan began speculating on her chances to win the nomination for the vice presidency, but it dates back at least to June 1955, when President Dwight D. Eisenhower made his historical visit to Maine at the invitation of Senator SMITH, and delivered his major address in Skowhegan.

There was considerable talk at that time that our lady Senator would make an excellent running mate for a GOP chief executive.

When Rockefeller bowed out of the presidential race in December 1959, leaving Nixon a clear field to capture the GOP nomination, the Somerset Reporter immediately proposed for serious consideration that a Richard Nixon-Margaret Chase Smith slate would be unbeatable.

The arguments we presented then still hold true today:

The lady Senator from Skowhegan is one of the few persons who would not cause a split in the GOP support—the type of split that has resulted in sudden death for Republican campaigners in past elections.

2. Senator SMITH is not only esteemed in this country, she is admired the world over. She is the first member of her sex who was able to penetrate the ranks of that most powerful and austere body—the U.S. Senate. Many political observers believe that, of all the women who are influential in the United States today, MARGARET CHASE SMITH is the most qualified to accede to the highest office in this Nation.

3. Think of the impact her name would have on the ballot. Women voters in every part of the country would rally to her support, regardless of their party affiliation, eager to help to prove to a man-dominated world that women have a God-given right to work side by side with men in controlling the destiny of our great democracy at every level of government.

4. And the Republicans can have the honor of nominating the first lady President—a sure sign to the countless on-the-fence voters that the Republican Party is more liberal in its concept.

Whether Senator SMITH announces on December 5 that she will seek the Presidency or the Vice Presidency, the Republicans would do well to seriously evaluate the tremendous impact that her candidacy would have on the national political scene.

SENATOR SMITH CAN WIN

Governor Rockefeller and some college experts on the subject of political science lately have been quoted as saying that Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Skowhegan, could not win the Republican nomination for President because she is a woman.

Personally I believe the Republicans are letting their best opportunity slip by, and will actually lose out if they continue to encourage talk that Senator SMITH can't win because she is a woman.

Indeed, Senator SMITH is a woman and a very unique one. She's a woman operating and maneuvering in a man's world. She has been there a long time and has learned well the ways of men, and many of her colleagues have stated many times that surely she belongs among them. This is what makes her unique and this makes her more than just a woman. She's a person that knows well the ways of both.

Since I am neither a political science expert nor a politician, this viewpoint may draw some chuckles, but anyone willing to analyze this situation without prejudice or influence may find this man-on-the-street observation accurate.

If the Republicans were willing to accept facts as they exist instead of trying to create the trend that they would like, they would have to conclude that Senator SMITH is the only Republican in the Nation that can make the election a good contest.

SAM BOUCHARD.

SKOWHEGAN.

Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the House of Representatives today marks the 45th anniversary of the de-

claration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia.

Certainly the cause of the oppressed peoples of the world merits the full attention of the entire free world, and I wish to commend and join my colleagues who are taking special note of today's anniversary and who are looking forward to the day when Latvia will be able to rejoin the community of free nations as an independent and free country.

The Point of It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, November 10, 1963, Dr. Paul Ludwig, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., preached a sermon on "The Point of It All," in which there was a very good diagnosis of some of our present situations and a possible solution to them.

His sermon follows:

THE POINT OF IT ALL

Many in this congregation have been deeply stirred on more than one occasion by the brilliant and fearless utterances of former Ambassador Charles Malik. It is reassuring to know that, even since his return to Lebanon more than a year ago, he continues to make an impact on American life. In a major address in New York City just a short while ago, he spun what is for him a typically airtight statement: "Nobody asks the fundamental question: What is the whole blooming thing for?" Knowing Charles Malik, we can be sure that he made this devastating comment within the framework of the Christian faith to which he is committed.

Wherever serious-minded men gather together, they are today being driven back to the fundamental inquiry: "But what is the point of it all? What are we trying to get done, anyway?" I would like you to explore with me several areas of illustration:

Hard on the heels of dramatic successes, space scientists are now haunted by the questions: "Is the moon really our objective—and if so why? Are we basically engaged in a program of defense? Is this a race for bargaining power; for technical inquiry and the collection of data? Or, must we now ask, 'Where in the total scheme of human advancement and divine destiny does this project belong—if it belongs at all?' "

Would you examine the politically explosive subject of foreign aid? Old assumptions are being questioned; new perspectives are being charted. All because men dare to question: "But what are we about? Are we buying something, giving something, or engaging in a gigantic, well-intentioned but dangerous gamble? Now perchance we begin to see that this is not solely, not even basically, a political and economic problem; that it belongs to a philosophical inquiry about human dignity, and to a theological inquiry about 'Whose we are' and 'Why we are here.' "

Or would the subject be education? There are more questions than answers these days—and the questions reach down deeper than ever before. In order to find out how, more and more educators are compelled first to ask why. "What is this knowledge going to do to a man; what is it going to make out of him? What is he to begin with that we should even bother?" It may well prove out that separating religion from public education is an impossible venture. For, in every area of human endeavor, we are being driven to confess the essential spirituality of all life. And when we trace this to its zenith we are in the realm of theology—we are in the presence of God.

Even theological education needs to be examined. I have just returned from a conference relating to the seminaries of our United Presbyterian Church. Over and over again in a variety of forms we were asking ourselves the question: "What is the end product we are seeking to create?" A high executive of our church offered a profile of the minister for today's world:

Among other things, he suggested that we must be producing a pious man. This has no reference to any kind of insipid religiosity. It only says that if we do not turn out men of God, we might just as well close shop. It only says that the greatest need in Christendom today is not churches that are well administered, beautifully organized and proudly prestigious. Our need is for churches where people can practice and feel the presence of God; and where clergy and laity alike have discovered their destiny in prayerful seeking of God's will. Theological students seem often to give the impression that they exist to bring in the Kingdom of God in their own clever 20th century style. Judging from the condition of the church many laymen are making the same fatal mistake. This is God's work we are about, not our own. The church does not exist to be the plaything of our personal, political ambitions.

On this subject, we ought to point to a tragic fact which seems to prove the floundering ineffectiveness of much that we sometimes dubiously call "the church of Jesus Christ." We Presbyterians cannot be very proud to know that out of 9,200 congregations in our denomination 7,715 have not a single candidate for the Christian ministry.

This should not be oversimplified. There are many reasons why the brightest and best among our youth sidestep a church vocation. But it is a fairly obvious conclusion that if the climate of the church were more deeply pervaded with an atmosphere of personal commitment to God, youth's sense of values would be vastly different.

If you have read Pope Paul's recent appeal to young men to respond to the call of the priesthood, you will remember this sentence: "What a candidate for ordination needs is to be young, to have a clear eye and a stout heart, to accept as a way of life the imitation of Christ, His heroism, His sanctity, His mission of goodness and of salvation."

There's the key—"to accept as a way of life the imitation of Christ." As we sit here this morning, can we in perfect candor say that this is the way of life to which we are daily and consistently committed; can we both declare and demonstrate that this is our practical conviction about the nature of the Christian fellowship: "the imitation of Christ, His heroism, His sanctity, His mission of goodness and of salvation."

The New York Times this week featured an editorial biography of John Huston Finley, remarkable educator and journalist. Among his many public services, he was Red Cross commissioner for Palestine after World War I. It is said that when he was beginning that assignment, "as his train approached Jerusalem, he got off to walk into the Holy City. This was how pilgrims had entered it from time immemorial, and he was a devout man."

It is not granted to many of us to imitate Christ in quite that way—but neither is it denied us to walk in His footsteps. And when the road is steep and the rough stones bruise our feet, and we are tempted to turn aside on more pleasant trails, let us not forget how Christ Himself stumbled up the Hill of the Cross.

Make no mistake about it, I am not glorifying suffering and difficulty and agony. One does not always have to be on a cross to know the mind of Christ—but if he shuns the cross or Christ's sake, he has denied Him.

It is all too easy to be an isolated sufferer—to withdraw into a useless and pointless chamber of dreary self-pity. When this happens, the spirit of a man dries up and only a miracle of love brings a ressurection.

I keep going back to the story of Elisabeth Barrett, confined to her room in her father's house, her fragile body hanging like an ambiguous weight on her soul. Each hour resembled the one before it, and day closed into night with such dull monotony that she thought of dates only for the custom that required her to put them on the letters which she wrote. Two years before, the watch had snapped its spring; she left it broken and silent in the drawer.

But now unexpectedly in the dead of that monotony came a letter which seemed to infuse her with life right through her fingertips. Time suddenly mattered again. It was Robert Browning, writing of his love for her poetry and ending his letter with the words: "And I love you, too."

This was the divine prescription for her sickness—the brightness that transfused her room where so little ever happened. She took flight from her cage of despair, swept aloft by the realization that someone cared.

Another letter arrived one day in the city of Philippi. It had been written from a Roman prison, but the man who penned it had a vivid mental image of the place to which it was going. How well he knew Philippi where he had once been beaten and thrown into jail. Yet he denied ever really being a prisoner then or now as he sat in Rome. What he wrote in that letter was a classic of what a great man stakes his life to.

"I want you to know my brothers, that what has happened to me has in effect turned out to the advantage of the Gospel. For first of all, my imprisonment means a personal witness for Christ before the palace guards, not to mention others who come and go. Then it means that most of our brothers, somehow taking heart in the Lord from the very fact that I am a prisoner for Christ's sake, have shown far more courage in boldly proclaiming the word of God.

"It all accords with my own earnest wishes and hopes which are that I should never be in any way ashamed, but that now, as always, I should honor Christ with the utmost boldness by the way I live. For living to me means simply Christ."

What a difference in Paul's life once he discovered what the point of it all was. His only gain was to be used up for Christ's sake. If something less than this has been our measure of the Christian way, there's no use beating our breasts over the condition of the church: God never fails. It is we who fail Him.

There is a simple little story which I heard a dozen years or more ago at a meeting of the General Assembly. It described a group of churchmen enroute to a convention, standing on a railroad platform. Pointing to a locomotive, one of the company said, "If that represented our church, what part would you like to be?"

One answered quickly: "I would like to be the whistle to call attention to the fact that our church is on the move."

But another replied: "I would like to be the great driving wheels which carry the load."

Then still another answered: "Why I would want to be the searchlight to point the way."

Finally, the last of the group spoke up and said: "You have forgotten the fuel. I would like to be consumed that the church may have the power to go forward."

Research conducted by a great American denomination on the role of laymen in the life of the modern church was reported yesterday in the daily press as having reached a conclusion. The conclusion is so indisputably true that no one will want to accept it. It is always the truth that embarrasses us. The conclusion is that we live and work in the church as if there were no such thing as the Holy Spirit. And the report warned that our hustle and bustle could be headed in directions that are not necessarily an expression of the Kingdom of God.

One of America's most distinguished pastors tells of meeting his friend Rollin Walker—then in his 90th year. And the grand old man broke the conversation wide open right at the start:

"George," he said, "I have just resigned as general manager of the universe."

"Well, and what happened?"

"The resignation was promptly accepted."

"And, then what?"

"Why things have been running much better ever since."

Can anyone possibly disagree that, before it is too late, we had better give the church—and ourselves—back to God? That's the point of it all.

For a Free Latvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago today, on November 18, 1918, the leaders and people of Latvia declared independence for their nation, as our own forefathers did for this Republic, 150 years earlier. And, like our forefathers, Latvians paid a huge price in lives for freedom while expelling two invaders, in 1918 and 1919. That republic which rose from the ashes of World War I surely had every hope and chance of success. Latvia had educated, devoted leaders, a sense of national purpose, a victorious army, fertile lands and forests, and hardy farmers. The Latvians proved their devotion to democracy by establishing an advanced form of representative government, with a parliament, cabinet, president and freely organized parties. All the basic freedoms enunciated in our own Bill of Rights, were guaranteed to Latvians.

But there was a corrupt Communist element in the Latvian midst, just as in so many other nations. Throughout the years of Latvian independence the Communist Party had represented only a small minority of Latvian voters. That would no doubt have continued to be the case, if Latvia had been located anywhere but adjacent to the Soviet Union, because it was only after impossible demands and then invasion by the Soviet army that Latvia lost her independence. Only then did that tiny minority of Latvian Communists triumph over democracy, and destroy the bountiful fruits of 22 years of dedicated, democratic labor.

Latvians can be sure that for a few years the example of Latvia proved to the world again how well democracy works, just as the present example of Latvia proves every day that no free nation succumbs to communism except in the face of overwhelming force.

As we remember Latvia today let us remember the happy, democratic Latvia of former years, not the sad Latvia of communism. Also, let us wish success to members of the American Latvian Association in this country and freedom-loving Latvians everywhere, in their struggle to bring Latvia back to democracy.

A Letter to Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the November 11 edition of the Sac Sun, Sac City, Iowa:

A LETTER TO UNCLE SAM

Several years ago I wrote you a letter. It was relative to what was going on in Washington, D.C., and in other parts of this great United States of America. Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN noted it, read it on the floor of the Congress, and it was made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am not sure that this letter will make the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I do want to ask you a few questions and to talk to you about some things that are of interest to me, and to many other people who live here in the Midwest.

First of all, I wonder why you are sending so much money to so many foreign countries. This is our money, but we have no voice in the matter; you send it wherever you wish, and we can do nothing about it. When I was a boy in school, I was taught that the Government is the servant of the people, but now it seems that the people must be the servants of the Government. I am particularly interested in the matter of foreign aid to countries that are opposed to our way of life. I can't see why we should be helping them.

As you well remember, representatives of the Soviet Union have told us that they will eventually bury us. They want to spread communism to all parts of the world and they hope to eventually make the United States of America a communistic nation. The democratic way of life, free enterprise, the freedom of various things which are guaranteed by our Constitution, are the things which have made this country great. Without them, we never would have become the power that we have been during the past century. I can't understand why we should help them to improve the economy of their country, when we know they are simply marking time; waiting until they become strong enough to bury us entirely.

The matter of tax reduction has been promised by none other than you, yourself. You have said that a tax reduction would stimulate business interests in the United States and would make a better economy. Most of us out here in the Middle West would appreciate a reduction in taxes, but we can't understand how you can reduce taxes, thereby reducing the income of the U.S. Treasury, unless foreign aid and spending is reduced. We're in debt about as far as most of us think we should be, and we'd like to see the budget balanced a little.

It has been quite a difficult task for some of us to pay our income taxes, our social security taxes, our dog taxes, our property taxes, our automobile taxes, our sales taxes, our hunting and fishing taxes, and the numerous other taxes that are required, and when we hear about people who are high up in government circles who avoid paying their fair share, many of whom do not even file a tax report, it makes us a little uneasy. Years ago when I was a young man, I had great respect for our elected officials. They were honorable men and I thought they were about the most important individuals who lived in this country. I am sorry to say that I have lost respect for many of them. I think everyone should be treated alike in this regard and, when elected officials fail to pay their fair share, I think they should either be removed from office or fined and imprisoned, or both. What has become of the great statesmen who used to occupy the seats of the U. S. Congress? Where are our Congressmen and Senators who may be classified as outstanding statesmen? I fear that they are few and far between. I am glad to say that most of them, I believe, are honest, but from what I read in the papers there must be many who do not follow the Golden Rule and who take advantage of their office to make a million. Just the other day I read of a man who was broke back in the middle fifties and who now is a millionaire. He was employed in Washington, D.C.

It seems that many are making a racket of their political positions to make millions for themselves, and I regret to make this accusation.

And further, isn't there something that could be done to keep our high-ranking officials clean and decent, so that they can merit the respect of their constituents. There was a great scandal in England a few months ago, all over a beautiful, red-haired girl and her relations with high-ranking officials of the English Government, and now we read of similar things happening in Washington, D.C.

It seems to me, Dear Uncle Sam, that it's about time you took some of these bad boys out to the woodshed and gave them a good tanning. It's your duty, you know, and you have the right. Many of us think it is your duty.

I know you have lots of relatives and friends, and it is a big job to keep them all under control. But you have lots of good workers who are willing to help you, when there is need. I'm glad to see such men as H. R. GROSS take a stand and fight for what he thinks is right. I know there are others there who are willing and capable; men of integrity and honor, like U.S. Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN, U.S. Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, and U.S. Senator JACK MILLER. You can depend on them. They may not belong to the same lodge of which you are a member, they may have attended different schools and universities, but I know them personally and I am sure that their judgment is good, they act according to the dictates of their conscience, and if you will listen to them now and then, you'll find it easier to make the right decisions in these matters of concern.

You are a wonderful old man, Uncle Sam. Like thousands upon thousands of other men, I have fought for you and for the principles for which you have long stood, and I want to be sure that these principles are maintained. I want this United States of America to remain "The land of the free, and the home of the brave" and I want my grandchildren to be assured of the opportunity of living in a nation in which their liberties are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America. That's why I am writing this letter to you. Please remember that I am only your nephew. I do not know as much as you know, Dear Uncle, but I do know that when you take more money out of the hopper than you put into it, it won't be long until that hopper will be empty and then we'll have a hard time indeed. That's what

the Soviets want; let's not become a tool in their hand.

Sincerely your nephew,

CHARLES A. HACKE,
Editor, the Sac Sun.

Equal Administration of Justice Under the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if we are to really have justice in our courts, the financial ability of the litigants must not be important.

Several improvements in our procedures and court system are needed to make this more of a reality and I am glad to see Attorney General Kennedy and others cooperating to that end.

A recent editorial in the Des Moines Tribune discusses this matter and calls attention to the commendable efforts now underway. So that all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have an opportunity to see it, I am having it set forth in the RECORD. It is as follows:

CIVILIZED JUSTICE

Attorney General Robert Kennedy met with Supreme Court Justice William Brennan and a number of court and law enforcement officers last weekend to plan a National Conference on Bail and Criminal Justice. The Department of Justice and the Vera Foundation, a private New York foundation that has done pioneering work on bail reform, are sponsoring the conference next spring.

The Attorney General explains:

"The purpose of the national bail conference is to focus attention on a problem that has gone on far too long without active efforts toward solution at both the local and Federal level. It is plain, for example, that bail discriminates against the poor man.

"Bail is supposed to protect the interests of society by assuring that defendants appear at trial. But it has served to impose great hardship on poor defendants. Because they cannot afford bail, they must stay in jail and thus cannot provide for their families or their defense."

An accused whose liberty pending trial enables him to participate in his own defense adds to the difficulties of the prosecutor. It is inspiring to find the Attorney General and Justice Department nevertheless calling attention to the inequities of the system in the case of indigents. The National Association of Attorneys General has also acknowledged the need for reform and pledged its cooperation with the national conference.

Attorney General Kennedy has been unusually diligent in promoting equal treatment in the administration of justice. He appointed in 1961 an Attorney General's Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice. This committee's excellent report formed the basis for the administration's proposal for establishing public defenders in Federal courts. The Attorney General has been a vigorous and outspoken advocate of public defender legislation.

No one who has heard the Attorney General speak out on the need for curbing organized crime can accuse him of being soft on criminals. The bail system and lack of public defenders pose no problem for the professional criminal, who has access to unlimited funds and top legal talent.

It is the poor and ignorant nonprofessional accused who most often must stay in jail and receive inadequate representation because of inability to make bail and to hire an attorney and investigators. "One of the prime objectives of the civilized administration of justice," declared the Attorney General's committee, "is to render the poverty of the litigant an irrelevancy." It is a painfully real factor now in the quality of justice dispensed by the courts, and the Attorney General deserves credit for his considerable efforts to remove the price tag from American justice.

An Affirmative Act of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the attached article from the Paterson Evening News of November 12, 1963, is a fine example of positive brotherhood.

It is most encouraging to see church leaders in the forefront of the continuing crusade for racial equality. The issue being primarily a moral one, clergymen and other persons with strong religious convictions should be taking the lead as the good people referred to in the attached article have been willing to do.

The article follows:

TWO EPISCOPAL CHURCHES TO BE MERGED

PASSAIC.—December 1 is the target date for the planned merger of the predominantly white St. John's Episcopal Church and St. Andrew's Episcopal Mission, an all-Negro church.

This movement, according to Rev. Richard N. Bolles, rector of century-old St. John's, came about as a result of a spontaneous request from members of both churches.

St. John's has about 450 families and St. Andrew's about 30 families. St. Andrews was founded 38 years ago and is headed by Rev. Eugene Avery.

Rev. Bolles, who will become head of the united church, said today that a recent message of Rt. Rev. Arthur Lichtenberger, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, stressing the need for racial unity gave the necessary impetus to the movement.

BISHOP'S MESSAGE

In his message Bishop Lichtenberger said, "I would ask you to involve yourselves. The crisis in communities North and South in such matters as housing, employment, public accommodations and schools is steadily mounting. It is the duty of every Christian citizen to know fully what is happening in his own community and actively to support efforts to meet the problems he encounters.

"I would ask you to take action. Discrimination within the body of the church itself is an intolerable scandal. Every congregation has a continuing need to examine its own life and to renew those efforts necessary to insure its inclusiveness fully. Diocesan and church agencies, schools, and other institutions also have a considerable distance to go in bringing their practices up to the standard of the clear position of the church on race.

"So I write with a deep sense of the urgency of the racial crisis in our country and the necessity for the church to act. Present events reveal the possible imminence of catastrophe. The entire Christian community must pray and act."

BISHOP STARK APPROVES

Reverend Bolles said that the planned merger has received the approval of the Right Reverend Leland Stark, bishop of Newark, who has said that St. Andrew's will be dissolved in order that the unification of the two churches may be carried out.

In a letter to both congregations, Bishop Stark said, "I am tremendously excited over the good news that the congregations of St. John's and St. Andrew's are planning to come together in common worship and service. The presence of a segregated church in Passaic has too long filled me with uneasiness. I have been kept informed of the informal discussions that have been taking place for some time between the clergy and lay leaders of both congregations and I cannot but believe that the guidance of God's Holy Spirit has been evident. I want you to know how thrilled I am at this prospect.

"I am not so unrealistic, however, as ot think that this joint venture of faith will be entirely free of tensions, but I verily believe that you are choosing to follow the path of the will of God and 'if God be for us, who can be against us?' "

ASSISTANTS

Reverend Bolles will be assisted, in addition to Reverend Avery, by the Reverend N. Robbins Winslow, as curate. Reverend Winslow is now a deacon and will be ordained a priest on December 27 at Trinity Cathedral in Newark by Bishop Stark.

In addition to serving as vicar of St. Andrews in Passaic, Reverend Avery is also vicar of St. Aidan's in Paterson, which has about 130 parishoners. Reverend Avery will continue as vicar of St. Aidan's but will serve St. John's after the merger as part-time missionary.

Both he and Reverend Winslow will conduct missionary work in Passaic, making neighborhood visitations and covering stores and other businesses.

This program, according to Reverend Bolles, is intended for everyone, regardless of race, national origin or economic background. "In this phase," he said, "the Episcopal Church will be departing from the picture that many people have had in times past—that it was primarily a church of only one economic or social class."

The union of the two churches is in keeping with a movement throughout the church and is in harmony with resolutions drawn by the denomination's governing body, the General Convention, and with action taken by the Anglican Congress held in Toronto last August.

Private News Wire Objects to Government Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the right of the USDA's market wire service to compete against an existing private news wire has been defended by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren.

We see no justification for restricting access to public information solely to sustain an exclusive position.

Says Mehren, as he declares that the Government market wire has been "mischievously misrepresented." Claiming injury, the private news wire, PAM, has sued the Department of Agriculture to cease its Government news wire activities.

The Journal of Commerce, November 7, states the "real issue is one of distribution." While PAM, prior to the Government-furnished service, was the sole private market news wire, PAM does not object to other commercial competition. What it does object to is a "rival tax-free, taxpayer-supported Federal enterprise in the same field."

While many Federal agencies, such as the Bureau of the Census, collect information and distribute it, they do not have the Department of Agriculture's "exclusive arrangement" with A.T. & T. to provide information to customers.

Text of statement by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren and the Journal of Commerce's reply are as follows:

AGRICULTURAL AID COMMENTS ON SUIT

Following is a statement by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren regarding action instituted by the PAM News Corp. relative to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Market News Service:

"The action by PAM News Corp., a subsidiary of the Ridder Publications, to enjoin the Department from making information on prices and supplies of agricultural products more widely available to the public will enable the public finally to gain an accurate picture of a situation which has been grossly distorted.

"It will, for example, make apparent to the public that the element of the Market News Service which PAM News Corp. seeks to stop is one which PAM News Corp. has enjoyed exclusively in its field until the Department through the program under attack made it available to any person, business, news media or private wire service. We see no justification for restricting access to public information solely to sustain an exclusive position.

"It will, for example, make apparent that the attacks upon Market News Service have mischievously misrepresented a service which today is an absolutely essential part of the Nation's marketing system. The food industry of this Nation literally could not function today without this market information. Currently, the Congress appropriates $6 million each year to enable market news specialists in over 135 marketing and producing areas to gather and disseminate accurate and unbiased information only on prices, on supply and demand and other market conditions for agricultural products. These reports are relayed to farmers, processors, distributors and other interested persons through condensed versions carried by the press, radio and television. Fuller versions of these reports are mailed each day to thousands of people.

"On August 1 the Department, after giving due public notice of its intentions and receiving a favorable response from trade and farm users, authorized any private firm or individual to connect directly with the leased wire system over which the Department transmits its market news information. No charge is made by USDA for this service, although the cost of extending the lines are paid to the owners of the leased wires by the individual user.

"The information carried on the leased wires is the same as that contained in the daily market reports sent through the mail or reported by the press, radio and television. Access to the leased wire is safeguarded by the same rigorous standards and procedures which apply to other services of the Department.

"Until now, the Department has not given a general public answer to the irresponsible charges made against the Market News Service, even though we have been concerned that the gross misrepresentations alleging censorship, propaganda, and other wholly false charges could undermine support for a respected public service which has been available since 1915. We now will be able to provide a full and accurate reply and know that it will be judged and reported on the basis of truth and accuracy.

"We also believe that this action will provide a basis for the thousands of farmers, processors and handlers who use the Market News Service daily to fully understand the nature of these allegations, and their divergence from fact."

WELL OFF THE TARGET

Elsewhere on this page today we publish in full a statement made by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture George L. Mehren in response to the complaint filed against USDA and others in the Federal courts this week by PAM News Corp., an affiliate of this newspaper.

We assume our readers are by now familiar with the main details of this issue, which involves an action by a private wire service to halt by court injunction a competing service set up by USDA on August 1 at Government expense.

Even if there were no laws discouraging newspapers from editorializing on the merits of a case before the courts, we would be reluctant to go further into the merits of the case now purely on the grounds of editorial decorum. We agree with Mr. Mehren on at least this much: That as a result of the complaint PAM has filed in the District Court of the District of Columbia, all the pertinent facts of the case should now be brought to light. But while we will not go further into the court phase of the dispute at this time, we do feel impelled to answer some of the phrases used by Mr. Mehren not in the courtroom, but in his own office. We are particularly intrigued with his feeling that the facts of the case have been "mischievously misrepresented" in a manner construed by USDA as being "irresponsible."

We presume that what Mr. Mehren has in mind is a projection we made editorially some weeks ago showing that if one Government department can use public funds to compete with a private news service, then there is no reason why others can't do the same thing and put a good many other commercial enterprises out of business, possibly including such general wire services as the Associated Press and United Press International.

Nothing in Mr. Mehren's angry retort disputes this. His statement does, however, misrepresent several of the issues, perhaps in consequence of its concentration less on justifying what USDA is doing than on attacking its critics.

For example, few seriously question the value of the service USDA performs in collecting and disseminating the information on farm prices, supply, demand, crop conditions, and the like. This is widely used by PAM, by this newspaper, by many other newspapers and by many other news media. If it costs the Government something like $6 million a year to gather this information from its 135 marketing and producing areas, we would think the price is justified by the value of the service itself.

The real issue is one of distribution. This was raised when USDA decided not only to go on collecting this information, but to enter into an agreement with American Telephone & Telegraph Co. under which it would supply the information gratis to any responsible citizen who would pay A.T. & T.'s wire charges. This immediately threatened to swamp PAM, which privately performs the same kind of service via the Western Union system.

Mr. Mehren makes much of the fact that PAM is alone in its field. In fact, if we read his words aright, we get the implication that USDA felt prompted to make its move in order to end the exclusive nature of PAM's service.

There are two things wrong with this. First off, there is nothing to prevent and PAM does not seek to prevent any other commercial enterprise from getting into the same act. Second—and more important—since when has the Government felt that the fact that a commercial service is exclusive in its field justifies establishment of a rival tax free, taxpayer-supported Federal enterprise in the same field?

Is this now to be construed as a considered policy on the part of the Administration? If so, with how much confidence can anyone say it will stop with USDA, or (even within USDA) with the new Federal farm wire service?

But even Mr. Mehren's own statement makes it plain that "exclusiveness" is not the issue, and never has been the issue.

There was nothing exclusive whatever about the manner in which USDA's farm crop information was previously disseminated. As he says in his own words, these reports are "relayed to farmers, processors and distributors and other interested persons through condensed versions carried by the press, radio and television. Fuller versions of these reports are mailed each day to thousands of people."

A lot of other information is also collected by other Federal agencies, among them the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This information, too, is widely disseminated, both directly and via all kinds of information media. But neither the Labor nor Commerce Departments have sought to go into competition with the news media by making the type of exclusive arrangement USDA has made with A.T. & T. to transmit their data direct to subscribers.

There are other factors in this case which are now properly in the realm of the courts. We will pass over those now and drop the matter with the observation that if "exclusiveness is found to be an issue at all, it will find not PAM, but the Department of Agriculture on the defensive.

Ex-Cubans Should Tell Their Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the September 16, 1963, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

EX-CUBANS SHOULD TELL THEIR STORY

Cubans get mixed reception in Florida where their large numbers pose special community problems, now, but the friendly reaction to Cuban refugees like the 89 who snitched a ship and escaped to Mexico the other day is typical there on the Yucatan Peninsula.

People in Yucatan have not been strangers to the stream of refugees from nearby Cuba, including other mixed groups such as this one involving men, women, and children, professional men, workers, and farmers.

They speak the same language, and they have a natural sympathy which is heightened by each such landing and the stories told by the refugees of their life under Castro.

Yucatan is the most passionately anti-Castro and anti-Communist area of Mexico. The heavily financed Communist literature which is made available extensively in central Mexico doesn't even exist in Yucatan.

The Reds don't bother to put it on the newsstands, or the newsstands won't accept it.

The Yucatecs are outspoken in their hatred of Castro and of communism, and often bitterly critical of President Mateos Lopez and the Mexican Government, itself, for its wishy-washy attitude.

The whole gulf circle of Central American nations exhibit a good deal of this strong anti-Castro sentiment.

This is the area that has been most exposed to the truth about Castro Cuba in direct experience, and this is the area most directly threatened by Castro's trouble-making export of saboteurs, propagandists, and guerrillas in small fast boats.

"Accommodation" with Castro Cuba is a bitter criticism and often a hot issue in the United States, but it is an even hotter one throughout that area, often directed at the present U.S. actions and policies.

If the same truths which naturally come to the attention of the people of Yucatan and the peoples of Central America, generally, could be brought home as effectively to the farther stretches of South America—and to Mexico City and Washington, D.C.—we wouldn't have much of a Communist problem in Latin America today.

It is hard to understand how, with tens of thousands of Spanish-speaking Cubans on our shores, many fresh from the hard realities of modern Cuba, we have failed to get their message across to so many of their Latin American compatriots.

If Castro can export trouble with his Cuban agents, why can't we effectively export truth?

Instead, we, ourselves, seem to constantly downgrade and almost ridicule the reports that stream in almost daily from the unending exodus of persecuted Cuban people fresh from behind Castro's Cane Curtain.

We act as if every farmer, worker, child, and young wife that risks his or her life to escape that island is a political propagandist giving us something else from the truth.

The fact that so many thousands have risked their lives, and continue to risk their lives constantly to escape every week, even after 3 years of Castro rule, is the clearest and best evidence that his rule is painful to the Cuban people.

These are certainly not Batista folk leaving these days. Nor the pre-Castro capitalists. These are the Cuban people, now, and they continue to flee at every opportunity ingenuity can provide.

Shouldn't this fact be a powerful argument in all Latin America, used well?

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include my weekly newsletter, "Capitol Comments," for release today in the Appendix of the RECORD. It follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

TVA

This week in Washington one of the most heated and lively issues being discussed among many Members of Congress and the press is the recent proposal to sell TVA by Senator GOLDWATER.

This proposal has met with strong and united opposition, not only from the Democrats of the Tennessee Valley area, but also from a number of members of the Republican Party, and others.

In my newsletter this week, I am including quotes from a few of the many remarks made by members of both parties opposing this proposal.

Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, in a statement to the press called the idea "wholly impractical and contrary to the public interest."

Senator H. S. (HUB) WALTERS, Democrat, of Tennessee, said, "We in Tennessee are proud of the fine work of TVA and it would be folly to seriously consider the suggestion put forth by someone unfamiliar with the people and the economy of the seven-States area served by TVA."

Representative HOWARD BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, said he was "unequivocally opposed to the suggestion that TVA be sold to private industry." He stated that "TVA was created by Congress to develop the Tennessee River and is a model for watershed development throughout the world."

Representative JAMES QUILLEN, Republican, of Tennessee, called Senator GOLDWATER's statement "very untimely" and said "TVA is doing a useful service to the people in my district, the State, and the whole TVA area."

Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, said the proposal to sell TVA "is absolutely ill founded, unwise, and will never happen in this country."

Representative ROSS BASS, Democrat, of Tennessee, stated that he was "shocked that a man who is supposed to have the basic concept of government and the intellect to be President of the United States would make such a proposal."

Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT, Democrat, of Tennessee, in denouncing the proposal said, "Either Senator GOLDWATER is misinformed or he cares not for the people of the valley.

Representative RICHARD FULTON, Democrat, of Tennessee, in referring to charges that TVA is "Socialist" said, "It is regrettable that this successful Government service for the benefit of the people must come under this attack."

Representative TOM MURRAY, Democrat, of Tennessee, said of the proposal to sell TVA, "Certainly not—not at all."

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, said it was "entirely impractical and unwise."

Representative PAT JENNINGS, Democrat of Virginia, called the GOLDWATER suggestion "utterly ridiculous."

Representative FRANK S. STUBBLEFIELD, Democrat, of Kentucky, called the idea "the most asinine, stupid suggestion I've heard since I have been in Congress.

Mr. Wiley Bowers, Executive Secretary of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, said the proposal to sell TVA, "is so absurd that it does not merit serious consideration."

Our Government has been building multipurpose dams for more than 50 years and the TVA has been operating successfully for more than thirty years. TVA's power operations are self-sustaining and self-liquidating. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the Nation's most profitable Government operation—not only from a dollars and cents point of view—of cash returns into the Treasury—but also from the point of view of strengthening our Nation.

TVA payments into the Treasury are in advance of scheduled requirements. Almost one-half billion dollars have been paid into the U.S. Treasury by TVA from power sales.

Other vast benefits have accrued from the operations of TVA, including flood control, navigation, reforestation, conservation, recreation, agricultural and industrial development, and a general improvement in the well-being of our people living in the valley area.

Great savings in power costs have been made for the Government by buying TVA-produced power for the several Government defense agencies located in the South.

Thus, TVA not only represents a great service to the people of the seven-States valley area which it serves locally, it also represents a great benefit to all the Nation.

TVA has survived its critics and will continue to survive and make significant contributions and accomplishments in the future. It stands as a symbol of democracy in action and a symbol to free nations all over the world.

Delhi Tech Forums on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following inserts tell of three recent forums held at the State University Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi, in Delaware County, N.Y., in my district.

The forum brought into sharp focus for the college student body three aspects of discrimination and prejudice. Mr. F. Peter Libassi, Assistant Deputy Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, discussed the historic and contemporary background of the problem. Commissioner George Fowler, Chairman of the New York State Commission on Human Rights, described the economic costs of discrimination. The final speaker, Dr. Warren Banner, Director of Research of the National Urban League, discussed the "Psychology of Prejudice." A question period followed each presentation.

The Delhi Tech forums serve in a real way to provide the student body with the kind of information and background that an informed citizenry must have if it is to intelligently function in free society.

[From the Delaware Republican Express, Delhi, N.Y., Oct. 31, 1963]

FIVE HUNDRED HEAR EXPERT ON CIVIL RIGHTS

"While Negroes in America have long been dissatisfied with their economic and social position, now their dissatisfaction is mingled with the hope that things can be changed." F. Peter Libassi, Assistant Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights made his remarks to more than 500 students at the State University of New York, Agricultural and Technical Institute at Delhi.

Mr. Libassi noted that the joining of Negro frustration with hope for change has set the stage for "a racial revolution" which

we are witnessing today. "The Negro is seeking, not just to improve his way of life, but to alter his entire relationship to society from that of a segregated, second class, half citizen to that of a free, equal, and full citizen."

"To meet the demands of Negroes for the enjoyment of constitutional rights," Mr. Libassi said, "the Federal Government, through the courts, the Congress, and the Executive, has moved to meet its responsibility."

Mr. Libassi's appearance on campus was sponsored by the Social Science Department of the college. Prof. Seldon Kruger, head of the social science department, in opening the meeting said, "The American dilemma of racial inequality had to be solved if we were to effectively lead the free world." Professor Robert Salton, a faculty member of Delhi Tech's social science department, acted as moderator.

[From the Oneonta Star, Oneonta, N.Y., November 15, 1963]

DISCRIMINATION CALLED COSTLY

DELHI.—George H. Fowler, chairman of New York State Commission for Human Rights, pointed out that "the Nation's economy suffers by the exclusion of any group from participating on terms on full equality in employment."

Mr. Fowler delivered his talk at the gymnasium at State University of New York Agricultural and Technical Institute, Delhi.

Citing surveys made by the U.S. Department of Labor and the National Urban League the Commissioner showed that deprivation of the Negroes in the area of employment was causing an economic loss of about $12 billion a year.

This loss, he said, "is equal to the actual earnings of Negroes and available employment." Mr. Fowler said that "should Negroes who constitute aproximately 11 percent of the labor market be accorded the right to employment opportunities, commencing with whites at equal wages, the entire economy would benefit," and he pointed out that "this potential in the gross national product would be reflected in the spending of their new earnings."

The money spent on food alone by Negroes would have great impact on the economic area. This, he said, "should be of prime interest to students of agricultural and food processing."

On the other hand, the commission chairman pointed out for every lost dollar in the economy an actual dollar was being spent in such areas as welfare, care for the aged, and similar spending programs for the indigent and unemployed.

Mr. Fowler, after citing the economic loss to the country through the deprivation of Negroes in employment, pointed out the moral responsibility of the community in affording equal opportunity in all areas of living to all citizens regardless of their race, creed, color, or national origin. He noted that New York State was the first State in the Nation to have adopted legislation assuring to all people equal job opportunity.

Similar legislation since the enactment of the law in New York State in 1945 has been adopted by some other 28 States and more than 40 other communities.

The New York State law has been expanded through the years to cover housing, and the use of places of public accommodations, assuring to all citizens their equal right to buy and rent homes that they may afford, and to make uses of all places of public accommodation and entertainment.

He urged upon the students that all of us, "teachers and students," enhance the American ideal by promoting the States equal opportunity laws. "Such laws," he pointed out, "have their foundation in American tradition, go back to the Declaration of Independence. Subsequent documents have stressed and supported this concept of equal opportunity and equal rights of all people in line with their dignity as American citizens."

Prof. Seldon Kruger, head of the social science department of the college, acted as host. Prof. Donald Kline was moderator.

[From the Delaware Republican-Express, Delhi, N.Y., Nov. 14, 1963]

RESEARCH DIRECTOR TECH SPEAKER

"When we make references to prejudice today we are relating to unfavorable reaction in people's relationships. Prejudice based on skin color is a new world concept." Warren M. Banner, research director, National Urban League, made his statements to a capacity student audience at Delhi Tech.

Mr. Banner noted, in speaking on "Psychology of Prejudice," that children are much without prejudice in early years. "Prejudice is not innate. The first years of life are the formative years which will condition the child's responses favorably or unfavorably, with or without supporting judgments.

"We know that prejudices are not entirely due to lack of knowledge, but that they lie also in the realm of the emotions." Mr. Banner said, "Therefore, our attack on prejudice must be a frank recognition of their emotional nature and an understanding of how they are formed."

Mr. Banner's appearance on campus was sponsored by the social science department of the college, Prof. Seldon Kruger, head of the department, acting as host. Moderator for the evening was Philip Briggs, faculty member of the State University of New York, Agricultural and Technical Institute Social Science Department.

The Airman and His Wings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gill Robb Wilson entitled "The Airman and His Wings" appeared in the November issue of the Flying magazine. He has conveyed remarkably well in this brief article the story of the 50 years the soldier-airman has worn the symbolic wings:

THE AIRMAN AND HIS WINGS

(By Gill Robb Wilson)

Human nature craves identity and in the pursuit runs the gamut from the sublime to the ridiculous—is welded into historic forces—is diffused into inane imitations.

Identifying himself with great aspirations, man becomes great; with less, man becomes less.

To proclaim cherished identities, men have always fashioned symbols. Heraldry is the mother of the arts. Language, painting, song, architecture—all followed after—even philosophies, ideologies, theologies. History could be written without the use of a single word in any language. A graph of symbols would do it.

When men took to the air, what more natural than that this long-cherished triumph of a dream must have a symbol? And what more fitting than the wings of man's predecessors aloft?

Certainly the boxlike structures of early aircraft have no symmetry to convey the experience of flight. The awkward takeoffs and landings, the sputtering roars of the engines, the noxious exhausts conveyed nothing of the far perspectives, the lonely heights, the deep silences, the triumph over hill and dale. Yet it was with these values that men sought identity. So not the image of the airplane but the image of the eagle and his kind became the symbol of the airman.

Here, in the United States, this year of 1963 marks the 50th anniversary of the symbolic wings designed to identify the soldier-airman. The symbol was called the Military Aviator's Badge, in design a horizontal metal bar inscribed "Military Aviator" from which was suspended by links the golden form of an eagle in flight, bearing in his claws a pair of signal flags—the latter detail both a suggestive function of military aviation and a plug for the Signal Corps which gave skeptical sponsorship to an aviation section."

Qualification tests had been defined but scarce more than a score of pilots were available, among them Roy Kirtland, Charley Chandler, "Bennie" Foulois, "Lew" Brereton, "Tommy" Milling, and "Hap" Arnold. Chandler had headed the original setup in the Signal Corps in 1907. Milling had made a night flight. Another of the group, Paul Beck, had established air-to-ground radio communications. The handful who wore the original badge were eagle minded but their "badge" had a short life.

World War I brought a comparative floodtide of pilots into the picture—their rating, Reserve military aviator; their wings of silver metal or embroidery extending from a central shield bearing the letters "U.S." This was the rating that fought the war and with variations this was the symbol that became traditional up through the years of Army aviation and the now 16-year-old Air Force.

We have no purpose here to describe the variations of aviation heraldry—as infinite as human imagination from the days of mythology onward, and presently climaxed by the badge of the astronauts. Our purpose, rather, in this 50th anniversary year of the symbolic wings of soldier-airman, is to hail the morale, the dedication, the devotion, the sacrifice which has been inspired by pride in the symbol of the airman's wings.

Each successive year since their origin they have connoted more and more, not alone of skills to fly, but of high purposes to which to climb and distant goals to be sought.

No symbol in history has so redirected military power from fighting war to prevention of war as have wings. At what cost to self few but they who wear those wings could know.

On the fifth anniversary of the victory of World War II, the Air Force Association held a great reunion of airmen in New York's Madison Square Garden. There, for the first time in history the Air Force made a civilian an official pilot, pinning on Mr. Bernard Baruch its silver wings. It was both a recognition that a pilot is something more than an airplane jockey; and a recognition that a great American had wings in his heart.

"No honor or tribute has ever meant so much to me as to be numbered among those who have earned these wings," said the elder statesman, the tears streaming unashamed down his cheeks.

If such as he could feel so, what shall we countless, faceless ones who have lived and died in the bond of our symbol, say, beyond a simple gratitude that we have walked in great fortune on the highroad of history?

Industry Recognition in Forest City, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, during the month of October many of the

cities in Arkansas celebrated industry recognition events hailing the economic roles of industrial operations in their communities and welcoming the many new manufacturing corporations who have moved into Arkansas.

The city editor of the Forrest City (Ark.) Times-Herald, Mr. Howie Bonham, used the week of industry recognition in his city to write a feature article on the development of his city and to link with it the splendid role in Arkansas development of Mr. W. W. Campbell, Forrest City banker and vice chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission. The article is an excellent one in that it graphically depicts the industrial growth of Arkansas by using Forrest City as an example and, at the same time, illustrates the progressive thinking of our Arkansas citizens as exemplified by Mr. Will Campbell.

The article written by Mr. Bonham will be of interest to the Members, and it is a pleasure to place it in the RECORD:

THE COTTON ERA ENDS AS CITY INDUSTRIALIZES

(By Howie Bonham)

When W. W. "Will" Campbell settles back into his comfortable office chair and talks about his favorite subject, his eyes crinkle from a hint of a smile. His favorite subject is Forrest City economic growth and the smile does not mean he takes the matter lightly, but more likely the inner glow which comes from seeing years of study, planning, and hard work blossom forth has found its way to his dignified face.

Recognition for progress is not novel to the chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Eastern Arkansas. Back in November of 1948, Fortune magazine did a feature article naming him as an outstanding country banker.

During his 63-year banking career, he has acted in official roles in countless banking association projects. At present, he is vice chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission (AIDC).

FORREST CITY'S GROWTH

To completely recap the industrial growth of Forrest City during this Industry Recognition Week, Campbell's role cannot be omitted, although he emphatically stresses that the citizens of Forrest City have played a more vital part. But when you visit him, there is no escaping the idea that his patience and wisdom have permeated the Forrest City economic transition.

As a banker, of course, he has channeled monetary assets into business enterprise most of his life. And every thriving community needs alert banking. But Campbell is more than a moneylender—he is an economic coordinator, a man who molds energies into fruitful output, and ever so modestly.

This week is devoted to industry recognition in Forrest City. The Forrest City Chamber of Commerce, civic clubs, newspapers, city administrations, and countless others have given themselves unselfishly to creating a city of business growth, mellowed with the ingredients of a community of good abode.

COTTON ECONOMY

The transition from a cotton economy to a balanced one, humming efficiently as surplus farmworkers find employment in local plants, has happened because of the faith and perseverence of the citizens. It is their story. And it is Will Campbell's story.

Up until 1950, Forrest City was a prosperous farm community. Mostly cotton found its way to the cash markets, and the cotton loans of Forrest City banks were prevalent. The only industries as we think of them today were the Forrest City cotton oil mill, Forrest City compress, and Forrest City machine works.

THE PIVOTAL YEAR

The pivotal year for economic growth was in 1950. In that year the city leased the utility plant to Arkansas Power & Light, because the community had outgrown the distribution facilities of the city utility. However, even then, the germ of a balanced economy was traveling about. In Campbell's words: "Although the community needed increased power facilities then, in the backs of our minds was the conviction that if we had more power, we could invite industry in."

The Forrest City population in 1950 was approximately 6,500, and the First National Bank deposits were $7,600,000. With two railroads and Highways 70 and 1, the city was becoming a small distribution center; companies moved in district offices.

THE MODERN ERA

In 1953 when Lerner-Sloan opened their pants factory the modern era of industrialization commenced. Today the plant employs about 400 persons. Citizens bought company bonds to build the factory.

The big news from industrially-ambitious Arkansas came in 1954 when the State legislature established the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and passed an enabling act which makes it possible for cities like Forrest City to form industrial corporations in order to finance industry within their boundaries. An outgrowth of this legislation was the Forrest City Industrial Corporation, which has been instrumental in the industrial hunt.

INDUSTRIAL ERA AFTER 1950

Using independent financing and a gift of land from the city, Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. built its sleek plant in 1955. This facility furnishes all hoisting equipment for the Yale & Towne system and currently employs 425 persons.

General Industries, maker of electric motors, moved into the community's industrial picture in 1960 and today employs approximately 400 people.

MORE ELECTRICITY

Another impetus to power for industry was provided by Woodruff Electric, a co-op in the REA system. It furnishes the power for General Industries and will hook into the new Forrest City Machine Works installation.

In 1962, Airtherm, Inc., producer of air-conditioning parts and employer of about 75 workers, built their new plant using independent financing.

As mentioned, this year marked one of expansion for Forrest City Machine Works, which was the forerunner of all heavy industry when it started business in 1946. This maker of farm equipment hires from 75 to 80.

Finally, in the parade of new plants, is the gigantic structure now underway to house Warwick Electronics. Warwick manufactures electronic products for Sears, Roebuck & Co. During the completion year 1964, their management envisions a work force of 1,000.

Although the financing of these plants was handled in different ways, there have consistently been expenses which the community has eagerly borne. Sewerage, water, the airport, and schools are a few of the examples in which citizens have cheerfully spent more money to attract industry.

"Citizens have met every requirement," said Campbell, "Financial and otherwise in negotiating with and attracting industry."

Looking to the future, Campbell sees great applications in the economic transition. He feels that industry provides the only method of keeping our young people in the community. Otherwise, they are educated here at great expense and take their productive abilities elsewhere.

FARMING GOES WITH INDUSTRY

The industrialization does not diminish the importance of farming, either. Rather, he feels farmers will prosper as never before. Better seeds, mechanization, higher yields will enhance his pocket. The surplus farm labor will be attracted by goodpaying industrial jobs.

RESULTS OF INDUSTRIALIZATION

The results of this magical word "industrialization" have been obvious. The bank's capital assets and deposits have doubled since 1950. The Arkansas Industrial Development Commission estimated Forrest City's population will double by 1970 (20,000).

When the interstate highway system is completed, the cloverleaf will increase accessibility to the city, and there is already talk about suppliers for the industrial plants locating here.

"Our future is bright," says Campbell proudly. "The groundwork has been laid, and the community will undergo a facelifting as mercantile businesses update their facilities. We must not stop now."

One has the feeling as he shakes hands with "Will" Campbell that Forrest City will not stop now.

A Bill To Impose Additional Duties on Cattle, Beef, and Veal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and to impose additional duties on cattle, beef and veal imported in excess of annual quotas. The proposed legislation will increase duties substantially on overquota imports: first, by 5 cents a pound on cattle weighing less than 700 pounds; second, by 6 cents a pound on cattle weighing more than 700 pounds; and, third, by 12 cents a pound on beef and veal, fresh, chilled or frozen.

These tariff increases will, I believe, restore to American cattlemen much of the domestic market lost to foreign countries in recent years—and with this would come a much-needed strengthening of cattle prices. The time has come for the administration to either support this legislation to impose higher tariffs on imported livestock or to enter into voluntary agreements with the major foreign importing nations to restrict beef imports in a manner similar to that already worked out for dairy products and cotton textiles.

The United States imposes only a token tariff on beef imports—averaging a little more than 1½ to 2½ cents a pound. This represents an open invitation to foreign producers to step up both production and exports to this country. In its outlook report for 1964, the U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts that American beef importations will remain extremely high. Last year, the United States took 79 percent of Australia's beef and veal exports and, for the past

3 years, we have been the market for 90 percent of New Zealand's boneless beef exports.

Today approximately 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States is imported. Fresh beef imports increased from 414 million pounds in 1960 to 863 million pounds in 1962. Live cattle imports jumped from 645,000 head in 1960 to 1,232,000 in 1962. There have been comparable increases in mutton and lamb imports.

Today choice-fed cattle bring about 25 percent less than they did a year ago in the livestock markets of Kansas City, Omaha and Chicago. And when the profits are largely eliminated from cattle feeding, the price effect is felt not only in the feeding lots but back on the range, as well.

Even as poor a nation as Haiti, which cannot feed its own population adequately, exported 2.7 million pounds of meat to the United States in the last fiscal year. This fact is a sidelight of the Bobby Baker scandal currently rocking Washington. Cattlemen believe price troubles facing their industry have been caused by unprecedented heavy imports of beef. They foresee continuing depressed prices for domestic cattle unless these imports are substantially reduced.

Western Kansas farmers receive most of their income from wheat and cattle and as I indicated on October 18, this year, the cattle industry is in deep trouble and has been for some time—largely because huge importations of foreign beef have been hammering down prices received by domestic producers. The "Farm Income Situation" released this week by the U.S. Department of Agriculture states that realized net income in 1964 is expected to be 5 percent or more below 1963. This would make farm income in 1964 less than in 1960, the last year of President Eisenhower's administration.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture contends it is powerless to act. The Federal Tariff Commission, however, unquestionably has authority to impose either higher tariffs or quotas or both, on foreign beef. Thus far the Commission has been reluctant to act. Congress, therefore, in my opinion, must override this reluctance with legislation.

Howard L. Jones, All-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, just recently, Sports Illustrated carried the following inscription in an article titled "They Met the Challenges of a Changing Era," in reference to Howard L. Jones, Colgate:

A fullback and All-American goalie on Colgate's hockey team, he spent three years as a pilot in the European Air Transport Command before returning to Colgate as a faculty member in the education department. His interest in education never dimnished. He is now president of Northfield and Mt. Hermon preparatory schools in Northfield, Mass., and for the past 2 years has been working to help establish the first college in the Virgin Islands.

The inscription was in conjunction with the magazine's annual silver anniversary award to 25 college football players from the class of 1939 for distinguished activities and outstanding qualities of citizenship since graduation from college.

The only resident of Massachusetts to receive the award this year, Howard Jones is a distinguished American and I am deeply grateful that he lives in the First Congressional District, where he continues to add immeasurably to the already outstanding education activities in the area.

A fine explanation of the award, and a brief background sketch of Howard Jones appeared in the Greenfield Recorder Gazette of November 6, 1963, and I am proud to insert the article in the Record. The article follows:

HOWARD JONES, ALL-AMERICAN

NORTHFIELD.—Dr. Howard L. Jones, president of Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, is among 25 American men named this week to Sports Illustrated's Silver Anniversary All-America Award.

The award was made to men who played senior varsity football in the season of 1938 and was based on their achievements during the past 25 years.

Two other educators received the award: Dr. Jerome "Brud" Holland, president of Hampton Institute, and Dr. Charles C. Sprague, dean of Tulane University School of Medicine. Dr. Jones was among 71 nominated for the award.

The winning list reads like a who's who of American industry and the professions. Included also are four who made sports headlines in their day; Marshall Goldberg, Allie Reynolds, Davey O'Brien, and Bill Osmanski. But, in this unique award, judgment is made not on the superior quality of football the man played 25 years ago but on the nature and extent of the man's performance in his career and way of life in the intervening 25 years. Nomination must come from the man's alma mater and the voting is by a panel of nationally distinguished citizens.

As Sports Illustrated points out, these men did not have an easy course to follow to their present eminent heights. The opening day of the collegiate football season in 1938 was the day of the Munich Pact and Hitler's march on Czechoslovakia. It was a year of fears and tensions and, in June 1939, they received their diplomas in a world about to erupt into the chaos of World War II. Almost all of them devoted years of their young lives to military service.

Dr. Jones was the nominee of Colgate University, where he lettered in football and won all-American honors as a goalie in hockey. He is a descendant of one of the founders of the university. He earned his M.A. and doctorate degrees from Syracuse University and spent 3 years as an Army Air Corps pilot with the European Air Transport Command during World War II.

Dr. Jones joined the faculty of Colgate University as an instructor in education in 1947. His career at Colgate saw him become director and then vice president in charge of development and the fruition of his work brought large expansion in facilities, improved faculty salaries and a wide variety of specialized grants to aid in faculty research.

The Next Phase in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the London Daily Express, under the dateline of November 12, 1963.

The British have far greater knowledge and understanding of Asia and Africa than we do, and after all, why not, they have been working closely in both for the past 100 years.

It is quite obvious from the article that it is looked upon as a fact that the United States was responsible for the recent coup in South Vietnam, and also for the bloodletting that ensued. Maybe this was necessary and desirable and maybe it was not, but in either case the responsibility is ours and methinks the chickens may come home to roost:

THE NEXT PHASE IN VIETNAM: AS SAIGON RETURNS TO NORMAL AFTER THE OVERTHROW OF THE DIEM REGIME, THE NEW GOVERNMENT IS FACED WITH THE STILL UNSOLVED PROBLEMS OF THE WAR AGAINST COMMUNISM

SAIGON.—The wild shooting in Saigon that followed the overthrow of the Diem family by no means ended the war in South Vietnam. The big question now is whether the generals who have taken over are united enough and tough enough to wage a successful battle against the Communist Viet Cong in the Mekong Delta.

The American and British Embassies in Saigon fervently hope they will be. One Western diplomat said that the revolution came at "the 11th hour," and that if President Diem had remained in power, the war against communism would have been lost "at an increasing pace."

The government's jurisdiction really runs only in the cities and major towns. The countryside is a free roaming ground, both militaryily and politically, for the Communists.

Because of the vast cost of military operations, Washington is looking more and more closely at the fighting war. President Diem was expendable because he resisted American ideas, and therefore, in the American view, made life more expensive for the American taxpayer. True, he made himself immensely unpopular with Buddhist, but among responsible Americans there is still serious disagreement as to how much that really mattered.

No one has ever believed that under Diem's regime there was democracy, or even, except a few Vietnamese intellectuals, that democracy was desirable. Communism had to be beaten, and for that the little-comprehended idea of democracy was too weak a weapon. Ngo Dinh Diem had the approval of the Americans when he tried to create his own form of dictatorship.

THREE QUESTIONS

American ruthlessness has been beaten before by American sentimentality. The Buddhist leadership in South Vietnam, according to South Vietnamese police records, which Americans do not dispute, is thoroughly permeated by communism. But the funeral pyres of Buddhist priests were more than American public opinion could take.

The American Embassy in Saigon, followed faithfully by the British, supported Diem's dictatorship until the realization came that

the Buddhist suicides were, as presented in the world's press, revolting world opinion.

It is true enough that those monks focused attention on public discontent in South Vietnam, and thus acted as a catalyst for troublemakers far outside the Buddhist fold. But the discontent was there before, while the Western Powers were silently acquiescent.

Three things really worry the Americans and the British now in South Vietnam, and none of them relates to public opinion there. One is whether the cost of military operations can be reduced; the sceond is whether the new Government is strong enough to prosecute the war against the Vietcong; and the third is what the fresh French interest in the country really means.

In the final phases of the debacle the advice of the American Embassy in Saigon was studiously ignored. There were "strategic hamlets" which were militarily untenable except at the great cost of airdropping supplies by the American Air Force. The strategic hamlets in South Vietnam are what the "new villages" were in Malaya during the emergency. They are a means of putting the rural inhabitants behind barbed wire in a concentration so as to be able to protect them—and also to keep a sharp eye on them. The Americans are now prepared to withdraw into towns and cities more easily defended, and to wait for a better opportunity to start an advance.

The generals now running the Government are a mixed bunch, too mixed for their own good, in the main pro-French and more anti-North Vietnamese than anti-Communist, which is an important distinction. The Americans are happy with "Big Minh," but not so confident that he and his colleagues—if they remain colleagues—have the united drive to do what is wanted. Diem, in fact, may have been dumb, but he was dedicated. There are many American soldiers in exposed positions in South Vietnam who realize this only too well.

Yet the Americans, at the very least, were tacit partners in the coup, with the British running happily behind. Almost every army unit that moved up to fire at the Presidential palace last Friday automatically had American officers and NCO's attached. The Americans, at least in an advisory capacity, assisted in the attack on the palace simply because they were so attached.

There were no orders given, as there were, for example, to British officers in India and Pakistan in 1947 that they should resign in case of battle. It was, indeed, on American military advice that the boundaries of the 3d and 4th South Vietnamese Corps were altered last weekend, thus making it possible for the 3d Corps to take part in the revolt.

TURNING POINT

All this having been said, there was clearly a time when the rebellion might have failed. The marines set things alight by taking over the post office and broadcasting station, and the air force, long known for its antagonism toward Diem, was willing to fire rockets in the direction of the palace even if it failed to hit it, but Big Minh hesitated. When he came in, Diem's regime was over, but clearly he had been more hesitant than the Americans in wishing it so.

The universal gasp of surprise that followed Diem's end left even the Communists breathless. Hanoi Radio was able only to say that the Americans had replaced him by a more docile puppet. That could be a very wrong assessment. What the Americans wanted was someone who would give all his attention to prosecuting the war against the Communists in South Vietnam. They believed, with some reason, that Diem was more interested in preserving his and his family's power, but now no one really knows whose is the power, nor whether it is primarily concerned with fighting communism.

The 70-percent Buddhist population of South Vietnam has ostensibly triumphed over the Roman Catholic minority, though the new government is being sensible and sensitive in not mentioning this. But neither Buddhism nor Roman Catholicism proved any moral barrier to communism in North Vietnam.

In the Asia that is east of India only one man has beaten communism on its own ground without massive foreign aid, and that is Lee Kuan Yew, Premier of Singapore. He has been ruthless about it but has preserved the popular vote.

South Korea's leaders have been far more ruthless, but they are backed by United Nations troop support such as South Vietnam cannot command.

Now there is a brief burst of gaiety in Saigon. But behind all the smiles is the question: Who is going to win?

FRENCH INFLUENCE

One South Vietnamese who would call himself an intellectual said in the quiet that followed the shelling that South Vietnam was not yet ready, and indeed had no preparation, for democracy. When one then asked, "What was the revolution for?" the answer was, "It was for the Americans," and one was back on familiar Asian ground. The outsider can't deny that the Americans—and the British—wanted a change of government, or even that most South Vietnamese wanted it, but he wonders whether any of the parties concerned had a clear idea of what was coming.

The generals who are behind the present Government are not united, though they are in loose cohesion. They intend, in the time-honored fashion of the generation's military revolutionaries, to hand back power to civilians.

Politicians exiled by Diem are flying back into Saigon at verbal loggerheads as soon as they step out of their aircraft. Students, who were embracing soldiers the day they were liberated after Diem's crass policy of mass arrests, were facing the same troops across barricades 24 hours later when they decided that they disapproved of the newly constituted Government.

Altogether, the face of satisfaction presented in the American and British Embassies is difficult to copy. One report being circulated in Saigon, clearly with Western inspiration, is that Diem was preparing to negotiate with Hanoi through the mediation of the French Government. No Vietnamese I have met, including the most passionate Diem-haters, believes this. In fact, French interests in, and influence on, the new Government seems far more likely to bear on rapprochement between Hanoi and Saigon than any weight used during Diem's regime. In Saigon the local terror has gone, but the ultimate terror remains.

Freedom of the Press in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, last week our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] extended his remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include an article by Robert Jones which appeared in the November 5, 1963, edition of the Indianapolis Star. Our colleague prefaced his remarks by stating that he was not personally acquainted with Mr. Jones, nor had knowledge of the authenticity of the affairs in Puerto Rico which Mr. Jones portrayed in his article. He limited himself to include the article with his remarks as a matter of possible interest to Members of the House in view of legislation, which was recently before this body and which pertained to the study of Puerto Rico's relationships with the United States. He indicated that it might possibly evoke comments on Puerto Rican affairs by other Members.

I think it is my duty to comment at this time. I shall begin by making reference to what is said in Mr. Jones' article concerning government censorship of the press in Puerto Rico.

It is interesting to note that charges of a similar nature were made recently by a spokesman of the "Puerto Rico Pro Independence Movement" who appeared before a Senate subcommittee while Puerto Rican legislation adopted by this House was being considered. Also, that as a consequence, on November 8, 1963, the Puerto Rican English language newspaper, the San Juan Star, one of our leading newspapers, published an editorial, which reads as follows:

NEWS TO US

A representative of the Puerto Rico independence movement told a subcommittee of the Senate Territories Committee in Washington yesterday that there is government control of the press in Puerto Rico. That certainly is news to us.

If there is government control of the press here it is the most subtle kind of control in the history of free journalism. We have, on occasion, as our regular readers know, made statements in this space that would have led the writer to the gallows, or the electric chair, or before a firing squad or had our newspaper confiscated in any one of dozens of countries on earth.

A country, for example, that might be governed by the type of man who made such a ridiculous statement yesterday before a Senate committee.

Concerning Mr. Jones' statement in the Indianapolis Star, another leading Puerto Rican newspaper, the Spanish language El Mundo, in its edition of November 13—the very day that the Jones article was offered for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—published on its front page the following article:

[Translation from El Mundo of San Juan, P.R., Nov. 13, 1963]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS UPHELD

The subject of the freedom of the press in Puerto Rico has popped up again. It has been discussed in the last few days at La Parguera and Indianapolis, Ind. The junior chamber (of commerce) was holding its annual meeting at La Parguera and our directors said there, among other things that within a few days: "I shall go before the annual meeting of the Inter-American Press Society and once more I will tell the corresponding committee that in Puerto Rico we have absolute freedom of the press."

He took advantage of the occasion to deny and repudiate a fib published in the Indianapolis Star, written by its Caribbean correspondent Robert Jones. Jones said that the Puerto Rican press for all practical purposes is under governmental censure.

Jones wrote a series of lies concerning Puerto Rico, including the fib that here the press doesn't criticize the government, because the government is the greatest adver-

tiser and the papers know that they would lose the bulk of their advertising if they openly attack the government. To this the director of El Mundo replied: "In Puerto Rico there doesn't exist such a situation and we hope it will never exist; but if, unfortunately, there ever were the remotest attempt to establish it, the free press and the free opinion of the country would go to the maximum in their sacrifice to safeguard that precious freedom without which we wouldn't be able to live."

Again, in its edition of November 14, 1963, El Mundo editorialized as follows:

[Translation from El Mundo of Tursday, Nov. 14, 1963]

AGAINST THE FIB

The newspaper Indianapolis Star of the city of the same name in the State of Indiana has just published a string of fibs that speak ill of its responsibility as a public informant. The information which appeared on the November 5 edition is signed by a Mr. Robert Jones, who is identified as "Star correspondent for the Caribbean."

We do not know who this Mr. Jones is. But what we do know is that it doesn't do him any favor to write without rhyme or reason, filling almost two columns of the editorial page of the Star with a string of opinions and conclusions that haven't any basis in reality. It might be said that this correspondent in the Caribbean, although he dates his dispatch in San Juan, wrote it from a rowboat anchored in latitude 15° and longitude 68°, which is about the geographic center of the Caribbean Sea.

If Mr. Jones had gotten a little closer to San Juan and if he had checked the prejudices which he listened to, God knows where and from what source, he might have sent to his paper a less fantastic dispatch. And as to fantasy, see to what extremes the correspondent can go:

"For all practical purposes, the Puerto Rican dailies are under government censure.

"There is no need for an official censure to maintain a press under control. The editors of the Puerto Rican papers know well the party line. They know that they would lose the bulk of their advertisements if they openly attacked the Governor."

This is a gratuitous and coarse offense made by the Indianapolis Star to the Puerto Rican press. We return it.

And we add: In Puerto Rico there doesn't exist such a situation nor do we expect that it will ever exist; but if there ever were, to our misfortune, the remotest attempt to establish it, the free press and the free opinion of the country would go to the maximum sacrifice to safeguard this precious freedom without which we cannot live.

El Mundo will shortly attend the annual meeting of the Inter-American Press Society and, once more, shall inform the corresponding commission that in Puerto Rico we have absolute freedom of the press. A freedom completely divorced from illegitimate interests. The liberty which all, absolutely all, Puerto Ricans are proud to fully maintain.

There are other aspects of Mr. Jones' article to which I shall refer. Mr. Jones states that we have in Puerto Rico something called party commissars. Where Mr. Jones got this notion is unknown to me. The only possible explanation I can think of is that Mr. Jones may have heard in Puerto Rico the Spanish word comisario and he has translated it into commissar. The translation for comisario would be commissioner. For instance, while in English we say "High Commissioner," such as Spain used to have in Morocco, in Spanish he was called "Alto Comisario." From my boyhood days, I remember that there existed in Puerto Rico, a remnant of the Spanish municipal system, a system of "Comisarios de Barrio"—Rural Ward Commissioners. These were ad honorem positions held by chosen citizens, who lived in the rural areas of Puerto Rico. They were the mayors' delegates and they acted as liaisons between the rural inhabitants and the municipal government offices, located in the urban areas. I may explain that in Puerto Rico we do not have separate governments for the urban areas and the rural areas. We do not have separate city and county governments. Our municipalities combine both urban and rural areas. The system of "Comisarios de Barrio"—Rural Ward Commissioners—has been dead for many years, as a natural result of the development of easy means of communication and transportation between town and country. We have 76 municipalities. The island is small. With our fine road system and inexpensive bus transportation, any person living in the rural areas can now come to the city with very little expense and in little time. So there have been no such comisarios for a long time.

However, old words cling. The city of San Juan, with about 500,000 inhabitants, extends over a wide area and includes many suburbs. Many people still call the municipal inspectors of the city of San Juan comisarios.

Again, there is reference in Mr. Jones' article to our civil service. I am proud to say that we have in Puerto Rico a very fine civil service law under an efficient personnel office. By the way, the chairman of the Puerto Rico Personnel Board is a distinguished and most respected citizen, Dr. Guillermo Barbosa, a member of the opposition party, the son of the founder of that party, an outstanding Puerto Rican.

I shall not dwell on other aspects of Mr. Jones' article, but I may state that it seems to me most unfortunate that his source of information in Puerto Rico has evidently misled him, and probably his lack of knowledge of the background and the community language of Puerto Rico has been a factor in his not getting an accurate picture of actual happenings in Puerto Rico.

Michael M. Martin, of Iowa City, Iowa, Reports on His "Week in Washington" Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the students from Iowa colleges to participate this year in the "Week in Washington" program which I sponsor in conjunction with the Iowa Center for Education in Politics, was Michael M. Martin, of Iowa City, Iowa, a student at the State University of Iowa.

Michael and his companion for the week, Loren Mitchell, of Estherville, Iowa, a student at Drake University, brought to 90 the number of "Week in Washington" students who have been the guests of Mrs. Schwengel and me since the start of the program in 1955.

The reports of each of these students have been testimony to the success of the program and have encouraged us to carry it on year after year. I am especially impressed with the report which Michael Martin has made on his experience. I feel that my colleagues will be interested in his keen observations and his appraisal of the activities with which he came in contact during his stay in the Capital.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer Michael Martin's report on his week in Washington:

WEEK IN WASHINGTON—AUGUST 18–24, 1963

(By Michael M. Martin, Republican, SUI)

In writing a report on my week in Washington I find myself faced with the problem of not knowing where to begin. An experience such as this provides one with so many varied and fond memories that it is difficult to achieve any sort of order in the telling. Nevertheless, I shall attempt to convey my impressions of our Nation's Capital and the workings of the Government as I saw it.

My partner, Loren Mitchell, and I were fortunate to be in Washington during a week in which so much important legislation was considered. So often the visitor to Washington feels cheated and confused because all he saw of Congress in action was the cursory consideration of a multitude of insignificant business. Told that Congress work is done in committees, he goes to a hearing and sees his elected representatives paying scant attention to some witness droning on about a matter of which the visitor knows little and cares less. We were doubly fortunate in that (1) the House spent most of the week in consideration of the foreign aid authorization bill, about which feelings were high and debate was correspondingly interesting, and (2) the Senate Foreign Relations and the Joint Atomic Energy Committees were taking testimony in open session about the nuclear test ban treaty.

In watching the debate in the House and in my talks with Mr. SCHWENGEL and others, I was impressed by several things. First, the quality of the debate was noticably higher than I remembered at the State legislature, though it was seldom as it is popularly conceived. A speech particularly impressive to the galleries may have little effect on the floor, and vice versa. My observations lead me to the conclusion that lawmaking, including debate, is as much a matter of personalities as reason or eloquence. Let me cite a few examples:

1. After the Democrats had failed to defeat two of three Republican amendments offered—and appeared to be in grave danger of failing a third time—Mr. MCCORMACK, who had up to that time refrained from participating, made a speech which regrouped the Democratic forces and led to an early adjournment, which gave the majority time to head off a Republican runaway with the bill.

2. Republican Representative ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana, was able to have adopted every amendment he presented because he was held in high regard on both sides of the aisle and because he presented measures which correctly represented the feelings of the majority. It was apparent that doing the proper groundwork—which includes good drafting, proper timing, and consultation with one's potential opposition, as well as per-

sonal relations and one's reputation as a Member—was vital if a minority Member's measure was to receive much consideration. Mr. SCHWENGEL was able to have an amendment of his passed on voice vote because, among other things, he first discussed his measure with Dr. MORGAN, the floor manager of the bill. Other Republicans, particularly those who have gained a reputation for obstruction and negativism, presented many amendments without success.

Another event I considered significant in understanding about the inside workings in Congress occurred the night the House stayed in session until 10:15 p.m. working on the foreign aid bill. Discussion was completed at that hour, but no vote was held that evening.

Reading of the engrossed copy was called for, thus requiring a session on the next (Friday) afternoon. There were two reasons given to me for this delaying action. First some Members were disgruntled that the floor manager had kept them in session so late when a session might as well have been held the next morning. Second, this was an attack on the "Tuesday-Thursday Boys"—Members from nearby States who go home Thursday evening and return Tuesday morning, thus not carrying their fair share of the congressional workload.

Aside from seeing the Joint Chiefs of Staff in full regalia and such notables as Dr. Willard Libby, Adm. Lewis Strauss, and Norman Cousins, I would say that the part of the test ban treaty hearings which impressed me most occurred when the Joint Chiefs were testifying. At first, they appeared to be of one mind favoring the treaty as long as the United States took certain precautions. They swore that they had come to such a conclusion by themselves, that they were subjected to no undue pressure. Then Senator GOLDWATER, and others, pursued the question, "Would you have favored this treaty if it were still in the proposal stage and had not been initialed?" At this the solid front cracked, with expressions ranging from the Army Chief's unqualified assent to General LeMay's quite negative "maybe." It was also interesting to see how the members of the committees used their role as questioners to express their own views.

In addition to observing Congress, we were provided with opportunities to visit agencies serving Congress, administrative agencies, and party headquarters. High on my list of significant experiences would be our visit to the Library of Congress and our talk with Dr. Hugh Elsbree of the Legislative Reference Service. I had known that the Congressman's workload is great, but the number and diversity of services the LRS tries to provide surprised me. After seeing the crowded quarters in which LRS must function, I wonder how it and Congress will be able to function in the evermore complex years ahead. Dr. Elsbree, a former political science professor, made a point in our discussion which, especially when corroborated by the man at the Internal Revenue Service, provides food for thought. He pointed out that the complexity of the times requires competence in two or more fields which may often be seemingly unrelated. In his department, for example, they are looking for men experienced in both law and technology. On the other hand, the broadening knowledge of the political process gained in the study of political science is of great value to the scientist in government service.

For my visit to an administrative agency I chose the Automatic Data Processing Division of the Internal Revenue Service. I spent about an hour with Mr. Earl Sharits, Planning and Control Officer in the Systems Division, who had a major part in the adoption of ADP by the IRS. It was quite interesting to see the modern means the Service has employed to maintain and improve this Nation's already fine record of efficient collection of Government revenues and voluntary compliance with the tax laws.

He, too, impressed upon me the importance of dual competence in government service today.

The one part of the program which I found weak was the visit to party headquarters. The fellow to whom I spoke, Stan Anderson (I believe he was assistant to the president of the Young Republican Federation), knew nothing about our program or what we were trying to do. Perhaps this was due in part to his secretary's failure to inform him of my appointment. Nevertheless, I enjoyed explaining the program and we had a good discussion. His experiences in party work have encouraged me to take a more active part in promoting the Republican Party and party activity in general.

Needless to say, we did some "rubbernecking," but the time was all too short. I did get to the National Gallery of Art and the National Archives, which I had missed on my previous trip to Washington. These magnificent buildings give one a new appreciation of our priceless heritage. Our tour of the White House seemed too superficial, perhaps because of my previous visit. However, the guidebook made it more meaningful. A visit to the National Cemetery at Arlington provided a relaxing and inspiring interlude in the week's activities. A fitting opening to the week was provided by the Marine Band concert and Lincoln program at the Watergate. Listening to the fine music and Mr. Ralph Newman's remarks while I was sitting in the VIP section made for an exciting evening. In addition, a tour of the Lincoln Memorial from roof to basement left us breathless, both literally and figuratively.

It would not be right to close this report without some word of thanks, unfortunately insufficient, to all of those who made this trip possible and such a success. Thanks are in order to the political parties, the Iowa Center for Education in Politics, and all of those who serve them so that the program may be successful. I thank those who by their interest and help made it possible for me to participate. I thank those of Mr. SCHWENGEL'S office staff, especially Charlie and Sylvia, for their unfailing and gracious assistance. Finally, I thank those people whose untiring interest, deep concern, and sacrifice have made the program what it is—the Schwengels. My experience has given me a better understanding of how our Federal Government works. It has strengthened my desire to actively participate in our Government as a voter, a party member, and, possibly, as an employee. It also causes me to hope that many others may have a similar rewarding experience through the "Week-in-Washington" program.

Education at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the East Side News, published in Madison, Wis., entitled "Education at the Crossroads."

In my opinion the editorial is a true expression of grassroots thinking relative to our great educational responsibilities.

EDUCATION AT THE CROSSROADS

A major purpose in observing American Education Week has been to emphasize to the public the vital importance of education in preparing our young people to benefit from the traditional American rights of individual liberty and initiative for building a better life for themselves in a free society.

Grassroots Americans have good cause to be proud of the past achievements and contributions of their locally built and locally operated primary and secondary school systems in strengthening and improving our American principles of human freedom.

A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

At the same time, they have an urgent need to recognize the dangers of allowing control of their schools ever to fall into the hands of politically appointed Federal bureaucrats who inevitably would use management of education as a political tool of those who control government—just as they are now using management of the news and information for that purpose.

Nothing would be more tragic—or a greater threat to American freedom—than to subject the minds of our children during their most impressionable and formative years to partisan political control by any individual or group in any political party or governmental agency.

HANDWRITING ON THE BLACKBOARD

On the record of past experience, such Federal control would be the inevitable result of surrendering local authority in exchange for the illusory benefits of Federal aid—for as surely as night follows day, Federal control follows Federal aid.

If further practical proof were needed, it can be found in the current controversy and proposed solutions for the problem of civil rights and segregation.

One of the most notable features of civil rights legislation proposed by the Kennedy administration was the provision giving the President and his political appointees the power to withhold Federal aid in other fields, social security, and veterans benefit payments, and even Federal deposit insurance on savings accounts, as the penalty for violation.

We do not argue the moral or legal ethics involved in the civil rights controversy. However, President Kennedy's proposal to use Federal aids as a club in this case should make it crystal clear how Federal control over education would be imposed if local governments allow their school systems to become dependent on Federal aids and grants for operating expenses.

Once this has been accomplished, politically-appointed Federal bureaucrats would use the same threat of fiscal retaliation not only to dictate how local schools shall be operated but, more importantly, what they shall teach.

And power that can be used for what is thought to be good (as in the civil rights problem) can also be used for evil.

"POLITICAL PUPPET" PUPILS

Every political despot and dictator in recent history has recognized the importance of education as a tool for perpetuating themselves and their tyrannies in power.

Hitler actually educated mere children to impeach their own parents and send them to certain death for political disloyalty to the Third Reich.

Russian children are being taught that the state is all-important with the people its servants, and Castro is teaching Cuban youngsters that only he can save their island from a U.S. military invasion.

A THIN LINE

There are those, of course, who will protest that "this couldn't happen here—not in the United States."

They would do well to consider President Kennedy's widely recognized and almost boastful policy of managing news and information about Government as a means of creating a favorable political image of himself for his reelection campaign.

They would do well to consider the statement by one of his spokesmen who defended this policy by declaring bluntly that "Government has a right to lie to protect itself."

And they would do well to ask themselves what valid reason is there for believing that an administration which openly and ruthlessly manages the news for personal political purposes would not also manage education, if it could—in order to protect itself as a political dynasty.

The line between management and control is razor-thin and mostly a matter of semantics.

GRASSROOTS INITIATIVE

In a greater sense, American Education Week is a tribute to grassroots Americans—parents and community leaders—who have met the growing problems of education by increasing their local taxes and the indebtedness of their communities to provide an adequate education for their children without running to the Federal Government for help.

They have earned and paid for the right to control the operation of their own schools—the hard way. It would be a tragic mistake now to barter away that right and privilege for the false and illusory benefits of Federal aid to education.

Alliance for Progress Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of this body an article appearing on the editorial page of the Newsday newspaper on Wednesday, November 13, 1963, which I believe deserves careful study.

CRISIS IN LATIN AMERICA

Our foreign policy chickens are coming home to roost in Latin America. President Joao Goulart of near-bankrupt Brazil has virtually written off the Alliance for Progress in a speech to delegates attending the second annual review meeting of that agency in Sao Paulo. He has demanded, in effect, that the United States supply unlimited aid without exercising any control over how it is used. Argentina, despite a plea from Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, is preparing to expropriate $200 million of investments and $100 million in oil produced by American companies under contract with a prior government. Premier Cheddi B. Jagan of British Guiana, a Castro-Communist sympathizer, is seeking to stir up anti-British sentiment within that colony.

The dire plight of the Alliance for Progress was foreshadowed in a report to its members issued in advance of Goulart's speech. The aim was to bring about a 2.5-percent annual increase in Latin American per capita income. Instead the 1962 figure ranged between six-tenths of 1 percent and a flat 1 percent, a drop from 1961 levels. Economic crises in Brazil and Argentina pulled down the income average.

So the crisis does not impend; it is upon us.

DOOMED FROM THE START

The Alliance for Progress was conceived as an international political ploy, with the idea that the United States would feed a billion dollars a year for 10 years into the Latin American economy. Actually the figure has been less, and even a billion a year would be a drop in the bucket. The concept therefore was doomed from the start.

What Latin America needs, and in her present nationalistic frame of mind cannot get, is an increasing rate of foreign investments. But what corporation whose officers are in their right mind would go into any country where the odds are so patently in favor of eventual expropriation, either without compensation or with totally inadequate compensation?

Instead American emphasis has been on cash grants and loans that may never be repaid, and coupled with this a demand that these nations reform to fit the North American pattern of democracy. The whole concept has been unrealistic from its inception, and the results are now apparent at Sao Paulo. Not later, but now, this country and the present administration must rethink the whole Latin American question and come up not only with sound policies but with able administrators and ambassadors who have the stature and the skill to sell the concept of sound governments that respect their international obligations.

The Tug of War Between Business and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, there are few men who have a better understanding of the relationship between business and Government than Mr. James A. Farley. His past experience as Democratic national chairman and as Postmaster General, and his present job as chairman of the board for the Coca-Cola Export Corp. have given him a fine insight into the problems of both. Last month, in an address before the Associated Industries of Florida, Mr. Farley expressed some of his opinions on "The Tug of War Between Business and Government." I commend them to the attention of the House.

The address follows:

THE TUG OF WAR BETWEEN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley)

Judging from the articles in business publications that attract maximum reader-interest among businessmen, the "give 'em hell" variety proves year after year that it is sure-fire copy. By "give 'em hell," of course, I mean the Government. Generally speaking, the target is the National Government, though State and local systems likewise come for a share of the fireworks.

In this seemingly endless tug of war, I have found myself for many years now in a somewhat enviable—or unevitable position, depending on how you want to look at it. I have been associated with Government and I have been associated with business, both in rather prominent capacities. In fact, I am sometimes considered something of a Siamese twin, or—even less flattering—something of a split personality.

Above all else, I consider myself a politician. That is, just a plain citizen determined to do something constructive about the state of affairs surrounding his everyday existence.

Now that word "politician" may scare you. It may conjure up connotations completely adverse to the definition I have given it. Perhaps you associate such adjectives as dirty, deceitful, disruptable with that word "politician."

How about "salesman"? What adjectives do you associate with that word? I have no intention whatsoever of belaboring the parallel for I am sure you are fully aware that, throughout these United States and, indeed, the world at large, there are some people for whom the connotations of dirty, deceitful, disreputable apply to that word "salesman."

The point I am making is that there are good politicians and bad politicians, just as there are good salesmen and bad salesmen. In business as in government, the bad ones are the ones who cause all the trouble.

Actually, the good politician and the good salesman pursue similar ends and use similar means for achieving those ends. So, when I say I consider myself a politician above all else I am likewise saying I consider myself a salesman above all else. And that is no evasion of the issue, it is simply the opposite side of the same coin. Whether you call the people customers or call them constituents they are the same people, whether you are in business or in government.

One dramatic difference in business, however, is the foreboding fact that "every day is election day." The customers cast their votes for you—or don't cast their votes for you—every time they go to the marketplace. No elected official of National, State, or local government is under more careful, more calculating, more continual scrutiny than the products, or services you offer the public. The ballots are the dollars and cents that spell the difference between success and failure in any business enterprise.

Products, such as those offered by Minute Maid Co., are particularly susceptible to the currents of change among the electorate. They are competing among 6,000 to 7,000 other candidates for the customers' dollars and cents in the average supermarket. Granted these products are needed, granted they are healthful, granted they are refreshing, but none of these things necessarily gets these products the votes of approval that gets them in the customers' shopping baskets. Price may prove the decisive factor. Package size may prove the reason to buy or not to buy. Display position. Impulse at the point of sale. Advertising in the supermarkets broadsides of weekend specials. Habit—yes; just the customers loyalty for proved product goodness in the past. However you look at it, the marketplace is certainly more precarious than the polling place.

Minute Maid Co. is now a division of the Coca-Cola Co. and I think I speak for everyone concerned when I say that the joint activity has been a happy endeavor for all of us right from the start.

In the Coca-Cola business, particularly, we were just venturing into multiple packaging and a full line of different carbonated drinks when the transaction took place, so we were able to profit enormously from the merchandising experience of Minute Maid Co. in these areas.

Both of us, of course, are businesses based on a broad common denominator of popular appeal. Everybody is our customer, young and old, rich and poor, town and country, labor and business, and government. With such a market we cant afford to alienate anybody. We can't offer a measure of health and hospitality with our products and be inhospitable ourselves. It isn't healthful for us.

We can't encourage enjoyment of the pleasant things of life and be unpleasant about it. We just can't be offensive and stay in business. Such an attitude, I believe is true, whatever the business and whatever its customer denominator.

Thus, in the seemingly endless tug of war between business and government, I think business should treat government as it would treat customers. In the final analysis, that's what government is. Officials are paid employees of the people. If your business is overwhelmingly dependent upon government contracts, there is all the more reason for the salesman-like approach. But, even if it is not the surest way to succeed with government is a persuasive application of the basic selling techniques you have mastered in the marketplace. In other words, the everyday give-and-take that is your stock in trade.

I can hear somebody now, saying: "Yes, but these petty bureaucrats aren't like normal customers. They are entrenched in a little job, and completely circumscribed by it. They couldnt make a decision, even if they wanted to. For some reason, or lack of reason, they always seem to have to refer everything to somebody else, some committee or something, that is always some place else."

One of the golden rules of business, one on which we pride ourselves, as businessmen, is attempting "to see the other fellow's problems and points of view." We wouldn't think of introducing some new products in a territory, for example, without certain preliminary surveys. Market research, we call it, the spadework necessary to promote our ideas. Believe me, it is equally important in dealings with the government.

Another thing, and let's be completely honest about this, especially among ourselves. All the petty bureaucrats aren't in the government. There are plenty of them in any sizable business organization, yours as well as mine, people content with small responsibility and afraid to take more. Nor is that contraption known as the committee unique with government. Frankly, I don't know which is worse—being on a committee or trying to work through one. When completely frustrated, as I'm sure we all are at times, I always comfort myself with the classic definition: "A committee makes decisions as a group that any member would be fired for making as an individual."

Frustration is just part of the selling game, and we just have to live through it and work around it. There are plenty of good people in Government jobs trying to get things done in the best and quickest way possible, and with a minimum of compromise. Government employees are by no means a separate breed of human beings. All in all, they are motivated by the same sense of service and the same sense of security that motivate business employees. Many of them are on "on loan" from business.

That brings up what I consider a highly advantageous opportunity for business in its relationships with Government. Instead of fighting them, why not join them, and genuinely help them? It's a two-way street. Many a Government official "on loan" from business has discovered that the corporate trappings of status have unintentionally insulated him from the world outside, and the problems of the people. For such, a Government appointment can prove a liberal education. For Government's role is to ballance out the viewpoints of business, labor, consumer, farmer, the aged, ethnic groups and so forth—not just business. Needless to say, of course, these different viewpoints are the viewpoints of different customers. But, all too often, especially in the higher echelons of business management the busy executive is so overwhelmed with the statistics of business operation that he forgets it is the customers who make the statistics. For such, the political exposure is a refreshing experience, indeed. The politician never forgets the constituents.

It is easy to stand on the sidelines in an attitude of sharp and grumbling opposition. What is more difficult is "to put up, or shut up." Instead of making impassioned speeches about "getting the Government out of business," we need to take the time and trouble and the patience and the money "to get the business viewpoint into Government". At all costs, business must avoid the tag of being "anti" and rise to the supreme challenge of offering constructive solutions to the complex problems of Government.

Definitely, businessmen should take a more active role in politics. Campaign contributions are not enough. I'm speaking of the working level of politics—the ward level, the precinct level. I'm speaking of the so-called personal sacrifice of actually seeking office. Public service, in some form or other, is the sacred duty of every individual American who has prospered as a result of our free institutions and has the ability to carry them forward to greater achievements in the future. Not only should companies educate their personnel politically, they should make it possible for their personnel to take Government jobs without penalty in regards company advancement. In fact, Government experience for a certain period of time could prove invaluable in promotions to top management.

All too often we think of the Government as we do the doctor—wonderful when we're in trouble, but don't bother us any other time. Most companies today insist on periodic checkups on the physical condition of their employees. Preventive measures, we call them, and some such preventive measures could be taken against possible Government trouble. Actually, it is my experience that the frightening symptons seldom occur when business is a good citizen.

I'm not just talking about a good citizen of the United States now. I'm talking about a good citizen of the world. For over 20 years, I have had the honor and pleasure to be chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. In that capacity I have traveled far and wide, for the products I represent are sold in over 120 countries throughout the free world. We have never sold that world short. We do business abroad the same as we do business at home. We have contributed fairly and squarely to the economic advancement of every community, even to the point of underwriting certain supplying industries until such time as they can stand on their own financial feet. Our business philosophy is quite simple: Prosperity is indivisible.

So it would appear to me in this seemingly endless war between business and Government: Prosperity is indivisible. We're all in this great experiment of working democracy together, and for the greater glory of mankind. There is so much to do to fulfill the universal dream of freedom that we should get on about our business—America's business.

Hands Across and Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to place in the RECORD a very timely editorial which appeared in the Tampa Tribune, one of the outstanding daily newspapers of the Nation. The same criticism that is made in the editorial, "Hands Across and Out," applies to many governments which have been the recipients of our foreign aid program.

The editorial follows:

HANDS ACROSS AND OUT

A more disconcerting state of affairs could not have greeted economic leaders meeting for the second annual review of the Alliance for Progress this week at Sao Paulo, Brazil.

The 10-year, $10 billion aid-reform program, which ought to be well along on the task of tugging up Latin America's lagging bootstraps, has sadly failed to live up to expectations.

Brazil and Argentina—two of the chief beneficiaries of the massive outpouring of U.S. dollars—are the leaders in deriding North American efforts as oppressive and ineffective.

Brazilian President Joao Goulart, supposedly making the keynote address of welcome to the conference, mentioned the Alliance only once and omitted any reference to U.S. aid. He advocated, instead, a nebulous Latin American confederation of trade to overcome the need for heavy imports—which he implied were at the root of the trouble.

"Today, and each day more so, Latin America should present to the world a uniter, solid, and cohesive front in the collective defense of our common interests," Goulart declared.

Yet this is the same Goulart who has since argued against greater Latin American participation in Alliance policymaking. This is the same Goulart who has depended upon Washington for dollar handouts just to keep his government afloat financially.

And he represents the same country which has allowed its population increases to outdistance its economic rate of growth, slogging along in an unbelievable morass of inflation.

While Brazil thus affronts its major source of outside help, Argentina turns an ungrateful hand against the American oil companies which have invested more than $200 million in the country.

Contracts negotiated with former President Arturo Frondizi are likely to be nullified and compensation scaled down by the new government of President Illia.

Yet the Alliance program badly needs to encourage more private investments in Latin America.

Argentine and Brazilian economic slowdowns this past year held back the overall "growth rate" calculated for the nations under the Alliance program. Instead of the goal of 2.5 percent annual increase in Latin American per capita income, an economic "stagnation" took place.

It would be easy to regard the Brazilian and Argentine attitudes as typical and to conclude that the United States might better leave Latin America to flounder in its own failures.

But this would be unfair to the countries which have made a conscientious effort to improve the conditions of their people, only to be snarled in the redtape of the U.S. aid-money machine.

Peru, for example, wanted $10 million to provide simple hand tools for Indian peasants who now try to cultivate their plots with little more than sharpened sticks. But American officials were occupied with a more grandiose roadbuilding scheme; they said it would take 2 years to process a pick-and-shovel loan. President Belaunde finally got the money from Finland, of all places, and soon hopes to be distributing farm implements to thousands of peasants thus far untouched by the Alliance for Progress.

There are other cases where better understanding and faster action would help the Alliance show more results.

Averell Harriman, chief U.S. delegate to the Sao Paulo conference, will reply today to criticism of the Alliance. Honesty requires him to acknowledge our own shortcomings in administration. But honesty also ought to impel him to tell these governments, notably Brazil's and Argentina's, that the U.S. taxpayer believes that hands across the border ought to be clasped in mutual friendship—not one giving and the other receiving, now and forevermore.

They're Only Kids? Ha!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER appeared in the New York Journal-American on November 17, 1963.

Most of the press seem to be under the impression, or perhaps they are ordered to give the impression, that there is a radical right but no radical left in the United States. Of course this is palpably ridiculous. The only difference is that the radical left is in power today and can call the shots while the radical right has no power whatever.

Mr. Speaker we will have radicals as long as we exist and this is probably a good thing. At least they have principles. But to label one set as pure white and the other coal black is simply vicious partisanship:

THEY ARE ONLY KIDS? HA!

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Democratic cries of pained anguish about the Young Republican convention in California recently grew strangely silent when the Young Democrats held their own western conference and advocated such embarassing things as resumption of diplomatic relations with Cuba and full recognition of Red China.

When cornered about their extremism, party leaders expressed only mild disagreement, saying, in effect, that kids will be kids and that they—the older Democrats—could not possibly agree with such things.

The facts, however, somehow belie these disclaimers, and make the youngsters look like a watered-down version of the real thing.

Most policies of the New Frontier, for instance, are shaped by current and former members of Americans for Democratic Action. Their views on just about every major issue, domestic or foreign, go at least as far as the Young Democrats went, and in many cases further.

Of the 50 current and former members of ADA brought into government by Kennedy, many hold the highest policymaking and advisory posts and have pressed consistently for ADA programs.

Among these are Adlai Stevenson, our U.N. Ambassador, who has denied membership, but who has been identified by the old-time ADAers as a founder of the organization; Arthur Goldberg, formerly Kennedy's Secretary of Labor and now a Justice of the Supreme Court; Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; Theodore C. Sorenson, special counsel to and speechwriter for the President; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a former chairman of ADA who now is J.F.K.'s administrative assistant, and Assistant Secretary of State Chester Bowles.

Other ADAers are key New Frontier spokesmen in the Senate, the House, in industry, business, organized labor, civic and fraternal organizations and just about every field imaginable. That they influence the policies of and speak for the Kennedy administration is undenied.

There also is the question of the now infamous collection of essays, "The Liberal Papers," compiled under the guidance of present and former liberal Democrats in the House and which has been labeled by Republican National Chairman William E. Miller as "going beyond the Communist line."

The Kennedy administration publicly has stated that the views expressed in the work are "contrary" to its own, but nevertheless has pressed forward on many programs it recommends.

The elder Democrats of the West in particular would do well to refer to a typical example of their own views—the platform of the Washington State Democratic Party adopted at Bellingham, Wash., June 23, 1962—and compare it with the document of the younger westerners. A delegate to the Washington Convention which adopted it stalked out, saying:

"What they have here is the Communist Manifesto. If I had stayed and voted with them, I would have been excommunicated from my church."

In any discussion of extremism—of the left or of the right—these would be points for all good Democrats to keep in mind.

President Again Proves His Failure To Understand Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 28, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that President Kennedy evidently has no understanding of communism or Communist motives. He insists on trying to make deals with Khrushchev in spite of the fact that on every occasion the Soviets turn the deal against us.

The ink was not even dry on the test ban treaty before we were witnessing new displays of arrogance by Khrushchev, more sabre rattling, and warnings that the Communist goal of world domination had not changed.

In the following column by Dr. Robert Morris, he reminds us that "Our Fears Are Realized" in the actions of the Soviets since the test ban treaty was signed.

OUR FEARS ARE REALIZED

(By Robert Morris)

During the test ban treaty hearings in the Senate, the Joint Chiefs of Staff reconciled the treaty with national security only if certain specific safeguards would be implemented. This was the express condition agreed upon by virtually everyone involved in the hearings.

Accordingly, the President wrote a strong letter of assurance to the Senate leaders of both parties, pledging that the safeguards would be met. With this guarantee the Senate ratified. Among the safeguards were "aggressive and comprehensive testing underground to the limit of the treaty," standby apparatus to test in the atmosphere if necessary, and an extensive monitoring system.

All the witnesses, and particularly Adm. Arleigh Burke, agreed that these would be costly precautions, but necessary and worthwhile.

Several weeks have now passed. Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, one of the best informed men on Capitol Hill on nuclear affairs, wrote recently to the President, to inquire about the promised safeguards. To his astonishment he received a reply from Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, saying that the administration is trying to get authorization to spend $18 million on safeguards. Congressman HOSMER and others had estimated that proper safeguards would cost at least a billion dollars.

When the hearings were in progress, we were told by Secretary McNamara, and by the President as well, that we were not developing an antimissile missile because this ultimate weapon was impossible to achieve. This assertion was received with skepticism by Dr. Teller and others who testified to their belief that the Soviets possessed the knowledge to construct such a weapon. The fact is that there were actually intelligence reports that the Soviets had already deployed an antimissile missile at Leningrad and intercepted missiles in flight with such a device.

Only last week in a Moscow military parade, Khrushchev wheeled out for public view what he represented was an antimissile missile. I do not suggest that we take Khrushchev's word for it. But, at the same time, we should not be trusting him to keep his word on the test ban treaty as we seem to be doing. The flaunting of the Soviet weapon dramatically points up the enormity of the risk we are taking by not developing our own antimissile missile with all possible haste.

In contrast, we announced last week that we were dismantling two more B-47 bases in England. This phasing out of our manned-bomber deterrent could prove to be crucial if the Soviets have, indeed, been successful in producing antimissile missiles.

In any event, the failure to implement the promised safeguards on testing and detecting, the refusal to proceed with an antimissile missile, and the gradual abandonment of our bomber deterrent, constitute horrendous risks with our security and our survival as a free nation.

A Salute to Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BEERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the stouthearted and liberty-seeking people of Latvia have never been numerous and powerful enough to defend their freedom, their most cherished prize, in their homeland in the Baltics. Most of their modern history has taken an uneven course, and during most of that time they have been subjected to the hated regimes of alien overlords. Since the late 18th century their country had been part of the sprawling czarist empire of Russia. And when that decrepit regime was overthrown in 1917, Latvians felt free, asserted their long-dreamed-of freedom, and proclaimed their national independence on November 18 of 1918.

Since that memorable day Latvians enjoyed freedom for a time before misery and suffering under alien rule again became their lot. During the interwar years they worked diligently and proudly, and succeeded in making their homeland a relatively safe haven for themselves. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, reconstituted their democratic institutions, and lived happily under their democratic government.

But this relatively short interlude did not last long. The rise of aggressive dictatorship in Germany in the late 1930's, plus the aggressive designs of Stalin on Latvia, threatened Latvia independence. Early in the last war Stalin carried out his evil plan. The Red Army overran and occupied Latvia in mid-1940; then it was annexed to the Soviet Union as one of its constituent Soviet Socialist republics. Thus ended Latvian independence, and then began the unhappy period in the contemporary history of the Latvian people.

Since the end of the last war the Kremlin has strengthened its firm hold over Latvia, and the country has become a mere province of the Soviet Union. Latvians have no freedom, and of course democracy is foreign to the Communist system of government under which they live. They are not masters of their fate, for they suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny.

On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we wish and hope that they will soon attain their national goal, their freedom, and then live happily in their historic homeland.

Rulers of Russia Are Never Honest—Latvia a Classic Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 8, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 45th anniversary of the Latvian Declaration of Independence.

This is a day of great significance to all people of Latvian origin living in the free world as well as those in the homeland. Its greatest significance lies in the fact that the people of Latvia were able to throw off the chains of Russian imperialism 45 years ago and to establish their national independence. This event marks a fullfilment of the long held hopes and aspirations of the Latvian people. Those hopes and aspirations of the Latvian people were satisfied from 1918 until 1939, when the Latvian nation blossomed into full sovereign and respected statehood. During that period the United States enjoyed the most cordial relations with the Latvian nation.

In 1939 Imperial Russia in a deal with Adolph Hitler, put an end to Latvian national independence. This deal was worked out in the Russian-Nazi pact of mutual assistance which triggered off World War II. Imperial Russia was given the right by conquest or such other means as it determined to bring Latvian national independence to an end. Stalin did not delay in exercising his end of this deal and Latvia was soon forcibly and illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union, as a so-called constitutent republic.

It is worth noting in this regard that Red Russia entered into a treaty of peace with Latvia in 1920. Article II of that treaty provided the following Russian guarantee of Latvian national independence:

> By virtue of the principles proclaimed by the Federal Russian Socialist Republic of Soviets which established the right of self-determination for all nations, even to total secession from the empire with which they have been incorporated, and in view of the desire expressed by the Latvian people to lead an independent national existence, Russia unreservedly recognizes the independence, self-government, and sovereignty of the Latvian Republic and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights over the Latvian people and territory which formerly belonged to Russia.

The Federal Russian Socialist Republic of Soviets was the new name of the Russian nation, adopted by the Bolsheviks. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, full successor to the reconstructed Russian empire, did not come into being until 1923. Nevertheless the new Russian ruling class assumed full responsibility for the treaty entered into with Latvia. The brutal violation of that treaty of peace with Latvia by the new Russian ruling class stands as a classic example of what happens to any non-Russian nation entering into treaty relations or any other types of agreements with imperial Russia.

Time must not be allowed to obscure this classic example of Russian behavior in the field of international relations. Observance of this 45th anniversary of Latvian national independence, therefore, serves as a proper occasion to renew this memory in the hope that our present dealings with imperial Russia will be governed accordingly.

Further, this occasion provides thinking Americans with the opportunity to renew our faith in the determination that Latvia shall regain its national independence in the foreseeable future.

Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, this day, November 18, marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia. Between 1918 and 1940, Latvia became a bright symbol for the great majority of Americans, who believe in freedom for all nations, large or small. It was a great tragedy when the culture, history, and genius of Latvia were crushed by the second Soviet Russian invasion in 1940. Latvians must be proud of the gains made by their country in the short span of 22 years of independence. Latvia would today furnish a model of progress rather than of tyranny had Russia offered a smile in place of a fist.

Latvia must regain her independence. Her people have the sympathies of all democratic Americans.

Foreign Aid: A Case To Be Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in vast areas of the world today more than half the children of primary school age are not in school. More than half the families live in substandard dwellings. More than half the people live on less than $100 a year, and two out of every three adults are illiterate.

Foreign aid may not be a particularly popular political subject to defend today, but aside from our own economic self-interest—it provides more than half a million jobs, it finances a rising share of exports—foreign aid is a defense against the economic and social chaos which these conditions can produce; against the Communist attack which would demand our far more costly attention.

As the New York Times stated in its excellent editorial of November 11:

> Congress has an obligation to ferret out mistakes and waste, and to seek improvement in the program.

But as the editorial continues:

> There is too much poverty in the world, too much need for economic development, too much continuing danger of Communist inroads to permit any basic U.S. retreat from its commitments in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this thoughtful article to our colleagues' attention:

BATTLE OVER FOREIGN AID

The administration is fighting hard to keep the foreign aid program from being chopped to bits by Congress. President Kennedy, Secretaries Rusk and McNamara and General Clay, who headed a special study group on foreign aid, have joined to combat a growing opposition to the program born of irritation, frustration and politics.

At issue are both the size and character of our help to other nations. President Kennedy originally requested $4.5 billion, but the Senate has already cut this to $3.7 billion and the House to $3.5 billion. And that is only the authorization; the real meat-ax slashes can be expected in the actual appropriations.

Our aid program is not a peculiarly American enterprise. It is part of a common undertaking on which all the economically developed nations of the free world have embarked as essential for their own survival. The Western nations and Japan spent $9.14 billion on such aid in 1961, of which the United States contributed about half.

At the cost of substantially less than 1 percent of our gross national product, we are helping maintain 3½ million allied soldiers around the Communist periphery to back up our own million soldiers abroad. This added defense for freedom is obtained

at one-tenth the cost of a comparable American force.

Furthermore, the aid program, so often assailed as a give-away, is a prop under our own prosperity. As President Kennedy points out, 90 percent of the aid dollars come home to buy American goods and services. Thus, while a $1 billion cut in aid might save $100 million in our balance of payments, it would cost us $900 million in exports. That is not economy; it is self-punishment.

At issue also is the growing congressional bent for removing flexibility from our foreign policy by clamping restrictions on its aid grants. Congress has the power of the purse, but the conduct of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President. Any attempt by Congress, which moves in annual cycles, to freeze our approach to specific situations when power relationships inside the Communist bloc are so unpredictable is perilous folly. The Senate gave some recognition to this obvious truth when it restored Presidential authority to continue most-favored-nation treatment in our trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, but other prohibitions remain.

Congress has an obligation to ferret out mistakes and waste, and to seek improvements in the program. But there is too much poverty in the world, too much need for economic development, too much continuing danger of Communist inroads to permit any basic U.S. retreat from its commitments in this field.

It's Ripe for Cutting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Capital Journal of November 9, 1963, entitled "It's Ripe for Cutting."

IT'S RIPE FOR CUTTING

Residents of this area know something about the Federal Government's accelerated public works program.

Several months ago, some Federal official somewhere proclaimed that the Marion-Polk County area had achieved a 6-percent unemployment rate, making it eligible to apply for Federal grants on various public projects. The Oregon Department of Employment couldn't understand how this area could be so considered, since the unemployment rate wasn't that high and was dropping. But that didn't deter the Federal men.

As a result, the city and the two counties fell all over themselves requesting Federal help on a long list of local projects, many of which were half-planned at best. The same thing has happened all over the Nation, with the result that there are more outstretched palms than dollars to fill them.

That shouldn't surprise anyone, of course. Something for nothing isn't hard to sell.

Anyway, Congress now faces the problem of whether or not to continue this accelerated public works program.

Congress provided $400 million in 1962 and another $450 million last May. Originally, there were about 100 of these so-called "depressed areas." Now there are about 1,000 and the list seems to grow. And so the administration, in order to meet this demand for free dollars, wants Congress to provide another $850 million.

President Kennedy, in his recent plea for tax reductions, pledged his administration to "a course of true fiscal responsibility, leading to a balanced budget." He also endorsed a statement in this tax bill which "recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending." And so the chairman of the House subcommittee considering this request for funds has decided not to embarrass the administration by asking its officials to testify on this bill.

Nevertheless, it's obvious where the administration stands.

We believe Congress ought to either abolish the accelerated public works program or greatly restrict eligibility.

Perhaps the Federal Government might pump some of this kind of money into a few truly depressed areas. But it's ridiculous to offer handouts to every community in the land that can approach the 6 percent unemployment level. Many of these 1,000 eligible communities are quite prosperous; Salem's average family income level, for instance, is well above the national average.

We believe the accelerated public works program is the ripest in all the Federal Government for abolishment. But maybe that's simply because we have seen its deficiencies so amply demonstrated on the local level.

Antitrust Policies Relating to Export Trade—An Address by Assistant Attorney General William H. Orrick, Jr., Department of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable William H. Orrick, Jr., Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Antitrust Division, U.S. Department of Justice, delivered an informative address regarding the antitrust policies of his Division.

In his talk he made pointed reference to the need for the businessmen of this country to increase their export sales and commented that although he did not know of a single instance in which the antitrust laws have hindered export trade, he urged any businessman who thinks he has such a problem to present the facts to the Antitrust Division under the Division's clearance procedures.

Hearings held recently by the House Small Business Committee served to demonstrate that foreign markets provide a genuine opportunity for the growth and expansion of the thousands of small business manufacturers and distributors doing business in all parts of our country.

The address of Mr. Orrick, I believe, merits consideration, not only by these small business concerns, but also by Members of the Congress and, for that reason, I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

In a speech which Mr. Crawford H. Greenewalt gave last August before the Antitrust Section of the American Bar Association, he voiced the business community's concern regarding certain of the operations of the Antitrust Division. Mr. Greenewalt suggested that the challenges of the 1960's require a continuing dialog between the business community and those charged with enforcing the antitrust laws. With this I agree, and having reflected upon Mr. Greenewalt's comments, I am delighted to have this opportunity to continue a dialog which was initiated by so highly respected a representative of the business world.

He said, in essence, that the Antitrust Division had fallen behind the times and was applying 19th century concepts to the very different competitive conditions of 1963. The Wall Street Journal's editorial writers quickly picked this up, but I think it fair to assume that Mr. Greenewalt said these things not so much in a spirit of criticism of the past but rather to indicate the challenge for the future.

I propose this morning to tell you how the Antitrust Division is, in fact, gearing its enforcement program to meet the challenges of the 1960's, and to present to the business community and this group in particular a challenge of our own.

But first I wish to say, as emphatically as I can, that the Attorney General and the Antitrust Division applaud Mr. Greenewalt's formulation of the great purposes of the laws we administer.

He said: "The purpose of the law, I take it, is to referee the competitive scene in such a way as to achieve a meaningful democracy, a high level of economic prosperity and an ethical standard offensive to no man's conscience." "We can all agree," he continued, "that these goals may be reached most directly through unimpeded access to the market place, through a competitive economy unencumbered by artificial restraints." Compare this formulation with that of the Supreme Court in the Northern Pacific case: "The Sherman Act," the Court said, "was designed to be a comprehensive charter of economic liberties aimed at preserving free and unfettered competition as the rule of trade. It rests on the premise that the unrestrained interaction of competitive forces will yield the best allocation of our economic resources, the lowest prices, the highest quality and the greatest material progress, while at the same time providing an environment conductive to the preservation of our democratic political and social institutions." [1]

This accord in views finds its parallel in the views of Presidents Kennedy and Hoover on the same subject.

President Kennedy has recently said: "The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decisionmaker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed. It thus is a vital underpinning of our democratic system." [2]

And President Hoover writes in his memoirs:

"In my pholosophy the antitrust acts had emancipated and protected the American people (the commonman, if you will) from the vicious growth of laissez faire economics inherited from Europe. By maintaining competition, our industries were forced into channels of constantly improving methods and plants and constantly lowering prices with the increasing consumption of goods.

"European industry with its uncontrolled laissez faire had grown into a maze of cartels, trusts, and trade restraints, the results of which were to stagnate improvements in favor of price and distribution controls."

Mr. Greenewalt suggested in Chicago that no responsible businessman could doubt that vigorous enforcement of these 19th century laws serves valid public policy aims in 1963. I frankly do not see how it could be other-

Footnotes at end of speech.

wise. Despite all the changes in technology and methods of doing business, the basic alternatives our people have concerning how and for what purposes America's great productive resources are to be allocated are exactly the same today as they were in 1890: We shall either have such decisions made deliberately by men—the commissar system—or we shall have them made by the autonomous forces of the marketplace—the competitive free enterprise system. This country has always believed that only the latter system is consistent with our political democracy. The judgment in 1890, supported by an overwhelming majority of both political parties, was that an antitrust law was necessary to insure the survival of that system against the encroachments of private market controls which, it was recognized, would inevitably lead to public market controls. Now, as then, our choices for the economy are competition or socialism.

This deep-seated belief of a direct connection between competition in the marketplace and all our other freedoms is unique in this country. It is as distinctly American as baseball and hotdogs. Antitrust legislation was part of the policy platforms of both political parties in 1888 and the final vote in the House in 1890 on the conference report which became the Sherman Act was 242 in favor of the bill, none opposed, with 85 not voting.[3] Since that date the party platforms of both parties have contained planks supporting antitrust.

I am deeply conscious of and dedicated to this great tradition. I do not for a moment believe that my task as head of the Antitrust Division is to regulate, much less to manage, business. As I conceive it, my job is the very opposite—to keep business and the economy free.

Now Mr. Greenewalt said in Chicago that in attempting to do this important job the Division has not caught up with modern business conditions. This, I deny—but I cannot help taking this opportunity to observe that even were that criticism justified, we would be in pretty good company, for there is evidence that industry itself is sometimes left behind by its own technological changes. For example, one proud achievement of modern technology is one machine talking to another machine. Perhaps you recently read, however, of the English power station so fully automated that it could, in the event of trouble, put a prerecorded telephone message through to the home of its chief engineer. On the day when trouble did arrive, automation has also arrived at the local telephone company. The power station's prerecorded message: "There is trouble in the third transformer" played over and over again to a telephone company tape recorder which responded over and over again, "The number you have called has been changed. Please consult the operator."

I think it is fair to say that Mr. Greenewalt, in saying that the Division was behind the times, had particularly in mind its approach to the market issue. We have failed, he said, to recognize the new "supplantive" or "functional" competition of physically distinct products from different industries—cellophane versus tinfoil, for example. And the Wall Street Journal's editorial comment on this aspect of his speech said:

"Almost every business faces competition from outside its own field; among numerous examples, steel against aluminum and both against plastics * * *. Yet the Government clings to its narrow construction of the competitive process."[4]

I must point out, however, that our challenge to the merger of the Continental Can and Hazel-Atlas Glass Cos.,[5] filed in 1956 and now pending on appeal to the Supreme Court, was based precisely on the contention that substantial interindustry competition exists between glass containers and metal cans. Indeed it was this case which led one unkind critic to accuse us of using an "accordion" concept of the market, which we expand or contract to fit our litigation needs rather than the economic realities.

It is most important that the continuing dialog between business and the Antitrust Division not break down due to a misunderstanding of our position on this point. We are here dealing with an issue of great subtlety, partly legal, partly economic. The market problem has been central to practically every significant merger case filed in recent years. No less than three cases on appeal to the Supreme Court this coming term involve that issue.[6] This problem has also been critical in monopoly cases under section 2 of the Sherman Act.

In the Cellophane case,[7] to which Mr. Greenewalt referred in his Chicago speech (for quite understandable reasons) the dispute between the parties was not based on any failure on the part of the Division to recognize that other products offered competition to cellophane. The issue rather was whether that competition was sufficiently pervasive as a matter of fact to prevent price control over cellophane.

I suggest to you that, properly viewed, the Division's litigation posture in monopoly and merger cases has not rested on any supported blindness to new forms of competition, but rather upon the statutory necessity to protect competition in broad markets as well as in narrow markets, wherever it, in fact, exists.

You and I would agree, I'm sure, that as a matter of economic reality there is no such thing as the market for most products. A new product of service may be introduced which gives the old a real run for its money, but this does not affect all customers equally. For example, a savings and loan association may offer competition to the real estate department of a commercial bank, but that is of no practical consequence to the local businessman dependent upon his commercial bank for short-term unsecured loans. Again, plastic unquestionably offers significant competition to glass for a broad range of uses, so that we should be concerned about the elimination of competition by merger between plastic and glass producers, but that competition has no significance to a distiller required by law to pack in glass. On the other hand, a merger which eliminated competition between the distiller's glass container suppliers might well deprive him of a substantial competitive alternative. Thus there are likely to be in any one case many markets and submarkets within larger markets.

If the antitrust laws are to do their job in the 1960's, we believe that the market must be delineated in such a way that the end result of our action will prevent restraints on commercially meaningful competitive choices. This, I take it, is the significance of the mandate given us by the Congress and the Supreme Court that the antimerger provisions of the Clayton Act are violated if the proscribed anticompetitive effect is visited upon any line of commerce in any section of the country.

It is important to note that the antitrust laws which I am sworn to enforce do not permit me to wink at anticompetitive effects in one market because these bad effects may in some sense be canceled out by good effects in some other market. Because more is at stake than simply the cause of industrial efficiency, Congress deliberately placed that duty on the Attorney General and the courts, fully recognizing the social costs that occasionally may be involved.

The Supreme Court's recent decision in the Philadelphia Bank case[8] is the latest judicial expression of this constant theme of our antitrust laws.

The Court said:

"We are clear, however, that a merger the effect of which 'may be substantially to lessen competition' is not saved because, on some ultimate reckoning of social or economic debits and credits, it may be deemed beneficial. A value choice of such magnitude is beyond the ordinary limits of judicial competence, and in any event has been made for us already, by Congress when it enacted the amended section 7. Congress determined to preserve our traditionally competitive economy. It therefore proscribed anticompetitive mergers, the benign and the malignant alike, fully aware, we must assume, that some price might have to be paid.[9]"

So much for meeting the criticism; now for meeting the challenge.

Mr. Greenewalt said in his Chicago speech: "It seems to me that everyone should agree that the mission of Government in the antitrust area is to administer the law in a way which will insure a vigorous, highly competitive economy. If that is indeed the mission," he continued, "it must inevitably embrace not solely the punishment of transgressors but more importantly the responsibility for determining at firsthand what a truly competitive system really comprises—in simple words, why the battle is being fought and what victory will really produce."

We have formed within the Antitrust Division a policy planning unit, composed of lawyers and economists, which is now engaged in examining these very questions. It is engaged in making an indepth industry-by-industry survey so that we may direct our efforts to those areas in which they are most needed, and so that these efforts may be better coordinated and more purposefully controlled.

The policy planning group includes a Foreign Commerce Section, through which we make a concentrated effort to keep abreast of competitive conditions in world markets. We are therefore well aware of the burgeoning new economic colossus across the Atlantic and of the possibilities for profound changes in competitive conditions and opportunities likely to be created by the European Common Market. I recently returned from a round of discussions in Europe with officials having responsibilities comparable with my own, and I am convinced that antitrust concepts ore bound to play an increasingly more vital role in that market.

One of the primary responsibilities of our Foreign Commerce Section in meeting the challenge of 1963 is to provide all the assistance we can to the Government-wide effort to expand exports. While I have yet to see a concrete instance in which the antitrust laws have hindered exports, I assure you that any businessman who thinks he has such a problem is most welcome to present the facts to us under our clearance procedure.

Our primary effort in meeting modern challenges is to learn all we can of the rapidly changing conditions under which business is actually conducted and to weigh carefully the significance of practices which could develop into full-scale clogs upon competition. We are avid readers of some 250 trade journals, from American Banker to Variety. We consult regularly with outside economists, law professors, and industry experts, both within and without the Government.

Despite these efforts on our part to meet the challenges of 1963, the nagging question always remains: Do we have the latest, the best information? Mr. Greenewalt suggested in Chicago that the Division's task "is not solely for lawyers," since it requires knowledge of the "facts of the business scene" and "the continually changing character of the business arena within which the law is to be enforced." He also suggested that

Footnotes at end of speech.

both the Antitrust Division and the business community should recognize that they have "precisely similar interests in the maintenance of a competitive economy" and should, therefore, "share their problems to the end that enforcement efforts can be directed effectively, not blindly."

And so I come to the challenge we would present to the business community and to this group in particular that you provide the Antitrust Division with the type of information Mr. Greenewalt says the Division needs in order to do its work effectively. I suggest that nothing could better advance the mutual interest we have in the preservation of a free competitive economy, of which Mr. Greenewalt spoke so eloquently.

As you can well imagine, we now get a good deal of free advice on what actions we should not take. I hope that you will adopt a more affirmative approach, and I urgently commit this proposal for your consideration.

Finally, I cannot leave this subject of the antitrust laws in 1963 without some reference to one particular point expressed by Mr. Greenewalt. He said, "I would question the practice of burdening the courts with the kind of theoretical trial balloon unrelated to economic reality that we observe so frequently in the antitrust field. In a way it seems to me that this practice parallels the attitude sometimes attributed to the advertising profession of 'running it up the flagpole to see who salutes.'"

There is here the hint of possible conflict with Mr. Greenewalt's challenge that we keep pace with changing competitive conditions, which may of course require the fashioning of new legal concepts. The applicability of section 7 of the Clayton Act to vertical acquisitions, verified in the *Du Pont-GM* case,[10] and the applicability of the antitrust laws to the banking industry, verified in the recent Philadelphia case[11] might be thought to be within Mr. Greenewalt's conception of "trial balloon" cases. The same might be said of our initial challenge to joint ventures in the Penn-Olin case[12] and our first attack on an interindustry merger in the Continental Can-Hazel Atlas cases.[13] We believe, however, that these cases represent the kind of creative rethinking of old concepts which the Division requires in order to keep abreast of modern business conditions.

I have indeed given a high priority within the Division to development of new legal weapons with which to challenge oligopolistic concentration and other modern restrictions on competitive opportunities. This will be done, however, with great care and deliberation.

Should you accept our challenge, I have every confidence that those participating would find the Division staff thoughtful, thoroughly responsible people. They would also find that proposed cases and new ideas must withstand a carefully constructed system of review and internal checks and balance.

We have been and undoubtedly will continue to be sometimes right and sometimes wrong in particular cases. But there surely can be no quarrel with the goal of all our cases, win, or lose—namely, to enforce what Mr. Chief Justice Hughes called a "charter of freedom"[14] upon which, I believe, all our liberties depend.

---

[1] *Northern Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States*, 356 U.S. 1, 14.

[2] Address, White House Conference of Business Editors, and Publishers, Sept. 26, 1962, quoted in 9 N.Y. Law Forum 1–2.

[3] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6314.

[4] Wall Street Journal, Aug. 15, 1963, p. 8.

[5] *U.S.* v. *Continental Can Co.*, 217 F. Supp. 761 (S.D. N.Y. 1963).

[6] *U.S.* v. *Continental Can Co.*, 217 F. Supp. 761 (S.D.N.Y. 1963); *U.S.* v. *Aluminum Co. of America*, 214 F. Supp. 110 (N.D.N.Y. 1963), prob. juris. noted, Oct. 14, 1963; *U.S.* v. *First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington*, 208 F. Supp. 457 (E.D. Ky. 1962), prob. juris. noted, 374 U.S. 824.

[7] *U.S.* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 351 U.S. 377.

[8] *U.S.* v. *Philadelphia Nat. Bank*, 374 U.S. 323.

[9] 374 U.S. at 371.

[10] *U.S.* v. *E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 353 U.S. 586.

[11] *U.S.* v. *Philadephia National Bank*, 374 U.S. 321.

[12] *U.S.* v. *Penn-Olin Chemical Co.*, 217 F. Supp. 110 (D. Del. 1963).

[13] *U.S.* v. *Continental Can Co.*, 217 F. Supp. 761 (S.D.N.Y. 1963).

[14] *Appalachian Coals* v. *U.S.*, 288 U.S. 344, 359.

International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8864) to carry out obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to point out that the amendment relates to prices as a result of the International Coffee Agreement. This bears on the point that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was trying to bring out that the Committee on Ways and Means did not—and I think this is proper criticism—avail itself of the knowledgeable people in the coffee field in an effort to gain information as to what these price levels might be.

Now, in the President's letter which is set out on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report, the President refers to putting a floor under these prices at the general level prevailing in 1962. Now, we know what those are. We also have a pretty good idea of how much coffee is in stock in the warehouses. It is considerable. It is certainly within our judgment capabilities to estimate prices in 1963. If this coffee agreement is to do what the President says he wants to do, to try to stabilize prices, and to some degree I suspect it would because it is putting a control over supply, then indeed the President has some judgment or can exercise some judgment with intelligence as to whether the International Coffee Agreement would or would not result in increased coffee prices to the United States consumer, relating to his letter and the prevailing prices in 1962.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is good discipline to put in the act and I hope that we will adopt it and in a small way we will have insured some protection to the consumer.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri very much.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that I am not by this amendment seeking to get the President to certify that coffee prices themselves will not go up. They certainly will fluctuate even under the most carefully controlled market.

What I am asking for is that we certify that the effect of this agreement will not result in higher prices to American consumers. There is an important distinction here and I do not believe it is an unreasonable judgment for us to expect the President to make in advance when he seeks the appropriation to carry out this authorization.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

A Sense of Obligation Concerning a Great National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the most vexing problem of how to finance, in the best public interest, the enormous campaign election costs of candidates and political parties, is one of increasing concern, not only to the President and the Congress, but also to all Americans desiring to preserve our traditional form of truly representative government.

A most timely and thought-provoking editorial on this vitally important subject appeared in the June 1963 issue of the General Electric Community and Government Relations Bulletin. This editorial, aptly titled "A Sense of Obligation," is, I think, well worth reading, no matter what our individual views may be, and I am pleased to bring it to the attention of the Members. The editorial follows:

A SENSE OF OBLIGATION

On April 30, President Kennedy submitted legislation to Congress designed to stimulate political contributions by giving certain tax advantages to the contributor.

The President's action again points up perhaps the most fundamental problem plaguing our political process. That problem, in a nutshell, is money.

The result is a disquieting situation that commands the urgent personal concern of General Electric managers and all responsible citizens.

Money represents a problem for three reasons: the need for it is big and getting bigger; there is not enough of it now; and what there is comes from too few sources.

Here are some telling facts:

In 1960 both major political parties spent a whopping $175 million for all purposes at all levels of political activity. This represents an increase of $35 million since 1952, or some 30 percent.

Both major parties spent a combined total of $20 million at the national level alone in

1960, almost double 1952. They ended the year with a combined $4.6 million deficit.

In 1960 almost two-thirds of all the money received by the two major parties came from contributors who gave $500 or more.

In 1960 Dr. George Gallup, of public opinion fame, found that only 9 percent of the American people contributed money to a political candidate or party. Asked how they felt about making a political contribution, 53 percent indicated no willingness at all to give; another 12 percent were undecided.

The result: inadequately financed election campaigns deprive the electorate of a full exposure to all candidates; political parties, indispensable instruments of a democratic system, find it increasingly difficult to operate on an effective, year-round basis; the truly representative nature of the entire political process is jeopardized.

The problems of political financing became so vexing in 1960 that President Kennedy appointed a 10-man Commission to study campaign costs and recommend possible solutions. Says the Commission's report, in part:

"A chronic difficulty * * * has been the lurking suspicion that contributing to political parties is somehow a shoddy business."

"Given the erratic flow of funds * * * individuals and organizations providing substantial gifts * * * can threaten to put a candidate in moral hock."

To which President Kennedy added this equally succinct observation:

"It is not healthy for our democratic process—or for the ethical standards of government—to keep our candidates in the (present) condition of dependence."

What can be done?

The President's Commission made 12 distinct recommendations and the proposed legislation embodies many of them: a deduction or tax credit for contributions, revised and broadened reporting requirements, creation of a Registry of Election Finance in the Comptroller General's office.

Passage of this legislation should be encouraged. It failed to receive much support during the 87th Congress. Its enactment would be a positive step ahead—albeit the results might be mimimal compared to the size of the problem.

Beyond this, there is a far more productive solution. The Commission puts it this way: it "hopes the American people will come to regard political contributions to parties with the same sense of obligation they display toward contributions to educational and charitable institutions."

Establishing such a sense of obligation will not be easy. For most Americans fall into one of two sorts when it comes to political contributions:

There are, indeed, those who think it is almost illegal to give money for political purposes. Or if not illegal, immoral.

And there are the others—by far the majority—who have no legal or moral reservations about contributing but who hide behind the "politics is dirty" alibi or who honestly fail to recognize any personal responsibility in the matter.

These people will have to be reached.

A good place to start is with the average American businessman. He, too, has demonstrated a remarkable naivete about the importance of political contributions. In fact, he has been extremely passive about engaging in political activity of any sort—more passive, sociologists say, than most other Americans.

Strangely, this naivete and passiveness totally contradicts the responsible sophistication that is so characteristic of business leaders in other areas of civic enterprise.

To be sure, businessmen have talked about the need for greater political participation on their part—but not much has really happened. For one thing, some of the grassroots kind of political work—polling the precinct, registering new voters, and the like—is not particularly appealing activity to the businessman, nor is it usually convenient, from a time standpoint, for him to engage in it.

On the other hand, political fundraising is a most effective kind of practical political participation. And businessmen have all the capabilities for doing it well.

Last year, for example, the American people gave more than $8 billion to their favorite charities. Businessmen took the lead in giving and getting this money.

It is time they do the same for the political party and candidate of their choice.

At stake is more than money. At stake is the proper functioning of our representative government. Our democratic process is built on voluntary participation by the greatest number of people. This, however, can be the source of its greatest strength or its greatest weakness.

Business leaders and the American people cannot let it continue to be a weakness.

Baltic States Robbed of Their Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago on November 18, 1918, the Latvians celebrated their independence day. Free Latvia was not created at the Paris Peace Conference or by the Treaty of Versailles. Instead, the people of Latvia fought for their independence on the battlefields against the Bolsheviks and German invaders at the close of World War I. Many lives were lost but independent statehood was acquired.

Free Latvia started life with an empty treasury, a destroyed industry, devastated fields and a scattered population. Despite these handicaps, Latvia prospered as a nation in the next 20 years and its people achieved a standard of living equal to the other free democratic Western European nations.

After enjoying 22 years of national independence and a constitutional government, Latvia and the other Baltic nations, Estonia and Lithuania, were again invaded by the Soviets and completely occupied by overwhelming Red forces in the beginning of World War II. The Baltic States have been robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of Soviet Russia.

By its aggressive acts, the Soviets have broken the peace and nonaggressive treaties that existed between Russia and the Baltic nations. Expropriation, exploitation, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedom, terror, mass murder and deportation are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. The brutal Russian rule of the subject people in Eastern Europe is evidence that the Communists are the proponents of colonialism and the opponents of the right of people to determine their own destiny.

The people in the Baltic States desire only to live in freedom and peace and are ready to sacrifice their lives to achieve these goals. I hope the day will come soon when these people and the others who live behind the Iron Curtain will again be restored to their freedom, their rights, and their dignities.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of November 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT—MORE MILLIONS FOR THE PEACE CORPS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The House approved, without a rollcall vote, H.R. 9009 to amend the Peace Corps Act and to up expenditures from $63,750,000 to $102 million, very nearly double. I protested the action and pointed out:

1. The bill was brought to the floor with insufficient information: (a) Only one public witness appeared at the committee hearings; (b) the report contained only boasting accounts of success by Peace Corps administrators; (c) no specific data was presented—the cost by country, by number of workers, projects involved, the success or failure of projects; (d) far too much of the taxpayers' money has been spent in publicizing and glamorizing the Peace Corps.

For my part the Peace Corps is unconstitutional, unnecessary, and self-defeating. We encourage, through it, Government planning, welfare statism, socialism, and godless materialism, all at the expense of capitalism and basic U.S. spiritual and moral values.

1. Government sponsored and directed Peace Corps projects are an unwarranted intrusion into areas properly the function of the private sector. It will eventually supplant the private help to peoples of other countries which has traditionally been the province of missionary and educational efforts.

2. Through the Peace Corps we extend aid to Socialist countries and to countries where people have no freedom but are subjugated by their government.

3. Its accomplishments are uncertain as it becomes a burgeoning bureaucracy.

PRICE FIXING WILL RAISE COST OF COFFEE

The International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963, implemented in the House this week, is going to force American housewives to pay more for coffee. The coffee treaty has already been ratified by the Senate, but the very fact that it was brought to the House for implementation indicates that there is an area for disagreement.

It is important to note that some of us warned last year during debate on the Trade Assistance Act of 1962 that it would lead to cartels, quotas, and limitations of trade.

The coffee agreement proves the point, and serves to point up the duplicity of the President's arguments for the trade bill.

Specific points show what the coffee agreement is as compared to what should be our goal.

1. The agreement is international control instead of competition in a freer import and export market.

2. It is trade by government agreement instead of the workings of the market forces of supply and demand.

3. It is price control and prevents price levels being reached through supply and demand, the only way to assure lowest prices.

4. It is rigid control of the market, not free trade.

Foreign aid became part of the debate when we were told we must have this agreement or increase foreign aid to the coffee countries. In an exchange with Congressman BECKER:

Mr. BECKER. The President said today he did not feel it wise to use the threat of withdrawing foreign aid too frequently. He said if threats of withdrawing foreign aid are used too often, there would be a great temptation on the part of the recipients to say 'Go ahead and cut it off.' Would the gentleman say this would be bad?"

Mr. ALGER. I think it would be very refreshing if we suggested the withdrawal and they took us up on it and reaffirmed their self-respect, which they must surely lose when they take our money."

We were told this bill would increase South American income and provide a higher standard of living. I say this can be accomplished only through capitalism, not through Government planning and control under a Socialist-Communist formula.

POLITICS—POLITICS—POLITICS

Taxpayers should ask themselves how much the President's political trip to Texas is going to cost them. They should question the new Postmaster General's urging of postal workers to get out and work for Kennedy's programs (clear violation of the Hatch Act). They should wonder at the freeze-out of some Members of Congress in getting White House tours for constituents. They should be angry over the use of taxpayers' money to propagandize them to win support for more New Frontier, welfare state, projects in every executive department.

In Memory of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we should take notice today of an important event which occurred 45 years ago—November 18, 1918. That is when Latvia declared her independence and became an outpost of Western democracy.

Latvian independence was only achieved by the sacrifice of Latvian lives and property. The first Latvian national leaders had to overcome invasions by both German and Russian empires to gain freedom. Then, between the final expulsion of the Bolshevik Russians in 1919 and their return in overwhelming force in 1940, Latvia showed the way to economic, social, and political progress. No one can say that Latvia did not do honor to her dead during those years of independence.

Latvia was one of the first European Countries to reform the currency and financial system. The land reform law of 1920 was a model of fair, democratic dispersal of feudal estates. Happily, it ended forever the supremacy of German—or Balt—nobles over the other 97 percent of the population. Latvian foreign policy was founded on friendly relations with Soviet Russia as well as the West, and trust in the League of Nations. By 1937, there were 5,717 industrial enterprises in Latvia. Seventy thousand farmers were enrolled in 2,300 educational societies. Hydroelectric stations were numerous. The national income increased 120 percent between 1927 and 1938 despite the depression. The Latvian National Bank's assets rose from 48.2 million lats, the local currency, in 1934, to 125.6 million lats in 1939. Latvian trade was almost completely with the West, especially Great Britain, Germany and the United States, carried in 103 Latvian ships. By 1939, Latvia was almost self-suporting, embarking on the voyage to exciting economic growth.

Soviet Russia ended all of this by invasion in 1940, in direct violation of all existing international law and morals, especially the 1920 treaties giving Latvia complete independence.

We should remember today the hopeful flowering of democracy in Latvia, and many other nations of Eastern Europe. We should remember the conviction of early Latvian leaders, and those who escaped to the West to continue the fight against oppression—many like Janis Cakste, Gustav Zemgals, Karlis Ulmanis, Janis Goldmanis, Karlis Zarins, former ambassador to Britain, and Alfred Bilmanis, former minister to the United States. We should remember the tyranny which destroyed their dreams. We extend our good wishes to their followers both in Latvia, and abroad, and share their hope for future independence for Latvia.

Private Plans Cut Health Tax Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, several years ago Congress passed the Kerr-Mills legislation providing a program of medical care for the aged. The Ways and Means Committee is presently considering another proposal, the King-Anderson bill, which would establish a medical care program under social security.

In the August issue of Nation's Business there appeared an article on the new developments of the private insurance plans for health care available to the aged. The article points out four important new developments:

First. The swift expansion of additional private health insurance plans.

Second. Growing public resistance to the administration's approach.

Third. Alternative legislative proposals for the diminishing number of aged who may need Government help.

Fourth. The steadily improving ability of the aged to meet their own needs.

The article goes on to point out the rapid development of the "pool-type" insurance plans, where with State authorization, private insurance companies pool their resources for these plans, such as the Connecticut 65 plan. As these programs take hold, insurance costs for the elderly will decrease, and thereby meet the needs of most of the population. The reduction of costs, coupled with legislative proposals of tax credits or deductions for insurance premiums paid, could readily cure all supposed inequities that the elderly suffer.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

PRIVATE PLANS CUT HEALTH TAX NEED: NEW DEVELOPMENTS DISPROVE SUPPORTERS' CLAIMS

Champions of a compulsory national program of health taxation are ignoring four important new developments:

The swift expansion of additional private health insurance plans.

Growing public resistance to the administration's approach.

Alternative legislative proposals for the diminishing number of the aged who may need Government help.

The steadily improving ability of the aged to meet their own needs.

The experience of one State deserves nationwide attention as the administration continues its campaign to provide a limited program for all under social security, regardless of need.

The New Jersey Legislature defeated a bill this spring that would have permitted private insurance companies to pool their financial resources and sales facilities, spread their risks, and achieve other economies through a large market to bring low-cost medical insurance to the elderly.

Democratic Governor Richard J. Hughes took a stand against the proposal, declaring: "Legislation of this type will be used to minimize the need for the President's program."

The sponsor of the bill, veteran legislator Alfred N. Beadleston, counters that the result meant: "To hell with the old folks in New Jersey."

Despite the attitude in New Jersey, such cooperative plans are making rapid headway in Connecticut, New York, and Massachusetts.

Legislatures in many other States have passed or considered the laws needed to participate. One authority says the west coast States may become the nucleus of a 13-State regional program, including Hawaii and Alaska, and that a small regional approach is being considered for North Carolina and Virginia.

He sees the pool-type program as supplementing the role of old age assistance and the Kerr-Mills legislation, which permits Federal-State aid to those who do not qualify for other forms of assistance but need help with medical bills.

COMPANIES EXPAND COVERAGE

As the program takes hold, say supporters, costs should be far less than plans of individual companies, which themselves have dramatically expanded programs available to the elderly.

Sources in the industry and Congress say these developments, emerging since full-scale hearings on the administration's bill, further strengthen the evidence that private insurance can meet the needs of most of the population within a few years.

Add some of the proposals for tax credits or deductions for payment of insurance premiums, grants in case of need, Government use of private plans—which get scant attention in the new administration—and the private approach could be applied to more of the hard core elderly who may need some Government help.

Yet Congress gets the argument that, since private industry doesn't claim it can provide for all the needy, Government must rush in with a plan to cover everyone.

Despite the propaganda, however, opinion polls run by several Congressmen this year showed constituents opposed to the administration's bill.

The thinking behind the barebones statistics is even more revealing, as reflected in this year's poll by Republican Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON of Ohio, whose district includes parts of Cleveland.

Her polls in 1960, 1961, and 1962, which simply asked whether each registered voter was in favor of medical care for the aged under social security, found as many as 60 percent replying "yes."

WHAT POLLS SHOW

But this year, for the first time, her questionnaire listed some alternative choices. The difference in replies was striking. Here they are, based on 16,000 replies:

Compulsory health care under social security, 37 percent for, 50 percent against; voluntary private health insurance with Federal tax credits of $150 a year toward premiums, 41 percent for, 32 percent against; no more Government in the health field, 32 percent for, 30 percent against.

Much of the remaining support for the administration's plan appears based on the misunderstanding that a worker would pay only $1 a month for health insurance covering his retirement years.

Although actual costs would be more than twice this amount, the plan would cover only 25 to 40 percent of real requirements.

Improvement in the financial position of the elderly is revealed in a report by the President's Council on Aging. It notes that in 1950 there were 12.3 million Americans age 65 and older with income totaling $15 billion; in 1961, there were 17 million elderly, an increase of 40 percent, with income of $35 billion, an increase of 130 percent.

Significantly, it adds: "In addition, the people who retire during the next 10 years will receive higher payments, on the average, than the benefits being paid today. * * * Private pensions will also play a bigger role in providing economic security for the people retiring during the next 10 years."

In addition, the report shows that the Federal Government contributes more than $17 billion in income maintenance and medical care payments, plus tax advantages, for the 17 million-plus citizens 65 and older, or an average of $1,000 apiece. Yet the pressure for Government to do more continues.

The Extinction of Wild Animals Will Rob Mankind of Priceless Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in remarks accompanying the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 107 on March 4—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3209–3212—I warned of the threat of extinction facing many species of wild animals throughout the world and suggested action to save them. A particularly sensitive expression of what the destruction of wild animals means to mankind appeared recently in an article by Fairfield Osborn in the New York Times magazine. Mr. Osborn, president of the New York Zoological Society, also describes the value of "survival centers" to preserve endangered species.

I include his article to inform the House more fully on the need for timely international action in wildlife conservation:

ANOTHER NOAH'S ARK—FOR NEW YORK—THE THREAT TO MANY SPECIES OF WILDLIFE CALLS FOR SURVIVAL CENTERS HERE AND ELSEWHERE

(By Fairfield Osborn)

Imagine that, not too long from now, newspaper headlines cried: "Earthquake Levels Taj Mahal"; "Louvre Razed by Fire"; "Explosions Obliterate Pyramids and Sphinx." Disasters of such magnitude would be staggering to the imagination and the entire civilized world would be horrified at the loss of priceless treasures. Though the possibility of such calamities is surely remote, if they did occur, man might well be able to reproduce in exact detail some of these lost masterpieces, and he would certainly continue to turn out new masterpieces, for as long as man survives, the arts of man will flourish.

Not so the arts of nature—the animals that adorn the earth. It has taken eons of evolution, not mere years, to create them, and their creation is far beyond the powers of man to duplicate. The destruction of an animal species is irrevocable. And today an increasing number of species seems headed for extinction within a few generations, unless man does something to protect them now. Fortunately, "Noah's Arks" are coming into being throughout the world, and one of the latest efforts is the new Wildlife Survival Center at the Bronx Zoo, created by the New York Zoological Society.

Man has always been fascinated by wild animals—those creatures of the sky, the earth, and the sea. In primitive times, this fascination stemmed from both fear and curiosity. The fear is easily understood: huge and powerful beasts, such as lions, tigers and elephants, threatened man's own existence. The curiosity is also understandable: there is an aura of mystery and magic about a reptile or a bird in flight. As a result, animals became symbols of the powers that man himself did not possess. The early Egyptians, for example, defied them, and had cults of "crocodile gods" and "serpent goddesses."

Some wild animals, such as the horse, the pig, and members of the bovine family, were domesticated and turned to man's use. However, most of the animals on the earth have remained "forever wild." It is these wild creatures that continue to be magnets to vast numbers of people, even though man has so little intimate contact with nature today. Zoos and their marine counterparts, aquariums, wherever they exist, have never been more popular. In the United States alone more than 60 million people visit zoos and aquariums annually. This same intense interest prevails throughout Europe and the other continents.

But the continued existence of many animals in their native habitats is acutely threatened. They may disappear from the earth within the next generation or two following the fatal trail of those already extinct.

The reasons for the extreme threat to wildlife in many lands are quite apparent. They stem from the rapidly growing pressure of ever-increasing human populations upon the natural areas where wildlife exists. On every continent the encroachments of growing numbers of people are despoiling the last remote forests and distant regions. And this impact of people upon wildlife will not diminsh. Unfortunately, it is bound to increase for many years to come.

There are other factors behind the plight of the animals. One is poaching. In Africa, for instance, rhinoceroses are killed merely for the presumed values of their horns, which are ground up and sold as an aphrodisiac. Antelopes are illegally slaughtered for dried meat, known as biltong. Even giraffes do not escape the hunter; they are killed not so much for their meat but—and it is hard to believe—for the tails which are sold as fly swatters. A more general problem arises from the demand of farmers in some regions that elephants and other foraging animals be destroyed because they frequently cause great damage to crops. In parts of Asia, man's war against animals also goes on, and everywhere there is a lack of well-managed wildlife reserves.

The obvious solution for the long-term protection of wildlife will come with the establishment of protected sanctuaries in critical regions in addition to the national parks and wildlife reserves that now exist. It is imperative that this be done before it is too late. Further, the governments of recently independent countries must become aware of and interested in the problem. And the people in these countries must come to realize the value of their natural heritages. There is, finally, a need in many countries for training schools in the techniques of wildlife management, for without such knowledge parks and reserves cannot be successfully administered.

The question is frequently asked, "What kinds of animals are now near extinction?" The list is long and conservationists have some differences of opinion about it, simply because there are not enough facts known. Any adequate compilation needs to include not only mammals but birds, reptiles and marine life. Some species are of no particular interest to the general public, such as the kouprey, a species of wild oxen in Cambodia, or the tuatara, a primitive reptile in New Zealand, although they are of interest to the zoologist.

But many kinds have a wide public interest, such as the imperiled Asian rhinoceros. No animal carries one back to the primordial period of evolution more than this vast armor-plated creature. Once quite common in zoos, it is now virtually unobtainable. The orangutan of tropical Asia is known around the world, but in the last couple of decades his numbers have been reduced to only 3,000, probably less than one-half the orangutan population 25 years ago. No one knows now whether the great panda of northern China will survive, and there is some concern about his fate. In North America, we are witnessing the end of two superb birds of flight—the condor of California and the whooping crane. Even the symbolic bird of America, the bald eagle, is becoming rare, and such great mammals as the polar bear and the walrus are vanishing, too.

In Africa, the mountain gorilla in the Congo and western Uganda, the white rhinoceros of southern Africa, that superb feline—the leopard—all face uncertain futures, the leopard perhaps because of the unhappy cult of leopard coats to adorn our "better dressed women." And, one sees the steadily diminishing number of elephants, giraffes, and the remarkably diverse members of the antelope family, from the greater kudu to the tiny dikdik. Severe pressures now threaten all of these interesting and beautiful creatures.

It is easy to place the blame for this situation on the people of the countries involved. Americans should avoid doing this because our own record, during our early years, was one of shameful destruction of wildlife of many kinds. Buffalo were slaughtered for their hides and birds for millinery purposes. Fortunately, we reformed just barely in time.

It was a revelation to me during two recent trips to east Africa, to find that many Africans had never seen a wild animal. They spend their lives in regions where no con-

centrations of wild animals exist. In the face of these circumstances, it is encouraging that the new African Governments of Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda, and others, have publicly announced their intentions to preserve their national parks as wildlife sanctuaries. They realize that the wildlife of their countries represents not only a unique possession but is of high tourist value, attracting thousands to parks to see the wild animals in them. This is becoming of ever larger economic importance. One can hope that other governments of recently independent countries will follow this example.

Speaking of examples, we of the Western World could do much about setting a few. It seems questionable whether the practice of "big game hunting" should be continued, at least in countries where it can be so easily misunderstood. The sportsman frequently plays an important part in wildlife preservation; certainly in our country this has proved to be the case in instances such as the programs to preserve and propagate waterfowl and other game birds.

But in this period of metamorphosis in Africa, the people may well fail to comprehend why big game hunting is allowed since they are being urged from all sides to protect animals. If I were an African poacher, I might say to myself, "Well, those people come over from the United States and Europe and do all the shooting they want and I get sent to jail for it."

Admittedly, the African's reasoning may be faulty, but one needs to think of the African viewpoint in questions such as this, as well as the viewpoint of the people in other countries who have not yet come to consider wildlife a national asset. Think what an impression it would make upon the Africans if safari hunting were done with the lens and not with the rifle.

Any program of wildlife preservation must necessarily be aimed at the maintenance and protection of wild animals in their natural habitats. This is the basic goal. At the same time there is a corollary service that the zoos in our country, as well as those abroad, can perform. This can be done through the establishment of what might be called wildlife survival centers within zoological parks, with breeding stocks of endangered species. This plan would at least insure the continued existence of a number of kinds of animals that may completely disappear in the wild state.

Past experience shows that this can be done. Sixty years ago there were only a few hundred buffalo left alive in the United States—the forlorn remnant of some 50 million that had been destroyed for the buffalo robe, meat, and hide trade. In 1907, 15 buffalo were selected from the Bronx Zoo's herd and shipped to the new Wichita Game Preserve in Oklahoma. They have flourished; now some 8,000 buffalo are safe within our national park system.

Another example is the Pére David deer of China, which is extinct in the wild but is at present proliferating in zoos and other reserves here and abroad.

As a result of the wildlife crisis, now so acute, the New York Zoological Society has established such a wildlife survival center in the Bronx Zoo. An extensive program of breeding groups of severely threatened species, including birds and reptiles as well as mammals, is now being initiated. This center will be located on about 100 acres in the eastern part of the zoological park. The land is both open and forested, so that it can be well adapted for various kinds of animals. The existing buildings, formerly occupied by the farm in the zoo, will be used as winter quarters for exotic species.

The center has already moved ahead with its plans to amass breeding stock of endangered animals from around the world. Orders have been placed for such species as the Mongolian Prjevalsky horse—there are 56 of these, the last of the wildest horse, left; the mountain zebra from the Cape Province in South Africa—there are a mere 82 of these small creatures; the pasang, Persian wild goats which have been hunted for meat throughout Asia Minor until they are now practically gone; Arabian oryxes from the area around Aden, which sportsmen have shot down to a mere handful of about 30 or 40; onagers, or Persian wild asses, which have been rare for about 200 years; the kouprey, the Cambodian wild ox, which has rarely been seen—in fact, the first one ever captured was taken from the northern Cambodian forest glades in 1936; and the Indian rhinoceros, which has been hunted down to a mere 700 left in the world.

In addition, there are animals and birds the center would like if it can get them, though hopes for immediate acquisition are somewhat dim. These include the Nubian ibex from Egypt, which has been hunted for trophies and food so avidly that it has been under protection since 1935; the kagu, a nearly flightless relative of the crane which lives only on the island of New Caledonia; the imperial pheasant, one of the rarest of all cranes—all living specimens in captivity are descended from a pair brought from the Annam jungles to France in 1924; and the great Indian bustard, another distant relative of the crane, noted for its spectacular courtship rites.

The center will also house a number of animals now within the confines of the zoo itself. Some have been almost impossible to breed in captivity and perhaps a change of environment will help.

They include lemurs and other lower primates, and the solenodon from Haiti. The center is also trying to get another cheetah to mate with the one it now has.

A number of birds and reptiles will be part of the project, too, including the rare Hawaiian goose, the Laysan teal, the giant Galapagos tortoise, the Madagascar radiated tortoise, and such exotic forms as the black caiman and the Chinese alligator.

A major objective of the plan is to acquaint the public with the fact that many species of wild animals are endangered, and to draw attention to the various steps needed to preserve them. A general plan is now being formulated within the Association of Zoological Parks whereby other leading zoos in this country and abroad may take cooperative action.

For my part, I do not find myself too pessimistic about the future and actually dare to feel some optimism because the urgency of the situation facing wildlife is now being widely and keenly realized. This crisis can be resolved assuming adequate steps are taken in time. If the heritage of eons of nature's handiwork is lost within the next generation, then we of today will be forced to say to posterity, "Sorry—we foresaw what was about to happen but we did not do anything about it."

A Word of Praise About the Fourth Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article by Lou Edman which appeared in the November 13, 1963, issue of the Windham County Observer and Putnam Patriot, published at Putnam, Conn., in my district. It is a word of praise and recognition of the harried life of all those associated with the press. It is an expression of appreciation which, in my estimation, should have been said long ago. The article is as follows:

(By Lou Edman)

There's an excellent publication called Editor & Publisher that comes out every week. The average person never sees it, and quite possibly has never heard of it. The latest circulation figure shows 20,400 subscribers, or about 1 subscriber for every 9,000 people in this country.

This magazine is published for a very select group of individuals, the members of the fourth estate; those engaged in the newspaper business, or game, as the amateurs call it. For the most part, the material that makes up the magazine consists of the story behind the story. It is written for the people who interpret the news, who write the daily headlines, who put out the newspapers that make the United States the best-informed Nation in the world.

Much of the material in Editor & Publisher should have far wider circulation than it has. For one thing, the average reader has no concept of what goes into the making of a story. Detailed accounts of the many difficulties encountered by reporters and photographers are commonplace in Editor & Publisher.

Reporters are subject to assault by irate citizens who resent what has been written about them, photographers have their cameras and heads broken by subjects who do not want to be photographed, and judges cite newsmen for not revealing their sources of information. Everyone who writes faces potential libel suits and the newspapers that print their output come under the same threat.

Despite all these hazards, and there are many more, most reporters have a pretty good sense of humor. They have to, if they want to survive. The finest example of the lighter side of the fourth estate appear each week in what I consider the best column in Editor & Publisher. This is called simply: "Ray Erwin's Column," full of contributions by the guys behind the news.

I'm not alone in my admiration for this weekly stint, because there have been a few occasions where Ray has used something of mine, or made a mention of me. Each time, letters were received by acquaintances from all over the country, and even Canada, to inform me of my sudden burst of fame. You may not read all of Editor & Publisher each week, but you don't skip Erwin.

To get back to my claim that much of the material should have wider circulation, it seems a shame so many items in Ray Erwin's column are read only by newsmen. I have a collection of gems clipped from it, most of them written expressly for the column and deserving of a wider audience. With some slight censorship, there is no reason why they couldn't appear in a family newspaper.

As an example, in the August 17 issue, Ray printed the following, sent in by Harold Winerip, of the Boston Traveler. It goes a long way in explaining what a reporter is. It might even make a reporter's job easier, if the public knew what he was up against:

"COUNT YOUR BLESSINGS

"It must be wonderful to be a newspaperman. He covers all sorts of exciting events: Rotary meetings, supermarket ribbon cuttings, incinerator hearings, lively obituaries.

"He gets free tickets to sparkling events, like wrestling matches, home show exhibits, plumbers' festivals, county fairs. He meets oodles of interesting people—undertakers,

aldermen, antilitter and prodog crusaders, public relations counsels.

"He has the thrill of facing deadlines, a stimulating challenge accompanied by ulcers, high blood pressure, and assorted nervous disorders. He enjoys the tingling experience of seeing his byline in print, and sometimes it's even spelled right.

"The pay is excellent. It's very common for a newsman to have a $20,000 annual family income, so long as he has two jobs on the side and his wife and two oldest sons work.

"He has the opportunity to express himself creatively with such sparkling phrases as "The zoning board of appeals will conduct a hearing tonight on a request for a variance from a national pickle company.'

"He can get plenty of free publicity for his friends, so long as there's space for a paragraph or two with a 14-point head. He's hep to all inside information in town such as who the assistant county clerk's girl friend is and who's getting the contract to build the new comfort station.

"He's free between editions to do anything he wants—work on advance stories, keep his files up to date, change his typewriter ribbon, sharpen his pencils, insert a ballpoint refill, call his wife and ask her what she wants him to pick up at the store."

The above, funny as it may sound, is closer to the truth than the Scoop Jones characters you see these days on TV. The next time you pick up the paper, look at what you are reading a bit closer. Winerip wasn't kidding entirely.

Questions for Tomorrow—A Redefinition of Cornell's Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 6, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, an unanticipated dividend of the congressional redistricting completed in New York last year, was the opportunity it has given me to represent the Cornell University community here in the House of Representatives.

As an alumnus of Cornell, it has been a real privilege to have thus renewed my ties with this great university, and to have been of some measure of service to it. On October 4, last, it was also my special privilege to attend the inauguration of James A. Perkins, Cornell's seventh president.

The inaugural ceremony, in accordance with President Perkins' wishes, was a simple but—for those of us who were there—a deeply moving affair. Its highlight, of course, was Dr. Perkins' inaugural address. In it, he posed his "Questions and concerns" about the future course of the educational institution he now heads—an institution which, in April 1965, will celebrate its centennial.

Those questions and concerns, while specifically posed for the consideration of the faculty, alumni, and students of Cornell, have an applicability to all institutions of higher learning in our Nation, and, in order that their meaning may be considered by a larger audience, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an account of the inaugural address, with excerpts therefrom, as reported in the October edition of Letter From Cornell:

In his inaugural address, Cornell President James A. Perkins called for an immediate reexamination of the university's teaching, research, and public service functions.

"The time has come to review the past, examine the present, and plan for the future," he said. "The dreams of our founders have become our traditions and we must review these traditions in order to dream again."

Noting the proximity of his inauguration to the university's centennial in April 1965, Mr. Perkins said: "The two events are naturally connected and I propose we bind them closely together. I propose that we look to the next 18 months as a period appropriate for the redefinition of our mission."

Turning to some of the issues which "must be brought into focus," Dr. Perkins said: "Future students and their instruction were the first consideration facing Cornell."

STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTION

"We want more young men and women of high intelligence and talent, motivated to prepare themselves for the large tasks they must assume. We want those who, during their years at Cornell, will be able to free themselves from any lingering biases of race, color, and creed; who will be devoted to their country, yet recognize the universality of the world's problems; who will come to realize that it is their own job to develop their own talents, whatever they may be; and who will be sensitive to the delicate balance between the requirements of individual self-fulfillment and the restraints required for adult membership in complex society."

Regarding instruction, Dr. Perkins said: "We must ask whether our attention to the excellence of our undergraduate program as a whole has slipped too far down our scale of priorities and has consequently endangered the balanced program that distinguishes a modern university from a research park.

"We must ask how to bring to the students we seek, and admit, the instructional resources which will fully challenge and fulfill their individual capabilities."

He said: "The university should also take a hard look at our current ideas about graduate students" and "the growing number of postdoctorates on our campus who, in some departments outnumber doctoral candidates."

The university must pay increasing attention to secondary level education in order to obtain the type of students it desires, he commented.

"We may wish to modify administrative and faculty arrangements to better represent the central interest of the university and the university faculty in the preparation of students," he said.

RESEARCH

Turning to Cornell's extensive research program, Dr. Perkins said: "That the large commitment to research is surely the distinguishing characteristic of the university.

"But it is precisely in the area of research that the modern university is in difficulty," he warned. "The scissors effect of a world of exploding knowledge and a world of insatiable demand is cutting into the university's capacity to maintain a balance between teaching and research.

"It is equally difficult to balance research programs with available funds and facilities. University communities must learn to face up to the necessity of choice among glittering opportunities. They must be prepared to select or even to develop a rationale for selection of research projects * * *.

"No one in his right mind can deplore the main thrust of this development," he continued. "It has added zest and range to university affairs and has brought in much fresh air. But the fresh air is fast becoming a gale and the pictures on the wall are beginning to rattle—sometimes our teeth, also."

Pointing out that striking a balance between teaching and research "will be a complicated and most delicate exercise," Dr. Perkins said "our best hope is for a better picture of the university's entire research program and the consequences of particular decisions.

"The growth of the research effort in this country shows little sign of flagging and Cornell commitments to research must and shall increase. To the availability of financial support, I propose to inject the new determinants of selectivity and choice."

PUBLIC SERVICE

President Perkins next considered Cornell's role in public service which he described as "the third dimension of the modern university."

"As complicated as it is, research may be an easier matter for the university to manage than the expanding demands upon it for public service," he asserted. "These requests are also frequently accompanied by large prospects for public funds. The university's concern for applied knowledge has been with us for decades but we have now moved a step beyond to the development of public programs and even to the machinery for their implementation * * *.

"With the world in the throes of industrial and social modernization, the demands on our universities for help are only beginning. We shall have to respond in increasing measure, at all levels of public organization, and in an increasing number of fields."

Pointing out that Cornell must consider how it can be of increased assistance to the city of Ithaca and New York State, Dr. Perkins also said "we are at the same time a national institution in the front ranks of the universities of this country and this presents obligations for service and influence at the national level. We shall be there and we shall be felt.

"Our public and private traditions and resources will give us the chance for unique contributions in an educational world where private universities are now receiving public funds and public universities are building up their private endowments * * *. There is another plane of interest that demands our attention; namely, the rising concern for educational development overseas and the emergence of an international intellectual community."

Dr. Perkins described the prospect of such an international community as one of the most significant developments of our time.

"Since knowledge and learning, by definition, know no frontiers, is it too much to hope that universal interest in the advancement and diffusion of knowledge may provide the strong cement that can hold together our fractured world?" he asked.

Regarding all public commitments, President Perkins warned that "we cannot automatically assume wide-range responsibilities in the public arena without an awareness of the relation of individual projects to the total unversity responsibility."

In his final remarks Dr. Perkins said universities alone can deal with the three great concerns of modern man—"the management of himself, his affairs, and his natural world to the fulfillment of his individual destiny."

He pointed out that learning, research, and public service are both "fundamental needs of modern man and the fundamental missions of the modern university."

"This is a large and even breath-taking task to contemplate," he said, "but Cornell does not come to this assignment unprepared. We are the inheritors of traditions and solid accomplishments that stand us in good stead. * * *

"We lead from strength, but we must be stronger—far stronger in every respect—if we are to enter our next century running hard and breathing easily * * *. We must all share in the task that is now our main business—to demonstrate by thought and work that Cornell is a great university on the move."

Fiscal Policy: Debt and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I put speeches of mine in the RECORD. Recently, though, I have made several speeches on Federal fiscal policy which express my views on the subject of tax reform and the Revenue Act of 1963. With unanimous consent, I wish to place in the RECORD at this time the speech I made before the annual conference of the National Tax Association on Tuesday, November 12, in Milwaukee, Wis.:

FISCAL POLICY: DEBT AND TAXES

(By the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Second District of Missouri)

It is my belief that the purpose of taxation is to obtain the revenues necessary to pay for the goods and services we wish to receive through the mechanism of political government. I think that tax policy should be as neutral as we can possibly make it in its economic impact. I hold that to deliberately use a tax system to produce economic results by indirection damages the tax system in attaining its primary objective and damages the very process of representative government.

Likewise, I feel that the purposes of government debt which, in essence, is deferred tax collection should be spelled out directly. And debt should not be used indirectly to achieve other economic results.

We have great latitude in governmental decisionmaking to produce the economic results we seek directly, through expenditure policy. Here is where policy can be made after forthright public debate. Why should we shy away from the direct way of doing things, to act by indirection, unless those who are in charge of running the Government are seeking to confuse the process of government decisionmaking?

President Kennedy stated that the proposed Revenue Act of 1963 was the most important measure to face the Congress in the past 10 years. I countered by stating that if the economic and political philosophy underlying this proposed Revenue Act prevailed, it was probably the most important measure that has faced the Congress in its 177 years of existence.

Surely it has now become clear to the general public that the fate of the Revenue Act of 1963 is wrapped up in a major and revolutionary theory of fiscal policy called planned deficit financing, rather than in the details, important as they may be, of the tax bill itself.

This is not just a matter of the soundness of the economic theory that cutting tax rates already insufficient to produce the revenues needed to meet our Federal expenditures will stimulate the economy to greater economic growth. It goes to the basic question I posed at the beginning of my remarks. Should tax policy be used to achieve these kinds of economic purposes?

In one sense, what I seek to point out may seem to be quibbling. There is little question that our present Federal tax structure has gone beyond the point of diminishing returns and is slowly eating away the very base upon which it relies for its future revenues. In other words, our tax structure is creating considerable economic impact, and of the wrong kind, just in trying to do its indisputed job of collecting revenues to meet our ever increasing and seemingly insatiable Federal expenditures.

Furthermore, when tax rates are high, however one alters any specific in the tax code one is bound to produce considerable economic impact as a byproduct, for good or for ill. However, I contend this is no quibble. There is considerable difference in the end product in writing tax laws to gain revenues as efficiently as possible with the minimum amount of impact upon the economic decisions in the marketplace and to deliberately interject Government economic decision into the marketplace through the use of the tax structure.

Indeed, I still have my doubts about how long the neo-Keynesians are going to stay in agreement with the neutralists on the theory that our Federal income tax rates are so high they are creating economic damage. To use tax policy for economic purposes most effectively, one needs to have high rates to start with. Otherwise, the differentials written in the tax laws are ineffective in forcing economic decisions.

The neo-Keynesians have joined the neutralists only recently in urging rate reduction, and I am not at all sure it was not forced upon them for practical political considerations necessary if they were to surplant our traditional policy of tax neutrality with that of using it as a major economic tool. After the principal has been established, they can then increase the rates again.

Burning in my mind is the phraseology used by the President in his message to the Congress first advocating tax rate reduction. He said that if releasing spending power to the private sector through tax reduction did not produce the economic growth he sought, increased Government spending was the alternative. The objective is to increase total spending, Government plus private; if the private sector does not do the spending, then Government must.

When one grasps this line of thought, it is not difficult to understand why President Kennedy has fought so bitterly the attempts of some of us in the Congress to tie the tax bill to expenditure reform by deeds rather than words.

The President won a temporary victory in the House when an intent of Congress was put in the tax bill in lieu of a requirement that the expenditure rates be cut.

It is important if we are to carry forward the debate on this fundamental fiscal policy to understand where the areas of agreement and disagreement lie.

I find the President and Dr. Heller, the Chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers, have created a series of straw men which they have been attacking with great vigor.

While they do battle with these straw men, however, they carefully avoid the real opponents. The success they have achieved is essentially one of getting their story to the public and preventing their opposition from being heard. They have the microphone, as it were, of the national news media so that their arguments and their version of the battle done against the straw men is heard around the country. The microphone is jerked away when we who differ on this matter speak, and so our arguments have not been heard.

Let me establish a basic point of agreement. Hoarding is the real enemy of economic growth. If people, and that includes the people's servant—government—do not spend, economic activity indeed will decline. It is very important to emphasize that investment money is money spent—not hoarded money. Investment money is spent for capital assets, and training and gathering together manpower. Investment money comes only from savings. The savings can be generated internally or externally. Use of external savings is borrowing someone's else savings.

The President's statement that his opposition is opposed to all borrowing—all debt, whatever its kind or source, is untrue. As a matter of fact, I have been seeking for sometime, without success, to have a full study in the Joint Economic Committee on the economic aspects of Federal debt to establish what aspects are economically desirable and what are not, and particularly what criteria should we establish to determine the proper levels of Federal debt.

Why have the President and Dr. Heller avoided a straightforward discussion of the economic part the Federal debt plays in our society? I think it is fair to suggest it is because the present level of Federal Governmental debt is the real villain in our economic picture right now and any further increase in this debt through further deficit financing, as the President would have us engage in, would make our unemployment picture and our balance of international payments situation worse. If this happened, the great economic growth we have been experiencing in spite of poor fiscal policy in the post-World War II decades would be seriously hampered, not enhanced. The President and his advisers have failed to identify the tremendous economic growth going on under their very noses because they have been using incomplete aggregate economic statistics never designed to measure true economic growth. They call our economy, which is suffering from serious growing pains—we have been growing so fast—tired, lethargic, and in need of a shot in the arm.

They identify obsolete, inefficient, and unwanted plant equipment as idle plant capacity, as if it could be put to good economic use if we only had more purchasing power. They identify the unemployed, concentrated as they are among the obsolete skilled, unskilled, and semiskilled people, as manpower available for immediate economically meaningful employment. They count on the inefficient, unwanted, and obsolete plant capacity and the obsolete skilled, unskilled, and semiskilled manpower to sop up the increased purchasing power they would inject into our economy through tax cuts accompanied by increased Government expenditures so no additional inflationary forces will be let loose. This is whipping the sea for following its tides.

They ignore the fact that corporate liquidity and consumer purchasing power are at all time highs and that today the question of spending vs. hoarding is related to the motivation for spending, not to the capacity to spend. Why are our corporations not investing in their own endeavors here in the United States to the extent that they have the power to do so? Why are personal and corporate funds increasingly being sent abroad for investment, so that the administration now asks Congress to impose an excise tax on these investments to keep them at home? To encourage them to be idle—to be hoarded?

I think it is about time we looked into the question of what makes men hoard by being idle themselves and letting their money and their assets be idle. I suggest that it has directly to do with what return they expect to receive for the discipline they exercised in saving and the risk they take for the saved dollar they invest. What sort of confidence do they have in their own personal and business economic future? People hoard if they are uncertain, and the greater the uncertainty, the greater the tendency to hoard. A governmental fiscal and monetary policy has more to do with hoarding than any other factor.

A government policy which says it will spend if its people are too stupid to spend and then seeks to finance the increased Government spending, not through taking the savings of the people, through increased taxes (which, of course, would create problems of its own), but through selling more Government bonds, is only going to aggravate uncertainty and encourage an ever greater incident of hoarding. This would set off a dangerous spiral all of its own, even if an inflationary spiral did not accompany it. Indeed, at a certain point, a deflationary spiral might set in and this could only be broken by massive Government intervention, which would deprive us of the right to call ourselves a free society.

Debt, whether corporate, personal or government, is related to two things. Assets to secure the debt and earning capacity to pay off the debt. Innovation, which is the sole source of economic growth, is financed by savings largely of one's own, not of someone else. The financing can be a mix of partly one's own savings and partly the savings of someone else. The more risky the venture is, the greater the part of the savings will tend to be one's own. Also, the more risky the venture, the higher the return must be for the borrowed dollars. So, the greater the innovation, the greater is the economic benefits to the society. So we must encourage not deter risk taking if we are to have maximum economic growth.

Debt backed up by physical assets tends to be less risky than debt backed up by anticipated earnings.

President Kennedy and Dr. Heller have sought to relate Federal Government debt to personal debt, to corporate debt and to local and State governmental debt. They do this to allay the fears of our people about the Federal debt.

This is a fair subject for debate. Then why do they pose the analogy and then refuse to discuss it? Indeed, we might well relate the assets and anticipated income behind these various kinds of debts to see how they stack up. A cursory examination of the composition of the Federal debt reveals that it comes off a very poor also ran. It doesn't even make the finish line.

The bulk of our Federal debt, just as the bulk of Federal spending, is for the defense of our country. And this is as it should be. But defense expenditures create little or no capital assets and what assets there are certainly produce little or no earnings. Military hardware must go on the books at $1. Most military buildings, being single purpose buildings, must also be listed at a very low value. Most of that small portion of the Federal debt which has created wealth or earning power has resulted from the Federal expenditure policies which are under the most controversy. Indeed, there is a great deal to be said for the point that if the purposes of the expenditure is to create wealth and earning power the matter should be handled in the private sector and not the governmental sector. Government is not the partner of the people. It is the servant.

Local and State governmental debt, it is to be noted, almost invariably relates to specific wealth creating expenditures, for highways, schools, sewers, community facilities, etc., and is often reflected in sinking fund and revenue bonds. This kind of debt, aside from reflecting the creation of real wealth, is also a device for spreading the cost of the capital improvement over its lifetime so that those who benefit from the facility over this period of time pay for it.

Let me read from a speech I delivered on the floor of the House on August 5, 1963, at the time I was discussing the balance of international payments problems. I went into this problem of the Federal debt from several angles:

"The Kennedy administration has sought to allay the concern of the people over the rising Federal debt by a series of specious arguments.

"First. The administration hides and dissembles over the increase in the rate of annual debt increases which its fiscal theories have produced and refuses to estimate the further increases in the debt which will result from its planned deficits into the future.

"Second. The administration relates the Federal debt as a ratio of gross national product and calls attention to the fact that this ratio has declined since 1946. Note the year 1946 is selected as the basis for this relation. Should the ratio of the year 1946 be the goal of our fiscal debt policy? Certainly no reasonable man would seriously advance such an argument—1946 is the year immediately following World War II when perforce the results of the overwhelming deficit financing we resorted to in financing this war reached their peak. Does the 54-percent ratio of GNP to debt in 1962 compare favorably to the percentage ratio of GNP to the national debt during other peacetime periods in the 20th century? It does not. In 1909 the ratio was 3.4 percent and this declined to 2.5 percent by 1916—a period during which GNP increased by 44 percent or about 6 percent a year. This is in relation to an overall growth rate from 1860 to 1960 of about 2.9 percent. In 1919, after World War I's deficit financing, the ratio stood at 30 percent. This declined to 16 percent by 1929. The ratio increased during the depression of the thirties and reached 43 percent in 1940—a period which incidentally showed a zero increase in gross national product. This should make people pause to reflect whether debt helps economic growth. In 1946, immediately after World War II, the ratio was 128 percent and it has now declined to 56 percent as of June 1962—debt $298.6 billion, GNP $553 billion.

"It should be noted that 70 percent of the decline in the ratio of the debt in the 15 years from 1946 to 1962 occurred in the first 5 years after 1946. In 1951 the ratio had declined by 51 percentage points, or 10 points a year, to 77 percent. This decline was largely the result of the serious devaluation of the purchasing power of the dollar which occurred during these years. Hardly a course to emulate or to praise. The debt, of course, remained in the constant dollar figure of 1946, while the GNP went up because it was measured in terms of the inflated dollar. Since the Federal Reserve-Treasury accord of 1951 which largely stopped this monetary inflation the ratio has declined only 21 points in these 11 years from 77 to 56 or 21 points a year. Even some of this decline is the result of further dollar devaluation rather than real economic growth. Since 1960 the ratio has dropped less than a whole point from 56.8 to 56. If the estimate of GNP for 1963 reaches $578 billion the administration anticipates and the debt goes to around $318 billion as the administration projects, there will be only another fraction decline to 55.2 percent. At this rate it will take 6½ years to reach a 50-percent figure and another 10 on top of that to even equal the peacetime high mark of 43 percent in 1940. This will be the year 1980.

"Certainly this leaves little resiliency for these 17 years ahead of us in our fiscal posture in the event that we should have another major war or depression forced upon us.

"Third. The administration relates the Federal debt to State, local, and private debt and points out that these debts have risen faster than the Federal debt. Again, what is the year of reference? A peacetime year? A year we would choose as our goal for an optimum? No, 1946 is again taken as the year, the year which reflects the 'high water mark' of extraordinary Federal deficit financing, as the result of World War II; 1946 is also the 'low water mark' of State and local expenditures because of our national desire to divert as much of our resources as possible to the effort of World War II. So in this instance the selection of the year 1946 as a benchmark is doubly deceptive.

"Parenthetically, I would remark that the Kennedy administration continues to show an abnormal inability to distinguish between an economy based upon war and one based upon peace in this matter as well as in other matters of economic and fiscal policies which require the use of economic statistics and the understanding of the basic laws of economics.

"What are the ratios over a period of time of State and local governmental debt to Federal debt?

"In 1946 which reflects the war expenditures the ratio rose to 94.4 percent Federal and declined to 0.8 percent State and 4.8 percent local. In 1960 that ratio had shifted to 80.5 percent Federal, 5.2 percent State, and 14.3 percent local. In 1962 the Federal ratio had further declined to 78.7 percent and State and local totaled 21.3 percent.

"The balance which formally existed between the three tiers of government during the periods when this Nation prospered the most are far from being reached in this ratio heavily weighted to the Federal Government. In 1902 the ratio was 35.9 percent Federal, 7 percent State, and 57.1 percent local. 1922 reflected the shift resulting from the massive Federal debt of World War I—69.4 percent Federal, 3.4 percent State, and 27.1 percent local. In 1927 the ratio had balanced to 55.4 percent Federal, 5.9 percent State, and 38.7 percent local. In 1932, 50.4 percent Federal, 7.3 percent State, and 42.3 percent local. The 1930 depression years show a shift to the Federal tier and by 1940 the ratio was 67.9 percent Federal, 5.7 percent State, and 26.4 percent local.

"The Federal programs set forth in the most recent budget of the Kennedy administration will hamper the shift back to the ratios of pre-World War II peacetime years. The balances that existed during the first 140 years out of our total 170 years social and economic development seem to be out of question today. However, if we are to match the growth rate of these 140 years in the ensuing decades, I believe we would be wise to set our sights in the direction of this kind of balance. Certainly setting our sights on the balances of the year 1946 is the height of folly.

"The argument that we need not worry about the Federal debt today because it is a less ratio to the State and local governmental debt in 1946 is out of context. It is designed to mislead. Sixteen years after the war instead of a 78.7-percent Federal ratio which we have in 1962, we should be much closer to a 50-percent Federal ratio. The most alarming decline which occurred during World War II, of course, is the local government ratio. The State and local debts must increase more rapidly than the Federal debt, or better still the Federal debt should be declining much more rapidly if we are to get back to the peacetime ratios when our Nation had its greatest growth.

"Fourth. The Kennedy administration seeks to compare the Federal debt to private and State and local government debt in order to suggest a point which is untrue, that a large part of the Federal debt goes for capital investment against which there are marketable and economic capital assets.

"It is true that most of the private corporate debt goes for capital investment against which there are offsetting capital assets. It is true that a good bit of consumer debt goes for capital expenditures, which remain as a capital asset securing the debt, such as homes and consumer durables. It is also true that almost all of the local governmental debt is for capital improvements, roads, schools, sewers, public buildings, and so forth. Indeed, most local debt is limited by law to these kinds of capital expenditures. Much of the State debt also goes for capital improvements. Some State

constitutions require this of both State and local debt. Indeed, most debt other than Federal debt is tied to capital improvements and so can be directly related to economic growth and remains a security against the debt.

"The Federal debt on the other hand, just as Federal expenditure, is almost all related to other than capital investment. Even today the bulk of the Federal debt is for past and future wars, for military expenditures, and the $10 billion interest we pay annually on the debt must be largely charged to military expenditures. Military assets must go into any economic accounting books at $1 value.

"The limited areas where the Federal debt can be said to relate to true capital assets and the areas the Kennedy administration seeks to enlarge are exactly the areas which cause the gravest political disputes today of whether these are constitutional and desirable, let alone efficient functions of the Federal Government. To wit, grants-in-aid to States and local governments, the TVA, and other public power projects, and the various other Government corporations, particularly lending institutions, like FNMA and CCC which would up capital assets. The traditional and constitutional public works of rivers and harbors and reclamation projects and the Post Office are about the only undisputed capital expenditures the Federal Government makes and these make up a very small part of today's $108 billion budget. Be this as it may, the ratio of the Federal debt which has been spent for capital assets is less than 10 percent of the total outstanding Federal debt. Ninety percent of the Federal budget expenditures are unrelated to capital assets and we have no capital assets to show for them.

"Fifth. The Kennedy administration is resorting to an argument I thought was discredited in the 1930's; namely, the size of the Federal debt makes no difference because we owe it to ourselves. This is probably the most specious and dangerous of all arguments advanced by the administration to justify its extravagance. First, we do not owe it all to ourselves. Foreign holdings amount to $15.3 billion. Second, the $55.6 billion of bonds in Government invested accounts are moneys deposited by civil service employees for their retirement—$12 billion; moneys to back up the social security payments—$18 billion, and so forth; and $68.8 billion of bonds are held by individual and corporate pension funds for the benefit of employees for their retirement. Sizable sums are in sinking funds earmarked by businesses and individuals for building homes, factories, stores, and other plants from whence come the jobs for our people. Many of our people own U.S. savings bonds. Their savings do not belong to their less provident fellow citizens; $97.3 billion of bonds are in the commercial and Federal Reserve banking system to back up the purchasing power of everyone's dollar as well as earmarked for the million and one different programs the ultimate owners of these assets have in mind.

"The most certain way to destroy the entire base of our society is to destroy the allocation of ownership of the debt securities in our society, private and governmental. Certainly we can have a complete redistribution of wealth by Government fiat or a military coup based on the economic concept that the debt is owned to ourselves without regard for the savings and efforts and planning that lies inherent in the present allocation of the ownership of the debt. This is what political scientists refer to as a revolution. Is this what the Kennedy spokesmen wish to suggest in behalf of their constituency from whom they seek votes by their profligate spending programs?

"And certainly, the debt can be lowered as a ratio of gross national product as was done by the Truman administration by devaluing the dollar—cutting into the purchasing power of the consumers. This redistributes wealth, mostly from the poorer to the richer, however. This is the process that destroys jobs and economic growth. This does not enhance it."

Now, having made these points in August, I find the administration spokesmen still reiterating what they said then. They have not sought to discuss the economic or any other aspects of the Federal debt. They merely fight strawmen of their own creation.

The structure of our monetary policy is based to some degree upon our Federal debt. After World War II we used the Federal Reserve System, not to have monetary policy neutral to make it serve its basic function as a weight and measure, a measure to evaluate goods, services, labor and savings, but to encourage economic growth by keeping interest rates low. This policy was proving so disasterous that in 1951 the Federal Reserve-Treasury accord was reached and this policy was reversed. This action brought to an end the massive devaluation of the dollar we experienced from 1946 to 1951.

Now the President, listening to this same economic school, would create planned Federal deficits and make them greater by the tax cut and have them financed by the Federal Reserve System buying the bonds. (If the bonds were sold to the private sector, this would take away the total purchasing power they were seeking to enhance.) This is designed to create more money, not from savings, but from the printing press. So, the essence of the administration's new theory is to expand the volume of money. This is to be done through tax policy, reducing tax revenues, and replacing these lost revenues with the proceeds derived from the sale of Government bonds to the Federal Reserve System. According to this theory, we come out with a balanced budget perhaps in 1972.

My concluding remarks are these. You can see from this speech how the use of the tax structure for purposes other than raising revenue as efficiently as possible has diverted the attention of the tax writer from the details of the tax laws. This can only result in a poorer Federal tax system, not an improved one.

The proper reform is to cut Federal expenditures so they do not exceed the revenues that can be raised from a sound tax structure which does not erode its own base. This the Puritan ethic.

Mr. Scully Goes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very pleased to insert into the RECORD a very fine article about Mr. William J. Scully, the very able administrative assistant to our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI. The article is published in the November 1963 issue of the Telephone Bulletin, monthly magazine of the Southern New England Telephone Co.

I have known Bill Scully for a number of years. He is not only a capable, sincere and hard-working individual, but also one of Connecticut's most politically astute young men. I am convinced that we shall be hearing a great deal about him in the coming years.

While this article is devoted entirely to Bill Scully and the performance of his activities in Congressman GRABOWSKI's office in Washington, it is at the same time an excellent description of the everyday life and work of many congressional aids. As such, I thought it would be of interest to all of our colleagues who may, perhaps, at times take for granted the fine staff work being done in their offices here on Capitol Hill.

The article reads as follows:

MR. SCULLY GOES TO WASHINGTON—SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE CO. MAN ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE RUNS CONGRESSMAN'S OFFICE ON CAPITOL HILL

A messenger dumped a towering heap of mail on the desk.

Bill Scully peered around the stack and grinned.

"You ought to see a really big delivery," he said. "We average 175 pieces of mail a day. About 150 of them are letters that have to be answered. We also average 140 telephone calls."

Bill ripped open the first letter and read it. He scribbled a note, clipped it to the letter and handed the papers to one of the girls in the office.

"That was from a man who says he hasn't been able to get a passport—even though he's a citizen," Bill said. "I'm sending it to the State Department for more information."

Digging up information needed to answer a continual torrent of letters is just one of Bill's duties. A former staff assistant in Southern New England Telephone Co.'s public relations department following a tour in traffic. Bill is currently serving as administrative assistant to Congressman-at-large BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI.

Bill had served as Congressman GRABOWSKI's campaign manager during the last congressional campaign. After he was elected, the new Congressman asked Bill to come to Washington and run his office.

In line with Southern New England Co.'s policy of granting leaves to employees for public service work, permission was readily granted for Bill to take the job.

"The telephone company has an admirable employee public service policy," Congressman GRABOWSKI said later after Bill accepted the job. "Without that policy, I would have been deprived of a very capable assistant and my constituents of an able public servant. Bill understands Connecticut problems and he knews Connecticut people."

Bill has been getting acquainted with our State's affairs and political leaders since his days at the University of Connecticut, where he majored in government.

"I joined the Young Democrats while I was at University of Connecticut," he said. "I worked with the Citizens for Martin when Luke Martin was running for Congress from the Fifth District in 1956. One thing led to another. In 1958, I worked for John Dempsey when he was running for Lieutenant Governor, and in 1960 for JOHN MONAGAN, the present Congressman from the Fifth District.

"Last year, I had occasion to meet Mr. GRABOWSKI after he'd been nominated for Congressman at large. We talked for a couple of hours and I was very impressed by him. In the end, he asked me to be his campaign manager. So here I am."

As administrative assistant, Bill relieves the Congressman of a number of duties. Much of Congressman GRABOWSKI's time is spent on the floor of the House and in committee meetings. He's a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance, International Trade and Consumer Affairs. On weekends, the Congressman is usually in Connecticut, appearing before groups who have requested him to

speak and getting information from his constituents.

Bill takes care of the office, supervising the staff of three girls and a man. He's responsible for digging up facts the Congressman needs to answer his mail and make legislative decisions. He also acts as the Congressman's adviser, speechwriter, and public relations counselor.

If Congressman GRABOWSKI can't attend a briefing, a banquet, or some other sort of meeting, he may send Bill to represent him and report back. Bill talks to constituents who call or visit while the Congressman is out. In many cases, such as simple requests for information, he can help them himself.

"I get in here about 8:30 in the morning," Bill said. "I usually leave about 6:30 in the evening, but sometimes I have to attend an evening affair. I come in on Saturday mornings a little later and stick around to clean up details and to be on hand in case anything happens. When there's a writing job to be done, I sometimes do it at home."

Bill paused a moment, then continued.

"Know what the most rewarding thing about this job is? Giving a hand to people who need help. You'd be surprised at the problems people have—an Army officer's wife who has not received her allotment for 6 months, a veteran who's had his pension cut off, a woman who can't get her granddaughter into the country because she was born overseas. They don't know what to do, so they write their Congressman.

"We sometimes get letters from people who disagree with us. Usually, they don't understand the situation they're writing about as well as they think they do. So when we answer their mail, we have to do our best to clarify any mistaken ideas they may have."

"I don't want to give the impression that we don't welcome letters," Bill said. "We do. In fact, we'd like to see more letters. Too many people are reluctant to write to their Congressman. Especially businessmen. Businessmen often assume their Congressman is either hostile and won't help them or that he knows all about their problems without being told."

In the last Congress, Bill pointed out, there were 13,423 bills introduced in the House and 3,809 in the Senate. That was the total for both sessions. By September of this year, with the first of the present congressional sessions still incomplete, 8,498 bills have been introduced in the House and 2,154 in the Senate. Bill explained that it just isn't possible for a Congressman to investigate every bill thoroughly enough to learn all its implications.

"We'd like to hear from people who think they'll be affected by these bills," he continued. "We may not always share their opinions, but at least we'll have both sides of the story and be able to make a more informed decision."

Bill has been busy informing himself in the last 9 months. At 28, he's the youngest administrative assistant in the Connecticut delegation and one of the youngest on Capitol Hill. He admits he has a lot to learn.

"You can imagine how it felt to come down here with no experience in Washington and take over this job. Fortunately, Congressman GRABOWSKI gave me his full backing on everything."

Congressman GRABOWSKI, who had quietly entered the office, spoke up:

"Bill's job is a very challenging one, but he's learned his way around here very well. He has a wide variety of duties. In the morning, for example, he may call an Undersecretary of Agriculture about some problems that face Connecticut poultry farmers. In the afternoon, he may attend a military briefing. In between, he has a load of office work to keep up with."

He paused and eyed Bill who had crossed the room to take an urgent phone call. "There's no doubt about it," he said. "Bill is indispensable in my office."

The Christian Witness in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I have received in my office a letter from Mr. Lewis I. Maddocks, Washington secretary for the Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ, wherein he calls to my attention a sermon delivered on June 30, 1963, by the Reverend William G. Dever, of Bethany Congregational Church, 18 Spear Street, Quincy, Mass. Reverend Dever is making a real contribution toward promoting better understanding of the relationship of the Christian faith in the current struggle for racial justice. I include in the RECORD part of the sermon by Rev. William G. Dever. This sermon has been received with wide acclaim in the South Shore area of Massachusetts. It is a compelling message which appeals forcibly to the mind of reason.

The sermon follows:

THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN RACE RELATIONS

(Sermon by Rev. William G. Dever)

Some of you will ask what right I have to address myself to such a controversial subject as race relations; so let me present my credentials:

I am a citizen; and I am concerned about the hardening of attitudes in race relations so that increasingly no course is left open to us except violence. I am a resident of Quincy and a property owner; and I am concerned about what is happening, or, more precisely about what is not happening in our city. I am a Christian; and I am appalled at the near failure of the church to come to grips with the problem of racial relationships, or even to face them. I am a minister of the gospel; and if I am faithful even to my limited vision, I must recognize that I did not choose the subject, it chose me. These are all the credentials that I have, or that you have, or that anybody has, to speak; but they are enough.

Now however complicated the implications of what I have to say may be, the essence of it is simple enough. What I have to say revolves around an attempt to answer two questions—what the real issue is, and what we must do about it. Let's look at these things one at a time.

What is the real issue in the racial crisis that we face in this country at the present hour? This is a deceptive question; it is much harder to answer than it appears. Let me try to come at it by suggesting some things that we do not face in this crisis. Certainly, anyone who has not been in a daze the last 6 months knows that an issue is before us, but we cannot appeal for any action until we see the issue quite clearly and divorce it from all peripheral issues.

What is the central issue? Well, I am sure it is not a legal issue. It is not a matter of the interpretation of the Constitution (that was settled a hundred years ago and resettled 8 years ago); it is not an open question. The legal basis of what we must do is clear enough.

We do not face a crisis which is primarily political. The crisis is not a test of the democratic spirit both at home and abroad as some people have suggested. That is to say, we cannot appeal to men who believe merely in the principle of equality and are desirous of practicing it at home and are worried about the prestige of the United States abroad because of its treatment of its minority groups at home. This is part of the issue but not the central issue

It is not an intellectual crisis which we face. That is to say, we cannot appeal simply to men who are enlightened and generally liberal in their views to take action, for men may be convinced of the theoretical right of the Negro. They may even accord him that right before the law because they are afraid of the extremist groups and their influence and because they feel a sense of duty. Yet, they may hate the Negro. If that is true, we have not yet reached the fundamental problem.

It is not even at root a moral issue. We need to be grateful that President Kennedy has reminded us of the fact that the issue has moral implications. I am ashamed that this had to come first of all from the President and not from the churches; but although fundamentally true, it does not reach far enough. For once again, people may act according to the highest moral principles and yet harbor hostility and resentment against those whom they claim to defend.

The issue before us is not an economic one. It is not a matter of preserving property values and stability in our neighborhoods so therefore, we cannot appeal simply to the good sense and the prudence of people to do what is right.

And lastly, the issue is not one of expediency. It is not a question of which method is the best—the nonviolent method or some other; for this is a superficial approach to the problem; and while we are debating the method, the Negro will get what he wants without us and our approach will prove to have been irrelevant.

All of the things I have mentioned are involved in the crisis before us, but none sufficiently explains it so far as the Christian is concerned. I speak now in a Christian context. The problem is ridiculously simple, and no attempt will obscure its simplicity. It is a question of whether or not we wish to live by hatred and violence, or by the principle of Christian love. It is that simple. And every attempt to complicate the problem is but another way to putting it off.

Now Jesus, not only in his life but in his expressed teachings, enunciated the principle of love. He went out of his way to indicate that this love was not closed in its reference to a particular community or race.

Now I am very much concerned to reduce the issue to what I think is the fundamental point—the point of prejudice versus love. Perhaps you will not agree that prejudice is so widespread or that the church is so badly infected by it. Let me bring some evidence forward. Let me examine some of the evidences of raw, ugly prejudice. First of all, let me note some of the cruder forms that prejudice takes; you can relax for a moment.

People in the churches have long insisted that if God had not meant for the races to be segregated, he would not have created them with differences of color and characteristics. And these same people have argued that the Bible supports and indeed demands the complete segregation of the races. Nonsense. No reputable Biblical scholar has ever held to that view. This attitude does not really rest so much on an understanding of the Bible as it does upon the remnants of a myth about racial purity or racial superiority. But the truth of the matter is that anthropologists and sociologists have long since proved that this is a myth; that there is no substantial physical difference between the races. The differences we see are the result of geographical and social and cultural conditioning. The anthropologists have reminded us, whether we like it or not, that racially all of us are mongrels. There is no such thing as a pure race and never has been.

Another crude form of prejudice is that which insists in very similar fashion that the Negro is inferior—that he simply is not

capable of earning his rights alongside of the white man; that he has certain gifts. He has gifts in the area of athletics and music and poetry but he has no other gifts. More often than not, this crude myth is expressed in terms of the taint of "Negro blood." And the lengths to which people will go to maintain this view are absurd. During the last war, for instance, the Red Cross was forced by public opinion to keep Negro blood donors and white blood donors separate so that their blood would not be mixed. And yet such a view has no basis; in fact, it is the result of simple prejudice.

Let us recognize that there is a new Negro who does not fit any of the stereotypes. This new Negro is not Uncle Tom—kindly, servile—whom we can regard with paternalistic affection. He is not Aunt Jemina on the pancake box—rotund, pleasant and harmless; he comes bearing a college degree. He comes not asking but demanding—ready and willing to compete on an equal basis. He is the new Negro. And I suspect that because we do not like him and are threatened by him, we insist upon thinking only of the old Negro in stereotyped terms.

And then there is the view that wherever Negroes settle in the community, the crime rates soars as though the Negro has some special predilection toward violence. The truth of the matter is, we have long since learned that the crime rate has to do with social and economic factors and if we were forced into ghettos to live as the Negroes are, our crime rate would be identical.

Now I have dismissed all of these as crude evidences of prejudice and they are just that. But let us look now at some of the more popular expressions and see what these indicate about our ways of thinking. For instance, most of us, even the best of us, tend to regard the Negro with a paternalistic attitude. Kyle Haselden in his remarkable book, "The Racial Problem in Christian Perspective," tells about revisiting his home in the South. A kind old Negro came shuffling up to him, hat in hand, and asked very quietly; "Captain, may I have a little tobacco?" His first impulse, of course, was magnanimously to give him a cigarette; and then because he was not only a southerner but a Christian, he thought and said, "When you put your hat back on your head and approach me like a man, I'll share a cigarette with you."

But most of us are still living in the past when the Negro could be treated in terms, for instance, of the trusty family retainer whom we accept and even love because he is still essentially a slave. But the free Negro, the ambitious Negro, the aggressive Negro; we cannot accept. As long as we treat him like a child, he is all right but when he wants to grow up, he poses a threat.

And then there is the nonsense about "States rights." People of the South have been talking about States rights for a hundred years, and nobody believes in them. States rights in the South is not now, nor has it ever been, a real issue. It is simply a mask to cover fear and hostility and hatred. There is only the issue of whether we hate or love, and we need to recognize that.

And then there is the myth, particularly widespread in the South, about "separate but equal facilities." The tragedy is, the facilities are separate all right but they are never equal.

And then we think of loving the Negro, of course, "in his place"; but where is his place? If you will look into the slums of our cities in the North and South, you will see where his place is and that's really what we mean when we say we like him in his place. We like him in Roxbury, but not in Quincy; in Dorchester, but not in Hingham or Weymouth.

And then there is the cry of a great many white liberals: "Patience." "Wait." "Be moderate in your approach." But the Negro rightly sees that "wait" almost always means "no," and he is not prepared to wait any longer.

And then there is something else that most of us are guilty of at one time or another. We say, "Why, I like Negroes; some of my best friends are Negroes," and the very attitude reveals our smugness and our condescension toward the Negro. We accept him in spite of his being a Negro because we are magnanimous persons.

But there are two final phrases I wish to discuss because they are even more revealing and these I classify simply as silly. For instance, there is the question which is always raised, "Would you want your daughter to marry a Negro?" Who ever said that any Negro wanted to marry your daughter? This is based upon a complete misunderstanding of what the Negro wants and is demanding. Furthermore, the question is irrelevant because it has nothing to do with whether or not we shall accord the Negro his fundamental rights. Supposing he does marry your daughter—that is another issue and it might well be discussed dispassionately but it has nothing to do with the basic issue.

And then there is always the response especially from the people in the North, "Why, we don't have any racial problems here." And that is the silliest of all because it is based upon an abysmal ignorance of the situation.

I wish we had time to examine the structure of prejudice. It is most interesting. It is perfectly obvious that we have made of the Negro in this country a scapegoat and on him, we have ridden all our sexual fantasies, our frustrations, our anxieties, our insecurities, our fears, our hostilities, and we have made him the victim of our own sickness. Whatever the Negro is, he is what we made him. And if we are sick at the sight of him, let us also be sick at ourselves for we made him that way. We have learned prejudice; we have drilled it into our children—even in our churches. My whole point in making this statement is that if prejudice is learned, it can be unlearned and it must be.

Prejudice is communicated from one generation to another like a disease; and as soon as we recognize that the fundamental fact is prejudice, and the sooner we move to erase it, the further advanced we will be in racial relations.

Now I have only time to quickly sketch what we must do. This I believe to be the issue—simple prejudice—in the churches, in all of us. Now we must do something and I want to stress each of these words—we must do something. The problem is here already; we cannot avoid it.

In Randolph, a high school boy was denied entrance to the DeMolay because of his race, despite the highest recommendations and the church, when it was apprised of this matter, replied—at least in the words of one clergyman—that it was not interested in forming a biracial commission to discuss this matter; that these things were not real problems. This particular clergyman wanted to have nothing to do with a pressure group which was creating artificial crises.

In Hingham, the director of the Protestant Social Service Bureau moved in recently. He is a Negro, a man of the highest caliber and competence, an asset to any community. There was a good deal of objection to his moving into the town. The ministers of the community came together and discussed the issue and felt powerless to do anything, and only handed it back to him (as if the tactful thing would be for him to withdraw and not create an awkward situation).

In Quincy, in our own parish, a Negro family bought a house on a street where some of our people are involved. Here was a clear challenge. They did not rise to it, nor did we; all we could think of to do was to raise a thousand dollars and try to buy them off.

If you want something that will make your hair stand on end, talk to the chairman of the South Shore Fair Housing Council, who is a member of our own church, and get him to tell you of his experiences in going around to realtors, trying to get them even to show to Negroes a home that is advertised for rent or sale. You would find it hard to believe the evasive tactics. There are all sorts of reasons advanced, of course, but they are not real reasons. The real reasons are clear.

You say we don't have the problem here? That is the problem. We ought to have it. There are eight Negro families in Quincy. Why are there only eight? Well, we accept them, of course; we welcome them. It just so happens we do not employ them and we won't rent a house to them or sell to them and we won't let them come to our churches and our places of business. They get the point—and so do you.

Now I suggest we must do something. It is a problem the church faces—this church, already. We must do something; we no longer have a choice about the time. The time is now. Let me read you a short passage from a moving letter written by Martin Luther King while he was recently in jail and had a great deal of time for that sort of thing. He says this:

"Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, "Wait." But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse and kick and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you see the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smoldering in an airtight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted as you seek to explain to your 6-year-old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has just been advertised on television and see tears welling up in her eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children and see ominous clouds of inferiority beginning to form in her little mental sky and see her beginning to distort her personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5-year-old son asking, "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?" when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the cramped corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading 'white' and 'colored'; when your first name becomes Nigger, your middle name becomes Boy, however old you are, and your last name becomes John, and your wife and mother are never given the respected title 'Mrs.'; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro—never quite knowing what to expect next—plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerate sense of nobodyness; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait." This is why we must do something and do it now.

And we must do something. I shall venture bold to suggest several things. In the first place, let us at least be honest enough to recognize our prejudice and not excuse it or rationalize it. Let us repent of it and let us begin to erase it from ourselves and from our children.

James Baldwin, the prolific Negro writer, who has caught the attention of so many young people through his books; "Nobody Knows My Name" and "The Fire Next Time" and others; has pointed to the fact that we must begin with ourselves, not with the Negro. He says, "I don't know any Negroes who are eager to be accepted by white people, still less to be loved by them. They, the blacks, simply don't wish to be beaten

over the heads by the whites every instant of our brief passage on this planet. White people will have quite enough to learn to do in accepting and loving themselves and each other and when they have achieved this—which will not be tomorrow and may very well be never—then the Negro problem will no longer exist. It will no longer be needed."

Let us begin with ourselves, here and now; let us try to sympathize with the plight of the Negro and, indeed, every person who is discriminated against.

And beyond that, we can be informed about what is going on; we can prepare ourselves and our neighborhoods for the change that is inevitable. We can agitate; we can get off the bench and into the game. We can speak up rather than keeping our mouths shut when this controversial subject comes up for discussion, as it does everywhere you turn, and we can be involved in specific projects.

Tomorrow a new law goes into effect—anyone who advertises a home for sale or rent must not discriminate because of race. Supposing the Christain people in this community decide to picket the real estate agents—would you join them? Would you make your voice heard? Or will you sit like a coward on the sidelines?

The time is past for polite discussion of the issue; it is time to act. However we disagree, let us begin to act according to our conscience.

Our State conference has taken the lead in a number of pronouncements, but pronouncements are futile unless they are translated into action. I want, in the last moment to measure this church against the recommendations of our own denominational headquarters. There are six things it is suggested that we do. The first is to make literature available on the subject. We have, and nobody reads it. The second is to form study groups to consider the racial crisis in its several aspects. We have no such group. The third is to reexamine the structure of our own church life to be sure there is no discrimination here. We have been extremely reluctant to undertake such a self-examination. Fourth, to support the Fair Housing Committee in your community. We have a Fair Housing Council; one of our own members is chairman of it. A meeting was recently called in Bethany Church and well publicized; two members of the church were present. One was already involved in the work and the other was one of the ministers. Fifth, to provide a scholarship gift for a Negro student who depends upon such help in securing higher education. We have provided numerous scholarships for Negro students in Southern Rhodesia; none in this country. Lastly, to provide summer employment for a Negro student attending one of the Negro schools and perhaps to welcome him into our home and church.

Well, draw your own conclusions. There are a number of ironies about the racial problem but one is most pointedly revealed in this letter which I received just last week from Arthur Harper, our own missionary in Southern Rhodesia.

He writes, "Mr. Jonathan Gaspara, a Negro student here, has returned from the United States where he spent a year at Columbia University. He speaks well of his experience in the school but he was appalled by the racial situation in New York and over the Nation. And I must say that the news coming out of the United States gives all of us out here a very uncomfortable feeling. I hope and pray that we will begin to hear of our churches taking a more active part in this matter. Especially, I hope they will initiate effective action in those communities where the race problem is smoldering on the verge of combustion. Boston is certainly one of these areas."

Is it not ironic that we should send a missionary half way around the world to the Negroes whom we love so well, and will by our hypocrisy at home, make his work impossible? Surely, the words of the Prophet Amos addressed to the eighth century B.C. are more relevant now than they ever were; if the Church fails to hear them, God help her:

"Says the Lord * * * I hate, I despise your feasts, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies.

"Even though you offer me your burnt offerings and cereal offerings, I will not accept them, and the peace offerings of your fatted beasts I will not look upon.

"Take away from me the noise of your songs; to the melody of your harps I will not listen.

"But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an overflowing stream."

Congressional Intent and New Spending Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I have made numerous speeches on the subject of Federal expenditure reduction before we enact a badly needed tax reduction program. The October issue of the "Tax Foundation's Monthly Tax Features" contained an article reviewing the actions of the Congress on the various spending proposals.

The article points out that there are two questions raised in the wake of the discussion on cutting Federal spending: First, has Congress actually cut spending much this session; second, has it expressed a desire on curbing spending actually reduced proposals for new spending authority? The Tax Foundation concludes that overall, this session, there might have been a reduction of $1.5 billion in Federal spending by action of the Congress.

As to the second question, that of new authority for Federal spending, there may be a reduction of $5 to $6 billion because of expressed congressional intent. There are several bills that are tied up in one of the bodies of Congress, such as the Vocational Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, and the Higher Education Facilities Act. But the article points out that the real proof of whether or not congressional intent is being heeded will be in the President's new budget to be submitted in January.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

SPENDING CUT DEEDS REMAIN TO BE SEEN

During the House debate over how much and where to cut income taxes, a great deal was said of the need for cutting Federal Government spending. Two questions are raised in the wake of this discussion, says Tax Foundation, Inc.: (1) Has Congress actually cut spending this session, and (2) has his expressed desire to curb spending affected the introduction of new or expanded spending legislation?

To answer the first query: Congress, as nearly as can presently be determined, hasn't actually cut much of the $98.8 billion spending originally proposed for fiscal 1964. Maybe, all things considered, by about $1.5 billion.

It has put a dent in the $107.9 billion asked in new spending authority, maybe by as much as $5 billion, on up to $6 billion.

Most of this cutting came before the House Ways and Means Committee wrote into the House-passed tax bill a declaration that it is the sense of Congress that tax cuts will, after a brief time, raise, rather than lower revenues, and that "such revenue increases should be first used to eliminate the deficits * * * then to reduce the debt."

The declaration said that to further the objective of future balanced budgets, the Congress recognized the importance of "taking all reasonable means," to restrain Government spending. It urged the President to declare "his accord with this objective."

The same day the committee wrote the declaration into the tax bill, the President asserted his administration was not opposed to expenditure control.

To answer the second question on recently introduced spending legislation, the Foundation notes the following—among many—expenditure measures already acted upon by one House, awaiting committee action, action by the Rules Committee or a conference outcome:

Increasing Federal grants to States to improve vocational education aid programs and a 3-year extension of the National Defense Education Act. Estimated cost through fiscal 1968: $3.2 billion.

Authorizing aid to mass transit. Estimated starting cost, $500 million; estimated overall cost, $10 to $15 billion.

Program to train jobless youth. Three-year program. Estimated cost, $740 million.

Extending Area Redevelopment Act for 2 years. Estimated cost, $355 million.

Authorizing 3-year program to aid colleges, universities, finance construction (first 3 years, of 5-year program). Estimated cost, $1.2 billion.

Constructing facilities to treat mental illnesses and mental retardation; 3-year program. Estimated cost, $238 million; Senate bill proposes an $850 million program.

Long-time observers of the Washington scene say that, despite economy promises, the outcome remains to be seen. The measures mentioned could still get the legislative green light. And the President's intentions for next year probably won't be known until he presents his new budget next January.

Goodby to the Ugly American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, only last week the House passed legislation extending the life of, and expanding the Peace Corps, despite some criticism that it should be curtailed and its appropriation cut. I said at the time that the Peace Corps had done a magnificient job in every country to which it had been invited to send its volunteers, and that a cut in appropriations would be unwarranted. I also pointed with pride to the worldwide favorable editorial support the

Peace Corps has enjoyed during little more than 2 years of existence.

May I again call to the attention of my colleagues a very favorable article on the Peace Corps which appeared in the Sunday magazine, Parade, yesterday, November 17. It was written by one whose country has had practical experience with the Peace Corps, the Honorable Amelito R. Mutuc, Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States, and is headlined "Goodby to the Ugly American." After reading this article, I am sure that Members will have renewed faith in the Peace Corps and its volunteers for the job they are doing as "ambassadors of good will" for America in far off areas of the developing continents of the world. Under permission previously granted, I included the article with my remarks in the Appendix:

GOODBY TO THE UGLY AMERICAN

(By the Honorable Amelito R. Mutuc, Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States)

The ugly American, that offensive caricature which had come to symbolize your people in the Far East, has had a facelifting. He has been transformed into an alert, clean-cut young man, eager to serve, who more properly might be called the helpful American. He is identified with the Peace Corps, the organization that has wrought this dramatic change in the American image.

In just 1 year, the Peace Corps has set an example of service and brotherhood that has impressed all Asia. Its works have ranged from the humble to the awesome, the tangible to the intangible. It has promoted international understanding in an area that is characterized by an intense desire to advance.

For these reasons, my government selected the Peace Corps this year to receive the Ramon Magsaysay Award (named for the late, beloved Filipino President), sometimes called "Asia's Nobel Prize." Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver flew to Manila to receive the award in behalf of the 2,000 volunteers serving in Asia.

These Peace Corps volunteers have come among us not to work for themselves but for others. Where others have exploited our needs, they explore them. They have been as willing to learn as they are to teach. The key to their success, I believe, lies in a quality which had almost gone out of style in the cynical postwar era: dedication.

I have watched the work of these young volunteers since the first group arrived in Asia a year ago. They came to my country: 128 teachers, brimful of enthusiasm.

Progress was uneven at first. The more zealous Americans took over classes completely, reducing native teachers to little more than aids. Some of our native teachers looked upon the newcomers not as helpers but as status symbols.

Mistakes were made. I remember one volunteer couple who burst into their assigned classroom the first day only to find it empty. They learned from persistent questioning that the seemingly kindly villager who had shown them around the previous day had been a hated collaborator of the Japanese during World War II. The couple had to go from house to house for 3 months after that to gather their pupils.

WORKING VACATIONS

The volunteers didn't stop their efforts after the school closed. During the 1962 summer holiday, they participated in 52 different projects throughout the islands. Some served as camp counselors; others helped farmers; a few worked in summer theaters. Two girls gave up their Christmas holidays to bind books and reorganize catalogs in school libraries.

But it was tragedy that really brought home to the Philippine nation the dedication of these young people. Two volunteers, Nancy Boyd and Phil Maggard, died in the crash of a transport plane. David Mulholland, working in Negros, an area of large plantations and relative comfort, contracted dysentery and subsequently died. Suddenly, we Filipinos realized the deep commitment which all of these young American men and women had made to our people.

ROUGH BEGINNING

The story has been the same in all the Asian nations where Peace Corpsmen are on the job: Afghanistan, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Nepal, North Borneo, Pakistan, Sarawak, Thailand. It's often rugged at the beginning—as witness the volunteers who arrived in Indonesia last May to be greeted by a Red-led "Yankee go home" demonstration—but after the people see these Americans in action, they begin to understand them.

Some of them, such as the doctors, nurses, and lab technicians who are trying to curb leprosy, yaws, and tuberculosis in Malaya, win prompt recognition through their work. But not all volunteer work is quite so tangible. As one Corpsman put it: "People in some projects can photograph a bridge they've designed or a road they've helped build. But who can photograph the mind of a child?"

Speaking for my country, I can say the coming of the Peace Corps has revitalized once again the close ties of friendship and cooperation between our two nations. We owe these selfless, young Americans much. But so do you. They have helped to erase the image of the ugly American, which spread like a stain across Asia during the postwar years.

The Problem of Equality—A Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter R. Courtenay, noted minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Nashville, Tenn., in a recent sermon discussed "The Problem of Equality"—a sermon which has been widely acclaimed for its good sense and wisdom.

In this sermon Dr. Courtenay makes certain observations and statements about democracy and the American way which are worthy of consideration by my colleagues, and under unanimous consent, I include his sermon delivered on September 15, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD. The sermon follows:

THE PROBLEM OF EQUALITY

(I Corinthians 11: 17–34)

During the past summer the air was filled with the raucous sounds of conflict in Birmingham, Chicago, New York, and Danville. It was also redolent with discord within the United Nations, and within the backward countries demanding recognition. Accompanying these was the endless struggle of labor and capital, and the seemingly endless drain of our resources into the give-away-programs at home and abroad. The air was charged with social electricity as individuals, groups, and nations fought for new status under the banner of equality.

Equality has intoxicated the modern world. Men walk starry-eyed through streets and halls dreaming of new days and improved status. The whole world seems in a pep-rally mood, and the bonfires grow larger and burn more fiercely, even as the songs, chants, and shouts of the participants become louder and more fervent. In a thousand tongues men scream their demands for equality, for place, for recognition, for rights, for privileges.

As one listens he frequently hears the words, "All men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." But the words never end there, but hurry on to declare that it is the responsibility of government to make all men equal and to maintain equality amongst men. Still other words are heard, declaring that democracy has failed to establish equality, and that men therefore must now turn to socialism and communism.

In my summer setting, close to nature, I looked around for evidences of equality in nature, and found none. Trees and hills are not the same in breadth and height. Rivers and lakes are not of uniform size. Not all animals and birds are swift and beautiful. The lion does not recognize the equalness of the antelope, nor the fox the rabbit. Some fields are fertile and others sterile, and clouds and puddles are not the same, though both are water created. In nature inequality seems to prevail, and yet the inequalities of nature produce the beauty we admire.

As I thought of it the same seemed to be true of history. Nations and races do differ in size, wealth, prestige, power, creativity, and vision. Some soar like eagles. Some build like beavers. Some grow like vegetables and weeds in the garden called the earth. Between individuals, races, groups, and nations there are broad differences, and equality is not a characteristic of either nature or human nature.

Having reached this point my mind asked the question, Can we have both freedom and equality? Someone has said, "Freedom without equality tends to become license. Equality without freedom tends to produce stagnation." How can these great objectives be secured without damage to the highest social system men have yet devised, democracy?

Looking back across history, I realized that the Jews preached concern for the poor, but not equality. The Greeks preached democracy, but not equality. The Romans preached justice under law, but not equality. The Middle Ages in Europe preached Christ, but not equality. In fact, not until the French Revolution did men openly affirm that "Men are born and always continue free and equal in respects to their rights," and not until our Declaration declared that "All men are created equal" did the world come alive to the possibilities of equality. These two events placed a new chemical in the cup of life, and the contents of that cup are changing men.

Here I paused to rethink the words, "All men are created equal." Are they? I could see that all men are created equally helpless, equally ignorant, equally inexperienced, equally sin touched; but I could not see how they could be said to be created equal in any other sense. Men do not begin life with an even start for all. Their beginnings are marked by differences in pedigrees, health, educational and moral levels, economic strength, social status, and personality potentials. There are broad differences in temperament, talents, drives, and desires. They do not begin life on a common line.

And what of the so-called unalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? Life is the gift of God, and so are liberty and happiness—in a certain

sense. But being born is never enough. Getting here alive is only a beginning. In order to really live one needs medical science, proper nutrition, adequate care, and a chance to become educated and equipped for adult responsibilities. As to liberty, it is not something that comes with birth. Liberty is man created, man achieved, and man maintained. God approves it, but man must win it. Happiness is a byproduct of a way of life rather than something granted us by birth. It, too, is something we achieve by effort. It depends on many things: employment, purpose, personal development, and the right use of the opportunities and duties of life. Life God gives, but liberty and happiness we must achieve.

Having reached that state of mind, I wondered why men ever thought that government could make men equal and keep them equal. How can mere laws produce equality amongst men on a heart level? How can coerced fellowship ever become real fellowship?

That government has a role to play in the mighty, moving drama of man's progress is not to be denied. Our Constitution and our Bill of Rights stand to affirm it. It is the function of government to state the conditions of liberty, equality, and responsibility, but unless it is the will of the people to give life to the law, it will not work. The prohibition era proved that beyond our contesting.

Then why do we believe and state in our legal documents that "All men are created equal," and have "unalienable rights"?

I presume it is because we must find some means of limiting the powers of the powerful and of protecting the rights of the weak. Great power, unpoliced, tends to become destructive power. The rights of the weak tend to be lost in a land where only the strong prevail.

We all understand this, even as we all realize that the clamor for equality is always a push from below rather than a pull from above, although it has often been both in these United States. Slaves have never enjoyed being slaves. The poor have never enjoyed being poor. The exploited have never been happy with exploitation. Those who fail have never been proud of their shortcomings, and the employed have always felt that it would be better if they were the employers. It is from this level of life that the hunger for equality rises. It is here that utopia displays its broad green fields and still waters. It is from here that the valley of Shangri-la appears as the answer to all the ills of man. It is the hopelessness of the masses that provides the soil for hope in those who will not surrender to the accidents of birth and environment, and it is well that it is so.

And yet, one must face facts. In any classroom of pupils only a few qualify under the letter A. Below these leaders of the class are the B students, and then the C's, and then the D's, and then the F's. Some by ability and effort rise to the top, while others because of lack of ability or application take their places on the descending curve of scholarship.

In every nation it is the same. Only a small percentage of people have the ability, the desire, the drive, the willingness to work and sacrifice, to foresee and prepare for success in any realm. The people who struggle to succeed are never interested in equality, but in superiority. Their goal is never the level of the masses, but a level above the masses. They endorse and espouse liberty because it creates for them a favorable climate in which to think, plan, create, work, and achieve according to their abilities and desires. They never pace themselves by the speed of the mediocre, but by the speed of the best. They are never satisfied by crumbs; they want half loaves and whole loaves.

It is such people who made America possible, and who have always led men in the upward climb. They are in truth the benefactors of the race. It is their ideas and creativeness that establish businesses and industries, thereby providing employment for others, and the taxes that make community and national progress possible. They furnish our best leadership, and give to the Nation our best guarantee of security. It is because of them that progress is produced in all areas of life, the intellectual, the artistic, the economic, the governmental and the social. While they did not build America alone, they provided the means whereby our Nation came into existence and has continued on its upward way.

Looking critically at such a line of thought, I suddenly realized that the success of the few creates the inequalities that loom large in the minds of the many. The haves highlight the have-nots. It is the successful who outlive the failures and all others who take their places on the curve of life as it sweeps downward.

During my summer days it seemed to me that:

It is the nature of some men to succeed, and others to fail.

It is the nature of some men to get by, and others to achieve.

It is the nature of the have-littles to want more.

It is the nature of the successful to seek to dominate.

It is the nature of those who are unsuccessful to resent it.

It is the nature of the poor to envy.

It is the nature of the wealthy to assume unjust privileges.

It is the nature of those who inherit wealth to use it well, to misuse it, or to feel guilty because they have it.

It is the nature of the intellectuals who receive their compensation from taxes or the gifts of the economically successful to advocate a change of system in order to get one wherein the intellectuals will be as generously rewarded as business executives under free enterprise.

It is because men are unequal in ability and drive, in opportunities for recognition and advancement, in rewards for work done and services rendered that people become restless socially. It is the inequalities of humanity that create the crusaders for equality. In the 18th century men looked to democracy as the answer to the inequalities amongst men, and now in the 20th men look toward socialism and communism.

Democracy as we have tried to shape it in America has been heavily impregnated with the Ten Commandments of Judaism and the Spirit of Jesus. Because of this we are suspicious of any system that advocates the big lie, covetousness, greed, the stealing of property, the destruction of life, and the taking away of liberties. Democracy condemns without reservations the confiscation of private property and capital by the state and the regimenting of human beings like animals on a farm. Our democracy is not perfect. Imperfections exist, but its virtues exceed those of any other system mankind has tried.

These observations moved me then to reach certain opinions concerning American democracy:

1. Democracy was never created to be a leveler of men. It was created to be a lifter, a developer of men.

2. Democracy was created to let the gifted, the energetic and the creative rise to high heights of human achievement, and to let each man find his own level on the stairway of existence.

3. Democracy was created to help men meet responsibilities and shirk no duties. That is why our Nation has been concerned about the honest needs of its citizens. We lead the world in justice, even though justice does not always move with prompt alacrity. Our Nation has been noted for the size of its heart and not merely for the size of its pocketbook.

4. Democracy demands that the nation be governed by the capable, the honorable, the farseeing, the clearseeing, and not by mediocre men. In the beginning it was so. May it be so again.

5. Democracy demands more from men than any other system in the realm of self-discipline, dependability, cooperativeness, industry, thrift, and honor. Democracy will not work when party politics are not guided by basic ethical principles. For a party to foster class consciousness, class conflict, misrepresentation, covetousness, violence, theft, and an open defiance of established law is to breed anarchy.

6. Democracy must give to all its people the following rights:

The right to equal learning.
The right to equal employment.
The right to equal treatment.
The right to equal justice.
The right to adequate housing.
The right to vote.

The meditations of the summer convinced me that governments of themselves cannot make men equal or remake men into the beings they ought to be. That is a spiritual venture, not an economic and political one. A change from democracy to either socialism or communism, or a change from private capitalism to state capitalism, will not solve the basic problems of mankind; it merely shifts the areas of power.

I am disturbed, therefore, when church leaders and church groups seem to advocate socialistic means and objectives as the answer to the problems of democracy, and especially the problems of equality. This is especially true when certain leaders voice slogans that appear logical and Christian, but are not. Let me name four:

1. "The world owes every man a living." No, it doesn't. Christian ethics have never said so, and I have never known any man worth his salt who has claimed special rights under such a slogan. It is the cry of the lazy, the inept, and the failures. Such a slogan is a far cry from our meeting the needs of the needy, which, of course, is our duty.

2. "Production for use, and not for profit." That sounds good, but it is phony as a Russian promise. It is profits that have produced the blessings of our Nation and enabled her to be a blessing to the nations of the world. Profits are essential to the general well-being of society. When the state takes over under the slogan of "use, not profits" men lose their liberties and their standard of living. Such a switch merely augments the insatiable appetite of the state.

3. "Human rights, not property rights." As I look out over the world, one thing is clear: where there are not private property rights there are no human rights. Private property rights form the seed bed in which human rights mature. As long as private property rights are clear human rights will flourish.

4. "The end justifies the means." According to Christian ethics the statement is not true. It was just such a statement that produced the crucifixion of Jesus, the torture of the martyrs, the burning of witches, and the denial of life and liberty to the inhabitants of current communistic lands.

Churchmen, whether lay or clerical, who seek to solve the problems of our society through socialistic processes rather than democratic ones within the free enterprise system are heading down a road that leads toward darkness. Only by encouraging Christians to envy, to covet, to be class conscious, to foster class conflict, and to approve stealing and even murder, can such objectives be attained. To realize them would bring about a broad denial of law and order, and the orderly handling of social problems. Whenever we as a church, an educational system or a Supreme Court encourage people to misrepresent facts, to use force wrongfully, to flaunt law and order and to stimu-

late bitterness and hatred, we depart from logic, Americanism, and Christianity.

I unhesitantly oppose the use of socialistic and communistic methods in the solving of the problems of our free enterprise democracy. Our problems are problems of human nature rather than of economics and sociology. The man who has two cars is not preventing another from having one. The man who earns $50,000 a year is not robbing him who receives $300 a month. The man who owns a good house does not thereby force another man to dwell in the slums. And the people who prosper under our system cannot be blamed for the problems that plague the lives of those who compose the lower 25 percent of the Nation. The so-called privileged are not always a credit to either church or state, but they are not in the main parasites on the body politic. We are therefore wrong when we damn the successful, the wealthy, the enlightened, and the patriotic in order to gain what we call equality.

Having said that let me hasten to add that the redistribution of wealth will not solve the human problem that plagues us. Wealth is not fairly distributed in any land under the sun; it never has been and I presume never will be. Nor do we solve social predicaments when we blame the top 20 percent of our people for the inequities that seem to mark the 80 percent. Nor is it logical for our Government to be forever emphasizing the neglected duties of the employer while ignoring almost totally the neglected duties of the rest of us. The wealthy have many sins to confess, but so do we all. And when we come to the advocacy of moving from private capitalism to State capitalism, and the listing of the sins of democracy while ignoring its multiple virtues, and assuming that virtue resides in the have-nots, but not in the haves, I can only shake my head at the presumed wisdom of such positions.

Let no one hearing any voice conclude that I am speaking as a have or a defender of the haves. Let no one believe that I am unconcerned about those in our midst whose rights are often ignored and whose status is questioned. I am not blind to the sins of the privileged any more than I am the sins of the underprivileged. The business leaders do not need my voice to defend their position; they are strong defenders of themselves. But I have walked the roads of life with men of all classes, and have reached one conclusion, "there is none righteous, no, not one." We are all bearers of the telltale gray of selfishness. The 5 o'clock shadow is on all our faces.

The Lord I love and serve was not overly optimistic about humanity. He knew man as he is, and worked with him for what he could become. He ministered to the multitude, teaching, healing, feeding, encouraging, comforting, but he never assumed that equality was part of the human scene. He talked of love and neighborness, but not equality.

Perhaps that is why the New Testament puts the emphasis on brotherhood and not equality. It emphasizes responsibilities, not privileges. It stresses love toward God and love toward neighbor. It seeks to create a church that will be brotherly within, and concerned for those without. It urges men to find the God way to self-hood, success, and happiness, and offers a heat-treated cell to all who misuse life, be they rich or poor.

Paul, in his letter to the Church of Corinth, denounced the lack of brotherhood within the church, and urged men to be concerned for one another, but he did not assume equality to be one of the "must" characteristics of Christianity. It was not a matter of love without differences, but love in spite of them.

The church, as someone has said, learned a long time ago that it is easier to create liberty than it is to establish equality. It has always known that equality can only be had by a loss of certain liberties. If men want equality above all else they may best find it in communism. If men want liberty and a fair portion of equality they must turn toward democracy.

What the world needs is a change of heart, a change of climate born of faith in God, a reaching up that there may be a reaching out, a confession that produces a new dedication. This, governments and laws cannot create, for governments and laws are but the reflection of the standards of a people. Everything in social Christianity depends on the wise use of possessions, time and talents, and only when we, Christian members of a democracy, become good stewards of the things that bless life do we begin to move in the direction of righteousness and justice, peace and true prosperity.

The problem of equality may be in many ways the greatest problem of our day. We cannot solve it by government, and we shall not solve it en masse. Only when we as Christians take seriously the teachings and example of Jesus shall equality and liberty exist without detraction or subtraction. Only when we stand before God confessing our needs shall we be empowered to meet the needs of others.

If I must choose between liberty and equality, I must choose liberty and then hope and work for equality, for such seems to me to be the Christian's way.

The Royal Road to Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of news disseminated during the recent past about the drug business and how it operates. It has been under congressional investigation and while there are some matters which should be corrected, I am convinced that the leaders of this great industry are sincere and honest straightforward businessmen doing their best to achieve something constructive for the interests of our country.

The chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson, Philip B. Hofmann, recently made an address which is entitled "The Royal Road to Ruin" at the pharmaceutical meeting of the National Association of Chain Drug Stores on October 17 in Washington, D.C., in which he urged the leaders of the industry to get together, correct any abuses which may exist, and go forward to promote the health and well-being of our citizens and, indeed, the citizens of the world. It contains good advice and sound philosophy which will benefit all who read it. I appreciate the opportunity to present Mr. Hofmann's address in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROYAL ROAD TO RUIN

This is a unique audience, for actually it is three different audiences in one room. We have the chain drug operators, the pharmaceutical manufacturers, and the men in Federal Government in Washington who work on pharmaceutical industry matters.

I am very fortunate. I grew up in a retail drugstore. I have spent 33 years with Johnson & Johnson. And to you men in Government, I know some of your problems. During the war I was Deputy Field Director for the Smaller War Plants Corporation for a year. I know what is meant by, and I have experienced, "pressures from the Hill."

Where is the pharmaceutical industry heading today? Gentlemen, are we on a royal road to ruin?

We could be if people like you and me don't shoulder our full responsibilities. If the health team does not stop bickering and start functioning once again as a team, we are headed for trouble.

Now, let's get one thing straight at the outset. None of us is perfect. We never have been. Don't judge us all by the mistakes of a few and we won't judge you by the handful of misguided men who would legislate this industry into a state of paralysis.

PRODUCE BETTER HEALTH PRODUCTS

When the first Food and Drug Act was passed, the screams were heard around the world. We survived. Most of us will survive the present legislative siege.

But profits aren't our greatest motivation in this industry. If they were, a lot of us in this room would not be alive today. Our goal is to produce better health products, to promote quicker healing and longer life, and in the process, to make a fair profit, to operate respectable and respected businesses, and to be loyal to the American way of life and the free enterprise system that has made America great. And let us never forget that it was this great America with the free enterprise system that defended the world in two world wars and enabled men to come out free.

What are the pitfalls of overlegislation and overregulation?

Well, the small companies get hurt first. The small pharmaceutical firm is in great danger of oblivion. The larger companies will begin to feel the squeeze later. Research can be curtailed. We won't feel the impact today but we will soon. The economic impact is secondary. The health impact is where it will hurt us most of all.

I don't have to recite to you the research cutbacks that have taken place. There is no need to go into that. You are all aware of it. I do not need to recite to you that overregulation can dry up our clinical research facilities, and I don't have to tell you that overcontrol and red tape scares the daylights out of creative people and drives them out of productivity—and God forbid that we lose them.

THE GREAT HEALTH TEAM

Now, where do we go from here?

What are your responsibilities and what are ours?

As I see them, it is something like this.

We are all members of a great health team that has given this country the world's highest health standards. It is a matter of record that there has been more progress made in medicine and in the health of mankind in the last three decades than since the beginning of time.

We talk about this health team often enough. Let's examine it closely.

It is a big team. It starts with a man with a test tube in a laboratory of a pharmaceutical company, a hospital, a university, a Government research project or other institute. It starts somewhere with a man, say like Fleming.

And gradually a product evolves, and this adds to the team a small army of engineers and production people, striving to produce a drug at a cost that can make it available to all men.

We then have to add an intricate system of checks and balances in the area of clinical testing, through a dedicated group of doctors traveling unknown paths as to what will happen.

Next comes the critical evaluation of the Government agencies, again devoted members of the health team who check for accuracy and safety. And along the way there are many areas of scientific conflict and honest difference of opinion. These have to be resolved.

Let me give you an example of honest difference of scientific opinion that happened during the war.

Penicillin was on allocation. A beautiful girl of 20 years of age had endocarditis. Her father tried to intervene to get penicillin for her—the doctors thought it would help. The girl was denied the penicillin and she died. Scientific knowledge had not at that time indicated the use of penicillin in endocarditis.

Gentlemen, today penicillin is the specific for endocarditis.

So now we have a product. The doctor must be informed about it. Medical papers must be written and published. Detail men must call on the doctor and acquaint him with not only what it will do but its dangers, because as drugs become more potent, they naturally become more dangerous.

And here the pharmacist enters the picture. He must have it in stock. It is no good if it's in the warehouse miles away. And the professional pharmacist plays an invaluable role which I am afraid is often underplayed and forgotten. Remember that the pharmacist has the legal responsibility for the accuracy of the prescription.

The hospital again comes into the picture and finally the ultimate goal is reached—the purpose of this tremendous team effort—the drug is administered and the patient gets well.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Would those of you in this room who have ever had pneumonia please put up your hands?

All right. Half of you put your hands down because you were dead before antibiotics. That was the death rate, just 50 percent. It is well to keep this in mind.

I am a realist, try to be. I know the vital role the Government staff men have in keeping this health team on the move. You men in Government, you help determine policy, you help write the laws. You enforce the regulations. Your responsibilities are awesome.

Quite frankly, when the new drug law was enacted, some of us thought the worst. I must be honest and say in recent months it has been our experience that the FDA has been both efficient and productive and most cooperative. No one can discount the importance of our legislative leaders, but those of you in the staff functions working in the Government committees, writing and enforcing the regulations—you are the backbone of the legislative procedure and the key men of the health team.

The Senator may not be reelected, but you will probably still be there.

Some things in government confuse me. I am a member of Luther Hodges' export expansion program committee.

President Kennedy at a recent meeting at the White House asked us to cut prices of exports for the purpose of helping our balance of payments. The Internal Revenue says, "No, it is tax avoidance"—and some who had cut prices of exports have been criticized for doing so. A situation like that leaves me slightly confused.

In government and in industry let us pause to take account of ourselves and our objectives. Let us not tolerate the profiteers, and I assure you they are a tiny minority. Profiteers never last.

On the other hand, let's not get caught up in a landslide of destructive legislation—and, fortunately, there are only a few who seem hellbent in this direction.

LET'S STOP BICKERING

When are we going to stop this constant bickering and get back to the job of improving health and saving lives?

What the pharmaceutical industry has spent defending itself in Washington and other parts of the world the last 4 years, in terms of manpower and money, is staggering. What started out as differences of opinion between our industry and some Government investigating committees has now become the source of distorted international propaganda—not so much anti-drug industry as it is anti-American. If you have any question on that, follow what is happening in Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, Great Britain, Canada—and we are now frontpage news in Sydney, Australia.

It is the duty of Government officials charged with protecting the consumers to fulfill their obligation to the best of their ability. But let us not be stupid and build a "Berlin wall."

I changed my attitude in dealing with Government agencies, first because of my experience here as a member of a Government agency; and, secondly, in more recent years, because of my personal contacts with the top men in Government agencies.

My reaction—fortunately in the distant past—was "that so and so."

But now I react differently. Now I say:

"Well, now, Hofmann, why don't these people understand? Have you made your position clear? Do they understand your motives and your purpose?"

We must all learn to arrive at the right viewpoint. And usually it's not my viewpoint, nor is it your viewpoint.

Gentlemen, it is our viewpoint.

PROFITLESS DRUGS UNMENTIONED

The drug industry contributes a great deal more than we have been willing to talk about in the past.

We have hidden behind a so-called ethical approach and we got hurt and badly.

Little mention is made of the profitless drugs that the pharmaceutical industry maintains and keeps today for the health of the Nation.

How many headlines have we seen about the drug for botulism that Lederle keeps in constant supply to take care of an epidemic—with 10 cases recorded in the United States in the year 1962?

I have not seen this put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I can go on with other products of other companies, but this will serve as an example.

There is rarely a major disaster in the world to which we do not respond with a generous outpouring of drugs and medical supplies. Exhibit A—the Cuban prisoners. I was part of the program in the drug industry. You know what was accomplished, and the prisoners were in Miami on Christmas Day.

WE CAN PERFORM WONDERS

This industry at all levels—manufacturing, retailing, distributing, research—everywhere—has humane qualities for which we are often given little or no credit.

Perhaps this is our fault because we don't know enough to stand up and be counted—but I must put that in the past tense.

I can assure you that for the most part the pharmaceutical industry in the United States is composed of dedicated people and companies who are excellent corporate citizens. We can match any industry in the Nation on this score.

And yet not so long ago we found ourselves being chased with our tails between our legs.

We have stopped running. Our panic is over. We have learned our lesson. We will tell the story of our accomplishments and we will try to tell it well, and I assure you we will tell it honestly.

But now that the chase is over, let us get back to the business of improving the health of this Nation and of the world, because what we produce here is immediately made available to people everywhere, prolonging the lives and solving the medical mysteries that still confound us.

We ask you to work with us for the common good. We make this appeal not out of weakness but out of strength.

We have much to contribute but we cannot do it without your cooperation. Together, all of us here today, with three different interests in the industry, we can perform wonders. But apart and disunited and distrustful of each other, we can gaily accompany each other down a long royal road to ruin.

Veto in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper on November 5, 1963, entitled "Veto in Sight" pointing out what is in sight for the quality stabilization bill if the Congress passes that iniquitous consumer-gouging and price-fixing legislation.

Plainly what will follow will be a Presidential veto.

It seems extremely unwise for the Congress to pass legislation so controversial, so destructive to the consumer interest, and so hurtful to the free competitive economy in which we take so much pride when a clear promise of presidential veto exists.

The article follows:

VETO IN SIGHT

Since late July the House has had on its calendar the so-called quality stabilization bill. This is the renamed price-fixing scheme for drugs and other "brand" products.

According to the flossy language which goes with this legislation, the bill would wipe out "cutthroat" competition in the retail business, get the consumers better products and lower prices, save the "small" businessman from extinction and in other ways benefit the general welfare and prosperity.

But the aim of the bill is still the same—to fix prices, up.

It attempts to do on a national scale what some States have done, at a high cost to consumers, and which other States tried, only to have the laws declared unconstitutional by their courts.

Any manufacturer, under this bill, who puts out a product with his name on it could lay down the law to any retailer who offered the product for sale. The retailer would charge the manufacturer's price, or else. And the United States Government would help him enforce his edict.

The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, and other branches of the Government are opposed to the bill. President Kennedy says the officials who have testified against it "have spoken my views."

He coupled this statement with a remark that he couldn't "comment" on any legisla-

tion until it gets to his desk. But in the name of consistency, he would have to veto it.

It conflicts with the spirit of all the antitrust, anti-price-fixing laws now on the books, and with the general policies of the Kennedy administration.

This should mean that the bill now on the House Calendar is merely an exercise in futility. Every consumer will hope so.

Paul Findley and the Federal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 21, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the November 5, 1963, issue of the Quincy Herald-Whig there appeared an editorial on the recent proposal made by my distinguished colleague, PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois. Congressman FINDLEY announced that he will offer an amendment to the Federal pay bill whereby the effective date of such legislation will be delayed until the Federal debt is reduced to a predetermined level.

The editorial points out a Federal pay raise should be earned by reducing budget requests as well as expenditures so that the enormous Federal debt can be reduced. I feel that such a proposal would have a good deal of merit and be a step in the right direction of maintaining the Puritan ethic in our Federal economic policies.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

FINDLEY PROPOSES

Our Representative in Congress, PAUL FINDLEY, of Pittsfield, comes up frequently with ideas—not always ideas with which we agree. But his newest, which he announced Monday afternoon, has real merit and might offer a dividend of fun on Capitol Hill, too.

FINDLEY announced he would offer an amendment to the Federal pay bill to delay its effective date until the Federal debt is reduced to $300 billion. In other words, the pay increases the bill proposes for upper echelon Federal salaries—including a $10,000 boost in pay for Congressmen—could be adopted, but with FINDLEY's amendment the increases would not become effective until the national debt was reduced to $300 billion.

Commenting upon his proposal, FINDLEY pointed out that the Federal debt now totals $307 billion, with the administration asking authority to increase it to $315 billion. (The permanent debt ceiling is $285 billion.) He adds that the administration "is planning for a $9 billion deficit both this year and next."

"Before a pay raise, let's pay up some of our debt," FINDLEY said in a statement released Monday afternoon. "It's high time we end our immoral fiscal policies—policies which put the burden of inflationary foolishness on elderly people who can't fight back, and the burden of debt financing on people not yet born.

"Under my amendment, every Federal employee involved in the pay bill would have a strong personal incentive to cut back on Federal spending to help make possible a reduction of the Federal debt. This would be especially true of cabinet officers and Congressmen, who would have a hefty $10,000,-a-year pay boost at stake."

Congressman FINDLEY's proposal has real appeal. Ordinary, long-suffering, taxpaying citizens surely will approve. It may not appear quite so attractive to FINDLEY's fellow Congressmen and many others who would be affected. It probably won't help our Congressman win popularity on Capitol Hill.

It could prove embarrassing to Congress. Congressmen might feel that if they were pictured paring Government expenditures to earn a pay raise it would not add luster to their image back home.

If accepted by Congress, the plan also might result in some economies that would most affect some of the less publicized and therefore more defenseless Government agencies, while others would continue to lead their fat and contented ways.

But, all things considered, FINDLEY's idea of "incentive pay" for Government officials should win a lot of approval in the country at large—if not in Washington.

Let's Know More About Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD a brief article on Mexico by Mr. Fred A. Orleans. The article is devoted to Alfonso Corona del Rosal, who is the president of the PRI, the major political party of Mexico. He has done a great deal to help bring political and economic stability to our worthy neighbor south of the Rio Grande.

This is another in the series of articles on "Let's Know More About Mexico" by Mr. Orleans, who is a recognized authority on Latin American affairs and an ardent worker for better United States-Latin American understanding and relations. He is an international attorney and economist, and has written extensively on Latin America. His article is as follows:

LET'S KNOW MORE ABOUT MEXICO

(By Fred A. Orleans)

Few people in the United States really understand the Mexican political panorama and its true significance. In order to obtain a better understanding of this subject, I recently had the pleasure of a lengthy and most informative meeting with Gen. Alfonso Corona del Rosal, who is president of PRI, the official party in Mexico. He is an extraordinary man, well qualified for the important position he holds.

It is under his leadership of the PRI that the people of Mexico have reached their present stage of maturity which permits them to calmly prepare for their 1964 presidential election at a time when extreme unrest is prevalent in most countries of Latin America. He has also been a decisive factor in the development of a new concept in politics, gaining the confidence of the Mexican people and striving to elect qualified people to office.

Gen. Alfonso Corona del Rosal stated that new elements are needed in PRI, in order for Mexico to continue its movement forward uninterrupted. He further indicated that, without the founding of PRI, it would not have been possible to live in a climate of tranquility and prosperity. He stated that Mexico lives in a climate of political tranquility since the people have confidence in the fact that the candidate for president of PRI will be the best man who can be chosen from its rank. He further stated:

"The nation will continue its march on the road of progress in accord with the principles of the Mexican revolution and in incessant search of the goals of social justice which constitute the root of the motive of being and the supreme objective of the Mexican revolutionary movement."

Gen. Alfonso Corona del Rosal was born in Ixmiquilpan in the State of Hidalgo, approximately 150 miles north of Mexico City. His scholastic record is impressive. He attended military college and at the age of 17 graduated as a lieutenant. Subsequently, he did postgraduate work in the military school of aeronautics and in the school of engineering. At a later date he returned to school to earn the degrees of bachelor in biological sciences and bachelor of law and social sciences.

In 1932 he entered the Law School of the National University of Mexico and is the only member of the Mexican Army to obtain the degree of attorney at law in the National School of Jurisprudence of the National University of Mexico and at the same time receive the honorable mention award. In the United States he carried on studies related to the functioning of military courts, as a result of the assignment given him by the Secretary of National Defense and he served with the Armed Forces of Fort Knox.

Starting in 1923, as professor of cavalry regulation in the military school of classes, over a period of many years he was active in the field of education. He is author of a book, "Military Morale and Patriotism" which is used as a textbook in some military schools and has been reprinted in various editions. Over a period of years he occupied the chair of political economics in the faculty of law and social science of the National University of Mexico. He has frequently written articles for the principal newspapers and magazines in the capital of Mexico.

As a soldier he has close to 40 years in the Mexican National Army. He has received numerous decorations, awards and medals over a period of many years, and attained the grade of general, as all previous grades, through vigorous effort and personal merit.

As a public official he has over 20 years of successful occupation of various positions terminating in his election in 1958 as governor of the State of Hidalgo. From 1953 to 1956 he was director of the Bank of the Army and Navy and as such was instrumental, during his 3-year term, in the bank's doubling its resources, lowering interest and other costs of loans; simplified the armed forces by 50 percent and helped bring about the procedures; increased life insurance on members and tripling of savings accounts by servicemen.

As a politician he began in 1938 as elected representative of the first military zone and of the Military Schools to the Constitutional Assembly of the "Partido de la Revolución Mexicana." He has occupied many positions of importance, including federal senator from Hidalgo, 1946 through 1952. As governor of the State of Hidalgo, which post he occupied until he was designated president of the Central Executive Committee of PRN, he performed his duties in a very enthusiastic and active manner, fully uniting all factions in the state and bringing about an important material work through the construction of numerous schools, important roads, athletic stadium, and many other works of social benefit.

As president of PRI he has worked hard, discreetly, and without publicity to change outdated formulas and bring new strength and vitality to his political party. Mexico is indeed fortunate to produce a man of the extraordinary caliber of Alfonso Corona del

Rosal: scholar, professor, banker, soldier, writer, government official, lawyer, outstanding political leader, and true patriot.

Plaque Presented to Hon. Angier Biddle Duke by the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PLAQUE PRESENTED TO HON. ANGIER BIDDLE DUKE BY THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York on Tuesday evening, October 8, presented their annual award and plaque to Hon. Angier Biddle Duke, Chief of Protocol of the State Department at a meeting in his honor at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City.

Mr. Duke is a member and honorary member of the Affiliated Young Democrats.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Young Democrats presided at this outstanding meeting where more than 500 members were present to honor Mr. Duke.

Mr. Moskovit, "praised the outstanding work on behalf of our country that Mr. Duke is doing as Chief of Protocol of the State Department. His yoemen work and service has brought praise from everyone."

Hon. Lester Kahan, mayor of Lindenhurst, Long Island, and a member of the Affiliated Young Democrats presented this plague to Mr. Duke.

The plaque reads as follows:

"Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, meritorious citation to Hon. Angier Biddle Duke."

In appreciation for faithful, unswering, untiring, and extraordinary service on behalf of all the people of our country.

Admired, venerated, and honored by our members of his outstanding assistance and guidance given to us and all young people for many years by helping us to promote the highest ideals of our young men and women, the future leaders of our city, State, and Nation.

Given this 8th day of October 1963, at the Hotel Piccadilly, New York, N.Y.

HAROLD R. MOSKOVIT,
State President.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part IX of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY STEAMROLLERS CONVENTION, PICKS ARCH-RIVAL JOHNSON AS VEEP—PART IX

On Friday, July 8, 1960, LYNDON JOHNSON swept into Los Angeles with his Texas sombrero filled with jibes at the candidate with the "Madison Avenue toothpaste smile." The first of the presidential contenders to arrive on the scene JOHNSON immediately denounced "the constant, crude efforts to smear candidates by guilt by association." He referred to well-circulated rumors that he was being supported by Jimmy Hoffa and the Teamsters Union.

"I really think," he told a mammoth press conference at the Hotel Biltmore, "that Mr. Kennedy, his father, and his brother have been running against Mr. Hoffa for several years now * * * the closer we get to the nomination, the hotter their breath becomes."

At the time, he indicated that he would not reject Senator Kennedy as his vice-presidential running mate. "The Vice-Presidency is a good place for a young man who needs experience," he observed.

But LYNDON JOHNSON—old "pro" that he was—knew that the only hope of stopping Kennedy lay in a deadlock that, in all probability, would result in Adlai Stevenson (whom he disliked intensely) as the compromise candidate.

Not that John F. Kennedy had the nomination nailed down when the convention opened. The New York Times estimated he was 160 votes short of the 761 needed to win. But his team oozed with supreme confidence perhaps born of the knowledge of the inevitability of victory.

A VARIED IMAGE

Political historians will have a time for themselves in analyzing the contrasting ideological pitches made in Kennedy's behalf by widely differing organizational associates.

Among liberals, and notably erstwhile Stevenson devotees, men like Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith pointed to Kennedy's qualifications as shown on the voting index of Americans for Democratic Action. What disturbed some liberals, however, was that Kennedy's apologists were constantly reminding them of how much growth potential there was in Jack. Was the White House ever intended to be a national laboratory, a test center, where promising young men could try out?

Among conservatives, especially southerners, the pitch was in the opposite direction. They used the voting index of ACA—Americans for Constitution Action, the right-wing group—which, according to Kennedy's backers, showed that the Senator was "1 percent less liberal" than STU SYMINGTON.

LAW LESSON FOR BOBBY

Nerve center of the Kennedy operation, which reached into each of the 50 State delegations, was a suite of rooms on the eighth floor of the Biltmore. Here shirt-sleeved Bobby Kennedy was directing convention strategy with Kenny O'Donnell, Larry O'Brien and others out of the tight inside group.

These were nonideologues. Their only concern was to win. Issues were only of importance if they would help Jack win. A revealing episode occurred the Friday night before the convention opened. Bobby Kennedy, interviewed on TV, was asked what he thought about the Connally amendment. Bobby, who was already being touted as Attorney General if his brother won the Presidency, confessed he had never heard of the amendment.

The amendment, under which the United States could not be hailed into the World Court without its permission, was explained to the future chief law officer of the United States.

Bobby ran the Los Angeles operation in a manner that soon earned him the nickname "Raul," after Fidel Castro's younger brother. He barked orders at the staff like a drill sergeant. His undiplomatic approach toward politicians many years his senior created resentment. "He talked to us like he was talking to Jimmy Hoffa," one politician complained.

DISNEYLAND OFF LIMITS

Once he gave his staff a dressing-down in Los Angeles that has become legendary. Bobby discovered that his "serfs" had visited Disneyland. They had taken time, he reminded them icily, which could have been put to better use for "my brother, the Senator." They weren't brought to Los Angeles to frolic in the sun. Henceforth, Disneyland was off limits.

Moreover, he was distressed about the tardiness of some staff members. When he called a meeting, he expected his troops to appear at the appointed time—not 5 minutes before or 5 minutes afterward. "And that's the way it's going to be if you want to remain on the Kennedy team," he barked.

Everything was pretty well under control by the time John F. Kennedy arrived in Los Angeles. It was Saturday, July 9, and on hand to greet "Lochinvar"—as James Reston persisted in calling him—were some 2,000 very girlish fans who squealed with delight as their hero consented to say a few historic words.

"A few days ago another candidate [JOHNSON] said that we needed a man with a little gray in his hair," said Kennedy. "We put that gray in his hair and we will continue to do so."

Taking nothing for granted, Jack Kennedy prowled the far reaches of Los Angeles, invading caucus after caucus with his plea for support, a plea always tempered with a recognition of the regional needs of the delegates to whom he was talking.

Thus, he told Iowans he intended to return to Washington to introduce a bill during the special session to put the farmer on his feet. "You see," the Dallas News commented, "a quick survey at the convention showed him a little weak in the farm belt. About all that this young millionaire socialite knows about farming is that there's votes in them thar fields. He is about as qualified to legislate on agriculture as a Japanese jujitsu artist."

LYNDON TEES OFF

LYNDON JOHNSON had made up his mind to keep fighting. The break JOHNSON had been waiting for came on Tuesday. In routine fashion, Kennedy headquarters had sent wires to various delegations requesting an audience for Jack. JOHNSON replied with a telegram suggesting a joint caucus of the Texas and Massachusetts delegations and a debate on the major issues.

Kennedy declined the honor and assumed the debate was off. LYNDON assumed no such thing and announced that Texas would hold an important business meeting at 2:15 p.m., and that the delegation would expect Kennedy and the Massachusetts delegation in the grand ballroom of the Biltmore.

A regiment of newsmen and television people took over the ballroom. At 2:45 p.m., LYNDON rode in with his boys from the cattle country, and asked whether anyone who could speak for Kennedy knew where the Senator was. The Senator was upstairs in apartment Q, not knowing what to do. The phone rang. It was Governor Hollings, of South Carolina. "You're going down to that debate, aren't you?" Hollings asked. Jack said he didn't think so. "You'd better get down there," drawled the South Carolinian. "I'm watching that commentator on TV and he'll ruin you if you don't.

It was 3:12 p.m., before the Senator of that book on political courage arrived in the jampacked ballroom. As he rose to speak, Kennedy's trembling legs made his trousers flutter, and beads of sweat tumbled from his upper lip. He made a set speech about the need for developing natural resources, facing up to new problems and so forth.

Against Kennedy's conciliatory remarks, LYNDON unloosed a barrage of sarcasm, the likes of which have rarely been heard in a face-to-face encounter. JOHNSON pistol-whipped his guest unmercifully. He repeatedly drew attention to Kennedy's voting record and Senate absenteeism. He questioned Kennedy's devotion to the farmer and reminded his audience that he was for rural telephones long before some people had even seen an outhouse. And he brought up the religious issue, an action that did not appear to appeal to Kennedy. "I think, Jack, we Protestants proved in West Virginia that we'll vote for a Catholic," he bawled. "What we want is some of the Catholic States to prove that they'll vote for a Protestant."

And, bellowed JOHNSON, where were certain people during all these quorum calls on the civil rights bill? "There were 45 rollcalls on civil rights in recent months," he observed. "LYNDON JOHNSON answered every one of them." But, he added, there were some people who would like to be President who failed to set much of a record. "I know Senators who missed as many as 34 of those rollcalls," he thundered.

Kennedy's face remained expressionless. And when JOHNSON finally concluded, Kennedy arose and made jokes. "The Senator wasn't specific in his remarks about voting on civil rights legislation," said Kennedy, "so I presume he was talking about some other candidate."

But by Wednesday, LYNDON knew it was all too late. When the rollcall was taken that day the tally was Kennedy, 806; JOHNSON, 409; SYMINGTON, 86; Stevenson, 79½. Through the tumult came Missouri's move to declare the nomination by acclamation. Despite a chorus of no's, the Chair ruled that Kennedy had been unanimously nominated.

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON of South Carolina, immediately sprang to his feet and made a dramatic effort to correct the record. The vote for Kennedy was not unanimous. South Carolina stood steadfastly against Kennedy even after he had won. When the party leadership refused to recognize JOHNSTON, the Senator rushed to the platform, which was blocked so that nobody could enter without the consent of the platform bosses.

Chairman Paul Butler refused to let the South Carolinian in, so OLIN JOHNSTON stood on the floor and yelled his denunciation at Butler.

THE MORNING AFTER

The next day stunned disbelief swept over the delegates. John F. Kennedy had announced, in the tones of a corporation executive announcing a shift in staff personnel, that Lyndon B. Johnson would be his running mate.

When the news hit the Symington people, they were thunderstruck. "Partner," said Missouri's James Blair, "we've just been run over by a steamroller."

"I'm sick," announced Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

"I'm shocked," gasped Robert Nathan, former ADA national chairman.

A Kennedy-Johnson ticket had long been the dream of Joseph P. Kennedy. In 1959, he had talked to Sam Rayburn on the subject. At that time Johnson, informed of the conversation, uttered a short ugly expletive.

In New York, Joseph P. Kennedy had watched his son's acceptance speech at the home of Time-Life's Henry Luce. His absence from the vast coliseum was noticeable that night as, one by one, the Kennedys were introduced by Chairman LeRoy Collins.

"If there are any Kennedys I have omitted, please let me know," Collins concluded.

There was a titter in the huge crowd. "Where's Joe?" people asked.

"As someone observed," wrote Randolph Churchill, "it was a lovely party, but where was the host?"

Liberty, Revised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the November 2, 1963, issue of the Richmond News-Leader contains an interesting editorial on the definitions of the word "liberty." The editorial is entitled "Liberty, Revised." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY, REVISED

Two of the most interesting people in this Commonwealth, Capt. and Mrs. Robert W. Orrell of Cardinal, publish an occasional bulletin known as Our Country. This is a literate, stoutly conservative bulletin, written and distributed as a labor of love and a work of patriotism.

In their current issue, Mrs. Orrell writes of some of the strange revisions that have been made in Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. She recently abandoned her dog-eared Fifth Collegiate, dating from 1936–41, in favor of the new Seventh Collegiate. Some old truths, she discovered, have now been rewritten.

In the fifth edition (and in the Sixth Collegiate of 1949, also), liberty was defined in this fashion: "Individual liberty now generally involves freedom of the person in going and coming (personal liberty), equality before the courts, security of private property, freedom of opinion and its expression, and freedom of conscience." The new Seventh Collegiate defines liberty as "the power to do as one pleases * * * the positive enjoyment of various social, political, or economic rights and privileges."

In the fifth edition (and also in the sixth), democracy was defined as a system of government in which the supreme power is "retained by the people." In the new seventh edition, the verb is subtly altered. Now demorcacy is a system of government in which the supreme power is "vested in the people." There is an enormous difference—the difference between owning property by inheritance and merely renting property by lease. How many students, we wonder, ever will pause to puzzle this out? How many will check back to see that once upon a time, in specific and unequivocal terms, liberty embraced security of private property? Now liberty, by Webster's definition, involves no more than "various rights and privileges."

In George Orwell's terrifying "1984," the masters of a totalitarian society see to it that all encyclopedias and reference works constantly are rewritten, so that every item inconsistent with the Government's policy will be obliterated. The offending items then are dropped down the memory hole. There are times, when these little discoveries of changed definitions creep across the desk, that we suspect Mr. Orwell dated his society 20 years too far in the future.

Situation Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, Mr. Martin Agronsky, a commentator for the National Broadcasting Co., gave the following situation report on the 11 o'clock news broadcast.

It seems to me to be a very clear and concise statement on the Otepka case and furnishes sufficient background to explain the recent resignations of Mr. Reilly and his assistant.

This case also gives weight to the theory that the Foreign Service clique in the State Department by getting rid of Otepka has now revenged the dismissal and prosecution of Alger Hiss.

The report follows:

SITUATION REPORT

The affair of the State Department's overzealous security section employee, Mr. Otto F. Otepka, is off the front pages for the moment. Mr. Otepka is the gentleman who was fired from the State Department's Security Division when it was learned he had been revealing the Division's secrets to a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Some of the committee's members, particularly Nebraska's Republican Senator HRUSKA, sought to save Mr. Otepka from punishment for functioning as his stool pigeon. Mr. HRUSKA released letters showing that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, John F. Reilly, and his two chief assistants, had admitted installing an eavesdropping device in Otepka's office and collecting papers from his "burn basket"—presumably to get the goods on him when they learned he was spilling the beans to the committee about them. Senator HRUSKA indicated this was no way to deal with so highly motivated an informer as Mr. Otepka. He said he wants Reilly and company investigated.

The State Department has ordered Reilly and his chief assistant to go on leave while this matter is examined further. Exactly what's happening now is a bit obscure. It raises a question best posed in the words of the song that goes: "Who will investigate the guy who investigates, the guy who investigates me?"

The State Department undoubtedly wishes it had access to some kind of Orwellian "memory hole" into which it could dump the whole smelly incident and forget it ever took place.

It did take place though. What's more it demonstrates to all State Department employees that they are constantly under the eye of a "big brother" security system whose operators are not only willing to use phone taps as a matter of course but are just as willing to lie about it when it suits them.

Last August when I made my first visit to Moscow, I was briefed by other correspondents on post there, and by our Embassy officials, on the importance of remembering that every word I spoke on a telephone might be overheard by Soviet security agents. When I lunched at a foreign embassy, the ambassador, an old friend, would discuss only trivialities at the table. He then asked me to walk with him in the garden. Once there he said, "Now we can talk. I'm afraid my whole Embassy is wired for sound. We make it a rule never to say anything inside the Embassy we would mind having overheard."

I asked him how he could tolerate living in such an atmosphere of constant mistrust, always overshadowed by security surveillance. "It's not very pleasant," he said, "but one must learn to live with it in a police state."

For westerners, it is this situation which poisons living in the capital of the Soviet Union.

It is an insidious poison, one which can no longer be unfamiliar to those who work in the State Department here, in the Capital of the United States.

Toward Assateague Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, earlier this year, the Secretary of the Interior proposed a plan, contemplating Federal development of Assateague Island, in Worcester County, Md. Subsequently, I joined Senator BREWSTER in introducing S. 2128, which embodies the Secretary's proposal.

During the past several months, there have been numerous discussions on this subject, and alternate proposals have been offered. An alternate proposal has been introduced by Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON, of Maryland.

On Friday, November 8, the Star Democrat, of Easton, Md., carried an editorial entitled, "Toward Assateague Unity."

This editorial suggests that "there is room for accommodation and compromise between the Federal-State and Morton positions." I believe that all views should be considered with respect to the pending legislation, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Toward Assateague Unity," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD ASSATEAGUE UNITY

Some weeks ago, when Congressman ROGERS C. B. MORTON introduced his plan for combined private and Government development of Assateague Island, the Star-Democrat gave its full editorial endorsement. Mr. MORTON's imaginative approach, which envisages three carefully circumscribed enclaves at 10-mile intervals on the island, has now been incorporated in a bill he has introduced in the Congress. The measure will probably come up for committe consideration early next year along with the Interior Department's proposal to have Assateague Island developed jointly by the State and Federal Government and preserved in its completely natural state.

The Morton plan would offer present lot owners on the island the choice of payment in cash for their land, or exchange for property in one of the areas to be developed with service, recreation, and housing facilities. It would therefore cost several million dollars less to implement than the Federal-State plan and would over the years, return millions of dollars to Worcester County in real estate taxes on the privately owned properties.

Critics of Mr. MORTON's proposal make two points: First, that even the limited development it envisages would spoil the natural state of Assateague irrevocably; and second, that any such development would be foolhardy because the island is subject to the vagaries of storm and weather and, therefore, unsafe for construction.

To answer the first point. Even the most vocal critics must admit that to draw millions of people a year into 30 miles of wilderness without making some provisions for creature comforts and necessities would be ridiculous. Mr. MORTON's suggestion is that these necessary adjuncts, plus facilities to provide added interest and attraction to the recreation area be concentrated in three specific locations. Since 10 miles would separate each of these spots, we can't see that the natural state of the island would be intruded upon to any recognizable degree. Moreover, the centers could afford vacationers with the opportunity to stay overnight on the island.

The key to success of the Morton plan is control. The areas to be developed must be carefully laid out. The development itself must be orderly and in accordance with a master plan which specifies what facilities are to be allowed, the architectural appearance of any structures and other such points. We would oppose any plan that did not incorporate these ironclad controls because if there were deviation, and spot or strip development ensued the effect would indeed be as ruinous as critics of the Morton proposal fear.

We would answer the second point of vagaries of storm and weather, and therefore danger from erosion or inundation of developed areas with this observation: the sites for development could include some of the highest land on the Delmarva Peninsula. British admiralty charts of Assateague Island show that thoes high points were in the same locations 100 years ago.

In actuality, there is room for accommodation and compromise between the Federal-State and Morton positions. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall indicated this in a talk in Baltimore this week when he commented that the Department "does not have a closed mind with regard to adjustments in the proposal," and that there could be "some things" in the Morton plan worth consideration. If Mr. MORTON were now to explore these areas of agreement with Mr. Udall, perhaps the Interior Department's plan can be modified and the two proposals united.

Charles R. Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the recent passing of Mr. Charles R. Hook, America has lost an internationally known industrialist and Government servant who devoted his entire life to principle.

It was my great pleasure to work with Mr. Hook through his efforts on the Hoover Commission. As the sponsor of legislation which his committee recommended, I had the opportunity to get to know and respect his great ability and devotion to his country. On the Hoover Commission, Mr. Hook made his specialty the business side of the Defense Establishment. He brought with him the experience gained in Government by serving, without pay, under three Presidents. He started as a $2 a week office boy for a Cincinnati, Ohio, steel firm and rose to serve as chairman of the board of one of our leading steel companies. This varied background in business made him well qualified for his Government service, and many of his recommendations on behalf of the Hoover Commission have been enacted into law.

Mr. Hook received many awards in his lifetime, but perhaps one of the last meant the most to him. This was the award presented "for devotion to principle" given by former President Herbert Hoover on behalf of the Hoover Commission task force. The citation said "you have provided strong leadership in the far-reaching and time-consuming task of assuring implementation of the Commission's recommendations. Hoover said to Mr. Hook that the citation was the only one of its kind ever awarded, and "it is an indication of the great esteem in which you are held." The citation praised Hook's "diligence, perseverance, integrity, and farsightedness."

Charles R. Hook is representative of that product of the American free enterprise system we tend to overlook too often. His life story is one of a man who worked his way up from the bottom of the ladder of industry to the top position in his field, and who gave of his time and energies to the Nation which had made it all possible. He did not seek honors nor compensation for his service, merely the opportunity to serve. He lived his life quietly, without great fanfare, and yet made a lasting contribution to Government and industry. As his biographer, John Tebbel suggested in his title, he brought "the human touch" to business, and to Government.

America has produced others like Mr. Hook. It is assured, through his good example and faith, she will continue to produce leaders of quality, and integrity.

To Mrs. Hook, and their son and daughter, we express our deepest sympathy, and pray that the strength of a lifetime of love and devotion sustain them.

Sigma Alpha Epsilon at the University of Georgia Honors Its Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Georgia Beta Chapter of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity paid a warm and sincere tribute to John Henry "Doc" Banks, who has been the fraternity's friend, adviser, and benefactor for more than one-half century.

Doc Banks, now more than 70 years old, is retiring, and members of the fraternity, both past and present, desired to show that they deeply appreciated his kind and friendly assistance, and they gave him a sizable cash gift, a lifetime pension, and other tokens of their esteem.

Doris Lockerman, of the Atlanta Constitution, wrote of "Doc Banks Day" at the fraternity, and I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Lockerman's warm column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIGMA ALPHA EPSILON TO HONOR "DOC" BANKS, THEIR FRIEND FOR 58 YEARS

(By Doris Lockerman)

The man who was on hand when Judge Richard Brevard Russell, father of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, was initiated into the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity at the University of Georgia;

The man who for 58 years has loaned money to Sigma Alpha Epsilon brothers in amounts up to $100 on the spot, without collateral or interest;

The man who has never forgotten the name of a pledge, even the countriest freshman;

The man who for more than half a century never missed a day looking after his boys, will be saluted by them Friday with the warmest tokens they can envision;

The Georgia Beta chapter of Sigma Alpha Epsilon will present to John Henry (Doc) Banks, their friend and major domo, their adviser and good shepherd, the fraternity's True Gentleman Award, an honor reserved for special distinction and achievement;

They will present Doc Banks a cashier's check in the amount of $2,000, more or less;

They will give the Negro man a scrapbook with at least 1,000 letters of praise and loving remembrances from Sigma Alpha Epsilon brothers scattered all over the world;

They will give him a pension for the rest of his life.

The latter, admits Jim Blanchard, chairman of Doc Banks Day, was the hardest thing of all to face. It will mean that the Beta chapter has become reconciled to the idea of Doc Banks' retirement. He is 74 or more years old. He, himself, is not sure exactly because age has never mattered to him until now.

Doc Banks Day will bring at least 400 fraternity men and their wives back to Athens to pay their respects to the tall, strong man in the white jackets who bespoke home and security to them when they needed it most.

Among them will be Senator RUSSELL, himself, if he can possibly get away from Washington. Representative JOHN FLYNT has assured the committee that he will be on hand for the reception at 4:30 p.m. at 247 Pulaski Street, at 6:30 p.m. for the dinner at the Moina Michael Auditorium, and for the open house and reunion at the Sigma Alpha Epsilon house afterward.

Banks suffered a mild stroke in late August, and has been convalescing at his home ever since, but he has been visited by small groups during the fall and he has promised them he will be able to make it Friday on his big day.

Of course he will make it. He must. Doc Banks is scheduled for the keynote speech.

He may be the only man in America who could command the silence of 400 old fraternity brothers and bring them to their feet in admiration and gratitude.

The 470th Anniversary of the Discovery of Puerto Rico by Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, 470 years ago, on November 19, 1493, Christopher Columbus, during his second voyage to the New World, discovered the island of Puerto Rico. He landed on the west coast of the island and took possession of it in the name of the Crown of Castille. For 15 years, the island was bypassed by the early Spanish colonizers, but in 1508, a young soldier, one of the companions of Columbus in the discovery of Puerto Rico, came back from Old Hispaniola, with 40 arms companions, to conquer and to settle. He was Juan Ponce de León. He founded the city of San Juan and organized it in accordance with the laws of Castille. Such was the beginning of the history of the Puerto Rican people.

For four centuries following the discovery, a stream of settlers continued to come to Puerto Rico from the Spanish peninsula. African slavery, established in the early days, existed until March 27, 1873, when all slaves, 33,000 of them, were set free amidst the rejoicing of all Puerto Ricans, including the slave masters. The aboriginal Indian disappeared, not as a result of warfare, but because of the diseases of the white man to which the Indian had no immunity; because of their early migration to neighboring islands to escape serving the newcomers, or because they were absorbed into the bloodstream of the new races which had come to the island. By the end of the 18th century, 100,000 inhabitants occupied the island.

Puerto Rico entered the 19th century with about 100,000 inhabitants but at the end of that century, it had 1 million people. This demographic development was not the result of natural increase alone, but of the continuous migration from the Iberian Peninsula to the Caribbean island. In addition, in the early years of the 19th century, the Spanish loyalists from Venezuela, as they fled from the wars of independence in the Spanish main, found a haven in Puerto Rico. This historic occurrence was parallel to the settlement of American loyalists in the Canadian Maritime Provinces as a result of the American War of Independence.

The purpose of this brief résumé of the 470-year history of the Puerto Rican people is to recall that today marks the date when the island of Puerto Rico was incorporated into the Western civilization; that this happened 470 years ago, and that because of those centuries of history, Puerto Rico is today the oldest community under the U.S. flag.

It was because Columbus discovered the island, it was because Columbus incorporated it into the Crown of Castille, that a historical process began, whereby the Puerto Rican people have attained their present station.

At the end of the 19th century, the old ties with Spain dissolved. In 1917, Puerto Rico became a community of U.S. citizens. There are today 2½ million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico. It is a showcase of freedom, democracy, modern life and high ideals and endeavors. Puerto Rico is a leader of thought and action in the Caribbean. It is also a haven for those who are fortunate enough to have escaped from despotism and oppression which unfortunately has showed its head in less fortunate lands in the Caribbean area.

Today is a holiday in Puerto Rico and I think it is proper that the people of Puerto Rico are paying tribute to the great explorer who made their existence possible; to that strong figure who so influenced the history of the world; to Christopher Columbus, the Admiral of the Ocean Sea, who offered mankind a new world for Western civilization to develop. As the representative of the people of Puerto Rico, I feel honored in paying tribute to his towering historical figure.

Our Fears Are Realized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent column by Dr. Robert Morris on the subject of the implementation of test ban treaty safeguards. The column is entitled "Our Fears Are Realized," and it is dated November 13, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FEARS ARE REALIZED

During the test ban treaty hearings in the Senate, the Joint Chiefs of Staff reconciled the treaty with national security only if certain specific safeguards would be implemented. This was the express condition agreed upon by virtually everyone involved in the hearings.

Accordingly, the President wrote a strong letter of assurance to the Senate leaders of both parties, pledging that the safeguards would be met. With this guarantee the Senate ratified. Among the safeguards were "aggressive and comprehensive testing underground to the limit of the treaty," standby apparatus to test in the atmosphere if necessary, and an extensive monitoring system.

All the witnesses, and particularly Adm. Arleigh Burke, agreed that these would be costly precautions, but necessary and worthwhile.

Several weeks have now passed. Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, one of the best informed men on Capitol Hill on nuclear affairs, wrote recently to the President to inquire about the promised safeguards. To his astonishment he received a reply from Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, saying that the administration is trying to get authorization to spend $18 million on safeguards. Congressman HOSMER and others had estimated that proper safeguards would cost at least a billion dollars.

When the hearings were in progress, we were told by Secretary McNamara, and by the President as well, that we were not developing an antimissile missile because this ultimate weapon was impossible to achieve. This assertion was received with skepticism by Dr. Teller and others who testified to their belief that the Soviets possessed the knowledge to construct such a weapon. The fact is that there were actually intelligence reports that the Soviets had already deployed an antimissile missile at Leningrad and intercepted missiles in flight with such a device.

Only last week in a Moscow military parade, Khrushchev wheeled out for public view what he represented was an antimissile missile. I do not suggest that we take Khrushchev's word for it. But, at the same time, we should not be trusting him to keep his word on the test ban treaty as we seem to be doing. The flaunting of the Soviet weapon dramatically points up the enormity of the risk we are taking by not developing our own antimissile missile with all possible haste.

In contrast, we announced last week that we were dismantling two more B-47 bases in England. This phasing out of our manned bomber deterrent could prove to be crucial if the Soviets have, indeed, been successful in producing antimissile missles.

In any event, the failure to implement the promised safeguards on testing and detecting, the refusal to proceed with an antimissile missile, and the gradual abandonment of our bomber deterrent constitute horrendous risks with our security and our survival as a free nation.

Hon. Carl Vinson

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, to honor CARL VINSON is to honor ourselves. This

great Georgian represents the pinnacle of achievement in representative government. His career is a guiding light for every youngster who sees in America a land of opportunity. His work is a model to which every Congressman aspires. He is America's finest argument for representative government for all the world.

It is an astounding thing that at 80 his voice is clearer and stronger than most; his mind is sharper and more active than most; his physical stamina is that of a man 20 years younger. The Congress has been blessed indeed that we have in our midst this great source of strength and inspiration. The Nation is blessed that we have had through these 50 years of his service his great contributions to sound government and strong defense. There has never been another CARL VINSON. We would be a richer and a better land if there were many more CARL VINSONS. But, we can be proud and proud indeed that we have the one CARL VINSON—for guidance, for inspiration, for lasting achievement.

Congratulations, CARL VINSON—warm, sincere, and from my heart.

Charles R. Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, in memory of Charles R. Hook, I include the following:

In the recent passing of Charles R. Hook of Middletown, Ohio has lost one of her outstanding citizens, and America has lost an internationally known industrialist—a man who served his Government, his State and his country in many ways. For 58 years Mr. Hook served in important executive positions with the Armco Steel Corp. of Middletown. He had the profound conviction men are more important than machines and applied a philosophy of simple humanity in the building of Armco Steel, which demonstrated the human side of business could be its most important aspect.

Mr. Hook accepted vital and important assignments as adviser and assistant to the two Hoover Commissions and served as Chairman of the Task Force on Business Organization of the Defense Department. Through his service and that of his task force, Federal taxpayers have been saved many millions of dollars annually in defense operational costs.

In April of 1962, Mr. Hook, as Chairman of the continuing Committee of the Hoover Commission Task Force Members, was presented with a special citation for his devotion to principle and his great contribution toward bettering our governmental structure, by former President Herbert Hoover at the annual meeting of the Committee in his suite at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

How Mr. Hook rose from a $2-a-week office boy in a Cincinnati steel plant to become an internationally known industrialist is one of the most interesting success stories that can be written. Wishing to learn from the ground up, he asked to be sent into one of the plants as a laborer. Promotions and recognition followed in quick succession until he became President of the Armco Co. of Middletown, Ohio. During his career he still found time to take an active part in a long list of national business organizations. Besides his work with the Hoover Commissions, our Government frequently made use of Mr. Hook's knowledge and experience. In 1938 he was appointed by President Roosevelt as a member of an American mission to study labor conditions in England and Sweden. Again in World War II he was asked to undertake another important mission when the war effort was hampered by a serious shortage of steel. President Truman also called upon him for assignments on several occasions, and under the Truman administration he was made a member of the Joint Labor-Management Conference. In 1952 he was appointed to the Government mission headed by Charles Sawyer and again went overseas to study Europe's economy. He was made Chairman of an Advisory Commission on Service Pay for the Armed Forces in 1947.

In spite of his many responsibilities, which were time consuming, Mr. Hook still found time to help American youth. For many years he was active in Boy Scout work, both locally and as a member of the National Boy Scout Council. Probably the award he prized the most highly was the Silver Buffalo—the highest honor the Boy Scouts of America can bestow upon anyone. He has frequently been honored for contributions to public service. He was given the Gary Medal by the steel industry for outstanding achievements in the field of human relations in industry. He was named Man of the Year by the National Association of Manufacturers in 1955. In 1957 he received the Governor's Award, the highest honor Ohio can confer upon a native son.

Opposition to Closing of Army Depot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolution 192, adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Schenectady County, N.Y., stating their opposition to the possible closing of the Schenectady Army Depot.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 192—OPPOSITION TO CLOSING OF ARMY DEPOT

Whereas the Schenectady Army Depot has been a bulwark of strength for our Armed Forces since the early days of World War I when it was constructed, and an integral part of the economic structure of the county; and

Whereas the proposed closing of said depot would be a financial calamity to a distressed area already suffering from chronic unemployment with the attendant rise in welfare costs; and

Whereas the residents of Schenectady County have already had to bear in recent years the disastrous economic losses resulting from the virtual closing of the Schenectady Naval Depot: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the interest of just and humane treatment for the residents of Schenectady County, the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors go on record as strongly opposed to any move by Federal authorities that would subsequently lead to the closing or reduction in operations at the Schenectady Army Depot; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy; U.S. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING; Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN; Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara; and Secretary of the Army Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.

Growing Grain Glut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the November 18, 1963, Wall Street Journal contained a story describing the Government's estimate that feed grain surpluses will increase 3 million tons in 1964.

The reasons for this added surplus, after progress in reducing stocks had been made in the past 3 years is because of expanded 1964 acreage as soil bank contracts expire; because the present planning controls are ineffective as yields increase and more producers reject voluntary restrictions; and also as a result of reduced exports. The result of this anticipated increase in feed grain surplus stocks will be to spur livestock production and thereby reduce prices and add $170 million to the Government farm cost.

Thus, again, after 3 years' effort and the expenditure of $2½ billion, a Government farm plan fails to be an answer.

More and more, as Government farm legislation fails to achieve a solution, all interested parties tend to a greater degree to finally determine that the solution to our so-called farm problem lies in extreme positions of complete Government control on the one hand, and absolute and final removal of Government participation on the other. Each course as an immediate action presents severe hardships, and an effort to find a middle course which will eventually free both the Government and the producer from their mutual entanglements should be one of our great resolves through the continuing course of the 88th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article of the Wall Street Journal heretofore noted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWING GRAIN GLUT?—ANIMAL-FEED SURPLUS, THOUGH NOW DECLINING, IS LIKELY TO RISE IN 1964—PENDING RETURN OF SOIL BANK LAND TO PRODUCTION COULD BOOST OUTPUT LATER, TOO—AN ELECTION EMBARRASSMENT?

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—Federal farm planners are fast losing hope of wiping out one of the most troublesome crop surpluses: A mountain of livestock feed grains, the raw materials for meat and milk.

It's true this heap is melting now. With the help of costly planting controls, Government and private stocks of corn, oats, barley and grain sorghums are expected to shrink to around 60 million tons next October 1 from the record 85 million of 3 years earlier. Cuts already made have had top billing among Agriculture Secretary Freeman's claimed accomplishments.

But a fresh pileup of fodder appears almost certain to begin with the autumn 1964 harvest. Early calculations suggest a 3-million-ton swelling of stocks during the succeeding year, as production from expanded 1964 acreage is expected to outrun animal appetites. A major cause for concern: The expected return to feed-grain production of several million acres idled under soil bank contracts in the past few years.

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN ISSUE?

This likelihood of more abundant feed might spur raising of cattle and hogs, and thus push down prices of steaks and chops. But a big new flight of feed grains to Uncle Sam's price-support shelter also would add many millions to the multi-billion-dollar annual cost of taking over, handling and storing farm surpluses. And, frets a Freeman adviser: "Any threatened new buildup and the extra expense would certainly be difficult to explain away in next year's presidential campaigning."

Already the Government's total farm-goods holdings are on the rise again, after an encouraging period of decline. When last tallied at the end of August, this heap stood a shade over $7 billion, a climb of $200 million from a year earlier. The biggest bulges came in cotton and tobacco.

Officials hope mounting farm exports will help turn this tide. But right now feed grains are making no contribution toward this end. U.S. shipments of these grains are unexpectedly slumping 15 percent below the pace of a year ago after reaching a near-record 16.5 million tons in the marketing year ended September 30. Though sales to some Iron Curtain lands, especially Hungary, may take up some of the slack, this country's chief feed grain customers in Western Europe are using their own rain-damaged wheat for animal feed and sharply cutting back on feed imports.

There's a batch of reasons why Federal farmmen expect feed grain production may overtake consumption next year. For one thing, present planning controls under which growers are paid an average $18 per acre for voluntarily idling up to 40 percent of their 1959–60 plantings, are proving increasingly ineffective. Yields per acre keep trending upward; an average acre of corn is bearing 66 bushels this year against a 1957–61 average of 54 bushels. And "noncooperating" growers are expanding their control-free production. Though the control plan has kept some 26 million acres of feed grain land off duty, this year's output is reckoned at 153 million tons, up 10 million from last year and only slightly below 1960's record of nearly 156 million tons.

END OF THE SOIL BANK?

The gradual expiration of the soil bank arouses deeper concern. Unless Congress quickly enacts some replacement for it, 7.4 million acres—a total area nearly as big as Belgium and largely concentrated in the Great Plains States—become eligible for renewed planting in 1964. Most are expected to return to unneeded feed grain production. This real estate has been idled under soil bank contracts for an average of about 5 years.

"It's the first rest most of it has had in 100 years," says an administrator. And because most of the land has been seeded in soil-building grasses, it's assumed the idled acres would be far more fertile now than before retired from production.

Nevertheless, Congress is expected to do little or nothing to head off the threat. Most legislators are weary of bitter battles over controversial farm programs. Even the Democratic leadership on Capitol Hill is divided on many agricultural issues. Last year, Democrats and Republicans teamed up to reject Mr. Freeman's proposed mandatory controls on feed grain output, and instead voted to extend 1961's voluntary planting controls through the 1965 crop.

Even this arrangement has recently drawn fire as both costly and ineffective. Incentive payments to farmers for reducing plantings rose from $782 million on 1961 output to nearly $900 million this year. If price-support payments are tacked on, the total net cost of feed grain programs has mounted from $937 million to almost $1.1 billion in the same time. And production is marching upward again.

CAN'T DO IT

Surveying this situation, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, recently charged that "the Government has spent $2.5 billion in 3 years to reduce the production of feed grain but find they can't do it." He noted that the record 4-billion-bushel corn crop in prospect this year is about 100 million bushels fatter than the crop in "the peak 'no-program' year of 1960."

In other feed grains, the 1963 situation isn't quite that bad. But next year, even without the output from acres freed from the soil bank, some Government economists are assuming total feed-grain output may match the 1960 record, given average weather and no change in present farm laws. If the former soil bank acres are cropped, some Government experts say, at least 4 million additional tons of feed grains will be produced, pushing 1964's output to a new pinnacle of nearly 160 million tons.

Even on the generous assumption that domestic and export consumption will rise 4 million tons, to about 157 million tons, this means that at least 3 million tons of feed grains would be added to the grain glut by the end of the marketing year on October 1, 1965. The total would thus hit 63 million tons, with most of it held by Uncle Sam.

A 3-million-ton addition would be enough, if fed entirely to cattle, to yield about 400 million pounds of beef, equal to about 7 percent of the Nation's expected beef output in 1964. If the extra grain went intirely into Government hoards, it would add $170 million or more to the annual price-support bill.

Unless Congress acts one way or another, the situation is unlikely to improve in the years after 1964. Feed grain output would be expected to reach a new high in 1965 as 3.3 million more acres, mostly former feed grain land, came out of the soil bank and into production. The remaining 14.2 million acres in the soil bank, out of a total of 28.7 million idled by the time Congress refused to extend the program in 1960, is scheduled for release in irregular-sized chunks through 1972.

It's true Congress might pass a bill to extend expiring soil bank contracts for a year or two. Such a measure has passed the Senate but is mired in the House Agriculture Committee.

But a Government poll indicates many owners of released soil bank land wouldn't sign up again for any short-term period. Soil bank payments average only $11.85 per idled acre. But the feed grain program's incentive payments, for which much former land in the soil bank would be eligible, average $18 per idled acre.

Moreover, many farmers might reap still better returns by putting their acreage back to work. An average acre of corn currently yields a gross of more than $70.

Ironically, congressional failure to do anything about the soil bank's expiration is due not only to the program's huge expense and alleged abuses of the past, but also to administration efforts to push expansion of a controversial rival plan.

THE CROPLAND CONVERSION PROGRAM

This is the so-called cropland conversion program, approved in principle last year by Congress, but with a spending limit of $10 million in calendar 1963. This scheme envisions paying farmers to take 68 million surplus acres out of crop production permanently by 1980, and converting them to other income-producing uses, including grazing for livestock, forests for lumber output, and recreation areas.

Because farmers could continue limited use of the land, the annual payment rate, Mr. Freeman contends, likely would run about half that of the soil bank. The whole permanent conversion could be accomplished, planners contend, at a final cost of slightly more than $3 billion, or only about $200 million more than the temporary retirement of the much smaller soil bank acreage.

Congress has so far refused to raise the $10 million spending limit so that the conversion program could be expanded toward national scope. Republicans, backed by cattlemen's associations and some conservative Democrats, argue that permitting livestock to feed on the retired acres would result in price-depressing overproduction of meat.

The administration, however, still is expected to support a Senate-passed bill raising the spending limit to $20 million in 1964. Though the bill will face heavy opposition in the House, it's expected some version similar to the Senate's ultimately will be approved.

A Million-Dollar Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Herald, Ahoskie, N.C., entitled "A Million-Dollar Enterprise." The editorial describes the growth of Chowan College in Murfreesboro, N.C., which is in my congressional district:

A MILLION-DOLLAR ENTERPRISE

The big business that is Chowan College began its 115th year this fall on a budget twice that of Hertford County, according to the news coming out of last week's Chowan trustees meeting.

The trustees approved a million-dollar budget for the Murfreesboro institution, set-

ting a new record. The total budget for Hertford County is just a little over $500,000, which gives an indication of how large Chowan has become and how important it now is to Hertford County's economy.

Student enrollment, including the extension division at Roanoke Rapids is 967. This is only slightly less than the total 1960 population of Winton and Harrellsville combined. Quite a showing for an institution that had been pronounced dead in the 1940's with burial in the form of selling its property being considered.

Chowan College's place in the sun in Hertford County is not assured solely by its contribution to the economy, important as that contribution is. Chowan, as any good educational institution should be, is a strong force in the educational, cultural, and spiritual life of our county. Many from the area who would have no opportunity otherwise receive, as day students or in evening sessions such as its very fine creative writing seminar, training which they are able to put to very practical use. The program in many churches is enriched by personnel from the college. Without the assistance of Chowan the concert series which people throughout the area attend would have long since died. Even the North Carolina Symphony appearance each year has been moved from Ahoskie to Chowan, a wise move which has kept the symphony's annual county concert on its calendar. The very existence of nearly a thousand young people in the county gaining a higher education is of benefit in giving a more youthful, vigorous if you will, outlook to many activities throughout the county.

We can only hope that Chowan finds that Hertford County is providing a good home for it. There is no doubt but what it is good for the county by the very fact of its being here.

Fish Protein Concentrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the current issue of the New Englander, published by the New England Council, appear two articles which I think would be of considerable interest to the other Members of the Senate in view of numerous recent discussions which have been held on the Senate floor concerning the fishing industry, and fish protein concentrate in particular. I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, "Time on the Water—From New England Shores" by John Tatge, and "Fish Flour: A Miracle Tied Up in Redtape" by Harold Putnam, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME ON THE WATER—FROM NEW ENGLAND SHORES

(By John Tatge)

The *Albatross IV*, the first exclusively designed oceanographic research vessel to be built in the United States, this month celebrates its first birthday. And, at the close of its first year the *Albatross IV* already boasts a retinue of accomplishments—accomplishments which have added to the storehouse of oceanography facts and which promise a stimulus for the ebbing tide of the New England fishing industry.

Operating out of its home port at the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Woods Hole, Mass., lab, the $2 million *Albatross IV* remains the newest and most advanced seagoing supplement to the Bureau's research activities. In addition to being the first exclusive oceanographic vessel to be U.S. built, it also has the distinction of being the first U.S.-built stern trawler.

What's the advantage of a stern trawler? Plenty—as being continually proven by the Russian fishing vessels that operate near our shores, operate on the whole more efficiently, economically, and quickly than their U.S. peers. The Russian vessels are all stern trawlers and complete manufacturing units in themselves. Aboard these ships the necessary and numerous steps that precede the eventual marketing of goods are effected and the varied middlemen necessitated by the conventional U.S. trawlers are done away with. The *Albatross IV* will, it is hoped, provide the impetus for the eventual development of long-range, large capacity U.S. factory ships that can span out across the oceans, not only catching but filleting and packaging their produce, thus helping to boost the fortunes of the gradually declining New England fisheries.

The kind of information uncovered by the *Albatross IV* is virtually unlimited—ranging all the way from the nature of bottom sedimentation in Nantucket Bay to taking census in the Gulf of Maine. Utilization of this knowledge is far-reaching too, enabling local fishermen, canners and processors to more accurately foresee future personnel and equipment requirements, furthering the fishing industry's various conservation practices and adding one more bit of information to the vast storehouse now accumulating at the National Oceanographic Data Center, Washington, D.C.

The most important data contributed by the *Albatross IV* are bathythermograph readings, depth and temperature recordings, taken 24 times daily for each day of each cruise.

Another top priority *Albatross IV* project is haddock counting. Two 14-day cruises are made three times annually for the purpose of this count which leads ultimately to accurate forecasting of haddock catches for the following year. The same study is undertaken twice a year for scallops.

One of the most important projects currently underway at Woods Hole, a project facilitated by the *Albatross IV*, enables scientists to direct fishermen to the more plentiful fishing areas, and enables fishermen to get greater returns for the effort they expend.

This study, conducted by Dr. Roland Wigley and his assistant, Roger B. Theroux, concerns the relationship of bottom sediment to the plentitude of benthos, a basic food of the four most important commercial bottom fish: haddock, flounder, cod, and hake. In an extremely time-consuming and occasionally tedious task, Dr. Wigley and his assistant gather up bottom sediment. They then separate the sediment from the minute benthos, a job which can only be performed effectively by hand.

"By comparing what we find on the bottom of the ocean with the kinds of food found in the stomach of cod, haddock, flounder, and hake, we can determine what fish can be found where and in what concentration," Dr. Wigley explained. "In those years when we find large quantities of benthos in an area, fishing will be good; conversely, if the food supply is low, the quantity of fish will be proportionally lower, and we can expect a bad year.

"Carrying this conclusion even further, we determine where benthos may be found in greater concentrations for they accumulate in particular areas—generally according to the nature of the bottom sedimentation."

In support of the Bureau's biological studies, serology tests are conducted with almost every new catch of fish made on the varying cruises of the *Albatross IV*. These tests enable marine biologists to identify the various races of the same species of fish as well as to predict methods of future runs and aid fish conservationists.

Research and investigations of the preceding sort abound at the Bureau's Woods Hole Laboratory. They move along more rapidly now that the *Albatross IV* has been commissioned—commissioned to move along the waters and help keep northeast fisheries apace with the rapidly expanding activities of the other major fishing nations.

FISH FLOUR: A MIRACLE TIED UP IN REDTAPE

(By Harold Putnam)

(NOTE.—A year and a half ago the New Englander published a report on fish flour—the processed food that could help break the back of the world's nutritional problem. We reported then that roadblocks had been thrown in the way. Here's the story—up to date—and the outlook is still bleak.)

All of us are familiar with the Biblical story of Jesus' feeding a multitude with nothing for raw material but a few loaves and fishes. There is no time limit on miracles. The economy of New England is ready for such a miracle today, but the prospects for success are enmeshed in so many coils of Federal redtape that the dawn of a new industry, an industry that could bring about this miracle, still seems very distant.

Fish flour, a safe and edible powder made from whole fish, can be produced in quantity at New Bedford, Mass., and elsewhere, to the joy of our floundering fishing industry and to the great nutritional good of the hungry peoples of the earth.

Fish flour can be sold for about 15 cents per pound. It can be stored indefinitely without refrigeration. It can be mixed with rice or tortillas or macaroni, or whatever the native dish, to improve the diets of millions of people unaccustomed to the luxury of eating proteins. But hold on; don't rush out of the corner store to get it. The Food and Drug Administration won't let you buy it.

The VioBin Corp., Monticello, Ill., parent company of the New Bedford plant, will be glad to make it for you and sell it to you, but you can't buy it if it is shipped in interstate commerce.

Safe? Yes, so adjudged by no less a body than the National Academy of Sciences after a full-fledged investigation requested by the highest authorities in the Federal Government.

Nutritious? No question about it. So declared by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the U.S. Department of the Interior and such private laboratories as the Arthur D. Little Co., Cambridge, Mass.

Then who objects? Well, the Food and Drug Administration, without any scientific evidence against safety or nutritional value of the product, offers a purely esthetic judgment: Some consumers might not regard "such a product made from the entire fish as a clean, sound, wholesome product."

And there lies buried the hope of reviving the New England fishing industry and the hope of applying modern science to our nutritional needs. There lie interred our grandiose dreams of eliminating protein-deficiency everywhere in the world. The VioBin Corp. can go on feeding its premium-quality fish flour to chickens and mink, to the very great good of these scientifically nurtured creatures, but human beings will have to suffer along with ingestions of materials less good for their tortured bodies.

This struggle for recognition for fish flour has been going on for several years now. The New England council, the New England

congressional delegation, our chambers of commerce and management and labor in the fishing industry have been pleading unitedly with Federal officials for an overdue blessing for this product—but so far without satisfactory results.

Other countries are working feverishly to catch up with the quality of the fish flour already produced by private industry in the United States. Important work is going on in South America, Canada, Africa, and Sweden. And only a few weeks ago a Scottish company fed fish protein bread to 1,800 delegates from 55 countries at the Sixth International Congress on Nutrition at Edinburgh. The long lead which New England industry possessed 3 years ago is being whittled down to nothing.

At any moment Russia may announce that a high-quality fish protein concentrate is being manufactured aboard its factory ships at sea, and is being packaged for immediate delivery to needy countries. It is entirely possible in the present state of the art, to haul fish by the ton into the stern-ramp trawlers and dump them directly into processing vats for conversion within an hour into pure and nutritious fish flour. It is highly unlikely that the Russian Government would permit any consideration of "esthetics" to deprive its people of this needed protein, and the Kremlin may see more clearly than we have the value to foreign policy of generous donations of such bounties from the sea.

Throughout this hectic battle, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have played curious roles. Interior's chief scientist has promoted the rumor that a chemical used by VioBin Corp., may be toxic, but the National Academy of Sciences supported the manufacturer: "The problem of solvent residues * * * was considered not to be of concern."

A Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spokesman now tells the public that VioBin fish flour is substantially "the same product that has been sold as fertilizer." Yet it has been many years since high-quality fish meal was sold as fertilizer, and VioBin's solvent-extracted fish meal has never been sold for this purpose.

Federal officials have demonstrated a curious reluctance to approve the VioBin product, so long as VioBin is the only U.S. manufacturer ready for commercial production. Bereft of any scientific or legal reason for further opposition, some officials seem bent on studying the matter to death.

Last May Congress appropriated $400,000 for further fish flour studies, under the supervision of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior, and a major portion of the funds has been allocated.

Artisan Industries, Inc., Waltham, Mass., will report on "the design and construction of a fish protein concentrate processing unit utilizing microbiological fermentation or enzymatic hydrolysis procedures."

The National Academy of Sciences in Washington will maintain a panel of experts for guidance and counsel to the program.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Mass., will investigate procedures to inhibit flavor and odor reversion factors in fish protein concentrate.

This substantial Federal expenditure may be worthwhile if only for the reason that the Food and Drug Administration has agreed to assign a senior scientist to keep pace with Department of the Interior research studies.

Speaking for the Interior Department, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife Frank P. Briggs says:

"In this way, we believe that many doubts and questions of the Food and Drug Administration will be answered as they see the product through all its processing phases. We are hopeful that through this kind of cooperation, coupled with the recommendations in the National Academy of Sciences report, FDA may modify its current position regarding fish protein concentrate made from whole fish."

A lot of other thoughtful people are hopeful that this shocking and shameful impasse can now be ended: The New England fishing industry which is eager to harvest the teeming schools of fish off our shore; the scientists who see our future salvation in the application of modern science to the abundant products of the sea; and our political leaders who realize that turmoil in backward countries ferments in direct proportion to the hunger of the people.

Wounded personal feelings, jealousy over governmental or private progress, self-interests of agricultural producers—none of these are sufficient excuses any longer for delaying the sale and use of fish flour.

Milestones in Titan III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant aerospace contracts awarded in recent years is for the Air Force's standard space launch system Titan III. The principal industrial contractor at work of the Air Force Space Systems Division on Titan III is Martin Co. The authoritative magazine, Aerospace Management, features in its November issue a cover story on Martin's president, William B. Bergen, and the significance of Titan III, which, as the story points out, is the first major test of Secretary McNamara's concept of incentive contracting for the defense industry.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following article concerning Mr. Bergen in the Appendix of the RECORD:

"What do I think about incentive contracting? I think it's pretty damn good." That's William B. (Bill) Bergen's spontaneous feeling about Secretary of Defense McNamara's directive on cost-plus-incentive-fee (CPIF) contracting. Bill, as president of Martin Co., has in his hands one of the hottest and biggest CPIF's let by DOD, through Air Force, to date—Titan III. His incentive is like a big six-figure bet with USAF that when they hit the launch button on the first Titan III it goes all the way. And, Air Force wants Martin and Bill Bergen to collect that money. Bill has put the entire technological skill and management ability of the Martin Co. on the line, and he has faith—lots of faith—that the company will win.

Naturally, the contract isn't in the form of an ordinary wager, the contract has been worked, reworked, and finally approved by both Air Force and Martin. Bergen agrees that there are still some very minor problems but nothing of consequence. The incentive for Martin to do a good job is even higher than the contract's maximum limit of 12 percent. The added incentive is the next contract that Martin bids on. The company just has to come through with a great record on time, on cost, and on performance.

Bill Bergen honestly believes that Martin has the technological ability to perform. His job is to make sure that the ability is managed successfully. Bill states: "Technology has galloped so fast that it is no longer the single dominant factor.

"We know there are more people (companies) in this business than ever before—everybody is in the act. Thus, there is lots of talent in the form of numbers, but there's always a shortage of quality. Now, today, management is as important if not more important than the technical participation. The real goal of a CPIF contract will be the ability for a company management to use its technological ability to the fullest at the most economical rate.

"Look, there aren't enough projects now to fill the aerospace plants. CPIF is going to be a great catalyst in separating the men from boys in this business. Americans recognize talent by financial reward. If you have it, you get; if you don't have, you don't get. CPIF will be a great factor in providing the measure and the reward of the industry's talents." So, Bill Bergen is highly enthusiastic about what incentive contracting can do for industry.

THE 2200 MILESTONES

Unquestionably, Martin's president knows that the contract puts the company on a pedestal for all to evalaute. Right now, he isn't worried. At the last report on the program, Martin's work was moving at a 96.8 percent acceptance rate and on schedule. How do they figure? Bill explains that the Air Force and Martin finally agreed on a total of 2200 milestones on the T3 program. Each milestone was thoroughly evaluated and finally 330 were chosen as the most important. The importance was based on major completion points in the design, fabrication, testing, and delivery of Martin's portion of the system. The 330 milestones were renamed "Incentive PERT Events" (IPE's). An Air Force monitoring team has maintained an hour-by-hour vigil over IPE since it got underway on February 1, 1963. The team constantly checks to determine whether IPE deadlines have been met. At the last summation, 65 IPE's had been approved. Bergen claims that the two disapproved events will not delay the program since they have already been straightened out.

In explaining the overall T3 system management, Bill states very frankly that "we are still in the honeymoon phase of the program. We are coming along very nicely and we've gathered a lot of learning. My anxious moment is not whether we can meet the schedule or the cost, but whether we can get that first one off the ground."

There were two major parts of the contract. The first involved program definition studies done on a CPFF (cost plus fixed fee) of about 5 percent. Of course, the second is the CPIF with the maximum 12 percent on the research and development of 17 Titan III space boosters. On the program definition studies, Bill again is in hearty agreement with McNamara, "they are necessary and beneficial." He does, however, add a qualifier—"if you have the time."

SHORT COURSE IN HISTORY

Tracing back our short missile history, Bill tells about how the contractors were "invited in" by the military to learn about missile technology right after World War II. "It was like going to college at Government expense." In those days and even in very recent years, Bill believes there was a real need for concurrency. "We had a critical time element and our technology was shaky. CPFF's were the only logical way to contract. Now, that's changed."

In Bill's mind, we now have the technology to do the job. And, he claims that time is not a critical factor. "That's when program definition really pays off when you have time to operate. Martin and Air Force spent over a year in program definition. It was an exhaustive job, but costs were cut in the very beginning by value engineering."

PROGRAM DEFINITION

To Bill, the subjects of program definition and CPIF contracting boil down to time. He continues to bring this up—"How much is time worth to you? How valuable is time? If you have time, you can save money."

On the subject of program definition, Bill makes the following official statement: "* * * proposals are dissected and studied and criticized and restudied by the potential customer before he makes a decision. This process of program definition and source selection may take more than a year. At no time before, I believe, has this painstaking technique aroused so much public interest as in the controversy over the TFX airplane. I have no interest in injecting myself into that controversy, but I would like to make one comment: It is amply demonstrated in the case of the TFX and of other major new systems, that concern over the factors of cost, high usage of talent, and long development times (due to complexity) has steadily increased in Washington. I think every taxpayer should take comfort from the fact that there is a determination to look before we leap."

PRICING

Agreeing on the final contract terms was quite a task between Air Force and Martin. Here the biggest problem, according to Bill, "was definition and understanding of the work statement." Once everyone could agree on terminology, the customer and contractor were not far apart. Originally, Air Force had figured Martin's portion of T3 to cost around $225 million. The Martin proposal came in at $325 million. When the differences of opinion on the work statement were settled, the final contract was signed at about $275 million. An example of the differences that existed originally was that Martin did not understand that Air Force wanted spares documentation.

How about some of the minor problems? Bill explains that under a CPIF there can be a question on Government furnished equipment. (GFE). As an example, if a contractor requested and received an aircraft from the military for use in the performance of a contract, that plane is considered GFE. When on receipt, the plane was found to need repairs, under a CPIF contract, the contractor would immediately start proceedings to have the repair work done. With the CPIF contract, the matter would have to be negotiated with the military. Extremely tight and concise work statements clearly are the essential ingredients of good incentive contracting.

Bergen feels that CPIF contracting has: "For the first time, put the monkey not only on the contractor's back but the customer as well. This will force Government and industry management counterparts to be coordinated as a unit. Also, it has been my experience, under previous contracting, that all overruns are charged to the contractor. On the other hand, if the contractor luckedout or just did a great job, he was said to have overestimated the job and the Government has been robbed. CPIF's will prevent these factors and program definition is vital to CPIF negotiations. I understand McNamara doesn't want mismanagement on the part of industry or the services. I buy this philosophy."

INCENTIVE ARRANGEMENT

The target fee for the T3 contract is close to 7 percent if all goes well. It can go down to 1 or 2 percent if Martin louses things up. The 12-percent maximum has already been stated.

Martin gets no incentive on this contract for beating the schedule. They must, however, deliver on time or be penalized. An incentive is provided for keeping costs down. But, again, the biggest incentive is performance of the hardware. Brig. Gen. Joseph S. Bleymaier, T3 program director for the Air Force, says the contract is "the model for future development programs."

Bergen in a speech to key Martin employees stated the company's official position: "As I have stated many times, we welcome the trend toward greater use of incentive and fixed-price contracts. The concept of rewarding superior performance and penalizing substandard work is certainly sound and entirely in accord with the American economic system. It means simply that the earnings of a company engaged in the defense and space business more and more will be determined by the caliber of the job done. We believe this is as it should be."

Martin is also putting out subcontract dollars on CPIF's. Out of the $25 million let so far, about $7 million is being shared by nine contractors on CPIF contracts. The largest, $3 million, went to Rocketdyne for attitude control work.

WHEN IS AN ENGINEER AN ENGINEER?

Bergen, as an engineer, believes that a good engineer with some good business sense makes a fine management man. He'll go the same route with good financial people who have good engineering sense. Unfortunately, to Bill, the term "engineer" is used and defined too loosely. There just aren't enough top-flight ones to go around. "With CPIF contracts in house, you need the best. We can't make big mistakes." He related a story of a certain airplane built under a CPFF contract. After designing and building the prototype with a builtup, welded canopy, the pilots thought a bubble canopy would be better. The idea was accepted without much forethought. When work started, it was found that a bubble canopy involved a change in the ejection apparatus, a major instrument panel change, a complete redesign of the cockpit structure. Total cost $10 million for a bubble. "With a CPIF, this just can't and won't happen."

WHEN FEE IS PROFIT

Bergen feels that one of the critical points is a better understanding between DOD and the Renegotiation Board. "The whole principle of incentive contracting can be negated by the Board," he points out, "if it measures fees for profits earned under CPIF by the same standards as it has measured them on other kinds of contracts in the past." He also foresees a potential problem for the Government's negotiators unless the various Government agencies fully understand and accept the spirit of incentive contracting. "It shouldn't happen, but the first time some contractor comes close to earning a maximum fee under CPIF, there is a possibility that the contracting officer who negotiated that contract will be accused of doing a lousy job, failing to protect the Government's interests, and so forth. This sort of injustice shouldn't happen," he says.

THE POLITICAL AWARD

Although, off the immediate subject, yet in a sense allied, Bill adamantly states, "I don't believe there is a political award. This has been highly overplayed in the press, in Congress, in the Pentagon, and in the industry. No company, nor Government agency can neglect the political area because taxpayers are footing the bills, and the people have a very definite right to be informed. This, and I mean this, is too often misconstrued as political activity. I prefer to think of it as a process of information or education."

What about Martin's future? Bergen is like a man thirsting in the desert—not for water—but for a major NASA contract. "We've worked successfully for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We think we belong in the men's locker room at NASA too. Yes, I want an important NASA assignment like the Lunar Orbiter."

Address by Miss Gale Adams, of Pantego (N.C.) High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address made by Miss Gale Adams, of Pantego High School, Pantego, N.C., on the occasion of the presentation of the National Bellamy Award to Central High School in Chattanooga, Tenn., on October 11, 1963:

To you of Central High School I bring greetings from the baby of the Bellamy family, Pantego High School, the smallest school to win the Bellamy Award. Pantego won the 15th award in 1956.

Pantego High School is located in the eastern part of North Carolina, an area deep in early history. Located within 125 miles are the famed "Lost Colony," the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse, the graveyard of the Atlantic, New Bern, site of the beautiful Tryon's Palace, and only 15 miles from Pantego is Bath, site of St. Thomas Episcopal Church, the oldest church in North Carolina, established in 1732. Pantego has grown from a small one-room school established in 1874 to a thriving seat of learning in a modern-day community. Of the 450 students at Pantego, 160 of which are high school students, the major portion live on scattered rural farms but as a school unit we all have grown to love Pantego through the many activities the school has offered us.

Unlike most high schools, Pantego does not know what it is like to have a football team for we have never had one, but we do boast our good sportsmanship through the competitive spirit basketball brings to us each season. In the past 7 years we have won five of seven county championships and have twice advanced to the State finals. During the entire time we lost only 24 of 180 games played. We may not know the real glory of a touchdown but we do know our basketball.

Each fall the Beta Club, an honorary society for students of high scholastic achievement, collects clothing and distributes it to the needy children in the school. In the spring they charter a bus and make a 4-day trip to Asheville for the annual State Beta convention, 425 miles from Pantego.

The seniors sponsor a barbecue supper, a magazine sale, a card campaign, and numerous bake sales to pay for their annual trip to New York and Washington, D.C., in October of each year.

My class of 23 seniors is the smallest to graduate in about 30 years and the rising senior class of 1964 is the largest to graduate in the school's history. We may be small but we are mighty.

The student representative to the Bellamy Award ceremonies is chosen by the faculty on the basis of scholarship, leadership, and character. The announcement of the chosen one is made at the commencement exercises in the spring. The PTA sponsors these trips as it did for me to come here to Chattanooga. I am proud to say it has not missed a year in sending a representative to the award ceremonies since 1955 when it sent a representative to the ceremonies in Seattle, a year previous to the year Pantego received the award.

I bring congratulations to you of Central High School from North Carolina and my home school of Pantego for being the recipient of the 22d annual Bellamy Flag Award.

Urban League of Springfield Observes Golden Anniversary Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Urban League of Springfield is today observing its golden anniversary of service to the Negroes of my home city. The Urban League of Springfield was founded in 1913 by the late Rev. Dr. William N. De Berry. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Urban League of Springfield for the significant and useful contributions it has made to build better human relations in the Springfield community over the last half century.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks in the Appendix, a story on the history of the Urban League of Springfield which was published in the Springfield Sunday Republican of November 17:

URBAN LEAGUE NOTES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE TO NEGROES IN COMMUNITY: FOUNDED IN 1913 BY LATE DR. DEBERRY, SOCIAL AGENCY HAS MAINTAINED HIGH LEVEL

A major milestone in the social and economic development of this community will be marked here Tuesday evening. Members and friends of the Urban League of Springfield will gather at the Kimball Towers to observe the 50th anniversary of the local agency's founding and to rejoice in its resourceful history.

HOME FOR GIRLS

Its history began in 1913 with an idea conceived by Rev. Dr. William N. DeBerry, that there should be a place in the community where young Negro women could live, learn, and work together in a wholesome and productive atmosphere.

The St. John's Parish Home for Girls, forerunner of the Urban League of Springfield, was founded by Dr. DeBerry that same year, just a half century ago. Within a few years it came to be recognized as a solid foundation on which to build better human relations in the Springfield community.

First meeting of the incorporators of the St. John's Parish Home was held at the office of Wilmore B. Stone, 15 Elm Street, on March 28, 1914. Dr. DeBerry was unanimously elected to serve as the first president. Alexander Hughes was elected vice president; Edward A. Treadwell, treasurer; and Walter W. Samples, clerk.

MAIN OBJECTIVE

Main objective of the corporation was to provide "a house where at a minimum cost girls and women may have the advantages of a well-ordered home; improving their moral, social, and industrial welfare; teaching them the various branches of domestic science and allied industries; and aiding worthy girls and women to obtain suitable employment."

In 1918, the corporate name of the agency was changed to St. John's Institutional Activities, so as to include in its scope the work of the Boy's Club and a proposed home for aged Negro people in the community. At the annual meeting that year, Dr. DeBerry told of the influx of Negroes from the South and ways in which the expanded organization was trying to help these people become properly adjusted to their new environment.

NATIONAL AFFILIATION

By vote of the corporators, January 11, 1919, the agency became affiliated with the National Urban League for Social Service among Negroes, which had been founded 9 years earlier with much the same objectives as those stated by Dr. DeBerry in speaking for Institutional Activities. These were:

"To carry on construction and preventative social work among Negroes for improving their social and economic conditions in urban centers; to bring about coordination and cooperation between existing agencies where necessary; to secure and train Negro social workers; and to make such studies in cities as may be required for carrying out the objects of the league."

Another important adjunct of the agency's work stemmed from the founding of Camp Atwater—a summer camp for boys and girls in East Brookfield—in 1922. Owned and operated by the Urban League of Springfield, the camp has facilities for housing and feeding 200 children at one time. It has a national constituency.

In February 1923, Mrs. Elizabeth R. Whiting was elected to succeed Dr. DeBerry as president of the local organization. The latter was appointed executive secretary. Over 7 years later the next major change came—in the name of the agency to Dunbar Community League; and in presidents, from Mrs. Whiting to Edward S. Kronvall.

FOUNDER RETIRED

Dr. DeBerry announced his retirement as executive secretary at the annual meeting November 15, 1946. At that time he was given the honorary title of director emeritus and A. B. Mapp was elected to succeed him. Mr. Mapp came to Springfield from Columbus, Ohio, where he had served the Urban League as director of its youth division.

Following Dr. DeBerry's death, January 20, 1948, members of the Dunbar Community League passed a resolution saying in part: "With the passing of Dr. William N. DeBerry, the community lost one of its great leaders and the organization lost its organizer and founder. He was a pioneer, a builder, a humanitarian, and a scholar."

In November 1943, the league purchased the Olivet Community House for the purpose of providing a recreation and social center for residents in the Hill section of Springfield. Within the next 2 years the Department of Research and Community Projects of the National Urban League conducted a study of employment conditions among the Negro population of this city. The study report concluded:

"Employment limitations based on race and color have an adverse effect on the security of the Negro population, and threaten the amicable race relations which have existed in the city over the years."

MAJOR CONSIDERATION

Out of the same study came a recommendation that the Dunbar Community League give immediate consideration to adopting the name "Urban League," so that it might be identified with the national movement as an agency giving major consideration to the economic and social welfare problems of Negroes. The change was made at the local organization's annual meeting November 15, 1950.

President George W. Lamb stated in his annual report of that year that the agency was steadily progressing toward complete identification with the National Urban League program, and expressed belief that this would result in a program of greater service to the local community.

In the following decade, first Robert F. Donahue and then Dr. Oswald L. K. Fraser served as president of the agency. John G. Andrews, Jr., current president, was first elected to this post on December 8, 1959.

INTERIM DIRECTOR

Mr. Mapp was given a 2-year leave of absence in 1956, in order that he might accept a position with the U.S. State Department in Pakistan. During his absence, Eugene Sparrow served as interim executive director.

Upon his return, Mr. Mapp again served with distinction until last February when he resigned to become an intergroup relations specialist with the U.S. Army Materiel Command Headquarters in New York. Chester N. Gibbs, a director of the league, was then appointed to serve as interim executive director.

With the approach of the agency's golden anniversay, local officials are hopeful that it will result in better and broader public understanding of the background, purposes and functions of the league in the community.

MAJOR PURPOSE

As a professional social work agency affiliated with the United Fund of Greater Springfield and located at 84–86 Hillman Street, the Urban League of Springfield maintains a staff including Mrs. Inez C. Evans, community relations secretary, and Mrs. Martha M. Wilson, secretary-bookkeeper, in addition to Mr. Gibbs.

As an affiliate of the National Urban League, the agency has adopted as its principal purpose: "to aid in the development of a secure and exemplary American democracy by helping the local community ameliorate conditions and solve problems arising out of racial inequities."

Its four specific program responsibilities in working for that purpose are: job development and employment; education and youth incentives; housing; and health and welfare.

East-West Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in September the 45th Annual National Convention of the American Legion adopted a resolution calling for an end to cultural exchanges between the United States and Soviet bloc countries. In light of recent events, the wisdom of the present conception and operation of these exchanges may well be questioned. Under unanimous consent, I include a copy of the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an indication of the breadth of opinion and comment in our Nation today.

RESOLUTION 236: EAST-WEST CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Whereas the U.S. cultural exchange program includes agreements with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries involving exchanges in the technical, scientific, educational, and cultural fields; and

Whereas such agreements are believed to be generally more advantageous to the Communists than to the United States, and the exchange groups permitted by the Soviets to visit the United States usually include trained Communist spies; and

Whereas, since the Communists consistently use such exchanges as propaganda

weapons to further their aim of world domination, the American Legion is convinced that the dangers involved in these East-West exchanges greatly outweigh any possible advantage to the United States and that, in any event, such exchanges are inconsistent with the free world's continuing struggle for survival against the forces of international communism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the 45th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., September 10–12, 1963, That the American Legion opposes all forms of East-West cultural exchange programs and urges the Government of the United States to refrain from entering into any further cultural exchange agreements with the Soviet Union or with any other Communist country.

Too Many Arms, Too Few Brains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, with debate scheduled tomorrow on legislation to amend the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to the thoughtful article by Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post of November 18.

Today, as Mr. Childs points out, 10 percent of our total gross national product is committed to defense expenditures. Ninety-three percent of our aircraft industry employees are working on warplanes. In shipbuilding we find 60 percent and in radio communications we find 38 percent.

Mr. Childs emphasizes:

Unless these industries are to go on into an indefinite future, turning out more and more war machines to be stockpiled, a basic adjustment will have to be faced up to.

This planning for economic conversion is one of the important steps which the U.S. Disarmament Agency must prepare us to take. And, this is one of the reasons why the full amount authorized by the House Foreign Affairs Committee should be approved.

The article follows:

TOO MANY ARMS, TOO FEW BRAINS

(By Marquis Childs)

With a presidential year just ahead, it is a safe bet that the rallying cry, "Elect me because I can do more for the great State of ----------," is certain to resound across the land. The eager officeseeker will give the impression that defense contracts, research contracts, projects large and small, are on the political auction block and he and he alone can snare them.

Defense spending takes today 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. This means that whole communities and large payrolls depend on a continuous flow of dollars from Washington.

A program put forward recently to help ease the adjustment from a cold war economy to a future peacetime economy went almost unnoticed. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, joined by 10 others including Majority Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY, proposed a national economic conversion commission. The commission would be responsible for drafting a blueprint for converting to peacetime work and for drawing up schedules of possible private and public investment that would help to bridge the transition period. All plants in which 25 percent of operation was in defense would be required to set up an operating conversion committee.

In presenting his proposal to the Senate, MCGOVERN quoted in support of it from an eminently respectable source, a survey of the Morgan Guaranty Bank:

"With about one-tenth of gross national product devoted to military purposes year after year, there has developed a reluctance, both public and private, toward cutting back so sizable a sector of economic activity. Thus, the very fact that makes it important to prepare for the possibility of a reduction in defense outlays—that is, the economy's heavy involvement in defense—could also make it more difficult to achieve reduction."

MCGOVERN uttered a warning similar to that which has long been coming from business. The fact that roughly three-fourths of the Nation's scientific and engineering talent is in military research and development, or space, has caused a drastic decline in the modernization of civilian industries. The United States, which once led the world in machine-tool production, today has slipped to fourth or fifth place, according to MCGOVERN.

The concentration of research in the Government sector means that this country has lagged behind in new and improved products. In West Germany only 5 to 10 percent of research is in defense and the balance in private industry.

What this means in world competition in the sale of goods and services hardly needs to be pointed out. The relation to America's unfavorable balance of payments is a direct one. As West Germany, Japan, and Italy have built up new plants, the United States is left today with the unenviable distinction of operating the most outdated metal-working machinery of any major industrial power.

The Wall Street Journal last summer conducted a survey revealing that industrialists felt that high defense and space research salaries paid out of seemingly unlimited funds had priced them out of the market. Between 1954 and 1961 personnel working on Government research contracts rose 317 percent to 190,000. In this same period industry increased its private research payroll only 30 percent to 130,000.

As the demand for technical manpower grows, the supply dwindles. According to the Wall Street Journal survey, the demand for new engineers alone now runs close to 60,000 a year. But in the current calendar year only about 33,700 will be graduated and this is down from 38,134 in 1959. The situation seems to be nearly as acute in the physical sciences, chemistry, and physics.

This is, of course, only one aspect of the cold war economy where adjustments are vital if trouble is avoided. McGovern pointed out that in the aircraft industry over 93 percent of all employees are working on warplanes. In shipbuilding the figure is 60 percent, in radio and communications equipment 38 percent. Unless these industries are to go on into an indefinite future, turning out more and more war machines to be stockpiled, a basic adjustment will have to be faced up to.

A horrible example of how not to succeed by hardly trying at all is in stockpiling. There, because of the pressure of private interests, the Government acquired mountains of material far beyond any foreseeable use. To repeat that on a far larger scale in armaments would be the height of folly.

Support for House Joint Resolution 174, Providing for the Issuance of a Champion of Liberty Stamp in Honor of Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 86th Congress we passed the Shevchenko resolution providing for the erection of a statue in our Nation's Capital in honor of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of the Ukraine and Europe's freedom fighter. This is Public Law 86–749 and in accordance with its provisions, this statue will be erected on the Shevchenko site at P and 23d Streets NW., and the historic unveiling is scheduled to take place on May 30 of next year.

This Congress has a splendid opportunity to follow up on the constructive action of the 86th Congress in reflecting its support for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of this East European figure of freedom and independence. It will also be another opportunity for us to show to the 45 million captive Ukrainian nation and to all captive non-Russian nations in Eastern Europe that the United States has not lost sight of their captive status and the undying aspirations for freedom and national independence. Today, as never before, Khrushchev needs this kind of reminder, and no more representative body of the people can do this than we of the 88th Congress.

The support I have received in behalf of my resolution (H.J. Res. 174), providing for the issuance of a champion of liberty stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko upon the occasion of the 150th anniversary of his death, is most encouraging. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communications in the RECORD indicating support for House Joint Resolution 174:

CHEEKTOWAGA, N.Y.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
House of Representtaives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DULSKI: I heartily support your resolution which calls for the issuance of a U.S. postage stamp in the champion of liberty series honoring Taras Shevchenko on his 150th birthday anniversary which falls on March 9, 1964, and is the real occasion for such an issuance.

I earnestly believe that U.S. Post Office will issue this special stamp.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT C. REESE.

SOUTHAMPTON, PA.,
October 21, 1963.

Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student of world geography and my teacher has made me aware of the feel for national aspiration of our Ukrainian fellow Americans. I strongly urge you to support House Joint Resolution

174 calling for the issue of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA ATKINSON.

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN YOUTH ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 4, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We Americans of Ukrainian descent wish to thank you for introducing of your Resolution, House Resolution 174, on the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp in 1964.

We wholeheartedly support your resolution and hope that it will be passed in the U.S. Congress in the near future.

Cordially Yours,

MYKOLA BACZARA,
President.

ROMAN METANCHUK,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., November 6, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of the U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Baltimore branch of the Ukrainian National Women's League of America asked me as their president, to convey their very sincere appreciation to you, for your effort in behalf of the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko "Champion of Liberty" postage stamp.

While expressing the gratitude of the Baltimore branch, I am privileged in adding my own word of grateful acknowledgement for your foresight and wisdom in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

LIDIA LEMISCHKA,
President.

Members of branch No. 59 of the Ukrainian Women's League in Baltimore: Luduzla Clay, Mary Luchyshyn, Hano Ozorniy, Olha Vorz, Maria Bulawha, R. Zclinsky, N. Babiak, Marja Charchalis, Amo Poliszezerk, Alcao Blawacka, Anne Lupinski, Oksuna Juzemio, Alexandra Seninter, Angela Talar, Walensyno Lucuo, Anna Stelmack, Halyno Pisecko, Nadia Zrikewych, Oksana Kalynowsky, A. Kachan, Joanne Mauiwick, Rostoweck Lofio, Anna Prytnka, Olha Suskko, Anne Melnyk, Maria Kotyk.

PASSAIC, N.J.,
November 10, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Congressman of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: I would like to extend my gratitude to you for your kind support of House Joint Resolution 174.

At the same time I ardently request you to support it in the future so that we Americans of Ukrainian descent may finally achieve success in obtaining the U.S. stamp representing Taras Shevchenko, a real freedom fighter.

Very truly yours,

B. A. FILIPCZAK, M.D.

SS. PETER AND PAUL CHURCH,
Auburn, N.Y., November 4, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: On behalf of all the members of our Sacred Heart Society of SS. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Catholic Church in Auburn, N.Y., we ask for your kind support of your resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukranian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the champion of liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

A Ukrainian poet and patriot, Shevchenko has been also recognized by the U.S. Congress with a book and monument in Washington, D.C. The rise in prominence of Shevchenko as a symbol of his people, a nation of 45 million persons, has been attributed to the inspiration by the American tradition to fight against imperialism and colonial occupation of his native land Ukraine, and reflection of man's aspirations for personal liberty and national independence.

Our city of Auburn recognized the Ukrainian poet laureate and national hero when on December 29, 1961, the city council approved the renaming of Heany Avenue to Shevchenko Avenue. The name change was requested by Rev. Basil Ostas and Rev. Peter Ohirko, representing the parishioners of SS. Peter and Paul Ukrainian Catholic Church and all Ukrainian societies.

In deep appreciation and with best wishes and regards,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. KAZIMER BOJNER.

PARMA HEIGHTS, OHIO,
November 3, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: First, I want to congratulate you on introducing House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp, in honor of his 150th birthday anniversary in 1964.

I strongly support your resolution for this stamp and also believe it will be of great help in fighting communism here and abroad.

For your effort in this matter, I sincerely wish you the best of progress and to assure you that you will be remembered in Ukrainian history as a supporter of your struggle.

Sincerely,

PAUL WOLAUSKY.

NOVEMBER 1, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: We, members of Plast, Ukrainian-American youth organization, Baltimore branch, wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your farsighted resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—which you have introduced early this year in order to have the U.S. Government issue a special Shevchenko postage stamp in its series of champion of liberty stamps in honor of the 150th birthday anniversary of Taras Shevchenko in 1964.

We also wish to assure you of our wholehearted support of this your farsighted and wise understanding calling upon our Government to issue this special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp. A century ago Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet and advocate of freedom, was openly inspired by our great American ideals and tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land, Ukraine, by Russia; in his poem then, he openly for the first time called on the Ukrainians to hope and expect their own George Washington; furthermore, in his poems he openly attacked all tyrants, czars, and oppressors and all enemies of human freedom and decency throughout the world.

To the Ukrainians, Taras Shevchenko is not only the poet and great patriot; to them he is a national prophet and symbol of their dreams and aspirations, their ideals and hopes. Ukrainians righteously refer to Taras Shevchenko as "The Father of Our Country." To the rest of the free world, Taras Shevchenko is the symbol of freedom and emancipation of all the oppressed and persecuted. Moscow knows the best the value of Taras Shevchenko to Ukrainians and to the whole free world; for these reasons, Moscow's Communist propaganda these days is trying so much to misrepresent this great Ukrainian fighter for freedom and present him to the world as a true proletarian poet and fighter for Communist emancipation.

The history called upon our country today to be the leader of the free world against any dictatorship or oppression. Issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in 1964, will be the best manifestation that our country still today stands for the same ideals, which it was offering to Taras Shevchenko 100 years ago. In your noble endeavour to have such a special Shevchenko postage stamp issued by the U.S. Government in 1964, you have our full support and prayers.

Very truly yours,

Joanne Macewisk, Mara Mulkewyce, Loise Zslinksy, Roman Hour, I, Peter Wojtowycz, Deunt J. Pisetzky, Adam Lurkswjki, Olen Bulawka, Bohdam Chaplynsky, Andrew Czomodolsky, Olena Luchyshyn, Jerry G. Sushko, Evhewia Czorniak, Alexander Troske.

Tara Prytula, Gisecko Halynd, Oksana Maceivah, Goliszczuk Thor, Ostan Stelmail, Leuek Lluseaueunesc, A. Rastovecky, Epocbaba Tsciuryk, Olga Hanas, Andrew Reed, Andrew Tatchyn, Wasyl Stasink, Theodore Luchyshyn, Romona Haciurah, Walter Hanas, Olga Zachaskiw, Bill W. Tymuik, John Kohut, Joshua Mycheplyshyn, Joanna Zacharkiw, Deprace Rostculsek, Dr. D. Rostculsek, Tania Mychojlyshyn, Dr. Nicolas Lasijczuk, Lesia Pisetzky, Lidia M. Shaviak, Ocra Cmacrok, Lilliana Shaviak, Mrs. and Mr. Antin Troska, Marin O. Prytula, Joseph Milan, Olha Korz, and Olef Beudink.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS, COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., BROOKLYN DIVISION,
Brooklyn, N.Y., November 1, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Our committee is writing to you in support of your farsighted resolution, House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the champion of liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government each year.

Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet and national prophet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. In 1857, more than a century ago, Shevchenko advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington," in a belief that the Ukrainian people, then under the despotic rule of czarist Russia, would achieve their national freedom and emancipation under such leaders as was George Washington, Father of our Country. Shevchenko remains to this day a beacon of national aspiration and a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million Ukrainian nationals now in bondage of Communist Russia. The Soviet Government, knowing how deeply Shevchenko is revered by the Ukrainian people, has been trying unsuccessfully to slant his poetry so as to suit its political propaganda, and to make him a "proletarian and anti-imperialist" poet.

But for the Ukrainians in their homeland and for those American citizens who come from Ukrainian ancestry Taras Shevchenko remains an inspiring symbol of freedom and humanity.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of free-

dom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Members of the committee: William Borleskuj, Matyczak Pitor, Inylok Strinka, Wasyl Smetowski, Wasyl Kwasnij, T. Kosowhivh, Wasyl Bosrek, Emil Rylelesky, Filimon Susol, John Sumokishyn, Nykola Myrko, Ignatius Romanzcak, Michael Kit, Charles Szymk, Anton Pirozek, Setphen Krouse, John Kehlmyer, Swan Keerbjt, Michael Koladij, John Dumansky, Dmytice Dmytriw, Jerry Kue, Dmytro Dosick, W. Boshko, Stewart Barabau, Michael Bihuan, Motodomyer Fushicwicz, Paul Hatatyn, John Prish, Hryhori Czrpak, and John Chomiczek.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BOSTON BRANCH,
Boston, Mass., November 6, 1963.

Hon. T. J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We ask you—our very good friend of Ukraine—support your action House Joint Resolution 174, for the issuance of a T. Shevchenko stamp.

On May 30, 1964 will be unveiled a statue of Taras Shevchenko in Washington, D.C.—on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

May we ask to do this day—like a first day of issue—T. Shevchenko's commemorative postage stamp (or, champion of liberty stamp).

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL VINTONIV.
ANA VINTONIV.

NOVEMBER 1, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Our organization, the Willimantic, Conn., Branch of the Ukrainian American Youth Association of America, are writing to you in support of your resolution—House Joint Resolution 174—calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the United States in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We fully appreciate your foresight and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the Champion of Liberty series, which is being issued by the U.S. Government annually.

Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. In 1857, Shevchenko advocated a "Ukrainian George Washington" in his firm belief that the Ukrainian people, then under the rule of the Czarist Russia, would achieve their national freedom and emancipation under such leaders as George Washington, father of this country. To this day, Shevchenko remains a symbol of freedom and independence to the 45 million Ukranian nationals now in bondage of Communist Russia.

Therefore, the U.S. Government would contribute greatly toward the cause of freedom not only in Ukraine but elsewhere in the world by recognizing the great significance of Taras Shevchenko not only for the Ukrainians, but for the other nations now oppressed by Communist slavery and tyranny, in issuing, a U.S. commemorative postage stamp in honor of this great freedom fighter of Europe on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

JOHN HROOMIOCK.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
November 3, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We Americans of Ukrainian descent, residing in Philadelphia City, wish to thank you for introducing House Resolution 174 on the issuance of a Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp in 1964.

We support your resolution wholeheartedly and hope that it will be passed in the U.S. Congress in the near future.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed by 28 persons).

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
November 3, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: The undersigned residents of Phoenix, Ariz., hereby express their support of resolution—House Joint Resolution 174, sponsored by you.

It is our sincere hope that we shall be able in the near future to attach to our letters a stamp commemorating 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, the great Ukrainian poet and visionary of freedom.

Respectfully,

(Signed by 32 persons.)

UKRANIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, STATE BRANCH—ARIZONA,
Phoenix, Ariz., November 3, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: On behalf of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, State Branch—Arizona, we would like to express our deep appreciation for your sponsorship of House Joint Resolution 174—champion of liberty stamp honoring Taras Shevchenko on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

We sincerely hope that our Government will honor Taras Shevchenko's contributions to national and human freedom, and will arrange for the stamp issuance on the date of unveiling of Taras Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C.

Taras Shevechenko was an outstanding fighter for freedom for all nations and races, and to this day Shevchenko remains a symbol of freedom and independence for the 45 million Ukrainian nation oppressed by the rule of communist slavery and tyranny.

It is our sincere hope that your efforts in issuing the stamp will be successful,

Sincerely,

WALTER CHOPIWSKYJ,
President.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BRANCH IN WATERVLIET, N.Y.,
November 4, 1963.

Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Member of U.S. Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in Watervliet, N.Y., are writing to you in support of your resolution, House Joint Resolution 174, calling for the issuance of a special Taras Shevchenko champion of liberty postage stamp by the U.S. Government in honor of the great Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

To us, Taras Shevchenko was not only a great Ukrainian poet and national prophet, but also an outstanding humanitarian and fighter for freedom for all nations and races. Taras Shevchenko is considered Ukraine's George Washington, because of his many achievements for national freedom, of his people. The Soviet Government knowing how deeply Shevchenko is honored and loved by the Ukrainian people, has been trying to change his poetry, so as to suit its political benefit and make him suit their purpose.

We fully appreciate your support and wisdom in proposing such a postage stamp in the champion of liberty series being issued by the Government. Our organization thanks you for your support.

JOHN ROMONOSTIAN,
President.

W. WASYLKIVY,
Secretary.

Kennedy Administration's Deliberate Sabotage of Kerr-Mills Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, before my Committee on Ways and Means, this morning, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, laid bare for every citizen of the United States to see, not only the sabotage being perpetrated on the Kerr-Mills program by some in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but also the violations of the law. I am pleased to include his testimony, which should be read by every American:

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION'S DELIBERATE SABOTAGE OF KERR-MILLS PROGRAM

(Statement of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, to be presented to House Ways and Means Committee, Tuesday, November 19, as part of hearings by committee on medical care for the aged.)

My primary purpose in testifying today is to call to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee barriers and obstacles which have been placed in the path of implementing the Kerr-Mills program, Public Law 86-778, in my State of South Dakota and in other areas as well. I think your contemplation of this situation is vital because of the testimony that will likely be presented during these hearings that Kerr-Mills has not met the problem of providing medical assistance to the older citizens of this country who have need for such assistance. I am convinced that when full implementation of Kerr-Mills is completed and each of the several States has had the experience of several years of administering and improving their programs with the full and vigorous assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which agency is charged with the execution of the act, then and only then can the final determination of success or failure be applied. Any such judgment before that time, is highly premature.

South Dakota's Legislature began studying the possibility of implementing the Federal law in its 1961 session only a few months after the enactment of the Federal act. The legislature initiated a study through its legislative research council to determine the need and scope for the program in the State. This cautious approach proved particularly valid because of experiences in other predominately rural States which initiated extensive programs only to face difficulty later in working out scope and financial support.

I was pleased to cooperate with the South Dakota Legislature in 1963 when they decided to adopt their rather unique approach in solving the problem of providing medical assistance to our elder citizens. The implementing legislation provided for a "pilot" program to determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their need, and a more accurate determination of the cost of the full program. The State department of public welfare was empowered to enter into a contract for the purchase of prepaid health coverage for eligible individuals. The law includes a provision that their insurance carrier must operate without profit or loss. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the pilot program will curtail high administrative costs of this medical assistance plan. The State legislature acted on the belief that it is conforming with the Kerr-Mills Act, Public Law 87-778 as amended by section 122 of Public Law 87-543.

The high regard I have for the Kerr-Mills approach in solving the problem brings me to the recent report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly to the Senate Special Comimttee on Aging. Frankly, gentlemen, I am distributed at what I consider the erroneous conclusions drawn by the majority in that report. For just a few minutes, I should like to dwell on several points in that report.

The Senate Special Committee report acknowledges and admits that the Department of HEW should attempt to help in the successful implementation of Kerr-Mills program at the State level. In fact, on page 17, section 3, it is stated, "The Department clearly has responsibility to assist the States in implementing the enabling legislation." It goes on to state, "All evidence available indicates that the Department has accepted and fulfilled that responsibility to the extent possible.

Gentlemen, it is my contention that this last statement is inaccurate. It is my intention to point out that while the Congress clearly obligated the Department of HEW in administering this public law, to provide constructive assistance to the States, the exact opposite was attempted in many instances by various members of Department staff.

The Senate Committee report accuses the States of "distortion of Congressional intent" in some of the MAA programs which have been implemented. I say the Department is guilty of failing to carry out Congressional intent by a program of deliberate sabotage of an act passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

First, instead of disseminating helpful and constructive information to the public about this law, staff members of the Department have, on many occasions, made public statements and written articles in which the Kerr-Mills law was maligned, ridiculed, and described in half-truths and false generalities.

For instance, Donald Kent, Ph. D., of the Department staff made the following statements in a meeting in Springfield, Ill., on April 7, 1962. "Kerr-Mills is just the same old relief program. * * * Relief is too expensive. * * * I believe we are facing the same tired old proposition that some people are more important than others and that we shouldn't worry too much about the less important ones."

On April 17, 1962, Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department, told the Nashville, Tenn., Sertoma Club that the Kerr-Mills program was not working; it could not do the job, but could only supplement the King bill. He said "90 percent of the funds being spent are being spent in the three States with smallest population."

In Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1962, Mr. Wilbur Cohen stated at a meeting of the Wisconsin Committee on Health Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security: "There is a great deal more to fear from the Kerr-Mills bill because by definition it is socialized medicine with a vengeance."

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW, addressed a group in Hartford, Conn., on March 26, 1962, and passed out literature which stated, "Kerr-Mills does not adequately take care of the near needy or even many of the very needy."

"Means test medicine in many cases does not let you choose your own hospital and doctor."

"Means test medicine can mean danger to health and safety."

Mr. DesMarais also spoke to at least one other group on the same subject. That was in Chapel Hill, N.C., on April 13, 1962.

On March 19, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Nicholas Zumas, Assistant Under Secretary, held a similar meeting.

In my own State, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a workshop conference was held on April 6, 1962, at which Mr. Dean Coston, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary was the featured speaker. The important feature of this meeting, which drew only about 30 people, was that it was open only to persons who opposed Kerr-Mills and supported King-Anderson. Although Mr. Coston was appearing at taxpayers' expense, the chairman of the conference stated in a letter dated April 2, 1962, that no organization could send a representative unless the organization supported King-Anderson.

And on April 25, 1963, Mr. Ivan Nestingen spent approximately 6 or 8 minutes of a 20- to 25-minute talk before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club deriding Kerr-Mills using such phrases as "administrative monstrosity" "optical illusions," "not a program which a great Nation like ours can be proud of."

Gentlemen, in these stated instances, we have public servants, paid with public funds, traveling at public expense, going about the country trying to destroy public confidence in a law enacted by this committee and the Congress. Not only do I question the legality of such use of Government funds, but I believe they have deliberately distorted the intent of this committee and this Congress.

Now, let me turn to more specific attempts by HEW personnel to sabotage Kerr-Mills. This is at the State legislative level and one instance occurred in my neighboring State of Iowa.

Iowa has had enabling legislation for MAA since 1961, but at the time the bill passed, no funds were appropriated. In 1963, a new bill was introduced in the legislature providing that those eligible for OAA benefits would not be eligible for MAA. Before this bill could be acted upon, HEW wired the Governor's office saying the provision to exclude OAA recipients "is not acceptable."

Gentlemen, I call your attention again to the section of the Senate special committee report which accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" by transferring OAA recipients to MAA. How can the majority report of the Senate committee condemn this practice and HEW at the same time uphold it by refusing to accept an MAA program which seeks to prevent the action? In fact, HEW in a later telegram to the Iowa Legislature again stated that approval could not be given to a program which denied assistance to persons because they had received OAA benefits.

The story of HEW's contradictory statements to Iowa is a long one and many other examples such as the ones just mentioned can be documented for this committee if it wishes. Suffice it to say that HEW has not carried out its responsibility of assisting in the implementation of Kerr-Mills in Iowa.

This brings me to a similar set of circumstances in my own States.

The story of HEW delay in South Dakota's case is most distressing. The plan submitted by the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare provided that the State would purchase insurance contracts for persons over age 65 who were eligible under the standards established by State law. The purpose of the insurance approach is to provide for eligible recipients a program most similar to what person with greater income would secure for themselves. Public Law 86-778 provides for the insurance mechanism but it becomes obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been most reluctant to see it used.

Chronologically, the South Dakota story goes like this:

During both the 1961 and the 1963 legislative sessions, Mr. Alfred Poe, Kansas City regional office, HEW, met with State welfare department officials, legislators, and representatives of the vendors of health services. He was appraised of every draft of the bill, its amendments, and its final wording. On February 11, he sat in on a joint meeting of the State senate and house committees on health and welfare, the welfare commission, and the Governor, and made statements to the effect that major changes would have to be made in the program before Federal approval would be forthcoming.[1] Under questioning by Governor Gubbrud, he admitted that there was actually nothing in the South Dakota law that would cause it to be turned down but there were questionable areas that would require elaboration.

The bill was signed into law March 11, 1963, and a plan submitted by the State welfare department to the regional HEW office on June 10. According to a statement made by the State director of public welfare at a welfare commission meeting in Yankton, S. Dak., on August 29, the plan was mailed from Kansas City to Washington on June 17. On June 28, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association was told at a meeting of HEW personnel that the plan had not as yet been seen in Washington.

In August, a letter was transmitted from the Washington office of HEW to Kansas City, indicating that the questions posed by Mr. Poe in his letter of transmittal of the plan to Washington should be answered before the plan was approved. The questions put to the South Dakota department were basically the same points already discussed on the previous occasion. After the questions were answered by the State department of public welfare in early September, no further word of plan approval or disapproval was evidenced by HEW.

On October 18, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association and the State director of public welfare met with HEW officials in Washington at which time they were told that one more statement was needed from the South Dakota Attorney General before approval could be given. This information was secured and relayed to proper personnel in the Bureau of Family Affairs, HEW on October 24, at which time the medical association representative was told that the plan would go to the Commissioner for decision without delay. It seemed that this timetable would be followed when information was given to Congressman Ben Reifel on October 25 that the plan would receive a decision "this week."[2] On November 6, Mr. Reifel's office was told that the material was in the hands of general counsel and would go to the Commissioner soon for a decision. To date, no decision has been made.

To the elderly in South Dakota who may have need of such a program, the Department of HEW has withheld care for a period of 6 months which, in fact, will mean a longer delay because of the time involved in setting up the mechanics of the program after approval.

Can any other conclusion be reached than that the Department has been deliberately

[1] Associated Press Dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963.

[2] Associated Press story dated Oct. 29, 1963.

delaying approval because the program might well prove a workable design for the rest of the Nation to emulate thereby weakening the argument for H.R. 3920?

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

I would also like to refer to a portion of the report of the subcommittee that charges excessive administrative costs in the operation of some of the Kerr-Mills programs.

The point may be well taken that government administrative costs are high. This does not exclude Federal Government administrative costs as contemplated in the social security approach. This is precisely the reason that the South Dakota Legislature wanted the claims paying function, the statistical function, and liaison with the vendors of care maintained by nongovernmental agencies trained and equipped to do such administration. The State welfare department's contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield obtains the services of two organizations which have combined administrative costs in acting as fiscal agents for South Dakota's old-age assistance program of less than 3 percent.

It is my understanding that Kansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield offered to administer that State's OAA and MAA programs at one-half of 1 percent. This is a striking illustration of the need to give the South Dakota plan an opportunity to prove itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been said before this committee and in countless other places that Kerr-Mills is not a perfect program for providing the Nation's elderly with health care. I have attempted to show why. It is the victim of a planned program of interference on the part of the Department of HEW, King-Anderson supporters in the Congress, and welfare workers and officials at the State and county level. These people, many in places of immense power, have used every means at their disposal to discredit Kerr-Mills in the eyes of the public, to confuse State legislatures in their attempts to enact proper programs, and to demean potential recipients of MAA benefits with meaningless redtape used under the guise of the means test. How could any program work perfectly with this kind of hamstringing at every turn?

Given a reasonable chance Kerr-Mills can and will develop into a mechanism which will answer the health care problem for every needy aged person in this country. But time must be allowed. Since the act was passed in 1960, only 3 years ago, 28 States and 3 other jurisdictions have implemented the act and have it in operation. Ten other States have enacted laws which will become effective shortly or which are awaiting approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12 States which have not passed cooperating legislation, 5 will meet in regular session early next year with the opportunity of acting. In the State of Texas, the electorate voted on the 9th of this month to remove constitutional barriers so the legislature can act in its next session to implement Kerr-Mills in that State. As a matter of record, only 3 of the 50 States have done nothing at all. This is a highly enviable record when it is realized that since 1960 Congress has always had legislation pending which would establish the social security oriented program and the possibility has thus existed that any State medical assistance program with its committed State funds might quickly be superseded.

I urge the committee to consider this problem carefully before enacting a compulsory program of compulsory health insurance attached to the social security program. "Medicare" is a gross misnomer for this approach because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and certain other limited services and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. The Kerr-Mills Act, on the other hand, recognizes that after retirement one may have a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits.

The reason Kerr-Mills can give a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is simple. This medicare program, being compulsory, requires that it be available to everybody so it is available to the wealthy as well as to those who don't need it at all instead of limiting to those people who require assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Another reason the compulsory medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 45 years on the gamble that maybe after age 65 they will need some health benefits and on the improbable hope that nothing will happen to the family until that time.

In addition, past history assures us that social security taxes will continue to rise sharply. No one can foretell with any degree of accuracy the upper limits of that increase.

Originally, the social security tax was set at 1 percent each on the employer and the employee on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Now it is 3⅝ percent each on income up to $4,800. The tax on the self-employed has risen during the same period from 2¼ percent of the first $3,600 of income to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800. For many taxpayers, the social security tax already takes a bigger bite out of income than the Federal income tax. Even without the enactment of medicare, the tax rate must be increased to provide for an actuarially sound trust account. By 1968, the employee-employer total tax will be 9.25 percent. Estimates based on actual claim experience of insurance companies indicate that within 6 years the estimated cost of the program will require a joint tax on a $5,000 income of 11 percent. This estimate is based on present benefits provided by the pending legislation. Once enacted there is little question that pressures would be engendered to expand the scope of the program, increase the benefits, provide for longer periods of time, and to lower the age limit. All this would, of course, substantially increase the wage tax and the employers tax for all American workers.

There is another feature of the compulsory wage tax and the corresponding tax upon employers for the limited health services proposed by the King-Anderson bill which I strongly dislike. That is the fact that this would be a system of regressive taxation for health purposes entirely violating the concepts of progressive taxation which have so long served us so well in the field of income taxes. In short, the health tax would entirely ignore and violate the ability-to-pay concept of taxation. It would in fact tax the very poor and the very rich at precisely the same tax rates on that first important segment of their annual income which serves as the tax base. For some Americans, for example, their entire income would be subject to this new tax grab while for the wealthy and the well-to-do by far the larger percentage of their income would be exempt from any health tax assessments or payments. In many ways this proposed Federal health tax is far more unjust to those with marginal incomes than would be a Federal sales tax which some are now proposing in lieu of Federal income taxes.

Another important consideration which seems to me to argue against the compulsory social security approach is that in establishing such a program we are taking an irreversible step. I say "irreversible" because we will be requiring people to pay taxes to a program from which they cannot benefit until age 65 so, once started, it would be exceedingly difficult to discontinue. To take such a step at this stage strikes me as very unwise. We are venturing into an entirely new area so far as the Government is concerned. We cannot predict with accuracy at this point what problems and difficulties will be encountered. This being the case it seems to me that any program established should be highly flexible so that it can be easily modified to meet unexpected problems which are bound to arise. From this standpoint the pending proposal would be most unsatisfactory.

I urge the committee to ponder well this extremely important and far-reaching and irreversible decision and I strongly urge sufficient time for the Kerr-Mills Act to be tested in the laboratory of life so that its true worth can be examined and evaluated. Until that is done, I strongly urge this committee and the Congress not to take the irreversible step of approving the King-Anderson bill.

Sorry White Journalism: The Megilla Over Ernest Petinaud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SORRY WHITE JOURNALISM: THE MEGILLA OVER ERNEST PETINAUD

(By Chuck Stone)

You read about Ernest Petinaud this week.

He's the headwaiter in the dining room of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Headwaiters unless they become endowed with the title, "maitre d'hotel," rarely attain international notoriety.

Ernest Petinaud was journalistically bathed in global fame this week for a skimpy three reasons:

1. He is an American Negro.

2. He accompanied U.S. Congressmen attending the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's meeting of parliamentarians in London as a messenger.

3. Some white reporters from America with a bellyful of bigotry resented his presence there as a Negro and decided to make a megilla (Jewish term for "big deal") out of it.

Don't kid yourself. The only reason that Ernest Petinaud's inclusion as part of the U.S. delegation was reported was because he was a Negro. Nothing else.

Had he been white, who would have known he was not a Congressman or a staff member?

Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, Democrat, of Ohio, head of the 10-man delegation to the meeting, was charitable in his reaction to the news report about Mr. Petinaud's trip with the U.S. delegation. "I hope all this publicity is not a racial thing."

Congressman HAYS, that's precisely what it was.

The New York Times had a field day splashing the story across its front page 2 days in a row, the second day, using a two-column headline.

Imagine a two-column head on the front page of the New York Times over a story that a headwaiter is attending a NATO conference with Congressmen.

Yet the New York Times placed Paul Zuber's announcement that he was going to file in the New Hampshire presidential primary on page 35 with a single-column head and a story of 2 inches.

What the New York Times should do is change its motto from "All the News That's Fit To Print" to "All the News That Our Editors With Their Racial Biases Believe Is Fit To Print."

There were any number of justifications for Ernest Petinaud being included in that trip:

1. The work he did is done by somebody, so why not assign him to its performance?

Foreigners are usually hired for these messenger and minor duties. Couldn't an American be utilized for the work?

3. The amount of money Ernest Petinaud's trip costs the U.S. taxpayer is virtually negligible. His expenses while in London were paid with counterpart funds which do not come out of U.S. funds, but English pounds.

4. The gross national product for the United States is $533,900 million, Mr. Petinaud's journey didn't damage it.

5. Ernest Petinaud is one of the finest, sweetest guys you'll ever meet. If anybody in Washington, D.C., deserved that trip, it was he. Because of the kind of human being he is—considerate, hard-working, genial, knowledgeable, and dedicated—it was about time somebody in the House of Representatives expressed their appreciation for the service he renders "above and beyond the call of duty" and brought these extra days of happiness into his life.

During my editorship of the Washington Afro-American, I frequently lunched on "The Hill" with Congressmen and Senators. One of the reasons I preferred to eat in the House dining room rather than the Senate dining room was Ernest Petinaud.

We got to know each other fairly well and whenever I visited the House dining room, he would make a point of discussing a particular editorial or story or column in the Washington Afro. Unlike many of our phony middle-class Negroes who don't want "Mr. Charlie" to know they're reading a Negro newspaper, Ernest Petinaud not only read the Afro, but told Congressmen and his friends he did. If he happened to know a Congressman read the Afro, he would comment to him about it, then proudly relay the information to me.

Always dignified, yet always accommodating, Ernest Petinaud handled an inordinarily thorny job with charm and grace. Imagine having to cater 5 days a week to the whims and idiosyncrasies of 438 Congressmen (Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina and Louisiana included), their families and their guests.

Despite the frightening possibility of 1,000 snafus, Ernest Petinaud runs that dining room like a combination PT-boat skipper and ovefastidious mother hen.

This fact was recognized by all Congressmen and for once the Congress of the United States laid open its heart and tenderly said: "We love you, Ernie. Have a trip on America."

Who disapproved? Some bar-stool-warming reporter who could find no news angle in a dull, prosaic conference of parliamentarians, so why not lynch a Negro in his news story?

This is the same kind of wretched slob in our profession who will never achieve the poetry of craftsmanship, knows it and spends his entire career ferreting out the trivia of human existence, while desperately praying that some pervert will nominate his reportorial garbage for a Pulitizer Prize.

He is a member of the white press' mediocrity, quick to criticize the Negro press for its biased approach to the news.

Biased? Man, we've got biases we haven't even used yet. But we admit it proudly because we're proud to be Negroes.

However, some white reporters won't admit they're bigots or that the reason they file a diarrhea of stories on the Ernest Petinauds and the Adam Clayton Powells is because they hate Negroes more than the putative immorality in public life.

Until the great hallelujah day when all white reporters will be able to write about Negroes without indicting us, when we are no longer nailed to a cross for the identical transgressions their white brothers have had a monopoly on for hundreds of years—until that day comes, American democracy and its free press will forever be blackened by these malicious hypocrites whose journalistic talents will never rise above whale carcasses.

And they're at the bottom of the ocean.

The Springfield Republican, One of Few Newspapers in Nation To Recognize the Beauty, Simplicity, and Sincerity of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address 100 Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today, November 19, 1863, about 15,000 persons gathered for the dedication of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg, Pa., and heard President Abraham Lincoln deliver a short address, of 269 words, that was to become a part of the American heritage and have an impact on mankind for generations to come.

I think it noteworthy on this centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg address to call to the attention of my colleagues that one of the few newspapers in the country to recognize the significance of President Lincoln's remarks was the Springfield Republican, which is still published as a Sunday newspaper in my home city of Springfield, Mass.

In 1863, the Springfield Republican, published by Samuel Bowles, was probably one of the most respected journals printed in the United States, and it has maintained its high reputation to this day. The Springfield Sunday Republican lead editorial is still as informative and perceptive today as it was 100 years ago when it caught the significance of President Lincoln's message, while other newspapers were criticizing the address.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield Sunday Republican of November 17 reviewed its editorial opinions on the Lincoln Gettysburg address of a century ago, and I ask permission to have these stories printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a story on the historic occasion by Hugh A. Mulligan of the Associated Press:

LINCOLN SPEECH MERIT IS SEEN AT ONCE HERE—ADDRESS AT GETTYSBURG, PA., IMMEDIATELY PRAISED BY THE REPUBLICAN

In a welter of generally adverse reaction—or no reaction at all—the Springfield Republican was one of few newspapers in the country to recognize the beauty, simplicity, and sincerity of President Abraham Lincoln's "remarks" at the consecration of the national cemetery at Gettysburg, Pa., 100 years ago Tuesday.

TEXTS CARRIED

The Republican carried the full Associated Press wire report of the dedication ceremony, giving three columns of space to the address by Massachusetts Statesman and former Senator Edward Everett.

The description of the ceremony and the texts of Everett's and Lincoln's speeches were carried in the Republican's edition of Friday, November 20, the morning after the event. It described Everett's 2-hour speech as "one of the most elaborate and eloquent productions."

Next day, in its Saturday double sheet and weekend news review, the Republican made the considered analysis of Lincoln's address. It was an appraisal that became famous throughout the journalistic world:

"Surpassingly fine as Mr. Everett's oration was in the Gettysburg consecration, the rhetorical honors of the occasion were won by President Lincoln," the Republican's summation stated.

"His speech is a perfect gem; deep in feeling, compact in thought and expression, and tasteful and elegant in every word and comma. Then it had the merit of unexpectedness in its verbal perfection and beauty.

"We had grown so accustomed to homely and imperfect phrase in his (the President's) productions that we had come to think it was the law of his utterance. But this shows that he can talk handsomely as well as act sensibly," the report continued.

The Republican advised its readers "Turn back and read it over—it will repay study as a model speech. Strong feelings and a large brain were its parents; a little painstaking its accoucheur."

There are some small variations in the text of Lincoln's address as reported by the Associated Press and other sources and the commonly accepted version today. Lincoln himself made some changes as he delivered the speech and in copies that he made later at the request of friends.

AP Reporter Joseph L. Gilbert, taking down the first half of the speech as Lincoln gave it, but borrowing the President's copy to complete his notes on the last half, reported that Lincoln said: "Our fathers fought and brought forth a new nation," while the accepted version makes it "fathers brought forth."

FACT DISPUTED

Gilbert also inserted notations of "applause" at four places during the speech and noted "long continuous applause with cheers for the President and the Governors of the loyal States" followed the conclusions of the address.

Other contemporary sources recorded that silence greeted the completion of the address. The fact is still disputed by historians.

THE SPRINGFIELD REPUBLICAN CALLED LINCOLN'S ADDRESS "A PERFECT GEM"

Press reaction to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address was mixed. For the most part, anti-administration papers attacked the speech and administration papers praised it.

The Springfield Republican, one of the few politically independent newspapers in the country during that time, called the speech "a perfect gem. Deep in feeling, compact in thought and expression, and tasteful in every word and comma * * * it has the merit of unexpectedness in its verbal perfection and beauty."

Because of its political independence, the Republican's comment on Lincoln's address was considered then to be objective, uncluttered with considerations of party or personalities.

Other papers also commented on the speech. Here is a sampling:

"The cheek of every American must tingle with shame as he reads the silly, flat and dishwater utterances of the man who has to be pointed out to intelligent foreigners as the President of the United States."—The Chicago Times.

"We pass over the silly remarks of the President. For the credit of the Nation we are willing that the veil of oblivion shall be dropped over them and they shall no more be repeated or thought of."—The Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot & Union.

"The dedicatory remarks of President Lincoln will live among the annals of man."—The Chicago Tribune.

"The ceremony was rendered ludicrous by some of the sallies of that poor President Lincoln. Anything more dull and commonplace it would not be easy to produce."—The London Times.

"Warm, earnest, unaffected, and touching. Thousands who would not read the long elaborate oration of Mr. Everett will read the President's few words, and not many will do it without a moistening of the eye and a swelling of the heart."—The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

"What could be more beautiful, more touching, more inspiring than the few words of the President?"—The Providence Journal.

CENTENNIAL OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—THE WORLD DID LONG REMEMBER: LINCOLN'S "FOUR SCORE AND SEVEN YEARS AGO" WILL BE FIVE SCORE YEARS OLD ON TUESDAY

(By Hugh A. Mulligan)

GETTYSBURG.—One hundred years ago this week, with vultures wheeling overhead and the skeletons of horses still scattered about the landscape, Abraham Lincoln mounted a wooden platform on the battlefield at Gettysburg to deliver the most famous address in American history.

The odd part about it was that no one really had intended for him to speak.

The orator of the day, as every schoolboy knows, was Edward Everett, former Secretary of State, U.S. Senator, Governor of Massachusetts, and president of Harvard, whose nationwide lecture tour had helped save Mount Vernon as a national shrine. Such was Everett's fame as an orator that the dedication date of the little 17-acre military cemetery at Gettysburg had been changed from October 23 to November 19 to accommodate his schedule.

LINCOLN'S ACCEPTANCE

Lincoln got into the act by accepting the same printed invitation that had been mailed to hundreds of others. Frankly surprised and a trifle embarrassed at his acceptance, the board of commissioners representing the 17 Union States which had joined to purchase the cemetery land quickly followed up with a more personal invitation in which they called on the President to make "a few appropriate remarks" after the Everett speech.

Clark E. Carr, of Galesburg, the Illinois member of the board, recalled later the decision to ask the President to say a few words came definitely "as an afterthought."

Contrary to persistent legend, most historians doubt that Lincoln jotted his speech down on the back of an envelope aboard the train to Gettysburg. He probably began on it at the White House on Tuesday morning, November 17, 2 days before it was to be delivered, writing at least the first page of it on Executive Mansion stationery.

Concentration must have been difficult, but the President had a great deal on his mind. The war in the west was going badly. A budget message was impending before Congress, and he had put it aside to sort out his Gettysburg thoughts.. His political fortunes were then at such a low ebb that one of his own Cabinet members, Secretary of the Treasury Salmon Chase, was making noises like a presidential candidate.

Thaddeus Stevens, for one, regarded the President as a "dead card" in the political deck. Upon hearing that Secretary of State William Seward would accompany Lincoln to Gettysburg, he sneered, "The dead going to eulogize the dead."

TAD LAY ILL

On top of all that, his best pal in the world, 10-year-old Tad Lincoln, lay sick of the fever in an upstairs bedroom. Mrs. Lincoln was beside herself with worry. Less than 2 years earlier, Little Willie Lincoln had died in the same bedroom after a brief illness.

The President, however, was in good spirits when Gen. James B. Fry called for him on Wednesday in an open carriage and urged him to hurry if they were to catch the special train leaving at noon for Gettysburg from the Baltimore & Ohio station. He responded with an anecdote about a fellow being josteled by crowds while en route to the gallows. "Boys," the fellow cried out, "you need not be in such a hurry to get ahead. There will not be any fun until I get there."

It was raining heavily as the President boarded the special four-car train, the last car of which was a director's car, fitted out as a drawing room. Besides Seward, he was accompanied by Secretary of the Interior John P. Usher, Postmaster General Montgomery Blair, his two personal secretaries, John Nicolay and John Hay, the Italian and French ministers, and a number of Congressmen, Army officers and newspaper reporters.

As the train pulled out, a little girl passed up some flowers to the President. He leaned out the window to kiss her, saying, "You are a little rosebud yourself."

Further along the line an elderly man who had lost a son on Little Round Top at Gettysburg came aboard to shake hands. Moved by the incident, Lincoln sighed, "When I think of the sacrifices of life yet to be offered and the hearts and homes yet to be made desolate before this dreadful war is over, my heart is like lead within me and I feel at times like hiding in deep darkness."

At Baltimore the cars were drawn by horses over to the tracks of the North Central Railroad and a baggage car fitted out as a diner was added. There was another switchover at Hanover Junction to the tracks of the Gettysburg & Hanover Railroad, and Lincoln was called to the rear platform to greet a small crowd gathered at the station. "Well," he smiled, "you have seen me, and according to the general experience you have seen less than you expected to see." The crowd cheered.

The rain had stopped by the time the train pulled into the little brick station at Gettysburg shortly before 6, and a big harvest moon was climbing into the frosty Pennsylvania night. A large enthusiastic crowd accompanied the President as he walked two blocks up the hill to the house of Attorney David Wills, chairman of the cemetery board of commissioners. The Wills house, a sturdy yellow brick affair, still stands overlooking the public square. It and the little railroad station are Gettysburg's main surviving reminders of the Lincoln visit.

After dining with Everett, Gov. Andrew Curtin, of Pennsylvania, and other dignitaries in the Wills home, the President was serenaded by the 5th New York Artillery Band, but he declined to address the crowd in the square.

"In my position," he begged off, "it is somewhat important that I should not say foolish things."

"Not if you can help it," cried an impertinent voice.

To which Lincoln good naturedly retorted: "It very often happens that the only way to help it is to say nothing at all. Believing this is my present condition this evening, I beg you to excuse me from addressing you further."

At 9 o'clock, Lincoln received a telegram from Secretary of War Edwin Stanton reporting that his son had improved slightly. With his Negro servant, William Johnston, he retired to his bedroom on the second floor to finish the first draft of his speech on a piece of foolscap borrowed from Wills. An hour later, he gather his papers together and went next door to show the speech to Seward, who was staying at the home of Robert Harper, editor of the local paper.

After breakfast next morning, Lincoln rewrote the speech again while waiting for the procession to start toward the battlefield. Gettysburg, a town of 2,100 had swelled to more than 15,000, with more visitors arriving hourly by foot and carriage and by special trains from Washington, Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Souvenir hunters roamed over Little Round Top and Culp's Hill, the Devil's Den and Cemetery Ridge, hunting for bullets, buttons, shell fragments, canteens, muddy knapsacks and other mementos of the bloody battle of 4 months ago.

Only 1,118 of the more than 3,000 Union dead have been reburied beneath the low wooden crosses in the new cemetery, and it would be 7 years before the Confederate dead were removed to cemeteries in Richmond, Charleston, and Savannah.

Amid the skeletons of horses and the scattered equipment, coffins protruded here and there where the rain had washed away the thin cover of earth hastily tossed on the graves by surviving comrades. People in Gettysburg blamed the high incidence of sickness that fall on the condition of the battlefield.

More than an hour late in getting started, the procession finally moved up Baltimore Street under a cloudless sky in perfect 52 degree Indian summer weather. Lincoln, in a Prince Albert coat, white gauntlets and a tall stovepipe hat that still bore a black crepe for Willie's death, sat astride a beautiful chestnut horse, "the largest in the Cumberland Valley." Even so, he seemed to dwarf the animal, with his long legs almost touching the ground. The march to the cemetery took only 15 minutes, but there was another hour-long delay because Everett was off touring the battlefield with Prof. Michael Jacobs of Gettysburg College.

During the long wait, Lincoln was handed up another telegram from Stanton containing some good news. Burnside was safe though still threatened at Knoxville, Grant had started a big battle at Chattanooga and, best news of all, "Mrs. Lincoln reports your son's health is a great deal better and he will be out today."

The ceremonies finally got underway at high noon with the Birgfield Band of Philadelphia playing a dirge and Rev. Thomas Stockton, chaplain of the House of Representatives, intoning the opening prayer. As the Marine Band struck up "Old Hundred," the President settled back in a battered settee on the platform, flanked by Seward on his left and Everett on his right. The wooden platform, erected where the Solders National Monument now stands, faced northwest across the site of the first day's battle and afforded a splendid view of Oak Ridge, the tower of the old dorm at Gettysburg College and, shimmering in the distant haze, the south mountain range.

Benjamin French, officer in charge of public buildings in Washington, introduced Everett. For the next hour and 50 minutes, in deep organlike tones, the 70-year-old spellbinder reviewed funeral customs in ancient Athens, described the 3-day battle at Gettysburg in detail, paid tribute to those who died there and vigorously assailed the States rights position.

Once when Everett mistakenly said Lee for Meade, Lincoln corrected him audibly. At the conclusion of his address, Everett was wrapped in a blanket, Lincoln and Seward came forward to pump his hand and the crowd applauded enthusiastically.

Next, the Baltimore Glee Club sang an ode written for the occasion by French. During the rendition, Lincoln extracted a pair of steel bowed spectacles from a metallic case, produced his manuscript from an inside pocket and proceded to study it. The crowd fell silent and ceased its stirring as Ward H. Lamon, marshall of the District of Columbia, introduced the President. Some had been on their feet for more than 4 hours.

"Four score and seven years ago," Lincoln began in a squeaky, slightly falsetto voice that nevertheless carried well in the clear autumn air to the back of the crowd.

Directly in front of him, Associated Press Reporter Joseph L. Gilbert scribbed furiously in shorthand. Alexander Gardner, Mathew Brady's man on the scene, crouched beneath the black cloth of his camera waiting for an emotional gesture that never came. In 4 minutes, the speech was over and Gardner had missed his shot. Gilbert borrowed the President's manuscript to fill out his notes and telegraphed the complete text to his Philadelphia office. From thence, it was sped to newspapers across the country.

According to Gilbert's account, the crowd applauded at least five times during the speech and there was sustained applause at the end, but Lincoln was plainly dissatisfied with his performance.

"Lamon, that speech won't scour," he said to Ward Lamon. "It is a flat failure and the people are disappointed." Scour was an old farm expression used to describe wet soil falling freely from the moldboard of a plow.

The ceremonies concluded with the singing of another dirge by a quartet, a benediction by Rev. H. L. Baugher, president of Gettysburg College, and an artillery gun salute. Back at the Wills house for lunch and a hand shaking reception line, the President again expressed his dissatisfiaction to Lamon: "I tell you, Lamon, that speech feel on the audience like a wet blanket. I am distressed about it. I ought to have prepared it more."

PRESIDENT FELL ILL

On the train back to Washington that night the President suddenly fell ill with what his doctor later diagnosed as varialoid, a mild form of small pox. Feverish and exhausted, he stretched out on a side seat of the drawing room car with a cold towel over his head.

Little did he realize, as the train rumbled through the dark Pennsylvania night and across the rolling Maryland countryside, that he had delivered one of the masterpieces of American literature, that in 270 simple words he had summed up the national purpose for all times, that schoolchildren for generations to come would memorize those immortal words, that they would be beaten in bronze and graven in granite, that people all over the world would find renewed courage and inspiration in them, and that history would prove him wrong.

The world did note and long remember what he said at Gettysburg on that fine full day.

Tribute to John Michael Carmody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us lost a friend in the death of John Michael Carmody, November 10. Friends of Rural Electrification, family farmers, labor, in fact the entire Nation, lost a dedicated servant. A servant who stood the test at a time when the need for his leadership was greatest—the dread thirties.

As the second Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, John Carmody, more than any other individual, stimulated the organization of rural electric cooperatives which brought electricity to the farmers. Aggressive in his defense of co-ops he valiantly withstood the attacks of the private power companies.

As President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Coordinator of the Government's major work relief agencies and a member of the National Relations Board, John Carmody also proved to be a true friend of labor from the beginning and continued to be throughout his entire life.

We who are concerned with the welfare of rural America feel deeply the void left by this man to whom we owe a great deal. A man whose fruits of labor we will continue to harvest for many, many years.

Of John Carmody it can be said; he was a dedicated public servant, a distinguished citizen devoted to the welfare of people—a truly great man.

Our No-Progress Policy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress has gotten so much publicity and has made such little progress, Newsday, in its editorial of November 13, makes some suggestions:

CRISIS IN LATIN AMERICA

Our foreign policy chickens are coming home to roost in Latin America. President Joao Goulart of near-bankrupt Brazil has virtually written off the Alliance for Progress in a speech to delegates attending the second annual review meeting of that agency in São Paulo. He has demanded, in effect, that the United States supply unlimited aid without exercising any control over how it is used. Argentina, despite a plea from Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman, is preparing to expropriate $200 million of investments and $100 million in oil produced by American companies under contract with a prior government. Premier Cheddi B. Jagan of British Guiana, a Castro-Communist sympathizer, is seeking to stir up anti-British sentiment within that colony.

The dire plight of the Alliance for Progress was foreshadowed in a report to its members issued in advance of Goulart's speech. The aim was to bring about a 2.5-percent annual increase in Latin American per capita income. Instead the 1962 figure ranged between six-tenths of 1 percent and a flat 1 percent, a drop from 1961 levels. Economic crises in Brazil and Argentina pulled down the income average.

So the crisis does not impend; it is upon us.

DOOMED FROM THE START

The Alliance for Progress was conceived as an international political ploy, with the idea that the United States would feed a billion dollars a year for 10 years into the Latin American economy. Actually the figure has been less, and even a billion a year would be a drop in the bucket. The concept therefore was doomed from the start.

What Latin America needs, and in her present nationalistic frame of mind cannot get, is an increasing rate of foreign investments. But what corporation whose officers are in their right mind would go into any country where the odds are so patently in favor of eventual expropriation, either without compensation or with totally inadequate compensation?

Instead American emphasis has been on cash grants and loans that may never be repaid, and coupled with this a demand that these nations reform to fit the North American pattern of democracy. The whole concept has been unrealistic from its inception, and the results are now apparent at São Paulo. Not later, but now, this country and the present administration must rethink the whole Latin America question and come up not only with sound policies but with able administrators and ambassadors who have the stature and the skill to sell the concept of sound governments that respect their international obligations.

Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all nations subjected to alien regimes suffer under discriminations and a series of legal disabilities, and some suffer endless hardships and persecutions. Still others are deprived of all forms of freedom and are prisoners in their homeland. Such has been the lot of the people of Latvia for more than two decades. As a matter of fact, theirs has been an unenviable lot since they were brought under the ruthless rule of Russian czars late in the 18th century, except during the two decades of interwar years.

At the end of the First World War many nations in Europe attained their freedom and independence. The Latvians were one of these liberated peoples. After attaining their fredom and the establishment of the Latvian Republic they managed to live in peace and prosperity and also in relative safety for a little more than two decades. But as the clouds of war began to thicken late in 1930, they became apprehensive of their national safety. Soon their worst fears turned out to be true. Early in the war their freedom and independence became a casualty of the war. In mid-1940 Latvia was overrun by the Red army, then the country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and the unhappy Latvians became subjects of the Kremlin.

During the war there was a change in their status, though not for the better. For about 2 years they were subjected to Hitler's Nazi regime, and toward the end of the war, when the Red army returned once more, the Kremlin's agents again flooded the country. These ruthless Communists have been ruling over Latvia since then. During all these years helpless Latvians are hoping and praying

for their delivery from Soviet tyranny. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day we all join them in their prayer and hope that soon they will be free in their homeland.

Brief for Comparability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, there was presented to me today by the National Association of Postal Supervisors a brief for comparability in Federal salary and correction of inequities in H.R. 8986. In view of the fact that the House may soon be considering this bill, I believe my colleagues will find the brief of interest, and it follows:

BRIEF FOR COMPARABILITY IN FEDERAL SALARY AND CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN H.R. 8986

Public Law 87-793, approved October 11, 1962 contained the declaration of policy that in the future the Federal salary structure shall be based on comparability. The President's recommendations were embraced in H.R. 8716 and H.R. 8717 introduced this year by Congressman UDALL and Congressman BROYHILL of Virginia. These bills were based on the latest available studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Later testimony by the Director, Bureau of Labor Statistics, disclosed salaries in industry had risen about 2.9 percent in the lower levels and up to 4.4 percent in the higher levels.

H.R. 8986, reported favorably by the committee added an additional percentage increase of approximately 3 percent to the lower levels. To offset this cost the higher levels were reduced. Accordingly, the principle of comparability was destroyed. This bill purports to reduce the timelag in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. However, it has been applied only to the lower levels. If the principle of comparability is to be maintained, then in equity the 3-percent increase must be applied to all levels.

Another inequity in this bill is the Dulski amendment confining credit for all past service prior to October 13, 1962, to employees in the first six levels. For example, employees in these levels with 21 years of service will be advanced to step 12; and employees with 18 years of service to step 11, and so forth. The restriction in the first six levels will distort differentials between supervisors and those they supervise, which is contrary to the intent of the Federal salary reform. Under this amendment, a level 4 employee with 21 years of service promoted to a level 7 supervisory position will go to step 7 of level 7. The level 7 employee with 21 years of service, promoted to level 7 prior to October 12, 1962, would be in step 5, or 2 steps below the employee promoted under the provisions of the Dulski amendment. This is obviously unfair and unequitable. The only solution is to extend the same provisions to all levels.

H.R. 8986 contains three provisions which will adjust inequities in Public Law 87-793. We urge Congress not to disturb these provisions. They are:

1. An additional step was added to level 7. Under the first phase of Public Law 87-793 this level contained only 10 steps, which meant that the level 7 supervisor in the top step received only $215 more than the level 6 employee, although there was a differential of $500 or more between the top steps of the other levels. The additional step—step 11—will increase the differential for the level 7 supervisor from $215 to $365, still a very small amount.

2. Employees in the first six levels advance from step 1 to step 7 at 1-year intervals under the present provisions of Public Law 87-793. These in level 7 and higher advance to steps 5, 6, and 7 after a 2-year period. This will lead to many cases of employees being promoted at a later date receiving higher salaries than the senior supervisors in the same level. H.R. 8986 extending the 1-year step increases to all levels will correct this inequity.

3. Employees under the classification act, whose position levels have been downgraded through no fault of their own, and who are in saved rates, will receive the second phase of the salary schedule of Public Law 87-793 in January. This was denied those in the Postal Field Service. This has been corrected in H.R. 8986.

We urge Congress to correct the inequities in H.R. 8986 outlined in this brief and to assure that action will be taken in this session to enact a bill embracing true comparability in all phases.

We support, without reservation, the salary adjustment proposed for Members of Congress with the firm conviction that it is not only needed but warranted.

Praise for the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of this House I am pleased to include herewith the following splendid editorial published in yesterday's issue, November 18, 1963, of the Washington Daily News:

PRAISE FOR THE PEACE CORPS

House approval of a 50-percent increase in the Peace Corps budget, without even the formality of a record vote, is a deserved tribute to a consistently successful experiment in foreign aid.

It demonstrates the eagerness of Congress—and the country—to help the peoples of less fortunate lands, so long as it can be demonstrated the money actually is doing some good.

The action is the more notable in view of congressional determination to clamp down on foreign-aid spending in general.

The Peace Corps budget is $102 million, compared to the $63.7 million appropriated last year. If finally approved, the Peace Corps will be able to increase the number of its volunteers from the present 6,634 to 11,300, permitting expansion in Latin America and Africa.

One Congressman said he never had voted for a foreign aid bill but favors this one because it helps the people. That is evident, and it is why relatively tiny sums have made us friends around the world where millions spent on elaborate projects got us no thanks. The director, R. Sargent Shriver, richly has earned the praise of Congress for holding down administrative costs and for skillful selection of capable volunteers.

It goes to show, in our opinion, that even a Government spender can earn the praise of the country. But he has to know his job and get something for his money.

Another Kennedy Untruth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, not only the President but many other administration spokesmen assured the American people that none of the $32 million of missing grain was behind the Iron Curtain. Again they have been proved wrong, as the following story in the November 12 issue of the New York Herald Tribune states:

REDS RECEIVED MISSING AMERICAN GRAIN—U.S. SLEUTHS CONFIRM DIVERSION

BONN.—American grain surpluses, which mysteriously disappeared on their way to Austria, really wound up behind the Iron Curtain.

Despite a vigorous Agriculture Department denial this summer—and despite Washington reports that President Kennedy personally had been assured that the surplus shipments were not diverted—German authorities here have definitely confirmed that quite a few of the 24 million bushels bound for Austria landed in grain-hungry Communist countries.

EXCLUDED

Under Public Law 480, only needy nations who can't pay for American goods in dollars can qualify to pay for low-cost grain under a barter arrangement. Communist countries are specifically excluded from receiving grain under these terms.

Businessmen, acting as middlemen in the East-West deal, made small fortunes while their manipulations went undetected for more than 3 years.

The mystery was unraveled, the Germans said, by investigators working for J. K. Mansfield, the State Department's Inspector General.

The missing grain, worth about $32 million, was part of a barter deal under which the United States swapped 40 million bushels of grain for strategic materials: industrial diamonds, manganese, bauxite, and smaller quantities of antimony, silicon, carbide, and aluminum oxide. The grain was sold at 7.5 to 9 percent below the usual export price.

In 1962, after 3 years of grain shipments, an agricultural attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Vienna began to wonder what 7 million Austrians were going to do with 40 million bushels of grain.

He soon learned, however, that Austrian consumption was not the problem. Only 16 million bushels reached Austria. The other 24 million bushels had disappeared. He notified the State Department, which told the Agriculture Department; news of the missing grain soon reached congressional ears.

In July, the administration confirmed that the missing grain had been diverted at the West German ports of Hamburg and Bremen where it was sold commercially for huge profits.

Six countries began to look for the grain. The Austrians, denying responsibility for the vanishing act, disclaimed reports that any of the grain ended up behind the Iron Curtain.

Meanwhile, in Congress, several Senators were shocked that anyone could lose 24 million bushels of grain without collusion. Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, said the case would "make Texas tycoon Billie Sol Estes look like a Rhode Island piker."

ONE-HUNDRED-THOUSAND-DOLLAR JOB

The Republican senatorial policy committee demanded that a special Senate committee be named to delve into the case and that $100,000 be appropriated for the job. Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, in a burst of bipartisanship, supported both requests. And that is the last anyone heard of the Senate's interest.

Over in the House of Representatives, the Agriculture Committee was given assurances by Agriculture Department witnesses that the United States did not lose any money on the transshipment. There was no evidence, they declared, that any of the grain had been diverted behind the Iron Curtain.

At the same time, the New York Times reported that President Kennedy had been told that "none of the grain went behind the Iron Curtain."

FIRMS INDICTED

Evidently both Senator MANSFIELD's office and House investigators were not satisfied with the results of previous investigations. They kept men in Europe tracing the missing shipments. Recently Mr. MANSFIELD's investigators came up with new evidence which clearly shows the path to Communist countries.

To date, the Germans said, several shipments have been traced and others are being traced.

The case dates back to 1959. During the Eisenhower administration, a series of barter deals were concluded with Austria under which U.S. surplus grains, including corn, barley and sorghum, were to be swapped for strategic materials. The deals continued during 1960, 1961, and 1962; then ended.

Last summer in Austria six import concerns were indicted for conspiring to defraud the Government. They were charged with serving as fronts for German firms to divert the grain from Austria to Germany.

The U.S. end of the deal was carried out under contract with 35 U.S. export-import companies. They were designated as barter contractors. Agreement was to ship the grain to 20 importers in Austria and to deliver specific strategic materials to the Government as payment.

In July, Federal investigators said there was no evidence of collusion by the U.S. companies.

They also reported that, so far, no shortages showed in the materials the United States was to receive for the grain.

The U.S. Government could sue the contractors for damages if it were proved they had been negligent in failing to assure shipment to Austria. The contracts provide for damages of 7.5 percent of the commodities or $2,250,000.

Unexplained, at that time, was how the grain diversions continued uninterruptedly and without notice for 3 years.

Forecast for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to enter into today's RECORD a statement made by Robert M. Hardy, Jr., president of the Sunshine Mining Co., of Spokane, in further recognition of the problems of our monetary system and those facing our silver industry.

Mr. Hardy's statement is as follows:

With the market price for silver equal to the monetary value of the U.S. silver dollar, demands on the part of industry for silver from the U.S. Treasury are increasing. As Federal Reserve notes are substituted for silver certificates, the Treasury Department has been using the silver thus released for subsidiary coinage and sales to industry at an alarming rate. Opinions vary as to how long the Treasury can continue its present policies and estimates vary from less than 5 years to a maximum of 17 years. When the Treasury's stocks are completely depleted or when sales are terminated prior to that time the price of silver will rise rapidly. The free world, whose consumption of silver exceeds production by 50 percent, will bid for the available supplies, which will force the market to a point where supply and demand are brought into balance. Some consumers will be eliminated, thus lessening the demand, and the search for development of new silver production will be stimulated apart from base metal production.

Meanwhile, much has been written about the probable effects of the price rise of the past two years in increasing silver production. Apparently many people have lost sight on the fact that although the profit margin of the silver producer has certainly improved over experience for the past several years, this has been a "catchin gup" process. Actually, 90½ cents per ounce for silver in 1946, when, for example, the average cost of an underground employee was $10.64 per shift, was better than $1.293 per ounce in 1963, when the average cost is $23.36 per shift and other expenses are in proportion. In 1962 two-thirds of domestic silver production was recovered as a by-product of base metal and gold mining and only one-third came from silver mining. By-product silver production cannot be increased significantly because lead, zinc and copper production will not be stimulated beyond what the base metal markets can assimilate. Consequently, it is the straight silver mining which must be stimulated if significant additional silver production is to be obtained. With today's inflated exploration, development and mining costs, silver will have to reach a price substantially higher than $1.293 per ounce before a genuine "silver rush" is experienced.

Statement Re the 45th Anniversary of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on this 45th anniversary of Latvia's rebirth as a free and independent state, Americans remain strongly convinced that Latvia, like all other nations, is entitled to freedom and national self-determination.

Though Latvian independence has been suppressed by forced incorporation into the Soviet Union, the Latvian people have displayed a determination to maintain their ideals and preserve their national heritage. The American Government, by refusing to recognize the illegal Soviet annexation of Latvia, registers its support for Latvia's cause and confidence that the Latvian nation will endure.

Early Passage of Medicare Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to include a newspaper article written by Mr. Robert K. Walsh and published in yesterday's issue, November 18, 1963, of the Washington Evening Star.

I am in thorough agreement with the position taken by the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze.

The article reads as follows:

EARLY MEDICARE PASSAGE URGED BY CELEBREZZE

(By Robert K. Walsh)

Welfare Secretary Celebrezze took the Kennedy administration's case for medicare to Congress today by warning that delay on the legislation is forcing larger numbers of older persons to go on public assistance roles.

The House Ways and Means Committee began 8 days of hearings as a preliminary to an avowed administration drive to obtain congressional enactment next year. Although a medicare bill was introduced again last February, no hearings were held until this week.

Secretary Celebrezze devoted much of his opening statement to answering principal complaints against the proposed social security method of financing hospital services, nursing facilities, home health services and outpatient diagnostic treatment for persons 65 and over.

He agreed that private health insurance plans could play a significant role in helping elderly persons meet the costs of prolonged or catastrophic illnesses. But he insisted that such plans alone could not do it adequately or fairly.

Declaring that "there remains a major threat to the financial security and peace of mind of our older citizens," he testified:

"Now we find that a large and growing proportion of people must turn to public assistance because they are not able to meet their health costs. Today one-third of the money being spent for public assistance to older people is spent for medical care.

"In the absence of a social insurance program providing protection against the major unbudgetable costs of serious illness, more, and more of our elderly citizens will have to rely on public assistance."

Mr. Celebrezze said that, while there are tax laws to help meet the medical expenses of those who are relatively well off and public assistance for the very poor, "there are no laws to help the great majority of aged people who face a real and present danger of high medical costs."

Main points in Mr. Celebrezze's testimony were his contention that:

Only the social security system would be adequate to provide real security for the aged in this proposed program of hospital and nursing services.

The proposed system would not depend on payment of health care costs out of a person's funds at the time of retirement but would enable elderly persons to pay such costs out of earnings and over the course of their working lifetime.

A coordination of basic contributory social insurance, private voluntary insurance and public assistance would work well in coping with the overall problem of financial protec-

tion for the aged, but the bill before the committee would apply only to the social security-financed program.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at Douglas Space Center Dedication in Huntington Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in Huntington Beach, Calif., the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, honored us by delivering the principal address at the dedication of America's newest and most modern center for space research and development. This space center was designed and built by Douglas Aircraft, Inc., a leader in this, the age of space.

Vice President JOHNSON's excellent speech outlined this Nation's commitment to, and stake in "mankind's last and greatest frontier—the frontier of space."

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the Vice President's speech at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE SPACE CENTER DEDICATION, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIF., NOVEMBER 14, 1963

This is a day of great and justified pride for all associated with the building of this outstanding center of research and development for the age of space.

It is a credit and honor to our system that a private organization begun in the back of a barber shop could within a lifetime grow in size, talent, and vision to participate in the pioneering of our Nation's search for peace out in mankind's last and greatest frontier—the frontier of space.

This center is not dedicated today as a monument to past achievement. It is dedicated, rather, as a testament to our American faith in the future and in our own national resourcefulness for achieving and realizing the potential of that future.

If there has been a single characteristic responsible for our success over the past 200 years, it has been the characteristic American confidence in the future. It was that same confidence which brought other generations westward across the continent to build what has been built in such a short time here on the shores of the Pacific.

Today, in our land—and in the world—there are those who argue for the view that we should not push forward into new realms or new enterprises unless this is clear and compelling evidnece of competition from other nations and other systems. I believe the American people reject the concept that their future—or the future of freemen everywhere shall be defaulted to the vision and ambition of the totalitarians.

We refuse to accept so negative a doctrine that we are not to interest ourselves in space unless the Communists are interested in space. We cannot live as freemen if for the sake of our own comfort, convenience and complacency, we permit ourselves to become slaves to the limitations, the deceptions or the guile of the Communist system and its leadership.

Those who say—as some are inclined to do—that our purposes and the purposes of communism in space exploration are the same misread and misunderstand the history and meaning of our times. In 1957 when the Soviets placed the first sputnik in orbit, the Communist rulers of Russia refused to consider sharing the fruits of space research with other nations—refused to consider committing themselves to developing space for peaceful purposes alone. In that same year, we of the United States clearly stated our own national policy and purpose. We committed and dedicated ourselves to sharing the fruits of space research with all mankind—and to the sole objective of developing the uses of space for peaceful purposes.

It is significant that while the Communist efforts are conducted behind a curtain of secrecy, we of the United States enjoy the cooperation, support and alliance of more than 60 nations for our space program. It is significant that while we of the United States can and do propose joint endeavors for peaceful purposes, the Soviet both rejects our proposals and devotes itself to attempts to dissuade us from continuing on the programs we have established.

America's commitment to the exploration of space for peaceful purposes—and for the good of all mankind—is a firm commitment. We will not retreat from our national purpose. We will not be turned aside in our national effort by the transparent maneuvers of those who would attempt to divert us.

Our national purpose in space is peace—not prestige.

Our foremost objective is not to send a man to the moon but to bring a greater measure of sunlight into the lives of men on earth.

Our space technology and research have moved forward rapidly and dramatically since the early days of the age of space barely half a decade ago. But our achievements and accomplishments in this field remain in their infancy. It is imperative that at this critical point of development and progress we keep our space technology and science free of the control and misdirection of arbitrary policy changes.

The history of science is a history of unending service to the betterment of life for man. The same has not always been so true for the history of political science. We must not fasten down upon the scientific potential of this new age the limited vision of passing political causes and conveniences.

We have the country we have—our cause of freedom has the strength it has—because we have always maintained faith and confidence in the future and in our own ability to control it for the good of man.

Today the full complex of our society—business, labor, education, and government—are working together in resolute and determined commitment to realize the potential of the space frontier. Our objective must be to continue on this sure course, laying aside petty rivalries, idle jealousies and momentary discomforts to bring the full strength of our remarkable capabilities to bear on achieving the potential opening now before us—and before all the world.

A failure in space would be the costliest failure of our national history—a failure ultimately fatal to the cause we have championed at such great sacrifice and with such great devotion throughout this 20th century. On the other hand, success in space—the success we shall eventually win—may well be the greatest economy of our history if, by that success, we succeed in bringing closer to reality a world without war, a world of universal peace, freedom and justice.

Thus, today, with great pride and greater expectations, we dedicate this center to the service of the future and the cause of freedom which is our country's cause and the highest cause of man on earth.

Veterans Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the wonderful opportunity of participating in the Veterans' Day program held at Arlington National Cemetery this year. The program was arranged and chairmaned by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. John Gleason, and highlighted an address by Gen. David M. Shoup of the U.S. Marine Corps. I was much impressed with General Shoup's address, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, include this address:

REMARKS BY GEN. DAVID M. SHOUP, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, NOVEMBER 11, 1963

Americans and their friends, good morning; when the designation of Armistice Day was changed to Veterans Day in 1954, we stopped celebrating the signing of a truce, and began paying honor to those men and women who have served America in the Armed Forces.

Why do we have Armed Forces? Because, with bowed heads we face the disheartening and distasteful fact that after many centuries of so-called civilization, man has been unable to prevent the killing and maiming of men, women, and children in war.

Man has learned the secret of the atom. Man has penetrated space. Man plans to explore the universe. In many areas science has lifted the load from man's back. In the United States we have developed the highest standard of living the world has ever known. But man has not yet learned to live in enduring peace with his fellow men, and follow it must that—we cannot practice the deception that somehow, without alertness and conscious effort on our part, an everlasting panacea may develop which will abolish for all time man's oldest plague—war.

But for past wars, these heroic veterans would not lie here. They served their country well. They earned their place in history. They are enshrined in the heart of free America.

These hallowed graves in this National Cemetery are mute but constant reminders that there are countless American graves throughout the world—on land and beneath the seas. All are symbolized here by the Tomb of the Unknowns. Our Commander in Chief has just placed a wreath at this tomb. By this act, he has expressed for all Americans, past and present, their deep gratitude to those who have made great sacrifices so that we can be here today, physically and mentally free.

The freedom we cherish, the Constitution we support, the rights we hold so dear, we owe to them. So that future generations may say the same of us, we must respond to the vexing challenges of our time with an unswerving steadfastness.

Should such response require man to again engage in mortal conflict, let us remember, that it is what Americans stand for and what Americans are willing to fight for that has made America great.

In America the individual is important. He has inherent rights. He has a voice in his Government. He can speak without fear and has a right to be heard. He enjoys religious freedom. And side by side with these rights he has solemn responsibilities—responsibil-

ities to his Creator, to his country, and to his fellow man.

These responsibilities are, in a sense, what America stands for: To respect the liberty of others, to further the welfare of the community, to protect the security of the United States, to be intelligently unselfish with the great assets of our Nation.

The millions of veterans we honor today have fulfilled these responsibilities. In so doing, many thousands of them paid the supreme sacrifice.

I believe that gathered here today, watching intently and listening carefully, are the invisible spirits of these thousands of gallant Americans. Their presence may be unseen, but they shall not be unheard. Someone must speak for them. What do they want mankind to hear? Many, many things, of course; but I believe that most of all they want the hopes and fears of their endless years to be expressed in: an admonition, a hope, and a prayer.

They admonish:

(a) You must strive for peace, but not peace at any price.

(b) Do not give up one bit of the priceless heritage of liberty which we helped to preserve.

(c) Accept and discharge your responsibilities to serve as unreluctant leaders of those who are willing to fight to protect this liberty.

Their hope: "That some day there will be a meeting at the summit which shall become as everlastingly important to humanity as the Sermon on the Mount."

Finally, the spirits of these living dead pray: "Please, God, may our Ship of State sail on and on in a world forever at peace."

Thank you.

Life Expectancy Greater in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, life is not only more enjoyable in Hawaii; it is also longer. Statistics appearing on page 12 of Parade magazine of Sunday, November 17, 1963, point to the fact that the average life expectancy for men living in Hawaii is 3 years longer than others of his specie living elsewhere in the United States—the average life expectancy for men in Hawaii being 69.5 years and those in other parts of the United States being 66.5 years. For some reason or other, women living in Hawaii have just about the same life expectancy as women living on the mainland. The average woman in Hawaii may expect to live to be 73.3 years of age, while those on the mainland may expect 73 years of living.

The reason for the longer life of the male specie in Hawaii may be that in the Aloha State men have more to live for. The eternal springtime climate, the beautiful scenery colored by Mother Nature, the swaying palm trees in tropical moonlit nights, and of course the lovely maidens with their tantalizing hula hands may in part account for this increased life expectancy in our paradise isles. In any event, Mr. Speaker, a man should look forward to living in Hawaii if he hopes to live longer than the average male. Hawaii welcomes you even for a short visit to find out the real reason why its men can expect to live longer.

The Risks in Russian Irrationality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, further emphasizing the failure of President Kennedy to understand communism or to recognize the devious course of Soviet Russia to gain world domination over all free nations, is the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of November 18:

THE RISKS IN RUSSIAN IRRATIONALITY

The wintry new blasts from the Kremlin are chilling many who had begun to warm themselves in the test ban's "spirit of Moscow." Yet these alternating airs—and no one in the West should forget it—form a pattern which has persisted throughout the cold war and indeed long before it.

It's not that most observers thought the Russian Communists had basically changed in the past few months; today's students of the Soviet are customarily more sophisticated than that. Rather, they thought Khrushchev might be seeking accommodations with the United States for the soundest of reasons, namely pure Soviet self-interest in the face of trouble with Red China and a host of domestic difficulties.

What we are getting at the moment, though, are a fresh spate of harassments on the Berlin Autobahn, belligerent Khrushchev talk on Cuba and anti-missile missiles, and the arrest of a distinguished American professor on spy charges. His release over the weekend only adds to the confusion. And as usual, speculative explanations abound.

All these manifestations, for example, can be attributed to a feeling on the part of Khrushchev that he must show his own militarists and the Chinese that he can still be tough, especially after the seeming thaw. Or to a general attempt to keep the West off base.

In the particular case of Professor Barghoorn, some saw it as a childish retaliation for the recent United States arrest of Soviet spies; others as an effort to sabotage the cultural-exchange talks that were about to begin. In the case of Berlin, some say the Russians never meant to ease the pressure.

However much validity there may be in any or all of these explanations, we suspect that Soviet moves on the international chessboard are not always as well calculated as they seem. A certain irrationality, from the point of view of their own interests, has long pervaded Soviet policy.

It was an excess of Soviet belligerence that jarred the West into forming NATO nearly 15 years ago. It was the Soviet-sponsored invasion of South Korea that gave tremendous impetus to that rearmament effort. These developments scarcely served the Soviet interests.

So today, the brutal arrest of Mr. Barghoorn has shocked the world, and especially the West's intellectual community which might have been most sympathetic to any Khrushchev moves to ease tensions. And while the professor has been freed after being held incommunicado for 2 weeks, that chill will remain a while.

This element of irrationality has roots longer and deeper than communism. Advance and retreat, push to the point of resistance and then pull back—this was the way of ancient Muscovy; as such it was sensible enough for incipient imperialists. But what got mixed into it over the centuries was a kind of national paranoia on the part of Russia's rulers, a sense of isolation, frustration, inferiority, suspicion, and xenophobia.

Lenin's theory of zig and zag to keep the enemy off base was to some extent just an adaptation of the old tactic of advance and retreat. The fact that it now came dressed in Communist clothes, however, could hardly remove the psychopathic tendencies so long a part of Russian internal and external policy. If anything, the irrationality of communism as an ideology could only compound them.

This, at any rate, is what the West has to contend with—not merely militant communism but behavioral characteristics that can have unpredictable and dangerous consequences.

It is no answer to say we should have nothing at all to do with the Soviets, any more than it is an answer to heap loving kindness on them. But such considerations should at least reinforce caution.

Many have put great store on these cultural exchanges, for one thing. In fact, not all of them combined can by themselves alter Soviet ambitions or deep-rooted Russian attitudes. In the larger contexts of policy, a test ban treaty cannot bring summer if the political barometer still says winter. Even if Khrushchev actually wants closer ties with the United States for his own nation's protection, what has to be kept in mind for our own protection is that it is bound to be a slow and halting process.

And if current and past history is any guide, the West will best contend with the Soviets by remaining prepared for all the risks and dangers that spring from that most unhappy combination: False ideology, modern weapons, and political irrationality.

Is the Administration Going To Help Finance the Building of Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, whenever the subject is mentioned, the Kennedy administration hotly denies that it makes behind-the-scenes deals with the Soviet Union. Each denial, however, is usually followed by proof that a deal was made or by a hint dropped by Khrushchev that he and the President have a perfect understanding.

For some time a few of us have been pointing out that this administration probably has been discussing loans to the Soviet Union. Of course, there is no way to prove it, but as usual the Soviet dictator drops a straw in the wind. The following item from the November 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report should be remembered if, in the next few months, we find the administration and the State Department telling us the advantages of arranging a loan to the Soviet Union:

Nikita Khrushchev seems to have dropped a hint to American visitors that he would be interested in a long-term loan from the United States for about $10 billion.

The Otepka Case: A State Department Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, now the two State Department aids who admitted they testified falsely before a Senate committee have resigned—an example of disgraceful coverup in the State Department for which the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, cannot be completely absolved from blame.

In today's New York Times the full story is told:

TWO U.S. AIDS RESIGN OVER OTEPKA CASE—STATE DEPARTMENT ACTIONS IRK CONSERVATIVE SENATORS

(By Henry Raymont)

WASHINGTON, November 18.—The State Department announced the resignation today of two security officials who admitted giving misleading testimony to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The officials are John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, and Elmer D. Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services in Mr. Reilly's office.

They played a key role in the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka as the Department's chief security evaluations officer. Mr. Otepka was dismissed for improperly transmitting information to the Senate subcommittee.

His dismissal, now under appeal, has aroused conservative members of the subcommittee and rightwing groups throughout the country.

AN EARLIER CONFLICT

The controversy carries overtones of the battle 10 years ago between the State Department and the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

It also raises the problem anew of how far Congress can go in interfering with the internal operations of executive agencies.

There were indications that Mr. Reilly and Mr. Hill had been asked to resign on the ground that they had embarrassed the Department.

The officials first denied, then admitted trying to intercept Mr. Otepka's telephone conversations.

The sentiment at the State Department was that, even though the security officials had acted to protect the interests of the agency, their conflicting testimony to the subcommittee could not be condoned.

It was also reported that none of their superiors had been acquainted with the wiretapping efforts or with the discrepancy in their statements until after they had been disclosed in the Senate.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, who is vice chairman of the subcommittee, first referred to the matter in a speech defending Mr. Otepka on November 5. Mr. Reilly and Mr. Hill were placed on indefinite leave the following day.

A third official mentioned by Senator DODD, David I. Belisle, was not sent on leave because he was absent when the listening device was installed. He has acknowledged that he was informed of the installation later, however. Mr. Belisle was Mr. Reilly's assistant.

In announcing the resignation of the two officials, Richard I. Phillips, the Department's press officer, said an inquiry was continuing "as to the facts and circumstances surrounding the testimony of Belisle."

He said that for the time being Mr. Belisle was taking over Mr. Reilly's duties as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk personally advised Senator DODD of the resignation of the two officials this morning. The move appeared to have been prompted by a desire to avoid unnecessary friction with the Senate group.

Senator DODD indicated that he was satisfied with the explanation that none of Mr. Reilly's superiors knew of the attempts to tap Mr. Otepka's telephone.

The Connecticut Democrat said in an interview he was pleased with Mr. Rusk's "very diligent" handling of the matter. He said that the subcommittee and the Department should "work together" in further clarifying the circumstances of Mr. Otepka's removal.

He did not wish to comment on Mr. Belisle's case because it was also being studied in executive session as part of an investigation he said was "far from over."

Mr. Hill, who testified before the subcommittee this morning, also declined to comment.

There were suggestions that some members of the subcommittee had suggested perjury action be taken against the Department officials in a move that might be used to help Mr. Otepka.

State Department officials are eager to keep the controversy over the testimony of the two officials from affecting Mr. Otepka's dismissal.

The Department has accused Mr. Otepka of giving confidential documents to the Senate subcommittee without proper authorization and of engaging in actions that left his loyalty to the agency in doubt.

Members and staff employees of the subcommittee have defended Mr. Otepka's conduct, insisting that executive employees had a right to divulge privileged information to the panel and that they were thus serving a loyalty higher than that owed to their superiors.

Mr. Otepka has filed an appeal against his dismissal. He is understood to have been given from 1 to 2 weeks to prepare his defense before a special committee within the Department.

There were indications today that the Senate group would make every possible effort to bring pressure in favor of Mr. Otepka.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee, prepared a form letter today to individuals and groups that have written him inquiring about the case.

"I share your concern about the Otepka case," the letter said. "Let me assure you that this matter has not ended nor have our investigations of State Department security."

The State Department said the resignations of Mr. Reilly and Mr. Hill would be effective "at an early date." Mr. Phillips said that "it is customary to allow certain lengths of time to wind up affairs."

Mr. Reilly has served the Government for 16 years and was widely respected in the Department as a dedicated official who took great care to protect individual rights in the management of security programs.

Mr. Hill was an engineer before he entered governmental service in February 1962.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois summarizing the major legislation and my activities as their Representative during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

In reporting annually to my constituents in past years, I had always done so following sine die adjournment. The 1963 session, however, is not likely to come to a close until shortly before Christmas—and there is even the possibility that the record-breaking duration of the current session may run through the end of December.

Looking back to my first term as a Member of Congress, it is difficult to understand why a legislative body which was able to complete its work and adjourn in August must now drag through a 12-month session. What is more significant is the fact that less has been accomplished in the way of legislative action this year than was achieved when the sessions were shorter. The fact of the matter is that indecision and indirection have plagued both the House of Representatives and the Senate, especially, on the prime political issues of this administration.

Less than 3 years ago the liberals in the Kennedy administration charged that Congress was moving too slowly because the House Rules Committee impeded the process of legislation. This committee was admittedly inclined to be conservative in recent years. It is the committee, as you know, which determines which legislation shall be reported to the floor of the House and prescribes the conditions of debate on various bills.

"Enlarge the Rules Committee," said the liberals, "and we shall get legislation moving." And, thus, Congress packed the Rules Committee by adding three members. Again during this session of Congress, the expansion of the Rules Committee was continued through majority action. It is indeed ironical that the expansion of the Rules Committee not only failed to do what the liberals claimed—but the record reflects contradictory results. Previously, the Rules Committee was used as a buffer for other committees which felt it politically expedient on other occasions to move bills which were known to be generally unpopular or which would become political "hot potatoes" if they ever got to the floor. Thus they were frequently tabled presumably en route to the floor of the House.

We have a prime example of this in the controversial Federal aid to educa-

tion bill because the several proposals to provide Federal funds for primary and secondary schools have become completely entangled in politics and religion. Many of the proponents of this type of legislation are content to see it resting quietly for if such a bill was ever reported many Representatives would find themselves in the difficult position of having to deal with the aid to private and parochial school programs. This is a situation packed with political dynamite in many areas.

With approximately a month remaining before the 1964 session gets underway, there are still important items of unfinished business.

The foreign aid appropriation bill is in serious trouble. The House slashed $582 million from the authorization bill—and the Senate is apparently in no mood this year to restore it as it did in the past. The ardent proponents of the multibillion-dollar foreign aid program of yesteryear are now coming around to supporting the position of the conservatives that have been trying to cut back during the past decade. The sad fact of the matter is that more governments have been overthrown or seized by coups around the world in the past 15 years than in the previous 75 years. Our position in the world today is admittedly no better and in many cases worse than it was when we embarked upon our foreign aid program. Certainly in some areas U.S. aid was necessary but, for the most part, the program has lost its appeal and has directly affected our critical imbalance of payments. Furthermore, our Western European allies have failed to meet their commitments and obligations in the cold war which continues with new eruptions and fluctuating tensions in the Far East and Latin America.

On the home front there is obviously deep public concern over Government fiscal policies. Three times during the past year Congress was obliged to raise the national debt because the Nation continues along a course of deficit spending. I have opposed Federal spending increases at every level as well as voting against increasing the public debt because of the frightening implications of pursuing policies which I consider fiscally irresponsible.

Aside from the fiscally sick condition of the Treasury, Government expansion into one area after another in our national life creates a consistently mushrooming bureauracy. It appears to me that the American people are becoming more and more skeptical of Government programs as a panacea for every problem which develops in our economic and social system.

The House-passed tax reduction bill written by the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, is stalled in the Senate and may not get to the Senate floor before the turn of the year. While I personally feel a tax reduction across the board is necessary and desirable, I opposed final passage after an amendment to tie a curb on Federal spending to the tax bill failed.. It is my understanding that many Members of the Senate feel that a tax reduction on borrowed money will only compound the Nation's fiscal problem in the months ahead.

The Ways and Means Committee began hearings on the various medicare proposals for the Nation's elder citizens 2 weeks ago. There is practically no chance for any such bill being reported this year—and there are grave doubts that such legislation will be passed in 1964 despite it being a presidential election year with the usual political pressures being present.

The fate of civil rights legislation is at present unpredictable and may well depend upon how successful Members of both legislative bodies are in amending titles II and III of the measure during floor action.

Significant in the pattern of this year's legislative activity was the defeat of the area redevelopment program which, after 2 years, failed to do the job which its sponsors predicted.

American farms soundly defeated the wheat referendum—an action which can only be construed as disappointment and disgust with Government controls of the Nation's agricultural economy.

And now for a more personal report on this past year's session. Because of the fact that this has been the longest session in peacetime history, congressional mail has been unusually heavy and has not tapered off during the months of September, October, and November, as it did in previous years. Needless to say, the length of the session has also made it impossible for me to spend the time in my district office that I did in the past.

LEGISLATION WHICH REPRESENTATIVE COLLIER INTRODUCED DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS

H.R. 1904: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years.

H.R. 3286: A bill to establish a Commission on Aircraft Noise Abatement to study means for abating aircraft noise and to recommend corrective measures.

H.R. 3927: A bill to provide for medical hospital care for the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 268: Constitutional Amendment—Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

House Resolution 265: A House resolution to amend the Rules of the House to further restrict action on bills providing for the withdrawal of money from the Treasury.

House Resolution 279: A House resolution to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

H.R. 4775: A bill to allow deduction for expenses incurred by taxpayer for education of a dependent.

House Concurrent Resolution 133: A House concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action in the United Nations calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union.

H.R. 5986: A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn.

H.R. 5987: A bill to terminate the retailers' excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations.

H.R. 5988: A bill to reduce excise tax on all-channel television sets to 5 percent.

H.R. 6409: A bill to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

H.R. 6490: A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications.

House Concurrent Resolution 166: A House concurrent resolution to revise and simplify the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

H.R. 6635: A bill to amend sections 162 and 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deductibility of certain business, entertainment, and so forth, expenses.

H.R. 6911: A bill to prohibit the use of the term "mahogany" in interstate commerce in connection with woods which are not in fact mahogany.

H.R. 6926: A bill to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from social security benefits.

H.R. 8204: A bill to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in rates of pay.

H.R. 8535: A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies.

H.R. 9077: A bill to amend tariff schedules on aluminum products, TV picture tubes and for other purposes.

More than 500 residents of my congressional district visited in my Washington office during 1963. In almost every instance my staff arranged for visits to the White House, provided gallery passes for both the House and Senate for visitors, and arranged for tours of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Engraving, and other places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Early this year, as in the past, we conducted a public opinion poll throughout the district. This was done by selecting families at random and mailing a questionnaire to get the grassroot sentiments of my constituents on the major legislative issues. Nearly 20,000 people in the 10th district participated in this poll, the results of which were published in the last issue of my newsletter.

Our congressional district is the largest in Illinois and one of the largest in the Nation with nearly 600,000 population. It is understandable, therefore, that the workload in an office such as mine is perhaps heavier than most of those where Representatives' districts average about 420,000 constituents.

In addition, my new committee assignment, which resulted in my being appointed to fill the one minority vacancy on the House Ways and Means Committee, was far more consuming in time and effort than I had experienced previously. This was primarily because our committee wrote the tax bill and revised 34 of the 37 recommendations for structural

changes in the existing tax law. No committee in the Congress met more frequently or conducted the number of hearings on a single bill than our committee did on the tax legislation this year.

The longer sessions have resulted in sharply increased living and travel expenses for Members of Congress who previously maintain two homes only 7 or 8 months of the year instead of the full year. The number of essential trips back and forth from Washington to the Member's congressional district to fulfill the usual commitments nearly doubled notwithstanding the fact that each Member is allowed only three round trips from Washington to his district in a single congressional session. This, together with the associated problems of a 12-month session, resulted in demands by many Members for sharp increases in compensation—particularly since the Congress, by the established rules of the House, should adjourn by midnight on July 31 of each year. It is permitted to stay beyond this date only because the Korean war emergency declared by President Truman back in 1950 was never rescinded by either President Eisenhower or President Kennedy thus technically leaving the Congress in a state of national emergency. Aside from the merits of the salary issue, it is my personal feeling that such action should be deferred until we get our fiscal house in order and reduce the ever increasing Federal-Treasury deficits.

In conclusion let me say that while the length of the long duration of this session is not conducive to the best legislative process or the enjoyment of the Congressman's work, I am honored and privileged in being able to represent the 10th District of Illinois in the U.S. Congress. The first session of the 88th Congress has been marked with certain achievements and more than its share of failures but this must be expected in the light of the seething world situation on one hand and the many controversial domestic issues on the other.

I have not had the opportunity to become as well acquainted with the residents of the new area of my congressional district as I would like. Under normal conditions, if Congress had completed its business and adjourned as it should around Labor Day, I would have had the opportunity to fulfill more of my commitments in the Maine, Leyden, and Cicero Township areas which were added to the 10th District in the legislative reapportionment in 1962.

I welcome the opinions and views of the people in my district on the many important issues with which our Nation is faced today. Staff members in my district office (Pioneer 9-4115) are available daily to assist constituents who may have problems pending with the various agencies of Government such as the Veterans' Administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and so forth. Matters concerning legislation should be directed to my Washington office at room 1622, Longworth House Office Building in the Nation's Capital.

Crossing the Broadcast Rubicon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, now that the 1964 TV season is in full swing, the onslaught of the TV rating services has begun. As the time for each periodic rating report draws near, TV executives and actors shudder and feverishly await the fate of their standing. Executives wonder whether their companies are going to rank first, second, or third, and ponder what that actually means since the companies are only separated by a few percentage points. Actors, directors, and producers worry that their meal tickets may possibly be arbitrarily cut off. Why should these fears that exist in one of America's largest industries be based on the apprehension of unreliable surveys and ratings? This injustice is one that is still evident, even after a full congressional hearing by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Investigations.

It has been hoped that the National Association of Broadcasters and the rating services could work out a sound plan of cleaning up this numbers racket. If the industry itself cannot work out the gross inequities being fostered by the rating services, then the Congress must take the initiative to see that a reliable system of television ratings is established if they are to continue.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a speech by the Honorable Oren Harris, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee before the Association of Broadcast Executives of Texas last week. He dealt with two threats facing the broadcasting industry: first, the stranglehold which the audience measurement services appear to have over most of the industry; and, second, the so-called fairness doctrine of the FCC which he said in his judgment threatens to inject the Commission into the day-to-day programing decision of the licensee:

SPEECH OF HON. OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF BROADCAST EXECUTIVES OF TEXAS, NOVEMBER 14, 1963, DALLAS, TEX.

Your association—ABET—is to be commended for your farsightedness, vision and recognition that to run a broadcast business and get the greatest utilization out of this resource in rendering a public service requires the efforts, cooperation and coexistence of any number of allied interests in this field. There is no other system like ours in the world. It is truly a hybrid organization. In a way it is similar in its total operation to a great bureaucracy, difficult sometimes to find the true head or source. Even so, in its infancy the broadcast industry has emerged through a maze of difficulties and is providing service to our people beyond imagination. It is truly an American enterprise. I salute the executives in the industry who obviously have provided guidance, organization and stability.

Even so, the broadcasting industry of today has become the melting pot of confusion in a stew of pronouncements, interpretations and rulemaking proposals which has resulted in greater frustration, fear, and uncertainty than I have yet to see with a regulated industry.

Why is this so? I think there are a number of reasons for it.

First, the very nature of the industry itself—highly competitive, service it performs to the public, dissemination of ideas in a free society and limitation of available frequencies in the spectrum.

In the second place, the origin of the industry as a necessary, partially regulated industry, as a private enterprise profitmaking business and as an industry under this system destined to influence the lives and fortunes of our people.

In the third place, this situation prevails to some extent because of the enthusiasm for freedom and opportunity for the industry to take its place in our business community without unnecessary interference except to serve the public interest.

In the fourth place, it is partially due to varying opinions and views of those charged with the responsibility of regulation from time to time as how best they can carry out their duties as they think the Congress intended.

And, finally, in the fifth place, this condition exists in part due to the failure of so many of you engaged in this business to realize the industry has yet to cross the Rubicon.

With this preface I would like to discuss briefly what I regard as two serious threats to the exercise of your responsibilities as licensees. As you know so well, your privilege to operate a broadcast facility is conditioned by your obligation to serve the public interest. The discharge of that obligation, as I see it, becomes more difficult than it might be otherwise by a combination of circumstances.

First, our system of broadcasting is financed not by you, the licensees, but by advertisers who may or may not share your feeling of obligation to serve the public interest. For the advertiser, broadcasting is but a means to his end—larger sales and bigger profits. I do not disparage that goal, for the healthy growth of our economy depends on its achievement. But I am mindful that the advertiser's efforts to reach the largest possible audience with his commercial messages may be an obstacle to the attainment of your statutory goal.

Unlike for the advertiser, broadcasting is for the licensee an end in itself. The law places on you the sole responsibility for carrying out your obligation to serve the public. Licensees may not delegate the discharge of their statutory obligation to anyone—advertisers, advertising agencies, network organizations, rating services—anyone. I will return to this theme in a moment.

Another difficulty you must live with is that you operate under the constant watchful eye of a Federal regulatory agency, the Federal Communications Commission. The broadcasting industry is, under the law, not a public utility. Yet because the broadcast media use the limited public airwaves, and because of the tremendous impact these media have on the listening and viewing public, it is necessary that some degree of regulation be imposed.

But the fact of the FCC's regulatory authority in no way changes the fact that the day-to-day responsibility for transmitting programs that serve the public interest is that of the licensee alone. Just as licensees may not delegate their responsibilities to

advertisers or others, nor may this responsibility be usurped by the Commission—at least as I think that Communications Act stands today. (And I don't think Congress is in any mood to shift that licensee responsibility to anyone else.)

Having said this, I would now like to focus more closely on two facets of the total problem as examples of the "melting pot of confusion" previously referred to.

First, the stranglehold which the audience measurement services appear to have over most of the industry.

Second, the so-called fairness doctrine of the FCC which, in my judgment—at least insofar as I am able to understand what it means—threatens to inject the Commission into the day-to-day programing decisions of the licensee.

I have been asked by a good many people why our committee saw fit to make an investigation of the rating services which lasted some 18 months and culminated in 5½ weeks of public hearings. The rating companies are, after all, private businesses, I am reminded, and not now subject to FCC licensing or other regulation.

Then answer is twofold. First, the committee wanted to find out the extent, if any, to which rating reports influenced licensees' decisions on programing, the purchase and sale of time, and the like. We were concerned, and I am still concerned (particularly when I read of the anxiousness with which the industry has awaited the October Nielsen reports), about the abdication of sound judgment by broadcasters in favor of numbers purporting to show sheer audience size.

Secondly, once the committee had become aware of the pervasiveness of the influence of the rating figures on licensee decisions, we thought it important to learn whether the figures merited the great faith placed in them by so many. While some statistical studies of the ratings had been made, none of these had attempted to go beyond the public claims of the rating companies. We felt we had to know more about sample design, field work, and tabulating and editing procedures than had been known before.

What we found out was hardly reassuring. The committee staff interviewed hundreds of people and retabulated several surveys, using the original field materials—interview sheets, diaries, and the like, supplied by the rating companies. The staff attempted to discover from the rating companies the techniques they used in editing the raw data. When they tried to apply the techniques the companies said they used, they often got results dramatically different from those published by the survey companies. While the committee recognizes the logic and legitimacy of many editing and weighting techniques, it was clear to us that some used were not at all appropriate. The eminent statistician engaged by the committee as a consultant characterized one such weighting scheme as—

"Nothing more or less than an excuse for doctoring the figures which were developed in the survey to perhaps bring out the personal opinion of whoever does the weighting."

The president of another rating company admitted that the figures circulated to his subscribers amount to little more than a calculated guess.

Still another survey company, in its promotional material, invited stations to say what they wanted about their delivery of the spendable dollar, and then document it with a report put out by that company.

In addition, there were many admissions during the hearings of carelessness and lax supervision. And there were unexplained instances of inconsistency within the same company in the use of editing techniques.

We do not claim or even pretend to be statisticians. But you don't have to be a statistician to see that the rating companies often have been doing one thing while they said they were doing something else.

You don't have to be a statistician to know that something is wrong when a survey firm does interviewing for a local report in counties where the local stations' signals don't even reach. Or when no interviewing is done in counties admittedly within the metropolitan area.

You don't have to be a statistician to understand that, in view of all the sources of bias and error disclosed during the hearings, the rating services have been claiming much greater precision for their figures than the facts can justify. And when the life and death of programs, the economic fortunes of producers and performers, even the existence of stations themselves may depend on differences of tenths of rating points, I think you can appreciate the committee's concern.

One thing that has been disconcerting is the attitude of some broadcasters and advertisers that nothing can or should be done to improve audience research. Many broadcasters seem satisfied with the ratings as they have been. Or at least they have been resigned to the present system on the ground that ratings are the only audience indicator that exists. The feeling seems to be that no one can do without comparative figures.

I submit that this is the outlook of the man with a crutch. If the crutch is known to be defective, he should want a better crutch. But his ideal is to be restored to health so that he will be strong enough to throw the crutch away.

I would like to make it perfectly clear that I am not a crusader, the committee has not been crusading. We did not start out on a witch hunt; we knew what we were doing from innumerable reports and we have been serious in our efforts toward correcting a bad situation and one which, if permitted to continue, would result in dire consequences.

Segments of your industry are now and have been working diligently to improve the quality of audience research. If you are going to have to continue to rely on ratings you should insist on the best research existing knowledge and techniques can produce.

I believe, with a few broadcasters, that your ideal should be to make your stations and your industry strong so that you will not need audience numbers in order to raise your revenue. But I am fearful most of you still feel the need for some kind of statistical crutch.

You may very well then ask—"how can you pay for it?" In view of the enormous sums of money, upward of $1 billion, that hang in the balance each year, it should not be difficult to meet the cost for sufficient sample sizes, better supervision and quality controls, as well as other improvements.

It was contended during the course of the hearings that the results of a statistical survey can be at best no more reliable than the raw data underlying them. I might also remind you that we had expert testimony which expressed the view that if you feed "garbage" into a computer, you will get "garbage" out.

Your National Association of Broadcasters proposes to do something about it in a three-point program that would assure ratings to be "valid, reliable, effective, and economically viable." It proposes:

1. The establishment of minimum standards and criteria in the field of broadcast audience measurement, and a system of accreditation of rating companies based on such standards and criteria:

2. The organization and supervision of Rating Audit Service; and

3. The projection of a continuing, effective program of research in audience measurement methodologies.

Unless you recover your own responsible decisionmaking functions, you will have no one but yourselves to blame, should the Federal Government on behalf of the public undertake to do something about it.

This brings me to the second principal point of focus in this discussion—the fairness doctrine.

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE

The fairness doctrine is undoubtedly a well-intentioned attempt by the FCC to reconcile the spirit of fairness as contained in section 315 of the Communications Act, dealing with political candidates, with the right of broadcasters to editorialize on controversial subjects.

Before attempting to analyze some of the problems I see in the considered fairness doctrine, let me undertake to put it in its proper perspective.

The equal-time provision of section 315, the right to editorialize, and the fairness doctrine are analytically separable subjects for discussion. Yet in much of the recent debate on these subjects they have become terribly confused.

It seems to me there is a need for clarification, at which I will now make a modest attempt.

First, let us consider the intent and requirements of section 315. By itself, the section does not require that a licensee allow air time to any legally qualified candidates for political office. But once a licensee has allowed a candidate to use its facilities to advance his cause, section 315 requires the licensee, if requested, to grant the opponent or opponents equal time under comparable conditions to advance his or their side of the story. It further denies to the licensee any power of censorship.

Despite persistent efforts on the part of broadcasters, particularly the networks, to abolish the equal time rule, Congress has never seen fit to do so. The closest we have come is to vote, this year as in 1960, to suspend the operation of the rule so as to permit the so-called great debates between candidates of the two major parties for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency.

The FCC has over the years, as we all know, blown hot and cold on the subject of editorializing by broadcasters. Since the overturn by the Commission of the Mayflower rule, licensees have been free to express editorial opinions—in the same manner generally that newspapers do. But many licensees have been and still are reluctant to program editorials on a regular basis, for fear they will run into trouble—either from advertisers fearful of any controversy, or from the Commission, especially since the enunciation by the Commission in 1949 of the fairness doctrine.

As early as 1958 I advocated the practice of editorializing by broadcasters. My views have not changed. It seems to me contrary to our traditions of free expression to forbid broadcasters to speak out on controversial issues of importance to their communities—as the FCC did in the old Mayflower case.

But when the Commission reversed itself in 1949 in order to permit broadcast editorials, it may have opened a Pandora's box of troubles, both for itself and for broadcasters. For at that time, it set forth the fairness doctrine.

The fairness doctrine, as I understand it, imposes on any licensee which editorializes on political campaigns or other controversial matters, an affirmative obligation to seek out spokesmen for viewpoints contrasting with those expressed by the licensee. Now that, on the face of it, seems simple and fair enough. But its simplicity is, I think, deceptive. For it seems to assume issues of a two-sided nature; for example, "We should get out of the United Nations; we should stay in the United Nations." Or, "We should not cut Federal taxes; we should cut Federal taxes."

But, what of the many side issues raised by such controversies? Take the tax-cut issue, on which there are many shades of

opinion. Many responsible persons believe there should be no tax cut until the Federal budget is balanced. Others believe that only with "planned deficits" can our economy continue to grow at a satisfactory rate under present conditions. (And what, parenthetically, is a "satisfactory" rate?) Many people believe, quite sincerely, that a tax cut, unaccompanied by reforms in our tax structure, is unthinkable. But they disagree heatedly over which specific reforms are needed. Others feel that we should cut taxes now and worry about reforms later when there may be more agreement on the subject of "which reforms."

I think this brief excursion into the tax cut issue will give you some idea of the problems raised by the fairness doctrine.

Let us say that a station broadcasts an editorial simply favoring a tax cut now—reforms or no reforms. Must the licensee mail to various spokesmen for all these and other different viewpoints transcripts of the editorial? Must he solicit them to use his facilities to express their various attitudes?

If he must—and I see nothing in the fairness doctrine that says he need not—he would be taking on an intolerable burden. I submit that the logical result of the fairness doctrine would be that the licensee would broadcast no editorials at all.

And this is precisely the opposite of what the FCC says it wants to encourage.

My feeling is that the judgment as to what "contrasting" viewpoints a broadcaster should permit to be aired over his facilities should be left with the licensee, where the Communications Act put it in the first place.

To these burdens that a concentrated effort to enforce the fairness doctrine would impose on licensees should be added the additional administrative burdens on the Commission itself. If we are to believe the Commission spokesmen who appear before the House Appropriations Committee, the Commissioners and staff are plenty busy as it is. The kind of effort that would be required for a thoroughgoing enforcement program in this field would divert much Commission manpower from tasks to which the Congress has assigned higher priority.

I cannot but conclude that the net result would be a setback to the public interest.

I have offered for your consideration what I consider two real threats to broadcasting in the public interest. Our committee is keenly aware of them, and you may be sure we are closely watching every development. Our primarily objective, as I see it, is to remove whatever obstacles we can that stand in the way of the freedom of a responsible broadcasting industry. I hope that through our studies and our hearings the committee has made some headway toward that goal.

But, in closing, I remind you again the key to a flourishing and improving system of free American broadcasting lies largely with you, the licensees. If the full potentialities of our system can be achieved and our people can realize the advantages of this vast resource, we will have "crossed the Rubicon."

Condolences to the Speaker and Family of the Late Hon. Edward J. McCormack

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that no words or act of any mortal being can beguile one from the grief that accompanies the loss of a loved one, I wish to add my expressions of sympathy and condolences to the Speaker, upon the untimely passing of his brother, and to members of his family and the family of the late Hon. Edward J. McCormack.

The full measure of a man is determined by what he did before his death. The Speaker's brother Edward carried the honorable name of McCormack well and contributed toward immortalizing that name in the history of the State of Massachusetts as well as that of this great Nation of ours.

As Hawaii's Representative to Congress, I extend my deepest sympathy to the Speaker and the surviving members of his family and his brother's family in the hope that they will find some comfort in the fact that there are many who share in their great loss.

Beyond the Pale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on October 28 the Nashville Banner carried an editorial which expresses the sentiments of all Americans who hold in high regard the distinguished service-to-country of former President Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles.

The editorial "Beyond the Pale" reveals the true character of the man who uses such damaging terms as treason and Communist when referring to these two great Americans. It is refreshing to find an editor who has enough strength of conviction to be outspoken against such vicious and unwarranted attacks.

Under permission to extend my remarks I recommend that all Members of Congress read "Beyond the Pale."

The editorial is as follows:

BEYOND THE PALE: SMEARER ROBERT WELCH NAUSEATES THE NATION

A Bible thought: "But I say unto you. That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment"—Matthew 12: 36.

The eccentric little mind engaged in minor splashes of mud—as by a child at play, for its own amusement—is at most a social irritant. Its soiled premises can be scrubbed; its aberrations dismissed by considering the source.

The vicious mind absorbed in smear, beset with ideas of self-deification by advertising its abnormalities as a virtue, and infecting its stratum with germs of hate, is something else. And even considering the source, decency cannot dismiss with silent contempt the studied slur—and defamation of character—tossed as a stink bomb by Robert Welch at two great Americans, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles.

In the course of a news panel "interview" on the air, Welch reiterated his slander of the living and the dead, accusing General Eisenhower of "treason," and the former Secretary of State of having been a Communist.

Even recognizing the point of its incubation, the infamy of such allegation is beyond the pale, and the Nation finds it both outrageous and nauseating. It is an unspeakable insult not only to men of monumental service to their country, of allegiance earning them a place high on its honor roll, but to the intelligence of every citizen. It is an affront to reason that strains not only credulity, but even the inventive capacity of a twisted mind.

Decency recoils at it—and finds such foul smear appalling. Those who have, in any degree, kept company with Robert Welch must see him now for what he is.

Thirty Years of Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, November 16, 1933, was the infamous day that Franklin D. Roosevelt formally recognized the Soviet Union. Since then—armed with a certain amount of respect because of this recognition—the Soviet Union has made trouble for the whole world.

In yesterday's issue of the New York Herald Tribune, David Lawrence reviews events since this act by President Roosevelt.

The article follows:

THIRTY YEARS OF RUSSIAN RECOGNITION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Just 30 years ago, on November 16, 1933, the U.S. Government formally recognized the Government of the Soviet Union. The anniversary furnished an opportunity to publicize formally the many violations of pledges by the Soviet Government during the intervening years, but somehow the U.S. Government was strangely silent.

The act of recognition and resumption of diplomatic relations came in 1933, after 16 years of hesitation and reluctance by Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, and with misgivings by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Certain conditions were imposed in the agreement which have since been flagrantly violated again and again by the Soviets.

In a significant memorandum written on July 16, 1933, to President Roosevelt by Robert F. Kelley, Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the Department of State, the following warning had been given:

"It would seem, therefore, that an essential prerequisite to the establishment of harmonious and trustful relations with the Soviet Government is the abandonment by the present rulers of Russia of their world revolutionary aims and the discontinuance of their activities designed to bring about the realization of such aims. More specifically and with particular regard to the United States, this prerequisite involves the abandonment by Moscow of direction, supervision, control, financing, etc., through every agency utilized for the purpose of Communist or other related activities in the United States."

The documents exchanged in Washington on November 16, 1933, between President Roosevelt and Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinoff made a particular effort to cover the point in the Kelley memorandum. The notes of recognition contained mutual promises, and the Russian Government thus agreed to the following pledge:

"To refrain and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of

the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including the organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions, and in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions."

Yet the Federal Bureau of Investigation and congressional committees have uncovered, in the last 30 years, instance after instance in which the Soviet Government has sent its agents into the United States and has financed organizations aiming to overthrow the American Government.

Only last year, there also was exposed to world view the plot to injure the people and territory of the United States by means of missile bases and military forces stationed in Cuba. These hostile moves, although ostensibly the responsibility of the Cuban regime, were directed as well as financed by the Soviet Government in Moscow.

Less than 2 years after formal recognition was extended, Secretary of State Cordell Hull—in a statement to the press on September 1, 1935—pointed to the violation of various pledges by the Russians, and said:

"If the Soviet Government pursues a policy permitting activities on its territory involving interference in the internal affairs of the United States instead of preventing such activities as its written pledge provides, the friendly and official relations between the two countries cannot but be seriously impaired."

American diplomats complained and protested often in ensuing years, but to no avail. In 1939, the Soviet Government became an ally of the Nazis and in a signed agreement guaranteed Hitler that he would not have to fight on his eastern front. He was thereby given a free hand to make war against Britain and France. Finally, after the Nazis attacked Russia and the United States entered the war in 1941, the military aid from this country was so decisive that without it the Communist regime would have been defeated. But no gratitude was ever shown the United States, and the recent incidents on the Berlin autobahn reveal a crass indifference to the rights of the Western Allies.

Indeed, in 1950—less than 5 years after World War II ended—the Soviet Government sent arms and munitions to Red China and North Korea for use against the United Nations forces which had been sent to repel aggression. Since the armistice of 1953 in Korea, the Communists have repeatedly violated their written pledges and have kidnapped American troops or wantonly fired on them. More than 1 million persons, including Koreans, were killed or wounded on the United Nations side in the Korean war. Yet the Soviet Union is still accepted as a member of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Today the Moscow Government is deeply involved in financing subversive activities in all parts of the world, including the United States. Yet the 30th anniversary of the signing of those pledges of forebearance by the Soviet Government—which have been violated in acts of treachery and hostility to the United States—has gone almost unnoticed here. The American Government might well have reviewed the record and let the Russian people know the basis for the universal distrust today of the written pledges of the Soviet Government.

We Are at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has actively started his campaign for reelection and we are told that he is going to base his entire appeal on the theme that his administration has maintained peace and prosperity.

I hope to discuss his claim that we are enjoying unprecedented prosperity from time to time to remind the American people how the big spending programs demanded by President Kennedy are actually resulting in less money in the pockets of all of us as each month he has been in office our dollars have bought less.

Today, however, I would like to explode the myth so often repeated by the President that we are at peace. We are not at peace. We are at war. The cold war is as real as if this Nation were actually under armed attack. If we lose the cold war we will come under Russian domination just as surely as if our cities were leveled by bombs and invaded by Soviet hordes.

The cold war is a deliberate part of the Soviet plan for enslaving the world, and we had better recognize this as a fact.

The President also overlooks the actual shooting wars that are going on at this very moment. At latest count some 130 American boys have died in Vietnam and that, Mr. President, is war. From your sheltered White House tower you may not recognize this, but I can assure you that the mothers and fathers and wives and children of those men who have died in Vietnam consider it a war.

The President's attempt to mislead the American people into believing we are at peace, must be exposed, less in his eagerness to use any means to be reelected, we lose the war and give the victory to the Communists.

As long as the Soviet Union is dedicated to ruling the world, to conquering the United States, to make good on Khrushchev's boast that "we will bury you," there is no peace. The war is already here and because of the President's apparent failure to understand either the Communists or their goals, Russia is gaining victory after victory. Under the present course of the Kennedy administration we are headed for destruction and we dare not allow him to get away with creating a false sense of security by insisting that he has maintained peace.

As a part of these remarks I would like to include an editorial by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report of November 25, clearly pointing out "The 'Cold War' Is a War."

The editorial follows:

THE "COLD WAR" IS A WAR

(By David Lawrence)

Every now and then a wave of euphoria sweeps this country. This is the word often used nowadays in official parlance to describe the feeling that ensues after Moscow makes one of its periodic gestures of peace. Promptly, each such move is hailed as the beginning of another era of friendship. But just as America settles down to occupy itself with matters of internal concern, the Soviets suddenly provoke friction and we discover that it isn't peace after all.

Does the fault lie with us? We are so eager to interpret any seemingly friendly move as a genuine act of good will that we lean over backwards to join in the euphoria or buoyancy of spirit which is engendered by such tactics.

Realism demands that we take a good look at what is happening around the world and that we do not allow the impression to be built up that we are so eager for a crumb from the Soviet-concocted recipe of coexistence that we are for peace at any price.

The Government which speaks for us presents to the world the image of a nation that sincerely wants peace. But the sad lessons of history tell us that supineness or appeasement is the very thing that causes an enemy to miscalculate. A lack of resoluteness at decisive moments eventually brings on wars.

The President of the United States by his speeches may choose to reassure his own people that they are making progress toward peace, but at the same time this overanxiety to produce an impression of achievement convinces our enemy that the necessary steps to vindicate our position may not be taken.

We shall, of course, use military force if attacked. But, because the whole American policy is based on the idea that we shall await attack, the man in the Kremlin has the advantage. He can bluff and bluff, extort concession after concession, and make his own people, as well as the people of the Communist-bloc countries, believe that the United States is steadily bending to his will.

The politicians who have been getting ready to extol Mr. Kennedy in the 1964 presidential campaign as the preserver of world peace do not like to advise him to take any steps that would escalate the situation. "Escalate" is another word in the official vocabulary in Washington. It refers to the sequence which may develop when one country takes a firm stand anywhere and the other side promptly reacts with some form of retaliation. The theory is that such successive steps now could lead to a nuclear crisis.

This permits Nikita Khrushchev to call the shots in the game he plays. For if he can terrify the United States by taking the initiative around the globe, he is accomplishing his major purpose—to anesthetize American policymakers while he pursues his acts of aggression.

It is easy to characterize every proposal for firmness as a desire to bring on war. Military preparedness, however, is meaningless if the enemy believes force will never be used unless a nuclear attack is made.

What should the President do? First—and most important of all—it is essential that the whole truth be told the American people. Many of the notes exchanged with Moscow after the Cuban missile crisis have never been made public. Mr. Kennedy told a press conference recently that all the Soviet troops are being withdrawn from Cuba and that the evacuation soon will be completed. The Soviet official newspaper, Izvestia, however, says no such promise was ever given.

The basis for a sincere friendship has not yet been established. Until it is, we shall be involved—as the Soviets are—in "brinkmanship." This can lead to mistakes and miscalculation.

The time has come for the United States to abandon the realm of secret diplomacy and tell the whole world—including the

Soviet people—what is going on. The negotiation of the nuclear test ban treaty was given wide publicity, but the factors which are every day depreciating the value of such an agreement and creating distrust are being handled in the routine of formalized diplomacy.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are vigorously fighting the cold war on every front—in southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Eastern Europe, in Latin America, in Africa, and in the Far East. We, on the other hand, are striving merely to bolster up certain underdeveloped nations with foreign aid, even as some of these same countries play one side against the other.

If we intend unwittingly to forfeit the chance of winning the cold war, then our lassitude and loose policy are understandable. If we mean to fight the cold war—for it is in every sense a war, inasmuch as many American lives have been sacrificed on certain battlefronts in the last few years—then it is time to bring the fight out in the open and let the world know of the schemes and duplicity of the Soviet Government.

If the enemy is permitted to push us around, there can be no peace. For the cold war is not peace. It is a state of war.

Unsung Heroes in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a news story which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser of November 15, 1963, indicates that there are many unsung heroes in the war against communism in Vietnam. Americans in Vietnam labor countless hours and risk their lives daily in the highest tradition of the Armed Forces of the United States. Three such valiant men are Pfc. Felipe Larisoa, Jr., of Ewa, Hawaii; Pfc. Roy Koyanagi, of Aiea, Hawaii; and Sp4 Rodney Kamaka, of Kona, Hawaii. There are other sons of Hawaii who are shouldering a lion's share of the continuing fight for a free world, as revealed by the following news story written by George Eagle:

ISLE GI'S JOB: KEEP 'EM FLYING

(By George Eagle)

SAIGON.—"These men are outstanding and dedicated individuals who work from sunup to sundown every day and risk their lives daily to keep our aircraft going—and they don't know what a 3-day pass looks like."

The 120th Aviation Co. helicopter pilot was talking about two men from Hawaii, Pfc. Felipe Lariosa, Jr., 23, of Ewa, and Pfc. Roy Koyanagi, 20, of 98-248A Aiea Kai Place, Aiea.

"Promotions are hard to come by out here, and strangely, seem especially hard for technically trained men to get," the pilot said. "We put in for awards, but they never seem to go through.

"About the only way we can show men like Lariosa and Koyanagi any recognition is to pat them on the back and maybe buy them a can of beer after a mission."

Lariosa and Koyanagi weren't complaining when I visited them at the helicopter ready line at Tan Son Nhut Airfield here, and in fact, said they liked the work.

Lariosa, 23, son of Mr. and Mrs. Felipe Lariosa of Ewa and a graduate of Waipahu High School, is crew chief of a CH-21 Shawnee copter he has named "The Tiki." He also mans a machinegun on the craft and is credited with 20 confirmed kills of Vietcong personnel.

"He got five of them, and a possible sixth, in one day when we got into a pretty hot situation," the pilot said.

Although the normal tour of duty here is 1 year, Lariosa, who has been in Vietnam since February 10, plans to extend his tour 6 months. "The people are wonderful out here," he says.

Koyanagi, 20, is crewchief on a fixed-wing L-19, so "I don't get shot at as much," he says.

He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Natsuji Koyanagi and a graduate of Radford High School. He also has been here since last February.

The L-19 he rides flies at several thousand feet on missions to direct and control the low-flying choppers.

Another Hawaii soldier who sees a lot of shot and shell in South Vietnam is Sp4. Rodney Kamaka, of 412 Kalaimoku Street, Honolulu, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank P. Kamaka, of Kona.

As a member of the Utility Tactical Transport Co., Kamaka is a crew chief for one of the HU1B "Huey" helicopters, a favorite Vietcong target because of their heavy, modern weaponry.

Kamaka is scheduled to go home next month and is "anxious to get back to Waikiki and old Kona."

The two helicopter companies are in the U.S. Army Support Group Vietnam, administrative command for all Army aircraft units in Vietnam.

USASGV also has some other men from Hawaii, including four in the 7th Finance Disbursing Section. They are:

Sp4c. Bruce Butts, 20, son of Mrs. Irene Butts, 20 Laukona Street, Hilo, a graduate of Hilo High School; Sp4c. Clarence Takeda, 20, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Takeda, 3055 Lakimau Street, Honolulu, a graduate of Kaimuki High School; Sp4c. Edward Agbincola, 20, son of Mrs. Adelaide Agbincola, Kapaa, Kauai, graduate of Kapaa High School, and Sp4c. Roy Higuchi, 24, 830 Kapaakea Lane, Honolulu, graduate of McKinley High School.

Job Insecurity Faces Union Members if Civil Rights Bill Passes Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is generally considered throughout the Congress that the pending civil rights legislation is aimed exclusively at the Southern States. Many persons living in other parts of the country have been deluded into the belief that they will not be affected by the legislation; that its purpose is to "emancipate" the southern Negro, and to wrest political control of the Southern States away from those presently in power.

Mr. Speaker, those who harbor this kind of belief will be in for a rude awakening should the pending civil rights bill become law. The fact is that this bill will shake the very foundations of individual liberty, and will strike just as hard at those in other parts of the country as it will against the people in the Southern States.

This morning a letter was received from a citizen in San Francisco, Calif., which I think contains much food for thought. Because this was an unusual letter and considering its geographical source, in particular, I am taking the liberty of quoting an excerpt therefrom which I feel sure will be of enlightening interest to the Members of this body.

One of the brighter rays of hope so far is an article in the morning San Francisco Examiner stating that the more conservative Negro leaders are alarmed about the poll showing that white voters are deserting the Kennedys by the millions. Just this week there was an incident here in San Francisco where a group of beatniks and real Communist young punks led by Vincent Hallinan's son picketed in front of a sandwich stand owned by Harold Dobbs, who was a candidate for Mayor. They demanded more jobs for Negroes.

Faced with a political and economic problem Dobbs and his partner negotiated a deal giving the Negroes assurance of prompt employment. Then, the white waitresses called upon their union leaders and demanded that the union protect them under its written contract with Dobbs and Weiss, protesting that the Negroes had no right to interfere with their contract preferences.

It seems to me that disputes of this kind are going to be arising all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, the excerpt quoted above points up a serious problem which will be created by the enactment of the pending civil rights legislation, and I would caution those now enjoying the security of labor union protection to pause and take a penetrating look at the probable effects of this legislation on their employment.

Let's Get Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, the Boston Advertiser raised in a fine editorial questions to which all New England awaits an answer. The quality of air service in the Boston area has been deteriorating for some time, despite the proclaimed policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide the best possible air service for all sections of the country. It is my hope that the New England Conference meetings scheduled for later this week with a representative of the CAB will clarify these matters. I include an excerpt from this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LET'S GET ANSWERS

The fur should fly in Bostontown this Thursday and Friday. Those are the days when the 39th annual New England Conference convenes here and if the gathering lives up to its reputation as a "regional town meeting," there are some burning questions to be asked which should produce some red-hot answers.

The replies may not always be satisfactory but, very definitely, they should be authoritative for the men of whom they'll be asked are eminently qualified to possess the facts that New Englanders will want to know.

Robert T. Murphy of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who will attend the conference, should be asked to explain why the CAB has permitted Boston, the metropolis of New England, to sink to second-class status as an airline city so far as equipment and domestic service is concerned.

CAB policy pledges the public the best possible air service. By what interpretation of that policy, then, was American Airlines allowed to drop out of the domestic transportation picture in Boston? To abandon its hourly flights to La Guardia and its frequent trips to Washington? To move its first-rate equipment out of New England for use in other cities on other routes?

Does the CAB feel that the mere convenience of shuttle service to New York and Washington is sufficent excuse to permit uncomfortable, noisy, and slow flights on outdated aircraft? Just what plans does the CAB have for upgrading air service to and from Boston?

Barthels Get Family Award at Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in these days of grave concern over the juvenile delinquency problems we hear a great deal about the fault lying with the parents. Certainly there is no question that the home is the basic influence in the life of a child.

As is so often the case, the news is full of examples of broken homes, mistreatment and abandonment of children, lack of proper training and parent irresponsibility, but we seldom hear about the responsible parents who are maintaining good homes.

For this reason, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to an article which appeared in the November 12 issue of the Frederick (Md.) Post concerning the George Barthel family of Braddock Heights, recipients of a special family award at the recent convention of the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers. It is families like the Barthels who will carry on the traditions and heritage of our great country and ultimately eliminate the juvenile delinquency problems that are of the greatest concern to us all.

The item from the Frederick Post is as follows:

BARTHELS GET FAMILY AWARD AT CONVENTION

Mr. and Mrs. George Barthel, Braddock Heights, received a special family award at the recent State convention of the Maryland Congress of Parents and Teachers in Baltimore.

Presented by the Maryland Congress of PTA's president, Mrs. William F. Robie of Oxon Hill, the award said, "Never before has there been such widespread appreciation of the family as the essential unit of society. Never have so many parents been aware of their responsibility to their children.

"The home is the place where children get their first images of life, their first inklings of freedom and justice and compassion," the award continued, "In our changing and troubled times, the home becomes an even deeper concern of the PTA's."

The award concluded, "We look to the future confident that, with families like the Barthels, the Nation can have the strong homes and human excellence which it needs to preserve its greatness and help to make a world a kindlier place for children everywhere. We salute the Barthel family."

Barthel, the former head of the Frederick County Council of PTA's who is now vice president in charge of the Howard, Carroll, and Frederick County District for the State PTA, organized the arrangements for the entire convention, since the Frederick County PTA was the host county council this year. Mrs. Geneva Barthel, head of the Frederick County Welfare Department, was a delegate from the Middletown High School. Harry F. Rhoderick of Braddock and Mrs. Betty Mainhart of New Market were the official host and hostess.

Rev. and Mrs. John C. Chatlos of Emmitsburg were honored as the representative family of the year from Frederick County. Richard Comstock of Woodsboro, the current president of the Frederick County PTA Council, was also active.

Other local delegates included Mrs. Mary Sullivan, Principal Harry O. Smith, Assistant Principal George Seaton, Scott Smith, and Lester Grossnickle from Linganore School.

PTA President Harry Swomley, Cecil Holter Jr., and Rhoderick served as delegates from the Middletown School. Mrs. Norman Koontz, Mrs. John Converse, and Mrs. Frank T. Elliott represented the Libertytown School.

Frederick County School Superintendent Dr. James A. Sensenbaugh also attended the convention.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important report from the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children. The report discusses the findings of a national survey conducted by the committee concerning the needs of migrant children. I believe that it is essential for all of us to read this report as it shows a shocking lack of concern for the approximately 150,000 migrant children in our Nation.

I have introduced a number of bills to alleviate the distressing condition of migratory workers and their children. One of these bills, H.R. 4902, provides for Federal financial assistance to the States for the education of migrant workers. The following report indicates the pressing need for prompt approval by the House of this and other migratory labor bills:

THE SCHOOL AND THE MIGRANT CHILD—A SURVEY INTREPRETED

Migrant agricultural workers have been a part of the American scene since the early twenties, and the educational problems of their children have been subject for study and concern for more than a decade. Yet, in the spring of 1963, no national program, public or private, existed to facilitate the education of these hapless children, whose parents followed the harvests from State to State. Indeed, even information concerning the actual numbers and educational attainment of migrant children was either lacking or at best contradictory. And despite the fact that migrant children were generally acknowledged to be among America's most educationally deprived youngsters, techniques for meeting their special problems and needs were few and little known.

In an effort to clarify the educational picture and to secure reliable information on a national scale, the newly formed National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children launched in July 1963 a survey of the actual conditions affecting these children.

The successful completion of the survey owes much to the cooperation of individuals from public and private agencies who took time from their busy schedules to answer the lengthy questionnaire that crossed their desks. On the other hand, the findings present a less successful picture of national attempts to meet the undoubted problems involved in the education of migrant children. Again, the lack of clear-cut answers in a number of instances raises important questions concerning the attitudes of those primarily invested with the responsibility for education within their respective States.

MECHANICS OF THE SURVEY

A five-part questionnaire was developed to delineate the number of migrant children in the given State, their participation in regular and summer terms, and the needs and problems connected with their classroom attendance. This questionnaire was sent to the departments of education in 48 States (Hawaii and Puerto Rico were not included in the survey), Protestant and Roman Catholic agencies active in migrant work in 41 States, Governors' committees dealing with migrant problems in 24 States, and citizens' committees having a like interest in 10 States. In this way the 48 States were queried from one to four times, with a total of 130 persons being contacted.

Replies were received from at least one person in all but 4 of the 48 States for an overall response of 60 percent. However, 11 State departments of education did not acknowledge receipt of the questionnaire, 12 reported that they had no migrant problem, and 7 more failed to complete the questionnaire for miscellaneous reasons. Thus 30 State departments of education are not represented in the final tabulations, although other agencies in many of these States did furnish important information.

WHAT THE RESPONSES SHOWED

One of the purposes of the survey was to determine the number of migrant children annually entering and leaving each State, their pattern of movement, and the numbers enrolled at various class levels during the years, 1960–62. This purpose was not realized. Few reports even gave estimates of the number of migrant children within State borders and less than one-third of the 44 tabulated States supplied enrollment figures. A few States noted that "migrants" were not distinguished in any of their records.

The survey established that migrant children could be accepted for enrollment in regular terms in 22 States, and summer programs for migrant children were provided in 18 States. But these positive reports of educational opportunity had to be somewhat qualified. Half of the summer terms were either wholly or partially underwritten by private agencies and received no support from State education departments. In most instances these privately supported schools could accommodate only a few of the migrant children in the State. One report listed an enrollment of 13 pupils for the State for the year and in no State were more than 150 pupils involved. Two of these summer programs were for preschoolers only, and one was a pilot study. Two of the summer programs operated by State education depart-

ments in 1962 had to be discontinued in 1963 because of lack of appropriations.

The reports of regular term enrollment posed similar questions concerning the number of migrant children who actually participated in the school programs. A number of reports cited State compulsory attendance laws as assuring attendance but also noted that enforcement was left up to the school districts. In answer to a direct query, only seven States reported making any special effort to enroll migrant children. Most of these seven, however, went into detail concerning the necessity for their programs because of the tendency of migrant parents to undervalue education for their children and the lack of interest of the youngsters themselves, hampered as they were by language difficulties and age/grade retardation.

An important part of the survey was devoted to a determination of problems and needs usually associated with the education of migrant children. Respondents were given an opportunity to list problems, as they were most frequently encountered, and to evaluate the importance of 12 categories of needs, ranging from reimbursement of school districts for migrant children to interest and cooperation of migrant parents. Suggestions as to possible action to meet the special conditions affecting migrant children's education were also sought. This section which measured opinion rather than fact drew more replies than any other part of the survey, suggesting perhaps that most respondents usually had a concern or a point of view.

More than 124 problems were enumerated, including such various obstacles to educating the migrant child as lack of funds for Spanish-speaking teachers, feelings of insecurity in the child engendered by transiency, economic deprivation and cultural differences, attitudes of teachers, of parents, of communities, and lack of materials appropriate to the degree of age/grade retardation usually encountered. Most reports cited mobility as the chief problem, frequently linking it to the difficulty of fitting the ill-prepared, transient child into the classroom.

When the respondents evaluated the 12 needs listed in the questionnaire, they showed strong agreement as to the 3 most important categories. The reimbursement of school districts for migrant children enrolled in regular or special term school, community understanding and concern for the problem of educating the migrant child, and a special program to enroll migrant children in summer schools where the needs rated as most important. Needs which were reported of least importance, sometimes not being rated at all, were as significant to the survey-makers as the most frequently mentioned categories, since these needs are essentially intrinsic to any educational program that really gets and keeps the migrant child in school. These infrequently rated needs were: information on the development of educational programs adapted to the needs of migrant children, orientation of staff and teachers to these needs, and the regulation of child labor in agriculture outside of school hours.

If the enumerated problems and evaluated needs seemed to indicate a tendency on the part of many respondents to see the migrant child as a disturbing element in the classroom and someone else's problem—the legislature's, to appropriate more funds or the community's, to have more concern—the lack of suggestions for action to meet these conditions seemed only to substantiate the impression.

SUMMARY—A GUIDE FOR ACTION

A national survey on the education of migrant children, based on reports from 44 States, established that few agencies knew how many such children entered or left their State or kept statistics on their progress through school. Most respondents recognized that migrant children were retarded in achievement and suffered from the mobility of their parents, but they were also unsure of or indifferent to the steps that could be taken to improve educational opportunities for this disadvantaged group.

And disadvantaged the migrant child certainly is. Moving from district to district, he is frequently untouched by attendance laws, unwelcomed in the classroom where his presence creates many and difficult problems for the teacher, and ignored by his classmates because of his lack of a social awareness comparable to their own. Often Spanish-speaking, he finds few bilingual teachers when he travels and seldom encounters a counselor to encourage or motivate him toward an education. Retarded in grade from 2 to 3 years, a retardation increasing with his age, the migrant child becomes an early school dropout. Unprotected by child labor laws, he takes his place beside his parents, working to add to the family income and becoming in time another cipher in health and welfare statistics.

Because of the escalating social, economic, and human costs represented by the uneducated migrant child, ways must be found as quickly as possible to provide him with the basic educational skills necessary in a rapidly changing nation.

The National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children was established to give support and impetus to this movement for improving the educational opportunities open to these children. It is in a position to counsel with State agencies, to encourage interstate cooperation, to make available through its clearinghouse the best and most recent information on tested methods and techniques useful in teaching migrant children, to serve as a liaison with Federal agencies, and to create at the national level a climate of opinion that will give support to community concern and action.

The NCEMC survey reflects a failure in many areas, but it also offers a positive contribution to action by defining where American education for the migrant child stands today.

The Role and Work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on November 12, 1963, I was privileged to address the 33d annual meeting of the New Jersey Taxpayers Association at the Hotel Robert Treat in Newark, N.J. As one of three House Members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I used the occasion to discuss the role and some of the work of the Commission, particularly its study of State property taxes and its unique position as a force for improving our Federal-State-local system of government.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my address:

THE ROLE AND WORK OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. Chairman, members of the association, ladies and gentlemen, for several reasons I am grateful for this invitation to meet with the New Jersey Taxpayers Association this year to discuss the position and the work of the Advisory Commission on Integovernmental Relations.

First, I always welcome an opportunity to meet with citizens of New Jersey to discuss issues of the day and to render an accounting of the positions which I take in the Congress affecting the people of the Nation and the State.

Second, the Advisory Commission, of which I am proud to be a member, works very closely with the Tax Foundation and through the foundation with the various State taxpayers associations throughout the United States. For example, at the present time the Tax Foundation is engaged in a concerted study of the report which the Commission has recently published dealing with the role of the States in strengthening the property tax. I will have more to say about this report in a few moments. Upon completion of the foundation's study of the Commission's report, however, it is hoped and expected that through one or more special publications the foundation will assist the Commission in promoting many of these recommendations throughout the country. In this connection, let me call your attention to a column by Mr. Raymond Moley appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on August 19.

Mr. Moley observes that:

"In one of his debates with Richard Nixon in 1960, John F. Kennedy said that the property tax was practically exhausted as a source of revenue. On this assumption he advocated vast new Federal expenditures for local facilities such as public schools.

"It is a pity that Mr. Nixon did not remind his opponent that it was the Federal income tax, not the property tax, which had reached the point of diminishing returns. Mr. Kennedy has admitted that in asking for tax rate reductions this year."

Mr. Moley goes on to refer to the comprehensive study of the property tax being published by the Advisory Commission and closes with the hope that by strengthening the property tax it may be possible to check the growth of Federal control of local affairs.

Third, I am especially pleased at this opportunity to explain something about the work of the Advisory Commission and to summarize the things it is for and the things it is not for—despite the rumors and allegations to the contrary. Let me note at this point that I have arranged to provide for your use a supply of pamphlets describing the functioning of the Commission. With this more comprehensive material available, I shall limit myself here to matters of special interest.

Now, a brief look at the events leading up to the establishment of the Commission.

You may recall that in 1953 the President and the Congress initiated a thorough review of Federal-State relations by creating a temporary commission made up of persons appointed by the President and Representatives from both Houses of the Congress. This Commission came to be known by the name of its chairman, the late Meyer Kestnbaum of Chicago. In 1955, the Kestnabaum Commission went out of business and issued its formal report, which constituted the most comprehensive review of intergovernmental relations since the adoption of the Constitution. Our own Gov. Alfred Driscoll, by the way, was a member of this pioneering group.

The Kestnbaum report covered not only the philosophical aspects of federalism, but also a variety of specific recommendations on the allocation of functions and responsibilities between the National Government and the States. The report did not get down to many specifics on taxes, but dealt extensively with grants.

From 1956 through 1958, the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, on which I serve as ranking minority member, undertook a comprehensive study of the recommendations of the Kestnbaum Commission, including those relating to possible

permanent arrangements within the National Government for attention to intergovernmental relations. In the course of this study, our subcommittee met with State and local government officials throughout a large part of the country. We were deeply impressed with the great body of evidence these officials provided, which showed a disturbing failure of communications between the various levels of government. It became obvious that this failure was at least partially responsible for a lot of waste and duplication. Not only did local and State officials not know what the other was often doing, or had done, or could do in particular areas, but just as often neither was familiar with the role of the Federal Government in that field. Under such circumstances, coordination and cooperation were difficult to obtain and inefficiency was encouraged.

With this situation in mind, our subcommittee chairman, Congressman FOUNTAIN, and I introduced companion bills to create a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Following a favorable report by the subcommittee, hearings on this House bill were carried on jointly by the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations. An identical measure was sponsored in the Senate by Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, of Maine, and a number of other Republican and Democratic Senators. These bills culminated in the enactment of Public Law 380 in the first session of the 86th Congress.

This act, approved by President Eisenhower, September 24, 1959, provided for the establishment of a permanent, bipartisan body of 26 members, to give continuing study to the relationship among local, State, and National levels of government. The act specifies the following composition of the Commission on a bipartisan basis: (a) three officers of the executive branch of the National Government; (b) three private citizens; (c) three Members of the U.S. Senate; (d) three Members of the U.S. House of Representatives; (e) four Governors; (f) four mayors; (g) three county officials; and (h) three State legislators.

Among the members of the Commission presently are: Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze, Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; Senators Ervin of North Carolina, Mundt, of South Dakota, and Muskie, of Maine; Congressmen Fountain, of North Carolina, Keogh, of New York, and Dwyer, of New Jersey; Governors Anderson, of Kansas, Sanders, of Georgia, Sanford, of North Carolina, and Smylie of Idaho; and Mayors Blaisdell, of Honolulu, Naftalin, of Minneapolis, Selland, of Fresno, Calif., and Tucker, of St. Louis.

The act creating the Commission assigns certain specific responsibilities to this group. The Commission is directed to:

1. Bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments for consideration of common problems.

2. Provide a forum for discussion of the administration of Federal grant programs.

3. Give critical attention to the conditions and controls involved in the administration of Federal grant programs.

4. Make available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine the overall effect on the Federal system.

5. Encourage discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation.

6. Recommend, within the framework of the Constitution, the most desirable allocation of governmental functions, responsibilities, and revenues among the several levels of government.

7. Recommend methods of coordinating and simplifying tax laws and administrative practices to achieve a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the levels of government and to reduce the burden of compliance for taxpayers.

Three major distinctions characterize the Commission, in comparison with predecessor efforts. First, it is a permanent rather than a temporary body and as such it can approach its work selectively, on a problem-by-problem basis; second, the cities and counties sit down as equals at the council table along with representatives of National and State governments; and third, it is not dominated by any one level of government or part thereof. Of the 26 seats on the Commission, 6 are controlled by the President, 6 by the Congress, and 14 by State and local governments. So only in a very technical sense can the Commission be considered a Federal agency. Currently, all of its funds come from Congress, but its congressional sponsors definitely had in mind the possibility that, if accomplishments warranted it, State and local assistance could be sought in financing the Commission's work.

As will be noted from the list of responsibilities stated in the act, the Commission has a broad mission. The Commission believes that the years ahead hold serious challenge for all levels of government. If our present system is to prove equal to these tasks, we believe, the resources of each level must be utilized to the highest degree of effectiveness. The Commission is therefore dedicated to strengthening local and State governments in particular, in order that they may play their full part in a period when the forces of international tension, rapid population growth, and marked technological change point to an increase in the responsibilities of government as a whole.

Finally, the Commission recognizes that its own value and place in the Federal system will be determined by the extent to which it is able to make constructive contributions. It cannot expect continuance and support over an indefinite period unless by its actions significant changes for the better occur in the relationships among Federal, State, and local agencies of government.

No single "party line" has emerged from the recommendations made by the Commission so far. The closest thing to such a position is the conviction of all of the members that State and local government in the United States must be strengthened if further unnecessary centralization at the Federal level is to be avoided. The Commission has recommended the enactment of a broad scope of enabling legislation by State governments for the unshackling of local governments, particularly those in urban areas, to permit a much greater degree of cooperation among these localities in meeting new problems.

Last year Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, one of my colleagues on the Commission, commented as follows: "The Congress has brought to a halt the present effort to create a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. Nevertheless, I urge State legislatures and Governors to lose no time in asserting by positive action their interest, their help, and their authority with regard to these problems brought about through rapid increases in population in our large metropolitan centers. If the States do not move in this matter, additional excuses will be seized upon by those who desire to see the Federal Government establish supremacy in this field."

Senator MUNDT then went on to commend for the consideration of the States the various legislative proposals which the Advisory Commission has made in regard to coping with metropolitan area problems.

Several of these recommendations—strangely enough—have become involved in the controversy over metropolitan government, or "Metro" as its opponents insist on calling it. To some people, apparently, even the word "metropolitan" is anathema, and, as far as I can determine, it is the Commission's use of this very well-defined, honorable and descriptive word which has made the Commission fair game. As a matter of fact, however, the Commission has never endorsed metropolitan government as such—directly or indirectly. Our interest is based on the fact that metropolitan areas exist; that, because of the multiplicity of governing bodies in metropolitan areas, there is a vital need to encourage and facilitate these individual governments in cooperating with each other to solve problems which are common to them all. Each of our recommendations is designed to accomplish this limited but important objective.

Ironically, by trying to tag the Commission's work in this field as part of "metro," opponents are helping to bring about—as Senator MUNDT suggests—exactly what they are supposed to be against: the development of centralized government in urban areas.

The Commission has been very concerned about the growth in the number and magnitude and complexity of Federal grants-in-aid. One of its first reports dealt with the need for the requirement by Congress of a periodic review of grants-in-aid programs to assure their termination or redirection when the need has ended or changed. I introduced H.R. 7160 which is pending in the House Committee on Government Operations to carry out this recommendation.

The Senate version of our bill, S. 2114, is scheduled to come up for hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations next month. Sponsored by Senator MUSKIE of Maine, our own Senator CASE and 28 other Senators of both parties, this bill, I suggest, is worthy of your active support. If you agree, your letters to New Jersey Congressmen and Senators could be very helpful.

The objective of this proposed legislation is to establish a uniform policy and procedure for review of new grant-in-aid programs which are designed to assist States or their political subdivisions in meeting recognized national needs. The bill is intended neither to encourage nor discourage the use of the Federal grant-in-aid device, but only to improve it where it is found desirable by the Congress.

Nevertheless, as all of us know, there is a persistent tendency for such programs, once enacted, to go on and on, no matter how useful they may be, without a meaningful or consistent congressional reexamination of their effectiveness as instruments of intergovernmental cooperation. The record shows that in all our history, only 14 Federal grant-in-aid programs have ever been terminated. Those terminated were special wartime or depression measures.

In my judgment, the failure of Congress to give continued and systematic attention to the problem helps to explain why this device is frequently the target of severe criticism. Congress ought to have a uniform policy and procedure for periodic review of grants-in-aid, not only to answer the critics, but to assure ourselves that programs we adopt are either adjusted to meet changing conditions or terminated when their original purposes have been achieved.

Under the bill, any new grant program hereafter enacted by the Congress would automatically expire at the end of 5 years unless an earlier date were specifically provided, or unless application of the act had been specifically waived, in recognition of the intent to provide continuing Federal assistance in a given program. The bill provides that the appropriate legislative committees in the Congress shall, at the end of 4 years, address themselves to the following questions:

First. The extent to which the purposes for which the grants-in-aid are authorized have been met.

Second. The extent to which the States or political subdivisions thereof are able to carry on such programs without further financial assistance from the United States.

Third. Whether or not any changes in the purpose or direction of the original program should be made.

The proposed legislation does not apply to existing grants, but we hope that such programs also will be assessed periodically by Congress and the executive agencies in terms of the same criteria provided in the bill. The importance of Federal grants-in-aid is beyond question. Programs that have almost quadrupled over the past 10 years and will consume over $10 billion of Federal funds during this fiscal year alone demand the continued and effective attention of Congress.

Now let us return to the property tax. This is a sore subject in the State of New Jersey.

We have been told by the courts to equalize our assessments among the various jurisdictions or run the risk of having them overturned in the process of judicial review. There is a great deal in the report adopted by the Commission that can be usefully studied in New Jersey. I will here only summarize some of the recommendations contained in the report.

1. Each State should take a hard, critical look at its property tax law and rid it of all features which cannot be administered as written, which encourage taxpayers' dishonesty or force administrators to condone evasion and which, if enforced, would impose an intolerable tax burden.

2. Both the legislative and executive branches of the State governments should study the property tax as consistently as the other major sources of State-local revenue and treat it as an integral part of overall State and local financial planning.

3. In order that the taxpayer may be kept informed, each State should require the regular assessment of all tax exempt property, and publish the findings, including the function, scope and nature of activities so exempted.

4. The geographical organization of each State's primary local assessment districts should be reconstituted, to the extent required, to give each district the size and resources it needs to become an efficient assessing unit and to produce a well-ordered overall structure that makes successful State supervision feasible.

5. The State supervisory agency should be empowered to establish the professional qualifications of assessors and appraisers and certify candidates as to their fitness for employment on the basis of examinations, and to revoke such certification for good and sufficient cause.

6. Assessors should be appointed to office, with no requirement of prior district residence, by the chief executives or executive boards of the local governments involved; they should be appointed for indefinite, rather than fixed, terms; and should be subject to removal for good cause, including incompetence, by the appointing authorities.

There are several additional recommendations which time does not permit presenting here. I would urge all of you to give a careful reading to this very valuable report.

Now let me say a few words about what the Commission is not doing. We are not promoting metropolitan government. We are not advocating the elimination of municipal home rule. We are not advocating the abolition of small local units of government. This does not mean to say that the Commission favors the status quo with regard to metropolitan area problems. The growth of population and the spread of technical functions in these areas has been such as to require greatly increased cooperation among the local units involved and a much greater degree of leadership on the part of the State governments.

The gamut of solutions to these problems runs from the urban-county approach used by Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn., and Miami-Dade County, Fla., to a metropolitan service corporation, adopted by the people of Seattle, to the establishment of joint contracts among units of local government. There are many modifications to all of these approaches. The Commission has urged that each State and each metropolitan area appraise its own situation and proceed accordingly.

In conclusion, let me urge the New Jersey Taxpayers Association to give a critical reading to the reports and recommendations of the Commission. I am sure that you won't agree with all of our recommendations, but I am equally sure that you will find yourself in agreement with a great many. The members and staff of the Commission would be appreciative of any criticisms or suggestions which you may have to offer regarding our work.

The Commission is dedicated to the proposition that the Federal system of government in this country, with its division of powers among local, State, and National governments, must be preserved and strengthened. We welcome your help in this task.

Aviation Week and Space Technology Magazine Editor Calls for New National Space Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial which appeared in the November 4 issue of the Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine:

NEW NATIONAL SPACE POLICY NEEDED

(By Robert Hotz)

The national space policy established by President Kennedy in May 1961, with his announcement of the Apollo manned lunar landing program has been so badly shredded in recent weeks that a fundamental reappraisal of what this Nation can and should do in space is urgently needed.

Both the Congress and the American public have been jarred and confused by a variety of conflicting statements, including President Kennedy's ill-conceived and hasty proposal for a joint lunar program with the Russians and the Soviet Chairman's well-timed attempt to torpedo the fiscal 1964 NASA appropriation with his implication that the U.S.S.R. has withdrawn from a race to land men on the moon.

QUESTIONABLE ECONOMY

Already, this confusion has had some bad effects on the pace and scope of the U.S. space program. The cutback in early Saturn and Apollo test vehicles will undoubtedly prove to be false economy. This reaction charts a course that ultimately will be much more costly in money, experience, and knowledge.

We believe that there is sufficient nonessential activity in NASA that could be cut instead of the Apollo hardware. But apparently NASA Administrator James Webb intends to make good his previously announced threat to put the burden for slowing the manned space flight program back onto Congress because it dared to cut his fiscal 1964 budget request.

The furor following the Kennedy-Khrushchev statements and the congressional budget cutting should make it apparent that a sound U.S. space program cannot be based on momentary reaction to Soviet statements or space feats. Instead, it must be based on a realistic appraisal of what possibilities space technology offers for furthering the national interests, both civil and military. Since the initial jolt of sputnik in 1957, the U.S. space program has been operated primarily as a fluctuating reaction to Soviet fact and fiction. The development of a truly national space program to meet U.S. requirements is long overdue.

We think that there are several basic flaws in the present U.S. space policy that must be eliminated to obtain the sustained level of national support required for a long-term development of space technology capability.

Most serious flaw is the lack of an adequate military research and development program in space and the lack of significant military participation in the NASA experimental development programs.

The Soviets have made no secret of their military aims in manned space flight. They are obviously concentrating on developing their technical capability in earth-orbital space station operations which offer the most promise for a militarily useful space system. One of the many advantages the Soviets obtained from the nuclear test ban treaty was the assurance that these experiments will not be treatened by U.S. high-altitude nuclear test explosions. The military objectives of the Soviet space program will become more and more apparent as its flight capability in earth orbits expands into rendezvous, docking and space station assembly. Neither Congress nor the American people are likely to support a sizable national space program for fiscal 1965 and beyond unless they are convinced that it will protect their military interests in space.

CONFUSION IN GOALS

The second serious flaw in current space policy has been the overemphasis on the goal of a manned lunar landing and the lack of understanding of the broad space capability this program entails. The Apollo program is a sound focal point for developing all of the major elements that will provide this Nation with a broad capability in space which can be applied to meet any specific requirements that may develop.

The Saturn boosters, the Apollo space vehicles, the lunar bug and the guidance, life support and propulsion systems being developed for the lunar landing mission will be the basic elements of any operational space system of the next several decades. This point is not yet sufficiently clear to either Congress or the taxpayers.

It is too late to salvage much from the fiscal 1964 NASA budget fiasco. But the fiscal 1965 space budget, which must appear on Capitol Hill in a few months, must be accompanied by a new appraisal of the space program based on solid elements of national self-interest, or it will founder fast.

Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill H.R. 9139 making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I find that I must vote against the passage of this bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, for the reason that it includes an appropriation of $200,000 in connection with the Brooklyn Navy Yard for new alterations for electronic data processing machine installation.

The allowance and expenditure of this substantial sum of money means the closing and discontinuance of activities now carried on within the Jay Street Annex in an eight-story modern building erected during World War II. I feel that the closing of this building and the proposed relocation of activities means further curtailment in the work of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. You may consider my vote a protest against reduction of work in the finest naval shipyard in the Nation.

Price Stabilizing Opposed on Basis of Boosting Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald entitled "Price Stabilizing Opposed on Basis of Boosting Costs."

The legislation opposed by the Council of Economic Advisers and referred to in the article is the so-called "quality stabilization bill" which is now pending before the Congress.

It is striking to note that the Council of Economic Advisers would come forth with a statement pointing out that this regressive legislation would hurt not only the consumer but would be destructive to the retailer and to the economy as a whole.

The article follows:

PRICE STABILIZING OPPOSED ON BASIS OF BOOSTING COSTS

(By Julius Duscha)

The Council of Economic Advisers said yesterday that legislation regulating retail prices would "increase prices in a number of ways."

In a statement commenting on the quality stabilization bill, the council also said that small retailers, who are the principal proponents of the legislation, might be hurt by it.

"One can only conclude," added Council Chairman Walter W. Heller in a letter to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, "that not only the consumer, but the retailer himself, would be served poorly by the enactment of this legislation."

Heller submitted the council's analysis of the bill to DOUGLAS, who is chairman of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. DOUGLAS had written to Heller seeking the council's views on the legislation.

At his press conference last Thursday President Kennedy noted in response to a question that he had "never been for the quality stabilization bill."

The legislation, which is being pushed largely by small druggists, would allow a manufacturer to refuse to sell merchandise to any retailer who resold the merchandise at a price lower than the one fixed by the manufacturer.

The bill is the latest in a decade-long series of efforts spearheaded by druggists and other small retailers to enforce fair-trade prices.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held fair-trade laws to be unenforceable. Under these laws manufacturers could set resale prices for all retailers in a State if only one store agreed to abide by such prices.

Although the Kennedy administration is opposed to such price-maintenance legislation, it has been approved by the House Commerce Committee and is awaiting action by the Rules Committee. The Senate Commerce Committee had held hearings on the bill.

Never before has such legislation moved through the House committee so quickly as it has this year.

Opponents of the legislation concede that once it reached the floor of the House and Senate it would be overwhelmingly approved because of the support in Congress for any bill put forward in the name of helping small business.

The statement in opposition to the bill by the Council of Economic Advisers is part of the administration's campaign against the legislation. Its most important backer on Capitol Hill is Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, the assistant Senate Democratic leader. HUMPHREY is a former druggist.

In arguing that the bill would result in increased prices, the council said: "With price competition eliminated, manufacturers would tend to set uniform prices at or near—or in some cases even above—the top of the present range. Retailers would be able to put pressure on manufacturers to provide wider gross margins."

There Is No Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, November 11, people across the United States commemorated the traditional Armistice Day holiday, now officially known as Veterans' Day. In stirring and certainly appropriate ceremonies, the people of our Nation demonstrated their respect for the veterans who gave their lives so that the Nation may remain free. Editorial comment was forthcoming in the news media across the Nation.

I place into the RECORD at this point a most thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the November 10 edition of the Suburbanite-Economist, an independent Chicago area newspaper, which speaks for itself and raises a point that we all should ponder.

The editorial follows:

THERE IS NO PEACE

At 11 a.m. 45 years ago tomorrow an armistice was signed between the Allies and the triple entente. The document called for the end of hostilities and the end of World War I.

A weary world greeted the news with wild, almost hysterical, celebrations. Peace again was promised.

America suffered the loss of 130,921 killed in action or from wounds, and the nonmortal wounding of 202,261. Almost every family in the land was affected by the mass slaughter.

Yet 23 years later the world was again plunged into war. The promises for peace made in Paris were ignored as having never been made.

World War II cost 389,769 lives and 659,977 wounded, the greatest combined total in the Nation's history.

Again peace was promised by the signatories to that war's armistice and again the world celebrated.

Now 22 more years have elapsed. Russia, our ally in the last war, continues to employ provocative measures which could lead to world war III. Hostilities break out in many sections of the world, such as in Vietnam, and new trouble spots develop seemingly without end.

The world has learned nothing from its gigantic tragedies and looking back through the pages of history, one doubts it ever will.

So it is with reverence we pay our respects to those who lost their lives in vain.

Need for Code of Ethics for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent events touching both bodies of the Congress and both political parties, I again call upon my colleagues to give consideration to a bill which I introduced on April 29 of this year, House Joint Resolution 392. This bill provides for a code of ethics for Members of Congress.

The public confidence in the Congress is being shaken by some recent disclosures and speculation. It is my belief that much of the speculation will be disproved when all the facts are known. By then, however, the damage will already be done. It is done by the press stories of innuendo based on the partial information which is available to them. The main reason I feel we must consider legislation like House Joint Resolution 392 is to prevent a recurrence of much of what has happened.

Among other things, the bill provides that each Member of Congress file with the House or Senate a sworn statement of his financial transactions each year. This statement would include the source and amount of all income, any gifts the Member received in excess of $25 in value, and so forth. Such reports would be public records.

There are other provisions limiting funds for congressional travel and providing for reporting of these expenditures, provisions to require congressional employees to be actually employed in the home district of the Member or in his Washington office, provisions prohibiting Members and their staffs from assisting in the prosecution of any claim against the U.S. Government for personal gain, and other provisions.

I believe that almost all Members of Congress are honest, upright, and dedicated citizens. They are among the finest citizens in the land. Therefore, I think their honor should be protected by passage of legislation which would eliminate the source of much of the incorrect and unfair speculation about the Members' activities.

I sincerely hope that House Joint Resolution 392 will be considered favorably in the very near future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thomas J. Hickey Named as Lowell Area "Man of the Year"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, no honor was more richly deserved than the one which has come recently to Thomas J. Hickey, of Lowell, Mass. Mr. Hickey has been named the Greater Lowell Man of the Year for his outstanding contributions to his community. Active in religious, charitable, and civic activities for a dozen years, Mr. Hickey has led hundreds of other area residents to extend their civic efforts. As a past president of the Lowell Chamber of Commerce he inaugurated a number of programs which will benefit the area for years to come. I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Lowell Sun describing Mr. Hickey's career and accomplishments:

The article follows:

THOMAS J. HICKEY NAMED AS LOWELL AREA "MAN OF THE YEAR"

LOWELL.—Joseph P. Quigley, chairman of the Greater Lowell Civic Committee, announces that Thomas J. Hickey, district manager for the Massachusetts Electric Co., has been selected as the Greater Lowell Man of the Year for 1963 and will be honored at the annual Man of the Year Award dinner to be held Sunday, December 7.

Born in Worcester, Mr. Hickey's family moved to Boston where he attended local schools. He continued his education at St. Mary's College, Pennsylvania. Later he enrolled for special subjects at Boston University and Holy Cross College where he took courses in management and labor.

His first job was with the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. in Boston. Then for the Royal & Eagle Indemnity Insurance Co. In 1929, he joined the Quincy Electric Light Co., and, in 1931 became sales manager for the Marlboro Electric & Marlboro-Hudson Gas Co., and in 1934 he was named general manager. In 1951, Tom moved to the Boston office as an executive assistant and was transferred in November of that year to the Lowell Electric Light Co. as vice president and general manager. When the multiple retail companies became one single organization, the Massachusetts Electric Co., he became district manager of Lowell.

He married the former Elizabeth M. Wilder and they have six children: Thomas J. Hickey, Jr., Mrs. John Lavallee, Anne I., John J., Daniel F., and James P. Hickey, and a granddaughter, Mary Elizabeth Lavallee.

In Chelmsford, where he lives at 6 Douglas Road, he was on the advisory board for the building of the new St. Mary's Church and is a member of the charitable society of St. Vincent de Paul and the Holy Name Society.

For the Greater Lowell community, he has been a volunteer worker for the United Fund for many years, working as everything from a solicitor to vice president, a post he now holds. As the volunteer general chairman of the 1964 United Fund campaign, he successfully led hundreds of other volunteers in an effort to collect more than a half-million dollars needed to support 26 service agencies.

He served as president of the chamber of commerce for two terms—1961 and 1962. During his terms, he provided the impetus to inaugurate farsighted programs which will continue to benefit the area indefinitely.

He is a past president of the Lowell Rotary Club, a member of the advisory board of St. John's hospital and building fund committee. Besides being a chairman of the businessmen's group to promote ZIP, the zone improvement program of the Post Office, he was for 3 years a board member of the Catholic charitable bureau, and he still is a member of the advisory committee of the Greater Lowell Industrial Management Club.

Mr. Hickey also is a member of the Yorick Club and Vesper Country Club.

The Negro Revolt: A Challenge to American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I was invited by the Intergroup Education Project of the Berkeley Unified School District to make the opening address at the annual Berkeley Community Enlightenment Series.

The subject which I was asked to present, "The Negro Revolt: A Challenge to American Education"—is both a current and a critical national problem.

I believe our colleagues may find this inquiry into a complex social issue to be of interest.

The address follows:

THE NEGRO REVOLT: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION

Ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply honored to be with you this evening as we begin this second annual community enlightenment series. Public participation and discussion are the backbone of our democracy—they are the lifeblood of a free and open society—and in a very real sense this series is in the great tradition of our American heritage.

On a personal basis, let me add, that Mrs. Cohelan and I are both very pleased to be home. This has already been a long session of Congress, and there is no question that we certainly have much left to do.

The subject before us tonight is a formidable one, but it is one in which I have had a long and a deep interest, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss it.

THE PROBLEM AND PROGRESS

This year of 1963 marks the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation—an act which declared in unmistaken ringing terms that all men shall be free—and of the Gettysburg Address which reaffirmed that all men are created equal.

This month of October in 1963 marks the 10th anniversary of still another historic event; of a Supreme Court term which struck down discrimination in our public schools, under the guise of separate but equal, as a violation of the 14th amendment to our Constitution, as a denial of equal educational opportunity for all.

In those 100 years, and more particularly in the last 10, grudging progress has been made. The Commission on Civil Rights has reported that more Americans than ever before are exercising more fully their rights as citizens. Today slightly over half of the 6,200 school districts in the 17 Southern and border States have both white and Negro students; 113 districts were desegregated for the first time this fall—18 of them by Court order—and in 2 States—South Carolina and Alabama—the previous all-white color line was broken.

But across our land Negro children are continuing to attend segregated schools. Ninety-four percent of the 265,000 Negro students who attend school with whites in the South do so in the border States. In the South, schools are generally segregated by official policy, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's finding that segregation on the basis of race cannot constitutionally be enforced. And, school segregation is not limited to this area alone. In the North and West de facto segregation continues; segregation because of existing housing patterns, and the practice of assigning pupils to neighborhood schools. As the Commission on Civil Rights has stated: Concentration of colored Americans in restricted areas of most major cities produces a high degree of school segregation, even in communities accepting the Supreme Court's decision.

THE PROBLEM IN GRAPHIC TERMS

The story of school segregation, however—of its heavy cost to the individual and the Nation—cannot be told in terms of statistics alone.

Education is the keystone of our democracy—it is the centerpiece in the arch of freedom and progress. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities. It is a principle instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. It is the very foundation of good citizenship.

For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to our national security and domestic well-being. But availability and quality cannot be meaningful when minority groups are denied equal opportunity—a denial which the Court has ruled inherent where discrimination is practiced.

For the individual, open doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college are vital in achieving the richest treasures of our open society: the power of knowledge—the training and skills necessary for productive employment—and the wisdom and understanding needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world. The Supreme Court, in its 1954 decision declared in fact: "It is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education."

But the fact remains that many Negro children who entered grade schools in 1954 have entered segregated high schools this year, suffering a loss which can never be regained. The lack of equal educational opportunity deprives the individual of equal economic opportunity; it restricts his contribution as a citizen and a community leader; it encourages him to drop out of school; and it imposes a heavy burden on the effort to eliminate discriminatory practices from our way of life.

It is startling, but the Negro in America today has half as much chance of completing high schools and a third as much chance of completing college. He has a third as much chance of being a professional man and half as much chance of owning his own home. He has twice as much chance of being unemployed and the prospects of earning only half as much.

This, of course, is the real story of school segregation. This is what a rising tide of Negro discontent against the complacency of our time—the Negro revolt, if you will—has revealed. And although the Horatio Alger legend is a well-established article of

our country's folklore, few Americans, today, I think, would agree that the typical Alger hero would have made it had his skin been of a darker shade.

DEPRIVED AND DISADVANTAGED

The temptation is certainly strong to say that the Negro child should be seen merely as any other child, respected as an individual, and provided with an educational program that will best meet his particular needs.

The answer is, of course, that the Negro child, like every other child, is entitled to be treated as an individual. Such treatment is the only sound basis for carrying on his or any other child's education, but this easy generalization does not completely come to grips with the whole truth.

The American Negro youngster and his fellow minority members are part of a group that for a long time have been the object of special political, legal, and social action. This is not a question of what should have been, or might be tomorrow, but an undeniable and inescapable fact of today.

As the very able and distinguished president of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. John Fischer, has stated:

"Every Negro child is the victim of the history of his race in this country. On the day he enters kindergarten he carries a burden no white man can ever know, no matter what other handicaps or disabilities he may suffer. When all the variability is conceded, it cannot be denied that every American Negro child must expect to encounter certain problems which none of our other children face in quite the same way."

Elaborating on this point, the Educational Policies Commission in a recent statement has emphasized that a substantial minority of Americans have grown up in cultures which are not compatible with much of modern life. This minority consists by no means only of Negroes, nor are all Negroes culturally disadvantaged. But vast numbers of them are disadvantaged as a direct consequence of legal, social, and I would add, economic segregation.

Many of the Negro children who come to school today are victims of their parents' lack of knowledge and of schooling—parents who in turn are victims of a situation over which they frequently had little or no control.

Teaching reading, for example, to a first grade child who has never seen an adult with a book requires an approach quite different from one appropriate to a child in whose home books are as normal as food. Similarly, a child who has never known sustained conversation with his parents must first learn the skills of continuing discussion before he can learn much else in school.

Pilot projects in California, New York and elsewhere have repeatedly shown that a tremendous, but unlocked potential exists. And the Civil Rights Commission, on the basis of numerous studies, has stated that a gap exists between the average starting white and Negro student—a gap which may represent as much as 1½ to 2 school years by the time the child reaches the high school grades.

A PROGRAM EXPLORED

What then does this mean for our schools today? In light of our democratic values, what guidelines for policy and practice are implied?

The first thought follows quite naturally from what has already been said—that the assessment of each student, and the release of his potentialities, must be approached on an individual basis. Each student's education must be peculiarly his own. Its success cannot be achieved unless seen against the history from which he has come, and in terms of the environment in which he currently lives.

With this as a start we can move to a second thought—the thought that equality of opportunity should mean more than a schoolroom desk for every child. It should mean that every student may rightfully expect to find himself in fair competition and on an even footing with his classmates.

Today, of course, this situation does not exist. Many Americans, and the Negro in particular, have been systematically deprived of the conditions which would make this ideal a reality. Progress has been made, but much more is required.

Again quoting from Dr. Fisher of Columbia—a man with long experience in this field:

"Is it not a reasonable contention—and a just one—that to compensate for past injustices, we should offer these children educational services beyond the level of what might be called standard equality? Could it be that to achieve total equality of opportunity in America we may have to modify currently accepted ideas about equality of opportunity in education itself?"

The answer, I think, must be a resounding yes, and the precedent, of course, is already well established.

COMPENSATORY OPPORTUNITY

Thousands of mentally and physically handicapped children today regularly receive teaching service above the norm. They benefit from physical facilities and supporting services which are more extensive and more costly than those furnished to children considered physically and mentally normal. No one, I am sure, would dispute the justness and wisdom of this approach, but it inevitably leads us to the suggestion that the generalization should apply to other underprivileged groups as well—that we may need to substitute for our traditional concept of equal educational opportunity a new concept of compensatory opportunity.

I doubt that anyone could say precisely what compensatory opportunity should mean in every case. But it could very well include some of the following:

Lower student-teacher ratios in certain schools;

Additional guidance services and special physical facilities;

Enlistment of teachers especially prepared to serve disadvantaged or deprived youngsters;

Development of curriculum particularly relevant to present life and the interests of pupils;

Encouragement of peer group support;

Parental involvement in school activities; and

Combinations of work and study programs.

California, as many of you know, initiated a 2-year pilot program of compensatory education for culturally deprived children this year—a program in which Berkeley is one of the first 24 participants. Berkeley has also been a pioneer in drawing on a great local resource—the University of California—for teacher trainees to work in classrooms of particular need.

Unfortunately, programs of this type today are few and far between. Their expansion needs to be encouraged and new ideas need constantly to be sought and tested. Berkeley can take pride in what it has done, but the need is so great, and the horizon so broad, that humbleness, perseverance, and an inquiring mind should be our constant guides.

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

A third and final thought might best be described as a striving for quality; as the quest for educational excellence.

Certainly one of the truly knotty problems in the North and West today is the matter of attendance lines which are drawn so that one race predominates in a school.

James Conant, in his excellent book, "Slums and Suburbs," has made a clear distinction between de jure and de facto segregation. He has indicated his belief that there is nothing wrong with socially unbalanced schools, provided they reflect the neighborhood; are not the result of assignment because of race, and offer an equivalent quality of education.

Others disagree quite radically with Conant, arguing that present concentrations of Negroes and other minority groups have been artificially achieved and that artificial means must be followed to break the pattern. And the case can certainly be made that the real issue is how to lead all of the communities' children into meaningful encounters with each other, to the end that they develop skills of citizenship commensurate with the demanding times in which they live.

The Supreme Court, of course, has not yet ruled on this question, but several lower courts have. In *Clemons* v. *The Hillsboro Board of Education* and in *Taylor* v. *New Rochelle*, Federal courts have stated that gerrymandering of school attendance boundaries for the purpose of confining Negroes to one school violates the 14th amendment. And in *Goss* v. *The Knoxville Board of Education*, the Court ruled that "no official transfer plan or provision of which racial segregation is the inevitable consequence, may stand under the 14th amendment."

It is well to note, however, that the Commission on Civil Rights, in its latest report, has found that the open enrollment plans studied had little effect on the racial composition of schools, even when transportation was provided.

In spite of all efforts to achieve racially heterogeneous schools, it seems evident, the Commission stated, that many, particularly in the large cities, will retain a large degree of racial imbalance until discrimination in housing and employment are things of the past.

It seems to me, therefore, that while our efforts on other fronts should not slacken, that we should be concerned with insuring the highest standard of educational excellence in all of our schools, regardless of their racial composition.

President Kennedy stated in a message to Congress last year that:

"Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hope for economic growth and the demands of citizenship itself, all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

The simple truth is that a free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts, breed failures in our social and economic system. They are the seedbed of delinquency and unemployment, of a loss of productive power, and a furtherance of chronic dependence. Failure to improve educational performance is not only a moral laxity, it is a poor social policy, and poor economics.

CONCLUSION

The steps to improved quality, of course, are not simple—they require time, and they require support. But the difficulties of operating schools which can cope successfully and simultaneously with both racial and educational issues are among the most puzzling and difficult facing the American people today.

They in turn require patience and perseverance, and a willingness to being. As the story goes, Marshall Lyautey, a great French general of the twenties, went out one day and asked his gardener to plant a tree. But, the gardener complained, this tree won't flower for 100 years. "Well then," responded the marshal, "We have no time to lose. Plant it this afternoon."

Our tree—the tree of true equality and excellence of educational opportunity—a tree which is the challenge for American education today, should and must flower before another 100 years have passed. But we too must begin today, and we too must be able to say with the poet:

"Give me men to match our mountains,
Give me men to match our plains,
Men with empires in their purpose,
and new eras in their brains."

Appendix

Opening of Maryland Northeastern Expressway and Delaware Turnpike—Luncheon Address by Robert Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at a luncheon at the Maryland House, Aberdeen, Md., on the occasion of the opening of the Maryland Northeastern Expressway of the Delaware Turnpike, on November 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964–65

Shortly after World War II, with its hard-earned lessons before them, the leaders of the auto world woke up to the need of roads and acceptance of the simple fact that good cars must have good roads to run on. Since then we have been engaged in a race against time to atone for neglect and get within reaching distance of the future. For this is a motor civilization and no amount of dramatic gesturing, big empty-sounding talk about comprehensive transportation systems in the hands of ambitious planners, embracing every medium and dimension, will make the task any easier for the tough, hard-bitten men who must do it.

As Drinkwater had it in the prayer:

"Knowledge we ask not—knowledge Thou has lent;
But Lord, the will—there lies our bitter need
Give us to build above the deep intent,
The deed, the deed."

In this business of big roadbuilding, if you live long enough, defy the actuarial tables governing official life expectancy, get yourself adopted by a rich old lady, charm people and the press and have a hell of a lot of luck, you will encounter no insurmountable obstacles, no unclimbable barricades and no unscalable peaks.

We are at last fairly launched on a truly metropolitan and continental express highway system, geared to some extent, though perhaps not enough, to other transportation, but independent in the sense of fixed administrative responsibility. It is no doubt rich in cliches and professional lingo, lacking in imagination and invention and suffers from the mystique of regional planning and the statistics of foundation research, but we are on the way.

We are still short of money for final plans and right-of-way acquisition, not to speak of construction, and our greatest obstacle lies in moving people and small business decently and generously. Here the politician, fearful of immediate reprisals, the social reformers with their cradle-to-the-grave solicitude, and the more sensational press eager for controversy and name calling, are our most formidable opponents, crying that what we call progress is merely uprooting and change and that the good life is to be charted only by those gifted with vision, and divinely inspired and anointed to speed up the millennium.

You open today a stretch of expressway on a strategic part of the northeastern coast—a section plotted long ago, slow to be realized and probably barely adequate for the immediate future. It is designed to something approaching parkway standards. What a mountain of thought and labor and courage have gone into it. It is to be hoped that improved maintenance and operation, more rigid inspection of roadways, cars and drivers, tougher policing, and more emphasis on safety will help to justify the expense of this new artery. We must somehow inculcate consideration of others and responsible operation of lethal juggernauts by young baboons with bright sports cars and tired truck drivers with freight car vans.

These superroads don't get any cheaper. Fifty-two miles of coastal construction in Delaware and Maryland cost as much as a short crossing of Manhattan Island and a fourth of the bill for an express route in Maine or Mississippi. A dollar honestly spent today saves $2 tomorrow.

As a neighboring ditchdigger and road, tunnel and bridge builder reaching down the coast and into the hinterland, I offer thanks and felicitations to the Federal and State agencies and to those associated with them in offices, at the mines and fabricating plants, at the drafting boards and on the ground, for bringing about this enterprise which will knit our people closer together, promote trade and friendship and anticipate the America of tomorrow.

Finally, I welcome this great white alley, opening well in advance of the New York World's Fair and leading the burgeoning southland straight to Flushing Meadow.

Keys to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, November 16, 1963, the distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, was honored by the National Catholic Youth Organization which presented its Pro Deo et Juventute Medal to him. His acceptance speech, entitled "Keys to Freedom," is one of the most stirring addresses that I have ever read. This is a speech by a great patriot. I wish that all Americans could have the opportunity to read it, and I therefore place this splendid document in the RECORD:

KEYS TO FREEDOM

I accept this award with a deep feeling of humility. I shall treasure it because of my great admiration for the outstanding work being performed by the Catholic Youth Organization. Your efforts on behalf of America's young people have earned the acclaim of all citizens who are concerned with the future of our Nation.

I am doubly honored that the invitation to attend this banquet was personally extended by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, a brilliant and dedicated leader and a devoted servant of God.

To His Excellency, Archbishop John J. Krol, Monsignor Frederick J. Stevenson, and all associated with the Catholic Youth Organization and the Youth Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference who have made this such a pleasant occasion, I express heartfelt appreciation. It has been especially good to see so many friends and to renew old acquaintances.

To the outstanding young people assembled here tonight, I bring warm greetings. Yours is a generation of great challenge. Through no choice of your own, you have entered the world at a time when deadly forces challenge your right, and the right of every American, to live in freedom under God.

Young people in postwar America have grown up with the disillusioning knowledge that the world is no longer safe for democracy.

High ideals are the birthright of youth, but the youth of postwar America must face, also, the chaos which present-day society presents, and bring about order through the realization of those high ideals.

We are at war with communism, in different ways on different fronts around the world. The Communist ideology is born in hate, but our philosophy of life is the practice of love and faith.

Just as freedom is your right, so challenge is your heritage—for freedom, once won, must constantly be defended.

Today, our country faces the most severe test ever to confront a free people. Here and abroad, mortal enemies of freedom and deniers of God Himself conspire to undermine the fundamental forces which are the lifeline of our country's vitality and greatness—our most formidable weapons, in peace and in war.

What are these forces? They are:

Faith—faith in a Supreme Being: God, the Author of Liberty.

Individualism—inherent dignity and worth of every sovereign individual with his personal rights and responsibilities.

Courage—the courage of a free people firmly dedicated to the noblest cause.

Integrity—that quality of trustworthiness which is essential in dealings between men, and between countries.

Discipline—and self-discipline, which are vital in a nation governed by laws rather than by men.

Vision—such as led our Founding Fathers into the perilous dangers of a hostile wilderness that was to become the proud American Republic in which we live today.

These are America's great bulwarks. They are under savage attack today, just as they were so severely tested nearly 200 years ago at Bunker Hill and at Valley Forge.

Daniel Webster, that brilliant early American statesman, eloquently declared, "God

grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Daniel Webster knew the heavy price America had paid for her liberty. And he knew also the disintegrating effect of self-indulgence, neglect of duty and public lethargy in a nation of free men.

These lethal influences are at work, constantly undermining the sense of personal responsibility and self-discipline so esential to our Nation's welfare. They form a common denominator with the aggressive enemies of our Republic in assaulting the cause of decency and justice across the length and breadth of the land.

Who are these enemies of our Republic? They are the crime syndicates, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the unscrupulous businessmen, the corrupt politicians and all others who blatantly defy the laws of the land.

They are the hatemongers and the false liberals who would subvert our Constitution and undermine our democratic processes in furtherance of their selfish ends.

They are the Communists and other subversive elements who wave false banners of legitimacy and patriotism while relentlessly plotting to destroy our heritage of freedom.

Communism—in all its forms and in all its variations—is the avowed enemy of liberty and of justice and of God. The Communists fear free and independent thought. They fear truth. They fear God even though they deny Him. They fear the inherent courage and dignity of man created in His image.

Today, the Communists are engaged in an intensive campaign to control the minds and win the allegiance of American youth. Toward this end, a National Youth Commission has been established within the Communist Party, U.S.A.; special publications have been issued; front groups have been organized; and an ambitious speech program has been directed against our colleges and universities.

During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: To create confusion, raise questions and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.

If their constitutional right to free speech allows them to use the public school forum to promote the secular creed of Marxism-Leninism which openly and avowedly denies God, does their constitutional freedom of religion also prohibit the rest of us from using the same public school forum to express our faith that God does exist?

It is indeed ironic that Communist Party speakers—whose minds and thoughts and actions are in no manner free—should demand the opportunity to parrot the Moscow line to young Americans under the guise of academic freedom.

Academic freedom is not an instrument for the perpetuation of conspiratorial ideologies. Nor is it an agent of self-destruction—a freedom to destroy freedom. As a free-flowing channel of truth and knowledge, academic freedom is not obligated to carry along the silted tributaries of lies and distortions of known Communists.

The Communists look upon students as potential sympathizers, supporters and contributors to the party's cause. Nor are they unmindful of the rich opportunity for infiltration presented by unwary racial and nationality groups.

This is especially true of the intense civil rights movement within the United States—for America's 20 million Negroes and the countless other citizens who share their objectives in the current struggle are a priority target for Communist propaganda and exploitation. Every organization engaged in this struggle must constantly remain alert to this vital fact, for, once under Communist domination, all freedoms and rights are lost.

The Communists are eager to capitalize upon all areas of misunderstanding and unrest. Their cause is the cause of Soviet Russia, for the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an inseparable part of the sinister international conspiracy which is financed and directed by the Kremlin. No amount of lies and duplicity can conceal this carefully documented fact.

Today, the godless Communist conspiracy controls more than one-third of the earth's people and a fourth of her land surface. In Europe, in Asia and here in our own Western Hemisphere, we witness the stark tragedy of souls, chained to the yoke of communism, clamoring to be free again.

The Khrushchevs, the Castros and the Mao Tse-tungs are faced with an eternal dilemma: The human spirit in bondage—no matter how heavy the chains—struggles relentlessly to break free. Witness the Hungarian Revolution; the boatloads of Marxist victims who continue to pour out of Cuba; the Poznan riots in Poland; the heroic dashes of subjugated people through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Make no mistake about the Communists in this country. Whether they are members of Soviet-bloc diplomatic establishments in New York and Washington—or whether they are fanatical adherents of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—all represent the same ideology of treachery, deceit, and subversion.

From the immunity which they enjoy as foreign diplomats on American soil, Soviet and satellite officials continue to carry out espionage assignments against the United States. That some American citizens, including concealed adherents to the Communist Party, have knowingly and willingly assisted these Iron Curtain intelligence networks is a criminal disgrace and a blight not only upon our Nation, but upon the entire free world. And it is equally disgraceful that well-meaning but uniformed citizens have permitted themselves to be duped by sympathy campaigns on behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, and other traitors.

Nowhere is the hope for peace more sincere than in the hearts of all true Americans. But in our quest for peace, we must never lose sight of the well-documented fact that every Red leader from Marx and Engels through Khrushchev, Mao, and the American Communist spokesman, Gus Hall, is dedicated to an ideology which upholds world conquest as its ultimate goal.

The Communists have never deviated from this objective. Despite the high-pressure campaign they have mounted behind Khrushchev's phrase of "peaceful coexistence," the Communists know that this is simply a propaganda slogan—one devised to further their own ends by stirring the hopes and emotions of those who seek an end to the turmoil, fear, and sorrow that world communism itself created.

Actions continue to speak louder than words, and certainly the Communists have shown no indication of a sincere quest for peace.

The takeover of Cuba and effort to convert it into an island fortress against democracy; the ever-constant infiltration of Red fascists into countries of Central and South America to create a Sovietized Latin America; the increase of espionage activities by Soviet and satellite agents in our country, particularly those who strive to penetrate our Government processes from the protection afforded them by diplomatic assignments in New York and Washington; the frantic efforts of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to subvert our youth; and the intense drive of the Communists operating from concealed positions to wrest control of the movement for Negro rights—does all this indicate a real and sincere desire to live in peaceful coexistence?

In recent years, the Communists have demonstrated an attitude of open defiance and contempt for our laws—an attitude which is fortified by their repeated ability to invoke loopholes, technicalities, and delays in the law to thwart justice. One former judge found cause to warn last summer not only of "inexcusable" delays in the courts, but also of what he considered to be a "trend of decisions in the last 10 years—favorable to extreme leftwingers, Communists, and subversives in general."

Another student of court rulings in the internal security field was prompted to observe, "Unfortunately, subversive activites are well on the way to becoming a no man's land in the law."

In 1957, a Federal judge in the Nation's Capital assailed what he considered to be "an unfortunate trend of judicial decisions * * * which strain and stretch to give the guilty, not the same, but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen." There has been no reversal of this alarming trend—a trend which is felt in our steadily rising national crime problem.

Justice in a free nation means protection for society as a whole, rather than leniency for the individual to the detriment of society.

Since 1957, when the Federal judge issued his warning, crime has increased nearly 40 percent. Its victims continue to mount at a relentless rate. Four serious crimes are committed every minute; there is a crime of violence every 3 minutes; and property crimes—robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and automobile thefts—occur within seconds.

Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime, filth, and corruption. No one can deny that motion pictures are deliberately and defiantly pursuing an increasingly bold courtship with obscenity. No one can deny the role of the television industry in bringing lurid portrayals of violence and sadism into the living rooms—and even the nurseries—of our homes. No one can deny that sensual trash is moving closer and closer to the children's books on the shelves of our newsstands and magazine stores.

Our youth do not need weakness; they need strength. They do not need indulgence; they need the guidance and the discipline which can best be provided by a decent home.

Above all, they need the benefit of religion—in church, at home, and in the atmosphere of our classrooms.

Despite the dedicated efforts of church and civic leaders and others who have a sincere interest in the proper development of our young people, the failures continue to mount. Each year, persons under 18 years of age are involved in nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, and approximately one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests. The newspapers of our major cities recount incidents of senseless murders, violent assaults, and brutal beatings inflicted upon innocent victims by arrogant gangs of teenagers and young adults.

Courts are influenced too much by the age—rather than the record—of the young hoodlum who stands before the bar of justice.

The bleeding hearts, some actually sworn to administer the law either as judges or social workers, are so concerned for young criminals and terrorists that they are indifferent to the rights of law-abiding members of society.

We have mollycoddled young criminals, lightly tapped hardened offenders on the wrists, and released some unreformed and unrepentant hoodlums to prey anew on society.

The time is long overdue for us to adopt a more realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the charitable approach toward young hoodlums and it has failed.

We are paying dearly for these failures. They represent a tragic waste of America's most valuable resource—the moral, mental, and physical health of her young citizens.

The crime problem costs the American people some $22 billion a year—nine times the amount contributed to our churches. For every $1 spent on educating our children, $1.11 goes to crime.

Nowhere in recent months have our people faced a more explosive condition of shame and violence than among the hatemongers, the moral degenerates, the lunatic fringe, and the other irrational fanatics who preach a doctrine of hostility toward their fellow man. This rabble has sown the dragon's teeth of malice and intimidation; and from the ground has sprung a series of hate-driven riots, bombings, and desecrations.

The voices of temperance, logic, and decency must speak out more effectively and make their influence felt. No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in a society of free men. Hate, terror, and lawlessness are not the American way of accomplishing any objective that is truly worthwhile. In meeting the tense crises which confront the United States in this nuclear age, we must look to God for guidance and inspiration.

This country has never run from its enemies. Challenge, not compromise—bravery, not cowardice—are integral parts of our heritage. Since that critical hour in 1777 when General Washington ordered his Revolutionary Army to "Put none but Americans on guard tonight," it has been the tradition of our proud Nation to rise to its greatest heights in the face of adversity.

There are important lessons to be learned in the pages of American history. From Faneuil Hall to Cape Canaveral, our greatest patriots have been men and women of deep religious conviction: Men like Thomas Jefferson, the principal author of our Declaration of Independence, who told his fellow colonists, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

In the eyes of a later-day hero, "Freedom, devotion to God and country are not things of the past. They will never become old fashioned." These words were spoken by Astronaut John H. Glenn.

America remains free because men of faith, men of individualism, men of courage, men of integrity, men of discipline, and men of vision have patrolled her most vital outposts for 187 years.

These strong qualities—faith, individualism, courage, integrity, discipline, and vision—are the keys to freedom.

When the United States has lost its youthful outlook, it will have lost its vitality and its capacity for progress. That is why I charge the young people assembled here tonight to preserve the pioneer spirit which has been the soul of America since her birth.

Meet every new challenge with confidence and determination. As you look to the future, do not lose sight of the important lessons of the past. History, all too often, repeats itself. The freedoms you enjoy today will be lost, as they have been destroyed at other times and in other nations, through neglect and abuse.

Do not hesitate to speak out and bring public pressure to bear upon negative influences within your communities. We must never become so accustomed to filth or so intimidated by the advocates of so-called worldly reality that we fail to revolt against corruption and decay.

May you always protect America's heritage of freedom. May you, with God's holy guidance, preserve and strengthen that priceless heritage for the generations yet to come.

As His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, observed so profoundly nearly a decade ago, "We have no right to expect to keep our freedoms, if we ourselves do not faithfully and thankfully protect the soil and soul of America from those who have abandoned God, and for God's commandments have substituted their own code of inhumanity, greed, and violence."

Let us protect and defend the real meaning of America. This is the debt we owe to the brave legions of the past who laid down their lives to safeguard the great truths which guide our destiny today.

A Successful Successor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last week I called to the attention of my colleagues a high honor which had been bestowed on a distinguished South Carolinian and former member of this body, the Honorable Charles E. Daniel, of Greenville, S.C. He was named Industrialist of the Year by the Society of Industrial Realtors.

This week, Mr. President, I am pleased to announce to the Senate that another distinguished South Carolinian, Mr. H. W. Close, president of the Springs Cotton Mills, has brought another significant honor to our State in being selected as the textile industry's Man of the Year. This award was made to Mr. Close, who makes his residence in Fort Mill, S.C., by the New York Board of Trade on November 13, 1963, in New York City. The Springs Cotton Mills are known all over the world, Mr. President, for their quality manufacture of cotton goods for over 75 years. These mills market 29,000 different products in this country and in more than 50 foreign countries. The Springs Cotton Mills constitute one of the largest enterprises in our State, ranking first in South Carolina as an industrial taxpayer by accounting for 10 percent of the total revenue of our State. The Springs Cotton Mills are the largest producers of cotton cloth in the world. In fact, in 1962 employees of these mills turned out more than 500 million linear yards of finished cloth, enough to weave more than 430,000 miles of 80-square standard goods—a ribbon of cloth 39 inches wide and stretching around the earth more than 17 times.

I was pleased to read in the State of Columbia, S.C., on November 17, 1963, an editorial tribute to Mr. Close on being selected as the recipient of this high honor. This editorial makes the point, Mr. President, that Mr. Close became president of the vast Springs textile operations at an early age, filling some very big shoes, those of the late Col. Elliott White Springs, who was a war hero and one of the most successful businessmen this country has ever produced. Mr. Close has fulfilled well the tremendous responsibilities placed on his shoulders in running the Springs Cotton Mills and through the great progress which has been made by these mills, he has demonstrated his eminent qualifications to be honored as Man of the Year for the domestic textile industry.

We in South Carolina take great pride in the Springs Cotton Mills not only because of the valuable contributions which these mills make to our economy, but also because of the good name which Springs' cotton goods bear over the world. We are also proud of the excellent working relationship which exists between labor and management in the Springs Cotton Mills, where management offers many good opportunities to the employees, including a profit-sharing plan which in 1962, in addition to employee paychecks, amounted to $4,250,486.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President that the editorial to which I referred in the State entitled "A Successful Successor" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, together with a news story of November 14, 1963, from the State entitled "Springs Mills President Honored at New York Ceremony."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUCCESSFUL SUCCESSOR

Falling heir to a very large responsibility, youthful H. W. Close shouldered it and handled it with such success as to win early national recognition for himself and for South Carolina.

The exacting task which fell to Mr. Close was to manage, as president, the Springs Cotton Mills, one of the State's biggest enterprises—and as the successor to a singularly gifted and achieving man, his father-in-law, the late Elliott White Springs.

But so well did Mr. Close take hold and accomplish that he was honored, last week, as the textile industry's "Man of the Year." With modesty, and significance, Mr. Close credited the results which were being recognized to the 13,500 persons who make up the Springs organization. The significance is that the 13,500 plainly and impressively reflected the immense proportions of the operation Mr. Close was called upon to direct after the death of Colonel Springs.

As Colonel Springs himself had done in succeeding his father, Mr. Close has shown the capacity not only to operate the mills of this system at the level he found them, but to improve and to expand. This has been a contribution not only to the area of the State in which these plants are located, but to the economy of South Carolina as a whole.

Perhaps all do not comprehend the true weight of accountability which rests on the heads of great American productive enterprises, but all should. The responsibility extends to the livelihood and well-being of the people employed and their families and on to those indirectly concerned as manufactured products move to the ultimate consumer.

Bill Close has demonstrated his perception of his obligation in successfully guiding the Springs undertakings and the honor he has received authentically documents it.

SPRINGS MILLS PRESIDENT HONORED AT NEW YORK CEREMONY

(By Ron Wenzell)

H. W. Close, president of the Springs Cotton Mills, was honored as textile's Man of the Year Thursday in special ceremonies at New York's Hotel Pierre. The award was made by the New York Board of Trade.

In his acceptance speech, Close urged the industry to learn to tell its story.

"In the last few years, we have sold the American public, the Congress and the ad-

ministration that we in the textile industry have problems," he said, "but at the same time we have also done a great deal of unselling by the things we have not done and the things we have not said."

He said the textile industry owns the most untold story of any major industry in America. "And it's our own fault," he said.

"It's not necessary to embroider the truth in telling our story. And we do not have to spend huge sums of money nor manufacture vast quantities of 'puff' stuff. We have only to tell the facts, simply and with commonsense. We have to recognize the value of human relations and then do what comes naturally."

Close said the industry can help itself if it will only tell the untold things.

"It can change the attitude of the public toward the textile industry," he said. "It can create an awareness that the textile industry is a dynamic industry in which plants, working conditions, products, and techniques are constantly improving. It can put our names before the public, giving us identity and acceptance. It can sell goods for us in the marketplace. It can change our own attitude, so that we become more responsive to the needs and desires of the people with whom we deal. It can develop understanding, spirit and pride among our employees. It can make our industry more attractive to capable young people who are choosing careers.

"We're known as crybabies," he said. "We're said to be put-upon. We're said to be weak. We supposedly underpay our employees. We're said to run sweatshops. There's a mistaken idea that we're getting help from the Government, when in fact we've been played for patsies. We can reverse this reputation by telling the true story."

Close recited the number of open houses and dedications the Springs company has sponsored in the past year and suggested this as one way to tell the story.

"They seem to have helped us in our relations with our employees, our communities, our State, the news media, and, I hope, our customers."

He said he doesn't think the future is black for American textiles.

"We're building. We're modernizing and expanding. We're diversifying. We're creating new jobs. We are of necessity merging for greater strength. We are entering foreign markets. And we are competitive, to say the least.

"The textile industry has much to be proud of, but the story has no value unless it is told. If we get the public on our side, then we'll get the Government cooperation we need."

In accepting the Man-of-the-Year Award, the president of Springs said it wasn't earned by Bill Close, but by the 13,500 persons who make up the Springs organization.

"It is on their behalf that I accept this award proudly and with deep appreciation," he said.

Accomplishments of the ARA in the Evansville, Ind., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, if called upon to do so, I could fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in describing the accomplishments of the Area Redevelopment Administration in my part of Indiana. I want to be brief, however, and point out only three of the many accomplishments this agency has made in my district.

The first thing that ought to be pointed out is the fact that the city of Evansville, one of the largest cities in the Nation to be placed on the ARA list of depressed areas, is no longer on that list. No one single factor is responsible exclusively for the radical improvement in Evansville's unemployment rate changing from more than 10 percent a few years ago to about 3 percent today. But the people of that city have given some of the credit to ARA. Listen to what the president of Evansville's Future, Inc., a nonprofit organization for community development wrote to ARA last July:

> While we have undertaken the rehabilitation of our community in the spirit and determination of self-help, the assistance which we received from your Administration was important and vital to our progress.

The mayor of Evansville, Frank McDonald, in another statement, dated July 29, 1963, told ARA that his city is now on the road to real progress. He said:

> However, this progress would not have been possible insofar as the construction of needed basic facilities, which in turn provided us the opportunity to gain new industry and new jobs, without the assistance of ARA, and your kind consideration.

From my direct association with the staff of ARA, I know that their first and foremost goal is to repeat the Evansville story. That is, to eliminate depressed areas from their list. I also know that in Evansville and elsewhere in my district, before ARA came into being, I found much unemployment. Seven of the eleven counties in my district were so-called distressed areas. Today, I find new hope, new determination, and positive action.

The families of New Providence, Ind., also know what I mean by these words. In April of last year, the Borden Cabinet Co., located at New Providence, was totally destroyed by a fire. That fire not only destroyed the physical plant of the building but it eliminated in one blow nearly 200 jobs—virtually the entire employment of the town.

As a result of ARA action, however, the town immediately received a grant for a new water system which would help prevent recurrence of the great fire loss, and the company obtained a loan to rebuild the plant, thereby not only providing continued employment for the original workers but also adding an additional 45 new workers. And all of this was accomplished within 90 days after the disastrous April 6 fire.

This type of program kindled the adrenalin glands of other communities in Clark County and today several other projects have been instituted. These additional job-creating enterprises have either been approved or are awaiting final action by the ARA at this time.

In another part of my district, in Corydon, in Harrison County, the citizens and the businessmen of that community saw the product of a persistent effort to make a vague industrial project into a concrete enterprise through the ARA's application of the advice and counsel of several Federal, State, and local agencies. After several weeks of analysis and recommendations about supply, market, and management organization, ARA was able to approve a loan application for the Indiana Glass Sand Corp., to develop deposits near Corydon at Elizabeth, Ind. Here is a perfect example of a community knowing for years that its area contained adequate sand deposits, but being unable to exploit the potential in its own backyard.

Without ARA's existence, no organized effort would have been made to initiate this project and to see it through all of the tedious, but necessary steps so often required in the field of economic development. Today, as a result of such persistent efforts by all concerned, Corydon now has a glass sand company directly employing about 30 people and a nucleus around which other plants needing this type of sand can be created.

Marking of Certain Lumber Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as my distinguished colleagues will recall, the Senate on July 18 agreed to an amendment which I introduced to H.R. 2513, relating to marking certain imported articles to indicate the country of origin.

The amendment, in effect, would require such marking on sawed lumber imported from Canada, a provision which had not been included in the bill as sent to the Senate from the House.

Strong support was given to this amendment from both sides of the aisle, and I consider the substantial vote by which it was agreed to constructive and nonpartisan.

At Salt Lake City, Utah, the Western States Democratic Conference adopted a resolution requesting that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin "to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities."

H.R. 2513 is now in conference, and it is my hope and that of others, whether Democrats or Republicans, in the lumber-producing regions of the United States, that the amendment will be accepted by the conferees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the Western States Democratic Conference printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT, SENATE, AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED

Whereas lumber imports are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-fifth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas a serious blowdown of timber occurred in Washington, Oregon, and California in October of 1962 and salvage of said blowdown timber will place a further burden on the orderly marketing of lumber from other domestic areas; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, due to advantages such as: (1) Depreciated currency; (2) low stumpage rates; (3) noncompetitive bidding; (4) less costly and restrictive forest practices; (5) lower wage rates; and (6) low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities; and

Whereas the President stated on July 26, 1962, that there should be established, "a preference for American products in the purchase of lumber by the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and other Federal departments and agencies." This cannot be done unless there is some way to indicate that the products are American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee.

Passed the 19th day of September 1963 at the fall meeting of Lumbering Committee of Western States Democratic Conference held in Salt Lake City, Utah.

CECIL D. ANDRUS.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part X of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

KENNEDY FLUNKS LEADERSHIP TEST IN SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS—PART X

Kennedy began to put his political house in order as soon as he reached Hyannis Port for his postconvention vacation. The party's left flank was Kennedy's major headache. Liberal disaffection with Kennedy-JOHNSON was expressing itself freely. New York's ADA denounced Kennedy's choice of JOHNSON as "an affront to liberals." Joseph Barry, columnist for the New York Post, wondered hopefully if 1960 might not go down in history as "the year nobody voted."

Kennedy was reasonably sure he had things definitely under control in Dixieland. The South's reconciliation to the Democrats seemed attributable less to JOHNSON's presence on the ticket than to the concession it implied—an apparent assurance that a Kennedy administration would not act beastly toward "the land o'cotton."

It was a new JOHNSON who arrived in Hyannis Port in late July.

"I have come to see my leader," he announced as he stepped off a chartered Viscount plane loaded with newsmen from the Lone Star State.

It was a JOHNSON who no longer called Jack Kennedy "Jack" but now referred to him as "John." It was a JOHNSON who had been telling folks back home, "It's a privilege to run with John Kennedy. I can tell a man by looking in his eyes. I looked in John Kennedy's eyes and I liked what I saw."

REUTHER WARMS TO LYNDON

The labor leaders who trekked to Hyannis Port finally swallowed all their past unpleasant remarks about LYNDON and pointedly exclaimed, in the presence of "The Leader," that L.B.J. would make an excellent Vice President. Of course, JOHNSON had a long and consisent record of voting for bills that organized labor had invariably certified as "antilabor"—as, for example, the Taft-Hartley "slave labor" bill.

Circumstances, of course, now required that people like Walter Reuther—usually so adept at sniffing out "antilabor" heresies—discover and praise the hitherto hidden virtues in JOHNSON's formerly "reactionary" background.

Kennedy held a series of conferences with his southern colleagues, among them that old apple farmer from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD. The story was first told by Frank van der Linden, Washington correspondent for the Nashville Banner.

When Kennedy and JOHNSON marched, into his office to solicit his blessing, Senator BYRD told them he could not go along with the Democratic plank calling for abolition of State right-to-work laws. Kennedy and JOHNSON then offered not to press the issue if they were elected.

"To us," commented the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, "the cold offer to ignore a key issue of the campaign in exchange for the support of another politician, no matter how powerful, is a measure of the faith that the public can place in Messrs. Kennedy and JOHNSON.

"Their offer not to press for repeal of the right-to-work law would be worth no more, in our judgment, than their promises to uphold the platform. In fact, we find difficulty believing in their sincerity about anything except the quest for votes. Political expediency is a poor basis for choosing the top leadership of a great republic."

THE BIG TEST

A stern leadership test awaited the new leader—a special session of Congress that JOHNSON had arranged.

Returning as his party's nominee, Kennedy sought to ram through a much heralded list of "gut" measures intended to be billed as Democratic accomplishments in the fall campaign.

"Hope ran high in every corner of Kennedy-land," commented the Cincinnati Enquirer. "From the west coast, where the self-styled 'clan' is fighting for the New Frontier under the inspiring moral leadership of Frank Sinatra and Sammy Davis, Jr.; all the way to the French Riviera, where the eminent retired philanthropist Joseph P. Kennedy is sitting out the campaign in exile, it looked very much as though Senator Kennedy might get his first bill through Congress—his first bill in 14 years of legislative life."

The Kennedy bill pertained to the minimum wage. It provided that it be increased from $1 an hour to $1.25. It also provided that it be extended to cover several million additional Americans.

Few bills were ever introduced in Congress under more favorable circumstances. In unmistakably clear language, the Democratic platform declared thae "we pledge to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to extend coverage to several million workers not now protected." There was no challenge to this pledge. From every indication, it was a pledge to which every Democrat was committed.

The Kennedy bill went into the hopper, moreover, at a time when the Democrats were more firmly in control of Congress than they had ever been since the early days of the New Deal. In the Senate, Democrats outnumbered Republicans by a 2-to-1 margin. In the House, the Democratic majority was only slightly less topheavy.

"But most important of all," the Enquirer noted, "the minimum wage bill enjoyed the magic of that celebrated Kennedy leadership—the inspiring dynamic, irresistible leadership of which the Democratic orators have been speaking as the salvation of America and Western civilization."

For a time, it looked very much as if the Kennedy bill might make it. It actually passed the Senate—after a long battle against weakening amendments, proposed mainly by Kennedy's fellow New Frontiersmen. The bill ran into trouble in the House, which was willing to increase the minimum wage only to $1.15. But Kennedy, in a pique, flatly refused to accept the $1.15 bill, declaring it did not represent progress. The Kennedy bill was dead.

CIVIL RIGHTS BYPASSED

And when, on August 8, a civil rights group inquired about an "August down payment" on his platform's promises, Candidate Kennedy declared, "I stand ready now, as I have in the past, to vote for all these measures."

But the next day Kennedy voted against the Dirksen proposals.

What happened was this: LYNDON JOHNSON, as majority leader, had pulled one of his famed parliamentary fast ones to get the bill tabled. "With a grin of delight on his face, JOHNSON forced the Republicans to a quick vote in which the Dirksen proposal was killed 54–28," reported the AP. "After a brief conference with JOHNSON, Senator Kennedy, the Democratic presidential nominee, added a soft-voiced 'aye' to support the motion." Only four Democrats had gone along with the Republicans.

LYNDON JOHNSON had persuaded the others that the Republicans were only playing politics. So most of the liberal Democrats decided to play politics. Or rather, they played JOHNSON's politics. And Kennedy defended all this on the ground that raising the civil rights issue would block the whole legislative program because the southerners would filibuster against it.

The New York Post was horrified. "It is the kind of performance that dims all luster in the Kennedy campaign and strengthens the neutralism so widespread now among independent liberal voters. * * * No de-

cision is irretrievable; there are still many August days left. What matters now is that Mr. Kennedy recognize that his deed has affronted thousands who care deeply about the quest for human equality, and that it has stirred grave doubts about the quality of his convictions."

To gain time, Kennedy demanded the Eisenhower administration issue and Executive order forbidding discrimination in Federal housing projects. "He could do it today. * * * If he does not do it, a new Democratic administration will.

BEGINS TO FIDGET

As the session wore on, accomplishing nothing, Kennedy became increasingly irritable. His Senate behavior under misfortune and strain was described in a revealing dispatch by the Washington Star's Mary McGrory, who was not unfriendly to Kennedy. "He darts in and out of his Capitol hideaway. * * * When he is on the floor, he paces around nervously. When he stops by a Senator's desk, he compulsively tidies everything. He lines up the pencils in the tray, straightens the edges of piles of papers. When he sits down, he nervously drums with his fingers, smooths his hair, fingers his tie. He gives a powerful impression of wishing to be elsewhere."

And rarely has Washington witnessed anything like the spectacle in the Senate Chamber when a Kennedy-backed proposal for social security-financed medical care for the aged came up for a vote. Every Democrat had been rallied to vote against an alternative plan sponsored by liberal Republicans; it received 28 GOP votes and no others. Then Jack Kennedy, who had refused to yield an inch on the GOP measure, realized he could not rally all southern Democrats to his medicare bill. He needed "at least five or six" Republican votes.

"So, just before the vote," as New York Senator JACK JAVITS recalled the scene, "Kennedy turned to the liberals on the Republican side of the aisle and asked for our support; he told us that a true liberal has to vote for a liberal measure regardless of defect, if it comes down to a choice of that bill or nothing at all for the time being. But liberal Republican views had been neither considered nor reflected in the Kennedy-supported bill. So, understandably, we were not a sympathetic audience."

After having failed to obtain passage of any of the other pieces of legislation he had dubbed "must," Kennedy was counting on passage of medicare to provide him with the glorious victory that he could take before the electorate as an example of his superb leadership.

When the voting was over, Kennedy threw his pencil down on his desk in disgust, stood up, and stalked out of the Chamber with LYNDON JOHNSON, presumably to discuss how soon he could be released from bondage on Capitol Hill.

The medical care plan enacted—the Kerr-Mills bill—provided for a Federal-State matching arrangement instead of Kennedy's proposed social security financing.

MERCIFUL END

There were other "must" items which Candidate Kennedy had hoped to get through the special session. But the greatness, with which his partisans said he was so abundantly endowed, could not prevent each of them from being pulverized; his aid-to-education and housing programs didn't even get out of the appropriate committees. Although Kennedy had promised at the convention to pass a farm bill to give farmers "full parity income," saying January would be too late for such vital legislation, no farm program was ever presented in the special session. The Democratic leadership had complained loudly about inadequate defense and promised to vote more billions for arms; but no additional money came out of the August session.

"Since young Mr. Kennedy fell on his face with everything in his favor, what leadership could he possibly be expected to exert if he were President?" asked the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

In retrospect, the surprising thing about the rump session was that it did Kennedy much less damage than most Washington observers, with their parochial preoccupation with congressional minutiae, had thought.

One reason was that many vacationing Americans were simply unaware of what was happening in Washington. In fact, during the closing days of the postconvention session, the remark, "Why the people back home don't even know Congress is in session," was frequently heard in the corridors and cloakrooms on Capitol Hill.

"Of those who do," commented the London Economist, "most have the vague impression that Mr. Kennedy fought for what he thought right and was overcome by the legions of darkness."

Soon the painful memories of the August session were being drowned in a flood of campaign oratory. Hardly had the session ended before Candidate Kennedy took to the hustings to bemoan "the lack of leadership" of the Eisenhower administration and to insist that only he could save the Nation—and the free world—from certain doom.

Dedicatory Address by Robert Moses at the Opening of the Maryland Northeastern Expressway and the Delaware Turnpike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, who presided at the dedication of the Maryland Northeastern Expressway and the Delaware Turnpike, at the Maryland-Delaware line, on November 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES PRESIDING AT THE DEDICATION OF THE MARYLAND NORTHEASTERN EXPRESSWAY AND THE DELAWARE TURNPIKE AT THE MARYLAND-DELAWARE LINE THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1963

INTRODUCING N. MAXSON TERRY, CHAIRMAN OF THE DELAWARE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

A century and a half ago there was much debate over a national public works program and an integrated system of canals and roads. Our early Presidents and leaders advocated such a program and insisted that we must adopt the longer view and look beyond States rights and local home rule to the expansion and unification of the whole country.

Years ago Mayor John F. Hylan, who came marching into city hall as reform collapsed, was a broth of a boy. Among his many classical remarks was one addressed to Governor Smith, who had come from Albany to explain the New York port plan and to attempt to persuade the mayor to be for it. The Governor took me along for company, so I can vouch for what happened. His Honor listened with rapt attention to an eloquent exposition of the geographical unity and indivisibility of New York Harbor, then put his arm around Governor Smith and said, "Al, to hell with New Jersey. Let's have a port authority of our own."

Delaware is a small State but, like Webster's Dartmouth College, there are those who love it. I give you now N. Maxson Terry, the distinguished chairman of the Delaware State Highway Department, who will present Governor Carvel, of Delaware.

INTRODUCING JOHN B. FUNK, CHAIRMAN-DIRECTOR OF THE MARYLAND STATE ROADS COMMISSION

It is no easy thing even today to find a major metropolitan route which meets local political and other extraneous pressures and is still consistent with Federal standards. For my sins I had something in a small way to do with the main stem through the central core of Baltimore, that is before the Patapsco Tunnel. I came in for a barrage of denunciation about bulldozers driven by tyrannical northern carpetbaggers to fleck the streets of Baltimore. Someday I suppose the Franklin Street route will be built, because you can't bypass every urban community with ring and belt systems.

The Governor of Maryland and his associates have been great and good friends of the New York World's Fair. I trust that the Governors of Delaware and Maryland, reenacting the famous meeting of the Governors of North and South Carolina, will agree that the interval between toasts shall not be unduly prolonged.

Delaware yields to Maryland, and the Chair now recognizes John B. Funk, who as chairman-director leads the Maryland State Roads Commission, and will introduce Governor Tawes of Maryland.

INTRODUCING PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Back in the days of the first President Adams, and long before the consulship of our present Chief Executive, New England Presidents found their way from Boston to Washington by the old colonial stage route over Staten Island. On that route we are now finishing the greatest suspension bridge in the world, the Verrazano-Narrows crossing, which we have asked President Kennedy to open next November.

This is still the logical route from Concord to the White House. Little by little it is being brought up to the modern demands and standards of an increasingly urban, motorized civilization. We all look to President Kennedy with confidence to bring to full realization the dream of President Adams of effective Federal leadership in aid of transportation.

Speaking of Roman roads, the great historian Gibbon said, "Since the beginning of time the road has been the handmaiden of civilization." This shrewd remark is as true today as it was when the Romans carried their military standards into the northern wilderness. Going back to first causes, it was of course the wheel that did it, but today's wheel is driven by internal combustion, supports the industrial revolution and makes our world go round.

Those who built the old military roads by fiat and decree—the Roman roads, the German autobahn, the Italian strada and others—did not have to contend with the ambitions and eccentricities of numerous jurisdictions as we do. The so-called democratic process does not readily lend itself to speed, deliberate or otherwise. Governor Smith used to say, "You can't build by law," and that, when you come to think of it, was a pretty smart observation.

Some years ago when I was chairman of the Governor's Public Works Committee in New York, there was a ferry at Rondout Creek on the Hudson which interrupted the entire flow of north and south traffic. This ferry was run by a local character very close to the leader in what was then, in British parlance, a Republican rotten borough. This leader had been as assemblyman and a contempo-

rary and friend of Governor Smith. The local boys blocked every bill which substituted a bridge for the ferry. So the Governor sent for the ferryman and his patron and roundly and wrathfully denounced this anachronism and interference with progress. "Governor," said the ferryman, "we like you. I might argue the merits, but I won't. I have a daughter who is a sophomore at Vassar. I support her and the ferry supports me. When she gets through college she will teach. When that time comes, you can have the bridge." So we got the bridge when the young lady got her diploma. That's human nature, and that's how very often big improvements come about.

I am delighted to present to you the chief architect of our modern highway system, President Kennedy.

A Responsible Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of November 20, 1963:

A RESPONSIBLE DEFICIT

President Kennedy is making a fresh attempt to get rid of the "antibusiness" label that has been attached to his administration. But prejudice dies hard, and he is unlikely to win many businessmen's votes by citing moves that have "directly benefited" American business and contributed to the record level of corporate profits.

The President is, however, making progress in gaining support for more enlightened economic policies. He has won the business community's backing for cutting taxes. Furthermore, he may yet convince the country that a deliberate deficit in the Federal budget is not necessarily reckless or irrational.

In his speech before the Florida Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Kennedy provided a realistic lesson in budget policy. Until last year, the White House had always presented a budget that either was apparently in balance or showed a surplus. Yet the budget was in the red 12 of the last 15 years. So Mr. Kennedy took the bold step of breaking with the tradition of presenting a fictitious budget. He budgeted for a deficit on the grounds that it would produce a balance by generating a much higher level of economic activity.

The precise mix of the administration's spending and tax reduction proposals is debatable, but there is nothing irresponsible about the plan for a deficit. As the President has pointed out, the Federal debt, inevitable result of wars and recessions, has been growing at a much slower rate than either State or private debt. It represents a constantly shrinking portion of gross national product, declining from a high of 120 percent in 1945, to 53 percent this year.

With unemployment at over 5.5 percent and the economy operating below capacity, the most irresponsible course would be to insist on an immediately balanced budget. This would entail a sharp cutback in spending that could depress the economy, with the result that the Federal budget would show an even bigger deficit than the record $12.4 billion chalked up under President Eisenhower (who had originally estimated a surplus) in 1959.

Mr. Kennedy's approach to budgetmaking is more prudent than that of his predecessor. It may not dispel the misconceptions that businessmen have about his attitude or the soak the rich image that has been traditionally applied to the Democratic Party. But whether or not he can gain politically, Mr. Kennedy is performing a useful and educational service by giving the Nation some straight talk about the economic facts of life.

Control Goes With Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with the broadcast editorial by the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. of Charlotte, N.C., entitled "Control Goes With Aid." This editorial was broadcast over the facilities of Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co. in Charlotte, N.C., and Florence, S.C., on November 15, 1963. It makes the important point, Mr. President, that where the Federal dollar goes, there also follows Federal control and specifically cites a recent court decision which further served to reinforce this unfortunate fact of life.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROL GOES WITH AID

The Federal courts have racked up another decision which shows beyond doubt that with Federal aid comes Federal control.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that Greensboro Hospital cannot continue to receive money under the Hill-Burton Act without changes to comply with Government standards; and those people who have been so very sure that Federal aid to education does not mean Federal control of the schools should be jolted back to reality by the decision.

We are not criticizing the court's ruling. Whoever puts money up for a project has the right to say how it should be spent. The principle that the Federal Government has a right to control whatever it subsidizes has been well established ever since aid to the States began. One of the first programs of this kind was Federal aid for highways, which began long before the Roosevelt era.

Even in those days, a highway had to come up to specifications in order to qualify for the money. That highway program was justified under the clause in the Constitution giving Congress the authority to establish post offices and post roads.

Under the New Deal, aid was expanded to include thousands of State and local projects. Today the "general welfare" clause in the Constitution is stretched beyond recognition, so that Federal money can be obtained for almost everything a local government wants to do. In all cases, the projects have to meet Federal specifications.

This principle has been almost universally accepted. But the advocates of Federal aid to education keep on claiming that this control which has accompanied all other Federal aid will not apply to schools. Every aid-to-education bill introduced so far has contained a clause forbidding any Federal control or direction of the schools.

That's why this hospital case is so important to understand. Under Hill-Burton the hospitals had the same kind of promise. The court's majority opinion admitted that they were given a solemn promise, written into the law, that they might continue their segregation policies. But the court said, since the State had to approve a hospital's application, any grant under the Hill-Burton Act involves State participation, and therefore the hospital concerned must be desegregated.

Here's the clincher—Greensboro Hospital was already desegregated. But it contested the suit in order to keep administrative control of the hospital in the hands of the trustees, without Government dictation. Even this effort must be counted a failure in view of the decision.

To those who still imagine it is possible to have Federal aid to schools without Federal control, we recommend a slow and careful reading of the court decision in the Greensboro Hospital case.

Right Site for NASA Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a very convincing argument in favor of establishing in western Connecticut the proposed new Electronics Research Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency has been advanced editorially by the Waterbury (Conn.) Sunday Republican.

In a concise and incisive inventory of advantages unique to this residential-industrial-cultural-educational center, the editorial presents the facts in favor of western Connecticut and arrives at a conclusion with which I agree:

No other region in the country is quite so good as western Connecticut for the Government's next big research installation.

Similar evidence, in detail, was presented on November 18 to Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, at a regional site hearing conducted at my request.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial from the Waterbury Republican of Sunday, November 17.

RIGHT SITE FOR NASA

A number of good locations will be bidding for the new NASA research center. But the best sites will be found in western Connecticut—for five main reasons, all of them closely tied to the needs of science itself.

When the National Aeronautics and Space Administration makes its decision on where to locate its $56 million research center, we hope that one of the sites in western Connecticut will be chosen.

It goes without saying that the big installation will provide many assets to the region in which it is built. But some regions will contribute a great deal more to the success of the NASA program than others will. Western Connecticut, judged on the basis of what it will provide for the sciences and the scientists of the big research center, is the ideal setting.

If an arc with a radius of about 130 miles is drawn from any point in western Connecticut, it will take in Cambridge, Mass., Schenectady, N.Y., Princeton, N.J., and a huge portion of the Nation's scientific institutions and facilities.

In this relatively small semicircle that has western Connecticut as its focal point will be found dozens of universities like Yale, Harvard, M.I.T., Princeton, and Columbia, with their eminent scientific communities. Within this semicircle, too, will be found a big share of the country's research-based industry.

It is no accident, of course, that this sector of advanced technology contains the Nation's best supply of skilled labor and the Nation's best schooled clerical workers.

Western Connecticut, in the center of the science sector, lies just beyond the suburbs of New York, on the one hand, and, on the other, within close reach of the science complex of central and eastern Massachusetts.

Nowhere in the Nation is the grid of high-speed highways better developed than in the region surrounding western Connecticut; and the communications programs now underway will double or triple the area's accessibility in the next few years.

At the same time western Connecticut, in the very center of the Nation's prime sector of technological skill, investment, and installation, remains a place of relatively low population density and it lies just far enough from what would be first-strike target areas to offer an unparalleled strategic advantage.

This important dispersal factor, in itself, is a bit of good fortune which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should consider very carefully in making its choice of a major new laboratory site.

Western Connecticut, with its focal advantage in the geography of the American scientific neighborhood and its direct superhighway links to the South and to the Midwest, also happens to be a place of highly developed electric and water resources, both of which are vital to any major installation of the type the Government is planning.

These things are all measurable factors and when they are read into the equation of site choice we are sure they will make western Connecticut the obvious answer.

But we think some of the nonmeasurable factors are just as important, too. Our part of the country is cool and beautiful, and the trim, well-managed towns and cities of our clean valleys provide the best living in the United States.

This factor of "good living" is why the country's most intelligent and most successful people make their homes here.

The kind of people which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will need to man its research center are the kind of people who would naturally prefer to live in western Connecticut—even if the area did not already offer so many advantages for the kind of work a space and aeronautics researcher must do.

These are the facts, and they add up to a conclusion which is inescapable: No other region in the country is quite so good as western Connecticut for the Government's next big research installation.

It Makes You Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the August issue of the Pacific Fishermen, published in Seattle, Wash., contains interesting comment on the presence of a Soviet trawler not distant from the State it is my honor to represent.

A point that particularly impressed me is that when Soviet vessels come prowling along our shores, whatever their objective, it is not a private venture, but an undertaking directed and conducted by the Red leaders in the Kremlin.

The question also is asked what the reaction of the Soviet Government would be if the Soviet trawler off our Northwest coast were seized and fined, as American tuna vessels have been seized and fined off the coast of Ecuador.

It is a good question which, however, at the present time should give the Russians no concern, as our present statutes relating to foreign ships that trespass our territorial waters have no teeth and provide no penalties of consequence only, a mild embarrassment to the trespasser.

Enactment of S. 1988, which the Senate has already passed, will remedy that deficiency and enable our Government to police ships of other nations poaching on our own fishing grounds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "It Makes You Think," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT MAKES YOU THINK

Appearance of a Soviet fishing vessel—perhaps of several—casually cruising and occasionally fishing on the banks westerly of Vancouver Island and the coast of Washington generated a lot of interest—and some concern—in July.

In any case, it makes you think.

The circumstance was surprising principally because it had not happened before. Dozens of Soviet vessels have been fishing as close to Kodiak Island as the newcomer—named *Krym*—was to Vancouver Island.

Actually, U.S.S.R. stern trawlers have been taking their fish off Massachusetts, closer to Hyannisport than the *Krym* was to Neah Bay.

The Soviet fleet in the Gulf of Alaska has been fishing primarily for Pacific Ocean perch, until they switched to tanglenetting for king crab this summer. But they like ocean perch a lot, and it is only natural to expect them to hunt for the best perch fishing. It's no secret among fishermen that most productive ground for this species isn't in the Gulf of Alaska—good as it is there—and that the Commies could be counted on to come looking for the best bottom.

Most reliable reports available in Vancouver and Seattle up to presstime for this issue made it plain that the Soviets were keeping safely to the international waters of the high seas, far beyond any limits even suggested, except in South America; and a long way outside the 12 miles beyond straight point-to-point baseline which Canada has declared her intention of applying next year.

In short, the Russians are looking for fish on the high seas, as they have every right to do; just as our vessels have every right to fish tuna off the coast of Latin America, and without the necessity of buying licenses to do it. But they find it's cheaper and better business to buy them anyway, rather than to count on Washington backing up their rights and dignity on the high seas.

Of course there are some definite points of distinction.

When *Krym* comes fishing and scouting and prospecting on Forty-Mile, in the Esperanza Deep, on the Rock Pile, the Astoria Canyon, or Stonewall Bank, it isn't just as though Capt. Johnny Yank was taking his dragger *Uncle Sam* within 30 miles of some other coastal nation. That would be a private venture and a private risk if some patrol boat knocked him over and put him in the clink.

But when the *Krym* comes venturing, whether it's off the cost of Kodiak, Vancouver Island or Cape Flattery, the venture is that of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics just as surely as if Nikita Khrushchev was her skipper. In short, it is a definite move by one great nation to extend her fisheries to waters off the coasts of two others. As it happens, the Canadians weren't using the fisheries themselves the middle of July, when they were exercising their expensive right to strike.

There are several things to think about in all this.

For example, in the waters off Alaska the past few years whenever the Soviet vessels moved into a new area, or a new fishery, the Japanese were close behind; and vice versa. So don't be surprised to read someday soon about other foreign vessels fishing out around LaPerouse, or perhaps just out of sight west of the Farallones, or the Channel Islands.

All this means that we are seeing renewed evidence of Pacific Fisherman's oft-repeated contention "fishing is a world industry; and the Pacific is half the world." Who are the great fishing nations of the world? Japan, Peru, Soviet Russia, China, the United States.

Where are they? Three of them are wholly on the Pacific; and so are the richest fisheries of the other two.

It makes you think also about national dignity.

Congressmen note that the fisheries of other nations have grown faster than those of the United States, whose position had slipped from second to third, to fifth place in tonnage of fish taken. We must do something to regain our position, they say.

One reason private enterprise in the United States has been chary of investment in advancing our fisheries is because governmental policy has failed to provide support for national rights in international waters.

By the common consent of nations, the Soviet trawler *Krym* has the right to be and to fish off Flattery; just as the American tuna seiners *White Stag* and *Ranger* had every right to be and to fish off Ecuador.

But what would happen if the *Krym* was seized, hauled into Port Angeles and fined $1,300? Would Moscow submit supinely?

It makes you think.

U.S. Aid to Communities: Just How Constitutional?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 14, 1963, the Suburban Trends of Riverdale, N.J., published an editorial concerning Federal subsidies for community projects. It should be of general interest to us all for throwing light on what the people back home think about the Federal Government's attempts to help local communities solve their problems:

U.S. AID TO COMMUNITIES: JUST HOW CONSTITUTIONAL?

The Trends area is undoubtedly one where there is increasing dependence on the Federal Government.

More and more of us are looking to the Government, through our municipal councils and committees, for funds to help pay the costs of sewers, sidewalks, and other local improvements. Our Federal Government has what is often a patronage approach to legislation and administration, and many of our municipal leaders are encouraging this dependence.

A White House Conference on Community Affairs is scheduled in December. President Kennedy's proposal to create a new cabinet post, Secretary of Urban Affairs, was rejected by Congress last year. But the idea to bring together the various Federal agencies that deal with local matters into one central agency still has strong support from municipal officials. Quite naturally the purely political-minded, patronage-minded municipal official would welcome this consolidation because it would dignify further the Federal reach into municipal affairs while widening the scope of community dependence on the Federal Government.

It will be interesting to see what this Conference produces. In view of the President's philosophy, as attested to by his proposal of such an agency, it can hardly be expected to crystallize sentiment against further Federal involvement in local affairs.

It adds insult to injury when we hear local officials proclaim Federal aid as a "saving to the taxpayers" of our townships and boroughs.

What the Federal urban renewal program is doing is creating such competition among all communities to get back a portion of the money that is being taxed from present and future citizens that this Federal program is nothing more than a "shotgun wedding" with the Federal Government wielding the shotgun.

Let our municipal officials at least be intellectually honest about this program. Instead of saying, "We are saving our community taxpayers so much money," let them say, "We, and many of you citizens, have helped to maneuver our local governments into such a relationship with the Federal Government that we have been drawn into a 'shotgun wedding' and in applying for community Federal aid we are seeing to it that we get our share of the proceeds." That may seem crude, but at least it would be honest.

What we are dealing with here is the fact that our Constitution enumerates certain powers for the Federal Government while reserving all other powers to the States and localities.

These enumerated powers deal with 20 subjects. On this community aid question we are concerned most directly with the beginning of section 8 of article I, which reads: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

The "general welfare" clause has been strained by patronage-minded legislators, by interpretations of the U.S. Supreme Court, and now by municipal leaders.

While placing the first amendment under strict interpretation on the matter of Bible reading and prayer. Supreme Court members have chosen to have an exceedingly broad interpretation of section 8 or article I, and many of our community leaders love it.

It is to be noted that a powerful influence in Washington for the creation of the "urban affairs" agency is the mayors' lobby. If the Nation's mayors really wanted to be constitutional about such aid programs, instead of lobbying for Federal aid, they would lobby for lower Federal taxes, which would enable our communities to pay their own way. And they would take such a position at the President's White House Conference.

Immigration Legislation Need for Changes in Our Present Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on his proposals to Congress for major changes in our present immigration laws. This legislation should be one of our first orders of business when the second session of the 88th Congress convenes in January 1964. My deep interest has led me to cosponsor the administration bill. My bill is H.R. 7830.

The chief purpose of the bill is to eliminate the discrimination inherent in the national origins system. No one can seriously deny that this system does discriminate unfairly against many people of the world whose friendship we want and seek by other means. As President Kennedy remarked in his immigration message, the national origins quota system is an anachronism in today's world and its use today "is without basis in either logic or reason." Whatever basis in logic or reason it might have once had, it is now outmoded, out of date, and out of step with our national sentiments and objectives. The President's recommendations, incorporated in my bill, represent for the first time in many years, specific proposals to abolish the national origins quota system.

Much of America's strength can be attributed to the diversity of our population. Immigrants from many lands contributed to this country's growth and prosperity. Our present national origins quota system is based on the composition of our country in 1920, and as the President pointed out, "It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose." The present system results in hardship because some of the nations most favored with quotas have few would-be immigrants, while other nations with vast numbers seeking admission have smaller quotas. About 60,000 quota numbers go unused each year, while tens of thousands from less favored lands must wait indefinitely. Our American heritage demands an immigration law inspired by a humanitarian spirit—not discriminatory immigration laws that bar entry to the United States on the basis of race or national origin.

In place of the national origins quota system, our new bill would write provisions into the immigration law allowing for the selection of immigrants based primarily on the qualifications of the immigrant. During a 5-year phaseout period the national origins quota would be reduced at the rate of 20 percent annually. After this 5-year period, no preference would be given to the inhabitants of one country over another. All quota immigrant visas would be issued on a first-come, first-serve basis to all eligible immigrants, subject only to the limitation that immigrants from no one country could use up more than 10 percent of the total worldwide quota at the expense of potential immigrants in other countries. Every immigrant would still have to meet the rigid personal qualification requirements in order to gain admission. No paupers, no subversives, no convicts, or others of undesirable character would be allowed in under the bill. The overall quota would be increased slightly, from around 157,000 to around 165,000. This does not represent any letting down the floodgate.

Under our present quota system, Great Britain is allowed to send us over 65,000 quota immigrants a year, if that many wish to come, which they do not. At the same time, the quota for Greece is 308. Thus, the present system denies entry to the 309th quota immigrant from Greece, while many thousand quota visas go unused under the British quota and those of other countries. In 1962, for example, only 23,447 quota immigrants entered the United States under the British quota. This means that over 40,000 British quota visas were unused that year.

The system proposed as a replacement for national quotas would give first priority to persons of useful skills and attainments on the basis of ability to add to our national welfare. Second priority would be given to persons whose immigration would reunite a family; to the unmarried adult daughter, for instance, of parents already in the United States. Other prospective immigrants would be given consideration on the basis of priority of registration.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to mention the main provisions of the bill. I see no threats to our national welfare or economy in the bill. It simply provides for a more sensible method of allocating immigrant visas than exists under present law. I hope the Congress will act on this important legislation early next year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I insert here a summary of the major provisions of the proposed new immigration bill, prepared by the State Department:

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION BILL

I. ABOLITION OF THE NATIONAL ORIGINS SYSTEM

1. The basic purpose of the bill is to abolish the national origins system, and to allow immigration on a first-come, first-served basis within preference categories.

2. The transition to the new system will take place gradually, over a 5-year period. The quota of each country will be reduced by 20 percent the first year, 40 percent the second year, etc.

3. The present total quota of about 157,000 will be increased by 8,000 to enable raising of minimum quotas from 100 to 200.

4. During each of the first 5 years, the pool created by the annual 20-percent reductions, together with all unused numbers from the previous year, will be allocated to immigrants from oversubscribed areas.

5. At the end of the 5-year period, all national quotas will have been abolished and all quota numbers will be in the pool. Numbers from the pool will then be allocated on

a first-come, first-served basis within preference categories:

(a) First preference will be given to those whose skills are especially advantageous to the United States.

(b) Second and third preference will be given, as before, to close relations of U.S. citizens and resident aliens.

(c) Remaining visas will be allocated as follows: up to 50 percent among other relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens; up to one-half of the remaining visas to immigrants filling a particular labor shortage; the remainder to "new seed."

6. An Immigration Advisory Board is established, composed of two members appointed by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, and three by the President. This Board is to advise on immigration matters and to help to implement the new legislation.

7. During and after the 5-year period, the President may, after consultation with the Board, utilize up to 50 percent of the pool:

(a) To avoid undue hardship resulting from the quota reductions; and

(b) In the national security interest.

8. After consultation with the Board, the President may also utilize up to 20 percent of the pool for refugees.

9. No more than 16,478 visas (10 percent of the total) may be allocated to any quota area except under the President's authority to utilize numbers from the pool.

II. OTHER PROVISIONS

1. The so-called Asia-Pacific triangle is eliminated. Persons of Asian stock will come in under the quotas of their places of birth rather than those of their remote ancestry.

2. Immigrants eligible for nonquota status must apply as nonquota immigrants. The fee provisions are revised, however, to make the total cost to a nonquota or preference immigrant the same as the cost to a nonpreference immigrant.

3. Nonquota status is extended to all parents of U.S. citizens as well as their spouses and children.

4. Nonquota status is also extended to natives of all independent Western Hemisphere countries.

5. A simplified petition procedure is established for first-preference skilled workers. The Attorney General need only determine that an opening exists in a field rather than that a particular employer has an opening.

6. The fair-share law is amended to eliminate any reference to the United Nations High Commissioner in order to avoid dependence on external limitations and to liberalize the law.

7. The definition of the western border of the Middle East in the Refugee Relief Act is expanded from Libya to Morocco.

8. The Secretary of State is granted discretion concerning the time and manner of visa fee payments.

9. The Secretary of State is also granted authority to terminate registrations of applicants who have declined visas and to require reregistration by applicants.

10. Issuance of visas is permitted to certain mentally ill persons and epileptics.

11. Consular officers are granted authority, in borderline cases, to require certain student and visitor nonimmigrants to post bonds.

An Excellent Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am recommending highly to the Congress and the American people an excellent new book, by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. This volume is wonderfully welcome to every person interested in our goodly American heritage, and the conservation and preservation of our priceless natural assets. The book contains vital history and real drama.

We conservationists, regardless of region or party, welcome such a heartwarming and well-written book on American history. History is not all dead past and cruel wars, but there can be battles in peacetime for the protection and advancement of our mountains and streams, forests and parks, that can and have been won for the public good and the general welfare of the American people. This is a lasting volume of high merit.

I enclose with my remarks the article from the Washington Post of Tuesday, November 19, 1963, a review by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, as follows:

UDALL WRITES A PRIMER FOR WONDERS OF AMERICA

("The Quiet Crisis," by Stewart L. Udall—introduction by President John F. Kennedy.)

If you want your children to grow up and get rich some day by exploiting the things and the people around them, I wouldn't recommend this book. But if you want them to acquire a reverence for the land and the forests and the wild animals, and to be inspired by the great figures of American history who have expressed this spirit in our public life, then I don't know of a better primer.

Interior Secretary Udall, in this terse little book, manages to see and express conservation as a wide-sweeping, all-encompassing part of American history. It is the story of a political, economic and philosophical struggle involving cowboys, Indians, transcendentalists, empire builders, robber barons, bureaucrats and Presidents.

For the most part, it is a sad story of an inevitable tragedy, of how the great American dream of a new empire stretching from ocean to ocean conflicted with many of the scientific principles of conservation. Secretary Udall tells how the new Nation flourished—but only at the expense of the Indian, the buffalo, the virgin timber, the clean water and the precious topsoil.

The heroes of this story are the few strong figures in our history who have had the soul to appreciate the precious things in our environment, and the backbone to fight to save them.

Udall describes what a masterpiece of creation the American continent was when the Pilgrims arrived. Yet it looked "hideous" to them, and they set about changing it. The conflict has continued ever since. The American Indian's concept of the land as something that existed for the enjoyment and sustenance of all had to be eliminated—and so did the Indian. The forests had to be cut down to build houses and make way for farms. The beaver had to be trapped to earn cash from Europe. The thin layer of grass on the great plains had to be plowed under to plant corn. The rivers had to be dammed. The western lands had to be given to the railroads. The gold-rich hills had to be washed away with high-pressure water hoses to bring out the nuggets of wealth.

Almost from the beginning, a few voices cried out in the wilderness. The result was blazing controversy and, in some cases, great victories for the public's stake in its environment.

"Where can I go now, and visit nature undisturbed?" demanded John James Audubon in the 1820's. His book, "Birds of America," was credited with arousing the national conscience and saving many species, and ultimately the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

Udall's story of tragic waste of priceless assets, mixed with half victories along the way, ends with the grim challenge of the future: The spectre of a population twice as large as today's, empowered by new technology to consume resources at an even greater pace, making a new assault on our battered environment.

The message of "The Quiet Crisis" is obvious. We have only a precious few years left to make a massive effort to the State, local and national level to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals and even the air we breathe. If we fail to act, these priceless resources may be destroyed forever.

Brooklynites Are Proud of This Fellow Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of this House, I include the following interesting newspaper article by Edith Evans Asbury, published in the New York Times of Sunday, November 17, 1963:

BLIND "MAN WITH THE DOG" FINDS CLIENTS CAN EASILY LOCATE HIM

(By Edith Evans Asbury)

The man to see when you are in trouble in Brooklyn, in the opinion of a large number of court defendants, is "the man with the dog."

Like justice, he is blind. But 40-year-old Gilberto Ramirez has built an active practice in criminal law during the last 6 years despite that handicap.

"Nobody wants to be blind, of course," Mr. Ramirez said in an interview last week, "but there is a definite advantage to being so easily identifiable.

"People who see me in court, or had friends or relatives who were my clients, don't have to remember my name when they need a lawyer. They just ask for the man with the dog, and someone sends them to me."

"Most sighted lawyers in practice for only 6 years don't have nearly as many cases as I do," Mr. Ramirez said during a day in which he appeared in behalf of six different clients.

Mr. Ramirez is one of only four or five blind lawyers in active practice in the city, according to the Lighthouse. He suddenly lost his sight in 1945, 2 years after he had been graduated from the University of Puerto Rico, where he had majored in the teaching of English.

"It's a great shock at first," he recalled. "You are terrified, confused, despondent. But the human being adjusts—to anything."

"It's like finding yourself on a different planet, where instead of the Biblical 'Let there be light,' someone said 'let there be no light,'" Mr. Ramirez said.

"But in no time at all, you find that living in this new world is an adventure, a day-to-day challenge, exciting to meet."

Mr. Ramirez met the challenge at first by lecturing for the Government of Puerto Rico on the prevention of blindness, an ironic occupation, since his own blindness was not the preventable kind.

He came to New York, where he had attended Seward Park High School as a youth, taught himself to type and operate a dictaphone and passed a civil service test. As a result he was appointed to a typing job in the welfare department in 1952.

The same year, he married Elba Velez. She had graduated from the University of Puerto Rico in 1949, despite the fact that she had been blind since the age of 5, following an attack of typhoid fever. They have four lively, fully sighted children: Iris, 10 years old; Gilbert, 8; Cynthia, 4; and Ellie, 3.

In 1953, Mr. Ramirez began studying law at night at Brooklyn College. He completed the 4-year evening course in 3 years, passed the bar examination, quit his job as typist, and opened a law office at 140 Bergen Street, Brooklyn, in November 1957.

For the first few days, there were no callers. Then a friend referred a woman who wanted a divorce.

Mr. Ramirez had never been in a courtroom before. "I walked into a dark room, heard mumbling and voices, and called everyone 'Your Honor,' because I didn't know where the judge was, or who the clerks were," he said, with amusement.

Now, with the help of his 7-year-old female german shepherd, Dell, Mr. Ramirez finds his way around courthouses not only in Brooklyn, but also in Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens.

The Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the trade publication, Broadcasting magazine, recently published an editorial entitled "Who's Boss?"

The editorial summarizes some of the primary issues involved in the controversy surrounding the harassment of the broadcasting industry by the Federal Communications Commission which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point:

WHO'S BOSS?

We make the flat charge that the Federal Communications Commission is not serving the public interest, convenience, and necessity. These are the counts:

It is overcommercializing its regulation of broadcasting, to grab headlines and euchre bigger appropriations.

It is neglecting regulation of telephone, telegraph, and other common carrier services which are more important to the consumer economically but which lack the glamor of broadcasting.

It is squandering taxpayers' funds through "made work," such as the inane hearings in Chicago and Omaha on local programing, the harassment of stations on license renewals, unnecessarily prolonged freezes, and other contrived devices to force stations to bow to its will.

It is defying congressional intent by seeking to arrogate control over broadcast advertising (which is really ratemaking that would transform broadcasting into common carrier status) and by seeking to impose filing fees without legislative authority.

It is spending so much time—an estimated 80 percent—on its broadcast crusades which it thinks have publicity value that many policy determinations are being relegated to the staff.

It is violating its own fairness doctrine (which is of doubtful legality) by demanding on the one hand that licensees determine their public's programing needs and, on the other, ignoring the views of elected representatives of the public, to wit, Members of Congress.

Since Chairman E. William Henry's "huckster" barrage in New York 2 weeks ago, three influential legislators have spoken. Chairman OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the House Commerce Committee, Chairman WALTER ROGERS, Democrat, of Texas, of the House Communications Subcommittee, and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, of the Senate Appropriations Committee have challenged the FCC's authority to place limitations on advertising, and to otherwise interfere with control over programing and business management of stations.

The commercial time issue is one on which all stations, large and small, and the networks, see eye to eye. This has stimulated more activity through State associations and by individual broadcasters with Congress than than any other regulatory issue in recent memory.

Two bills, introduced by Representative ROGERS—to prohibit the FCC from making rules on broadcast advertising and to prohibit it from assessing filing fees—are in the hopper. Mr. ROGERS wants hearings "as soon as practicable."

We suggest that, in the absence of immediate action by the FCC withdrawing the commercial time rulemaking and postponing indefinitely from the January 1 effective date the filing fee rules, broadcasters encourage Mr. ROGERS and his committee to convene hearings forthwith.

Meanwhile, it would seem prudent for Mr. Henry and his like-minded "give-em-hell" colleagues to take a new look at the law and the congressional intent and not accept as gospel that which the staff masterminds serve up to them.

Congress created the FCC nearly 30 years ago. It can, if it wishes, abolish the seven-man Commission and create a new one of three, five, or nine men. Unless the present FCC sees the light glaring red from Capitol Hill, we predict the Congress will take strong measures to bring the FCC back under control.

The Other Cheek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, another great triumph for the spineless foreign policy of the Kennedy administration is seen as we witness the failure of the State Department to protect legitimate American investments in the Argentina oil industry.

I place into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune entitled "The Other Cheek," which effectively points up the basic errors of the New Frontier in international relations.

It would be well for us to face the facts of life—that coexistence with communism and retreat behind unwarranted activities of nations in any part of the world against the United States bring international disrespect for our country and have reduced our foreign relations to complete chaos.

THE OTHER CHEEK

President Kennedy at Miami affirmed that the United States will take no retaliatory action against Argentina because of its revocation of contracts with 12 privately owned oil companies, 8 of them American. Mr. Kennedy's pronouncement made it clear that he intends to persist in the pursuit of his twin fetishes of foreign aid and the so-called Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

The Argentine Government technically stopped short of outright expropriation of the $227 million worth of American-owned properties, but the effect is substantially the same. While there is vague talk about compensation, the foreign companies are to be required first to hand back any profits of the last 5 years and to be accountable for "damages" for taxes waived under the previous contracts and for "irrational exploitation" of Argentine resources.

The Government's decrees were couched in insulting terms and took no account of contentions that American contributions had enabled Argentina to triple production in 4 years and virtually to attain self-sufficiency in petroleum. The jingoistic language of the decrees served as a further irritant to Members of the U.S. Senate, who had just been through a long wrangle over the continuation of foreign aid to ingrate nations.

At Miami, however, Mr. Kennedy refused to heed their demands that economic aid be suspended. He professed still to be hopeful of the eventual success of the Alliance for Progress, stating that this $20 billion aid program, largely to be financed by the United States, does not dictate to any member nation how it must organize its economic affairs.

"No country," said Mr. Kennedy, "can tell another how it must order its economy."

Yet, when the Alliance for Progress was proclaimed in August 1961, the text of the declaration, under American inspiration, laid down a series of specific contractual obligations which were to condition the receipt of U.S. aid. These provided not only rules to order Latin American economies, but also the political and social organization of Central and South American states.

These countries were to formulate "national programs for the development of their economies"; to foster "agrarian reform" in order to eliminate "unjust structures of land tenure and use"; to "reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, punishing tax evasion severely"; to "stimulate private investment," etc., etc.

If these draft conditions submitted by the United States were not plainly designed to tell other countries how they must order their economies, what were they? Yet Mr. Kennedy now misrepresents, if he has not forgotten, the fundamental precepts of his Alliance for Progress. He ignores his earlier demand that the Latin American countries encourage private investment and, in fact, condones what amounts to the robbery of private American enterprises which are to be stripped of their interests.

As usual, Mr. Kennedy chooses to play from weakness. After submitting to Castro's uncompensated raids on American holdings in Cuba, to Brazil's seizure of the American telephone system in that country, he offers encouragement to more Latin American brigandage. And, after $371 million in economic aid pumped into Argentina already, he intends to follow up $78 million in handouts given to Argentina last year with similar amounts this year and next.

If the administration is capable of this folly, U.S. private investors are under no ob-

ligation to throw good money after bad. They are abundantly warned that they are inviting a holdup.

Would Drive Family Farmers to the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John A. Herman, of Willmar, Minn., has provided me with a copy of a letter which he wrote to the editor of the West Central Daily Tribune, of Willmar, Minn., in which he commented on the recently issued 20th Century Fund report, entitled "Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age" by Prof. Edward Higbee of the University of Rhode Island. Mr. Herman requested that I have his letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that his remarks might come to the attention of my colleagues here in the House. I include his letter commenting on the 20th Century Fund report in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

WOULD DRIVE FAMILY FARMERS TO THE CITIES

To the EDITOR:

Many remember the agricultural policy report of the CED, a liberal group whose directors comprise many supporters of the leftwing Committee for an Effective Congress. This report posed a so-called solution for the farm problem. Now another leftwing educational front, the 20th Century Fund, has come up with a report even more devastating called Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age, by Prof. Edward Higbee of the University of Rhode Island. Listed as trustees for the fund are such liberal pundits as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (adviser to J.F.K.), Adolph A. Berle, Francis Biddle, J. Kenneth Galbraith (economic adviser to J.F.K., 1960 campaign), Robert Oppenheimer, and David E. Lilienthal (also a CED trustee. The report contends that, "There is no point in trying to keep alive the old shopworn concept of the family farm."

According to Farm Quarterly, "The central theme of the author is that the usual statement of the farm problem, even the picture of the farmer himself, is largely a hoax contrived by creating a homogenized blend of all farmers who qualify for that name under the loose definition of the Bureau of Census and passing off this fictitious character as the family farmer."

The report says that 44 percent, or 1,640,910 farmers, should move to the city because they and their "undercapitalized farms are obsolete." The next group singled out by the report are the 34 percent of the farmers who gross between $2,500 and $10,000 per year. These 1,271,558 farmers who produce 22.8 percent of all farm sales, Higbee says, are on the "fringe of failure," but should be allowed to remain in agriculture and keep their small portion of the market. The other 22 percent of the farmers, the report claims, produce 72 percent of all farm sales.

The report which begins "American agriculture never had it so good," concludes with the statement, "If the welfare of the American family is of real significance to the Nation's policymakers, let them look to the city where most of those families live, instead of backward to the country."

This report, like the CED report, wants to drive the family farmer to the city to join the army of unemployed. From their ivory towers these liberal intellectuals propose solutions for the problems of rural America. But their solutions would create greater problems than the ones they attempt to solve. Where are those who leave their farms in such great numbers to find employment? What are those who are dependent upon the farmer as a market for goods and services to do?

JOHN A. HERMAN.

WILLMAR, MINN.

Kennedy Tells World We'd Fight for Cuba, But He Didn't Say When

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Miami Herald:

UNITED STATES WILL FIGHT TO PROTECT ANYONE REDS THREATEN, J.F.K. PLEDGES HERE—BUT HE DIDN'T SAY WHEN

(By Hal Hendrix)

MIAMI BEACH, November 20.—Two and a half years ago President Kennedy told the American Society of Newspaper Editors the United States would fight against outside Communist penetration in the Western Hemisphere.

His strongly worded declaration was delivered at the American Society of Newspaper Editors convention in Washington, immediately following the disastrous collapse of the U.S.-backed Bay of Pigs invasion attempt.

Two nights ago, addressing the Inter-American Press Association convention here, Mr. Kennedy said the United States would fight for any Western Hemisphere nation the Russians or any other Communists try to take over.

CUBA

Despite those bold pronouncements, the fact remains that between the ASNE and IAPA speeches Russia has clamped complete control on Cuba, militarily, economically, and politically.

So it was not too surprising that the President's renewed anti-Communist protection assurance to the IAPA delegates was received somewhat less than enthusiastically.

Reflecting on Mr. Kennedy's remarks here, the editors and publishers agree he made it clear the United States would help the Cubans only after they have freed themselves.

REBELLION

Some of the news executives shared an opinion that Mr. Kennedy, in effect, had invited the anti-Castro Cubans on the island to launch a rebellion when he said:

"No Cuban need feel trapped between dependence on the broken promises of foreign communism and the hostility of the rest of the hemisphere. For once Cuban sovereignty has been restored, we will extend the hand of friendship and assistance to a Cuba whose political and economic institutions have been shaped by the will of the Cuban people."

This paragraph may have been meant for potential dissident elements in Castro's armed forces as well as for resistance groups in Cuba.

But considering the past record of the Kennedy administration since failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, many of the editors here wonder whether the United States would rush to the assistance of rebellious anti-Castro forces or permit them to suffer the same fate as the anti-Communist patriots in Hungary.

Apart from Cuba, the IAPA delegates generally were disappointed in the President's speech.

POLICY ADDRESS

It had been heralded as a major policy address on Latin America. But in the postmortems by the newsmen, the feeling was nearly unanimous that the address was little more than a rehash of earlier speeches.

It is perhaps significant that Mr. Kennedy injected a distinct dose of criticism of the Latin Americans in his remarks dealing with the problems of the Alliance for Progress.

Some of the most prominent Latin American delegates commented that they were aware of Latin America's shortcomings in moving toward Alliance goals and did not need a lecture from Mr. Kennedy.

They added they recognized many of the platitudes punctuating Mr. Kennedy's address and could only attribute them to his speechwriter.

It was widely assumed that the speech-polishing author was Richard Nathan Goodwin, former self-designated Inter-American Affairs expert for the Kennedy administration.

That Mr. Kennedy recalled Mr. Goodwin for the IAPA speech chore was puzzling to the news executives. They thought he had completely discredited himself on the Latin American scene during the first 2 years of the New Frontier administration.

Mayor John Babiarz of Wilmington, Del., Visits Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mayor John Babiarz of Wilmington, Del., visited Poland together with Mayor Alex Smetka of Rochester, Mayor Walter Waryasz of Poughkeepsie, and Mayor Chester Kowal of Buffalo, N.Y.

Mayor Babiarz, one of Delaware's abler public officials, told me he was greatly impressed by what he saw in Poland, and the confidence shown by this great people.

The delegation of mayors was enthusiastically received everywhere; the group saw new construction, as well as the historic monuments of the past including the old cathedral in Gniezno, the seat of the primate of Poland.

I can attest to the spirit of hope and confidence shown by the Polish people, for as a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, I traveled to Poland during the 1962 Easter recess. In Poland I had a series of conferences with Ambassador John Cabot, members of the American Embassy staff, representatives of U.S. voluntary organizations conducting programs in Poland, and Polish Government officials. Everywhere I traveled I saw a brave and confident people, a people which has contributed, and will continue to contribute, great things to our culture and to civilization.

I include here an article from the weekly publication, the Polish American World, which reported on November 15, 1963, on the recent visit of Mayor John Babiarz and the other American mayors to Poland:

THE MAYORS IN POLAND

(By Irene M. Sokol)

Last week, I had lunch with three U.S. mayors and their Polish guides. After a full 3-week tour of Poland, this was their first free day since arriving in Poland. The three—John Babiarz of Wilmington, Alex Smetka of Rochester, and Walter Waryasz of Poughkeepsie along with Mrs. Waryasz—were keyed up, exhausted, but joking and all smiles. They had been dined, wined, given the royal treatment. The fourth member of the party, Chester Kowal, of Buffalo, had departed the day before.

The official-semiofficial tour of the country was a success. This was due primarily to the easy sociability of the entire group. Their ability to communicate in Polish placed less reliance on interpreters. Consequently, rapport was easily established and lines of communication kept open. Nor was the conversation limited to official questions and answers. Chit-chat was often far more revealing.

At the same time, they were able to converse with people in the street. Crowds form whenever an official party comprising foreign guests tour a city, visit a monument or make a call at one of the many palaces or churches. I learned that at one point one of the mayors declared that he felt a Polish song coming on, burst forth, and that was the end of formality at the reception.

Their honors were also exposed to the contradiction of a developing economy. They were impresed by the urbanity and cosmopolitan air of Warsaw and Krakow—two very different cites from the point of architecture as well as atmosphere. Also, the delicate and highly technical reconstruction of old market squares in Warsaw and Gdnask was something to be commended. They do not look 20 years old but as if standing for centuries. The reconstruction of the church in Oliwa with its famous organ consisting of thousands of pipes and moving objects is a treasure of national pride.

At the same time, Mayor Waryasz could not help but feel the wide gulf that exists in other sectors of the country. His grandmother, living out in the provinces, still has no electricity. Agriculture is conducted on a fairly primitive basis. Horse drawn carts and hand machinery are the basic tools of the farmers. For a country whose chief export is food, this is a drastic problem.

That each farmer cannot possibly afford a tractor and other specialized machinery is understandable. That small plots of land do not yield the maximum is also a known fact. But the farmer, having resisted the collectivized farm, clings to his few acres and will not be convinced that some sort of grange movement—Polish style—could be beneficial not only in terms of labor but in maximum yield. But this to the farmer is an emotional sore point, and any plan hinting at a "pooling" of resources is summarily dismissed.

The mayors also commented on the inspiring experience of hearing Mass at the old cathedral in Gniezno, the seat of the primate of Poland; receiving innumerable gifts and illustrated books, the promise of an album of photographs taken during their tour. They looked back on 3 weeks of being served Polish ham at least once a day (too much of a good thing, etc., etc.), and the big meals.

They congratulated Mrs. Waryasz for steadfastly keeping up with the schedule, not once excusing herself for shopping, for the hairdresser or any other female endeavor. Along with the others, she trudged along in boots among the pig sties on a collective farm and wound her way through the hot mills in Nowa Huta.

Her one big complaint was that she came to Poland to hear some good Polish music, only to be confronted with the twist (it is dying out) or with whatever is taking on popularity. Mrs. Waryasz recollected that our own Eugene Kusielewicz had warned her to learn the twist when he met her in Schenectady a few days before their departure for Poland. But she didn't really believe him.

I believe that the entire trip could be summed up with Mayor Waryasz's comment: "It was a tremendous experience."

The Federal-Aid Highway Program After 1971

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 launched the greatest public works program in history: Completion of the 41,000-mile national system of interstate and defense highways by the year 1972. We are now approaching the halfway point in this great program, and it is time for us to begin considering the nature and extent of the highway program to follow it.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 did not occur over night. It was the product of extended congressional consideration of detailed and exhaustive studies and reports prepared over a period of many years. The first basic investigation of the feasibility of a nationwide network of superhighways was the result of a congressional directive enacted in 1938—some 18 years before the 1956 act.

The Federal-aid highway program to follow our present interstate highway program must be based upon thorough, comprehensive studies and analyses. Preparation of these will take time, and additional time must be allowed for congressional consideration. Recognizing these facts, I and several of my colleagues have introduced measures to require comprehensive studies and recommendations concerning the highway program after completion of the present one.

The first of these measures was introduced by my able and energetic colleague, the gentleman from Florida, WILLIAM C. CRAMER. Subsequently, at a meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, Mr. CRAMER spoke on the subject, "The Federal-Aid Highway Program After 1971." His cogent and well-reasoned remarks are recommended to the attention of all Members. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. CRAMER's speech:

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AFTER 1971

(Remarks of the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER at the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, Portland, Oreg., October 22, 1963)

It is always gratifying to me to attend these annual meetings of highway officials. This is partly due to the fact that I thoroughly enjoy them and the opportunity to renew old acquaintances. But, more important, I find that your meetings, without exception, are vastly educational and of real help in viewing highway matters in their proper perspective.

The number and scope of subjects discussed in your committee sessions, the enthusiastic and almost never-ending exchange of information and views concerning problems of common interest, are impressive and inspiring. After attending a meeting of AASHO, I always return to Washington much better informed about the highway program, with a greater insight into the problems which must be solved, and with the renewed conviction that highway officials in the main are able and conscientious.

At the meeting this year much attention will be devoted to the progress and status of the Interstate Highway program. This is appropriate because half of the time allotted for completion of the program will have elapsed before your next meeting, your 50th annual convention, in Atlanta, Ga., next year. For my part, I am confident that the interstate program can be completed in 1972, as contemplated by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. It will not be easy. It cannot be done without the full and dedicated efforts of all concerned. But it can be done. The official policy statement of AASHO adopted in Miami Beach, Fla., last year, included a reassurance to the Congress that the individual State highway departments have the ability to efficiently complete the interstate program within the planned time schedule. This reassurance is encouraging. I can assure you that the Congress, convinced of the importance of completing the program on schedule, is closely observing the progress of the program and will not be tolerant of any undue delay.

With this in mind, I believe that it is extremely important to give serious thought to the highway program after 1972. It is not too early to do this. Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton has pointed out that to complete the interstate program on schedule, the final construction contracts should be awarded in 1970, that the final design work and right-of-way acquisition should be underway no later than 1968, and that the last of the studies on route location should be winding up right now.

The necessary and orderly continuation of the highway program after fiscal year 1971 requires that construction planning, traffic surveys, and route location studies be commenced in the near future, so that there will be a firm program for continuation of highway improvement to take up where the present program leaves off. The nature and extent of the future highway program must, of course, be determined by the Congress, but we must have such a program. Without it the abrupt substantial reduction in the amounts expended for Federal aid highways would cause a severely adverse impact on the Nation's economy. A temporary suspension followed by later acceleration of the highway program would necessitate slow and costly replacement of staffs and equipment inventories. And, in the meantime, our transportation needs would continue to grow.

Whatever decisions are made as to the nature and extent of the Federal-aid highway program after 1971, they should be based upon detailed and comprehensive studies. And enough time should be allowed for these studies to insure their accuracy and reliability. We certainly want to avoid recurrence of problems such as those which arose in the early years of the Interstate program. You will recall that the original money authorizations for completion of the Interstate System, set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, were based upon cost estimates submitted to the Congress in 1955. Later estimates, pre-

pared in 1957, and submitted to the Congress in 1958, showed that the cost of completing the Interstate System would be some $10 billion more than shown in the 1955 estimates—and a financial crisis resulted. A number of factors contributed to this increase, but one of the basic causes was the fact that simply not enough time had been allowed for preparation of the 1955 estimates. The 1955 estimates necessarily were hurriedly put together, without time for the careful and comprehensive cross-checking which is so essential to insure accuracy and reliability.

Also Congress, which will have to make the final decisions, must be given time for its deliberations. To illustrate, let me briefly trace the origin and development of the Interstate System over the period from 1938 to 1956—some 18 years.

In 1938, the Congress directed the Bureau of Public Roads to investigate the feasibility and cost of constructing six superhighways across the Nation. The report of this investigation, submitted to the Congress in 1939, found that the construction of such highways was feasible and desirable.

In 1941 the President appointed the National Interregional Highway Committee to continue the investigation. The report of this Committee, transmitted to the Congress in 1944, reiterated the importance of an interregional system of highways and strongly recommended prompt beginning of its construction.

That same year, 1944, the Congress authorized the designation of a "National System of Interstate Highways," but no funds were then earmarked for its construction. In 1947 the Bureau of Public Roads announced the designation of interstate highway routes totaling 37,681 miles. In 1948, the Congress directed a study of the status of improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways. A report of this study was submitted to the Congress in 1949, under the title "Highway Needs for the National Defense."

It was not until 1952 that funds were authorized specifically for expenditures on the interstate system only, and then in the token amount of $25 million annually. In 1954 this authorization was increased to just $175 million annually, and the Federal share of the cost of interstate highway projects increased from 50 to 60 percent. In 1955 a report entitled "Needs of the Highway Systems, 1955–84" (which I earlier referred to as the 1955 cost estimates) was submitted to the Congress. The report, together with the so-called Clay committee report ("A 10-Year National Highway Program") submitted the same year, culminated in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, which launched our present interstate highway program.

In all, a total of about 18 years elapsed between submission of the report "Toll Roads and Free Roads," an enactment of the 1956 act. Of course, there were several intervening factors, including World War II and the Korean emergency, and I am not implying that so long a time would be taken again. But this does illustrate the necessity for beginning comprehensive studies of future programs well in advance of the time action must be taken.

Now, let us consider for a moment what such studies should encompass.

The 1963 policy statement of AASHO recognized the need for further evaluation of the size of and justification for Federal aid to the ABC programs, and the possible future extension of the interstate highway system. Following adoption of this policy statement, I introduced House Joint Resolution 464 to direct the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other agencies and the State highway departments, to make a comprehensive investigation and study of highway traffic and needs, and to submit to the Congress by January 1966, a report and recommendation for a 10-year highway program commencing with fiscal year 1972.

The investigation and study would cover the following general matters:

1. Types and volumes of estimated highway traffic as projected for 20 years;
2. Any changes (including the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of highways) which may be necessary in the Federal-aid highway systems needed to accommodate such traffic;
3. The cost of such changes;
4. The extent of Federal participation in the cost of such changes;
5. Methods for financing such Federal costs; and
6. Methods of apportioning Federal-aid highway funds among the States.

Comprehensive studies of these general subjects would involve many subsidiary items, and some of these are spelled out in the resolution. They include: examination of highway classifications, the possible creation of new Federal-aid highway systems, the possible extension of the Interstate System, and examination of the many problems resulting from the construction of toll facilities.

With the report and recommendations resulting from these studies before it, the Congress will be able to proceed to determine the future Federal-aid highway program on the basis of accurate, factual, and reliable information. But, even if the report is submitted in 1966, as provided in House Joint Resolution 464, the Congress will not have very much time for its deliberations. In 1966, the Congress should authorize funds for the ABC programs for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, and by that time we should have some fairly definite plans for the highway program after 1971.

A few additional comments as to who should make the investigations and studies we have been discussing. It has been suggested that they be underatken by a congressional committee. I feel very strongly that the investigations and studies should be undertaken by the State highway departments and the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Bureau of Public Roads which for years has been the Federal agency chiefly responsible for the development of the Federal aid highway program. In any event, whoever undertakes the project will have to rely almost entirely on the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads for the information necessary to support the ultimate decisions. I simply do not believe that any congressional committee has the time, the staff, or the specialized knowledge required to accumulate and evaluate the tremendous amount of facts and data which must be considered. Obviously, the investigations and studies must and will be carefully reviewed by the committees of the Congress before decisions are made. But the Congress should devote its time to the making of decisions and ask the highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads to gather and submit the necessary background information.

It is pertinent to note the fact that in 1953, the House Committee on Public Works adopted a resolution reading, in part, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives through its Subcommittee on Roads is authorized and directed to make a comprehensive study and review of the highway problem. In the conduct of the study the committee shall seek the counsel and advice of responsible Federal, State, county, and city officials, and other individuals and organizations qualified to advise them in their respective fields."

Pursuant to this resolution, the Subcommittee on Roads held extensive hearings over a period of several months during 1953. I am sure that this national highway study, and the testimony presented at the hearings, were of inestimable value to the committee and to the Congress in considering subsequent legislative proposals. However, they did not result in a final decision as to what action should be taken to meet the urgent need for an accelerated highway program to overcome the serious deteriorations and deficiencies in our highway systems. One year later, in 1954, the Congress directed the Secretary of Commerce to make studies on several aspects of the highway problem. It was not until the Congress had received and considered these and other reports and recommendations that positive action was taken for the completion of the Interstate System: enactment of the 1956 act.

I hope that we can learn from history. I hope that we will start now to make the comprehensive studies necessary to determine what our highway program will be after 1971. And I hope that the primary responsibility for undertaking these studies and the development of appropriate recommendations will be placed upon and accepted by the proper parties: the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Before closing, I would like to make very brief mention of one more subject: that of mass transit. We hear a great deal about this nowadays, and particularly about the competition between the highway interests and the mass transit interests. There should be no such competition, in the sense that there must be a winner and a loser. If there is such competition, the real loser will be the American public.

We are dedicated to solving the transportation problems of the Nation. We know, beyond any doubt, that an extensive network of highways is now and will continue to be essential to our economy and well-being. It is possible that mass transit facilities would serve to alleviate transportation problems in many urban areas, and, to the extent that this is true, I recognize the need for transit facilities in appropriate areas.

Studies and consideration of the need for mass transit facilities as well as highways are necessary and desirable. But such studies and consideration must not be used as an excuse for delaying highway construction. They must not be permitted to develop into planning controversies or disputes as to priority for funds.

A good example of what should not but can happen is found in Washington, D.C., where desperately needed highway projects are being delayed because of the morass of mass transit proposals. Plans for interstate highway routes in the District of Columbia include a bridge across the Potomac River—the so-called Three Sisters Bridge—and an inner loop to carry traffic around the congested downtown area. The bridge and inner loop are key parts of the Interstate System in the Washington area, and their selection was based upon exhaustive studies and planning continuing over a period of several years. Recommendations for construction of the Three Sisters Bridge date back to at least 1953.

In 1960 the Congress created the National Capital Transportation Agency, and directed it to prepare a transit development program. In May of this year, the President transmitted the transit development program to the Congress and recommended its adoption. However, in addition to this, the President also recommended that appropriations for the Three Sisters Bridge and certain essential parts of the Inner Loop be deferred pending a "careful reexamination of the highway program of the District of Columbia in the light of the transit development program and the social, economic, and esthetic impact of highways on the Nation's Capital."

The recommendations of the President were based upon the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency. I have studied the report and supporting material with considerable care, and have not been able to find any indication that the Agency gave adequate study or consideration to the critically important aspects of the need for highways for national defense and interstate transportation. Furthermore, the law specifically required the Agency to cooperate and coordinate with other agencies on arterial highway matters, and specifically stated that responsibility and authority for location, design, construction, and operation of highways shall remain with the agencies having jurisdiction. Despite this, testimony before committees of the House showed that the Agency did not cooperate, did not coordinate, and did not solicit or accept the views or assistance of the highway agencies.

Notwithstanding these and other shortcomings in the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, several essential parts of the Interstate System in the District of Columbia which have already been exhaustively studied and which have already been delayed too long are being further delayed pending additional studies. I cite this as an example. We must not permit the 41,000-mile national system of interstate and defense highways to be subordinated to mass transit proposals and localized problems of urban planning and improvement. We cannot do this unless we are ready to abandon the goal of completing the Interstate System in 1972.

Mass transit facilities are not a substitute for, nor do they eliminate the need for, adequate highways. In any given area the question of whether provisions can and should be made for mass transit is one which must be decided upon on its own merits. I am unalterably opposed to proposals to delay needed highway projects pending studies of the feasibility of mass transit facilities, or to defer needed highway projects to enhance the financial feasibility of mass transit schemes, or to divert highway user revenues to finance mass transit facilities.

The continuing need for highways has been established. Let us proceed with the construction of those highways. If the need for mass transit facilities in particular areas is established, let the local communities provide for such facilities, without interfering with the highway program.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me express again my pleasure at being able to participate in the 49th annual meeting of AASHO.

A Fair Gift for Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, who represents the 22d District of Ohio so ably, is well known for the many humanitarian deeds she has performed.

The following column, written by one of America's leading newspaperwomen, Ruth Montgomery, relates another example of Mrs. BOLTON's kindness:

CAPITAL LETTER: A FAIR GIFT FOR AFRICA

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—In a dramatic 11th-hour rescue, Representative FRANCES BOLTON has saved the day for 23 African nations that had all but abandoned their long-held dream of an African pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

The Ohio Congresswoman, ranking GOP member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is the acknowledged African expert on Capitol Hill.

Learning at the last minute that the choice space reserved by the fair for the African pavilion was about to be reassigned because the new African nations could not afford to finance their exhibit, Mrs. BOLTON exclaimed: "There must be an African pavilion. There simply must be one."

She immediately took to the telephone, calling numerous friends and bankers around the country in an attempt to raise the necessary funds.

The clock was running out on the land option, however, and minutes before the deadline, Representative BOLTON reached a decision.

"I personally will underwrite it," she declared, reaching for her checkbook. "We cannot let our African friends down. They must have a pavilion—period."

The distinguished Congresswoman, called "Mother" by admiring friends throughout the length and breadth of Africa, has visited 25 African nations in her official capacity as ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs African Subcommittee. In 1955 she made the first full-fledged congressional factfinding tour of the emerging continent, and in 1957 was an official U.S. delegate to the independence celebration of Ghana.

Mrs. BOLTON, whose unpublicized good works are legion, is understandably excited about plans for the African pavilion.

Designed by Ray Graham of Graham Associates, the exhibit will feature an exotic tree-house restaurant, native dancers, a waterfall, panoramic motion pictures of romantic Africa, and the finest African art borrowed from the Louvre and other world-famous galleries.

Animals and birds native to the Dark Continent can be viewed in a lifelike natural habitat. Elephants will pull trainloads of kiddies, and tame lions will pose for color pictures with brave moppets.

Ancient ritual, ceremonial and religious dances are to be performed in traditional costume, and the architecture of the numerous buildings, featuring the turreted, rondavo-type huts native to Africa, will provide a spectacular skyline for the fair.

American Negro organizations are to be invited to serve as ceremonial hosts, with the Ambassadors of the 23 African nations acting as honorary hosts for their individual exhibits.

Situated directly opposite the unisphere in the center of the fairgrounds, the African pavilion will undoubtedly be one of the most unique exhibits ever assembled at an international fair.

Except for the indomitable Congresswoman from Ohio, who refused to take "no" for an answer, the African nations could not have won this exciting place in the sun.

Poppies From Flanders Field Are Flown Here for Pershing Rites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, a great soldier and gentleman, the late General of the Armies John J. Pershing, was uniquely honored this past Veterans Day weekend.

A wreath of poppies from the historic Flanders Field was flown from Paris to Washington, presented, and displayed at Pershing Park in downtown Washington, and laid at the grave of General Pershing during services conducted by the Veterans of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the fine article describing these ceremonies as printed in the November issue of the Torch, the official newspaper of the Veterans of World War I:

POPPIES FROM FLANDERS FIELD ARE FLOWN HERE FOR PERSHING RITES

"In Flanders Field the poppies grow" is true today as it was in World War I when the Canadian doctor, Lt. Col. John McCrea, penned the now famous lines in memory of all those comrades in arms who were buried there.

For Veterans Day this year the metropolitan area council of veterans' organizations had arranged for a wreath of poppies from Flanders Field to be flown to Washington from Paris by Pan American Airways for the annual ceremonies honoring the memory of General of the Armies John J. Pershing, who commanded the American Expeditionary Forces in France in the First World War. The council, composed of State and district commanders of all veterans' organizations in this area, is headed by District of Columbia Veterans' Affairs Director Waldron E. Leonard.

The historic battlefield flowers arrived Saturday night at Dulles International Airport, kept in refrigeration until 1 o'clock Sunday afternoon, and delivered to the park at 15th Street NW., between Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street, which has been designated in various legislative proposals as the site for a Pershing memorial and is unofficially known as Pershing Square.

Here the floral piece was formally presented by Pan American officials to a delegation of French war veterans, who in turn presented it to Gen. Jacob L. Devers, veteran of both World Wars and Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission. With him were Gold Star Widows, American War Mothers, and an honor guard from Flanders Field barracks, World War I veterans, Members of Congress, especially those from Missouri, where Pershing was born, and others active in the Pershing Square legislative effort also participated. The wreath was on display for approximately 30 minutes against a background of massed colors of all veterans' organizations and auxiliaries.

At 1 o'clock Sunday afternoon it was delivered to Arlington National Cemetery, where General Devers made the formal placement during the annual graveside memorial services conducted annually by the Veterans of World War I.

Second Anniversary of Jacques Loewe Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to salute the Jacques Loewe Foundation in

Brooklyn on the occasion of its second anniversary.

We are all mindful of the enormous role played in health care by large hospitals which not only care for patients, but also maintain extensive training and research facilities. While we must not underestimate the importance of these institutions, too often we tend to overlook the contributions of small, voluntary, neighborhod hospitals.

This month, the nonprofit hospital of the Jacques Loewe Foundation, Brooklyn, celebrates its second anniversary under the auspices of the Loewe Foundation, a distinguished medical research organization. Over the past 2 years, this fine hospital has served residents of the Flatbush section of the borough in truly admirable fashion.

The hospital has steadfastly adhered to its pledge to provide "round the clock" emergency medical service, for it is keenly aware of the fact that about 800,000 people live in the immediate service area of the hospital, but there are less than 1,000 care beds available to them.

Since it was acquired by the Loewe Foundation, the hospital, under the expert direction of Administrator Robert Forhman, has seen a steady upward climb in its census in almost every area of activity. In all its efforts the hospital has maintained the highest possible health standards.

In the coming year, a member of every second family in Brooklyn will be hospitalized because of injury or sickness. The hospital of the Jacques Loewe Foundation therefore recognizes the need to expand and modernize its facilities in order to better serve the community.

Mr. Forhman, an astute and knowledgeable administrator, firmly believes that a friendly, personal touch is as vital to a patient's recovery as any other therapy or medication. This approach has therefore characterized the efforts of the entire hospital staff, and, I believe, the institution is to be saluted on its second anniversary for the eminent place it has earned in Brooklyn's hospital community.

IQ Cost of Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the cost of bias in the United States is no better demonstrated than in Prince Edward County, Va., where Negro children have lacked schools for the past 4 years. The following article, which reports the findings of a psychological team from Michigan State University, who are delving into this matter, is enough to turn one's stomach. I do not see how the most hardened segregationist could help but see the tragic results of his philosophy.

The article follows:

IQ COST OF BIAS: MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY TEAM FINDS WIDE EDUCATION GAP IN VIRGINIA CHILDREN LACKING SCHOOLS FOR 4 YEARS

(By William W. Lutz)

EAST LANSING, November 9.—With deep sympathy and understanding, a psychological team at Michigan State University is finding answers that may help rekindle the educational spark in 1,700 Negro children in Virginia's "Tragic County."

The MSU educational researchers are Dr. Robert Lee Green, a Negro, and Louis J. Hofmann, white, who last summer conducted an extensive study in Prince Edward County, Va., where an integration battle denied schooling to Negroes for almost 4 years.

ANSWERS STILL COMING

Answers from the investigation, which was supported by a $75,000 Federal research grant, will continue to pop from MSU computers for some weeks to come.

But already Green and Hofmann are funneling their startling data to representatives of a private school system which reopened schooling in the county this fall with a program heavily spiked with remedial classes.

"We found that more than 500 children between the ages of 6 and 10 who had never been to school as the result of closing of public institutions to them in 1959," Green said.

CAN'T HOLD PENCILS

Attempts to test the youngsters' intelligence quotients were beset by such basic difficulties as inability to hold a pencil properly and illiteracy.

"We had to send out for large crayolas which the children clinched in their fists to make crude X's on the test papers," he related.

Because test results showed the children had received little or no parental schooling during the 4 bleak years, remedial reading classes are being offered in the makeshift private school system from the 1st through the 12th grades.

"Some of the basic concepts of schooling were confusing to them," Green explained, "because they had never been exposed to a classroom situation."

The MSU tests were conducted in church basements. School desks were arranged to simulate a class setting.

CAN'T UNDERSTAND

"When we gave a simple instruction such as 'Please turn the page,' we found some would turn three or four pages.

"We learned that an inability to cope with test procedure hurt many of their scores. Some could not understand such simple instructions as 'Please match the objects drawn on this page by circling those that are alike.'

"Yet they knew what ducks and geese look like. They just couldn't match them up according to directions."

Some didn't know what the ringing of a school bell meant.

The survey is finding that the living environment of a county without schools not only failed to advance the children intellectually but set them back.

IQ's dropped progressively the longer children were out of school.

"Experience, reputedly the greatest of teachers, failed most of them," Hofmann declared, adding:

"One of the biggest tasks ahead is to elevate the 15- and 16-year-olds, which we found to have a fifth-grade level of knowledge, to high school status.

"This is pretty frightening when we consider that in 2 or 3 years these youngsters will be asked to compete in a job market that more and more demands greater formal schooling."

The researchers also are ferreting out information on the county's "brighter youngsters" so that they may be advanced more quickly in school. But these make up a small part of the problem.

"The bigger problem is to incite an interest in school in children who have run freely for so long," Green added. "They find sitting 4 and 5 hours at a stretch tedious and boring."

COOPERATE IN JOB

Classes opened this fall as the result of a cooperative effort of the U.S. Justice Department, State and local authorities. They are being financed through donations with larger sums from the Nation's foundations.

Virginia has opened public school buildings in the county's six school districts to the program. The private system pays the cost of maintaining the buildings.

Enrollment is 1,570 to date.

Both Green and Hofmann believe a bigger study is ahead, possibly a year hence.

"We want to see how much of the lost 4 years these youngsters can recapture," Green said, "and whether time is on our side."

U.S. Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on November 18 our distinguished colleague from the 16th District of Ohio, Congressman FRANK T. BOW, presented a significant address in Minneapolis, Minn., on the subject of the proper function of the U.S. Employment Service.

Because this area of Government operations is vitally important, I recommend the address to all Members of Congress and request that it be reproduced here:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK T. BOW AT THE MINNEAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

For the past 30 years, the central issue in American political life has been the proper role of the Federal Government.

There are those who argue that the Federal system is obsolete; that we have reached a point in our development where only a powerful Central Government can deal successfully with our economic and social problems; and that the systems of checks and balances between State and National Government, and between the branches of each, are inefficient and unresponsive to human needs.

I contend that the primary human need is individual liberty, and that individual liberty is assured and safeguarded by our Federal system as it is nowhere else on earth. I insist that the Federal system is serving us well. State and local governments have greatly expanded their activities in response to the new challenges of our times. Competitive free enterprise and individual initiative are playing dynamic roles in the growth and progress of the Nation. The problems of a diverse and complex society are being met and solved by these forces. The only flaw in an otherwise bright picture lies in Washington where an already powerful National Government is continually at work to extend its control over the States, private enterprise and individual opportunity.

Let us apply my description of the Federal system to the problem of unemployment in the United States.

In 1933 we decided to attack this problem as a Federal-State cooperative venture. We established a U.S. Employment Service, financed by a Federal tax on payrolls, to cooperate with State employment services, financed by a State tax on payrolls. It is the function of the Federal agency to supply administrative funds for the State systems. The State funds are used to pay unemployment compensation. This Government effort is supplemented, in the private sector, by the long-established group of businesses devoted to finding jobs for individuals. These employment agencies or placement agencies are operated for a profit, and they perform a useful service to the individual seeking a job and the business, school or industry searching for talent.

There is also a close liaison between the colleges of the Nation and large employers which helps to place each year's new crop of college men and women.

Various professions have special organizations that fulfill this function.

Other Federal, State, and local agencies provide vocational training, retraining, counseling and other services that help to equip individuals to find gainful employment.

This would appear to be an almost perfect balance of National and State Governments, business and individual teamwork to solve a social problem. It should be a good example of how the Federal system should work to accomplish a basic American purpose—the task of helping each person develop his individual ability to the fullest extent.

Unfortunately, it is not working well because the Federal agency concerned is trying to control or eliminate all of the others.

USES ENCROACHMENT

In my remarks I shall try to show you how the U.S. Employment Service is using its control of administrative funds to force the State employment services into new patterns of activity whether they like it or not; how the USES seems bent on putting the free enterprise placement agencies out of business; how it is intruding in the highly specialized fields of college placement and high school counseling: as well as why I believe it has turned its back on its own special responsibility—that of finding jobs for the unemployed, and is driving hard for complete control over the manpower resources of the United States.

In passing, I will mention how the creation of a new bureaucratic empire has brought with it the usual corruption and waste of taxpayers' money.

The USES was established in 1933 and charged with responsibility for finding employment for 13 million Americans who were out of work. That has always been its primary responsibility. No subsequent legislative enactments have given it any additional authority, yet Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, the Director of the Agency reads into the basic law far more than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the time reveals to the rest of us.

Two years ago the Kennedy administration, properly concerned with the problem of unemployment, asked for a large increase in funds for the USES and for the administration of the 50 State employment agencies as part of his major attack on that problem. Most Members of Congress agree that the continued joblessness of 5 percent of our labor force is an intolerable condition that demands remedy. We went along quite willingly with the suggestion that USES should tackle the job. The record of the past 2 years indicates that our confidence was misplaced. USES did not use the additional money to redouble its efforts in behalf of the 4 million chronically unemployed Americans. Instead, it launched the drive for manpower control that I have outlined for you.

BUREAUCRATIC EXPANSION

An example of what happened to the physical operation of the USES and the State agencies has been disclosed in Cleveland, Ohio.

Cleveland is one of 55 major metropolitan areas where USES asked the State agencies to abandon the traditional concept of a public employment service preoccupied with the problems of the unemployed, and develop a new image.

Administrators and employees were told that "we must reorient our program thinking, widen our perspective, and greatly improve our operating effectiveness. We must operate as the manpower agency, concerned with all aspects of human resource development and utilization in the labor market and the economy. It is intended that the employment office in each locality will become the community manpower center."

And part of the job was to provide "spacious, well-lighted and well-furnished quarters which will be attractive to professional applicants."

In Cleveland, Ohio, this mean that the employment service would be divorced from its longtime partner, the office for unemployment compensation. Historically, the two have operated in the same quarters, utilizing some of the same personnel, so that the unemployed worker who registered could draw his compensation and look for job openings at the same place. Now the employment service moved downtown, to spacious, well-lighted quarters where professional people might feel at home. Symbolically and as a matter of fact, the employment service turned its back on the unemployed.

The new and more spacious quarters needed new and more numerous employees. Throughout the country 4,700 people were added to the payroll. Cleveland hired 88. So far as I know, this was the greatest contribution the employment service made toward solving the unemployment problem in that city.

The 88 new people were divided into several small bureaus, each with a supervisor, with nothing much to do.

In private industry I believe it is the custom to hire a new man or woman only when the workload grows to the point that it cannot be handled satisfactorily by the old staff. In the bureaucracy, the opposite is true. As Mr. Goodwin told the Appropriations Committee last spring, his first job was to expand the staff by 4,700 jobs; the second job was to find work for these people to do. And in Cleveland, Mr. Goodwin's regional director put it this way:

"We knew that these 88 new people wouldn't immediately have enough work to earn their keep. They might be sitting around and worrying about it. But we are building a potential, and you have to start somewhere."

CORRUPTION UNCOVERED

What happened in Cleveland may be known to you by now. A new State director, Willard Dudley, was not impressed by the tremendous staff. He began to investigate and he found that some of these people were falsifying records to justify their jobs. The regional director said they didn't have to justify their jobs, but these were people less sophisticated in bureaucracy, and so they began to make false claims that individuals had been placed in jobs when, in fact, they were still unemployed.

This is great personal tragedy for the Government employees whose sense of insecurity in what they knew were featherbedding jobs caused them to make false statements. And it was an even greater tragedy for the unemployed whose records were falsely altered. It meant that they were no longer considered for job openings, because when one of these clerks wrote "hired" on an individual's card, that card went into an inactive file and the Government agency could make no further effort to place him.

Mr. Ward A. Riley, the civil servant in charge of the Cleveland office, dismissed the entire affair by saying that the falsification in Cleveland was really nothing new. He told a reporter that "you will find that in every employment office in the country. * * * It's been the pattern everywhere since 1930."

When the USES talks about the number of job placements, take the statistics with a grain of salt. No one knows how many people actually were placed. No one knows how many people were placed for only 1 day's work—perhaps as a circus roustabout—and went into the agency records as a "hire." And no one knows how many of these job placements involve the same individuals. One employment service official in Ohio placed his three sons in a total of 140 different jobs in the space of a year and claimed 140 placements on his record. We do know that even with the inflated claim of new placements for 1962, the total was about the same as placements 10 years ago.

The Cleveland case is an example of what happens when bureaucracy grows like Topsy. Disquieting as it may be, the overall program of USES and what it intends to do to the American way of life is far more alarming.

MANPOWER MONOPOLY

Let me give you now a brief outline of how USES is planning to become the manpower monopoly of the United States, with a manpower center in every community.

The new USES offices are designed to serve managerial, professional, sales, clerical, and technical personnel whether or not they are already employed. Men and women are urged to come in and discuss their ambitions with employment counselors. They are urged to become job applicants. Columns of newspaper advertisements are devoted to seeking applications for well-paid jobs. In short, the employment service is using the taxes you pay as a businessman to encourage your employees to leave your payroll and find greener pastures.

These are people who do not need taxpayer help to find work. They can find it for themselves, or they can use the services of a private enterprise placement agency if they wish, but they do not need public assistance. To the extent that they are receiving public assistance—as part of the USES campaign to establish itself as the manpower center of the community—the unemployed are being neglected.

USES also solicits employers and in some areas virtually strong-arms them in an effort to have them list job openings only with the public employment services. They want a closed shop from industry. List all of your job openings with us and hire only people that we refer to you is the theme of this campaign. Again, money and effort are being diverted from the unemployed who need help.

USES wants to take the place of the union hiring hall and some unions are agreeable to shifting this burden onto the Government agency.

USES officials believe that no person should be required to go to a fee-charging agency in order to get a job. The answer, of course, is that no person is required to do so. But the fee-charging private enterprise placement service is a legitimate American business and the Government has no right to try to destroy that business as USES is now trying to do.

USES is muscling in on the annual conventions of professional associations and societies, which have always been the scene of bargaining for jobs. The members of these

associations are capable, learned, and self-sufficient individuals. They can look out for themselves. Yet USES is establishing placement bureaus at such conventions. To the extent that it uses its money and effort for this purpose, it is neglecting the problems of the needy unemployed.

COLLEGE PLACEMENT

USES is interfering in the college placement system of the United States. Most colleges operate placement services and most large companies have college recruiting departments. They have long experience in fitting the right graduate to the right job. But to the dismay of the college officials and of the company officers concerned, USES is trying to take over this field of endeavor.

As David H. Morgan, director of college relations for Dow Chemical Co., said recently, the USES might possibly, after many years and many millions of dollars, provide a college placement service that was minimally adequate, but it cannot provide a service as satisfactory to the graduate, the college, and the company as is in effect today.

Mr. Morgan listened to some of the theories of USES officials and expressed alarm that their placement activities might lead them into undergraduate counseling and control of college curricula, and he expressed horror at the thought that this counseling and control might then extend into the high schools so that every boy and girl would have his career established under the careful guidance of some bureaucratic representative of Uncle Sam.

I have news for Mr. Morgan. High school guidance and counseling services are already being provided by the public employment service. I contend that USES has neither the legal authority nor the technical competence to do the job. It is a job for which other agencies of Federal, State, and local government already are responsible.

OUR LIBERTY THREATENED

Where does all this lead? What happens when USES and its State affiliates become the one and only manpower center for the United States?

It means that in my high school and college work I must accept the guidance of a Government employee or risk his displeasure. His displeasure may mean that I will be numbered among the forgotten unemployed, because his colleagues control employment. They have forced private agencies out of business and closed down the college placement services. They have won agreement with employers that only those who are referred from the public agency may be hired. And what happens if I wish to change jobs and better myself? Must I justify my reasons to a clerk in the Government service and win his approval before I can be referred to a new position? And, if I am an employer, must I accept whomever is sent to me to fill a job or risk the displeasure of the bureau?

If you know what is going on in Federal Government today you can add one more dimension. Federal employment today is based largely on political reliability. If USES becomes the manpower center of the community, will I need the okay of the chairman of the political party in power before I can get one of the better jobs?

This is where we are heading if we permit the public employment service to grow unchecked.

The statements of Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Levine, his assistant, and the statements and writings of dozens of other officials in the agency substantiate my conclusions. If any further proof is needed, I refer you to House Joint Resolution 607 recently introduced in the House of Representatives which would give congressional authorization to the activities I have described today.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, this is the story of a major breakdown in the Federal system, brought about by the determination of the men in one Government bureau to take over all services in a major area of American life. The unfortunate side effect has been that the agency established for the specific purpose of finding jobs for the unemployed has turned its major attentions from that responsibility and is engaging in a great many functions that are not its responsibility.

A narrow view might describe the problem as of concern only to the private enterprise placement services that are threatened by Government competition. The fact is that the similar problems confront the broadcasting industry, the newspaper industry, meatpacking, and one could go on. Thus it becomes a problem for all of us who are interested in the continued development of the Federal system of Government and in the preservation of the personal liberty and opportunity which only the federal system can guarantee.

The Flag and the Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Comdr. Gilbert Darlington, past commander of the New York chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars, has written a poem in tribute to the Stars and Stripes. His poem was composed and dedicated especially for the 42d annual massing and blessing of the colors.

Commander Darlington's poem reflects patriotism and service to the Nation in its highest form. I commend his poem to my colleagues:

THE FLAG AND THE CROSS

(Composed and dedicated especially for the 42d annual massing and blessing of the colors)

Salute your flag.
Help all our children see
Its Bill of Rights safeguards their destiny.
From reveille at dawn till taps each night
Persuade and drill them to uphold each right.

Honor your flag.
Hail its red, white, and blue:
Red from the blood of heroes shed for you.
White from eternal truth that sets men free,
Dark blue from skies where stars shine peacefully.

Treasure your flag.
Its thirteen sovereign states
Chose brotherhood instead of iron gates,
Discarded frontier walls, and threats of war,
To win much nobler freedom under law.

Respect your flag.
Don't sing, "In God We Trust,"
Then let its folds drag vilely in the dust.
Resolve that in your heart mankind shall see
The Stars and Stripes aloft in majesty.

Revere your flag.
The Founding Fathers gave
Their toil and blood. Their grandsons freed the slave.
Our task is to make war and hatred cease,
And train each child in our flag's pledge of peace.

—LT. COMDR. GILBERT DARLINGTON.

Diem Dedicated to Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Lt. Gen. John W. (Iron Mike) O'Daniel, U.S. Army, retired, which appeared in the San Diego, Calif., Union, Sunday, November 10, 1963. I was in Saigon following the surrender at Dien Bien Phu and witnessed the evacuation of the refugees from Hanoi into South Vietnam. I visited the resettlement areas and had a long visit with President Diem discussing the problems facing the new government. I was impressed by his dedication to create and preserve an anti-Communist South Vietnam.

I have charged the administration with the responsibility of the death of President Diem and his brother, as under the law, a conspirator is just as guilty as the man who holds the gun and commits the murder, and our administration was a conspirator in plotting the overthrow of the Diem government and, therefore, must assume the guilt. The story which General O'Daniel tells in the following article should be carefully read by every American:

DIEM DEDICATED TO CAUSE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—To Lt. Gen. John W. (Iron Mike) O'Daniel, U.S. Army, retired, who wrote the following article, the death of President Ngo Dinh Diem in the revolt in South Vietnam was a personal loss. He also believes it was a great loss to America and the cause of freedom everywhere. O'Daniel, who now resides in San Diego, was chief of the U.S. military delegation to South Vietnam in 1954 and 1955, when that country was just getting on its feet. O'Daniel became well acquainted with President Diem and his family in those 2 years, and has closely followed the progress of South Vietnam as a result of many subsequent visits.)

(By Lt. Gen. John O'Daniel, U.S. Army, retired)

When I think of Ngo Dinh Diem I think of Dien Bien Phu and the surrender of the French in May 1954, and I think of the upheaval it created in Vietnam.

I think of Geneva and the armistice of June 1954, and of the 17th parallel which divided the country; and that Ngo Dinh Diem did not agree with the terms of the armistice.

I think of the prediction by many people, Americans included, that Ngo Dinh Diem and South Vietnam would not last for 6 months.

I think of U.S. Task Force 90 under command of Admiral Sabin, which transported 400,000 refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam.

I think of Dr. Tom Dooley who administered to the sick and those maimed by the Communists as they came to Hyphong to embark to freedom.

I think of Ngo Dinh Diem during his first few weeks in Saigon, and of the chaos that existed.

I think of 800,000 refugees who had to be resettled and the way he did it.

I think of the land he provided for them so that they could begin rebuilding their lives.

I think of the day that Bao Dai ordered General Vy to take over the premiership of South Vietnam from Ngo Dinh Diem; I think of Ngo Dinh Diem and his stubborn reaction and his statement, "I am staying."

I think of how he allowed the general to escape from those who would have shot him. I think then of those Vietnamese generals whom he trusted.

I think of Ngo Dinh Diem's desire to rebuild his armed forces and how pleased he was to see it accomplished. Then I think of how they were persuaded by many things to turn against him.

I think of the Vietnamese officers I knew and it seems incredible that they would turn against their duly elected President without a nod from someone.

I think of May 1955, and the armed attack by the Binh Xuyen against the Saigon military posts.

I think of Diem's cool appraisal of the situation, of the fact that he knew his own people and that it was necessary to counterattack and destroy the insurgent group.

I think of the French and American people in Saigon in high-level positions, who advised against a counterattack for fear it would start the Communists shooting again.

I think of the counteroffensive and the complete destruction of the Binh Xuyen without a murmur from the Communists.

I think of Ngo Dinh Diem's astuteness in bringing other dissident groups into his government. I think of his election as President of his country by winning over 90 percent of the votes.

I think of that time because I was in Vietnam and noted that the voting was done without coercion of any kind.

I think of the General Assembly that was formed with 125 Members, 12 of whom were women.

I think of Ngo Dinh Diem when he said to me, "We are in a war, a war to the finish; and I have to act as a general would act and direct my people toward winning."

I think of the rebuilding of 1,000 school buildings. I think of school attendance jumping from 400,000 in 1956 to 1,500,000 in 1960.

I think of the founding of the University of Hue, of Diem's pride in it; and of my visit there in 1958 when it was beginning to flourish.

I think of Ngo Dinh Diem's land reform program when he bought up thousands of acres from large-scale landowners and resold the land to peasant farmers.

I think of the day in 1956 when I accompanied him to Soc Trang and was requested by him to hand out one of the first certificates of ownership to a beaming peasant farmer.

I think of visits with him to newly built villages in central Vietnam which housed people from overpopulated areas on the coast.

I think of those villages and that they were strategically placed to intercept infiltrators from Laos and Cambodia.

I think of an evening at Ban-Me-Thuot when we had returned from a long hard visit to new villages in the interior, wherein the President had walked among the people and talked to them and, in the evening, we sat and discussed his pet project and how enthusiastic he was to do more.

I think of the fact that an entire textile mill that had been transported from North Vietnam piece by piece was rebuilt and employment provided for many people.

I think of per capita food production having risen by 20 percent in 4 years. I think of how rice production had expanded to export totals of 150,000 tons per year.

I think of how important is "face" to the oriental. I think of how it takes about 6 months to be trusted by the oriental. He is suspicious until you prove that you are to be trusted regardless of nationality.

I think of the recent flare-up by the Buddhists and the fact that the Chinese Communists have instructed their Buddhists: First, understand politics; second, understand labor problems; and last, "Then you may worship."

I think of the charges made against Ngo Dinh Diem that he was oppressing the Buddhists.

Then I think of the fact that the Vice President of Vietnam was a Buddhist; that 50 percent of the General Assembly were Buddhists; that 16 out of 19 South Vietnam generals are Buddhists, and that Ngo Dinh Diem had rebuilt some Buddhist pagodas with his own money.

I think of the student uprisings and of Dr. De Jaegher, who spent many years in China and was there during the Communist takeover; and of his book, "The Enemy Within," and his description of how Communist cells were recruited from the graduates of one university and were matriculated as freshmen in other schools in order to carry out propaganda and insurrection.

When I think of Ngo Dinh Diem I remember a day a few years ago in Washington, D.C., when I saw him arrive at the airport there, where he was met by the President of the United States, and afterward they rode in state together to the White House.

Then I think of a day or two afterward, when I sat in the gallery in the Senate and saw Ngo Dinh Diem receive a rising ovation from a joint session of our Congress.

I think of all these things and then I think of the propaganda against Ngo Dinh Diem ever since he came to office.

I think of a series of newspaper articles that appeared 4 or 5 years ago, about corruption in Vietnam and how congressional investigation proved the charges practically without foundation.

I think of the sniping and smearing that has been going on in many areas of our communication media, of cartoons to ridicule Ngo Dinh Diem and his family.

I think of the well-intentioned, well-known but misguided Americans who signed a petition, in the form of a paid ad in the New York Times, which castigated Ngo Dinh Diem.

I think of what Ngo Dinh Diem's feelings must have been when so-called friends deserted him when he needed them most.

I think of the glee with which the Communists from North Vietnam broadcast via radio Hanoi these damaging statements to all of southeast Asia.

I think of the way the flame was fanned against Ngo Dinh Diem and how an additional spark was all that was needed to set off the powder keg.

I think of all these things and then I think of Ngo Dinh Diem, the man; small in physical stature, determined, patriotic, anti-Communist, deeply religious, sincere, with the love of his country and its welfare an obsession.

I think of one of his brothers who was buried alive by the Communists.

I think of Ngo Dinh Diem as the strongest anti-Communist ally that we had.

I think of the statement made on November 4, 1963, by Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin—who headed a House Foreign Affairs Committee that visited Vietnam less than a month ago—that "President Diem impressed us as a dedicated nationalist; sincere, incorruptible and determined to defeat the Communist Vietcong."

I think of all these things and I wonder why a man of such proven ability was overthrown and murdered.

I think of all these things and they all add up to a concerted effort to destroy a man who didn't always follow our advice and do the things we thought he should do.

I think of these things and then I think that Ngo Dinh Diem knew his own people and how to handle them. I think he recognized the war there better than we.

I think again as Representative ZABLOCKI does: There must have been "some encouragement" for the revolt. I think someone, somewhere, gave the nod.

I think of the trust Ngo Dinh Diem must have had in surrendering to the junta as he did, and how a duly elected president of a brave little country was betrayed and brutally murdered.

I think of these things and my heart is heavy and my ire is beyond expression.

I know I will always remember Ngo Dinh Diem; the many good and fine things that he did as well as some of the mistakes; but that the good things far outweight the errors.

I will remember all these things; how he lived and the way he died. I hope America will never forget.

Copperhill is Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Georgia is filing a suit before the U.S. Supreme Court making an unwarranted claim to Tennessee territory. I take this opportunity to put Tennessee on record as ready, willing, and able to maintain the right of our citizens to continue living in the finest State in the Union.

Apparently, the Governor of Georgia is trying to attract new industry to his State, and he is not unaware of the existence of our Tennessee Copper Co.—a thriving and progressive business happily located in the rich copper basin of my congressional district. Even so, the people of the disputed area are Tennesseans, and the Volunteer State has pledged to protect them from the present attempt at gerrymandering.

Tennessee was admitted to the Union in 1796 with uncertain borders with eight surrounding States. However, as early as 1817 interested parties from Tennessee and Georgia met and agreed to the present State boundary; it is somewhat south of the 35th parallel which Georgia erroneously claims as the border. I am told the legislatures of both States approved the existing borderline in 1819, thus it is difficult to understand the current distraction from the more pressing problems now facing our States and our Nation.

When the line was drawn, there was no error of surveying; there was no misjudgement—but there was an agreement to the accepted boundary. We fully expect Georgia to live up to its word, and to continue to utilize the more normal and acceptable programs for growth which have made it an outstanding example of our progressive and prosperous new south.

Western Connecticut Site Suggested for NASA Electronics Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, at my request, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, conducted a hearing at which testimony was presented in support of locating the proposed NASA Electronics Research Center in western Connecticut. In the course of this hearing, I had the privilege of introducing several prominent officials and residents of western Connecticut who offered impressive testimony of the advantages of locating the proposed center in the section of Connecticut which I represent.

I am confident that the Space Agency and the people who staff it would gain measurably from a Connecticut location for this new research center, authorized by Public Law 88–113.

With permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD, a copy of the statement which I made at the hearing:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, FIFTH DISTRICT, BEFORE DR. HUGH L. DRYDEN, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, OF THE COMMITTEE FOR INVESTIGATION OF SITES FOR THE NASA ELECTRONICS RESEARCH CENTER, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

I appear here today to ask NASA to locate its proposed Electronics Research Center (authorized by Public Law 88–113) in western Connecticut.

I am grateful to the Agency for giving me and interested citizens and officials from my section of Connecticut the opportunity to come here today to outline the advantages of locating in our section of the State.

We appear before you today with the honest conviction that western Connecticut offers an excellent site for your new facility. In making this claim, we do not desire to appear parochial. We do not maintain that there is any magic line dividing one part of the State from the other. We agree that many other areas in the State would provide desirable locations but these locations will be described and supported by others. We, therefore, wish to make certain that the committee and the Agency have clearly in mind the undoubted advantages of the portion of the State from which we come.

We strongly believe that Connecticut and its institutions and people can contribute something to the Space Agency. We do not view this project simply as one from which Connecticut can gain employment and economic activity important though that may be. We are confident that the Space Agency and the people who staff it would gain measurably from a Connecticut location for this new research center.

I should like briefly to set forth some of the advantages of a western Connecticut location.

Waterbury, the center of western Connecticut, is located 1½ hours from New York City and 2 hours from Boston by automobile. It is within 22 miles of the great educational center at Yale University and a comparable distance from Wesleyan University and Trinity College. A slightly larger circle of 130 miles includes Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and innumerable other important educational institutions.

In addition to the convenient location, in Connecticut, of the institutions which I have mentioned, I wish to emphasize to the committee the existence of another project which will be of vital importance to the scientific municipality. This is the formation and organization of the Associated Universities of Connecticut, a joint enterprise wherein the resources of eight of Connecticut's institutions of higher learning are being joined in a cooperative venture to provide unprecedented educational advantages for scientists and engineers in the increasingly complex industrial society of the future.

Clearly, these educational facilities come within the first requirement which Administrator James E. Webb has set forth as a criterion for the new research center.

The second requirement was the location in an area where the industrial community had allied technical interests and was research oriented. Once again, our qualifications are impressive. Connecticut ranks first in the United States in the number of industrial research laboratories per capita. There are about 360 in Connecticut and they employ about 5,700 engineers and scientists and 6,300 supporting technical personnel. Western Connecticut has 60 research laboratories with a combined technical staff of close to 1,500 research workers. Anaconda American Brass recently built a $1.5 million research center in Waterbury and the U.S. Rubber Co. is now constructing a multimillion dollar Management Information Center in Naugatuck.

The general qualifications of western Connecticut are impressive too. Our electric and water resources are highly developed and this would be an important factor in the consideration of the new agency. We have a reservoir of highly skilled labor that is unparalleled in the country.

Our network of high speed highways provides quick and safe connection between Connecticut cities and with major metropolitan centers.

Our grammar and secondary schools are excellent and one has only to mention the names of Taft, Hotchkiss, Canterbury, and Kent to realize that our secondary schools rank in excellence with our institutions of higher learning.

Our area has a relatively low population density and thus the dispersal factor would be extremely favorable in comparison to location in a metropolitan area. This would be true both in connection with defense against enemy attack and in insulation against the interference and irritations which would come from a location in close proximity to a major population center.

One vital factor should not be missed. It is the unquestionable fact that Connecticut is a satisfying place in which to live. With its bustling cities and its cool, beautiful, trim, and well managed towns, with its cultural activities, its art galleries, its symphony orchestras, its art festivals, and its magnificent and varied scenery, Connecticut is one of the most attractive residential areas in the whole Nation. Its people may enjoy the advantages of urban and rural living without the crowding and congestion of the large city, while remaining within easy reach of the two major cities of the northeast.

I submit, therefore, that western Connecticut provides to an ample degree the educational facilities, the industrial technology, and the ideal living conditions which are required by the space agency. It is my recommendation and my earnest hope that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration consider favorably our recommendation that its new Electronics Research Center be located in one of the sites in western Connecticut which will be set forth in detail by later witnesses. At my request, material has been furnished by the Connecticut State Development Commission setting forth in detail various recommended sites in western Connecticut and outlining the outstanding qualifications of the State of Connecticut for the location of the Center. I ask that this report be made a part of the record and that the committee examine it carefully for the wealth of material and pertinent data which it contains.

I shall now proceed to call upon the various private and public officials from western Connecticut who will present various details of our case.

All of us fully appreciate that the details of site selection may very well be left to another time. We shall feel that we have done our job today, however, if we shall have left with this committee a lasting impression of the outstanding qualifications of western Connecticut for the location of the new NASA Research Center.

Rev. Francis J. Early Succumbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Hoosier, Christian gentleman, and a valiant American soldier died November 7, 1963, in Indianapolis, Ind.

I refer to the Reverend Francis J. Early, pastor-founder of Holy Spirit Catholic Church and former U.S. Army chaplain.

Under unanimous consent I include the following article from the November 8, 1963, Indianapolis Star in the RECORD. It provides an accurate summation of Father Early's fine career:

The Reverend Francis J. Early, pastor-founder of Holy Spirit Catholic Church and former U.S. Army chaplain who was cited for heroism during World War II, died last night in St. Vincent's Hospital. He was 60 years old.

Father Early, who was admitted to the hospital on October 16, had undergone surgery for a circulatory ailment.

He began organizing the new Holy Spirit Parish following his discharge from the Army soon after the end of the war in 1945. This assignment was begun under Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter, later to become cardinal at St. Louis. Father Early served briefly at Little Flower Church here while organizing Holy Spirit Parish.

The first building erected under Father Early's direction for the new parish was the priests' house, completed in the spring of 1946. The living room was used for the parish chapel.

With the building of the school in 1948, the chapel was moved into that structure, one wing of which also housed the sisters who taught in the school. In 1952 a convent for the nuns was completed.

The erection of the church itself was completed in 1958. Holy Spirit Parish is one of the largest in the Indianapolis archdiocese, despite its area having been curtailed upon the opening of St. Simon's Parish in 1960.

Father Early was cited for heroism after accompanying an expedition to the site of an airplane crash on a high mountain in north Africa so that the 24 victims might get proper burial.

As an Army chaplain during the north African campaign of World War II, Father Early risked his life with other American, British, and Arab members of the expedition to reach the isolated wreckage of the plane.

Born in Indianapolis, he attended SS. Peter and Paul elementary school and St. Meinrad Seminary where he was ordained to the priesthood in June 1927 by Bishop Joseph Chartrand.

In July 1927, he was appointed assistant pastor of St. Philip Neri Church.

In 1938, he was appointed pastor of St. Joseph's Catholic Church at Corydon.

In 1942 he joined the U.S. Army, and was commissioned a lieutenant in the Chaplain's Corps. When he completed his military service he held the rank of lieutenant colonel.

He served as chaplain at the 38th General Hospital at Camp Bowie, Tex., and later became post chaplain.

He arrived in Cairo, Egypt, November 1, 1942, during the fighting nearby between the British and German General Rommel's Africa Corps.

Father Early later became chief of chaplains in that theater of war.

While studying for the priesthood, Father Early in 1926 served as superintendent of playgrounds for the Indianapolis Park Department, holding the job which later was to be filled by a city recreation director.

Very Rev. Msgr. Cornelius B. Sweeney, chancellor of the archdiocese of Indianapolis, said:

"The death of Father Early is a great loss to the Catholic Church and the community in Indianapolis. His years in the priesthood were spent in useful labor for God and country. Many of his works are evident in such things as the parish, church, and school he erected. But only God knows the great spiritual blessings he has brought by his priestly life. To his family, friends, and parishioners we extend our heartfelt sympathy."

Word of Father Early's death was sent by Monsignor Sweeney to Archbishop Paul C. Schulte in Rome where he is attending the Vatican Ecumenical Council.

Funeral arrangements are being made by the Feeney-Kirby Mortuary.

Friends may call at the mortuary after noon Saturday. Father Early will lie in state in Holy Spirit Church from 3:30 p.m. Sunday until time for funeral services at 11 a.m. Monday.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. James P. Galvin will be celebrant at the requiem solemn high mass assisted by the priests' choir of the archdiocese.

The Men's Club of Holy Spirit Church will form a guard of honor during the time Father Early will lie in state.

Vespers for the dead will be conducted at 3:30 p.m. Sunday in the church, while the office for the dead will be offered at 10:30 a.m. Monday, preceding the funeral mass.

He was the son of Henry P. Early and brother of the late Maurice Early, who was political editor and columnist of the Indianapolis Star.

Survivors include his mother, Mrs. Emma F. Early of Indianapolis; three brothers, John R. Early of Brownsville, Tex.; Robert P. Early, managing editor of the Indianapolis Star, and Philip L. Early of Indianapolis, and four sisters, Mrs. Eileen Cissell, Mrs. Catherine Moran, Miss Mary R. Early, all of Indianapolis, and Sister Jane de Chantal, a member of the Sisters of Providence Order.

Vital Measures Delayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the prolonged delay in the legislative process of the House of Representatives has become a matter of national concern. The failure of leadership to present legislative issues for their ultimate votes has been the subject of much editorial comment throughout the Nation.

It is true there are times when underlegislation is better than overlegislation, but a point is soon reached where important legislative matters of concern to the people of this country seem to be avoided in a manner verging on subterfuge. A directness by the executive branch of Government toward legislation could lead to enactment or rejectment by a perceptive Congress. It would be indeed a refreshing experience for the American people in this year 1963.

I am placing in the RECORD today an editorial from the Meadville Tribune, Meadville, Pa., which clearly expresses the irritations and frustrations which the people of the Nation feel concerning this administration and this Congress:

VITAL MEASURES DELAYED

President Kennedy has all but given up hope that tax reduction and civil rights legislation will be passed this year. Failure to enact at least one of the measures would indict Congress as being unconcerned about the national welfare.

If Congress is unable to take action on two such significant measures—one to guarantee the basic rights of all Americans, the other to spur the economy toward new heights—what can citizens expect of their national legislative body?

All of us, from the President right on down to each individual citizen, share the blame. Mr. Kennedy has been less forceful than he might have been. He has not used the full power and prestige of his office to induce Congressmen to action. The congressional leadership of both parties, particularly that of the majority Democratic Party, has been ineffective. The people themselves have failed to become sufficiently aroused to demand that their representatives act.

But, basically, the fault lies with Congress and its outmoded procedures. The legislative branch can move quickly when faced with an emergency, as it demonstrated last summer when confronted with a railroad strike threat. But archaic regulations permit Congress to tie up indefinitely legislation which may be controversial or which a minority of powerful Congressmen may oppose. Tax reduction and civil rights bills have been subjected to endless hearings which require witnesses to repeat their testimony before House and Senate committees.

Civil rights, additionally, faces a filibuster when it reaches the Senate floor, making its early submission more imperative.

Congress may be forgiven its lackadaisical attitude toward some legislation. It would be almost physically impossible to consider the 405 legislative requests made by the President and, indeed, some of them deserve to be shelved permanently. But needless congressional delay on legislation so vital to the Nation's social and economic welfare as civil rights and tax reduction cannot be excused.

It's Still Armistice Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following article by Mr. Dan Kidney which appeared in the November 11, 1963, edition of the Washington News:

IT'S STILL ARMISTICE DAY

(By Dan Kidney)

(NOTE.—Mr. Kidney, for years a Scripps-Howard Washington correspondent, now retired, taps his memory for how life was with the American doughboy in the mud of France, 45 years ago.)

"You men of Illinois, I envy you. Each and every one of you."

When Illinois Gov. Frank O. Lowden coined this bit of "campaign oratory" in 1917 he was addressing the troops of the 33d Division of the Illinois National Guard (of which I was one) at their embarkation point.

We had not yet been issued our oversea uniforms and could only wrap ourselves in Army blankets when mustered out in the rain to hear our Governor talk.

There can be no doubt that it was an inspirational speech. We could not forget it, at least those first two lines. When our column of infantry was slogging along in the rain and mud of Northern France in that winter of 1917–18, those words became our battle cry.

Sometimes the front of the column, sometimes the rear, began the chant, "You men of Illinois, I envy you. Each and every one of you." As the rest of the column took up the refrain, a mounted officer galloped down the line warning us to be quiet—we were in enemy territory. But as soon as he passed the chant began again, and the officer would come, buckety-buck back through the mud, to warn us again. He wore himself out on that horse.

It seems quite possible that this speech to the 33d Division may have contributed to Governor Lowden's defeat for the GOP presidential nomination in 1920.

Soldiers don't seem to take to speech-making—particularly the inspirational kind. We heard a number of such speeches that winter, especially from Secretary of War Newton D. Baker. After a particularly lengthy oration in which he told us how we were "making the world safe for democracy," he asked if there were any questions. In unison the doughboys shouted, "When do we eat?"

These incidents are what we recount when we reminisce about World War I on November 11—Veterans Day. Perhaps this is a better name for that day—but to us who fought in the trenches of France that winter of 1917–18 and remember the mud and the blood—well, today is still Armistice Day.

The Lynchburg (Va.) Advance Strongly Backs the Patman Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Lynchburg, Va., newspaper Advance, published on October 22, 1963, an editorial strongly backing the latest report by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, who has been investigating tax-exempt foundations with assets running into billions of dollars. The editorial states that—

The long-suffering U.S. taxpayer should find Representative PATMAN's facts and charges most interesting, and fervently hope that his efforts will result in speedy congressional action to correct these abuses.

Representative PATMAN's latest blast excoriates the Treasury Department and IRS for "indefensible apathy" and "archaic procedures" which he contends "have encouraged certain owners of foundations to exploit their tax-exempt status for personal gain and for the benefit of others with whom they are affiliated.

The Lynchburg newspaper advises its readers that "not only is the Internal Revenue Service disregarding the laws regulating tax-exempt foundations, but the latter are also ignoring them" and goes on to point out that—

"No less than 55 percent of the 546 foundations examined by us," say Representative PATMAN, "failed to comply with certain Treasury regulations during 1 or more years. To date, the granting of Federal tax exemptions to foundations has been a mere formality. The record proves that, as far as the Treasury is concerned, an organization becomes charitable by merely describing itself as such."

I include this editorial for the information of my colleagues, since it will be of particular interest to officials in the Department of the Treasury.

THE PATMAN REPORT

The U.S. Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service are indifferently making a mockery of enforcing the laws regulating the hundreds of tax-exempt foundations with assets running into billions of dollars. As a result of this shocking nonfeasance the Government is annually losing tens of millions in taxes.

This, in essence, is the scathing accusation in the latest report, released over the weekend, by Representative PATMAN, the Texas Democrat and chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, who has been investigating these foundations and their complex financial and business operations and manipulations for several years.

The long-suffering U.S. taxpayer should find Representative PATMAN's facts and charges most interesting, and fervently hope that his efforts will result in speedy congressional action to correct these abuses.

Representative PATMAN's latest blast excoriates the Treasury Department and IRS for indefensible apathy and archaic procedures, which he contends have encouraged certain owners of foundations to exploit their tax-exempt status for personal gain and for the benefit of others with whom they are affiliated.

IRS Commissioner Caplin draws scorching criticism. He is bluntly assailed for doing a lot of talking but little law enforcing. "Our findings show that the Internal Revenue Service record, in terms of supervision of foundations, is a dud, a dismal failure," says the report.

While the Commissioner deplores the lack of such supervision prior to 1961 and has released torrents of words during the past 2 years, assuring the Congress and the public that the Internal Revenue Service is engaged in intensive examination of tax-exempt foundations, there is no recognizable sign of progress in this area.

"Signs are multiplying that (1) the Internal Revenue Service cannot meet its responsibilities through ringing statements by Commissioner Caplin, press agentry, and public relations gimmickery, and (2) fewer speeches by the Commissioner could conceivably enable him to answer his congressional mail in under 30 to 60 days."

Not only is the IRS disregarding the laws regulating tax-exempt foundations, but the latter are also ignoring them.

"No less than 55 percent of the 546 foundations examined by us," says Representative PATMAN, "failed to comply with certain Treasury regulations during one or more years. To date, the granting of Federal tax exemptions to foundations has been a mere formality. The record proves that, as far as the Treasury is concerned, an organization becomes 'charitable' by merely describing itself as such.

"Once the exemption has been granted, there is little or no check on the foundation's operations. Perhaps significantly, the Revenue Commissioner has indicated that he favors a minimum of Federal control over tax-exempt foundations. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that the Treasury prefers to remain arrogantly ignorant of the enormous concentrations of economic and financial power among foundations.

"The ever-increasing drift of wealth into such organizations does not seem to bother the Department one bit, even though the result is an erosion of our tax base impairing the revenues of the Federal Government. * * * In my view, the use of foundations as business devices and for tax avoidance has become a major economic evil and must be stopped. Otherwise we will degenerate into a Nation with one law for the rich and another for the poor."

The Patman report charges flatly that the IRS officials lack the zeal and know-how "for thorough supervision of tax-exempt foundations" and the big 407-page document spells out in exhaustive detail the basis for this blazing accusation. Consider this shocking summary:

Four hundred and thirty-three foundations had no field audit. The 433 foundations had assets ranging from $2,423 to $2.1 billion, with a combined value of no less than $8.6 billion.

The 10 largest foundations had no field audit. Their assets ranged from $131.2 million to $2.1 billion, with a combined value of no less than $4.6 billion.

One hundred and fifteen foundations (combined asset value $7.8 billion) each having assets of $10 million or more—had no field audit. These 115 foundations represent approximately 72 percent of the 160 foundations having assets of at least $10 million each with a combined asset value of $9.2 billion.

Eleven Rockefeller-controlled foundations—out of 14 Rockefeller-controlled foundations (combined asset value $1,089,322,230)—had no field audits. The 11 foundations had assets ranging from $11,863 to $536 million, with a combined value of $1,016,440,732.

Eight Ford-controlled foundations—out of nine Ford-controlled foundations (combined assets value $2,240,289,227)—had no field audit. The eight foundations had assets ranging from $455,851 to $2.1 billion, with a combined value of no less than $2.2 billion.

None of the five Carnegie foundations had field audits. The five foundations had assets ranging from $10 million, with a combined value of no less than $413 million.

Four Mellon-controlled foundations—out of six Mellon-controlled foundations (combined asset value $241 million)—had no field audit. The four foundations had assets ranging from $5.6 million to $78.7 million, with a combined value of no less than $160 million.

Six Du Pont-controlled foundations—out of nine Du Pont-controlled foundations (combined asset value $175.6 million)—had no field audit. The six foundations had assets ranging from $13,221 to $7.5 million, with a combined value of no less than $18.8 million.

A Debt of Ignorance and Unpreparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz made a memorable address when he highlighted the 75th anniversary banquet of the International Association of Machinists in Seattle, Wash., September 21.

Many valuable points were stressed, but one, in particular, cannot be overemphasized. He said:

I hear about not passing debts on to the next generation. The one debt I don't want to see us pass on to the next generation is the debt of ignorance and unpreparedness which will mean they can't make their own way. That's the one thing we can't do as far as this next generation is concerned.

Then Secretary Wirtz proceeded to call meaningless the 5½-percent unemployment rate in the Nation unless one also recognizes that "unemployment in this country for people with education of less than a seventh grade level is 9½ percent and unemployment for persons with a college education or more is 1½ percent."

Secretary Wirtz also called attention to the founding of the International Association of Machinists in "that locomotive pit in Atlanta 75 years ago" and saluted the organization as "builders of democracy's past and who are today the architects of its future."

I was not able to attend this 75th anniversary banquet. However, my colleague from the State of Washington, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, was in attendance.

Our Washington machinists have told me many times of their appreciation that Secretary Wirtz could be with them and deliver this powerful message.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Wirtz' address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY'S MANPOWER PROBLEMS

(By the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor)

The most serious economic fact in this country today is the fact that 4 million people who want to work are being denied the opportunity to do so. You are pointing out that the effect of this is exactly the same upon the economy as if the whole country were to come to a halt with no production, no service, no profit, no pay for a 3-week period out of the year. You are pointing out that with 4 million people in this country unemployed, the result is exactly the same in its effect as the loss of from $30 to $40 billion in the growth of our gross national product and you are saying there is no excuse for this and we must do something about it. And you are pressing in connection with this problem on all three of the principal action fronts across which it seems to me we must move if we are to achieve the goal and the purpose of full employment. Senator JACKSON has already referred to these briefly and I would develop them only slightly more.

You have said, in the first place, with a voice loudest of all of those and clearest in American labor, full employment in this country is dependent upon development of substantially larger markets for American products. You have led the fight for the development of the export trade of this Nation. You fly over your national headquarters in Washington every day, and I think you are the only union in the country who does, the "E" flag for exports conferred by the Department of Commerce.

At your 25th quadrennial convention in St. Louis in 1960 you debated whether you were to follow the protective line, whether you were to hide behind the maginot line of protective tariffs. And then President Al Hayes convened the session in Washington in 1962 and you decided after 3 days of debating this problem that you would not follow that line and you announced a positive world trade policy for labor. You have recognized that every $1 billion of exported goods from this country means about 150,000 more jobs for men and women in this country, and you have realized that as the work force grows at the rapid rate at which it is now growing we are dependent for full employment upon the development of larger markets in the world as a whole. You have spoken the truest voice of labor's interest in the enlarged welfare of the whole Nation when you have adopted the kind of policy you have with respect to the development of our foreign trade.

Second, there is the importance to which Senator JACKSON has also already referred of the tax reduction program. We will not have full employment in this country unless we can put the economy to a pace which it has not yet achieved. We recognize fully that this is almost entirely a matter for domestic private development and yet we know, Senator JACKSON has pointed out, that it is important that the economy be freed of the fetters which now bind it in the present tax system. It is essential to the development of full employment in this country that there be that invigoration of the economy which will come from the release of another $11 billion of consumer purchasing power. And when I see men of smaller minds saying that it's only a little bit for each of a great many people in this country, I can only point out that it does mean that another $11 billion will be spent through consumer channels in this country and that that will mean an uncountable number of additional jobs.

I can't tell you how many the economists figure out with their accelerators and their multipliers, and so on and so forth, what it will mean—I don't know how many more jobs it will mean. You can't tell for sure. I say to you as sternly as I can muster the facts that it is essential to full employment in this country that this step be taken. I think it is essential that it be taken this year. It seems to me there is a crisis before us which must be met and met quickly. I can only express strongly as I possibly can the view which the President, of course put so much better on Wednesday night when he said that we have got to face immediately the problem of developing 10,000 new jobs a day in this country. That's 10 million new jobs in the next 2½ years and it is essential to this that we put into the purchasing power of this country the benefits of this tax program, that we stimulate investment in production by passing the new tax reduction program.

Now the third point, the one upon which you have placed most emphasis recently and the one which I should like to develop in just a little more detail this evening. The third point is that you are facing squarely in this organization the issue of the relationship between men and machines. At your golden anniversary celebration 25 years ago you said this, "Gold and silver are still, as in the past, the important precious metals but iron and steel have crept into the lives of men until today they seem to rule the world." Today, at your 75th anniversary it seems that machines are creeping into the lives of men and sometimes that they are asserting dominion over the future.

The answer of the International Association of Machinists is again in the finest tradition. It is not that automation should be opposed for it cannot be opposed. It is rather that, as President Hayes has put it, "We welcome automation because we know that it can improve and enrich the lives of workers both on and off the job." But even more importantly, automation is obviously the means by which we can eventually release mankind all over the world from the grip of historic scarcity. You insist at the same time and with equal vigor, and again in President Hayes' words, "The purpose of technological progress must be the advancement of the welfare of people as a whole and not the means of making a portion of our citizenry expendable." You insist, and properly, that replacing a man with a machine is not progress unless there is an opportunity given that man for other kinds of work. You agreed, a little more lightly, that necessity is the mother of invention but you insist that invention should not be the mother of necessity.

As I read last night President Kennedy's magnificent speech yesterday at the U.N., I thought of how much of a parallel there is today between the central international and domestic issues of our times. In both areas, in the area of international relationships or the area of war, in the area of domestic concern or the area of work, the science of things has moved way out in front of the science of people. The question today is whether we are going to know how to use the scientific knowledge that has suddenly been thrust upon us. "The question about the new instruments of war," President Kennedy said, "is whether we can be as bold and farsighted in the control of them as we have been in their creation."

And this is the central question, too, about the new instruments of work. Here, unlike the other area, the answer cannot be to stop their use. It must be rather to use them to the full and to do those things which will permit this, and at the same time to increase people's standards of living and their freedom and their usefulness. Now this isn't just going to happen. I don't propose to engage in debate or controversy about whether automation produces more jobs than it destroys. There can be only one answer to this question and that is, that there are going to be more jobs in the future than there are now. We are not going to put up with the present situation. There are between a million and a million and a half more people in the work force every year. In addition, there must be the cutting down of the present figure of unemployment, and in addition to that we must provide jobs for those whose places are taken by machines. There is only one answer to this and this is, that we are going to do it. And if the question is about how, I say that we will get there, not for the passing of any magic wand or the supplying of a single answer but by attending to the various parts of this problem which present themselves. The approach through the development of foreign trade is one, the approach through the stimulation of the economy through the tax reduction and other similar programs is another, and a third of great importance and one which falls particularly within the area of concern and responsibility of the Department of Labor is through the development of a training program which will bring people in this country into a position to make use of the new opportunities and to fill the new demands of the technological world. And I would like to talk just a little more about this.

Thirty days from today 800,000 people will be at different jobs from the ones in which they are today. Thirty days from today 400,000 of them will be doing something different from what they are doing today. Most of the retraining job is going to have to be done privately, but another substantial part of it has got to be done publicly. And when I say publicly, I mean to include the whole educational system as we now have it and know it. I say to you in complete humility with whatever license the spending of most of a lifetime in teaching gives me, that I think the educational system in the country today is falling every day further behind the demands of the new world of work. I think it for these reasons; it used to be all right to train everybody for college and not to worry too much about those who, taking that training, didn't go on to college and who went out into the world of work without any useable skill. That didn't matter too much before because there were unskilled jobs for those boys and girls to do. Today there aren't. The one thing which is clearest about automation is the machines are from here on out going to be doing the unskilled jobs and there isn't going to be anything for the boy and girl without a useable skill to do. It has become silly business to say that a boy shall stay in school until he is 16 and he may then drop out. It would only make sense if we were to say in his interest and in that of society, "you must stay in school until you have a useable skill and then you may move out into the world." I don't propose new laws, I only propose to try to make it clear what is involved as far as this situation is concerned and the good sense of this country will do the rest. I wish I could say to every boy and girl in this country, "If you drop out of school you are making a $50,000 mistake because that's what it amounts to. Our figures show that with a useable skill your average earnings will be $50,000 more than without a useable skill." I wish I could say to every boy and girl in the country, "If you drop out of school, if you try to move into the world

of work today without a useable skill, you're going to cost the rest of the country about a thousand dollars a year the rest of your life in unemployment insurance, in welfare benefits, in institutional care of one kind or another."

I wish we could make clear what the arithmetic of the economics of this thing are: 700,000 boys and girls out of school and out of work today, and most of them are just starting lives of uselessness and unemployment. We could salvage this group at a cost today of about $1,000 to $2,500 apiece. That's what it would cost to pick them up and to give them the useable skills which they need. If we do do that, our figures show they will, within an average of 3 to 4 years, return the full cost of that program in the taxes which they'll pay on their higher incomes and they'll make the additional $50,000 during their lives. If we don't do that, then it will cost us as a society another $1,000 a person the rest of those people's lives.

I hear about not passing debts on to the next generation. The one debt I don't want to see us pass on to the next generation is the debt of ignorance and unpreparedness which will mean they can't make their own way. That's the one thing we can't do as far as this next generation is concerned. I wish there were some way of driving home the fact that what automation clearly means is that no longer is there going to be a place for the person without a skill, the untrained person. At the other end the situation is one of equal need pressing immediately upon it for larger and larger numbers of people with special skills, training, and professional competence of one kind or another.

You hear that unemployment in this country is 5½ percent. The figure is meaningless. The unemployment in this country for people with education of less than a seventh grade level is 9½ percent and the unemployment for people in this country with a college education or more is 1½ percent. Unemployment is becoming daily in this country a matter of lack of education, of lack of preparation and we've simply got to do something about it, and we've got to do it fast. Because, where before, as I have said, the untrained person could be taken up in an unskilled job, no longer is that opportunity available.

The two figures that can haunt me and keep me awake at night are these: That there are in the adult work force in this country today 3 million people with educational attainment levels of less than a fifth grade education. That's one. And the other is that the next 30 months 5½ million young men and women will be moving into the work force, and 2 million of them will have less than a high school education. And there aren't jobs for those people. Now we've got to move in on this, we've got to move in on it rapidly. If we do, then I think that the problems of automation technological development will be met. If we don't, then not only will there accumulate this scrap heap of uneducated people behind us, but there will not be the people we need trained for the highly technical jobs which the new technological age demands.

I make the argument for the Manpower Development and Training Act and for the amendments of it which are now before the Congress. I think there should be a Youth Employment Act which is presently before the Congress for consideration. I think we must do a good deal more about vocational education of one kind or another. I make most strongly the argument that we recognize that eventually this is something which must be done through the education, general educational system in this country and the sooner we face up to that necessity and demand the better. It's got to be full employment.

You have talked to me about the problem of collective bargaining, the problems we have had this year, the headaches which we have had. You have had them in this area and they have been all over the country. You asked whether collective bargaining is going to work better in the future or not, as they did at the press conference this afternoon. There is only one answer to that and that is, that if we get full employment collective bargaining is going to work. If we don't get full employment, it's probably not going to work.

This country is concerned properly and deeply today about the problem of equal employment opportunity especially among the races. There will be equal employment opportunity in this country when there is full employment in this country. We're getting the problem of discrimination licked. But we won't be able to realize on our gains until we achieve that purpose. Well, I don't mean to go on at great length about what in a way is obvious and yet, I suppose the exploration of the obvious is sometimes the healthiest thing for us. I hope that I can leave in your minds an attitude toward automation and technological development which includes no element of fright because I am not frightened about it, which includes every element of optimism about the future of automation and about the things that machines can bring. Because they are, again in the words of the President's speech last night, they add up to this: "Never before has man had such capacity to control his own environment, to end thirst and hunger, to conquer poverty and disease, to banish illiteracy and massive human misery. We have the capacity to make this the best generation of mankind ever in the history of the world or, he added, the last."

These machines could be the instrument of our release as human individuals, they could be the instrument of the destruction of opportunity, on the other hand, for a great many people. It's important that we realize that the science of things has gotten so far out in front of the science of people. It's important that we realize how little most of us can know from here on out about the mysteries of science. It's important that we realize that from here on out we will be living, all of us, just a single spark away from destruction and that those forces will be in the hands of people with whom we can't even communicate, the scientists. And yet, there is nothing in the world which suggests that we cannot be as imaginative in our capacity as citizens as we are in our capacity as scientists. There is everything to suggest that if we put ourselves to it, we can use the new instruments which are being developed for our benefit, that we can remain the masters of them and that they will never become the masters of us.

Finally, I say this, we have got to face up to the fact that the principal difficulty we have in this country doing anything about 5 or 6 percent unemployment is that other 94 percent of the people in this country are doing so well. We will begin to meet our problems when, and only when, we decide as a nation, not as an administration but as a nation, to start doing the things which we want so much to do and which, if we do them, will give us the full employment needed as an element in our program.

I turn again, in conclusion, to the men who gathered that night in that locomotive pit in Atlanta 75 years ago. They were thinking mainly and naturally of getting more for themselves by getting more from the company which had just day reduced their wages. Our thoughts tonight, 75 years later as we look ahead, are about how we can improve our own positions but now by making the whole system work better by strengthening and claiming more of the markets of the world, by pushing the opening doors to the universe, by making machines that instrument of man's fulfillment.

It's been for me a very real pleasure to be here in Seattle just to say "happy birthday" to you and to the International Association of Machinists. But beyond that, it's not just a matter of pleasure or happiness, it's a very real honor to come here to salute the members of a union who have been the builders of democracy's past and who are today the architects of its future. Thank you very much.

Concrete Mattresses for the "Father of Waters"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dave Reynaud, the editor of the News-Examiner at Lutcher, La., recently had a most interesting editorial in his newspaper relative to the concrete mattresses which are employed by the Corps of Engineers in stabilizing the bed of the channel of the "Father of Waters," the Mississippi. Recently the engineers launched work on a project at Geismar, La. and editor Reynaud commented on it in the following column which I think will be of interest to all of us.

It follows in full:

THIS WEEK WITH THE EDITOR

We never thought we would—but this past Monday we saw a branch of the Government doing a job with efficiency that would shame most private industry.

We're talking about the U.S. Corps of Engineers which launched a $2.2 million project aimed at preserving a priceless strip of Mississippi River landmark near Geismar.

Through local Pontchartrain Levee Board President W. F. Middleton we were invited by Col. Edward B. Jennings, Army district engineer, to look over the project along with representatives of the industries in the area and members of the press, radio, and TV.

We saw some 600 men, all working in perfect rhythm, doing a job so fast and so efficiently that it defies description. You just have to see it to believe it.

Inasmuch as the Mississippi River has been threatening this area (with plants conservatively valued at $160 million) Colonel Jennings launched a dogged and determined fight to save this investment. During the 9-month period ending July 1962 the river had consumed an average of 40 feet of the batture and in some spots the eaten away areas reached in as much as 70 feet landward.

Colonel Jennings and the U.S. Engineers refused to surrender the land and sold the idea of holding the bank with a revetment.

That's what they're doing now, using a huge floating plant known as a revetment sinking unit. The revetment consists of a series of flexible concrete mats with each mat about 25 feet long and 4 feet wide. Supply barges move up smoothly on the riverside of the sinking unit and mats are loaded on the plant and slid into place on launching ways. The concrete, incidentally, is poured at St. Francisville, La.

Once in place, the mats are tied with cables, twist wires, and clamps.

A section 140 feet wide is anchored on the bankline and the sinking unit moves out

into the river, playing out the mattress as it goes and lowering it to the bottom of the river. Sort of like a fisherman letting his lure out of his reel.

The plant has been moving at 750 feet a day and should complete the project by Tuesday, November 12.

The mattress is added to until workers reach the deepest part of the river, a distance of almost 500 feet at New River Bend. Then they move upstream and by overlapping the previous mattress, repeat the cycle. Upon completion of this work the upper bank will be paved with asphalt, overlapping the concrete mattresses and extending to the top of the bank.

The equipment is marvelous, the organization of the workers is fantastic—they move like Rockefeller Music Hall Rockettes, almost as though the entire action had been planned by some world famous dance choreographer.

Colonel Jennings had high praise for the local levee boards and their work in getting the rights-of-way.

But, if you talk to the people on the job, the levee board folk, the industry representatives in the area you can come to only one conclusion.

And that conclusion is that Col. Edward Jennings is a dedicated man of action—a real pusher who never stops until he gets his job done.

Watch a job like this and you know some of your tax money is being stretched out along the Mississippi in a manner industry and other governmental agencies could use as a model.

Hats off to the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

Carl Vinson's Unique Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the unique record of the Honorable CARL VINSON is the subject of an editorial from the November 19, 1963, Savannah Morning News, which I would like to offer for all Members of Congress to read:

CARL VINSON'S UNIQUE RECORD

An unprecedented record of service in the U.S. House of Representatives will be closed when Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, retires next year.

In announcing that he will not seek reelection on completion of his 25th term in the House, Representative VINSON pointed out that he has served with eight Presidents, four Republicans and four Democrats. He has been chairman of the Armed Services Committee for 29 years. When he retires, he will have established an alltime record for House tenure—a shade better than 50 years in Washington.

Representative VINSON—some call him "Uncle CARL"—is 80 years old, still vital, still energetic, and still firmly in command of the key committee he has headed for so long. Some people didn't really believe that he would retire, even though there had been rumors to that effect, for he remains an influential and forceful figure, in the thick of many strategic congressional battles.

The greatest contribution Representative VINSON has made, his friends and his foes agree, has been in the field of military affairs, where his expert knowledge and his committee chairmanship have enabled him to play a key role in the national defense.

In announcing his retirement, Representative VINSON repeated his belief that the readiness of our Armed Forces is an effective weapon for peace and must be maintained. This effectiveness is in large part due to the leadership of Mr. VINSON.

Georgia will lose a familiar and colorful Representative, the House a leader of great force and influence, when CARL VINSON retires.

The Price-Fixing Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Roanoke (Va.) Times of Tuesday, November 12, 1963 entitled "The Price-Fixing Proposal."

This excellent editorial points out the vices of the so-called quality stabilization bill. The President's Council of Economic Advisers in its analysis to the Joint Economic Committee reported this legislation would have extremely hurtful effects on the consumer and the economy as a whole.

This excellent editorial chonicles another reason why it is most important that the Congress not enact legislation of this kind despite its high sounding but misleading title.

The editorial follows:

THE PRICE-FIXING PROPOSAL

The so-called quality stabilization bill is a disguised version of "fair trade" legislation which has been invalidated by court action in a number of States. The measure, which has been approved by the House Commerce Committee and is now being considered by a Senate committee, would make legal for manufacturers to fix prices of brand merchandise. Dealers could not sell such products at a price lower than that set by the manufacturer.

As is the purpose of all "fair trade" laws, the quality stabilization bill is designed to regulate competition. The manufacturer's argument is that he needs it to safeguard the reputation of his brand name; the retailer contends he needs it to safeguard his business from price-cutting discounters. But basically the argument for it is a matter of profits: one group of businessmen wants a special privilege—the power of law—to protect it from its competitors. Because that is its purpose, the quality stabilization bill has no place in our private enterprise system.

President Kennedy recently stated he did not favor the measure. A few days ago, the President's Council of Economic Advisers stated it's objection to the bill. In brief, the Council said the legislation, if enacted, would not only hurt the consumer by increasing prices, but would in the end injure the retailer as well. Eventually, said the report, volume of sales would be reduced, and large stores and chains, by developing their own brands, would lure shoppers away from small dealers. In addition to that, the Council sees price-fixing legislation as halting progress in merchandising, curtailing incentive for innovations and efficiency which competition in a free market provides.

Proponents contend the bill is essential for the little man in business, a political appeal likely to have a powerful effect if the measure gets to the floor. But anything which reduces total demand by consumers can hardly be regarded as good for anybody. Deterrence to economic growth is in substance what the quality stabilization bill would accomplish—by strangling competition and loading huge costs on the consumer.

Cleveland's Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, there appeared a fascinating and amusing book entitled "Parkinson's Law," in which the author described in humorous vein the often snarled red tape in the modern world. To the lore of the bureaucracy, my distinguished colleague, JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, has added "Cleveland's Law." The enigmatic smiles he describes in his recent congressional newsletter are no substitute for vigorous service on behalf of our transportation systems. The spirit of Cleveland's Law was picked up by the distinguished New Hampshire weekly, the Milford Cabinet and Wilton Journal in an editorial which appeared on November 14. I include an excerpt from Mr. CLEVELAND's newsletter and the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CLEVELAND'S LAW

Over the years I have encountered a bureaucratic phenomenon which, for the benefit of frustrated citizens, I shall attempt to describe. Following the celebrated Parkinson, I shall designate it "Cleveland's law" for lack of a better term. It goes like this: As a State Senator, when I complained about poor roads in my district, friends in the highway department would produce statistics showing that so few people used the roads that no improvement was justified. When I pointed out that the roads were so bad that no one in his right mind would use them unless he had to, I got only enigmatic smiles. And so it still is. When I ask the FAA for increased navigational aids at Keene, Lebanon, or Berlin, they point out that traffic at those airports is not sufficient to justify improvement. When I reply that traffic is presently discouraged because of this condition—enigmatic smiles. When I ask the Treasury Department to keep the port of entry at Pittsburg open at night, Cleveland's law functions again. "Not enough people use the port to justify improved service." I protest that uncertain service itself discourages use—again, that good ol' enigmatic smile.

[From the Milford Cabinet and Wilton Journal, Nov. 14, 1963]

CLEVELAND'S LAW

JIM CLEVELAND in his report from Congress last week gives the whimsical title of "Cleveland's Law" to one of the frustrations faced by everyone who deals with bureaucracy. A road needs repairs. It is not repaired because there is not enough traffic to justify the expense. The worse it gets the less traffic there is, so the less reason there is to repair it. JIM cited other examples.

Certainly the decline of the railroads can be attributed in part to "Cleveland's Law."

The poorer the service became, the fewer the people who used the railroad, so the less justification for improving the service. The same was true of a number of the buslines that served Milford. As the equipment wore out service became uncertain, fewer people took the bus, and finally the whole venture would be given up.

Or take this simple matter of a stamp vending machine in the Milford post office lobby, such as every other post office of comparable size seems to have. Back a few years when we first started to complain we marched into the post office one day and asked why a stamp machine would not be a reasonable and sensible post office service. The answer? You guess; Cleveland's Law again. "There isn't enough demand to justify the expense." No stamp machine, so nobody uses it, so no stamp machine.

Espionage at the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, espionage on the part of the Soviets connected with the United Nations has been going on over a long period of time. The seriousness of the problem was underscored recently when two Soviet diplomats attached to the United Nations were caught participating in a spy plot.

If U.N. authorities themselves are unable to bring this situation under control, certainly steps must be taken to deal with the offenders. As the host country for the headquarters of this world organization, we simply cannot allow it to remain a haven for spies who are plotting against our security interests.

A column entitled "United Nations Spies Not Laughing Matter," was written from U.N. headquarters by Louis Fleming for the Los Angeles Times back in July of this year. What he says in the column is still pertinent today.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the column at this point:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 6, 1963]

UNITED NATIONS SPIES NOT LAUGHING MATTER

(By Louis Fleming)

UNITED NATIONS.—With new spy charges added to the recent reports of occasional prostitution, the United Nations is getting a reputation like the Casbah in Humphrey Bogart's prime.

There may have been little of consequence to the lurid tales of wild women in the delegates' lounges, but the epsionage question is no laughing matter.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sounded a warning 3 years ago in a report on espionage by the Soviet Union involving the United Nations.

"They are guests of the United States and are supposedly dedicated to the cause of international peace," he said, "but they are, in fact, carefully selected envoys of the international Communist conspiracy, trained in trickery and deceit, and dedicated to the concept of fully exploiting the freedoms of the countries they seek to destroy."

Hoover added: "It is too much to suppose that they would not prostitute the United Nations."

Another warning was expressed last October by Senator THOMAS DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, who said:

"I must warn the United Nations Secretariat frankly that if the Soviets continue to use its headquarters on a wholesale scale as a cloak behind which they can conduct espionage activities with immunity, the people of America will not indefinitely tolerate such a situation."

He accompanied his statement with a list of 14 Soviet citizens who had been arrested or involved in espionage or other unsavory activities while working for the United Nations or the Soviet Union's mission to the United Nations.

The record is sufficient to indicate misuse of the United Nations by some of its employees, Soviet citizens for the most part, and by some of the diplomats attached to their countries' delegations here. But the total number of cases may not justify the impression that it is a widespread or common practice.

There are, for example, 140 employees of the United Nations from Communist bloc nations, including 74 from the Soviet Union, at last official count.

But in the entire history of the United Nations, only three Secretariat employees have been arrested on espionage charges, and unofficial records indicate that only five others have been involved in espionage activities but escaped formal charges by fleeing the country.

Espionage has been more actively operated from the delegations, which enjoy diplomatic immunity. At present, the Soviet Union alone has 47 diplomatic officers on the staff of its mission to the United Nations, not counting clerks and secretaries. The U.S. mission lists 39 on its regular staff.

Most of the espionage efforts have been directed against the United States. There is little to probe at the United Nations itself. But at least one case involved an Asian employee of the Secretariat rifling the files of an Asian delegation and furnishing papers to a Soviet agent. So there may be some traffic in international secrets from the various delegations.

The Secretariat of the United Nations has taken a tough position regarding any United Nations employees involved in espionage cases. They have all been dropped from employment, but in most cases they have skipped the country before the charges were made public.

None has served a prison term. In the three cases in which formal charges were brought, one received a suspended sentence on condition he leave the country, one was granted dismissal of charges if he agreed to leave the country, and the third, arrested last Tuesday, is being held for preliminary hearing.

The Florida Keys—Fishermen's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, through one of my constituents, Capt. Stu Apte, of Big Pine Key, Fla., I have just learned of a very interesting television program which will be presented on ABC television's "Wide World of Sports" this Saturday, November 23—5 p.m., Washington time—and one which will be of special interest to the many sporting enthusiasts here in the Congress.

The program this week will feature championship tarpon fishing from Big Pine Key, one of the Florida Keys' finest angling areas. The show's format is in the form of a contest between two of the Nation's best known fishermen, Al McClane of Field & Stream magazine and Joe Brooks of international fishing fame and a resident of Richmond, Va.

Both of these men raise and land tarpon well over the 100-pound mark and they do this with lightweight fly rods and artificial flies. The show is filmed in color and presents some of the most exciting scenes of big tarpon leaping ever presented to TV audiences.

Tarpon, often referred to as the Silver King, is one of the most sought after of all the keys' more than 600 species of game fish to be found in the waters of the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Others include bonefish, dolphin, mackerel, kingfish, marlin, barracuda, snook, amberjack, snapper, and sailfish.

The Florida Keys have been aptly described as bodies of land completely surrounded by fishermen. It is certainly true that the fisherman is king throughout the Florida Keys, and I cordially invite my colleagues and their families to sample the delights of the keys—from fishing and skindiving to golf or water skiing—not to mention the marvelous pollen free weather with refreshing trade breezes and low humidity and year-round temperatures between 65° and 89°.

I am confident that after watching this Saturday's "Wide World of Sports" program, I may look forward to greeting many of my colleagues as they enjoy a winter vacation—even though it may be very brief this year—in the Florida Keys.

What Do You Say, Orville?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Lyle Johnson of Glencoe, Minn., recently provided the Glencoe Enterprise with a letter including a most probing article written by Senator GOLDWATER. The substance of the Senator's remarks are so important as to warrant the close attention of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in today's RECORD:

WHAT DO YOU SAY, ORVILLE?

Maybe you have been puzzled as I have about the conflicting stories about our big "Wheat Deal" with Russia. Senator GOLDWATER clears them up very well in this recent article in the Los Angeles Times:

"WHY IGNORANCE ON RED FARMING?

"(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona)

"Whether or not the sale of 375 million bushels of U.S. wheat to Russia is consum-

mated, the most startling aspect of the entire incident—the collapse of American intelligence about Soviet agriculture—is due for a thorough public airing.

"It would be unfortunate indeed if the controversy over the sale itself, despite its many explosive features, is allowed to preempt an investigation of this failure. To say that the caliber and expertness of Americans who supposedly toured Soviet agricultural communities were lacking would be ridiculous, for they ranged from Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on down.

"Admittedly, Mr. Freeman had no farm background when he was appointed to his present office, but as this Nation's No. 1 official in the agricultural field, his exposure to the subject has been complete.

"He recently completed an 18-day tour of Russia and supposedly was shown by friendly officials just about everything there was to see. So impressed was he that he returned to this country bubbling over with praise of the abundance of everything Soviet and the efficiency of Communist methods.

"'Total production,' he told the Nation at that time, 'has risen considerably. They have the ability to feed their people.'

"Countless other officials of our Department of Agriculture recently have made 'inspection' tours of Russia, and almost without exception, they looked, considered, and arrived at the same conclusion.

"Rosewell Garst, the American farmer who once played host to Nikita Khrushchev and since has been a frequent visitor to Russia, returned recently to report that America's 30-year lead in agriculture has been cut to 8 and added: "The world may be startled at the crop yields in Eastern Europe this year.'

"That statement perhaps was the only correct assessment of the situation to come from any of our touring experts. The world was indeed startled when announcement of the 228-million-bushel sale of Canadian wheat and flour to Russia revealed that for the fifth straight year the Soviet Union had suffered a devastating shortfall.

"Almost immediately, our experts began to rationalize, but their rationalizations pertained only to the efficiency of the Communist agricultural system, not to their own erroneous assessments. The crop failure, they said, would not have happened except for a hot, dry summer.

"But this argument, too, is proof of our inability to evaluate such vital aspects of Soviet economy as its agriculture. Mr. Freeman, Mr. Garst, and the others who returned with such glowing accounts could have found out, simply my making a telephone call to the U.S. Weather Bureau, that conditions in Eastern Europe this past summer made crop failure an almost inescapable probability.

"Actually there were hundreds of other indexes which could have established beyond question that the prospects for a successful wheat season in Russia were practically nil, but these were ignored. Some considerations should have been given to the constant and well-publicized shakeups within the Soviet agricultural program, the shortages of fertilizers and fertilizer equipment which we were being begged to sell to Russia, the known inadequacy of farming equipment and the shortage of repair parts.

"Under these circumstances, it is difficult to conclude anything other than that our experts indeed had all the evidence, but flatly refused to heed it. The entire matter is somewhat reminiscent of the administration's attitude about the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba—until the eve of the 1960 elections."

We believe you are right, Senator. Speak up some more.

LYLE W. JOHNSON,
Chairman of McLeod County Minnesotans for Goldwater.

GLENCOE, MINN.

Wise and Inspiring Counsel From Hon. J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is deeply indebted to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover for the vigilant service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under his long and able leadership, in safeguarding the United States against the twin threats of crime and communism.

The Nation is equally indebted to him for his wise counsel to his fellow citizens, and, particularly, for his inspiring influence with American youth.

A striking example of this inspiration and counsel is provided by his address, Saturday evening, November 16, upon receiving the Pro Deo et Juventute Medal of the Seventh National Convention of the Catholic Youth Organization, in New York City.

Because of the timeliness and significance of his remarks—and of his newest challenge to American youth—I include the full text of Mr. Hoover's address:

KEYS TO FREEDOM

I accept this award with a deep feeling of humility. I shall treasure it because of my great admiration for the outstanding work being performed by the Catholic Youth Organization. Your efforts on behalf of America's young people have earned the acclaim of all citizens who are concerned with the future of our Nation.

I am doubly honored that the invitation to attend this banquet was personally extended by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, a brilliant and dedicated leader and a devoted servant of God.

To His Excellency, Archbishop John J. Krol, Msgr. Frederick J. Stevenson, and all associated with the Catholic Youth Organization and the Youth Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference who have made this such a pleasant occasion, I express heartfelt appreciation. It has been especially good to see so many friends and to renew old acquaintances.

To the outstanding young people assembled here tonight, I bring warm greetings. Yours is a generation of great challenge. Through no choice of your own, you have entered the world at a time when deadly forces challenge your right, and the right of every American, to live in freedom under God.

Young people in postwar America have grown up with the disillusioning knowledge that the world is no longer safe for democracy.

High ideals are the birthright of youth, but the youth of postwar America must face, also, the chaos which present-day society presents, and bring about order through the realization of those high ideals.

We are at war with communism, in different ways on different fronts around the world. The Communist ideology is born in hate, but our philosophy of life is the practice of love and faith.

Just as freedom is your right, so challenge is your heritage—for freedom, once won, must constantly be defended.

Today, our country faces the most severe test ever to confront a free people. Here and abroad, mortal enemies of freedom and deniers of God Himself conspire to undermine the fundamental forces which are the lifeline of our country's vitality and greatness—our most formidable weapons, in peace and in war.

What are these forces? They are:

Faith—faith in a Supreme Being: God, the Author of Liberty.

Individualism—inherent dignity and worth of every sovereign individual with his personal rights and responsibilities.

Courage—the courage of a free people firmly dedicated to the noblest cause.

Integrity—that quality of trustworthiness which is essential in dealings between men, and between countries.

Discipline—and self-discipline, which are vital in a nation governed by laws rather than by men.

Vision—such as led our Founding Fathers into the perilous dangers of a hostile wilderness that was to become the proud American Republic in which we live today.

These are America's great bulwarks. They are under savage attack today, just as they were so severely tested nearly 200 years ago at Bunker Hill and at Valley Forge.

Daniel Webster, that brilliant early American statesman, eloquently declared, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Daniel Webster knew the heavy price America had paid for her liberty. And he knew also the disintegrating effect of self-indulgence, neglect of duty and public lethargy in a nation of free men.

These lethal influences are at work, constantly undermining the sense of personal responsibility and self-discipline so essential to our Nation's welfare. They form a common denominator with the aggressive enemies of our Republic in assaulting the cause of decency and justice across the length and breadth of the land.

Who are these enemies of our Republic? They are the crime syndicates, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the unscrupulous businessmen, the corrupt politicians and all others who blatantly defy the laws of the land.

They are the hatemongers and the false liberals who would subvert our Constitution and undermine our democratic processes in furtherance of their selfish ends.

They are the Communists and other subversive elements who wave false banners of legitimacy and patriotism while relentlessly plotting to destroy our heritage of freedom.

Communism—in all its forms and in all its variations—is the avowed enemy of liberty and of justice and of God. The Communists fear free and independent thought. They fear truth. They fear God even though they deny Him. They fear the inherent courage and dignity of man created in His image.

Today, the Communists are engaged in an intensive campaign to control the minds and win the allegiance of American youth. Toward this end, a National Youth Commission has been established within the Communist Party, U.S.A.; special publications have been issued; front groups have been organized; and an ambitious speech program has been directed against our colleges and universities.

During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: To create confusion, raise questions and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.

If the constitutional right to free speech allows them to use the public school forum to promote the secular creed of Marxism-Leninism which openly and avowedly denies God, does their constitutional freedom of religion also prohibit the rest of us from using the same public school forum to express our faith that God does exist?

It is indeed ironic that Communist Party speakers—whose minds and thoughts and actions are in no manner free—should demand the opportunity to parrot the Moscow line to young Americans under the guise of academic freedom.

Academic freedom is not an instrument for the perpetuation of conspiratorial ideologies. Nor is it an agent of self-destruction—a freedom to destroy freedom. As a free-flowing channel of truth and knowledge, academic freedom is not obligated to carry along the silted tributaries of lies and distortions of known Communists.

The Communists look upon students as potential sympathizers, supporters, and contributors to the party's cause. Nor are they unmindful of the rich opportunity for infiltration presented by unwary racial and nationality groups.

This is especially true of the intense civil rights movement within the United States—for America's 20 million Negroes and the countless other citizens who share their objectives in the current struggle are a priority target for Communist propaganda and exploitation. Every organization engaged in this struggle must constantly remain alert to this vital fact, for, once under Communist domination, all freedoms and rights are lost.

The Communists are eager to capitalize upon all areas of misunderstanding and unrest. Their cause is the cause of Soviet Russia, for the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an inseparable part of the sinister international conspiracy which is financed and directed by the Kremlin. No amount of lies and duplicity can conceal this carefully documented fact.

Today, the godless Communist conspiracy controls more than one third of the earth's people and a fourth of her land surface. In Europe, in Asia, and here in our own Western Hemisphere, we witness the stark tragedy of souls, chained to the yoke of communism, clamoring to be free again.

The Khrushchevs, the Castros, and the Mao Tse-tungs are faced with an eternal dilemma: The human spirit in bondage—no matter how heavy the chains—struggles relentlessly to break free. Witness the Hungarian Revolution; the boatloads of Marxist victims who continue to pour out of Cuba; the Poznan riots in Poland; the heroic dashes of subjugated people through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Make no mistake about the Communists in this country. Whether they are members of Soviet-bloc diplomatic establishments in New York and Washington—or whether they are fanatical adherents of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—all represent the same ideology of treachery, deceit, and subversion.

From the immunity which they enjoy as foreign diplomats on American soil, Soviet and satellite officials continue to carry out espionage assignments against the United States. That some American citizens, including concealed adherents to the Communist Party, have knowingly and willingly assisted these Iron Curtain intelligence networks is a criminal disgrace and a blight not only upon our Nation, but upon the entire free world. And it is equally disgraceful that well-meaning but uninformed citizens have permitted themselves to be duped by sympathy campaigns on behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, and other traitors.

Nowhere is the hope for peace more sincere than in the hearts of all true Americans. But in our quest for peace, we must never lose sight of the well-documented fact that every Red leader from Marx and Engels through Khrushchev, Mao, and the American Communist spokesman Gus Hall is dedicated to an ideology which upholds world conquest as its ultimate goal.

The Communists have never deviated from this objective. Despite the high-pressure campaign they have mounted behind Khrushchev's phrase of peaceful coexistence, the Communists know that this is simply a propaganda slogan—one devised to further their own ends by stirring the hopes and emotions of those who seek an end to the turmoil, fear, and sorrow that world communism itself created.

Actions continue to speak louder than words, and certainly the Communists have shown no indication of a sincere quest for peace.

The take-over of Cuba and effort to convert it into an island fortress against democracy; the ever-constant infiltration of Red fascists into countries of Central and South America to create a Sovietized Latin America; the increase of espionage activities by Soviet and satellite agents in our country, particularly those who strive to penetrate our Government processes from the protection afforded them by diplomatic assignments in New York and Washington; the frantic efforts of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to subvert our youth; and the intense drive of the Communists operating from concealed positions to wrest control of the movement for Negro rights—does all this indicate a real and sincere desire to live in peaceful coexistence?

In recent years, the Communists have demonstrated an attitude of open defiance and contempt for our laws—an attitude which is fortified by their repeated ability to invoke loopholes, technicalities and delays in the law to thwart justice. One former judge found cause to warn last summer not only of inexcusable delays in the courts, but also of what he considered to be a "trend of decisions in the last 10 years * * * favorable to extreme leftwingers, Communists, and subversives in general."

Another student of court rulings in the internal security field was prompted to observe, "Unfortunately, subversive activities are well on the way to becoming a no man's land in the law."

In 1957, a Federal judge in the Nation's Capital assailed what he considered to be "an unfortunate trend of judicial decisions * * * which strain and stretch to give the guilty, not the same, but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen." There has been no reversal of this alarming trend—a trend which is felt in our steadily rising national crime problem.

Justice in a free nation means protection for society as a whole, rather than leniency for the individual to the detriment of society.

Since 1957, when the Federal judge issued his warning, crime has increased nearly 40 percent. Its victims continue to mount at a relentless rate. Four serious crimes are committed every minute; there is a crime of violence every 3 minutes; and property crimes—robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and automobile thefts—occur within seconds.

Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime, filth, and corruption. No one can deny that motion pictures are deliberately and defiantly pursuing an increasingly bold courtship with obscenity. No one can deny the role of the television industry in bringing lurid portrayals of violence and sadism into the living rooms—and even the nurseries—of our homes. No one can deny that sensual trash is moving closer and closer to the children's books on the shelves of our newsstands and magazine stores.

Our youth do not need weakness; they need strength. They do not need indulgence; they need the guidance and the discipline which can best be provided by a decent home.

Above all, they need the benefit of religion—in church, at home, and in the atmosphere of our classrooms.

Despite the dedicated efforts of church and civic leaders and others who have a sincere interest in the proper development of our young people, the failures continue to mount. Each year, persons under 18 years of age are involved in nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, and approximately one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests. The newspapers of our major cities recount incidents of senseless murders, violent assaults, and brutal beatings inflicted upon innocent victims by arrogant gangs of teenagers and young adults.

Courts are influenced too much by the age—rather than the record—of the young hoodlum who stands before the bar of justice.

The bleeding hearts, some actually sworn to administer the law either as judges or social workers, are so concerned for young criminals and terrorists that they are indifferent to the rights of law-abiding members of society.

We have mollycoddled young criminals, lightly tapped hardened offenders on the wrists and released some unreformed and unrepentant hoodlums to prey anew on society.

The time is long overdue for us to adopt a more realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the charitable approach toward young hoodlums and it has failed.

We are paying dearly for these failures. They represent a tragic waste of America's most valuable resource—the moral, mental, and physical health of her young citizens.

The crime problem costs the American people some $22 billion a year—nine times the amount contributed to our churches. For every $1 spent on educating our children, $1.11 goes to crime.

Nowhere in recent months have our people faced a more explosive condition of shame and violence than among the hatemongers, the moral degenerates, the lunatic fringe and the other irrational fanatics who preach a doctrine of hostility toward their fellow man. This rabble has sown the dragons' teeth of malice and intimidation; and from the ground has sprung a series of hate-driven riots, bombings, and desecrations.

The voices of temperance, logic, and decency must speak out more effectively and make their influence felt. No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in a society of freemen. Hate, terror, and lawlessness are not the American way of accomplishing any objective that is truly worthwhile. In meeting the tense crises which confront the United States in this nuclear age, we must look to God for guidance and inspiration.

This country has never run from its enemies. Challenge, not compromise—bravery, not cowardice—are integral parts of our heritage. Since that critical hour in 1777 when General Washington ordered his Revolutionary Army to "Put none but Americans on guard tonight," it has been the tradition of our proud Nation to rise to its greatest heights in the face of adversity.

There are important lessons to be learned in the pages of American history. From Faneuil Hall to Cape Canaveral, our greatest patriots have been men and women of deep religious conviction: Men like Thomas Jefferson, the principal author of our Declaration of Independence, who told his fellow colonists, "The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time."

In the eyes of a later-day hero, "Freedom, devotion to God and country are not things of the past. They will never become old-fashioned." These words were spoken by Astronaut John H. Glenn.

America remains free because men of faith, men of individualism, men of courage, men of integrity, men of discipline, and men of vision have patrolled her most vital outposts for 187 years.

These strong qualities—faith, individualism, courage, integrity, discipline, and vision—are the keys to freedom.

When the United States has lost its youthful outlook, it will have lost its vitality and its capacity for progress. That is why I charge the young people assembled here tonight to preserve the pioneer spirit which

has been the soul of America since her birth.

Meet every new challenge with confidence and determination. As you look to the future, do not lose sight of the important lessons of the past. History, all too often, repeats itself. The freedoms you enjoy today will be lost, as they have been destroyed at other times and in other nations, through neglect and abuse.

Do not hesitate to speak out and bring public pressure to bear upon negative influences within your communities. We must never become so accustomed to filth or so intimidated by the advocates of so-called "world reality" that we fail to revolt against corruption and decay.

May you always protect America's heritage of freedom. May you, with God's holy guidance, preserve and strengthen that priceless heritage for the generations yet to come.

As His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, observed so profoundly nearly a decade ago, "We have no right to expect to keep our freedoms, if we ourselves do not faithfully and thankfully protect the soil and soul of America from those who have abandoned God, and for God's Commandments have substituted their own code of inhumanity, greed, and violence."

Let us protect and defend the real meaning of America. This is the debt we owe to the brave legions of the past who laid down their lives to safeguard the great truths which guide our destiny today.

International Fisheries: The Problems Are Complex

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very intelligent and well thought-out article on international fisheries. The article, entitled "The Problems Are Complex"—as indeed, they are, was written by one of the top writers in this field, and he is knowledgeable and well informed in every respect in regard to it. The article was published in the Seattle Post Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post Intelligencer, Oct. 10, 1963]

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES: THE PROBLEMS ARE COMPLEX

(By Don Page)

In this world where shifting conditions and shrinking distances are constantly raising new problems and embarrassments for us peoples who inhabit the globe, that fisheries conference going on now in Tokyo is an especially embarrassing event.

The fisheries conference certainly must be embarrassing to the Japanese people.

The Japanese pride themselves on an orderly way of life, with meticulous concern for the rights of others. Yet at the Tokyo fisheries conference a few great monopolistic Japanese fishing cartels are trying to frame a legalistic right to invade and plunder fisheries built and maintained by other peoples. Many Japanese people must be lowering their eyes in humiliation from the spectacle.

In turn, there lies embarrassment at Tokyo for us on the eastern rim of the North Pacific. We Canadians and Americans see our representatives traveling almost halfway around the world to account to another nation for the way we are running our fisheries and to engage in legalistic debate with that other nation, Japan, on why we should be allowed to keep our fisheries.

These are our fisheries. We did build them. We do maintain them.

MUCH MONEY INVESTED

Our Canadian and United States Governments have invested many millions of dollars in their programs to study, protect and conserve our North American stocks of salmon and halibut. Our fishermen, too, have sacrified the harvest of millions of dollars worth of fish to protect the longtime welfare of these stocks.

If Canada and the United States had not seeded these stocks with their investments and their sacrifices, there wouldn't be enough salmon and halibut left here today to make the Japanese want to move in on the harvest.

The North American salmon is a carefully reared creature. It is a family creature, too. It returns almost invariably to spawn in the same stream where it was born. In the Columbia River, the Fraser River, the streams of Bristol Bay and southeast Alaska and Puget Sound, our two countries—Canada and the United States—pamper the salmon, nurse it through its infancy and rigorously control the catch of salmon off the mouth of these spawning streams to insure that every race of salmon is given the best possible chance to survive and reproduce.

The halibut is not a creature of inland streams. But it lives all its life and in the North Pacific is best harvested on ledges of the Continental Shelf off Alaska and Canada. Some decades ago the halibut of the North Pacific seemed headed for near extinction. Then the United States and Canadian Governments joined in an international commission that studied the halibut, learned how to protect it and by the sacrifice of some immediate gains for fishermen, nursed these halibut stocks back to their present flourishing state.

The halibut of our North Pacific waters, like the salmon of North American origin, are there because we, or our forebears put them there.

A DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

Japanese proposals for high seas fishing would endanger, might even wipe out, the stocks of salmon and halibut we have planted. In the one area where Japanese fleets now can catch some red salmon of Bristol Bay origin, their narrow mesh nets are sweeping up great numbers of immature salmon.

High seas net fishing for salmon scrambles our efforts to insure proper escapement to each spawning ground. Our United States and Canadian fishermen are not allowed to fish as the Japanese do, at sea with nets for salmon.

Not many years ago, distance and the nature of the world would have protected such national resources as the salmon and the halibut from raids like the ones proposed by these few Japanese monopolies. Back in the days when the present 3-mile limit to territorial waters was determined by the range of a cannonball, nations could safely nurture such stocks of fish along their shores, secure from encroachment by foreign powers.

Today technology has wiped out that protection of national resources. Today great fishing fleets can sail anywhere in the world. The traditional 3-mile limit still seems appropriate for ownership of territorial waters and an adequate limit to curbs on navigation. For fisheries, the 3-mile limit is outmoded. Fisheries resources in our age demand the protection of more flexible, thoughtfully considered methods than territorial waters can provide.

New, modern international understandings, vigorously asserted by this Nation, are necessary to guard the rights that once were guarded for us by our own isolation.

Our framing of such international understanding and statements of our rights have been hindered by a lag in awareness of the new set of ground rules imposed on us by the modernization of our world, by apparent lack of understanding by our Government of how important the wealth of our seas will soon become to our national welfare and, frankly, by the same pussyfooting approach that in the years since World War II has put the United States behind the eight-ball too often in varying fields of international relations.

It is a sad fact that America's stand on its property rights in these homegrown North Pacific fisheries is not so strong as it was a quarter century ago.

Our United States and Canadian claims to these fish and our efforts to keep intruders out are not, as the Japanese monopolies would have us believe, an indignity imposed on the defeated Japanese by our conquering forces of World War II. As early as the 1930's Canadian and United States pressure was successfully exerted on England to keep her from sending a fleet of boats to our North Pacific halibut grounds.

And in 1937 when Japanese interests made a grab at North American fishing stocks, sage old Cordell Hull, as U.S. Secretary of State, sent the Japanese a warning note. Hull wrote then:

"Because of the sacrifices and the part that American citizens have played in bearing the cost of conserving and perpetuating the salmon resources, it is the strong conviction * * * on the part of the American public generally that there has been established a superior interest and claim in the salmon resources of Alaska. * * * The fact that salmon taken from waters off the Alaskan coast are spawned and hatched in American inland waters and when intercepted are returning to American waters adds further to the conviction that there is in these resources a special and unmistakable American interest."

THE TRUMAN PROCLAMATION

Later, in 1945, President Harry Truman wrote this:

"In view of the pressing need for conservation and protection of fishery resources, the Government of the United States regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas of the United States wherein fishing activities have been or in the future may be developed and maintained on a substantial scale * * *. The character as high seas of the areas in which such conservation zones are established and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

Those statements of 18 and 26 years ago certainly are stronger and more forthright than the "abstention principle" spelled out in the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty 10 years ago.

The abstention principle adds the requirements that nations operating the exclusive fisheries shall maintain scientific studies, conservation measures, and "full utilization" of the affected stocks. Japan seized on these requirements to lean over the shoulders of the United State and Canada and demand that they justify all details of their protected fisheries. It was this technical demand that forced our two nations to admit Japanese boats to the eastern Bering halibut grounds this year. Japan could not prove we were not operating our halibut fishery there efficiently, but we could not, in turn, prove "maximum utilization."

Certainly, this is not a strong position for the United States and Canada, letting a third nation sit in judgment on how we are operating our fisheries.

The abstention principle is not, as the Japanese say, too strong. It is too weak. A firmer assertion of our property rights in

these home-developed coastal fisheries is in order. There are enough farmers in Asia and in North America for a principle like this to be understood on both continents:

"It is we who have sown the seeds. It is we who must reap the harvest."

Outstanding Public Service of Henry Shore, Regional Director, and W. G. Stuart Sherman, Regional Attorney, for National Labor Relations Board in Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh, western Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, are proud of the fine record of Henry Shore and W. G. Sherman, of the Pittsburgh NLRB office, when they have been honored this year for a quarter of century of dedicated service. This excellent service to the National Labor Relations Board, which administers the Nation's principal labor relations law has been of real value to our industrial communities in giving fair service and impartial decisions. The confidence and respect of Director Shore and Attorney Sherman has been a weighty factor in the development, not only of fair and humane labor-management rulings and good labor-management relations, but are basic elements in the progress and advance of our whole economy.

I have asked for and have received the NLRB release covering the NLRB fourth annual awards ceremony in Washington, D.C., honoring Director Shore and Attorney Sherman, which follows:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
DIVISION OF INFORMATION,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1963.

Henry Shore and W. G. Stuart Sherman, Regional Director and Regional Attorney for the National Labor Relations Board in Pittsburgh, were honored Friday for a quarter century of service to the agency which administers the Nation's principal labor relations law.

They were 2 of 43 members of the NLRB staff given special recognition for 25 years' service at the Board's fourth annual awards ceremony in Washington.

Mr. Shore, who as regional director supervises NLRB operations in western Pennsylvania and much of West Virginia, is a native of Bellevue, Pa. He gained his law degree at the University of Pittsburgh and practiced law in Pittsburgh until he joined the NLRB September 8, 1937 as a field attorney. He was promoted to Regional Attorney in 1941 and Regional Director in 1947. His full quarter century service with the Board has been in Pittsburgh. Mr. Sherman, who received his LL.B. from Georgetown University Law School, began his NLRB career October 13, 1937. He worked as a member of the legal staff in Los Angeles and Atlanta Regional Offices before being promoted to his present position as chief attorney in the Pittsburgh office.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz was principal speaker and NLRB Chairman Frank W. McCulloch presided at the ceremony which also honored three men who rose through Government career ranks to top positions with the Board through appointments by the President. Twenty-year Federal service pins were presented to Board Member John H. Fanning of Rhode Island, to Board Member Gerald A. Brown of California, and to General Counsel Arnold Ordman of Maryland. A 10-year service pin was given Board Member Boyd Leedom of South Dakota.

In 1937, when the 43 joined the 3-year old Board, they formed almost 15 percent of its total personnel. Few if any Federal agencies or departments have such a sizable percentage contingent of its early staff in such extended continuous service. Today, with more than 2,000 employees, the NLRB has 2½ percent of its personnel with more than a quarter century of labor relations experience.

We are also proud to have in the Pittsburgh NLRB office, the recognition of good and faithful service for 3 additional people at the fourth annual awards ceremony.

In Pittsburgh, three members of the NLRB regional office staff were awarded Federal Government service pins: Alys E. Gazal, 20 years; Emilie B. Alexander, 10 years, and Rosemarie Hermesky, 10 years.

In his address, at the fourth annual NLRB awards ceremony in Washington, D.C., Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz paid tribute to the NLRB and its corps of quarter-century employees, who "built a law of job rights paralleling what it took the common law 3 or 4 centuries to do as far as property rights are concerned."

He said:

I think of the National Labor Relations Board as having established a foundation of private freedom, private democracy in this country.

Secretary Wirtz' remarks:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ

I wish I could boast of 25 years with the National Labor Relations Board, to having as a matter of remembered experience of my own what you people did and went through and started, not as a matter of public boast, but as a matter of inner pride and satisfaction which it must give you. I know it hasn't been a matter of glamor and glory and that kind of thing. There's been a lot of drudgery involved in it. I don't know what your attitude is about things; it all depends on that.

I think again of the three stone masons of Chartres. We all know it, but it's a story we repeat, as we repeat the Lord's Prayer or sing the Star-Spangled Banner, because it's so close to what is centrally important. A man approached three stone masons working at Chartres and asked them what they are doing and the answer of one, "I am cutting stones," and the answer of the next, "I'm making a living," but the answer of the third, "I'm building a cathedral."

I think that the National Labor Relations Board is made up of people who have thought from the beginning not that they are bucking for a GS-12 or that they are writing briefs or that they are pounding typewriters, but that they are building and preserving a free society. That is why there are so many of you here today; that is why although in all your lives a good many of you have never seen your names in the newspapers and you have read a thousand editorials critical of the National Labor Relations Board for every one that contained a single word of approbation; that is why it all seems so completely worthwhile.

I wish I had an experience which goes back 25 years in this field so that it would leaven all of the vicissitudes of today. What can seem very serious today to people who think back to labor relations and the basis on which you found them, which meant sweatshops and company unions and yellow dog contracts and sitdown strikes and all that kind of thing. Think of how far things have come since that time. Think back that you built a law of job rights, paralleling what it took the common law three or four centuries to do as far as property rights are concerned. You have built a jurisprudence in the plants of the country, take the form of the grievance machinery, and so on and so forth. You think back to a time when there were 12 million unemployed people in this country with a work force only a little more than half of what it is today. What can seem too difficult today as you look back over a period during which you built with your hands, with your heads, and your hearts; when you built the integrity of millions of individuals to which Judge Charles Fahy has already referred?

I wish I were sitting where you are. I wish I could claim that kind of accomplishment. The thanks you get are mostly unspoken. That is because your job has been for 25 years to buck the status quo, to change the status quo, and you don't get public plaudits for changing things. The criticism is almost always the other way. You have been stewards of a principle and few of us can boast of that. If the jobs from time to time have been the humdrum jobs, they have nevertheless added up to the accomplishment of a change which, so far as I know, is unparalleled in the jurisprudence or in the human relations, or in the economic relations of the democratic society and I say that without qualification and on a considered basis.

I know no other field in which, suddenly, the society, acting from desperation, because the circumstances of those times forced it to its senses, did what needed so much to be done, which probably wouldn't have been done if things hadn't been so bad.

I know of no other situation in which a whole new principle, a whole new concept, a whole new ideal, idea and ideal of the integrity of the individual were accomplished by statute.

Oliver Wendell Holmes said once that "So long as conflicting notions hold the battlefronts against each other and the idea destined to prevail has not been established, the time for law has not yet come." Your act was passed when the conflicting notions still kept the battlefronts against each other and you have had to fight the problem of making law work under those circumstances.

I say only to you that with whatever advantage comes from being not a part of the National Labor Relations Board, but having watched it as a teacher and Government administrator over the period of years, I say I know no other record which parallels yours when it comes to the changing of what would otherwise have been the situation through the work of an institution. I suppose most institutions simply ride along with what would have happened anyway. Not the National Labor Relations Board. The country is so different today from what it would have been if there had not been an NLRB, and I suppose that is probably the largest accomplishment in the history of the United States by a small group of people. I suppose that this whole revolution, for that's what it's been, has been brought about by a comparatively small number of people and they aren't just the labor leaders, they aren't the industrial labor relations managers; to a considerable extent they are those of you who have participated in the bringing of Govern-

ment service to the aid of individual independence, of private freedom.

I think of the National Labor Relations Board as having established a foundation of private freedom, private democracy in this country.

I can only say to you my most sincere compliments I hope that for all of you, both those who are being honored here today as well as for others, this work means, as I say, not the pounding of a typewriter, not the writing of a brief, but of building and maintaining of a free society, which is the one thing which is most important to all of us.

Foreign Language, Union Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1961 session of the California Legislature, legislation was passed requiring that foreign languages be included in all California public schools for grades 6, 7, and 8.

This presented a challenge which was immediately accepted by the progressive leaders of the Union School District in San Jose, Calif.

It is my pleasure to know the assistant superintendent, Mr. S. Robert Infelise, who with the district superintendent, Mr. Berkeley Mathews, can be credited with initiating a most imaginative and extensive foreign language program in the Union School District. Mr. Infelise has furnished me with an article entitled "Foreign Language, Union Style" which is so interesting that I would like to share it with Members of the House and Senate.

The article follows:

FOREIGN LANGUAGE, UNION STYLE

(By S. Robert Infelise, assistant superintendent, Union School District, San Jose, Calif.)

Assembly bill 2564, passed in the 1961 session of the California State Legislature, amended Education Code No. 7604. It required the inclusion of foreign language in the elementary course of study for grades 6, 7, and 8 beginning not later than the fall of 1965. This legislation has produced an interesting reaction throughout the State. The responses ranged from enthusiastic endorsement to outraged indignation. The enthusiastic endorsers usually numbered those districts who had already begun a foreign language program of sorts and were happy to see that enlightenment had finally reached Sacramento.

The "view with alarmers" had a much more complex membership. Some were worried about how they were going to include another subject into an already crowded curriculum. Others were concerned about financing the program. Still others were moved to invective against "another case of big government taking away the rights of the individual." And so on.

The Union Elementary School District of Santa Clara County enlisted in the latter group when first it realized the effects of the legislation. However, this position presented one significant problem. It offered no solutions to the inevitable. Slowly, the realization came that those who help themselves were going to be ready for 1965. A more realistic appraisal of our situation found the following facts:

1. The Union School District has no foreign language program.

2. The Union School District was not prepared to offer a foreign language program.

3. The Union School District personnel generally were not enthusiastic about the foreign language program if they would have to provide it in our existing curricular organizational pattern.

4. The "power structure" of the Union School District, i.e., key teachers, citizens, and administrators generally favored a program of foreign language, providing a reorganization for instruction could be effected to include foreign language.

5. None of the "power structure" knew what constituted an effective foreign language program—except the superintendent, of course.

This last statement presented the first task to be accomplished—determine what was a good foreign language program. What content? What grade levels? What language or languages? What personnel? What changes in organization for instruction? All these and other questions were investigated as thoroughly as was convenient for a staff that still had to run an educational program for 6,000 elementary pupils.

This phase of our project was an interesting exercise in "whose bandwagon shall we jump on"? The television people offered a complete solution in an electronic tube—just turn it on and off two or three times a week. The foreign language experts offered the "new approach" oral-aural (or is it audio-lingual?). This also included a diet of alphabet soup like FLES, FLASC, etc. There were still some traditionalists who insisted on declensions (conjugations?) and a few tenses scattered here and there.

One significant fact seemed to manifest itself in all the inquiries. The amount of exposure to the language was considered of paramount importance. Paradoxically, few programs in existence seem to provide an effective amount of daily time for the student to work with the language.

Additionally, there was a great range of grade levels in which foreign language was taught. Some districts offered it in all grades beginning in the kindergarten. Others offered it only in grades 7 and 8.

A greater range of differences existed in the personnel who taught the language. Some teachers were teaching (either by diplomatic coercion or administrative mandate) without any prior knowledge of the language. There were a scattered number of native speakers found in the study as well as a few "gringos" who had acquired a degree of expertise in the target language.

As a result of the investigations, we were able to establish a framework for our foreign language program:

1. Foreign language will be offered in grades 4 through 8 beginning the fall of 1965.

2. Foreign language will be offered to all students daily ranging from 20 minutes in the fourth grade to 45 minutes in seventh and eighth.

3. Initially, one language will be offered—Spanish.

Two major problems confront us. How do you offer language daily without spending a fortune in salaries for specialists? Where are you going to find the personnel to implement the program?

Problem one is being approached from the standpoint of reorganizing the class day into a semi-departmentalized or core program for grades 4, 5, and 6. Grades 7 and 8 are already completely departmentalized. By achieving the rotation of teachers provided by this structure, we can use specially trained personnel (if we had them) as homeroom teachers, i.e., they carry a full ADA load while teaching in their specialty. An apology is offered for this too brief explanation of the organization but the main point is that we can do this without adding the salary of specialists.

Problem two was the most challenging. Expert observers predicted that there would be a dearth of foreign language specialists in 1965. In light of this we decided to select teachers from our existing staff who would be willing to participate in a 2 year in-service program at district expense. Ability in a foreign language was desirable but not necessary.

The State department of education, through Everett O'Rourke's office, assigned Tom Doran, consultant in foreign language, to assist us in developing the format for our experiment. The in-service program was designed as follows:

Phase 1, (completed) June 1 to August 3, 1963:

(a) Select consultants to work with teachers.

(b) Select locale for initial training period (University of Santa Clara).

(c) Select materials to be used for project.

(d) Teachers begin training daily at the University of Santa Clara—June 24 to August 3, 1963.

Phase 2, September through June 1963–64:

(a) Teachers continue training on a weekly basis with consultants.

Phase 3, June 15 to August 1, 1964:

(a) Teachers go to selected locale in Mexico for further study with consultants.

Phase 4, September through June 1964–65:

(a) Teachers continue training and assist in the writing of curriculum and developing materials with consultants.

Phase 5, June 15 to August 1, 1965:

(a) Teachers conclude training.

The training program is designed to prepare the teachers both in the language and in techniques. The group of teachers who participated in phase 1 generally lacked any background in the target language. However, the consultants, using the same approach as is intended for their use, were quite successful in achieving initial control of pronunciation. Of course, the 6 weeks in Mexico is the key phase of their training in the language. (If progress continues at the same pace, there is sufficient reason to believe that they will achieve a high degree of success.)

Before we conclude, a word about financing the project should prove interesting to those who might be wondering how this could be accomplished in an "impoverished" district.

The voters of our district approved a tax override in the spring of 1963. The campaign for the increase included a stipulation that $35,000 would be used for training our personnel in foreign language. The actual cost of preparing sufficient teachers to provide two per K–6 school will be less than that. These people will not be assigned as specialists as indicated above. The only continuing cost will be materials and training new people to take care of growth and normal attrition of the existing foreign language people.

The greatest advantage to the district is not monetary. With this number of trained teachers we will be able to provide our youngsters with two or three times the exposure they would receive if the program were handled by specialists. We estimate that each student will get daily instruction as opposed to the twice weekly average visitations by the traveling specialist in the districts studied.

The initial reactions by the 16 teachers who have participated in phase 1 of the project have been very positive. We expected this, however. It would be ridiculous of us to say "we were pleasantly surprised"

after all the efforts of people like Tom Doran, Marie deCarli, and Carlos Lopez (the latter two were consultants and instructors for the initial phase). We achieved what we set out to do. Our next goal is the one that set the wheels in motion, that is, by 1965 we expect to be in a position to offer a foreign language program that has been carefully and thoroughly developed, one which is philosophically and practically sound, and which we believe will provide the finest program possible to the children attending the schools of the district.

Amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 12, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the two Pittsburgh newspapers, during this week, had articles pertaining to dropouts and to the increase in steel production, shipping and profits but the continuing decrease in employment.

On November 17, the Pittsburgh Press discusses at considerable length the record of steel for the first three-quarters of 1963. Peter Bradley, the author of this article, has an excellent reputation for objective reporting and I ask the Members of Congress to read his report with full confidence that it is not slanted in any way.

Mr. Bradley states the industry worked longer hours, increased the payroll expenditures, yet had 8,000 less employees than last year. It also had an increase of over 11 percent in production and over 7 percent in shipments.

It is very interesting to note that over one half of the eliminated employees came from the white collar group pointing to the gradual growth of automation and technological developments in that area as well as in the production area.

On November 18, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette carried a lead editorial entitled "Dropouts Revisited" and found that many who had been approached and returned to school for the fall semester have again dropped out. It estimated that by January, 90 percent of those who returned will no longer be in school again.

It points out the need for special training for these young people if we hope to make them employable in the years ahead. Just returning them to classes, to the same courses and conflicts, is not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, these two reports stress the necessity of the urgency of the program conducted through the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the speedy enactment of the amendments to that act which my subcommittee and the full Committee on Education and Labor reported out.

With the industrial segment of the Nation granted a $2 billion depreciation tax writeoff by the Department of Internal Revenue and with the promise of another $2 billion tax reduction as an incentive to modernize its facilities and equipment in the new tax proposal, it is necessary that Congress act to assist those workers who will feel the effects of this modernization—both through job elimination and attrition.

The following are the articles:

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Nov. 17, 1963]

STEEL HAVING BANNER YEAR, PAYROLLS HIGH—BUT JOBS DOWN

(By Peter Bradley)

The record of the American steel industry for three-fourths of 1963, as unfolded by the American Iron & Steel Institute, is a gratifying one—except for one factor.

It is a record of accomplishments in sales, profits, production, and shipments.

It shows that more money was delivered to employees than in the same period last year.

Yet one disturbing flaw remains.

Employment is down.

This trend is not new, of course, but it is one which bears repetition, for it mirrors the basic economic problem of this decade.

PAYROLL HIGHER

Here is the basic industry of the United States, showing an 11.6 percent increase in production over last year, a 7.4 percent gain in shipments, generally improved profits.

Many agencies, public and private, are grappling with this problem in many fields.

But the steel record tends to bear out the observation of one respected student of the industry that the most important development in the industry in the last 10 years was "not the basic oxygen process, but the Human Relations Committee."

It also shows a total payroll for the 9 months of $3,036,136,577, an increase of nearly $49 million over the same period last year, and total hours worked of 776,109,395, an increase of nearly 3,500,000 hours over the same period in the previous year.

Yet the average number of employees—524,542—is down by 8,000.

WHITE COLLAR LOSSES

The job losses include, for the first time in significant numbers, salaried workers as well as hourly paid production workers.

The number of white collar workers dropped by 4,200 to 114,648 over the 9-month period, and the number of production workers fell by 3,900 to 409,894 during the same period.

The average workweek for production workers rose by an hour a week to 37.6, indicating increased overtime was one of the devices which helped spur production without the use of additional manpower.

In short, the record shows a continuing trend of more and more pay for fewer and fewer workers.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Nov. 18, 1963]

DROPOUTS REVISITED

The latest issue of the U.S. Office of Education's journal, School Life, reprints an exchange of letters in which President Kennedy and Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel patted each other on the back for the success of their $250,000 campaign against dropouts. The magazine was barely off the press before reports began to emanate from other sources that the drive was a national flop.

While this coincidence tends to make the Messrs. Kennedy and Keppel look rather silly, at least part of the blame can be laid to a misfortune in timing. Although their letters were not published until late October, they had been written early in September—only a month or so after the dropout campaign was launched August 1.

At the time the letters were penned, the effort to focus special attention on the need to keep young people working for their diplomas did, indeed, have all the earmarks of success.

The trouble is that the Kennedy-Keppel plaudits were premature. What is now apparent—and this is the basis of the charges of failure—is that the recaptured dropouts are dropping out again. One expert predicts that by January 90 percent of those who were persuaded to make another stab at study will have given up again—and probably for good this time.

The factors which push young people out of school before their time lie beyond the reach of an oversimplified appeal based on mere publicity. Slogans do not improve anybody's capacity to learn, or cure emotional disturbances, or relieve the hardships of poverty and discrimination, or create new curriculums that cater to special needs, or stem the tide of economic revolution.

Unless ways are found to deal with these fundamental and extremely difficult problems, potential dropouts are going to remain potential dropouts—until, in all likelihood, they become actual dropouts. And the first step toward meeting the challenge is to recognize that it is not one big problem, susceptible to a mass attack of publicity, but thousands of individual problems.

One of the best answers to the problem of dropouts is the provision of high schools so comprehensive in their course offering as to meet the needs of all the students, including those most likely to drop out. There is no point in enticing the dropouts back to school unless the school has courses tailored to their needs. Strengthening of technical and vocational courses would, we believe, better meet the needs of many youths who drop out of high schools where the emphasis is almost wholly upon academic subjects. We should provide more young people with the manual skills required by the new technology.

Address by Dr. Francisco Gonzalez de la Vega Before 33d Convention of American Society of Travel Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Dr. Francisco Gonzalez de la Vega, head of the Mexican Government Tourism Department. The address was delivered at the inaugural session of the 33d Convention of the American Society of Travel Agents, in Mexico City. The Senator from Washington also had the privilege, along with the President of Mexico, of addressing the convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. FRANCISCO GONZALEZ DE LA VEGA, HEAD OF THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT TOURISM DEPARTMENT, AT THE INAUGURAL SESSION OF THE 33D CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS

We are gathered today to inaugurate one of the events that will have the highest significance for our country's tourism—which, as is well known, has come to be one of the most important and outstanding factors in our international balance of payments. But beyond its economic importance—and re-

flecting the stated view of our illustrious President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, who is honoring us with his presence here—Mexico sees in tourism a fountain generating cordial contacts with other peoples of the earth and most specially those who, due to geographical proximity, maintain closer relations with us.

It is for this reason that the 33d Annual Convention of the American Society of Travel Agents has been hailed with the greatest praise by public opinion here from the moment it became known that it was to be held in this city.

To the delegates who are now our guests, we extend a most cordial welcome on behalf of the Government of Mexico. We see in them not only friends, who deserve every hospitable attention, but at the same time we recognize the technical capacity and experience which qualify them to appreciate the tourist potential of any country.

We have already said on another occasion that the travel agent has become in our time a modern creator of dreams, of attractive and brillant distances—a powerful person who relieves tedium in humanity, the inertia of man. Consequently, he freshens man's imagination and is thus a professional who can do much to elevate mankind. Furthermore, we find among our guests people whose related activities make possible the full realization of a trip.

We shall not insist on speaking of what the American Society of Travel Agents is, because the press and other organs of information have already made known its importance as an organization grouping almost 7,000 experts on different aspects of tourism and operating in more than 80 countries.

Rather, what we now desire is to transmit our sentiments as we receive the members of this conference and our hope that they will become familiar with our country—most particularly in those aspects which are of greatest concern to their important activities.

Our desire that your stay in Mexico be agreeable and profitable would be a mere diplomatic formality if the nation did not today add to the gracious hospitality of its people an atmosphere of creative peace, of political continuity, of ceaseless work, and of surprising material transformation.

Based on a tradition of many centuries, we Mexicans are striving to build a modern nation, alert to the problems of a world which can find the key to its future welfare only in peaceful coexistence; a nation in which the glory of history or the spontaneity of custom do not interrupt the rhythm of living things.

The travel agents who visited us in 1949, when Mexico was the scene of an ASTA Congress, can become convinced that Mexico has succeeded since then, and at an accelerated pace, in constructing luxurious hotels, superhighways, airports, roads and, in one word, has united all the elements that make the stay of a visitor pleasant in a country. And those who have come to our land for the first time can also prove that this aspiration toward modern comfort heightens rather than destroys a tradition which is a blend of many cultures.

Mexico is a country that today is in the mind of travelers for more than one reason. Peace and the social activity of a people where the State is at the service of man, and not man a cog of a machine at the service of the State; a renewed continuity in the tasks that our fellow citizens have set for themselves since 1910 when the revolution began; the efforts of our successive administrations to carry on gigantic programs of public works; the efforts to raise Mexicans to the level of individual dignity which people more favored by nature enjoy. We understand this new Mexican not only as an individual abandoned to a policy of "laissez faire, laissez passer," but as a member of a class, of a social sector, whose handicaps within the social conglomerate should be corrected and compensated by public effort. The persistence of ideals of social justice which appear repeatedly in the conscience of Mexico at different stages in its history all make it possible for the traveler to visit a Mexico more healthful and with better communication, where the ferment of humanistic ideas rises alongside our social and economic progress.

Mexicans are no longer, as has been said, a marginal people. The will to participate in the life of the world, and to fight together with other countries for the peace of the world, which led our President to visit North and South America, Asia, and Europe, is a clear indication that we do not accept national isolation and that we aspire, with the weapon of our ideas, to fight indefatigably to erase or to conquer all that now darkens the horizons of the human race.

We love liberty; but liberty to create and to contribute to concord among human beings and to a more equitable distribution of goods. Ultimately, we seek new rules of life for mankind.

Within a framework of universal coexistence, we wish our collective existence to crystalize genuinely democratic ideals; but never forgetting that peace can only flourish in an atmosphere of justice and that justice cannot be understood except among equals.

Our national problems include economic, social, and cultural differences among our compatriots which the efforts of our revolution are trying to solve. In this great effort, Mexico is reaching a new culmination due to the work of our President, who, being almost of the same age as our revolution itself, owes the structure of his mind and the temper of his spirit to this great historical process, being its perfect representative, its persistent champion and its genuine standard bearer.

The accelerated rhythm of our progress takes on its full significance for the future because Mexico has, as the man most responsible for its public activities, an heir of the country's purest spiritual essence. His efforts to give meaning to each one of his works, from the vastest to the most humble, could not disregard an item as important as tourism. Our President know that peace is only possible where human sympathy is created, that this is bred from direct contact, and he knows that peoples, when their personalities, their traditions and their cultures are deeprooted, lose nothing from foreign influences, but rather become stronger through contacts that come from outside.

In referring to tourism, it is useful to note that we Mexicans do not understand it merely as travel for pleasure, as the word is defined in dictionaries, but as a drive to know other scenes and other men so as to widen our capacity for coexistence.

In our century, much has been said about "homo economicus"—the economic man—but Mexico aspires to the ideal of universal man, who is made richer when his blood or his ideas have something pertaining to all the races that populate the earth.

A world shrunk by better communications does not necessarily enrich the spirit of man. The advanced techniques that now link us would be wasted if through them we were only to export aggressive regionalism.

Tourism, through today's techniques, must contribute to the ideal of a human race firmly united.

Delegates to the 33d Convention of the American Society of Travel Agents:

Welcome to our country. We offer it to your expert vision during one of the most propitious moments for world tourist promotion. We have become the seat of the Olympic games for 1968, a fact that makes manifest the unrivaled conditions which our country enjoys for the celebration of events of the utmost importance. Due to this and due to your presence, gentlemen, this is indeed a gala occasion.

The Polish University Club of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Polish University Club of New Jersey, one of the most active and constructive organizations of its kind, celebrated its 35th anniversary last month with a most impressive and enjoyable banquet and ball at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark.

In connection with this event, the club published a very informative and attractive program which contains a great deal of important information about the club and its activities.

Founded in 1928, the Polish University Club's purposes have been admirably summarized by Dr. Charles Allan Baretski, its historian:

An outpouring of love for America and respect for its Government and institutions and gratitude for sacrifices made in their behalf by their parents and families and a determination to foster an appreciation of their Polish heritage bespoke a readiness on the part of the club's founders to charter an organization for Polish-American men whose only standard would be one of excellence. Thus, ab initio, the Polish University Club of New Jersey was something more than a fraternal group, much more than an ethnic or "nationality" society, singing its own praises. Ideally and actually, it was and is meant to be a service group, and it does serve. It illuminates the ideals of American citizenship, holds high the torch of learning and scholarship, and disseminates the fruit of Polish culture.

Among the group's most important contributions has been its sponsorship, beginning in 1953, of the Institute of Polish Culture at Seton Hall University in South Orange, N.J. Now known as the Polish Cultural Society at Seton Hall University, this institution has regularly implemented the club's ideals by bringing to the public, under university auspices, outstanding programs featuring Polish scholars, music, poetry, and history.

The club's scholarship program is another of its activities in which members take special pride. Over the years, a long list of deserving young men and women have been aided in pursuing college careers at various institutions inside and out of New Jersey, thereby extending the beneficial influence of the the club far into the future.

In addition to a very active women's auxiliary, the club has also engaged in numerous social affairs, awarded medals for academic excellence, aided numerous good causes, and has exercised a constructive impact on our State far out of proportion to its numbers.

The president of the Polish University Club of New Jersey for the current year is a distinguished citizen of my own congressional district, Mr. Jan Zaprawa-Ostromecki, of Roselle Park. A former member of the Polish Parliament, a lawyer, economist, and engineer, Mr. Zaprawa-Ostromecki was a leader of the Polish underground in World War II

and was captured, tortured, and imprisoned by the Nazis.

Other officers this year include: James R. Barwick, first vice president; Casimir J. Drygas, second vice president; Stanley Wyglendowski, corresponding secretary; Walter J. Pietrucha, recording secretary; Wallace Nowel, treasurer; Dr. Charles A. Baretski, historian; and Raymond Wozniak, sergeant at arms.

Chairmen of the club's committees for 1963–64 are Walter Brytczuk, budget; Peter Pietrucha, good and welfare; Casimir J. Drygas, dinner-dance; John A. Wroblesky, bulletin; Stanley Strand, publicity; J. Thaddeus Rospond, scholarship; Edmund Wiss, life membership; Edward Mizerski, ways and means; John Lacz, academic award of elementary schools; Leonard V. Gorson, outstanding citizen award; Charles Pierce, Seton Hall Institute; Edward Mizerski, legislative and constitution revision; Dr. Edward Wolski, membership; Chester Stanowski, dinner meeting; Frank Gubernat, theater party; Eugene Bogatko, liaison; Jan Zaprawa-Ostromecki, 35th anniversary; Dr. Charles A. Baretski, Poland's millennium; Joseph Zaorski, promoting courses in Polish language and literature; Dr. Eugene Nargiello, 600th anniversary of Cracow University.

As evidence of the high regard in which the Polish University Club is held by the people of New Jersey, the club's honorary committee for the 35th anniversary includes the entire New Jersey delegation to the House and Senate, as well as the following: Most Rev. John Dougherty, auxiliary bishop of Newark and president of Seton Hall University; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis P. Kowalczyk, P.A.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Bronislaw Socha; Very Rev. Msgr. Michael Fronczak; Gov. Richard J. Hughes; Mayor Hugh J. Addonizio; and Dr. Juliusz Szygowski, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Polish government-in-exile.

I was very privileged, Mr. Speaker, to be one of the speakers at the 35th anniversary celebration of the Polish University Club of New Jersey and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my speech on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and friends, it is a special pleasure for me to be here with you tonight and to be asked to speak on this notable anniversary celebration—not only because I feel so much at home with so many friends but also because I find the goals and ideals of the Polish University Club so similar to my own.

Your emphasis on and practical contribution toward excellence in education recognizes the growing importance of equipping our people with the skills, the training, and the understanding which are needed to deal with this modern world in all its complexity. Both the opportunities and the hazards of our age are fairly obvious, but it is even more apparent that, in order to benefit from the opportunities and avoid the hazards, we must improve the quality of education and broaden the availability of education to all our people. I am happy to see that you are doing your part.

You are also dedicated to freedom—both personal freedom and national independence—at a time when neither can be taken for granted anywhere in the world. And the two go together, as you so well understand. It is not enough that a nation be independent—whether that nation be the United States, Poland, Cuba, or the Soviet Union. If its people are not free to govern themselves, if they are forced under the heel of an oppressive government—whether that government is homegrown or imported—then we cannot be content or consider that our ideals have been achieved. National independence without personal freedom may represent progress of a limited kind, but it is not by any stretch of the imagination the end of the struggle. Independence is empty unless it is filled with the hopes and dreams of people whose basic human rights are respected and protected.

I emphasize this distinction between national independence and personal freedom because it applies directly to the present situation in Poland and in other Eastern European countries, and because I believe it is a keystone to the understanding of what is happening to the cold war in that crucial part of the world.

The time has come, I believe, to make a major reassessment of our foreign policy with respect to Soviet Russia and to other Communist governments, especially in Eastern Europe. We need a new national debate on the course our country should follow. We should have a clearer understanding of how our Government views the great issues involved here and what it proposes to do about them. The events of recent weeks which have alarmed some and encouraged others—and I refer to the nuclear test ban treaty, the sale of wheat to Russia, the proposed joint American-Soviet expedition to the moon—has also served to confuse even more of us about the policy our Government is now pursuing.

Whatever that policy may be, it should, I believe, carefully avoid two unworkable, unrealistic extremes. I cannot agree, for instance, with those who deny that times can change and that we must be ready to take advantage of the new opportunities these changes bring. I cannot agree with those who would deny us any contact, any relations, with the countries of Eastern Europe because their governments are Communist-controlled. I cannot agree with those who still maintain, in this age of the superbomb that the only course we can follow is the forcible and violent overthrow of these governments.

That is one extreme. At the other extreme, I would also condemn those who naively expect too much from too little evidence—who are too ready to believe the best of Communist words at the expense of the worst of Communist actions—those who place too much emphasis on the loosening of direct Soviet control over countries like Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia, but who overlook the tyranny of teh so-called independent Communist regimes there—and I condemn the optimism of those who are too willing to forget the fundamental evil of communism.

Somewhere between these two extremes, there is a practical course and a realistic policy for our country to follow. In seeking that course, I would remind us all that international communism remains a powerful opponent. As an idea, it has a deceptive appeal which has infected individuals throughout the world. As an organized system of force, it has mobilized hundreds of millions of people, overthrown legitimate governments, terrorized innocent victims, and sought to intimidate the rest of the world by displaying its military might.

This is not ancient history. The means and objectives of communism have remained fundamentally the same. Today, as in the beginning, world domination is its goal, and its means include anything that will work to its own advantage.

Free people, therefore, must oppose communism—both as an idea and as a system of power, both here at home and wherever it seeks to pull down free institutions and enslave free men. This is an obligation that arises from the right of self-defense and from the very logic of freedom.

How, in any specific way, the free world should go about the work of opposing communism is a matter of governmental policy and, therefore, is subject to controversy and debate. There is no single right way, valid for all times and places and circumstances. The strategy of freedom must be flexible, ready to confront the changing tactics of communism in various parts of the world, and ready, too, to utilize every opportunity to strengthen freedom and present freedom's case forthrightly and persuasively.

As a part of this strategy of freedom, we must, I believe, recognize the fact that conditions are changing within the Communist world, and with those changes comes the need to reexamine our own tactics. Since the death of Stalin, there has been a limited but unmistakable relaxation within Soviet Russia—a little more attention to the people's needs, a little less reliance on total police control. Not much, but a little. The same kind of loosening-up process has been evident in relations between Soviet Russia and the satellite countries of Eastern Europe. With Poland and Yugoslavia taking the lead, Russia has been forced to acknowledge the right of other Communist states to follow at least a partially independent national policy, rather than total subservience to the U.S.S.R. This "victory"—limited though it is—has led to the most decisive split in the history of communism, the deep division between Soviet Russia and Communist China, in which every Eastern European government except Albania has taken the side of the Soviet Union.

This is a hopeful situation. Obviously, I do not see the end of the cold war in sight—far from it. But it does present the United States with new opportunities to lessen the danger of nuclear war and to encourage the further separation of one-time puppet governments from their one-time foreign boss. Independence isn't everything, as I have said before, but it is an essential first step—provided that we don't stop here.

Poland is an outstanding example of the new situation that confronts us. The Polish people, supported by their church—as you know so well—have never surrendered to communism. They have never given up the struggle for freedom, never stopped their resistance to the power of the Communist state. Their courage has won them at least some independence, and we can hope for more.

Now is certainly not the time to shut the door on Poland. To do this would be to play into the hands of the Communists themselves. If the free world, especially the United States, should abandon Poland, we would be proving that Communist propagandists are right when they argue that America doesn't care or can't be counted on for help. We would be forcing the Polish people to turn closer to other Communist powers and away from freedom.

Instead, we in the United States should look for every possible way of distinguishing between the Polish people and their Communist government. In every way we can, we should help the people without strengthening the government. We should increase the contacts between people of the free world and the people of Poland. We should reinforce their hopes for the future, by convincing them that we have not forgotten their brave struggle against tyranny. We should weigh every chance to help by the test of whether it will increase the people's desire, hope, and demand for greater freedom.

Freedom, we should know by now, is a dangerous thing for communism. A little freedom only sharpens the appetite for more. It creates a hunger that must be satisfied. This is our greatest weapon.

If we of the Western World truly believe in our ideals of freedom and independence,

democracy and self-government, and the dignity and worth of each human being, then we have nothing to fear from communism. We should compete with communism wherever we find it—compete with it by demonstrating the superiority of freedom, by proving that we really care about people and that we are willing to help them in their hour of need.

It won't be easy. There is no guarantee of early victory. But to those who understand it and value it, freedom is priceless, and no matter how much patience, ingenuity, and determination it may require, freedom is worth the struggle.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

President Kennedy in Tampa, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, November 18, 1963, President Kennedy visited my congressional district. He is the first President of the United States to appear in the Tampa Bay area of Florida while President.

President Kennedy's visit was enthusiastically received by a very large turnout, probably numbering into the hundreds of thousands.

While in Tampa, the President addressed four gatherings. One of these was the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, composed of leading businessmen from throughout the State. During his appearance before the chamber of commerce he delivered a speech saying that his administration is neither probusiness nor antibusiness, but pro-the-public interest. He called for the passage of a tax cut as has been previously passed by this House and discussed four questions that he said are frequently asked him by the business community. At the conclusion of his formal address he answered questions proposed from the floor, touching on such questions as the civil rights bill now pending in the House.

For those who were unable to hear his address, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD a verbatim transcript of his speech and of the question and answer period that followed his speech.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS TO THE FLORIDA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to be here at this distinguished gathering. I came at the suggestion of the senior Senator of Florida—Senator (GEORGE A.) SMATHERS who represents this State with distinction and also his—of course the majority whip in the Senate and therefore speaks for the United States.

So, I'm glad to come here as the son of two citizens of Florida, my mother and father come here with your Governor (Farris Bryant) who has helped make the decisions which I think will make progress in Florida possible not only now but in the future.

And I'm glad particularly to be here with this group who played such a leading role—Tom Flemming and others—in securing the passage of the bonds which will make it possible for Florida to have the kind of educational system which is necessary for leadership in this State and country.

I said before and in the presence once of the Governor that I felt that the extraordinary progress which California had made in many technical and engineering fields was due to the emphasis which that State had put on higher education.

COMMENDS SCHOOL PLAN

And I think the effort which this State is making to make your schools and colleges and universities as good as they possibly can be, to make it possible for you to take care of the twice as many boys and girls who will be trying to get into our colleges in 1970 as were in 1960 because this group which ordinarily might not be regarded as free spenders supported this great State effort, I want to commend you.

A little more than 1 year ago, when our bill to grant a tax credit for business investment was before the Congress, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was on a plane to this State, and he found himself talking to one of the leading Florida businessmen about the investment tax credit.

He spent some time, he later told me, explaining how the bill would help this man's corporate outlook and income, and the businessman was most impressed.

And, finally, as the plane landed at Miami, he turned to Secretary Dillon and said:

"I'm very grateful to you for explaining the bill. Now, tell me just once more, why is it I'm against it?"

That story is unfortunately not an exaggeration. Many businessmen who are prospering as never before during this administration are convinced, nevertheless, that we must be antibusiness.

With the new figures on corporate profits after taxes having reached an alltime high—running some 43 percent higher than they were just 3 years ago—they still suspect us of being opposed to private profit.

With the most stable price level of any comparable economic recovery in our history, they still fear that we're promoting inflation.

RECOUNTS PROGRAM

We have liberalized depreciation guidelines to grant more individual flexibility, reduced our farm surpluses, reduced transportation taxes, established a private corporation to manage our satellite communications system, increased the role of American business in the development of less developed countries, and proposed to the Congress a sharp reduction in corporate, as well as personal income taxes, and a major deregulation of transportation.

And yet many businessmen are convinced that a Democratic administration is out to soak the rich, increase controls for the sake of controls and extend at all costs the scope of the Federal bureaucracy.

The hard facts contradict these doubts. This administration is interested in the healthy expansion of our economy. We are interested in the steady progress of our society. And it is in this kind of program in my opinion in which American business has the largest stake.

Why is it that profits are at an alltime high in the Nation today? It is because the Nation as a whole is prospering.

It is because our gross national product is rising from $500 to $600 billion, a record rise of $100 billion in 3 years—36 months.

It is because industrial production in the last 3 years has increased 22 percent and personal income by 15 percent.

It is because, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out last week, the United States now leads most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion for the first time in many years. In the last 18 months, our gross rate exceeded that of France or Germany.

It is because, as Fortune magazine recently pointed out, corporate profits in America are now rising much faster than corporate profits overseas.

It is because these profits have not been eaten up by an inflationary spiral and finally it is because we have reversed the dismal trend toward even more frequent recessions, which are the greatest enemy of profits.

By next April, with the indispensable help of the pending tax cut bill, the United States will be sailing with the winds of the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion in our Nation's entire history.

I do not say that all this is due to the administration alone, but neither is it all accidental.

The fiscal and monetary policies which we have followed are the key element in whether the economy moves toward a path of expansion or restriction. In the last 3 years American business and industry have directly benefited from a host of our legislative and administrative actions which increased corporate cash flow, increased markets at home and abroad, increased consumer purchasing power and increased plant modernization and productivity.

And still other steps have been taken to curb the wage-price spiral—the first 6 months of 1963 there was less time lost in strikes than any time since the Second World War—to hold down the cost of credit and to bring more harmony into industrial relations.

I do not say that these actions were taken for the benefit of business alone; they were taken to benefit the country. Some of them were labeled probusiness, some of them were labeled antibusiness, some of them were labeled both by opposing groups. But that kind of label is meaningless. This administration is pro-the-public-interest.

Nor do I say that all these policies could please all American businessmen all of the time. So long as the interests and views of businessmen frequently clash with each other, no President could possibly please them all.

Most businessmen, though perhaps not most business spokesmen, are associated with small business. They ask the Government for assistance—to protect them against monopoly, to assure them of reasonable credit, to enable them to participate in defense contracts. And both large and small business work with the various arms of the administration every day on trade, transportation, procurement, balance of payments, and international business affairs.

They do not show the hostility which is so often described, or find that our policies and personnel are so incompatible with their own.

Businessmen are welcome at the White House. And I welcome the chance to address business meetings such as this. Not because I expect that it will necessarily affect the results of elections, but I do think, I do think it can affect what this country does and how it moves ahead and whether we're going to be able to find jobs for all the people that need them, and whether we're going to build the kind of a country in which all of us can take pride and credit. And that's the kind of cooperative effort which I invite from businessmen and from other interested citizens.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED

If we can keep open the channels of communication this country can make progress ahead. To further that understanding I would like to answer four questions that I'm most frequently asked by businessmen or written about or written to.

The first and most frequently asked question is:

Is the Federal Government growing so large that our private economy is endangered?

My answer to that is no. The Federal Government has been growing for 175 years. Our population has grown even faster. Our territory and economy have grown and become more closely linked.

The size of our business, labor, farm, and other establishments and organizations has grown. Above all, our responsibilities around the world have grown, and our stake in the world peace has grown immensurably.

Life itself is more complex. And the American people in the 20th century have come to expect more from governmental action. But there has been no sudden spurt in the growth of Government under this administration.

Leaving national security outlays aside, Federal civilian expenditures today, when measured, as they should be measured in a growing economy, as a percentage of our national output, are no higher than they were at the end of the Second World War. A mere 5 percent of our gross national product is not a threat to our economy.

The real growth, and this will not come as a surprise to your Governor, the real growth in government has been at the State and local levels. Between 1948 and 1962 while Federal civilian expenditures were rising by 65 percent State spending, on the average across this country, rose by 227 percent from less than $10 billion in 1948 to over $30 billion in 1962.

RISE BY STATES

Florida's State expenditures in that same period rose by 270 percent, or more than four times as fast percentagewise as the Federal budget; Georgia by 331 percent; Ohio by 300 percent; Kentucky by 431 percent.

The Federal Government has no desire to expand the size and scope of its activities merely for the sake of expansion. Many tasks could never have been taken on by the Congress had they been able to have been fulfilled at the State and local levels.

And this administration has made efforts to transfer to private ownership many of the financial assets held by the Government, to substitute private for public credit, to reduce farm surpluses, to dispose of excess commodities and to make our transportation system less restrictive. This is a far cry, I believe, from a government too big for the economy.

"NO" ON DEBT AS DISASTER

And secondly, I am asked, are not continuing deficits and the mounting national debt certain to drive us into bankruptcy? And my answer to that is "No."

Once again we must look at these facts in perspective. From 1948 to 1962 the total Federal debt increased less than 20 percent. We had the Korean war, all our obligations abroad, a tremendously growing country, tremendously growing population. The Federal debt grew by less than 20 percent while the average for all the States was 500 percent. But taking only the 4 years from 1958 to 1962 the Federal debt rose only 8 percent while State debt as a whole went up 41 percent.

Obviously, neither the States nor the Nation are teetering on the edge of bankruptcy as the result of these debts. In 1945 our national debt was 120 percent of our gross national product. Today it's 53 percent. Next year it will be 52 percent.

At a time when our debt has gone up by the percentage I have described our gross national product is double, and therefore as this country moves to a trillion-dollar economy, which we're moving toward, quite obviously as long as we maintain these proportions, the fiscal credit of the United States will still be secure. While the Federal net debt was growing less than 20 percent in these years, total corporate debt, not my debt, your debt, was growing by nearly 200 percent and the total indebtedness of private individuals rose by 300 percent. So who is the most cautious fiscal manager?

You, gentlemen, or us?

CALLS FOR TAX CUT

It is true that the pending tax cut will add to this debt by temporarily reducing Federal revenues, but the purpose of the tax cut is not to produce a deficit but to boost the economy. A full employment economy is the only way to balance the budget. A recession-ridden economy, recessions occurring every 24 or 30 or 32 months, on the other hand, are a guarantee of chronic higher deficits and continually deeper debt.

We must remember that in 1958 President Eisenhower sent up a budget to the Hill which was balanced in surplus by a half a billion dollars. A a result of the deficit of the recession of 1958 that budget ended up that year unbalanced $12.5 billion.

The greatest enemy of the balanced budget is a recession and it is to prevent a recession and to provide for economic growth and provide for the jobs for the 10 million people who are coming into the labor market in the next 2½ years that I strongly believe in the tax cut very quickly, and not too far away.

And third, I am asked why can't this administration cut Federal expenditures. And my answer is that we have cut. I recommended an additional $620 million in reduction in this year's budget since first submitting it last January. Domestic civilian expenditures, excluding national defense, space, and interest on the debt, domestic civilian expenditures were budgeted below the level of last year, a feat rarely accomplished in the last 15 years.

CONTRACTS SPENDING

Once 16 percent larger than State and local expenditures, our Federal civilian expenditures are now 43 percent smaller. What all this suggests is not that the States have been less prudent than we've been but this country is growing and the needs are growing.

You here in Florida and this chamber know it very well, or you wouldn't have supported a $75 million debt obligation on the people of Florida. You can't tell the children of this State that they can't go to college in 1970 because you didn't take the decisions in 1963 and what we're trying to do in this State is what we're trying to do across the country.

What we have to do is be prudent, responsible, selective, make our judgments about what is really necessary and valuable and what can be put aside. That, it seems to me, is the essence of responsible management by the National Government, by the State government, by the local community, and by private business.

We reduced the number of Federal employees serving every 1,000 people in this country. There are no more people today working for the Federal Government than there were 10 years ago. Federal employment has not increased in the last 10 years. There are less people working today for the Federal Government than there were a year ago, but it will go up, because this country grows. The question is, in what proportion. But I can assure you that there will be less Federal employees serving every 1,000 people next year than there were this year.

PENTAGON SAVINGS

Secretary McNamara has instituted cost reductions, for example, in the Pentagon which will save a billion dollars a year, and finally save $4 billion a year. We are constantly reexamining these programs to determine what can be done.

But many of those who call for larger expenditures are forgetting the growth of our population and the complexities of our problems. And economy advocates from Florida are not opposed to the cross-Florida barge canal, which was so strongly supported by your Governor and by me, or the State's effort at Cape Canaveral or the Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex.

They talk instead about midwestern feed grain programs and far western reclamation projects. But out West the economizers talk about the Tampa Air Force Fuel Annex, and so the argument goes on across the country.

And fourth, and finally, the question arises, will the fiscal policies of the Government lead to inflation? And my answer to that is no. The danger of inflation arises when the level of total and private demand presses against our productive capacity. We are far from that today. Total output in this country would have to increase by $30 billion to reduce unemployment to 4 percent. Our productive plant, still, as all of you know, is still well below what you could produce operating at maximum capacity. Idle men and machines allow plenty of room for decreased taxes and increased demand without the risk of inflation.

The tax cut, moreover, can be expected to stimulate productivity and growth and thus add to our productive potential, lessening the danger of inflation. It's long been believed that a budget deficit automatically means inflation. The facts indicate otherwise.

INFLATION FEAR DISCOUNTED

The record peacetime deficit of 1959 produced no inflation then or subsequently, nor have the deficits of recent years. In fact, most of our post-war inflation occurred in the year of budget surpluses, 1947, 1948, 1951, 1956, and 1957. Recent scattered price increases have caused concern and stimulated fear that expanded demand would lead to inflation. But the wholesale price index so far shows little or no reflection of these increases.

Some prices have been reduced and most prices have not moved. Many of the increases have been in the price of raw materials, which have declined, and inasmuch as the trend of such prices have been stable or downward for a number of years, some recovery is not unexpected. But the abundance of the world's raw materials would indicate that even here we do not have to fear serious inflationary pressures.

QUOTES DICKENS

Moreover, the current remarkable stability of labor costs per unit of output clearly indicates that such price increases as have occurred do not reflect a general upward surge of costs.

I realize that there are some businessmen who feel only they want to be left alone—that Government and politics are none of their affairs—that the balance sheet and profit rate of their own corporations are of more importance than the worldwide balance of power or the nationwide rate of unemployment, but I hope it's not rushing the reason to recall to you the passage from Dickens' Christmas Carol in which Ebenezer Scrooge is terrified by the ghost of his former partner, Jacob Marley. And Scrooge, appalled by Marley's story of ceaseless wandering, cries out, "But you were always a good man of business, Jacob." And the ghost of Marley, his legs bound by a chain of ledger books and cash boxes, replied:

"Business? Mankind was my business. The common welfare was my business. Charity, mercy, forebearance, and benevolence were all my business. The dealings of my trade were but a drop of water in the comprehensive ocean of my business."

Members and guests of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, whether we work in the White House or the State House, or in a house of industry, or commerce, mankind is our business and if we work in harmony, if we understand the problems of each other and the responsibilities that each of us bears, then surely the business of man-

kind will prosper, and your children and mine will move ahead in a secure world, and one in which there is opportunity for them all.

Thank you.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

Question. (By James H. Covey, Jr., president of Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce.)

Answer. Mr. President, as you can see, we have an avalanche of questions.

[Question not heard because of interruption on air.]

We have, however, in association with other countries of this hemisphere joined together in an attempt to isolate the bias of communism and in that regard he have achieved some measure of success. Only five countries in this hemisphere now recognize Cuba. In 1959 the trade of the free world with Cuba was about $1.3 billion. Now, in 1963, there has been an 80 percent reduction in that trade. There has been, for example, in the first 10 months of 1963, a 60 percent reduction as compared to 1962 of the number of free registry, free-world-registered ships, and not with the recent order put by the Greek Government, which, with British traders, were the great free world traders with Cuba, we're going to find a further sharp reduction.

In addition, while there is a good deal of discontent and turmoil and danger in Latin America, I do not think that there is any doubt that Fidel Castro as a symbol of revolt in this hemisphere has faded badly. Every survey, every report and I think every newspaperman, every publisher would agree, that because Mr. Castro has embraced the Soviet Union and become—and made Cuba its satellite, that the appeal he had in the late fifties and early sixties as a national revolutionary has been badly damaged and scarred.

THE WHEAT DEAL

Question. How will the recent wheat deal with Russia affect our economy and would it lessen the U.S. problem of surplus grain?

Answer. Yes, it would. Even though—even with the deal, if it goes and it amounts to 2.5 to 3 million tons, we would still have a surplus of 750 million bushels of wheat, which is still a substantial surplus. But it would affect—we now carry about a billion, and of course we pay the charges for the maintenance of that surplus. In addition, if the sale were consummated we would provide $200 million to our balance-of-payments account, which is important. It would make our carrying charges of our surplus less; it would provide a higher price for wheat, which otherwise would be depressed because of excess production next year. And therefore, if we can work the deal out—and that still is in question—I'm for it.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Question. Thank you, Mr. President. What is the outlook for your civil rights program and, sir, why are you pushing it so vigorously?

Answer. I think that—first, I think that—while I know that this program has not gotten great support here in Florida, I think you gentlemen should recognize the responsibility of the President of the United States. His responsibility is different from what your responsibility may be. This country—I carry out and execute the laws of the United States; I also have the obligation of implementing the orders of the courts of the United States, and I can assure you that whoever is President of the United States, he will do the same, because if he did not, he would begin to unwind this most extraordinary constitutional system of ours. So I believe strongly in fulfilling my oath in that regard.

Now, we have proposed a—legislation, the most controversial section of which deals with so-called public accommodations. The bill which came out of the judiciary committee which is now before the—going to be before the House shortly, has the following provisions in it on public accommodations.

It provides that lunch counters shall be open to all citizens regardless of their race, their creed, or their color. And so shall hotels, motels, theaters except in the case of rooming houses where they are owner-occupied and with 6 rooms or less. Now, you gentlemen may not regard that—you may regard it as an intrusion on your property rights, but you should remember that over 33 States stretching back to 1875 had provisions like this. Many States have much stronger provisions.

In addition, some States have provisions making segregation compulsory, which is not new, and I really believe that after the events of the past 6 months that all of us regardless of our own personal views, must recognize that if we're going to have domestic tranquility, if we're going to see that our citizens are treated as I would like to be treated and as you would like to be treated—that they have to meet a standard of conduct and behavior but they're not automatically excluded from the benefits which other citizens enjoy merely because of their race, their creed, or their color.

It is my view of what our responsibility is in 1963. The Congress, of course, must make the final judgment. What the Congress passes I will execute. We will know in the next 2 or 3 months what judgment the Congress will reach. But I believe that it's going to be with us long after I've disappeared from the scene. No country has ever faced a more difficult problem than attempting to bring 10 percent of the population of a different color, educate them, give them a chance for a job, give them a chance for a fair life. That's my objective, and I think it is the objective of the United States, as I have always understood it.

CANDIDACY IN 1964

Question. Thank you, Mr. President. Sir, I think about half of the people here would like to know when will you announce that you're a candidate for the presidential election of 1964.

Answer. Well, I don't know which half.

Question. You have nothing to say on this about that?

Answer. I was a candidate so early in 1959 I'd keep it and——

Question. Mr. President would you comment on the scope and role of the proposed Domestic Peace Corps?

Answer. Well, I'm not sure Congress is going to pass it. It only passed the Senate by a very close vote. What our hope was that—there are so many places in mental institutions, Indian reservations, parts of eastern Kentucky, for example, where there are high unemployment rates, where counties don't even have food distributed. There are some of our islands in the Pacific where we, for example, have had a bad epidemic of paralytic polio which could have been avoided—it seems to me if perhaps the Government had been more alert.

But there are these areas that sort of—poverties—islands of poverty in the United States and it was our hope that we could enlist men and women of any age to serve perhaps a year or two at very limited compensation and that they would inspire others in the community working with the voluntary associations and with the local government and the State government and the National Government to try to serve as a catalyst to try to do here at home what the Peace Corps is doing abroad. It's new, we may not get it now, but we will sometime, because I don't think that there's any doubt that there's a strong streak of idealism in this country, a strong desire to serve and as long as we're going to serve in the far corners of the world, I think we also might give them a chance to serve here at home.

Question. Because, sir, that your schedule is a tight one and because you answered so many questions in your remarks, I would, this one is from a little girl who asks, simply, Why didn't you bring Caroline?

Answer. Well, she liked it as the White House, but, we're getting used to Florida. I want to express my thanks to all of you. You've been very generous and I hope that—I'm very grateful to you for your invitation. I hope that any time you have any thoughts about how we can improve our operations that you write and that if you don't write to me that you will write to Senator SMATHERS because I find that he disposes of the messages very quickly from Florida. Thank you.

Big Government and the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver recently addressed the Institute of Government at Idaho State University, at Pocatello, Idaho. His theme was that in domestic policy the Congress does not force a project upon a State, but answers popular demand and local motivation; and that centralized government need not be remote or authoritarian.

The Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune used Secretary Carver's excellent address as the basis for an editorial showing how local and cooperative efforts pave the way for public projects.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG GOVERNMENT AND THE COMMUNITY

Idaho's John A. Carver, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, touched Thursday on a theme which should be reiterated frequently as Americans struggle anew with the complex relationships between Federal, State, and community governments.

"Centralized government need not be cold, remote, and authoritarian," Carver declared at an Institute of Government at Idaho State University.

The Federal Government acts in domestic policy, he said, when "popular demand and local consensus create the motivation. Congress has never yet forced a flood control project, or a national park or a major irrigation and power facility on a protesting State."

Many citizens fail to distinguish very clearly among the numerous and widely varied functions of government. Many draw back in alarm from the total cost of Federal Government, forgetting that 80 percent or more of the Federal budget is devoted to past, present, or future defense expenditures. Strangely, there is an inclination to excuse waste and extravagance in national defense—where waste and extravagance are most prevalent—and limit criticism to expenditures in the field of domestic policy. Furthermore, many citizens fail to recognize that investments in public projects in the United States often are self-liquidating and usually create much more

taxable wealth than the initial investments cost.

Anyone working jointly with Federal, State, and community governmental units to promote any particular public project in the nonmilitary sphere is likely to discover rather quickly what Carver was talking about.

Congress naturally looks first for valid reasons to reject new projects involving Federal expenditures. The demand for public services far exceeds the supply of funds to finance them. Congressional committees constantly screen the applications from communities, States, and regions. If a project does not promise to provide economic and other benefits substantially in excess of costs it usually is discarded immediately. If there is any significant disagreement about the merits of the project in the area promoting it Congress rapidly loses interest.

This region abounds in examples. The Lower Snake River dams are under construction because the Pacific Northwest demanded in unison that they be built. The Lewis & Clark Highway was completed because the residents of this region steadfastly supported their excellent case. Hells Canyon Dam was lost because Idaho was divided on the question. Burns Creek Dam thus far has been delayed primarily because of opposition by private power companies in southern Idaho and Utah.

Long before these projects are submitted to congressional scrutiny they must pass stern tests imposed by the executive department agencies which would administer them. The Department of Interior, for example, rejects far more proposals for national parks or national monuments than it approves. The Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers do not recommend river development projects until they have met rigid standards.

Neither Congress nor the executive department of Government, in other words, forces projects upon a "protesting State."

These public projects usually become part of Federal programs because State and community governments are not equipped to handle them. Idaho, for example, has neither the funds nor the professional staff to create or to administer a Nez Perce Country National Historical Park which would meet standards even remotely comparable to those demanded by the National Park Service. Yet those standards are essential if the project is to have long-term value in serving real needs of the Nation, the State, and the community.

The real problem, as Carver suggests, lies in combining Federal, State, and community efforts to obtain greatest public benefits from these programs. Federal efforts to develop the economic and human resources of American Indians, for example, are frustrated constantly if they are divorced from community efforts to achieve similar goals. "Centralized government need not be cold, remote and authoritarian," but it will be—and will be ineffective as well—wherever it fails to elicit the working cooperation of State and community interests.

At the recent annual convention of the Inland Empire Waterways Association at Portland, speaker after speaker representing a wide variety of Federal agencies described their most pressing problems. A common theme seemed to emerge, though it was expressed in many ways.

The theme, it seemed to us, was this: The vast, complex Federal agencies and many of the smaller ones cannot serve the public adequately or accomplish their important objectives by going their separate ways. Their traditional divisions of functions and responsibilities are breaking down wherever they have failed to coordinate their efforts effectively with other Federal agencies, with States, and with communities.

Those critics of Government "bigness" who keep demanding a "return" of governmental responsibilities to States and communities have an excellent point. Many Federal programs are too remote from the people they serve. Most of them depend for success in the final analysis upon vigorous translation into action by citizens at the community and regional level. Without such implementation in communities the programs tend to remain mere outlines of objectives which Federal employees constantly reshuffle and reappraise without really getting anywhere.

But thoughtful, dedicated officials of Federal Government are more aware of this danger and more concerned about it than almost anyone else. The really limiting factor in the wise and efficient expenditure of Federal funds usually lies in the failure of State and community leaders to plunge in and carry their share of the load. Their participation is essential to translate Federal appropriations into real accomplishments for the public.

Citizens who want to get their money's worth out of Government—at all levels—must think harder and work harder in the area of coordination of Government and private efforts. It can be done. It must be done if Federal Government is not to become "cold, remote and authoritarian."—B.J.

A User's View of Outdoor Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the recent Fifth American Forest Congress held here in Washington October 28 to 30 marked another milestone in conservation in this country. Key leaders of forestry from all over the land participated in the congress and presented papers of great interest to conservation in the United States.

Among those presented is one that I think is very significant in the present situation of recreation use of public lands. Mr. Michael Frome is an authority on travel, wilderness, and recreational use of our great out of doors. I include his paper "A User's View of Outdoor Recreation," in the RECORD.

A USER'S VIEW OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

(By Michael Frome)

Ten years ago this December I attended the Mid-Century Conference on Resources for the Future, held here in Washington, and participated in a group considering rural land uses. I recall that recreation was one of the lesser items on the agenda. For every other point on the program, one person had been designated as the discussion leader. But there was none for recreation and so I offered to speak first, urging more funds for the national parks, greater recognition of the recreational aspects of the national forests, and more emphasis by State and local governments on the development of recreation and vacation areas to keep pace with the needs of the American people.

Conservationists have traveled a long road in the past 10 years. Recreation, the forgotten tail 10 years ago, has moved virtually to the head of any discussion on land use. But I like to think that I have traveled a long road, too, and have learned that merely by meeting recreational needs alone this country cannot fulfill its obligations toward its natural resources.

It seems to me that in many ways conservation is fast becoming the tail of the recreation giant. Chairlifts, resorts, roads, campgrounds, reservoirs are increasingly bestowed upon us. But I do believe that these times—when the precious land is vanishing, and with it the birds and animals, the clear streams and wild places, which are part of the national soul—demand that all of us, who constitute the great outpouring of recreational use, must endeavor to understand the meaning of conservation in its broadest sense.

We should not anticipate or demand, or tolerate, the transformation of all our open space into one vast playground for motorcars, motorscooters, and motorboats. We should not run roughshod over other uses, whether logging, mining, grazing, watershed, or wilderness, but try to find the means whereby all of these are planned for as complementary units of a harmonious whole. Nor should this be the responsibility of only political leaders or land managers. The fishermen, canoers, campers, boaters, birdwatechers, skiers, hikers, and hunters must do more to demonstrate responsibility to the land than to assert our inalienable rights to use it. We must participate, in the same sense that we participate in a parent-teachers association, in the affairs of a hometown, in the management of a business, for the management of the land is everybody's business. The tragedy is that we know more about outer space than we do about our own resources, that we are much better informed on the situation in Vietnam than about timber supplies and the water crisis, which are basic to our survival. We simply do not know, we are in the dark on conservation, we are permitting ourselves to be deluded into accepting recreation, complete with blatant billboards, resort living and mechanized convenience, as a substitute for conservation.

This is why I am here before you, who are concerned with the course of conservation, to emphasize that your efforts depend not on the mass of recreational facilities you provide, of whatever nature, but on the extent to which the users are enlightened and understand their fundamental stake.

For this outlook on life, I am indebted to the association sponsoring this Congress. A few years ago, while trail riding in the high Rockies as one of a group conducted by the American Forestry Association, I felt overcome by the marvels of the raw American earth that surrounded me. The fact was that I had had nothing to do with placing or arranging them as I found them. But in my hands, and in the hands of others like me, lay their fate and future. One might say that in the instant of truth, out where the sky and mountains meet, this recreationist experienced the meaning of the phrase, "Think not of what your country can do for you, but of what you can do for your country." On that day of reckoning, I decided it was my obligation to find out how these lands are managed, and by whom, and why, and in what direction for the future.

The core of the answers to these questions is not easy to come by. We look to the President, who recently embarked on an expedition to bring the story of conservation before the people. It began on a marvelously high plane at the old Gifford Pinchot estate in Pennsylvania, where his words stirred the conscience of the country to appreciate the deep meaning of our natural resources and the need for their protection. But as the President made his way westward it became plain that he was not speaking of conservation in precisely this sense. It was recreation that he meant, the kind of play and pleasure enjoyed by large numbers of people, and the expenditure of large amounts of Federal moneys for dams, reservoirs, and big power projects. By the time he was through, it was universally evident that he had missed a magnificent opportunity to present conservation as a philosophy, a belief, a way of

life that stands above politics, deserving the support of all.

We look to our lawmakers in Congress, many of whom have awakened to the recreational surge, not necessarily to spur appreciation of the force of conservation, but to satiate the appetite for outdoor playgrounds. I read a speech recently by the chairman of the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL, on the "Recreational Aspects of Conservation." Said he, "Congress is and should be a stabilizing influence in developing a conservation policy." Though I hope this shall be the case, sometimes I wonder, while one Member after another campaigns to establish a national park area in his district, though such are often clearly below the standards of the "jewels of America"; or one Member after another intercedes for chairlifts, resorts, and other intrusions advocated by the local chamber of commerce. Sometime I would like to hear Congressman ASPINALL, or some other prominent figure in Government, speak on "Conservation Aspects of Recreation." There is a difference between them. One deals with land as a total entity with a future, the other with satisfying people in the present. For example, conservationists have pleaded for the zoning of the south and southeast arms of Yellowstone Lake in order to protect waterbirds and the pelican rookery from speedboat disturbance. But under pressure of motorboat manufacturers and legislators, the Department of Interior continues to permit boats and is proud of its large new marina, "to better accommodate the ever-increasing number of boaters," though I question why boats are allowed at all on a lake designated for preservation rather than mass use.

At this point, may I interject an observation on events of the very recent past and statements by officials of the Interior Department on the future of the national park system. From here on, to quote one newspaper report, efforts will be intensified to "open up more parkland wilderness for development as recreation areas to serve a growing population."

Is this the proper role of the national parks? I would much rather see a rededication of the national park system to the principles upon which it was founded, as a composition of priceless vestiges of scenery and history, each one bearing the weight of overpowering national significance. I would much rather feel that the direction for the future provides greater, rather than less, protection and preservation of the national parks, free of political considerations, free of commercial pressures, and a reversal of the marked present trend to lower standards and to dilute the system with the addition of playgrounds called national recreation areas or some such name.

Of course, there should be provision for recreation developments. This is what we look to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to accomplish by giving guidance and leadership to the States and private landowners. But I find it frightening to hear the rising demands by commercial interests, and in turn by their legislative representatives, that the Federal Government pay the bill by establishing national parks in their regions and by altering the character of parks that now exist. One day last year I went out to see a proposed new area in company with a chamber of commerce man, who explained his complete endorsement in the following terms: "If we get a national park here, every roadmap in the country will be marked with a green dot. Vacationers will come in droves and our section will earn millions in income." Where will it end? When green dots sprawl across the map and they are virtually meaningless?

The facts of population pressure and the shrinking land make the national parks all the more precious. They accent the challenge to protect the parks as sanctuaries of the American soil and spirit. I hope the Department of Interior will exercise boldness in facing this true challenge, rather than pursue a course of opening parkland wilderness and enlarging the national park system below its standards. Certainly the Department deserves great credit for establishing the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and giving it full suport. Let the Bureau inspire the States to do a job in the recreation field, which only few of them are now doing; but I hope the national park system may be reconsecrated to fulfill its fundamental, time-honored role.

There are some in Congress who take their conservation, as well as recreation, seriously. Recently Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, made what to me was an intensely impressive and important speech before a Washington audience, in which he warned that conservation of woods, lakes, streams and other natural resources constitutes the most urgent and crucial domestic issue facing the Nation today. But to find a report of his remarks in one of our fine Washington papers, the Post, I had to look to the bottom of the obituary page, where it lay buried below the deceased, like a very dead issue.

Someone tallied the total of syndicated Hollywood columns at 99 and the total on conservation—that "most urgent and crucial issue"—at 0. There are a few newspaper people who write of the subject with knowledge and perception, John Oakes of New York, Roger Latham of Pittsburgh, Edward Meeman of Memphis; scarcely any magazine writers, outside the outdoor publications, since the passing of Bernard DeVoto and Richard Neuberger; hardly any authors of major books beyond Rachel Carson and Justice Douglas. And while you may disagree with what these people have to say, they have done their best to stir a public passion in conservation. The preference by the press as a whole for the glossy and glamorous is a sorry commentary on our times. Moreover, as long as it treats conservation—water, timber, wildlife, grazing, mining, recreation, the overall values of the shrinking land—as an incidental, now-and-then side issue, the public will remain in the dark. The truth is that if we cannot interest newspapers and magazines in giving thorough coverage to conservation, it becomes even more incumbent upon the public to assume the responsibility of informing itself.

In our quest for answers we look to the Federal and State agencies dealing with natural resources. From some of them and from industries represented here as well, we are verily deluged with varied information, each assuring that its own brand of conservation is the very best. In a sense, this is good for they provide us the opportunity to weigh their policies and actions, and to judge for ourselves. But inevitably they lay the heaviest stress on the new facilities they are providing, whether dams, boat docks, campgrounds, ski lifts, or roads. What they are playing is a numbers game, and a dangerous numbers game, it appears to me, in which we the users are being used—and left enmeshed in confusion as to how they are managing our resources as a total entity.

So it is up to the users to go forth and observe, to perceive, question, challenge, and decide, to tell our Congressmen what we want rather than have them advise on all they are doing for us. As campers, we should understand the why and wherefore of timber cutting around us in the woods, and whether it is good, bad, or indifferent to the land we are using. As fishermen, we should concern ourselves with steep slope strip mining, which fills our streams with silt and kills fish with acid poison. As motorists, we cannot turn away our faces from the blight of billboards and other commercial intrusions that bring profit to a few but scar the countryside that belongs to us all. And curiously, some of the very Congressmen who vote against billboard control are among the first to ask the Federal Government to build beautiful parkways in their States. All of us who look for outdoor clear water must be concerned with the evils of pollution and trace them to their sources. The hunter cannot avoid concern with management and protection of wildlife, and neither can the lover of animals and birds for their own sake, that maligned soul who is derided in the crush to mass recreation as an "esthete" and "emotionalist," but who stands out for his willingness to share a portion of the outdoors with wild creatures.

The recreational user must find the means to make his voice heard, as a responsible citizen deeply concerned with the well-being of the country as well as his own immediate welfare. We recently had the experience of Assateague Island, in nearby Maryland, where the landowners were virtually the only group in the State that expressed itself. My impression is that that State failed in its obligation to protect its own resources and that the agreement to establish a national seashore came only after it was reckoned that a flood of tourists would bring in new money. Conservation, unfortunately, was not an overriding consideration, and the Maryland public generally did not bestir itself. Now there is underway a study of the administration of the North Cascades being undertaken by two departments of Government. I wonder whether we are going to let these two departments, with their pulls and tugs, resolve the disposition of the North Cascades. The public ought to know, to understand, to weigh what we may be getting, what we may be losing, what the implications are for the future in terms of all of our needs for natural resources in the decades ahead. Another circumstance involves the Allagash Waterway in Maine, where a tremendous area has been proposed for transfer from private hands to public hands. Whether or not this is sound ought not to be decided solely in the State of Maine, or on the basis of filling a recreational need alone, but on the basis of providing the wisest use of the land and the best means to conserve it. If the American public were not groping in the dark for an understanding of conservation, both these questions would be answered on a far higher plane. And I hope that all the issues and implications will be far more broadly aired, so that the private citizen may have the opportunity to express his viewpoint.

Every conscientious recreational user should aline himself with a force of expression, whatever it may be, whether the Appalachian Mountain Club in New England, the Mountaineers in Seattle, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League, or the others like them. They are yet today small voices in the wilderness; they must grow and give the public a sense of participation in the effort to safeguard and enhance the conservation aspects of recreation. Even so, when they are heard they are heard well, as when the Audubon Society won its battle to protect the golden eagle from extinction; and when the sportsmen groups in Pennsylvania quit listening to the politicians and insisted the politicians listen to them on the need for strict regulation of surface mining; and when the Izaak Walton League in Oregon spoke out against political interference in the administration of grazing lands. You may not like what these groups have to say all the time, but they are the rallying points for the people and I have confidence that given the light we shall find the way, that if right is on your side in the conflict for land use we shall recognize it.

As a member of the American Forestry Association, I am proud of its sponsorship of this Congress, a forum presenting all the viewpoints on conservation. The Association has tradition, a background of experience and

wisdom; it has no ax to grind for any special cause except the well-being of the Nation. But this meeting should be only a starting point, from which to tell the story and needs of conservation to a far broader audience than its own membership, and encourage the public at large to exercise interest and responsibility as private citizens.

Speaking as a recreational user, I have learned that I must look beyond my own campfire, and beyond my small tomorrow. What I have tried to do here is give voice to idealism and integrity, a feeling for conservation without which outdoor recreation will become meaningless. Around me in the woods are many others, whose fires of understanding and action are waiting to be lit.

Washington Is Safe but Is Peoria?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has ruled that Peoria and Woodford Counties in Illinois are off limits to Russian officials. The only reason so far is: "National defense and security."

Woodford County is 96 percent rural and has a population of only 25,000. Peoria County also includes considerable farming in addition to a large industrial complex in and around the city of Peoria. However, the State Department would not comment on why Peoria County was ruled out of bounds and Tazewell County, where many of the principal industrial installations in the Peoria complex are located, was not.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote to Secretary Rusk on November 19, 1963, asking for the criteria which is used to make these determinations. His reply should be most interesting. I do want to say that if the Department of Defense has actually developed classified data to substantiate this determination, rather than by throwing darts at a map, I would not want this information disclosed.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the November 18, 1963, issue of the Peoria Journal Star concerning this subject:

WASHINGTON IS SAFE BUT IS PEORIA?

Isn't it pleasant to have world tensions eased?

Now that we've agreed not to test any new types of nuclear weapons and to sell wheat to the Soviet Union, don't you enjoy the pleasant, relaxed, friendly atmosphere?

This is the nice kind of world in which American soldiers go unarmed in front of Communist North Korean lines after announcing in advance when and where they are going there to the Communists—and are promptly shot up, with rescue teams going to aid the wounded shot at, too.

(The war, itself, didn't always play that dirty, ah, but this new kind of peace is beautiful.)

This is the kind of free-from-tension world in which a Yale professor, in Russia as a 30-day tourist, is nabbed and tossed into the clink and isolated in a manner which is illegal in this country for mass murderers.

We are so free from tension that Soviet spies have been penetrating the very electronic command setup of our whole defense.

The FBI, as it happens, caught them. (That's how out of step the FBI is with this new relaxed world.)

American troops are blocked, isolated, virtually kidnaped on our guaranteed access route to Berlin, and left sitting there in the open without the simplest common decencies, for more than 2 days and 2 nights just to show how relaxed the tensions are—and Khrushchev blandly tells a group of American businessmen he did this to "test our nerves."

Meanwhile, American soldiers in Vietnam still operate under the rule that they have to give the Communist Vietcong "the first shot" before they can shoot back to protect their own lives.

Oh, tensions are very much eased for American soldiers in the Vietnamese rice paddies.

But in Washington, let's face it, tensions really are eased. Incidents which would have created a furor 1 year, 2 years ago, are brushed off as minor matters, and we proceed to ease the tensions over Cuba by canceling all military flights over the place—the flights that saved us just a year ago.

Isn't it nice now that we've turned off the the cold war?

Isn't it lovely, doing business with the Communists?

Doesn't it make you feel peaceful, secure, and proud?

Thank Heaven, for such sublime wisdom in the White House, huh?

And we wonder why they will insult, humiliate, or clobber us next.

We have been trying to figure out by what process the Government made Peoria and Woodford Counties off limits for Russian officials, while leaving Tazewell approved.

It is a fascinating question.

About the only answer we can figure out is that they threw darts at a map.

Or else they thought of Les Ahrends in connection with Woodford and Bob Michel in connection with Peoria and decided not to let those nasty Republicans have any Russians, while regarding Tazewell as properly Democratic.

Maybe they don't want the Russians to discover any GOP strongholds?

An even more fascinating question comes at the prospect of Russian official visitors to Tazewell County. Do they blindfold them for landing at the Peoria airport, and conduct them across the river before removing same?

Or use a sealed railroad car from Chicago, and switch it across the river before unsealing it?

Or do we have them drive south from Chicago and circle Woodford over the back roads into Tazewell?

Ah, well, in any case it is a comfort to know that the Hanna City radar station and the farm laboratory are being protected from prying Soviet eyes.

And let the Russians go to Peiping and look at the huge new, solid concrete, giant grain elevators there and at Creve Coeur, especially now when the crop is such that all storage facilities are jammed.

Let them eat their hearts out.

A Memorial Day Address by Judge William F. McDermott, of Watervliet, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished newspaperman in my district, Mr. Keith Marvin, of the Record Newspapers, recently sent me a copy of an address delivered by Judge William F. McDermott, of Watervliet, N.Y.

When I read the address, which was in honor of departed veterans, I was impressed by its sweep and beauty, so much so that I am offering it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

A MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY JUDGE WILLIAM F. MCDERMOTT

The tendency to honor the memory of our departed veterans seems to spring spontaneously from the deepest instincts of human nature.

From Maine to Hawaii, from Florida to Alaska, and in all of the cities, villages, and hamlets of our 50 States, we are gathered together, "lest they and their ideals be forgotten."

I am oppressed with a sense of impropriety of uttering words on this solemn occasion. For if silence is ever golden, it must be here.

With words, we make our promises, plight faith and praise virtue. Promises, however, may not be kept; plighted faith may be broken and vaunted virtue be only the cunning mask of vice.

We do not know what promises these men made; these men, now buried in hallowed ground. We do not know what pledges they gave nor the words they might have spoken.

But we do know that they summed up and perfected all by one supreme and final act.

For love of country, they faced and accepted death, thus resolving all doubts, thereby making immortal their partiotism.

For the noblest man that lives, there still remains a conflict.

I know nothing more appropriate on this occasion than to inquire into the reasons which brought us here—what high motives led our fallen comrades to condense life and invite the hand of death to overtake them.

Let us consider all of this.

This country was born in war. Yet, we are an unwarlike nation. We live in a country where peace, liberty and personal security and blessings are as common and universally accepted as the sunshine and the flowers.

But let our peace and tranquillity be threatened and we are a people in arms. We are Americans. They were Americans. We have never lost a war and we would never betray our trust or surrender or compromise these inalienable rights, come what may.

I believe that no heroic sacrifice is ever lost and that the characters of men are moulded by what has been done by their predecessors.

So here and now we have the sheaves, reaped before us into the harvest of death from every battlefield from Saratoga, Gettysburg, San Juan Hill, Château-Thierry, Bastogne, Okinawa, and Pork Chop Hill.

They who lie buried—some our fathers, brothers, closest friends, but all our heroes—will never seem to us less fresh or less daring than when they sallied into their last battle. For they will always have the dew of their youth. It is we alone who shall grow old.

As Thomas Campbell put it, "To live in the hearts we leave behind is not to die."

In growing old, their memory inspires us to greater deeds of charity and dedication of purpose. We are the treasurers of their sacrifice. Aware of these obligations and responsibilities as their beneficiaries, we accept unflinchingly this perpetuation of their memory.

To us they have passed the torch and it is our sacred duty to keep that torch burning to so enlighten the world against a call to arms in the future. By use of diplomacy instead of missiles; education instead of coercion, it is our obligation to bring the peoples of the world into friendly relations and to maintain them. If we fail in this re-

sponsibility, then those we now eulogize have died in vain.

In honoring our brave ones now, let us pay them proper tribute and homage and bow our heads in prayer for the repose of their immortal souls, resolving that their resting place may never be disturbed by the roar of future conflict.

Then, and only then, will the silent victors smile from their heavenly home. For they will know that the cause for which they fought was triumphant.

The Fed May Be Somebody's Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, last week William L. Slayton, the head of the Urban Renewal Administration, spoke to a regional Urban Design Seminar in Atlanta. His visit prompted an editorial by Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta Constitution. Because Mr. Patterson's view are of interest to all civil servants, I offer the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE FED MAY BE SOMEBODY'S FATHER

(By Eugene Patterson)

Bill Slayton is a bureaucrat. He is on the Federal payroll. He is one of those Government employees. It is very popular to knock Federal employees at will and never to notice what kind of job they do. Well, this is a word for the conscientious bureaucrats.

Bill Slayton, of course, happens to be a higher-up. As Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, he dispenses a lot of that largesse we hear about going down ratholes. We were reassured last week, therefore, to find the Federal urban renewal boss down here speaking firmly to us about the ratholes in Atlanta's programs.

In effect, he said: No improvement, no dough.

Therefore there will be improvement in Atlanta's disoriented urban renewal effort.

The bureaucrats will see to that. If they don't move in and do things like this all over America, the country would be in pretty poor shape. Inefficiency, bankrolled by Federal money, would turn urban renewal into a waste and a sham.

But due to the jog from Mr. Slayton's bureau, we will now pull up our socks.

The thousands of Federal employees who live in Atlanta bear their bruisings in silence. They are fair game for everybody who wants to cuss the Government, or who may have run into a timeserving dunderhead among them (what payroll isn't weighted with some of those). Redtape is their bane and public jibes are their lot. But without really being able to defend themselves, the good ones go along doggedly seeing to the public good while the public, instead of appreciating it, dogs them.

Anybody who receives a visit from the Federal income tax examiner does not often thereafter like Federal income tax examiners. But without them, what single taxpayer or businessman could feel his present assurance that everybody, more or less, is paying taxes alongside him?

The Department of Labor is particularly unpopular in some circles. But without the wage-hour investigators based in Atlanta, who would shield unlettered workers from being paid less than the minimum wage law might specify, if their employers were unscrupulous?

But the investigators who do just this can't advertise it. When a Federal employee tries to justify himself by telling what he does, it may look as if the Government is shoving people around.

So Federal employees suffer in silence while they talk down airplanes, deliver mail, catch crooks, predict weather, guard convicts, nurse the economy, approve projects—or disapprove them, as Bill Slayton and his people did. If the law says do it, the bureaucrat sees that it's done. He deserves more credit than he gets from the people. He happens to be working, not for any special interest, but for them.

Dr. Adam C. Powell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of November 19, 1963:

DR. ADAM C. POWELL

(By Jimmy Breslin)

In the narrow, brown-walled hallway of the Abyssinian Baptist Church, 135 East 138th Street, Dr. ADAM C. POWELL, minister, there is a candy machine set up against an old wooden pay phone booth, and a few steps from this is an area used by the Federal Credit Union of the Abyssinian Baptist Church. The credit union is open at night, a cardboard sign said, and its office is partitioned off by the frosted, corrugated glass which is so popular with Household and Seaboard and the other loan companies. It seemed strange to see a loan office in the hallway of a church on Sunday morning, but religion in Harlem, and particularly religion in the Abyssinian Baptist Church, wrestles not only with sin, but with the landlord, too.

In the side vestibule of the church, the sun came through casement windows and fell on the four old women who sat on the bench and waited for the 12 o'clock services.

THE SUN

They were heavy women who had the rough hands of people who had spent the week "working in Miss Anne's kitchen," which is what Negroes say when they talk about day workers. Now, they sat in the sun by the windows and talked while they waited to go inside the church and sing.

"You've got to remember something," one of them, in a high red hat, was saying. "You can't think of him just as ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. That's an individual. You've got to think of him as being more than that. You think of him as being our leader."

Next to her, a brown hat nodded emphatically. "Uh, huh," she said.

At a little before 12, the four old women got up and became part of the crowd which was walking into the church and taking seats in horseshoe-shaped rows. Upstairs, an organist and a red-robed choir of 32 took places. Then Dr. ADAM C. POWELL, in a black ministerial robe which covered gray, beltless show-business slacks, walked to the front of an altar covered with flowers and started the 12 o'clock services.

THE SUBPENA

The Abyssinian Baptist Church says it has 10,000 members and it is considered the largest Protestant congregation in New York City. Over 2,000 people were present for this second service on Sunday. Most of them were women, old women with rough hands who work in Miss Anne's kitchen, and this was their church and, never forget it, this was their minister.

The Reverend POWELL comes to New York only on Sunday, flying in from his home in Puerto Rico, and he leaves by nightfall because New York is not his home anymore. There is also the matter of a subpena calling on him to pay $211,500 to a woman the court said he slandered by calling her a "bag woman" for police. Subpenas are not issuable in New York on Sunday.

But these are things people write about in white newspapers and they do not interest the women who sat in the Abyssinian Baptist Church on Sunday. If you sat with them Sunday, through services that were solemn, and heard them afterward, you could see why ADAM CLAYTON POWELL will be their minister, and will be U.S. Congressman from the 12th District, New York, for as long as he wants it. For this was, as the old women had said outside, their leader.

THE LITANY

He spoke to them quietly, with his right hand stuck into his pocket. Usually, the Reverend POWELL speaks to his people of practical matters, such as colored people and white people, but on Sunday his talk was shortened by communion and was religious.

"We have some confused minds here which need divine illumination," the Reverend POWELL prayed.

"Yes, Lord," the women said.

"There are sinners here who need help for their stained souls," he said.

"Yes, yes, Lord," they said.

Behind him was a banner which said that the church was having its 155th anniversary reunion on November 21 with a fashion show. And while women ushers, in white dresses and stockings, passed out collection envelopes, the Reverend Powell observed from in front of the altar, "Anybody 155 years old, I don't care who they are, anybody that old deserves a birthday present."

In the next seat, an old lined-faced woman in a black hat and white dress put on her glasses and reached into a long purse and came out with two crumpled dollar bills and put them on the silver collection plate. There were scrubbed floors and defrosted refrigerators and an awful lot of "Yes, Ma'ams" in those two crumpled dollars the woman put on the plate and it moved you a little bit when she did it.

Then the old woman sat back and the Reverend POWELL went through communion, and after it he said to take out No. 110 in the hymn book, and the choir began singing it. The Reverend POWELL picked it up and his congregation first began to moan and then hum and then as he lead them, they sang.

"This is my story, this is my song," he said aloud, and everybody sang the words.

THE TROUBLE

When it was over, the Reverend POWELL sat in an office in the back with a cup of tea with lemon. He had on a minister's dickey front and a T-shirt and he puffed a big cigar. John Young, a political friend, and Bill Chance, the lawyer, and Mrs. Lillian Usher, Democratic leader of the 12th AD South, came in and sat around and now the Reverend POWELL became Congressman POWELL and the talk was politics.

"What's the matter?" POWELL said, when Mrs. Usher mentioned somebody who had trouble.

"Immigration," she said.

"Immigration?" POWELL said. "Tell him if he wants a private bill, I'll introduce it for him. I'm against the McCarran-Walter Act, you know."

He puffed on the cigar. This was the politician at work. He speaks with ease and command, and it was impressive to hear him say he would introduce a bill in Washington for somebody. But you knew the strength was not in the room. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's strength was outside the office. It was down the hallway past the Federal credit union, where more old women sat and talked in the sun coming through the casement windows in the vestibule.

To Amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 777) to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I shall be much briefer than was the reading of the amendment. It was necessarily long because it deals with many portions of the Disarmament Agency Act. The amendment is drafted to do four simple things:

First. I takes the word "disarmament" and drops it from the name of the agency and eliminates the function of disarmament from the responsibility of the agency so that the agency is now named and is responsible for arms control.

At such time in the future as disarmament becomes other than a dream, the agency can be shifted to that function. But now the function is arms control and let us make no mistake about it. If we confuse disarmament with arms control, we derogate the actions and the responsibilities and the capability of the agency.

Secondly, this amendment will bar the agency from setting up in its own research shop and thereby abrogating this function to an inwardly oriented group of civil servants who cannot be fired. By contrast, it requires the agency to go out on the private market for its research, doing it by contract in a broad fashion so that the best American minds can be brought to bear on this very important problem.

The third thing that the amendment does is to strip the administrator of the Agency of the responsibility to go to the international negotiating table as a negotiator. We already have people in the State Department hired and trained to go to do this work. It keeps him at the side of the table as an adviser, where he should be, and it keeps him as an administrator of an inquiring research agency, which he should be. It avoids the contingency of his taking positions off the cuff and shooting from the hip during negotiations, then having to distort the Agency's research function to support such hasty, illogical, and often mistaken and dangerous positions.

The fourth thing the amendment does is simply take the Agency outside of the influence of the State Department. In the future it would look for its support to the General Services agency rather than to the State Department. It would look for its housing to the General Services Administration rather than the State Department. It is an agency to advise the President and the Secretary of Defense and other agencies of the Government and should not, by any logic or reason, be smothered by the State Department as it is today. That is it.

I think that today the Disarmament Agency is a sick Agency with a dreary past and a dismal future unless we, the Congress, act to reform the charter under which it operates, and unless we do so reform it I see no reason for spending public money to perpetuate it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

White House Speech Artists Draw Misleading Comparisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in this country to have alert newspapermen with the ability to fill in the facts for the reading public when the White House speechwriters perform mathematical gymnastics with parallels.

A recent example of the use of misfit parallels was President Kennedy's speech before the Florida Chamber of Commerce in which the notion was advanced that the Federal Government is a better fiscal manager than private business.

Columnist David Lawrence quickly set the record straight pointing out among other things that when business borrows it is also expected to reduce past debts out of surpluses which is something the Federal Government does not do. Other inaccuracies of the parallels are also pointed out by Mr. Lawrence in his column which follows:

FEDERAL VERSUS BUSINESS FINANCING: PRESIDENT'S COMPARISON OF DEBT GROWTH VIEWED AS GIVING WRONG IMPRESSION

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy would not intentionally mislead the American people about the finances of the Government of the United States—but unfortunately, some of his speechwriters have given a wrong comparison of the way the Federal Government and private business, respectively, handle their debts.

Mr. Kennedy, in a speech before the Florida Chamber of Commerce Monday, gave the impression that the Federal Government is a better fiscal manager than private business. He said:

"While the Federal net debt was growing less than 20 percent in these years (1948–62), total corporate debt—not my debt, your debt—was grow[illegible] nearly 200 percent and the total indebtedness of private individuals rose by 300 percent. So, who is the most cautious fiscal manager?"

There is no real parallel. What Mr. Kennedy failed to make clear was that during all this time, while corporations and individuals were increasing their debts, they were also paying off their loans or mortgages or were borrowing money to acquire new assets. The Federal Government, on the other hand, was borrowing money almost entirely to refund past loans, but not to reduce debt.

During these very years—1948–62—when the total corporate debt was rising by $228 billion, these same corporations earned $291 billion in profits after taxes. In contrast, the Federal Government during that same period had total budget deficits of $41 billion and at the same time added $54 billion to the gross public debt.

No business could borrow money if it did not reduce its past debts out of its surpluses. An increase in corporate debt is based upon the expectation of repayment of this same debt in a specified time. A very small part of any such indebtedness is not refinanced without at least a substantial payment on the principal.

But the Federal Government makes no such curtailment of its principal and keeps on borrowing more and more money, incurring more and more deficits, and increasing its total debt.

Any business which attempted to finance itself on the pattern of the Federal Government would certainly not be able to borrow any money in the capital markets today or at any other time. Thus, the Federal Government in fiscal year 1963 piled up a gross borrowing of $227 billion, of which less than $8 billion represented growth in the net debt. The remaining $219 billion was borrowed to refund existing debt.

Corporations, on the other hand, have been paying off a substantial part of their loans, and their increased debt represents investment in new projects—new plants and equipment or new enterprises.

It is incorrect, therefore, to compare corporate financing with that of the Federal Government and say that the latter is better because it did not increase its debt as much as did the private sector in the economy. Individuals may incur debt by borrowing to buy their homes, but they earn enough money after expenses to make regular payments on the mortgages and at the same time to buy an automobile and pay for it in 2 or 3 years. Nobody could buy an automobile in 1948 and fail to pay it off by 1962. And yet the Federal Government has merely borrowed the same amount of money to refund or replace the previous indebtedness, so that the total amount of the 1948 debt remains on the books, plus increased borrowings of $54 billion since 1948.

President Kennedy also gave an erroneous impression when he discussed profits. He has done so on several occasions lately in discussing this subject. He said to the Florida Chamber of Commerce:

"Why is it that profits are at an all-time high in the Nation today? It is because the Nation as a whole is prospering."

What Mr. Kennedy did not tell the American people is that profits in a realistic sense are way below what they were a few years ago.

Thus, manufacturing corporations from 1955 to 1957—which was an era of sustained economic activity and relatively full employment—earned 5.2 percent on their sales and 11.7 cents per dollar on their net worth.

But since the year 1957 profits of manufacturing corporations have been at relatively depressed levels. For the last 6 years, they have averaged only 4.5 percent of sales. This means that profits are 15 percent below the 5.2 average of the 1955–57 period. The

profits also have been only 9.3 percent of net worth, which is down considerably from the 11.7-percent average of the 1955–57 period.

It is to be noted that in 1963 after 2 years of so-called economic recovery, profits are 4.5 percent of the gross national product. This is only a slight rise from the 4.2 percent reported in 1961, which was the lowest figure in the period following World War II.

To lay stress on the gross total of profits without regard to whether individual companies are making a satisfactory percent on their investment is to confuse the issue. It is like saying that, because there are more people employed today than ever before, America is prosperous. Actually, the unemployment figure is still around 5.5 percent, and there are many parts of the country called distressed areas. It is illogical to boast about the amount of total profit when the actual percentage of profit on sales made remains well below the 1955–57 average.

The Assurancemongers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and most timely warnings against the danger of minimizing the threat of domestic communism is given by Columnist Henry J. Taylor in his November 6 release.

It is a sharp and much-needed rebuke of those he aptly labels "assurance-mongers"—including some in the highest places of Government itself.

I commend Mr. Taylor's comments to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues and the American people.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the full text of the article:

THE ASSURANCE MONGERS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Distinguished New York Times drama critic Brooks Atkinson compounds a dangerous error sponsored by many intellectuals everywhere. The scope (and typicalness) of this is what makes it important.

Dealing with subversives in the arts (New York Times, October 25) the critic first puts that in a wise and constrained perspective. But then he fell smack into the trap of belittling the Communist menace as if it were merely a matter of bearded beatnik bums and snag-toothed bumettes. Moreover, he collapsed into the same old numbers game.

Citing the limited number of hard-core Communists, Atkinson stated that "to believe they can undermine the Nation is to believe in spooks * * * the strength of the rest of the Nation is impregnable * * * the fear of internal communism is neurotic and naive. This is also a wholly un-American form of cowardice."

We are constantly told it's a new world, not the comfortable world of McKinley or isolationism. Yet one of the major problems in the free world today is that many intellectuals are either too civilized or too reluctant to grasp the obvious about the Soviet system. And the greatest danger is always the danger which comes from blindness to danger.

It seems incredible that so many intellectuals depreciate the vitality in the Red's cancer of thought, in which the great common theme is torment and betrayal, and fail to see that a silent threat may be the deadliest.

But it's an ancient error. "Sometimes even the good Homer fell asleep," said the Greeks. In India Jawaharlal Nehru is described as an intellectual. Yet he starts his day by standing on his head yoga fashion, and many swear that he views the world from that position for the rest of the day. As one result it is commonly agreed that the main threat of communism does not come from the tragically poor but from intellectuals. The same problem persists in France and Italy and most of Latin America and even in Britain.

It is remarkable that intellectuals who so clearly saw the Fascist menace seem colorblind about the Reds. They ride through all the stoplights. Yet without knowing and meeting what menaces us—the Communist threat externally and internally alike—we cannot protect our safety. Nation after nation has shown that it is then too late for any answer except remorse and misery, like the community that fails to discover typhus in the milk.

This is the disservice of those like Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Theodore C. Sorensen, Chester Bowles, et al., and even our Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, who constantly claim, as does Atkinson, that the Red danger is from abroad, not at home. Moreover, the President himself pushes on this pedal every now and then, although, the free world expects the President of the United States to lead the fight against the Communists, not against the anti-Communists.

The Communists are people—a pretty repulsive kind of people, unles you can stomach liars and traitors or the sort of coward who keeps silent when his friends or family are taken away to torture or execution, as happens, wholesale.

In truth, and on the worldwide record, the Red attack is two-pronged: from the outside and the inside as well. Oh, no, the United States is not impregnable. A more dangerous reassurance is hardly conceivable. Nobody is suggesting these wily coercers can pull a Castro-like takeover here. That's absurd. But it does not follow that they cannot cripple our communications industries, harbor and recruit for the Soviet's largest espionage network (which is here), put the Red line into street demonstrations defying law and order, infiltrate defense unions, mass media and even teachers' groups, the State Department and elsewhere in our Government—as demonstrated time and again by the FBI.

Unless we fight relentlessly on both fronts we will not fight well on either front. Nehru-minded Americans will never save us any more than they are saving India today. The assurance-mongers will never save us. For the basic reality of power politics is always: Who is going to control your life and your Nation's freedom of action, you or your enemy? If you belittle this question in advance you are lost.

Automation—The Unmet Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in today's New York Times calls attention to what I consider one of the greatest unmet challenges and problems of our time—the challenge and the problem of automation. I have introduced H.R. 8429 calling for the establishment of a Federal Commission on Automation to bring together representatives from labor, management, Government, and the public to study the impact of automation and to recommend to Congress steps designed to ease its impact. I believe the following editorial from the New York Times concerning consideration of this issue by the recent AFL–CIO convention should be read by all my colleagues:

LABOR AND AUTOMATION

The AFL–CIO has wisely acted to remove the impression that it believes the way to advance the national interest is to veto technological change.

Such an impression could easily have been gained from the declaration of George Meany, president of AFL–CIO, at the convention's opening that automation was fast becoming a real curse to society. But the convention has ended with a resolution acknowledging the contribution automation can make to abolishing poverty, expanding public facilities and enabling the United States to fulfill its world obligations.

Labor's quarrel is—or ought to be—not with automation but with the idea that workers must bear the sole burden of its introduction in the form of mass unemployment. The AFL–CIO has now set forth a far-reaching program of measures it considers necessary to create a full-employment, full-production economy and this guard against the imbalance in the present distribution of automation's benefits.

This program involves vastly more centralized Government planning and spending than any of the bills President Kennedy is already finding it impossible to move through Congress. Furthermore, some of its elements—notably the proposal for a statutory 35-hour workweek with no cut in present weekly pay, would increase unemployment, rather than reduce it.

But picking holes in labor's prescription is easier than putting people back to work. The overriding responsibility of the President and Congress is to come forward with a workable plan—one that will show tangible results in cutting the shockingly high toll of joblessness.

Rutland, Mass., Citizens for Public Prayer Action Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, a group of honorable, conscientious, God-fearing, loyal, patriotic Americans of the historical community of Rutland, Mass., have formed a Committee of Citizens for Public Prayer with the legitimate and avowed purpose of attempting to accelerate congressional approval of pending constitutional amendments designed to restore the recitation of prayer in our public schools with due protection of the rights of the dissenters.

The summary, plain objective of these public-spirited citizens is to promote, at the earliest possible date, through the agency of Congress, the exercise of the American people's right to vote yes or no

on a constitutional amendment to restore prayer and reverence in our public schools.

In pursuit of their conscientious, patriotic, and legitimate objective, the citizens for public prayer are perseveringly engaged in conducting and projecting an educational and action program, and they have requested me to include in the RECORD a summary of their coordinated program; the summary follows:

1. There is currently, on the Speaker's desk, in the House of Representatives, a House resolution, otherwise known as a discharge petition, which has for its purpose the discharge from the House Judiciary Committee for presentation to the U.S. House of Representatives, House Joint Resolution 9, a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayer in public schools and other public places in the United States. To be effective, this discharge petition requires the signatures of at least 218 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. It is urgent, therefore, that we activate our relatives, friends, and acquaintances here and everywhere to send letters to their Representatives in the Congress respectfully requesting them to place their names on this discharge petition.

2. It is true that some Congressmen are clearly with us but do not believe in the discharge petition procedure. They feel that all such matters should be handled through committees. The problem, though, is that action in the committee appears unlikely. Only, through a discharge petition which moves the issue to the floor of the House does it seem as if we are going to get any action at all. Besides, this is not the usual discharge petition. It does not seek some particular advantage, or some sectional gain. It proposes simply to give the American people the right to vote yes or no on public prayers and reverence in public places. Still, if a Congressman says he is against discharge petitions, we must respect his right. But a second letter should then be directed to him if he has indicated he agrees with us on an amendment but disagrees on the petition procedure—this letter to inquire what, then, he proposes to do to make it possible for the people to vote on an amendment.

3. Apparently, the most effective mail tactic is to send individual letters, rather than collective petitions, and to follow up with second and third letters, if necessary.

4. It is still urgent that we ask local boards of selectmen, school committees, veterans, and school groups, such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the PTA to go on record in favor of amendment and to notify the Congressman for the district of their action.

5. Some of our fellow citizens, more or less on our side of the argument, seem to be held apart by what they fear is the extreme difficulty of coming up with a good amendment, one which will do what we think necessary and still not deny proper minority rights. There are many answers to this attitude. In general, the important thing is not how we word an amendment so much as the absolute need for some form of Government action to reverse once and for all the tragic trend evident in the two Supreme Court "prayer decisions."

6. We do not deny that care must be exercised in writing an amendment. We are confident that this care is possible. The point is to withhold one's active support from our cause for fear of what an amendment would say is ridiculous. It's rather like refusing to fight for one's life with a gun whose exact mechanisms one does not understand even though that gun is the only weapon presently available.

7. Again, we believe that the Constitution, as it stands, is in accord with our position. What we suggest is not an attempt to change the Constitution or to withdraw anyone's basic constitutional rights. What we suggest is simply an amendment to the first amendment to spell out exactly the fact that what is meant is not religion as such, but rather organizational and sectarian manifestations of religion. In actuality, we are the defenders of the real Bill of Rights.

8. The worst thing that could happen now would be for the American people to forget the matter. We must keep the issue constantly before our communities. The dangerous precedents set down in the prayer decisions do not diminish with time. Unfortunately, too many Americans seem content to wait until the further storms strike them before rallying to the cause of amendment. We feel the time to move is now, while this thing is still in its early stages. We must not relax with the first letter to Congress, the first protest, the first approach to local officials and school committees. We have got to keep moving. What we fight for, again, is not only the right of our children to maintain public reverence in the classroom, but also the right of all other instances of nondenominational reverence to survive in the Nation.

9. Are we still optimistic? Certainly, and for these reasons among others:

(a) Contrary to some press reports, we hear from an experienced news hand on Capitol Hill, Washington, that the discharge petition is moving faster than is usually the case.

(b) Prominent Congressmen and Senators, Democratic and Republican, have taken up the cause.

(c) The American Legion, at its national convention in Florida, went on record in favor of amendment.

(d) Twice the Governors' Conference, by immense majorities, has gone on record in favor of amendment.

(e) New evidence comes in every week that groups across America are keeping up the effort.

10. What should be our major thrust at this time? We must keep up the struggle visibly and continuously. Our goal remains, again, something from which few of our neighbors can dissent however they feel about the issue and that is to give the American people the right to vote yes or no on public reverence in public places.

Maimonides Award Goes to Dr. Jonas Salk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, at its annual fall meeting of the Jewish Federation-Council, the Maimonides Award was presented to Dr. Jonas Salk. This award, given annually to some member of the Jewish faith who has made a distinguished contribution to mankind, is given in the name of Moses Maimonides, who was a distinguished physician and rabbi of the 12th century. Because of Dr. Salk's national prominence, I am pleased to insert the text of the award, as well as his response, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF THE MAIMONIDES AWARD TO DR. JONAS SALK BY JUDGE IRVING HILL, PRESIDENT, JEWISH FEDERATION-COUNCIL OF GREATER LOS ANGELES, OCTOBER 8, 1963

The Maimonides Award is designated to be given to a person of the Jewish faith who has made an outstanding contribution to the well-being of our fellowmen. Under the rules, the award need not be made annually. This is its third presentation. It was last given in 1961 when the award was made to Dr. Felix Bloch, Nobel laureate in physics.

The life of this year's awardee in many ways parallels the life of the revered Maimonides, for whom the award is named. Moses Maimonides earned his place in history not only as a theologian but also as a teacher and a physician. His role as physician may surprise some of you. Not many people recall that Maimonides, after years of wandering in exile from his native Spain, established himself in Egypt, and became court physician to the Egyptian sultan. Only in the security of that place of honor was he able to produce the religious works for which we remember him. But in his lifetime he was noted throughout the Middle East as much for his knowledge of the science of medicine as for theology. And in medicine and theology he was a great teacher, teaching Jews and non-Jews alike.

Jonas Salk has yet to tackle theology. If he ever finds time, the rabbis had better look to their laurels. But his contributions as teacher and physician have already earned him a place in history which should, like that of Maimonides, last for centuries in the memory of the human race.

Before listing Dr. Salk's scientific accomplishments, let me tell you a little of his early life and something about him personally. Jonas Salk was born in New York City 48 years ago. He grew up in East Bronx. His mother was born in Minsk, and came to this country with her parents at the age of 12. His father was born here, the son of immigrants from Kurland in Lithuania. Mr. Salk was a garment worker and they were a family of very modest means. Dr. Salk grew up in an Orthodox kosher household. He went to cheder at Bronx Jewish Center through his bar mitzva and retains much of his Hebrew to this day. Dr. Salk has been to Israel and was moved by it. A year ago he sent his oldest son, Peter, to work on a kibbutz for the whole summer in the upper Negev.

Dr. Salk graduated from the City College of New York at the age of 19, Phi Beta Kappa and Sigma Xi. If City College had not had free tuition he would not have been able to go to college. He became interested in medicine only in his last year in college. His mother wanted him to be a schoolteacher. Dr. Salk, all through college, was preparing to be a lawyer. He entered medical school at New York University, graduating in 1939 with honors including Alpha Omega Alpha, which the doctors will recognize as the medical honorary for scholastic excellence. He took a year out to teach chemistry. With these earnings and summer earnings from work in a laboratory, he financed his medical education. Upon graduation, he interned at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York and then at the age of 27 went to the University of Michigan Medical School as a national research council fellow and later as associate professor. Since 1947 he has been at the University of Pittsburgh, where he was named chairman of the department of preventive medicine and has the chair of Commonwealth professor of experimental medicine.

The professional honors that have come to Dr. Salk are too numerous to list in full. Among them are membership in the Association of American Physicians, the American Society for Clinical Investigation, a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, consultant to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Army in Epidemic Deases and membership on the Expert Advisory Panel on Virus Diseases of the World Health Organization.

In "Who's Who," under Dr. Salk's name, appear six words which measure the useful-

ness of one human life to this generation and to countries unborn generations. The six words read "codiscoverer influenza vaccine; discoverer polio vaccine." The control, and through control, the eventual conquest of two dread diseases, would be enough to earn the lasting gratitude of the world. But my friends in the medical profession tell me that even those six meaningful words do not fully and accurately describe what Dr. Salk has done. As they explain it to me, he has discovered and given to medical science the techniques and knowledge basic to all modern immunization. These discoveries have established the method of measuring antibody responses in the human body, which Dr. Salk used in influenza and polio, which others have used in the control of measles, and by which all of the infectious diseases, one after the other, will eventually be controlled.

Dr. Salk is not finished yet. Though he remains professor at large in the Pittsburgh Medical School, he has now become a Californian. He is the director of a great new research center at La Jolla, which has been named the Salk Institute for Biological Studies. It is to be a gathering place for the most eminent of the basic scientists, especially in the field of molecular and cellular biology. They are to have no diversions from the primary task of hard thinking and basic research into some of the major unexplored areas of the nature of the process of life. Dr. Salk himself is now at work on the problem of immunization and local reaction to independently growing cells, such as cancer cells. May God grant him success.

Maimonides wrote that the preservation of life is a divine commitment and he wrote that the physician who carries out that commitment should be regarded as an instrument of the Almighty. This deeply embedded respect for the physician and his calling are with us still. Couple it with the biblical injunction that man is dutybound to God to give of himself and his substance for the welfare of others. Together, they go far to explain the attraction of medicine, and especially academic and research medicine, for the best of our Jewish sons, and to explain our compulsive drive to erect Jewish hospitals, clinics, and research centers, open to all, for the benefit of all. And I think these Jewish values may explain, in part, Dr. Jonas Salk and what he has done.

In ancient sources is found a passage which says that "all Israelites are surety (meaning "responsible") for one another." This is usually quoted in the negative sense. When one of us has committed an offense or incurred the wrath of someone in authority, we are accustomed to being blamed as a whole people, with each of us shouldering part of the guilt and the burden. But the saying is true in a positive sense as well. When one of us has made contributions of surpassing excellence to the welfare of all mankind, it is neither unreasonable nor unjust that all of us share a little bit and feel a personal glow of pride in his accomplishment. That's how we feel tonight.

Dr. Salk, I present this award to you in behalf of an immense Jewish community, and with it their affection and respect to you, as one of the most valuable and noble men whom this country, and our people, have given to the world.

KNOWLEDGE AND WISDOM

(Remarks by Jonas Salk, San Diego, Calif., presentation of the Maimonides Award of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles, October 8, 1963)

Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon lived about 800 years ago. He was philosopher and a rabbinic literary scholar. He sought to harmonize biblical and rabbinic teaching with philosophy, and especially with the philosophy of Aristotle. By appointment he was a physician to Saladin. He wrote "The Guide for the Perplexed."

The Rambam, as he was affectionally called, tried, in his time, to bridge the distance between the "two cultures" of his day.

He lived long before Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, long before Jenner discovered vaccination for smallpox, and, long before Freud explored the unconscious. Even though this great rabbi and physician did not possess the knowledge that a physician now must have, there was embodied in him a kind of wisdom that has healing qualities.

A knowledgeable man is not neecssarily a wise man. A man who is both knowledgeable and wise would possess the power of Maimonides. How much this world needs men to serve as guides to the perplexed. Are we conscious of this need and are we able to bring about, in a deliberate way, the development of men who might so serve society?

Each age has its own special problems arising from the solutions of the recent past and needs arising from the new urgencies uncovered thereby. In respect to the measure of knowledge possessed in ages past, it may be that the proportion of wisdom, earlier in time, may have been greater. Are we, in this day and age, learning more and understanding less? Do we feel an urge to return to the philosophers and wise men of the past for those satisfactions that nourish the soul? Where are the men of the present who may be, or who may become, the insightful ones for the future?

If we look to the past we see a Maimonides, whose name bespeaks an ideal. With his name honor is expressed. What qualities did he possess that led him, a rabbinical philosopher and man of letters, to become a healer and a guide to the perplexed? How does something like this come about? Are such men born, or are they made, or are they those who, by circumstances, have the opportunity to become such men?

What are the conditions and the circumsances likely to develop wisdom in those who also possess knowledge that might bring forth healing power and guidance for the perplexed?

In the days of Maimonides the question that men pondered concerned the nature of all things—the origin of the universe, the origin and nature of life, the nature of man, and the nature of God. The discourse in those days was carried on by natural philosophers and theologians. In rare instances were some who, like Maimonides, could engage in the dialogue among each and between both.

As we glance into the past we note the closeness of astronomy and physics in Newton's time. This was a moment when a link was made into the future from knowledge and understanding of the heavenly bodies to knowledge and understanding of the mechanics of the universe. Astronomy had begun to be solidified by the insight of Copernicus who revealed the true relationship between the sun and the earth. In the intervening period the astronomer was also the physicist of his day. This was the time when the bridge was being built from one well-formed branch of knowledge to one not yet fully formed. Physics became solidified by the insight of Einstein who revealed the true relationship between energy and mass.

As we look into the more recent past we see seemingly diverse branches of knowledge joining each other with understanding of relationships of a new order still to be revealed.

From the recent past we see the effect of the thrust of imagination and reasoning applied to the question of the nature of the physical universe. In more recent moments in time, as history is measured over the long perspective, we have begun to understand the nature of living matter. The great insights and discoveries that have been made in recent times in respect to the nature of living things have come from the naturalists, such as Darwin, who brought clarity through the concept of evolution, and Mendel, who made clear the basis for heredity. The dawn of a still newer era came when physicists joined with biologists to try to understand better the nature of the hereditary substance that contains biological information that is passed on from generation to generation.

How far can we see into the future? We see evolutionary trends from the past not only with respect to the structure of living things, but even in ideas and in understanding possessed by man. We see the way in which living things have increased in complexity in the course of evolutionary time; a point has been reached at which evolution has produced man with some of the attributes of the Creator. Whatever may be the nature of the Supreme Intelligence through which has been fashioned the matter of which the heavens and earth have been composed, and of which living things are made, the nature of man is such that he is able to unravel some of these mysteries, and now possesses, to a frightening degree, the power of life and death.

In these terms, you might say to yourselves, we can trust God, but can we trust man? We can, very likely, trust some men and not others, just as we can trust God and not the Devil.

It seems that we have come to the age-old question of good and evil.

We have talked of evolution of living things in the strictly hereditary sense—that of the evolution of physical traits and functional attributes; we have also talked of evolution in man's intellectual, cultural, and social expressions. We observe that man's intellectual evolution has brought him to a threshold at which he may soon be able to manipulate the substance of which life is composed. When this happens he will be confronted by decisions such as he had to make in the very recent past when he learned how to manipulate the substances of which the heavens and the earth are composed.

In respect to this great power which man possesses over nonliving matter, and which he can choose to use for good or for evil, we note with concern the rapidity with which he approaches the realization of his power over living matter. With the most noble intentions, man has already interfered with human life—to reduce disease and premature death—and has thereby brought upon himself, in large parts of the world, even more suffering than prevailed previously when fewer had survived to suffer.

Thus, with the very best of motives, it would seem that man's power to control life—or living things—is fraught with great danger. What, we may ask, might be the consequence of his being able to create affluence and the easy life? What will humans be like after generations have been born into an environment markedly different from any that heretofore existed in evolutionary time? For answers to these questions, it is not knowledge alone that is needed, but wisdom as well. Knowledge can be only of the past while wisdom contains a quality of the sense of the future.

It should be clear from what has been said in the last few minutes that the trend of man's intellectual evolution is in the direction that will bring about the merger of minds that are concerned with the nature of life itself and of minds that are concerned with the meaning and value of human life.

The natural philosophy of the past was concerned with the laws that govern the behavior of matter. The natural philosophy of the present calls for understanding the laws that govern the behavior of living matter, including man. Perhaps what we seek is the natural philosophy that emerges from an understanding of biological systems, and si-

multaneously a philosophy that emerges from a corresponding concern with the special biological system called man.

I have come by a long and circuitous historical route to the state of evolutionary development of man's present and future concerns. Man has always been concerned with himself, whether in relation to his God, or to his fellowman. He is concerned with his own survival as an individual and as a species; this is part of his nature. He must, therefore, give thought to his system of values lest he tamper precariously with values which, for survival, nature may not regard very highly. In contrast to nature, man's values are not in terms only of survival, in the animal sense. A concern that is also built into his nature is for a meaningful life—that is, one that satisfies not only his need to survive contentedly in the present, but one that simultaneously satisfies his concern for the future; the future not for himself alone, but for family and for his species. He is concerned about protecting himself from premature death, and he is concerned about protecting his family and his species against intrusion, or against invasion by any element that can become lethal, even though this may be long after the time has come for him to make way for those who, later, will either benefit from his wisdom or will suffer from his shortsightedness.

The relevance of these thoughts on this occasion arises from the fact that for several years we have been engaged in trying to create a place of work and of discourse in relation to questions with which man has long been concerned—is now concerned—and with which he must inevitably be concerned in the future. What we are trying to do is expressed in the nature of the group who comprise a new institute now in being not far from here. An essential quality of each individual who has committed himself to this undertaking is that he has a sense of the future. The life of each reveals how effectively he has contributed to the resolution of problems in the past. They saw the direction in which solutions could be found, and they sensed when the time had come. They have joined together to create a force greater than they could exert separately. Time does not permit more than this brief reference on this occasion.

I am aware that you have selected me to be the recipient of the Maimonides Award because of your regard for the work with which I have been associated in the past. In expressing my respect for Maimonides, the ideal you have selected to express your sense of value, I have tried to indicate the continuity of the thread of the inheritance transmitted through him down to the present when those who bridge distances in time and in thought find so much in common now, as they will continue to find in the future. What is needed is the recognition that knowledge must be coupled with wisdom for man to reach the fulfillment he so hopefully seeks.

A Tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, an old newspaper associate of mine, Kay Magenheimer, has compiled for publication early next month by Pageant Press of New York City, a series of her poems titled "Love's Stigmata."

I am pleased, indeed, that a friend should contribute to the all too slender stream of American poetry. Beyond that, I am impressed by the delicacy of expression and the depth of understanding in each of these little gems.

The publisher said it well when he noted that Kay Magenheimer in her poetic portraits of people reveals her awareness of the spark of divine love essential to all men.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my remarks a wonderful tribute by the author to a most distinguished and beloved woman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whom I knew for many years, two of whose sons have served with honor in this House. Of Eleanor Roosevelt, the gifted poetess wrote:

It was said; it was true
She was a gabbler and a gadabout
Gainsaying
Her diffidence.

Who then could foresee
In 1933
That this gaberlunzie for experience
Would become a mendicant for independence
Carrying emeralds and gold
In her pouch
For the oppressed;
And, under her gabardine cloak,
A bowl of rice,
A loaf of bread
For the hungry.

Concerning Our Trade Missions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to read an advance copy of an article scheduled to appear in the December issue of the Reader's Digest, which reports some of the significant contributions being made by the businessmen of the United States who are serving in a voluntary capacity on our trade missions.

Because it is a heartening report, I am taking the liberty of including it under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

Of particular interest to me is the fact that among those singled out for praise in the article is Mr. Louis Spilman, of Waynesboro, Va., the energetic president and editor of the News-Virginian, Waynesboro's daily newspaper. In addition to his editorial and business direction of the newspaper, which he has headed for 34 years, Mr. Spilman has made significant contributions to the improvement of printing techniques.

The article follows:

A GOVERNMENT-BUSINESS TEAM THAT WORKS—THESE NEW TRADE MISSIONS PROMISE TO INCREASE U.S. EXPORTS AND BIND THE WESTERN WORLD CLOSER TOGETHER THROUGH THE POWERFUL TIES OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(By André Fontaine)

A California manufacturer of industrial machinery has more than a million dollars in new business with France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom, thanks to a new kind of teamwork between our Government and private business. Similarly, a Pennsylvania producer of petrochemical processing equipment is building a $4 million plant in India as a joint venture, and American publishers are selling paperback books in Malaya. The cost of the program to the taxpayer is negligible compared to the profits and the benefits to the free economy of the West.

This unusual business-Government cooperation was started by the Department of Commerce to help stop the drain of gold from the United States by increasing sales of U.S. products abroad. At the time, only 1 American manufacturer in 20 did any export business. To the smaller manufacturers, export business was too unknown and too involved with the redtape of licenses, foreign exchange and credit. Roy F. Gootenberg, appointed director of the program for the Bureau of International Commerce, set out to help businessmen overcome these obstacles. He has succeeded beyond his most optimistic hopes.

This is how the program works. Commerce Department field offices around the country ask businessmen in their areas what they'd like to sell. Soon proposals flow into Washington—one man has some used textile machinery he'd like to dispose of, another wants to sell a couple of tugboats, a third wants to license an agency to sell his auto brake linings. Meanwhile, reports from abroad show what products are needed where—Italy, for example, wants computers and automation equipment; Japan, machine tools.

Gootenberg and his staff now organize a trade mission composed of five or six businessmen and two men from the Department of Commerce. Mission members must meet tough qualifications: they must be expert in a specific business area; they usually have some experience in foreign trade; they must give promise of being good ambassadors. Moreover, they must have both time and money, for they receive no pay. The Government grants them only travel expenses and a living allowance of about $15 a day. Everything else comes out of the member's or his company's pocket. The average mission, Gootenberg figures, costs the Government $35,000 to $50,000, and each member $500 to $800, plus the salary he may lose for the 2 months away from his job. Nevertheless, there are always many more businessmen wanting to serve than there are assignments.

Once selected, the mission members come to Washington for what one has called "the best briefing I've ever had—and that includes intelligence briefings during the war." They receive a quick, thorough survey of the politics and economy of the countries they'll visit; a short course in export regulations and Commerce Department credit-checking facilities, how to work with an interpreter, how to conduct meetings with foreigners. They and the two men from the Commerce Department then fly to the host country, where U.S. embassy and Commerce Department officials have been lining up businessmen with proposals they want to discuss.

The members of the American mission may not do business for themselves. Though every other country's trade missions are composed of men out to get orders for themselves, American mission members are ambassadors for all U.S. business, including their competitors. Robert Kell, for example, heads the Grey Hosiery Mills in Bristol, Va. On his mission to Greece last year he saw some business possibilities about which he informed two of his competitors. Both began negotiations for joint ventures with the Greek firms.

Often mission members' know-how helps not only U.S. businessmen but foreigners too. On a mission to the Philippines last fall Lester L. Wolff, food-marketing expert, saw where huge cattle ranches and vegetable

farms had flourished until the Japanese destroyed them during the war. He knew that the Philippines, despite great resources, were not self-sufficient in food, that food stores were tiny, primitive and high priced. An idea took shape: why not start a completely integrated food operation, starting with revived ranches and farms, proceeding through slaughtering, packing, warehousing, trucking to eventual sale in supermarkets?

When he got back to the United States Wolff lined up a group of men with capital, and now a $50 million joint venture with Filipinos and Americans each investing half is in the offing. Wolff is confident it will make the islands more self-sufficient, lower food prices and bring profits to both U.S. and Filipino investors.

Often mission members, by being on the spot, can solve a problem that has frustrated both U.S. and foreign businessmen. One of the biggest textile manufacturers in Greece told Robert Kell he had ordered $3 million in textile machinery from a U.S. firm, but some hitch in Washington had been holding things up so long he was about to place the order elsewhere. Kell phoned the U.S. Embassy, which, in turn, phoned Washington. In 48 hours the hitch was cleared up and the contract signed.

"You have done us a wonderful favor," the Greek told Kell. "We wanted to buy the machinery from America, but were at the point where we couldn't wait any longer."

Trade mission members offer foreign businessmen an unparalleled chance to broaden their knowledge. The mission to Italy last year included Ray Ellis, an electronics expert from Raytheon Co.; Eugene Grabbe, of Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., a specialist in computers; and Dean Burnett, of Leeds & Northrup Co., a graduate electrical engineer. All three visited Italian plants and gave freely of their knowledge. Burnett told the Italians about new furnaces used in America for heat-treating metals. Grabbe told both steel and chemical manufacturers how they could improve productivity by using the latest developments in U.S. computers—and not only those made by his own firm. Ellis did a similar job in electronics factories.

On the other hand, mission members often broadened their own knowledge. On his return from a mission to the Netherlands early in 1963, Sam G. Adler, Jr., department store head from Savannah, Ga., told Gootenberg, "I found a shopping service technique that's better than anything in this country. I'm going to copy it whole in my store, and I'm going to make money from it."

After they leave the host country, the trade missioners visit 10 to 12 U.S. cities to report to businessmen on what they have learned. Sometimes they bring back more business proposals than they took over.

One of the most notable jobs in getting other businessmen involved in export trade was done by Louis Spilman, editor and publisher of the Waynesboro, Va., News-Virginian. Spilman was on the mission to West Germany last year as an expert on printing machinery, but while there he kept in mind the industries of Waynesboro. When he got home he told the Virginia Panel Corp., which makes computer panels and had done export business only in England, about opportunities he'd noticed. The company is now selling its products in Germany also.

Spilman talked to executives of a General Electric plant that makes automatic-control equipment. As a result, the Waynesboro plant, together with another in Lynn, Mass., has established an export division in Germany to service the whole European Common Market.

He convinced chiefs of a Reynolds Metals plant they were missing a bet. They now are setting up an export department to sell aluminum products in Germany. He was also asked by Germans to find an automatic fresh-egg-vending machine they could buy—he did—and a particular kind of rustproofing material—he did. All this was a far cry from printing machinery.

The purpose of the missions is, of course, to get those who have never done any export trade to start. It seems to work. The Malco Fabrics Co., of Brockton, Mass., had never done any export business when Dan Matthews, its president, went to the Boston meeting held by missioners to Greece. He heard a business proposal that interested him, got in touch with the Greek firm and completed a profitable deal. He wrote Gootenberg, "Without the help of your department I doubt we would have entered the export market at all."

Another executive told Gootenberg what the mission program had done for his company: "Less than 5 years ago our exports amounted to approximately 6 percent of our domestic business. Today, with joint ventures in Italy, Israel, and Mexico, our total international sales equal 33 percent of our domestic business. We're aiming for 100 percent."

Every businessman I have talked with is excited about the program. Over and over they tell the same story: foreign businessmen are eager to get American products and American know-how. But there is more than a vision of new business in their enthusiasm. They are proud of their part in a program that is binding the Western World closer together through the powerful ties of free and flourishing enterprise.

Group Research, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the guilt-by-association smear techniques which the liberals claim to deplore but which they themselves are employing now.

Under the title of Group Research, Inc., a leftwing organization closely allied to the Americans for Democratic Action, the AFL–CIO, and the National Democratic Party, an index has been and is being built up on all people who disagree with the leftwing goals of this organization.

We find Presidents Eisenhower and Hoover sharing space in this organization's index with such notorious fanatics as American Nazi Party leader, George Lincoln Rockwell.

The purpose of the index is outlined in an article by Columnist Richard Wilson which appeared in the November 20 issue of the Evening Star, and which follows my remarks.

These abortive tactics prove once again that the radical left does not hesitate to use guilt-by-association techniques through Group Research, Inc., on an intentional, well-financed, and broadly circulated basis.

The article follows:

LABOR'S INDEX OF THE "NON-LEFT," LISTINGS—EISENHOWER, ROCKWELL, AND SO FORTH—IS CALLED DIVISIVE AND A FEAR TACTIC

(By Richard Wilson)

"Eisenhower, Dwight D.: II—Grede, William: IV—No. 12, Frdms. Fdn., 5, 21, 40."

This cryptic reference is to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as he is listed in the index of Group Research, Inc. This identifies General Eisenhower with various kinds of conservative organizations and principles which are explained in more detail in what is called the Group Research, Inc., Directory.

General Eisenhower, and many others who have made great contributions to the Nation's security and welfare, are thus bracketed and indexed with the wild and woolly partisans of the far right.

The former President shares this distinction with Gen. Omar Bradley, Clare Booth Luce, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, Ozzie and Harriet, Chiang Kai-shek, Gen. Mark W. Clark, the late John Foster Dulles, Herbert Hoover, J. Edgar Hoover, and many others too numerous to mention.

They are all dumped unceremoniously into the index along with such proud wearers of the far right label as Gerald L. K. Smith, Kent and Phoebe Courtney, and the American Nazi leader, George Lincoln Rockwell.

The indexing is truly portentous. Take, for example, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, the World War I ace flyer and organizer of Eastern Airlines. This culprit is classed thus: "Rickenbacker, Capt. Edward V.: I—Com. For Monroe Doctrine., 1–2 Yaf, 5; II—Clark, Fred, 2; Rickenbacker; IV—Nov. 7, Natl. Indig. Con., 2; No. 11 Hargis, 19; No. 12, Frdms. Fdn., 21, 38."

All this abacadabra indicates that Captain Eddie has been pretty active in expressing himself. The abbreviation "Frdms. Fdn." means Freedoms Foundation and has gotten a lot of people into the "index," including Harold Stassen. Freedoms Foundation is described by the operators of Group Research Inc., as a "conservative-patriotic" society, but is considered by others to be a well-meaning organization promoting respect for American institutions.

Group Research, Inc. came into being a year or so ago with the "encouragement" of the AFL–CIO and other organizations, according to its founder, Wesley McCune. Mr. McCune took leave of his position as public relations director of the Farmers Union, the liberal farm organization which alines itself with Americans for Democratic Action and the Auto Workers Union, to devote himself to Group Research, Inc. He says it is supported by numerous clients including labor unions, farm organizations, universities, cooperatives, etc.

The index runs some 46 typed pages and includes approximately 2,300 names. Director McCune says his research material is for the use of people and organizations desiring to identify various personalities, right or left, for various reasons. But it is clear that at least 90 percent of the people indexed are on the conservative side, and he admits this. He has thrown them all in higgledy-piggledy because it is just too hard to grade conservative identifications in their varying degrees from center to far right.

The index and the directory are used by labor unions and AFL–CIO's Committee on Political Education to carry on the warfare against the far right. One labor organization has circulated the index to key people along with the following directions on how to use it:

"When you hear that a rightwing speaker is coming to town, check him immediately in the directory and alert friendly groups. * * * Inform your local newspaper by personal visit if possible. * * * The idea is to alert democratic groups to the possibility of trouble. * * * Use the letters-to-the-editor column. * * * Develop a pool of well-informed speakers to address church groups, fraternal, civic and service organizations, and schools. * * * In many cases exposure alone will turn the tide. * * * Labor can provide the real leadership in such a maneuver."

"Mention of a person or organization in this directory has no editorial significance of itself," says Director McCune, apparently

suffering a slight twinge of conscience. "The user must draw his own conclusions in each instance."

Users do draw their own conclusions and the index and directory are used to spread a new kind of guilt by association. These tactics increase the already great misunderstandings in American public life. The tactics are divisive. They spread fear and suspicion.

All these things were said a generation ago about the anti-Communist activity of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. They were said by the same people who now are using tactics which do not differ much in principle from those they once criticized.

Forty-fifth Anniversary of Latvian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of our former sister republic, the Republic of Latvia. It is appropriate that all true Americans should pause once again to pay tribute to the valor, gallantry, and spirit of the Latvian people.

It is an occasion also for all of us to rededicate our purpose with vigorous determination to the liberation of Latvia and the other small, helpless nations that have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain by a combination of bestial violence, unconscionable diplomacy and subversive infiltration.

Latvia was one of the three Baltic Republics overrun by the Red Army invasion of 1940. For many years Latvia struggled against discouraging odds to establish and maintain her freedom. First, it was czarist Russia, which oppressed Latvia until 1918. It is the declaration of independence after the czarist collapse that we remember today. Then the well-known Soviet methods of force and subversion were used to temporarily impose a puppet Latvian Government, for 5 months in 1919. But the Latvian people heroically rejected this farcical regime. During this time also Latvia had to defeat the remnants of German imperialism in the Baltic.

Then for a too short 20 years Latvians guided their own destiny. And they did an admirable job of it. Latvia became a respected, dedicated member of the League of Nations in 1921. She made great advances in manufacturing and agriculture. Ninety-five percent of Latvian trade was with Western Europe and the United States during the thirties. The Constitution of Latvia was founded on the latest constitutional principles of Western thought. In the Latvian Parliament, the Saeima, party government of the kind we know was the modus operandi.

On August 11, 1920, the defeated Bolsheviki had agreed to final and irrevocable independence for Latvia. And for a few years, while Stalin consolidated his power, Latvia was not unduly molested.. On February 5, 1932, Latvia and the Soviet Union signed a treaty of nonaggression which absolutely forbade the Soviet Union to meddle in Latvia affairs. But if anyone took hope from this, it was false hope, as so often before and since. Because, soon thereafter, in violation of their spoken and written word, the Communists began the careful, militant subversion of free Latvia. The pace was notably increased in 1935, and Latvia's fate was assured by the infamous treaty with Hitler in 1939. It took Stalin very little time to concentrate 16 divisions on Latvia's border and, this time, force capitulation.

The decline and terrible repression of Latvia after that are well known. Fortunately, a few Latvians have been able to reach freedom and to continue the fight against the Soviet Union. There is no doubt the majority of Latvians, whether at home or abroad, desire self-determination.

As I have stated so many times, there can be no compromise on the great human questions of the destiny of free peoples. Foremost among these is the right of nations desiring it to be free, the right of each individual to be free, the right of the human soul to find expression in free institutions, to achieve that measure of freedom bestowed by the Creator, the right of the lowly and the weak to be protected in their choice of life and in their desire and intention to walk humbly in the ways of the Lord seeking and enjoying the privilege that can come only from free government to order their own lives and to be liberated from the bondage and the slavery which selfish, rapacious tyrants impose upon them.

Let us be true to our own glorious heritage of freedom. This heritage was not won through fear and trembling, appeasement and cowardice. It was won through bitter sacrifices, bloodshed, and suffering by millions of people, past and present, who were willing to give everything they had—their honor, their possessions, their material resources, and their lives to protect and sustain our liberties. This heritage was won through determination, through strength, through courage, through fearlessness, and it can only be preserved and protected by the same means.

It is fitting that on this 45th anniversary of Latvian independence we should pledge anew to all small nations under the yoke of Soviet tyranny and oppression our determination to work for the restoration of freedom to these unhappy lands.

Let it be known by the great freedom-loving Latvian people and all oppressed peoples the fight for freedom is our fight because it is the fight for liberty, democracy, justice, morality, and human decency.

Let us express our determination and hopes for a free Latvia to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Vietnam—With Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the recent developments in Vietnam, and I believe that one of the best of the articles penned on that situation was by Emmet John Hughes, entitled "Vietnam—With Reason," which appeared in the November 18 issue of Newsweek.

Mr. Hughes deals eloquently and pointedly with our foreign policy, and I would commend his article to my colleagues as most worthwhile reading:

VIETNAM—WITH REASON

(By Emmet John Hughes)

With sudden drama, a foreign crisis occasionally explodes in a way to test something more vital in America than its capacity to fight. It can test the Nation's capacity to think.

This now has occurred in the emotional aftermath of the coup d'etat in Vietnam. To Americans, this event seemed an almost fantastic climax to the sojourn of Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu. She had traveled the breadth of the land lecturing the United States on the impregnability of her family's regime, the devotion of its army, the puniness of its enemies, the serenity of its people, and the incomprehensible stupidity of American skeptics in high places. And the retort to all this came from the full-throated laughter of the Vietnamese throngs, unleashed by the coup to surge in joy through the streets of Saigon.

Yet before this stunning moment—with personal tragedy capping political catastrophe—Madam Nhu had set a peculiar and a striking tone to every scene she had enacted. Again and again, privately and publicly, she had scorned all critics and all cautions, deriding Buddhist demonstrators as fanatics and student rioters as draft dodgers. Soft in speech but deadly in venom, she had labeled all doubters of her word—including the President of the United States—as untrustworthy, "a little too liberal," and "not as anti-Communist as we." Beautiful and bitter—dropping slanders and innuendoes in her path as delicately as if they were handkerchiefs—she more and more gave her pilgrimage an intellectual air suggesting only one modern political precedent: the West European journey, a decade ago, by two inquisitorial aids of Senator Joseph McCarthy hunting through U.S. embassies for the insufficiently anti-Communist.

PERILS AND PARADOXES

As Madam Nhu left behind these mementos, however, she gathered others—alive. These were her new and voluble champions: some angry young Republicans, a few wealthy Birchite executives on the west coast, and those rightist pundits most quick to clutch at fevering causes. From the outset, some of them even joined Madam Nhu in making fun of suicidal Buddhist rebels—with a tastelessness that they would have decried as blasphemy, if ever anyone had so caricatured martyrs of their own Christian faith. And, in the end, after such hearty espousal of Madam Nhu's version of life in Vietnam, these zealots had to view the coup as worse than a bloody political crime. It was a downright personal embarrassment.

All this would hardly be worth a moment's passing dismay—if it did not possibly hold an ugly portent for the national election year of 1964. For such unreasoning rhetoric could corrupt all national debate into the crude terms of "soft" and "hard" American policies, toward communism generally and Vietnam particularly.

This peril becomes the more real because U.S. policy in Vietnam now clearly faces not calmer but stormier days—for at least three reasons:

1. In a country like Vietnam, the preachment of demoracy is mastered much faster than its practice. And any lapses by the new regime are sure to be twisted by the illogical into posthumous proofs of the benign nature of the old regime.

2. Paradoxically, the United States may now enjoy less rather than more influence over Vietnamese domestic politics. For the new leaders are unlikely ever to fear any American threat, in any crisis, to disengage and look for a third regime.

3. The United States now must define with precision its true military objective in Vietnam. Ultimately, this means a choice between driving Communist forces back to China's border—the strategy of such memorable folly in Korea—or negotiating a Korea-style line of truce around Vietnam's 17th parallel.

All such dilemmas as these cannot be met—or even sensibly discussed—in a U.S. political atmosphere poisoned by the smog of slogan and simplification, insinuation, and invective.

The tale of Vietnam thus takes its place as part of the larger challenge to all U.S. foreign policy just laid down publicly by George F. Kennan, upon his retirement as Ambassador to Yugoslavia. Urgently, Kennan has warned lest American politics become a tragicomic contest between parties and leaders racing—breathlessly and witlessly—to prove themselves "sufficiently anti-Communist." And he has stated the crucial truth: "People who expect the capitulation of Communist power are talking about something so unrealistic they really want war."

This was the fatal flaw in the doctrines and the policies of John Foster Dulles for the better part of a decade. And it remains the fallacy in all current orations decrying the menace of "coexistence" as simply insidious. For the orators never specify their chosen means for precipitating the nonexistence of communism.

So this much may be said of Vietnam: its value in guarding the security of southeast Asia may be surpassed by its value in testing the rationality of American political thought.

What Makes Sunday Different?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in This Week magazine of November 24, 1963, there appeared an article written by Elmo Roper entitled, "What Makes Sunday Different." It is the most refreshing article that I have read in some time. It is a thoroughly scientific answer to the pessimistic moralists who feel that we are a lost people. Elmo Roper, whose qualifications need no expounding in this introduction, made a survey which proves that Americans are predominantly a churchgoing, family-loving people, not too unlike our pioneering ancestors. A typical Sunday to this group of Americans consists of getting up before 9, reading the newspapers, going to church, visiting or being visited by relatives and friends, and then they relax Sunday night with the family.

In the midst of a troubled world and pessimism at home and abroad, I take pleasure in bringing Elmo Roper's column to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

WHAT MAKES SUNDAY DIFFERENT?

(By Elmo Roper)

(NOTE.—It's a day we look forward to eagerly and reflect on fondly. A noted researcher tells why.)

The fashionable part-time occupation in the United States today is worrying about morality. Everyone seems to be discussing it, in public print and at private parties, and the conclusion of all this talk can be summed up in a word: pessimism. A new breed of social critics has sprung up since the end of World War II, and since then these gadflies have liberally bombarded us with facts, figures, and a grim set of predictions about our future.

We have been told that our teenagers are delinquents and our adults are godless; that we are rapidly drifting away from religion; and that family unity, which has been so much of our heritage, is disintegrating.

I am happy to report that this pessimistic image is far from accurate. My opinion is based on a nationwide survey of thousands of Americans which my firm has just completed for This Week on the meaning of Sunday. Sunday has been the traditional day for church and family. It is also the one day during which we are left to our own devices and can do what we want. The editors reasoned that, if there had been a breakdown in religious attitudes and family unity, this breakdown would probably show up most vividly on Sunday.

The survey gives a rather different impression of modern American life from that drawn by the caustic commentators on the American scene. It shows that we are, in fact, a people with strong religious commitments and deep family ties.

A VERY SPECIAL DAY

First of all, we found that for most Americans, Sunday is a very special day. Fifty-six percent of the people we interviewed said Sunday is the day of the week they most look forward to. Another 16 percent said it is their second favorite day. And why? For nearly half of the people we asked, it is because it's the day they go to church. For these people, church is not just a habit and it is considerably more than a duty. It is the essential meaning of the day.

On an average Sunday, a little over half of American adults will attend church. Over two-thirds of the people in this country attend religious services at least once a month (whether on Sunday or other days of the week), and only 8 percent never go at all. Women attend more regularly than men and adults under 35 years old a bit more often than people over 50.

Still there is a feeling of some falling away from the religious fold. Twenty-two percent of the people say they attend religious services more often than they did 10 years ago, but 29 percent say they attend less often. Forty-one percent say their attendance is about the same.

Protestants and Jews attend church and synagogue less often than they used to; Catholic attendance has stayed about the same.

Religion isn't all Sunday is about. Almost tied in importance as a reason for looking forward to Sunday is that it is a day of rest and relaxation. Sunday is a day for taking it easy, for napping on the couch, and for just sitting around. People may do things, but they're relaxed about it, and it doesn't feel like work. Sunday seems to be the only day active Americans can be idle without feeling guilty.

THE DAY THAT'S FOR FAMILIES

This leads us to the third cornerstone on which most people build their Sunday: the opportunity it offers for being together with their families. For most Americans, Sunday is a social, family-centered day—and family in this case includes relatives living elsewhere. When people go out, it usually is to visit relatives or friends. And if they don't go out to see others, it's likely that they will have visitors. Church may be the reason people look forward to Sunday. But family, in 66 percent of our interviews, is what makes Sunday of greatest value.

A typical Sunday might run something like this: Americans will sleep a bit later on Sunday than the rest of the week. However, 83 percent of the country is up by 9 in the morning. One percent, however, sleep past noon.

Morning is the time for a leisurely breakfast, reading of the Sunday paper, and going to church. After dinner, some people take a drive to visit relatives or friends; others just sit around and relax. A few people work around the house or the yard on Sunday. Many get involved in discussions about present family problems and future plans. These might include such subjects as the children's education, where to go on a vacation, or the next sizable family expenditure—a car, dishwasher, or a new livingroom rug.

Sunday evenings find most families watching television and our typical American called it a day by 11 o'clock.

We found some nostalgia for the Sundays of a generation ago. There is a feeling, expressed by 24 percent of our respondents, that families were even closer then than they are now. Nineteen percent felt it used to be quieter, simpler, more restful day, with fewer distractions. Sixteen percent said that Sundays were better a generation ago because people were more religious and spent more time in church.

Yet others think Sundays have improved. The main contrast with the Sundays of yesteryear seems to be that we are more active today. On a typical Sunday, for example, two-thirds of us travel in the car an average of 35 miles.

It's clear that we want to keep the Sunday in Sunday. Sixty-eight percent of the people questioned felt that political rallies on Sunday are improper; 56 percent disapproved political speeches on TV; and 77 percent were against candidates talking to people as they left church.

This conservatism runs over into America's thinking about Sunday "blue laws." Only essential stores and services should be open, in most opinions. The essentials include: drugstores, newsstands, small gorcery stores. Most of us don't mind bowling alleys being open on Saunday, nor do we object to movies. But a majority feels that nightclubs, liquor stores, bars, auto dealers, discount houses, supermarkets, and department stores should remain closed.

The idea of life without Sunday evoked, for many Americans, something close to the end of civilization. "There would be a loss in spiritual values" was one of the milder reactions expressed by 53 percent. "Religions would die out" was the prediction of 45 percent and 44 percent said "Life would be a mess."

HOW THEY ENJOY SUNDAY: GOOD, MEDIUM, AND POOR CHURCHGOERS

Those who go: Often, 71 percent; occasionally, 55 percent; never, 49 percent, find Sunday happy.

Those who go: Often, 56 percent; occasionally, 49 percent; never, 45 percent, find Sunday restful.

Those who go: Often, 55 percent; occasionally, 51 percent; never, 43 percent, find Sunday satisfying.

Those who go: Often, 53 percent; occasionally, 45 percent; never, 40 percent, find Sunday contented.

Those who go: Often, 44 percent; occasionally, 12 percent; never, 9 percent, find Sunday inspirational.

Those who go: Often, 7 percent; occasionally, 6 percent; never, 10 percent, find Sunday tiring.

Those who go: Often, 4 percent; occasionally, 6 percent; never, 10 percent, find Sunday lonely.

Those who go: Often, 2 percent; occasionally, 4 percent; never, 6 percent, find Sunday monotonous.

ARE WE GETTING BETTER?

The incessant pounding that social critics have been making has, we found, affected the thinking of many Americans. Fifty-eight percent of the people we talked to said that we are less considerate of our fellow man today than in our parents' generation. Forty-five percent said we are less honest and truthful today; 42 percent said we are less religious today. However, of special significance, in view of today's troubled race relations, is the fact that three times as many Negroes as whites felt people are more considerate of their fellow man today than in the past.

One survey of Sunday cannot reveal the whole moral climate of a nation, but it does provide clues. Obviously there are many dark spots and we are right to be concerned about them. But every society has had problems from the beginning of time, and we should not be surprised that our society has some headaches, too.

However, one cannot help being reassured when reading over the results of these interviews. Despite the anxiety and tensions, the confusions and complexities of modern life, there still exists in this Nation a deep and sound reservoir of people whose lives are grounded in the things that count.

It is this reservoir which is encouraging to me, a heartening example that at its core America is basically healthy and well.

Ethics, Advertising, and Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very thoughtful and timely address delivered by Daniel J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission. Mr. Murphy is a former resident of Chelsea, Mass., a city which I am privileged to represent. Mr. Murphy's address, entitled "Ethics, Advertising, and Responsibilities," was given on November 16, 1963, before Georgetown University and Catholic Apostolate of Mass Media, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

It is indeed a pleasure to participate in this conference on ethics, advertising, and responsibilities.[1]

May I observe that in relation to advertising it may be more descriptive to refer to the responsibilities and obligations of the advertiser rather than his ethics and morals? These words—"ethics" and "morals"—are high-sounding terms and appear to belong more in a philosophical frame of reference rather than in a reference to advertising—whether it is deceptive or not. At the same time, we recognize that there is a moral concept involved in the observance of law generally, even though compliance with law may provide only a minimum standard of conduct. There is an element of morality inherent in the Federal Trade Commission Act in prohibiting unfair practices which includes deceptive advertising. However, rather than calling it "moral" or "ethical" to obey the law, may I refer instead to legal responsibilities and obligations?

The courts have recently reminded us that there is no constitutional right to disseminate deceptive advertising.[2] On the contrary, there is a constitutional responsibility and obligation not to disseminate deceptive advertising.

There is severe criticism of certain current advertising practices. Complaints by consumers and business competitors are appreciably increasing. We appreciate the great contributions advertising has made to the economic and business life of the country, so we do not subscribe to the extreme criticism that advertising is an unproductive industry.

But it must be recognized that deception does exist in a wide variety of advertising, not only locally but also nationally and regionally, and there are involved certain responsibilities and obligations.

A prominent advertising manager at a meeting of advertising men asked:

"How many of us here can say that he's never been a party to deceptive advertising; that he has never, at the very least, allowed advertising of one kind or another to go by him that encouraged favorable but untrue inferences about his product?

"And who among us has not been so mesmerized by the lyricism of a piece of copy, or the beauty of a layout, or the poetic tintinnabulations of a musical commercial, that he has ignored the consumer's rightful desire to be told quickly and clearly—without a lot of meaningless guff—how the product will benefit him?"

It is no answer to say deceptive advertising represents only a small percentage of the $12½ billion figure for all yearly advertising. It may be a small percentage, but it is a loud and dramatic percentage, a persistent and repetitive percentage. Moreover, it is a harmful percentage—it hurts everybody—the advertiser, business, consumer. It operates against the public interest and at times insults public intelligence. It cannot be ignored.

It is no answer to say there has been a vast improvement throughout the years in advertising standards. While this is acknowledged, it must be admitted that there is still room for further vast improvement. While the outright lie may not be evidence, slick, clever, sophisticated choice of words and pictures which convey an implication and impression contrary to fact is many times quite evident.

It is no answer to say there is no intent to deceive. Intention is not necessary. The test is not the intent of the advertiser, but the understanding of the consumer. The question is, "Does the advertising have the capacity to deceive?" Many times the motivation is quite clear—to place an impression in the minds of consumers in regard to a product or a service, an impression that is simply not true.

Let us look at a few examples:

(A) The problem of hair loss and baldness. There is no known drug preparation, device, or method of treatment which may be truthfully advertised as a cure or competent treatment for common baldness. The common baldness (male patent baldness), which constitutes 95 percent of all baldness, is considered permanent and incurable. Despite a large number of actions by the Federal Trade Commission, advertising for worthless preparations, devices, and treatments continue to defraud the gullible public. It is estimated that 25 percent—one out of four—of men 25 years old have some stage of baldness and that approximately $20 million are spent annually on these preparations.

(B) Arthritis and rheumatism are common ailments of aged people. It is estimated there are about 12 million people in the United States afflicted in some manner with these illnesses. It is estimated that about $32 million were spent during 1962 for arthritic and rheumatic pain-relieving drugs. These drugs include pills, salves, ointments, rub-ins, devices—claiming adequate and permanent cures. The Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation estimates that all forms of "frauds and fallacies" cost arthritis sufferers $250 million annually. The Commission has issued several complaints and orders to cease and desist prohibiting these extravagant claims and, in any event, limiting claims to temporary relief of minor aches and pains. Yet advertisers, with claims for cures, still continue to give empty hope to the afflicted.

(C) Cold and cough product advertising. It is estimated that about 500 million cases of common cold occur annually. This provides a wide and fertile area for the advertiser in making extravagant claims for the various products with respect to relief of symptoms. But the overall effect is an implied representation that colds can be cured. There is, at the present time, no drug or combination of drugs known to medical science which will prevent or cure the common cold. It is estimated that the consumer spent about $375 million in 1962 for these cold products. Advertisers compete with each other in the extravagance of their claims. Where is the responsibility of the advertising industry?

(D) Consider the full-page nationwide newspaper advertising of so-called land developers. Thousands of families have been attracted by clever advertising to buy, sight unseen, marginal land with the hope of establishing retirement or vacation homes. In most instances the land—arid, desert wasteland—is extravagantly advertised. A brief, on-the-scene inspection would have disclosed that, contrary to the advertising, there were no utilities, no streets, no schools, no churches, and, in a few cases, there was no water or vegetation. It is estimated that last year alone $500 million was paid out or committed for payment on installment plans, for mail-order land. The Commission initiated over 15 investigations in this area—these actions are being coordinated with activities of the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice to prevent fraudulent use of the mails.

(E) Fictitious prices: Probably the primary evil of deceptive advertising involves fictitious pricing. Fictitious pricing may be defined generally as a representation that a selling price of a product is a bona fide reduction from a former price, when, in fact, the product rarely, if ever, has been sold at the former price, in the trade area where the product was offered. The Commission issued guides against this practice which is common to many industries. The Commission has also in this area issued several complaints and orders to cease and desist—it has many times been sustained by the courts in these matters—yet advertisers continue to use this technique and are inventing new terms and phrases to cover the same practice.

[1] Remarks are personal and not official.

[2] *Murray Space Shoe Corporation, et al.*, FTC Docket 7476 (C.C.A. 2, June 7, 1962); *The Regina Corporation*, FTC Docket 8323 (C.C.A. 3, Aug. 19, 1963).

Perhaps the answer to these problems lies with an industry program of self-regulation that is effective and realistic with an adequate and recognized authority. Attempts heretofore made in self-regulation have not generally been successful.

The Federal Trade Commission has responsibilities in this area of advertising. It has the widest advertising jurisdiction of any Federal agency. This jurisdiction extends to all media and with few exceptions to all commodities. The Federal Trade Commission is the only Federal agency equipped by statute, by personnel, by experience, and by procedures to perform this most vital responsibility. It is meeting its responsibilities by promulgating new procedures and techniques to speed up the administrative process.

In addition to its formal proceedings, the Commission has adopted and employed several informal procedures and techniques in meeting the challenges of deceptive advertising, including consent settlement procedure, trade practice conference rules, advertising guides, trade regulation rules, advisory opinions, assurances of discontinuance, and compliance advertising.

Once again—in a period of 2 years—we have overhauled and revised our rules of practice in order that we may more expeditiously be of genuine assistance to businesss and the public; in order that unfair acts and practices, including deceptive advertising, may be eliminated. We have employed the industrywide approach, when practicable, to avoid the singling out of one competitor when his competitors are engaged in the same practice.

It is not practical to think the Federal Trade Commission can, by itself, regulate and control all deceptive advertising. We are comparatively a small institution. Each of the 100 largest advertisers spends in excess of $6,900,000 per year for advertising—an amount which is more than six times greater than the total allocation of funds to the Bureau of Deceptive Practices of the Commission. The Bureau's funds must be used not only for regulation of advertising but for prevention of deceptive labeling and numerous other forms of deceptive schemes and practices.

Advertising, with its $12½-billion budget, exerts a vital and tremendous force in the growth and prosperity of a free American economy. Because of this vast influence, the advertising industry—its whole chain of command—the advertiser, the agency, and the advertising media—has corresponding responsibilities and obligations.

It is appreciated that, stripped of its fanfare, the primary purpose of advertising is to sell; advertising is salesmanship, whether in picture, in print, or in voice. In the selling process advertising men have a right to make a profit. But they have no right, in selling, to deceive the consumer. I do not think it is an unjust criticism of advertising to allege that advertising men are more creative in promoting or selling a product or a service than they are in avoiding deception.

Business and the advertising fraternities must assume greater responsibilities of properly and honestly informing the consumer of the qualities and value of their products and services without the use of false and misleading statements and without disparaging observations of competitive products.

The advertising industry should be aware, and no doubt is, of two very important factors:

1. There are approximately 200 bills which affect advertising, directly or indirectly, which have been introduced in this 88th Congress.

2. In July 1962, the President appointed the Consumer Advisory Council to provide Federal agencies with advice on broad issues of economic policies and on governmental programs protecting consumer rights, the right to safety, the right to be informed, the right to choose, the right to be heard. Thus, the consumer heretofore not effectively organized—is now being recognized in an advisory capacity in governmental deliberations of these problems. It has recently rendered its first annual report to the President.

It behooves the advertising industry, therefore, to appreciably intensify and coordinate and strengthen its attempts at self-regulation or assume the serious risk of increased regulation by the Federal Government.

There Is No Substitute for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a sermon, entitled "There Is No Substitute for Justice," which was delivered by the Reverend Wilbur Canaday, Jr., of the Park Avenue Congregational Church, Arlington, Mass., which is located in the congressional district I am honored to represent:

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

(A sermon on the racial crisis preached in the Park Avenue Congregational Church, Arlington, Mass., by the Reverend Wilbur D. Canaday, Jr.)

It is going to be a hot summer in Washington, D.C., with Congress in session over the controversial civil rights bill and the District of Columbia itself a city that is over 50 percent colored in composition. Anything can happen in the weeks ahead. The National Council of Churches calls the moral situation one of the most crucial this Nation has faced. "Words and declarations are no longer useful in this struggle," it warns, "unless accompanied by sacrifice and commitment. This summer may be a decisive period in American history. * * * Modest tokens of progress in racial justice are no longer adequate." [1]

Why is this summer so critical? Because at last the Nation has come squarely to the moment of truth in the relations between the races. The seeds of injustice, rejection and oppression are coming to a harvest of resentment, hatred, and retaliation.

The remarkable and hopeful thing is that the victims of injustice, for the most part, have not been seeking revenge for all the hurts and humiliations they have suffered. They are still willing to forgive—though not willing any more to take the short end of everything and smile humbly at the same time.

One of the most troublesome problems in the whole racial question is that until recently both sides have assumed there was some substitute for justice which would answer the requirements of the situation.

WHAT DOES JUSTICE REQUIRE?

Justice means giving full recognition to the existence of persons as persons. It means giving full respect to human beings as growing individuals with goals and desires for which some place must be allowed in the overall picture of human society. It does not necessarily mean that everybody is equal in every way. We are equal as we stand before God. Yet there are differences of capacity, of character, of intelligence, of vitality and aggressiveness. A young child is not given as many privileges as an older child. That is justice. A person with limited skills is not given as responsible a job as a well-trained one. Yet each is respected for what he is as an individual. Justice drives toward a realistic recognition of the claims of each person. Justice drives toward bringing out the full power of being that lies in each man or woman, regardless of the outward circumstances of his life.

But this equity—this fair play—is hard to establish. For one thing, it means accepting limits on ourselves as we encounter other persons who have aims and purposes of their own. It means developing an outgoing concern for the needs of others and rejoicing in their fulfillment as part of our own maturing as persons. This is the way of creative love, and the way is hard, however rewarding it may be in the end. And because it is hard, we have tended to avoid it—by shutting our eyes or by looking for easier alternatives than the direct facing of truth.

What are some of these substitues for justice which have stood in the way of a frank and honest dealing with the legitimate claims of our colored citizens? I think we can sum them up under three headings. To make them easier to remember, we can start them all with the letter "P." The substitutes for justice are "patronizing," "piety," and "patriotism."

PATRONIZING ATTITUDE IS NOT GENUINE LOVE

First, the attitude of patronizing—the condescending manner of giving kindness to inferiors. At first sight this may seem like Christian love. "We always put up the bail for our Nigras when they get into trouble." "We take good care of our Nigras. If only those agitators would keep out, they'd be perfectly content." This sounds like affection and selfless concern. But it is a sentimental kind of love and not the real thing. It is a possessive love that does not want the other to grow up. It is a domineering love that does not really listen to what the other is saying.

We have seen it elsewhere in some parent-child relationships or some teacher-pupil relationships. The person in authority, the one in a superior position, is happy as long as he can control the situation, as long as he can see himself as the benevolent giver and the other as passively and happily receiving.

But when the power-structure alters—when the child grows up, or the pupil knows as much as the teacher—then there is an explosive possibility, for the complacent ego is challenged by the demands and the self-assertion of another. Transfer this to the racial setting and you can see why some white persons are saying with real perplexity, "I don't understand why our Negroes are so uppity lately." The person brought up in the patronizing tradition cannot realize that things will never again be the way they used to be. He cannot grasp that the old forms of kindly but condescending behavior are obsolete, they are no longer adequate to express the realities of today.

A southern novelist has seen discerningly into this new situation that is caused by the awakening of the Negro to his rightful possibilities. Lillian Smith says:

"We now find it difficult to see ourselves or Negroes as complex human beings, each with varying gifts and differences and all with the same civil rights. Instead, we see ourselves as nice people, who, if not pushed too hard, will give Negroes a bag of goodies now and then. We see ourselves graciously handing them little bits of their rights (which are not ours to hand), doling them out as we (or our grandfathers) used to dole out fat bacon and sweets and cornmeal at Christmas. We see ourselves shimmering in an aura of kindness; we feel goodhearted, and often gently tender as we give our little presents. But they are not ours to give—

Footnotes at end of speech.

ah, this is what hurts; the Negroes are reminding us their rights are not ours to give as we see fit but theirs—given them as human right by God and as civil rights by the U.S. Constitution."[2]

Love is not genuine love unless it has within it the backbone of reality, and that means the power to perceive where justice lies in a particular changing situation. Love with backbone in it has to step in and sweep aside what is against love, what is standing in the way of a true reunion of peoples and races.

Thank God that our colored brethren are asserting themselves, using their buying power as a reminder of their latent strength, standing up to be counted. Thank God they are saying "I'm somebody and not just nobody." Since whites have been so slow and lethargic about realizing this truth, we can be grateful for people like James Baldwin and even Malcolm X for forcefully calling to our attention the burning resentment of the long years of humiliation and injustice. We closed our ears before, but we have to listen now.

PIETY AS AN EXCUSE FOR AVOIDING TRUTH

The second "P" used as a substitute for justice is piety. This was one of the evasions the Old Testament prophets found among the Hebrew people. They were using correct ritual observance as a substitute for doing right by their fellow men. They felt good, felt very righteous and very holy, but they were not doing the things that were right in God's sight. And so the only answer they could receive was the indignation of God. The prophet Amos looked out in anger at this perversion of religion. "I hate, I despise your feasts and burnt offerings," says the Lord. "Take away from me the noise of your songs. * * * But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an everflowing stream." Isaiah spoke in the same vein when he said, "Your hands are defiled with blood, your lips have spoken lies, truth has fallen in the public squares. * * * The Lord saw it and it displeased Him that there was no justice."

There is something false and even revolting about a piety that prides itself on knowledge of the Bible, on lusty singing of the hymns of the church, and yet turns back because of his skin color, a worshipper who stands at the door of the church. The grievous sin lies here—that such people have put the fellowship of race ahead of the fellowship of Christ.

The church claims to be the body of Christ in the present day, acting as he would have it act. Yet how can the church forget so easily that Jesus Christ himself had close contact with persons of all kinds—with lepers and outcasts, with the despised Samaritans, with women and children, and all those who didn't count in the power centers of the empire. The Son of God looked not on the surface—color meant nothing to Him, or size, or status in the world. He looked on the heart of a man and revealed that man to himself for what he really was.

It is a perversion of piety, this arrogance of those who think they are most religious while all the time they are really defying God's will for reunion and mutual ministry among men. Piety without justice becomes demonic self-righteousness. It has no saving power, but can only injure oppressor and victim alike.

FALSE HUMILITY

The opposite kind of piety, which this arrogance may bring forth by way of reaction, is the piety of a false humility. The oppressed become hopeless, overwhelmed by the injustice of their position. They feel helpless to strike back and so they become obsequious. They suppress their own power of being in face of the dominant powers who exercise lordship over them. They bow and scrape before their masters, fearful of offending in any way. And of course the masters approve of all this: "Oh, how religious our Nigras are; oh, you are so patient. Oh, how we admire you for your humility. S-o-o-o religious."

This was the way it was with race relations until today. The Negroes were humble, humble, humble. Ah, but underneath they were developing a huge resentment, for justice cannot be thwarted forever without causing deep scars within or violence without. Their own power of being could not be suppressed and denied forever without denying reality. The claim for justice, for recognition as persons must break forth. And it is the shame of white persons that we have been so dense in grasping this fact.

Right now we are at the stage where the old repressions are giving away. No longer does a Negro in the South get off the sidewalk when he sees a white man coming, no longer does he go to the back door, hat in hand. No longer does he cringe and acquiesce in whatever the white lords decide. The student generation will no longer buy such obsequiousness—and personally I thank God for that because it releases the rest of us from a great guilt that has weighed us down—the guilt of having treated them in the past as automatic inferiors and ourselves as automatic superiors.

But during this transition period—when not everyone has grasped emotionally that segregation is dead—there will be certain tensions and hypocrisies that cannot be avoided. Southern Negroes who want to be gentle with their white brothers are going to hate to disillusion them too quickly. So for awhile they may present one face to the arrogant white man, another face to those who are sympathetic.

There was the white cabdriver in Birmingham who told a visiting reporter, "Everyone knows this whole integration business is Communist. The old niggers in town, they don't want no part of it. They like it the way it is. See that old nigger at the stand on the corner? I asked him about it and he said he wanted no part of it. But these younger ones." Two hours later the reporter talked to the same old man at the corner stand. What did he think of the student campaign? He gave a long hard look and said, "I'm with them. The only way our people can move ahead is to stick together."[3]

We can only hope by our attitudes to hasten the day when we can stand up together, white and black, and talk to each other as man to man and let our real feelings be made known in the frankness of genuine love. Today's Negroes are fed up with a piety that calls for submission now in the promise of a happier heaven hereafter. Piety is doomed unless it is based on reality, based on facing up to a moment of truth. Genuine piety includes a respect for oneself as a child of God and it includes a true humility which confesses when a wrong has been done and seeks to make up for the hurt and the harm. Piety must be founded on justice or else it becomes destructive within and without.

LAND OF THE FREE?

The third smokescreen that is used as a substitute for justice is patriotism. We love to exalt the Nation as the greatest in the world. The danger is, however that we will use our flag waving as a substitute for real justice. Southern Senators plan a filibuster to prevent expansion of civil rights, hiding behind the right of free speech or behind the respectable banner of States rights.

In the north, we think of ourselves somewhere in the back of our consciousness as the Union forces who liberated the slaves. We are the noble liberal heroes. What we forget is that the process of liberation is not complete, and that we have blocked its full flowering as much as anyone in the South. We love to talk of freedom, and to recite in resonant tones the pledge of allegiance—"one Nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all."

I'm sure that those of us who attended the pops concert by our choir last week were stirred by the final scene in which all the participants were waving flags and singing the chorus from the musical, "Mr. President." Who could deny a certain emotion as they sang of the "land of the free and the home of the brave"? But somehow I couldn't keep out of my mind the picture of those Negro youths who were waving American flags in the streets of one of our cities and were shortly thereafter arrested and put in jail for disturbing the peace.

Some of the same national organizations that love to wave flags have been organizations that have resisted giving equal recognition and rights to our Negro citizens over the past 25 years. And I must confess to a certain shock at seeing one of the most prominent presidential aspirants from the party of Abraham Lincoln drag his feet so long in coming out for stronger civil rights measures by our Congress.

Think of our image and influence abroad, when people everywhere receive the pictures of Americans using police dogs, cattle prodders and fire hoses on fellow citizens who want to enjoy the privilege of voting or sitting at a lunch counter to eat a hot dog. All this in the "land of the free." Can we blame the world's peoples if they don't quite grasp the difference between this kind of thing and life under a fascist dictatorship? We have not yet become a great nation, or rather, we cannot remain one, until we have included all our people in the benefits and opportunities of our free society. Injustice against others is always injustice against ourselves.

If we are going to use the phrases of patriotism, then let's see that the reality corresponds to what we say. Otherwise, let us drop the pretensions and admit that our American society is founded on naked power and the racial superiority of whites. But if we mean what we say, then let us see to it that our Negro citizens have job opportunities and educational opportunities the same as everyone else. Then it won't sound so hollow when we sing, "God Bless America." Patriotism is no substitute for justice. In our American heritage, patriotism is a call to establish justice and freedom for all persons, regardless of race, creed or national origin.

FULL PARTICIPATION IS THE GOAL

Patronizing, piety, and patriotism are no substitutes for justice. How then is justice to be established—especially thinking now of justice to our Negro citizens. Again we can use the letter "P," this time to fix in mind the goal toward which we are aiming. The word is "Participation." Not tokenism—a few gestures of acceptance and tolerance—but full and unconditional participation in every aspect of American life. A sharing in its destiny and its decisions, sharing in solving its problems and shaping its future. Those whom we have so long rejected we must embrace as fellow human beings with feelings and emotions like everyone else.

This does not mean we have to be buddy-buddy with everyone, but it does mean full acceptance of all as persons, full affirmation of their human dignity and their right to be and to become.

To accept persons as persons means to realize that among any given race, some will be wise and some will be foolish. Some are going to kick over garbage cans in Harlem and others are going to rely quietly on the use of legal processes.

Whatever the irritations involved may be, our task is to see to it that persons of all races have an equal chance for education

Footnotes at end of speech.

(for with education go job opportunities), and the chance to live anywhere within their economic means.

Creative justice, which is motivated by love, takes into account the special needs of each historic moment. This may mean, in the present years, leaning over backwards for a time to hire Negro employees or to upgrade them into more responsible positions. It may mean making a special effort to see that good housing is available for such minority groups. Of course, in the long run, justice would mean that a Negro must compete on equal terms with every other person. He will have to stand on his own merits alone and can claim no special treatment. But right now we need to recognize that injustice, exclusion, and oppression had gone so far that we should take deliberate, self-conscious steps to redress the balance.

But the goal is the full participation of every citizen in the life of our Nation and in the life of the neighborhood. Only if this is our aim can we hold our heads high and look each other in the eye, and rejoice in the contribution that each person can make to the enrichment of us all.

PRAYER

O God of all truth and reality, help us to discover in the depths of our living that Thy love is not a sentimental and spineless emotion, but a concern that includes justice and right dealing with our fellow men. May we respect each person's claim to be recognized as a human being and may we have the courage to defy conventional patterns if they stand in the way of the reunion of all Thy children in one family under Thee. Amen.

In addition, Paul Tillich's "Love, Power, and Justice" is very relevant. Scripture: Isaiah 59.

---

[1] Quoted by NAACP in New York Times advertisement, June 9, 1963.

[2] Saturday Review, Oct. 20, 1962; p. 18.

[3] Saturday Evening Post, Sept. 8, 1962, p. 19.

J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth—Part XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include part XI of a series appearing in the September 14, 1963, issue of Human Events containing a review of Victor Lasky's book "J.F.K.: The Man and the Myth":

CAREFULLY NURTURED RELIGION ISSUE PROVED KENNEDY'S BEST VOTEGETTER—PART XI

One of the big Kennedy weapons in the 1960 campaign was the so-called "People Machine"—a big, bulky electronic monster that busily forecast voter responses and outlined the most productive campaign strategy for Kennedy.

The "People Machine"—also known as the "People Predictor"—was perfected by several distinguished social scientists with $65,000 provided by the Democratic Advisory Council. It was manufactured by the Simulmatics Corp. under the guidance of Dr. William McPhee, of Columbia, Dr. Ithiel de Sola Pool of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Robert Abelson of Yale and Edward L. Greefield of Madison Avenue.

The story of how this computing device was secretly designed for the Democratic presidential campaign was related in full detail in the January 1961, issue of Harper's, in an authoritative article by Thomas B. Morgan. At first Kennedy's press representative, Pierre Salinger, denied any knowledge of the "People Machine." "We did not use the machine." He said flatly. "Nor were the machine studies made for us."

Pierre's recollection was somewhat refreshed, however, after it was disclosed that Bobby Kennedy had helped finance the People Machine by a sum of $20,000 and that reports based on its findings went directly to Bobby.

Morgan said that information, designed to outline voters' attitudes, was assembled by Dr. Abelson in the summer of 1959. It consisted of 100,000 interviews with voters, the results of 66 nationwide polls made since 1952. The interviews were divided into 480 "voter-types" such as "midwestern, small-town, poor, Catholic, female" and "western metropolitan, Jewish, male."

Armed with this kind of information, the People Machine provided the Kennedy strategists with important information about the images of Kennedy and Nixon and about voters' attitudes toward issues. Here is the recommendation on foreign affairs contained in a report to Bobby Kennedy on August 25, 1960:

"This issue is Kennedy's area of greatest weakness, but it is also an area in which he has positive opportunities * * *. Should he or should he not attack the Republican [foreign affairs] record? We conclude that the answer is: He should attack. As part of an aggressive, partisan campaign, Kennedy can materially affect party feeling among the electorate and enhance his own image by: (1) talking and acting about foreign affairs in a way which conveys a sense of knowledge and power; (2) unmistakably exposing the degeneration of prestige and power which the United States has suffered under the Republican administration."

CAN'T LOSE ON RELIGION

Another question put to the machine according to Morgan, was, "What if the riligious issue becomes embittered close to election day?" The machine's answer (supplied to Bobby Kennedy) was this:

"It is in Kennedy's hands to handle the religious issue during the campaign in a way that maximizes Kennedy votes based on resentment against religious prejudice and minimizes further defections. On balance, he would not lost further from forthright and persistent attention to the religious issue, and could gain * * *. Under these circumstances, it makes no sense to brush the religious issue under the rug."

In short, Kennedy was advised to play up the religious issue for all it was worth on the premise he could gain from it. Which was exactly what he did that fall when he repeatedly urged American voters to forget his religion by constantly reminding them of it.

"If by now people don't know his stand on that they never will," commented David H. Beetle in the Albany (N.Y.) Knickerbocker News early in the campaign. "Repeating it can only serve to stir up once again a question that doesn't seem pertinent."

Bobby Kennedy was placed in charge of making sure that the voters would be constantly reminded of the necessity of forgetting the religious issue.

Bobby raised the issue at the opening of Kennedy headquarters in Cincinnati on September 13.

"Did they ask my brother Joe whether he was a Catholic before he was shot down?" he asked.

He couldn't go on. What appeared to be real tears gushed from his eyes, and he sat down. The audience broke into applause.

Four days later, Bobby toured the resort areas in New York's Catskills, this time reminding audiences that "it is not important as to what church a candidate attends on Sunday, but whether or not the prestige of the United States, as leader of the free world, can be restored."

Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., who accompanied Bobby, reminded their largely Jewish audiences that "If religious prejudice is raised against one minority today, it can be raised against another minority tomorrow."

Kennedy had stated that he would discuss the religious issue only when he was asked to do so. But the Associated Press correspondent, traveling with him in Texas in early September, reported that "he has sometimes seemed almost eager to be asked. Twice during this Western swing he has invited questions from his audience. These have been written out and screened by his staff. Each time a question on religion was included."

LIBERTY VERSUS BIGOTRY

The prejudice theme was developed by AFL-CIO's COPE—the committee on political education—in a booklet saying the issue in the campaign was not Kennedy versus Nixon but liberty versus bigotry. It carried on its cover a picture of the Statue of Liberty and a caricature of a Ku Klux Klansman.

As the religious issue intensified, the Kennedy camp made a major decision, probably the most important of the campaign. An invitation for Kennedy to address a group of Protestant ministers in Houston, Tex., was quickly accepted. (This came after "Positive Thinker" Norman Vincent Peale attacked Kennedy as a Catholic.)

The importance of the Houston meeting on September 12 could be seen from the fact that Kennedy people paid for the large ballroom in which it was held. Bobby had movies made of Kennedy's speech before the Houston ministers in which he said he would not take orders from the Vatican, and that he would resign as President rather than do so.

In New York, Baltimore, Chicago, and other northern cities where there were large Catholic populations, expensive television time was purchased by the Democrats to broadcast and rebroadcast the selected portions of the speech made by Kennedy before the Houston ministers.

"While we see that it may be desirable to distribute to Protestants who misunderstand and fear Catholicism the film clips of Mr. Kennedy's reply to the Texas ministers, we see little need to show the film before Catholics who, presumably, have no such fears," observed Commonweal, the liberal Catholic weekly.

"This has brought up the question as to whether there now is a campaign effort to keep the issue alive and to take advantage of the natural resentment many Catholics feel when the so-called religious issue is raised," commented David Lawrence.

GOOD RESPONSE

"Our precinct workers are gaining access to the homes of Republican Catholics that they have never been able to get into before," a Democratic spokesman told U.S. News & World Report. "Our workers go in and talk about the candidates for Governor and Senator. Finally they raise the question: 'Do you think they are going to keep Kennedy from being President just because he is a Catholic?' It gets a good response. We are winning lots of new votes."

The cynicism of those masterminding the use of the religious issue was demonstrated when Bobby Kennedy told newsmen the GOP was spending over $1 million on anti-Catholic literature. (This charge was checked out after the campaign by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and was found to be without foundation.)

And one of LYNDON's acquaintances, a fellow Democrat named Billie Sol Estes—who later became renowned for his fertilizer deals—paid for a full-page advertisement in

his hometown paper in Pecos pleading with west Texans to "Show the World Texans Are Not Religious Bigots." (A few months later Billie Sol paid for an ad for an upcoming revival at his church which said, "Come and Hear About the Two Biggest Threats to Western Civilization Today—Communism and Catholicism.")

The volume of printed matter addressed to the religious issue was unquestionably greater than what was circulated in the 1928 campaign.

"We have received large amounts of this so-called anti-Roman literature," commented the Greenville (S.C.) News. "Not all of it is scurrilous by any means, although its accuracy and the motives of its originators are open to question in many instances. Some of it is demonstrably false."

Much of it originated in the North. "The origin of this material makes us all the more curious as to just who is mainly responsible for its distribution. Some of the more extreme arguments are falling on fertile soil both here and elsewhere. But it is causing an opposite reaction in pivotal Northern States and many southerners are coming to be of a like mind.

"The question is: Who is making the most use of the religious issue, and for or against whom?"

Another question, never fully answered, arose out of the fact that large numbers of Catholic families in the North received particularly vile pieces of literature concerning their faith. Who was responsible?

PRIDE BEATS PREJUDICE

As the noted Pollster Samuel Lubell observed after the election: "Too much publicity and attention was given the circulation of so-called 'hate' literature. Of course, these 'hate' sheets were disgusting and sickening. But how important were these anti-Catholic tracts? And didn't the enormous publicity given these 'hate' sheets leave a distorted, one-sided view of the campaign which ignored that on both sides deeply rooted religious prejudices were constantly at work?"

In the end, the massive swing of Catholic votes to Kennedy was the biggest factor in Kennedy's election. As Louis Bean put it, the statistics showed that Catholic pride was a stronger factor than anti-Catholic prejudice in bringing about Kennedy's victory.

With some 78 percent of the Catholics and 70 percent of the Negroes and 80 percent or more of the Jews voting for him, Kennedy took lopsided majorities in the big cities, and thus in the big electoral-vote States they controlled. Looking at the Catholic vote as a whole, according to figures provided by Dr. George Gallup, the Democrats got 56 percent of the total in 1952 and 51 percent in 1956, but the figure went up by 27 percentage points to 78 percent in 1960. No other religious group showed a switch of that proportion.

"One thing is certain," Pollster Elma Roper commented in the Saturday Review, "if there was a net victim of religious prejudice it was Nixon more than Kennedy."

Law Is No Assurance of Prior Congressional Approval to Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss one aspect of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

During the debate on S. 777, the legislation to authorize funds for the Agency and amend the act, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN] in his opening statement said that there is no way in which the Disarmament Agency or the President can obligate the United States to disarm or reduce its Armed Forces without congressional approval. He said this was clearly stated in section 33 of the act.

The ranking minority members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] spoke in the same vein. She told the House that the United States has not entered into any agreements obligating the United States to disarm. She said under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act no such action could be taken without prior congressional approval and she quoted from the law which reads:

> That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the bill I indicated that I disagreed, spelling out the fact that this provision gave no assurance Congress would be consulted, because an international Executive agreement, unlike a treaty, requires no advice or consent of the Senate. Whereupon Mrs. BOLTON agreed, saying that ever since 1933 we have had all too many agreements and not enough treaties.

Mr. Speaker, the existing Arms Control and Disarmament Act—and I repeat this—states that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that would obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit our Armed Forces or armaments except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution, or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by Congress.

What has concerned me, as I explained in my colloquy with Mrs. BOLTON is whether a Chief Executive would ever follow that provision of law but instead would execute an executive agreement which does not require congressional approval. I explained what has happened under section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act which likewise provides that a program of international space cooperation must have advice and consent of the Senate. However, as I said, when President Eisenhower signed that act in 1958 he stated that he regarded this provision merely as recognizing that international treaties may be made in this field. He said this did not preclude less formal arrangements for cooperation.

In this connection, the Space Administration in answer to my inquiry has said that the legal determination would be up to the Department of State as to the form of an arrangement. It could be under section 205 with Senate approval or by executive agreement not requiring such approval.

As a matter of fact all NASA cooperative projects with other nations to date have been without Senate advice and consent.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I very much doubt if section 3 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act has or will have much influence on our Department of State.

I believe, of course, when Congress writes a law calling for a treaty or for congressional approval, a President should follow it, but Presidents are jealous of their prerogatives. However, Congress does have power to limit use of administrative funds so an appropriation bill can be effective unless it comes too late. That is why, when President Kennedy suggested a joint venture with the Soviet Union for a lunar landing, I introduced an amendment to the space appropriation bill limiting the use of funds for that purpose unless such a program first had been approved by Congress. I did not want to wake up some morning and find some arrangement for such an expensive and unwise venture was an accomplished fact under an executive agreement.

I wish there was some real safeguard in the Disarmament Act. Frankly, I am fearful many persons and Members of Congress erroneously may feel that section 33 contains such a safeguard.

The extension of the Arms Control Act as passed yesterday, in my opinion, contain some new limitations which meet with my approval but I want to restate what I said during debate with regard to the requirement of congressional approval of an international agreement. The fact is this provision could be meaningless. Let us not delude ourselves about that.

VFW and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most talked about, yet misunderstood areas of the world, is the free Chinese island of Quemoy off the mainland of Red China. It is unfortunate that there has been, and still is, so much misunderstanding as to the responsible role which Quemoy plays to the defense of not only Taiwan but the U.S. position in the Western Pacific. The Communist regime of Red China continues to demand the surrender of Quemoy. If these crude demands of Mao Tse-tung are ever complied with by the United States, we will be the architects of our own disaster.

I recently noted a relatively brief but information-packed article on the importance of Quemoy. I refer to the column, "VFW and National Security," by a very able former Marine officer, Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, retired, director, VFW National Security and Foreign Affairs, in the VFW magazine, which is the offi-

cial monthly magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

This highly respected VFW magazine is published under the supervision of Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, Brooklyn, N.Y., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. John L. Smith is director of publications and public relations. As most Members of this House are well aware, the VFW has taken the lead in the eyes of our Nation in opposing all concessions to Red China. The VFW also has followed the unswerving policy of resisting any efforts to neutralize or give Quemoy to the Communists. In so doing, the VFW has performed a patriotic service of historic magnitude.

Because this column so well reflects the strong and knowledgeable position of the VFW with respect to Quemoy, I include it under leave to extend my remarks:

VFW AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired)

The island of Quemoy off the China mainland has probably been the subject of more argument and misunderstanding than any similar location in the world. Unfortunately, there have been serious proposals in this country that Quemoy is not worth defending. Nothing can be further from actual fact. As the VFW has long, and correctly, held, the island of Quemoy is vital to the entire U.S. strategy in the Western Pacific. Rather than being indefensible, Quemoy is one of the most powerfully fortified installations in the world.

Here are a few basic facts with respect to this much talked about and too little understood bastion:

Quemoy is no barren rock jutting up off the coast of Red China. It is about 10 miles long and a couple of miles wide. Almost 50,000 civilians reside on the island, as have their families before them for generations. They are farmers, tradesmen, merchants, shopkeepers, and school teachers. There is one middle-sized city and over 45 villages. There are 39 public schools.

The military force on Quemoy is over 40,000. It is one of the most important field commands of President Chiang Kai-shek's powerful free Chinese Army. The troops are lean and hard. They are well trained, and they know the purpose of their training—to whip the Communists.

The reason for Quemoy's importance is readily evident: As long as Free China holds Quemoy, the Chinese Reds cannot carry out their oft-repeated threats to seize Taiwan. Quemoy is squarely in the center of and controls the great Pacific port of Red China, Amoy. Thus Mao can't get an invasion force out of the harbor until he first takes Quemoy.

In simple terms, Quemoy is the cork in the bottle of Red aggression. The best way to keep the Red poison from spilling out into Pacific Asia is to keep the bottle tightly corked.

Those who say Quemoy is not defensible have forgotten some important recent history. In 1949 the Reds launched a major attack against the island. Every one of the thousands of attacking Communists were killed or captured. Today Quemoy is infinitely stronger than it was then.

As a symbol of freedom, as an example of what courageous people can do to maintain their freedom literally under the guns of Red aggression, Quemoy is to Asia what West Berlin is to Europe.

The VFW has made and continues to make a major contribution to the security of the United States and the cause of freedom in demanding the continued free Chinese control of Quemoy.

Kennedy Gives Misleading Information in Speech Before Florida Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 22, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prevalent New Frontier techniques is to cite misleading information to cover up shortcomings of the administration. This was used by the President in a speech before the Florida Chamber of Commerce Monday in comparing the Federal debt with the debt of private business and in discussing business profits.

Columnist David Lawrence, in an article appearing in the Evening Star on November 20, discusses the erroneous impression Mr. Kennedy tried to leave. The article follows:

FEDERAL VERSUS BUSINESS FINANCING—PRESIDENT'S COMPARISON OF DEBT GROWTH VIEWED AS GIVING WRONG IMPRESSION

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy would not intentionally mislead the American people about the finances of the Government of the United States—but unfortunately, some of his speechwriters have given a wrong comparison of the way the Federal Government and private business, respectively, handle their debts.

Mr. Kennedy, in a speech before the Florida Chamber of Commerce Monday, gave the impression that the Federal Government is a better "fiscal manager" than private business. He said:

"While the Federal net debt was growing less than 20 percent in these years (1948 to 1962), total corporate debt—not my debt, your debt—was growing by nearly 200 percent and the total indebtedness of private individuals rose by 300 percent. So who is the most cautious fiscal manager?"

There is no real parallel. What Mr. Kennedy failed to make clear was that during all this time, while corporations and individuals were increasing their debts, they were also paying off their loans or mortgages or were borrowing money to acquire new assets. The Federal Government, on the other hand, was borrowing money almost entirely to refund past loans, but not to reduce debt.

During these very years—1948 to 1962—when the total corporate debt was rising by $228 billion, these same corporations earned $291 billion in profits after taxes. In contrast, the Federal Government during that same period had total budget deficits of $41 billion and at the same time added $54 billion to the gross public debt.

No business could borrow money if it did not reduce its past debts out of its surpluses. An increase in corporate debt is based upon the expectation of repayment of this same debt in a specified time. A very small part of any such indebtedness is refinanced without at least a substantial payment on the principal.

But the Federal Government makes no such curtailment of its principal and keeps on borrowing more and more money, incurring more and more deficits, and increasing its total debt.

Any business which attempted to finance itself on the pattern of the Federal Government would certainly not be able to borrow any money in the capital markets today or at any other time. Thus, the Federal Government in fiscal year 1963 piled up a gross borrowing of $227 billion, of which less than $8 billion represented growth in the net debt. The remaining $219 billion was borrowed to refund existing debt.

Corporations, on the other hand, have been paying off a substantial part of their loans, and their increased debt represents investment in new projects—new plants and equipment or new enterprises.

It is incorrect, therefore, to compare corporate financing with that of the Federal Government and say that the latter is better because it did not increase its debt as much as did the private sector in the economy. Individuals may incur debt by borrowing to buy their homes, but they earn enough money after expenses to make regular payments on the mortgages and at the same time to buy an automobile and pay for it in 2 or 3 years. Nobody could buy an automobile in 1948 and fail to pay it off by 1962. And yet the Federal Government has merely borrowed the same amount of money to refund or replace the previous indebtedness, so that the total amount of the 1948 debt remains on the books, plus increased borrowings of $54 billion since 1948.

President Kennedy also gave an erroneous impression when he discussed profits. He has done so on several occasions lately in discussing this subject. He said to the Florida Chamber of Commerce:

"Why is it that profits are at an all-time high in the Nation today? It is because the Nation as a whole is prospering."

What Mr. Kennedy did not tell the American people is that profits in a realistic sense are way below what they were a few years ago.

Thus, manufacturing corporations from 1955 to 1957—which was an era of sustained economic activity and relatively full employment—earned 5.2 percent on their sales and 11.7 cents per dollar on their net worth.

But since the year 1957 profits of manufacturing corporations have been at relatively depressed levels. For the last 6 years, they have averaged only 4.5 percent of sales. This means that profits are 15 percent below the 5.2 average of the 1955–57 period. The profits also have been only 9.3 percent of net worth, which is down considerably from the 11.7 percent average of the 1955–57 period.

It is to be noted that in 1963, after 2 years of so-called economic recovery, profits are 4.5 percent of the gross national product. This is only a slight rise from the 4.2 percent reported in 1961, which was the lowest figure in the period following World War II.

To lay stress on the gross total of profits without regard to whether individual companies are making a satisfactory percent on their investment is to confuse the issue. It is like saying that, because there are more people employed today than ever before, America is prosperous. Actually, the unemployment figure is still around 5.5 percent, and there are many parts of the country called "distressed areas." It is illogical to boast about the amount of total profit when the actual percentage of profit on sales made remains well below the 1955–57 average.

Prayers Did Not Hurt Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 21, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a timely and excellent editorial appearing

in the November 15, 1963, issue of the Tacoma Labor Advocate expresses the sentiments of many American citizens. I am sure many Members will agree that prayers recited in schools did not hurt anyone. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

PRAYERS DID NOT HURT US

Members of the earliest classes at Lincoln High School will remember that their first principal, W. W. Parker, opened each assembly with a prayer. We can recall that there were a few scoffers among the student body, but they were in such small numbers that they carried little weight, and there were probably many to whom the prayers meant little one way or another. But nobody ever made a Federal case of the matter, and it is quite unlikely that our old principal had any idea that the Supreme Court some years later would render a far-reaching decision on the subject of prayers in public schools.

We suppose that the Lincoln High students of those days felt that they could "take it or leave it," and we do not recall that any parents, or taxpayers, or self-proclaimed guardians of individuals' rights made any issue out of the practice instituted by Mr. Parker. His opening of assemblies with prayers was accepted much in the same manner as invocations and benedictions at public gatherings are looked upon—meaningful to some persons and of no consequence to others.

As a result of our experience, perhaps, we are somewhat disconcerted by the almost fanatical insistence by some persons and groups against any form of religious instruction or activity in the schools. For that matter, since we feel that the Supreme Court decision against required prayers or Bible reading in public schools has been widely misinterpreted, we also deplore the continued attacks on that body.

We concur in the Supreme Court decision to the extent that Bible reading or recitation of prayers should not be compulsory, but we do not share in the view of those who would outlaw religious instruction in the schools on a voluntary basis. The best place for this, of course, is in the church, synagogue, or temple of one's choice—and in the home—but to ban voluntary religious activities in the schools because a decided minority finds such practices unacceptable is like banning the teaching of history because some persons do not approve of things that happened in the past.

What brings this to mind is the October 21 newsletter of the American Civil Liberties Union, which announces that it is pressing legal action against local school boards which, in the opinion of the ACLU, do not comply with the High Court decision. The ACLU, which deserves credit for serving as a watchdog over civil liberties so assiduously as often seeming ready to bite either friend or foe, could easily find more pressing things to be concerned with, it seems to us.

At least, we never heard of anyone being hurt by the prayers of our old school principal.

Kirwan's Aquarium Called Smithsonian of the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the wisdom and foresight of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. MICHAEL KIRWAN, have been proven time and again.

Recently, it has been a pleasure to read different news accounts praising MIKE KIRWAN for his work in the House—and more specifically for his courageous leadership in championing the fight in Congress to establish a national aquarium in our Nation's Capital.

Many of those who fought hardest to defeat MIKE KIRWAN's proposal to build the $10-million national aquarium in Washington are admitting that his idea now appears to be a sound one.

The Associated Press wire service recently carried a story calling the aquarium the Smithsonian of the sea, and credited KIRWAN as "the father of the project, who pushed the appropriation through the Congress."

What MIKE KIRWAN told the Congress last year when this bill was being considered that the aquarium will be the foremost marine research institution in the Nation, and that it will pay for itself through modest public admission fees, is currently receiving independent corroboration from the news media.

For example, the November 1963 edition of Extension magazine said the aquarium will be "the Nation's most important center for aquatic biology research."

For an industry with as much national interest and concern behind it as the fishing industry enjoys, the Kirwan aquarium is long overdue. The more than 20 million Americans who purchased fishing licenses last year for recreational purposes, and the $1,095,000,000 commercial fishing industry indeed had a true and loyal friend in Congressman KIRWAN.

Not only the fishing industry, but every American owes a debt of gratitude to the leadership of Congressman KIRWAN in shaping and preserving the face of our Nation.

His wisdom to see the needs of our country, and his willingness to battle for congressional support for bills which will preserve and develop our great natural resources represent contributions to our Nation, the benefits of which are enjoyed by every American today and for many generations to come.

At this time, I wish to insert in the RECORD the complete Associated Press story on the national aquarium. The story points out the many good things we have to look forward to when the aquarium is completed in 1967 or 1968. The story follows:

KIRWAN PUSHED PROJECT—"WIZARD" PLANNED CAPITAL AQUARIUM—DR. SPILHAUS HOPES IT WILL BECOME SMITHSONIAN "DISNEYLAND OF SEA"

(By John Lundquist)

MINNEAPOLIS, November 16.—A new national aquarium—something of a combined Disneyland and Smithsonian of the sea—is the latest sightseeing spectacle planned for the Nation's Capital.

Entertainment would be blended with learning in such features as:

A spacious auditorium with plastic dome where visitors can view marine life all about them.

Tunnels rippling with water to reveal how fish swim upstream.

A pond with dead fish to show the public how a polluted stream harms wildlife.

A fishing pond and special retreat for camera fans.

WILL INCLUDE RESTAURANT

And a seafood restaurant whose menu would include such marine rarities as a "Japanese hamburger"—raw fish with seaweed.

This ambitious departure from the conventional aquarium would be called the "World of Water."

Its planner is a restless revolutionary in the field of scientific education, Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the University of Minnesota Institute of Technology.

He was the commissioner of the U.S. science exhibit at the Seattle World's Fair, which attracted millions of visitors. He is the author of a comic page strip called "Our New Age."

Years ago Spilhaus invented the bathythermograph for recording temperatures at ocean depths. His latest contrivance is the "Spilhaus space clock." It ticks off 14 kinds of information—such as the position of the sun, moon, and stars, perpetual calendar, sunrise and sunset, tides and so on.

WORKS FOR PUBLIC

But Spilhaus likes to put his experimental educational background to work in a project devoted to the public.

"After all," he says, "it's the public's money, and they should enjoy it to the maximum. You've got to have an impact, like a Broadway show."

His idea of enjoying something is experimenting with all five senses, as children do.

"Children don't have inhibitions about learning," he said. "It's only when you get older that you get inhibitions about it."

Spilhaus is chairman of an advisory committee to the Department of Interior to plan the acquarium for which Congress has appropriated $10 million.

KIRWAN PUSHED BILL

The acknowledged father of the project is Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, who pushed the appropriation through Congress over opposition that sometimes was furious.

KIRWAN argued for it as a great tourist attraction for citizens visiting their National Capital, and one that would pay for itself through modest admission charges. Opponents called it a conspicuous waste of money but KIRWAN, who is a real power on the Appropriations Committee, prevailed.

Preliminary plans call for the acquarium to be located on 20 acres of Hains Point, which projects into the Potomac River.

Here's how the "World of Water" might shape up:

Visitors get into the spirit with a ferry ride—the only way to reach the acquarium.

Then they begin with the story of how a drop of water from the clouds begins, in the mountains, its long journey to the sea. From a simulated mountain, sightseers walk into the depths of the ocean's myriad life. Penetrating sunlight changes to an eerie blue-violet.

Next come the Continental Shelf and holes depicted as deeper than the Grand Canyon, carved by rushing rivers.

GRAVEYARD OF ORGANISMS

The plastic dome exposes viewers to action of the tides, green algae, great varieties of marine life and deep sea sediments, the million-year-old graveyard of organisms.

There's to be sharks, porpoises, octopuses and perhaps a mounted walk-in whale. A refrigerated ice shelf set in icy water provides a haven for penguins.

Small ponds, dams and estuaries surround the main aquarium. People angle for fish there. Boys and girls pick up starfish. And there's the underwater room for camera bugs.

After the committee which Spilhaus heads has finished its task, an architect will put

his imagination to work. The aquarium may be ready in 1967 and 1968, and it's certain to embody many of Spilhaus' suggestions.

Tribute to Gen. David M. Shoup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in paying tribute to a great marine—Gen. David M. Shoup—who will soon retire after 38 years of duty.

General Shoup has been a Marine officer since 1926 and has a truly remarkable record of service culminating in his nomination and service as the 22d Commandant of the Marine Corps. He has taken on a bewildering variety of assignments and has superbly performed each one.

Less than a year after becoming a Marine officer and while attending a Marine Corps school, he was assigned to an expeditionary force in Tientsin, China. Later he served in the Marine detachment on the U.S.S. *Maryland* which, 12 years later, was to provide fire support for an assault which he himself commanded.

His assignments during the 1930's included further duty in China, at Shanghai and with the U.S. legation in Peiping, and a number of duties at home. He was a company officer at San Diego, an instructor at Quantico, and he served on temporary duty with the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the coming of World War II it was inevitable that General Shoup would be in the thick of action. Even before the Pearl Harbor attack he was decorated for service with the 1st Marine Brigade in Iceland.

We all know of the great record of the Marine Corps in the Pacific theater, and General Shoup personally helped to make it one of the great military campaigns in history. General Shoup became operations and training officer, and then commander of the 2d Marine Division as it prepared for the assault on the Tarawa Atoll. During the period of training in New Zealand he was an observer of an Army assault in New Georgia, receiving the Purple Heart for wounds received.

On November 20, 1943, 20 years ago, General Shoup went into action with his own division. He had not recovered from his previous wound, and was wounded again going ashore at Tarawa. But for 2 days he led the attack, exposing himself to fire, against fanatic opposition. During this attack he showed tactical skill and daring, and what every fighting marine would like to be remembered for, the ability to lead men in offensive combat. The Congressional Medal of Honor that he earned was the 25th of the war for the Marines. Subsequently he saw action at Saipan and Tinian.

After the war and up to the time of his assignment in 1959 to the highest post in the Marine Corps, General Shoup again performed a wide variety of duties, at home and abroad, including such jobs as logistics officer, commanding officer of the Pacific force, division chief of staff, basic training school commander, Fiscal Director, and Inspector General of the Marine Corps. During his career General Shoup has commanded the 1st, 2d, and 3d Marine Divisions.

Judging from this record we can assume that General Shoup's retirement will be active and productive. He deserves our lasting gratitude for a job well done.

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following Calendar of Events of the National Gallery of Art for the month of December 1963:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

December 1963 gallery hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New exhibition: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Ground floor, central gallery, galleries G–7 through G–15. Opening December 17, to continue through March 1, 1964.

New publication: Paintings from the Museum of Modern Art, New York. Exhibition catalog, 100 pages, 9 by 10¾ inches, with preface by John Walker, foreword by René d'Harnoncourt, and introduction by Alfred H. Barr, Jr., 13 color plates, 141 black-and-white illustrations, reproducing all of the 153 paintings in the exhibition.

New reproductions: Set No. 4, paintings by Rembrandt; set No. 5, paintings by Renoir. Boxed sets of 2 by 2 inch original color slides of paintings in the gallery, each with a folder of descriptive text about the 10 subjects.

Sunday lectures: A series of four lectures on "Art in the City of Washington" will be given during the month of December.

Holidays: On Christmas and New Year's Day the gallery will be closed.

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. Closed December 25, 1963, and January 1, 1964.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, THROUGH SUNDAY, DECEMBER 1

Painting of the week: Watteau. "Ceres (Summer)" (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 53, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Portraiture. Rotunda, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda. Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Thursday, 1; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Sculpture for Washington." Guest speaker: Frank Getlein, art critic, the Washington Star, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: James Oliver Bushwell IV, violinist; David Garvey, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, THROUGH SUNDAY, DECEMBER 8

Painting of the week: Modigliani. "Gypsy Woman With Baby" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 62, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Genre painting. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Painting for Washington." Guest speaker: Leslie Judd Alhander, art critic, the Washington Post, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Ella Lee, soprano, Edward Schick, pianist, East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadacst by station WGMS–AM (570) and WGMS–FM (103.5).

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, THROUGH SUNDAY, DECEMBER 15

Painting of the week: Homer, "Breezing Up," (gift of the W. L. and May T. Mellon Foundation), gallery 71, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Still life painting. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotuna, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Architecture in Washington after the Civil War." Guest speaker: Richard H. Howland, head curator, Department of Civil History, Smithsonian Institution, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: University of Virginia Glee Club, David Davis, director, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 16, THROUGH SUNDAY, DECEMBER 22

Painting of the week: Piero di Cosimo. "The Visitation With Two Saints." (Samuel H. Kress collection), gallery 13, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Mythological subjects. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Leonardo's Christmas Picture." Speaker: Raymond S. Stites, curator of education, National Gallery of Art, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, East Garden Court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, DECEMBER 29

Painting of the week: Petrus Christus. "A Donor and His Wife" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 35, Tuesday, Thursday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Religious art. Rotunda, Tuesday, Thursday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday, Tuesday, Thursday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Washington City Plan." Guest speaker: Frederick Gutheim, president, the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Françoise Vetter, cellist; Lillian Freundlich, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

Appendix

A Cruel Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has great responsibilities to the unemployed millions of our Nation. The fulfillment of these responsibilities was placed in jeopardy by the recent disclosure of irregularities in the Cleveland, Ohio, office of the Ohio State Employment Service—OSES. The problem involves the Federal Government because Federal funds are used to pay the expenses of the operation of OSES.

Reports from Cleveland indicate that it was common knowledge that job placement records were being altered. Eight people signed affidavits admitting that they falsified records. One person admitted giving orders to alter the records. Nothing in the record suggests that the Cleveland incident is an isolated case. On the contrary, there is reason to suspect that the "Cleveland techniques" are being used in other local offices from coast to coast. The falsification of records existing in even one office is an intolerable situation and represents a cruel hoax upon the people who turn to Government service personnel and place their confidence in the U.S. Employment Service and affiliated State agencies.

The circumstances surrounding this specific case justify a congressional investigation to determine the degree such practices are common to the USES in all parts of the United States. In the House of Representatives jurisdiction of Department of Labor matters rest with the Education and Labor Committee. Therefore, today I have sent a letter to the chairman, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, requesting the Special Subcommittee on Labor be authorized to conduct an extensive investigation into the operations of the USES offices. A comprehensive report by such a subcommittee would allow Congress to fulfill its responsibilities in this field.

Earlier this year I introduced a bill which would take USES off college campuses, where it does not belong. It is my firm belief that USES should stay in the field for which it was created—that of helping the unemployed in this country find jobs.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated annually to aid the unemployed. Congress has tried to attack this problem through training programs, educational programs, and insurance programs, and there is no room for "featherbedding" on agency staff jobs when the stakes are so high. Every single dollar should be spent to aid those in need.

The citizens of Ohio are not proud of what has happened in our State, but they look to the Congress as well as the State to guarantee that such shenanigans will not be tolerated in Ohio or any other State. The employees of a governmental agency have deceived both the Congress and the people who pay the bill.

The letter to Representative POWELL follows:

NOVEMBER 21, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Recently there have been stories in the press about the Cleveland office of the U.S. Employment Service falsifying its records to maintain a larger staff.

With the unemployment problem in the United States today being of prime concern to all of us, it is vital that agencies such as USES concern themselves with fighting this important problem, not with the building up of their own bureaucracy. The situation in Cleveland should be explored and therefore I am asking you to authorize an investigation by the Special Subcommittee on Education and Labor. I would suggest that the subcommittee attempt to determine the degree to which such practices are common to the USES offices all over the country and then to submit a report to the full committee containing their findings and recommendations.

I know you share my views that it is the duty of the Congress to keep a watchful eye on all departments and agencies of the Government, and, therefore, I urge you to authorize the inauguration of such an investigation immediately.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TAFT, Jr.

Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Third Congressional District of Washington, of which I have the honor and privilege of representing, depends to a considerable extent upon water transportation for its economic life.

This nine-county area is bounded on the south by the great Columbia River, on the west by the Pacific Ocean, and on the north by Puget Sound, and it is apparent that good water transportation is essential to the 450,000 people residing in my district.

The public works projects carried out by the U.S. Corps of Engineers over the years have made possible an excellent system of water transportation and the bill passed by the House on November 19 will make further improvements possible.

Over the past several years a system of barge transportation has been built on the Columbia River making possible cheap and efficient water transportation from the interior of Washington to the fresh water ports of Camas-Washougal, Cathlamet, Ilwaco, Kalama, Longview, Vancouver, and Stevenson.

This bill appropriates $1 million for a start of construction on a 40-foot channel, and over the next several years construction will continue so that our ports will be able to accommodate the larger vessels which are becoming more common in today's merchant marine. There have been many instances of these large ships leaving our Columbia River ports less than full laden because of the shallowness of the channel.

This bill will make possible a start on dredging the channel, and will eliminate in time the need for vessels to leave less than fully laden.

This bill also appropriates $100,000 for start of construction on the Camas-Washougal flood control project on the Columbia River. This is an area subject to periodic flooding, and each year at flood stage Columbia River waters seep into land where industrial plants are daily trying to survive in this highly competitive world.

Included in this bill, also, are sufficient funds to maintain the Columbia River and to continue model studies at the mouth in an effort to design structures which will control the shoaling in the area.

The appropriations for the Willapa Harbor area will make it possible for this lumber port to continue to contribute to the employment stability of the area. And the money made available for the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River areas will make it possible for ships to make efficient use of the facilities.

I won't fail to mention the appropriations for the Bonneville Power Authority. The electric power provided by this agency of our Federal Government has made possible an industrial expansion which is the equal of any in the country, and the money in this bill will make it possible for BPA to continue to serve efficiently and well the hundreds of thousands of people living in the area.

In conclusion, I express my deepest appreciation of my distinguished colleagues on the Appropriations Commit-

tee and in the House of Representatives. I know full well that this money will be used wisely and well and will reflect great credit on this great body.

European Views on U.S. Payments Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include sections of a November 1963 report, "Europe and the Prospects for a Strong Dollar," by Dr. Hans Heinemann, economic consultant, of New York City. Since the Joint Economic Committee has long emphasized the need for review of U.S. balance-of-payments policies in Western Europe, it is gratifying to find in this report that the European business and financial community shares the committee's concern and some of its views. The text of the report follows:

EUROPE AND THE PROSPECTS FOR A STRONG DOLLAR

From the vantage point of Europe it appears quite evident that the internal purchasing power of the U.S. dollar has been better maintained in recent years than the French and Swiss francs and other European currencies. It is the generally accepted opinion in Europe that the dollar is and will remain the key international currency. The Kennedy administration's proposal to restrict capital movement is viewed as the turning point in the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

The United States must limit is expenditures in foreign currencies to its foreign income if it is to avoid a chronic balance-of-payments deficit. Unrestricted capital investment abroad and military, foreign aid, and tourist expenditures all contribute substantially to the deficit. On the other side of the ledger, the United States has a favorable balance of trade and a still rising tide of dividends and other income from foreign investments. Any deficit expenditures must be paid for out of earnings from foreign trade and investment.

However, the U.S. share of world trade, while still as favorable as in 1938, has lost ground in the last 10 years. This share, contrary to some predictions, cannot be expected to improve as a result of increasing European production costs. Rising internal prices on the Continent have not been paralleled by rising export prices. Furthermore, while the increasing flow of interest and dividends from investments abroad is an encouraging aspect of the U.S. balance of payments, the rate of increase is likely to be retarded because of the profit squeeze in the European export trade, the tendency toward self-financing by European industry and because of the many financial, social, and political problems created by the payment by foreign countries of ever increasing amounts of dividend income to the United States.

The United States is now beginning to work toward control of its deficit expenditures, and already there is some evidence of improvement in what has appeared to be a chronic balance-of-payments deficit. But the problem will not be eliminated by sitting back and letting nature take its course. A great deal more needs to and can be done to reduce foreign outlays and especially military expenditures.

If, in addition, the United States handles its export problems imaginatively and deals with the complexities of its oversea investments in a statesmanlike way, a surplus in the balance of payments is possible in the years to come, and is, in fact, predicted by some of Europe's central bankers.

RESTRAINT OF CAPITAL MOVEMENT

The U.S. proposal for an interest equalization tax is accepted in Europe with much more equanimity than in the United States, as Europeans have long felt that some action was necessary. This particular piece of legislation is not liked here nor abroad and it is felt that, in many instances, it imposes real hardship, but it is believed likely that as the administration and the financial community gain experience with the tax it will be amended so as to eliminate unnecessary inequities. However, European central bankers are genuinely puzzled by the American financial community's resistance to the idea of a restraint of private capital movement. It is pointed out everywhere that the United States is the only country in the world which opens its capital market to foreigners without any restrictions, and it is felt that the time has arrived for the United States to take action in this regard.

In Germany and Switzerland bankers and industrialists have very close ties, sit on each other's boards, and are on joint committees which perform a liaison function vis-a-vis their respective central banks. The banks would not make foreign loans, the proceeds of which could be spent abroad, if it were felt that this was detrimental either to their customers or contrary to national policy. Both Great Britain and Holland have capital issues committees which must approve all foreign flotations. The great bulk of the private loans in these countries have in the past been tied to purchases within the lending country whenever this was desirable in the national interest.

Some European bankers are saying that, in order to protect its balance of payments, the United States must tie its private loans to purchases in the United States, and some leaders are going one step further and are pointing out that this would be beneficial not only to the United States, but would check the inflation which the large unrestricted U.S. capital inflow is creating in Europe.

As the U.S. economy generates enormous savings, at present approximately 14 percent of gross national product, and as U.S. industry goes to the marketplace for only a small part of its capital needs, U.S. savings are looking far afield to find profitable sources of investment. No such reservoir of savings exists in Europe, and first-class European concerns find that American institutions are eager to lend them funds on more favorable terms than European institutions. As these dollars pour into European banks, only a proportion of them are used for purchases of U.S. goods and services. U.S. prices often are higher than in Europe, and ordinarily the borrower wishes to use his funds where he can buy most advantageously. If, for example, the Dutch borrower does not wish to buy U.S. products, he asks his bank for guilders against his deposit of dollars, which, when they are issued, add to the money supply. As there are no corresponding products coming into Holland in exchange for the dollars, these new guilders inflate the Dutch currency and create domestic problems.

The same inflationary effect is felt as the result of direct U.S. capital investments in many parts of Europe insofar as the funds are not used for the purchase of U.S. goods. After World War II, in the reconstruction period, direct U.S. capital investment was, of course, greatly welcomed. However, even at that time, U.S. funds were, in effect, tied to U.S. purchases, as American goods were the only goods available. If today the host countries required that the bulk of U.S. private investments, especially in new industries, be tied to U.S. purchases, a stimulus would be provided to U.S. economic activity and employment, and the U.S. balance of payments would benefit. But under these circumstances some U.S. industrialists, who go abroad in order to benefit by lower costs, would not be interested in making the investment at all, and Europeans would lose the opportunity to increase sales of plant and equipment. Nevertheless, many European central bankers feel that the damaging inflationary effect of unrestricted direct U.S. investment outweighs the advantage of increased business. They feel that Europe and the United States would both be better off without this kind of investment unless it can be tied to U.S. purchases.

The British have met this problem and avoided its inflationary effects by relending unwanted U.S. dollars outside of the United Kingdom. Other countries are slowly evolving the institutional facilities to make foreign loans. The Dutch are already sufficiently concerned to have felt it necessary to veto some direct U.S. investments in Holland. There is no doubt that the serious concern of European central bankers over the inflationary effect of unrestricted U.S. investment abroad was a key factor in the U.S. administration's decision to restrict capital movement.

The threat of the U.S. interest equalization tax has, in fact, practically stopped new portfolio investments abroad, has checked new foreign financing in the New York market and, in the opinion of some European investment bankers, has introduced into the foreign investment decisions of the American fiancial community a new criterion of patriotism, or national interest, which did not exist before July 18, 1963. Europe welcomes not only the relief from inflationary pressure which this restraint provides, but also the fact that apparently this move has started a swing of the pendulum away from the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

U.S. MILITARY EXPENDITURES ABROAD

U.S. military expenditures abroad is, of course, a large factor in the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. Europeans quite generally feel that the United States could have a much more spartan military establishment in Europe, and one more in line with the standards of the host countries. The minimum which America must spend to maintain its end of NATO's power is thought to be very substantially below present levels.

While, for political reasons, the new German Government is loudly protesting a reduction of American forces in Europe, privately German bankers and industrialists feel the United States could have just as much or more power with a smaller military establishment. However, it is stressed that any change must be brought about gradually, tactfully, and without fanfare, as, in a sense, the U.S. forces are a symbol of the promise of reunification of Germany.

Reunification has been the keystone of Adenauer's policy, as well as that of the other NATO allies. A central banker commented that it has not been recognized publicly that Germany started and lost the war and as a result lost East Germany but privately the division of Germany is accepted as a fact of life which could be altered only by force, and Europe will not go to war to unify Germany.

The Russians deeply distrust the Germans and will not entertain a German peace settlement on the basis of reunification. While the Communist regime in East Germany is hated by many, it is not on the point of imminent collapse.

Consequently, at present there is a complete stalemate on the German question which is the core of the East-West conflict in Europe. But changes can occur on both sides. The Germans, as well as other Europeans, are watching the Chinese-Russian conflict. Russia has already become a "have" country and China is a "have-not" country, and no political leader in Russia is able to depress the standard of living of 220 million Russians to extend meaningful aid to some 700 million Chinese within the context of Communist theology. As a "have" country, Russia must get along with the other "have" countries, as otherwise she could find herself in conflict with both East and West. Russian policies, both at home and in her satellites, are in motion and are changing. Frequent visitors to Russia report that the old slogans in factories and on billboards hailing the victory of communism are now replaced by slogans hailing the victory of socialism. The conflict of China and Russia appears to be one of the reasons for the change in the satellites, as the Russians find it desirable to avoid the possibility of satellite uprisings in the event of trouble with China. Russia has the means to dominate Finland militarily, but has evolved a policy which clearly leaves Finland culturally a part of the Western World. Russia has loosened her grip on Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Sooner or later she will have to loosen her grip also on East Germany. In answer to questions in Germany as to whether West Germany would recognize an East German state which enjoyed the same privileges and obligations as Finland, the reply was generally negative, but it was said that it was quite conceivable that the next generation might feel differently.

As long as the German question is unsettled, major military expenditure in Europe appears unavoidable. A settlement would bring about a substantial shift in the balance of payments. The opening up of East Germany in the Finnish manner could create immense capital requirements for West Germany, changing her persistent balance-of-payments surplus into a deficit, and the reduction of U.S. military expenditures would probably result in a surplus for the United States.

In any event, in terms of the balance of payments, it is said that even today there is no further need for the United States to make a net contributions in dollars for military expenditures in Europe. For every dollar the United States spends in foreign exchange for its military establishment in Europe, many Europeans contend Europe is able to buy a minimum of a dollar's worth of U.S. war materials. Progress has been made in this direction, but the United States should press to bring about a further balance.

However, the United States must expect to carry large portions of her military expenses outside of Europe by herself, as Europe is unenthusiastic about some U.S. policies, such as the involvement in Vietnam and Taiwan and the nonrecognition of Red China.

FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES

Prosperous Europe feels a sense of obligation to assist developing countries. Switzerland is educating young people from these countries, and France is training people and investing in developing countries which were formerly French colonies and are now in the French sphere. The United Kingdom is active in the newly independent parts of the British Commonwealth and in ex-colonies. Belgium is approaching the Congo problem with a great deal of enlightenment. Her old investments in the Congo are a fraction of their former value. Nevertheless, the Belgians recognize the need of aid, regardless of future reward. However, Europeans show little interest in participating in American foreign aid programs. France and Holland, for example, having withdrawn from Vietnam and Indonesia, do not wish to become involved again. Europe generally considers Latin America a U.S. problem. The most the United States can expect is that Europe will assist developing countries in which they themselves have a special interest. The Common Market countries, for example, are showing some interest in helping the development of tourist facilities in areas where Europeans wish to travel, such as Spain, Greece, and Turkey.

On the whole, Europe is critical of American foreign aid as too great a strain on the balance-of-payments positions, too unselective and in some cases, ill advised. Some countries, such as France, have large dollar surpluses, and they have leave large balances in the United States. These balances help the United States to finance its foreign aid, and the dollar surplus countries understandably object to having their balances used to support policies of which they do not approve. These countries have the power to withdraw their balances and demand gold, placing the United States in an awkward position. While Europeans have no interest in jeopardizing the dollar, they can certainly be expected to be heard from if they disapprove U.S. policies. This is the position vis-a-vis France at the present time. It is impossible to maintain an unchallenged big power position and a chronic balance-of-payments deficit at the same time.

Therefore, unless the United States changes some of its military and foreign aid policies, it must expect little help from Europe in certain areas and must be prepared to continue to use part of its earnings from international trade and investment for such expenditures.

THE U.S. BALANCE OF TRADE

While foreign capital investments, military, and foreign aid expenditures and tourism have been the source of deficits in the U.S. balance of payments, this country has had a favorable balance of trade. However, the United States has lost ground since 1950, although it still retains the approximate share of world trade which it had in the 1930's. Since military costs, tourist expenditures, etc., have been going up, this relatively static export trade has been unable to cover the balance-of-payments deficit.

A favorite American thesis is that European inflation is advancing faster than inflation in the United States and, as this is reflected in European export prices, the United States will be able to step in and capture a larger share of the export markets and correct her balance of payments. But the fact is that while internal prices are rising faster in Europe than in the United States, there has been little movement in export prices of manufactured goods since 1958, and a major change is not expected in Europe in the foreseeable future. A comparison of the relative stability of export prices with internal prices on the Continent since 1952 is shown in the charts on the opposite page.

Exports are the lifeblood of all European countries and constitute a much greater proportion of their economies than in the United States. The competition for export markets is such that Europeans do all they can to prevent rising internal prices from being reflected in export prices. The Times in London on October 18 reported that the European Parliament of the Common Market has called for the application of a common tax on added values in all the six member countries by the end of 1967. France has made wide use of this tax indirectly to subsidize its exports, and not only the rest of the Common Market countries, but Sweden, Great Britain, and others outside the Common Market are finding it necessary to explore the possibility of following suit in one form or another. Higher internal prices in Europe will not, in themselves, make it more possible for the United States to conquer the export markets which Europeans now dominate.

Nor can the United States expect much help for her exports through lowering of European tariffs in the immediate future. The success of the so-called Kennedy round of tariff negotiations due next April depends first of all on the formation of a common agricultural policy within the Common Market. France insists that Germany buy its cereals which are produced more cheaply than German cereals. German farmers would, of course, be hurt by such an agreement, and whether Erhard is strong enough to make such a political decision before the 1965 elections is not known. It is said that a political image of Erhard has been created, but that nobody knows what he is really like and it is hard to predict what he will do. He is, however, in the unfortunate position of having to prepare for an election soon after taking office, and Adenauer has left many agricultural problems for him to deal with. The civil servants of the Common Market in Brussels expect that a common agricultural policy will be agreed upon before next spring, but other observers are not very hopeful. Without an agreed agricultural policy within the Common Market, it will be very hard to negotiate effective tariff agreements with outside countries. It was noticeably easier for the Common Market countries to arrive at agreements in their first period of healthy expansion, but the prevailing inflationary pressures are stimulating nationalistic interests and viewpoints.

U.S. INVESTMENTS ABROAD

The enormous investments abroad which the United States holds today are yielding $4.3 billion of interest and dividends per year. Against these, barely $1 billion of interest and dividends are paid abroad by the United States. At the present time the rest of the world owes to the United States a net interest and dividend bill of approximately $60 million a week, as well as a weekly royalty and license fee bill of $12 million. This dividend and interest bill in the recent past has increased by about $400 million a year, or by over $7 million a week. In addition, a not inconsiderable portion of U.S. foreign earnings are reinvested abroad and thus help to increase the earning power of the U.S. foreign investments.

This income has been increasing at over 12 percent compounded annually and, at this rate, would double in about 6 years. It is a source of immense strength for the U.S. dollar. However, it cannot arbitrarily be assumed that the income will continue to increase at this rate, and that it will be adequate to cover any and all deficits in the U.S. balance of payments.

To begin with, the profit squeeze and the beginning of the trend to self-financing of industry may reduce dividends, and Americans may reduce their investment in Europe if they find themselves subject to the profit squeeze.

Secondly, the very success of the American corporation abroad presents complicated financial, social, and political problems. As long as the United States has had a large balance-of-payments deficit the rest of the world has had no trouble in finding the dollars to pay the dividend and interest bill. But as the balance-of-payments pendulum begins to swing the other way and as the interest and dividend bill goes up, the problem will increase. Even if the United States ceased reinvesting in Europe, its increased

withdrawals would present a payments problem. Already some political leaders fear their interest and dividend bill will become unmanageable and are advocating local participation in foreign-owned industry. One British merchant banker commented that while the United States has assumed the role of anticolonial leader, the great American corporations have been building a new financial colonialism. It is considered debatable whether the rest of the world will be able or even willing to pay the United States an ever-increasing weekly dividend, interest, royalty, and license fee bill. If the United States hopes to depend on income from this source for years to come, it is essential that American industry adopt statesmanlike policies allowing local participation in oversea enterprises on terms and under conditions which are attractive both to the United States and the host countries. While this might result in reduction of income in the short run, U.S. oversea investment would be on a much sounder and more secure basis for the long pull.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Death of Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it was my privilege last Sunday to hear an inspiring sermon by Dr. R. B. Culbreth, pastor of Metropolitan Baptist Church, in which, after deploring the passing of a great President, he appealed to the people of our Nation to rededicate themselves to the service of our Lord and Master. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of that sermon may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEATH OF OUR PRESIDENT

(Sermon preached by Dr. R. B. Culbreth, pastor, Metropolitan Baptist Church, Sixth and A Streets NE., Washington, D.C., Nov. 24, 1963)

Scripture: Isaiah 6: 1–13.

Not since Jesus Christ died on the cross in Jerusalem has a death affected the lives of so many people as the untimely, senseless murder of President John F. Kennedy. Regardless of our political belief, he was our President, and a little bit of each of us died with him. He was indeed a man of courage, brilliant intellect, and a dynamic leader. He had won the respect of most of the nations, even our enemies, and had become a symbol of freedom to millions from many nations. His death brought shock and sorrow to all of us, and plunged the entire Nation—and much of the world—into deep mourning. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15: 13).

This message is not an effort to condemn the man who pulled the trigger that felled our President, even though much could be said about our laxity regarding the sinister forces of evil that are evidently growing within our land. It was from this same pulpit that the Honorable STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, warned about the growing menace of communism. We can be grateful that the warped mind that planned this murder was bred on the evil powers of communism rather than the foul racial prejudice, or the equally foul religious prejudice. Atheism produces communism. Prejudice breeds hatred; hatred can result in murder.

Does the Bible have anything to say to us in this tragedy? Can God speak to our hearts in the midst of our sorrow? Yes, praise His name, He can. Day is usually preferable to night, but night has some advantages over the day. In this night of gloom and of national tragedy God's love can shine brightest.

We have a parallel in the Bible to our day. Around the middle of the eighth century B.C. the good King Uzziah died. Perhaps the young man, Isaiah, had gone to the Capitol to view the body, then to the funeral of the only King he had ever known. Feeling the great need of prayer he then went into the temple to pray. It was here that he had an experience with God and his life was changed. Let us take a closer look at Isaiah's experience and pray that we may have a similar one. May we center our thought around four words: Revelation, prostration, purification, and dedication.

I. REVELATION

"In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord." O God, may it be that in the year that President Kennedy died, people will see the Lord. In this dark, tragic hour you would think that people would flock to the church seeking God as did Isaiah. When he came seeking, he saw the Lord.

What kind of a God did Isaiah see? First of all, he saw a God that was still on the throne—"high and lifted up." The King had been toppled from the throne, but God was still reigning. We need to see this matchless truth today. Our brilliant young President has been dethroned by the assassin's bullet, but the God of this universe is still on His throne. He can never be dropped by the enemy's shots.

When Jesus was facing the crucifixion He told His disciples that He would soon leave them, but that the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, would come, and the world could not seize Him (John 14:17). The world could and did seize Jesus, death did seize Mr. Kennedy, but death cannot touch our God. He is still on His throne.

Isaiah also saw a God that was majestic and described him in these words: "His train filled the temple. Above Him stood the seraphim: each one had six wings; with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he did fly."

"Seraphim" are burning messengers of God. The wings are symbolic. The two that covered his face mean "reverence"—necessary in any true worship. America needs to rediscover this sense of reverence for God. So many things have crept into our national life and worship that many think of God as one of us, rather than the Almighty, omnipotent creator of this universe.

The two wings that covered his feet suggest humility. This is a lesson sorely needed by all Americans. We have a very exalted opinion of ourselves. We have read of other nations deposing their leaders, and with smugness have said that we are a too sophisticated and civilized people for that to happen to us. But it did happen and we are humbled by it personally and by its possible effect upon our image abroad. Humility before God is not a sign of weakness, but strength, and we need to get back to it.

The two wings that enabled the seraphim to fly suggest unhindered action and service. Too many of us run hot and cold in our devotion and service to God.

Not only did Isaiah see a God who was still on His throne and a God who was majestic, but also a God who was thrice holy. Holy means separate or apart, different. God is different from men. His ways are not our ways and His thoughts are not our thoughts.

If America can get a vision of God through our President's death, then he will not have died in vain. If his passing will shake us from our spiritual lethargy and make us realize our spiritual poverty, then his death will produce good.

II. PROSTRATION

When Isaiah had the vision of God he realized a deep sense of sin both personal and social. This is the natural followup of a vision of God. Our own weakness and unworthiness parades before our eyes as we compare our relationship to God.

One is not often conscious of dress until he is in the presence of others who are dressed better, and the same is true of speech. It is equally true that we are not conscious of our sins, shortcomings, and spiritual needs until we get into the presence of God.

Thoroughly smitten with his own lack, Isaiah cried out, "Woe is me, for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts." He could never get away from the sense of sin. His lip-service and that of his people paraded before his eyes and he fell prostrate before God.

America needs a vision of God and a sense of sin. We have become a great and powerful people, chosen, I believe, of God to be a blessing to all nations. But our greed and lust, and trust in military might alone could be our undoing. Our record of murder, divorce and crime precede our witness for Christ abroad and cause our missionaries' lips to give hollow sounds when they tell others about how God can change human lives for good. America needs to fall on her knees before God crying with Isaiah, "Woe is me."

III. PURIFICATION

It is one thing to have a vision of God and realize a sense of sin, but the real test comes in what you do about it. Many people admit they are sinners and need God, but few are doing anything about it. Repentance is a broken and contrite heart and very few people like to have their hearts broken and pride dethroned.

If sin is to be dealt with, it must be done drastically, "so as with fire." Fire consumes and purifies. It must be dealt with "from above." One of the Seraphim took from the altar a live coal and laid it upon the mouth of Isaiah. This drastic action was symbolic of purification. "Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged."

America's hope of survival lies in this direction. Our sins are grevious in God's sight. We must let Him deal with us, as did Isaiah, with coals taken from the "heavenly altar." Let us pray that through the death of our President, God shall lead us to confession of sin and purification.

IV. DEDICATION

When a person sees God, realizes sin, and receives forgiveness the next step is dedication. Isaiah heard God calling for volunteers for His service—"Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Quickly he found a voice for the deep emotions within him and responded, "Here am I; send me." God said, "Go and tell this people." This same God, speaking in the same voice, under a similar circumstance is calling each of us to speak for Him. Will we hear? Will we obey? Will we do it? If so, then our Nation, so dearly loved by us all, and for which John F. Kennedy gave his life, shall accomplish His purpose for us as a nation. These things can only come as people surrender to God. It was belief in God that led us to greatness and it is a return to the Bible and personal belief in, and acceptance of the Christ of the Bible, that will preserve our greatness and make us as a nation a fit servant of God. Let us pray.

O God, we pray that through this national tragedy we may search our own hearts and rededicate our lives to the principle for which Mr. Kennedy died. Grant that we may be a nation used of God as a channel of peace and understanding to all people of the world. Give to President Johnson, our Father, the divine wisdom and strength necessary for the great responsibility suddenly thrust upon him. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

Johnson Despises "Littleness"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of November 25, 1963:

JOHNSON DESPISES "LITTLENESS"

(By William S. White)

When there is death in the family there is shock and horror and grief and then there is, terribly, and inevitably, the harsh awareness that life must go on for those who are left.

When there is death in the national family, death removing the very central arch of the power and purposes of the Western World, as brutal death has removed John Fitzgerald Kennedy, horror and grief are inexpressibly multiplied. But one thought, one emotion, must master all others.

This is that the Republic of the United States of America must go on, under the command now of a new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. It is he upon whom the great burden has now fallen and it does not seem wrong to thank Providence that the successor is worthy of both the man who has gone and of the country they have both always loved and served, wryly, toughly, unsentimentally and gallantly well.

If ever in all our history there was an hour when men must put aside all that is small, all that is angry and ugly and pettily partisan in our national life, this is, supremely, that hour. For unless all the people, the parties, the factions, the regions, the races, the clashing private interests, can summon up among themselves the sense and honor to unite behind the new President, the United States of America will face perils of disunity it has not known before.

Who is this man, Lyndon Johnson, who must now have the support, the help, and the understanding of all who are in the United States, and of all they have and are? What I am now about to say I should never in ordinary circumstances have said, for in ordinary circumstances it would be name-dropping in its most tasteless form. But because of the special circumstances, I say it all the same, so that readers may have some standard to measure the worth of my evidence.

MAN OF TOLERANCE

For 30 years—since he was a slim and eager young secretary to a Texas legislator—I have intimately known Lyndon Johnson as I have never known any other public—or private—man. I have known no other man of more true tolerance, if a tolerance sometimes hidden behind the brusque mannerism of a master of his profession—politics—sometimes impatient of slower minds and always impatient with those of smaller motives than his own.

I have known no other man of truer compassion—to the poor and dispossessed, yes; but also to those of more favored status who, too, sometimes weep silently in the night from the fears, the anxieties, the pitiless pressures and private despairs which never wholly exempt any part of humankind.

I have known no man of more true devotion to this country—all of it, North and South, East and West, black and white and brown and yellow. And I have known no public man, anywhere in the world with a greater talent—indeed a greater genius—who has given greater service, sometimes at high cost to himself, to that old ideal of one Nation indivisible under God and of justice for all so far as justice can be found in a world none of us ever made.

But precisely because he is a political genius, precisely because he has all his public life been too busy doing things—and too proud—to explain things about himself, this man has had his tireless detractors to a degree rarely seen in American politics. I have said this is no time for bitterness; accordingly this is no time to go forward with this theme. It is a time, however, a desperately necessary time, to appeal to them right here in print to drop the little animosities of the past.

DEVOID OF LITTLENESS

For I say, weighing my words and in full awareness of their implications, that I have never known a truly first-rate man in either party who, truly knowing Mr. Johnson, has ever hated or despised or undervalued his incredible capacities, simple dislike, and simple disagreement on principle being set wholly aside.

He has his faults, but this can be said of him: There is not anywhere in him an ounce of littleness; he is larger than life in every sense, including the complete inability to comprehend really little purposes in others.

I have said that I have been and have remained his friend through the greater part of the life span of us both; but I have also on many occasions, been a critical friend on public issues, and may no doubt be on many occasions again. For among the largenesses of Lyndon Johnson is that one form of criticism and one alone can move him to swear like the combat naval officer he once was—he who can also weep for others like a child. This is the criticism of malice based on motives that are small and ugly.

This is a great political figure, a great and natural leader. But this is also, first and foremost and always a man, M-A-N.

Lincoln and the World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Lincoln and the World's Fair," delivered by Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at a luncheon in celebration of the centennial of the Gettysburg Address, at Springfield, Ill., on November 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN AND THE WORLD'S FAIR

(Remarks of Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964–65, at a luncheon in celebration of the centennial of the Gettysburg Address, Springfield Elks Club, Springfield, Ill., Nov. 19, 1963)

Matthew Arnold, referring to Shakespeare, said:

"Others abide our question. Thou art free. We ask and ask; Thou smilest and art still, out-topping knowledge."

Abraham Lincoln too is among the few in the Book of Gold whose greatness and significance are unchallenged. Like Washington, he is in the clear upper sky. These men are far beyond the carping critics, detractors, head shrinkers, analysts, and cautious purveyors of faint praise.

This modest man was wrong for once, for the world has noted and will long remember what he said on this occasion. A century has put the final seal and imprimatur on the Gettysburg Address. It is timeless now. The march of its simple, compact, unadorned English poetry is in the finest traditions of the Bible, Shakespeare, Bunyon, Franklin, Pitt, and Webster. The least subtle mind will detect in the Gettysburg talk of less than 300 words echoes of great literature familiar to Lincoln—The 23d Psalm, Paul's oration at Mars Hill, the Sermon on the Mount, Hamlet's Soliloquy, Pilgrim's Progress, Franklin at the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and Earl of Chatham's speech on America in 1777, and Webster at Bunker Hill.

Lincoln at Gettysburg pondered the durability and fate of democracies and took increased devotion from the sacrifices of our soldiers for a great ideal. Like the prophets of old and the Saviour, he assumed vicariously some of the intolerable burdens of mankind. It was more a prayer than a mere affirmation. The Emancipator saw that the end is not yet. It is in fact a long way off, no impossible goal but one to be reached by sacrifice one step at a time. As Vachel Lindsay put it in "Abraham Lincoln Walks at Midnight":

"His head is bowed. He thinks on men and kings,
Yea, when the sick world cries, how can he sleep?
Too many peasants fight, they know not why,
Too many homesteads in black terror weep."

We at the World's Fair salute you of Illinois for your initiative in sending to us Walt Disney's Lincoln, the astonishing animated figure of "the prairie lawyer, master of us all."

Walt Disney is another great product of Illinois. He and the chairman of your Illinois World's Fair Commission, Ralph Newman, and Carl Sandburg and Everett Dirksen, have been among those who sat at the feet of the prairie Gamaliel.

You cou'd have thought of nothing which so vividly epitomizes the spirit which informs Illinois, and typifies your purpose, effort, and achievement in every field. This is your man, but one you share with all of us and one we shall proudly present to the whole world as the warp and woof of our American character, and the substance and witness of the American dream.

A Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past incredible 72 hours, like all Members of Congress, I, too, have received expressions of grief from many of my con-

stituents. One in particular deserves the attention of my colleagues.

Following, Mr. Speaker, is a eulogy composed by Mr. Norman H. Kindlund, of my district in Chicago, Ill., whose beautiful words express the deep loss that we have all suffered in the untimely death of our President:

HAIL HEROIC SHADES

Centuries of statesmen
Leaders of all lands,
From your earned repose
Where your spirits rest,
Hearken for another
Has overcome the test.

Persevering virtue
Held 'gainst calumny,
Loneliness in cause—
Hard by lies oppressed,
Firm in his convictions,
Ne're from these digressed.

Youth now stands before you
As our Nation is,
Dominant in mien
Resolute and free—
Bid him salutation
From your company.

Author of your exploits
Styled in eulogy,
Void of flowery praise
Yet with rev'rence due,
Tribute to your courage
Pass by in review.

Scorning all aloofness,
On his feet for all,
Example showing freely—
Mankind must be fit,
For survival's mandates
And no cringe admit.

Though he falls foreshortened
By a coward's stroke,
Honor shields forever
With invigorating rest
Youthful Chief of State;
Greet him as our best.

Penchant, trenchant style,
Uplift in word and deed,
Humanity's great burden
With sincerity made clear—
Welcome now his spirit
To your fearless ranks a peer.

The International Chamber of Commerce—Expansion of International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the International Chamber of Commerce, since its inception in 1919, has examined carefully all issues pertaining to international trade and foreign investment. Its studies, recommendations, and action programs have been widely distributed and have been made available to governments and to intergovernmental organizations, as well as to the general public. There is no doubt but that the continuing work of the ICC in this field has had a far-reaching and constructive influence on the international scene.

A major objective of the International Chamber of Commerce is the expansion of international trade. The chamber welcomed passage of the U.S. Trade Expansion Act and hailed it as a major step forward. The national committees of the ICC in 41 countries, counterpart organizations of the U.S. council, are committed to a policy that endorses the principles of the Trade Expansion Act, and they are putting forward their best efforts to see that these principles will be fully realized during the forthcoming GATT negotiations—the so-called Kennedy round.

In May 1961, the U.S. council promulgated and published "Principles of an International Trade Policy for the United States." Many of the principles recommended by the council were subsequently enacted into law in the Trade Expansion Act. In January 1963, the council published its recommendations, "Implementation of the 1962 Trade Expansion Legislation," which supported the objectives of the U.S. Government.

As a further step toward this objective, the expansion of international trade, the U.S. council was influential in securing the adoption of the Executive Committee of the ICC of a new trade expansion policy statement. This statement contains a series of recommendations which can serve as specific guidelines in the implementation of the Trade Expansion Act.

Already endorsed by the international business community through the ICC, it has been submitted formally to GATT, and is being submitted to individual governments by members of the ICC throughout the world.

I want to commend the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce for its forward-looking and courageous position in support of a determined effort to liberalize further and expand more rapidly the flow of international trade. It is essential that the national committees of the ICC, such as the U.S. Council, work diligently in their respective countries to see that the principles of the Trade Expansion Act will be translated into reality at the forthcoming trade talks in Geneva.

I am heartened that the ICC considers it particularly important that agreement is reached on the elimination of nontariff obstacles to trade at these talks. I have been and will continue to support such action on the floor of the Senate.

I consider it of equal importance that major attention be focused on the expansion of trade of developing countries, including tropical products, raw materials and simple manufactures. It is about time that we realize that unless the United States is successful in obtaining access for the exports of Latin America in the EEC and other major markets on an equitable basis the billions of aid earmarked for Latin American development will fall for short of their objective. I ask unanimous consent that the international chamber's "Statement on the Expansion of International Trade" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

FOREWORD

In today's complex world, two necessities have top priority. One is maintenance of sound economic conditions and stable employment in the advanced nations. The other is acceleration of economic development and improved living standards in developing areas. A widening body of opinion believes that an aggressive expansion of international trade can assist greatly in attaining these objectives.

The U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce early defined the new and complicated circumstances today affecting world trade and made specific recommendations in a statement published in May 1961 as "Principles of an International Trade Policy for the United States." In the U.S. Trade Expansion Act of 1962, passed 17 months later, most of these principles are embodied.

Hailing this unprecedented legislation, the U.S. Council in January 1962 published its recommendations, "Implementation of the 1962 Trade Expansion Legislation," supporting generally the U.S. Government's objectives.

Against this background, the International Chamber of Commerce Commission on Commercial Policy (since renamed the Commission on the Expansion of International Trade) decided to reexamine the growth possibilities of and the barriers to worldwide trade. The 30 nations represented at the October 1962 Commission meeting in Paris asked rapporteur Jean Royer, formerly Deputy Director of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), to analyze the report on the potentialities of and difficulties confronting world trade. The ICC's broad new trade expansion policy, printed herein, is base dupon Mr. Royer's subsequent report, a classic document deserving wide and careful study.

The ICC policy statement has been received warmly by the GATT on behalf of its 53-nation membership, the Commission of the European Economic Community (EEC), the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and development (OECD), and the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations of the United States.

Currently, International Chamber of Commerce business leaders in some 60 countries are discussing the program with their governments. Never before has there been such widespread and thoughtful participation by the business community in the preparations for trade negotiations. Never before have the proposed areas of negotiation been so board, so significant and complex.

Progress toward expansion of world trade is so vital to the maintenance of economic growth, political stability and the security of the free world that this International Chamber of Commerce statement should have the widest possible distribution and consideration.

HARVEY WILLIAMS,
Chairman, International Chamber of Commerce Commission on the Expansion of International Trade.

THE EXPANSION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The International Chamber of Commerce has reviewed recent developments in international trade and the decisions taken, individually or jointly, by the governments of trading nations with a view to stimulating trade between the various countries and regions of the world.

The broad background facts are that, during the postwar period, striking progress has been made, largely through the instrumentality of GATT, in the enlargement and liberalization of international trade and that such advances have enabled developed and, to a certain extent, developing countries, to

benefit from technical and industrial progress and from an improved international division of labor. Recently, however, the rate of economic growth in a number of countries has tended to slow down, and the income earned from exports by developing countries is not, generally speaking, expanding rapidly enough to meet their requirements for economic development.

Moreover, since commercial policy issues were last examined in the International Chamber of Commerce in October 1962, the political climate affecting international trade has changed. There has been a halt in the progress toward harmony of thought on the fundamental issues, evidenced among other things by the breakdown of the negotiations for the entry of the United Kingdom into the European Economic Community, the difficulties encountered in reaching agreemnt in the recent Geneva ministerial discussions and the insistence of the developing countries on the transfer of the discussions from an economic to a political forum which might well aggravate divisions of opinion and policy and retard constructive results.

The International Chamber of Commerce therefore strongly urges that the time has come for the countries of the world to join in a determined effort to liberalize further and expand more rapidly the flow of international trade. Such an international action is of vital importance to advanced as well as to developing countries. Enlarged international exchange of goods and services can be a most potent force for growth of production, employment, and economic welfare. Equally, the opportunities for the relaxation of trade barriers and expansion of trade will be directly related to the pursuit by governments of general and balanced policies of economic growth leading to an expansion of demand.

The International Chamber of Commerce is pleased that the stage is now set for such a course of action. The passage of the Trade Expansion Act, 1962 enables the U.S. administration to take an effective part in carrying out a bold program of action, in cooperation with the other trading nations. The decisions taken by the Ministers assembled in Geneva in May 1963 offer a sound basis for starting meaningful negotiations. The International Chamber of Commerce believes GATT to be the appropriate forum for conducting these negotiations. It is hoped that the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development will assist in clarifying the issues for all participants and in lending the desirable political impulse to the whole program of action.

The outcome of the new trade negotiations is of such importance to the whole world, both politically and economically, that neither the preparatory work nor the negotiations themselves should be treated as purely technical matters but should be followed and encouraged by governments from the highest political levels. Cases are bound to arise where the negotiators will be unable to overcome the problems that may arise without governments taking the responsibility of settling the differences at the political level. This will require mutual understanding of the highest order.

As the organization representative of the international business community, the International Chamber of Commerce believes it to be its duty to collaborate with governments in the preparation of these trade negotiations and to support the efforts made by them with a view to accelerating the flow of international trade, broadening its base, enlarging its composition, and removing outstanding obstacles in the form of tariffs or other restrictions.

The task of governments will be made easier if they can rely on the support of businessmen the world over, not only for the definition of the objectives to be attained, but also for the approval of specific methods for reaching such objectives. The International Chamber of Commerce therefore invites its national committees and, through them, the businessmen of the world, to give the fullest support to their governments in preparation for the new trade negotiations under the auspices of GATT, and to impress on them the need to enter these negotiations, not in a doctrinaire spirit or on the basis of rigid instructions, but with the utmost goodwill, a sense of urgency and the determination to go as far as possible to achieve constructive results in the interests of all.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The International Chamber of Commerce considers that the most practical method to achieve a further significant reduction of existing obstacles to international trade is for the trading nations to paricipate fully in negotiations based on the principles of equality of treatment for the exports of all participating countries and of mutual advantage, as proposed by last May's ministerial meeting.

2. The scope of that conference should be as broad as possible; it should cover all sectors of trade: agriculture as well as industrial products, raw materials as well as processed goods. It should include as many countries as are able and willing to assume specific trade commitments, and its success will largely depend on the active presence of all countries having a substantial interest in trade.

3. The negotiations should be conducted on the basis of well-defined rules, which should be agreed upon by all participants before the negotiations begin; these rules should be simple, practical, and equitable. In this respect, the International Chamber of Commerce offers the following specific suggestions, which may assist governments in supplementing the arrangements which they have already adopted at the last ministerial meeting of the GATT.

4. The International Chamber of Commerce endorses the method of linear reduction as the basic rules for future negotiations, subject to the specific qualifications set out in the subsequent sections. It considers that, in the 1964 negotiations, the percentage of reduction should be high, for instance 50 percent. It hopes that either at that Conference or in the near future it will be possible to carry the reductions further up to the complete suppression of duties in certain sectors.

Manufactured products

5. In the case of manufactured products, the International Chamber of Commerce considers that, although the negotiation of tariff concessions will constitute the main objective of the Conference, governments should, at the same time, reach agreement on the elimination of other obstacles to trade which can be as restrictive as high tariffs or can nullify the benefit of tariff concessions. It would be essential to identify the measures or practices which have a restrictive effect on imports to various countries. Such obstacles include quantitative restrictions, internal taxes, regulations relating to public tenders, valuation methods, antidumping duties, customs formalities or administrative practices, health regulations, and standards imposed by public authorities.[1] The International Chamber of Commerce is of the opinion that governments should accept standing commitments to obviate the undesirable effects of such measures or practices or establish practical procedures for dealing with specific complaints, including the right for affected countries to take remedial action.

6. The International Chamber of Commerce is of the opinion that the usefulness of trade concessions is substantially reduced when they can be withdrawn unilaterally. It urges that governments consider ways and means of enhancing the durability of the commitments entered into and of limiting, as far as possible, the use of present escape clauses of renegotiation procedures.

7. As regards the linear method of reduction, while recognizing that such reductions may have to be spread over a period of 5 years, the International Chamber of Commerce expresses the hope that it may be possible for certain countries to agree among themselves on measures of acceleration, without infringing the most-favored-nation clause.

8. The International Chamber of Commerce is aware of the fact that, in certain specific instances, it may be necessary to deviate from the linear approach to take due account of significant tariffs disparities or of the structure of the export trade of particular countries, but it considers that such exceptions should be limited to cases where the automatic application of linear cuts would result in an undesirable lack of reciprocity.

9. The rights of governments to exclude specific items from the negotiations should be subject to strict limitations. The International Chamber of Commerce recommends that each government submit its list of prospective reserved items well in advance of the Conference. These lists should be subject to confrontation and governments should try, before negotiations start, to reduce these lists in order to maximize the results of the negotiations. In any event, trade in products on such lists should represent only a small fraction of each country's total import trade.

10. When governments find that the application of the linear method of reduction to certain products raises serious problems of reciprocity, for instance when certain participating countries levy particularly high rates of duty, or for other reasons, the International Chamber of Commerce recommends that instead of excluding the products from the negotiations, the governments should consider using other techniques such as (a) substituting a method based on the reduction of the weighted incidence for a given group or sector of products, or (b) applying the reduction percentage to a given quantity of imports in the form of a tariff quota, or (c) methods of alinement or harmonization of tariffs applied to a group of products, or (d) methods of "écrêtement" which would provide for the application of higher than average reductions to exceptionally high tariffs.

11. With respect to countries whose tariffs are generally lower than those of other participants, the International Chamber of Commerce feels that governments should consider the possibility of allowing these countries to apply a somewhat lower percentage of reduction, either for their tariff as a whole or for specific sectors.

12. With respect to industrialized countries whose trade is concentrated on a few products or which can show that the application of the linear method would lead to a serious imbalance in the value of concessions, the International Chamber of Commerce suggests that such countries should be allowed to offer concessions matching those received, even if they are not defined in accordance with the basic negotiating rule.

13. The general application of the linear method to manufactured goods will bring marginal benefits to developing countries. The International Chamber of Commerce considers that these benefits should be extended to these countries without compensation. If developing countries are the major beneficiaries of a particular concession, some form of compensation—for instance, in the field of capital goods—should be found, which would not seriously affect the revenue of the developing country or countries concerned or retard their economic

[1] See ICC Brochure No. 191, entitled "Obstacles to the International Distribution of Goods."

development. The International Chamber of Commerce hopes that these countries will rapidly reach a high level of development and that this rule should therefore be of temporary application.

14. The International Chamber of Commerce notes that fears of market disruption in certain quarters may induce governments to exclude items from negotiations or to insist on special safeguards. The view of the International Chamber of Commerce is that, as a rule, concessions should be extended to all countries which accept equivalent commitments and that governments should not be entitled unilaterally to introduce discriminatory restrictions. If exceptional circumstances exist which make it unadvisable or impractical to have recourse to safeguards existing in the GATT or in other international agreements, it might be necessary to establish additional procedures, but the International Chamber of Commerce is firmly of the opinion that exceptional safeguards should be introduced only temporarily with the consent of, or on the basis of an agreement with, the exporting country or countries concerned or be subject to reference to, or frequent review by, an independent Conciliation Board.

Raw materials

15. The International Chamber of Commerce recommends that the full percentage of reduction should be applied without any exception to raw materials, that duties not exceeding 5 percent be rapidly eliminated, and that the negotiations result at the same time in the removal of nontariff obstacles.

16. The removal of obstacles to trade in this sector should not imply any concession from developing countries.

17. The suggestions contained in the previous two paragraphs apply equally to raw materials whose value has been increased by grading and/or simple forms of processing. Moreover, governments should consider taking additional measures to eliminate or substantially reduce tariffs on those products, either in the course of the 1964 negotiations or as soon as possible thereafter.

Tropical products

18. The International Chamber of Commerce generally endorses the resolutions adopted by the ministerial meeting of the GATT in May 1963 relating to the expansion of trade of developing countries. It agrees that tariffs and internal taxes applied to tropical products which do not compete with domestic products should be removed as speedily as possible. In order to take care of the interests of producers who are largely dependent on certain markets where they enjoy preferential treatment, arrangements should be made to help such producers as will initially be adversely affected by the elimination or reduction of present preferences. On the other hand, it would be desirable for all countries exporting tropical products to look to the cheapest markets for their supplies of all kinds.

19. Free access to the main markets should be guaranteed, not only for tropical products in their crude form; it should be gradually extended to products having undergone a simple form of processing.

Agricultural products

20. As far as possible the rules recommended for manufactured goods should apply to agricultural products. It is recognized, however, that in many instances the application of such rules would be ineffective or would conflict with the national agricultural policies that exist in practically all countries for a number of deep-seated economic, social and other reasons, which may be modified but which are unlikely to be abandoned rapidly. The International Chamber of Commerce considers that the governments themselves should agree, in those cases, on special rules of negotiation, which may involve the acceptance of a new set of international commitments affecting both exporting and importing countries, including provisions designed to insure that exporting countries enjoy acceptable terms of access for their products on the markets of other trading nations.

21. Various techniques are possible and the International Chamber of Commerce intends to submit more specific suggestions as a result of the work of its Commission on Primary Products and Raw Materials. Governments might for instance consider the possibility of negotiating worldwide agreements on a different basis from that of traditional commodity agreements to insure a better equilibrium between supply and demand and to maintain prices, both on the domestic and world markets, at levels which should be remunerative for reasonably efficient producers and should not artificially encourage uneconomic production. These agreements should take due account of the interests of developing countries that are producers of the commodities in question; they might be supplemented by international arrangements for the disposal of surpluses in the most economically constructive and socially profitable manner. One method would be to see how surpluses should be used in conjunction which schemes for assisting growth in the developing countries through an extension of the present pilot world food program. Finally, governments might agree to harmonize their agricultural policies in the context of periodical confrontation exercises organized on a worldwide basis.

22. The International Chamber of Commerce is convince that there is a clear interdependence in the proposed trade negotiations between the agricultural and the industrial sectors and that the new trade negotiations will be really successful only if exporters of temperate zone agricultural products or of products competing with the products of that zone derive benefits from the negotiations comparable to those which are expected in the industrial sector.

U.S. COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON COMMERCIAL POLICY

CHAIRMAN

Harvey Williams, president and director, the Company for Investing Abroad.

MEMBERS

Robert W. Belcher, vice president, Dictaphone Corp.

Ralph M. Binney, vice president, the First National Bank of Boston.

Charles Cain, Jr., executive vice president, the Chase Manhattan Bank.

John Church, vice president, Booz-Allen & Hamilton International, Inc.

J. W. Coolidge, vice president, United Shoe Machinery Corp.

W. W. Cross, president, Kimberly-Clark International, S.A.

J. K. Evans, Washington, D.C.

George L. Farnsworth, executive vice president, International Department, Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.

S. B. Hanes, Jr., executive vice president, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

W. R. Herod, New York, N.Y.

Donald M. Kendall, president, Pepsi-Cola International.

Dr. A. T. Knoppers, president, Merck Sharp & Dohme International.

Richard O. Lang, international administrator, International Division, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

Francis McIntyre, chief economist and economics coordinator, California Texas Oil Corp.

Paul R. Miller, Jr., McGraw-Hill International Corp.

Robert Murphy, president, Corning Glass International.

W. Josiah Norton, director of international activities, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Mary G. Roebling, president and chairman, Trenton Trust Co.

Ralph I. Straus, director, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.

J. Wilner Sundelson, planning assistant, Ford International Staff, Ford Motor Co.

C. C. Walther, president, Walther Bros. Co., Inc.

R. Edward Warn, vice president, Westrex International.

J. A. Williamson, vice president, Carborundum International, S.A.

Robert E. Worden, Worden & Risberg.

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. COUNCIL

CHAIRMAN

Amory Houghton, chairman of the executive committee, Corning Glass Works.

VICE CHAIRMAN

Leo D. Welch, chairman, Communications Satellite Corp.

TREASURER

Max E. Gevers, first vice president, Bankers Trust Co.

MEMBERS

S.C. Allyn, Dayton, Ohio.

William M. Black, senior partner, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

Roger M. Blough, chairman, United States Steel Corp.

Dr. Courtney C. Brown, dean, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University.

Emilio G. Collado, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co. (N.J.).

Philip Cortney, president, Coty, Inc.

Charles B. Harding, senior partner, Smith, Barney & Co.

H. J. Heinz, II, chairman; H. J. Heinz, Co.

Walter Hochschild, chairman, American Metal Climax, Inc.

H. F. Johnson, chairman; S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

Sigurd S. Larmon, New York, N.Y.

August Maffry, senior vice president, Irving Trust Co.

Malcolm Muir, honorary chairman, Newsweek.

Robert D. Murphy, president, Corning Glass International.

George Nebolsine, partner, Coudert Brothers.

Frank Page, Jr., New York, N.Y.

Warren Lee Pierson, chairman, Great Western Financial Corp.

Philip D. Reed, New York, N.Y.

Ralph T. Reed, chairman of the executive committee, American Express Co.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman, International Business Machines Corp.

Harvey Williams, president and director, the Company for Investing Abroad.

An Echo in the Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the comment by Emmet John Hughes in this week's Newsweek needs no comment. I include it at this point:

AN ECHO IN THE SILENCE

(By Emmet John Hughes)

He belonged uniquely to us—to this time and place, to this Nation and generation—and to no other. In all history, what else could he have been, where else be seen, and when else be heard? A Hapsburg prince or a

Bourbon sovereign? A minister to Victoria plotting designs of empire? A German Chancellor fretfully patching the Weimar Republic? Or some earlier American President slackly presiding over the 1920's? Each weird image confirms how wholly and how rightly he found his home in this—our—generation. He was ours as the first President to be born in this tempest of our century—to glimpse life during the First World War, to bear the ordeal of the Second, and to fight back the darkness of a Third. Sometimes it happens so: the instant of history and the instinct of the man appear almost to plot their meeting with secretly timed precision. So it seems with us. We were clearly meant to be together, for this while. And this is why the assassin, as he put a bullet in his brain, also put a scar upon our generation.

He did not find this place with us, of course, because he won universal assent and applause. He won something more important: a recognition of his person and his force. A student of history, he often quoted its earlier scanners, like Edmund Burke, to depict his own nation: "We sit on a 'conspicuous stage,' and the whole world marks our demeanor." And his demeanor indeed was so marked—down to the thrust of a finger and the flash of a smile. A student of the Presidency, too, he repeated the challenge of Woodrow Wilson: "The President is at liberty, both in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can." We shall never know the laws this President might have signed. But we can be aware of the size of the man.

He cannot yet be measured, and he may never be measured, by the crises or debates that seemed—for fierce, fleeting moments—to stir his Presidency—steel prices and medical care, Peace Corps and "managed news," tax reform and test ban, missiles in Cuba and troops to Alabama. Now, all that he did and all that his death left undone seem to matter far less than what he knew—and felt—of himself and of his country.

He understood the Presidency. There was quiet proof of it on one occasion last year—with his formal White House dinner to honor 49 Nobel Prize winners. He warmly hailed the assembled poets and physicists and dramatists, peacemakers and mathematicians. He saluted them as "the most extraordinary collection * * * of human knowledge that has ever been gathered at the White House—with the possible exception of when Thomas Jefferson dined alone." And so he let them know that he discerned the rare sign of Presidential greatness: the steady power to be, to believe, and to decide—alone.

He sensed the cruel paradoxes of democratic leadership, thus dismaying zealots and exasperating simplifiers. He knew a leader must summon his people to be with him—yet stand above, not squat beside, them. He knew that he must try to be resolute without being arrogant, patient without being timid, and compassionate without being maudlin. He detested cant but delighted in eloquence. He could appeal for conciliation without forswearing power. And he could respect ideas without confusing them with deeds, exhort action without unharnessing it from reason, and esteem words without becoming infatuated with his own.

He belonged uniquely to us—above all—in his joyful passion for political life. For by this he proved he knew the root and genius of his Nation. He knew it to be conceived and dedicated—not to the propagation of such faiths as once came out of Israel, nor the fostering of the arts of a new Greece, nor the spread of sovereignty in the way of ancient Rome—but to the matchless political art of governing men in freedom. And so he knew, too, that his Nation was born not of an accident of history but of an act of intelligence: the triumph of men who studied seriously, spoke articulately, wrote fearlessly, debated rationally, and concluded—intelligently.

He strove to do as they. And he had some of this on his mind and ready for his utterance as he met death. The speech he never would deliver warned against hucksters of "seemingly swift and simple solutions." He was ready to deplore the confusion of rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible. And he would firmly insist: "America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

He took lively pride in his native Massachusetts, of course, and its men of greatness. So his ear and his wit always and easily recognized the voice of the rebel of Concord, Henry David Thoreau. And he almost surely would have shared the philosopher's judgment, pertinent perhaps even to his own tragedy: "Better a monosyllabic life than a ragged and muttered one. Let its report be short and round like a rifle, so that it may hear its own echo in surrounding silence."

He leaves—lastingly—such an echo.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, Noted Space Scientist, Addresses Annual Dinner of Charleston (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce—Receives Centennial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, W. Va., is comprised of energetic and public-spirited citizens who are dedicated to the continued progress of the Mountain State and the capital city area. Each year, they gather for an annual dinner at which they are addressed by a leader of national and international renown. The 1963 event occurred on Tuesday, November 5, in the civic center.

Principal speaker on this significant occasion was Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., and a leader in U.S. space programs. It was my privilege to introduce Dr. von Braun to an attentive and responsive audience numbering more than 650 persons. Charles E. Hodges, managing director of the business and professional group, had carefully arranged the program with his characteristic attention to details.

Presiding was Chamber President Charles W. Cammack, Jr., and the invocation was offered by Rev. William M. Kirkland of the St. Johns Episcopal Church. Also present were Representative KEN HECHLER of Huntington, a member of the Aeronautics and Space Committee in the U.S. House of Representatives, and Representative JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., who serves on the House Appropriations Committee. Mayor John A. Shanklin, members of the Kanawha County court, and the presidents of institutions of higher learning in the State, were honored guests.

A highlight of the evening was the presentation of the Order of the 35th Star to Dr. von Braun by Mrs. William Wallace Barron, wife of the Governor. Her husband was unable to be present. The award was established as a part of West Virginia's 1963 Centennial celebration and has been given to a number of dignitaries who have made contributions to growth and achievement.

Dr. von Braun cautioned that U.S. space probes must not be taken lightly, and that our success in rocketry will have direct bearing on national security. He explained:

"Our national security demands that we insure no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us."

The famed scientist illustrated his speech with color slides showing an artist's conception of the Apollo spacecraft, and its round trip journey to the moon. Dr. von Braun said:

"We are on the eve of the greatest scientific and economic revolution in history, brought on by the expanding knowledge from research in every field of endeavor. And the urge to explore the unknown is its stimulus."

Mr. President, I request that portions of the text of Dr. Wernher von Braun's speech be printed in the Appendix, together with my remarks in introducing him. I also ask the inclusion of the editorial "Dr. von Braun Welcome Choice" in the November 5, 1963, issue of the Charleston Gazette.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, IN INTRODUCTION OF DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN, DIRECTOR, GEORGE C. MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA., AT THE ANNUAL DINNER, CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, CHARLESTON, W. VA., NOVEMBER 5, 1963

Mine is a twofold privilege, since I am afforded the opportunity to greet men and women who are vitally interested in the development of West Virginia, and also to introduce our brilliant and renowned speaker.

We have enjoyed modern science for little more than 300 years, and have learned to utilize it in revolutionizing the power of technology only in the last 150 years.

Three centuries ago the Cardinals who condemned Galileo stated that it was false to assert that the earth was not the center of the universe, and to believe that the earth moved through space.

Today, a moment later from the standpoint of historic time, we are sending aloft manmade earth satellites—intricate devices which gather thousands of seemingly unimportant bits of information and relay them to tracking stations back on our globe.

The space age has truly arrived, and with it a pace of living, a scope of change which brings benefit and complex new problems.

Today we confront change on an ever-broadening scale and at a rapidly increasing rate. Automation and mechanization which are so much a part of the age of space have brought far-reaching implications to each of us. It is particularly appropriate that we have as our guest a man who has been deeply involved in the planning, construction, and execution of all phases of the surge toward outer reaches of the universe. He is conversant with technological advance and has been associated with the new science of rocketry since its infancy.

Dr. Wernher von Braun is recognized and respected as a leading figure in rocket propulsion and space powerplants. His service to this country has included such meaningful endeavors as the participation in de-

velopment of the Jupiter IRBM and Pershing rockets; and the perfection of special versions of the Redstone, Jupiter C, and Juno II missiles used in launching the free world's first satellites of the Earth and Sun—satellites Explorer I, and Pioneer IV. He also exercised leadership in the 1st successful space flight and the recovery of animal life.

In 1959 Dr. von Braun was awarded the Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Award by the President of the United States, for significant work in the space program. Today he is Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, in Huntsville, Ala., and is recognized throughout the world as a foremost authority in the space sciences.

International tensions and the expanding technology have become the significant challenges of the sixties. The role of American space effort has genuine meaning in each of these problem areas, and Dr. von Braun has been among the leaders in the application of technological advance and in maintaining a position of progress in astronautics. I know he shares with all West Virginians a concern for useful space achievement, and for sensible solutions to the economic problems which confront citizens in various sectors of our economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are delighted to have Dr. Wernher von Braun at this notable gathering of citizens of Charleston and of West Virginia—Dr. von Braun.

THE NEED TO EXPLORE SPACE

(Remarks by Dr. von Braun, Director, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Huntsville, Ala., at Charleston, W. Va., November 5, 1963)

This is a happy occasion to discuss pioneers and exploration. There is an imperative need today to cultivate, rather than squash, the urge to explore that has helped make America the most powerful Nation in the world, at the same time offering us the most freedom and independence. The urge to explore, self-sufficiency, and love of freedom come naturally to West Virginians. I understand that the immortal Daniel Boone, reknown the world over for his love of "elbow room," once represented Charleston in the Virginia Assembly. If this famous explorer were alive today, I am sure he would be an astronaut, eager to go to the moon. NASA has one West Virginian who is a modern-day pioneer in this field. He is Col. Charles E. Yeager, the first man to fly faster than the speed of sound.

I have learned recently of another pioneer of your State. You see—your centennial publicity is widespread. We read a lot about it in Alabama. James Rumsey of West Virginia had a steamboat operating on the Potomac 20 years before Robert Fulton's. If Rumsey could have had Governor Barron and the centennial's publicity chairman on his staff, the popular conception of history would more accurately reflect his pioneering accomplishment.

Rumsey's paddle wheel steamboat must have been a picturesque sight steaming up the Potomac. Its boiler capacity was limited, however. Every time the whistle blew, the paddle wheel would slow down. I ought to be back in Huntsville right now, getting up steam to go to the moon, but here I am blowing my whistle.

Your State is rich in natural resources—timber, minerals, oil, and natural gas. You are more blessed than California, in fact. But your most valuable asset is your human resources. I am delighted to hear of your efforts to improve your educational system, and to provide the specialized vocational training that a worker needs in the complex technology of the space age. Brainpower will make a desert bloom. How much easier then, will it be for West Virginia to go forward with its fortunate combination of human and natural resources. Progress needs the proper climate, however—a climate of the mind.

The people themselves must want to move forward before a state—or a nation—can advance. A favorable state of mind must be cultivated, a pioneering spirit imbued, and willingness to sacrifice for a noble cause encouraged.

Fortunately for the advancement of civilizations, man was born with an itch to explore the unknown. He has always wanted to see what was under the big rock, over the next hill, across the ocean, inside the atom—and out in space. It is the role of leadership to point the way, to stimulate, inspire, and to lend encouragement to others. This is true on the battlefield, in religious, social, and community affairs, and in programs of national importance.

One of the biggest national programs today is the exploration of space. The space age began on October 4, 1957, when Russia's Sputnik I blazed a trail across the horizon, dazzling the world, and striking a blow to America's pride and prestige. This spectacular achievement in space reflected an advanced scientific and engineering technology in Russia. That was supposed to be our strong point. Project Vanguard was underway to orbit a grapfruit-sized satellite as part of our scientific participation in the International Geophysical Year, but it was having technical difficulties. A completely new launch vehicle was being designed in Project Vanguard, and it takes time to iron all the bugs out of any new system. While the world watched, and the American public called frantically for action, a Vanguard missile suffered an unfortunate explosion at launch.

Washington was reluctant to use a military missile in a satellite launching attempt, but eventually consented, to salvage what it could of our damaged prestige. Our research and development team at Huntsville was able to place Explorer I, the free world's first satellite, into orbit 83 days later. We used a modified U.S. Army Redstone missile with solid propellent upper stages to loft a payload weighing about 31 pounds. The first-stage thrust of the launch vehicle was 78,000 pounds. This was the largest operational rocket we had on hand at the time.

Meanwhile, back at the Soviet rocket range, more large payloads were being placed into orbit. Although information was meager about their missile and space programs—and still is—it was evident that powerful rockets were used to orbit the heavy payloads. The Russians were using rockets for space exploration that were developed in their military program. They were obviously larger than any missile then under development in our intercontinental ballistic missile program.

In the beginning, rockets were built to deliver atomic bombs. Rocket designers were given the job of building a rocket big enough to carry a certain size atomic bomb so many miles to its target. But the rocket was to be no larger than necessary for its mission, since this would make it more costly, and longer to develop. At this time the United States enjoyed a substantial lead over Russia in nuclear technology, consequently, we knew how to build more compact and lighter weight atomic bombs, with sufficient destructive power. So we built smaller and less powerful rockets which could, nevertheless, deliver the same explosive power the same distance as the larger and less efficient systems.

Now, when it was realized that rockets developed for military purposes were of immense importance for space exploration, Russia appeared in a very advantageous position—because of her ineptitude in another field.

The spectacular achievements of Russia and the United States in space were having significant impact on people around the world. The United States, historically and fundamentally a peace-loving Nation, wanted to separate its space program from its defense effort. To accomplish this, President Eisenhower proposed the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I was honored with an invitation to testify about the proposed creation of this separate Government agency in the opening testimony before the House select committee considering the bill. I was employed by the Army at the time, but my opinion on the need for a sustained effort in space has not changed. I said at the time:

"Even more important than the budget figures for the first year is the question of how we can stabilize this program and keep it going at a sustained, accelerated rate over a number of years, how we can eliminate this lethal and wasteful hot-and-cold blowing that has plagued all our missile projects in the past. I think this lack of steady determination and unwavering support over the years has hurt us more than anything."

Others spoke out just as strongly. Speaking in Los Angeles in April 1958, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, now Deputy Administrator of NASA, said:

"I know that some knowledgeable people fear that although we might be willing to spend a couple of billions for space technology in 1958, because we still remember the humiliation caused by the appearance of the first sputnik last October, next year we will be so preoccupied by color television, or new style cars, or the beginning of another national election campaign that we'll be unwilling to pay another year's installment on our space conquest bill. For that to happen—well, I'd just as soon we didn't start.

"Fortunately, for the sake of our children's future, if not for the protection of our own skins, I don't think we're that grasshopper minded. * * * As a Nation, we have the scientific and technical competence. We have the resources to pay the bill. We can and we must succeed in finding our destiny in space."

NASA was established in October 1958, and began to organize for a broad assault on the mysteries of our atmosphere and space. Weather, communications, and navigation satellites were launched successfully, and factfinding probes were made into the space near earth and the lunar region.

Then on April 12, 1961, Yuri Gagarin struck another blow to America's pride and international prestige when he became the first human being to orbit the earth. This dazzled the world more than anything that has taken place since Sputnik I in 1957. All America was astir. If you will recall, the Russians didn't tell us beforehand that they were beginning a program of manned space flight. Just as they didn't tell us in 1957 that they were planning to orbit a scientific satellite.

One month after Gagarin's flight, on May 25, 1961, President Kennedy proposed an accelerated space program for the Nation. "This is the new ocean," he said in his inaugural address, "and I believe the United States must sail on it, and be in a position second to none."

To exemplify our developing space technology, he held up for all the world to see, the goal of landing an American on the moon and returning him safely to earth.

"No single space project in this period will be more exciting, or more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space," he said, "and none will be so difficult or expensive to accomplish."

Later he added:

"Let it be clear * * * that I am asking Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment for a new course of action—a

course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs * * *. If we are to go only halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, in my judgment it would be better not to go at all."

Three NASA centers are primarily engaged in carrying out Project Apollo. They are supported, of course, by all other NASA centers, universities, and a large segment of private industry.

The Marshall Center is providing the Saturn V launch vehicle. The Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston is providing the spacecraft and the mission control center, and will select and train the astronauts. The Launch Operations Center at Cape Canaveral has under construction at Merritt Island the necessary launch facilities.

Lunar orbital rendezvous has been chosen as the best method for accomplishing the mission. All major contracts for hardware have been let, and design and development are underway. Complete new facilities for the Manned Spacecraft Center are under construction at Houston.

Extensive expansion of laboratory and test facilities is in progress at Huntsville. We have acquired the huge Michoud manufacturing facility in New Orleans for the fabrication of Saturn stages, and are modifying and enlarging it. Construction is underway for a static test site in Mississippi. The first stage of the Saturn V moon rocket is well along at Huntsville, and the first production F-1 engine arrived last week for acceptance testing. In other words, we are building up considerable momentum for accomplishing the mission that has been assigned us. Our course is charted and the pace is set. Now we must stick to it.

When the heat is on, we are too prone to holler for a crash program. When the pressure eases off, we grab for the emergency brake. You can't even drive a car by switching suddenly from accelerator all the way in to both feet on the brakes—and back again. And the space program is far more complex than an automobile. It takes time to get up momentum, and sustained effort to maintain it. You don't work miracles overnight. Plans must be made, designs drawn, people hired and trained, buildings constructed, hardware built and tested. And all this work must be integrated to come out on schedule with a rocket and spacecraft on the launch pad and trained pilots aboard, with thousands of qualified technicians standing by to help with the mission. Visualize the immensity of this task, if you will, by a comparison with Project Mercury, completed this summer. The total cost of Project Mercury was less than half a billion dollars, and two million people had some part in it. Project Apollo will cost $20 billion, and will require contributions from countless workers.

NASA's program is carefully planned, well conceived, and well paced to achieve a national capability in space on a broad front. The lunar landing goal per se is not the overriding consideration in our space program. It has been chosen as a goal easily understood by everyone, toward which all parts of the space program can be focused, matched, and integrated. Another goal, such as a manned orbiting laboratory, could possibly have been picked instead. But the moon offered the best choice as a goal since it embraces all vital elements of a true national space flight capability.

Governor Barron has called the West Virginia Centennial a challenging opportunity for the State.

"Our centennial, in itself," he said, "is not a magic carpet to a better life for West Virginia. But it does give us a rallying point. Through our centennial we can show a united front to the rest of the country by demonstrating our pride and confidence in West Virginia."

If the Governor will permit me to paraphrase his statement, I would like to say: Project Apollo, America's manned lunar landing program, is not a magic carpet to a national capability in space. But it does give us a rallying point. Through Project Apollo we can show a united front to the rest of the world by demonstrating our pride and confidence in the scientific and engineering technology that makes a trip to the moon possible.

The United States today is in a position somewhat similar to that of a family that a few months ago bought a new car. The excitement of the purchase is over, and now the installments are coming due with relentless regularity. Some second thoughts creep in as the householders juggle their budget. Susie needs a winter coat, and Johnny's shoes are wearing out. What should they do? You've had the problem, I'm sure, and you know the answer. A car is a necessity these days. So they buckle down and do both—pay for the car, and still have all the other necessities of life. If they have to trim back, they cut out a few luxuries, like a weekend outing or other expensive recreation.

Just as our space program is getting its second wind, some people are having second thoughts about it. The annual budget is under consideration, and the pro's and con's are being aired. Public debate is the very essence of democracy, and none of us would change it. Men have fought and died for the principle of government by, for, and of the people. And we cannot make the right decisions unless we hear all the facts.

As a citizens, I want to add my two cents worth to the debate with the thesis that space exploration is a necessity for a dynamic America, vital to our role of world leadership, and essential for the preservation of peace.

Nikita Khrushchev has said that the Russians are not planning to put cosmonauts on the moon in this decade. One of his cosmonauts says they are going next year. Perhaps Nikita hasn't given him the word, or vice versa. Some Americans are willing to believe Khrushchev. But let me remind you, Mr. Khrushchev did not say that the Russians were not developing a national space capability. Nor did he outline his immediate goal in space, although we know they have a rapidly accelerating space program. Personally, I would not be surprised if the Russians orbited a 40- to 50-ton satellite before the end of this year. The heaviest object placed into orbit so far weighed less than eight tons.

What Mr. Khrushchev says or doesn't say is not the point. The size and pace of our space program should be decided by America's needs, and not on the basis of Mr. Khrushchev's comments. Man has pushed his explorations into the nearer fringes of space. The need to push onward is great, and now is the time to do it. Man has long dreamed of a trip to the moon. But it has been possible only in his imagination. Now, for the first time, our science, technology, and economy can transform the imagination of the past into reality.

When Mr. Khrushchev said he would bury us, he implied that it would be done through the weight of the socialistic system in developing Russia's economy, and crushing our free enterprise system. Now he is buying wheat from us. Going to the moon or not going may be a purely economic choice for the Russians. Perhaps they cannot afford it. But we can—without detriment to the comfort of our standard of living. All of NASA's programs cost each person in the country less than 10 cents a day.

The Space Age is more than 6 years old, but some people will still have nothing to do with it. It's difficult to understand. I am reminded of the two caterpillars who were crawling along in the grass. Looking up, they saw a butterfly fluttering about overhead. One caterpillar turned to the other and said, "They'll never get me up in one of those things." The Space Age is here, and it's here to stay. And we must accept it, for it affects every one of us. We are on the eve of the greatest scientific and economic revolution in history, brought about by the expanding knowledge from research in every field of endeavor. And the urge to explore the unknown is its stimulus.

A comedian has suggested a possible means of securing all-out public support for Project Apollo. He would put all the women on the Moon and leave the men on Earth. Then, he says, think how busy everybody would be building Moon rockets. And it would solve the unemployment problem.

Project Apollo is a serious, scientific undertaking. It is not an adventurous race to the Moon for dramatic propaganda purposes, although it will be crammed with adventure and drama such as we have never before witnessed. And there will be undeniable beneficial prestige effects when we demonstrate our ability to accomplish lunar exploration. It will reflect the heights which science and technology can reach in a society of free men.

But remember—Project Apollo is only a stepping stone in the effort to expand human knowledge of phenomena in Earth's atmosphere and in space. Beyond the Moon the planets beckon. Will we find life on Venus or Mars? What kind of life will it be? If we should meet with other creatures on another planet, let us hope that they will find us socially acceptable, understanding, tolerant—anything but delicious.

There are many unknowns in space, and many hazards. We are not even certain at this time about the surface of the Moon. Some scientists say it may consist of a coral reef-like structure, similar to cobwebs piled one on another to give it a porous, fairy castle appearance. Others fear that the dust may be so deep that it will swallow anything that lands there. Others say that the dust may be electrostatically charged, and will sweep out to meet the spacecraft, covering it like a cocoon. High-speed meteoroids may puncture the spacecraft, and heavy atomic particles from a solar flare could give the astronauts an excessive dose of radiation unless they are protected by appropriate shielding.

Whether these things are true or not remains to be seen. In spite of the hazards, I believe we can make it.

Whenever I need a bolstering of faith, I try to imagine the conditions at the time Wilbur Wright climbed into his tiny plane with bicycle wheels at Kitty Hawk, N.C. A horse was considered suitable transportation at that time. What would he have thought if I had walked up to him and said: "You are opening a new era for man today. Fifty years from now a jet pilot will take off from New York in a giant mechanical bug and cross the Atlantic at 600 miles an hour over a raging storm with 100 helpless men, women, and children aboard. Yet they will ride in air-conditioned comfort, with steak, television, and beautiful stewardesses to ease the rigors of the trip." He would not have believed me.

The predictions we are making today of things to come may sound impossible—but they are just as realistic.

Why should we explore space?

First and foremost, man has always explored space. Even before he could read and write he was exploring the world about him, migrating across continents. Later he penetrated the depths of the jungles, climbed the great mountains, and fought his way through Antarctic blizzards to the South Pole. He built devices to explore the subminiature world, then theorized on what was too small to examine even with the most powerful of microscopes. He built larger and larger telescopes to penetrate the universe,

and again theorized on that which was beyond his reach. In short, man was born with an insatiable curiosity to learn more about himself and the universe about him. He has always been an explorer, and he always will be.

Second, Sputnik I demonstrated that international preeminence in science and technology is synchronous in the eyes of the world with preeminence in space flight. This identification, whether well founded or not, is a fact that we dare not ignore. The prestige value alone of demonstrating America's technological and financial capability for manned lunar exploration is by no means something to be taken lightly.

Third, our national security demands that we insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us. It is impossible to predict now what the military significance of peace will be. That space has a military significance is amply demonstrated by the intercontinental ballistic missile, which must travel through space to reach its target. What we need now is the general NASA program to accumulate a body of knowledge, and to make the United States a spacefaring nation.

Fourth, the scientific knowledge gained from our space program will offer vast returns right here on earth for years to come. Scientific discoveries advance technology, and improved technology spurs the economy. New products are born, and jobs are created. As one observer put it. "We don't spend the money on the moon, you know; we spend it right here in the United States."

There are other indirect and intangible benefits of space exploration. Not the least of these is its stimulus to education. Space is fascinating to young minds. The space effort's use of practically all the scientific disciplines encourages their study and demands improved curricula and better teachers.

I hope that you share my conviction that we must sail on and on over this new ocean, and that you are eager to explore the mysteries about us. I hope that there is not a caterpillar among you.

DR. VON BRAUN WELCOMES CHOICE

The Charleston Chamber of Commerce has scored a small triumph in obtaining the service of Wernher von Braun tonight as speaker at its annual banquet.

In an age that is being profoundly altered by science and technology, Dr. von Braun is a towering figure. Through a combination of accomplishments and personal experience, his name is familiar to those who are otherwise oblivious to the impact the technological revolution is having on their world and their lives.

By choosing him as a speaker, the chamber has stressed the importance it places not only on his work but on the work of the countless scientists-technicians he has come to symbolize. In doing so, it is to be congratulated.

In accepting the chamber's invitation, Dr. von Braun is recognizing the responsibility of the scientists to share his knowledge and ideas. And, for a man who goes around with his mind in the clouds, he has an abundance of each.

The Bellamy Flag Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Bellamy Flag Award is made to some deserving high school within the United States. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Miss Ellen Shuler, a student of Cradock High School in the city of Portsmouth, Va., and the representative to the 22d Annual Bellamy Award presentation on October 11, 1963, to Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn.:

NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD—CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., OCTOBER 11, 1963

(By Ellen Shuler, Cradock High School, Portsmouth, Va.)

CHS—The letters "CHS" bring forth a double image: first, a large, comparatively new high school in Portsmouth, Va., and also an older and smaller school nestled in the mountains of Chattanooga, Tenn.

The letters "CHS"—whether used to designate my own school, Cradock High School, or this school, Central High School, spell home for me and a number of Central and Cradock students here today. I feel quite at home at Central for not only did I visit here for a week last spring, but this summer a group of Centralites visited my city. I'm sure they will remember with me as I recall the notable landmarks they visited in my State.

There was reconstructed Jamestown, site of the first permanent English settlement in America. We actually stepped back into history as we boarded the replica of the three little ships from England, strolled through the old fort and watched the colorful changing of the guard. There was quaint Williamsburg, early Capitol of the Nation. We admired the Governor's palace, sat in Patrick Henry's chair in the old Capitol Building, and locked Misses Miller and Miss Major in the stocks at the old jail.

We toured the beautiful grounds of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, and visited Thomas Jefferson's home, Monticello, full of the fascinating devices and inventions of this extraordinary man.

The city of Portsmouth is but a short distance from the Atlantic Ocean. We will all long remember the rollicking times we had together at Virginia Beach playing football in the surf and sand.

A leading landmark of Portsmouth is the huge U.S. naval shipyard where the first ironclad vessel, the *Merrimac* of Civil War fame, was constructed, and where many great carriers, such as the U.S.S. *Forrestal* was given birth.

My community, Cradock proper, is laid out in the form of an anchor, with the main streets forming the shaft, and others branching forth in the stock and the arms. Many of the streets are named for naval heroes such as John Paul Jones and Admiral Farragut. Cradock itself was named for Sir Christopher Cradock, an admiral in the British Navy during World War I.

Cradock High School is extremely proud of its ship's bell presented to the school by the U.S. Navy. It is our victory bell. Each time a sports victory is achieved the bell is rung seven times, once for each of our sports. The only other school known to have a ship's bell is the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis.

The nautical theme is further carried out in that our competitive teams are called the Cradock Admirals, our school newspaper, the Shipmate; our magazine, the Log; our handbook, the Quartermaster; our teachers' handbook, the Anchor; and our yearbook, the Admiral. A copy of the Admiral together with the miniature replica of the four flags that have flown over Portsmouth I now present to Central, along with our warmest congratulations and welcome into the Bellamy Award family of schools.

Waterbury and President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no place in the United States where President Kennedy was taken to the hearts of the people to a greater degree than in Connecticut, and no place in Connecticut where he was more beloved than in Waterbury and the adjacent communities of the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent.

I had the distinct and memorable privilege of accompanying President Kennedy on his campaign tour, in the early hours of the morning, through the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut on the Saturday and Sunday just preceding the election day of 1960.

I recall riding with him in an open convertible in the chill late evening and early morning hours, through the towns of Ansonia, Derby, Seymour, Beacon Falls, Naugatuck, and on to Waterbury, where at 3 a.m. he was greeted by an estimated 50,000 enthusiastic people. In Naugatuck, where 4,000 residents waited to greet him after midnight, he smilingly cautioned the crowd to "not make so much noise—you might awaken the Republicans."

In the November 23, 1963, edition of the Waterbury Republican, there appeared, after the tragic death of President Kennedy, a touching review of that campaign tour, and a report of a subsequent visit to Waterbury by the President.

That 1960 visit to Waterbury had national impact.

In his book "The Making of the President, 1960," Theodore H. White reported on it at length.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include, for my colleagues and for posterity, the article "President Kennedy had Special Place in Waterburians' Hearts," as it appeared in the Waterbury Republican, after the death of the President.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY HAD SPECIAL PLACE IN WATERBURIANS' HEARTS

Waterbury loved President John F. Kennedy.

Waterburians probably felt closer to Kennedy than to any other President in the history of this country.

This love and devotion sprang into full bloom when he came to the city at 3 o'clock in the morning in 1960 just days before the election. It flowered even more beautifully when he came back to Waterbury 2 years later and made a promise to come back still one more time.

This promise an assassin prevented him from keeping.

This promise to come back caught the imagination of the people of Waterbury, for it was not just an ordinary promise. It was a pledge to return to the city during the election campaign next year to return at the most improbable hour of 3 o'clock in the morning.

Just how much did Waterbury love Kennedy? Love can't be measured, but there is one statistic that can be used. It is the record-shattering plurality of almost 22,000

votes that the city gave him in supporting him for President.

TALK OF COUNTRY

This plurality—even more—the President's visit was an item of conversation in political circles throughout the country whenever the campaign was discussed. Reporters with Kennedy said there had been nothing like it at any time during the campaign.

It wasn't the size of the crowd. There had been far larger crowds. It wasn't the enthusiasm. There had been as enthusiastic audiences.

It was the combination—the unbelievable combination of Waterbury's biggest crowd in history turning out on the green at 3 a.m. in a wild, cheering display of affection for a man running for President.

The story of his trip to Waterbury did not get newspaper headlines around the country because it was long past the deadlines of morning newspapers. There were no afternoon papers because it was a Sunday, and by Monday, the Kennedy entourage had swept on to too many other communities, and too many other speeches had to be reported.

But the trip did have a national impact. It is mentioned at considerable length by Theodore H. White in his book "The Making of the President, 1960."

It has been mentioned by Connecticut political reporters whenever they discuss presidential campaigns. It was mentioned by national reporters on visits to Waterbury. They all wanted to know how Kennedy's 1962 visit to Waterbury compared with 1960.

TIME DIFFERENT

These newsmen realized, of course, that it couldn't be the same because in 1962 Kennedy spoke on The Green in the early evening.

But all newsmen—more important—all Waterburians, have been waiting. They have been waiting for a promise that cannot now be kept. They have been waiting for—as Kennedy said it on The Green:

"Our meeting here 2 years ago at 3 in the morning was the high point of the 1960 campaign, and we will meet at 3 o'clock in the morning the last week of the 1964 campaign and see what's going to happen then."

Waterburians have been waiting to "see what's going to happen then." They have already joked about standing on The Green after midnight on a morning early next November to greet the President. They have talked of having parties in their homes and then going to The Green to celebrate.

They have talked about taking their children, yes, even at 3 oclock in the morning, because they have been speculating that it would be something for history to remember.

Mass hysteria? Curiosity? Pride? Love and devotion? Perhaps a little bit of all, but mostly love and devotion for a President who has been close to Waterbury.

Waterburians have been waiting. They've been waiting to show the entire country just what kind of a reception they could really give.

The wait is over.

How did it start?

BEGAN IN 1956

Back in 1956 Kennedy first attracted more than normal attention in Waterbury and in the State. State Chairman John M. Bailey and then Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff backed Kennedy for the nomination for vice president. Because these two top Democratic leaders were for him, the Connecticut press paid more attention to the Massachusetts Senator than might have been normal at a national convention.

And Kennedy came close to making it. He was close but not close enough.

Waterburians had been reading of him. Soon they could see him. Kennedy made a campaign speech in 1956 in Library Park for Stevenson.

For 4 years Bailey and Ribicoff kept the Kennedy name before Connecticut. The thought of an Irish Catholic President had a particular appeal in this city where Irish Catholics have been prominent in the political field for generations.

Kennedy won the nomination. The campaign had more appeal, perhaps, than many to Waterburians, but a peculiar set of circumstances took it out of the ordinary.

The word came to Connecticut that Kennedy would campaign in the State. Connecticut's political leaders were told one city could have him for a midnight rally only. The others would get him during the day.

The political leaders in the other cities were doubtful about a midnight visit. Mayor Edward D. Bergin stuck his neck out. He said Waterbury would produce a crowd.

SPECIAL FEELING

On Saturday afternoon, the city took on a special feeling. One could feel, if not see, that something big was happening. People walking on the The Green walked differently. Bergin had his fingers crossed, hopeful that there would be a crowd, not at midnight as originally planned, but long after.

The crowd started far down the Naugatuck Valley and grew as the campaign motorcade drove north through Ansonia and Seymour and Beacon Falls and Naugatuck.

There was the policeman who forgot about traffic and turned to wave and cheer. There was the woman standing in her nightgown with a coat over it. And another. And still another. And pretty soon national newsmen stopped calling these women "nuts" and began to wonder.

And the motorcade hit Waterbury. Crowds jammed South Main Street from building across to building. It was impossible to drive. Security forces were almost helpless. The shouts completely drowned out the Mattatuck Drum Band—probably the only time in history the drum band has been drowned out.

Kennedy stepped out on the balcony of the Roger Smith Hotel at 3 a.m. and the city exploded.

Kennedy said: "I promised your mayor I would have you all in bed by 3 a.m."

And the crowd responded with a tremendous "No." Then they chanted, "We Want Kennedy."

The crowd was estimated at from 25,000 to 50,000. White sets it at 30,000 in his book on the campaign. Regardless of numbers, it was the biggest turnout in the city's history.

WENT TO MASS HERE

The next morning, November 6, Kennedy went to mass at the Immaculate Conception Church. From there he went to the Roger Smith to greet Democratic Party workers and others.

He spoke very briefly, saying the turnout in Waterbury had been "the greatest rally that we have had in this entire campaign." He said it was the "biggest crowd we have had in a city of this size in the United States," and it was not at noon but at 3 a.m.

In 1962 when he returned to Waterbury and spoke from a platform set up on the green, Kennedy looked over the mass of humanity which came a second time to see him and said:

"I must say, having been here at 3 o'clock (in the morning) and now at 6:30 (in the evening), that Waterbury is either the easiest city in the United States to get a crowd in, or it has the best Democrats in the United States."

Waterburians loved him.

They adored him when he added:

"In any case, our meeting here 2 years ago at 3 in the morning was the high point of the 1960 campaign, and we will meet at 3 o'clock in the morning the last week of the 1964 campaign and see what's going to happen then."

The President of the United States cannot keep that promise.

President Kennedy, President Johnson, and the Presidential Succession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of November 25 which sums up in clear and concise language the situation which confronts the country today due to the tragic death of the late President, John F. Kennedy. In a brief way it analyzes the characteristics of the late President and those of President Johnson and explains in an informative manner what it designates as "the presidential succession":

PRESIDENT KENNEDY

On this day of mourning the Nation and the world grieve for the President. Whatever his place in history may be, no one could question the fullness of his patriotism or the untiring dedication he gave his country's interests.

It is only honest to say that many Americans did not always see his country's interests as he did. Many, ourselves included, differed with his concept of the role of Government and the numerous reflections of that view in specific issues. Yet all who knew him even slightly, as we did, could sense his statesmanship and see what an engaging and thoughtful man he was.

All the harder, then, to believe that this man, with his gentle jibes, his Frostian wisdom, and his Lockean skepticism, has been so brutally cut down by a sniper's bullet, his darting intelligence stilled forever. Even this, however, he would have seen in the perspective of the history on which he set such great store.

The dangers of high office, he certainly knew, were enormous. His sense of history would have told him that they cannot be escaped even in our land of liberty. Idiots we have always among us, and if they have coloration at all it is more likely to be the black night of the individual soul than the political shades of red or white.

His sense of history would have told him that all such murders were the work of individual hysteria, just as was the murder of the assassin, not the working of the historical process. We have had assassinations before, but they are not, as in many other countries, the normal means of political change.

So, we believe, he would not have made the occasion of his own tragic death the opportunity for a new witch hunt of either the left or the right without even ascertaining the facts. He would not have been so quick as some politicians and commentators to jump to conclusions. All the more shame on those who were so ready to attribute his assassination to some organized diabolical plot of the so-called radical right.

There is, unquestionably, an element of hysteria in our national life—what society has ever been without it, what nation has ever been free of assassins? But he would not make the mistake of imputing to our freest of all societies the sins of more primitive lusts for power. He would know, in his early worn knowledge, that no society and no bulletproof car can protect against the telescopic rifle of the deranged mind.

Therefore he would have welcomed President Johnson's sad but calm acceptance of high office and the orderly transition it implied. President Kennedy might have added

that this political society has evolved in an intricate pattern of preserving man's freedom, a pattern far more definite than the world has known before.

Differences with him many had indeed, but always he was able to see another man's point of view and persuasively to state his own. These surely are the characteristics of a leader of men and a gentleman.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

The new President of the United States brings to his new task two personal qualities which are of especial virtue at this hour.

The first gift of Lyndon Johnson is a lifetime's experience in political leadership. Both his father and grandfather served in the Texas Legislature, and he was imbued from childhood with the idea that political service is both honorable and worthy.

It is now more than 30 years since he first came to Washington to learn, as an apprentice in a Congressman's office, the ways in which the Nation's affairs are managed. It is more than a quarter of a century since, as a young Congressman, he began himself to participate in the conduct of those affairs.

His participation has been both rich in experience and deepening in responsibility. From representing a district, he came to represent a State. With the passage of years men came to respect him. When the opportunity arose, his colleagues in his party chose him to lead them in the Senate. Barely 3 years ago he was, in the eyes of his party, second only to John Kennedy as a choice for President and no one doubts but what it was his own presence on the Democratic ticket that played a major role in winning for his party its precarious victory.

And not the least of his experience are the years as Vice President. There both he and the Nation profit from the wisdom of President Kennedy in carrying forward the tradition begun by President Eisenhower in which the second in responsibility is made ready to be the first.

But experience is not the only, or even the most important, thing President Johnson brings to office. Of especial merit in the circumstance are his own attitudes toward the political process and his conception of the duties of a political leader.

Lyndon Johnson has never been, and we doubt now if he will prove to be, the kind of political figure who dazzles people with his brilliance and sets their imagination afire. But if there are times in history when these qualities are useful to revive a nation in a great depression or relight its spirit in an hour of defeat, there are other times when a nation's problems call for other virtues. And that nation is fortunate which is given the right man for the right hour.

We are, right now, a nation almost equally divided on many great issues. We made our choice at the last election only by a hair's breadth, and it was from this division among the people, deep and sincere, that grew many of President Kennedy's great difficulties. That the Nation is now one in sorrow and outrage does not alter the fact that, as a nation, we are still undecided about the shape of our national society and about the means of molding it.

To confront this kind of task, now made even difficult by the shock of assassination and the consequent political disruption, it would be hard to imagine a man of more suitable qualities.

We recall a personal incident. It was at a moment in the last campaign when it appeared that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson might lose. The man who is now President sat on a hotel sofa, expressing vigorous disagreement with the policies and programs of his opponents. But his personal discouragement did not tempt him to deny honor and good will to those who opposed him, and he closed the conversation with the remarks that he was ready to serve the President, whichever man he might be.

And now as President, we think, this attitude will not desert him. He has sometimes been criticized because he will not hold immutable positions on every program that comes along, seeking compromises at the point where the price of battle becomes acrimony and discord. But this grows out of a commonsense to distinguish between the important and the less important, and the realization from his lifetime of political experience that where the people are divided there is wisdom in the way of reconciliation.

This is a virtue which, at this hour, the country has need of.

AND THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Not the least part of our heritage was symbolized when Mrs. Kennedy, only hours after she held her dying husband, stood alongside the new President as he took the oath.

In this instinctive act, Mrs. Kennedy reflected the continuity characteristic of our institutions of Government, just as did Mr. Johnson's calm taking over of the powers of the Presidency. All was provided for; the new President was prepared for the time of duty. Without legislation the country turned to him for leadership.

To most Americans this may seem unremarkable enough. But it seems so only because we are used to ordered transfer, even in the case of assassination, not because it is the customary way of the world.

The usual manner of political change is far different. When dictators die in lands like Russia, it takes years of bloody struggling to establish even a temporary succession. In the West itself, a De Gaulle can come to power on the shoulders of soldiers, and no one can know what will happen when such a man goes.

We make these observations not in castigation of others or in complacent gratification at the American system, which Heaven knows has its faults. We say it because there are those who appear not to understand, whose misery is compounded by the feeling that our institutions aren't any better than those devoid of a representative base.

It is just not true. For this was no attempt to overturn the Government, even though the man charged with the crime had a Communist background. Even if it had been such a conspiracy, the events of the past 3 days make clear it would not have succeeded.

The institutions remain firm, in the worst as well as the best of circumstances. They have survived three previous assassinations and numerous attempts. They have survived the crucial test of fratricidal warfare.

The institutions have survived, and so kept us free not only because they are so well grounded in a wise fundamental law. Among the blessings we have inherited were men wise enough to write that law; they had that wisdom through their own high intellectuality, their sweep of history, their understanding of the prevalence of tyranny and the fragility of freedom.

In Arlington Cemetery is today enshrined a President and a reaffirmation of the order and continuity which are our political heritage.

Death of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from Mr. James F. Tindall, president, Virginia Press Association, expressing sympathy over the tragic death of President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARION, VA.,
November 22, 1963.

Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the newspapermen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, may I express profound regret and deep sympathy for our Nation and its leaders on the tragic death of our President. May God grant us strength to seek unity and humility in our efforts to help mankind.

JAMES F. TINDALL,
President, Virginia Press Association.

No Adjournment of Congress Until Public Laws 815 and 874 Are Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable talk among Members of Congress and others about possible adjournment of Congress now and coming back in January and finishing our job.

Contrariwise it seems to me advisable that Congress remain in session—if for nothing else than to unsnarl some of our important legislation.

I have in mind that closing down Congress is not going to cure such situations as the stalemate between the House and Senate over a vocational education bill which is holding up enactment of other major education legislation.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for Members of Congress to go home until Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 have been extended. Impacted area assistance has been going on since 1950 and continuation of these programs is vital to our educational system. More than 4,000 local school districts are unable to complete their budgets and are in the dark about the number of teachers they can hire and the amount of salaries and other essential planning. By delaying the legislation Congress is putting our school administrators in an almost impossible situation.

As the House knows impacted area legislation provides for Federal reimbursement of costs to schools in localities where Federal defense establishments have placed a burden on local communities and where such military establishments unlike private industry do not pay taxes for the support of these schools.

Obviously while Congress has delayed passage of legislation to continue these laws, the school administrators have counted on our acting to continue these programs and it certainly does not seem right for us to close up shop and let the schools go on waiting. Extension of these two laws mean better than $10

million to my State of Washington and to certain school districts these funds are absolutely vital.

Johnson Well Trained for Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of November 25, 1963:

JOHNSON WELL TRAINED FOR ROLE—KENNEDY FOUND HE HAD SPECIAL TALENT FOR SIZING UP FOREIGN MATTERS

(By Max Freedman)

TUCSON, ARIZ.—President Lyndon B. Johnson would be the first to admit that there are many things about the Presidency which he must learn for himself by stern experience in the next year. But his close association with President Kennedy has made him more qualified for the duties of the White House than Mr. Truman was immediately after Mr. Roosevelt's death, or than Mr. Nixon was after Mr. Eisenhower's heart attack. This training for the problems of the Presidency may well be Mr. Kennedy's last gift to the Nation which he served even unto death.

In measuring Mr. Johnson's patient preparation for the Presidency, it is not enough to think of the specific Executive duties that Mr. Kennedy gave him. Mr. Johnson worked very hard on the space program and on the removal of discrimination in all contracts awarded by the Federal Government. But these activities touched the mere fringes of his relationship with President Kennedy. That relationship amounted to a partnership on public policy during the very period when thoughtless or ill-informed people were making silly little jokes about Vice President Johnson.

When President Kennedy discovered that Mr. Johnson had an unexpected talent for stating a case calmly and persuasively, he began to use the Vice President all across the Nation as a principal spokesman for the administration on issues ranging from unemployment to Berlin, from civil rights to Vietnam. After the speeches, it was Mr. Johnson's habit to report at once to President Kennedy on the temper of public opinion. From these discussions, which were frank and wide ranging, President Kennedy gained new insights which enabled him to make necessary adjustments in his policies. They also gave Mr. Johnson the chance, which he greatly appreciated, to have a hand in the shaping or modification of these programs.

The same cooperation was even more visible after Mr. Johnson's trips abroad. The public saw little more in these ceremonial visits to other countries than the attempt to win some fleeting good will for the United States. What the public never knew, because neither the President nor Mr. Johnson saw any point in talking about it, was that each of these major trips produced an incisive and helpful report for the guidance of American policy.

President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk learned to rely on these reports, whether written or oral, and that is why they were always glad when Mr. Johnson could go on a foreign mission for a few days. As a result of this experience, President Johnson personally knows more about the world figures with whom he will be discussing the major questions of foreign policy in the next few months.

It has never been a secret to Mr. Johnson's friends that he would have done some things differently, or would have changed President Kennedy's emphasis in doing them. But there never was a murmur of discontent, never a suggestion of grievance, never an impulse to criticize. His loyalty to President Kennedy's program, both domestic and foreign, was unlimited and uncalculated.

It should be remembered that President Johnson's experience with the White House goes back to the era of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he was that President's favorite young Member of Congress. Then came the crowded years of association with President Truman and President Eisenhower when he was in and out of the White House many times a week. All these experiences will help to mold his judgment and influence his decisions now.

The last 3 years have taught him a great deal—in his numerous talks with President Kennedy on the most sensitive and controversial question of national policy; by his work on the National Security Council; by his careful study of confidential Government reports and documents; and by his endless discussions with public officials. President Johnson will unquestionably bring some of his own people into positions of great responsibility into the White House. But he will make these changes very slowly, and he will aim always at preserving the greatest possible continuity in policy and personnel.

The large number of people who think that President Johnson was converted by President Kennedy to a new intense faith in racial equality and human dignity are strangely unfamiliar with his long-standing convictions, and with his personal dedication to this cause. The tone may be different in the new administration as it conducts its own campaign on civil rights but the target will remain the same.

We must think today not only of President Johnson but of his wife. She is, quite simply, and in the full meaning of the words, the most important influence in his life. Her quite wisdom and constant dignity have helped him over many hard places in the past. They will be invaluable again to him in the White House.

President Johnson has always shown that he has what amounts to a political genius in creating the largest possible consensus for legislation. He is at his best when he is working in a spirit of national unity and is speaking for the national interest. There can be no better leader in this period of tension and tragedy than President Johnson as he seeks to hold the Nation together in sedate unity and to move it forward to new achievements. He deserves not only our compassion but our cooperation and support.

He Thought He Had Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the entire civilized world paid a final tribute to a fallen leader.

It is ironic that 3 days prior to the day of this tragic event several nations joined in a tribute to a leader who suffered a similar fate.

Sunday, November 17, 1963, in the Student Union Building of Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., marked the beginning of 3 days' activities commemorating the 100th anniversay of the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

It appears fitting that the addresses given on the occasion of this anniversary be recorded for posterity.

They follow in the order of delivery:

TEXT OF REMARKS BY LT. GOV. RAYMOND P. SHAFER

I deem it a great honor to have been chosen to open these ceremonies commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I welcome the representatives of France, Great Britain, and Italy. Their presence is a singularly heart-warming tribute to the cherished memory of a beloved American.

I am privileged, too, to welcome so many of my own countrymen: the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, and you ladies and gentlemen who are here gathered.

This is the only place in the world, to my knowledge, where a monument has been erected to mark the delivery of an address.

What remarkable power did these few words, spoken here a century ago, possess that they should become immortal?

Almost as we ask the question, we are aware that they have drawn us here today.

Certainly they cannot be separated from this setting.

They cannot be separated from the event which gave rise to them.

They cannot be separated from the man who uttered them.

A boy visiting Gettysburg sees—as did boys a century ago—the excitement and the glory of war.

His father—like Lincoln—sees the tragedy.

The boy thinks how much stronger the Union is because the battle was fought.

The father thinks how much greater the Nation might have been if the issues of the Civil War could have been resolved by councils rather than cannons.

President Lincoln came to Gettysburg to pay tribue to the fallen soldiers of the North. He spoke, not of the victory, but the sacrifice. He stressed, not the valor, but the devotion. He urged, not reprisal, but reunion.

Legend has it that he wrote his remarks on the back of an envelope while en route by train from Washington—as if, in an inspired burst, they flowed from the stub of his pencil.

Whenever and however they were written, they were born out of the sorrow and anguish which had traced their toll in the furrows of his face.

They emerged from the long loneliness that was his—the long loneliness of command—the long loneliness of the test to which a dream, a hope, and an ideal had been put.

Yet they had to be spoken, so that a broken nation might look to a brighter day.

He felt that his address was a failure.

Using the language of the plowman, he told a friend it didn't scour.

In his honest humility, he had thought himself a failure. He had tried to preserve the Union by statesmanship, but in the end the task was turned over to the soldier.

Lincoln was not destined to know the heights to which his Gettysburg Address would subsequently soar.

He was not destined to know that, in time, he would personify the cause to which he gave the last full measure of his own devotion.

He was not destined to know that he would, as those whom he had come to honor, go into the shadow of the valley of death before there would be a rebirth of freedom.

But he saw with uncommon clarity that, when the carnage was over, the reconstruction of the Republic would have to be the work of both North and South.

He saw with uncommon clarity that if the Union were dissolved, those in distant lands who looked to America as a model, might lose faith in the ability of free men to govern themselves.

And if Lincoln was not spared to see his dream fulfilled, the testament of faith and hope which he gave here would live on as the noblest expression of a noble President.

The seed of his thought did scour.

It weathered the storm of bitterness which lesser men precipitated after he was no longer here to stay the hand of retribution.

Like a perennial flower, his phrases blossom anew in the place which Lincoln would have loved most—the lips, minds and hearts of the children.

This is the power that gave his words immortality.

For a great man had spoken so simply that generations of schoolchildren could commit his sentences to memory. Pigtailed girls and freckled-faced boys would repeat them in shrill voice, in the haste of shyness—with or without expression. But somehow, if they were not fully understood, they reflected the goodness and the gentleness of Lincoln, and his spirt became a part of them.

My generation has come of age.

We read those words with the weight of maturity.

We see them through the eyes of experience—eyes that have been clouded by the tragic mists of war—eyes that are alight with the aspiration of the dream of universal peace.

And the words of Gettysburg assume new depth, new meaning—not only for Americans, but for all who, under God, love freedom.

ADDRESS AT CEREMONIES COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

(By Mr. J. E. Chadwick, Minister, British Embassy)

Lieutenant Governor, Secretary Rusk, Your Excellencies, Dr. Hanson, ladies and gentlemen, Her Majesty's Ambassador has asked me to express his profound regrets that a long standing engagement in New York has prevented him from being here today.

It is fitting, however, that I should be his representative, just as Mr. McDougall represented the British Minister, Lord Lyons, in that historic scene 100 years ago.

I have been asked to speak about what the Gettysburg Address has meant to my country since then.

In Britain, as for that matter in the United States, it was some time before the deep significance of President Lincoln's words was fully understood.

They did not at once evoke the emotion and admiration with which our people responded to Lincoln's second inaugural, an address which the London Times of the day described as "the most sublime state paper of the century."

This was praise, indeed.

For neither the Times nor the administration of Lord Palmerston, nor the Victorian Establishment generally had been particularly friendly to President Lincoln.

There were complex political and economic reasons for this, most of them unrelated to the issue of slavery.

But such leaders of the parliamentary opposition as John Bright and Richard Cobden championed Lincoln and the Union cause up and down our islands.

The masses of the people, who were only beginning to be politically articulate, responded to Lincoln as to no other statesman of the day.

A contemporary American journalist noted that unlike the Government, the British people "believe that ours is the cause of freedom against slavery, of democracy against privilege, of labor against hereditary capital and property."

When the news of Lincoln's death reached London, the wave of sympathy which swept the country astonished American observers.

Memorial meetings and services were held all over the country.

Both Houses of Parliament within 24 hours formally expressed in an address to the crown their sympathies with the Government and the people of the United States; and Queen Victoria penned her famous letter to Mrs. Lincoln, "from a widow to a widow."

From that time on, the Gettysburg address worked like leaven in British political thought, and Lincoln became for all in Britain, in every stratum of society, and of every political color, a model of courageous leadership in the march toward a compassionate and humanitarian democracy.

The address which we commemorate today came to be adopted and established as one of the noblest expressions of British ideals.

What is more, because it has been adopted into British thought, the British way of life, it has greatly contributed to bringing to pass Lincoln's own wish, expressed in his well-known message to the spinners and weavers of Manchester. I quote his words: "Whatever else may happen, whatever misfortune may befall your country or my own, the peace and friendship which now exist between the two nations will be, as it shall be my desire to make them, perpetual."

In this 20th century we have endured two world wars in which Western civilization as a whole has been called upon to face an inescapable moral challenge of the same order as confronted Lincoln.

National leaders in both Britain and the United States have been deeply conscious of this.

You have only to reread their speeches to note how often they went back to Lincoln, and particularly to the Gettysburg Address, to find the most profound and eloquent definition of what we were fighting for.

The gates of Janus's temple are still not closed.

We are engaged in a struggle for the hearts and minds of men in which, now as then, the freedom and dignity of the human individual are the central issue.

This struggle is not to be thought of as merely a contest between rival nations of titanic power or between rival theories of social and economic organization.

It comprehends these rivalries; but beyond them, it is fundamentally a struggle between two standards of values.

For us in Britain, as for you in the United States, and for our great allies, the standard which we uphold, the standard which we must proclaim to all the world, is the moral and spiritual standard defined by Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address.

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS CENTENNIAL

(By His Excellency Sergio Fenoaltea, Ambassador of Italy)

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Rusk, distinguished colleagues, and guests, ladies and gentlemen, when a century ago my predecessor the Italian Minister accepted an invitation to make the 6-hour trip to come here from Washington, it was to convey, with his presence at the consecration of Gettysburg's cemetery, the feeling and hopes of a European nation which at that very time was struggling to achieve its own unity—the same goal which inspired "the brave men * * * who struggled here."

After 100 years, after so many events and turning points in history, we are here today to express the same feelings and hopes, which have remained actual and alive, as are the words of Lincoln's immortal address, and to confirm our faith in a human society "conceived in liberty."

President Lincoln's message made a profound impact in Italy at that time. May I quote two of his contemporaries: Mazzini and Garibaldi, the prophet and the fighter of Italian unity.

Commenting on the victory of the Union, Mazzini wrote in 1865: "You have done more for us in 4 years, than 50 years of teaching, preaching, and w ting from all your European brothers have been able to do."

From a message addressed by a group of Italian patriots to President Lincoln, of which Garibaldi was the first signatory, I quote: "If in the midst of your titanic battles, our voice can yet reach you, let us, O Lincoln, free sons of Columbus, send you a word of good wishes and admiration for the great work you have begun. * * * You will pass to posterity with the name of the Emancipator; more enviable than any crown or any human treasure."

It was this message that prompted Mazzini to remark: "The principle in the name of which Garibaldi sends a salute to Lincoln—the principle that God has set as goal of the American battles * * * is the holiest possible * * * it is the principle of humanity."

Finally may I cite from a letter Garibaldi wrote to an American friend: "I do not doubt of the triumph of the cause of the Union * * * but if the war should unfortunately continue * * * I shall overcome all obstacles which detain me, to hasten to the defense of a people who are so dear to me."

No wonder that the Italians were present on this battlefield with a number of volunteers. Some of them are now resting in Gettsyburg's cemetery.

Lincoln's address holds its rightful place among the immortal messages which the idealism of the New World has conveyed to the Old. One century after the American Nation has achieved its unity. We men and women of the 20th century must be grateful to divine providence for having vested a Nation, inspired by so high an idealism, with so great a strength. Because it is on the unique combination of American strength and American idealism that, in this century, rests the primary and certainly the strongest safeguard for all men and women who are and intend to remain free.

The historians tell us that Lincoln's words were heard in silence; they evoked no cheers. This can happen when great men speak in terms which go beyond the horizons of their generation.

But, while the veil of oblivion has shrouded many a speech which at the moment stirred the enthusiam of the crowd, we continue to honor Lincoln't message. His words will be remembered and repeated every time that, confronted with a threat, men will fear that freedom might "perish from the earth."

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY H. E. M. HERVE ALPHAND, FRENCH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

One hundred years ago, on the very same battlefield where we are gathered today, my predecessor, the French Envoy, M. Mercier, was at Lincoln's side when he uttered his unforgettable address. More fortunate than I, M. Mercier found himself in the comfortable position of listening without having to speak.

As all great masterpieces, as the best of Pericles and Demosthenes, Lincoln's words belong not only to one country but to mankind as a whole. To us they remain as a lesson which will forever endure.

First a lesson in humility: in all modesty Lincoln believed that "the world would little note, nor long remember, what he said here." How mistaken he was.

Then a lesson in brevity: in 268 words, loaded with thoughts, he left in the minds of men imprints that will never wear out. Let those totalitarian politicians who deem it necessary to speak for 8 hours whenever

they stand on a podium, learn by this example.

In fact, I know of but one exhortation which was shorter than Lincoln's, but whose aim was identical: I am referring to the three words which our Revolution bequeathed as its national motto to the French Republic three words which have also made their way around the world and, today as yesterday, remain the inspired lifeline of our two peoples: liberty, justice, fraternity.

Liberty, main theme of Lincoln's canticle; liberty for the sake of which our nations fought three times since your Republic was born, to defend your independence at time, ours at other times and again the independence of some others. Liberty which brings us today side by side on the autobahn to Berlin, since we have to fight once more against a new kind of tyranny which would like to dominate the world.

Equality, because in this country where "all men are created equal" your Government is still struggling against the dark forces of discrimination which Lincoln opposed; and because we also want this equality among nations, we, who within a few years, have recognized the existence of nearly 20 of them, in Asia as well as in Africa, and cannot accept that the rights of self-determination should not be recognized also to old peoples in Central and Eastern Europe.

Last of all fraternity, because you and us wish that "these dead shall not have died in vain," that each one of us may live without danger, and according to his own choice, that despite the differences in ideologies, a brotherly cooperation be established among men for the fulfillment of the great tasks awaiting us and first of all assistance to those two billion human beings who have been living for centuries like their ancestors, deprived of the bare necessities.

The hatred spread all over the world and to which so many recent events bear testimony, shows us that this time has not come yet. But it is up to us, the living, to act in such a way, without respite or desperation, following at times different paths, that peace in liberty and justice reign at last among us.

At no time in their history did France and the United States cease to struggle in unison, so that "this unfinished work be nobly advanced."

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE

One hundred years ago there came to this community a most remarkable man whose memory is revered by all of us who are the heirs of those who fought here—both in blue and in gray. He spoke here about ancient verities—not as a sophisticated philosopher—but as a man who felt deeply about the hopes which lie in the heart of man. It was a speech of only 10 sentences, 271 words. It disappointed many who heard it, and the man who gave it thought it was a failure. But it has become the most widely read speech ever made by an American and perhaps by anyone in the English language. It has been translated into every written language and is cherished around the world.

In accepting the Latin version for deposit in the Vatican Library in 1959, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, His Excellency Egidio Vagnozzi, called the Gettysburg Address not only "a great American document" but also a great Christian document—"one of the greatest documents ever issued by man."

What is there about those words which makes them memorable? In the original tongue they have beauty and cadence—"the vibrations of deathless music." They express tender sentiments. But these qualities are inadequate to account for their indelible imprint. What makes it great and enduring is the simple eloquence with which it restates the ideas to which this Nation is dedicated: "liberty * * * the proposition that all men are created equal * * * government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Lincoln believed, with the authors of the Declaration of Independence, that the large principles it set forth were universal truths. As he saw the meaning of the American revolution: "It was not the mere matter of separation of the colonies from the motherland—but something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time."

Lincoln believed, with the authors of our Constitution, that they were founding a "new order of the ages," as our great seal puts it.

He believed, with Washington, that "the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the defense of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

He believed that this experiment was the "last best hope of earth."

He believed that the central issue in the struggle in which this Nation was engaged a century ago was whether this or any nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" could "long endure." And let us not forget that his reaffirmation of the American commitment to that "proposition that all men are created equal" had been preceded by the Emancipation Proclamation.

The advocates of democracy in many other lands saw the central issue as Lincoln saw it. From England, John Bright wrote: "There is no other political constitution now in existence, in the preservation of which the human race is so deeply interested." From France, liberal republicans spoke out—Edouard Laboulaye said "the cause of America is the cause of liberty" and "should liberty become eclipsed in the New World, it would become night in Europe." From Italy, Garibaldi and his friends hailed Lincoln as the "pilot of liberty." Carl Schurz and other German democrats, many of whom had come to this country after the failure of their own revolution of 1848, saw the struggle in the same light.

After Lincoln's death, a noted French liberal, Lucien Anatole Prevost-Paradol, wrote: "He has not lived for his country alone, since he leaves to everyone in the world to whom liberty and justice are dear, a great remembrance and a pure example."

As our own Brooker T. Washington put it: "By the same token that Lincoln made America free, he pushed back the boundaries of freedom everywhere, gave the spirit of liberty a wider influence throughout the world, and reestablished the dignity of man as man."

Over the years, admiration for Lincoln has spread into other parts of the earth. Sun Yat-sen, the father of the Chinese liberal revolution, drew his three principles of government from the Gettysburg Address. The Lincoln Memorial is a mecca for millions of visitors to Washington every year, including tens upon tens of thousands from abroad. Prime Minister Nehru has kept on a study table a brass mold of Lincoln's right hand. A few years ago high school students in Tokyo ranked him as one of the most respected of all world figures. And Tolstoi said that "of all the great national statesmen of history, Lincoln is the only giant" and predicted that his name would live thousands of years.

Thus Lincoln is a worldwide symbol of freedom and democracy. And the Gettysburg Address is the utterance through which his dedication—and ours as a people—to freedom and democracy is most widely known. Indeed, the central commitments of the American experiment are probably known to more people in other lands through the words of the Gettysburg Address than through those of the Declaration of Independence.

People all around the world not only know of these central commitments but share them. Liberty, equality, the dignity of the individual, "the government of the people, by the people, and for the people"—these are aspirations rising out of the nature of man.

Since the World War II nearly 50 new nations have emerged. Nearly all are republics or democracies, at least in name. Unhappily, some are in reality dictatorships. In some, the early national governments have tolerated no opposition. In others, democratic governments collapsed or were overthrown. But the yearnings for genuine political freedom have not been eradicated. They are manifest in every nation, including those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Our commitments to freedom are the source of our foreign policy. They explain our attitude toward colonial questions, our concern about the future of Eastern Europe, and why we are more comfortable in dealing with democracies than with dictatorships. They explain also our concern about our failures here at home to live up fully to our own great commitments.

The independence we won for ourselves we have favored for others. We have welcomed the rise of the former colonial peoples to "the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." We want to see these new nations make solid progress—economically, socially, and politically.

Within the free world, old empires have been largely replaced by new partnerships between the less developed and the advanced countries—partnerships based on political equality.

But new empires have appeared, clothing their lust for domination with ideology which plunders the noble concepts of freedom to subvert freedom itself. There are large and dangerous questions which call for final solution—and there is no more enduring basis for settlement than the simple notion of self-determination: let the people themselves decide.

For almost two centuries we have been opposed to dictatorship. We remain so today—and will be opposed tomorrow. We recognize that there are many possible forms of democratic institutions. But we believe deeply in political democracy, individual dignity, and the rule of law. We do not like it when democratic institutions are suppressed. We believe that the setbacks which democracy has suffered in many of the new nations, and a few old ones, will be temporary. For we know that ordinary men and women throughout the world respond to Lincoln's phrase "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Likewise, we will not be at ease until every one of our own citizens enjoys in full the rights pledged by the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. The National Government is heavily committed to insuring these rights for all.

The rest of the world is watching closely the struggle for full equality in this country. Our failures distress our friends and hearten our enemies. But this is not the main reason why we must complete this task. We must complete it as a duty to ourselves. It is past time to complete the task which Lincoln began with the Emancipation Proclamation.

We are a powerful Nation—with almost incomprehensible power. Our farms and factories are ever more bountiful. We enjoy levels of well-being almost beyond the dreams of men a generation or two ago. But our greatest strength lies in the ideas about freedom and human dignity which gave birth to our Nation and to which Lincoln renewed our dedication in the Gettys-

burg Address. These ideas, these aspirations, are shared today by a great majority of mankind. They bind us with others throughout the world. They are the mightiest force in the world today. They are the enduring memorial to the apostles of liberty for all men, of whom none has been greater than Abraham Lincoln.

Truthful Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation still gropes from the shadows of unbelief in the tragic death of our late President John F. Kennedy, still numbed by a cowardly, dastardly act, the absolute need of national unity never was more recognized than at this time. All Members of Congress have pledged their cooperation and help in the immediate trying days ahead. But, as we strive to move forward in strength and unity, let us not take part in damning our Nation for this tragedy. I believe the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, published in today's edition, November 26, 1963, points out some very dangerous trends and pitfalls in our Nation's necessary recovery. Permit me to quote the last sentence from this editorial:

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

The editorial follows:

NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio, or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on the people of Dallas because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

The Blackest Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the various newspaper publications throughout our land have come forward with editorial offerings relating to the tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

I insert into the RECORD two articles in this respect from two newspapers in my State of Maine, one the Lewiston Daily Sun and the other the Lewiston Evening Journal. I commend their content to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

PRESIDENT ASSASSINATED

An assassin's bullets have destroyed the life of the President of the United States, and changed the course of history.

The rifle shots which rang out as the official motorcade rode through the streets of Dallas, Tex., wrote a violent end to the career of President John F. Kennedy and plunged the Nation and the world into mourning.

In the brief moments of the terrifying sound of gunfire, the President and the Governor of Texas lay wounded. America's First Lady had flung herself in front of her husband in a brave but vain attempt to shield him from the bullets which already had found their mark.

President Kennedy was in Texas as part of an effort to strengthen the Democratic Party there. He had spoken out against factionalism and strife within his party. He did not foresee that a fanatical assassin would take matters into his own hands to strike a blow against life itself. Even the extraordinary precautions always taken to protect a President were not enough.

Violence is common to the politics of many countries. It is unusual and all the more shocking in the United States. That there were hotbeds of extremism in the West and Southwest has been a matter of common knowledge. That it would kindle the awful flames of assassination was unexpected.

The President's assassination cut short his brilliant career at its very height. He was in the preliminary stages of a campaign for another 4-year term, although he had made no official announcement of his candidacy. His visit to Texas, like the tours into other parts of the country, including the recent trip to the University of Maine, formed part of that background campaign.

Every American, regardless of party, has suffered a personal loss. America has lost an outstanding leader whose brave program for a peaceful world was the hope of all mankind.

There are no words to soothe the pain of his grief-stricken wife and family. But an America in mourning strives to share that great sorrow.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Evening Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

THE BLACKEST DAY

Today we, the American people, mourn the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. There are no words which can be written to describe adequately the depth of emotion we are feeling over the untimely, brutal, calculated murder of our youthful President.

His near 3 years as leader of our Nation were marked by severe international crises, domestic problems that featured racial bitterness in the South and in some of our larger cities and problems involving a Congress which did not always see eye to eye with him insofar as certain important legislative matters were concerned. Despite the complex and often irritating issues which faced President Kennedy these past 3 years, he maintained a basic good humor and a sense of purpose that made his political opponents like him as a man and admire him for his persistency.

The great warmth of the late President was exemplified many times during the course of

his press conferences. Many Maine citizens had a recent opportunity to witness it upon his visitation to the University of Maine where he received an honorary degree. And most remembered of all, of course, were those pictures of John Kennedy which appeared in the press and on the television screen to show him the uninhibited, loving father and family man.

Friday, November 22, 1963, will go down in American history as one of the blackest days this Nation has ever faced. It definitely represents the most tragic single event since the surprise attack upon Pearl Harbor. It was a deed most obviously undertaken by one imbued with the stark, deadly hatred which moves only within those who have taken up the cause of the lunatic left or the radical right. The assassination of President Kennedy carries within it the curse of Cain as so often witnessed to by those who are extremists. May his death bring all who have veered over into paths of intolerance and hatred back to the reality demanded of all who have faith in God; back to a realization that intolerance and hatred solve nothing, and that only love of one's fellow man possesses the virtue to bring understanding.

There are no tears shed which can relieve use of a terrible sense of loneliness and lostness. There are no emotions sufficient to disclose the measure of our sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy, 6-year-old Caroline, and 3-year-old John. Only through our prayers and our faith may we hope to walk from the valley of shadow back into the light.

Today the world shares the bereavement of John Kennedy's family and friends. May the American people of the immediate tomorrow assure the end of any similar future tragedy by dedicating themselves to the sacred task of building and preserving peace for our time at home and abroad. Then and only then may the American people proclaim that the death of this dedicated American was not in vain.

What Makes America Great?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished newspaper in my district, the Decatur Daily, asked this question in a recent editorial: "What Makes America Great?"

The editorial found the answer to this question in a few sentences composed by my friend and colleague of the Alabama congressional delegation, CARL ELLIOTT. Mr. ELLIOTT's words, and the editorial, written before we were overwhelmed by recent tragic events, provide us, I believe, with much needed guidance for the critical days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHAT MAKES AMERICA GREAT?

In this day and time we have some organizations which claim to have a monopoly on Americanism. To hear them tell it they, and only they, know what it takes to make and keep America great.

Making and keeping America great though it seems to us, is pretty much an individual responsibility.

So we were attracted to what Representative CARL ELLIOTT had to say recently in one of his weekly reports to the people. He said in part:

"I have always wanted America to be first in everything that matters: education, job opportunities, military strength, world leadership, progress in outer space, the eradication of disease—first in all the things which spark the continued advancement of a great and growing Nation."

Those are the words of an individual American. True, he is a Member of Congress from Alabama. The people of his congressional district saw to that. Then the people of the whole State had to say who was going to Congress and again they sent CARL ELLIOTT and in the one paragraph quoted above we see the real reason for their decision.

Here is a man who believes in America. Here is a man who spends his days working for America.

And we would like to tell you something else; there are many more like him in Congress or this Nation would not occupy the position of world leadership that we occupy.

Mark you well, there is no hate expressed in those words of Representative ELLIOTT; he is not tearing down, he is building up through individual effort, and if you ask our opinion of this brand of Americanism we will reply that it is the best brand we know anything about. It is the brand felt by most of the American people in their own hearts and although they may not have a forum in which to say it, they believe it and act it and thus is America great, made so by her sons and daughters.

The Nat King Cole Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this body the unheralded but decidedly extraordinary service that one outstanding American has been performing for our country.

I refer to a man born Nathaniel Coles, better known to us as Nat King Cole. This man, the son of a poor Alabama farmer-preacher, has risen by virtue of sheer talent and character to be one of the top members of his profession, enjoying an affection in the hearts of the public shared by few other entertainers.

During the over of a quarter of a century that Nat Cole has been before the public he has changed but little physically, but he has grown to be a figure of international importance. He has sold over 50 million records, performed in literally thousands of concert halls and theaters throughout the world. He has traveled to over a score of foreign countries including Japan, Sweden, England, France, and Australia, to mention just a few. His unique voice and his own remarkable presence have made him a great ambassador of good will without portfolio, for our country, for whenever Nat Cole entered a foreign country, whatever its attitude may have been when he arrived, we know from the reception he received that he improved our image and made a legion of friends for us.

At a time when monarchs throughout the world reign in a shrinking market America can well boast of this king who extends his admirable domain peacefully and happily as the years pass. He symbolizes for us and for our neighbors abroad much of the best that is America, a kind of dignity, of integrity and assurance of bearing, a kind of indestructible character that is a credit to his people and to the United States.

This coming year Nat Cole will be traveling once more abroad to Europe for an extended concert tour. He is a man, above all, who feels strongly that whenever he sets foot outside this country he represents us. It would indeed be wonderful if we could be sure that every representative of ours brought as much prestige and created as much good will for America as Nat King Cole.

The Nat King Cole story follows:

THE NAT KING COLE STORY

Twenty-five years ago, on a hot summer evening in 1937, a slim young musician named Nathaniel Adams Coles nervously made his way to the bandstand of Hollywood's tiny Swanee Inn. After seating himself at the piano, he signaled the two men behind him to begin playing. At that moment entertainment history was made.

The Nat King Cole Trio was born.

The ensuing quarter-century saw the world in the most violent state of upheaval in its history. With this turbulence also came extraordinary mechanical, electronic, and social changes that were to have a profound effect on the people involved in the volatile world of show business.

Over this long period one star, perhaps more than any other in the popular field of record and nightclub performing, has endured and thrived in a unique manner: he has not only held the generation of afficionados who discovered him in the thirties; he has won for himself the youngsters of his early fans.

In short, Nat Cole bridges successfully two generations, and is well on his way to winning as fans the grandchildren of his original devotees—truly a remarkable achievement. Today Cole is one of the highest paid nightclub artists in the world.

He is Capitol Records' top singing star.

He has his own film, TV, and theatrical company (named after his son Kelly), Kell-Cole Productions and headed by Ike Jones. It has produced, among other projects, two editions of his own musical show, "Sights and Sounds."

He recently established his own recording company, K-C Records, which is enjoying considerable success.

And yet, Nat has changed little. The initial nervousness is long gone, but the physical appearance of the slim, young musician seems to remain unchanged by the years. His superb style seems to conjure a warm nostalgia among his audiences which makes the older ones look back and the younger look forward.

Cole's immense personal appeal is one that transcends national barriers. Throughout Latin America and the Orient he has rated for the past decade as one of our top record sellers. His tours of these countries and Europe have demonstrated that Cole's unique voice is his passport and entry to alien-tongued peoples, succeeding in winning friends for America in many an instance where official ambassadors have failed.

In fact, a few years ago when then Vice President Richard Nixon was greeted with violent demonstrations of hostility in Caracas, Cole followed him only a few days later for a concert appearance. The singer was met by an unprecedented crowd of 16,000 at the airport with expressions of affection and enthusiasm as warm as Nixon's reception was hostile.

Equally important is the affection and respect he has won from his fellow performers. This is illustrated by a singular kind of testimony to the esteem in which Nat Cole is held by members of his own profession. This occurred several years ago when he launched his network television show, the first ever headlined by a Negro performer.

The budget on the show was such that Nat actually lost money doing it—but he succeeded in getting a remarkable roster of guests including such stars as Stan Kenton, Sammy Davis, Jr., Peggy Lee, Ella Fitzgerald, Johnny Mercer and Hugh O'Brian, to name a few. All of them waived their usual four- or five-figure salaries to appear on Nat's show to work for minimum scale. Some even paid their own expenses from New York to Hollywood to do it.

The story of the man who occupies such an extraordinary position in the affections of the public and the members of his profession is one that deserves examination at this quarter-century mark.

It was the year 1937. In America, the hopes of everyone were rooted in the word "recovery." But if the depression seemed to be nearing an end for most of the Nation, it had only deepened early that year for the wandering minstrels of a road show with the peculiarly fitting title, "Shuffle Along."

The revue had shuffled all the way from Chicago to Long Beach, Calif., when an employee with obviously scant optimism for the show's future resigned without notice. More than that, he helped himself to the company's entire bankroll, $800, as his severance pay. "Shuffle Along" ground to a dead stop right there—and disintegrated.

Being broke and stranded in a strange town is never a pleasure to anyone. To one member of the company, its 18-year-old bandleader, Nathaniel Adams Coles, it was akin to a major calamity. Not only was he a rookie in show business, but he was very reluctant to write home for money since his father, the Reverend Edward Coles, a Baptist minister in Chicago, was considerably less than enthusiastic over having his children trotting around the country tooting horns and plunking pianos.

Young Nat wisely decided to make the best of his bad bargain and rough it out in California—at least until he could raise enough money to go home with his head held high.

For the next several months he pounded beer-soaked Baldwins and scotch-stained Steinways in dives from Bakersfield to San Diego. His asking price was 5 bucks a night, but he could be had for less, and usually was.

During that year one thing happened to the lanky, good-natured youngster. He abbreviated his name to Nat Cole, and one night while he was working in the old Los Angeles Century Club, a gagster slipped a paper crown on his head and dubbed him "King." From that night forward, he was to be Nat "King" Cole.

Looking back over the quarter century since then from the relative security of his present fame (his recordings sell more than 7 million copies a year) and fortune (an average income well over $10,000 a week), Nat Cole may well wonder what his life might have been if fate had not sent him to the bottom of the class so early in his career.

Because from the fold-up of "Shuffle Along" until today, Cole's life has been punctuated with setbacks that have turned out to be breaks. Some of them were large enough to provide him with footholds in his climb to the top of one of the toughest heaps in the world.

His singing is perhaps the outstanding example. One of Cole's stops on his job-hunting rounds as an itinerant pianist was a Hollywood nightclub, the previously referred to Swanee Inn (which is still operating). The manager offered to pay Cole $75 a week if he could come up with a quartet overnight. At the time, for that kind of money Nat would have produced the Philadelphia Symphony—or at least tried. He rushed out and corralled guitarist Oscar Moore, bass player Wesley Prince and a drummer whose name remains unrecorded because he failed to show up for work on opening night.

The trio was hardly an immediate sensation. That was the era of the big bands. Club owners demanded plenty of bodies and plenty of noise for their money. An instrumental trio—the group was strictly voiceless—was about an marketable as a vaudeville juggling act. Still, the King Cole Swingsters, as they were known then, did begin attracting the attention of jazz aficionados, attracted by the trio's musical purity. In time, club bookers became aware that these fans, small in number and strange in tastes though they might be, were willing to put their money where their loyalty was. When that understanding got around, Cole and his cohorts found that they were working with encouraging regularity. Sometimes their leader's take-home pay ran as high as $25 a week

It was during this cushy engagement at the Swanee Inn in Los Angeles, that Cole suffered another humiliating setback—or so, at least, it seemed to him at the time. One of those inevitable lushes in the audience, who wouldn't have known a dissonant chord from a harpischord and wouldn't have cared, came stumbling to the bandstand and demanded that Nat sing his favorite tune, "Sweet Lorraine."

Cole was gentle. "We don't sing," he said softly.

The portly patron was in no mood to be put off, however. He brought his eyes to focus on Cole and in the voice of a platoon sergeant commanded, "Sing." That brought the manager of the place on the double. He summed up the situation on his mental cash register and gave Cole the word: "Sing. This guy's a big spender. Sometimes 3 bucks a night."

Nat Cole sang, nervously, reluctantly and, although there were no critics around at the time to comment on his performance, probably not very well. Certainly he had no training, and by the vocal standards of the day, his voice scarcely could have been called naturally golden.

Yet today that voice is among the best known in the world of popular music, has impressed itself on probably more hit records than any other and is considered one of the most saleable commodities in the always tricky recording business.

If Nat Cole's success story followed the Hollywood film formula, that first timorous rendition of "Sweet Lorraine" would have been the climax. But it wasn't. The truth is that Cole wasn't then particularly impressed with his voice, although in the 25 years since then critics have graced it with such terms as "pussy-willow textured."

And so he submerged himself again in the trio, which prospered increasingly as its cult of followers swelled. The bookings were progressively better until the group reached the once famous Trocadero, where a room was named for it.

With that sore of encouragement, the next logical step was a nationwide tour. It was logical, but it wasn't especially successful. The trio's ulkewarm reception was made worse when bass player Prince was drafted into the Army. Cole's return to the kindlier atmosphere of Los Angeles was anything but triumphant.

Meantime, however, Gene Wallichs, a music store owner whom Cole had met while playing at the Radio Room next door, had teamed with songwriter Johnny Mercer and formed a new recording company—Liberty Records, later to become Capitol.

The company struggled through its first year and, in 1943, Wallichs heard Cole and his reorganized trio play "Straighten Up and Fly Right," a tune Nat had written during his lean years and sold for $50 to pay the rent. On the strength of it, Wallichs offered Cole a contract to record that song and do some other solo singing. That last part didn't appeal to Nat much, but he agreed. "Straighten Up and Fly Right," of course, was the first of his—and Capitol's—smash hits.

Still, Cole considered himself a full-time instrumentalist and a part-time singer. In the next 3 years, he and the trio made a number of records which today are regarded as collectors' items by jazz buffs, who rank Cole among the finest jazz pianists of all time.

So great was their reverence for him, in fact, that when he decided in 1946 to stake his future on his voice, instead of his fingers, some of his fans screamed with outrage that he was "selling out."

But Cole had set his course, a risky one but one he was determined to follow. For every jazz devotee who had listened raptly to his pianistics, hundreds of new followers were waiting just to hear his unique, breathy singing. As a single attraction in nightclubs and on records he made more money than he had dreamed possible before.

And in 1947, in a $20,000 wedding, the second largest in Harlem history, Cole married Maria Ellington, a pretty band vocalist, who was more than willing to abandon her own career to become King Cole's queen. While they were honeymooning in Mexico, Capitol wired him that his latest recording, the strange, haunting "Nature Boy," was another smash hit. The world was a bright place, indeed, for Nat Cole.

His tenure on cloud nine was characteristically brief. Cole still had a lot to learn—and quite a few things to teach.

Shortly after the honeymoon, he and his bride purchased a sumptuous, ivy-covered tudor-style home in Hancock Park, an exclusive Los Angeles residential area. Some of the homeowners in the neighborhood felt strongly about what they called an "invasion" of the district by Negroes.

But the Coles stuck, turned the other cheek and, without being obsequious, tried to make friends with their neighbors. An attorney for the outraged property owners called on Nat to announce that, "We don't want undersirable people coming here." The singer replied with typical candor, "Neither do I, and if I see anybody undersirable coming into this neighborhood, I'll be the first to complain."

In time all the ruffled feelings were soothed so successfully that when a next-door neighbor wanted to employ the Coles' gardener, he first came to Nat and asked permission to make the gardener an offer.

But what racial misunderstanding couldn't accomplish, Uncle Sam almost did. As befalls many such an open-handed, easy-come-easy-go entertainer as Cole, he awakened one morning to find that the Government had slapped an attachment on his beloved home and had a $150,000 bill against him for back income taxes. Nat, who had always proceeded on the carefree assumption that someone else was taking care of those details, was thunderstruck. When the shock wore off, he sat down with the tax men and promised to make good. It took several years, and he drove himself two-thirds of the way to the grave to do it, but he made it. It cost him far more than money.

In 1953, all the long smouldering worries, frustrations and resentments erupted within him, and he collapsed in the wings of Carnegie Hall during an Easter recital. The diagnosis was acute ulcers and internal hemorrhaging. The cure was surgery to remove half his stomach—and a drastic change of attitude on his part.

Since that brush with tragedy, Nat Cole has become more taciturn, more introspective and less easy to lean on. He has learned to invest his money—and has build an efficiently operating organization around him-

self that allows him a more reasonable amount of time for the things he loves most—his wife, their children, Carol, Natalie, Nat Kelly, Casey and Timolin, and baseball, to which he is hopelessly addicted.

Among the principals in that organization are the head of his recently formed Kell-Cole Production Co., Ike Jones, who produced "The Merry World of Nat King Cole" at the Greek Theater in 1961 which set a record gross of $101,000 in a week's engagement. (Cole returns there this year in August). There is also his attorney, Leo Branton, and his longtime manager, Carlos Gastel, all of them playing important roles in keeping the Cole machinery functioning smoothly.

No amount of planning, however, can stave off all defeats, especially for a man as willing to gamble as Nat Cole. And so he has had his fair share of them, perhaps even more, to go with his incredibly indestructible success as a nightclub and recording artist.

Probably the bitterest of them, to Cole, was what happened to his network television show in 1957. Actually, the show was on the air for 64 weeks and could have remained if Cole had submitted to an airtime change insisted upon by NBC.

But it didn't accomplish what Nat had hoped for and sacrificed for. It was a costly venture. Besides plowing part of his own salary back into the production costs, he turned down $500,000 worth of nightclub dates to stick with it.

Why did it mean so much to him? Although Cole never has been a shouting crusader for Negro rights, in his own quiet way he has always espoused the cause of racial equality, often more effectively than its more militant adherents. As the first Negro ever to have his own weekly show on TV, to him fell the opportunity, and the burden, of proving that such a program could achieve public acceptance on both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line.

Cole proved that. His show had a sound rating and drew excellent reviews. The biggest names in show business guest-starred on it. But one of the peculiar details of the electronic medium defeated him. No national sponsor dared back Cole's play. In some areas, the program was sponsored regionally and successfully by the tab payers, but the big spenders of Madison Avenue, without whose support the show could not long survive, looked the other way.

Another blow to his pride and pocketbook was the premature closing of his musical "I'm With You," several years ago in Detroit before it had a chance to open on Broadway, Nat's ultimate goal. The show had opened on the road in San Francisco to reviews that were as complimentary as usual to Cole, but tepid to the musical itself. Despite heroic efforts on Cole's part and the infusion of considerable money, the show folded.

But the setbacks were few in comparison with the triumphs. After 19 years as a recording artist, his is still the first name on the list of singers whom music publishers hope to enlist to wax their latest tune. If he does, he still gives those tunes an 80–20 chance of becoming hits.

The number of nightclub engagements and concerts he can play are limited only by the number of nightclubs and concert impresarios who can afford the Cole tariff.

The 20-year Cole record of accomplishment over setbacks and disappointments is one that anyone could be proud to claim. For such a record to belong to the Alabama-born son of a minister who might never have sung at all if a slicker had not absconded with $800 and a nightclub drunk had not insisted on hearing someone wail "Sweet Lorraine," it might be classified as a minor miracle.

A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a sermon delivered last Sunday at Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church by the assistant minister, the Reverend Robert Clyde Curry.

This sermon was but one of thousands delivered on a Sunday but 2 days removed from the tragic event of last Friday. This sermon, like the others, undoubtedly replaced one already prepared. Many of them, I have read, were excellent and reflected something of the greatness of this Nation, its tremendous and ultimate unity.

Washington, D.C., is a church-going city, and last Sunday Washington's churches were crowded. Chevy Chase Presbyterian was one of these. We listened intently as Reverend Curry spoke from his heart and with fiercely honest conviction.

At the earnest suggestion of others who heard this fine sermon, I am pleased to use my privilege to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE PEOPLE OF THE MAN—IN MEMORIUM, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY (MAY 29, 1917–NOVEMBER 22, 1963)

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has died. He has been taken from our lives and from our history. The last rites of his communion have been administered. We declare with them the words of assurance from "The Book of Common Worship" of our communion:

"Unto the mercy of Almighty God, we commend the soul of our brother departed, in the sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The shock and shame of our President's death stuns and angers. We are stunned to think that one so great and so young could be destroyed so easily. Anger boils with intensity and self-righteousness as we strike out at the deed, the individual, at the place, the time. Weak we become as we weep openly or within for the life of another human being untimely dead; for his wife, his daughter and son, his close-knit family, his future. We are made fearful and anxious because leadership has been lost, the course of history profoundly altered. And what of our history? What of the "land of the free and the home of the brave?" A leader has been lost. Another shall arise. A President has been killed. What he believed in is enmeshed in policies and programs yet to be realized. But what of the land? He is dead, but we, the people, live on. He is gone, but the land remains. His life has been sacrificed—but our life continues. What of our land and her people?

In this memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy let us look at the "people of the man." Let us honor and memorialize him by looking at our people, our Nation whom he served, whom he loved, as whose leader he died. In his death, perhaps, we, the people, shall learn.

WHEN SHALL WE LEARN THAT TOMORROW IS ALWAYS TOO LATE?

The psalmist writes concerning the length of life, "three score years and ten and if by reason of strength they be forescore." No matter what the length of life cries the psalmist, "Teach us, O Lord, to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." "* * * that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." Does it always demand a tragic crisis for us to see, to know, to do the good? Is it only when a church school is bombed and children are killed or when a President is shot or personal tragedy strikes that we will apply our hearts unto wisdom? That suddenly the superficialities of our lives are stripped from us and we see what is true, what is of import, what is of value. Numbering our days does not mean sitting and crossing off blocks on the calendar. It means knowing, knowing that tomorrow is forever, today is now. It means knowing that life never, never stands still nor waits. It means beginning to live is not going to take place at the next party, the next stage in life, or after the next hurdle is passed, or beyond the present crisis. Life is going on now. Numbering doesn't mean listing, it means knowing the limitations. We work within our own lifespan only, no one else's. The numbering is important if only to make this clear again.

But the numbering is necessary if we are ever to apply our hearts unto wisdom. If we realize the ultimate limits then, perhaps, we can attempt to approach the immediate problems with wisdom, with insight, with courage. This is the psalmist's plea—"teach us to number our days, that we might apply our hearts unto wisdom." That we might live wisely.

Tomorrow is not only forever, it is always too late. Tomorrow is too late for one segment of our society to be accepted as men. Tomorrow is too late to remove the stigma of hate, of cruelty, of persecution from any man. Tomorrow is too far away and too slow in coming for dreamers of great dreams. Today may already be too late.

Tomorrow is too late to talk peace—for tomorrow may never come. There may be no tomorrows if today there is no peace.

Tomorrow is too late to apply our hearts unto wisdom for the wisest possible decision of our lives are needed this day.

We need to number our days.

A local newspaper had no obituary prepared on President Kennedy. On the other living Presidents such was on file. Not for Mr. Kennedy. He was too young to die. How wrong they were, and yet, how right. For he lives as a man for whom no obituary would be necessary. The man who numbers his days and applies his heart to wisdom lives not for the final number, not for infinity, but for the expression of wisdom in his life now.

When will our people learn, when will we learn that tomorrow is always too late?

WHEN WILL WE LEARN THAT SACRIFICE IS DEMANDED OF US ALL?

The words when first spoken rang with authenticity. They have since been mocked and questioned. It has been noted how little they have been realized in practical politics. Yet their truth has never lessened.

"Ask not what your country can do for you; ask only what you can do for your country."

The direction is right. The way is hard. These words were not and are not intended for the relief roles of the Nation or for the aged or for the minorities, all of whose needs are so very real. The were and are directed to every citizen who permits his Nation's destiny to be decided without either personal effort or personal concern.

Little there is that we can do as part of the mass of men. Little there is that we can affect from positions relatively unimportant and obviously removed from the power structures of our community and Nation. Little there is that the complexity of our life permits the individual, the one, to do.

And these are very real barriers. Each of us must face them. Yet just as surely the sacrifice that is demanded most is the agonizing reappraisal of our national and our personal goals. We must submit ourselves, our practical beliefs, our way of life to honest confrontation with the life that ought to be and the God who rules us all. This is never easily done nor lightly undertaken.

This Thanksgiving season must find us on our knees. Not to thank God for things. Not to thank God that we are not like other men—Communists, poor, uneducated, unsophisticated, unclean, hungry, naked. But to thank God that we are exactly as other men. To thank God that with all men we stand before Him and Him alone, as our God. To thank God that with all men we stand before Him in need and in hope, in confusion and in certainty; in desperate sorrow and anguish, but at least—at least before Him in love.

Sacrifice is sacrifice only when it costs. Of personal anxiety there is much. Confusion and questions abound. Only as we reach out to our brother with our abilities, our concern, our interest, our time, energy, and money will the action be sacrificial. It is not enough to put our gift on the long pole of the United Fund and reach out, giving, but clean; helping, but untouched. We must physically take ourselves there and bring their needs here. These two dare no longer be mutually exclusive. The sacrifice now will be real. And this is not sacrifice in a morbid, depressing sense at all. This is sacrifice that converts the life, that turns the life around, that lifts the life up. That which was or those who were hated and despised, that which was or those who were avoided and disdained, are enveloped in our love and our concern.

This agonizing reappraisal and sacrifice each of us must do. Do it for our personal goals as well as those of our Nation. Such an act cannot help but touch and affect every institution—our families, or communities, our churches, our Nation, our world. We need to recall that the prayer—"let this cup pass from my lips" was uttered in the same breath with "not my will but thine be done." And that both were raised to God in the dark night of a garden filled with death and despair, yet from which the hope of the world was to come.

"Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask only what you can do for your country"

"Ask not what you can get. Ask only what you can give."

These words ring with truth and judge us rightly in this season. When will we learn that sacrifice is demanded of us, each one of us now?

WHEN WILL WE LEARN THAT GOOD IS GOOD, BAD IS BAD, AND PEOPLE ARE BOTH?

We are a black and white culture. This has no reference to race. It means only that we tend as a people to view others, but not ourselves, as either good or bad. We identify our enemy by his badness. The popularity of westerns on television has pointedly illustrated this characteristic. Here identification of good and bad is easily and simply accomplished.

As much as we would have life be one great cineramic continuous "Winning of the West"—it is simply not this way. There is good. There is right. There are standards. Our sense of the right as a Nation has been outraged by the murder of our President. Our people and the peoples of the world unite in identifying this act as despicable, as horrible, as heinous. We know good and we know bad. And we know people, or at least we know one person, ourselves.

And we know that we are good. We know that we are not murderers. We know that we are not evil.

We know that we are not murderers, except that we do hate and our Lord has called such hate "murder of the heart." We are not evil. We are not bad. Except with the Apostle Paul we must cry out "The good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do."

When are we to learn that good is good? That there is right? And that bad is bad? That there are wrongs, and no matter how one rationalizes or excuses them from their lives, they remain wrong? And that we, the people, are both? When will we learn to distinguish between the sin and the sinner? When will we learn that the greatest tragedy that can befall a man is not death, but to be isolated from his fellows by hate? When will we learn that hate breeds hate even when of self, and leads only to destruction? When will we learn that people beginning with ourselves are both good and bad?

The death of our President must be attributed to a warped mind. Only such a one could have done such a thing. That the accused man is of the political far left may save the face of many. But political far left or political far right, both have evidenced a contempt and a hate that leaves one anxious of his Nation, fearful of his people. If we are involved in either of these extremes the hate that finds expression through them must be revealed. What causes these pockets of hate to be so difficult to confront is the political and religious cloak behind which they hide. That cloak has been ripped from the face of our land since early Friday afternoon. We Christians, citizens of this land, must lead the way. We must stop the mouth of the slanderer. We must halt the malicious and destructive hatred of men wherever we find it beginning with ourselves. This may mean that soon, perhaps today, you and I are going to confront a friend or a neighbor or perhaps a stranger with—"You are wrong. You have misjudged. You are involved in a deep hate." And more honestly we are going to be confronted by a friend, perhaps a neighbor, or only the voice of a stranger over the television saying—"We are wrong. We have misjudged. We are involved in a deep hate."

Some mornings we stride into this sanctuary ready to lift our voices in robust praise to Almightly God. The stronger and more vigorous the hymn the more it encourages the expression. To offer a prayer of confession fits neither the mood nor the theology. Another morning we confront the whole service with only the need to be cleansed, to be forgiven, to be loved once more. Both are needed, for we are children, children of the light and children of the dark.

WHEN WILL WE LEARN THAT CHRIST'S GOSPEL OF GOD'S LOVE IS FOR THE WHOLE WORLD

The women was an adulteress. "Go and sin no more."

The man was a tax collecter. "Come and follow me."

The rich man was confused. "Sell, give and come."

The holy man was unctuous. "Pray simply—Our Father—."

The brother was a prodigal. "Kill the fatted calf and come let us be merry."

The disciples were afraid. "Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you."

Who were these people to whom the good news was brought? Who were these people that responded? Who went and sinned no more? Who forsook all and followed after? Who sold and gave? Who learned to pray humbly? Who lost their fears and found only courage? They were people. People in and of the world who needed to know and to feel the love of someone for them.

It is incomprehensible that God should love all. We cannot understand what this love is or means. What we can understand is that God loves us, loves me. And as significantly, loves you. It is this love that is for the whole world.

Love has an odd characteristic. It shrivels, dies into hate if it finds no expression, no sharing. The love of our God can never be dogmatized. Can never be ritualized. Can never be held in a stone building or a rigid denominational pattern. The love of God denies dogma, for someone not worthy of love is always loved. The love of God forsakes ritual for its forms are as varied as we are. The love of God escapes the tabernacle, even when built to his glory, for in its shadows outside its walls hover the "beloved of the Lord." And his love has no name except our own.

What dare we feel for Mrs. Kennedy and her children? Her life and her tragedy? Deep grief. And we weep with her. Her loss is ours and the worlds. But more, we know God's love for her shall not fail. His love for us shall not fail. "Faith, hope, love abide, these three, but the greatest of this is love."

Paul writes to the Christians at Rome: "Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved. But how are men to call upon Him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in Him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear unless there is a proclaimer. And how can men proclaim unless they are sent."

How can the love of God for the world be made known unless there are those who believe? How can the love of God for the world be told except those who believe be sent. How is the love of God to be taken to the world unless and except we take it? Will we learn, we who are Christ's followers, that the love of God is for the whole world, but it must be taken to that world? The message needs messengers. The gospel needs tellers. The love needs vehicles. When we learn, then we shall indeed be Christ's men—God's ambassadors.

When will we learn that Christ's Gospel, the good news of God's love, is for the whole world?

The President is dead. His soul we commend to the care and love of Almighty God.

To whom shall we commend the soul of this our Nation? In whom shall we find her life? It is in us, the people of this man and the people of God, that the answer must be found.

In a speech never given, the President quoted the second verse of the 127th Pslam.

"Unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchman stays awake in vain."

To it we must add the prior verse—"Unless the Lord builds a house, those who build it labor in vain."

Unless the Lord builds the Nation, those who build it labor in vain. The people of this man, the President of the United States—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, dare not labor in vain.

Cities Are Less Than Equal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from WCBS-TV in New York tells the story of apportionment in New York State. It is a sad story repeated too often across the country in

self that allows him a more reasonable amount of time for the things he loves most—his wife, their children, Carol, Natalie, Nat Kelly, Casey and Timolin, and baseball, to which he is hopelessly addicted.

Among the principals in that organization are the head of his recently formed Kell-Cole Production Co., Ike Jones, who produced "The Merry World of Nat King Cole" at the Greek Theater in 1961 which set a record gross of $101,000 in a week's engagement. (Cole returns there this year in August). There is also his attorney, Leo Branton, and his longtime manager, Carlos Gastel, all of them playing important roles in keeping the Cole machinery functioning smoothly.

No amount of planning, however, can stave off all defeats, especially for a man as willing to gamble as Nat Cole. And so he has had his fair share of them, perhaps even more, to go with his incredibly indestructible success as a nightclub and recording artist.

Probably the bitterest of them, to Cole, was what happened to his network television show in 1957. Actually, the show was on the air for 64 weeks and could have remained if Cole had submitted to an airtime change insisted upon by NBC.

But it didn't accomplish what Nat had hoped for and sacrificed for. It was a costly venture. Besides plowing part of his own salary back into the production costs, he turned down $500,000 worth of nightclub dates to stick with it.

Why did it mean so much to him? Although Cole never has been a shouting crusader for Negro rights, in his own quiet way he has always espoused the cause of racial equality, often more effectively than its more militant adherents. As the first Negro ever to have his own weekly show on TV, to him fell the opportunity, and the burden, of proving that such a program could achieve public acceptance on both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line.

Cole proved that. His show had a sound rating and drew excellent reviews. The biggest names in show business guest-starred on it. But one of the peculiar details of the electronic medium defeated him. No national sponsor dared back Cole's play. In some areas, the program was sponsored regionally and successfully by the tab payers, but the big spenders of Madison Avenue, without whose support the show could not long survive, looked the other way.

Another blow to his pride and pocketbook was the premature closing of his musical "I'm With You," several years ago in Detroit before it had a chance to open on Broadway, Nat's ultimate goal. The show had opened on the road in San Francisco to reviews that were as complimentary as usual to Cole, but tepid to the musical itself. Despite heroic efforts on Cole's part and the infusion of considerable money, the show folded.

But the setbacks were few in comparison with the triumphs. After 19 years as a recording artist, his is still the first name on the list of singers whom music publishers hope to enlist to wax their latest tune. If he does, he still gives those tunes an 80–20 chance of becoming hits.

The number of nightclub engagements and concerts he can play are limited only by the number of nightclubs and concert impresarios who can afford the Cole tariff.

The 20-year Cole record of accomplishment over setbacks and disappointments is one that anyone could be proud to claim. For such a record to belong to the Alabama-born son of a minister who might never have sung at all if a slicker had not absconded with $800 and a nightclub drunk had not insisted on hearing someone wail "Sweet Lorraine," it might be classified as a minor miracle.

A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a sermon delivered last Sunday at Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church by the assistant minister, the Reverend Robert Clyde Curry.

This sermon was but one of thousands delivered on a Sunday but 2 days removed from the tragic event of last Friday. This sermon, like the others, undoubtedly replaced one already prepared. Many of them, I have read, were excellent and reflected something of the greatness of this Nation, its tremendous and ultimate unity.

Washington, D.C., is a church-going city, and last Sunday Washington's churches were crowded. Chevy Chase Presbyterian was one of these. We listened intently as Reverend Curry spoke from his heart and with fiercely honest conviction.

At the earnest suggestion of others who heard this fine sermon, I am pleased to use my privilege to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE PEOPLE OF THE MAN—IN MEMORIUM, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY (MAY 29, 1917–NOVEMBER 22, 1963)

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has died. He has been taken from our lives and from our history. The last rites of his communion have been administered. We declare with them the words of assurance from "The Book of Common Worship" of our communion:

"Unto the mercy of Almighty God, we commend the soul of our brother departed, in the sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The shock and shame of our President's death stuns and angers. We are stunned to think that one so great and so young could be destroyed so easily. Anger boils with intensity and self-righteousness as we strike out at the deed, the individual, at the place, the time. Weak we become as we weep openly or within for the life of another human being untimely dead; for his wife, his daughter and son, his close-knit family, his future. We are made fearful and anxious because leadership has been lost, the course of history profoundly altered. And what of our history? What of the "land of the free and the home of the brave?" A leader has been lost. Another shall arise. A President has been killed. What he believed in is enmeshed in policies and programs yet to be realized. But what of the land? He is dead, but we, the people, live on. He is gone, but the land remains. His life has been sacrificed—but our life continues. What of our land and her people?

In this memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy let us look at the "people of the man." Let us honor and memorialize him by looking at our people, our Nation whom he served, whom he loved, as whose leader he died. In his death, perhaps, we, the people, shall learn.

WHEN SHALL WE LEARN THAT TOMORROW IS ALWAYS TOO LATE?

The psalmist writes concerning the length of life, "three score years and ten and if by reason of strength they be forescore." No matter what the length of life cries the psalmist, "Teach us, O Lord, to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." "* * * that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." Does it always demand a tragic crisis for us to see, to know, to do the good? Is it only when a church school is bombed and children are killed or when a President is shot or personal tragedy strikes that we will apply our hearts unto wisdom? That suddenly the superficialities of our lives are stripped from us and we see what is true, what is of import, what is of value. Numbering our days does not mean sitting and crossing off blocks on the calendar. It means knowing, knowing that tomorrow is forever, today is now. It means knowing that life never, never stands still nor waits. It means beginning to live is not going to take place at the next party, the next stage in life, or after the next hurdle is passed, or beyond the present crisis. Life is going on now. Numbering doesn't mean listing, it means knowing the limitations. We work within our own lifespan only, no one else's. The numbering is important if only to make this clear again.

But the numbering is necessary if we are ever to apply our hearts unto wisdom. If we realize the ultimate limits then, perhaps, we can attempt to approach the immediate problems with wisdom, with insight, with courage. This is the psalmist's plea—"teach us to number our days, that we might apply our hearts unto wisdom." That we might live wisely.

Tomorrow is not only forever, it is always too late. Tomorrow is too late for one segment of our society to be accepted as men. Tomorrow is too late to remove the stigma of hate, of cruelty, of persecution from any man. Tomorrow is too far away and too slow in coming for dreamers of great dreams. Today may already be too late.

Tomorrow is too late to talk peace—for tomorrow may never come. There may be no tomorrows if today there is no peace.

Tomorrow is too late to apply our hearts unto wisdom for the wisest possible decision of our lives are needed this day.

We need to number our days.

A local newspaper had no obituary prepared on President Kennedy. On the other living Presidents such was on file. Not for Mr. Kennedy. He was too young to die. How wrong they were, and yet, how right. For he lives as a man for whom no obituary would be necessary. The man who numbers his days and applies his heart to wisdom lives not for the final number, not for infinity, but for the expression of wisdom in his life now.

When will our people learn, when will we learn that tomorrow is always too late?

WHEN WILL WE LEARN THAT SACRIFICE IS DEMANDED OF US ALL?

The words when first spoken rang with authenticity. They have since been mocked and questioned. It has been noted how little they have been realized in practical politics. Yet their truth has never lessened.

"Ask not what your country can do for you; ask only what you can do for your country."

The direction is right. The way is hard. These words were not and are not intended for the relief roles of the Nation or for the aged or for the minorities, all of whose needs are so very real. The were and are directed to every citizen who permits his Nation's destiny to be decided without either personal effort or personal concern.

Little there is that we can do as part of the mass of men. Little there is that we can affect from positions relatively unimportant and obviously removed from the power structures of our community and Nation. Little there is that the complexity of our life permits the individual, the one, to do.

And these are very real barriers. Each of us must face them. Yet just as surely the sacrifice that is demanded most is the agonizing reappraisal of our national and our personal goals. We must submit ourselves, our practical beliefs, our way of life to honest confrontation with the life that ought to be and the God who rules us all. This is never easily done nor lightly undertaken.

This Thanksgiving season must find us on our knees. Not to thank God for things. Not to thank God that we are not like other men—Communists, poor, uneducated, unsophisticated, unclean, hungry, naked. But to thank God that we are exactly as other men. To thank God that with all men we stand before Him and Him alone, as our God. To thank God that with all men we stand before Him in need and in hope, in confusion and in certainty; in desperate sorrow and anguish, but at least—at least before Him in love.

Sacrifice is sacrifice only when it costs. Of personal anxiety there is much. Confusion and questions abound. Only as we reach out to our brother with our abilities, our concern, our interest, our time, energy, and money will the action be sacrificial. It is not enough to put our gift on the long pole of the United Fund and reach out, giving, but clean; helping, but untouched. We must physically take ourselves there and bring their needs here. These two dare no longer be mutually exclusive. The sacrifice now will be real. And this is not sacrifice in a morbid, depressing sense at all. This is sacrifice that converts the life, that turns the life around, that lifts the life up. That which was or those who were hated and despised, that which was or those who were avoided and disdained, are enveloped in our love and our concern.

This agonizing reappraisal and sacrifice each of us must do. Do it for our personal goals as well as those of our Nation. Such an act cannot help but touch and affect every institution—our families, or communities, our churches, our Nation, our world. We need to recall that the prayer—"let this cup pass from my lips" was uttered in the same breath with "not my will but thine be done." And that both were raised to God in the dark night of a garden filled with death and despair, yet from which the hope of the world was to come.

"Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask only what you can do for your country."

"Ask not what you can get. Ask only what you can give."

These words ring with truth and judge us rightly in this season. When will we learn that sacrifice is demanded of us, each one of us now?

WHEN WILL WE LEARN THAT GOOD IS GOOD, BAD IS BAD, AND PEOPLE ARE BOTH?

We are a black and white culture. This has no reference to race. It means only that we tend as a people to view others, but not ourselves, as either good or bad. We identify our enemy by his badness. The popularity of westerns on television has pointedly illustrated this characteristic. Here identification of good and bad is easily and simply accomplished.

As much as we would have life be one great cineramic continuous "Winning of the West"—it is simply not this way. There is good. There is right. There are standards. Our sense of the right as a Nation has been outraged by the murder of our President. Our people and the peoples of the world unite in identifying this act as despicable, as horrible, as heinous. We know good and we know bad. And we know people, or at least we know one person, ourselves.

And we know that we are good. We know that we are not murderers. We know that we are not evil.

We know that we are not murderers, except that we do hate and our Lord has called such hate "murder of the heart." We are not evil. We are not bad. Except with the Apostle Paul we must cry out "The good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do."

When are we to learn that good is good? That there is right? And that bad is bad? That there are wrongs, and no matter how one rationalizes or excuses them from their lives, they remain wrong? And that we, the people, are both? When will we learn to distinguish between the sin and the sinner? When will we learn that the greatest tragedy that can befall a man is not death, but to be isolated from his fellows by hate? When will we learn that hate breeds hate even when of self, and leads only to destruction? When will we learn that people beginning with ourselves are both good and bad?

The death of our President must be attributed to a warped mind. Only such a one could have done such a thing. That the accused man is of the political far left may save the face of many. But political far left or political far right, both have evidenced a contempt and a hate that leaves one anxious of his Nation, fearful of his people. If we are involved in either of these extremes the hate that finds expression through them must be revealed. What causes these pockets of hate to be so difficult to confront is the political and religious cloak behind which they hide. That cloak has been ripped from the face of our land since early Friday afternoon. We Christians, citizens of this land, must lead the way. We must stop the mouth of the slanderer. We must halt the malicious and destructive hatred of men wherever we find it beginning with ourselves. This may mean that soon, perhaps today, you and I are going to confront a friend or a neighbor or perhaps a stranger with—"You are wrong. You have misjudged. You are involved in a deep hate." And more honestly we are going to be confronted by a friend, perhaps a neighbor, or only the voice of a stranger over the television saying—"We are wrong. We have misjudged. We are involved in a deep hate."

Some mornings we stride into this sanctuary ready to lift our voices in robust praise to Almighty God. The stronger and more vigorous the hymn the more it encourages the expression. To offer a prayer of confession fits neither the mood nor the theology. Another morning we confront the whole service with only the need to be cleansed, to be forgiven, to be loved once more. Both are needed, for we are children, children of the light and children of the dark.

WHEN WILL WE LEARN THAT CHRIST'S GOSPEL OF GOD'S LOVE IS FOR THE WHOLE WORLD

The women was an adulteress. "Go and sin no more."

The man was a tax collecter. "Come and follow me."

The rich man was confused. "Sell, give and come."

The holy man was unctuous. "Pray simply—Our Father—."

The brother was a prodigal. "Kill the fatted calf and come let us be merry."

The disciples were afraid. "Peace I leave with you. My peace I give unto you."

Who were these people to whom the good news was brought? Who were these people that responded? Who went and sinned no more? Who forsook all and followed after? Who sold and gave? Who learned to pray humbly? Who lost their fears and found only courage? They were people. People in and of the world who needed to know and to feel the love of someone for them.

It is incomprehensible that God should love all. We cannot understand what this love is or means. What we can understand is that God loves us, loves me. And as significantly, loves you. It is this love that is for the whole world.

Love has an odd characteristic. It shrivels, dies into hate if it finds no expression, no sharing. The love of our God can never be dogmatized. Can never be ritualized. Can never be held in a stone building or a rigid denominational pattern. The love of God denies dogma, for someone not worthy of love is always loved. The love of God forsakes ritual for its forms are as varied as we are. The love of God escapes the tabernacle, even when built to his glory, for in its shadows outside its walls hover the "beloved of the Lord." And his love has no name except our own.

What dare we feel for Mrs. Kennedy and her children? Her life and her tragedy? Deep grief. And we weep with her. Her loss is ours and the worlds. But more, we know God's love for her shall not fail. His love for us shall not fail. "Faith, hope, love abide, these three, but the greatest of this is love."

Paul writes to the Christians at Rome: "Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved. But how are men to call upon Him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in Him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear unless there is a proclaimer. And how can men proclaim unless they are sent."

How can the love of God for the world be made known unless there are those who believe? How can the love of God for the world be told except those who believe be sent. How is the love of God to be taken to the world unless and except we take it? Will we learn, we who are Christ's followers, that the love of God is for the whole world, but it must be taken to that world? The message needs messengers. The gospel needs tellers. The love needs vehicles. When we learn, then we shall indeed be Christ's men—God's ambassadors.

When will we learn that Christ's Gospel, the good news of God's love, is for the whole world?

The President is dead. His soul we commend to the care and love of Almighty God.

To whom shall we commend the soul of this our Nation? In whom shall we find her life? It is in us, the people of this man and the people of God, that the answer must be found.

In a speech never given, the President quoted the second verse of the 127th Psalm. "Unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchman stays awake in vain."

To it we must add the prior verse—"Unless the Lord builds a house, those who build it labor in vain."

Unless the Lord builds the Nation, those who build it labor in vain. The people of this man, the President of the United States—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, dare not labor in vain.

Cities Are Less Than Equal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from WCBS-TV in New York tells the story of apportionment in New York State. It is a sad story repeated too often across the country in

many other States. As our cities and suburban areas continue to grow the inequality will continue to grow. Baker against Carr, the Tennessee case decided by the Supreme Court last year, is the first real step toward forcing State legislatures to reapportion. Let us hope that other steps will quickly follow, particularly in New York.

The WCBS-TV editorial follows:

WCBS-TV EDITORIAL, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1963

Last week, New York City voters overwhelmingly endorsed legalized off-track betting. And yet, the odds are against the State Legislature ever approving a bill of this kind. As a matter of fact, even if a majority of voters throughout the entire State were in favor of off-track betting, a minority could block it.

How is this possible?

Because New York State is afflicted with a system for distributing seats in the legislature which is wholly undemocratic, it is possible for a minority of the voters to elect a majority of the representatives in both the senate and assembly. This system, which dates all the way back to 1894, assures overrepresentation for upstate rural areas in terms of their population—and underrepresentation for cities and suburbs.

Here are just three examples of the way in which this 1894 system discriminates against New York City voters:

There are 25 counties in upstate New York whose combined population is barely one-third that of Brooklyn's—but collectively they have more seats in the assembly than Brooklyn does.

Each of New York City's assemblymen represents an average of 114,000 persons; assemblymen from thinly populated rural districts represent an average of only 61,000.

In some cases, inequalities exist which are even more glaring. For example, in upstate Schuyler County, an assemblyman represents less than 15,000 people; an assemblyman from Queens represents 190,000 people—more than 12 times as many.

As a result of this system of apportionment, rural New York State has had almost continuous control of the legislature. This has led to discriminatory treatment of cities and suburban areas—especially in matters of State aid. And during the past 5 years, it has been a strong contributing factor in blocking legislative approval of several city-sponsored, off-track betting measures.

New York City voters will continue to get the short end of the stick from Albany until such time as we get our fair share of representation in the State legislature. We have no right to complain about insufficient State aid for such critical services as our city schools, welfare and housing so long as we remain indifferent to the root of the problem—unfair representation. Unless we speak out for fair representation, we are not likely to get it—nor are we likely to get legislative approval of off-track betting. If you will send your views on this critical issue to WCBS-TV, we will see that they are made known to our legislative leaders in Albany.

I'm Gideon Chagy.

Double Standard for Picketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Suburban Times, an excellent weekly newspaper published in my district, received favorable comment on the part of some of my constitutents. At their request I am inserting it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DOUBLE STANDARD FOR PICKETING

The only discordant note in the President's Tacoma visit was the threat of violence to and the rapid ejection of three women pickets from Cheney Stadium. Two of the women carried signs questioning freedom for Cuba and the third, the statement, "One nation under God." They were admitted into Cheney Stadium, but were suddenly confronted by a jeering mob of teenagers. Vile language was hurled in their direction—along with a few apples. Police officers, without a word, grabbed the women and forcibly ejected them from the park. The women, scared for their safety, relied on the protection of an elderly Negro couple while they retreated to their car.

Such an incident is intolerable. It would be impossible to say that the messages on their signs could incite a riot. It was no more than an expression of free speech. If trouble would ensue from these signs it would appear to us that the police should have used restrictive measures on the crowd rather than on the pickets. The gathering at the stadium was open to the public and the pickets had every right to be present. It might be mentioned that the only other trouble in the stadium was caused by the same apple-tossing group as they broke a barricade behind the speaker's platform.

The right of peaceful picketing has been written into law on the basis of free speech with regards to labor disputes.

Why is the form of picketing seen at Cheney Stadium last Friday any different?

Perhaps the President might have been displeased had he seen the signs. But since when have the citizens of this country been restricted in voicing their displeasure with any President. We doubt President Kennedy would have approved of the threats to and ejection of the pickets. Overzealous local officials should realize that their actions were completely contrary to our basic freedoms.

Thoughts on Our President's Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as we mourn our great loss, I believe that our colleagues will find the discerning remarks of the Reverend Dr. Charles Edward Berger, All Saints' Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md., to be both timely and appropriate.

To hear this superb sermon, "Thoughts on our President's Assassination," as I did on last Sunday, November 24, 1963, was a source of consolidation and inspiration. I want to share it with my colleagues in this period of national sorrow:

THOUGHTS ON OUR PRESIDENT'S ASSASSINATION

We are stunned, appalled, saddened as we say our prayers for Mr. Kennedy, for his wife and children, for the other members of his immediate family, for that larger family of his which we call our country, and for the still larger group we know as humankind. All sorts of questions are raised by his assassination, and among the most persistent of these are religious questions. Why did it happen? Why does our world in every age give birth to men who can do things such as this? Why does a good God permit something of this kind to occur?

What is raised in appalling form by what happened to Mr. Kennedy in Dallas is a problem as old as Adam. Theologians call it "the problem of evil."

It always appears in concrete form: perhaps in the birth of a mentally deficient child; perhaps in the accidental electrocution of a father of 10 children; perhaps in the appearance of cancer in healthy tissue; perhaps in the gunning down of a bystander. It is never simply theoretical; it is not a figment of the imagination. We find the problem in our minds because we see its ugly face in reality. It is thrust at us each time a momentarily unattended child falls to its death, or burns to death, or suffocates or is beaten to death; or when a car, whether driven recklessly or carefully, goes out of control and snuffs out life; or when a workman uses defective pliers in fastening a wire which breaks under stress and plunges a great aircraft to earth, killing all aboard; or when a patient, released from a mental hospital, turns out to be not so sane after all, reaches for an ice pick and kills an old woman; or when some loved one becomes so senile that he or she turns into a kind of vegetable and becomes a crushing burden to the family.

We theorize about evil not because it is theoretical, but because it is so real and so terrible that we cannot help asking why: Why such things have happened, and do happen, and appear certain to continue to happen. And because we have no entirely satisfying answer, we do not call it "the question of evil" but "the problem of evil." For while we have many answers to many questions, and these help by pointing toward some better understanding than we might have otherwise, the problem why God permits such things remains.

We believe that God is good, and we believe Him omnipotent. Why does He not always exercise His almighty power in arresting evil utterly, and in preventing things like these. We cannot adequately answer. Why He spares one life, and not another—why He does not spare them all, makes Him seem capricious, when we believe He's not. When we are confronted by a good man dead and an evil man living we are far from able to answer all the questions raised.

II

It does not help much to know that part of the answer to this terrible tragedy lies in the fact that we are free in very significant ways. We are not puppets in all respects—are not automata which work only as it was ordained we should. We are free to love or to hate, to let live or to kill; and while to a large degree the sins of our fathers are visited upon us for generations, and our society so conditions us that we are sometimes quite predictable, a God-given potential remains in us, and we can so greatly change what would appear to be our manifest destiny that even murderers can repent and become saints. But the matter doesn't end there. Unfortunately, freedom works both ways, and good men can go wrong and do murder. The hand that breaks the bonds of men can also break their necks, and the mind which plots the course of a planet may choose to plot the death of a president.

So it doesn't help much to know that some of our evils arise out of our being free, or even that God made us free so that we might love, for then a new and an unanswerable question arises: why does not a good and an omnipotent God make love a possibility without exposing us to such frightful dangers? It would seem that an almighty God could let love be possible without making murder almost certain. Why didn't he? And when that is asked we reply that we do not know.

One thing we know quite well is that we are not free of the consequences of our actions. Our world is one of cause and effect, and when we choose hatred, and make it our policy, we open the door to all sorts of attendant evils which prove to be the effects of that cause and have to be called its children. Inability to believe what is good about an enemy is one of the tawdry effects of hatred, while readiness to believe and to spread lies about him is another. The room is soon filled with the dreadful brood as hate-filled man undergoes Jekyll-Hyde metamorphoses until at length he becomes merciless and murderous. And when at last a man or a woman reaches that state, the whole being is filled with evil potential. One's mind might be quite sane as one reaches for a knife or loads the gun or adjusts the bomb.

Contrary to the opinion of many, a man need not be a madman to kill as madmen do. All that is necessary is that he think so little of his enemy as to believe he does the world, or the cause, or himself some service by killing his enemy. It might be simply a matter of revenge, of striking back, of retaliating more severely than one was offended. Hatred does not know restraint; so when hatred is nursed and nurtured, it is only a question of time before some sort of violence erupts.

What happened in Dallas might have happened elsewhere. It might have happened here in Washington. It could have happened in New York or in Los Angeles, in Boston or Chicago, in Philadelphia or Moscow, for it could have happened anywhere there is a man who hated Mr. Kennedy. The suspected man may have hated him because he was too hard on Communists, but there seem to be more in our country who hated him because they thought he wasn't hard enough on Communists. Unless my reading has misled me, and I do not think it has, others hated him because of his championship of civil rights, or because of medicare, or because of his proposal to reduce taxes without cutting expenditures, or because of his efforts to close tax loopholes, or for other reasons. To look is to find example after example of people who insisted upon mixing religion with politics, and hated him (a religious matter) or loved him (also a religious matter) for what he did politically, or for what he made it clear he wanted to do politically. Tears streamed down the face of the Negro driver who heard the terrible news over his car's radio and shouted to me, "He's dead. They say he's dead." And a woman, seated next to a friend of mine in a restaurant, on hearing that Mr. Kennedy had been shot, said disgustedly, "Well, that will assure his reelection."

As things turned out, it assured his death. But it also assured mountainous guilt in many of our people. They didn't hate him, but they put up with people who did because they were so anxious to see him lose, or his proposals defeated. More was done to inflame than to control political passions. Men could and did speak theological nonsense and philosophical foolishness and still be cheered because they were attacking him. It was as if the fires of discontent were nursed because in that way the President's house might burn. But not to offer every conceivable discouragement to this religious thing called hatred, even when it is rooted in political differences, is like deciding it's quite all right for a particular forest to burn because it's not really ours, although it is just across the road from ours. Hate groups and others who agreed chiefly in being opposed had grist for their mills and helped create a climate in which someone with the right combination of hatred and cunning and skill and opportunity could be encouraged and emboldened to attempt assassination.

Not a one of us who did not strive to purge hatred from the soul of American postwar political life is altogether innocent. Even though police may find at length that this was no plot by a gang, but the act of a solitary individual, it is possible that by letting demagogs confuse paranoia with patriotism, millions of our people helped create the climate of hatred, and because they permitted it to exist, were accessories. They didn't know they were accessories. They didn't want to be accessories. But the question is neither what they knew nor what they wanted but what they were. May God have mercy on our country for harboring such, and may God have mercy on any of us who may be among them.

III

But this is more a time for resolve than for remorse.

Resolve always to recognize hatred, wherever it appears, as the murderer it is.

Resolve to combat hatred in anyone, especially yourself, because hatred is a cancer which destroys its host.

Remember that unless love informs political actions, hatred is invited to do so, and that to keep your religion out of your business and your politics and other things that really matter is to keep your religion out of your life.

Never forget that when Jesus reduced God's will to just two commandments, he used the word "love" in both of them, and that to ignore love in the name of liberalism or of conservatism, in the name of race or region, in the name of party or policy, clan or country, is to tempt tragedy and to court disaster.

Let us pray: "Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.[1]

"O Lord, who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth; send Thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before Thee. Grant this for Thine only Son Jesus Christ's sake. Amen."[1]

(Text of sermon preached in All Saints' Episcopal Church, Chevy Chase, Md., by the Reverend Charles Edward Berger, Th. D., D.D., rector, on November 24, 1963, at 9 and 11 a.m.)

[1] From the "Book of Common Prayer."

Judge Advocate General's School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to share with my colleagues confirmation of the success of any governmental program. However, the pleasure is highlighted when the particular activity is one in which I have a very deep interest.

I refer to the Judge Advocate General's School at Charlottesville, Va., which, under the auspices of the Army, has been giving outstanding instruction in military legal subjects for over 12 years. As a member of its Board of Visitors for the first 8 years, I saw its steady development and became well acquainted with its capable staff and extensive curriculum. It was founded to give the lawyer in uniform the specialized knowledge necessary to enable him to confidently and efficiently discharge his duties in farflung operations around the world. Also, it was designed to provide a high level of graduate study. Time has demonstrated the extraordinary degree of success the school has achieved in fulfilling its mission.

Recently, in the October issue of the Journal of the American Bar Association, Mr. Walter E. Craig, its distinguished president, made some personal observations as a result of visits to the school. I wish to share with the House the tribute he pays to the Judge Advocate General's Corps as a worthy representative of the great legal profession.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S SCHOOL

(By Walter E. Craig)

On two recent occasions it has been my pleasure to visit the Judge Advocate General's School of the U.S. Army in Charlottesville, Va. The first was to address the school's 38th special class on its graduation. The class consisted of 100 young law school graduates, recently admitted to the bars of their respective States, who had been selected from more than 700 applicants for direct commission in the Army's legal branch. After a military orientation course at one of the Army's topflight line schools, these young officers reassembled at the Judge Advocate General's School, located on the campus of the University of Virginia in close proximity to the College of Law, where they pursued a 10-week course of instruction in military law.

My other recent visit was in connection with the conclusion of the career officers' refresher course and conference, which called for the attendance of judge advocate general officers from Army posts all over the world.

The American Bar Association long has been familiar with the activities of the Judge Advocate General's School. Maj. Gen. Charles L. Decker, now the Judge Advocate General of the Army, was the first commandant in Charlottesville; he is largely responsible for establishing the close relationship between the association and the school that exists to this day.

The curriculum of the school was originally developed with association guidance, and in February 1955, the graduate program of the school was approved by the house of delegates on recommendation of the section of legal education and admissions to the bar. Nevertheless, it was most interesting and impressive to observe at firsthand the varied activities of this fine institution of legal education. I am certain that any lawyer would be as impressed as I was.

In addition to the special course, I noted the program of the career course, a full year of study for senior judge advocates that includes, among other things, a thesis program and a course in jurisprudence given by Prof. Edwin Patterson, Cardozo Professor of Jurisprudence Emeritus of Columbia University.

Although many laymen think of the judge advocate primarily in his role as counsel or judge in the court-martial system, the varied responsibilities of the lawyer in uniform extend far beyond this function. The officer-lawyer of today must be exceptionally well versed in international law, government contract law, administrative law, and civil affairs, to highlight but a few of his fields of interest. Moreover, the presence of several students at the Judge Advocate General's School from the legal branches of allied armed forces demonstrates most forcefully the geographic scope of military law practice.

Anyone who reads newspapers is aware that our military forces are engaged in such varied places as Laos, Vietnam, Europe, Korea, and the Arctic. However, only when one stops to realize that the complexities of the modern world require the Army to provide its own legal department wherever it goes is the breadth of this type of practice fully appreciated. All of us are aware of the skills and dedication of our fine military commanders. Never in our history have men of such experience and leadership in crisis been at the helm of our Armed Forces. What fills me with a bit of parochial pride, however, is that outstanding members of our own profession are serving at their sides and giving them sound legal advice to help them make their decisions.

Developments in military law during the past dozen years, including the enactment of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, have brought military law and practice into closer harmony with the civilian practice, and one cannot spend much time with these judge advocates, young and mature, without being impressed by their total dedication to the concept of the rule of law. An overwhelming majority of them are members of the American Bar Association and active in its affairs. When I left the school I carried with me a satisfying impression that the officer-lawyers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps are not only fine military leaders but also outstanding representatives of the legal profession.

There is an atmosphere about any institution of learning that reflects its ideals. Although easy to observe, it is very difficult to communicate. The commandant of the Judge Advocate General's School, Col. John F. T. Murray, a graduate of Harvard Law School, asked me to extend an invitation to members of the American Bar Association to visit the school at any time.

The school is to be commended for the quality of its faculty, its comprehensive curriculum, its esprit de corps, and its earnest cooperation with the College of Law of the University of Virginia, as well as the American Bar Association and the legal profession.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy the Finest Product of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, much has been spoken and written in eulogy to our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with such eloquence and thought-provoking sentiment that nothing I can say here can add to what has already been said or been written. There is, however, an editorial which appeared on the front page of the Honolulu Advertiser of Saturday, November 23, which I believe worthy of the attention of this body and under unanimous consent, I read it into the RECORD:

JOHN F. KENNEDY

The tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination is almost beyond belief.

Here, one moment, was the young dynamic leader of the world's greatest power—driving through the crowds he enjoyed and from whom his personal magnetism always brought warm rapport.

Here, the next moment, was the fatally wounded victim of a madman whose ancestors-in-violence had slain Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley and sought the deaths of Roosevelt and Truman.

President Lincoln was cut down within a week after the end of a war which had divided the Nation.

Ninety-eight years later, President Kennedy was slain in the midst of a struggle which divides the world.

History will write its appraisal of the 35th President as it already has of Lincoln, the 16th—"the finest product of democracy (and) its greatest exponent:"

But even in the midst of shock and deep sadness, this can be said:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a President in the truest tradition of America. He had great intelligence. He had courage, as his action on Cuba a year ago so clearly showed. He had eloquence and he had wit.

Above all, he had faith in his Nation and in its ability to sustain a great destiny:

"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."

He also said—this before his election 3 years ago—"we will need in the sixties a President who is willing and able to summon his national constituency to its finest hour, to alert the people to our dangers and our opportunities, to demand of them the sacrifices that will be needed."

In giving his life in the hazardous leadership of this Nation, he made the greatest sacrifice of all.

But in those words above, and those which follow, he left an inspiring and valid legacy to President Johnson:

"With a good conscience our only reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Richard M. Duncan—Outstanding Jurist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I first came to the Congress some 23 years ago, I had the pleasure of serving with the Honorable Richard M. Duncan who represented the Third Congressional District of Missouri.

Richard Duncan served in the Congress on the Ways and Means Committee. His dedication was outstanding and his unceasing efforts gave the businessman and taxpayer alike, hope and encouragement. His exemplary work for his people made America a better place in which to live.

He was a great scholar—a student of law. Because of his tremendous ability in this field, he was selected for an appointment to the Federal court in 1943 by then President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Today, at the age of 74, he is still on the bench—vigorous and capable, handling a back-breaking log of tangled cases and legal questions.

In a series of personality sketches, the Kansas City Star recently paid a long-deserved tribute to this dedicated American and jurist. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby include the article for the information of the Congress:

MELLOW HUMOR, PLAIN TALK, CHARACTERIZE JUDGE DUNCAN

(By Joe Henderson)

Judge Richard M. Duncan, senior judge of the Federal district court here, is almost as well known around the courthouse for his fondness in using colloquialisms in dealing with law violators as for his repugnance for narcotic sellers and needless Government spending.

A few years back the smashing of a narcotic ring resulted in the arrest of 14 dope pushers, all of whom found themselves in Judge Duncan's court. The defendants clearly had no defense since all had made sales to undercover employees of the Narcotics bureau, but each pleaded not guilty and demanded a trial to learn the identity of the persons to whom they made the sales.

Judge Duncan's patience (never his long suit) melted steadily as one defendant after another put the Government to the expense of a trial for the sole purpose of exposing the undercover man.

When the jury had deliberated less than 10 minutes in convicting the fourth defendant and he stood before the bench for sentencing, Judge Duncan told him:

"There's an old saying around the poker table that it costs to see the hole card. You went to trial to see the hole card and now it's going to cost you."

The judge then assessed a 15-year sentence and told the defendant: "And when you get back over at the jail tell the rest of the gang it's a bull market over here—the sentences are going up."

The next day brought a quick reply from the jail. The remaining 10 defendants were ready to plead guilty.

Judge Duncan believes that to be effective a judge must talk to the defendant in words he can understand. It is the general consensus in the courthouse that many first offenders have been saved from a life of crime by Judge Duncan's plain talk.

On more than one occasion the judge has placed a defendant on probation after a severe verbal dressing down and completed his comments by saying:

"I'm going to take a chance on you. But I want to make it quite clear to you that if you violate the court's confidence in you and get in trouble again, there will be no second chance. If you come back to this court again you'd just as well bring your little black bag—because you're going to the penitentiary."

The times a defendant has returned are few, but if he does he finds the judge is as good as his word—it means a trip to prison.

Judge Duncan has a favorite story he likes to use in dealing with a type of offender who always is on the fringe of the law, but who has managed to avoid a stiff prison sentence.

"You are somewhat like the farmer's mule," the judge tells the defandant. "It seems the farmer sold the mule, but the mule refused to obey his new master, who complained to the farmer about the mule's stubbornness. The farmer didn't say anything. He just picked up a big club and

hit the mule a good lick, and after that the mule followed instructions to the letter.

"The new owner was impressed, and he asked the farmer why he hit the mule.

"It's very simple," the farmer replied. "He's a good mule, but you have to get his attention before he'll do what he ought to."

Then, fixing the defendant with a stern gaze, the judge says, "I think that's your trouble. Nobody has gotten your attention. Perhaps a little time in the penitentiary will get your attention. It will make you realize you cannot continue violating the law unless you want to spend the rest of your life behind bars."

If Judge Duncan is somewhat unusual in his approach to criminal matters, it may be because he is a man of unusual accomplishments. As one indication of this, he has been a member of the Missouri Bar more than 50 years and a Federal judge 20 years—but he never attended law school.

The judge, born in 1889 on a farm 10 miles north of Platte City (he is 74 today), might have become a farmer. But he looked up to a shining example, his uncle, A. B. Duncan, of St. Joseph. Duncan was a lawyer, a member of the Missouri Legislature and a probate judge in Buchanan County 28 years.

"My uncle married rather late in life and had no children," Judge Duncan recalled. "I was the oldest of the grandchildren in our family, and he took a special interest in me. I was a great admirer of his. I suppose that's why I decided to become a lawyer. I lived at his home in St. Joseph while I was at Christian Brothers College."

Judge Duncan's "law school" was the Buchanan County courthouse, where he was deputy clerk of the circuit court from 1911 to 1917.

"It was wonderful training," he recalled. "I had the opportunity to observe some of the great lawyers of the day and I had access to all the law books. It was simply a matter of studying them. I did that every night."

The success of this schooling was proved in 1916, when Judge Duncan passed the Missouri bar examination without ever having been inside a law classroom.

From then until he was elected to Congress in 1932, the jurist was an active practicing attorney in St. Joseph. He served as city counselor of St. Joseph from 1927 to 1930. In 1928 he yielded to a desire for public office and was a candidate for Congress from the old fourth district.

"I just had a hankering to run. I suppose it was in my blood," he said.

He was defeated, but the "hankering" remained. In 1932 he tried it again.

"That was some campaign," he said. Missouri had lost three congressional seats in the 1930 census, and when the legislature was unable to agree on a redistricting plan it was decided all congressional candidates would run at-large in the 1932 election.

"There were 56 Democrats and 26 Republicans running for 13 congressional seats. We had to campaign the entire State—and in those days that was a job. There was no air travel, no television. We just had to get around the best way we could and meet the people."

When the smoke cleared, Dick Duncan was 1 of the 13 men elected to the House of Representatives. The following year the State was redistricted, and from 1934 to 1942 he was the Congressman from the Third Missouri District.

In the national election of 1942 five Democratic Congressmen from Missouri were defeated. Dick Duncan was one of the casualties. As usual he was philosophical about the setback, and, as usual, he has a ready phrase to describe the situation: "If you're going to live by the sword you have to keep it sharpened."

Then the judge laughed and added: "The anxiety of a man in Congress who does not have independent financial means is rather trying. It is a tremendous expense to campaign every 2 years; it is trying both to the body and the purse.

"Of course I was disappointed in being defeated, but a man in politics must realize that if he keeps running defeat is inevitable."

The defeat did not dent the judge's sense of humor and today a favorite joke with his longtime friend, Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the St. Joseph News-Press and the Gazette, is that his only defeat came when Burrowes and his newspapers were backing him.

"Looking back, I would have to say serving in Congress was probably the greatest experience of my career—the most interesting period of my life," he said.

"The most important legislation I had a hand in was the writing of the social security bill. I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee at the time. It was our job to write the bill from the ground up. It was new legislation. We had no precedents to guide us. It was a tremendous task."

Judge Duncan also participated in writing tax legislation, reciprocal trade agreements and some military legislation.

After the judge's 1942 defeat, his friend, Harry S. Truman, then a U.S. Senator from Missouri, suggested that he consider an appointment to the Federal court. A new judgeship has been created in Missouri and was unfilled.

"Fact is, I had no hankering to be a judge," Duncan said. "As long as I was in Congress I didn't think about any other jobs. I had helped write much of the Federal tax legislation of the day, and I had occasionally thought I might like to be on the Tax Court. But I had never really considered serving on the bench."

However, under the sponsorship of Senator Truman, Richard Duncan was appointed to the Federal court by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 7, 1943.

When Judge Albert L. Reeves retired in 1953, Judge Duncan became the chief judge for the Western District of Missouri, and he served in that capacity until he reached his 70th birthday in November 1959. The law stipulates that the chief judge must relinquish the post when he becomes 70 years old.

Again Judge Duncan found himself in a unique situation. The law also requires that a judge must have served at least a year before he can fill the office of chief judge.

When the late Judge R. Jasper Smith died unexpectedly in January 1961, Judge Floyd R. Gibson, next in seniority, had not yet completed his first full year, so Judge Duncan again found himself chief judge of the district.

Judge Duncan is the ranking judge in the two Missouri districts in seniority and is third in seniority in the entire Eighth Judicial Circuit. He recently was elected Judicial Conference representative for district judges of the Eighth Circuit.

When it comes to avocations the judge sums it up like this:

"I have a lot of them, but about all I do is talk about them. Take fishing, for instance. I have a boat and two very fine motors sitting in my yard, and I love to fish. But I don't get to do much of it. And, when I do, I'm only moderately successful."

The fact that Judge Duncan has had only two vacations of more than 2 weeks in the last 16 years, and none in the last 5 years, undoubtedly figures in his fishing record.

Woodworking is one of his favorite pastimes. In this he has scored better than in fishing, because he spends many nights working in his basement shop. He has virtually every kind of power tool. His accomplishments include rebuilding two kitchens and replacing most of the interior woodwork in his home.

His ability with tools goes back to his boyhood. His father was a blacksmith as well as farmer, and he grew up shoeing horses and repairing wagons.

The judge and his wife, the former Glenna Davenport whom he met in St. Joseph, observed their 50th wedding anniversary this year. They are members of the Central Presbyterian Church. They have, in effect, raised two families. Their son, Richard D. Duncan, also is a lawyer. Their grandchildren, Diane, 21, and Richard, 17, have lived with them most of their lives. Diane is a senior this year at Lindenwood College and Richard is a senior at Southwest High School.

The disadvanage of a judge's career, Duncan said, is a certain amount of loneliness.

"A judge must live with his books and his problems," he said. "No one can decide for him in a given case, what he must do. The final decision must be his alone."

"The rank and file of people who come into court are faced with what they feel is the most important thing in their life. Their liberty is at stake; or, if it is a civil action, financial damages are at stake. The judge must be absolutely fair and must make certain their interests are protected."

"This position limits a judge's activities outside the courtroom. He can not always go the places he would like, and he cannot always be with the persons whom he would like to be with."

It is only a coincidence, but of the five or six lawyers who have been charged with Federal income tax evasion, all have appeared before Judge Duncan for trial and sentence.

"Having another lawyer before you for sentencing causes the court concern, of course," the judge said. "But all defendants look the same in the eyes of the law, and a judge simply does what he has to do, unpleasant though it sometimes is."

For those who know Judge Duncan well and see him often, it is difficult to believe he is 74 years old. His appearance is robust, his hair is barely flecked with gray, and his wit is sharp. His health is better now than in many years, and in the last 15 years he has missed only one-half day because of illness.

Of the myriad cases which he has tried during his score of years on the bench Judge Duncan can pinpoint three as the most interesting. They include the election fraud trials of 1948 and 1949, the antitrust case involving the Brookside Theater and the motion picture industry; and the antitrust case involving the Star.

Judge Duncan was instrumental in the adoption of a policy in the Federal court here of having arraignment day each Friday. This means a defendant can expect swift handling of his case and is not faced with the prospect of weeks of waiting for his case to come up on the docket.

The policy works two ways. It guarantees a defendant a speedy trial. To criminals it means something else: If they're caught they can expect to face the court in less than a week.

Judge Duncan describes the change in the judicial system since he has been on the bench as "tremendous."

"There is no comparison between now and at the time I started practicing law," he said. "Then there were few cases in Federal courts. Now that the Government is getting into everything, Federal jurisdiction is much broader. Here in Kansas City, where we have people going back and forth across the State line several times a day, the caseload has increased rapidly."

Though he has been eligible for retirement for several years now, Judge Duncan says he does not plan retirement as long as his health is good.

Then he adds: "My mother and one of my uncles lived to be 95 years old, and I have two other uncles who are 89 and 91, so if that's an indication, it looks as if I may be around for quite a while."

Conflict of Interest Is Not Limited to Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of Robert N. Tuller, delivered at the Second Investment Bankers Association Municipal Conference in Chicago on June 21, 1963, and reprinted in the July 4, 1963, edition of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle.

Mr. Tuller speaks about a separation of authority of the investment banker and the commercial banker and the problem of conflict of interest in allowing the commercial banker to underwrite securities:

BANNING COMMERCIAL BANKS' MUNICIPAL UNDERWRITINGS

(By Robert N. Tuller)

(NOTE.—Cogent brief favoring separation of the investment banker and the commercial bankers refers to problems of conflict of interest, events of the 1920's and early 1930's, and whether a bank serving a variety of functions should be permitted to underwrite any class of security. More importantly, in differing with Comptroller of the Currency Saxon's moves liberalizing banks' underwriting, Mr. Tuller says that if banks are permitted to underwrite they should have entry to all types of securities "suitable for bank investment" and not merely certain types of tax exempts.)

The fact that there exists an area of controversy concerning the underwriting of municipal bonds by commercial banks of deposit is well known. The issue must be of vital importance to generate so much conflict between the advocates and those who believe this function should remain illegal as far as the commercial banks are concerned. While I do not agree with Comptroller Saxon in his viewpoint on this issue, I can only welcome his frankness in stating his position and his opening the door for discussion of an issue which will not disappear because it is unpleasant, but will be like the "damned spot" which so plagued Lady Macbeth.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

I do not propose to discuss the issue of underwriting revenue bonds since I believe others can more eloquently, and I hope they will. But I do want to mention an issue which to me is so much more vital, deserves full discussion and debate, and on which I believe every member of this group will ultimately have to know where he stands and have the courage to take a stand. That issue is whether the commercial banker accepting demand deposits, exercising trust functions, investing for bank portfolio, loaning to many classes of customers, including underwriters, should be permitted to underwrite any class of security. In short, is there a fundamental and inherent diverse interest between his primary and necessary function as a commercial banker and his operation as an underwriter? I believe this conflict of interest which has existed in the past, especially the 1920's, exists today in a limited fashion, and will be with us in unlimited force if the commercial banker expands further into the underwriting field.

The groups which have taken the initiative in presenting the investment banker's side of the revenue discussion have stated their case well, but when I examine their fundamental reasons for their position, I can only conclude that their points argue more validly for a complete and total separation of the function of the underwriter and that of the commercial banker.

LIMITED KNOWLEDGE

While this subject is familiar to anyone who has been in this business for 30 to 40 years, I am appalled at the lack of knowledge on this issue by those who entered this business, especially since World War II, and who are on the threshold of taking over our responsibilities. Many of these younger men have limited knowledge of the Glass-Steagall Banking Act of 1933 or of the conditions which led to its passage. And so I call for full information for all on the two conflicting viewpoints on this issue over a reasonable period of time. If we neglect to get a clear-cut answer on this problem or attempt to hide it or not resolve it among ourselves, I submit others not identified with the industry and not so sympathetic to our problems will provide the answer in a cumbersome, restrictive manner and in a political atmosphere. It is the public's interest which will finally determine the direction of our efforts.

The distasteful public image we received springing from the abuses of the 1920's is something we would not wish to occur again. Once in a business career was more than enough. This is something the younger men may not appreciate, but by discussion they can learn the facts and reach a conclusion.

You can see from my remarks that I feel that the investment banker and commercial banker should be by legislation pleasantly separated. In the same breath, I would state that if the commercial banker can prove his case as an underwriter to me, then I would say he should be full and complete underwriter of any type of security which to quote the words of the comptroller's committee meet the standard of "Quality suitable for bank investment." Remembering the 1920's and early 1930's this did cover quite a wide spectrum, from such things as State of Vermont all the way to Krueger & Toll.

But let us make an assumption, that those who write the rules and dispense the justice, do restrict the commercial banker completely from the underwriting field. Happily this does not present tragic overtones. Because of the size of our business and its prospective future, there is room for every bit of manpower and brainpower now doing the job regardless of who their employer might be. There is also room for every bit of capital contribution any able man can commandeer, and there will always be room for the friendship which exists among the members who have differing views on this subject.

Los Angeles County Bar Association Supports Federal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Maynard J. Toll, president of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, has just written to advise me of the support of the association's board of trustees for Federal pay legislation now pending in the Congress. Because this matter may soon be before us, and it is considered by many to be of a controversial nature, Mr. Toll's letter is set out below so my colleagues may be aware of the association's position.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., November 20, 1963.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: I am pleased to advise that at today's meeting of the board of trustees of the Los Angeles Bar Association it was voted to support the legislation now pending which would provide substantial increases in the salaries of Federal judges and Members of Congress.

On behalf of the 5,500 members of this association we urge your support of this important legislation which we think would be in the public interest.

Further, in the opinion of members of the board, passage of such legislation is essential to the continued attraction and development of Federal judges and legislators of the highest caliber.

Sincerely,

MAYNARD J. TOLL,
President.

Youth's "Deep Sense of Identification With John F. Kennedy"—Editorial in New York Journal of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in what might seem to be a most unlikely place—in a periodical devoted largely to commodity futures prices, shipping schedules, insurance actuarial developments, and other vital but prosaic commercial news—I saw today a beautiful editorial on our late President which moved me deeply. It deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe, among the finest tributes to John F. Kennedy and among the eloquent and incisive evaluations of the significance of his life upon our national life.

The editorial appeared today in the New York Journal of Commerce. Entitled "Recessional," it calls for action by all of us—the whole Nation—to keep alive, through sacrifice and effort and even some economic strain, if necessary, the bright hopes kindled in the youth of America in these past 3 years by the young President with whom they identified so closely—what the Journal of Commerce expressively described as "that largely intangible but strangely compelling spirit that flowed through the rotunda all Sunday night."

The editorial is as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Nov. 26, 1963]

RECESSIONAL

To those who could not tear themselves away from their TV screens during that desolate weekend, one thing stood out over everything else, even over the murder of the suspected assassin. It was the faces of the thousands upon thousands of ordinary Americans moving slowly past the bier in the rotunda of the Capitol—all that cold night and well into the next morning.

These were mostly the young. Students, soldiers, sailors, young mothers with children, girls who knelt and crossed themselves, in a solemn procession that seemed to have no end.

It was impossible to watch this without being deeply moved. It was impossible to watch it without grasping its meaning. These young people—some stoic, some dabbing at their eyes, some preoccupied with cleaning their glasses—had a deep sense of identification with John F. Kennedy. He had fired them with enthusiasm and imagination. He was one of them and he was dead.

We think it vital that these young people should retain this sense of identification. The bright hopes kindled among them these past 3 years should not be dashed or diluted. They should not be made to feel that only when all other matters have been disposed of—economic and otherwise—will their future be given serious thought.

In a decade those who are now 20 will be 30; those who are 30 will be 40. This is the body of the whole Nation. It is worth some sacrifice, some extra effort, even some economic strain, if necessary, to keep alive that largely intangible but strangely compelling spirit that flowed through the rotunda all Sunday night.

North Carolina Leads in Textile Production, Value of Shipments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have pointed out to our colleagues the preeminent position of the State of North Carolina in the textile field. On November 14, 1963, an article printed in America's Textile Reporter recited some of the facts regarding this important industry in our State.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD for today:

[From America's Textile Reporter, Nov. 14, 1963]

NORTH CAROLINA LEADS IN TEXTILE PRODUCTION, VALUE OF SHIPMENTS—PRODUCES ALMOST ONE-FOURTH OF ALL U.S. BROADWOVEN GOODS, MORE THAN THIRD OF MANMADE FIBER FABRICS, ALMOST 10 PERCENT OF WOOLEN GOODS

(NOTE.—The addition of 36 new plants and the expansion of 121 existing facilities in the last 12 months, has increased North Carolina's textile payroll by close to $2 million. Director Robert L. Stallings, Jr., of the Department of Conservation and Development, presents this interesting report of North Carolina's position as a textile State.)

Textiles have played an increasingly important role in North Carolina's development and progress since the first settlers brought with them the arts of spinning, weaving and sewing by hand operated methods from their native England.

The industry has come a long way since those colonial days when cotton, which grows so plentiful in North Carolina, was laboriously harvested by hand and spinning, weaving, and sewing were slow, crude operations usually performed in the home of the ultimate user.

Growth of the textile industry in North Carolina, however, did not take on any noticeable stature until the first mills were constructed at Lincolnton and Rocky Mount about 1813.

Now, as they have for many years, textiles form the hard core of North Carolina's economic structure. They are not only the leading industry in the Tar Heel State, but they lead the Nation as well in the value of output of textile products annually.

Records of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, the State's principal development agency, show that at the end of 1962 there were 1,085 textile and 250 apparel manufacturing plants in operation.

The 1,085 textile plants provided employment for 223,700 workers, or 40.7 percent of all persons employed in manufacturing in 1962 in North Carolina's more than 7,500 industrial establishments. The 250 apparel manufacturing plants, which are so closely related to the textile industry, employed 41,400 persons at the end of 1962.

The importance of the textile and apparel manufacturing operations in North Carolina's general economy can be further spotlighted by the fact that 44.6 percent of all industrial workers in the State at the end of 1962 were employed in textile and apparel manufacturing facilities.

In gross wages the textile and apparel manufacturing plants paid their employees $940,055,328 in 1962 on the basis of North Carolina insured employment and wage payments for that particular year.

As they continue to modernize, as they broaden their research, as they increase their output of a wide variety of marketable products, they also continue to grow in North Carolina, a State which has proven it is good for the textile industry and that the industry is good for it.

There were 36 new textile plants and 121 expansions of existing facilities in North Carolina from October 1962 to September 1963.

These 157 new and expanded textile manufacturing establishments represented total capital investments of $92,539,000, provided potential employment for 5,886 persons, and increased the annual textile payroll by $19,942,000.

Today the State's textile workers are producing a wide diversity of products that had an output value in 1962 of $3,071 million while that of apparel manufacturing plants for the same year had an output value of $383 million.

North Carolina, the national leader in textile production, produces, in value of shipments, almost a fourth of all broadwoven goods in America, more than a third of the manmade fiber fabrics, and almost 10 percent of all woolen and worsted goods, according to the North Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association.

The State's spinning mills turn out almost half of all cotton sales yarn produced in the United States, while its knitting mills produce about 50 percent of the Nation's entire hosiery output.

North Carolina-made textile products are sold in the marketplaces of the Nation and the free world to meet consumer needs for every conceivable end use—for apparel, home furnishings, industrial applications, and military use.

Gov. Terry Sanford and other North Carolinians in general have a deep appreciation of the importance of the textile industry to the State's overall economy and the welfare of so many of its people. They are proud of the industry.

Predominantly of native stock, North Carolinians working in textile manufacturing plants in the State have proven—and continue to prove—they are efficient and productive as well as being willing to do a full day's work for a day's pay. Their low lost-time record is one they are justifiably proud of and they should be, because they earned it by their daily devotion to doing the work assigned them.

This comparatively low lost-time record, based on statistics issued by the U.S. Department of Labor, continues to be a major factor in the stability and growth of the textile industry in North Carolina, because the workers in general show—and continue to show—they can produce at the jobs they hold.

Another important factor is that labor-management relations are generally kept at a high level.

Still another important factor is North Carolina's fine business climate and the good government for which it has been famed for so many years.

The textile industry, like other industries locating in the State, has progressed during the businesslike administration of Governor Sanford. He is a chief executive who never misses an opportunity to let industry know it is appreciated and that the State is always ready to lend a hand in helping it to enjoy pleasant and profitable operations.

Textile plants are located in more than three-fourths of North Carolina's 100 counties. There is no shortage of labor and good site locations. Community attitudes with regard to new textile plants are exceptionally good and owners and plants as well are given warm welcomes. They are given all possible assistance at local and State levels.

Inquiries about what North Carolina has to offer the textile and other industries are welcomed and prompt attention given them by the Division of Commerce and Industry of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development and the scores of local development organizations and other State agencies with which they work so closely.

North Carolina has proven it likes industry. It wants industry to like it. And industry in general is showing by the faith it places in North Carolina and its people by the investments it has made and continues to make that it does like the leading industrial State of the South.

Complete Elimination of the Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, after years of effort the so-called cabaret tax in May 1960 was reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent. The results of that tax cut and the experience as far as the income of the Federal Treasury was concerned is most significant.

To begin with the objective of removing the longstanding inequity of this war-time excise tax was more jobs for musicians. But the interesting part of this tax reduction is that not only did it increase work opportunities and musicians' earnings but now it can be shown that the Government lost no revenue because of the reduction in the rate of taxation.

This analysis of the results of the 50 percent reduction is set forth in a report by the International Statistical Bureau for the American Federation of Musicians. This report based on an independent study found that the increase in incomes for musicians alone ranged between $25 and $35 millions. The many millions of additional taxable income of

proprietors and other employees was not included but the facts seem quite clear on the basis of this impartial survey that elimination of the remaining 10 percent of this depressive tax is desirable and would not cost the Government a penny.

Mr. Speaker, evidence is available that the first cut increased jobs and earnings by more than a third for musicians and an estimated five times that for other employees such as culinary workers in establishments subject to the tax.

Now with the Congress considering a tax reduction bill to stimulate employment and prosperity I do not know any more effective area for a tax cut than outright repeal of this unfair job destroying tax.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation to accomplish this purpose. Actually, rather than consideration of a separate bill I would hope the Senate would amend the House-passed tax bill so as to expedite repeal of this tax. The purpose of my introducing a new bill—which is H.R. 9243—is to invite the U.S. Treasury's comments as to the merit of such legislation.

Originally Treasury officials were skeptical of opinions such as mine that elimination of the cabaret tax would stimulate business. It was not believed possible that a tax cut would increase business to the extent that it would not cost the Government any revenue.

Now, however, the record as to what has happened since the 50-percent reduction became effective should assure a more optimistic attitude by the Government. Indeed it is hard to believe the Treasury could be opposed to this legislation.

Summing up, Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress will give consideration to complete elimination of the tax. If so, I am sure there will be another 34-percent increase in man-hours of employment for musicians, and even greater employment and taxable incomes in other kinds of work. This type of reduction would accomplish just what is intended by the administration tax recommendations. Here is the way, with no loss in Government revenue, to create more jobs. This has been proved. The facts are available. Let us completely eliminate the cabaret tax.

Hon. Charles H. Silver Dedicates the International Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of the Honorable Charles H. Silver, executive assistant to the mayor of New York and president of the International Synagogue at Idlewild Airport, at the dedication of the Synagogue on November 10, 1963. Mr. Silver, former president of the New York Board of Education, a great industrialist, a leader in civic and philanthropic affairs, and a longtime personal friend, spoke at the laying of the cornerstone of this spiritual way station for those passing through one of the great airfields of the world:

Mr. Silver's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER

The dramatic story of our people has always been linked with the ceremonial and festivals we celebrate in the synagogue. By feasting or fasting we mark the joys and sorrows of the past. With prayer and song we recall the escape from bondage, the triumph of Esther, the victory of the Maccabees.

Our religion is a history. Our history is a religion.

The Torah, which relates our origin and early wandering, also recites the law and precepts by which we live in accord with the will of the Creator.

The Talmud, with its philosophic interpretations and ethical teaching, offers a way of life rich in historical reference, but remarkably practical in its application to the problems of our own day.

Housing these two holy books of our faith, the focal point, the magnetic center, the very core of Jewish destiny has always been the synagogue. It held together the 10 tribes that were once a nation of kings and mighty warriors. It protected them when they became slaves. It sheltered them as wanderers, mourned them as martyrs, and inspired them as a free people returning to their promised land.

The synagogue keeps us one in this beloved country we call home. Spread across the face of the earth, scattered among the nations, we remain bound together by the faith we find in our own hearts and multiplied by those who meet with us to worship.

It imbues us with the strength of unity and courage to survive anguish and oppression—to endure the rack, the whip, the flame, and even the gas chamber.

It inspires us to split the sea of slavery and cross seven oceans, settling on alien soil, making the barren desert bloom, mingling in many lands to enrich the culture, advance the science, and increase the learning of all mankind for all time.

What is the eternal secret of the Jew's eternity?

It is the synagogue, the holy sanctuary in which he seeks his Maker as he sits beside his kin and his comrades, one with all the generations of Israel, his ancestors and his heirs unborn in the long lineage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

That is why today is of such great importance in the long procession of Israel's destiny. For we have come together in a sacred cause—to lay a cornerstone—to leave our own imperishable milestone on the endless highway of Israel's glorious history.

We are marking the creation of a new center of Jewish expression—a sacrament in stone and steel—a sign to the heavens—and to those who soar across them—that faith has its place even in the age of flight.

We have met to make history as religion takes its stand on the very outposts of space—where time and distance are conquered by the miracle of speed—and only the things of the spirit remain still, quiet, immovable and—like the synagogue—everlasting.

Here we will join to praise the Almighty, to beseech His blessings, to glorify His name in song and supplication with ancient words on our lips and an ageless exaltation in our hearts.

We build this temple in the tradition of a thousand such steppingstones for the soul of man.

We know that the synagogue is the source of our strength where, together, we seal our covenant with God.

It is the synagogue which has sustained and preserved us * * * no matter what voice has been raised against us—no matter what charge has been hurled against us—no matter what hand has been lifted against us.

The synagogue, with its eternal light, has shown the way through the darkness.

The synagogue with its holy scrolls has given us the law by which we live.

The synagogue, with its air of sanctity, has held us together as one people with a common ideal, a mutual heritage, a universal mission of mercy, peace and justice.

We have submitted ourselves to the building of such a setting for rejoicing in God's word and the restoration of man's soul, as a symbol of the faith that we embrace, a hall of worship raised for all who seek a sacred altar in a peaceful place, where men may walk with God, and think, and speak.

I don't know what feelings well up in your hearts today—but mine is bursting with pride that we are fulfilling this noble project, yes, and that you have called upon me to serve as your president, and that you are serving with me as we dedicate this cornerstone for the tabernacle to rise at Idlewild.

I am humbly grateful that you and I have been given this unique hour of opportunity, that we have been granted this moment and the means to establish a citadel of mankind's better self.

Our synagogue will be a tribute to human dignity and humanity's highest ideals, where man may seek infinite understanding in a house of God—but a house of God unlike any other—on the very crossroads of the skies.

It will stand side by side with the structures of the other two great faiths, a magnificent demonstration of the common bond that unites all Americans in their loyalty to the religious and democratic principles that motivate the brotherhood of man.

And I propose that, above the cornerstone, we carve a new credo which will contain these words:

"Rest here and read the sacred scroll,
Whose flaming words of faith will never fade,
While we preserve the Torah in our soul—
Rest here and pray, then journey unafraid."

The three shrines of religious freedom that will grace the International Airport lagoon give evidence that Christian and Jew share the same rich heritage. All three faiths turn to the glowing pages of the Old Testament, to its immortal truth and eternal values.

Christian and Jew alike believe in the fatherhood of one God, all seeing, all knowing, all compassionate.

Alike, we rest our code of moral conduct on the Ten Commandments and the wisdom of the prophets. Our conscience, our ethical concepts, our conviction that we were made in the image of our Maker, all these are the same, and they are far more significant than our differences.

The three faiths who comprise this community of devotion affirm their mutual belief in the same Divine Spirit—in the One whose love can be returned best by loving one another in a world where race, color, and creed are of no consequence to men of good will.

Today, we need this closeness and coming together for worship more than ever before. We need this trinity of congregations to demonstrate that we all are here under the same divine obligation, to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God.

In carrying forward the work of construction, we will be concerned not with boundaries or with differences—even among ourselves—but with harmony and cooperation in creating a dynamo of strength and confidence inspiring all who depart to every corner of civilization's borders.

Though we may wander long, or fly to far places, the grandeur and majesty of our Cre-

ator, and the sanctity of all His creations are eternally preserved for our return to the synagogue. Within its walls, the miracle of Jewish unity will be self-evident, embodying the burning truth that, "We are a people, one people under God."

Here, where history's unpredictable pattern has joined all degrees of Jewish observance in our one great purpose, we dedicate our hearts and hopes as we dedicate this cornerstone.

Here, we shall meet to join in worship, knowing that, "The Lord is nigh unto all that call upon Him."

Here shall stand a synagogue consecrated in the blessed words of the prophet: "My house shall be a house of prayer for all peoples."

May its cornerstone stand like the rock of our faith, and its walls be a strong as the spirit of Israel.

May it endure, please God, as a light among the nations forever and ever more.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Distinguished and Effective Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. J. Willard Marriott is one of the most constructive and thoughtful civic leaders in the District of Columbia. I have had the privilege of working with her as part of my service on the District Committee, and I know of her deep concern in providing better schools for Washington and generally improving the civic climate of the District of Columbia.

All too seldom do people who really work hard in civic matters receive the praise to which they are entitled. Considering the fact that Mrs. Marriott does not have to be as active in civic affairs as she is, I wish to commend her for the way she has helped make the Nation's Capital a better place in which to live.

An article from the September 22, 1963, issue of the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., follows:

SHE'S CALM AND COMPETENT

(By Frances Lide)

Mrs. J. Willard Marriott looks like the kind of woman who enjoys needlepoint and antiques which, indeed, happen to be two of her favorite hobbies.

Calm and competent, "Allie" Marriott also has the ability and background to make her a logical choice for the important post of treasurer of the 1964 Republican National Convention, an appointment she received last summer.

For the past 4 years she has been Republican National committeewoman for the District and, as such has taken an increasing role in political affairs. For example, she currently is working on the upcoming October 15 Eisenhower birthday dinner as a cochairman with Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS and Mr. Edward Burling, Jr.

She's an experienced businesswoman, too.

As a bride, she helped her husband launch an enterprise which soon became known as the Hot Shoppes and since has developed into a fabulously successful restaurant and hotel chain.

OFFICER IN FIRM

She still serves as vice president and director.

This weekend she's in Dallas, Tex., for the formal opening tomorrow of new convention facilities at the Marriott-Dallas Motor Hotel.

Mrs. Marriott at one time was the interior decorator for all the Hot Shoppes. Now, with the organization greatly expanded, she acts in a supervisory capacity over a staff of four professionals, personally making the final decisions on "all the things women are interested in," such as decor, selection of china and uniforms.

Her interest in antiques started shortly after her marriage and has continued over the years. Many of her finds—especially in Americana—have found their way into Marriott restaurants.

There also was a period when she was in charge of the finances of her husband's infant business enterprise.

"I looked after the money—did all the banking, paid the bills and wrote all the checks," she recalled the other day.

This experience undoubtedly will prove useful in her job as GOP convention treasurer which will involve keeping track of a budget of at least $650,000.

"I've been getting the books set up this summer and the bills already have started coming in. I signed a few checks the other day," she said.

"I just hope my addition and subtraction will come out even," she continued jokingly. "I have to submit a financial report once a month to the committee and to an auditor."

WORKING HERE NOW

Most of her work on advance preparations will be done in Washington but Mrs. Marriott plans to spend all of July in San Francisco, the convention city.

"I expect to enjoy it. It should be interesting to see how a convention is run," she said.

The Marriotts have lived for more than 20 years in a French Provincial house in Wesley Heights which formerly was the residence of her mother and stepfather, the late Senator Reed Smoot of Utah.

Her mother's marriage in 1930 gave Mrs. Marriott her first real taste of political life—and a novel introduction, it was, too.

The Senator had planned to take his bride to Honolulu for a wedding trip but, as it turned out, the couple spent their honeymoon in the White House.

President Hoover wanted the Senator here during consideration of the London Naval Treaty and summoned him back just after his marriage, so the newlywed couple were the Hoovers' guests for 2 weeks.

Mrs. Marriott, then a young Washington matron, remembers running in and out of the White House. "It really was quite a thrill to ride up to the front door and walk in," she said.

She also used to assist her mother at the latter's weekly "at home"—a custom once rigidly observed in official circles in Washington.

Other Presidents she has known have included General Eisenhower who, with his wife, was a guest of the Marriotts one winter day at Fairfield, their farm at Hume, Va. "But I have never called Mrs. Eisenhower 'Mamie,'" she noted.

FRIEND OF ROMNEYS

She's on a more intimate basis with the wife of a potential GOP presidential nominee—Gov. George Romney.

She and Mrs. Romney were classmates at the University of Utah and their friendship continued when the latter's father was serving on the Federal Radio Commission—forerunner of the FCC.

The Marriotts, like the Romneys, also are Mormons. Mrs. Marriott's father was Bishop E. S. Sheets of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints.

The furor which developed when a reception the Marriotts gave for the Romneys last May was interpreted as launching the Michigan Governor as a presidential candidate amazed some of their mutual friends. The Marriotts frequently entertain for the Romneys when the latter are in Washington.

Mrs. Marriott, whose tact and straightforward approach have kept her out of political controversy, was regarded as a "dark horse" candidate when she was elected Republican National Committeewoman for the District to succeed the late Mrs. Howard A. Coffin.

Her interests are by no means confined to politics. The list of organizations in which she is active run the gamut from such varied groups as the "Welcome to Washington" Club and the Home Rule Committee to the Washington Ballet Guild and Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

In her spare time, she likes to pick up her needlepoint. Several years ago she completed a Joan of Arc wall hanging, copied from a painting in the Louvre. And she's now doing a wallpiece portraying a girl on a horse for her oldest grandchild, 6-year-old Debbie, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Willard Marriott, Jr., who also have two little boys.

Her other son, Richard, also is married and is now attending the Harvard Business School after recently graduating from the University of Utah.

The day before she left for Dallas last week, Mrs. Marriott held a meeting for the group who will be heading the women's committees for the dinner which will celebrate former President Eisenhower's 73d birthday. The fundraising event is to take place at the Sheraton-Park Hotel under sponsorship of the Republican National Committee, the District of Columbia Republican Committee, and the Capitol Hill Club.

She also went to the Capitol Hill Club earlier in the day for a meeting on arrangements for the October 7 Golden Anniversary Luncheon of the League of Republican Women. She's a member of the committee as campaign chairman for the league.

In fact, with these and other mushrooming activities, she has felt the need for more office space at her home and spent some time Friday with carpenters adding a room to the house.

Her formula for carrying on so many diverse activities?

"I stay up late at night," she laughed. "But the telephone calls have to be over by the time my husband comes home."

Transportation Needs of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on the morning of November 22, 1963, Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, made a statement at the transportation session of the 39th Annual Conference of the New England Council, meeting in Boston. In the statement, Mr. Murphy traced the necessity for providing adequate air service for places other than the largest cities

of the country. I think his statement is an excellent one, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT T. MURPHY, VICE CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, AT TRANSPORTATION SESSION, 39TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., NOVEMBER 22, 1963

I am honored, indeed, to have this opportunity to participate with you of the New England Council in this discussion today on the transportation needs of my native New England region.

I have an abiding interest in the preservation and development of a sound air transportation system geared to the present and future requirements of this area. Thus, I feel a special duty to acquaint myself with the affairs and thinking of this organization dedicated to the economic development of New England so that I may better understand the problems and their best solution from a grassroots point of view.

No section of this great country is more acutely dependent upon air transportation for its economic and industrial well-being than is New England. This is particularly true of northern New England—Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, where rail passenger service has so declined as to be practically nonexistent over much of the area and where problems of terrain and climate pose special problems for surface transportation during much of the year.

In analyzing and planning for a truly regional air transportation system for all of new New England States, we must look beyond the periphery of service to the major metropolitan area of Boston. Adequate levels of air service at Boston do not necessarily accrue to the benefit or meet the needs of other industrial areas of New England whose economy is not irrevocably linked with this great and important hub city. We must direct our attention to the eastern part of this State, to the many cities and communities north of the Massachusetts border and to the south and southwestern part of old New England. I suggest that we could borrow as our motto for the future development of air transportation in New England the motto which is found on the great seal of the State of Rhode Island—the word, "hope." It has been a special devotion to this great virtue of hope which has kept the sovereign State of Rhode Island very much alive and quite progressive as the smallest political entity in our great Republic despite a trend toward bigness—a trend which has ground under heel at times a tolerant respect for the significant social and economic contributions which can be made by small entities in various phases of our political and social strata.

What does New England need in the way of adequate air service? Of course, no single person can have all the wise answers to such a challenging question. However, I do know this: If New England is to retain its present industry and attract new industry and to move forward, together with other great areas of this country, toward better days for its citizenry, it must hold onto its present level of air service. Present service and carriers must be the base on which we build for the future. To dissipate present service would be a grave mistake and to suggest that it can be radically reduced would not, in my judgment, be wise counsel at all.

We know that other parts of the country, in recent years, have enjoyed a much more impressive rate of industrial and economic growth. A salient factor in arresting the trend of industry away from New England is the preservation and betterment of all of our transportation media—including air transportation.

Keys to an adequate pattern of New England air service are frequent and reliable regular service. Northern New England should have direct through service available to points beyond Boston—to New York and south, for example. We need the assurance of through trunk service as our traffic grows.

In any long-range planning for New England, we must take a leaf from what is happening in New York and Chicago. There is no need to create air traffic problems at Logan Airport by stopping through traffic even though there is still room for expansion and growth here without moving toward satellite airports at this time. There is no reason for people living in Rhode Island to travel north to Boston for beyond air service. In Connecticut, air commerce is being squeezed down to the point of one trunk airport in the entire State—an irreducible minimum of trunk service for this growing industrial State. All elements of the New England business community and of this organization must actively support the services now available if we are to see the future improvements which are so vital to the area.

Special attention must be focused on seasonal air service to meet the vacation economy travel needs of northern Vermont, Maine, and New Hampshire and the other well-known vacation spots in New England. The tourist industry depends on good transport service to make the many attractive vacation spots in New England accessible to the ever-increasing east coast population. These needs will not be wholly met through area airports which require arrangements for long surface movements to destination. This travel market, so important to the local economy, can and should be served and developed through the aegis of New England's own carrier, Northeast. With subsidy support now available for regional services, Northeast should be able to better meet these needs.

Sound, reliable air service in many areas of New England is not economically possible without subsidy as is also the case in all other parts of the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii. This subsidy represents a sound Federal investment in the economic well-being of this area. It is bread cast upon the waters which will return manifold in terms of increased business, industry, employment, sales, etc.—all to the benefit of the national economy and, hence, our National Treasury. New England's subsidy claim is a relatively modest requirement in comparison with that allocated to other areas of the United States and cannot be regarded as improvident or unnecesary. If we are considering spending $750 million to $1 billion to assist development of some 200 supersonic transport planes, primarily useful in coast-to-coast and foreign travel, then we ought not to balk at wise and provident expenditures for transportation services in New England which are vital not only to the local economy, but which will in turn contribute to our national economy.

Basic to reliable air transportation service in New England is a system of adequate, safe airports. Many of the service complaints of the past were attributable to lack of the modern navigation systems and aids which would assure all-weather service in many areas of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Certain improvements must be installed if we are to build soundly for New England's future in the sixties and seventies. Frequency and reliability of air service are the key to traffic growth. As one New Hampshire aviation expert said recently, it is somewhat ironic that we talk and plan for landing vehicles on the moon with great confidence when it is still impossible to land a plane in inclement weather in New Hampshire. Further improvements are essential and your State and community airport officials must continue their efforts and press their case with the FAA.

One final thought. New England is an ideal area where a modern, economic, small aircraft could be laboratory tested, as it were, to see if we can reverse the trend of trying to adapt public service policy to technology, rather than technology to policy. In short, I fear we have been allowing the machine to rule us, rather than building the machines to best serve our multifaceted transportation needs. We are told that the jet is too large to serve small cities and that the DC-3 is wearing out and is no longer acceptable. Why should not the Government cooperate in working out reasonably priced rental arrangements with selected carriers for experimental use of some of the small aircraft now available? No one can say how such a program would work out but, in my view, it is certainly worth further study and active consideration. Congress has expressed interest in such a proposal and, although we would probably require specific legislative authorization, I am of the view that such an experiment could be useful in developing traffic and improving service over some of the lighter traffic routes in this area. The local service carriers and the Government have expended considerable energy in attempting to define criteria for a usable small plane and significant progress is being made. We also see favorable signs in the trunk carriers' increasing interest in shorter haul aircraft. It would be anomalous indeed were we to see a downgrading in service at middle and smaller size cities as so-called technological advances continue. We must not permit this to happen.

There Is No One Answer to the Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no one overall solution to our unemployment problem; any ultimate solution must be made up of a lot of small solutions. According to a recent Christian Science Monitor article, Armour & Co., in cooperation with a number of unions, have established the Automation Fund Committee in an attempt to seek out these smaller solutions.

According to the cochairman of the committee, George P. Shultz, dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago, one approach is to close the many loopholes in the Federal retraining program which the committee says exist. Specifically, the Automation Fund Committee concentrates on the training of workers with the very lowest educational skills; namely, the dropouts and many older workers, who are most often overlooked by the public programs. Furthermore, since workers undergoing retraining are not eligible to receive unemployment compensation, this private group has established a liberal loan program to help relieve their financial burdens.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that imaginative private retraining programs are taking hold throughout the country. Under unanimous consent, I include an article from the November 13 Christian

Science Monitor, describing the Automation Fund Committee's program in more detail, in the RECORD at this point.

RETRAINING PLAN ACCENTS INITIATIVE

(By Nobuo Abiko)

CHICAGO.—No single "big magic wand" is going to solve the national problem of relocating and retraining workers made jobless by automation, according to George P. Shultz, dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago.

Any ultimate solution, he avers, must be made up of "a lot of little solutions."

Among these, he suggests, would be some changes in existing Federal legislation affecting retraining of workers.

Under current law, Dean Shultz points out, a jobless worker can be disqualified from receiving unemployment compensation if he engages in a full-time retraining program that prevents him from being instantaneously available for proffered work.

CURB ON JOBLESS SEEN

"It just seems strange to me," says Dean Shultz, "that a man who sits at home waiting for a call from the employment service should be eligible for unemployment benefits while another man who has the get up and go to reequip himself with new skills should be disqualified."

This law, operative in a majority of the States, the dean feels, has deterred many jobless workers from enrolling in retraining programs.

Dean Schultz is cochairman of a unique committee, composed jointly of union, management, and public members, which was formed to supervise a special program of relocating and retraining workers displaced by plant shutdowns.

The committee, called the Automation Fund Committee, was established under agreement between Armour & Co. and two unions, the United Packinghouse Food & Allied Workers Unions of America, AFL–CIO, and the Amalgamated Meatcutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO.

It has been involved in relocation-retraining programs in Oklahoma City, Fort Worth, and Sioux City, Iowa, following closing of Armour plants.

Dean Shultz' recent experience in the Fort Worth project has convinced him that Federal retraining efforts tend to overlook workers who most need help.

"There has been a great deal of wringing of hands about the impossible situation we have with people whose educational levels are low, whose basic skills are not marketable—that is, not transferable to other industries—who are along in years and have been in one industry for a long time," he says.

DISADVANTAGED EXCLUDED

Yet this very "disadvantaged group," he says, is excluded from Federal retraining programs by the requirement that a definite job must be in prospect before a man can be accepted for retraining.

As a result, he says, Government programs generally take workers who have at least some high school education and who are presumably young enough (25 to 40) to be more easily retrainable.

"To me, this is wrong," declares Dean Shultz. "We should be working with the dropout-type problem and the older people—people who represent the hardest problem. Your batting average with such a group will not be as good, but these are the ones who need the most help."

In the Fort Worth project, Dean Shultz' committee worked with just such workers. The average age was 46, nearly 70 percent were unskilled, about 50 percent had no more than an 8th grade education, and 50 percent were nonwhite.

Yet 86 percent of the 117 who completed retraining found jobs.

"This modest accomplishment," says Dean Shultz, proves that "the situation is not hopeless" for this "disadvantaged group."

One of the important effects of a retraining program, adds Prof. Arnold R. Weber, also of the University of Chicago, who directed the Fort Worth project, is in "reorienting people" to new job opportunities in the labor market.

NO SUBSISTENCE PAY

"Even if the new job is not related to the worker's training," says the professor, "it shows him that all is not lost just because he has been displaced from a long-held job."

Although the Automation Fund Committee financed the retraining of the displaced Armour workers in Fort Worth ($270 per course), no subsistence pay was given, as under the Federal program.

To relieve jobless workers of this hardship while they undertake retraining, the committee—in its Sioux City project—has experimented with a loan program similar to those now in force for college students. Its prime ingredients are more reasonable interest rates and deferment of repayment until 3 months after the worker has completed his training course.

Dean Shultz says he detects "a gradual increase in flexibility" in the Federal retraining program so that it is starting to reach those workers in most need to help.

Chevy Chase Recreation Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article on "Citizens of Chevy Chase Community Want Recreation Building," printed in the November 7, 1963, issue of the Uptown Citizen. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CHRISTIANSEN, COUNCIL, CITIZENS WANT RECREATION BUILDING

The site is at 5601 Connecticut Avenue, once the old Brown Elementary School, and since 1946 the Chevy Chase Community Building. The huge, clumsy site of a building, with less than two-thirds of the space being utilized, still affords a beehive of activity for upper Northwest Washington children and adults.

Included in the purposes it serves for the community is more than meeting places for citizens, groups, arts, sciences, music, and for children almost any normal activity from gymnastics and sports to kindergarten games. Not to exaggerate, but to point out facts, the week ending November 9, 1963, there were 69 organized group activities carried on in the building, from preschool children to the old "fossils."

Here is a site of 1.68 acres of land bounded on the north by Northampton Street, west by Connecticut Avenue, and south by McKinley Street, which is geographically ideal for a modern and efficient recreation building. Yet, only the basement and ground floor are being utilized with foot traffic and human activities needed for much more than it affords. Where the door once was open for use of the second floor, a wall now closes the space, which means this part of the building will not pass the District of Columbia inspection regulations.

In the Community Building is a branch of the District of Columbia Public Library with its address facing McKinley Street.

At an open meeting for interested groups held at the Chevy Chase Community Center on September 23, 1963, Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, Superintendent of the District of Columbia Recreation Department, pointed out that the District of Columbia Public Library had applied to the Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia for planning funds for the construction of a new modern library building on the site at Connecticut Avenue and McKinley Street.

Since the Public Library and the Recreation Department now jointly occupy the premises and building, the Recreation Department believes it proper and timely, even urgent, to request allocation of planning funds for new facilities of its own. Obviously the project should be developed jointly and simultaneously for best use for both.

Representatives of various citizen groups were called on. They represented many interests now using the building. All stated the value of the center to the community and were enthused about continuing.

Mr. Christiansen stated that both departments, particularly the Recreation, would need the strong, active support of the community in order to gain approval and funds for the new construction.

Present at the meeting were three officers of the Chevy Chase Community Council who had done original work and campaigning: Mrs. Henry G. Doyle, vice president; Edward T. Stafford, treasurer; and Samuel F. Higger, president. Mr. Higger chairmaned the meeting and all went on record endorsing the Recreation Department's request for building planning funds in the current budget request. This request has been made to the Budget Department and Department of Buildings and Grounds.

Some 27 organizations of the area, civic, business and service, are hopeful. As quoted by Mr. Christiansen, "A building such as we would like to have would be a great stabilizing force for the far-reaching neighborhood from the preschool up."

Thanksgiving—Editorial From Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican dwelling on this 1963 Thanksgiving. I take pride in the editorial pens of the men of this great newspaper. This editorial, appearing in its November 24 issue catches the mood of this particular Thanksgiving Day.

THANKSGIVING

Thanksgiving Day will have a sad atmosphere this year, because of President Kennedy's untimely death at the hands of an assassin. But President Kennedy himself would not have wanted his fellow countrymen to forget their many great blessings, because of his passing.

Although Thursday will not be—cannot be—a festive occasion this year, it is perhaps more than ever a time for prayerful gratitude to Almighty God for the rich gifts that He has lavished on this favored land. For not the least of these gifts was our late, great martyred President.

Hardly any American needs to be convinced that this is indeed the most fortunate country on earth. Foremost, perhaps, among the many things for which we should give thanks on Thursday are our freedoms, both personal and national, that are equaled in few other parts of the world and exceeded in none.

Our freedoms are due in large part to the good spirit and farseeing wisdom of the early settlers, who came to this new world mainly to obtain personal liberty. Generation after generation, the creed of freedom, established by the founders of the Nation, has been well kept and even enlarged.

Our material blessings are so well known, and so widely shared by most people, that no extensive recapitulation of them is required. Yet, in this Thanksgiving season, it is not amiss to recall that nowhere else do so many people participate so equitably in an abundance of life's luxuries, to say nothing of necessities.

And nowhere else are there more wide-open avenues for success than here. It is no exaggeration to say that almost any American boy or girl of normal intelligence who really wants to achieve success can do so, through use of free educational facilities and the career opportunities that are always open to well-qualified candidates in virtually every field.

For those unable to work—for the ill, the disabled, the widows and small children, the aged and the infirm—America's assistance is generously given. True, some improvements need to be made along these lines, especially in the case of the elderly, but perfectly enormous strides have been made in recent years, as everyone knows, and further progress is assured.

On the score of civil rights, for some racial minorities, more than in any other one field, we have been lagging. But the trend here is vigorously ahead, in the right direction. And the proof of this may be found in a brief backward glance. The climate of fair-play and equality is growing better every day, the advances that have been made just in recent years are great, and these will certainly continue.

From earliest colonial days, this has been a highly favored land. And its blessings have increased steadily, year by year, century by century. The early Massachusetts settlers gave sincere thanks to God for what, to us today, would seem like only the barest essentials: for mere survival in a strange and still-dangerous new world, for enough food merely to sustain life, for crude shelter against the elements, for protection against wild animals and hostile Indians.

Today, the things for which we give thanks are so numerous and so great that they could not even have been imagined, as being ever possible, by the Massachusetts colonists of the early 1600's.

On Thursday, perhaps even more than on the first Thanksgiving Day so long ago, Americans ought to give deepest and most heartfeld thanks to the Creator, whose gifts have been so bountifully lavished on us. Truly, no people on earth have greater reason to mark well and devoutly a day of nationwide thanksgiving.

The REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the following editorial from "Electrical Hi-Lites," a publication of the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative at Huntley, Mont., was written by Mr. Max Mathews, the manager of the Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative, and therein he makes a strong point as to why many of the customers of the REA co-ops are reported as nonfarm residents because the report shows them working in nearby towns whereas they actually live in rural areas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, the editorial to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The rural countryside has seen some tremendous changes in the last decade. Farms are becoming fewer but larger. This increase in size has become necessary because farm prices have remained relatively level and in some instances even lower. With increased costs of operation this leaves a farm operator but one choice—expand. Expand and get more use from his equipment.

This shift has brought about almost 200 idle or unused services in the Huntley to Custer area. This represents an investment of almost $200,000 in lines that are no longer returning any revenue. This figure could be worse if it weren't for the fact that when farms are consolidated one set of buildings is many times leased to city workers who prefer to live in the country. Many people on the project commute to Billings jobs.

In still another part of the rural areas we see farms that are divided into acreages and here again we find city workers who enjoy the peace and quite of rural life and want their children to grow up with some association with nature.

This apparently is becoming our way of life in the 1960's and we aren't about to argue right or wrong of this change in people's living habits. However because most of these families are shown on our reports as nonfarm residents and because the report does not show where they live, some opponents to the rural electrification program have added these meters to those we serve around and in towns and come up with a total figure that would make one believe that we don't do anything but hook up city meters. It would behoove many politicians and others to acquire a more intimate knowledge of rural changes before they take figures out of their true perspective and use them to develop an emotional campaign item.

New Child Health Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and neighbor, Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, has conducted her first national child health survey since 1945–46. Her findings are shocking.

The statistics revealed in this study show that 10 percent of our children never reach a doctor, and 40 percent of our chronic cases do not receive medical attention as often as once a year. In fact, these statistics would normally be associated with some country other than America.

The following Associated Press article from the Evening Star is a résumé of Mrs. Oettinger's findings:

AVERAGE CHILD ACUTELY ILL THREE TIMES A YEAR

(By the Associated Press)

The average American boy or girl has three acute illnesses a year and one of every five has at least one chronic condition, the children's bureau reports.

Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, chief of the bureau, says this was one of the significant findings in the first national child health survey since 1945–46.

The findings of a joint study of the bureau, the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Public Health Service have been published in a booklet, "Illness Among Children."

Among the findings:

Although dental decay is the most common physical defect among school children, one-half of the children under 15 have never been to a dentist; of the remaining half, a sizable proportion are not receiving adequate care.

More than 74 of every 1,000 children have hay fever, asthma, or some other allergy, and more than 34 of every 1,000 are afflicted with chronic sinusitis, bronchitis, or some other respiratory ailment.

Those two groups of conditions account for more than half of the almost 33 million school days lost annually because of chronic conditions.

Forty percent of the chronic cases do not receive medical attention as often as once a year, and 10 percent never reach a doctor.

Trustworthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is searching its soul, and millions of words have been written to try to explain the grievous and untimely death of our President, John F. Kennedy. In my opinion, neither our country nor the city of Dallas deserve self-condemnation or abuse from outsiders.

I hope some of the biased commentators and columnists will not be able to draw attention away from the facts leading up to the assassination of our President.

The cancer of Castro's communism is apparent throughout our hemisphere. The tragedy in Dallas must surely be related to the tragedies being caused all over the Americas by Castro and his supporters.

Condemnation and vituperation should be aimed properly away from Dallas and toward Castro's Cuba.

Under unanimous consent, I include as a portion of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Evening Star, as follows:

TRUSTWORTHY?

The terror in Venezuela has continued apace over the past 3 or 4 days. Nearly 100 persons have been left dead or wounded, all of them innocent victims of a cruelly calculated effort to keep the people away

from the polls next Sunday. Quite clearly Dallas is not the only place in our world where abstract evil and down-to-earth crackpots and fanatics reside.

We do not have to look far for the villain of this piece. It is Cuba-based communism. Although once supported by Venezuela's President Betancourt—who has since put up a brave fight against him—Fidel Castro has turned against his former friend. He has left no room for doubt that he wants to install a Communist regime in Caracas. Hence the bombings, the machine gunning, the acts of arson, the individual atrocities and all the rest of the terrorism designed to frighten the country into the kind of paralysis that would make it an easy pushover.

But the Venezuelan people apparently refuse to be intimidated. The indications are that they intend to turn out in very large numbers to cast their ballots in Sunday's elections. As for the outcome, the betting is that they will pay their respects to the courageous Mr. Betancourt—who is constitutionally debarred from succeeding himself for another term—by electing his chief lieutenant, Raul Leoni. Should that happen, should the Communists suffer a heavy defeat, Caracas might enjoy some peace for a while.

This prospect, however, is "iffy" at best. The puppet Red tyranny in Havana has a job to do. As the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has reported, the job is one that links Fidel Castro in an "alliance for violence" with the Soviet Union, and probably also with Red China. Anyhow, as far as Moscow goes, the subcommittee's words are worth quoting: "International Soviet agents, experts in the field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist tactics and guerrilla warfare, are operating schools for violence in Cuba, training and indoctrinating Latin American subversives."

Nikita Khrushchev, Mrs. Khrushchev (with tears in her eyes), and the impersonal Kremlin have sent warm messages of condolence to Mrs. Kennedy and our country. These may be sincere in their fashion. But the fact remains that the Soviet Union, acting through the puppet Castro tyranny, is doing its best to upend and take over Venezuela as a further step toward conquest of the hemisphere. In these circumstances, how can one be hopeful about making progress toward a trustworthy detente?

The Man Who Wasn't Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, every student of Lincoln discovers new and interesting information on the man who was not particularly wanted at Gettysburg, Pa., 100 years ago. The following address is a different approach than others delivered during the centenary commemoration of Mr. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address:

"THE UNWANTED SPEAKER"—AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY BANQUET OF THE LINCOLN FELLOWSHIP OF PENNSYLVANIA, HOTEL GETTYSBURG, GETTYSBURG, PA., NOVEMBER 19, 1963

(By Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., executive director, U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission, Washington, D.C.)

Today marks the 100th anniversary of the most memorable cemetery dedication in world history. Ironically, the immortality of that occasion stems solely from 270-odd words uttered by a man no one really wanted in Gettysburg that Thursday morning in mid-November, 1863. Yet for Abraham Lincoln the feeling of unwantedness was not novel. Few Americans have ever had to weather so much enmity in such critical times as did this awkward product of the midwestern frontier. Conversely, that Lincoln was at his best when forced to rise above adversity was irrefutably one of the bases of his greatness. His participation at the dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery is an excellent though painful case in point.

The invitation for Lincoln to make at Gettysburg "a few appropriate remarks" was an afterthought, and it was also tinged with strong misgivings. Lincoln's reputation as a humorist and teller of bawdy stories alarmed the battlefield commissioners. One official from Lincoln's own State of Illinois expressed serious doubts of the President's "ability to speak upon such a grave and solemn occasion."

In a sense this was understandable. By 1863 Lincoln the public speaker was still an unknown entity. His 1860 "Farewell Speech" at Springfield had passed largely unnoticed. As for the inaugural address of the following year, many people believed that William H. Seward had supplied most of the thoughts and composition—which, in reality, he had. Hence, little argument greeted Wendell Phillip's evaluation of Lincoln as "a first-rate, second-rate man"; and when Congressman Thadeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, learned that Lincoln was to take part in the Gettysburg ceremonies, he quipped: "Let the dead bury the dead."

Lincoln exhibited no concern over these criticisms and derisions. In that third year of the war, more confronted him than the mere antipathy of his countrymen. Two writers were assuredly correct when they concluded of Lincoln's remarks at Gettysburg: "Certainly few great literary masterpieces have been composed under conditions so adverse."

Lincoln was in low spirits that dreary November primarily because the war was then going badly for the Union. Rosecrans's Federal Army in the West was seemingly trapped at Chattanooga; Meade and his Army of the Potomac were floundering anew against Lee in Virginia; Burnside and another Federal force were bottled up inside Knoxville; Confederate horsemen under Bedford Forrest and "Ranger" Mosby were constantly threatening both before and behind Union lines; a growing demand for peace at any cost permeated much of the North; and at sea Confederate privateers were emulating the pirates of old—and enjoying greater success.

At this same time, personal problems bore down on Lincoln's already sagging shoulders. Young Tad Lincoln lay seriously ill in the White House with an undiagnosed malady. Only the year before, Lincoln had buried his beloved Willie. Now a second son courted death; and on top of that, the President's high-strung wife had succumbed to a new combine of tantrums and hysteria.

Thus, as the bunting-bedecked special train left Washington for the 6-hour trip to Gettysburg, its chief passenger sat alone and stared solemnly out the soot-blackened windows. He was withdrawn, tired, beset with a thousand anxieties, sagging with grief at the human cost of national unity, and keenly aware that for many Americans his absence would make the heart grow fonder.

Somehow Lincoln overrode these heavy burdens. He had a small, almost inconsequential task to perform at Gettysburg, but he looked forward to it eagerly. For he wanted his countrymen to share with him a dream of the present and a hope for the future. His dream was that the Old Union, with its many virtues and in spite of its many vices, would be preserved. But at the same time, Lincoln hoped fervently that from the smoking ashes of that terrible cataclysm would rise a New Union—a union in which the Nation could enjoy a new birth of freedom, a rebirth of liberty, and an unchallenged perpetuation of a government both of and for all people. As well as he could, Lincoln wished to assure his fellow countrymen that those men who in battle had displayed the last full measure of devotion had not done so for naught, that the patriot's death would guarantee the Nation's life.

On a crisp November morning 100 years ago, therefore, Lincoln joined 15,000 persons who had gathered in the battle-scarred town for the special program. The rotting carcasses of horses, and the odors of partially buried soldiers, still hung offensively over the land. Yet a bright November sun illuminated the autumn colors of Pennsylvania; and quite possibly Lincoln sensed that for the past four months—since those sacrificial days of July—a richer glow bathed the hills and vales of Gettysburg. It was the light of the courage of man which, for now and forever, would beam as a radiant heritage.

Lincoln sat patiently and attentively as Edward Everett, the distinguished and silken orator from Massachusetts, delivered the principal address. The golden-tongued statesman lived up to expectations. For 2 hours he elaborated upon the war in general, the battle of Gettysburg in particular, the sins of State sovereignty, and the virtues of the Union. When Everett sat down, prolonged applause left no doubt but that he had been superb.

And then it was Lincoln's turn. John Russell Young of the Philadelphia Press described the moment: "The music ran on a bit and then the President arose. Deliberate, hesitating, awkward, 'like a telescope drawing out,' as I heard someone say, the large bundled up figure untwisting and adjusting itself into reasonable conditions." Lincoln was wearing a black suit whose shiny knees and frayed sleeves reflected its overly long use. He moved slowly to the edge of the platform, "stood an instant waiting for the cheers to cease and the music to exhaust its echoes, slowly adjusted his glasses, and took from his pocket what seemed to be a page of ordinary foolscap paper, quietly unfolded it, looked for the place, and begin to read."

The Wisconsin German, Carl Schurz, once observed that Lincoln's voice "was not musical, rather high-keyed, and apt to turn into a shrill treble in moments of excitement; but it was not positively disagreeable. It had an exceedingly penetrating, far-reaching quality." Lincoln's presentations, added Schurz, could be "awkward. He swung his long arms sometimes in a very ungraceful manner. Now and then he would, to give particular emphasis to a point, bend his knees and body with a sudden downward jerk, and then shoot up again with a vehemence that raised him to his tiptoes and made him look much taller than he really was." But Schurz quickly added: "There was, however, in all he said, a tone of earnest truthfulness, of elevated, noble sentiment, and of kindly sympathy."

In a high midwestern drawl audible only to those crowded close around the platform, Lincoln spoke 10 sentences. Two-thirds of his words were monosyllable. He was not ever original in what he had to say. He had borrowed some thoughts from Thomas Jefferson, and he leaned heavily on phrases from the Old Testament. Many in the audience were more attentive of a photographer laboriously trying to get a picture than they were of the speaker. Everett had spoken 2 hours; Lincoln barely consumed 2 minutes. So quick an ending startled most of his listeners, and the scattered and polite clap of hands at once convinced Lincoln that he had "scoured," or, in modernday terminology, that he had laid a rotten egg.

Initial reaction to the remarks confirmed Lincoln's belief. One observer referred to the "almost shocking brevity" of the speech. The Chicago Times reported: "The cheek of every American must tingle with shame as he reads the silly, flat and dishwater utterances of the man who has to be pointed out to intelligent foreigners as the President of the United States." And a correspondent for the London Times disgustingly informed his readers: "The ceremony was rendered ludicrous by some of the sallies of that poor President Lincoln. * * * Anything more dull and commonplace it would not be easy to produce."

Lincoln returned to Washington that night—and promptly went to bed with a mild attack of smallpox. For him, an inglorious day thus came to an injurious end.

However, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address marked a turning point in his life. Theretofore, his genius of logic and his genius of imaginative thought had formed two separate, practically indiscernable streams. (Lincoln's writings were so simple that Englishmen had to inform Americans of their literary quality.) Yet at Gettysburg these two currents merged under great emotion and gushed forth in a eulogy for freedom now known by heart the world over. Even more than that, the remarks at Gettysburg ultimately brought to Lincoln recognition as an articulate statesman and respect as an extraordinary man.

Lincoln needed this increased esteem. It was difficult for many Americans then—just as it is difficult for many writers today—to look beyond the raw, robust frontiersman whose high-pitched laugh was likened to "the naying of a wild horse on a prairie." He had come to the White House as an unknown and an oddity. His behavior in earlier years was but a derivative of the western wilderness that nurtured him. Many were the tales of his alleged escapades in the virgin regions of Indiana and Illinois. For example, Lincoln's sister died in the 1830's, and young Abe felt that the neglect of her husband had been a contributing factor to death. Several years later, the brother-in-law and a friend married two sisters in a double ceremony. That night Lincoln reputedly was the leading spirit in maneuvering the two brides into the darkened and wrong bedrooms.

To the disgust of sedate easterners, Lincoln had been rather coarse in his courtship of Miss Mary Todd. He met his future wife at a party, and it took him several minutes to work up the courage to ask her to dance. And after he had finished hopping around the floor with a complete disregard for the music's tempo, Lincoln stammered to his baffled partner: "Miss Todd, I like to dance with you the worst way."

In his first years as President, Lincoln was noted by and large for witty and unpredictable sayings. Once, when an official commented on the contrast between Attorney General Edward Bates' snow-white beard and jet-black hair, Lincoln quietly observed: "Well, it could hardly be otherwise, and the cause is that [Mr. Bates] uses his jaws more than he does his brains." On another occasion, a Cabinet member raised strong objections to the antics of bungling, cross-eyed Gen. Ben Butler. Lincoln interrupted his colleague with the admonition: "Ah, sir, you must not criticize General Butler, for he does not see things as we do."

Many northerners meeting Lincoln for the first time asserted that the sight of him had frightened the South into secession. His own generals referred to him as "that gangling baboon." Abnormally tall, unbelievably thin, Lincoln nevertheless made constant references to his own ugliness. Indeed, he seemed to go out of his way to accentuate his ungainly appearance. He insisted on wearing a tall "stovepipe" hat quite out of fashion in those Victorian times; he shuffled around the White House in carpet slippers; and he appeared most at ease in ill-fitting, rumpled clothing.

Yet, as the Nation came slowly to learn, the man within was a marked contrast to the man without. One must remember that Lincoln is the only President who entered office with a civil war awaiting him. He had little time for merriment; as President he seldom laughed and rarely smiled. His constant anxiety over Federal armies in the field, his despondence at one stunning Union defeat after another in the war's first years, his concern over the plight of 3 million enslaved humans, his sharp agonies at such duties as approving the death sentence of 267 Federal soldiers, the remembered sordidness of his childhood, the limitations of a self-acquired education, an unhappy family life—these were only a few of the hindrances to happiness that Lincoln experienced.

He transcended these habitats of sadness and inferiority by means of an abiding patience, an ever-developing maturity, a deep love of humanity, and a consuming faith in the future of his country. The bickerings of politicians and the indecisions of generals Lincoln tolerated with a patience few men could have displayed in those tumultuous times. His ability to exploit his assets and overcome his liabilities made him a statesman with an unusual capacity for growth. From a keen sense of reality, a remarkable sense of timing, and an incisive understanding of men, Lincoln developed into one of the shrewdest politicians ever to grace the American stage.

But above all, Lincoln had a wonderful capacity for identifying himself with the masses. Americans of the 1860's never forgot—because Lincoln would not let them forget—that he was a plain man of simple origins. The masses loved him because he seemed to be one of them and because he strove hard to accomplish a difficult task that would profit them all. Although he lacked warmth in his personal relationships, Lincoln was ever sensitive to the tribulations of others. His rough nature and earthy stories sometimes shocked the Victorian elements of society; but these same traits won Lincoln the warm affection of that class on whom the destiny of this Nation has always rested: the common people.

No explanation is therefore needed as to why a favorite northern war song bore the title: "We Are Coming, Father Abraham, Three Hundred Thousand Strong." A lowly private in the Federal army spoke for countless numbers of his compatriots when he wrote after seeing Lincoln for the first time: "Concentrated in that great, strong yet tender face, the agony of the life-and-death struggle of the hour was revealed as we had never seen it before. With a new understanding, we knew why we were soldiers."

Only recently, one of the Nation's more caustic literary critics concluded of Lincoln: "He must have suffered far more than he ever expressed from the agonies and griefs of the war, and it was morally and dramatically inevitable that this prophet who had crushed opposition and sent thousands of men to their deaths should finally attest his good faith by laying down his own life with theirs."

This then was the man who came to Gettysburg to make "a few appropriate remarks." This is the man whose life and utterances we now acclaim. Perhaps it is fitting that on this centennial observance a Virginian would have the honor of journeying to Pennsylvania in order to praise a son of the Midwest. This occasion in itself is a realization of Lincoln's hope. We here today are living proof that the wounds of civil war were not too deep for healing—that this Nation did have a new birth of freedom—that Lincoln's beloved government of the people did not perish from the earth.

We live and prosper and glory in America, not in spite of what Lincoln sought to attain, but because of it.

Keeping the citizens of the North firmly behind the cause of national unity, while at the same time extending the hand of brotherhood and conciliation to the people of the South, is what gives Lincoln his place in history. Perhaps democracy has never been ideal, but Lincoln's beliefs represent the ideal democracy.

Rosemary Benet once wrote a poem about Lincoln's mother, Nancy Hanks. It goes something like this:

"If Nancy Hanks could return as a ghost,
Seeking news of what she loved most,
She'd ask first, 'Where's my son?
What happened to Abe? What's he done?
Poor little Abe, left all alone
Except for Tom, who's a rolling stone;
He was only 9 the year I died.
I remember still how hard he cried.
Scraping along in a little shack,
With hardly a shirt to cover his back,
And a prairie wind to blow him down,
Or pinching times if he went to town.
You wouldn't know about my son?
Did he grow tall? Did he have fun?
Did he learn to read? Did he get to town?
Do you know his name? Did he get on?'"

Today Nancy Hanks need worry no more about what became of her son, for the unwanted speaker at Gettysburg became freedom's herald of hope for all time to come.

My President Is Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, each of us has mourned the passing of President Kennedy in our own way. It is not always easy or possible to articulate the grief we feel at a moment of great tragedy.

To some are given the gift of expressing that which we may feel. For such comfort as my colleagues and my fellow Americans may derive therefrom, I offer here a poem written by a very dear friend in Arizona, Mrs. Willard "Billee" Shoecraft, on the day President Kennedy passed away:

MY PRESIDENT IS DEAD

Oh, the wind is bitter cold tonight
That moans through the cypress trees.
The moon is dark and has no face
And gone is the gentle breeze.
So still is the song of the mockingbird.
His music I hear no more.
And the angry waves cry out in the night
As they beat on the ragged shore.

Oh, lift him gently and lay him down
Beneath a blanket of snow.
Wrap him with love and tenderness
For cold are the winds that blow.

He was only here such a little while.
He was much too young to die.
So find him a valley that's green again
With a patch of blue for his sky.
Maybe he wasn't always right,
But he fought for what he believed.
For a better world and the right to be free
In a land that must not be deceived.
He looked like a boy when he smiled sometimes
With a twinkle in his eye.
Yet he stood so tall in a world of men.
Why did he have to die?

Bewilderment covers the earth tonight.
A nation stands shocked and stunned.
How could the violent seed of hate
Stop a life that had only begun?

Let not the good that he sought to do
Lie now in a cold, dark grave.
Let the peace on earth and the freedom of man
Be the price for the life he gave.

Oh, cold is the wind from the mountain tonight
And unknown the road ahead
For the wind wails out through the cypress trees
My President is dead.

—*Billee Shoecraft.*

I Am Opposed to Guilt by Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there are people today, some in high judicial office, who are indicting the whole Nation for the act of a dedicated Communist. I do not feel that our great Nation should be talked into an inferiority complex.

It is, therefore, most refreshing to include herewith an excellent editorial from yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

LET'S BE SENSIBLE

The first reaction upon seeing Lyndon Johnson walking with the others to the service at St. Matthew's was one of surprise. Was it wise for the President, after what happened in Dallas, to take the risk?

The more one thought about it the more proper it seemed. Should the President have ridden behind bulletproof glass? Should the same precaution have been taken in the case of Charles de Gaulle, Prince Phillip, Anastas Mikoyan, and the others? We think not. For to have done this might have lent a certain plausibility to the false notion that there is a sort of madness abroad in the land; that it was this, not a deranged mind, upon which must rest the blame for the assassination of President Kennedy.

There are, of course, those who preach violence in America. And there are those who practice it. But does this call for an indictment of all of us? Does it mean that ours is a generation apart? There are those who are suggesting as much. But how do they explain the assassination of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley? How account for the excesses of our own American Revolution? Is there some weakness that is inherent in and peculiar to a free society such as ours? If so, what is the explanation for the assassinations in the closed societies?

No one knows what was at work in the unbalanced mind of Lee Harvey Oswald. Perhaps we will never know. He said something about being embittered because of hardship endured by his mother during the great depression. But millions of mothers suffered during those years. Yet their sons do not go around killing Presidents.

No, this theory of national guilt will not wash. The lunatic always has been and always will be with us. Every proper precaution should be taken to safeguard the President. But his security can never be made absolute. And we might just as well face up to it.

Another absurdity is the conspiratorial explanation of the murder of Lee Oswald by Jack Ruby. The official East German news agency quotes the inevitable political observers as saying that the assassination of President Kennedy was ordered by the extreme right-wingers, that an attempt was made to link the Communists to the crime, and that it was then decided to eliminate Oswald in the Fascist manner so that he would never be able to name the real killers. This same line is being heard in veiled suggestions by otherwise sane Americans.

What utter nonsense. President Johnson has wisely called for a prompt and thorough investigation of all the circumstances surrounding the President's murder. The report which results should set to rest the orgy of speculation to which we have been treated in recent days.

Assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of November 26, puts into frank perspective the question of where, if anywhere, the guilt should be established—or blame laid—for the tragic assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th man to hold the highest office in the land as President of the United States of America.

I commend this editorial to the attention of Members of the House of Representatives, and the public, and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At this same time, I would also like to include a copy of my public statement, made shortly after this tragic event took place:

NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress, and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people

STATEMENT RELEASED BY CONGRESSMAN DON L. SHORT, REPUBLICAN, OF NORTH DAKOTA, IMMEDIATELY AFTER LEARNING OF THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

All sane-minded Americans are shocked at the tragedy of the assassination of the President of the United States.

Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, people of all races and creeds, deplore this tragic happening on what will be recorded as a dark day in our Nation's history.

This is the work of a demented person, as similar attempts on the lives of former Presidents and high Government officials have been in the past. Americans believe in, and have accepted since our Nation was founded, the principle of rule by law.

Forceful overthrow of government is completely un-American, and this shameful incident in our history is completely contrary to the principles by which this Nation, under God, was founded—to give men a new and permanent opportunity for freedom.

Our President has truly laid down his life in the service of his country.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, newspapers throughout my State of Maine have been making editorial comment on the untimely and tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Just recently I had the opportunity of reading the editorials that appeared in the Bangor Daily News and the Portland Sunday Telegram. I have found these editorials eminently interesting, so I insert them into the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Nov. 25, 1963]

FROM THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE EARTH

As John Fitzgerald Kennedy is laid to his eternal rest today, sorrowing Americans can find comfort and reassurance in the great outpouring of sympathy that has come from all parts of the world.

The formal diplomatic messages were to have been expected. But there has been much, much more.

France's Charles de Gaulle will attend today's services in Washington to bid final farewell to the man who was leader of the free world as well as President of the United States. Britain will be represented by Prince Philip and Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas Home. Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany will be a mourner.

Their presence is a tribute to the late President and to the Nation. But most heart warming of all has been the spontaneous response of the world's common people.

In West Berlin, 80,000 free world men and women marched in a solemn torchlight parade, demonstrating their grief over the loss of the young and vigorous free world leader. Candles were burned in the windows of Berlin homes.

The commander of the Japanese naval craft that sunk Kennedy's PT boat in World War II—and thus very nearly taking Kennedy's life at that time—sent condolences to the Kennedy family. The cameldriver friend of President Lyndon B. Johnson sent his personal message of sympathy from Pakistan. A Russian woman—a private citizen—brought an armful of roses to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

And so it went after the news of the late President's assassination was flashed to the far corners of the earth. The plain and good people of the world were shocked and grieved.

More than that, their words signified encouragement to the Nation that has the task of leading the struggle for freedom and justice for all men everywhere. They were speaking from their hearts. They were expressing gratitude for what this Nation has done for them. And they were rallying behind the cause which John Fitzgerald Kennedy symbolized as the President of the United States.

Today's sorrow must be borne. Life must go on. The struggle must go on. The burden is made lighter by the outpouring of sympathy that has streamed into the Nation's Capital from the plain, good people of the world. They have faith in America. This strengthens the faith of Americans in themselves.

And so now to the sad task of saying farewell to John Fitzgerald Kennedy—whose dedicated service to his country was cut short by an assassin's bullet.

[From the Portland (Maine) Sunday Telegram and Sunday Press Herald, Nov. 24, 1963]

HISTORIC WARNING

As the Nation lifts itself from the shock of the President's assassination, it faces into a new chapter of American history.

Like a symphony repeating a grand theme, the story of the American Republic has almost looped back on itself to encompass the shooting of another noble President who had been catapulted into fame by his championship of Negro freedom. On Friday the Union acted out a muted version of those events of nearly a century ago, with a startling parallel—the succession of a Vice President named Johnson.

John Kennedy's brief administration was marked by one thing above all. It was his recognition of the disease of racial segregation that infects the whole country; his appraisal of its virulence; and his courage in speaking and acting to remedy the evil. More than any President in modern times, he took his stand for the rights guaranteed to Negroes in the U.S. Constitution. And that deliberate act made the parallel with Abraham Lincoln more than a mechanical one of date and fatal bullets and Vice Presidents named Johnson.

President Kennedy has fallen at a critical time in the evolution of the racial problem. Like Lincoln, he was greatly admired and bitterly hated for his words and actions in the cause of human freedom. He leaves a country divided, with a new presidential election approaching, in which the main issue may be "black and white."

Fortunately, the Nation is not wounded as it was 100 years ago by the Civil War. President Lyndon B. Johnson has a much greater chance to conciliate the opposing factions than did his namesake, President Andrew Johnson, who was the victim of bitter squabbling and vindictiveness in the days of Reconstruction. He is a southerner himself, but has shown a broad sympathy for the cause of civil rights. His career in the Senate was a lessonbook in bringing divergent groups together for effective action. He is no weakling.

But if he is to succeed in preventing America's most critical issue from once again tearing the Union apart, he must receive the help, the charity, the determination of millions of Americans that "this Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," shall endure. The historic parallel is a warning. This is a time for men of all factions to live by the legacy of John Kennedy: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Economist Doubts Tax Cut Would Improve Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the administration's arguments for its program to cut taxes while increasing Federal spending is that it would result in an improvement in our serious balance-of-payments situation. Doubts have been expressed from many quarters about the theory that an economic expansion results in improvement of a country's balance-of-payments position.

Recently a highly competent analysis based upon the historic record since 1920 was prepared by an economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. The study concluded that in only 2 out of the 10 business cycles composing the 1920–62 period, was the balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

The study, which is of major importance in the current debate on the administration's tax program, has been published by the Joint Economic Committee in a joint committee print released this month and entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments—Perspective and Policies." In addition to the study already referred to, the committee print includes a factual and objective discussion of our balance-of-payments problem by the committee's international economist, Gerald A. Pollack, and additional studies on how foreign aid, our defense program, and the business cycles influence our balance of payments.

Under unanimous consent, I include at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of the study by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia and an article from the New York Herald Tribune of November 20 commenting upon the study:

WILL GROWTH END THE PAYMENTS DEFICIT? THE LESSONS OF PAST EXPERIENCE

(By Jack C. Rothwell, economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia [1])

During 12 of the past 13 years the United States has sustained a deficit in its international balance of payments. The deficits have amounted to a total of $26 billion. To finance this sum we have transferred $8 billion in gold to foreigners and have increased our liquid liabilities by $18 billion.

The policies undertaken to relieve the deficit have ranged all the way from Government-sponsored programs to expand exports to a decrease in the dollar value of duty-free goods that American tourists may bring in from abroad. Yet still the deficit has continued.

In recent months a relatively new balance-of-payments hypothesis has gained wide-

Footnotes at end of speech.

spread acceptance: that the deficit can be relieved through an acceleration in the rate of economic growth in this Nation. In this paper we examine the degree of confidence which might be accorded this hypothesis on the basis of past experience with growth and the balance of payments.

REASONING BEHIND THE GROWTH HYPOTHESIS

The rationale behind the growth proposition concerns both the international capital and trade transactions between this country and foreign nations. It is reasoned, first of all, that more rapid economic growth in the United States will make this Nation more attractive to foreign and domestic investors, more attractive because accelerating growth will create a greater demand for capital and a rise in profits and interest rates. Greater demand for capital and higher profits and interest rates will cause both domestic and foreign investors to channel more of their funds into U.S. investments—into new plant and equipment, purchases of stocks and bonds, and into short-term investments, such as Treasury bills. The increased investment at home, it is reasoned, will mean a reduction of investment funds flowing abroad, funds that reached a $3.3 billion total last year.

It is also reasoned that accelerating economic growth would have favorable effects on our trade position. A higher growth rate, the argument goes, would increase income and demand for goods. Greater demand for goods would increase production from present levels, thereby doing two things; (a) Cutting unit costs of production and (b) providing more profits so business could modernize plant and equipment, thus further cutting costs. This double-edged decrease in costs would help both our export industries and our import-threatened industries to compete with foreign goods.

It is recognized that the rise in incomes created by a hike in the growth rate will mean an increase in imports and thus an increased outflow of dollars for imported goods. But the growth proposition concludes that the combination of (a) the decrease in capital flowing abroad and (b) the better competitive position of our export and import industries will provide more than enough counterforce to make up the increased imports and still contribute to a reduction in our deficit.

This is the argument. Let us examine it in the light of past experience.

TECHNIQUE OF ANALYSIS

Since the theory hinges on growth one might go back in history, look at periods characterized by substantially differing rates of economic growth, and see how our balance of payments actually behaved. During periods of fastest growth, for example, did the rate of capital outflow really decline in reponse to greater demands for capital and higher profits and interest rates? And what actually happened to the trade balance?

To answer these questions, balance-of-payments flows first were examined during different phases of the business cycle. Every cycle since 1920 was analyzed to see if discernible patterns of behavior could be established for balance-of-payments items as the cycle phase shifted from fast growth to slow growth to recession. Then longer timespans were examined to see if the expected growth patterns emerged. First, then, how did the balance of payments behave over the differing growth phases of the business cycle? The answer to this question is provided in the tables which follow. But before we examine the findings, let us first take a look at the structure of the tables.

TABLE I.—*Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments* [1]

Balance-of-payments item	1920–62 (10 expansions, 10 recessions)		1945–62 (5 expansions, 5 recessions)	
	Expansions	Recessions	Expansions	Recessions
1. Net private capital flows abroad	[2] 20	[2] 80	[4] 20	[4] 80
(a) Direct investments	[2] 33	[2] 67	[4] 20	[4] 80
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[3] 37	[3] 63	40	60
(c) Short-term investments	[3] 44	[3] 56	[4] 20	[4] 80
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	40	60
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	70	30	80	[4] 20
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	50	50	40	60
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	40	60	40	60
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	60	40	60	40
5. Imports of goods and services	30	70	[4] 20	[4] 80
6. Net export balance	50	50	60	40
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	50	50	60	40
Above including total of errors and omissions	60	40	60	40

[1] In this and following tables balance-of-payments items from which the ratios are derived are expressed in average monthly flows of funds. An improvement during the boom phase (say in capital account) would occur if the rate of outflow of funds decreased relative to that in the preceding recession period or if an outflow of funds in the recession were replaced by an inflow. NBER reference dates were used to determine cycle periods and quarterly balance-of-payments data (yearly data in the earlier period) were interpolated to arrive at the average monthly flows of funds for each cycle.
[2] Statistically significant at 90-percent level.
[3] Odd number because of fewer cycles, 9 for direct investment and short-term capital, 8 for long-term portfolio investment.
[4] Statistically significant at 80-percent level.

TABLE III.—*Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments*

Balance-of-payments item	1945–62 (5 recessions, 5 expansions)	
	Fast growth phase	Stability
1. Net private capital flows abroad	[1] 80	[1] 20
(a) Direct investments	60	40
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[1] 80	[1] 20
(c) Short-term investments	60	40
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	60	40
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	40	60
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	[1] 80	[1] 20
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	60	40
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	[1] 0	[1] 100
5. Imports of goods and services	[1] 100	[1] 0
6. Net export balance	[1] 0	[1] 100
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	40	60
Above including total of errors and omissions	[1] 20	[1] 80

[1] Statistically significant at the 80-percent level.

TABLE II.—*Percent of total business cycles during which item contributed to an improvement in the balance of payments*

[6-months lag in balance-of-payments items]

Balance-of-payments item	1920–62 (10 expansions, 10 recessions)		1945–62 (5 expansions, 5 recessions)	
	Expansions	Recessions	Expansions	Recessions
1. Net private capital flows abroad	30	70	[2] 20	[2] 80
(a) Direct investments	30	70	[2] 20	[2] 80
(b) Long-term portfolio investments	[1] 50	50	40	60
(c) Short-term investments	[1] 56	44	60	40
Net private capital flows abroad plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	40	60
2. Foreign direct and long-term portfolio investment in the United States	60	40	60	40
3. U.S. private capital flows less foreign direct and long-term investment	60	40	60	40
Above plus ½ errors and omissions	50	50	60	40
4. Exports of goods and services (excluding military transactions)	[2] 80	[2] 20	[2] 100	[2] 0
5. Imports of goods and services	[2] 10	[2] 90	0	100
6. Net export balance	40	60	40	[2] 60
7. Net export balance less difference in U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows	60	40	60	40
Above including total of errors and omissions	50	50	40	60

[1] Odd number because includes only 9 cycles; long-term investment item computed for 8 cycles.
[2] Statistically significant at 90-percent level.
[3] Statistically significant at 80-percent level.

TABLE IV.—*Average annual percent change in selected balance-of-payments flows over periods associated with differential rates of economic growth* [1]

[Minus signs indicate a deterioration in the balance of payments]

Balance-of-payments items	1921–29	1930–39	1948–56	1959–62
1. Net private capital flows abroad	−8.6	+11.8	−24.7	−6.1
(a) Direct investments		+11.6	−12.6	−1.0
(b) Long-term portfolio investments		−6.0	−59.7	−8.3
(c) Short-term investments		−4.4	−137.2	−14.6
Net private capital plus ½ errors and omissions	−11.5	+14.1	−86.3	−4.3
2. U.S. private capital outflows plus ½ errors and omissions less foreign direct and long-term portfolio capital inflows	−4.0	+7.4	−53.5	−15.1
3. Net export balance	−2.4	+5.8	−6.6	+54.4
4. Net export balance less combined U.S. and foreign capital flows	−5.4	+7.8	−9.6	+130.9
5. Above including 100 percent of errors and omissions	−9.2	+7.1	−9.4	+70.2

[1] Percent change over the period is calculated from an average for the 1st 2 years of the period to an average of the last 2. Simple annual rates of growth as measured by the industrial production index are as follows: 1921–29, 11.6 percent; 1930–39, 2.3 percent; 1948–56, 6 percent; 1959–62, 4 percent.

THE TABLES

Column 1 of the first three tables contains several balance-of-payments items, both individual entries and selected groupings. First, for example, we have the total of net private capital flows abroad and then the subitems which compose these capital flows.

Next, we have foreign direct and long-term portfolio capital flows into this country. Third is the difference between private capital outflows and foreign capital flowing in, both including and excluding a portion of errors and omissions.

Next comes exports of goods and services, imports, and out net export balance. Finally, we have combined our net capital flows, trade balance, and errors and omissions.

The remaining columns contain a series of ratios for each balance-of-payments item and group. The ratios tell us the percentage of business cycles in which an improvement occurred as we changed from a slower to a faster rate of growth. For example, if in 8 of the 10 cycles occurring since 1920 the capital flow slowed down as we moved from recession to expansion, then we would put an 80 percent in the expansion column and 20 percent in the recession column, indicating that capital flows contributed to an improvement in our balance of payments 80 percent of the time as we entered the faster growth phase.

The cycles in the first two tables are broken into two time periods: the period 1920–62 and the subperiod 1945–62. Granted, our balance-of-payments data were not so good during the earlier years, but the similarity of behavior during the two periods is an indication that the data may be adequate for the type of analysis employed.

Now to the findings of the analysis. What actually happened to our balance-of-payments items as we moved from slower to faster rates of growth?

RESULTS

1. Looking first at the net private capital flow abroad in table I, we see a different sort of picture than we might have anticipated, given the growth hypothesis. In only 2 out of the 10 cycles composing the 1920–62 period (and also in only 20 percent of the postwar cycles) was our balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

2. Looking next at the items composing our net private capital flow abroad, we see that all (including short-term capital flows) contributed to an improvement more often in recessions than in the accompanying expansion phase. The pattern is even more pronounced in the postwar cycles than in the period as a whole.

3. When we add one-half of errors and omissions to the net private capital flow abroad we see a 50–50 pattern during the entire period 1920–62, indicating no preponderance of improvement in expansions or recessions. In the postwar period, however, there is still a slight edge in favor of improvements during recessions.

4. When we calculate the difference between U.S. capital outflows and foreign capital inflows we once more see a 50–50 pattern during the 1920–62 period and a slight edge in favor of improvement during recessions for the postwar period.

Adding one-half of errors and omissions to the U.S. capital flow changes the pattern only slightly. In both periods we are better off 6 out of 10 recessions and 4 out of 10 booms.

5. Looking next at the trade picture, we see that exports tend to improve our balance-of-payments position most often during the expansion phase. This is true for both periods. Imports, however, help improve our balance-of-payments position only rarely during expansions. Calculating our net export balance, we see a 50–50 pattern during the entire period, indicating no preponderance of improvements in expansions or recessions. In the postwar period a slight edge appears during the expansion phase.

6. The last entry in table I combines our capital flows, net export balance, and errors and omissions. As can be seen, this most comprehensive measure of our balance-of-payments performance gives a slight edge to improvements during the expansion phase. This is true both for the 1920–62 period and the 1945–62 period.

Yet the margin is small. During 6 out of 10 cycles this combination of items shows improvement as we move from slow to fast growth; during 4 out of 10 cycles it shows deterioration. Indeed, the test for statistical significance (the footnotes on the table show which items may be considered statistically significant), this test tells us that we can have virtually no confidence that the 60–40 pattern did not evolve simply due to chance.[2]

In summary, then, private U.S. capital tends most often to cause deterioration rather than improvement as we move from recession to expansion. But when corrected for errors and omissions and for foreign capital inflows, the total capital account shows little preponderance for improvement during either the expansion or recession phase. Similarly, our net export balance shows no marked tendency toward improvement in either expansions or recessions. The same thing is true when we group capital, the net export balance, and errors and omissions. One would thus be hard pressed to make a case for the growth hypothesis on the basis of table I.

But let us go a step further. It is quite possible that the balance of payments responds to an increase in the rate of growth only after a time lag. One might reason, for example, (a) it takes time for increased growth to be reflected in rising profits and interest rates, (b) it takes time for investors to become aware of the increased growth, higher interest rates, and profits in this country and (c) time is required for the physical arrangements necessary to direct a larger volume of investment into the domestic economy.

Table II shows the recession-expansion comparison adjusted to include a 6-month lag in the payments items. Yet despite the lag adjustment, the main groups of items show a striking similarity to those in table I.

The total U.S. private capital outflow tends to cause deterioration in the balance of palments as we move from recesion to expansion but, after correcting for errors and omissions and also when coupled with foreign capital inflows, the combined capital account once more shows little preponderance for improvement during either the expansion of recession phase.[3]

Similarly, though both exports and imports show a higher concentration of improvements in the expansion and recession phases, respectively, the net export balance exhibits no significant preponderance of improvements in either phase. The same pattern holds true when we group together the combined capital, the net export balance, and erorrs and omissions. Thus on the basis of table II one would also be hard pressed to make a case for the growth hypothesis.

Yet it is still possible that a very fast rate of cyclical growth might result in a balance-of-payments pattern more in keeping with the growth hypothesis. To test this possibility, a comparison was made of the behavior of the post-World War II balance-of-payments items within the expansion phase: as the cycle moved from the trough into the very fast upward phase and then leveled off into the phase of relative stability or "bumping along the top" as it is sometimes called. What, then, happened as the cycle moved from fast growth to stability? In fact, an interesting change occurred.

As shown in table III, we have a concentration of improvements in capital flows during the fast-growth phase. Both (a) U.S. private net capital and (b) the combined U.S. outflow and foreign inflow accounts show improvement in 80 percent of the cycles during the fast-growth phase. When we include errors and omissions, however, both accounts drop down to a statistically insignificant level: growth-phase improvements during only 60 percent of the cycles.

The net export balance in every cycle shows deterioration in the fast-growth phase and improvement in the stability phase.

Finally, when we combine capital, the export balance, and errors and omissions, we have improvement during the fast-growth phase during only one out of five cycles. The predominance of capital account improvements during the upswing erodes under the pressure of the export balance and errors and omissions.

Thus even though the growth hypothesis looks a little better on capital account in the fast-growth/stability comparison, by no means are we able to establish the proposition.

But so much for the cycle. Let us now look at the balance-of-payments items over longer time periods.

GROWTH AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS OVER LONGER PERIODS OF TIME

Table IV shows average annual percentage changes in selected balance-of-payments items during two fast-growth periods, 1921–29 and 1948–56 and two relatively slow-growth periods, 1930–39 and 1959–62. Granted, the depression period is associated with rather extraordinary events affecting the world economy, but since the years for which we have balance-of-payments data are limited, the period is included with the obvious caveat.

In general, table IV suggests that fast-growth periods are associated with deterioration in the balance of payments (increases in outflows of funds or decreases in inflows), and slow-growth periods with improvement. The table should not be taken, however, as evidence that the reverse of the growth hypothesis is true. The observations are too few, data in the earlier period are not without question—to mention just two reservations. Rather one might say that the table is not calculated to inspire confidence in the validity of the growth hypothesis.

As for the individual items in table IV, percentage increases in private capital flowing abroad are greater during the fast-growth periods (though this tendency is less evident when U.S. capital outflows are coupled with foreign capital inflows). The net export balance deteriorates during the fast-growth periods and improves during the slow-growth years, as does the grouping of capital, net export balance, and errors and omissions.

CONCLUSIONS

One might be tempted to draw the conclusion from this analysis that there is a slight edge in favor of the proposition that a faster rate of growth tends to promote disequilibrium in the balance of payments; that imports tend to grow faster than exports during the fast-growth periods, and that businessmen tend to invest more at home—but also more abroad during expansions (e.g., "Profits look good so let's expand in Cincinnati, and while we're at it we might reconsider the subsidiary in Milan" or "things look good the world over so let's stretch out for an extra 1 percent on a Canadian issue").

Yet such a conclusion is probably unwarranted. After all (and as previously mentioned) the balance-of-payments observa-

Footnotes at end of table.

tions are relatively few; the results of all comparisons were not uniform in outcome; the data may be questioned; there is some secular trend in the cyclical comparisons (though from an examination of the data this problem is considered to be minimal).

To be on firmer ground one might conclude instead that the evidence presented suggests that the growth hypothesis may be a case of oversimplification, that the behavior of our balance of payments is an extremely complex multivariate function which defies simple explanation, that there is simply no clear-cut tendency for an acceleration in the rate of growth to bring about an improvement in our balance of payments.

Given this conclusion, then, what guidance might this study offer the policymaker? Perhaps the following.

An increase in the rate of economic growth may help relieve our balance-of-payments deficit. Then again, it may not. Hence the wisdom which may be gained from this study is perhaps this: we should not count too heavily on growth as an equilibrating force; we should not put all our eggs in this basket; we should not even commit half our eggs. Instead, we should continue to strive for balance-of-payments equilibrium across the entire broad spectrum of public and private policy. And perhaps we should intensify our efforts.

TAX CUT HELD NO SOLUTION TO PAYMENTS LAG

(By Ben Weberman)

The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia yesterday demolished the thesis that a tax cut which would accelerate economic growth would help solve the balance-of-payment deficit.

The argument for a tax cut has leaned heavily on the international aspects of the payments problem as well as on the need to speed growth domestically to meet the nagging unemployment problem.

The bank concluded that policymakers of the United States should not count too heavily on growth as an equilibrating force which will keep funds here.

Instead, it was urged, the country should continue to strive for balance-of-payments equilibrium across the entire broad spectrum of public and private policy—and intensify these efforts. That would mean less foreign aid, less military spending, as well as tariff efforts designed to improve the balance of trade.

It based this judgment on a study of every cycle since 1920 to see if discernible patterns of behavior could be established for balance-of-payments items.

It did this because the thesis which is now commonly accepted stresses that if there is rapid economic growth, the United States will be attractive to foreign and domestic investors and will bring funds here.

While prosperity would increase the domestic demand for goods and therefore increase imports, the faster pace of output would permit companies to trim their unit costs of production. By providing more profits, business will have greater incentive to modernize and will end up by becoming more efficient and therefore more competitive in world markets.

Nonsense, says the Philadelphia Fed in a study authorized by Economist Jack C. Rothwell.

In only 2 out of the 10 cycles composing the 1920 to 1962 period was the balance of payments better off in the fast growth or expansion phase than it was in the recession phase.

Looking at the trade picture, the net export balance for these cycles shows a 50–50 pattern during the entire period, indicating no preponderance of improvements in expansions or recessions.

In summary, the bank noted, private U.S. capital tends most often to cause deterioration rather than improvement as the country moves from recession to expansion.

[1] The views expressed here are solely those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect the thinking of officials within the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

[2] The Chi-square test was used to determine statistical significance. The hypothesis formulated was that the items contributed predominantly to neither improvement nor deterioration in our balance of payments during either phase of the cycle. A rejection of this hypothesis on the basis of the test indicated that an item did indeed contribute predominantly to improvement or deterioration. The percentage indicates the degree of confidence (i.e., 80 percent, 90 percent) with which the hypothesis was rejected. This confidence did not prove extremely high even for the items where the hypothesis was rejected.

[3] It should be noted, however, that short-term capital flows now show a predominance of improvements as the cycle moves from recession to expansion (the postwar period).

United States and Canadian Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the October 23 issue of Roll Call, I noticed an article which commented on an exchange program involving congressional staff aids and staff members of the Canadian Parliament. This would indeed, promote a better understanding of the two nations' Legislatures.

The American Political Science Association has again taken the lead in a most worthwhile program. Mr. Don Tacheron, of the American Political Science Association, and another congressional assistant have gone to Ottawa to work out the details of this program. This cannot help but pave the way for similar programs with other countries.

The article of October 23, 1963 follows:

STAFFER SLATE CANADA TRADE

An exchange program involving congressional staffers and employees of the Canadian Parliament is now being worked out.

Under the proposed program, about a half dozen legislative aids of the two nations would trade places for 6 months. The purpose would be to promote mutual understanding of the Canadian and United States Legislatures.

Leaving Tuesday for Ottawa, the capital of Canada, were Don Tacheron, of the American Political Science Association, and Kent Watkins, administrative assistant to Representative WILLIAM MOORHEAD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania. They hoped to reach agreement with Canadian officials on details of the program.

According to Tacheron, the Canadian venture might become a pilot program for similar exchanges with other countries. Capitol Hill staffers would work for members of legislatures of various nations, with their respective counterparts working for similar periods in Congress.

The idea has been endorsed by numerous Members of Congress, including Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Representative CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey. Representative STANLEY R. TUPPER, Republican, of Maine, whose grandfather was Prime Minister of Canada, is also interested.

Such a program might help alleviate a complaint by Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, issued at commencement services at Notre Dame University in South Bend last June, that Canadians are always worrying about their powerful neighbor while Americans "only think seriously about us when something goes wrong across the border."

The President and a Former President Write

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1963, President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower wrote letters to Mr. Paul Roy, editor of the Gettysburg Times (Gettysburg, Pa.)

Three days later the pen of the President was forever silenced by a bullet, triggered by the finger of a conscienceless madman.

Little did the President realize he was writing prophetic words when he wrote of "the uncertainties of the future." Nor did he realize when he admonished "All rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of those ideals of which Lincoln spoke so luminously," that this was to be one of his last messages to the American people.

It appears fitting that this letter and that of Mr. Eisenhower, be made a part of the permanent RECORD, at this time.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

PAUL L. ROY,
The Gettysburg Times,
Gettysburg, Pa.:

From the past man obtains the insights, wisdom, and hope to face with confidence the uncertainties of the future. Abraham Lincoln was keenly aware of this when, a century ago, he journeyed to Gettysburg to make a few appropriate remarks.

Today, as we honor Lincoln's immortal eulogy to the dead on Cemetery Ridge, let us remember as well those thousands of American patriots whose graves at home, beneath the sea and in distant lands are silent sentries of our heritage.

Lincoln and others did indeed give us a new birth of freedom, but the goals of liberty and freedom, the obligations of keeping ours a government of and by the people are never-ending.

On this solemn occasion let us all rededicate ourselves to the perpetuation of those ideals of which Lincoln spoke so luminously.

As Americans, we can do no less.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

GETTYSBURG, PA.,
November 19, 1963.

Mr. PAUL L. ROY,
Editor, the Gettysburg Times,
Gettysburg, Pa.

DEAR MR. ROY: On the 100th anniversary of his immortal Gettysburg Address, the Nation pays tribute to one of history's towering figures, Abraham Lincoln. Of all our great national leaders, Lincoln was most typically

American. His achievements from the humblest beginnings to the final crowning years of his life stand as a lasting inspiration to every citizen to respect and defend the fundamental principles on which our governmental system of personal liberty and individual opportunity was founded.

The Nation calls on us now for the same faith and devotion so deeply felt by Lincoln as he stood here amid the havoc of Gettysburg to memorialize our way of life as a government "of the people, by the people and for the people." More than ever we need the example of Abraham Lincoln to guide, influence and uphold us.

The wise, compassionate, challenging words of his Gettysburg Address should be etched on the minds and hearts of every American. They will ever be one of the brightest jewels in the Nation's rich heritage.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Dedication of New Office Building, National Capital Region, National Park Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, about 900 people attended a special program dedicating the new three-story office building of the National Capital region, National Park Service, on the grounds at Ohio and Buckeye Drives, SW.—Hains Point—on Thursday, November 14, 1963.

The program, which was presided over by T. Sutton Jett, Regional Director, National Capital Region, began at 2 o'clock with a concert by the U.S. Navy band. Following the invocation by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, and presentation of colors, Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, introduced a number of guests including Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; Assistant Director of the National Park Service, Clarke Stratton; District of Columbia Commissioners Walter N. Tobriner and John B. Duncan; Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia; Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, Mrs. James H. Rowe; executive director of the Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau, Clarence Arata; Superintendent Milo Christiansen, and Assistant Superintendent Joseph Cole, of the District of Columbia Recreation Board; Architect William Haussman, formerly of the National Capital Region Design and Construction Office, who designed the building; and Victor R. Beauchamp, contractor for the building.

A short address was given by Secretary Udall, and a new composition, "National Capital Region March," by Lt. Anthony A. Mitchell, director of the U.S. Navy Band, was dedicated to the park system and played to an audience for the first time by the band.

The dedication ceremony ended with the retirement of colors, after which an open house was held.

An interesting fact about this new building is that for the first time in a history covering a 175-year period of continuing operation, this organization now has its own headquarters building.

By authority of the Resident Act of July 16, 1790, President George Washington appointed three Federal Commissioners to lay out a district, 10 miles square, for the seat of the Federal Government. Later, Pierre Charles L'Enfant was chosen to plan the new Capital. In his plan, the character of the Capital was formed by its parks. The parks were developed to provide settings for the Government buildings. In the beginning, these three Commissioners were, with broad powers, in control of all public buildings and grounds in the Federal City, but as time passed and the Government grew, certain functions of the original Federal Commissioners were given to other Federal agencies.

In 1849, the parks of Washington were assigned to the Department of Interior for administration. From 1867 to 1925, the Chief Engineer of the U.S. Army was responsible for the National Capital Parks, and in 1933, control of the parks was returned to Interior, as they became an important unit of the farflung national park system.

National park areas of the Capital at first included such areas as the Mall, the Washington Monument grounds, Franklin, and Garfield Parks, and the "President's Park." Eventually, however, 301 park reservations were established on lands acquired from the original landowners in 1791. A most significant addition to the Washington park system was the establishment of Rock Creek Park in 1890, one of the largest and most beautiful natural metropolitan parks in the world. Number of units in the National Capital Region at the present times is 771, covering an area of 39,500 acres. Visitation in 1962, in the parks of the Nation's Capital was over 15 million. This does not include the national memorials which received another 7 million. The following figures are for the year 1962: Lincoln Memorial, 2,672,294; Washington Monument, 1,758,287; Jefferson Memorial, 1,251,251; Custis-Lee Mansion, 446,473; Lincoln Museum, 261,513; House Where Lincoln Died, 163,886.

The new three-story office building for the National Capital region staff has 26,000 square feet of floor space, and was built at a cost of approximately $1 million. The steel frame, fireproof building is of modern contemporary design, faced with Indiana limestone and brick. There are Vermont marble window spandrels.

A U.S. Park Police headquarters building now under construction on the grounds is scheduled to be completed in March of 1964. This building, two stories in height will have 11,000 square feet of floor space, and will serve as the headquarters for the 250-man force.

Landscape features of the 11-acre area, when completed, will include a number of linden trees, flowering shrubs, and a parking area.

For the first time in many years, the principal administrative offices of the park department will be housed in one building, and it is anticipated that this move will increase efficiency of operations of the park department, which traces its legal origin to the Residence Act of July 16, 1790.

A Man of Prayer and Action—John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was idolized by the people of West Virginia. All in this great State are in deep mourning over his passing, and extend heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy as I include my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the following extremely fitting tribute paid to President Kennedy—this man of prayer and action—by the Reverend Robert E. Brengartner, Catholic chaplain at the U.S. Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. Father Brengartner has so perfectly described the great spirit, the selfless dedication and spiritual depth of our late President that I want to share these expressions with President Kennedy's family, as well as with my colleagues in the Congress:

"Greater love than this no one has, that one lay down his life for his friends."—John 15:13.

Nineteen hundred years ago our Blessed Lord not only expressed this idea, but exemplified it in His own life.

Through the ages men and women have heeded this call of love and laid down their lives for others. They are the martyrs of our faith; they are the martyrs of our country. They died for truth, for the love of God, for the freedom of man.

To this long list of heroes has been added the name of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States. The day he took the oath of office is the day he accepted in all its stark reality not only the honors and powers of his office, but also the awesome responsibilities and the dangers to life connected with such a position. We are all aware of the courage and determination mingled with a constant cheerfulness with which he tackled every problem.

He seemed the ideal Christian man, combining the age old Christian axiom of Ora et labora—pray and work. Pray, as if everything depended upon God, and work, as if everything depended upon yourself. He was a man of prayer and action.

If anyone was truly alive President Kennedy was. He lived life to the hilt. And I mean this in the good sense of making use of every talent and every moment God has given.

Born to high station—with a silver spoon in his mouth—John F. Kennedy could have spent his life in leisure and security—Switzerland in the winter—the Riviera in the summer. But with his God given qualites of compassion and justice, wisdom, courage and decision, he was drawn into the battle for humanity—the ocean of human inter-

ests—to be the leader of a great people, and a friend to the peoples of the world.

As a John the Baptist, a voice crying in the wilderness, he would cry out for social justice, for equality, for the rights of the individual. And who cannot say that like John the Baptist he was murdered for speaking the truth—for defending the rights of God and man?

Who can say what brought about this hatred in the mind of a man who would kill our President? What influenced him to such an act of revenge? Was it some prejudice on our part—some hatred of ours—some act of rebellion against lawful authority—some sin of social injustice?

Look at the crufix. There you can see what sin did to God's own Son.

Look at the broken body of our young President. There again you can see the effect of a sinful act.

Look at Mrs. Kennedy and Caroline and John, Jr., and you see the sorrow caused by one man who defied God's law—"Thou shalt not kill."

From the echo of that shot in Dallas last Friday waves of sorrow and misery have flowed over the world.

Perhaps President Kennedy can accomplish in death what he could not accomplish in life—to show that all men are created equal and that social justice must prevail. If this can be accomplished, then John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, will not have died in vain.

Independence of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence, and on this occasion we wish to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Moktar Ould Daddah; and His Excellency, the Mauritanian Chargé d'Affaire to the United States, Mohamed Nassim Kochman.

On November 28, 1960, the last of France's African colonies attained her independence. Mauritania, which stretches over the sands of the Sahara on the northwest coast of Africa, is somewhat larger than our State of Texas but has a total population which has been estimated at roughly 650,000. Observers questioned whether this small and scattered population could carve a viable 20th-century nation state out of Mauritania's desert sands.

Mauritania has achieved remarkable progress in the 3 years which have now passed since independence. Its success has been due in measure to the dynamism of its youthful President and Premier, Moktar Ould Daddah. Even before independence Premier Ould Daddah was off to Paris and Washington in search of funds to develop Mauritania's one important resource, iron ore, the key to the country's development. He returned with a $66 million World Bank loan and a promise from MIFERMA, a French-controlled mining company including British, Italian, and German interests to mine the ore, transport it to the sea, and market it abroad, splitting profits 50–50 with the Mauritanian Government. The agreement included the development of port facilities. Thus Premier Ould Daddah set out to forge a modern nation from ancient Mauritania.

The territory of Mauritania received its name from the Romans, who subjugated two kingdoms inhabited by the Mauri people, or Moors. For centuries before the Europeans arrived in Mauritania its desert sands were the scenes of much of West Africa's bloodiest history as empires rose and fell. Its population is a combination of Moorish and Negro. The large majority, in fact, are Moors, nomads of the north who move their flocks of sheep and goats from waterhole to waterhole. About one-fifth of the population is Negro, a sedentary population settled in the south of the country.

Because of this racial mixture and of its geographical location Mauritania's largest hope is to become a bridge between black and white, the connecting link uniting Africa into one continent. If Mauritania can accomplish this it will have achieved an indelible landmark on the pages of African history.

Of more immediate, if less global concern, is the internal development of Mauritania. Mauritania has become a land of striking contrasts as it has begun to move, swiftly, into the mid-20th century. Although much of the country's population still moves from place to place, taking their tents with them as they go, three new cities have sprung up from nothing in little over 3 years' time. In Nouakchott, the capital, neat modern buildings have risen where a small desert village of mud huts stood 4 years ago; all houses in the capital of 10,000 inhabitants have running water and electricity. Telephone lines link some 15 oases and towns. A 400-mile railroad is under construction along the frontier of Spanish-held Rio de Oro. Planes land at 21 airstrips. Most important, exploitation of the country's iron ore deposits holds promise of an increasingly optimistic future.

We congratulate you, President Ould Daddah, and the people of Mauritania for the progress you have achieved during 3 short years of independence in transforming your country into a modern nation state.

A More Realistic View of Profits and Private Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, administration spokesmen have frequently made the assertion that corporate and individual debt since the end of World War II have risen at a much faster rate than the Federal debt. They have also pointed out that corporate profits in an absolute sense are at an alltime high, but what they have failed to do is relate profits to sales, to the investment dollar, or to gross national product in order to get a realistic profits picture.

David Lawrence's column in the Washington Star of November 20 points out some of the fallacies of the administration's approach both with regard to its comparisons of increases in Federal as compared to private debt and to its discussions of corporate profits. The article make a real contribution to clearing up some of the confusion that has been created by the statements of the administration in these two areas.

I include David Lawrence's column in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

FEDERAL VERSUS BUSINESS FINANCING—PRESIDENT'S COMPARISON OF DEBT GROWTH VIEWED AS GIVING WRONG IMPRESSION

President Kennedy would not intentionally mislead the American people about the finances of the Government of the United States—but unfortunately, some of his speechwriters have given a wrong comparison of the way the Federal Government and private business, respectively, handle their debts.

Mr. Kennedy, in a speech before the Florida Chamber of Commerce Monday, gave the impression that the Federal Government is a better fiscal manager than private business. He said:

"While the Federal net debt was growing less than 20 percent in these years (1948 to 1962), total corporate debt—not my debt, your debt—was growing by nearly 200 percent and the total indebtedness of private individuals rose by 300 percent. So who is the most cautious fiscal manager?"

There is no real parallel. What Mr. Kennedy failed to make clear was that during all this time, while corporations and individuals were increasing their debts, they were also paying off their loans or mortgages or were borrowing money to acquire new assets. The Federal Government, on the other hand, was borrowing money almost entirely to refund past loans, but not to reduce debt.

During these very years—1948 to 1962—when the total corporate debt was rising by $228 billion, these same corporations earned $291 billion in profits after taxes. In contrast, the Federal Government during that same period had total budget deficits of $41 billion and at the same time added $54 billion to the gross public debt.

No business could borrow money if it did not reduce its past debts out of its surpluses. An increase in corporate debt is based upon the expectation of repayment of this same debt in a specified time. A very small part of any such indebtedness is refinanced without at least a substantial payment on the principal.

But the Federal Government makes no such curtailment of its principal and keeps on borrowing more and more money, incurring more and more deficits, and increasing its total debt.

Any business which attempted to finance itself on the pattern of the Federal Government would certainly not be able to borrow any money in the capital markes today or at any other time. Thus, the Federal Government in fiscal year 1963 piled up a gross borrowing of $227 billion, of which less than $8 billion represented growth in the net debt. The remaining $219 billion was borrowed to refund existing debt.

Corporations, on the other hand, have been paying off a substantial part of their loans, and their increased debt represents investment in new projects—new plants and equipment or new enterprises.

It is incorrect, therefore, to compare corporate financing with that of the Federal Government and say that the latter is better because it did not increase its debt as much as did the private sector in the economy. Individuals may incur debt by borrowing to buy their homes, but they earn enough money after expenses to make regular payments on the mortgages and at the same time to buy an automobile and pay for it in 2 or 3 years. Nobody could buy an automobile in 1948 and fail to pay it off by 1962. And yet the Federal Government has merely borrowed the same amount of money to refund or replace the previous indebtedness, so that the total amount of the 1948 debt remains on the books, plus increased borrowings of $54 billion since 1948.

President Kennedy also gave an erroneous impression when he discussed profits. He has done so on several occasions lately in discussing this subject. He said to the Florida Chamber of Commerce:

"Why is it that profits are at an alltime high in the Nation today? It is because the Nation as a whole is prospering."

What Mr. Kennedy did not tell the American people is that profits in a realistic sense are way below what they were a few years ago.

Thus, manufacturing corporations from 1955 to 1957—which was an era of sustained economic activity and relatively full employment—earned 5.2 percent on their sales and 11.7 cents per dollar on their net worth.

But since the year 1957 profits of manufacturing corporations have been at relatively depressed levels. For the last 6 years, they have averaged only 4.5 percent of sales. This means that profits are 15 percent below the 5.2 average of the 1955–57 period. The profits also have been only 9.3 percent of net worth, which is down considerably from the 11.7 percent average of the 1955–57 period.

It is to be noted that in 1963, after 2 years of so-called economic recovery, profits are 4.5 percent of the gross national product. This is only a slight rise from the 4.2 percent reported in 1961, which was the lowest figure in the period following World War II.

To lay stress on the gross total of profits without regard to whether individual companies are making a satisfactory percent on their investment is to confuse the issue. It is like saying that, because there are more people employed today than ever before, America is prosperous. Actually, the unemployment figure is still around 5.5 percent, and there are many parts of the country called distressed areas. It is illogical to boast about the amount of total profit when the actual percentage of profit on sales made remains well below the 1955–57 average.

A Time To Heal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, as we turn from the searing emotion of the past dark days in American history, a splendid editorial in yesterday's New York Times by James Reston quotes a favorite Biblical passage of our late President, that this is a "time to heal." Mr. Reston's recommendations deserve the attention of my colleagues in the House who must join our new President in charting the course for the U.S. ship of state in this period of trial for our people and our Government. The editorial follows:

A TIME TO HEAL—CHANGE DISCERNED IN CAPITAL POLITICS FROM SHARP CONFLICT TO MODERATION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, November 25.—This is now, in the words quoted today from President Kennedy's favorite passage in Ecclesiastes, "a time to heal."

The agony of the last few days has sobered, and may even have cleansed, the Nation, and the sad and noble grandeur of Mr. Kennedy's last farewell this afternoon, has transformed the atmosphere of the Capital. There was today a spirit of humility and concord in Washington. A whole people was lifted up in a common sorrow, ennobled by the grace and serenity of Jacqueline Kennedy, and carried back to the memory of a simpler time by the comfortable words and music out of a religious past.

"Everyone to whom much is given, of him much will be required." The truth of the old text of St. Luke on every thoughtful mind today, as the illustrious Kennedy family bore its grief. And this contentious town, depressed by the ugly events of last weekend, was at last calm and united.

This is more than a mood. The death of President Kennedy and the shock of the brutality that caused his death have changed the direction of American politics from extreme conflict toward moderation.

No doubt the coming presidential campaign will open up new divisions and revive some of the bitter rhetoric of recent months, but there is a revulsion in the country against violence and disunity, and the outlook is now for an election, not between the liberalism of Kennedy and the conservatism of GOLDWATER, but between President Johnson and some other moderate.

A mood of defiance was developing here between the major political parties, between the executive and the legislature, and between the allies. That spirit of comity and compromise, without which no party can govern and no alliance can operate effectively, has recently been breaking down.

On taxes, civil rights, and education at home, as on nuclear and commercial policy abroad, an attitude of contention and even of hostility was developing. And the more it appeared that the Republicans might nominate GOLDWATER, the more difficult it became to get bipartisan agreement on progressive measures.

Now, if both parties seem to have an equal chance of victory next November, and both need the support of uncommitted moderate voters, the chances are that there will be a greater willingness to reach compromises that will appeal to the broadest possible majority of the electorate.

This will not come right away. President Johnson has been strongly urged by his congressional leaders to postpone the big controversial questions of taxes and civil rights until January and turn his attention to the organization of his administration.

For this purpose, it has been suggested to him that he appeal to the country for unity this week, then either get Congress to pass the main appropriation bills, if this can be done in a hurry, or, if not, to pass a continuing resolution that would enable the administration to pay its bills up until January 30, and let Congress go home.

The new President needs time to adjust to his sudden new responsibilities, to select a personal staff, to study and prepare next year's budget and to master the intricacies of many foreign policy problems.

If Congress remains here until the end of the year, the President's close friends feel that he will get so deeply involved in congressional problems, where his skill and knowledge are great, that he will have little time to deal with other problems which are less familiar.

FEARS COMMUNIST HUNT

There is another reason for urging the President to let Congress go soon. This has been a long, frustrating, and quarrelsome year on Capitol Hill. Congressmen are physically tired from the long grind, and emotionally tired from the scandals, arguments and disasters of the last few weeks.

The assumption here is that, after the death of President Kennedy, Congressmen will find the voters in a serious mood, willing to give President Johnson a chance, and longing for a period of unity and moderation.

This may not be true everywhere. One of the things President Johnson is said to be concerned about is that the pro-Communist background of Lee Oswald, the man who is accused by the Dallas police of assassinating President Kennedy, may lead in some places to another Communist hunt that will divide the country and complicate the new President's relations with Moscow.

This was one of the reasons why President Johnson answered so quickly and warmly Chairman Khrushchev's message of condolence, and why the State Department has been so fast in emphasizing that it had no evidence that any foreign government was in any way involved in the death of President Kennedy.

President Johnson is almost bound to strive for a dramatic "first hundred days," short as this is for so many problems. For he will have little more than that before the presidential primary elections start, and the election campaign is bound to open up new divisions.

Often before, the Nation has been unified through adversity or the death of a President, only to lose the sense of common grief and fall into disarray. This is what happended after the administrations of Lincoln and Wilson, and President Johnson's first obligation to the Nation, to his predecessor and to himself is to heal the wounds of the last few days and see to it that President Kennedy's program is carried on.

Crisis in Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting article on "Crisis in Beef Imports" by C. W. McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, which appeared in the December 1963 issue of the Farm Journal.

Mr. McMillan's report followed a 4-week tour of New Zealand and Australia by a group representing the American National Cattlemen's Association.

The article follows:

CRISIS IN BEEF IMPORTS

Imports have already cut some cattle prices as much as $3 per hundredweight. And as long as our tariffs remain low and tonnage unrestricted, they'll continue to increase.

We saw lands of paradox and contrast.

We saw some of the best livestock production and potentials—and some of the worst—in the world. Some fine animals, but some real scrubs.

We dined, argued, laughed, and exchanged notes with men like ourselves, equally concerned with the elements, their beasts, local conditions, taxes, and the world markets for beef.

And we came home convinced that livestock production in the United States, more than ever before, needs more realistic protection from foreign meat.

"We" were a group of U.S. beef producers and feeders (for names, see box, page 88) representing the American National Cattlemen's Association on a special study tour of New Zealand and Australia.

We all wanted to see firsthand whether the tremendous increase in their beef exports was temporary—due to relatively higher prices here—or whether they were forerunners of a deliberate buildup aimed at the U.S. market.

And we also wanted to see if we could show the Australian and New Zealand stockmen, on a producer-to-producer level, that they are wrecking our market and, at the same time, endangering their own.

Frankly, we found little to reassure us. As long as our tariffs remain low and tonnage unrestricted, there'll probably be little slackening of imports. Rather, we can expect them to grow over the years.

Producers in both countries were sympathetic. But many—especially exporters—are more fascinated with the gold in the U.S. market. Even if prices drop here, this is a far better market for them than anyplace else. It looked so good to them that they only now are making token effort to find alternate consumers at home and elsewhere in the world.

The chart at the left below gives you an idea how fast beef imports have been increasing. While almost everyone recognizes that foreign beef has an adverse impact on U.S. producers, a few figures help to emphasize the danger signs—and the rapidity in the buildup of the problem.

Total beef imports, including live animals, accounted for about 11 percent of all the beef we ate in the United States last year; an all-time high. Another record will be set this year—imports for the first 8 months of 1963 were 122 percent of the same period last year.

And what a beachhead the Aussies and New Zealanders have established. From only a smattering 6 or 7 years ago when their exports were committed to Great Britain, their shipments now amount to over 80 percent of all our beef imports.

Don't let anyone tell you that this tonnage has no direct bearing on fed-cattle prices. True, most of the shipments are of "manufacturing beef"—a lean, boneless product. However, more than one-fourth of every one of our fed-beef carcasses becomes ground beef, and 60 percent of the beef from Australia also goes into ground beef here.

And, realizing that beef competes most with other beef, rather than pork or poultry, say, then any extra tonnage can't help but depress total and specific prices.

Economists figure that recent import levels have cut some cattle prices—or held others down from expected levels—as much as $3 per hundredweight.

You also have heard that all the U.S. cattlemen has to do is become more efficient or just raise more and more animals, then he'd be able to compete with anyone in the world.

It's simply not so. No matter how hard our stockmen work or how many miracles come from the laboratory, there is no way that he can cut costs today to equal those of the Australian, for example.

Our study group, all knowledgeable ranchers and feeders, estimated that the Aussie could raise a "beast" on his "station," trek it hundreds of miles to slaughter and still make money at prices roughly half what most American ranchers would have to have for a comparable animal.

And exporters can ship the beef 8,000 miles (or more), pay duty of 3 cents per pound and still make money when our beef market is too low for profit to American stockmen.

Basic is the cost of leasing or owning land.

In western Queensland and the Northern Territory, most of the land is owned by the Crown. It is available on 50-year leases with an annual rental payment ranging from 65 cents to $1 per square mile. A good carrying capacity might be seven or eight animals per square mile. Stations in this drought-vulnerable vastness are big. One we visited was 6,159 square miles in size. That's nearly 4 million acres.

By way of contrast, we saw smaller operations in New Zealand where pastures carried up to four ewes and one cow to the acre. The year-around carrying capacities are astounding by our standards. They're blessed with a well-distributed 40 inches of rainfall a year and they fertilize generously, a lot of it by airplane.

The Angus breed dominates, with Herefords and Shorthorns battling it out for second place. The quality is excellent. Because of the high cost of grains, nearly all of the beef is finished on grass with little or no drylot feeding.

New Zealanders like the sheep-cattle combination, and it is unlikely that there will be a big shift away from sheep to cattle. Sheep and wool are their big sources of income and will undoubtedly stay No. 1, with beef and dairy next.

But Australia has a fantastic potential for increased beef production, and its numbers are building fast.

In southeastern Queensland we saw land being cleared in a 24-inch rainfall zone. The rough land cost about $10 per acre. It took another $22 to chain and burn, plow and seed. Planted to sorghum alum, they're fattening one steer per acre. There is a 15-million-acre potential of this kind of land.

Further development in the vast outback must await more capital, but the biggest potential lies in the higher rainfall areas of the east.

The outback must develop more stock water and transportation facilities. A cow might have to go 15 miles for water, and some cattle still are driven as long as 6 months to reach market.

On one station we saw cattle that cost the rancher $7 for annual maintenance, but he needed another $14 to get each animal to market.

Outside capital is being encouraged to come into Australia for development of its beef industry. There are some meaningful incentives. For example, there is no capital gains tax, and the depreciation allowed to encourage capital improvements is such that at the end of 5 years it amounts to 120 percent.

Australia is a young country, a growing country, not unlike the United States a number of years ago. You can't help but feel after being there and talking with their people that they will overcome their problems. They will improve their cattle, their pastures and their management.

We saw few signs that the whole meat industry down under is trying very hard to cushion itself against growing cost-price squeezes or possible disappearance of the U.S. market. Stockmen are concerned, and are pushing for more consumption at home or in other export markets. But exporting packers—and U.S. importers—have their sights set this way.

And this leads to the question: Will they continue to arouse the ire of American stockmen, political and business leaders so that severe restrictions are imposed? Already several bills calling for markedly higher tariffs or quotas have been introduced in Congress by alarmed lawmakers.

No American stockman wants to cut off reasonable competition. But his patience—and pocketbook—are worn mighty thin.

Remarks of Lt. Col. Paul A. Fino at Memorial Services for Lt. Col. Clifford W. Johnson, Lt. Col. Jacque Segal, and Capt. William Gibson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, on November 16 the Civil Air Patrol, an auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force, was saddened by the loss of three of its officers who were killed in a Civil Air Patrol plane which crashed in North Lindenhurst, Long Island, shortly after takeoff.

The three CAP officers attached to the New York wing were Lt. Col. Clifford W. Johnson, Lt. Col. Jacque Segal, and Capt. William Gibson.

On Sunday, November 24, memorial services were held in New York City. My distinguished colleague, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, who is a legal officer and holds the rank of lieutenant colonel was the main speaker at these services. I am privileged to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, Congressman FINO's sympathetic and understanding remarks on this sorrowful occasion:

(By Lt. Col. PAUL A. FINO, Member of Congress)

In this solemn moment, we gather to pay honor and tribute to three members of our organization who died because of love of country, dedication to a cause, and enthusiasm for aviation.

No question or controversy can disturb the tranquility of this occasion.

It is indeed fitting and proper that we pause in the quiet and serenity of our garden of memories and reflect upon the lives of our departed brothers.

We are conscious that we are pausing under the shadow of a great loss. Although the certainty of death and the uncertainty of life are ever with us, these memorial services bring upon us a new sorrow and humbles us in our struggle toward the fulfillment of our ambitions.

These men who died in line of duty, have built temples of honor and virtue and unselfish devotion to the everlasting good of the Civil Air Patrol.

To the members of the bereaved families, we extend our deepest and profound sympathy. We ask them to seek consolation in the fact that their loved ones' lives were filled with service to mankind.

The friendship and brotherhood found in the Civil Air Patrol have few parallels in life. Each member of the CPA, young and old, men and women, from all walks of life, all creeds and all religious denominations, is a dedicated public servant. We are grateful, indeed, for the lives we honor on this occasion.

Our departed brothers had a part in the concrete expressions of the ideals of our

organization. Our memorial to them must include the continued projection into the future of our accomplishments.

What better course can we of the Civil Air Patrol take than to dedicate our lives to perpetuating the strength of these memorial services? We must accept this challenge and weave the highest good of the past into the fabric of the future.

Private Industry Plays Key Role in Retraining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, rapid technological advancement and automation—while creating new jobs—displaces thousands of unskilled workers and replaces them with machines. The unemployment created by technological change must be tackled by effective training and retraining programs, both public and private, in order that it becomes a blessing and not a curse to society.

An excellent example of a well-planned private retraining program at the General Electric plant in Lynn, Mass., was described in the Christian Science Monitor of November 19. A retraining school staffed and equipped by General Electric was recently established to keep workers with obsolete skills in the company by training them to fill vacant jobs requiring a greater degree of skill.

The key to any solution of our unemployment problem demands a constant upgrading of our labor force to fill the new and more demanding jobs created by automation and technological change. It is gratifying to read of the steps being taken to train and retrain employees within private industry, and I insert the article describing the General Electric program from the November 19 Christian Science Monitor be included in the RECORD at this point:

JOBS CHANGING—TRAINING FOR AUTOMATION

(By Abraham Oseroff)

LYNN, MASS.—Red, green, and yellow lights flash on a control panel. A workman adjusts dials, flicks switches, presses buttons.

An 18-foot gantry creeps forward.

It drills, mills, and does other operations to turbine casings, combining jobs formerly performed by separate machine tools.

The scene is a main shop at the General Electric Co. Lynn River Works plant. Similiar scenes may be found in other shops where complex machines are doing work formerly done by simple machine tools.

BYSTANDER OR BOSS?

On a platform of the gantry, the workman looks like an interested bystander. He's much more, of course. He's the boss.

His name is Mike Jerzylo. A few months ago, he relates from his perch, he couldn't help his daughter with high school algebra.

"She thinks I'm a hero now," he says.

For he can not only help her with algebra, but at GE he does technical work he considers interesting and challenging. Formerly, he was grinder in the shop, which machines casings for multimillion-dollar turbines.

Hunks of the turbine the gantry works on may weigh 50 tons—worth $10,000, some of them. A mistake could be expensive.

But Mike knows what he's about. "I enjoy every bit of it," he says. "I refreshed myself on my subjects."

LAYOFFS REDUCED

On his own time, Mike attended a retraining school staffed and equipped by GE. Similar to schools held by many companies, the Lynn GE program is extensive and is looked to by many as a model.

An indication of its success, GE spokesmen say, is reduction in the number of people who have been laid off for lack of skills.

"In 1959, about 800 men were laid off for lack of suitable skills, while at the same time we were hiring 660 new people who had the skills we needed," a spokesman says. That incurred severance pay and unemployment compensation, as well as lowering of company morale and loss of the investment an employee represents.

In addition, when a union man with seniority was laid off, he would go to another part of the plant and displace a man with less seniority. Each such bump, GE estimates, cost $300.

Bumps numbered 3,521 in 1959.

HARD LOOK NEEDED

It was decided that a long, hard look at manpower planning procedures was needed.

A staff was appointed to increase the accuracy of employment need forecasts; and to consider conditions of the turbine market, retirement and general attrition rates of workers, kinds of skills in the plant, skills available in the Boston area, and skills needed for anticipated technological changes.

"By the end of 1962, the number of people off for the lack of suitable skill was virtually nil," the spokesman says. "Bumps dropped to 240. It was learned that retirements in the next 10 years will amount to 25 percent of the work force, much higher than supposed."

At present there are 200 apprentices in a 4-year program and 300 employees taking 6-month off-the-job courses to increase skills, job security, and earnings. Each off-the-job student costs GE $130.

NOTHING ALTRUISTIC

"There's nothing altruistic about it," O. Robert Coe, employment manager, says of the retraining program. "It's a hardheaded program of our own to meet our own needs."

Retraining replaces obsolete skills or enlarges basic ones.

When the company closed a foundry in Everett, Mass., in 1961, 45 men found themselves with totally obsolete skills. They were patternmakers, molders, and others, whose skills were needed only in a foundry. Their seniority averaged 20 years.

"Forty-two of the men learned new skills," Mr. Coe says. Those who left could have had jobs if they had wanted them.

In the case of the gantry, no one person in the plant had skill enough to run it.

Fifteen men are needed on it for three shifts. Twenty-two are now in training.

An automatic telephone exchange was put in a few weeks ago, he adds. Switchboard operators are now becoming stenographers and key punch operators.

RETRAINING ESSENTIAL

Bumps are prevented by switching a man who is not needed in one spot to an open job somewhere else in the plant, instead of laying him off.

With an increasing number of complex machines, 10,000 hourly employees, and 1,200 job skills at G.E. employment planning and retraining is essential.

"Seven or eight years ago we'd advertise for 20 machinists and we'd get 60," an assistant in the employment office says. "This is no longer the case because of the increasing sophistication of the machine tools we use.

"Large companies used to have such an advantage: pay, benefits, vacations. This is not so much the case today."

One Hundred Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a bright, warm sun under a cloudless November sky added to the solemnity of the occasion as thousands gathered to help commemorate the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address, Tuesday, November 19, 1963.

One hundred years before the U.S. Marine Band led the procession from the square to the National Cemetery at Gettysburg. On this occasion, last week, the band again performed that same function, under the direction of Lt. Col. Albert F. Schoepper.

Miss Marian Anderson added to the solemnity of the occasion as she sang "Lead Kindly Light" and "He's Got the Whole World in His Hands."

Justice Michael A. Musmanno, member of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, recited Lincoln's famous words.

The following addresses were delivered in the order printed:

PRESIDENT OF NEGRO GROUP SPEAKS HERE

The following address, "One Hundred Years After Lincoln's Gettysburg Address" by E. Washington Rhodes, editor-publisher of the Philadelphia Tribune and president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association, was delivered at exercises in the Gettysburg National Cemetery Tuesday afternoon:

"I consider it a great privilege to have been invited as a representative of the American Negro people to participate in an occasion of such national historic importance at this time of racial tension and unrest. This, then, is a historic moment of high honor and high drama, which will be forever cherished by the American Negro people, as they march with heads erect to the goal of full and complete equality of citizenship rights.

"One hundred years after the Battle of Gettysburg, 100 years after the Gettysburg Address, the anguished expectations and hopes of Abraham Lincoln for a united nation remain unrealized, unfulfilled in American life. The present grave civil rights struggle attests to this melancholy, tragic fact.

GREAT STATESMAN

"The march on Washington on August 28, 1963, ended at the Lincoln Memorial—at the knees of Lincoln—at the knees of a magnificent stone image. Today, as we evoke the living, breathing presence of Abraham Lincoln here at Gettysburg, we and the entire Nation should become acutely aware of his great, compassionate heart sustained by a statesmanship unparalleled in his day. By nature, by instinct, Lincoln understood statesmanship, and became not only one of America's greatest statesmen, but also one

of the world's greatest statesmen and is so recognized throughout the world today.

"It has been said that 'statesmanship is characterized by wisdom, breadth of vision or regards for the general welfare rather than partisan interest.' May God grant to us in unstinting measure both the determination and the will to substitute statesmanship for racial antipathies—statesmanship for political expediency and frivolity—statesmanship for educational, social, and economic inequities—statesmanship for fragmented views of life—statesmanship for sectional hatreds—statesmanship for walls of hostile silence. Such positive, affirmative, imperative action alone can satisfy the great compassionate heart of Abraham Lincoln 100 years after the Gettysburg Address.

"HOUSE DIVIDED

"Abraham Lincoln, prior to his election as President, quoted from Holy Writ, declared with the wisdom of the ages that 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' He continued: 'I believe this Government cannot permanently endure half slave and half free.'

"With all the vigor at my command and the great esteem which I have for my beloved country, I am respectfully urging my fellow men to take note that this is as true today as it was centuries ago—'a house divided against itself cannot stand.'

"Second-class citizenship with all of its attendant evils must end. Unless men of substance and creative minds take positive action, move forward with alertness and stout hearts to remove this injustice, I fear that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, will soon be endangered beyond repair."

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON AT CEREMONIES COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, SOLDIERS NATIONAL CEMETERY, GETTYSBURG, PA., TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

To this hallowed ground 100 years ago came the 16th President of the United States to voice the solemn hope that this Nation, under God, might have a new birth of freedom.

He stood here humbly in the presence of a ghostly army of Gettysburg dead. Reflections of his heart's agony were etched in the craigy furrows of his countenance as he admonished his countrymen:

"The brave men," he said, "living and dead, who fought here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract."

One hundred years later we stand in the long shadow cast by that gentle man both on this field and on the pages of history. Our purpose is to commemorate his memory—and, we are, of course, engaged in a needless task far above our poor power.

His memory to endure has no need of our faint applause.

His life's work—or even the few eloquent words he spoke here—need no commemoration from us to insure their honored place in the annals of mankind.

If we are but one-tenth as humble as he was, we will realize that we are not here for his sake.

Rather, we are come for our own sake, as free men, to refresh ourselves at this shrine. We are come to find increased devotion for the unfinished cause of human freedom. We are come to take comfort in the victories of the past because we know that for liberty there lie fierce battles in the future.

Long before Abraham Lincoln spoke here, the homeless visionary, Thomas Paine, had been able to rally an embryo nation to the cause of liberty by writing that the aspirations of a free people were little more than "Common Sense."

Lincoln rallied what was left of a Nation to fight for the cause of union by appealing to that same commonsense.

Abraham Lincoln was of the people * * * not because he was born in a log cabin, or because he split logs, or came from a poor, but honest family * * * but because he had a superb appreciation of the honest commonsense that can come to a public official from the American people, if he will but let it. And to that, Lincoln was willing to contribute his own quite considerable talent for leadership.

In Lincoln, the two great mainstreams of American political philosophy converged, and he drew deeply from both. From the Jeffersonians, Lincoln took an appreciation of the people's ultimate wisdom. From the Hamiltonians, he took a belief in the need for strong leadership.

Thus, Lincoln, though a master politician, did what our American folklore has come to say is impossible to do * * * he was able to fulfill his own campaign slogans. He was great as a man and as a President because he had faith in the people, listened to them, but yet led them.

This same strong mixture of following and leading is what is needed in America today.

There are those who would say, of course, that there is no valid comparison between the America of today and the America of Abraham Lincoln.

They would say that we have entered the nuclear age and everything has changed.

Everything has not changed.

Grapeshot fired at Manassas ripped life from a man just as surely as an atomic bomb dropped at Hiroshima.

What is more, the ultimate way in which man may die does not change the ultimate way in which he must strive to live.

That ultimate striving for us, as a Nation, can be nothing less than eternal warfare on the forces of tyranny, no matter the garb in which the tyrant comes disguised.

Whether the tyranny is of power, or of money, or of unjust privilege * * * whether it's a tyranny of fear, or of hunger, or of censorship * * * whether the tyrant wields the dagger of prejudice or of demagoguery * * * whether he comes openly mounted on a high horse, or more subtly disguised on a soapbox * * * in every case the great unfinished work to which each generation of Americans must be dedicated is to strike down the tyranny and destroy the tyrant.

In the 187 years that have passed since the American Colonies declared their independence, we have found no sounder formula for destroying tyranny than that of Abraham Lincoln.

America will survive so long as we have leaders of the people who use as their guidelines the people's commonsense.

While politicians, and even statesmen, for instance, may argue mightily about the relative danger to the Republic from the far right or from the far left, the people in their commonsense reject both.

While politicians and lawyers discuss the legalistic fine points of civil rights legislation, the tyranny of prejudice is doomed because the American people in their deep commonsense realize it is wrong.

While men of great importance carry on erudite debates over the relative merits of total victory versus total coexistence, the American people long ago decided that, though we are not a Nation of belligerents, we must never abandon the ultimate effort to free captive peoples wherever they are imprisoned in the world.

The wise and gentle Mr. Lincoln would have understood today's American people. Their commonsense would have appealed to him.

"Human nature," Lincoln told an audience shortly before he died, "will not change. In any future great national trial, compared with the men of this, we shall have as weak and as strong, as silly and as wise, as bad and as good."

Today, 100 years after Abraham Lincoln on this field gave the world his few appropriate remarks, let us resolve to keep faith with the memory of the man who had such great faith in us as a Nation.

If we but do that, this Nation, under God, will have a new birth of freedom. If we do that, we shall not perish from the earth.

CENTENNIAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS, NOVEMBER 19, 1963

(By Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower)

We mark today the centennial of an immortal address.

We stand where Abraham Lincoln stood as, a century ago, he gave to the world words as moving in their solemn cadence as they are timeless in their meaning.

Little wonder it is that, as here we sense his deep dedication to freedom, our own dedication takes added strength.

Lincoln had faith that the ancient drums of Gettysburg, throbbing mutual defiance from the battlelines of the Blue and the Gray, would one day beat in unison, to summon a people, happily united in peace, to fulfill, generation by generation, a noble destiny.

His faith has been justified but the unfinished work of which he spoke in 1863 is still unfinished; because of human frailty, it always will be.

Where we see the serenity with which time has invested this hallowed ground, Lincoln saw the scarred earth and felt the press of personal grief.

Yet he lifted his eyes to the future, the future that is our present.

He foresaw a new birth of freedom, a freedom and equality for all which, under God, would restore the purpose and meaning of America, defining a goal that challenges each of us to attain his full stature of citizenship.

The beauty of the sentiments Lincoln expressed enthralls us; the majesty of his words holds us spellbound. But we have not paid to them their just tribute until we—ourselves—live them.

For well we knew that to live for country is a duty, as demanding as is the readiness to die for it.

So long as this truth remains our guiding light self-government in this Nation will never die.

True to democracy's basic principle that all are created equal and endowed by the Creator with priceless human rights, the good citizen now, as always before, is called upon to defend the rights of others as he does his own; to subordinate self to the country's good; to refuse to take the easy way today that may invite national disaster tomorrow; to accept the truth that the work still to be done awaits his doing.

On this day of commemoration, Lincoln still asks of each of us, as clearly as he did of those who heard his words a century ago, to give that increased devotion to the cause for which soldiers in all our wars have given the "last full measure of devotion."

Our answer, the only worthy one we can render to the memory of the great emancipator, is ever to defend, protect and pass on unblemished, to coming generations the heritage, the trust, that Abraham Lincoln, and all the ghostly legions of patriots of the past, have bequeathed to us—a Nation free, with liberty, dignity, and justice for all.

Unfinished Business in the New Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is naturally thought as to what developments might occur on the Washington scene, following the tragic assassination of President Kennedy, and I insert into the RECORD at this point a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, November 26 edition of the Chicago Tribune:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN THE NEW ORDER

The brief years in which John F. Kennedy's hand and mind stirred and in some sense governed the affairs of his countrymen ended yesterday with the solemn and majestic pageantry and rites with which a nation said farewell to its elected leader. Today is a new day and with it there is a new order.

The orderly transition, accomplished barely an hour after Mr. Kennedy's death Friday, is a testimonial to the great men who met in Philadelphia so long ago "to render the Constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the exigencies of the union." Thus adequate has this instrument always proved.

Under it a new constitutional executive has replaced the man who is gone. The American people accept the transfer of power as normal and expected, under the constitutional provisions prescribing order and continuity in the conduct of the National Government.

This is a nation of sober and sensible people, despite the aberrant behavior of the erratic few. Presidents may come and go, but there is solidarity behind our institutions, and loyalty to the Nation, and the liberties which our Constitution has so well conserved through a century and three-quarters.

President Johnson will have the good will of all of his countrymen. As he marched in yesterday's funeral procession, there was the sense that here was a man, first among equals, but still only a steward charged, as any President is, with acting for the general welfare of us all.

How Mr. Johnson will interpret this mission we cannot say. He will have support and approval according to the wisdom with which he discharges the vast responsibilities of the Presidency. He will labor under the checks and balances of a wise Federal system. Under that system, no man can expect, as no man would deserve, unquestioning obedience, for every citizen has the same independence and the same right to his private judgment as the highest officer of the land.

Mr. Kennedy's program is on the agenda, but Congress has had deep reservations about much of it, so that after 11 months of continuous session the record of legislative achievement has been slight. Perhaps now is a time for reflection and reconsideration. Certainly the most unfortunate thing that could happen would be an attempt at whirlwind dispatch of the Nation's business in a climate of emotionalism.

It is our judgment that Congress would be wise to deal with the appropriations measures necessary to keep the Government running. The great controversial topics which are part of Mr. Kennedy's legacy, such as the tax cut proposal and the portmanteau civil rights legislation would be better carried over into the next session of Congress, beginning in January.

A prompt adjournment would give the new President time to consider his course, to think through the problems piled on his desk, and to develop order and proportion to his proposals. It would give an exhausted Congress a chance for recuperation and an opportunity to return to Washington with some hope of achieving a sober consensus on what needs to be done.

Most of all, it would give an emotionally drained people a chance to consider what direction the country is now to take.

The Late George F. Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our sadness at the death of our late President should not cause us to overlook the passing of another friend, and another leader who served Massachusetts well throughout a long lifetime.

George F. Hines was buried today in Washington at the age of 74. I know, Mr. Speaker, that he was born in South Boston, very close to the day of your own birth, and that he was your lifelong friend and loyal supporter.

George Hines was the special representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Nation's Capital for over two decades. First appointed to the post by the now Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, he served later under Governors Dever, Herter, and Volpe. Without partisanship he faithfully pursued the best interests of the people of Massachusetts.

He was a close personal friend of Speaker MCCORMACK, and of former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., and other members of the Massachusetts delegation.

During recent years, his services were crowned with unique success in helping to locate the Army Quartermaster Laboratory in Natick, Mass., and how, we hope, the NASA Space Research Laboratory in eastern Massachusetts. On both of these important projects, he worked untiringly on behalf of our Commonwealth.

His son, Richard, is a valued employee of our House Committee on Science and Astronautics. A nephew, Peter, is a respected member of the Boston City Council. His family, like the Kennedy family, has shown a rare aptitude for dedication to public service.

For the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note our appreciation of this wise and good man, and express to his family our sorrow and our sympathy at his passing.

I would also like to include an article in the RECORD from the Boston Globe which outlines Mr. Hines' long and distinguished career:

GEORGE HINES, 74, REPRESENTED MASSACHUSETTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George F. Hines, 74, born in South Boston and for many years special representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in Washington, died Saturday evening at the National Health Institute in Washington. He had been undergoing treatment for a kidney disorder.

Mr. Hines, who was credited with an important part in the arrangements to get the NASA and Natick Quartermasters' Laboratories into the Boston area, for the past 2 years worked for the Associated Industries of Massachusetts in Washington.

He was appointed by former Govs. Leverett Saltonstall, Christian Herter, Paul A. Dever, and John Volpe as the Washington representative for the State.

For many years prior to his appointment in Washington Mr. Hines worked as a reporter for Boston newspapers and later as public relations director for the Boston Chamber of Commerce. Later, both the National and Associated Manufacturers' Associations employed him for public relations. He was also executive secretary of the Haverhill Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Hines frequently entertained social, religious, and veterans' groups with piano playing, especially during World War II, although he never had any formal training.

He leaves a wife, Helen (Mansfield) Hines; a son, Richard; five sisters, Mrs. Joseph J. Hurley, Mrs. John J. Walsh, and Mrs. Agnes Meagher, all of West Roxbury; Sister Therese, Sisters of Notre Dame, and Sister Mary Walter, Sisters of Mercy; and four brothers, Colonel Paul of West Roxbury, Dr. Francis J., Walter J., and Albert J. Hines, all of Boston.

Services will be in Washington.

The Attack on Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago, a leading legislator from a Southern State made some very unfair and unconstructive comments about our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the chairman of our national committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

In view of the serious problems facing the people of our country in the civil rights field, it is indeed most unfortunate that this type of personal vendetta is carried on against Congressmen HALLECK and MILLER who have heavy responsibilities for constructive civil rights programs.

Mr. HALLECK deserves, and has justly received, praise and recognition for the statesmanlike and realistic attitude which he has taken to move toward a unified Republican position on the civil rights front.

BILL MILLER's voting record also indicates a strong civil rights position. Certainly as chairman of the Republican National Committee, the gentleman from New York certainly shoulders a great responsibility in seeing that the Republican Party is constantly moving forward.

To Congressman HALLECK and Chairman MILLER go a well-deserved pat on the back for their constructive role in obtaining a settlement in the first step of the long path ahead for the civil rights bill. I certainly hope that we Re-

publicans can progress in this area of civil rights without our leaders being subjected to petty criticism.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, all the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida express their intense regret for the tragic death of the late President Kennedy; and they extend their heartfelt sympathies to Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and all the family. The following editorials speak eloquently and are representative of the intense feelings, and the thoughts and prayers of the people I am honored to represent in the Congress of the United States:

[From the Miami News, Nov. 23, 1963]

WE MOURN FOR OURSELVES AND FOR THE WORLD

The President of the United States and the leader of the free world is dead.

The prayers of millions follow President John Fitzgerald Kennedy in death, and beseech guidance for his successor, President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

We mourn for President Kennedy's family, a notably close family even in a Nation where close families are the norm.

We mourn for our country, which must undergo a difficult change of leadership in critical times.

And mostly, we mourn for ourselves, who have been denied the fullest potential of a brilliant young President.

We have been denied by what Winston Churchill has rightly called a monstrous act, whose full impact is only beginning to seep into the hearts and minds of the Nation.

In late years it has been axiomatic that the man who occupies the highest position in the United States occupies the most powerful position in the world.

America has been fortunate that the men who have held this lofty office have treated it as a sacred trust. Certainly it was treated so by John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Only rarely in the course of our history have we been blessed with a President whose qualities of leadership combined to inscribe his greatness forever on our national shrines. Jefferson was one of these, and Lincoln was another. And more and more you are going to hear Mr. Kennedy's name mentioned as one of the great ones.

He had youth, charm, and a zest for life and leadership that the White House has seldom known.

Surely no President faced larger problems than John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and none met his problems with greater optimism.

It was a measure of his leadership that he never hesitated to attack a problem merely because that problem seemed insoluble, and Heaven knows many of them must have seemed just that. They would have crushed a lesser man into inactivity.

He had courage in war and in peace, and he had the wits to confound those at home or abroad who would despoil his beloved country. He had brillance when only brilliance would suffice.

Like Jefferson, he kept faith with the common man, believing in the common man's ability to manage his own freedom.

Like Lincoln, he had an abiding conviction that all citizens have a right to equality. Despite his certain knowledge that this conviction was unpopular in much of the Nation, he supported it to the fullest. This was a demanding test of his integrity, and he passed it in his own way as nobly as Lincoln passed his.

America is a great Nation, and it is one of the blessings of our democracy that our Government endures even such catastrophes as this. These are times when we rally together behind our new leader.

The President is dead, God save the President.

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 25, 1963]

JUSTICE HAS BEEN CHEATED

No one will ever know from his own lips why Lee Harvey Oswald, who called himself a Communist, shot and killed President John Kennedy, if indeed he did.

In another incredible blunder of security—a blunder so fantastic that it almost seemed contrived—the suspected assassin was assassinated himself.

With him dies the motive of a murder which has staggered the world. With him goes a story which well may have had complications grave for the national security, made even more serious now by an eternal silence.

Of course, Lee Oswald was marked for death in any case. He had killed a Dallas policeman in the plain view of witnesses. In turn, police had constructed what they thought was an airtight case in the Kennedy killing.

Then came the unthinkable decision to transfer him from one jail to another as reporters and photographers and loiterers milled around the scene.

Every canon of police work demands that a high-security prisoner be moved in dead of night with the most extraordinary precautions.

When these are not taken, prisoners have been snatched by lynch mobs. In effect, Oswald was lynched by a man whose motives also are obscure.

While there is nothing obscure about the enormity of the Kennedy assassination, the death of Oswald leaves frowning questions.

He seems the kind of man who might at length have broken under interrogation. Then we would have had the whole story of President Kennedy's martyrdom in a community which he had dared enter to ease its convulsions of hate.

The sequel to the Kennedy assassination is thus a chain reaction of terrible proportions. When do men cease to take the law into their own hands? When does this orgy of hate and fear and suspicion and violence come to an end?

Until it does, America must hang its head in shame as well as remorse before the civilized world.

[From the Key West Citizen, Nov. 24, 1963]

AS THE WORLD MOURNS

As the world stands bowed in grief today over the untimely death of one of the all-time great leaders of the world, our President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the real stature of this protagonist of peace is beginning to emerge as other world leaders pour out their hearts in sympathy.

Sympathy, first of all to the bereaved family; then to the Nation he has led so well for 2 years and 10 months, and, lastly, to the whole population of the world, a world which has lost a mighty champion of peace and good will among all peoples.

For the first time in the history of the world, the citizens of the bereaved Nation have been able to see the deep lines of grief etched upon the faces of the peoples of this and other nations and to hear, first hand, their expressions of regard and concern.

It is highly significant that in this great tragedy even those who have disagreed with the President and his philosophy of government are as sincere in their grief as those who marched side by side with him as he stood firm at the helm of this great Nation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with firm determination and courage seldom found in mortal man, confronted the might of Soviet Russia and won his way, thus earning great respect for himself and for our Nation throughout the world.

He fought valiantly for the betterment of the people of his own nation and for the bringing about of equal opportunities for all.

As in the case of all great national tragedies, the world faces a time of readjustment and, we pray, self-examination.

As we mourn the passing of one great American, we turn our thoughts and prayers to the one upon whose broad shoulders the mantle of peacemaker has fallen.

Our Nation shall long remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy for the deeds he did and the light he shed upon a dark and troubled world.

People are wont to erect great memorials to leaders who have passed on to the Great Beyond. The greatest memorial that the world could erect to our late President would be one of a lasting peace and understanding among the peoples and nations of the earth.

Even as we are bowed in sorrow let us each dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task of the 35th President of the United States.

[From the Miami Beach Daily Sun, Nov. 24, 1963]

OUR PRESIDENT: HIS BEQUEST TO US

You cannot stop an idea with a bullet.

In the numbness of President Kennedy's assassination, this is perhaps our only solace.

Our President died for freedom Friday. He was killed by hate; whatever particular label it may bear is only incidental.

What killed him was the fury of the small minds which cannot tolerate anything different from themselves, any outlook different from their own, any aspirations with frontiers beyond their own crimped view.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave voice as have few political leaders in this century to the cravings of all Americans for a job, for an education, for the right to move freely about one's own country as a full-fledged citizen of this Nation.

Mr. Kennedy was a fighter, a trait which served him well in elections but which ennobled him in times of national need such as the Cuban crisis. He articulated for us all the resolution necessary to back down a murderer named Khrushchev in Cuba.

Memorials may well be raised to our late President. They really are but a postscript for even in death he left us with a living one: He cared enough for his fellow man to insist on a better way for him and his posterity.

[From the Diario Las Americas, Miami Springs, Fla., Nov. 24, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY

When the world learned the tragic news of the assassination of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, a profound spiritual commotion invaded all the civilized peoples of the globe, who recognized in him one of the most outstanding figures of contemporary mankind. John F. Kennedy was, more than a President of the United States of America, an extraordinary man, a statesman of lofty intellect, a great master of the oratory, a renowned warrior of liberty, a noble defender of human equality and dignity.

When his life was a promise for his country and for the world, an irresponsible assassin fired the weapon that cut short the thread of President Kennedy's existence, plunging the United States and all those who on the face of the earth have their heart in the right place, into deep and confusing consternation. In a matter of a few minutes a

Communist assassin caused the physical disappearance of a man of eminent qualities, of superior intelligence and of upmost human sensibility, whose ideas and intentions will vibrate forever in his exceptional speeches, which were a model of pronouncements for their impeccable style and for their unmistakable ideological depth. The Communists have assassinated an illustrious defender of democracy and of the just social replevins, but that does not mean that they have been able to kill the ideal and work of John F. Kennedy, which from now on will have more meaning in the remembrance and admiration of all the peoples on earth.

The man who triumphantly defied death as hero and patriot in the Second World War, lost his life when, in the fields of peace, he struggled for the prevalence of the principles that ordered his actions in the feat of the Pacific Ocean that was and will always be a source of pride for the United States. The enemy's bullets respected the life of a then very young John F. Kennedy, perhaps to permit humanity to see at the White House in Washington a ruler of the elevated hierarchy of the one who, with his death, has just darkened with mourning the flags of all the civilized nations of the world.

In the life and death of John F. Kennedy there are lessons to be learned. In his life won the will to excel, the talent, the goodness of sentiment, the impassioned love for the fatherland and for the cause of liberty, his devotion in study, his political vocation in the function of democracy. His accomplishments will be source of inspiration for those wanting to climb to the heights of the supreme values of patriotism and of the spirit. In his death is, once more, the hard lesson of what the Communists are capable to do. The coldness of crime, the calculation for the execution of a savage act that stands for anticivilization. And in the face of those proofs of Communist monstrosity, the United States and the free world should react in a determined action of combativeness and defense.

Diario las Americas joins with profound respect to the immense grief of the people of the United States in these sad moments of their history, and expresses its sentiments of deep sorrow for the death of this illustrious head of state who will figure in universal history as one of the most enlightened personalities of the 20th century.

May in the peace of God rest the soul of John F. Kennedy, so that he may enjoy in eternity the quiet and light that corresponds to those who, like him, were an example of spiritual excellence.

The FCC's Chaotic Unfairness Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following item by Colmunist Bill Sumner is an excellent review of the chaos in the broadcasting industry which has followed a recent FCC ruling. It appeared in the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram and other Ridder newspapers:

HOW EQUAL IS FCC'S RULING ON EQUAL TIME?

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Communications Commission has, in its bureaucratic wisdom, put an administrative damper on the expression of opinion on television and radio.

The full impact of its recent push for "fairness" has yet to reach the entire industry. But here and there across the land station after station is caving in to FCC pressure, erring always on the safe side, to provide equal time to opposing viewpoints on all controversial issues.

In a notice published July 26, the Commission restated the fairness doctrine written by the FCC in 1949. And through interpretation since then on specific cases it has written muscle into the order.

As it stands today, a broadcaster is obligated to provide equal time for "an appropriate spokesman" on the other side of any partisan broadcast on an issue of controversy. Furthermore, the dissenting side can demand free time whether no not the other side was paid for or presented as a public service. The test here is ability to pay.

In theory, this FCC ruling could apply to such broadcasters as Drew Pearson, Chet Huntley, Howard K. Smith, anyone who expresses an opinion or apparently advances a doctrine. In fact, it has applied to date to those who have advanced antiadministration doctrine.

To date, the howls of anger have come mainly from the rightwing, who see in the fairness doctrine a direct threat to a daily broadcast known "Life Line." This is a show designed to save us all from communism, and its fans see in the fairness ruling the fine hand of Walter Reuther, who they say, has asked the administration, among other things, for FCC examinations into free time given the radical right and for pressure to assign time for opposing points of view. Whatever the effect of this alleged request, the FCC did move in on TV station KTTV in Los Angeles, charging it with unfair practices, as the result of freewheeling attacks one of its commentators made on President Kennedy's good friend Edmund G. (Pat) Brown during last year's gubernatorial race, attacks for which the Brown forces demanded, but did not get, equal time for reply.

And more recently, the Council of California Growers was given an example of FCC power. After deciding it was not getting fair treatment on the bracero issue, it bought time with a Fresno radio-TV broadcaster to present its side of the argument. While the show was on the air, demands were made on the station for free equal time by union groups and a Democratic organization.

The station's attorney advised his employers to meet the demand, based on an FCC interpretation which stated:

"* * * where the licensee has chosen to broadcast a sponsored program which for the first time presents one side of a controversial issue * * * he cannot reject a presentation otherwise suitable to the licensee—and thus leave the public uninformed—on the ground that he cannot obtain paid sponsorship for that presentation."

In this case, it was the station that reached the decision, but it was obvious—despite the fact that the antibracero opposition had been heard—that it feared to bite the hand of the body which rules it through its licensing powers.

What has developed from this is a chaotic condition in which only God and the FCC—perhaps only the FCC—can judge what constitutes controversy and what constitutes "an appropriate spokesman" for the "other side," whatever that might be.

If, for example, the Citizens Committee for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty demands and gets free equal time to oppose a Life Line broadcast, can then the John Birch Society demand and get equal time to oppose Drew Pearson, Edward P. Morgan, Chet Huntley, David Brinkley, President Kennedy the presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers and the American Medical Association, 80 percent of the Members of Congress, and other menaces to Americanism such as the scouting movement, liberal Catholics, the Epworth League, Christian Endeavor, and the graduates of Harvard, Stanford, Yale, Princeton, the Universities of California, Minnesota, Ohio State, Purdue, Northwestern and other hotbeds of radicalism?

In fairness, yes.

The Dollar Is Still Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, despite the predictions of the administration's critics the dollar is still sound. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the August 8, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

GLOBAL BANKERS—DOLLAR STILL SOUND

(By Ben Weberman)

Four of the world's leading central bankers declared yesterday that the U.S. dollar is as sound as ever and that fears over the ability of the currency systems to handle need for increased liquidity are wholly without foundation.

The opinion was expressed in a lengthy statement published in the August Review of the New York Federal Reserve Bank of New York and signed by Charles A. Coombs, of the New York Fed; M. Ikle, of the Banque Nationale Suisse; E. Ranalli, of the Bank of Italy, and J. Tungeler, of the German Federal Bank.

These men, whose actions represent the backing of billions of dollars of central bank and Federal Treasury funds, are in daily telephone contact with each other, visit frequently, and meet monthly in Basle.

Their combined view was designed to sit hard on the recurrent notion that there is some problem in international liquidity—that the world's countries may run out of currency to finance trade and aid—under present methods of backing of foreign exchanges.

They pointed out that "it seems clear to us that the international financial system has demonstrated a high degree of flexibility and resilience in absorbing, during a period of recurrent pressure on both the dollar and sterling, the successive shocks of the German deutsche mark and the Dutch guilder revaluations, the Berlin crisis, the Canadian devaluations, worldwide stock market declines, the Cuban crisis, and finally, the rejection of the British application for membership in the Common Market.

Measures taken by the United States to meet its own problems received wholehearted indorsement of these important bankers. The various steps completed so far actually set the pattern for a much broader system of exchange protection that is flexible enough to meet any emergency, they asserted.

"We can visualize, therefore, in very rough outline, the consolidation of an international financial system which would provide arrangements or similar bilateral understandings on an informal basis covering exchange of currency (c) issue of special certificates and bonds denominated in the currency of the creditor country, and (d) access to the International Monetary Fund.

They asserted that the problem of international liquidity is essentially a problem of dealing with the swings from surplus to

deficit in balance of payments of the major trading countries.

The thesis that there is a liquidity dilemma because a U.S. payments deficit supplies liquidity but at the same time undermines the dollar or that solution of the payment outflow will hurt world trade is completely wrong, they pointed out.

Failure to eliminate the international payments deficit would have disastrous consequences for the United States extending far into the future, they declared. World trade increases, they added, results in enlarged credit facilities to insure adequate financing.

Recognizing the possible long-term need for supplementing outright official holdings of gold and foreign exchange, we have considered various proposals to permit a continuing growth in foreign official holdings of dollars and sterling by equating these key currencies with gold through the medium of a gold guarantee. We would conclude that such instant gold proposals afford only illusory advantages. Such guarantees probably would not prove credible.

We can visualize no effective alternative but to rely on a further development of mutual credit facilities among the major trading nations to cope with the inevitable swings in their payments accounts.

At the short end of the credit facility spectrum, the Federal Reserve has negotiated during the last 18 months an extensive network of swap arrangements with most of the major facilities providing for virtually automatic access to credit up to specified amounts but, as has been repeatedly emphasized by the central banks concerned, are primarily designed to deal with flows of funds expected to reverse themselves within a relatively short period.

Meeting the need of a medium-term credit facility in the say 15- to 30-month maturity range, which might usefully be employed to deal with deficits and surpluses that were unlikely to reverse themselves within the short space of time appropriate to swap arrangements, but were not so generalized as to suggest recourse to the International Monetary Fund, was the next problem. Recent U.S. experiments with the issuance of special certificates and bonds denominated in foreign currencies might well be developed further.

In effect, then, these bankers said that there is no need for a Maudling plan, a stamp plan, a Bernstein plan, or one of Posthouma, South Africa, or any other plan.

Since 1958, by using ingenuity within the confines of statutory limitations, the bankers have been able to amply meet the problems of recurrent crises that in former times may have been serious. Innovations are feasible, it has been proven, they assert, and can be continued.

President Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in this hour of grief we can be reassured by the knowledge that the leadership of our Nation has passed to one already so well proven a wise, experienced, and great leader.

The newspapers of Newark, I believe, are typical of all America in their appraisal of and confidence in our new President. And I am pleased to commend their editorials to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Newark Evening News, Nov. 23, 1963]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

By the cruel assassination of a youthful and vital President, Lyndon B. Johnson has been thrust into the most burdensome office in the world.

Minutes after John F. Kennedy's life ebbed away, Mr. Johnson took the oath and assumed the duties of the Presidency.

Thus the democratic transition was made. Thus the orderly procession of Government continues. And for this we are indebted to the foresighted men who so framed our Constitution that even by this swift, perfidious stroke the Nation is not bereft of leadership.

The changeover is eased further by the experience in Government which Mr. Johnson brings to office. Six terms in the House, 12 years in the Senate (8 of them as Democratic leader), almost 3 years as Vice President—this is his portfolio.

As Vice President, Mr. Johnson consulted with our allies in Europe and traveled extensively throughout critical areas of the Far East. Wherever he has gone, his warmth has won friends for his country.

Few men have a deeper understanding or fuller appreciation of the responsibilities of the office he now assumes. As leader of the opposition, Mr. Johnson had occasion to challenge and to oppose President Eisenhower, a Republican. To his great credit, the battle was joined on issues, never on personality, and, most importantly, never in a way that reflected disrespect of the Presidency.

Now that Mr. Johnson occupies the President's lonely chair—at times the loneliest on history's horizon—the Nation's prayers go out to him. In the difficult days ahead he will need clarity of vision and strength of purpose.

Above all, he will need the support of all Americans who now stand united in sorrow and revulsion over the terrible deed that took the life of President Kennedy.

[From the Newark Sunday News, Nov. 24, 1963]

THE TORCH PASSES

"I will do my best. I ask your help—and God's."

And now the torch of leadership passes to Lyndon Baines Johnson, to be carried in what President Kennedy only days ago described as "a very dangerous, untidy world."

Fortunately, Mr. Johnson is no stranger to the world beyond our borders. He has traveled to its troubled areas, expressing the good will his nature exudes and pledging to free peoples the support of the great nation he represents.

Perhaps more than any other Vice President, Mr. Johnson has been privy to executive decisions. He has dealt firsthand with the problems and the opportunities that lie before us.

To those problems and to those opportunities he brings knowledge and appreciation of the fine art of the possible. Statesmanship, no less than politics, demands this.

As Democratic leader of the Senate he had succeeded in extracting workable compromise from conflict. He has broken obstruction to achieve gain.

This talent is precious in a world far less orderly than anyone dared foretell when the guns of the last great war fell silent. The Western Alliance, once firmly bound in dependence on America's strength, has developed cracks where national aspiration and economic interest have collided. Latin America, Africa, great parts of Asia—all are caught up in the divisive struggles of nationalism.

Nowhere are there clear guidelines as to where these nations may be headed. Everywhere there is a revolutionary impatience and disdain of existing structures.

Nor is order more perceptible in communism's ranks. The clash between Soviet and Chinese leadership is at once baneful and promising. It presages a weakness we once dared not anticipate. It also holds the possibility of competitive thrusts elsewhere in the world.

Perhaps the greatest legacy of hope which passes on to President Johnson is the realization, derived from Cuba, that above all else the safety latch on nuclear arms must be firmly held. The United States and Russia, possessing the most destructive potential in history, also know they possess the means of preserving civilization.

At home, President Johnson will be engaged in a divisive conflict over civil rights. Lest he be mistakenly associated with southern sentiment because of his Texas origin, his leadership in guiding passage of the civil rights bills of 1957 and 1960 should be recalled.

No one can foretell what Mr. Johnson may achieve during the months ahead in the other great areas of national need—fuller employment, tax reduction, a balanced economy, a constructive partnership between industry and labor during the disruptive period of automation, a more rational resolution of all our differences and a diminishing resort to violence.

To these and allied problems, President Johnson may be expected to apply, as he once expressed it, a policy of being "prudent without being radical; conservative without being reactionary."

Fate, in the form of an assassin's bullet, has thrust Lyndon Baines Johnson into the office he sought in 1960 by electoral process. He comes strongly equipped by his experience in Government for a task for which there is no complete preparation.

Commemoration of the 45th Anniversary of Independence of the Republic of Latvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of Latvian-American citizens of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich. on the 17th day of November 1963, to commemorate the 45th Anniversary of Independence of the once free Republic of Latvia.

All right-thinking men join Latvian-American citizens of the city of Detroit and elsewhere in sorrow at the loss of freedom and self-determination by the people of Latvia and in rededication to the cause of freedom for these fine people and other captive nations elsewhere in the world.

Until the people of the Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—have received again their God-given freedom certainly no nation anywhere in the world is fully free.

The statement follows:

The Latvian-Americans of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on the 17th day of November 1963, to commemorate the 45th anniversary of independence of the Republic of Latvia, unanimously agreed to issue the following statement:

"1. As we pause today to observe the 45th anniversary of the Republic of Latvia, we again thank the U.S. Government for refusing to recognize the forcible seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. We urge that this policy be continued.

"2. In the 22 years of Latvian independence, there was economic and social progress. However, after the forcible incorporation of Latvia into the Soviet Union, there has been nothing but chaos and disaster. Wherever Communists move in, misery follows. Russification as carried out in the Soviet Union against minority peoples, such as Latvians, is colonialism in the crudest form. Its goal is to destroy the nation; Soviet policy is nothing short of genocide. Since the Communist revolution in Russia 46 years ago, the system has been maintained by terror inside the country and economic aid from the free world.

"3. Present Communist strategy is to combine peaceful coexistence with disarmament. At the same time, the Communists seek expanded trade with the West to obtain desperately needed tools and foodstuffs to bolster their sagging economy at a minimum cost to themselves.

"4. In view of this Communist strategy, we urge the United States to proceed with extreme caution in entering into any trade negotiations with the Soviets, sign no nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union, and take no action that would indicate approval of Communist rule in any country in the world. Instead, we urge the United States to take more vigorous action on all fronts to overthrow Communist tyranny wherever it has been imposed.

"5. We urge the United States to bring before the United Nations the question of the Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania—whose seizure by the Soviet Union is a blatant example of Soviet colonialism at the time when Western powers have freed nearly 900 million and the Communists have enslaved a billion people.

"6. We further urge the U.S. Congress to establish a special committee on captive nations to focus attention on the plight of the once free nations whose rightful place is in the world of freemen.

"7. Fortunate as we are to live in a free country, our thoughts are ever with the oppressed people in Latvia who have suffered so much for us and who ask for only one thing, their God-given right to live in freedom. Twenty-three years of Communist persecution have failed to crush their spirit. How long will the leaders of the free world continue to ignore those brave men and women?"

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 17th day of November A.D. 1963.

Halleck's Role Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, civil rights has been called correctly the burning issue of 1963. As one who has studied the problem for many years, I know it is a trying and difficult one. Its moral and ethical aspects are somewhat clearer than its civil and political implications.

I am happy to see that Roscoe Drummond, one of the more thoughtful of our columnists, has paid well deserved tribute to Mr. HALLECK and his associates for their part in the recent handling of this issue by the Judiciary Committee. It is always easier to blame than to praise. But the recognition being given Mr. HALLECK is in the finest tradition of the Republican Party. His leadership in the face of this critical situation is deserving of the recognition accorded a statesman.

I know that in the difficult months ahead, Mr. HALLECK will need the kind of support and confidence evidenced in Mr. Drummond's column if the outcome is to bear the unmistakable Republican stamp of determination, courage and thoughtfulness.

The Drummond column, as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune and many other syndicated papers, follows:

NO SELLOUT OR DESERTION—HALLECK ON CIVIL RIGHTS: HE FOLLOWS GOP LINE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The story is going the rounds that on the sunny morning after he had done so much to rescue the civil rights bill and assure it Republican support, House Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK found an odd gift perched ominously atop his desk: a big black umbrella a la Chamberlain.

Whether the incident is real or apocryphal, the meaning is the same—that someone is accusing Mr. HALLECK of selling out to the Democrats, of throwing away an opportunity to harass the Kennedy administration by stymieing civil rights.

The implication of this Munichesque charge is that Mr. HALLECK is giving his backing to the bipartisan civil rights bill is deserting Republican Party policy.

Such a charge is inaccurate, untrue, and unfair. Mr. HALLECK is implimenting Republican policy. His politics-at-any-price Republican critics are not.

The Republican record in Congress, the Republican commitments in its 1960 national platform, and the majority views of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives all prove that Mr. HALLECK, far from shoving civil rights down the throat of his party, is in fact acting faithfully in behalf of established party policy. Here is the record:

On the passage of the first civil rights bill in 80 years—in 1957—House Republicans voted 151 for, only 15 against. (The Democratic vote was 128 for, 82 against.) On the same bill Senate Republicans voted 37 for, 0 against. (Senate Democrats voted 23 for, 15 against.)

The next civil rights bill was in 1959. This time House Republicans voted 80 for, 8 against. (House Democrats voted 141 for, 73 against.) On the same bill, Senate Republicans voted 28 for, 1 against. (Senate Democrats voted 43 for, 17 against.)

Republican HALLECK is acting in accord with this party record.

The 1960 Republican national platform committed the party, as follows: "We pledge the full use of the power, resources, and leadership of the Federal Government to eliminate discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin."

Mr. HALLECK is helping his party to carry out this pledge.

Early in this session of Congress, in January, well ahead of any action by the White House, 42 House Republicans took the initiative to jointly introduce a wide-ranging civil rights bill. In June, still ahead of the White House, 31 House Republicans added a further civil rights measure.

Last week Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, ranking Republican member of the House Judiciary Committee, and Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, salvaged civil rights from hopeless deadlock by negotiating the terms of a strong bill capable of winning decisive bipartisan support.

It was this bill to which Mr. HALLECK gave his indispensable support. From the whole record it is obvious that he is not acting to impose a civil rights position on a reluctant party, but is responding to Republican initiative.

The Republican actions cited above not only solidified the Republican Party at this session, but helped to encourage and stimulate the White House to pursue a more active course than was visible before the antidiscrimination demonstrations. Since then Mr. Kennedy has boldly-galvanized his own party in Congress.

The result: a bipartisan agreement which puts the welfare of the Nation ahead of party maneuver.

Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert as a portion of my remarks the statement by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the Seventh National Convention of Catholic Youth Organization in New York City, on November 16, 1963.

In his remarks, Mr. Hoover warns of the worldwide Communist plan to organize youth groups, and especially the increased activity in the United States. He points out the importance of guidance, discipline, and religion in fitting our youth to battle the propaganda which communism is continually creating.

I believe my colleagues will find Mr. Hoover's remarks sobering, yet inspirational in that they reveal the insight this great American has into the basic problem of dealing with the Communist menace in the United States.

The text of Mr. Hoover's remarks is as follows:

KEYS TO FREEDOM

I accept this award with a deep feeling of humility. I shall treasure it because of my great admiration for the outstanding work being performed by the Catholic Youth Organization. Your efforts on behalf of America's young people have earned the acclaim of all citizens who are concerned with the future of our Nation.

I am doubly honored that the invitation to attend this banquet was personally extended by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, a brilliant and dedicated leader and a devoted servant of God.

To His Excellency, Archbishop John J. Krol, Monsignor Frederick J. Stevenson, and all associated with the Catholic Youth Organization and the Youth Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference who have made this such a pleasant occasion, I express heartfelt appreciation. It has been especially good to see so many friends and to renew old acquaintances.

To the outstanding young people assembled here tonight, I bring warm greetings. Yours is a generation of great challenge. Through no choice of your own, you have entered the world at a time when deadly forces challenge your right, and the right of every American, to live in freedom under God.

Young people in postwar America have grown up with the disillusioning knowledge that the world is no longer safe for democracy.

High ideals are the birthright of youth, but the youth of postwar America must face, also, the chaos which present-day society presents, and bring about order through the realization of those high ideals.

We are at war with communism, in different ways on different fronts around the world. The Communist ideology is born in hate, but our philosophy of life is the practice of love and faith.

Just as freedom is your right, so challenge is your heritage—for freedom, once won, must constantly be defended.

Today, our country faces the most severe test ever to confront a free people. Here and abroad, mortal enemies of freedom and deniers of God himself conspire to undermine the fundamental forces which are the lifeline of our country's vitality and greatness—our most formidable weapons, in peace and in war.

What are these forces? They are:

Faith: faith in a Supreme Being: God, the author of liberty.

Individualism: inherent dignity and worth of every sovereign individual with his personal rights and responsibilities.

Courage: the courage of a free people firmly dedicated to the noblest cause.

Integrity: that quality of trustworthiness which is essential in dealings between men, and between countries.

Discipline: and self-discipline, which are vital in a nation governed by laws rather than by men.

Vision: such as led our Founding Fathers into the perilous dangers of a hostile wilderness that was to become the proud American Republic in which we live today.

These are America's great bulwarks. They are under savage attack today, just as they were so severely tested nearly 200 years ago at Bunker Hill and at Valley Forge.

Daniel Webster, that brilliant early American statesman, eloquently declared, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Daniel Webster knew the heavy price America had paid for her liberty. And he knew also the disintegrating effect of self-indulgence, neglect of duty and public lethargy in a nation of free men.

These lethal influences are at work, constantly undermining the sense of personal responsibility and self-discipline so essential to our Nation's welfare. They form a common denominator with the aggressive enemies of our Republic in assaulting the cause of decency and justice across the length and breadth of the land.

Who are these enemies of our Republic? They are the crime syndicates, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the unscrupulous businessmen, the corrupt politicians and all others who blatantly defy the laws of the land.

They are the hatemongers and the false liberals who would subvert our Constitution and undermine our democratic processes in furtherance of their selfish ends.

They are the Communists and other subversive elements who wave false banners of legitimacy and patriotism while relentlessly plotting to destory our heritage of freedom.

Communism—in all its forms and in all its variations—is the avowed enemy of liberty and of justice and of God. The Communists fear free and independent thought. They fear truth. They fear God even though they deny Him. They fear the inherent courage and dignity of man created in His image.

Today, the Communists are engaged in an intensive campaign to control the minds and win the allegiance of American youth. Toward this end, a National Youth Commission has been established within the Communist Party, U.S.A.; special publications have been issued; front groups have been organized; and an ambitious speech program has been directed against our colleges and universities.

During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: To create confusion, raise questions and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.

If their constitutional right to free speech allows them to use the public school forum to promote the secular creed of Marxism-Leninism which openly and avowedly denies God, does their constitutional freedom of religion also prohibit the rest of us from using the same public school forum to express our faith that God does exist?

It is indeed ironic that Communist Party speakers—whose minds and thoughts and actions are in no manner free—should demand the opportunity to parrot the Moscow line to young Americans under the guise of academic freedom.

Academic freedom is not an instrument for the perpetuation of conspiratorial ideologies. Nor is it an agent of self-destruction—a freedom to destroy freedom. As a free-flowing channel of truth and knowledge, academic freedom is not obligated to carry along the silted tributaries of lies and distortions of known Communists.

The Communists look upon students as potential sympathizers, supporters, and contributors to the party's cause. Nor are they unmindful of the rich opportuinty for infiltration presented by unwary racial and nationality groups.

This is especially true of the intense civil rights movement within the United States—for America's 20 million Negroes and the countless other citizens who share their objectives in the current struggle are a priority target for Communist propagnada and exploitation. Every organization engaged in this struggle must constantly remain alert to this vital fact, for, once under Communist domination, all freedoms and rights are lost.

The Communists are eager to capitalize upon all areas of misunderstanding and unrest. Their cause is the cause of Soviet Russia, for the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an inseparable part of the sinister international conspiracy which is financed and directed by the Kremlin. No amount of lies and duplicity can conceal this carefully documented fact.

Today, the godless Communist conspiracy controls more than one-third of the earth's people and a fourth of her land surface. In Europe, in Asia, and here in our own Western Hemisphere, we witness the stark tragedy of souls, chained to the yoke of communism, clamoring to be free again.

The Khrushchevs, the Castros, and the Mao Tse-tungs are faced with an eternal dilemma: The human spirit in bondage—no matter how heavy the chains—struggles relentlessly to break free. Witness the Hungarian revolution; the boatloads of Marxist victims who continue to pour out of Cuba; the Poznan riots in Poland; the heroic dashes of subjugated people through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Make no mistake about the Communists in this country. Whether they are members of Soviet-bloc diplomatic establishments in New York and Washington—or whether they are fanatical adherents of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—all represent the same ideology of treachery, deceit, and subversion.

From the immunity which they enjoy as foreign diplomats on American soil, Soviet and satellite officials continue to carry out espionage assignments against the United States. That some American citizens, including concealed adherents to the Communist Party, have knowingly and willingly assisted these Iron Curtain intelligence networks is a criminal disgrace and a blight not only upon our Nation, but upon the entire free world. And it is equally disgraceful that well-meaning but uninformed citizens have permitted themselves to be duped by sympathy campaigns on behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, and other traitors.

Nowhere is the hope for peace more sincere than in the hearts of all true Americans. But in our quest for peace, we must never lose sight of the well-documented fact that every Red leader from Marx and Engels through Khrushchev, Mao, and the American Communist spokesman, Gus Hall, is dedicated to an ideology which upholds world conquest as its ultimate goal.

The Communists have never deviated from this objective. Despite the high-pressure campaign they have mounted behind Khrushchev's phrase of "peaceful coexistence," the Communists know that this is simply a propaganda slogan—one devised to further their own ends by stirring the hopes and emotions of those who seek an end to the turmoil, fear, and sorrow that world communism itself created.

Actions continue to speak louder than words, and certainly the Communists have shown no indication of a sincere quest for peace.

The takeover of Cuba and effort to convert it into an island fortress against democracy; the ever-constant infiltration of Red Fascists into countries of Central and South America to creat a Sovietized Latin America; the increase of espionage activities by Soviet and satellite agents in our country, particularly those who strive to penetrate our Government processes from the protection afforded them by diplomatic assignments in New York and Washington; the frantic efforts of the Communist Party, USA, to subvert our youth; and the intense drive of the Communists operating from concealed positions to wrest control of the movement for Negro rights—does all this indicate a real and sincere desire to live in peaceful coexistence?

In recent years, the Communists have demonstrated an attitude of open defiance and contempt for our laws—an attitude which is fortified by their repeated ability to invoke loopholes, technicalities, and delays in the law to thwart justice. One former judge found cause to warn last summer not only of inexcusable delays in the courts, but also of what he considered to be a "trend of decisions in the last 10 years * * * favorable to extreme leftwingers, Communists, and subversives in general.

Another student of court rulings in the internal security field was prompted to observe, "Unfortunately, subversive activities are well on the way to becoming a no-man's land in the law."

In 1957, a Federal judge in the Nation's Capital assailed what he considered to be "an unfortunate trend of judicial decisions * * * which strain and stretch to give the guilty, not the same, but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen." There has been no reversal of this alarming trend—a trend which is felt in our steadily rising national crime problem.

Justice in a free nation means protection for society as a whole, rather than leniency for the individual to the detriment of society.

Since 1957, when the Federal judge issued his warning, crime has increased nearly 40 percent. Its victims continue to mount at a relentless rate. Four serious crimes are committed every minute; there is a crime of violence every 3 minutes; and property

crimes—robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and automobile thefts—occur within seconds.

Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime, filth, and corruption. No one can deny that motion pictures are deliberately and defiantly pursuing an increasingly bold courtship with obscenity. No one can deny the role of the television industry in bringing lurid portrayals of violence and sadism into the living rooms—and even the nurseries—of our homes. No one can deny that sensual trash is moving closer and closer to the children's books on the shelves of our newsstands and magazine stores.

Our youth do not need weakness; they need strength. They do not need indulgence; they need the guidance and the discipline which can best be provided by a decent home.

Above all, they need the benefit of religion—in church, at home, and in the atmosphere of our classrooms.

Despite the dedicated efforts of church and civic leaders and others who have a sincere interest in the proper development of our young people, the failures continue to mount. Each year, persons under 18 years of age are involved in nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, and approximately one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests. The newspapers of our major cities recount incidents of senseless murders, violent assaults, and brutal beatings inflicted upon innocent victims by arrogant gangs of teenagers and young adults.

Courts are influenced too much by the age—rather than the record—of the young hoodlum who stands before the bar of justice.

The bleeding hearts, some actually sworn to administer the law either as judges or social workers, are so concerned for young criminals and terrorists that they are indifferent to the rights of law-abiding members of society.

We have mollycoddled young criminals, lightly tapped hardened offenders on the wrists, and released some unreformed and unrepentant hoodlums to prey anew on society.

The time is long overdue for us to adopt a more realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the charitable approach toward young hoodlums and it has failed.

We are paying dearly for these failures. They represent a tragic waste of America's most valuable resource—the moral, mental, and physical health of her young citizens.

The crime problem costs the American people some $22 billion a year—nine times the amount contributed to our churches. For every $1 spent on educating our children, $1.11 goes to crime.

Nowhere in recent months have our people faced a more explosive condition of shame and violence than among the hatemongers, the moral degenerates, the lunatic fringe, and the other irrational fanatics who preach a doctrine of hostility toward their fellow man. This rabble has sown the dragons' teeth of malice and intimidation; and from the ground has sprung a series of hate-driven riots, bombings, and desecrations.

The voices of temperance, logic and decency must speak out more effectively and make their influence felt. No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in a society of free men. Hate, terror, lawlessness are not the American way of accomplishing any objective that is truly worthwhile. In meeting the tense crises which confront the United States in this nuclear age, we must look to God for guidance and inspiration.

This country has never run from its enemies. Challenge, not compromise—bravery, not cowardice—are integral parts of our heritage. Since that critical hour in 1777 when General Washington ordered his Revolutionary Army to "Put none but Americans on guard tonight," it has been the tradition of our proud Nation to rise to its greatest heights in the face of adversity.

There are important lessons to be learned in the pages of American history. From Faneuil Hall to Cape Canaveral, our greatest patriots have been men and women of deep religious conviction: Men like Thomas Jefferson, the principal author of our Declaration of Independence, who told his fellow colonists, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

In the eyes of a later-day hero, "Freedom, devotion to God and country are not things of the past. They will never become old fashioned." These words were spoken by Astronaut John H. Glenn.

America remains free because men of faith, men of individualism, men of courage, men of integrity, men of discipline and men of vision have patrolled her most vital outposts for 187 years.

These strong qualities—faith, individualism, courage, integrity, discipline, and vision—are the keys to freedom.

When the United States has lost its youthful outlook, it will have lost its vitality and its capacity for progress. That is why I charge the young people assembled here tonight to preserve the pioneer spirit which has been the soul of America since her birth.

Meet every new challenge with confidence and determination. As you look to the future, do not lose sight of the important lessons of the past. History, all too often, repeats itself. The freedoms you enjoy today will be lost, as they have been destroyed at other times and in other nations, through neglect and abuse.

Do not hesitate to speak out and bring public pressure to bear upon negative influences within your communities. We must never become so accustomed to filth or so intimidated by the advocates of so-called wordly reality that we fail to revolt against corruption and decay.

May you always protect America's heritage of freedom. May you, with God's holy guidance, preserve and strengthen that priceless heritage for the generations yet to come.

As His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, observed so profoundly nearly a decade ago, "We have no right to expect to keep our freedoms, if we ourselves do not faithfully and thankfully protect the soil and soul of America from those who have abandoned God, and for God's commandments have substituted their own code of inhumanity, greed and violence."

Let us protect and defend the real meaning of America. This is the debt we owe to the brave legions of the past who laid down their lives to safeguard the great truths which guide our destiny today.

Proposed Fair Trade Act Would Cost the American Family $250

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News of Wednesday, September 11, 1963, pointing out very simply that if the quality stabilization bill now pending before the House Rules Committee is enacted into law the average cost to families would be $250 per year.

Cost of enactment of this legislation has been estimated by economists to run about $11 billion.

Should legislation of this kind be enacted by this Congress the result would be that the proposed tax cuts would be effectively eliminated as a stimulant to the economy and the whole value thereof would flow into the pockets of manufacturers who would utilize this fair trade law to the detriment of the small businessman, the consumers, the public, and the economy generally.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Sept. 11, 1963]

PROPOSED FAIR TRADE ACT WOULD COST $250 A FAMILY

As if most American families didn't have enough troubles these days keeping up with the steadily increasing cost of living, Congress is now considering a piece of legislation which it has been estimated will add another $250 a year per family to living costs.

This legislation has been sneakily tagged with the title of a "quality stabliziation" bill. Shorn of its smokescreen, however, the bill is nothing more than a price-fixing bill which would forbid retail merchants to sell any national brand merchandise at a price lower than that established by the manufacturer.

This is the same type of so-called "fair trade" legislation which has been approved by a number of States but which has almost inevitably been knocked down by the courts whenever tested. At latest count there were some 18-State court decisions which have declared these so-called "fair trade" laws to be nothing more than unconstitutional price fixing.

Sponsors of these "fair trade" laws, however, never seem to stop trying. Beaten down in most of the individual States, they have now moved in on Congress and are attempting to do by national legislation what they haven't been able to achieve on a State level.

Surprisingly enough, they are having considerable success, as even though the bill has been opposed by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Justice Department, the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department and many labor unions and consumer organizations, it has been cleared by the House Commerce Committee and stands a relatively good chance of being passed.

As usual, the arguments advanced in behalf of this type of legislation weigh heavily on the benefits it would bestow on small merchants who have trouble meeting the price competition of discount houses, large chains and big department stores. It is readily granted that in many cases small or independent retailers cannot compete pricewise with their bigger brothers in the retail trade.

But competition has always been the lifeblood of our economic system, and it has generally been assumed that when a retailer purchases merchandise from a manufacturer it becomes his prerogative to price that merchandise for resale to his own customers at whatever figure he might feel is most advantageous to his own interests.

Manufacturers, of course, can and usually do suggest a retail price structure for their products. In some cases they require retailers to contractually pledge to maintain the manufacturers' suggested price structure. But where such contracts between manufacturers and retailers do not exist, the retailer is normally free to use his own judgment as to the margin of profit he will seek.

This process undoubtedly serves the best interest of millions of consumers in this country as it enables them to shop around and obtain the maximum value for their dollars. Without this free competition there is little question but that the cost of living would shoot skyward because of retail price increases on thousands of products sold on a national basis.

Price fixing, either by Government edict or by any other device, inevitably means higher prices for the consumers because the fixed price is normally set at a figure that will guarantee the least efficient retailer a profit. For proof of this fact it is only necessary to look at an industry where price fixing is the rule rather than the exception. This is the milk industry which in most States is closely controlled by regulatory governmental agencies.

It is almost axiomatic that in areas where milk prices are not fixed, consumers pay less for their milk than in areas where prices are fixed or controlled by law. Since there is a public health factor involved in the production and sale of milk, there is, at least, some justification for control over both the quality and the selling price of milk.

This justification is not present, however, in regards to uncounted thousands of other products, and any attempt to fix the retail selling price of these products by law can only result in saddling millions of American families with higher prices for innumerable items they buy.

As we pointed out above, it has been estimated that the cost to the average family of this "quality stabilization" bill will be $250 per year. This is bad enough, but on top of that extra cost will be piled the public burden of maintaining yet another governmental agency to oversee the administration of the price-fixing law.

This is not only an unwise and unneeded bill but it is one that will put the long arm of the Federal Government even deeper into every individual's pocketbook and his private business.

We need more Government intervention into private business like we need a hole in the head, and any Congressman who gives his support to this kind of legislation deserves to be voted right out of office the very next time he comes up for election.

We All Helped Pull the Trigger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic day of November 22, 1963, when our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, was struck down by an assassin's bullet, there have been many eloquent editorials and tributes to him. We give pause to reflect upon how this horrible act could have occurred in this day and age.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the November 23, 1963, issue of the Long Island Press which, I believe, should be read by every American:

WE ALL HELPED PULL THE TRIGGER

In the past hundred years, 19 men have held the proud office of President of the United States. Of the 19, 4 were assassinated—Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and now John F. Kennedy. Two more narrowly escaped being murdered: Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman. Still another, Theodore Roosevelt, by then an ex-President, was wounded, though not fatally.

Seven presidents out of 19, slightly more than 1 in every 3, have been the targets of assassins. This is a ghastly record hardly to be equaled in the unruly Balkans or among the wildest desert dynasties, or in the jungles of Africa. Yet it is the record of the United States of America, leader of the West, the world's bulwark, the hope of mankind and the shining pinnacle of civilization.

We are rich—richer than half the world dreams of ever being.

We are generous—pouring out money all across the earth.

We are educated—with so many Ph. D.'s that if laid end to end they would reach to the moon.

But we are not disciplined, we are not thoroughgoing, we are not tough enough with ourselves or with our children.

We go for the big and the easy. We let our children slither and slide through schools where everything is made as soft as possible. We create a national atmosphere in which the queer become queerer and are encouraged to deviate in the name of tolerance.

We make discipline impossible of enforcement; we applaud interpretations of the law so broad that minor offenders are left free to grow into major criminals.

Yesterday all this caught up with us. Our President, in the full vigor of life, was shot down. We cannot excuse ourselves by saying that the assassin must have been mad. True as this may be, it is we who have encouraged the madness.

We have been a nation which has tolerated the wildest vilification of our public men. We have become used to the preaching of hatred. Let it go on, we have said; our people are too intelligent to be taken in.

Yet in the grim aftermath of Mr. Kennedy's assassination we must acknowledge that we have let social evils flourish not because we are too tolerant but because we were too lazy to fight them; too busy making the comfortable dollar.

Yesterday's martyr was a man trying to lead us out of our moral morass. He was young, intelligent, vigorous, and indefatigable. Before his fellow citizens he held aloft the torch of a real Americanism * * * an Americanism based on spiritual courage, on moral fiber, and on plain hard work.

In his dedication to mankind he dared to defy powerful elements within his own political party. He was a standard bearer for human freedom in every quarter of this world, and above all a stalwart champion of his Nation, the man who faced down Russia time and again. And he spoke alway to the best that is in us, striving to rekindle the spirit that carried the United States to greatness.

Perhaps the tragedy of his death will reawaken us. Perhaps the horror of yesterday will shock us out of our lethargy.

Possibly we shall even see a reaction from hatreds; and if this occurs, let us prayerfully hope that President Johnson will be able to seize upon it and channel it into constructive social action.

To Mr. Kennedy's striken family, we can only offer our hope that the consolations of their religion will carry them through the terrible days ahead. Their loss is beyond estimating. Not only did a President die yesterday; a son died and a brother; a grinning young war hero died, a youthful Senator died; a young lover, a husband, a father who had just built a new house, a father who took the kids to church on Sunday.

So brave a life, so debonair, so full of accomplishment and so big with promise of still greater things.

Wiped out * * * murdered * * * a victim of the system we have helped create.

President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my words can add nothing to the eloquence of the editorials of the Newark newspapers about our beloved and great late President:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Nov. 23, 1963]

HOUR OF DARKNESS

John F. Kennedy lies dead at the hand of an assassin. The Nation is prostrated with shock and grief and shame.

His death will have global consequences, but now there is room in our hearts only for sorrow at the death of a gallant young President.

The country's first thought goes to his near ones—to the anguished wife who sat at his side when gunfire struck him down in Dallas, to the children suddenly bereft of a father, to his parents and others of a large family knit by strong bonds of affection.

But we mourn also for the United States, which has lost a President who discharged his responsibilities with diligence and devotion, with grace and dignity. He had courage. He had magnanimity. For all who are underprivileged he had compassion.

John F. Kennedy's name is now added to a sad and tragic roll—Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley.

His death is a grievous loss not only to his country, but to all the Western world.

He was the personification of the brave, youthful leadership to which the world looks for a more rational and tranquil existence. To him words like freedom and liberty and justice were not abstractions. They were ideals to be fought for and defended.

But for the moment all this is irrelevant. For most Americans, in this hour of darkness, the only reality is that, by an infamous act, a beloved President lies dead.

It is an hour when our thoughts turn backward to a brighter day, and we seem to hear again the inspiring words that concluded the inaugural address of our 35th President:

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Now the President who spoke those memorable words has given his life for his country. No man can do more.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Nov. 23, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT IS DEAD

President Kennedy is dead, the victim of a shocking, senseless tragedy.

The first, almost reflex, reaction to the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy is the chilling, grievous loss to our country and the free world.

Another reaction, almost as immediate, is heartfelt sympathy for his grief-stricken family.

In a sense, they are related—the loss to his family and the Nation—the loss is deeply personal and immeasurable.

It is difficult to measure words so soon after an incident of such catastrophic dimensions. The words come hard, haltingly because the shocking impact of this tragedy numbs the senses.

Mr. Kennedy was struck down at the height of his vigor. He was an articulate spokesman for the cause of world democracy, a symbol of hope for undeveloped nations

and the new countries emerging into strange, new independence in Africa.

How can you measure his loss on the international scene? In his tragically short tenure in the White House, Mr. Kennedy became a beacon of hope for the free world. He was a vigorous exponent of foreign aid, the lifeblood to the future for less privileged nations.

It is ironic that the President should die at a time when his efforts to ease world tensions appeared to be taking firm hold, after months of wearing negotiations and anxiety.

Mr. Kennedy had matured greatly in office. He had the most difficult task in this uncertain, anxiety-ridden world, a world that is divided by two diametrically opposed political and economic philosophies.

The President had taken on new stature after the showdown in Cuba, when he stood up to the missile-waving Premier Khrushchev. This was a major breakthrough for American foreign policy; it gave fresh, new hope to free nations that were deeply concerned over Communist aggressions.

At home, Mr. Kennedy found greater obstacles to his legislative programs in recent months, an uneasy prelude to the national election next year.

There was stubborn resistance to his foreign aid program, his social legislation was stalled and he faced formidable opposition to his civil rights bill.

In recent months, it became apparent that Mr. Kennedy was moving slowly and inexorably to a centrist area on economic problems, in an effort to deal more effectively with the Nation's nagging unemployment problem.

Now Mr. Kennedy is dead.

How do we measure him as a President, as a leader of world opinion, as a catalyst for the free nations and the undeveloped countries?

It is still too early to fully evaluate him in this respect. His administration was shockingly brief; he was not able to carry through the difficult, painstaking international programs.

Many problems are still unsolved, at home and abroad. But much progress has been made in his short time in office.

The United States and the free world had come a long way under Mr. Kennedy's leadership—it has a long way to go. The road is long, tortuous and full of pitfalls. In his own way, the President made that road a little smoother, a little easier to traverse.

The assassin's bullet ruthlessly removed that heavy burden from the President's shoulder. This burden now is the awesome responsibility of Lyndon Baines Johnson, an experienced political leader of high competence and tireless energy.

Mr. Johnson is faced with a big job. We are fortunate he is a big man.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, Nov. 24, 1963]

A MAN OF PEACE

Even now in this solemn period of mourning, it is difficult to comprehend the tragedy that has befallen the Nation in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Messages of condolence pouring in from all over the world reflect the disbelief of the American people that in this age such a thing could have happened here.

All Americans are united in a common sorrow, a sorrow that for many is deeply personal. For if there was political opposition to John F. Kennedy, there was, save in one malignant mind, little personal enmity.

He had won the hearts of millions not only in the United States, but around the world. Even in Moscow women wept when his death was announced.

This affection was a response to his personality and character. He had wit and intellect, grace and style, gallantry and idealism. He brought to the Presidency energy, imagination, and courage, and applied them all in his efforts to solve that which confronted him.

But above all else, in everything he did, Mr. Kennedy gave proof of his supreme dedication to the cause of peace and freedom. To him these were the transcendent needs of our time—at home as well as in the world.

His gravest economic problem was persistent unemployment. He sought to combat it by stimulating economic expansion through tax reduction. To improve social conditions, he worked for the implementation of constitutional guarantees on civil rights.

To meet want, he advocated programs of mental health and health insurance for the aged; for community betterment he offered redevelopment programs. He proposed Federal assistance in other areas, notably in education.

In most of this Mr. Kennedy was frustrated by congressional indifference or, as in the case of civil rights, by intraparty hostility. He encountered increasing difficulty with Congress over his foreign-aid programs. But Congress supported his efforts to strengthen the Nation's defenses and the space program which made such rapid strides during his administration.

In foreign policy he achieved more evident success. Offsetting an initial defeat in the Bay of Pigs was his successful confrontation of the Soviet Union in the crisis arising over Russian missile bases in Cuba.

The President succeeded in lessening cold war tensions. He negotiated with the Russians a treaty banning atomic tests in the atmosphere, and authorized the sale of surplus American wheat grain to Communist countries, but he remained forever wary of their ultimate purposes.

Complicating Mr. Kennedy's efforts to provide rational and constructive leadership for the West was a new spirit of nationalism in Western Europe, which was largely the result of the economic rehabilitation that America had financed.

Personifying this spirit was President de Gaulle, whose dream of a Europe united under French leadership conflicts with the American ideal of a wider Atlantic community.

And America's generous foreign-aid program created another problem, an unfavorable balance of trade that threatened the stability of the dollar.

The President's noble concept, the Alliance for Progress, through which he hoped to bring an end to poverty and illiteracy in Latin America faltered largely because most of the beneficiaries have failed to do their part.

But if at his death much that he had begun remained unfinished, he had won the world's respect. He cared for people, he cared for the world, and he worked unceasingly that they might be prosperous and peaceful. And the people and the world, believing in the sincerity of his purpose, mourn the loss of one who had offered so much hope.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Nov. 25, 1963]

OF MOURNING AND REDEDICATION

Today has been proclaimed a day of mourning. Americans everywhere will join in a heartfelt, sorrowful tribute to the Chief Executive so ruthlessly and viciously shot down by an assassin.

Now that the initial shock has been somewhat worn away by the inexorable process of time, the terrible enormity of the crime—with all its farflung ramifications—is only beginning to dawn on the American people.

And they are realizing, too, that the deeper the tragedy the more difficult it is to truly do it justice.

The impact of the tragedy was further brought home to millions of Americans via the television sets in their living room. They saw the flag-draped casket bearing the remains of John Fitzgerald Kennedy move slowly on a horse-drawn caisson through the streets of Washington from the White House to the Capitol rotunda.

They heard the regular beat of the hushed drums—100 steps to the minute. And the mournful rhythm beat a tattoo the American people will not quickly forget. There have been few, if any, instances in history where so many people participated in a service marking so great a tragedy.

In many a living room yesterday it would have been hard to find a dry eye. The sight of Mrs. Kennedy, little Caroline at her side, bravely kneeling to kiss the casket of her husband will be etched for a long time on the minds of millions of Americans.

The loss Mrs. Kennedy suffered is, of course, a great one. But all of us also have suffered a great loss.

Mr. Kennedy served but a brief period in the White House. But it was an eventful period. Historians may be reluctant to pass final judgment at this early date. It was clear, however, since shortly after his inauguration that the Kennedy administration was to be earmarked by youth, vigor, intelligence, and determination to make a fresh attack on accumulated problems at home and abroad.

Seeing their young President in action, the American people had a growing confidence in his ability. Not everyone agreed with him. But no one—least of all John F. Kennedy—would have expected or wanted unanimity. The American Government provides room for disagreement and diversity. This is one meausre of its strength.

But there is no room for hatred of the type displayed by the assassin who ended the President's life. When it comes to hatred, there is only room for hatred of injustice and violence.

In his few years in the White House, President Kennedy sought to end injustice and inequality in the Nation and violence from abroad. And millions of American people are undoubtedly better off today because of his efforts.

By proclamation, today is a day of mourning. It is also, by proclamation, a day of rededication. In their mourning, the American people should not overlook the obligation to rededicate their efforts to help make their country a better place for all its citizens—in a world secure in justice and freedom, removed from the threat of violence.

Perhaps such a utopia—of which man has dreamed for centuries—cannot be achieved on this earth. But this was the aim of the Founding Fathers of this Nation. And it was the aim of John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy's tragic death may have helped sharpen the full realization of fundamentals to which Americans are accustomed to give lipserivce. Now is the time for all to rededicate themselves to giving much more than lipservice to the high ideals on which this Nation was founded.

John F. Kennedy Memorial Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, together with other Members of the House, I have introduced legislation to establish the John F. Kennedy Memorial Center. I would like to read into the RECORD a

splendid editorial from the Washington Post of November 27. It bespeaks my feeling and I am sure a host of other Members of this House in renaming the National Cultural Center in memory of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

A FITTING MEMORIAL

Of course the National Cultural Center should be newly consecrated to the memory of John F. Kennedy. There could be few more fitting memorials to a President who enlivened the White House with music, drama, and poetry. Mr. Kennedy, moreover, was the embodiment of life and vivacity; a conventional monument would be false to his own spirit. Far better a place where people gather to hear and see works of beauty than a marble mausoleum which would seem to embalm rather than evoke his memory.

A John F. Kennedy Memorial Center—the name itself is an improvement over the present self-conscious name—would have an additional merit. It would enable the sponsors of the Center to reexamine the design and location in the light of a changed purpose. Perhaps the present setting and architecture would in the end be found adaptable to a memorial function. But the objections raised about inaccessibility and structural limitations could be thoughtfully reconsidered.

No living memorial could catch all the qualities of a gifted President who was equally at home in the library and on the football field. But the best single suggestion so far is a memorial center for the performing arts—potentially, a place of splendor and grace that could be a proud addition to the Capital of the United States.

Jack Askins—Civil Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 30, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jack Askins, Small Business Advisor to the Secretary of Army, a civil servant, good American, and Texan has been decorated for exceptional performance on two occasions by the Department of Army. His commendations follow:

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY SMALL BUSINESS ADVISOR RECEIVES GOLD AND BRONZE MEDAL AWARDS SIMULTANEOUSLY

For the past 10 years industry and the Defense Establishment have recognized Jack W. Askins, Small Business Advisor to the Secretary of the Army, for continued outstanding contributions to the businessman who is desirous of doing busines with the Government.

On October 3, 1962, the Secretary of the Army, at the Army's 7th annual awards ceremony, at the Pentagon, conferred upon Mr. Askins the Army's two highest awards—namely, "Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service" and "Meritorious Civilian Service Award." The Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service Award is the Gold Medal Award and the highest award within the Department of the Army. The citation by the Secretary of the Army is as follows:

"Department of the Army Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service.

"Jack W. Askins has received official commendation for exceptional performance of duty.

"Citation—For exceptional service as Small Business Advisor to the Department of the Army, 1957 through 1962. His judgment and unusual ability have contributed immeasurably in the development of an effective program to assist small business concerns in participating in Department of the Army procurement for supplies and services. His understanding of industry problems and his willingness to expand every effort to solve these problems have enhanced the Department of the Army's role in its relationship with the small business community of the Nation, as well as all other elements of industry and commerce engaged in the defense effort. His devotion to duty and his reputation for integrity gain him the respect of those with whom he is associated and reflect great credit up himself and the Department of the Army.

"CYRUS VANCE,
"Secretary of the Army.

"Washington, D.C., March 25, 1963."

Advertisement Branded Malicious and Erroneous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Power County Press, of American Falls, Idaho, carried an advertisement on page 8 of their November 14, 1963, issue sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom. The committee's advertisement, entitled "Civil Rights & Legal Wrongs," is a malicious, erroneous, and highly misleading analysis of the civil rights bill of 1963.

The entire presentation is so blatantly false that a rebuttal of all of the erroneous and contrived assertions would take hours. However, as I have had a particularly close relationship with title VII of the civil rights bill which prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, I will focus my attention upon the portion of the propaganda tract which treats this title which appears to be representative of the quality of the entire presentation.

The section headed "Employers and Employees" contains over 200 words, Mr. Speaker, and not a single truth. Not a solitary factual assertion. I cannot believe that this constitutes a serious, objective attempt to analyze the legislation. Rather, it must be a calculated attempt to mislead readers. This is a gross perversion of the right to freedom of expression. This is subversion of the democratic processes. It is an attempt to sway public opinion, not by persuasion, but by deliberate falsehoods.

It is absolutely clear that an FEPC will not have power to tell an employer whom he shall hire, fire, promote, or demote. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will have authority to prohibit discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin. But it does not have the authority to initiate actions dictating to an employer which individual he shall hire or fire. No quota systems are authorized. No balances among ethnic groups will be established. Every case must be considered on its own individual merits. Moreover, significant steps have been taken to guarantee that every complainant and respondent receives due process of law. The final determinations will be made by the Federal courts according to traditional judicial standards.

Mr. Speaker, such attempt at influencing public opinion, of exercising freedom of expression, do a great disservice to the Nation. I do not desire to constrain anyone's constitutional rights, but merely to criticize such licentious exercise of these most valuable and inalienable rights.

The advertisement follows:

[From the American Falls (Idaho) Power County Press, Nov. 14, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LEGAL WRONGS—CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1963

A package of legislation called the Civil Rights Act of 1963 now is pending in the U.S. Congress.

The title is a misnomer. This bill is but 10 percent civil rights. The rest—90 percent—is an extension of Federal executive power created at the expense of individuals, States, and municipalities. The bill is, in fact, the blueprint for a controlled system of life; it would establish new principles of law of drastic and far-reaching implications.

Consider the bill's principal provisions:

Under the cloak of civil rights—if this bill becomes law—the Federal Government henceforth will dictate to whom you may sell or rent your home.

If you are the proprietor of an establishment that offers goods and services for use or hire—not just public accommodations (hotels, restaurants and such) but any kind of business that offers anything to the public—then, under this bill, your business would be subject to Federal control.

In like manner, the bill covers all "contractors and subcontractors" in every program or activity where direct or indirect financial aid is rendered by the Government. It will apply to you: If you borrow money from or deposit money in a Government-insured bank; if you have an FHA, VA, or Small Business Administration loan; if you are a realtor or developer; if you are a farmer who has financial dealings with the Farm Credit Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the Soil Conservation Service, or if you have Federal crop insurance, or deal with the REA or participate in any agricultural program involving Federal funds.

EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Under this act, all employers who participate in any of these programs can be told by a Federal FEPC whom they shall hire, fire, promote and demote, and how they shall handle their employees.

Under this act Federal inspectors would be empowered to rule that racial or religious imbalance exists in a business. Thereafter, that business could not employ or promote the people it might prefer but only such racial or religious individuals as the Federal inspector designated. His ruling could require that racial or religious balance be obtained and apply to all job classifications: to common laborers, to skilled laborers, to the secretarial staff, to supervisory employees, and to vice presidents, all alike. A Federal agency would be prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner.

ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement of the Federal inspector's findings would be simple; failure to comply would mean the end of all participation in Federal programs. Your loan could be

called; you could be blacklisted for further loans from banks or financial institutions insured by the Government; and you could be prevented from taking part in any activity that had to do with Federal financing. In certain injunctive situations, an employer could be jailed without the protection of a jury trial.

And that is only part of it.

PROFESSIONAL AND SMALL BUSINESS

The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would also bring under Federal control individuals and businesses never before thought to be constitutionally subject to such regulations. Under the bill's title II, any person who pays a business license to a State or municipality could be included.

Thus, the act brings under Federal supervision almost every profession and every business—lawyers, realtors, small establishments, doctors, restaurants, gasoline stations, theaters, hotels, motels and lodging houses. The smallest soda fountain would be covered.

SCHOOLS

The bill goes even further. If this act should become law between 100 and 200 statutes now in effect would be amended. Everyone who has dealings with Federal educational programs, for instance, would be subject to new requirements. Under the provisions of the act, the U.S. Commissioner of Education could influence the transfer of children from one school to another—back and forth—until racial balance and religious balance existed. (The correction of racial imbalance is of such importance to the sponsors that the phrase appears eight times in a single brief section of the bill.)

Under the authority proposed in connection with Federal financing, school lunch programs, research programs, the building of schools, Hill-Burton hospitals—all such programs and organizations would be subject to new Federal controls.

VOTERS

Nor is that all. The bill boldly seeks for the Justice Department unprecedented powers to gain Federal control of the electoral machinery.

In 1961, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recommended—contrary to express provisions in the Constitution—that the Federal Government impose new control over the qualification and registration of voters. The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would implement these recommendations.

It follows, then, if this act were made law, a politically minded Attorney General could go into an area where the voting might be close and swing the election. See how it would work: The language of the bill allows the Attorney General, at his own discretion, to file a descrimination suit and, without proof of his allegations, register tens of thousands of voters. The ballots, then, could be cast and counted and the election won, even though the Attorney General's action, later, were determined by the courts to have been invalid.

UNIONS

The bill goes on: In giving the Federal Government new control over the hiring, firing, promoting, demoting, and payment of employees, the act also would give Federal Commissioners new powers to destroy not only the seniority system of unions, but also an employee's rights within the company for which he works. This is so because the act gives full and unlimited power to Federal inspectors to determine who shall be hired, promoted, demoted, or fired, whenever a change is made that racial and/or religious imbalance (discrimination) exists.

EVERYONE

A careful reading of this Civil Rights Act of 1963, we believe, will convince the impartial citizen that the administration is here proposing, under an emotional and racist appeal to civil rights, to destroy age-old liberties of the individual and to cast off constitutional restraints upon Federal power. The bill would intimately and immediately affect every parent of schoolage children, every businessman, every professional man, every homeowner, and every wage earner in the United States.

Many of the provisions of the act, in our view, violate the Constitution of the United States. They are also contrary to existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. But, no one can foretell what the Supreme Court would hold, if Congress were to make a legislative finding in the areas mentioned—that is, if the Civil Rights Act of 1963 were passed by Congress.

The so-called softening amendments proposed by Attorney General Kennedy do not actually change the effects of the bill.

WRITE CONGRESS

If you do not want such controls to apply to you, if you do not want your personal liberties snatched from you in the areas covered by the bill, if you want to preserve liberty under the law, then write to your Senators (both of them) and to your Congressman, today. Ask them, earnestly, to vote against this legislation. Tell them the truth, that 90 percent of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 is not civil rights at all, but Federal control. Do this and you will stop this grab for power. Fail to do it, and the legal foundation will be laid for the most revolutionary change in our country's history. You have "civil rights" too. Put them to use in a fight against this bill.

Sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, Suite 520, 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM LOEB,
Chairman.
MANCHESTER, N.H.

JOHN J. SYNON,
Director.
RICHMOND, VA.

Deadly Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act, in order to make it more difficult to indiscriminately purchase firearms. I believe that the legislation is long overdue and in view of the dreadful events of last Friday, the assassination of President Kennedy, I believe this is the time to enact it.

In explanation of my reasoning for introducing this legislation, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of November 27, 1963:

DEADLY WEAPONS

Men have perfected many devices for killing their fellow creatures; but none has proved so deadly as a gun. Of the 7,261 murders reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation last year, more than half of the victims were killed with guns. Of the four Presidents of the United States who have been assassinated, all died by shooting.

Yet guns are readily available to every demented being who may take it into his head to snuff out the life of the Chief Magistrate of the American people. Guns can be purchased for a few dollars, brought into the country at will from abroad, or even, as in the case of Lee Oswald's high-powered rifle, ordered by mail. Guns are readily available also, it seems, to any thug who chooses to thwart the orderly processes of American justice and snuff out the life of an accused without trial or even so much as a judicial hearing.

What lunacy is it, what bemusement with a frontier past long vanished, that leads the people of this land to allow firearms to be sold and possessed in the United States almost entirely uncontrolled? It is estimated, although no one really knows, that there are more than 50 million guns in the United States today. According to a Gallup poll, at least half of all American householders own guns; in the South there are firearms in two out of three homes. And apart from the crimes they abet, there is no way to measure the mischief they foment—the deaths and injuries resulting from careless handling of guns by their lawful owners, from accidents occurring when firearms are left within reach of children, from suicides, from the actions of normally law-abiding persons who find a gun at hand in a moment of anger or intoxication.

Guns are weapons. They are designed for the killing or maiming of living creatures. Some types of rifles and shotguns are called sporting weapons by those whose idea of sport it is to kill or maim birds or the wild creatures of the country's steadily diminishing forest. They are, nonetheless, mortally dangerous to human beings. And pistols of every kind have no other function than to injure or destroy human life.

In England, and in most civilized countries, no one may purchase or possess any firearm unless he has been issued a police certificate specifying the purpose for which the weapon is wanted; and certificates are issued only to persons of supposedly sound mind and good repute. This is the beginning of rationality in regard to firearms. There is nothing whatever in the language of the second amendment to the Constitution which forbids such a sensible safeguarding of the public welfare.

Senator DODD's bill to control mail-order sales of handguns would be a useful step in the right direction. Representative Anfuso's bill, introduced in 1961, to require the filing of a registration statement with respect to the possession of a pistol by any private person would go a desirable step further. But the country ought to recognize from the tragic events of the past week that regulation of greater stringency is imperatively needed. We believe that it should include a drastic reduction in the present proliferation of firearms, the strict establishment of responsibility for reporting sales or transfers of these deadly weapons and a recognition in law that the owner of a gun may be held liable for any injury which it may inflict.

It is high time to put an end to the merchandising of murder and assassination.

The Road to Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 29, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, on October 24 the Wall Street Journal printed an editorial titled "The Road to Equality." This editorial is succinctly summed up in one sentence which reads:

And whatever men may wish, it is the reality of things that men must face.

I believe this writer has faced reality on the subject of civil rights and social acceptance. For this reason, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the full text of the editorial from the Wall Street Journal and recommend it for serious perusal by every Member of the Congress:

THE ROAD TO EQUALITY

In last week's issue of Newsweek there is a report—done in depth and forthrightly presented—on what the Nation's white community thinks about the Negro's present struggle for civil rights and social acceptance.

We think it something to be pondered, especially by those in Congress now deliberating on what the law may do to improve the position of the Negro people. If not always happy reading, the Newsweek poll gives a measured shape to things as they are. And whatever men may wish, it is the reality of things that men must face.

In substance, if so detailed a study can be summarized, the Newsweek report shows that the white community—North and South—has a consensus, spoken and unspoken, on three things of major importance.

The first, and this ought never to be forgotten, is that the Negro people must be given equality in all the basic rights of citizenship, and that if necessary this must be done by force of law.

The unanimity on this is remarkable. Even in the South 92 percent of the white citizens think there should be a law guaranteeing a Negro citizen's right to vote; 80 percent of these same white southerners favor laws for equal treatment in public transportation; 62 percent favor legal protection for the Negro in job opportunities. So any southern politician who takes his cue from the noisier diehards, it is clear, mistakes the temper of the times.

The second thing on which a consensus shows in the Newsweek poll is in the area of what the law ought not to try to force.

Here, as one might suppose, southern white voters oppose laws to set up job quotas for Negroes or give them preference in hiring, or any kind of law to force integration in housing. But the significant thing is that the whole white community, North and South, feels the same way.

Nationwide, 81 percent of the white people oppose the quota system; 97 percent oppose legal efforts to give job preferences to Negroes; 56 percent oppose antidiscrimination housing laws. Only on the question of legally integrated schools is there a significant sectional difference; 57 percent of the southerners oppose forced integration while only a quarter of the whole white community, across the Nation, resist integrated schools.

But the third area on which the Newsweek poll shows a common national viewpoint is, we think, the most important of all. For it deals not with tangible matters, like a law one can be for or against, but with the deep, silent attitudes of the white majority toward the methods of the Negro revolt and toward the social acceptance of the Negro people.

Here the cold statistics of the Newsweek poll will make disturbing reading for the Negro people. In every question asked about the recent tactics of the Negro revolt—lunch counter sit-ins, boycotts against shops and manufacturers, the practice of courting jail demonstrations or such things as lying down before trucks at construction projects—in every one of the cases the majority of the white people, North as well as South, disapproved of the actions.

Even more discouraging to Negroes are the figures on where the white community presently draws the line in its attitude toward social acceptance and equality. Here, plainly, there is a vast difference between what is publicly said and what is privately felt.

Whether North or South, only a minority of the white people any longer feel any serious antipathy toward working with a Negro on a job. But in both North and South the overwhelming majority of whites do not want to have a Negro family living next door, entertain Negroes in their homes or see their children date or marry a Negro. The figures for those objecting to this kind of social contact range, nationwide, from 80 percent to very nearly 100 percent.

Given those attitudes, it still might be possible with sufficient force to break up old neighborhood patterns, forcing Negroes and whites to be next-door neighbors regardless of anything else. Enough force might also put an end to private clubs, to restricted gathering places, to exclusive inns and restaurants and to all the other ways in which men choose their private associations in their private lives. Conceivably, enough pressure might drive out all open expression of "prejudice."

Yet would that achieve what the Negro needs? His ultimate goal is, and must be, not merely the right to walk into a voting booth or a classroom, or even to take a job, vital though these be. What the Negro wants to achieve—and what the nation should want him to achieve—is the final dignity of full acceptance as an integral part of the community of Americans.

If that be so, then victories won by coercion would be for the Negroes victories turned to dust. Not only would they be shams. They would put the substance of victory farther from the Negro's grasp because resentment would build a higher wall to bar the way.

Nor would this be a senseless resentment. For while it is a moral evil for society to deprive a man of his public rights under law because of the color of his skin, it is not a moral good for the law to deprive a man of his private rights to a private life. No man has a "right" to another man's association.

That is won only by the working of time, and part of the Negro's responsibility is to use time well. If that sounds discouraging, it need not be defeatist. Every minority group in this country—indeeed, every minority group everywhere—has always had to travel the same patient road. And if some of the Newsweek poll makes sad reading, there is also a clear reminder of what great changes time has already wrought. That, in itself, is a victory for us all.

Yet in any event, the way is not to defy the realities of the world as it is but for those concerned, white and Negro, to act wisely so that tomorrow those realities may be different. Until they are, coercive laws will be both futile and perilous. When they are, there will be no need for laws.

Shall We Banish God From Our Schools and Our Public Life?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days when many of us are so deeply concerned at the rise of secularism in our lives and at the direction in which recent Supreme Court decisions appear to be taking us, I think a sermon recently given by the Reverend Paul H. Krauss in Trinity English Lutheran Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., is most timely. I hope that many people will read and profit by this great sermon.

The sermon follows:

SHALL WE OFFICIALLY BANISH GOD FROM OUR AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE?

(A sermon preached by the Reverend Paul H. Krauss in Trinity English Lutheran Church the 13th Sunday After Trinity, Sept. 8, 1963)

Text: Deuteronomy 6:4–9.

"Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord:

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart:

"And thou shalt teach them diligently unto, thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.

"And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes.

"And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates."

Let us pray: In the beauty of holiness and in the quiet of Thine house, we beseech Thee now, O God, warm our hearts, enlighten our minds and strengthen our wills to serve Thee—

"Drop Thy still dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease,
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace."

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The American people confront great crises today. The problems of racial integration, of nuclear ban testing, and population explosion, of foreign aid and world responsibility, of inflation, and deteriorating morality—all of them challenge the health, the happiness, and the future well-being not only of America, but of the entire human family.

The most drastically serious of these challenges is connected with a trend in American life toward paganism. The decision of the Supreme Court banning Bible reading and directed prayers in the public schools has hastened that trend toward paganism, and constitutes a further step toward irreligion in American life. Obviously, it must encourage the coming of secularism and the elimination of the official recognition of God, and the kind of irreligion that will delight the friends of communism and the foes of Americanism throughout the world.

The majority of the American people are God-fearing. They know that this Nation was established under God, and they properly are deeply concerned about any trend in education without God.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States states, exactly, we "Shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." That is to say, and the concern of these Founding Fathers was directed to this end, there shall be no state church. It certainly was not directed toward the banishing of the recognition of God or the exercise of religion in American society. But the action of the Supreme Court, in prohibiting the directed use of prayers, and specifically the Lord's Prayer, involves more than precaution against the establishment of the state church. It restricts the desire and privilege of the people to recognize God in American life and constitutes another step toward irreligion, secularism, and godlessness by an unnecessarily strict interpretation of that amendment. We have now come to the point in American life when we are putting the whole force and influence of our great tax-supported public school system on

the side of just one element in the community, in its beginning at least, and that a minuscule minority of atheists.

If the position taken by the gentlemen of the Supreme Court is clear, its implications are inescapable, and intolerable.

1. By the implication of this action the United States has no right formally to engage chaplains for the opening of the sessions of the Senate or the House of Representatives. I have in my hand here a copy of a book called "Prayers," published at the expense of the taxpayers by the Government Printing Office, and sent to me and to many others free by our Senators at the public's expense, containing the prayers of the Reverend Dr. Peter Marshall, for a long time the helpful and inspiring Chaplain of the Senate of the United States. I have also had the privilege of meeting Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, formerly honored Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

If we are at the behest of a minority who can order the banishing of religion and its recognition from our public school system by the Court's interpretation of that first amendment, by what right does the Congress recognize and support, from our taxes, these chaplaincies and these devotions?

2. A second dark implication of the action of the Supreme Court is that we have no right to place the motto "In God We Trust" on our coins. To do so is not only a reminder of God, but by implication would tend toward the "establishment of religion."

3. We have a military chaplaincy force, thousands of them serving the spiritual needs of the men in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and Marine Corps, in which service some of my most gracious spiritual memories are centered, as a former Navy chaplain. If by the implication of this action of the Supreme Court, we must avoid the recognition of God in our public school system, it seems to me by the same logic we have no right to maintain that Chaplains Corps. These chaplains recognize God and, in the interpretation of the Supreme Court, this constitutes a trend toward an establishment of religion, a state church, in the strict meaning of the first amendment.

4. We must discontinue all Christmas programs in the public schools, and dispense with the Easter lilies. They constitute a recognition of religion and subject the pupils to a propaganda which, in the implication of the action of the Supreme Court, certainly tends toward the establishment of religion, insofar as they inculcate the concept of the resurrection, and life victorious over death.

By the implication of the Supreme Court's action, the State has no right to give encouragement to any such doctrinal position, lest it lead to an establishment of religion. There should be no organization of a public school program which recognizes Christmas holidays and Easter vacations, nor the closing of schools on Good Friday, for that tends toward the establishment of a religion. No high school choir may sing "Holy Night" at Christmastime, or any religious songs. Only the secular songs that have no relationship to God or absolute values, doubtless the noblest products of "Tin-Pan Alley," which convey only the sense of the temporal, the rootless, and the trivial, can be permitted.

5. Furthermore, by the implication of this action we have no right to exempt churches from taxes, we have no right to exempt religious hospitals, orphans' homes, old peoples' homes, every sort of religious agency owned by a church, no matter how much it may serve human needs. These institutions, when they are exempt from taxes by the State, add to the burden placed upon the atheist in his taxload. In addition, theoretically in the implication of the gentlemen of the Supreme Court, this will constitute an establishment of religion, because their witness and testimony and the influence of their care upon people will indoctrinate their beneficiaries, and tend to make them religious.

6. Actually, it would seem impossible to take an oath in a court without at least by implication violating the position of the first amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court, because that refers to an absolute who is dependable, and the moment that is done, religion comes in through the door.

Let us bear in mind, the purpose of that clause was to prevent the establishment of a state church, the kind of state church in Europe from whose oppressions our ancestors fled to this free land. Your ancestors, my ancestors, wanted none of that. They stood for freedom of conscience, but they were never anti-God, and looked upon atheism as an ultimate evil.

The people who framed and adopted the Constitution were profoundly religious people. They feared God and worshipped Him. Now we have come to a point in American life when we tend to put the whole force of our great tax-supported public school system on the side of secularism. (Incidentally, the woman who was the plaintiff in the Baltimore case, whom the Supreme Court supported in her protest against prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, according to a recent issue of Time magazine carrying her picture and a story, more recently attempted to promote a nudist colony in Kansas.

I am sure that the great majority of the American people are disturbed by this trend toward liquidating religious practices in our American public life. It constitutes a tragic threat not only to the best traditions of our American history, but to the health and integrity of our present society and to the future of the American dream. I repeat, historically and practically, such positions were never intended by the men and women who founded this Nation. The Declaration of Independence appeals to "the laws of nature, and of nature's God," and notes that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." These are religious references. Even agnostic Thomas Paine, in his famous pamphlet beginning "These are the times that try men's souls" concludes the first paragraph with these words "so unlimited power can belong only to God." The Mayflower Compact begins "In the name of God. Amen." and supplicates help "by the grace of God." But the action of the Supreme Court tends to support the position that our children shall not be subjected to such influences, because forsooth, they may lead to the establishment of a state church.

1. What can we do? From where shall help come?

Obviously as Christian citizens we must obey the law, as interpreted by its highest tribunal. But has the time not come for the American people to remember that ours is a government by majority "of the people, by the people, and for the people?" Let us think clearly again as to the proper interpretation of that first amendment, as meaning, "there shall be established no official state church." Let us amend that amendment, if need be, and spell it out so that the people shall know, and the world understand that this Nation exists "under God," and that religion has not been banished from American public life. Furthermore, let every public school authority use such measures and such recognitions of morality, ethics, and religion as the majority of their community may approve, exercising a kind of local option in the practice of whatever programs may seem desirable for the health and happiness of each community.

Let us also insist that antireligion shall not be permitted in our tax-supported colleges and universities. This is not a one-way street. If tax-supported schools have no right to teach religion, they have no right to propagate atheism, no right to upset the religious beliefs of students, no right to propagate the kind of barnyard approach to sex, morality, and life popular in some anthropologies today. The Supreme Court ruled that the school could not teach the atheist's little boy the Lord's Prayer, because that would be an establishment of religion. By at least the same logic no professor in any tax-supported university has the right to destroy the faith of our sons and daughters, in religion and worship, God and prayer, for that would be using tax moneys and public power for the establishment of atheism, and irreligion.

I read with grave concern the testimony of former United States Senator Ralph E. Flanders from Vermont given some time ago, concerning his experience with this kind of situation. Senator Flanders was a man of sound judgment, fine logic, and religious reverence. He said:

"I had the great privilege and responsibility a year ago last fall of serving as visiting professor in practical politics at the University of Massachusetts, located at Amherst, the same town of Amherst College. I was required at the end of November and December to give four public lectures and I chose as my topic, 'The Moral Law in the Modern World.' After I delivered the four lectures, one student after another told me that their professors in sociology and philosophy tell them that there is no moral law and that there are no absolutes. That is the atmosphere in which young people get their education."

Senator Flanders goes on to say:

"Some of the most eminent members of the Supreme Court have said substantially the same thing. Oliver Wendell Holmes denied that there are any absolute rights and wrongs to which appeal can be made by the courts. In one of his judgments Chief Justice Vinson, whom I knew personnally and respected as a person, said in effect, 'If there is anything that is well established, it is that there are no absolutes.' Now that is the intellectual atmosphere in which far too many of our young people are growing up."

2. What can we do?

It is an important and encouraging fact that in every public school every Christian teacher can bring a Christian atmosphere and a Christian ideal. He can teach as "thinking God's thoughts after Him." That is the expression of one of the great minds of history, the astronomer, John Kepler, who defined three great laws of astronomy, helped to originate calculus, did creative work on the refraction of light and optics, a pupil and collaborator of Tyco Brahe. He was a genius and a profound thinker, who cried, "I think God's thoughts after Him." Every Christian teacher will teach that way as a witness to those fundamental and absolute truths which give sense to an otherwise insane world. No school system can be godless that is managed and taught by Christian men and women.

3. What can we do?

Make your homes nurseries of Christian virtue, Christian example, and Christian love. Here is where the process of inculcating a Christian society must begin and continue. The place to teach children how to live is where they live. In 1 year, if my mathematics is correct, there are 8,760 hours. We give the public school system 30 hours in a 40-week year, or 1,200 hours, the Church perhaps 3 hours a week, or 156 hours in the year, and the home all the rest of that time. Parents, make your homes teaching centers, of Christian love and truths.

4. What can we do?

Make your churches much more effective centers of religious education. Let the ablest people in our congregations give themselves to the task of training our children in the Sunday schools. America's public enemy No. 1 is not the hoodlum, but the privileged Christian person who is so "busy" about many other things that he has

no time for religious education or worship or work in the life of his church. We have a fine equipment here for training our children in religion. We have made a beautiful investment here in Trinity Church, in classrooms and chapels, in which to teach the meaning of life in terms of Jesus Christ. Let us make our church schools flourish for the sake of the souls of our children. We need your help. Pastors Sjauken and Frazier and Mr. Carlson and Miss Ferguson are doing a good work, but we need the help of all of you, to bring your children, to teach your children, by your example in worship to inspire your children, with the ideals that are precious and priceless for their future happiness and health, and the well-being of our country.

It may be, to preserve the ultimate ideal of God, if this trend toward atheism and paganism in American life continues, that the churches everywhere will have to establish their own day schools. That would be unfortunate. It would fragmentize American life, and destroy its unity, setting up a congeries of competing sects. Then the American dream will be destroyed. It will be destroyed because we have officially banned God—at the behest, also, of a minority of the ultraliberal and the godless. But if the choice means God, we must make that choice.

Let us then as Christians and Americans do all we can to maintain the recognition of God in American life. We still believe in majority rule. We can reinterpret the first amendment. In our local communities we can continue to do what always has been an essential part of American democracy, and set up such programs as shall respect religion and honor God. We must be watchful that the agnostic and atheist forces in our society are not its conspicuous and decisive elements in our schools or anywhere else. We must maintain in the testimony of our daily lives, whether we teach, or whatever we do, the "Spirit of God in the face of Jesus Christ." And in our churches and in our homes we must there begin, continue and complete the religious teaching process.

Let me read you some paragraphs, the headlines of which struck me; I will give you the author's name at the end:

"Should I force my child to go to church?

"Shall I make my child go to Sunday School and church? Yes. And with no further discussion about the matter.

"Startled? Why? How do you answer Junior when he comes to breakfast on Monday morning and announces to you that he is not going to school any more? You know. Junior goes. How do you answer when Junior comes in very much besmudged and says, 'I'm not going to take a bath.' Junior bathes, doesn't he?

"Why all this timidity, then, in the realm of his spiritual guidance and growth? Going to let him wait and decide what church he'll go to when he's old enough? Quit your kidding.

"What shall we say when Junior announces he doesn't like to go to Sunday School and church? That's an easy one to answer. Just be consistent. Tell him, 'Junior, in our house we all go to church and Sunday School and that includes you.'

"Your firmness and example will furnish a bridge over which youthful rebellion may travel into rich and satisfying experience in personal religious living."

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

This is a word from God, at a critical moment, to all parents and Christians:

"And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

"And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart:

And thou shalt teach them unto thy children."

Amen.

Our New First Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, our new First Lady is facing one of the most difficult jobs in the world. She has all of the necessary qualifications to discharge her new duties with distinction.

Mr. Blake Clark, a distinguished journalist, has an article in the November issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "Lyndon Johnson's Lady Bird." Mr. Clark, in just a few paragraphs, has done a magnificent job in drawing a verbal portrait of our new First Lady.

Because the Reader's Digest is published in the congressional district which I represent, I am especially proud of this article. I commend it to my colleagues:

LYNDON JOHNSON'S LADY BIRD

(By Blake Clark)

The wife of the Vice President of the United States leads several busy lives simultaneously. How does she do it? By being deeply interested in all of them.

Her life is often hectic, and it is never quite predictable. On the evening of May 22, 1962, she was looking forward to an occasion at which she had only to be present as her husband, the Vice President, received the second annual Peace Through Health Award. But late that afternoon came a call from the White House. Mrs. Kennedy, for her film on the White House, was to be given the TV Emmy Award for public service, that very evening. But she had a previous commitment. Could Mrs. Johnson possibly receive the Emmy for her?

Mrs. Johnson could. Changing into a dress appropriate for both occasions, she met the Vice President at his award dinner and explained that she would have to leave the head table briefly. This she did, taking a car to a nearby hotel. With only 5 minutes left, she stepped into a phone booth and studied what to say. Then an escort took her to the banquet hall, where she faced the audience and TV cameras and, on a nationwide broadcast, made a gracious acceptance for the First Lady. Minutes later she reappeared at the first hotel in time for the presentation to her husband. She had carried it all off so swiftly and smoothly that she had hardly been missed.

Lady Bird Johnson is Washington's No. 1 pinch hitter. She has come capably to the rescue of the President when pressures of state kept him from making scholarship presentations. Because Mrs. Kennedy has small children, and strong interests in other fields, many political activities are handled for her by Mrs. Johnson. Says a White House assistant, "Lady Bird is invaluable to us." She also on occasion receives official guests, and pitches in for her husband and other administration members when they are unable to keep speaking engagements. She can make an effective political speech, then charm the voters individually at a reception.

There was little in her early life to foretell her development into the kind of versatile person who is confident and at ease in the public eye. Born in the town of Karnack (population 100) in east Texas, she was christened Claudia Alta Taylor. A nursemaid said, "She's as purty as a lady bird," and thus gave her the name everyone calls her today. There are times when she would prefer Claudia Alta.

She was left motherless at 5. Her father, a big, powerfully built man, ran two country stores and cotton gins several miles from town; a sign over one of his places announced "Thomas Jefferson Taylor, Dealer in Everything." Lady Bird was a good student—but so shy that when it looked as if she might be high school valedictorian or salutatorian and have to make a speech, she prayed to get smallpox or lower grades. She was enormously relieved when two other girls got 4-year averages of 95 and 94½ to her 94.

It was years before she conquered the shyness. Marriage helped. "Lyndon saw more in me than I saw in myself," she says, "and he expected more than I realized I could do." Becoming involved in his career, she had to overcome reticence. "If you want people to do something, like vote," she observes, "you must reach out to them. You believe in something deeply and become wrapped up in it, and you forget to be shy."

After getting degrees in liberal arts and journalism from the University of Texas, Lady Bird stayed on in Austin. There, one day in 1934 in the office of a girl friend, she met Lyndon Johnson, at that time secretary to Congressman Richard M. Kleberg, of Texas. He was excessively thin—but a very good-looking man, she thought, with lots of dark wavy hair. He was also the most outspoken, straightforward, determined person she'd ever encountered. "I knew I'd met something remarkable," she says, "but I didn't know quite what."

He asked her to meet him for breakfast next morning. She hesitated, then agreed. After breakfast, they went for a ride. He volunteered all kinds of personal information—his salary, how much insurance he carried, what each member of his family was like—then asked her to marry him. She refused to say yes or no. But after 2 months of daily phone calls from him in Washington, and finally a "now or never" ultimatum, she accepted his proposal.

Lyndon's salary as secretary to the Congressman was $267 a month. He kept $100, from which he made payments on the car and life insurance. On the remaining $167, Lady Bird ran their one-bedroom apartment, with sufficient economy to buy an $18.75 savings bond each month. Watching the pennies during this period developed into a strong habit. Though today she is a woman of considerable wealth, she still buys seconds in towels and other linens. Not long ago at Washington National Airport she ran into several wives of delegates to the United Nations. "We will see you on the plane," said one. But they did not. They were in first class, she in tourist, as she always is when traveling alone.

In 1937 the elderly Congressman from their district died, and Lyndon asked his wife if she thought he should run. He would be the least known of the 10 in the race. Knowing how much he wanted to run, but knowing also that this decision might well shape the rest of their lives, Lady Bird did not make a snap judgment. She consulted a wise older friend about Lyndon's chances of winning. The reply: "Frankly, at least four others have a far better chance—but he does have a chance." "Thank you," she said. "That is good enough for me."

The campaign would cost at least $10,000. Lady Bird telephoned her father and asked if he could advance it to her against her inheritance from her mother. He agreed. After the election, the loan was repaid—at the rate of $500 a month out of the new Congressman's $800 monthly income.

Resourcefulness is learned through meeting crises. For Lady Bird as for many other Americans, December 1941 was a time of testing. The day after Pearl Harbor, Lyndon joined the Navy. Although she had never

worked in his congressional office, Lady Bird took over the management of it, and ran it as Lyndon's link with the people of their district. She served without pay.

Each day brought an infinite variety of problems and demands that left her exhausted. But the work gave her a particular insight into her husband's job—plus the feeling that she could stand on her own two feet. Without that experience of constant problem-solving, she might not have had the confidence to try her wings as a businesswoman. But when the opportunity came in 1942, shortly after the President called all Members of Congress back from the armed services, she did not hesitate.

A small Texas radio station, KTBC in Austin, was for sale. Knowing how insecure the tenure of elective office can be, the Johnsons had often wished for a business of their own, something to return to after Washington. Not having the money for a newspaper, they settled on KTBC, and swung the deal for $21,000 plus the station's debts.

It was losing $2,000 a month. Lady Bird went out to see why. She stayed on the job day and night for 5 months, until finally, in August 1943, the station showed a profit of $18. Then she returned to Washington. But she has kept close watch on the enterprise ever since, through detailed daily and weekly reports. And she has handled her investment with drive and finesse that many another business executive might envy.

From a small radio station "in debt to everybody in town," with only nine employees and only 250 watts of power, KTBC has grown to over 100 employees, full association with CBS, a sizable staff of local news gatherers, and a building of its own from which a 5000-watt radio and a multiple-panel TV station do a thriving business. Profits from KTBC have enabled Lady Bird to buy four Texas cattle ranches. She personally supervises them all, along with the 3,000 acres of Alabama pineland inherited from her mother.

Two daughters—Lynda, born in 1944, and Lucy, born in 1947—added to the fullness of a busy life. So did political campaigning. Before World War II, Lady Bird had not done any electioneering herself, beyond just saying "Howdy" at the barbecue. But in the 1948 primary contest for the Senate, Lyndon trailed by 100,000 votes. So Lady Bird joined in the second primary campaign, determined to help him make the best showing possible—if nothing else, to narrow the losing margin.

With a friend she organized the women. She personally called on every student she had known at the university, or whom Lyndon had known at Southwest Texas State Teachers College, asking them to be volunteer workers. These and other friends composed her political machine. Though flying made her ill, she flew all over the State representing her husband before small groups of Texas women voters.

Two days before election she was in a car that turned over twice. She got out of the mud, drove on to the town of Seguin, where she stood in a reception line in a dress borrowed from her hostess. Then she met Lyndon in San Antonio and made a speech without telling her husband about the accident. The next day she and Lyndon's mother and three sisters called everyone in the Austin telephone book, urging them to vote for their man.

When it was all over, in an election where more than 1 million went to the polls, Lyndon won by 87 votes. Ever since, the onceshy Lady Bird has been an active campaigner, and an invaluable one.

A reporter once asked, "As wife of the Vice President what do you do?"

She said, "Well, take today for an example. At 9 o'clock I had a Spanish lesson, interrupted to make an appointment for Lynda with the dentist and for Lucy with a geometry tutor; 11 o'clock, I opened the National Cathedral Flower Show; 1 o'clock, attended luncheon for the Heart Fund drive, with 'appropriate remarks' in hand; 2:30 to 5, I answered mail; 5 o'clock, entertained 35 students en route to Chile with the Peace Corps; at 6, an emergency call had me dispatching Lyndon's tux to the Capitol; then I dressed and joined him at 7:45 at the White House for dinner."

Said the reporter, "I know, Mrs. Johnson, but what do you really do?"

"Actually," she said, "that question is one that I suppose every woman, and especially every wife involved in public duties, asks herself. With all the demands on you, you undergo what Anne Lindbergh called 'fragmentation of self.' You just hope that all your efforts add up to something worthwhile. But the day does come when you see results. You are able to speak Spanish to President Betancourt of Venezuela. Lucy's grades improve. The flower show and the Heart Fund make their goals. And in the mail comes the letter of an elderly pen pal: 'Heaven bless you for your recipe for cornbread dressing.'"

How ever does she get so much done? "I make little lists—and scratch 'em off." The "little list," her planned program for the day, keeps her moving. Even at the beauty parlor, for example, she will have with her a suitcase-size Mexican straw bag containing chores. Under the drier—"It's a good uninterrupted 40 minutes"—she reads letters and reports, signs checks and makes plans for tomorrow. In one such sitting recently she wrote 5 letters, none less than three paragraphs, and signed 50 checks, including 1 to a lumber company for $1.38 and another to a bank for $10,998.25.

"Every once in a while I yearn for nothing to do," mused Lady Bird recently. "But then of course I realize I'm glad I'm busy. There's so much for Americans to do today. As I travel around the world with Lyndon I often think of that funny old sign on my daddy's store, 'Thomas Jefferson Taylor, Dealer in Everything.' Now science and time and necessity have propelled the United States to be the general store for the world, dealers in everything. Most of all, merchants for a better way of life, I hope. And the world is full of eager buyers, thirsty for knowledge and hungry for freedom."

In that world, our Second Lady—active, versatile, and concerned—is an admirable and true representative of her country.

Mr. Speaker, as Mrs. Johnson takes on her new duties in these difficult times, she has the backing and understanding of every American.

Our Fallen President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, many will endeavor to express their great sorrow at the tragic passing of our beloved President, but few will find words adequate to do so. The impact of such an event is so deep and so special as almost to defy expression.

An assassin's bullet has robbed our Nation and the free world of a young and vigorous leader. Without warning, and while the cheers of thousands were ringing in his ears, his brilliant career came to an end. A cowardly, criminal act has done that which enemy action so nearly accomplished in the dark waters of the South Pacific.

In the intervening years, John F. Kennedy lived an exciting, useful and memorable life. The youngest man ever to be elected President, he demonstrated a poise and resourcefulness which belied his years. He worked hard at his task. He was articulate and forceful. He made friends at home and abroad. He was dedicated to his public service, and to it, he made the supreme gift of self. This, a grateful, yet sorrowing Nation, will remember.

In our grief we should particularly remember the sorrow within the family circle. Our hearts go out to his wife and children who have been robbed of a young husband and father. Little Caroline and John-John have crept into the hearts of millions. They and their brave mother will be remembered in our prayers.

We trust this sad hour will cause us to be even more dedicated to the welfare of our country and the preservation of all that is best in our national life.

Address of Jay Stern, President, Wood County Bank, Parkersburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by Mr. Jay Stern, president of the Wood County Bank, Parkersburg, W. Va., at the 60th National Savings Conference of the American Bankers Association in New York on March 4, 1963:

NEEDED: A NEW LOOK AT BANKING

(Remarks by Jay Stern, president, Wood County Bank, Parkersburg, W. Va., at a symposium on "Needed Changes in the Savings and Time Deposit Operating Environment of Laws, Regulations, and Supervision for Commercial Banks and Competing Financial Institutions," Mar. 4, 1963)

Perhaps there is a fruitful analogy between banks as creatures living in a competitive environment and that law of biology which says that living creatures must adapt themselves to their environment in order to survive. It is generally recognized by biologists that there is a mutual interaction between the living creatures and their environment. The creatures do change the environment, but, by and large, the environment controls and regulates the growth and survival of the creatures. Somehow, a way of living within the environment must be found. Biologists tell us that human beings do this by the use of their intelligence, translated into action.

I think it would be fair to say that the inhibitory laws, regulations, and supervision under which commercial banks operate today are, in large part, the response of the environment to the living creatures which banking institutions are. To the extent that we find them excessive, to represent layer upon layer upon layer of laws, regulations and supervision, perhaps they are the reaction of the environment to the commercial

banks. In short, perhaps we have ourselves to blame—at least to a considerable degree.

There is another law from the world of physics which perhaps has relevance to the problem we are considering. This is the well-known law of inertia, which states that a body at rest continues to remain at rest, and a body in motion continues to remain in motion, in a straight line, until acted upon by an outside force. I think it would be fair to say that we commercial bankers, for many reasons—some good, some bad—are as motivated by inertia as we are inhibited by laws, regulations, and supervision.

I think it would also be fair to say that many of our competitors are much less inhibited and less in need of being motivated by outside forces; that many of them are much more self-motivated, self-vitalizing, self-adapting than we are. It goes against our ingrained conservatism to recognize this, but I think it is a law of competitive life today.

Why are banks and bankers so much against change? We know that our function is inherently a conservative one, that change can only be demonstrated to be worthwhile after the fact, that the spending of time, energy and money, now, for improvement later, has to be clearly demonstrated by experience and by cautious calculation in advance. The only way to get experience is to try to do something. But, somehow, we feel we have to have the experience before we are willing to try. We find ourselves in a dilemma, which is most easily solved by not doing anything new or different. Our competitors are willing to experiment—and experiment is forward-looking. For us bankers to look far forward seems almost a violation of a natural law. Yet, until banks and bankers are willing and able to experiment with their own money—and I don't mean other people's money—they will continue to move more toward the avoidance of dangers which are past than toward the creation of new attitudes and better management in the future. Experiment, in banking, is a dangerous word, but the failure to experiment may be even more dangerous, if we expect to adapt and survive.

Let's have a look at some of our favorite ideas to see how much of inertia and inhibition they contain. Let's take competition first. We all believe in competition, not pure, classical competition, but something called "workable" competition, whatever that means. We have had varying degrees of "pure competition" in the past and have ended up with the National Banking Act of 1863 and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation of 1935. Without going into the necessary detail because of lack of time, what I am trying to suggest here is that our ideas of what we mean by and what we do under the concept of competition are by no means clear, by no means well thought out, by no means uncontradictory or uncomplicated; and that our environment is always changing and will always continue to change as long as we have a so-called free market economy, or even a mixed economy. I think it would be fair to say that our ideas about competition have not really changed very much for many years—and, in consequence, have little basic relevance to the competitive environment in which we live today. We are still inhibited by the errors of our past.

Let's take a look at our thinking about asset management. How flexible are we, really? How much has our thinking changed in recent years? A year or so ago, it had to change radically when regulation Q permitted 4-percent interest to be paid on savings deposits. Suddenly, most banks discovered that there were great virtues in municipal bonds, with their tax-exempt features. Suddenly they began to purchase them in large quantities. What caused the change? Challenge to our inertia. Relaxation of our inhibitions. And what did we do? We all rushed in to buy at the same time. We drove prices up, we drove yields down, and I'm afraid that many of us locked ourselves in. In a broader perspective, we have been buying our bonds when they were high, and we have been selling them when they were low for years and years. Some of us blame the supervisory authorities. But, do we blame sufficiently our own inertia? How many of us think in terms of asset "mix"? Our business customers do—they have to. Somehow, we conceived the idea that specific assets must be allocated against specific types of liabilities. We have allowed the laws and the regulations and the supervisory authorities to get away with this for years. Why? Inertia. Inhibition. We recognize in our customers that they must mix their output, they must have a variety of profit rates on a variety of products, that parts of their operations must be carried on at little or no profit, while others are carried on at a good rate of profit, that it's the whole mix, the total result which must be made to show a good profit. There are all too few of us who will say, "Give us the money, we will make it earn, regardless of the competitive savings interest rate." Our customers and our competitors aren't under such inhibitions. They search for new materials to work with; they search for new products, new processes, new product mixes, and they watch their profitability, and they watch it grow.

What about our ideas on liquidity? We know of many kinds—riskless liquidity, as defined by the supervisory authorities; cash liquidity; market liquidity, or the ready salability of assets; liquidity at a profit; liquidity at a loss; repayment liquidity on loans as against the market liquidity of securities; liquid flow of assets from one type of investment to another. Instead of coming firmly to grips with this fundamental yet confused problem, we still think of liquidity in terms of ratios and formulae and rules and regulations.

Now, let's talk about bank ownership. Here, it seems to me, is the greatest area of inertia. There are some 13,500 banks in the country, and the securities of none of them—I repeat, none of them—are traded on the stock exchanges. Perhaps a thousand of them are actively traded "over the counter." What about the others? Why do the shares of 12,500 banks, which are generally profitable, growing, supervised, regulated, at least moderately well managed, remain in the hands of small groups connected closely with each of these banks? Why aren't the shares of these banks widely owned and traded? Why haven't we come up with a device which will enable the general public to own shares of banks anywhere and everywhere? How many insurance companies or pension funds or other institutional investors buy shares in banks whose shares are not traded fairly actively over the counter? Why does the ownership of such shares seem to be concentrated and handed on from generation to generation, and why does the ownership and management of banks tend to be so closely intertwined, particularly in the smaller banks? Here, we have typically the inability of the owners of shares of smaller banks to realize anything close to book value when they come to sell, because there's no market for them, whereas, in the over-the-counter market, shares of the larger banks will sell for 125 to 150 percent—or more—of book value, even though they may not carry a particularly high yield. Why is the rate of return on bank shares relatively small? How could the ownership of these shares be made more attractive and more available to the general investing public? Here, again, we have inertia. Here, again, we have inhibition. Here, we have the unwillingness or inability to experiment.

Now, let's take the question of leadership in the banking industry. We have a big trade association—the ABA. We have 50 smaller such trade associations in the various States. It would seem to me that, if we were to put first things first, an examination should be undertaken at once of the fundamental problems of banking and competing financial institutions. Would we rather respond to the questions raised by others, to the positions taken by others, such as the Commission on Money and Credit, the Heller committee, the Saxton committee, and so forth, then face the basic problems ourselves? When we do take constructive rather than negative positions, why are these almost always about subjects other than banking? Do we analyze our own problems, or do we wait until problems arise, then hit them over the head, thus almost inevitably taking negative positions? If this sounds unkind—or unfair—or ungracious to ABA, it is not so intended. Exactly the opposite is intended, for ABA has the means, the manpower, the business and professional competence to make such a fundamental and searching examination—if it will. If it is to respond adequately to its environment, I think it must.

What do we do in the way of political action? All of our competitors, all of the other segments of our economic life are not averse to getting down into the arena and fighting it out. Do we? Or, are we too governed by our conservative instincts and our heavy daily tasks? Do wet get involved in the election of good Congressmen from our districts and our States? Do we try to get good men on the House and Senate committees which must consider the legislation concerning banking and competing financial institutions over the next few years? Are we willing, as bankers, to get down into the dust of the legislative process, not relying alone on the very competent professionals of trade associations staff? Or, do we leave this to be done by the legislative process itself—and by our competitors—either because we feel we are so right that we don't need to assert ourselves—or, that the legislators are so well informed that they will automatically come up with the best answers? Or, do we feel it is so hopeless that there is nothing we can do about it anyway? In any event: How do we respond to our political environment?

Now, I've asked this whole series of questions in the hope that some of them may stimulate answers to the particular question before this panel. I have said that the inhibitions presented by our environment are related to our own inertia and our own conservatism, and that we must adapt ourselves to our environment, as well as change it, if we are going to survive. But, I don't believe in merely asking questions that I myself am unwilling to try to tackle. I'm going to suggest a few possible answers. These, I am sure, some of you will not agree with, or perhaps some of you will agree with in part. The point is that I think questions like these must be answered if we are to meet the legislative challenge of the next few years, as well as the competitive challenge of the next 10 years. We must do this for ourselves, if we are to survive. It cannot be done for us.

For instance, let's encourage more supervisory support for long-term loans as a means of taking a greater than 6-percent risk and as an answer to the Small Business Administration and other Government-sponsored lending agencies. This means that we are going to have to work harder to find ways of saying "Yes", and that we are going to have to be willing to give more guidance, financial counsel, supervision, and so forth to the borrower than we have under past practice. It means that we are going to have to find somewhat different credit standards for capital loans. It means that we are going to have to know more about our customer's business and still stay out of the

active management and supervision of that business. This isn't easy, but I think it can be done. Supervisory outlook should be viewed as corrective, not directive. I believe that we will find, if we really look into the matter, that the supervisory authorities are quite sympathetic with this description of their function.

Here's another suggestion. Let's ask for legislation permitting the tax-free exchange of bank shares for shares of bank share investment companies. Such bank share investment companies not only could sell their own shares to institutional buyers, but could perform the necessary function of investigation, selection and even acquisition of shares of closely held banks where no true market presently exists. The tax-free exchange of such bank shares could very well initiate the change from close ownership of many smaller banks to broad public ownership, with its healthy pressure for increased profitability. Or, if this proves to be an undesirable or impossible avenue, why don't we think of the chartering of mutual commercial banks? Such an idea may be heresy, and certainly is against our tradition. But, have we asked ourselves, in recent years, why not? I don't advocate this idea, but if our competitors have been so successful under mutual charters, why shouldn't we consider them? Or, if we shouldn't, why don't our competitors consider more extensively our type of private stockholder organization?

Let me try some suggestions in another area. There is current agitation, which is politically very difficult to withstand, for an increase in insurance on share accounts of savings and loan institutions from $10,000 to $25,000. Commercial banks generally do not favor such a further increase for themselves. Mr. Saxon has pointed out the obvious fact that the more "insurance" banks have for their depositors, the less incentive there is for good management. I would suggest that we tackle this question in a fundamental way by investigating the necessity for any insurance at all; that is, insurance paid for by the bank.

America has sometimes been called the "Insurance state"—and it would probably be impossible to do away with the idea of insurance entirely. So, let me suggest the alternative of having such insurance available to each depositor, but let him buy his own insurance, at standard premiums and to the extent he finds desirable. The insurance company could continue to be a Federal corporation, if this is deemed necessary, and financial institutions could be prohibited from paying the insurance premiums themselves—making it strictly elective with the depositor. It seems to me that this could be done without serious change of the supervisory functions. It would be a very fundamental answer to the problem we all face, namely, how far can Federal insurance coverage rise before it becomes natural for the Federal Government to take over the management and operation of the banks, which it would be insuring in full, or almost in full, anyway?

And, while we're looking at the question of insurance, why should some loans be insured and not others? Why not do away with loan insurance entirely; or, why not insure all loans? I know that this question strikes hard at the root of the home building industry and urban renewal projects and many other things, but it is of rather fundamental importance. If banking is to continue to be privately owned and privately operated, I think sooner or later this question has to be faced. Why don't we face it sooner rather than later?

Here's another suggested answer. Why don't we arrange to make private banking a profession, very much as public banking, in the Federal Reserve System, is today? It seems to me that professional management, not necessarily identified with ownership, can be achieved. It is particularly important that this be done by smaller banks. I believe it can be done without sacrifice of independent judgment—or threat of restraint of trade. After all, we have a good example in the legal profession, which is certainly very closely knit. One lawyer practically never sues another, and yet, neither Mr. Kennedy nor anybody else has suggested, so far as I know, that lawyers are in "restraint of trade," even when they happen to be in almost complete agreement on parts of particular issues.

My last suggestion is this: There is a clear need for a new concept which will define and regulate and protect and challenge all of our financial institutions, and yet will assure adequate funds to meet private and public financial needs. Such a concept should do for financial services what the public utility concept has done in the not too distant past for the light, power, water, transportation and communications service industries. Not long ago, public utilities faced many of the same sort of problems faced by financial institutions today. Somehow, they managed to meet their problems and yet remain private enterprises. When we are talking about insurance, why don't we come up with a concept of the function of private financial institutions, and in particular, of banking, which would insure our adequacy to meet a changing environment and a growing economy—and then do something about it?

How do we start? I suggest that the first step can be a formation of a "leadership committee," under the banner of our own ABA. This committee can be composed of bankers who are well-known and well-regarded for their knowledge and experience and for their differing viewpoints—as well as bankers, selected at random from a qualified panel, who would represent various sections of the country, different sizes of banks, and all the various kinds of banking activities—a broad spectrum of viewpoints.

This committee could explore, with a deep sense of urgency and the importance of its task, the interrelationship of all our financial institutions. Its incamera deliberations and conclusions could then be extended to a grassroots basis. This would create the opportunity for a broad-scale examination and debate of clearly defined and well-thought-out positions on fundamental issues.

One thing I think we can all agree on: Today's banking must meet the clear challenge of its time, determine for itself its desirable and realizable goals and unite to make a vigorous attempt to attain them. The way we meet this challenge may well spotlight our real problems. For the real problems may not be how to agree, or how to speak up, or how to fight for what we want—they well may be inhibition and inertia and the insidious morphine of contentment with present security which often dulls the senses to slow but steady loss of self-reliance, self-vitalization, self-regulation. Thank you very much.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just lived through a tragic period in the life of the Nation. It has been one of those intense moments in our history when we as individuals in a vast pluralistic society have come to fully realize ourselves as citizens of a single community bearing common experiences. This commonality of sentiment and understanding is echoed in the many statements, often even of similar phrasing, spoken by national and world leaders and private citizens as well. This reiteration discloses the very great and common personal feelings these words convey however often they are repeated. In order that the record may reflect the deep sentiments of some of Michigan's citizens as this tragedy becomes history I would like to include in the RECORD editorials contained in the Lansing State Journal for Saturday, November 23, 1963, and the Flint Journal for Saturday, November 23, 1963. The editorials follow:

[From the State Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY

The Nation today mourns the sudden and violent death of its young President.

The earthly life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy was cut short Friday by an assassin's bullet as the presidential motorcade passed through cheering throngs in Dallas, Tex.

The American people received with a sense of profound shock the news of the assassination of the President and the wounding of Gov. John B. Connally, of Texas, who also was struck by the bullets fired from ambush.

A man of strong convictions and a courageous fighter for what he believed to be right, Kennedy, like many of the Nation's Presidents, was a controversial figure.

But there was never any doubt as to his devotion to America and the ideals it seeks to uphold throughout the world.

Some Americans, perhaps, had come to believe that this country was immune to the degree of turbulence that has led to the brutal slayings of leaders of other nations.

The tragic fact is that Kennedy is the fourth of this Nation's Presidents to die at the hands of cowardly assassins and that attempts have been made on the lives of two other Presidents.

No words can adequately express our shock and sorrow at the death of the vigorous and earnest young American who served his country and the cause of freedom in war a heroic PT boat commander, and in peace a Member of the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate and, finally, as Chief Executive.

We join with all Americans in expressing our deepest sympathy to the President's bereaved young wife and to all the members of his family.

We hope and pray that this tragedy may have a sobering effect upon the fanatical extremists who believe their causes can be advanced by bloodshed and violence.

Americans now join in prayer that President Lyndon B. Johnson will have the benefit to divine guidance as he assumes and seeks to discharge the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency and the leadership of the free world.

[From the Flint Journal, Nov. 23, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY ANSWERS TRUMPET OF HIGHER SUMMONS

"We shall bear any burden, meet any hardship, pay any price * * * to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

So spoke John F. Kennedy upon being sworn in as President of the United States.

Friday he paid the supreme price.

He gave his life in his country's service.

The President's death at the hands of an assassin left the Nation shocked and grief stricken almost beyond comprehension.

It is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the tragedy that struck the hearts of all Americans; to fathom the severity of the

loss our country and the entire free world has suffered.

It is beyond estimating.

It could not have happened. But it did.

Without warning, with frightening suddenness, the vibrant, exuberant spirit of the youngest, most-influential leader and champion of freedom in the world today was stilled, his life snuffed out.

Gone, now, is the enthusiasm and zest with which John F. Kennedy met every problem and challenge.

Gone is the personal magnetism which he possessed in rare quantity and with which he cemented close friendships, even among political foes.

Gone is the indomitable courage, displayed in both military and civilian service, that helped to strengthen the moral fiber of those who looked to him for leadership in time of crisis.

Gone is the fresh and spontaneous interest which he inherently displayed in the troubles, the hardships, the disappointments and the hopes of little men and humble people of every race and every walk of life.

There were those who disagreed with some of his policies and actions. But few could deny that this young man, who preferred public service to a beckoning life of idleness and ease, possessed vision to understand clearly the crises of our times and the resoluteness to boldly meet each crisis as he was convinced it should be met for the good of the country he loved.

His underlying policy was clear. It was forged from a deep conviction that only in a world in which there is room for equality and freedom can we hope to preserve for ourselves and others the only way of life which Americans believe to be worth living. Even those who sometimes questioned his methods had a profound respect for his devotion to the ideals for which he worked and fought.

In accepting without reservation the most burdensome responsibility of our time, this dedicated young statesman faced every challenge unflinchingly, almost with relish. He seemed to thrive on pressure. He possessed a unique charm. Even under fire he combined a rare affability and informality with a winning smile, succeeding in transforming austerity into personal warmth.

Rarely has this country been led by a President with more political astuteness, with such superbly persuasive ability.

Still he put his personal convictions ahead of political gain when he went before the people with his civil rights bill. Even realizing the possible ramifications at the polls, he placed his personal influence and the weight of his office squarely behind an all-out demand for an end to racial discrimination in every segment of community life.

"Let it be clear, in our hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right."

John F. Kennedy's courage and inner strength were never displayed more dramatically than in that hour. Not even in his alerting his fellow Americans to the possibility of all-out war during the Cuban missile crisis.

An appraisal of this youthful President, struck down even before attaining the peak of his dedicated career, is impossible at this time. This must be left to the pages of history.

But of one thing grieving Americans can be certain. John F. Kennedy devoted his heart, body, and mind to fulfilling the solemn oath he swore before them and Almighty God.

At that time, as our newly sworn-in President at age 43, he said "* * * the trumpet summons us * * * to a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

In harking to that summons, he followed his own plea to his fellow Americans. He asked himself what he could do for his country, and he set about doing what he believed would best serve to fulfill its commitments.

Friday, John F. Kennedy answered a higher summons.

In our hour of sadness, and beyond, our constant prayer should be that his sincere efforts for the future peace and happiness of our Nation, and of the other nations of the world, may not have been in vain.

A Nuclear Submarine in Honor of John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the late President Kennedy's love for the U.S. Navy is well known. So is his bravery and the record of his gallant service in the Navy during World War II.

Several very worthy proposals have been made in the Halls of Congress and elsewhere to pay tribute to his memory and to immortalize the man and his deeds. In the 3 years that it was destined for him to lead our Nation, he was instrumental in building up our fleet of nuclear-powered submarines for the security of our country and of the free world.

I am, therefore, proposing that we name one of these nuclear-powered submarines, now under construction at Electric Boat, Groton, Conn., in honor of the late great President. I feel that this would be a very worthy tribute to him. Consequently, I am this day writing a letter to Acting Secretary of the Navy Paul B. Fay, Jr., suggesting that the U.S. Navy name one of its submarines the U.S.S. *John Fitzgerald Kennedy*.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my letter to the Secretary of the Navy. I am also inserting several editorials from newspapers in my district in Connecticut commenting on the tragic and untimely death of our beloved President and its meaning for the Nation. These editorials are from the Norwich Bulletin, the Middletown Press, the New London Day, and the Rockville Leader. They are as follows:

Hon. PAUL B. FAY, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: All of us are deeply grieved and stunned by the sudden death of our beloved President and many of us in Congress are thinking of ways of perpetuate his name and to honor his memory.

In view of the late President John F. Kennedy's great love for the U.S. Navy and his gallant service in the Navy during World War II, I propose to you that the next nuclear-powered submarine to be completed at Electric Boat, Groton, Conn., be named the U.S.S. *John Fitzgerald Kennedy*. I believe this would be a most fitting and appropriate maner of paying tribute to the memory of our late President and at the same time it would also be a signal honor for the U.S. Navy to have one of its ships bear this illustrous name.

In recent months, I proposed that nuclear-powered submarines be named in honor of the Revolutionary War patriot, Haym Salomon, and the early American inventor, David Bushnell, I believe, however, that the present suggestion should take precedence over my earlier proposals for very obvious reasons.

I further suggest that when this submarine is completed and ready for launching, the courageous widow of our late President, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, who bore up so graciously under the strain of this great tragedy, be invited to christen the new ship.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Member of Congress.

[From the Norwich Bulletin, Nov. 26, 1963.]

IN HIS HONOR

Amid solemnity that was hushed, yet vibrant, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, yesterday was laid to rest in a martyr's grave in historic Arlington Cemetery. The words that John F. Kennedy spoke in his inaugural address some 34 months ago, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country" will be engraved on the pages of history. They were prophetic words—and John F. Kennedy fulfilled them to the last degree. He gave his all to his country.

Even though John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, struck down most foully by an assassin's hand, the cause he championed as acknowledged leader of the free world lives on. We who survive him can best honor his memory by doing all in our power to advance that cause which he held so precious, which is the very cause for which this Nation was founded—the liberty and dignity of all mankind.

As we thumb through the pages of history for guidance in a troubled time perhaps the best guidance for the difficult time ahead may be taken from the immortal words spoken by Abraham Lincoln on that solemn occasion at Gettysburg almost exactly 100 years ago. For President Kennedy died in defense of freedom as truly as did those who fell on that historic field of battle. In these days of profound national sorrow it is appropriate to recall and reflect on Mr. Lincoln's exhortation to his fellow Americans "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

To resolve thus and to act thus—that is the task to which we must now turn our minds and our efforts. This is so even though grief and a deep sense of loss will far outlast the period of stunned and outraged shock of the past few days at the murderous acts that have occurred in Dallas. We cannot sink ourselves in a sea of heedless sorrow. The forces that work against the realization of man's highest dreams of liberty and dignity remain strong and malignant. Those are the forces which must now be countered with a new dedication of devotion so that John F. Kennedy's martyrdom in the fullness of life shall indeed not have been in vain.

All that was mortal of John F. Kennedy lies in Arlington Cemetery overlooking the banks of the Potomac for which he had such love, but his spirit of devotion to his country will remain forever with us as an inspiration to carry on the cause which he held so dear. The heaviest burden now falls upon Lyndon Bains Johnson, who became President of the United States at the moment John F. Kennedy's thread of life was cut by an assassin's bullet.

But all citizens of these American States in some measure must share the burden that now rests on the shoulders of President Johnson. In his first public utterance as Chief Executive, President Johnson said this to the people of America and the world: "I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask your help—and God's." His words were a commitment, and a challenge, worthy of the best that is in all of us.

The Nation must go on. The threads of the fabric that was so rudely torn apart that day in Dallas must be gathered and rewoven into an even stronger fabric of freedom and dignity. We must wear it with renewed consciousness that the entire world is watching us. We must so wear this garment of liberty and dignity so that in years to come the entire world will be wrapped in its folds. That is the lest we can do to honor this man who gave so much that freedom should never perish from the face of the earth. That is our task and the task of future generations. We must not fail.

[From the Middletown Press, Nov. 25, 1963]

THE PRIDE AND THE SHAME

Unto the land he so dearly loved, President Kennedy was committed today. The last drum roll has dirged, the last caisson has rolled, the last 21-gun salute has echoed across Pennsylvania Avenue and the green hills of Arlington. The last chords of "Hail to the Chief" have drifted away, and now the land has hushed.

There were kings and queens, and princes, and prime ministers and presidents today in Washington, the largest assemblage of foreign dignitaries ever at once on our shores. And there were thousands of common people too, coming from near and far of this uncommon land where young men, many young men, have grown up to be President.

The pagentry and dignity of it all brought us closer to the national fabric and made us proud.

Steadfastly, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has proved an example to us all. As her husband was a courageous man—which Ernest Hemingway once described as grace under pressure, so she has again proved to be a gallant lady. With her tiny children, she has borne with bravery the awful hours that began for her near noon on Friday. The ring she placed in her husband's dead hand, the kiss she bestowed upon our flag so proudly draped, are moments none of us will soon forget.

Would it be that this was the whole story. But yesterday in Dallas the terrible hours continued. In the police station of the city that formerly saw Vice President Johnson spat upon, Adlai Stevenson attacked by pickets, and our President murdered, the prisoner charged with assassinating the President was murdered in the full view of the Nation.

And Dallas is worried about its image.

Whatever may be said about the wisdom of President Kennedy having gone to Dallas, or the security precautions taken there, what can be said about murder in the police station? What can be said about a nation that harbors so many people so conscious of its image, so oblivious to its laws, so willing to disregard its legal and moral precepts? Somewhere we are all failing, and not just in Dallas.

If the majesty of a young President who gave his life for his country cannot be obscured by such horrible events, the least we as citizens can do is to rededicate ourselves to all that is uniquely great about our country—that man does not take the law into his own hands, that man does follow the law of the land whether he likes it or not, that man should care for his substance and not his image. It is in the support of these ideals that we must persist.

[From the New London Day, Nov. 25, 1963]

NO ONE'S ABOVE THE LAW

"Why is everybody going around shooting each other?" the 8-year-old boy asked. Knowing only of the small world around him in which he is occupied chiefly with school and play, he is innocent of complex adult emotions. Perhaps because of this, his reaction is uniquely objective. After the starkness of the weekend's reality has softened and the Nation is able to consider more fully what has happened, many of the boy's elders must try to find the answer to his question.

The shocking developments in Dallas culminated yesterday in the slaying of the President's alleged assassin, even while he was under heavy police guard. This deed was done by a man who walked unquestioned into the Dallas city jail and to within a foot of his quarry, still undergoing questioning as the prime suspect in the slaying of Mr. Kennedy.

As a result, we might well ask whatever became of the principles of law and order in America, or, with the little boy, "Why is everybody going around shooting each other."

The breakdown seems to have begun long before the assassination. It had been evident not only in Dallas but in hamlets and metropolises in many parts of the United States. It is apparent in contempt for the minor laws as well as in the studied disregard for basic concepts of human dignity and rights embodied in the Constitution.

Lee Harvey Oswald didn't act for humanity in his heinous crime on Friday. Jack Rubinstetin, the Dallas nightclub operator who slew Oswald, didn't act for Americans. Both took the law into their own hands.

As a result of Rubinstein's shot there may always be doubt as to the origins, and the possibility of others being involved, in the tragedy of Friday. It did not avenge Mr. Kennedy or the American people. There can be no sympathy for those who place themselves above the law.

The terror of the past weekend can be answered only in one way: The American people must renew their belief in law and order, in small matters and large. Freedom is based on principle and has its limits. The sober aftermath of the events in Dallas is the time to give deep thought about whether the Nation can afford to encourage or even tolerate those who would live above its laws.

[From the Leader, Rockville, Conn., Nov. 25, 1963]

A DAY OF MOURNING

Today is a day of mourning, not only for the Kennedy family, but for all the people of the United States and indeed the whole world.

Word Friday that President Kennedy had been assassinated spread quickly and stunned everyone. Certainly nothing has happened in the United States since Pearl Harbor that has come with such a shock.

To be sure, leaders have been assassinated in other countries of the world, and indeed three previous Presidents of the United States have died at the hands of assassins. However, most Americans have felt that we had reached a degree of civilization where such things could not happen.

President Kennedy was the youngest man ever to be elected to the Presidency. During his less than 3 years in office, he was called upon to face problems of a magnitude that few peacetime Presidents have had to face. He did this with initiative and courage.

Certainly at 46 his potential for many years of productive, useful service was great, and he most certainly would have found ways to continue his public service after his years in the Presidency were over.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." His own life was a personification of these words for his contributions in war and peace were many, including the greatest contribution of all—his own life.

The whole world is sorrowing with Mrs. Kennedy, the two Kennedy children whose relationship with their father was an ideal one, other members of his family, and his close associates.

Backward Ran Town a Day The

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Russian language magazine, Amerika, which is distributed in Russia by the U.S. Information Agency, contains a story by Elizabeth Baker entitled "Backward Ran Town a Day The," describing the unique situation which occurred last year in Valdese, N.C., when the local electric power supply went into reverse.

This unusual occurrence has attracted nationwide attention, and Mrs. Baker's story is a delightful and interesting account of the incident.

Valdese is in my congressional district. It is one of the most progressive industrial towns in North Carolina. I believe my colleagues in the House would be interested in the story appearing in Amerika, and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

BACKWARD RAN TOWN A DAY THE

(By Elizabeth Baker)

Over the years, man has learned to trust his friend the machine, which he created to perform in his own ideal image: tirelessly and efficiently and above all, reliably. To distinguish himself from the perfect machine—a robot—man reserved the right to behave irrationally, to be an idiot if he chose. Nevertheless, there are occasional outrageous instances in which machines contrive to behave just like men.

Mrs. Dorothy Bridges sat at her looping machine in the hosiery factory, methodically setting up toe stitches in ladies' seamless stockings and watching the big turntable in front of her turn slowly around and around as her work progressed. Unconsciously her head rotated in a slow, clockwise circle, too, as her eyes followed the disk. At the big hosiery mill, the day shift was almost over and, as surely as any clock, Mrs. Bridges' revolving head was marking off the moments until quitting time. Then suddenly, the electricity at the mill went off and the machines all coasted to a stop.

The power was off only a few seconds. When it came back on, the town of Valdese in western North Carolina made industrial history. As her machine started up, Mr. Bridges' head automatically sought once more to follow the disk's customary path. But she stopped in bewilderment. Now the disk was traveling backward—counterclockwise. Mrs. Bridges' first reaction was to mistrust her own senses. "What in the world is wrong with me," she wondered.

At the Waldensian Bakeries across town, at precisely the same moment, Mrs. Chris Sain was watching a cake with lemon frosting come down the icing line toward her. A cardboard plate from a second feeding mechanism popped up in front of her at just the right time—exactly as tens of thousands of other cakes and cardboard plates had alway arrived at her station—where it was her job to take each plate and put a cake on it. then the power went off. When it came back on, the cake was moving away from her on the line and the cardboard plate was vanishing too. Mrs. Slain made a grab for the plate but missed.

Within microseconds of these occurrences—the time it takes for electricity to speed over short distances through high-voltage lines—hundreds of other machine workers in the town of Valdese were stunned into disbelief. The machines they tended abruptly began doing their jobs backward. Air conditioners pumped out hot air. Spindles unwound thread at 12,000 revolutions per minute.

At the hosiery mill, Theodore Hildebran punched a button expecting to send a couple of dozen 1-meter-tall stocking forms forward on a track into the steam closet. Instead, the forms jiggled away from it. Hildebran gaped while they reached the end of the line and piled up untidily against each other. Then he shrugged and punched another button, stopping the machine.

At the bakery, loaves of hot bread headed back into the ovens as if, the assistant plant superintendent said later, "the bread was thinking it wasn't baked enough." In the roll department, a baker yelped in terror as pans of unbaked dough came rolling back out of the 260° C. oven and fell at his feet.

"Everybody in the bakery," said an oven operator, "kind of looked like they had a big question mark up over their heads."

Ernest Smith, a fireman in one of the mills, watched glumly as the coal he had been laboring to shovel onto a conveyor belt came tumbling back down at his feet. He threw down his shovel and went inside the boiler room to see what in the world was happening there. Fireman James Miller had enough problems of his own. He was listening to strange noises from the automatic stoker, which was now drawing coal away from the fire in the furnace. Simultaneously the powerful fans which normally blow smoke up the smokestacks were blowing it back down into the firebox.

The first reaction everywhere was the same. Almost everyone thought that the chaos confronting him was personal, the result of some unaccountable hex on his own particular machine. But it shortly became clear to each worker that almost everything in his plant was going backward. Many were reminded of science fiction stories they had seen on television. "It was like one of those space adventures where you go off somewhere and you don't know what's going to happen next," said Mrs. Sain, laughing. "It was kind of weird."

Then, one by one, the cooler heads among Valdese's citizenry found the switches that shut off the power to the errant machines. Some 10 minutes after Mrs. Bridges' head began to swing the wrong way, the power company finally pulled the main switch feeding all the electricity into the whole town. This brought the historic uproar to a permanent end but also plunged the buildings into semidarkness. (Electric lights and other users of electricity not involving motors had been unaffected.) Workers spilled out into the streets, babbling to each other of their experiences.

It was a long time before some of them got to bed that night. At 3 in the morning, Lenoire Houston, still at the bakery, was struggling with great masses of sticky bread dough. The dough had risen impossibly high while the ovens were shut down and he was now feeding some of it back through the mixing machine again, adding in fresh dough. The mixture would be shaped into new loaves of bread. And at the mills, hundreds of dozens of shredded stockings, thousands of broken needles and miles of unwound and now useless yarn had to be swept up and thrown away.

When the damage was all added up, the actual loss was surprisingly light for so spectacular an adventure—about $5,000.

Almost as soon as the first, nearly incoherent, telephone calls came in, engineers at the Duke Power Co. knew what must have happened in Valdese. Less than 2 hours after things started to run backward, they had restored electrical order to Valdese. Their explanation was about as folksy as a utility company ever gets. "It has been said—and not denied—that somebody goofed," one of their men put it.

The phenomenon that provided Valdese with its niche in manufacturing history is known as phase reversal. Almost all powerful electric motors, such as those running most of the mill and bakery equipment, are of the three-phase type. If any two of the three wires running to them are reversed, the motors will run in reverse. In the course of tying a new 44,000-volt line a kilometer or so out of town, power company employees had inadvertently reversed the connections to 12 of 15 Valdese mills. "The odds against this happening again," said a Duke vice president later, "are simply fantastic."

Address of the Honorable J. L. Robertson, Member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, May 14, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address of the Honorable J. L. Robertson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the 72d Annual Convention of the Illinois Bankers Association at Peoria, Ill., on May 14, 1963:

THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN UNCONGENIAL INTERBANK RELATIONS

(Remarks of J. L. Robertson, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the 72d Annual Convention of the Illinois Bankers Association, Peoria, Ill., May 14, 1963)

Up to now this convention has been an enjoyable one for me. I have certainly encountered nothing here that is at all reminiscent of the reputation Illinoisans had at a much earlier period in history. When Lincoln represented this great State in Congress in the 1840's (around the time my father was born in Whiteside County, just north of here), a dispute arose among the Congressmen about the proper pronunciation of its name. Some contended that it should be Illinois and some Illinoiz. The dispute was taken to the venerable John Quincy Adams, and that great statesman rendered the following verdict, "If one were to judge from the representatives in this Congress from that State, I should decide unhesitatingly that the proper pronunciation is all-noise."

I am sure that if Adams were alive and with us today he would revise that harsh judgment. I only hope that what I have to say will not be marked down as all noise, even though the subject I want to discuss—bank competition—is one which has come in for a great deal of noisy debate in recent years.

In focusing our attention on this subject, you and I will have plenty of company. Over the past year or so, financial circles and the press have given a great deal of attention to a variety of supervisory actions that have affected the structure and competitive atmosphere of the banking system. I have in mind particularly the amendment of regulation Q to raise the ceiling on interest on time and savings deposits, the stream of bank charter, branch, merger, and holding company actions, Justice Department charges regarding restrictive practices among banks, and a succession of reports of study groups and commissions, such as the Commission on Money and Credit, the Advisory Committee to the Comptroller of the Currency, and—most recently—the President's Committee on Financial Institutions.

It could be, of course, that press coverage of all kinds of events has simply been increasing in breadth and depth—some evidence of such a trend is to be found in the fact that my hometown, Broken Bow, Nebr., recently found itself on the front page of the Wall Street Journal. I think it more likely, however, that the reason for current interest, both journalistic and general, in banking matters is that a lot has been happening—frequently accompanied by sharply differing opinions among supervisory agencies and some resulting lively arguments.

The emphasis placed on Government regulation by this kind of attention may make some bankers, in their darker moods, wonder if their industry isn't being nationalized—rather than just regulated. They may feel somewhat like the little boy with the fake steering wheel attached to the dashboard watching his father do the actual driving. But the fact of the matter is that it is bankers themselves who do the driving; the supervisors merely license the drivers and establish the rules of the road which will make it possible for them to get where they are going quickly and safely. Parenthetically, perhaps I should have suggested that they are driving buses, presumably in competition with each other, and therefore have to provide routes, destinations, and service that will bring them passengers. Then one could readily see the need to establish regulations and basic rules of the road. How quickly, indeed, do we leave behind Walden Pond and the footpath through the woods; but then Thoreau did not care about being a busdriver—or a banker.

The point I wish to make today is that the kind of attention that has been generated has tended to reverse the proper emphasis on the course of events. I suspect the impression has been given that the supervisors are initiating actions in a range of new areas or with respect to a range of new problems. The fact is that the primary determinants of regulatory actions, and of overall banking progress, are—and should be—the bankers themselves.

This contrast between appearance and fact reminds me of the circuit-riding preacher who used to travel through the sandhills country around Broken Bow. His horse went lame as he came through town one day, and he went to the local horse trader to buy a new mount. As it happened, the trader had one good-looking but particularly fractious beast that no one around home had quite been able to handle. The trader was a good Presbyterian, and so it hurt his conscience to think of inflicting this horse on a man of the Gospel. But he was also a good horse trader, and so he sold him the horse for $30. The preacher managed to get astride

and head out of town, and that was all that was seen of him for about a month. Then one day he returned on his circuit—rider and horse galloping smoothly as one across the prairie. The trader could not resist remarking to the preacher about his obvious ability to handle a horse that had defied some of the best hands in Custer County. "You sure sit that horse nicely, parson", he said. "How did you manage it?" "Well," said the preacher, "it took a lot of patience and practice before I learned to act as if I wanted the horse to go where it had already got it into its head to go."

I am sure some of my colleagues on the supervisory side of the fence join me in the occasional feeling that the banking system has "got it into its head to go" various places, faster and farther than supervisors deem appropriate. On the other hand, once in a while a supervisor comes along who seeks to dictate where banks must go, and how fast, regardless of their wishes. Frequently, in both cases, the loud sputtering one hears is only the prelude to a fizzle. But the achievement of real progress depends on getting both going together, in the same direction—the direction of development and growth, commensurate with the credit needs of the community and the nation, and compatible with the maintenance of a safe and sound banking system.

In many ways, of course, both the initiative in banking developments and the restraints upon the scope of banker action are provided by the existence of competing banks. Fundamentally, ours is a society wedded to the competitive process as a chief safeguard of the public interest. Most of our laws with respect to banking are designed to try to promote the effective functioning of competition. Both our statutory measures and supervisory actions have usually been introduced in reactions to competitive practices on the part of banks that were regarded as inadequate or inappropriate.

I suppose there are few better examples in this respect than the legislation that gave the Federal Reserve Board the power to promulgate regulation Q, limiting maximum interest rates payable on time deposits. The painful "rate wars" of the 1920's, and their aftermath, were clear in every mind's eye when this measure was adopted. The purpose in establishing a ceiling on such rates was not to halt competition but rather to confine it within viable limits. That is in no way inconsistent with an interest in healthy competition. I know of no contest short of war that is not played with white lines or the equivalent, including a family game of touch football—and even there someone is apt to move the sweater that marks the goal if no one is looking.

The raising of the interest rate ceiling in December 1961 was a moving back of the boundaries to give the players more room to maneuver. It was not a regulatory rigging of the game. It was a step away from regulation, taken in the belief—or at least the educated hope—that such increased leeway for free competition could be afforded without undue risk to adequate and sound banking.

As you know, banks responded by raising their rates with alacrity, and the sharp response of their customers led to a much enlarged flow of loanable funds to some of the basic investment sectors of the economy—for example, housing and State and municipal facilities. In addition, the step served to reduce the obstacles to effective competition between banks and other types of financial institutions.

The results of this pattern of action over the past year have not, I am sure, always proved comfortable to bankers—what with the increased cost of operations and the difficulties of finding profitable outlets for funds—but that was not its purpose. The acid test of this action can be stated in the form of a question. Have commercial banks proved sufficiently competitive to exploit the higher range of permissible rates to the benefit of both themselves and the public but also sufficiently responsible in their response to market forces of supply and demand to carry such rate competition only to reasonable lengths? I shall not answer that question; the facts that would support an answer in each particular instance are more in your possession than in mine. I will point out, however, that what was being tested was not regulation Q, but the competitive mettle—and responsibility—of banks themselves.

There is another area of bank activity that currently seems to me to be providing just as clear, though not as dangerous, a case of "bank competition gone wrong" as did the interest "rate wars" of the 1920's. I am referring to those competitive bookkeeping manipulations that are sometimes euphemistically termed "yearend adjustments"—"window dressing" to you and me. These machinations, whether accomplished by round-robin deposit arrangements or otherwise, do not fit into the image of the industry that bankers have sought to project.

There is little doubt as to how a good banker would react to a borrower's statement that was inflated to show a more liquid position or a larger volume of business than in fact existed. To the degree these efforts succeed, they result in deceiving the public. And, to the degree they are recognized and discounted, they result in raising doubts as to the reliability of bank statements and of bankers' statements.

"Window dressing," designed to move an institution up a notch or two in the American Banker's list of the largest banks, may reflect an intensely competitive spirit; but this kind of competition, unlike the product and service competition upon which our efficient free enterprise system has been built, tends to be self-destructive and does no credit to those engaging in it. Of course, it really is not competition at all. It is more like an exercise in "How to succed in business without actually trying," and as such belongs more on the Broadway stage than in banking.

Another competitive evolution in banking—one that is almost reaching the dimensions of a revolution in some areas—is being wrought by the stream of applications for bank charters, branches, mergers, and the affiliation of banks in holding company systems. These pour in on the supervisory agencies, numerous as aspirin tablets—and you can guess why I associate the two.

Illinois, of course, is a sea of comparative tranquility in this respect, at least on the surface. What lies beneath the surface I shall wait for you to tell me. The hint has come to me that the subject of your State's statutory policy in this field may not be as securely entombed among you as are the revered remains of your most famous citizen, Mr. Lincoln. But I would be rash, indeed, if not impolitic, to inject myself into the debate. Since I do not propose any tampering with the dual banking system or the freedom of each State to determine the structure of its banking system, my remarks are those that seem applicable to whatever framework a State may have chosen—or may choose in the future.

In most applications—charter, branch, merger, or holding company—that come before the supervisor, two key elements are the state of competition within the relevant banking market, and the adequacy of bank services. The laws that we administer call for careful attention to both of these elements in reaching judgments as to approval or denial of the applications. Here again, the nature of those judgments is determined in a major degree by the banks in the community.

If the community is characterized by lackadaisical competition or by a convenient network of "gentlemen's agreements" that make the banker's life more comfortable, the participants will have done much to foreordain the eventual decision of the supervisory authorities. This kind of situation is apt to invite applications from other banks or financial institutions to penetrate the area through the acquisition of some kind of office or outlet, and likely it will weigh in the direction of favorable supervisory action in order to invigorate competition.

Similarly, if the services that a bank provides are not the best that are feasible, if its correspondent bank connections cannot provide convenient but nonpaternalistic supplements to the local bank's capacity (unhibited by fear of loss of local customers to the correspondent), this situation, too, will delimit the scope of supervisory reactions to applications affecting the banking structure. Such circumstances might well prove to be an open invitation for some form of vertical combination, such as absorption of small banks by larger banks or by holding companies, where that is permissible. And such circumstances with respect to the quality and availability of banking services will supply some added weight on the side of supervisory approvals.

But just as the absence of full and vigorous competition in a community can invite actions to change its banking structure, so banker efforts to obtain undue market advantage or an undue concentration of financial power, by merger or other combination, can invite supervisory denials. Merger proposals that would make a relatively large bank still more dominant in its market area, reduce the number of effective competitors for the business of various classes of bank customers without substantial offsetting public benefits, or widen the gap between the competitive abilities of one or two major institutions and the remaining body of smaller banks—these are the kinds of proposals that are a clear challenge to the preservation of competition.

Such merger possibilities may appear very attractive from the self-interest viewpoint of the two combining banks, but if that attraction stems from such factors as sheer size, a sheltered geographical location, or any market advantage that has not been won in straightforward and uninhibited competition with other banks of roughly comparable capacities, then that private attraction has no counterpart in the public interest. A bank merger calculated to exploit such private advantage should have a hard time winning supervisory approval.

This kind of proposition often carries with it a juicy premium for the selling stockholders, and sometimes supervisors are told they should not deny them such a profitable opportunity. But not only is such a profit not a good reason for approval, it is sometimes a reflection of a sheltered market advantage that the buying bank is coveting, and as such may signal a reason for disapproval.

While I am interested in preserving competition and protecting the public interest, I am not opposed to mergers as such. There have been cases where mergers have improved competition, by combining noncompeting or ineffectively competing banks into institutions that contributed to a more balanced and vigorous competition within their banking markets. Merger proposals in the pursuit of private advantage that point in this direction warrant respectful attention; would-be mergers that overreach these bounds, however enthusiastically conceived for the greater glory of the proponents, are apt to be stillborn.

Vigorous competition among banks is what is sought—not as an end in itself, but for its fruits in the way of improved services to bank customers. Its purpose, like the avowed

purpose of horse racing, is "improvement of the breed," and we generally subscribe to the belief that if one bank has to serve the public better than another does in order to get the business, it will try to do so. One of the best cases that can be made for the independent bank is the contribution it can make to healthy competition. The corresponding responsibility upon such an institution is to assume a vigorous competitive posture in all its activities.

Questions regarding too congenial interbank relations have become very touchy—witness the disputes which have been raging over alleged restrictive practices, with strong views being expressed by bankers and strong actions being taken by the Department of Justice. I do not know all the facts on which the actions are based, and, in the best American tradition, I assume innocence until guilt is proven. However, I hope no one permits the heat of the controversy to obscure the fundamental economic principle involved. The public has a right to expect competitive effort from all businessmen, and there is no reason why banks should be more protected than the members of any other industry from criticism or punishment for lack of competition within the bounds established by law, regulation, and ordinary banking prudence. To be blunt, "price-fixing" is just as adverse to the public interest when it occurs in banking as when it occurs, for example, in the electrical equipment industry. Frankly, I think all bankers interested in the long-run welfare of the industry should feel this way, and they should expect their supervisors to feel likewise and to act accordingly.

I do not want my comments to be taken to imply that banks are always at fault in these matters, and that the various supervisory and regulatory agencies are always flawless. Supervisors have their imperfections, too. We are all human; the frailty that is inevitably a part of man's makeup cannot help but give rise to some mistakes. However, we humans in the Federal bank supervising business receive an unhelpful assist in this respect from the organizational drawbacks to which we are subject. Three Federal bank supervisory agencies in Washington, with overlapping jurisdictions, unclear legal guides to responsibility, and a variety of decisionmaking procedures, make coordination of actions difficult, consistency practically impossible to attain, and a race of laxity among them hard to avoid.

Every reasonable consideration leads me to conclude that the functioning of Federal bank supervision would be incomparably better under a unified banking commission, such as I have suggested elsewhere. Such an organization would be more economical and more efficient. It could fairly be expected to be more clear cut, balanced, and consistent in its decisions. Such a commission should be able to do a better job of establishing uniform ground rules that would aid—rather than impede—the progress of the entire banking industry and equalize competitive opportunities within it.

Incidentally, my proposal for a unification of Federal functions in this field would strengthen—not jeopardize—the dual banking system. It would facilitate the buildup of each State's supervisory force, to the point where it could perform its functions without the assistance of a Federal agency, without imposing heavy financial burdens on the supervised banks. This results from the fact that under my proposal examination costs of all insured banks—State and National—would be paid out of deposit insurance assessments.

However, when all is said and done, even the best designed regulatory superstructure cannot by itself render banking a better industry. On the contrary, our kind of regulatory arrangements work best when they are tempering the workings of a banking system that is vigorously competitive, striving to progress as rapidly as the market permits, in the direction of expanded and improved services to a wider and wider range of customers, at the lowest practicable real cost. We need a high level of responsible competition in the banking industry as a spur to this kind of banking performance. Competition, in this context, is a servant of the public interest. Bankers, in their local operations, bankers through their regional and national spokesmen, and bankers in their role of citizens, must apply this principle with vigor and determination.

You may be noting, somewhat ruefully, that the results of all this might not be particularly enjoyable, at least for the managements of the banks invloved. I agree. But we were warned about this a long time ago. Way back in the birth year of our Republic, 1776, a very wise man with the appropriate first name of Adam and the unremarkable last name of Smith gave us our first, and in some respects still our best, lesson in the valuable discomforts of competition. In his famous "Wealth of Nations," Adam Smith, the grandfather of modern economics, wrote, "Good management * * * can never be universally established but in consequence of that free and universal competition which forces everybody to have recourse to it for the sake of self-defense." In plain English, the philosophy of free competitive enterprise allots to the businessman a life of perennial discomfort, always prodded by the needle of competition.

We who believe in this philosophy in general must suffer its stings in particular. I cannot assauge those stings, however much they may afflict you, but I can urge you to reconcile yourselves to them—even to rejoice in them—as the world's best substitute for rules and regulations, with the realization that they permit (in fact, compel) a banker's career to be more responsible, more challenging, and more productive.

President Kennedy's Death Teaches A Lesson About Hatred Consuming People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Justice Earl Warren states the lesson to be learned from the tragic death of our President like this:

> If we really love this country; if we truly love justice and mercy; if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least adjure the hatred that consumes people.

Three outstanding journalists, Walter Lippmann, Ralph McGill, and Doris Fleeson, help straighten out the chaotic web of fact and fancy, truth and error being sifted by historians, sociologists and journalists, They all three call for a reduction of hate. Excerpts from their articles follow below.

Mr. Speaker, this week must not be remembered just as a jarring nightmare followed by a television spectacular with an all-star cast. We must draw deeply—and now—upon the terrifying lessons of these past few days in order that we may set right that which is so clearly wrong.

MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who assaulted Lyndon Johnson and Adlai Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much searching of conscience, and well there should be. For Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

HARVEST OF PSYCHOPATHIC HATE

(By Ralph McGill)

After the long and dreadful night of rioting at Oxford, Miss., a little more than a year ago, where two men were killed by snipers' fire, the Department of Justice interviewed many witnesses. Some of them quoted arrivals who had driven from distant points to Oxford as saying, "I am glad at last to be able to fight against this damn country."

Ever since Little Rock's school riots 6 years ago, it has been obvious that persons psychopathically dangerous would use dynamite and gunfire against established law. Sunday school children have been dynamited to death. We are grown used to seeing the hate-twisted faces of young persons and adults in news pictures and on television, crying out the most violent threats and expressing a virulence of venom against their country and its authority. All this is a piece of the mosaic of hate that has poisoned this country to the point where in Texas a killer murdered the President and seriously wounded the Governor.

One can only wonder in what furnace this hate-filled brain had been fired. One asks, too, how many more there are secretly planning violence and death. We see daily that there are in this country men and women who no longer feel any love for it. They have withdrawn in hate to hateful causes.

The extreme right and left have revealed their minds to us in their literature, public utterances, and an anonymous flood of mail and filth and lies about the now-dead President and our Government. We have had extremists in high places openly call on their people to defy their own Government. And in some instances great wealth, made in America, is reported behind some of the more extreme organizations and propaganda.

They have preached that freedom is dying seemingly because they could not dominate the Government with their greedy dreams of power.

Those persons who at luncheons and cocktail parties have indulged in vulgar jokes and expressions of hate against the President, his wife, and their Government, as was done against Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, must also feel a small share of guilt. So at this hour, before we begin to mourn, we would do well to understand that hate can kill a President, and, if unchecked in behalf of morality, decency, and human dignity, it can also kill a nation or so weaken it that it will die.

THOSE WHO FAILED THEIR PRESIDENT—PEOPLE, THROUGH INDIFFERENCE, ARE FELT TO HAVE PERMITTED A RAGE OF HATE

(By Doris Fleeson)

The crowds which lined up for 3 miles on a bitter night to pass quietly before John Kennedy's bier in the Capitol rotunda seemed to feel that they owed him something they knew not otherwise how to repay. They included all manner of men and women, youth and age, the well dressed and the humble.

The question was put to them repeatedly: "Why are you here?" The invariable answer—almost invariably stated in the same simple terms: "I came to pay my respects."

It is impossible not to believe that such people can run a democracy, make good choices and do what needs to be done. Yet they had failed their President and their country by indifference or lack of judgment permitting a rage of hate to flourish.

Even when not of it, too many have lived side by side with it without protesting. Somehow it has been unfashionable to join battle with the haters, their publications and their contributors. Even when they passed well beyond the bounds of protest movements, pasting on the treason labels at their whim, disrupting schools and destroying public order, they have been dismissed as "just politics."

Now they have had their blood sacrifice in one of their hate capitals. Their voices are subdued, but it is to much to expect they will remain so. What the citizen will now do to protect the Republic is still in hazard.

President Kennedy's Undelivered Speech

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, at this time of tragedy there is much that all of us could say, yet in a sense there is nothing to say. In this hour of national and international grief let us dedicate ourselves to the principles and purpose of President John F. Kennedy; let us unite in common determination to cleanse our national life of bigotry and vituperation; in doing so, let us consider the words of our beloved President which he had prepared to deliver to the Dallas Citizens Council and the Dallas Assembly. In that speech, an eloquent statement of American policy, it is significant that President Kennedy intended with words of reason to caution against "voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness."

The text of the undelivered speech follows:

TEXT PREPARED FOR DALLAS

I am honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city—and leadership and learning are indispensable to each other.

The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and political support—and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership's hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from M.I.T. to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking graduate research center.

LINK IN WORLD AFFAIRS

This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company—but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadersip must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness.

At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

STEVENSON QUOTED

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained—nor are they quickly and simply explained.

There ars many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion. Displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination.

Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, but belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be no help.

STRENGTH OF AID PLAN

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British Fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin, or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba.

But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in those and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due—not to the words we used—but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

REVIEWS AREAS OF STRENGTH

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most massive deterrents to the most subtle influences. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation's progress in each major area of strength.

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year—increased by more than 70 percent our total Polaris purchase program—increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert—and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces.

Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons—and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces—increased by 45 percent the number of combat ready army divisions—increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern army weapons and equipment—increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion and modernization program—increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft—increased by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons—and increased the strength of the Marines.

As last month's Operation Big Lift—which originated here in Texas—showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft—and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability. Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, directly depend on the security and strength of others—and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice.

Our assistance for these nations can be painful, risky, and costly, as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct U.S. intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign-aid program, and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

MOST FOR NINE COUNTRIES

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc; nine countries confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own chiefs of staff think needed in the common interest.

Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased oversea deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the $50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the $4 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign-aid program is not growing in size; it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses, but we have undertaken to correct them, and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs.

Dollar for dollar, in or out of Government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much abused foreign-aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

LOSS THROUGH BALLOTS

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our information agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent—increased Spanish-language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin-American readers—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education, and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defense of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strengthing our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion.

And the margin of corporate profits—by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our oversea competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some $11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure this Nation of the longest and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the $500 billion mark—will soon pass $600 billion for, a record rise of over $100 billion in 3 years. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history average factory earnings have exceeded $100 a week. For the first time in history corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of $27.4 billion.

My friends and fellow citizens, I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, good will toward men. That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago, "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

The Iron Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Richard Martin, editor of the Jacksonville Journal, on the excellent editorial published in the Journal's November 25 edition, on the tragic death of President Kennedy and on some of the implications of this event.

The editorial was written before Lee Oswald was murdered, but it is still pertinent, perhaps more so, in the wake of Oswald's death. The editorial reads as follows:

THE IRON HAND

Friday was the day
Of the prodigy and crime,
When they killed him in his pity,
When they killed him in his prime.
They killed him in his kindness,
In their madness and their blindness,
And they killed him from behind.
He lieth in his blood—
The Father in his face;
They have killed him, the forgiver—
The Avenger takes his place.
There is sobbing of the strong,
And a pall upon the land;
But the people in their weeping,
Bare the iron hand:
Beware the people weeping
When they bare the iron hand.

—*Herman Melville.*

Herman Melville's reaction to Abraham Lincoln's death bore a prophecy that was to become grim reality for southerners in the Reconstruction policies of the Federal Government after the Civil War. In the same sense, in our time, there is a reaction against Cuba, Castro, and communism in general—all of them represented in Lee Oswald, the suspected assassin of President John F. Kennedy.

In their grief, as a President is carried to his eternal rest, some of the people who loved and admired and vested their hopes in him want to strike back. It is not enough for them just to shed tears. Something must be done. The new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, already has expressed concern at the possible repercussions on the national scene that might follow in the wake of the assassination.

Who can tell what may result? The manner of President Kennedy's death—violent and lawless and unreasoning in a land dedicated to law and order and reason—weakens the Nation's influence abroad and undermines the confidence of other peoples in the strength of democracy. But even had President Kennedy's end been the result of natural causes, the change of leadership in the most powerful nation on earth would have had similar consequences. The newcomers to the highest seats of power always have their time of testing.

President Johnson is not a newcomer to Americans or other people around the globe. As a Senator and Vice President of the United States, he is known in his own right although he has been definitely overshadowed by President Kennedy in recent years. His experience in 30 years in public office should be a reassurance to the people.

The Nation will go on.

It was this theme that the poet Walt Whitman chose to write about in his anthem on Lincoln's death, "When lilacs last in the dooryard bloom'd." Whitman wrote not so much of the horror of the American people but of their grief even while they continued to conduct their everyday affairs, even while the stream of American life flowed relentlessly forward. Whitman later said:

"Death does its work, obliterates a hundred, a thousand—President, general, captain, private—but the Nation is immortal."

This is a bitter truth. But all men must confront it, sooner or later. The poet, reflecting on this, might be inclined to observe that though a single flower is crushed under foot, beauty does not die. The patriot, thinking on the President's death, is aware that while democracy is jealous of the lives and rights of the least of its citizens as well as its greatest, it is not dependent on any single man.

As President Kennedy goes to his eternal rest, the Nation pauses, but does not—cannot—stop. The pulse of America courses on, throbs with industry, flows in its commerce, beats in its people, is expressed in the halls of government as new leaders come to the fore.

It remains to be seen what the Nation's mood shall be in the crucial months ahead. Will it be that of a Melville or of a Whitman? Or both?

Lincoln's death paved the way for a radical movement in Government that designed and inflicted upon the prostrate South the cruel and remorseless policies of Reconstruction. It took years before the love and kindness that were part of Lincoln's political wisdom could rise from the grave and overcome the shouts of the avengers and the spirit of vengeance his death had loosed upon the land. This was the same spirit of the assassin who took Lincoln's life.

It is well that America should have an iron hand in its people. It is good that that hand should be clenched in anger and the people behind it unified and more determined than ever to hold up the image of democracy, even a bloodstained image. But if the people would be true to the spirit of the President they mourn they will not strike in anger. They will recall that President Kennedy could manipulate the iron hand of democracy with a light and right touch commanding a respect for America that brute force might never have achieved. He could suffer personal abuse and criticism rather than endanger America by smashing at her enemies when that course of action seemed the most simple and popular. And he could, as in the missile crisis in Cuba, hold high the threat of his people's iron hand, ready to use it only when the danger was sufficiently great to justify such an action. It would be in the character of the late President to hold back those who would now avenge him by striking out blindly or in hurt at world enemies to satisfy a need for vengenance or alleviate hurt caused by the death of one man, even a President.

Let us not, in our time, loose again the spirit of the assassins. Let us not, hurt though we are, let them pull us down to their base level.

New Sociological Survey Explodes Myths About City's Indian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of a survey on Indians and the Indian problems as they appear in the city of Rapid City, S. Dak. I am sure Members will find this interesting. The news release, which appeared in the daily newspaper of that city, is as follows:

NEW SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEY EXPLODES MYTHS ABOUT CITY'S INDIAN PEOPLE

A number of prevailing myths concerning Rapid City's Indian population were exploded Monday when results of an exhaustive sociological survey were released.

In recent years, estimates of the exact Indian population in the community have ranged from 4,000 to 7,000 in the total population of 45,000 people.

Results of this door-to-door survey addressed to anyone of Indian descent produce 550 families or 2,550 Indians in the city today.

In a community acutely conscious of the poverty-stricken Indian in the lower socioeconomic levels, the survey reveals 42 percent of the Indians here own their own homes and 34 percent have incomes of $5,000 or more per year.

The study focused on the degree of Indian adjustment to the expectations of an urban society. Seventy-four percent of those surveyed indicated a preference for the urban way of life with its higher standard of living.

A lack of adjustment of many Indian children to the city's school system was evident. The average educational attainment of the parents, most of whom were educated in reservation schools, is 9.9 years. The survey showed the average Indian child, mostly in public schools, completed 10.3 years of school. This is a bare advance over the parent generation.

Statistical information of value to the community organizations concerned with the adjustment of the Sioux Indian to the urban community was made available for the first time in this report.

The material was presented in summary to the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations Saturday by Rev. Robert White of St. Louis University and was made public Monday.

CONSIDERING PROBLEMS

Rapid City with its proximity to several reservations has long been aware that adjustment is frequently difficult for families moving directly from the reservation. The moves have in many cases brought about special social problems for the community.

The report has isolated factual data in a number of areas where popular notions about Indians in the city have been misleading.

Having determined for certain the size of the Indian population, comparison with reliable estimates for 5 and 10 years ago showed the Indian population is decreasing with many families returning to the reservation or moving to other off-reservation communities.

Statistics show 70 percent of the Indian population has lived in Rapid City more than 10 years and the number moving from the reservation to Rapid City has been steadily decreasing in recent years.

Looking at the other extreme of the socioeconomic levels, the survey reveals 37 percent of the Indian people have no plumbing in their homes and 31 percent of the families subsist on less than a $3,000 income each year.

Some of the elements of the Indian population are dissatisfied with urban living. Definitely preferring a return to the reservation where good jobs are available were 32 percent of those surveyed.

One indication of ties with the reservation is whether the children of the Indian families in the city are enrolled at birth in the tribe of their parents' ancestry.

In 65 percent of the families contacted, at least some of the children were enrolled, but only 43 percent enrolled all of their children.

LOST LANGUAGE

The tendency of second generation off-reservation Indians to lose contact with the tribal heritage is shown by the fact that in only 6 percent of the families do children both understand and speak the Indian tongue.

Children in 79 percent of the homes neither understand nor speak the language of their forefathers.

In making his report to the mayor's committee, Father White identified one of the major factors is lack of advance in schools.

He said many parents, reared in a rural reservation background do not fully realize all that is necessary for their child's success in the city schools.

The competitive nature of city schools demands more careful attention to the child's progress and constant encouragements. Consequently, the Indian child may enter the school with many disadvantages and slowly fall behind the other students as he moves through the grades.

The study was jointly sponsored by the Protestant-supported Community Service Center, the Roman Catholic Mother Butler Center and the mayor's committee.

Particular interest in the religious affiliations of the Indians in the community has made the study significant to a number of churches in the community.

Results show that those admitted to church membership, 227 families named the Roman Catholic Church, 114 the Episcopal Church, 15 the Congregational Church, 11 the Presybterian Church, 9 the Methodist Church, but none claimed membership in the Indian Native American Church.

There were 43 families that spoke of mixed marriages and 10 adherred to various Pentecostal groups.

The census was part of a study begun by Father White in 1957 when he interviewed 150 Indian families in Rapid City.

Since then he has spent considerable time here in conjunction with his work in sociology at St. Louis University in Missouri.

Support for the census and for a related study among the non-Indian families in the city has come from the National Institutes of Mental Health, Bethesda, Md., and help in the actual canvassing was given by individuals from various organizations, including the American Association of University Women, the two church centers and the mayor's committee.

The complete report on the entire study will be presented in a book Father White is compiling. Publication is due in 1965.

Watchdogs Over CIA Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have continually called for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to oversee the CIA and our other intelligence agencies. Since the beginning of this year when I introduced legislation in the form of House Joint Resolution 211, which would accomplish this objective, I have called on Congress to act on this matter. The people of America are concerned over the unbridled activities of the CIA, and the news media has joined in this concern by pointing out time after time the hazards of an unscrutinized intelligence community.

I fear that the CIA sometimes seems to embody the fiction of an Ian Fleming novel—however, intelligence information is fact, not fiction, and should be dealt with accordingly.

It is clear in my mind and apparently in the minds of several of our colleagues who have joined me in introducing legislation to provide for a "watchdog committee" over the CIA, that there is a need for a joint congressional committee whose sole function is to oversee the activities of the CIA and our other intelligence agencies.

At this point in the record, I would like to insert a recent article from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Watchdogs Over CIA Demanded," written by John H. Averill:

WATCHDOGS OVER CIA DEMANDED—LAWMAKERS ASSERT THEY HAVE RIGHT TO CHECK ON AGENCY

(By John H. Averill)

WASHINGTON.—Speculation on the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam's coup d'etat has revived congressional demands for a special watchdog committee to keep an eye on the spy agency's activities.

There have been similar demands in the past, particularly after one of the CIA's U-2 spy planes went down over Russia in 1960. The demands got nowhere.

However, advocates of a congressional watchdog committee say that more and more Members of Congress are becoming concerned and demanding that something be done. The CIA was established by Congress in 1947 under the Defense Unification Act and given broad authority in the intelligence field overseas.

POINTS TO RIGHT

"I think that Congress has a right to know if the Nation is getting its money's worth from the CIA," said Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, one of the more persistent backers of efforts to create a joint Senate-House committee on intelligence activities.

As things now stand, only a select handful of Senate and House Members even know how much money the CIA gets. Estimates range from a half billion to a billion dollars a year.

It is this handful which most strongly opposes creation of a watchdog committee. And since the group includes some of the most influential Members of Congress, such as Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, the powerful and crusty chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, it has been able so far to stave off the watchdog committee proposals.

NO NEED SEEN

VINSON, chairman of a special nine-man Armed Services Subcommittee on Intelligence, declared he sees "absolutely no need for a joint committee."

"We know what the CIA is doing," VINSON said in an interview. "We know what goes on and we are satisfied with the operations of the CIA."

He noted that the House Appropriations Committee also has a special subcommittee headed by Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, to pass on CIA appropriations and that the Senate has a similar six-man group made up of members of its Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

"I've been around here for 49 years," VINSON said, "and I'm satisfied the CIA is getting sufficient congressional supervision."

This view is challenged, however, by some other Members of Congress in both Houses.

SAYS HE'S IN DARK

"We are working in the dark," said Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, "or at least in the semitwilight."

LINDSAY and ROGERS are among 15 House Members of both parties who are sponsoring resolutions to create either a joint committee with the Senate or a special House committee to keep a constant eye on CIA activities.

"I think we are gathering more support all the time," said ROGERS, "particularly after the debacle in Cuba, rumors of CIA foulups in Latin America and reports that the CIA was involved in the Vietnam affair."

ROGERS, while emphasizing he was not quarreling with the Armed Services or Appropriations Committees argued that an adequate job of checking CIA activities cannot be done by anything less than a full-time committee which has no other function.

"There must be a continuing watchdog," he said, "not only of the CIA but of the Defense Department intelligence community, too, and there must be a constant review of how intelligence information is coordinated and evaluated.

"Any agency of Government that is not carefully watched can develop practices that would not be tolerated if they were open to careful and responsible congressional review.

"I'm not saying the CIA has developed these practices. We just don't know. If it hasn't it would have nothing to fear from congressional review. But there is mistrust and concern in Congress about the CIA and if we had a joint committee we could allay these suspicions and restore confidence."

ROGERS' views were seconded generally by Representative H. ALLEN SMITH (Republican, of California), a former FBI agent who worked on several World War II espionage cases.

SAYS FBI REPORTS

"The CIA is no more secret than the FBI," SMITH said, "and the FBI gives Congress all the information it requests, puts out annual reports on its activities, and lets Congress know how much money it needs and spends.

SMITH said it was because of all the secrecy that he opposed a bill passed by the House last week to authorize more liberal retirement benefits for CIA agents involved in hazardous assignments.

In opposing the bill, SMITH said it was his guess that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev "and even the Russian Embassy here in Washington know more about CIA than I do."

SMITH in an interview said he was not advocating release of any secret information that might harm national security or jeopardize a CIA agent's life.

"I just think we have a responsibility, since we vote the money, to know how many employees the CIA has, what they do, what the policies are, if any, and whether the job is being done as it should be," SMITH said.

POINTS TO DANGERS

This view was challenged by Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Republican, of Michigan, a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Intelligence.

"I see no need for any special committee," FORD said, "I know of no instance where we have requested information that it has been denied.

"The CIA is a lot more complicated than the FBI. It is involved in operations throughout the world and there could be real dangers to expose the CIA to total scrutiny."

FORD agreed that perhaps his and VINSON'S subcommittees could do more to allay congressional suspicions about the CIA by apprising their colleagues of some of the information the subcommittees obtain.

"The trouble," he said, "is to determine what can be released. Everything about the CIA is so sensitive to national security you just can't give it to everyone but if you give it to one you've got to give it to all and then you have a big, first-class leak."

We Must Stand Together in This Hour of Sorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Caleb King, Jr., editor of the Florida Times Union,

on the excellent editorial published in the November 25 edition of that paper. It was truthfully there said that "A man of courage and ability has fallen in the service of his country." Having served with Mr. King in World War II, I know that when he paid this tribute to our fallen leader, President Kennedy, he is conscious, as am I, that the President died as a soldier for his country, as truly as any recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Soldierlike, Mr. King observes that "life must go on" and we must all "stand strongly behind" our new leader. The late President Kennedy would have been the first to say that. The editorial reads as follows:

WE MUST STAND TOGETHER IN THIS HOUR OF SORROW

A grim and sorrowing Nation will honor the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in solemn rites in Washington at noon today. The grief, which every American shares with the widow and family of the late Chief Executive, is in no way assuaged by the knowledge that justice is moving swiftly to exact retribution for the dastardly crime.

All Americans may, however, take justifiable pride in the way in which our Nation has drawn together in this hour of mourning and in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation which the Congress has pledged to President Lyndon Johnson upon his succession to the office lately held by a young and vigorous leader.

Many Americans are inclined to view the theory of bipartisan support with skepticism. The theory was devised by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to meet the emergencies and needs of World War II, but it has not always been successfully applied since his time.

But, bipartisanism is an honorable policy for all to follow in times of national crisis and tragedy, such as this Nation is now experiencing. In such times there can be no thought but that which is the best for the Nation as a whole.

In these modern times it is hard to decide where domestic and foreign policies end or begin. It used to be said that domestic policies ended at the water's edge, but now those things which affect us internally often affect us externally as a nation. The President's murderer has, therefore, changed all our history in the single, treacherous pull of a trigger.

No one can say with certainty what the changes will be nor how they will affect all of us or all free men in the world.

The new President has in brief and solemn words sought the bipartisan support of Congress, the help of the people, and the aid of Almighty God. The trials which now face him are many and great and upon their successful resolution much depends.

In the final analysis life must go on. A man of courage and ability has fallen in the service of his country. None can explain or understand why he should have been called upon to make this supreme sacrifice, to all it appears a useless and senseless waste of a life dedicated to service.

We may all give meaning to the life of the late President, so tragically shortened, by pledging ourselves anew to stand strongly behind President Lyndon Johnson and to offer prayers for the comfort of the living and a safe voyage through these perilous times for our Nation.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire world mourns the passing of our late President, as does our own Nation. We in Florida and the Sixth District feel the loss acutely, as we considered the President and his family as neighbors and friends. The winter White House at Palm Beach was a familiar place to all, and Palm Beach itself had witnessed not only the comings and goings of the President but his growth and development from childhood until the weekend prior to his tragic death.

Millions of words have already been written about the man and the act which has taken him from us at the prime of his life, when we know in our hearts words cannot express our feelings. To his family we can only say the prayer, God be with you, which has already manifested itself in the courage and strength which we have all witnessed and which will be an inspiration for years to come.

To the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy the American people should rededicate themselves to abolish from this land forever the hate and discord which created the atmosphere for this tragedy, and remember the warning of Lincoln that while no foreign power may ever conquer, we have within ourselves the power to destroy our own Nation. Every single citizen must take an active part in the work of returning our Nation to the rule of reason and of law.

Mr. Speaker, I include several representative editorials from Florida at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Palm Beach Post, Nov. 23, 1963]

SHOCK AND MOURNING

America today is in mourning.

A great, good man is dead at the hands of an assassin. The youngest man ever elected to the Presidency of the United States, a brilliant statesman with a valorous war record, a beloved family man with an abiding faith in God—has been cut down in the prime of his career.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has joined the martyrs. Like his illustrious predecessors, he now belongs to the ages.

In the Palm Beaches, which was to the President a "second home" and site of the "winter White House," shock prevails. Only a few days ago, he was among us, vigorous and smiling.

We join the universal hope that his assassin will be apprehended and properly punished. But this is a secondary consideration. Such a foul deed could have been conceived and executed only by diseased minds.

Our thoughts at this time are primarily of sympathy for the bereaved family, and of hope and concern for our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

May God be with them all, and with us.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Nov. 24, 1963]

WORDS UNSPOKEN AT DALLAS OFFER GUIDANCE TO NATION IN THE TRYING DAYS AHEAD

President John F. Kennedy was to have made a speech in Dallas on Friday. Before he reached the appointed place, the 35th President of the United States held a rendezvous with death and his voice was stilled forever, his words unspoken.

Although they were left unsaid, the words should be our guide in this awkward hour when a President of the United States rests this very day in state in the rotunda of the Capitol, and while the new President works in the heavy presence of death and mourning, to take over our Nation's affairs and chart the direction the ship of state shall sail for the next 14 months.

Well might President Lyndon B. Johnson heed those words unspoken. Well might every American citizen weigh them and accept them as counsel through the convulsions that must occur during the difficult transition.

What Mr. Kennedy had intended to say in his Dallas speech was an excerpt from the Bible, Psalm 124: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Mr. Kennedy was a master of oratory and there were those among us who believed that he often spoke wise counsel, but too often did not pay heed as he spoke. All of that is of consequence no longer, for in the martyrdom of his high office, the President rests expiated of human frailties, left to the judgment of his Maker and of history.

What is of consequence is that Mr. Kennedy had chosen to recite from a psalm which, through lamentable and shocking circumstances, should now become an echoing reminder for Americans through the remaining ages.

They are the words in which can be found the answer to the anguished question of House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who, when informed of Mr. Kennedy's assassination, cried out: "My God, My God. What are we coming to?"

Both the question and the reply found in the psalm should serve as admonitions to each and every American citizen. Indeed, what were we coming to in the mounting tempest, calmed for now by the chill of death?

Irrefutably, we had become a divided nation; ultra-liberal against ultra-conservative, Democrat against Republican, northerner against southerner, atheist against religionist, black against white, American against American.

We had been caught up in an ugly web of opportunism, of materialism; placed at the mercy of outside influences that would bury us, sapped of resolve to pay any cost for the preservation of our inherited doctrine, caught in a crosscurrent of demands upon another without regard for one to the other.

We were a finely divided nation and we knew it; yet little of anything was accomplished in restoring our national unity. We were on a collision course with the future that awaited us in November 1963.

Our direction from that point on shall remain forever unknown, obliterated by a searing bullet triggered by one individual whose horrendous action may leave us uncertain and exposed to deepening schism, or spared the rendering that awaited at the point of collision.

That we never will know.

But this we do know: If this Nation is to be destroyed and, as Mr. Kennedy once said,

become part of the debris of history, it is we, the living, who shall destroy it. If this Nation is to survive in strength, it is we, the living, who shall make that determination in the months ahead.

Thus, the admonition left unsaid by John Fitzgerald Kennedy assumes meaning far greater than had he pronounced from a speaker's platform in ill-fated Dallas: "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

And with humility, Lyndon B. Johnson gave the Nation encouragement for the future when he said as he was sworn as the 36th President of the United States:

"I will do my best—that's all I can do. I ask your help—and God's."

WILLIAM A. MULLEN.

[From the Fort Myers News-Press, Nov. 23, 1963]

"ASK WHAT YOU CAN DO"

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

In the shock and sorrow, in the confusion and uncertainty following the assassination of President John F. Kenedy, well may those words he uttered in his inaugural address be recalled now and pondered by his countrymen.

They were noble words and inspiring. But many came to take a cynical view of them in the weeks and months that followed their delivery on that freezing January day of 1960 by the 43-year-old President elected by a popular vote margin of only one-tenth of 1 percent. How much Kennedy himself, by the actions he took and the programs he espoused, contributed to that public cynicism need not be examined at this time of national bereavement but may be left to the later judgment of history.

It is appropriate instead to recall the achievements of Kennedy's short administration of less than 3 years, and there were many. There were notable successes in the space program, the creation of the Peace Corps, some tax revision, the bolstering of the United Nations through a bond issue and other means. The outstanding accomplishment of the Kennedy administration is certainly the negotiation and ratification of the treaty outlawing nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, which gives mankind good ground for hope, at least, that the poisonous pollution of the air will now cease and that further progress may be made in the international control of the awesome bomb.

Now in the aftermath of the tragedy in Dallas, many question marks arise over the Nation's future policies and programs which devolve upon President Lyndon B. Johnson. The initial impact of the tragedy is so overwhelming that none can venture to answer them with assurance, nor would care to undertake their consideration in this hour. Of only one matter can there be assurance now—that all segments of the Nation will uphold the hands of President Johnson in the difficult days of readjustment immediately ahead.

In this dark hour all Americans, of all persuasions, mourn the untimely death of the young President Kennedy. Their thoughts go out in sympathy to his wife and two little children and to the others of his family.

In this hour too Americans can find good guidance from their fallen leader in his words—"ask what you can do for your country."

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Your Challenges: Regulation and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 21, this year, our able colleague, Hon. WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, made the most interesting, challenging speech to the Texas Association of Broadcasters. His subject was "Your Challenges: Regulation and Responsibility." I have heard many fine comments from members of the association and others who were privileged to hear this address.

Due to the fact that it deals with some of the problems of not only the broadcasting industry but with other regulatory procedures, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members and commend it for your consideration.

The speech follows:

YOUR CHALLENGES: REGULATION AND RESPONSIBILITY

(Address of the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, Member of Congress from the 18th District of Texas, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at the convention of the Texas Association of Broadcasters, Monday, October 21, 1963, in Dallas, Tex.)

Members of the Texas Association of Broadcasters, your distinguished visitors, and guests, I am indeed happy to be here today to visit with you on issues that I feel are important not only to your industry but to our State and our Nation.

I come before you as a duly elected Member of the Congress of the United States of America, fully aware that there are rumors afloat that the actions of that body have not been universally satisfactory. However, I am enjoying a temporary sense of well-being in the knowledge that the group present here today are not strangers to trials and tribulations and have had some experience with criticism.

You executives in the broadcasting industry, whose days are filled with bumbled commercial announcements, complaining sponsors, irate listeners, equipment failures, sharp questions from the station owners, network preemptions, sudden cuts in the opposition's rate card—and another letter from the FCC, probably feel that no other individual could possibly be confronted with so many and so varied problems.

Let me point out that a friendly and understanding soul might be your own U.S. Congressman, whose average day is filled with almost every conceivable turn of events, beginning with the troubles of a misplaced constituent in darkest Africa or a missent baby book, and ending with a letter from an irate constituent beginning Dear Sir—spelled C-U-R.

Please don't misunderstand me, I am not complaining. I am like the rooster who found a football, pushed it home to his own barnyard, and displayed it to the flock of hens telling them he was not complaining but just wanted them to see what was being done in other backyards.

I have always subscribed to the school of thought that if you don't like what you are doing, try something else. Whether we are in politics, the broadcasting industry, or any other phase of the economy of this great country, it would be well to follow the admonition of former President Harry Truman, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

The problems of politics, broadcasting, industry, and so forth, cannot be solved by bickering and complaining and calling people names. Life in itself is a challenge, as is everything we undertake in life. Our responsibility is to meet those challenges and to deal with them fairly, honestly, and effectively.

For the purposes of this meeting, and in keeping with the limited time available, I think it would be well for us to address ourselves to a few of the more vital problems facing your industry, the proper solutions of which will serve not only you as individuals but, in my opinion, the Nation as a whole. I think it would be well to preface my remarks by the comment that, in my opinion, the broadcasters of this Nation—both television and radio—have done an outstanding job.

In less than 43 years commercial broadcasting has earned, through technical excellence, imaginative programing, and sound management, the preeminent position as America's entertainment-information medium. For this you are entitled to the highest commendations from this Nation and the world, but I would warn you that it does not relieve you of the continuing need for aggressive action on your part and for constant vigilance to protect yourselves and your industry in the true sense of the private enterprise system of our economy.

The dangers lie in the future, not in the past. Among these many dangers, there are three upon which I feel immediate attention must be focused. I refer to the issue of editorializing, the issue of license fees to be collected by the FCC and, perhaps the most important, the issue of the FCC fixing the length or frequency of commercials.

Taking these up in the order listed, let us turn first to editorializing. All of you are well aware of the extended hearings which have been conducted on this subject to date. I hope to conclude those hearings in the near future and that the committee will make recommendations on the subject matter.

I think one of the most enlightening aspects of these hearings was the reaction of the broadcasters in the first instance when they were announced. So very many in the broadcast industry seemed to view with alarm the movement of a congressional committee into this subject matter. This came as quite a surprise to me, because I had felt that the broadcasters would welcome an opportunity to clarify their position on the subject and to voice the complaints that many had privately expressed to me with regard to alleged arbitrary practices on the part of the FCC. In fact, many broadcasters openly attacked me and took language out of context, thereby misinterpreting my views as well as my purpose in trying to help solve a very touchy problem.

I do not criticize them for what they did because I am satisfied that they were simply equating the Congress of the United States with the Federal Communications Commission and considering the two agencies as being completely interwoven. Let me dispel that myth here and now. It is true that the independent agencies of this Government, including FCC, were considered as arms of the Congress for administrative purposes. The word "independent" was intended to mean that these agencies were independent from the executive branch of the Government.

However, from some of the muscle flexing that has taken place in recent years, it would seem that some of these agencies have decided to construe the word "independent" literally and to consider themselves as the fourth branch of the Government, completely free of any control from the executive, the judicial, or the legislative.

If such is the intention of those now constituting those boards, or the thoughts of the unseen powers behind the throne, now is the time for this whole problem to be dragged out into the open and for a definite policy decision to be made by the people of this country. I think that the problem can be handled if the Congress will face the issue without delay and with definitive action.

If the Congress is not going to recognize and deal with the problem, then the matter should be submitted to the entire electorate, because we are dealing with an attempt to change the constitutional processes, the power to do which should rest only with the people.

The editorializing hearings have brought forth much useful and pertinent information which can serve this country well in the future but, in my opinion, they would have been a great success had they accomplished only the single purpose of awakening the industry and the public to the inherent dangers of permitting administrative agencies to legislate.

The primary question is not whether or not the fairness doctrine was fair, not whether or not the broadcasters should or should not editorialize, not the content of the editorial, and not the programing of these broadcasts. The primary and important question that should be in the minds of broadcasters and the public is as to who, under our Constitution and under a representative form of government, shall have the right to make those decisions in the first instance.

But let us not stray away from the isolated issue of "editorializing," because it is this issue that could provide the open door to the wider subject of the proper base for legislative powers under our Constitution. When this matter was first set for hearing, many of the broadcasters jumped to the conclusion that the Congress was advocating the prohibition of editorializing. Some of them immediately editorialized for editorializing and against the Congress. Some seemed to feel that this was an excellent opportunity to start a fight with the Congress and they certainly did not want to miss such a golden opportunity.

However, I think that most of them have now concluded that the objective was not to enforce or prohibit editorializing but, on the contrary, was to clear the air of confusion about your rights and responsibilities in

opinion broadcasting. It has developed that many broadcasters felt that they were taking a calculated risk by editorializing; that in serving their community by stimulating thought on public issues, by taking positions of opinion leadership, by helping their listeners to understand some of the complexities of the issues involved—they were putting their licenses on the line at renewal time.

On the other hand, some, seeking to avoid controversy, refused to editorialize only to have it suggested to them that a policy of not editorializing would seriously jeopardize their licenses.

In my opinion, there is absolutely no need for this kind of confusion, nor is there need for the many other areas of confusion that have stemmed from some of the more recent proposals of the FCC.

Most all of the witnesses felt that the crux of the situation was the fairness displayed by the broadcaster. Of course, there were some who expressed dislike for a fairness doctrine, and one who indicated that he saw no reason to be fair—period.

However, I think the general feeling of the witnesses was exemplified by the testimony of John Tyler of KFDA television in Amarillo when he told the subcommittee with reference to the fairness doctrine, and I quote, "If the doctrine did not exist with the FCC and I was a broadcaster and an editorializer, I would still be fair about it." I think this reflects the position of all conscientious, bona fide journalists. He is committed to being fair not because the Government tells him he should, but because his own ethical standards so dictate.

I think it can be further said that most all of the witnesses subscribe to the proposition that under the law the broadcast spectrum is public property, which broadcasters are licensed to use. Hence, public responsibilities rest upon your shoulders which are not present with your friends who use their own printing presses.

Your principal responsibility in expressing opinions on the air is to be certan you provide ample opportunity for broadcasting opinions dissenting from your own. The newspaper publisher is under no such obligation. Nothing but his own conscience compels him to be fair.

I have always had faith and confidence that the broadcasters would conduct their business in a fair, honest, and conscientious manner. And, I might add that experience would prove that in a vast majority of cases, this confidence has not been misplaced. However, if it is necessary for rules and regulations to be written to avoid abuses and unconscionable practices that could occur, the laying down of basic policy on the subject is the office of the duly elected Members of the Congress of the United States and not the administrative agency created by the Congress, if we are to pursue proper constitutional guidelines.

Some say that this is a matter so complex that it cannot be the subject of legislation. The utter fallacy of this argument is apparent on its face. The Federal Communications Commission is made up of human beings; the same is true of the Congress of the United States.

The only difference lies in the fact that the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people and are directly answerable to them every 2 years. The members of the FCC and other agencies are appointed for various terms. The staff people in the offices of the Members of Congress, as well as on the congressional committees, have no job guarantees or fringe benefits usually associated with civil service and Foreign Service personnel. The staff people serving the FCC and the other independent agencies have job rights and all of the other fringe benefits associated with civil service employment. Perhaps it is this built-in protection from the wrath of the electorate that is supposed to make the people in the independent agencies more capabale of writing laws than the Members of the Congress who were elected by the people under the Constitution to do this job.

Laws, whether you call them rules, regulations, or otherwise, are the product of man. It occurs to me that if we are to preserve government of the people, by the people, and for the people, then the duly elected representatives should be the ones who lay down the guidelines necessary for the proper conduct of the affairs of this country.

Now let us turn to the second issue before mentioned, to wit: the establishment of fees for the licensing and regulatory activities of the FCC. As most of you know, this has been a highly controversial subject. Many of the parties subject to this order have no objection to paying a reasonable fee. This has been one of the arguments presented to me by people both in government and in industry.

Others, however, are vigorously protesting. However, the size of the fee and the person assessed is not the primary question in issue. The primary question is again the basic question of who has the right to make the determination of whether or not any fee should be charged. I would point out in this respect that the FCC in its original order of May 6 on the subject made this statement: "In summary, the Commission believes it has the authority under title V of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1952, to adopt rules requiring the payment of fees for its licensing and regulatory activities."

If the Commission believed that the Congress had vested it with this power and ordered them to exercise it, why did they wait 10 years? Was it an open defiance of the Congress, or was it the fact that they didn't think they had the power at any time? I prefer to subscribe to the latter. Many of the staff people of the FCC are career employees. And they know the rules of the Congress as well or better than they know the rules of their own agencies.

They know that under the Rules of the House of Representatives the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee; that the proper procedure for the adoption of a new law is for the matter to be proposed by the agency advocating the change submitting it to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who in turn refers it to the proper legislative committee. They also know that under the basic law of this land an agency created by the Congress has only those powers expressly granted it or necessarily implied to carry out the powers granted; they know that the provisions contained in the Appropriations Act of 1952 would have been subject to a point of order and stricken from the bill; they know that there were a great number of Members of Congress who would have made that point of order, including yours truly, had they had the faintest idea that any such strained construction was intended to be put upon that language.

The proper procedure would have been to have made known at the time their intentions. If this was not to be done for 10 years, then good faith and good conscience would require that this Commission or any other independent agency submit to the Congress in the usual manner and in the regular channels proposals to bring about the result sought, so that it could be subjected to public hearings before the proper legislative committee.

Stress should be placed on the word "legislative," because the Appropriations Committee has to do with the appropriation of funds and does not have public hearings on those matters for which they are called upon to appropriate money. Hence it can be said as to the licensing fees proposed that this matter has never been the subject of public hearings in the Congress of the United States of America.

I might add that when it became obvious to me that the FCC intended to put into effect the proposals as to fixing fees, I introduced H.R. 6697 to prohibit the FCC from assessing fees or charges unless specifically permitted by law. I would also add that there are other proposals for the assessment of fees; but, I repeat, this is a matter to be decided by the duly elected Members of the Congress in the regular manner and after full and proper public hearings. I shall do my very best to see that this is done.

Turning now to the third category and, as I said, probably the most important, the issue of the FCC fixing the length or frequency of commercials. Let me say in the beginning that hearings have been scheduled on H.R. 8316, which I introduced to prohibit the FCC from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. These hearings will commence November 6, 1963.

This is a subject on which thousands and thousands of words have been written and spoken, dating back to 1927 when the Federal Radio Commission was established. It is also the first proposal by either the Federal Radio Commission or the Federal Communications Commission in 36 years for direct regulation as to the amount of advertising that could be broadcast.

My observations with regard to the unwarranted assumption of power by the FCC in the license fee category would be as appropriate, if not more so, with regard to the assumption of power by the FCC with reference to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. In this instance, the Commission did not even have the help of a 10-year-old appropriations bill.

I can well appreciate the many divergent opinions of the populace as to the amount of advertising, the content thereof, and the frequency thereof the radio and television screen. I am sure that these opinions would vary in the numerous geographic areas of our country. Many would say, more power to the FCC. Others would say this is none of the business of the FCC or anyone else, and in between would be thousands of other comments.

Here again we must not lose sight of the basic issue involved. That is, "Who has the right under our form of government to make this determination in the first instance, if it is a question on which determination must be made?"

If the situation is so acute that some action must be had to place limitations on the quantity and the frequency of advertising certainly there must be some very strong supporting facts and justification. If such is the case, then I would ask, "What is wrong with presenting the matter to the duly elected representatives of the people of the United States of America?"

"Have we reached the point that representative government has become so top-heavy and so complex that it remains only in name, and the vital decisions must be by appointed officials?" I grant you that the Congress has delegated too much power in recent years—powers which I think should be reclaimed.

However, it has not delegated nearly as much power as some of the delegates are assuming. And unless affirmative action is taken by the Congress to stop this trend, these assumed powers will become actual. In the case that we are presently treating there are many facets to the problem involving not alone the economic philosophy but the political philosophy upon which this country was founded.

These are basic policy decisions that should be made in the first instance by the Congress of the United States, unless we are ready to admit that the powers to write substantive law have been transferred to independent

agencies and the executive branch of our Government and that Congress shall in the future concern itself only with defense, taxes, and appropriations. Let the record show here and now that I am not ready to make such an admission and will vigorously contest anyone who does.

The step proposed in the rulemaking proposal relating to the length and frequency of broadcast advertisements is a step that should not be taken under any circumstances unless it is clearly and conclusively established that only hereby can the best interests of the public in a free enterprise economy and within the confines of our Constitution be best served—a burden of proof that will no doubt be most difficult to meet, but one that must be met if we are to follow the traditions that have made this country great.

In conclusion, let it be said that whether the laws of Congress or the rules of the FCC are to be the dominant governmental influence in your affairs, the fact remains that you will be subject to Government regulation so long as you use the property belonging to the people. Perhaps this regulation will be more than you or I feel necessary, perhaps it will not be as much as many voices say is needed. In either event, it will continue to present challenges to you individually and as an industry—challenges that must be met by responsible action on your part.

You must remember that no regulated industry is more carefully spotlighted, none more in the public attention, than is the broadcasting industry. In most every home in this country reposes someone who is prepared to offer a strong opinion about what he wants from the broadcasters who serve him. This vast audience can make itself heard with the Government; it can outshout you, and it can outvote you. Hence, you must continue to serve it wisely and well or it will cry out for stronger regulation of your affairs.

Before other regulated industry groups I have urged that a unified front be presented wherever possible in the industrywide relations with the Government. In no industry is this more important than in yours. It would be well for you to consider three questions which I leave with you:

"What of your own house?"

"Can you reach agreements as an industry on problems facing you—agreements strong enough so that you can address your Government with a unified voice?"

"Can you recognize that the challenge of regulation is not one to be met merely by loud protests, but that concerted, unified effort is required?"

Of responsibility I would say this: Your sense of service is made clear by the programs you transmit. Most of you do very well. Most of you are responsive to the needs and desires of people you serve. The public is your ultimate judge and as the public judges you, so will be decided your success as broadcasters.

Even within the confines of Government regulation, you are still free to pursue courses of responsibility and irresponsibility. Firmly convinced that most of you most of the time will make the correct choices, I will do my best to see that those decisions are always yours to make.

An Occupational Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe Morning World of November 27:

AN OCCUPATIONAL HAZARD

Now that final rites for John Fitzgerald Kennedy have been held, it would seem in order to view a few things in the calm atmosphere of respect concerning the still almost unbelievable case.

First of all the American people are not a people of hatreds. The efforts of some to seize upon the word "hate" in the manner it often has been used in the past few years as purely a political weapon has been disservice to themselves, to the American people and to the United States as a nation. It has been disservice also to the memory of a young man who found so much that was wonderful in life in this country—perhaps one could say even especially in his associations and conflicts with those who disagreed with political philosophy he represented.

The pretense by both implication and sometimes direct word that domestic political hate imbuing the hearts of American people as a whole brought his assassination, has been spread to every corner of the earth for as each word was uttered on the air or set forth in print that word also was spread to all countries of the globe often in only a few seconds because of the speed with which communications media operate these days.

Next, neither this assassination nor any other is a "weakening of the fabric of law which is the protection of us all" as one of our larger eastern newspapers has stated in editorial anger.

Counting Mr. Kennedy the United States had 35 Presidents up to President Johnson. More than 17 percent faced assassins' bullets and nearly 11½ percent died from such bullets. Assassins sought the lives of three of our last four Presidents succeeding with Mr. Kennedy.

In addition, two mayors of Chicago and a Governor of Kentucky have been assassinated in the past 70 years.

With one possible exception in none of these instances was the assassin or would-be assassin in any way what could be called a real American—a believer in and understander of true Americanism. In each instance whatever hate was in the heart of the man with the gun, it was a hate stemming from and created by some "ism" entirely foreign to our beliefs.

The man who tried to kill Franklin D. Roosevelt in Miami, Fla., in 1933—and killed Mayor Cermak of Chicago while missing the President-elect—was a born lifetime professional anarchist.

The men who sought to shoot down Mr. Truman in 1950 were radicals—leftists if you want to use political directions—from Puerto Rico. It was Puerto Rican radicals also who shot up the House of Representatives not many years ago wounding several Congressmen working at their desks.

The man who sent his bullets into the head and throat of John F. Kennedy was born an American citizen but grew up as a disciple of Marxism and as a brainwashed dupe of American leftists who were dragged by professional organizers into a movement to convince people that the United States under both Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Kennedy was an oppressor of Cuba. He was an American citizen only because he had failed to gain the Russian citizenship he sought after renouncing under oath his American citizenship. Oddly although skipping his rent at times, he had money for a quick trip to Mexico City, a seat of Communist operations in the Western Hemisphere, immediately after Mr. Kennedy's final Texas and Dallas itinerary was announced.

In general what is said of the above three instances is true also of the attempted assassination of Theodore Roosevelt, of Chicago Mayor Carter Harrison in 1893, and Kentucky Gov. William Goebel in 1900. In the case of Lincoln there were reasons evolving from internal dissentions which have existed only once in this Nation.

Thus to some extent the possibility of attempted assassination has been an occupational hazard of the Presidency of the United States, especially in the last 30 years.

This has been true not because of hate in the hearts of any large or small number of American people but chiefly because of the tremendous increase in speed of both transportation and communications as applied to political activities.

Where a President once required at least 12 to 15 days for a political trip across the Nation and back with only a few speeches a President now can get out of bed in the White House in the morning, travel through 5 or 6 States by jet plane, make 10 or 12 speeches and be back in his own bed that night.

Further he will know that he has both been seen and heard on television in every major city in the Nation and perhaps in most of the capitals of the world—now that we have satellite relay television—if what he said was important. Thus the whole plan of politicking (and Mr. Kennedy was on a strictly politicking 3-day tour of Texas trying to heal the split between Democratic liberals and Democratic conservatives) calls for the greatest public exposure possible. This means wide open cavalcades, open autobiles, crowds on the sidewalks, and tall buildings which are natural hiding places for snipers all along the way in either small or larger cities.

No President these days is going to shun this. To do so would be to shun political advantages he knows he must seek. As one of the more sensible TV commentators put it even as early as Friday afternoon—only 2 or 3 hours after the assassination—"In these days an American President necessarily is an open target for an assassin almost every day of his life."

There are haters and bigots in this country and every other country and always will be. Political direction of their philosophy may at times be the cause of hatred but we are not a nation of bigots and haters because of direction of political philosophy and our own people should not so picture us.

There is no nation in the world that we know of where the attributes of fineness of intelligence, of fairness to others and of good Samaritanism and willingness to help those who need help stand out so prominently as in our Nation.

Some of us are filthy but they are the few and not the whole and it's time for all of us to stand up against efforts to smear filth on us that is not ours.

The Last Half of the Ninth Inning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Ross U. Porter, editor and general manager of the Shawnee (Okla.) News-Star, discussed the critical situation of the oil industry in a timely editorial, "The Last Half of the Ninth Inning," which appeared November 19.

The article shows how the elected corporation commissioners of the State of Oklahoma were able to surmount a difficult situation at the State level. Mr. Porter suggests significantly that the problems of the oil industry, so vital to

our survival as a Nation, can be handled better at the national level by the Congress, responsible to the electorate, rather than by administrative agencies.

The editorial follows:

THE LAST HALF OF THE NINTH INNING

The oil game is a fascinating and exciting business. The industry should tell its story of growth and progress more frequently, because that story must, in all honesty, keep in perspective the failures, the hardships and the perplexing problems the industry is forced to face each morning.

Too often, the general public visualizes every oilman as a Rockefeller, a Paul Getty, or an H. L. Hunt with no problem except what to do with his money.

There are thousands of would-have-been tycoons who failed for each one who made it. Even the failures, however, make fascinating reading. It has been a survival-of-the-fittest contest all the way.

It still is, only more so.

The rules of the game have changed since John D. Rockefeller's time. So have the umpires. A nonelected bureaucrat calls all the plays from Washington now, only on foreign oil at the moment, and that shuts off production of 2 million barrels of American oil every day from our States to let in the sheik's oil from Saudi Arabia. His wells are allowed to produce at the rate of 8,000 barrels per day each. The Oklahoma operator is thus cut back to an average of 8 barrels per day per well.

This system is appropriately named—foreign aid.

Oklahoma's oil industry is umpired by three corporation commisisoners whom we all elect. The Oklahoma system under the close supervision of the present incumbents is a model of justice and fairness to the large and small operators alike.

The Oklahoma oil industry was critically ill 3 years ago; the commissioners, sensing the urgency of the situation, held proper hearing, modified the rules promptly to meet existing contingencies, and the industry began to recover immediately.

This analogy of the Federal method and the Oklahoma method quickly converts one to the States rights team. No real rugged individualistic oil man wants on that Federal control team—but the "Federals" are really after him, and the pathetic part is they may get him.

Tragically, then, the fascinating and exciting game will reach the last half of the ninth inning. A great and wonderful era will have ended; so will the new Rockefellers, Gettys, and Hunts.

This is why, too, we now have Oil Recognition Week. The industry has been a godsend to our community and to all of Oklahoma. It has been the citadel of free enterprise—until they changed the rules and the umpire.

Cultural Center Trustees Back Dedication to Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I introduced legislation to rededicate the National Cultural Center for the Performing Arts as the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center. That evening the Washington Star carried an excellent editorial supporting this action and included the comments of various public and cultural leaders favoring this living memorial to our late President. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial and the collection of comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

LIVING MEMORIAL

There is a twofold significance in the warm, immediate outpouring of support for the proposal to dedicate the National Cultural Center as a memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It affirms first the need and the desire of a Nation still grieving to give physical substance to its respect and depth of feeling for this extraordinary leader.

It affirms also the thoroughly natural compatibility between this particular monument and this particular man.

In itself, such compatibility is rare. Historically, the selection of a memorial to a President in the Nation's Capital is an agonizing process, and not always a seemly one. For illustration one need only recall the controversy, which at times has reached farcical proportions and which is still unsettled after all these years, over a fitting memorial for Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The present decision is easier. Among our Presidents, John F. Kennedy will be remembered first, perhaps, for his youth and the vibrancy of his personality. These are not qualities best preserved in cold stone. They are more fittingly preserved, apart from memory, in a living, functional, useful monument. It is the rarest of good fortune that in this period of his untimely death there happens to be at hand a project whose purposes are so closely related to the character and the interests of the man. This is the point which has impressed those at the highest levels of Government and leaders in every walk of life. It seems to everyone so completely the natural thing to do. So also it seemed to us in advancing the proposal.

There is another fortunate circumstance. From its inception, the Cultural Center has been visualized as a thoroughly national institution, belonging to all Americans. In his imaginative initial design, and in the refinements which followed, Architect Edward D. Stone has never forgotten that.

Inevitably, of course, there will have to be changes in detail from the original project. These matters, however, already are under consideration, and we need not delve into them here. They pose no serious problems.

The need now is to proceed with legislation which will change the name of the Center, formally dedicate it to its new purpose, and authorize a Federal appropriation to underwrite any portion of the eventual cost which may not be covered by private subscription. As to the latter, we doubt that such an authorization will need to be invoked. As a matter of prudence, however, it should be approved.

Fortunately, those Members of the Senate most intimately acquainted with the Cultural Center program already have introduced the necessary legislation. House Members are ready to do so. Steps should be taken to move these bills ahead immediately.

TRUSTEES BACK DEDICATION TO KENNEDY

There was overwhelming support today from members of the National Cultural Center Board of Trustees, Congressmen, and others connected with the project to dedicate the Center to President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. They had the following to say:

Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas: "I certainly do favor naming the Center after President Kennedy."

Senator MANSFIELD, majority leader: "This would be a perpetual monument."

Senator DIRKSEN, minority leader: "President and Mrs. Kennedy were pioneers in the cultural field and it would be most appropriate for the Center to be so dedicated."

Senator HUMPHREY, Democratic whip, of Minnesota: "Not only do I endorse the idea, but I began thinking of making such a proposal on Saturday and had already held some conferences on the subject."

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, also endorsed the proposal.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey: "It certainly would be appropriate. I can't think of anything more fitting than a living and vibrant memorial to a man who was so vibrant himself. He was the first President to give the arts and cultural affairs their proper place and emphasis in our national life." Mr. THOMPSON added he would have to give further thought to the question of whether he would support legislative authority for a Federal contribution to speed construction of the Center.

Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations Secretariat: "Personally I think it is a very interesting idea. I think it would be a good idea. Both President and Mrs. Kennedy were actively interested, and were a very good and great help." Mr. Bunche added that he felt it would be inappropriate to endorse the idea in his official capacity as a trustee of the Center until he confers with other Board members.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President, and Mrs. Eisenhower, said at this time they were in "no position to comment," and wanted to study further the proposal before making a statement, according to an assistant of Mr. Eisenhower. The idea of the Cultural Center originated during Mr. Eisenhower's term of office. His wife and Mrs. Kennedy are honorary chairmen of the Center's Board of Trustees.

Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board, also declined to comment at this time, but L. Corrin Strong, former Chairman and now Vice Chairman and a trustee, said: "I think it will be a wonderful idea. I have nothing but praise for the idea. I think it is an excellent one."

William Walton, Center trustee and Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission: "I am entirely in favor of it. But I think the word 'cultural' should be left out. It's a deadly word. And I think that the need for an adequate endowment is the most important of all—more important than a roof. It would be terrible to erect a beautiful empty shell."

Senator PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts, in a statement prepared for delivery in the Senate: "Great art speaks in a universal language. The great poet or painter, or sculptor or musician * * * goes beyond narrow limits of time and place * * *. He illuminates our vision, so that we can better understand each other and better comprehend the goals we seek.

"In this sense, I believe President Kennedy was a true artist—not alone in the words he used to motivate us, but in the impulses which motivated him. And therefore * * * I think it would be appropriate that our National Cultural Center—as it is contemplated, as it is planned, as it emerges to reality—should bear his name."

Floyd Akers, a Center trustee: "I would be for it. I think it would be a very fine thing. It would stand for something he represented. He represented the youth, the progress, the things we need for the future, and the culture we need for the future. I think it is a grand movement, and I think we should do it, because he has spearheaded the renewal of this since President Eisenhower started it."

Dr. J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, which recently announced its $1 million grant to the Center: "Naming the Center after President Kennedy is an intriguing idea, an imaginative one, certainly very appealing. It seems to me

that in memorializing a great leader, it is always better to do so with a living monument, something that is dynamic and continuing.

"And since the late President and his family have been the prime moving force behind the Cultural Center, it seems to me most appropriate to name it for him and to expedite its construction. The memorial would be in an area he personally espoused—culture."

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution: "I think this is a very interesting and very significant suggestion and would advocate its most sympathetic consideration by the Board."

Mrs. Herbert May, patroness of the arts: "I think it is a very good idea. But I think the word 'cultural' should not be included in the name of the center. It could be, as a suggestion, the John F. Kennedy Art Center."

Charles A. Horsky, special adviser to the President for National Capital Affairs: "Certainly there was nothing closer to the President's personal interest than the Cultural Center. If anything is to be named for him the Center would seem to be very high on the list. However, I think we need more time to determine what would be the most appropriate memorial."

Walter N. Tobriner, District Commissioner: "If the Kennedy family agrees to naming the Cultural Center after President Kennedy I would be heartily in favor of it. It seems to me that naming both the Cultural Center and District Stadium after President Kennedy would reflect the manifold nature of his interests since he was a man with wide cultural interests as well as one with an interest in competitive sports."

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO: "I would be heartily in favor of the proposal to name the Center in honor of the late President. I always felt that the name 'National Cultural Center' left something to be desired. I feel that, in view of the President's close relationship to the concept of the Center, naming it in his honor would be ideal."

Ralph E. Becker, Washington attorney and Center trustee: "Not only am I heartily in favor of dedicating the center to the memory of President Kennedy, but I think it is most important that we plan with care to make it a living memorial. We must be sure that there is an adequate endowment to fill the Center with the sound of music and drama that so delighted Mr. Kennedy during his life. Sufficient funds must be provided to make this Center the last word in view of the fact that we have waited so long for such a center."

John Nicholas Brown, chairman of the Cultural Center board for Rhode Island according to his wife, said that within 24 hours of President Kennedy's death he declared that in his opinion the Cultural Center would be the ideal memorial to Mr. Kennedy.

Daniel W. Bell, former president of the American Security & Trust Co.: "I would rather not comment. I think it is a matter to be discussed in the board of trustees. I don't think it would be right for me as a trustee to discuss the matter prior to a meeting of the trustees."

Mrs. Albert Lasker, a New York trustee: "I think it's a wonderful idea—couldn't be better. It is very suitable. He was deeply interested in the Cultural Center, and did a lot to help it. I think Congress ought to change the name of it to the Kennedy Memorial Center and to pay for the remainder of the cost. It would be a more prompt way to raise the money than the public fund-raising, but in any case, I am sure it is the will of the people. I can't think of a more suitable and living memorial."

Garfield Kass, a member of the advisory committee: "I said to my wife when we came back from the funeral, wouldn't it be a wonderful thing to dedicate the cultural center to Kennedy? It would be the greatest memorial they could give to him. I am 100 percent in favor. It's a splendid idea. The advisory board has a meeting next week and I'm going to push for it. I also think Congress should help with an appropriation."

William H. Waters, Jr., Chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, said: "I don't think the idea should be entertained unless the immediate family of President Kennedy feels it is appropriate. If they do, then in the light of the President's interest in the arts, which certainly was deep and strong, it is up to the trustees to consider renaming the Center in honor of Mr. Kennedy. It would be a very fitting gesture."

George A. Garrett, Chairman of the Federal City Council: "I think it would be not only proper, but a very fine thing, not only for us to do, but it would be an awfully fine thing for the Cultural Center itself. I think it would insure the success of the cultural center. As Chairman of the Council, I was one of those who interviewed the President about having his entire Cabinet enrolled as trustees of the Council. He did it. He not only did that, but he sent messages to Congress as to what he thought Congress owed the Federal City."

Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., a trustee: "I would vote for such a proposal. I am in favor of it."

L. Corrin Strong, Vice Chairman of the Center trustees: "I think it will be a wonderful idea. I have nothing but praise for the idea. I think it is an excellent one."

Conrad L. Wirth, National Park Service Director and Center trustee: "There should be some way of commemorating the very strong stand he took on developing the arts. That might be the way to do it."

The Moon Project as Capital Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to a recent article written by Eugene Patterson, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, in which he succinctly expresses the message being sounded by the distinguished Dr. Wernher von Braun.

Dr. von Braun who, I am proud to say, is Director of the NASA complex in my home State of Alabama speaks with the authority of a man who can help guide America as we sail that magnificent new ocean to the moon and beyond.

I commend Mr. Patterson's article to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD:

VON BRAUN'S VIEWS: THE MOON PROJECT AS CAPITAL INVESTMENT

(By Eugene Patterson)

Wernher von Braun is an American citizen of German ancestry who, in the days when most of us were asleep, developed the capability to put the United States into the space race after sputnik woke us up. Now he is watching us fall asleep again. He is not taking it silently.

If Congress persists in cutting the space budget further for fiscal 1964 through "tragic understanding" of what space is all about, he says, then the American landscape is going to be scattered with half-finished facilities "which would sit there as monuments to our halfheartedness in the face of one of the greatest challenges ever presented to us."

In an urgent, general-alarm letter from his base at Huntsville, Ala., to Representative GEORGE W. ANDREWS of the House Appropriations Committee, Von Braun scarcely veils a NASA belief that the U.S. Air Force is behind some of the criticisms of the space program.

He doesn't name the Air Force. But again and again he objects to the current contentions that space exploration ought to be more military in nature. He clearly feels this view is contributing to the flagging of congressional interest reflected in space budget cuts.

GENERAL PROGRAM

And the point he makes repeatedly is that, yes—"space has a military significance"—but it is impossible to predict now what it will be, and that therefore what is needed now is the general NASA program to accumulate a body of knowledge and to make the United States a space-faring nation.

Only then, as the World War I dogfights grew out of general study of flight, can the United States make military spacecraft intelligently.

"History has showed repeatedly that a large body of experience must be gained in a new form of transportation before substantial military use can be made of it," said Von Braun.

"I think the American people should be told that the (moonlanding) goal per se is not the overriding consideration," he said, of NASA's critics, "but that the lunar landing was chosen as a goal toward which all parts of the program can be focused, matched and integrated. Another goal could possibly have been picked instead, but since it embraces all vital elements of a true national spaceflight capability, the moon offered the best choice."

INTO ORBIT

The Saturn V lunar booster could just as well put a jet airliner into orbit as an Apollo moon vehicle, he said. "Saturn V really doesn't care what those 120 tons of initial payload are made of. Thus, if and when the need arises for any heavy military space payloads, Saturn V will be ready to carry them."

The moon program "is like a capital investment into the next few decades of space exploration, both military and civilian," Von Braun said. He called the moon landing "a mere byproduct of this investment."

To Von Braun, whose vision of space and rocketry has been proven to be so much clearer than any other living man's, it is incredible that the United States is vacillating now, and letting arguments like the military-application thing lull Americans into rationalizing a cutback.

"Yet here stands the space program," he said, "in grave danger of defeat, and here stands the United States seemingly tending to back out of our publicly stated commitment and admit defeat."

It will be an incredible American performance if the United States shrinks back now from the space age into which Von Braun dragged us, kicking and protesting, and in which he is now having to struggle to keep us.

How To End the Dollar Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, November 19, the gentleman from

Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 21198–21202, an excellent article by Clarence K. Streit, editor of Freedom & Union magazine, which analyzed the mounting crisis in the U.S. dollar. As a companion to that presentation, I call attention to the article, also by Mr. Streit, specifying the course of action needed to meet the dollar crisis.

It deserves the attention of all Members. To me, Mr. Streit's recommendation makes great sense:

HOW TO END THE DOLLAR DANGER

What is the United States doing to meet and remove the dollar danger? What should it do?

In his message to Congress on the balance-of-payments problem on July 18, President Kennedy understandably gave a most optimistic picture of the situation. After emphasizing all the strong factors in the U.S. position he conceded that "it is now clear that despite the favorable forces at work over the long run, more remains to be done today to eliminate the continuing payments deficit."

He called his tax reduction bill "the single most important step that can be taken to achieve balance abroad," and then proposed, as "the primary long-term means," 10 remedies. He stressed also the coming round of negotiations under the Trade Expansion Act, hopes for which have been dimmed by failure thus far in the Common Market. The other measures were, like his presentation of the problem, purely economic and monetary; the one exception aimed at reducing U.S. expenditures abroad, particularly on the military side in Europe. The President's proposals were mainly technical and at best stopgaps rather than cures, except for a vague suggestion for joint study "with our friends abroad" of "long-term improvement of the international monetary system"—with no indication of what should be done.[1]

Governor Rockefeller is the only Republican presidential aspirant who has thus far offered any alternative answer. His statement of September 2 on the balance-of-payments problem forthrightly emphasized the danger (see excerpts below). But he, too, was concerned only with its purely economic and monetary aspects and did not hint at the political and military factors of power politics that have been brought out here. Although he declared that "timid tinkering is a luxury we cannot afford," the five measures he recommended were no more radical than President Kennedy's. They were indeed of much the same nature, the main difference being that Governor would move sooner and more strongly. His program was disappointing since in his "Future of Federalism" he declares:

"The Federal idea, which our Founding Fathers applied in this historic act of political creation in the 18th century, can be applied in this 20th century—if we will but match our forefathers in courage and vision."

In his statement on the dollar danger, as in his previous one on sharing atomic power with NATO, the Governor overlooked a good opportunity to follow their revolutionary example. Missing were the courage and vision of their approach, and their understanding that the political, military, economic and monetary arms of national sovereignty are so interrelated that they must be tackled as a whole, through the creation of a common Federal Government. There is, however, cause to hope that the Governor will return to, and surpass, the level he reached in his book.

What should the United States do?

The stopgap measures to protect the dollar which the President and Governor propose are useful, but they do not touch either the worst immediate threat or the basic danger. Nor do they assure that the time needed to remove the latter will be gained.

To them the United States should add:

(a) Negative political action urgently needed to gain time, and (b) positive political action to use this time promptly to effect an enduring cure.

FOUR NEGATIVE TIMEGAINERS

(a) The negative action consists in ceasing to push four political policies that are intrinsically unsound, and that contribute decisively to President de Gaulle's distrust of Washington—the factor most capable of precipitating, however unintentionally, a run on the dollar. Along with this, Washington should make a strong effort to win his confidence. None of the four moves requires congressional action. All can be put into effect swiftly by the President, if he so desires. The four negative moves he should make are:

1. Avoid direct talks of any kind with Moscow on any questions that also concern France, Germany and other European allies.

Any agreements thus reached are either dangerously illusory in present conditions, or not worth the distrust they cause, or the time they take from more urgent work.

2. Cease under present conditions to give even implicitly top importance to reaching agreement with Moscow on any major question concerning Europe, whether by "Summit" or Big Five talks, or broader conferences at any high level.

These efforts too are not worth the suspicions they rouse, and they dangerously divert the United States from its important task.

3. Cease treating the problem of achieving effective democratic unification of the Atlantic Community as Washington's Cinderella, and give it top importance and priority until it is solved.

Such unification is essential to an enduring solution of the monetary problem—and of our economic and nuclear problems. It is also the prerequisite of any trustworthy and serious agreement with Moscow. As President Kennedy himself said of our Atlantic allies in his inaugural: "United there is little we cannot do * * * divided there is little we can do." To make our actions suit these words involves some early heart-to-heart talks with President De Gaulle on a fresh basis. It also involves dropping another longstanding U.S. policy—see the next point—that not only has caused much of the present tension but is unsound anyway. All this should put him in a mood to do nothing that might endanger the dollar, pending an enduring solution of the monetary problem.

4. Cease pushing for the creation of a European Union, and delaying effective Atlantic unification until it is achieved.

Face the fact that there is no possibility of advancing this project—Operation Dumbbell—in the near future in view of President De Gaulle's opposition to it, and that it is highly imprudent to delay Atlantic unification any longer. Face too the fact that there is even less possibility of securing British participation in such a European Union. Not only has this most roused President De Gaulle's distrust but Britain's probable Labor Prime Minister also opposes it.

Face finally the fact that Britain's absence in a European Union changes the situation radically. The United States rightly deemed British participation an essential safeguard against the dangers in Operation Dumbbell. Put Operation Dumbbell therefore on ice, at least. Cease wasting time in wishful waiting and use it to take a genuinely fresh look at other ways to unite Atlantica. Begin by giving President De Gaulle's long ignored views on this subject respectful consideration—if only because this will help get him to give similar consideration to some sounder solution.

Apart from these practical considerations, the fact is that it would be a major mistake to consummate politically Operation Dumbbell, namely, federate Europe so that it would balance in strength the United States and then unite the two by a bar called Atlantic partnership. Its very able European and American authors have had the best of motives. Until recently, it was generally considered the most practical way to advance Atlantic union. Its impressive achievements in European economic unity thus far—particularly the Common Market—have more than justified the effort, and have helped immensely to prove the case for Atlantic unification. Nonetheless, the political consummation of the operation would be charged with danger on both sides of the ocean.

When present emotions have cooled, I believe that most of its ardent champions will recognize this, and credit President de Gaulle with having given time for a sound solution to be reached. Whether they will still think his motives were wrong will depend on whether he too drops his own mistaken solution in favor of one that does the job. Surely the best way for Washington to get him to do so is to begin by admitting its own mistakes.

In these pages I have pointed out through the years a number of reasons why the dumbbell solution would prove to be dangerously unworkable. I have only touched, however, on the monetary side which concerns us here. This happens to offer one of the easiest ways of showing the hidden perils in it for both Europe and America.

Consider table 5 below. It compares the monetary reserves of the United States in June with the total for the Common Market Six, and for Britain. It shows that if the United States had achieved the political European union it has been seeking to create since 1945, the currency of that union's government would be backed by reserves amounting to $17,929 millions, while the dollar would have only $15,830 millions in gold behind it:

[1] Trial-balloon light on administration thought has since been given by an article in October Foreign Affairs on "Reforming the International Monetary System," by Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury. It rejects both returning to the old gold standard and going to the opposite extreme of abandoning any fixed price for gold. It would continue the present gold exchange system but add other "forms of credit" to those it now includes, and hints that the International Monetary Fund might possibly be given "the capacity to create credit and the power to allocate such credit among members."

TABLE 5.—*Central bank reserves of Common Market nations, United Kingdom, and United States*

[In millions of dollars]

Country	Total reserves		In gold		In dollars	
	June 1963	Year previous	June 1963	Year previous	June 1963	Year previous
Belgium	1,606	1,539	1,373	1,335	233	204
France	4,532	3,463	2,814	2,417	1,718	1,046
German Federal Republic	6,462	6,210	3,753	3,667	2,709	2,543
Italy	3,434	3,339	2,289	2,244	1,145	1,095
Netherlands	1,895	1,920	1,581	1,581	314	339
Common Market total	17,929	16,471	11,810	11,244	6,119	5,227
United Kingdom	4,352	4,471	[1] 2,447	2,618	1,905	1,853
Total if United Kingdom joined Common Market	22,281	20,942	14,257	13,862	8,024	8,180
U.S. gold reserve	15,830	16,182	15,830	16,182		

[1] Total United Kingdom gold in March, latest figure available.

NOTE.—U.S. law requires a gold reserve of $12,000,000,00 to guarantee internal circulation of the dollar.

Decline in U.S. reserve in past year: $352,000,000. Rise in Common Market reserve in past year: $1,458,000,000 (of which $566,000,000 in gold, $892,000,000 in dollars).

Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin for August 1963.

The true picture would be even worse, however, since $6,119 million of the European reserves are in dollars which a European union could require the United States to turn into gold. Subtracting these $6,119 million from the $15,830 million of the U.S. gold leaves the United States with only $9,711 million in gold—or $2,289 million short of the $12 billion reserve needed to guarantee its internal currency.

The United States would thus be reduced to a little more than half of the $18 billion held by the European union.

Had Washington succeeded in adding Britain to the European union, the latter's currency would have $22,281 millions behind its currency. If it turned its dollar reserves into gold, the United States would be left with only $7,806 millions in gold—about one-third of the European union's total.

With or without Britain, a European union's money would be the strongest in the world; it would replace the dollar as the currency of international trade; the dollar and the United States would lose their present prestige, and be in worse jeopardy than today, because all the other nations that now keep dollars as part of their monetary reserve would hasten to replace them with the solid European union currency. This would leave the United States with no gold at all back of either the domestic or foreign circulation of the dollar, while still facing billions of unhonored foreign claims—if it hadn't early devaluated or placed an embargo on gold. But either move would also destroy confidence in the dollar and in the United States.

Doubtless a European federal government would not let things be carried to the horrendous extremes that are theoretically possible. But those who think General de Gaulle is obsessed with the pursuit of grandeur should face the fact that a man, such as they assume him to be, might well have the power over a European union that he now has only in France.

At best, the existing dangers of a run on the dollar and another 1931–33 depression would be far worse had General de Gaulle sought to achieve a European federation, instead of to prevent it. At best, again, such a European union would be in the monetary driver's seat to a degree that would irk many Americans as much as U.S. nuclear domination of Atlantica irks General de Gaulle and many Europeans. One shudders to think of the fate of the American statesmen responsible for the creation of a sovereign European union, once its existence brought home the consequences of their policy.

One can understand more readily why European nationalists should bitterly blame the general for blocking its creation than why American nationalists should. It is still stranger that a major American incentive behind the effort to federate Europe has been, and is, a nationalistic one—to avoid the "sacrifice of national sovereignty" which Washington sees in the alternative. Washington fears this in an Atlantic federation as General de Gaulle fears it in a European one.

The economic crash and political disunion resulting from the shift in monetary predominance from America to Europe, which creation of a European federation would entail, would hurt freedom and the free in Europe as much as in America. Even if the two sovereign unions sowehow achieved a rough balance in the strength of their currencies, their inevitable rivalry would curse international trade with a very precarious basis for business. World trade has always flourished best when there was one clearly dominant world currency, whether the pound before World War I, or the dollar more recently.

So much for the negative political measures which the White House should take—in addition to the President's monetary and economic moves to improve the balance of payments—in order to remove the immediate danger long enough to solve the basic problem.

(b) We turn now to the positive side of the remedial program—what the United States should do in the time thus gained to achieved lasting monetary stability.

Here again the action must be primarily political since, as we have seen, the basic danger stems from a political source, namely, the prevailing doctrine of national sovereignty. This concept keeps the Atlantic community divided into independent national governments, even as regards their most interdependent monetary, economic, and military affairs. From it inevitably results the struggle for power among the stronger ones, and their use of the interrelated monetary, economic, and military arms, which now threaten the dollar.

In last analysis, the balance-of-payments difficulty is not the economic or monetary problem it is represented as being, any more than the present Atlantic nuclear arms question is a military one; primarily they are both political. They spring from the fact that the Atlantic community has achieved no greater unity than an alliance or association of sovereign national governments for a relatively small degree of military, monetary, and economic cooperation.

The way to remove lastingly the dangers inherent in the related Atlantic monetary, economic, and military affairs is to transform the present association or alliance into an Atlantic Federal Union, patterned broadly on the United States, Canadian, and Swiss federal systems.

By federation each of these people has enduringly removed all such dangers within their own territory.

Such a federal union would give Atlantica a common currency, a common market, a common defense force, and a common foreign policy. These would be governed by an Atlantic federal executive and Congress or parliament, elected by the people of the union, who would have equal citizenship in it—in addition to their present national citizenship. More details will be given later. What would be the monetary effect?

ATLANTICA'S VAST GOLD RESERVE

We saw in table 1 (not printed in the RECORD) that the gold reserves of the NATO allies total $31,598 million, or 76 percent of the total for the non-Communist world. This means that once the alliance is transformed into an Atlantic federation the union's common currency would have 76 percent of the non-Communist world's gold reserves behind it—more than twice the backing the dollar now (theoretically) has.

The present monetary danger to the dollar, we have seen, lies in the fact that the United States has only $3,830 million left in gold with which to meet short-term dollar claims held by foreign countries which total $20,893 million (deducting those held by such institutions as the International Monetary Fund), that 56 percent of these are held by NATO allies, and that Paris and Bonn together hold more than the United States has gold to pay them—without encroaching on the $12 billion earmarked billions.

It follows that the danger to the dollar lies within the Atlantic commuinty. But the other side of this medal is that Atlantic union would remove this danger completely.

Its creation would transform 56 percent of these foreign claims into internal short-term debts of the federation. Its gold stock of $31,598 million would amply meet the remaining $9,234 million of these foreign claims plus the much smaller total of short-term claims against the pound, franc, and other Atlantic currencies, now held by the rest of the world.

Clearly, Atlantic Union would remove enduringly the present monetary threat to the gold exchange standard and the consequent danger of another great depression. It would also remove the economic danger to monetary stability—both worldwide and domestic—in the present intra-Atlantica balance-of-payments problems of the United States, Britain, and other NATO nations. Thanks to Federal Union, no such balance-of-payment danger exists among the 50 States of the United States to threaten the U.S. currency. The boom, with full employment and rising standards of living, which the Common Market nations have enjoyed since they tried that fraction of the Federal solution, gives a hint of the blessings that would be heaped even more on the people of Atlantica once they began full federation. This would make their currency still more impregnable.

The military factors in the current dollar danger would also be removed at the same time by Atlantic Union. The present burden on the dollar, and the pound, resulting from the Armed Forces they maintain on the Continent would be shifted to the Union, and shared by all the other NATO nations. This would be a far safer solution than withdrawing these forces in present conditions. The cost of the forces maintained in the rest of the world, and all the foreign aid burden would be similarly shared.

The solidity of the Atlantic currency would be further strengthened, and the economy of all Atlantica healthily stimulated, by the enormous economies that would result from

the creation of a common Atlantic defense force. P. F. Brundage, Director of the Budget Bureau under President Eisenhower, has estimated that the United States alone would thus save at least $10 billion a year, while gaining stronger defense.[2] The savings for the other allies would be in proportion; and the appalling waste both in money and scientific-technological resources, which is inherent in independent United States, British, and French atomic efforts, would be ended.

The cut in taxes—and consequent further stimulus to business— that would result from all this cutting of costs would be far greater than that which the administration seeks now. Moreover, it would be healthy, for the union could cut taxes while balancing its budget, as the United States apparently can no longer do.

Along with these monetary, economic and military arms of power politics, Atlantic Union would remove the incentive—the compulsion—to build up and use these arms which is inherent in national sovereignty. It would disarm the people of the Atlantic nations in these regards in relation to one another in the same way and to the same degree that the people of the 50 States of the United States have disarmed themselves through their Federal Constitution. By the same token, it would arm the Atlantic union with the combined monetary, economic and military power of its member nations to defend the lives and liberties of their citizens from the Communist threat, whether atomic or subversive, and give the emerging nations the material and moral aid they need to develop free institutions.

Only Atlantic union can do all this. European union, by federating only halfway, fails as inevitably as would an attempt to cross a chasm 4 feet wide with a couple of 2-foot steps instead of one 4-foot jump. Operation Dumbbell's Atlantic partnership, instead of disarming Western Europe and North America in regard to each other, would arm the former against the latter monetarily, commercially, and militarily.

We have noted how that operation would divide Atlantica's monetary power and face world business with, at least, two fluctuating rival currencies, competing for top place. The "chicken war" should be sufficient warning of the ominous dangers inherent in Dumbbell's division of democratic economic power. Militarily, the motive that impelled the British to develop an atomic arm, and General de Gaulle to follow suit, would be irresistible in a European Union. It would be driven to the immense waste of building up equal "overkill" power with the American and the Soviet Union. The closer it got to this goal, the less the United States could depend on it in a Cuban-type crisis, the less it could count on the United States in a Berlin-type showdown—and the easier for Moscow to destroy both by divide-and-rule.

The primal danger in Operation Dumbbell boils down to this: Instead of eliminating national sovereignty's compulsion to play power politics, as Atlantic Union does, it reduces the democratic players to two, while it leaves each armed with monetary, economic, and military arms fatal to both, and lets each deadlock and cancel out the other, to the benefit only of dictatorship.

True, Atlantic Union would end the U.S. Government's atomic monopoly; it would give the Western Europeans the same democratic voice in atomic policy that American citizens have now. But French, German, British, Dutch, and other European lives and liberties are involved as much as those of Americans in any decision to risk atomic war. Is it wrong for all the citizens of Atlantica to have an equal vote in electing the government that takes such decisions? Is it right for American citizens to inflict on their fellow free men in Europe the tyranny of "atomic annihilation without representation"?

It is also true that Atlantic Union would end the dream of those who seek an "inward-looking" European Common Market or a political "third force," and it would require Europeans to do and pay their fair share of Atlantic defense. But in return it would open to them the vast U.S. market, and guarantee them a stable currency, and overwhelming defensive power. True, finally, that Atlantic Union would end the dream of Operation Dumbbell's Atlantic partnership, and the dream of a Europe des Etats confederation and an isolated "fortress America." But think what it would give in return:

Its tested Federal balance between Senate and House would guarantee Europeans not merely an equal but an effective voice with Americans in all Atlantic foreign policy and defense decisions, free from deadlock. Without the grave dangers inherent in a Europe des Etats, it would guarantee the French[3] what the De Gaulle confederation could not possibly assure—the direct and equal share with Americans in all those decisions which President De Gaulle insists on, and which Operation Dumbbell reduces to a fractional voice indirectly given through a European union government. And it would also guarantee the Americans what alliance and partnership can at best only promise, and what fortress America would hopelessly renounce—that the European half of the Atlantic community would stand with them in every emergency in the future, whether military, monetary, economic, or political.

At best, none of the alternatives could possibly do what a full-fledged Atlantic federation would—end with enduring victory, at long last, the "war to make the world safe for democracy." * * * safeguard freedom in all the non-Communist world as well as in Atlantica, safeguard it not merely from another world war but another monetary crash and depression.

[2] See P. F. Brundage, "Why Atlantic Union Would Cut Taxes and Outdo European Common Market Gains," Freedom & Union, January 1963; reprint available from our office, 10 cents.

[3] An Atlantic union would, of course, also assure this similarly to the British, Germans, Italians, Canadians, Dutch, and other nations in it.

John F. Kennedy Gave His Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of Friday, November 22, much has been written and much more will be written about President John F. Kennedy.

Undoubtedly there will come forth hereafter many articles, dissertations, and full-length books, and then the final pages of history will be written many years from now.

Right now, it seems to me, there is a sort of duty or obligation imposed on the membership of Congress, who served during this tragic week, to screen out or comb through the best in editorial comments, in their respective districts and, after a determination of what seems to be the best, insert these editorials and comments as a part of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

By so doing, there can be preserved a cross section of American thought from every corner of our United States. These spontaneous writings coming at a time when the writer feels the spirit in the air, of these last few days, should not be lost but made a part of the permanent record.

As a noteworthy instance, I have asked consent that there be printed in the RECORD the leading editorial from the Kansas City Times of Saturday morning, November 23, 1963, which follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY, WHO GAVE HIS LIFE

This Nation and the world stand in shock today.

This Nation and the world have lost, in a few moments of terrible finality, a young and vigorous leader who had found his place on the stage of history. John F. Kennedy died for his country, as did his brother in a moment of wartime violence. More has been lost in the last few hours than could possibly be put into words. And with the loss there is a scar, now, across the face of the Republic.

Yet in finality there is a beginning. With the prayers and sympathy for Mrs. Kennedy and her children, there must be the hope and the prayers of the Nation and the world for President Lyndon B. Johnson. If the reins of democracy are dropped in the flash of an assassin's bullet, they must be seized at once. Death closes a chapter; it must open another.

We do not know what animated the wretched assassin. But we are struck by the comparison with another excruciatingly difficult period of history in which another President, Abraham Lincoln, gave his life.

Less than 3 years ago the youthful John F. Kennedy took over the heavy responsibilities of his office at a fateful time for the U.S. role in the world and for far-reaching decisions at home. He showed the courage to face down the threats and power of Soviet Russia. He carried forward the responsibilities of American world leadership against widespread misunderstanding and recrimination at home. He displayed beyond a doubt a deep conception of this world's problems, a deep understanding of the cold war and of the meaning of international communism.

In domestic affairs he had the courage to move forward, moderately but firmly, to carry out the mandates of the Constitution for all American citizens. For this, too, he encountered widespread recrimination, but he showed no fear of opposition at home or abroad.

A young man, arriving in the final hours of a generation of older world leaders, he quickly earned the respect of the people of other nations. But the years were to be tragically short.

Not for more than six decades—in those terrible 8 days when President McKinley struggled in vain for his life—has the Nation witnessed so awful an upheaval in its political life. It is the type of thing, the United States has told itself, that happens elsewhere; but not here in this mid-20th century. We know otherwise, now, and we should know, too, what fruit can grow from the seeds of hatred, whatever the source of hatred may be.

So it is the morrow of a day of death. History must move on. The mantle falls upon Lyndon B. Johnson and we can take heart in the fact that he is a man with training for this job. As majority leader of the Senate, he was close to the problems of nations and the cold war. As John F. Kennedy's Vice President, he was in the inner council, a man who has moved easily in the halls of state.

As was John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson will be tested and probed by the Communists and other enemies of freedom. We can take comfort, however, in the knowledge that he has been prepared for the ordeal of fire.

The business of freedom and democracy must not end and it never will. John F. Kennedy died the death of a martyr for his country and Lyndon Johnson stands in his stead. For all Americans, it is a time to rally around their new President. For the Republic, it is a time of the deepest sorrow and a time of prayer.

Teenage Scientists Are Encouraged by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg and Featured in "Science All Stars" TV Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the need for more young people to plan for careers in science is stressed by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in a recent address set out below. He urges us all to improve school curricula and to make careers in science more attractive to young people.

Dr. Seaborg spoke at a conference announcing a new network TV series called "Science All Stars." It will feature the work of award winners of school science fairs around the country.

Dr. Seaborg is to be complimented for his attention to this important problem in education, and the company sponsoring the TV program, Honeywell, is to be congratulated for taking the lead in showing what American industry can do to help our schools and Nation find and encourage new scientific talent.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF DR. GLENN T. SEABORG, CHAIRMAN OF THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AT A PRESS CONFERENCE AND PREVIEW OF "SCIENCE ALL STARS"

Many scientists enter their chosen fields because of some spark that was struck in them early in their lives. For example, I am a chemist today, largely through the influence of an inspiring high school teacher, and I know of many other instances of the same nature. For this reason, what happens to the potential scientist in his formative years is most important. We know of men who have gone on to significant accomplishments as a result of an early interest. What we do not know is how many potential Einsteins or Fermis or Lawrences may have been lost to the world because there were no favorable circumstances to lead them into the paths of scientific achievement.

There have been considerable improvements in the teaching of science and mathematics in the high schools in recent years, but much remains to be done. Curricula still are in need of improvement to take into account the great advances in knowledge over the last decade or so. In too many instances, courses such as chemistry, biology, and general science are taught by people without college degrees in science. There still is little incentive for the able and well-trained person to teach science in the high school, since the status and monetary rewards of such a career are small compared to those of other fields you can enter.

President Kennedy in his recent speech at the centennial celebration of the National Academy of Sciences made an eloquent case for the need of our country to foster pure science. It has become quite obvious that modern scientific developments warrant large expenditures of money. We now know that the search for new knowledge, if not restricted to subjects of foreseeable and immediate practical importance, results in an unexpected increase in our understanding of physical or biological phenomena.

These increases, in turn, give rise to far-reaching practical applications which could not have been anticipated from the original basic research. Our scientific knowledge and technology are advancing at an explosive rate. The time lag between the discovery of a fundamentally new scientific principle and its application in engineering or medicine is now very short, and these rapid developments are changing the lives of all of us in many ways which we only dimly perceive.

An equally basic requirement for scientists and technological growth is an adequate number of able scientists to supply new ideas and to direct them along fruitful lines of research. Money alone will not produce scientific excellence; our progress depends on a relatively small number of creative and persistent people. We cannot afford to lose the talents of any such person through lack of proper educational opportunities.

There is another requirement that, in our democratic society, is perhaps as important as the training of scientists and engineers. This is the need for increasing the nonscientist's understanding of the basic principles and purposes of science. As I have said before, we are in the midst of the third revolution—the scientific revolution—which will have as profound effects on our lives as the American Revolution which laid the foundations for our Nation, and the industrial revolution which made it a world power. Increasingly, our important national decisions are based on scientific considerations. If our Nation is to continue to operate successfully as a democracy, the voting public must have some basic understanding of what science is about. Therefore, we need to improve the scientific education given to the great majority of students who will not become scientists, as well as that given those who will undertake scientific or engineering careers. Courses directed specifically to this end should become part of the college and university curriculums throughout the Nation.

Available studies indicate that there will be an increasing shortage of scientists and engineers unless careers in science are made more attractive to the young people now in our high schools and elementary schools. Various things can be done to achieve this objective. For one thing, we can show by our attitudes that we recognize and value the work of the scientist and engineer. I suspect that today a good football player still has considerably more status in school than the good science student. I don't mean to imply that I am anti-football, because I am not, but I do feel that scientific excellence should be valued at least as much as athletic excellence. Similarly, the high school teacher should be respected and honored as one who makes a really valuable contribution to our society.

As I have stated, we need further improvement in the science curriculums, both for those students who are potential scientists and those who will enter other fields. We need to find ways to fire able students with enthusiasm for scientific endeavor early in their lives, rather than making them feel that science and mathematics courses are drudgery. And we need to find ways to keep more able students—both in the sciences and in other fields—in the high schools and colleges so that they will not add to the already alarming number of half-trained and dropouts.

We live in an age in which, for better or worse, the influence of science is pervasive and revolutionary. It is a part of our culture which is shaping nearly every aspect of our lives and our institutions. Properly nurtured and employed, science can provide us with marvelous tools for the solution of many of the weighty problems of our physical and social world. Because of our growing and inescapable dependence on modern science and technology for our defense, our national growth, our economic well-being and social freedoms, we must regard trained brainpower as a precious natural resource and carefully nurture it. The promise of the future lies in the hands of the dedicated and the educated.

President John F. Kennedy's Great Contribution to National Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a very timely article, stressing the great contribution of our late President John F. Kennedy to the revival of culture in this country and the world, that appeared in the November 26 issue of the Worcester, Mass., Evening Gazette, authored by Mr. Ivan Sandrof, the distinguished literary editor of the combined Telegram-Gazette newspapers.

The article follows:

WORLD OF CULTURE HAS LOST AN ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORTER

(By Ivan Sandrof)

The death of John F. Kennedy struck down not only a President of the United States and a statesman, but a scholar. Bookmen, savants, poets, prosemen, actors, musicians—the entire world of culture, have reason to mourn, for not since the days of Jefferson have the arts had a more warm and enthusiastic supporter.

The active support of our culture was more than shared by Mrs. Kennedy. This year, for example, the White House appointed a special consultant on the arts, August Heckscher. The President was in favor of the National Cultural Center to be built in Washington.

The cultural events at the White House are too familiar to repeat. But the image made its point; culture had assumed a new, national dignity and importance. It was said well by Heckscher, who observed that the President cared about the life of the mind; he cared for excellence in all fields. And so he was led to care for the arts, which he felt to be bound up with the well-being and the vitality of the Nation.

A WRITER HIMSELF

"He reminded our writers and poets, our musicians and painters and actors and playwrights that what they aspire to and achieve is of central importance to us all."

Perhaps it all stemmed from a deep-rooted drive, the creative urge of the writer. Kennedy's book, "Profiles in Courage," won the Pulitzer prize for biography in 1957. His friends said this honor meant more to him than any other.

There is reason to believe that he once considered a career as a writer. Looking back, there are clues. At his inauguration, the late Robert Frost, poet, was in the spotlight. Only last October 26 President Kennedy was in Amherst to honor the opening of the Robert Frost Memorial Library.

ONETIME REVIEWER

Edward A. Laycock, veteran book editor of the Boston Globe and one of the best known critics in New England, recalls a shy young man who once asked if he could review books, and did for a time. His name was John F. Kennedy.

And so the clues appear and reappear that he loved the written word. Rocking away in his favorite chair, he read widely and well—perhaps the happiest moments of his Presidency.

While he was Senator, after 1953, Kennedy delivered a memorable speech calling for an end of war between writers and politicians. Among his telling points: "We award medals and memorials to distinguished civil servants, to famous military men, to outstanding scientists, and, of course, to retiring politicians—but nothing to distinguished authors. I have serious doubts that a national poet laureate could ever get Senate confirmation," he said. "We subsidize beetgrowers, silver miners, fertilizer spreaders, and even honeybees—but not authors."

PEACE BY RECOGNITION

Senator Kennedy affirmed that "Peace between these longtime enemies will be achieved not by an accentuation of our differences but by a recognition of our similarities, of all we have in common, of all we share and should share."

He disclosed that the Nation's first great politicians included most of the Nation's first great writers and scholars. "The founders of the American Constitution were also the founders of American scholarship. The works of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, Franklin, Paine, John Adams, and Samuel Adams * * * influenced the literature of the world as well as its geography. Books were their tools, not their enemies."

He decried the fact that there were not more men of political courage, willing to go out on a limb for what they believe, and the rise of awareness in a modern politician "that what he says but never writes can almost always be denied; but that what he writes and never remembers may someday come back to haunt him."

A POINT MADE

To prove his point, he told the story of a famous Senator of half a century ago who had become so accustomed to political caution and guarded opinions that when he went to see the Siamese twins he warily asked the guard at the exhibit, "Brothers, I presume?"

And again, he invoked a similarly inclined and similarly cautious Senator of a generation ago, William B. Allison, of Iowa, about whom it was said "that if a piano were constructed reaching from the Senate Chamber to Des Moines, Allison could run all the way on the keys without ever striking a note."

The President-to-be stressed again how inextricably entwined are the professions and the fates of our politicians and writers, and pleaded for "the synthesis of our efforts and talents [that] may provide a greater service to the cause of freedom—a bulwark to meet the challenge of the future."

Those watching television Sunday saw a man in a drenching rain pushing a dolly from the White House with two rocking chairs, topsy-turvy, the rockers upside down. Here was the full malignant finality: He would rock and read no more.

And the final bitter irony. The assassin did his dirty work in a warehouse of books and sat on a carton of books as he rested his rifle on the window sill and brought to an end the head of the Nation.

Kennedy Legend Will Live On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, thousands of words have been written since the tragic event of Friday, November 22. Perhaps the dominant or overbearing reaction even yet is one of disbelief.

First, it was incredible that a fanatic assassin could murder our President. Then this was made even worse by the act of a self-appointed prosecutor, judge, juror, and executioner who, during our mourning, fired another bullet ending the life of the President's assassin. Few will ever weep the death of Lee Oswald but these same persons realize that a man accused of the most heinous crime is entitled to a trial.

This is why it is so difficult to even classify or identify all the changing emotions of this past week. But one thing is beginning to take shape and that is the fact that even in death President John Kennedy will continue to serve his country. It is this thought that is dominant in a combined editorial-feature story appearing upon the front page of the Kansas City Star of Sunday, November 24, and written by the editor and publisher of that paper, Roy A. Roberts, one of the leading journalists in America today, the first half of which follows:

KENNEDY LEGEND WILL LIVE ON

I am confident that the legend of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, living after the man, will drive forcefully toward his two major goals; The peace of the world and the rights of mankind.

Even in the sorrow of the moment, it is possible to see that in the long course of history the legend may prove more effective than was the vibrant national and world leadership of John Kennedy.

But what a shocking price it is to pay. What a pointless sacrifice of a human life at the hands of an assassin.

If I know the American people—and I believe that I do—they are sentimental and they are fine. They cherish the memory of a man and oftentimes in their midst, the honored legend of one of their fallen fellows carries further than did his voice, however eloquent and powerful.

We can know, certainly, that the legend of John Kennedy will not quickly pass. In these few terrible hours it has been inscribed on the Nation's consciousness. Both the man and the legend have their place in history and both will grow with the decades. Violent death, pointless death, so often guarantees that it will be so.

And, in the case of the late President, it could be no other way. He was first in so many things.

He was the first President elected to the space age.

He was the first Roman Catholic President.

He was, almost unique in our history, a truly urban President.

He was the first President to carry for long—although Dwight Eisenhower knew the burden in his later years—the awesome responsibility of the finger on the button. He knew that the moment of decision could come and that civilization, in the push of a button, could be reduced to chaos.

Throughout the story of the Republic, there has always been the lonely man in the White House, ordained by his people to make the decisions. The Presidency has always been an assignment of terrible burden. But from the other day henceforth, until man learns to control these nuclear forces, the burden has grown and will continue to grow. It is a time of no second-guessing and beyond peace lies death.

Thus does the happenstance of time ennoble and enshrine the legend of the young President struck down because of some twisted mind's decision. In sorrow, animosities are buried. From grief grows the memory that works on for the cause.

Certainly the immediate impact of the tragedy has sobered the Nation. I hope, indeed, that it will erase permanently some of the fierce antagonisms of the forthcoming campaign. I do know that the American people, as they have always done in moments of emergency past, will close ranks in this dark time. Because it has always been thus, this Nation has reached its heights of freedom and democracy.

State Conservation Council Honors Eleanor McClatchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a story which appeared in the Saturday, November 2, 1963, edition of the Fresno Bee concerning an honor reward which has been granted by the California Conservation Council to Miss Eleanor McClatchy. Miss McClatchy, who is the publisher of the McClatchy newspapers in California, is richly deserving of this honor because of the ceaseless interest of herself and her newspapers in behalf of conservation.

The article follows:

STATE CONSERVATION COUNCIL HONORS ELEANOR MCCLATCHY

PASADENA.—The California Conservation Council last night voted its honor award to Eleanor McClatchy and merit awards to Charles Raymond Clar and Charles A. DeTurk, all of Sacramento.

Miss McClatchy, publisher of the Sacramento Bee and the McClatchy newspapers, was named for the award because of "her continual personal support of conservation practices and the strong editorial support of the McClatchy newspapers against desecration of California's landscape."

Clar, assistant executive officer of the State board of forestry, received a merit award because of his contribution to forest firefighting techniques and conservation practices through the authorship of several books.

HEADS PARKS

DeTurk is director of the State department of parks and recreation. His award is for outstanding contributions toward the conservation of California's landscape during his

5 years as chief of the division of beaches and parks and as director of the department, and as a cooperator with Federal agencies and citizens programs in the cause of conservation."

In addition to the Sacramentans, other award recipients were:

Honor: Mrs. J. H. Comby, of Whittier; State Senator Fred S. Farr, of Carmel; Charles S. Jones, chairman of the board of the Richfield Oil Co.; and Albert McKee, Jr., president of Ducks Unlimited.

MERIT AWARDS

Merit: Edward W. Demars, director of county planning, Monterey and Salinas; Dr. Herbert L. Mason, professor of botany emeritus, University of California; Edward O. Pearson, recreation specialist in outdoor education; Dr. William H. Wake, professor of geography, University of Southern California, and Mrs. Helen Mary Williams and Mrs. Cora S. Wilson, teachers in the Pasadena school system.

The awards were announced by Dr. Pearl Chase, president of the conservation council at the organization's annual meeting.

House Committee on Banking and Currency, Under Chairman Wright Patman, Seeks To Inform Itself on Facts of Our Nation's Banking System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the subject of "Banking" is the first business of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, under the rules of this House—rule XI, 4(a). Under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the committee has assembled an expert staff and is now engaged in a conscientious effort to gather all available information on the banking system.

Recognizing the soundness of this method of proceeding for the committee charged with insuring a sound banking structure, a recent Washington Post editorial delineates some of the subjects on this which information is now being gathered. I include that editorial:

BANKING SURVEYS

Without a knowledge of changing trends and managerial practices within the industry, Congress cannot intelligently regulate the banking services which are vital to economic stability and growth. An excellent beginning has been made by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, chaired by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, and its efforts to gather information should be continued on an expanded scale.

During the past year, the committee, working in cooperation with industry groups, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve System has circulated questionnaires which provide valuable information on the market for bank stock, management succession policies, correspondent relationships between banks and banking services for exporters. In undertaking these surveys and conducting special studies, the committee has assembled an able permanent staff and in addition has utilized the part-time services of experts in the academic community.

Mr. PATMAN is now asking the House Administration Committee to approve a larger budget for next year. The additional funds would be used to study the effects of changes in bank examining procedures and judgments on the monetary system. Aspects of foreign branch banking, the United States and domestic savings and loan industry might also be investigated.

We hope that the members of the Administration Committee will accede to Mr. PATMAN'S requests. For without a clear grasp of the structural changes now occurring within the banking industry, it would be foolhardy to draw up new legislation for its regulation.

Soil Bank Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker many of my colleagues and I have been urging throughout this session that the agricultural conservation reserve contracts be continued.

I believe this editorial, which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on Monday, November 25, 1963, clearly states the case:

SOIL BANK SHOULD BE CONTINUED

Department of Agriculture spokesmen have been boasting that the present farm program cut the surplus of feed grains. There has been a modest reduction, but there are strong prospects the oversupply in Government hands will increase with next year's crop.

A main reason is that nearly 7½ million acres of land will come out of the soil bank at the end of 1963. A million and a half of those acres are in Minnesota.

At the end of last year 1,399,000 acres were scheduled to come out of the soil bank in the Nation, 203,000 acres in Minnesota. Congress voted a 1-year extension of the plan. Owners of 700,000 acres in the United States, 90,000 acres in Minnesota took advantage of the extension.

The Senate this year voted a 2-year extension of the soil bank but the House gives no indication of action before 1963 expires. Thus a big share of the soil bank land seems likely to come back into production and create another crop surplus in 1964.

After the first of the year Minnesota still will have 951,000 acres in the soil bank and some of them will be idled until 1972. But unless Congress acts quickly the soil bank will quickly lose force as a deterrent to crop output.

A couple of other programs remain in effect. The feed grain program provides that up to 40 percent of normal corn and grain sorghum acreage (up to 50 percent next year) may be idled at an average payment of about $18 an acre. These are only 1-year arrangements.

A cropland conversion program provides for a smaller payment, though the owner can make limited use of the land. But only $10 million has been allotted to this plan.

The soil bank, especially when applied to entire farms, is the best crop control found so far. Until something better can be found, Congress should extend it—even expand it.

Dr. Pollack on the Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 13, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include an address by Dr. Gerald A. Pollack, international economist of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, before the National Foreign Trade Convention in New York, November 20, 1963, on "Influences on the Future of the Balance of Payments":

INFLUENCES ON THE FUTURE OF THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(By Gerald A. Pollack, international economist, Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, presented at the 50th National Foreign Trade Convention, the Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N.Y., November 20, 1963)

I greatly appreciate the opportunity of participating in this roundtable. As the chairman has stated, my appearance is entirely in my personal capacity as observer of the balance-of-payments scene. I do not speak for the Congress, the Joint Economic Committee, or any of its members, or the administration.

I. PROBLEMS OF FORECASTING THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The task assigned to me—to peer into the future of the balance of payments—is hazardous, if not impossible. The past record of economists in forecasting is humbling. In an article in the New York Times, titled "Economics Isn't Funny, but Economists Are," George Schwartz observed that "most forecasts of a coming scarcity have generally been the signal for a glut." The deficits in the U.S. balance of payments began in 1950, but the forecasters of chronic dollar shortage were just beginning to hit their stride at that time. And their concern over the dollar shortage continued to mount even as the very problem that alarmed them was in the process of disappearing. His own experiences at forecasting led Sir Donald MacDougall, an eminent British economist, to remark philosophically that "the only thing which can be said with certainty about any country's balance of payments is that it changes when one least expects it, and often in the opposite direction." He observed further:

"There is a strong human tendency to assume that the balance of payments cannot change very much from what it is at the moment. This may be due to natural conservatism or perhaps to lack of imagination. In fact it can change very rapidly. The fundamental reason is, I suppose, that it is a marginal part of a marginal part. The balance is a marginal part of the total trade and the trade is in turn a marginal part of the national income." A Danish humorist summed it all up when he stated that "it is difficult to make forecasts, particularly about the future."

I will make no attempt to provide a quantitative forecast of the balance of payments. But for those who are interested in the details of such a forecast, I suggest a careful reading of the study by a group of Brookings Institution authors entitled "The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968." This study, commissioned by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was first published by the Joint Economic Committee and was

the chief focus of the hearings held by our committee on July 29 and 30, 1963. At that time Mr. Lederer was one of our expert witnesses, and his excellent statement, now published in the committee's hearings, illuminates that practical difficulties involved. The Joint Economic Committee has just released a compendium of 68 critical statements on the Brookings projections which assess, from varying points of view, the likelihood that the projections will actually be realized. The Brookings authors themselves wrote: "The value of the projection lies less in its quantitative result than in the process of obtaining the result, for that process identifies the kinds and direction of influences that will determine the future development of the basic payments position of the United States." The consensus among the four expert witnesses who testified before the Joint Economic Committee in July and the 68 whose views have now been published is that the Brookings effort, while admirable in many ways, should not be relied upon as a guide to future balance-of-payments developments.

My discussion today will be devoted to three important problem areas in the balance of payments, each of which has a major bearing on the future of the U.S. international payments position: U.S. competitiveness in world markets; American investments abroad; and Government expenditures abroad for aid and defense.

II. THE U.S. COMPETITIVE POSITION IN WORLD MARKETS

In 1962, U.S. exports, excluding goods transferred under military grants, were $20.5 billion, nearly 65 percent of total U.S. receipts (credits) from abroad; and imports were $16.1 billion, around 47 percent of total U.S. payments (debits). A small percentage increase in exports relative to imports could, given these large magnitudes, eliminate the balance-of-payments deficit. Suppose, for example, that last year's exports had been 6 percent higher and imports 6 percent lower, and that the higher exports were paid for in cash, not with credit from the United States. These hypothetical changes would have improved the balance of payments by $2,196 million, or $10 million more than would have been required to eliminate last year's deficit.

An improved trade balance would offer by far the best solution to the U.S. problem. For if the trade balance could be made to adjust to the capital outflows, Government oversea spending programs, and other noncurrent account debit items, the United States would be freed of the restraints which the balance of payments now imposes, and could abandon such inherently undesirable policies as tying aid, buying American when the budget cost is higher here than abroad, raising interest rates when unemployment is high, and interfering with private capital flows. In short, improving the surplus on goods and services provides the key to a solution of the balance-of-payments problem within the context of a liberal commercial and financial policy framework—a framework which embodies the principles long championed by the United States. And that is why the Government is united in emphasizing an improvement in the current account as a primary objective in its program to improve the balance of payments.

An important element in such an improvement is an increase in foreign prices relative to American—a favorable change in other words in the U.S. international competitive position. Price stability in the United States, therefore, is a matter of great importance for international as well as domestic reasons. Of course, in classical theory, declining rather than merely stable prices should be the objective of policy, since the theory envisages that money wages and prices could decline without unemployment or reduced output and real incomes. But rigidities in the actual world have caused deflation to bear more severely on output and employment than on prices, and countries today are reluctant to incur heavy social costs as a result of imbalance in their international accounts.

The recent record of the United States has been excellent with respect to price stability and the stability of labor costs per unit of output. The index of wholesale prices of all commodities was 100.3 of the 1957–59 level in mid-October, a hair below the average for all of 1958. The wholesale index of industrial prices was lower in mid-October than it has been at any time after early 1959. And an index of labor costs per unit of output in all manufacturing industries was below the 1957–59 average at the end of September.

The situation in Europe contrasts strongly with that of the United States. Between 1959 and 1962, wholesale prices rose 7.5 percent in France, 8.3 percent in Germany, 6.4 percent in the United Kingdom, 7.5 percent in Sweden, and 4.2 percent in Italy, while the U.S. increase was only one-tenth of 1 percent. The change in unit labor costs offers an even more striking contrast. Between 1959 and 1962, such costs rose 27 percent in Germany, 10 percent in France, 13 percent in the United Kingdom, and 18 percent in the Netherlands. On the other hand, unit labor costs in the United States fell 1 percent during the same period.

These developments are gratifying from the balance-of-payments point of view. But we cannot rely complacently on a continuation of past trends. The monthly survey of the National Association of Purchasing Agents for October reported that the percentage of firms encountering higher commodity prices rose to the highest level in 5 years. For their part, the European countries have become concerned about inflationary trends in their countries and have taken measures to achieve greater stability. A number of them have adopted "incomes" policies to keep wages and salaries from rising at a faster rate than productivity. (The use of policies of this type and other relevant policies in various countries is discussed in a Joint Economic Committee publication released last month entitled "Governmental Policies To Deal With Prices in Key Industries in Selected Foreign Countries.") In September France announced a major program to halt inflation.

It is clear that, while we may well continue to benefit from cost and price increases in Europe, it would be prudent not to rely exclusively or even primarily on developments abroad to cure our balance-of-payments deficits. The experience of the European countries in the years after World War I has made them especially sensitive to inflation and anxious to avoid its occurrence. It is urgent, therefore, that public and private policies in the United States be addressed to developing cost-reducing methods of production, product innovation, and other measures to enhance the marketability and promote the sale of American products abroad.

The EEC, as is well known, threatens to impair U.S. exports to the Common Market countries, particularly exports of agricultural products. Speaking before a group of U.S. lawyers in Brussels in September, Robert Marjolin, Vice President of the EEC Commission, argued that the EEC has been a force for trade liberalization. But he noted certain exceptions. The EEC press release of September 24, 1963, stated that "Mr. Marjolin acknowledged that unusual economic circumstances have made necessary certain EEC exceptions to the overall pattern of liberalization. But he stressed that these measures were comparable to steps that the EEC's free-world trading partners would have taken to meet similar conditions."

This is, as we must all acknowledge, an argument of striking logic and force. Thus might a traffic violator tell his judge that, while he was speeding as charged, he was going no faster than the judge would have gone if the judge had been in as much of a hurry. And it is only a little step further to come to the clinching argument, "If you knew as much as I do, you would see things my way." I am afraid that we cannot find much reassurance in Mr. Marjolin's explanation of the "certain EEC exceptions to the overall pattern of liberalization." The EEC poses a real threat to American exports, and we will have to be aggressive in using the authority of the Trade Expansion Act and normal channels of diplomacy to prevent or mitigate adverse consequences.

III. AMERICAN INVESTMENTS ABROAD

I turn now to American investments abroad. The effect of these investments on the balance of payments has been the subject of much misunderstanding. The cumulative effect of investments made abroad has been to generate a return stream of income receipts which has in recent years reached impressive dimensions—$3,850 million in 1962 alone. There has been a tendency to compare the returns on international investment with annual investment outflows, and to conclude from the equivalence, or near equivalence, of the respective amounts that capital outflows have little, if any, adverse impact on the balance of payments. But this line of reasoning is misleading.

Let us look first at portfolio investments. We know that profitable portfolio investments pay back over the long run more than they cost the balance of payments in the short run. The longrun effect is favorable. But it takes a long period for investment returns to accumulate to the initial balance-of-payments drain resulting from the act of investment. The income returns from abroad in 1962 were only in small measure related to the capital outflows of that year. The bulk of these returns stemmed from American investments made throughout the past. If not a single dollar of new capital had flowed abroad in 1962, the income remitted from foreign investments would not have been substantially different.

Direct investments are more difficult to analyze. Their unfavorable short-term effects on the balance of payments may not in all cases be offset by long-term benefits. Some direct investments abroad may, in other words, permanently injure the U.S. balance-of-payments position. Direct investments give rise to certain kinds of exports—capital goods, industrial materials, components, and perhaps finished products complementary with those produced abroad. But they also displace exports from the United States with oversea production, and we must suppose that, at least in some cases, these exports would not have been lost in the absence of the U.S. investment abroad. Moreover, the amount of exports displaced may grow over the long run as subsidiaries which begin by importing components and parts from the United States expand their operations so as to produce these items abroad.

The Brookings Institution study summed up the problem by stating: "The crux of a judgment as to whether foreign direct investment improves or weakens the U.S. balance of payments is the actual amount of the displacement of domestic production by imports and by loss of exports as a result of sales from foreign subsidiaries." And Hal B. Lary, author of the important work "Problems of the United States as World Trader and Banker," stated before the Joint Economic Committee: "I doubt that anyone can make a valid generalization in the present state of knowledge. Some cause for concern is, nevertheless, suggested by * * * trade in research-intensive products * * * our export performance over the past decade has been weakest in some of the products in which our investment in European manu-

facturing has been most active. One may worry lest our exports now falter in some other lines in which, more recently, American manufacturing facilities in Europe have been rapidly expanding."

Some actual figures suggest the magnitude of the problem. In 1962, sales by direct foreign investments in manufacturing totaled $28.1 billion, more than 50 percent above the 1957 volume and nearly $8 billion more than U.S. exports in that year. In the same period, U.S. exports increased less than 6 percent. The Department of Commerce selected certain groups of manufactured products and found for such groups that sales from foreign plants of U.S. companies grew much faster than exports from the United States. Since 1957, the value of foreign production of products in these groups rose more than $7 billion, while exports increased by a little more than $1 billion; adding U.S. exports and foreign sales by U.S. direct investments abroad, exports declined from 38 percent of the total in 1957 to 31 percent in 1962. These figures show that American corporations are supplying an increasing share of the foreign market from their production facilities abroad. And they suggest that a substantial volume of exports may be displaced as a result of direct investments abroad.

Until we can determine whether direct investments are favorable or unfavorable for the balance of payments, there is little point in going further and estimating capital outflows in future years. At the same time we should be wary of the common tendency to associate all investments abroad with benefits to the United States. After all, the limiting case would have all sales abroad handled by U.S. subsidiaries in foreign countries, and no exports whatever. If that occurred, the United States would have an extremely favorable international asset position and it would enjoy a large volume of dividends, interest returns, and profit remittances. But few would say that the country would be better off.

IV. GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES ABROAD

I turn finally to Government expenditures abroad. Here I must remind you that I am speaking only for myself, and not for the Congress or the administration. I have little to say about aid programs. It is evident from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that support for the programs has diminished somewhat, and appropriations have been under downward pressure. Since aid expenditures result in U.S. exports, at least in part, a dollar cut from aid expenditures is less than a dollar saved to the balance of payments. A study by the Agency for International Development estimated that from 70 to 75 percent of total economic assistance resulted in additional U.S. exports of goods and services in the period 1957–58 and 1961–62.

Military expenditures in the balance of payments have been in the forefront since Under Secretary of Defense Gilpatric's Chicago speech of October 19, but they were, of course, a matter of concern even before. Mr. Gilpatric said: "This Big Lift exercise will demonstrate our ability to project our military power far more quickly over far larger distances than has ever been the case in the past. By employing such a multibase capability the United States should be able to make useful reductions in its heavy oversea military expenditures without diminishing its effective military strength or its capacity to apply that strength swiftly in support of its worldwide policy commitments." But he carefully added: "Any such adjustments will, of course, be based on consultation with our major allies and so far as possible upon agreed NATO policies. In particular we look forward to continued close understanding with our allies in the Federal Republic of Germany who share with us a primary responsibility for the central front of the Western Alliance. The central object of our policy will we unchanged: to sustain a major American presence in the defense of Western Europe at all levels of force."

Now all I know about the Government's program in this area is what I read in the papers. Let's see what kind of a story can be pieced together from the New York Times and the Washington Post. The West German Defense Minister said that "he had been assured repeatedly, by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara in particular, that the United States planned no reductions in military strength in Germany." (New York Times, October 24.) "Secretary of State Dean Rusk assured Chancellor Ludwig Erhard today that the United States has no plans to withdraw in the immediate future any of its forces now stationed in West Germany." (Washington Post, October 26.) "Despite official disclaimers, Pentagon leaders definitely plan a reduction of U.S. military forces in Europe. But it will be Air Force units in Britain, France, and Spain, not Army troops in Germany, that will be brought home." (Washington Post, October 27.) "Recall of a U.S. regiment in Germany reported near, 5,000 soldiers would be withdrawn—other scheduled moves also appear to contradict officials' assurance." (New York Times, October 31.) On November 18, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said: "We are continuing the essential effort to reduce the impact of defense spending on our balance of payments * * * without reducing the combat ground forces deployed in Europe, and while strengthening our overall combat effectiveness."

What does it all mean? Again I must say that I speak entirely unofficially, and have no inside knowledge whatever. We know for a fact that military spending in the Western European NATO countries is over $1.5 billion a year. Spending of this magnitude in an area that tends to accumulate reserves has been a large drain on the U.S. balance of payments and on U.S. gold reserves. The administration's emphasis on curtailing these expenditures is certainly understandable. And the President stated, in his July 18, 1963, message on the balance of payments that "the annual rate of expenditures abroad by the Department of Defense will be reduced—by measures to be put into effect before the end of calendar year 1964—by more than $300 million from the 1962 level."

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it seems to me that the outlook for the balance of payments looks brighter than it has for a number of years. The third quarter results are definitely encouraging. And the situation of a number of European countries has weakened somewhat recently. Italy, in particular, has run into balance-of-payments difficulties. It now appears that Italy will have a large deficit this year. The French balance-of-payments surplus appears to be declining, with imports in a strong uptrend. The Netherlands has found it difficult to maintain its noninflationary wage policy, and is suffering some deterioration in competitive position. Inflationary pressures are evident in Belgium, but borrowing abroad to finance the domestic budget deficit has preserved the level of Belgian international reserves. Switzerland, despite a large trade deficit, appears to remain in a strong reserve position, benefiting from the influx of liquid funds seeking protection against cold war developments and other contingencies. With large liquid liabilities to foreigners, the Swiss net liquidity position, of course, is not as favorable as is suggested by the level of reserves. Germany, on the other hand, has recently strengthened its international payments position, and the British situation remains reasonably good.

We appear to be making progress—but not so fast or easily that we can abandon our efforts or relax in our policies. There is already some evidence—although it is not conclusive for the future—that the ground is gradually shifting in our favor. Dr. Max Iklé, the managing director of the Swiss National Bank is reported to have said: "The position of the dollar today is stronger than at any time since 1957." We are not yet out of the woods. But perhaps we are beginning to see that market forces and the policy measures of the past few years are yielding results.

Endorsement of Wheat Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and I have, since last May, been working for passage of a comprehensive, voluntary wheat program, to replace the wheat stabilization program which expires this year. We have felt such legislation imperative, since the farmers themselves turned down the administration's program of strict, mandatory Government controls over production in the wheat referendum of May 8, 1963.

As a result, it is encouraging to us to receive the type of support recently given by the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation. The Oregon Farm Bureau passed a resolution at its convention endorsing the bill, H.R. 6546, which was introduced by myself and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] and 18 other Members of the House. Mr. Louis R. Norris, director of legislative and tax affairs for the Oregon Farm Bureau, indicates that the Oregon delegation will take its resolution along for consideration at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau.

I would like to submit for your consideration the resolution of the Oregon Farm Bureau, for I believe it expresses the feelings of a broad cross section of the American wheatgrowers.

NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

Oregon Farm Bureau members have indicated that they believe farm programs with reference to wheat and feed grains should be changed. The present supply and export situation offers the farmer an excellent opportunity to make an orderly transition from Government control.

We reaffirm our belief that a land diversion program is a sound and sensible approach toward solving the problems arising from the ability of the American farmers to produce in excess of effective market demand. However, we must recognize that this program has not found favor in Congress and serious questions have arisen on the adverse effect such a program would have on local communities if whole farms were retired.

We believe that land retirement is essential to any farm program but cannot be the single answer to our problems.

We are opposed to grazing on diverted acres.

Over the years the Pacific Northwest has been sorely penalized by Federal farm programs. Government programs have distorted the price relationship of feed grains between various areas of the United States. Future programs must establish and maintain stable and equitable price relationships

among various grains and among major grain producing and grain feeding areas of the Nation.

We believe that compensatory payments pose a real trap for farmers. They would make the farmer directly dependent upon the Federal Government for a large portion of his income. We are opposed to compensatory payments for wheat.

It is our belief that the wheat and feed grains bill introduced by Congressman QUIE of Minnesota and Congressman DOLE of Kansas offers a reasonable compromise between the divergent views on farm programs. The Oregon Farm Bureau Federation endorses the principles of the Quie-Dole bill, which are as follows:

"First. It would be voluntary. Price support and diversion payments would be available only to those who retire acreage from production.

"Second. It would require land retirement and conservation as a condition of eligibility for program benefits. A minimum 20 percent would be required with an optional and additional 30 percent reduction allowed.

"Third. It would use only payment-in-kind for making diversion payments. The Secretary could, however, advance the producer cash in anticipation of the sale of grain, but there would be no direct payments, as provided under the 1963 feed-grain program.

"Fourth. It would be based on a market economy. The CCC release price for surplus grain in inventory could not be less than 105 percent of the current support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. When the supply is back to a normal supply, this release price would be 115 percent of the current support price, plus reasonable carrying charges, and CCC would be required to make equivalent market purchases for grain which has been sold as being 'out of condition.'"

The 4-H Gold Star Banquet at Mount Pleasant, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, 1963, at Mount Pleasant, Tex., I was privileged to attend the district 5 4-H Club Gold Star Awards Banquet. This meeting, attended by several hundred, was sponsored by the six rural electric cooperatives serving the area witnessed awards to the following outstanding young leaders:

Bowie County: Miss Clara Borcherding and Rodney William.

Camp County: Miss Sylvia Warrick and Tommy Bynum.

Cass County: Miss Janette Clark and Wendell Frost.

Delta County: Miss Carol Trapp and Scotty Calvin.

Franklin County: Tommy Tower.

Gregg County: Miss Brenda Cabbiness and Chuck Cowan.

Harrison County: Miss Janet Newman and Pat Wright.

Henderson County: Miss Judith Oliveria and Ed Reeve.

Hopkins County: Miss Judy Potts and Doyle McKinzie.

Lamar County: Miss Catherine Roberts and Mike Sparks.

Marion County: Miss Sandra Grubbs and Jerry Dreesen.

Morris County: Miss Karen Towler and Gary Northam.

Rains County: Nelson Spinks.

Red River County: Miss Marie Pace and Bill Marr.

Smith County: Miss Pat West and Billy Rozell.

Titus County: Miss Barbara Reese and David Adams.

Upshur County: Miss Betty Huggins and Billy Younkin.

Van Zandt County: Miss Joyce Durgin and Ralph Beal.

Wood County: Miss Angela Pipkin and Mickey Barnett.

The banquet was also a tribute to the Texas District No. 5 county extension agents, who spent so much of their time and energy in the training and guidance of these young Americans.

Their names follow:

Bowie County: H. R. Lynch.

Camp County: Robert B. Walsh.

Cass County: W. Truitt Powell and Mrs. Leopal Lambert.

Delta County: James R. Risinger.

Franklin County: C. R. Brown.

Gregg County: O. D. Taylor and Mrs. Jo Etta York.

Harrison County: Joe C. Frobese and Mrs. N. Sue Farris.

Henderson County: Harold O. Spann and Miss Betty J. Pinkerton.

Hopkins County: Paul D. Herschler and Miss Adell Hale.

Lamar County: S. L. Neal and Mrs. Marian B. Moore.

Marion County: Weldon B. Morris.

Morris County: Robert J. Dean and Miss Betty L. Garner.

Rains County: Mr. Herbert W. Brewer.

Red River County: Robert J. Moody.

Smith County: B. M. Browning and Miss Vera E. Adams.

Titus County: E. E. Neal, Jr. and Mrs. Anne S. Buchanan.

Upshur County: John H. Henry and Mrs. Evelyn W. Simpson.

Van Zandt County: Todd W. Berry and Miss Alma F. Flippo.

Wood County: E. A. Spacek and Mrs. Barbara A. Thomas.

District Agents: Mr. J. H. Surovik and Miss Mary L. Cothran.

My address on this occasion is set forth below in further recognition of the fact that with young people like these rest our hopes for the future.

The address follows:

EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE

It is a great personal pleasure for me to be here at Mount Pleasant with Miss Cochran, Mr. Surovik, and all of you other young members of the 4-H.

Youth has been defined as the first 70 years of your own life and the first 20 years of everyone else's. By that token we are all here together as young people to participate in this happy ceremony.

It is exciting to consider that there are 19 counties involved in this project tonight with 36 award winners. And with the pleasure comes a challenging conviction that we are all partners in the greatest enterprise of all time, the success of our democratic way of life. Upon this depends the hopes of mankind for continued progress.

Tonight we have quite a few champions here in district 5 at this 4-H goldstar banquet, and we have come to give our recognition to them. They have earned and won it, and I feel privileged to come here from Washington to join you, in paying our respects to these young people for their achievements and for the leadership qualities they have shown. At the same time it is important to remember you are all at the beginning of a serious and fruitful adventure, and the honors awarded tonight are the beginning of what I hope will be a series of milestones in your careers.

Leadership is, of course, an honor and distinction. It is also a responsibility and sometimes a chore. But it is a road that must be taken in every generation by those who have the vision, courage, and stamina to pick up the torch, and one of the satisfactions is that when you do, others will follow.

You know, there is a story about a tenderfoot on a ranch down in Texas, who asked one of the experienced hands why he always slapped his pony on one side when he got into the saddle. "Well," said the old cowpuncher, "I figure that if I got one side going, the other is pretty sure to follow."

There is no necessity to spell out the challenges before you young people. You surely must feel it in your bones. In many parts of the world we have political revolutions as young societies break out of their static way of life and grope for a more fulfilling type of society. Vast economic changes are underway in Europe through the Common Market and other cooperative measures that are having tremendous effect on people. Communist nations continue to threaten our way of life.

At home our whole economy is undergoing vast changes, which have a profound significance for young people. We are in a revolution of automation that will produce results beyond our imagination.

Machines can turn out four automobile engine blocks in 3 minutes, or produce steel bars without any human activity. In the last 10 years, the automobile industry has gotten to the point where they can produce 15 percent more cars with 25 percent fewer workers. One American workman can now produce enough food and goods to sustain himself and six other people, and still leave something over for export to other countries.

The machine has taken over many jobs and is causing extensive unemployment. Coal miners are a case in point. There are just not enough jobs for all the trained coal miners because machines are now doing the work. As a result, their number has dropped from 450,000 to 130,000 in the past 15 years. Or take automobiles. In that same period the man-hours required to produce one car has dropped from 300 to 150.

It concerns you young people particularly because as a result of automation and inadequate purchasing power for goods, our economy hasn't been growing fast enough to absorb in useful work all of our growing labor force. Two years ago approximately 2½ million people reached the age of 18 and soon the annual crop of 18-year-olds will exceed 3½ million. Meanwhile automation is eliminating 1½ million jobs a year.

At the same time, ironically, new machines have created a demand for more skilled employees than we have ever had before. As a result, we have the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, with almost 6 percent of the labor force out of work and another 2½ million workers restricted to part-time work. At the same time, it is impossible to meet the need for highly skilled employees that the age of automation is demanding.

The problem is a twofold one: First, we must resolve the problems of our economy so

that our Nation is as productive as possible and continues to grow fast enough to fully absorb our growing work force. Secondly, we must achieve a higher level of education for Americans. Automation has no time, no place, no patience with the "standpatters"—the people who want to go along with things as they are, or as they used to be. In the real world of today, there are no wagon trains to the past.

This is the biggest problem you will have to face. If you exhibit the leadership that I know you have, this ceremony here today will be a symbolic one. It is the young leaders who are going to have to be sure that their associates will not be permitted to drop out of school or drop back in their efforts. We cannot afford to let our Nation slide into the doldrums.

You must see to it that we have a better educated nation tomorrow than we have today—to direct and operate the entirely new industries that are being developed, and to push the margins of research and development farther into the unknown.

This is not work which calls for people who merely push buttons. Nor does it call for those who swing pickaxes. There will be work, and plenty of it, that requires technical training and skill, as well as managerial competence and leadership, along with reliability and confidence. The world of the future will be a far cry from the dream of the lazy schoolboy that someone would produce a machine to answer all of the questions on his exam whenever the right button was pushed and that someone else would invent a robot to push the button.

The young people who go out into this future world without training and skills will be going into a dead-end street where there is no turning back and only frustration. And if many of our young people try to face the modern world without adequate training, our country will be doomed to mediocrity.

But I do not believe that this is going to happen and one good reason for this optimism is the kind of audience I see before me today.

We in the United States are going to move ahead not as a vast heartless machine, but as the people of faith that we are. And history shall bear us out.

It is important, however, that we all see our tasks and carry them out. Those of us in the legislative halls in the Congress, and in the State and municipal legislatures, must see to it that education and training are adequately financed, that our economy functions fully, and that our research and development move forward in a balanced vigorous style. And you young people who will make up the Nation's human treasure must see the sweep and scope of the problem and act accordingly. We have moved into an age of preparation and education. The frontier of opportunity will be open in precise ratio to the education and preparation that you can bring to your future work.

You may be sure that the world will be in need of everything you have to offer. No one can provide you with the character and education that this requires. You must study for it, strive for it, and earn it. And when you do, like the skilled athlete who enters the arena, you will be given your chance to run with the ball.

Begin your leadership now. Work with and for those among your associates who are less able. Make certain as far as you can that they remain in school and continue their education as you must continue yours.

Don't let automation become an instrument of lessening your job opportunities—instead make it a broad avenue for widening and increasing them.

Our forebears have done a job for us, greater than any in the whole of human history, to make our lives free and enjoyable. The responsibility is now being passed on to you. Your fathers and grandfathers fought through two World Wars and a harrowing depression, and they came out of it whole for themselves and for you. You come of a race that has gallantry and heroism—this has been proved again and again right in your own time. The future, with all its threats and all its perplexities, is brighter for this generation of youth than it has ever been for any generation of youth that has gone before. You here before me today are making an excellent start. I have faith that in the decades to come this Nation, under God, will prove the fulfillment of its destiny as the great hope of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it was heartwarming and inspirational to see these young people respond with brightened faces to the following presentation with which the banquet concluded:

CITIZENSHIP

Setting: American flag, spotlight, record, "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

DOYLE MCKINZIE. We have all been reading about interplanetary flight. However, we all know the most important space—is that space which we take up as individual citizens in a democracy.

There are many important characteristics in being a good citizen in a democracy. These must be considered, not only at this banquet, but put into practice in our home, club and everywhere we go. We will discuss some of these characteristics.

JUDY POTTS. I would like to talk about charity. Honor and forgiveness of others. Charity towards others, honor in our activities and forgiveness of other's shortcomings. These three things are necessary in living happily with people. This is a major part of citizenship which is developed each day by each of us. Have you practiced these qualities in your club, in your community, in helping your family, in understanding and appreciating people of different interests from your own? These and the next quality, tell us about things that are necessary to live comfortably with our neighbors.

BARBRA REESE. Self-control is essential to every good citizen in our democracy.

Many brilliant and talented people have risen to the top in their chosen fields, only to fail because of the lack of self-control. Every time we permit the petty annoyances of people around us to arouse resentment, anger and impatience we are displaying the lack of self-control. Without this quality we seem undependable and it is easy to say and do things which hurt others deeply. Things which we later resent but cannot call back.

JUDY POTTS. Love of country is saluting the flag, singing the National Anthem. Love of country is the joining of Armed Forces to fight for freedom. But remember that loyalty is the most important quality of them all.

To love God is to know His will and way as revealed in His Bible. To feel loved by Him is to set our compass for the journey through life on a true course. It insures a safe passage, destination, and the greatest of all companions on the travel. That is why we say to our friends when it is time to part—what I say to you now, "Go with God every step of the way."

DOYLE MCKINZIE. Remember the important characteristics which were stated: Charity, forgiveness, honor, self-control, and love of God. To be a strong democracy we need to rededicate ourselves to these ideals which are important to this great Nation.

One of the most inspiring pledges of rededication ever made comes to us from the past in the beautiful words of Abraham Lincoln.

David Adams: Recitation of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Mr. Speaker, if people all over the world could attend such a meeting, and observe our people in this setting, it would demonstrate with convincing force that we are a peace-loving, God-fearing nation and that this new generation is strong to defend our flag and our freedoms, and proffers a wealth of good will to all who will accept.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Modern Miracle and the Ancient Curse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of November 26, 1963:

THE MODERN MIRACLE AND THE ANCIENT CURSE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 25.—For the first time since leaders of the nations assembled at the bier of another, to pay final tribute to him and to his people, all have been able to make the pilgrimage within two settings of the sun. Only 3 days had elapsed from the death of President Kennedy in Texas to the hour when his requiem was intoned in Washington. Yet so complete has been man's conquest of time and distance that the requiem mass and the following interment were attended by the heads or plenary representatives of more than 100 states in the 6 continents of the world.

Probably it is true, as archivists are saying, that not since the funeral of King Edward VII has there been a comparable gathering of the incarnations of power. On May 20, 1910, the British sovereign was buried at Windsor after a long procession through the streets of London led by his son and successor, George V, seven European kings, the heirs-apparent or prince consorts of many others and a group of special ambassadors that included former President Theodore Roosevelt. But Edward's life had ended 2 weeks before his state funeral could be held because air transport was only in its crude, elemental stage. And, the electronic age being far in the future, no radio and television existed to make the whole world a spectator.

HAMLET'S MEDITATION

If grief had not been uppermost among those who watched the magnificent funeral ceremonies, these manifestations of ever-expanding human genius might have been accented, as in Hamlet's meditation: "What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty, in form and moving! How express and admirable in action! How like an angel in apprehension! How like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals!" But submerging the incidence of the scientific miracle was the thought of the ancient and abiding curse of violence which these potentates and princes from afar had come to mourn.

The young President lay dead in his coffin under his country's flag because not even the enlightened system of freedom and self-government of which he was the shining symbol has exercised this curse from the human heart. "At his best," said Aristotle, "man is the noblest of all animals; separated from law and justice he is the worst." At Dallas both law and justice had been trampled upon by the President's assassin, by their civic guardians, and by the maddened avenger who took law and justice into his own hands.

This is the shame which all the elegiasts—at the Capitol, in the press, and throughout the world—lamented. And the theme common to all the elegies may eventually be sustained by factual evidence. This theme is that the violence of political differences that is current in the United States stimulated the fanaticism that expressed itself in the murder of the President. But the American people have always been violent and often venomous in political debate; fanaticism bred in personal or doctrinal grievances has taken the lives of three earlier Presidents and unsuccessfully attempted the assassination of four who were, were to be, or had been Presidents. Hence, there is no merit in the implication of some of the orators that Mr. Kennedy's murder should be related to the area where it occurred because of the intensity there of the controversy over his policies.

NOT A RIGHTWINGER

This implication especially lacks merit by reason of the only facts known about the only suspect, Oswald. He was a Marxist; at least a sympathizer with the religion of communism; emigrated to and married in the Soviet Union; and was trying to return. This is certainly not the dossier of the "right-wing extremists," a stigmatic label of Dallas which some members of the administration are too prone to affix.

That inclination was revealed by the Voice of America broadcast at 1:59 p.m. last Friday of the ghastly tragedy in the city. "Dallas," the Voice of America explained to the world, "is the center of the extreme rightwing." This gratuitous, and as it proved false, suggestion that such was the affiliation of the assassin was deleted from the broadcast at 2:10 p.m. but it was grist to Moscow's mill, which has been grinding it ever since.

The Americas—Each Nation an Anchor to Hemispheric Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 it was my great privilege to join with others at the dinner of the Americas Foundation in New York City and pay tribute to James S. Copley, chairman of the corporation publishing the Copley newspapers and chairman of the Copley News Service which specializes in Latin American news. That evening Mr. Copley became the 20th winner of the foundation's Americas Award for his efforts in "advancing the solidarity and mutual trust and respect between the 21 American republics."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address made by Mr. Copley that evening in which he gives his suggestions for improving relationships in the Western Hemisphere:

THE AMERICAS—EACH NATION AN ANCHOR TO HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY

It has been some three decades since this country took historic steps toward a greater understanding and neighborliness with those nations which share with us the land mass of the Americas.

It seems to me in looking back upon those times that this country under the good-neighbor policy gave something more important than dollars—it gave our neighbors a feeling of individual dignity and importance, and greater self-respect in the community of nations.

Today, as chairman of the Copley News Service, which covers with special interest the affairs of South and Central America, I wonder how all of us can become better neighbors again—the United States, and the other American countries to the south.

For it is clear that some of our neighborliness, in recent years, has been lost in suspicion or spite. There are those who deliberately try to grow hate instead of friendship.

As a newspaperman, I am quite sure that we cannot repair such friendships with dollars alone, but only with better understanding and communication. This begins, I think, with a willingness to accept each other as we are, not as we might like to require each other to be.

This is the only way any neighbors can get along.

This lack of willingness to accept each other, fully and realistically, may be the secret of why some of our neighbors might not be too unhappy if the house of this particular neighbor—this United States house—developed a leaky roof, or got rocks through the windows, or even burned down.

Because in some places—and we must face this—there is anger toward the United States, and it is cunningly nurtured by those who cry "freedom" but who sell slavery, and who cry "imperialism" but seek everywhere for broken bits and pieces of the world to add to their own godless, and ultimately hopeless, empire.

In looking toward the reasons why the good-neighbor policy has suffered growing strains, it is easy to mention such things as lower commodity prices, and their effect on many Latin nations, and to assume that all ills stem from such econmic problems. But to do so, I think, ignores four other developments that have come quite simultaneously. If we are to be candid in understanding each other, there four things must be understood too.

1. Latin Americans are our special neighbors: no longer are they almost our only ones. The "neighborhood" has grown. In our own country's world isolationism before World War II, our real neighborhood was our hemisphere. Now it has become the world—whole new continents have been added. As a result, when we seek to help neighbors, there are many more to be helped.

Unfortuately, some must be helped not only from friendship but from fear of their becoming enemies. I think it is human and natural that some of our old friends in Latin America, who may be in need, unconsciously resent the widening circle of our assistance.

2. Postwar economic progress in the world has most blessed those nations which al-

ready had existing industrial foundations upon which to build. Many Latin American nations, agricultural for the most part, thus have not shared in the technological boom which has enriched many other countries. Yet Latin America has to purchase many of its needs in a world economy in which prices of manufactured goods have spiraled upward.

3. The transportation revolution wrought by the jetplane has changed the world's geography, bringing many countries closer together, but in the process making others seem farther away, at least in terms of time and convenience.

4. In these same years, the contest of systems and ideologies between free nations and atheistic communism has led to the first full-scale infiltration of Latin America by secret agents of a foreign power.

In the light of all these disturbing factors, it is both surprising and reassuring that those who have sought to break the historic chains of American hemispheric solidarity have accomplished so little in the way of real damage, except in Cuba.

Cuba, of course, is damaging enough.

Cuba was not only our neighbor, but a next-door neighbor. Now this neighbor's house is filled with guns and thugs.

How can anyone tolerate such a neighbor, and for how long? It is a problem in which we have not acted alone, but have instead consulted other American neighbors.

All we have done, so far, is to insist that this neighbor no longer keep atom bombs in its household. But he can still, any day, shoot up all our houses, and by example and deed try to corrupt all those around him. This latter he already does, with success or failure not easy to measure.

All that can be surely known is that Castro, in the 1962 missiles crisis, demonstrated that for the sake of communism, and that of personal power, he was willing to doom not only his own people but those of his American Hemisphere to the flash of atomic death.

It is the same mad conceit shown by any lunatic who carries a torch of flame in one hand, supposedly illuminating the world, and carries in the other a trembling vial of nitroglycerine.

From time to time, we hear that Castro is really changing. For instance, he is now said to tolerate religion, after his 1961 seizures of schools and deportation of Spanish-origin priests.

The fact is, however, that Blas Roca, an important Cuban Communist, has let it be known that it will be the job of the Communist Party, as distinguished from the government, to combat religious "lies and prejudices"—to blackjack religion when the time comes.

It may be Castro's view that for the government itself to impose communistic godlessness on God-fearing people would be the final chipping away of brick that would bring his prison walls tumbling down.

It is significant to note that while the Berlin wall escapes are often more dramatic, refugees to the United States from Cuba are far more numerous, and are estimated to total more than a quarter of a million persons—a severe loss of talented and courageous people from a land that has some six and a half million population.

Dictator Castro, who has slain or jailed thousands of other good citizens, may be unable to afford any further affront to other thousands who have tried to keep some faith in a restored free Cuba, and so have stayed at home.

The ultimate fate of Cuba is hard to guess, partly because it is so closely connected with communism's own concealed schemes. We do know that Castro has had to reconcile himself to the fact that Cuba must continue to grow sugar, while giving up dreams of grandiose steel mills, and we do know that the economic pinch on the common people grows more painful daily, despite slave-state edicts that they produce or starve.

What, indeed, has happened to the Cuban worker, who is supposed to have been the beneficiary of revolution? Now that Cuba's sugar mills, the stores, the power companies and the telephones are claimed to be the property of all the people, the worker has learned that it is not only unpatriotic, but dangerously counter-revolutionary, to concern himself about the right to strike to improve his conditions.

Not only is he expected to do his normal work, but then, when he is weary, he also is expected to volunteer to cut sugarcane. He is, in fact, enslaved. Cuban officials rant long and loud against workers who lie down on the job. Perhaps they lie there from exhaustion—or from lack of hope of any better tomorrow.

In finding that sugar is still the base of the Cuban economy, and has to be cut and sold, the Reds have again proved that they do not have any easy, pat answers to the economic problems that face us all.

What can we, and other American nations, learn from Cuba, and so guard against a repetition of such catastrophe visiting itself upon other freemen, in still-free nations?

First of all, I think we must recognize that revolution did not come to Cuba only because of want or hunger. Cuba, from many standpoints, was making economic advances at the time Castro came to power. The progress could have been faster had it not been fettered by a corrupt government.

It is this—the ultimate cost of corruption—that we can learn from Cuba. Revolutionary leaders—good and bad ones both—grow in lands where bribery and dishonesty put their blight on efforts by people to improve their lot. It was Cuba's special misfortune that a financially corrupt Cuba regime had to be overturned by one that was also corrupt—this one rotted through with the concept that the individual is worthless and has no rights, and that the state can be his all-knowing master.

It is the moral tragedy of our times that so many young people, in many lands like Cuba, reach forth with eagerness for the manacles that all other generations of men have fought to shed. Castro was one of these eager youth; now he is himself as much enchained by Communist disciplines as any of those followers of his who have not yet died before his Red firing squads.

Other young people, in many of our nations, continue to find a fatal and insane fascination in such slavery, and so more Castros may be growing up, as obscurely as any Hitler or Khrushchev or Castro, waiting their day to help forge more chains for any and all of us. Where their governments are corrupt, their way is made easier, for they can seek converts among those made pessimistic of progress in any other way.

The most helpful of any single move for greater hemispheric progress, I think, is to fight corruption at any and all levels of government. Better education already is instilling a revulsion against mordida as a way of life, because mordida, and grafts of all kinds, benefit only the individual while harming all others, and weakening the state.

Lest I be misunderstood, we in the United States know that we sometimes have our degrading briberies and corruptions, too, extending into State and National legislatures. So I am not pointing in scorn to something not known in our own country.

But just as we in our country fight for honest government, and hunt down those who betray our trust, so we feel that other nations also could strengthen themselves by insisting on clean and decent servants in their governments.

The Latin American press can be of great service here, just as the press in the United States has been in our country.

Stable and honest government becomes a matter of practical U.S. concern, because if U.S. money is misspent, in any country, it cannot achieve those objectives which otherwise might be possible. Those objectives, simply stated, continue to be to help other nations to help themselves.

It is in this area of self-help that people of good will, both in the United States and in the other countries of the hemisphere, can find their greatest opportunity to build mutual good will.

I think we can build good will by refraining, as conscientiously as possible, not only from seeming to dictate any actions by our neighbors, but also by guarding against the appearance of dictation in making our aid available.

We cannot insult proud friends by any know-it-all attitude. It is possible we have been guilty of such an attitude in going along with those who talk too glibly of the need for "land reform" in Latin nations.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to look up the statistics on land utilization in Latin America will be struck with the jumbled information on this. It appears that no matter whose estimates or figures are accepted, the amount of land under cultivation in most countries is far, far less than the amount of virgin land available for colonization or farming.

If it is true that in some countries a high percentage of cultivated land is in the hands of relatively few persons, one way to lower that percentage—without cutting into total farm production by hasty breaking up of large and efficient producers—is to bring more new lands to use.

Whether it makes more economic sense to put new lands into production, by helping pioneers to clear them, rather than to break up present successfully run units, is a matter the consideration of which has been greatly hampered by cries, many of them from the United States, for agrarian reform.

It is strange that the United States, the great agricultural wealth of which was built by pioneers, should so ignore the role that such pioneers could possibly play in Latin America.

A second way to build good will would be by keeping our promises to Latin America as faithfully as possible.

In the present Congress, efforts to reduce total foreign aid now imperil the promises we made in helping to set up the Alliance for Progress. To fail to keep our own promises, under a program mutually developed, would seem to me to be a highly dangerous and even dishonest course for us.

One way to attack this problem in future years might be to treat hemisphere aid as a separate item from all other foreign aid. Then, if other aid programs are badly administered, and suffer public resentment, the Latin American program will not be punished for sins which are not its own.

A third means of strengthening U.S.-Latin friendships would be to rely increasingly on fact-finding missions to Latin America, the personnel and methods of which would merit the fullest confidence of those countries they visit.

Too often, our own Copley News Service reporters see evidence in Latin America that decisions are made in Washington on matters where the facts have not been clearly determined beforehand by careful field study.

But the fourth, and perhaps most important, means of strengthening our good-neighbor policy is to emphasize again that spirit which motivated us in the 1930's.

This is to view each of our neighboring countries as a proud individual, who does not want anyone trying to run his life for him. It is to view those countries as comrades in arms for a better world, in which each country, large and small, has its own vital role to play, and its own traditions to uphold.

If the world gets into a shooting conflict, the Americas will indeed have to stand shoulder to shoulder in the battle to preserve the freedoms so dear to all the Americas.

If we view our neighbors in such a way, perhaps they also will be able to see us in a different light—as someone who is willing to bear his responsibility in helping his neighbors get along.

They will see that when it comes to crisis, we too bring courage to the ranks. And they will see that when it comes to freedom, this hemisphere still offers the great and lasting hope.

It is a time for all neighbors' hands in this American hemisphere to be outstretched again in friendship and trust—not outstretched, instead, for another hemisphere's manacles and chains.

Investigating Committees Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, in the December issue of the American Legion magazine there is an editorial concerning the investigating committees of Congress. It is a well-reasoned argument supporting the work of our investigating committees.

The recent activities of Fair Play for Cuba Committee, I have in mind demonstrations on Capitol Hill, makes this editorial compelling reading for those who are interested in fighting subversion. I commend the following American Legion magazine's editorial to my colleagues:

THE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

There are few things that we regret more than that the average American never reads, and never has a chance to read, the published transcripts of hearings conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

We assume that most Members of Congress actually do read them, instead of reading about them in the writings of others who may, or may not, have an ax to grind, but who do (and perhaps must) write all too briefly, anyway.

It hardly seems possible that a Congressman who reads the hearings in full could vote to abolish or limit either of the committees. Yet Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, regularly attempts to wreck the House Un-American Activities Committee, and while he got a paltry 6 votes to support him last year, this year he got a paltry but larger number—20. It is our personal feeling that several million dollars appropriated to publish and circulate many, many more copies of these hearings, rather than depending on the sketchy reports that the newspapers publish, would be for the good of the Nation.

We have at hand one of the Senate reports. It is 323 pages long, and involves only the questioning of Jacob Rosen, a sometime student of New York's City College, who was pretty convincingly identified as an energetic organizer of American youth along Communist Party lines, and as one of the 42 youngsters who junketed in Cuba in defiance of the State Department's travel ban. The Rosen hearings are but one of a series on the general subject of "Castro's Network in the United States."

Occasionally, Mr. Rosen answered a question. He did admit to having been a carpenter, but declined to identify his union, though the Senators told him there was nothing at all suspect about his union. He did identify himself as being Jacob Rosen, of 636 West 174th Street, New York. He declined to answer questions about a news story in the New York Times about the disillusionment of many members of a touring U.S. youth group in Moscow. The story had noted that, while many of the traveling youngsters seemed disillusioned with the Soviets, "Jacob Rosen, of 636 West 174th Street, Manhattan, a junior at City College, went without sleep [in Moscow] to keep things moving."

Throughout most of the 323 pages he respectfully declined to answer questions. Not having 323 pages at our disposal we can only list here a small sampling of the questions he didn't answer. He declined to say anything about a photo of a bearded Jacob Rosen in Cuba; or articles written by a Jacob Rosen directing how American youth should be organized along Communist lines; or an article: "I Was in Youth Brigade Building School-City in Cuba" by a Jake Rosen; or an identification card issued to U.S. Carpenter Jacob Rosen by a "Volunteer International Workers' Brigade" operating in the Sierra Maestra in Cuba.

One of the things that more people would appreciate if they could actually read the full texts of these hearings is the documentation which congressional committees put in the record as the basis of their questioning. Very few Americans, we believe, would entertain any further notion that these committees are fishing expeditions, or are out to "smear innocent people," if they could secure the full, fascinating transcripts instead of getting their information too briefly at second hand. If the committees are ever mistaken in the enormous research on which they base their questioning the hearings give any innocent parties an opportunity to point out the mistakes. Mr. Rosen, and many others, prefer to remain silent. It would be a good thing for public information if you, and everyone else, could read all this documentation and all this silence. An "informed public opinion" is supposed to be the basis of true democracy, and we respectfully call this to the attention of Representative ROOSEVELT and his friends before they make their next move to choke off informed public opinion when Congress reopens in January.

If they actually believe in government by an informed public, we have a suggestion. This year, instead of trying to abolish the House committee, let them take the lead in placing several million transcripts of committee hearings in the hands of high school students, teachers, civic organizations, church groups, public libraries, college classes, PTA's, local veterans posts, State and local legislatures, etc., along with a sample mailing of them to a goodly cross section of American homes—and in the future be guided by the reaction of an informed public.

An Ode to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

AN ODE TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, 35TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Breckenridge Porter, Jr.)

In his heart a passion lived
That the world might be more amative.
Love of man his main concern;
Peace he spake, hate he spurned.
Throughout the world he made his plea,
For peace on earth, and unity.
And from those countries he traveled home,
Only to fall among his own.
Now our peoples are coterie,
And Heaven is the resting place, for
John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Please, God, Help Us Keep the Clock of Democracy Wound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the following address was given by Mr. Joseph L. Gabriel, of Hollister, Calif., at the Dixie Dinner in the Biltmore Bowl during the Rotary International Convention in Los Angeles, June 5, 1962. Mr. Gabriel is one of my constituents who has done considerable thinking about some basic concepts of America. He knows where of he speaks. His remarks seem especially valid today. I quote him as follows:

It is a distinct honor to have been invited to be on your program, and to talk to you on a subject close to my heart, a subject which should be close to the heart of every loyal American.

Democracy is like a clock. It will run down unless our generation keeps it wound. Our gathering together in fellowship, you good people from the Southern States of our great Nation, the States so well known for hospitality and friendship, and we of district 513 from the northern part of California, is democracy in action.

I come before you as a plain, common American citizen, deeply concerned about the welfare of our beloved America. I am not representing any political party or attacking any of its leaders. I am not running for office. I do not want you to vote for me. I have no merchandise to sell. I speak to you as I think and feel. I want you to help me sell America to the American people.

I have been requested to tell you a personal story, which I hope will make you appreciate what I have to say to you a little more. I am an American citizen by choice. I came to this country at the age of 13. I couldn't speak a word of English. I hadn't a penny in my pocket. I was barefoot and hungry. My parents passed away before they could learn the language. I never had a penny left to me. I did all kinds of work. I struggled. I saved. I did not question the number of hours I was obliged to work, the kind of work, or the price paid. All I wanted was an opportunity in America.

I have bought and sold many kinds of merchandise. I have been an employee and an employer. I have been chiseled, and I have done a little chiseling. I was born in Lebanon, a small nation on the Mediterranean, where the rich are very rich, and the many poor are very poor. Everything was scarce in those days. The poor had to struggle for their livelihood. Many went hungry. I have been one of those.

Such conditions exist now in many parts of the world, many cases worse than I experienced. They are due to lack of freedom, overtaxation, domination, poor management on the part of the leaders, and lack of responsibility on the part of the individual.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen of this great country, let us be aware of our responsibility to our beloved America. We are now, and have been, overtaxed. We have lost much of our freedom. There is disunity between management and labor. Our dollar is in trouble. Do you realize the American dollar is worth half of its value? Things are out of balance. Too many strikes are affecting our democracy more than you think. Too many people look to the government for personal benefits. There are too many departments of government. One out of eight individuals is on the State or Federal payroll. There is too much competition between government and private enterprise. A sound economy is the basis of our strength, and it is in danger. We are spending more than we take in.

In 1929 the national debt was $15 billion. It is now $300 billion. The interest on the national debt is $9 billion annually. We have $9 billion worth of surplus commodities on which we are paying storage and interest.

Some say we never had it so good. They fail to realize that we are operating on borrowed money. They fail to realize we have mortgaged the children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren of this generation, and they are not going to like us for it. They fail to realize that every man, woman, and child in America has an obligation of $1,700 to the national debt, not including the individual's personal obligation. Nothing can kill the initiative of the people more quickly than for half of them to get the idea that they need not work because the other half will feed them. People suffer in the end when they demand more and give less.

No nation, however rich or powerful, can continue to take the beating our beloved America has taken. No individual business large or small, or institution can continue to spend more than it takes in and not be eventually bankrupt. Some say it cannot happen here. Read history. History tells us that many nations have been wrecked because the people failed to accept the full responsibility of citizenship, and lost all.

The soul of democracy is the voice of the people. The people fail to rise and do their part. They fail to accept democracy as a sacred responsibility. They fail to take part in politics fearing to lose business. I say to you if you don't take part in politics you will have no business. We have lost interest in the goose that lays the golden egg. We take things for granted. We let George do it.

It is not too late. I have faith in this great country. We have the resources, the potential in power and strength. What we need is the spirit of our people once again asserting itself. It is not too late to turn over a new leaf and take inventory, evaluate our citizenship, and realizing its worth, accept our responsibilities to the greatest country on the face of the earth.

I realize I am talking to a Rotary international convention. I realize that there are individuals in the audience from other parts of the world. I'd like to remind you all that Rotary says to us, "It is the duty of every Rotarian to be a loyal and devoted citizen of his own country." That I shall be as long as God gives me breath. I ask you to do likewise. What is good for America is good for the rest of the world.

Democracy has bitter competition and enemies in the world today among nations whose philosophy differs from ours. They seek to impose their philosophy on us. They seek control of our lives, our homes, our freedom. We fail to meet the challenge. We are too soft, too kind, too generous.

Democracy needs the individual's attention, daily care, time and effort. It needs in every community the leadership of people of the caliber we have here assembled. The United States of America is the largest single business in the world. It deserves the very best in leadership by people of character, ability, and balanced judgment. It needs people of courage and devotion, who are willing to put the country before their party and themselves. It needs the support of all of us. We must elect such people to public office or we shall lose our freedom.

If this freedom is to be saved, Government expenditures must be curtailed. The dollar must be saved, inflation must be checked. Russia must be halted. She has bluffed us long enough. Labor and management must be policed, and made to realize their interests are mutual. Labor and management must recognize their responsibilities. If we kill one we kill both. Kill both and we kill free enterprise. Free enterprise means free labor as well as free management. We cannot expect cooperation unless we give it. Give and you will receive. Love and you will be loved. It is much later than you think.

At the time the Constitution was signed in 1887, a woman, if you please, asked Benjamin Franklin, "What do we have now?" He replied, "We have a republic if we can keep it." Another woman sometime later put a similar question to James Lowell, American Minister to Great Britain, "How long will the American Republic endure?" He replied, "As long as the ideas of the men who made it continue to be dominant."

Ladies and gentlemen, the survival of our Nation depends on what you do as individuals. "What can I do?" you ask. You need to accept the full responsibility of your citizenship. You need to render more service than ever before to the community and to the Nation. You need to awaken the people around you. You need to have more faith in democracy. You need to encourage respect and harmony between you and your employees which will make for greater efficiency. You need to take part in politics, and time out to vote the right people into office. You need to encourage your family, your neighbors, and the people around you to do likewise. You need to stand up and be counted as loyal and faithful citizens. You need to return to your homes and discharge George. You need to guide and teach the youth around you the value of our system of free enterprise and what it means to them. I say to you with all my heart that the future of America and its institutions depends on what you do to guide the citizens of tomorrow.

You are the guiding force of the community, State, Nation and free world. You are the heart of the community in which you live. Your influence is much greater than you think. The safety of our freedom is in your hands. If we value anything more than our freedom we'll lose it.

Ladies and gentlemen, freedom of opportunity made America what it is. We have the highest standard of living for all classes any nation has ever had. We have more opportunity for initiative than any nation on earth. Here the weak may become strong. Men can rise from the depths to the heights provided they have the determination, the energy, and of course the capacity. That's the glory of America.

I like this country for many reasons. Let me, in conclusion, list a few. I like this country because the children of the rich and the children of the poor attend the same school, are taught by the same teachers. Such is not the case in many parts of the world. I like this country because the painter, the carpenter, the laborer, and the clerk has the opportunity to join socially the business and professional men. I like this country because the individual has the opportunity to work, to build, and to create, and to provide opportunities for others with less interference. Not too long ago I was able to stand before an audience like this and say with no interference.

I love this country more than I can ever tell you because it gave me opportunity, because I no longer have to carry wood on my back, wood I've hunted and scratched for because it was so scarce, water on my shoulder in jugs I've filled from a spring after waiting in line because it was scarce. I love this country because I no longer have to eat stale bread I was glad to get, go barefooted, sleep on the floor. All these things I did before I came to America.

God bless America. God give us the energy, the courage and the determination to do our part to keep it free, strong, and peaceful. If any native born or naturalized citizen does not like this country let him buy a one-way ticket to the country of his choice. The sooner he leaves the better.

Ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you with all my heart, in all sincerity, and ask you as individuals to do your part to safeguard our institutions of liberty. Please God help us to keep the clock of democracy wound.

No Cause for Cotton Panic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow we begin the consideration of the Cooley Cotton bill (H.R. 6196). I am hopeful that all Members will read the following article from the November issue of the Missouri Delta Farmer which explains some of the things which could and should be done to improve this bill:

NO CAUSE FOR COTTON PANIC

While everyone knows that cotton is in trouble, and almost everyone agrees that additional legislative authority is needed to do the many things that need to be done for cotton and the various segments of the industry, there is no reason, absolutely no reason at all, to become panicky about the current cotton situation.

Unfortunately for everyone the drive for legislation has lost its sense of direction, and becomes involved in a maze of exaggerated and misleading claims that threaten to scuttle all possibilities for remedial legislation in the foreseeable future. For example, a certain organization recently circulated a statement saying, "Cotton has suffered a direct competitive loss to competing fibers of about 1½ million bales" since August 1, 1961. However, a look at official records of the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows that the average offtake of U.S. cotton (domestic plus exports) for the most recent 10-year period (including the 1963–64 season) is 13.6 million bales per year. The estimated offtake for the current marketing year is 13.8 million bales or some 200,000 bales above the 10-year average. Another sentence in this same statement says that "exports have dropped from 6.6 million bales to 3.3 million bales" in the 2 years ending July 31, 1963. In the case of exports, official figures show an average of 4.9 million bales were exported during the most recent 10-year period (including the 1963–64 season). Instead of a drop in exports, the estimate of 5 million bales for the current marketing year actually means a small increase in the movement of U.S. cotton into world markets.

Official figures on domestic consumption and exports of U.S. cotton very definitely contradict and belie claims that cotton has

gone to the "dogs." It is true, of course, that cotton has not made the gains that the entire industry would like to see it make, but neither has it lost the ground that some people would lead us to believe it has.

The backers of the all-or-nothing domestic mill subsidy provision in the Cooley bill say that "we must eliminate the inequity between domestic and foreign prices." On the surface this sounds like a responsible position, but the advocates of this so-called one-price system fail to say that they are actually trying to give domestic mills a 3- to 4-cent-per-pound price advantage over foreign mills. They also fail to mention that they would subtract some 3 cents per pound from the farm price level in order to give domestic mills a price advantage over their foreign competition. They never bother to explain that the real difference or inequity between domestic and foreign prices is the delivered price at the domestic mill door as opposed to the delivered price of U.S. cotton to the foreign mill. They will have everyone ignore the fact that there is an average added cost in excess of 3 cents per pound in transportation charges that foreign mills must pay to get U.S. cotton that is over and above the price paid by domestic mills. This added transportation cost that must be paid by foreign mills means that the real difference or inequity between domestic and foreign prices is roughly 5 cents per pound rather than the full amount of the export subsidy rate (now 8½ cents).

Freight differentials have always been reflected in both the CCC loan level and the market price of cotton within the continental United States. Freight differentials are a part of our marketing system. They must be considered between domestic and foreign points just as they are considered between points within our domestic boundaries.

The price of U.S. cotton in Liverpool (England) during August 1963 averaged about 27.25 cents (M-1''). This is representative of the price that European users must pay for U.S. cotton delivered to their mills even though the export price for the same cotton at its point of origin in the United States is near 24 cents. The backers of the all-or-nothing domestic mill subsidy provision in the Cooley bill are saying, in effect, that U.S. mills must be allowed to buy cotton at a delivered price that is 3 to 4 cents under the actual delivered price in world markets—even though it would be necessary to take the extra margin out of the farmer's pocket.

Another loose statement being bandied around by the same group of mill supporters is "it [Cooley bill] would protect the income of the farmer and the whole economy." Apparently they haven't given too much thought to this statement as the Cooley bill would, without question, reduce the price of cotton by some 3 cents per pound or about 10 percent from where it is at the present time, and it would make this reduction in price without any compensating acreage increase to the farmer. Any responsible economist would agree that a 10-percent reduction in the gross price of cotton without a compensating acreage increase would lower net cotton income to the individual producer anywhere from 25 to 40 percent. There is no way, absolutely no way at all, to reconcile these facts with claims that the Cooley bill would protect farm income.

The most outlandish claim that has been advanced for a domestic mill subsidy equal to the export subsidy rate is that it would alleviate the "main cause of rising cotton textile imports." When the infinitesimal cost of raw cotton in textile products is considered, it is downright ridiculous to say that the price of raw cotton is responsible for increased textile imports during the past several years. Cheap labor and lower manufacturing costs in foreign countries, not the price of raw cotton, make it possible for foreign manufacturers to produce and sell their products for a lower price than our domestic textile mills are able to do.

Early in January of 1963 the National Cotton Advisory Committee made recommendations to the administration and to the Congress which would have made cotton available to users in this country at prices in line with actual world prices, maintained cotton farm income and permitted cotton producers who wished to do so to grow more acres at lower prices on an individual choice basis. These recommendations were generally favored until the special interests apparently decided that the industry and the Congress could be stampeded into cutting the price of domestic cotton from the current 32½-cent level to 24 cents or about 3½ cents below the actual world price level for U.S. cotton. To accomplish their objective and to divide the industry, the special interests devised a monstrosity of a bill that in addition to giving domestic mills preferential treatment would intensify existing inequities in the distribution of individual acreage allotments, perpetuate the inefficient grower who, if left alone, will go out of cotton production and into a more profitable line of endeavor, cut the price of cotton 3 cents per pound without any compensating acreage increase, and triple present costs of the cotton program to the taxpaying public.

Cotton is in trouble. There is no doubt about it. But this is not a new situation—cotton has been in trouble for a generation or more. It is odd indeed that less than 18 months ago, domestic textile mills were saying that they needed 30-cent cotton to meet their competition and make a reasonable profit. Today they insist that they must have 24-cent cotton. Things haven't changed this much in so short a period of time. It is also interesting to note that even less than a year ago the people who are today pushing for 24-cent cotton were saying that all we needed was a gradual downward adjustment in the price level, and further that we didn't need any legislative change at all—just some simple administrative adjustments.

It is time, and high time, for everyone concerned with the cotton industry to take a good look at some of the things that are going on. Cotton is not on the brink of disaster as some people would have us believe. There is no reason to grasp at straws and take a chance on legislative changes that could easily do more harm than good.

The Cooley cotton bill could be amended to do most of the things that need to be done for cotton and cotton producers. There is every reason to believe that constructive amendments will be pushed if this measure ever reaches the floor of the House. The time has come to ferret out the exaggerated claims, to brand the special interests involved, and to ignore the scare campaigns. In short, it is time for reasoned judgment. This is not the time to push the panic button.

Half-Century Saga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Nov. 21, 1963]

HALF-CENTURY SAGA

Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, has decided to call it quits. After 50 years in the House of Representatives he has come to the conclusion that it is time to sit and reflect.

Representative VINSON has been one of this Nation's most forthright Government envoys. He has fought for naval strength and achieved it. Beyond that, he has been an engineer in our overall defense strategy.

He has served in the House longer than any other man. Last July he passed the record of more than 48 years held by the late Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

Representative VINSON is called affectionately "Swamp FOX," "Admiral," and "Uncle CARL." He is entitled to all the titles. Few men in history have had such an awareness about this country's military needs.

Representative MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, will succeed Mr. VINSON as chairman of the Armed Services Committee in 1965. That is fortunate for the nation. Representative RIVERS, as is Representative VINSON, is acutely aware of our defense needs. He will carry on outstandingly, we are sure, in the tradition of Representative VINSON.

Representative VINSON's service to this country never will be forgotten. He has given 50 devoted years to his country. They are years in which he advocated that only a nation that has strength can survive in these perilous days.

The Nation needs more men who exemplify the qualities of Representative VINSON.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a eulogy which was a part of a special requiem Mass which was said for our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy at St. Raphael's Church, Englewood, Fla., on November 25, 1963.

The eulogy follows:

A whole nation and all the world mourns today the untimely death of John F. Kennedy, late President of the United States. He loved his country, he loved its people, he loved humanity. John F. Kennedy is dead, but the spirit of John F. Kennedy will go on forever. He fought for his country in war. He fought for justice and the rights of all people, including his own. He waged a battle for peace and went down fighting with flags flying and bands beating.

Greater love than this hath no man than that a man lay down his life for his friends. The world and the Nation are thankful to God this day in the midst of its tears and desolation. Thankful to God are we for the noble, courageous, and generous soul, who gave everything—even his life—that men and women everywhere be happier, more abundant and live in harmony with their fellow men. His great belief in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God is his rich heritage to all men of good will. All right thinking people must surely realize the deep, abiding conviction that possesses the soul of this great leader.

Today our hearts reach out and only ask him, as he meets his Maker face to face to pray for a grief stricken Nation that God may guide its destinies in the hands of another great American, Lyndon B. Johnson.

May we pray fervently that God who in His inscrutable ways has seen fit to take our President in his best years, comfort and console his wife, the parents, the loved ones of this just man. May God help us remove from our midst hatred and bitterness against which John F. Kennedy fought so hard. To him it was a greater challenge, a more glorious battle than the PT boat 109 battle of World War II. There he had to fight for justice, for liberty and for peace. He fought for them nobly, against all opposition, as President of the United States. His was a dedicated life, a life spent for others. He knew what suffering was, and did his best for the sick. The underprivileged of the world were near to his heart. He had one hate—injustice. He had one love—peace.

Were he to speak this morning, he would probably say to us, "Grieve not, let not your hearts be troubled, justice will prevail, peace can be achieved. Preach it from the pulpits, say it in the streets, shout it in your hearts and homes—justice will conquer injustice, love will destroy hate, tolerance will win over intolerance, that the peace of Christ may reign forever in nations as well as in men."

May the soul of John F. Kennedy find that peace in death that he so ardently fought for in life. May his soul rest in the eternal splendor of God. He has fought the good fight, he has finished his course, he has kept the faith. Well done thou good and faithful servant, because you have been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many. Enter John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, into the joys of the Lord.

Hail to the Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by John S. Knight, entitled "Hail to the Chief." Nothing I could say could add to the deserved praise and expression of confidence this editorial includes. It appeared in the Charlotte Observer on Sunday, December 1, 1963. I consider it a salute to President Johnson.

The editorial follows:

JOHNSON HAS QUALIFICATIONS OF GREATNESS—HE'LL BE STRONG PRESIDENT; HE KNOWS HIS GOVERNMENT

(By John S. Knight)

Hail to the Chief:

What manner of man is Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of the United States?

In what respects does he differ from the late President Kennedy?

What are our new President's strengths and weaknesses?

What is his basic philosophy—liberal, conservative or progressive?

What may we expect from his administration?

These questions—and many more—are on the lips of all Americans and literate peoples everywhere.

The purely personal views expressed here reflect my own impressions of President Johnson based upon long acquaintance, and an objective analysis of opinion obtained from both admirers and past opponents.

To begin, let me quote from Columnist William S. White who writes: "I have intimately known Lyndon Johnson as I have never known any other public—or private—man.

"I have known no other man of more true tolerance * * * no other man of truer compassion * * * no man of more true devotion to this country. This is a great political figure, a great and natural leader. But this is also, first and foremost and always a man, m-a-n."

Such a magnificent tribute from an experienced journalist to our new President is reassuring, and yet Mr. White readily concedes in the same article that Lyndon Johnson "has had his tireless detractors to a degree rarely seen in American politics."

Columnist Roscoe Drummond is another unqualified admirer who says: "A man of Presidential stature is President of the United States. That is a godsend."

Understandingly, the Johnson critics of the past have remained silent. None has suggested that the President is without ability, or lacks the necessary qualifications for the office.

But they will be heard in time, as the drama of succession moves inexorably from tragedy to transition.

DEDICATED TO THE PEOPLE

Any attempted comparison of the late President Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson risks being misunderstood since they were dissimilar in every respect but one—their great love of the Nation and their dedication to its people.

John F. Kennedy had an intellectual turn of mind, with a flair for expression. He was an omniverous reader and possessed a broad comprehension of the scope of history.

Our late President was a thinker, an innovator, a projector of causes and ideals. But his speeches on these subjects were more to be admired than their implementation.

The staff work under President Kennedy was not well organized, and yet this shortcoming was largely overcome by the President's brilliance and powers of analysis.

A MASTER OF DETAIL

It has been said of Lyndon Johnson that he has been preparing himself for the Presidency ever since he first came to Washington as a congressional secretary in 1933.

His main strengths spring from this long schooling in the science of government. As Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, once said about him: "Lyndon Johnson hasn't got the best mind in the Senate. He isn't the best orator. He isn't the best parliamentarian. But he is the best combination of all those qualities."

Another southern Senator calls Johnson "a master of detail and organization * * * a real 'doer,' and perhaps the most powerful and effective majority leader of the Senate in our times."

Intimates of our late President recall that he would concentrate upon a written memorandum, but gave only casual attention to verbal presentations.

On the other hand, Lyndon Johnson is sometimes described as an "ear man" who prefers to "reason together" with friend or foe.

In legislation, President Johnson has always practiced the art of the possible. He was a Senate leader who seldom moved until he had calculated the chances of success. In this role, he dealt with men rather than ideas.

STRONG, EARNEST NEGOTIATOR

If Lyndon Baines Johnson has a weakness, it lies in the field of foreign affairs.

Until his election as Vice President in 1960, our President's travels were not extensive. And by Johnson's own choice, he preferred assignment to Senate appropriations rather than to the foreign relations committee.

While serving under President Kennedy, the Vice President made a determined effort to fill in the missing background by visiting a score of countries on formal ceremonials. He relies heavily on Secretary of State Dean Rusk for advice and counsel.

Still, President Johnson is a strong and earnest negotiator who cannot easily be gulled. Conceivably, his blunt and direct tactics will get results where attempted persuasion has in some instances failed.

HE WILL PRESS FOR ACTION

Philosophically, President Johnson is self-described as "a freeman, an American and a Democrat in that order." In the past, he has said that he was also a "liberal," a "conservative" and a "progressive."

His former Senate colleagues say that "Lyndon is neither way out left or way out right."

I think it is accurate to say that the "true liberals" don't really trust him, and the conservatives are convinced that Johnson is less liberal than he claims he is.

The President's first address to Congress gave assurance that he will press for the Kennedy legislative program and with greater urgency than had been anticipated.

As an early backer of civil rights legislation in 1957 and 1960, the President is making it clear that he wants action. He has called for a tax bill "without delay."

Actually, he is not likely to get either of these bills passed until next year, and even then, certainly not in their present forms.

President Johnson's emphasis on his intention to get a "dollar value for a dollar spent" will not please the architects of planned deficits.

His plea for unity * * * away "from the fanatics of the far left and the far right * * * an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence" should please everyone.

JOHNSON HAS PROVED HIMSELF

My judgment is that Lyndon Johnson will be a strong President.

He was the first man in Washington to bring some perspective to the space program.

As Vice President, he convinced leaders of industry that simple justice demanded greater employment and opportunities for Negroes.

As a U.S. Senator and majority leader, he got action, left oratory to others, and became the second most powerful figure in Government.

President Johnson has a working rather than a theoretical knowledge of the problems of business and labor. He has espoused the Negroes' cause because he believed it to be right.

The great challenge before him is the formulation of policy, both at home and abroad. For it is one thing to carry out the programs of one's superiors in Government; quite another to provide the guidance and inspiration and leadership which is the compelling responsibility of the President himself.

Lyndon Johnson can be equal to that task if the country gives him the unity and support which he has asked, and heeds his appeal for an end to the hate, evil, and violence with which the fanatics have too long tormented our Republic.

The Best in People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial as an example of the feeling of many fine Americans

across this country who are speaking out for all the good, decent, and patriotic folks of Dallas. We are saddened by the tragic event that occurred there, but the actions of one fanatic and mentally unbalanced Marxist should not defame the good name of the folks of Dallas.

The editorial follows:

DALLAS PEOPLE DISPLAYED PATRIOTISM, WRITER SAYS

(By Lloyd C. Riggs)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article by Lloyd C. Riggs, editor of Bank News, appeared on the front page of this week's issue of the Kansas City banking publication.)

Great and sudden tragedies seem to bring out the best in people.

It was that way in many Kansas and Missouri communities during the great flood of 1951.

And it was that way last Friday in Dallas.

It was by coincidence that this writer happened to be in Dallas that day.

This is a city of wonderful people, and they displayed their true patriotism, and their humane qualities, on the day a world-shaking tragedy occurred in their midst.

Never before in our life had we witnessed such a complete and sudden reversal in the atmosphere of a city—from the festive air of the morning as Big D prepared to welcome the President, to the pall of the afternoon.

People of all walks of life, and all races and creeds, first huddled around radios or TV's to learn the condition of the President, and then revealed their shock and their grief when the word came that he was dead.

Total strangers spoke to each other as though they were old friends. One well-dressed man—we haven't the slightest idea who he is—said to us: "This is just terrible. Nobody disagreed with his policies more violently than I did. But this isn't the American way."

And a young waitress:

"He was the President. But he was human, just like the rest of us. Why would anyone want to kill him?"

Those are just two typical quotes that we remember from our own dazed condition after hearing the news. Almost everybody added the line, "And to think it happened in Dallas."

Business of all kinds came to a complete halt. Nobody seemed able to do anything except express their emotions about the assassination.

Without any official action, most stores and offices closed early. Entertainment spots were closed Friday night. Only eating places were open.

Dallas' pill was the more difficult to take because the city had wanted so badly to give the President a big, cordial welcome.

It is no secret that the New Frontier was not popular in Dallas. Wealthy, conservative Dallas was one of the few big cities in the Nation to go strongly against the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in 1960. And it has gone against candidates with a New Frontier label in subsequent elections.

This made the attitude of the people all the more admirable. They recognized that Mr. Kennedy was the President of our great Nation, and that political differences should be forgotten during his visit.

People who couldn't join in this feeling were asked to stay away from the motorcade route. American flags and red, white and blue bunting decorated the route. People were in good spirits. There were no derogatory signs to be seen. At noon, as the motorcade was approaching, people were lined so deep along Main Street that those who wanted to walk down the block had to worm their way slowly.

All was going according to plan.

Until one transient man committed his dastardly act.

This could have happened anyplace. Dallas has long been one of our favorite cities. It still is.

The staff of Bank News joins all Americans in extending sympathy to the Kennedy family.

And to the wife and children of Sgt. J. D. Tippit of the Dallas police force, who gave his life in the line of duty, in the course of the apprehension of the man suspected of killing the President.

The Men Who Fight Want Manned Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal and Register of November 23, 1963:

THE MEN WHO FIGHT WANT MANNED AIRCRAFT

It is noteworthy that the trend over recent years toward missiles and away from combat aircraft has not had the endorsement of a single military commander. Indeed, professional military leaders have warned repeatedly that we must not neglect the development and production of new manned aircraft, for we will need them as far in the future as we can safely predict.

Let us review some of the statements made by the responsible heads of major Air Force commands:

Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC CinC: "As gratifying is the buildup of our missile capability is, we cannot afford to neglect our manned weapon systems. I guess this is the first time in the history of the U.S. Air Force, formerly the Army Air Corps, that we have not had some type of bomber in production. I suggest you will never have one if you do not stop talking and build one."

Lt. Gen. Herbert B. Thatcher, ADC: "Picture for a moment the United States faced with this possible threat (enemy supersonic bombers), and having in its possession only interceptor aircraft that were on the drawing board 10 years ago. And it is a fact that no new interceptor aircraft has been built within the last 2½ years. We need an improved manned interceptor. I do not consider the TFX the version responsible to our requirements."

Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, TAC: "A step forward to give us a greater degree of survivability plus operational flexibility in our basing and in our range of speeds, is the VTOL or the V/STOL airplane. If we can develop assault VTOL airplanes with adequate range, we are convinced that this will materially improve our ability to support the Army."

Why the manned aircraft when logic and computers emphasize the economy and greater destructive power of missiles? General Power, under whose control falls the bulk of our ICBM's, gives the answer:

"There are the uncertainties concerning the effect of high-yield nuclear weapons on our missile sites which will have to ride out the initial attack. Therefore, it becomes apparent that we cannot depend on missiles alone to deter throughout the 1970's. And that is the primary reason why I see a continued need for manned aircraft in that time period.

"Among the many other unique advantages of the manned weapon system is the fact that it has greater reliability.

"If the Soviet perfects an anti-ICBM, you could lose your deterrent if your entire deterrent depends on ballistic missiles."

Is there enough future development in the aircraft field to warrant going ahead? The answer to this lies in the revelation by Gen. B. A. Schriever, AFSC commander (see last week's J. & R.), that the Air Force's detailed "Forecast" studies show that we are just on the threshold of big, new advances in manned aircraft.

Therefore, we are in the situation where the men who must lead the forces in war say they need new, advanced performance, aircraft. Present technology promises great new strides if we will only go ahead.

Here is a dire warning against the peril of a continued holdback in the development and production of manned combat aircraft. Congress has shown its willingness in the past. It is up to the Department of Defense to lift the bars.

We Should Proliferate Weapons Among NATO Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's Star published an editorial, "Nuclear Generosity," commenting on the proposal of the Republican project committee on NATO unity—of which I am a member—that the United States give tactical nuclear weapons to our NATO allies. Here is the text of the editorial:

NUCLEAR GENEROSITY

A group of House Republicans looking for ways to shore up the Atlantic Alliance is urging that the United States give small nuclear weapons to NATO countries. The idea is that these countries will no longer be irritated by the American monopoly, and the Alliance will tend to draw closer together.

This would be a generous gesture—but a dangerous one. The United States has kept control over its nuclear weapons during the past three administrations for sound reasons. Here are some of them:

Nuclear war is so incredibly dangerous to civilization that even the smallest nuclear weapons should be used only if there is no alternative and only in the most controlled and deliberate way possible. The more countries that can fire these weapons in time of stress, the more likely it is that they will be fired unnecessarily.

Once one is fired, there could be a tendency for both sides to use more and more, bigger and bigger warheads until the world slips unwittingly into what could be nuclear suicide. The more countries that are free to contribute to this slide, the more apt it is to happen.

Nuclear weapons of any size may never be used again, or if they are used, close control may prove to be possible. These uncertainties make it none the less important, however, to try to keep the weapons under control. Congress was wise to make transfer of nuclear weapons to other countries illegal. The law should not be changed out of hope for a change in the attitude of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the conclusions reached in the editorial, but believe the newspaper rendered a public service in calling attention to the proposal.

The main purpose of the proposal was to help shore up the NATO alliance. To me, the strengthening of NATO is the most urgent and vital task confronting the United States. The uncertainties which naturally accompany a change in U.S. executive leadership make the task all the more urgent.

At present we are treating our NATO allies like irresponsible children. We deny them weapons we know our common adversary possesses. If West Germany were invaded by the nuclear-armed Communists, for example, it would have no nuclear weapons of its own for defense. Tactical weapons with nuclear warheads exist in West Germany, of course, but they are locked up. The United States holds the keys. Whether they would actually be used to defend West Germany would depend on a U.S. decision at the moment of crisis. The decision might be either yes or no.

As our allies review recent U.S. policy they may be justified in wondering if we would actually defend Europe's cities with our nuclear weapons. Witness our weak followthrough in Cuba, withdrawal of missiles from Italy and Turkey, the test ban treaty, cancellation of Skybolt.

At any moment, Khrushchev may nibble aggressively at NATO frontiers, figuring the United States will not respond with nuclear weapons.

If we give our NATO allies nuclear tactical weapons, we would at the same time be giving each of them—and the NATO alliance—the strongest possible vote of confidence. It would be a U.S. commitment to defend Europe far stronger and more tangible than words. This assurance would not be overlooked in Moscow.

Khrushchev would know that if he attacked any part of NATO he would bring nuclear weapons into action. This knowledge would be a strong deterrent to Communist aggression.

Sharing nuclear weapons with our NATO allies would actually reduce the danger of war. The weakness of our present policy can be illustrated by drawing a parallel between the NATO alliance and the U.S. Federal Union.

Suppose each of our 50 States had its own military defenses, with the 50 tied together with a treaty alliance. Of the 50, only 1—Illinois, let us say—had nuclear weapons. Illinois dispersed nuclear vehicles among the other 49 States and promised to use these weapons to defend each of the other States in case of Communist aggression. Illinois kept the nuclear warheads under lock and key, however, and reserved to itself the final decision on when and if they would be used.

Under these circumstances, would it not be better—for the cause of peace as well as resistance to communism—for Illinois to supply the other 49 States with complete nuclear weapons, which each could use at will?

This would not be the ideal arrangement, of course. Central civilian control of all U.S. nuclear weapons is far better than proliferation among the 50 individual States of the Union. But proliferation certainly would be far better than an Illinois monopoly. Illinois might have the best of intentions, but in a showdown its promise to defend California—or any other State—might not be fulfilled.

Nor is the proliferation our project committee recommends the ideal arrangement for NATO's 15 nations. In my opinion, central civilian control of all NATO nuclear weapons would be far better.

Unhappily, no central civilian authority exists. NATO is not a government and holds no authority. Consequently, there is no central civilian authority to which control of all NATO nuclear weapons could be transferred.

NATO is but a treaty alliance, far weaker than the Articles of Confederation which proved to be grossly inadequate for the Thirteen Original States in early U.S. history.

Curiously, we have advanced to the nuclear age in military science, but we are still in the oxcart age in political science. We have not had the good sense to link the NATO peoples with the same type Federal structure that serves the people of the 50 U.S. States so well.

We should proceed at once to forge this linkage, and thus create a central civilian authority to which all NATO nuclear weapons could be transferred.

Meanwhile, we should strengthen NATO by giving its member nations the tactical nuclear weapons they need and deserve. Proliferation of weapons among those who love liberty is an act of humanity and peace.

Poem to Mrs. John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a poem written to Mrs. John F. Kennedy by one of my constituents from Peoria, Ill., Mr. John A. "Arch" Page. Mr. Page did not send the poem to Mrs. Kennedy, thinking it would be lost in the mass of letters and wires which she has been receiving. I therefore think it is appropriate to insert it in the RECORD.

The poem follows:

JACQUELINE

Right hand in left they
  Started on their way,
Past cheering throngs, she smiling;
  He cheerful and gay.

The warm sun of Texas gave
  Comfort to the scene,
No hint of pending sorrow,
  No damper to their dream.

On rolled the wheels of destiny
  To rendezvous with sorrow.
Who there could tell, among that
  Crowd, the gatherings of tomorrow.

All Dallas loves you—but
  Overlooked was one.
"Oh no," she cried, as life
  Ebbed and—death had won.

Lonesome, dry eyed, controlled
  With poise beyond belief,
God alone knows and understands
  The intensity of her grief.

She took a ring from her finger
  And placed it in his hand.
No vision then of ceremony,
  Caissons and marching bands.

Home now, still controlled, with
  Thoughts of love and him.
But he was of the world
  And the world moved in.

Gone now the dignitaries but
  Not gone his world of friends.
Here now is just the beginning
  For your world is not at end.

We of your great country from
  Mountains, valleys and prairie,
Are with you in love,
  As you are with Virgin Mary.

United again is our Nation
  United in praise of him.
What can you do for your country
  Now that his voice is dim.

Keep your eyes on the cross
  On yonder steeple.
Keep faith with your
  Own fine people.

May the nations faith in our
  Destiny, forever and ever increase.
May you and your fine family
  Find everlasting peace.

—*John A. Page.*

PEORIA, ILL., *November 27, 1963.*

Communism—A System of Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the shrill demand that we subsidize and support the buildup of communism by the sale of wheat and subsequent deals, it is practical to note an honest analysis of the Communist economic system.

The Palos Regional, an independent local publication in Palos Heights, Ill., in an editorial of November 14, dramatically emphasized the results of the Communist system, and I feel this analysis is of such practical and timely nature that it deserves the attention of our foreign policy planners, and insert it into the RECORD at this point:

COMMUNISM—A SYSTEM OF SCARCITY

New accounts periodically tell of shortages, some critical, of consumer goods in the Soviet Union. As a matter of official dictate, rationing for most goods was formally abolished some time ago, but in many instances it still seems to be in effect. And prices, aside from those charged for basic necessities, are inordinately high by American standards.

Communism's troubles in this regard are attributed to a variety of causes. Bad weather conditions have produced crop shortages, for one. And, for another, the emphasis has long been on heavy industry—including, above all, the war industries—as against the light industries which produce consumer wants.

Such elements as these have, without doubt, played a role in communism's troubles at home. But they are not unique to the Soviet Union or her satellites. We, and the other advanced Western nations, also have suffered disasters from weather. We too have concentrated on heavy industry. But, at the same time, we have managed to satisfy consumer wants in almost boundless abundance.

Why have we succeeded, where communism has so far failed? The answer lies in the contrasting systems. And we see an example of that contrast here at home every day of our lives, in the retail stores we patronize. They must compete vigorously, even fiercely, for consumer favor. The demands the consumer makes upon them are reflected in their orders to the factories, and so determine what those factories produce. They stock what people want—not what some dictator thinks they should have. And they offer it at prices which honestly reflect costs involved—not prices which a bureaucracy establishes by order.

In the Communist nations the stores—like every other facet of their economies—either are the property of government or are dominated by government. Competition, in the real sense, does not exist. The system which produced this situation is a system of scarcity.

Assassination Evokes Odd Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in the many comments about the assassination of President Kennedy there has been a tendency on the part of some people to jump to unwarranted conclusions and to make blanket indictments of other Americans.

In this time of supercharged emotions, when men are easily led to make rash, unthinking accusations, the column of Richard Wilson, which appeared in the Washington Star on Wednesday, November 27, is worthy of our attention:

ASSASSINATION EVOKES ODD VIEWS—MANY SEEN LINKING KENNEDY KILLING TO RACISTS, RIGHTISTS, DESPITE FACTS

(By Richard Wilson)

The mood of self-examination which has overtaken the country following the assassination of President Kennedy has produced both ludicrous speculation and tortured reasoning.

We can see coming now the tracts entitled "The Conspiracy To Murder John F. Kennedy." In one version it will be an inverse antidesegregation conspiracy using a double-agent Communist to carry out the deed. In another version it will be just a plain Communist conspiracy. Additional versions will prove the ingenuity of the human mind when stimulated by 4 days of unremitting TV-radio programing.

These fantasies are not confined to the lunatic fringe. Here in Washington, simple but seriously intentioned people arrived at the strange conclusion that the murder of the President is related in some amorphous way to the slaying of a desegregation leader in Mississippi.

In spite of the simple facts of the assassination, there are many in this city who will not separate the President's tragic death from the segregation and far right issues. Their tortured reasoning is that the assassin came out of the same pot, that the city of Dallas in the reactionary Southwest had spawned them all and all were equally culpable.

Even the Chief Justice of the United States allowed himself to stray from the path of sound reasoning. The misguided could deduce from his remarks that the extremities of the right in this particular case carried a responsibility for inspiring the extremities of the far left.

It is understandable that reasonable men, shocked and perplexed, should grope for the causes of the savagely incongruous event. But why there should be supposed to be any vague relationship between the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of President Lincoln escapes rationality. Lincoln's assassination was indeed the act of a crazed and pitifully inadequate conspiracy that aspired to control of the Nation. That assassination was part of the great civil war over the issue of slavery and the rights of the States.

All too often, and without sound cause, the events of today are cast in the mold of a century ago, as if the relatively peaceful demonstrations for Negro equality were revolutionary acts. All too often the reaction of the white community of the Nation is related to the cause for which millions of men sprang to arms a century ago.

These exaggerations seem to be part of the uncertain national mood. It could be expected, therefore, that the man in the street last Friday, before the circumstances became known, should conclude that the attack on the President could be traced either to the segregation or the far right issues.

This notion is given up by some only reluctantly and if any twisted version can be made to fit their preconceptions they readily turn to it.

Nothing could have been more repugnant to the vibrant spirit and rational mind of John F. Kennedy.

Now a series of inquiries is beginning. One is by the FBI and the Justice Department into both the assassination and the murder of the accused assassin. Another study will be conducted in Congress in connection with legislation to make a murderous attack on the President and Vice President a Federal crime wherever committed. The State of Texas will conduct a special ex post facto inquiry.

If these inquiries are well-conducted they can help to clarify whether or not Oswald, in fact, murdered the President and his probable motives; they can never prove in the legal sense, however, that Oswald was the assassin, and he will remain for all time the accused assassin.

Only a continuing self-examination by those who influence public thinking will find the root-causes for the act. It may simply be that the cause lies more in the disorderly, undisciplined and callous phases of American life than in the ideological concepts that divide the country.

But one simple fact should not be ignored. The accused, and likely, murderer was a proudly professed Marxist; he never boasted of being a segregationist or a far-righter.

Foolproof Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following editorial entitled, "Foolproof Profits," which appeared in the November 30, 1963, edition of the Washington Daily News:

Speaking of borrowing yourself rich, one tax-exempt institution has made it, according to Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois.

This, according to his figures, is accomplished by drawing money from the Federal Treasury at 2 percent, and lending it back on Government-guaranteed securities at 3.5 percent.

The co-op in question is an electric company in Jefferson City, Tenn. Like other co-ops, it is permitted to borrow money from the Government, at the 2-percent rate, by act of Congress. In theory this helps bring electric lines to rural areas but this job has been finished long since. So co-ops have been branching out in a variety of enterprises such as ski lifts.

The Jefferson City co-op, according to Congressman MICHEL, branched out into Farmers Home Administration notes which are insured by the Government and pay 3.5 percent.

He charges, further, that this co-op has accumulated a kitty of nearly $1.5 million by failing either to reduce rates or to refund to its customers.

Internal Revenue Service, he says, is investigating. While this possibly may compel the co-op to disgorge some of its profits, it will take action by Congress to remedy the basic trouble. These electrical co-ops should pay taxes like their private competitors and borrow their money at the going commercial rates.

Friendly Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all Americans, especially the folks of Dallas, Tex., are filled with sorrow and regret over the tragic incident that occurred on November 22, it is reassuring to see such messages as the following exchanged and printed in the Dallas Times-Herald on November 29:

FRIENDLY WORD OFF THE WIRE

The 36 domestic offices of Ingersoll-Rand Co. received the following teletype message this morning from our operator in the St. Louis office which we feel should be passed on to other Dallas citizens for uplift at this very sad time in our beloved city:

"Beautiful day in St. Louis—temperature just about freezing but sunshiny and lovely—

"Just wanted to send a note to Dallas. I am concerned that they—the people from Big D—should even let the thought enter their heads that the rest of the world blames them for the heart-breaking happening in their town. So long as there are hates and prejudices in the world there will be people who commit that sort of thing.

"I think we all should be concerned about our neighbors, and by our very concern make it impossible for such things to happen. I know that is a far-off day, but somehow, someway perhaps we will be a little more tolerant and understanding. My heart hurts for all the children that are left.

"Anyway—Dallas we send you our special love. Thankgiving is here. It really should be more meaningful this year than ever before—not so joyous but certainly more signifcant.

"Have a good day all—this is the day the Lord hath made. Use it wisely—Mary."

BRUCE SMITH,
Ingersold-Rand Co.

DALLAS.

INDEBTED TO DALLAS

I want to say to my fellow Americans in Dallas that I feel indebted to you for several reasons.

In what was to be his final hour of life, 250,000 of you showered upon our beloved President the affection and devotion so befitting of America to its first citizen. You represented all of us who were not there, and you represented us well. After the fatal shots were fired you administered the best possible medical aid, and even though it was to no avail no one could have done more. Meanwhile, your police force scoured the city, and within an incredibly short period of time had apprehended and captured a prime suspect. One of your citizens gave his life effecting the capture. No American could have made a greater sacrifice.

And so, this is one citizen who although distant from Dallas, is also close to Dallas in the renewed spirit of unity that has bound all Americans closer together for a greater and stronger America.

It would be remiss to close these thoughts without also extending to all of Texas our thanks for giving us a great man who as our Vice President reflected the highest credit upon our Nation, and now as our new President I am sure will do no less.

ERNEST A. VILLAS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Private Ownership of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from "Shooting Times" reprinted in the November 25, 1963, issue of the Peoria Journal Star which points out that the basic cause of President Kennedy's death was not due to the private ownership of a firearm. The editorial calls upon us to search much deeper for the reasons as to why a man would use a gun against a democratic society rather than for it, in order that our freedoms might be maintained. The editorial follows:

ASSASSINATION—BY HATRED

As this is being written, John Fitzgerald Kennedy lies in state in the rotunda of the Nation's Capitol, struck down by an infamous wretch blinded by a stupid hatred which may never be understood by the people of our Nation. Yet, it must be understood.

At about the time that John F. Kennedy's widow knelt beside her daughter and placed a parting kiss on her late husband's bier, the man who allegedly killed him breathed his last—also struck down by another man filled with blind hatred. This righteous killer's stupidity may possibly never be understood by our people either. Yet, it, too, must be understood.

Both the President and his assassin were torn by bullets fired in misguided anger. As a result, the immediate instruments of these men's deaths—and all instruments like them—are under the closest criticism and scrutiny. These immediate instruments were a rifle and a pistol.

Certainly, it is natural and even, perhaps, logical, that firearms take the first vaguely thought out brunt of the Nation's shock and anger over the almost incomprehensible degradation that brought about our President's death. Yet, as so many first-impulse decisions, the quick choice to outlaw firearms in one way or another in order to prevent any such occurrence again is a case of intellectual laziness and complete lack of analysis.

Before those who now thunder for the abolition of privately owned firearms continue their pushing of a natural but poorly considered campaign, they should be made to pause for a moment—in order to think and at least try to understand.

The fact is that our late and revered President's death was not basically caused by a bullet. Neither was his alleged assassin's. President Kennedy was murdered by insane hatred and stupidity. His assassin was killed by another man of the same ilk. One killer deprived us of a great statesman. The other robbed us of the proper course of justice, of which this country is so proud.

Would either of these two killers have been successful if the basic right to keep and bear arms had already been deprived the American people in general? The answer must undoubtedly be "Yes." The President's assassin would have used a bomb, or a knife, or a brick, or poison, or a sword or one of a host of other means of violence. So would have the assassin's killer.

It is interesting to note here that this month's issue of Shooting Times contains a preplanned story on Abraham Lincoln and his love for firearms. The November issue contained a story on Theodore Roosevelt's enjoyment of the gun hobby. We have been considering a story on Dwight D. Eisenhower's love for hunting. We have also noted President Kennedy's hunting trips with our present President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

We are convinced that President Kennedy, and every other past President, would abhor the present lobbying for the abolition of private gun ownership. President Kennedy's message to us today would be this: Abolish the tides of hatred that have been sweeping through our country. Understand each other. Realize that there are always different points of view. And don't think you can protect our country by abolishing the freedoms of which it is actually composed. If you do, you will only destroy the country itself.

Readers of Shooting Times are generally lovers of guns, men who understand their importance to our country. Today, more than any other time in our country's history, the right to bear arms is in grave danger. It is up to us now to impress our fellow Americans with the importance of this great freedom. It is a freedom which has made our country great and mighty. Yet it is a freedom, which, like any other freedom, carries along with it inherent dangers and obligations. Are we to abolish this freedom because we are afraid of its dangers or because we cannot accept its obligations? This is cowardice. Instead, we should accept the danger and face up to the obligations.

The danger, obviously, is the depraved mind of a man who would use a gun against society rather than for it. The obligation, which Americans seem to have neglected, is to guard against the birth of such depravity.

The hatred which killed our President apparently sprang from the ultra-ultra-so-called leftist thinking of a madman. It could, however, have sprung from the ultra-ultra "right" or from the various extreme tangents of the civil rights controversy—or from any other debatable cause. Such thinking comes from an unbalanced mind. But what we seem to have forgotten is that unbalanced minds receive their catalyst from the not-so-good thinking of those who have high levels of intelligence, but have failed to use it.

We Americans, at least up until this Sunday on which the final drama of the President's assassination is unfolding, have not been using our heads. Instead, we have been fostering tides of hatred along one route or another. We have been doing so either by complacence or by jumping onto bandwagons of thought which have no solid, truly American foundation. We are doing so because we are not thinking.

Perhaps President Kennedy's death will make us stop and think. If so, his death will not bring about the infantile abolition of one of the greatest of our freedoms. Instead, from our shock and anger will come a self-assessment which will unite us all in a common cause—of Americans for America. If so, the hatreds which have caused this horrible situation will disappear and our country will have a rebirth of the rightful pride we have always had in all our freedoms. If so, we will not be afraid of danger. If so, we will accept our obligations and do something about them.

If so, President Kennedy's sacrifice will not be in vain.

A Sermon on Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon by the Reverend Julian A. Cave, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Chester, S.C., given to the congregation assembled on November 24, 1963.

This was brought to my attention by the Honorable Wilbur Grant, State senator of Chester County, S.C., who attended and felt that the fine expression might well be brought to the attention of the Nation through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The sermon is as follows:

How tragic the event of last Friday. Who can forget it? I was finishing the sermon for today. My wife was away in the car. Suddenly, she drove into the yard, jumped out of the automobile and ran into the study to say, "The President has been shot!" Both of us dashed to the radio. There we stood, speechless, listening for additional reports being given. News of a critical injury offered some faint hope that he would recover, but soon, all too soon the official announcement was made that the President of the United States was dead, killed by a sniper's bullet. In a later interview, the attending surgeons confessed that there was never any real hope of saving the President's life. That's a moment I can never forget; neither can you.

Momentarily, the news media began to convey the stunned reactions both within our country and around the world. Expressions of shock were varied, but each reflected a noticeable sameness. "Beyond instant comprehension," remarked Adlai Stevenson. Being deeply upset, former President Harry Truman refused to comment until 4 hours after the brutal crime. DIRKSEN, the Republican leader, called the act "incredible, leaves one speechless." "The assassination of the American President was overwhelming," reacted Governor Sanford. A newscaster termed it "one of the most ugly scenes in recent history." Others shouted "Senseless." Billy Graham said, "This is the most tragic day in the history of the United States since Lincoln was shot 98 years ago." It's crude, I know, but one disturbed citizen put it bluntly: "The whole damn thing is so unnecessary!"

Our country, indeed the entire world, was plunged into mourning. Shoppers lost heart to purchase and clerks lacked incentive to sell. A large department store in New York drew curtains over all the advertising windows except one. Here was displayed the portrait of the late President, flanked by urns of flowers. A deadening mood, like a heavy mist, settled upon us all. In the cities, traffic moved at a slower pace; taxis became

increasingly scarce. Sporting events were postponed; television canceled its regular schedule of entertainment and commercials until after the President's funeral. Broadway theaters had no shows. One New York nightclub with a sign out front reading "capacity 600," had only 8 persons. Grief was felt by everyone, cutting across political, religious, national, and racial limits. The situation remains largely unchanged at this moment.

Please forgive me, but I haven't been able to get away from that which the newly appointed President called a sad day for all people. I simply want to talk about it this morning. Perhaps I ought to qualify my remarks, as I do not wish to be misunderstood. It is not my purpose to offer a eulogy to President Kennedy. Of course, from some areas his death has already been linked with that of Abraham Lincoln. "Now he belongs to the ages," noted one Senator. I will refrain from this value judgment. At the same time, I believe that all of us would agree that our country has lost a leader of great mental capacity, of a rare personal charm, of an aggressive spirit which caused him to demonstrate tremendous drive for realizing what he genuinely felt to be in the national interest. Could it be that only in his death, when we forget all partisanship, that we are able to detect his real stature? But I am not here to praise him.

You will understand that I am not attempting to forward any political viewpoint through these remarks today. I will refrain from lauding the New Frontier, neither will I become an opportunist by using this awful happening to preach conservative government. Partisan speeches are profane in this atmosphere.

In this moment, as I speak with you, I keep reminding myself that nothing can make up what happened in that Dallas street. The sharpshooter's mission was successful, and the body of the President lies in state. Mrs. Kennedy enjoys some accommodations—$10,000 a year and the right to send letters without postage, but her companion is gone.

Finishing his short interview with reporters, Carl Sandburg remarked, "I must go now. I haven't had my meditation on this subject." I am keenly aware that it is daring to speak about a subject of such dimensions without extended thought, but fearing that I would forfeit the fitting and proper time to do this, I decided that we would meditate together on the slaying this morning. Two outstanding questions surround it.

1. The initial question is, "Who was the unworthy, unseen assassin?" Of course, the eyes of the world are being focused on a certain Mr. Lee Oswald. He is being held without bond in a Dallas jail. A formal charge of the murder has been made, but he insists that he didn't kill anyone, and under our legal system a man remains innocent until proven guilty. However, the evidence seems so conclusive that the suspect might face difficulty securing a lawyer and an unbiased jury. The Nation itself has already identified the crime with Oswald. Expressing his disgust, a foreign student called the assailant a mad animal. Hugh Downs bitterly exclaimed, "How could anyone so nothing leave his nasty mark on the course of history." Already attempts have been made on his life. He has become the object of our wrath. How disgusting is his face.

In the midst of this outpouring of hate for the young man, I want us to pause to question, "How right are we in making Lee Oswald solely responsible for the President's death?" Could he not be the dramatic expression of corporate guilt? Might he stand as a symbol of the group's wrongdoing? Perhaps his teachers failed to instill in his mind a proper respect for life and authority. What about his family? Did they eagerly and faithfully educate him in religious truth? To what extent was honorable conduct displayed for him to emulate? How much did his friends influence him toward decent citizenship? Were lawful actions demanded? As for the churches, how aggressive were they in trying to bring this misfit into their care? Had ministers and teachers become satisfied that he was incorrigible? (Ironically, this brutal act occurred in a city at which is located a large Methodist University and the largest Southern Baptist Church in the world.) Evaluate the political climate in which the shooting happened. Here was a stronghold of extreme rightwingism. (Stevenson was rudely accepted at a previous visit.) In some ways, the extreme right is akin to the extreme left; that is, each strongly denounces the Government, broadcasting seeds of hate, violence and bitterness. How vicious they become? This atmosphere of hate is growing. Perhaps Oswald felt that in the light of such strong feelings of resentment he could become the immediate hero of both the left and the right by the slaying, executing a deed which everyone wanted, but no person was courageous enough to perform. Let me say parenthetically that when our public officials as well as our citizens make gestures of defiance toward law and order, we are simply inviting the display of brutality. The blood of killings cannot be washed from our hands. Our failure to condemn language of hate ("Shoot the Kennedys" "Hang the Chief Justice") makes us accomplices to the crime. The guilt for the recent church bombing in Birmingham can't be restricted to that city. All the blame for a slain President doesn't rest upon a 24-year-old in Dallas.

I am persuaded that each of us shares the guilt of this horrible hour. Here was a community failure, a disturbing expression of our sins. In passing, I want to say that on last Friday Mr. Lee Oswald of Dallas shot the President. That still remains far away from our town. Another President has been sworn into office, and it is not unlikely that in the future another assassination will occur. The chances are 9 to 1. Could the next assassin be a native of Chester? Your child or mine? Are we providing fertile soil for an assassin to develop? When the announcement of the President's death was made, one of our adult citizens remarked, "Had he come to Chester, I would have shot him." Passing on to another the word of the slaying, a local resident said, "Have you heard the good news? The President has been shot." Although this is a minority sentiment, and possibly the speakers are cowards at heart, still this kind of language is out of order. My friends it is having its influence. We have sown a wind, and we are beginning to reap a whirlwind. In a nearby school, one 12 year old said, "I'm glad. I'm glad he is dead. He's just a nigger-lover anyway." When the public address system at the local school reported the sad news, one student stood and cheered. What are we teaching our children in the homes, on the streets, within the schools, through the churches? If these comments are indicative, we are just starting to reap a harvest of hate. Still we piously ask, "How could this happen in America?" I want to ask quite frankly, "How could it have been avoided?"

2. A second question keeps arising, "What, if any, good can emerge from this tragedy?" Everyone knows that our country has been in difficult times, fraught with discord and divisions: the North stands over against the South, Democrats tangle with Republicans and each faces disturbances within its own ranks, civil rights tear us apart, Federal power has been set in opposition to States rights. Conflicts can be healthy, but it seems that our diversity has been mounting to dangerous proportions. In this kind of climate, the President was killed.

The cross stands as an eternal reminder that death can be redemptive, that death can speak a more profound language than life. Aware of its strange workings, I am hopeful that Mr. Kennedy did not die in vain. It is my prayer that the slaying of the President might—

(a) Cause our Nation to experience a growing solidarity. Agreement in many areas not possible, but there can be a unanimity against violence, hate and distrust. This dastardly act must show to us the error of creating a climate in which bitterness seems proper and right, and judge our apathy which has permitted this spirit to go uncontested;

(b) Urge the recovery of respect for the official leadership of our Nation. How symbolic an assassination. To strike down the Chief of State makes treason appear trifling. Here is no mandate to agree completely with any President's political stance, but an insistence that we recognize who he is and the role he plays. When we differ, he is to be removed by a ballot, not a bullet.

(c) Restore confidence in our system of government which permits each citizen to express his differences without fear of reprimand. We are to guard each American's right to speak, yet deter any American's right to oppress;

(d) Invoke the Almighty God to have mercy upon us for our wrongdoings, to renew our individual and corporate commitment to Him, to implore His help in shaping this Nation according to His teachings and to aspire to make this to be always, "One nation under God." Significantly, the last words of the intended address by the President in Dallas was to have been a Biblical quote: "Unless the Lord keepeth the city, the watchman waketh, yet in vain."

From this death, you and I can work relentlessly to see that "this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

REV. JULIAN A. CAVE.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a prayer which was a part of a special requiem mass said for the late President Kennedy at the Church of the Epiphany, Venice, Fla., on November 24, 1963.

The prayer follows:

JOHN F. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

As a fruit of exceptional beauty and promise is plucked from the tree before it has reached the peak of its destined maturity so has our President been shorn of life as he ascended steadily and surely the ladder of greatness.

This man—in the very prime of life—with vast intellectual powers, remarkable gifts of personality and a comprehension of history and the Presidency that few possess has been snatched from us. It leaves us stunned and shocked beyond the power to express.

A thousand and one lessons will come home to us in the days to come. The eternal question of "it might have been * * *" will restlessly turn up in our thinking. If I may interject one small thought among the many that will cross your mind; How much more important it is to express our loyalty, our fidelity, our allegiance, our devotion, our affection, our cooperation, our love for our leaders while they are with us. When the all-knowing hand of God takes a soul unto himself with numbing suddenness we poor humans grope to express our grief

and our sense of loss and we hasten to display our fealty and dedication. The feelings of love, devotion, respect, honor and loyalty that have hidden deep within us bubble forth in a great physical outpouring. Yet think how we could have eased the awesome burden of responsibility on his shoulders had we but expressed these feelings in proper time.

May the noble example of this dedicated man inspire in this Nation a renewal of those eternal Christian truths and those American qualities that he knew so well and which he exemplified with such distinction.

May Almighty God grant him eternal happiness in Heaven.

What We Can Learn From the Polynesians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the November 24, 1963, edition of Parade magazine. Are there any of us who can deny that the most important thing in any society is love? Surely we should learn to love our neighbors more, to be more tolerant and to be less impatient.

The article follows:

WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM THE POLYNESIANS

(By Lloyd Shearer)

LAIE, OAHU.—In this picturesque little seaside village 40 miles north of Honolulu, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) has just finished erecting a showplace of the Hawaiian Islands.

Called the Polynesian Cultural Center, it cost $1,500,000 and consists of a 15-acre tract on which are 6 true-to-life villages representing the culture of the Tahitians, Maoris, Fijians, Hawaiians, Samoans, and Tongans.

Each of these villages is staffed by some of the 500 natives flown to Oahu by the church. According to Jerry Loveland, director of the Polynesian Institute: "Our purpose is to help these people from the various Pacific Islands adjust to modern life and also to revitalize the old arts and crafts of Polynesia. What we want to do is to retain the best ingredients of their culture and to infuse it with the best of ours."

Wandering around the Center, peopled by these smiling, happy, carefree Polynesians, I asked many of them which culture they thought had more to offer the world—the American or the Polynesian.

Leila Huhoe, a Tahitian girl of 20 who has been attending the Church College of Hawaii for almost 2 years, told me: "You can teach my people about airplanes and computers and how to turn out bigger and better handicraft, but I think we can teach you how to live a better, more tranquil life."

I then polled 30 other Polynesians from Samoa, Tahiti, and Tonga with this question: "What do you think Americans can learn from the Polynesian way of life?"

Practically everyone answered: "Love—we can teach you how to love."

Listen to Erena Mapuhi from Tahiti, who who spoke to me in French: "What surprises us at once about Americans is how little they love each other. I do not mean love of the flesh, but love of the spirit. Here, everything is money. You show gratitude with money, love with money, appreciation with money. We think that is awful. People should love one another, they should do for one another because we are all brothers. In Tahiti we live the communal life. We are all part of the same village. In America it is every man for himself. I guess it leads to accomplishment, but it also leads to selfishness."

I next questioned Mahana Moo, another Tahitian, who is studying business administration and has learned how to type.

LOVE OR AIR CONDITIONING?

"In terms of material comforts," she explains, "Americans lead a much better life than we do. But I think we are happier. I see American children. They have so many toys. I never had a doll in my life, but my youth was the happiest. Everyone was my mother. Everyone, my father. I had great love, and great love is not what people are searching for in America. They are searching for money, and they call this search progress. I know that we have to keep up with the times, but does progress make one happy and content? Which do people want more—love or air conditioning?"

Kay Amaru, a Maori from Tolaga Bay on the east coast of New Zealand, was raised to think first of others, then of herself.

"From what I can see," she declares, "that is not the American way. We Maoris are happy working at something we like whether we are paid for it or not. We like to sing. We like to dance. We like to help others. It's our nature to help and love. I think we could make a great contribution to your culture by increasing the importance of the word 'love.'

"How much," she asks, "do Americans do in their daily lives for money, and how much for the love of neighbors and friendship? I know that we are way behind you in mechanical things. I know that many of us have lost the handicraft skills of our fathers—how to make tapa cloth and carvings and weave baskets—but what we have not lost is our ability to love and to spread love. I hope we can spread some of it here."

The Polynesians I spoke to are enormously fond of Americans. What is difficult for them to understand is our hostility.

"I have met many Americans," one Samoan confided to me, "and what they have not learned is that it is foolish to stay angry or bear grudges against anyone. I don't know why it is so difficult for Americans to forgive completely. Maybe it's because you people are so competitive, Samoans are not."

Millie Tengaio, a Maori of Hamilton City, New Zealand, explains: "What the Mormon Church is trying to do in bringing us here is to intermesh American individualism with the Polynesian communal system.

"I guess," she says, "the thinking is to get us to adjust to a rapidly changing world, to make us more ambitious. In Polynesia today we have jets flying in and out every week. The world is getting smaller and smaller. We cannot live as we used to. But I do think we should maintain our sense of values on love, friendship, and trust. To us, these mean more than money. Love is the mainspring of our lives. It is the only thing we have to bring to American culture."

Love or money? Which is more important? The Polynesians brought to Hawaii by the Mormon Church rank love first. It will be interesting to see what a year or two in Honolulu does to that fundamental belief.

Air Force Tops Chess—Chavez, Clark Score High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD an article which reports on the fourth annual armed services chess championship held in Washington.

This program is a fine, wholesome recreational pursuit, one which stimulates mental activity, and can be engaged in wherever military men congregate. I am pleased that Gen. David M. Shoup is chairman of the honorary committee which directs the chess program.

I hope that my colleagues will read with interest the report on this tournament which was published by the Navy Times. Text of the report is as follows:

AIR FORCE TOPS CHESS—CHAVEZ, CLARK SCORE HIGH

(By Macon Reed)

WASHINGTON.—Chief M. Sgt. Irwin J. Lyon led the Air Force in a one-two-three sweep of the fourth annual Armed Forces chess championship. Rated eighth of the 16 players going in, Lyon scored 7½—7 wins and a draw—out of a possible 9 to win going away in one of the biggest upsets in a whole week of upsets.

Airman Third Robert E. Bailey, Tyndall Air Force Base, Fla., went in sixth but won second with 6½ while 1st Lt. Peter Gould, Lackland AFB, Tex., took third with a score of 6.

Rated second, Gould was about the only player in the 16 who came anywhere close to conforming to the advance rankings.

Zacharias S. Chavez, Coast Guard stewardsman and an unknown in national chess, won fourth and the prize for the most brilliant single game in the competition.

Finishing a whisker behind him was Gy. Sgt. Walter W. Clark, a Marine from Philadelphia Reserve Training Center.

Half a game below him was Army's top finisher, Pfc. Gerald Ronning, of Fort Lewis, Wash., and the top Navy contestant was Comdr. Eugene Sobczyk, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

Lyon was eighth man down the totem pole when the players lined up in the first round according to their ratings in the record books of the U.S. Chess Federation.

The Keesler AFB top noncom remained a sleeper through four rounds, winning over three lower-rated players and losing to Army's Ronning, who was the top-rated player going in. Not until Lyon toppled Chavez in the fifth did the sergeant suddenly emerge as a dangerous contender.

Bailey won the first three and looked dangerous from then on, though he lost his fourth round match to Chavez.

The little Filipino (who has just become a U.S. citizen) from the Coast Guard cutter *Nemesis* in St. Petersburg, Fla., threw a real bombshell. Chavez had no national rating at all and his only known achievement had been taking fifth in the Navy's 5th district tournament in Norfolk last summer.

He was nowhere and expected to stay there. But to the surprise of everyone, including especially Chavez, he knocked off three comparative veterans and drew with Gould, whose rating is just under the master level.

A loss to Clark and one to Lyon held him to the 5½ score.

Clark, the only Marine entry, got the prize for most improvement. He didn't win a game in last year's tournament, nor even draw one. This year he won five, drew one.

When Tournament Director Everett Raffel announced the selection of the brillancy winner, he said that the newcomer from the Coast Guard figured in all three of the best games in the 72-game tournament.

These were Lyon-Chavez, Chavez-Sobczyk, Clark-Chavez.

As winner of the tournament, Lyon was by tradition out of the running for the most brilliant game, so the choice was narrowed to the other two, and the award went to Chavez for an "attacking-defense" called the Sicilian that won against Sobczyk.

At the post-tournament banquet, Lyon received a trophy emblematic of the Thomas Emery Cup, the original of which was transferred from the Army to the Air Force for the next year. Army's 1962 all-service champion, Roy Mallett, did not defend.

This is the second time the trophy has gone to the Air Force; the first time it was split on a tie between Air Force and Army.

John Slinkman, editor of Navy Times, presented the traditional Navy Times awards to the top finisher for each sea service—Chavez, Clark, and Sobczyk. The prizes were monogramed scorebooks and chess clocks.

Clark was prevented from attending the banquet by a death in the family and his awards were received for him by Maj. Gen. William P. Battell, Marine Quartermaster General.

The sergeant was really on the spot, being the only marine contender in a tournament whose honorary committee chairman was Marine Corps Commandant Gen. David Shoup, and whose financial sponsor, Emery, was a marine of the First World War.

Capt. John Higgins, new chief of Morale Services for Bupers, represented the Navy at the banquet. Rear Adm. George A. Knudsen, Chief of Personnel, represented the Coast Guard.

Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Butchers, Provost Marshal, represented the Army and Brig. Gen. Henry C. Huglin, Assistant Chief of Staff, represented the Air Force.

Other Air Force players were A1c. Richard C. Moran, Sioux City, Iowa, air station, A3c. Vernon O. Bragg, Elmendorf, Alaska.

Other Army entrants were Sp4c. Laszlo Incze, Fort Richardson, Alaska; Pvt. Melvin Feuerman, Dugway Proving Ground, Utah; WO John M. Yates, Fort Huachua, Ariz.; Cpl. Peyton D. Philley, Fort Shafter, Hawaii.

Other Navy entrants were Edgar G. Atkinson, Jr., aerographer second, Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.; Capt. H. Leonard Jones, Jr., Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, playing as an alternate; Lt. (jg.) Gail S. Kujawa, Air Control Squadron 13, Pacific Amphibious Force.

It was a Swiss-type tournament, in which winners tend to be paired against winners and losers against losers. Thus the 16 players played only 9 games apiece.

Ties are broken according to the strength of the opposition. Example: Chavez and Clark had the same score, but the players that Chavez beat finished higher, on the average, than those beaten by Clark.

This was the first year in which the Coast Guard had a competitor and it also was the first year in which the number of players exceeded 12. In previous meets, every player played every other one in an 11-game roundrobin.

Actual playing rules remained the same. Each player had to make 40 moves in 2 hours, an average of a move every 3 minutes.

Sincere Message of Sympathy on the Death of President Kennedy From a Sincere and Grief-Stricken Citizen of Three Rivers, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, millions of messages of sympathy poured into Washington following the untimely death of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Today, I received probably one of the most touching and genuinely sincere messages that I have read so far. It came in the form of an anonymous letter from one of my constituents in Three Rivers, Mass., who signed it as "A Member of Christian Church." Enclosed was a $20 bill as an offering in memory of the late President Kennedy, and an expression of sorrow that the writer could not afford the expense of attending the late President's funeral in Washington, D.C. I will personally see to it that this money offering from a sincere, humble, and grief-stricken citizen will be used for the purpose in which the anonymous sender intended.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include the following anonymous message of sympathy printed with my remarks in the RECORD:

DEAR SIR: In memory of our late President, of grieve and sorrow that extends over all the world and the whole remaining family we all have our sympathy to share in all sudden tragic unexpected emergencies of our great and beloved late President, of whom will never be forgotten. I extend my small donation as a gift as all that I could afford at this time. I am sorry that I could not afford the money to travel to Washington, D.C., funeral.

A MEMBER OF CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Tennessee Memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the shocking and tragic news of the untimely death of President Kennedy has shaken the feelings and emotions of the world. In my own State of Tennessee, on Sunday, November 24, prior to the funeral of the President, a memorial service was held in Nashville, the capital city of Tennessee, which I was privileged to attend along with the Governor of Tennessee, The Honorable Frank G. Clement, members of his cabinet, members of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, and representatives of all religious faiths and leading public officials of Tennessee who were in attendance and participated.

The vast War Memorial Building of Tennessee was packed to capacity, including the galleries with standing room only. Governor Clement made the observation that it was the largest crowd he had ever witnessed in this vast auditorium.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, The Honorable Weldon B. White, distinguished justice of th Supreme Court of Tennessee, gave the principal memorial address and eulogy on the life and public service of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Judge White's address is a beautiful memorial to our late President, which I feel many will want to read, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address of Judge White be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The memorial address to the late President Kennedy follows:

MEMORIAL TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917–1963

Governor Clement, Lieutenant Governor Bomar, former Governors Cooper, McCord, and Buford Ellington, Congressmen Richard Fulton and Joe Evins, distinguished members of the Cabinet, members of the general assembly of the State of Tennessee, fellow members of the judiciary, State and Federal, Mayor Briley, members of the Metropolitan Council of Nashville and Davidson County, the clergy of all faiths and all creeds who are with us on this platform here today, members of the press, radio, and television, and members of this audience, numbering more than 3,000, and fellow Tennesseans:

It is an honor to have been selected by the committee on arrangements to deliver this memorial address. I speak the sincere and deep sentiment of all loyal patriotic Tennesseans in saying that the flag of our country and the heart of our people fly at half mast because—

The President of the United States is dead.

These sad and meaningful words were broadcast and rebroadcast by all news media to a sorrowful nation and a shocked world, the real victims of an assassin's bullet, on November 22, 1963.

Born to wealth and educated by the masters, he possessed a love of country, a dedication to public service, and a responsive feeling for the welfare of the average American citizen far beyond that of most men.

Answering his own conscience, and his Nation's call to duty in World War II, he gave his best efforts and almost his life in valiant service of this country that he loved so dearly.

Returning to his home in Boston at the close of the war, and despite his injuries and consequent suffering, he became active and fruitful in the political affairs of his State and our Nation, meeting with such success that he finally attained the Presidency, the pinnacle of success. He was the youngest man ever elected President of our country.

At his inauguration in January 1961, he outlined a program of ideals and goals which he hoped to gain during his administration. He then pursued them vigorously and wholeheartedly with his every resource of spirit, mind, and body. He was a strong and resolute man.

Rebuff at home and abroad failed to daunt his courage or swerve him from these ideals or his chosen path and determined goal. He felt that this country, nearing 200 million, had sufficient natural resources and technological capability to provide an excellent standard of living for all of us, and, at the same time, maintain our place in the Sun.

He foresaw the need of other nations to know of and be acquainted with our institutions, our people, our purposes, and our democratic way of life. The Congress of the United States joined with him in creating the Peace Corps to travel abroad and to lay before the people of foreign lands our ideals and our way of life. The success of the program is known to all.

He foresaw, too, that the cause of human progress would be advanced by acquiring knowledge of outer space and all the mysteries that lie there. Great strides are being made toward this end of our program.

In confrontations with powerful leaders of other strong nations he stood erect and unbending in the belief shared by all Americans that the world can live in peace through the Rule of Law rather than suffer by the Rule of Force. But, he convinced those same leaders that if Force be necessary we Americans stood with him.

This type of leadership, decisive action and resolution demonstrated to the enemies and friends of our country that we want and

desire peace—not peace at any price—but peace on terms honorable and just to all.

The 35th President of the United States, the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is now dead but he and his ideals remain a part of the heritage of this great Nation. He was stricken down in the discharge of the duties of his office. Mrs. Kennedy, another great soldier, was at his side and gave him comfort and strength in his last moments. Her stanch devotion then and in the hours after his death gives to her a unique place in our history.

We salute you, too, Mrs. Kennedy. You discharged your every duty to the President of the United States, your husband, and to the office you have graced for the past 3 years despite many hardships and personal losses.

Robert Frost, the poet and the personal friend of President Kennedy, said:

"Despite our fears and worries—and they are very real to all of us—life continues * * * it goes on. In these three words I can sum up everything I have learned in my 80 years about life" said Mr. Frost, "it goes on."

We recognize, as Mr. Frost did, that life does go on.

The drafters of our Constitution knew that the life of a nation does not stop at the passing of a man, even a great man. It has to go on, and for this purpose provision was made for succession to the presidency. Within the space of 2 hours after the death of Mr. Kennedy, the Vice President, Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson, with his hand upon the Bible, and with Mrs. Johnson on one side and Mrs. Kennedy on the other, subscribed to the oath of office as President of the United States. And, within the space of another 2 hours, he stood in the Capitol City and gave to the American people this humble statement:

"I will do my best. This is all I can do. I ask for your help, and God's."

What more can we Americans ask of any many than that he seek our help and invoke the blessings of God upon assuming the obligations, duties, and responsibilities of this, the highest office occupied by man. We of all faiths, creeds, and color are united in our grief at the passing of our President.

We must be equally united in our support of our new President who will need our help and that of Almighty God in maintaining and pushing forward this growing and maturing American society in its quest for educational, cultural, and economic advancement and political stability.

We should bear in mind that our institutions do not rest on thin air. They rest on sacrifice, character, ideals and faith. Being an American is more than just being a citizen of a country. It is being a member of a strong, progressive, vibrant living society in which every man has respect for the other and the Government has respect for the integrity of all.

At the time when we grieve over the death of our President, it is fitting that we pray to God that He grant to us as individuals the wisdom to "know ourselves" and from that knowledge to rid ourselves of all bitterness, hate and resentment that may be in our hearts, lest their acid eat into our physical being and corrode our spirits; and that He help us not to be frightened by the problems of the day, but rather to be a part of the answer and not a part of the problem.

I think it most appropriate to quote the last paragraphs of the speech prepared for delivery by President Kennedy to the Dallas Citizens Council, the Dallas Assembly and the Graduate Research Center. He was to have said:

"Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

"That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes."

Mr. Kennedy continued:

"We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of 'peace on earth, good will toward men.'"

So ends the last speech prepared by our President.

In Switzerland, I am told, there is a church among the Alps far up on the mountainside and in it there are no lights or lamps. When the time comes for evening service one can see the villagers coming from their homes, each one bearing his own light. At first there is only a glimmer in the darkness, but when they have all arrived for the service the little church is aglow with the combined light of many lamps and candles.

Many of us have only a small light. John F. Kennedy had a large light. A gun in the hand of a man with a diseased and depraved mind has snuffed out the bright light of this forceful, courageous, and dedicated man.

In our grief over this great tragedy we must remember that America like the little church in Switzerland has no light at all, save as we bring our individual lights together for its improvement and the betterment of man.

To the family of Mr. Kennedy we, Tennesseans, extend our sympathetic understanding.

To our new President, Mr. Johnson, we, Tennesseans, pledge our loyalty and support in the troubled and difficult days ahead.

WELDON B. WHITE,
Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Tennessee.

(The above address was delivered in the War Memorial Auditorium on Sunday afternoon, November 24, 1963.)

Keys to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of our truly great Americans is Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation. His views are always worthy of deep considerations.

On November 16, 1963, Mr. Hoover received the Pro Deo Et Juventute Medal at the National Convention of the Catholic Youth Organization.

In my remarks, I include the splendid and informative address, he made on that occasion.

KEYS TO FREEDOM

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, upon receiving the Pro Deo Et Juventute Medal at the Seventh National Convention Catholic Youth Organization in New York City, November 16, 1963)

I accept this award with a deep feeling of humility. I shall treasure it because of my great admiration for the outstanding work being performed by the Catholic Youth Organization. Your efforts on behalf of America's young people have earned the acclaim of all citizens who are concerned with the future of our Nation.

I am doubly honored that the invitation to attend this banquet was personally extended by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, a brilliant and dedicated leader and a devoted servant of God.

To His Excellency, Archbishop John J. Krol, Monsignor Frederick J. Stevenson, and all associated with the Catholic Youth Organization and the Youth Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference who have made this such a pleasant occasion, I express heart-felt appreciation. It has been especially good to see so many friends and to renew old acquaintances.

To the outstanding young people assembled here tonight, I bring warm greetings. Yours is a generation of great challenge. Through no choice of your own, you have entered the world at a time when deadly forces challenge your right, and the right of every American, to live in freedom under God.

Young people in postwar America have grown up with the disillusioning knowledge that the world is no longer safe for democracy.

High ideals are the birthright of youth, but the youth of postwar America must face, also, the chaos which present-day society presents, and bring about order through the realization of those high ideals.

We are at war with communism, in different ways on different fronts around the world. The Communist ideology is born in hate, but our philosophy of life is the practice of love and faith.

Just as freedom is your right, so challenge is your heritage—for freedom, once won, must constantly be defended.

Today, our country faces the most severe test ever to confront a free people. Here and abroad, mortal enemies of freedom and deniers of God himself conspire to undermine the fundamental forces which are the lifeline of our country's vitality and greatness—our most formidable weapons, in peace and in war.

What are these forces? They are—

Faith—faith in a supreme being: God, the author of liberty.

Individualism—inherent dignity and worth of every sovereign individual with his personal rights and responsibilities.

Courage—the courage of a free people firmly dedicated to the noblest cause.

Integrity—that quality of trustworthiness which is essential in dealings between men, and between countries.

Discipline—and self-discipline, which are vital in a nation governed by laws rather than by men.

Vision—such as led our Founding Fathers into the perilous dangers of a hostile wilderness that was to become the proud American Republic in which we live today.

These are America's great bulwarks. They are under savage attack today, just as they were so severely tested nearly 200 years ago at Bunker Hill and at Valley Forge.

Daniel Webster, that brilliant early American statesman, eloquently declared, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Daniel Webster knew the heavy price America had paid for her liberty. And he knew also the disintegrating effect of self-indulgence, neglect of duty, and public lethargy in a nation of free men.

These lethal influences are at work, constantly undermining the sense of personal responsibility and self-discipline so essential to our Nation's welfare. They form a common denominator with the aggressive enemies of our Republic in assaulting the cause of decency and justice across the length and breadth of the land.

Who are these enemies of our Republic? They are the crime syndicates, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the unscrupulous businessmen, the corrupt politicians, and all others who blatantly defy the laws of the land.

They are the hatemongers and the false liberals who would subvert our Constitution and undermine our democratic processes in furtherance of their selfish ends.

They are the Communists and other subversive elements who wave false banners of legitimacy and patriotism while relentlessly plotting to destroy our heritage of freedom.

Communism—in all its forms and in all its variations—is the avowed enemy of liberty and of justice and of God. The Communists fear free and independent thought. They fear truth. They fear God even though they deny Him. They fear the inherent courage and dignity of man created in His image.

Today, the Communists are engaged in an intensive campaign to control the minds and win the allegiance of American youth. Toward this end, a National Youth Commission has been established within the Communist Party, USA; special publications have been issued; front groups have been organized; and an ambitious speech program has been directed against our colleges and universities.

During the past 2 years, Communist spokesmen have appeared on nearly 100 campuses from coast to coast. Their purpose: To create confusion, raise questions, and spread doubt among our young people concerning the American way of life.

If their constitutional right to free speech allows them to use the public school forum to promote the secular creed of Marxism-Leninism which openly and avowedly denies God, does their constitutional freedom of religion also prohibit the rest of us from using the same public school forum to express our faith that God does exist?

It is indeed ironic that Communist Party speakers—whose minds and thoughts and actions are in no manner free—should demand the opportunity to parrot the Moscow line to young Americans under the guise of academic freedom.

Academic freedom is not an instrument for the perpetuation of conspiratorial ideologies. Nor is it an agent of self-destruction—a freedom to destroy freedom. As a free-flowing channel of truth and knowledge, academic freedom is not obligated to carry along the silted tributaries of lies and distortions of known Communists.

The Communists look upon students as potential sympathizers, supporters, and contributors to the party's cause. Nor are they unmindful of the rich opportunity for infiltration presented by unwary racial and nationality groups.

This is especially true of the intense civil rights movement within the United States—for America's 20 million Negroes and the countless other citizens who share their objectives in the current struggle are a priority target for Communist propaganda and exploitation. Every organization engaged in this struggle must constantly remain alert to this vital fact, for, once under Communist domination, all freedoms and rights are lost.

The Communists are eager to capitalize upon all areas of misunderstanding and unrest. Their cause is the cause of Soviet Russia, for the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an inseparable part of the sinister international conspiracy which is financed and directed by the Kremlin. No amount of lies and duplicity can conceal this carefully documented fact.

Today, the godless Communist conspiracy controls more than one-third of the earth's people and a fourth of her land surface. In Europe, in Asia, and here in our own Western Hemisphere, we witness the stark tragedy of souls, chained to the yoke of communism, clamoring to be free again.

The Khrushchevs, the Castros, and the Mao Tse-tungs are faced with an eternal dilemma: The human spirit in bondage—no matter how heavy the chains—struggles relentlessly to break free. Witness the Hungarian Revolution; the boatloads of Marxist victims who continue to pour out of Cuba; the Poznan riots in Poland; the heroic dashes of subjugated people through the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Make no mistake about the Communists in this country. Whether they are members of Soviet-bloc diplomatic establishments in New York and Washington—or whether they are fanatical adherents of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—all represent the same ideology of treachery, deceit, and subversion.

From the immunity which they enjoy as foreign diplomats on American soil, Soviet and satellite officials continue to carry out espionage assignments against the United States. That some American citizens, including concealed adherents to the Communist Party, have knowingly and willingly assisted these Iron Curtain intelligence networks is a criminal disgrace and a blight not only upon our Nation, but upon the entire free world. And it is equally disgraceful that well-meaning but uninformed citizens have permitted themselves to be duped by sympathy campaigns on behalf of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, Morton Sobell, and other traitors.

Nowhere is the hope for peace more sincere than in the hearts of all true Americans. But in our quest for peace, we must never lose sight of the well-documented fact that every Red leader from Marx and Engels through Khrushchev, Mao, and the American Communist spokesman, Gus Hall, is dedicated to an ideology which uphold world conquest as its ultimate goal.

The Communists have never deviated from this objective. Despite the high-pressure campaign they have mounted behind Khrushchev's phrase of "peaceful coexistence," the Communists know that this is simply a propaganda slogan—one devised to further their own ends by stirring the hopes and emotions of those who seek an end to the turmoil, fear, and sorrow that world communism itself created.

Actions continue to speak louder than words, and certainly the Communists have shown no indication of a sincere quest for peace.

The takeover of Cuba and effort to convert it into an island fortress against democracy; the ever-constant infiltration of Red Fascists into countries of Central and South America to create a sovietized Latin America; the increase of espionage activities by Soviet and satellite agents in our country, particularly those who strive to penetrate our Government processes from the protection afforded them by diplomatic assignments in New York and Washington; the frantic efforts of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to subvert our youth; and the intense drive of the Communists operating from concealed positions to wrest control of the movement for Negro rights—does all this indicate a real and sincere desire to live in "peaceful coexistence"?

In recent years, the Communists have demonstrated an attitude of open defiance and contempt for our laws—an attitude which is fortified by their repeated ability to invoke loopholes, technicalities and delays in the law to thwart justice. One former judge found cause to warn last summer not only of "inexcusable" delays in the courts, but also of what he considered to be a "trend of decisions in the last 10 years * * * favorable to extreme leftwingers, Communists and subversives in general."

Another student of court rulings in the internal security field was prompted to observe, "Unfortunately, subversive activities are well on the way to becoming a no man's land in the law."

In 1957, a Federal judge in the Nation's Capital assailed what he considered to be "an unfortunate trend of judicial decisions * * * which strain and stretch to give the guilty, not the same, but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen." There has been no reversal of this alarming trend—a trend which is felt in our steadily rising national crime problem.

Justice is a free nation means protection for society as a whole, rather than leniency for the individual to the detriment of society.

Since 1957, when the Federal judge issued his warning, crime has increased nearly 40 percent. Its victims continue to mount at a relentless rate. Four serious crimes are committed every minute; there is a crime of violence every three minutes; and property crimes—robberies, burglaries, larcenies and automobile thefts—occur within seconds.

Americans, in growing numbers, are developing a dangerously indulgent attitude toward crime, filth, and corruption. No one can deny that motion pictures are deliberately and defiantly pursuing an increasingly bold courtship with obscenity. No one can deny the role of the television industry in bringing lurid portrayals of violence and sadism into the living rooms—and even the nurseries—of our homes. No one can deny that sensual trash is moving closer and closer to the children's books on the shelves of our newsstands and magazine stores.

Our youth do not need weakness; they need strength. They do not need indulgence; they need the guidance and the discipline which can best be provided by a decent home.

Above all, they need the benefit of religion—in church, at home and in the atmosphere of our classrooms.

Despite the dedicated efforts of church and civic leaders and others who have a sincere interest in the proper development of our young people, the failures continue to mount. Each year, persons under 18 years of age are involved in nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts, and approximately one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests. The newspapers of our major cities recount incidents of senseless murders, violent assaults and brutal beatings inflicted upon innocent victims by arrogant gangs of teenagers and young adults.

Courts are influenced too much by the age—rather than the record—of the young hoodlum who stands before the bar of justice.

The bleeding hearts, some actually sworn to administer the law either as judges or social workers, are so concerned for young criminals and terrorists that they are indifferent to the rights of law-abiding members of society.

We have mollycoddled young criminals, lightly tapped hardened offenders on the wrists and released some unreformed and unrepentant hoodlums to prey anew on society.

The time is long overdue for us to adopt a more realistic attitude toward this critical problem. We have tried the charitable approach toward young hoodlums and it has failed.

We are paying dearly for these failures. They represent a tragic waste of America's most valuable resource—the moral, mental, and physical health of her young citizens.

The crime problem costs the American people some $22 billion a year—nine times the amount contributed to our churches. For every $1 spent on educating our children, $1.11 goes to crime.

Nowhere in recent months have our people faced a more explosive condition of shame and violence than among the hatemongers, the moral degenerates, the lunatic fringe and the other irrational fanatics who preach a doctrine of hostility toward their fellow man. This rabble has sown the dragons' teeth of malice and intimidation; and from the ground has sprung a series of hate-driven riots, bombings, and desecrations.

The voices of temperance, logic, and decency must speak out more effectively and make their influence felt. No problem is so acute, no crisis so severe, that terrorism can be tolerated in a society of free men. Hate, terror, and lawlessness are not the American way of accomplishing any objective that is truly worthwhile. In meeting the tense crises which confront the United States in this nuclear age, we must look to God for guidance and inspiration.

This country has never run from its enemies. Challenge, not compromise—bravery, not cowardice—are integral parts of our heritage. Since that critical hour in 1777 when General Washington ordered his Revolutionary Army to "Put none but Americans on guard tonight," it has been the tradition of our proud Nation to rise to its greatest heights in the face of adversity.

There are important lessons to be learned in the pages of American history. From Faneuil Hall to Cape Canaveral, our greatest patriots have been men and women of deep religious conviction: Men like Thomas Jefferson, the principal author of our Declaration of Independence, who told his fellow colonists, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

In the eyes of a later-day hero, "Freedom, devotion to God and country are not things of the past. They will never become old fashioned." These words were spoken by Astronaut John H. Glenn.

America remains free because men of faith, men of individualism, men of courage, men of integrity, men of discipline and men of vision have patrolled her most vital outposts for 187 years.

These strong qualities, faith, individualism, courage, integrity, discipline, and vision, are the keys to freedom.

When the United States has lost its youthful outlook, it will have lost its vitality and its capacity for progress. That is why I charge the young people assembled here tonight to preserve the pioneer spirit which has been the soul of America since her birth.

Meet every new challenge with confidence and determination. As you look to the future, do not lose sight of the important lessons of the past. History, all too often, repeats itself. The freedoms you enjoy today will be lost, as they have been destroyed at other times and in other nations, through neglect and abuse.

Do not hesitate to speak out and bring public pressure to bear upon negative influences within your communities. We must never become so accustomed to filth or so intimidated by the advocates of so-called worldly reality that we fail to revolt against corruption and decay.

May you always protect America's heritage of freedom. May you, with God's holy guidance, preserve and strengthen that priceless heritage for the generations yet to come.

As His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, observed so profoundly nearly a decade ago, "We have no right to expect to keep our freedoms, if we ourselves do not faithfully and thankfully protect the soil and soul of America from those who have abandoned God, and for God's Commandments have substituted their own code of inhumanity, greed and violence."

Let us protect and defend the real meaning of America. This is the debt we owe to the brave legions of the past who laid down their lives to safeguard the great truths which guide our destiny today.

Rabbi Lasker Sermon in Memory of John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Meir Lasker of Temple Judea Congregation, which is in my district in Philadelphia, delivered an unusual sermon in memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy on Friday evening, November 22, the day that our late President was shot.

The sermon is so outstanding that I have included it for the Members to read:

SERMON DELIVERED FRIDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 22, 1963, IN MEMORY OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Friends, I know that all of us were stunned beyond words at the tragic events of today. The startling echo of the phrases coming over the radios "the President has been shot," "the President of the United States is dead," still rings in my ears, and I am certain in your ears as well, and it has left all of us shaken and bewildered. Is there any real American in our midst whose soul is not now numbed, whose heart is not now mired in the valley of the shadow of death?

A fearful emptiness fills our being as our seared spirits cry out "Why?"

Here was a young man, gifted, educated to the concept of democracy. Whether we concurred with all of his ideas and ideals—or whether we failed to go along with them in part or in entirety—is of little consequence at the moment. All of us realized, and I am certain all of us sympathized with the tremendous tasks he faced, the heavy burdens he carried, and the innumerable crises that John F. Kennedy was confronted with.

He had a dream—this youthful President of ours, a wondrous magnificent dream—to bring America a little bit closer to the realization of the ideals set by the Founding Fathers of this country "that all men were created equal." He had a dream—that all men, regardless of tint of skin or race, or nationality or creed—might walk with dignity under the protection of the flag of our country. He had a dream—that all would be equal before the law both in the North and the South, in the East and the Western sections of our land. For this he lived, for this he fought, and because of this he was assassinated. And as I contemplate this tragedy, I can only say: "You, John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States, you unremittingly fulfilled the words of our sage Rabi Tarfon: 'It is not incumbent upon you to complete the tasks'—but begin it you did—and others will pick up the bloody banner that fell from your hands so suddenly—and carry it to victory.

"For the dreamer dies—but never the dream
Though death shall call the whirlwind to his aid
Enlist men's passions, and trick their hearts with hate.
Still shall the vision live."

Friends, I am certain that all of us tonight are engulfed with memories, emotions, thoughts. For this moment is not a sorrowful moment for Mrs. Kennedy alone—who lost her husband, nor for the Kennedy family who lost a son and a brother—but it is a moment of grief and soul searching for 180 million Americans. For in our hearts, we know, that we cannot throw the entire guilt upon the head of the young assassin, nor even upon the shoulders of the white council groups—who undoubtedly influenced, by their corrupt standards, this irrational act.

For in truth we are all somewhat responsible, all of us should proclaim "Hotonu"—we too have sinned in this—that we have sat by silently for days and weeks and years—permitting such conditions to develop—that lawlessness was bound to raise its ugly head.

If the death of our President is to have any meaning—and his life blood that was shed—be not in vain—it should sound the alarm for us with new urgency. It should awaken us—shock us into the realization that we must act—and act now—not tomorrow—not next month and not next year, but now, that the lawlessness that has engulfed our Nation, the false concepts of first and second class citizens; superior and inferior citizen—may for all time be detroyed and vanish from the shores of our land.

Yes. I believe that John F. Kennedy had a dream. He was raised to the noble position of Presidency of the United States not merely because of the honor it entailed—but because he felt with and for the peoples of this land; the poor, the aged, the downtrodden. And because he sympathized with their hunger and their needs—he strived to initiate legislation that would aid them. Slum clearance, aid to students, and medicare. Having seen the crises that engulfed other nations, where the common man was neglected—he strived to stave this off in the country he loved. For this he was abused, for this he was hated, for this too, he died.

Time after time he called upon the American people to awaken from their lethargy; to meet the challenging needs of our time—but we, as a people failed to rise to the challenge—we lagged behind, our Congress and Senate lagged behind—but I suspect that this bloody orgy—which struck today—may awaken us—that we must act now.

Here was a man, a real man—father of children—who shared with many parents the terrible fear, the haunting dread—that the nuclear arms race, unless quietly arrested—would doom us all.

And because of his position as President of the United States, he saw clearly what horrors might strike our civilization at any moment and blow our world out of existence. He strived to bring about a little light in the gloomy darkness—through a nuclear test ban. He hoped, as we all prayed—that we and our children and our children's children might live out our lives in peace—with none to make us afraid.

And now—he who sought peace for us—lies dead—dead by the bullet of an assassin. Shall we now fail him?

I should like to close with words paraphrased from the poet. Words that the spirit of John F. Kennedy—a martyr of our Nation may ask us:

"What will you do with the world that I died for to make new
With the strength and the beauty of life—and its Valor—
What will you do
Will you lead out of bondage the captives—
Or fetter mankind?"

Rabbi MEIR LASKER.

Cockeyed Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

MICHEL], has called attention to the disastrous effects of governmental economic planning under the Area Redevelopment Administration. The Rockford (Ill.) Star recently provided a very meaningful editorial commending Representative MICHEL, and showing the economic detriment to the State of Illinois resulting from actions of the ARA. I urge my colleagues to give careful thought to the editorial, which follows:

COCKEYED ECONOMICS

Representative ROBERT MICHEL, Peoria Republican, had plenty of reason to be critical of two examples of the "pirating" of industry from Illinois to eastern Tennessee. One of the firms is at Washington in MICHEL's congressional district. The other is at Eureka in the district of Representative LESLIE ARENDS, Melvin Republican.

Both plants, which make cartridges for phonograph tone arms, are being closed because the company, Radio Manufacturing Engineers, Inc., has been underbid by firms in the so-called "depressed areas." The Illinois company will close its two plants, move to Tennessee, and get a new plant which will be built with Federal funds.

That is what happens under the Area Redevelopment Administration. Two Illinois communities lose factories, which under private enterprise have created jobs and payrolls that bolstered the local economies. The firm moves to a "depressed area" and into a new plant financed by taxpayers from all over the country.

If this isn't cockeyed economics, perhaps the Area Redevelopment planners can tell us where we're wrong. We agree with Congressman MICHEL that it's a clear-cut case of industry piracy by the Federal Government. It is a brand of economics based on political decisions, rather than on the availability of skilled labor and management's opportunity to meet competition.

Remarks of Dr. Frederick W. Cropp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, 1963, I was privileged to have been tendered a dinner in my district at which Minority Leader Charles Halleck presented the address.

The invocation for the dinner was given by Dr. Frederick W. Cropp, minister of the San Marino Community Church, San Marino, Calif.

It seems appropriate to bring the words of Dr. Cropp to the attention of the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks I submit the invocation for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

Almighty God, who hast given so much to us, give us one thing more—a grateful heart.[1] Especially may we be grateful in the midst of our plenty and the glow of our fellowship this night.

We are grateful for the dedicated devotion to our Nation of him whom we honor with our presence this night. As we assure him of our friendship do Thou continue to enable him to think clearly, act wisely, and in accordance with Thy will.

Restore to this Nation its sense of dignity and the spiritual judgment of its forefathers.

Let courage rise with danger and let us in vigilance be victorious over all evil opposition, whether it be at home or abroad.

From the enthusiasm of this meeting send us back to our duties better equipped to combat the foreign and domestic enemies of this our beloved land, firm in the realization that Thy right arm of omnipotence fights steadily on the side of moral purpose.

Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou will keep the United States in Thy holy protection, that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, and entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large.[2]

Help us, to remember and to enact the words and spirit of him who said a century ago:

"With malice toward none;

"With charity for all;

"With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right,

"Let us strive on to finish the work we are in.[3]

That this Nation under Thee may have a new birth of freedom, so that government of the people, by the people and for the people may, far from perish, rather increase upon the earth.

In the name of that power that hath made and preserved us as a nation, we pray. Amen.

[1] George Herbert.

[2] From George Washington's prayer, June 8, 1783.

[3] Lincoln's Second Inaugural.

"Our Economy," an Address by the Honorable Matt S. Szymczak, Before the Stockholders' Meeting of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, Kans., May 4, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Matt S. Szymczak, a member of the faculty of Georgetown University here in Washington and a former distinguished member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. He spoke at a stockholders' meeting of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, Kans., on May 4, 1963. His remarks follow:

OUR ECONOMY

(By Matt S. Szymczak)

Savings and loan associations are close to home. Therefore my message today is on our economy—where it is and where it is likely to go. But more importantly it seems to me my message will stress our home problem, the problems we face today and must resolve as soon as possible, lest they increase to such proportion that they will overwhelm and destroy that for which we gave so much—our home and freedom and our high standard of living.

It is a natural tendency for man to relax in spring, when business shows some improvement. We welcome good news and we dislike to be told that there is much to be done to improve and to strengthen our economy and to keep it at a high and stable level.

Last fall the pessimism seemed greatly overdone. At that time all the factors that influence spending and therefore economic activity pointed more or less toward maintenance of current levels. It appeared to me that economic activity would not change drastically upward or downward, for many months.

I think the current optimism is equally overdone. I continue to see no serious recession on the horizon, and it seems quite likely that the next several months will witness a welcome improvement in the economy. But before we go overboard and count on a real boom that would strain our resources—a boom of the kind we had in the late forties, or one of the 1955–57 variety, let us look at the facts a little more closely. Sobriety now may spare us unnecessary disappointment and an excessive counterswing of the pendulum later.

Throughout last fall and winter, the economy was sluggish but—in contrast to business psychology—never weak. Consumer income was steadily advancing, and with it, almost in exact proportion, consumer spending. Prospects for investment outlays seemed a bit uncertain, but the effects of last summer's provision for investment credit and revised rules for depreciation allowances were bound to be felt sooner or later, and promised at worst to prevent a serious drop, at best to stimulate a rise in new investments. Government expenditures on the Federal, State, and local levels were scheduled to increase steadily. Exports also were slowly rising, and though the leveling off of the European boom might slow down the rate of further expansion in exports, a serious fall was certainly not in the cards. In brief, all indications last fall pointed to a slow but continuing improvement.

They still do. Nothing basic has changed. Nothing has happened that was not foreseeable half a year ago. Investment credits and revised depreciation rules are beginning to encourage modernization as intended. The steady rise in consumer spending is gradually absorbing excess capacity and thus stimulating expansion of facilities. As a consequence, investment plans for 1963 now promise a 5-percent increase in investment outlays. Inventories, exceptionally low in relation to sales all last year, inevitably have to be built up in line with gradually rising sales—another plus factor. Government expenditures on all levels keep increasing, as scheduled. Residential construction remains strong in view of the high rate of family formation now and throughout the sixties. Exports continue to maintain a satisfactory level, even a slowly rising trend—as was to be expected, barring an economic calamity abroad.

Does not all this add up to the beginnings of a boom? It does not seem very likely. No doubt the rise in investment outlays will, through the so-called multiplier effect, speed up the rate of economic expansion. And higher sales will have an accelerating effect on the accumulation of inventories. On both counts, we may expect a healthy boost to the economy for the coming months. But will that be enough to bring us back to real prosperity and full employment? Perhaps there would be a chance if we could make society stand still, if we could freeze the population, the work force, and technological development. But we cannot—and neither would we want to. As it is, we must find outlets for an ever increasing production if we merely want to avoid increasing unemployment. To quote Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz from a recent interview in U.S. News & World Report, "in order to take care of the new people entering the labor force and also to replace those jobs taken

over by machines, it is estimated that we will have to find about 50,000 or 60,000 new jobs every week."

The trouble with our present spurt is twofold: it is based partly on factors which are only transitory, and it is held back by a built-in brake. The transitory factors are automobiles and steel. A second banner year for automobiles—and 1963 has all the makings of one—can probably be explained in terms of heavy demand from the large number of young people now coming along, ready to buy their first car. Many of them, in fact, are looking for used cars. But that too helps: a buoyant second-hand car market boosts trade-in values and determines many others to buy a new car now. On that reading it is quite conceivable—though by no means certain—that car sales may remain high for months or even years—but probably not at the peak rate of the last 18 months. As to the strength of steel, much of it is of course due to hedging against a possible strike later this year. We must surely hope that the uncertainty be removed soon lest the buildup of inventories be carried further and then be followed by a precipitate drop in sales, as happened last year.

The built-in brake in the economy is of course our present tax structure. Having such a brake is not in itself a bad thing—quite the contrary: if properly adjusted to a safe speed from time to time, it could be a real blessing. But of course, it hasn't been adjusted for 20 years, apart from some little tinkering with it every few years, and the results of that omission are obvious. The absolute level is too high—based as it is on wartime rates which were still appropriate and useful in the early postwar years when inflationary demand pressures had to be held back, but a real drain on available purchasing power in a normal peacetime economy. Equally damaging, if not more so, is the steep progressiveness of the structure. Even without the price inflation of the postwar years, this would have meant that as the economy grows and per capita income rises, even larger chunks of that income are taken out in taxes. This of course is the perfect recipe for stagnation—ever larger unemployment of resources—unless we are prepared to implement the logical counterpart of such a tax policy: to increase government expenditure not only in step with rising national income, but much faster than that, until government accounts for 25, 30, 40, 50 percent of total spending—and eventually even more than that. Surely nobody is willing to contemplate such fantastic enlargement of the government sector.

This braking effect of the progressive income tax would have made itself felt in any event, simply as a result of rising standards of living. The postwar price inflation has simply reinforced it and brought us face to face with the dilemma much more quickly and dramatically. But my point is that the braking effect as such is a good thing—provided it is periodically adjusted to the changing economy. What makes it so farcical at the moment is that we are trying to run a model 1963 economy with a brake of 1940 vintage. Let us by all means retain a brake in the form of a progressive tax structure, but one that is adjusted to a much faster and larger economy. Then and only then, will we once again have a built-in stabilizer—not a gadget that brings the economy to a screeching halt every time we come within 8 percent (and eventually perhaps within 10 or 15 percent) of full employment of our resources, but rather a safety valve when too much steam is building up and inflation threatens.

With a revision in the outmoded tax structure so important for our future prosperity and growth, it is obvious that the recent indications of an economic upswing make it appear less necessary, but actually and in truth the tax revision is much more necessary. In fact, rising incomes will quickly lead to disproportionately larger tax receipts, probably to some reduction in Government transfer payments, in brief, to a shrinking in the Government's cash deficit long before full employment is reached, and will thus take the steam out of any revival before it gets very far. Nothing at the moment is more important than to bring home this one point as emphatically as possible: the truly serious flaw in the present tax structure is not that it may lead to a recession, but that it stifles any honest-to-goodness revival and thus prevents us from making full use of our resources and from realizing our potential for growth. It would be tragic if this truth were lost sight of in the squabble over details of the tax bill. Whatever happens to the various reforms—and it now looks as though most of them may be lost, at least this year—it seems imperative that a net cut in the tax take of at least close to $8 billion be salvaged. This appears to be the minimum and the spread over 3 years is too long. It seems to me that the spread should be 2 years beginning as soon as possible. Otherwise we shall have to resign ourselves to the modest hope that a few more years of semi-stagnation and high unemployment will ultimately lead to greater understanding of the issue involved, and that after a period of clear exposition by the leaders of opinion, the public will finally be ready for the radical tax overhaul we really need.

There is still another reason why we must guard against any complacency about our economic performance, even if in the coming weeks and months the economy picks up and seems to be advancing at a brisk pace. Not only must we run faster merely to stand still—a quantitative problem—but we are also facing a serious qualitative social problem, the need to adjust to a profound revolution in the country's economic structure. The President's recent manpower report gave a glimpse of the magnitude of this task. Quite apart from the (quantitative) fact that over the past 5 years the economy generated on the average somewhat under half a million new jobs per year while the labor force increased by (on the average) 781,600 workers annually, and will increase at a much faster rate throughout the sixties, there is the drastic shift in the type of job opportunities that are available. Agricultural employment has been declining by roughly 200,000 annually, and a similar contraction has been taking place in mining jobs. As to manufacturing, technological changes are radically altering the job pattern there too. There continues to be less and less demand for unskilled and semi-skilled labor—over the past 5 years the number of blue-collar workers declined by over 7 percent—while the increasing requirements for engineers, scientists and similar highly skilled occupations are often hard to satisfy. It is here that shortcomings in the educational system will soon create serious social problems. The large number of school dropouts; the uneven, and often seriously inadequate education provided in some of our high schools; the weaknesses in mathematics, science and engineering education; the haggling over aid to education, both on the primary and secondary levels and on the college and professional school level; the difficulties of retraining many older workers whose skills are rapidly becoming obsolete: all these factors are building up to a social problem—a serious social problem.

That is why at this time of a short-term spurt in the economy, it appears advisable for me to sound this serious note of caution. What may well happen is that a majority of us—those who have jobs and the right skills—will rest on this economic rise while an ever larger minority—young people who are inadequately trained, older people whose jobs have disappeared, racial minorities who are discriminated against—cannot find jobs at all. Disraeli once spoke of "two nations" in Britain; it would be a tragedy if America, after three centuries of economic and social equality, and opportuinties for all, were now to develop such a cleavage between "haves" and "have nots." And as you well know, and as history teaches us every day, the "have nots" become increasingly more and more desperate.

Let me sum up: The short-run economic prospects look good. There has been underlying strength in the economy: High levels of income out of which consumers have consistently spent 92 to 94 percent after taxes; willingness and ability to expand consumer credit; low inventories which call for a considerable buildup as sales expand; outlays on new plant and equipment which are likely to rise quite a bit; gradually increasing levels of Government spending, both on national defense and on the enormous backlog of social overhead, especially on the State and local level; and a continued slow growth in exports. Nor must we overlook the possibility that inventiveness and technological changes may lead to unforeseen new bursts of activity in many sectors. But pleasing as these prospects are, we must never forget the submerged five-sixths of the iceberg that constitute the real challenge of the sixties: How to fit a rapidly swelling number of new jobseekers into a radically changing economic structure—really two staggering problems rolled into one. The answer is clear at least in outline: We must take the tax brakes off the economy so that it can take off into rapid and sustained growth and provide a job, a living, and an economic justification for the more than 1 million new members that will join the labor force every year from now on; and we must finally bestir ourselves to prepare people, especially young people, for the jobs of the sixties.

This, therefore, is my message—much yet remains to be done at home. This is a good time for all of us to join in doing it. This is no time to relax and to let somebody else do it. That is our job—yours and mine.

Savings and loan associations, by the very nature of their financial operations, are close to home and to the grassroots of our economy and our social structure. Therefore, savings and loan associations are in a position to understand and to join in this determination to concentrate our efforts to resolve not only our short-range problems but also, and more importantly, our long-range economic problems. History will judge us by that which we do or do not do now.

We Shall Overcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic death of our beloved President John F. Kennedy, eulogies in newspapers and magazines all over the world have paid eloquent tribute to a great emancipator and peacemaker. Among these tributes none is more eloquent than the editorial which appeared in a special edition of New York's Amsterdam News on Saturday, November 23. The publisher, Dr. C. B. Powell, an ardent admirer of President Kennedy, had a special edition of the Amsterdam News put out for the first time in the 54-year history of the paper. I hope that all of

my colleagues will pause to read this moving farewell to the President:

WE SHALL OVERCOME

The mere words of mere mortals are not adequate to pay tribute to a man like John Fitzgerald Kennedy—but mere men, being what they are—can try.

President Kennedy was more than just the President of the United States to this Nation's 20 million Negroes—he was a symbol—a beacon of hope—a "Sermon on the Mount" whose very way of life stirred black men everywhere to fervently sing "We Shall Overcome."

And the ending of that life by an assassin's bullet will only serve to encourage more and more Negroes to sing, louder and longer—"We Shall Overcome."

For though John F. Kennedy was every inch the President of the United States to all its people, the Negro people of America probably understood him better than any other group in America.

And when Negroes in the future sing "We Shall Overcome" they will be doing so because they know more than anyone else that J.F.K. would have had it so.

No President in history has ever devoted so much time to the problems of the Negro. No President in history has shown such a warm and sympathetic understanding of the problems of the Negro. No President in history has ever submitted stronger legislation to the Congress on behalf of the Negro.

And no President in history will be remembered with more love and respect by Negroes.

President Kennedy spent his life working toward the right and the light.

And the greatest tribute which this Nation can pay him is to say, as we say now, that that work will go on to the final victory.

One poet has posed the question:

"Is there beyond the silent night
And endless day?
Is death a door that leads to light?"

We say that there is.

There is a door which leads to the light and John Fitzgerald Kennedy has passed through that door and is at peace in the world of light for which he worked.

And because we know this, even in our sorrow over his death, we are still able to say with the scriptures:

"Oh death where is thy sting. Oh grave where is thy victory."

"We shall overcome."

Death Carries No Party Labels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Thousands of words have been spoken and many thousands more written in eulogy of our late President, and many thousand more will be heard and read in the days ahead for Americans will not soon forget the terrible tragedy of the assassination.

Reactions to this incomprehensible act have appeared in print in newspapers all over the world, but, I believe no editorial presents the heart of America better than one entitled "Death Carries No Party Labels" written by Leo T. Paulin which appeared in the November 27 edition of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase (Md.) Advertiser.

Under permission to extend my remarks I submit the text of this editorial and commend it to my colleagues:

Death carries no party labels: It was 8 o'clock when I walked out of my office and into Wisconsin Avenue last Friday night. The same amount of current as always flowed through the wires to the street lights that illuminate Wisconsin Avenue.

But on this night the intensity of their light could not penetrate the gray fog which enveloped everyone on the street. A man walked by holding an infant in his arms. His face, too, was fog-gray. He stared ahead—an empty stare, uncomprehending, tragic. It was almost like a man walking into destination unknown with a dead son in his arms.

Traffic along the broad avenue moved reluctantly. Cars came to a gentle stop at the red light. When the light turned green they tiptoed on their way with reverence; like people leaving a funeral parlor. The drivers were intent. It seemed not at all important to beat the driver in the next lane away from the intersection.

An hour before I left the building I stood gazing into the street from my second-floor office. With me were Joan Winters, our fashion editor, and Bill Hantzis, one of our account executives. The windows were open and the distant wail of sirens told us that the awful tragedy that had befallen the United States, and most of the world, a few hours earlier would be coming even closer to us in a few minutes.

Helmeted police astride screeching motorcycles came first. Then the long light-gray naval hospital ambulance carrying the lifeless body of our President passed under our window. I made the sign of the cross; so did Joan. Bill Hantzis was silent, motionless.

In the ambulance also was courageous, magnificent Jacqueline Kennedy, still wearing the blood-stained suit against which she had cradled her dying husband.

At 2:25 p.m. on that fateful Friday, November 22, 1963, I walked out of Suburban Hospital where I had visited Jack Espey, a patient there and vice president of the Paulin Publishing Co. Minutes after I started my car I heard the frightening flash: "President Kennedy has been shot."

As the reality of the horrible act dawned, my eyes filled with tears. I stopped the car on Georgetown Road and listened to the enveloping details. When I arrived at our publishing building I went into my private office and found most of the staff there clustered around the TV set.

The women were crying openly; the men were red-eyed holding back tears. Somehow men are not permitted the release of sobbing unashamedly. The pall of tragedy was wrapped around us. Our work, so important minutes earlier, had become meaningless, absurdly insignificant.

The couple of dozen phones in our office which seem to ring incessantly were stilled. For a time America's heart had stopped beating. And America was as dead as John F. Kennedy, the strong, vibrant, dramatic personality who successfully challenged the greatest forces in life but succumbed to a piece of lead, pencil eraser size.

No writer anywhere can piece words together to adequately describe America's grief, shock, revulsion over the cowardly slaying of its beloved President. You reason, you rationalize, you ask, why? And there is no answer.

Was it part of God's design that this man, this great intellect, who pioneered new trails in the affairs of nations be taken from the world of mortals just 2 years and 10 months after he assumed the Presidency?

Was it part of divine design that John F. Kennedy missed by the narrowest of margins, yet missed, the nomination for Vice President in 1956? Had he captured that nomination and had been defeated along with Adlai E. Stevenson, would he have been elected President in 1960? There is no answer.

Today, John F. Kennedy lies in a hero's grave in Arlington. The moment life passed from his body was a moment of deepest despair. All the Nation was grieved. His political opponents as completely so as his political supporters. And this is one of the marks of America's greatest. There are countries in the world, too many of them, where the passing of a head of state is a festive occasion for the opposition.

Only here, in America, can we detach political philosophy from the person espousing the philosophy. While he lived I did not subscribe to his New Frontier program and design for America. I opposed it at the polls and through my writings.

Yet when John F. Kennedy died I cried. I cried because I opposed only what he stood for and not what he was. I loved his warmth and gregariousness. His death revealed to all America the deep-seated affection for him which transcends all political antagonisms.

In the short span of his career John F. Kennedy has achieved greatness. He has left his mark on the world. His death, as no other single tragedy, not even World War II, awakened us once again to the true power of our beloved United States. Our unity, as a people, is our strength.

The office of the Presidency is sacred. The man who occupies it is our President.

And as the tears of sorrow dry and life returns to near normal, those of us who do not agree with the policies of his successor will marshal forces to oppose him. But let no man take his life. He's our President. We love him. This is America's greatness.

The Negro Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

PROPOSAL BY DUNBAR S. MCLAURIN AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ANNUAL AWARD DINNER—THE NEGRO REVOLUTION—ECONOMIC PHASE

A. The purpose: The purpose of this memorandum is to outline a plan whereby Negroes and their friends can mobilize their money to provide the necessary economic strength and muscle to complete the present revolution for equality, freedom, and jobs.

B. The problem: The problem has two major aspects:

1. Providing the necessary capital and bank credit, traditionally denied Negroes, and which alone would allow them to become employers themselves, create their own jobs and businesses, and to own their own property in the same manner as the white community. To start, our target here would be $1 billion.

2. Providing the funds for the civil rights organizations in sufficient quantity, which are absolutely necessary to do their jobs.

We can no longer expect the revolution to be financed by the same structure against which we are revolting. Nor can we expect our leaders effectively to lead when so much of their time and energy is diverted to fund-

raising. Generals should fight the war—not finance it.

We have arbitrarily estimated here that the civil rights organizations should operate on a minimum budget of $10 to $20 million per year to do their job.

C. The plan: The plan is for the civil rights organizations to use their leadership in mobilizing the National Negro community and its friends into conducting a gigantic "Bank-In."

Using the existing structure of our present commercial banks and savings and loan associations, we would seek to get 1 million people to transfer an average of $1,000 each, from their present bank accounts to a Negro banking institution, and to assign the interest thereon to the civil rights organizations.

On this basis, we can provide a fund of $1 billion from which the civil rights organizations could count on, say, a 2-percent net return to them, or a fund or $20 million each year. While the individual interest rates might be higher than 2 percent, the average would be brought down by no-interest commercial deposits, necessary reserves, administration expenses, etc.

D. The advantages: The following advantages are claimed for the plan:

1. For the first time it would mobilize the economic strength of the Negro community and provide it with at least the beginning to adequate banking and credit facilities.

2. It would considerably strengthen our banks, upon which alone a middle class of businessmen and self-employed can be built. Our largest savings bank at present has only about $70 million in assets and our largest commercial bank only about $15 million.

Our largest financial institution—the North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co., has only about $80 million in assets. We can certainly do better than that.

3. It would work practically no hardship upon the depositors:

a. Funds could be withdrawn at any time if needed.

b. The amount of the deposit, and the amount of interest earned on it is small for each depositor and is already probably lying around forgotten or put for a rainy day in some other bank.

c. Each depositor would have absolute safety, because the funds would be insured by the Federal Government to each depositor, up to $10,000 each.

d. Since we are not asking a transfer of all of the deposits of any firm or individual, the plan would not disrupt normal banking relationships where convenience is a factor.

4. It would release the civil rights organizations from the financial worry, and leave them free to do their job of leadership.

5. The collateral effects of this gigantic financial shift would be, almost certainly, to create an awareness on the part of the U.S. financial structure of the Negro's collective financial strength, which is now so diluted, and thereby generate widespread and more liberalized credit and employment policies in the financial community.

6. Finally, it is my opinion that the plan has such potential that even if we fail completely and only achieve 10 percent of our goal, we still would have generated $100 million into our financial community, and the civil rights organization would still receive $2 million in benefits. So even in failure, there is success.

However, with a target potential of 20 million Negroes and at least 30 million sympathetic whites, plus all of the labor unions, churches, foundations, pension funds, etc., I have no doubt of success in reaching the goal of a mere one million depositors. It must be remembered, we are not asking them to give $1,000, but only to redeposit it.

E. Implementation: It is not to be expected that such objectives could be achieved without problems, planning, work, and, perhaps, even investment of money in a campaign by the organizations. But the same thing was true of the march on Washington. Yet we overcame.

We have won a moral victory; it is time now to win a financial victory so that we can vigorously wind up this battle—now.

In my opinion, we must now pause momentarily in the frontal civil rights struggle and devote ourselves for 2 or 3 months wholeheartedly to the problem of reequipping our troops for the final push. In battle they call this a "strategic withdrawal for regrouping."

But more importantly, even this bank-in campaign is itself a vital part of the Negro's struggle for economic freedom and jobs; so that this is not so much a withdrawal as it is the opening of a new front in the battle.

F. The timetable: Time is of the essence here. I hereby call upon the six leaders of the American Negro revolution to convene a conference of the Negro business, economic and financial leadership. A proposal such as this one I have outlined might be included in the agenda as one of the means to implement the economic revolution of the Negro in America.

I respectfully await your reaction and hold myself available for any small part I might play.

BIOGRAPHY—DUNBAR S. MCLAURIN

Dunbar S. McLaurin, a 43-year-old, Oklahoma-born lawyer, earned his Ph. D. in economics from the University of Illinois at the age of 21; he is also a businesman who headed his own million dollar import-export company in the Far East, the head of a New York realty company which owns and manages a number of buildings in the city, a specialist in African affairs who headed a Rockefeller brothers team study on the feasibility of locating various industries in Nigeria, and a founding member of one of New York City's political clubs. He is the founder of the Freedom National Bank of New York, Harlem's first community bank dedicated to serve the needs of its businesses and residents.

McLaurin taught economics at several colleges before serving with the Office of Price Administration as an economist in 1942. He served overseas as an officer in the U.S. Army in World War II and began his business career in the Philippines immediately after release from the Armed Forces. He organized and headed several companies with headquarters in Manila, and branches in Hong Kong, Shanghai and Tokyo. Among these were McLaurin Enterprises and Far Eastern Trade Associates, organizations which supported the industrialization of the postwar Far East through the import-export of a wide range of industrial products, as well as through the training of native personnel in industrial fields.

By 1951, with the Asian nations generally on the way to economic recovery, McLaurin organized a New York City realty company and began to study law at Brooklyn College. He was admitted to the New York bar in 1954 and began his practice in the Harlem community.

In 1959, as the African nations gained independence from Europe, McLaurin again turned his attention to the area of industrial development for emerging countries. He founded McLaurin & Pryor Associates, a consultant organization specializing in international economics and industrial development. With the help of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the firm studied the possibility of glass manufacturing operations in Nigeria and, subsequently, arranged for businessmen in the United States to visit Nigeria. The feasibility study was the basis of a now-successful Nigerian glass manufacturing plant. Since then, the firm has been active in manufacturing development operations covering more than 50 varied industries.

In 1952, McLaurin received a special achievement award from the Harlem Lawyers Association for his legal work in international law, having represented the Government of Nigeria in a multimillion dollar case—the first Negro to do so.

Dunbar McLaurin believes that he, along with other members of his race, has a special responsibility to make Negroes more active in the American banking community. He feels this is a necessary first step in the growing role which the Negro will play in the economy of the United States. This is why he founded the Freedom National Bank and organized a committee of Negroes and whites to help him make the bank a truly representative institution serving the community.

His interest in entering the financial world started many years ago. He once said, "For years, financial institutions have collected the Negro's money in banks, insurance, businesses and pension funds. But they have invariably taken the Negro's and Puerto Rican's money and invested it in other communities." The Freedom National Bank, as proposed by McLaurin, will be biracially owned and managed and dedicated to serve both the Negro and white residents and businessmen in New York's Harlem area.

The bank has received preliminary approval from the Comptroller of the Currency, James J. Saxon, who is the regulator of all federally chartered, or national banks. Joining McLaurin, who will become president of the bank, are Jackie Robinson, slated to be chairman of the board, and Irving S. Altman, vice president and executive officer. The other members of the organizing committee are Jack Blumstein, Herbert B. Evans, Alvin C. Hudgins, Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., and Frank Schiffman.

McLaurin is a member of the Lions Club, the Harlem Lawyers Association, a former president of the Riverton Tenants Association, and a former delegate to the Negro Leadership Conference on Africa. He is married and has one child, a daughter.

The Alcoholic Beverage Control Law in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a lot of unwarranted comments have been made recently about the proposals and recommendations purportedly made by the Moreland Commission, appointed by Governor Rockefeller to investigate and recommend changes in the A–B–C law in New York State.

WCBS broadcast an editorial favoring the elimination of retail liquor price controls in New York State and the easing of the 15-year-old ban on new liquor store licenses. On November 14, 1963, WCBS broadcast a reply by Mr. Oscar A. Bloustein, executive director of the Metropolitan Package Stores Association of New York.

Mr. Bloustein's remarks follow:

The Moreland Commission was set up by Governor Rockefeller to study the broad area of liquor control. The commission has

held a series of hearings on the subject that has created a great deal of publicity. As a result of these hearings, a widespread variety of unwarranted assumptions have been paraded as facts.

Our alcoholic beverage control law was enacted in 1934. The law was adopted to promote temperance and moderation and to foster respect for and obedience to the law. Its main features are these: limitation of licenses—the neighborhood package store concept, and minimum consumer price control. These features are entirely consistent with the purpose of the law.

Apart from spokesmen who appeared for industry, two main types of public witnesses have testified at the hearings * * * professors from various colleges who had set up study groups for the Moreland Commission, and sound, experienced men who have administered New York's alcoholic beverage control law.

John O'Connell who was appointed by Governor Dewey and served for 12 years; Thomas Rohan who served for 5 years under Governors Harriman and Rockefeller; and Donald Hoestteter who was named by Governor Rockefeller 10 months ago.

These three administrators served a total of 18 years. All testified that the law worked well and saw no reason to change it substantially. It did promote temperance and moderation and respect for and obedience to the law. For 30 years it was recognized as a model control law throughout our country.

Are we to take the seasoned opinions of these veteran administrators and people well versed with law enforcements? Or, do we follow some well-meaning but highly unqualified theoreticians who have no experience in the complex enforcement problems of a control law? They advocate sweeping revision of the present law. They want a virtual abandonment of effective controls in favor of a wholly untried, experimental scheme.

The professors say that it makes no difference where whisky is sold. Apparently they are unaware of the enforcement and control problems inherent in so dangerous a practice.

We say that liquor should not be sold freely in all kinds of retail establishments. Whisky is not soap powder or groceries—it is a commodity which has always been and should be sold under tightly drawn regulations. We do not believe that the average New York State father or mother wants liquor sold in any other way.

Much has been said about liquor being available in some areas at prices cheaper than those in New York. The District of Columbia is cited as a prime example.

Comparisons are not made with our neighboring States such as Connecticut and New Jersey where orderly control systems, patterned after our own model law, have been in operation since repeal. The fact is that only a handful of cutrate stores in downtown Washington sell whisky at cutrate prices. Even then, these cutrate bargains are only offered as loss leaders on a catch-as-catch-can basis. Here in New York we pay higher taxes, the highest union wages, and provide the greatest amount of services by law-abiding, honest business people. Our distribution costs are naturally much higher than they are in the 8-square-mile area of the District of Columbia.

Bear in mind that 60 percent of the price of liquor in New York State represents Federal, State, and local taxes. From the balance must come the cost of the product, the cost of packaging, labeling, handling, and distribution. If the Moreland Commission wants lower prices to the consumer, let them recommend a tax cut to the State legislature.

Hatred and Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, 10 days have passed since the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. There have been some unfortunate statements made, which I am sure were later regretted, in an attempt to find a place to put the blame for this deplorable event in our history. The first reaction by some was that this obviously was the work of the radical right. One observation was made to the effect that the rightwing should be satisfied that they have now received their pound of flesh.

When Lee Oswald was identified as the assassin and a Marxist-Socialist, the identification moved to extremist—but with little attempt to identify Oswald—as would have been more appropriate—as a leftwing extremist. The fact is that this mentally mixed up human being belonged with no American political extremist group. He belonged with other Presidential assassins in that classification of demented humanity that we have always had, and probably always will have. So long as we have people, we must realize there is that million-to-one chance of a mentally deranged individual attempting assassination of high public officials.

Many Americans, in their reaction to the tragedy of November 22, are wrongly assessing themselves with some of the guilt for the President's assassination. It is difficult to identify any reason for this guilt when the test is applied to specific individuals. Oswald had no apparent connection with the so-called rightwing extremists. Neither did he have any connection, that has so far been revealed, with leftwing groups, segregationists, or integrationists. His only identified interest was a sympathy for Castro and Cuba. There would be few in our country guilty of sharing this sympathy.

Let us put aside any feeling that Americans should feel personal guilt for the recent tragic event. Let us put aside the implication that there existed in our hearts a hatred for some of our fellow men and, surely, for our President. Let us put aside an attempt to place the blame for one of our greatest tragedies at a doorstep where it does not belong.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an editorial from yesterday's Sunday Star on "Hatred and Hysteria," which I commend to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives:

HATRED AND HYSTERIA

In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons, both in pulpits and in the public prints, on the evils of hatred. The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradiction of any known facts, with the attitude of the radical right—specifically the attitude of those who favor racial segregation. We are urged to purge ourselves of a poison which the dreadful act in Dallas supposedly has revealed in our bloodstream.

The sermons are sincere and, hopefully, edifying as well. But they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

Segregation is morally wrong. A political program based on the repeal of the income tax is fiscally simple minded. But neither one had anything to do with the murder.

If it is absurd to try to blame the assassination on the political right, it is yet more absurd to insinuate that it was the result of something dreadfully wrong with American political life as a whole. Until we know something different, the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

It would be good and desirable if the world could now abjure all hatred. But since hatred still exists 1,900 years after the Crucifixion, it is unhappily unlikely that it will vanish now.

Meanwhile, the continuing hysteria about national hatred as the central feature of this national tragedy does us a national injustice. It ignores, too, the most obvious expression of national feeling.

The line of mourners formed at the Capitol a week ago is still moving.

It may be seen in Dallas, where citizens bring flowers to the place in the road where the President was shot.

It may be seen across the Potomac, where Americans are coming in thousands to visit his grave.

It may be seen in the spontaneous and universal actions taken to reverence the memory of the martyred leader by giving his name to places and institutions that will endure.

Surely it is this outpouring of love and grief which speaks truly of the state of the Nation.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of November 30, 1963:

AMERICA'S HOUR OF TRIAL

The violent act of a madman has brought sorrow to every American heart. There is no individual who does not grieve at the untimely death of John F. Kennedy. We offer our prayers that his widow and his children receive the God-given strength and wisdom which alone can make the burden bearable. Even in our grief, however, we recognize that life and death are intertwined—that death is not the end, but the continuation for the soul of man. No matter how tragic the death, how deep felt our sorrow, life and the Nation must go on. We pause to pay tribute and honor to our dead President. In that vein I issued the following statements over the last tragic weekend:

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT

"No words can express our deep sorrow in this tragic hour. God alone can sustain us in our loss. Our hearts and prayers go out to

Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and other members of the Kennedy family. We pray, also for the speedy recovery of the Governor. We must call upon our inner strength to keep cool heads and preserve our country and our people."

TELEGRAM TO MRS. KENNEDY

"There are no words to express the deep sorrow felt by all the people of the Nation, but we did want you to know that our thoughts and prayers are with you and the children at this time. May God give us strength to protect and preserve our country to which our husband so valiantly dedicated himself."

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

"The entire Nation is with you as you assume the tremendous responsibility now imposed upon you. May God give you the strength to preserve the Nation and the ideals for which it stands and to that end we pledge our support."

Now the last tributes have been paid and the President sleeps on the hillside in Arlington. It is up to all of us now to move forward in preserving the Nation and its liberties so that John F. Kennedy will not have lived nor died in vain. In preserving this Nation we must preserve the constitutional government with its three branches—we must preserve the freedom of debate, to oppose those things we believe wrong and support those we believe are right. Opposition, loyal opposition, is a tradition of our free society. Opposition to legislation is not based on hate, nor does the mere fact that a legislator opposes certain legislation or certain programs make of him a breeder of hate or an accessory to murder. To believe that to oppose is to destroy would put an end to representative government and there would be no meaning to the President's dedication to his principles or to his death.

In that spirit, then, let's continue to build in America. Let's not condemn the whole Nation, the city of Dallas, or those of opposite political parties. There is good sense in the editorial from the Wall Street Journal of November 26, 1963. I commend it to all the people of Dallas and reprint it here as a part of this newsletter:

"NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

"In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

"Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

"Anyone who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio, or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress, and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

"A Senator said that the responsibility lay on 'the people of Dallas' because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was 'reaping the whirlwind of hatred.' One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the 'hatred and malevolence' that are 'eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.' A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that 'none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence.' And these were but a few among many.

"Such statements can only come from men who have not been abroad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

"A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

"In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In restrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowdes of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

"It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man acused of so henious a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

"Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

"One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

"In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grive, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

"But there is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

"Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people."

TRIBUTE TO ANOTHER HERO

We remember, too, in this moment of sorrow Officer J. D. Tippit of the Dallas Police Department. I attempted to convey some of the feeling of the people of Dallas in the following telegram to his family:

"In this hour we would like you to know that you have our deepest sympathy. May God be with you and give you strength and courage. It may comfort you to know that an entire nation recognizes the bravery and dedication of your husband and that in his death he will become an inspiration to others that we may all meet our challenges with the same courage he did whenever duty calls."

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

President Johnson said what had to be said. He presented his plan, his beliefs as embodied in the legislation to which he has given his support. He will continue the program of the New Frontier. We admire his forthrightness and his decisive action in enunciating his program:

The tragic event of the past few ways will not be forgotten by any who lived in this time, but as President Johnson stated so eloquently, the country must move forward. The legislative process must be pursued and those of us charged with the responsibility of representing the people in the Congress of the United States must make an effort to guard the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Some of us will continue to oppose the encroachments on the freedoms of the individual by big government. To abandon our convictions would be a mockery of our system and all that elected representatives of the people should be.

It is a basic part of our constitutional form of government that opposition to stated programs be expressed. Through the give and take of debate, then, we arrive at legislative conclusions in the interest of the whole Nation and all of its people.

Opposition is not hatred. Holding of views contrary to the leadership on given legislation does not make those who hold such views disloyal or accessories to murder.

Should opposition on principle be subdued because of fear of criticism, then the American concept of government will be lost and our late President will then truly have lived and died in vain.

I have faith, however, in the goodness and the stability of the American people, in the honor and judgment of our elected representatives, and I am certain we will move forward, a united nation, each of us dedicated to preserving it and the principles for which we stand in a climate of freedom in which all of us believe.

In this spirit I shall continue to point out the dangers I see in some of the specific legislation now pending. I shall continue to do my best to preserve fiscal responsibility and the soundness of the dollar and will, as I have always done, apply to each piece of legislation the acid test of its constitutionality and whether or not it is within the framework of the amount of money the taxpayers can afford to spend.

I do regret President Johnson's emotional appeal, asking for support of legislation in memory of our late President. We who believe in government of law, not men, endorse or oppose legislation on merit alone, and should not be asked to evaluate legislation on taxation, civil rights, education, and other areas on any other basis.

Also, I share the view expressed by some who sensed the inconsistency of President Johnson's avowal of belief in independence and integrity of the legislative branch just after having appealed as President, in the name of our late President, that we pass all pending administration legislation.

NOW WE LOOK AHEAD

The week has now ended and the events have been recorded in the book of history. Our duty demands that we look to the future. Our national purpose, our national character have been sorely tried, but in the magnificent response of the American people our country withstood the test. We will continue to have our differences of opinion on what means should be used to achieve the common good, but we have proved to the world and, more importantly, to ourselves that we are one people, a united people, able to band together in time of crisis and to

openly express our deepest feelings when any neighbor or any fellow human being needs comfort and strength.

Looking toward the future our national purpose is unchanged—to protect and preserve this free Nation and in the words of the Constitution, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, so much has been spoken, so much has been written of the tragedy of November 22—the assassination of a young and beloved President. Most of what was said and written was eloquent and this was to be expected, for John F. Kennedy was a man who by his very nature evoked eloquence.

Much of what men expressed in this period of national grief should be preserved. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an editorial written by a friend of his Mr. Eugene Farrell that appeared in the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N.J., on November 23, 1963. These are warm and personal words, a remembrance of a great leader not alone for his greatness, but for his own warmth and friendliness, a friendliness that the people of one city like so many cities the world over will cherish for years to come.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

You think all the things an editorial writer is supposed to think, the awful evil of political assassination, the terrible wantonness of it, the incomprehensible fate that lets a demented marksman obliterate a President, but you keep going back to a picture of a young, vital American—President, yes, but a family man like the fellow down the block having fun with the children, weighed down with great affairs, yes, but not so much as to miss the point of a joke and have a good laugh, holder of the most august temporal title, yes, but a man you talk with as easily as you talk to the fellow beside you in the coffee bar.

You keep thinking of when first you met him, before his nomination. It was in Washington and he had just finished a landmark speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in which he closed forever the question of a Catholic in the White House; you intercept him as he gets out the door and tell him: "Senator, I'm from the place that is going to give you New Jersey, Hudson County," his eyes light and he says: "Fine, Neil Gallagher has been telling me about it * * * I'm certainly glad to meet you." His handshake is strong, friendly, but he looks so boyish you wonder will the people choose him over Dick Nixon. Then he moves on through the crush. You have had the seconds he can spare.

You see him that fall in Journal Square, a crowd has waited patiently in the November cold, the largest ever packed into the square, they say, finally he arrives, hatless as usual, you have a good view because Arthur Knaster lets you and the photographers use the windows of his law office on the second floor of the Jersey Journal Building. You are just above and behind the grandstand and you see him come up, through the crowd, onto the stand and before the microphone. You remember how that wild hair stands up on the back of his head and think bitterly now: "This is how he must have looked to the murderer through that telescope sight" but that night who could think of him slain? The roar of that crowd as he told them how they would help him win. Then a farewell smile and he is away. This was the final rally of the long outdoor campaign * * * the votes will be all in in little more than 48 hours. When he comes this way again he will be President of the United States.

You remember the telegram just about a year later inviting you to luncheon at the White House with the President. He is host to editors from New Jersey. The guard checking you through, the walk up the drive to the front door, noticing some peeled white paint along the driveway wall. Then into the Blue Room to wait. A few minutes later the President arrives and joins his guests with their cocktails. His is tomato juice. Through luncheon he explains how "this job" keeps him too far from the people. In effect he asks "What do you hear?" The luncheon is lively with questions and answers * * * once he discusses the movie "Advise and Consent," his tone implies he would not have cast Franchot Tone as the President * * * you lean across to him and ask: "Mr. President, you could not get that role?" He laughs and snaps back: "I was too busy." He talks about fallout shelters and world economics and Dick Hughes' chances against Jim Mitchell. He autographs his menu because Marty Gately's hero-worshipping teenager has asked you to bring back a souvenir for her * * * leaving and shaking his hand, you say: "A year ago you were fighting hard to get this job. Now that you have it, what do you think?" * * * suddenly he looks much older, then half whispers: "The weapons. The weapons." * * * and you know why he seems to have an invisible weight always upon him.

And only a few months ago, at another editors' meeting in Washington, a spring evening and cocktails and a reception at the White House * * * he has a light word for everyone in the long line * * * a handshake and a word of greeting passes about Hudson and John Kenny and Bill Flanagan * * * the line moves on * * * without suspecting, you have seen him for the last time * * * 6 months later all that vitality and youth will be exchanged for a madman's bullet * * * and he will be a commander-in-chief slain for his country as truly as any man who ever died earning the Medal of Honor.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Greatest Man in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on November 30, I had the pleasure of attending the annual dinner of the St. Andrew's Society in Baltimore.

One of the high points of the evening was a talk by Mr. David Ogilvy, who represents his Scottish ancestry with eloquence. I am proud to count among my ancestors, children of the Scottish soil.

In order that all those who hold a special place in their hearts for Scotland may enjoy Mr. Ogilvy's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his talk entitled "The Greatest Man in the World" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST MAN IN THE WORLD

(By David Ogilvy)

(David Ogilvy is chairman of Ogilvy, Benson & Mather, the New York advertising agency. He is the author of "Confessions of an Advertising Man," published October 21 and now in its fourth printing.)

Today is the birthday of the greatest man in the world. Sir Winston Churchill is 89.

At the risk of breaching the Official Secrets Act, I am going to tell you a story about him which has never been published. The incident took place at the end of the Casablanca Conference. It was the last morning, after the official business was finished. Sir Winston sent for his security officer. The old man had just finished breakfast and was lying in bed smoking a cigar. When the security officer entered the bedroom Churchill looked up at him and said, "Codrington, I want to visit the bazaars."

Codrington said that he would have to consult the American G-2, who were responsible for the security of both delegations. The Americans promptly vetoed the expedition as too dangerous. This placed poor Codrington in a ticklish position, because he knew from bitter experience that Churchill did not like being thwarted.

However, he was an ingenious fellow, so he said to the Prime Minister: "Sir, the Americans don't want you to go. German assassins have been parachuted around Casablanca, and there is no time for the military police to clear the streets where the bazaars are situated. The Americans think it would be most dangerous for you to go. Of course I have explained to them that you are indifferent to all considerations of personal danger. So I suppose you may as well go. However, Sir, there is one thing I would like to point out. The bazaars are full of disease. If you were to catch one of these diseases, it wouldn't matter—you have the constitution of an ox. But I must remind you that your friend President Roosevelt is extremely delicate. If he caught the disease from you, well, the consequences might be tragic."

Churchill winked, and said: "All right, Codrington, I won't visit the bazaars. However, I would like you to know that I was not planning to visit the bazaars for the particular purpose you seem to have in mind. And even if I had been, and had I had the misfortune to contract one of those loathsome diseases to which you are evidently referring, I can assure you that I would not have transmitted it to the President of the United States."

The other day my American wife gave me a book called "The Scot in History" by the distinguished Yale historian, Prof. Wallace Notestein. The first thing I did was to look up the index, and there I found—"Scots, characteristics of." Under this heading the great American historian identified the following Scottish characteristics: Barbarity, lawlessness, boorishness, tendency to violence, craving for revenge, cruelty, inconsistency, treachery, melancholy, and boastfulness.

For this sublime contribution to historical scholarship, Professor Notestein was rewarded with an honorary degree at Glasgow University, a fellowship at Balliol, and the Eastman chair of history at Oxford.

I'm afraid that his view of my fellow countrymen is not entirely unique. Six hundred years ago Petrarch referred to "the vile Scots." He was an Italian.

Hazlitt said: "Among ourselves, the Scotch, as a nation, are particularly disagreeable. They hate every appearance of comfort themselves, and refuse it to others. Their climate, their religion, and their habits are equally averse to pleasure. Their manners are either distinguished by a fawning sycophance, that makes one sick, or by a morose, unbending callousness, that makes one shudder."

Charles Lamb said, "I have been trying all my life to like Scotchmen and am obliged to desert from the experiment in despair * * *. The tediousness of these people is certainly provoking. I wonder if they ever tire one another."

Lord Byron called Scotland "a land of meanness, sophistry, and lust."

Gentlemen, Byron and Lamb and Hazlitt were Englishmen, poor wee devils. I am a Scotsman and I beg leave to disagree with them. I would like to speak in praise of Scotland, my native country.

Last time a member of my family tried this he got into terrible trouble. My Ogilvy kinsman was talking to Oliver Goldsmith—and that repulsive old English bore Dr. Samuel Johnson. Here's how it went, according to Boswell:

"Mr. Ogilvy was unlucky enough to choose for the topic of his conversation the praises of his native country. He began with saying that there was very rich land around Edinburgh. Goldsmith, who had studied physics there, contradicted this, with a sneering laugh. Disconcerted a little by this, Mr. Ogilvy then took a new ground, where, I suppose, he thought himself perfectly safe, for he observed that Scotland had a great many noble wild prospects."

It was at this point that Dr. Johnson delivered his famous snub to my unfortunate ancestor: "Norway, too, has noble wild prospects: and Lapland is remarkable for prodigious noble, wild prospects. But, sir, let me tell you, the noblest prospect which a Scotchman ever sees, is the highroad that leads him to England."

I kicked the bottom out of my cradle the first time I heard that story, and I expect you did too. But I couldn't resist telling it again, because it shows the danger we Ogilvys run when we boast about Scotland.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once left Massachusetts and went over to Scotland to see Thomas Carlyle in Ecclefechan. The two great men went for a walk together through the Scottish countryside and when Emerson saw the poor soil, he turned to Carlyle and asked this question: "What do you raise on land like this?" And Carlyle replied: "We raise men."

I'm going to tell you about two men raised in Scotland who came to America.

The first is Alan Pinkerton. Pinkerton was born in Glasgow and came to the United States when he was 23. Four years later he was appointed deputy sheriff of Cook County, Ill. In 1861 he uncovered a plot to assassinate Abraham Lincoln here in Baltimore, and thus saved his life. Lincoln was so grateful that he made this Scottish emigrant the head of his secret service.

Unfortunately, Pinkerton resigned after General McCallan was removed from command of the Union forces, and his successor, Lafayette Baker, lacked Pinkerton's genius for counterespionage. I have always believed that, if Lincoln had kept Pinkerton, he would have averted the tragedy which took place at Ford's Theater on the night of April 14, 1865. I am intensely proud of the fact that this Scotsman, Alan Pinkerton, was the father of the American Secret Service, the FBI, OSS, and the CIA.

The other Scottish emigrant I would like to praise is Philip Murray, who became president of the United Steel Workers and the CIO.

Phil Murray started working a Scottish coal mine at the age of 10. When he was 16, his father brought him to Pittsburgh, and together they worked in the Pennsylvania coalpits. Murray was a man of enormous talent and energy. He was also a very humble man, inspired by a strong spiritual faith.

He was loved and respected not only by workers, but by industrialists as well. When he died, Benjamin Fairless, the president of United States Steel, said that America had lost a great citizen, and a Christian gentleman.

The night before Murray died, he went to a banquet in San Francisco, and his very last words were, "I want to tell you how glad I am as a Scotsman to be able to come here and enjoy a free plate of roast beef."

Philip Murray was one of the great statesmen of the labor movement. In his own way, he contributed as much to the steel industry as that other Scotsman, Andrew Carnegie.

Murray was that rare thing—a Scottish Roman Catholic. Like a white blackbird. There are some parishes in Scotland which are so remote that the Reformation never reached them at all. They remain Roman Catholic to this day.

When I was a boy there was a Jesuit schoolmaster in a small village in the highlands. I don't think he ever had more than eight or nine boys in that little one-room schoolhouse. But he lived to see three of his boys become members of the war cabinet.

Andrew Carnegie and Phil Murray made good in Pittsburgh. Another roving Scotsman made good in Mecca. When Doughty, the Arabian explorer, finally penetrated into

the Holy of Holies, he found the secret Mohammedan shrine under the control of a kilted Scottish sergeant. He had deserted from the Black Watch when that regiment was stationed in Cairo.

Imagine one of the "Ladies of Hell" earning his living as the verger-in-chief at the holy shrine of Mecca.

And that other Scottish adventurer, James Keith. He fought for the Jacobites in the Forty-Five, and they were defeated by the English. So Keith had to run for it. He emigrated to Prussia, and entered the service of Frederick the Great. In no time at all he became a field marshal in the Prussian army and defended Prague against the Turks.

One morning during the siege it became necessary to negotiate a truce with the Turkish enemy, so that both sides could go out and bury their dead. The great Scottish soldier rode out from the walls under a flag of truce, to parley with his opposite number in the Turkish army.

There in the distance, galloping toward him on a little Arab horse, was the terrible Turkish general. The two horsemen, the two enemies, the Prussian field marshal and the Turk, finally came within hailing distance, and the Turk said to the Prussian, "Hello, Jaimie, how long is it since you heard from Inverurie?"

That was only one of the Keiths. At the same period other members of the clan were adventuring in other countries. William Keith came to America and got to be Governor of Pennsylvania. Another Keith became chief adviser to the czar of Russia.

I find myself in a somewhat similar position. I may not be adviser to the czar of Russia, but I am adviser to Sears, Roebuck, and a good many other American corporations, here amid the lovely alien corn. One of the things I advertise is Britain, and another is the United States of America.

On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays I write advertisements for American magazines, inviting American tourists to visit Britain.

On Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, I write advertisements for British magazines, inviting my fellow countrymen to visit the United States. Every advertisement I write for the U.S. Travel Service is a bread-and-butter letter from a grateful immigrant.

I would like to read you a few passages from one of my advertisements.

"In Washington you can see Congress and the Supreme Court in session—free. You can actually go into the White House—and it won't cost you a penny.

"You can photograph your first bear, antelope, Big Horn sheep, coyote, buffalo. You can picnic in the shade of giant sequoias which were living in the time of Christ. You will see wild gentians and azaleas, wild forget-me-nots and larkspur, wild lupins and aquilegia, mountain laurel, and lobelia cardinalis.

"American birds are equally exotic—roseate spoonbills, wild turkeys, hummingbirds, indigo buntings, scarlet tanagers, Baltimore orioles, snowy egrets, golden eagles, and ospreys galore.

"There are more than a thousand symphony orchestras in the United States. Americans now spend more money on tickets to symphony concerts than tickets for baseball games. You will hear enchanting American folksongs, many of Scottish origin—'The Blue-Tail Fly,' 'The Arkansas Traveler,' 'Sweet Betsy From Pike,' 'Shenandoah,' and 'Turkey in the Straw.'"

"Turkey in the Straw" brings me back to Churchill. When he came to Washington in 1942, Mr. Roosevelt had the Marine Band to play for him on the White House lawn. Sir Winston stuck his head out of the window and shouted at the conductor, "Play Turkey in the Straw." It is his favorite American tune.

And that reminds me, in closing, of another incident in the musical history of Washington. The year is 1862. The place, Constitution Hall. Abraham Lincoln is in the audience. They are singing Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic," for the very first time:

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored,
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword:
His truth is marching on.

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free."

They finished singing, and there was silence. Then Lincoln jumped to his feet and shouted, "Let's sing it again." Last Sunday, in Westminster Abbey, we sang it again—in memory of John Kennedy, who died to make men free.

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at Annual Fall Conference Luncheon, United Neighborhood Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following remarks made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York on Monday, November 18, 1963, at the annual fall conference luncheon of the United Neighborhood Houses held at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

This is a fine gathering. It is one at which I feel at home. I have been working with most, if not all, of you on one project or another ever since I became a public official in this city. The projects on which we have been working together have been directed at some of our city's most fundamental problems—the human problems—the problems of those people who are almost hopelessly lost in the forest-world of the city, and others too young, too sick or too old to care for themselves and still others who are the outcasts and the misfits of our urban society. Most of these are the underprivileged and disadvantaged of our city—the victims of forces beyond their control and understanding.

We of the city government and you of the settlement houses and of the other social agencies represented here today are engaged in closely related attack upon the problems presented by these fellow citizens. Indeed, all of us are, in this sense, members of the same disarmed forces, but belonging to different services. Occasionally I have trouble telling where the forces of government end and where those of the voluntary agencies begin. We get all mixed up together sometimes. There is nothing particularly wrong with this. It is just a little confusing. And there are some aspects of this confusion which ought really to be clarified—in terms of responsibility and authority. But that is a project and a problem for the future.

Our present problem is not who among us does what and who has the responsibility, but rather what shall we do together, mobilizing all our energy and resources, to make headway against our problems. What can we do—what can any of us and what can all of us do together to accomplish what is not being accomplished, and to make progress where far from enough is being made.

This gathering is sponsored by the United Neighborhood Houses which represents a part of the voluntary agency field which has a very special meaning for the people of our city. The settlement houses have been in the vanguard of social reform and progress in this city from the earliest days of social effort. At this point, I want to pay my special and personal, as well as official tribute to both the lay leadership and the professional workers of the settlement houses of this city.

In order that by praising some, I may praise all, let me single out, for the professionals, that lovely lady, that paragon of feminine charm and unyielding determination: Helen Harris.

She continues to be what she long has been—a powerful, articulate, and always persuasive voice for good government and, above all, for the welfare and well-being of the underprivileged and unrepresented. In the name of the causes which she and the United Neighborhood Houses support, she bewitches her friends and bedevils the enemies of those causes. In all this, Helen Harris is, as I said, typical of the ladies who are part of the leadership of the settlement house movement and who have been so prominent in it from its earliest days, beginning in this city with Lillian Wald and Mary K. Simkhovitch.

The lay leadership of the settlement house movement is typified by my good friend and former associate in the city government, Clarence Davies, president of United Neighborhood Houses—a dedicated, principled man of high social purposes; Clarence Davies and the hundreds of other lay members of the boards of the settlement houses and of the voluntary social agencies of this city, are the bedrock of the voluntary agencies of New York City and of the Nation.

Having paid my tribute to those who make the settlement house movement possible, let me turn now to the subject matter of your conference—the meat and meaning of this occasion.

You in the settlement houses are concerning yourselves with the problem and question of civil rights. This is appropriate because one of the main problems concerning us all today results from a withholding of essential rights of equal opportunity and participation from some of our people on the basis of race and color. We are dealing with the deprived bodies and the disadvantaged minds of some of these people who became the objects of social concern and assistance when they were no longer able to keep up with the rest of society and had to call, directly or indirectly, for help—for themselves or for their children.

The settlement houses are working, for the most part, in those sections of the city where the disadvantaged live—where the newcomers live—and those left behind in the social advance of their fellow citizens. Many but not most, of these objects of our social concern belong to the minority groups. It is important to take passing note, in this connection, that the majority of the recipients of city welfare assistance, for instance, are neither Negroes nor Puerto Ricans. I cite this statistical fact merely to dissipate a current myth, and not to detract from the fact that we are and must be deeply concerned with the problems and conditions of housing and working and schooling and living of our fellow New Yorkers who are Negroes and

Puerto Ricans. They constitute a disproportionate number of our poor, and also of our problem population—the unemployed, the unemployables, the school dropouts, the socially maladjusted, the illegitimate children, the juvenile delinquents.

I emphasize the plight and the problems of the young. The young are our special concern, not only because of juvenile delinquency, but even more because they represent both the hope and the challenge of the immediate future. And unless we do make progress, they represent a threat as far as the future is concerned.

But most of you know all these facts and appreciate further that in addition to dealing with the problems of these individuals as individuals, we must also deal with the underlying social problems—chief among which today is the problem of discrimination and disadvantage—the problem of equal civil rights, equal opportunity, and equal participation.

In this field, New York City has always been in the van and forefront of progress.

We had the first city commission on human rights—a government body charged primarily with promoting those rights and with discouraging the violation of them.

We had the first fair housing law, applying to all but one and two family houses in our city.

We had the first open school enrollment plan, and the first busing of minority children out of their own neighborhoods to the better schools.

We had the first and most effective program of integration in public housing.

We had the first program of integration in middle-income housing.

We had the first government-sponsored and supported body to discourage individual cases of exploitation and discrimination on the job—the committee on exploitation in our city labor department.

We had the first government-sponsored and government-supported committee on advancement, to encourage the selection of Negroes and Puerto Ricans for promotion to positions of responsibility in private business and the professions.

We had the first city law prohibiting discrimination in employment, or in the performance of any work contract with the city.

We had and still have a pioneer open employment policy in the city government as a result of which—and this is a startling figure—10 percent of the total Negro labor force of New York City is employed by the city government.

The city commission on human rights is making an ethnic survey of city government employees. This is a sight survey not based on enumeration or interrogation. The results of this survey have not yet been submitted to me, but I am sure it will reflect, as a whole, the results of the overall policy I have just referred to. I know that in one of our departments—almost the largest single employer of personnel—the department of hospitals, 56 percent of the employees are Negroes.

I have not attempted a complete listing of all the measures we have already taken to reflect our overall policy of forward movement and leadership in the field of equal rights. My purpose is not to boast or claim credit for what we have done. It is rather to describe the posture we are in while we advocate for the city government and for all groups, elements and factors in our city more forward movement, and faster, in this most essential of all fields of social action.

We now have, I believe, more intercommunication among and with all the groups making up our city's population than in any other city I know. There are those in the highest places in our city who can and do speak for our minority groups and the disadvantaged elements among them. I can tell you that the mayor of this city listens intently to those voices and to others of unofficial rank and position.

And we constantly seek and must seek to expand our channels and levels of communication with the minority groups—to the end that they shall feel in New York City that they are represented and are heard in the councils of government, even though all their demands may not and cannot be entirely met.

I want to emphasize that I am not satisfied with the state of things in our city, as far as equal rights for members of our minority groups are concerned. They do not have equal rights, if by equal rights we mean equal access to privilege and outlook for personal fulfillment.

Their lives, in almost every aspect, whether it be housing or schooling or employment, are substantially more restricted in scope and opportunity—and this, in the city of New York.

The young start off with the stigma of their color—as far as most of the white world is concerned—and they immediately acquire a vast range of disadvantages which grow greater as they grow older. Some of them achieve the almost-miracle of success in the competitive world; some manage to get by; may fail and fall by the wayside.

The question posed at this luncheon today is, What is the next step in civil rights? The answer to this is simple and yet immeasurably complicated. The next step is many steps, and a faster pace in those steps which are already being taken.

In answer to the current Negro slogan of "All—here—and now" we can only reply that this is a slogan and not a program. But we must have a program and must press ahead with all possible, deliberate speed with that program. And that program must bring progress—here and now.

Surely one of the main areas of progress is in regard to employment—jobs—the progressive breaking down of the walls of discrimination and prejudice; and expanded facilities for training the unskilled, the unlettered and unlearned.

When we say that there must be equal job opportunities without discrimination, it means that we need to equalize opportunities that in the past have not been equal. Hence we must step up and expand employment policies that will include recruiting and training the personnel to compete on an equal basis for the jobs in question. Let others argue about words. This is what I, for one, mean.

As far as the New York city government is concerned, I can tell you that we are going to move ahead at an even greater pace on the entire width and length of the front defined by the words I have just spoken.

We must press hard against those who are animated by prejudice; we must work hard at the side of those who seek to make progress against prejudice and discrimination.

We will expand our programs of training, seeking Federal and State assistance to the maximum extent available, but recognizing that we must move forward on this front, whatever the limitations on available resources.

We are now exploring the possibilities of establishing, in connection with some of our guidance, counseling and training programs, some programs of sheltered work for those who need such training. We hope to go ahead with such an undertaking whether or not the Federal or State Governments provide adequate financial support for such a program.

We are going to move ahead on all other fronts, too—particularly in housing and in schooling, and in general in all possible measures to relieve both the conditions and the manifestations of poverty and disadvantage.

There can be no greater challenge than this one—to you assembled here, and to us in city government.

You have a full share of the responsibility. This front represents, in fact, one of your greatest responsibilities today. We cannot make progress or maintain headway in our attacks against the social phenomena with which your individual social agencies and settlement houses are concerned, without making real progress on the broad civil rights front.

I recall the meeting we had on the steps of city hall with some of the young people who belong to the clubs of some of the settlement houses represented here today. The theme of that meeting was jobs for the young.

Well, the need is for that, but for much more than that, and for programs along with slogans.

We need to see the whole picture and to move forward within it—to the specific goals of equal justice, equal opportunity for fulfillment, and equal participation, at all levels, for all people.

This, too, is a slogan—but it is a broad one which includes all our aims. Let this slogan be written on our banners, and under those banners, let us march forward, to work, to act, and to serve this noble and essential cause.

Senator Mundt's Statement on Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the House Ways and Means Committee hearings last month on the proposed medical care for the aged through social security, I called to the attention of that committee the obstacles and barriers which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has placed in the path of the State of South Dakota in its efforts to implement Public Law 86-778, the Kerr-Mills Act for the people of that State. Because I think my statement will contribute to the solution of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My primary purpose in testifying today is to call to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee barriers and obstacles which have placed in the path of implementing the Kerr-Mills program, Public Law 86-778, in my State of South Dakota and in other areas as well. I think your contemplation of this situation is vital because of the testimony that will likely be presented during these hearings that Kerr-Mills has not met the problem of providing medical assistance to the older citizens of this country who have need for such assistance. I am convinced that when full implementation of Kerr-Mills is completed and each of the several States has had the experience of several years of administering and improving their programs with the full and vigorous assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which agency is charged with the execution of the act, then and only then can the final determination of success or failure be applied. Any such judgment before that time, is highly premature.

South Dakota's legislature began studying the possibility of implementing the Federal

law in its 1961 session only a few months after the enactment of the Federal act. The legislature initiated a study through its Legislative Research Council to determine the need and scope for the program in the State. This cautious approach approved particularly valid because of experiences in other predominantly rural States which initiated extensive programs only to face difficulty later in working out scope and financial support.

I was pleased to cooperate with the South Dakota Legislature in 1963 when they decided to adopt their rather unique approach in solving the problem of providing medical assistance to our elder citizens. The implementing legislation provided for a "pilot" program to determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their need, and a more accurate determination of the cost of the full program. The State department of public welfare was empowered to enter into a contract for the purchase of prepaid health coverage for eligible individuals. The law includes a provision that their insurance carrier must operate without profit or loss. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the "pilot" program will curtail high administrative costs of this medical assistance plan. The State legislature acted on the belief that it is conforming with the Kerr-Mills Act, Public Law 87-778 as amended by section 122 of Public Law 87-543.

The high regard I have for the Kerr-Mills approach in solving the problem brings me to the recent report of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly to the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Frankly, gentlemen, I am disturbed at what I consider the erroneous conclusions drawn by the majority in that report. For just a few minutes, I should like to dwell on several points in that report.

The Senate special committee report acknowledges and admits that the Department of HEW should attempt to help the successful implementation of Kerr-Mills program at the State level. In fact, on page 17, section 3, it is stated, "The Department clearly has responsibility to assist the States in implementing the enabling legislation." It goes on to state, "All evidence available indicates that the Department has accepted and fulfilled that responsibility to the extent possible."

Gentlemen, it is my contention that this last statement is inaccurate. It is my intention to point out that while the Congress clearly obligated the Department of HEW in administering this public law, to provide constructive assistance to the States, the exact opposite was attempted in many instances by various members of Department staff.

The Senate committee report accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" in some of the medical aid for the aged programs which have been implemented. I say the Department is guilty of failing to carry out congressional intent by a program of deliberate sabotage of an act passed by this Congress and signed by the President.

First, instead of disseminating helpful and constructive information to the public about this law, staff members of the Department have, on many occasions, made public statements and written articles in which the Kerr-Mills law was maligned, ridiculed, and described in half-truths and false generalities.

For instance, Donald Kent, Ph. D., of the Department staff made the following statements in a meeting in Springfield, Ill., on April 7, 1962: "Kerr-Mills is just the same old relief program * * *. Relief is too expensive. * * * I believe we are facing the same tired old proposition that some people are more important than others and that we shouldn't worry too much about the less important ones."

On April 17, 1962, Mr. Ivan Nestingen, Under Secretary of the Department, told the Nashville, Tenn., Sertoma Club that the Kerr-Mills program was not working; it could not do the job, but could only supplement the King bill. He said "90 percent of the funds being spent are being spent in the three States with smallest population."

In Madison, Wis., on March 31, 1962, Mr. Wilbur Cohen stated at a meeting of the Wisconsin Committee on Health Insurance for the Aged Through Social Security "There is a great deal more to fear from the Kerr-Mills bill because by definition it is socialized medicine with a vengeance."

Mr. Phillip H. DesMarais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of HEW addressed a group in Hartford, Conn., on March 26, 1962, and passed out literature which stated, "Kerr-Mills does not adequately take care of the near needy or even many of the very needy.

"Means-test medicine in many cases does not let you choose your own hospital and doctor.

"Means-test medicine can mean danger to health and safety."

Mr. DesMarais also spoke to at least one other group on the same subject. That was in Chapel Hill, N.C., on April 13, 1962.

On March 19, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Nicholas Zumas, Assistant Under Secretary, held a similar meeting.

In my own State, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a workshop conference was held on April 6, 1962, at which Mr. Dean Coston, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary, was the featured speaker. The important feature of this meeting, which drew only about 30 people, was that it was open only to persons who opposed Kerr-Mills and supported King-Anderson. Although Mr. Coston was appearing at taxpayers' expense, the chairman of the conference stated in a letter dated April 2, 1962, that no organization could send a representative unless the organization supported King-Anderson.

And on April 25, 1963, Mr. Ivan Nestingen spent approximately 6 or 8 minutes of a 20- to 25-minute talk before the Chattanooga, Tenn., Rotary Club deriding Kerr-Mills, using such phrases as "administrative monstrosity," "optical illusions," and "not a program which a great Nation like ours can be proud of."

Gentlemen, in these stated instances, we have public servants, paid with public funds, traveling at public expense, going about the country trying to destroy public confidence in a law enacted by this committee and the Congress. Not only do I question the legality of such use of Government funds, but I believe they have deliberately distorted the intent of this committee and this Congress.

Now let me turn to more specific attempts by HEW personnel to sabotage Kerr-Mills. This is at the State legislative level and one instance occurred in my neighboring State of Iowa.

Iowa has had enabling legislation for medical aid for the aged since 1961, but at the time the bill passed, no funds were appropriated. In 1963, a new bill was introduced in the legislature providing that those eligible for old-age assistance benefits would not be eligible for medical aid for the aged. Before this bill could be acted upon, HEW wired the Governor's office saying the provision to exclude old-age assistance recipients "is not acceptable."

Gentlemen, I call your attention again to the section of the Senate special committee report which accuses the States of "distortion of congressional intent" by transferring old-age assistance recipients to medical aid for the aged. How can the majority report of the Senate committee condemn this practice and HEW at the same time uphold it by refusing to accept a medical aid for the aged program which seeks to prevent the action? In fact, HEW in a later telegram to the Iowa legislature again stated that approval could not be given to a program which denied assistance to persons because they had received old-age assistance benefits.

The story of HEW's contradictory statements to Iowa is a long one and many other examples such as the ones just mentioned can be documented for this committee if it wishes. Suffice it to say that HEW has not carried out its responsibility of assisting in the implementation of Kerr-Mills in Iowa.

This brings me to a similar set of circumstances in my own State.

The story of HEW delay in South Dakota's case is most distressing. The plan submitted by the South Dakota Department of Public Welfare provided that the State would purchase insurance contracts for persons over age 65 who were eligible under the standards established by State law. The purpose of the insurance approach is to provide for eligible recipients a program most similar to what persons with greater income would secure for themselves. Public Law 86-778 provides for the insurance mechanism but it becomes obvious that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been most reluctant to see it used.

Chronologically, the South Dakota story goes like this:

During both the 1961 and the 1963 legislative sessions, Mr. Alfred Poe, Kansas City Regional Office, HEW, met with State welfare department officials, legislators, and representatives of the vendors of health services. He was appraised of every draft of the bill, its amendments, and its final wording. On February 11, he sat in on a joint meeting of the State senate and house committees on health and welfare, the welfare commission, and the Governor, and made statements to the effect that major changes would have to be made in the program before Federal approval would be forthcoming.[1] Under questioning by Governor Gubbrud, he admitted that there was actually nothing in the South Dakota law that would cause it to be turned down but there were questionable areas that would require elaboration.

The bill was signed into law March 11, 1963, and a plan submitted by the State welfare department to the regional HEW office on June 10. According to a statement made by the State director of public welfare at a welfare commission meeting in Yankton, S. Dak., on August 29, the plan was mailed from Kansas City to Washington on June 17. On June 28, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association was told at a meeting of HEW personnel that the plan had not as yet been seen in Washington.

In August, a letter was transmitted from the Washington office of HEW to Kansas City, indicating that the questions posed by Mr. Poe in his letter of transmittal of the plan to Washington should be answered before the plan was approved. The questions put to the South Dakota department were basically the same points already discussed on the previous occasion. After the questions were answered by the state department of public welfare in early September, no further word of plan approval or disapproval was evidenced by HEW.

On October 18, a representative of the South Dakota State Medical Association, and the State director of public welfare met with HEW officials in Washington at which time they were told that one more statement was needed from the South Dakota attorney general before approval could be given. This information was secured and relayed to proper personnel in the Bureau of Family Affairs, HEW, on October 24, at which time the medical association representative was told that the plan would go to the Commissioner for decision without delay. It seemed that this timetable would be followed when information was given to Con-

[1] Associated Press dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963.

gressman BEN REIFEL, on October 25 that the plan would receive a decision "this week."[2] On November 6, Mr. REIFEL's office was told that the material was in the hands of general counsel and would go to the Commissioner soon for a decision. To date, no decision has been made.

To the elderly in South Dakota who may have need of such a program, the Department of HEW has withheld care for a period of 6 months which, in fact, will mean a longer delay because of the time involved in setting up the mechanics of the program after approval.

Can any other conclusion be reached than that the Department has been deliberately delaying approval because the program might well prove a workable design for the rest of the Nation to emulate thereby weakening the argument for H.R. 3920?

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

I would also like to refer to a portion of the report of the subcommittee that charges excessive administrative costs in the operation of some of the Kerr-Mills programs.

The point may be well taken that Government administrative costs are high. This does not exclude Federal Government administrative costs as contemplated in the social security approach. This is precisely the reason that the South Dakota Legislature wanted the claims paying function, the statistical function, and liaison with the vendors of care maintained by nongovernmental agencies trained and equipped to do such administration. The State welfare department's contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield obtains the services of two organizations which have combined administrative costs in acting as fiscal agents for South Dakota's old-age assistance program of less than 3 percent.

It is my understanding that Kansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield offered to administer that State's OAA and MAA programs at one-half of 1 percent. This is a striking illustration of the need to give the South Dakota plan an opportunity to prove itself.

CONCLUSION

It has been said before this committee and in countless other places that Kerr-Mills is not a perfect program for providing the Nation's elderly with health care. I have attempted to show why. It is the victim of a planned program of interference on the part of the Department of HEW, King-Anderson supporters in the Congress, and welfare workers and officials at the State and county level. These people, many in places of immense power, have used every means at their disposal to discredit Kerr-Mills in the eyes of the public, to confuse State legislatures in their attempts to enact proper programs, and to demean potential recipients of MAA benefits with meaningless redtape used under the guise of the means test. How could any program work perfectly with this kind of hamstringing at every turn?

Given a reasonable chance Kerr-Mills can and will develop into a mechanism which will answer the health care problem for every needy aged person in this country. But time must be allowed. Since the act was passed in 1960, only 3 years ago, 28 States and 3 other jurisdictions have implemented the act and have it in operation. Ten other States have enacted laws which will become effective shortly or which are awaiting approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Of the 12 States which have not passed cooperating legislation, 5 will meet in regular sessional early next year with the opportunity of acting. In the State of Texas, the electorate voted on the 9th of this month to remove constitutional barriers so the legislature can act in its next session to implement Kerr-Mills in that State.

[2] Associated Press story dated Oct. 29, 1963.

As a matter of record, only 3 of the 50 States have done nothing at all. This is a highly enviable record when it is realized that since 1960 Congress has always had legislation pending which would establish the social security oriented program and the possibility has thus existed that any State medical assistance program with its committed State funds might quickly be superseded.

I urge the committee to consider this problem carefully before enacting a compulsory program of compulsory health insurance attached to the social security program. "Medicare" is a gross misnomer for this approach because it provides no medical care at all. It is simply a very inadequate and partial program of hospital insurance and certain other limited services and does not give the aged or the needy the kind of care that they require. The Kerr-Mills Act, on the other hand, recognizes that after retirement one may have a variety of ailments and so it provides for doctors and surgeons and hospitalization and nursing and drugs and dental benefits.

The reason Kerr-Mills can give a more adequate protection against a compulsory universal program is simple. This Medicare program, being compulsory, requires that it be available to everybody so it is available to the wealthy as well as to who don't need it at all instead of limiting to those people who require assistance at the time of an ailment in old age.

Another reason the compulsory medicare concept is wrong is that it does nothing whatsoever to protect the young family during its working years. It requires them to pay a tax sometimes as long as 45 years on the gamble that maybe after age 65 they will need some health benefits and on the improbable hope that nothing will happen to the family until that time.

In addition, past history assures us that social security taxes will continue to rise sharply. No one can foretell with any degree of accuracy the upper limits of that increase.

Originally, the social security tax was set at 1 percent each on the employer and the employee on the first $3,000 of annual wages. Now it is 3⅝ percent each on income up to $4,800. The tax on the self-employed has risen during the same period from 2¼ percent of the first $3,600 of income to 5.4 percent on the first $4,800. For many taxpayers, the social security tax already takes a bigger bite out of income than the Federal income tax. Even without the enactment of medicare, the tax rate must be increased to provide for an actuarially sound trust account. By 1968, the employee-employer total tax will be 9.25 percent. Estimates based on actual claim experience of insurance companies indicate that within 6 years the estimated cost of the program will require a joint tax on a $5,000 income of 11 percent. This estimate is based on present benefits provided by the pending legislation. Once enacted there is little question that pressures would be engendered to expand the scope of the program, increase the benefits, provide for longer period of time, and to lower the age limit. All this would of course substantially increase the wage tax and the employers tax for all American workers.

There is another feature of the compulsory wage tax and the corresponding tax upon employers for the limited health services proposed by the King-Anderson bill which I strongly dislike. That is the fact that this would be a system of regressive taxation for health purposes entirely violating the concepts of progressive taxation which have so long served us so well in the field of income taxes. In short, the health tax would entirely ignore and violate the ability to pay concept of taxation. It would in fact tax the very poor and the very rich at precisely the same tax rates on that first important segment of their annual income which serves as the tax base. For some Americans, for example, their entire income would be subject to this new tax grab while for the wealthy and the well-to-do by far the larger percentage of their income would be exempt from any health-tax assessments or payments. In many ways this proposed Federal health tax is far more unjust to those with marginal incomes than would be a Federal sales tax which some are now proposing in lieu of Federal income taxes.

Another important consideration which seems to me to argue against the compulsory social security approach is that in establishing such a program we are taking an irreversible step. I say irreversible because we will be requiring people to pay taxes to a program from which they cannot benefit until age 65 so, once started, it would be exceedingly difficult to discontinue. To take such a step at this stage strikes me as very unwise. We are venturing into an entirely new area so far as the Government is concerned. We cannot predict with accuracy at this point what problems and difficulties will be encountered. This being the case it seems to me that any program established should be highly flexible so that it can be easily modified to meet unexpected problems which are bound to arise. From this standpoint the pending proposal would be most unsatisfactory.

I urge the committee to ponder well this extremely important and far-reaching and irreversible decision and I strongly urge sufficient time for the Kerr-Mills Act to be tested in the laboratory of life so that its true worth can be examined and evaluated. Until that is done, I strongly urge this committee and the Congress not to take the irreversible step of meeting the King-Anderson bill.

National Bellamy Award Address by James Poole of the Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following address by James Poole, of Tulsa, Okla., on occasion of the 22d National Bellamy Award at Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn.

NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD—CENTRAL HIGH, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., OCTOBER 11, 1963

(Address by James Poole, Will Rogers High School, Tulsa, Okla.)

The "Oil Capital of the World," Tulsa, Okla., brings special greetings to Chattanooga's Central High School on this outstanding occasion.

I am proud to be a representative at this 1963 award presentation for it symbolizes the Americanism that must be perpetuated by our generation.

Today we pay tribute to this fine school as an example of our American ideal of education. Our way of learning is unsurpassed by any nation in the world. We have a system that develops basic skills, sound judgments, and expands our spiritual and intellectual, and developmental areas of living.

My high school, Will Rogers, was named for the famed Oklahoma cowboy. The beauty of Will Rogers High School is more than brick deep. We are well aware that

our school possesses a living spirit that inspires the student body in all endeavors. That spirit is the student himself. And yet, this spirit is inspired by the memory of our namesake, Will Rogers.

To help students attain their goals we have an excellent faculty. Our principal, Dr. Raymond W. Knight, was chosen Principal of the Year in 1961-62 by the National Association of High School Principals, and this year is president of the Oklahoma Education Association.

Last year Will Rogers was honored by the Ladies Home Journal as one of the top 25 high schools in the United States.

This year will mark the 25th anniversary of our school. For the past quarter of a century it has brought these American ideals to 15,000 graduates. Recognizing its efforts for patriotism, the 16th annual Bellamy Award was presented to my school in 1957. Since then we have continued to teach Americanism as we have concentrated on the student as an individual. We have endeavored to prepare him for a worthwhile place in our democratic society.

We trust that you will accept the Bellamy Award and cherish it as we have. You are truly among the outstanding and we extend our congratulations to you, the newest member of the Bellamy Award family.

To Bryant Millsaps, for the school library, I should like to present a copy of the Rogers 1963 Lariat which, for the third consecutive time, has won an all-America rating in nationwide competition.

Death of Robert Edwards, Editor, Beloit Daily News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Robert Edwards, editor of the Beloit Daily News, died. He was a fine man, a man I grew to know and admire in recent years. Mr. Edwards was a very able editor, highly respected by his coworkers on the Beloit News and throughout the Beloit community.

I ask unanimous consent that an article, from the Beloit Daily News of November 26, 1963, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROBERT EDWARDS, EDITOR, DIES AT 69—ACTIVE IN CIVIC, CHURCH, YOUNG PEOPLES AFFAIRS

Robert T. Edwards, well known Beloit newspaper editor and civic leader, died at 11 p.m. Monday in Beloit hospital following a short illness.

Mr. Edwards was actively at his post in the Daily News until a week ago when he submitted to surgery from which he failed to rally.

Active in community affairs Mr. Edwards was secretary of the YMCA board, a director and past president of the Salvation Army board, and a member of the executive committee of the Daily News Credit Union, which he served from the time of its organization 30 years ago.

BORN IN WISCONSIN

He was active in the affairs of the First Congregational Church, having served as chairman of the board of deacons and as moderator of the congregation. He was a past president of the Daily News Quarter Century Club, and the Wisconsin Managing Editors Association. He was a member of the Beloit Rotary Club, the Masonic lodge in Dousman, Wis., and the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Born in Rockland, Wis., November 1, 1894, Mr. Edwards was the son of Benjamin Franklin and Phoebe Phillips Edwards. He attended the University of Wisconsin from 1914 to 1917, enlisting in the Army and serving overseas in France. He served as a sergeant of engineers. When he returned to the United States he went to Beloit College, graduating in the class of 1922.

Mr. Edwards was married June 21, 1922, to Leola Belle Hadfield, who survives along with a daughter, Mrs. Merle O. Thorp, Janesville, and a grandson, John.

INTERESTED IN HISTORY

Following graduation from Beloit College Mr. Edwards became a reporter for the Daily News, and was made city editor in 1928. In 1941 he became managing editor of the newspaper. On November 1, his semiretirement was announced by Publisher Walter A. Strong, and he was named editor emeritus.

Mr. Edwards was intensely interested in local and State history, and was the author of many articles on historical places and events. He was a member of the Beloit Historical Society. He was a railroad hobbyist, and camera enthusiast. He particularly liked scenic photography associated with historical places.

A lover of flowers, Mr. Edwards was especially proud of his roses at the family home, 1881 Sherwood Drive, and visited gardens and conservatories in the Midwest and as far away as New Orleans and cities in Florida.

ON SYMPHONY BOARD

During World War II, when many members of the Daily News staff entered military service Mr. Edwards filled several posts on the newspaper, and devoted hundreds of hours to community projects for service personnel. He was active in the Council of Defense, the USO, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion.

Interested in the theater and music, Mr. Edwards was a strong supporter of the Little Theater and the Beloit College Court Theater, and the Beloit Civic Symphony. He was elected to the Symphony's board at its last annual meeting in September.

Although Mr. Edwards was a Republican by political affiliation, and supported the Republican cause personally and through the editorial policy of the newspaper, he was at all times fair and unbiased, and his editorials were widely read and commented upon. He was well known in State and midwestern newspaper circles, and he was a member of Sigma Delta Chi, national honorary journalism fraternity.

Funeral services will be held at 3 p.m. Wednesday at the First Congregational Church with the Reverend Stanley B. Crosland officiating. Burial will be in Eastlawn Cemetery.

Friends may call after 4 p.m. today and until 1:30 p.m. Wednesday at the Rosman-Uehling-Kinzer central chapel.

National Customer Appreciation Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in his capacity as a trustee of the Customer Relations Research Foundation of Philadelphia, Mr. Norman Cohn, executive vice president of Santa Claus Industries, Waterloo, Iowa, advises me that many Governors and other public officials are designating December as "Customer Appreciation Month" by issuing the following proclamation:

Whereas men of understanding and vision recognize that good will is a vital element in the development of greater harmony and progress, be it between governments or between buyers and sellers in the business community; and

Whereas farsighted businessmen throughout our great Nation have joined together to pay tribute to their customers, and especially to demonstrate tangible appreciation during this traditional season of good fellowship;

Therefore do I hereby proclaim December as Customer Appreciation Month and urge all persons to join this broad and heartwarming national effort to cultivate more good will at every level of business activity.

The Case for Civil Defense in Baltimore County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, is presently holding hearings on H.R. 8200, the civil defense bill.

During our consideration of this legislation, I believe it is essential that we obtain the thinking of all levels of government and all interests on the advisability of establishing and maintaining an effective civil defense program. On November 21, 1963, Spiro T. Agnew, the county executive of Baltimore County, Md., issued a statement setting forth his views on the need for an effective civil defense program.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Agnew's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR CIVIL DEFENSE IN BALTIMORE COUNTY, NOVEMBER 21, 1963—A PUBLIC STATEMENT BY SPIRO T. AGNEW, BALTIMORE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

The terrible possibility of atomic attack and the real doubts in the minds of many people that we can survive and recover from this type war have naturally resulted in confused opinions due to the complexities inherent in nuclear strategy, tactics and weapons effects.

Some feel that the problems are too complex and the solutions are too difficult, and therefore impractical. Others have a revulsion against preparations for war. Still others object to spending money for contingencies unless an early tangible return is foreseen. These feelings are often transferred into rejection of the subject or arguments that shelters may provoke enemy attack or lead to a false sense of security.

On the other hand a large segment of our people cut through the emotionalism which surrounds the subject, face the issues squarely and fully support the best practical

solutions to the problem. I am pleased to be able to report that these appear to constitute a majority.

It is an axiom of the law of negligence that as the gravity of possible harm increases the apparent likelihood of its occurrence need be correspondingly less.

The odds may be a thousand to one that no train will arrive at the very moment an automobile is crossing a railroad track, but the risk of death is nevertheless sufficiently serious to require the driver to take precautions against the train.

To take no precautions where the risk is nuclear attack cannot be justified on the ground that the odds are against it.

The most comprehensive and authoritative appraisal of the entire problem of civil defense I believe, is contained in the report of hearings held last summer on H.R. 8200 by the Congressional House Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee. The hearings on this bill, which provides Federal financial assistance for incorporating fallout shelters in Federal, State, and local government buildings such as schools and hospitals, were the most extensive ever held on civil defense in the United States. They extended over a period of 8 weeks while testimony was taken from 108 competent witnesses including Members of Congress who are particularly well informed on the subject of nuclear weapons and their effects, the Chief of Staff of the Army speaking for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the business and banking community, a winner of the Enrico Fermi Award, the father of the hydrogen bomb, the President of the National Academy of Sciences, a spokesman for the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, the National Education Association, State Governors or their representatives, commanders of most of the veterans organizations, and many others of similar responsibility and ability. The bill was favorably reported out 32 to 4, and the chairman observed that the attitude of members of the committee changed from opposition to firm belief in support of the fallout shelter program. The fact that the Senate has not yet acted on the measure does not lessen the significance of the testimony presented during the subcommittee hearings.

In view of this preponderance of authoritative support for civil defense, I am convinced that we in Baltimore County would fail in our responsibilities to the people if we were to curtail in any way the capabilities of the bureau of civil defense in its efforts designed to minimize the effects of natural or nuclear disaster.

A number of individuals have suggested that the county civil defense functions be transferred to the police or fire bureaus. These individuals cannot be aware of the scope of civil defense activities. The fire and police bureaus already are a part of the civil defense team and have major disaster responsibilities. All other elements of the county government likewise have civil defense responsibilities, just as I have in continuing to direct the activities of the departments and offices in event of disaster.

The responsibilities of the bureau of civil defense are those of planning, coordinating, and training.

General planning for natural or nuclear disaster can best be done by a separate government element which is free from possible bias which might result if individuals charged with the task were members of an office where they might be influenced by the specialized activities of their colleagues.

Each department and office in turn is responsible within its own specialization for planning the details of its emergency service activities. However, the coordination of these detailed plans, in order to insure that all mesh together properly without duplication of effort and that appropriate priorities are assigned to each function, is the responsibility of the civil defense bureau. Training plans, and in some instances actual instruction in survival activity, is also the civil defense bureau's job.

To illustrate the scope of disaster responsibility and civil defense activity I would like to point out that our county warning system, which is connected by radio and land lines to the State and National system, includes 135 sirens, most of which are designated exclusively for attack warning. To coordinate the entire effort, communications are required which, aside from commercial telephone facilities, will be handled by volunteer amateur radio operators, all of whom are licensed by the FCC and are fully qualified. Radio nets, in addition to those currently used by highways, police, and fire organizations extend to adjacent counties and to Maryland State Civil Defense Agency, which in turn has facilities which are part of the national network.

Public works must restore roads and damaged buildings, reestablish water and sewage systems, and coordinate efforts with the gas and electric company in rehabilitating those facilities.

The radiological service, established to measure radiation intensities and analyze fallout data reports, is the responsibility of the health department. However, most of the individual monitoring stations which must be manned by trained radiological meter operators are located in the police and fire stations throughout the county. Monitors are being trained for duty in community shelters as well. More than 1,000 have been trained.

The fallout shelter program is the direct responsibility of the bureau of civil defense. Activities include negotiations of permits for use of private and public buildings as fallout shelters, marking of the buildings, procurement and delivery of essential survival supplies to each of the designated shelters.

The police are responsible for continuation of their normal activities with major efforts directed toward traffic control, prevention and control of mob action, looting and vandalism. The regular force is augmented by volunteer auxiliaries.

Manpower service, a joint effort of the U.S. Employment Service in Baltimore County and the director of Baltimore County's personnel office must locate, maintain records, and procure personnel with needed skills and aptitudes who may be required for the wide variety of activities related to defense against and recovery from a disaster.

The supply service is responsible for procuring essential materials and distributing to all other services.

The fire service in addition to its functions of fighting fires which might result from nuclear detonation, is responsible for rescue activities and radiological decontamination. All volunteer fire companies have specific tasks in an emergency and will be under the control of the chief of the regular fire bureau.

Health services under the direction of the Baltimore County health officer provides medical care for the sick and injured. This includes treatment for effects of chemical, biological, and radiological warfare. His job also includes the planning and assignment of professional and lay volunteer personnel to each of the medical facilities together with the procurement and maintenance of medical stocks. Up to this time six civil defense emergency hospitals have been designated and provided with all needed equipment and supplies to go into immediate operation. Thirty casualty clearing stations have also been set up under the same basis.

Other emergency activities for which plans must be made, personnel oriented and detailed functions assigned are legal, public information, religion, transportation, and welfare.

Regardless of what action or lack of action or organizational modifications of civil defense that may be taken by other communities, it seems clear to me that in order to realize the full value of each county agency in the event of disaster it is most necessary to have a unit responsible for their coordination and this can best be met by our present allocation of duties.

It can be seen that civil defense cannot be treated lightly, and that the job of all of us who are responsible for the security and well-being of our residents, is tremendous.

Every employee in the 14 departments and agencies of Baltimore County will assume his full obligation in meeting this challenge, and I hope that the thousands of civic-minded residents of Baltimore County will support our effort and share in these responsibilities.

Radio and Television Coverage of Recent Sad Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I believe that recognition should be given to the television and radio networks for their coverage of the death of our esteemed President, John F. Kennedy, his burial, the transition of Government, and the meeting of the world leaders with President Johnson. In paying tributes to the networks, we should also recognize the part that the independent radio and television stations played in giving the people of the United States the factual story. They all completely disregarded their commercial obligations and assumed the tremendous cost involved. I also noticed that the networks made all of their programs available to stations that are not ordinarily associated to them.

A serious crisis was averted by their report of the transition of Government. We must remember that the majority of our people had just viewed a shocking, tragic event—one that had not occurred before in the life time of the great majority. They needed to know that ours was a continuing Government—that the Constitution was to be upheld—that in time of great crisis that there were no political parties—that we were as one in the support of the new President in his conduct of international affairs.

This they saw with their own eyes when upon the landing of the Presidential plane in Washington, President Johnson was met by the Republican and Democratic leaders of the Congress and immediately assured of their complete support.

We must remember that these pictures were flashed around the world. This was a most needful thing. Many of the foreign countries believe that the assassination of a national leader is a signal for opposition political parties to seize control of the reins of Government. There are even those who might have wished to take advantage of the confusion that they would have believed to have followed such an action.

You may be certain that every foreign embassy was following every action and reporting on it to their governments. They saw a rapid and most orderly transfer of Government. The possibility of any adverse movements was completely averted.

The American people had immediate knowledge of the security of our Government—the leaders of the foreign nations of the world had immediate knowledge that our new President was the spokesman for all of the people.

The radio and television networks and the individual stations recognized their responsibility to the Nation. They well earned the title of a great American institution—one to be saluted by all of us.

Speeding Up Traffic on the Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an article in the December 1, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail calls attention to the fact that construction of the huge new dam and locks on the Ohio River at Belleville, W. Va., is proceeding ahead of schedule.

The dam at Belleville is one of a number of replacement dams scheduled for the Ohio which will cut in half the time required to move long barge tows up and down the river. The speeding up of traffic on this vital trade artery should prove a boon to the commerce of the entire Ohio River Basin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which explains the system of dams and locks now under construction on the Ohio, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACE LIFTING ON THE BEAUTIFUL OHIO

The engineering problems involved don't stagger the imagination and embody the glamour of a Hoover or Glen Canyon Dam project, but the U.S. Corps of Engineers has a facelifting project going on the beautiful Ohio River that, dollar for dollar, is going to pay richer dividends.

In short, the Engineers are going to take 24 stumbling blocks out of a 961-mile stretch of the river, raise the river level from 3 to 30 feet, and just incidentally, back the water up into tributaries, which will be a tremendous boost to pleasure boating.

All this is going to cost something like $1.2 billion. They hope to have it finished by 1974.

The most important aspect of this, economically, is removing the 24 stumbling blocks. Navigation on the river is made possible by 41 original dams, the last one finished in 1929. Each of these 41 dams had to be bypassed with a set of locks. When the first dams were envisioned, river tows were steam propelled and much smaller. But, with the development of powerful diesel tugs, tows got longer and longer and longer. And some single barges now being used on the Ohio are as long as a football field. One single oil barge may now hold more petroleum than was shipped on the river for the whole year of 1915.

Breaking a tow and locking it past a dam piecemeal is time consuming and therefore costly. When that has to be done 41 times in less than a 1,000-mile stretch, it gets very costly.

So the facelifting is designed to reduce the 41 dams to 19, and make the locks big enough so that a whole tow can be passed through intact.

Of the proposed new dams, three have been completed: New Cumberland, above Steubensville; Greenup, below Ironton; and the Markland, below Cincinnati, which was dedicated last month.

Four others now are under construction: the Cannelton locks and dam above Tell City, Ind.; the Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam below Maysville, Ohio; the Pike Island locks and dam above Wheeling; and the Belleville locks and dam below Parkersburg.

Another seven either are tentatively proposed, under study or have been authorized. The remaining projects which have been tentatively proposed, are under study or now are underway, will not require completely new dams but will include partial reconstruction and additional improvements.

Some idea of the engineering problems involved in completing one of these new dams and locks on the busy Ohio River, is given by the photos accompanying this article.

The construction shown here is at the Belleville project. Incidentally, there is some confusion about the project's name itself. When the original plan was adopted in 1953, the proposed dam was identified with the town on the West Virginia side of the Ohio—Belleville in Wood County.

But, when the project is completed, the locks themselves will be on the Ohio side of the river, at an Ohio town known as Reedsville. As a result, there is some sentiment for changing the name of the project to the Belleville-Reedsville locks and dam.

Regardless of what it is called, the project, it is estimated, will cost $61 million, eliminate three existing dams and create an upriver pool 41.5 miles long. The completion date target is 1968.

After core drilling to determine the proper strata for exact location of the dam and locks, a cofferdam was placed to wall off a 28-acre section of the Ohio River which would permit construction of the locks—1,200 and 600 feet, long.

The cofferdam was completed early this year and the river pumped out of the enclosure, but twice flood waters poured over the walls and it had to be pumped dry all over.

But, the long dry months of spring, summer and fall were compensation and now with 500 workers swarming about the forest of cranes, the $22 million lock building contract is ahead of schedule.

The King Is Dead—Long Live the King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, tragic psychology, but a truism of our times is that life must go on. No man understood better than President John Kennedy that time stands still for no man. We must continue to chart the course of a free America.

On the west coast, the San Francisco Chronicle has recently pointed to one of the first evidence of courage of our new President Lyndon Johnson in voicing his outspoken support for the early enactment by Congress of a meaningful, fair opportunity civil rights act. The President has earned the support and respect of the West by his forthright declaration of leadership.

The article follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE SUMMONS OF A NEW LEADER

The summoning of strength, stamina, and will to meet the unexpected demand of an emergency is a capacity with which evolution has fortunately endowed mankind. It was surely manifest yesterday in the face and words of Lyndon Johnson, speaking to Congress, the Nation, and the world.

"Who is your new President?" Americans around the world have been asked. Mr. Johnson provided a sure and confident impression of himself and his policy which should resolve the anxious questioning. He is going to be a strong President, on the showing of yesterday's address to the joint session, and faithful to the Kennedy principles and policies.

There will be no cause for rejoicing in Peking after the President's speech is considered there; but there is, we feel, great cause for hope in the nations of the West and also—it is not too much to suggest—in Moscow.

There was no escaping the determined mood of the new President's challenge to Congress to get on with its work with the civil rights bill. "We have talked long enough * * * for 100 years or more. Yes, it is time now to write the next chapter—and to write it in books of law," said this Texan, this southerner, this American. One could easily imagine the wheels of calculation turning in the minds of some of his former colleagues in the Senate, wondering how the head of pressure built up behind the appalling events of the week can be resisted this time. But it may be too late for the senatorial rearguard to stop the forward movement toward the enactment of this law.

An act of hate has thrust Lyndon Johnson into power. May it be his destiny as a Texan and a southerner, to lead his State and his region, and indeed his country, toward their absolution from some of the hate and violence which is being taught and preached by the fanatics and apostles of bitterness and bigotry.

To Worry or Not To Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a sermon by the talented pastor of the Chevy Chase Methodist Church, Dr. Clifford Homer Richmond, in which he gave the members of his congregation, and I now wish to give to a much larger audience, a summons to fulfill the duties of Christian citizenship.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

TO WORRY OR NOT TO WORRY

(Sermon of Dr. Clifford Homer Richmond, pastor, Chevy Chase Methodist Church, Chevy Chase, Md.)

E. M. Forster, a veteran novelist, once made the remark: "One has two duties—to be worried and not to be worried." This statement has suggested the title for my message this morning.

According to Mr. Forster one of our duties is to be worried. It would seem that we need little advice along this line. Our age has been called the age of anxiety. Worry is something we have plenty of. Many books and articles are written on this subject; all suggesting ways in which we can avoid worry, tension and conflict. Even from the pulpits we hear preachers who seem to be making the Gospel merely an antidote for worry. They are presenting a Christianity which is little more than a tranquilizer. They seem to overlook the challenge of the Cross and the cost of discipleship. Jesus said: "If any man would be my disciple, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow Me."

In spite of all of our efforts, however, to avoid worry almost everyone worries. It has been said that worry kills more people than any other disease. Why, then, should Mr. Forster suggest that one of our duties is to be worried? I think we should remember that the worry he is here talking about is not the worry which becomes self-centeredness. Most of our worry comes from being too concerned with ourselves. When Mr. Forster says that one of our duties is to be worried, he means that we should be worried, concerned about the welfare of others—the condition of our world—our obligations to society.

Albert Schweitzer is a splendid example of this. Dr. Schweitzer is not a man who worries; at least, about himself. He is not self-centered. This does not mean however that he does not worry. He is gravely concerned about the needs of others—the pain and suffering of human life. He has said: "I have rarely had a truly happy day in my life. I have never been able to fence myself off from the suffering of mankind. It seems to me that we should all take our share of the burden of pain which lies upon the world."

That is what Mr. Forster was talking about when he said one of our duties is to be worried. We should be greatly concerned about the suffering of mankind. We should be worried, if you will. We should all take our share of the burden of pain which lies upon the world. But, do we? Most of us try to avoid worry. We have a feeling that our main business in life is to learn how to stop worrying and start living. Nothing is further from the truth. How can anyone, living in world like this, not worry? How can one look out upon the hunger, pain and suffering of life and not be concerned?

All too many of us are like the priest and Levite who walked the Jericho Road. We are so preoccupied with ourselves that we seldom see the needs of others. Or, if we do look upon the suffering of the world we do little about it. We simply pass by on the other side.

When we do this, however, we certainly are not following in the footsteps of our Master. He said: "I came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." He also said: "Inasmuch as ye do it or do it not unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye do it or do it not unto Me." And when He said this He had in mind feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick in prison.

As Christians we have a definite obligation, responsibility—to be concerned—to be worried if you will—about the conditions of the world in which we live.

One of the biggest problems we have to face—whether it is with reference to civil rights, nuclear tests, economic injustices, communism, etc., is the alarming apathy and indifference of so-called Christian people.

I tell you, friends, it is about time we as Christians become disturbed—about time we begin to worry about a number of things—and worry to the extent that we endeavor to do something about them. What about the increasing filth on our magazine stands, in much of our modern fiction, in our moving pictures, theaters, etc.? Does this worry you—at least to the extent that you will begin to take what steps you can to do something about it? To write those responsible—to support only the decent movies, books, etc., to visit your neighborhood drug store and talk to the manager about the situation, and seek his cooperation?

Take the racial tensions in this country. Do these worry you? Worry you enough to lead you to ask God to take all the prejudice and hatred out of your own heart toward any of His children? The only place this race problem has ever been solved—or ever will be solved, for that matter—was in the early church. In that church, Christ so dwelt in the hearts of all that there was neither "Jew nor Gentile—bond nor free, male nor female"—all the walls of separation, which were so evident in the world, were broken down. The church today, I must confess, does not display the unity of that early church.

Now you can never remove racial prejudice by law. Law may lower the fence between races; but, they still will be there. Only in Christ can these walls of hostility be demolished and brethren dwell together in unity. Are we concerned enough to let love of Christ fill our hearts that we see men and women not as black, brown, rich, poor, educated, illiterate, but as brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus?

Yes, I am worried—about a lot of things.

I am worried about the watering down of our Christian faith. In the name of ecumenicity—so-called tolerance—wanting everyone to think well of us, we are getting so that we are afraid to admit that we are Christians—that Jesus Christ is our Lord and Master—that we are convinced that He and He alone is the answer to our individual problems and the problems of the world.

We are trying to seek a common denominator in all religions and in doing so we are sacrificing the uniqueness of our Christian faith, and the supremacy of Jesus Christ in human life. God forgive us. It wasn't this kind of Christianity which turned the world upside down in the days of the early church and unless in some way we can return that fervor, emphasis, and dedication, Christianity has no reason for existing. The Christian church is through. If we believe that our Christian faith is unique, that Jesus is the way, the truth, and the life—let's say so. Let us stand up and be counted.

I am worried about the concerted effort on the part of a small minority in this country to remove every trace of God from our national life. They have already taken prayer and Bible reading out of our public schools. The other day a principal forebade the singing of the fourth stanza of "My Country 'Tis of Thee" in a public school. I never thought I would live to see the day when we couldn't sing the fourth stanza of "My Country 'Tis of Thee" in our public schools.

"Our Father's God, to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing:
Long may our land be bright,
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, Our King."

But I have lived to see it—and so have you. Now, they are trying to take "under God" out of the "Salute to the Flag." All of this is just the beginning. Also under attack is "In God We Trust" on our coins, etc. Doesn't this worry, concern you?

I wish you all could read the article by Mrs. Bella Dodd in the current issue of Guideposts. I should like to see a copy of this in every home in this Nation. She suggests that there is a conspiracy against God in this land. She suggests that even though all who are in this conspiracy are not Communists, still they are serving the Communist cause by helping to make this Nation secular—even atheistic. I disagree with some of my ministerial colleagues in this connection and some of our Methodist Church leaders. Certainly our children need not less, but more emphasis on spiritual values in our public schools. I agree that no child should be forced into any religious exercise against his conscience, but should a minority deprive your children of the privilege of praying—thanking God for food and hearing a few words of spiritual wisdom, at least from the Old Testament?

Are you worried enough to do something about it? Write your Congressmen. Support those who are working on an amendment to the Constitution to make prayer and Bible reading legal in our schools. Write your school boards urging them to think of ways to teach our children the basic concepts of morality and God.

When "In God We Trust" goes from our national life—we shall witness the end of this country as we have known it.

Now, a word on Mr. Forster's other point. Our duty not to worry. We should worry, be concerned about the things which concern the welfare of others; but, we should not worry about the things which rise out of our own self-centeredness. Jesus was vitally concerned, or worried, if you will, about the needs of others—about the tragic conditions of His day. He healed the sick, fed the hungry, forgave the sinful, cleansed the Temple of the moneychangers—wept over the state of His beloved Jerusalem—sweat drops of blood in Gethsemane, etc. Yet, He was a man of perfect peace. He never worried about anything concerning Himself. On the eve of His crucifixion, He turned to His disciples and said:—"Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your hearts be troubled, neither let them be afraid."

In the midst of the storm on Galilee, He slept like a baby. When the soldiers came to arrest Him, He called His betrayer "Friend." Before Pilate, when He was falsely accused, He opened not His mouth. On the cross He forgave His executioners, and finally in perfect peace He dropped His head on His bosom and said: "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit."

As Christians we can be greatly "worried"—"concerned" about our world and still have perfect peace in our hearts. While others fret and stew—we can have the peace which passeth all understanding, the joy that is "unspeakable and full of glory." They say that at the heart of a hurricane, although it can wreak the most frightful devastation, there is a place of perfect calm, such a stillness that a feather plucked from the breast of a swan lies motionless. This is the way it was with Jesus and this is the way it may be with us.

The secret of it all, of course, is to simply do our best from day to day and leave the rest to God.

Gladstone was able to do this. On one occasion, in a national crisis in England, he worked very hard—toiled for weeks, 10 hours a day. Finally he had to see Queen Victoria in what proved to be a very stormy interview; but, after it was all over and he had done his best, he walked over the hills around his home with the carefreeness of a teenager, worried—yet, not worried.

Jesus was able to do this even more perfectly because He believed that when all is said and done everything is in the hands of God. He believed in God, the Maker and Master of the Universe, the Lord of history—a God who was working out His purpose through the years. That is why He was so calm. He knew there was nothing to worry about as long as He lived in close fellowship with the Heavenly Father.

Do we have this faith? When the storms come, when tragedies surround us, when crises break over our heads, and the world seems to be going to pieces—are we conscious of the fact that we are not alone—that we do not have to face life with our own limited powers—but, that He is near? Can we hear Him say: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world"?

Behind us and within us there is a power with wisdom to guide us, strength to uphold us and love to keep us to the end. Therefore, we need not worry.

An Ambassador was tossing and turning on his bed through the night in anxiety about his country. An associate, lying in the same room, said: "Sir, may I ask you a question?" "Certainly," replied the Ambassador. "Did God govern the world before you came into it?" "Undoubtedly." "And will He govern the world when you have gone out of it?" Again, the Ambassador replied: "Undoubtedly." "Then, sir, can you not trust Him to govern the world while you are in it?" The tired Ambassador turned on his side and fell fast asleep.

Let us pray:

"Keep us alive, O Lord, while we live;
Arouse the sluggish forces in our being
So that we sleep not the sleep of death.
If there be a task in the church to do,
And we have the energy to do it,
Save us from the shabby excuses we make
For spiritual laziness and listlessness.
If there be a foe to face
May no lack of courage bow our spirit or silence our voice.
Keep ever before us the picture of an earnest Christ."

—Author Unknown.

Dallas Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written in defense of the good folks of Dallas and in condemnation of the leftist-Marxist, gun-slinging maniac who caused the tragic incident in Dallas and brought shock and sorrow to the world on November 22.

Dallas is properly defended and the blame for this terrible deed is properly directed in the following article from the Park Cities-North Dallas News on November 27, 1963:

SHOULD DALLAS BEAR THE SHAME?

The impact of the assassination of our President, felt more sharply in Dallas than elsewhere, and the compassion felt for the President's family, have plunged Dallas into mourning, more deeply felt here than in any other city. The President had never received a more friendly welcome than this one in Dallas, until his tragic death in our midst.

The sorrow felt by the people of Dallas has obscured the imputation of guilt which some have sought to place upon Dallas. One of our leaders spoke of intemperate words which could push the mind beyond the brink of derangement. From critics, in other parts of the Nation, come righteous charges that bigotry can inflame the mind of a potential assassin.

Let us place the blame where it belongs, and not on the people of Dallas. The Communist manifesto, which was written for an early convention of followers of Karl Marx, was repleat with hatred. The bourgeoisie are trembling, it said. Violent overthrow of capitalism was the theme of the document, few in pages, but mighty in effect. The leaders of communism, from that day to this, have plainly stated this same intention.

The assassin, Oswald, stated that he first heard of communism from a pamphlet given to him at the age of 15 which defended the Rosenbergs, who were later executed for giving our atomic secrets to Russia. He later read Das Kapital and, of course, the manifesto. The subsequent 9 years of his life were spent absorbing the indoctrination of hate, instilled by international communism.

The constant hatred for capitalism and its leaders, read and heard, was the cause of the assassination. Three years spent in Russia, receiving this hatred daily, added to the effect. Oswald was born in New Orleans, attended school there, acquired a Russian wife while in Russia. His connection with Dallas was mainly in relation to the murder of the President. We don't claim him, and he never claimed Dallas.

Let the blame and the shame be placed where it belongs: on the heads of those who preach Marxism and the destruction of capitalism and its leaders. This was the source of the hatred and the cause of the assassination. Oswald undoubtedly felt that he was striking a blow for the cause which had been the motivation of his life.

We all regret that the blow was struck in Dallas, but the culpability is not ours.

Some Thoughts on Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on November 20 of this year former Senator Chan Gurney, now a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered a most thought-provoking address to the Transportation Club of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., entitled "Some Thoughts on Aviation." Our former colleague drew on his 25 years of experience in Washington, both in the U.S. Senate where he served for 12 years and as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board to make sound suggestions as to how to make our air carrier service succeed.

Chan Gurney also used this occasion in this address in his home State to announce that at the expiration of his term of service on the CAB in 1964 that he will retire and return to South Dakota to take up life once again back home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Gurney's address for the edification of all of his colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME THOUGHTS ON AVIATION

(Address by the Honorable Chan Gurney, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board)

It is a pleasure to be with you this evening, on the occasion of your annual meeting. My talk is intended to give you some idea as to my personal plans for the next few years, and then to give you some thoughts I have accumulated in the dozen years I have been a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, possibly colored by my previous Washington assignment which you gave me as your representative in the U.S. Senate for my first dozen years away from our State.

Taking it all in all, my present final 6-year term in aviation is continuing through the calendar year 1964 because of my appointment by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on December 9, 1958. At the end of that time I will have had more than 25 years in Washington, and that is long enough for this South Dakotan to be away from home. To this Mrs. Gruney says amen. We will move back to Yankton in the fall of 1964. This is a definite arrangement I have promised my good wife, so that is final.

I want to be out where the West begins because I have a great desire to hear the coyotes howl again, and I think Yankton is the place to be because one can take a sleeping bag and go into the Devil's Nest country across the new lake behind the dam at Yankton and hear the coyotes almost any night. Up here at Sioux Falls, where the population has increased tremendously—more than double since I lived here—you have new streets, new subdivisions, new manufacturing, new everything, including interestate highways and what have you, I am sure that you have to go farther west because you have no chance of hearing a coyote howl in this our biggest South Dakota city—and how wonderful it is.

Tonight my talk will be on the progress of aviation and the relationship of the Civil Aeronautics Board to this dynamic industry.

I expect many in this audience do not have a clear understanding as to the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and have not had time to differentiate our functions from the job the Federal Aviation Agency has to do. First, the CAB, meaning Civil Aeronautics Board, is a small agency of few more than 800 people, contrasted with the FAA which has almost 40,000. We call the CAB a quasi-judicial agency, for although we do have many executive powers, decisions are arrived at through the judicial process as outlined in the Administrative Procedure Act. That act gives litigants certain specified procedural rights between the time original petitions are filed and a final decision of the Board. Each litigant has a fair chance to present evidence, appear in a public hearing before an examiner, file briefs, the right to present argument to the Board, and to receive a final judgment of the Board as is done in court procedure—even to the extent of filing petitions for reconsideration and appealing to the U.S. courts any decision that a petitioner contends is unfair or unjust or in violation of existing law.

The CAB, among many other duties, sets the rates that passengers pay for their tickets, after a filing by the airline, and the same on any cargo they ship, and sets the rate the Post Office must pay to the airlines for carrying the mail. We also set up the transportation network of the certificated airlines, designate which communities they may serve, and see to it that they give adequate service to these cities and towns. It is also our responsibility to investigate all aircraft accidents to determine whether there are any deficiencies in the airplane or in its operation, which may give us a lead on how to increase safety of flying in any way. Although I would like to give more time to this, our number one responsibility—safety in the air, I must pass it over by just stating that we do count it our number one responsibility. That job has been very well done, for since 1940 the Board has been able to come up with the probable cause of more than 94 percent of all U.S. air carrier accidents, and in somewhat more than half of these corrective actions has been taken so that U.S. scheduled airline accident fatalities for more than 10 years have been less than 1 fatality in 100 million passenger miles. This is in

face of the fact that there are almost 2,000 aircraft in scheduled operation. For our international carriers, this is the third consecutive year that they have experienced no fatal accident—a truly remarkable record.

The Federal Aviation Agency personnel are commonly known as the policemen of the air, but they do much more than that. They see to it that every manufactured airplane meets high safety standards, and the same for the crew that flies them. The plane is approved only after it passes all safety tests, and the crew must also pass rigorous technical as well as physical and efficiency examinations. Manufacturing and maintenance procedures must also meet the FAA high standards. The FAA also selects, installs, and maintains all navigation aids and then operates this equipment in the safest possible way.

This is a thumbnail sketch of the difference between the two agencies that have prime responsibility in the aviation field. Each of these agencies is operating under the basic Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, re-enacted in 1958, which in its declaration of policy states that the CAB in the exercise and performance of its powers and duties in accordance with the public convenience and necessity must encourage and develop an air transportation system best adapted to the present and future needs of the commerce, the postal service, and the national defense. And I emphasize national defense. There are other policy guides stated in this law and one I would also like to emphasize is that which requires the Board to consider competition to the extent necessary to assure a sound transportation system.

Now, I want to give you a thumbnail sketch of some of the ideas and beliefs that I have endeavored to follow since my term began on the CAB in March of 1951. First, each Government agency tends to build on itself and the fault is not always with the agency itself. Congressmen have said many times during and since the passage of the Civil Aeronautics Act that they consider the CAB an arm of Congress. This because it was obvious, and remains obvious, that Congress could not possibly handle the myriad of details necessary to regulate the air industry or to promote and develop a sound air industry, needed for our air commerce, postal service, and national defense. Communities petition for service—and more service. These petitions must be handled. Airlines desire to grow as does every other private industry in this free country of ours. They must compete with other airlines just the same as a grocery store which has a competitor starting up across the street. Providing competition to the extent necessary—but only to the exent necessary in the public interest—is mandatory on the Board in order to be sure the best possible equipment and service are provided to the communities and people of the United States.

A sound, stable air industry is the responsibility of the CAB. On any air route where competition already exists to the extent needed in the public interest, an additional air carrier or carriers should not be given the right to fly that segment. A plethora of carriers makes it uneconomic for all. The result has been that too many additional carriers have been added to many of the airline routes in the Nation. I have contended that many of these decisions were wrong, that the decisions caused a dilution of airline revenue for all carriers on those routes, that the additional competition was uneconomic and was not in the best interest of the traveling public or the airlines. This is proved by the fact that even the strong carriers are not making the return on investment to which the Board has said they are entitled.

Aviation is a dynamic industry, started by young men in the 1920's, and even before World War I. They saw not only the romance of flying, but also the need our country had for being first in world aviation. The air industry is now one of the largest in the United States, and thank Heaven for that. The young people who started first in aviation are now tops in their field—in flying, in manufacturing, and in the many jobs that must be done properly to make aviation reliable and safe. My only quarrel with a regulatory agency is that sometimes it becomes overburdened with regulatory work and neglects the promotional side. Members of a regulatory agency must not live in an ivory tower thinking they know how to operate an airline better than those actually in the business who know the job firsthand and from the ground up.

Here I interject an important phase of national defense, for I feel it has a bearing on what I am about to say. Our very existence during World War II was dependent on those who knew about flying and those who manufactured the machines they piloted and, yes, the ammunition they carried. We, as citizens of the United States, are greatly indebted to the "flyboys" and those who kept them in the air. The commercial airlines have the planes for the Nation to use in an emergency and the know-how to make the best use possible of them when the country calls. My view is there should be minimum regulation and maximum promotion for our country's interest and protection, all consistent with our responsibility under the law. The operators should be permitted to operate in our capitalistic system of government as a private enterprise without burdensome regulation. It is my considered judgment it is in the best interest of the people of the United States, and certainly the government, to develop the strongest possible commercial airline network, for it has a top place in the transportation of our country. Our decision in cases involving the economics of an airline operation can make or break the air transport system.

Now, why have I said that the CAB has neglected the promotional side? I will try to explain. The trunk airlines in the past 10 years are short on their net profits, taking them all together, by more than half a billion dollars under the rate of return the Board has previously decided was necessary for their economic well-being. What do I mean by economic well-being? I mean enough profits to attract investors that will provide the necessary capital. Huge amounts are needed when you consider that for jet equipment alone the trunk airlines have already expended for equipment on hand over 2 billion, 111 million-odd dollars. These same carriers have on order jets to be delivered in the next few years that will cost them over $800 million—$865,220,000 to be exact. These figures, I want you to know, do not include the supersonic jets which the airlines have said they will need to keep up with the advancement of the art and which our country will need in its national defense.

The Board in its regulatory job on rates and the granting of excessive route segments to too many airlines has not considered the great necessity of the airlines to make reasonable profits to maintain a sound, stable air industry serving the public interest.

Without question, we have the best aviation system in the whole world. Without question our people—62 million of them carried as passengers each year by the scheduled airlines—know it is a good system. Also, the fact that last year 62 percent of the 2½ million persons who crossed the North Atlantic by air were U.S. citizens leads me to believe the people of the United States are sure the airplane is here to stay. I believe there is a necessity for those air passengers in international travel to help out wherever possible by using U.S. flag carriers in preference to those of other nations, first because I am sure they will get a good ride, and it would be in our own self-interest by helping out the balance-of-payments problem—the gold question, so to speak. As a result of our Government's having entered into reciprocal agreements with foreign nations for the exchange of air routes, 19 different foreign airlines operate across the North Atlantic to our shores. We have three flying the Atlantic—one a cargo carrier, Seaboard & Western, and the other two, Pan American and Trans World Airlines. Thirteen years ago our airlines carried 75 percent of this international passenger traffic, but this percentage last year declined to less than 50 percent. To increase our share of the market, it is essential that the U.S. travelers prefer U.S. airlines. In spite of this declining share of the market, the progress of our air carriers has been great. More people are flying on better and faster planes, with better service. Much help has been given by the Board, but policies tried and true too often change. I give credit to airline management for providing the citizens of the United States the best air transportation possible at the lowest economical price. Let the airlines suggest rates that will keep them a viable industry, able to purchase the best machines available, keep up with the advancement of the art, and return a reasonable profit to the stockholders of the airlines. The Board should keep in mind always that is regulatory activity must only be enough to keep an economically strong, healthy, and vigorous air transport system.

During my term on the Civil Aeronautics Board I have seen the airlines go heavily in debt for the newest, best and safest airplanes possible to secure, the greatest advancement being in the last few years when those who travel have been happy with the speed and safety of the jet airplanes. Remember, if you will, that the international and domestic trunk airlines made this possible by obligating themselves for $2 billion or more for new jet equipment, and they are continuing to buy additional modern airplanes for the long- and medium-long stretches of their systems. The FAA and CAB are pushing for a short-range compact plane for the local service lines that will operate more economically and guarantee that the smaller communities receive, and continue to receive, the service to which they are entitled. By that I mean faster, air-conditioned, pressurized jet or turboprop airplanes. Even with this big investment in flying equipment, the airlines have continued to hold their prices down. Consider, if you will, the 8 to 12 cents per mile it takes to run an automobile. Compare it with the tourist fare, economy or thrift airline fares that are available—or even compare it with the price charged for a trip from Sioux Falls to Pierre, S. Dak.—that is, the per-mile cost. I challenge you to drive from here to Pierre early in the morning, transact your business there, and return that evening feeling fit as a fiddle and ready to do a decent day's work the next day. Some per-mile rates in the United States for the very heavy areas of traffic are below 4 cents per mile. The rates have been no lower than this at any time since commercial air travel was first offered, and they now run between that figure and 7 cents per mile—with an average, I would say, of around 5½ cents for a coach seat. Contrast that with the difference in the cost of an automobile when it first appeared on the scene and now. I remember buying five Model-T Fords in Yankton for our company just before World War I, at $280 apiece. I heard of a fellow the other day who bought a wonderful Ford for $3,900. Of course, you can buy smaller models for less money, but I still remember that Model-T and how wonderful it was. Contrast too, if you will, the low cost of air travel per mile wtih the growing prices you pay for the house you live in, clothing you wear or things you eat, and you will come up with the answer—the airlines have held the line.

To conclude, I want to put in a strong word as to my belief that the local service airlines must be supported by the traveling public and also supported by the Civil Aeronautics Board in every way possible. All of you buy airmail stamps and the aggregate sale of the airmail stamps totals around $200 million per year. Let's say it costs the Post Office to handle airmail one-half of that amount and that the payment (called subsidy) now going to the local service airlines is between $60 and $75 million per year. For a long time I have felt that the word subsidy used in this connection was wrong. It looks to me like the users of air mail pay for this service. Since it is necessary to move this mail, the services of the local carriers are necessary to provide this transportation to all communities of the United States, be they large or small. Local service airlines feed passengers into the trunklines, sell tickets, and advise the travelers the best way to reach their desired destination. The local service airlines take your mail and bring mail back to you. We could not do away with that service any more than we could do away with rural free delivery, and who is there here who would say the farmer is not entitled to delivery of his mail as well as the businessman on Broadway? Congress is alive to this necessity and in very recent statements by House and Senate committees they have told all of us, including the Civil Aeronautics Board, that they will continue to support a sound local service system, and by that I mean such airlines as North Central, Ozark, and Frontier. They take care of South Dakota now and will continue to do a better job as travel increases on the better airplanes they expect to get in the not too distant future. I predict that within 3 or 4 years that wonderful veteran of local service fame, the DC-3 aircraft, will be put out to pasture and replaced by pressurized, air-conditioned, faster airplanes, going around 200 miles an hour. These planes will serve the thinnest routes, be of smaller size—carrying from 14 to 24 passengers—able to land on the shortest fields, thereby cutting airport costs for the smaller communities which cannot support a larger airport. It behooves the Civil Aeronautics Board to continue its active endorsement and support of the local service industry for our United States of America.

With that, let me say it has been a joy to be back in Sioux Falls, my home No. 2, and I hope it will be not too long before I see you again.

Kennedy a Victim of Hate Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column in which Drew Pearson quotes William R. Mathews of Tucson, Ariz. Mr. Mathews has been a great leader in our State and I thought his comments, together with the others contained in Mr. Pearson's column, should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

KENNEDY A VICTIM OF HATE DRIVE

(By Drew Pearson)

If you study the history of American Presidents who have been assassinated, you find that most of these tragedies did not come about through the fanaticism of one man. They came about because powerful influencemolders in the Nation had preached disrespect and hate for the authority of the Government, and the man in the White House who symbolized Government.

In the city where President Kennedy was killed, the Dallas News had long preached disrespect for the President. Its publisher, Ted Dealey, had accused Mr. Kennedy of running the Nation as Caroline rode her tricycle. On the day the President arrived, the Dallas News carried a full-page ad, berating Mr. Kennedy in vitriolic language.

It was placed by the American Fact-Finding Committee, an unheard of committee, and signed by Bernard Weissman, a shoe salesman. It gave as an address, Post Office Box 1792—Dallas 22.

President Kennedy obviously did not know about this editorial in advance. But he did know that Dallas had attacked and insulted Adlai Stevenson; that Bruce Alger, the Republican Congressman from Dallas, had done the same to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson; and that Dallas was one of the most vitriolic cities in the United States.

Knowing this, Mr. Kennedy had prepared a speech which in mild and scholarly language reminded the people of Dallas that "in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason."

"There will always be dissident voices heard in the land," he said, "expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side, and seeking influence without responsibility.

"But today," he said, obviously with Dallas in mind, other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality * * * which assume that vituperation is as good as victory, and that peace is a sign of weakness."

Dallas' answer, even before that speech was delivered, was to shoot John F. Kennedy.

ARIZONA'S ANSWER

After that answer, William R. Matthews, a neighboring editor of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson wrote this editorial:

"The hatred-preachers got their man. They did not shoot him: they inspired the man or men who did it.

"It was a carefully planned assassination. It looks as if there were three assassins who fired one shot each, because three bullets appear to have arrived simultaneously.

"I was in Dallas last week at a meeting of men from all over Texas. I was discouraged and alarmed over the violence of the hatred expressed not only against Jack Kennedy but at Lyndon Johnson. * * * The haters and the name smearers have reaped what they preached."

The greatest monument the American people can erect to John F. Kennedy is a spiritual monument—the eradication of hate.

"If we really love this country," said Chief Justice Earl Warren at the late President's bier, "If we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence."

Gov. Pat Brown, of California and Charles Taft, of Ohio, cochairman of America's Conscience Fund, have proposed that in order to erect a spiritual monument, men gather in cities across the Nation in a candlelight procession to pledge the end of intolerance and to affirm that such tragedy shall not happen in America again.

INTERFAITH MEMORIALS

"The beautiful funeral services at St. Matthews Cathedral are still fresh in our memory" said Governor Brown and Taft, "and, thanks to the modern miracle of television, Protestants and Jews were able to participate in the services of President Kennedy's own faith. But since John F. Kennedy as President belonged to all faiths, we suggest interdenominational services be held in the gathering dusk with candles on the first appropriate Sunday in other cities; so that America's conscience may speak out against the mentality that moves men to take the lives of other men.

"We suggest that for those who may not have candles readily available, they be sold near the place of meeting for a nominal price, so that America's conscience fund may provide support for the widow of the Dallas policeman and her three children who now suffer because of hate; and to help others who have suffered from the bombings and the wave of intolerance which now poison the Nation.

"The demented mind of the assassin who took the life of John F. Kennedy in Dallas is no different from the mind of the murderers who snuffed out the lives of four little girls in Birmingham.

"These shameful blots on America's conscience will continue until America's conscience speaks out."

Cathedral Memorial to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the spiritual leaders of our Nation have examined the Nations' wounds made evident by the assassination of President Kennedy. In so doing, many have found words which suggest to each American the thoughts and actions whereby these wounds may be healed. The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean of the Washington Cathedral, found such words in his sermon at a memorial service in the Cathedral Sunday, November 24. He used as a text the 26th chapter of the Book of Jeremiah, verse 16. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATHEDRAL MEMORIAL TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(By the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre)

The people said of Jeremiah, "This man is not worthy of death."

This is the thought that is burning deeply in every American heart as we mourn our President. There were some who hated Jeremiah the Prophet; some who feared him because he did not shrink from declaring the truth as God gave him to see it. Nor did he fail to live it out, whatever the political consequences at the hands of those who presumed to fashion the nation after their own image instead of God's.

But when it came to a plot against his life—ah, then the reeds are pushed aside, the crabgrass cut. And men look down at the deeper springs of the man's life: The courage underneath; the hidden suffering; the lonely track against the lowering gloom of destiny, the free and shining vapor trail across the skein of heaven.

When the sharpness of death sums up all of a man's life, then is the inner source known. If it is a man like Jeremiah, or like John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the anguish of sorrow will cry out:

"This man is not worthy to die: for he hath spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God."

As the first reeling shock of sadness passes, echoes of sacred conscience remain. We begin to separate the strands of our loss. Out of the very tragedy came fresh glimpses of the truth. Crisis always brings forgetfulness of ourselves, and so a plainer view of God and of His will for us.

I think, first of all, that we have understood that God has shown us our guilt. News of the President's death drove us to our knees in national penitence. The weapon that killed John Kennedy was not only in the hand of his murderer, but was in the heart of every one of us who ever hated: who ever set brother against brother by his selfish spirit. Surely we all do repent that shallow and divisive contentiousness which bred an atmosphere in which some ignorant sharpshooter would one day execute our careless threats, and think he served his country well by the despicable crime. Blame not the man, nor the city, nor the region where the deed was done. But let us search our own hearts to see if pettiness or hostility or unworthy anger did not set the stage for the overt act.

Yet, if God has shown us that, has He not forgiveness, too, in store for us? A purer love, a humbler citizenship, more honest acceptance of one another? May our sorrow prompt us to that prayer this day.

There is another strand that most of us by now have identified, mixed in with our grief: anxiety for the future. Suddenly a brave and intelligent leader is taken away. What does it bode for our Nation at a moment of dread uncertainty and fearful risk? How shall we do without the sure-footed assurance of this young President whose style of manner, whose backbone of responsibility the world had already come to admire and depend upon?

But in the very fearfulness God finds a way to make plain His grace. I am sure we have all been led to remember how, in another period of awful uncertainty, God knew to raise up a guide for our Nation's destiny. After the Civil War, when the wilderness of pain had brought our people's public morals to lowest ebb, another great President was shot. In Lincoln's stanch shoes stood an adroit little politician named Johnson—Andrew Johnson. How would the wounds be healed and the high road found by such a man as he was on that fatal day? Yet there was in him a reservoir of higher metal all unknown to others, and even to himself, which, for the sake of all, God did now reveal. As Andrew Johnson rose beyond the water-level of all he knew, he met the challenge now laid upon him.

Strange and wondrous is the Christ-like power that discovers strength in weakness, new life in the presence of death, and faith that can conquer chaos and dismal fear. Such is the power of God, to redeem anxiety and to lift up all that is cast down, to sustain us when we falter, and to give us life again.

Thus the final experience that is distilled from the tragedy that afflicts, is that of faith. May it be the faith of our people now. When the whirlwind came for Elijah, the prophet of old, he turned to Elisha, his young companion:

"What wouldst thou receive of me before I am taken away from thee?" the old man asked.

"That a double portion of thy spirit be upon me," said Elisha.

"Thou hast asked a hard thing," he replied.

But so it was, when Elijah passed to Heaven, that his mantle fell upon Elisha. And he who was now called to fill the holy man's shoes, took the mantle and smote the waters of Jordan as he had seen the Prophet do before. Again the waters parted, and the people passed through.

As now the mantle falls from one man to another, let that same faith be in us that was in Elisha. And let us take up the mantle, smite again the waters: Knowing that God will help us to push back the spectre of hate, the terror of man on every side. And that by the healing power of God we shall safely pass to the other side.

Crisis Steadiness Cited as Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that it took the death of President John F. Kennedy to prove the probusiness stance of his administration. Detractors, armed more with personal dislike than economic fact, kept up their dirge of statements that this administration, which included both the late and present Presidents, was stifling to business expansion. And they continued this in spite of repeated assurances and actions by the late President. Yet the stock market clearly showed in its record rise the confidence of current business prospects and the continuance of present economic policies by President Johnson.

The new President has already indicated his support for the business economy by calling for early passage of the tax cut legislation. This legislation, as envisioned by John F. Kennedy, would give the private sector more freedom in their economic choices and a chance to solve the problems of unemployment, price spiral, and balance of payments.

Sylvia Porter has called the tax cut the key to solving these problems and the longer we wait the greater the disease to be cured. Now is the time to stop any germs in our economic bloodstream while they can still be controlled.

I include Miss Porter's article and recommend its reading to my colleagues:

[From the Evening Star, Dec. 2, 1963]

CRISIS STEADINESS CITED AS STRENGTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

It is a tribute to the basic strength of the United States and to the defense network we have created for the dollar that so little has happened in the economy since President Kennedy's assassination.

This is not a facetious comment. Often what does not happen in the sphere of finance is as important as what does happen. Last week was an illustration of this point.

The governors of the Federal Reserve System did not find it necessary to call a special meeting to ease credit to bolster a faltering economy because the economy didn't falter.

The Treasury's debt managers did not find it necessary to alter their financing plans to reassure the Government securities market because investors in Government securities did not panic.

DOLLAR HOLDS FIRM

The central bankers of the free world did not find it necessary to take extraordinary steps to protect the dollar from a speculative raid because the dollar's defense network prevented speculation and the dollar held firm.

Wall Street's leaders did not find it necessary to act to prevent a disorderly slump in stock prices because when the markets reopened last Tuesday, what disorder existed was more upward than downward.

Leading businessmen did not find it necessary to reduce their programs for spending on new plants and equipment in anticipation of a slowdown in the economy because there are no signs that Mr. Kennedy's death will be a direct cause of an economic slowdown.

Budget officials did not find it necessary to revise their figures on the next budget to fit President Johnson's views because Mr. Johnson's views on the budget are generally what Mr. Kennedy's were.

So it goes. But just as Mr. Johnson has inherited a sturdy economy and a protected dollar from Mr. Kennedy, so he has inherited the economic problems that frustrated Mr. Kennedy from the start to the end of his aborted term.

Our unemployment rate is way down from the recession level of 7 percent. But after 33 months of sustained economic advance, the overall rate still sticks at 5½ percent and the jobless rate among teenagers is 15.4 percent.

Industrial production is at an all-time high and the gross national product is climbing toward $600 billion. But due to our sluggish growth rate in recent years, our output is at least $30 billion below our normal capacity to produce and many factories are operating below their preferred, profitable rate.

PRICES STABLE

The gap between what we spend abroad and what we earn abroad—the deficit in the balance of payments—is way down from the near catastrophic rate of $5.1 billion recorded in the second quarter. But the deficit in our international accounts for the full year of 1963 will approach $3.5 billion, another deficit is in sight for 1964 and this red ink is a constant threat to the dollars value.

Prices have been remarkably stable in the last few years. But upward pressures are mounting and the danger of a renewed price-wage spiral can never be shrugged off.

Thus, Mr. Johnson takes over the problems as well as the achievements.

Our economic growth must be accelerated to provide jobs for our mounting labor force to take up the slack in production, to create sufficient profits and paychecks to balance our domestic budget. Our spending abroad must be curbed and our earnings abroad must be increased to narrow the deficit in our balance of payments.

The tax reduction bill Mr. Kennedy wanted so much is a key to these goals. The speed with which Congress passes the bill now will be the first test of Mr. Johnson's power and skill as President.

The Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a number of eulogies of the late President have been written since his untimely death. A number of them have been made a part of the RECORD for permanent keeping. I insert an editorial written by Don Sattell of radio station KEEL, Shreveport, La., and presented on that station on the day of the last President's funeral:

America's sadness is felt throughout the world during this day of the funeral of our

President. But now the eyes of the world turn to another American for leadership. President Johnson must now take up the burden left him by his predecessor. The load will be heavy, the road long and difficult. Our allies and our enemies will be watching and waiting for signs of strength and weakness. They will be wondering if Americans are really a united people. It is difficult for people in other lands to understand that we Americans all believe in one thing—America. They cannot understand that while we may disagree on policy, we are all in agreement on the greatness of our Nation. The world now looks to us for a leader. We need a strong President, a man who will stand straight and unwavering, strong in the knowledge that the people are united. The strength of Lyndon B. Johnson will come from the people. If they are strong, he will be strong. This is a day for every American to rededicate himself to the principles that are America. Lyndon B. Johnson needs the strength of every American and every American needs the strength of Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson Renews Pledge on Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from the New York Times of December 3, 1963. This story shows that President Johnson has clearly pointed out his objectives and I know it will be of interest to my colleagues:

JOHNSON RENEWS PLEDGE ON RIGHTS—SEES URBAN LEAGUE DIRECTOR—FOUR KEY KENNEDY AIDS AGREE TO STAY IN POSTS

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, December 2.—President Johnson reinforced today his commitment to President Kennedy's civil rights program.

After meeting with President Johnson for nearly an hour, Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, said:

"While President Johnson is committed to carrying out the Kennedy program, he has deep convictions in his own right."

Meanwhile, four of President Kennedy's closest advisers—Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel; P. Kenneth O'Donnell, appointments secretary; Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant for liaison with Congress, and Pierre Salinger, Press Secretary—agreed to serve President Johnson for as long as he wants them.

There were indications, however, that Mr. Salinger might be considering a race for a House seat from California.

In lengthy discussions concerning his forthcoming budget, President Johnson put new pressure behind his campaign to hold down Government spending. He did so in conferences with the two top officials of the Budget Bureau and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

Mr. Young said that he and the President had spent much of their time discussing Negro unemployment, which is about twice the rate of whites.

Regarding employment, Mr. Young said:

"The Negro faces a catastrophic situation to which civil rights legislation only in part addresses itself."

Mr. Young told the President that in his view the immediate problem could be met only by "a vast public works program," because Negroes did not want to be on Government relief.

President Johnson, Mr. Young said, did not commit himself on a public works program. He asked Mr. Young if it were "absolutely needed," and when Mr. Young said the only alternative for many Negroes was chronic dependence on unemployment payments, Mr. Johnson asked him to write a memo on the subject.

A public works program of the magnitude suggested by Mr. Young would throw the President's contemplated budget even more out of balance than present plans call for.

Mr. Young said that President Johnson had some ideas on how to get labor and industry more involved in there training of workers.

At present the decisions on retraining programs are left largely to the education departments of the States. As a consequence, Mr. Young said, there are "vast industrial retailing facilities that are unused."

JOHNSON INTERESTED

Mr. Johnson, he said, was interested in making greater use of these facilities.

Despite the fact that he was the strategist and field commander of the Senate forces that finally passed the civil rights acts of 1957 and 1960, there has been a lingering reservation in the minds of many Negro leaders whether Mr. Johnson, a Texan with close friendships among Southern legislators, wholeheartedly subscribed to the far-reaching Kennedy program.

The President has been at pains to disabuse these leaders of their doubts. In his address to Congress last week, he called for the "earliest possible passage" of the civil rights bill now ensnared in the House Rules Committee.

Furthermore he has made a point of having lengthy talks with leaders of Negro organizations. Last week he conferred with Roy W. Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. His meeting today with Mr. Young will be followed tomorrow by another with the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt, Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Roy Arthur Hunt, of Pittsburgh, Pa., has been one of America's most talented and eminent women. Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt has received signal honors from many quarters for her accomplishments in horticulture and botany, as a master craftsman and designer in the execution of fine bindings of beautiful books, and as a highly respected authority on the medieval and renaissance literature about plants and gardens. We in Pittsburgh lost a true and generous friend of our city in her passing on February 22, 1963, and America has lost a true genius of the highest renaissance level, accomplished and outstanding in many fields.

Mrs. Hunt, the wife of Roy Arthur Hunt, chairman of the executive committee of the Aluminum Co. of America, was born at Turtle Creek, Pa., June 30, 1882. She was the daughter of Mortimer and Rachel McMasters Miller and attended Thurston School in Pittsburgh and Miss Mittleburger's School in Cleveland.

She was instrumental in founding numerous organizations in the fields of horticulture and literature. She was honorary vice president of the American Horticultural Society in 1956, was active in the Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania, the National Society of Colonial Dames of America, and had held many chairs in the national offices of the Garden Club of America. She was one of the founders of the Garden Club of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Pa. She served for many years as an elected trustee of the associates of the Yale Medical Library, and of the John Carter Brown Library of Brown University. She was the first woman ever to be invited to speak before the erudite membership of the Grolier Club in New York City.

It has been in recognition of her achievements that she was awarded the Bulkley Gold Medal of the Garden Club of America and later its Distinguished Service Award of the New York Botanical Garden, the Gold Medal of Honor from the Herb Society of America, and a special certificate of meritorious service from the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society. In 1961 she received the Gold Medal from the Distinguished Daughters of America, and 3 years previously had been named Woman of the Year by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Hunt was the author of many books and scores of papers in the fields of horticulture and literature. Most notable of the former was her monographic study of "William Penn and Horticulture." She was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of legal letters by the University of Pittsburgh in 1954 and the honorary degree of humane letters by Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1960.

Without question, Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt's greatest contribution has been the assemblage over a half century of collecting of what was the most important and largest private library of botanical and horticultural books in America. This highly specialized library was given by her and her husband to Carnegie Institute of Technology, together with funds for the fine new modern building which houses it, in 1961. As the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, it represents today the world's only center devoted exclusively to the bibliographical research of botanical and horticultural literature and to the rendering of service to the public and scholars alike who are concerned with these fields.

Rachel Hunt was not a mere collector of books. She knew the books she acquired. She read French, Latin, and Italian easily and concentrated on the collection of books in those languages as well as those in English.

Rachel Hunt collected and studied illustrations as well as the extensive writings in these fields. She endeavored to

bring together representations of the original paintings and drawings by botanical artists and illustrators that had been reproduced in the books of this subject area. On her passing she had brought together more than 3,000 water colors, several hundred black and white drawings, and in excess of 2,500 prints of botanical portraits and garden scenes. The greater part of these are works that were produced prior to 1850 and the oldest go back as early as 1540. The world's greatest botanical artists are represented and her collection of works by the great Belgian artist, Pierre-Joseph Redouté—1759–1840—is considered to be the most representative and complete available in America—surpassed only by the great collections once held by French royalty and now in the archives of various museums in Paris. Students today may consult these works at the Hunt Botanical Library and study with them the files of correspondence by both the artists and the authors concerned. Here are to be found more than 16,000 pieces of manuscript and autographed letters written by the men who contributed to the development of botanical or horticultural science during the 17th to 19th centuries.

Not content to have a library only of books, paintings, prints, letters, and manuscripts, Rachel Hunt also sought and brought together the finest collection of botanical portraiture available on this side of the Atlantic. Here are to be found the engraved likenesses of more than 300 botanists of the 16th to 18th centuries. Portraits in oil were also collected. Included is the only painting known to have been made from life of the great English herbalist and physician, John Parkinson. Also included is the only painting—a miniature—known to have been made from life of the renowned 18th century French naturalist, Michel Adanson.

No facet of botanical literature received greater attention and affection from Rachel Hunt than did that represented by the herbals: those early works of medical botany which dealt with plants then believed important for their properties of curing or alleviating human illness. Her collection of these is certainly the finest held privately in this country and includes many rare items of the incunabula period, those books published from the time of the Gutenberg Bible's printing in 1454 to the end of that century. More than 120 volumes are in this collection, six are the only copies known in America and two are the only copies known anywhere. It is a collection that matches favorably today with the great collections that have been assembled at the National Medical Library, the combined libraries at Harvard, and the fine collection at the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis.

As a student of bibliography, and one to recognize the importance of adequate documentation of rare books, Rachel Hunt was the first person anywhere to promote and produce a catalog of her works (now bring completed) that has been recognized and acclaimed as the finest bibliographical production in the field of biological science of all time. Her sponsorship and production of this fine work, both as to content and design, is a monument to her penchant for high scholarship and perfectionism. For the excellence of its content it has received the cherished Oberley Award for works in bibliography. For the excellence of its typographical design, its second volume was chosen as one of the Fifty Books of the Year for 1962.

Rachel Hunt was a woman small in physical size, but mighty in intelligence, the vigor and charm of her personality, in the height of her standards of excellence, and in her capacity to achieve her goals and objectives through undaunted determination and hard work.

In addition to her husband Roy Hunt, who participated with her in her wide interests, she is survived by 4 sons and 11 grandchildren. Not only has the field of botany and horticulture been enriched by her accomplishments, but all who are in any way associated with these two fields throughout the world will continue to be enriched by the fruits of her planning and foresight in the establishment and perpetuation of the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library at Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh.

Rachel Hunt is a glowing example of the tremendous influence on our U.S. culture and progress, that a dedicated American woman can have, in her goodly heritage that she has given to all of us in Pittsburgh, in Pennsylvania, and our good country.

Life Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the RECORD the first two articles of a series by Robert S. Boyd of the Detroit Free Press, Washington Bureau, concerning life today behind the Iron Curtain. Mr. Boyd has performed a valuable service for his readers by the scope of his inquiries and the deep measure of his insights. The first of these articles appeared on November 17, 1963, before the recent tragic events which shocked the world. The articles are as follows:

LIFE TODAY BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—POLISH TOAST: "TO J.F.K., HEALTH; TO K., PFOOEY"

(By Robert S. Boyd)

WARSAW.—"Tell President Kennedy that we love him," said the young Polish architect, his eyes full of tears.

He spoke loudly and confidently, without a sign of fear, although the room was crowded with strangers.

"Tell the American people that we trust you, we believe in your democracy and your freedom.

"We know you are not perfect. But you are not afraid to talk about your faults as well as your strengths. We like you for that."

The Pole raised his glass of ice-cold vodka—"Polish vodka, my friend, not Russian vodka"—and said: "To Kennedy, na zdrowie (good health)—to Khrushchev, pfooey."

This scene took place not long ago in the middle of one of Warsaw's ritziest night spots, the cabaret Kongresowa, in the cellar of the towering Palace of Culture and Science, Russia's gift to Poland after the war.

Elegantly dressed couples were twisting around a gurgling fountain in the center of the polished dance floor.

Waiters in starched white shirts scurried among the tables bearing ice buckets, brandy and platters of hot roast chicken.

"Everybody's doing it, the twist, the twist," crooned a girl singer. Eight young ladies pranced out onto the floor in polka-dot bikinis, twirling parasols. The floor show was beginning.

But the young architect had no eyes for the girls. His mind was on his pet topic—the United States of America.

He introduced his friends, several advanced students at the University of Warsaw.

There was a great round of bear hugs, hand pumping and clinking of glasses while the band played on.

"Isn't this dangerous to speak this way, here, in a public place?" the architect was asked.

"No, not now, not any more," he said, but then he paused and added, with less assurance: "I don't think it will cause any trouble."

He lowered his voice and pointed to one of his associates. "That one I don't trust completely. He has an uncle who is a general in the army. I am not sure about him."

This outspoken friendliness of most Poles for the United States is one of the first things that strikes a visitor.

Their warmth is overwhelming. They stop to talk with you on the street, bring you presents, offer to guide you around their city, wrestle to pick up the check for a beer or a cup of coffee.

This doesn't mean that the Poles are eager to adopt the American economic system.

The technically educated younger generation is generally indifferent to communism but agrees with the Communists that big industries, mines, stores and banks should be under public, not private, ownership.

Almost everybody approves of the social-welfare programs of the Polish Government, particularly the free medical care and the phenomenal spread of education.

What they seem to long for is a blend of a socialist economy with a political democracy, rather on the order of Sweden.

Nevertheless, the word "Amerykanski" has a magic ring here.

The causes for this romance with the United States are many—historic ties dating back to the American Revolution, the presence of countless relatives in the United States, admiration for our exalted standard of living.

Poles are not fond of Russians, and seem to take a special delight in demonstrating affection for the Soviet Union's greatest rival.

The monstrous Palace of Culture and Science, which dominates this capital city, draws sneers from the inhabitants instead of gratitude to the Russian donors.

People here speak warmly of the Hungarians, who fought Soviet tanks in the uprising of 1956, but jibe at the Czechs, who remained quiet during that year of crisis.

"Poles and Hungarians—we are the best fighters in Europe," bragged one young man at the Hybryda Club, the favorite jazz hangout for Warsaw's students.

Later, outside the club on the sidewalk, the same student was chattering boisterously about his enthusiasm for the West. A policeman approached.

But no. All the policeman said was: "Please be a little quieter on the street."

No. 1 Complaint of Poles: There's Not Enough Cash

(By Robert S. Boyd)

Warsaw.—What is it like to be a Pole in Poland after 18 years of Communist rule?

Ask 100 people and you get 100 different answers—ranging all the way from satisfaction to despair.

Many chafe at the lack of political freedom. But even more complain about the economic recession that is squeezing their country.

Here are some samples of the joys and sorrows, hopes and frustrations of ordinary Poles in 1963:

Dr. B. is a college teacher with a degree from Harvard and the author of a scholarly work known to experts in his field in the West.

He is married, and lives with his wife and a 4-year-old son in a two-room apartment furnished virtually rent free by the university where he works.

Nevertheless, to make ends meet, his wife has to teach high school, and Dr. B. has to hold a part-time teaching job at a provincial university a 3-hour train ride away. Thus he is away 3 nights a week.

The family's combined earnings from these three jobs is 3,000 zlotys a month (about $120 at the official exchange rate, far less in reality). And Dr. B. estimates he needs a minimum of 3,500 zlotys to live on.

"We simply cannot get by on what we make," he said, redeyed from overwork.

Dr. B. says the Government blames the economic crisis on bad weather. He blames it on bad administration.

EDUCATION BOOMING

Dr. B. is not entirely discouraged. He is writing a new book that he hopes will be published in the West.

He takes considerable pride in the spread of higher education in Poland—170,000 university students now compared to 50,000 before the war.

He is especially happy that admission to the overcrowded universities is strictly by merit—not party favoritism.

"Oh, once in a while a high Government official will call to ask how his son's or to ask how his son's or daughter's application stands. We know what they want, but they don't get anywhere with us," he said firmly.

Jan T. is a young engineer just starting his first job after university. As a beginner, he makes a bottom salary—1,200 zlotys a month ($48). He is going to night school to qualify for a better-paying position.

Jan sees some good things about modern Poland—especially the social welfare system. He is proud to belong to the new generation of technically trained young people, on whom Poland's future as an advanced industrial nation depends.

But he resents his dependence on the Soviet Union, and yearns for closer bonds between Poland and the West, especially the United States.

He taught himself English at home, so he could read technical articles. He is trying to save up money for a trip to England.

A bachelor at 29, he pals around with older university students, enjoys drinking, dancing, and swapping jokes. He is a little envious of a friend who has an uncle who is a general in the army and has the use of a private car—a rarity in Poland.

ISLANDS OF PLENTY

Jan gripes openly at the restrictions on personal liberty here. But even more he seems to resent his genteel poverty, which keeps him from buying books, records, clothes, and traveling the way he thinks a cultured young man should.

"In America I know you have poor people, too," he said. "But they are islands of poverty in an ocean of plenty. In Poland, we have islands of plenty in an ocean of poverty."

Stefan J. is a Polish newspaperman. Recently divorced, he lives with his 7-year-old daughter.

Stefan is happy, because he has just landed a better job as a foreign correspondent, which will take him to the West. He has been padding his income by ghost writing and doing special articles for radio and television.

Stefan says he thinks modern Poland is generally on the right track. He approves of the Government's social and economic development programs. He says nobody wants to turn the clock back to the prewar period, when Poles were largely a rural, illiterate people dominated by large landowners, as he put it.

He complains about the inefficiency of the present system. But he wants it improved, not scrapped. He talks like an American who is dedicated to free enterprise but very conscious of its flaws.

Stefan says a recent poll of university students, taken anonymously, so the answer would be honest, showed that less than 2 percent considered themselves dedicated Communists.

But a large majority (more than 75 percent) wants to preserve most of the programs of the Communist government, such as public ownership of big industries and free medical care, he said.

Stefan says he agrees it would be better if Poland had a two-party system, like the West, so that criticism of government policy could be better organized.

"But that is just not possible now," he said with a shrug.

Right now Andrzej and Krystyna are happy with their lot. They are honeymooning in the scenic Tatra Mountains, in the south of Poland, in a charming Alpine chalet owned by Krystyna's father.

They were married one recent Sunday morning in a civil ceremony conducted by a solemn young government clerk in a velvet waistcoat with a silver chain about his neck.

A record player tinkled out Mendelssohn's "Wedding March," while friends and relatives stood in a half-circle in the bare little room, watching the young couple nervously sign the official register.

Later there was a church wedding and a merry reception at a Warsaw hotel. Late in the afternoon, the newlyweds headed for the mountains in Krystyna's father's car, a four-seat, Czech-built Skoda, piled high with baggage and flowers.

THE LUCKY ONES

When they come back from their honeymoon, they have an apartment waiting for them in a new housing project near the Warsaw Airport.

The car, the chalet, the pleasant apartment—these are still rarities in Poland. Andrzej and Krystyna are among the lucky ones.

Krystyna's father is a famous character actor. He earns 7,000 zlotys a month (about $290), a princely sum here. Krystyna is a budding young movie actress, and Andrzej is taking advanced work in light industrial engineering.

Artists belong to the favored elite in Poland. Their incomes, privileges, and social status are high. Even fairly controversial writers can get published and modern abstract art—which gives Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev a "bellyache"—is all the rage.

The night before the wedding, Krystyna's father played the role of Luke in Maxim Gorky's bitter play about czarist Russia, "The Lower Depths." Two nights later he was to play the doctor in Chekhov's "Three Sisters."

His car and chalet are sure tokens of affluence: the smallest Polish car, the Syrena, costs 70,000 zlotys (about $2,800), and the standard car, the Warszawa, which is modeled after the 1947 Ford, costs 120,000 zlotys (about $4,800). At these prices, cars are out of the question for all but a handful of Poles.

"Are you a Communist?" Andrzej asked an American guest at his wedding.

"No."

"Good. Neither am I. I am a Catholic."

Catholic or Communist, Andrzej and Krystyna are obviously doing well under communism.

Peter Z. is not doing well at all. His coat is worn, his eyes are shifty. He has no job and little education.

He is a black marketeer, one of a sizable army of footloose Poles who swarm the streets of Warsaw, seeking to buy American dollars or other goods they can resell at a profit.

The police pick Peter up occasionally, he says. They ask him why he is not working, give him 48 hours in jail, and boot him back into the street.

He shrugs. "It's not so bad now. During the rough time (the Stalinist terror of 1949–56) I did 5 years at hard labor.

"I was a soldier, and I just asked why there were Russian generals running the Polish Army. 'Didn't we have good enough Polish generals?' I asked. So they threw me in."

Peter opened his mouth and showed two metal teeth. "See, that's where they knocked my teeth out. They beat me here and here too," he said, pointing to scars on his face and head.

Peter says there are many men out of work in Poland, despite government claims to have wiped out unemployment.

"Things are getting worse every year," he said. "Are you sure you don't want to sell any dollars? I give you top price."

Josef K is an air traffic controller at Warsaw Airport. Before the war, he was an air force pilot. When Poland fell, he escaped to England and fought with the RAF.

He came home in 1946, and signed on as a pilot for the Polish National Airline. Then the Communists clamped down.

In 1950, at the peak of the Stalinist terror, Josef, and all Poles like him who had served in the West, were kicked out of their jobs. Some were imprisoned, but Josef was sent to work on the railroad.

EXTRA JOB HELPS

In 1956, the thaw came. He was allowed to return to work, but had to take a ground job since all the pilots' berths were filled.

His salary of 2,300 zlotys a month (about $95) isn't enough to support his wife and two teenage children, he says. So he must try to make ends meet by working Saturday afternoons and Sundays as a guide for English-speaking tourists.

Thus Josef's service in England, which got him into trouble once, is now helping him balance the family budget.

Adam P is an elderly bookkeeper. He lives in a middle-sized town in southern Poland, where he keeps track of the money for a small, state-owned business.

ADAM HATES SOCIALISM

"I tell you, things will never be good in 1,000 years under such a system," he said. "Before the war, things were cheaper and better. Now they are expensive and no good."

Adam used to live in a section of Poland that has been taken over by the Soviet Union. He has nothing but contempt for the Russians.

"Bandits and beggars," he called them. "Your President Kennedy should keep a strong fist—that is all those bandits understand," he said.

Adam was having supper in a cheap restaurant in Warsaw, where he was attending

a government-sponsored bookkeepers' conference.

He leaned across the table and confided, with a touch of pride, "Last year I was at a conference of 80 bookkeepers, and not one of them was a Communist."

He described Poland's present leaders as "farmhands" for the Soviets.

Like oldtimers everywhere, Adam is convinced Poland is going to the dogs. He finished his supper of hamburger, mashed potatoes, and beets and growled:

"Before the war, for that price, I could have an excellent dinner. And now, this awful stuff."

THIS IS POLAND IN 1963

It's no paradise, but it isn't hell either.

Life goes on, and hope, though dim, is not dead.

He Was One Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the moving poem composed and read by Irvin R. Lindemuth, pastor of the Birmingham Congregational Church, 25 Carrick Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Sunday, November 24, 1963:

IN MOURNING AND IN MEMORY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HE WAS ONE MAN

(By Irvin R. Lindemuth, Pastor, Birmingham Congregational Church)

He was one man. Mortal man was he,
With love of life, love of home, love of family,
Love of country, all life means
To all who love it. Many dreams
Were dreamed when he was but a boy.
Perhaps some day, in some strange way, his Nation would employ
The very gifts he had to give, the very life he had to live.

War came then, cruel curse of men;
Man became a beast again.
No one wins, when man kills man.
Because man sins, some higher plan
Is needed so that all men gain,
And man can be a man again.
He must have prayed to be unafraid.

Trained and talented, wise
Beyond his years, youth could not disguise
The hopes and dreams of men like him.
Even the Presidency could not dim
The boyish smile, the ruffled hair,
The outstretched hand, the inward prayer.
He was a man of God's own plan.

Religious? Yes, he knew
Religion's teachings, like me, like you.
Many opposed his different faith,
But there is little difference in God's grace.
Men are what they are born in race and creed.
A nation saw the higher need,
Heard him, stirred him.

Let this be said: he, too, was man.
But man is part of God's own plan.
The world today is so ashamed.
Let one more mortal man be named
Among the dead who died that others
Might look on all men as their brothers.
He was one man. Mortal man was he.
But God gives immortality.

Speeches by Hon. Wayne L. Hays and Hon. Leslie C. Arends, Before NATO Parliamentarians Conference, November 7, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the current and continuing concern over the future of the NATO alliance. It is a concern which will and must occupy the attention of the new administration and the Congress in the coming months for it is a matter of supreme priority to make certain that the free world's position is not weakened.

As we in the Congress consider these problems, I feel it would be well to have the principal speeches made at the recent annual NATO Parliamentarians Conference on November 7, 1963, by Representatives WAYNE HAYS, chairman of the House delegation, and Representative LES ARENDS, ranking minority member of the House delegation, readily available for further reference and I, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, am placing the statements in the RECORD today.

As a member of the House delegation, I found their statements to be important contributions to the work of the Conference and able expressions of the American position; and certainly ones which should not go unnoticed and unread here at home. The statements follow:

STATEMENT BY HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

We of the U.S. delegation welcome questions on the military and political value of a multilateral force. This force is now under study on a noncommitment basis by a seven nation working group meeting here in Paris. It will come into existence only if (a) it proves to make military as well as political sense, and (b) if enough members of the European side of the Alliance want it.

As for the military value of a multilateral force, the U.S. Navy, as Vice Admiral Ricketts, Deputy Chief of Operations, has told many of your civilian and service military chiefs, is convinced that the multilateral surface missile fleet would not only be feasible but also a militarily effective and powerful deterrent force.

The multilateral force, as our Navy envisages it, would have the latest version of the Polaris missile, would be deployed and operated in European waters in such a way as to give it high survivability, and would thus be a force the Soviets would have to respect. It would not be simply a "first strike" force. Indeed, we contemplate it would be put at the disposition of SACEUR for use against targets selected by him which directly threaten Europe or support any Soviet attack.

Those are the conclusions of our military authorities. We do not put them up on a "take it or leave it" basis. These conclusions are now undergoing multinational examination in a military subgroup in Washington. There, military men of seven NATO countries are now conducting a war game designed to test just these conclusions as to survivability and military value of a multilateral force.

We often get the question why, if an MLF is so good, the United States has not already invested in surface missile ships of this type. One conclusive reason lies in the United States geographic situation. Our Polaris submarines must operate worldwide from home bases in the United States, removed by thousands of miles from the European and Pacific theaters. The necessary range of these nuclear submarines is bought at considerable cost. The MLF would operate in European waters from a European base and would obtain the necessary survivability by dispersion, the method of operation of the warships, and the characteristics of the warships.

Let me digress here for a moment and say that these would be warships and there would be no attempt to have them seem anything else, except that on a radar screen they would look like merchant ships. To give you some idea of the difficulty the enemy would have in identifying these ships, let me recall to your mind our own experience when a group of rebels captured a Portuguese merchant vessel and sailed it through American waters for a week. There was considerable comment that the American Navy could not find it. Well, it is not generally known but it is a fact that the American Navy had to fly down and literally read the name on the bows of 400 ships before they found the one they were looking for. This gives you some idea, in the waters of Europe where there are literally thousands of merchant ships, of the difficulty the Russians would have in pinpointing each and every one of these ships of a multilateral force. Our people have concluded that it would be an absolute impossibility.

The additional substantial costs of nuclear submarines as carriers of the missiles would not be needed and would not add significantly to the military value of a European-based force. Furthermore, the surface warships would facilitate the indispensible factor of mixed manning.

The U.S. authorities do believe in the military value of an MLF. That is why they have gone on the basis that, if enough of our European allies want the MLF, the United States would envisage putting up something like one-third of the cost.

The President and the Secretary of Defense would not be contemplating that if this were a second-rate military ineffective political force. In other words, we just would not be spending one-third of the cost for something we did not think would be useful militarily.

The U.S. view of the MLF is not that it would be a frill, an extra or even superfluous addition to an already adequate alliance nuclear deterrent. If it comes into existence, it will be programed, like U.S. Polaris submarines and United Kingdom V-bombers, as a basic part of alliance nuclear strike forces.

The question arises, should European members of NATO want the MLF? That is for them to say. Many of us in the United States can understand a feeling that the burden of maintaining the nuclear deterrent of the alliance should not be left only to the United States. Certainly, this feeling has already been strong enough to lead two NATO members to the great effort of developing their own independent force de frappe. If our European allies do want to participate in the nuclear deterrent, we do believe that the MLF is one of the best ways to do it. They would then be part of a militarily first-rate, modern force, without oppressive costs for anyone of them, and in a way which would strengthen rather than go against the integration of the alliance.

The question arises, would MLF costs be excessive and be paid at the expense of needed conventional forces? We in the

United States believe that strengthening of NATO conventional forces and thus improving the balance of NATO nuclear and conventional forces is necessary and is within the capability of our allies. As for the MLF, however, the multilateral approach which is inherent in it would make participation in the nuclear deterrent feasible without undergoing the level of costs which burden countries going it alone in the strategic nuclear field. To use some figures which would not be too far off of estimated costs, if the MLF cost $3 billion over a 10-year period, a 10-percent share would be $30 million a year. Many of our allies could afford one or more shares with that price tag—and without encroaching on required defense outlays in other fields, taking into account the rate at which national income is rising here and the gap between what many of our European allies allot to defense as compared with U.S. defense allocations.

As for the U.S. veto, let me put the question back to my colleagues here: would it not be only right that substantial contributors to an MLF will want a voice in decisions as to its use? The United States is no different from others. Furthermore, would you want nuclear war to be launched unless the United States—whose nuclear forces would continue to be the major element of Alliance nuclear power—were joining in without any delay or doubt? The indivisibility of management of nuclear war is indispensable, here as elsewhere, for the effectiveness of the deterrent and for the solidarity of the alliance.

The MLF at this time is an idea put forward for discussion. It has not been considered, let alone adopted, by the Congress of the United States. What it is designed to do is to provide for fuller sharing of the burdens and responsibilities of nuclear defense in the alliance, in a way which will unite rather than divide the alliance. If there are other ways of achieving these purposes, we certainly hope that our allies will put them forward for consideration, which they will surely receive on the United States side.

Let me say further that I am known in the American Congress as a long-time friend of France. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee—a previous chairman—once jokingly called me his representative from France on the committee. I was the first to speak up in the Congress and defend General de Gaulle, but this does not necessarily mean that friends must always be in agreement. I would say to France that if she develops her force de frappe she will not be alone. She does not need to expect that she alone in Europe, outside Russia, will be able to have this weapon, without Germany and without other nations developing it too; perhaps not as soon but inevitably they will.

I would like to say also to those who have at least raised the suspicion that the United States would not consider an attack on Hamburg or an attack on Copenhagen or an attack on Brussels as a reason for going to war, that the United States would consider an attack on any one of those cities exactly as it would consider an attack on New York.

I further say to you that, if any of you doubt that, you have only to recall to your memory what happened only a year ago. As I said in the Political Committee, when the Russians had missiles in Cuba which were operative and which were coming into operation, which would reach every city in the United States except Seattle, Wash., the American Government made the decision to face them down and transmit word to Moscow that either the missiles had to go or we were prepared to go to war with nuclear weapons and to take the consequences. I would think that you would think that if Brussels or Copenhagen or Luxembourg were destroyed the United States would consider this just the same as if New York were destroyed. We are realists in the United States and we would know that if Russia made an all-out decision to attack any one of these cities or Paris or London or Rome, they anticipated a worldwide nuclear war and that they would get exactly what they were anticipating.

I want to say one further word, and again I think my French friends should think about this. there seems to be some difficulty economically in Europe and—I said this to a group of visiting Germans the other day, and I said the same thing to a group of visiting French that I spoke to in Washington—it is inconceivable to me to believe that German, Italy, Luxembourg, Beligium, and the Netherlands are going to put up 65 percent of the capital for an economic cooperation and let France have 65 percent of the directors. I think this inevitably is going to fail. I am hoping that the French Government will reconsider its position and decide to join with the rest of the free world in an economic alliance that really has some substance and that will really do the job. I would say to them tht I think we in the United States are willing to do our share in that kind of a partnership.

I have one final word, Mr. Lord President, and then I have finished. I should just like to throw out one word of counsel to my friends of the Labor party in the British Delegation. If they should come to to power in England—and we have read in the papers that they well may—I think they may find that the path of doing business with Moscow is not going to be strewn with roses, and that the difficulties of doing business with Moscow are going to be just as great for a labor government as they are for a conservative government, or as they were for a Republican Government in the United States and as they have been for a Democratic Government. I think you always have to keep in mind that if there is a detente it is because Mr. Khrushchev thinks at that moment it is good for Russia. Whatever decision he makes, whatever agreement he comes to, I think you always have to keep in mind that he is not interested in what good it does for Great Britain or the United States; but his primary interest is what advantage does this give to Russia. If it does not give Russia a clear advantage, is it worth going forward with? I think this has to be kept in mind at all times. I am not one of those—and there are some in my country—who think that we ought not to talk with Russia, that we ought not to sell them wheat, that we ought not to do business with them. On the contrary, I think I was the first in Congress to speak up in favor of the wheat deal. I said I was for it for three reasons: one, it will help our gold problem a little; two, it will get rid of a little bit of our surplus; three, and most important, it shows to the world that Russia with its vast agricultural regions under its communistic system is not able to produce the food for its own people, whereas the United States under free enterprise system is able not only to produce the highest standard of living in the world for its own people, but is able to sell food to 50 other countries and help to feed the Russians besides. I would not like you to think that I am against everything Russian, everything which has the word Russian in it. I am a realist and I know that Russia is here, that Russia exists in the world. We cannot bury our head in the sand and ignore it. However, I would again advise my friends in Great Britain that it is not the easiest thing in the world to do business with the Russians.

STATEMENT BY HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

We have listened to our NATO parliamentarian colleagues with great interest as regards the problem of sharing responsibility for the nuclear deterrent of the alliance.

With respect to the distinguished speakers, we first wonder whether the respresentative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Walker, is speaking for his Government, or his party, or for himself personally. Mr. Walker has said we face a definite choice between the required buildup of conventional forces or the establishment of a multilateral force. Should we assume that this constitutes a promise by the United Kingdom representative to build up British conventional forces and augment the BAOR to fulfill SACEUR's requirements? Immediately, let me say we would welcome this declaration, for we believe all NATO members should meet their NATO commitments and, we believe, there should be an equitable sharing of the burden for our common defense.

The United States, I am proud to say, has for long fulfilled its NATO commitments, and it does so today, even in spite of current balance of payments difficulties, which in large measure derive from America's effort to bolster the free world's defenses and hopes for a better economic future. In fact, some of our congressional colleagues cannot be here today because they had to remain in Washington to take part in the great debate on our foreign military and economic assistance program. Naturally the U.S. efforts directly relate to the problem of the sharing of the burden which should be the common obligation of all members of our great Atlantic alliance.

The United States wants to do its utmost to build a strong NATO; we only ask that others do their part. The United States looks upon our defense as interdependent. Again and again we have stated—and I state it now as a Member of Congress—that we would regard an attack on any part of the NATO area as an attack upon us. The United States wants to insure that the alliance realistically has the means to deter such an enemy attack and, if unfortunately deterrents fail, that the alliance has the defence forces to deal with an aggressor. The United States believes that we together in this Atlantic alliance can do what is necessary. Under the protection of the defensive shield of NATO over the past 16 years we have seen both Europe and America become more prosperous and our economic and social life greatly improved. Surely we can pay the costs of our defense insurance. The United States does not believe that we confront a choice in economic terms between adequate conventional forces and adequate nuclear forces, nor between SACEUR's conventional force requirement or SACEUR's nuclear force requirement. Economically we can afford to do both, if politically we have the will. So far there has not been a choice; it has been neither or nor; neither adequate conventional forces nor a shared burden with respect to nuclear forces. We have a time-honored American expression: he that has a glass house should not be the first to throw stones. So, over the years while America has fulfilled its NATO commitments, the NATO conventional defence requirements have not been fully fulfilled by our partners, although we are still waiting with faith. Meanwhile, in the nuclear area members of the alliance have been pulling away from each other and the cardinal principle of interdependence has been weakened. We believe that the alliance ought to pull together in the whole spectrum of our defensive deterrent and this responsibility should be shared.

Just as we seek to share the burden in the area of our conventional defense, the U.S. Government seeks to find a way to share responsibility, and even ownership, in the area of our nuclear deterrent. The U.S. administrations since 1960 have made a far-reaching proposal in this regard. They have offered one conception—full nuclear consultation and an Atlantic multilateral force—and nobody else has yet suggested any other. We, as American parliamentarians, may have various views on the American Government's proposal, and we are considering them among ourselves in our Congress. We are specifically

awaiting the outcome of the studies now being made among seven countries—Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States—in Paris in the MLF working group and in Washington in a military subgroup. We think all of us should await the completion of these studies and if our governments recommend the establishment of an MLF we shall want, in our national legislatures, thoroughly to study the recommendation in all its aspects; at the time we could then also appropriately consider such recommendations in the NATO Parliamentarian Conference.

Meanwhile, it might be appropriate for me to state, if only in a general way, what the U.S. administration has in mind as a concept. The United States seeks to provide a means for every member of NATO who desires to share in the responsibility for the absolute weapon which constitutes the principal element of our alliance deterrent, and this without causing the national poliferation of nuclear weapons. The U.S. administration seeks this in order that the Atlantic alliance might be more cohesive and united in common purpose and effort; it seeks the mutual recognition of our interdependence; and it seeks a practical way to further common responsibility and knowledge about the alliance's nuclear deterrent. To do this it has suggested the possibility of establishing an Atlantic force, multilaterally owned and manned, which would be an addition to any arrangement for deeper consultation and exchange of information in the nuclear field, and would be an addition to the necessary effort that must be taken to provide appropriate conventional defense. We all know SACEUR has declared there is a requirement for MRBM to deal with targets that especially threaten Europe. Obviously, the multilateral force would go far to meet SACEUR's stated requirements, especially as the missiles of such a force would, I understand, be assigned to SACEUR for targeting and would help fulfill his strike plan.

We think that we parliamentarians should debate this subject further when we have the completed studies being prepared here in the NATO building by representatives of our governments, and I hope we shall have a chance to discuss the matter in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

John Garner Celebrates 95th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, my most distinguished constituent, the Honorable John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, Tex., celebrated his 95th birthday on November 22. The occasion was saddened by the tragic death that day of President Kennedy, which occurred after the President had personally telephoned the former Vice President at his home to offer his congratulations and extend best wishes to one of America's most respected elder statesmen.

A story about the birthday ceremony honoring Mr. Garner was written by a friend and former Uvaldean, Mr. R. G. Jordan, now with the San Antonio Express. I am sure that all Americans will be interested to know that this great American is alert and in good health, and that he continues to take personal interest in his friends and in his country which he served so faithfully and well for a half century. I am therefore including Mr. Jordan's article as a part of my remarks:

JOHN GARNER CELEBRATES 95TH BIRTHDAY

The 95th birthday of former Vice President John Nance Garner here Friday—a gala occasion at brief ceremonies at the Garner home during the morning—was turned to tragedy by the assassination of President Kennedy.

Garner, who received birthday greetings from the President in Dallas by telephone at 10:15 a.m. Friday in what was probably one of the last telephone calls Kennedy made, was not advised of the death until he awoke from his afternoon nap at 2:10 p.m. He spent the remainder of the afternoon watching television.

"It's the most terrible tragedy I've ever heard of in my life," Garner's housekeeper, Mary Salazar, quoted him as saying when she told him of the assassination. She had heard the report some time earlier on radio. She said "Garner was greatly disturbed."

AIDED TO PHONE

Garner's brief outdoor birthday celebration had just ended when someone told him that he had a phone call. He asked someone to take the call and when he was told that it was the President calling him, he arose from his chair on the lawn and walked to the telephone, aided by a couple of townsmen.

"I congratulate you on being in Texas," Garner told the President in their brief telephone conversation which lasted less than 2 minutes. "I'll stay with you as long as I breathe," Garner said at the conclusion of the conversation.

The 95th birthday celebration had been arranged in connection with Uvalde's second annual farm-city week and ranch show, which was dedicated to Garner. Dolph Briscoe Jr., Uvalde banker-rancher and a longtime friend, was master of ceremonies at the exercises and lauded Garner for his understanding and efforts in behalf of agriculture.

The brief program was scheduled to begin at 10 a.m., but Garner showed up, neatly dressed and wearing a new Stetson hat, 25 minutes earlier. He sat on a lawn chair in front of his frame house. He was rather disturbed as the crowd began to gather and he could not offer each of the ladies a chair, even offering to allow them to use the chair he was occupying.

Only once during the ceremonies did Garner rise from the chair and that was when Miss Sandra Dietz of Fredericksburg, Miss Mohair, and Miss Inger Alnaes, Uvalde High School exchange student from Norway, each presented him with a bouquet of red carnations.

HINT ON HATS

Newsmen asked Garner about the Stetson hat. He replied, "as a matter of fact I have two of them, but as to where I got them you are getting into an interview and I don't give interviews anymore." In the phone conversation with Kennedy Garner was heard to say "the hats are just fine," but no further mention was made as to the donors.

"When a man gets to be 95 my friends gather around to congratulate me on being on the face of the earth," Garner told the crowd around him.

One newsman asked to hang a microphone around his neck and he quickly refused, saying "I don't talk for radio or television." He then pointed out that "when I get some publicity, I get so many cards and letters and I can't answer them that it's embarrassing."

The Uvalde High School Coyote Band was on hand to render a couple of numbers during the ceremonies and as a huge birthday cake was presented to Garner, band members sang "Happy Birthday." The cake was a gift from Walter Koenig of San Antonio and was presented to Garner by Mr. and Mrs. Koenig's little daughter, Debbie, who kissed Garner on the cheek.

NOT TOO CLOSE

As photographers sought to get a picture of Miss Mohair, Miss Alnaes and Garner together the girls were asked to put their heads close to Garner's. As they moved to comply with the request, Garner warned "that's close enough, not too close," which brought a round of laughter from the crowd.

At the conclusion of the ceremonies, Garner, speaking from his chair, told the approximately 200 people present that "you don't know how much I appreciate all this. It's mighty fine to live in this old world and to live to be in the nineties."

Tears which trickled down his cheeks were soon replaced by smiles as he told his fellow townsmen and visitors, "come to see me as often as you can and make me happy."

The Assault on the American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in this morning's Wall Street Journal, December 3.

The editorial should be widely circulated because it says much that needs saying at this time. It is high time that our people show to the world that we are capable of discipline, moderation, and dignity in our private and public lives.

The editorial follows:

THE ASSAULT ON THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

From pulpits and the pens of commentators, from Government officials and assorted other citizens is issuing a torrent of talk to the effect that the American people are consumed with rancor and hatred. In the words of the outgoing head of the National Council of Churches, President Kennedy's assassination forces us to our knees in shame for all "our unharnessed hates."

The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America.

The attack, to begin with, distorts all historical perspective. If this assassination is read as the result of an outpouring of hate peculiar to our time and place, how are the assassinations of the past to be accounted for? In the case of Lincoln, at the end of a great civil war, it would seem more appropriate to speak of forces of hatred and violence.

Nor do the histories of other peoples support the idea that there is something especially wrong with our society. A capacity for violence is obviously embedded in all men, and has shown hideous faces in man's long past; how well or ill it is controlled depends on a variety of civilizing influences. Yet in many more or less civilized places today, not even an election can occur unaccompanied by violent death.

In America, the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation. An assassin who even as a boy was considered by a psychiatrist to

be a potentially dangerous psychopath—is it honestly believed that this particular individual sums up the American character? Or sensible to say that he and his rifle could only have emerged out of the forces of hate abroad in the land?

No one could deny that there are individuals and small groups peddling hate. There have always been and probably always will be, but if anything they are today less important in national life and less indicative of national character than at some other periods.

It is fashionable nowadays to lump the haters with the extremists of the far right. In some individual instances there may be an identity, but individual hatreds also exist at the other extreme, in those who hate so much they would destroy America's institutions. In their obsession with the far right, some people seemingly refuse to believe that the deranged killer was a man of the far left.

In any event, all this is outside the mainstream of American life. Not hatred but growing understanding and even compassion typify the general temper of this society at this time.

Such qualities are evident all around us—in the normal home, in the comfortable working conditions of the normal company, in the increasing acceptance of once-despised minorities. It is hard to think of a time of so much concern by so many for the dignity of all men.

And it was such qualities that marked the reaction of the overwhelming majority of Americans to the President's death. It was not violence and hate but an outpouring of deep and personal grief, and that does reflect the American people.

To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow.

The Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Albert Ambrose, pastor of the First Baptist Church at Drexel, N.C., recently delivered a very fine sermon during a memorial service arranged by the Burke County, N.C., Ministers Association for the late President John F. Kennedy. I believe there is a lesson in Reverend Ambrose's message for all of us, and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AN ATMOSPHERE FOR MURDER

(By Rev. Albert Ambrose, Pastor, First Baptist Church of Drexel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is from a memorial service at Calvary Lutheran Church, arranged by the Burge County Ministers Association, for a national day of mourning over the assassination of President John F. Kennedy).

President Johnson has proclaimed that today shall be a day of mourning for our country.

In these few moments I would like for us to consider what comes after today. Will we spend today in mourning and then tomorrow it will be back to business as usual. We may try to do this, but we can't.

We can't hide our heads in the sand, and like the watchman of the night cry out all is well, and think that by our saying it that it is.

All is not well. Our failure to deal with the pressing problems of our day has created an atmosphere in which all things are possible. We go over the last several months and we find the groundwork for the sort of thing that happened in Dallas on Friday. The murder of a man whose only crime was standing up for his people. The murder of four young girls whose only crime was going to Sunday school. The shameful display that took place in and outside a hearing room in our Nation's Capital at the questioning of those who made an illegal visit to Cuba. The incident, also in Dallas, that surrounded the visit of our Ambassador to the U.N.

When people ask how can this happen, that our President can be assassinated, look back and you can see how.

As we look back we also need to look ahead. Do you see an America growing in strength, prestige, influence, and usefulness, or do we see an America increasingly wracked by violence, and disorder? The boys thought they would play a joke on the wise old man of the village. One held a bird in his hand. "Is the bird alive or dead." The wise man answered "As you will." It is all up to you. It is up to our people.

It is up to us to decide whether we shall let the hate-mongers, and the apostles of violence continue to pour into the bloodstream of the life of America their poison. Shall we let the disciples of prejudice and class hatred have an influence far out of keeping with their number and which is far different from that which is held by a majority of our people.

What will the good people of our church do? Will we remain silent as, by and large, we have done, or will we seek to know the mind of the Lord. This is not the time to sit back and watch the world plunge into oblivion. This the time for a moral and spiritual revolution that will shake the foundation of this land. It is the time for God's people to stand, to throw off the shackles of complacency and indifference. It is the time to put on the whole armor of God, and stand in the evil day.

Let our day of mourning also be a day of repentance. All of us share in the guilt of the slayer of our President. All of us share in the guilt of Jack Ruby. The Bible says "blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord."

The Bible also says "If My people which are called by My name will humble themselves and pray, and turn from their wicked way, then I will hear from heaven, and I will heal their land."

Our only hope today is in God. But our hope in God must be expressed in terms of vital relationship with the living Lord, with Jesus Christ. To know Christ is to know God, and to know God aright is life eternal.

To know Christ is also to be committed to the struggle against the forces of evil. It is a battle, it is a life and death conflict, and the stakes are the souls of men.

Paul writes in Romans 13:11 words that are especially fitting for our day:

"And this, knowing the season, that already it is time for you to awake out of sleep; for now is salvation nearer to us than when we first believed. The night is far spent, and the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light: Let us walk becomingly as in the day; not in revelling and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and jealousy. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the last thereof."

"Encamped along the hills of light, ye Christian soldiers rise, and press the battle ere the night shall veil the glowing skies. Against the foe in vales below let all our strength be hurled. Faith is the victory we know that overcomes the world.

"On every hand the foe we find draws up in dread array. Let tents of ease be left behind and onward to the fray. Salvation's helmet on each head, with truth all girt about. The earth shall tremble 'neath our tread and echo with our shout.

"Faith is the victory that overcomes the world."

I would like to read for you a poem, a tribute to John F. Kennedy, by Timothy Brendle, a young member of my church.

"A TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY

"(By Timothy T. Brendle)

"A clip is hooked, a chain is pulled
And then a flag unfurls,
Half ascended, half descended,
A message to the world.

"A volley sounds, and then again
The sound lifts o'er and o'er.
A statesman from our midst departed
Through life's immortal door.

"A family weeps, a nation mourns,
But time erodes the pain.
And for the deeds he's done so well
His country gives due fame.

"But onward time will go marching
And praises will subside.
For in the shadow of his greatness
The Nation's grief we hide.

"Will we really e'er forget him,
Who served us day by day
By doing his best to master
The task that came his way?

"Our Country often found great strength
In his desire to serve
And now, in death, his challenge rings:
'Go on and Peace preserve.'"

Johnson Well Prepared for Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, of all our recent leaders, none seemed less likely to die in office than John Kennedy. His youth, his vigor, and the vital intensity of his personality completely precluded any thoughts of his not finishing his full term of office. How easy it would have been for him to have chosen a lesser man than Lyndon Johnson, or to have left his Vice President out of high-level policy decisions. It is a measure of President Kennedy's greatness that he not only chose a man eminently qualified to meet any eventuality, but also took great pains to give his Vice President fullest access to the decisionmaking councils of Government. The true value in President Kennedy's utilization of Lyndon Johnson's great capacity is just beginning to be understood.

One writer who recognizes all this is Max Freedman. Writing in the Los Angeles Times of November 26, Freedman points to the spirit of cooperation that existed between President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, and the benefit America reaped from their association. I fully concur in Freedman's

observations, and include the article at this point:

JOHNSON WELL PREPARED FOR TASK

(By Max Freedman)

TUCSON.—President Lyndon B. Johnson would be the first to admit that there are many things about the Presidency which he must learn for himself by stern experience in the next year. But his close association with the late President Kennedy has made him more qualified for the duties of the White House than Mr. Truman was immediately after Mr. Roosevelt's death, or than Mr. Nixon was after General Eisenhower's heart attack. This training for the problems of the Presidency may well be Mr. Kennedy's last gift to the Nation which he served even unto death.

In measuring Mr. Johnson's patient preparation for the Presidency, it is not enough to think of the specific executive duties that Mr. Kennedy gave him. Mr. Johnson worked very hard on the space program and on the removal of discrimination in all contracts awarded by the Federal Government. But these activities touched the mere fringes of his relationship with President Kennedy. That relationship amounted to a partnership on public policy during the very period when thoughtless or ill-informed people were making silly little jokes about Vice President Johnson.

When President Kennedy discovered that Mr. Johnson had an unexpected talent for stating a case calmly and persuasively, he began to use the Vice President all across the Nation as a principal spokesman for the administration on issues ranging from unemployment to Berlin, from civil rights to Vietnam. After the speeches, it was Mr. Johnson's habit to report at once to President Kennedy on the temper of public opinion. From these discussions, which were frank and wide ranging, President Kennedy gained new insights which enabled him to make necessary adjustments in his policies. They also gave Mr. Johnson the chance, which he greatly appreciated, to have a hand in the shaping or modification of these programs.

The same cooperation was even more visible after Mr. Johnson's trips abroad. The public saw little more in these ceremonial visits to other countries than the attempt to win some fleeting good will for the United States. What the public never knew, because neither the President nor Mr. Johnson saw any point in talking about it, was that each of these major trips produced an incisive and helpful report for the guidance of American policy.

President Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk learned to rely on these reports, whether written or oral, and that is why they were always glad when Mr. Johnson could get on a foreign mission for a few days. As a result of this experience, President Johnson personally knows most of the world figures with whom he will be discussing the major questions of foreign policy in the next few months.

It has never been a secret to Mr. Johnson's friends that he would have done some things differently, or would have changed President Kennedy's emphasis in doing them. But there never was a murmur of discontent, never a suggestion of grievance, never an impulse to criticize. His loyalty to President Kennedy's program, both domestic and foreign, was unlimited and uncalculated. What is even more important, it was deepened and enriched by his affection for President Kennedy as his friend and leader.

It should be remembered that President Johnson's experience with the White House goes back to the era of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he was that President's favorite young Member of Congress. Then came the crowded years of association with President Truman and President Eisenhower when he was in and out of the White House many times a week. All these experiences will help to mold his judgment and influence his decisions now.

President Johnson has always shown that he has what amounts to a political genius in creating the largest possible consensus for legislation. He is at his best when he is working in a spirit of national unity and is speaking for the national interest. There can be no better leader in this period of tension and tragedy than President Johnson as he seeks to hold the Nation together in sedate unity and to move it forward to new achievements. He deserves not only our compassion but our cooperation and support.

Johnson's Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage that a man is judged by the company he keeps and undoubtedly the same philosophy will apply to those holding political office.

It seems strange that the President would cast reflections on President Eisenhower so soon after calling him to the White House as one of his first acts in office.

Certainly if the following article by Mr. Rowland Evans and Mr. Robert Novak quotes Mr. Johnson accurately that he is a "Roosevelt New Dealer," then he cannot long maintain an aurora of conservatism.

The article by Mr. Evans and Mr. Novak which appeared in the Washington Post on December 3 follows:

INSIDE REPORT—JOHNSON'S LIBERALS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

By moving rapidly—and, as one of the Kennedy liberals puts it, with "great dignity and persuasion"—President Johnson has stopped the threatened exodus of New Frontier liberals from his administration.

An event that occurred within hours of the late President's death dramatized the new President's commitment to the liberals. It was late in the evening, and a leading liberal official who fully expected to resign had just finished a half-hour briefing session with Mr. Johnson. As he turned to leave, President Johnson reached out and grabbed him hard by the forearm in a characteristic Johnson gesture.

"I want you to understand that I'm no Eisenhower Democrat," he say simply. "No matter what you may think, I'm a Roosevelt New Dealer. I need you with me."

These and similar appeals from Mr. Johnson have already struck home in a way that would have seemed impossible 1 week ago today.

For example, consider Arthur Schlesinger, another official who submitted his resignation with every intention of having it accepted. Schlesinger was unique in the Kennedy White House, not so much in policy as in his role as legatee of the Stevenson Democrats and as the focal point for Mr. Kennedy's efforts to stimulate the arts.

Now Schlesinger will stay, at least for the time being. The President even invited him to be Mrs. Johnson's guest in the House visitors' gallery last Wednesday during Mr. Johnson's address to Congress.

In the Labor Department, another old Stevensonian, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, and his whole team of New Frontiersmen will stay. As one of them says:

"We made it very clear last week that if anyone looked crosseyed at us, we'd get out of here fast. But by Thanksgiving Day the whole mood had changed."

An even better illustration of the new President's success in preserving the liberal and intellectual spirit of the New Frontier is Walter Heller, the Chairman of the Kennedy Council of Economic Advisers. Heller had been planning for a long time a return to academic life at the University of Minnesota. Now, he will stay on, perhaps to the end of the term.

Mr. Johnson's first decision when he took over was that Presidential appointees should not hand in their resignations. He did not want them. But when Secretary of State Dean Rusk heard about the new President's decision, he talked him out of it. It might set a bad precedent, he said, for some future President's death in office. Mr. Johnson accepted this advice and then refused to accept the resignations that poured in.

To cynics, the President's great effort to keep the New Frontier intact is nothing but politics. As the almost certain Democratic nominee next year, he would look naked indeed if, in the interim, the leading liberal lights of the New Frontier had left him.

It is precisely in the liberal camp that Mr. Johnson must find support to offset the reputation that he has in some liberal circles—a wheeling-dealing politician from the South who takes care of his friends, including the oil barons.

But this cynical interpretation is far short of the mark Mr. Johnson must, it is true, cultivate the liberals because they are indispensable to his election. But beyond this obvious fact, he wants to preserve the intellectual stimulation of the New Frontier for its own sake. It is worth recalling, for example, that 5 years ago, when he was king of the Senate, he once summoned Arthur Schlesinger to Washington for a long talk in his office for no apparent reason other than to get to know him.

For the liberals themselves, there is one notable irony in all this. Because President Kennedy's image was liberal (perhaps overly liberal), the liberals around him were a political liability. But because President Johnson's image is conservative for a Democrat, these same liberals suddenly become an absolute political necessity for him.

"In Memoriam," a Poetic Tribute to the Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy by Brian F. King, Distinguished Columnist of the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, poems are being penned continuously in memory of the late beloved Chief Executive, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. A poem that I think profoundly expresses the sentiments we all share concerning the late President Kennedy was written by Brian F. King, a creator of verse and distinguished columnist for

the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican, and appeared in that newspaper last Sunday, December 1, under the title: "In Memoriam." I insert Mr. King's verse to be printed in the Appendix:

IN MEMORIAM

In Arlington a skylark wings
Its lonely way across the sky,
And wind-swept grasses sigh and grieve
O'er graves where gallant heroes lie;
They whisper of the shameful deed
That called a valiant heart to rest,
And bend to kiss the hallowed soil
A mourning nation's tears has blessed.

In Arlington there is no hate;
Its aisles are steeped in peace and pray'r;
In comradeship its heroes sleep,
For all is ever tranquil there.
God grant its sacred vales will bring
To him who lies there, shrined, alone,
Surcease from ev'ry mortal care,
While we atone—while we atone.

In Arlington a songbird trills,
Its small voice pure and crystal clear;
It sings his hymn of love and faith,
Of bright tomorrows, free from fear;
It sings of his love for God and man,
And falters as, with troubled grief,
Its sweet crescendo sings the dirge
Of a sad farewell for a martyred Chief.

—BRIAN F. KING.

Needed: A Capitol Pages Residence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time bills have been introduced into Congress providing for a permanent residence for the more than 80 pages who, year in and year out, work tirelessly for us as we carry out our legislative responsibilities. Among them is my bill, H.R. 973.

Although none of these bills has been acted upon by either body of Congress, they are indicative of the deep concern felt by many Members for the well being of our congressional pages.

There are several reasons which prompted me to introduce a bill providing for the construction of a dormitory and school for our Capitol pages.

First, since we sponsor our pages we have a moral responsibility, both to them and to their families, to see that their minds and characters are developed to the fullest while in Washington.

Second, there is little or no proper adult supervision after the pages are finished with their work for the day. This condition is hardly conducive to the boys' best behavior or study habits.

Third, in many cases our pages live without adequate housing and under living conditions which are less than satisfactory in many instances.

The passage of legislation creating a Capitol page residence may take some time. Even if a bill is passed during this Congress—and that appears highly unlikely as we confront the many legislative tasks immediately before us—additional time would be required for planning prior to construction.

Further, construction of a residence and school for pages could take several years. In the meantime, our pages would continue to be without adequate supervision and without proper housing and living conditions.

For these reasons, I suggest that Congress immediately set aside the necessary amount of space in the Congressional Hotel for the housing of the pages. This step should be considered only as a temporary, stopgap measure until a residence and school facility can be built.

The U.S. Government owns the hotel and should be able to direct its use in the way I have suggested.

The need for immediate action in this matter has been effectively pointed up in a series of articles on living conditions of pages, written by Reporter Gerald Grant of the Washington Post. I commend the attention of my colleagues to these articles, the first two of which follow:

LIVING CONDITIONS FOR CAPITOL PAGES FOUND SHODDY

(First of a series)

(By Gerald Grant)

The conditions under which Capitol Hill pages live are receiving a closer look with the airing of charges that the boys are not adequately supervised during their off-duty, out-of-school hours.

Congressmen and other witnesses at a Senate hearing have said the system allows exuberant youngsters with a lot of cash in their pockets to be "footloose, fancy free, and loose on the town."

Mrs. Thomas Davis, of Arlington, a page's mother who toured the roominghouses where the 14- to 17-year-old boys live, reported that she found beer in the rooms of 14-year-olds, virtually no hours restrictions nor other regulations, and some shoddy living conditions.

Her tour raised again the fears that page boys are not getting proper rest, food, or medical attention and that there is considerable "partying" at the expense of education.

The hearing was called to discuss the need for a central, supervised dormitory for the pages. There are 50 pages employed by the House, 26 by the Senate, and 4 by the Supreme Court.

The pages attend a special District public school from 6:30 a.m. to 9:45 a.m. so that they can be available whenever Congress meets. They are paid $380 a month, out of which they arrange for their own meals and living quarters. There is no tuition charge for the page school, even for nonresidents.

The living, working, and studying conditions of the Capitol Hill pages were surveyed by this reporter who interviewed their teachers, Hill staffers and a score of the pages. There was a consensus that changes were required to eliminate abuses complained of and general agreement that a dormitory was needed.

Some of the pages interviewed were angry because they felt that the dust raised by the charges of misbehavior against a few had dirtied all their reputations.

One page, Dale Warnasch, 17, of Houston, Tex., suggested that some of the misbehavior is encouraged by the living conditions. "You get used to living in a rathole, you get used to broken furniture and you hear what a wild time you can have here. Some do."

Mrs. George J. Smith, who runs one of the pages' roominghouses, said much of the breakage is caused by the pages themselves. She said boys had poured lighter fluid on a mantel in an upstairs bedroom and set fire to it, thrown darts at the ceiling and abused furniture.

"I have no power over these boys at all. Drink? I have a constant fight against the beer cans. I have seen the boys so drunk that they had to be carried up the stairs," Mrs. Smith said.

The rooming house facilities vary widely. In one, the landlady, nearly 70, does not live in the house. The boys come and go as they wish and hold parties when they wish. As many as eight boys share one bath. Three boys in a top floor room have only one wall plug and wires crisscross the floor.

In a second-floor room there is no wall plug at all and the only light emanates from a bare overhead bulb. Some boys go through others' rooms to get to their own. Conditions appear crowded and ill-suited to study.

By contrast, some of the other rooming houses are pleasant, spacious, and clean, indicating the presence of more supervision.

Rent is not uniform. In one house three boys have been crammed into a room with only a few feet between beds. They share a bath with half a dozen other boys who live on that floor. For this and room and laundry service, each of them paid $50 monthly rent, a total of $150 a room.

In some other rooming houses boys pay only $40 for large, clean, single and double rooms with private and semiprivate baths. Page Frank Greer, 17, from Tuscaloosa, Ala., said that when he came to Washington he lived for a month "in a room that rented for $60 that I could hardly turn around in."

Only 1 of 10 rooming houses in which pages live furnishes meals. Bill Hafer, 16, a page from Hamburg, Pa., said, "Gosh, am I sick of eating in these greasy spoons around here; I hardly ever eat breakfast and we don't get regular food."

Hafer, a member of the wrestling and cross-country teams at his hometown high school, also protested the lack of physical education facilities for pages.

Because the proposed pages' dormitory would provide a gymnasium, lower rents, better living conditions, and regular meals, most pages favor it.

Brad Breeland and Reggie Frantz, both 15 and from Louisville, Ky., said they thought there was such a dormitory available before they came to Washington and were surprised when they found there was none.

But pages say that living on their own has led to improper behavior by only a few.

A page who asked not to be identified said there was "plenty of drinking but I think that's true of most high school kids in the country today. Sure, it's easier here, and that leads some kids to do things here that they might not do at home, but I'd say the percentage is small."

He said pages drank in the rooming houses and at bars and parties. Some of them were invited to parties in the apartments of young Hill secretaries, where they were accorded the privileges of adults, he added.

Supreme Court page Melvin Hays, 17, from Danville, Va., blamed much of the trouble-making on the 30-day pages, those who are appointed for only a month by Congressmen who believe the opportunity to be a page should be spread around as much as possible.

He said that because they do not have to attend the page school and do all the required homework, they have time to get into mischief.

Page School Principal Henry L. DeKeyser said he was in partial agreement with Hays and that many of them look upon their trip to Washington as a "wild vacation."

DeKeyser, however, has favored a dormitory for pages for years because, among other reasons, it could provide supervised study periods for the boys. Members of the faculty unanimously favor it also.

PAGE SCHOOL CRAMS TEACHING IN 3-HOUR DAY

(Second of a series)

(By Gerald Grant)

The U.S. Capitol Page School is among the smallest high schools in the country, one of the hardest to get into and probably the only one where students get a 15-minute coffee break.

"And brother, do we need it," said one sleepy-eyed Senate page last week as he raised a cup of coffee to his lips with both hands.

The pages' short schoolday starts at 6:30 a.m. and is half over by the time most American youngsters are getting up from the breakfast table. At the midpoint, 8 a.m., the pages descend from their classrooms on the third floor of the Library of Congress to the snack bar in the basement.

School is over by 9:45 so that the pages can report to work in the Halls of Congress by 10 a.m. Some days they will be on their feet until 10 p.m., like the sleepy page with the coffee, and never have a chance to crack a book before rising at 5:30 the next morning.

FORMER PAGE COMMENTS

The Pages School teachers must cram into 3 hours the instruction that most youngsters have all day to absorb.

Thus it was not surprising that a former page who is now president of the District Bar Association, John H. Pratt, recently told a Senate subcommittee:

"What has not been emphasized as much as it might be is the responsibility to provide an atmosphere for an adequate education. The difficulty over the years with these page jobs has been the fact that it has been difficult to have schooling that is comparable to the schooling that boys of the same age have."

While absenteeism at the school is low, it is not unusual to see a boy drowsing in class, especially among the freshmen and sophomores. Although boys from 14 through 17 may be appointed pages, several teachers at the school don't think most 14- and 15-year-olds are capable of handling page jobs and schoolwork.

CLASSES STAY SMALL

Page School Principal Henry L. DeKeyser feels that the pages get an excellent basic preparation for college in English, mathematics, economics, and languages. He is proud of his teaching staff of six teachers, all of whom have master's degrees and at least 10 years of teaching experience.

With a student body that varies from 35 to 80 students, depending on whether Congress is in session, classes are small. Students receive more individual attention in class and teachers are able to spend more time going over each student's written work.

Jessie L. Williams, an English teacher, said that the school's record speaks for itself. She pointed out that 18 of the 20 in last year's graduating class went on to college, that students scored high on college aptitude tests and that they have done well in college.

DeKeyser admitted, however, that the short schoolday does limit the school program sharply.

All the pages are not "whiz kids." They vary widely in intelligence (22 percent have IQs between 92 and 108) and in the quality of previous schooling. But the only time that slow students can be helped outside of class is before 6:30 a.m. or during the coffee break which is the only breakfast many of them get.

NO CHEMISTRY TAUGHT

Other drawbacks are an absence of arts, music, speech, and other electives available in most high schools. Chemistry cannot be taught because it is considered hazardous by Library of Congress officials. There are no facilities for physical education.

Some teachers feel that they are spread too thin because each of them is required to teach all 4 years of his subject, another reason they favor restricting appointments to juniors and seniors.

Most pages said the school was tough but good.

Doug Bosco, of Sunnyvale, Calif., said it was a "very good school." He was proud that several members of the senior class had won early acceptance to Ivy League colleges.

Student Council President George Andrews, from Union Springs, Ala., commented that the school's standards were high and that pages can't afford to slip because their report cards go to their parents as well as the Congressmen who appoint them.

DISSENTING OPINION

Among the dissenters was Dale Warrasch, of Houston, Tex., who said "everything is so rushed * * * I don't think this is the best possible education we could receive. All the teachers pile the homework on. I was getting A's and B's back home and now I'm getting D's and F's."

History teacher Fred Hilton said that grading was stiff but that a boy who got A's and B's at the school could get A's and B's in college anywhere.

"Some of these boys may not have a brilliant academic aptitude," language teacher Florence C. Block added, "but they all have high political IQ's."

Two Ways To Deal With the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Robert W. Smith in an incisive editorial in the Minneapolis Tribune has aptly summarized the two predominant schools of thought regarding our relations with the Soviet Union and the Eastern European Communist states. On one hand there are what he calls members of the evolutionary group, and on the other is to be found the revolutionary group.

Both groups hold the same end—which is to share this world with governments in Russia and Eastern Europe willing to peacefully coexist with the West. The differences between the groups, however, come in the means the groups would choose to reach this end.

The revolutionaries adopt force as their means, and hope to instigate the overthrow of the Communist regimes in Europe and Asia. Mr. Smith notes that while this group talks tough, they always halt short of taking that last step—the use of outright force—which is implied by their position.

Evolutionaries believe in mixing both firmness and amicability in our dealing with the Russians. They see Russia as changing, perhaps slowly and irregularly, but changing nonetheless. And to support their position they cite numerous instances where the Russian state has loosened its grip upon its citizens.

The evolutionaries would seem to command more confidence, for the more revolutionary school has yet to come up with any substantive and realistic plan for dealing with the Russians. Our country must devise policies to make it both easier for Russia to move toward genuine coexistence and more difficult for it to retreat to Stalinist patterns.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT'S PROPER, SAFE POLICY TOWARD REDS?

(By Robert W. Smith)

Our Nation is edging toward a major, potentially historic, and even possibly cataclysmic decision in foreign affairs. We may of course fail of the wisdom to face up to such a climacteric, and the decision may be fudged, defaulted or otherwise obscured. But the opportunity for decision is emerging out of current events.

It has to do with our relations with Russia and the rest of the non-Chinese Communist bloc. And the choice lies between means, not ends.

For the current rival schools of thought—one of which might be called "evolutionary" and the other "revolutionary"—agree on the general end to be achieved; i.e., governments in Russia and eastern Europe genuinely willing to coexist peacefully with the West. The means to achieve that end are at issue, however.

The revolutionaries want us to follow policies which, they're confident, will cause the overthrow of, or drastic change in, the present regimes in Moscow and its European satellite capitals.

By refusing to sell wheat and other foodstuffs to Moscow—to cite just one example—they suggest we might bring about such unrest in Russia as to cause Khrushchev's overthrow, or at least force a craven retreat on the present regime, leading to the raising of the siege of Berlin or evacuation of Moscow's buffer zone of satellites in eastern Europe.

Former Vice President Nixon is an outstanding spokesman of this group. Mulling over his recent statements, Commonweal magazine sums them up this way: "The United States, he says, must (a) free Eastern Europe, (b) not use force to do so, and (c) not use peaceful means which would 'directly or indirectly' give the impression that we accept Communist hegemony in the area."

"Just what he has in mind, then," comments Commonweal rather aptly, "is somewhat unclear."

For the weakness of the revolutionaries is that while they head out bravely in that direction, they halt, or resolutely mark time, short of taking the last step implied by their logic. That is—to recommend American intervention in force if some tough policy on our part touches off new armed revolts in Hungary, East Germany and other satellites.

Their reluctance to do is understandable. For it is all too probable that the appearance of Western armies on Russia's borders would be as likely to escalate into full-scale nuclear war as was the appearance of Soviet missiles in Cuba last October.

The evolutionaries are less certain than the revolutionaries that they have "the" answer. But they are warily hopeful.

Summed up, their belief is that Russia and its satellites are changing. Slowly, and perhaps irregularly, but surely the Soviet Union seems to be evolving toward being the kind of country in which a relatively prosperous citizenry becomes a definite force against aggressive policies, whether on behalf of communism or any other ism.

Russia's present prosperity is nothing like our own affluence, of course. But poor as it is by American standards, compared to what they have had before, the Russians' present lot apparently is more than good enough to focus popular attention on domestic concerns and effectively take the steam out of whatever Red evangelist zeal they may once have had.

Evidence of some loosening of the Communist yoke is more visible within several of its satellites. And the loosening is an irregular process. But even in Russia, while

nonconforming, restive writers are regularly slapped down by uneasy officialdom, they are only slapped down and not, as in Stalinist days, cut down. And they keep popping up again.

In any case, the evolutionaries are convinced that by a mixture of firmness and amicability, by such mutually beneficial things as the limited test ban and the proposed wheat deal, we make it both easier for Russia to move toward genuine coexistence and more difficult for it to retreat to Stalinist patterns.

This country's choice, then, is between the revolutionary policies and the danger of armed conflict they clearly involve, and evolutionary policies in which there may be a risk that when its economies are stabilized the non-Chinese Communist bloc may become more, rather than less, warlike.

Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the November 29, 1963, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune concerning the magnificent address of President Lyndon B. Johnson to a joint session of Congress last week:

FORWARD

With something like eloquence, President Lyndon B. Johnson has done a great deal in two speeches—one to Congress, one directly to the citizens of the United States—to focus a diffuse grief into a new sense of purpose and national unity.

Those who feared abrupt changes in American foreign policy now have the President's solemn pledge that the goals and temperance of the Kennedy administration will be retained.

Those who wondered if a southern President could support the domestic legislative program of a Massachusetts liberal have heard Mr. Johnson say unequivocally, "Yes."

Those who worried about the Nation's morale in the wake of a Presidential assassination, and those who feared a vacuum in national leadership, can relax. With humility and determination, President Johnson has turned the country gently away from the immediate past and asked it to look to, and work for, a better future.

"No memorial oration or eulogy," said the President to Congress, "could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill for which he fought."

Mr. Johnson stopped short of asking Congress to pass that bill before it adjourns for the year, but he left the impression that such a decision by Congress would not displease him.

Unfortunately, Congress shows little sign of doing more than routine business before it goes home, and a good number of Congressmen are righteously justifying their desires by claiming the break will "let the new President get his bearings."

President Johnson obviously has got his bearings. Congress could, if it wishes, provide useful legislative leadership by enacting a civil rights act.

The President also made a plea for the tax cut bill, but here there is virtually no possibility of completing action before 1964. The central debate—whether to cut expenses along with taxes—is not finished, and so Congress has legitimate reason to take a little more time on a tax decision.

It has no such excuse on the civil rights bill. "We have talked for 100 years or more," said President Johnson. "It is time now to wirte the next chapter * * * in books of law."

Our American Heritage—Birthplace of Thomas Alva Edison, Milan, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Alva Edison, his name, his accomplishments, his awards, are known to every schoolboy and schoolgirl.

Many are familiar with his home at Glenmont, Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N.J., now a museum operated by the National Park Service. However, not many are aware of the home built in 1840 by Edison's father, where Thomas was born in 1847. The attractive town of Milan, Ohio, where the birthplace of the great inventor, Thomas Alva Edison stands, is located 12 miles south of Sandusky on Lake Erie in the area known as Ohio's vacation land.

The red brick house, built by the inventor's father was restored by his wife and daughter, Madeleine (Mrs. John Eyre Sloane). Mrs. Sloane is president of the Edison Birthplace Association, Inc., and the major contributions for its support have been made by her. Mrs. Sloane deeded the birthplace and land to the association and she and her brother, Charles Edison, deeded to the association the house next door and an area of land going down to the old Canal Basin and the Huron River.

For several years I have been honored to be one of the trustees of the Edison Birthplace Association, Inc., a nonprofit organization formed in 1950. In order to insure its permanent preservation the Edison Birthplace Association, was formed with a board of trustees and provision for contributing memberships. This association now owns and maintains the museum. Memberships are used to provide a living endowment fund for its preservation and development.

It is important that the National Park Service recognize this historic shrine for future generations by designating it as a National Historic Landmark under their National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings in their subtheme study "Inventions and Scientific Discoveries." This is presently under consideration.

Lest we forget the incredible contribution Thomas Alva Edison made to our lives, I am listing below his principal inventions and discoveries:

PRINCIPAL INVENTIONS AND DISCOVERIES OF THOMAS ALVA EDISON

In 1868: Electrical vote recorder.

In 1869: Universal stock ticker and unison.

In 1872: Motograph, automatic telegraph system, duplex, quadruplex, sextuplex, and multiplex telegraph systems and paraffin paper and carbon rheostat.

In 1875: Discovered "Etheric force," an electrical phenomenon that is the foundation of wireless telegraphy.

In 1876: Electric pen used for first mimeographs.

In 1877: Carbon telephone transmitter, making telephony commercially practical. This included the microphone used in radio.

In 1877: Phonograph.

In 1879: Incandescent light. Radically improved dynamos and generators. System of distribution, regulation, and measurement of electric current—switches, fuses, sockets, meters, etc.

In 1880: Magnetic ore separator.

In 1883: Discover the "Edison effect," the fundamental principle of electronics.

In 1885: System of wireless induction telegraph between moving trains and stations. Patented similar system for ship-to-shore.

In 1891: Motion picture camera.

In 1896: Fluoroscope. Fluorescent electric lamp.

In 1900: Nickel-iron-alkaline storage battery.

In 1914: Electric safety miner's lamp. Process for manufacturing synthetic carbolic acid.

Recognition as an historic landmark, without cost to the Government, will help insure preservation of the birthplace for future generations. Since it opened in 1947 the annual attendance has increased to some 16,000 persons and over the years, 166,165 people have visited it. Needless to say, a great number of the visitors are school children who obtain from it the inspiration to emulate Thomas Alva Edison's contributions to humanity.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most telling resolution in opposition to the so-called quality stabilization bill, adopted by the National Association of State Purchasing Officials at Miami, Fla., November 10 to 14, 1963, at the annual meeting of that organization.

I also insert the letter of enclosure on that matter signed by Mr. Charles A. Byrley, secretary of the National Association of State Purchasing Officials.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 18TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PURCHASING OFICIALS, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., NOVEMBER 10–14, 1963

IV. PROPOSED QUALITY STABILIZATION ACT, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION [1]

The association reaffirms its unalterable opposition to the proposed Quality Stabilization Act, recognizing that, although so styled, it is but another price maintenance bill of the type which has had the so-called fair trade label for many years.

The secretariat is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to all Members of Congress and appropriate congressional committees, the Attorney General of the United

[1] Minnesota abstained from voting.

States, and to all Governors and State attorneys general.

VI. FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY

Senate bill 1457, presently pending before the Congress of the United States, if enacted into law would facilitate the procurement of certain Federal surplus property by the several States and their political subdivisions. This association announces its unanimous approval of said legislation and urges its passage. All members of this association are requested to make every effort to generate interest and support for the early passage of Senate bill 1457.

The secretariat is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to all Members of Congress and appropriate congressional committees, the Attorney General of the United States, and to all Governors and State attorneys general.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PURCHASING OFFICIALS,
SECRETARIAT, THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS,
Chicago, Ill., November 27, 1963.

TO ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Please find enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the National Association of State Purchasing Officials opposing the proposed Quality Stabilization Act now pending before Congress. We have also enclosed another resolution adopted by the association urging the passage of Senate congressional bill 1457 which would facilitate the procurement of certain Federal surplus property by the several States and their political subdivisions.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. BYRLEY,
Secretary.

Abuse of Power by the Majority Can Be Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we have been conditioned in our society to majority rule, but in accepting such a principle we have always been careful to protect the rights of the minority and the individual.

In the abuse of power by powerful labor bosses in compelling men to join a union in order to work, or to pay dues to a union whether the individual is a member or not, the rights of the individual have been demolished. The compulsory union shop or agency shop or whatever subterfuge is used to force American workers to pay tribute for the right to work is wrong and cannot be defended on any moral grounds.

The following editorial, "A Peculiar Freedom," from the Wall Street Journal, reminds us that "majority rule is wrong if it commits injustice":

A PECULIAR FREEDOM

"I do not call this compulsory unionism. I call this the American tradition of majority rule after freedom of choice."

So spoke Gov. Nelson Rockefeller the other day in an address before a large labor conference in New York City. He was defending the "union shop," in which all workers in a bargaining unit are forced to join a union when the majority votes for it. Endorsing a view widely held among labor leaders and politicians, Mr. Rockefeller argued that this practice was no more than a typical exercise of American democracy.

Now it is certainly true that majority rule is a long established precept of American government. It's also useful in settling issues at the private level; matters as diverse as a country club's decision to build a new swimming pool or a family's deliberations on whether to take a seashore vacation or a Western trip. But like a lot of ideas that are bruited about without additional examination, the majority rule principle can be both misunderstood and misapplied.

Certainly this seems to be the case with the union shop. It is no secret that many workers in union shops would not belong if they had free choice in the matter. They are forced against their will to pay dues by checkoff and even to finance union political activities which they may privately oppose. They also have little voice in union affairs, and are denied the right to drop out of the union without losing their jobs.

This compulsion is justified by union chiefs on the grounds that all workers gain from the unions' efforts, therefore all should support them. But this curious argument—that men should pay for services which they didn't contract for—is hardly one that anybody would accept under most other circumstances. Nor is it by any means certain that a union's services to its members are at their best in a system whereby the union leadership is automatically guaranteed financial support without justifying its usefulness to the membership.

But it is perhaps the American tradition itself—to which Mr. Rockefeller made appeal—that ought to be more carefully examined if there's to be an understanding of how majority rule should be applied. Certainly it shouldn't prevail at all in some cases; nobody believes the majority ought to determine what church he should attend, for example, or what books he should read.

For majority rule is wrong if it commits injustice. As the founders of the American Republic well knew, an unchecked majority could become as tyrannical as the monarchs of 18th century Europe; elective despotism, Jefferson called it.

Which seems to be what we have when the "American tradition of majority rule," as interpreted by the Nation's unions, leads to a vast denial of minority rights.

The Image of Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED FOREMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, all Americans and folks around the world were saddened by the terrible and tragic incident that took the life of our President on November 22. Certainly, people everywhere were heartbroken and sickened by this unfortunate incident, but most folks recognize that it was not the good people of Dallas who did this deed and they should not be condemned over the irresponsible acts of the two wild-eyed fanatic maniacs who did. Mr. Carl L. Estes, editor of the Longview (Tex.) Daily News and the Longview Morning Journal wrote an editorial upholding the reputation of the good folks of Dallas and I include it for the review of my colleagues:

THE IMAGE OF DALLAS

While the spirit of Dallas is bowed in the sackcloth of deep grief over the irresponsible acts of two wild-eyed fanatics, we are witnessing the sorry and un-American spectacle of a widespread campaign of slander and vilification designed to discredit and destroy her recognized influence and strength as a center of faith and patriotism, culture, and progress.

Two gun-slingers on a shooting spree do not represent nor reflect the true spirit and life of Dallas. Dallas leaders and citizenship alike have firmly condemned the violence. But while the great heart of Dallas has been too deeply moved to speak adequately in its own right, we hear the airwaves literally sizzling and see the pages of the ultraliberal press spread with the outcries of a howling horde of left-wingers, opportunistic political aspirants, unhappy social climbers, sensationalist TV announcers, and not a few highly placed officials who are doing their ugly best to project a horribly discolored and false image of Dallas.

East Texans, and especially we here in Longview, will not sit idle and mum while the red-paint bucket brigade puts the big smear on our metropolitan neighbor. When outsiders jump on Dallas and seek to condemn her before the Nation and the world as a sinkhole of crime and outlawry, we east Texans can and do proudly declare: It isn't so.

Because two zealots of questionable background have wantonly spattered blood on the proud image of Dallas, is it fair or reasonable that uninformed outsiders should join their dastardly cause and make the smear national and international in scope? This is justice gone berserk.

Who are these self-righteous and howling critics who would drown Dallas in the blood spilled by two fanatical acts of violence? They appear to be led by Communist Russia with the "me-too" approval of Cuban Dictator Castro, and apparently are joined by left-wingers, social climbers, and the misinformed who so easily are deceived. What blind fools some mortals be!

We east Texans flatly refuse to keep quiet and see Dallas crucified by an unholy aggregation of character assassins, disgruntled misfits and social malcontents who display the strong suspicion if not the self-professed admiration of godless foreign isms of questionable color and name.

What has happened in Dallas could have happened almost anywhere. Is a great city to be judged by the action of a mail-order foreign-made rifle said to have been fired by a self-confessed Marxist and admirer of communism? Can decent-minded people fairly judge a city by the blast of a pawn-shop type revolver stealthily wielded by a Chicago-born night club and dance hall operator with a strange penchant for strip-tease shows, and a passion for social climbing? God forbid.

East Texas people know the heart and spirit of Dallas. We want to tell the Nation and the world that we regard it as manifestly unfair and cruelly vindictive for persons standing on the idiotic fringe to try to recast the image of Dallas in a mold of common outlawry because of the foul deeds of two discontented misfits who set themselves as prosecutor, jury, judge, and executioner of their fellowman.

Dallas is a great city. Dallas is big, dynamic, forceful, cosmopolitan. Dallas also is civic minded, cultural, patriotic, religious. Dallas has the marks of character and courage, enterprise and leadership, achievement, and stability, vision and a steadfast dedication to high purpose.

The great traditions of the free press—established by the late G. B. Dealey of the Dallas Morning News and the late Edwin Kiest and Tom Gooch of the Dallas Times

Herald, and so ably and commendably perpetuated today by Ted Dealey and Joe Dealey of the News and by John W. Runyon and James F. Chambers, Jr., of the Times Herald—provide a rich heritage which both Dallas and east Texas admire and cherish.

Dallas is a major stronghold of private enterprise in Texas and the Southwest—the cherished free system which from the earliest days of the Republic has underwritten and continues to sustain the material strength of our Nation. This system of free enterprise and individual opportunity, so faithfully nurtured and vigorously promoted by Dallas, not only affords the people the highest standard of living the world has ever known but has given multiplied billions of dollars worth of aid and succor to downtrodden peoples and weaker nations the world around.

In a measure almost beyond description, Dallas has contributed to the progress and strengthened the image of Texas as a leader among the States of the Union. The State Fair of Texas, although not exclusively a Dallas institution, has been developed and operated by Dallas for Texas as a whole. It has become the greatest exposition of its kind in the Nation. The Cotton Bowl, built, and largely financed by Dallas, is nationally recognized as a symbol of Texas and its leadership in outdoor sports and entertainment spectacles.

East Texas, indeed all Texas and her neighboring States, as well, look to Dallas as the financial center of the southwest. The enterprising leadership and progressive standards of banking set by such giants as the late Fred Florence and by Nathan Adams, R. L. Thornton, Sr., and others, and so admirably and effectively maintained and extended today by James W. Aston, Robert H. Stewart III, and Ben H. Wooten, R. L. Thornton Jr. and others, have given Dallas a preeminence that challenges and inspires others all across Texas and the southwest.

Dallas paces Texas and the great central southwest region in the field of insurance, with such stalwarts as Dan Williams and Ben Carpenter among many others symbolizing the leadership which has built a large number of strong companies which now make Dallas a major headquarters of this important institutional service.

Symbolizing the pioneering role of industrial development of Dallas and much of Texas was the leadership of the late John W. Carpenter, and the present-day leadership of young Ben Carpenter and associates in the ambitious dream and worthwhile canalization of the Trinity River and development of its tremendous potential.

All of us here in east Texas are keenly aware of and impressed by the magnificent role in industrial progress which W. W. Lynch continues to play in Dallas and throughout central Texas. The eyes of Texas have long been on the valuable leadership of E. B. Germany, chairman of the Texas Industrial Commission. The hopes and confidence of east Texas and a great section of the southwest ride with the current leadership of George A. Wilson and associates such as L. D. Webster and others of Dallas-based Lone Star Steel Co.

Dallas has an able, dedicated and widely recognized mayor in Earle Cabell—a man whom east Texas has long admired and loved. Dallas is noted for its energetic and responsible city government.

East Texas looks to Dallas for its religious, educational, and cultural inspiration and leadership. For three generations and more, we have often attended and regularly followed the leadership of its fine churches and religious institutions, its colleges and universities, its art centers and libraries, its theaters and symphonies, operas and concerts.

Exemplary courts and honorable and hard-working judges are the hallmark of Dallas.

A major medical center has been in development in Dallas over the years. Today its many modern hospitals, study and research centers, excellent doctors and trained technical staffs have national and world recognition.

Dallas' leadership is a major asset to Texas and the Nation. It is characterized by ability, courage, energy, friendliness, and understanding. We have named only a few but Dallas has thousands of big men who have served with devotion and faithfulness over the years—including such indefatigable workers as B. Hick Majors, Bob Cullum, Earle Wyatt, Julius Schepps, Henry English, Rae Skillern, Erik Jonsson, Stanley Marcus, Willis Tate, and many others.

We here in east Texas are homefolk with the people of Dallas. We have much in common. Call the roll of Dallas leaders and we find prominent among them many who came from our sandhills and piney woods.

Here in Longview especially do we recognize Dallas as our friend and neighbor. We can never forget that it has been Dallas to which we have turned when we needed help, financial and otherwise, in our pursuit of new industrial payrolls to bolster the economy of east Texas. Across the years—in the cotton era, later in the oil era, and in the latter years of our spreading development as an inland industrial center—we have had the assurance that Dallas was at our side.

Dallas has been the friend of east Texas across the years. Our material, cultural, and religious interests are rooted in Dallas. As for many of us east Texans, our friends and kinsfolk are there, and some are buried there. Our hearts are there.

In this hour of crisis and distress when the bright image of Dallas is under outside fire, we in east Texas will not turn our backs and run. In the face of a rising chorus of leftwing attacks and condemnation, we will not sit cowed in silence. While some may run for cover before the onslaught of the red smear brigade, we will stand up with Dallas and be counted at her side.

For, you see, we know the great heart and the true spirit of Dallas and have the firm imprint of her proud portrait in our hearts. Whoever would wantonly distort and smear her fair image must learn that when outsiders jump on Dallas they also jump on Texas.

Fair warning is enough. While all honorable Texans condemn and decry deliberate acts of violence, we here and now serve public notice to character assassins of whatever ilk and color that the outraged spirit and righteous indignation of a united Texas must be reckoned with, both now and hereafter.

A Day To Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, eloquent words beyond counting have expressed the sorrow and the deep sense of loss our Nation suffered in the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy. I am inspired by a splendid editorial which appeared on November 25, 1963, in the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N.J. It suggests that perhaps the finest tribute to a great President would be to follow in our daily living the examples he set in his short lifetime and to help put in motion the programs for the betterment of mankind which he proposed.

The editorial follows:

A DAY TO PRAY

This day of national mourning is a day to pray.

In churches everywhere there are special services this day in memory of our slain President. It is a way to perpetuate his memory in each one's own heart.

In the last 72 hours a shocked, a grief-stricken people have put forward many ideas to honor his memory. One can be sure that schools, streets, parks, and buildings will be named or renamed for him. He has earned much more than this kind of superficial tribute from all of us, however earnestly we mean it.

The day he took office, he told us: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

There would be our finest tribute to him: To do for our country our very best. To pursue high ideals with vigor and sincerity. To be stanch in times of crisis as he was only 13 months ago when he defused Cuba. To be physically fit, as he wanted us to, perhaps even to be able to walk a bit instead of driving every time there is an errand to the corner. To be intellectually honest with ourselves; doing more than mouthing phrases about equality, actually not running away when interracial preachings must be put into practice. To be the kind of good family man he was—son, husband, father. To enjoy life wholesomely as he did, the arts, culture, hobbies, exercise, sport, afloat and ashore, indoors and out.

It is a day to pray and to hope that something of the good qualities of the man we mourn somehow miraculously will cloak all of us.

Assassination of a President or Vice President—Make It a Federal Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues in the House, I was astonished to learn after the tragic death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, that it is not a Federal crime to assault or assassinate the President of the United States. Under our present laws, the trail and penalty for the assault or assassination of a President are determined by the laws of the State in which the crime took place.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman RICHARD SCHWEIKER, was the first to call this to my attention and the first to introduce in the House, a bill to provide for the greater protection of the President and Vice President by amending the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to assassinate the President or Vice President. Many Members of Congress—both Republicans and Democrats—have joined in sponsoring a similar bill. I am introducing such a bill in the House today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a Federal crime to kill lesser Federal officials, such as a U.S. judge, a U.S. attorney, a Federal marshal, or a FBI or a Secret Service agent. I strongly urge that we extend the protection of Federal jurisdiction, offered to these lesser Federal officials,

to cover the two highest officials of our land.

With permission, I insert an editorial of November 26, 1963, which appeared in the Washington Post:

MAKE IT A FEDERAL CRIME

Certainly the law should be amended to make the assassination of the President a Federal crime. It is ironic indeed that the criminal who murdered President Kennedy violated only the law of Texas. Actually his foul deed was a crime against the Nation—one of the most serious crimes against the Nation in this century.

As the law now stands, severe penalties are prescribed for felons who murder or attack Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, postal inspectors, Secret Service officers, customs agents and various employees of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. But this law for "protection of officers and employees of the United States" does not, strangely enough, cover the President or members of his Cabinet.

Presumably the need for Federal law in this field has not previously been emphasized. When Lincoln was assassinated, the country was still under martial law. The assassin of President Garfield was prosecuted in the District of Columbia and the assassin of President McKinley in New York. There is a strong presumption that Texas would have convicted Lee Harvey Oswald of the slaying of President Kennedy if Oswald himself had not been killed as he was being transferred to the county jail. But the serious bungling of this vital case by the Dallas police constitutes a strong argument for the direction of such delicate operations by the FBI from the very beginning.

The events in Dallas have shown all too clearly that Federal officials should have been in charge of the police work from the beginning. High crimes against the Nation cannot be safely left to investigation and prosecution by local officials of the community in which such crimes happen to take place. As soon as Congress resumes its operations, Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania, will introduce a bill to extend the protection of section 1114, United States Code, to the President and Vice President. We hope that it will be given prompt attention by the Judiciary Committees and that they will also include within the terms of the bill other officials in the line of succession to the Presidency. Perhaps agency heads, their deputies and Members of Congress should also be included.

Israel—Observations of Mrs. May Silbermann, Prominent Citizen of Bronx, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely and informative statement of a prominent resident of my congressional district, Mrs. May Silbermann. A longtime friend of mine, and executive leader of the Monroe Democratic Club, in the Bronx, she has made noted contributions in charitable, civic, educational and political activities in our community. She has been an active worker for the Democratic State Committee and a delegate to the Democratic State and Judicial Conventions.

Mrs. Silbermann recently visited Israel, where I had arranged through our State Department, for her to meet with leaders of political parties to learn more about election campaigns and other political activities of the democratic State of Israel. She reports in a letter to me that the meetings proved most interesting and helpful, and I am sure that those with whom she spoke, in turn, found her own knowledge of American politics stimulating and of interest to them.

I believe my collegues in the House will find Mrs. Silbermann's comments and observations informative and thought provoking. She has praise for the people of Israel and for their great accomplishments in spite of many problems; she expresses concern over border incidents and the fact that Israel finds herself surrounded by dedicated enemies; and she feels there is a need for a collective defense agreement with Israel as proposed in my House Resolution 448.

Mrs. Silbermann's letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On my return from Israel recently, I read a copy of the resolution offered by you in the House of Representatives urging a collective defense agreement with Israel.

As a result of my visit to Israel, I now more fully appreciate the deep need for the collective defense agreement you have suggested.

It is only when you are in Israel that you really experience the full impact of the phrase "sitting on a tinder box." It is a "tinder box" when you know that at various border points (but a short distance comparatively from the center of the country), if you made one step forward at this point, you would be in Lebanon; and if you took one more step forward in another section, you would be in Syria; and, at another border point, in Trans-Jordan; and at still another border point, in Saudi Arabia. When but a short ride from Eliat comes Egypt, one fully appreciates the constant sense of danger under which the nation of Israel lives.

I do not know of any other country in the world that is so surrounded by dedicated enemies. Yet Israel, for the United States, is a beachhead of democracy in the Middle East. From my personal observation, it is a beachhead in several ways. It is a living example that a country can start over again and create a democratic way of life, where all people receive the benefits of education, of the right to work regardless of their color or sectarian belief, the right to raise their families while "sitting under their own fig trees," and the security of knowing that they will be taken care of in their old age. Israel brings to the whole Middle East a living example of what can be done by each Middle Eastern country for its own citizens—a living example that willingness, desire, and the sweat of one's brow can make sand and swamp turn into fertile lifegiving areas.

It is said in Israel that engineers and guides are the two highest paid professions. The guides, I imagine, because so many people are interested in visiting Israel to see what a small people have accomplished in such a short time with a stake that was not much more than a sandy, barren area 15 or more years ago; and engineers because they are proving that ingenuity and inventiveness can bring back to the land resources and vitality that had been destroyed over thousands of years of historical waves of conquest and reconquest. However, more important to the present day world, engineers symbolize the technical training offered to the underdeveloped countries of South Africa who send their students to Israeli technical schools. It is these technical graduates—whether they be engineers, aircraft designers, electrical engineers, agricultural engineers, etc.—who are fanning out throughout the underdeveloped countries of South Africa, such as Tanganyika, and bringing to them the fruits of the knowledge they gained in Israel. Israel thus contributes further to the world through the help it provides in raising the standards of living of people in underdeveloped areas. This continuing activity can only be maintained in a peaceful world.

Israel, in the role of receiving basin of the oppressed of the world, has many problems in integrating new arrivals who have different customs and traditions. There are the tasks of providing adequate housing and medical facilities, re-educating and starting them on a constructive, fruitful life, and the redevelopment and protection of the land.

If you ask the average man on the street in Israel what he wants most, the response you get is first and foremost: "Peace." The 70 percent of their budget that provides for the country's defense could be used to make the land bloom, like the Negev Desert that has not bloomed in thousands of years.

To visit Israel is to visit a land that is vital, that is jumping—a land where no one offers the questions or gives the answers: "Where shall I go?—Nowhere. What shall I do?—Nothing." The people are actively engaged in building a country, and ever present is their pride in what they have achieved in the 15 years of existence as a state. It is a pride to which they are justly entitled.

The necessary peaceful conditions that could come about through achieving the collective defense agreement called for in your resolution, could be the trigger for their continuing pride in their development and in their constructive contributions to the world.

Because of my particular area of interest—politics—I was fortunate to have had arranged for me, through your kind efforts, the appointments with Mr. Zvi Harmor, executive member of Mapai Party and Mr. Yitzhak Artzi, executive member of the Liberal Party. The time I spent with these two gentlemen was most interesting and I secured a bit of background in how political parties are run in Israel. I learned what I wished to learn, and I think they learned a few things from me. At the very least, the American Embassy was very pleased to arrange the appointments because it provided additional areas of contact between interested American citizens and Israelis, and in that sense, contributed in its little way to good relations between our countries. I was much impressed with the dedication of these two gentlemen and with their astuteness. Without hesitation, I would say, if this is the caliber of their party official, then their parties are indeed in good hands, dedicated to the interests of the people and the welfare of Israel.

Since my return from Israel there have been border incidents; and having been there, I have a deepened sense of their frightful meaning. Your efforts for a collective defense agreement, the benefits of which would extend far beyond Israel's borders, are a "Mitzvah" (a blessing) for this "tinder box" area.

Communism Still Poses Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that of all the nations in the world the only one which gloated over our President's assassination was Red China. Their official remarks clearly

demonstrated the viciousness and hatred which typify the leadership of that country.

It might be well to briefly study the ruthless and insane ambition which is demonstrated in the actions of the present ruler of the 700 million Red Chinese today. I will quote extracts from writings either by Mao Tse-tung or written under his direction. Mao Tse-tung, himself, is a brilliant, well-educated man.

The following verses are taken from a Chinese folksong:

The sun is rising red in the East.
China has brought forth a Mao Tse-tung.
He plans blessings for the people.
Aiyayo, he is the people's great saviour.
Mao Tse-tung is a son of the Chinese earth;
He will lead us to fight the enemy.
There will come a time when we will be masters.
Aiyayo, all our enemies shall be beaten.

Mao's supreme egotism is shown in this extract from an official publication of Red China:

Mao Tse-tung is China's greatest theoretician, thinker, and revolutionary * * * Mao can truly be regarded as a genius such as never before has appeared in Chinese history.

Perhaps the following extract from a poem written by Mao himself best displays his military ambitions to conquer. In this poem he places himself as a greater military genius than Genghis Khan, the great Mongol leader who was perhaps the greatest and most ruthless conquerer of all time.

These lands, these rivers, their bewitching charm
Inspired the conqueror of Chin and Han,
Tang and Sung in splendour striving to expand.
Alas! All short in stature! And Genghis Khan
Knew only how to shoot a hawk for play.
For the towering figure watch the scene today!

Perhaps the principal cause of America's failure to understand what to expect from our potential enemies is that we have forgotten that "he who will not learn the lessons of history is doomed to relive it."

The histories used in American schools have recorded little of the great and ruthless Chinese conquerors who have led a cruel and relentlessly expanding nation in the past. The strength of China has ebbed and flowed several times in the last twenty centuries.

In the centuries of Chinese history, she also has been controlled by dynasties of the Mongols and Manchus, but in each instance these conquering peoples became Chinese themselves.

It is true that for three centuries Russia has been an aggressor against China, but today Mao appears to be bent on revenge toward the rest of the world.

His subjects are hungry. There is nothing Mao would like better than to take over Russian territory in Central Asia and Siberia, much of which was once controlled by China. He has created several border incidents, but he knows that he cannot today cope with Russian strength.

He is creating incidents along the border between North and South Korea; he has invaded India in two different places, and India has been one of his friends; he is now taking over American influences in Cambodia and the American mission has been ordered to leave. He is pushing the war in Vietnam, and is gaining control of Laos. The tentacles of Red China are probing deep into the new and underdeveloped countries of Asia.

The fact that China is today vengeful toward Russia should not fill us with hope and confidence toward a better relationship with Russia, for world communism today, whether dominated by Russia, China, or Cuba, is our mortal enemy, and it is naive to believe otherwise.

In Memoriam, John Fitzgerald Kennedy—1917–63

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial written by my good friend, Abraham Schlacht, editor and publisher of the East Side News. Mr. Schlacht did not affix his name to this particular editorial because he wanted it to be the general expression of the newspaper.

This is a typical characteristic of Abraham Schlacht, a man who has worked tirelessly and unceasingly in behalf of the people of the East Side of New York, most of the time without making known his efforts. However, fame has a way of singling out for recognition even the most unassuming of individuals. In the case of this outstanding journalist, his address on the occasion of the presentation of an award to him by the East Side Post Jewish War Veterans, later incorporated as an editorial entitled "Freedom Versus Apathy," was considered for an award by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

His editorial in memory of our late President speaks for the people of that area of New York which is known worldwide as New York's East Side—the melting pot of the Nation. I commend it to my colleagues:

IN MEMORIAM, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917–63

A week ago today our great President fell at the hands of an assassin, and the Nation has not yet recovered from its tragedy.

Our hearts still overflow with grief at the loss of our Commander in Chief—John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a sacrifice to the cause of freedom.

Our hearts go out, too, to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and her two children, Caroline and John, Jr., who have suffered their greatest blow.

Mrs. Kennedy will ever be remembered for the manner in which she bore her hour of sorrow.

From the beginning to end of this tragic event, she reflected a stoic air and dignity that can never be erased from our memory.

Since the days of the Great Emancipator no other President's death has struck the Nation with such shock and horror as did the senseless assassination of our President.

No other President has left the world with such hollowness and meaninglessness as did the death of the late President.

And no other in the annals of this generation has held the world spellbound, and no other has championed and symbolized the hopes of our youth and that of the world as did our stricken commander.

To all of us, his passing is our personal tragedy.

In eternal glory lie the mortal remains of our immortal President in Arlington National Cemetery.

They rest on an open hillside among tall, bare elms, and a slight distance away stands a solitary cedar.

As one looks about from the grave of the President, one can see several hundred feet away thousands of our honored dead, and the floodlighted columns of the Curtis-Lee Mansion. One cannot help but sense a quiet, awesome feeling of deepest solemnity pervading the cemetery grounds.

At the head of his grave burns an eternal flame, and around it is a multi-array of flowers.

Let us trust that the light of this flame will cast its peaceful rays in the hearts of all men everywhere.

And without a doubt millions of people of all races and creeds from every clime will make their pilgrimages to honor his memory.

The American people cannot forget those moving words which he delivered in his inaugural address:

"Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths and encourage the arts and commerce."

Which other leader in American life has expressed so aptly in so few words?

Which other in this generation, we ask, has expressed in such simple and stirring language the things that lie closest to the average human heart.

The image of the late President can never be forgotten from our memory.

Who among us can ever fail to recall his winsome smile, his humor, often displayed at public places and press conferences; his repartee and brilliance in debate, and his knowledge and mastery of problems of state?

Moreover, who can ever forget his innate sense of refinement, and, in particular, his unwavering steadfastness in the face of national peril?

He will live on not for decades, but for centuries, so long as human beings love peace, righteousness, and mercy.

May his soul repose in peace. May his memory ever abide in our thoughts. May his principles, for which he so ardently toiled, for ourselves and for humanity, become a reality. May his memorial, reflected in his utterances and deeds, be a glowing light ever to behold and an inspiration to this and to all future generations.

For the people's safety and domestic tranquillity, let us dedicate ourselves anew to make these United States a haven of peace and good will, where hate and bitterness shall be forever obliterated, and where all are Americans, first and always.

The Assault on the American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a time in the history of this Na-

tion when our people should be ruled by reason and not by emotion, that time is at hand. In the wild indulgence of self-incrimination on the part of too many writers, clergymen, and self-styled keepers of the conscience of the people, we are indicting our country unfairly and without just cause.

One of the greatest assets of our late President was his great intellect. It is an insult to his dedication to his beliefs to now destroy the finest instincts of all Americans in the wave of character assassination in which many are now indulging.

The heart of the American people was seen in the response to the President's assassination. The character of the American people was put to the test in that terrible moment and it was not found wanting. What is to be gained now by picturing us as a nation of guilt-ridden, hate-filled people except to play into the hands of the Communists who have been trying to sell this image of America for decades.

It is a far finer tribute to our late President to walk forth in pride as a great nation, a great people, than in the present attempts to make all Americans share the guilt of one Communist murderer.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal should be carefully read by all Americans and I include it at this point as a part of these remarks:

THE ASSAULT ON THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

From pulpits and the pens of commentators, from Government officials and assorted other citizens is issuing a torrent of talk to the effect that the American people are consumed with rancor and hatred. In the words of the outgoing head of the National Council of Churches, President Kennedy's assassination forces us to our knees in shame for all "our unharnessed hates."

The prevalence of such views is somewhat puzzling and not a little disturbing. Frightful and frightening as the murder was, it is hard to see on what rational grounds it can be made into an assault on the whole character of contemporary America.

The attack, to begin with, distorts all historical perspective. If this assassination is read as the result of an outpouring of hate peculiar to our time and place, how are the assassinations of the past to be accounted for? In the case of Lincoln, at the end of a great civil war, it would seem more appropriate to speak of forces of hatred and violence.

Nor do the histories of other peoples support the idea that there is something especially wrong with our society. A capacity for violence is obviously embedded in all men, and has shown hideous faces in man's long past; how well or ill it is controlled depends on a variety of civilizing influences. Yet in many more or less civilized places today, not even an election can occur unaccompanied by violent death.

In America, the picture of a people possessed by hate does not fit the facts disclosed by simple observation. An assassin who even as a boy was considered by a psychiatrist to be a potentially dangerous psychopath—is it honestly believed that this particular individual sums up the American character? Or sensible to say that he and his rifle could only have emerged out of the forces of hate abroad in the land?

No one could deny that there are individuals and small groups peddling hate. There have always been and probably always will be, but if anything they are today less important in national life and less indicative of national character than at some other periods.

It is fashionable nowadays to lump the haters with the extremists of the far right. In some individual instances there may be an identity, but individual hatreds also exist at the other extreme, in those who hate so much they would destroy America's institutions. In their obsession with the far right, some people seemingly refuse to believe that the deranged killer was a man of the far left.

In any event, all this is outside the mainstream of American life. Not hatred but growing understanding and even compassion typify the general temper of this society at this time.

Such qualities are evident all around us—in the normal home, in the comfortable working conditions of the normal company, in the increasing acceptance of once-despised minorities. It is hard to think of a time of so much concern by so many for the dignity of all men.

And it was such qualities that marked the reaction of the overwhelming majority of Americans to the President's death. It was not violence and hate but an outpouring of deep and personal grief, and that does reflect the American people.

To make the assassination of a President an occasion for character assassination does worse than confuse issues. The harping on hate is a disservice to the Nation, for it makes it more difficult for the nonviolent majority to get on with their and the Nation's business in a time of sorrow.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The End of an Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the great outpouring of expressions of indignation and sorrow during the past 2 weeks, some have been particularly notable for their sweep and style.

As an example of such expressions—one which might otherwise command only local attention—I would cite the following tribute appearing in the San Diego, Calif., Exchangite—a publication of the San Diego Exchange Club—on November 28, 1963:

President Johnson, in his first proclamation, termed it "an act which must outrage decent men everywhere."

Former President Eisenhower declared people throughout the world were united in indignation against this monstrous deed.

President John F. Kennedy was dead; slain brutally, senselessly, in one of the great tragedies of mankind.

And to the now doleful strains of "Hail to the Chief," the muffled roll of the funeral drums, the final, long, slow, procession of the flag-draped coffin, millions of sorrowing eyes might well have witnessed the end of an era.

An era which has meant much to the entire world, which created some never-to-be-forgotten memories, and which might well and appropriately remember this sad Thanksgiving season.

For as a London newspaper stated, America, for the very first time has achieved majesty. A special type of regal, unquenchable majesty, as typified by the slim, unflinching figure of the First Lady carrying out her final duties, bearing bravely a sorrow even black veils would not hide.

This great courage was not lost on the vast throngs, which seemed to catch their cue from her and unlike most American crowds did not push, shove, jostle each other, despite the freezing cold and long, long lines.

There are so many memories, earlier ones, happier ones.

The girlish giggles of Caroline scampering about a White House balcony completely stealing the show from an important ceremonial on the lawn below her.

The unforgettable magazine cover showing the President and his young John, clearly showing their mutual pride and happiness in each other.

Jackie's charming capture of the fashion world, her graciousness in inviting the world to tour the White House through television; her sense of history and thoughtfulness in restoring long-forgotten pieces of Americana to the White House which she clearly felt belongs to the Nation, not to individuals.

Indeed, there never has been, nor probably never will be, such an example of youthful family happiness and closeness in the White House. We can be thankful today this Nation did experience it albeit for such a little while.

As for J.F.K.—so many, many memories—a young man of vision and dedication whose greatness is readily admitted by his most ardent political critics; the magic which caused Berliners to march by torchlight in his memory; the precedent-shattering procession of world rulers at his final farewell; the handsome, honest face; he cared, so the Government cared, about school dropouts, the aged, sick, civil rights; the Peace Corps, which brought Americans to foreign lands, not as money-laden tourists, but as low-paid, hard-working helpers and teachers; brushing back his hair, his tanned face smiling broadly as he stood erect in his limousine parading along El Cajon Boulevard; his patience, determination, and statesmanship in turning back civilization from certain annihilation to a world, however uneasy, where reason still prevails and negotiation continues.

For this, and for much, much more, we give thanks today, and above all for this Nation which can and must survive.

What's Right With the Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress and the country a most interesting and informative address recently delivered by the Honorable Boyd Leedom, member of the National Labor Relations Board, at a meeting of the Labor Relations Council of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

I recommend the reading of this speech to all those who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since I believe this presentation will clear up some of the misunderstandings which sometimes develop concerning the work and the functions of the NLRB.

I ask unanimous consent that Boyd Leedom's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE LABOR BOARD

(Address of Boyd Leedom, member of National Labor Relations Board)

Because this is the first time I have appeared before an audience such as this since the tragic death of President Kennedy, I wish to speak briefly of him.

In my personal contacts with him when he was chairman of the Senate Labor Committee and I was chairman of the Labor Board, and in even briefer contacts since, he was always kind and considerate, friendly and sincere. He was strong and courageous, with a down-to-earth attitude that enabled him to laugh at himself. He will long be remembered, much in the tradition of Lincoln, for advancing at a time when greatly needed the neglected cause of human freedom. The best we can do to pay homage to the man, and to honor the high office he held, is for each of us, in his own way, to do something real to eradicate from our way of life the evil and the malice and the hate, prevalent in our land, that contributed to his assassination.

The most accurate measure I have of President Kennedy's stature in office is the caliber of the men he named to the Board on which I serve. All four of my colleagues are now appointees of President Kennedy. All are men of exceptional ability. No President, realistically, could have made better selections, a circumstance that bears directly on my theme today.

My talk is presented under the tractable title: "What's Right With the Labor Board." Some of you management-minded people may think such a speech could not possibly be as long as this one. But my purpose is to counter some of the things being said about what is wrong with the Board and to put the picture of our activities in true perspective.

Now my title, "What's Right With the Labor Board," as I have said, is flexible. It leaves room for more than one speech under the same caption. For, as you well know, what's right with anything depends a lot on who is talking, and a little on who is listening.

I know, of course, that a chamber of commerce audience might not readily accept the rightness of those NLRB decisions that are favorable to unions. And so I, sensitive to audience receptivity, propose not to talk about those decisions. You hear often enough about them from other sources. Rather, I want to tell you about the recent Board decisions that have sustained the management position, and that represent, in my judgment, a new reaching out by the Board to give management relief. These are the decisions that the unions complain about.

The storm that envelops NLRB every now and then involves only a very small part of our entire workload. But the decisions that bring on the blasts are significant ones growing out of highly controversial areas of our law. In the main, notwithstanding the never-ending clamor about us, our agency has done a commendable job, and is now doing one; it is giving effect to the complex law we administer and resolving day after day thousands of disputes, most of them in the incipient stage. But let me categorize and classify the difficult areas as I see them—the Board decisions that seem to cause the trouble.

First, I mention those areas where, in my judgment, the Board has veered toward the position of labor. The first has to do with union efforts to become the representative of employees by picketing the employer for a contract, even though the union does not represent a majority, and possibly not any, of the employees. Such union activity is what Congress sought to control in the provisions of section 8(b)(7) of the Landrum-Griffin amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

The second problem area has to do with the appropriate unit, or voting group of employees, in the elections the NLRB conducts to determine which, if any, union shall represent the employees.

Controversial area No. 3 relates to new restrictions imposed by the Board on an employer's right to speak out against the union in representation election campaigns.

Problem area 4 involves the scope of subjects about which the employer is required to bargain with the union. This area

includes the highly controversial cases requiring an employer to bargain about subcontracting.

I have dissented vigorously in the 8(b)(7) cases and in many involving free speech; also as to unit matters and certain aspects of the scope of bargaining. And I will continue to dissent as long as the Board follows its present course in these areas of the law.

I didn't come here, however, to talk about these cases. I mention them primarily to establish that I am in agreement with some of the criticism of our work.

I want to talk about three other areas of labor relations in which the Board during the last 2 years has handed down a number of significant decisions favoring the management position. These are (1) secondary boycotts, (2) hot-cargo contracts, and (3) lockouts.

A secondary boycott, as most of you know, is a union's attempt to force an employer with whom it does not have a labor dispute to quit doing business with some other employer with whom the union does have a dispute. Section 8(b)(4) of the act was adopted in 1947 as a part of the Taft-Hartley amendments to protect the employer who was not himself embroiled in a labor dispute and therefore had a neutral or "secondary" status. The question has arisen, however, as to what happens, for example, if the union pickets the retail store of such a neutral employer urging the public not to buy the products which are being sold there and that are produced by the employer with whom the union does have a dispute.

The union's argument is that this picketing is aimed solely at customers. But the Board has rejected this view, and instead has held that such picketing threatens the retail store with loss of business, and that such picketing necessarily has an unlawful, coercive effect on the neutral employer.

The Board has further broadly construed 8(b)(4) in holding that a union engages in an unlawful secondary boycott where it attempts to force a neutral employer to modify its method of doing business with the primary employer. Even though in this situation the union does not have a cease-doing-business object—which is the statutory language—the Board held that such conduct is unlawful, because in any event it involves neutrals in disputes in which they have no concern.

Finally, in several cases involving complex fact situations, the unions in effect claimed that the employer alleged to be the secondary employer actually was a primary employer, and therefore no secondary boycott was involved. The Board has rejected this argument. If it were accepted, there would be few secondary boycotts.

The second major area where the Board has interpreted the act restrictively as to certain union activity involves so-called hot-cargo contracts. In these contracts, the employer agrees ahead of time to quit doing business with other employers who are nonunion or who have a labor dispute. Section 8(e) outlaws such agreements. Congress added this section in 1959 to prevent unions from pressuring employers into signing hot-cargo agreements and then later forcing the employer by means of moral suasion and otherwise into living up to the agreements and ceasing to do business with such other employers.

The Board has also shown a strong desire to implement the legislative intent to obliterate completely all forms of hot-cargo agreements. So, the Board has looked to the substance rather than the form in deciding whether the clause in question was covered by 8(e).

For example, the Board has held unlawful a contract clause providing that an employer, in subcontracting work, must give preference to union firms. Even though such a subcontracting clause said nothing explicitly about one employer ceasing to do business with another employer, the Board held that the clause had the effect of preventing an employer from entering into business relations with nonunion firms.

Similarly, the Board has held unlawful under 8(e) a clause barring an employer from discharging employees who refuse to handle goods originating from a plant where the employer had a dispute with the union. The Board reasoned that if his employees were free not to handle struck goods, for all practical purposes the employer himself had to stop doing business with the struck employer. And recently the Board gave broad scope to 8(e) in finding unlawful certain types of agreements under which the employer agreed not to penalize employees for refusing to cross picket lines at another employer's premises.

The Board has also broadly construed the language appearing in 8(e) that provides that employers and unions may not "enter into" hot-cargo agreements. In many cases the Board was confronted with contracts containing hot-cargo clauses entered into before section 8(e) was enacted. We have held in effect that enforcement of a hot-cargo clause is "entering into" such an agreement. Consistent with this view, the Board also held that where an employer himself enforces a hot-cargo clause against another employer, his conduct violates the act. The Board concluded that the employer was reaffirming the effectiveness of the clause and thus was entering into a hot-cargo agreement within the meaning of 8(e).

Now, the third problem area—the lockout decisions. A lockout, as many of you know, is an employer's weapon to counteract a strike. In a strike situation, employees refuse to work in order to pressure an employer into accepting their demands. In a lockout, the employer refuses to allow employees to work in order to force the union to capitulate. Although lockouts have ordinarily been held to be unlawful, in a number of recent cases, the Board has sympathetically evaluated the interest of the employer in closing his business and locking out employees.

Thus, the Board recently decided by unanimous vote that employer members of a multiemployer association could agree that in the event any union, party to the associationwide contract, engages in a work stoppage against one of the employers in violation of the contract, the other members of the association may suspend operations, thereby locking out employees, until the matter is settled. Similarly, in a recent case, an employer, engaged in the business of constructing roads and bridges, was threatened by an imminent strike. The Board found that in view of the dangers to the public's health and safety and the unusual losses to the employer which would result from a quickie strike, the lockout was justified.

Finally, the Board recently held that employers engaged in the building and construction industry who were threatened by strikes by the Carpenters and the Operating Engineers Unions could close down the entire jobs, thus locking out employees in other crafts, because it would have been economically unfeasible for them to operate the various construction jobs without carpenters and operating engineers.

Thus, from any objective viewpoint it should be apparent that the Board is not unmindful of employers' interest in significant areas of labor-management relations.

Throughout the Board's history, critics not only have inaccurately labeled the Board as either promanagement or prolabor, there have been not-so-subtle implications that various members, over the years, have been biased or deliberately bent on frustrating the will of Congress.

These criticisms of the entrenched partisans are based on the notion that the various Board members are readily categorized as pro one side or the other. Any assumption that the votes of any one member fall into a strict pattern is not valid—and I speak from the experience of almost 9 years on the Board.

The Board has been unanimous in important and difficult decisions on both sides of the labor-management fence. For example, the Board decided in 1961 without dissent, in a highly controversial case, that an employer discriminated against his striking employees when he granted superseniority to striker replacements. Ray Rodgers and I joined in this decision. The Supreme Court, also without dissent, has affirmed the Board, although management, understandably, argued strenuously that we were clearly wrong.

On the other hand, all five of us held that a union could not strike to get or to enforce a hot-cargo contract in the building and construction industry even though Landrum-Griffin explicitely permits employers and unions voluntarily to make such agreements in this industry.

We have recently been reversed in this holding by a circuit court of appeals and the case is likely headed for the Supreme Court.

Even in the controversial areas where the Board has split, there is no fixed overall pattern of voting by the various members. Chairman Frank McCulloch and I joined in a dissent where Ray Rodgers, John Fanning, and Gerald Brown made up the majority. The majority held that an otherwise unlawful rule against distribution of union literature in a plant was not valid just because the employer and the incumbent union had agreed to the rule.

In another case, Gerald Brown, Ray Rodgers, and I joined in holding that a union violated the law by causing an employer to discharge an employee for an arbitrary reason even though the reason was not related to union considerations, a factor theretofore a requisite to finding such a violation. And it was Chairman McCulloch who joined Ray Rodgers and me in deciding that the hot-cargo contract restrictions prohibited not only the signing but also the enforcement of such agreements as well. In another case, Member Rodgers joined Chairman McCulloch in a dissent that argued for the legality of a lockout where Members Fanning, Brown, and I could not find that the employer was justified in denying his employees the right to work.

Our newest member, Howard Jenkins, replaced Ray Rodgers on the Board. He has been with us so short a time hardly any of the decisions in which he has participated have been published. But from his brief participation, thus far, it is clear that he will be a real asset on the Board. I am pleased to be counted as his colleague.

Having said all of this, there is something more I want to say in my earnest desire to present to you a truly factual picture of our Board.

I know as well as you may know that in the past 3 years there have been significant changes in Labor Board law, and on balance these changes have been far more acceptable to labor than to management.

I recognize, of course, that the terms prolabor and promanagement lend themselves to varied interpretations. I reject these labels because of their implication that Board members deliberately ignore a fair interpretation of the law to reach a desired result. Those who choose to disparage the Board in such terms would, in order to be consistent, have to label the Board on which I served under the previous administration as promanagement. Neither charge withstands scrutiny, in my view. The swing of the pendulum merely reflects honest differences of opinion flowing from the varying backgrounds and the philosophical outlook of Board members.

I recall a speech made by a U.S. Senator under a title that clearly reveals its content.

That title was "Perversion of the Taft-Hartley Act by the National Labor Relations Board." The Chairman of the Board made a good reply, I thought, in his effort to show to the Senate Labor Subcommittee that not all of the Senator's criticism was warranted. Because what was said in the Chairman's letter reveals to some extent the anatomy of the Labor Board, I quote a part of it. The Chairman said:

"I feel I can say with propriety that all my colleagues are men of the highest integrity.

"Decisions by all courts and quasi-judicial agencies necessarily reflect to a degree the economic and political views of the members.

"Therefore some changes constantly take place in the interpretation of the law, not inconsistent with the statutory scheme of continuous changes in the personnel comprising the tribunal. But there is no merit whatever to the charge that any member or group of members of the Board, within my experience, ever set out to pervert the congressional intent as expressed in the statute."

The speech of the Senator and the letter of the Board Chairman are not of recent vintage. The Senator was criticizing the so-called Eisenhower Board in a speech delivered in 1956, and I was that Chairman who sent the answering letter to Capitol Hill. This answer is as valid today as it was then, though the criticism comes from the opposite side.

Current charges of distortion of the act remind us that history does repeat itself.

I have had no other purpose today than to give you a full, fair, rounded picture of the present Labor Board. Thus I may help build a bridge of better understanding between two contending forces—friendly enemies, so to speak, labor and management—whose ultimate goals are as much alike as two peas in a pod. And this I regard as a worthwhile purpose. For, as was said in another edict, issued some 2,000 years before Landrum-Griffin and Taft-Hartley and the Wagner Act: "True justice is the harvest reaped by peacemakers from seeds sown in the spirit of peace."

I do not like the fact that changes in the interpretation of our act take place with each change in national politics. There are those, however, who think that change is a normal corollary of change in administrations, neither undesirable nor essentially different from other change that takes place when our Government passes from one party to the other. But, assuming there is a condition that needs a remedy, the medicine prescribed should cure rather than kill the patient. Therefore I oppose the radical suggestion that the Board's jurisdiction over unfair labor practices be transferred to the courts. One remedy might be to lengthen Board members' terms so they would span the normal expectancy of any President's tenure. Thus the reflection of the national administration in Board decisions might be dimmed.

Meanwhile, criticism of the NLRB that is wholly unreasonable, or that is motivated by self-interest, can only be destructive. In these difficult days, the troubled area of industrial relations needs help from men of wisdom and good intentions who are truly dedicated to the welfare of America.

President Johnson: A Strong Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the strong, throughtful, courageous beginning made by President Johnson, combined with the need for prompt congressional action on many priority measures has been well stated in the New York Times editorial of November 29.

As the Times so correctly points out:

The strength and self-confidence President Johnson has exhibited in this first grim days in office have helped to ease the paralysis that seemed to freeze the world after President Kennedy's assassination.

And the Times goes on to make the important observation that—

The momentum of his first week must not be allowed to turn into deadlock and delay on measures that have already been studied to death.

Mr. Speaker, President Johnson deserves the gratitude of all Americans and the support of Congress.

A STRONG START

The strength and self-confidence President Johnson has exhibited in his first grim days in office have helped to ease the paralysis that seemed to freeze the world after President Kennedy's assassination. His performance lent added solemnity to his Thanksgiving promise last night that he would strive for "a new American greatness, a new day when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind."

Through his talks with world statesmen come to mourn his slain predecessor, his statements and his initial address to Congress, he has won applause in all parts of the free world and cautious approval even in Moscow. A measure of the uncertainty that originally existed on both sides of the Iron Curtain has been wiped away by the vigor of his pledges of uninterrupted forward movement in the fulfillment of our commitments for the defense of freedom and the pursuit of peace.

Congress responded in cordial fashion to the first message from its old friend and former leader, but Mr. Johnson is too experienced in the ways of Congress to mistake the warmth of his reception for an assurance that the long stalemate on Capitol Hill is about to end. However, at least one of his urgent calls has already had an affirmative response—his plea for preserving executive flexibility in foreign affairs.

Proposed restrictions on the sale of wheat to Soviet Russia have been rejected—restrictions that both President Kennedy and President Johnson opposed as infringing on executive prerogative. Shackles put on executive authority in the foreign aid bills also have been removed. The President may now continue to aid Communist-ruled countries at his discretion if he deems this vital to the security of the United States and the independence of the recipient countries, in particular Poland and Yugoslavia. But many restrictions remain to hamper our policy in dealing with Argentina, which has annulled American oil contracts, with Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, and especially with Cuba.

Securing adequate appropriations for foreign aid remains a formidable task in the coming days. So does the need for speedy action on civil rights, taxes, and other priority issues. The best that seems to be in store for this session is a House vote on the civil rights bill. Turning his ideas into effective action is the challenge that faces President Johnson. The momentum of his first week must not be allowed to turn into deadlock and delay on measures that have already been studied to death.

New Concert Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recent developments in the musical world indicate important changes in the pattern of concerts and audiences in New York and throughout the country. There have been important increases in the size of audiences, and significantly in the number of colleges and universities which are interested in sponsoring concerts. This is one symptom of the cultural ferment that is evident throughout the country, and it emphasizes the urgency for Federal action along the lines of a National Arts Foundation such as I have proposed in my bill. It also stresses the need for the Advisory Council on the Arts which the late President Kennedy initiated and which I hope very much President Johnson will now appoint.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the analysis by Theodore Strongin entitled "New Concert Era Is Dawning," which appeared in the New York Times of November 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CONCERT ERA IS DAWNING—AUDIENCES DRAWN BY MUSIC ITSELF MORE THAN BIG NAMES

(By Theodore Strongin)

The New York concert scene, until recently arranged according to well-established traditions, is in the midst of change. The resulting ferment, already apparent in New York, is beginning to be felt all over the country.

These are the major changes shaping up:

The virtuoso recital, centered exclusively on the star performer, is on the decline, along with solo recitals of any sort.

A new breed of young concert manager is beginning to merchandise music in a new way, based on program content rather than big names.

The concert repertory is being enriched with music of chronological periods and combinations of instruments that were not formerly heard on standard programs.

The specialized program (all-Bach, for instance) is becoming more common and, if anything, more specialized (such as all-Bradenburg concertos of Bach).

With two major concert halls now open in New York (Philharmonic and Carnegie), a larger audience has been tapped than most managers thought existed.

The era is drawing to a close in which artists on tour played down to audiences.

There has been an important increase in the number of colleges and universities engaged in the concert business as buyers of talent for annual series. There has been an equally important increase in the effect of colleges and universities on the general audience and the music it wants to hear.

Foundations, a new element on the scene, are still very much a question mark but definitely to be watched. The same goes for Government support, including State arts councils and the like.

SOME PROBLEMS REMAIN

Meanwhile, no change at all has appeared in New York or elsewhere in the difficulty

a young artist experiences in building a career—and in the problem a medium-established artist has in gaining financial security.

"Personality worship is on the decline," says Claude Frank, a pianist who often plays with major orchestras and who is now touring for Columbia Artist Management's Community Concerts.

"In general it's hard to sell a solo artist today," says Humphrey Doulens, a Columbia executive who has been selling solo artists for many years.

"It's a relatively exciting development, getting away from selling only artists' names," says Herbert Breslin, who operates at the publicity end of the concert business. "The solo man is defeated today," says Norman Seaman, a new-generation impresario who in recent years has presented more new artists in recital than anyone else has.

Jay Hoffman, another new-breed impresario (and a manager of solo artists, too), says, it's simple to say 'Buy Rubinstein' or 'Buy Isaac Stern,' but recordings have changed our habits."

"Traditionally, all programs used to be in chronological order—a Bach sonata, some Mozart, some Chopin, some Debussy—for no reason except habit," says George Schutz, Mr. Hoffman's partner. "We sought the record buyer. He listens to all the Brandenburgs or to six Corelli sonatas all in a row," Mr. Schutz says.

Herbert Barrett, head of a management firm that specializes in solo artists, also feels that audiences are changing and are more sympathetic to the music itself. "The whole scene is tremendously different," affirms William Judd, another Columbia executive. "I wouldn't have believed that an all-Vivaldi concert could go big in Clarksville, Tenn., but they take it and love it."

FRINGE AUDIENCE IS SEEN

However, Arthur Judson, a giant of the traditional concert management world who recently resigned from Columbia Artists says, "A fringe audience, not a steady one, goes to the specialized concerts."

Julius Bloom, executive director of Carnegie Hall, agrees with Mr. Judson that a fringe audience, an audience of occasional concert goers, attends the specialized attractions. But Mr. Bloom feels that the occasional audience will become a regular one if attractive series are offered to it. It is now excluded from sold-out subscriptions series, such as those of the Philharmonic.

"American audiences in general have grown up," says Gerald Devlin, in charge of setting up programs for Community Concerts. "They are more sophisticated—and not just in the metropolitan centers. I attribute this to the recording industry. All over the country, they take a large dollop of what formerly was thought recondite."

But Mr. Seaman feels that some of the specialized approach toward concert merchandising is merely gimmickry. "Bach is a gimmick now," Mr. Seaman says.

"There are only five or six young artists who can sell out by name, without gimmicks," says Frank Solomon, head of the New School Concerts and press representative for Rudolf Serkin's Marlboro Music School and Festival. In the latter capacity, especially, Mr. Solomon is familiar with the woes of the cream of the medium-established and younger artist crop that flocks to Mr. Serkin's virtual Utopia in Vermont each summer. "New York hasn't changed," says Mr. Solomon. "The city is still just as difficult for the middle-ground name to make out in."

OPPORTUNITIES IN EUROPE

Sylvia Rosenberg, violinist, who once was managed by Mr. Judson and toured for Community Concerts, now finds her greatest artistic opportunities in her European engagements. Many other American musicians have found Europe a more fertile field than their own country.

When in New York, Miss Rosenberg makes ends meet by freelancing. There is a network of chamber music and other nonsolo events that the best violinists, cellists, and so on penetrate. The living is marginal and it is not fully gratifying. The future, though real, is unknown and unsteady. But freelancing at such events is a common way for the committed solo artist to stay in the business.

"It's a tragedy unless something is done to make more concerts," says Mr. Seaman.

Marks Levine, like Mr. Judson, a giant of traditional management days, divides the history of musical merchandising into a set of continuing revolutions. The latest is the tremendous growth of activity by educational institutions that give concert series for their students.

Mr. Bloom, in addition to his Carnegie Hall duties, is president of a large national association of college concert managers.

He agrees that the collegian and the college graduate are accounting for an ever-increasing percentage of the concert dollar.

"But we cannot explain today's ferment without considering another factor," he says. "Most colleges are not urban. They are towns in the center of an area. They are becoming central community resources with a radius of influence extending 15 to 75 miles. This is a challenge.

ADJUSTMENTS ANTICIPATED

"And in New York, too, there is a tremendous challenge. We need more concerts. It would mean adjustments whereby we change the cliche thinking about showcases. It means series. And it means series around an idea, not a name.

"For the first time there are two prime-grade large concert halls in New York City. For the first time in many years we can experiment with virtually doubling the big audiences."

Mr. Doulens, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Devlin, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Frank—and others not quoted here—underline Mr. Bloom's judgment about the importance in depth of colleges and universities on the concert scene. Colleges and universities have improved their music departments. With the help of recordings and, in more and more cases, with performing artists on the staff, they are creating a more knowledgeable and sophisticated general concert audience.

Through exposure, many members of the general audience are discovering their own special talents and studying music.

This is the challenge to today's concert manager: to create a framework in his industry that will care for the needs of both groups, that will bring increasing numbers of worthy performers to bigger and better audiences. In meeting the challenge, today's manager is already changing the traditional concert scene.

Foundation help and Government subsidies on many levels, including State arts councils are being discussed warily, disgustedly, or enthusiastically by managers, who wouldn't mind having their financial problems solved for them.

But so far it's mainly a question of merchandising: How to get the finished materials (the artists) to the consumer (the audience) in the most efficient way possible, under a free enterprise system.

The Good People of Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, leading newspapers across the Nation are continuing to stand up, speak out, and defend the good name of people of Dallas. We all regret the sad, tragic event that occurred there on November 22, but certainly the fine folks of Dallas should not be blamed for the actions of the irate, irresponsible Marxist and self-styled Communist who shot our President. In answer to some of the unfair accusations that have been leveled at the good folks of Dallas, I include two excellent editorials from separate sections of the country—the El Paso Times, El Paso, Tex., and the Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Ill.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE GOOD PEOPLE OF DALLAS

The city of Dallas has suffered much unjustified criticism in the last few days because of the accident that two madmen found their chance to strike there. The first was the assassin who struck down President Kennedy. The second was the disoriented busybody who took upon himself the function of judge, jury, and executioner in dealing with the man accused of killing Mr. Kennedy.

Maniacs can turn up anywhere. Despite all of the intensive security precautions of the secret service and the Dallas police, it was impossible to insure the President total protection from a deadly marksman hidden high above street level.

The Dallas police are now being subjected to equally unjust censure for failing to move the accused assassin safely from the city jail to the county jail. Despite the presence of 60 policemen and deputy sheriffs, a self-appointed avenger of the President pulled a gun and cut down the prisoner as he was being led through the city jail.

After the killing, blame was heaped upon the police chief, who had been working on the assassination for many hours without sleep, and had set the time of the prisoner's removal after many reporters had petitioned him to fix a time so that they would not be obliged to keep an all-night watch. Because of his willingness to accommodate, the chief gave up the chance to move the prisoner safely in secret.

Yet the performance of the police was of a high order until then. Very shortly after Mr. Kennedy's death, the suspect was in custody, and the police sacrificed one of their own men in apprehending him. The evidence against the man was gathered thoroughly and appeared overwhelming.

Dallas is a great city and its law-abiding people undoubtedly abhor the violence of recent days as much as Americans anywhere. It would be shameful if the good name of the city were stained by events which could not have been foreseen and hence controlled.

ALLEGED ASSASSIN WAS A MARXIST

(By W. J. Hooten)

The American people have gone through an extremely trying week, with the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the attempted assassination of Texas Gov. John Connally, and the swearing in of a new President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

It is accepted, of course, that the real sufferers, the ones directly affected, are the members of the Kennedy family. But many citizens of this great country wept openly and unashamedly.

It was the first time a President had been assassinated in the lifetime of most of us now living. I was just a year old when President McKinley was gunned down in Buffalo, N.Y.

But many of us recall the death of President Warren G. Harding and the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

On all of those occasions, it meant the quick transfer of the Presidency to the Vice President.

Our Government continued without interruption.

Anyone who stops to thing for a moment will see at once what that means. It is one of the greatest and most significant provisions of our Constitution.

Let no one ever try to change it.

OSWALD WAS A RED

I am still trying to understand why some writers, including Drew Pearson, and one or two clergymen, are trying to blame the city of Dallas for the assassination of President Kennedy.

If I have read and heard correctly, the alleged killer of President Kennedy was Lee Harvey Oswald, a Marxist and self-styled Communist who had tried to defect to Soviet Russia and who married a Russian woman.

I am not in the least impressed with any suggestions that Oswald was swayed by the fact that Dallas is a hotbed of conservatism and that the Dallas News carried a political advertisement critical of the President the morning he arrived in Dallas to meet his death.

In his Friday column, Drew Pearson, after quoting from the speech President Kennedy had prepared for delivery in Dallas, wrote:

"Dallas' answer, even before that speech was delivered, was to shoot John Kennedy."

That was most unfair, and I intend to send this to Drew Pearson.

I still insist that the good people of Dallas, who are far in the majority, were just as upset as the rest of us at the assassination of President Kennedy. Some of them were more upset because it occurred in their city.

And I wish to repeat that the alleged assassin was a Marxist, a self-styled Communist who did not like anything about the U.S. system, or said he didn't. He happened to be living in Dallas He was not even born there.

His killer, Jack Rubenstein, alias Ruby, was a product of Chicago.

I have an idea we have not heard the last of that—not by a long way.

"The Deed Has Been Done—There Is, However, Something That We Can Do"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following personal statement on the President's assassination by my good friend, Fred W. Newman, of Malverne, N.Y.:

MALVERNE, N.Y.,
December 1963.

To My Friends:

Whatever your politics, you must surely be with me in my feeling of sorrow that any American citizen could so forget the meaning of democracy that he would use brutal violence as a substitute for the ballot box.

John F. Kennedy would not have been assassinated if he had lost the last presidential election.

The deed has been done. Our minds and hearts are with the Kennedy family in their time of sorrow, but there is nothing that we can do now for him or for them.

There is, however, something that we can do for ourselves, for our children, and for the future of our country and the world. Let us resolve that partial democracy in our land is not enough. Let us all agree that if we want liberty, we must accept responsibility; if we want freedom of speech, we must consider the consequences of what we say; if we want self-determination, we must practice self-control; and if we want the vote, we must accept its verdict. Let us practice democracy and let us teach it as well.

And, last, let us support Mr. Johnson, not only because he is the President, but also because he is a Texan. We must make Dallas and Texas secure in the knowledge that we hold them blameless. What happened in Dallas could have happened in your town—or mine. Let us do our best to see that it never does.

FRED W. NEWMAN.

Connecticut Rabbi Commemorates the 100th Anniversary of the Capitol's Completion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was 100 years ago in the midst of the Civil War that on high noon, December 2, 1863, the National Capitol was completed. The triumphant raising of Armed Liberty to her lofty spot above the dome was accomplished by a significant bit of power display. As the head piece slid into place at high noon, the American flag was unfurled, a 35-gun salute boomed out from the Grounds, and in turn an iron-throated answer was roared by cannon from 12 of the forts then encircling Washington.

Exactly at 12 noon on Monday, December 2, standing in the rotunda, Rabbi Saul Israel Wisemon, of the Beth El Synagogue, Torrington, Conn., offered a prayer of meditation to commemorate this historic event. He then went to the Prayer Room, directly off the rotunda, to once again offer this prayer.

Rabbi Wisemon, long a student of American history said:

There is no other symbol that signifies to the Nation and the world—the idea and ideals of American democracy as does the Capitol.

It was also the first time that the 3,500-year-old Priestly Benediction had been recited in the original Hebrew in the rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I include at this point the text of the prayer of meditation which was offered by Rabbi Wisemon:

Our Father who art in heaven, we pray that Thou wilt bless this Nation and these men, chosen by the people of this Nation, for Thou knowest them, their needs, their motives, their hopes, their fears. Help them in their offices, in committees, and above all as they meet here in legislative session.

Our Father, Thou alone knowest the difficulties these men must face and the grave decisions they must make.

We pray for the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and all who minister to the needs of the people, the representatives of the people, and all those in authority, that it may please Thee so to rule their hearts that they may rightly use the trust committed to them for the good of all people. Voice through these men, we pray Thee, O Lord, that what they say and what they do may be in accordance with Thy will, for this land that we love so much.

May we remember that it takes time to build the Nation that can truly be called God's own country. It takes time to work out the kind of peace that will endure. It takes time to find out what we should do, what is right and what is best.

Experienced though we be in the ways of men, we know all too little of the ways of God. But Thou knowest us by name and deeds, each and every one of us.

Amid all the pressures brought upon them, may they ever hear Thy still small voice and follow Thy guidance for the good of all the people.

O Lord, teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom. Time is short, no one knowing how much or little time he has left. Help us to use it wisely. Give us the faith to believe that there is no problem before us that Thy wisdom cannot solve. As Thou hast guided men and the destiny of this Nation and the world from this sacred place, so, we pray Thee, guide these men today.

We pray for all the people of our country, that they may learn to appreciate more the goodly heritage that is ours. We need to learn in these challenging days that to every right is attached a duty, to every privilege an obligation.

Make us aware, O Lord, of the record that Thou art writing, the record that one day will be read by the King of Kings.

Teach us, O Lord, the disciplines of patience, for we find that to wait is often harder than to work. We ask Thee not for tasks more suited to our strength, but for strength more suited to our tasks. Help us to work with Thee that it may be a good century to come with good things done. We know that a different world cannot be built by indifferent people. Help us to see that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail. Guide us how to work. Since we cannot always do what we like, grant that we may like what we must do, knowing that truth will prevail.

As we pause to commemorate the centennial of our Capitol's completion, we continue to ask for Thy guidance. As Thou hast been with this Nation from the first, and since this bastion of liberty and light to the world was completed, we implore Thee be with us yet, be with us yet, in the hours and years of crises ahead, in the times that try men's souls.

For here, O Lord, in this hallowed sanctuary of liberty, we have enshrined forever in our hearts all our immortal heroes, all our immortal ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for the Nation and all mankind, for which they gave their last full measure of devotion.

From this sacred place the Nation and the world have paid their final tribute and homage to our immortals. Since thy completion, four martyred Presidents have rested beneath the shelter of thy dome. From the immortal Abraham Lincoln, Abraham who truly the "father and preserver of our great Nation," to the tragic and untimely passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who, 1 week ago today, received homage from the world at this thy sanctuary. John meaneth "the Lord has graced or given." We thank Thee for the gift of life and leadership of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, for we feel that he was, as his name implies. Of John Fitzgerald Kennedy it can truly be said that not only did he grace the leadership of the people of these United States, but indeed he graced the leadership of the entire world.

Be, we pray Thee, with Thy servants President Lyndon B. Johnson, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, and to all who minister to our needs, upon whom the mantle of leadership has fallen. Guide them, we pray Thee through Thine own good counsel, that their will be Thy will, O Lord.

For futile will have been their sacrifice, if we do not resolve to live and if need be die, to bring to fruition, that for which our immortals have made the supreme sacrifice. We earnestly pray that the time not be distant, O Lord, when these hallowed words will find fulfillment.

"America, America, God shed His grace on Thee
And crown Thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

Grant, we pray Thee, that to all people You give Your benediction.

"The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord deal kindly and graciously with you, the Lord bestow his favor upon you and grant you peace."

New President Stresses Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have pledged my wholehearted support to President Lyndon B. Johnson in his efforts to enact the legislative program that we have been trying to obtain approval on throughout this session of the 88th Congress.

An editorial in the Washington Evening Star yesterday, Thursday, November 28, 1963, was particularly perceptive in its analysis of President Johnson's recent address to the Congress, and I would recommend the reading of this item to all who have not already done so:

A CALL TO CARRY ON

Lyndon Baines Johnson may not be the greatest orator in the world. He would make no such claim for himself. But the new President, in his first address to Congress, said many things that needed to be said. And he said them with force and conviction.

The basic theme was a dedication to the "ideas and the ideals" which John F. Kennedy "so nobly represented." These ideas and ideals, said the new President, "must and will be translated into effective action."

Beyond this domestic pledge, there was a firm commitment which should be heeded in every quarter of the world. We will maintain our strength and stand by our allies. We also recognize "the obligation to match national strength with national restraint." But no one should misunderstand. This Nation, while striving for peace, "will keep its commitments from South Vietnam to West Berlin."

There were other commitments. Of his administration, the President said: "We will serve all of the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans." A generality, to be sure. But perhaps it will help to "put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." There were also specific commitments. One was the unqualified pledge to support the United Nations. There was the promise to strive for enactment of a civil rights bill. There was the urgent appeal in behalf of and a promise to work for passage of a tax bill. This was followed by the assurance that "the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality." Then came the enumeration of and an appeal for a long list of projects which have been slumbering quietly in assorted pigeonholes on Capitol Hill.

It simply is not in the cards that this Congress will translate all of these proposals into law. Mr. Johnson knows this. But before another summer rolls around the key ones, we believe, will be on the statute books.

The new President is no Churchill. But he has a real talent for getting things done. He proved this beyond dispute when he was majority leader of the Senate. And this is as good a time as any to recall the words that used to be passed around in the Senate cloakrooms: "What Lyndon wants, Lyndon gets."

What America Means to Her

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a young lady in my congressional district has distinguished herself through the words of a prize-winning essay in which she describes "What America Means to Me." It is usual, but certainly not the rule, for young people to place most value on temporal or transitory pleasures, taking for granted with only casual recognition the fundamental components of a free society and overlooking natural beauty and the spiritual valuation of just being an American.

Miss Susan Farrar, of Jefferson City, Mo., a 14-year-old student at the Simonsen Junior High School has written a very expressive composition for participation in activities of "Know Your America Week," in which her love of America and her patriotic spirit are portrayed and well described. The literary composition won Miss Farrar first place in a citywide contest and a $25 savings bond. I congratulate this young patriot and commend her essay to all American youth.

I am sure all young people in America have conscious perception and awareness of the natural beauty of America, of the vast metropolitan areas, the American freedoms of which they hear so much about today, and of the threat of communism which overshadows the world, but Miss Farrar in an unadorned and a very express manner relays her personal gratification for just being an American. Her essay follows:

To me America is the most wonderful place in the world. Maybe that opinion is a little one-sided, considering I've lived here all my life, but I still think it's wonderful.

In America you can see almost anything you want. There are huge cities, mountains, plenty of wide open spaces, large forests, rivers, lakes, animals of all kinds, and most of all, there are millions of different people.

In many cities there is a touch of another part of the world. In San Francisco there is Chinatown and in New York there is the United Nations, which has a part of every country.

Some towns in the United States are the same as they were hundreds of years ago. These ghost towns are now museums in themselves.

In general these features each represent a different place to visit. A person could probably spend years just roaming around, visiting each of these different places.

The thing about America that I like the most is our freedom. Men of years gone by gave up their lives to maintain this precious idea that had been in their minds for centuries. Americans have had to fight many times for this freedom, I guess, that is why it means so much to everybody.

Right now we have some people from another country who are trying to take away our freedom. These people have been threatening us for sometime now, but I have a tremendous amount of faith in our Government and I think they will pull us through these troubled times with the same ability that they have before.

I truly feel that I am now living in the most wonderful nation in the world.

I love America.

An Argument for Seniority System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission, I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial from a daily paper published in my district, the Durham Morning Herald, which pays a glowing tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON, and which also points out the value of the seniority system which prevails in the Congress, which is too often unfairly assailed and criticized.

It is a pleasure to insert this editorial, not only as an expression of my high regard for Congressman VINSON but also for the reason that my distinguished predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable Carl T. Durham, was a longtime associate, close friend, and fellow committee member of Mr. VINSON. It was back in 1953, when I visited Washington, that Mr. Durham introduced me to Mr. VINSON—long before I had any thought of being privileged to succeed Mr. Durham in the House of Representatives and to become a colleague of Congressman VINSON. The editorial follows:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Dec. 2, 1963]

AN ARGUMENT FOR SENIORITY SYSTEM

When a person these days says he remembers when CARL VINSON of Georgia was not in Congress, he admits to being elderly or quite close to it. For the Georgia veteran has already served 49 years in the House—to break the record for length of membership, having taken his seat November 14, 1914, filling an unexpired term.

And if a person tells you he can remember when CARL VINSON was not chairman (or ranking Democrat) on a major defense committee and isn't gray haired or getting gray, it's a fairly safe bet the hair he has left is artifically colored. For when the Democrats took over control of Congress in December 1931, following the November 1930, elections (those were the days of the lame-

duck), Representative VINSON took over the chairmanship of the old Naval Affairs Committee.

Following the consolidation of the War and Navy Departments into the Department of Defense in 1947, the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of Senate and House were consolidated into Armed Services Committees, and Representative VINSON became chairman of the House committee. With the exception of the 80th and 83d Congresses (1947–49, 1953–55), when the Republicans were in control, Mr. VINSON has been chairman of a major defense committee for 32 years.

Consequently announcement of Representative VINSON's decision not to seek reelection next year means the severing of a link which connects the present with a long past.

Mr. VINSON's record is a strong argument for the seniority system in Congress. While length of service put him in the chairman's seat 32 years ago and has kept him there, he has not rested on seniority. No Congressman has done his homework more diligently than CARL VINSON, and no committee chairman has a more intimate knowledge of the governmental agency and service under his committee's oversight than he.

CARL VINSON deserves the Nation's praise and thanks for the integrity with which he approaches the conduct of the Nation's business. He can be depended upon to take the broad view of the Nation's best interests. His impending retirement is to be regretted.

A Hundred-Billion Budget for Fiscal Year 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed beyond words when I read in the Washington Post this morning that President Johnson is expected to send a budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1965 of over $100 billion and that the President plans a deficit for fiscal year 1965 of $8½ billion, and at a time when our Federal debt is crowding $310 billion, or $7,000 for each American family, on an average, or their children or their grandchildren to pay, somehow, some way, some day or else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, and as one who has never played politics with any issue which affects the lives and pocketbooks of all our people, I recently had high hopes for a balanced budget in fiscal year 1965, which begins July 1 next, but irrespective of the newspaper report above mentioned, I shall, along with the economy minded Members of our committee and of Congress, work constantly and I hope effectively for a balanced budget for fiscal year 1965 and for every year thereafter. To be worthy of our place we can, we will, we must do no less, and without partisan politics, fear, or favor.

Mr. Speaker, that is my pledge to the American people, and I am quite certain I speak for all the conservative Members of Congress, as well as a great majority of our already overburdened American taxpayers.

Never Mind the Grief—We Want Paid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while most of the country experienced shock and grief over the assassination of President Kennedy, one New York local union seems more concerned at the prospects of recouping for the pay they will lose as a result of Broadway theaters closing on November 22 and 25. Maybe with the experience of this unprecedented black day in history under their belts, the Theatrical Protective Union, Local 1, can make a provision in future contracts to assure their pay in case of a A-bomb attack, assassination of the President or any similar contingency.

The following article appeared on page 56 of the New York Times of December 4. It makes rather disgusting reading, to put it mildly.

The article follows:

BROADWAY FACES NEW PAY DISPUTE—DEBATES WAGES FOR WORKERS IDLED BY KENNEDY DEATH

(By Sam Zolotow)

Theatrical Protective Union, Local 1, known as the stagehands' union, is trying to solve a problem—whether department heads (electricians, carpenters, and propertymen should be paid for the two performances that were canceled in the Broadway theaters November 22 and 25 because of the murder of President Kennedy.

If department heads are paid, other theatrical unions will insist on payment. They include actors, musicians, treasurers, press agents, company and house managers, porters, cleaners, ushers, ticket takers, and engineers.

Replying to the criticism leveled by the trade at local, Frank DeVerna, president of the union, said yesterday:

"Our only position is that we do not have a legal right to waive or surrender as union officers, wages due or owing to our members under a collective bargaining agreement with the League of New York Theaters, representing producers, theater owners, and operators."

Mr. DeVerna expects to meet soon with league representatives and the Shuberts, who control 17 of Broadway's 31 playhouses. He added that full salaries were paid by the film houses that were dark from 5 p.m., on November 22 and all day on November 25.

A special meeting of the league's board of governors has been called for 11 a.m. today at 137 West 48th Street. One of the items on the agenda is the stagehands' situation.

Resentment against the stand taken by the stagehands' union was privately expressed by many producers. The only one who would comment publicly was Alfred de Liagre Jr., producer of "The Irregular Verb To Love," starring Claudette Colbert and Cyril Ritchard.

He said:

"I find that the behavior of the stagehands' union is the most shocking and disgusting in the history of organized labor in this country. I am really outraged by it."

Department heads are under contract and are paid on a weekly basis. Other backstage employees, who are members of the stagehands' union, do not receive a weekly salary. They are paid for each performance they work.

Producers and theater owners acknowledged there was no protective clause in the agreement with local 1, whereby pay could be waived in the event of a national emergency or act of God. Booking contracts between theater owners and producers carry such a precautionary clause, absolving the theater from damages.

President's Health Is Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an Associated Press article from the Washington Evening Star of November 28, quoting Dr. George W. Calver, official physician to Members of Congress, concerning the health of President Johnson.

The article follows:

DOCTOR GIVES JOHNSON A CLEAN BILL OF HEALTH

"You can give Lyndon Johnson a clean bill of health * * * his heart is in excellent condition," says Dr. George W. Calver, official physician to Members of Congress.

Dr. Calver said he gave Mr. Johnson a "complete and thorough" physical examination within the last 6 or 8 weeks—including an electrocardiograph test of the heart which underwent a coronary attack in 1955.

The then Vice President was found to be in "excellent shape," the physician said in a telephone interview. He is in Florida.

"I'd bet that Lyndon Johnson is as good a health risk as anyone you could get hold of considering his age and everything," Dr. Calver said. "And by 'everything' I mean the stress that the man has been subjected to.

"I wouldn't want to have to carry it."

DOUBTS ADVERSE EFFECT

By stress Dr. Calver referred to Mr. Johnson's 32 years in Congress, many of them as a key Member, and to his nearly 3 years as Vice President.

Asked whether the strain of the last several days may have had an adverse effect on Mr. Johnson's health, the physician quickly answered: "I doubt it."

"He doesn't worry about himself," Dr. Calver declared. "He carries on * * * and he does a very good job."

The physician declared this "hygiene of a quiet mind," as Mr. Johnson calls it, is "something you people who think you have hypertension (high blood pressure) should learn how to have."

Dr. Calver said Mr. Johnson has three or four physicians in various parts of the country, including one at the Mayo Clinic, one at the Naval Hospital in Bethesda, and one in Texas.

INDORSES THE PROP

"It's well for a man who chases around much as Lyndon Johnson to have some prop to lean on wherever he goes," Dr. Calver said.

The congressional physician said electrocardiograph tests—which record the electrical output of heart muscle and therefore offer a means of gaging any adverse changes that may have occurred since a previous test—are given to all Members of Congress who have had coronary attacks.

Asked if Mr. Johnson was being treated with any anticoagulant drug—a medicine given to many people who have had heart attacks with the thought of possibly preventing another attack—Dr. Calver said "not that I know of * * * and I should know."

Dr. Calver said he personally does not favor the use of anticoagulant drugs for such a purpose.

On the Death of John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, each of us has responded in his own way to the shocking event of November 22. One of my constituents in the city of La Mesa, Calif., sent me some especially moving poetry which seeks to suggest the magnitude of our loss in the death of President Kennedy.

Author of the following lines is Mrs. Linda Hurley, of 6155 Dalhart Street, La Mesa, Calif.:

ON THE DEATH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Out of west Texas
The Texas of Neiman-Marcus
Of oil wells and limousines
And barons without castles
And long-horned critters
Came the thunderbolt—the silver sliver
In the November noonday
The bullet that felled
The man who was humanity
To a city called Berlin
And a city called Saigon
And a score of other cities
In every latitude and longitude
Of every magnitude and multitude.
And humanity wept
The children wept
And the bankers wept
And the statesmen wept
Rivers of tears,
To wash away
The blood the bullet brought
The bullet in the brain of the man whose name was Hope.
Weep not for him, but weep for me
And for all the funny letter-words like NATO, SEATO, and U.N.,
And for the black-skinned people
And the white-skinned people
And the slant-eyed people
For the people of the cross and
The people of the star with six points.
Wrap the coffin in the red, white, and blue flag
That was his banner.
Let this be his shroud
Sound the salute not with cannon
Sound it instead with his own ringing words
For his words were hope
And his way was truth
And his manner was bold and his gift was manifold.
It did not belong to him—
The life the madman took.
It belonged, in part, to me
For I am an American
And he was my President.
He was not the President of the man who killed him for he was no real American—
Just some sick, sad, soul,
Some self-appointed Judas
With a mind incompetent
To comprehend
Even the ugly theory he embraces
And should he die a million deaths
And each with endless agony
He could not repay the loss
Nor could he heal the wound.
Oh, what is justice now.
The only justice is the future
And the burden we all bear
To mold our world as
Would the man we mourn.
So let us do our mourning
As we build
Our moaning as we plan
Our monument of living, acting faith
To this man who left his mark
Upon our land.
You cannot bury a soul
You cannot murder an ideal.
You cannot assassinate man's will to be free.
You cannot kill us all.
I love my bleeding
Nation even more.
In mourning there is solidarity
In dedication there is
Resolute strength
To mold the future with
Integrity
For words remembered
Shout their living challenge
And death gives way to martyrdom.
The only vengeance for
This grievous hour
Is what our Nation is
And will become.

We'll Believe It When It Happens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are immediate practical doubts that the public raises concerning the validity of President Johnson's announced policy of control of Federal spending.

Public doubts are well expressed in an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

WE'LL BELIEVE IT WHEN IT HAPPENS

With a $10 billion deficit for the current fiscal year in the making, Lyndon Johnson has moved to put into practice his initial pledge as President that "thrift and frugality" are to govern Federal spending. He has ordered the Secretary of Defense and Budget Director to remove excess Federal employees and to keep "cost consciousness" in mind in military and civilian spending.

The looming deficit is a legacy from the Kennedy administration. Mr. Johnson will be presenting the first budget of his own making in January, covering the fiscal year which starts next July 1. When this budget is submitted, there will be some basis for judging the depth and effectiveness of the new President's desire to hobble the unlimited expansion of Government.

Mr. Johnson indicated yesterday that he would submit a budget $3 billion under that which Mr. Kennedy would have proposed. But, as no one has disclosed the total of the intended Kennedy budget, it is impossible at this point to say whether spending is to be reduced substantially from the deficit level of the present year.

Fiscal prudence and economy, as Mr. Johnson has pledged, are soothing terms, but the reality will become manifest only as they are translated into practice. To order officers of Government to cut payrolls and costs is one thing, as familiar experience not only in Washington but in Springfield and Chicago attests. To make such exhortations produce tangible gains in savings and in curbing inflation is something else, which we will be prepared to believe when it happens.

Msgr. William G. Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of our finest educators, in all phases of education, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. William G. Ryan, of Seton Hill College delivered a sermon on the 24th of November 1963 worthy of the attention of all men of good will.

The good Sister Serafina expressed it much better than I can when she said:

The thoughts expressed in these few pages have a very direct bearing on the formation of citizens devoted to God and country, who strive to make real the ideals to which America has dedicated itself. They come from a generous heart, the heart of a patriot, a Christian, and a priestly priest with love for all men, and with malice toward none. That is why I should like to make the content of this brief discourse available to as many readers as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully include the attached sermon by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. William G. Ryan, Ph. D., president of Seton Hill College, as a part of this day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SERMON DELIVERED BY RT. REV. MSGR. WILLIAM G. RYAN

The sadness which is according to God, leads to repentance.—II Corinthians, 7: 10.

One hundred years ago last Tuesday Abraham Lincoln delivered the Gettysburg Address. In less than 300 words he said what American freedom and equality meant to him and should mean to all Americans. A year and a half later an assassin's bullet made him a martyr to the cause to which he had dedicated himself. The whole world wept: but only death and history could define the meaning of Lincoln's life. Only the termination of an earthly life and the retrospect of history could show the moral grandeur of the things for which Lincoln lived and to which he dedicated himself without reservation.

Now we and our Nation and all men who love freedom are weeping for the death of another President. This President also died a victim of hatred—hatred aroused principally by his dedication to the cause of civil rights, in other words, the cause of equality and freedom. We do well to weep, as I shall say; but we will do better if we weep for the right reasons.

We cannot help feeling, for instance, that John Kennedy's work was only beginning, but upon reflection, I think this is confused thinking. A man's work in life must be viewed in two different ways. In one way, his work is his own salvation, and in another way it is his contribution to the world. For his salvation, God provides, and only God knows when this work is done. So Saint Peter writes: "The God of all grace, who called you into His eternal glory in Christ, will himself, after you have suffered a little, restore, establish, and strengthen you" (I Peter 5: 10).

And as for man's work in the world and for the world, he can only do his share—the whole work is never done. And one man's share in it—only God knows when that is done.

Think back to last June. Last June we were all shattered by the death of Pope John XXIII, and we all said: "If only he could have lived long enough to finish the work

he began." But now, less than 6 months later, we see that his part in the renewal of the church was to challenge all Catholics, to challenge all men of good will, leaving it to others—to his successors and to all Catholics and to all Christians—to take up the challenge and to carry forward the work.

And now John Kennedy—his death leaves the work unfinished—the work of making real, of giving legal, and social, and economic reality to the ideals of freedom and equality to which the Nation is dedicated. This work is not finished, but we must bow in faith before God's wisdom and believe that John Kennedy's share of the work was done. Like that other John—Pope John the Good—like Abraham Lincoln, John Kennedy challenged America, he challenged Americans, he challenged us, to be and to do what America is dedicated to being and doing.

This Nation was "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We, all of us, are still engaged in a great war, "testing whether this Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure." The war is between hatred and love, it is between fear and trust, it is between selfishness—a selfishness that by locking other people in their ghetto locks us into ours—and generosity, a generosity that makes all men our neighbors and our neighbors, friends.

This is the war, and the battlefield is first of all our own hearts. All of us, indeed every American since the introduction of slavery into this land, have been and are guilty before God, guilty to some degree of the hatred and fear and selfishness which do wrong—constant, unbearable wrong—to our Negro neighbors, and make their life a journey through shadows. And if this is the battlefield, we know that only we can win the war by acting against hatred and fear and selfishness.

On Friday, November 22, hatred struck a mortal blow, and we are grieved and horror-stricken. But we must acknowledge our own share of that hatred, our own prejudice, our failure to act against discrimination and segregation. And acknowledging our own guilt, we do well to weep; but we must in St. Paul's words (II Corinthians 7: 10) turn our sorrow to repentance, and work from this day forward to right these great wrongs.

I cannot tell you all the practical ways to do that, but I know, and I think you know now better than ever before, that this calls for action. We must first get rid of our own prejudices and hatreds. It would be easy now to hate the man who fired the shot, but this would be to make him the scapegoat and to pile on him the guilt of all of us. It would be easy (and I find myself tempted to do this) to hate the South—Mississippi and Alabama and Texas—and to blame the South for the things that have happened in the South; but I know and we all know that it is not just in the South—and I know I shall have to make a special and constant and prayerful effort not to have these feelings any longer.

And then we must join in action, in protest against the wrongs that we see—first of all, opening our eyes to them. There is the Catholic Interracial Council, and this is a worthwhile movement. There is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and this is a most worthy civic endeavor. I think that more of us should be concerned with such movements and join in acting with them. It may be that we should try not to patronize places that practice discrimination, but this may be a dangerous recommendation to make as a general rule. Surely, however, we must learn to be neighbors and to be Christians. We must welcome our neighbors and give them the sense of Christian fellowship which we owe them.

But whatever practical action we take, surely this is a day on which we should dedicate ourselves. Abraham Lincoln dedicated himself and he died for his cause. John Kennedy was a dedicated man. We no longer see the possible political motives of any of these earthly circumstances. He stands forth in the cleanness of his moral grandeur; and he stands beside Abraham Lincoln, which is surely glory enough for any American. Countless others have died in this same fight and for this same cause.

Now it is for us, the living, to be dedicated "to be dedicated to the unfinished work" * * * the unfinished work.

A Letter From Somalia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, among the memorials to the late President Kennedy perhaps none are more fitting than those living memorials that are the work of John F. Kennedy's own mind and heart. Among these is the brilliantly successful Peace Corps. The key to understanding this success lies with the people of the Peace Corps—from its inspired leadership to the most recent recruit. I have recently received a letter from one of the volunteers now serving in Somalia. The enthusiasm of Tom Ris is typical of the entire Corps, and I recommend it to my colleges. The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 12, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Since you were instrumental in helping me become a Peace Corps volunteer, through correspondence with Dan and Mabel Wolf, I thought you might be interested in the progress achieved by my Peace Corps project which completes its tour in the Somali Republic next spring. There are 30 of us here teaching English, math, and science in secondary and intermediate schools to students who will ultimately work for one of the various ministries in the Somali Government.

On arriving here in Somalia, our group of volunteers was warmly welcomed. However, neither the Somalis nor the volunteers knew exactly what to expect from the other. After some months of working together and becoming accustomed to each other, we developed an excellent working relationship. Of course, this is perhaps one of the great virtues of the Peace Corps which allows two diverse peoples to know one another firsthand in a legitimate working situation. Naturally, we had our ups and downs, disappointments, and I'm happy to report, triumphs. Although I feel the Somalis were at first a bit skeptical about the Peace Corps, as was the rest of the world, an excellent rapport now exists between us which makes our work and mission particularly useful and effective.

Now as our tour is ending, the Somali Government is terribly eager to have replacements for the volunteers returning home. This in itself is flattering, but more important, a healthy and practical way for the Somalis to solve some of their educational problems. However, there seems to be some reluctance in Washington toward the Somali request for replacement teachers. Peace Corps officials have agreed to send a few volunteers here next year, but not even the number originally sent out, and far less than is actually needed or requested by the Somali Government.

This seems puzzling to us here, as we read in Peace Corps literature about the 200 volunteers in neighboring Ethiopia, and the additional 200 being trained which will soon join them. In fact, this generally seems to be the pattern all over Africa, to replace returning volunteers and in most cases add additional numbers where they are needed or wanted.

All of us here would like to see the work we started carried on and backed by new and enthusiastic volunteers. Although we will never really see the fruits of our work, it would be satisfying to know that our efforts were being continued rather than dropped after 2 years of pioneering.

I would be very pleased, as would all of the volunteers in this project, if perhaps you and some of your colleagues would encourage the Peace Corps to consider sending additional volunteers to replace us. It will be easier leaving knowing that our work and efforts on behalf of the United States and the Somali Republic will not be lost. Anything you can do on our behalf will be greatly appreciated. Also, I can assure you that you'll have the unspoken, but nonetheless sincere thanks of our Somali students.

Sincerely,

THOMAS F. RIS,
Peace Corps Teacher, American Embassy, Mogadishu, Somali Republic, East Africa.

Elena Esposito Chapter, the American Parkinson Disease Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an address given by former Congressman Alfred E. Santangelo at Elena Esposito Chapter of the American Parkinson Disease Association, Staten Island, N.Y., on November 27, 1963.

SPEECH BY FORMER CONGRESSMAN ALFRED E. SANTANGELO AT ELENA ESPOSITO CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN PARKINSON DISEASE ASSOCIATION, STATEN ISLAND, NOVEMBER 27, 1963

Reverend Father Rizzo, Rabbi Cohen, Mr. Chairman, Professor Harter, Dr. Sutter, Mr. Esposito, Dr. Maestrone, Mr. Garbarino, Mr. Lindsay, my friend and colleague Congressman MURPHY, my former colleague in the State senate, Senators Marchi and District Attorney Braisted, Mrs. Hursh, and my friends whom I left on Staten Island when I emigrated to Manhattan 20 years ago, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I return Staten Island, the place where I grew up and whose memories are so near and so dear to me. I am once again at home. I thank my old friend Mr. Salvatore Esposito for the opportunity to speak to you about a subject and a disease which effects approximately 500,000 people in these United States, Parkinson disease.

A nation's heart is judged by the concern its government has for the sick, infirm and the aged. Primitive nations following the law of the jungle destroyed its weak, its sick, its infirm.

Today civilized nations pursue contradictory, courses of activity, one is directed towards destroying its physically and mentally

strong manhood through senseless wars and perhaps mankind itself with nuclear bombs and thermonuclear weapons, the other course is directed to perserving the lives and health of our afflicted, our sick, and our aged. While civilized nations despoil the air and contaminate our food with strontium 90, these same nations spend several billions of dollars in research to discover the nature, the causes and the cure of fatal and debilitating diseases in order to prolong the lives of the afflicted. Those who control our government recognize the folly of thermonuclear war, yet nevertheless appropriate over 50 billion dollars annually for military measures. They justify these expenditures in the name of defense and preparedness. They inwardly recognize the insanity of nuclear war and urge participation in a peace organization called the United Nations which had done and does yeoman work in preseving peace and preventing global war. Depite these steps toward annihilation and oblivion, our Nation does take measures to survive, and does take measures to care for the weak, the infirm, and the aged. It came to me as a shock to learn that in this country of ours, in the United States of America, that there are 10 million people who are neurologically disabled, that one-third of them are totally disabled and that 500,000 of them suffer from Parkinson disease.

The American taxpayer is a contradictory creature. He willingly pays billions of dollars for defense and for destruction but the American taxpayer when he pays his taxes begrudges the millions he is called upon to pay for nondefense programs. Notwithstanding the built-in contradictions, our Government does care, and its health measures, its legislation, and proposed programs demonstrate that it does care. Our Government provides a vast public health service, it recommends a medicare program for the aged through the social security, it has created National Institutes of Health, it has created a cabinet post of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

What a boon and a blessing it would be to health and mankind if we could transfer those billions of dollars we spend for warlike preparation and use them for nondefense purposes and for the purposes of research to find a cure for all the various diseases which affect mankind, such as blindness, cancer, deafness, epilepsy, heart disease, narcotic addiction, neurological disabilities such as cerebral palsy, muscular distrophy, multiple-sclerosis, Parkinsonism, and other neuromuscular disabilities.

While Government is doing much it is not enough. Help must be forthcoming from the individual person. Our Government does encourage private enterprise to initiate activities for research. It grants tax exemption to foundations which then can collect funds from the general public and can allocate these funds to institutions for research and a quest for a cure. Our Government makes direct grants to universities and institutions and pays a substantial percentage of administration costs. What has the sum total of our Government contribution been? In fiscal year 1963 our Federal Government provided $973 million for medical research, less than 1 percent of our annual Government expenditures. It provided 62 percent of all the moneys spent for medical research in our country. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness spent $2½ million in fiscal year 1963 on Parkinson disease. All this aid and assistance which the Federal Government provides has not and can not solve the health problems alone. What is needed to do the job is the sympathy and cooperation and contributions of the public. In fiscal year 1963 non-Federal expenditures for medical research totaled $577 million. People like you who believe in that commandment of the decalogue "love thy neighbor" bear the burden of being your brother's keeper.

Here gather tonight not the forces of the Democratic and Republican Parties or the forces of politics but the forces of humanity. Here gather those who want to do something about trembling palsy or Parkinsonism.

I commend you and your association for the humanitarian work in which you are engaged. Many of you who dedicate yourself did so because misfortune has struck you at one time or other or misfortune has overcome a loved one but whatever the reason, whatever the motivation, the important fact is that you are doing this work to help your fellowman doing God's Commandment and that you have dedicated yourselves to a noble and charitable cause.

Your president, Salvatore Esposito, has been my intimate friend for many years. During those years when cataracts cast a dark shadow across his path, he never lost faith and hope. His personal suffering added a little more to his generous character. He has been motivated by a philosophy which is summarized by an anonymous author who said "I shall pass this way but once, any good that I may do or any kindness that I may show let him not defer it or neglect it but let him do it now, for I shall not pass this way again."

When Salvatore Esposito asked me to speak on Parkinsonism, I did not know too much about the subject and I asked him for some literature on the subject which he provided. While I have seen one or two Parkinsonisms, I was not aware of the extent, the cause and the cure. I have been shocked and amazed as to the extent of this disease and the extent of neurological disabilities which exist in our country. The National Institutes of Health disclose that there are from 300,000 to 500,000 cases of Parkinsonism in the United States and that there are over 10 million people suffering from neurological disabilities which sap our Nation's strength. Each victim of this disability has a cross to carry, each family of the victim has an albatross around its neck. Each case is not only a statistic but heartache which affects the whole family and its entire mode of living.

What is Parkinsonism? It is defined in terms of symptoms. It is the involuntary tremulous motion, the rigidity of the body; the forward bend of the head and neck; the blank stare into space; the loss of associated movement; the glacial face which does not smile in a natural way; the walk which is unstable and unsure which makes the person run or trot in order to keep his balance. All this without loss of intellect. The tremors and rigidity often make it difficult for the victim to perform the simplest motions and often he cannot feed himself, turn over in bed or even manage his saliva.

For many years it has been known that the symptoms of Parkinsonism are a manifestation of injury or disease of certain portions of the brain and the nervous system. The focal point for the disturbance lies in the basal ganglia, the aggregation of nerve cells deep within the brain substance which regulate posture and probably many automatic and involuntary types of posturing activity.

What causes this injury or disability of the brain and nervous system? Some brochures claim that the cause is unknown. Recent discoveries in research in the United States of America indicate that these symptoms are caused by a chemical derangement of the nervous system. The discovery that certain tranquilizing agents can induce Parkinson's disease is also extremely important since it provides another clue to the susceptibility of basal ganglia to specific chemicals.

This is a great discovery and has been learned from the use and withdrawal of tranquilizing drugs. The Russians are working on the theory that a virus causes these symptoms. We in the United States are working on that theory in Maryland.

There is evidence of chronic epidemic encephalitis which is a unique form of Parkinsonism was characterized by injury to the basal ganglia followed the influenza epidemic of 1918. There is a possibility that virus may exist in an attenuated form and mild cases of encephalitis are being studied.

The most dramatic development of Parkinsonism is the surgical treatment of tremor. In certain selected instances of Parkinsonism, destruction of portions of the brain by newly developed surgical means will alleviate tremor.

We have seen that a person with Parkinsonism suffers from three different disabilities. They have rigidity, uncontrolled tremor, and loss of associated movement.

The surgical treatment can relieve the tremor but unfortunately it does not have very much effect on the loss of movement. It is a most important step, especially since it is rendering increasing knowledge of the basic mechanisms of this disease. Surgery usually involves application of oil or alcohol to the basal ganglia area although sometimes a radioactive substance is injected.

Another important advance has come from the study of drugs which are capable of producing symptoms of Parkinsons disease. If you give too large a dose of chlorpromazine or certain other tranquilizers the person develops symptoms which look very much like Parkinsonism. Fortunately in most instances it is reversible by withdrawal of the drugs. This gives a clue that there may be a chemical basis for the disease, which seem to relate to the activity of parts of the nervous system which are not functioning properly. So it looks as though some form of Parkinsonism may be the result of a chemical derangement of the nervous system. It is a very hopeful sign because if we can find out what the chemical abnormality is, we will have a key for prevention. At the moment all we can do is alleviate.

If the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness continues its research, and there is every reason to believe that it will, and you support the work of the American Parkinson Disease Association we can better coordinate our efforts, and I predict that in the foreseeable future research will break through and a cure will be found.

It would be foolish and wasteful for private groups to compete with the Government in this research program; it is too costly.

The Government has not entered into the rehabilitation program in the way that two of the foundations have done in building centers for physical therapy, psychological counseling, and related services for victims of Parkinson's disease. This seems to be an area in which you and the other voluntary organizations can be extremely effective in raising funds, planning the facilities, and building staffs of professional personnel to carry on the treatment programs. Of course, those two existing programs, the one in Miami and the one proposed in New York City, do not begin to meet the needs for rehabilitation facilities and services, but, since they are done so well by the foundations, probably the Government should continue to encourage more of these through Hill-Burton grants but leave their management to the voluntary organizations.

The field of research is the only one in which there is now any overlapping of governmental and foundation effort. Since there is a great deal still to be done before we will completely understand and be able to control Parkinson's disease, there should be ample room for contributions from many sources. Coordination of effort is necessary, however, to avoid wasted time and money, and I think it is the responsibility of the foundation to learn what the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is doing and to develop a sound research grant policy based on cooperative planning in order that there can be a realistic hope of progress against Parkinson's disease.

In the meantime, what can the victim do? While hope exists life is bearable. Without

hope, all is bleak. I am happy to say hope has not escaped from Pandora's box.

For those who are not satisfied with their physical and material lot, let them see what a palsied victim suffers.

For those who have lost faith in tomorrow, let them see how a palsied victim hopes.

For those who have no inspiration, let them see how a palsied victim lives.

For those palsied victims let us extend our hands and hearts to give them renewed courage to sustain their pressing burden until that time when we can proudly say Parkinsonism is no more.

A Texan Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner by George Todt, well-known columnist. His column expresses the high regard that we in California hold for my colleague the Honorable BRUCE ALGER.

A TEXAN SPEAKS OUT

(By George Todt)

"The irresistible strength of the Republic of the United States comes from the many millions of her citizens who have a fundamental faith in America and a deep, abiding belief in Almighty God." Hon. William F. Knowland, address, October 8, 1963.

Question: How can one imagine he is listening to Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in Los Angeles when the newspapers say he is vacationing on the eastern seaboard of the United States at the time?

Answer: Merely listen to BRUCE ALGER speak. I attended a dinner with the United Republicans of California at their first statewide convention in the Statler-Hilton recently, and heard this outstanding Texan speak.

The hard-hitting conservative Republican Congressman from Dallas, Tex., sounds like BARRY at his best and thinks on his feet. Like the Senator, he was a football player and a pilot in World War II. Graduated from Princeton University. Has practically nothing in common with Adlai.

CHAMP OF FREEDOM

ALGER is over 6 feet tall and weighs a trim 195 pounds at 45—but looks 10 years younger. Bears more than just a little resemblance to the late actor Dick Powell. Intelligent, good speaker with a fine sense of humor. Knows his conservative American ideology.

The lone GOP Congressman from the Lone Star State—introduced by another great footballer, Joe Shell—believes 100 percent in the beleaguered American heritage of free enterprise. He is militant in its positive defense. In my book, he is as courageous as they come.

One telling point he made to Republicans everywhere is that it is time to stop cannibalizing. Oppose instead the Americans for Democratic Action and their Fabian Socialist philosophy for our Nation.

"Within the Republican Party there is room for differences of opinion," he told his attentive audience, "because we believe in the right of the individual first—and that is the basic principle upon which all Republicans are united. We believe in Joe Doakes, his rights, his freedom."

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

BRUCE thinks the real sickness in the world today is communism, based on godless materialism and atheism. We should identify and isolate it. Most of all, refuse to deal with it. Determine to give no aid to the Marxian enemy.

What is the antidote to this dread disease, communism, now afflicting large segments of the civilized world and its peoples? Why American free enterprise and capitalism, of course. Let's export it.

Most of all, let's stop apologizing for capitalism—the real hope for progress on our planet.

VOICE NEEDS OUTLET

But it can flourish only in a free society and we must be sure to protect our national sovereignty—so we can direct our own destiny.

So, BRUCE ALGER maintains, the chosen instrument through which we Americans must chart our individual destinies is our capitalist-libertarian (free enterprise) Republic. It is imperative for us to maintain its limited constitutional safeguards.

One of the most important items in this respect is the maintenance of a free American press. Voices championing libertarianism must be heard.

A Resolution To Give the Presidential Commission the Power To Compel Testimony Under Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, because I feel strongly that investigation of the facts attendant upon the tragic assassination of President Kennedy should adhere to the highest requirements of probity, I have today introduced a House joint resolution that would give the Presidential Commission the power to compel testimony under oath. It would also require that the results of the investigation, together with recommendations for legislation, if any, should be reported to Congress.

The far-reaching ramifications of this horrible crime committed we believe by an admitted Marxist with a record of residence within the Soviet Union can have serious effect upon both our internal security procedures and our foreign policies. The American people are entitled to have the Commission's report based upon sworn testimony that was given subject to the penalties of perjury. It is too important a matter to be left in the realm of rumor, conjecture, or hearsay.

A copy of the House joint resolution I have proposed is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 838

Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of records

Resolved, That the Commission established pursuant to Executive Order 11130, dated November 29, 1963, to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out its duties under such Executive Order, to hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places within or without the United States including any commonwealth or possession thereof, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission may deem necessary and advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman may authorize any member of the Commission or its staff to conduct on its behalf any part of the investigation herein provided for and in such event and for such purposes any member so authorized shall have all of the powers herein granted to the Commission.

For the purposes of this resolution the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and places during the First or Second Sessions of the 88th Congress, recesses and adjourned periods, and to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistance as may be required.

The Commission shall report not later than the first day of the First Session of the 89th Congress to the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

The expenses of this investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

John Akers Guides the Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Akers, president of Akers Motor Lines, Inc., Gastonia, N.C., was recently elected president of the American Trucking Associations.

Akers Motor Lines, Inc., is one of the largest motortruck carriers in the United States. The home office of the corporation is located in my hometown of Gastonia, N.C. I share the pride of the community in the honor which has come to it by reason of Mr. Akers' elevation to the presidency of the American Trucking Associations.

John Akers is an outstanding public-spirited citizen and business executive. He has exceptional executive ability, and his work in behalf of religious and civic organizations has done much for the growth of his home community, State, and the Nation.

The Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette recently carried an editorial regarding Mr. Akers and Akers Motor Lines, Inc., and I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JOHN AKERS GUIDES THE TRUCKERS

It has been a long and sometimes arduous route that John Akers has followed over the past 30 years.

Sometimes he had to force his optimism as he watched his trucks leave Gastonia in the depths of the depression. Back then, there were few trucks.

But he and his colleagues laughed at their problems and didn't know when they were

licked. And they weren't. They kept telling people that they ought to haul their freight by trucks. And now Akers Motor Lines is the 24th ranking motor carrier in the Nation.

Thursday, John Akers was elevated to the presidency of the American Trucking Association.

Talking from Miami, the Gastonian couldn't control the excitement in his voice, the enthusiasm with which he always tackles a job.

He is looking forward to the year, he said, and he hopes to do a good job.

Knowing Mr. Akers, we are confident that he will do an excellent job.

If he didn't do anything else but appear at meetings and be his amiable, affable, jovial self, it would be a boost to the trucking industry.

Gastonia is proud of John Akers, indeed of the entire Akers organization.

Although the operations part of the firm has since moved to Charlotte, Akers is Gastonia born and Gastonia bred. It grew up with us.

So, we say congratulations to John Akers. This is a year that he will long remember.

A Murder Most Foul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, among the billions of words that have been said or written during the heartbreaking days following the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy, the words of columnist Walter Lippmann have been in the top drawer of eloquence and brilliance. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD Mr. Lippmann's column of November 26, 1963, "Murder Most Foul."

The article follows:

MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad which demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit which we have first to realize and then resolve.

The American future depends on it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, as outside the laws and the community of their fellow men.

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who assaulted Lyndon Johnson and Adlai Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much searching of conscience, and well there should be. Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the major of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing arts of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence. For his great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

"The Ablest Man I Know in American Politics"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, gives us in the following article from the November 27, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune an excellent thumbnail sketch of the marvelous relationship between John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. We should all keep it in mind and recognize, as Alsop says, the "enduring good luck of the United States."

The article follows:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—"If I didn't want the job myself, I'd get behind Lyndon. He's the ablest man I know in American politics, and he really cares about this country as I want a President to care."

In this fashion, in an interval of his hard-fought contest for the Democratic nomination and almost offhand, President John F. Kennedy gave his own estimate of his chief rival of that time, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In President Kennedy's years in office his false friends (of whom every President has a few) and his Vice President's false friends (of whom every politician also has a few) did everything in their power to poison the Kennedy-Johnson relationship.

It is a tribute to the character of both men that the attempt always failed. In a certain sense it is a miracle that it did fail, for no Vice President, in the nature of his office, can ever hold more than a watching brief.

President Kennedy was an active, leading, all-directing chief of the American state. President Eisenhower was a passive, reacting, watching-and-waiting chief of state. But even President Eisenhower publicly and somewhat cruelly admitted that he could not call to mind a single contribution made to his administration by his Vice President despite all the Madison Avenue build-up of the countless contributions of Richard M. Nixon.

President Kennedy would never have said that sort of thing about his Vice President, for he always valued and constantly sought President Johnson's advice on every kind of matter.

Yet the fact remains that it must have been enormously hard for President Johnson to be only the man holding a watching brief in the Kennedy years, even if called upon as a valued adviser—as he was; and even if required to participate actively in the policymaking process at all times of serious crisis—as he also was.

It must have been hard for President Johnson to hold only a watching brief, because he is an almost pure man of action, in the way that his predecessor never was. No pure man of action, like President Johnson, can simultaneously act and stand apart, so to say, coolly judging and even on occasion mocking his own action. President Kennedy did that. President Johnson will never do that.

Thus President Kennedy could never tear a passion to tatters, in the way the political gallery gods often enjoy, and hated above all things any public show of his own emo-

tions, even when they were very deep indeed. Whereas President Johnson downright enjoys tearing a passion to tatters if this is justified by the occasion; and like Sir Winston Churchill, he is wholly capable of giving way to public tears if he is genuinely moved.

This difference between the two men explains the anomaly—for it is a real anomaly—of the different kinds of support they have enjoyed and the different kinds of toleration they have commanded.

President Kennedy's contemplative, intellectual side appealed to the American left. Thus the left forgave him a degree of conservatism, manifested in the tax bill, for instance, which ought to have earned, but of course did not earn, the prayerful gratitude of the whole business community.

President Johnson's character as a pure man of action appeals to the American right and especially to the senior leaders of the Senate and House who acknowledge him as the great master of their craft. Thus he has had support from many who suspected President Kennedy, and he also arouses idiotic suspicions among many who have no smallest ground for suspecting him.

This only goes to show the powerful political influence of silly, superficial, even rather vulgar stereotypes. But if you look behind the stereotypes, what do you find in Lyndon Baines Johnson? You find, in fact, the qualities that are most wanted in a President.

You find commonsense, courage, intelligence, a knack of getting things done and the deep, true concern for this country that President Kennedy himself noted in the quotation above given. To this summary of President Johnson's prime qualities one must add, with warm gratitude, that the new President has not put a foot wrong in the tragic, difficult circumstances of these last days. Lyndon Baines Johnson is in fact a very big man, not just physically, but in all his dimensions as a human being. That was why John Fitzgerald Kennedy chose him as his Vice President, on the specific ground, as this reporter can testify, "that you've just got to think about what might happen."

When that choice was made it bitterly offended many compromisers and breast-beaters. But although President Johnson will no doubt make his mistakes, as all Presidents must do, this widely unexpected choice should later be remembered as sovereign proof of the enormous, enduring good luck of the United States, just as the untimely death of President Kennedy will be remembered as a cruel American loss.

The President's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following television and radio editorial:

THE PRESIDENT'S DEATH

KDKA brings you an expression from Harold C. Lund, vice president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., Fred E. Walker, general manager of KDKA-Radio.

President Kennedy is dead. It is a shock to people in Pittsburgh and everywhere throughout our Nation and the world.

Another President, Lincoln, nearly a century ago, died the same way, at the hands of an assassin, fighting for the same cause, the principle on which this Nation was founded, that all men are created equal and entitled to live that way.

We think it appropriate at this time to remember the words of President Lincoln, at Gettysburgh—100 years ago. He said and we quote: "We here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

President Kennedy was in Texas fighting for that same cause. We fervently hope and pray that his death will hasten the day when all men indeed can live as equals. Then, he shall not have died in vain.

What About the Kidnaping of an American Colonel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what is being done by our Government to bring about the release of Col. James K. Chenault, kidnaped by the Communists in Venezuela? How long are we going to tolerate such indignities against the United States and our citizens by the Castro agents in South America?

It seems to me it is time for the American people to remember the Communist goal of world domination has not changed; their promise to bury us has not been recalled; the Soviet Union is still exporting subversion and sabotage through Cuba to every country in South America; the threat of Soviet missiles and Soviet troops still exists in Cuba and there is no indication our State Department has any plans to challenge Communist aggression in this hemisphere.

I cannot understand how it is possible for the United States to ignore the kidnaping by the Communists of a colonel of the U.S. Army while he is engaged in serving this Nation in a foreign land. Certainly it is proper for us to ask, what is going to be done to free Colonel Chenault, and now. Why should our Government continually assure the Communists of our friendship in the face of such outrages?

The following story from the Washington Daily News of December 3, points out that our Embassy officials in Caracas and the family of Colonel Chenault are "showing increasing anxiety." What about our Government? The News article follows:

FEAR RISES FOR KIDNAP VICTIM

(By Hal Hendrix)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Six days have passed since the kidnaping here of U.S. Army Col. James K. Chenault, and concern for his safety is mounting.

The popular deputy commander of the U.S. military mission to Venezuela was abducted last Wednesday morning by four armed members of the terrorist Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN).

Since the FALN announced its members had seized Colonel Chenault for propaganda in its campaign to sabotage Sunday's presidential election, it had been hoped the American would be freed by the weekend.

SOCCER STAR

A previous FALN kidnap victim, world-famous soccer star Alfredo di Stefano, was released unharmed after only 3 days' captivity last August. Now that the FALN has been thwarted in its terror campaign to cancel the elections, it is feared in some quarters the organization might hold Colonel Chenault for a prolonged period just to show they can defy and outwit Government authorities.

There is fear also that in a desperation move to attract more attention, the FALN might harm or even kill the American, hoping perhaps to provoke some form of U.S. intervention.

The pro-Castro FALN has made one proposal to release Colonel Chenault in exchange for 70 women political prisoners the organization says are held in Venezuelan jails.

DIM VIEW

The Government, which has conducted an intensive but futile search for the colonel, has ignored the demand. The American Embassy, much as it would like to see the release of Colonel Chenault, takes a dim view of the ransom proposal.

A soft-spoken woman identifying herself as "Commandante Concepcion" of the FALN has telephoned messages to news agencies and to the U.S. Embassy to report that Colonel Chenault is unharmed and in good condition.

Nevertheless Embassy officials and Colonel Chenault's family are showing increasing anxiety.

Weltering in the Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of the New Frontier apologists to paint a rosy picture, this country, both domestically and on the foreign front has slipped a great deal since we had that great flourish of oratory on January 20, 1961. The Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times has put its finger on the cause of much of our difficulty—leadership which does not measure up to its oratory and intraparty friction in the majority party. For some thoughtful observations on the present-day scene, I commend this editorial from the October 9 edition of the Times.

WELTERING IN WILDERNESS

The Kennedy administration has been described as being in disorder and discord. With major legislation blocked, inquiry going deep into the State Department and reports rampant of disagreement between U.S. agencies in Vietnam, it is an apt description.

It is a situation which ought not to exist in view of the hold which the Democrats have upon White House, Congress, and the departments of Government.

It would not exist if from the White House there stemmed leadership to hold congressional Democrats in line, prevent State Department scandals, and see that friction has no part in the all-but-impossible Viet situation.

It is a Democrat, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, who demands that Secretary of State Rusk appear to explain reported laxity in security procedures in his department.

This is a result of evidence given the Senators by Otto F. Otepka who now claims to be the victim of departmental intrigue for having testified.

Robert G. Baker, protege of Vice President Lyndon Johnson has quit his $19,000 a year job as secretary of the Senate majority as an investigation into his outside operations appeared to be near.

The Vietnam picture, despite the quickie trip of Secretary McNamara and General Taylor remains in confusion with no assurance that the Diem regime is in mood to be cooperative.

Our foreign relations have dropped into a morass with appeasement as the major instrument of our policy.

We have appeased Russia, evidently are willing to pull Khrushchev out of difficulty by feeding his people.

We went in for appeasement in Laos and Communists are taking over.

Washington has given evidence that coexistence with Communist Cuba is desirable. As a result of that, Latin American governments are toppling all over the hemisphere.

President Kennedy was in the fortunate position of being heir to governmental policies which under Truman and Eisenhower permitted of no Chamberlain nonsense.

This far, no farther, was the principle of Truman and Eisenhower, and as a result the United States upheld its own standards against encroachment of dictators.

Returning to Congress, disorder is constantly evident, and this is a Congress which ordinarily would be marked by the unity which an overwhelming majority gives to a party.

The Kennedy administration has been unable to capitalize upon Democratic strength and in the ensuing congressional drag there lies likelihood of a session extending beyond Christmas to the moment for convening a new session.

Dissension between a President of one party and a Congress of another would not be unusual, politics being what it is.

But intraparty friction is the basis for today's snags to governmental procedure and indeed to good government.

It is an indictment from which the Democratic party, from the Presidency down, cannot escape as the bumbling and the growling and the disputes continue.

What a way to conduct the Nation's business.

Congressman William L. St. Onge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome back to our body a good friend and respected colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Never has the Second Congressional District of our State been so well represented as by my worthy associate who has been sorely missed during his absence from this Chamber. I join my fellow Congressmen in greeting our compatriot and know that he will bravely join us in the fight to enact the policies formulated by President Kennedy and now embraced by President Johnson which will insure the continued growth of our Nation.

Spoken Like a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the few days since the tragic assassination of President Kennedy the world has watched with great interest and concern the effectiveness of the laws of succession which in the final analysis proves that the strength of our Nation comes from the fact that it is a Nation based on laws instead of individuals. The key to the future, of course, has been the words and actions of President Johnson who in a moment of extreme national crisis has stepped in and taken hold of the reins with a firm and courageous hand. The course of action for this Nation was spelled out in the somber but courageous address of President Johnson before us 1 week ago today. This moving address has received great support in the press of the Nation and the world. One such reaction is that of the New York Herald Tribune in the editorial published on Thanksgiving Day.

At this point I would like to have the editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPOKEN LIKE A PRESIDENT

The new President's words to Congress were fine words, fitting words, at times inspiring words. But as significant as what he said was the way he said it.

Lyndon Johnson was thrust suddenly into the White House, and to much of the country the new President was a stranger. The last two Presidents before him were sharply different in personality, but both were men of commanding public presence. In Congress, Mr. Johnson had a reputation for getting things done; he was master of the Senate, but his mastery, to most of the public, was veiled in mystery. His arena was the Senate cloakroom and the fastness of the majority leader's office, not the public platform, and even at the height of his power he never engaged the public imagination.

Even in his first days as President he was—as the tragic occasion demanded—the man at the edge of the stage, not at its center the center belonged, still, to John F. Kennedy and his magnificently heroic widow.

But yesterday was Lyndon Johnson's day and as he stood before Congress and the Nation he showed himself not a fluke of history, but a President. He had the presence of a President, and he said the things a President should have said.

His strong emphasis on civil rights was probably dictated not only by the evident need for action, but also by the doubts so many have harbored that he, as a southerner, would continue the pressure for such action. But it was vital that these doubts be laid decisively to rest. He did so eloquently, and it should now be clear that the man who, as majority leader, engineered the passage of the first major rights bill since Reconstruction, and who as Vice President vigorously championed the Negro cause, does mean to work as President to "eliminate from this Nation every trace of discrimination and oppression that is based upon race or color."

"Courage to seek peace, and * * * fortitude to risk war" were not the gifts of President Kennedy alone; these have been necessary qualities in every postwar President, and they are rooted in the resolution of the Nation at large. But it was well that President Johnson, at the start of his administration, reminded both friends and adversaries alike that these have not been lost.

It was well, because the world is anxiously watching to see what effect the change of Presidents will have on American policy. President Johnson will have his own style, but the Nation's purposes are unaltered, its commitments—as he also noted—undiminished.

The climatic events of the past week shook the Nation as it has not been shaken in this generation. And yet it has shown that it can carry on, and it will. Tragedy has drawn the Nation together, in a catharsis of grief and self-searching. From this it can, if it will, emerge stronger, more determined, more united.

It can and perhaps will, as President Johnson urged, "turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream." It can resolve to get on with the business of Government, not wasting itself in penny-ante politicking and futile procrastination.

Capitol Hill, as Mr. Johnson somewhat nostalgically noted, was his "home" for 32 years, and as majority leader he was a Senator's Senator, the epitome of the legislative man. When he stood before Congress yesterday for the first time as President, he made it clear that a Johnson administration will respect the role of Congress as it should be respected; but also that the man who once made the Senate run expects Congress to fulfill that role.

In asking the help, with his awesome new responsibilities, of both Congress and the people, President Johnson asked what it is in the Nation's interest to give—and what he deserves to get.

Congress Understands This Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the keen interest being shown today in the probable effectiveness of our new President, a man whom the country as a whole seriously considered electing in the 1960 campaign. In this vein I would like to include an article recently printed in the Washington Star:

THE KEY TO SUCCESS—CONGRESS UNDERSTANDS THIS LEADER

(By Mary McGrory)

Often when campaigning for the vice presidency in 1960, Lyndon Johnson used to say, "It's a long way from Austin to Boston."

Yesterday, making his first address to Congress and the Nation, he seemed to be trying to say that the distance is not so great.

If he cannot carry on the Kennedy style, he will at least carry on the Kennedy policies.

The speech was full of echoes of the New Frontier; he was assisted in its preparation by members of the Kennedy staff. It was, moreover, brief, creditable, and seemly.

His Texas drawl was less pronounced than heretofore. He used to call it "Amurrika"; yesterday he spoke it as it is spelled.

The circumstances were for him, and everybody with him in the Chamber, excruciating.

No one doubted for a moment that he spoke nothing but the truth when he said, "All I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today."

No man, regardless of his ambition or his drive would have wanted to stand in Lyndon Johnson's shoes yesterday. He stood in the place of the great life-brightener of 20th century politics, the light-footed warrior-chieftain, whose splendid funeral was held 2 days before.

The further circumstance of its being Thanksgiving eve contributed yet another factor of consternation.

With their applause, at his arrival and departure, the Chamber seemed to be trying to tell the President they understood. The Southerners were conspicuously silent during his pledge for civil rights. The Republicans found no cause to encourage him except when he promised "the utmost thrift and frugality."

But when he came in and when he left, they gave him heartening acclaim.

By far the most interesting and perhaps most significant line in the speech was its one autobiographical reference, "For 32 years Capitol Hill has been my home."

The men before him knew him, as no Congress has ever known a Chief Executive before.

And he knows the Congress, particularly the Senate, as no Chief Executive in history.

He is a Senate man in the profoundest sense, and that is another of the great contrasts with his predecessor. John Kennedy was something of a stranger and a sojourner on Capitol Hill; his eye was on the White House. But Lyndon Johnson's world was the Senate.

Senators know him as a Texan, boastful, vain and overbearing. They also know him as a leader, shrewd and patriotic. He has grasped their lapels and loomed over them. As John Kennedy studied history, Lyndon Johnson studied Senators. He was proud of his dominion over them. They resented him but they always respected him.

Now they are the key to his success. He must make good, through them, as "a can-do man."

His future depends on his ability to wring from them legislation they refused his predecessor. The amused tolerance with which President Kennedy publicly eyed the futilities of his former colleagues will undoubtedly be replaced by even sterner and more importunate demands for action from the White House.

When Lyndon Johnson demands action, as he did throughout his opening speech, he means it. The immediate reaction from Congress was typical: The House adjourned right away and the Senators fell to wrangling among themselves as to whose fault it is they are so behind-hand.

"Let us meet," said the new President, "in action, in tolerance and mutual understanding."

Of the "mutual understanding" there can be no doubt. Executive and legislative never understood each other better.

Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, made a very effective address last week before the Washington Urban League's Equal Opportunity Day Committee's 1963 Observance.

He took this occasion to announce a new training for apprenticeship program in Washington, D.C. In view of the interest of the Congress in this subject, I am certain my colleagues will find his remarks particularly meaningful and timely.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the text of the Secretary's speech, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR W. WILLARD WIRTZ AT THE WASHINGTON URBAN LEAGUE'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY DAY COMMITTEE'S 1963 OBSERVANCE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Sitting last evening at my desk at home, beneath a picture of the original author of Equal Opportunity Day, I found myself repeating his grandly simple reminder that "all men are created equal"—and then looking up and asking "Are they?"

In what meaningful sense are all men created equal?

Lincoln spoke directly to the error that had developed in a nation's thinking: that in the act of creation itself there was an intended distinction which was marked by the color put in children's skins. Until that false notion was corrected nothing could be accomplished.

Today, too long a century later, that earlier ignorance has been substantially overcome. If there is not yet unanimity in the Nation there is nevertheless a clear consensus that accords with our conscience. Americans are agreed now that life was not designed in the pattern of discrimination.

Yet we gather here today with the consciousness that there is much more to it than this—and that what lies ahead requires something beyond the recognition of a divine equity.

It is as though in this historic 100th year, we had climbed a mountain called discrimination, only to find on approaching the summit that what lies ahead is another mountain called disadvantage.

If the error in men's minds a century ago warranted the reminder that "all men are created equal," the necessity today is that we face squarely the limitations within which this is true.

For the fact is that each child brings with him very different gifts from God.

The fact is that with his first breath a child's endowment becomes principally whatever portion of advantage or disadvantage the circumstances of his environment confer upon him.

In the century ahead, the requirement upon America is that it be dedicated to the proposition that men will correct the inequalities which men have created, that the inequities children inherit will be lifted from them.

So I speak today of equal opportunity that includes much more than freedom from denial of opportunity when the chance comes. If equal opportunity is to mean anything it must include the right to be ready.

I realize that my thinking today is particularly of equal opportunity in the field of employment. This is partly because of the nature of my own responsibilities, and partly because I think the equal right to work is perhaps closest to the surface—if not the heart—of a great many of today's long-overdue current demands. Perhaps this is because equality in employment presents some of the hardest problems which lie ahead.

I mention only a few of the key factors here.

There will be loss, not gain, from any person's demanding or receiving a job for which he is not qualified.

Honest and sincere men reach different conclusions about whether previous discrimination warrants preference now—to "even things up." My own strongly held view is that such preference could be justified only on an assumption that this is a matter of competition between two sides. It isn't, and there is great importance in avoiding and eliminating any mistaken grouping along color lines. The victims of preference would be individual human beings, and more likely than not today, persons who are themselves opposed to discrimination.

To think in terms of quotas is again to think in terms of two groups, which is the thing to be avoided. I believe strongly in the necessity of a Federal fair employment practices act, but surely such a law must be written in terms of the absolute of equality, with no exceptions of any kind.

To believe in equality of opportunity except as it increases competition for one's own job is selfish hypocrisy. Discrimination is no less ugly for its being inspired by self-interest, entirely unrelated to racial prejudice.

Nor can it be questioned that more than equality is not only justified but is required so far as preparation for opportunity is concerned. There is no unfair hurting of someone else if preference in education is accorded those who have been previously disadvantaged. Here there is only the necessary compensation for the ravages of a century of unfairness.

I take this appropriate occasion to announce a new training for apprenticeship program for Washington, D.C., which may become a model of what can be done to break this cycle of unemployability.

Within a month, a new MDTA experimental demonstration project will get underway, sponsored by the National Institute for Labor Education, acting for the AFL-CIO and the Department of Labor. The project will give 100 Washington youngsters a chance to upgrade their skills so that they may become apprentice carpenters.

It is expected that the majority of the trainees will be out of school, out of work, Negro youths ranging in age from 17 to 21. None of these youngsters would be able to qualify as apprentices without the type of training they will receive in this program. Many of them will not have completed any kind of high school program, nor will they have had a close association with the building trades through family or friends.

The value of the project is that it will preserve the standards of apprenticeship training, while opening the doors to new opportunities for youngsters who otherwise would be facing the blind alley of the unskilled.

Surely the single most critical front in the current battle for meaningful equal opportunity is the education of the presently disadvantaged minority group youth. I suggest that this minority can be best described not in racial terms at all but in terms of all disadvantaged youth. We who are here today hate the bigotry of racial prejudice with all that is in us, especially when it is inflicted on a child. But the hurt to a child is no less when he is denied a fair chance for any reason beyond his control. Racial discrimination is no worse in its effect than the discrimination which results from poverty, from chronic unemployment, from growing up in a slum or in a broken family.

It is not enough today to be against discrimination. That's easy now. If we are to be true to ourselves we will buckle down to the job of preparing the next generation to seize opportunities they do not (because they cannot) know they have. They were not created equal, or they lost their birthright the moment they drew their first breath.

We have effectively opposed the folly of discrimination. Now we must stop the fallout of disadvantage. We must get through to these boys and girls that there

is opportunity beyond what they have seen at home.

If we believe what we say, we will put our best schools in the slums, not in the suburbs.

If we believe what we say, we will make a flat commitment to all American boys and girls that they will receive all the education they are willing to use, right on through college.

If we believe what we say, we will adopt the education program President Kennedy has presented to the Congress, the vocational education program, the Youth Employment Act, and the proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Equal opportunity will not come merely by preventing the denial of opportunity to those disadvantaged by reason of race or previous condition of environment. That's like trying to get rid of dandelions by cutting off the tops. Equal opportunity will come only by digging out the roots of inequality, by giving those who are least ready for opportunity the preparation they need. "It is here," it has been said, "that 'more than equality' makes sense; and today anything less makes no sense at all."

"A nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." What Lincoln was saying, of course, was that what fault there is, what inequality, is not of God's making, but of man's, and that it is man's to correct.

Address of Hon. John S. Monagan on Water Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, water pollution control and abatement is a matter of great concern to the people of Chicago, and the address this week of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], was an event of importance.

I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Congressman MONAGAN's speech before the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators, delivered in Chicago on December 3, 1963:

I am delighted to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems of water pollution control and abatement. As you know, your association testified earlier this year before the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, on which I serve, at its water pollution control hearings in Washington. Your association made a significant contribution to the subcommittee's record. I hope that my remarks here today will be as useful to you as your association's testimony has been to our subcommittee.

The water crisis of the century is not the shortage of water itself, but the shortage of usable, clean water.

Water pollution has become the Nation's single most desperate natural resources problem. Almost all of our major streams and rivers and lakes are suffering increasing pollution. This pollution jeopardizes our water supplies, menaces the public health, destroys aquatic life, and disgraces our environment. It is a direct result of rapid growth in population and urban living, plus the unprecedented technological advances of industry in the past two decades.

The impact which the increasing population and the growing urbanization of our country have on our clean water supply can easily be understood in terms of a few figures.

In the 63 years since 1900, the Nation's population increased from 76 to 180 million; new towns and cities sprang up where only farms or wildernesses existed; villages of 3,000 or 4,000 expanded to 50,000 and more; cities of 100,000 are approaching or have exceeded a million in population.

In 1900 the Nation's urban population was 30 million. It has grown beyond 125 million in the sixties. By the year 2000, the urban population of the United States may exceed 300 million.

Water pollution control problems caused by the increases in population are already urgent. In the remaining 36 years of this century they will become overwhelming unless a basis for dealing with them is laid today.

The sources of pollution in our Nation's rivers and streams are almost innumerable. Untreated wastes are still being dumped into rivers and streams in many parts of the country. Oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines, and many other substances, including new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, radioactive wastes, and a number of other items that we could mention, are ruining our waters.

Water demands are increasing every day. Vast quantities of water are required to produce 1 ton of synthetic rubber, or a ton of high-grade paper, or a ton of cold-rolled steel.

New or developing industries will, within the next few years, more than double the demand for good quality water. We will have to reuse our waters as they pass from the land to the sea, and unless we take bold and concerted action to meet this expanding demand for reusable water, the United States will, within the next generation, face economic retardation and a resulting impairment of our national strength to an almost unprecedented degree.

The control of water pollution thus involves the health and economic destiny of our entire Nation. We have an equally great responsibility to maintain clean waters for recreation, propagation of fish and wildlife, and preservation of the esthetic beauty of our country.

It was for these reasons that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, established the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives to make an extensive and intensive inquiry to appraise how effectively Government agencies and others are dealing with the problems of our Nation's increasing water pollution and to determine what can be done to improve the techniques for preventing or controlling the rising pollution levels of so many of our Nation's rivers, streams, and other surface waters.

The Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee has held extensive hearings in Washington, as well as in different regions of the country, including New England, the Middle Atlantic area, the Midwest, and the Pacific Northwest, and this week in Texas. I assure you that the Congress is deeply concerned about the problems of water pollution.

During these intensive hearings, almost 200 witnesses submitted information. Government and industry representatives, as well as other interested citizens, testified.

While reflecting substantial achievements of State and Federal officials, the testimony before our subcommittee has revealed the rapidly growing backlog of needs that must be met to carry out successfully a national water quality control program.

Under the Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1961, much more must be done. New projects are required—to keep pace with population growth—in the field of municipal waste collection and treatment. In addition, the testimony before our subcommittee revealed that there are 15 million Americans today who are not served by any sewers or treatment works. The method of sewage treatment employed today is the same in principle as that used by the Egyptians 2,000 years ago. That is not progress.

Both municipal and industrial wastes have presented pollution problems for some time. The newest pollution problem comes from the fast growing companies producing synthetics and chemicals which find their way into watercourses. These chemicals include pesticides, radioactive materials, detergents, and fertilizers. Testimony showed that many of these chemicals do not respond to biological treatment and that they persist in streams for a long time. They are increasingly troublesome sources of pollution with far reaching and still unpredictable effects on our rivers and streams. Some of the wastes carry both immediate health hazards and long-term genetic hazards which have not yet been adequately appraised.

These newer pollution problems, as well as the growing backlog of conventional problems of treating municipal and industrial waste, indicate the compelling need for major new efforts in the reduction and prevention of water pollution. Recently enacted Federal legislation is pointed in the right direction. Yet we are faced with the inescapable fact of the deterioration of water quality, a fact which clearly demonstrates the need for new preventive efforts.

These efforts must be made by the States and local agencies by enforcing antipollution laws which are available to them and by strengthening those which are shown to be inadequate. In addition to the preventive efforts required through the enforcement of antipollution laws, there is a great need for more sewage treatment works to handle effluent from cities, industries, and farms, and for the development of new methods to treat chemical, pesticide, and radioactive wastes.

Though much remains to be learned about many of these problems, water pollution control cannot wait upon the development of all the answers. Our present state of knowledge in many fields is sufficient for the imposition and vigorous enforcement of controls to safeguard the public health and welfare, and to provide for the quality and quantity of water which our rapidly expanding population and economy require.

Among the new pollutants are the hard detergents which are found in most soaps and cleaning solutions. They have been a serious nuisance in a number of streams where the foaming has been excessive. The companies manufacturing detergents have assured us that the chemical formula of their products is going to be revised so that they will be degradable and susceptible to treatment in our treatment plants. This is something that must be done. Legislation is pending in Congress, as we know, to forbid the manufacture and sale of so-called hard detergents. I think that the work of our subcommittee is going to encourage progress in this area.

I must admit that at times during the hearings it sounded as though we were making no progress at all in pollution abatement. Water pollution seemed to be as bad as it was 50 years ago. At that time we were losing lives from waterborne typhoid; now we are losing lives from waterborne hepatitis.

Perhaps one of the most encouraging parts of the hearings was to learn of the great amount of research that is being done at all government levels, and by industry and other private concerns. I think that this accelerated research and development work now

taking place will do great things for the overall pollution abatement program.

The responsibility for research and for the management of water pollution falls on all water users, as well as on local, State, interstate, and Federal agencies. The simple reason for this is that streamflow does not recognize political boundaries. So from the beginning we have recognized that streams may transcend local areas and become a national concern. The problem of pollution is so enormous that it is big enough to give everyone a share in its solution.

Water pollution is expensive. It costs the individual, the businessman, the community, and the Nation. No one escapes the economic loss brought about by the pollution of our most valuable resource.

Some of these losses or damages are evidenced by the additional costs which must be met, such as construction, operation, and maintenance of water treatment facilities.

But the bulk of the costs of pollution cannot be directly tabulated.

How is the impairment to health measured in dollars? Or the loss of recreational facilities, depreciated property values, or the failure of industry to expand?

While these indirect consequences of pollution cannot be expressed in precise dollar terms, they are nevertheless real and constitute a critical barrier to the fulfillment of local and national economic goals.

Pollution control measures combat these adverse conditions and produce economic benefits associated with the improved water quality. These benefits are often not apparent to the public, however, because they constitute insurance for future use of water as well as for immediate use.

The taxpayer must realize that while it costs money to prevent or combat water pollution, the return is great in attracting thriving and expanding industry and producing healthful community water conditions.

Water pollution is not new and the problem has become more serious for three primary reasons: (1) rapidly expanding industry, (2) growing and shifting population, and (3) use of more water per person. The problem of water pollution is more acute in some areas than in others, and is especially severe in some areas. It is the key part of the whole complex problem of wise water use.

We are not running out of water, but now and in the future we will have to use our streams more wisely to meet our growing needs.

Although significant progress has been made in managing water pollution, we are not keeping up with growth and demand and we need, therefore, to step up study, research, and all other efforts if we are to head off a very real water supply crisis.

In stepping up these efforts, there are responsibilities facing all of us as water users. We need to work as effectively as we can at the individual and industrial level, and through the most effective agencies we can use at the local, State, interstate, and Federal levels.

Most important of all, the different classes of water users, including industry, must cooperate to guarantee that the needs for the differing and sometimes conflicting uses of water are met in a safe and equitable manner.

At the beginning of my remarks I stated that unless a basis is laid now for dealing with the water pollution problems of the next 30-odd years, these problems would be absolutely overwhelming by the year 2000. A good first step toward meeting the challenge of the year 2000, occurred on October 16, when the Senate passed a bill (S. 649) introduced by Senator MUSKIE to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The bill would accomplish, in brief, the following purposes:

1. It would express the national policy "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and * * * for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

2. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer comprehensive programs, interstate cooperation, enforcement measures to abate pollution, establishment of water quality standards, and pollution by Federal installations.

3. It would provide for an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist the Secretary of that Department to supervise and direct the administration of that Department's functions related to water pollution.

4. It would authorize appropriation of $20 million annually for 4 years research and development grants, up to 50 percent of the estimated reasonable cost of demonstration projects for separating combined sewer systems;

5. It would increase the individual dollar ceiling limitations of Federal grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project, and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities;

6. It would authorize an additional 10 percent in the grant for construction of waste treatment works if the project is certified as conforming with a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area;

7. It would authorize enforcement measures to abate pollution when any person is prevented from marketing shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce as a result of such pollution and action of Federal, State, or local authorities;

8. It would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after public hearing and consultation with all interested parties, to prepare and to encourage the development of regulations establishing standards of water quality for interstate waters;

9. It would provide that waste water discharges by Federal installations shall be controlled under permits issued by the Secretary of HEW.

10. It would establish a procedure to evaluate progress in the development of decomposable detergents which will not cause or contribute to the pollution of surface and underground waters, to develop standards of decomposability for such detergents, and to authorize the promulgation of such standards at such time as detergents conforming to the proposed standards of decomposability are generally available to the manufacturers of detergents.

11. It would establish audit procedures concerning expenditure of construction grants.

12. It would state the authority of the Secretary of Labor over labor standards governing construction of federally aided waste treatment facilities.

The Muskie bill, as well as a companion bill which I introduced earlier in the House of Representatives (H.R. 9007), are now pending before the House Public Works Committee, and hearings on these bills will be held this week, beginning tomorrow, December 4.

I do not take the position that our water resources cannot survive without the enactment of each of the provisions in these bills. I have been a legislator far too long to believe that the Nation, or its natural resources, will stand or fall on the enactment, or failure of enactment, of a particular provision. But I do believe that taken altogether the provisions of these bills represent a most important and worthwhile effort to meet our water resources problems before it is too late.

Achieving cleanliness in our streams will entail the making of judgments and the weighing of competing factors of economics and the less tangible benefits of recreational, esthetic, and wildlife values. The lines which must be drawn will vary from area to area, from stream to stream, from basin to basin, and will depend on the varying judgments of many people. There will undoubtedly be disagreements between those who believe in utilizing the full assimilating capacities of the streams, and those who believe that streams are more important for fishing, boating, and swimming. There will be differences between those who believe that water pollution control is solely the job of the locality, the State, or the region, and those who believe that the Federal Government must take an increasingly vigorous role in the control and reduction of pollution

Our subcommittee recognizes these many problems and differing attitudes. We are examining all the available facts, opinions and recommendations on this subject from every part of the country. We are using them to stimulate action in many quarters. From our findings and recommendations will undoubtedly evolve legislation, executive action, research, and new points of view.

The hearings and investigations by our subcommittee are not yet complete. I am convinced, however, that the subcommittee has already created a heightened awareness on the part of Government officials responsible for the Federal water pollution control program. It has sharpened administrative practices and stimulated more imaginative and creative policies.

For example, when our hearings disclosed how little has been done to control water pollution caused by drainage of acid waters from both existing and abandoned coal mine works, the Secretary of the Interior gave personal emphasis to create an intensified effort within the Interior Department on that subject. Similarly, as a result of our subcommittee's inquiry, many Federal agencies are now scrutinizing their own waste discharge practices and much progress is being made to reduce or abate their pollutional effects. Various agencies are also examining their statutory authority with respect to water pollution control, and I anticipate that various bills will be introduced to eliminate deficiencies in the existing law on this subject.

The subcommittee's hearings have also served another significant purpose which, I feel, is all too often neglected—that of educating the public. The great number of newspaper reports and articles appearing in professional and trade publications regarding the subcommittee's hearings leave no doubt that we, along with other groups, have made a deep impression on the public conscience. Where before there was apathy, there are now the stirrings of widespread citizen concern over the preservation of our water resources. In a democratic society such as ours, that is the all-important beginning of a solution to a problem.

The Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators has secured for itself, by virtue of its constant and diligent efforts, a vanguard position in the crusade to preserve the Nation's water resources. Please accept my congratulations for the work you are doing. We Members of Congress are happy to be associated with you in this great enterprise. I know we will succeed.

Life in Poland Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three additional articles from the series by Robert S. Boyd of the Detroit Free Press,

Washington Bureau, on life today behind the Iron Curtain. The articles are as follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Nov. 19, 1963]

POLES' CHOICE: MOONLIGHT OR TURN CROOKED

(By Robert S. Boyd)

WARSAW, POLAND.—Stand on a street corner in Warsaw, look reasonably American and you'll soon get company.

A man will sidle up to you glance quickly around for the police and mutter:

"Want to change any dollars?"

He is a blackmarketeer, one of a swarm that infects the streets, cafes and hotels of this city.

You don't have to wave the flag or hum "The Star Spangled Banner"—he'll sniff you out.

There are two reasons for his breed, and for government's strict warning against using his services:

The phony official rate for the Polish zloty. The banks give you 24 zlotys to a dollar. The blackmarketeer will offer you 40, and the word is that he can peddle your buck to someone who wants it badly for up to 400 zlotys. The regime is thus bleeding Western tourists and visitors to meet its need for hard currencies.

The economic crisis that is gripping Poland this winter. Prices are rising, and incomes are low. The squeeze is driving Poles to desperate measures to make ends meet.

Almost everybody moonlights—even high officials. Holding down a second job or putting the wife to work is one way to get by.

Other ways verge on the illegal—such as the chauffeur for a Government agency who acts as a taxi driver during the rush hour. He pockets the fare, although he is using a Government car and Government gasoline.

There is a tremendous amount of petty pilfering. A river of spoons, saucers and glassware vanishes from restaurants—simply because people cannot afford to buy their own.

The Hotel Bristol, one of Warsaw's best, is being repainted inside. A Pole predicts that 100 private apartments in the city will get a new coat of the same paint this winter.

Hooliganism and vandalism got so bad last month that a great number of bars were ordered closed. The pleasant little sidewalk kiosks that used to sell beer were also shut down until the bad boys learn to behave.

Alcholism remains a serious problem. The rate has tripled since the war.

This sort of social demoralization is a symptom of the discouragement of the populace.

They are probably the freest and most prosperous of any people in Eastern Europe.

But they get little joy from it, because the movement in Poland is backward—not, as in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, forward to greater liberalization.

Slowly, the trend here is toward tighter control by the state—not greater freedom for the individual.

It is the direction in which they seem to be moving, not the burden of restrictions, that makes Poles so unhappy.

Many of the bright promises of the 1956 thaw have been abandoned. Proposed wage increases have been canceled. The death penalty has been extended to economic crimes, such as theft of state property.

Newspapers are being squeezed by an alleged paper shortage. Some less cooperative university departments have been abolished.

And now, the economic recession has added to the popular mood of depression. The price of coal and gas doubled this year. Electricity nearly tripled. Milk, matches, and vodka have also increased in cost.

"Prices always go up—they never come back down," sighed one white-collar worker, unconsciously echoing the lament of many an American housewife.

"And I'm afraid it's going to keep on getting worse for years and years," he said.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Nov. 20, 1963]

POLES' DAY OF MOURNING IS ANTI-RED PROTEST

(By Robert S. Boyd)

WARSAW, POLAND.—One day in the year, the living outnumber the dead in tragic Warsaw's many burial grounds.

On All Saint's Day, from dawn until late at night, an endless stream of Poles squeezes through the gate of vast Powazkowski Cemetery, not far from the old ghetto where 400,000 Jews were slain by the Nazis.

The pale gold November sun lights up the shellholes that scar the cemetery wall. After dark, thousands of flickering candles turn the long rows of tombstones into a ghostly cathedral.

Eighteen years of Communist rule have not destroyed the old Polish tradition of decorating the graves on "the Friday of the Holy Dead."

The crowd jamming trolleys and swarming the streets outside the cemetery creates an atmosphere like homecoming day at an American football stadium.

This is no sullen throng prodded to attend a Government-sponsored political rally. These people come voluntarily, eagerly, even cheerfully to the graveyard.

For many, it is a quiet form of political demonstration against the Government, as well as a remembrance of the dead.

The military cemetery, where soldiers of the Polish Home Army are buried, is a symbol of this.

During the Stalinist period in Poland, Home Army veterans were suspect and in disgrace. Memories of independent Polish action were forbidden.

But now, on All Saints Day, the soldiers' graves are a blaze of candles.

One Home Army veteran makes it a point to go out each year and put a candle at one of the many unmarked graves, where an unknown soldier lies.

He is not grieving for a lost father or brother. He is paying tribute to a man who fought for Poland.

Polish patriotism and nationalism are felt intensely.

The old monuments of Polish civilization—churches and palaces—are being painstakingly restored and preserved. The Communist government spends huge sums on these projects and the ordinary people flock to them.

Official guides point out the memorials to Polish patriots, like Kosciusko and Paoniatowski, who led rebellion against the Russians.

A powerful strain of patriotism enters, too, into Poland's religious life.

Warsaw's many churches are jammed—and not only on Sunday. There is standing room only at daily mass.

One Thursday evening, shortly after dusk, a November chill crept into the dimly lit Church of the Holy Cross, near Warsaw University.

The breath of the worshippers, many of them students, filled the air with little clouds of steam. Every pew was filled and other faithful knelt on the icy pavement while the priest led them in prayer.

The Roman Catholic Church, with 60,000 priests, monks, nuns and seminarians, is the only organized opposition force in Poland.

And its powers are being chipped away gradually.

This fall, the Government started to shut down some of the lower-level seminaries. The closing not long ago of the only school that trains church musicians caused a 3-day riot in a small town near the Soviet border.

The fact that the riot took so long to suppress in a police state like Poland shows the fierce loyalties of the people—including many of the militia—to their faith.

A joke going the rounds in Warsaw points up the political as well as the religious nature of church-going in Poland.

There was a big crowd in church. Everybody knelt to pray except one man. He remained standing despite nudges and whispers to kneel.

Later, leaving the church, he was asked: "Why didn't you kneel?"

"I'm an atheist," the man replied, "but I'm against the regime."

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Nov. 21, 1963]

"ZORRO" SYMBOL OF DEFIANCE IN POLAND

(By Robert S. Boyd)

WARSAW, POLAND.—"Help us Zorro," the banner read. The Polish plant manager was horrified.

During the night, someone had hung the offending slogan on the factory wall. Such things are not allowed in Communist Poland.

To the factory workers, angry over recent price increases without a corresponding pay hike, the message was clear:

Zorro, the star of the Walt Disney TV series, is a folk hero here. The series was rebroadcast over Polish TV last year and Zorro promptly became a symbol of the West, freedom and defiance of authority.

You find Z's scratched on the walls of buildings or marked in the dust on the back of a car. "Zorro was here" has replaced Kilroy as the mysterious visitor in public lavatories.

This is about as far as a Pole can go in acting out his dissatisfaction with his government.

Talk here is free. Since 1956, you can speak as critically as you please. But don't try to do anything about it.

There are no pickets, no political posters, no sitdowns or sit-ins or rallies here.

Strikes are strictly forbidden. The nurses of Warsaw struck for 3 days last spring for higher wages.

They got nowhere and their leaders were jailed briefly and then packed off to less desirable jobs in the provinces.

Many Poles take out their frustrations in indirect fashions.

Some resort to lethargy. They slow down on the job. Productivity has declined the past year, despite frantic government efforts to boost output. Even plant managers are starting to ignore orders from headquarters to speed up.

A government official, asked about the low wage scales here, commented: "Well, for the work they do, I think they're overpaid."

There are other ways to express resentment. Being anti-Russian is one.

A well-dressed symphony audience at the Warsaw Philharmonic booed a Soviet pianist who recently gave a sloppy performance.

Polish sports fans split the air with shrieks of enthusiasm when their athletes are matched against Russians. The crowds are intensely partisan.

At a basketball championship last month, there was a crescendo of shouts every time a Russian player tried to concentrate on a free throw.

A bike race in Poznan nearly created a riot when the Polish and Russian racers, neck and neck at the finish, started flailing each other with their tire pumps.

The telecast of the race was blacked out "because of technical difficulties," and the victory was awarded to the Russian team.

"It was rigged," groused one who saw the race.

Poles consider themselves Europeans and a part of the west. But their fascination for things Western also takes on political, anti-Communist overtones.

From Zorro to the latest Parisian fashions, jazz, the twist, bouffant hairdos, modern painting and sculpture, American movies, magazines, and books—all cast a spell over Poles who find them a way to express their inner feelings.

The Western craze had gone so far that the government felt it had to crack down somewhat this year. Fewer American movies are vigorously promoted. The government says it won't buy any more pieces of abstract art or display them in state galleries.

So about all the Poles can do is fill the air with bitter talk. The government tolerates this as a way to let off steam without building up a dangerous pressure.

Go too far, however, and the political police strike fast.

The Polish press carries occasional nervous little sketches satirizing the timid soul who is summoned to the investigations bureau for questioning—by mistake, of course.

Americans who live in Warsaw are fairly sure their homes are bugged.

One pointed at a radiator grill near the ceiling of his room the other evening and said:

"We sing 'The Star-Spangled Banner' and sign off for 'them' every night."

Public Favors Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, there is currently a great deal of discussion about the tax reduction bill, H.R. 8363, which has been approved in the House and is now the subject of hearings in the Senate.

A public opinion poll published earlier this week indicates the public favors the tax cut bill and would like to see it approved at the earliest possible date.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of this significant poll, as printed in the Washington Post on December 2:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—ADMINISTRATION TAX CUT MEASURE CONTINUES TO HOLD PUBLIC'S FAVOR

(By Louis Harris)

If Congress is to follow majority opinion in this country, then it will pass the tax cut bill now advocated by President Johnson and initiated by his predecessor, the late President Kennedy.

By well over 2 to 1, the public is in favor of the administration's proposal to cut taxes as soon as possible. By a 3-to-2 margin, people feel such a reduction will contribute to the prosperity of the Nation. And a plurality of the Nation feels that the tax cut should not be delayed until the budget is balanced.

All in all, these results show a marked shift in favor of tax legislation in the past 3 months.

In September and again just before President Kennedy's assassination, a cross section of the American people was asked about the tax cut issue directly:

TAX CUT NOW

[In percent]

	November	December
Favor	66	62
Oppose	26	22
Not sure	8	16

As the number with no opinions has diminished, the rather substantial margin in favor of the tax cut (20 percentage points) remains as decisive as in September.

The main argument put forth by President Kennedy and again now by President Johnson in favor of cutting Federal taxes is that such legislation will materially enhance the prosperity of the country. In fact, both strongly have implied that failure to pass a tax cut might increase the chances of a recession.

This appeal was positively received a few months ago and has maintained its position with the public.

TAX CUT AS PROSPERITY AID

Tax cut will:

[In percent]

	November	September
Help prosperity	46	40
Hurt prosperity	29	23
Not sure	25	37

The main opposition to the tax cut, of course, is not that relief of the taxpayer is undesirable, but rather that there should be no reduction until the Federal budget is balanced.

Back in the late summer and early fall, a plurality went along with this view. Now there has been a reversal that puts public opinion squarely behind a tax cut now—without any further delay:

TAX CUT TIMETABLE

[In percent]

	November	September
Delay until budget balanced	39	41
Don't delay tax cut	46	36
Not sure	15	23

Public opinion on the tax cut, then, has edged toward greater majorities favoring it. The conviction that a tax cut will enhance the prosperity of the Nation has become more widespread.

More important, however, is the decline to minority status of the belief that any cut in Federal taxes should await a balancing of the budget.

Along with the national mood of rallying behind the new President, these results concerning a tax cut now indicate that Mr. Johnson is in a strong position to push the objective he demanded in his first address to Congress: Passage of the legislation.

However, whether dominant public opinion will be followed or whether this legislation will bog down in congressional delay (as was the case under the Kennedy administration) remains a major riddle that only Congress itself can answer.

Apart from the arguments on the tax measure pro or con, President Johnson has invoked another undoubtedly powerful reason for asking Congress to act now: The fact that the tax measure was given with civil rights legislation, top priority by the late Mr. Kennedy.

Following his assassination, a wave of deep shock and sympathy for the late President spread over America. The tax bill was well on its way toward gaining majority support in its own right before Mr. Kennedy's death. It can be argued that public support for a tax cut has probably grown rather than diminished as a result of that tragic event.

Teaching Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past few years about the need for improved techniques of science instruction at the high school level. Here, after all, many of our future leaders in the field make their first real acquaintance with the world of science and technology.

I was delighted to read in the Wall Street Journal for December 3 that new teaching methods are being employed at Lexington High School, in Lexington, Mass. Under the leadership of a group of scientists from MIT and Harvard, and with the assistance of a National Science Foundation grant, new textbooks and teaching aids have been prepared to assist students in developing the thought processes and skills that will enable them to respond to rapidly moving developments in science.

I congratulate the students and teachers at Lexington High for having the foresight to adapt to these new techniques and under unanimous consent insert the fine article by Cal Brumley in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TEACHING SCIENCE—HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTION MODERNIZED TO REFLECT SCIENTIFIC ADVANCES—MIT, HARVARD SCHOLARS WRITE A PHYSICS TEXT; CHEMISTRY STRESSES REASON, NOT ROTE—NEW COURSES WIDELY ADOPTED

(By Cal Brumley)

BOSTON.—The vast scientific and technological advances of the past quarter century are at last beginning to spill over into courses in American high schools, where most of the Nation's prospective scientists receive initial training in their fields.

Already hundreds of thousands of students are taking high school physics, chemistry, biology and mathematics courses whose content and instructional methods depart radically from past teaching. The new courses play down rote learning, such as the memorization of the periodic table of properties of the elements in chemistry, and stress the drawing of conclusions from the students' own observations—the formulation of light wave theories, for example, by gathering data on the reflection of candlelight from curved mirror surfaces.

Says John S. Choate, head of the science department in the high school in Lexington, Mass., a Boston suburb: "Instead of just learning how to use the old mental tools of technology, built by someone else, students in the new courses are taught to build the tools they will need to deal with circumstances which may arise. That's the only way they'll be able to cope with the new knowledge that is coming along so rapidly."

NEW SCIENTIFIC FIELDS

Some scientists suggest that knowledge about the physical world is doubling every 10 years. It's frequently pointed out that more scientists are alive and adding to the store of knowledge today than have lived in all previous time. Some of today's major fields of scientific endeavor had barely begun to take shape a generation ago. Nuclear physics and solid state physics, which has led to the transistor and other electronics advances, are in this category. So are the chemistry of synthetics and the branches of biochemistry and biophysics that are now beginning to shed light on some of the basic processes of life, including heredity.

The impetus for updating high school science instruction has come mainly from university scientists. Many have become aware that students starting college are often totally out of touch with modern scientific developments. Although the university men's concern about the situation grew acute during the general reexamination of the quality of U.S. education after the Russians launched the first sputnik in 1957, the move-

ment to revise high school courses began to gather momentum in 1956.

In that year a group of physicists from Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard took it upon themselves to evaluate high school physics courses. The conclusion of the group, led by Prof. Jerrold R. Zacharias of MIT, was that the courses were 50 years behind the times.

The professors then proceeded to write a new physics textbook. Following the procedure since used in other fields, they obtained a grant from the Government's National Science Foundation and worked in cooperation with experts on high school teaching. The new text was used experimentally in a number of schools beginning in 1957, and revisions based on classroom experience were made until the text was finally published as a hard-cover book in 1961.

LEAVING THE IVORY TOWERS

The physics project was an educational landmark, in the opinion of Gilbert Oakley, managing director of Educational Services, Inc., a nonprofit organization formed to administer the affairs of the physics group. "For the first time university scholars came down out of their ivory towers, from which they had criticized the poor job done in high schools, and helped improve courses in an effective way," says Mr. Oakley.

The new course abandons such time-honored physics course tasks as memorizing the mechanics of a steam engine. The time saved is devoted to experiments designed to teach students how to go about discovering scientific truths on their own.

At Lexington High, for example, physics students make careful measurements of the movements of tiny wooden carts as they are propelled forward by rubber bands.

"A compilation of their observations enables the students to develop a formula for movement of various weights at differing speeds," explains Mr. Choate of the science department. "What they work out—actually discover for themselves—is what is commonly known as Newton's second law of motion. This is usually written as F equals MA, or force equals mass multiplied by acceleration." While the student experiment is crude, by making the same type of observations and calculations scientists can determine how much fuel will be needed to boost a rocket of a specific weight fast enough to escape gravity and go into orbit or reach the moon.

In the new chemistry courses, beginning students may be handed a burning candle and asked to write down as many observations about it as they can. Most come up with 10 or 12, such as the candle's emission of light and heat and the melting of the wax. Then their efforts are compared with a professional chemist's list of 53 items. The idea is to jolt the students into an appreciation of the amount of information that can be acquired by painstaking observation.

In traditional chemistry courses students are simply handed the formula for sulfuric acid and told to make it, says Neil Soule, a chemistry teacher at Lexington High. "Now they perform experiments that give them a chance to learn how the atoms of hydrogen, oxygen and sulfur exchange electrons to form sulfuric acid, and this leads them to theories of how elements will combine under various circumstances. They develop habits which will enable them to form the basis for thinking about new ways to combine elements to make new materials." This, of course, is the way chemists come up with new synthetic fibers and plastics.

Mr. Soule's students may refer to their books during tests. "A chemist in the real world can refer to manuals or other books to look up all the known facts about chemistry," he explains. "The students are allowed the same privilege. They can look up any material we have covered to apply it to the reasoning type answers required on the test."

In updated biology courses students "start right out with experiments to observe life processes," says John Rennie, a biology teacher at Lexington High. "There is absolutely no memory work like the learning of the species and subspecies of animals."

Sample experiment: Yeast cells are surrounded with a series of solutions—some harmful to the cells and some beneficial—that have been colored with dyes. The students observe how the walls of the cells keep out harmful materials while admitting beneficial ones. "This is a relatively simple experiment to show that cells adapt to their environment by controlling materials which they let in," explains Mr. Rennie. Much of the process of evolution involves the adaptation of cells and organisms to their environment.

The new mathematics courses "emphasize an understanding of the structure of mathematics rather than manipulative procedures," says G. Baley Price, chairman of the math department at the University of Kansas and a leader in the revision of high school math instruction.

In practical classroom terms, according to Jack Shapiro, head of the math department at a high school in the Boston suburb of Newton, this means, among other things, that "instead of being given a geometric theorem to memorize the students experiment and discover the theorem for themselves and learn how to apply it in useful situations."

The new courses are not without their critics. The revised math courses have failed to satisfy all mathematicians, and the new physics course is faulted for leaving out some traditional material a number of physicists consider essential.

Many educators and scientists are convinced, however, that the new approaches to science courses are sound. It will be years before a complete evaluation can be made, but already there are indications that high school graduates who have taken the new courses are better prepared than other students for college level science and math. The products of the new courses are scoring well on college entrance examinations, according to educators. Several colleges, including Duke University and the University of Minnesota, are finding it necessary to revise freshman science and math courses to include more advanced material.

Although it will be a long time before the new science courses reach all the Nation's 13 million high school students in nearly 30,000 public and private schools, the modernized instruction is winning acceptance with surprising rapidity.

An estimated 40 percent of the 500,000 high school physics students in the United States are using the new physics text written by the MIT-Harvard group. One authority guesses that 5 to 10 percent of all high school students are now studying the new mathematics courses.

The new chemistry and biology books became available commercially only this year. But about 110,000 high school students are already using the new chemistry text, and Houghton Mifflin Co. says its first printing of a new biology book has sold 70,000 copies since coming off the press in August.

Why Businessmen Make Good Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following from Nation's Business, issue of November 1963:

The business community has a vital stake in improving government at all levels, and there is much that businessmen can contribute.

This is the opinion of Representative HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, a Williamsport, Pa., businessman who has been in Congress since 1960. Mr. SCHNEEBELI, a Republican, was first elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Representative Alvin R. Bush. He was reelected in the general election of 1960 and again in 1962. He is a member of the influential Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI is a businessman of 30 years' experience. He is a commission distributor for the Gulf Oil Corp., owner of an automobile dealership and part owner of another Gulf distributorship in a nearby community and two wholesale-retail tire outlets. An Army captain during World War II, he served as commanding officer of a high-explosives plant at Kingsport, Tenn.

An active interest in civic affairs led Mr. SCHNEEBELI into politics. He served as president and campaign chairman for the Community Chest and was campaign committee chairman for YWCA and Williamsport Hospital fund drives. He also was appointed to the school board.

Then he was persuaded by the directors of the Williamsport Chamber of Commerce to act as coordinator of its first political action course. The course was in progress when Representative Bush died, and a number of the city's leading citizens prevailed upon Mr. SCHNEEBELI to run for the vacant seat. He won the special election in April 1960, and in the two general elections since, increased his winning margin from 4,200 to 40,000.

In this interview with Nation's Business, Representative SCHNEEBELI tells why he believes more businessmen should run for public office, what qualities they have that are useful in solving Government problems, and explains how he has put his own business experience to use in the House of Representatives.

"Question. Mr. SCHNEEBELI, have you found your business background helpful in Congress?

"Answer. It is a terrific asset, particularly in the committee on which I serve, the taxation committee. I feel that I can do a pretty good job because, being a taxpayer of some consequence, I am allergic to high taxes. On the other hand, having to meet a payroll, I recognize the fact that we should raise the money to pay our expenses. So I have an interest in both ends of the problem, and I think my business background, together with my education in business administration at Dartmouth, helps me grasp a lot of the intricate problems of the Ways and Means Committee.

"There is much to learn, and I am still very much in the learning process. There is much that I don't know, but I am an eager student and try to keep an inquiring mind.

"Question. What qualities and abilities does the average businessman have that are useful when brought to bear on problems of government?

"Answer. First of all, government should be operated as close to a profit and loss basis as business. The experience of a businessman in trying to balance a budget and show a profit is an important counterbalance to those people in Congress who don't seem to have much concern in this area, who feel that all social programs are justified regardless of cost. We have a little more realistic approach—a business cannot succeed unless it shows some sort of profit or surplus.

"Secondly, I think businessmen tend to deliberate a little more on the broad reactions to and results of a decision. Where we have used our own money in business we have been circumspect as to what the final answer is going to be. We are a little broader

in our outlook, I think, in determining all angles to a problem.

"A businessman also brings into politics certain characteristics of ethics and morality. Certainly in local business you must have these qualities or you are not likely to be successful.

"I think that experience in handling labor, finance, management, sales promotion, and all the various aspects of business gives us a little deeper appreciation of the many problems that go into a decision here in Washington.

"Question. Do you feel it is important that more businessmen run for public office?

"Answer. We are witnessing a gradual decrease in the number of people in politics who are simply political professionals. In their place, more and more, I believe we will find business and professional people and others with experience outside the field of politics alone. This is a healthy trend and one which is essential if we are to have sound government in the years ahead.

"Since government is getting into the affairs of business so deeply in so many areas, it certainly should be a matter of concern that government would be sympathetic to and appreciate business problems. And who knows better what the business problems are than a businessman?

"I think the professional politician gradually is going out, and I think that people in the professional and business world are gradually recognizing their responsibilities in this area. The trend is from restricted activity—accepting civic responsibility in local affairs and philanthropic drives—to a more active participation in politics on all levels.

"They recognize the problem and they are doing something about it.

"Question. Businessmen feel they have a vital stake in taking part?

"Answer. Very much. All we have to do is think about the tax bill, for example. If we can reduce the taxes of business by 10 percent, we will have accomplished something very beneficial to the whole Nation.

"Question. What active roles other than elective office can businessmen take in politics?

"Answer. Well, they can serve in several capacities. They can serve on a finance committee of a political party, which is very important. They can serve on the executive committees of district and county organizations. They can serve as committee people and ward workers. They can lend their interest and presence and active participation in politics in many areas—as a candidate, in financing the party, and as an active worker.

"Question. Has holding public office been a rewarding experience?

"Answer. It has been very enriching in broadening my appreciation and concept of our many national problems and it has been very challenging. I often meet with the heads of large corporations. As Congressmen, we meet with people of this type continually. We get to know their thinking. We probably are in an area of higher executive influence and contact than were we to stay home in business.

"The problems we have to cope with here in Washington prepare us for handling big business problems. If we have any basis for advancement, it would be furthered by the contacts we make in this type of work.

"Question. So the experience is valuable for the businessman who enters politics?

"Answer. There is greater personal development than if you were to stay with a single corporation, because you have access to many more people with divergent ideas. This is much better preparation for handling a big corporate job.

"It gives you a concept of problems on a national scale and you are thinking of things in a broader sense, which is also becoming more and more a top corporate problem.

"Question. How does being a political decisionmaker in Congress differ from being a business decisionmaker?

"Answer. First of all, the business decision in my case is local, limited or personal, while in Congress it is more impersonal, of national consequence generally, probably more philosophical, and on a much broader scale, with much deeper implications all around. The problems here are deeper and more disturbing.

"I usually sleep much better with my business problems than I do with my congressional problems.

"Question. Does it require a different approach to get things done in Congress than in running your own business?

"Answer. Yes. In Congress you tend to take an academic approach to problems in trying to grasp their broad significance. Secondly, in trying to decide your stand on an issue it is almost like being judge or jury. Thirdly, there are political aspects of party policy and loyalties which have some importance. Your business problems are a lot more immediate, limited, and specific.

"In Government you are dealing with the public bank account. You are very concerned with doing the right thing. The problems are always new and usually more difficult to delineate specifically and solve.

"Question. Have you found that compromise is a more important part of accomplishing something in Congress than in business?

"Answer. Yes. In business it is usually yes or no. But in Congress there are so many aspects. Take this tax program. There were 35 or 40 different areas in which changes were recommended or made. Well, you might be able to subscribe to 80 percent of them, but the only way you get 80 percent of them is to accept 20 percent you don't like. In business you would be more apt to take the 80 percent and discard the 20 percent. We don't have that choice here.

"Question. Do you think that most companies are doing enough to encourage their executives to take part in politics?

"Answer. I don't know that most companies are. Many companies do a very effective job. Some of the larger companies I know should do more.

"One of the largest companies, A.T. & T., is doing a marvelous job. Another large national corporation is doing virtually nothing, and I have told the chairman of its board that I think it is unfortunate his company doesn't get into this area more. So much of their future is tied up in what happens in Washington that it behooves them to see that the representatives who are down here are not unsympathetic to the fact that business helped to create a lot of what is good in America.

"I believe there is a strong trend toward big business encouraging political participation at all levels, and this is good for the country.

"Question. Do most corporations support their executives once they get into politics?

"Answer. Corporations which encourage their employees to get into politics certainly should and do support them because they recognize their responsibility in creating this interest.

"Gulf Oil, for example, with which I am affiliated, has a salaried employee from Scranton, Pa., who happens to be Democrat and who recently was elected to the State assembly. So Gulf does not necessarily just reflect the Republican viewpoint, because their other man in politics from Pennsylvania is a Democrat.

"Gulf Oil was one of the original leaders in urging businessmen to get into politics. Much of this spadework was done by Archie Gray, former executive vice president.

"Since my election, there have been no pressures or political overtures from Gulf or any of my other business connections. As a matter of fact, in committee I voted in favor of the two tax provisions regarding additional taxation of oil companies, which were contrary to the interest of the major oil companies.

"Question. What is the best way for a businessman to get started in politics?

"Answer. He should create in the public mind the knowledge that he is interested in public service. He can do this by working with community projects and by not limiting himself to his business alone. Being a good community worker is probably the best background.

"Question. How did you set up your political organization?

"Answer. At the outset, I capitalized on my knowledge of organizing people with a common objective. I had a meeting each Monday of the first 2 months with people whose opinion I valued and people who had some practical experience in politics.

"In the first 2 months I went around to the other seven counties, visiting newspaper editors, county chairmen, people interested in politics, radio stations, and so forth. I wanted to let people see and know who HERM SCHNEEBELI was. They had no idea, since I was new at this work.

"Then I got to the practical matter of going around to Republican political meetings being organized for our special election.

"Suddenly the special election became a big national issue because it preceded the 1960 presidential election. Political pundits were looking for straws in the wind, and I guess I was one of the straws. The Republicans were determined they weren't going to lose this seat, which they had held for years, despite the fact they had a businessman who had never run for politics and had to be sold as a candidate. And the Democrats, realizing they had a pretty good proposition, began pouring in an awful lot of money. It was pretty rough going for an amateur.

"Question. How big was your winning margin?

"Answer. In the special election I won by 4,200 votes. The following November I ran against the same person and won by 20,000. In 1962, I won by 40,000.

"I attribute this increase to, first of all, hard work in Congress; and secondly, sales promotion work which I had learned in business. I became aggressive and advised the people that I was their Congressman in order to help them, and asked what their problems were and what their views were. They liked this approach, which was learned through business experience.

"Question. Since your election have you retained your business interests?

"Answer. Yes. I go home about every other weekend and I spend about 5 or 6 hours a month on my personal business. I think that it is just as well that quite a few Congressmen have an independent income so they aren't beholden to the office and can express an independent view at times.

"I am not a professional politician in that respect, and I think this independent income is an asset to me in making an independent, impersonal decision.

"Question. Do you hope to stay in Congress or do you eventually plan to go back to full-time business?

"Answer. From what I have seen down here I think one of the most difficult problems is for some people to realize when their term of contribution and worthwhile service is ended.

"Although there aren't too many instances of this type, there are a few people who tend to stay too long, and I hope I don't get in the same sort of situation. But it is difficult to be too self-critical in trying to arrive at a proper appraisal of when our service is declining."

Johnson's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

When President Johnson addressed the joint session of the Congres on November 27, 1963, all of us here as well as the citizens across the Nation and around the world were impressed with his deep sincerity of purpose and reassured that the reins of Government have fallen into firm and unfaltering hands following the monstrous assassination of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. An article by David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune of November 28, 1963, admirably sums up the deep impressions President Johnson made in his address to the Congress. The article follows:

JOHNSON'S SPEECH: HE 'MET THE TEST'

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—It was not just the eloquent words, but the firm resolve and spirit of dedication manifested by President Johnson which enabled the American people and the peoples of the world to derive from his first address to Congress a feeling of continuity in the high purposes of our national and international policies.

The frequent applause that came spontaneously from all sides was an answer to those persons who had worried about the impact of change itself. Confidence comes now because the new President interprets so accurately the basic desires of the American people.

Mr. Johnson reflected a universal view when he said that "we must be ready to defend the national interest and to negotiate the common interest." Reiteration of America's objectives in supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Alliance for Progress was not unexpected. Nor was it surprising that the new President said: "This Nation will keep its commitments, from South Vietnam to West Berlin."

There had arisen abroad in the last few days a fear that a change of policy might be in the offing. This can only be attributed to a lack of knowledge of how deeply Americans, irrespective of party, feel about the need for resolution and firmness, yet open-mindness toward those who differ with us in international policy.

With respect to the highly controversial domestic issues, Mr. Johnson said "the ideas and the ideals which he [President Kennedy] so nobly represented must and will be translated into effective action." These, of course, are broad principles and necessarily will have to be defined by Congress in the coming weeks and months. While urging the passage of the tax bill and the civil rights bill, the President realizes that Congress must find ways to secure agreement on many points of dispute in trying to achieve the basic goals of these measures.

This means that a spirit of compromise will doubtless develop. Mr. Johnson pointed the way to it as he said:

"As one who has long served in both Houses of the Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. And I promise you that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones. With equal firmness, I believe in the capacity and I believe in the ability of the Congress, despite the divisions of opinions which characterize our Nation, to act—to act wisely, to act vigorously, to act speedily when the need arises."

There will be much discussion about the implicit phrases of Mr. Johnson's address, for they were indeed significant. He spoke of the need for "tolerance and mutual understanding." The following paragraph especially will long be quoted:

"The time has come for Americans of all races and creeds and political beliefs to understand and to respect one another. So let us put an end to the teaching and the preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

This is but another way of saying that in America the voice of reason can be triumphant over violence and that debate and discussion—and even vehement expressions of opinion—can be phrased to reflect the sincere beliefs of conscientious citizens. But, even in saying this, there is need for self-restraint among those who have become impatient with the slow-moving processes of the law and threaten arbitrary steps to force action.

As Mr. Johnson counseled the people to deal with public affairs in a dispassionate mood, he made no reference to the motives of the assassin who took Mr. Kennedy's life. But nobody can logically infer that the mentally unbalanced or deranged individuals who were inflamed by some personal grievance to seek vengeance and assassinate four of our Presidents could be in any way considered typical of the manhood of this or of any other country.

Our Nation was waiting for words from the new President which would bring confidence and quiet the emotions arising out of our controversies in domestic and foreign issues. Mr. Johnson met the test. He gave the country and the world assurance that the Government of the United States continues to reflect the ideals and high purposes of the American people unmarred by the tragedies of the past few days.

Requiem for the President: Delivered by Rev. Donald L. Garfield, Rector of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Springfield, Mass., During Requiem Mass on Sunday, November 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has been eulogized throughout the country in newspaper editorials and in church requiem services. One of the most thoughtful sermons, which aptly pays tribute to President Kennedy's work of upholding man's personal dignity through civil rights legislation, was delievered by Rev. Donald L. Garfield, rector of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Springfield, Mass., while conducting a requiem mass for the late President on Sunday, November 24. I include this sermon with my remarks in the Appendix:

REQUIEM FOR THE PRESIDENT

"The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance: they will not be afraid of any evil tidings."

Across this land today, indeed throughout the civilized world, men of good will are commending John Fitzgerald Kennedy, his wife and family, his successor in office, and our country, to a care beyond human reach. However we worship God, however we voted for President in 1960 or will vote in 1964, we stand united in giving thanks for the integrity and courage of the man who in 3 years made so telling an impact on all who love freedom and uphold man's personal dignity. As you and I offer Christ's sacrifice—full, perfect, and sufficient for the sins of the whole world—we offer it for the repose of a great soul, a sheep of Christ's own fold, a lamb of his own flock, a sinner of his own redeeming. "Receive him," we pray, "into the arms of Thy mercy, into the blessed rest of everlasting peace, and into the glorious company of the saints in light." There, he will not be afraid of any evil tidings—nor need we fear. For the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance, and the good work begun in him and in all who have laid down their lives in the service of our country, will be made perfect through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The work which was John Kennedy's greatest—the work which no Christian can quarrel with—was the work of upholding man's personal dignity. Call it what you will: civil rights, racial equality; but put it in practice as God gives you to see the right. The principle of equal opportunity to serve and be served comes from the Saviour who shed his blood and thereby made all men to be of one blood—to be brothers and sisters because we are sons and daughters of one Father—our Father and his. If John Kennedy's life work, and his death, will call us to seek out one another, to know one another and therefore serve and live in peace with one another, then he will not have died in vain.

One hundred years ago, dedicating a cemetery for the men who died at Gettysburg, President Lincoln said: "The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they have, thus far, so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

These are familiar words—familiar ideals. Fellow citizens, fellow Christians, what have you and I done to translate ideals into everyday acceptance? Can we point accusing fingers at others who obviously, shockingly, betray the ideals of our country without looking at ourselves, our own hidden motives, our acceptance of things as they are, our reluctance to stand solidly and openly for human dignity, and to see justice done to all men? Great empires have crumbled because little men betrayed them with little sins—a letting go of truth so gradual as to go unnoticed. Great ideals can become empty flag waving unless you and I apply them where it is not easy, where it may make us lose face and favor with those we thought were friends.

Your children, our country, face a future which is in your hands and mine, and what we do day by day will shape it. What we do this afternoon when representatives of religious groups of Springfield look at their role in inter-racial understanding will help to

shape our future, and I ask your prayers for that conference. What you do when you go back to your neighborhoods, to your school or shop or office, and what you and I do when we come together in St. Peter's Church to worship our one God and Father, will have still more to do with the future—good or evil—of this city, our country, God's world. "No man is an island," we go forward together, or we fall back into the anarchy which martyred our President.

To God's mercy we commend him in this mass and in the prayers we shall offer after mass at the catafalque that symbolizes the presence of his body and joins us with those who can be physically present with it tomorrow. Incense burning itself out before God rises as a symbol of sacrifice. Water sprinkled on the bier is a sign of spiritual cleansing. We offer incense and holy water, praying that Christ's sacrifice may purge his soul, so that it may be presented pure and without spot before God.

To God's mercy, also, we commend his family and our country, knowing that if we live uprightly we need not be afraid of any tidings, however evil. It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us: a task which a century has not completed and only another century of increased devotion may accomplish—that this Nation under God may have a new birth of freedom.

"Judge eternal, throned in splendor,
Lord of lords and King of Kings,
With thy living fire of judgment
Purge this land of bitter things;
Solace all its wide dominion
With the healing of Thy wings."

Dallas Chapter DAR on the Death of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following letter sent to me by the Jane Douglas Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Dallas, Tex.:

JANE DOUGLAS CHAPTER,
DAUGHTERS OF THE
AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Dallas, Tex.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALGER: As Jane Douglas Chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution was assembling for its regularly scheduled meeting at Dallas, Tex., on Friday, November 22, 1963, the tragic and shocking news of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the murder of Police Officer J. D. Tippit, and the wounding of Gov. John Connally reached the chapter house.

All members joined in prayer and, before adjourning in sorrow and respect, voted to go on record as deploring the terrible tragedy which had just taken place. Only moments before many members had watched while the President received a friendly welcome from crowds of Dallas citizens as the motorcade passed through the streets. Now this vicious act by an avowed Marxist and outspoken enemy of the United States, who apparently had made careful plans to come to Dallas after public announcement of the impending visit of President Kennedy, left all true Americans stunned by its impact.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to the families of President Kennedy, Officer J. D. Tippitt, and Gov. John Connally.

Despite the great tragedy involved we are thankful for our constitutional form of Government which means that the Republic survives even such a critical crisis. May our new President Lyndon B. Johnson receive guidance from Almighty God as he assumes the highest office of our great Nation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEE MILLER BLAKE,
Regent.

Mrs. HENRY G. RICHARDSON,
Chaplain.

Full Text of Mr. Seaborg's Address at Dedication of Zero Gradient Synchrotron Facility at Argonne National Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today in my home State of Illinois there was the formal dedication of the Zero Gradient Synchrotron at the Argonne National Laboratory, and the address on that occasion was delivered by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Because of the importance of Dr. Seaborg's address on this historic occasion I am extending my remarks to include the full text, as follows:

THE ARGONNE ACCELERATOR—INSTRUMENT AND SYMBOL OF RESEARCH PROGRESS

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have this opportunity to participate in these exercises at the Argonne National Laboratory on the occasion of the dedication of the 12.5 billion electron volt zero gradient proton synchrotron and its associated facilities.

I am especially pleased that all of those who were involved with the construction of these high energy physics facilities have done their work so well. Scientists and engineers from the Argonne National Laboratory, working under the able leadership of Albert Crewe, Roger Hildebrand, and Lee Teng, are to be especially congratulated for the highly professional job they have done to make the ZGS a useful and productive accelerator which scientists from the Midwest can now begin to exploit in their research studies.

The manager of the Chicago Operations Office of the Atomic Energy Commission—Kenneth Dunbar—and his staff, can also be proud of their participation in supervising the construction work on the ZGS and in maintaining effective liaison with the many industrial organizations who have done so much to make these exercises possible today.

I am also happy to be here where I have enjoyed, during the past 21 years, close personal and professional relations with many of the scientific, educational, and administrative leaders of this fine institution and of its predecessor, the Metallurgical Laboratory at the University of Chicago. As many of you know, I have had the privilege of spending 4 years in the Metallurgical Laboratory—a period that I recall with nostalgia and much pleasure. I enjoyed my association with many of the people who were members of the Laboratory then and who are still making important contributions to the continuing program here. I remember with particular pleasure that many of you, working in the divisions headed by Winston Manning and Oliver Simpson, came here first at my invitation.

I know that all of you will agree with me when I say that our present harvest of the peaceful benefits of the atomic age would not be possible had it not been for the guidance, leadership, and zeal of men like Arthur Compton, Enrico Fermi, Norman Hilberry, and Walter Zinn. We owe a debt of gratitude to these men for their part in laying a firm foundation of scientific excellence for the Argonne National Laboratory. Without such a broad tradition of excellence in chemistry, biology, engineering, reactor development, mathematics, and nuclear physics, I feel certain that the high energy physics program could not have gotten off to such a fine beginning.

With the successful operation of the Zero Gradient Synchrotron, the Atomic Energy Commission's high energy physics program has completed an important phase of its work—preparatory, of course, to entering upon a still more important phase—the intensive employment of this facility in tasks of the kind it is uniquely fitted to accomplish. I was in Copenhagen—en route to the Seventh General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna—when Dr. Crewe, with the emotions resembling those of a new father, wired me the news that the ZGS had been fired up and was in excellent health. Unfortunately, the telegram was handed to me as a note that looked like no telegram I had ever seen before. It was only later, in Vienna, that I rescued the crumpled note from my pocket and was immensely pleased by the belated news of AEC's fine new particle accelerator.

There are other interesting aspects of the Zero Gradient Synchrotron's history. You will recall that when the decision was made to authorize the ZGS, the 6 Bev Bevatron at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at the University of California and the 3 Bev Cosmotron at the Brookhaven National Laboratory had been producing exciting scientific results for several years. Furthermore, at that time, the design plans for the 33 Bev Alternating Gradient Synchrotron at the Brookhaven National Laboratory were well along; and the Soviets had announced that they would soon be operating a 10 Bev synchrophasotron, as they called it. To complete the picture, the Congress, as of 1956, had authorized the construction of the 3 Bev Pennsylvania/Princeton Proton Accelerator and the 6 Bev Cambridge Electron Accelerator.

All of these activities and projected plans were part of a milieu of a decade ago, in which it had become clear to many physicists that any real understanding of the nature of the elementary particles and their interactions with each other and with electromagnetic fields would be achieved only by devoting large amounts of human and material resources to the effort. Many curious and baffling events were being observed in high energy physics laboratories in this country and elsewhere in the world. To probe into such events with more powerful tools and, if possible, elicit their patterns seemed both to the professional scientist and the layman to be a worthwhile allocation of a significant amount of the resources of this country.

There were those who thought at the time that Argonne National Laboratory should be asked to build a 10-bev sealed-up version of the bevatron and have it operating before the Soviet 10-bev synchrophasotron could be completed. Actually, a project of this kind was authorized for construction in the Midwest in 1956 when it became apparent that the Soviets would be leading the world in maximum proton energy. But the Argonne National Laboratory took a steadier, and what I believe has turned out to be a more productive view of the situation. After serious study, the Laboratory decided that

a worthwhile accelerator could not be built within the funds authorized for this project before the Soviets completed their machine. Rather, the Laboratory and others recommended that the crash project be cancelled and that the Laboratory be authorized to construct a 12.5-bev zero gradient synchrotron with proton intensities sufficient to carry out the important research experiments envisioned for the accelerator.

That this recommendation, which was approved by the Atomic Energy Commission and by the Congress in 1958, was justified, is evidenced by the enthusiasm with which the interested groups of scientists from universities in the Midwest and from the Argonne National Laboratory are approaching the extremely difficult job of assigning priority to the many projects bidding for time in using this facility.

Words of praise for the capabilities of this accelerator have been expressed by many individuals throughout the world. For example, Professor Bernardini—in a speech last spring in Geneva—stated his conviction that the ZGS type of machine had numerous advantages over existing higher energy accelerators in Europe and the United States. As an aside, I might say that representatives of this Laboratory, believing as they do in the virtues of rapid communication, lost no time in letting us know in Washington of these laudatory remarks by Professor Bernardini.

There is no good way, of course, to predict the ultimate useful life of a facility such as the ZGS. I am sure all of us would agree that if the ZGS—or any of the other high energy accelerators now in existence or under construction—should provide us with a clear and definitive understanding of the nature of elementary particles and their role in the structure of matter, it would have earned a rest and could be closed down in good conscience. From present indications, however, there seem to be many years of intensive effort before us until that day is reached. I can only say now, based on the known demands for research time on the ZGS, that this facility—with appropriate improvements—should serve as a very useful instrument for Midwest physics for a long, long time.

It is worthwhile on an occasion such as this, when we are gathered to share the excitement and satisfaction of realizing this kind of collective scientific achievement, that in counting our blessings we also think seriously on the obligations implicit in the privilege we enjoy of using a major scientific facility of this kind. American science has been fortunate during the last several years in having been given the wholehearted support of the American people. I believe that with wisdom in the goals we select and pursue and with dedicated effort on our part in seeking to achieve these goals, we will continue to merit and receive an even greater degree of intelligent public support. I believe strongly, however, that as responsible scientists we have an obligation to do everything within our power to encourage an intelligent and well-informed climate of public opinion regarding science.

For two reasons this latter comment applies with particular force to the study of high-energy physics. In the first place, it is difficult for the ordinary citizen to see why scientists should make so much fuss about probing into the ultimate secrets of matter. Even though by now the layman may understand that such experiments as these somehow were instrumental in the release of nuclear energy, so much stress has been laid on the short-term benefits to be expected from basic research that the layman may be inclined to expect some beneficial miracle every other week and to show impatience when it is not forthcoming.

Secondly, his attitude may be even further exaggerated when he learns of the high cost of high-energy physics relative to other fields of basic research. I would emphasize the phrase "relative to other fields of basic research." Even the GAC–PSAC Panel's recommended 10-year program envisaging an annual rate of expenditure rising to $600 million by 1975 for the construction and use of high-energy accelerators is not impressive by comparison with our expenditures on space research and development. It is nevertheless a substantial sum.

There is much we can do as individuals, as teachers, and as members of professional groups to help lessen the first difficulty. The citizen in our contemporary world must gain the realization that to participate fully in the life of his age he will have to become much more than the passive recipient of the material dividends of this or that innovation. As one scientist has said, "Education, which transmits from each generation to the next the heritage of the past and the seeds of new powers yet to be, ought * * * to reflect the central reality of modern life." Today's education should, of course, reflect science as being more and more a central reality of our time.

In this context it becomes almost as important for the scientist (including the scientist who deals with the delicate and complex issues of high-energy physics) to provide his fellow citizen with illuminating insights into the broader implications of his discoveries as for him to assure that these same discoveries are communicated to fellow scientists with the utmost dispatch and accuracy.

The second difficulty—that concerning the expense of high-energy physics—will also be greatly lessened insofar as the ordinary citizen understands what we are about. He will understand that by their very nature the major investigations of high-energy physics are expensive undertakings which require large and enormously sophisticated machines necessarily manned by large organizations of even more sophisticated scientists, engineers, and technicians. He will understand why, with our continuing demands for ever-higher energies and intensities, the great high-energy physics research centers are sure to become more, rather than less, expensive.

But when the citizen has reached this desirable level of understanding, he is almost certain to begin asking himself the same questions we are more and more asking each other. I will list a few of these questions—not because any of us presently have the answers, though we may feel we have good first approximations—but because the questions are vital to the sound future development of high energy physics.

In the first place, our average citizen may raise a question as to the real value of continuing to put ever-increasing emphasis on understanding the role of elementary particles in nature. He may ask if we are choosing an illusory star of hope that will continue to elude our efforts toward some stable definition of its image. Are we making real progress toward our objective? Would we be better advised over the long pull to proceed at a more leisurely pace, or have we already reached a stage in our investigations when it is essential to drive with renewed vigor toward a realizable goal just beyond our grasp? These questions become very important when their answers involve expenditures of the magnitude required to build such accelerators—first, in the energy neighborhood of 200 billion electron volts; and, later, in the neighborhood of four or five times that figure.

Informally among ourselves and more formally by the members of the GAC–PSAC Panel on High Energy Physics, questions such as these have been discussed and will continue to be discussed. Questions ancillary to these, as well as questions concerning the relation of the programs conducted in high energy physics research centers to advanced education and research as undertaken by the universities, must be given our careful consideration.

The conduct of independent research in high energy physics facilities as large and as complex as the ZGS raises many issues of fundamental concern to all of us. How can the dedicated scholar continue to participate in the academic and educational life of his university and also, at the same time, make effective use of these large accelerators in his independent research? What are the appropriate ways to make it easier for graduate students from the Midwest universities and their professors to take advantage of the ZGS and for their counterparts to take advantage of similar accelerators elsewhere?

From an even broader standpoint, what can be done to assure that the ZGS and other high energy accelerators are made "available to competent scientists and groups of scientists without regard to their current affiliations but, rather, in accordance with the scientific merit of their proposals"? This latter problem assumes crucial importance as we begin to consider retiring older accelerators from service and as more expensive projects push us toward even further emphasis on the research to be conducted at a few very large centers.

Perhaps I have been too serious on such an occasion as this. If so, let me hasten to say that I do not regard any of the questions raised or any of the problems listed or restated by me in these remarks as being insoluble. On the contrary, I believe they are problems that challenge the prospective users of the Zero Gradient Synchrotron to demonstrate as fully as possible its potentialities for very high achievements in the field of high energy physics. I will be surprised indeed if this new particle accelerator does not become a significant enterprise supported by high energy physicists and their most promising students throughout the midwestern region of the United States.

With your leave, let me stray from the matter-of-fact for a moment and suggest that even the initials Z.G.S. may, in a fanciful, philosophical sort of way, portend well for this new undertaking. I believe it was the 18th century philosopher, Johann von Herder, who anticipated Spengler and Toynbee in developing the notion that history is a completely determined series of epochs, each fulfilling a specific function and each contributing to the next higher stage. He based this idea on the supposed unique interaction between the spirit or genius of a people and their environment. Von Herder thought this spirit or zeitgeist of the times determined the moral and intellectual travel of an age or period.

May we let ourselves hope that ZGS can be appropriately transcribed either as Zero Gradient Synchroton or as Zeit Geist Scientia? I believe it is the scientific spirit of our time that will determine both the extent of our travel and the nature of our journey. I believe, also, that the ZGS may prove itself to be a fitting symbol of this spirit and help lead us to even more rewarding achievements of the intellect during the years ahead.

Let me say once more that I am pleased to see old friends again on this challenging occasion and to participate with all of you in dedicating this new accelerator to the highest service of science and the pursuit of objectives we all cherish.

Jack F. Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that today under unanimous

consent I am able to extend my sincere congratulations to Mr. Jack F. Mills who has been named executive director of the Republican National Congressional Committee, effective January 1, 1964.

Over the years Mr. Mills has provided valuable assistance to many of my colleagues. He has been a good friend, and a credit to all of us in public service.

I know my colleagues who have worked with Jack will agree that his reputation and character over the years is truly a record of which we can all be proud. He has served his Nation in commendable fashion.

May I take this opportunity to introduce Jack Mills to my colleagues who have not yet had the opportunity to meet him.

Jack was born in Milwaukee, Wis., September 14, 1920. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Annette (Christy) Mills, he is married to Anna Lenor Butke and the father of four children. He has been an executive in industry and earlier in life was the assistant golf professional at the Milwaukee Country Club.

Since coming to Washington he has shown initiative and ambition, and has helped shape the image of public service of which we are all proud.

The President's First Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of November 29, 1963, with respect to President Johnson's first week in office. It is to be noted that the comments are particularly laudatory of the President's activity and I would like to add my commendation to our new President for the excellent manner in which he has commenced handling the duties of his new office. The article follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST WEEK

It is now 1 week since President Johnson assumed office, and even in so short a span, so clouded in tragedy, he has done much to command respect and encourage confidence. People have been impressed as much, perhaps, by the President's demeanor as by his words and acts.

There has been thoughtfulness for everyone; for the late President's family, the Government employees, high and low, the Members of Congress, the Governors of the States, the visiting heads of foreign nations, and, not least, thoughtfulness for the American people whom he has sought to address when possible, even with a special Thanksgiving talk last evening.

There has been calmness in the midst of exhausting turbulence, so that the machinery of Government slowed but did not falter. An ease of manner, as in his meetings with the foreign dignitaries in the most difficult of circumstances. An instinct for the right thing, as when he did in fact confer with those dignitaries despite protocol advice to the contrary.

And much more, all of it suggesting a President compassionate and capable, certainly one who is in charge. His words, general though they have understandably been so far, have buttressed that impression.

During this week President Johnson has pledged support, as was expected, for President Kennedy's foreign and domestic policies, with particular stress on the tax-reduction and civil rights bills. On these and other matters, he asked Congress to act speedily but wisely.

What is notable, however, is that he has not tried to rush Congress to specific dates of action or make urgent new demands upon it. That is an indication of a man who is not likely to be stampeded but will give due thought to courses of action—an excellent thing in a President, especially in times of continuing international trouble.

Such restraint, in turn, is an important element of national confidence. In this connection, Mr. Johnson has sought to foster confidence in the many millions concerned with the Nation's business. He has expressed, in down-to-earth language, his belief in free enterprise, a belief shared by most Americans. Nor is this anything new for Mr. Johnson; he has said much the same before and plainly believes it.

The President, moreover, has emphasized the need to control the Federal budget and eliminate waste from Federal spending. He has promised to demand the utmost thrift and frugality in Washington, to insist that the Government get a dollar's value for a dollar spent, and that it set an example of prudence and economy.

Though few would call Mr. Johnson a fiscal conservative, few consider him antibusiness either. He has a strong economy going for him, and the business community has already given him a strong expression of confidence. This, we think, but reflects the feeling of most Americans.

None of us can yet say what kind of President Lyndon Johnson will eventually make, or what further trials may be in store for all of us. But at least this week has shown a man of ability and resolve. The Nation today is thankful that out of high tragedy can come high promise for the future.

Mental Retardation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House and the Senate a very fine and noble series of articles written last month by Mr. Crozet J. Duplantier, executive editor of the New Orleans (La.) States-Item, my home city newspaper, on the many problems which he and his wife, Peggy, have faced for many years, and are continuing to face, in raising a retarded child. Cro Duplantier, one of my city's finest reporters and sports writers, has displayed great courage in writing such a touching, intimate series of stories on the heart-rending task of raising Chris, his 8-year-old son who suffers with this affliction.

By his willingness to present intimate details of Chris' life in his home, Mr. Duplantier has given me and all those who have read his stories a better understanding and insight into the heavy burden which the parents of any retarded child must bear. I am confident that my colleagues in the Congress will feel the same way when they read this ennobling series of five stories which I am pleased to offer to them through our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As all of you know, one of the subjects closest to the heart of the late President Kennedy and to the members of his family has been the assistance they have provided to help those unfortunate children and adults who are afflicted with mental retardation. One of the late President's sisters is so afflicted; and his father, Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy established in 1946 the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation to provide financial aid to hospitals, day-care centers, custodial centers caring for the mentally retarded, and also funds for research projects in the field of mental retardation.

This foundation already has donated some $17 million to help combat this affliction and to care for those who suffer from its effects. In connection with the foundation, Ambassador Kennedy and his family have established the Kennedy Institute in Washington, D.C.; two Kennedy Child Study Centers, one in New York City and the other in Santa Monica, Calif.; the Kennedy School for Exceptonal Children in Palos Park, Ill., and the Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Brighton, N.Y. All of these institutions are dedicated to seeking a prevention for mental retardation, to finding ways to ease the condition of those so afflicted and to caring for them.

Following more than 17 years of splendid contributions in this field by the Kennedy family, the 88th Congress, in this first session, has enacted pioneer legislation in the fields of mental retardation and mental health. Just 1 month before President Kennedy was assassinated, the Congress gave final approval to legislation authorizing a $329 million program to combat mental retardation and mental infirmity in our country. Of this sum, a total of $126 million was authorized during the next 4 years to build facilities for research in the field of mental retardation, and facilities for the care and treatment of people so afflicted. An additional $53 million was authorized over this 4-year period to expand the existing training programs for teachers of the mentally retarded, and to authorize the training of teachers for all kinds of handicapped children.

This legislation may well prove to be the finest single action of the first session of the 88th Congress, and I know that my colleagues in the Congress are proud of this positive action, and particularly so because it was done prior to the tragic death of President Kennedy to whom this legislation and this program meant so much.

In his letter to me, Mr. Duplantier noted that President Kennedy was assassinated during the observance of National Retarded Children's Week. He cited the fine work which the late President and his family have done, and are

continuing to do, to help the mentally retarded children and adults in our country. Particularly in the light of his own personal experience, Cro Duplantier expressed his deep appreciation for all that President Kenndey, his father, and the other members of his family and the Congress have done in this important field, which is now so close to his heart and that of Mrs. Duplantier, as it was to John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is indeed a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to insert these five stories by Cro Duplantier on his own son, Chris, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Duplantier's five stories appeared in the States-Item on November 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. The articles follow in order:

[From the States-Item, Nov. 19, 1963]

PROBLEM WILL NOT GO AWAY—WORDS "CHRIS IS RETARDED" CRUSH FATHER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The States-Item today begins a series on mental retardation as seen through the eyes of the parents of one of the youngsters. The father is States-Item Executive Sports Editor Crozet Duplantier, who wrote the articles to accent National Retarded Children's Week which is in progress.)

(By Crozet Duplantier)

It was Friday, May 13, 1955, when my wife Peggy went to Hotel Dieu to await the birth of our third child.

As with any young family, it was a moment of happiness, concern, hope.

We were happy because we wanted a number of children, concerned because we worried each time about the prospects of something being wrong with the new one, and hopeful that everything would turn out all right.

For me it was a period of extra hope, for our first two children had been girls and every young father waits anxiously for his first boy.

The waiting period was a brief one, and shortly after he was born, at 1:02 a.m. May 14, I had my first glimpse of Chris.

Unconsciously, as I had in the past, I inspected him head to foot, mentally counting fingers and toes, looking for deformities.

And then there was the moment of relief. He was a fine, plump-looking youngster completely normal, physically.

This was the last real concern I had about him until months later when I began to worry at his slowness at sitting, at trying to creep—in everything.

But, in a way I was lucky. I was spared months of knowing, months of the agony my wife had experienced, for she had known, or suspected, almost from the beginning. And, one of the nurses, in fact, had noticed it at the moment of delivery.

Shortly afterward Peggy found out that at the moment of his birth one of the nurses had said, "Oh, look at him, what a shame."

Peggy's concern grew with each month and was confirmed gradually as she read her father's medical books and then, finally, as she talked with him and others. Our doctor; for example, mentioned at about 9 months that there was a possibility that something was wrong.

Somehow she kept it from me, sparing me this extra worry, as at the time I was working late into each night after my regular office hours. I was in the last months of study toward my master's degree, and even on a part-time basis that would be tough.

The months ticked by.

In my blissful ignorance, I saw him only as a delight. He was a good baby, fat, quiet, even tempered. He smiled easily. Demanded little.

These were wonderful qualities for a new baby in our crowded little apartment; wonderful especially when I had so much to do.

He was just a little over a year old when the school session ended, I received my degree, and then the news.

It's a funny thing now, just 8 years later, I can't remember the circumstances under which Peggy told me but I'll never forget the words.

"Chris," she said, "is retarded; he's a a mongoloid."

The world stood still for a moment.

There was that tight feeling in the stomach that comes when disaster is at hand, and hope is struggling to give you a lift.

Thinking back, it was something, like lying on that beach at Guadalcanal, trying to burrow your way into the tiny pebbles as the Jap planes whined toward earth and slugs from their guns began kicking around you.

You know this must be unreal; that soon they would go away; and your unit could resume its quiet swim behind the lines.

But this problem would not go away. I was weak, sick, near despair as I realized that my first son was going to be a child all his life.

[From the States-Item, Nov. 20, 1963]

MUST FACE UP TO PROBLEM—PARENTS CAN HELP RETARDATES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second in a series on mental retardation as seen through the eyes of the parents of one of the youngsters. The father is States-Item Executive Sports Editor Crozet Duplantier, who wrote the articles to accent National Retarded Children's Week which is in progress.)

(By Crozet Duplantier)

The admission that your child is retarded is the most difficult problem parents of retardates ever face.

But this does not mean that once you admit it to yourself the problem is over.

All it does mean, really, is that at last you can begin to work toward solving or, rather, handling the problem.

When we faced up to the admission that our first boy, Chris, was a mental retardate—a mongoloid—it was with despair in our hearts.

The depths of this despair would have been much deeper had we known what was in store for us in the years ahead.

He had been slow in every aspect of physical progress but there was some progress and, as it continued, this is what heightened, not eased, the problems.

Of course, it made us happy when he could finally sit, and when he learned to crawl and, finally, at about 16 months (4 to 5 months later than our other children) when he learned to walk.

But creeping meant getting into things, walking meant getting into more things and no matter how much correcting there seemed to be no understanding.

There was a time, for instance, when he managed to get to the edge of a second-story porch and through the protective railing around it, onto a little ledge.

I approached him with dread, fearing that any sudden movement on my part would send him walking off the side.

I kept calling to him, asking him to return, but he only laughed. It was a game.

Finally, very close to him, but not close enough to reach him I turned my back on him, repeating over and over again, "Piggyback, Chris, piggyback, Chris."

I don't ever remember such relief as when I felt his stubby fat hand on my shoulder. He was ready for another game now and another near tragedy had been averted.

Then there was feeding time, a happy time with most kids and for the parents as they watch a youngster use a spoon for the first time.

This is one area in which Chris was fairly adept. But where others generally only spill food, he tossed it.

We had moved as our family grew, and, in the big kitchen he would sit at one end of the table, eating quietly; then, suddenly, whoosh, he'd send his plate sliding down the table. Before anyone could grab it, it would topple off onto someone's shirt or lap and then to the floor.

Perhaps the two most frustrating things were the matters of toilet training and correction.

No amount of toilet training suggestions seemed to make an impression and he continued to wear diapers into his second, third, fourth years.

Every correction was a frustration to him and us alike. Suggestions, cajoling, urging, threatening, spanking—nothing did any good. And each time when we were finished he'd punish us—and himself—by lying face down on the floor and beating his forehead against it.

For months on end there was a lump on it—an open sore, really, for it never had time to heal.

There were frequent moments when we wondered whether we had erred in not following the advice of so many to have him, as they said it, "put away."

The only thing that prevented us were his happy moments, his smile. We didn't know how we could ever voluntarily separate ourselves from these moments. And we wanted to believe that the new idea in the care of retardates, in keeping them in the family circle if it is at all possible, was the right idea.

[From the States-Item, Nov. 21, 1963]

LIFE NOT ALL MARTYRDOM—CHRIS' JOY IS INFECTIOUS

(Third in a series on mental retardation as seen through the eyes of the parents of one of the youngsters. The father is States-Item Executive Sports Editor Crozet Duplantier, who wrote the articles to accent National Retarded Children's Week which is in progress.)

(By Crozet Duplantier)

For the parent of a retardate—at least one in the category of ours—to present a picture of perpetual gloom would be absolutely unfair.

Living with our Chris is not a martyrdom for, while he presents so many more trials than does the normal child, while there is a problem that continues on and on, there are also moments of great happiness.

To begin with, he is a mongoloid. As children they are physically attractive, as adults not unattractive.

And, the most prevalent attitude is one of love and happiness.

When Chris is happy there is no one happier.

When he smiles, his is the happiest smile that you have ever encountered.

And when he is happy, gay, and smiling it is almost impossible for anyone anywhere near him to be anything but just the way he is.

His happiness is indeed infectious.

Chris is primarily a mimic and a comic.

After I have bawled out one of the others, he waits, just the proper amount of time and then he bawls someone else out with all the gestures, with all the noise, with all the bluster.

Laughter replaces anger and resentment in the household.

He can be Roy Rogers' pal Pat Brady and in a moment he's Mitch Miller.

He leads the orchestra when his records are playing. He's Dave Seville and Alvin and all the Chipmunks. He dances the twist like his life depended on it.

And he likes to tease, take someone's hat and run with it—his cigarettes and hide them behind his back.

That's one of his favorite games. He calls it something which sounds like "Hin-a-bak." And no matter which hand you guess first, you're always wrong.

For me, of all the happy times the mornings and bedtime are the happiest. Because that's when he's happiest.

He can do a lot of little things now that he's 8, and each of them bring him and me—great happiness.

He's always been an early riser and now in the mornings his mother lets him out to walk down our long drive to the street to fetch our paper.

He brings it upstairs to me in bed, with musical accompaniment.

"Goo mornin' to you, goo mornin' to you," he sings, to the tune of the birthday song.

"Here's you paper," he says.

Then, as I put a hand out for it he throws it at me and runs.

The service in the morning is wonderful. He brings my underclothes to the bathroom as I shower, fetches my shoes and socks as I begin dressing.

And then he begins to balk when it's time to dress himself.

He loves bedtime, because it's story time, and his favorites are those that are made up as we go along.

He'll listen to a story from a book from Mama but when it's Daddy's night, he always tells me, "Read a story outta the head."

And his eyes light up as the story starts, he giggles at all the silly situations and the ridiculous names. He even likes to try his hand at story telling himself.

He always begins this way: "Once a pony time * * *."

And after he's established his characters, the next line always is: "And then one day—."

It's the classical approach but the stuff in between and after is hardly that. Two years of schooling has done wonders with his speech. But it is far from perfect. Trying to understand him is difficult. But he doesn't mind the questions nor the fact that many times we have to depend for translation on one of his little brothers, little Cro, or Co-Co, as he's called.

He doesn't mind, in fact he seems to understand that this is perfectly normal. For Co-Co is 4—the same age as our 8-year-old Chris.

[From the States-Item, Nov. 22, 1963]

CHRIS LEARNS TO FORM WORDS—TIME BRINGS FRUSTRATION, JOY

(Fourth in a series on mental retardation presented in connection with National Retarded Children's Week, which is in progress. The author, States-Item executive sports editor, writes of his son.)

(By Crozet Duplantier)

There is a constant tugging at the heart of parents of retarded children as they watch them continue to grow physically and continue to fall behind mentally.

He reaches 2 and you remember the others were talking by that time. Yet he makes no intelligible sounds.

He reaches 3 and you remember the others were accomplished conversationalists by then.

He reaches 5 and still it's mostly grunts, squawks, smiles, and pointing or grabbing for what he wants.

And his little brother, 15 months younger, is talking up a storm, growing away from him already.

It's a point we make with Bobby, at 4, about Chris who is then 5. He's the big brother now, even though Chris is older.

But there is progress in some areas.

Finally, for example, wet pants start to annoy Chris and he begins to toilet train himself.

And he learns to pull a tee shirt over his head and his underwear up his muscular legs.

But always it's only the grunts and sing-song sounds and gritting of teeth. Trying to teach him to speak is almost as frustrating to us as it is for him trying to learn.

Everyone joins in the effort, even the little ones—Bob, and now, little Co-Co, at that time a precocious toddler. He calls Chris Tee-Wee, instead of Chrissie and that becomes his name.

"Tee-Wee say this—" one of them tries.

"Tee-Wee say this—"

"Tee-Wee say this—"

But all Tee-Wee says is something that sounds like "Row—row—row," and we sing, "Row, row, row the boat," hoping he'll learn something more than the sound that has begun to drive us mad, for he keeps at it all day.

And then it comes one day—the bolt from heaven—and Chris says to me:

"I, Tee-Wee——"

The joy of finding the lost sheep, the lost coin—these are nothings compared to the joy when a child finds speech he never possessed. Tee-Wee has discovered Chris.

"I, Tee-Wee——"

Then "I, Tee-Wee want——"

"Tee-Wee hungry."

The joy is general. Everyone wants him to say something over and over again.

He is praised for each new accomplishment.

We find ourselves carried away with each new deed, heaping praise on him—at 5 and then at 6—for learning to do things that two little brothers already can do, or say.

If there is a miracle in a child growing, learning as nature plans it for most of them, it is an even greater miracle when the non-learner begins. For with the others it is natural, there is no effort.

With Chris you can see the effort, watch the wheels turning in the furrowed brows as he tries to get his pants up, close or open a zipper—things that look so easy and natural, but for him come only with great effort.

But there was a cloud even in this bright sky of happiness.

For one day my wife scolds me.

"You know," she said, "this can be overdone—especially where the little ones are concerned—praising Chris so for such things and hardly noting when they, so much younger, are doing so much more. This is hard on them."

We were approaching a new problem in communications now that the one we had worried about so long had been solved. Now we had to communicate with the rest, to make them understand that his would have to be a different and difficult role and that it might mean difficulties for them too.

[From the States-Item, Nov. 23, 1963]

FITTING INTO FAMILY DIFFICULT—RETARDATE STRIVES FOR "'VANTAGES"

(Final in a series on mental retardation presented in connection with National Retarded Children's Week. The author writes of his son.)

(By Crozet Duplantier)

Fitting a retarded child into the lives of a family where there are many other children is one of the difficult problems of the parents of the retardate.

While we intended to relegate this problem to sometime in the future, our children soon made us see that this was impossible.

Overemphasis on Chris was apparent to them, even to his little brother, Bob, when Bob about 5 and Chris a little over 6.

I was shaving one morning when Bob said something which startled me so that I still feel fortunate that I did not cut myself badly.

"Daddy," he said, as he watched me in the mirror, "I wish I was retarded."

My God. What had I done to him, to make this perfect little boy wish that he was afflicted as was his brother?

I tried to be calm as I asked him why.

"Because," he explained in the logic that a boy that age possesses, "they have so many more 'vantages."

The advantages he cited included things such as the fact that Chris was not punished for pushing someone down, that he was allowed to get up at night and join his parents in their bed, that he didn't have to eat all his vegetables.

I suppose he could have gone on and on, but I stopped him because he had made his point. It was time, I realized, to make some adjustments in our attitude toward Chris and to make our youngsters realize that they too must have some, and must carry out their idea of logic all the way.

It hasn't been difficult. For the other children are generally very bright, and, despite my frequent complaints, generally understanding.

It has been the policy at home since then to have the subject of mental retardation discussed openly. We do not try to have them hide it from their friends, nor do we hide Chris from ours.

We take him many places, try not to mind the stares that generally come from people the first time they see him. We even find amusement in occasional contacts.

I'll never forget the day a few months ago when I took Chris—a mongoloid child, you remember—with me to the neighborhood supermarket. Two youngsters about his age were scuffling in the parking lot, and, suddenly, as we passed, one of them stopped, stood up and told his playmate: "Look, look at that little Chinese boy."

They stared at Chris as long as we were in their line of vision, utterly fascinated.

He's called a mongoloid, of course, because of a slight oriental cast to his features, something which actually we hardly ever notice any more.

What we remind the other children about regularly is that Chris' advantages, the things he can get away with regularly, have been shrinking, and that these advantages hardly compare with their own advantages, in being able to visit about the neighborhood freely, to go to the movies, to the store, to accompany us to many places where he can't be taken because he is too restless.

The older ones certainly understand, and not only have they accepted him as a member of the household, but as an extra charge of theirs. They have adopted a very protective attitude toward him, go scurrying about the house and the land and the neighborhood when he climbs a fence and disappears, as he does occasionally, because he wants at least one of their advantages—the opportunity to visit neighbors.

Fortunately our nearest neighbors—the Ned Ferrys—seem to be genuinely fond of him and when he disappears he generally goes directly there.

The other day, he did just that and as the children searched each room upstairs and down, and our own yard, I ran over there.

Mrs. Ferry opened the door for me and there was Chris across the room in one of their big chairs, the picture of a gentleman at ease.

"Go home, da-wee," he said as he giggled and gestured me out of the house.

And his hostess suggested that I do just that, that she'd bring him home after while.

As I walked out Chris smiled that happy smile with which there is nothing to compare.

He had won a little "vantage" for himself.

He had scored another victory, however small, in the difficult battle that life presents these little fellows—the battle for acceptance.

I turned as I closed the door behind me.

"Bye, da-wee," he yelled after me.

He was the picture of utter contentment. The happiest little boy I had ever seen.

See America Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 658, my resolution authorizing the President to declare 1964 as "See America Year" has now progressed through approval by Subcommittee Four of the House Judiciary Committee and will soon be up before the full Judiciary Committee.

Interest in my resolution has continued to grow and improvements made in the language by the subcommittee, ably chaired by my distinguished colleague from Georgia, Mr. FORRESTER, have substantially added to the merit of the resolution.

Mr. William Thomas, coordinator for the Association of Community Civic Leaders of Northern Illinois and Chicago, is one of those who has taken a great deal of interest in the resolution. I wish to include at this point a letter to Mr. Thomas from Thomas Zazeckis, a 15-year-old student at St. Mel High School, in Chicago:

COMMUNITY CIVIC LEADERS OF NORTHERN ILLINOIS AND THE CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA, WILLIAM J. THOMAS, COORDINATOR,

Cicero, Ill.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: Enclosing my beliefs and others in our belief on House joint resolution to have President Kennedy proclaim 1964 as "See America Year."

One of the leaders on the Pioneer movement once said, "Go west young man." He urged the people to fight the wilderness, Indians, and anyone or anything that would stop them from settling in the land they had been so long in obtaining.

Today we have a much similar challenge. We too must be as pioneers and travel about the country. However, we are not urged to fight anyone, or have any struggles. Today we are not told to "go west." Today we are urged to go in all directions, north, south, east, and west. We must see the land our ancestors fought for. We have to see all the monuments, great cities, and natural wonders to realize that their struggle was not in vain. It is not enough to read about them in a book; not enough to let someone else describe them to us. You must see them, feel them, and daydream by them to fully realize how great and inspiring they really are. You cannot imagine the beauty and wonderful feeling you get by standing at the edge of the Grand Canyon with the wind blowing through your hair, and the majestic colors glimmering in the sunrise. You cannot get that swelling sensation of pride or patriotism ever as much as you get by standing under the statue of Lincoln in Washington, D.C., with him looking down at you knowingly. You cannot appreciate freedom unless you visit the sight of a battle and see how men suffered and died to preserve it. One can even find beauty in the great cities if they dare to slow down and look between the hustle and bustle.

There will always be people with excuses, who say it is impossible for them to see such sights. They may say "I don't have the time," or "I don't have any way of going," or even "I can't afford it."

The jet age has solved the time factor. One could eat breakfast at one place in the United States hop a jet, and arrive anywhere else in time to see the sights and eat supper. In this way, anyone with even a short vacation can see many great wonders.

Transportation is the easiest problem to solve. Just ask anyone with a car, and he will tell you how many such conveniences he sees. There are also many guided tours in which all you have to worry about is getting on the same bus you came from.

Money is always a tricky subject. When one comes to realize that of the total $2.2 billion spent outside of the United States, $1.2 billion were spent by tourists alone, it seems that an awful lot of people are spending in other countries—thinking nothing of it. The common man would have a tougher time with the purse strings, but if he skimped a little here and there, he would make it.

What is the fuss over our country? Ask any veteran why he fought in the war, and he will tell you what the fuss is. It is a kind of patriotism. A feeling for our country you get by looking at it. We must, therefore, urge the President to get every man, woman, and child to see their land, the land of freedom, the land they fought for, by proclaiming next year "See America Year."

Sincerely,

THOMAS ZAZECKIS,
Age 15, St. Mel High School, Chicago.

The National Association of Letter Carriers Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of history occurred on November 22 when President John F. Kennedy was taken from us at the peak of his career. All of the American people were deeply affected and grieved by what happened.

The National Association of Letter Carriers by action of their executive council officially conveyed the sympathy of the membership of this organization to Mrs. Kennedy and her children. It also passed an official resolution pledging the prayers and loyalty of the 165,000 letter carriers to our new President, Lyndon Johnson.

It gives me great pleasure to place these resolutions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I believe they typify the feelings of all of us.

The National Association of Letter Carriers is to be highly commended for taking this action.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Whereas the cowardly and senseless assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has spiritually impoverished the entire free world; and

Whereas the cause of intelligent liberalism has suffered an irreparable blow through the sudden death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and

Whereas the National Association of Letter Carriers, its officers and its 165,000 members, feels a deeply personal loss in the death of a man whom they considered a very great President and a beloved friend; Be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the National Association of Letter Carriers convey to the widow of the martyred John Fitzgerald Kennedy and to his children the expression of their deep and personal grief, their abiding affection, their loyalty, their gratitude and their boundless admiration and sympathy.

Jerome J. Keating, President; James H. Rademacher, Vice President; J. Stanley Lewis, Secretary-Treasurer; Charles N. Coyle, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer; George A. Bang, Director, Life Insurance; James P. Deely, Director, Health Insurance; Philip Lepper; James C. Stocker; Edward F. Benning; Carl J. Saxsenmeier; Thomas M. Flaherty; William T. Sullivan; J. Joseph Vacca; Glenn M. Hodges; Tony R. Huerta; George G. Morrow, Jr.; Dean S. Soverns; Austin B. Carlson; Fred Gadotti.

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson has, through his entire public life, courageously and consistently proved his friendship to the cause of postal and Federal workers; and

Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson has always proved himself to be magnificently equipped for every position of trust and honor that he has occupied; and

Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson has succeeded to the highest secular position of responsibility and honor in the history of the world through circumstances so grievous as to overwhelm the minds and hearts of free men everywhere: Be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the National Association of Letter Carriers convey to President Lyndon Baines Johnson, on behalf of the 165,000 public servants whom they represent, their deep affection, their undying loyalty, their unshakeable confidence, and the assurance of their constant prayers during this perilous and greatly troubled period in the history of mankind.

Jerome J. Keating, President; James H. Rademacher, Vice President; J. Stanley Lewis, Secretary-Treasurer; Charles N. Coyle, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer; George A. Bang, Director, Life Insurance; James P. Deely, Director, Health Insurance; Philip Lepper; James C. Stocker; Edward F. Benning; Carl J. Saxsenmeier; Thomas M. Flaherty; William T. Sullivan; J. Joseph Vacca; Glenn M. Hodges; Tony R. Huerta; George G. Morrow, Jr.; Dean S. Soverns; Austin B. Carlson; Fred Gadotti.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Senator Smith of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "If Senator Smith Should Run," written by John M. Cummings, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 20, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF SENATOR SMITH SHOULD RUN

(By John M. Cummings)

HARRISBURG, November 19.—Naturally enough, women, regardless of party, are interested in one of their sex becoming a candidate for either President or Vice President. In our quiet talks with delegates to the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women we quickly discovered an important provision in their approach to this subject.

A candidate for public office, high or low, must have something besides her womanhood to commend her to the type of delegate representing some 60,000 council members in the 67 counties of the State. She need not be beautiful enough and shapely enough to attract attention, but she must have something under her wig calculated to command it.

Talk to an average delegate about the prospect of Maine's Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH becoming a candidate for one of the top places on the Republican national ticket next year and you get a response that indicates she fulfills the specifications. In this respect they echo the opinion of Agnes Veitch, who on Tuesday was elected to a second term as president of the council.

"In my opinion," said Agnes, "Senator SMITH's candidacy, if she is a candidate, is not founded in the remotest degree on her sex. She is a woman of marked ability and wide experience in Government. She is capable of discharging the duties of President or Vice President and that is the necessary qualification of a candidate, regardless of sex."

In our personal mingling with the ladies, especially those of the younger generation, we found this to be the prevailing opinion. Hannah Cooke, the belle of Blue Bell, and Gertrude Stauffer, the lighthearted lady from Lancaster, and her daughter Sarah, said they believed Agnes Veitch spoke the sentiment of the council.

Of course, they added, Governor Scranton, as Pennsylvania's favorite son candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, will have the hearty support of the council. And since this organization is the most cohesive Republican agency in the State, the Governor has at his command a large and powerful force.

Significantly enough, the council at one of its sessions, adopted a resolution advocating Federal legislation to nullify the Supreme Court's ruling banning prayer in the public schools. The resolution added that proper precaution should be taken to insure adequate recognition of minority religious groups.

While the council feels the Republican Party made substantial gains in the State in the recent election, it is not satisfied to sit by the roadside and rest for a while. Its members feel the work of improving the State organization for next year's presidential election should get underway without delay.

As Philadelphia Councilman Virginia Knauer pointed out, there is plenty of work to be done if Pennsylvania's electoral vote is to go to the Republican presidential candidate in 1960. More than this is at stake, she reminded. A U.S. Senator is to be elected—Senator HUGH SCOTT probably will be renominated; Congressmen are to be chosen in all districts; half the State senate and an entire house are on the agenda and, in addition to all this, the State will vote on candidates for auditor general and State treasurer.

Successors to Auditor General Thomas Z. Minehart and State Treasurer Grace M. Sloan will be chosen next November. If custom is followed, Minehart and Mrs. Sloan will attempt to swap jobs. Neither, under the constitution, may succeed to the office presently occupied. Both are Democrats, elected 4 years ago when President Kennedy carried the State by virtue of a 331,000 Philadelphia majority.

There is some talk of the Republicans following the Democratic example by nominating a man and a woman for these fiscal offices.

Revitalize the American Cotton Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I hate to add to your burden at this late hour, but there is one thing that has been a burden to me and that is the question of whether anything is being done with reference to the discriminatory practice of storing this cotton. As I understand it, and if my information is wrong, I wish you would correct me, there is a differential where reconcentrated cotton is stored for 30 cents a bale and less while other Government-owned cotton may be stored even in the same warehouse running from 46 cents to 51 cents because it is not subject to competitive bidding.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. This bill does not touch the question of storage rates in one way or the other.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that. What I want to know is if you are doing anything about it.

Mr. POAGE. This bill does not do anything about it.

Mr. CASEY. Is the committee doing anything about this discrimination which, as I understand it, would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars because this cotton is not subject to competitive bidding.

Mr. POAGE. This particular matter has been referred to the oversight subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture. Frankly, I do not know what arrangements they have made as to further hearings on the matter, but it is presently before that subcommittee.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly hope they get some action on it.

Mr. Chairman, I take it from the answer received from the gentleman, that he is aware of a discrimination in the placement of cotton in storage.

I sincerely trust that the Agriculture Committee or a subcommittee thereof will immediately dig into this matter.

From the limited information I have, the Department of Agriculture procedures are costing the taxpayers of this country approximately $2 million per month more than it should for the storage of Government-owned cotton alone.

Competitive bidding would eliminate this practice which has in my opinion unjustly enriched some warehousemen.

The storage of cotton under loan should also be thoroughly gone into as it appears that the storage of this cotton is costing more than is reasonable in some instances.

I reach this conclusion and I am sure others of this House would, when you see reconcentrated cotton being stored for 30 cents per bale per month in the same warehouse continuing loan and other Government-owned cotton being stored at a cost of 46 to 51 cents per bale per month.

I respectfully hope the committee will give immediate attention to this matter.

Hatred and Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I would like to include a splendid editorial which was published in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., on December 1, 1963. This piece was brought to my attention by my dear friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. This scholar relates that many Maryland leaders, including Mr. and Mrs. D. Robert Cervere, commented favorably upon this article and indicated that they would like to see the editorial receive national and international attention. It is their view that truth and fairness suggest that responsibility is something personal and that U.S. citizens, generally, are not to be blamed for the crimes of a few individuals. Dr. Thorning believes that this is a wholesome judgment.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HATRED AND HYSTERIA

In the emotional aftermath of President Kennedy's murder, the Nation is being subjected to a seemingly endless series of sermons, both in pulpits and in the public prints, on the evils of "hatred." The idea is always pretty much the same. The frame of mind which produced the assassination is equated, in resolute contradiction of any known facts, with the attitude of the "radical right"—specifically the attitude of those who favor racial segregation. We are urged to purge ourselves of a poison which the dreadful act in Dallas supposedly has revealed in our blood stream.

The sermons are sincere and, hopefully, edifying as well. But they happen to be irrelevant to the death of Mr. Kennedy.

Segregation is morally wrong. A political program based on the repeal of the income tax is fiscally simpleminded. But neither one had anything to do with the murder.

If it is absurd to try to blame the assassination on the political right, it is yet more absurd to insinuate that it was the result of something dreadfully wrong with American political life as a whole. Until we know something different, the reasonable assumption must be that the assassination was the result of something dreadfully wrong in the mind of Lee Oswald.

It would be good and desirable if the world could now abjure all hatred. But since hatred still exists 1900 years after the crucifixion, it is unhappily unlikely that it will vanish now.

Meanwhile, the continuing hysteria about national hatred as the central feature of this national tragedy does us a national injustice. It ignores, too, the most obvious expression of national feeling.

The line of mourners formed at the Capitol a week ago is still moving.

It may be seen in Dallas, where citizens bring flowers to the place in the road where the President was shot.

It may be seen across the Potomac where Americans are coming in thousands to visit his grave.

It may be seen in the spontaneous and universal actions taken to revere the memory of the martyred leader by giving his name to places and institutions that will endure.

Surely it is this outpouring of love and grief which speaks truly of the state of the Nation.

Citizens of the City of Buffalo and of Western New York Sorrowed by Assassination of President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy has engendered a sense of loss among the citizens of this Nation.

To most of us, his death was a shocking and personal tragedy.

To many, it meant the loss of a courageous Chief of State who sincerely sought to bring to this world a permanent peace.

To others, his death meant a loss of a political leader who sought to aid the oppressed, the ill, the needy among us.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the city of Buffalo and of western New York State join the people of this Nation and of the world in revering and in honoring the memory of our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The depth of sorrow and sympathy of the people of the Buffalo area over the loss of this great President is accurately expressed in editorials appearing in the two major newspapers published in the city of Buffalo, N.Y.

Excerpts from these two newspapers follow:

From the Buffalo Evening News, Saturday, November 23:

A MARTYRED PRESIDENT

The sense of incredulous shock and total tragedy that swept over a stunned Nation with yesterday's terrible news from Dallas has been so universally experienced and so widely articulated that further words today could add no more than a trite echo.

From the Buffalo Evening News, Monday, November 25:

THIS DAY OF MOURNING

This is the day officially designated for Americans to pay their final homage to the elected leader whom assassination has snatched from them.

It is a day, moreover, on which President Johnson has fittingly invited all "the people of the world who share our grief to join us in * * * mourning and rededication"—and in fact the heads of a score of major foreign states have flown in to Washington for the solemn occasion.

This funeral day is thus, as the President's proclamation suggests, a time for Americans not only to "pay their homage of love and reverence," but to turn from grief to rededication.

From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Saturday, November 23:

SNIPER'S SHOT A NATIONAL CALAMITY

Shots from a Dallas ambush have thrown a Nation into mourning for a martyred President. John F. Kennedy fell victim to an assassin's fusillade. The Nation and the world have lost an inspiring and admired leader.

From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Monday, November 25:

A LEADER DIES, ANOTHER CARRIES ON

Suffice it to say that the loss is incalculable, undoubtedly far greater than can be estimated at the moment. John F. Kennedy was a leader the United States and the world can ill afford to do without.

He came to the Presidency the youngest man and the first Roman Catholic ever elected to that high office. He came endowed with expert politicianship and with the advantage of valuable governmental experience as the result of legislative service in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. He entered into his duties as Chief Executive with enthusiasm and a display of leadership which probably culminated in his courageous handling of the crisis arising from the menacing presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba.

President Kennedy's accomplishments were many and impressive. History will well and truly record them. And history would have no way of knowing the heights he might have attained had he been spared.

The Nation mourns a valued President.

Tribute to a Fallen President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, a high school senior from my State, Miss Geraldine Marie Quigley, of Wilmington, has written a poem in honor of the late President Kennedy. It is very well done. It reflects not only her sentiment but, I am sure, those of millions of her fellow Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have this poem, "Tribute to a Fallen President," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO A FALLEN PRESIDENT

No ears can hear, nor tongues can speak
That which has taken place;
But only weeping silently
We turn a tear-stained face.

Our hearts are heavy, our minds are sad;
Our Nation stilled and crying
Turned its face to God, to pray
For a hero who lay dying.

The country loved, and then it lost
A gentle, noble soul;
And a pang of sorrow swept the land
As mournful church bells toll.

We lost the life, the man is gone,
But his gallant spirit stays
To lead his people safely
Through dangerous, hate-filled days.

A hero both in war and peace
He died a hero's death,
And for his beloved country
He gasped his dying breath.

Oh, merciful God, we pray You
Hear our prayers so fervent,
And into your gentle hands receive
The soul of this Thy servant.

No more to meet with chiefs of state,
Nor leaders of foreign sod,
For on this fateful day, in death,
Our President met with God.

Requiescat in pace.

—GERALDINE MARIE QUIGLEY.
WILMINGTON, DEL.

A Tribute to Our Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the reaction from the people of the Fourth District of Minnesota to the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was instantaneous and profound. I received spontaneous expressions of grief and shock from many ordinary citizens, from community and business leaders.

I would like to share with the Congress and the Nation just a sample of the communications sent to me after the tragic event of November 22, 1963:

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
November 22, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. KARTH: The entire 3M company is shocked and saddened by the death of our President. The death of John F. Kennedy is a loss to our Nation and to the world. On behalf of all employees and stockholders we wish to express our condolences to his family and reaffirm our support to our Government in the difficult days ahead.

MINNESOTA MINING & MANUFACTURING CO.,
WILLIAM L. MCKNIGHT,
Chairman of the Board.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The entire St. Paul labor movement was shocked and grieved by the President's death. Please extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and the Kennedy family. President Kennedy will be remembered by us for his reawakening of the true ideals and values which are America's heritage. We will continue to work for them in tribute to his memory.

ST. PAUL AFL–CIO TRADES & LABOR ASSEMBLY.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
November 22, 1963.

Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH,
Washington, D.C.:

The St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce is deeply shocked at the untimely death of President Kennedy. We want you to know that the business community of St. Paul stands ready to serve in any way we can at this critical time.

FREDERICK BJORKLUND,
President, St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our hearts were saddened, our senses shocked by the tragic death of our President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Kennedy and the family in these hours of grief. We renew our pledge to support the legislation which President Kennedy wanted to help achieve his long-range goals to establish a just peace in our time.

FOURTH DISTRICT, DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR PARTY, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

NOVEMBER 22, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The tragic death of our President profoundly shocks and saddens us. We extend our most heartfelt sympathy to Mr. Kennedy's family and to every representative of our Government. We are outraged by this act and pledge you our support during this most critical period.

R. M. HUBBS,
President, St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co.

ST. PAUL, MINN.
November 23, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of our management and employees please express our deep sympathy and grief to Mrs. Kennedy and her family, as well as to the Governmental staff, of the loss of a great man and a great President. We share in President Johnson's request for God's help for a united support from all in the face of the tragedy that has befallen our country.

ELMER R. ERICKSON,
President, Northwestern Refining Co.

ST. PAUL POSTAL UNION,
St. Paul, Minn., November 22, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH E. KARTH,
U.S. Congressman of Minnesota,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The tragic death of our great President came as a terrible shock to us. It is a sad commentary on our country that something like this could happen and it saddens us.

This assassination is a tragedy beyond words for the President's family, his party, the country, and the world. The bullet fired from the assassin's rifle has stricken a brilliant and dedicated statesman at the very height of his career.

There must and should be a more careful way of protection from madmen and crackpots for our leaders. The man or men who have committed this heinous crime are totally unfit to live in our great country. Words cannot express our grief and we extend our most heartfelt sympathy to our martyred President's family and to every representative of our Government. We are outraged by this atrocious act and pledge our support during this most trying time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. ULMER,
Legislative Representative.

Messages of Condolence Cited by Senator Hartke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the death of John F. Kennedy has evoked among our people a great emotional stirring. Some reflect this in a tear, others with words of great eloquence. Throughout the land, uncommon tributes are being paid an uncommon man.

Hundreds of my constituents in Indiana have been moved within the past week to express, through my office, their shock and their deep condolences. I would like at this point to cite three such instances.

The first is an editorial read on radio station WXLW, Indianapolis, on the day of the President's assassination; the second, a moving message by Rabbi Frederick A. Doppelt, of the Congregation Achduth Vesholom, Fort Wayne, delivered on the day of the President's funeral; and third, two resolutions presented by the Young Democrats of Indiana, John D. Bottorff, president.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these three statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial, sermon, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL—ROBERT D. ENOCH, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

This is a dark day for the United States—and for each one who calls himself an American. The President is dead, the victim of an assassin's bullet. Each of us mourn his death, and grieve for those closest to him.

Our heads are bowed in shame, in the knowledge that such a deed can happen here.

The cloak of civilization is yet too thin a garment. The pride we have taken in our expanding worlds of intelligence has lost touch with the humbleness, the love, and the moral consciousness of the true servants of God.

It is a time for prayer. It is a time of soul searching. It is a time for rededication to the faith of our fathers that founded this Nation.

We weep for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and pray for him and his family.

We pray for our Nation.

TEMPLE SERVICE OF NATIONAL MOURNING FOR JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963, 11 A.M.

A solemn and saddened congregation filled the sanctuary of the temple to capacity for a brief service of mourning preceding the funeral services for John F. Kennedy in Washington, D.C. Rabbi Frederic A. Doppelt delivered the following message:

"THE MEASURE OF KENNEDY'S LIFE

"What is the measure of a man's life? How shall we measure especially the life of John F. Kennedy? By time or eternity? By the number of years he spent on this earth which were altogether too few and fleeting, or by how he used his brief and precious time to bring eternity down to earth?

"Let us measure it by his consummate devotion to the highest office in these United States which he ennobled with ability and integrity, and graced with dignity and humility—for that was the true measure of Kennedy's life.

"Let us measure it by his unyielding determination to honor our historic commitment as a nation under God that liberty and justice are the birthright of every man of every color and every creed in this land—for that was the true measure of Kennedy's life.

"Let us measure it by the courageous dedication of his position and power to the biblical vision of a world where nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and of a time when the Fatherhood of God will reign over the brotherhood of man—for that was the true measure of Kennedy's life.

"By mere length of time, his span on earth was only a mere handbreath in the vastness and expanse of the universe. But when

measured by the greatness of his soul and excellence of his deeds, the life of John F. Kennedy was a holy moment in the conscience of humanity which will abide as a living force unto all eternity.

"May his soul be bound up in the bond of life eternal."

RESOLUTION OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF INDIANA, ADOPTED NOVEMBER 24, 1963

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, at all times stood as an inspiration to all Young Democrats, for his love for his country and its people; in the best of times made his fortunes our fortunes, in the worst of times exhibited valor surpassed by none, attempted by few, and recognized by all.

Now, therefore, the Young Democrats of Indiana resolve that as he loved his country and its people, we weep for him; as he was fortunate, we rejoice at it; as he was valiant, we honor him; offering tears for his love, joy for his fortune, and honor for his valor.

Resolved this 24th day of November 1963.

JOHN D. BOTTORFF,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF INDIANA, ADOPTED NOVEMBER 24, 1963

Whereas Lyndon Baines Johnson, 36th President of the United States of America, has asked that the people of the Nation lend him their support in these perilous times, has asked that we pray for divine help and guidance;

Now, therefore, the Young Democrats of Indiana, recognizing that Young Democrats have a particular duty and desire to answer our President's call, resolve that we lend to Lyndon Johnson our uniform and unrelenting support; we offer our prayers for him and the Nation.

Resolved this 24th day of November 1963.

JOHN D. BOTTORFF,
President.

Revitalize the American Cotton Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, no longer should the people of America refer to the "sacred cow." If they wish to make reference to something sacred they should refer to the "cotton cow" or "sacred cotton."

For 2 days we have been witnessing another example of what can happen to an agricultural commodity raised in the South.

There is no question but that the cotton textile industry is in distress because of the price differential between what the domestic textile producer must pay for domestic cotton and what the foreign textile producer can buy identical cotton for from CCC stocks.

Just what is so sacred about cotton that the support price should not be permitted to drop by 2 or 3 cents or possibly 4 cents so that domestic mills would be in a more competitive position? Just why is the cotton producer so much more sacred than the wheat producer for instance?

In 1962 Congress passed a so-called wheat support bill which was so un-American in its provisions and conditions that the wheat farmer rejected it in a referendum. This was early in the spring of 1963 and yet neither of the Agriculture Committees of the House or Senate has taken any action to provide any legislative relief to the wheat farmer of America. His price will drop to possibly $1 or $1.25 per bushel. Apparently this is all right in the eyes of the Democrat-controlled Agriculture Committees. But rather than to see the producers of "king cotton" take any reduction in production price, the committee comes in stampeding the Congress for a brandnew subsidy program. This subsidy program opens a brandnew field for subsidizing any industry injured by imports. Now the taxpayer is to subsidize the industrial production of cotton goods. I ask, Mr. Chairman, why cotton is given preferred treatment. I know the answer as does every Member of this House.

Ralph S. O'Leary, Brilliant Writer With Houston Post, Passes Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the death of Ralph S. O'Leary, science editor and former city editor of the Houston Post, Texas and the news profession lost one of its finest members. I ask unanimous consent that the following articles from the Houston Post be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD: "Ralph O'Leary, the Post's Science Editor, Dead at 52," the Houston Post, November 13, 1963; "Post Card," the Houston Post, November 24, 1963; "Ralph S. O'Leary," the Houston Post, November 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 13, 1963]

RALPH O'LEARY, THE POST'S SCIENCE EDITOR, DEAD AT 52

Ralph S. O'Leary, science editor of the Houston Post and a prize-winning newspaperman, died in his sleep Tuesday while on assignment in Christchurch, New Zealand.

He was found dead in his room at the bachelor officers quarters of the Naval Support Force for Antarctica, which has its headquarters in Christchurch.

O'Leary, 52, had been sent to Antarctica with other U.S. and foreign newsmen to cover scientific studies being made on the frozen continent. He left October 30 and was due back in Washington, D.C., next Sunday.

His body was found at 9:40 a.m., New Zealand time. A doctor's tentative diagnosis was a heart failure, said Lt. Comdr. Jerry Zornow of Naval headquarters in Washington.

The trip to Antarctica was the second for O'Leary, who spent 17 days there during October and November of 1960.

O'Leary, as science editor, probed and reported on the mysteries of many scientific matters, from flight in outer space to exploration of the earth's interior. In 1962, the Texas Headliners Club presented him with its first place award in the scientific writing field "for intelligent and dedicated reporting of science news in language understandable to all literate persons."

In 1953, he won one of the highest awards in the journalistic profession—the National Sigma Delta Chi Award.

O'Leary was city editor of the Post from 1954 to 1960.

During his tenure as city editor, two men on his staff exposed Houston's land and housing scandals. The reporting won an Associated Press award for the 1955 stories.

O'Leary recently was listed in Who's Who in the South and Southwest.

The 1953 Sigma Delta Chi award was in recognition of a series of articles O'Leary wrote for the Post about the activities of a secret pressure group called the Minute Women. The series received five major awards in 1953 and 1954, including a National Headliners Club award.

O'Leary had already won both the Sigma Delta Chi and the Headliners Club awards—in 1943, when he was a reporter for the St. Louis Star-Times. He teamed with a fellow Star-Times reporter, Julius M. Klein, to do a series about a World War II St. Louis ammunition plant through which defective ammunition was being passed by inspectors.

He was employed by the New Orleans Item and Tribune from 1928 to 1941, before joining the now defunct Star-Times, where he worked until 1951.

He went to the Houston Chronicle for a short time, then joined the Post on February 1, 1953, as a rewrite man.

In his years with the Post, O'Leary worked as a reporter and rewrite man before becoming city editor. He became science editor in 1960.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Ellen O'Leary; a daughter, Mrs. Lulian Norman, and a son, Semmes O'Leary.

O'Leary's body was taken to Christchurch Public Hospital, where an autopsy was to be performed. A Naval spokesman said the body would be transferred to the Watney, Sibuns Sons Funeral Home in Auckland, New Zealand, pending further arrangements.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 14, 1963]

RALPH S. O'LEARY

Ralph S. O'Leary, science editor of the Post, is dead. He died in Christchurch, New Zealand, while returning from an assignment in Antarctica. There are no words to express the depth of the shock and the grief felt by all of his associates, colleagues and friends. And there are few who came to know him during his lifetime career as a newspaperman who did not regard him as a friend.

The reality of death always is hard to accept, but it is especially difficult in his case because of the vitality, the energy, the zest, and the enterprise that were the dominating characteristics of both his work and his personality.

It is not enough to say that Ralph O'Leary was a brilliant, a dedicated, a highly skilled and a universally respected member of the journalistic profession. It is not enough to say that, in his practice of that profession, he exemplified its highest ideals and adhered to its most honored ethical principles. It is not enough to say that he ranked among the ablest of newspaper craftsmen. Nor is it sufficient to say that he was one of the best liked and most highly regarded members of the Post's editorial family.

Indeed, in his case, that highest of all tributes that can be paid to any practicing newspaperman—he was a newspaperman's newspaperman—seems hardly adequate to those who knew him best.

If one must single out one characteristic that predominated in both the life and work of Ralph O'Leary, it was his passionate and uncompromising devotion to the pursuit of truth. His motivation was not facts for the sake of facts, but a profound belief in the right of the public to know.

Endowed with a keen intellect and a sharply analytical mind, as well as an unusual ability to reduce the most complex set of facts to simple and understandable terms, he regarded any obstruction that might be placed in his way as a challenge.

He had been science editor of the Post only since 1960, but his interest in that area of human knowledge was long standing, part of an abiding desire to understand and help others understand the deepest mysteries of the human environment and to help press back the frontiers of ignorance. By combining accuracy with simplicity in his reporting, he commanded both the respect of scientists and the interest of his readers.

Ralph O'Leary spent only a little more than a decade of his newspaper career in Houston, but as a reporter, as a rewrite man, as city editor, and more recently as science editor of the Post, he made a truly significant contribution to raising the standards of journalism in this area. He will be remembered by his fellow newspapermen for that, no less than for his unusual talent, his technical skill, and a personality that won for him innumerable friends both in and outside his profession.

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 24, 1963]

POST CARD

(By George Fuermann)

Ralph S. O'Leary—The name was O'Leary, but no other name could have concealed that he was Irish to the eyes. He was merry and yet a grave and gifted connoisseur of folly, a contradiction borne by Irishmen with brains. He was, to use an old-fashioned word, a journalist more than a newspaperman, but then he was in some ways an old-fashioned man.

His last assignment was the fiction of science, of the spaceseekers, and his work was exceptional. He was a pro. But the posture of his mind was Swiftian. He would have come up short, unabashed, in a utopia. Rowdies and spoilers, those of the mind rather than the fist, comforted him. He would have made a contented pamphleteer.

Ralph S. O'Leary died unexpectedly last week at the age of 52. We were colleagues for more than a decade. During a good part of that time I parried as best I could the swift and sanguine thrusts of his wit, which was as saucy as it was always free of malice.

One day in 1954 a schoolboy in Baytown wrote to say that he was going to review a book I had written and to ask some questions about my past. "The attached post card came in the mail this morning," said a note from O'Leary. "Since I was unable to reach you, I took the liberty of writing a biography and sending it off by mail. I am enclosing a carbon for you." The biography, somewhat shortened, follows:

"Mr. Fuermann is the son of an itinerant cello player. His father's name was Krausmeyer and he named his son Karl. Karl, or George, studied veterinary science in Arkansas. He changed his name to Fuermann, adding a second 'n' for dignity, after becoming a columnist.

"His column appears only intermittently because it is written by his wife, who sometimes is tied up with housework. Fuermann, or Krausmeyer, is unable to write his column any longer because he spends his nights at a place called the 2-K Restaurant, usually needing a shave and wearing house slippers. By 8 a.m. he is dead tired and goes home to spend the rest of the day in bed."

He didn't send the letter to Baytown, the more's the pity, but by writing it he lighted up a day for both of us—and never again did I go to the Post needing a shave. He had perfect pitch in judging men, nearly all of whom he put into one of two camps—friendly adversaries and adversaries, not for pole position, not really for any stake the world calls achievement, but for the sport of matching wits, of fencing with minds.

He lighted many days for me. I miss him.

His Memory Remains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text of the sermon by Father George E. O'Donnell of the faculty of St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Overbrook, at the memorial mass for President John F. Kennedy at the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul, Philadelphia, on November 25, 1963:

HIS MEMORY REMAINS

The memory of him shall not depart away, and his name shall be in request from generation to generation.—Ecclesiasticus XXXIX 13.

In the days when it was customary to put glowing tributes of praise on tombstones, a wise man (Oliver Goldsmith) suggested that everyone should write his own epitaph, that he should express it in the most commendatory terms, and then spend the rest of his life living up to it. Few men have lived worthy of their hopes and promises.

Our Blessed Savior, of course. He said: He came into the world to do the will of him who sent him. In the crisis of the Garden that will prevailed, and on the Cross He could say, "It is consummated." In terms of meaning for the world Our Lord expressed the will of the Father, which was His own, when He said, "I am come that they (my flock, men) may have life, and have it more abundantly." And the epitaph above the empty tomb will always read, "I am the resurrection and the life."

What an example, of reliability Our Savior gave the world. All the promises that were made about Him in the Old Testament—His birth, His life, even the manner of His death—He fulfilled to the letter. Then His own fulfilled promises: His cures, "I will come and cure him"; His raising of the daughter of Jairus and His friend Lazarus from the dead; His going up to Jerusalem when He knew it meant His crucifixion: His promise to give His flesh and blood, His giving them at the Last Supper and on the Cross; and greatest of all promise and fulfillment, His resurrection from the tomb on the first Easter.

When we speak of other men in the same breath with Christ, we dare not forget that He is immeasurably above us; but on the other hand neither should we forget that He said, "I have given you an example."

THE SUPREME QUESTION

The Supreme question which all humans must meet and answer is this: "What shall we do with our lives?" The answer of Christianity is ever the same: "You shall give them away." In normal times this means devotion beyond duty to the welfare of others. In heroic times it means the acceptance of death that others may live. It is the highest degree of charity. "Greater love than this no man hath that a man lay down his life for his friends."

By this standard we may measure the life and death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy. In devotion to God, to Country, to the welfare of all men he meets the test of Christian heroism. For the quality of his reliability in his promises let all Americans recall the famous words of his inauguration, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country," and then supply as his epitaph, "I have given you an example."

Our hearts go out in sadness and sympathy to the bereaved relatives and friends of President Kennedy. At the tomb of Lazarus our Lord wept, not for Lazarus—whom He was about to bring back to life—but for Martha and Mary and because Lazarus was His friend. Again at Naim He had compassion on the mother of the dead youth. So our prayers go to Heaven today for strength to his loved ones to bear the burden of grief.

At the time the shots were fired, Mrs. Kennedy is reported to have turned to the President and cried out, "Oh, no." A stunned world said, "I can't believe it. I can't believe that he is dead." If by "dead" is meant the final disintegration of the body and the annihilation of his soul, if by "dead" is meant the end of all he was and stood for in this life, then we still say, "We can't believe that he is dead." By the faith we shared with him we are confident he will rise again to the embrace of his Savior, and by our devotion to his ideals he will live in us for the life of our Nation.

"The memory of him shall not depart away, and his name shall be in request from generation to generation."

Resolutions of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds which is the coordinating and service organization for over 200 associated Jewish community agencies throughout the country recently held its annual general assembly in which 1,200 local community leaders participated. They expressed their deep concern on such issues of national interest as civil rights, immigration, public welfare programs, and the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolutions on these subjects adopted by the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, November 10, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS

A. Jewish role

The ideal of individual dignity and worth is rooted in Jewish tradition, and stems from a profound commitment to democratic free-

doms reinforced by centuries of Jewish experience and history.

Our history as a people gives a special understanding of the struggle of Negroes and other minority groups for full civil rights and liberties, and places every Jewish organization under obligation to advance the cause of equality by all means appropriate to it as a sectarian agency. The organizations should therefore review their policies and practices on employment, their services when offered to the general public, and other aspects of their operations in order to assure that they are fully consistent with these principles.

They should strive to place their patronage, including the holding of public functions, only with companies and places that practice nondiscrimination.

B. Government action

It is the obligation of Government in a democracy to protect all citizens in the enjoyment of the rights which have been guaranteed by the Constitution. We commend the President for his legislative proposals to the Congress to guarantee the realization of these rights.

The bill reported by the House Judiciary Committee represents a significant forward step.

We call upon both political parties to join in bipartisan action to assure the earliest possible enactment by the Congress of comprehensive and effective civil rights legislation.

IMMIGRATION

We commend the President for his proposals submitted to the Congress to enact legislation which would replace the national origins quota system with a more equitable, nondiscriminatory formula for the admission of those seeking to enter the United States as immigrants.

The need for such reform has been long established by testimony in congressional hearings and by numerous studies and accumulated experience.

We call for early action by the Congress to enact an immigration code as recommended by the President, fulfilling American principles of equality and human dignity, and consistent with our national interests.

PUBLIC WELFARE

A. Interdependence of governmental and voluntary agencies

This assembly has affirmed that "all citizens have a deep and profound stake in the health and welfare standards and services of the Nation. For the voluntary agencies serving these needs, there is a special concern and interdependence with the scope and quality of governmental programs. This concern and interdependence grow in importance.

B. Public welfare amendments

The assembly has expressed its gratification with passage of the Federal public welfare amendments in 1962, which have made possible major gains in restoring dependent people to self-support. In order to achieve these gains, greater Federal appropriations by the Congress are required. Especially critical is the need for Federal training grants, since there is currently only 1 trained worker for each 23,000 recipients of public assistance, and skilled personnel is essential in order to carry out the rehabilitation programs which have been authorized.

Likewise required is action by the individual States to enact the legislation, appropriate the necessary funds, and undertake administrative changes to put into effect the liberalized Federal provisions and matching funds, including greater provisions for professional training through State programs.

C. Further Federal action

We urge that the Congress should—

1. Enact medical care for the aged through the mechanism of the old-age and survivors insurance program, while making adequate provision for those persons not so covered.

2. Extend Federal participation to assure public assistance financing and services for all needy persons not now covered under Federal law.

3. Extend retraining programs for economically deteriorated areas, including youth employment programs to deal with the 1 million youth between the ages of 16 and 21 who have dropped out of school or have completed high school but are unemployed, by enacting programs for urban youth and for rural youth conservation corps.

4. Complete legislative action to establish a National Service Corps to encourage greater numbers of men and women of all ages, working under local direction, to help meet urgent domestic human needs.

5. Revise Federal legislative requirements and incentives to encourage the States to remove residence and citizenship restrictions which are paradoxical in an economy dependent upon mobility of labor and which serve to prolong dependency.

D. Comunity federations responsibility

We urge community federations, in cooperation with their affiliated agencies and with sectarian and nonsectarian organizations, to continue to give greater year-round attention to public welfare and health needs and services, bringing the benefits of their special knowledge and experience to guide public policies, standards, administration, and financing.

JEWS OF THE SOVIET UNION

We are gravely concerned and dismayed by the continued and intensive assaults in the Soviet Union on Jews and on all aspects of distinctive Jewish life.

In recent months there have been vituperative attacks in the controlled press against synagogues.

Synagogues have been closed, prayer books could not be printed, and religious and cultural practices and organization which are permitted other ethnic and religious groups have been denied to Jews.

The baking of matzoth for Passover has been prohibited.

Jews have been singled out for severe sentences, including death, for so-called economic crimes.

The documentation of these practices is full and irrefutable. They have been exposed in the United Nations and confirmed by the State Department of the United States.

We join with others in the appeal to the conscience of the world to press the Soviet Union for the early and full removal of these discriminations and we urge coordinated participation of the Jewish community in appropriate actions for these objectives.

A Tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know only too well, the tragic and untimely death of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy has brought sorrow and grief into the hearts of all Americans, and indeed, into the hearts of all peoples throughout the world. Capt. Lewis E. Moore, Jr., chairman of the history department of the Columbia Military Academy, an institution in my congressional district in Tennessee, delivered a speech to the student body at special memorial services held for our late President which is an outstanding expression of the sentiments which we all share at this time. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to submit the following for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY CAPT. LEWIS E. MOORE, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT OF COLUMBIA MILITARY ACADEMY TO THE FACULTY AND STUDENT BODY OF CMA AT SPECIAL MEMORIAL SERVICES, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963, AT THE SCHOOL 11 A.M.

At 10:15 p.m. on the evening of April 14, 1865, President Abraham Lincoln sat in the Presidential box at Ford's Theater in Washington intently watching a performance of "Our American Cousin." Suddenly and without prior warning John Wilkes Booth, an American actor of note, burst into the Presidential box and at point blank range fired a pitsol shot into the head of the Great Emancipator. Mortally wounded Lincoln died 9 hours and 15 minutes later—a victim of the irrationality of a man whose only defense was his desire to be remembered by history. In a split second of time this deranged egotist had erased the life of the one man who could have begun the work of reconciliation in the South which fruits might have been a truly united nation with equal rights and opportunities for all citizens rather than today's hatred and fear that characterizes our relations with the descendants of the slaves of 1860.

On a railroad platform at the Washington railroad station on July 2, 1881, President James Garfield was shot by a mentally unstable and disappointed office seeker, Charles J. Guiteau. The life of a duly elected President of the United States was snuffed out by one whose only service to humanity was his selfish feeling that he above all men deserved a position in the Government of the very country whose President he cowardly killed. Present on that railroad platform on that ominous day stood Robert Lincoln, Secretary of War, the only surviving son of Abraham Lincoln.

On September 6, 1901, while attending a reception at the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, N.Y., President William McKinley was shot by Leon Czolgosz, an anarchist, one whose political beliefs led him to hate all governments, even that Government under whose protection he had been free to commit such a dastardly act.

On November 22, 1963, while enthusiastically waving and smiling to thousands of Dallas Texans who thronged his parade route, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy fell victim to an assassin's bullets fired cowardly from a window some 75 yards away, from a rifle with the aid of a telescopic sight. Within the hour a man, whose entire adult life had been dedicated to public service, was dead—killed apparently by an openly avowed pro-Castro Communist sympathizer, Lee Harvey Oswald, who used the freedom of an open society to commit a crime whose implications will remain of unknown proportions for years to come. Oswald, himself, fell before an assassin's bullet nearly 48 hours later. America will not know for weeks, and, perhaps never fully know, the real reason for or all those involved in the plot to assassinate our President.

Who was this President whose death has caused so much worldwide mourning? Descended from Irish immigrants to the United States whose father, controversial Joseph Kennedy, amassed one of our Nation's largest fortunes, the deceased President was born on May 29, 1917. He graduated cum laude from Harvard in 1940 and then studied at the London School of Economics. While abroad he wrote an anlysis of England's attitude before the start of the Second World

War entitled "Why England Slept." He was 23 years old. In 1957 his writing talent received further recognition when his book, "Profiles in Courage," was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for biography. During the Second World War Mr. Kennedy received the Navy and Marine Corps Medal and Purple Heart in connection with the now historic PT-109 incident in the South Pacific.

At the age of 29, Mr. Kennedy was elected as a U.S. Representative from Massachusetts, an office he held for three terms. In 1952 he was elected U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, a position he held until his election to the Presidency in 1960. At 43, John F. Kennedy became the youngest man ever elected President of the United States. He became—last Friday—the youngest President ever to die in that office.

As is the case with all Presidents, in varying degrees, Mr. Kennedy had many domestic and foreign problems facing him when he took office in January of 1961. Among those things for which our revered former Chief of State will long be favorably remembered are these:

He forcefully called the hand of the Russians when in October 1962 he instituted a naval blockade of Cuba, warning Russia that aggressive troops and weapons must be withdrawn from that island 90 miles off our shore.

Mr. Kennedy will long be remembered for the creation of an international Peace Corps in which the youth of America can give of its talents and energies to help the underdeveloped and backward areas of the world to advance toward a higher standard of living.

He was instrumental in negotiating a nuclear test ban treaty with Soviet Russia which gives to the world hope that nations with nuclear potential will not continue to spew the atmosphere with the dreadful possibilities of radioactive death.

Mr. Kennedy had an unswerving loyalty to the American policy of containment of communism reflected in his determination to keep South Vietnam and West Berlin from falling into Russian Communist hands.

He was consecrated to the ideals of equality of opportunity for all citizens as embodied in the Declaration of Independence which so magnificently laid the philosophical groundwork for the "American dream" in that eventful year of 1776.

In 1962 and 1963 Mr. Kennedy twice stood true to his constitutional duty and in the face of unpopular reaction in the South took the necessary action to insure that the "laws be faithfully executed".

Mr. Kennedy's realization of his position as representative of the public interest was no more evident that in his condemnation of the proposed steel price increase in 1962. His action in the face of influential big business opposition brought condemnation ringing down on his head from the Nation's leading industrial figures.

Mr. Kennedy's victory as the first Roman Catholic to win the Presidency was a monumental victory for tolerance over prejudice—a milestone on the path toward the realization of the "American dream".

Can any such impressive list of accomplishments be drawn up for his suspected assassin? There can be none. This man who at one time tried to obtain Russian citizenship can make claim to only one major distinction—he killed a president * * * or did he? Yes, you heard correctly. Did He? Strong indications are that Oswald pulled the trigger on the murder weapon but who or how many placed his finger there and helped exert the pressure which sent the fatal bullet on its despicable mission?

It would not be completely false to say that everyone, some of you included, whoever hated a fellow American, or who ever wisecracked that "someone will get that Negro lover" or who ever preached disregard for the laws of the land, or who ever called for the hanging of Chief Justice Earl Warren, or who ever indifferently said "Everybody in politics is crooked" helped Oswald pull the trigger. Yes, you, whoever and wherever you are, helped create the climate of opinion which encouraged a murderous personality to summon up the necessary disregard for civilized society to point a rifle at the exposed head of the President of the United States and in a moment snuff out the life of the man that Americans had elected to the highest office in their power to give. The assassin took the processes of government into his own hands and defied our democratic system of election. He destroyed the votes of millions of Americans. A minority of one has taken our most precious possession—the vote—away from us and yet some people, some of you, laughed, and in so doing gave your approval to an act which signifies the awesome possibilities of an armed dictatorial state where no man has a voice in how he is governed but rather he must bow before the threat of force. We say it can't happen here—but also we said that the events of last Friday could not happen in America.

It is a credit to this student body that most of you felt a genuine remorse and sense of loss when news of the President's assination reached you. Let us hope that your feelings of sadness came from a true sense of pride in our political system—our world's last best hope. Let us hope that you realized that after the votes are counted * * * be you Democrat or Republican—the victor becomes the president of us all and can expect—not our blind allegiance, but rather either our enlightened support or at least forbearance realizing that if we do not favor the encumbent president we will have an opportunity to select a different one through the peaceful method of free election. Let us hope that you realize that violence begets violence in which no one or no thing is safe. Let us hope that you are dedicated to the continuance of this, the greatest governmental system yet devised by man—a system which emphasizes the idea of peaceful evolution by means of the ballot box as opposed to the system of revolution by force. To those of you who shed a tear for the intellectual, witty, vibrant, and warm-hearted young man who so ably served for so short a time as our Chief Executive, we commend you; to those who would find pleasure in the events of the past days, we can only hope that it is youthful immaturity which motivates your actions. If it is not, then we pray that our system will be able to survive in the face of such complete unawareness of the danger of such attitudes.

The United States of America will survive this crisis as it has survived others. We will miss the young President who brought the warmth of a loving husband and father to the historic halls of the White House, but, as provided for in our constitutional system, we immediately, upon the passing of Mr. Kennedy, elevated one to replace him. No man, however great, is inexpendable. Our system is sufficient to the task at hand. President Lyndon B. Johnson, a man of unique qualifications, having served as Representative, Senator, Senate majority leader, and Vice President, will, our prayer is, have the strength and endurance to handle this, the most exhaustive position in the world.

On January 20, 1961, the city of Washington was buzzing with the excitement of the inauguration. Today there is only sadness there as hundreds of thousands file by the unopened casket which rests on the same catafalque which bore the weight of the assassinated Lincoln 98 years ago.

Today over the land much will be said to pay respects to a brave leader prematurely fallen. Perhaps here today we would better pay an enduring tribute to his memory if we recall the challenge he hurled at Americans on that January day almost 3 years ago:

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask rather what you can do for your country."

God give us strength to examine our own attitudes and determine that we will do positive things for our country:

We will try to make ourselves better-educated and informed citizens.

We will take part in the political activities of our State and Nation.

We will try to wipe out hate and prejudice in all areas of our lives.

We will stand for equal justice for all.

We will rededicate ourselves to constitutional government which emphasizes peaceful evolution by the ballot rather than violent revolution by force.

We will take renewed pride in being Americans.

If we do these things faithfully, then the 35th President of the United States will not have died in vain. If we fail to do these things, the weeds will grow tall over the grave in Arlington, and John Fitzgerald Kennedy's memory will fade, fade, fade away.

Dollars for Scholars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I have just learned of the farsighted plans of five New Hampshire communities to organize a chapter of the Citizens' Scholarship Foundation, a nationwide movement to provide financial assistance to needy students for continuing their education beyond high school. This new chapter, including citizens from the towns of Bethlehem, Easton, Franconia, Littleton, and Sugar Hill, will join the more than 13 chapters already in existence in New Hampshire.

Originating in Fall River, Mass., 4 years ago, this remarkable movement represents a novel approach to encouraging our Nation's youth in the pursuit of higher education by focusing on local initiative and participation. These commendable efforts of the New Hampshire north country serve to reflect the inspiring New England tradition of community response to meeting the needs of our time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "Dollars for Scholars—The Fall River Scholarship Plan—A Simple, Practical Way To Give Deserving Students a Foothold in College."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLARS FOR SCHOLARS—THE FALL RIVER SCHOLARSHIP PLAN—A SIMPLE, PRACTICAL WAY TO GIVE DESERVING STUDENTS A FOOTHOLD IN COLLEGE—DOES YOUR COMMUNITY KNOW ABOUT IT?

(By Robert O'Brien)

A Gladstone, Mich., youth needed only $200 to gain the opportunity he desperately wanted—a chance to become a mining engineer. He'd budgeted his savings and prob-

able earnings from part-time work for his freshman year at Michigan Tech, and was still short. His grades were good, but not quite good enough; merit scholarships were going to brighter students. His father, disabled in a lumbering accident, couldn't help.

Thousands of young Americans face the same dilemma: a college education, more than ever, is the key to a rewarding career, yet for them it is financially out of the question. Fortunately, help is now reaching out to some of these hard-working students—as it did to the Michigan youth—through the swiftly spreading Citizens' Scholarship Foundation of America.

This remarkable movement, only 4 years old but with chapters in some 100 cities and towns, last June awarded nearly 400 scholarships, with a total cash value of more than $100,000, to deserving hometown youngsters. In Gladstone (population 5,267), the local CSF chapter awarded 8 scholarships valued at a total of $2,400. Fall River, Mass., where the movement began, raised $21,000 and awarded 86 scholarships.

The movement, ironically, was born out of a school board election defeat in Fall River late in 1957. The losing candidate was 36-year-old Dr. Irving A. Fradkin, an optometrist. Fradkin, one of seven children of a Chelsea, Mass., baker, had been able to pay his way through Massachusetts College of Optometry by working nights and weekends. But in Fall River, where he practiced, he saw hundreds of youngsters who could never earn enough to go to college. The community, once a great textile-manufacturing center, was struggling for survival. Many of its mills were closed. Jobs were scarce. Some youngsters were working while still in high school, not to earn money for college but to help with family expenses. Fradkin ran for election on the promise that, if victorious, he would find financial aid for Fall River students who wanted to go to college.

After his defeat he met a high-school student on the street. The boy, whose ambition was to become a doctor, had been hoping for Fradkin's victory and scholarship help. "I'm sorry for you, Dr. Fradkin," the boy said, "but I'm even sorrier for the students. You lost an election. We lost a college education."

The boy's words haunted Fradkin. Whenever he saw a crowd—in the movies, on the street, doing their Christmas shopping that year—he thought, if each of these people would give only $1 there'd be enough for scholarships.

He devised what is now known as the "Fall River Plan," for the first Citizens' Scholarship Foundation. Arguing, pleading, cajoling, he persuated Fall River leaders that it would work. They named Fradkin president, made the school superintendent chairman of the board, and appointed to the all-important awards committee a banker, a lawyer, a real-estate broker, a doctor, an optometrist (Fradkin), and a guidance counselor.

The drive for funds opened in February 1958. It rocked the town as it hadn't been rocked since the Lizzie Borden murder case in the 1890's. Mayor John M. Arruda proclaimed a Scholarship Week. Students in cap and gown swarmed through the streets selling $1 memberships in the Foundation. Housewives peddled memberships to neighbors. Contributions poured in from Catholic and Protestant church groups, from Jewish temples, from service clubs, from workers in the mills, from an all-night diner and a Chinese restaurant.

Most of the dollars came from people who had never gone to college. One of them, a truck driver, spotted Fradkin, stopped his truck, leaped from the cab and shoved some money at the optometrist. "Thanks, Doc," he grinned. "It's great to be able to put a kid through school." He jumped back in his truck, waved, and roared away.

When the drive ended, the people of Fall River had given nearly $4,500 to the Citizens' Scholarship Foundation. With this heart-warming start, the awards committee went to work. It accepted applications from any Fall River high school senior scholastically in the top half of the class. It coded applications by number; no one would know the identity of winners until judging was final. It voted to ask the winners to refund the amount of their scholarship, when and if possible (and without interest charges), to help future students through college. That June, at an awards night in the packed auditorium of Durfee High School, CSF officials presented scholarships to 24 high school seniors.

In 1959, Fall River's CSF drive netted $13,000, enough to renew the previous year's scholarships and grant 24 new ones. In 1960 the city boosted contributions to $18,000. Including the record grants of 1961, Fradkin's idea has resulted in 225 scholarships for Fall River youngsters. Their cash value: $56,500.

Meanwhile, word of the plan spread. Letters asking for information poured into Fradkin's office from communities in every State. A dozen New England cities and towns organized their own CSF chapters. Late in 1960 they voted to unite in the Citizens' Scholarship Foundation of America, with Fradkin as president. Humorist Sam Levenson, a former high school teacher, was named honorary president, and Mrs. Lynn J. Cooper, Fall River housewife, was chosen secretary, CSF's only paid official. Her office space and equipment are contributed by Philip Goltz, a Fall River attorney.

For a free-spending student at a high-priced college, the CSF awards of $125, $200, even $350, wouldn't last a month. But these youngsters, fighting for education, cut every corner. Their precious tuition dollars go mostly to State colleges and universities, local nursing schools and small, hometown, technical institutes. They find summer jobs to help out at home, and to earn money for textbooks, busfares, and lunches. At college, they wait on tables, babysit, wash cars. They study hard; if their marks are good enough, they may get scholarship help or loans from other sources.

CSF scholarships frequently inspire students and their families to challenge apparently hopeless odds. One Durfee High School senior's ambition was to be a chemical engineer. His father was a hospitalized veteran, his mother a part-time factory worker earning less than $2,000 a year. The boy's talent as an accordionist helped make ends meet; he added about $600 a year to the family income by playing in dance bands and giving lessons. His teachers described him as "definitely college timber." But it was the old story: he couldn't afford it, and he didn't have the "top 10" grades that might win him a merit scholarship. He applied for CSF aid. "Without your help," he wrote, "I'll never make it." The committee gave him a $600 scholarship, a guarantee of $150 a year for 4 years.

Today, the boy is a freshman at Fall River's Bradford Durfee College of Technology. He lives at home. He and the committee have set up an annual budget: tuition, $200; books and materials, $150; laboratory fees, lunches, clothing, $300; total, $650. After he received his CSF award, a local service club voted to help out with another $100 for his freshman year. The remaining $400? "I'm earning it with my accordion," he told me.

The awards committee figures that a college student, working part time, can average $1 an hour. Thus, $150 represents 150 hours of extracurricular work during the school year, or about 4 hours a week. Says Committee Chairman Lloyd Dixon, "If he's already putting in full time on his studies and working to pay his tuition and possibly to help out at home, this added 4 hours could be the straw that breaks his spirit. Our $150 makes him a present of these 4 hours. It may remove just enough of a burden, may lift his morale just enough, so that he comes through with flying colors."

"The combinations of achievement are endless," a high-school principal told me. "Take one senior last year, a top student. Her father was dead. She and her mother got by on a small pension. All she had was willingness to work, intelligence—and the desire to devote her life to helping others as a psychologist. She won a PTA scholarship and a high school alumnae award. She was so exceptional that the CSF also granted her a scholarship; $200 a year for 4 years. Put this with the other awards, add earnings from part-time jobs at school, and it's paying her way through one of the best women's colleges in the East."

Early recipients are already repaying their awards to finance new scholarships. The Fall River awards committee is particularly proud of one 1958 winner, the attractive 21-year-old daughter of a textile worker. She was awarded $400 against the cost of a 2-year secretarial course in nearby Providence, R.I. Because of her outstanding business-college record, a Fall River bank offered her a responsible well-paying job at the end of her first year. She accepted, and turned back her unused $200 to the committee.

Later on, she repaid the other $200 with crisp, new $100 bills that she received as Christmas bonuses. "These," she told Chairman Dixon, "are to help you give others the same chance you gave me." Now some of her income helps pay her younger brother's way through Brown University.

The prospects of the Fall River plan look bright. National CSF officials believe that next June more than 100 chapters in 30 states[1] will be awarding 1,500 scholarships with a total cash value of $750,000. But there's more to it than scholarships. "In the long run," says Fradkin, "it's the communities themselves that stand to gain the most. Year after year, they will be enriched by the return of the young men and women they've helped through college."

[1] For a descriptive brochure and information on how to start a chapter, send $1 to Citizens' Scholarship Fundation of America, Box 362, Fall River, Mass.

Vegetable Oil Blowup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, events of the last few days have revealed what complications hover around the exercise of future trading in commodities, and to point this up I introduce to the RECORD an article on soybean oil futures as appearing in the December 5 issue of the Washington Post.

I would also like to point out that presently I have a bill prohibiting futures trading on Irish potatoes in the Congress. This legislation was approved by the House Committee on Agriculture by a vote of 23 to 8 back in July of this year, but the bill has not gone anywhere since that time.

The following article in the Washington Post points up some of the continued complication we can expect to occur, unless something is done—as through

such legislation as mine—with respect to futures trading in the various agricultural and other commodities:

DE ANGELIS GOES BANKRUPT: UNITED STATES POWERLESS TO ACT IN EDIBLE OIL SQUEEZE

(By Frank C. Porter)

A huge commodity trading firm had bought up 90 percent of the Nation's future cottonseed oil supplies and 40 percent of all soybean oil futures before it was declared bankrupt Tuesday with claims of more than $40 million against it.

This was reported yesterday by Agriculture Department officials who said they had the operations of the firm's mercurial president, Anthony (Tino) De Angelis, under scrutiny months before his finanical bubble burst November 19 with a bang heard around the business world.

"We were in the middle of the arena with both hands tied behind our back," said one official, who explained that Agriculture was powerless to take action against De Angelis' activities.

De Angelis' firm, Allied Crude Vegetable Oil & Refinery Corp., filed a petition for voluntary bankruptcy when vegetable oil prices dropped last month. It was unable to meet margin calls of nearly $19 million by two New York investment houses.

As a result, one of the investment firms was bankrupted and the other merged with a competitor. More than a score of the Nation's leading commodity trading firms and banks financing them were left holding the bag when Allied's vast tank complex at Bayonne, N.J., failed to yield sufficient vegetable oils to cover earlier sales.

Ironically, the crisis has been blamed indirectly on Moscow. The market break which exposed Allied's plight is believed to have been a sympathetic reaction to the failure of expected Russian purchases of U.S. wheat to materialize.

THREE INVESTIGATIONS REGUN

Three Government agencies are now pressing investigations into Allied's tangled affairs. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has called for a congressional inquiry which could well lead to stiff Federal controls for the largely unregulated commodity trading industry.

Agriculture is investigating to determine whether De Angelis actually sought to corner the vegetable oil market. The Justice Department reportedly seeks to find out if fraudulent bankruptcy, mail fraud, interstate transport of worthless securities or possible antitrust violations are involved. And the Securities and Exchange Commission's probe is directed toward safeguarding the future solvency of stockbrokers who also handle commodity contracts.

Meanwhile, De Angelis blames his situation on the Agriculture Department.

ACCUSES IOANES

After invoking the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions at two bankruptcy hearings, De Angelis called a press conference Tuesday. He accused Raymond A. Ioanes, who heads the Department's foreign agricultural service, for directing a planned cutback in foreign aid shipments of vegetable oils well below previous export forecasts made by Agriculture.

The forecasts induced Allied to make heavy purchases of vegetable oils but the shipment cutback resulted in onerous storage and other costs which hurt the company badly, De Angelis said.

An Agriculture spokesman pooh poohs the charge, asserting that Allied's downfall was not caused by excessive inventories but, on the contrary, insufficient stocks to meet present commitments.

The spokesman noted further irony in the charge in light of documents released Tuesday by Comptroller General Joseph Campbell and read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator WILLIAMS.

MORE THAN NEEDED

The Comptroller's report charged that an Agriculture agency had actually shipped more salad oil and shortening abroad than was actually needed in an effort to support soybean and cottonseed prices.

Campbell's report and a subsequent letter were introduced by WILLIAMS to show that De Angelis has had numerous brushes with the Government over the past 10 years.

One involved complaints of leaky containers among a 1961 foreign aid shipment of more than 400 million tons of salad oil and shortening supplied by another De Angelis company, Shortening Corp. of America, as subcontractor for other firms. Agriculture officials attributed the defect to poor quality control from which the company had nothing to gain. And De Angelis made good losses at his own expense, they said.

SETTLED OUT OF COURT

Earlier, the Justice Department brought a civil frauds action against De Angelis on charges that false shipping information was supplied to obtain Government financing for Allied soybean oil and cottonseed oil shipments to Spain. Allied said it was not aware that shipping information was false and settled the case out of court for about $1.5 million.

In 1952–53, De Angelis tangled with the Government as president of Adolf Gobel, Inc., a meatpacking firm in two different instances. Both involved short weight or missing shipments on Government contracts and both were settled out of court with part of the settlement being paid by trustees after Gobel went into bankruptcy in 1953.

Gobel common stock had earlier been suspended from trading on the American Stock Exchange after the SEC charged it had understated its 1952 loss. After the company emerged from bankruptcy in 1958, De Angelis was found innocent of charges that he induced an employee to commit perjury during the 1953 investigation.

De Angelis' present troubles go to the very root of the Nation's commodity trading system—a system which operates on almost unlimited credit.

An investor or speculator buying common stocks on the Nation's regular exchanges must put up a certain margin of cash determined by the Federal Reserve Board. This margin is presently 70 percent, meaning that the buyer must put up $70 for every $100 in securities purchased with the broker extending $30 in credit.

SET OWN MARGIN

No such Federal limitations exist in commodity trading, where the exchanges are free to set their own margin requirements for purchases of corn, wheat, rye, tallow, fish oil, hides, cocoa or what have you. These margins are typically 10 percent or less and in certain circumstances no down payment at all is required.

Commodity transactions are divided into two groups: cash or spot sales for immediate delivery and futures contracts for commodities to be delivered at a specified time in the future.

De Angelis began buying heavily into vegetable oil contracts some 18 months ago. Allied soon became such a big factor in the trade that it was a "dealer's dealer," supplying some of the country's biggest trading firms with their oil requirements.

ON SMALL CAPITAL

It was able to pyramid its stocks and future holdings on comparatively little capital From the Chicago Board of Trade, it could buy a soybean oil futures contract (60,000 pounds worth roughly $5,000 at today's prices) by putting only $500 down. And as a refiner, Allied could buy cottonseed oil futures on the New York Produce Exchange without any downpayment.

Most large commercial traders "hedge" their transactions. A large milling concern, for example, will make a large spot purchase of wheat toward future operations. But if the price subsequently falls it will be stuck with supplies of high-cost grain that put it at a competitive disadvantage. As a hedge, it simultaneously goes short on futures by selling wheat it does not have for subsequent delivery. Then if the price goes down, it is able to cover the delivery with spot wheat bought below the futures price it received, providing a profit to offset inventory losses on the cash grain it bought earlier.

GOES LONG ON PURCHASES

But trading circles in New York say that Allied did not hedge; it went "long" on both cash and futures purchases. This was fine as long as vegetable oil prices continued upward, spurred by the conviction of many traders that if crop failures made the Russians so desperate as to buy U.S. wheat, they certainly would also be in the market for oils.

But as wheat sales prospects faded, vegetable oil prices dipped and brokers demanded of Allied nearly $19 million, roughly the difference between the credit extended Allied and what the futures contracts were now worth. Allied couldn't pay and filed for bankruptcy along with three subsidiaries.

RUN TOUCHED OFF

This touched off a run on Allied by customers who had bought oil and received warehouse receipts showing the commodities were held in storage at the Bayonne tank farm. But the oil in the tanks was sufficient to cover only a small part of the promised deliveries. One of the questions the FBI is now trying to resolve is why warehouse receipts were issued when there was nothing to show for them.

Meanwhile, a fifth De Angelis firm, Chicago Refining Co., filed for bankruptcy yesterday.

So widespread are the repercussions of De Angelis' difficulties that Reuters last night quoted reports linking a sinking spell on the London Stock Exchange to rumors that some British merchant banks that had loaned money to Allied customers might suffer some losses.

The 25th Anniversary of the Smaller Business Association of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Smaller Business Association of New England recently celebrated its 25th birthday at an interesting and well-attended meeting in Boston. The legislative policy statements of this organization are most helpful to all members of the Small Business Subcommittee and also to members of the Select Committee on Small Business. Mr. Russell E. Maintain has prepared a very fine short history of this organization, which has done so much to develop and present the views of New England's smaller businesses. I ask unanimous consent that his article, published in the November 1963 issue of the SBANE Bulletin, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.

(By Russell E. Maintain)

The Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., better known as SBANE, was organized in 1938. Its organization was inspired by a meeting in Washington, D.C., of small businessmen from all over the country. The meeting had been called by the then Secretary of Commerce, Roper, and its purpose was to get small businessmen to present and discuss their problems. It was hoped that the result would be that some practical solutions to their problems would be found that would improve the existing depressed small business climate.

The Washington meeting turned into a very disorganized and confused babel of demands, and probably the most promising thing that came out of it was that some of those who attended determined to form a working organization that would really adequately represent smaller businesses in New England. The result was SBANE.

PURPOSES

The purposes of the association as stated in the bylaws were and are:

"To protect and promote the welfare of small business in New England and elsewhere;

"To provide and support legislation and other governmental activities which may benefit smaller business and to oppose legislation and other governmental activities which may be detrimental to the interests of smaller business;

"To cooperate with business organizations and groups, now or hereafter organized, to the end that the interests of smaller business may be benefitted;

"The association is a nonpartisan business corporation, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings shall inure to the benefit of any member or individual."

The association became most active and productive during the early days of World War II by assisting small business concerns to adapt their facilities to defense and later to war production. At one time more than 90 percent of the Government war contracts were being given to 85 corporations.

It was easier for Government procurement officers to give one $10 million contract to one big business concern than to give 10 $1 million contracts to 10 small firms. It was also easier to check the financial responsibility of 1 large concern than that of 10 small concerns.

An example of the attitude toward smaller business concerns in 1941 was expressed at a hearing in Washington, when General Somervell said, "The best contribution a small buiness can make to the war effort is to turn the key in its door and go to work for big business."

The Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., together with other individuals and groups, persisted in presenting to legislators the very substantial skills and facilities which tens of thousands of smaller business concerns throughout the country had available. The result was the development of practical subcontracting methods, which were put into practice, and which substantially speeded up the war effort.

WAR PLANTS CORP.

Very early in the war, the association promoted the formation of the U.S. Government Agency, the Smaller War Plants Corporation. One of the association founders and later president—and still active on the association board of directors—S. Abbot Smith, became one of the five members of the Smaller War Plants Board of Directors. Richard C. Cooke, another of the association's founders, and a past president of the association, became the New England director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Many hundreds of small business concerns in New England, as well as all over the country, are still in business today because of the foresight and accomplishments of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The present day Smaller War Plants Corporation is, of course, The Small Business Administration, successor to the Small Defense Plants Administration. Its formation was advocated and promoted by SBANE, has been supported by the Asssocation over the years—and a past president of the Association, Edward J. Stewart, was New England Regional Director of the Small Defense Plants Administration and the New England Regional Director of the Small Business Administration until recently.

The close of World War II found small business generally in as difficult if not more difficult position than it was in at the beginning of the war. Now it was necessary to convert to peacetime activities. There was a huge backlog of civilian needs and wants, plenty of money to pay for them, but a tremendous shortage of materials with which to produce them—and who got first preference? It was the company with the most money and the most credit and the most potential—big business.

RECOGNIZE PROBLEM

The major problems of small business then included getting a fair share of materials that were in short supply, including raw materials and production equipment; and most important of all, the financial resources to insure payment. When they turned to the banks, they found the banks, on the whole, were conditioned to the thinking and fears of the deep, dark days of the great depression of the 1930's. But financing small business was one of the great problems that had been overcome by small business, the Government and the banks when small business had converted to war production.

The Smaller Business Association of New England members and officers recognized the problem as one of educating the banks to new ways of extending credit to small business with safety to the banks and with resulting great prosperity to many a community that had found itself with tremendous unemployment problems when the big war plants closed down, and when the military services discharged their millions.

It was small business that relieved a large part of the great unemployed hordes by absorbing this huge pool of workers—not big business. And the Smaller Business Association of New England played a major part in helping Government in Washington solve many of the problems incident to reconversion to peace. Its officers, staff, and members were almost constantly in Washington, attending congressional committee hearings on every conceivable matter pertaining to business and the future welfare of the country.

THE BULLETIN

Besides problems of procurement and finance, there were problems of employer-employee and union relations, and what needed to be done in Washington to insure the rights of both. There were taxation matters and SBANE's Taxation Committee members made many trips to Washington, each paying his own expenses, to present to congressional committees not only the viewpoint of small business but also SBANE recommendations, which had been sweated out by our members in many a smoked-filled room at association regional meetings in every important community center in New England.

Through the SBANE Bulletin, "The Voice of Small Business in New England," every member of the association is kept informed of the activities of the association, and in it each is encouraged to speak up and make his contribution for the best interests of all.

Many of the post war problems were beginning to be remedied, when Korea exploded, with difficulties to be overcome, and a whole new set of conditions. Here again, the association did its part and enhanced its reputation in Washington circles as being the soundest and most dependable representative of small business in the United States.

Every year since the close of World War II, a group of SBANE members, officers, and staff representatives, has gone to Washington, always at their own individual expense, and there presented a comprehensive program of small business to all New England Congressmen and Senators, as well as to the Senate and House Small Business Committees, and to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. At the close of the day, after the presentation, the group has held a "Boston tea party" at a Washington hotel, to which all who had attended the meetings throughout the day, and others are invited. These "Boston tea parties" have been attended by groups from all branches of Government who are anxious to hear and discuss the dynamic progress that small business is achieving to make free, private, competitive enterprise in the United States the envy and aim of the world.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Another important activity of the Smaller Business Administration of New England has been its educational program. Its aim has been to educate all concerned to know and understand the important part small business plays and has played in the growth and stability of the American free enterprise system, and at the same time to strengthen small business itself by improving its management techniques. Annually, for many years, Smaller Business Association of New England representatives have addressed school and college graduating classes, pointing up the great opportunities that are open to them in small businesses. The need for this activity was realized when it was discovered that college graduates were being overwhelmed by the luring inducements and solicitations of bigger businesses, who seemed to overstress security, ease, and comfort rather than individual self-reliance.

Foreign trade has always been of paramount concern and promotion by Smaller Business Association of New England's board of directors.

Association officers and members also planned and presented a number of courses for colleges and evening divisions. These were held in institutions all over New England, and were widely copied all over the country. They enabled small business to do a better job in operating their own businesses. It is believed that that activity of Smaller Business Association of New England was the inspiration which induced the Small Business Administration to plan its program of business courses for businessmen.

The association found it was not only small businessmen themselves, however, who needed education on the importance of small business in our economy, but also practically every other group outside of small business. The solution to this opportunity was, besides the Smaller Business Association of New England's bulletin, the association speakers' bureau, which supplied well informed speakers on small business topics to address service clubs, veterans organizations, church groups, or any other group that would listen to the wonderful story of small business, and how almost every big business in this country today grew up from a small busines.

FOUNDERS STILL ACTIVE

For some years a 3-day live-in conference of small businessmen has been sponsored by the association at the Harvard Graduate School of Business. Besides helping small businessmen to get closer to and better understand the latest in business educational techniques, and to pick up many a good idea they could use, the courses have been helpful to the business school faculty, and help to give them a better understanding and appreciation of the high character and caliber of

the many small businessmen who in every community take a prominent part in all civic activities.

Many of the men who founded the Smaller Business Association of New England over 25 years ago, are still active in the affairs of the association. They are dedicated men who are more interested in the preservation of American Freedom than in the welfare of any individual pressure group. The association has received many commendations for its achievements. These have come from practically every important field, government, education, business, labor and others.

Some of the specific and continuing objectives in our programs have included:

Developing sources of adequate capital for small business;

Assuring small business a fair share of materials in short supply;

Assuring small business a fair share of Government contract procurement;

Fair and equitable taxation; income tax reform;

Presentation of association survey results to congressional committees to aid them in the formation of new laws and revision of old laws;

To protect and guard small business from effects of activities of pressure groups seeking special privileges for themselves;

Improve labor management laws and relations;

To help improve Government efficiency and economy, and to reduce Government competition with private enterprise;

Stimulate and foster greater participation in foreign trade;

To improve the management techniques of small businessmen so as to enable them to better meet the increasing competition, both domestic and foreign.

In recent years, the general understanding of the attitude toward small business and the Smaller Business Association of New England has improved in all directions—government, labor, big business, banks, and others—and our relations have improved in mutual understanding and helpfulness. Both political party platforms include planks for small business, and our members have appeared at their prepolitical conventions to present suggestions and recommendations.

The Smaller Business Association of New England is generally received as the voice of small business in New England.

PAST PRESIDENTS

The following is the list of past presidents of this association:

Elected in

Years 1938–39–40: Alfred C. Gaunt, Merrimac Mills, Methuen, Mass.

Years 1941–42: Richard C. Cooke, 240 Otis Street, West Newton, Mass.

Year 1943: J. Claude Shea, Colonial Beverage, Cambridge, Mass.

Years 1944–45: Edward J. Stewart, United Metal Seal Co., Boston, Mass.

Year 1946: Arthur D. Cronin, Cronin-Gartland Co., Boston, Mass.

Years 1947–48: S. Abbot Smith, Thomas Strahan Co., 150 Heard Street, Chelsea, Mass.

Years 1949–50: Howard D. Williams, Washington Mills Abrasive Co., North Grafton, Mass.

Year 1951: Russell E. Maintain, Maintain Store Eng. Service, 22 Crane Court, Woburn, Mass.

Year 1952: A Dudley Bach, N.E. Metallurgical Corp., 475 Dorchester Avenue, South Boston, Mass.

Year 1953: A. L. Lawrence, H. B. Smith Co., Inc., 57 Main Street, Westfield, Mass.

Year 1954: Ralph A. Fletcher, H. E. Fletcher Co., Groton Road, West Chelmsford, Mass.

Year 1955: Daniel F. Viles, Waltham Screw Co., 77 Rumford Avenue, Waltham, Mass.

Year 1956: John P. Carleton, McLane, Carleton, Graf, Greene & Brown, Manchester, N.H.

Year 1957: John Hazen White, Taco Heater, Inc., 1160 Cranston Street, Cranston, R.I.

Year 1958–59: Philip J. Potter, State Street Bank & Trust Co., Boston, Mass.

Year 1960–61: Nathaniel F. Bigelow, Jr., Nathaniel F. Bigelow, Jr., Co., Manchester, N.H.

Year 1962: Richard B. Learnard, Bolt Dalton & Church, 89 Broad Street, Boston, Mass.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee received for the first time the final additional report of members of the Judiciary Committee on the civil rights bill, which bill has been before the Rules Committee 8 legislative days. The bill, introduced June 20, had been before the Judiciary Committee about 6 months and the new substitute bill finally reported has had no hearings before the Judiciary Committee or any other committee.

The civil rights bill is the most controversial and emotional bill that Congress has had to deal with in my recollection. It is one that requires sober reflection and careful consideration in a calmer atmosphere than exists at present.

However, I realize the great national interest that has been aroused on both sides of this controversy and it is my purpose and intent, with the approval of the majority of the Rules Committee, to hold hearings on this bill reasonably soon in January after the Congress reconvenes.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it appears parliamentarily impossible to hold and conclude hearings, or to take final action, on the civil rights bill now before the Rules Committee until January, and in light of the fact an application for a rule was not filed by the Judiciary Committee until November 22, and the final report on the civil rights bill was not filed by the same committee until yesterday, which under the rules would prevent the holding of any hearings before tomorrow or Monday, the minority members of the Rules Committee accept at full face value Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH's statement he will promptly schedule hearings on the civil rights bill for early January, to be continued until the committee has an opportunity to vote on the adoption of a rule to send the civil rights bill to the House floor.

It is believed the above results can and will be accomplished without undue delay, despite the fact that no hearings on the pending civil rights bill were held by the House Judiciary Committee or by any other committee of the House.

Rout Forces of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a speech made by Hon. LeRoy Collins. A former outstanding Governor of Florida, he served with distinction as chairman of the Democratic National Convention in 1960. He is presently serving as president of the National Association of Broadcasters. Governor Collins appeared before a group of businessmen in Columbia, S.C., on December 3. In his speech, urging that the forces of hate and bigotry be routed, he appealed to Southerners to rise up and defeat these evil forces in their midst. His words, while directed to a southern group, have meaning for all in these troubled times, and are a proper tribute to our departed President, John F. Kennedy.

Governor Collins' speech follows:

REMARKS BY LEROY COLLINS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE GREATER COLUMBIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, COLUMBIA, S.C.

It is a high privilege for me to be here in Columbia, and to participate in the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce Annual Meeting of 1963.

I like South Carolina, and I always have. Yours is a State rich in history and exciting in opportunity.

Your distinguished Governor, Donald Russell, who honors us all by his presence here tonight, is a public leader of conspicuous competence and of uncommon dedication.

I would like to add my warm congratulations to all of your chamber of commerce officers and committees. You have had a remarkably successful year; and, while the rank-and-file support of your membership doubtless has been excellent, special praise is due all who have supplied the leadership.

My message this evening is being carried by many broadcasters across this State. I am grateful to them. I also salute them, along with all other broadcasters, for their enormous efforts in reporting to the American people and to the world the story of our Nation in the agony of its trial after the assassination of President Kennedy. As soon as the first dastardly shot was fired in Dallas, response of news broadcasters was immediate. It became complete, and reflected the highest skill and dedication.

This was the free broadcaster at his finest. No one from the government had to make the slightest move to get him going, or to keep him at his task, or to hold out any hope that his commercial losses would be offset in any way or shared by anyone else. It was his job. And in performing it, he asked not what the country could do for him, but only what he could do for his country.

I do not believe anyone is more genuinely proud of his southern birth and raising than I am. I love this land. Some thoughts have been brooding in my mind lately, especially in the few mad days since the murder of our young President, and I think South Carolina and Columbia are good places for me to talk these out.

Not all of you will agree with what I have to say. This does not trouble me, and it should not trouble you.

I have tried to be a southerner who speaks plainly on sensitive issues, and you are sons and daughters of a State which, from the time of Sumter and Pickens and Calhoun, has been characterized by forthright debate.

Doubtless as you have detected down the years, a number of people in other neighborhoods of America have not always agreed with the forthright talk emerging from South Carolina. But debate, if it is honest and thoughtful, refines the decisions in our Republic and makes them more intelligent.

I have not come to address old grievances. It is the future of the South and of our Nation I wish to take up with you here tonight. And the one is inseparable from the other.

I would hope first that we might consider as our own the creed of our new President, Lyndon Johnson, who, once exasperated by his critics in the Senate when he was the leader of that forum, sought to explain himself in these terms: "I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat, in that order."

Most of us, when we talk about the South, find the easy things to say. We like to recall the handicaps our region has suffered in the exploitation of its natural resources; the impoverishment which followed the Civil War, and the later unjust and repressive efforts made to thwart our growth and development. Then we like to speak of the happier days of our recent dynamic economic growth and prosperity—of the "new South," a land of vast new opportunities. And these things are all true. We can prove them by the bank deposits, by the new factories, by the lines on the charts, by the clothes we see children wear to school.

We also like to speak of the "new, new South," which glitters with projections of future prosperity almost beyond comprehension. And I firmly believe that you and I will see all this come to pass in our lifetimes.

But let us think together this evening about things more personal than material progress.

I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States. But the prime reason they do this is that for too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it.

We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South—the very ones against whom we in the South have had to struggle in our towns and in our State capitals for much of the progress we have made.

They have done it in speeches on the floor of the Congress which have sounded like anti-American diatribes from some hostile foreign country.

They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region.

And all the while, too many of the rest of us have remained cravenly silent or lamely defensive while Dixie battle cries have been employed to incite sick souls to violence—egged on by the rabble-rousers' call to stand up and fight.

It is little wonder that other Americans fail to regard us on occasions as being in the mainstream of American life and citizenship.

And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these Claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners.

It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody-shirt-wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry. It is time we started speaking and acting together more like loyal Americans and self-respecting southerners.

You here in South Carolina have shown in many ways that you understand—that you are moving forward.

The cities of Oxford, Birmingham, Little Rock, New Orleans, Dallas—and Philadelphia and Chicago, for that matter—are not to be found in the State of South Carolina.

And that fact, as all of you well know, is no accident of geography.

It is because the leadership of this community and this State reached a rational decision that South Carolina was not going to allow bigotry and lawlessness to pervade your society and pollute your bloodstream.

There has been no need for Federal marshals patrolling your university campuses, thanks to the good sense and respect for law among the people of this State.

You have demonstrated to the rest of the Nation, which includes the rest of the South, and to yourselves, that a Deep South community does not have to throw itself onto a funeral pyre of hate.

Yes, there are forces at work in the South—men and women who do not have their faces turned backward, stalwart men and women who have not received the headlines and public notices which have been accorded the more sensational examples of lack of progress, but who have been in the vanguard of progress nonetheless.

There is a story which came out of World War I. I do not vouch for its literal accuracy. In fact, there are many reasons for doubting its truth in detail. But its message rings true.

Three American soldiers—one a Protestant, one a Catholic and one a Jew—became fast friends as they marched and fought together in France. They entered into a pact committing the survivors to do everything possible for the family of any one of them who might be killed in action.

In a battle soon afterward, on the outskirts of a small French village, the Protestant boy was killed. The only place of worship was a little Catholic church. The Catholic boy and the Jewish boy asked the priest of this little church for permission to have their friend buried in the church cemetery adjoining. But when the priest learned that the dead boy was not Catholic, he regretfully declined, pointing out that under the regulations of the church the cemetery had been established and blessed for the burial of Catholics only.

After considerable discussion of the point, the priest suggested as an alternative that the burial be made just outside the fence of the cemetery and said, "Here we will be sure to see that the grave is cared for and not desecrated, just as faithfully as we care for the graves on the inside."

The arrangement was worked out, and the two boys who survived went on through the war. When peace came, they returned to their homes in the United States.

They had the understanding, however, that 3 years from the date their friend was killed they would meet in the French village and together visit the grave.

When this day came, they met as agreed and soon came to the little church. But when they arrived just outside the fence where they had buried their friend, they were shocked to see no sign of the grave. Angrily they found the old priest and scolded him for his neglect.

Then the old father took the two young men out into the cemetery and led them down the inside of the fence. There was the grave just as the soldiers had left it. Then he said, "You know, some time after you left, I went back and studied our regulations further. I found it to be very clear that while I was not permitted to allow the burial inside the fence, there was nothing which prevented me from later moving the fence over."

Fellow southerners, we can talk about our mores, our local laws and customs, the low standards of many Negroes, but the time has come when we must move some fences.

The soul of man is beyond the reach of a court order or a legislative act. But while courts and laws cannot change the innermost dictates of the human conscience, courts and laws most certainly can control the acts of men.

This task of assuring racial justice is no easy one for us in the South—nor is it for those in the North. But Americans everywhere must recognize that this is a national commitment and a national necessity. It is not going away.

The advancement of all rights of national citizenship, as we well know, will occur with the overt aid of the national government if lcal citizens and local and State governments do not move effectively to accomplish this on their own.

Yet, too many politicians down our way have been hoodwinking the people on the civil rights issue. They have been trying to pretend, for their own personal political advantage, that the changes which are coming over the hill really are not there. They talk defensively of "State's rights" when they and we well know that there can be no such thing as a State's right to default on a national duty.

Any rational man who looks at the horizon and sees the South of the future segregated is simply seeing a mirage.

"That all men are created equal" is not an empty cliche. It was not put in our Declaration of Independence by Jefferson merely to stir our revolutionary forces to greater sacrifice.

It is a mighty idea that is the keystone of our Nation's whole meaning and perpetual commitment. It is the basic idea which supports the dignity of man as an individual.

It is an idea that can never be stopped—not by custom—not by prejudice—not by hate—not by murder—not by armies—not by any mortal force.

It may be thwarted—it may be delayed—its triumph may be at great cost and sacrifice—but it will keep coming on and on, for it has the invincibility of simple truth, justice, and right.

Aside from human attitudes the most basic changes which must occur to aid us in resolving our racial difficulties is the improvement of the standards of living of all underprivileged Americans. The taproot of future progress is greatly expanded and improved public education for all American youngsters.

While in the Florida Legislature many years ago, I undertook the leadership for the passage of legislation known as the minimum foundation program. Under it, the State government guaranteed to every child in Florida, regardless of where he lived or how poor his county, a public education of no less quality than certain pre-

scribed standards. This has worked quite well, and other States have developed similar plans.

There was talk at the time that a program like this would rob local communities of local interest and influence, but this did not turn out to be the case.

Now, I feel that we should mount in this country a massive National Minimum Foundation plan under which the Nation would assure to every child an education adequate to the full development of his talents.

This would call for the supplementing of local resources in proportion to need. It could enable us to close our educational gap and bring to an end our vicious cycle of ignorance breeding more ignorance with resulting impoverishment of body, intellect, and spirit.

This is not only a national need; I say it is a necessity. We must do this to enable the Nation better to meet its adversaries in a hostile and competitive world. But, more importantly, we must do it to provide for American children a seedbed of simple justice which is now their rightful heritage, although for millions it has not been their inheritance.

Our country has a right to expect the best from all of us, regardless of where we live.

And just as it is wrong for anyone, including some southerners, to sell the South short, by the same token we in the South have no right to go off in a corner and sulk.

Southerners, like Americans from every section of this land, have a solemn obligation to make whatever general and unique contributions they can to the national good.

It is high time the South rid itself of any political inferiority complex.

Leadership in the South—business, professional, educational, and political—instead of being rejected out of hand nationally must be regarded as a valuable resource in the role which America must play in meeting the challenge of history.

Some politicians in other regions of the Nation contend that the South now bears such a stigma before the Nation that it is incapable of producing national leadership. And there are even some southerners who parrot the same fallacy.

After all, where was this Republic founded? By whom were our Nation's principles of freedom and individual dignity hammered out?

So much of this came from the minds of Washington and Jefferson and Henry. The young Republic was nourished by the philosophies of Madison and Monroe and Jackson. Southerners all.

The South should be bright and optimistic, indeed, as we face the future.

To become a more vital part of the Nation's efforts for the fulfillment of national goals will not demean our posture as States, but enhance it. It will not be a retreat, but an advance. It will not be a defeat, but a victory.

My fellow countrymen, a few long days ago our young President was struck down on the street of an American city. Good men have differences, and many Americans had differences with John Kennedy. But I do not know of any fellow countryman who, after rendezvousing with his soul, would not share the sweet dream of John Kennedy for a better America or his dedication to move his dreams toward reality. He was the unusual, heroic person in politics who thought not in terms of years, but in terms of generations and of what America must be for our children and the children of our children.

Just a few days before his death, President Kennedy was talking to one of our leading southern editors—a very close friend—William Baggs, of the Miami News, about the year A.D. 2000, and of what we, in our generation, must plant and plow up to make this country right for its sons and daughters in A.D. 2000.

I say to you tonight that above all else it is the moral duty of our generation to plow under racial injustice everywhere in the United States and to plant new opportunities for the generations which will come along after us and reside in this green part of our old planet.

This has not been anything like the speech that last week I expected to make here.

But the other day, as I followed the caisson drawn by the six white horses to Arlington's green hillside and listened to the bugler's mournful cry and saw the flame lighted on the grave as if to hold back at least a tiny part of the approaching darkness, my conscience grew heavy with the long promise of history: "Beyond the sundown is tomorrow's wisdom; today is going to be a long, long ago."

Oh, God of all mankind, help us to find that wisdom. Help us to make today count for more than its sorrows.

Society Too Soft on Oswalds, Rubys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial entitled "Society Too Soft on Oswalds, Rubys," appearing in the Peoria Journal Star of Monday, December 2, 1963, in its entirety in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

SOCIETY TOO SOFT ON OSWALDS, RUBYS

We make it a habit to study a great many other newspapers, of course, and in looking them over from Texas to Canada as of Saturday, November 23, (the day after the assassination) we noticed especially the Toronto Daily Star.

It carried a one-column picture of Lee Oswald at the top of the front page with a one-line caption, which simply said: "United States paid his fare home."

In every great shocking event such as the assassination, people cast about for something to do, something to hit at even though it may be a fringe matter that has nothing useful or basic to do with the crime at all.

Thus we have seen a drive started against the purchase of guns, and a great upset about the gun being inexpensive, as if any legal restrictions on this sort of thing will prevent another assassination, or would have affected this one in any important way.

We have a drive on also to make the assassination of a President a Federal crime complete with the death penalty, as if adding another jurisdiction for such murders will have any effect on prevention.

To us, if there is a significance in the events leading up to the crime it lies in the true instrument of death, Lee Harvey Oswald.

This man was antisocial. He opposed our system of government and the very form of our society, for many years. He renounced his citizenship, disappeared into the Soviet Union for nearly 3 years. He reemerged asking to be restored, complete with his Russian wife, and what did we do?

We gave him back his citizenship and our Government paid his fare to bring him back to the United States. Back here he had a continuing Communist attitude and philosophy, propagandized for Castro, tried to spy on anti-Castro Cubans, bought a rifle, made preparations for getting out of the country by the shortest available route, studied up at public expense via the New Orleans library on assassination techniques and effects, plus reading spy thrillers, and pro-Communist works, and studied about Mao Tse-tung.

(Mao's most quoted phrase, incidentally, is that the flower of social revolution can only bloom from the muzzle of a gun.)

He fed himself, mostly, according to increasing piles of physical evidence, on Castro propaganda.

Then, he returned to Dallas, lied his way into a job in a key building, worked with a map to figure ideal firing points, stationed himself at a sixth floor window where he would not be noticed by the crowd of 250,000 when all eyes were on the President, braced his rifle on packing cases, and shot the President.

He left the rifle, rushed down to the cafeteria, and was sitting among other workers when police rushed in. He started off from there to home, changed clothes in hot haste, and took off again.

There followed the mysterious shooting of the policeman, a chase, and his capture.

He told police nothing, asked for John Abt to be his attorney (Abt has defended a number of Communist defendants) and made a very formal statement of denial, calmly, before the TV cameras.

The Canadians picked up the key fact, the ironic fact, that the United States permitted him to return, and even paid his way back to insert himself into the society he was fanatic to destroy—our society.

It was not our liberality with guns that killed the President.

It is our preoccupation with antisocials, fanatics, and criminals, as the chief recipients of our sympathy, our assistance, special privilege, and a second chance, a third chance, and even a fourth chance.

The further out of the pattern of society a person gets anymore, it seems, the more we want to woo him back by treating him "extra nice."

We have said before that this superconcern with antisocials involves us in a shocking unconcern and irresponsibility toward worthy and innocent members of society.

The victims of such policies are many.

The latest victim has been the President of the United States.

A genuine, realistic, and responsible humanitarianism demands more protection for the innocent from those who are antisocial, and not this perverted humanitarianism that coddles the antisocial at the expense of the innocent.

This crime was committed, as are so many of those committed against other good men and women, by a known enemy of our society whom we welcomed back into our midst with a noble gesture.

We welcomed him back, as we have Cosa Nostra criminals and petty hoodlums as freely as Marxist rebels, to full membership in the land of opportunity, including the opportunity to steal, to cheat, to sabotage, and to kill—including even the opportunity to kill the President.

Now, those who preach this superhumanitarian doctrine, say that the assassination should be blamed on the fact that our society is too tough and too violent.

They pull their evidence from every corner of our society—indeed from everything and everywhere but the physical evidence concerning the killer himself. And take a look at Jack Ruby's history, too.

The record shows otherwise. If it is to be laid at the door of any national attitude on the basis of the facts of the record, it would have to be that we have become too soft.

Ours is a society that too readily puts up with the Lee Oswalds—and the Jack Rubys.

We do, indeed, need less extremism of both left and right in politics, and less extremism of hate and superhumanitarianism in social philosophy—and whole lot more down-to-earth realism in both.

In God We Trust—A Sermon in Tribute to Our Martyred President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, during the fateful days following the murder of President John F. Kennedy prayers for the repose of his soul and the protection of the Nation were intoned from countless pulpits around the world. Like many things, we sometimes find the most eloquent expressions of sorrow, shock, dedication, in our home communities and that was my experience as I sat in my own church on the Sabbath 2 days after the assassination.

The pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church of Downingtown, Pa., the Reverend Robert M. Taylor, is my good friend and respected confidant. It was, therefore, with deep appreciation that I listened to his message on that fateful Sabbath and I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD with these brief remarks as a clear but moving expression of our natural grief and consternation over this foul deed, while at he same time leaving us completely oriented to our faith in a Creator who orders all things.

IN GOD WE TRUST

(Sermon preached in the Central Presbyterian Church, Downingtown, Pa., November 24, 1963, by the Reverend Robert M. Taylor, pastor)

Today, Sunday, November 24, 1963, a nation mourns. In the rotunda of the Capitol in Washington, D.C., John Fitzgerald Kennedy will soon lie in state.

An act of lunacy early Friday afternoon snuffed out the life of the Chief Executive of this American Nation. One or two diabolically and accurately placed shots were all that were necessary.

And today the Nation and the world mourn.

In our Nation of civil order and due process no riots occurred; no revolutionary outbursts erupted; no "take-over" of Government was executed. Only two people were executed: a Dallas police officer and the murdered, or, if you prefer, assassinated President of these United States.

Possibly never before in our time can it be said that people of various political, economic, social, racial, and religious backgrounds were drawn together more closely across this vast land. They were drawn together by a shocked state of unbelief and a sad, almost ashamed, awareness that this could happen here.

The life of a human being has been coldly, deliberately, ruthlessly rubbed out. And a nation is stunned. Indeed a nation is humbled.

Whatever the beliefs and creeds, the people are drawn together in a sorrow and grief beyond compare. The raining skies over Chicago on Friday wept tears for countless millions of mourners. The stunned silences in the buildings and on the streets of this land of the free bore mute testimony to the shock of a people which has lost its leader.

But it is a people who, in ordered and measured ways, now prepare to go on. The assassin's bullets tore into a life, a wife cradled the dying breaths, doctors employed every skill and art they could muster, and in about one half hour a young life was ended. Just a bit over an hour and a half later a new President was sworn in and winging his way to the Nation's Capital.

A man of powerful dignity then began the assumption of the reins of Government left limp by his predecessor. A short time later, at Andrews Air Force Base in the suburbs of Washington, Lyndon Johnson gave the public its first look at its new President.

He spoke briefly, cogently, reverently. He indicated his sorrow, shared his sympathy, accepted the office, asked for help from the people, and implored the help of Almighty God. Later he was to open his first Cabinet meeting with a minute of prayer. He began his leadership responsibilities wisely.

He turned to God.

Millions turned to God. Prayers were offered on interview programs. The U.N. paused for a minute of prayer. Prayer moments were observed in schools. Tear-filled hearts bowed in prayer before television sets, in offices, and wherever stunned people heard the news.

They turned to God. Children went to bed with prayers for children like they, who now are without an earthly father—children who had only a heavenly Father.

But what a privilege to have a heavenly Father. How fortunate to have one to whom we can turn. How very sad it really would be if there were no Father to turn to.

Yet, in spite of, and possibly because of, the many pressures against religion today, children of all ages, and we are all children before our Father, turned to Him who alone can guide the destinies of nations and the affairs of the world.

The prayers were for comfort for the young widow who soon must leave the Presidential mansion; comfort for the two little ones whose birthdays this week will be less full than anyone ever dreamed they would be; comfort for the relatives who will miss a loved one; comfort for a nation in sorrow.

But prayers were also offered for those who now step into positions of extreme responsibility: For the new President and his family; for the new leaders who most surely will need the guidance which comes only from above; and for the Nation which now will rally behind its new Chief Executive.

And that Nation will rally. For that Nation is a great nation. And no matter how many try to expunge it from its life and history that Nation is conceived in liberty under God. Indeed it is not hypocritical when it asserts, "In God we trust."

And in God we do trust.

At a time of national tragedy, in God we trust.

At a time of unified mourning, in God we trust.

At a time of resolved intention, in God we trust.

At a time of renewed unity, in God we trust.

At a time of national thanksgiving, in God we trust.

It is thanksgiving time. This Thursday we, as a nation, will celebrate our annual festival of gratitude. We will remember what gave us our blessings in our beginnings. We will remember what has carried us through many a trial. We will remember from whence we come and where we go. We will remember that it is in God we trust.

And we will offer thanksgiving. We will raise our hearts in praise to Almighty God that He has blessed us. And we will offer our prayers of confession for all which would keep us from witnessing to the faith we have been given. And we would pray for those who can know our Father only through our witness, praying that our witness be true and pure and dedicated. We would pray for those who need to know of our Father who loves us and watches over us and protects us even in the valley of the shadow.

Above all, we would lift our united hearts in praise, not because we are so blessed and others may not be, but that we have been chosen to bear the responsibility of sharing the love of the One who loves us.

Many will ask now, as they ask at any death of any person, "Why? Why did this have to happen? What did God have in mind when He permitted this? How can we give thanks to a god who permits such to take place?"

Well, for many there is no anwser. There is no answer, that is, unless you are willing to place everything in our Father's hands, to adore Him as our loving protector, to honor Him as our redeemer, to worship Him as our comforter. Then, recognizing His control in love, we can turn to Him and pray, "Help me to see as clearly as Thou dost wish me to. Then some day let me see, not as in a glass darkly, but face to face. Praise be to Thee oh most high."

The assassination Friday, November 22, 1963, was not the assassination of a wealthy person, it was not the assassination of a Democrat, it was not the assassination of a man; it was the assassination of the President of the United States of Amercia, it was the assassination of the leader of the greatest Nation ever to be known in the history of the world; but more so, it was the assassination of a child of God, a God-given life, a God-created existence.

And for this reason this is a crime against God as well as a family and a nation.

But, in God we trust. In God we trust concerning the life of the late President; in God we trust concerning the course taken by the new President; in God we trust concerning our lives as a nation; and even in God we trust concerning the fate of the murderer.

While we may be filled with hate, we need also to recognize that hate kills something in the hater, too. Let us offer prayers that this hated and despised copy of a man, whoever he may be, will be visited by God, will repent of this evil, and will find the peace alone which will prepare him to meet his God.

And may we, at this time of national mourning also recall that this is a time of national thanksgiving—thanksgiving, above all, that we, as well as little John and little Caroline, are not without a father—that we are not orphans—but that we have a Heavenly Father, a loving Heavenly Father, who wills that none of his children shall be lost.

Let us pray anew, and together, as possibly never before, in God we trust.

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Senior Citizens' Eulogy to the Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in one of the late President's addresses to Congress in 1962, he reaffirmed his belief and faith in the people of the United States. His White House statement to the Congress of the United States on February 26, 1962, was that—

> The basic resource of a nation is its people. Its strength can be no greater than the health and vitality of its population.

These words of our late President ring true and have a sound, clear logic with

a necessity all their own. The health of all citizens is not only an individual and family concern, but one of national import.

For this reason President John Fitzgerald Kennedy gave his support to a program which would assist the elderly to better health and better days. He gave his support to them because it was these people who needed his help and support most. His program was called medicare.

Senior citizens everywhere have expressed their deep sorrow over the loss of our beloved President. At the same time they expressed their immediate fear that their champion was dead and they needed reassurance for the future.

It is these thoughts which moved the Hudson City Senior Citizens Club to write this eulogy that I now would like to insert in the appendix of the RECORD. Mrs. Lillian Allan, chairman of the club, requested that this eulogy be read as "from all senior citizens of America":

EULOGY TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY FROM THE SENIOR CITIZENS OF AMERICA

Never since Abraham Lincoln was there a President of the United States so concerned for the happiness and welfare of all mankind. He listened to the problems of the elderly, and tried to help by sponsoring medicare—hospitalization and health care for senior citizens.

He knew that there was a very great need of help with hospital bills for oldsters on social security and pensions.

President Kennedy saw actual facts and figures on the cost of a long hospital stay, when his father suffered a stroke.

Now that our beloved President is dead, let us carry on and work for the success of the medicare program, that he sponsored. This will need the support of every senior citizen in the Nation.

Let us show Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy that we are grateful for President Kennedy's vigorous efforts in behalf of senior citizens.

When the medicare bill is passed, it will be another star in the heavenly crown of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States.

In Memoriam—John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, joining in tribute with thousands of other houses of worship throughout our Nation to pay honor to the memory of our late beloved President, the Bialyskoter Synagogue in New York City's lower East Side, held a memorial meeting on Sunday, December 1, 1963. The meeting was attended by an overflow crowd, not alone of the Jewish faith, for the Bialystoker Synagogue is one of the oldest orthodox Jewish synagogues in New York City whose services are performed by the truly orthodox patriarchs of the Hebrew religion, but by other residents of the area representing all races and religions. Within these hallowed halls there was but one desire—to pay homage to a man beloved by all and to offer prayers for his soul.

It was my privilege to be one of the speakers at this meeting, not only as a Representative to the Congress for the area, but as a resident of the area and a member of the congregation of the Bialystoker Synagogue.

At the request of the membership, I am taking the liberty of including in the Appendix of the RECORD my statement which was greeted with favor by those assembled:

The bells have tolled in the canyons of Wall Street; over the factories in Detroit; schools and universities across the land and on our ships at sea or wherever news could travel; across Washington's broad avenues; and in thousands of towns and villages throughout the United States—the bells have tolled a great President has died.

At the American Embassy in Bogotá, Colombia, a lone marine walks across the lawn, salutes the flag and lowers it to half mast. Wherever the American flag flies throughout the world, whether under the searing sun or a soft and gentle rain, the flag flies at half mast. A great American President has died.

At U.S. bases throughout the world, from Saigon, South Korea to London, England, cannons boom out every half hour, from dawn to dusk, in a tattoo of grief. A great President has died.

It was the kind of a feeling one can hardly describe—people gathered in knots on street corners, an air of disbelief in their faces, their heads shaking, muttering to themselves, "It's not possible."

People who seldom enter the church or synagogue are suddenly drawn into their holy walls: some pray, some cry, some merely sit or kneel in silence. A great President has died.

On a street corner, a blind Negro woman plucks at her guitar, half singing, half weeping a funeral dirge—"He promised never to leave me" she sang. An Italian barber on the lower East Side said what was in his mind in two words, "I cry." A woman on Times Square said them in another way, "My God!" Jacqueline Kennedy said them as her husband fell forward, dying, "Oh, no!" A Roman Catholic priest said them after administering the last rites to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, "He is dead." A great President has died.

In the U.S. Senate, the chaplain says, "We gaze at a vacant place in the sky, as our President falls like a giant cedar."

On the morning that Lincoln died, James A. Garfield then a Representative in Congress who was to die by assassination himself 16 years later, said, "God reigns and the Government in Washington still lives." Mortal man goes on to his reward, but our institutions remain. A great President has died.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, has walked through the valley of the shadow of death yet our Government continues—though a great President has died.

No one believed that it really happened, but it did. A young, vigorous, aggressive, scholarly President had been assassinated. The bullet that struck down John Fitzgerald Kennedy, struck at the hearts and minds of all the people, in this country and throughout the world; a world that had learned to admire and respect this young man who in a few short years had left his mark on it.

When he died we, all of us, died a little bit and I died just a little bit more because John Fitzgerald Kennedy had befriended me. I recall visiting him at the White House. He was a man who could disagree without being vindicative. He was young, vigorous, aggressive, and scholarly. He knew the needs of his country and fought to fulfill that need.

He was wedded to peace and vigorously sought this greatest of all goals of mankind. He believed that the extension of the enjoyment of living was a goal that could and should be achieved not alone by the wealthy, but also by the humle and the poor. He was a great man, a good man, a humble man.

Why must the life of a young man, moved only by high motives, impelled by understanding and vision, be brought to an untimely end with his labors unfinished? And why, in a free land, untouched by the heel of a dictator, where the humblest citizen may freely utter his grievances, must that life be cut short by an evil instrument moved by malice, frustration, and hate? This is the incredible thing which leaves us bewildered.

Some months ago, when I learned that Egypt had hired Nazi scientists for the purpose of building up an arsenal of deadly weapons, of terrible, destructive powers; to build missiles and submarines, I became alarmed. I knew that they could be meant for only one nation—Israel.

I wrote to the State Department complaining that by our assistance we were enabling Mr. Nasser to prepare for war against Israel; that he had sworn to drive Israel into the sea. I asked the State Department to make representations to both the German Government to recall its scientists and to the United Arab Republic to desist from spending its needed moneys for these devilish purposes.

The State Department replied saying that they would not interfere in the internal affairs of another country; that if the German scientists were withdrawn or removed, Russian scientists would take their place. Being unhappy on the receipt of this reply, I then wrote directly to President Kennedy. I received a reply in letter form from the White House and 3 days later the President publicly announced at his press conference in Washington, "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors" * * * "We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Near East which, would, of course, destroy the independence of the people."

President Kennedy was the first President of the United States to sell defensive military armaments to Israel. This was a change from the policy set down by the previous administration—not to incur the displeasure of the Arabs by selling Israel arms. At the direction of President Kennedy, Hawk missiles are being sold to Israel. These defensive weapons are the latest word in destroying invading aircraft.

And he went further. He invited members of the Israeli air force to come to this country so that they could learn to operate these Hawk missiles.

This is the man whose passing we mourn. This is the man who was cut down as the result of the hatred of a diseased mind; hatred that has been engendered of late in this country both from the extreme right and the extreme left. What a waste has been committed upon the body politic.

Let me also say that our hearts go out to Mrs. John Kennedy and her two children, Caroline and John, Jr., who have sustained such a great loss.

Before I close, I want to say a word about the man who has now become the 36th President of these United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson. In 1957, when President Eisenhower threatened Israel with punitive sanctions unless she withdrew from the Sinai Peninsula, Mr. Johnson was then the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He told President Eisenhower that the Senate would not approve economic sanctions against Israel. He called for a just peace and de-

plored the attempted coercion of Israel as "a method of settlement."

As a Senator, President Johnson fought to obtain for Israel a fair share of economic aid, noting that Israel was forced to divert its own resources for defensive arms against the Russian arms that were flowing into Egypt. I am confident that President Johnson will continue the policies of the Kennedy administration toward Israel.

A great President has died. Let us pray that our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the loftiest symbol of the American way of life, shall not have died in vain; that by our own treatment of others, by our own considerate treatment of our neighbors, we shall build a living memorial to his desire for the equality of man. And that with his passing, he shall be a pleader for the cause of mankind, and let us also pray that the countenance of the Almighty may shine upon our new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and lead him along the path of righteousness and good fortune.

General Statement on Need for Additional Authorizations To Make Loans for Various Rural Community Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, many of the small rural communities which have requested FHA assistance in developing or improving domestic water supplies have also needed the same type of assistance for sewerage. Expansion of business, attraction of small industry and often the basic health of the community are dependent upon better facilities for sewage treatment and disposal. In many instances where rural water systems have been installed, the availability of adequate supplies of pure water has resulted in increased use of water and the overloading of existing septic tanks and other makeshift sewage facilities.

The rapid expansion of suburban areas and rural residences into farm communities, together with the increased demand for modern living has resulted in a large increase in the use of septic tanks for waste disposal. Increased use of septic tanks where soil is inadequate for a proper disposal field is continuing. Approximately 14 percent of rural dwellers have sewage disposal systems available to them and about 56 percent use septic tanks for waste disposal, leaving around 30 percent of the rural facilies without either of these forms of sewage disposal facilities.

For many of these rural communities, there is now no adequate source of long-term credit. In addition to credit, most of them need advice and technical assistance in planning and operating their projects if they are to be successful.

The Farmers Home Administration has received many requests from interested farmer groups concerning the possibility of financing rural gas distribution systems. The increasing popularity of natural gas in many areas as fuel for irrigation-pump motors and the widespread use of gas in the same areas for heat and other domestic purposes makes it advisable to provide financing for these facilities. Private utilities are not interested in extending service to most rural areas, and no other financing is presently available to associations of farmers and rural residents for this purpose.

In areas where gas is available nearby, the needed improvements in rural homes and services to local industry can best be provided if gas is made available locally at economical rates.

There is a widespread need for community centers in rural areas. Provisions have already been made by Congress for the financing of water systems, and recreational facilities. However, these programs will result in a much greater degree of development for many rural communities, and as they develop, there will be certain other service facilities which will then be necessary, or at least highly desirable, for the well-being of the communities. These will include better fire-protection facilities, community halls, visiting clinics, libraries, auditoriums, and many other special-purpose improvements of this nature.

Other Federal programs have been established in recognition of the need for Federal assistance in the development of utilities and other community facilities. Similar authority should be provided the Farmers Home Administration so that grants could be made up to 50 percent of the total costs of projects serving low-income communities through the development of water supplies, waste disposal, fuel distribution systems, and rural community services such as auditoriums, clinics, community halls, fire-protection facilities, and libraries. Such grants would be available to rural nonprofit associations and to public bodies in those areas not eligible for such assistance from other existing programs.

Thanks to the Television and Radio Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I know that many of our Members have already expressed their gratitude and thanks for the great sacrifices made by the employees of the television and radio industry through almost 4 days following the assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I, too, would like to express my appreciation to the television and radio industry for their splendid achievements in presenting to the American people and people around the world, the saga of all the events following this great international tragedy.

The industry and its employees spared nothing in time, effort, money, and imagination to present these historic events to millions of people; every ounce of energy, every available personality and employee, every known engineering device, every piece of available equipment, was utilized to bring to a saddened world the picture and word story of the calamity of the assassination of the President of the United States.

As my colleagues know, following the slaying of President Kennedy, the leaders of all the networks and major television and radio stations in our country decreed that all commercials and regular programs would be canceled until after the solemn ceremonies were completed a week ago Monday. As a result of this unparalleled and unprecedented coverage of the death of our late President, the industry lost in revenues an estimated total of $28,700,000. This is a tremendous sum of money, and represents a splendid example of patriotism and unselfish devotion to the people of our country and to our departed leader.

I know that I speak for all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the gratitude of the Congress is sincerely given to the television and radio industry, to all of its reporters and writers, to its engineers and cameramen, to its producers and couriers, and to its officials, for a job well done—done truly in the American way and in the American spirit.

A Shock, Then Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week of November 30, 1963:

A SHOCK, THEN RECOVERY—MOST TOP ECONOMISTS FORESEE A STRAIN ON BUSINESS AS A RESULT OF THE ASSASSINATION; THEY BELIEVE A TAX CUT IS MORE VITAL THAN EVER TO KEEP THE ECONOMY ADVANCING

U.S. economists, striving to assess the impact of the assassination of President Kennedy, do not minimize the force of the blow to the Nation's economy. Yet all believe that the economy can and will sustain it.

In the short run, nearly all look for a period of interruption—lasting only days or weeks—followed by a resumption of the economy's moderate upward course.

Longer term, however, many economists are worried that the strains and uncertainties, following not only from the tragedy itself but from its wider national and international effects may increase the dangers of recession and aggravate the unemployment problem later in 1964.

Virtually all—conservatives and liberals alike—now say that it is more important than ever that Federal taxes be reduced to insure the strength and stability of the economy. Even some who had been in the minority that was cool or indifferent to the need for tax reduction now feel its importance has been increased by the shock of the

events of the past week, and the uncertainties that lie ahead.

Most believe that President Johnson will follow through on the tax cut and will be successful in gaining congressional support for it—and that his overall monetary and fiscal policies will be calculated to sustain national and international business confidence.

A Business Week survey of some of the Nation's outstanding economists—including some who have advised Presidents in the past—finds that most put heavy stress on the importance of national and business policies to buttress the economy.

Here is how some top economists see the picture:

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers: "The basic strength of the economy, combined with President Johnson's strong reaffirmation of the urgency of tax reduction, should enable the economy to withstand the shock and tragedy of President Kennedy's death."

Gabriel Hauge, president of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. and former economic adviser to President Eisenhower: "The basic strengths of the economy that have been lifting it to higher ground remain generally unimpaired. The new President has moved with great skill in his first trying days, and one cannot doubt that he will continue to do so, reinforcing confidence in the future as he proceeds. One can reasonably expect that his efforts will be reassuring at home and abroad, and that they will lead the Congress to enact the pending tax bill in the context of a sensible Government expenditure program before the first quarter of 1964 has run out."

Robert C. Turner, of Indiana University, former member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman: "The tragedy of President Kennedy's death and all the events accompanying it have undoubtedly shaken the confidence of the American people. This is bound to have an adverse effect on business activity. Under these circumstances, a vigorous expansionary Government economic policy is all the more necessary if we are to maintain the forward momentum of the past 2½ years.

"Mr. Johnson's succession to the Presidency will remove some of the less rational obstacles to the acceptance of President Kennedy's policies. This is especially likely in view of the fact that, in the main, the opposition to President Kennedy's policies, especially the tax cut, has had its origin not in differences as to economic analysis but in political considerations. After a period of inevitable uncertainty, therefore, I look forward to responsible congressional and public action and to further advance."

Henry C. Wallich, of Yale, former Eisenhower CEA member: "President Johnson will stick to Kennedy's programs. He is unlikely to unsettle things before the election * * * Because of Johnson's conservatism, there will be no extra worry about the dollar and the gold flow."

William F. Butler, vice president, Chase Manhattan Bank: "There will be some hesitation until people figure out what it means. I do not see a downturn, but some leveling out. A tax cut is more necessary than ever; President Johnson must make a strong statement to Congress and follow through. Without it, the business picture may worsen. The great unknown is the reaction abroad. Short term it looks like general strength. But how will the Russians react? Will they try to exploit the situation? They have a history of putting new Presidents to a test. How will they test President Johnson?"

Raymond J. Saulnier, Columbia University, Chairman of President Eisenhower's CEA: "I'd say that were at at a high point and after a period in which we will absorb this terribly profound shock, the economy will resume a path rather like the one it was traveling. The tax cut will come just about when expected before—February or March—and will work just about as anticipated, giving a modest stimulus to the economy."

James Tobin, of Yale, former member of President Kennedy's CEA: "There will be no permanent effect on the economy. After a brief period of hesitation, the fundamental trends in the economy will reassert themselves. Since there was no great strength in the economy even before this week, I now regard a tax cut as more essential than ever."

Victor von Szeliski, vice president, U.S. Economics Corp., business consultant: "Today's uncertainty is not of a sort likely to lead business to curtail plant and equipment programs. Today's business investment is a response (so far an underresponse) to the strength in consumer markets and the availability of funds, sources of strength which have been demonstrated for more than a year. Not having been overdone, investment will not be easily undermined.

"In the consumer area, some sales losses have already resulted from the closing down of retail outlets and the general shock to individuals. Consumers are not likely to work out of their psychological malaise right away, and November sales totals will be sharply down from the October record. But shortly the boosts in pay, the higher year-end dividends—and in time and most importantly the tax cuts—will rebuild their confidence. The backlog of investment commitments will sustain the advance until consumer demand asserts itself."

Roy Blough, Columbia University, former CEA member under President Truman: "This kind of crisis cannot help but have a confusing effect. * * * It's probably not possible to pass the tax bill before the next session. Don't forget there are some 300 pages in the bill—only about 30 given over to the simple tax reduction part. Of course, it's not inconceivable that some of the extra features will be jettisoned in an effort to speed up passage of a simple tax reduction. * * * If we needed the tax cut at all before, we need it more now. The uncertainties following President Kennedy's death and the accession of a new President have shaken the economy."

Otto Eckstein, Harvard, former director of growth study for Joint Congressional Economic Committee: "There's no reason for the outlook to change with the accession of Johnson. It looked like a good year in 1964 with the tax cut and it still does. Government spending was a question mark before and it still is. Johnson should have no adverse effect on the private economy—presumably he will be as friendly to business as Kennedy. Probably he will go ahead with the tax cut. * * * Johnson has somewhat more discretion than many think about what he can do. He is not completely caught in Kennedy's programs."

The Kennedy Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on this day of eulogy for the late John F. Kennedy, I think it fitting to consider the words and the warning of Alexander F. Jones, executive editor of the Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-American, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include his recent editorial entitled "The Kennedy Light."

THE KENNEDY LIGHT

(By Alexander F. Jones)

President Johnson made an eloquent plea in his Thanksgiving Day message for an America that will "banish rancor from our words and malice from our hearts—to close down the poison springs of hatred and intolerance and fanaticism."

He envisioned "a new American greatness, a new day, when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind."

He said this is the work he most wants us to do.

This is a splendid concept of what human conduct should be.

Coming at the moment the death of President John F. Kennedy at the hand of a Communist fanatic is still a matter of acute national grief, this statement takes on much added weight.

If it had been uttered before that fatal shot in Dallas, it would have been dismissed as a cliche from a Utopian seeking perfection in a sadly imperfect mankind.

But today there is realization in this terribly shocked Nation that there is much in the President Johnson statement about which we can do something. It is not all an idealistic concept by any means.

At the end of a splendid mall in Washington stands the beautiful Lincoln Memorial reminding us forever of the first Presidential martyr who spoke up for an end of racial intolerance. It is a constant reminder of the hopes he had for this Nation.

In another lovely spot is the memorial to President Thomas Jefferson, author of our Declaration of Independence and creator of the words "all men are created equal."

On the slope in Arlington Cemetery Mrs. Kennedy plans a tomb over the grave of her husband where an eternal light will burn.

It will be another potent reminder of our responsibilities as citizens, for John Fitzgerald Kennedy's memorial will always be what he hoped for this country. He was in office too briefly to see his hopes take form as realized legislation.

But it will ask its beholders this:

"What are you doing to make peace closer? What are you doing to bring education closer to all American youth? What are you doing to banish racial discrimination? What are you doing to make all citizens conscious of their responsibilities in proving their right to that priceless heritage? What are you doing to prove that you are doing something for your country and not asking its favors instead?"

If these and other messages to young Americans, are held out in the years to come, we may profit more by the fact that John F. Kennedy came this way than we can now realize. He will become another symbol of hope.

When President Johnson speaks of present-day rancor, malice in our hearts and poison springs of hatred in our hearts, intolerance and fanaticism, just who and what is he talking about?

First, he is talking about Communist subversives who would destroy our Republic and enslave our people. He is talking about the vicious fringe representing Fidel Castro of Cuba, one of whom killed our President, and who are plotting the end of what democracy there is in South America.

He is talking about the fanatical rightwing extremists who exhibit their own vicious futility by charging patriots with being Communists and urging that this Nation climb into a hole and refuse to consider any step promising progress. They are as guilty of intolerance and hatred as the other end of the pole.

He is talking about forces who would deny American Negroes the right to vote and the right to enjoy equal privileges in public places in this country.

The moral rightness, to say nothing of the constitutional aspect, of this position is unassailable.

It, civil rights legislation, will come to pass, for the simple reason that it must if our democratic ideals and concept of justice are to survive.

I cannot speak for President Johnson, naturally, but as certain as I am that civil rights legislation will pass and a smoother path assured for Negro citizens, I am equally sure that coercion by Negro leaders and their organizations attempting to force special privileges for members of that race will not only fail but will continue to cause much of the "poison springs of hatred" that President Johnson so properly deplores.

To allow an organization like the Black Muslims, preaching hatred of the white man and urging formation of an all-black government in the United States, to exist is a matter that should concern us all.

Another cause for disregard of our moral needs, along the line of President Johnson's thinking, in my opinion, is the action of the U.S. Supreme Court in banning prayer in public schools on the fallacious argument that such utterances are violations of the constitutional provision guaranteeing separation of church and state.

When Chief Justice Warren appeared on the Capitol memorial program for President Kennedy and asked God's help for this Nation I unconsciously winced. Who is this man, I asked myself, to appeal to God in this terrible moment? He and his associates would not even allow public school children to mention "God" in our public schools.

Did this decision, I ask, help to build "a new American greatness"? To me it lacks all consideration of human understanding. The Pilgrims came to this land to pray as they pleased long before there was a Supreme Court.

Let no one think for a second that any new American greatness will involve the right for the people to disagree on policies of every nature.

Hammering out the truth from varying viewpoints is how our Republic was fashioned and why it grows. President Johnson is too experienced a politician to believe that his eloquent plea will eradicate political opposition. He is an old campaigner and will enjoy the heat and the excitement of battle.

But he is eternally right in asking an end to the viciousness of littleness, of stomach-turning demagogs seeking personal notice in any cause.

It is to be hoped that the light from the tomb of John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be a warning for us all against all poison spreaders—as a lighthouse is for ships at sea seeking to escape the shoals.

Sweeping Changes Needed in Procurement Division of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, another battle has been won in the fight to save taxpayers' dollars in the purchase of our defense equipment. This battle took 2 years and there is going to be some waste involved. But just as at the end of the rainbow there is a pot of gold, so there is a considerable amount that will be saved for the taxpayer when this radio set—the ARC–54—is bought by competitive bidding.

The Army has reluctantly agreed to buy half of its next year's requirements for the ARC–54 by competitive bidding. Just last week, it advertised a sole-source purchase of 853 of these sets from the sole-source developer. Its last price was about $6,000. When the next sole-source price is calculated, I intend to compare it to the competitive price due next year. Then we shall see how much could have been saved in the past, and we can calculate the savings of the present.

Mr. Speaker, the Army originally intended to keep purchase of this radio under the expensive sole-source shelter for at least all of fiscal year 1964. This was my conclusion after studying the case since September 1961.

However, on July 17, 1963, I made a speech on the floor of the House attacking the sole-source shelter that surrounded this radio. That speech can be found in the RECORD for July 17, 1963, on pages 12091–12094.

After making that speech, Mr. Speaker, I referred the case to the Comptroller General for a complete study. Here again, as in past cases, I hoped to prove that intelligent inquiry and hard work would establish that a competitive purchase should be undertaken, whereas superficial investigation by the Army only buttressed its contention that purchase must be by sole source.

On September 27, 1963, the Comptroller General reported to me in a 6-page letter, which showed the depth to which GAO went to get at the truth of the ARC–54 case.

The GAO report concluded:

> Every effort should be made to effect procurement of the radio sets (ARC 54) for the balance of the fiscal year 1964 on a competitive basis at the earliest possible date.

The GAO had upset the Army's sole source applecart and wrote the Secretary of the Army with its recommendations. Any Member is welcome to look at that letter in my office.

On October 7, 1963, I reported GAO's findings to the Members of the House, and that speech may be found on page 17943 of the RECORD for that day.

On October 22, 1963, the Comptroller General advised that the Army had agreed to split its purchase of the ARC 54 for fiscal year 1964, buying about half sole source and about half through competitive bidding.

Mr. Speaker, the last sole-source price for this radio was $6,000. The latest sole-source procurement, opened last week in Chicago, will probably be a little under that figure. However, when the competitive procurement for this radio is opened early next year, I predict a startling drop in price under past sole-sources prices.

That lower price will prove just how much money could have been saved for the taxpayer in the past had better planning, more efficient work, and a more protective attitude toward the taxpayers' dollar been in force in Army purchasing departments.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more reason why it is imperative that the purchasing machinery of the military be completely overhauled. Here is another instance in which the Army has been forced to allow competition to save tax dollars. How many more are there that have gone or will go undiscovered?

Sweeping changes are needed in procurement divisions of the military, and they are needed now. I have been able to show in the past how some errors have been admitted and corrected by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but progress is entirely too slow.

Revitalize the American Cotton Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

If it is not possible for the House to take action on Mr. DOLE's amendment it is at least appropriate that the subject of wheat legislation be discussed here today. Much has been said about the importance of the cotton industry to our economy. Even more could be said about the importance of wheat to not only our economy but to the very survival of our society. Bread is often referred to as the staff of life and it is unquestionably true that without wheat we would be hard put to feed our people. We use about 550 million bushels of wheat each year to feed the American people. We have exported more than that much wheat during each of the last several years and this year we will approach 800 million bushels, not counting the possibility of selling wheat to Communist Russia.

The wheat and feed grain program which Mr. DOLE's amendment would authorize is one which in my opinion deserves favorable consideration. I am one of those who introduced this legislation in the House. I did so because being a farmer I thought I knew what many farmers wanted in a wheat program. They wanted, if possible, a voluntary program such as they had in the feed grain program which was strenuously supported by this administration. This is probably the most important feature of this proposed program. In simplest terms, it would add wheat to the present voluntary feed grain program. Anyone not wanting to participate in a Federal price support program would not be required to do so. He would be able to raise all the wheat he wanted to, but he would not be eligible for price support or land retirement payments. He could sell his wheat for whatever price he could secure on the

market. He would not be limited to selling his wheat for export as in some of the voluntary programs that have been proposed.

When wheat farmers rejected the administration's certificate wheat plan in last May's referendum, they were not voting for no wheat program. They were rejecting a plan that seemed entirely too complicated and restrictive and hoping that Congress would give them a program that was fair and equitable. I believe our proposal is sound and would fulfill the obligation that Congress has to give the farmer something real instead of just hope.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that Mr. DOLE's amendment would be of benefit to the farmer. This cotton bill we are considering today will do nothing to help the cotton farmer, but from all the evidence presented here it would mean millions to the processing industry.

Revitalize the American Cotton Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, we can with great justification assume that we have reached another milestone on the long, winding road of Government programs for agriculture. It becomes increasingly clear that we here in the Congress, along with leaders of all farm organizations must apply the utmost of our commonsense, knowledge, and ability to the framing of a farm program which will be effective and acceptable in the following respects: First, it must maintain or improve the possibility of increasing farm income; second, it must reduce the Government's role in the management of the affairs of our Nation's farmers and decrease the costs to the taxpayers; third, it must be basically voluntary in its application; fourth, it must apply to total wheat and feed grains production in order to avoid transfer of problems in one area to another and get at the problem of reducing surpluses; fifth, it should work toward restoring the normal grain trade to its proper place in the farm market economy; and sixth, it should not be a temporary or crash program which would be subject to radical changes from one crop year to another—it should be given the chance to prove itself.

Let me say that we have come a long way on that road in our bungling attempts to make adjustments for the tremendous increases in the productive capacity of our country's farmers. The trouble is that there have been too many detours, and all too often we have been on a road which would have led us to we know not where.

Looking back over the years we recall that in 1947 CLINTON ANDERSON, now U.S. Senator from New Mexico, became Secretary of Agriculture. He advocated a badly needed, long-range farm plan based on flexible supports—if a short supply in a commodity exists, raise supports to encourage production. When surpluses mount, drop supports, but always with a floor to protect the farmer. President Truman supported Mr. ANDERSON, and Secretary Brannan did, too, for a time when he took over the Department.

A year later, in 1948, both political parties stood for flexible supports, but by the spring of 1949, Secretary Brannan scuttled the idea in favor of his own infamous plan, and what chance could there possibly be for agreement on anything except to let the mistakes continue and the surpluses mount.

By 1952 the Republicans stuck with flexible supports and the Democrats campaigned for high rigid supports and through the next 8 years the battle was fought and refought to the utter confusion of everyone, and with a surplus problem that became increasingly a headache.

The Kennedy administration next moved in on the scene. They then proposed the Agricultural Act of 1961, known as the "omnibus farm bill," which attempted first to take over the functions of Congress, and second to obtain authority to place into operation the Cochrane theory of supply management over every one of the 256 agricultural commodities produced in America. The Congress was wiser than the controllers. It refused to give this authority. The proponents by the application of their concept would destroy the U.S. marketing system by placing controls over every segment of the marketing system, and thereby destroy the free market.

In the meantime the so-called emergency feed grain bill had been passed and I might say that this program has possibilities, the theory being that land would have to be retired in order to balance supply and demand, but now we find that those who were the strongest advocates of high supports and full parity for the farmer are administering agricultural programs with the farmers of the Nation struggling with a parity ratio of 77 percent for the first 6 months of 1963. This, I might comment, is the lowest parity figure since 1939.

Further examination of the history of farm legislation reveals that the Congress has been dealing with many separate commodities, many times attempting to legislate in one commodity only to have a problem break out in another. It is no great secret that the natural wheat-growing areas were asked to cut back in production while the door was opened for 15-acre producers to eventually produce more than the total annual surplus. Attempts have been made to cut back on the production of corn, while opening the door for grain sorghums. It is not so long ago that an attempt was made to permit the growing of barley on idle wheatland, and more recently a bill has been reported to permit the grazing of soil bank land.

So in reviewing the entire legislative conduct it becomes increasingly clear that there is a lack of across-the-board consideration and it is obvious that in our attempt to legislate by commodities we fail to recognize a basic need and that is to consider the total acres producing crops of all kinds and attempt to design legislation to encourage full participation in a land retirement program. This approach is necessary if we are to hope for adequate participation and to eventually bring supply and demand into proper proportion.

The bill that I introduced earlier in this session seeks to meet these qualifications, and I feel that there is a desperate need at this time to enact legislation, especially because of the situation that will develop in the area of wheat production. Statements have been made to the effect that the wheat farmer has indicated he wants no program, this judgment having been reached because of the wheat referendum vote. I do not believe that that is a proper interpretation to place on this action on the part of the farmer. In my judgment the farmer was saying, We do not want this type of a program, and I believe that they look to the Congres to come up with a more acceptable plan. I also am of the opinion that the proposal submitted by myself and others would be acceptable and would be endorsed by the wheat farmers of America.

I have further reasons for concern as to the wheat producers. While my district is largely a feed grain area, it is my opinion that if wheat prices are driven down, we will face still further competition in the feed grain areas which, of course, will result in cheaper feed and cheaper livestock. Already prices are distressing according to recent reports indicating that net farm income in the Midwest is down as much as 15 percent—Wall Street Journal, July 10, 1963. The Department of Agriculture reports farm income—excluding Government payment—in 1960 at $11.1 billion; in 1961 at $11.1 billion; in 1962 at $11 billion; and in 1963, an estimated $10.5 billion. The farm parity ratio has stood at 77 percent for the past 3 months and that figure for the month of November is the lowest since 1933.

The bill that I have introduced is very simple in its application. It is entirely a voluntary program which requires not less than 20 percent land retirement and permits up to 50 percent. One feature that in my judgment will be attractive to the family livestock farmer is the provision in my bill that the farmer who takes grain as payment-in-kind, instead of cash, will receive a more liberal treatment. This is a means of encouraging the small farmer to participate, and in their instance usually feed grown is fed on the farm and needed on the farm. This approach will keep many bushels of grain out of storage and out of government ownership.

Questions may be asked to cost, but regardless of what approach is made in

the field of agriculture, it will be costly. But it is my hope and the hope of many farmers that little by little the staggering surplus can be drawn down and we can again get agriculture to working in a more normal fashion. It is also our hope that we may establish better world markets in areas where food is a scarce commodity. This must be done by greater activity among farm organizations and people in the grain trade as well as the Government through Public Law 480.

I believe that the wheat growers of the United States deserve a better program than the one which will go into effect in 1964.

First. The present program will cause an extremely sharp reduction in wheat growers' income;

Second. If the present program is not radically altered, we are bound to be witness to a sharp expansion in wheat acreage accompanied by low price. These sharply low prices will make the wheat competitive with feed grains in the feed market; and

Third. An excess of feed supplies would ultimately drive down the prices of livestock and livestock products.

It should be noted that in the Midwestern States, between two-thirds and 80 percent of the farm income is derived from sales of livestock. I do not intend to stand idly by and watch the price structure for livestock and livestock products go into a nose dive.

It does not make sense to me to force the wheat grower to deplete his soil by overcropping in wheat in order to meet his expenses when at the same time this will cause irreparable damage to farmers clear across the conutry. Wheat growers and other farmers deserve better of their Government. It is for these reasons that I am strongly in favor of a voluntary wheat program which makes economic sense.

This Congress May Have Set a Record in Reducing Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think many of our news commentators and observers of the Washington scene today in criticizing Congress for its slow action disregard the fact that speedy action is not necessarily the test of good legislation.

When July 31 was established as an adjournment deadline by the Reorganization Act of 1947, as I recall, the budget was $38 million and the population of the United States was about 140 millions of people. Certainly a $98 billion budget and public services for 190 millions of people should require more time for Congressional scrutiny of programs and Government spending.

While Congress this year is setting a record for slow action on annual appropriations bills, it also may well establish an outstanding record for budget cutting.

In this connection, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce suggests that the net reduction on the 1964 budget will be a reduction from the original budget request of in excess of $5 billion—the largest total cut since 1953.

Some of us have anticipated this reduction will be more than $6 billion and since this would represent a saving of $129.96 for each family in America I think it might indicate to the taxpayers of America that there is some merit in proceeding slowly when spending other people's money.

The Duties of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on November 27, President Johnson made his first speech to the Congress as President of the United States. Reaction to his speech has been swift, and in some cases, extreme. I would like to call to my colleagues' attention an editorial that appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat on November 28 commenting on Mr. Johnson's speech. I place this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NEW PRESIDENT, OLD CONGRESS

Lyndon B. Johnson went back yesterday to Capitol Hill, where he has spent 32 years of his life, as the new President of the United States. He was excellently received by the Congressmen, all of whom he knows, many intimately. The honeymoon was on.

He delivered the message expected of him with simple brevity. It was perhaps the only speech he could have made: A pledge to carry forward the policies set by the late President John F. Kennedy.

But it was an old Congress to which the new President spoke. Most of its Members have been dealing with Kennedy legislative programs 3 years, cautiously and with meager acceptance.

They are sympathetic with Mr. Johnson and would join political ranks to help him. That does not mean they will jump through hoops to pass the administration's programs in the first 100 days, or the next 340.

The President pleaded for speedy enactment of the civil rights bill and next the tax reduction proposal, as a fitting memorial to the late President. He seemed, incidentally, to invert the importance placed on these two programs; Mr. Kennedy had put the tax measure first.

Understandably, Mr. Johnson sought to push for action quickly, while the honeymoon atmosphere of Congress is at full tide.

However, with all respect for martyred John Kennedy, it is not the duty or function of Congress to adopt major laws as a memorial, or be swayed by emotional or any other pressure. Nor is Congress likely to do so.

If the civil rights measure is sound, it ought to be passed on its merits. If it is bad, it ought to be defeated. These should be the sole, guilding reasons for action.

As a matter of fact, many features of the civil rights bill are good; it may well be passed with some amendment.

If the tax bill is wise for the country, in the weighed judgment of Congress, only that basis should impel passage. If it is dangerous without a curb in Federal spending, as very many believe, it should be killed.

Emotional appeal or compassion for the sudden, towering problems of a new President should not be factors in important decisions of Congress.

President Jonhson's mien was solemn, without the oratorical glamour of his predecessor but characterized by a down-to-earth directness and certain drama. His words were chosen carefully, politically; for the present he follows a pattern that must be molded to Kennedy policies.

Mr. Johnson undoubtedly plans to seek election on his own next November. Every act and word will be colored more or less by that end. He will feel it incumbent to follow the Kennedy basic policies, in domestic and more completely in foreign affairs. But the emphasis will most probably change, the methods shift considerably.

Knights of Pythias Proclaim 30-Day Period of Mourning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following proclamation has been issued by the Supreme Chancellor of the Knights of Pythias Brother Joseph B. Hacker, setting an official period of mourning for our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, which all Pythians will observe in their lodges throughout our Nation.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION OF THE SUPREME LODGE, KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS

"Whereas a pall of sorrow has been cast—not only over the United States of America, but over the entire North American Continent, and throughout the free world, because of the untimely death of a beloved and dedicated American and world leader, the 35th President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose life was ended and whose courageous service to his nation and the world ceased, because of the hatred of a crazed assassin; and

"Whereas we of the Order of Knights of Pythias, having given lodgment in our minds and hearts and souls to its sublime lessons, mourn the passing of a great and noble man, one fearless in the cause of right and of humanity; one who, to those dwelling in the darkness of tyranny, oppression and fear, had kindled a flame of hope for better things:

"Now, therefore, to every member of the Order of Knights of Pythias, I, Joseph B. Hacker, supreme chancellor, do hereby proclaim that a period of official mourning shall forthwith commence and shall continue for 30 days hereafter; and that each subordinate lodge, with appropriate memorial ceremonies, shall drape its charter as an evidence of our sorrow; that prayer be offered in memory of our fallen leader, and for God's blessings and divine consolation for the widow, children and all members of the family of our deceased President;

"Further, That likewise we offer our supplications in behalf of President Lyndon B. Johnson. May God in His infinite wisdom bestow on him an abundance of His richest gifts, wisdom, courage, and faith and grant to him divine guidance as he assumes the responsibilities of leadership of the peoples of the free world, looking toward and hoping and praying for the day when all men everywhere shall enjoy the unfettered rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and

"May each one of us, with divine help, rededicate our lives to the God given privileges which are ours to work and pray that the whole wide world may become holier and happier, as we earnestly strive to banish from our own hearts and minds any personal prejudice and every unkind thought. May friendship, charity, and benevolence become in fact the motivating forces which guide our thoughts and words and deeds."

Given under my hand and under the great seal of the supreme lodge and attested by the supreme secretary thereof, on this the twenty-fifth day of November in the year of nineteen hundred and sixty-three and the Pythian period the one hundredth.

JOSEPH B. HACKER,
Supreme Chancellor.

Attest: E. J. KNELPER,
Supreme Secretary.

Kennedy Memorial Resolution of Council of the City of Binghamton, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on December 2, 1963, the Council of the City of Binghamton, N.Y., meeting in regular session, unanimously adopted the following resolution honoring the memory of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, which resolution was thereafter approved, on December 3, by the Honorable John J. Burns, mayor of Binghamton, and then forwarded to me with the request that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, the resolution is hereto appended:

IN COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BINGHAMTON, STATE OF NEW YORK, A RESOLUTION HONORING THE MEMORY OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, and the greatest leader of our time, has met his untimely death on November 22, 1963, at the hand of a cruel and cowardly assassin; and

Whereas his dedication to the cause of peace and the elevation of human dignity will always be remembered by the immortal words and work he left behind, which are not only known to this grieving Nation but to the world; and

Whereas President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in all his public utterances, exhorted the people of this world to strive for the common good with the best that is in each of us; and

Whereas he was a man whose private and public life was above reproach; who was sincere and equitable, honest and honorable; one to whom artifice and treachery were unknown, who was a stranger to bigotry and prejudice, an adviser of the indigent and a friend of all, regardless of race, color, or creed; and

Whereas at Gettysburg 100 years ago, that great and kindly man, Abraham Lincoln, most eloquently spoke to the people a few words which now in paraphrase, seem to express our thoughts about our deceased President:

"It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which John Fitzgerald Kennedy who fought here has thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from this honored dead President we take increased devotion to that cause for which he gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that this man shall not have died in vain;" and

Whereas we dedicate this meeting in memory of our compatriot, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose name is written in letters of gold upon the fleshy tablets of our grateful and appreciative hearts, and whose name is deeply engraved in the pure white marble of honest fame and whose name will be inscribed on the tablet of the immortals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council when it adjourns tonight, it do so in the name and on behalf of the city of Binghamton and its citizens, with deep and sincere regret and in respect to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the city of Binghamton forward a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, the widow of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and also that a copy be forwarded to Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON, Congressman of the 33d District of the State of New York, with instructions that this resolution be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and that the clerk of the city of Binghamton spread this resolution upon the minutes of this council.

Dated: December 2, 1963.

LEO J. KELLEY,
President of Council.
JOHN I. BURNS,
Mayor of the City of Binghamton.

Appraises Federal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the statements contained in the letter by John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, to the editor of the Washington Evening Star under date of December 2, 1963, explain in great detail many of the reasons that prompted the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to favorably act upon H.R. 8986, and I would suggest to my colleagues that they examine his statement carefully because of the information that it contains:

APPRAISES FEDERAL PAY BILL

I was surprised by your November 11 editorial describing the Federal pay bill approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee as a bad bill—particularly in view of your earlier editorial (Sept. 26, 1962) in favor of the concept of comparability between Government and private industry pay scales. The measure you oppose goes far toward carrying forward this principle of comparability which Congress made a matter of public policy in enacting the Salary Reform Act of 1962.

I must question both the reasons and the data you cite to support your view of H.R. 8986:

1. The cost of the legislation should not automatically make it a bad bill; actually, simple equity demands that the Government fulfill its commitment to the comparability principle on which it is founded.

2. The substantial raises scheduled to take effect in January 1964, were provided as the second phase of a gradual catchup formula in the Salary Reform Act of 1962: They actually average only 4.1 percent, would benefit only those in the first 15 pay grades, and would extend full comparability only through grade 7 and only to 1961 (representing about a 3-year timelag).

3. Your reference to substantial fringe benefits for certain jobs leaves the impression that these are greatly to the advantage of Federal employees compared to those found in the private sector. Studies we have conducted show that this is not the case. Although Government is generally credited with somewhat more liberal leave policies, it does not appear to be as liberal in group insurance policy and opportunities to acquire extra income such as through profit sharing, bonuses, stock options, etc. And Federal employees tend to pay a higher share of the cost of group insurance and retirement benefits.

4. Under the principle of comparability, pay increases are warranted all along the line—not just in the secondary levels where you agree increases are justified—as you will see explained below.

5. Your comparison of the lower average pay rates of workers in private employment with those of Federal employees is akin to comparing apples with oranges and has no validity for proof of your point. The average pay in the private sector is dragged down by the inclusion of a large proportion of unskilled and industrial-type positions, while the Federal service has fewer of these and a greater proportion of professional and high-skilled white-collar positions. As to the comparison of the average pay of employees of the State of Ohio and the Federal Government, I would point out that Ohio ranks in the lower half among the 50 States in average pay rates for its employees. The invalidity of both comparisons is demonstrated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys discussed below.

6. Contrary to your assertion, the Federal employee is not better off than his opposite number in private employment, except in the two lowest grades, as the following facts make clear:

The Salary Reform Act of 1962, in addition to establishing the current salary schedules and the higher rates to be effective in January 1964, also provided for an annual review and a report by the President to Congress as a means for achieving and maintaining comparability. The basis for determining comparability is the annual Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of clerical, administrative, and professional jobs in 80 different metropolitan areas, covering 75 classes or categories of jobs. In reporting these surveys, the Bureau of Labor Statistics provides a national average figure for each of the different levels of responsibility in each job category, and these averages serve as the basis for determining Federal salary schedules which would be comparable with private enterprise pay levels. It deserves emphasis that the rates reported by BLS, being national average rates, are lower than those paid by the highest paying half of private enterprise.

In its report on legislation that became the Salary Reform Act of 1962, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee noted that time did not permit adequate development of needed information on executive pay, and it specifically requested the

President "to recommend for consideration in the next session of Congress appropriate increases in Federal executive salaries at all levels." In response to the committee requests, the President asked his Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems (the Randall committee) to study the question of executive pay and to report its findings and recommendations. Its subsequent recommendations for substantial adjustments for key positions in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches are well known to you.

It was this review process—the BLS survey, the Randall committee report, the President's recommendations for pay adjustments, and the House committee's consideration of the data and proposals—that produced H.R. 8986.

Our own careful analysis of H.R. 8986 is that (1) it contains important reform provisions which are clearly consistent with the principles of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962; (2) it reaffirms congressional support for the principle that Government pay and pay for like jobs in the private economy should be kept at comparable levels by periodic review and appropriate statutory adjustment; and (3) it achieves comparability in the lower career levels and moves in the direction of attaining comparability in the upper career levels. The increase in the rates for the lower career levels does not depart from the comparability principle but takes into account the 1963 BLS survey data released last month; in the intermediate levels, comparability on a 1962 basis would be achieved; and, in the highest career levels, the rates are roughly comparable with the 1961 BLS data.

The bill falls below the executive branch scale supported by the administration, but it rationalizes and simplifies the executive salary levels in all three branches of Government on a basis which provides badly needed relief for top positions in the executive branch—although still considerably below the salaries recommended by the Randall Panel.

As the House committee report on the measure states, this bill "represents the first—and undoubtedly the conclusive—test as to whether Congress intends to abide by its commitment to the comparability principle or discard it within a year after its adoption. The bill is predicated upon the conviction that Congress will not abdicate its responsibility but, instead, will meet its obligation to Federal employees and the public by maintaining and strengthening the comparability principle."

It is because of these important and overriding considerations that the administration has expressed the hope, by letter of November 9 to the chairman of the House committee, that it will be possible for the House to consider H.R. 8986 in the near future in order to permit time for final congressional action on pay legislation this year. In view of the foregoing facts and your previously stated position in favor of comparability, I would hope that you would reconsider your editorial appraisal of the bill.

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent editorial of my longtime friend, John J. Edwards, owner of the West Side News, 229 Wyoming Avenue, Post Office Box 1042, Kingston, Pa., concerning our beloved late President John F. Kennedy.

The editorial follows:

One of the most distressing aspects of the untimely death of President John F. Kennedy is the fact that no man on earth had more good to live for than he. His life was dedicated to that which is good and his every effort in public life seemed to be aimed at improvement in the welfare of his fellow human beings. In addition, his personal life promised to go on being an exceptionally happy one.

President Kennedy's personal characteristics were contagious. His vigor, his enthusiasm, his optimism, and his good humor all seemed to have their influence upon his fellow citizens, and certainly they were responsible for his having become so endeared to his fellow citizens.

Always with President Kennedy it was to smile and to keep busy, busy, busy. He had so much to do and so little time that he couldn't even be bothered with with a hat and topcoat. He wanted his fellow Americans to be busy also and to be physically fit through exercise. He was the President who had a poet, the late Robert Frost, as a speaker at his inauguration and he and Mrs. Kennedy were active sponsors of music and the arts.

So, his personality and his leadership have left what we hope will prove to be indelible marks on the face of the Nation, and we hope that the high principles for which he stood so firmly will be maintained in our Government and national life.

J. Edgar Hoover Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, when he received the Brotherhood Award of the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, December 4, 1963. Mr. Hoover's address follows:

FAITH IN FREEDOM

This is a great moment in my life. To be recognized in this manner by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation is a distinction which I shall cherish always.

I am especially honored by the presence of so many close friends, including the distinguished civic leaders whom you have selected as recipients of other awards.

How have these men come to positions of prominence in our community? It is because they have dedicated themselves to service—they have eagerly accepted the responsibilities of good citizenship, and they are willing to be judged upon their records of positive contributions to the cause of decency and of justice.

Decency and justice—these are the high aims of this Brotherhood, just as they always have been an integral part of the Hebrew religion which has given mankind the Ten Commandments and the concept of a monotheistic God. For these sacred gifts, all true religious of the Western World are eternally indebted to you.

Americans of the Hebrew faith are doubly blessed. The rich, cultural inheritance that has been handed down since early Biblical times to generation after generation of Jews is combined, in our country, with a proud heritage of freedom. It is a heritage that was won by the sweat, the blood and the sacrifices of men and women on many nationalities and many religious creeds.

Devotion to God; belief in the inherent dignity of mankind; faith in man's ability, through divine providence, to guide his own destiny—these are the strong ties that hold together our United States, the greatest brotherhood of freedom in the history of the world.

No one has a deeper understanding of the true meaning of freedom than the members of the Hebrew faith, for no peoples have suffered more relentless persecution and injustice at the hands of tyranny through the ages.

Today the fires of anti-Semitism continue to burn with fierce intensity in many areas of the world. This is particularly true behind the Iron Curtain where communism, the bitter enemy of Judaism and of all other religions of the world, seeks to destroy your priceless heritage and the right of your people to live according to the tenets of God.

During the past generation, the conscience of decent men everywhere has been shocked by the continuing vicious atrocities that have been committed against Jews in the Soviet Union. Rabbis have been arrested and imprisoned or executed; synagogues have been desecrated; the traditional Jewish school system has been liquidated; and Hebrew literature, language and customs have been suppressed by the Russian Communists.

Despite Communist claims of improved conditions for Jews under the Khrushchev regime, the opposite actually is true. Additional forms of suppression have been introduced.

The observance of Passover no longer can be held according to tradition; sacred Hebrew burial customs have been obstructed; and a statewide program has been instituted to make Jews the scapegoats for criminal acts affecting the Russian economy. Jews are clearly identified by religion on the internal passport which all Soviet citizens must carry.

Last October, the outrageous extent of this program was disclosed by the Moscow newspaper Izvestia when it announced the arrests of several persons involved in an alleged criminal conspiracy. The leaders of this gang have "Jewish names," Izvestia told its readers in demanding a "show trial" and "death sentences."

Vicious outbursts of religious hatred such as this caused one American newspaper recently to warn its readers, "For reasons best known to themselves the Soviet leaders discriminate heavily against Jews. The evidence is overwhelming and incontrovertible and renewed almost daily by the Russians themselves."

In a joint statement released last summer, three American Jewish organizations denounced the Soviet press for conveying "a viciously negative image of the Jews," and indignantly proclaimed, "Soviet Jews are deprived by official policy of religious and cultural rights * * * and are the victims of discrimination."

Communism and religion—like communism and freedom—can never coexist, for Marxism is unalterably opposed to all forms of religious beliefs. Lenin acknowledged this fact more than 50 years ago when he exhorted his followers, "We must combat religion—this is the A B C of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism." Then he declared, "The Marxist must be * * * an enemy of religion."

Since the time of Lenin, atheistic communism has surged forth from Russia to enslave nearly one-fourth of the earth's surface and a third of her peoples. Nowhere are its advance battalions more active than in our own Western Hemisphere, where agents trained by the Kremlin continue to burrow deeply into countries of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Their deadly objective is to undermine legitimate governments, foment revolution and create a Soviet Union of Latin American Republics.

I have said this before and I would like to repeat it here: We are at war with communism and the sooner every redblooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Here in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed, and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents, and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks.

Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within. Foremost in this campaign are the party's efforts to exploit misunderstandings and capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest wherever they exist. This is especially true in the intense civil rights movement, for America's 20 million Negroes and all others engaged in this struggle are a major target for Communist propaganda and subversion.

It would be absurd to suggest that the aspirations of Negroes for equality are Communist inspired. This is demonstrably not true. But what is demonstrable is that some individuals and groups exploit the tension for purposes not confined to the equality of human rights under the Constitution of the United States. The crusade should not become a vehicle for political radicalism or organized violence.

Devotion to race must not supersede devotion to established institutions.

It would be useful if responsible Negro leaders themselves could make it clear to all who follow them that their interest is solely in racial equality.

This Nation was conceived under God and its progress has been under God. There could be no greater disaster for our Nation than that it should deny in any respect, to even the smallest degree, the presence, the power, the guidance, the protection, the instruction of almighty God.

There is unmistakable evidence of divine guidance all through the history of our Nation. We must guard it. We must cherish it. We must revere it. We must work for it.

The record of our Nation is better than that of any other nation in any other part of the world. It is true there are injustices in this Nation toward those of dark skin, as well as light, but even worse injustices prevail in other parts of the world. Whether the people are black- or yellow- or brown- or white-skinned, these things will have to be worked out.

America has taken the lead in working them out, and it is taking the lead today. It is doing more for its underprivileged minorities than any other nation in the world, but there is more to be done.

We thank God that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

As citizens of a free country, we must judge people as individuals—not by race, creed or color.

Legitimate civil rights organizations must remain constantly alert to attempts by the Communists to influence their actions, take over their programs and corrupt their ranks.

Communism feeds upon ignorance, prejudice and sickness of the mind and soul. It probes relentlessly for weaknesses in America's moral armor.

That is why the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe and other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellow man.

These venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right, are carriers of a highly infectious disease. They clutter the streets—and the mails—with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to acts of hate, terror and intimidation. They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children and destroyed churches and other temples of worship. They are a national disgrace.

Invariably, these merchants of hate attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism. But their real objective is to profiteer and capitalize upon ignorance, prejudice and bigotry while destroying the very ideals which they claim to uphold.

Today, the Communists continue with impunity to breathe out lies and distortions against the United States. Their designs on American youth revolt and anger those steeped in our national ideals of freedom.

The peddling of their dishonest doctrine to high-minded, largely inexperienced, and basically eager to believe young people is not unlike the peddling of filth and dope in demoralizing effect. It can undermine patriotism, create doubts about our social and economic system, and mock the many wholesome youth organizations in this country.

The great majority of American youths are genuinely convinced that they would not fall for the Communist bait. Many never would. But there are others who might never know they were "hooked" until the enormous tragedy of their loss of faith dawned after bitter years of fighting the American way of life, almost unwittingly, as dupes of the Communists.

It has happened to idealistic Americans before.

There is not an avenue to the heart and mind of Americans that is not used to implant their false ideology. Communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name calling, but it can be defeated by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

The God-given ideals which are responsible for this country's greatness are being attacked on many fronts today. Moral lethargy, self-indulgence, neglect of duty—these lethal forces are undermining many facets of business, labor, industry and Government.

We find their influence in the repulsive attitude of "half-way Americans" to whom life in this country is the enjoyment of rights and privileges devoid of responsibilities.

We find their influence in those courts of law where the true purpose and intent of our Constitution as a document designed for the protection of society have too often been warped and distorted for the benefit of offenders.

We find their influence in the continuing increase of crime—a tragic national problem which is growing four times as fast as our expanding population.

Crime has no respect for age, nationality, sex, color or religious creed. It has turned our streets into virtal jungles of terror and fear.

Today, a brutal crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill—is committed every 3 minutes. The number of these senseless atrocities will continue to grow until men of strong moral conviction assert greater influence toward the prevention of crime and administration of justice.

Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity and fair play. The moral strength of our Nation has slipped alarmingly. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to cure this moral illness.

Law and order are bulwarks on which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where strength and realism are essential needs.

There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is no longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets—and our families—will continue to be endangered.

Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

Judge Learned Hand said: "Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear in the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime."

Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us "keep the balance true."

Wherever politics and opportunism remain primary considerations in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the "rock from which we were hewn."

Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance, and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding, and faith in God.

There must be a moral reawakening in every home in our land.

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts or selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

Law and public sanctions help to keep our deeds in line—only conscience polices our thoughts. It is much easier to control our actions than our thoughts.

For, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Two hundred years ago, our Founding Fathers had a vision of a nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision—the determination that faith, cour-

age, and decency will prevail over all enemies of freedom.

Since 1753, when the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it has borne a solemn Old Testament inscription from Leviticus xxv, verse 10:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Let us all work together to maintain this great American ideal. With God's divine guidance, let us build an ever more powerful brotherhood of liberty and justice for the benefit of all mankind.

As the Father of our Country so aptly said—"As we declare our loyalty to our country, help us to keep in mind the need of faith in God and immortality without which life is meaningless and vain."

This is our mission as a nation of free people, united in one faith—faith in God.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 1917–63

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, many of my distinguished colleagues have today eulogized our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Their words will ring throughout this great land.

One of the finest, most sympathetic tributes to our late President has been written by Alberto Gavasci, a distinguished Boy Scout leader and a columnist for the Home News & Times of Yonkers, N.Y.

I take great pride in quoting Mr. Gavasci's heartwarming tribute:

(By Alberto Gavasci)

John F. Kennedy, Scout: Our President was a Tenderfoot Scout. As a boy he lived close to Yonkers, just across the Bronx River Parkway in Bronxville. He was a member of troop 2. His former scoutmaster, Donald MacKinlay, once said, "He was a regular Scout."

On Friday night, November 22, a group of institutional representatives of the Yonkers district Boy Scouts of America, met to renew our beliefs in scouting. At the close of the meeting I asked permission to say a few words. I asked the assembled group to rededicate themselves to the high moral and spiritual beliefs of the Scout movement, and to the human dignity and understanding of mankind that President Kennedy had stood for. We all rose for a moment of silence in respect for Scout President John F. Kennedy.

This summer I visited Ephesus in Turkey, Asia Minor, the city where John the Apostle built his first church. I viewed the ruins of this once great city, cradle of Christianity, and with deep insight I understood the mission of John the Apostle. These words in poetic illustration of John Ephesus I dedicate to our late John F. Kennedy:

"Trace the steps of John Apostle, religion bent
Through Ephesus, Antioch, empire cities great—
His thundering words proclaim to those reverent
Along streets, alleys, gardens from morn 'til late.

"The Spirit of Christ touches the mighty and the low
Sowing words of love, good to merchant and foe.

"The glittering sunlit marble columns sprinkle light
On opposite black-green hills of sage and olive trees.
With deep noon shadows cast on the temple site,
Goddess Diana stands alone in lattice frieze.

"Apostle John lifts his voice to speak and teach
'Christ and God is One,' he dares to preach.

"He builds his first church and six more will stand—
For citizens follow his footsteps crying, 'John is here
To save souls with love,' our time is sand,
Scattering in the wind, and falling everywhere.

"John the Apostle walks and prays rebirth
Opening mortals' eyes to God's alert.

"Ephesus port of call for Nomad and Roman
Falls to destruction, waste, and the ocean leaves.
But, John's church remains as an holy omen,
That man will love, live forever in God's eaves.

"Ephesus in stone, tradition and church of Christ
Is alive in the hands of John, Apostle of God's Might."

ALBERTO P. GAVASCI,
Yonkers Scouter.

Takoma Park Adopts a Sister City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

In June 1961 the Congress commended the sister city project of the people-to-people program as a major step forward in increasing good will and understanding in bringing the people of all nations together in the bond of mutual understanding, friendship, and cooperation.

Today more than 150 American cities representing every section of our country and every size of community, from New York City to Oakland, Nebr., with a population of only 1,600, have affiliated with sister cities in other nations.

In the November 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest, former President Dwight D. Eisenhower writes of this program in an article titled "An Epidemic of Friendship." He states that—

The sister city projects have a basic common denominator: A breaching of the age-old barriers of geography, language, race, history, and customs. As the dark breeds fear in children, so ignorance breeds suspicion in the people of this world. But now, in the middle of the 20th century, communications have been speeded and the flow of knowledge has grown from a trickle to a wide, steady stream.

I am pleased to report that the city of Takoma Park, Md., in my congressional district, has officially adopted the Sister City project by affiliating with the town of Jequie, in the State of Bahia, in Brazil, South America.

A permanent citizens' committee has been named to supervise and expand Takoma's Sister City affiliation with Jequie. This information is contained in the November 1963 issue of the Takoma Park City Services, the newsletter of the city of Takoma Park, Md.

The newsletter continues by giving information that formal affiliation with the Brazilian city took place last January when the Honorable Antonio Lomanto, Jr., then mayor of Jequie, and now Governor of the Province of Bahia, met in Takoma Park with Mayor George Miller, and officially exchanged town affiliation charters, uniting the two communities. The exchange concluded 3 years of negotiation between the city, the State Department, and the American Municipal Association.

The October 10 meeting was in effect the first formal organization of some 30 citizens who expressed strong support of the project.

One of the first problems facing the committee was finding a home for the Brazilian student who is expected to arrive in January. The student, Miss Arly Souza Britto, niece of Governor Lamanto, is expected to stay with Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Coffman, Takoma Park's public affairs director, and attend a local high school on an exchange basis. Because of time differentials, Takoma's student, upon selection, is expected to visit Jequie next June.

The individuals who have been named to head the new citizens' executive committee for the Sister City project are as follows: E. W. Tarr, chairman; W. H. McClenon, first vice chairman; Leslie Pitton, second vice chairman; Mrs. Esther Geib, secretary; and Mrs. Rhoda Ross, associate secretary.

In addition to this, the citizens' committee decided to name subcommittee chairmen in order to develop full exchange in communication with the citizens of Jequie. These citizens are as follows: Robert Chasm, community relations; John Postle, ham radio; H. Eugene Walker, education; Mrs. Ruth B. Pratt, fine arts; Mrs. Rita Robinson, library; Mrs. Fred Grabe, public affairs; Mrs. Barbara Thorn, student exchange; Mr. Herbert Smith, technical; Mrs. Hilda Rocco, translation; and W. H. McGlenon, organization.

Takoma's Sister City, Jequie, has a population of 51,000, is a county seat, and is located on the left bank of the Contas River, 120 miles southwest of Salvadore, capital of the Province of Bahia.

The State Department, in cooperating with the city's efforts, has continually emphasized that the success of the Sister City program is based upon grassroots communication, volunteer citizens activities, and the basic exchange of mutual interests through common communications. Takoma Park, Md., is achieving this through the establishment of this citizens committee and widespread community support.

The committee has reviewed the definition of a town affiliation, and they determined that the affiliation is mutually established between an American city and a city of another country of the

free world, jointly affecting a program of practical communications on a people-to-people level. The purpose of the organization is twofold. First, to promote mutual understanding, respect, and friendship between the people of the sister cities, and to help create an international relationship which will ultimately replace differences with meetings in an atmosphere of cooperation and amity.

Throughout Maryland we find that there are five cities with Sister City projects. They are as follows: Frederick, Md., with Landau, Germany; Forest Heights with Villaviciosa, Philippines; Hagerstown with Wesel, Germany; Rockville with Pinneberg, Germany; and Takoma Park with Jequie, Brazil.

Mayor George M. Miller and the Takoma Park City Council are cooperating with the citizens committee in setting up arrangements for making this program a reality. The organization is also cooperating with the American Municipal Association.

This Sister City or town affiliation program is a dramatic movement which is vitally important in a tense world.

The Sister City project offers the means by which individuals in Takoma Park and all Maryland cities can learn from individuals in other nations. This willingness to learn on the part of our citizens of Maryland is significantly important today, and I wish to commend them here for extending the hand of friendship as neighbors and as partners to the people of Jequie.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

How One Thing Leads to Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, when the wheat sale to Russia was first proposed, the Wall Street Journal, one of the Nation's leading newspapers, in its editorial columns, seemed to be quite enthused about the proposal. Apparently this fine newspaper has taken another and a more realistic look at the proposal as indicated by the following editorial which appeared in its December 5, 1963, edition:

HOW ONE THING LEADS TO ANOTHER

When the Russian wheat deal was first proposed last October, the late President Kennedy, in clear and specific language, laid down some excellent terms. He carefully explained what the deal would be and would not be.

This would be a private, commercial transaction, the Government's role being limited to granting the necessary permission, he said. The sale would be for gold or American dollars, either cash on delivery or "normal commercial terms." Basically, in his words, "the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer * * * who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants."

In presenting this arrangement, Mr. Kennedy emphasized that one feature of it was that the wheat sold to the Soviet Union would be carried in American ships.

Thus while even then the wheat sale was not without its critics, it was generally accepted by the public on the basis of this straightforward arrangement. On such terms the Russians could buy wheat on the world market anyway, and it seemed as though we would get a fair "quid" for the Russian "quo."

Now, it seems, things aren't quite what they seemed.

One of the first things that happened, once the Soviet buyers got the U.S. Government's approval to the principle of a sale, was that they balked at having the wheat shipped to them in American ships. Mr. Khrushchev, figuratively at least, banged the bargaining table, and the U.S. Government relaxed this part of the arrangement.

After that it developed that the Soviet Union didn't want to pay cash after all, either in gold or U.S. dollars. Nor were the Communists willing to deal on "normal commercial terms," meaning such short-term credit as they might get from either the private sellers or private banks. A few efforts at obtaining such credit on their terms, here and in Europe, were unproductive. Whereupon the Soviets said to us: No credit, no deal.

So next the proposition was that the U.S. Government, through the Export-Import Bank, itself finance the Russian wheat purchase by guaranteeing a loan for 75 percent of the purchase price.

The first reactions to this, not unreasonably, were objections in Congress. A bill was introduced to prohibit this U.S. financing of Russian trade. And although Treasury Secretary Dillon argued that we must underwrite the sale or there would be no sale, the Senate Banking Committee appeared unpersuaded that the deal was worth that price. Appeared unpersuaded, that is, until the assassination of President Kennedy.

Then, in the aftermath of that tragic event, the Senate committee quietly decided to put aside its objections to financing the Russian wheat sale. The explanation given was that this was intended as a tribute to the man who had so carefully spelled out the original terms, and somehow as a gesture of confidence to the new President.

This action had hardly been taken, yielding one more point to the Soviet bargainers, when there developed an argument over the shipping rates for transporting the wheat to Russia. The Russians decided they were too high, implying that if something can't be done to get cheaper shipping rates—a special U.S. subsidy, perhaps?—maybe they would have to get their wheat somewhere else.

What interests us here is not so much the wrangle over the Soviet Union's credit standing, although Senator MUNDT had a point about the unpaid Soviet debts due us from World War II. Nor so much even the fact that a Soviet wheat loan would be a major change in the Export-Import Bank policy, which has so far never extended credit or credit insurance to a Communist bloc country.

Rather, the intriguing thing here is the progressive change in the wheat deal and the attitude of U.S. officials to the changing Soviet demands. We have witnessed a typical Communist maneuver. First a proposition that has the sound of reasonableness. Then, a bargain seemingly struck, demands for a "little change." Finally, this being agreed to, a new set of demands. The same sort of thing has happened a thousand times over in different kinds of bargaining with the Communists.

Unfortunately, the American reaction is also all too typical. Congratulations at a well-struck bargain; next a little yielding in the hopes of saving the bargain. Finally, "getting a deal" seems to become to us as important as the terms of the bargain. And before you know it, the Russians have what they were after in the first place.

Whatever else may be said about the present proposals, they are a far cry from the thoughtful terms laid down by President Kennedy last October. It is really astounding, when you think of it, how one little thing leads to another.

Assistance to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the provisions of Act 574 that was approved this year by the Legislature of Alabama to provide further for assistance to blind persons. This new legislation that was approved without a dissenting vote will promote self-care, enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and stimulate the blind to greater efforts in rendering themselves self-supporting.

I ask unanimous consent that Act 574 as passed by the Alabama Legislature and an evaluation of that act by Mr. John F. Nagle, the able chief of the Washington office of the National Federation of the Blind, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the act and evaluation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED "AN ACT TO PROVIDE FURTHER FOR ASSISTANCE TO BLIND PERSONS"

Be it enacted by the Legislature of Alabama:

SECTION 1. The purpose of the provisions of this act is to relieve blind persons from the distress of poverty, to promote self-care, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and to stimulate the blind to greater efforts in striving to render themselves self-supporting.

SEC. 2. Assistance to the blind shall be payable under this act to or on behalf of any person who shall comply with the other requirements of this chapter and who (a) is blind according to the definition of blindness established by the State department; (b) has not sufficient income and resources to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health as further provided in this act; provided, however, that any income or resources required or permitted by the Federal Social Security Act or regulations made thereunder to be disregarded are hereby excepted; (c) has resided in the State for at least 1 year immediately preceding the filing of application for assistance; (d) is not receiving any other type of public assistance for which Federal matching is available; (e) has not directly or indirectly disposed of or deprived himself of any property for the purpose of qualifying for the benefits of this chapter; and (f) no application for assistance to the blind shall be approved until the applicant has been examined by a duly licensed ophthalmologist or a licensed physician skilled in the diseases of the eye or a licensed optometrist, whichever the individual may select. The examiner shall certify to the county department in writing the results of the examination upon forms prescribed by the State department; and (g) shall not during the period of receiving assistance publicly solicit alms. The term "publicly solicit alms" shall be construed to mean either the wearing, carrying, or exhibiting signs denoting blindness, for the securing of alms, or the carrying of receptacles for the purpose of securing alms or the doing of same by proxy; or the stationary or house-to-house begging or any other means of securing alms.

SEC. 3. Any applicant who qualifies under the provisions of this act shall be entitled to an amount of assistance which, when added to the income of the applicant from all other sources, equals $70 per month. The value of any income or resources which is exempt pursuant to the Federal Social Security Act shall be excluded.

In any case where it is found that the needs of an applicant exceed the maximum provided by this section, an additional amount of assistance shall be paid as necessary to meet his need. The additional amount is intended to provide additional assistance to persons with needs arising because of circumstances and situations not common to all recipients which are not included or not adequately covered by the maximum allowance of $70 provided by this section.

SEC. 4. An applicant may retain personal or real property owned by him or in combination with any other person without reference to its value if it serves to provide the applicant with a home. Real property owned by the applicant or in combination with his spouse which is producing income, reasonably consistent with its value, which is used for the support of the applicant, may be retained in an amount not to exceed an assessed valuation of $5,000 as assessed by the county assessor, less any encumberances thereon of record. The applicant may retain as a reserve for future contingencies any combination of personal or real property not to exceed a total net value of $1,200. The value of the following property shall be excluded in determining elegibility under this act:

1. Personal jewelry, personal effects, home furnishings and other property used to provide, equip and maintain a home for the applicant.

2. Equipment and material which is necessary to implement a rehabilitation or self-care plan for the applicant.

3. Motor vehicles needed for transportation.

4. Any property right which is essential to land use or which is not available for the use of or expenditure by or in behalf of the applicant to meet a current or future need of said applicant.

SEC. 5. All aid given as public assistance for the blind shall be absolutely inalienable by any assignment, sale, attachment, execution, or otherwise, and in case of bankruptcy the assistance shall not pass through any trustee or other person acting on behalf of creditors. The cost of hospitalization or other medical care or other service furnished by the State or by a county to a recipient of assistance under this act shall not constitute a lien upon any real or personal property or personal effects of such recipient.

SEC. 6. No relative shall be held legally liable to support or to contribute to the support of any applicant for or recipient of assistance under this act. No relative shall be held liable to defray in whole or in part the cost of any medical care or hospital care or other service rendered to said recipient pursuant to any provision of this chapter if he is an applicant for or a recipient of assistance under this chapter at the time such medical care or hospital care or other service is rendered.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this act are severable. If any part of the act is declared invalid or unconstitutional, such declaration shall not affect the part which remains.

SEC. 8. All laws or parts of laws which conflict with this act are repealed.

SEC. 9. This act shall become effective immediately upon its passage and approval by the Governor, or upon its otherwise becoming a law.

EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF ALABAMA'S NEW AID-TO-THE-BLIND LAW (ACT 574) BY JOHN F. NAGLE, CHIEF, WASHINGTON OFFICE, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Since the very beginning of the organized blind movement in 1940, sightless men and women from all parts of the Nation and representative of all strata of American life, experience, and activity, have been working together in the National Federation of the Blind to improve conditions and equalize opportunities for all the blind of America—for all the blind of the world.

These goals are now much closer to realization for the blind of the State of Alabama.

The recent session of the Alabama Legislature adopted, without a dissenting vote, a new aid-to-the-blind law which, because of its enlightened provisions, and because of the progressive philosophy it embodies, will make it possible for the blind of that State to achieve a far greater measure of fulfillment in their lives than was previously available to them—than is presently available to the blind in most of the other States.

The adoption of Act 574 places Alabama in the very forefront among the States for its demonstrated concern for the uniquely different difficulties and problems of blind men and women, as they strive to live and function competitively and cooperatively in a sighted world.

This fine accomplishment, this exemplary piece of sensibly humanitarian and soundly economic legislation was the achievement of the blind of Alabama themselves, working together in the Alabama Federation of the Blind, greatly aided by the National Federation of the Blind of which the Alabama group is an affiliate.

Act 574 has two objectives—its provisions are directed toward aiding needy blind Alabamians with an employment potential to realize, to the fullest extent possible, fulfillment of this potential.

It also provides throughout its provisions that blind people in need—whether they have a rehabilitation possibility or not, whether they are on aid for 3 months or all of their lives—it provides that they shall be allowed to live dignified, decent lives.

In short, Act 574 does not punish or penalize blind Alabamians because they are in need, but it does help them by providing an adequate means of abating their need; it does not harass or humiliate them with outmoded ani antiquated social and economic concepts and practices of poor relief, but it does provide a means of stimulating, encouraging, and helping them to work their way from reliance upon relief and dependence upon others to self-reliance and dependence upon themselves.

Recognizing that publicly provided assistance to blind persons in need must do much more than satisfy the basic bodily needs of these people for food, clothing, and shelter, the purpose clause of Alabama's aid-to-the-blind law declares that it is intended, not only to "relieve blind persons from the distress of poverty," but, it continues, it is intended "to promote self-care, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and to stimulate the blind to greater efforts in striving to render themselves self-supporting."

In furtherance of these clearly and emphatically stated restorative and rehabilitative objectives, Act 474 provides a floor of financial security to its blind citizens in need of public help by establishing the amount of $70 as the amount presumed to be needed each month by recipients of aid to the blind—but it also specifies that this amount shall not be a ceiling on aid granted, that blind persons having special needs beyond this amount, shall have their special needs met and provided for in addition to the $70 grant.

It is the belief of the National Federation of the Blind that you cannot pauperize a blind person in need of public help, you cannot strip such a person naked of all he possesses, and then expect him to rebuild his life under adverse conditions.

To pauperize and stigmatize a blind person in need of public help, to take from him all he possesses, is just not depriving him of the only material assets he has and which he will need in his struggle to return to normal, economic self-sufficiency, even more damaging, it deprives him of self-pride, it deprives him of hope; it crushes his spirit, it degrades and demeans him so that he will no longer have the heart and spirit to strive to achieve self-dependence and self-support, for all effort will seem purposeless and futile, only static, passive survival will seem left to him.

The new Alabama aid-to-the-blind law recognizes all of this by allowing an applicant for, or recipient of, assistance to retain a home of whatever value so long as it is occupied by the blind person, to retain income-producing property of $5,000 in value so long as the income derived is used to assist in the support of such blind person, and it allows him to retain personal property in the amount of $1,200 "as a reserve for future contingencies."

Then finally, Alabama's Act 574 strikes down and removes from the law and from the lives of needy blind persons two of the unfortunate inheritances from the punitive Elizabethan Poor Laws—it prohibits the impostion of liens for aid or hospital or medical care furnished to blind persons in need, and it outlaws the responsible relative concept in the State's program of public assistance to sightless Alabamians.

All of the provisions of Act 574 indicate Alabama's determination to carry out the congressionally designated purposes of the Federal-State welfare programs, which were first enacted in the social security amendments of 1956, then reinforced and broadened in the public welfare amendments of 1962—for the congressionally declared purposes require, and so does Alabama's new aid-to-the-blind law, not only that public assistance to the blind shall provide support adequate to meet all basic bodily needs, but blind persons in need and dependent shall be assisted and encouraged to care for themselves, to support themselves, and the ties of the blind person with his family shall be strengthened.

All members of the National Federation of the Blind are proud of the accomplishment of the organized blind of Alabama in securing adoption of Act 574, its new aid-to-the-blind law—for we have found from experience in such matters that gains which are won for the blind of one State make easier the obtaining of gains and improvements for the blind in other States; increased opportunities secured for the blind of one State help to equalize opportunities for the blind of the entire Nation.

Tyrant in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post edition of Friday, December 6. It is another example of this publication's effort to discredit the legislative arm of our Government.

TYRANT IN THE HOUSE

At a time of crisis in American life, the legislative branch of the National Government stand paralyzed. The representatives of a self-governing people have lost the capacity to govern themselves. In its Committee on Rules, the House of Representatives has created a tyranny; the tyrant who heads that committee, HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, has held up an imperious hand

forbidding the House to act on civil rights legislation which, if it came to the floor, would certainly be endorsed by a majority of the Members.

Representative SMITH insists that the Rules Committee hold hearings on the civil rights bill on which the Judiciary Committee has already held hearings; and he has made it plain that he has no intention of beginning those hearings until some time in January. This is a perversion of the Rules Committee's power; it is a use of power for obstruction. The Rules Committee has no business holding hearings on the merits of legislative proposals. Its single proper role is to send such proposals to the floor of the House in orderly fashion and to fix the conditions for debating them there.

It is an irony of history that the Rules Committee, established to implement and advance the aims of the House leadership, has come to frustrate them. In 1910, when the House rose against the tyranny of Speaker Cannon, it removed the Speaker from a place on the Rules Committee, thus turning that body into a power in its own right, and allowed it to assume authority to regulate procedure vested in the House itself by the Constitution. For many years, Mr. SMITH, supported by a coalition of southern Democrats and Republican conservatives, has used his power to delay or to destroy progressive legislation.

The civil rights bill has been painstakingly studied by the Judiciary Committee. It has been endorsed in its present form by the administration, under President Kennedy and President Johnson alike, and it is supported by the administration's spokesmen in the House. It represents another and an inevitable step in the country's progression toward recognition of full first-class citizenship for colored Americans. Its provisions have general popular support and are imperatively needed to meet an altogether justified and dangerous unrest throughout the Nation.

In one way or another, the House must declare its independence and rid itself of this Rules Committee tyranny. It may make a majority of the committee's members recognize their responsibility to the House majority and persuade them to override Mr. SMITH; or it may discharge the committee by petition from further consideration of the bill. But concern for its own rights and its own dignity compels the House to bring about a vote on civil rights.

When that vote has been taken, it will be time to strip Mr. SMITH—and any chairman who may succeed him—of power to frustrate the House of Representatives. Tyranny has no place in the legislature of a democracy.

Social Security Hospitalization Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that the voice of the people most often finds its best expression at the grassroots. And the thinking of our people at the grassroots is best reflected in the columns of our Nation's weekly newspapers.

The Paoli (Ind.) News is one of those weekly newspapers which exercises its public trust with conscientious, significant editorials in each edition. I was particularly pleased to read one of their recent articles on the social security hospitalization plan. In view of the widespread interest in this proposal, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTE FOR DEMOCRATS WHO AID YOU

Eight Democratic Senators last week attacked the weak Kerr-Mills health plan on its third year of existence as a health care bill that is not meeting the problem of 18 million elderly citizens that sorely need medical aid and hospitalization.

The critics state that less than 1 percent of the above received aid under the Kerr-Mills bill, which is positive proof that the bill is a failure.

What this country needs is the long-stalled health care bill financed as social security is now financed.

You voters who are now enjoying the fruits of social security should recall that the same Republican Party which so long fought social security, is now fighting the hospital and medical care bill proposed by Democrats.

Remember, it was Democrats that gave you social security and it will be Democratic votes that will give you free hospitalization and medical care. Never expect anything from conservative Republicans.

Gov. William W. Scranton Moves To Attract Space Age Industries to Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the industrial development efforts of Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, are attracting more and more attention among the business publications of the country.

The following article title "Pennsylvania Governor Outlines Moves To Lure Space Age Industries" appeared in the September 23, 1963, issue of the Metal Working News. The article describes in part a few of the ways employed by the Scranton administration in the hope of attracting space age industries to the Keystone State.

The article follows:

PENNSYLVANIA GOVERNOR OUTLINES MOVES TO LURE SPACE AGE INDUSTRIES

(By Ed McLaughlin)

HARRISBURG, PA.—In a big way, Pennsylvania is becoming competitive in the race to lure burgeoning space age industries to new homes within its borders.

Over the past several months, the administration of Gov. William W. Scranton has moved in the following ways:

1. Bolstered the State's industrial development program to include more liberalized tax benefits to business, and particularly to research and development companies. At the same time, it is providing more funds to be used for industrial development purposes.

2. Set into motion the formation of a task force of 100,000 Pennsylvanians who, by word of mouth, letter, and other contacts, will talk up the industrial and economic advantages of this Commonwealth. Chairman of the "100,000 Pennsylvanians for the Economic Growth," as this project is known, is Frank L. Magee, chairman of the executive committee of Aluminum Co. of America, Pittsburgh. The program will be launched October 1.

3. Taken steps to improve the State's general business climate, especially where business relations with the State government are concerned, by utilizing the talents of 21 top business and industrial leaders to serve on the Governor's council of business and industry.

THE REASONS

Why the sudden muscle flexing by Pennsylvania?

Governor Scranton, in an interview with Metalworking News, pointed out that Pennsylvania was saddled with an economy extremely dependent on industries that had become less vital, leaving the State with a legacy of unemployment problems.

Last year, for instance, the Governor said, plants in Pennsylvania experienced a 6.8 percent decline in the dollar amount of prime contracts awarded and the State's total share of defense contracts for production and research dropped nearly 9 percent.

In R. & D. alone, Pennsylvania in 1961 received 3.7 percent of prime military projects, compared with 41.34 for California, 12.19 for New York, and 5.78 for Massachusetts.

Not only that, but Pennsylvania has lacked a reservoir of skilled technicians. In California, he explained, there are five or six trained technicians to every engineer. Pennsylvania has four or five engineers to every technician.

This, observers say, points up a lack of adequate technical institutes, which is hurting the State.

However, as the State government tackles the problem of improving education, it is going ahead full swing to attract new industry.

LOAN PROGRAM

The legislature recently approved measures to make it possible for research and development facilities to qualify for Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA) loans, just as manufacturing facilities do.

Because of expenses involved in their establishment, R. & D. facilities are now eligible for loans up to 45 percent of total costs, rather than the usual 40 percent.

"The new emphasis on R. & D. is important because these are the so-called "multiplier industries" which create many other jobs wherever they locate," it was explained. Pennsylvania-based industries will be encouraged to develop R. & D. facilities just as foreign operations will.

In addition, R. & D. industries were exempted from capital stock and franchise tax to encourage their location in this Commonwealth.

In late August, tentative approval was given by PIDA for $2,821,608 worth of projects, including the first for R. & D. firms. The same day, approval was given to 10 other loan applications, worth $1,201,574.

The first two requests for R. & D. loans came from Allegheny County. One of the applications was filed for the American Institute of Research, which seeks $787,500 for a new building to house expanded operations, creating an estimated 175 jobs. The other was for a $463,000 loan for a new building to house an unidentified firm moving into the State from New York. It was estimated the firm would create 72 jobs.

Restoration of Lee Chapel, Washington and Lee University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in May 1961, the Ford Motor Co. Fund of Dearborn, Mich., announced a gift of $370,000 to be used by Washington and Lee University for the restoration and preservation of the Lee Chapel as a living shrine of the American heritage.

Lee Chapel was rededicated on October 11, 1963, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these proceedings paying tribute to a great American.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEE CHAPEL REDEDICATION, WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS BY DR. FRED C. COLE, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

Mr. COLE. It is my pleasant task this afternoon to welcome you to this auditorium as participants in one of the most significant events to take place at Washington and Lee University in many years.

I am certain that every person in this audience is familiar with the history of Lee Chapel. You will recall that Robert E. Lee, during his presidency of Washington College, recommended that this simple structure be erected to serve the spiritual needs of the college's students; that Lee later maintained his office on the lower level of the chapel; and that he was buried beneath the chapel upon his death in 1870. In 1883 there was added to the chapel the Lee family crypt and Valentine's marble masterpiece. These facts and others have attracted many thousands of Americans and persons from all over the world who visit here each year honoring the memory of one of history's most noble figures.

Certainly, it was not Lee's intention that this chapel should ever become a monument to his memory. But it was inevitable that it should become just that, although there have been periods during the chapel's history when its future was temporarily in doubt. Lee's son, Custis, who succeeded his father as president of this institution, questioned the utility of the chapel as late as 1909, when he suggested in a letter to a friend that perhaps the chapel should be replaced, for, as he said, "the present one has been patched enough already."

Fortunately for us, and for all Americans, the patching process was to continue for another half century, until such time that the essential major restoration project became a reality. In 1961, Washington and Lee University received from the Ford Motor Co. Fund a gift of $370,000 for the restoration of Lee Chapel and for its preservation for the future as an American historical shrine. From June 1962 to August 1963, this restoration was accomplished with the greatest of care and devotion to detail. I hope all of you are pleased, as I am, with the results of this historic undertaking.

It is appropriate today, I believe, that we should rededicate the restored Lee Chapel, and that this rededication include a dimension not stated in the first dedication of the building at commencement in 1868. On that occasion, as Lee reported to the college trustees, the chapel was dedicated "to the services of Almighty God." But then, as now, the chapel was involved in the daily, ongoing life of the college that extended beyond the regular worship services of Lee's time. Besides Lee's office on the lower level, there were other important offices of the college located there. Today, this auditorium is the scene of noteworthy academic events and other activities of a college year.

Thus, in rededication of the Lee Chapel today, we not only reaffirm its heritage as a place of worship, but we encompass in its purpose a fitting tribute to the memory of a great Christian and his influence upon this university and his Nation.

I am glad that you have come to share in this program.

It is my privilege now to introduce Robert E. Lee IV, great-grandson of the man we honor today and son of the late Dr. George Bolling Lee who was for many years a trustee of this university. Mr. Lee, a loyal and distinguished alumnus, is director of national advertising for the San Francisco Chronicle. We are pleased that he would come this great distance to share with us this important occasion. He will speak at this time on behalf of the Lee family.

REMARKS BY ROBERT E. LEE IV AT THE REDEDICATION OF LEE CHAPEL

Mr. LEE. Thank you, President Cole.

As you can imagine, this is a very special moment for me.

In fact, there are a number of special moments in my life that are associated with this university and this chapel. The feeling that I have as I stand here today is very similar to that which I felt when I came to this campus as a freshman in 1946 and sat in this auditorium for the usual orientation addresses. It is much the same feeling I had when I marched in the academic procession to this chapel for the baccalaureate service and then, again, on the following day when Dr. Gaines handed me my diploma.

It is a feeling of great pride, an awareness of a very strong personal link with our Nation's great past and with one of the notable figures of history. The feeling is not one that I permit myself to savor very often, and indeed, it is more precious because of the infrequency with which it comes. But this sensation of pride—and humility—is inescapable for me in these surroundings.

My part on this program today is that of a spokesman for the Lee family, and perhaps, in some measure, as a spokesman for Washington and Lee alumni of many student generations.

There are many statutes, many memorials and tributes to Robert E. Lee throughout our country, but I know I speak for all Lee descendants when I say that this chapel is the most honored monument to his memory of all. It is comforting to me, and I know it is comforting to all members of the Lee family that the Lee Chapel has been so beautifully restored and that its future preservation is assured. The memory of Robert E. Lee is not solely the possession of his descendants, for he is a part of history, and he belongs to all Americans, of both North and South. This chapel, as a symbol of the ideals and purposes of Robert E. Lee which so many of us strive imperfectly to achieve, will inspire many thousands of Americans in the future, as it has in the past.

So, on behalf of the Lee family and all others who cherish the memory of Robert E. Lee, I extend deep, heartfelt gratitude to the Ford Motor Co. Fund, whose financial resources made this restoration possible, and to Washington and Lee University, whose trustees and other officers provide a stewardship that will preserve for new generations this chapel and the memory of noble life for which it is a symbol.

President Cole, Mr. Ford, I thank you.

Washington and Lee University is honored to have as its guest today Mr. Benson Ford, vice president of the Ford Motor Co. and president of the Ford Motor Co. Fund. In both capacities he combines rare qualities of leadership that enable him to contribute to the efficient management of one of the Nation's foremost industrial concerns and, at the same time, permit him to make important contributions to his fellow man through outstanding civic activities, ranging from a broad national level to the local affairs of Grosse Pointe Shores Village where he lives. When Washington and Lee University sought the support of the Ford Motor Co. Fund for the Lee Chapel restoration, it did so with the foreknowledge that Benson Ford, and men of similar foresight and public spirit, would determine whether this project was worthy of the fund's resources. I now present Mr. Benson Ford, president of the Ford Motor Co. Fund.

REMARKS BY BENSON FORD AT THE REDEDICATION OF LEE CHAPEL

Mr. FORD. We are here today to rededicate a memorial to greatness. This chapel holds deep meaning and stirring memories for the people of the South. But it is a shrine which belongs to an entire nation, for the man whose memory this structure honors belongs to all America. It is unfortunate that in spite of his fame, Robert E. Lee, the man, is still unknown to many Americans. It is not that his fame has been bounded by geography or sectionalism. It is rather that too many know him only as the gallant leader of a vanquished army. There are many, born in the shadow of his greatness, who still do not know of the traits that made him a giant among men.

Lee the general is already enshrined in history. Today, by this rededication, we also honor Lee the man of God, Lee the molder of young minds, Lee the healer of raw wounds. Today, our rededication of this shrine reflects the lengthening shadow cast by a great man across almost a century.

I am proud that the Ford Motor Co. Fund participated in the preservation of this part of our American heritage. The restoration of this historic chapel was a novel undertaking for the fund. For although we had often contributed to the support and advance of education, this was the first time we had ever allocated funds for a project of historical restoration. We made our decision to underwrite the restoration of the Lee Chapel because we realized that this structure embodies something important for every American. We made our decision because we realized that, without our assistance, the university might be forced to draw upon resources which could otherwise be devoted to purely educational needs. We made our decision in the spirit of my grandfather who believed strongly in the value of reconstructing and preserving outstanding examples of our national past as an inspiration and lesson for our future.

We are especially pleased that this shrine is part of a great southern university whose students come from virtually every State in our Nation. We hope that the reconstruction of this memorial will bring Robert E. Lee closer to the consciousness of all of the now-united States.

As consecrated tomb, historical monument, museum, house of worship, and place of inspiration, this chapel can, we believe, cement a new and necessary understanding among all parts of our Nation. By dramatizing the selfless dedication of Robert E. Lee to the principles of honor, human dignity, learning, and "the thorough education of all classes of the people," this chapel can become a symbol of the fundamental values that unite us all. It will truly enshrine the memory of Robert E. Lee. Then, perhaps, in years to come, people, in thinking of him, will not say he led an army in the service of half of a nation. Instead, they will say he led a school in the service of all mankind.

Mr. COLE. Thank you, Mr. Ford.

Ninety-three years ago tomorrow, Robert E. Lee died in the campus home built for him by the trustees of Washington College. He later lay in state on this platform and on October 15, 1870, he was buried in a vault beneath the floor of the chapel's lower level.

For a time, the deep sorrow of millions was focused upon this small building on the campus of a small college. People the world over mourned the loss of a heroic military commander, a general who commanded greater respect and admiration in defeat than other great captains of history have earned in victory. They mourned also the loss of an inspirational leader whose example gave courage and promise to the people of a South afflicted by destitution and suffering that can be appreciated by few persons living today. Relatively few persons of that time were sufficiently well acquainted with Lee's work at Washington College to anticipate the impact of his death upon the future of that institution and upon generations of future college students.

Lee had come to this campus in September 1865, because he felt it was his duty to undertake some kind of work which would contribute to the renewal of the economic, political, and social vigor of his Virginia and of the South. When the invitation to the presidency came from the trustees of Washing College, he felt that this opportunity was heaven-sent. It was a position of great challenge, for Washington College was impoverished by the war. His reward would be largely the self-satisfaction that he was making a significant contribution to the future through the education of young men. There were other opportunities for more remunerative work, but he declined these, and to one such overture, he replied in this manner:

"I am grateful, but I have a self-imposed task which I must accomplish. I have led the young men of the South in battle; I have seen many of them die on the field; I shall devote my remaining energies to training young men to do their duty in life."

To this self-imposed task Lee devoted himself with what an associate described as "quiet zeal and noiseless energy." For a man trained in the science and teaching of war, he displayed amazing awareness of the requirements of education for peace. The accomplishments of his administration have been reviewed many times and are familiar to everyone here: the student body was expanded and attendance was encouraged by young men of the North as well as those of the South; the endowment increased; the faculty was enlarged to accommodate the greater enrollment and a broadened curriculum; a system of elective subjects was introduced, and in the fields of science, commerce, and journalism, Lee introduced new programs and courses that were to distinguish him as an educational innovator of unusual foresight. Virtually no one teaches or studies at Washington and Lee today who does not come under the influence of educational practices and philosophy that were introduced or developed during Lee's administration.

Yet, if one were challenged to determine the area of Lee's greatest influence upon this university, the answer would not be concerned with academic curriculum, or the broad geographic origins of the student population, or similar tangible evidences of Lee's presence here. His greatest contribution to this university affects not so much young men's intellect and learning as it does their hearts, their character, and their attitudes toward their fellow men.

In carrying out his avowed purpose to train young men to do their duty in life, Lee taught these young men rich lessons of humility, tolerance, gentlemanly bearing and conduct, and above all else, personal integrity and honor. This was not accomplished through formal lecture or lesson, but through his unwavering personal example and through the mutual respect that existed between the president and his students. The climate of student life on the campus of Washington College was to become an enduring thing, developing into traditions passed from one student generation to the next and guarded jealously by each. No Washington and Lee student since Lee's time has graduated without having been personally involved in the preservation of these traditions, and I believe no student has graduated who is not the better man for having lived in a company of men so guided by principles of honor, integrity, and gentlemanly regard for the rights of others.

When, in 1866, Lee proposed to build a chapel to fulfill the need for a place where students could join in Christian worship, he was motivated by his personal conviction that a deep-seated faith in God was essential to the development and realization of man's greatest potential. Lee's faith did not grow out of experiences in war, but was a characteristic of increasing dimension throughout his lifetime. It was a source of strength to him in times of great adversity, and it was his inspiration and joy in times of success and fulfillment. He determined that his students at Washington College should have a place where they might join in worship and prayer and thus develop in the fibers of their character a God-given strength that had sustained him in war and peace. From this determination, there evolved this chapel that we rededicate today.

If, 93 years ago, this chapel was a focal point of a nation's sorrow, it was in the 2 years prior to Lee's death the place where Lee found happiness, tranquillity, and a sense of fulfillment. When Lee was buried here, the chapel became a shrine to which mourners and admirers of Lee came, honoring the memory of a great and beloved military leader. In later years, as his importance as an educator and a leader in peace became more widely recognized, and as his influence upon the hearts and characters of Washington and Lee men spread across the Nation, the Lee chapel came to be recognized as a symbol of what Dr. Gaines was later to call so aptly, Lee's "final achievement." As Mr. Ford most effectively stated earlier, it is in this latter context that we consider the chapel's purpose today.

There are in Lee chapel inescapable suggestions of Lee's greatness as a general and war leader. It is appropriate that this be true, but we are convinced that this should not be the primary emphasis here. Here in this chapel, which is Lee's last resting place, we propose to honor the memory of Lee as a man of learning, as a man of uncompromising principles of honor. We shall seek to emphasize the enduring, universal truths that governed Lee's attitudes and his life, and we shall suggest that these lofty Christian principles and personal guidelines are as timely and as important for purposeful living today as they were when Lee lived. And we shall suggest that the admirable traditions that enrich the lives of Washington and Lee students are traditions which can be shared by all Americans.

In closing, I present to you an excerpt from the resolution passed by the Washington College faculty after Lee's death.

"Be is therefore resolved, That in the midst of the severe calamity which has befallen us, in the death of our beloved President, we, the faculty of Washington College, experience a profound pleasure and pride in recognizing the fact that the fame of General Lee, while it belongs to the whole country, is, in an especial sense, the heritage of Washington College; and that it is our duty, as it is our privilege, to provide here suitable memorials whereby this previous possession shall be acknowledged, and his name publicly held in grateful remembrance by this college, for all future time."

The linking of Lee's name with that of Washington in the title of the institution was one way in which that faculty proposed to honor Lee's memory. Another—the providing of suitable memorials—is a concern of ours today. Certainly, no more suitable memorial to Lee could be fashioned than this simple, but quietly beautiful chapel. The very nature of its design suggests the profound Christian influence which governed Lee's life. Its presence on the campus of this university underscores the contribution to education made by Lee during the final 5 years of his life. Throughout the chapel and museum the broad scope of Lee's achievements are recorded, and in the adjoining crypt, he rests with other members of his family in a place of dignity and honor.

As Mr. Ford suggested in his remarks, it would have been most difficult for the trustees of Washington and Lee University to effect this restoration without the assistance of others who admire Robert E. Lee and honor his memory. For the trustees, faculty, students, alumni, and all others associated with Washington and Lee University, I extend heartfelt gratitude to the trustees and officers of the Ford Motor Co. Fund for making possible the restoration of the Lee Chapel. Their gift helps preserve and honor the memory of one of the noblest men who ever lived and whose ideals shall life on forever in the heart of every American.

The 75th Anniversary of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, November 27 marked the beginning of the the 75th year of service to the community by the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. I think it appropriate that we take note of this event.

This organization is without a doubt the foremost civic group in the National Capital area. Its list of presidents reads like a Who's Who of Washington and includes men who became Federal judges, Commissioners, corporation presidents, newspaper editors, and leaders of the bar. Many former top Federal officials and Members of Congress have been and are members.

The board of trade was founded in 1889, by a group of civic-minded community leaders who recognized the necessity for an organization which would represent without favor or prejudice all sections and interests of the area. This it has done in a most exemplary fashion, having been identified through the years with practically every community improvement project of any significance.

In my capacity either as a member, or as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I have been intimately acquainted for over 24 years with leadership of the board of trade. It has been a source of invaluable assistance to my committee in matters affecting the District.

I consider it an honor on this occasion to invite the attention of the Congress to the following proclamation recently issued by the District Commissioners in well-earned recognition of the innumerable contributions to the betterment of the National Capital area which have been made by the board of trade:

Whereas on November 27, 1889, a group of business and professional leaders of the Nation's Capital met in the Ebbitt Hotel and organized the Washington Board of Trade; and

Whereas this organization will begin its Diamond Jubilee Year on November 27, 1963, commemorating its 75th year of service to Washington; and

Whereas the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, as its recently changed name implies, has grown with this community from a membership of less than 200 to more than 7,000 representatives of substantially all business and professional classifications of the National Capital area; and

Whereas the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade has played a leading role in the development of the District of Columbia from a city of 230,392 to its present status as the heart of a metropolis of more than 2 million, and having been intimately identified with efforts to secure most important public improvements during its existance, including Union Station, many parks and bridges, our 2 airports, and the D.C. Stadium; and

Whereas since 1889, the board has been our premier economic development agency through its visitor and new business promotional activities which have benefited our citizens and our Government; and

Whereas the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade has established an enviable and respected reputation as an effective and constructive agency devoted to community improvement:

Now, therefore, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim the year beginning November 27, 1963, as the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade's Diamond Jubilee Year, and urge all District of Columbia residents and enterprises to take appropriate notice of this significant observance.

WALTER N. TOBRINER.
JOHN B. DUNCAN.
C. M. DUKE.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, daily editorials have appeared in our newspapers throughout the country, reflecting the deep sense of loss our Nation has suffered in the tragic and untimely death of President John F. Kennedy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include two excellent editorials which were carried in Buffalo's newspapers last week. These follow:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Nov. 23, 1963]

A MARTYRED PRESIDENT

The sense of incredulous shock and total tragedy that swept over a stunned nation with yesterday's terrible news from Dallas has been so universally experienced and so widely articulated that further words today could add no more than a trite echo.

The assassination of President Kennedy was a dastardly deed so senseless, so utterly devoid of any rational service to any conceivable cause, that it had to be an act of lunacy. But what precisely motivated the assassin, what sinister influences or psychopathic hates had worked him up to plot and do this thing—these are questions that still cry for answers on the day of grief and anger that follows the first day of shock.

Probably no other tragedy in our time has triggered such a profound sense of public disbelief. Death, to this young President so full of life and future, came so swiftly, so suddenly, so incongruously. In speeches that morning, he had sparkled with wit and zest. Texas had given him its warmest, most festive welcome. Just at the mortal moment, the wife of its Governor was happily chiding him, "You can't say Dallas is not friendly to you today." Then the shot, the slump, and his life, his Presidency, were over.

This assassination will inevitably be compared with the others—of McKinley here in Buffalo in 1901, of Garfield in the first months of his term in 1881, of Lincoln nearly a century ago, an act that brought another Johnson so unexpectedly to the Presidency. But of the four, we venture to predict that history will regard the striking down of John F. Kennedy as the most tragic in its timing. For Garfield's Presidency had hardly begun, and both McKinley and Lincoln had finished full terms and had the sense of fulfillment that decisive reelection gave them.

Of Lincoln, indeed, Walt Whitman could write, before his Captain "lay fallen cold and dead," that his "ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won; the port is near, the bells I hear, the people all exulting."

But for President Kennedy, the journey was only well begun. Some reefs were safely past, but the heaviest weather lay ahead. The prize of reelection, of a second term mandate, was only dimly perceived on the far horizon. And the safe port, the bells, the people all exulting—whether any of this could have been written of President Kennedy, history now can only speculate.

While today's journalism must defer to tomorrow's history for definitive judgments about the Kennedy Presidency, however, some things in appreciation can be said with assurance even now.

High among them is an enumeration of the great qualities of mind and spirit this young man brought to the Presidency—courage, both physical and moral; a high sense of purpose and patriotism; intelligence, cool and analytical; judgment, daring on occasion but usually balanced; an immense self-confidence tempered by a penetrating wit and disciplined by the wisdom to face and profit by his own mistakes; and with all this, a charm of manner that put on his administration a unique stamp of dash and verve.

By all the tangible yardsticks available, moreover, the state of our Union has fared well under this foreshortened Presidency. Our national economy has functioned at a steadily advancing pace; our national strength is high, militarily beyond compare with that of any combination of would-be foes. Where foreign threats were clear, we have resolutely faced them down. If the world has not been made measurably safer for free peoples, it is certainly not measurably less so. At home, while his leadership had yet to spark enough response from Congress to bring much of his domestic program to fruition, he will doubtless be best regarded by history for this year's moral leadership and appeal to national conscience in the field of civil rights.

What distinguished the Kennedy Presidency more than anything else, however, was its style. Here was a White House filled to overflowing with youth and vigor, charm and sophistication, a Presidency of culture and taste and deep regard for human achievement in all the enduring areas of art, literature, science, and intellect.

It is in this area, of course, where the Kennedy Presidency was a team effort, its magic touch deftly supplied by the beautiful and gracious First Lady. And it is to her and her children, that the Nation's heart pours out its deepest sympathy in this day of their tragic bereavement.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Nov. 26, 1963]

JOHN F. KENNEDY—MARTYR TO HATRED

Our President has been laid to rest. The brief but intense period of national grief is ended. Life in these United States will go on.

No one who sat before the television screen and watched the incredible unfolding of this horrible weekend could escape a sense of shock that these things could happen in this Nation. And no one can escape a share of the blame. For this Nation, a symbol of all that is great and good in Western civilization, a golden land of opportunity, must expel the hatred which caused this despicable act.

This propensity for hatred is prevalent not just in Dallas, not just in Texas, but everywhere. In Buffalo, in New York, in every corner of the Nation. It was not enough to oppose. We had to hate. Nationalistic hates. Racial hates. Hatred of unions by management and of management by labor. Hatred of the Birchites and hatred by the Birchites. Hatred of the Kennedys; hatred of Goldwater; hatred of Communists; hatred of Catholics, of Protestants, or Jews, or atheists. Hatred of modern art or modern music. Hatred of anything that did not conform to our basic beliefs.

Each of us can say: "No, not I." But each of us who told or laughed at a hate-inspired joke or story, each of us who spread or listened without complaint to a hate-inspired rumor or report helped to prolong and promulgate the wave of hatred which culminated so tragically on the streets of Dallas.

May God grant that life will not go on as before, that each of us will be able to view the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a symbol of the futility and corrosiveness of hatred, that we can oppose without rancor, dispute without venom, that we conduct our lives in public and in private in accord with the phrase so often spoken in connection with our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson: "Come let us reason together."

Let us resolve in this hour of national mourning to pluck the hatred from our hearts and in so doing give new meaning to the resolution uttered 100 years ago by another martyred President that "these dead shall not have died in vain."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to render the eulogy at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Services held at Anchorage during those dark hours of Novem-

ber 23, following the assassination of our great President the day before.

The words are mine but they come from the hearts of the people of Alaska, as follows:

Fellow Alaskans, in simple words, we are gathered here as mourners to honor our honored dead, and with heavy hearts to pay a parting tribute to our beloved leader and fellow American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, whose life and dreams were ruthlessly taken from him—and from us—at the peak of his great career.

The consequent disruption of the lives of his lovely widow and children and sorrowing parents and other members of the Kennedy family calls forth from our hearts our deepest and most compassionate sympathy. Although we here are but a handful of grieving people, we symbolize the hearts and minds of Alaskans and Americans everywhere. We bespeak the tidal wave of admiration and affection for the memory of John F. Kennedy, which sentiments sweep across our land and indeed across the world. This admiration and affection, of course, stems from his own great personal courage, and friendliness and unflagging concern for the freedom and welfare of his fellow men. It is also directed toward his deep patriotism and dedicated and unstinting contribution of his great knowledge and talent for leadership to the service of his country, and in the interest of all of God's children everywhere.

Born at Boston, Mass., on May 29, 1917, he was reared by strong and farsighted parents to be strong, energetic, brave, industrious, knowledgeable, and wise, and these were the traits which characterized every crowded year of his full and rich and warm personal and public life. Reams will be written about his greatness, his achievements, his strength—but I want to remember, too, Kennedy the man—the devoted son, husband, and father—the good-humored way he met and talked to the people of the press at his news conferences, calling each by name—the way he shook his finger for emphasis—the way he said "Cuber" and "Alasker"—his big ready grin.

In terms of his public life, he was always way out in front—for example, his service in the Navy and heroism in World War II—his Membership in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate at an early age—the fact that he was the youngest President of the United States in history, and the first President of the Catholic faith. In keeping with his great gifts, he grasped the meaning of our changing times from colonialism to freedom, from feudalistic systems to democracy, and the appalling threat of catastrophic nuclear war in a world seething with change in the midst of a worldwide population explosion. Thus, his strength was matched by his farsightedness and desire and effort to keep America ahead in the cold war and related events, and in the effort to secure world peace through strength, as the only long-range guarantee of our national security and a better world. For this we blend our affection and admiration of our so recently departed great President with gratitude for the benefits America has derived from his having lived and worked with and for us. Among those benefits, we count the heritage of the great inspiration he has left with us to lead more magnanimous and stronger and better lives. This is the inspiration left to our able and distinguished and patriotic new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, and to others in high places who will proceed to guide the ship of state through turbulent waters, on an even keel. Let us then join in standing strongly behind our new President with confidence that the destiny of our great Nation is in strong and capable hands, to take the place of those of our late great brother, John F. Kennedy.

Remarks of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a very splendid speech given on December 4 in Washington by America's distinguished Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover. Mr. Hoover, who has served our country faithfully and well for four decades or more, delivered this fine address to members of the Brotherhood of Washington Hebrew Congregation who honored him for his magnificent service to our country. Mr. Speaker, I commend to every Member of the House and Senate this very fine speech in which Mr. Hoover not only recites many eternal truths about freedom and liberty, but also he says them very well.

The speech follows:

FAITH IN FREEDOM

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in Washington, D.C., December 4, 1963)

This is a great moment in my life. To be recognized in this manner by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation is a distinction which I shall cherish always.

I am especially honored by the presence of so many close friends, including the distinguished civic leaders whom you have selected as recipients of other awards.

How have these men come to positions of prominence in our community? It is because they have dedicated themselves to service—they have eagerly accepted the responsibilities of good citizenship, and they are willing to be judged upon their records of positive contributions to the cause of decency and of justice.

Decency and justice—these are the high aims of this brotherhood, just as they always have been an integral part of the Hebrew religion which has given mankind the Ten Commandments and the concept of a monotheistic God. For these sacred gifts, all true religions of the Western World are eternally indebted to you.

Americans of the Hebrew faith are doubly blessed. The rich cultural inheritance that has been handed down since early Biblical times to generation after generation of Jews is combined, in our country, with a proud heritage of freedom. It is a heritage that was won by the sweat, the blood, and the sacrifices of men and women of many nationalities and many religious creeds.

Devotion to God; belief in the inherent dignity of mankind; faith in man's ability, through divine providence, to guide his own destiny—these are the strong ties that hold together our United States, the greatest brotherhood of freedom in the history of the world.

No one has a deeper understanding of the true meaning of freedom than the members of the Hebrew faith, for no peoples have suffered more relentless persecution and injustice at the hands of tyranny through the ages.

Today the fires of anti-Semitism continue to burn with fierce intensity in many areas of the world. This is particularly true behind the Iron Curtain where communism, the bitter enemy of Judaism and of all other religions of the world, seeks to destroy your priceless heritage and the right of your people to live according to the tenets of God.

During the past generation, the conscience of decent men everywhere has been shocked by the continuing vicious atrocities that have been committed against Jews in the Soviet Union. Rabbis have been arrested and imprisoned or executed; synagogues have been desecrated; the traditional Jewish school system has been liquidated; and Hebrew literature, language, and customs have been suppressed by the Russian Communists.

Despite Communist claims of improved conditions for Jews under the Khrushchev regime, the opposite actually is true. Additional forms of suppression have been introduced.

The observance of Passover no longer can be held according to tradition; sacred Hebrew burial customs have been obstructed; and a statewide program has been instituted to make Jews the scapegoats for criminal acts affecting the Russian economy. Jews are clearly identified by religion on the internal passport which all Soviet citizens must carry.

Last October, the outrageous extent of this program was disclosed by the Moscow newspaper Izvestia when it announced the arrests of several persons involved in an alleged criminal conspiracy. The leaders of this gang have Jewish names, Izvestia told its readers in demanding a "short trial" and "death sentences."

Vicious outbursts of religious hatred such as this caused one American newspaper recently to warn its readers, "For reasons best known to themselves the Soviet leaders discriminate heavily against Jews. The evidence is overwhelming and incontrovertible and renewed almost daily by the Russians themselves."

In a joint statement released last summer, three American Jewish organizations denounced the Soviet press for conveying "a vicious negative image of the Jews," and indignantly proclaimed, "Soviet Jews are deprived by official policy of religious and cultural rights * * * and are the victims of discrimination. * * *"

Communism and religion—like communism and freedom—can never coexist, for Marxism is unalterably opposed to all forms of religious belief. Lenin acknowledged this fact more than 50 years ago when he exhorted his followers, "We must combat religion—this is the A B C of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism." Then he declared, "The Marxist must be * * * an enemy of religion."

Since the time of Lenin, atheistic communism has surged forth from Russia to enslave nearly one-fourth of the earth's surface and a third of her peoples. Nowhere are its advance battalions more active than in our own Western Hemisphere, where agents trained by the Kremlin continue to burrow deeply into countries of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Their deadly objective is to undermine legitimate governments, foment revolutions, and create a Soviet Union of Latin American Republics.

I have said this before and I would like to repeat it here: We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Here in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed, and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents, and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks.

Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within. Foremost in this campaign are the party's efforts to exploit misunderstandings and capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest wherever they exist. This is especially true in the intense civil rights movement, for America's 20 million Negroes and all others engaged in this struggle are a major target for Communist propaganda and subversion.

It would be absurd to suggest that the aspirations of Negroes for equality are Communist inspired. This is demonstrably not true. But what is demonstrable is that some individuals and groups exploit the tension for purposes not confined to the equality of human rights under the Constitution of the United States. The crusade should not become a vehicle for political radicalism or organized violence.

Devotion to race must not supersede devotion to established institutions.

It would be useful if responsible Negro leaders themselves could make it clear to all who follow them that their interest is solely in racial equality.

This Nation was conceived under God and its progress has been under God. There could be no greater disaster for our Nation than that it should deny in any respect, to even the smallest degree, the presence, the power, the guidance, the protection, the instruction of Almighty God.

There is unmistakable evidence of divine guidance all through the history of our Nation. We must guard it. We must cherish it. We must revere it. We must work for it.

The record of our Nation is better than that of any other nation in any part of the world. It is true there are injustices in this Nation toward those of dark skin, as well as light, but even worse injustices prevail in other parts of the world. Whether the people are black- or yellow- or brown- or white-skinned, these things will have to be worked out.

America has taken the lead in working them out, and it is taking the lead today. It is doing more for its underprivileged minorities than any other nation in the world, but there is more to be done.

We thank God that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

As citizens of a free country, we must judge people as individuals—not by race, creed or color.

Legitimate civil rights organizations must remain constantly alert to attempts by the Communists to influence their actions, take over their programs and corrupt their ranks.

Communism feeds upon ignorance, prejudice and sickness of the mind and soul. It probes relentlessly for weaknesses in America's moral armor.

That is why the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe and other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellowman.

These venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right, are carriers of a highly infectious disease. They clutter the streets—and the mails—with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to acts of hate, terror, and intimidation. They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children and destroyed churches and other temples of worship. They are a national disgrace.

Invariably, these merchants of hate attempted to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism. But their real objective is to profiteer and capitalize upon ignorance, prejudice and bigotry while destroying the very ideals which they claim to uphold.

Today, the Communists continue with impunity to breathe out lies and distortions against the United States. Their designs on American youth revolt and anger those steeped in our national ideals of freedom.

The peddling of their dishonest doctrine to high-minded, largely inexperienced, and basically eager-to-believe young people is not unlike the peddling of filth and dope in demoralizing effect. It can undermine patriotism, create doubts about our social and economic system, and mock the many wholesome youth organizations in this country.

The great majority of American youths are genuinely convinced that they would not fall for the Communist bait. Many never would. But there are others who might never know they were "hooked" until the enormous tragedy of their loss of faith dawned after bitter years of fighting the American way of life, almost unwittingly, as dupes of the Communists.

It has happened to idealistic Americans before.

There is not an avenue to the heart and mind of Americans that is not used to implant their false ideology. Communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name calling, but it can be defeated by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

The God-given ideals which are responsible for this country's greatness are being attacked on many fronts today. Moral lethargy, self-indulgence, neglect of duty—these lethal forces are undermining many facets of business, labor, industry, and Government.

We find their influence in the repulsive attitude of "half-way Americans" to whom life in this country is the enjoyment of rights and privileges devoid of responsibilities.

We find their influence in those courts of law where the true purpose and intent of our Constitution as a document designed for the protection of society have too often been warped and distorted for the benefit of offenders.

We find their influence in the continuing increase of crime—a tragic national problem which is growing four times as fast as our expanding population.

Crime has no respect for age, nationality, sex, color, or religious creed. It has turned our streets into virtual jungles of terror and fear.

Today, a brutal crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill—is committed every three minutes. The number of these senseless atrocities will continue to grow until men of strong moral conviction assert greater influence toward the prevention of crime and administration of justice.

Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity, and fair play. The moral strength of our Nation has slipped alarmingly. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to cure this moral illness.

Law and order are bulwarks on which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where stranges and realism are essential needs.

There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is no longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets—and our families—will continue to be endangered.

Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

Judge Learned Hand said: "Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear it the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime."

Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us "keep the balance true."

Wherever politics and opportunism remain primary considerations in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the "rock from which we were hewn."

Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding and faith in God.

There must be a moral reawakening in every home in our land.

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts of selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

Law and public sanctions help to keep our deeds in line—only conscience polices our thoughts. It is much easier to control our actions than our thoughts.

For, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." Two hundred years ago, our Founding Fathers had a vision of a nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision—the determination that faith, courage and decency will prevail over all enemies of freedom.

Since 1753, when the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it has borne a solemn Old Testament inscription from Leviticus XXV: 10:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Let us all work together to maintain this great American ideal. With God's divine guidance, let us build an ever more powerful brotherhod of liberty and justice for the benefit of all mankind.

As the Father of our Country so aptly said—"As we declare our loyalty to our country, help us to keep in mind the need of faith in God and immortality without which life is meaningless and vain."

This is our mission as a nation of free people, united in one faith—faith in God.

Teachers' Salaries for 1963–64

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1693

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., was recently the author of "Annual Survey of Teachers' Salaries, September 1, 1963." He wrote a summary for the American Teacher, which was published under the title "Teachers' Salaries for 1963–64." Because of the great national interest in salaries of teachers and programs for further improvement of same, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Dr. Reuter's summary:

TEACHERS' SALARIES FOR 1963–64

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

The study this year of teachers' salaries includes 793 districts and 4 territories, or a total of 797. Of the 793 districts of the United States, 204 are in the Northeastern States, 342 in the Central States, 106 in the Southern States, and 141 in the Western States. The four territories included are Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

TABLE I.—*National averages*

	1961	1962	1963
Bachelor's	$4,328–$6,228	$4,428–$6,468	$4,536–$6,710
Master's	4,567– 6,819	4,730– 7,063	4,905– 7,405
Master's plus year	4,839– 7,256	5,135– 7,724	5,340– 8,041
Doctorate	5,124– 7,887	5,366– 8,120	5,559– 8,427

Salaries have increased on an average throughout the Nation during the past year. The average salary of all types of public school teachers, ranging from the bachelor's degree through the doctorate, is currently $6,365, with the average bachelor's salary of $5,623, which includes all teachers in the bachelor's area. Using the same measurement for the master's, it is $6,155; for one year beyond the master's, $6,691; and the doctorate, $6,993.

Table I shows the complete breakdown for 1961, 1962 and 1963. Fairbanks, Alaska, has the highest beginning bachelor's salary in the United States, which is $7,043. Last year this same community paid $6,780. Mt. Pleasant, S.C., has the lowest, which is $2,980. For the master's, Fairbanks, Alaska, leads again with a beginning salary of $7,715, which is over last year's high for the same community of $7,340. Clarksdale, Miss. is the lowest for the master's degree with $3,400.

MAJOR CITIES

Thirty-four major cities with a population ranging from 400,000 to 7,710,000 are considered separately. Also, Phoenix, Ariz., is divided into two parts because they have separate elementary and secondary schools with varying salaries.

TABLE II.—*Major cities*

	1961	1963
Bachelor's	$4,509–$7,176	$4,851–$7,386
Master's	4,953– 7,659	5,179– 8,017
Master's plus year	5,186– 8,285	5,599– 8,676
Doctorate	5,274– 8,309	5,749– 9,233

Table II shows an increase in current average salaries for 1963. This is true for each beginning salary as well as each ceiling. New Orleans, La., is the low city for the beginning bachelor's salary, which is $3,725 and San Francisco, Calif., is the highest with $5,575.

REGIONAL SUMMARIES

The Western States lead the Nation in regional averages. This section is composed of 13 States. The central region, which is composed of 12 States is in second place, and the northeastern region which is composed of 9 States is in third place. This leaves the southern region, which is composed of 16 States and the District of Columbia, in the lowest category. Table III shows the regional breakdown for beginning salaries.

TABLE III.—*Regional averages*

	1961	1962	1963
Northeastern States:			
Bachelor's	$4,181	$4,337	$4,540
Master's	4,455	4,634	4,863
Master's plus year	4,733	5,027	5,209
Doctorate	5,015	5,385	5,501
Central States:			
Bachelor's	4,399	4,592	4,666
Master's	4,734	4,913	5,049
Master's plus year	5,031	5,191	5,343
Doctorate	5,408	5,504	5,769
Southern States:			
Bachelor's	3,848	3,986	4,123
Master's	4,168	4,298	4,488
Master's plus year	4,581	5,962	5,144
Doctorate	4,866	5,057	5,185
Western States:			
Bachelor's	4,532	4,698	4,814
Master's	4,913	5,074	5,221
Master's plus year	5,009	5,365	5,663
Doctorate	5,205	5,518	5,779

TABLE IV.—STATE AVERAGES

The highest State average for a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree is Alaska, which is $6,675. This is an improvement of $219 over 1962. The lowest average is South Carolina with $3,323. Below are the State minimum and maximum salaries for a teacher with a bachelor's degree:

Alabama	$3,781–$4,795
Alaska	6,675– 8,734
Arizona	4,863– 7,156
Arkansas	3,799– 4,756
California	5,137– 7,714
Colorado	4,379– 6,966
Connecticut	4,788– 7,749
Delaware	4,800– 8,000
Florida	4,427– 6,421
Georgia	4,055– 5,127
Hawaii	4,020– 5,940
Idaho	4,414– 5,747
Illinois	4,974– 7,124
Indiana	4,897– 7,055
Iowa	4,703– 6,635
Kansas	4,555– 6,340
Kentucky	4,175– 5,500
Louisiana	3,618– 5,920
Maine	4,110– 5,934
Maryland	4,590– 7,481
Massachusetts	4,675– 7,126
Michigan	4,877– 7,595
Minnesota	4,757– 7,677
Mississippi	3,403– 4,593
Missouri	4,405– 6,828
Montana	4,843– 6,751
Nebraska	4,590– 6,496
Nevada	5,033– 6,617
New Hampshire	4,280– 6,238
New Jersey	4,817– 8,020
New Mexico	4,675– 6,422
New York	5,128– 8,471
North Carolina	4,178– 5,966
North Dakota	4,563– 7,081
Ohio	4,527– 6,793
Oklahoma	4,125– 5,700
Oregon	4,717– 7,120
Pennylvania	4,480– 7,107
Rhode Island	4,514– 6,722
South Carolina	3,323– 4,733
South Dakota	4,260– 6,290
Tennessee	4,208– 6,074
Texas	4,538– 6,006
Utah	4,389– 7,112
Vermont	4,067– 6,823
Virginia	4,383– 6,517
Washington	4,609– 6,281
West Virginia	3,897– 4,793
Wisconsin	4,878– 7,401
Wyoming	4,762– 6,862

CONCLUSIONS

While this year's report is better than last as far as averages of salaries are concerned, it is still far below the goal of the AFT of what teachers' salaries should be.

One is reminded of the current need by the statement of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, "I do not believe that a society that has shamefully starved and neglected its public education can claim to have exploited its fullest possibilities and found them wanting."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, while attending the burial services of John Fitzgerald Kennedy in Arlington Cemetery, I noted the stately figure of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the President of the Republic of France, standing at the bier. His appearance called my attention to the fact that two of the foremost leaders of the free world were present—one alive and one dead. On further reflection I realized that in a short period of 6 months the free world had lost four out of five of their outstanding leaders; namely, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, former Chancellor of the Republic of West Germany, retired on October 15, 1963; the Honorable Harold Macmillan, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, resigned on October 18, 1963; the Honorable Amintore Fanfani, former Premier of the Republic of Italy, resigned on May 16, 1963. And now the Honorable John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States of America. My thoughts turned back pages of history to the year 44 B.C. when Julius Caesar, ruler of the Roman world, and the foremost leader of the world at that time fell victim at the hands of an assassin. History tells us of the momentous impact on the entire world through that great loss.

How will the world of today accept the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy who was the foremost spokesman of the free world? His untimely death has created a vacuum in world affairs, making it necessary for every nation to reevaluate its foreign policy. The peoples of the world received the tragic news with heartfelt sorrow. They knew of his vital contributions to the security of the free world. In the field of general welfare, the people of the world knew of his great interest in assisting other countries to become independent and self-supporting and to achieve economic and social progress through free institutions.

With the death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the world has lost a mighty champion of peace and good will.

My family and I join the people of the world in extending our heartfelt con-

dolences to Mrs. Kennedy and to members of the late President's immediate family in their hour of bereavement.

Russian Wheat Deal a Typical Communist Bargain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it just seems some of our officials can never learn that the Communists are not to be trusted. They have one objective, world domination by the Soviet Union and every phase of their national life is geared to that end. Trade with the Soviets is to them a political weapon. Agreements, treaties, promises are just so much paper to the Communists. Breaking treaties, welching on agreements, lying, is a part of Communist strategy. In fact, it is written into their constitution.

For some reason our officials just will not accept this. We continue to believe that we can deal with the Communists as an honorable government with the result that in every deal they win and we lose.

The latest farce is the deal to sell wheat to Russia. In spite of all the assurances that U.S. interests would be protected, we have now arrived at the point where none of the original agreements will be included.

This should prove to us, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot do business with the Communists and that you can trust the Communists only to do what they have said all along they will do, win the cold war and destroy us.

As a part of these remarks I include an editorial from today's Wall Street Journal, "How One Thing Leads to Another." It is a step by step account of how Communist Russia has conned us into giving them all they wanted in the first place on the wheat deal. The editorial follows:

HOW ONE THING LEADS TO ANOTHER

When the Russian wheat deal was first proposed last October, the late President Kennedy, in clear and specific language, laid down some excellent terms. He carefully explained what the deal would be—and would not be.

This would be a private, commercial transaction, the Government's role being limited to granting the necessary permission, he said. The sale would be for gold or American dollars, either cash on delivery or "normal commercial terms." Basically, in his words, "the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer * * * who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants."

In presenting this arrangement, Mr. Kennedy emphasized that one feature of it was that the wheat sold to the Soviet Union would be carried in American ships.

Thus, while even then the wheat sale was not without its critics, it was generally accepted by the public on the basis of this straightforward arrangement. On such terms the Russians could buy wheat on the world market anyway, and it seemed as though we would get a fair "quid" for the Russian "quo."

Now, it seems, things aren't quite what they seemed.

One of the first things that happened, once the Soviet buyers got the U.S. Government's approval to the principle of a sale, was that they balked at having the wheat shipped to them in American ships. Mr. Khrushchev, figuratively at least, banged the bargaining table, and the U.S. Government relaxed this part of the arrangement.

After that it developed that the Soviet Union didn't want to pay cash after all, either in gold or U.S. dollars. Nor were the Communists willing to deal on normal commercial terms, meaning such short-term credit as they might get from either the private sellers or private banks. A few efforts at obtaining such credit on their terms, here and in Europe, were unproductive. Whereupon the Soviets said to us: No credit, no deal.

So next the proposition was that the U.S. Government, through the Export-Import Bank, itself finance the Russian wheat purchase by guaranteeing a loan for 75 percent of the purchase price.

The first reactions to this, not unreasonably, were objections in Congress. A bill was introduced to prohibit this U.S. financing of Russian trade. And although Treasury Secretary Dillon argued that we must underwrite the sale or there would be no sale, the Senate Banking Committee appeared unpersuaded that the deal was worth that price. Appeared unpersuaded, that is, until the assassination of President Kennedy.

Then, in the aftermath of that tragic event, the Senate committee quietly decided to put aside its objections to financing the Russian wheat sale. The explanation given was that this was intended as a tribute to the man who had so carefully spelled out the original terms, and somehow as a gesture of confidence to the new President.

This action had hardly been taken, yielding one more point to the Soviet bargainers, when there developed an argument over the shipping rates for transporting the wheat to Russia. The Russians decided they were too high, implying that if something can't be done to get cheaper shipping rates—a special U.S. subsidy, perhaps?—maybe they would have to get their wheat somewhere else.

What interests us here is not so much the wrangle over the Soviet Union's credit standing, although Senator MUNDT had a point about the unpaid Soviet debts due us from World War II. Nor so much even the fact that a Soviet wheat loan would be a major change in the Export-Import Bank policy, which has so far never extended credit or credit insurance to a Communist bloc country.

Rather, the intriguing thing here is the progressive change in the wheat deal and the attitude of U.S. officials to the changing Soviet demands. We have witnessed a typical Communist maneuver. First a proposition that has the sound of reasonableness. Then, a bargain seemingly struck, demands for a little change. Finally, this being agreed to, a new set of demands. The same sort of thing has happened a thousand times over in different kinds of bargaining with the Communists.

Unfortunately, the American reaction is also all too typical. Congratulations at a well-struck bargain; next a little yielding in the hopes of saving the bargain. Finally, "getting a deal" seems to become to us as important as the terms of the bargain. And before you know it, the Russians have what they were after in the first place.

Whatever else may be said about the present proposals, they are a far cry from the thoughtful terms laid down by President Kennedy last October. It is really astounding, when you think of it, how one little thing leads to another.

National Council of the Churches of Christ Urges Signatures on Civil Rights Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 9, Members of the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to take an important forward step toward the passage of one of the most significant pieces of legislation that Congress has considered in many years, the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

This opportunity will be presented to Members of the House in the form of a petition to discharge the Rules Committee of further consideration of the civil rights bill and I hope that the required 218 Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, will sign their names to this petition.

As evidence of the support of many of the major religious denominations in our country for the passage of the civil rights bill and specifically for the use of the unusual discharge petition procedure, I draw the attention of Members of the House to the adoption on December 5, 1963 of a resolution on civil rights legislation adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States.

The text of this resolution follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A. RESOLUTION ON CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(Adopted by the general assembly Dec. 5, 1963)

The eyes of the world are upon the American Congress, watching to see whether our national legislative body, in a bipartisan way, can meet the challenge of one of the greatest moral issues of our time. Six months have already passed since comprehensive civil rights legislation was introduced. Further delay by the Congress could undermine the faith of the American people in the capacity of its political institutions to function and the confidence of all men who love liberty in the ability of the United States to advance the global struggle for freedom.

The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, therefore, calls upon the Congress of the United States to take every step necessary to insure the earliest possible passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, including the immediate use of a discharge petition which will enable the House of Representatives to take action on the bill.

The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches also calls upon Christians across the Nation to urge their Representatives in Congress to sign such a petition when it is presented.

In Memory of John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, we who are the Members of this distinctive parliamentary body today have had a great privilege in knowing and working with John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Our close association with our late beloved President assigns to us at this moment the role of evaluating the man. The wanton taking of his life by an assassin has assigned to history, to the generations of the future, the role of evaluating John Kennedy the President.

As a contemporary of the late President, I enjoyed an all too brief association with him. I found it an inspiring experience. No leader of our time was so completely a part of the 20th century. No leader of our time so fully understood the significance of the American role in the second half of the 20th century. No leader of our time was so obviously the master of the complexities of this most difficult and too frequently frustrating era. President Kennedy had an unusual zest for the challenge, however awesome that might be, in the high position he occupied for less than 3 years. This fact was so clearly stated in his own words in his inspiring inaugural address on January 20, 1961, when he said:

> In the long history of the world only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it.

This was truer at the moment of death than at the time of inauguration. The outpouring of sympathy, the obvious grief evident throughout the civilized world, attested to the success of his efforts to minimize those things which divide the peoples of our time and build upon the opportunities which tend to unite mankind.

President Kennedy was a man of unusual intellectual capacity and yet he was a most comfortable person to be around because he understood not only the problems of his generation but the generation itself. Perhaps no President in his public utterances so phrased his statements as to make them fully quotable as did Preisdent Kennedy, yet few have shown the humor which characterized the dialogue of his administration. In fact, within a few hours preceding the senseless act of assassination, the President demonstrated the keenness of that wit, the delightful turn of a phrase, whether designed to have you laugh with him or at him. There was nothing pompous about John Kennedy, yet in the fullest sense he was the President and carried that role with every dignity befitting the office. He worked hard; he never ducked a fight and he enjoyed both to the fullest.

All America, yes, and I quess the greater part of the world has taken pride from the young President with his beautiful wife and very attractive family. All have enjoyed the delightful antics of Caroline and the President's beloved John-John. All have been proud of the regal dignity of Jacqueline Kennedy, and while the Kennedys became a political issue, all have enjoyed the vigor of the President's brothers and sisters. Nevertheless, none would deny the dedication of this family to the welfare of all our citizens. This was a vital family unique in the American political experience and we are all the poorer because of the tragedy of Dallas.

At the very moment when the world was beginning to sense the magnitude of his achievements, the success of his international policies and the almost spectacular emergence of a healthier domestic economy, we were robbed of the leadership of this vital young intellect. But even in that moment of darkest despair, the unusual insight of the President was again demonstrated when we witnessed a new President taking over the onerous burdens so unexpectedly thrust upon him, because the choice made by John F. Kennedy in Los Angeles in 1960 was a wise choice. He had wanted Lyndon Johnson as his running mate—a selection made with utmost care, a deliberate assessment of the needs of the nation. The President's wisdom in that choice each day becomes more apparent.

President Kennedy, the first man of my generation to achieve the Presidency, afforded all who lived through his brief tenure in office an experience of enrichment. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will most thoughtly review his many public statements, his carefully conceived programs recommended to this Congress, and after a more deliberate evaluation of them, make a renewed dedication to make them work as he knew they would for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, a tribute to President Kennedy would not be complete without mention of the great courage of his widow. Her conduct from the moment tragedy struck should make every American more proud. Perhaps no woman in history was ever called upon to play a more difficult role under more brutal or tragic circumstances. No one could have done it better. The British press stated that Jacqueline Kennedy gave the American people something they lacked. That something in their words was "majesty", but however we characterize it, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize that the grief felt by each of us was only a small part of that felt by her. How many of us with our small part of the burden could have conducted ourselves with the grace, the courage, and the majesty of Jacqueline Kennedy?

I am pleased to announce to the Congress that the Sacramento City Board of Education on November 27, 1963, acted to honor our late President in a most fitting manner. All of us who were privileged to work with the late President knew of his vital concern to provide education for all the people of the United States. Therefore, it is most fitting that a new senior high school in Sacramento is to be named the John F. Kennedy Senior High School.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks with the resolution adopted by the Sacramento City Board of Education:

RESOLUTION BY SACRAMENTO BOARD OF EDUCATION

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a great statesman who served as America's eloquent spokesman throughout the world in our country's search for peace and security for all mankind; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a true champion of education and the equality of educational opportunity for all, regardless of color, creed, social or economic status; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy was most articulate in his support of good citizenship, physical and mental fitness, vocational competence, and of improved living standards for all citizens; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy had become known and respected as a true champion of freedom, justice and understanding in America and among all nations; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy, with all his great responsibilities as the head of our Nation, still gave continued evidence of love of children and family and a deep concern for the values of home, community, church, and school; and

Whereas John Fitzgerald Kennedy endeared himself through his sincerity, his high principles, and his ennobling example to young and older alike: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District, on behalf of all pupils and the entire district staff does herewith express sincere and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, daughter Caroline, son John F. Kennedy, Jr., and all members of the Kennedy family; and be it further

Resolved, In order to perpetuate in this Sacramento community the memory of a great and renowned man, a new senior high school, now in progress of planning and soon to be built, shall be known as the John F. Kennedy Senior High School; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Education of the Sacramento City Unified School District of Sacramento, Calif., in special meeting assembled, does approve this resolution in sincere tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States of America, whose tragic death brought deep sorrow to all loyal Americans and to the entire world; and be it further

Resolved, To adjourn this meeting of the board of education in honor and sincere tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our late esteemed President.

We hereunto set our hand and seal on this 27th day of November 1963.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

By Jewel W. Blucher, president; Genevieve N. Didion, vice president; Marie E. Babich, M.D.; John Quincy Brown, Jr.; Alba Kuchman; Gladys R. Paulson; Milton L. Schwartz; and F. Melvyn Lawson, superintendent and secretary.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the heartbreak, grief,

and sorrow shared by west Texans and folks around the world over the tragic incident that took the life of our President on November 22.

Although, I did not always agree with his philosophy or his legislative recommendations, President Kennedy was a vigorous and articulate exponent of his political philosophy. He was truly an outstanding young American and the world mourns his untimely death.

Our thoughts and prayers are with Mrs. Kennedy and her little children during these trying times. May God bless, love, and comfort them.

Two Telegrams in Opposition to H.R. 8929

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in the city council in Buffalo, N.Y., where I became familiar with the operation of public transportation and the cost of the operation to provide transportation facilities.

I am very proud of the transportation service rendered by private enterprise in my city.

One only has to glance at the reports that have been submitted by New York City to realize the cost of their operation. H.R. 8929 is another bonanza for the District of Columbia, where the taxpayers of the United States will provide cheap transportation for the people who live in the District of Columbia.

I wish to bring to the attenion of my colleagues two telegrams that I have received in opposition to H.R. 8929, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. The telegrams follow:

H.R. 8929 now before the House for action providing for the construction and acquisition of a portion of a rapid transit system does not provide a labor relations policy for labor protective provisions. We therefore strongly oppose H.R. 8929.

JOHN M. ELLIOTT,
International President, Amalgamated Association of Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America AFL-CIO.

H.R. 8929 provides for a minimum addition of $400 million to the national debt to build an outmoded stopgap subway system for the District of Columbia with no provision protecting enterprise against public operation. I strongly urge opposition to and defeat of this bill, because it will saddle the Government with public ownership of this system and creates a governmental Frankenstein without any experience in the transit field to run it. This is in violation of the franchise given by Congress to D.C. Transit System, Inc., to operate the public transit system in Washington. The Federal Government should make clear that it is not going into the transit business. However, in the event the Congress decides to authorize the $400 million expenditure, the bill should be amended to provide for experienced private operation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., pursuant to the act of Congress granting its franchise.

O. ROY CHALK.

The Enemy Is Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert the following editorial from the San Diego Union of November 30, 1963.

EVIL IS NOT ERASED: THE ENEMY IS COMMUNISM

This is a time of rededication.

A long struggle against the threat of communism still lies ahead of the United States. Nothing has changed. Our enemies have not been chastened and evil has not been erased.

We must not forget that it was a gun aimed by a Communist which took the life of a President.

Communists never rest. The revolution by which Fidel Castro delivered Cuba to communism has been imported to Venezuela, as we should have known it would be, and Venezuela has called for an emergency meeting of hemispheric foreign ministers to so consider an "act of aggression."

Tons of guns and ammunition have been smuggled from Cuba to Venezuela, to supply underground territory organizations, and scores of personnel already have been slain. Unless action is taken, and quickly, Venezuela may become the first South American country to meet the fate of Cuba.

In the United States, the investigations into the assassination of President Kennedy must be pressed.

It may be some time before we have all the facts on the life of Lee Harvey Oswald. We only know that he hated the land of his birth and sought citizenship under communism. At his funeral, his Russian-born wife said that "Everyone dies for a good cause."

To a Communist, betrayal is honorable, the lie a cynical weapon, and violence the fulfillment of life.

There have been attempts to portray him as an idealistic Marxist. But idealists do not kill. He has been called a social outcast, because of the poverty and hardship of his childhood. But he was not alone in the struggle of life. Poverty also has been a road to the White House.

Somehow, somewhere, along the course of his life he became infected with atheistic communism. So have millions of others, and their dedication to their cause, to the sacrifice of all moral, ethical and religious principles, has enabled them to enslave nearly a billion of their fellow men.

Lee Harvey Oswald was a weak man, but a useful Communist. The incidents of the last week grimly sharpen the issue that divides the world.

There is a tendency to seek to punish ourselves, to blame what has happened on our own faults and failures. Too many of us decry an image of America as a lawless country, where even a President can be shot down in the heart of a friendly city.

But we must remember that even in the Western World, President de Gaulle of France has been the object of a number of attempts at assassination, and on the other side of the world, the events of South Vietnam should still be fresh in our minds.

Sudden death can strike under any guise.

The death of the late President Kennedy came not out of political dissension but out of a perverted and corrupting ideology. Nations have been destroyed and millions murdered in the name of an ideology, from Stalin to Hitler.

Let's not turn on each other, in blame.

The enemy is communism. As long as it can command the power of great countries, and threaten us with atomic destruction while it slips its spies, propagandists and subverters among us, we too, will need to be a dedicated people.

Guy Easterly: He Fought for the People's Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago as the Special Subcommittee on Government Information initiated its study of information problems, a number of distinguished editors and reporters served on a press panel to outline the Government information picture. This was the subcommittee's first hearing, and most of the members of the press panel were men who had gained national prominence. One among them was relatively unkown. He published a couple of small newspapers in east Tennessee and he also served as Chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the National Editorial Association.

His name was Guy Easterly, and the words he spoke on that day—and the force, conviction and honestry with which he spoke them—had more effect upon the subcommittee than many of the well chosen phrases of nationally prominent editors. He translated the ideals and principles of freedom of information into common, everyday language. His grass roots knowledge of the workings of democracy added meaning to the ideas he expressed.

Throughout the years Guy Easterly was available to advise those of us working for the people's right to know here in Washington. His valuable advice will be available no longer. I am sure the Members of Congress will be interested in the editorial printed on November 29, 1963 in the Knoxville News-Sentinel following the death of Guy Easterly:

GUY EASTERLY

A man whose life and works had an impact far beyond the native east Tennessee where he always lived is gone. Guy Easterly, the La Follette-Jellico newspaper publisher, had carried his fight for the people's rights to Washington, and indeed, from coast to coast. He was a champion of freedom of information—the right to know. This had chiefly characterized his administration when he was president of the National Editorial Association, the organization of country's weekly and small city newspapers.

Guy Easterly also was a fighter for clean elections, for freedom of the ballot for all people regardless of party. He had done yeoman service for a score of years for the Tennessee Press Association, of which he was a past president. And as a Civil War buff he made valuable contributions to the recording and disseminating of the history of that war in his Appalachian area.

Typical of his unselfish nature was his going back to school to teach in spite of his other duties when wartime shortage called for such services.

Guy Easterly will be greatly missed and his memory widely honored.

Answer to a Columnist's Smear of Dallas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the very regrettable tragic incident that took place in Dallas. Some folks do not seem to realize, or want to realize, that a Marxist, self-styled Communist committed the murder of our President, not the fine people of Dallas. I include a letter from an editorial column from the El Paso Times concerning this.

REPROACHES DREW PEARSON

(By W. J. Hooten)

Here's a letter from my old friend Ben Turner, which is self-explanatory:

"DEAR BILL: Drew Pearson's column, the Merry-Go-Round, November 29, is truly a merry-go-round of accusations—accusations of hate, intolerance, and disrespect of government, and includes a charge of responsibility for the assassination of the President, when he says: 'Dallas' answer even before that speech [Kennedy's], was delivered, was to shoot John F. Kennedy.'

"As a reporter, Pearson normally does a good job, and provides an interesting and informative column, but on the occasion that he writes editorially, he does so poorly and today's offering borders on the offensive.

"To accuse the city of Dallas with the assassination of our late President, because of contrary political beliefs, the editorials of the Dallas News and a full-page ad, critical of the President's stewardship, however positive, these articles may have been, is an insult to one's intelligence. His condemnation of this great city is not only undeserved, but actually libelous.

"The press of the Nation agrees that the assassination was committed by a professed Marxist, a Communist sympathizer, who had visited Russia, who was pro-Castro, and a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, all communistic, and as far to the left as one can go. To the contrary, Dallas as a city is known as conservative, and far to the right.

"Conservatives whether right or wrong, are known for their belief in law and order, and the legality of every action, while communism lives and thrives by breeding confusion, turmoil, and strife, and does not hesitate at murder.

"Pearson in his article, denies the right of one to have a different political philosophy. If this philosophy is desirable and attracts adherents who do not agree with the ruling clique and give voice to their protests, then they become a powerful influence-molder and preach disrespect and hate for constituted authority and the Government.

"At this point, would it be subversive to inquire what has become of our right of political expression, guaranteed by the Constitution; has this right been abrogated, or has it become the sole property of the liberal or leftwing? To be a conservative must one be voiceless, or labeled anarchistic?

"We were once taught that a loyal and vocal opposition was desirable, in that it tended to keep the incumbents honest. I clothe neither of these great forces with a cloak of virtue—there is good and evil in each; but they must not be denied or handicapped in their expressions—for from the boiling caldron of their thoughts and ideas will come forth the greater and better America of tomorrow.

"No. The city of Dallas should not be blamed for an act, the assassination of the President by a communistic inflamed psychopathic, who doubtless planned it last summer in New Orleans. 'It could have happened here.' Dallas' answer to Drew Pearson's letter might well be "Physician, cure thyself.' "

The 50th Anniversary of Silver Wings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, before the year 1963 fades into history, I believe it is imperative that due and proper credit be given to the year as the 50th anniversary of the first badge ever worn by military aviators.

I speak, of course, of the proud Silver Wings worn by the officers and airmen who have had the distinction of qualifying for the select fraternity of the sky.

Fifty years, in many ways, is a brief time. Yet in the history of airpower it spans from rudimentary, kitelike flying contraptions to the manned missiles of today.

Air Force Silver Wings to me, however, are significant of the men who have marched across the past 50 years, rather than the machines. It took heart to conquer the air—and now space itself—and it is no coincidence that the Silver Wings are worn over a flier's heart.

I like to recall the stirring words of the Air Force song which proudly sends "a toast to the host of those who love the vastness of the sky."

In this spirit, it is my privilege to salute the Air Force officers and enlisted men who are entitled to wear the historic Silver Wings.

And I would like to add herewith a brief history and commentary which has been called to my attention on the occasion of this anniversary year of Silver Wings:

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SILVER WINGS

The year 1963 marks the 50th anniversary of the first award of a distinctive badge for military aviators.

Capt. Charles DeForest Chandler and Lt. Thomas D. Milling, of the Signal Corps, U.S. Army, were awarded these first pilot wings, the Military Aviator Badge.

Lt. H. H. Arnold, who later became the only U.S. military aviator to attain the rank of five-star general, also qualified but did not receive his wings until later because only two badges had been initially authorized.

This anniversary is significant because military wings have become the symbol of a special fraternity of U.S. airmen who fly to defend our way of life.

General Arnold wrote in 1948 that "the airmen's wings mean something to me far beyond insignia or symbol of rank.

"Every man who wears Silver Wings knows that they are, in a sense, the Air Force itself—the men, the deeds, the gallantry, the danger, the undying spirit.

"Silver Wings are the badge of combat and devotion of duty. They represent the pilots, the bombardiers, the navigators, the mechanics, the officers, the enlisted men.

"Silver Wings are a symbol of America, our country, our flag, the love all of us feel for our free and proud homeland."

Commenting on the appropriateness of pausing to mark this milestone, Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has said: "The Silver Wings of the Air Force pilot, observer, navigator and crew member are a symbol of the strength of the U.S. Air Force. The badge is the mark of professionals imbued with dedication to their country and to the mission to which they have been charged. It is a symbol attesting to the truth that they would defend to the death the principles of civil authority vested in the Government of their country. More than that, it is a symbol of courage to look ahead and think beyond the limitations of the day * * * the courage to pursue knowledge, embrace new concepts, and exploit new technology. We are proud of the heritage passed on to us by former wearers of Silver Wings. We, who are honored by wearing this distinctive symbol today, rededicate ourselves to continue to serve in a manner so that our counterparts of the future can look back and say, 'They have done their job well.' "

Also commenting upon the 50th anniversary of Silver Wings was Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, commander of the Space Systems Division of Air Force Systems Command, who wrote in the command newspaper, Astro News: "The history of military aviation has been a history of personal achievements. Aircraft have gone progressively higher, faster, and farther because men of courage have flown them there.

"And on this, the 50th anniversary of the Air Force's Silver Wings, it should be equally clear that future aerospace progress will depend heavily on people trained and willing to probe the unknown.

"The first Military Aviator Badges were awarded in 1913. Two were presented.

"Today, members of the Silver Wings fraternity are numbered in the tens of thousands. And, in the genealogy of the insignia, certain designs have come and gone.

"Balloon pilot, glider pilot, technical observer, aerial gunner, liaison pilot, bombardier: in the evolution of airpower, these and other aviation specialties have served their purposes * * * and faded away into the blue.

"Today's order of Silver Wings identifies the Air Force pilot, the Air Force navigator or aircraft observer, the Air Force flight surgeon, the Air Force flight nurse, the Air Force aircrew members, and * * * the Air Force pilot astronaut.

"Fifty years after Military Aviator Badges were accorded two uniformed men who dared to leave the ground, Astronaut Wings have been awarded to four officers who have dared to leave the planet. For their space flights, Air Force Majors Grissom, White, Rushworth, and Cooper now wear the first Pilot Astronaut Wings to be conferred on U.S. citizens.

"Between the 50-foot altitude flights of yesteryear and the 50-mile high flights of today stands a half century of personal and professional determination, dedication, and development—a half century illuminated by names like Arnold and Spaatz; Lahm and Foulois; Rickenbacker, Mitchell, and Luke; Doolittle and Chennault; LeMay and Quesada; Stapp, Yeager, Everest, and Kincheloe.

"The names become legends, but the accomplishments survive. Our airmen heroes of the past and present should be a constant inspiration to all of us in the Space Systems Division who are building for the future. There, too, progress surely will be paced by the people who wear the silver badge of courage."

The remarks of these Air Force leaders underline that wings have always been indicative of the idealism and accomplishments of those who have elected to serve their country in the realms of aerospace. This symbolic device through various forms and designs reflects a history of U.S. military aviation—a history of the U.S. Air Force.

Both as a history, and as a symbol for the future of manned military flight, this anniversary deserves full recognition.

In Memory of John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the bullet from the assassin's gun that felled President John F. Kennedy on that beautiful fall morning in Dallas, Tex., only a few days ago, was a national tragedy. Death as a result of natural causes is always a sad event, but when a young man, and particularly a young man who is President of the United States, is struck down at the hands of an assassin, it is most reprehensible.

On the morning of November 22, President John F. Kennedy rode down the street of Dallas, Tex., a happy man with the vigor of youth, with virtually the world at his feet. He was the leader of the greatest and most powerful nation in the world, he was possessed of wealth, power, and happiness; he enjoyed the love and adoration of his parents, brothers, and sisters as well as his charming wife and infant children. He had everything to live for. His popularity was worldwide; even those who did not share his philosophical views respected this young President of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult sometimes to understand the scheme of life and death. It is certainly most difficult to understand the motivation of this warped-minded individual who fired the fatal shot. And yet, we know that throughout the recorded history of mankind every generation of men has been plagued with such types of depraved human beings. Unfortunately, President Kennedy's tragic death is not without precedent in the comparatively short life of this Republic; as witness the unfortunate and tragic deaths of Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley. In each instance, these four Presidents died at the hands of assassins of dubious objectives conceived by unbalanced minds. Possibly the greatest parallel in this most recent national tragedy is that of President McKinley who died at the hands of an admitted anarchist. The obvious murderer of President Kennedy was an admitted Communist.

Mr. Speaker, as one who honestly and sincerely differed with our lamented President, as thank God it is our right to do under the American political system, I also was one of those who had a genuine affection for the President and, like all other Americans of good will, Mrs. Wilson and I join in extending our sincere sympathy to his family.

The Ill Wills of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, during the last decade the effects of imports upon the American economy have been the subject of much discussion, debate and to some industries—a serious matter of concern.

As a Member of Congress I was named chairman of the Committee Studying the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment. My hearings and the seriousness of the statistics and logic in the eight volumes of testimony convinced me that the real seed of our chronic unemployment could be traced to the trade agreements and the side effects such as increased automation, foreign investment and Government subsidy for both exports and foreign competitive facilities.

Because of this conviction I stood practically alone in my fight against the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which, in practical operation, wiped out the escape clause as well as the Congress of the United States in any effort to relieve undue, unfair and devastating foreign competition.

Mr. Speaker, we have an economy with built-in high cost production. This is as it should be since by having high costs, we in turn, have high incomes.

No nation on earth provided more opportunity for individual or corporate advancement and welfare. No nation on earth came within even 25 percent of our wage level and for this reason, we enjoyed the highest standard of living in the entire world.

We have been told that we must share our well-being and as Americans we have—to the tune of billions of dollars, millions of man-hours of counseling and advice and technical assistance.

On top of this we took the responsibility for military and police defense of the entire free world.

No one should complain about these good deeds unless the time arrives when we are no longer able to do so because of adverse effects upon our own well-being.

That time has arrived and unless we give recognition to the problem as of this moment, the time will pass when we can stem the tide of destruction of our way of life.

I am not a scarebird; I do not run at every shadow and for 30 years as a legislator, I have never let sentiment or propaganda swerve me in my vote for the little peoples, for social reforms, for adequate defense, for necessary farm relief and all other humane and socially oriented legislation.

However, I am—I believe—a realist and I will not stand by quietly while my country becomes a second-rate nation, second in its economic growth, stalemated and stagnant in its increased benefits to its people and its institutions.

I would no more starve my Nation for the benefit of another than I would let my family go barefoot and hungry while my neighbors waxed fat on my paycheck.

Charity has no virtue when the giver takes it from another whose need is as great.

A year has passed since the trade bill was enacted. Already a majority of Congress has signed a petition begging and petitioning for relief for U.S. shoe manufacturers. Over a hundred Members have signed petitions for the relief of the coal industry from imported fuels.

Numerous bills have been introduced to give aid and succor to the producers and workers in glass, rubber, mushrooms, woolen goods, stainless steel, aluminum products, and on and on.

This day, November 4, the year of our Lord, 1963, the Congress is adding the tremendous amount of 350-odd millions of dollars to the taxpayers burden for the relief of the textile mills of the United States.

Every speaker has lambasted the imports of textiles as the cause for the desperate straits in which the textile industry finds itself.

How long, Mr. Speaker, how long can we—the taxpayers of the United States, with over 6 million of our own walking the streets of desperation and despair, unemployed for months, yes, even years—how long, I ask, Mr. Speaker, can we continue the policies of trade that are unrealistic, uneconomic, and unfair to both our peoples as well as the exporting nations who are building their hopes for economic well-being on the will of the wisp of foreign trade.

At this moment, the cheese producers of America, who have lost 50 percent or more of their home market to foreign imports, are fighting for their lives before the Tariff Commission. Their foreign competitors, not yet satisfied, are petitioning for lower and lower customs, and elimination of protective covenants for U.S. industry.

We may kid ourselves in Congress that the little people do not understand the ramifications of big time political maneuvering, but they do, and their understanding stems from the oldest of all human instincts—self-preservation.

When a worker loses his job he can be fooled for a while about why he lost it, but soon he awakens to the realities of the situation and finds that his country's leaders are more interested in surplus for export, through automation and subsidy, than they are in his opportunity to earn a living for his family.

I have said many times before and want to again state what I believe to be the only basis for a balanced economy.

A successful economy must have five pillars: investment, production, employment, consumption, and profit.

All are equally important. When a government policy disrupts any of these sustaining pillars, the economy becomes unbalanced and the results are unemployment, bankruptcy, run-away investments, and economic instability.

I have had the opportunity to read the statement made before the U.S. Tariff Commission by Frank J. Klensch, executive vice president of the Tolibia Cheese Co., Fond du Lac, Wis. I believe it contains facts and information that

can help the Members of Congress in their deliberations on the serious matter of import competition.

Mr. Speaker, I include this statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY FRANK J. KLENSCH, LAKE FOREST, ILL., EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, TOLIBIA CHEESE MANUFACTURING CORP., BEFORE TRADE INFORMATION COMMITTEE, RE DOCKET NO. 63-2, NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING RELATING TO ARTICLES TO BE CONSIDERED FOR TRADE AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

This statement is made in behalf of this company; the American Producers of Italian-Type Cheese Association, Inc., of which I am president, and the American Blue Cheese Association, of which I am a director.

I will endeavor in this statement to bring to your attention pertinent facts that should be considered for use as guidelines in the coming negotiations. American duty rates are presently well below most other nations' rates on agricultural products in general and dairy products in particular. Our quotas are more permissive than of other nations with whom we trade. Many dairy products have been removed from quota or have never been under quota and quotas have been enlarged on numerous occasions. It appears that in previous negotiations the United States has done all the giving, with little or nothing in return. There is every indication that the only way an American company can enter and share in a foreign market is to purchase a foreign company or set up a production plant in the national market where we wish a share. Many American companies have done both these things. Free trade must be based on the free movement of people, currencies, and products in that very order of importance, and in both directions. As of this moment our foreign trade policies have resulted in a one-way street. Our low duty rates have created a tax haven for foreign shippers. I feel that every dollars worth of merchandise being offered the American consumer, whether it be produced in America or elsewhere, makes the same tax contribution to the U.S. Government.

Any decrease in U.S. duties on imports of dairy products would actually be a "windfall" either to the exporter, our importers, or the dealer in imported products. The American taxpayer is already carrying a costly support program, as well as the unemployment benefits that have been increasing in direct proportion to the amount of imports sharing our markets.

It is naive to assume that we need only reduce tariffs, and by some magic, wages and prices in this country will become competitive with those prevailing, or likely to prevail, throughout the world in the future.

We have read and heard in recent months a variety of theories why the United States should erase its tariff barriers. We think that those who support a wholesale tariff elimination would prefer not to have Congress consider seriously these theories.

Our negotiators must constantly keep in mind that the members of the Common Market, including prospective as well as associate members, have not yet abandoned their trade protection policies. Historically, they have imposed whatever exchange controls, quotas, tariffs, and the like they deemed necessary to protect their industrial as well as agricultural interests from having to share their market with others.

It is apparent that the wage differentials between the United States and the Common Market are a dividing point on price in our marketplace. The Common Market is unwilling to accept this logic when they appeal for increased quotas on agricultural products they export to the United States. Yet, we note at this very moment, the Common Market imposed stiff trade barriers against such countries as Japan, with the simple explanation that the Common Market countries cannot compete against the wage differentials which exist between Japan and these countries. Yet wage differentials, that occur between the Common Market countries and Japan, are less than the wage differentials between the Common Market countries and the United States.

We find ourselves severely handicapped when we attempt to compete against foreign producers because of high milk costs and high labor costs.

The manufacture of our products, specialty cheese, cannot be performed by machinery. Therefore, two very important factors have to be considered:

1. The high level of skilled manual labor required, provides for a resultant high level of geographical area, employment, which when jeopardized by cheap imports could cause severe economic distress.

2. These necessary employees, of course, are paid wages that far exceed those paid to their opposite number in foreign countries. And, you probably agree that it is not the aim of our Government to create several classes of labor.

Our Government supports the price of milk at a level well above world prices. This is the floor price at which American milk enters the processing plant. Congress in passing the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, included section 22 to prevent agricultural imports from interferring with the price-support program. I'm sure we are all agreed that Congress had no desire or intention of fixing ceiling prices on agricultural products in general or dairy products in particular. Countries exporting cheese to the United States are in effect putting a ceiling price on like products produced in America. The landed price plus duty of imports fixes the ceiling price at which like American products can enter the wholesale level of our own market. This then, is in effect the ceiling for American products produced from milk at higher than world prices, plus labor as much as five times these factors in the foreign-made products. Any reduction in duty would in effect lower this ceiling, making it impossible for the American product to compete.

Witness during the campaign to sell the trade bill to the public and legislators the emphasis on using trade not aid to contain Communist gains within the Sino-Soviet bloc trading group. Witness today the new approach in checking the Soviet and its satellite members; we are selling them wheat and the excuse is primarily one of economic reasons. I believe that any tariff program should have one essential purpose; to improve the competitive position of the United States in world trade.

We feel that the U.S. Department of State is acting independently of the best interests of the American farmers, workers, and processors. This inconsiderate policy produces a feeling in the minds of these people that small industries, such as ours, are expended with little if any consideration. The State Department has given away American taxpayer's money to foreign industrialists, enabling them to plague the American market.

There are endless arguments to be made in behalf of protecting the American farmers market, American labor, American industry and the most comfortable standard of living in the world. They all boil down to, self-preservation being the first law of man and Americans should not flinch from practicing under that law.

Extensive thought should be given to a study published by the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, dated February 1962, which stated that our overall tariff levels are currently only one-fifth of the rates that prevailed in the 1931-35 period, when Smoot-Hawley Tariffs were in effect. The results of the tariff reductions made during the thirties cannot be soundly evaluated because of World War II, and further reductions since the war have been obscured by the great outflow of foreign aid, both military and civilian, to war damaged nations.

In the words of the survey:

"It is none the less apparent that American leadership in the present phase of liberalization should be emphasizing gaining concessions, rather than giving them."

After a generation of generosity at the negotiation table it is high time for our friends and allies to consider what they can do for America in return for past favors.

With less than 4 percent of our gross national product finding its way into our export program, it is not difficult to understand the testimony of our Department of Commerce before the Ways and Means Committee, wherein it was said, that the Trade Expansion Act was indeed motivated politically.

Foreign dairy product manufacturers are keenly interested in our cheese market by virtue of the high profits that can be gained. They become very indignant when we attempt to point out to them that we have a domestic price support program to consider, and what the ultimate effects on that program would be, should the mild restrictions we presently impose on dairy product imports be suddenly destroyed for political reasons.

We are cognizant of the explosive growth of agricultural production in the Common Market countries, as well as Denmark and the Scandinavian countries. We fully realize that they couldn't begin to consume their over production which must be exported. Perhaps, they should consider production controls, such as our Government is investigating for our farmers. It is our belief that by raising the standard of living, via increased wages in Europe, that they could consume that portion of their dairy production that they now desire to ship to United States for the added profit.

The Common Market has adopted a common agricultural policy. They have already begun to implement tight import restrictions and seasonal embargoes against agricultural imports that would interfere with their own farm price support programs. They protect their programs far more effectively than we do our programs.

They continually attempt to and often succeed in circumventing our import controls, whereas, the same opportunity does not even exist for us.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, was enacted to make certain that we have at our disposal the tools to combat the importation of farm products that would materially interfere with our price support program. Fortunately, the Department of Agriculture is cognizant of this fact. We agree with the Department's position and recognize the attempts of other Federal Departments to frustrate the Department of Agricutlure's watch-dog status with regard to section 22.

It is common knowledge that a tremendous amount of our exports of agricultural products have been either subsidized or giveaways under Public Law 480, a program which cost the American Government an enormous amount of money. This fact alone should certainly impress this committee, that a more realistic view is needed with regard to raising tariff rates and lowering quotas as long as present policies exist in those nations with whom we are going to negotiate.

Millions of pounds of foreign produced cheese enter the American market each year. This cheese displaces domestically produced cheese, whether the imported cheese is made from cows' or sheep's milk. Milk that would have otherwise been used for the domestic production of specialty cheese, displaced to the market, must eventually find its way into Commodity Credit Corporation purchases in the form of Cheddar cheese, nonfat dry milk,

or butter, adding to the U.S. taxpayers' burden.

As a specific example of what is under consideration by this committee with regard to the negotiation of tariff and quotas, etc., I offer as evidence in our experience in this area, starting early in 1963, we embarked on an investigation of the possibility of selling the specialty cheeses which we manufacture, namely, blue cheese, provolone (in many sizes and shapes), gorgonzola, romano, parmesan, and mozzarella cheese. We were of the opinion that we could create a new market for these products, especially in those nations that have a high per-capita consumption of these types of cheese, countries such as France, England, Denmark, Italy, and West Germany. We assumed then and still believe that our products could share in these markets without difficulty. In our investigation we contacted the Department of Agriculture and in July 1963, were informed by officials of the Department that because of rigid import restriction in these countries, the chance of our ever exporting any of our specialty cheeses on a commercial basis was, for all practical purposes, hopeless.

We have offered this example to demonstrate the inequitable position that we as a trading nation, find ourselves in. We are invited to appear and participate at GATT conferences. Whereas, you can see from the above example, we really have relatively nothing to bargain with. Our doors, in comparison to the other participating nations, are literally, even at the present time, wide open.

In view of all that is said here, the only conclusion we can reach is to instruct our negotiators to aprpoach GATT conferences with extreme caution.

My statement has to this point reflected the interest of my company and our industry. However, I think that even when we consider the whole spectrum of GATT conferences and their potentials, I can hardly understand how we can ever achieve any benefit for our country. You all know the old rule of thumb: Enter the poker game with at least a like amount of chips as one of the other players and this, as you know, is impossible for us to do under the present circumstances.

We must stand pat or withdraw from the game with regard to the following items of the U.S. tariff schedules: 117.00, 117.05, 117.45, 117.50, 117.55, 117.65, 117.67, 117.70.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK J. KLENSCH,

Executive Vice President, Tolibia Cheese Manufacturing Corp.

John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, both on my own behalf and in behalf of the people of western South Dakota I join my colleagues in expressing our grief and sorrow at the unconscionable assissination of John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States.

While I liked and admired the man and his exceptional ability, I disliked and disapproved of many of his policies and programs. At the same time, however, I, as did many of my colleagues, recognized the personal ability and personal influence of this brilliant young man struck down in the prime of life.

I extend our sympathy to his widow and our deep feeling of compassion to his children who have thus had their father snatched from them.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as we sit in this Chamber, each with a heavy heart, it is most difficult for me to realize that John F. Kennedy is dead.

Less than an hour before he was assassinated, he joined 8 or 10 of his friends on his airplane as it was preparing to set down in Dallas. He was cheerful and deeply appreciative of the warm and tremendously large reception he had received in San Antonio, Houston, and Fort Worth. He was anxiously awaiting the same warm reception by thousands of people in Dallas.

His death instantaneously brought to the surface the deep fundamental respect, admiration and devotion which the people of the United States and nearly every foreign country felt for him. That devotion, respect and appreciation of the man and his great work will make his memory stand out in American and world history. I shall not mention here his renowned works—volumes can and will be written on that subject.

I had the high honor and privilege of introducing him in Houston to a crowd of some 3,500 diners and one of the largest radio and television audiences on record in Houston, some 14 hours before his death. At that time I said, "This great leader will go down in history as one of the greatest men the United States has produced."

The human response to his tragic death from all over our Nation and the world clearly indicates that history will record John F. Kennedy, alongside George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, as one of our greatest Americans and one of our greatest Presidents.

My family joins me in extending to one of the bravest women I have ever known, his wife, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, and to little Caroline and little brother, John, our sympathy and understanding in their great loss.

Decreasing Tariff on Foreign Dairy Products Would Further Complicate Domestic Dairy Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Tariff Commission opened public hearings this week in preparation for the sixth round of tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—scheduled to begin in Geneva next May. Under the basic negotiating authority contained in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the President is permitted to lower duties on imports by as much as 50 percent of the July 1962 rate.

However, in keeping with our democratic traditions, the Tariff Commission hearings are being held in order to give interested parties an opportunity to testify about the economic effects of possible tariff reductions on American industry. Final decision as to the articles on which the United States will negotiate will not be completed until the testimony presented at the hearings has been thoroughly reviewed and analyzed, and the President has received the views of the special representative for trade negotiations, the Tariff Commission, and other Government agencies.

Because of my longtime interest in and work with the problems and programs affecting dairy farmers, I submitted a statement to the Commission on the adverse effect which lower import duties on foreign dairy products would have on domestic production. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LESTER JOHNSON, OF WISCONSIN, AT U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION HEARINGS

The dairy problem has been with us for a long time. It can be summarized as a situation in which the amount of milk produced exceeds the amount of milk which can be sold on the commercial market at prices that result in an adequate return to dairy farmers for their labor and investment. In 1961, net income for seven groups of commercial dairy farms in different parts of the country averaged nearly $2,500 less than the average annual wages of $4,802 for factory workers.

While the number of milk cows has declined more than 2 percent annually during the past decade, this decrease in milk cow numbers has been more than offset by the increase in milk production per cow. Milk output has increased at an annual rate of about 200 pounds per cow during the past 10 years.

The current national production level of 7,370 pounds per cow is well below the inherent potential of cows to produce. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the present annual increase in milk production per cow will do anything but continue. Mat-

ter of fact, with dairy income in such a depressed state, increasing numbers of farmers are likely to exploit the potential of their dairy herd in order to improve incomes.

The rise in milk production and the subsequent increase in our supply of dairy products has been going on at an irregular pace for the past four decades. Since 1924, this increase has averaged around a billion pounds per year, or about 1 percent. Milk production rose dramatically from 1960 to 1962 following a period of decline. The increase totaled about 1 billion pounds in 1960 and nearly 2.5 billion pounds in 1961.

To further complicate an already complicated situation, the per capita consumption of dairy products has been on the decline since the 1930's, with the exception of the wartime period in the early 1940's. In 1962, consumption of dairy products per person was only 76 percent of the peak in 1931 and 86 percent of the 1957 level. This downward trend in per capita consumption is expected to continue, thus eliminating the possibility that our growing population will take care of the dairy surplus and the dairy problem.

Various Federal programs designed to improve the dairy situation have been in effect since the early 1930's. Following the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up to carry out the Government price-support purchase and loan operations. This was the first major effort to improve milk prices through Government purchases of surplus dairy products.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 made support prices for milk and butterfat mandatory at levels between 75 percent and 90 percent of parity. The Secretary of Agriculture was given discretion to establish the parity price level within that range for each marketing year. The Government buys surplus butter, American cheese, and nonfat dry milk to maintain the established parity prices for manufacturing milk and butterfat.

Prior to 1949, Government purchase of dairy products under the price support programs were relatively small. In fact, they amounted to the equivalent of a billion pounds of milk in only 1 year during this period.

However, since 1949, the picture has changed drastically for the worse. Purchases have exceeded the equivalent of a billion pounds of milk in 13 of the past 14 years. In the 1953–54 marketing year—and again in 1961–62 and 1962–63—these dairy price-support purchases were equivalent to more than 10 billion pounds of milk. The sudden upturn in purchases in the 1961–62 marketing year reflected both the increase in milk production and the decrease in milk consumption.

During the 1962 fiscal year, the Commodity Credit Corporation spent a record $602.9 million on dairy price support programs. This figure does not include the $89.2 million spent that year for the special school milk program. Preliminary figures for the 1963 fiscal year indicate a $471.6 million expenditure for dairy support activities, plus the $93.9 million which were spent for the special school milk program.

At the U.S. Department of Agriculture's 41st Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference, held last month here in Washington, D.C., the economists painted an equally unpromising picture for the dairy industry for the coming year. According to the report titled "Outlook for Dairy Products in 1964 and Beyond," dairy production will equal 1963 levels, commercial demand will increase less than the population, and excess dairy products will continue to move to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In other words, the dairy problem will still be with us in 1964 and beyond. Frankly, I cannot see any sense in compounding that already complex problem by lowering the import duty on cheese and other dairy products, thus opening the door to a flood of dairy imports.

The heart of the problem is summed up neatly by Truman Graf of the University of Wisconsin, Glynn McBride of Michigan State College, and Robert Story of Cornell University, in their excellent publication, "An Investigation of the Dairy Problem and Analysis of Selected Program Alternatives."

They point out: "Since the demand for milk and dairy products is relatively inelastic, increases in aggregate supply would cause sharp reductions in farm prices in the absence of Government supports. For example, an increase in supply of 1 percent would be expected to reduce the farm price of milk by 3 or 4 percent in clearing markets."

If a housewife who is shopping for a pound of cheese picks an imported cheese, she is not going to buy a second pound of domestic cheese. The domestic cheese which has been displaced by its imported counterpart must find a home somewhere.

Under the provisions of our dairy price support program, that home will likely be a Government warehouse. There the displaced domestic cheese, which has been purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation with Federal funds, will be housed at the taxpayers' expense. I see no reason why our tax dollars should be spent to subsidize foreign dairy production.

As chairman of the House Dairy Subcommittee, I have held extensive hearings this year on various proposals aimed at raising the income of our dairy farmers, reducing our dairy surpluses and cutting the cost to taxpayers of the purchase and storage of surplus dairy products. If you have ever milked a cow, you know that the left hand has to work with the right hand in order to get the desired results. Lowering the tariff on dairy products would be a perfect example of the left hand working against the right hand.

In June of 1961, my colleague in the House, Congressman JOHN DENT of Pennsylvania, brought his Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment to Wisconsin for emergency field hearings on a proposal then before the U.S. Tariff Commission to increase the import quotas on cheddar and blue-mold cheese. As I pointed out at those hearings, the importation of more foreign cheese would have a very harmful effect not only on the farmers who supply the milk to the cheese factories, but on the number of dairy plants and their employees as well.

Since 1950, the number of dairy plants and cheese factories in Wisconsin has dropped sharply. In 1951, a total of 2,102 dairy plants were in operation in my home State. By 1960, this figure had dropped to 1,302. Likewise, the number of cheese factories declined from 1,279 in 1950 to only 823 in 1959. Unfortunately, this trend is continuing.

We all know what happens to the small-town businessman when farmers and dairy plant employees do not have money to spend for groceries, clothing, automobiles, gasoline and so forth. The cash registers ring less frequently and less merrily on Main Street, U.S.A.

I have gone to considerable lengths to detail the dairy problem—past, present, and future—for I feel that this background information is essential for a clear understanding of how adversely a cut in import duties would affect our Nation's dairy industry. That it is an important industry is underlined by the fact that about 14 percent of the Nation's total cash farm receipts comes from milk and dairy products, providing a leading source of agricultural income which is spread throughout virtually every State in the Union.

Thank you.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation, yes, even the world was shocked at the untimely passing of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States.

The ensuing grief and bewilderment which an assassin's bullet brought transcends party lines, and persons from all walks of life, both Republican and Democrat, have asked the question which confounds us all—why must it be? Only the passing of time and history itself will record what his place may be.

It is only honest to say that many Americans did not concur with his interests. I would be less than candid if I did not point out that my concept of the role of Government differed with his, and though on occasion I took exception with his philosophy of government, never at any time did I question his sincerity or motives in desiring to reach his objectives.

While I differed with him I respected his viewpoint as I am sure he was always able to see the other person's view. There were no sour grapes in the spirit of John Kennedy.

No one can deny that he was active and aggressive in the pursuit of endeavoring to bring his programs to fruition. Most certainly he was a thoughtful and engaging young man.

A man of great determination, gay, friendly, and happy—ambitious beyond end but apparently always willing to listen to reason.

I am sure that he was the leader of a generation who felt he must contribute something to the fulfillment of an American dream. This he attempted to do.

Surely he will be missed, and I am sure, while we mourn his passing, we shall always remember the fullness of his patriotism and the untiring dedication he gave to his country's interest.

Pennsylvania State Senate Resolution 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to present Senate Resolution 9, introduced in the Senate of Pennsylvania, on December 2, 1963, by the Honorable William J. Lane and James S. Berger, in memory of our beloved President, as follows:

RESOLUTION

DECEMBER 2, 1963.

The 22d day of November will go down in history as the anniversary of the day that the people of the world were thrown into deep sorrow upon hearing of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It was a day of sadness for all and will linger in the minds of mankind for many years to come.

It would be most fitting for the Congress of the United States to set aside November 22 of each year as a day when the people of our Nation can rededicate themselves to the ideals which were set forth by our 35th President; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate in Washington, D.C., as well as each Member of the Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution Serial No. 9, introduced by Senators William J. Lane and James S. Berger on behalf of the entire membership of the senate and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 2d day of December, 1963.

MARK GRUELL, JR.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

IN

Pr
Ap
ap
(V

w
as

no
Fr

m
th
w
W

sh
co

sh
be
se
h
co

S

a
D
S

A
t

i
h

r
s
v

s
D

D

D

D

Appendix

A Death in the Afternoon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an item which appeared recently in the St. Albans (W. Va.) Advertiser.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEATH IN THE AFTERNOON

(By Deane Morrison)

In Dallas, Tex., President John F. Kennedy is shot to death on the afternoon of Friday, November 22, 1963.

That death in the afternoon was the most tragic episode involving a President of the United States since Abraham Lincoln was mortally wounded in Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C., 100 years ago.

Millions of people the world over were shocked and saddened by the vicious, brutal, coldblooded murder of our President.

It is indeed a terrible tragedy that there should be in this Nation an individual so unbalanced, so twisted and torn in his heart, so demented in his mind and emotions, that he would take a powerful rifle and with it commit such a wicked and evil crime.

John F. Kennedy and his wife came to St. Albans on the evening of April 30, 1960.

At that time, of course, Mr. Kennedy was a candidate for the nomination, on the Democratic ticket, of President of the United States.

Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy appeared at the St. Albans Junior High School Auditorium and there both of them spoke briefly.

On that evening Mr. Kennedy had a severe infection of the throat, and for that reason he did not speak as long as he had intended.

Nevertheless he did speak for a few moments, and many local people heard him, and heard Mrs. Kennedy, and shook hands with them and talked to them briefly.

This is a great Nation, a great country, and President John F. Kennedy became a part of its history.

His death is a great tragedy.

President John F. Kennedy was the most powerful individual in the modern world.

Both those who agreed with him and supported him, and those who disagreed with him and fought him, were all saddened and outraged and shocked by his death.

Written in St. Albans by Deane Morrison on November 23, 1963.

"Skoal"

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in all our history nothing has so shocked the Nation and the world as the tragic death of our beloved leader.

When the annals of these critical days are written, he will rank as one of the greatest in that long line of distinguished men who have occupied the office of the Presidency down to this or any future time.

But had John F. Kennedy never been President, he still would have been one of the outstanding men of his time.

Every war has produced heroes, and the legendary stories of heroic accomplishments have come down to us from every battlefield. Lieutenant Kennedy's remarkable salvage of every man of his command when survival seemed hopeless, after PT boat No. 109 had been lost by enemy action, is one of the all but incredible achievements of the war. And he carried to the end the disabilities incurred in that historic disaster.

He was a most uncommon man—a man of engaging presence and magnetic personality. It was said of him that he walked like a prince and talked like a scholar. He was indeed a scholarly man. In addition to other notable academic honors, both during and after his undergraduate days, he wrote a book at that early age, "Why England Slept," of such unusual merit that it was in demand throughout Europe and America. His "Profiles in Courage" was awarded the Pulitzer Prize. And, of course, his "Strategy of Peace" is found in every library in America and Western Europe.

Among the leaders of the world, among all the executives of state, kings, presidents, and premiers, who today direct the affairs of nations, he was outstanding, not only in position and prestige and power, but in the realization of great ideals and aspirations in national and international precepts and policies.

The devotion and majestic dignity of Mrs. Kennedy at the most tragic crisis of her life, in the greatest bereavement that could befall her, add lustre and laurel to the family and the Nation on this terrible occasion. To her and the children we extend our deepest sympathy. Our hearts go out to them.

But the man who struck him down did even a greater disservice to our form of government. The strength of democracy depends on the acquiescence of those who in a campaign have differed from the verdict of the voting majority. President Kennedy, above all others was a notable example in that respect. When at the Chicago Convention in 1956 he lost by the narrowest possible margin—it could not have been closer—the nomination for the Vice-Presidency of the United States, he accepted it smilingly, without evidence of regret or disappointment, and cooperated in that campaign as heartily as if he had himself been on the ticket.

This untoward act of force and violence has served to disturb the long-established custom by which, after every election, however bitterly contested, we conform and concur, regardless of any previous convictions we may have had or statements we may have made, in the decision of the majority. This is the soul and essence of democracy and democratic government.

It is a relief to know that this unspeakable crime was the individual act of one twisted and disordered mind and that no party or faction or group or organization prompted or promoted it. It was insanity. It was not American.

The Nation still lives. And he still lives—in the hearts and memory of the people—in the enhanced stability of the Government to which in his brief administration he gave such added impetus, and for which he died.

It is for us who are left behind to close ranks, to present a united front and "to continue," as he admonished, in the development and achievement of loyal and patriotic citizenship.

He died as he would have preferred to die—in the press of strenuous events—in the harness and with his face to the front—on the crest of recovery from threatened recession—and in the hour of his greatest fame and acclaim. Skoal.

Memorial Services for President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a beautiful eulogy given by Elder Bryant A. Alder at the memorial services honoring President Kennedy, held in Portland West Stake, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, on Monday, November 25, 1963.

I have found it to be a very moving eulogy and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY HELD IN PORTLAND WEST STAKE, CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS, NOVEMBER 25, 1963

For the past 72 hours, through the medium of radio, television, and the printed word, we have been witness to a historic incident—one in which America needs to bow its head in sorrow and shame. The assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy brings to all Americans the full measure of grief which each of us experiences in the loss of a loved one. And at the same time causes us to bow our heads in shame that this could happen, as it has done to three other Presidents, in this cultured and democratic land.

This day has been declared by our new President as a day of mourning for our late President. There has already been much mourning—there will undoubtedly be much more in the days to come. No more than has already been said could possibly be said here, of value, of the merits of the man who has been lost, or the principles that have been jeopardized by this unspeakable act in Dallas, Tex.

Anything which I might say regarding his accomplishments would be secondhand and merely repetitious—but this is an hour of great tragedy, grief, and personal loss to every citizen of this great country. And so it is only proper that we gather here, at the recommendation of the president of this great church, to pay our honor and respects to the memory of the young, fallen President. Whatever political beliefs we may individually possess, or whatever our differences of opinion might have been on various subjects—on this particular occasion we are all united.

In the few short years he walked on this earth, President Kennedy realized an almost incredible number of accomplishments, and will be remembered unpredictably far into the future for his dedication to the call which was made of him to direct the affairs of this Nation.

Probably a summary of his attitude could be expressed in one statement made in his inaugural address: "Ask not what your country can do for you—but what you can do for your country." And certainly no man could give more for his country than his life.

But our thoughts today should be more with those who mourn him in the close relationship of life—his family and loved ones. In the minds of many people when they see a talented and gifted young person such as this taken prematurely in life, the question naturally arises: "Why did God snatch him away from this earth?"—and the answer might come that when you go forth into your flower garden to pick a bouquet, you never select the withered and drooping flowers, but always look for the brightest and gayest buds and fresh blossoms. Maybe God does that at times, too. If heaven is just an extension at a higher level of what we see here on earth, then heaven is not solely an old people's home. It must also contain babies, and toddlers, and teenagers, and young people—not just the aged.

Certainly, as taught by all the prophets of ancient and modern times, Mrs. Kennedy and her children can expect to be reunited with their husband and father at some later date. Life here on earth would hold very little promise if this were not so. Surely, if one can judge by their outward demonstration of devotion to their beliefs, they believe in God and the resurrection which Jesus underwent here on earth.

Of course, that doesn't stop their tears or their mourning. Neither did it prevent Jesus from weeping at the tomb of his friend, Lazarus. For farewells are fraught with sadness, even while we realize we are under the everlasting will of God.

As Latter-day Saints we believe in a literal resurrection. We do not entertain the idea, as many in the world do, that the resurrection will be a spiritual one only. The promise of the Lord is that we shall receive our bodies again. We look upon death merely as a temporary separation of the spirit and the body. We do not look upon death as the end of our individual existence. On the contrary, knowing Christ to be our prototype, we have the assurance that death is only temporary, and that there will come a time after death when we shall again receive these same bodies which we possess here upon the earth, and that the union of spirit and body shall never be dissolved. The bodies we shall receive will be immortal, and the spirit and body united will constitute a living soul—and this should offer to Mrs. Kennedy and all those who mourn great solace and comfort.

This is the time when every man, woman, and child under the protection and blessing of free government should bow his head in prayer of rededication to all that we hold so dear. It is so easy to take for granted all the good our country gives us. It is so easy to become involved in unimportant details of minor individual interests that we forget, or fail to appreciate, the tremendous magnitude of the rights and privileges granted us by our Constitution. The greatness of the United States as an outstanding, dynamic, and progressive nation, lies in the sound principles of the American Constitution. Some people may still argue that our Constitution is not a perfect one. This statement does not contain a great amount of evil, due to the fact that if this be true, there are methods of changing it as has been done in the past. Our greatest concern should be that these changes—if changes become necessary—are made for the benefit and interest of all people.

At this particular time, probably every American is asking what influence will this incident have upon the future of this country—and if I were to editorialize certainly the only answer that can be given is that his death is a tragedy of unknown proportion—it may shape the course of our lives in ways we do not now understand. However, the days and weeks which follow will require that all men, whether in high positions of Government leadership, or just we as ordinarily citizens, demonstrate our faith in the strength of the United States system of government.

"This is our country." Almost 190 million American people should thrill with the significance of these four humble words, "This is my country." America is a land of promise. It is a land choice above all other lands upon the face of the earth—and we as Latter-Day Saints have far greater understanding and appreciation of this statement than does any other group. The men and women who have taken an active part in the building of these United States have made contributions to our lives far greater than our abilities to ever comprehend and appreciate.

Yes, we have lost a President this day—but we have not lost a country, or a nation, or the principles thereof. Tragically, Mr. Kennedy did not have time to prove what his place in history might become. But he will be remembered as a courageous leader, one who proved his bravery in the face of death as a naval lieutenant in World War II, and who in the White House has faced crises after crises with the same kind of bravery. His insistence in recent months to want to get close to the people and shake their hands was a source of great concern to the members of the security guard, and probably his own reluctance to use special protective measures in the motorcade was a contributing factor in his death.

The President is a martyr to the causes in which he believed. Nothing that happens from now on can take this role away from him. He accomplished a great many things in a few years he walked in this life. These things will remain as a tribute to him.

In II Timothy is recorded a statement which probably best expresses the sentiments that John F. Kennedy would have felt prior to his leaving us. "The time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love His appearing."

I think Edgar A. Guest best explains what we must do when sorrow comes:

"WHEN SORROW COMES

"When sorrow comes, as come it must,
In God a man must place his trust.
There is no power in mortal speech
The anguish of his soul to reach.
No voice, however sweet and low,
Can comfort him or ease the blow.

"He cannot from his fellow men
Take strength that will sustain him then.
With all that kindly hands will do,
And all that love may offer, too,
He must believe throughout the test
That God has willed it for the best.

"We who would be his friends are dumb;
Words from our lips but feebly come.
We feel, as we extend our hands
That one power only understands
And truly knows the reason why
Such a man as this must die.

"We realize how helpless then
Are all the gifts of mortal men.
No words which we have power to say
Can take the sting of grief away.
That power which marks the sparrow's fall
Must comfort and sustain us all.

"When sorrow comes as come it must,
In God a man must place his trust.
With all the wealth which he may own,
He cannot meet the test alone.
And only he may stand serene
Who has a faith on which to lean."

I think our united prayer this day should be to rededicate ourselves to a determination to help keep this Nation forever free, a place where men and women can build homes and rear families with faith and confidence. I would hope that we could rededicate ourselves to the determination to help keep this a land where children of all ages, sects, and creed, regardless of wealth, position, or family—may have the privileges of a free education.

I think that we should rededicate ourselves to living at peace with our families, our neighbors, and our associates, for no nation can be a happy, free nation, if its

people war among themselves in their domestic or neighborhood relationships.

And for those who are responsible for the tragedy which permits us to assemble this day, I think we should recall the words of the Lord given to our modern prophet: "My disciples, in days of old, sought occasion against one another and forgave not one another in their hearts; and for this evil they were afflicted and sorely chastened. Wherefore, I say unto you, that ye ought to forgive one another; for he that forgiveth not his brother his trespasses standeth condemned before the Lord; for there remaineth in him the greater sin. I, the Lord, will forgive whom I will forgive, but of you it is required to forgive all men. And ye ought to say in your hearts—Let God judge between me and thee, and reward thee according to thy deeds." (Doctrine and Covenants 64: 8–11).

The grief of the Kennedy family is shared by countless millions throughout the world. He has now taken his place among the great figures of the world. We can truthfully say that we are better off because he has passed our way. In the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

Let's Not Sing Like the Cuckoos Sing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column entitled "Let's Not Sing Like the Cuckoos Sing" by Tom Donnelly, which appeared in the December 4, 1963, issue of the Washington Daily News. It seems to me that the column is a timely and thoughtful one.

The article follows:

LET'S NOT SING LIKE THE CUCKOOS SING

(By Tom Donnelly)

Some people are saying that a climate of racial and political bigotry, and the rantings of the hatemongers, are directly responsible for the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Others are saying that the assassin was a madman who lived in a world all his own, and that the far right has no particular guilt.

The members of the latter group point out that, after all, the assassin was a leftwinger, and the members of the first group say that the prevailing atmosphere is sufficiently poisonous to inspire any extremist to violence.

Those who view the assassin as having no connection with anything, except maybe the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, insist that "America can't be blamed," nor can any part of America, including Dallas. (The defenders of Dallas as a quiet, nice, though conservative, community are having an extremely awkward time of it these days, what with bomb threats against ministers and other continuing incivilities.)

The case for Oswald as a creature of the prevailing moral climate may not be airtight, but it seems to me there is a lot to be said on this side of the debate. And one thing that can surely be said is that it wouldn't do any harm at all to clean up the atmosphere, regardless of where the primary blame is placed.

Soul searching is probably something a nation does only in moments of great crisis, or in the aftermath. What we need is headwork, on a day-in, day-out basis. Now here's something all men of good will can attempt. In the process, one hopes, the extremist will wind up in quarantine.

For a start, how about calling things by their right names?

Newspaper reporters might stop routinely identifying crackpot outfits as "anti-Communist groups." As in: "The Save America Before It's Too Late Committee, an anti-Communist group, today charged that the Pleasant Park High School English department is feeding the freshman class a diet of Dreiser, Sinclair Lewis, and Herman Melville."

Why not write: "The Save America Before It's Too Late Committee, a 'Let's impeach Earl Warren' group."

Or, "An antifluoridation group."

Let's assume, as we have every right to, that very few groups in this country are "pro-Communist," and that groups that have never done anything braver than charge Cabinet members with being takers of Moscow gold aren't entitled to the dignity of an anti-Communist classification.

Surely there must be some nonviolent way of discouraging people who swear that any man we happen to have in the White House is busy selling our great Nation to the enemy? In the past, such people have been invited out socially, to say nothing of commercially, by other people who do not hold such views but assume that being a cuckoo doesn't, somehow, disqualify a man from serving as treasurer of any community endeavor. I say let the cuckoos flock together. All by themselves.

I know that school principals have their tactical problems in dealing with board members and the public. Still, they might take a braver stand when loudmouthed disrupters demand a hearing on the charge that their teenage daughter, Geraldine, has been subverted by exposure to authors somewhat meatier than, say, Norman Vincent Peale. They could try telling Geraldine's parents to get lost, or to take it to the Supreme Court. Well, perhaps they'd better not say that last. No-point Communist literature, including the novels of Theodore is going out of your way to get branded as a supporter of commie fronts.

Perhaps TV stations might devote 5 minutes every night to explaining the difference between fair comment and mad attack. Examples: If a public figure in any given community says the unbalanced budget is an abomination, that can be fitted under the heading of fair comment. If the man says the administration is bringing in a horde of Zulu warriors to invade Alabama, that's mad utterance.

Just little things, nothing spectacular. But they could add up. They wouldn't imperil freedom of speech, and they might make cuckooism just not very respectable.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Stresses the Importance of a Strong National Effort in Education as a Response to the Challenge of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in an article in the December issue of the Rotarian magazine, the Secretary of Labor, Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, made the following statement:

The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before.

The basic question is whether the new technology—including computers, atomic energy, space age developments, whole manufacturing processes controlled by automation—is outrunning the achievement of the U.S. school system in preparing our youngsters for the employment complexities of such an era. There is evidence that education and employment are falling out of step. We can no longer proceed upon the assumption that the principal mission of the school system is to prepare our young people for life in only its broadest sense.

Instead, we must begin giving intensive consideration to the role of the school in the basic preparation of individual employment skills. And because the matter is one of grave national consequence, some form of Federal action is clearly required. Such action is embodied in the National Education and Improvement Act of 1963, presently before the Congress.

I concur wholeheartedly with Secretary Wirtz in his assessment of the urgent need which confronts us in the field of education and in areas of retraining for those citizens displaced by technological expansion. It has long been my view that the gravity of this menace requires that immediate and imaginative steps be taken to insure that the most modern facilities and full educational opportunity are made available to all who seek them, and to those who need our encouragement and help in providing training for meaningful endeavors.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Labor, Education, and Employment and Manpower, it has been my privilege to participate in the consideration and revision of legislation designed to alleviate in part the shortcomings to which Secretary Wirtz refers. I am confident that measures enacted during this session will have significant value in raising the level of our educational system and in building increased public awareness of the needs which exist.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Education: Answer to Unemployment," by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, in the December 1963, issue of the Rotarian, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: ANSWER TO UNEMPLOYMENT

(By W. Willard Wirtz)

At one time, not so long ago, a man who was physically capable of working could usually find a job. Today, however, this is not so. A widening chasm lies between many of the unemployed and the jobs they seek, and more and more we are finding that the only bridge across it is education and training.

If a new axiom is needed, it's as simple—and persistent—as this: the less schooling, the less chance for a job. What is distressing about it is its provability, for among the 4 to 5 million U.S. unemployed are legions who don't have even the most modest academic tools.

Recent data show that in the United States more than 300,000 people looking for jobs had less than a fifth-grade education, and almost 1½ million had less than an eighth-grade education. People so ill prepared are

at an initial disadvantage in today's highly skilled labor market, and will become progressively more disadvantaged as the Nation pushes its way toward greater technological achievement.

The close correlation between unemployment and educational attainment can be seen in the monthly reports on the labor force. In March 1962, for instance, the unemployment rate was 9.2 percent for people with less than a grade-school education, but only 4 percent for those with some college education.

Earnings of workers are also relative to their educational attainment. A recent study by the Bureau of the Census reveals that additional schooling is clearly associated with a very substantial increase in lifetime income. Over a lifetime, the difference between the total earnings of men with 1 to 3 years of high school and those of high school graduates is better than $46,000. The difference in lifetime earnings between a high school graduate and a college graduate is close to $180,000. Urban males with 4 years or more of college education had annual incomes of $6,780 in 1958, as compared with the income of $2,504 for urban men with less than 8 years of schooling.

About three-fourths of the heads of families with incomes under $3,000 a year, had not completed high school. Approximately 58 percent of the family heads making $15,000 a year and over had some college education. Only 21 percent of family heads with incomes of $15,000 or more a year had not completed high school, the survey showed.

Facts such as these provide a picture of the increasingly tighter link between education and employment, a consequence, largely, of the complexity of so much modern work. Where there was once a place for the youth who left high school without a diploma, who took an unskilled job and worked his way up, today that place is filled, often, by a machine. That 700,000 16- to 21-year-old youths are presently out of school and out of work is dramatic evidence of this fact.

The future in the United States for the unskilled worker is dim.

Between 1950 and 1960, total employment in the United States went up 11 percent. During this period the number of "professional, technical, and kindred workers" increased 67 percent; and the number of "craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers" went up 12 percent. The number of laborers (not counting those on farms and in mines) went up only 4 percent.

Over the past 15 years, the percentage of white-collar workers in the work force has risen from 35 percent (1947) to 44 percent (1962). The percentage of blue-collar workers has dropped from 41 percent to 36 percent.

In the 10 years following 1952, the number of white-collar workers increased by about 7 million. The number of laborers (again leaving out the farm and mine group) went down by 150,000.

All this is a result primarily of the developments we lump together under "automation" and technological change. The casual, and classical, view of automation is that it creates as many jobs as it destroys, even more. If this is right at all—and there is increasing question about it—what it leaves out is that the new jobs almost all require some skill, whereas this was not true before.

The basic question is whether the new technology—including computers, atomic energy, space age developments, whole manufacturing processes controlled by "automation"—is outrunning the achievement of the U.S. school system in preparing our youngsters for the employment complexities of such an era. There is evidence that education and employment are falling out of step. We can no longer proceed upon the assumption that the principal mission of the school system is to prepare our young people for life in only its broadest sense.

Instead, we must begin giving intensive consideration to the role of the school in the basic preparation of individual employment skills. And because the matter is one of grave national consequence, some form of Federal action is clearly required. Such action is embodied in the National Education and Improvement Act of 1963, presently before the Congress.

This bill's provisions would help to underwrite a revitalized educational program for the Nation—ranging from improved teacher quality, to higher teachers' salaries, to college construction. Of great interest to the Department of Labor are provisions which would greatly strengthen the country's vocational-education system. The proposed law would moderize and expand the present program of Federal grants to the States in this field, and it would benefit far more individuals than is now possible. It would provide financial assistance for the implementation of a new and highly promising concept, the area vocational-educational school. It would assist the development of a large number of ancillary services, notably teacher training and teaching techniques and materials. Finally, it would establish a direct link between the vocational-education planning of the States and the employment-pattern appraisals of the local offices of the public employment service.

Behind all this is the intent to correlate a man's education and the productive role he is to play in an advanced industrial society. Such a purpose does not recoil from the fact that a problem of nationwide proportions is at hand. Nor does it seek to abrogate what are traditionally and constitutionally State and local responsibilities.

What is sought here is an acceptance of the challenge presented by the advance of technology. It recognizes that the Nation's present unacceptable rate of unemployment may climb even higher as a result of the inadequacies of our present school system.

Another Federal program based upon the same philosophy and equally important in terms of the dilemma is that of the Manpower Development and Training Act, administered by the Department of Labor. This program, a little more than a year old now, is directed toward the opening up of job-training opportunities to unemployed or underemployed workers all across the Nation.

Good as it is, however, the measure, as originally construed, leaves something to be desired. The law does not permit us, presently, to pay training allowances to jobless youths between the ages of 16 to 19, and limits the kind of an allowance we can pay to young people between 19 and 22. It also places a 5-percent ceiling on the amount of appropriated funds for the act which can be used for any aspect of youth training.

Amendments to the MDTA now being sought by the administration would lower the training-allowance age to 16 and increase the proportion of funds for youth training to 15 percent.

Some 26 million young people will pour into the U.S. labor market during this decade, and all of them will represent the mass product of the American school system. Only if the link between education and employment is strongly forged will the outlook for these youngsters be a bright one.

Our Nation's Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the widely circulated Enterprise Newspapers of California recently carried these inspirational words by columnist John Edwards:

I'M A TRIFLE SICK BUT NOT ASHAMED

(By John Edwards)

I am a trifle sick inside. From all the news media come the shrieks of shame, remorse, and guilt. I do not feel guilty. A man has been assassinated and they seem to decry the Nation that gave breathing space to the assassin. I don't feel this way.

I don't feel ashamed of this Nation. I don't feel ashamed of Texas and I don't feel ashamed of Dallas. I am a little weary of breast beating, and assumptions that I should do penance.

This Nation did not kill Mr. John F. Kennedy. This Nation held the man in such high regard that it gave him the highest award an American can aspire to, the Presidency of the United States. We gave him our trust and our faith in his ability. And rightly so.

We, this Nation, did not kill this man. Many of us disagreed with his policies. I am sure that he certainly would have disagreed with many of mine. Yet this Nation did not rise in anger and strike him down. We never thought of killing as a solution. We patiently waited for an election and our right to disagree at the polls.

This Nation did not kill its President, and it does not have to feel shame. It does not have to do penance.

Look. I'm going to tell you something about this thing that happened. A man aimed a killer gun. A man squeezed off three shots. A great and good man died. A father died. A son died. I can feel no shame over this happening. I can feel dismay, disgust, and anger. Not shame.

Just you remember that the Nation that spawned the killer also bore the son that died. The idiot that pulled the trigger was mad. Mad as a hatter. He struck at you and me, at all of us who make up this Republic.

He beat at the very blood and bones of America. He sneered at you, at me, at all of us, who believe passionately that we have a government the like of which the world has never seen.

By heaven, we embrace every man. Far left and far right. We have nothing to fear. We are America. We are these United States. We have been around for 188 years. We have had four assassinations. What's more we shall probably have others in the future, so long as we are a conglomerate mass of individuals, not units of a system.

By God, each and every one of us is the system. We have more or less agreed to abide by the law. We are the law. Every 4 years we change a man at our discretion. What's more, the loser doesn't have to stand against a wall because he opposed the man in power. The loser doesn't have to take a powder into exile.

You see, we have a right to an opinion, and we have a right to say it. This is the system that bred a man called John Kennedy. It also bred a man called Lee Oswald. It also bred a man called "Ruby." This Nation has a system that can't possibly work, but it does.

It has amalgamated, homegenized the ungodliest grouping of individuals in this world, and united them under a Constitution that works. It works because of, not in spite of.

Because we are the peoples we are. Because we are individuals. Because we are bigoted. Because we are prejudiced. Because we are opinionated. Because such a system has in the past, and always shall, breed some few unstable, some few mad, some few incredibly insane. Not all, though. Not at all, not all of us are incredibly insane.

Good God Almighty, fellow citizens, I beg of you to remember your birthright. Liberty for the individual. A nation under God. A nation of law. A nation of order.

Even now in the good city of Dallas, in the fine State of Texas, in the great Nation of the United States, a man awaits trial for the shooting of a suspected assassin. His right under the law, under the Constitution, granted him by your belief that a man is innocent until proven guilty in a court of law.

Had the assassin lived, he, too, would have been granted the same rights. Not because it is written, but because you make it so.

I shall abhor the man and the assassin's bullet who chopped down John F. Kennedy. I shall with my dying breath eulogize this country, this razzle-dazzle, greathearted, magnificent, wonderful, crazy, impossible system that works with all the odds against it.

No, my fellows, my friends, I am not ashamed.

I will not hang my head in shame over the act of a madman.

I will sorrow for the man who was assassinated, and with tears of sorrow in these eyes I shall shout great hosannas to a Nation that gave birth to such a son.

A country that has proven, and with God's help will continue to prove that, "This Nation under God shall not perish from the earth."

Twenty-second Anniversary of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 14, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 22d anniversary of the day that the late President Roosevelt said "shall live in infamy." It was 22 years ago today that the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and plunged this Nation into the most costly war in the history of civilization, not only in terms of dollars but in terms of lives lost.

This was a war that could have been avoided had mankind heeded the warnings of those leaders who believed in freedom and dignity. Our own American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as early as 1937 warned against the rise of the dictators in Europe and the Far East.

But the world was in no mood to listen.

The seeds of World War II were again clearly visible at Munich when Prime Minister Chamberlain agreed to capitulate to Hitler. Again, the world was in no mood to listen.

The years just before Pearl Harbor are replete with volumes of evidence clearly showing the diabolical intentions of Hitler and his storm troopers. But again, the world was in no mood to listen.

On September 1, 1939, when Hitler's storm troopers plowed through Poland, we again had a clear and concise warning of things to come. But even at this late date, the world was in no mood to listen.

The thousands of American boys and fighters for freedom from all nations of the world could have been spared had the world been willing to recognize its responsibility with courage.

Here on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the National Archives Building, those two imposing monuments constantly remind us that "What is past is prolog. Study the past."

Mr. Speaker, this day shall pass in vain unless we Americans can pause to reflect upon the lessons of the past.

Our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, tried to marshal the forces of courage in America to recognize the fact that only through strength and preparedness can we pave the way toward a lasting peace.

President Kennedy has stated so magnificently his principles when he stated:

> Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

President Kennedy well knew that World War II was the result of a world which had failed and refused to prepare itself against despotic aggression. He had welded our Military Establishment into the most awesome defense complex in the world. He did this to make good on his magnificent pledge:

> Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate.

We can find comfort on this 22d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, in that President Lyndon Johnson feels the same deep understanding for the need of a strong Military Establishment.

In his first message to a joint session of the Congress, President Johnson has quite properly warned our would-be adversaries not to test our patience.

Mr. Speaker, let us bow our heads in reverence to those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor and the harrowing years that followed. But let us also at once, on this 22d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, pay our respect to those gallant Americans, both in the military and the civilian sector, whose heroic contribution made victory ultimately possible. Let not the 22 years dull our memory.

The words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt are as livid today as they were on December 7, 1941, when he said that day shall live in infamy.

"There Was a Camelot"

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, thousands of brilliant words have been spoken and written in tribute to President Kennedy—for his magnificent leadership, brilliance, and humanity. I, too, want to join the distinguished leaders of this House of Representatives in paying a deep and sincere tribute to President Kennedy and to his courageous widow.

From my own heart, and from the hearts of the sorrowing people of my district, comes the deepest sympathy and our love to Mrs. Kennedy.

One single, simple sentence speaks eloquently for so many of us—the moving words of Theodore White in this week's Life magazine: "for one brief, shining moment there was a Camelot." These words will forever bring me the memory of faces, young and old, as they passed through our Capitol where the body of our President lay on that ice-cold November night—faces sorrowing; yet in their way reflecting some essence of the great spirit John Fitzgerald Kennedy left mankind. The spirit which was a shining symbol of faith and hope in a brighter, better world. Those faces said that they, too, saw Camelot.

Sermon by Rev. James Comfort Smith on the Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will be moved and inspired after reading the beautiful sermon delivered on the Sunday following President Kennedy's tragic assassination by my friend, the distinguished clergyman and leading citizen of the Seventh California District, the Reverend James Comfort Smith, of St. John's Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Calif.

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(A sermon presented at St. John's Presbyterian Church, Berkeley, Calif., November 24, 1963 by the Reverend James Comfort Smith)

On this Thanksgiving Sunday of 1963, it would be fatuous foolishness and, perhaps, a kind of theological quibbling for us to speak in terms of thanksgiving. In any case, I felt no inclination to think with you about the matters that I had originally planned and prepared for this day. There is no blinking the fact that our country has sustained a great and lasting loss, and that under circumstances which have shamed and angered and frightened us all. I sat in my study yesterday morning seeking for some word I might bring you. There have been so many words, packed so tightly into these past 48 hours, words spoken in shock, in grief, almost in disbelief of the fact that we as a people have been forced to face. There has not yet been time to reflect in any real depth on what the death of Mr. Kennedy will mean both to our Nation and our world. None of us has the right to assume too much of a prophetic role, and we would be fools to try.

Even to ask why this thing should have been allowed to happen is in a sense an idle question. It will be asked, of course; each one of us, probably, in his own heart, has asked it, whether he has verbalized it or not. Though the question is idle, let me speak to it for a moment, because I suspect it lurks not far beneath the surface for us all.

Practically speaking, why should the deed have been allowed; in other words, with all of the precautions that were taken, how was it that the murderer's gun was able to accomplish its purpose? I have heard the question asked this way more than once in these past hours.

It is, of course, obvious that the motorcar in which the President was riding was a very specially constructed vehicle, with a bulletproof arrangement which at the time was not in use. And, we need to remember

that it was not in use for a very good reason—which was that the people of the State of Texas had been exceeding all expectations in their sincere and enthusiastic welcome of their President. His reaction to their friendliness was the right and authentic reaction; he returned openness with openness, and he could not have done otherwise. Any leader who is to be beloved by his people must not fear to go among them. Anyone who has been inside Russia in recent years marks the tremendous popularity of Mr. Khrushchev as compared to the almost sullen toleration of Mr. Stalin on the part of the same Russian people. And why? Mr. Khrushchev trusts his people and walks among them, as Mr. Stalin was never willing to do.

A love for people is always vulnerable; the open heart can always be hurt. It has always been so, and it will always be so. As the London Daily Herald remarked on Friday night: "The Stalins of the world mostly die in their beds; it is the Lincolns and the Kennedys who are shot down."

One TV commentator remarked tellingly Friday evening that it will always be possible for someone to shoot the President down if he really wants to. This is frankly true, and to make the President a remote and impersonal figure, so surrounded by safety impediments that he is never among his people, never allowed to be vulnerable—this would be to destroy him and the office of President with him.

Further, the question—Why?—can, of course, be asked theologically. Why should a good and loving and fatherly God allow human suffering, and especially capital tragedy such as last Friday's was? One of my sons, following our memorial service here Friday evening, asked it of me on our return home.

I suspect this way of asking the question has occurred to many of us, too, if the truth be admitted. There are pat answers to it, which help not at all. The most magnificent statement of the question that has ever been made, of course, was that of Job, whose book lays to rest one pat answer after another that was offered by his well-meaning friends to the suffering man. Why, indeed, should a good and worthy man suffer; why, indeed, should an able leader of his people be shot down in the prime of life just as some of the programs to which he had most rigorously given himself seemed to be ripening and preparing to bear fruit?

Why, indeed? We can only feel our way toward the answer; but it seems to me that we need to remember the place in which we stand before the Almighty, the loving God, our Father. We need to remember the frequency with which the word "son" or "loving son" is used in the Bible, especially on the lips of our Lord. God insists that there will be no immoral short cuts for us—that we shall become, as the old phrase has it, meet for fellowship with Him—that is, fit to be his sons, in the true sense. If this is a correct discernment, it would follow that God refuses to treat us like pawns on a chessboard, to be pushed around regardless of our own willing. Rather, He places upon us the tremendous responsibility to make our decisions, and then to accept the results of them; to know that we are loved, and to love in return—or, if we choose, to withhold our love.

Love must be bestowed; it must be given. It can never be snatched from us, not even by God. Thus, if we are to be related to Him as sons, He must leave us free to make the return of love which only we can make, to live for or against Him, and to live with the consequences of what we decide. We need to be aware, of course, that this is not the whole story of our relationship to God, but it is an authentic part.

All of this leads, it seems to me, into a situation wherein—and one tries to choose his words carefully here—wherein we are placed under responsibility, wherein we are given the freedom of certain choice, wherein God cannot, even though in His suffering He would long to—cannot intervene at every single point to correct us or smooth the bumps for us or protect us from the moral realities of life. To do so would destroy the responsible relationship of sonship which God has chosen at constant cost to himself, no doubt, to hold us within.

I haven't given you any final statement of an answer, of course. I can only indicate a direction of thought that I think is very fruitful. It is easy for us to throw up the question, "Where was God, when a madman was training the sights of his rifle on President Kennedy?" Where was God? I remember a remark of James Robinson, that magnificent Negro pastor and leader of his people, when a grief-stricken father approached him upon the death of his little son, and said, "Where was your God when my son died?" And Robinson answered, "He was right where He always is—standing by a cross watching His own son die."

Even in that stark moment in history, God could not step in with some bolt out of the cosmos, some miraculous intervention—not, and remain true to the responsible relationship in which He had chosen to place us. I think we need to remember this, and to struggle continuously to understand what it means to live in this responsible relationship toward God.

The question "Why?" has been asked continually in these past traumatic hours from a third stance. Why, in this advanced culture of ours, this most experienced democracy in the world, should assassination be a possibility? How is it that we, of all people, should fall victim to a madman's attack?

The question in these terms is understandable; but the answer, it seems to me, is rather obvious. We've touched on it already.

One facet of the matter is that ours is a frankly open society. The freedom for all men to express themselves publicly and without imprisonment is preserved at all costs, as it should be, even if some of those who so express themselves are on the lunatic fringe, either of the radical left or the radical right. The language with which political opponents refer to each other is seldom restrained or even polite—and I for one think that there is something essentially healthy about this, whether one finds his sensibilities at times offended or not.

The point, though, is that in such an open society, all of us are vulnerable, vulnerable to the attack of the diseased mentality along with any other kind. And yet, despite this vulnerability, most of us would not choose to live in the midst of an efficient, safe, tight dictatorship even if we could. The vulnerability is our constant statement of trust—trust in each other, trust in those whom we elect to public office, trust in the essential good will of one man toward another. If, because of even such tragic violations of that trust as the death of our late President, we lose even in part this openness of our communal life, we shall be in dire straits indeed.

The other facet of the question—How could it happen here, to us?—ought to call us, in the face of what has happened in these past hours, to a frank self-reappraisal. I think that the one hope that has been most universally on the lips of all of the varied commentators to whom I've listened is that, somehow the tragic event of Friday morning will spur us on toward a more unified and a swifter move into genuine civil liberty and genuine equality for all of our people. Regardless of what the twisted motivations were that led his murdered to commit the deed, it is no secret to any of us that many people in America disliked and feared our late President for his forthright and outspoken stand in favor of equal rights for all men. We are engaged in a gigantic civil struggle in this country, in these days, which all the world is watching almost with bated breath. The sort of tragedy our Nation has sustained in this past 48 hours is only a repetition, writ large, as it were, of the suffering and the struggle and the deaths that have been our lot as a part of the battle in which we are currently engaged. We are not yet through the morass of struggle and of tragedy; there will be yet more to come. But if, in our newly heightened sense of the meaning of the principles for which Mr. Kennedy lived and worked, many of us who have been lukewarm, or who have chosen the slow and safe way—will be moved permanently out into the place where the currents of history are moving swiftly, out to throw our weight and influence really on the side of human justice and decency—then his life shall not have been given up in vain.

In brief—it could happen here—and can happen here again—because human justice is not yet—within our land. There are those among us still, well financed, and very vocal, who would delay its coming. As someone put it within these past hours, the most fitting memorial we could offer to John F. Kennedy would be to make real that for which he lived—and for which it may be proved that he died.

Well—and what of the future? As Senator DIRKSEN remarked almost immediately after it became known officially that Mr. Kennedy had died, the Republic will continue. Yes, it will. The Nation was without a President only for a matter of minutes—not much more—before our new President was sworn into office by a judge, a woman whom Mr. Kennedy himself had appointed. The Republic will continue, to be sure, thanks to a Constitution and a legal structure which is believed in and supported by the people of our land. We have a new President, and the machinery of Government is already rallying around him; he is a man of considerable experience, and there are many good portents.

There is no doubt, however, that the loss we have suffered is a costly one; we shall not know for some time to come just how costly it is—both with reference to our image around the world, and our continuing domestic life and well-being.

Whatever be the eventuation of these things, it sems to me that there is a strange and unique sense of personal loss which, thanks both to the communications media with which the life of the first family has been surrounded, and the Kennedys' own identity as young people, and, therefore, lovable and forceful and uniquel open and appealing—there is a sense of personal loss which ought to make a genuine difference in the attitude of all of us. One member of the staff said to me early Friday afternoon "It's strange, but I feel as though if I had just tried a little harder, this might not have happened." I think this was an authentic reaction, and one which has been very common in these days. Uniquely in our history, it seems to me, we have been brought close to a President, his wife, his young children, his domestic affairs in general, even the clothes he wore and the way he cut his hair. We have sensed a personal involvement in his life, and now somehow in his death.

Another young man in the parish remarked to me Friday evening, "You know, I tend to go along my own particular way, busy with my own affairs, and not paying much attention to Government and public life—until a thing like this happens. Then, I become almost angry with things as they are, and I want to go out and become involved."

Both of these are authentic reactions, and to an extent, all of us are familiar with them. To an extent, too, the world has evidenced them. After midnight Friday, 80,000 people in West Berlin joined in a great processsion of mourning, ending at the steps of the city hall, where Mayor Willi Brandt, himself a strapping and rather young man, not unlike our own late President, said to the people:

"I feel as if a light has gone out for all men who hoped for peace and a better life."

In Russia, all the radio broadcasts which we've been able to pick up have been essentially solemn music, broken by announcements of the tragic events of these past hours. Mr. Khrushchev appeared Saturday in mourning black, and one Moscow announcer, an American, remarked that his grief was to be seen in his eyes more than in his clothes.

Somehow, one begins to wonder even whether Mr. Kennedy in death has not said a word to us and to the world which in life he might never have succeeded in speaking. But that word will have to be heard by us, and heard not with the top of our minds only, but with the bottom of our hearts, because on Tuesday morning the funeral observances will have been finished, and we'll begin to look forward to the new leadership of Mr. Johnson, and business will resume as usual.

As usual? Every thinking American knows what Mr. Kennedy lived and fought for, and we all won't agree on all of them, any more in his death than in his life. But while he needs no eulogy from us, the Nation he served will never be the same again if it remembers about him these three things: A rich man, himself, his concerns were for the poor and the laboring; a young man himself, his concerns were responsibly for the aging; a white man himself, his concerns were for the darkskinned and the dispossessed. In relation to all of these, he was, moreover, unashamedly a Christian and a churchman.

We will do well to remember these things of him, certainly, but it will be far more important to remember and live them simply because they are right, and because they are characteristic of our land—in her highest and best moments.

Balance of Payments Improves Markedly During Third Quarter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I include an article on the balance-of-payments problem, from the Daily Bond Buyer, November 18, 1963:

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IMPROVES MARKEDLY DURING THIRD QUARTER

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON, November 14.—The Nation made a remarkable comeback in its balance-of-payments deficit during the third quarter of the year. The Government reported today that the deficit had dropped to an annual rate of slightly more than $2 billion during the July-September period.

The recovery from the second quarter, when the deficit had risen to an annual rate of more than $5.2 billion, was due almost entirely to a substantial drop in the outflow of long-term capital and an even greater decline in the net outward movement of short-term capital.

Actually, during the third quarter the decline in U.S. monetary reserves and the rise in liquid claims against the United States totaled about $585 million. If, however, the securities held by foreigners were classified as long-term obligations rather than liquid claims, the adverse balance during the 3-month period would be $410 million, or at an annual rate of about $1.6 billion.

The 1963 third quarter balance was less than half of the average quarterly balance of nearly $900 million last year and, in fact, was the lowest quarterly figure since the final quarter of 1957.

RESULTS PREDICTED

The results of the last complete 3-month period has been fully anticipated and freely predicted by U.S. monetary officials, including Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon and Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa.

Indeed, a little more than a week ago, Mr. Roosa stated in Paris, where he was meeting with international bankers on the current world liquidity study, that the "deficit problem is now clearly under control."

Principal contributory factors to the decline in short- and long-term outward movements of capital were, of course, the administration's proposed interest equalization tax on foreign flotations, which Treasury officials said had cut long-term movements "to a trickle," and the rise in the Federal Reserve's rediscount rate, as well as the continuing upward pressure on Treasury short-term bill rates.

THE "ROOSA" BONDS

Moreover, a substantial portion of foreign claims against the United States are now held in special nonmarketable, medium-term Treasury issues—the so-called "Roosa bonds" which the Treasury developed essentially as a safeguard against drains on the country's gold stocks. These holdings of special securities do not reduce the magnitude of the deficit. They merely provide another way of reflecting it, and are, as Secretary Dillon says, "a short-term expedient, aimed at easing the pressures on gold stocks."

Clear evidence of the impact of the interest equalization tax on foreign flotations was furnished in the Commerce Department's preliminary study which showed that purchases of new foreign offerings had declined from $520 million in the second quarter to about $175 million in the third quarter, or at an annual rate of $700 million, just about $100 million more than the traditional annual rate of $600 million prior to 1962.

At the same time, net purchases of outstanding foreign issues, which had been running at a rate of about $50 million during each of the first two quarters, fell to zero on the third quarter.

In respect to short-term movements, here again the benefits of direct Government intervention were clearly apparent.

SHARP REDUCTION

Short-term outflows, most reflected in bank credits extended, declined from about $400 million in the second quarter to less than $100 million in the third quarter.

Longer-term bank loans also declined, but by how much cannot be determined in a preliminary survey of balance-of-payments accounts.

The improvement of the third quarter figures over second quarter results becomes even more spectacular when trade balances are taken into account. During the July-September period the net surplus of exports over imports was $1.1 billion, down $300 million from the $1.4 billion surplus during the April-June period.

To some extent, the improvement in the balance in the third quarter was due to receipts from special Government transactions.

FOREIGN REPAYMENTS

Receipts from advance repayments by France and the Netherlands amounted to $230 million, but these were partly offset by a special U.S. Government obligation incurred earlier this year, and a conversion on nonconvertible to convertible securities, totaling $95 million.

The balance of the other, or "regular," types of transactions for the quarter was adverse by about $720 million, and after seasonal adjustments, by slightly under $400 million.

This compares with an adverse balance of $1,280 million in the second quarter, and $960 million in the first.

On a year-to-year comparison basis, during the first three quarters of this year the deficit is running at an annual rate of $2,360 million as opposed to $1,685 million in the first 9 months of 1962.

Memorial to J.F.K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following Memorial to J.F.K., written by Miss Carolyn Woods, a senior at Enid High School, Enid, Okla.

MEMORIAL TO J.F.K.

He was a man.
And yet he was more than a man.
He was a symbol of peace and security to a troubled world
A symbol borne forth in all nations
Loved by every nationality
Praised by all religious
Yes, he was more.

He was a statue
A statue of love and light
In a world of hate and anger
A statue placed in every country
Raised by friendly hands
For all to view
Yet, he was more.

He was a child
A child of wisdom and knowledge
In the great classroom of experience
A child yearning and hoping
For the answer of right and justice
And yet, he was more.

He was a teacher.
A teacher of deeds and good works
A teacher in the world of the teachless
Striving for the enlightenment of the masses
Through the spreading of righteousness
Yet, he was more.

He was a husband and father
The provider of bread and protector of life
To a small, loving, close family of four
Yet, his love extended to another already
Bedded in the arms of the earth
Yet, he was more.

He was a writer
A writer of tragedy and fame
Collector of two Pulitzer prizes for his written words
About the teachings of experience
Learned by him first hand
Yet, he was more.

He was a statesman
Winner of political fame
Representative of the masses he loved and worked for
A servant of the people
Wrapped up in their desires and ideas
And yet, he was more.

He was an Irishman
Entwined in tradition of family lineage
Favorite son of Ireland's thousands
For whom only months before they had cheered and
Now were to weep and pray
Yet, he was more.

He was a son
Stepping to the place of an older brother
The pride of an aged stricken father
The favorite of two brothers and four sisters
The hero of numerous nephews, nieces, and cousins
And yet, he was more.

He was a President
Opposed on policies by some
Leader of a New Frontier on an old continent
Founder of international movements
Respected by young and old, rich and poor
Yet, he was more.

He was a guest
In a city of American people
A guest who was waved at and
Later victim of an Italian rifle's bullet.
Principal figure of a hospital race.
Then he was dead.

Today he is again a symbol
A symbol of dedication to a cause men have died for.
Slumbering in death along with other national heroes
Has not quenched his teachings
He is a dedication of the world to peace and hope.

The life breath is gone from his lungs
The heart of this leader beats no more
Yet his silenced hope for peace in a troubled world lives on
It is to this goal that John Fitzgerald Kennedy would have us dedicate our lives.

He was a symbol, a monument, a teacher
Child of wisdom, father of love
A statesman and writer dedicated to right and justice
A son, a guest, a dedication
Yet, he was more,
He was an American.

—CAROLYN WOODS.

The Assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the assassination of the President of the United States, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD newspaper and other articles which were published subsequent thereto:

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 27, 1963]

THIS WAS MR. KENNEDY'S THANKSGIVING MESSAGE

President Johnson yesterday urged that the late President Kennedy's November 5 Thanksgiving Day proclamation be read in houses of worship as a memorial tomorrow. He also asked the press to "make it available to all the American people." It follows:

"Over three centuries ago, our forefathers in Virginia and in Massachusetts, far from home on a lonely wilderness, set aside a time of thanksgiving. On the appointed day, they gave reverent thanks for their safety, for the health of their children, for the fertility of their fields, for the love which bound them together and for the faith which united them with their God.

"So too when the colonies achieved their independence, our first President in the first year of his first administration proclaimed November 26, 1789, as 'a day of public thanksgiving and prayer to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many signal favors of almighty God' and called upon the people of the new republic to 'beseech Him to pardon our national and other transgressions * * to promote the knowledge and practice of true religion and virtue * * * and generally to grant unto all mankind such a degree of temporal prosperity as He alone knows to be best.'

"And so too, in the midst of America's tragic Civil War, President Lincoln proclaimed the last Thursday of November 1863 as the day to renew our gratitude for America's fruitful fields, for our national strength and vigor, and for all our singular deliverances and blessings.

"Much time has passed since the first colonists came to rocky shores and dark forests of an unknown continent, much time since President Washington led a young people into the experience of nationhood, much time since President Lincoln saw the American Nation through the ordeal of fraternal war—and in these years our population, our plenty, and our power have all grown apace. Today we are a nation of nearly 200 million souls stretching from coast to coast, on into the Pacific and north toward the Arctic, a nation enjoying the fruits of an ever-expanding agriculture and industry and achieving standards of living unknown in previous history. We give our humble thanks for this.

"Yet, as our power has grown, so has our peril. Today we give our thanks, most of all, for the ideals of honor and faith we inherit from our forefathers—for the decency of purpose, steadfastness of resolve and strength of will, for the courage and the humility, which they possessed and which we must seek every day to emulate. As we express our gratitude, we must never forget that the highest appreciation is not to utter words but to live by them.

"Let us therefore proclaim our gratitude to providence for manifold blessings—let us be humbly thankful for inherited ideals—and let us resolve to share those blessings and those ideals with our fellow human beings throughout the world.

"Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, in consonance with the joint resolution of the Congress approved December 26, 1941, designating the fourth Thursday in November in each year as Thanksgiving Day, do hereby proclaim Thursday, November 28, 1963, as a day of national thanksgiving.

"On that day let us gather in sanctuaries dedicated to worship and in homes blessed by family affection to express our gratitude for the glorious gifts of God; and let us earnestly and humbly pray that He will continue to guide and sustain us in the great unfinished tasks of achieving peace, justice, and understanding among all men and nations, and of ending misery and suffering, wherever they exist."

[From the Denver (Colo.) Register, Dec. 8, 1963]

DALLAS PRIEST RELIEVES PRESIDENT'S FINAL HOURS—FATHER HUBER POINTS TO OUTBURST OF LOVE IN CITY WHERE J.F.K. DIED

(By Very Rev. Oscar L. Huber, C.M.)

The great day set for the visit of the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, had arrived. Dallas had worked feverishly to make this the most enthusiastic welcome ever to be given a President of the United States. On TV at 11:35 a.m., I saw his arrival at Love Field and heard the enthusiastic welcome given him. Then I walked down to Lemmon and Regan Streets, about three blocks from Holy Trinity Church, to await the motorcade that would bring the President along the planned route that would end at the Dallas Trade Mart, where a sumptuous luncheon and a spendidly arranged program were to highlight his visit.

There both sides of the street were lined with people eagerly awaiting the President—there also were the children of Holy Trinity school, their teachers, the Daughters of Charity, and lay teachers. Soon the car carrying the members of the Presidential party passed by. The President and Mrs. Kennedy were waving and smiling to everyone and these gestures of good will were enthusiastically returned by the happy onlookers along the way. It was a thrilling moment for me as I had never before seen a President of the United States.

I returned to the rectory—ate a brief lunch—had just finished when Father [James N.] Thompson, C.M., one of my assistants, who had finished his lunch previously and was watching the motorcade on TV—came to the refectory and announced that the President had been shot. We went to the recreation room where we heard, over TV, the President had been taken to Parkland Hospital—this hospital is within the confines of Holy Trinity parish. Within a short time we were on our way to the hospital. Shortly after we left the rectory, a telephone call came from someone at Parkland saying Mrs. Kennedy was requesting a priest to administer to the spiritual needs of the President. Within 10 or 15 minutes we were at the hospital. Father Thompson parked the car while I was escorted by a policeman to an emergency room where I found the fatally wounded President lying on a portable table. He was covered with a sheet that I removed from over his forehead before administering the last rights of the church.

Because of the President's condition, I administered conditionally the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction, followed by the Apostolic Blessing. After this I recited for the President, from the ritual, prayers for the dying and for the repose of his soul, to which was added: "Eternal rest grant unto him, O, Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him. May he rest in peace. Amen."

During these ceremonies, Mrs. Kennedy was standing beside the President. She and others in the emergency room answered the prayers with which they were familiar. Mrs. Kennedy bent and seemed to kiss the President and then, I believe, placed on his finger her wedding ring. This, I have been told, signifies: "Together in life, together in death." Soon after this, followed by Mrs. Kennedy, and others who were present, I walked from the emergency room to the adjoining corridor. Sorrow and consternation bowed the heads of everyone present. The silence that pervaded the corridor was mute evidence that another President of the United States died at the hand of an assassin. Yes, it was evident—the President was dead.

During this most trying ordeal, the perfect composure maintained by Mrs. Kennedy was beyond comprehension. I will never forget the blank stare in her eyes and the signs of agony on her face. I extended my heartfelt sympathy and that of my parishioners to her. In a low tone of voice she thanked me graciously and asked me to pray for the President. I assured her I would do so. Shortly after this Father Thompson and I returned to Holy Trinity rectory.

At 5:30 the same afternoon of his death, I offered a Requiem Mass for the repose of the President's soul. Sunday morning at 9:30 a Requiem High Mass was offered for the President. On Monday, the National Day of Mourning, a Requiem High Mass was offered at 8:45 with Holy Trinity schoolchildren in attendance. In the evening at 5:30, a Solemn Requiem Mass was offered in the presence of an overflowing crowd.

I believe that in every place of worship in Dallas, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, services, attended by unprecedented crowds, were held for the President on the National Day of Mourning. To me this was a marvelous expression of love, devotion, and deep-seated respect for the President of the United

States. The fantastic interest of the people shown by the meticulous preparations made for the visit of the President, merits for them a lasting place in the hall of loyalty. A striking demonstration of sorrow can be seen by the great number of wreaths that decorate the spot where the President was assassinated.

The people of Dallas, along with the whole world, deeply mourn the loss of our President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. May God grant him eternal rest. Likewise, may God lead the new President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, safely along the arduous paths that lie ahead of him.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Nov. 23, 1963]

OVERWHELMING TRAGEDY: ASSASSIN'S BULLET CLAIMS PRESIDENT

What can be said that would pass as adequate comment on the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination?

So overwhelming is the impact of his slaying at Dallas that full realization of what the assassin's bullet wrought cannot be expected to be grasped immediately.

But shock, rejection of the deed, grief, and a sense of shame that this sort of thing happens in the United States today are reactions shared by everyone—and properly so.

The people of this Nation recoil from acts of violence. Their disapproval of such methods as a means to eliminate an official from office is paramount to any feeling they may have about th official's policies.

We grieve that John F. Kennedy has joined the ranks of the martyred Presidents, Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, and William McKinley.

In so doing, he gave his life for what he believed.

And such strength of conviction must be respected, even by those whose beliefs may differ in great degree and whose convictions are also unwavering.

Mr. Kennedy injected into the Presidency a winning type of personal diplomacy that comprised a new formula for solidifying Western relations on the grassroots level.

The young and dynamic head of an attractive young family, the Chief Executive brought to the White House a vitality and an atmosphere of family life that hadn't been known there since the dawning years of the 20th century.

And he died as surely in the service of his country as had he fallen in military service. All but those whose gnawing rancor has overpowered Judeo-Christian ethic will say as much.

Out of this senseless bloodshed comes a burning truth which Americans cannot escape: Hate breeds more hate and, unstemmed, it and blood spill over into the streets.

For President Lyndon B. Johnson, the position suddenly thrust upon him is necessarily even more complex than it was for his predecessor. May the prayers of a nation, brought together by bonds of sympathy, rest with him as they rest with the family of the late President.

The scar of yesterday's tragedy can never be erased but Americans of good will can see to it that American principle is again enshrined.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 23, 1963]

A PRESIDENT DEAD—ALL MUST SUFFER

A few rifle shots rang out near a Dallas underpass around midday Friday. But the sound moved 'round the world with the impact of a nuclear bomb.

The President of the United States had been assassinated. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead.

With the suddenness of the rifle shots, 200 million people were immersed in a great sorrow. At home and almost equally abroad, people were engulfed in perplexity. Who would want upon him the blood of John Kennedy, kindly man, humanitarian; the blood of a President and statesman, the most influential spokesman for the Western World? A crime so useless, so futile, so destructive to the peace of mind of countless millions—how could a thing like that happen in a country like the United States?

But after all, there's no real mystery. For among humankind there are always men of imbalance, of twisted mind, warped concepts and strange causes, some with a deep and ugly malice toward their fellow beings. Often their hate centers upon those in high places. This time the target was President Kennedy, just as thrice before Presidents of the United States had died upon the evil impulses of such assassins.

People everywehre shiver and grieve at the President's death. It is a very personal loss for most, as well as the loss of a leader. While the Nation mourns, the greatest grief, as always, overwhelms the President's family, whose members all of us wish we could console.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was sworn in as President a couple of hours after the tragedy Friday. How the change will affect the affairs of State or U.S. policies abroad, one can only surmise. History tells us that the jitters will wear off soon and orderly processes will resume.

Meantime, the horror of Friday, November 22, 1963, holds the Nation in a vise that will not loosen immediately—not in these troubled days when we suffer for the crime that has been perpetrated among us.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

A DAY OF MOURNING

A national day of mourning proclaimed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, coincident with formal funeral services in Washington for John Fitzgerald Kennedy, will find citizens of the United States somewhat recovered and ready to pay their respects today in a thousand ways to the memory of a dynamic Chief Executive brought to untimely end.

In his successor, they have a man qualified by long years of active dealing with the affairs of the country in legislative halls at Washington; the personal choice of the late President for second position in the executive branch; a Vice President who, thanks to the enlightened policy instituted by Mr. Eisenhower, and its adoption by Mr. Kennedy, became so conversant with affairs of state and world conditions that he can take the reins with far greater assurance than ordinarily would be the case.

But as if to pile outrage on outrage and shock on shock, an assassin came forward on the Sabbath to murder the alleged assassin of Mr. Kennedy, depriving the law of its proper course. The same police department that so promptly corralled the prime suspect and with other enforcement agencies built a circumstantial case that at least saved the Nation from a period of uncertainties, wild accusations and unfounded suspicions: The same police failed somehow to shield it and its prisoner from a second unforgivable crime.

The accused individual never admitted guilt. If this was brutality against brutality, coldbloodedness against coldbloodedness, stupidity against stupidity, with no more chance given one victim than another, it nevertheless grievously affronted justice; and it may very well have circumvented it, in that otherwise the full truth of the primary crime might more readily be established.

Needless to say, pursuit of all facts and possibilities remains imperative in this connection, as it does with regard to the second slaying. Judgments, meanwhile, must remain in suspense.

New Orleans is as unhappy to be associated in nativity with the late suspect as Dallas is to have been the scene of tragedy; as our new President must be, that it occurred in his own State. But there is, of course, nothing but unhappiness connected with the entire, ghastly event. The wound that was fatal to John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a wounding of the sensibility of all Americans, wedded to the principle of a Chief Executive serving and representing all the people, and thus identified with his safety and security. The wound fatal to his alleged killer scars another foundation of our common faith. There was far too much to mourn as it was.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 26, 1963]

KENNEDY'S SPEECHES PUT HIM AMONG HANDFUL OF PRESIDENTS

During the dramatic unfolding of the great tragedy in which the American people have shared, one of the commentators observed that John F. Kennedy was the most articulate President since Abraham Lincoln.

He overlooked, to be true, Woodrow Wilson, a profound scholar, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, a fluent phrasemaker, but he was on solid ground.

For John F. Kennedy indeed brought intellectual brilliance, wide knowledge, and sound scholarship to the White House, as was often noted.

Carl Sandburg, the poet and biographer of Lincoln, expressed it beautifully and ably in a foreword to a collection of President Kennedy's speeches, published in 1962 under the title, "To Turn the Tide." Said Sandburg:

"Not often has a President of our country had, besides content and substance to his speeches, the further merit of style as such. We recur to Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, the two Roosevelts, and we are near the end of the list. In the opinion of many, Kennedy belongs among those always having good solid content, often color and cadence in style, and there are moments in the cause of human freedom when his words move with a measured passion."

A few quotations from John F. Kennedy's early speeches in office may remind us that his words did indeed "move with a measured passion."

Eleven days before assuming, as he called it, "that high and lonely office," President-elect Kennedy addressed the Legislature of his native Massachusetts and pledged to characterize his administration with "courage, judgment, integrity, dedication."

The courage of which he spoke was "to stand up to one's enemies, and * * * to stand up, when necessary, to one's associates, the courage to resist public pressure as well as private greed." His idea of judgment concerned, "the future as well as the past * * * our own mistakes as well as the mistakes of others, with enough wisdom to know what we did not know, and enough candor to admit it." His concept of integrity envisaged "men who never ran out on either the principles in which we believed or the people, who believed in us, men whom neither financial gain nor political ambition could ever divert from the fulfillment of our sacred trust." Dedication consisted of "an honor mortgaged to no single individual or group, and compromised by no private obligation or aim, but devoted solely to serving the public good and the national interest."

In President Kennedy's inaugural address, undoubtedly one of the great inaugural speeches, he reaffirmed the faith of the Founding Fathers "that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God."

And then President Kennedy directed his words across the Iron Curtain and there could be no doubt in friendly chancelleries as well as in the Kremlin as to what they meant:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

He called for an end to the deadly atomic race "to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war." He called for "a beachhead of cooperation" to "push back the jungle of suspicion." He urged: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate." And the keynote of his speech is as valid today as it was yesterday and will be for endless tomorrows:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

In the light of events, this is a call for all factions in American life to rally behind the successor of John F. Kennedy—President Lyndon B. Johnson.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

PRESIDENT'S SLAYING THROWS PALL OVER 61ST TULANE-LSU GAME

The senseless, brutal killing of President Kennedy cast a pall over the 61st football game between Tulane and LSU.

As far as I'm concerned, the game should have been postponed until next Saturday. Apparently close to 10,000 ticket holders felt the same way, for although 64,000 seats were sold for the game, the attendance was estimated at 55,000 over the loudspeaker. I'd like to bet it didn't exceed 50,000. Threatening weather may have kept some at home, but the likelihood is that they didn't have any stomach for football in such a moment of national tragedy.

And for those who were there—or so it seemed to me, because that's how I felt—it was just another football game, not the Tulane-LSU game.

One may rationalize until he's blue in the face that the late John F. Kennedy, himself, a lover of sports, would have wanted the game to go on. Most of the other, but not all, self-respecting universities in the country didn't feel that way and why Tulane and LSU chose not to line up with the vast majority of these schools is anybody's guess.

I said it was just another game. As a Tulane fan, who hasn't seen his team beat LSU since 1948, it really didn't make much difference how it came out. As Tulane lost again, 20 to 0. I found little or no cause to grieve in the face of national grief. What is a lost game when we've lost a President? Had Tulane pulled the virtually impossible, an upset, I doubt if the long denied victory would have brought any feeling of exaltation to me. Does one, can one, feel personal joy while experiencing the impact of an unbelievable national catastrophe?

Normally, I would have devoted this space to the Tulane-LSU game. I will stop here after saying that LSU was a bigger and better and faster team than Tulane and demonstrated it ably and that Tulane, although outmatched, was not outclassed nor outfought.

News of President Kennedy's death came over my car radio Friday as I was driving up to Baton Rouge for a meeting. As the airport slipped by, the first flash came and then, mile by mile, the dreadful story unfolded. Everyone to whom I spoke at Baton Rouge or when I got home had the same reaction. This was a monstrous thing, cruel to a nation, and to a family. And anyone with an honest heart, whether he be pro-Kennedy or anti-Kennedy, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, must have done some soul searching since the fatal shots were fired.

There are those who hated John F. Kennedy with a blind hatred, because they opposed his policies. Can't one have an honest opposition without hatred and venom?

There are those who encouraged disrespect for the law because they didn't like the law any more than they liked Kennedy.

On the other hand, there are those who idolized Kennedy and were perhaps as blind in their idolatry as the Kennedy haters were blind in their hatred.

But the true stature of the man who was the youngest elected President of the United States is shown by the worldwide shock and dismay over the news of his assassination and by the glowing tributes of world leaders, most of whom had flown into Washington for today's funeral.

The consequences of an irresponsible, cruel act—the aim of a gun, the pressure of a trigger finger—were far reaching, for not only a nation, but the free world mourns. And, more intimately, three families have been shattered by the gunfire by Lee Harvey Oswald.

First it was the Kennedy family—suddenly bereft of a son, a husband, and a father.

Then, when Oswald was trying to get away, he killed Policeman Tippitt, bringing shattering grief to the officer's family.

And when Jack Ruby killed Oswald in a bizarre development in this tragic story, he brought extra grief to the already grief stricken mother, wife, and children of the President's assassin.

From Oswald's initial shot stemmed a chain of grief which circled the world, starting from the Kennedy family and ending with his own.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: MURDER MOST FOUL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The first need of the country is to take to heart the nature of this unspeakable crime. There is no public crisis at home or abroad which demands such instant attention that it cannot wait until we have collected ourselves and can proceed deliberately. But there is a searing internal crisis within the American spirit which we have first to realize and then resolve.

The American future depends upon it, and our capacity to govern ourselves. What we have to realize is that, though speech and gossip and rumor are free, the safety of the Republic is at stake when extremists go unrestrained. Extremists may profess any ideology. But what they all have in common is that they treat opponents as enemies, as outside the laws and the community of their fellow men.

What happened in Dallas could, to be sure, have happened in another city. But it must be said that the murder of the President was not the first act of political violence in that city but one in a series. The man who is now the President of the United States was manhandled by his fellow Texans. The man who represents the United States at the United Nations was spat upon.

In this atmosphere of political violence lived the President's murderer, himself addicted to the fascination of violence in his futile and lonely and brooding existence. The salient fact about him was his alienation from humanity, from country, family, and friends. Nothing within him, it would seem, bound him to the President or to the Governor as human beings. No human feeling stayed his hand.

In his alienation Oswald turned to the left. But that was incidental. Those who assaulted Lyndon Johnson and Adlai Stevenson had turned to the right. The common characteristic of all of them was their alienation, the loss of their ties, the rupture of the community.

An extremist is an outsider. For him the Government in Washington is a hated foreign power and the President in Washington is an invading conqueror. There is no limit, therefore, to his hatred which feeds upon the venom of malice, slander, and hallucination. In Dallas today there is much searching of conscience, and well there should be. For Dallas has long been conspicuous for its tolerance of extremists, and for the inability of its decent citizens, undoubtedly the great majority, to restrain the extremists and restore a condition of honest and temperate and reasonable discussion.

It was comforting, therefore, to read on Sunday that the mayor of Dallas, Earle Cabell, had said that "each of us, in prayerful reflection, must search his heart and determine if through intemperate word or deed we might have contributed in some fashion to the movement of this mind across the brink of insanity."

We must all follow the mayor of Dallas in that prayerful reflection. For it is only too easy to forget that in a free country there must be not only liberty and equality but also fraternity.

The only solace for the Nation's shame and grief can come from a purge, or at least the reduction of, the hatred and venom which lie so close to the surface of our national life. We have allowed the community of the American people to be rent with enmity. Only if and as we can find our way back into the American community will we find our way back to confidence in the American destiny.

We must stop the flow of the poison that when men differ, say about taxes or civil rights or Russia, they cannot be reconciled by persuasion and debate, and that those who take the other view are implacable enemies. In the light of this monstrous crime, we can see that in a free country, which we are and intend to be, unrestrained speech and thought are inherently subversive. Democracy can be made to work only when the bonds of the community are inviolate, and stronger than all the parties and factions and interests and sects.

I wish I felt certain that the self-realization into which grief has shocked us will endure when we go back about our business. The divisive forces of hatred and ungovernability are strong among us, and the habit of intemperate speech and thought has become deeply ingrained. It is deepened by the strains of war and the frustrations of this revolutionary age, by the exploitation of violence and cruelty in the mass media, by the profusion of weapons and by the presence of so many who know how to use them.

But I do have much hope in the healing arts of Lyndon Johnson. We can turn to him with confidence. For his great gift is in finding the consensus without which the American system of government, with its States and regions, its checks and balances, is unworkable.

To find the consensus among our divided and angry people is his historic opportunity. To restore the internal peace of the United States is his unique mission.

That done, all else will be manageable.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1963]

KENNEDY SLUMPED OVER AND SAID NOTHING: CONNALLY DESCRIBES ASSASSINATION: "FROM GREAT JOY TO GREAT TRAGEDY"

DALLAS, November 27.—Texas Gov. John Connally, wounded during the assassination of President Kennedy, said today that after being shot the President "slumped over and said nothing."

"As I turned to the left, I was hit. I knew I was hit badly. I said, 'My God, they are going to kill us all.' "

"Then there was a third shot and the President was hit again. Mrs. Kennedy said 'Oh, my God. They killed my husband. Jack, Jack.'

"In the space of a few seconds, great joy and anticipation was turned to great tragedy."

Connally, in an interview from his hospital bed—the first since he was shot while

riding with Mr. Kennedy last Friday—said he has had many thoughts since the tragedy and one of the most important was why Mr. Kennedy's life was taken and his was spared.

Connally recalled:

"It was a great morning. The crowds were great in Fort Worth. There were huge throngs in Dallas.

"Dallas was real warm, real understanding, and real appreciative.

"The ovation for Kennedy was tremendous.

"The President and his wife both remarked about how warm it was.

"Not 30 seconds before the President was shot, Nellie (Mrs. Connally) had said to the President that no one could say that Dallas did not love and appreciate him.

"Kennedy answered her, 'You sure can't'."

Then Connally described the actual shooting.

Connally said he did not think the assassin was after him only.

"The man did what he intended to do—he shot both of us," the Governor added.

Connally said that perhaps the President, through his death, was asked to do something that is hard to do in life, and that is:

"To shock and stun a nation and its people and the world to what is happening to us through this cancerous growth of extremism."

"This is the only answer I can give you on why he is gone and I am not," he added.

He said the world should avoid the type of extremism that breeds hatred.

"The genesis of our self-destruction—if we are going to be destroyed—comes from this extremism," he added.

Connally wept and dried his eyes with a towel during a pause in the interview, the first portion of which lasted 5 minutes.

NOT TOLD OF DEATH

The Governor said he was not told that the President was dead until Saturday, the day after the assassination.

"But it was no news, I was almost sure he would be after those two shots."

"My first conscious thoughts were, 'My God, what a horrible tragedy in a space of a few minutes.' It makes you ponder and wonder if you are making the contribution you should make to society because you never know when a thing like this can happen."

Connally said a monument should be built to President Kennedy, "but I hope that the people build not in the sense of absolving themselves. The monument should be through patience, tolerance, knowledge, human understanding, and dignity."

The Governor said he had been very close to the new President, Lyndon Johnson, serving with him in the Navy during World War II.

"I thought how ironic it was that the man who defeated him (for the Democratic nomination) named me Secretary of the Navy and on the day of the tragedy Johnson became President of the United States."

Asked to give his opinion of President Johnson, Connally said he was a person "of many complexities."

He said that President Johnson had a great understanding of human nature, was a man of his convictions and was forever working for perfection.

"No man ever assumed office better equipped to carry out the duties of the Office of President."

Connally said Mr. Johnson was born of hard times and his days of school were arduous.

"But he walked with many people of many nationalities and he understands the heartbeat of this Nation as no other man in this position has," Connally said.

NEWSMEN SEARCHED

Connally's interview late this afternoon in Parkland Hospital was conducted by Martin Agronsky of the National Broadcasting Co., picked by Connally as a pool reporter. Other reporters watched the interview on a closed television circuit as a part of the interview plan.

Prior to the actual news conference two still photographers and one silent movie cameraman were allowed in Connally's room. Newsmen were checked thoroughly and searched before being allowed near the door.

"We were asked not to reveal the location of the bed in the room or the other security measures that had been taken," a photographer said.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

NO TIME FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT

In the shock of these past few days it is understandable that Americans should find their grief mingled with some shame that these events should happen in their country. We all stand a little less tall than we did last Friday morning.

Yet, for our own part, we find past understanding the remarks of some otherwise thoughtful men who, in their moment of shock, would indict a whole Nation with a collective guilt. It seems to us that they themselves have yielded to the hysteria they would charge to others, and in so doing show that their own country is past their understanding.

Any one who has been reading the newspapers, listening to the radio or watching television has heard these men; they include public commentators, Members of our Congress and men of God. And the substance of what they charge is that the whole of the American people—and by inclusion, the ways of the American society—are wrapped in a collective guilt for the murder of a President and the murder of a murderer.

A Senator said that the responsibility lay on "the people of Dallas" because this is where the events took place. A spokesman for one group of our people said the Nation was "reaping the whirlwind of hatred." One of our highest judges said the President's murder was stimulated by the "hatred and malevolence" that are "eating their way into the bloodstream of American life." A newspaper of great renown passed judgment that "none of us can escape a share of the fault for the spiral of violence." And these were but a few among many.

Such statements can only come from men who have not been broad in the land, neither paused to reflect how the events came about nor observed in what manner the whole American people have responded to tragedy.

A President lies dead because he moved freely among the people. He did so because he was beloved by many people, respected by all, and because everywhere people turned out in great numbers to pay him honor. In a society of tyranny the heads of state move in constant fear of murder, cordoned behind an army of policemen. It is the fundamental orderliness of the American society that leads Presidents to move exposed to all the people, making possible the act of a madman.

In the tragedy there is blame, surely, for negligence. In retrospect, perhaps, it was negligent of a President himself not to be aware that there are ever madmen in the world; yet it is a negligence born of courage and confidence. It was negligent of the police authorities, perhaps, not to search and cover every corner, every window, which might shield a madman; yet it was a negligence born of years of proven trust in the crowds of Americans through which Presidents have safely moved.

It was most certainly a terrible negligence on the part of the local police authorities which permitted one man to take vengeance into his own hands. It was an outrageous breach of responsibility for them to have moved a man accused of so heinous a crime in so careless a fashion. It was outrageous precisely because all the American people were themselves so outraged by the crime of assassination that anyone who knew these people ought to have known that one among them might be deranged enough to do exactly what was done.

Yet the opportunity for negligence came because here the accused was being treated as any other accused, his detention in the hands of local police, the procedures those followed for the ordinary of murders. In another land he would have been efficiently buried by a secret police in a Lubyianka prison, never again to be seen or heard of until his execution.

One might say, we suppose, that some of this negligence could be laid to all of us. It is, after all, the eager interest of the people in the persons of their leaders that brings them into open caravans, and it is the desire of the people to follow the normal ways even in murders of State that left the accused to bungling local police.

In sum, there is in all of this—let there be no mistake—much to grieve, to regret, to blame. We can't escape remorse that there are madmen in our midst, that a President is dead, that we have been denied the right to show in open court the virtue of a free society. Now we pay the price of all sorts of negligence.

But this is something different from the charge in the indictment. It is more than nonsense to say that the good people of Dallas, crowding the streets to honor a President, share a murderous guilt; or that the tragic acts of madmen cast a shadow on the whole of America. Such an indictment is vicious.

Of reasons for shame we have enough this day without adding to them a shameful injustice to a mourning people.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 26, 1963]

SOCIOLOGISTS DOUBT DALLAS KILLINGS INDICATE NATIONAL MORAL SLUMP—BUT THEY WARN THAT ECONOMIC TENSION, FAMILY TROUBLE STIR INCREASE IN VIOLENCE BY A FEW

(By Herbert G. Lawson)

A crowd outside the Dallas city jail cheers the news that Lee Harvey Oswald, accused slayer of the President, has been fatally shot. A Sioux City, Iowa, man stabs his stepfather to death in an argument over the late President. A Negro on a Staten Island, N.Y., bus accuses a white passenger of being a party to the Presidential assassination, and a fight is narrowly averted.

For 4 days the Nation has witnessed violence that has appeared almost incredible. Countless Americans are asking themselves how this explosive impulse arises and whether the entire public perhaps must shoulder the burden of guilt.

Sociologists and other students of behavior offer some tentative answers. They argue that such violence is not part of our fundamental character. But they warn that pressures in American life have generated an increase in violent crime by the demented and the dispossessed.

"Crimes of violence have been increasing in the last 4 or 5 years," says Gresham Sykes, executive officer of the American Sociological Association and former head of the sociology department at Dartmouth College. "It seems to spring from a derangement of the family. A person like Jack Ruby (Oswald's accused killer) is more likely to come forward to commit such an act in our society."

MORE ASSAULT CASES

Federal Bureau of Investigation figures confirm the recent increase in violent crime. Ironically, murders last year declined 2 percent from the 1958–60 average. But all reported crimes rose four times as fast as population in the past 5 years. Aggravated assault cases last year soared 14 percent

above the 1958–60 average, while forcible robbery climbed 17 percent.

But the prevalence of violent crime, including the tragedies of recent days, is not a sign that violence is a national trait, according to Richard James, a New York psychologist. "The average citizen couldn't do these things," he says. "The whole tenor of the country's reaction has been admirable. A friend of mine at the United Nations pointed out that in almost any other country in the world such an assassination would be followed by riots and civil disturbance."

Others note that the United States is not the only nation where violence or the threat of it is directed against the head of state. Following the Kennedy murder, Swedish Premier Tage Erlander was threatened with death by an anonymous caller, and special security guards were posted. French President Charles de Gaulle has been a target for assassins' bullets.

HIGH MURDER RATE

But a critical look at American society would have to concede that destructive impulses are widespread. Murder rates are several times higher in this country than in most, if not all, other industrial nations.

Even while dismissing the likelihood of a basic streak of violence in the national character, the experts concede the high U.S. murder rate may be due, to some extent, to habits of thought and action that have their roots deep in American history.

"We have a frontier tradition in which there is a tendency to take the law into our own hands," notes Lewis A. Coser, professor of sociology and an expert on homicide at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

The funeral of William McKinley, 25th President and victim of an anarchist's bullet in 1901, provides evidence that such a vigilante attitude has long existed. According to one account of the funeral, the minister presiding at the Washington services said that if he "had been present at the shooting he would have provided the leadership the crowd needed for an on-the-spot hanging." Actually, the assassin, Leon Czolgosz, was tried, convicted, and electrocuted by New York State.

But sociologists who have studied the urges that have led to violent crimes say other factors are more important than the vigilante tradition. One clear-cut conclusion of their investigations is that geography, economic status, and the quality of law enforcement locally have much to do with crime rates.

For instance, the murder rate is nearly eight times as high in the South as in New England, notes Mr. Coser. Homicide is far more frequent among people at the bottom of the economic ladder. Negroes have the highest rate.

Cities vary greatly in their crime rates, suggesting that the quality of police action has conisderable importance. Milwaukee has only about 5 percent as many robberies as Chicago and fewer than one-tenth as many assaults, on a per capita basis. Dallas ranks well down the list of per capita crime rates among the 20 largest U.S. cities. It is sixteenth in robberies and eleventh in assaults, according to FBI figures.

Mr Sykes of the sociological association suggests that the rise in violent crimes in the past few years "springs from derangement of the family." He cites trends to increased urbanization, crowded housing, and the absence of strong father figures in many lower-class families, which means that children often obtain their values on the street rather than in the home.

The loud and often violent propaganda of some fringe groups, such as racists in the South, may trigger violence, he says. "Anything that declares the world is divided into the 'goods' and the 'bads' can lead to violence," observes Mr. Sykes. In juvenile gangs and among some racist groups, he says, the tendency is to excuse violence against outsiders.

Was Lee Harvey Oswald a victim of family pressures that turned him against all society? Did the message of a "hate group" turn his inward frustration into violent action? The answer is unclear. "The unfortunate thing about this is that we'll never understand Oswald as an indivual," says Mr. James.

[From the Clarion Herald, Nov. 28, 1963]

THE LAST FULL MEASURE

"Every day is a good day to be born and every day is a good day to die."

With serene faith, Pope John XXIII accepted the illness that on June 3 of this year terminated his brief but brilliant term as Supreme Pontiff.

His words are a consolation as all mourn the tragic death of another world leader on November 22—John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

It is a consolation sadly needed, for, humanly speaking, the passing of President Kennedy seems far more untimely.

The Holy Father died at 82. In his short reign he achieved a greatness that few men in history have reached in decades. In his "Pacem in Terris," completed not long before his death, he left a heritage of hope for world brotherhood and peace. In his convoking of the Second Vatican Council he challenged not only the church but the world to a renewal of faith, to a refashioning of spiritual forces to meet the needs of a world in turmoil, to a uniting of all men in the brotherhood of Christ and the fatherhood of God.

President Kennedy died of an assassin's bullet at 46. He achieved greatness in the service of his country as a naval officer in World War II, followed by distinguished performance as U.S. Representative and Senator, and by truly notable service as President and world leader. Yet his work had only begun. As experience ripened into greater wisdom his native gifts of intelligence, courage, and leadership, how much more could he have wrought for America and for the world.

Upon the strong shoulders of Pope Paul VI fell the mantle of Pope John. Ably has he carried on the mission of the church and especially the concern to complete the ecumenical council.

To Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson are committed the responsibilities of Mr. Kennedy. With his training and experience there is no doubt that President Johnson will prove an able leader. But Kennedy's genius will be sorely missed, particularly in the struggle to make completely effective the American democratic ideal of full equality for all.

This struggle began a century ago with the efforts of another President, Abraham Lincoln, who also was prevented from completing his mission by an assassin's bullet. Just 100 years ago this month Lincoln made his immortal address at Gettysburg, concluding with this charge to the Nation:

"It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The "last full measure of devotion" given to America by these two great Presidents today is a charge upon the conscience of all Americans that they shall not have died in vain.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 29, 1963]

TEXT OF MESSAGE—END HATRED, JOHNSON ASKS

(NOTE—Following is the text of President Johnson's personal Thanksgiving Day message to the American people, delivered over nationwide television and radio networks.)

My fellow Americans, on yesterday, I went before the Congress to speak for the first time as President of the United States.

Tonight, on this Thanksgiving, I come before you to ask your help, to ask your strength, to ask your prayers that God may guard this Republic and guide my every labor.

All of us have lived through 7 days that none of us will ever forget. We are not given the divine wisdom to answer why this has been, but we are given the human duty of determining what is to be, what is to be for America, for the world, for the cause we lead, for all the hopes that live in our hearts.

A great leader is dead; a great Nation must move on. Yesterday is not ours to recover, but tomorrow is ours to win or to lose. I am resolved that we shall win the tomorrows before us. So I ask you to join me in that resolve, determined that from this midnight of tragedy, we shall move toward a new American greatness.

More than any generation before us, we have cause to be thankful on this Thanksgiving Day. Our harvests are bountiful, our factories flourish, our homes are safe, our defenses are secure.

We live in peace. The good will of the world pours out for us, but more than these blessings, we know tonight that our system is strong, strong and secure. A deed that was meant to tear us apart has bound us together. Our system has passed. You have passed a great test. You have shown what John F. Kennedy called upon us to show in his proclamation of this Thanksgiving: That decency of purpose, that steadfastness of resolve, and that strength of will which we inherit from our forefathers.

What better conveys what is best for America than this. On Saturday when these great burdens had been mine only hours, the first two citizens to call upon and to offer their whole support were Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman.

Since last Friday, Americans have turned to the good, to the decent values of our life. These have served us. Yes; these have saved us. The service of our public institution and our public men is the salvation of us all from the Supreme Court to the States. And how much better it would be, how much more sane it would be, and how much more decent and American it would be if all Americans could spend their fortunes and could give their time and spend their energies helping our system and its servants to solve your problems instead of pouring out the venom and the hate that stalemate us in progress.

I have served in Washington 32 years—32 years yesterday. I have seen five Presidents fill this awesome office. I have known them well and I have counted them all as friends: President Herbert Hoover, President Franklin Roosevelt, President Harry Truman, President Dwight Eisenhower, and President John Kennedy.

In each administration, the greatest burden that the President had to bear has been the burden of his own countrymen's unthinking and unreasoning hate and division. So in these days, the fate of this office is the fate of us all. I would ask all Americans on this day of prayer and reverence to think on these things. Let all who speak and all who teach and all who preach and all who publish and all who broadcast and all who read or listen—let them reflect upon their responsibilities to bind our wounds, to heal our sores, to make our society well and whole for the tasks

ahead of us. It is this work that I most want us to do, to banish rancor from our words and malice from our hearts, to close down the poison spring of hatred and intolerance and fanaticism; to protect our unity North and South, East and West; to hasten the day when bias of race, religion and region is no more; and to make the day when our great energies and decencies and spirit will be free of the burdens that we have borne too long.

Our view is outward. Our thrust is forward, but we remember in our hearts this brave young man who lives in honored eternal rest across the Potomac. We remember him; we remember his wonderful and courageous widow that we all love. We remember Caroline and John and all the great family who gave the Nation this son and brother.

And to honor his memory and the future of the works he started, I have today determined that Station No. 1 of the Atlantic Missile Range and a NASA Launch Operation Center in Florida shall hereafter be known as the John F. Kennedy Space Center.

I have also acted today with the understanding and the support of my friend, the Governor of Florida, Farris Bryant, to change the name of Cape Canaveral. It shall be known hereafter as Cape Kennedy.

On this Thanksgiving Day, as we gather in the warmth of our families, in the mutual love and respect that we have for one another, and as we bow our heads in submission to Divine Providence, let us also thank God for the years that He gave us inspiration through His servant, John F. Kennedy.

Let us today renew our dedication to the ideals that are American. Let us pray for His divine wisdom in banishing from our land any injustice or intolerance or oppression to any of our fellow Americans whatever their opinion, whatever the color of their skins—for God made all of us, not some of us, in His image. All of us, not just some of us, are His children.

And, finally, to you as your President, I ask that you remember your country and remember me each day in your prayers, and I pledge to you the best within me to work for a new American greatness, a new day when peace is more secure, when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home of all mankind.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 30, 1963]

BISHOP SCORES HATE CLIMATE—CALLS ON AMERICANS TO RECOGNIZE GUILT

The Episcopal bishop of Louisiana called upon Americans to recognize their guilt Friday night at a service of prayer and meditation occasioned by the assassination of President Kennedy.

The Right Reverend Girault M. Jones told worshipers at the Church House on St. Charles Avenue, "We have so completely forsaken the Biblical precepts of charity and of brotherhood that what was once a close-knit society is coming apart at the seams."

"We know that hatred leads to violence, and yet we have been willing to risk such consequences. We have identified political policies with one man, we have personalized worldwide social unrest by this man's image, we have shared in gossip, in offcolor jokes, and in deliberate misrepresentation * * * all in such a way as to plant the seeds of personal hatred, and to nurse them into flower," Bishop Jones said.

"America has created a climate of suspicion and of hatred in which no man is permitted to be himself," he told worshippers at the service, held by the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches and the New Orleans Ministerial Union.

Stating the "American way of life" cannot "stand the test of world scrutiny," Bishop Jones continued, "and now we must admit what can happen in the Congo, or in the Dominican Republic, or in Vietnam * * * can also happen here."

"This is a tragic day. We grieve the loss of a President, and we would honor his memory. We grieve for his family, and we would offer sympathy. We grieve for this Nation, and indeed for the world, and would pray that out of this shocking experience, God will recall us to Himself," the bishop concluded.

Other clergymen who participated in the service were the Reverend Dr. G. Avery Lee, pastor of St. Charles Avenue Baptist Church; the Reverend Dr. Alex W. Hunter, minister of the First Presbyterian Church; the Reverend Herbert L. Polinard, minister of the St. Charles Avenue Christian Church, and the Reverend George Wilson, executive secretary of the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches.

The Reverend W. K. Sisk, Jr., minister of the Elysian Fields Baptist Church, presided.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 1, 1963]

ASSASSINATION PLUS SOCIETY ALSO SUFFERED TWO GREAT WOUNDS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Everyone who has spoken and written about the misshapen events that have engulfed us—assassination and then murder on top of assassination—have avowed and prayed and predicted that, as a people and as a nation, we would emerge from the shock and shame of these events a better people and a better nation.

I believe this will prove to be true. But neither words of wrath nor words of expiation nor words pious and wishful thinking will make it so. Words will do little and words without deeds will do nothing.

Jesus taught that man must be judged by his fruits, not by his protestations. And Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, after commending us to think on whatsoever things are pure and honest and just and of good report, instantly added the higher command:

"These things, which ye have both learned and received, and heard, and seen in Me, do, and the God of peace shall be with you." (Philippians 4: 9)

If we are to learn some good from these horrible events, we must fix clearly in mind the exact wounds that have been inflicted upon our society and upon our Nation.

The murder of the President is grievous enough. But great wounds were inflicted upon our whole democracy.

1. The assassin's bullet struck from the hands of the 68,836,385 citizens who went to the polls in 1960 their precious right to have a President of their own choosing and an administration by the consent of the administered.

2. The murderer's bullet struck from the hands of the accused assassin the most precious guarantee of a free society, an open trial in open court by a jury of his peers.

These are two grievous wounds to the fiber and fabric of what most Americans cherish as the pillars of our social compact: a knife wound at our process of democracy, a knife wound at the process of justice.

After Jack Ruby shot Lee Harvey Oswald as he was surrounded by Dallas police in the basement of the city jail, you do doubt listened to the many interviews in the street which television recorded. Not a few of them expressed their praise and pleasure at the murder of the accused assassin. In almost the same words, each said, "I believe in an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; I'm glad he got it."

Are they, when they think it over? Our criminal law is based, in part, on the Old Testament moral law of an eye for an eye, the doctrine that punishment must fit the crime. But who shall determine the guilty? An enemy, an avenger, a crackpot—or a court of law? Ruby acted to sentence Oswald before he was tried—and the American social compact was torn asunder as it has been torn too often in recent years.

I believe that the point of beginning is to be a little less sure that we alone are right and that those who disagree are automatically wrong. I share the view that the words and actions of the extremist right and the extremist left have sown seeds of hatred and violence in the land. But even here I would draw with great care the lessons from the acts of hideousness we have recently experienced.

There is no evidence that the assassination was the act of a racist. There is no evidence that the assassin was influenced to commit his act by the seeds of hatred which extreme racists have sown and which have come to fruition in the murder of Medgar Evers and the Negro schoolchildren in Birmingham.

We don't know what went on in Oswald's twisted mind and, because Ruby took the law in his hands, we never will know.

But we do know that the words of President Johnson need to be taken to heart by all of us: "Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence. Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

Why shouldn't we?

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 23, 1963]

THE PRESIDENT

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, and the Nation mourns him. Yesterday's first shock of horror gives way this morning to a depth of sorrow beyond expression. We can at this moment only look back briefly, and try to look forward briefly, and look into our own hearts as individuals and as a people.

President Kennedy loved the life that has been taken from him. That is what we think of first, remembering him. The pictures that come back are the lively ones: the candidate fighting with a kind of cheerful ferocity for the great office in the performance of whose duties he died; the President laughing, sailing, throwing himself into a speech, joking with his children, reveling in a world full of things to see and hear and think about and above all, do. Life and color and, to use his favorite word, vigor, went with him everywhere. He was greatly endowed by fortune and, unlike many men so endowed, knew it. Complaint and repining were no part of him. Lethargy was no part of him. This quality of vividness, which captivated first the country and then much of the world, makes it seem all the more incredible that he should have been struck down, at the peak of his abilities, gone at an age when most men of his stature are still but on their way toward high achievement.

His death is a tragedy with many facets. The country's first thoughts go to his family, his gentle wife and his young children, only just old enough to understand that their father and companion is gone; his close-knit band of brothers and sisters, his parents, who now lose a third child dead too young. That for all of us is the personal aspect: in loss, all mankind is kin.

There is the tragedy too of great tasks unfinished, of the plow stopped part way down the furrow, th house left standing in framework, the story checked midsentence. No one now can say what Mr. Kennedy's accomplishments would have been had he lived. We do know that he was a strong man in a crisis, and the graver the crisis the stronger the man. Berlin in 1961 and Cuba last year are the memorable examples, written forever in our history: at those breathless moments President Kennedy held the Nation's fate in his hands, and the hands were firm. We do know that in shocking

national failure, as with the Bay of Pigs, Mr. Kennedy could take upon himself the full burden of responsibility. We do know that he left his country stronger in the world than he had found it, and more confident of its destiny. We do know that when internal discord arose to threaten our tranquillity, because of wrongs left too long unrighted, he faced the issue gravely, squarely, and honestly, leading the country in another crisis, a crisis this time of the national conscience. Thus the record so far. What the rest might have been we shall never know.

Regret for a life's work cruelly cut off, and honor at the way Mr. Kennedy died, and grief over personal loss, are not enough. We must resolve as a nation that the story in which Mr. Kennedy was for all too short a time the chief actor shall continue, and grow brighter and more honorable, until the blots of bitterness and hatred no longer stain its pages.

The Government of the United States continues; that Government of which a President is at once master and servant. Any one man's passing is, in the long life of this democracy, but a missed heartbeat. Mr. Kennedy, who had looked death in the face oftener than most, who was a scholar of the Constitution and a pragmatic politician, knew that as well as anyone. To every President the existence of the Vice Presidency is a constant reminder of the continuity of the Republic, though men are mortal. It must have crossed Mr. Kennedy's mind, from that moment more than 3 years ago when he asked Lyndon Johnson to run for office with him, that his old Senate colleague, his political rival and friend, might through an accident of history be his successor.

Upon President Johnson now falls this weight of office. Only one other man in the United States knows how heavy the mantle is when it falls suddenly upon the shoulders. Harry Truman, in 1945, spoke for Lyndon Johnson today when he asked his hearers, if they ever prayed, to pray for him now.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1963]

KENNEDY'S GREAT WORK—ITS IMPACT ABROAD

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

LONDON.—John F. Kennedy did not have time to achieve everything he hoped to achieve. The biggest single waste in terms of statecraft is that he will not have the chance to use in what might have been his second term the influence and prestige which he had gained during his first.

The immediate damage is minor, since, in effect, a recess had been called in diplomatic affairs. The week of the assassination opened with a restatement of the world balance of power by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara which had the effect of closing the season. The Soviets would hardly be expected to negotiate in the wake of an announcement of decisive Western superiority in both conventional and nuclear weapons.

Even without the McNamara speech the chances of useful or constructive diplomacy during the balance of this year and 1964 were uncertain. Great nations do not often negotiate over major issues when elections are in the offing. Had Mr. Kennedy been spared, he might have been able to do little more until after the November elections next year than others apparently can do now. It appeared probable to be a period of waiting.

But had he won his reelection substantially, he would have possessed such influence and prestige as few staesmen in history ever have achieved. It would have been an advantage to himself and his country of significant value—a credit to be spent for the greater security of his country, of his allies, and of the world.

An English workman who knew me to be an American stopped me on the street and offered me his sympathy on my loss and told me that when he heard the news he wept. I asked him why, and he said, "He was one of us. He was a good man. And I felt safe while he was there."

Many "felt safe while he was there."

That feeling of safety was not an old condition; it was a very recent condition. It can be dated from the Cuban crisis of October a year ago. Until Cuba, the duel between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy was unresolved and relentless. At some point there had to be the decisive confrontation, the final test of strength.

That moment of the Cuban crisis grows larger in perspective as it recedes into the past. It stands out on the record of the past as the watershed between the period when the possibility of nuclear war ever was present in our lives and the period when the danger seems itself to be a major deterrent.

Mr. Kennedy gave the West, indeed all the world, the priceless gain of release from fear of inevitable nuclear war. He gave us all a chance to look and think and plan ahead in an atmosphere of confidence and relief.

Perhaps not everyone realized the achievement until the man who had gained it was gone. Surely the workman on the street did not realize until the blinding moment of tragedy that he indeed had felt more safe and secure over a whole year for the first time since the last great war ended. When the climactic moment came, he understood it and could articulate it.

In one sense that achievement remains for the greater safety of all. The clock can scarcely be turned back entirely to the dark and dangerous times before the Cuban confrontation. The essential facts of these new times remain unaltered and undamaged. It is reasonable to assume that diplomacy can resume its work once the various political uncertainties of the next year are resolved.

But there already will have been two Presidents in the White House in Washington during a span of 2 years and 10 months and there is new a possibility of three in 3 years. The chance of much achievement until this time of change is over is not large.

The evil work in Dallas has taken from us all the opportunity Mr. Kennedy had earned for himself and the human race to use a longer period. None other can use it for him as he could have used it. It takes the better part of 4 years to make a President.

Mr. Kennedy had only just emerged in his full stature as the leading statesman of the world when hatred struck him down. This is the heaviest loss to the world.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 25, 1963]

GO, STRANGER

(By Joseph Alsop)

Of all the men in public life in his time, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the most ideally formed to lead the United States of America.

Such, at any rate, is this reporter's judgment, perhaps biased, but at any rate based on long experience and close observation, and no longer possible to suspect as self-serving. To be sure, judging Kennedy was never easy, for he was no common man, to be judged by common standards.

Courage, intelligence, and practicality; a passion for excellence and a longing to excel; above all, a deep love of this country, a burning pride in its past, and unremitting confidence in the American future—these were the qualities which acted, so to say, as the mainsprings of Kennedy the President.

Kennedy the man, Kennedy the private face, was half the enemy and half the reinforcement of Kennedy the President. He had an enviable grace of manner and person. He enjoyed pleasure. After Theodore Roosevelt, he was the first American President to care for learning for its own sake. After Abraham Lincoln, he was the first American President with a rich vein of personal humor—which is a very different thing from the capacity to make jokes.

This strange, dry, detached, self-mocking humor no doubt aided him to assess men and events; but in his public role, it was a handicap. Certainly it was not the same sort of handicap as Lincoln's humor, which actually prevented great numbers of otherwise intelligent persons from taking Lincoln seriously.

President Kennedy's humor instead inhibited him from showing the depth of his feelings. Any public exhibition of emotion gave him gooseflesh. So foolish people said he was a cold, unfeeling man, although few men in our time have had stronger feelings about those things that mattered to him.

After his country, what mattered most to him was to live intensely, with purpose and effect. He was in some sense the ultimate personification of the observation of Justice Holmes: "Man is born to act; to act is to affirm the worth of an end; and to affirm the worth of an end is to create an ideal."

The ideal that Mr. Kennedy affirmed in action was singularly simple: for no man was ever more contemptous of the theological complexities of ideology. (It was hard to know, indeed, whether he held a more sovereign contempt for the doctrinaire mushiness of the extreme American left or for the doctrinaire hate-preaching of the extreme American right. He was slow to anger, but these made his gorge rise.)

His ideal could be completely summed up in only a score of so of words—a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal; the proud stronghold of a new birth of freedom; and the standing promise to all men Government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth. The noble, ancient phrases, the pieced-together tags from the finest of all American utterances, are as well worn by now as antique coins, whose legend is illegible. But, he could read the legend still. He still took this definition of our Nation's purpose with perfect literalness and this was the ideal that his actions sought to affirm.

Whereas, Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office when the Nation was clamoring for leadership and crying out to be shown a new course, John Fitzgerald Kennedy took office in a time of violent—yet hardly comprehensible, change.

Too many, then as now, confronted the vast revolutionary processes of our time either with fatty complacency or with shrill, embittered indignation. His task was therefore a hard task, and he was untimely cut off before his task could be half done.

Yet if we look at our country and the world in which we live—if we honestly compare the prospects now opening before us with the prospects as they seemed when Mr. Kennedy's Presidency began—we can see that there has been a new birth of hope.

It is perhaps pardonable, at this moment, to be personal. Speaking for myself, I have not dared to hope as I do now since those grst months of the Korean war, when such overly high hopes were born from a strong sense that America was grandly accomplishing a high, historic service. That service had its heavy price.

I still remember watching the wolfhound regiment through a long, hard fight, and how the bodies of the fallen were carried in when the fight was won, and how I suddenly could think only of Simonides' epitaph that was inscribed, for all to read, on the tomb of the dead Spartans at Thermopylae:

"Go stranger, and in Lacedaemon tell
That here obedient to the laws we fell."

But the President who is lost to us, like those men who were lost so many years ago, was no drilled, unthinking Spartiate. He

was the worthy citizen of a nation great and free—a nation, as he liked to think, that is great because it is free and this was the thought that always inspired his too brief leadership of this Republic.

[From the Shreveport-Bossier City (La.) Journal, Nov. 25, 1963]

MICKLE ATTACKS HATEMONGERS

"The stage had been set for someone to murder President John F. Kennedy somewhere. It could have happened to Shreveport."

So spoke Dr. Joe J. Mickle, president of Centenary College, this morning, in addressing a memorial service at the college for the assassinated Chief Executive.

"I make these statements," said the educator, "because John F. Kennedy was much hated—hated both by the Communists and the professional haters of Communists.

"Judging by certain editorials, letters to the editor, an avalanche of filthy printed material, certain radio and television programs and political speeches by any number of candidates for offices in our States, John F. Kennedy was the personification of almost all evil.

"Thus it is that our thinking has been warped by an almost endless stream of words of suspicion and hatred. Hatred and violence have ridden unchecked across our land. Eventually this constant stream of destructive criticism, suspicion, hatred, and violence begins to take its toll; and faith in our Government, our churches, our schools, and our international organizations so vital to world peace and security is undermined. Thus, a climate has been created in which almost any person of warped mind or emotionally disturbed may feel that he is rendering a great service by sending a bullet crashing through the brain of a Government official.

"We can honor a great American, John F. Kennedy, only if we individually and as a nation bow our heads in introspection, humility, and repentence before Almighty God," Mickle said.

Elsewhere in Shreveport and Bossier City, residents joined with the fellow Americans in the national day of mourning for the late President.

From 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., the business life of the community came to a virtual standstill. The Shreveport Civic Center, Bossier City Hall, and many stores and business establishments were closed during the period out of respect to the slain Chief Executive.

Banks, Federal and State offices were closed for the day. So were Caddo Parish public and parochial schools. Bossier Parish schools will be closed throughout the week because of a previously announced teachers' meeting and the Thanksgiving holiday.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 27, 1963]

A SCENE UNDUPLICATED

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Pictures and sounds and music told the story better than words.

The Nation, emotionally depleted, went back to everyday life—to routine jobs, to holiday shopping, and to television commercials, but with a new President and ache when it thought of a former one and with a sense of guilt that it could not quite define but could not eliminate.

Above all, the Nation had watched a brave woman, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, representing it among visiting kings, presidents, and dignitaries—a woman who had seen her young husband slain at her side only 3 days before but who somehow managed from an inner spring of strength and self-control to put her sense of duty above her personal grief and to redeem in personal dignity some part of the shame and ignominy the Nation felt.

VERY DETERMINED CROWD

The story of the day can never quite be duplicated in this restless Capital. Scene after scene unfolded, then blurred into one another, and finally ended with the evening starlings flying in as usual from across the Potomac against a fiery sunset.

Sometime during the day the White House announced the President Johnson, as one of his first acts in office, had sent to Nikita S. Khrushchev, Soviet Premier, a message pledging to continue the efforts for peace of his predecessor, John F. Kennedy.

The Johnson message replied to one of condolence and sympathy from Moscow.

Long before this announcement of state, however, the patient crowds had collected and waited and shuffled in the freezing weather all night long for a chance to file past the bier of President Kennedy. It was placed on the Lincoln catafalque in the great echoing rotunda of the hushed Capitol.

Officials were awed at the queue which, by midnight, extended back 30 blocks. At 2 a.m., and 3, at 4, and again at 5, the police warned the shuffling throng that there was little chance of getting in before the great bronze doors shut at 9 a.m. But still they came and came.

At the end, with the grotesqueness that mingles with tragedy, the line was hurried past the casket in a kind of lope.

All during Sunday dignitaries from four quarters of the globe had been gathering in Washington; so many, so varied, and so subdued that often they went to their embassies virtually unrecognized: 22 presidents or prime ministers, 3 reigning kings, and the princes and princesses of 9 countries.

SOVIET EMISSARY

There was stately President de Gaulle of France, rotund Chancellor Ludwig Erhard of West Germany, and wily Anastas Mikoyan, Soviet First Deputy Premier, who came on a special flight from Moscow as Premier Khrushchev's personal emissary.

From Britain there was Prince Philip, Prime Minister Alec Douglas-Home, and opposition leader Harold Wilson. There was beautiful Queen Frederika of Greece, picturesque Emperor Haile Selassie, and Premier Hayato Ikeda from Japan.

Then somewhat before noon, down historic Pennsylvania Avenue came the roll of drums, and the crowds, lined 10 to 20 deep, craned to see the military procession and cortege, moving from the Capitol to the White House, from whence it would go on to St. Matthew's Roman Catholic Cathedral.

The grief was genuine but is was different from that which greeted the bier of Franklin D. Roosevelt on his final ride.

DIFFERING EMOTIONS

For Roosevelt, the crowd made no effort to hide its sobs, as though for a father or protector. For President Kennedy, it was poignant rather than overwhelming. The feeling toward this gay, graceful young man evidently did not go so deep as to the wartime President; it was the tragedy of a broken home and lost opportunity rather than the vivid personal identification to the President of 12 years. Above all, it was crowd eager to see Mrs. Kennedy.

Soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and special service detachments moved precisely, with black-draped drums. The journey was in two parts. The procession came to the White House that seemed to be keeping a kind of silent vigil of its own. And there Mrs. Kennedy and her family and the visiting dignitaries left cars and walked behind the procession to the cathedral.

Crowds were so dense along the streets that those in the rear could not see. Many heard only the clatter of the horses, the cadenced scuff of soldiers' feet, and the Air Force band playing "America, the Beautiful."

At many times at the cathedral and later Mrs. Kennedy stood with her two brothers-in-law, Robert Kennedy and Edward Kennedy.

Caroline and John Jr., wearing blue coats, arrived in a car and joined their mother. Her thoughts were toward her children; she comforted John who cried at one point.

A BOY'S SALUTE

At another time she bent over as the band played, and he stepped forward, holding a pretended salute.

She seemed composed as she emerged after the sonorous Latin service and waited while the coffin was placed back on the caisson for its final ride to Arlington. She held the hands of her two children, Caroline sobbing. Bells pealed softly.

Two former Presidents and old opponents, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman, chatted on the cathedral steps. They were asked by Senator KENNEDY to speak to Mrs. Kennedy and came forward briefly to say a few quiet words of comfort. Then they entered the same car for the ride to the cemetery.

CENTER OF SCENE

It was around Mrs. Kennedy that the scene turned. It was she that the hushed and almost awe-struck crowd followed with its eyes.

In the solemn serenity of Arlington cemetery the simple headstones of soldiers from all America's battles lie in ordered sequence.

The sky was so clear that vapor trails of airplanes were like sweeping chalkmarks on a blue board.

So on a brilliant November afternoon, in which shadows gradually lengthened, John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, came to rest at last, some of his work done, most undone, in a career cut short in senseless tragedy.

Shortly before midnight, Mrs. Kennedy slipped out of the White House and rode to Arlington National Cemetery to place flowers on her husband's grave. A perpetual flame on the grave was burning through its first night.

The only meaning to all the shock and horror at the end came from the posture of his wife, Jacqueline, a woman long considered beautiful, but who came through the ordeal with ennobling dignity.

A PROCLAMATION

(Mayor Victor H. Schiro issued the following proclamation today designating Monday, November 25, 1963, as a day of sorrow in New Orleans in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy.)

Whereas the sudden and untimely death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, has cast the dark pall of sorrow and regret over the city of New Orleans; and

Whereas the assassination of our Chief Executive ranks with the vilest crimes of this generation and as such brings down the resentment of law-abiding people everywhere; and

Whereas citizens of this community abhor and do condemn this truly un-American act which snuffed out the very life of the man chosen by this great Nation to be its duly elected President and Commander in Chief; and

Whereas law-abiding citizens are outraged at this dastardly crime which removes from his place of high esteem the leader of this Nation, a man who not yet attained his true and ultimate mark in life:

Now, therefore, I, Victor H. Schiro, by the powers vested in me as mayor of the city of New Orleans, do hereby proclaim the day of President Kennedy's funeral service, Monday, November 25, 1963, to be a day of sorrow, and urge all citizens to publicly and private mourn the passing of our Chief Executive.

On this sad occasion, and in tribute to our late President, I have ordered that city hall and all municipal offices be closed and I re-

quest that all American flags, displayed on public and private buildings, homes, institutions, etc., be flown at half-mast during the period of local and national mourning.

I urge all municipal employees, as well as all citizens, to observe Monday, November 25, as a day of prayer and reverence so that God, in His infinite wisdom and goodness, might: bring peace and eternal rest to the soul of President Kennedy; that the President's wife, Mrs. Kennedy, and his family might be sustained in this hour of bereavement; that our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, might be given strength and guidance in this hour of crisis; that our Nation might be greater united to meet the challenges that face us today and in the days to come.

In addition, I recommend that all places of amusement and business be closed on Monday, November 25. Where it is not possible to close certain business establishments because of undue hardship on employers or employees, I request that at 11 a.m., c.s.t., on the above date that a 5-minute period of silent prayer be observed.

VICTOR H. SCHIRO,
Mayor.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Nov. 25, 1963]

BOGGS DESCRIBES SHOCK, SADNESS IN WASHINGTON—SAYS FREEMEN EVERYWHERE LOST FRIEND

(By U.S. Representative HALE BOGGS, House majority whip)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This is a day I never thought I would see. I shall always remember each sad detail.

I had had a busy week. On Sunday, Speaker (JOHN W.) MCCORMACK's brother had died in Boston, and Congressman (CARL) ALBERT spent the week as Speaker pro tempore, and I was acting majority leader. This meant constant attention to floor details.

Today, however, the House was not in session, and I thought I would take care of several of my many requests from constituents.

I got the news (of the President's death) in a Government agency office downtown. Immediately, the Capitol switchboard was swamped, and the streets of Washington almost instantly were jammed with people.

I hurried to Speaker MCCORMACK's office. He had just returned today from his brother's funeral in Boston. Already, the Secret Service had quietly moved in to protect his person. (He is now next in line of succession to President Johnson.)

FLOOD OF RUMORS

Already, he was complaining about the Secret Service agents. I told him that they would be with him from now on whether he liked it or not.

We were flooded with rumors. One was that the Vice President, now President Johnson, had suffered a severe heart attack. This visibly shook the Speaker and caused grave alarm among all of us. Fortunately, this dreadful rumor was unfounded.

Soon the word came that President Kennedy's body would arrive at Andrews Air Force Base in nearby Maryland at 6:05 p.m. Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, the dean of the House; Speaker MCCORMACK and I went out to the base together. Other cars brought the other congressional leaders.

Soon, out of a clear and crisp autumn night, came the beautiful Air Force red-white-and-blue jet No. 1. Awaiting it were the dignitaries of the world who represent their Governments in Washington; Representative CHARLIE HALLECK and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican leaders of the House and the Senate, were standing right next to me.

WEEP FOR WIFE

As the brown casket carrying the body of our young President was moved from the plane, the great and the near great wept openly for the brave Mrs. Kennedy, who followed behind the casket, and for the man who had given his life for America.

The President's body was then taken to the Bethesda (Md.) Naval Hospital.

The congressional leaders then went to the White House for a meeting with a grave and saddened Texan who now becomes the loneliest man on earth. Present from the Senate were Senator (MIKE) MANSFIELD, the majority leader; Senator DIRKSEN, the minority leader; Senator (HUBERT) HUMPHREY, the majority whip; Senator (THOMAS) KUCHEL, the minority whip; and Senator (GEORGE) SMATHERS, the Senate deputy whip.

And from the House, there were Speaker MCCORMACK, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, Minority Leader HALLECK, and myself.

ALL PLEDGE HELP

The new President asked for our help. He asked for a united country. He said he had been in touch with former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman and they had said they would come to Washington.

We pledged our help, and each of us, on leaving President Johnson, said, "God bless you, Mr. President."

As I left, the White House was dark except for a light in the nursery. The rocking chair in the President's office was now empty, and a lump came into my threat. I remembered on Wednesday, just the day before yesterday, at our usual weekly breakfast, the vibrant health of our President. I remembered his interest, as always, in every detail of the legislative program; his quiet comment on his warm reception the day before in Florida, and his concern for the Speaker and the loss of his brother.

As I drove away, I said to myself, I have lost a friend. The Nation has lost a peerless leader. And freemen eevrywhere have lost him too.

Capt. D. Edward Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Capt. D. Edward Sullivan of the Brockton, Mass., Police Department will terminate his 33-year career on December 15, 1963. Captain Sullivan has served through some of the most celebrated investigations in the annals of Brockton crime.

A native of Brockton, Captain Sullivan was appointed to the police department as a reserve officer in 1930. In 1935 he became a regular officer and within 2 years was promoted to sergeant. In 1939 he became a lieutenant and in 1951 reached the position of captain. He has been in charge of the detective bureau for the past 20 years, and attended the FBI National Academy in Washington during 1948.

Captain Sullivan, one of Plymouth County's most respected law officers is a dedicated, devoted lawman whose unquestioned ability and dignified manner command the professional and personal respect of subordinates and superiors alike.

Chief Joseph C. Wright has said:

As far as we are concerned, he is one of the top police officials in the country. An outstanding officer, Captain Sullivan will sorely be missed.

Captain Sullivan is looking forward to a well deserved rest to formulate his yet uncertain plans for the future. I wish to enclose an article by Richard A. Powers from the Boston Globe of Monday, September 2, 1963, concerning Captain Sullivan's retirement.

BROCKTON "POLICEMEN'S POLICEMAN" ENDING 33 YEARS WITH DEPARTMENT

(By Richard A. Powers)

BROCKTON.—A law enforcement career covering 33 years and some of the most-celebrated investigations in Brockton crime annals is drawing to a close.

Capt. D. Edward Sullivan, one of Plymouth County's most-respected officers, will retire from the Brockton department at the end of the year.

Soft-spoken "Cap" Sullivan is a hard-nosed, no-nonsense lawman whose unquestioned ability and dignified mien command the professional and personal respect of subordinates and superiors alike.

Toughest on slayers and gamblers, his batting average against these offenders over the years is far above average, and he has been cited on more than one occasion for his fast, efficient investigations.

"As far as we are concerned, he is one of the top police officials in the country, said Chief Joseph C. Wright. "An outstanding officer, Captain Sullivan will sorely be missed."

Plymouth County District Attorney John R. Wheatley of Abington, with whom Sullivan has worked on many cases, declared, "I have the highest regard for him. He has been right up there as a police officer."

Brockton's Mayor F. Milton McGrath said of the captain, "He has a splendid record of achievement. Captain Sullivan has been cited many times by former mayors. He has always been a fair and conscientious police officer."

The head of the 15-man bureau of criminal investigation, who worked up through the ranks from reserve, was described by one of his own men as a "policeman's policeman."

"Cap" Sullivan is the type guy who, when he speaks, everyone listens," the officer asserted.

Sullivan was a shoe worker when he decided to pursue a police career. He had to work as a reserve patrolman for 4 years before being appointed a regular in 1935.

He was 31 years old when he joined in 1930 and in 1937 he was promoted to sergeant. In 1939 he became a lieutenant assigned to the criminal investigating bureau.

He earned his present rank in 1947 and in 1951, under Mayor Melvin Clifford, he was appointed chief for 1 year.

"It is getting difficult to be a police officer," Sullivan said, pointing to several recent laws including the illegal search and seizure law.

His plans for the future are undecided at present, except for one thing—a vacation to make up his mind what he wants to do.

He is the father of two sons—Edward J., a State trooper working out of headquarters in Boston, and Dr. David F. Sullivan, a local dentist.

We Are a Nation of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one lesson we and the world should heed from the terrible events of last November 22

was recorded recently by Columnist John Edwards. His words appeared in the Enterprise Newspapers of California on November 24 as follows:

YOU CAN'T KILL THE PRESIDENT

(By John Edwards)

And so what have you killed? The President? Sorry fellow, you have not killed the President. You killed a man named John F. Kennedy. A husband, a father, a son.

You failed, little man. You have failed.

The President lives. The President of the United States of America is alive. The Nation goes on. The laws are still laws of the land. The Congress will convene. The Nation has lost a man. That's all you killed. A man. The President is in the office.

Didn't anyone tell you? Read to you? Didn't you read it yourself? You can't kill a title. You can only kill a man.

We know that men can die in office. We know that fools might kill. We know that death comes to every man in time. We know that our elected representative can be only a man.

So we, the people, have provided for this emergency. The office of the President is never empty. My God, haven't you read the history of our Presidents who have been killed or died in that office? Men die and the office is filled.

Policies? The policies continue. The Nation does not die. There is no ruction. There is no dissolution. There is no real disturbance. The way of life continues.

The President of the United States is in office. His name is Lyndon B. Johnson.

So now what have you proven? That a bullet will kill a man? That no man is safe from death? Lord, we've known from time immemorial that men die.

Let me tell you something. You can kill a king.

You can kill an emperor. You can kill a dictator. These are men in power through their absolute despotic control.

But you can't kill a President. We change ours pretty regularly, and we continue to be this one same Nation. This United States.

You cannot kill a President. You only kill a man.

My God, how empty is the victory over a name. We don't change the Presidency, little man. We change the name of the man at the top. We change names little man, that's all, names.

Our leader is not and never has been the individual.

Our leader has been the President.

We shall pause briefly for a day or two. We shall mourn the passing of a husband, a father, a son. We shall go on.

We, the people, will continue, and we shall support our President.

You see, little man, you failed.

Reaction to the Monroe Doctrine at Home and Abroad 140 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 140th anniversary of the famous document, the Monroe Doctrine, Dr. Bronis L. Kaslas, associate professor of international law at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, has written a series of articles on the meaning and significance of that historical document. As part of my remarks today, I would like to include the second part of the series which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Wednesday, December 4, 1963.

The article follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Dec. 4, 1963]

REACTION TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE AT HOME AND ABROAD 140 YEARS AGO

(This is the second in a series of four articles on the Monroe Doctrine, written for the Times-Leader Evening News by Dr. Bronis L. Kaslas, associate professor of international law at Wilkes College, in connection with the observance of the 140th anniversary of the famous document which is being put to a new test in these troubled times.)

Simultaneously, and independently of the Latin American problem, a dangerous situation was developing on the Pacific coast. Russian trading posts had been established on the islands of the American Pacific coast from the 55th parallel as far as Bodega Bay, only 50 miles from San Francisco.

The crucial event leading the United States to take concrete action, however, was a Russian imperial decree of 1821 in which Tsar Alexander I extended exclusive Russian jurisdiction south of the 51st parallel. The decree prohibited all foreign ships, including American vessels, to come within 100 Italian miles of the coast. Russian warships were sent to patrol the area and enforce the decree.

To protect its claims to the Oregon Territory, the United States could not permit Russia to penetrate this far. Thus, out of the situations in Latin America and on the Pacific coast was born the Monroe Doctrine.

England, like the United States, was opposed to any European intervention restoring Spanish power in Latin America. The British Government decided to make proposals to the United States for common efforts to protect the former Spanish colonies.

FORMER PRESIDENT'S VIEWS

In 1822, George Canning became British Foreign Secretary and soon proposed that the U.S. Government join with England in declaring that the two countries had no ambitions to acquire any portion of the Spanish colonies themselves and would oppose transfer of any of them to other power.

Before replying to the British proposal, President Monroe consulted two former Presidents, Jefferson and Madison. Jefferson advised as the fundamental principle of American foreign policy "never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe" and "never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with Atlantic affairs."

Both Jefferson and Madison believed that by acceding to the British proposal, the United States would separate England from the Holy Alliance and bring her over to the side of free government. They both advised acceptance of the British proposal.

John Quincy Adams, the American Secretary of State, strongly advocated that the United States be alone in announcing American policy toward European interference in the Western Hemisphere, rather than coming in "as a cockboat in the wake of the British man-of-war."

President Monroe and the Cabinet agreed with his strategy, and it was decided to enunciate the principles of American foreign policy in the President's message to Congress. The Jefferson principle of the two separate spheres was also to be incorporated. This message was submitted to Congress on December 2, 1823, and was subsequently to be known as the Monroe Doctrine.

In the first part of the document, President Monroe alluded to Russian claims in the Pacific and enunciated the non-colonization principle in the following words:

"The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Later in the message, Monroe turned to Latin American affairs:

"We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers (of the Holy Alliance) to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their systems to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

"With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power, we have not interferred and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

UNITED STATES CALLED "IMPUDENT"

Monroe's message was welcomed by the Nation with great enthusiasm, but the reactionary governments of autocratic Europe called it "impudent." The Russian czar declared that Monroe's message contained "views and pretensions so exaggerated that it merited only the most profound contempt."

In spite of their negative reactions, the powers of the Holy Alliance never issued a formal protest against the Monroe Doctrine or declared it null nor void.

Dr. Frank F. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly fine expressions of friendly good neighborliness occurred early last month in Spokane, Wash.

Dr. Frank Warren, president of Whitworth—Presbyterian—College was given a citation of honor by Gonzaga University, a Jesuit institution of outstanding merit.

The citation:

CITATION OF HONOR GIVEN BY GONZAGA UNIVERSITY

The President and faculty of Gonzaga University, to all who head these present letters, greetings in the Lord.

Whereas he has helped to bring together separate and at times dissident educational forces into a working unity;

Whereas he has signalized himself as a builder both of buildings and human friendship;

Whereas he has survived through so many adversities, hard times, and good times for almost a quarter of a century as the president of Whitworth College;

Whereas even in sickness he has continued through the airwaves to bring people his own good thoughts on Almighty God;

Whereas through his life he has endeavored to give witness to the teachings of the Master;

We commend Dr. Frank F. Warren and present to him this day a citation of honor.

JOHN P. LEARY, S.J.,
President.

SPOKANE, WASH., *November 2, 1963.*

Whitworth College was indeed a struggling institution when Dr. Warren became its president in 1940.

Its growth under his leadership has been tremendous and attests to his tireless labors. It is indeed a proud and living testimonial to a great educator.

Who's Who in America includes this brief biography:

Dr. Frank Furniss Warren, college president; born at Gilead, Mich., November 23, 1899; son of Robert Hopkins and Alice May (Furniss). Received A.B., Seattle Pacific College, 1922; D.D. (honorary), 1942; M.A., Drew University, Madison, N.J., 1929; LL.D. (honorary), Whitworth College, 1955; Litt.D., Pacific Luthern College, Parkland, Wash., 1958; married Lucile Secord, June 20, 1922; children—Miriam Joyce, Virginia Lucile, Kenneth Rees. Ordained to ministry of Presbyterian Church, 1940; religious educator to Osaka, Japan, 1925–32; dean Department of Religion, Seattle Pacific College, 1933–40; president, Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash., since 1940; carried radio program, the Whitworth Chapel Hour since 1940; member State parks and recreation commission, 1949–60. Member of the Rotary Club. Address, Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash.

Sale of Fore River Shipyard to General Dynamics Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the Bethlehem Steel Co. sold the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass., to the General Dynamics Corp. With this sale it will mark the third such move Bethlehem has made recently. Previously two other shipbuilding yards owned by Bethlehem were closed out.

The General Dynamics Corp. advised that the yard will be known as the Quincy Yard of the Electric Boat Division. The new firm is a highly aggressive and competitive bidder and, with this acquisition and its proven capabilities, should be in an excellent position to compete with other yards for construction of nuclear submarines and surface craft.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. has played an important role in the economic and civic life of the south shore area for many years. I join with the people of the area in thanking the company for this valuable contribution rendered.

I include in the RECORD two news items from the Quincy Patriot-Ledger and one from the Boston Traveler concerning this sale:

[From the Quincy Patriot Ledger, Dec. 7, 1963]

HIGHER JOB LEVEL AT YARD—HOPE OF GENERAL DYNAMICS

QUINCY.—The Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp. said last night it hopes its new Quincy yard, where it expects to start operations within 30 to 60 days, "will be so successful that it will enable us to increase the employment level there."

The agreement by General Dynamics to purchase Bethlehem Steel's Quincy shipyard was announced yesterday by Roger Lewis, chairman of the board, president, and chief executive officer.

SURFACE SHIP PLANS

Last night, Electric Boat said it expects to start operations here in 30 to 60 days "upon completion of detailed arrangements."

It said it expects to continue fabrications of submarine sections at Quincy and "in time to get the surface ship business because the acquisition of the Quincy yard will provide the corporation with greater flexibility and the capacity for a wider range of marine work."

Electric Boat said Fore River Shipyard will become the Quincy yard of the Electric Boat Division and not a separate division of General Dynamics.

The operations at the yard will be under the direction of J. William Jones, Jr., president of Electric Boat at Groton.

The company said it expects to transfer no employees from the Groton yard to Quincy.

Regarding reports that submarine work will be taken from Groton and sent to Quincy, the company said, "For some time the Quincy yard has been doing subcontract work for Electric Boat, primarily fabricating hull sections and it is expected this type of work will continue."

The company also said it has "no plans at this time" to move submarines to Quincy for fitting out.

It continued that Electric Boat is not taking over the labor contracts at the Quincy shipyard, stating: "Electric Boat is purchasing the physical assets only. However, we want to utilize the skills of the people at Quincy as much as possible and hope the yard will be so successful that it will enable us to increase the employment level there."

Earlier yesterday, just prior to the announcement an agreement had been reached with Bethlehem, Electric Boat officials met with representatives of the Metal Trades Council of New London County, which represents the 11 craft unions at submarine shipyard.

After the meeting, the council said, "The jurisdictional rights of our members will be protected to the fullest as will their job status and workload conditions."

The council said it will meet with the company on "jurisdictional potentials" next week after the Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL–CIO, which represents employees at Fore River, meets with General Dynamics next week.

Ronald Orcutt, Local 5 president, was asked today if a report that the yard will shut down Friday and that General Dynamics will rehire after January 1 is true.

"I would doubt it very much," Mr. Orcutt said.

He pointed out that union officials will meet with General Dynamics Wednesday in Boston. "What the dates are, I don't know," he said of any possibility of the yard closing.

"Our intention is to do everything we can to convince General Dynamics to keep the yard open and keep the people there," Mr. Orcutt said of what the unions will try to do Wednesday.

"We will do everything we can to convince them (General Dynamics) not to shut down the yard at all," Mr. Orcutt said.

Company officials at Fore River could not be reached for comment today.

[From the Quincy Patriot-Ledger]

GENERAL DYNAMICS AGREES TO BUY FORE RIVER YARD

QUINCY.—The long-anticipated sale of Fore River Shipyard to General Dynamics Corp. was confirmed today with the indication that General Dynamics is planning to enter the field of surface-ship construction.

NO PRICE DISCLOSED

General Dynamics President Roger Lewis, from his New York office, announced an agreement to purchase the physical assets of the Fore River Shipyard from Bethlehem Steel. He did not disclose the price.

In his announcement, Mr. Lewis indicated General Dynamics will enter the field of surface-ship construction, saying, "Acquisition of the Quincy yard will supplement existing facilities of our Electric Boat Division at Groton, Conn., and will provide the corporation with greater flexibility and capacity for a wider range of marine work."

General Dynamics will take over the construction of two nuclear attack submarines, now under contract with Bethlehem. The prototype of these submarines is under construction at the Electric Boat yard.

The Quincy yard includes building ways, building basins, outfitting piers, a wet basin, shops, office space, and equipment capable of building and overhauling all classes of ships.

General Dynamics' announcement stated that the Quincy yard will be closed down by Bethlehem prior to General Dynamics commencing operations at the yard.

General Dynamics had no date when this would take place, but said it hoped that the deal would be completed sometime in January.

At the Quincy yard it could not be ascertained when a closing down date would take place and officials of Bethlehem in New York could not be immediately reached on the matter.

On the heels of this announcement, Arthur B. Horner, chairman and chief executive officer of Bethlehem, confirmed that Bethlehem has completed an agreement to sell its Quincy properties to General Dynamics.

Mr. Homer said, "Possession of the properties will be delivered in the near future when the remaining details are worked out, at which time Bethlehem will permanently cease operations at Quincy."

"We believe," continued Mr. Homer, "that the arrangement with General Dynamics, which means the cessation of our particpation in future operations at Quincy, will prove to be to the best interests of the employees, their families, and the community."

The problem of seniority rights for members of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America has not been thrashed out at this stage, George E. McPherson, executive secretary of local 5, said this morning.

"That's one of the main things that will be discussed with General Dynamics next week," he said. "Our legal minds are working on it now."

WILL PROTECT MEMBERS

Meanwhile, commenting on the sale, John Grogan, international president of the union, said, "Our union will continue to represent its members and to put forward all its energies and financial means to protect them and their families.

"We have arranged to meet with the representatives of General Dynamics on Wednesday, December 11, in order to establish our continuing status as bargaining representatives of the men and women.

"We are also meeting with representatives of Bethlehem Steel during the next few days to iron out all problems that may arise for the employees under our contract as a result in the change of the yard's ownership.

"We are hopeful that the new management will mean more and continuous work for our members and renewed prosperity for the Quincy community."

Mr. Grogan; Andrew A. Pettis, vice president; M. H. Goldstein, national counsel; John Bonner, secretary of the Bethlehem Atlantic Coast Committee; and New England Regional Director E. Eugene McCabe have been meeting for the past several days with the officers of local 5, headed by Ronald Orcutt, president, and George E. McPherson, executive secretary, and local 90,

headed by Arthur L. FitzGerald, president, and Charles Johnston, executive secretary.

Negotiations between the two corporations have been underway at least since late October.

NO CONNECTION

Last Monday, several flatbed truckloads of submarine components arrived at Quincy from Groton, but both firms insisted the shipments had nothing to do with the expected sale.

General Dynamics was seeking other shipconstruction facilities because of its big backlog of submarine orders and lack of facilities at Electric Boat to meet delivery dates required by the Navy.

Inasmuch as assurances were being given in Groton that Electric Boat would not be adversely affected by work being given to the Quincy yard, reports began circulating that possibly General Dynamics, a highly diversified corporation, was contemplating going into surface-ship construction, primarily the work done at Quincy.

Substance was given to these reports by Mr. Lewis' announcement.

In addition to being the prime contractor for the construction of nuclear attack and Polaris submarines at its Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics is engaged in the manufacture of military and commercial aircraft, guided missiles, and electronics and communications equipment.

The corporation and Grumman Aircraft in November 1962 won a billion-dollar contract for the TFX all-service tactical fighter plane, to be manufactured at Fort Worth, Tex.

[From the Quincy Patriot-Ledger]

LEGISLATORS ASSURE FIRM OF SUPPORT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Three Massachusetts legislators today praised the General Dynamics Corp. for its agreement to purchase the Fore River Shipyard and pledged their cooperation in obtaining work for the yard.

In a telegram sent to the firm, Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and Congressman JAMES A. BURKE said:

"Your company's acquisition of the Fore River Shipyard indicates your confidence in the ability of this yard to regain its position as a leader in the American shipbuilding industry.

"We are hopeful that work will be expeditiously transferred to Quincy in order to utilize the many thousands of skilled shipbuilding personnel in the Massachusetts area.

"We stand ready to cooperate with you in seeking new work, especially in the nuclear field, where Fore River has shown its outstanding qualifications in the past."

[From the Boston Traveler, Dec. 6, 1963]

GENERAL DYNAMICS BUYS QUINCY YARD

(By Dick Lamere)

Bethlehem Steel Co.'s big Quincy Shipyard was sold last night to General Dynamics Corp., builders of nuclear submarines at Groton, Conn.

The sale opened the way to thousands of new jobs for workers who have been sidelined at the Quincy yard in the past year due to lack of work.

During the slack period, the yard's work force dropped from 14,000 employees to the current 1,600.

General Dynamics is expected to hire a much larger group of workers than now on the payroll at Quincy. Union officials said the new owner plans to build both nuclear submarines and surface craft at the facility which employed close to 40,000 workers during peak World War II employment.

The Quincy yard will be closed down by Bethlehem prior to the Electric Boat Division at Groton commencing operations. The big switchover may take place before the end of the month, one official said.

The official sale price was withheld, but it's believed to have involved millions of dollars.

General Dynamics also said it will take over construction of two attack-type nuclear submarines now under contract with Bethlehem. The prototype of these submarines is under construction at Groton.

Union officials at Quincy got the word of the sale early today. Shortly thereafter, both corporations confirmed the big transaction.

BETHLEHEM CONFIRMS SALE

Arthur B. Homer, chairman and chief executive of Bethlehem, said transfer of the properties will take place with working out of final details in the near future.

He also expressed belief the transfer will benefit the employees and the Quincy community.

The Quincy yard includes building ways, building basins, outfitting piers, a wet basin, shops, office space, and equipment for building and overhauling all classes of ships.

The shipyard has been the scene for generations for building of large Navy and commercial craft, including some of the world's largest tankers.

"We believe the arrangement with General Dynamics Corp., which means the cessation of our participating in future operations at Quincy will prove to be in the best interests of the employees, their families, and their community," Homer said.

Roger Lewis, General Dynamics president, said, "acquisition of the Quincy yard will supplement the existing facilities of our electric boat division at Groton, Conn., and will provide the corporation with greater flexibility and capacity for a wider range of marine work."

SAYS PROSPECTS MUCH BRIGHTER

Richard Nash, spokesman for Local 151, American Federation of Technical Engineers, AFL–CIO, at Quincy, said "the prospects look much brighter."

He said General Dynamics has a backlog of 15 nuclear submarines at its Groton yard and plans to build some of them at Quincy, along with surface craft.

John J. Grogan, international president of the Shipbuilders Union, AFL–CIO, in Boston, said:

"Our union will continue to represent its members and to put forward all its energies and financial means to protect them and their families.

"We have arranged to meet with the representatives of General Dynamics next Wednesday in order to establish our continuing status as bargaining representatives of the men and women.

"We are also meeting with representatives of Bethlehem Steel during the next few days to iron out all problems that may arise for the employees under our contract as a result in the change of the yard's ownership.

"We are hopeful," continued Grogan, "that the new management will mean more and continuous work for our members and renewed prosperity for the Quincy community."

The production force at Quincy is now represented by Local 5, Shipbuilders Union, headed by President Ronald Orcutt, Executive Secretary George McPherson, George McCall, Paul McVay, Robert Kehoe, Vincent Cagliano, Jack McGonagle, and Joseph P. Duffy. The clerical force is affiliated with Local 90, headed by President Arthur FitzGerald and Executive Secretary Charles Johnson.

The local union officials have been meeting with their international officers for the last several days. Besides Grogan, the international officers included Vice President Andrew A. Pettis, Legal Counsel M. H. Goldstein, Secretary-treasurer James Bonner of the Bethlehem Atlantic Coast Committee, and Regional Director Gene McCabe.

Faith in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, spoke before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. His remarks were so apropos at this time in America's history that I should like to call them to the attention of my colleagues:

FAITH IN FREEDOM

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in Washington, D.C., December 4, 1963)

This is a great moment in my life. To be recognized in this manner by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation is a distinction which I shall cherish always.

I am especially honored by the presence of so many close friends, including the distinguished civic leaders whom you have selected as recipients of other awards.

How have these men come to positions of prominence in our community? It is because they have dedicated themselves to service—they have eagerly accepted the responsibilities of good citizenship, and they are willing to be judged upon their records of positive contributions to the cause of decency and of justice.

Decency and justice—these are the high aims of this Brotherhood, just as they always have been an integral part of the Hebrew religion which has given mankind the Ten Commandments and the concept of a monotheistic God. For these sacred gifts, all true religions of the Western World are eternally indebted to you.

Americans of the Hebrew faith are doubly blessed. The rich cultural inheritance that has been handed down since early Biblical times to generation after generation of Jews is combined, in our country, with a proud heritage of freedom. It is a heritage that was won by the sweat, the blood, and the sacrifices of men and women of many nationalities and many religious creeds.

Devotion to God; belief in the inherent dignity of mankind; faith in man's ability, through divine Providence, to guide his own destiny—these are the strong ties that hold together our United States, the greatest brotherhood of freedom in the history of the world. No one has a deeper understanding of the true meaning of freedom than the members of the Hebrew faith, for no peoples have suffered more relentless persecution and injustice at the hands of tyranny through the ages.

Today the fires of anti-Semitism continue to burn with fierce intensity in many areas of the world. This is particularly true behind the Iron Curtain where communism, the bitter enemy of Judaism and of all other religions of the world, seeks to destroy your priceless heritage and the right of your people to live according to the tenets of God.

During the past generation, the conscience of decent men everywhere has been shocked by the continuing vicious atrocities that have been committed against Jews in the Soviet Union. Rabbis have been arrested and imprisoned or executed; synagogues have been desecrated; the traditional Jewish school system has been liquidated; and Hebrew litera-

ture, language and customs have been suppressed by the Russian Communists.

Despite Communist claims of improved conditions for Jews under the Khrushchev regime, the opposite actually is true. Additional forms of suppression have been introduced.

The observance of Passover no longer can be held according to tradition; sacred Hebrew burial customs have been obstructed; and a statewide program has been instituted to make Jews the scapegoats for criminal acts affecting the Russian economy. Jews are clearly identified by religion on the internal passport which all Soviet citizens must carry.

Last October, the outrageous extent of this program was disclosed by the Moscow newspaper Izvestia when it announced the arrests of several persons involved in an alleged criminal conspiracy. The leaders of this gang have Jewish names, Izvestia told its readers in demanding a show trial and death sentences.

Vicious outbursts of religious hatred such as this caused one American newspaper recently to warn its readers, "For reasons best known to themselves the Soviet leaders discriminate heavily against Jews. The evidence is overwhelming and incontrovertible and renewed almost daily by the Russians themselves."

In a joint statement released last summer, three American Jewish organizations denounced the Soviet press for conveying "a viciously negative image of the Jews," and indignantly proclaimed, "Soviet Jews are deprived by official policy of religious and cultural rights * * * and are the victims of discrimination * * *."

Communism and religion—like communism and freedom—can never coexist, for Marxism is unalterably opposed to all forms of religious belief. Lenin acknowledged this fact more than 50 years ago when he exhorted his followers, "We must combat religion—this is the A B C of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism. Then he declared, "The Marxist must be * * * an enemy of religion."

Since the time of Lenin, atheistic communism has surged forth from Russia to enslave nearly one-fourth of the earth's surface and a third of her peoples. Nowhere are its advance battalions more active than in our own Western Hemisphere, where agents trained by the Kremlin continue to burrow deeply into countries of the Caribbean and Central and South America. Their deadly objective is to undermine legitimate governments, foment revolution and create a Soviet Union of Latin American Republics.

I have said this before and I would like to repeat it here: We are at war with communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

Here in the United States, the cause of international communism is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A.—a cunning and defiant subversive conspiracy which is financed, directed, and controlled by the Kremlin. Its membership consists today of a hard core of revolutionary fanatics who are knowingly and eagerly subservient to the dictates of Moscow. The dupes, the dissidents, and the faint of heart have long since been purged from the party's ranks.

Today, the Communists are engaged in a vigorous campaign to divide and weaken America from within. Foremost in this campaign are the party's efforts to exploit misunderstandings and capitalize upon areas of dissension and unrest wherever they exist. This is especially true in the intense civil rights movement, for America's 20 million Negroes and all others engaged in this struggle are a major target for Communist propaganda and subversion.

It would be absurd to suggest that the aspirations of Negroes for equality are Communist inspired. This is demonstrably not true. But what is demonstrable is that some individuals and groups exploit the tension for purposes not confined to the equality of human rights under the Constitution of the United States. The crusade should not become a vehicle for political radicalism or organized violence.

Devotion to race must not supersede devotion to established institutions.

It would be useful if responsible Negro leaders themselves could make it clear to all who follow them that their interest is solely in racial equality.

This Nation was conceived under God and its progress has been under God. There could be no greater disaster for our Nation that that it should deny in any respect, to even the smallest degree, the presence, the power, the guidance, the protection, the instruction of Almighty God.

There is unmistakable evidence of divine guidance all through the history of our Nation. We must guard it. We must cherish it. We must revere it. We must work for it.

The record of our Nation is better than that of any other nation in any other part of the world. It is true there are injustices in this Nation toward those of dark skin, as well as light, but even worse injustices prevail in other parts of the world. Whether the people are black- or yellow- or brown- or white-skinned, these things will have to be worked out.

America has taken the lead in working them out, and it is taking the lead today. It is doing more for its underprivileged minorities than any other nation in the world, but there is more to be done.

We thank God that where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

As citizens of a free country, we must judge people as individuals—not by race, creed, or color.

Legitimate civil rights organizations must remain constantly alert to attempts by the Communists to influence their actions, take over their programs, and corrupt their ranks.

Communism feeds upon ignorance, prejudice and sickness of the mind and soul. It probes relentlessly for weaknesses in America's moral armor.

That is why the cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe and other rabble who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellow man.

These venomous fanatics, whether they are extremists of the left or the right, are carriers of a highly infectious disease. They clutter the streets—and the mails—with their slanderous obscenities, urging impressionable teenagers and unstable adults to acts of hate, terror and intimidation. They have brought forth the bombs and ignited the flames that have killed decent Americans and even innocent children and destroyed churches and other temples of worship. They are a national disgrace.

Invariably, these merchants of hate attempt to drape themselves in a cloak of patriotism. But their real objective is to profiteer and capitalize upon ignorance, prejudice and bigotry while destroying the very ideals which they claim to uphold.

Today, the Communists continue with impunity to breathe out lies and distortions against the United States. Their designs on American youth revolt and anger those steeped in our national ideals of freedom.

The peddling of their dishonest doctrine to high-minded, largely inexperienced, and basically eager-to-believe young people is not unlike the peddling of filth and dope in demoralizing effect. It can undermine patriotism, create doubts about our social and economic system, and mock the many wholesome youth organizations in this country.

The great majority of American youths are genuinely convinced that they would not fall for the Communist bait. Many never would. But there are others who might never know they were "hooked" until the enormous tragedy of their loss of faith dawned after bitter years of fighting the American way of life, almost unwittingly, as dupes of the Communists.

It has happened to idealistic Americans before.

There is not an avenue to the heart and mind of Americans that is not used to implant their false ideology. Communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name calling, but it can be defeated by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

The God-given ideals which are responsible for this country's greatness are being attacked on many fronts today. Moral lethargy, self-indulgence, neglect of duty—these lethal forces are undermining many facets of business, labor, industry, and government.

We find their influence in the repulsive attitude of "halfway Americans" to whom life in this country is the enjoyment of rights and privileges devoid of responsibilities.

We find their influence in those courts of law where the true purpose and intent of our Constitution as a document designed for the protection of society have too often been warped and distorted for the benefit of offenders.

We find their influence in the continuing increase of crime—a tragic national problem which is growing four times as fast as our expanding population.

Crime has no respect for age, nationality, sex, color, or religious creed. It has turned our streets into virtual jungles of terror and fear.

Today, a brutal crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape, or assault to kill—is committed every 3 minutes. The number of these senseless atrocities will continue to grow until men of strong moral conviction assert greater influence toward the prevention of crime and administration of justice.

Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity, and fairplay. The moral strength of our Nation has slipped alarmingly. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to cure this moral illness.

Law and order are bulwarks on which successful government must stand. Without law and order, society will destroy itself.

Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where strength and realism are essential needs.

There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is no longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets—and our families—will continue to be endangered.

Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

Judge Learned Hand said: "Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime."

Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained until it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us "keep the balance true."

Wherever politicals and oportunism remain primary considerations in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the "rock from which we were hewn."

Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding and faith in God.

There must be a moral rewakening in every home in our land.

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts of selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

Law and public sanctions help to keep our deeds in line—only conscience policies our thoughts. It is much easier to control our actions than our thoughts.

For, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Two hundred years ago, our founding fathers had a vision of a Nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision—the determination that faith, courage and decency will prevail over all enemies of freedom.

Since 1753, when the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it has borne a solemn Old Testament inscription from Leviticus xxv, verse 10:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Let us all work together to maintain this great American ideal. With God's divine guidance, let us build an ever more powerful brotherhood of liberty and justice for the benefit of all mankind.

As the Father of our Country so aptly said, "As we declare our loyalty to our country, help us to keep in mind the need of faith in God and immortality without which life is meaningless and vain."

This is our mission as a nation of free people, united in one faith—faith in God.

The Burial at Arlington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, many people who have been touched by the tragedy of November 22, 1963, and the solemn funeral ceremonies for our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has expressed the full intensity of their feeling in many ways.

I read and was especially moved by a sonnet written by Sister Marie David, CSJ, who is an art instructor at the college of St. Catherine in St. Paul, Minn. I want very much to share the inspiration of these verses with my colleagues and I include the sonnet in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE BURIAL AT ARLINGTON NOVEMBER 25, 1963

(By Sister Marie David, CSJ)

Death was not quick enough to close the door
Through which he captured you. We all have seen.
And now we come with gifts. Forevermore
This later land has its Andromache in
Whom it grieves. The Nation meditates.
The Nation mourns as one heart, broken, and
The whole world grieves. And prays. And waits
Drum beat, bagpiper, gunfire salute, and band,
Air Force and bird cry. Then the slow bugle, lonely
Crown of the dirge. High. Final. Bright
Rousing cry to a people who have this day, only
Followed a builder to this loveliest site.
Forever stay. Enrich our richest earth.
So from it spring your several dreams to birth.

Admiral Ricketts Evaluates the U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, until the oceans of our earth disappear, their benevolent control must be the keystone of America's policy for peace. No more thorough student of seapower and no finer sailor serves our Nation than Adm. Claude Ricketts, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations. Therefore, his recent remarks on the subject of our great Navy before the Chicago, Glenview, and Evanston-North Councils of the Navy League of the United States deserve attention by ourselves and the Nation. Expressed on October 27, the remarks were as follows:

President Burch, Mr. Crown, ladies, and gentlemen, when I am put in this position and have a seat of honor at the head table with so much talent, and I look out over the audience with an equal amount of talent, and the gracious ladies who have helped the men attain what they have attained, I feel increasingly humble; and I recall a story of a man who had been out on the town for the evening, and he had been celebrating perhaps a little too freely. He was walking home with a rather unsteady gait, and a policeman was following him at some distance. As the man came to a bridge across the river he stopped and looked down at the reflection of the moon in the water. The policeman came up and stood beside him, and the man said to the policeman, "Tell me officers, is that the moon away down there?" The officer said, "Yes, my good man, that is the moon." The man said, "Tell me officer, if that's the moon away down there, how did I get away up here?"

I want to thank you first very much for your invitation to me to participate in your program tonight. Being your guest is a privilege and an honor that is greatly appreciated.

We of the Navy are very happy with your traditional observance of Navy Day and the fact that you devote a special program to it. Because, obviously there is something far more basic in your motivation than the celebration of Navy Day by a good dinner and fine fellowship.

We interpret your recognition of this day as recognizing the fact that the seas and the ships that sail the seas are interwoven throughout the history and the development of the United States; and that the current and future destiny of this country is closely associated with seapower. If this interpretation is correct, then you would expect some thoughts from me on how we of the Navy are contributing to our security today and how we expect to contribute to that security in the future. Also, perhaps, some of the logic of military reasoning behind our decisions.

But, any analysis of our naval power is meaningful only if it is considered in relation to our total national military strength. Analysis of one service, one weapon system, one function, is faulty if it is considered only in isolation from the others. Consequently, I propose to expand my theme to cover briefly four primary points which concern us of the Navy and I would hope concern all Americans. These are:

1. The position of the United States in the world today;
2. Our national military requirements;
3. The role of the Navy; and
4. The role of the individual.

In analyzing the position of the United States in the world today, it is well to recall something of the origin of our country, and to refresh our memory as to its spiritual strength, which is one of the main pillars of our national strength.

The founding and the growth of the United States is truly one of the marvels of human history. From the vision, from the dedication, the purpose and the burning desire in the hearts of the pioneers of this country, not only was a vast virgin land developed, but here was launched a new form of democracy. The basic doucments—the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence have stood the test of time, and they constantly reveal the distant vision of their originators. They have stood the test of: external and internal wars; an undreamed of industrial expansion; a growing population that has multiplied itself many times; and international relationships that have varied from an extreme isolation to one of global regional alliances.

Our national history is a rather short one as far as human history goes, being some 187 years old, but our relatively short life has certainly been a full one. The vigor of the forces that gave us our birth have been sustained and well utilized by succeeding generations. We have grown from a fringe of 13 colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to the leading world power. With that has come great responsibilities, and also, great opportunities.

In the meantime, some empires have crumbled, others have diminished in size and influence, and yes, others have grown in power and in ambitions. And while we can look back with pride on our own national growth, and certainly the incentives that have inspired that growth, we cannot afford the luxury of complacency. A brilliant history does not of itself guarantee a brilliant future. Self-sacrifice, industry, moral courage in a father do not flourish in his son automatically. These attributes and all of the other things that have made our country great are not inevitable assets of future generations solely because they were in the hearts of their forefathers.

But fortunately for the United States, and indeed, fortunately for the free world today, the generations of Americans since 1776 have had the qualities to meet the successive challenges with which they have been faced,

and we can say with some pride that our own generation has made many contributions.

While some of these threats have been serious, they have up until the recent past been rather narrow in scope. Rather than an assault upon the basic concepts of our democracy, they have been assaults upon the material products of our democracy. Such threats come from such things as economic pressure, population pressure, or a dictator that is reaching for personal power. The threats have been accompanied by impatience that readily revealed themselves. That is the dictators and those who sought great power and have started wars to satisfy that greed, have sought military conquest at an early time. Consequently, they have brought their methods sharply into focus where they could be readily recognized, and consequently, our own action against them could be brought sharply into focus also.

But in recent years, there has arisen an avowed threat to the very principles of our democracy. The threat is broad in scope. It stems from a conflict of ideologies, and consequently an assault upon the very foundations of our belief. This threat and our own national maturity have coincided with a period of unprecedented scientific achievements. This advance in science has given us, certainly, many material comforts and has also given us weapons of phenomenal power. Unfortunately, in some countries the heart of man has not kept pace with the mind of man. In those countries the products of his mind are being prostituted for the selfishness of his heart.

It is indeed fortunate that our own national maturity has coincided with the need for a strong leader of the free world; one who can and is willing to divert the main power of modern science from selfish aims to preventing the attainment of selfish aims by others. Of course, this turn of events passes to our shoulders a great responsibility and, as I said, great opportunities.

We are undergoing a new experience that requires an unprecedented degree of alertness. The threat is subtle; it covers a broad spectrum; it involves economics, psychology, prestige, education, and yes, also military power. In this kind of conflict it is not necessarily the aggressor's military power that we will feel first.

When Prometheus was bound by Jupiter to the rock, it was not an eagle but a vulture that tore at his vitals. Like Prometheus, we of the United States are subject to attacks of several kinds and from more than one source. But unlike Prometheus, we are not bound, but rather, we are free to resist any type of threat. Alertness, readiness, and willingness are the basic tools at our command. Our readiness to respond to this threat must also cover an equally broad spectrum—or even greater. Regardless of its nature there is one ingredient that is vital—and that is military power. Even though this power is not used directly, without it, our other efforts would be meaningless, and certainly, ineffective.

So, let's consider briefly our national military posture—our military forces as a whole—what they should be doing, and some of the reasons why.

The preeminent position of the United States in the world today demands that we have a versatile military force. It must be strong. Its characteristics must be broad. Its capabilities must be able to respond to many different situations. It must add additional substance to the statements of our diplomats. It must contribute to freedom of action by our Government officials. We must never be in a position of telling our President, "This is the only thing that we can do." It must be designed so that it can back our officials up, if need be, with more than one kind of a military action.

It must support the officials of our Government by permitting them to use boldly and with confidence, means other than military action, such as economic means, political means, psychological, and any other nonmilitary means. In other words we must give them a diversity of choices.

I think that this is not far different from that of industry, wherein many industrial establishments find it very convenient and very desirable to diversify their efforts. In the investment field the mutual funds have grown up on that same basis in order to permit the small investor to diversify his investments.

Our military forces must be designed first as a deterrent, as a preventer of war, and in these days, firepower is one of the greatest deterrents of an aggressor. But if the deterrent should fail, then our military forces have to be capable of striking back with devastating effectiveness—and inevitably so—regardless of the nature of any military attack that might be launched against us. We can't afford to present the enemy with just a neat package of problems so that he can provide a single answer. He must not even think that he has all of the answers. There must always be serious doubt in his mind as to the success of any military venture on his part.

We can provide this kind of a capability by having a great variety of weapons—those that operate from the land, from the sea, and from the air. The land, the sea, and the air each has its advantages and its disadvantages as a medium for the operations of military systems. We have to exploit the advantages of each, because only by so doing can we complicate to the maximum the enemy's military plans.

This, then, is a broad coverage of our national military requirements.

Now may I, as a naval officer and participating in the celebration Navy Day, outline to you what we sailors consider our own role to be in this national military strategy and some of the reasons why. To do this, I will cover just briefly some of the unique characteristics of the oceans because it is really their characteristics that are different from the other media that give them the advantages that we should exploit.

In the first place the oceans are very extensive. I think we can understand that better by looking at the area of the United States, that is, land over which United States has sovereignty. It is only something like 3¾ million square miles on an earth that is almost 200 million square miles in area. The United States has less than 2 percent of the earth's surface under its sovereignty. But what immediately comes to a sailor's mind is, Why not go to the seas? By doing that we can operate over an area 35 times as large as that of the United States. That is a tremendous difference.

I try to relate that to something that I can more readily understand. For example, it's a difference between a $2 shore leave and a $75 shore leave. I can't tell you anything about a $75 shore leave, but I can assure you that a $2 shore leave has many restraints. Or for the ladies, it is the difference between a $40 cloth coat and a $1,500 mink coat.

But, what can we do? In some cases we can establish bases on foreign territory but these require treaties or other agreements. And these, very frequently, are good expedients, but they are not permanent solutions.

In the time I have been in the Navy the range of weapons has increased tremendously—I'm talking about naval weapons. When I first entered, for example, there was only a small fringe of an enemy land mass bordering the seas that we could reach by naval weapons. It was restricted to the range of the gun, or a very short range airplane. Since that time, the range of the aircraft has gone from only a few miles to well over a thousand miles. And, of course, with the firing of the A3 Polaris missile yesterday, no target in the world is beyond the range of the sea-based weapon.

Now, the basic mission of your Navy is to use this additional portion of the earth's surface in both peace and war, and, to restrict its use to the enemy in time of war. Most of our allies are overseas, and the oceans could be barriers between us and them, but they are not. Instead, they are bonds that tie us together. Likewise, all of our prospective enemies are overseas. Again, we must have the use of the seas to project U.S. combat power to the shores of the enemy. But these oceans will tie us to our allies, and provide avenues that we can use to project U.S. power only as long as we have the capability of controlling them. Certainly, they will become a barrier to our use if we should ever lose that control.

Now, what we have done in the Navy to try to exploit these great potentials for the ocean is to have a great variety of Naval forces so that we can use them throughout the spectrum of activities that we might be called upon to use. This requires forces that can operate underneath the surface, on the surface, and above the surface, and this is the reason why we have developed the weapons systems that we can project from these three positions. By doing this, we have given the Nation its only mobile airfields. We have given the Nation its moving delivery systems; those that operate both beneath the surface and on the surface of the seas, and in these days this kind of movement for a target is becoming increasingly important.

And with our very gallant Marines—comrades in arms—we have developed an amphibious warfare system that is beyond that of any other nation's.

Certainly, in our Polaris submarines we have married nuclear power with the missile, and the United States has the world's most survivable weapons system. We have Naval forces that support these combat forces—logistic support forces. We can make up task forces that can be assigned a task of many different requirements.

These things have not come about only from the efforts of Navy people. They have required the assistance and the cooperation of people of industry, our government officials, Members of Congress, and, of course, the taxpayers of the country. The responsibility of taking these things that the American people have given us and translating them into these kinds of weapons are the responsibility of those of us in uniform, and we shall continue to seek your cooperation and your assistance in exploiting the things that future science can give us.

These tactics, borne and nourished by the special characteristics of the sea, permit us to launch attacks directly from the sea. They permit us to integrate the efforts of those of the Army, the Air Force and the Marines, and, indeed, combine them to make up a really formidable U.S. defense team. These precious attributes of naval weapons systems provide advantages that accrue only to those who understand and exploit the unique characteristics of the oceans. The advantages are so great that this Nation cannot afford to forfeit an assured lead that we have over all other nations in this respect.

But what of the future? Does the Navy have a future as well as a past? As I see it and analyze it, I think that the Navy's future will be even more brilliant than its past. Technology permits it; military logic demands it; the potential is there; the national need is there. We have to exploit further the potentials of the oceans and the use of science in exploiting that potential. We need to apply nuclear power in the future to a greater extent than we have in the past. We need to learn more about the subsurface of the oceans. For example, isn't it a little tragic that while we can track satellites that are several hundred miles above the surface of the earth, we cannot locate the *Thresher*

that is only 8,400 feet below the surface of the ocean.

We need to explore more the subsurface of the polar icecap. We need to do a lot more with underwater sound. We need to explore more the potentials of space, and that is, utilize satellites in communications, weather reconnaissance, and navigation, and other uses which it can give us.

Now, let me proceed to the last portion of my talk, i.e., people—the role of the individual. What part do people play? In these days we do lots of boasting about our material achievements. We brag about the weapons that we have. We call many of them automatic. Actually, they are not automatic. Some place along the line goes the input of the human mind, and the characteristics of the output are no better than the quality of the input. This requires more and more these days, people who can learn very quickly the skills to operate and maintain some of the most complex equipments that we have in the world. When you take a modern airplane or a modern ship, or a missile, or almost any system, it is a terrifically complicated piece of equipment. The people who are operating those equipments are bluejackets who, until recently, were in civilian professions. Many of them just out of high school; many of them just coming from farms, from delivery boys in grocery stores, from salesmen, from other professions that are far removed from this business of going to sea. I think it is a tremendous tribute to the capabilities of American youth that they can learn these things so quickly.

We have to look to the future, because the future demands an increasingly strong educational base upon which we can build. Because the time that we can spare to take the people who come into the Navy and train them to operate these equipments is getting increasingly short, because more and more of our ships and planes are having complicated equipments. It is fortunate that we have been able to meet these things up until now, and I have every confidence that we are going to meet them in the future. Sometimes I go to our recruit training stations throughout the country—only recently to the one here in Chicago. It is always a tremendous inspiration to watch these boys, having been in the service only a few weeks, turn in the performance that they did. And, as we looked at this choir here tonight, and saw the clean-cut youth who have come to us; certainly, we can be proud of their possibilities. I have found that American boys really accept responsibility, if it is passed to them. Sometimes we get discouraged, but I have found nothing so far in my contacts to justify great discouragement.

In the Battle of Pearl Harbor, I was in the battleship *West Virginia* which was sunk during that attack. One of the most inspiring things to me was the way in which the crew of that ship rose to the occasion. Here were people who had never been under fire before. Suddenly, within the space of a very few minutes this tremendous attack hit us—seven torpedoes and several bombs hit the ship—the ship settling to the bottom, listing to where the water was awash on its main deck—fuel oil burning all around us—and the people in the ship, the sailors, saying, "Mr. Ricketts, what can we do? Isn't there something we can do to fight back?" I think nobody that goes through an experience of that kind can lose much faith in American youth.

The performance of the Navy up until this time, and certainly, always in the future will be directly in the same ratio as the performance of the individuals that make up the crew.

The fabric of America is woven of many elements. The strongest of all is the moral fiber of its individual citizens.

It is the privilege of our generation to live in these stirring times. No period in history has been so packed with action. No generation has been faced with such a succession of challenges. The future holds every promise of increased action, and increased demands upon the United States in whose hands, above all others, rests the destiny of the free world. It is our privilege, yours and mine, as citizens of the greatest nation in world to be in a position to contribute collectively and individually to this national effort.

Our Navy will remain one of the Nation's greatest assets, because the officers, the men and the women whom you have given us are determined, with God's help, to make it so. Thank you.

Urban Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 7, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, though I was not on the floor of the House yesterday for the eulogy to our late President, I was in southwest Missouri when the assassination occurred and expressed at that time, my shock at this crime. A few days later on November 26 it was my privilege to be present at the regular meeting of the Springfield, Mo., Rotary Club. The speaker was Father William H. Magill, rector of St. James' Episcopal Church, of Springfield. The assassination of the President was still fresh in our minds. The impact of Reverend Magill's remarks was that this tragedy must redound to the people's growth; and that the loss of the Chief of State need not, indeed cannot, foreshadow a complete overthrow of our system. I commend his remarks to the attention of all:

URBAN CULTURE

(By Father William H. Magill, rector, St. James Episcopal Church, Springfield, Mo.)

It shall be my purpose today to expose the facts of urban culture within which we all live. I shall attempt to show you how our urban culture affects you.

There was a time in the history of this great Nation of ours when men lived their entire existence in one community. There were no large cities, only small settlements where a man's survival was, to a large degree dependent upon others' concern for him. This was love. There are many definitions for love, the Greeks have seven words for love. Our understanding of the word is dependent upon our own particular definition. I shall give you the meaning I am thinking of as I use the word in this context. I mean being vitally concerned for another persons welfare. To be concerned for the destiny of his soul. This definition permits me, you see, to love even the persons whom I do not like. And there are some. This definition permits people to love me even though they do not like me. There are some of these persons too. I am sure it is in this sense that God wants us to love our neighbor. I would like to ask each of you to stop and think for a moment—What do you know of your neighbor next door? You may know that he is a good gardener, or a poor one. He may leave his garage door open, or his trash barrels out, he may have an attractive wife, his children may bother you. But these are things which you know about him. What do you know of him? To know about a person is one thing. To know the person is quite another.

Unlike a few generations ago, we today live in more than a single community. We live in many communities, each one quite separate from the others. We live in the Community of our home, where we work, in the community in which we buy, and we live in that very large community in which we play.

This existence in several communities, rather than just one, has developed in us a very real feeling of lack of responsibility toward our neighbor. We don't really know him, we are not concerned for him, and we really couldn't care less.

In addition to these points we have lost our sense of public morality. We are told, and we believe, that moral codes have changed. We are led to believe that things which used to be wrong are now right. We are told that America must accept a new moral code. We have lost something very precious. A deep sense of moral responsibility.

Another force is at work which affects us, directly in the community of our work, and indirectly in all the other communities. We shall call it automation.

The machine is doing the job faster than the man did. It doesn't get sick or take a vacation. It doesn't make nearly so many mistakes as the man. It is not necessary, for the machine's sake, to work it only 8 hours a day.

Through automation we will be able to produce more and produce it better. For example, I have been told that steel production for the year 1962 showed an increase of 17 percent, while as an industry employing 19,000 fewer men.

I am not attempting here an evaluation, I am merely stating the fact that all these points are contributing to our urban culture.

So what of the result of these observations, and there are many more which have not been noted. The result, as I see it, is a culture boom. We have more time, extra time, now than ever before. We have an ever-increasing employment problem. The available jobs are decreasing as the population is increasing. I am told that we need 12,000 new jobs each month just to break even with the population increase. Work is becoming less and less the determining factor in life. We used to put a premium on hard work and long hours. A man was judged by how hard he was willing to work. Now, it appears that the premium may be upon leisure time, which would be a complete shift of emphasis.

So here we are in the midst of life. And life is like a river. We are inclined to drift along, following the channel, until we reach the sea where we become lost in this great expanse. The fresh water being completely destroyed by the salt.

However, it is possible to build a dam on the river. The best place for this dam is at the narrowest point. We can then harness the power of something which is already available. Our river of life was in existence when we become a part of it. The water of humanity had long been forging a channel through which to flow. The Creator of the river, therefore, should be that for which we are the most thankful; for everything else depends upon this creation.

Let us look for a moment to our heritage. We live in a rich land. A land which is full of beauty. We have the greatest degree of mobility about the land. We abound in natural resources. So many in fact that we can supply many other nations as well as ourselves. And in this heritage many persons have died that we might live.

All the way through history we can see many points at which all of this could have been lost to us, forever, if the people of that

time had been as apathetic as we sometimes are. If they had decided that the price was too great to pay. If they had refused to trade comfort for discomfort. But they didn't. Thank God. They have passed on to us a heritage which has been built upon the strongest foundation possible—God. We can dismiss God from our thinking, and we have. But this does not mean that His existence is dependent upon our believing in Him or thinking of Him. It isn't.

The man can say, "I am a self-made man." He can claim full responsibility for his success, but whether he can see through his "little gods" or not does not deny that his life, his particular talent, the time he was to employ this talent, all this is a gift from God. A pure gift from God which he did not earn, and maybe, a gift which he might not deserve. How the man sees this tells us what kind of man he truly is.

We can—and do—warp our soul through rationalization. Through our attempts to justify a selfish position.

To be truly thankful then is to recognize the source of the gift. This has been made very hard for us in today's culture. We have become so concerned for the fabric of life. We are so engulfed in and surrounded by materialism.

Every human creature must have a God. He must have something outside of himself or he turns in and dies. If we, in our apathy and culture, lose sight of the true God we will settle for something less. The professed athiest worships himself, his own selfish interests, the fabric of life not the life itself.

So, in todays' world, in the culture which we ourselves have created from the gifts which God has given us, we begin to see, if we will open our eyes to see, and if we then open our minds to truly understand that which we see, we begin to see certain danger signs. These danger signs have been in man's sight before. This is nothing new. Each civilization which has perished before this one has been preceded by these same signs. But, you say, we are smarter than they. We certainly should be. We can profit from their experience. We can use the knowledge which they have handed on to us.

This Nation, this world, has just witnessed a supreme tragedy. Not a "shot that was heard around the world," but a shot that was felt around the world. And just as death, when viewed from this side of the veil appears to be the end, and when viewed from the other side is seen to be a birth into a new life, so this tragedy must be turned into something more. We cannot sit idly by and permit this death to teach us nothing. We cannot sit idly by and permit death to continue a human feeling of hate. We have an obligation to ourselves, to the world, to the yet unborn and to God to see in this our means of salvation as a civilization. We must be eternally thankful that this man lived. We must be eternally thankful for the pure and noble witness made by a woman. A witness to the truth that strength can, and will come from faith in God. Today we must be thankful that our forefathers have handed us a government so strong, a government so right, that the loss of the chief of state need not, indeed cannot, foreshadow a complete overthrow of the system.

We must be thankful that we have been shown that party loyalties and differences can dissolve themselves in pure Americanism. That denominationalism cannot erect a barrier over which love and concern and prayer cannot pass. That our denominationalism is quickly dissolved in the strong light of God.

In these past few days where are the people who told us not to pray? Where are the ones that warned us of the terrible dangers in a wedding of church and state? The church is people. The state is people. And we are people.

People make the culture in which they live. We had created a culture which nourished bigotry, defiance against authority, hatred, malice. Nourished it and fed it. Words such as apathy, materialism, selfishness, unconcern, are the food which has the power to destroy us.

But this is a new day. The night has passed, and the day must dawn clear and bright in determination.

The day has passed when we can support the bigot, the segregationalist, the hater. The day is here when we must meet these problems person to person. Me to you. You to you.

All the tinsel must be torn away that we may be permitted to behold the tree. The clouds which have covered this land of ours must give way, that we may be permitted to see the endless sky with its bright sun of truth and morality which have the power to melt all the lesser gods.

We must, because Thanksgiving Day 1964, Thanksgiving Day 2064 depend on you and on me.

A Dying Sport—Mushroom Hunting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues would enjoy the light humor of Mike Royko, an outstanding newspaperman in Chicago, who has touched upon some tender moments of days gone by. Mr. Royko was born of a Polish mother so he may have witnessed the secret exodus to the wilds when the sport of mushroom hunting was at its best. It is too bad we have not carried on in the tradition set by our parents for this sport has always produced stories such as the one that follows:

A DYING SPORT—MUSHROOM HUNTING

(By Mike Royko)

They say that when the first Pole—or maybe he was a Bohemian—landed in the United States, he ran down the gangplank and headed for the nearest forest with a bushel basket in his hand.

Someone shouted: "Stop. There are hostile Indians in there."

"I don't care," answered the Pole or Bohemian, over his shoulder. "It is mushroom season."

This story came to mind recently when several fungi lovers said that 1963 will be remembered in their circles as the year the secret mushroom patch went dry.

"It was a terrible year," said round-cheeked Jerry Voda, 52, of 1008 West 20th Place, a Bohemian who thinks nothing of returning home from the Harvard, Ill., area with 6 or more bushels of mushrooms.

"It was too dry. You have to have moisture and warmth. This year we had the warmth but we didn't have the rain. It was the worst mushroom year I remember."

It is a shame that mushroom hunters should have even one bad year, because it is in a way a dying sport.

The number of mushroom pickers has declined over the years, roughly in proportion to the number of European immigrants who settle in Chicago.

"You don't see any young people picking them any more," said Cap Sauers, the forest preserve superintendent. "Mainly middle aged and elderly folks."

The children and the grandchildren of the mushroom hunters, it appears, get their mushrooms at the store and their sunshine on the golf course or in a motorboat.

Besides, mushroom hunters don't try to enlist newcomers to their ranks. And it isn't much of a spectator sport. Television would be hard pressed to find much drama or excitement in the sight of babushka-clad ladies bent over the stump of a tree.

But it is a sport that has traditions far more rigid than most others.

Golfers long ago abandoned the gentlemanly traditions inherent in the sport. They dress like peacocks and attack each other in motorized vehicles.

Baseball has exploding ball parks. Skiers spending more time drinking and telling lies to girls than they do in sliding down hills.

Ah, but the mushroom hunter.

Early in the morning, even before some golfers are getting themselves nervous and upset, the mushroom hunter sets out with his equipment—a stack of bushel baskets. (These frugal sportsmen see little sense in games that require large investments for equipment while not producing something to eat.)

He heads for the country and his favorite spot, known only to him, the route committed to memory. (Somebody could steal a map.)

Once there, he may drop his hat on the mushroom-loaded stump, his coat on another, and his bushels on still another.

This means, in the strict code of the mushroom man, that nobody in the whole world can pick mushrooms from these spots.

Through the day, he fills his baskets, pausing occasionally to refresh himself with a tonic and to look at the countryside.

Hours later, he returns home, happy and tired. The mushrooms are washed, pickled, dried or frozen. He looks forward to months of having mushrooms with nearly everything but his oatmeal.

Like most sports, there are legends about mushroom hunting. They generally deal with the ability of the hunter to keep secret the location of his favorite spot.

"You have a better chance of finding out how much money a Bohemian has in the savings and loan than finding out where his mushroom patch is," someone has observed.

"You are better off asking a Pole not to collect rent than to ask for the location of his mushroom patch," is another truth.

One oldtimer, whose name has been lost in history, is spoken of with great respect for his sense of secrecy.

A close friend asked him if he could go along on a Sunday for a day of picking.

"Sure," said the oldtimer. "Come by my house at 5 in the morning."

At 5 the friend was at the door. The oldtimer's wife appeared and said: "He left at 4. And he drove around the block three times to make sure he wasn't being followed."

Mushroom hunting, like most worthwhile endeavors, involves some risk. It takes experience to avoid mushrooms that will permanently curl your toes.

Strangely, most mushroom hunters don't know for sure which ones are poisonous. But they know that certain kinds are safe—so they stick to them.

As a result, Chicago has not had a death that could be attributed to mushroom poisoning for many years. However, it remains the position of the Chicago Board of Health and other public health agencies that mushroom hunting is dangerous and that it should be discouraged.

Eventually, they will have their way, but not because the mushroom hunter takes their advice.

No, he will just fade away, not telling anybody where he went, and making sure he isn't being followed.

Some Sobering Thoughts on the Assassination of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination touched the hearts of Americans everywhere. Many of my constituents have sent me expressions of their thoughts and feelings concerning the act which robbed us of our head of state. One statement, in particular, which I feel I should call to the attention of my colleagues, was written by Merton Ephraim, of Fairfield, Iowa. It has appeared as a "Letter to the Editor" in the columns of the Fairfield (Iowa) Daily Ledger and it carries some sobering thoughts for all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD the words of Merton Ephraim, of Fairfield, Iowa.

The statement follows:

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

As we slowly, very slowly, return to a semblance of our normal routine after the sudden and horrible shock of the event which just couldn't happen in this peace-loving country, I find it necessary to record my thinking.

The impact of this horrendous act in addition to the suddenness of its happening left me grievous, shocked, and angry. Our President, be he friend or foe, is among us always with a personal attachment and warm respect. His family, his travels and activities, his every act, is known to us more or less intimately. In a national crisis he stands and speaks our voice and unites us as one, as we are today in the untimely passing of this dedicated and devoted man whose personal status offered him the opportunity to avoid the burden of the heaviest responsibilities of our world today. I think back to the three previous Presidents murdered while fulfilling the tremendous duties of their office, with great reverence and respect, but these happenings are past blotches on our great history. This act, with the benefit of the news media, picturing him at his last breakfast; his speech with its ever-present fervor and humor; his acceptance of gifts including a hat and his challenge to those present to visit him at the White House on the day which developed to be his burial day to see him wear the hat; the pictures of him arriving in the city of his fate and starting jovially on his last ride, truly moments before the fatal instant, all bring us desperately close to his faithful wife and family.

I feel that his death, this supreme sacrifice, is the direct result of his greatness in the carrying forth of the concepts of our way of life. True, we have our own differences in a great many areas but basically we are as one.

We now stand trial in the eyes of the world for permitting the accomplishment of this dastardly deed—each and every one of us who stands for true Americanism. It is imperative that we unite now on every front to overcome this shadow cast. We must carefully inventory our tolerance of the factions who would cause this dreadful situation and take action in keeping with our concepts of justice. My own experience with such a faction just a few short weeks ago and my immediate forwarding to the FBI of all facts brings to my mind this point indelibly.

John F. Kennedy's death stands as a gross violation of our beliefs and our faith and a part of each true American goes to his grave with him. It is now strictly within the power of each and every one of us to determine whether or not he shall have died in vain.

MERTON EPHRAIM.

Hatred Breeds Fanaticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the tragedy of November 22, the world has stopped to ponder where it has been going and what changes should be made in our course.

An editorial in the Des Moines Register of November 26, 1963, very appropriately points to one change that is badly needed and one thing that everyone can participate in. It is as follows:

HATRED BREEDS FANATICISM

"Ask what you can do for your country," John Fitzgerald Kennedy exhorted his countrymen in 1961, in his inaugural address as President of the United States.

Chief Justice Earl Warren told a grieving nation Sunday one thing that all Americans can do. The white-haired Chief Justice of the United States spoke from the rotunda of the Capitol, before the flag-draped casket of the assassinated President:

"If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us and the bitterness that begets violence."

Americans are a violent people. Europeans were shocked, when American Presidents have visited their shores, at the precautions the U.S. Secret Service felt necessary to take for their safety. Americans, who have shot at three out of four recent Presidents and killed four in a hundred years, know these precautions are needed—and not wholly effective even so.

Ordinary respectable Americans in great numbers hate their country's potential enemies, foreign and domestic (or those whom they believe to be enemies), in a grossly un-Christian way. America's wars have been the occasion for childish outbursts of unreasoning hatred along with patriotism.

In some whole areas of the country (not just in the South) defense of the remnants of white supremacy and racial segregation is accompanied by shocking outbursts of hate, by responsible community leaders who should know better as well as by those whom they help to miseducate.

Discussions of foreign policy are pervaded by an appalling callousness toward the poverty of two-thirds of the world, and toward the threats of nuclear war which have been the anguished commonplaces of American diplomacy since the 1940's.

In this poisoned atmosphere, fanaticism of the deed takes root, as the country has learned to its sorrow by the deaths of its young President and of the younger man charged with his assassination. Some even cheered the second lawless killing.

Thoughful people who truly love their country will try to abjure hatred and by their example soften hatred in others. All the highest wisdom of the ages joins Chief Justice Warren in pointing down this road.

Necessity for a Change of Thought and Policy in Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Walter Lippmann appeared in the Washington Post of December 5.

It points out the necessary and long overdue necessity for a change of though and of policy in foreign affairs, especially in regard to our European allies—we must give up the role of nursemaid or maiden aunt to the world and become partners, equals, and even competitors:

ON CONTINUING

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the preceding article I talked about some of the difficulties at home and abroad which complicate President Johnson's intention to continue the policies of President Kennedy. It is taking too simple a view of his problems to overlook the dealock and standstill which prevail at home and abroad.

Although President Kennedy might have waited until he had been reelected, he could not have put off indefinitely a serious reappraisal of many of his foreign policies. The condition of affairs has changed tremendously since these policies were first conceived and formulated. They were addressed to the world of the late 1940's and the 1950's when there were two, and only two great powers. Now, there are several, and the two big nuclear powers are finding that in the outer world their control is weakening and their influence diminishing.

It will be necessary to reappraise the policies which come down from the time when the non-Communist world, and particularly the European part of it, looked to Washington for leadership because it depended wholly upon the United States for its defense against communism and for its recovery from the war. This abnormal relationship had to come to an end. It was the avowed purpose of our postwar policies to bring it to an end. And though it is human to cling to a superior place, we must recognize that Europe has recovered and enjoys a freedom of action hitherto denied it. This is because the balance of power has been organized successfully to rule out great war.

By the end of the 1950's when the New Frontier was struggling to come into power, the abnormal preeminence of the United States had already begun to fade away. The phenomenon was then ascribed to the weakness of Eisenhower and not to the nature of things. It was necessary at that time to prepare ourselves for giving up our former position of undisputed leadership. Insofar as our European policies have been working badly, it is not so much because General de Gaulle is spoiling them but because events have overtaken them. General de Gaulle has not brought about the decline of NATO and the American-led Atlantic partnership and the primacy of the United States in all the underdeveloped continents. General de Gaulle is pointing out the decline of an American leadership which was temporarily necessary but inherently abnormal—abnormal in regard to the national spirit of the Europeans—abnormal also in regard to the historic traditions of the Americans.

In my view, President Johnson will do well to begin with a confident acceptance of an acomplished and unavoidable fact—that our position in relation to Europe is no longer that of guardian and tutor. From abjuring

the pretension to superiority in world leadership will come, one may hope, the end of that eager-beaverism which has interfered with our serious thinking and has done nothing but irritate and destroy confidence. We should accept the fact that since we are no longer needed or able to lead Europe, the time is over for hotfoot missions to Paris and London and Bonn and Rome to sell some one of our devices.

It is time to relax and wait considerately and receptively for proposals from Europe. It is most emphatically not the time for the new President to consider traveling abroad, for him to listen to the naive argument that, fact to face with the European leaders and with sufficiently large crowds cheering him along, Europe will relapse once more into the dependent posture of the 1940's and the early 1950's.

The time before our elections is too short, the accumulated problems here at home are too many, to allow time or energy for the diversions and distractions of propaganda travels abroad. What cannot be done through diplomatic channels, or face to face in Washington, almost certainly cannot be done at all.

We are in the 1960's, and we must search our minds lest we accept unexamined the assumptions of the postwar years, lest we act on the reflexes which were conditioned in another age. The paramount theme of the 1940's was the necessity of American intervention to save European civilization from destruction. The paramount theme of the 1950's was to consolidate the Western world against the onset of revolutionary communism. The paramount theme of this decade as we know it thus far is that we are emerging from a two-power world and entering one where there are many powers.

It will be false to say that a recognition of the change in our relative position is a revival of isolationism. Reappraisal of our position involves no retreat from the task of maintaining the nuclear peace. It means no withdrawal and no desertion of our friends. But it does mean a change in our role in power politics, let us say from wooer to wooed, from buyer to seller, from seeker to sought.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the incredible and shocking news of the tragic death of President Kennedy stunned the civilized world.

The portrayal by modern news media of the sequence of events that followed even beyond the 21-gun salute and taps, sounding over the hills of Arlington National Cemetery, plumbed the depths of human emotions of mankind everywhere—perhaps to the greatest degree in history.

Countless eloquent words have been written and spoken in tribute to the life and work of our late President. He served his country well; he sought peace with justice for all nations. This brilliant, dedicated, and courageous young leader built his own monument—a monument to inspire his present and future countrymen.

The people of North Carolina have in many ways expressed their sorrow over this national tragedy. I extend my personal sympathy to all loved ones of the President.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of December 7, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

In the aftermath of the assassination of President Kennedy it is vital to the security of the United States that we keep the record straight. Now, more than ever, Americans must remember the words of Abraham Lincoln: "As freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide." Only Americans can destroy America.

What are many columnists, commentators, and editorial writers doing today? They are blaming the people of the United States for a foul deed done by a self-avowed Communist. Too many Americans are parroting the line laid down by the Communists in Tass and Pravda. "Beware the extremists of the right and left wing," we are being told. "Americans are filled with hate," we hear over and over again. Ignored completely is the basic American character of compassion, kindness, sympathy so dramatically exhibited in the unity of the entire Nation following the tragedy; the outpouring of sympathy and love for Mrs. Kennedy and the children; a quarter of a million Americans standing all through the cold night outside the Capitol in silent tribute; the immediate and magnificent response of giving concrete help to the widow and children of the slain Dallas police officer, J. D. Tippit; even the contributions, out of our sense of sympathy, to the widow and children of the alleged assassin, Oswald.

Now, what are the facts?

1. The President was killed by a Communist. The hate was in the heart of the killer—hate of America, hate for what is our national purpose, hate for any type of authority.

2. Prior to the moment of the killing, President Kennedy and his party were being honored with enthusiasm, respect and love by thousands of Dallas citizens.

3. The Communists are the purveyors of hate in today's world. It is they who encourage lying, deceit and murder to accomplish their goals.

Of course, there are extremists—there have always been since the dawn of history. If, by extremists, we mean any who would take the law into their own hands by violence or killing, we abjure such action. We hate the deed, but in Christian charity try not to hate the individuals. It is important that we make a clear distinction, short of those who advocate murder, between the so-called rightwing and leftwing extremists.

1. The rightwing belief is based on preservation of the Constitution, to keep America free, to protect the security of the Nation.

2. The extremist on the left (and this does not include the sincere liberal who seeks the common good and believes it can be accomplished only through big government) but the far-out leftist whose goal is communism, the abrogation of our Constitution, and the destruction of America.

3. The great bulk of the American people belong to neither extreme, but are dedicated to this Nation and its free institutions, including the freedom of debate and opposition.

THE DANGER

Once we have made this clear distinction, we ask ourselves, what is the real danger? The threat to America is getting the American people to fall into the Communist trap and ending our will to resist. How?

1. By carrying out the policy of the 1960 Communist manifesto to eliminate the anti-Communists.

2. Get the American people to condemn themselves as bigots, breeders of hate, assassins, degenerates. Entice their own writers, clergymen, educators, politicians, any who can be duped into emphasizing American faults, drown us in self-criticism and self-guilt, ready to accept socialism which by definition escalates into communism.

Our danger comes from the extremist on the left who is dedicated to the Communist conspiracy to conquer the world and destroy the United States. We can handle the extremist on the right, short of those advocating violence (and there are some and always will be as long as man is man) because we can reach him through reason and debate because the objective of the right is the preservation of our limited Government under the Constitution.

THE ANSWERS

What do we do about the danger?

1. We adhere to American principles.

2. We do our best to preserve the spirit and the letter of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

3. We recognize the issues which divide our people, we debate them freely, and we compromise our views to arrive at solutions which will strengthen our country and the freedoms of our people.

4. We encourage, not stifle opposition. To intimidate, by calling them "hate mongers" any who disagree, will only play into the hands of the enemies of our system.

5. We do all possible to keep our people informed, wipe out ignorance, end blind prejudice for any reason.

We maintain uninhibited faith in the collective judgment and wisdom of the people. Under our system of government, divinely inspired, it is a natural law that, given all the facts, the people, in their final judgment, will not be wrong.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's assassination is a tragedy touching the heart and mind of every American. The wanton destruction of this gay, ardent, vivid young man at the zenith of his powers first stunned us, and then left us with a deadening feeling which continues to persist. I believe this same effect has been felt by people throughout the world who had been in-

spired by his ideals so eloquently expressed.

I mourn the loss of this fine young man who was so boldly steering our ship of state through the turbulent waters of domestic troubles and international strife.

I had the privilege of knowing him since he first came to Congress. I watched his brilliant career, admiring his courage and ability.

My deepest sympathy goes out his wife and his two lovely young children at this time of their great sorrow, and to the other members of his family.

My heartfelt prayers go out to Almighty God for President Johnson, our new Commander in Chief, as he takes over the gigantic problems now facing the Nation. Fortunately, President Kennedy had seen to it, with foresight, diligence, and care, that President Johnson made the contacts and undertook the responsibilities which equipped him to step into the breach fully armed for the tasks ahead. This is one more thing for which we can thank our late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Cameron Keeps Voters Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to see a freshman Congressman embark upon an ambitious program designed to keep his constituents fully informed of his activities on Capitol Hill.

Since coming to the Congress I have placed considerable emphasis on keeping the folks back home appraised of how I carry out my responsibilities in Washington, how I evaluate the great issues of our time, and how particular pieces of legislation are apt to affect them as citizens of the United States and as residents of an individual State. I have every hope and intention of continuing this informational program because I consider it one of my chief obligations as their representative.

My good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMERON], obviously shares this view for he has devised a unique and excellent method of keeping his constituents informed of his actions in the House. In fact, to the best of my knowledge he is the only one among us who periodically mails out a complete rundown on each and every rollcall, including quorum calls. His tabulation includes the yeas and nays on every measure which comes before us, how he voted on the particular bill, and an explanation of those items which are of great significance. On quorum calls he not only lists the Member who asked for the call and the number of absentees, but if he is absent he tells constituents why he wasn't on the floor. There can be no doubt in the minds of voters in California's 25th District as to how their Congressman is representing them.

The extensive format of the gentleman's newsletter, which he calls his "Congressional Rollcall," has prompted feature stories in both of the daily newspapers in his district—the San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune and the Whittier Daily News.

I call the attention of my colleagues to these articles because I think they not only provide a penetrating insight into the character of the gentleman from California, but also because they illuminate his thinking on the functions and responsibilities of his office, and his approach to the American political process.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those of us who have been fortunate enough to work closely with the gentleman during the past year would all agree that these articles are a true reflection of the man, that he is indeed a man of courage and conviction who meets his responsibilities in the highest traditions of the Congress.

The articles follow:

[San Gabriel Valley Daily Tribune]

CAMERON KEEPS PEOPLE POSTED

(By Dick Tracy)

It is easier to promise than to perform.

That, my friends, is a truism of politics and if proof is necessary just examine the platforms of both major political parties for the past 20 years.

What politician, for example, has been elected without first promising piously to keep his voters fully informed of his actions.

Usually the exact wording goes something like this: "* * * And, my friends, you will always know how I cast your vote in Washington."

Malarkey. Keeping track of Congressmen, Senators and the like is about as simple as catching rainwater in an eyedropper.

Representative RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, Democrat, 25th, is living up to his promise. And he may be the first "our man in Washington" ever to do it.

At his own expense, CAMERON publishes for his constituents a congressional rollcall, a pamphlet which itemizes his presence at quorum calls and his vote on rollcalls.

It explains why he voted yea or nay on major bills * * * and even tells when he's absent and why.

This is a strange pamphlet, only in that no one seems to remember it ever having been done before.

Since he was elected in 1962, CAMERON has published four of the voting reports and in them is a complete vote-by-vote breakdown on him.

CAMERON says he astonished seasoned politicians when he explained to them his plans. They frankly told him, "You're crazy."

But now some of his colleagues plan to issue the same kind of report.

It's a costly experiment, CAMERON's franking privilege as a Congressman covers only postage and printing of envelopes. He must pay for the printing and paper for the report itself.

Initially, the Whittier Democrat mailed only a few copies; the last mailing went to 55,000 registered voters at a personal cost of $1,400.

By the next issue (a report is issued when there are sufficient votes to fill the four pages), the Congressman plans to increase the printing to cover virtually all registered voters in his district.

CAMERON's cost then will go up to $2,000.

Not all of the voters who get the report are going to agree with the way he voted in every case. But, at least, they'll not have to scurry through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a highly tedious project—when election day rolls around.

[Whittier Daily News]

CAMERON KEEPS VOTERS INFORMED

(By Mel Rich)

Representative RONALD BROOKS CAMERON is generally regarded as an outspoken lawmaker who will discuss his convictions, popular or not, at the drop of a hat.

Unlike many of his colleagues in public office, the Congressman from the 25th California District is not hesitant to advertise his record.

"The people I represent should know how I vote," said the Whittier Democrat, and to keep his constituents informed, CAMERON regularly mails out reports on his record on rollcall issues in the House. On what he considers to be key issues, he adds an accounting of his reasons for favoring or opposing a proposed measure.

PURPOSE OF REPORTS

"In the past I have often found it difficult to secure information on the voting records of persons who have represented me," said the Congressman in a statement included in his first report. "In the belief that others in our congressional district have had the same problem, the following is a complete tabulation of each rollcall vote of the 88th Congress, through April 30, and my vote on each item. On items that are considered to be of the greatest significance, I have given a brief explanation of the reasoning behind my vote."

CAMERON's initial report, which he calls the "Congressional Rollcall," covered the period January 9 through April 30 and included the first 34 rollcalls in the House. His latest report, received this week, covers the period May 1 through June 20 and includes the House rollcalls Nos. 35 through 78.

The reports indicate that CAMERON has voted with the House majority on 27 issues, opposed the majority on 6, and is recorded as not voting on 1. All other rollcalls were for the purpose of determining if a quorum of the Members were present. On quorum calls he is reported as being present 28 times, absent 9 times.

BELIEVES IN FRANKNESS

CAMERON followed the same frank practice when he served in the legislature as representative of the 50th assembly district. Several times during his terms there he became embroiled in public controversies for taking unpopular stands.

He attacked health and accident insurance policies that did not provide proper protection, criticized some of the medical profession for certain practices, and opposed secrecy on certain hospital records.

A year ago, CAMERON decided not to seek reelection to the assembly, and sought instead the Democratic nomination in the 25th Congressional District. He defeated a former Congressman George A. Kasem in a spirited campaign.

Next he took on and defeated the Republican incumbent, John H. Rousselot, who had 2 years earlier ousted Kasem.

His contempt for political hanky-panky has caused some observers to forecast his defeat in past elections, but CAMERON has yet to lose. His most loyal supporters counter with a claim that its is CAMERON's frankness that wins him votes.

And even his foes will have to admit that the Congressman isn't afraid to tackle an issue head-on.

An illustration of his individualism is his vote against a proposal to limit travel expenses for congressional staff members and Members of Congress. CAMERON's negative vote was one of but two recorded.

HIS COMMENTS

About this resolution (House rollcall No. 40) he reported as follows:

"At present there are adequate rules of the Congress, which, if rigidly enforced, would protect the public from any would-be malfactors. House Joint Resolution 245 is not foolproof. Its provisions can be circumvented just as existing laws can be thwarted. I considered my vote against the resolution to be a small exercise of protest in contrast to a large exercise of pacification. I also consider the proposal to be discriminatory, in that Congressmen on official business overseas will not be reimbursed for such necessary expenses as phone calls, cables, interpreters, etc. Executives in the private sector are reimbursed for all necessary expenses relative to their work, and I see no reason why a Member of Congress should not be accorded the same consideration. It is significant that the House failed to include travel within the United States in the proposal. If the resolution is indeed aimed at accomplishing great reforms, I would think its applicability should not be limited to travel abroad."

CAMERON works tirelessly on his report-to-the-people program. While he hasn't been in Congress long enough to fully develop this phase, he did on his return home during the Easter recess set up a series of public meetings throughout his district. His constituents were invited to come and discuss their viewpoints. He plans to do this again when he returns to the district following adjournment.

Flags in Mourning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem written by Vernon Boyce Hampton, of Staten Island, N.Y., in memory of our late President:

For our martyred President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

FLAGS IN MOURNING

(By Vernon B. Hampton)

Old Glory flies in the spirit of mourning,
Symbol of America's grief;
Greatening with each hour's drawing
In the shock of loss of the Nation's Chief.

Anthemed in a colorful requiem,
Ten million flags o'er land and sea
Wave in the breeze in solmn requiem
For John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The colors half-staffed, mutely flying,
Speak of the world-wide loss deplored,
For the one struck down had a faith undying:
That brotherhood promised world accord.

The flag that he loved, his life defended
In war and peace and in martyrdom,
And our Nation, as his life is ended
Must finish the tasks he would have done.

So we dedicate ourselves anew,
In the hour of his soul's release,
To consummate the dreams he dreamed
Of justice, brotherhood, and peace.

VERNON B. HAMPTON.

The period of national mourning is observed for 30 days from the date of President Kennedy's death November 22, 1963.

Effect of Meat Imports on Cattle Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been watching the livestock and meat situation in the United States and I must say that it has been with a great deal of concern. The cattle market is always somewhat erratic, but since November of last year, cattle prices began an unusual decline, and as always, stockmen and others in the trade searched for a reason. Attention was focused on cattle and veal imports which recently have increased in large amounts. I am well aware of the special report on the livestock situation where the Department of Agriculture found no evidence justifying the citing of beef imports as a cause of the price break for fed cattle. They point out that although total beef and veal imports are at record levels, most of that imported was manufacturing beef. Very little high quality fed beef was imported. It is pointed out that during the increase in imports, fed cattle prices were also rising. However, as we look at the present market, the question comes to mind: imports are increasing, then why are prices falling? For example, last November the average price for choice steers in Chicago rose to a high of $30.13 a hundred, and thereafter began a fall which ended at a disastrous low of $22.61 a hundred in May of this year—a decline of almost 25 percent. Average prices in the following 2 months rose to $24.11 in September, $5.74 a hundred below September 1962. Choice slaughter steer prices in the first half of this year were 9 percent below the first half of 1962. Declines have occurred in other classes of cattle; prices of stocker and feeder steers at Kansas City in the first 6 months of this year were 4 percent below the same period a year earlier. Chicago prices of commercial cows were down 3 percent, cutters and canners were down 3 percent and the wholesale price of fresh choice beef carcasses in New York down from $0.502 per pound in September 1962 to $0.426 in September 1963.

A considerable census of opinion attributes the price declines to the increased volume of meat imports into the United States over the past few years. Imports of beef and veal in 1962 were more than twice the 1956–60 average, and more than four times the 1951–55 average. Moreover, beef imports in the first half of 1963 outpaced those for the first half of 1962 by more than 20 percent. Simple logic would indicate that these increased imports do, indeed, bear down on the price our cattlemen are receiving for livestock, especially when one considers that such imports in 1962 accounted for almost 11 percent of total domestic production as compared with only 4 percent in 1957. The United States has increased its share of the total world meat imports to over 25 percent in 1962—1,850.4 million pounds—compared with 14.8 percent—889.1 million pounds—for the 1956–60 average. In fact, the United States exported 29 percent—103.2 million pounds—less meat in 1962 than the 1956–60 average—145.3 million pounds—while for the same period of comparison our total imports rose an astounding 108 percent. In 1962 exports further decreased approximately 8 percent while imports rose another 39 percent. Even more important, examine the figures for the first 6 months of 1963. Nearly all types of red meat imports were higher than during the same period in 1962. Beef and veal imports at 491 million pounds were 21 percent above the first half of last year, with the major beef item—boneless—20 percent above the previous year at 407 million pounds.

About 96 percent of U.S. manufacturing meat imports came from 8 countries in 1962, Australia and New Zealand supplying 56 or 20 percent, respectively. Last year the United States was the leading market for Australian meats, and has been the major market for New Zealand's boneless beef exports for the past 3 years, taking over 90 percent of their production. All of this is particularly interesting in view of the study of nontariff agricultural protectionism by the Department of Agriculture. This study shows that all our major trading partners practice a higher degree of agricultural protectionism than the United States through nontariff barriers. These nontariff import controls involve such things as import quotas, embargoes, variable levies, monopolies, preferential treatment, import licensing, bilateral agreements, and so forth. Using such nontariff import controls as the criteria, the Department of Agriculture found that the following percentages of a country's domestic agricultural production was protected from outside competition: Australia, 41 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; Denmark, 100 percent; France, 95 percent; and West Germany, 95 percent. The study indicates that the United States is among the most liberal in the world in its agricultural import policies.

Statements credited to officials in the U.S. Department of Agriculture minimize the impact of imports on domestic meat-animal prices. They point out that imports, two-thirds of which are coming from Australia and New Zealand, constitute lower quality beef used in making manufactured and processed products, such as frankfurters and luncheon meat. However, representatives of the American National Cattlemen's Association maintain that such imports have a direct impact on cattle prices. The National Livestock Feeders Association has pointed out a possible fallacy of the Agriculture Department theory:

Processed products constitute very real competition in the sale of fresh beef and veal. The availability of large quantities of imported manufactured boneless beef and veal has resulted in a continuously larger proportion of processed products being offered consumers, in comparison to the volume of fresh cuts which come principally from carcasses grading USDA Good and Choice. Boning beef comes principally from old bulls

and cows and from low grade steers and heifers. Without the very large volume of imports, there would be a substantial downward substitution of the cheaper cuts from carcasses of higher grades for use as boneless beef. This provides price and supply movement stimuli to the fresh beef market.

We hear quite a bit about the United States not being able to supply the canner and cutter quality of animals and that most of the imports are of that type; however, one must remember that the average age of a cow herd is increasing, and that when a rancher has an area of good grass, a cow will be kept for another winter if there is a possibility she will survive and produce another calf. Because the cow will still have the same slaughter value the following year, many ranchers are optimistic about returns from feeder calves and will carry through the winter many aged cows not barren. Obviously, the time will occur when it is no longer of benefit to return her, however, with foreign beef consistently underselling domestic by some 5 cents a pound the processor who buys domestic beef has no choice but to pay the farmer less. This depressing effect of cheap foreign meat cannot help but cause havoc in the cattle industry.

These various points of view, it seems to me, though they come from highly authoritative sources, are so divergent as to prompt Congress to concern itself with a thorough study of the question. In glancing through USDA statistics, I note that steer and heifer slaughter under Federal inspection in the first 6 months of this year was about 9 percent above a year earlier. Such increased slaughter would seem to support the U.S. Department of Agriculture position that increased slaughter—and not imports—was the cause of the price decline.

But let us look at the facts a little further, red meat production is continuing at a high rate, up 4.3 percent from the first half of 1962, and we are told that a per capita consumption will reach 167 pounds for 1963, a 3-pound increase over 1962. With an expansion in demand for beef from the increased population, higher incomes, and continuation in consumer's preference for beef, one would think that cattle prices would also remain at a high level. At the same time, one cannot escape the inherent logic in the Cattlemen's Association and Feeder's Association statements that sizable imports of beef directly affect the price which producers in this country receive.

I should also call attention to the fact that prices received for farm products in the first 6 months averaged about the same as last year, with lower prices for livestock nearly offsetting higher prices for crops. On the surface, this may appear to be economically sound; however, while farm income has remained the same, the rest of the economy has moved ahead. Indeed, in the June quarter the farmer's share of the food dollar fell to 36 cents, the lowest quarterly average in 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, the livestock segment of our agricultural economy is extremely important. Last year, sales of nearly $20 billion of livestock products accounted for almost 56 percent of total farm income while sales of nearly $12 billion of meat animals alone made up about a third of total farm income.

We are both the world's largest exporter of agricultural products and because of our high purchasing power and liberal policies, the world's second largest importer of agricultural products, exceeded only by the United Kingdom. Over half our agricultural imports are products that compete with our own farm production.

But as realists we are not seeking completely free trade, for many reasons—economics, political, and social, no country is either prepared or willing to remove all protections from its agriculture. The basic question has to do with the degree of protection. Nations must participate in active two-way trade. The two-way trade in agricultural products practiced by the United States is of a vigorous healthful nature. More countries should follow our lead.

I am not sure what would be the proper approach to our meat import problem, and of course, I do not think anyone would demand total exclusion of foreign meats since some is necessary to meet the demand for processed and manufacturing products. However, imports are jeopardizing one of the most important segments of agriculture, and I believe it would be proper to put into effect import quotas or increase the duty on live cattle and meat products. I strongly urge that we give this problem our serious attention.

U.S. average beef cattle prices per 100 pounds, 1953–63

Year	Prices received by farmers for all beef cattle	Choice slaughter steers at Chicago	Feeder steer prices at Kansas City	Commercial grade cows at Chicago
1953	$16.30	$24.14	$17.35	$13.92
1954	16.00	24.66	18.97	13.28
1955	15.60	23.16	18.60	12.98
1956	14.90	22.30	17.37	12.72
1957	17.20	23.83	20.33	14.83
1958	21.90	27.42	25.56	17.76
1959	22.60	27.83	25.61	19.11
1960	20.40	26.24	22.93	16.21
1961	20.20	24.65	23.30	16.07
1962	21.30	27.67	24.53	15.89
1963 [1]	20.22	24.15	23.70	15.75
January	21.60	27.27	24.53	15.30
February	20.40	24.93	23.89	15.24
March	19.60	23.63	23.45	15.68
April	20.30	23.77	24.12	15.86
May	19.70	22.61	23.50	16.44
June	19.70	22.69	22.74	16.17

[1] 1st 6 months.

Source: USDA. Statistical Reporting Service, July 1963 (Statistical Bulletin No. 355) and USDA, Economic Research Service. Livestock and Meat Situation Reports, 1963.

U.S. imports of cattle and beef, compared with production, 1950–62—Cattle and calves and beef and veal

Year	Imports				Meat production [3] (million pounds)	Imports as a percentage of production (percent)
	Live animals		Meat (million pounds)	Total [3] (million pounds)		
	Number (thousand head)	Meat equivalent [1] (million pounds)				
1953	177	62	271	333	13,953	2.4
1954	71	35	232	267	14,610	1.8
1955	296	93	229	322	15,147	2.1
1956	141	43	211	254	16,094	1.6
1957	703	221	395	616	15,728	3.9
1958	1,126	340	909	1,249	14,516	8.6
1959	688	191	1,063	1,254	14,588	8.6
1960	645	163	775	938	15,835	5.9
1961	1,023	250	1,037	1,287	16,341	7.9
1962	1,232	280	1,445	1,725	16,311	10.6

[1] Estimated at 53 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle.
[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.
[3] Total production.

Source: USDA. Economic Research Service, Livestock and Meat Situation, May 1963 (LMS-130).

U.S. steer and heifer beef production under Federal inspection, by month, 1962–63

[In millions of pounds]

Month	Steer beef production in the United States		Heifer beef production in the United States	
	1962	1963	1962	1963
January	654	678	188	214
February	574	591	173	196
March	647	662	190	222
April	601	710	169	214
May	699	782	192	227
June	700	732	184	199
Total	3,875	4,155	1,096	1,272

Source: USDA. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Livestock and Meat Situation, October 1962.

Discharge Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for a number of days now, I have received impassioned pleas from friends and constituents to sign the discharge petition which was placed at the Clerk's desk today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Many of these communications have stated the opinion that it is absolutely vital and necessary that I sign this petition in order to demonstrate my fealty to the cause of civil rights. All of these opinions, I realize, are sincerely expressed. I respect the authors of those opinions as men and women of courage and conviction. However, I want to take this opportunity to explain why I cannot in good conscience be swept along with the tide of public opinion that is currently calling for signatures on this petition. It is my honest feeling that the various media of communication in this country have done a real disservice to the cause of civil rights by improperly conveying the impression that the issue is now whether or not a Member will sign the discharge petition. I had been under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the cause for which we are all striving is the far larger and more noble cause of civil rights in the broadest sense of implementing constitutional guarantees with respect to voting rights and all of the privileges and immunities of first-class citizenship without regard to race or color.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a brief chronology of the events which have led up to the present conflict of civil rights legislation is in order. Mr. CELLER, who is sponsoring the petition, has for many years been chairman of the House Judiciary Committee which he controls with a comfortable 21 to 14 Democratic majority. He introduced a civil rights bill in the 87th Congress back in 1961, but he did not even begin to hold hearings until May of this year although 40 Republican bills were introduced in January. He did nothing to produce a bill for floor action in the 87th Congress. Where was his sense of urgency then? And it was not until October 29, 1963, that Mr. CELLER finally had a bill reported out of his committee. I think it is important to point this out because it clearly shows where the responsibility for delay should really rest. It was not until December 4, 1963, a date which was reached only last Wednesday, that additional views accompanying the report on this legislation were finally filed with the House. Therefore, for the mass media of communications to mislead the American people as it has in this instance by ascribing the delay to a bottling up within the Rules Committee is nothing but gross misrepresentation.

Further, it was not until after the sordid events in Birmingham that the President sent a civil rights message to Congress on June 19, 1963, attaching great urgency to this matter. Thereafter, when the Attorney General, Mr. Robert Kennedy, testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he admitted that he had not even taken the time to read any of the more than 40 Republican bills that had been offered and which I referred to above. If you will look at the record you will find that there were only two civil rights bills passed in the last 80 years—in 1957 and in 1960. These bills received overwhelming support from the Republican membership in the House of Representatives. Even more significant than this fact is the fact that it was Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, who is now the ranking Republican member on the Rules Committee, who saw to it that these bills were not unnecessarily delayed within the Rules Committee. Mr. BROWN is still on the committee, and I have his assurance plus the assurance of the other four Republicans that they expect to vote out a civil rights bill. Furthermore, they do not expect to countenance any undue delay when hearings are held in January. When you couple these facts with the fact that a successful discharge petition would still require the bill to lay over until mid-January at the very earliest, I am unconvinced of the merit of this procedure.

It is my conviction that the political maneuvering on the part of some people who are civil righteous either in whole or in part because of political advantages that they see therein, is doing real damabe to the cause of civil rights and jeopardizing the passage of the civil rights bill.

I made it clear many months ago that I was in wholehearted support of a civil rights bill, and would vote for it. This I fully intend to do. I will do it even though I do not expect any political advantage therefrom; indeed, I have every reason to believe that many of those who are most vocal in this regard are completely opposed to me in most of the stands that I take. Nevertheless, it is a matter of conscience with me, and I am proud and happy that I have an opportunity to cast an affirmative vote. At the same time, I feel deeply on the matter of some of the pressures that are being exerted with respect to the discharge petition. To those of us here in the Capitol in Washington, it is quite clear that the sponsor of the petition and others are seeking to use this as a political ploy to obtain some small partisan advantage and gain. They seek thereby to obscure the facts of their own negligence and untoward delay in bringing about the passage of this legislation.

In conclusion, let me say that it is difficult to disagree with our friends on this issue, particularly when we are not an enemy to the cause of civil rights, but have every intention of supporting the bill when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives. However, for the reasons already set forth we simply cannot in good conscience lend ourselves to what we honestly feel is nothing more or less than political chicanery.

I would also like to point out further that many persons lose sight of the fact that once a Member of the House of Representatives signs a discharge petition on this particular bill, he is absolutely defenseless before the onslaught of demands that he act similarly with respect to the other pieces of legislation for which discharge petitions have already been filed or will be filed, some of which bills should never see the light of day. If we were to adopt the use of the petition with respect to this legislation, it is almost certain that some of these other bills would find their way to the floor. I think it is significant that our ranking Republican member on the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, has absolutely identical views with mine with respect to the use of the discharge petition for any purpose. Yet without the work of Mr. MCCULLOCH, a civil rights bill would never have been reported out of the House Juriciary Committee in a form so that it could pass the House of Representatives.

The Other Side of the Debate on Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, all that we have heard about automation is the complaint of union leaders that millions are

being thrown out of work because of technological advances.

There is another side to the argument. Employment is at its highest peak in history. In spite of the gloom peddlers more and more jobs are being created. Automation is not our problem. Restrictive union rules and practices which price U.S. manufacturers out of the market are far more serious.

As a reminder that there is good in automation, I include as a part of these remarks a copy from an advertisement by Warner & Swasey in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report:

IF AUTOMATION PUTS PEOPLE OUT OF WORK WHY ARE MORE AND MORE PEOPLE EMPLOYED?

The fact is that automation shifts jobs but increases the total—and increases the workers' income, too.

Because of mechanized farming, there are fewer farmers—but more workmen in farm machinery factories, more salesmen, more servicemen.

There are fewer pick-and-shovel coal miners, but more men required to refine oil, and make and service oil and gas burners, for easier, uniform heat.

There are fewer railroaders but more truck drivers and workmen in truck and bus manufacturing plants.

And in what authorities call the "life-enrichment industries" such as education, health, entertainment, and research, employment has soared and keeps on rising.

Total employment in America is 69,891,000 at the highest wages, which (because of automation) buy more useful things for more people.

Revitalize the American Cotton Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6196) to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production, and for other purposes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, there seems to still be some lingering misunderstanding among some of the Members of the House as to how the Department of Agriculture would administer the provisions relating to changes in the support price of cotton as changes in the costs and efficiency of cotton production develop.

Section 3 of the bill requires that the Department make a determination as to how much change there is in the cost of growing cotton. It has been argued that it is not possible to measure accurately the cost of growing cotton. Let me emphasize that this bill requires only that the change in the cost of growing cotton be measured. There is no question but that it would be extremely difficult to get general agreement on the exact number of cents per pound it costs to produce cotton. But there is general agreement that the change in the cost from year to year can be measured with a very high degree of accuracy. The Department of Agriculture has done considerable work on this subject. In November 1962, a report on this work was published. It is entitled, "Changes in Costs and Efficiency of Cotton Production." Two charts from this report are contained on page 287 of the hearings. This is the method we would expect the Department of Agriculture to use to measure the changes in costs.

I have also heard it said there is some doubt about how the Department would apply this cost reduction provision to the price support level. This also has been worked out by the Department. An index of the average cost of growing cotton would be determined for a period of about 3 years ending in the latest year for which data is available. Three years is suggested in order to eliminate as much as possible the effects of weather. Another such average, ending 1 year earlier, would then be determined. The comparison of these two averages will reflect the change in the cost of growing cotton.

Under leave to extend, I will include in my remarks at this point a description of just how this calculation would be made This is what the Department says it will do should H.R. 6196 be enacted:

PROPOSED METHOD OF ADMINISTERING SECTION 3 OF H.R. 6196, AS APPROVED

The Department's publication, "Changes in Costs and Efficiency of Cotton Production," dated November 1962, contains the basic procedure and some of the data which would be used in administering section 3 of the bill. However, some additional data would need to be obtained in order to analyze and make available estimates of sufficient accuracy for this purpose.

In establishing a statistical series for measuring changes in the cost of producing cotton, it is intended that it will reflect not only those costs arising directly from the production of cotton such as labor, machinery, materials, ginning, and other contract services, but also a reasonable allowance for general farm overhead costs including a return to land. In the matter of establishing a return to land, however, it is expected that to the extent feasible account will be taken of, and appropriate adjustments made for, the many factors that have contributed to an artificial inflation in prices of farmland so that the return to land reflects only its value for agricultural uses.

It should also be pointed out that the Committee intends that changes in production costs from any cause be recognized in administering this section. It is not intended that reductions in price support be predicated only on reductions in production costs realized through the special cotton research program provided in section 3 of the bill.

The Department's publication measures the changes in costs of production for each year. In order to minimize the effects of weather on the cost in any particular year, an average of a few years should be used. The average should be kept as short as possible in order to bring changes in costs to bear on the price support within a reasonable time. But there must be sufficient lag to permit the data to be collected and the cost change determination made.

It is suggested, therefore, that for 1965, the average cost index during the 3 years ending in 1963 be divided by the average index during the 3 years ending in 1962. The result (but not more than 1.00) would be multiplied by the 1964 price support level to determine the level for 1965.

Each year thereafter, the 3-year averages would be advanced by 1 year.

An exception to the above would be made in the event costs go up, and then start down again. No reduction in the price support would be made as costs are coming back down until the previous lowest level is reached. From that point on the price support would again begin to be lowered as costs go down in the manner described above.

This provision is fair to the farmers in that it assures them that their price support will not be reduced unless the cost of growing cotton is reduced. With the kind of a research program contemplated by the bill, production costs can be reduced substantially. As the lower costs of production are reflected in lower price support, the overall expenditures for the cotton program will be reduced.

I think there is a good chance that by 1966, we can expect expenditures to be even less than they are under the present program. Over a period of say 8 to 10 years, it is highly possible, even probable, that costs can be reduced to the point where virtually all of the Government expenditures will be eliminated. To me this is one of the most important features of the bill. It removes from the political arena the establishment of the level of price support for cotton and puts it on a basis which is sound—both to the Government and to the farmer.

Tribute to Late President John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as deeply as most of us loved and respected John Fitzgerald Kennedy, it would be that people who knew him so well may have underrated his stature. The intense grief that his mindless assassination has created throughout the free world has borne home to most of us the devotion and affection with which this young President was held by people in all walks of life in every land where freedom is cherished.

Perhaps this was best summed up in a personal letter written by the great Irish playwright, Sean O'Casey. Mr. O'Casey, writing to an American friend, said:

What a terrible thing has happened to us all. To you, there; to us, here; to all, everywhere. Peace, who was becoming bright-eyed, now sits in the shadow of death: her handsome champion has been killed as he walked by her very side. Her gallant boy is dead.

It was a curious thing about the character and personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy that everyone, even those who lived in far-distant lands, thought of him as a warm personal friend whom they had known all their lives. There was no great difference between the public image of President Kennedy and the private image. The public personality was merely a clear projection of the vibrant spirit that animated the man in his personal relationships.

As we mourn his assassination, Mr. Speaker, each of us in this body cherishes

personal memories. For instance, it was my privilege to fly with him in the Executive Compartment of the airplane that carried him from Fort Worth to his rendezvous with destiny in Dallas. With the easy familiarity which his manner induced, we spoke about the importance to the Nation of our space program. As always, he was magnificently informed about the subject and fortified his contagious enthusiasm with extensive factual data. It was an inspiring conference and one that I shall always remember with pride modified by sorrow.

We came to Congress together, Mr. Speaker, in 1946 and, despite the fact that we sprang from different sectors of the country, and from different backgrounds, and despite the fact that we had basically different opinions on some issues, we were good friends, always. We served 6 years together on the District Committee, and I clearly recall the idealism with which he approached the task of trying to solve the problems that chronically beset the Nation's capital. Many Members of the Congress consider service on the District Committee an onerous and thankless task. Typically John F. Kennedy considered it an important challenge in the field of human relations.

On several occasions we put on the uniform of the Washington Senators together to play in the annual charity baseball game against our friends on the other side of the aisle. He played in these games, I believe, with a little more seriousness than did most of us. John F. Kennedy never saw any sense in engaging in any contest, athletic, mental or political, unless one played to win. And, until the cowardly murderer struck him down, he was a consistent winner in everything he attempted.

More than any President in our history, he was one of us. He was part and parcel of the Congress, and the Congress was a permanent element in his bloodstream. This was so apparent when—after his election to the Presidency—he would call us to the White House for conferences. He always understood what was possible of accomplishment in our deliberations, and what was not. He respected our judgment; he understood our problems; he treated us as friends and colleagues.

With his death, every one of us, Mr. Speaker, died a little.

We have lost a great leader.

We have lost a great friend.

And the entire free world has lost a living symbol of courage and decency. Indeed, as Mr. O'CASEY said, the handsome champion of peace was killed as he walked by her very side. Her gallant boy is dead.

Economic Illiteracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we should all be concerned with the lack of appreciation many people in the country have for the virtues of our free enterprise economic system. This theme is most effectively described in an editorial in the Thursday, December 5 edition of the Blue Island Sun-Standard which I place into the RECORD, wishing to emphasize its importance and logical summation.

The editorial follows:

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Economic illiteracy is among the greatest of this Nation's problems, particularly among university and high school students.

That, in substance, is the view of President Robert C. Kirkwood of the F. W. Woolworth Co. And, as he sees it, if this problem is to be solved educators and businessmen must develop more effective ways to bring the teaching of free enterprise up to date.

The evidence is all on Mr. Kirkwood's side. Dependable surveys have shown that only one person out of three thinks that investment in factories and machinery makes a major contribution to economic growth. And they have also shown that more than half of the adults in this country believe that net profits of most firms are equal to or exceed the wages these firms pay. Fewer than one-tenth know that payrolls substantially exceed profits.

Such misconceptions as these provide fertile ground for those whose purpose is to destroy free enterprise and the free political institutions which are part and parcel of the American system—a system which has done more good things for more people—materially and spiritually—than any other yet devised by man. There is a crying need, indeed, for a better knowledge of how this system works and what it produces, most especially among the young people who will determine the course our Nation is to take in years to come.

Television Overcommercialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement I made on "Congressional Conference," broadcast over station WOR–TV, channel 9, New York, on Sunday, December 8, 1963.

The statement follows:

Permit me to offer praise to the broadcasting industry (both radio and television) for its reporting of the events of the frightful and frightening days, commencing with the firing of the fateful bullet that laid low our late, martyred President.

The industry measured up to highest standards. The achievement is worthy of proud commendation.

The television and radio stations and networks themselves have presented a shining contrast to their ordinary course of business as usual with their comprehensive noncommercial news coverage of the assassination and burial of our late, beloved President Kennedy and the succession of President Johnson.

Advertising revenues, of course, make such a public service possible but broadcasters must recognize, as their audience does, the difference between enough and too much.

The mad, almost weird, scramble of TV and radio stations to push as many commercials as possible at the audience has become a national scandal. The air is saturated with such commercials and the public is surfeited and suffocated.

The airwaves are a public resource. Operators of radio and TV stations are licensees of the U.S. Government through the agency of the Federal Communications Commission. Hence, it is clear that any abuse of the license granted by FCC must be examined by it. And it is an abuse, I maintain, when many TV and radio stations thrust 30 minutes of commercials on the air for every hour of program. A public franchise, giving each broadcaster a limited monopoly of the public airwaves, should not become a license to bombard the public with inane advertising for nearly half the broadcast day.

Obviously, then, the industry has failed to regulate itself. The National Association of Broadcasters in 1948 proposed a limit of 12 minutes of commercials for every broadcast hour—or 1 minute for commercials out of every 5. Many broadcasters, however, do not belong to NAB, and many of those who do failed to live up to its code. The NAB, instead of enforcing its own code, relaxed it this year so that now 18 minutes of commercials to every hour of broadcast—roughly 1 minute out of every 3—is deemed reasonable. But, as I stated before, many stations go far beyond even that 1-to-3 ratio.

The viewing and listening public is virtually a captive audience. Unlike the newspaper reader who can skip past the advertisements to the story which attracts his interest and read it through from beginning to end, you, the television viewer, cannot escape the intrusive interruption of commercials if you are to watch the porgram of your choice.

Certainly the industry is entitled to a reasonable profit on its investment, but it is equally reasonable that in the public domain a balance be struck between the public interest and the private interest of the licensee.

Broadcasters have enjoyed phenomenal profits in many cases. Radio and TV stations are changing hands for $3, $4, $7, even $10 million these days. Recently, $8 million was offered for a TV station which was worth only $3 million in 1960. A $5 million capital gain on a $3 million investment over 3 years represents a pretty fair profit by any standards.

The networks and their affiliated stations too are enjoying record profits and sales, with sensational advances reported in some instances. How can such broadcasters justly complain about a more reasonable balance between the public and private interest?

While the Federal Communications Commission has sought information as to the number of commercials and licensee uses, it has not sought information as to the amount of time devoted to commercials in each hour of the broadcast day. Without such information it cannot get a true picture.

There are those who oppose any FCC regulation of commercials but its public duty is plain. The overuse of commercials is self-evident. The victims of such overuse, the viewers and listeners of TV and radio, agree, I am sure, that the insistent, intrusive, incessant, inescapable cries of vendors and pitchmen over the air must, in a measure, be inhibited.

A Tribute to President Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my tribute this afternoon to the many eloquent ones which have been

said in memory of our late President, John F. Kennedy.

The stunning news came to me as I had started my drive back to Illinois on that fateful Friday, November 22. I was between Hagerstown and Hancock, Md., when the confirmed report came over the radio that the last rites had been administered and that the President had died. I pulled off the side of road to control my shock and emotion and sought out the first telephone that I might phone my wife. Neither of us could talk very intelligently but we did decided that I should turn back and return to Washington.

I shall never forget that drive back to Washington along Route 240 which I had driven so many times. Cars were pulling off to the side of the road in numbers and those still on the road were just poking along. It was quite obvious that drivers were listening intently to their radios for every fragment of news. As I turned onto Embassy Row, down Massachusetts Avenue, I never before have noticed so many flags representing foreign countries, and all were drawn to half mast. I guess there never has been so tragic an event that has touched so many capitals around the world and certainly attests to the stature this relatively young man achieved in so short a time.

His being taken from our midst in such an awful manner reminds us how the course of history seems to be charted more by accident than by design, and of the Biblical Scripture which tells us that these events can happen "within the twinkling of any eye." Rhetoric and prose are so inadequate at a time like this but I do want to simply add the profound sympathy and condolences of our family to those untold numbers which have gone out and continue to be said for Mrs. Kennedy, the children, and the entire Kennedy family.

Another Myth Demolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a column by Robert Peterson which appeared in the November 29, 1963, edition of the New York Journal American the myth that this country has the highest longevity rate and the lowest mortality rate is demolished by simply stating the facts. The political doctors of the AMA who have been using this argument against the enactment of medicare—hospital care for the aged through the social security program—will have to find a new gambit now since at least two other nations, England and Sweden, have lower mortality rates and higher longevity rates than we do. Mr. Peterson's comments on the subject follow:

ANOTHER MYTH DEMOLISHED

The medicare plan, which would provide hospital care to the aged under the social security program, is still under fire by physicians.

One of their arguments is that Americans have the finest medical care and the lowest mortality rates of people anywhere in the world, and that this would be jeopardized if Uncle Sam were to become involved in financial medical care.

But wait a minute—are our medical services and mortality rates as superior as we are led to believe?

If you'll check the 1962 Encyclopedia Britannica, volume 12, you'll find on page 319 the startling fact that infant mortality in the United States is 27 per 1,000 live births, whereas in England it is only 25, and in Sweden it is only 18.2.

As regards longevity, the latest figures released by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. reveal that current life expectancy in the United States is 67 years for males and 73.6 years for females.

But in volume 14 of the 1962 Encyclopedia Britannica it states that life expectancy in England is 1.6 years higher than it is in the United States.

And I have before me a letter from N. U. Allard of the Swedish Consulate in New York which states, "The current life expectancy in Sweden for males is 71.6 and for females 75.2 years."

These are provocative facts considering that England and Sweden are up to their bureaucratic ears in socialized medicine. Of course, President Kennedy's medicare proposal is far removed from socialized medicine. But these figures suggest that Government assistance in financing medical care does not necessarily undermine the quality of medical care or the health of the citizenry.

Integration at the University of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered at the University of Illinois, Navy Pier, Chicago, by Russell H. Barrett, professor of political science, University of Mississippi. It is my good fortune to be acquainted with Professor Barrett and I believe all Members will be interested in his comments on the situation at the University of Missisippi.

The speech follows:

INTEGRATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

(By Russell H. Barrett)

Whatever else might be said about the University of Mississippi, it is true that the university was integrated last year. Subject to the qualification that no more disastrous beginning could have been planned or carried through, there were some elements of victory during that year of both physical and educational combat. Mr. James H. Meredith accurately described the situation as a battle in which neither the rules nor the weapons were agreed upon. It is inevitable that such a battle would produce damage and casualties, and the university will take some time to recover from them. There were some individuals in Mississippi and elsewhere who expected the struggle to be easier than it was, and everyone who believes in education wishes that it could be easier; but it is nonetheless essential. There must be those who will stay in the State and others who will come in spite of the difficulties if the path cleared by James Meredith is to remain open.

Most people in and out of Mississippi do not appreciate the really substantial accomplishments of Meredith's attendance at Ole Miss. Here was a Negro who was said to be both mentally and psychologically unqualified to attend the university. After an 18-month court fight for admission he began classes more than a week after other students. His "student orientation" began with a riot and continued during weeks of abusive harassment. His replies to this harassment consisted of a smile and an occasional statement to the press, usually carefully worded, and many forget that he made no press statements prior to the riot and abuse. With these and other difficulties to contend with, he passed all courses but one during his abbreviated first semester and made good grades during the second semester and summer session. Faced with a demanding set of requirements in fields which included mathematics, natural science, and foreign language, he completed the requirements for graduation in the shortest time possible. James Meredith was in many ways an ideal type for our first Negro student, and I doubt whether anyone without his rather unique combination of features would have lasted until graduation or even through the first semester.

We had this different type of Negro in Mr. Cleve McDowell, who was rather inaccurately pictured as the stereotyped Mississippi "nigra." He was certainly different in some ways, having been welcomed by no riot or gubernatorial stand at the gates, having made no statements, and having emphasized in many ways that he just wanted to be a student. But his exemplary pattern of behavior produced the illusion that a Negro could attend the university without any type of guarding, and this was his undoing. McDowell actually had some student friends within the halls of the School of Law, although that friendship changed to congenial inattention once he went outside of the building. But some of the drivers on the highway between his home and the university certainly were not friendly, and neither were the off-campus law enforcement officers. His departure from the university resulted from a monumental piece of bad luck and personal indiscretion, plus an unconscious conspiracy among the citizens council, the NAACP, the Department of Justice, the university, and law enforcement officers. The difference between James Meredith and Cleve McDowell is that the former would have seen to it that U.S. marshals were present before he returned to the university, probably by issuing a statement to the press. This development demonstrated that Negro students at Ole Miss need to be interested in more than "just getting an education." There are too many other people who are prepared to prevent the realization of this simple ambition.

One of the most regrettable aspects of last year's developments was that the University of Mississippi, as a single educational institution, received more than it deserved of both blame and penalties for the rioting and other forms of resistance against integration. There is no doubt that the university made mistakes, but with a State atmosphere even as favorable as that in Alabama, the university would have followed a standard of conduct similar to that in other universities of the Deep South. Reasonabe standards of fairness should demand that the university be judged on its performance in areas over which it had control.

On the positive side there was fair treatment of Meredith by his professors, although there were suggestions from Mississippians, New Yorkers, and Californians that he should be flunked out without reference to his performance. There was active and substantial support from faculty members of his right

to be treated as a human being as well as a student, and there was a smaller proportion of students who took a similar stand. This kind of support was not without cost to these faculty members and students in the form of harassment through various methods by people from Mississippi and from many other States. The treatment varied with the moral depravity of the abuser, and it included telephone calls, letters, property damage, anonymous publication of libelous material, and even some annoying of children. Those who supported Meredith were appointed as "honorary niggers" by the white citizens council, and the appointees considered it to be an honor. Another plus factor is that Meredith did attend public concerts and lectures, and on some occasions those who sat next to him were not U.S. marshals but were friends. He played golf as a member of the University Golf Club and frequently outplayed his white competitors, who again paid penalties not usually associated with golf. There was heavy pressure to get rid of one minister, but to the credit of an impressive group of courageous church members it did not succeed. Of course Meredith ate regularly in the cafeteria, frequently with faculty members and others joining him, sometimes in excessive numbers. After the first 6 weeks he was able to study in the library with not difficulty, often almost completely alone, since there were numerous white students who were not interested only in getting an education. Finally, there were administrative officials who were sincerely interested in treating Meredith the same as other students, even though their conception of equality was not always the best. They also worked in the face of abuses, and they do not deserve by those who do not understand the pressures they faced.

The negative factors at the university have received much more publicity than those I have just mentioned, and some of this news was simply not true. Contrary to what was reported in some media, we do have a solid academic program, a large number of good students, and an impressive extracurricular presentation of lectures and concerts, including lectures such as Margaret Mead, J. K. Galbraith, and Clement Attlee, and artists such as Katherine Cornell, George London, and Goldovsky Opera Theater, the American Ballet Theater, and several top symphony orchestras. It should not be necessary to even mention these and other common characteristics of American universities, but an amazing amount of bad reporting makes it necessary. We do have academic weaknesses, but the real shortcomings of the university were in other areas. First, there was the fact that the university went along with the fiction that it was not a segregated institution, one result of which was to give academic support to certain aspects of the State attitude which I will mention later. Second, and most important, the university waited too long before it adopted a strict policy on student discipline, even though the justification of this was in part the appeasement of State groups outside the university. Third, it pursued a policy of weakness in protecting the rights of the minority of students who were willing to befriend Meredith, even though those students were harassed so unmercifully by other students that most of them left the university. It added to these mistakes by its mistaken attempt to blame the riot on the marshals. Other factors could be mentioned, but these were the elements of the situation which the university could have controlled more effectively and which permitted much of the revolting behavior to take place. It is perfectly true that stronger policies on these matters would have brought additional political pressure and harassment on university officials, but this should have been considered part of the cost of upholding academic integrity. But even though there were shortcomings, the primary blame for our difficulties does not rest with internal characteristics of the university.

The primary blame for our difficulties lies in the characteristics of the "closed society" so well described by the president of the Southern Historical Association, Prof. James W. Silver. The custodians of that society are the present political leadership, the citizens council activists, and the dominant newspapers of the State. The Governor called for all means of resistance against Federal court decisions and refused to accept responsibility for upholding the law. Citizens Council publications have challenged the importance of accreditation and have suggested the evasion of court decisions by the substitution of private for public schools. They spearheaded a postcard campaign which called for the firing of the dean of the law school, the vice chancellor, and two professors at the university. The newspapers, with some notable and praiseworthy exceptions, supported the anarchist elements at the university and described as "innocuous" the anonymous Rebel underground which called the chancellor of the university a dictator and advocated the assassination of the President of the United States. Soon after the riot more than 100 top business leaders issued a statement which criticized "inflammatory statements" in the "irresponsible" state press. Associated with these causes of difficulty is the pattern of legal harassment or what might be termed "selective law enforcement." Cleve McDowell was speedily arrested and convicted on a charge of having a concealed weapon on the university campus, but there were no attempts under State law to convict those white students who violated various laws last year, including those against possession of weapons. The Negro who attempted to enter Mississippi Southern University was sentenced to 7 years in the penitentiary for allegedly receiving $30 worth of stolen chicken feed, but it would take a long search to turn up similar convictions of white students. Finally there is the failure of moderates to speak out soon enough and loud enough. This is partly because so many moderates have left the State and partly because of the pressures of the closed society, but the Mississippi moderate is prone to believe that he can best win by being careful and expedient. The fact is that he has accumulated a long history of losing by following that approach.

Where does all this leave us as part of a university in a State where it is not easy to maintain a university in the full meaning of that term? It leaves us in a weak position, in a position that has been made still weaker by criticism from outside the State which should have been directed at others. It leaves us in the inescapable role of either fighting to regain a position of academic honor or of leaving the university to be defended or ruined by others. Too many faculty members have left who should not have left, and with a few exceptions they deserted their principles. The person who says he is resigning in protest is deluding himself. Most who leave the university do so either because they want better jobs elsewhere or because they no longer feel able or willing to teach under the admittedly difficult circumstances which I have only partially described. For the same reasons there are far more professors in other institutions who would not be willing even to come to the university. In this connection there is a serious misunderstanding which needs correcting. There are those who say there is no academic freedom at the University of Mississippi. The fact is that there is academic freedom which has been better defended by the administration than at some other universities. But the exercise of such freedom is not always easy and it will not make the professor popular with all people. Academic freedom is used in a State atmosphere that does not always welcome its use, and this is no place for the fainthearted. Yet we teach what our field calls for us to teach in the classroom, we have no interference with selection of books at the university, and outside the classroom some exercise an extensive amount of freedom both professionally and as citizens.

We therefore need good faculty members who will not leave. We need good faculty members who will join us, and most of them will find the situation less difficult than they imagine. We need good students from other States, both graduate and undergraduate, partly because they produce a student body with broader and more varied interests and viewpoints. Even with a drop in out-of-State enrollment this year, more than 25 percent of our students come from other States or foreign countries, a total of 1,349. After all of the pluses and minuses are considered, the fact is that education can be and must be carried on at the University of Mississippi. There is certainly no more challenging place for the teacher; and if teachers are unwilling to face challenges, they are in the wrong field.

To Shed Light on the Assassination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, constructive criticism must be forthcoming over the special Commission appointed by President Johnson to conduct an inquiry into the assassination of President Kennedy. The constructive criticism of which I speak is found in an editorial in this morning's Chicago Tribune which very effectively analyzes the history of such inquiries, as well as properly spotlights some present questions. Its contents are well worth pondering over by all of us.

The editorial follows:

TO SHED LIGHT ON THE ASSASSINATION

Just as the Senate Judiciary Committee had decided to conduct a full and open investigation, before television cameras, of the assassination of President Kennedy, President Johnson intervened. He appointed a seven-man special Commission under the chairmanship of Chief Justice Earl Warren of the Supreme Court to take over the inquiry.

This procedure is bound to be less satisfactory by far than a Senate investigation in full public view. The Presidential Commission may perhaps work behind closed doors and is to draft a statement of findings and conclusions, to be addressed to Mr. Johnson and released through the White House. The Commission is seeking to persuade Congress to invest it with power of subpena.

The personnel of the Commission leaves much to be desired. The constitutional separation of functions is ignored in the choice of the Chief Justice to act as an agent of the executive. This practice has been invoked before, with melancholy results. Franklin Roosevelt snatched Justice Owen Roberts off the Supreme Court after the Pearl Harbor disaster in 1941, and commissioned him chairman of an investigating commission.

The mandate of this Commission was deliberately restricted so that it could only consider derelictions of duty or errors of

judgment by Army or Navy officers, but could not consider the behavior of civilian authorities in Washington. The product of the inquiry was a report which was utterly discredited by evidence produced at a later congressional investigation, itself hardly distinguished for objectivity.

There is the further consideration that Chief Justice Warren and one other member of the Commission, Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, have prejudged the case by publicly announcing that the murder could not have occurred had the climate of opinion not been inflamed by activities and statements of the radical right. Inasmuch as the accused assassin was a declared Marxist, an apologist for Castro, and a defector to the Soviet Union, these utterances are errant poppycock.

A thorough and dispassionate inquiry was imperatively needed to clear the air of mindless scattershot accusations, doubts, suspicions, and myths. It was needed, in particular, because the man accused of the Presidential murder was himself shot to death by a self-appointed avenger of Mr. Kennedy before he could be removed from the Dallas city jail. The suspect, Lee Harvey Oswald, despite mountainous evidence pointing to his guilt, died without confessing.

His death ended the chance of producing all the evidence in a public trial. It deprived the people of an official verdict in the case. The Senate investigation could have gone a long way to rectify this yawning gap in the record. But a Presidential Commission? We shall have to wait and see.

Even President Johnson has joined Warren and Boggs in the grapeshot allegation that "venom and hate" infect all of American life and "stalemate us in progress." It is a disservice to the people of the United States that so many self-appointed partisan apostles are trying to make capital out of an event which all decent Americans equally deplore. Thus any opposition to any element in the administration's inherited program is equated with stalemating progress.

Those who are demanding a universal repentance are trying to browbeat the people into passivity if not consent. An inert citizenry cannot participate in government, and, without participation, the Republic loses its vitality. The danger exists that a handpicked Presidential Commission might convert itself into a willing instrument to this end.

Opposition Party Essential to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest danger to our American system of government would be to eliminate a strong two-party system and institute one-party government. There are some who would bring this about by denying opposition to any of the programs sponsored by the late President Kennedy.

It shows no disrespect to John F. Kennedy if the Republican Party opposes legislation now to which it was opposed during his administration. Rather, it is essential to the cause of a free nation that the issues be debated and the opposition heard.

The following article by Raymond Moley in the December 16 issue of Newsweek, points the responsibility of a loyal opposition:

AFTER THE PARTY TRUCE

(By Raymond Moley)

When these brief December days have passed into history, the business of the American people will be to prepare for a momentous choice of national policies, of party government, and of the individual who will occupy the White House after 1964.

Past patterns of public behavior after the death of a President in office have so far been followed. First there is shock, then general expressions of grief and mourning, then good will toward the new President. Finally, there is restoration of the debate and decision making which is appropriate in a free, independent, and self-governing Republic.

This has happened in all five instances during the past century when a country has mourned the death of a President—in 1865, in 1881, in 1901, in 1923, and in 1945. In this present instance the tenure of the presidential successor will be shorter than in any of the foregoing. And a more serious consideration of the policies to be determined lies ahead than in any previous instance since 1865. The time to make that determination is shorter than ever before.

Hence, the readjustment to new national leadership must be more immediate. This much we know: that President Johnson was elected as Vice President on the issues raised in the campaign of 1960, that he has loyally supported the late President's proposals and policies, and that he has already professed his intentions to seek the same objectives.

CONTENDING POLICIES

The issues to be decided in 1964 will have great impact upon the future of the Nation. They will have to do with the relation of the Federal Government to the States, the communities, and to individual Americans. These issues go to the very marrow of national policy. For the most part, those which are substantive concern the domestic scene. Both of the opposing ideologies among us are united in the objectives of foreign and military affairs. There the differences are about personnel, method, and emphasis.

The domestic policies upon which there is sharp difference are, in terms popularly accepted, liberal and conservative. Both positions are supported by plausive arguments.

The former argues that since advances in technology and science have revolutionized communication and transportation, there is greater uniformity within the Nation. Authority and services which were hitherto left to the States, the communities, and the individual have become Federal responsibilities. Hence, there must be great expansion of the Federal Establishment. Since greater expense is involved, new economic theories have been asserted in its justification.

The conservative challenges selectively, not generally, these extensions, this expense, and the economic justifications for this cost.

THE COMING DEBATE

The dominant majority of the Democratic Party for 25 years has accepted the liberal position. After 1936 and until 1960, Republican candidates for President, and in large part, Republican candidates for Congress, blurred this issue by compromise. But during the past 5 years, and especially during the past 3, the Republican minority in Congress has generally accepted the conservative position.

It seems essential that the issue be drawn sharply in 1964. For further to postpone the reckoning would confuse the electorate, create voter apathy, and produce a meaningless choice at the polls.

It is hardly conceivable that President Johnson can avoid the meeting of this issue in ideologies. For by virtue of his office he is the leader of his party and is bound by his past commitments. His strategy will differ in method but hardly in objectives.

But the precise strategy of his opposition must be subject to some reconsideration. That will await the President's pronouncements in January—in his messages, his budget, and approval of the various programs projected by Mr. Kennedy. When he asserts his party leadership at that time, the lines will be drawn and the national debate will begin. As President, Mr. Johnson will be respected. As party leader, he will be opposed. That is what our institutions demand.

Independence Day of Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1961, Tanganyika achieved her independence. We wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Tanganyika, Julius K. Nyerere, on the occasion of the second anniversary of Tanganyika's independence.

Two years have now passed since the new green, black, and gold flag of Tanganyika was first raised in the Dar-es-Salaam and rockets rose 300 miles to the north from Mount Kilimanjaro's icy summit in celebration of Tanganyika's independence. Many changes have taken place in these 2 years, but few of them have been in the news. The changes have been peaceful—the gradual progressive political and economic development of a stable nation toward well-defined objectives—not the shocking, disrupting stories of violence that make interesting newspaper copy.

Still, one of the changes in particular was so momentous that it received wide coverage in the foreign press. On December 9, 1962, Tanganyika ceased to be a legal part of the British monarchical system, a dominion, and declared itself a Republic. Tanganyika retained membership in the British Commonwealth, but the institution of the British Governor-General was jettisoned forever. Dr. Julius K. Nyerere was chosen President of the new Republic in an election in which he received more than 98 percent of the total votes cast.

The country of which Dr. Nyerere is President on Africa's east coast is a land of natural beauty, of ancient legend, but yet of modern outlook. Tanganyika is four times the size of its former colonial master, Great Britain. On its northern frontier Mr. Kilimanjaro rises in a giant floating sugarloaf. To the east lies the Indian Ocean where colorful Arab and native craft plow the coral-reefed sea. To the west is Lake Victoria and the source of the Nile.

In northern Tanganyika archeologists have discovered what are probably the oldest traces of man on earth; deep valleys and gorges reveal the fossils of prehistoric ages. The coast of the country has been known to voyagers for nearly 2,000 years; in contrast, the interior has been known to the outside world for little more than 100 years. Tanganyika was the object of several waves of colonization. The Arabs came in the 8th century; the Portuguese in the 14th. Both

these people were interested in Tanganyika chiefly as a stopping place on their profitable trading voyages to India and the Far East. British explorers penetrated the interior in the middle 19th century; by the end of the century German hegemony had been established, only to be ceded to Britain under a League of Nations mandate at the end of World War I.

But the Tanganyika of tdoay is very different from the Tanganyika of the past. Under the skillful leadership of President Nyerere and his party, the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), the economy is gradually being developed in spite of a low potential of natural resources. Increased production of sisal, cotton, and coffee—the country's three most important commercial products—is being encouraged. The transportation network is being improved. The Government has accepted aid from international agencies, Britain, West Germany, and the United States. Peace Corps volunteers—roadbuilders, geologists, secondary school teachers—have been welcomed.

On the second anniversary of your independence we congratulate you, President Nyerere, and the people of Tanganyika, for skillfully putting your resources to the most profitable use and for working cooperatively with friendly countries who desire to assist Tanganyika to reach its development goals.

Estes Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected passing of my long-time colleague and friend, the Honorable Estes Kefauver, is not only a great personal loss, but a loss to the State of Tennessee and the entire Nation as well.

I first came to know Estes Kefauver when I was elected to this House in the 78th Congress. We served here together until the fall of 1948 when he was first elected to the other body. He was a hard-working and devoted Member of the U.S. Congress, and I am sure many will agree that this country is a better place today because of his continuous crusade against crime and corruption, racketeering and monopolistic practices in industry. Estes had a genuine concern for the welfare of his fellow men and because of his unyielding dedication to duty and service, he will long be remembered and missed by millions of Americans.

I greatly admired and respected Estes for his honesty, his ability and for his courage, and I am deeply saddened by his passing. Mrs. Kefauver and the children have my heartfelt sympathy and prayers in their great loss.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1936

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have often found it difficult to secure information on the voting records of legislators who have represented me. Recognizing that citizens in my congressional district have probably experienced the same problem, my periodic reports from Washington are a complete tabulation of all rollcall votes, including quorum calls. On measures which are considered to be of greatest significance, I endeavor to give a brief explanation of the reasoning behind my vote.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include my first report covering the period from January 9 through April 30, 1963:

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
*1	Jan. 9		Present				Quorum call on original organization of the Congress.
2	do		McCormack				Election of Speaker—straight partisan vote: McCormack, 256; Halleck, 175.
*3	do	5	Yea	249	183	1	Motion to cut off debate on permanent enlargement of Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members.
*4	do	5	do	235	196	2	Final passage of the enlarged Rules Committee.
5	Feb. 27	284	do	254	154	27	Final passage of supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture.
*6	do	249	do	386	20	30	Final passage of appropriation to continue the work of the HUAC.
7	Mar. 11		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (51 Members absent).
8	do	2438	Yea	388	3	44	Final passage of 4-year extension of existing draft law.
9	Mar. 12	4374	do	378	21	36	Final passage of Winston Churchill citizenship bill.
10	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (35 Members absent).
11	Mar. 13		do				Quorum call by Mr. Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia (31 Members absent).
*12	do	2440	Nay	226	179	29	Amendment to military appropriations increasing same by $363,000,000.
*13	do	2440	do	149	256	27	Motion to recommit military appropriation bill by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri.
*14	do	2440	Yea	374	33	28	Final passage of military authorization bill.
15	Mar. 14		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Passman, Democrat, of Louisiana (38 absent) (R.B.C. at Africa Subcommittee hearing).
16	Apr. 4	5366	Yea	386	17	32	Final passage of Post Office appropriation bill.
17	Apr. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Halleck, Republican, of Indiana (39 Members absent).
18	Apr. 10		do				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (23 Members absent).
*19	do	5517	Yea	228	184	21	Amendment of public works appropriation bill to restore money cut in committee.
*20	do	5517	do	251	122	60	Final passage of accelerated public works appropriation.
21	Apr. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (38 Members absent).
22	Apr. 24		do				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (30 Members absent).
*23	do	12	Nay	171	239	24	Motion to recommit bill authorizing loans to students in medical, dental and nursing education and grants to schools in health fields by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio.
*24	do	12	Yea	288	122	24	Final passage of Health Professions Educational Act.
25	Apr. 25		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (37 Members absent)(R.B.C. in conference at office).
26	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Jensen, Republican, of Iowa (38 Members absent).
27	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Michel, Republican, of Illinois (55 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference in Speaker's dining room).
28	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (42 Members absent).
29	do	4997	Nay	196	205	32	Motion to recommit feed grain bill by Mr. Harvey, Republican, of Indiana.
30	do	4997	Yea	208	196	29	Final passage of feed grain bill.
31	Apr. 29		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (112 Members absent) (R.B.C. at conference re right-wing movements).
32	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Stinson, Republican, of Washington (97 Members absent).
33	do	1762	Yea	292	50	91	Final passage of an act to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation.
34	Apr. 30		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Cederberg, Republican, of Michigan (48 Members absent) (R.B.C. at cold war hearings, Foreign Affairs Committee).

* Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 1

This quorum call was the first recorded vote of the session and provides an opportunity to explain the purpose of a quorum call. Any Member can request a quorum call at any time. The presiding officer then counts the number of Members in the Chamber. If there

is less than a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union present, the presiding officer will notice the absence of a quorum and the Clerk will be directed to call the names of the Members. When the Clerk starts to call the names, three bells ring throughout Capitol Hill to notify Members that a quorum call has been asked for. If Members are sitting as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union—virtually all debate is carried on when Members are sitting as the Committee—100 Members constitute a quorum. It takes approximately 40 minutes to call the names of all the Members and, therefore, the device of a quorum call is frequently used as a delaying tactic. This tactic is frequently used by the minority party to give them time to round up votes. Of the first 16 quorum calls this session, 12 were called by Republicans, 3 by Democrats, and 1 was organizational.

The record indicates that members of the Rules, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs Committees, as well as each of the joint House-Senate committees, tend to miss more quorum calls than the balance of the Members. This is because each of these committees has a continuous authorization from the House to meet while the House is in session. The tremendous volume of work of these committees and the nature of the witnesses who appear before them has prompted the House to give extra consideration to these committees.

Procedure on my committee—Foreign Affairs—is for general committee meetings to be called at 10 a.m. every morning, Monday through Thursday, with subcommittee meetings most afternoons at 2. The House goes into session at 12 noon every Monday through Thursday and frequently on Friday. The House stays in session generally until after 4 p.m. and frequently until after 6 p.m. There is no time out for lunch, coffee breaks, et cetera. Thus, office work must be flitted in before 10 a.m. or after adjournment, and on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and unfortunately some of it must be done while either the House, the committee, or both, are in session.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 3 AND 4

Under the rules of the House of Representatives, proposed legislation is referred by the Speaker to the committee of original jurisdiction. This is the committee that makes the policy decision as to whether the proposal is one that should be submitted to the entire membership for consideration. When the committee of original jurisdiction gives its blessing to a bill, under the rules the chairman of the committee refers the bill to the Rules Committee. Rules' function is to decide how much time should be devoted to the debate on each proposal and to schedule that time so that there will be adequate time for each proposal. Rules may not amend a bill; its function is purely housekeeping. However, if a majority of Members happen to be opposed to a particular bill, although they have no power to change it, they can refuse to give a rule which means they refuse to assign time for debate to that matter. In effect, they kill the bill by denying the membership of the House an opportunity to debate the issue.

During the 87th Congress when Sam Rayburn was the Speaker, Mr. Sam determined that it would not be possible to get many proposals assigned time for floor debate because of the nature of the composition of the committee. The chairman was Judge SMITH from Virginia. With his southern colleagues on the committee, and the Republicans, they were in a position to thwart the will of Congress by making an "unholy alliance." To assure that this did not happen, Mr. Sam proposed that the Rules Committee be expanded from 12 to 15 members. This would give an opportunity to appoint three new members who, hopefully, would not use the power of the committee in a manner adverse to the interest of the entire House. Mr. Sam's proposal was adopted by the 87th Congress, for that Congress only. It proved to be a great help in restoring the Rules Committee to its proper role in the legislative process.

Rollcalls 3 and 4 had to do with making this provision a permanent feature of the rules for the 88th and all subsequent Congresses. I voted on both of these rollcalls to keep the committee at its expanded membership of 15 and thus assure that when the committee of original jurisdiction makes a policy decision on a bill, the will of the 435 Members of Congress will not be frustrated by 6 persons who are operating under an "unholy alliance."

ROLLCALL NO. 6

This was to provided the funds necessary to continue the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. A controversy developed early in the session in an effort to abolish this committee. Many persons believe, and with much reason, that the committee at times has acted in true "McCarthy" fashion in denying due process and condemning innocent persons by innuendo. At the time of this controversy, I clearly stated that I was concerned over past acts of the committee and would therefore support a move to transfer the area of inquiry handled by this committee to the Judiciary Committee. I was hopeful that the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee could be conducted in a manner similar to the Senate Internal Security Committee, which is a subcommittee of Senate Judiciary.

As a result of parliamentary maneuvers in securing permanent enlargement of the Rules Committee, the 88th session of Congress unanimously adopted the resolution by a voice vote creating the House Un-American Activities Committee along with all other standing committees for the 88th Congress. Although I would have preferred to see jurisdiction of the committee transferred, I could not support motion to deny Congress the right to investigate in the area of un-American activities, which would have been the case had the appropriation for the committee been denied.

ROLLCALL NOS. 12, 13, 14

All three of these rollcalls dealt with military construction appropriations for fiscal 1963–64. My vote in each instance was in support of the administration position to provide adequate funds for the acquisition of the planes, ships, guns, and so forth needed to maintain our superior Military Establishment. The Republicans, almost to a man, voted to increase the President's requested budget by $363 million to build three additional RS–70 planes. I voted against this proposal although it passed. There is no indication that the three prototype RS–70's currently under construction will be successful military aircaft. There is need for a substantial breakthrough in the technology of weapons systems on these planes that does not appear on the horizon. At present they would have to be equipped with a weapon system similar to the B–52. It does not seem logical to build an aircraft that costs $100 million and have it no more effective than our existing B–52's which cost about $5 million each. It is very doubtful that this money, although authorized, will ever be spent.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 19–20

During the 87th Congress a program called the Accelerated Public Works Construction Program was developed to provide in depressed areas much needed employment in the form of necessary public works; work which was scheduled to be done soon, however, was to be accelerated because of the employment problem. It was the feeling of the 87th Congress that it would be more beneficial to provide a Public Works program with tax dollars than to use the same dollars for public welfare. To qualify for this program it was necessary for the local agency to submit a plan which called for the maximum number of man hours of labor, the minimum amount of material cost, and a project that could be completed within 12 months from the start. The original program called for a total investment of $900 million, plus local matching funds, to be spent in a 24-month period. The 87th Congress approved the program in principle, appropriated the $450 million for the first 12 months and left the obligation to the 88th Congress to appropriate the balance. Many communities throughout the country, acting upon the program started in the 87th Congress had incurred substantial costs in connection with this program in preparing plans, submitting applications, and arranging financing for local participation. During debate on this bill, it was interesting to note that many Members who voted against the appropriation argued in favor of the projects in their districts. There is no project in the 25th Congressional District which comes under this legislation since, thankfully, we are not a depressed area with chronic unemployment. However, I believe that Congress had the obligation not to "welch" on its previous commitment to these communities which had projects underway and I voted to fulfill our obligation.

ROLLCALL NO. 24

The Health Professions Educational Act provides a system of matching fund

grants to accredited medical, osteopathic, dental, and nursing schools. The Federal Government will provide 50 percent of the funds necessary for new construction of educational facilities when the facilities are directly related to increased enrollment. The bill provided 75 percent of construction funds to public health and paramedical school facilities, also predicated on increased enrollment. The bill also provides a system of interest-bearing loans to students who have completed their first year in these schools, upon the recommendation of the school and administered by the school. The loans, together with the accrued interest, are to be repaid after graduation. In the interest of attempting to provide an incentive for physicians to practice in rural areas, there is a forgiveness feature of up to 50 percent of the loan to an individual physician if he establishes a practice in certain designated rural areas where there is an extreme shortage of medical personnel.

All of the medical and dental schools in California contacted me in favor of this legislation. They pointed out in detail that California must license 2,500 physicians a year to maintain our inadequate physician-patient ratio and yet our schools are capable of graduating only 700 doctors a year; that there are only 5 of our 50 States which graduate enough physicians to meet these needs, and the plight of dentistry and nursing is nearly as bad. The schools pointed out that many persons with the desire and ability for a medical education are unable to secure it because of their parents' limited financial ability. All in all, I believe the arguments in favor of the bill were overwhelming and I supported it.

Gettysburg 1863–1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, history was made in Gettysburg 100 years ago.

One hundred years later, November 16, 17, 18, 19, 1963, that history was rather thoroughly reviewed by men in various professions.

The following is another in that series of lectures this one delivered by Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, First District of Iowa, before the Sons of the Union Veterans and other patriotic groups:

THE LITERATURE OF GETTYSBURG

(By Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, Congressman from First District of Iowa)

Those of us who are here today know that we are here again trying to evaluate an elemental force in human nature beyond anything in the whole spectrum of biographical literature from Plutarch to Carl Sandburg.

We are in the community where one of the noblest utterances ever delivered on this soil was made.

It was spoken a century ago.

Next Tuesday we share with each other a profound emotion of reverence toward the author like that felt by participants in some devout, even mystical, ceremony of worship.

The whole world and all of time will little note nor long remember what we say here today.

But historians and interested citizens will note this commemoration as a renection on and an extension of what was said on this now sacred spot in that imperishable 2 minutes or so after one of the most decisive battles in the history of mankind.

Somehow our emotions are keyed to the brooding genius who, even as I speak, hovers over this hallowed place.

And whose voice, like eternity itself, can almost be felt whispering to us out of the infinite.

It does our hearts good and it enriches the soul to discuss, to evaluate, to reflect upon, to adulate this infinitesimal fragment of the world's literature we call the Gettysburg Address.

It is our literature because it is inspired by Lincoln.

It is American in every breath and syllable, every punctuation mark.

And it was given to mankind by one of our own.

SPRUNG FROM OUR SOIL—THE BEDROCK OF FREEDOM

It is as universal as the Lord's Prayer with which it bears—in my judgment—a measure of divine resemblances.

The literature of Gettysburg and the address which we commemorate today has in it, not only for us but for the whole human race everywhere on this planet, something of a quality that touches all of us.

In whatever condition, it touches us at the noblest side of our nature.

It is my belief that this is its essential secret.

I dare—with reverence and humility—to equate it with the tone, the style, the inner nature and the all-encompassing compassion of the Lord's Prayer.

Is not this the reason that from the very moment of its utterance these brief, utterly sincere 10 sentences, spoken at a moment of overwhelming national bereavement, captured the imagination of the contemporary world?

There were, as you know, those who passed the Gettysburg Address by on the day that it appeared in the public prints and for sometime after.

Like the Lord's Prayer it failed in its own day to receive total recognition.

But there were those on the public level who caught its meaning and its impact at once: Surviving soldiers, poets, editors, reporters, publicists, clergymen, and orators of the day including the remarkable Edward Everett.

This of course was not a speech dashed off on the back of an envelope, but a speech, which had behind it 45 years of learning and deep experience that produced some powerful thinking.

Maybe this is the reason that all that I say here today—which is without value except for what it commemorates—is a sort of irreducible minimum, the tiniest morsel, of what is yet to be said and written about this Gettysburg Address for generations and thousands of years to come.

We have the evidence that the words moved men in the hour in which they were spoken.

The most obvious observations made about the phrases of Lincoln scattered over this blood-drenched field a century ago is their affinity with Holy Writ: "these honored dead," "the last full measure of devotion," "shall not have died in vain," "shall not perish from the earth."

I ask, with all the reverence I can bring to bear upon this humbly offered comparison, do not these words, in their rhythm, their sublime simplicity, their compactness, their ineffable music, the richness of their meaning, and their solace and dedication, have a kinship that is mystical and enduring with the most prayerful lines in Biblical literature: "Hallowed by Thy name," "give us this day our daily bread," "forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us" "deliver us from evil."

The inner meaning of both pieces of literature bring the loftiest emotions of the human soul into adjustment with the facts of our daily lives.

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

The highest aspirations to which man can reach touch hands with the needs of the moment: spiritual striving on the most idealistic scale wedded with what needs to be done in this hour of necessity and travail.

It is in this wise, it seems to me precisely, that the Lord's Prayer unites the kingdom of heaven with the hunger for one's daily bread.

Something of the immediacy of the impact of Lincoln's words on Lincoln's world, is conveyed in an article that appeared Monday morning, November 23, 1863, in the Daily Ohio State Journal, of Columbus.

Let me read you this revealing and moving literature. It appeared under the headline: "Dedication Day at Gettysburg."

It goes like this:

"Thursday, the 19th day of November, 1863, will long be remembered as the day when the President's calm but earnest utterance of this brief and beautiful address stirred the deepest fountains of feeling and emotion in the hearts of the vast throng before him; and when he had concluded, scarcely could an untearful eye be seen, while sobs of smothered emotion were heard on every hand. At our side stood a stout, stalwart officer, bearing the insignia of a captain's rank, the empty sleeve of his coat indicating that he had stood where death was revelling, and as the President, speaking of our Gettysburg soldiers, uttered that beautifully touching sentence, so sublime and pregnant of meaning—'The world will little note, nor long remember what we here say, but it can never forget what they here did:'—the gallant soldier's feeling burst over all restraint; and burying his face in his handkerchief, he sobbed aloud while his manly frame shook with no unmanly emotion, and after a struggle to master his emotions, he lifted his still-streaming eyes to heaven, and in low and solemn tones exclaimed:

" 'God Almighty bless Abraham Lincoln.' And to this spontaneous invocation a thousand hearts around him silently responded 'Amen.' "

There may be a touch of reportorial hyperbole in some of the nuances of this newspaper story.

Yet it is indicative of the effect of the War President's words on the reporter who heard them and on the audience that was on the spot.

I am much less concerned with the reporter's slightly inaccurate quotation than I am with the plainly stirring emotion that the short speech created and the feeling it elicited of love and veneration for the speaker.

Moreover this very love and this very veneration seems to be timeless and grips the hearts and souls of generations of Americans—and people the world over—in every climate, almost as much as it did those who stood beside the living President and in front of him a hundred years ago.

There were of course editorials that gave praise to the Lincoln utterance on this soil and there were the encomiums from the pulpit.

Phillips Brooks was easily among the greatest pulpit orators of his day.

On April 23, 1865 (8 days after Lincoln's death), in Phillips Brooks' sermon at the Church of the Holy Trinity in Philadelphia, Bishop Brooks left us a literary gem.

Speaking from the title, "The Life and Death of Abraham Lincoln," this Protestant Episcopal bishop said in part:

"He (Lincoln) once stood on the battlefield of our own State, and said of the brave men who had saved it words as noble as any countryman of ours ever spoke.

"Let us stand in the country he has saved, and which is to be his grave and monument, and say of Abraham Lincoln what he said of the soldiers who had died at Gettysburg."

"He stood there with their graves before him, and these are the words he said—"

Here Phillips Brooks quoted the Gettysburg Address.

Then he added the hope and prayer: "May God make us worthy of the memory of Abraham Lincoln."

It seems to me there were few more proficient authorities on what were and what were not "words as noble as any countryman of ours ever spoke" than this enormously respected and famous clergyman—contemporary of Abraham Lincoln.

Then for me there is the subtle appeal and a most penetrating insight with literary beauty and some prophecy in the lines on Abraham Lincoln in "The Man of the People," by Edwin Markham. Markham was about 11 years old when the Gettysburg Address was delivered.

In fact, among the American poets he is one of the greatest.

We hear the prophecy and note great literature in: "His word were oaks in acorns;" "and his thoughts were roots that firmly gript the granite earth."

This, of course, is testifying in the compactly concentrated language of poetry to the immortality of Lincoln's speech.

"His words were oaks in acorns."

Still another poet, more our contemporary than Lincoln's, was James Oppenheim, who was inspired to write in this touching discriptive poem: "The Lincoln Child."

"And lo, as he grew ugly, gaunt,
And gnarled his way into a man,
What wisdom came to feed his want,
What worlds came near to let him scan.
And as he fathomed through and through
Our dark and sorry human scheme,
He knew what Shakespeare never knew,
What Dante never dared to dream—
That men are one
Beneath the sun,
And before God are equal souls—
This truth was his,
And this it is,
That round him such a glory rolls."

What Oppenheim makes poetically dramatic here is an element basic to the Lincoln character.

This element is the element of Godliness, of spirituality as something separate from denominational religion.

The profound Biblical precept: "That men are one" permeates the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln.

(My, how that needs thinking on and responsed to today.)

It is embedded in Lincoln's character like the cornerstone of a great and magnificent piece of architecture.

We might ask, is it anywhere more manifest than in the Gettysburg Address?

It is clear to me that Lincoln never thought of the North and the South, or East and West, rather he thought of all sections as one Nation.

He found and tried to apply in his time the fundamental tenet that "all men are created equal."

And isn't this the very essence of the American dream?

Even here, at Gettysburg, where the two sections confronted each other on the level of the highest order of human drama, Lincoln still thought of one nation, and could not bring himself to deliver his funeral oration in honor of one part of the country and in derogation of the other.

For him, even in this high moment of intense crisis and antagonism, there were no soldiers of the Union and no soldiers of the Confederacy.

There were only just soldiers.

There was about this awful carnage only "the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here" not enemies and not antagonists.

The magnificent Carl Sandburg makes my point far better than I can make it.

Speaking before the joint session of Congress, February 12, 1959, to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, Mr. Sandburg said:

"His words at Gettyburg were sacred, yet strange with a color of the familiar:

We cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living, and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far beyond our poor power to add of detract."

Sandburg dramatically continues as he observes:

"He could have said 'the brave Union men.' Did he have a purpose in omitting the word 'Union'?

"Was he keeping himself and his utterance clear of the passion that would not be good to look back on when the time came for peace and reconciliation?

"Did he mean to leave an implication that there were brave Union men and brave Confederate men, living and dead, who had struggled there?

"We do not know, of a certainty.

"Was he thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate gray, the father inscribing on the stone over their double grave, 'God knows which was right?' We do not know."

It can be said with some confidence that Lincoln is the most quoted of our Presidents, and he inspired more quotes and noble litterature than any other President.

There are sublime passages in Lincoln that derive an immensely dramatic impact from the facts of his life and the majesty that accrues to his career from having been President.

The greatness and thoroughness that is Lincoln can be found in the Cooper Union speech.

Research, study and respect for history is evident in the capacity for clear reasoning which is shown in the debates with Douglas.

And they achieve a certain posture of validity and responsibility when he speaks as President of the United States.

In uttering the words in the first inaugural: "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection." The greatest of our Presidents launched himself into the rarefied altitudes where only the world's immortals are to be found.

This is also evident in that greatest utterance of compassion to be found anywhere in the whole history of statesmanship and leadership: the Biblical paragraphs in the second inaugural.

The words "with malice toward none, with charity for all" are like some indestructible light leading into a new horizon for the whole of the human race.

The impact of these words—and the other in large part—would not have been so great had he not been the President of the United States, upon whose fabulously competent shoulders rested a burden almost beyond human endurance.

And it is this unearthly responsibility that gives his words a flame, a meaning, an immortality, that they might not otherwise have had.

For the drama of his life is inescapably intertwined with the grandeur of his words, and their transparently sincere, soul-searching, decency, and conviction, their unassailable logic.

They were simple words, of course, but that's only a fraction of their virtue for their simplicity was arrived at through immense complexities and confusion.

It is their clarity and their humanity which thrust whole shafts of light where there was only darkness and bedlam.

Shafts of light not only for the young Nation known as the United States of America in the middle of the 19th century but shafts of light that is dazzling today and will brighten the paths of men on their march to freedom to the end of time everywhere on this planet.

We here find abundant testimony to the admonition that it is our businesss as a nation and as individuals to make other men wise and better as we can find or make opportunity to do so.

Like him then let us try to find the right way, the right place and the right time to do what is right.

Kennedy's Great Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that history will write the true record of the Kennedy administration and that while some of us who are his contemporaries may not see eye to eye in all respects with the historians, all of us I think will agree with an editorial appearing in the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, under date of Saturday, December 7, 1963, entitled "Kennedy's Great Achievement."

Those of us who remember the 1960 campaign and the role that the religious question played in the campaign will rejoice in the action of the National Council of Churches and will agree with the editorial that President Kennedy, more than any other person, is responsible for finally and completely removing the religious question from national politics.

I commend the editorial to the membership and offer it in its entirety at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KENNEDY'S GREAT ACHIEVEMENT

"Unique" is a word that should not be used carelessly or often.

But it is the proper adjective to describe the tribute paid by the National Council of Churches to the late President John F. Kennedy this week.

The murdered Chief Executive was to have addressed the 3,000 members of the council's general assembly on "Our Liberties, One and Indivisible." Instead, the meeting at which he would have appeared was turned into a memorial service for him. It was quite without precedent and especially notable because the late President was honored by 3,000 Protestant leaders as a Roman Catholic who transcended all theological division and whose assassination came just when a new era of hope for Christian unity in the United States, for which he had done so much, was dawning.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, said in the main address that President Kennedy was "a good Catholic" who proved to his fellow Americans that "his kind of Christianity was a strength, rather than a handicap, to his serving the whole people of the whole Nation under the Constitution and under God."

"President Kennedy's coming to address this assembly on this night, if an assassin's hand had not prevented it," Dr. Blake said, "would have clearly symbolized the beginning of a new era of hope for Christian cooperation in the United States.

"His coming here tonight would have symbolized the fact that beyond all partisan differences, and transcending all theological division, there was a call to all Christians to act for justice, in faith, in courage, and in love."

Dr. Blake recalled that during the 1960 campaign there was "considerable discussion" of Mr. Kennedy's Catholicism as a possible handicap to him in the Presidency. But, he continued, "Short as was John Kennedy's time in office, it was long enough to make it abundantly clear that those who had feared a Roman Catholic President had misunderstood both the man and his church."

Former Mayor Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, one of the lay leaders of the council, added that President Kennedy had quickly dissipated "most prejudice" against a Catholic in the White House. He said, "It is the last element people would consider in the voting booth, I think, given a choice between equally qualified candidates."

We are too close to John F. Kennedy today to assess his achievements clearly and dispassionately.

But it is entirely possible that history 50 or 100 years from now, and as long as our beloved Republic lives, will say his greatest achievement was to lay, once and for all, the ghost of Protestant fears of a Catholic in the Presidency. Except for a tiny minority of irreconcilables such fear no longer exists, and being a good Catholic is no longer a handicap in seeking the Presidency or any other American office.

For that great and happy fact President Kennedy is responsible more than any other one man. And he brought it about by his actions in the short space of 2 years and 10 months during which he occupied in the White House.

Commissioning of the U.S.S. "James Monroe (SSB(N)-622)," Newport News, Va., December 7, 1963—Address by Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great pride for me to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a superlative address given by an outstanding Member of this body at commissioning services for this Nation's 14th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James Monroe*.

Our colleague, J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Richmond, Va., who has served the capital city of Virginia with great ability and great integrity for 20 years, is known to all of us as an extremely effective Member of the House Appropriations Committee with a deep understanding of our Nation's security needs.

His remarks on any occasion would be deserving of our attention, but I believe his address at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. this past Saturday contains a number of points of very great significance to all of us.

I would like with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to give our colleagues an opportunity to read VAUGHAN GARY's outstanding address, and under unanimous consent I would like to include his address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The text follows:

Admiral Smith, Admiral Grenfell, Admiral Taylor, Captain Sandeford, Captain Cobean, distinguished guests, and friends of the Navy, as we gather here today to celebrate the commissioning of our 14th Polaris submarine, the U.S.S. *James Monroe*, I hope you will not accuse me of falling back on an old cliche in saying what a high privilege it is for me to be aboard and have a part in these memorable ceremonies. Since late summer I have cherished the invitation extended me by the Secretary of the Navy. And now that this exceptional ship has been officially delivered to the Navy and turned over to the care of its two gallant crews, my pride in the U.S. Navy, its officers, men, and its fleet runneth over. Particularly at this time I also share your pride in Roger Staubach, whom I hope to see perform in characteristic Navy fashion against the Army this afternoon. And last but by no means least, it is also a pleasure for me to speak in the hometown of my friend, TOM DOWNING, who so ably represents this district in the Congress of the United States.

I had just completed the preparation of my remarks for this occasion when the shocking announcement of the heinous crime which took the life of our great President and your Commander in Chief exploded like a bombshell over the air. The entire world was first startled then stunned. We share a profound grief over the tragic passing of former President John F. Kennedy at the prime of his life, when he had so much to offer his country. But we cannot stop the world in its orbit. It must go on.

If President Kennedy were living today I know that he, as one of your valiant naval heroes, would applaud the progress you are making in assuring the peace of the world through the deployment of Polaris submarines in every strategic sea. His order to you would be: "Carry on."

One thing that makes this Nation great is the continuity of the Government it is our privilege to enjoy. The Polaris submarine program in the last 10 years has progressed under two Commanders in Chief and we can rejoice that it will continue with the same vigor under our new Commander in Chief, Lyndon B. Johnson.

As a Virginian, I take pride in the fact that this ship was built by Virginians working for one of our great defense corporations, the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., headed by my good friend, Mr. William Blewett, who is on board with us today. This great enterprise has built many of our most seaworthy and best warships and has thereby contributed immeasurably to the industrial life of Virginia and to the fighting power of the U.S. Navy. We in Virginia are extremely proud of its record.

I had the privilege of visiting one of the outstanding products of its handiwork a year or two ago when I cruised on Guantanamo Bay on the mammoth nuclear-propelled aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*. As she flexed her muscles amid the deafening roar of jets being catapulted from and landing on her decks, I was amazed at her maneuverability, speed, and power. My heart filled with pride, as a Virginian and as an American, and I returned to Washington with a far greater feeling of security than I had enjoyed before.

I also share the pride of the citizens of Virginia in the fact that the ship we commission today is named after an illustrious son of Virginia. At relatively the same place and relatively the same time, five men were born in Virginia, the counterpart of which cannot be found in any other nation in all history. These men—Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Madison and Marshall—not only rocked the cradle that nurtured our great Republic, but their influence is still felt throughout the entire world today.

This newest addition to the Navy fleet bears the name of James Monroe, one of those immortal patriots.

James Monroe, the fifth President of the United States, was born April 28, 1758, in Westmoreland County, Va. He attended the College of William and Mary, fought in the Third Virginia Regiment, at White Plains, Brandywine, Monmouth, and Trenton. He studied law with Thomas Jefferson, was a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and of the House of Representatives of the United States. He was a U.S. Senator, Minister to France, and four times Governor of Virginia. Jefferson sent him to France as Minister in 1803 to conduct negotiations for the purchase of the isle of New Orleans from France and east and west Florida from Spain. Exceeding instructions, he signed a treaty for all of Louisiana, a venture for which we Americans of today should call him blessed.

He served as Secretary of State and Secretary of War. In 1816 Monroe was elected President and in 1820 he was reelected with all but one vote, this being cast for John Quincy Adams, so that only Washington might have the distinction of a unanimous election to the Presidency of the United States. After his term as President, eschewing complete retirement from political life, he accepted the office of justice of the peace in his native Commonwealth of Virginia. What a man. What a career.

It appears that James Monroe served everywhere except in the Navy, but he crossed the Delaware River with Washington for the attack on Trenton, where he was wounded during the American Revolution, and as President he was given credit for opening the Mississippi River to navigation for the United States.

As President of a young and struggling republic, James Monroe exhibited the same determination and courage which had characterized his actions when he served with Washington at Valley Forge. In his message to the Congress on December 2, 1823, he made a statement with reference to our international relations that came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine and this doctrine has remained, through the years, as one of the tenets of our foreign policy. In that pronouncement, he stated that we would not interfere in the internal concerns of any European power but that we would view any encroachment by such powers on the independent nations of this hemisphere "as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States."

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who assert today that the Monroe Doctrine no longer exists but the falacy of that assertion was clearly demonstrated last year when the Soviet Union attempted to establish offensive missile bases in Cuba. The action of President Kennedy at that time was prompt and firm.

And the response will continue to be the same whenever any foreign power commits an act of aggression against this hemisphere.

When the Monroe Doctrine was stated, our Nation was weak but the expansive oceans which almost surround us were bulwarks of defense to our safety. Today, in the event of hostilities, these oceans will serve as avenues of attack. Therefore, in view of our

extensive coastlines, our commitments throughout the world, and particularly our adherence to the Monroe Doctrine, we must not only maintain the strongest and best Navy in the world but it must be the most modern.

I am glad to know that this conviction permeates the Navy even to the young midshipmen. It was my privilege to visit the Naval Academy a short time ago. While I was being escorted around the grounds by several of my appointees, we were discussing the rapid changes in weapons and techniques. "Yes," one of the boys remarked, "we have a saying here at the Academy—if it works, it's obsolete." To keep up with modern progress in technology we must be certain that our country does not lag in the fields of science and education.

The U.S.S. *James Monroe* is evidence of the Navy's belief in modernization. This last word in striking force has been added to the Navy not for the purpose of aggression. We will never wage a war of aggression. Our cherished desire with respect to other nations is that they may enjoy the opportunity of freedom with us and that we may enjoy the opportunity of living in peace and harmony with them.

Therefore, we must seek every available avenue of peace and take every advantage, though it may be slight, to advance the cause of better understanding among nations, but we must approach this objective with the full realization that we are dealing with one regime that has no integrity and cannot be trusted. This was the course pursued by President Kennedy in successfully negotiating a nuclear test ban treaty, which, we hope, will prove to be one of his chief accomplishments.

It was my privilege to visit Europe in 1947. I well remember that upon my return to the United States, I made the statement that the one thing which impressed me most during my trip was the fact that regardless of what country we were in there were unmistakable evidences of the fact that the rulers of the Soviet Union had embarked upon a course of world domination and that nothing short of that accomplishment would satisfy them. The events which have transpired since have confirmed that opinion.

As I utter these remarks, my thoughts wander back 22 years to that black day in history—December 7, 1941—when a deceitful, treacherous and double-dealing enemy made its infamous attack on Pearl Harbor. A monument erected over the sunken grave of the battleship Arizona today memorializes the 1,102 brave men who lie buried in its hull. This catastrophe would not have happened if we had been alert and prepared. The monument, therefore, should also be a constant reminder to us that we must never let it happen again.

It is our fervent hope that the U.S.S. *James Monroe* will serve as a deterrent to war and that any nation which is bent upon aggression will know that she and her sister ships will be lurking in the depths of the seas ready at all times and at a moment's notice in the event of attack to unleash from their hidden recesses the most devasting force of destruction ever heaped upon an enemy.

Sir Alex Douglas-Home, the new Prime Minister of Britain, in a major review of the world situation, said recently in London: "I believe we may be over the watershed of danger with the Soviet Union, but if so it is because the deterrent has deterred and, above all, because the Polaris submarine, as a second-strike weapon, has convinced the Soviet Union that war is too dangerous."

In conclusion, may I say to Captain Cobean, Captain Sandeford and their gold and blue crews that this ship is delivered into your hands with the full confidence that you will operate it in the true tradition of the U.S. Navy.

I hope the life of Monroe will be an inpiration to you. You will be crossing greater Delawares, of course, but there may be Valley Forges in your future when the great capacity of your ship will test your endurance to the limit.

Like Monroe—President and justice of the peace—your tasks will be both great and small but remember, there is no greater reward than the satisfaction of a job well done.

You have a great ship and with it you stand as guardians of the liberties of the American people. May the God of our fathers in whom we trust guide your destinies, for freedom must not and shall not perish from the earth.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Late President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget that tragic and dark day of November 22 when, with you in the House restaurant here in the Capitol, I heard the dreadful news about the assassination of our 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It was, and still is, extremely difficult to believe that such a terrible thing can happen in the United States today. But happen it did and a great leader was taken from us.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was born to wealth and could have chosen a career in any field, but he chose the most difficult one of all, that of public service. And he served boldly and courageously, both in war and in peace. He was a strong and fearless leader, both in war and in peace.

The entire world recognized his outstanding character and qualities and our loss was also their loss, mourned even by our enemies.

To his bereaved widow and family I extend my heartfelt condolences.

The following poems by one of my constituents, Miss Bettie LaVeck, express much better the feelings of all Americans over this loss:

WE THE PEOPLE OF THIS UNITED STATES

We the people of this United States of America live in the manner we so desire with the right to speak as we believe, live as we believe, pray as we so desire. We have more as a family than any other country of living people on this whole earth, and yet we are still greedy, filled with hate, hate for others that we envy and are jealous of not realizing that each family, each person has a cross to bear of their own to enter into heaven, the heaven created by God for those whom are worthy of entering this Kingdom of Heaven. With this in mind, I write a few words to try to bring out the true meaning of love, of life, of the meaning of togetherness for all mankind. The hunger of greed, lusts of life, not truly believing in ourselves can be our very downfall as a Nation. Destroying each other in inhuman acts.

ETERNAL REST

The President's casket is now laying in state.
The murderer who has chosen his fate.
Noblemen pass to bid farewell
To their past President they knew so well.
Time passes.
Servicemen erect in form
Have their duties to perform.
The horses' hoofs beat upon the streets with time,
The drums beat with a rhythm rhyme.
In disbelief crowds gather and stare,
Time meaning nothing, they're going nowhere.
A small lad steps out in plain view,
Saluting his father in front of you.
Religion of all faiths busy with their prayer,
Each and every human willing to do their share.
Never in history have people turned to God as of this day,
No matter what color or age, they bow their heads to pray.
Time passes.
Each mourn the way he sees fit,
Throughout this vast world a small candle is lit.
The flag stands at half mast, the bugles gives its call,
The stillness echos through the air, the guns salute in all.
The sun slowly sinks into the west,
While we have placed our President to eternal rest.

—BETTIE A. LAVECK,
TAYLOR, MICH. *Age 35.*

WE MOURN OUR PRESIDENT

Today Mr. Kennedy with a smile on his face and a hand shake for all
Was shot and killed, into his wife's arms he did fall.
She cuddled him and cradled him while death came to call
Our Nation deeply saddened as bare trees in the fall.

Oh President, my President, what fate made you go?
The highest peek of your career was now that we know.
You worked each day for each of us, your courage never wavered,
Now I feel God chose you to sit beside your Savior.

And as the years go by, little John and Caroline will know,
That the President, their daddy, really loved them so.
For his love will live in history, his accomplishes reread with time
And you will tell your children, that daddy he was mine.

Mrs. Kennedy I touched you though you felt me not,
Your bravery and your courage could never be forgot.
May a candle brightly glow and kindle in your heart,
For God walks close beside your, for you He is a part.

I'm sure that each American feels hurt, shocked and sad,
Indigent acts such as this make America look rather bad.
It takes just one to start a heavy stone to roll,
And soon several others start to take their toll.

We wonder and we ponder, we shiver and we cry,
We cannot find the answers no matter how we try.
Yet, it was our President that gave his life this day
And set our Nation mourning for God to show the way.

—BETTIE A. LAVECK,
Age 35.
TAYLOR, MICH., *November 28, 1963.*

Father Thorning Receives Order of the Sun Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, recently in ceremonies at the Peruvian Embassy the Order of the Sun of Peru in the rank of commander was conferred on the Reverend Dr. Joseph Thorning by the Government of Peru. Father Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church in Carrollton Manor in Frederick, Md., is known as a "country parson whose parish is the world."

This Maryland educator, author, editor, and religious leader is well known to the Members of the House of Representatives. For 19 consecutive years he has offered the invocation to God in the House on the official Capitol Hill celebration of Pan American Day. I am proud of the recognition which has come to him for his service in the cause of inter-American amity and under permission to extend my remarks wish to insert here the citation he received from the Government of Peru:

ORDER OF THE SUN CITATION

Father Joseph F. Thorning, doctor of philosophy and doctor of divinity, has been described by Senate majority leader MIKE MANSFIELD as "the Padre of the Americas." This title was given to the Maryland educator, author, and editor because, for 19 consecutive years, he has responded to the invitation of both parties to offer the invocation to God in the U.S. House of Representatives on all official Capitol Hill celebrations of Pan American Day.

Father Thorning's service to the cause of Peruvian-North American understanding is a matter of historic record. In 1940, he founded and organized the first inter-American seminar for U.S. professors and students in the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru. Ninety-four students and faculty members from North American universities and colleges took courses in Peruvian history, art, linguistics, archeology, international law, and Peruvian literature in Lima and in the University of Arequipa, under Father Thorning's spiritual leadership. He himself was invited to lecture on international relations and the role of Peru in world history in the Aula Magna of the University of San Marcos.

Preparation for this work had been undertaken in Marquette Academy; the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.; the St. Louis University; Georgetown University; and the Catholic University of America, where, in 1931, Father Thorning was awarded the degree doctor of philosophy in sociology, economics, and political science. His graduate studies were completed in Oxford University, England, under the direction of Sir Alfred Zimmern, the Montague Burton professor of international relations.

In his books, Father Thorning indicates the importance of Peru and the cause of inter-American amity. Among these books are "Builders of the Social Order"; "A Primer of Social Justice"; "Religious Liberty"; "Costa Rica: A Rural Democracy"; and "Cuban Aftermath: Red Seeds Blow South," and also his well-known biography of Francisco Mirando.

Under both Democratic and Republican administrations, Father Thorning served as an official member of a number of U.S. special diplomatic missions to South America, Central America, and the Caribbean. In March 1954, he acted as special adviser to the U.S. senatorial delegation at the 10th Inter-American Conference in Caracas, Venezuela.

In recent years, numerous articles about Peru have been published in magazines of national and international reputation under Father Thorning's signature.

Today, Father Thorning is an associate editor of World Affairs; honorary professor of international relations in the Pontifical University of Chile; special lecturer on Ibero-America in Marymount College, Arlington, Va.; the U.S. honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil; and pastor of one of the most historic churches in the United States, San Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor in the heart of Maryland.

In consideration of the above, the Government of Peru is pleased to confer on Father Joseph F. Thorning the Order of El Sol del Peru in the rank of commander.

The Foreign Trade Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the contradictions that were so visible to us last week as the cotton bill was passed with a good deal of arm-twisting and behind-the-scenes manipulations, are a source of concern to all who wish to have an intelligent and clearly directed foreign trade policy. The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial this morning, December 9, performs a true public service by its timely and precise editorial commentary pertaining to this subject, which I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point:

THE FOREIGN TRADE MUDDLE

The contradictory foreign trade policy of the United States is well illustrated in the way wheat is sold overseas and later finds its way into other world markets and in the latest move by Congress to set a new subsidy for cotton.

What foreign trade policy the United States does have is a carryover from domestic policy. The two are not compatible. They contradict and nullify each other. Consider the following two examples:

The United States, in effect, grants a subsidy to the wheat farmer by guaranteeing him a price that is above the world market price for wheat. Wheat is sold to West Germany at the lower world market price because West Germany is a friendly nation. West Germany processes the wheat into flour and sells the flour, in competition with U.S. producers of flour, at prices lower than the U.S. prices because West Germany buys the wheat at a lower price than the U.S. processors can buy wheat. In effect, the West German economy is deriving as much benefit from U.S. domestic farm policy as the American farmer.

In the case of cotton the United States has set a subsidy to cotton farmers so the farmers may have higher income. Then, because the subsidy priced the U.S. exporters out of the market the Government granted a subsidy to the exporters.

Now still another subsidy, a third, is proposed, this one to the U.S. mills through the device of subsidizing the cotton brokers so the U.S. mills can meet the foreign competition that has been created by the first two subsidies.

If the United States is to compete as a producing and selling nation in the world as it is today, with its enemies or its friends, then this endless piling of subsidy upon subsidy must be slowed. A return to the freer market is the mandatory solution to the contradictions of the present foreign trade policy.

The Oder-Nysa Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following statement which was delivered at a meeting of the Polish Western Association in Hartford recently, by Mr. Lucian J. Daum:

Distinguished guest, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad to have the opportunity to make some remarks, and note that I said remarks and not a speech, about a matter of great importance to us—the Oder and Nysa line. The land along the eastern bank of the Oder-Nysa Rivers belong geographically and economically as a demographic unit with Poland. The fact is that the western provinces of Poland were originally Slav-Polish, forcibly colonized, brutally conquered by the Germans and regarded even by the Germans themselves as eastern colonial lands. They were never completely integrated into the German economic, political and social structure. It was in 1763, after the Seven Years' War, that this land came under Prussia. And only the cities have been dominantly Germanized where the country's population had remained mainly Slav-Polish. That was the source of constant German worries as the springboard for "Octflucht"—the flight from the east, which had been in progress for decades preceeding World Wars I and II. The end of this German colonialism "Drang nach Osten," in the heart of Europe has been brought by the Germans themselves who started the war against Poland in 1939, and destroyed and plundered at least 38 percent of Poland's national wealth in a planned genocidal fury and killed over 6 million Polish civilians. The total defeat of Germany by the Allied Powers brought about the dissolution of the Prussian state which has long been the historic driving force of German aggrandizement.

The western part of Poland is now populated by over 8 million Poles. Today the production and manufacturing output is higher than in prewar years. As a matter of fact, in the previous year their production increased over 10 percent, which is very favorable in comparison to the American economic growth. Another very interesting statistic is that in the prewar years, higher educational institutions were attended by only 6,000 and are now attended by 50,000 students, which is proof of the Polish people's capabilities and vitality and proves that the German propaganda concerning their claims that Poland possessed not the resources and ability to govern their own native land by themselves, to be completely false.

Now, in reference to the so-called German "Fluchtinge," who are engaged in a policy of strength to regain the so-called lost territories of the east, with the blessings of Doctor Adenauer, a few remarks. Let me say first of all that the German expellees, many of

whom left voluntarily, have been completely absorbed by the West German State and their claims that the so-called eastern territories have been necessary for the Germans as lebevisraum is proved to be false. There is almost no unemployment in West Germany and their skills have been an asset to the German economic rebirth, not to mention the thousands of foreigners (Italians) now working in Germany.

The core of expellee leadership consists of former Nazis and extreme nationalists.

Ernest S. Pisko, of the Christain Science Monitor, an expert on Eastern and Central European problems recalls in an article the ruthless policy of Germanization dating back to the Bismarck's era and reaching a tragic climax under Hitler. He recognized the steadily growing revisionist propaganda campaign as a disturbing sympton. Evaluating the expellee propaganda circulating in the United States, Mr. Pisko exposed its methods of falsification of statistics, biased quotations, and misrepresentation of facts.

The still prevailing Nazi ideas among the refugees, their often expressed contempt for the democratic concepts, and their hopes for a territorial change in the East constitutes a long-range danger to the political stability of Germany and Europe as well. It is this situation that in recent years has caused serious concern in Western capitals. At the beginning of 1959 an article in the London Times urged Bonn to reappraise its eastern policies. The article took the Adenauer government to task for "keeping alive the sentiments and hatreds" so frequently expressed by the expellees. The paper suggested that Bonn should adopt a realistic attitude and recognize the Oder-Nysa line. The Federal Republic, it said, "hesitates to pay the price of defeat" for World War II, but the balance of power has changed and "a new colossus has risen in the East."

This criticism by the London Times which often reflects the views of the British Foreign Office was resented in Germany.

The advice to accept the "status quo" was called by the refugee paper Volksbote "unfair" and "criminal." A peace "built on gangsters' methods will not last," said the Volksbote and no German government would ever dare to give up Germany's rightful claims.

Two months later, in March 1959, General de Gaulle stated at a press conference that the Oder-Nysa line is Germany's definite eastern border and should not be changed. To which the Bonn Government replied that "the German borders are still those of December 30, 1937."

The expellee leaders now speak quite diplomatically of the peoples' rights to a homeland, they also claim the right to self-determination as advocated by Woodrow Wilson in 1917. This, however, is a legalistic veil to cover up the old aggressive plans. They are in a hurry because a second generation of about 3½ million Poles born in western Poland will shortly be eligible to vote and for them it is their native homeland. But the Fluchlinge are slowly dying out. So eventually any plebiscite with every year is to the German disadvantage; and so with it the Germans are losing any moral rights, if there are any, and according to international law, rights to this territory, not to mention that the Germans, first of all, brutally conquered this land from the rightful owners.

The recognition, de jure, by the United States, of Polish western territories on the Oder-Nysa line is a necessity for the promotion of peace and justice. And all Poles, wherever they are; are determined to keep this originally Polish land in Polish hands. Where the Oder and Nysa flow; we were; we are; and will be.

TV Interests of L.B.J. Co. Under Scrutiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, events of last few weeks have dramatized a basic question: Should Members of the House, Senate, and officials of the executive branch be permitted to acquire or hold television and radio rights while serving in the Government?

It should be apparent that the President, Vice President and others of high rank in the Government should not obtain interests in a Government-controlled industry. There is either direct control of appointments to the Federal Communications Commission, as in the case of the President, or the troublesome situation where high officials have great influence that might be misused in associating with the FCC.

It should also be apparent that Members of the House and Senate have a position of some control over the FCC, through legislation, proposals of legislation, through appropriations, through investigations, and otherwise through political links. It is unreasonable to expect that all members of the FCC can retain an absolutely objective posture in making decisions on radio and television involving Members of the Senate or House. This is particularly true if the television or radio rights sought personally involve key figures on the commerce committees, appropriations committees, or persons who are otherwise in position of leadership.

Does the establishment of a trust in the case of the L.B.J. Co. wipe out of the minds of the members of the FCC the fact that the members of the Johnson family are the real owners of radio and television interests? The property has been put in trust for the duration of the period of time that President Johnson is in public office. However, the profits accumulate for the family.

I submit that every member of the Federal Communications Commission is going to be aware of the interests of the Johnson family in the field of radio and television. And I further submit that in the case of the FCC the chairman holds office at the pleasure of the President.

In the light of the following article which appeared in the December 8, 1963, issue of the Des Moines Register, it appears that Congress must give consideration to legislation which would bar the possibility of conflict of interest in this field. Such legislation should apply to the immediate members of the families of Members of the House and Senate as well as other branches of the Government.

The article follows:

PROBERS GET DATA ON L.B.J. TV INTERESTS—PAID FOR JOHNSON'S LIFE INSURANCE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Senate Rules Committee has been asked to examine financial transactions involving the television holdings of the family of President Johnson.

It was learned from committee sources Saturday that Senator JOHN WILLIAMS mentioned some transactions involving President Johnson while testifying as a witness in the Robert (Bobby) Baker investigation.

The Delaware Republican listed a number of witnesses he said should be questioned. Among these was a man who has already delivered documents to the Rules Committee that involve some financial transactions of the television interests of the Johnson family, held by the LBJ Co.

It is reported that Senator WILLIAMS recited a chair of circumstances and a list of witnesses that he said should be "checked out," but made no allegation.

WILLIAMS said he would not comment on the type of information he has given the Rules Committee in two appearances.

BEFORE ASSASSINATION

His testimony was given some time before November 22, when Vice President Johnson succeeded to the Presidency.

Financial records involving the LBJ Co., were delivered to the Senate Rules Committee on the morning of November 22—less than an hour before the assassination of President Kennedy.

Chairman B. EVERETT JORDAN of the Rules Committee confirmed for the Register that some transactions involving President Johnson had been called to the attention of the committee.

NO CHARGES

However, he said it was not clear in his mind whether the initial mention of Mr. Johnson came from Senator WILLIAMS, through documents Senator WILLIAMS delivered, or through some other person.

On the basis of the information submitted, Senator JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, stated: "I do not believe that any charge of impropriety or wrong-doing was made."

He reiterated that Senator WILLIAMS had provided the committee with some facts, and he quoted Senator WILLIAMS as saying: "All I'm doing is giving you the information that ought to be checked out."

Senator JORDAN added that "it did not seem to me that the information was derogatory."

SCOPE OF PROBE

Chairman Jordan said he and his investigators will pursue all of the information supplied by Senator WILLIAMS and others if it seems to involve persons or problems within the jurisdiction of the investigation.

The investigation covers the outside business activities of Senators, former Senators, and either present or past employees of the Senate.

President Johnson was a Member of the Senate, and from 1955 through 1960 served as majority leader. In 1960 he was elected Vice President.

President Johnson and his family have divested themselves of contorlor management of the multimillion-dollar radio and television interests they acquired during the period he was a Congressman.

It is now their stated intention to continue this severance until Mr. Johnson has left public office.

TO TRUSTEES

A week ago Mrs. Johnson, under her legal name of Claudia T. Johnson, filed application with the FCC for permission to turn over control of her Texas radio and television

holdings to two trustees. Permission was granted Friday.

White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger said Saturday that Mrs. Johnson put her television interests in a trust "to avoid any possibility of a conflict of interest."

The stock of Mrs. Johnson and her daughters in the LBJ Co., constituting 83 percent of the total, will be handled by A. W. Moursand, 44, of Johnson City, Tex., and J. W. Bullion, 50, of Dallas.

Mrs. Johnson informed the FCC that Moursand and Bullion will have complete discretion in holding, managing, or selling the property, and that they will be prohibited from consulting her in any way until after Mr. Johnson leaves political life.

"The sole information the trustee shall furnish to the grantor shall be the information which the grantor is required to show on her annual income tax return, or which may be required for reports to governmental authorities or for other governmental purposes," the application stated.

QUESTION OF PROPRIETY

Periodically, the question has been raised in the Congress and in the press over the propriety of Congressmen acquiring Government licenses for television and radio stations.

In an interview with U.S. News & World Report, Senator WILLIAMS recently spelled out his doubts as to the propriety of Congressmen acquiring interests in businesses that are regulated by Federal agencies.

"The propriety of that would depend upon how such interests were acquired," Senator WILLIAMS said. "It's not what you own or what you're doing; it's the background of how you got it.

"In my case, I did not own a television station before I was elected, my wife did not. It would certainly raise a question if we came out of here (the Senate) owning one. I think you have to go behind each instance to see the background."

GOLDFINE-ADAMS

In 1958, an investigation of the regulatory agencies and the explosive Sherman Adams-Bernard Goldfine case pointed up the problem of ethical conduct in connection with regulatory agencies.

Members of the regulatory agencies, which include the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) are appointed by the President to serve for a term of years.

A few telephone calls to inquire about the status of cases at the SEC and FTC involving Goldfine became grounds for the forced resignation of Adams as a top aid of President Eisenhower.

General questions were raised a few years ago about the television interests of congressional leaders and their wives.

Johnson, then the powerful majority leader in the Senate, said he had no television interests that could create a "conflict of interests" and that his wife, Lady Bird Johnson, was entitled to hold any businesses in her own right.

Johnson has consistently contended that he had nothing to do with the acquisition of the radio and television interests of the LBJ Co. The first investment is said to have been made from Mrs. Johnson's inheritance from her parents.

Johnson has stressed that his wife is an efficient and effective business woman, who has made them wealthy with her financial skills while he devoted himself to public service.

Mrs. Johnson was, until she set up the trusteeship, chairman of the board of the LBJ Co. and owns 313 shares, which is 52.9 percent of the stock, according to the reports filed with the FCC.

Another 184 shares of stock, 30.9 percent of the total, is held in trust for the two daughters, Lynda Bird and Lucy Baines Johnson.

FOUR MILLION DOLLARS

The LBJ Co. is reported to have a value of at least $4 million. Its major facility is KTBC-TV in Austin, Tex. KTBC-TV was the only television station licensed to operate in Austin until last spring, when the FCC approved permits for a small ultrahigh frequency station.

KTBC-TV is still the only very high frequency station licensed in Austin, a city of more than 200,000 persons.

The LBJ Co. advertised its Austin television station as "the strongest voice in the capital of the biggest State."

The first Johnson broadcasting holding was radio station KTBC in Austin, which was purchased in the early 1940's, several years after Johnson was elected to Congress.

The LBJ Co. also owns 29 percent of KWTX Broadcasting Co., which is the holder of licenses for KWTX radio and television in Waco, Tex.

The FCC records state that KWTX Broadcasting is also a 50-percent stockholder in Brazo Broadcasting Co.; holder of the license for KBTX-TV in Bryan, Tex., has a 75-percent interest in Texomo Broadcasting, Inc., the license holder for KXII-TV in Ardmore, Okla., and has a 78.9-percent interest in Victorial Broadcasting, Inc., licensee of of KMAL radio station in Victoria, Tex.

The LBJ Co. also owns Music for Business, which holds the Muzak franchise in the Austin area, according to records filed with the FCC.

PAYS PREMIUMS

President Johnson holds no stock and holds no office in the LBJ Co. and has contended that he has had no connection with its operations. But the LBJ Co. has been paying premiums for insurance on his life for 5 years.

In 1957, Johnson suffered a heart attack. In 1958 he bought $100,000 in life insurance through Don Reynolds & Associates, a Silver Spring, Md., insurance agency.

Robert G. Baker, then secretary to the Democratic majority in the Senate, was listed as a vice president of this firm.

Reynolds was introduced to Johnson by Baker, and Johnson personally negotiated the insurance arrangement with Reynolds that provided that the LBJ Co. would pay the premiums. The company was the beneficiary under the policy.

In the first year, Johnson had $100,000 of the insurance, and later he boosted it to $200,000. The premiums have run as high as $12,000 a year.

TAX POLICY

To treat such life insurance premiums as business expenses, it would be necessary for a business firm to demonstrate that it had an insurable interest in the person whose life is being insured, Internal Revenue Service spokesmen explained.

The tax experts state that life insurance premiums would be deductible from taxable income only if the insured person was a "key man" who had made such a substantial contribution to the business success that the insurance would be regarded as "ordinary and necessary business expenses."

Photostatic copies of the LBJ checks to Reynolds, and other records on these transactions were turned over to the Rules Committee early November 22, along with other financial records indicating that the Don Reynolds Co. of Silver Spring was making payments to the Johnson television station in Austin, Tex., for advertising.

Mr. Speaker, any member of the FCC is going to be aware of the interests of the Johnson family. In the case of the FCC, the Chairman is named by the President.

I am sure that various members of the FCC were aware of the position of power that Mr. Johnson held as majority leader in the Senate. While many of them may have leaned over backward to avoid any favoritism, or any bending to his power, there is reason for grave concern as to whether all of the members of the FCC have been so circumspect in their behavior. In fact, we have two rather noteworthy cases in recent years—the cases of John Doerfer and Richard Mack—that demonstrate there was considerable laxity in that agency.

It is time for this Congress to consider legislation to bar the possibility of this type of a conflict of interest.

The Great Debate on United States-Soviet Trade Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the characteristics which makes our Nation a great one is the ability of the American people to engage in significant national debate on important Government policies, both domestic and foreign.

Such a debate is now in progress over whether the United States should continue its present restrictive trade policies toward the Soviet Union or whether those policies should be somewhat liberalized.

An excellent presentation of the issue appeared in the December 1 issue of the Sunday Milwaukee Journal. Written by Mr. Thomas A. Blinkhorn of the Journal's staff, the article explains the background of the question, presents significant factors to be weighed in a decision, and gives arguments pro and con.

Because of its pertinency, I am including the article and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE: NEW POLICY NOW?—PRESIDENT JOHNSON FACES PUZZLING CHOICE BETWEEN FREER TRADE IDEA PUSHED BY LATE PRESIDENT AND RESTRICTIVE LINE PURSUED IN PAST AND STILL DEFENDED BY SOME

(By Thomas A. Blinkhorn)

One of the most perplexing decisions now confronting President Johnson is whether to liberalize American trade policy with the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. The possibility of modifying existing trade restrictions has received much attention since the late President Kennedy gave approval on October 9 to the sale of possibly $250 million worth of surplus American wheat to Russia. Certain administration officials favor freer trade as one possible method of easing cold war tensions. The State Department reportedly is exploring possible consequences of such a step. The ultimate decision rests, of course, with the new President.

The question was brought to the fore last week when the Senate killed a bill that would have prohibited the Export-Import Bank, or any other Government agency, from financing commodity sales to Communist countries or extending guarantees of private financing.

The action eliminates a major hurdle in negotiations over the wheat sale to Russia. American grain exporters contend that Gov-

ernment credit guarantees are essential for any deal.

ALLIES FAVOR TRADE

A major factor in the Senate's decision was a letter written November 15 by President Kennedy and read to the Chamber last week, opposing the bill as "against the interest of the United States * * * crippling the American exporter in fair competition with other free countries for nonstrategic trade with the Communist world."

The sale now apparently hinges on settlement of the problem of relatively high American shipping rates, and an acceptable compromise appears to be near.

Whether the wheat transaction is completed or not, the subject of American-Russian trade has been revived and is likely to be a lively topic in the months ahead.

Existing U.S. policy has been predominantly antitrade. Legal restrictions as well as strong opposition in and outside Congress have resulted in little commercial exchange with Communist countries other than Poland and Yugoslavia. Our exports to the Soviet Union last year, for example, were less than $16 million, compared to total exports of around $20 billion. Measured against total Russian imports of more than $6 billion last year, American sales look tiny indeed.

This hard antitrade line is not shared by some of our allies, however. The policy, in fact, has long been a potentially divisive factor in the Western alliance. Britain, particularly, opposes it. The British maintain that trade with the Russians is desirable, that it will make the Russians more amenable as they get more of the material comforts and that it will lessen the likelihood of aggressive Soviet policies.

The U.S. argument, basically, has been that it is not the business of the free world to help strengthen economies of its avowed enemies and that any increased trade tends to help the Communists out of their current economic problems.

EXPORT CONTROLS VARY

But even in Washington there appears to be a growing difference of opinion about this restrictive stance. Assistant Senate Majority Leader HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, asserted the other day that the existing policy was "not in the best interests of the country."

This view has found increasing support in business and financial circles. The First National City Bank of New York, in its latest economic letter, states that the American policy of attempting to check Russia's economic growth by officially discouraging trade was driving this country into "a position of economic isolation." And a recent White House Conference on Export Expansion, attended by 200 business executives, urged that the Government liberalize its policies on trade with the Communists.

Present restrictions vary according to the country and the goods concerned. All trade with Communist China, North Korea and North Vietnam is embargoed. Trade with Cuba is limited solely to exports of food and medicines. In the case of the Soviet Union and most Eastern European nations, shipment not only of war materials but of other materials, equipment or technical data considered to be of strategic or of critical value is prohibited. A more liberal export policy is followed in the case of Poland and Yugoslavia, mainly to encourage a tendency toward independence from Moscow.

Effectiveness of these export controls is limited, however, by differences with our allies. This problem has plagued the West since the control policy was instituted in 1947 and 1948. An informal, Paris-based committee of 15 nations, known as the Consultative Group, attempts to coordinate the control measures, but with limited success.

Earlier this year the British refused to join an embargo on sale of large dismeter pipe to the Russians. More recently, British newspapers have reported Russians' interest in purchasing vehicles, machine tools, even entire factories from Britain. Only highly strategic items would be barred from this trade under existing British restrictions.

Soviet trade with other Western European countries also appears to be increasing. In Germany, the Krupp enterprises have just closed a deal to supply Russia with three complete synthetic fiber plants. Krupp also reports substantial sales of railroad equipment, including boxcars, and a wide range of construction machinery. Italy recently signed a new agreement with Russia, calling for a 50 percent rise in trade between 1966 and 1969 and covering a wide range of commodities such as Russian oil, Italian machinery, ships, and steel.

According to a European correspondent for the Wall Street Journal, this industrial buying, added to the Kremlin's wheat deals and mammoth Russian purchases of natural rubber and copper, promises to push free world exports to the Soviet bloc to a peacetime record this year, considerably above the estimated $4 billion of last year. One indication of this trend is the fact that the U.S.S.R. has sold between $300 million and $400 million of its gold in London alone this year to get foreign currencies to buy Western goods. Its gold sales totaled only about $210 million in 1962.

It has been firm Russian policy to husband gold reserves. Payments deficits are generally restricted to the amount that can be covered by a year's output of Russian gold—about $200 million. This is one reason the Soviets are holding out for trade credits in their wheat negotiations with the United States. They seek to borrow up to 75 percent of the price of the wheat, paying 25 percent in cash.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE IN PAST

American trade with the Soviet Union has never been extensive. The peak pre-World War II year for U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. was 1930 when the shipments were valued at $114 million; imports from the Soviet Union reached a peak peacetime value of $31 million in 1937.

Lend-lease shipments, which began to flow to Russia in November 1941, changed this picture significantly. Government figures show that American exports to the Soviet Union were at the rate of nearly $2 billion a year through 1945.

Since the war, U.S. sales to the Soviet Union have dropped from the high lend-lease levels but have remained generally above prewar totals.

Even if present policies were liberalized to encourage greater American-Soviet trade, several problems remain. One is the lack of legal protection for patent rights and the Communist habit of pirating machine plans and designs.

WHAT WILL WE BUY?

Another is the question of the kinds of increased Russian imports this country almost certainly would be required to purchase.

"I would say there is nothing very much the Russians produce that we need particularly," Eugene M. Braderman, Director of the Bureau of Economic Commerce, Washington, D.C., has said. The biggest potential demand would be for caviar, vodka, or furs. The United States has plentiful supplies of oil—one of Russia's biggest export products.

However, if the Soviet Union proved willing to sell increased amounts of gold in the West, a further expansion of trade with the United States might prove possible, despite the limited demand here for Soviet export goods.

Congress Considers Legalized Price Fixing on Everything From Nylons to Razor Blades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the International Fire Fighter of November 1963, pointing out the evils of the so-called quality stabilization bill and the destructive impact of that legislation on the consumer, the retailer, and the economy generally.

This gives excellent reasons why that iniquitous legislation should not become law:

[From the International Fire Fighter, November 1963]

CONGRESS CONSIDERS LEGALIZED PRICE FIXING ON EVERYTHING FROM NYLONS TO RAZOR BLADES

The quality stabilization bill—Madison Avenue's word game for legalized price fixing—is being studied by Congress and, if enacted, will increase consumer prices by as much as 30 percent on brandname products.

The bill, implying restraint of higher prices, actually would have exactly the opposite effect and would cost the consumer an estimated $14 billion yearly in the form of increased prices.

The bill is simply a new version of the old "fair trade" laws. It would allow the manufacturer to artifically set prices at the level at which he would like his product sold. The bill would authorize him to then enter into a private agreement with the retailer to sell at that price. The retailers who don't agree, don't get to handle the product. Those who agree, then later reduce the price—such as for a sale—could be sued by the manufacturer for any damage which may have ben done to the "good name" of the product.

What the bill amounts to them, is a private contract between the manufacturer and the retailer—enforced by Federal law.

The bill is being vigorously opposed by organized labor.

Besides increasing consumer prices on everything from hair sprays to prescription drugs, the so-called stabilization bill would tend to squeeze out small merchants who could not afford to carry inventories of both price-fixed brand name merchandise and lower priced "private" or "house" brands.

Labor has taken particular exception to specific provisions of the measure. Among them:

(1) The "unconscionable" failure to exempt prescription drugs, which frequently carry "needlessly exorbitant prices even under present conditions."

(2) The lack of public safeguards, such as review and approval of fixed prices before they are put into effect.

The legislation, approved by the House Commerce Committee and pending before the Senate Commerce Committee, also raises some problems regarding antitrust laws and policies.

This was stressed by Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, lone dissenter in the House committee vote. He charged the bill would "gut" antitrust laws, "deny the vitality of free enterprise" and substitute "the manufacturer's price dic-

tates" for the "individual retailer's independent business judgment." He characterized the legislation as "bad for the economy, bad for the retailer, and very bad for the consumer."

STATES HAVE CHOICE

The House committee did, however, add a "States rights" amendment to the bill specifying that the legislation would not apply in any State which had a law prohibiting manufacturer-imposed minimum prices. The bill would apply to brand name products where the manufacturer does not have a monopoly and competes with similar products made by other manufacturers.

Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the AFL-CIO Department of Legislation, pointed out to the Senate Commerce Committee's special subcommittees on quality stabilization that business failures, 1946 through 1961, were consistently higher in States having price maintenance laws. The more comprehensive the law, the higher the failure rate, he said.

The AFL-CIO "simply cannot put much stock" in the claim that manufacturers need to dictate resale prices to "prevent deterioration" of their products, Mr. Biemiller said.

"Good products, which consumers want, do not need artificial price supports," he stated.

The price stabilization argument is exploded in any case by the prevalence of "private" labels, he noted. These come about when the maker of a brand name product makes quantities of it available for marketing under a different name and at a lower price—through a supermarket chain, for example. The product is identical. Only the name and the price are different.

"We suggest that the Congress explore less dangerous and dubious routes to the preservation of small business than the one under consideration in this bill," he said. "Such measures might include, for example, strengthening the Federal Trade Commission's powers to deal with genuinely predatory price cutting."

Fair Redistricting Needed in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the New York State Legislature and Governor Rockefeller to act on redistricting our State so that urban areas will be fairly represented in the State assembly and State senate. The following editorial was broadcast recently by WABC-TV in New York and speaks to this point. I commend it to our colleagues:

A CHALLENGE FOR NEW YORK

WABC-TV told you in our last editorial that we think the New York State Legislature should change its method of drawing up legislative districts in the State. Six States have changed their constitutions to take the districting power away from the political wrestling of their State legislators. These States have given the power to draw district lines to citizens' committees. We'd like to see the New York Legislature show the same kind of political courage. This is what the New York Legislature could do right now. It could name a small group of respected citizens to make recommendations for redistricting the State; citizens with no party interests, with interest only in better government and with the broadest knowledge of democracy and government. Men like Prof. Wallace Sayre, head of the public law and government department at Columbia University; and William Boyd, associate director of the National Municipal League—men who have spent many years working for better representation for all the people.

The legislature might look, too, at the districting method used successfully in Illinois since 1954. There the State parties select groups of men who hold no political office. From these groups, a boundary commission is set up composed of five members from each party. If they can't agree, then every member of the State legislature is elected in the next election by statewide vote. Since no legislator wants to run for office with the whole State voting for or against him, the legislature makes sure the committee does its job. If the New York Legislature adopted either of these methods, WABC-TV thinks politics would lose its hold over your right to representation.

If you agree with us, that your right to representation is bigger than politics, we ask you to write Governor Rockefeller and your representative. Tell them you want politics taken out of districting. The rest is up to them.

American Legion Honors President Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a transcript of a portion of a joint American Legion and Auxiliary fall convention, memorial services held in Minneapolis, Minn.; and the remarks made by the national commander, the Honorable Daniel F. Foley:

REMARKS BY DANIEL F. FOLEY, AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL COMMANDER, AT A JOINT LEGION AND AUXILIARY FALL CONFERENCE MEMORIAL SERVICE IN BEHALF OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY DELIVERED AT THE PICK-NICOLLET HOTEL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., NOVEMBER 23, 1963

National President Mrs. Johnson, my fellow Americans, for some time, I have looked forward to this conference, for the wanderer yearns for home. To be home with members of my own department, where the Legion spirit is deep and where the Legion heart beats strongly.

But today we are sad. The heart of America is sad. The soul of freedom aches. Our President has died—a martyr for the cause of justice and of freedom, not just here in the United States, but throughout the world.

It is the character of the true American to love justice and to jealously regard the highest rights of man as a creature of God.

The sincere, determined efforts of President Kennedy to promote justice among men everywhere will speak well for him before the tribunal of divine justice.

It is the inborn desire of all men to be free, and throughout all of our history brave men and women of great courage have and do defend the cause of freedom. Defenders of the cause of freedom daily lay their lives on the line that freedom may endure.

President Kennedy gave his life for his country as surely as if he had died in combat, and all men of good will are crushed by this tragic event.

But again the great character of the American people, their deep love of God, and loyalty to country will spring forth in all its fullness, for all the world to see, in this time of crisis.

Let no one think for a fleeting moment that this Nation will be divided in this hour of challenge.

Whatever differences of a political nature or disagreement on issues that may exist are quickly set aside as all Americans rush to accept the challenge these tragic circumstances have thrust upon our Nation.

One of the hallmarks of a free society under constitutional government is its continuity. What dictatorship can face the people of the world and say it speaks from the freely expressed will of the people?

But here in this Nation, which has now seen eight Presidents die in office, some at the hand of the assassin, such as Abraham Lincoln, James Garfield, William McKinley, and now John Kennedy, the Government of the United States continues on—confident and courageous are its people—dedicated and sincere its leaders.

It is this desire to perpetuate freedom that has inspired the American Legion in its many years of fruitful service. We pledge ourselves to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism, maintain law and order, to promote peace and good will on earth, to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. Devotion to these principles characterizes the service which John Kennedy has left to all the ages, for his lifework was filled with courage, compassion for others, a deep sense of justice, and a love of freedom, as God willed it when he created man.

Into the stream of challenge, created at this hour, the American Legion, a powerful force for good, may well face its most crucial hour—its most difficult test.

We believe it to be the responsibility of every American to be an active participant in the affairs of the present, in a responsible manner. Every man who would enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship in a free society must discharge the accompanying duties and responsibilities of citizenship. It is the total business of our life's work to be always consistent with the ideals of freedom, which encompasses a love of God—love of country—regard for the rights of others, and a renewed realization of our great responsibility to preserve for our children and our children's children, down through the ages, an America forever strong and forever free.

The Legion has the great challenge now, if it is to contribute significantly in these moving times, to hold its head high in service to the high cause of freedom, set an example for others to follow in all our actions, in all our utterances and so conduct ourselves in all of our posts across the length and breadth of the land, that our people will always see our work at its best and our ideals at their loftiest.

By so doing, we show reverence to the memory of our dearly loved President, who has fallen, and give hope and encouragement to our new President, who now assumes the awesome responsibility of leadership.

In this hour, so sad to us all, in this hour which challenges us so, we say for all men to hear:

Though the forces of evil, lawlessness, and hatred may beat with all their fury upon the breasts of liberty;

This Nation will endure strong in justice—

This Nation will prosper rich in compassion—

This Nation will stand down through the corridors of time secure in freedom.

France's Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, France, the oldest ally of the American Republic, gave our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and the First Lady, Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, one of the most tumultuous, most affectionate, and warmest receptions ever seen or recorded in ancient Paris. The United States and France together have shared a special affinity for each other ever since the French gave moral support and financial assistance to the American colonists in their revolution for freedom and independence. The French people and government held President Kennedy in special and unique esteem. The French Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency M. Herve Alphand, has prepared a brochure of France's tribute to the late President Kennedy, including the statements of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, President of the Republic of France, official messages, and French public opinion. I include these statements with my remarks in the RECORD:

General de Gaulle's statement on the death of President Kennedy:

"President Kennedy died like a soldier, under fire, in the line of duty and in the service of his country.

"In the name of the French people, ever the friend of the American people, I salute his great example and his great memory."

OFFICIAL MESSAGES

Message to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy from General and Madam de Gaulle:

"The great sorrow that has just befallen you distresses my wife and myself to the bottom of our hearts. Rest assured that we are with you in our thoughts and in our prayers. President Kennedy shall never be forgotten."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from General de Gaulle, President of the Republic:

"The death of President Kennedy is a source of deep sorrow to the French people, who held in the highest esteem this great head of state, illustrious servant of freedom and of the destiny of mankind.

"In the face of a misfortune which so profoundly affects your country and which concerns all the peoples of the world, and at a time when fate bestows upon you the highest responsibilities, rest assured, Mr. President, of the more than ever loyal and confident friendship of France for the United States of America."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from M. Georges Pompidou, Premier:

"Deeply moved by the tragic loss experienced by the United States on the death of President Kennedy, whose courage and great gifts as a statesman were admired by all, the French people wish to convey to you the grief felt by all my fellow countrymen.

"Rest assured that at a time when under such cruel circumstances you take up your high office, my colleagues of the French Government and myself join with you in a feeling of most grieving and most loyal friendship."

Message to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"Profoundly shocked by the news of the act which has just cost the life of the President of the United States, may I assure you that I deeply share in your mourning and in that of the Government and the American people. Mindful of the welcome that President Kennedy extended to me only a few weeks ago, I can appreciate the extent of your sorrow.

"All my countrymen join with me and share in the feelings of friendship toward your country which have existed for two centuries."

Message to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara from M. Pierre Messmer, Minister of the Armed Forces:

"Upon hearing of the tragic death of President Kennedy, I ask you to accept the condolences of the French Armed Forces and also my own personal, sincerest and grieving condolences."

Message to Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces:

"May I express to you, and request that you convey this message to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the shock and the indignation of the French Armed Forces on hearing the news of the outrage against President Kennedy.

"May I also express to you my deepest personal sorrow at the death of the President of the United States who welcomed me such a short time ago with so much friendliness and warmth."

Statement by M. Roger Seydoux, Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations:

Before a plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly, held on November 27, 1963 to pay homage to the memory of the late President Kennedy, Mr. Roger Seydoux, Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations, made the following statement:

"All my compatriots, for whom the visit in Paris of Mr. and Mrs. John Kennedy remains a bright memory, turn toward the people of the United States, our everlasting friend. We wish them to know that their trial is our trial, their sadness our sadness, their mourning our mourning. Ours also is, despite the heavy loss they must bear, their steadfast faith in the future as is steadfast our confidence in their great destiny."

Statement by the French Premier, M. Georges Pompidou:

The following statement by the French Premier was broadcast over French television and transmitted to the United States by satellite via the Pleumeur-Bodou relay station:

"The stupefaction engendered by a despicable assassination, the indignation at seeing President Kennedy struck down by the side of his young wife in the fulfillment of his duties as a humane and liberal head of state, is accompanied by a great sadness also felt in our hearts: sadness because, once again, blind violence has triumphed; sadness because a great and friendly people is plunged into mourning; sadness because the free world has lost one of its surest guides.

"In these tragic hours, all France is at the side of the United States in anger, in grief, and, despite everything, in confidence also for the future."

Statement by French Foreign Minister, M. Maurice Couve de Murville:

M. Couve de Murville made the following statement over the three major American television networks. It was transmitted by the communication satellite relay:

"It was with the most grievous impression of shock that we all in Paris and in France, heard the appalling news of President Kennedy's cold-blooded murder. Many elements combined in our thoughts: the terribly premature disappearance of a statesman of the first magnitude, the death of a man who was the incarnation of youth and vitality, the awful tragedy that hit a glamorous and lovable family, the general feeling of a blow inflicted to a great country for which France has, from the beginning, felt the closest friendship, further reinforced by comradeship in three wars.

"For me, who had the privilege of long talks with President Kennedy, the memory will not pass of his friendliness, his eagerness, his wisdom, and his courage.

"Believe me when I say that we, the French people, today, all grieve and pray together with the American people."

Statement broadcast over American television by M. Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States:

"The tragic death of President Kennedy has deeply moved the French people, forever the friend of the American people. Your sorrow is our sorrow and this sorrow we share with Mrs. Kennedy and her family, tonight we pray with them.

"The President had always displayed toward my country a great fondness, particularly on the occasion of his visit to Paris in 1961.

"For me it was also a personal friend who always showed me a profound affection and understanding.

"As General de Gaulle said today, he died as a soldier. We shall never forget his example or his memory, the memory of a great man."

General de Gaulle attends President Kennedy's funeral

The Presidency of the Republic issued a communique on November 23 announcing that General de Gaulle, President of the Republic, would attend the funeral of President Kennedy. He would be accompanied by M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces; and M. Etienne Burin des Roziers, General Secretary of the Presidency of the Republic.

FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

France mourns President Kennedy

On the personal orders of General de Gaulle, all flags on public buildings were flown at half staff from 9 a.m. on November 23.

In paying this respect to the memory of President Kennedy, General de Gaulle departed from French tradition, which requires flags to be flown at half staff only during the funeral of a head of state of an allied or friendly power.

On November 23, the Paris Municipal Council sent a telegram to Mrs. Kennedy in which it told her that the city of Paris was in mourning. In addition, a member of the Council proposed that the name of John F. Kennedy, defender of the fundamental freedoms of man and who fell for these freedoms, be given to a street in Paris. The Council unanimously adopted this proposal on November 28.

In addition to messages of condolence addressed by official French circles to Mr. Charles Bohlen, many people from all walks of life, veterans' associations, French-American associations and others sent messages of sympathy to the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

Among many expressions of sympathy, mention should be made of a group of between 2,000 and 3,000 students of all nationalities who went to sign the register of condolence in the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

A service in the memory of President Kennedy was held on November 25 in the cathedral of Notre-Dame de Paris. It was attended by the U.S. Ambassador and Mrs. Bohlen and by Madame Charles de Gaulle. M. Georges Pompidou, French Premier, the President of the Senate and Madame Gaston Monnerville, members of the Government and members of the diplomatic corps in the French capital were also present in the great cathedral which was unable to hold the crowds of Parisians who wished to attend the service and who overflowed into the square in front of the cathedral, where members of the Grade Républicaine, swords unsheathed, formed an honor guard.

The French Press

The entire French press without exception reflected the feeling of affliction among the French people at the death of President Kennedy. Raymond Aron in Le Figaro of November 23 wrote: "The assassination of J. F. Kennedy affects all mankind. * * * He wanted to be one of those statesmen whom history remembers because they accomplish their task. * * * He will leave a memory which will not be unworthy of the grandeur which he dreamed of achieving."

In an editorial of November 23, Combat wrote: "The crime committed yesterday is the worst one can imagine, since the man it struck down was a symbol in the eyes of hundreds of millions of our contemporaries."

Also on November 23, France-Soir wrote: "Like lightning, anguish and grief have hit the world. The hearts of men and women sank, at the same moment, in every country and on all continents. All peoples weep also and above all for this man who, in the words of Pope Paul VI, 'defended the liberty of peoples and the peace of the world.' "

La Nation of November 25 published the following editorial comments: "He was one of the great men of this world. A man with a personal fortune for whom it was possible therefore to have narrow views and yet he was more aware than millions of others of man's fate, a man above all who had the courage to direct his actions in tune with his heart."

Paul Bastid, in l'Aurore of November 25 wrote: "There was in the personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy a kind of lucid fire in the service of liberty and peace which commanded admiration and sympathy. He devoted himself entirely, with the energy of his temperament and of his age, to causes that are dear to us."

Le Monde, in an editorial in its November 26 issue said: "He leaves an inspiration, a style, a line from which America will not easily stray." In the same issue, the French poet and Nobel Prize winner St. John Perse wrote: "Kennedy * * * was an athlete running in a race against fate. He fought fairly and squarely always and his encounter with death came with his face uncovered."

The next day Le Monde published an editorial containing the following comment: "The gesture by the President of the Republic who, right at the outset, decided to be present at the funeral of a man whom many considered his rival, has come opportunely to show that, in difficult times, he intends to behave as a loyal friend of the United States. He had already proved this during the Cuban crisis."

EULOGY PRONOUNCED BY M. JACQUES CHABAN-DELMAS, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

At the opening of the November 26 sitting, in the presence of Mr. Charles Bohlen, U.S. Ambassador to France, M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly, pronounced the following eulogy of the late President Kennedy:

"John F. Kennedy was not only the world's most powerful head of state. He was also an exceptional man.

"The murder of this hero, who fell in the flower of his youth, who knew what power and glory was, this murder in which the fate of the ancients finds expression has already taken on a historic amplitude and its echo will never die away. No, we shall not forget John F. Kennedy.

"Yesterday, in Washington, France expressed her grief through the presence of the most famous of her citizens, he who, without a doubt, already belongs to history and continues to forge the future.

"Today the National Assembly shares as one in the mourning of the United States and of its Congress. It participates with emotion in the sorrow of the Kennedy family. Deeply shocked, it pays its respects before the anguish of this charming, worthy and courageous young woman who brought a little of the gentleness of France into the harsh existence of America's first citizen.

"Tomorrow it will be up to each and every one to pursue his task in defending and expounding the great principles shared by our two countries, principles in whose respect President Kennedy lived and also died."

M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, associated the Government with the words of the National Assembly:

"The homage paid by the National Assembly marks the share taken by the French people in the mourning of the American people and shows the esteem and affection for the President who died in the line of duty."

More than 400 deputies stood and observed 1 minute's silence. Meetings were suspended for 1 hour as a sign of mourning.

Memorial Resolution of National Association of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following memorial resolution adopted by the National Association of Letter Carriers relative to the death of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and conveyed to the Congress by their executive council:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Whereas the tragic death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has deprived the free world of its most courageous, most powerful and most inspiring leader; and

Whereas the cause of liberalism and human freedom hangs trembling in the balance because of this mindless murder of its most foreceful advocate: Be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the National Association of Letter Carriers convey to the leaders of both Houses of the Congress, its fervent prayers that the legislative branch of Government carry through to a successful conclusion the liberal program initiated by our martyred President, including the program of raising the standards of Federal employment; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the National Association of Letter Carriers convey to the leaders of both Houses of the Congress an expression of their deep friendship, respect, confidence and support in this time of tragedy and peril.

Jerome J. Keating, President; Charles N. Coyle, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer; Philip Lepper, Carl J. Saxsenmeier, J. Joseph Vacca, George G. Morrow, Jr., James H. Rademacher, Vice President; George A. Bang, Director Life Insurance; James C. Stocker, Thomas M. Flaherty, Glenn M. Hodges, Dean E. Soverns, Fred Gadotti, J. Stanley Lewis, Secretary-Treasurer; James P. Deely, Director, Health Insurance; Edward F. Benning, William T. Sullivan, Tony R. Huerta, Austin B. Carlson.

Texas Baptist Leader Comments on Death of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, religious tolerance is a cornerstone of the American public. John F. Kennedy was our first Roman Catholic President. It is most fitting that the editorial in the November 29, 1963, issue of the Baptist Standard be given the widest possible publication.

The words of Editor E. S. James are as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S UNTIMELY DEATH

It is now 3 p.m., Friday, November 22. Two hours ago the President of the United States was assassinated on the streets of Dallas, and at this hour Gov. John Connally lies seriously wounded from the same brutal attack. The Baptist Standard joins multiplied millions over the whole earth in grief over the President's untimely death and the terrible manner by which it was effected. Texas citizens can never forget the shame that has been brought to this State and to the city of Dallas by the cowardly assault. It is not yet known who committed the crime, but whoever it was did not represent the level-headed and patriotic citizenship of this State and city.

President Kennedy was not a Baptist, but it is safe to say that southern Baptists have had no better friend in the White House. He defended the principle of religious liberty for which many Baptist forefathers gave their lives. The editor of this magazine probably knew him about as well as any gospel minister in America knew him. We gave it as our opinion last February that he was a man of courage, integrity, and faith in God; and we shall ever remember him as such.

We did not help elect him, and he knew it; but regardless of political differences we came to admire and respect him for standing by his convictions and doing it in the face of the strongest opposition. America has lost a leader whom it will not forget, and the Nation has now reaped the bitter harvest of unbridled political hatred.

The deceased President's faith in God is probably best expressed in a Thanksgiving Day proclamation issued by him November 7.

—E. S. JAMES.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Survey of Berkeley Fair Housing Law Vote Gives Revealing Insight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present concern and impending vote on civil rights legislation, I feel that a recent analysis of the April 2, 1963, vote in the city of Berkeley, Calif., which turned down a fair housing ordinance, is extremely significant. The following summary of the report made by the California Foundation for Social Research affords a brief picture of their findings:

A SUMMARY OF A REPORT PUBLISHED BY THE CALIFORNIA FOUNDATION FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH, ENTITLED "FAIR HOUSING"

The Rumford fair housing bill was passed by the California Legislature last June and immediately became the cause of much heated controversy. The California Real Estate Association has started a major drive to obtain enough signatures to have the issue placed on the ballot as an initiative measure. It is their contention that, if put to a vote, that the electorate will override the legislature and remove the Rumford fair housing law.

A revealing insight into the type of person who is opposed to having a law protecting the rights of minority groups in the purchase or rental of private homes was clearly demonstrated by the results of two public opinion surveys conducted by the California Foundation for Social Research. This foundation, a nonprofit research organization, surveyed the opinions of representative samples of the residents in Berkeley, Calif., just prior to and then again just following the April 2, 1963, local election. That election placed a city fair housing ordinance before the electorate to determine if the residents would accept or reject the ordinance passed by their city council.

It was determined in the preelection study that there were some positive correlations between the respondents who favored the ordinance and their political registration, religious affiliation, ethnic derivation, age and education.

Some 74 percent of the Democrats favored the ordinance while 81 percent of the Republicans were opposed. Among those who favored the ordinance 57 percent had a college degree or postgraduate degree, while only 31 percent of those who were opposed had a comparable education. When the respondent's age was considered it was found that 50 percent of those in favor were under 36 years and that only 15 percent of those opposed were that young, in fact, 53 percent of those opposed were over 55 years of age.

When the figures were broken down by religious affiliation, some very interesting results appeared. The Caucasian Protestant women were only 28 percent in favor, while the Caucasian Protestant men were 38 percent in favor. Among other Caucasians, 32 percent of the Catholics were in favor as compared with 83 percent of those of Jewish faith and 61 percent of those who profess no religious affiliation. An anomaly within the religious breakdown, when subdivided by political registration, was that among Democratic Protestants, 60 percent were in favor, but among Democratic Catholics only 43 percent were in favor. This is the only major cross-tabulation where Democratic registration failed to correlate positively with a favorable opinion on the ordinance.

It was apparent from the results that the opposition to the ordinance was going to come primarily from Caucasian Republicans, older people, those whose education was comparatively limited and from those who were generally members of Catholic or Protestant sects. Conversely, those in favor were Democrats, younger people, persons whose education was generally above average for Berkeley, those who were Jewish or profess no religion and the Negro community.

When election day arrived, over 80 percent of the electorate turned out and barely defeated the ordinance. At the very time the election was being held in Berkeley, Assemblyman Byron Rumford of Oakland was trying to get a statewide fair housing bill through the California Legislature. When the ordinance failed in Berkeley, it became extremely important to determine the factors which caused its failure, hence the California Foundation for Social Research was requested to conduct a second study in Berkeley.

When the results of the postelection survey are analyzed, certain recognizable characteristics become quite evident, characteristics which when viewed in concert, generally typify the person who voted against the ordinance. A number of reasons were given by the respondents for opposing the ordinance. Some of the reasons mentioned were that they did not like being forced to do something, or that it was an interference with their rights, or that it was unconstitutional to make a person sell his home to someone he did not wish to sell to, or that the criminal penalty attached was too harsh, etc. Regardless of these rationalizations, the person who voted against the ordinance did so primarily because he did not want to sell or rent to Negroes.

In order to describe a bigot or a person who tends to discriminate against another because of his race or color, I have listed the following percentages taken from the results of the postelection survey. Following is a statistical portrait of a person who would tend to practice racial discrimination. Of those who voted against the Berkeley fair housing ordinance:

1. Ninety-eight percent were caucasians;
2. Sixty-three percent were females;
3. Fifty-five percent were over 55 years of age;
4. Ninety-two percent were members of the Christian religion, of which 78 percent were Protestants and 14 percent were Catholics;
5. Sixty-nine percent attend their church on a fairly regular basis;
6. Sixty-nine percent were registered Republicans (84 percent of the Republicans opposed);
7. Sixty-nine percent were retired persons or housewives;
8. Sixty percent had educations limited to high school or less or some college experience;
9. Thirty-seven percent owned their homes;
10. Fifty-nine percent had lived in their neighborhood for 20 years or longer; and
11. Their average annual family income was $9,500.

Another question of importance in the postelection survey was how the voters in Berkeley would feel about a statewide fair housing bill. According to the answers given, a State bill would have been more widely accepted than was the local ordinance. Some 44 percent of the respondents favored the local bill, while 52 percent opposed and 4 percent refused to say how they voted. As to a State bill, 47 percent said they would vote for one if placed on the ballot compared with 37 percent opposed and 16 percent undecided. When the undecided respondents are removed the remaining percentages become 56 percent in favor and 44 percent opposed.

If the California Real Estate Association is successful in getting the initiative to repeal the fair housing law on the ballott, it will probably be rejected by the California voters, but if they are successful in killing fair housing in this State there is no doubt that it will open a pandora's box of racial strife.

W. W. BLANCHARD,
Director of Research, California Foundation for Social Research.

President Kennedy: A Memorial Eulogy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have recently received a copy of an address delivered at a community memorial service held in Howard Hall, Frankfort, Ind., on November 25. The citizens of Frankfort, like those in so many communities all over the Nation, gathered on that morning in tribute to the late President Kennedy in order to express in united fashion the grief and mourning which has touched us all.

The address was given by the Reverend Charles W. Ridlen, pastor of Frankfort's East Side Christian Church. It is a thoughtful tribute, full of dignity and beauty appropriate to the occasion, reflecting a spirit worthy of our consideration. I ask unanimous consent to insert this address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY

We come today to honor the memory of our late President, John F. Kennedy. We, the people of the Frankfort community, hereby express our deep regret and sorrow at this hideous crime against freedom and human-

ity. We convey to the Kennedy family our heartfelt sorrow and sympathy.

We have all been shocked and angered by the horror of our President's death, as he was so cruelly cut down by the cowardly assassin's bullets.

President John F. Kennedy has now answed his own fateful challenge as he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what can you do for your country?" In that final and full measure of devotion, he has answered with his all. No man can do more. He has died as he had lived, giving himself completely in devotion to the task he saw before him. In this he has displayed a soul and character of great strength and drive templed in a fragile house of clay. He overcame injury and illness that would have left lesser men whining for pity, but he asked no quarter in the great struggle of life.

He seemed always possessed by the urgency of his mission, as perhaps he sensed his rendezvous with death as in the words of the poet—Alan Seeger:

"I have a rendezvous with Death
At some disputed barricade,
And I to my pledged word am true,
I shall not fail that rendezvous."

He had met head on with courage those forces which he had seen, but this he did not see. He had fought with vigor and stamina to survive against the forces of the sea and jungle, but this he could not fight.

He had guided with skill and determination those events over which he had control, but this course could not be altered.

President Kennedy died as a soldier at his post of duty; his was not a martyr's death but that of a soldier of valor on the battlefield of life. As he fulfilled his duty, he calmly accepted the accompanying risks and dangers. He understood the hazard, yet felt the call of duty even stronger. May our Nation now follow his example in this brave act. May we answer the call of duty for freedom's sake and face the hazards of courageous action.

May I point out to you this morning, by way of contrast, the qualities that make our Nation great. Firstly, in our President we see a man who believed in God. He trusted in Him, he worshipped Him, and sought His divine aid and counsel in life. He lived in obedience to the disciplines of his faith in Almighty God and died in the good graces of his church. His accused assailant believed there was no God. He was a dedicated and avowed Marxist. He trusted only in the theories of men. He worshipped power and power-maddened men. He sought comfort in revolution and death. He lived in disobedience to the laws of Almighty God and died by the gun, as he had lived.

Secondly, our President believed in the worth of a man. He believed that man was created in the image and glory of God. He was sensitive to the needs of men and sought to provide for those needs. He had purpose in his heart to help men in need wherever they were and pursued this to the last moments of his days. He tried to ease the hunger and ignorance of the world. He endeavored to bring about an order in the world wherein men would live without war. In sharp contrast, his accused assassin saw no value in a man. He saw man as a creature for production, as a purely materialistic being without a soul. He was sensitive only to his own needs and desires. He took and did not give. He tried to ease no suffering but has caused great grief and sorrow. This cowardly assassin sought to build the new order on the ashes of dead men and a ruined world.

Thirdly, the contrast is most vivid in the way of action of these men. Our President moved and worked under the law, the law of the land that has stood the test of time. Though he was often peeved and chafed by the slowness of the powers of law, he understood that right could only come by being true to the law of our great Republic. He thus restrained the impatience of youth and waited to accomplish a greater good. The stark terror of the assassin's deed is seen, as he makes himself a law unto himself and snuffs out life without the least regret. This coward was afraid to await the verdict of men and time and so committed such an immense crime against humanity and liberty.

Thus may we learn the bitter lesson of today as to what makes our Nation great: Our faith and trust in Almighty God; the value and worth of a man; a government regulated by law.

Was President Kennedy great? This question we leave to time and history for only they can answer. No man has been called great in his own day, for the test of time must be applied to his ideas and works. Was he great or not, we cannot say today. But this we can say, he was well known to us all. President John F. Kennedy has been in my home many times. I have listened to him with a concerned interest as he spoke his plans and desires for our country. I have had opportunity to argue the point, to disagree with his logic and to oppose the judgments of his position. I feel I have had a part in hammering out the hard problems of state, as the President visited in my home. The electronic marvels of our day have made this possible and have made the President more personal. He was my President; he was my Commander in Chief, as I served in my country's Army. As the President, I loved and respected him as I am sure all of Frankfort did.

We falter for words in this attempt to express our feelings to the family of our fallen hero, President John F. Kennedy. We can only give to you the warm love and comfort of our hearts and pray God's blessing of strength and assurance for you.

May each of us carry with us now the memory of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, as we think of the words of that great hymn, "America the Beautiful."

"O beautiful for heroes proved in liberating strife,
Who more than self their country loved
And mercy more than life.
America! America! May God thy gold refine,
Till all success be nobleness and every gain divine.

"O beautiful for patriot dream that sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam, undimmed by human tears.
America! America! God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea."

We now deeply and solemnly honor the memory of President John F. Kennedy. He gave all that he could give.

Senator Monroney and Oklahoma Congressmen Defend Domestic Cattle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 days, the Oklahoma congressional delegation has gone on record before the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee to protest the damage to the domestic cattle industry resulting from imported beef and beef products.

This morning, before the Tariff Commission, the dean of our delegation, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, presented an excellent statement on the dangers facing our domestic beef producers.

This statement is supported by the entire Oklahoma congressional delegation. I feel that Senator MONRONEY's remarks represent a very thorough study of the present status and the future prospects of the U.S. cattle industry.

The complete text of Senator MONRONEY's remarks follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION DECEMBER 10, 1963, BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, FOR HIMSELF AND THE OKLAHOMA DELEGATION IN CONGRESS, SENATOR J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, CONGRESSMEN CARL ALBERT, PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, JOHN JARMAN, TOM STEED, AND VICTOR WICKERSHAM

The seriousness of the impact of importation of beef and beef products on the domestic cattle business cannot be denied. This can well be pointed up by a committee resolution adopted by the Senate Finance Committee on November 20, 1963, directing the U.S. Tariff Commission to investigate the competition in the United States between beef and beef products produced in the United States and in foreign countries. To my knowledge, the committee has never requested such an investigation except upon obvious occasions of critical and hurtful competition of foreign products upon a domestic industry.

The importance of livestock to the health of agriculture in this country is axiomatic. In 1962, $20 out of every $100 in sales of agricultural production was derived from cattle and calves. Therefore, any action taken or condoned against the cattle business is a shock wave throughout the agricultural economy of the whole Nation.

Illustrating further the importance of the cattle business, live weight sales of beef have grown from 17.5 billion pounds in 1940 to about 38 billion pounds in 1962, an increase in 22 years of more than 217 percent, while 50 percent of the harvested crops is fed to beef cattle and calves and over 1 billion acres of land is used for pasture. Sixty percent of the total farms in the United States have cattle on them.

The tariff on beef and veal was reduced in 1947 from 6 cents to 3 cents a pound.

By the very fact of a stable 3-cent-per-pound tariff, in light of increased prices the tariff has been automatically lowered. For example, in 1947 prices received by farmers for beef cattle were about $15 per hundred weight, in 1962 about $22 per hundred weight. Therefore, the tariff of $3 per hundred weight was 20 percent in 1947 but was only 13.6 percent in 1962. This is not enough to deter imports. Imports have risen steadily from less than 4 percent of production in 1957 to almost 11 percent today in spite of increased per capita domestic consumption of beef and a decided population increase. By comparison, the United States has among the lowest tariffs on beef in the world and among the highest production costs, overlapping about twice world production costs.

By the very nature of the cattle business, it cannot like other industries change locations, build new plants, or reduce overhead. The cost of doing business is steadily going up, prices for finished products are going down, and the tariff squeeze makes it possible for importers to operate at a high profit while the domestic prices are being depressed by $2 to $3 per hundred weight. This is the difference between profit and loss.

We urge adequate tariffs and a reasonable percentage quota be fixed to protect the domestic livestock industry.

It is very surprising to find that the list of products which are to be considered for further tariff reductions includes beef and beef products.

Here is an industry that is so vital to so many families in the United States and one that is so depressed at the present time because of excessive imports that further tariff cuts and further damage to the industry are unthinkable.

It is proposed here to demonstrate that (1) imports are already entering in such quantities as to damage seriously the U.S. cattle industry, and (2) that any further tariff reductions would be disastrous.

One deduction can be made from the facts as they present themselves—namely, that if the present low tariffs are promoting imports at the record rates indicated by the statistics, then further tariff cuts would cause a still greater volume of imports and would permanently damage, if not destroy, the cattle growing and fattening industry of the United States.

The industry objected strenuously to the tariff reductions of the past, indicating that they were ill-timed and too deep. What was forecast then has now transpired. Imports grew and grew until at present the depressed prices for domestic beef can be traced directly to the huge volume coming in from foreign countries.

The tariff on beef is not only very low, it is a specific duty—one that is so much per pound. It is not necessary to explain to the experts that as time passes and the economy grows, the spiral of inflation reduces the protection afforded by a specific rate of duty. When the Tariff Act of 1930 was adopted, the price of beef was very low compared with present prices. As the general price index climbed, the 6-cents-per-pound tariff on beef, fresh chilled, or frozen, gave less and less protection. Without any tariff reductions per se, it could be said that as a result of the increasing prices of beef over the years corresponding to the general growth of all price indexes, the farmer would be getting fractionally less protection than he formerly had. Whereas many ad valorem duties were reduced in trade agreements by 50 percent, or in some instances by more than that, the producers of beef have had a double cut and it has proved to be of very serious dimensions.

The average value of imports of boneless fresh or frozen beef in 1962 was about 31 cents per pound. This is boneless only. As the general price spiral continues, the price of such beef may reach 35 cents and then perhaps 40 cents with, of course, accompanying increases in our costs of producing competitive beef. However, when this occurs, the equivalent ad valorem will have dropped by a proportionate percentage, and this without the help of any additional tariff reductions.

This is mentioned to lend force to the claim that any further concessions on imported meats will but compound what is already a serious situation and one that can only grow steadily worse without any impetus given by added tariff reductions.

Now for a close look at what will happen if the already inadequate tariffs are cut still further. There is not a major cattle producing country in the world that cannot grow cattle much cheaper than it can be done in the United States. This is not to say that U.S. producers are not efficient. U.S. producers are the most efficient cattle growers in the world, but this does not mean that they cannot be undersold by foreign growers.

A day-old calf worth $35 to $50 in the United States would be worth about $5 in Australia or New Zealand. The feed necessary to bring an animal to market condition may run as much as 10 times higher in the United States. The labor necessary in the caring for cattle, bringing them to market, and reducing them to boneless beef would cost perhaps five times as much in the United States. It is not inefficiency in the United States that makes it impossible for U.S. growers to compete. No matter how much costs are cut and prices are held, imports will continue to undersell the U.S. products.

If duties were further reduced, foreign beef producers in a number of countries would take it as a direct invitation to wage war on the American market. Further indications that the U.S. market is to be opened wider and wider will but spur world output of beef until the cattle of Canada, Mexico, Ireland, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand start competing for the U.S. market. No longer will it be competition between foreign and domestic beef. The wide open market will sound the death knell of beef production in the United States. When these foreign herds have grown to the point where they must be sold regardless, then no farmer, no cattle grower in the United States will have a chance.

Judging from the history of the past, and confirmed by the president of the American Hereford Association, for every 1 percent of the U.S. market supplied by imports, domestic producers can count on getting $25 less for a steer and $10 less for a calf.

Now to turn briefly to the growth in imports. The statistics are readily available, and it will not be necessary to dwell upon them. It should be pointed out, however, that the relation of growing imports to declining domestic production and prices is plain and unescapable.

Charts have been prepared to indicate the trend in production and imports. In 1957 when imports began their sharp upward climb, domestic production took an even sharper drop. In 1959 when foreign growers of cattle had oversold and depleted their herds in an endeavor to reap the reward of a lucrative U.S. market, it was necessary to curtail imports somewhat, and the domestic production reacted slightly upward.

Beginning in 1960 as foreign cattle growers increased their herds, domestic production leveled off and imports began another sharp increase. In 1961, 1962, and 1963, sales of domestically grown cattle leveled off and barely held their own, but at a terrific sacrifice. This should be emphasized. Many thousands of farmers in the United States depend on sales of perhaps 2 or 3, perhaps as many as 50 animals each year per farm for the cash necessary to the modern American way of life. When the time comes for the sale, the farmer must sell and accept the price offered. Domestic sales dropped and dropped until they hit bottom—that point at which sales had to be made whether the farmer made money, broke even, or lost money. Most of them have been losing money in the last couple of years. Prices have dropped on choice steers, f.o.b. Chicago, from $28.58 per hundred in 1959, to just over $24 at present; prices on canners and cutters dropped from $16.30 in 1959 to less than $13.50 at present. At the very time when these prices were falling sharply, the general price index was going up. Feed for cattle has a great bearing on whether the farmer gains or loses, and feed has continued to cost more. Gasoline, fencing, fertilizer, materials for barns, seed, labor, and all the other farm essentials, including tractors, planting equipment, and harvesting equipment, cost more each time the farmer makes a purchase. At the very time when the farmer had to take less and less for this cattle, he had to pay more and more for what he bought.

The leveling off of domestic sales as indicated by the chart is the result of thousands of farmers unloading, even at losses which will be reflected in the taxes paid to the Federal Government.

Statistics prove that imports are supplying about 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States. Foreign suppliers are building up their herds in anticipation of a still greater share of the American market. Where will it stop? This is a matter of chief concern at the present time, and it does not seem fitting that this growth should be encouraged and assisted when there is so much surplus of agricultural products in the United States.

According to a table compiled by the Tariff Commission, imports of beef and veal in 1963 in terms of dressed weight equivalent amounted to 1,762 million pounds. It is assumed that before these hearings are over some experts will translate this into the number of acres of feed which have been idled or which have been harvested and put into storage by the Federal Government as absolute surplus. On translating this, consideration must also be given the thousands of our unemployed who might otherwise have found jobs producing and processing this enormous amount of beef. There can be no doubt that many thousands of acres of land are involved and many thousands of workers as well.

This is not a case of shortage in the United States, nor a lack of ability to produce sufficient for our consumption. It is the direct opposite of that. For many years U.S. growers not only supplied this country's wants, but also exported to many countries of the world. It could be granted that limited amounts of imported manufacturing beef, which is used in the many kinds of prepared cooked meats that find important uses in the kitchens of America, might be imported. The farmers of the United States are not complaining about any reasonable amount of imports. However, it is now noted that imports of manufacturing beef amount to about 40 percent of our consumption. This is entirely too much—it is a ruinous amount and is very seriously affecting domestic prices and the whole future of the industry.

The price of canner and cutter cows dropped more than $4 per hundred since 1959, and the price of choice steers dropped about $5 per hundred during the same period. It is no coincidence that this occurred during a sharp upward spiral in imports. The price of choice steers held firm for a while, but in 1963 it could hold no longer and the sharp decline was accentuated by the attempt to hold the line in the face of heavy imports.

There is no question about the desirability of foreign trade. There should be a maximum of beneficial foreign trade, in beef as in a thousand other items. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 does not contain any directive to the Tariff Commission to find the exact point at which the domestic industry would be imperiled by imports resulting from duty reductions. However, it will make reports, and those reports should make it plain that there comes a point when maximum benefits are reached and where damage outweighs the benefits.

The fact that the Tariff Commission has, in the past, kept its reports objective and accurate and has not been prone to let untested theories dilute the facts is appreciated. Here, as in the past, a long and careful look should be given what is already happening in the industries affected by this great influx of beef and beef products and the possible results of further reductions should be weighed carefully. It is felt by many that the costs will be incalculable. If sales of domestic cattle fall off still further, millions of bushels of feed grains will increase the already great surplus. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land may be added to the millions now idle because of surpluses. Farm income will decline below the already shameful low level.

In the final analysis, however, it must be emphasized that the greatest danger in further encouraging foreign cattle growers and

processors to take over the market here is the heavy cost to the farmers and cattle growers of the United States. No matter who benefits, it would be dangerous to the economy of the United States to subject its farmers to a still lower standard of living and greater losses in the sale of their beef and veal. It is hoped that something will be done to improve their lot and to get beef prices back to normal, rather than increase the burden they find so heavy at present.

It is urged that the Tariff Commission, in its report to the President, make clear the balance sheet of gain and loss involved in a consideration of whether to reduce duties further and make an already sorry situation still worse. It is believed that the President, when he sees such a balance sheet, will not allow any further tariff reductions on beef and its products. An adequate tariff and a reasonable percentage quota are thought to provide the only fair and equitable solution to this problem.

Manufacturing beef: U.S. imports, production, and total of imports plus production for use in processed-meat products in the United States, 1954-63

[Quantities reported in million pounds carcass equivalent]

Year	Imports for consumption [1]	Domestic production [2]	Total of imports plus production
1954	48	4,250	4,298
1955	38	4,496	4,534
1956	50	4,450	4,500
1957	166	4,398	4,564
1958	635	3,312	3,947
1959	847	2,825	3,672
1960	582	3,140	3,722

Footnotes at end of table.

Manufacturing beef: U.S. imports, production, and total of imports plus production for use in processed-meat products in the United States, 1954-63—Continued

[Quantities reported in million pounds carcass equivalent]

Year	Imports for consumption [1]	Domestic production [2]	Total of imports plus production
1961 [3]	806	3,100	3,906
1962 [3]	1,246	3,100	4,346
1963 [3 4]	1,223	3,100	4,323

[1] Imports include boneless beef, fresh, chilled, or frozen, pickled and cured beef and veal, and the boneless cured beef imported in the schedule A class 0032 900 (par. 706). The latter was estimated as the increased imports in this class from South American countries in 1957-60 over the 1954-56 average. All imports were converted to carcass equivalent by multiplying the product weight by 1.5.

[2] Unpublished estimates of the U.S. Department of Agriculture on cow and bull beef production.

[3] Preliminary.

[4] 1st 6 months at an annual rate.

Source: Production estimates, compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; imports, compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Imports of live cattle into the United States have steadily declined from 141,898 head in January 1963 to 16,905 head in August 1963. Imports in 1961 were 1,022,799 head; in 1962 there were 1,232,256 head imported, with no month in either of these years as low as either July or August of 1963.

Beef imports (carcass weights equivalent) were 175.5 million pounds in August, as compared to 172 million pounds in the same month of last year.

The following table compares U.S. meat (beef) production with imports:

U.S. imports of cattle and beef, compared with U.S. production, by year, 1954-62

CATTLE AND CALVES AND BEEF AND VEAL

	Imports				U.S. meat production [3]	Imports as percentage of production	Per capita supply of beef and veal [4]
	Live animals		Meat	Total [2]			
	Number	Meat equivalent [1]					
	Thousand head	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Percent*	
1954	71	35	232	267	14,610	1.8	91.3
1955	296	93	229	322	15,147	2.1	93.2
1956	141	43	211	254	16,094	1.6	96.8
1957	703	221	395	616	15,728	3.9	95.0
1958	1,125	340	909	1,249	14,516	8.6	90.1
1959	688	191	1,063	1,254	14,588	8.6	89.1
1960	645	163	775	938	15,835	5.9	92.8
1961	1,023	250	1,037	1,287	16,341	7.9	96.0
1962	1,232	280	1,445	1,725	16,311	10.6	96.7
January-August:							
1962	583	132	893	1,025	10,895	9.4	----------
1963	555	118	1,086	1,204	11,386	10.6	----------

[1] Estimated at 58 percent of the live weight of all dutiable imports of cattle.
[2] Canned and other processed meats have been converted to their carcass weight equivalent.
[3] Total production (including an estimate of farm slaughter).
[4] Commercial beef and veal production plus beef and veal imports per capita.

Exports of live cattle have materially declined from 43,945 head in the peak year of 1957 to 19,312 head in 1962.

Exports of processed beef and veal are as follows:

Year:	*Million pounds*
1950	16.5
1951	11.6
1952	14.7
1953	38.7
1954	33.8
1955	40.7
1956	89.3
1957	88.6
1958	33.6
1959	37.3
1960	41.7
1961	43.2
1962	40.9

Production and consumption of beef in the United States have shown a steady increase in both total amount and per capita consumption.

Beef

Year	Production	Consumption	
		Total	Per capita
	Million	*Million*	*Pounds*
1940	7,175	7,257	54.9
1941	8,082	8,021	60.9
1942	8,843	8,049	61.2
1943	8,571	6,860	53.3
1944	9,112	7,146	55.6
1945	10,276	7,665	59.4
1946	9,373	8,533	61.6
1947	10,432	9,916	69.6
1948	9,075	9,163	63.1
1949	9,439	9,439	63.9

Beef—Continued

Year	Production	Consumption	
		Total	Per capita
	Million	*Million*	*Pounds*
1950	9,534	9,529	63.4
1951	8,837	8,472	56.1
1952	9,650	9,548	62.2
1953	12,407	12,113	77.6
1954	12,963	12,743	80.1
1955	13,569	13,313	82.0
1956	14,462	14,121	85.4
1957	14,202	14,242	84.6
1958	13,330	13,786	80.5
1959	13,580	14,202	81.4
1960	14,727	15,121	85.2
1961	15,296	15,871	88.0
1962	15,296	16,303	89.1

The Monroe Doctrine: Great Factor in World Peace After 140 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bronis S. Kaslas, associate professor of international law at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., has written a series of articles on the Monroe Doctrine which has appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News. Today I would like to submit for the RECORD the first in a four-part series in which Dr. Kaslas has made a significant historic contribution.

The article follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—GREAT FACTOR IN WORLD PEACE AFTER 140 YEARS

(NOTE.—This is the first of a series of four articles on the Monroe Doctrine by Dr. Bronis S. Kaslas, associate professor of international law at Wilkes College, written for the Times-Leader The Evening News.

(An authority on international law, Dr. Kaslas is a native of Lithuania and a graduate of the Kaunas University, Lithuania, where he received the degree of bachelor of law and of Strasbourg University, France, where he received his doctorate in philosophy. Dr. Kaslas, who came to America in 1946 and became a citizen in 1951, taught at the University of Detroit before coming to Wilkes-Barre. He will receive the Monroe Doctrine Citation from the State Department of the American Legion at a ceremony at Joseph E. Conlon Post at Plains in connection with the observance of the 140th anniversary of the Monroe Doctrine.)

In examining the manner in which the United States carries out the political scheme which it designed to check penetration of foreign powers into the Western Hemisphere, we intend to determine the precise character of acts by foreign powers which the Monroe Doctrine prohibits, to set forth the grounds which justify interference by the United States in other parts of the Americas, and the methods by which the prohibitions of the doctrine have been executed.

It is not our purpose to present any discussion of differences in interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine or of its applicability to the case of Cuba. Justification for the recent American "quarantine" against that country will rather follow naturally from the conclusions drawn by the readers of this article.

The purpose of the article is to set forth the magnitude of the problem in the light of the conditions and circumstances of the time

and in the light of the international law on which the doctrine rests.

The possibility of transfer of colonial possessions in the Americas from one European power to another has been a cause of special anxiety to the leaders of the United States. From the very beginning, this anxiety was based on the deep desire of the United States to end European colonial rule in the Western Hemisphere and thus to assure that this country would in the future not have to become involved in any form of "European power politics," if transferred to this hemisphere, would endanger U.S. security and would involve her in wars for the defense of vital interests.

SELF DEFENSE

Thus, long before President Monroe issued his famous message on December 9, 1823, American statesmen had often declared that the United States could not, for reasons of self defense, look with indifference upon certain actions of European states affecting the American continents.

As early as 1808, President Jefferson expressed interest in the prevailing unrest in Latin America, welcomed efforts for independence there and voiced the opinion that the most desirable solution for Latin America would be the exclusion of all European influence from the Western Hemisphere.

We can easily see that President Jefferson was even then thinking in terms essentially similar to those of the later Monroe Doctrine. In subsequent years, Presidents Madison and Monroe believed that the greatest danger to the cause of the Latin American rebels was that European monarchies might help Spain reconquer her colonies.

Such European intervention would have been consistent with one of the basic principles of the Holy Alliance, the principle of legitimacy, by which the European powers would justify intervention. The principle of legitimacy meant that the only legitimate governments would be the autocratic monarchies. According to this principle, other forms of government must be suppressed.

By the end of 1821, Buenos Aires, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Chile, and Mexico declared themselves free and independent. On March 2, 1882, President Monroe sent a message to Congress expressing the opinion that the Latin American states were entitled to recognition and asking for the necessary appropriations. Congress consented to this request unanimously.

The powers of the Holy Alliance did not intend to recognize the new Latin American states, considering that these colonies had violated the principle of legitimacy. The fact that the form of government of most of the new states was that of a popular republic was most distasteful to all the great European powers. They had mutually agreed and pledged to suppress any popular revolution and not to tolerate creation of republican governments.

One most striking and remarkable aspect of this policy is that then, as today, the leader in the suppression of popular movements for freedom was Russia. Tsar Alexander I was, in fact, the inspirer and organizer of the Holy Alliance, which became the mechanism for intervention and for suppression of European independence movements.

The periodic congresses became an executive organ of the Holy Alliance, which made decisions and sent armies to wage wars of intervention in foreign countries wherever a movement for freedom arose. At the Congress of Troppau in 1821, the three autocracies, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, accordingly decided to uphold the principle that all popular revolutions for freedom were dangerous to the status quo and must be suppressed.

CHALLENGE TO UNITED STATES

To implement this decision, that same year, Austrian troops marched into Italy and restored local rulers to their former absolute authority. In 1822, the congress at Verona decided to suppress the liberal movement in Spain, and French troops, therefore, marched into Spain and reestablished the tyranny of Ferdinand VII. Ferdinand then appealed to the Holy Alliance for help in regaining his lost domain in Latin America.

At this moment, a grave question arose for the United States. Should this country, itself born of a popular revolution against European tyranny, stand quietly by and watch the newly gained freedom of American sister states be destroyed by European autocracies, see European foreign systems extend their military political power into the Western Hemisphere and eventually threaten the safety and security of the United States, or should the United States intervene to prevent such eventualities?

California Alliance for Progress Partner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have demanded a new face on our foreign aid program as was evidenced by the recent aid authorization debates.

Now is not the time for partisanship in international relations. None of us should be complacent that American revitalized dollar diplomacy will have instantaneous worldwide acceptance unless we continue to strive to make aid effective in reaching people and substantially changing standards of living.

A monumental action was taken in this area last Friday when a tripartite agreement was executed between AID, the Republic of Chile and the State of California.

As was evidenced by the statement of Gov. Pat Brown, Preston Silbaugh, and Earl Warren, Jr., plain Californians do care about the welfare of their Latin brothers. California will cooperate in a massive effort of people-to-people stimulating cultural, educational and technical exchange of advisers, students and tourists in an attempt to bring California greatness south of the Equator. The students of the University of California at Davis in my Fouth Congressional District are already engaged in this exchange.

At the State Department Friday, Congressmen HAROLD JOHNSON and HARLAN HAGEN attended with myself as California became a new partner to the Alliance for Progress. The press announcement and the statements of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Ambassador Gutierrez-Olivos follows:

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON PREPARED FOR CEREMONIES MARKING THE SIGNING OF ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND REPUBLIC OF CHILE

I have asked the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, to convey this personal message of greetings to those, both here and in California, who are participating in today's transcontinental signing ceremony:

"Last February, President Kennedy and Governor Brown inaugurated a new dimension in the Alliance for Progress: the enlistment of the resources of one of our great States—California—in the effort to speed the development of one of our alliance partners—the Republic of Chile.

"Since then, dedicated and imaginative men from the State of California, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, have worked with our Chilean friends to convert that plan into a concrete program. They have succeeded. The documents signed today open the way for Chile to tap the superb resources of men and experience which California's private and public institutions have in such abundance. And California will be enriched by the experience. For it will be working with a country, as we saw recently in the Image of Chile series, with a great cultural and intellectual heritage.

"President Kennedy called this California-Chile plan a pioneering effort under the Alliance. I certainly agree. It is the first attempt to bring the full range of resources of one of our States to bear on the development problems of another nation. It is also a new initiative to bring the Alliance closer to our peoples. For under it, individuals and institutions within our two countries can now develop their own close patterns of cooperation under the Alliance.

"Last week, in addressing the distinguished Latin American delegates and ambassadors who had come to Washington to pay their last respects to our late President, I reaffirmed this Nation's continuing commitment to the goals of the Alliance for Progress, and called upon all our peoples to make this Alliance a living memorial to John F. Kennedy.

"Thanks to the leadership of Governor Brown, and the fine cooperation between his representatives, the Republic of Chile and our AID mission in Santiago, we are today taking this significant step to make good on this pledge.

"In asking the Administrator of the AID Agency, Mr. David Bell, to execute these documents, I want to express my sincere support and best wishes for the success of the program. I also ask Ambassador Gutierrez, who has done so much to help us understand and appreciate the country he represents, to convey to the Government and the people of Chile my assurance of our continued cooperation with them in the pursuit of the high objectives which Chile has set for itself under te Alliance for Progress."

JOINT CEREMONIES MARK CALIFORNIA AID TO CHILE

California today became an active partner of Chile in furthering the Latin American country's economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress.

In simultaneous ceremonies at the State Capitol in Sacramento, and at the State Department in Washington, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Chilean Ambassador Sergio Gutierrez-Olivos, and Administrator of the Agency for International Development David Bell signed documents to inaugurate the Chile-California program of technical cooperation in the fields of economic planning, agriculture, education, transportation, and water resources development. U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress Teodoro Moscoso joined in the Washington ceremony.

Early this year, the late President Kennedy and President Jorge Alessandri of Chile requested that the idea of a Chile-California association be explored.

California responded quickly and in a joint announcement at the White House on February 12, 1963, President Kennedy and Governor Brown declared, "This is the first time a State has been called upon to investigate the extent to which all of its resources can be brought to bear on the development of another country."

Strikingo similarities between the South American Republic and the Golden State are expected to make California's development experience useful to Chile.

Their first European settlements were of Spanish origin. Both areas have long Pacific coast shorelines—2,900 miles for Chile and 1,200 miles for California. Both produce grapes for wine, besides cattle, fruit, wheat, and alfalfa. And both have large mineral deposits as well as extensive desert, forest, and mountain regions.

The acquaintance of Chile and California started more than a century ago. About 40,000 Chileans joined the gold rush to California in 1848 and 1849. Some struck gold. But a more meaningful association came during the San Francisco fire and earthquake of 1906. At that time, Chile sent immediate aid to California. Fifty-four years later, in 1960, when an earthquake devastated parts of Chile, California sent relief supplies to her southern neighbor.

California has adopted a community called "California" in Chile, where the State's Bear Flag flies over the village plaza—7,729 miles south of Sacramento.

During the spring and summer months of this year two groups of Californians made preliminary survey trips to Chile. They conferred with Government officials and with the AID Mission in Santiago. On the basis of these discussions it was decided to focus California's technical resources in the areas of economic planning, agriculture, education, transportation, and water resources development.

A field office has been opened in Sacramento and an headquarters office will open early next year in Santiago, Chile. Governor Brown has appointed Preston N. Silbaugh, administrator of the business and commerce agency of the State and a member of the Governor's Cabinet, as Director of the Chile-California program.

Mr. Silbaugh has named Earl Warren, Jr., as the deputy in charge of the Sacramento field office.

The program initiated today will be a key part of the substantial U.S. contribution to Chile's 10-year economic development plan and is expected to create long-term relationships between public and private institutions in Chile and California.

A nonprofit organization, the California-Chile Fund, is being established to encourage private support and participation in the program as a supplement to AID's contribution.

STATEMENT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY AMBASSADOR SERGIO GUTIERREZ-OLIVOS, OF CHILE, AT THE SIGNING OF THE CHILE-CALIFORNIA PROGRAM, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1963

This ceremony, that so eloquently symbolizes and confirms the mutual affection and esteem that bind California and Chile, has an added significance for us today. It is a tribute and memorial to the wisdom and farsightedness of your great leader—I should say of our own great leader as well, for Latin America looked on him as such—the late President John F. Kennedy. Without his profound and intuitive understanding of Latin America and its needs, without his energetic determination, this ceremony might not have taken place in our lifetime.

President Kennedy possessed a rare appreciation of the important role of Latin America in the destiny of the free world at large, and of the United States in particular. He had the broad vision and imagination to discern the road to be traveled if we were to conquer hunger, illiteracy and the economic and social ills that impede progress toward the life of dignity, hope and fullness that should be the birthright of every human born into this world.

He was a leader who sought the most direct route in all that pertained to reaching this goal. I recall a courtesy visit I made to the Department of State shortly after my arrival in Washington, and before I had presented my credentials as Ambassador. There I was introduced to a group of Californian businessmen and specialists who were meeting with officials to discuss the type of program we have undertaken today. Later, when President Kennedy and Governor Brown were about to announce the program, the President paid me the great honor of inviting me to join him and the Governor in the proceedings. He spoke, the Governor spoke, both looked at me, and I spoke. It did not matter to the President that I had not yet presented my credentials. He was determined to get the ball rolling in the most expeditious manner, and that was all that mattered.

Some 10 years ago, President Johnson gathered the representatives of the Latin American republics at the White House and told us of his intention to carry on undiminished the noble enterprise begun by his illustrious predecessor. He made clear to us his own deep and heartfelt concern for the prosperity and stability of the nations to the south and the well-being of their peoples. His words, and the warmth and sincerity with which he spoke them, gave us great comfort and reassurance.

The ceremony in which we have just participated is the harbringer of a new and vital era in California-Chilean relations, but above all it is the renewed confirmation of a cooperation, born of mutual esteem and affection and a myriad similarities, that has joined us for many years in a summer uniquely intimate and complete.

Cooperation between this beautiful land of yours and my own no less beautiful land—how could it be any less beautiful when it so amazingly resembles yours? is by no means new. It has been almost an instinctive part of us for a century and more. California has left many an indelible imprint on Chile, and the signs of our presence are abundant among you.

Thirty thousand Chileans—a 50th, no less, of our population of the time—surged into California in 1848 to reach for the fabled riches of your Gold Rush. As in the case of most, their dreams of wealth dissolved into disappointment, but unlike many, they found other riches in this land so like their own, the spiritual riches and satisfactions of helping to build a new, dynamic and intimitable society in this world of promise and fulfillment that is California.

Many thousands of these Chileans remained in California to cast their roots into its fertile soil and become an inseparable part of its destiny. They built communities, and in the manner of exiles the world over, gave them names that evoked and perpetuated cherished memories of the homeland: Chilecito—"Little Chile"—Buenaventura Sanchez, J. M. Ramirez. They built streets and avenues, and called them Matte, Bulnes, Ossa, Alessandri, Valparaiso—names that vibrate in the history of Chile. They built Sacremento's first hospital and they published California's first periodical.

They are still with you and shall always be with you I hope, and among the many good Californians who proudly bear the name of Gutierrez, I am sure—with all due apologies to Sir William Gilbert—that I number cousins by the dozens, even as do so many of my countrymen.

When California was visited by catastrophe in 1906, it was to be expected that Chile should stand well in the vanguard of those who bore aid and succor to your afflicted citizens. In a like manner, when Chile was scourged by earthquakes in 1960, it was no more than natural that California should lead in extending the fraternal hand that helped raise us from disaster.

One could continue indefinitely in this vein, for the many-faceted cooperation that so spontaneously unites us provides a wealth of example from which to draw. Let it suffice to say that rarely, if ever, has such an affinity and sympathy existed between any two peoples as exists between Californians and Chileans.

We may confidently await great things from this compact into which we have entered today. It opens to us the wise counsel and technical advice of those who have given California its truly remarkable growth and made it a byword for initiative and progress the world over. Because it is the first of its kind, it can serve as an incentive and guide to other countries and other States of this great Union in drawing closer the ties of understanding and assistance that are among the firmest guarantees of peace and progress.

To help perpetuate the sympathy and understanding that for so long has joined us to California, we are arranging for an exhibition of Chilean contemporary art and of photographs depicting the land and people and life of Chile at the University of California in February.

To bring this compact and others like it to full fruition calls for a realistic and objective appraisal of the Alliance for Progress, of its intent and accomplishments and present development, so that we may pragmatically assess and adapt to our needs the advantages and obstacles which it presents.

We are in the third year of that decade that President Kennedy hoped would become for our hemisphere "a tribute to the power of the creative energies of free men and women, an example to all the world that liberty and progress walk hand in hand." The instrument of that evolution was to be the Alliance for Progress, and in this third year of its existence its impetus fluctuates and it becomes the target of often unjust criticism and unfounded doubt.

This is a far cry from the hope and even illusion that greeted the birth of the Alliance 3 short years ago. We overreacted then in our optimism, just as today we too often tend to overreact in our pessimism and doubt.

It is just as unrealistic to shroud the future of the Alliance in gloom as it is to chant of success. Like any work of man, the Alliance has defects and limitations, but for all that it already has given us many heartening and even impressive accomplishments. These accomplishments are the product of faith, imagination, and drive such as have produced our Chile-California program. The defects will be corrected and we already are correcting them, as has been demonstrated by the recent meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at São Paulo, where action was taken to guarantee the greater effectiveness of the Alliance and broader participation by Latin America in its basic decisions.

My good friends, the Alliance needs us and our support, if for no other reason than that the alternatives point to our common destruction. Let us see in this ceremony in which we have participated today something of the true promise of the Alliance. Let us realistically acknowledge that, while time is of the essence in forging our salvation, time must inevitably pass before we are safe on the way to that salvation.

Whether that time is shortened or not will depend on our common faith in the Alliance and our will to give it of our best. Let us show that faith, just as we show faith in our action of today, an association between California and Chile that is but a part of our larger Alliance.

A Tribute From a Man Who Loved His President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a resident of the district I have the honor to represent, George (Farmer) Schaeffer, of Box 418, Canyon, Tex., was one of the Texas Panhandle's stanchest admirers of the late President John F. Kennedy. Mr. Schaeffer, a lifelong student of history and current affairs, is as truly a patriotic American as I have ever known. His own deep sense of obligation to his country was reflected by his enlistment, at an advanced age, in the U.S. Army for service in France as an infantryman in World War I, and as a private soldier again in World War II, after recruiting officers chose to overlook the fact that he was well past 50 years of age.

Mr. Schaeffer shared with President Kennedy a love of his Nation's history and of literature, and the tragic death of the President inspired the following sorrowing lines from Mr. Schaeffer's pen.

I submit them for inclusion in the RECORD as the heartfelt expression of grief from a private citizen who loved his President:

A shot rang out one sunny day,
  A nation plunged in grief,
Those silent throngs have gathered round,
  In shocking disbelief,
But yes, 'Tis true, alas, too true,
  Too late to call him back,
A grieving wife his only shield,
  From murderous attack.

A sober thought across the land,
  Our conscience now divulged,
A tragic sequence to the thoughts,
  We have so long indulged,
The fruits of hate, we now have plucked,
  And bitter though they be,
We must thereof, eat to the full,
  In sad humility.

His rendevous with destiny,
  Although it was so brief,
The ship of State, in troubled waters,
  He guided by the reef,
His love of country knew no bounds,
  His works, They did suffice,
And for that love and loyalty,
  He paid the highest price.

The world has lost a giant, great,
  Who battled for the right,
This erring world pays tribute to,
  A brave man and his might,
The colored man has lost a friend,
  The poor an advocate,
We all have lost a captain bold,
  To guide the Ship of State.

Down Pennsylvania Avenue,
  The cortege wends its way,
Past weeping throngs of citizens,
  With silent lips that pray.
With measured tread the caisson rolls,
  The Stars and Stripes his shroud,
The flags are flying at half mast,
  The cannon boom so loud.

With muffled drum and sound of taps,
  In sorrow laid to rest,
We wonder why it had to be,
  God does things for the best.
In mystic ways He sometimes moves,
  His wonders to perform,
The foulest air is somehow cleansed,
  In wake of brutal storm.

Wistful children, so woebegone,
  A widow numbed with grief,
'Tis only through the grace of God
  That they have found relief.
The widow now, walks not alone,
  For God walks by her side,
Her children walk, also with her
  In understanding pride.

The lighted torch he carried high,
  Its flame will never dim,
Eternal flame of liberty
  For it was lit by him.
Ever onward this vision goes
  To far ends of the world,
To light the hopes of mortal man
  This challenge by him hurled.

Safe at last across the river,
  Beyond the pale of sorrow,
He left his stamp upon the world,
  Left a bright tomorrow;
We thank the Lord that we have had,
  Him with us for a while,
His steady hand upon the helm,
  His ready willing smile.

We know he had not lived in vain,
  For he accomplished much,
We hope he has not died in vain,
  He left that human touch;
A noble warrior for the right,
  He shirked not from the fray,
We have a duty to the dead,
  Let's start on it today.

All that is left are memories,
  Wrote with a golden pen,
Memories that will ever live,
  Live in the hearts of men;
Farewell, farewell John Kennedy,
  But no, 'tis not farewell,
Just au revoir, our gallant chief,
  He whom we loved so well.

—FARMER SCHAFFER.

Hon. Leon H. Gavin

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 19, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my profound sorrow over the loss of our good friend and your colleague of many years, LEON H. GAVIN, the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation.

LEON, a man of strong convictions and sincerity of purpose, served his district, his State, and his Nation faithfully and well.

Throughout the years he was truly a servant of the people in the Congress and he worked hard for the interests of the people who placed their faith and confidence in him by returning him to Congress so many times.

LEON was an outstanding American, devoted to his country, and he was continually in the forefront in the fight to preserve our wonderful form of Government.

His work in the field of conservation, for the armed services and national defense, for veterans, and in many other areas, will not soon be forgotten. He left the imprint of his interests and efforts upon so many of us.

I know LEON will be sorely missed by all of us and I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family.

NASA's Electronics Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the December 6 issue of the Indianapolis News.

I agree with the editor's statment that the national interest would be served by the location of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's projected electronics research center in the Midwest.

The potential of the Midwest has been neglected. Both Purdue University and the University of Notre Dame have made strong cases for such a center in the Midwest.

I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

WE'RE ENTITLED TO THIS

The national interest, as well as the furtherance of Indiana's economic well-being, would be served by the location in this State of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's projected electronics research center.

NASA officials who will pick the site should be impressed by the logic of the arguments presented to them by Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University, supported by a bipartisan lineup of Hoosier Congressmen.

The University of Notre Dame, which also should be seriously considered as a location for the national research center, likewise offers outstanding advantages.

The Midwest area, including Indiana, has been bypassed with respect to major installations of this kind, which in the main have gone to locations on the east and west coasts. There is no logical reason for this, because Indiana can offer transportation advantages, availability of trained young scientists, a favorable labor climate, coordination with established private industry, good living conditions and ample space for expansion.

Purdue and Notre Dame provide outstanding examples of what should be a top-priority site for installation of the $50 million facility proposed by NASA. Purdue has trained and is training more astronauts than any school in the country. Scientists educated in this State now have to go elsewhere to make their services count. That need not be, if the Government sees to it that Indiana gets its deserved share in the Nation's space future.

In addition to scientific brains, either Notre Dame or Purdue could supply the

technical hands required by a highly specialized research center. And the universities are strategically situated close to the biggest Midwestern industrial and business complexes.

Indiana is a natural for the NASA research facility, and the site-choosing officials should be thoroughly acquainted with that fact.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, among the many houses of worship which grace the Ninth District of Illinois, that I am fortunate to represent, is Temple Ezra located at Hollywood and Winthrop Avenues on Chicago's great and beautiful North Side.

The year 1939 saw such a planned and concerted attack upon the Jews in Nazi Germany as to have left the civilized world gasping and incredulous. The placing of the torch of hate to thousands of synagogues was the signal for those fortunate enough to escape to such protective shores as the United States of America.

It was in Chicago in that year that some former members of the burned houses of worship gathered together and formed Temple Ezra and built a living monument as a continued reminder of the common past.

For 25 years Temple Ezra has prospered, and on November 1, I was proud to have been invited as a guest to the rededication service addressed by its president, Mr. Herbert Prauer, its rabbi, Ira Sud, and possibly one of the foremost Jewish religious speakers of the Germanic period prior to 1939, Dr. Manfred E. Swarsensky, now rabbi of Temple Beth El, Madison, Wis.

Appropriately the three speakers spoke respectively on the subjects of "Lest We Forget," "But Joy Cometh in the Morning," and "To Remember Is To Live."

I believe that the membership of this Congress and the readers of its RECORD should have an opportunity to share this moving experience, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

"BUT JOY COMETH IN THE MORNING"—REDEDICATION SERMON ON THE OCCASION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF TEMPLE EZRA

(By Rabbi Ira Sud, spiritual leader of Temple Ezra, Chicago, Ill.)

My brethren of the clergy, Dr. Bradley, Hon. Congressman FINNEGAN, dignitaries, members of our congregation: our tradition quotes the 30th psalm of King David on the occasion of the dedication of a temple. As we rededicate this, our cherished house of worship, I quote from this psalm: "But joy cometh in the morning."

It was the morning of our youth, young men and women of the remnant saved 25 years ago, who first got together as a Jewish youth center in order to preserve their minds in a healthy body. In the course of time, all age levels were drawn together. Technically, the congregation as such and Temple Ezra developed later. However, as a tribute to our "joy that came with the morning," we go back 25 years, when the dawn of a new era, on American soil, gave the promise of a great future.

Temple Ezra has a mission. It is a monument to the past, a tribute to the present, and a promise for the future.

My dear friends—this night is so different from all other nights. It embodies the full cycle of our holy days. We built this temple because we are free. This reminds us of Passover, the festival of freedom. The Founding Fathers of our beloved America knew well the meaning of the festival of freedom.

We built this temple because we believe in the Torah of Moses. This reminds us of the festival of the giving of the Torah.

We worshiped in humble quarters prior to the acquisition of this edifice, a former Greek Orthodox Church whose Father Demetrios Koursaris is present today. This reminds us of the festival of booths, when we offer prayers in a flimsy hut. Tomorrow, we shall read from the Torah the portion relating to the struggle of Abraham in search of the understanding of God and the story of the intended sacrifice of Isaac. This very same portion is traditionally read on New Year's day, when we worship in the People's Church of our good friend, Dr. Preston Bradley, due to lack of space right here.

Tonight we remember all our loved ones who fell victims to the world's greatest holocaust, as we remember them on our Day of Atonement. Tonight we rededicate our temple, 25 years after the infamous Crystal Night, when hundreds of our houses of worship abroad went up in flames. This reminds us of the rededication of the temple in Jerusalem, by the valient Maccabees, and of Hanukah. Finally, our heart is filled with joy, as it is on Purim, when the celebrated Queen Esther led her people prayerfully, to victory.

Our 25 years are a short span of time, if compared with the 50 years of the United Synagogue of America, or the 120 years of the oldest Jewish service organization, B'nai B'rith. This span of time is even shorter if measured against the over 2,000 years of the unbroken existence of the institution of the synagogue, mother of all monotheistic houses of prayer.

My friends, this tree, Temple Ezra, will grow with joy that cometh tomorrow; its branches will spread on the free soil of this great Republic of ours, under God. Amen.

"LEST WE FORGET"—PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS FOR REDEDICATION SERVICE, NOVEMBER 1, 1963

Reverend Clergy, honored guests, members and friends of Temple Ezra; tonight I stand before you not only as president of Temple Ezra, but also as a spokesman for the hundreds of men, women, and children who during the past 25 years have been affiliated with our congregation. My voice tonight is the voice of the presidents before me who have guided our temple to its present eight. It is the voice of the presidents of our auxiliaries, and of all the board members who throughout all these years have toiled and labored to help our congregation grow. It is the voice of our wonderful membership; generous, charitable and, unlike many other religious groups, most faithful and loyal. It is the voice of our religious leaders, and it is the voice of those foresighted and courageous men and women who in true and divine Jewish tradition conceived and founded this congregation: A community such as the prophet of the exile saw in his vision:

"And marked will be their seed among the nations and their offspring among the peoples. Everyone that will see them will point to them as a community blessed by the Lord."

Yes, blessed by the Lord, because our temple was dedicated in memory of our loved ones who sacrificed their lives for the sanctification of God's name, as is engraved in a bronze tablet over our entrance hall. Tonight we commemorate the founding of this temple 25 years ago, and we do it with all our religious fervor and idealism. Unlike most other congregations which are being formed and built for reasons of geographical convenience and new residential developments, Temple Ezra was found with only one deep religious, holy purpose in mind: To build a living memorial to the 6 million Jewish martyrs who lost their lives in that greatest holocaust of human history.

This commemoration of Temple Ezra's founding is a great historic event, and I know that you sense the awe-inspiring greatness and serenity of this Shabbat eve. When the history of our days will be written, it will be recorded that the remnants of a once great and proud Jewish community of Central Europe fulfilled their obligation to perpetuate a precious heritage and to salvage the scattered remains of a once glorious Jewish culture from all parts of Europe. It will be recorded that new temples were built to replace what had been ruthlessly destroyed; houses of worship where the bewildered and penniless newcomers could pray, and establish a living contact with God, between their concern and His will, between despair and promise. Only those aware of their past can work for the future, for the future of their children, for the future of Judaism and for the future of the country in which we live. Those who are trying to deny their origin, or think that they can live a full spiritual life without affiliation to a religious organization, are building their lives on quicksand and are bound to lose their identity in the melting pot of history.

Words of the Prophet Isaiah (ch. 51: 1) still remind people of all lands never to forget or deny their origin, but to "Look unto the rock, whence ye were hewn, and the hole of the pit, whence ye were digged."

In this solemn hour, we reverently recall those members of our temple family, who did not live to see this great day of honor for our temple and for its members and why by their devotion, loyalty, and hard work demonstrated the very finest in Jewish tradition: eternal optimism, eternal vision, eternal faith.

In this solemn hour, we thank God for having guided our temple and its members to this day of rededication; we are deeply grateful that the sapling that was planted 25 years ago, took roots and today is a strong tree of life, that can withstand the most violent storms. And as a tree draws its nourishment through its roots from the soil on which it stands, so does our temple draw new members from the neighborhood, and we are proud that many American-born families have joined our congregation and are sending their children to our religious school. As a synagogue in the great city of Chicago we are constantly striving to make our contributions to the development of religious and civic projects; we have become part of United Synagogue of America, are members of the Edgewater Community Council. Our participation in Jewish Philanthropic Fund drives is noteworthy, and brotherhood for us is not just a beautiful word but a practical experience. The presence of the neighborhood clergy and distinguished representatives of public life tonight and on previous occasions is the finest testimony to this excellent relationship.

As Jews, in the service of our religion and with our ideals in mind, we still have a tremendous mission to perform. Before us, a great book of human and Jewish destiny stands open. In it is mirrored the experience and the suffering during thousands of years, through many civilizations, and we ourselves, through our own exodus and our own sufferings, have added another chapter to this great book. If only our generation

and its successors can become fully cognizant of our heritage like the founders of this, our Temple Ezra, were, we will not only make certain of our people's eternal survival but will also significantly help in charting mankind's path toward its ultimate, let us say, messianic, goals. Then and only then will it not be necessary any more to dedicate temples to the memory of Jewish martyrs of present day history. Then, and only then, will the words of our Torah become reality: "The Lord shall be King over all the earth. On that day, the Lord shall be One and His Name One."

TO REMEMBER IS TO LIVE

I deeply appreciate your kind invitation to share this anniversary service with you. It has been my privilege to have known Temple Ezra almost from its very beginning when it was still the Northside Jewish Center. I have always appreciated the many occasions to visit this congregation. The tradition which you have endeavored to preserve has been part of my own life. The human and spiritual roots reach back to my own past.

At this service tonight at which we commemorate the 25th anniversary of Temple Ezra, I recall in reverence my colleagues who served this congregation with distinction. I remember in affection the men and women who built this temple from humble beginnings, giving to it a full measure of their devotion and loyalty. Before our mind's eye appears the image of beloved souls who, in the course of this quarter of a century, have gone from our midst to their eternal reward. Indeed, for all of us this anniversary service is a service of remembrance.

Martin Buber has characterized Jews as "Erinnerungs-Gemeinschaft," a community bound together by common memories. "Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations, ask thy father and he will tell thee, thine elders and they will declare unto thee." These words of Moses, our teacher, are spoken to us too.

To remember is not peculiar to old age. To remember is the essence of life at all stages. To remember is to live.

The sense of historic continuity distinguishes man from the animal. The animal exists in the today; man has his being in the threefold time dimension of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. He alone can experience the push of the past, the life of the present, and the pull of the future. There are but two types of people who desire to expunge the record of the past—the criminal and the plebeian. The man of true human nobility is neither overawed by the past nor haunted by it. He knows that the past is never dead but lives. The past lives in him. Woven into the fabric of a historic continuum, his life possesses an inexhaustible fountain of inner strength and dignity. His days on earth will not be totally without direction for the future.

The Jew in particular is bound to the past as if with a mystic tie. He who has seen empires rise and fall has always lived more in time than in space. This is the reason why he has often been pronounced dead. Among those who issued death certificates have been dictators and theologians, statisticians and historians, men of little faith in the reality of the invisible, and of no faith at all. Yet, the "Eternal Protestant," as the Jew has been called, has defied all theories. Out of the night of death and destruction he has risen again and again to proclaim to the world: "I shall not die but live and declare the works of the Lord."

Into this service of remembrance are crowded sentiments of memory and sentiments of hope, sentiments of tragedy and of triumph.

Leopold Zunz, the Jewish historiographer of the last century, once wrote: "If there are ranks in suffering, Israel takes precedence over all others. If the duration of sorrows and the patience with which they are borne ennoble, the Jews are among the aristocracy of every land. If a literature is called rich in the possession of a few classic tragedies, what shall we say to a tragedy lasting for 1,500 years in which the poets and the actors were also the heroes?"

Obviously when the Jewish historian wrote these words, he had in mind the Jewish fate during the Middle Ages with its recurrent round of persecution, despoliation, autos-da-fe, expulsion, homelessness, and massacres. What would Zunz have said had he known the million times greater Jewish tragedy of our time which saw the slow torture and murder of 6 million of our people, 1 million of whom were children.

No matter how often we may repeat it, the human mind will never be able to comprehend, the human heart never be able to feel, human speech never be able to express in rational terms the enormity of a crime which has no parallel in human history. Considering the rabbinic truth that each human being is a microcosm, a little world, and that as our sages said: "He who destroys one human life is like one who has destroyed a whole world," the nefarious destruction of millions of innocent human beings is a tragedy of cosmic dimensions. It defies all standards of historic experience. Something has happened to the very order of creation. After Auschwitz, Buchenwald, and Dachau the world has not been the same, cannot be the same.

Or has it? If, indeed, the world had remained the same, the tragedy would only be compounded, for then the blood of the innocent would have been shed in vain. The suffering and the death of millions would have been senseless, purposeless, futile—like a Greek tragedy—without redemption, without hope.

To be sure, who would dare arrogate to himself the gift of insight into the ultimate secrets of existence or plumb the depths of the mastery of history. But somehow I do believe—yes, I could not live if I did not believe—that the blood of the martyrs was not shed in vain, but that it has fertilized the soil of mankind's future.

We are still far removed from the Messianic era of which our prophets dreamed, the age when "men will beat their swords into plows and their spears into pruning hooks"; far from the blessed age which our seers envisioned when the lion and the lamb will dwell together and "justice shall flow like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." At the same time, who can ignore the fact that the horror of Jewish destruction, which was but the prelude to the horrors which came in the wake of World War II, has shaken the nations of the world out of their indolence and indifference. It is through tragedy that man has learned that, whether he wants it or not, he is his brother's keeper; that no one in this world can walk his way alone; that as the 16th century British poet, John Donne, said, "Every man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind."

What our own tradition proclaimed thousands of years ago, the world has come to learn slowly, infinitely slowly only now in this 20th century; and learned not in its sunshine hours but only as dark clouds gathered on the horizon of history.

Our religious tradition has proclaimed that there is but one God over all, that all men are his children, that every individual is endowed with dignity, that all life is sacred, that justice and love are the foundations of the world, and that man is a coworker with God in advancing His Kingdom.

These spiritual affirmations of our faith are slowly becoming the basic aspirations of modern society, as we see nations which for thousands of years had lived in slavery and dependence emerge into the full light of freedom and independence; as we witness the great social revolution which is to give the colored masses of the world their birthright as children of God sweep the entire globe, even our country; and as all over the world we observe the walls erected by totalitarian rulers over the centuries crumble. Men are beginning to build bridges which are to unite people to work together for the good of all and the hurt of none. Slowly we are starting to realize that we have not come into the world for the brief visit on earth which is our life, to hurt, to hate, and to hunt but as the Prophet Micah said, "to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with God." The question is no longer whether or not black and white, Jew and Christian, Protestant and Catholic, American and Russian, Israeli and Arab can live together peacefully in the same world but rather when will they have matured enough to realize that this planet is large enough for all of God's children to live together "everyone under his vine and under his fig tree without anyone making his neighbor afraid." It is not true that "there is nothing new under the sun."

We are still far, I say, from the realization of this, our messianic dream. And yet, the Jewish tragedy, the warning signal of the even greater tragedy of World War II—which saw 35 million lose their lives, not only synagogues burned and Jewish dwellings destroyed but whole cities incinerated and their population maimed, mutilated, and buried under the debris—this unparalleled tragedy can have redemptive quality only if men of good will and understanding today have the strength of will and of heart to translate tragedy into triumph, defeat into victory, despair into hope.

As one surveys the long and checkered history of our people this question appears as an enigma: Why is it that a people that numerically has always been one of the smallest in the world and therefore has been exposed more than others to the whims of the many, that has endured exile and homelessness, that has always lost some of its numbers through apostacy and violence, why has a people—the perennial Job in history—that has had reason to despair, to lose its faith in the goodness of life, in the trustworthiness of men, yes, in the providence of God—why, I ask, has a people with such a unique historic experience preserved an unbroken will to live, maintained its sanity, its faith in life, in people, and even in God?

This riddle which has always puzzled me has become only more puzzling after the horrors of the most recent catastrophe. Would it not have been logical if the Jewish will to live would have been utterly broken, the Jewish faith in the worthwhileness of existence utterly shattered? Should one not have expected the survivors of the European inferno to have become the world's greatest apostles of atheism, cynicism, and nihilism?

The fact that what one should logically have expected has not come to pass is to me one of the great world miracles. What is there in the spiritual alchemy of the Jew that makes him transform tragedy into triumph, despair into hope, death into life? What is there that made the doomed remnant of the Warsaw Ghetto sing, as it went to its death: "I believe with perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah, and even though he may tarry, I believe." I wish I knew the answer. All I can say is, it is a veritable miracle before which I bow in deep humility. The 20th century Jew has given one answer, the only sensible answer to death and destruction: and that is, not hatred, not vengeance, but life, more life; light more light; love more love. This is our vengeance: our hallelujah to life:

Out of the destruction of the European communities has grown new Jewish life in the old-new land of Israel where young pioneers in the sweat of their brows have rebuilt the old waste places and transformed

rock, sand, and swamp into a flourishing garden and a citadel of democracy.

Who could not but admire the courage, the determination, and the patience with which those who came to the shores of this blessed land, often in advanced age, rebuilt their lives and contributed their particular gifts to the weal of this free and fair land which has become their home.

It is with justifiable pride that we note that those of our European brethren who went to other lands such as South America, South Africa, and Australia have reconstructed their shattered lives with equal determination, and in all these lands have founded new centers of Jewish life and creativity.

Temple Ezra, itself, is a living symbol of this miraculous Jewish will not to give in nor to give up, but to live, to build, and to preserve and by its very existence to proclaim to the world, "I shall not die but live and declare the works of the Lord."

Saying all this is not to deny that during these last few fateful decades in our lives, there were moments when we felt that God had forsaken us. These were those dreadful moments when we saw our synagogues go up in flames; when we experienced the tortures in concentration camps; when we heard the cries of helpless men, women, and children on their way to the gas chambers; when we desparingly looked for a haven of refuge. Yes, who can ever forget those days and years when it seemed as if the heart of the world had frozen into ice. We thought that we would never be able to live, never be able to work again, never be able to laugh again, never be able to pray again. But here we are today, proclaiming by our very presence at this Service of Remembrance with the Psalmist: "Though I am fallen, I shall rise again."

So let us give thanks to the God of our fathers—in spite of everything. Let us live a life worthy of our noble past, worthy of our forefathers, and hand the torch of our faith to our children and children's children. For then, in the best tradition of our millennial faith, we shall have translated tragedy into triumph, death into life, memory into hope. For then indeed "to remember is to live."

Resolution in Memory of Hon. Leon H. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, It was my privilege to serve with the Honorable Leon H. Gavin, former Member of this body from the 23d District of Pennsylvania, both in this body and on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. He served both the House and the Commission with great distinction and credit.

This morning the Commission held its first meeting since the death of this distinguished Member and when it adjourned, it adjourned out of respect to his memory and in appreciation of his fine service.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the resolution of respect that was passed by that Commission, consisting of Senators Metcalf and Hruska, Secretaries Udall, Hodges, and Freeman, and myself, as it commemorated his association with us and attested his service to the Commission and to the Nation.

The resolution reads:

Whereas the Honorable Leon H. Gavin, Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania, served this Commission for more than 6 years with outstanding loyalty and devotion; and

Whereas death called this distinguished Member on September 15, 1963, bringing an end to his service and depriving us of his wise counsel, advice, and leadership; and

Whereas in his passing, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission feels a deep and continuing loss: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Commission be now adjourned in respect to his memory, and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made a permanent record of this Commission, and that a copy be furnished to his family as an attestation of our respect, admiration, and true regard for this trusted, valued member.

Studebaker and Trade Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following release was given to the press today:

Congressman DENT, of Pennsylvania, calls Studebaker's move another nail in the coffin of the U.S. economy.

DENT says Studebaker joins the hundreds of runaway industries in its attempt to gain profits by dodging U.S. responsibilities and share of the cost of the U.S. Government.

Congressman DENT, longtime critic of what he calls economic suicide trade agreements said the Studebaker decision is nothing new. Many corporations have done the same thing only they hid their movements behind patriotic, theoretic, and disarming slogans of free trade, peace, underdeveloped nations, and in many cases, false and misleading packaging, advertising, and merchandising. DENT repeated his warning that in today's world market the United States can only participate by paying subsidies similar to the textile mill subsidy passed by Congress last week, and by monopolistic domestic production tied into world cartels. This is already true in our export programs for wheat, cotton, and other subsidized farm products; it will soon be true in textiles. It's true in our import program for sugar to the detriment of our domestic sugar industry.

Said DENT, "No matter how you try to explain it or cover it up, the theories of trade relations put into practice by the profiteering internationalist trader, have been the cause of the major portion of our domestic unemployment, our negative trade balance in goods and man-hours, our flight of gold, and the mad rush of U.S. industry to displace man with automated machines.

"It's long been my belief that the first duty of a government is to provide work and pay opportunities for its own citizens; not the production of surplus for export. Every nation in the world wants to export more than it imports. It can't be done, and the unprotected nation in this economic war will die.

"I have today warned the Congress that the time is running out for reconsideration of our trade policies, our foreign investment policies, and our aid policies. I've asked Congress to put an out-and-out embargo on all Studebaker and any other products produced outside U.S. limits by American capital in competition with domestic industry.

"To do less, is to add to the further depreciation of our industrial, agricultural, and mining complexes.

"When we finally admit to ourselves that Studebaker is not leaving the automobile manufacturing business but is only leaving this country because of three very normal pressures: (1) A lower cost of production in a foreign country, (2) opportunity to make greater profits while still holding onto the U.S. market, and (3) the threat of foreign governments against U.S. corporations doing business in their markets unless the U.S. corporations create employment and profit for their peoples and nations.

"The pressure from Canada on U.S. imports is no secret. The Canadians, like every other nation except the United States, looks to its people's welfare first, last, and always.

"Chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign trade is like a dog chasing its tail; after he catches it he has to let go because he can't go anywhere with his tail in his mouth and besides, it hurts."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, for his early and untiring efforts to alleviate the harsh conditions to be visited upon this community, its peoples, its institutions, and particularly the displaced workers and their families by the decision of the Studebaker Corp.

The attached release was issued by Congressman BRADEMAS and Senators HARTKE and BAYH, of Indiana.

A review of the record shows that, under the provisions of our ill-advised Trade Expansion Act of 1962, Members of Congress find the avenues of relief in situations of this kind restricted to petition and relief.

Nothing can be done to save these jobs except to subsidize Studebaker.

WASHINGTON, December 10, 1963.—Senators VANCE HARTKE and BIRCH BAYH and Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS said today that in response to their suggestion to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, a meeting was held here this morning of representatives of several Federal agencies to consider the manpower implications of termination of automobile and truck production by the Studebaker Corp. in South Bend.

In addition to BRADEMAS and aids of HARTKE and BAYH, present at the meeting were William Batt, Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration; Stanley Ruttenberg, Economic Advisor to the Secretary of Labor; representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security and the Manpower Development and Training Administration, both in the Department of Labor; representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Indiana State Labor Commissioner Hobert Butler and Dan Bedell of the Washington office of the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO.

The group discussed the facts in the Studebaker situation and considered measures, local, State, and Federal, which might assist Studebaker workers who face immediate unemployment.

The two Senators and the Congressman emphasized that "the primary responsibility for meeting this extremely difficult problem is at the State and community level." They said, however, they wanted to insure that "all possible Federal resources" would be made available.

They said that they have been in touch with Indiana Gov. Matthew Welsh to be sure of coordination of Federal with State efforts.

HARTKE, BAYH, and BRADEMAS also announced that Dr. Harold L. Sheppard, now with the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, and formerly with the Area Redevelopment Administration, would serve on the spot in South Bend to insure that resources of the Departments of Labor and Commerce are both made available and are coordinated with State and local activities.

Friends of Civil Rights Can Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session when attempts were made to tie civil rights—antidiscrimination—amendments to vital education bills, I raised the question whether some of those who used this method were more interested in killing much needed legislation than supporting human rights. I had hoped, and still do; that I was wrong.

This week in the House the real friends of civil rights have an opportunity to sign a discharge petition, thereby speeding up a vital early vote on civil rights and demonstrating their true colors.

Now is the time for those who are responsible and conscientious about this cause to act. Further speeches, explanations, or confessions of "love for mankind" are unnecessary.

Weak excuses that this is a partisan Democratic maneuver, that this method is wrong and some other is the right way, or that it is an insult to our chairmanship system—will not be adequate explanations to those who in personal sacrifices must demonstrate and suffer further humiliations and deprivations in attempts to obtain food, shelter, and human dignity.

I am pleased to call my colleagues' attention to a portion of an editorial in the Washington Post of December 8, 1963, which summarizes in clear and unanswerable logic the issue now presented by the pending discharge petition before the House.

The editorial quotes a Member of the other body as stating:

Unless a rule can be obtained promptly, I believe that signing a discharge petition may turn out to be as important an action in the other body as the vote for cloture of debate on the civil rights will ultimately be in the Senate when that test comes here.

The editorial continues:

The Senator is abundantly right. And no one in either Chamber should have any illusion about it. Their constituents will know that the crucial test of civil rights support in the House will consist in signing the discharge petition and the crucial test of civil rights support in the Senate will consist in voting to end the southern filibuster. And let the Members of the House make no mistake about it: the test is at hand. They will determine the fate of the civil rights bill by their willingness to sign the discharge petition before they go home for Christmas.

Anyone who wants to know what's the hurry need only look at the calendar. The civil rights bill was sent to Congress by the President as an emergency measure last June. It was presumed by the colored people of the country, who have long and patiently petitioned Congress for a redress of their grievances, that the measure would be passed by the House and under consideration by the Senate before the end of summer; that is why they scheduled the march on Washington for August 28. Their hopes and their confidence in the orderly processes of representative government have been cruelly disappointed.

Plainly, the foes of civil rights mean to use delay for the purpose of destruction. Do they mean to aggravate the tension and stretch the endurance of Negroes until fresh demonstrations in the streets of the Nation's cities erupt under the provocation of police brutality into desperate violence? Then will they say sanctimoniously that Congress cannot act under this kind of pressure which its own paralysis has provoked?

What's the hurry? The hurry is the same as the hurry felt by surgeons who see a malignant tumor eating away at human life. For a hundred years delay has been piled on delay in dealing with the American cancer of discrimination until the patient is in desperate straits. The test is now. It is a test which will tell definitely who is friend and who is foe of civil rights. It is a test of the capacity of Congress to meet an inescapable and historic challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the Washington Post, and I am honored to have been the 11th person to sign the discharge petition.

A Prayer by Rt. Rev. Msgr. William A. Gallena

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Lake County, Ohio, has been blessed in many ways—by its location, by the fertility of its soil, the growth of its industry, and, above all, by the people who have come there.

But, for the last 50 years it has been blessed also by the devotion and service of Rt. Rev. Monsgr. William J. Gallena, who, today, rounds out a half century of pastoral service to St. Marys, Painesville, Ohio, and a resident of Lake County.

Monsignor Gallena has been a spiritual leader in Catholic circles in northern Ohio—but he has been much more. His guidance and friendship have left their mark on literally countless members of all faiths of his community, including this Congressman, who is privileged to consider Monsignor Gallena as a friend.

Recently Monsignor Gallena, at the request of the county commissioners, prepared a prayer for use at their sessions. Because it so well expresses that which is in the hearts and prayers of all of us who are privileged to serve in public office, I am pleased to share it with you, my colleagues, at this time:

Grant us, O Lord, light to our understanding, prudence in our investigating, foresight in our planning, sincerity in our deliberating, and the grace to follow truth in our judgments.

Help us to be moved in our decisions neither by fear nor by self-interest, and to do our work faithfully.

May we respect the authority vested in us, for Thou art the source of all authority, and may we use it in our directives for the common good, and for Thy honor and glory.

Tribute to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, among the finest tributes to our late and beloved President Kennedy was a message delivered at the memorial service held at the National City Christian Church in Washington, D.C., on Monday, November 25, 1963.

The message was delivered by Dr. George R. Davis, minister. Dr. Davis is my dear personal friend. He served as minister of the First Christian Church of Wichita Falls, Tex., before coming to Washington to assume his present position of service.

Throughout my years of acquaintance with him, I have always found that Dr. Davis has a remarkable capacity to speak the right words at precisely the right moment. His message in his memorial service for President Kennedy was no exception. I commend his message to my colleagues:

Shall we ever be the same again? Most of us never again. We do not wish to be. When we knew for certainty that the shadow had fallen across the path of our beloved Nation, that our young President had actually been lost to us, in one tragic, senseless moment, something died in us. A man may be judged and executed for the crime, but he will not have been the product of one State, one city, one family, not altogether. I was born a Kansan, and have lived in Oklahoma, Missouri, Texas, and now in the Nation's Capital. I have watched people everywhere, and have looked deep into my own heart. In the 12 years I ministered in Texas, I think I came to know something of the heart of the people, and the heart was sound. I had more than a passing interest in Dallas. It was and is a great city. There has been a "streak of viciousness, more than a streak, in certain kinds of radicals" running through the area. But I have found that same streak in Washington too. I refuse to let one State, one city assume the guilt for this tragedy, or to be a part of those who seek to fasten the guilt upon them. "Let the one without sin cast the first stone," the one who has not stooped by action, attitude, or even by indifference, to create the climate which was festering in America. All I have said in this regard, you will find to be true if you search your hearts and listen. You and I know this, in our deepest heart. Where did hate find birth in our time? Where was this evil spawned which sets loose such madness even in one person? Who are to be judge and jury? How expertly men have learned to hate in recent times, revealed in the mountains of cheap mail, whispered rumors, discord, and violence, idle stories, obscene humor so-called,

racism, bigotry. And when some minds flounder on such a sea of spiritual sickness, who is really guilty? Perhaps a moment of greatness would be reached in the character of each of us, if we were able to respond with those men gathered about a table in upper room centuries ago, when on the edge of the darkness of guilt they cried out, each one for himself, "Lord, is it I?" Let us not imagine for one moment this would lessen the guilt of the hand which struck the devilish blow, it only widens the circle of involvement. This is a time for soul searching, a time for each of us to travel through the vast and hidden places of our own hearts, to open wide every window to those secret places, that the light may shine in every door that God may enter with cleansing and healing power.

We shall ever be remembering the face of a young and vigorous leader, his steadiness and his vibrant spirit. Millions had taken courage and hope, especially the young, but not the young alone, from his courage and hope. We shall be remembering for a long time a beautiful, gracious, and devoted young mother, and a little girl, and a little boy, a little boy who was just beginning to discover the wonderful ways of a happy father with a happy little boy. To so many they were like the family next door. This came not from an undue presumption of familiarity, rather from the genuine warmth of which the human heart is capable at the right times. Perhaps there were some who forgot how young they were, the family in the White House, and resented their breaking of the old customs, the customs for the old. But they were not old. Isn't it tragic what we so often do to the young, on the battle fields of a thousand wars, and often to their dreams by unconsciously resenting their youth. God grant that a new spirit may be born in us, that our President may not have died in vain, "that there shall be a new birth of freedom in our Nation, so that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." Our prayers encompass President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson and their daughters, as tasks too heavy for men to carry are laid upon his shoulders. We take heart in the continuity of our Nation's Government, which has been born out of the experience of the years, and out of other tragedies in peace and war. We take heart from the patient preparation which trained a tall and friendly Texan for such an unforeseen emergency, and that we were not left adrift when our captain fell. We take heart in the realization that though "tried, the Nation is not undone, though stricken we are not destroyed, though bowed in grief, we are comforted."

It is not out of place in time of such sorrow to remind ourselves the process of life must go on, and it goes on, undirected or directed, it goes on in chaos or with order. We rejoice that trained hands were there to take the helm, hands trained in the art of governing and politics. The times still confront us across the earth with dangers on every hand. We cannot be sure altogether of what tomorrow is to bring forth. But we believe a "sparrow does not fall to the ground without the Father's notice," that "great nations are not without His concern" in times of grave peril. And we know that in our peril we still have men and women adequate with the help of God, and who ask for the help of God even as the President now asked, "For your help, and God's."

"They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary. They shall walk and not faint."

Only the most callous would be insensitive now. Only the most politically partisan would raise an issue now about the rightness of our sorrow and our expressed appreciation for a great man who has fallen the victim of the violent in man, and in which many of us shared, if only by our indifference to a mood, a black and sinster mood, which had been fastening itself on the mind of the Nation in some quarters. God grant that mood has been shattered, though high the price. We may be thankful in these recent hours the partisan voice has not been raised. Americans have been Americans. Every hour, almost without exception, has been marked with dignity, by the press, the radio, and television, the public statements of public officials. There has been a greatness across the Nation. The family of John F. Kennedy in numerous ways during all these darkened hours gave character to the events, and in a sense saved the Nation from utter disgrace by the pattern of their conduct. Even the dramatic tones, which may have seemed to some overdone, were exalting. Our new President and his family, in ways which have marked their conduct during his years as Vice President and before, left nothing to be desired in them as great people. For all of this we are grateful.

We do not make a god of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He walked on feet of clay as all mortals. Not all Americans, not by any means, on the day before he was shot down, stood in agreement with his policies, all his suggested programs. Far from it. And Americans of free mind will not all feel compelled in the high emotionalism of deep sorrow to say, "Yes," to all he advocated. I am a little bothered by those who have begun to suggest that to clear our consciences of guilt, and to build a fitting memorial to him, all he wished for the Nation must now be immediately granted. I can think of no quicker way to ruin all he really stood for, if one reads carefully all he said, and he said much, and with a brilliance and clarity seldom if ever equaled in the American Presidency or elsewhere. I think it is true, men now will see him, his ideas, in a new light of appreciation, both his advocates and his opposition. And it is to be hoped down the years men of all views will express themselves toward each other with greater charity, greater tolerance, because his senseless death shocked men into taking a second, long look, always, at one another, and will somehow refuse to let their tongues become the instruments of hell in caustic judgments. It could be wildly hoped, with a kind of desperation, that his blood will wash out even the ugly scrawlings of the extremists, and that even they might be redeemed, and thus the Nation be saved from an eventual, awful judgment. But to surrender the right to oppose, to see either in the Congress or among our people in general an end to the right to differ, to see the end of men who go on saying, "no," unmoved even by the pressures from martyrdom, would be no true memorial to John F. Kennedy. That would be the death of all we cherish. Men will return to their debates. They should, with a new kindness let us pray, but return they should, unhindered by the charge that to do so is a betrayal of a fallen leader. Not so. Only let a new spirit be born, a true brotherliness. Only let us move onward toward those goals which the best men and women on both sides of the aisle really wish equally to see attained, goals of freedom, justice, dignity, for all people, our own, and across the whole earth. As we have heard the muffled drums, and the tolling of the solemn bells, let us again be reminded by John Donne, "No man is an island unto himself. Each man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. A clod washed away by the sea, makes Europe the less. I am involved in mankind. Every man's death diminishes me. Therefore, never send to know for whom the bells tolls. It tolls for thee."

The Wheat Deal: How One Little Thing Leads to Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in the course of more than 2 months of negotiations over terms of the proposed sale of American wheat to the Soviets, including the questions of payment in cash or credit and shipping rate costs to the Red purchasers, there has developed a pattern of concession to Soviet demands on our part which makes the deal increasingly more inadvisable.

A Wall Street Journal editorial of December 5, titled "How One Thing Leads to Another," in forceful manner summarizes what has happened. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that editorial at this point:

HOW ONE THING LEADS TO ANOTHER

When the Russian wheat deal was first proposed last October, the late President Kennedy, in clear and specific language, laid down some excellent terms. He carefully explained what the deal would be—and would not be.

This would be a private, commercial transaction, the Government's role being limited to granting the necessary permission, he said. The sale would be for gold or American dollars, either cash on delivery or "normal commercial terms." Basically, in his words, "the Soviet Union would be treated like any other cash customer * * * who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants."

In presenting this arrangement, Mr. Kennedy emphasized that one feature of it was that the wheat sold to the Soviet Union would be carried in American ships.

Thus while even then the wheat sale was not without its critics, it was generally accepted by the public on the basis of this straightforword arrangement. On such terms the Russians could buy wheat on the world market anyway, and it seemed as though we would get a fair "quid" for the Russian "quo."

Now, it seems, things aren't quite what they seemed.

One of the first things that happened, once the Soviet buyers got the U.S. Government's approval to the principle of a sale, was that they balked at having the wheat shipped to them in American ships. Mr. Khrushchev, figuratively at least, banged the bargaining table, and the U.S. Government relaxed this part of the arrangement.

After that it developed that the Soviet Union didn't want to pay cash after all, either in gold or U.S. dollars. Nor were the Communists willing to deal on normal commercial terms, meaning such short-term credit as they might get from either the private sellers or private banks. A few efforts at obtaining such credit on their terms, here and in Europe, were unproductive. Whereupon the Soviets said to us: No credit, no deal.

So next the proposition was that the U.S. Government, through the Export-Import Bank, itself finance the Russian wheat purchase by guaranteeing a loan for 75 percent of the purchase price.

The first reactions to this, not unreasonably, were objections in Congress. A bill was

introduced to prohibit this U.S. financing of Russian trade. And although Treasury Secretary Dillon argued that we must underwrite the sale or there would be no sale, the Senate Banking Committee appeared unpersuaded that the deal was worth that price. Appeared unpersuaded; that is, until the assassination of President Kennedy.

Then, in the aftermath of that tragic event, the Senate committee quietly decided to put aside its objections to financing the Russian wheat sale. The explanation given was that this was intended as a tribute to the man who had so carefully spelled out the original terms, and somehow as a gesture of confidence to the new President.

This action had hardly been taken, yielding one more point to the Soviet bargainers, when there developed an argument over the shipping rates for transporting the wheat to Russia. The Russians decided they were too high, implying that if something can't be done to get cheaper shipping rates—a special U.S. subsidy, perhaps—maybe they would have to get their wheat somewhere else.

What interests us here is not so much the wrangle over the Soviet Union's credit standing, although Senator MUNDT had a point about the unpaid Soviet debts due us from World War II. Nor so much even the fact that a Soviet wheat loan would be a major change in the Export-Import Bank policy, which has so far never extended credit or credit insurance to a Communist bloc country.

Rather, the intriguing thing here is the progressive change in the wheat deal and the attitude of U.S. officials to the changing Soviet demands. We have witnessed a typical Communist maneuver. First a proposition that has the sound of reasonableness. Then, a bargain seemingly struck, demands for a "little change." Finally, this being agreed to, a new set of demands. The same sort of thing has happened a thousand times over in different kinds of bargaining with the Communists.

Unfortunately, the American reaction is also all too typical. Congratulations at a well-struck bargain; next a little yielding in the hopes of saving the bargain. Finally, "getting a deal" seems to become to us as important as the terms of the bargain. And before you know it, the Russians have what they were after in the first place.

Whatever else may be said about the present proposals, they are a far cry from the thoughtful terms laid down by President Kennedy last October. It is really astounding, when you think of it, how one little thing leads to another.

L.B.J.'s Right Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the pleasure of working with Mr. Walter Jenkins during his outstanding service as administrative assistant to our new President, Lyndon Johnson, have come to admire and respect this man's ability and dedication.

Walter Jenkins is a tireless worker, a dedicated American, and a person who desired no public credit for his efforts. His only desire has always been to do a job good enough that he could take a personal satisfaction in his contribution. It would be wonderful if there were more men like him in this Nation today.

The Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times contained an editorial in its edition of December 3, 1963, titled "L.B.J.'s Right Hand," a tribute to Walter Jenkins, whose home is in Wichita Falls. It is with a great deal of pride that I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

L.B.J.'s RIGHT HAND

Almost as long as President Lyndon B. Johnson has been in Washington, D.C., Walter Jenkins of Wichita Falls has been his right-hand man.

When President Johnson represented the Austin district in the House of Representatives, served in the Senate and was elevated in that Chamber to majority leader, and when the Nation elected him Vice President, Jenkins was in the background but in a position of greatest trust and highest responsibility.

The people of Wichita Falls and this area are probably more keenly aware of the role that Walter Jenkins has had in the career in President Johnson than any group outside of the Nation's Capital. He has been, since 1949, Johnson's chief administrative assistant, and except for wartime military service has been on Johnson's staff since 1939.

A good many words that describe Jenkins and his work behind the scenes for the fellow Texan who now occupies the Nation's highest public office come to mind easily. They are words like "loyal," "dedicated," "tireless," "self-effacing," "capable," "thorough," "dependable."

The responsibilities that Jenkins has shouldered and ably carried through the years for President Johnson have now been increased by the burdens of the Presidency his "boss" has unexpectedly assumed. His hometown folks are confident that Jenkins has the ability to take them, too, in stride.

A Teenager's Thoughts During the Evening of November 22, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, many days have elapsed since the dreadful assassination of our late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and yet moving tributes do not cease.

A personal loss was felt by many who knew of President Kennedy only from a distance but who felt close to this warm, inspiring man. The anguish and the despair which overcame especially the very young I think is illustrated by the excerpt from a narrative which was written by Miss Gayle Woodhouse, a constituent, on the evening of November 22, 1963.

Under unanimous consent, I include Miss Woodhouse's impressions in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A TEENAGER'S THOUGHTS DURING EVENING OF NOVEMBER 22, 1963

(By Miss Gayle Woodhouse)

The unanswered questions that still remain in the minds of the people can probably never be answered. Why? How? The hopes, dreams, aspirations, triumphs, and laughter of this last 3 years are now quiet, drifting in a sea of tears. Ambitions crushed, hopes shattered, and laughter vanished, the American people stand confused amidst the wreckage of their lives. They will rebuild their lives on the faith of the future, but what of the future?

I am a teenager. What does my life hold for me? At this point, I am not at all sure. All I have lived for and believed in has been destroyed by one man in the society that created him, and my beliefs. Everything the American people stood for is destroyed. Kennedy is and will always be an idol for the youth of America. His forthright manner, lack of pretense, courage in the face of danger, hopes and dreams feed the minds of youth. Are we a nation to be converted to extremes? To live in a state of lawlessness, political chaos might appear to be better for us, but of course it is not. All of us must find the courage of religious principles and moral convictions to make the United States a good, decent and free place to raise our children and our children's children.

I don't pretend to have a panacea for the world situation. There is no person that could know what is best for us except the Almighty. We must have faith in the Supreme Being, regardless of what our religion may be. I am firmly convinced of the logic of this although I cannot understand what purpose the loss of a great man like Kennedy would serve for the betterment of mankind. God must have a reason. This is the one consolation that the world has. It is the last vestige of hope to be found in the hearts of man. Why men of this foul and lecherous nature are allowed to exist is beyond my comprehension. It is as if the world was created to conflict with its parts. All the triumphs of the world only serve to confuse the world with its illogical endings. Every enlightenment seems only to hide the elusive truth from us a bit longer. The only sure thing in life is death, and even then, we never know when our time is to die. This fact should strengthen our religious belief. Death can only lead to a life that can be predicted both in heaven and hell. Life has a logic to happenings there. There is none we can understand here on earth.

Have courage, faith, and trust in the Almighty. Preserve life as patience, patience as good, good as truth, and truth as liberty. Only then can we understand. Only then can we calm the grief in our hearts and accept life, and death, as it affects our lives. God will give us courage to face death and overcome its fears as we struggle to keep our hearts pure and clean in the threat of iniquity and madness. For what is murder but madness, and what is madness but fear?

When we do these things, peace will come. Remember the brave men who sacrificed their lives so that others could live in happiness. John Fitzgerald Kennedy was one of these men. Remember not the bad things as men are inclined to do, but remember the good, as you would have yourself remembered. While you remember, strive for right as a loyal American should. Then you can understand the grief and anguish of the masses, the dismay and despondence of the world and the fear of the informed who know that without such men, our lives are in danger every minute we live. A man who lived to defend us and our principles was John Fitzgerald Kennedy, one of the best, ablest, and noblest men of all mankind.

The American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, much will be said and much will be written in time to come of the recent

event which shook our Nation and the world. The assassination of a President is a fearsome thing, a deed so monstrous that it passes understanding. Yet we must make an effort to do so. I am pleased therefore to place before the House a remarkable address delivered Wednesday last in this city by the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope and trust his commentary will receive careful and thoughtful attention. Senator FULBRIGHT's address on "The American Character," delivered before the Rockefeller Public Service Awards presentation luncheon is as follows:

THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

(Address by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Rockefeller Public Service Awards Presentation Luncheon, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963)

It is an honor and a privilege for me to participate in this presentation of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards for 1963. These awards are the highest and most valued honor accorded by a private source for career government service. The recipients, both past and present, are outstanding public servants who have served their country with intelligence and dedication. We are all indebted to Mr. John D. Rockefeller III, for making these awards possible and to Princeton University for its administration of the award program as a national trust.

I am indeed pleased to join in honoring the five distinguished award winners for 1963: Mr. Weber, Mr. Loomis, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Wessenauer, and Mr. Astin. If I may inject a personal note I should like to express my pride and pleasure—which I know is shared by every member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that one of the winners is Mr. Carl Marcy, our committee chief of staff.

As we mourn the death of President Kennedy, it is fitting that we reflect on the character of our society and ask ourselves whether the assassination of the President was merely a tragic accident or a manisfestation of some deeper failing in our lives and in our society.

It may be that the tragedy was one which could have occurred anywhere at any time to any national leader. It may be that the cause lies wholly in the tormented brain of the assassin. It may be that the Nation as a whole is healthy and strong and entirely without responsibility for the great misfortune which has befallen it. It would be comforting to think so.

I for one do not think so. I believe that our society, though in most respects decent, civilized, and humane, is not, and has never been, entirely so. Our national life, both past and present, has also been marked by a baleful and incongruous strand of intolerance and violence.

It is in evidence all around us. It is in evidence in the senseless and widespread crime that makes the streets of our great cities unsafe. It is in evidence in the malice and hatred of extremist political movements. And it is in evidence in the cruel bigotry of race that leads to such tragedies as the killing of Negro children in a church in Alabama.

We must ask ourselves many questions about this element of barbarism in a civilized society. We must ask ourselves what its sources are, in history and in human nature. We must ask ourselves whether it is the common and inevitable condition of man or whether it can be overcome. And if we judge that it can be overcome, we must ask ourselves why we Americans have not made greater progress in doing so. We must ask ourselves what, if anything, all this has to do with the death of our President. Finally, and most important, we must ask ourselves what we must do, and how and when, to overcome hatred and bigotry and to make America as decent and humane a society as we would like it to be.

I do not pretend to be able to answer these questions. I do suggest, however, that the conditions of our time call for a national self-examination although the process may be a long and difficult and painful one. I further suggest, and most emphatically, that if such a national self-examination is to be productive it must be conducted in a spirit of tolerance rather than anger, serenity rather than guilt, and Christian charity rather than crusading moralism.

We might begin our reflections about ourselves by an examination of the effects of crusading self-righteousness, in the history of Western civilization and in our own society.

Moral absolutism—righteous, crusading, and intolerant—has been a major force in the history of Western civilization. Whether religious or political in form, movements of crusading moralism have played a significant and usually destructive role in the evolution of western societies. Such movements, regardless of the content of their doctrines, have all been marked by a single characteristic: The absolute certainty of their own truth and virtue. Each has regarded itself as having an exclusive pipeline to heaven, to God, or to a deified concept of history—or whatever is regarded as the ultimate source of truth. Each has regarded itself as the chosen repository of truth and virtue and each has regarded all nonbelievers as purveyors of falsehood and evil.

Absolutist movements are usually crusading movements. Free as they are from any element of doubt as to their own truth and virtue, they conceive themselves to have a mission of spreading the truth and destroying evil. They consider it to be their duty to regenerate mankind, however little it may wish to be regenerated. The means which are used for this purpose, though often harsh and sometimes barbaric, are deemed to be wholly justified by the nobility of the end. They are justified because the end is absolute and there can be no element of doubt as to its virtue and its truth.

Thus it is that in the name of noble purposes men have committed unspeakable acts of cruelty against one another. The medieval Christians who burned heretics alive did not do so because they were cruel and sadistic; they did it because they wished to exorcise evil and make men godly and pure. The Catholic and Protestant armies which inflicted upon Europe 30 years of death and destruction in the religious wars of the 17th century did not do so because they wished anyone harm; on the contrary, they did it for the purpose of saving Christendom from sin and damnation.

In our own time the crusading movements have been political rather than religious, but their doctrines have been marked by the same conviction of absolute truth and the same zeal to perpetuate it. Thus the German Nazis, with their fervent belief in a primitive racial myth, murdered 6 million Jews in their zeal to elevate mankind by ridding it of a race that they deemed venal and inferior. Similarly, the Russian Communists under Stalin, who as Djilas writes, was a man capable of destroying nine-tenths of the human race to make happy the one-tenth—killed millions of their own people and consigned countless others to the slave labor camps of Siberia in order to pave the way for a society in which all men should be equal and happy and free. And the Chinese Communists of the present are able to contemplate with equanimity a nuclear war in which hundreds of millions would be killed because of their conviction that such a war would destroy capitalism and lead to a higher and nobler civilization.

The strand of fanaticism and violence has been a major one in western history. But it has not been the only one, nor has it been the dominant one in most western societies. The other strand of Western civilization, conceived in ancient Greece and Rome and revived in the European age of reason, has been one of tolerance and moderation, of empiricism and practicality. Its doctrine has been democracy, a radically different kind of doctrine whose one absolute is the denial of absolutes and of the messianic spirit. The core of the democratic idea is the element of doubt as to the ability of any man or any movement to perceive ultimate truth. Accordingly, it has fostered societies in which the individual is left free to pursue truth and virtue as he imperfectly perceives them, with due regard for the right of every other individual to pursue a different, and quite possibly superior, set of values.

Democratic societies have by no means been free of self-righteousness and the crusading spirit. On the contrary, they have at times engaged in great crusades to spread the gospel of their own ideology. Indeed, no democratic nation has been more susceptible to this tendency than the United States, which in the past generation has fought one war to "make the world safe for democracy," another to achieve nothing less than the unconditional surrender of its enemies, and even now finds it possible to consider the plausibility of total victory over communism in a thermonuclear war.

It is clear that democratic nations are susceptible to dogmatism and the crusading spirit. The point, however, is that this susceptibility is not an expression but a denial of the democratic spirit. When a free nation embarks upon a crusade for democracy, it is caught up in the impossible contradiction of trying to use force to make men free. The dogmatic and crusading spirit in free societies is an antidemocratic tendency, a lingering vestige of the strand of dogmatism and violence in the Western heritage.

Although no Western nation has completely dispelled the absolutist spirit of the crusades and the religious wars, some have been more successful than others. The most successful of all, I believe—at least among those nations which have had an important impact on the world beyond their own frontiers—has been England. For a number of complex historical reasons, while most of Europe remained under absolute monarchs and an absolute church, England evolved very gradually into a pluralistic society under a constitutional government. By the time of the establishment of the English colonies in the New World, the evolution toward constitutional democracy was well advanced. The process quickly took hold in the North American colonies and their evolution toward democracy outspaced that of the mother country. This was the basic heritage of America—a heritage of tolerance, moderation, and individual liberty that was implanted from the very beginnings of European settlement in the New World. America has quite rightly been called a nation that was born free.

There came also to the New World the Puritans, a minor group in England who became a major force in American life. Their religion was Calvinism, an absolutist faith with a stern moral code promising salvation for the few and damnation for the many. The intolerant, witch-hunting Puritanism of 17th century Massachusetts was not a major religious movement in America. It eventually became modified and as a source of ethical standards made a worthy contribution to American life. But the Puritan way of thinking, harsh and intolerant, permeated the political and economic life of the country and became a major secular force in America.

Coexisting uneasily with our English heritage of tolerance and moderation, the Puritan way of thinking has injected an absolutist strand into American thought—a strand of stern moralism in our public policy and in our standards of personal behavior.

The Puritan way of thinking has had a powerful impact on our foreign policy. It is reflected in our traditional vacillation between self-righteous isolation and total involvement and in our attitude toward foreign policy as a series of idealistic crusades rather than as a continuing defense of the national interest. It is reflected in some of the most notable events of our history: in the unnecessary war with Spain, which was spurred by an idealistic fervor to liberate Cuba and ended with our making Cuba an American protectorate; in the war of 1917, which began with a national commitment to "make the world safe for democracy" and ended with our repudiation of our own blueprint for a world order of peace and law; in the radical pacifism of the interwar years which ended with our total involvement in a conflict in which our proclaimed objective of "unconditional surrender" was finally achieved by dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Throughout the 20th century American foreign policy has been caught up in the inherent contradiction between our English heritage of tolerance and accommodation and our Puritan heritage of crusading righteousness. This contradiction is strikingly illustrated by the policy of President Wilson in World War I. In 1914 he called upon the American people to be neutral in thought as well as in their actions; in early 1917, when the United States was still neutral, he called upon the belligerents to compromise their differences and accept a "peace without victory;" but in the spring of 1918, when the United States had been involved in the war for a year, he perceived only one possible response to the challenge of Germany in the war: "Force, force to the ultmost, force without stint or limit, the righteous and triumphant force which shall make right the law of the world, and cast every selfish dominion down in the dust."

The danger of any crusading movement issues from its presumption of absolute truth. If the premise is valid, then all else follows. If we know, with absolute and unchallengeable certainty, that a political leader is traitorous, or that he is embarked upon a course of certain ruin for the Nation, then it is our right, indeed our duty, to carry our opposition beyond constitutional means and to remove him by force or even murder. The premise, however, is not valid. We do not know, nor can we know, with absolute certainty that those who disagree with us are wrong. We are human and therefore fallible, and being fallible, we cannot escape the element of doubt as to our own opinions and convictions. This, I believe, is the core of the democratic spirit. When we acknowledge our own fallibility, tolerance, and compromise become possible and fanaticism becomes absurd.

Before I comment on recent events, it is necessary to mention another major factor in the shaping of the American national character. That factor is the experience of the frontier, the building of a great nation out of a vast wilderness in the course of a single century. The frontier experience taught us the great value of individual initiative and self-reliance in the development of our resources and of our national economy. But the individualism of the frontier, largely untempered by social and legal restraints, has also had an important influence on our political life and on our personal relations. It has generated impatience with the compex and tedious procedures of law and glorified the virtues of direct individual action. It has instilled in us an easy familiarity with violence and vigilante justice. In the romanticized form in which it permeates the television and other mass media, the mythology of the frontier conveys the message that killing a man is not bad as long as you don't shoot him in the back, that violence is only reprehensible when its purpose is bad and that in fact it is commendable and glorious when it is perpetrated by good men for a good purpose.

The murder of the accused assassin of President Kennedy is a shocking example of the spirit of vigilante justice. Compounding one crime with another, this act has denied the accused individual of one of the most basic rights of a civilized society: The right to a fair trial under established procedures of law. No less shocking are the widespread expressions of sympathy and approval for the act of the man who killed the accused assassin. Underlying these expressions of approval is an assumption that it is not killing that is bad but only certain kinds of killing, that it is proper and even praiseworthy for a citizen to take justice into his own hands when he deems his purpose to be a just one or a righteous act of vengeance. This attitude is a prescription for anarchy. Put into general practice, it would do far more to destroy the fabric of a free society than the evils which it purports to redress.

The mythology of the frontier, the moral absolutism of our Puritan heritage, and of course, other factors which I have not mentioned, have injected a strand of intolerance and violence into American life. This violent tendency lies beneath the surface of an orderly, law-abiding, democratic society, but not far beneath the surface. When times are normal, when the country is prosperous at home and secure in its foreign relations, our violent and intolerant tendencies remain quiescent and we are able to conduct our affairs in a rational and orderly manner. But in times of crisis, foreign or domestic, our underlying irrationality breaks through to become a dangerous and disruptive force in our national life.

Since World War II times have not been normal; they are not normal now, nor are they likely to be for as far into the future as we can see. In this era of nuclear weapons and cold war, we live with constant crises and the continuing and immediate danger of incineration by hydrogen bombs. We are a people who have faced dangers before but we have always been able to overcome them by direct and immediate action. Now we are confronted with dangers vastly greater than we or any other nation has ever before known and we see no end to them and no solutions to them. Nor are there any solutions. There are only possibilities, limited, intermittent, and ambiguous, to alleviate the dangers of our time. For the rest, we have no choice but to try to live with the unsolved problems of a revolutionary world.

Under these conditions, it is not at all surprising that the underlying tendencies toward violence and crusading self-righteousness have broken through the surface and become a virulent force in the life and politics of the postwar era. They have not thus far been the dominant force because the Nation has been able to draw on the considerable resources of wisdom, patience, and judgment which are the core of our national heritage and character. The dominance of reason, however, has been tenuous and insecure and on a number of occasions in these years of crisis we have come close to letting our passions shape critical decisions of policy.

American politics in the postwar period has been characterized by a virulent debate between those who counsel patience and reason and those who, in their fear and passion, seem ever ready to plunge the Nation into conflict abroad and witch hunts at home. As the years of crisis have gone on, the politics of the Nation have been poisoned by the increasingly irresponsible charges of those zealots who, as President Kennedy would have said in his undelivered Dallas speech, assume that "words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory, and that peace is a sign of weakness."

The voices of suspicion and hate have been heard throughout the land. They were heard a decade ago, when statesmen, private citizens, and even high-ranking members of the Armed Forces were charged with treason, subversion, and communism, because they had disagreed with or somehow displeased the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy. They are heard today when extremist groups do not hesitate to call a former President or the Chief Justice of the United States a traitor and a Communist. They are heard in the mail which U.S. Senators receive almost daily charging them with communism or treason because they voted for the foreign aid bill or for the nuclear test ban treaty.

If I may, I should like to read a section of a letter which I recently received from a person called John Haller of Greenville, Pa., who writes on stationery carrying the letterhead, "In Defense of the Constitution." The letter is not atypical. It reads, in part, as follows:

"Just heard on the news that you are defending the wheat sale to Russia and are for giving them credit at the American taxpayers(') expense.

"For some time now I have been checking your record and find that you would make a better Communist than you make an American. Any proposals that would protect America or our free-enterprise system are opposed by you and any proposals that would help our enemies are given your wholehearted support. Your famous memorandum is a disgrace and you are a traitor to the Constitution."

This malice and hatred which have become a part of our politics cannot be dismissed as the normal excesses of a basically healthy society. They have become far too common. They are beyond the pale of normal political controversy in which honest men challenge each other's judgment and opinions but not each other's motives and integrity. The excesses of the extremists in our country have created an intolerable situation in which we must all guard our words and the expression of an unorthodox point of view is an extraordinary act of courage.

It was in this prevailing atmosphere of suspicion and hate that the murder of the President was spawned, whatever its immediate causes may have been. In an atmosphere in which dissent can be regarded as treason, in which violence is glorified and romanticized, in which direct action is widely preferred to judicial action as a means of redressing grievances, assassination is not really a radical departure from acceptable behavior. As Chief Justice Warren said in his eulogy of President Kennedy: "What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by the forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life."

What is to be done? What must we do to overcome hatred and bigotry in our national life?

For a start, we can call forth the basic decency of America in the wake of the tragedy which has befallen us. Again, in the words of the Chief Justice:

"If we really love this country; if we truly love justice and mercy; if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

"Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?"

It is to be hoped, profoundly to be hoped, that there will be some redemption for the death of our President. That redemption

could issue from a national revulsion against extremism and violence, from a calling forth of the basic decency and humanity of America to heal the wounds of divisiveness and hate. We will, and should, continue to have controversy and debate in our public life. But we can reshape the character of our controversies and conduct them as the honest differences of honest men in quest of a consensus. We can come to recognize that those who disagree with us are not necessarily attacking us but only our opinions and ideas. Above all, we must maintain the element of doubt as to our own convictions, recognizing that it was not given to any man to perceive ultimate truth and that, however unlikely it may seem, there may in fact be truth or merit in the views of those who disagree with us.

On another level, we must do more than we are now doing in the way of organized public effort to explore the depths of human motivation. We must learn more than we now know about the pathological roots and the therapeutic treatment of violence and unreasoning passion in human behavior. "Passions," writes Eric Hoffer, "usually have their roots in that which is blemished, crippled, incomplete and insecure within us. The passionate attitude is less a response to stimuli from without than an emanation of an inner dissatisfaction." [1] We must seek the means, in our homes and in our schools and in community programs of mental health, of overcoming that which is crippled, incomplete, and insecure within us and of bringing meaning, fulfillment, and dignity into the lives of all Americans.

Furthermore, if we are to overcome violence and bigotry in our national life, we must alter some of the basic assumptions of American life and politics. We must recognize that the secular puritanism which we have practiced, with its principles of absolute good, absolute evil, and intolerance of dissent, has been an obstacle to the practice of democracy at home and the conduct of an effective foreign policy. We must recognize that the romanticized cult of the frontier, with its glorification of violence and of unrestrained individualism, is a childish and dangerous anachronism in a nation which carries the responsibility of the leadership of the free world in the nuclear age.

Finally, we must revive and strengthen the central core of our national heritage, which is the legacy of liberty, tolerance, and moderation that came to us from the ancient world through a thousand years of English history and three centuries of democratic evolution in North America. It is this historic legacy which is the best and the strongest of our endowments. It is our proper task to strengthen and cultivate it in the years ahead. If we do so, patiently and faithfully, we may arrive before too long at a time when the voices of hate will no longer be heard in our land and the death of our President will be redeemed.

[1] The Passionate State of Mind, p. 1.

Memorial Resolution Introduced at a Meeting of the Board of Supervisors in the City of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of my personal friends, Hon. Frank E. Wendling, supervisor of the 11th ward, Buffalo, N.Y., recently introduced a resolution at a meeting of the board of supervisors in the city of Buffalo.

The resolution encompasses the many thoughts that have been expressed since the tragic death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy. I wish to insert the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Recent tragic circumstances compel us at this time to reappraise and reevaluate our Nation, its foundations, and institutions, and its people.

Magna Carta began "by the grace of God" and "in the presence of God."

The Declaration of Independence reaffirmed that all men are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights and that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights.

These documents and their concepts became the very bedrock of our Nation.

The United States came into being to secure the blessing of liberty for ourselves and our posterity, and in article 2 vested executive power in the President of the United States of America.

At a high time in our history, John Fitzgerald Kennedy was chosen as our Chief, and vested with the awesome powers and responsibilities of that high office.

The scope of that leadership extended beyond our geographic boundaries, and our President is the leader of freemen everywhere and the hearts and minds gain strength and courage from the torch of liberty held in his hand.

In a world torn by strife, bitterness and insecurity John Fitzgerald Kennedy looking toward new horizons accepted the challenge of the sixties and became our 35th President.

Sworn to uphold our Constitution and our laws, this young man of strength and courage and vision came forward, accepted the burdens and moved ahead into dangerous and unchartered waters.

Peace with dignity, rights of fellow man, love for neighbor, respect for others all gathered with an abiding belief in a Supreme Being with recognition of His supremacy became the credo to lead our Nation and the world from darkness to light.

Symbolically his public life in this capacity lasted for 3 years.

However, the forces of hate, and bigotry, and bias, and prejudice had too long gone unattended in the hearts of many men.

With valiant effort, he strove to rekindle in his people humility before God, understanding among men.

He showed us the way, but his candle alone was not enough and we must rededicate ourselves and our Nation to the cause and the flame which flickers must be joined by all of us so that his supreme sacrifice will have not been wasted on an unappreciative mankind.

He could give no more than his life; he gave no less.

He told us among many other things that we shouldn't ask our Government what it could do for us, but rather should ask what you can do for it.

We must profit from the presence of this man in our midst, and his life, his energies, his ideas, ideals and spirit must go forth in all of us everywhere.

Let us think on Friday, November 22, 1963 not as a day of despair and hate or we forget him and his message too quickly, and his supreme sacrifice will have been wasted among us.

Wherefore, it behooves us to set aside a day annually for each man to meditate in his own way, to examine our individual consciences, to remove blackness, bitterness and hate from our hearts and instill therein a dedication of love and understanding for our fellow man so that all peoples everywhere can truly learn by our example and we can secure for our posterity a world for all mankind that will meet not only the challenge of the sixties but thereafter; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this, the Erie County Board of Supervisors memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to set aside as a national holiday the 22d day of November as one of memory and remembrance and reevaluation and dedicated to the spirit of love and freedom throughout this great Nation and among our peoples.

FRANK E. WENDLING,
Supervisor, 11th Ward.

Washington, Your National Hometown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us had little realization of the serious problems faced by the people of the District of Columbia until we took up residence here. We then became aware of the urgent need for improvements and some of us believe these will come only when District citizens receive a measure of home rule.

This feeling is shared by Mrs. Ruth F. Kirk and she has taken the trouble to set down her beliefs in a memorandum which she is mailing to friends all over the country this Christmas. Mrs. Kirk was for many years an active partner with her late husband in the Indian trading business in Gallup, N. Mex. From 1942 to 1951 she was chairman of the State Board of the New Mexico Department of Public Welfare. For years she has been active in rehabilitation of Navajo Indians and has served in various civic positions which have enhanced her insight into community problems.

Mrs. Kirk's memorandum is thoughtful and stimulating and I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

Washington, D.C.
December, 1963.

WASHINGTON IS NATIONALLY YOUR HOMETOWN

(A memorandum to my friends and other Americans from Mrs. John J. (Ruth F.) Kirk)

Before I moved here, if you had asked me, "Do you know Washington?" I would have replied, "Goodness, yes. I've been there dozens of times." But that would have been the wrong answer.

When from all over America, we dash blithely, purposefully into and out of our Nation's Capital, we see, experience and understand only its Federal exterior—beautiful, historic, of global importance. But one must live here—observe, study and care about the appalling human and civic needs of the District of Columbia, its Federal interior—before we know Washington. I'm learning.

For years, I've heard my District of Columbia friends complaining about District conditions, crying for home rule; and while I felt regretful, it didn't dawn on me that it was any responsibility of mine. Now that I live here, I realize that when I lived and voted in Gallup, N. Mex., I had more power to help the District of Columbia than I have today, as a voteless District resident. I hope you will come to that same realization, and go into action to help your national hometown.

WHY IS WASHINGTON NATIONALLY YOUR HOMETOWN?

Why? Because America's voters run this town—you elect the Congressmen who serve as our city council, make our policies, pass our laws, serve as our board of finance and appoint our District Commissioners.

The District is not in good shape—which is woeful for people here who need improved public safety, better schools, health, welfare, opportunities of all kinds. It is sad for us, for the Nation; and we are visible internationally.

You can help because Congressmen naturally listen to the voices of those who elect them. If you speak they will hear.

YOUR CONGRESSMEN NEED YOUR ENCOURAGEMENT

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN recently said (in debate on passage of the District of Columbia 1964 budget): "I was on the House District of Columbia Committee for 16 years, I know what a thankless job it is. I know it does not show up in the form of political profit back home, because people far removed from the District of Columbia are rather indifferent to affairs of the District."

In the same debate, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY said, "I am sure every Senator realized today what a tremendous effort Senator (ROBERT) BYRD has put into this work—work that does not yield any political dividends back home."

I recently attended a meeting of the Capitol Hill Community Council. The speaker was Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, member of the House District Committee. Asked if his constituents object because he spends time on District problems, he replied, "No, not yet; but if we don't get a home rule bill pretty soon, they may begin to."

Mr. SCHWENGEL had an interesting statistic; he figured that the last session of Congress had cost the taxpayers $150 million and had enacted about 1,120 bills; of which 110 were District bills. On a pro rata basis, one might figure that it cost the taxpayers $15 million for that year's District legislation. Whatever the cost, you and I and he know it could be done much better, at less cost, if we elect our own city government.

I have heard that many times good District bills go down the drain, defeated, because many Congressmen don't show up to vote on District bills (which are usually scheduled as the first order of business on a Monday). This is understandable. Our Congressmen are heavily overburdened with work that involves important national and international responsibilities. But they can't in good conscience neglect the District as long as they continue to be responsible for us.

(Once all the Congress showed up for a District vote and the bill sailed right through; they were present because this was the Monday that John Glenn addressed Congress.)

WHAT ARE THE DISTRICT NEEDS?

1. Population problems: About two-thirds of the people of the Metropolitan Washington area live in Maryland and Virginia.

"From 1950 to 1960, the total population of the District dropped from 800,830 to 763,956. During the same period, the number of school-age children rose by 30,000 an increase of 23 percent. Older citizens, over 65, increased by 12,500 or 22 percent. Thus the age groups requiring heavy public expenditures for such services as education, welfare, health, and recreation continued to increase, while the wage-earning group which requires a minimum of these public services and provides the solid source of tax revenues decreased by 16 percent." (From the late President Kennedy's 1964 District of Columbia budget message.)

Earnings of 17.3 percent of District of Columbia families are less than $3,000 a year. Many people with more income are transient. The Washington Post puts it: "Important psychologically is the impermanence of top level Washington society * * * the majority vote and pay taxes elsewhere and maintain tenuous allegiance to hometowns. People who would be leaders don't think of this as their permanent home."

2. Health: The District is one of two cities with the highest rate of infant mortality; and is second in tuberculosis. It has the highest venereal disease rate in the Nation—the gonorrhea rate is eight times the national average.

There is need for increased professional health personnel; improved modernized health facilities; more child health care; health care for older citizens; protection of all citizens from contamination of food, air and water; and other measures.

3. Welfare: The Public Welfare Department of the District has a rigorous investigative procedure to keep ineligibles off the relief rolls. The caseload, as reported on November 18, has a total of 11,067 families (27,597 persons) on welfare assistance. Average grants, in comparison with those of the 50 States, are generally about midway between the top and botton ranges. There are many unmet needs.

Junior Village, which has been unfavorably in the news from time to time, is the District's institution for neglected children. With a capacity for 320, at present it is overflowing with 693 children.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE has said: "The cost of maintaining a child in the Junior Village is $183 a month, and all of that amount is paid with District of Columbia funds; the cost of maintaining a child in a foster home is $57 a month."

A bill now under consideration would provide more caseworkers, expanded day care programs, and increase payments to foster home parents. However, the bill excludes payment of welfare benefits to children of unemployed parents (4 percent of our population is currently unemployed). Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF earnestly, eloquently sought to have this type of assistance included, but unfortunately, by a close vote, the Senators defeated his motion.

There are many youth problems—school dropouts, delinquency, lack of recreation. Recently, in asking for a Pilot Youth Conservation Corps program here, Senator HUMPHREY said he would have been impeached as mayor in Minneapolis if he had allowed the paucity of youth services that exists in Washington.

4. Education: The school population is increasing: It was 93,361 in 1950; 138,500 for 1964; estimated at 168,700 by 1970.

The District of Columbia Citizens Council report that "years of neglect of school construction, combined with the rapid, still continuing growth of pupil enrollment, led the Board (of Education) to adopt a 6-year (1964–69) building program totaling $120 million." (Only a small portion of this was included in the 1964 budget and that has not yet been voted.) "Thus we see a continuation of the long, sad story of delays leading inevitably to more part-time schooling, deteriorating building and more overcrowded classrooms."

They lack libraries; textbooks supplied by the District are worn, torn, outdated, and so scarce that in one school I have heard there is a ratio of one textbook for each three children. The buildings I have seen are old, drab, dreadful. (I live near Hine Junior High School which I am told was condemned in the late 1920's; but it is still in use, and attended by clean, bright-looking young students who deserve better.)

There is only a 15.8-percent participation in the school lunch program in the schools, yet probably nowhere are there more hungry children.

5. Crime: You read the magazines. Women are not safe on our streets; homicide deaths have reached an alltime high, etc.

We are not holding the line against juvenile delinquency. Of 1,800 cases referred to juvenile court in the last 6 months of 1962, only 20 percent resulted in commitment to either the District or Federal corrective institutions. The others were turned back on the street; the District has no place in which to put juvenile delinquents.

DISTRICT BUDGETS AND FINANCE ARE THE FEATURE STORY

The Federal share of the District budget is set by Congress and the Commissioners must submit a balanced budget based on available and authorized revenue. Last year for every $1 spent, 13 cents came from Congress and 87 cents from District taxpayers. In 1963, the Federal share was set at $30 million.

But—hear this—the Citizens Council reports:

"In making up the 1964 budget, the District Commissioners faced a difficult combination of facts. Congress had enacted legislation to raise the pay of teachers, police, firemen and classified city employees for a total of $12.4 million; reduced the workweek of firemen from 56 to 48 hours, requiring $1.2 million; liberalized pensions for police, firemen and their survivors for about $1 million; and mandatory increases, such as staffing of new construction, totaled $5 million.

"But neither Federal payments nor tax increases were provided by Congress to accompany the required expenditure increases."

Not only that, but in the 1964 appropriations bill, as reported out by the House, the Federal share (in the general fund) was left at the $30 million.

The Senate has acted to raise the Federal payment to $45 million. The joint House-Senate Conference will have to agree on a compromise figure.

And the above concerns appropriations for the year which already is half gone.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD told the Senate: "No city electorate in the country would stand for the kind of management that the District is receiving at the hands of Congress." Citing the fact that the District is 5 months into the fiscal year without appropriations, Senator DODD said: "Any city government which operated in this manner would be thrown out, and rightfully so. But the unfortunate people of the District have the Congress of the United States as their governing body. So they must endure a government * * * which cannot even find time to consider the minimum housekeeping chores without which the city cannot function."

SOME OTHER PROBLEMS

Washington is an expensive city to maintain—in its role as the Federal City, the District of Columbia has higher expenses—must pave wider streets, plant and care for more trees, keep up more parks. The District also has been required by Congress to help finance federally aided projects located here, such as private nonprofit hospitals and the new D.C. Stadium.

In addition, we have the nationals of foreign countries, personnel of embassies and other foreign or international agencies who are exempt from all taxes. But they use all the District services and facilities—it costs about $1 million annually to educate the children of foreign diplomats who reside in the District.

Our taxes are high. Only 18 States have a higher income tax; we pay 3 percent sales tax and many other taxes. Some were raised last year; important increases are under consideration.

Also the District of Columbia must carry functions usually performed by a State for its cities; but is without benefit of a statewide tax base. Our boundaries (69 square miles) are fixed and the District cannot replace land or taxpayers lost to the tax rolls by Federal construction.

(Now can you see why I want you to help us worry and help us solve these problems? Remember, our city council is the Congress—they will listen to you.)

WHAT ARE THE CHANCES FOR HOME RULE?

Several bills, to provide for a city government elected by the District residents, plus a nonvoting delegate to Congress, are pending in the House District Committee. But, as usual, they do not seem to be getting anywhere. Some of our Congressmen are really putting it on the line—here is a quote from the Washington Post:

"Home rule vote urged by REUSS. Even if the House District Committee is opposed to home rule for the District, it has the moral obligation to let the full House accept or reject home rule legislation, Representative HENRY S. REUSS contends. * * * If the Committee still opposes home rule after the current round of hearings * * * (it) should report the bill adversely and let the House act.

"REUSS will appear as one of a bipartisan group favoring home rule for District residents. The others are Representatives FRED SCHWENGEL, MORRIS UDALL, and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

"Mr. REUSS said he would make the following points: Six times since 1948 the District Committee has held hearings on home rule bills or has received bills passed by the Senate. But never has a home rule bill reached the House floor. Committees are intended to give the House their judgment, not impose their judgment on the House. The District Committee is so constituted that a majority is likely to oppose home rule for years to come. He said the "spirit of democratic government as well as fairplay make it incumbent on the committee at least to give the House a chance to vote on the bill."

RACIAL PROBLEMS?

The proportion of Negroes in Metropolitan Washington is about the same now as it has been for decades. Many of them live in the core city, few in the suburbs. The District population is 54 percent Negro.

Some people seem to consider this a reason for denying self-government to the District. I do not agree; I think race is not and cannot be a valid issue in a democracy. Everyone who has the privilege and obligation of fighting, perhaps dying for our country, also must have the privilege and obligation of the ballot. It is incumbent on a democracy to provide all citizens with education and opportunity, so all the people can live up to the privileges and obligations, and enjoy the fruits of democracy.

DO DISTRICT CITIZENS TRY TO HELP THEMSELVES?

Yes. I have never seen anything like the dedicated community service given by local organizations and people; they work their hearts out. There are 25 hard-working, competent, unpaid leaders on the Citizens' Council for the District of Columbia, appointed by the Commissioners to study issues carefully, act responsibly and be persistent in supporting their recommendations. There are many, many other volunteer groups; recently I heard Commissioner John Duncan say there are about 350 active organizations interested in District problems; and each wants speeches from the District Commissioners.

HOW TO CURE THE PROBLEMS

The late President Kennedy proposed a formula for the Federal share of District funds. He said:

"The problems of the District have become so critical as to challenge the National Government to redouble its understanding of and interest in the Capital City.

"The present lump-sum authorization of $32 million has no direct relationship to local taxes or requirements and does not reflect the proper share of the financial needs of the District which should be furnished by the Federal Government. Therefore, I fully support legislation to authorize an annual Federal payment based on a formula which more accurately measures the Federal responsibility to the Capital of the Nation. This formula method will result in an appropriate degree of flexibility, will relate more directly to District needs and local resources, and will be predictable for long-range financial planning."

Under the suggested formula, the Federal payment authorized in fiscal year 1964 would be approximately $53 million. The President also asked that local taxes be raised, to produce $9 million additional revenue in 1964.

On November 30, President Lyndon Johnson issued a formal statement about the District of Columbia. Among other things, he said:

"I believe that this Capital City is entitled to the benefits of self-government so its citizens can have a full voice in their own affairs. * * * A great nation deserves—indeed, requires—a beautiful and inspiring National Capital. We shall do everything possible to achieve this goal."

HOW CAN YOU HELP?

1. Accept in your heart and conscience the realization that your national home town needs help that only you can give.

2. Encourage your friends, neighbors, local organizations, and news media to join hands with you, that all shall understand and accept personal responsibility, to work together for self-government and a sound financial system for the District of Columbia.

3. Let your Senators and Representatives know; encourage and support their interest and action. (All the Congressmen mentioned in this memorandum have a sincere concern for District problems and are working to help solve them; how about your own Congressmen? They will appreciate hearing from you.)

FBI Director Hoover Commends the Butler County American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Alvin D. Smith, editor and publisher of the Butler County American, commented editorially on the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In his editorial, "FBI Sets New High Records Protecting Freedoms in U.S.A.," Mr. Smith praised J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, for leading the cold war struggle against communism. I should like to join Mr. Smith in expressing our appreciation to Mr. Hoover and the FBI.

Editor Smith's note and Mr. Hoover's letter follow:

FBI DIRECTOR HOOVER COMMENDS THE BCA—PAPER IS GRATEFUL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—If we were asked to pick one who, in this cold war struggle with communism, has done more, and most dedicated to the preservation of fredom for all regardless of race, color, or creed, our pen would name J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director. Despite his heavy duties, he finds time to write and commend the BCA for its efforts to inspire its readers to support the American way of rule under law and order. We thank Mr. Hoover for his letter in which he says:)

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.

Mr. ALVIN D. SMITH,
Editor and Publisher, Butler County American,
Hamilton, Ohio.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Mr. Edmund D. Mason, special agent in charge of our Cincinnati office, brought to my attention your November 16 editorial entitled "FBI Sets New High Records Protecting Freedoms in U.S.A." It was thoughtful of you to make this information available to your readers, and I want you to know I am deeply appreciative.

Your editorial support and confidence in our organization have contributed immeasurably to the success we have obtained in law enforcement. You may be sure we will continually strive to merit the trust you have placed in us.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Our Brothers' Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, our foreign aid authorization bill conference report has now been accepted by the House and sent to the Senate for their action.

This brings to mind our many struggles over the years to bring our foreign aid program into some semblance of order—and enable the American taxpayer who foots the bill for this aid to receive at least a modicum of assurance that it is money well spent. This the foreign aid program obviously has failed to do, and the American public has become aware of this and made the Congress and the administration aware of their feelings.

The title of a column written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones "Our Brothers' Keeper," which appeared in the Washington Star yesterday, December 9, 1963, reminded me of another and perhaps more apropos Biblical parable about the man traveling to a far country who gave one servant five talents, another two, and another one, according to his several ability. Upon his return he found that the one given the five talents had traded and made them into five other talents. The one with two talents did likewise. The one with one talent was afraid and hid his talent in the ground and could only return the one talent to his master. The master praised those of his servants who had made good use of their talents and took away from the one who had hoarded his talent, what he had given him.

I believe you will understand why I thought of this story when I read Mr. Jones' column. It is an excellent presentation of the attitude of the general American public to our past foreign aid operations. I think it deserves the attention of the Congress, and would like to ask unanimous consent that it be included with my remarks today. It brings clear, logic, and commonsense to an issue that too often is wreathed in sentiment and mistaken charity.

The article follows:

OUR BROTHERS' KEEPER—CONGRESS REFLECTS U.S. DISILLUSIONMENT WITH WHAT HAPPENS TO VAST FOREIGN AID

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

What is the sensible thing to do about foreign aid?

And let's define "sensible."

Foreign aid should feed the calf without killing the cow. It should help unmess messed-up political systems and social philosophies.

It should turn mendicant countries with chronic deficit economies into going concerns that can stand on their own feet.

It should expand the area of freedom, making realistic allowances for the fact that ignorant and volatile people have to make a choice between a high degree of centralized authority and utter chaos.

Our first attempt at foreign aid, the Marshall plan, was a thumping success. Western Europe and Japan lived on industry, and the war had wrecked their means for living. American aid plus native energy and know-how created a miracle of reconstruction that filled a vacuum into which communism had confidently expected to flow.

But no sooner had we shored up war-ravaged economies than most of the rest of the world, including that part of it which far from having been injured by the war had profited from it, began shaking tambourines in our faces and crying, "Do you love us less?"

And we couldn't think of any other answer except to unlock Fort Knox.

It wasn't long before someone in Washington invented a marvelous phrase, "the take-off point." You were to give foreign aid to a poor and underdeveloped country until its industries were started, its dams and irrigation projects built, its starved fields revitalized with fertilizer, and then the marvelous "takeoff" would arrive.

This was the point where the country's economy would become self-regenerating and self-expanding. Foreign aid would then no longer be necessary and what had once been a miserable land, easy prey to communism, would become a vigorous, happy, free nation.

And this could happen, indeed. Provided such a country did have large untapped natural and agricultural resources, that its people were energetic and eager to learn, that public servants were generally honest and progressive, and that its wealthy citizens were willing to reinvest their money in new job-making and wealth-spreading ventures.

The only trouble is that where people had all these qualities they were generally already pretty prosperous. What we soon found ourselves doing was running a gigantic WPA for fouled-up nations remarkable for laziness, graft, and huge private fortunes that hid themselves in foreign banks.

In some nations we have simply shored up inefficient Socialist regimes that have smothered enterprise in redtape and scraped the bottom of the confiscation barrel. In other words, as in India, we have poured money down a widening rathole as the increase in population chronically outruns the rise in the gross national product.

In Yugoslavia we gave the frankly Communist Mr. Tito a billion or so on the theory that this would encourage an independent course for satellites. Mr. T. and Mr. K. are now closer than 10 college students in a phone booth.

If we expected gratitude we misjudged human nature. Many peoples to whom international philanthropy is unbelievable looked for the bug under the chip. They were helped by hints from the Communists about "hidden Yankee imperialism." The human being rebels at thinking of himself as a recipient of charity. He prefers to imagine that he is giving value in return, willingly or not.

President Sukarno of Indonesia recently said that the world's new nations, including his own, do not have "rising expectations," but "rising demands." He expects these demands to be met by the wealthy nations of the world.

Well, Sukarno runs a graft-ridden travesty of democracy, notable for its inefficient administration and its own brand of neoimperialism. How do we advance human justice by periodically bailing out Sukarno?

Among some tribes of the Ivory Coast in Africa it is customary for a man to retire at 25. After that he squats around the village with his fighting cocks. How much earlier must a 65-year-old Iowa farmer get up so that he can contribute to the retirement fund of these 25-year-olds?

A huge bureaucracy has grown up in Washington and in the Foreign Service as a result of foreign aid. A man naturally sells what his job depends on and Americans have been given a heavy dose of the propaganda line that only our outlays can save the world for democracy.

But the recent reaction of Congress only reflects an advance disillusion among Americans in general. Americans, representing 7 percent of the human population, cannot continue to underwrite the deficits of people who cuddle their dry sacred cows.

Only a radical minority would end foreign aid altogether. There is much good that can be done with a carefully supervised and screened program for people who are determined to exercise the energy and self-discipline necessary to make their economies viable. But we're through tossing the gold over the transom. And history will not blame us.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following eulogy printed in the Northwest County Journal on November 28, 1963:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

If ye break faith with us who die we shall not sleep.—"In Flanders Fields," Lt. Col. John McCrae.

Now he has taken his place with the thousands who for an ideal have given their lives,
Left to our hands is a task uncompleted—our task is to see that ideal survives;
Those who have fallen may rest from their labors in honor forever—their course has been run—
If we would honor our heroes and martyrs, we dare not seek rest till that task has been done.
Sorrow is fitting for those who have fallen, but mourning is empty and sorrow is vain
If we forget to rekindle the fire we receive as a trust from the hands of the slain.
Honored who died in the cause of our freedom—in ground they made sacred forever they sleep,
We have been pledged by a courage unflinching, and falter we dare not—that pledge we must keep.
Prayer may be said for the souls of the fallen, for much good is wrought by the prayers which we say.
Searching our souls let us also beg pardon for sins we've committed, if humbly we pray;
Ask that our eyes may see clearly, unblinded by pride of possession, by hatred or fear,
Ask that our lives be made worthy the lives of the fallen, whose deeds we revere.
Father of Mercy, in mercy forgive us our share in the guilt for the blood that was spilled,
Grant us the grace and the strength and the courage to put our weak hands to a task unfulfilled;
Grant that the faith which we have in this Nation be vibrant and virile in glorious deed,
Grant us the strength and the courage and wisdom to cherish and practice democracy's creed.
Now he has taken his place with the thousands this Nation will honor while freedom shall live,
Will we begrudge—this example before us whatever our country must ask us to give?
May we not ask for a nation united, our hearts purged of envy and cankering hate?
Cannot we learn that as God is our Father, each man is our brother—before it's too late?
Praise is becoming, but what shall come after, the echoes of eulogy muted and still?
Man is but mortal, but man is a spirit and here is a task for the mind and the will.
Grave is the challenge that faces this Nation, and caution would bid us to falter and quail,
Those who have died dared the bright face of danger, and these we must honor, for they did not fail.
Pray for the dead who with selfless devotion have counted but lightly their strength and their youth,
Learn from the dead we need more than a gesture if we would do homage to freedom and truth;
Pray we as well for ourselves, since we need it if we would be worthy His choice for our part,
Never have tears stayed the dull hand of death, and He only hears prayers when they're said with the heart.
Father of Mercy, in mercy forgive us, Thy children who far from Thy percepts have strayed,
Dark are the clouds in a world filled with hatred, and Father, Thy children now seek Thee, afraid;
Grant us the peace which we hopefully seek for, but which lacking Thy help, we can never attain,
Grant us a cleansing of heart and of conscience, that those whom we honor have died not in vain.

—JOE EFADE.

A Voice of Sanity in a Confused Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, we can all profit greatly from the following editorial in the Catholic Standard of December 6, published here in Washington,

D.C. It is one of the wisest commentaries that has been made on the subject:

LEST WE FORGET

It is very commendable and appropriate that our country make a special effort in these days to eradicate or at least to lessen the antipathies and hatreds that exist among some of the citizens in our country. It is particularly fitting that this be urged as a memorial to the ideals of the late and beloved President.

It is certainly not consonant with the ideals of the late President to refrain from stating plainly that the assassin was a Marxist, if not an active Communist. There is very strong evidence to support the contention that he was a Castro-Communist having distributed literature recently for him; there is no doubt that he lived in Communist Russia, that at one time he professed his support of the Communist doctrine, and that he had Communist literature in his room. There is no evidence that motivation for his crime came from any source other than communism.

The Communists in Europe were so convinced that the assassin was at least a Communist supporter that they immediately began to apologize for his actions. Almost within 24 hours after the crime, the Communist Party in Italy had posted printed notices around Rome claiming that the assassin was only a fanatic trying to exculpate the Communist Party. Some Reds claimed he was a Trotskyite, therefore a deviationist from party policy.

This is not to say that the Communists prompted directly this unfortunate man to commit this crime. Only God knows the full motivation of the man, and we implore His mercy on him. There is evidence, we think, that this man was possibly mentally deranged—but nevertheless communism influenced his thoughts and actions.

The interests of our country and the safety of our officials as well as the cause of justice demand that we be honest. The overwhelming proof is that the assassin was deeply imbued with communism.

We should be especially cognizant of this fact as we read of the horrible crimes committed daily in Venezuela by Red terrorists whose only aim is to disrupt that country. Just before the recent elections, the terrorists even threatened the whole civilian population of Venezuela, ordering them to stay off the streets at certain times before the elections. The Government of Venezuela, whose President is certainly left-of-center, has asked for coordinated action in the Americas to protect the continent from Castro and his followers. Communism is a daily and deadly peril in Latin America.

The first requisite for defense is to recognize an enemy. Communism is the foremost enemy of our country, now and until it withers away. In justice to the memory of the late President and to the cause of our country we should remind the world that overwhelming evidence indicates that it was a Communist-dominated mind that killed our President. The ultimate fatuity of the country would be to forget the identity of the man who shot the President.

Smut Peddlers Merely Cry "Censorship"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, whenever we in the Congress seek to legislate in an effort to control the spread of pornographic material, the cry of censorship is invariably raised. The same thing is true at every level of government. Whenever parents seek to drive the salacious material from the neighborhood newsstand, the drugstore, the supermarket and its other outlets, the cry of censorship is raised.

"Censorship" is a word that conjures up unpleasant images, un-American images. Its use by those who oppose controls on pornography is clever and self-serving.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a valid use of the word. The courts of the land have held that pornography is not governed by the first amendment, that constitutional guarantees do not extend to the obscene and the wares of the filth merchant.

Inez Robb wrote a telling column on this subject which appeared in yesterday's Washington Daily News. I believe it is not only timely but pointed and should be given the widest possible publicity so that citizens can be alerted to the phony use of this word "censorship."

The column follows:

SMUT PEDDLERS MERELY CRY "CENSORSHIP"

(By Inez Robb)

NEW YORK.—The great city of New York has once more girded itself to fight a problem universal to the United States—the sale of pornography, a $5 word for smut, to schoolchildren.

It doesn't take a prophet to know that the city, no matter how earnest its efforts, is licked from the start. This fight against smut has been going on for years, fought on the same old battlegrounds, and the forces of right have never won yet.

For once I am in sympathy with city hall. It is waging a war that is not only one-sided but fixed from the start. For what the city is fighting is this Nation's real untouchables.

The untouchables in modern society are the writers, publishers and salesmen of smut. They have both the money and the opinion-makers on their side.

No matter how cheap, scabrous, pathological and clinical a book or publication is today, its opponents flee into hiding at the mere mention of one word.

That word, which banishes all opposition, is "censorship." It—censorship—is equated today with cholera, halitosis and, most damaging of all in this age, with unsophistication.

Sophistication is the hallmark of social acceptability in all levels of society today, from the nude swimming party in Hollywood to the reefer soiree in New York.

It is censorship to keep smut out of the hands of children, off newsstands and out of bookstores, and on the rock of phony censorship and drives against pornography are doomed to failure.

The plea that smut is preferable to any hint of censorship is a phony cry. Within a few hours after it was announced at city hall that the municipality would begin yet another drive against smut aimed at its children, this phony cry and its banner had been raised.

Both were raised by Ralph Ginsburg, the editor and publisher of an erotic magazine, Eros, that has already been suspended. Mr. Ginsburg pulled out all the old-tried-and-true stops in behalf of smut when he cried that an "obscenity panic is plaguing our city and country."

"The number of obscenity cases in the courts of the country has increased alarmingly," he continued. "We're really dealing with something akin to witchery, because obscenity is neither measurable nor definable nor worthy of the law."

So there you have it—"obscenity is neither measurable nor definable nor worthy of the law." Long live obscenity. Opposition to it is a witch hunt. Before long, I am certain, we shall hear that obscenity is good for children and better for adolescents.

The money and the lobby for smut are powerful. The city hasn't got a chance. Recent court rulings all over the country and from the lowest to the highest courts have decreed that anything goes. The untouchables are just that.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, December 6, it was my privilege to present on the floor of the House of Representatives a statement concerning the assassination of our late President.

It has come to my attention that on the same day the Very Reverend Philip M. Hannan, bishop of the diocese of Washington, editor in chief of the Catholic Standard, writing in the December 6 issue, set forth an editorial opinion on this matter that should be read and pondered both by my colleagues in the Congress and by the American people.

Bishop Hannan, you will recall, delivered the eulogy at the funeral mass of our late President at St. Matthew's Cathedral on Monday, November 25.

The editorial referred to above follows:

LEST WE FORGET

It is very commendable and appropriate that our country make a special effort in these days to eradicate or at least to lessen the antipathies and hatreds that exist among some of the citizens in our country. It is particularly fitting that this be urged as a memorial to the ideals of the late and beloved President.

It is certainly not consonant with the ideals of the late President to refrain from stating plainly that the assassin was a Marxist, if not an active Communist. There is very strong evidence to support the contention that he was a "Castro-Communist," having distributed literature recently for him; there is no doubt that he lived in Communist Russia, that at one time he professed his support of the Communist doctrine, and that he had Communist literature in his room. There is no evidence that motivation for his crime came from any source other than communism.

The Communists in Europe were so convinced that the assassin was at least a Communist supporter that they immediately began to apologize for his actions. Almost within 24 hours after the crime, the Communist Party in Italy had posted printed notices around Rome claiming that the assassin was only a fanatic, trying to exculpate the Communist Party. Some Reds claimed he was a "Trotskyite," therefore a deviationist from party policy.

This is not to say that the Communists prompted directly this unfortunate man to commit this crime. Only God knows the full motivation of the man, and we implore His mercy on him. There is evidence, we think, that this man was possibly mentally

deranged—but nevertheless communism influenced his thoughts and actions.

The interests of our country and the safety of our officials as well as the cause of justice demand that we be honest. The overwhelming proof is that the assassin was deeply imbued with communism.

We should be especially cognizant of this fact as we read of the horrible crimes committed daily in Venezuela by Red terrorists whose only aim is to disrupt that country. Just before the recent elections, the terrorists even threatened the whole civilian population of Venezuela, ordering them to stay off the streets at certain times before the elections. The Government of Venezuela, whose President is certainly left of center, has asked for coordinated action in the Americas to protect the continent from Castro and his followers. Communism is a daily and deadly peril in Latin America.

The first requisite for defense is to recognize an enemy. Communism is the foremost enemy of our country, now and until it withers away. In justice to the memory of the late President and to the cause of our country we should remind the world that overwhelming evidence indicates that it was a Communist-dominated mind that killed our President. The ultimate fatuity of the country would be to forget the identity of the man who shot the President.

Claremont, Calif., City Council Expresses Its Sorrow Over the Passing of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on the day of the tragic assassination of our President, John F. Kennedy, last November 22, the mayor of Claremont, Calif., Hon. Kenneth G. Beyer, called the city council into a special in memoriam session.

A certified copy of the minutes of the special session were forwarded to me for conveyance to the family of President Kennedy and the Federal Government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of the November 22, 1963, proceedings of the Claremont City Council:

COUNCIL CHAMBER,
Claremont, Calif, November 22, 1963.

A special meeting of the city council, held on Friday, November 22, 1963, was called to order by Mayor Beyer at 3 p.m.

Present: Mayor Beyer, Councilmen Gibbs, Malan, and Spear.

Absent: Councilman Taylor.

Present: City manager and city clerk.

Mayor Beyer announced to the city officers and employees in attendance that this special meeting had been called in memoriam of President John F. Kennedy, who this day had been assassinated.

The mayor requested Councilman Gibbs to read a selection from a prayerbook.

Mayer Beyer offered a prayer for the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for the members of President John F. Kennedy's family, and for the whole Nation. This was followed by a period of silence offered in memory of the late President.

The mayor requested that on the date of the funeral for President the city hall be closed.

It was moved by Councilman Gibbs that the minutes of this meeting, with an appropriate letter, be sent to Congressman GLENARD LIPSCOMB, in order that he may convey to our Government the feelings expressed by this council, and our sorrow and sympathy to the family of the slain President. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

The meeting in respect to the memory of the late President was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Attest:

KENNETH G. BEYER,
Mayor.

BRUCE A. ALTMAN,
City Clerk.

Recommendation To Revise U.S. Beef Import Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement before the U.S. Tariff Commission, December 10, 1963, which may be of interest to other Members:

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing here today on behalf of the livestock industry generally, and specifically on behalf of the thousands of Kansas farmers who have a valid "beef" concerning our present beef import policy.

Just last week our Government raised tariffs on imports of brandy, trucks, and certain starch items; for example, brandy valued at more than $9 a gallon in containers of not more than 1 gallon, were raised from $1.25 a gallon to $5. The tariff on trucks valued at $1,000 or more was raised from 8½ to 25 percent, and I might point out that more trucks are used by farmers than any other group I know of. This action is to be commended and mentioned primarily to point up the unfavorable situation the cattle producer is faced with.

During 1963 particularly, the American cattle industry has suffered drastically because of reduced prices, particularly involving cattle in the feedlots of the farm belt. To a large extent depressed livestock markets are a result of rising foreign imports of live cattle and finished beef products. Farmers, livestock organizations, members of the business community, and Members of Congress representnig areas of the Nation where livestock is a major source of income, are increasingly alarmed over this situation, which is steadily worsening.

Kansas ranks fourth in the Nation in cattle population, with more than 5 million head of cattle as of January 1, 1963. Farmers in my district, as in other areas, have gone into the livestock business as a necessary means of bolstering shrinking incomes from the production of wheat and feed grains. Western Kansas, particularly, is not suited to a wide diversity in production of crops, and much of it is often referred to as a "one crop area" due to a lack of rainfall and a limited growing season. Forage crops can be successfully raised, hence many farmers have been feeding from 30 to 40 heads, to as many as 300 to 400 head, of cattle.

Today in America there are nearly 4 million farms, and 2.5 million of them have livestock. Over 1 billion acres of land are involved in pasture, either permanent or temporary. The growing cattle industry has made a substantial contribution toward holding down the surpluses in feed grains, as millions of bushels are consumed on farms where grown.

The seriousness of depressed cattle prices on the farm economy, and in fact the economy generally, can be immediately seen when the loss per head is estimated to be as high as $30.

Cattle prices have continued to drop steadily for a year now. Choice cattle that were commanding a price of $30 per hundredweight a year ago brought $22 during the current month of December. These declines in fat cattle prices have been reflected also in the prices of "feeders" which have dropped from $3 to $4 per hundredweight over the same time. In the December 7 issue of the Drovers Telegram it was stated:

"Local prices of $21.20 past week is lowest since May 1957, and $4.54 below the 1963 high. Slumping fat cattle markets the past week dropped the average price on slaughter steers at Kansas City to the lowest level in more than 6 years. Losses of $1.00 or more suffered in the local trade the past 5 days tumbled the average price on beef steers to $21.20 a hundred pounds, lowest weekly figure here since May of 1957. The price compared with $22.01 last week and $26.98 the corresponding week in 1962."

Some officials in the Department of Agriculture have attributed reduced prices primarily to heavy marketings, but we cannot disregard unprecedented beef imports the last 3 years have been a major factor. In 1961 imports totaled nearly 1.3 billion pounds, in 1962 nearly 1.5 billion pounds, and it is estimated they will reach almost 2 billion pounds in 1963. Today nearly 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States is imported from Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and other countries.

On November 18, 1963, I introduced H.R. 9145 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit imposition of increased duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported in excess of realistic and reasonable annual quotas. In recent years duties on beef have been reduced about 50 percent, and prompt steps must be taken to avoid chaotic conditions in a vital industry. As stated by A. G. Pickett, secretary, Kansas Livestock Commission, in a letter to the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations:

"In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries have not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as using other import controls.

"The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the U.S. cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage. Producers in this country feel that our tariffs and trade policies are permitting this country to become a dumping ground for world supplies of meat, and particularly beef."

USDA officials now recognize imports are having an adverse effect on cattle prices, though they seek to minimize the situation by stating the numbers of live cattle coming into the country are not significant, but admit most 1963 imports have been in the form of frozen and canned beef; in fact, 81 percent was boneless frozen beef, and 14 percent canned beef. It is difficult for farmers, or anyone else, to understand how imported live cattle compete with our cattle producers, but that the finished meat products do not. It has also been suggested by USDA officials that cows imported and used for beef used in hamburger and hot dogs do not significantly affect domestic prices.

The livestock industry is known throughout the history of our country for its independent spirit. Cattlemen pride themselves on being rugged individualists and fear Government programs which could ultimately encompass them, and because of this spirit they have remained free from governmental control or direction.

Now that cattlemen ask their Government to protect their industry against unwarranted imports of beef, some are saying the industry is asking for a subsidy, a form of price support, or even an indirect Government payment. This attitude "begs" the question and is an insult to the integrity of this great industry.

Tariffs are as old as our country and have played a major role in our industrial development. Tariffs are, in many cases, a necessary facet of our way of life and our economy would suffer without them. Is it un-American to protect this American industry rather than use it as a pawn in foreign decisions?

Something must be done immediately to avert disaster to thousands of our farmers. The urgency cannot be overemphasized, and I respectfully request prompt action to raise tariffs to the level necessary to protect a great American industry. The Kansas Livestock Association very properly suggests "a system of quotas be established based on average imports over a long period of time. This system of quotas should be accompanied by substantial increases in our import duties. We feel it is only fair to the livestock industry that our import duties at least equal those of our competitive importing nations. This plan would give importing countries access to our markets on a competitive basis."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The "Drop the Hate" Hokum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the death of President John F. Kennedy was a tragedy that all decent Americans will remember the rest of their lives. No matter how much anyone agreed or disagreed with the policies of his administration, Americans everywhere and including Dallas, Tex., respected the high office of the President, admired the individual who had served his country with courage and wished nothing but the best of health and happiness for the President, his wife, and their children.

While the tragic, unexpected death of our President has been mourned throughout the country, the impact of his assassination is probably felt more deeply in Dallas, Tex., than in any other city. Yet Dallas cannot and should not be held responsible or condemned for the dastardly act of a self-admitted Marxist and a self-appointed official of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a Castro-front organization. What has happened in Dallas could have happened almost anywhere. Until we are ready, willing, and able to accept the fact that we do have a Communist conspiracy in this country determined to destroy our freedom and our way of life, I am fearful that there will continue to be periods of darkness and turmoil similar to those of recent days.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared recently in the New York Daily News. I believe the editorial upholds the opinion of 99 Americans out of 100 and I am happy to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

THE "DROP THE HATE" HOKUM

We grow exceedingly weary of the current talk about how, in the wake of the Kennedy assassination, we've all got to drop hatred and extremism and get milksoppish and everloving. Dire consequences are threatened if we disregard this advice.

Our reaction: Nonsense; also nerts, to revive a good old slang word.

The drop-the-hate talk is coming mainly from pinkos and leftists who are bitterly disappointed that Lee H. Oswald, President John F. Kennedy's murderer, was a Communist and a Castroite.

Had Oswald been a member of the John Birch Society or a hater of Negroes, the current peddlers of love and kisses would be stirring up a witch hunt in every one of the 50 States at this moment.

Reds hate all non-Reds and anti-Reds. Hatred is at the core of their creed. They cannot justly complain, and their friends, open or secret, should not be surprised, that the Red's hatred generates counterhatred of equal intensity. Every action, says a law of physics, generates an opposite and equal reaction. It's the same with human emotions.

We think most Americans are going to go right on hating Reds—and the more so because one of these rodents killed a much-loved, young U.S. President.

Also very boring, we feel, is the "we're all to blame" blah being voiced by some supposedly serious thinkers concerning the Kennedy assassination.

Insofar as we can follow these eggheads' "logic" at all, they reason that there is something sinister or cruel or violent in most Americans, and that this mass trait somehow impelled Oswald to murder the President.

MYSTICISM GONE WILD

If this is so, why is it that the great majority of us neither murder nor maim people we dislike or disagree with, or anybody else? Why do we contribute billions a year to charity and churches? Why don't juries in our homicide cases always acquit? And a dozen other questions like unto those.

This "we're all to blame" stuff just won't wash, as we see it, and is an insult to 99 Americans out of 100, or maybe 999 out of 1,000.

Equally nonsensical, in our opinion, is the "shame of Dallas" baloney peddled by still other serious thinkers, including some in Dallas itself. Or, if you happen to hate Texas, you can speak of the "shame of Texas" as springing from the fact that President Kennedy was murdered in Dallas, Tex.

WHERE'S ALL THIS SHAME?

True, Dallas is a bit on the wild side. But it is no more so than Birmingham, Chicago, Hollywood, and parts of New York City, among other places.

Nuts, killers, rapists, and arsonists live in all of those cities and frequently do grave harm to harmless citizens. But no shame properly attaches to the cities on that account. Chiefly, it indicates a need for more police and tougher judges. Certainly it is no disgrace to Dallas that President Kennedy happened to be murdered there by a Communist whose spiritual home was Havana or Moscow.

(We're not speaking at this time of the Dallas police and the later assassination of Oswald. We expect to discuss that some other day or days.)

Well, we've been a long time getting around to Thanksgiving Day 1963 and a few remarks concerning this beloved holiday.

The tragic death of the 35th President overshadows the occasion this year; no question about that.

And yet, there were aspects of this hideous event, even, for which we can all be grateful.

MIGHT HAVE BEEN WORSE

By the grace of God, Mr. Kennedy was spared a miserable lingering death like those suffered by our other martyred Chief Executives. He never knew what had hit him, which is the best way to die.

And in the courageous, beautiful, and utterly appealing conduct of Mrs. Kennedy and the two children following the tragedy, Americans have a memory to treasure for decades.

Southern Self-Deceit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Ralph McGill, the astute publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, which appeared in the December 8, 1963, edition of the New York Herald Tribune. His assessment of President Johnson is of particular interest.

The article follows:

SOUTHERN SELF-DECEIT

Notes made in California: Here, as in other regions of America, the pundits, commentators, and propagandists are speculating that President Johnson's problems of administration and his chance at election in 1964 likely will be handicapped because he is a southerner.

These statements, based as they are on an entirely false premise, cannot do otherwise than make the thoughtful southerner sad. There is pathos in such an assertion, but there also is in it a certain retributive justice. For a good many years now a substantial segment of the political leadership of the South, including Members of Congress and a Governor or so, has been saying that a southerner cannot be elected President, no matter what his ability.

With out exception, those southern politicians who have made such statements are men who have made a career out of opposing civil rights measures. Their careers have been erected on a foundation of a one-party system which historically supported such institutions as the county unit system, white primaries, and other measures that restricted the ballot and the right of franchise.

The percentage of white southerners who vote is much below the national average. The Negro is just now coming to the ballot box in some of the Southern States. That these politicians have set themselves against the mainstream of national life, and yet at the same time lament their inability to attract a national following in politics, has been, and is, a curious, almost morbid, exercise in intellectual dishonesty or, at best, in the practice of self deceit. The southern politician has been made into a caricature or stereotype by a long parade of characters best illustrated by Cotton Ed Smith and Theodore "The Man" Bilbo out of the past and by Govs. George Wallace and Ross Barnett out of the present. The fact that the South has a number of really first-rate men in the Congress and in statehouses is obscured by the stereotype.

In the days since the assassination of President Kennedy, the South and its political leadership have been subjects of accelerated discussion. One who travels across the country is dismayed to find how deeply fixed is this caricature of the southern politician. That this has come about because of the many filibusters in the field of civil rights and statements by those who have taken extremist positions in racial problems cannot be denied.

The South now has, and always has had, men of very real competence in the Congress,

especially in the Senate, but over them all has hung the dark cloud of the regional dilemma. Some of these Members of Congress have talked with bitterness and regret of positions they have had to take in order to be elected. They believed they had to be racists, or had to make the people think they were, in order to keep down opposition and to make elections easier and less expensive. In so doing they helped create a narrow sectionalism, encouraged extremists, and made all but impossible the development of a two-party system.

There have been southerners in the Senate, able and intelligent, who knew themselves to be superior in preparation and ability to men who have been nominated for the Presidency. They have suffered an agony of spirit and morale because of what they have done to themselves. Others callously have not dared. But never has it been true that a southerner could not be elected President because he was a southerner. Those who cannot be elected are those who chose to take a position contrary to the national principle.

President Johnson was never that sort of southerner. Across a span of 32 years he has been remarkably free from the taint of demagoguery. Perhaps he was lucky. He came along with the late Sam Rayburn. He served under Franklin Roosevelt and understood the philosophy of the New Deal. He knows that Roosevelt and the New Deal saved the free enterprise system and made it stronger. Senator Johnson was careful always to disassociate himself from any share in the opinions of the Members of the Congress who exploited the race problem for political gain. His record is an astonishingly consistent one. At no time has he used prejudice as a political weapon. He has not joined in the attacks on the courts. It was he who rescued and put through the civil rights legislation of 1957.

It is necessary to comprehend that one must be an American before one is a southerner, easterner, westerner, or northerner.

Money and Nursing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have had to spend some time in a hospital know of the invaluable service that is rendered by the nursing profession. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the American Journal of Nursing, November 1963, entitled "Money and Nursing":

MONEY AND NURSING

(By Barbara G. Schutt, R.N., editor)

One of the most precious commodities bought and sold in this Nation is nursing. How completely unnatural, therefore, economically speaking, that in spite of the demand for nursing, those who want to purchase it are unwilling to pay much for it; and, in spite of the size of this commodity within the total health package, no one knows how much it costs.

Because the Journal believes that it's time for the public and nursing to recognize these anachronisms, we are offering in this issue a special supplement boldly called "Money and Nursing." We say "boldly" because we suspect that one of the reasons a proper dollar value has not been placed on nursing is the ladylike reluctance on the part of nurses to utter these two words in the same breath. As Elizabeth Porter reminds us in the lead paper of the seven-article supplement, there are special reasons for this. And it's not just the tendency of the American housewife to feel more comfortable buying luxuries with green stamps than taking money out of her household allowance.

It's a rare day that a nurse does not encounter a major problem in trying to give her patients proper care because there are just not enough funds to purchase or maintain the necessary equipment and supplies, to attract and prepare truly helpful auxiliary personnel, or to assist in underwriting the cost of a nurse's continuing education so that she can adapt to her vastly expanding role in increasingly complex settings. At the root of this lack of funds—as becomes apparent in this supplement—is the whole unclear system of medical economics in this country resulting from the tremendous recent growth of the total health care bill, and the divergent and often vested views about the sources of dollars to pay it as well as about the way of dividing those dollars.

These are, primarily, the public's problems; but nurses must have a deeper comprehension of all of them, and assume the responsibility to interpret the need for a fair allocation of these dollars for nursing.

THE VAGUENESS OF THE VALUES ON NURSING

Few would deny that nursing is a major factor in the quantity and quality of the total health care the public receives, in spite of the fact that its cost is so inaccurately reflected in the itemized bill. The fact is, as many a director of nursing knows, that when it comes to reconciling the red and the black of the health service ledger, nursing takes the first cuts. Even a small percentage of the cost of nursing (and some strange items fall in this category) can represent a significant number of dollars; and it's easier for the vending agency to live with the results when the values placed on nursing are so vague.

It's this very vagueness which is the problem for nursing. What is the true dollar value of a nurse's services? Certainly, it's more than what her organization sets forth as minimum, if that word is applied literally to the established employment standards, and if that minimum standard is measured against salaries of comparable workers. (We disagree completely with Eli Ginzburg when he compares, even roughly, nurses with stenographers in his article. We think there is far more distinction in the method of selection for entering their respective fields, the depth or intensity of their educational programs, and the ultimate responsibilities each will carry. We merely respect his right to say what he wishes.) Until nurses, themselves, put a proper value on the services they render, no one else can do it; and so long as nurses—and other employed health workers—help to pay for health care by accepting inadequate salaries, the public will not really know its true cost.

WHAT MUST NURSING DO?

But more than the value of a nurse's time is vague. Although nursing is usually the primary service a health agency sells, very little attention, if any, is given to the need for, or the content and use of, a nursing budget, especially in hospitals. If the budget system is the accepted form of guidance for sound expenditure of funds from our private households to our Federal Government, one would expect it to be a necessary form of control of expenditure of that hard-to-come-by health dollar. Yet the general use of sound budgeting methods in the hospital business is only a recent development, and a well-conceived nursing budget within that general budget is relatively rare. Not until nursing service departments are able, by skill and opportunity, to prepare and defend such budgets will we or others learn what expenditures are legitimately those of nursing, and how much value should be placed on them. Who else but nursing can take the initiative in this?

Putting the words "money" and "nursing" together in their proper relationship is long overdue. It demands a sophistication and a realism which nurses have been either unable or unwilling to display, whether it is in the assumption by the individual of her obligation to expect a decent salary; in the willingness of groups of nurses to engage in collective bargaining to stabilize their employment conditions; in the forthrightness of the director of nurses in obtaining and controlling funds for nursing services; or in the skill of those employed by government to know how, when, and where to obtain nursing's necessary share of that large number of health care dollars.

As the total bill for health care continues to climb in this country, the public is going to be less and less inclined to use sentiment as its measure of the value of nursing. The public is entitled to know how much it's paying for nursing. It's nursing's job to tell it why.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of many of the more desirable features of the Kennedy administration's legislative recommendations and an interested observer of the effects of its intense efforts at propaganda upon the public, I think our current mail on the subject of civil rights is worthy of comment. Those with a personal interest in the subject as well as those most easily impressed by the public media are, of course, in the majority; while others, through personal experience or thoughtful individual analysis, caution against the obvious pitfalls involved in hasty legislation. Strangely enough, those who express great haste, in some instances, are the very individuals who earlier in the present session, insisted that the Rules Committee be packed with liberal thinkers and now complain of their own handiwork.

To anyone who is under the impression that a civil rights bill has been pending before the House during the 3 years sentiment has been whipped to a fever pitch for its enactment, may I call attention to the fact that the first bill of this nature to come before the House Rules Committee for definite action has to date been pending but 7 legislative days. During that week, I understand hearings were scheduled by the House Rules Committee, a fact which certainly does not bespeak undue delay or procrastination. Unaccountably, the friendly Judiciary Committee had already taken 6 months to write up a bill and refer it to the Rules Committee.

Some of our correspondence and press reports carry the suggestion that any Member who does not sign the discharge petition to bring the bill before the House a day or two before Christmas, is an enemy of the cause of civil rights. I

think it is most unfortunate that this attempt at political chicanery should follow the most extreme and tiring lobbying effort that has been witnessed in Washington for many years. I doubt that informed friends of civil rights would recommend such precipitous action were they to review the results of other movements of this nature. Actually, less than 10 percent of the bills brought out by petition have been enacted into law, and many legislators have a hard-and-fast rule of signing no petitions of any nature.

Consistent with my customary support of civil rights and because of the acknowledged importance of a reasonable bill to all of our citizenry, I think it requires the most sober reflection and careful consideration in a calmer atmosphere than exists at present. Should the House Rules Committee fail to act following the holiday recess, I feel that I would be favorably inclined to add my name to a petition.

Our Brothers' Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a rather routine fashion, the House approved the foreign aid conference report. The growing disillusionment of the public with the failures of the program, in light of the continued deterioration of our foreign policy image and position abroad, becomes especially great when we note, in the face of growing administration bungling in foreign affairs, congressional rubberstamp of State Department unquenchable thirst for funds.

An article by the noted columnist, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, in yesterday's Evening Star is a most timely discussion of the foreign aid issue, and I direct it to the attention of the Members:

OUR BROTHERS' KEEPER—CONGRESS REFLECTS U.S. DISILLUSIONMENT WITH WHAT HAPPENS TO VAST FOREIGN AID

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

What is the sensible thing to do about foreign aid?

And let's define "sensible."

Foreign aid should feed the calf without killing the cow. It should help unmess messed-up political systems and social philosophies.

It should turn mendicant countries with chronic deficit economies into going concerns that can stand on their own feet.

It should expand the area of freedom, making realistic allowances for the fact that ignorant and volatile people have to make a choice between a high degree of centralized authority and utter chaos.

Our first attempt at foreign aid, the Marshall Plan, was a thumping success. Western Europe and Japan lived on industry, and the war had wrecked their means for living. American aid plus native energy and know-how created a miracle of reconstruction that filled a vacuum into which communism had confidently expected to flow.

But no sooner had we shored up war-ravaged economies than most of the rest of the world, including that part of it which far from having been injured by the war had profited from it, began shaking tambourines in our faces and crying. "Do you love us less?"

And we couldn't think of any other answer except to unlock Fort Knox.

It wasn't long before someone in Washington invented a marvelous phrase, "the take-off point." You were to give foreign aid to a poor and underdeveloped country until its industries were started, its dams and irrigation projects built, its starved fields revitalized with fertilizer, and then the marvelous "take-off" would arrive.

This was the point where the country's economy would become self-regenerating and self-expanding. Foreign aid would then no longer be necessary and what had once been a miserable land, easy prey to communism, would become a vigorous, happy, free nation.

And this could happen, indeed. Provided such a country did have large untapped natural and agricultural resources, that its people were energetic and eager to learn, that public servants were generally honest and progressive, and that its wealthy citizens were willing to reinvest their money in new jobmaking and wealth-spreading ventures.

The only trouble is that where people had all these qualities they were generally already pretty prosperous. What we soon found ourselves doing was running a gigantic WPA for fouled-up nations remarkable for laziness, graft, and huge private fortunes that hid themselves in foreign banks.

In some nations we have simply shored up inefficient Socialist regimes that have smothered enterprise in redtape and scraped the bottom of the confiscation barrel. In other words, as in India, we have poured money down a widening rathole as the increase in population chronically outruns the rise in the gross national product.

In Yugoslavia we gave the frankly Communist Mr. Tito a billion or so on the theory that this would encourage an independent course for satellites. Mr. T and Mr. K are now closer than 10 college students in a phone booth.

If we expected gratitude we misjudged human nature. Many peoples to whom international philanthropy is unbelievable looked for the bug under the chip. They were helped by hints from the Communists about "hidden Yankee imperialism." The human being rebels at thinking of himself as a recipient of charity. He prefers to imagine that he is giving value in return, willingly or not.

President Sukarno of Indonesia recently said that the world's new nations, including his own, do not have rising expectations, but rising demands. He expects these demands to be met by the wealthy nations of the world.

Well, Sukarno runs a graft-ridden travesty of democracy, notable for its inefficient administration and its own brand of neoimperialism. How do we advance human justice by periodically bailing out Sukarno?

Among some tribes of the Ivory Coast in Africa it is customary for a man to retire at 25. After that he squats around the village with his fighting cocks. How much earlier must a 65-year-old Iowa farmer get up so that he can contribute to the retirement fund of these 25-year-olds?

A huge bureaucracy has grown up in Washington and in the Foreign Service as a result of foreign aid. A man naturally sells what his job depends on and Americans have been given a heavy dose of the propaganda line that only our outlays can save the world for democracy.

But the recent reaction of Congress only reflects an advance disillusion among Americans in general. Americans, representing 7 percent of the human population, cannot continue to underwrite the deficits of people who cuddle their dry sacred cows.

Only a radical minority would end foreign aid altogether. There is much good that can be done with a carefully supervised and screened program for people who are determined to exercise the energy and self-discipline necessary to make their economies viable. But we're through tossing the gold over the transom. And history will not blame us.

Mexicans Forge Ahead in Careers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the following excellent editorial entitled "Mexicans Forge Ahead in Careers," by Ed Ainsworth, which appeared in the December 4, 1963, edition of the Los Angeles Times:

MEXICANS FORGE AHEAD IN CAREERS

(By Ed Ainsworth)

THERMAL.—Down here in the Coachella Valley I had the pleasure a day or two ago of meeting David Perez, a Mexican farmer whose 50-acre place is on the Rio Ancho on the borderline between the states of Jalisco and Zacatecas.

At intervals Perez comes here voluntarily to work in the citrus groves of this valley at wages more than 10 times what he can get at home.

He likes his job. He likes the money he makes. He is putting it to good use on a project of his own at home. His neighbors at home, who help him farm while he is away, are pleased too, because Perez is using his earnings to install concrete pipelines to increase the amount of irrigated acreage available to his neighbors and himself.

Perez is one of those ambitious Mexicans who have been aided immeasurably by the bracero—imported Mexican farm labor—program. This is the program now threatened with an immediate end in Congress, or with cessation after 1 year.

EXAMPLES OF AMBITION

In my opinion, Perez is a fine man who is doing good in the world, in two countries. Here he is a respected and valued worker. At home he is creating new opportunities and new economic values.

His example can be mulitplied thousands of times in the ranks of the braceros, who are competent to do work in the hot country down here (so similar to their homeland) which Americanos del Norte shun. No bracero is depriving any American del Norte of a job because the law clearly states that preference must be given, in all cases, to the latter if they apply.

Al Newcomb, who operates a big wholesale citrus nursery here, and his long-time superintendent, Alfred Romo, were telling me of some remarkable instances of former braceros who improved their status in their homeland by learning new techniques up here and then utilized their money, made in wages, for their own advancement or to aid their relatives in Mexico.

Guadalupe Gonzalez, for instance, learned so much from his work at the Newcomb ranch that he now has opened a successful citrus nursery of his own in Guadalajara.

With him he took the knowledge of the latest discoveries in citrus root stock so as to combat the disease known as "quick decline" and to make plantings with root stock resistant to fungi. His work in Guadalajara has been so outstanding that the Mexican Government is giving a helping hand in enlarging the scope of his scientific activities for the benefit of citrus growers in the area.

It all began because Gonzalez was a bracero.

GIVING A HELPING HAND

Those of us who have been intimately acquainted with the bracero program for a long time know that certain abuses which existed many years ago when it started have been corrected, and that it is a highly successful endeavor in which the Mexican nationals are given full protection. Conversely, they aren't hurting anybody because nobody else really wants the jobs they fill in the hot fields and groves. They are very faithful about sending home their money to their families.

Let me tell you about Pelar Garcia, a blacksmith by trade. During the years he worked here as a bracero he saved enough money so he could set up one of his sons in business as a blacksmith in Mexico. Likewise, he was able to finance a candle factory for another one of his children.

Then there was the former Mexican general who had become politically unpopular and came up here as a bracero and financed his son through medical college at home.

Aurelio Munoz used his money to start a cattle ranch in Mexico with his brother Crescensiano. They got into a tight financial spot and asked Romo, superintendent of the Newcomb ranch here, for a $400 loan to save the property and the cattle. Munoz was lent the money. And he paid every cent back.

The bracero program a bad thing? What do you honestly think?

A United Nation Does Not Mean a Regimented Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal which points out that different points of view on legislation are vital to the permanency of our free institutions:

UNITY BUT NOT UNANIMITY

"Our American unity," said President Johnson, "does not depend on unanimity." And with so much talk about unity these days, it is perhaps not too soon to talk about what unity should and should not mean in our Nation.

A general sense of drawing together after the shock of violence; a special feeling of loyalty to the person of the new President; an eagerness to give him a chance to get his administration organized; a temporary moratorium on politicking—all this is natural, understandable and appropriate. It is the way Americans usually respond in times of trouble.

Some officials and others, however, would go much further. They seem to think that in the name of unity the people should somehow gloss over all diversity of policies and politics; that they should abandon discussion and debate not only now but indefinitely.

In foreign policy this attitude appears in new appeals for "bipartisanism." For one example, former President Eisenhower had been suggesting a withdrawal of most American troops from Europe; now he is being urged to reverse himself and, as it were, rededicate the Nation to existing European policy.

Actually, the question of how many troops are needed in Europe is not a simple partisan matter but rather a complex question of strategy, diplomacy and economics. Bipartisanism in the sense of sweeping discussion under a rug never has been an intelligent way of resolving foreign-policy issues.

In domestic matters you hear the view that Congress should promptly pass the major legislation before it—tax cuts and civil rights—as a memorial to the late President and a demonstration of unity behind the new President. The new President himself suggested something of the sort, though he wisely refrained from trying to stampede Congress.

The emotional content in proposals to rush legislation is plainly high, since it would mean throwing reason to the winds. The tax bill involves major issues of economic policy; the civil rights bill, among other things, raises significant constitutional questions.

To disregard such considerations would be no proper memorial, as we are sure President Kennedy would have agreed, or suitable show of unity. It would be unfair to the people because it would be an abdication of congressional responsibility.

In the altered political outlook are similar indications of carrying unity too far. It is said, and for all anyone knows it may prove correct, that the prospects for a sharp election confrontation have been reduced. Instead of the possibility of a Democratic liberal pitted against a Republican conservative, the likelihood now is Democratic moderation against Republican moderation. The implication is that this is to the good to the extent that it seems to unify the Nation.

Perhaps, but it should be remembered that the political debate which has been building up in recent years is no mere matter of personalities and isolated local issues, or a mere matter of hatred and rancor. It also represents a philosophical division between those who believe in the seemingly unlimited expansion of Government and those who believe in the necessity of restraining it.

There is nothing particularly "moderate" about the expansionists; nothing necessarily "extreme" about the advocates of restraint. For the opposition party to forget the existing political divisions, and once again assume it need do no more than copy the party in power, is to deny the voters a choice which a great many have indicated they want.

An instinctive sense of national unity in a time of uncertainty is one thing, but no one should want a monolithic unanimity in this country. As President Johnson has also emphasized, ours is a government of many balances.

One of the most important checks is not even institutionalized: It is the check imposed by diversity of viewpoint. That produces not a sham unity but a very real balance in our national life.

Communism in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Hon. H. Ralph Burton, a Washington attorney, has completed a dissertation on the subject "Communism in Review." He is a student of communism and the history of the Bolshevik movement. He brings a scholarly appraisal of the aspirations of this world movement.

It is significant that this subject has attracted Mr. Burton's study and inquiry, for as a leading attorney and investigator for the Government, he has achieved an outstanding record that makes definite and authoritative his dissertation.

Mr. Burton is a patriot in the truest sense of the word, and his analysis of the Communist conspiracy is full, complete, and timely. His treatment of the overall subject matter is skillful, and it is hoped that the membership of the Congress will see fit to read this learned and outstanding document carefully.

It has been my distinct pleasure on two occasions in past years to work with Ralph Burton. His services as general counsel of the Committee on Military Affairs during the war years was superb. I had occasion to observe the caliber of the man and his accomplishments, as I was a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs during those years. He discharged his duties with dispatch, zeal, and determination. In 1952 he was general counsel for the House Select Committee on Current Pornographic Materials. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of this committee.

Mr. Burton became a member of the bars of the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and a member of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. He is a founder and life member of the National Press Club.

Starting in 1938 his talents were utilized as a special investigator for two Senate committees and by the House Appropriations Committee. As an investigator for the House Appropriations Committee he came again and again across the trail of the Communist conspiracy. Thousands of Communists and fellow travelers throughout the United States were eliminated from the Federal payroll at considerable savings. He fought Communists who were then working in positions that gave them valuable information on plans and specifications for municipal utilities in and around New York City.

In 1941 Ralph Burton became general counsel for the House Military Affairs Committee and following this service was connected with the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and House Campaign Expenditures Committee during 1948 and 1949.

In each of these positions Ralph Burton brought a legal and scholarly mind to bear. His approach was to get the facts, all of the information, and to present it clearly and concisely.

He has followed this procedure in the article which follows. Mr. Burton's contribution is worthy of studious consideration:

COMMUNISM IN REVIEW

(By H. Ralph Burton)

I find it very difficult to understand how officials of our State Department continue over the years to ignore those basic facts

which the years of experience have taught us about communism and continue to deal with it as though it were something which is amenable to our concept of justice and right or that of almost any other nation.

Communism is not anything new for it has existed in one form or another ever since the latter part of the 12th century when there was an organization called the "Confrerie de la Paix," the principles of which were much the same as those which exist today. The tenets definitely included destroying, breaking down and leveling everything not under their control, and following such concepts, they began to destroy works of art, but the government was too strong and they themselves were destroyed.

Adam Weishaupt, 1748–1830, a Bavarian professor, founded a secret rationalistic anticlerical sect in 1776, known as the Society of the Illuminati, communistic in its every phase. It is not considered necessary here to go into detail, but the basic principles on which this society was founded, underlie all organizations of this character from that day to this. They are:

Abolition of government.
Abolition of private property.
Abolition of inheritance.
Abolition of patriotism.
Abolition of family.
Abolition of religion.

It may be interesting to note here that at the same time Weishaupt and his followers were building up that society and formulating destructive principles, our forefathers were struggling for their independence and formulating the noble principles upon which our Constitution rests.

I shall not pursue this phase further except with a reference to Karl Marx who became the leading exponent of communism in the middle of the 19th century and whose works remain to the present time the bible of the Communists.

It does not serve any immediate purpose to deal further with Communist history until the year 1917 when events took place which seemed to be entirely overlooked by our State Department and other Government officials.

Each year with regularity, messages are sent by this Government to that of the Communist regime in Russia, offering congratulations upon what is termed the "revolution of November 1917," knowing full well that no such event took place. It is a historical fact, and certainly very well known to the officials of the State Department, that in March of 1917 there was a revolution, at which time an attempt was made to establish a democratic form of government. Aleksandr Kerenski had been designated as Premier, and there was every reason to believe that the result of the revolution would be establishment of what the people desired, a democratic form of government for Russia. Unfortunately, however, Lenin, who had been living in Switzerland out of fear for his life, managed to get back into Russia, and through his conniving, traitors close to Aleksandr Kerenski persuaded him to issue what was known as General Orders No. 1, the result of which was destruction of discipline in the Russian Army.

Commissars, appointed through Communist conspiracy with Lenin's guidance, began their destructive propaganda with the result that conditions became perfect for the Communists under the leadership of Lenin to take over Russia, and on November 17 by our calendar, and November 7 by the Russian calendar, this took place. No such thing as a revolution occurred, a fact very well known to even those conversant in a slight degree with Russian history covering that period.

Statements which have been heretofore issued by the State Department * * * are clearly set forth in a memorandum entitled "Certain Aspects of the Bolshevist Movement in Russia," dated October 27, 1919, from Secretary of State Lansing to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. It said, among other things:

"The theoretical 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' acknowledged to be the rule of a minority, with a definite policy of preliminary destruction is found in fact to have degenerated into a close monopoly of power by a very small group, who used the most opportunistic and tyrannical methods, including 'mass terror.'

"One of the main aims of the Bolshevist leaders from the very beginning has been to make their movement a worldwide social revolution. They insistently declare that success in Russia depends on the development of corresponding social revolutions in all other countries. Bolshevist policies and tactics are subordinated to the idea of the international proletarian revolution. Apparent compromises with 'bourgeois' governments or countries have proved temporary and tactical.

"CHARACTER OF BOLSHEVIST RULE 'DICTATORSHIP OF PROLETARIAT'

"The theoretical purposes of the Bolsheviks are clearly set forth in the following statement of aims which was embodied in the call for the first Congress of the new Revolutionary Internationale (later called the Third or Communist Internationale), as having been worked out in accordance with the programs of the Spartacus Association of Germany and the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). As wirelessed by the Bolsheviks from Petrograd January 23, 1919, this statement contained the following:

" 'The present is the period of destruction and crushing of the capitalist system of the whole world.

" 'The aim of the proletariat must now be immediately to conquer power. To conquer power means to destroy the governmental apparatus of the bourgeoisie and to organize a new proletarian governmental apparatus. This new apparatus must express the dictatorship of the proletariat.

" 'The dictatorship of the proletariat must be the occasion for the immediate expropriation of capital and the elimination of the private right of owning the means of production through making them common property.

" 'In order to protect the Socialist revolution against external and internal enemies and to assist the fighting proletarians of other countries it becomes necessary to disarm entirely the bourgeoisie and its agents and to arm the proletariat.' "

I have quoted only a part of this memorandum to show * * * that Communists took control over the people of Russia by torture, brutality, and cruelty.

To show in part how this was accomplished through instilling terror in the people of Russia, I call attention to a document which should have been published long ago so that the people of this country could know that the people of Russia were subjugated by the Communists through terror, as previously stated, and that they dare not raise a hand. This document is entitled "A Collection of Reports on Belshevism in Russia," and was presented to the English Parliament by command of His Majesty in April 1919. * * * To illustrate how important it has been ever since that date to let the people of the United States know what took place, I quote some extracts from this document which is about 100 pages in length:

"QUOTATIONS FROM A COLLECTION OF REPORTS ON BOLSHEVISM

"Mr. Lockhart to Sir G. Clerk

"NOVEMBER 10, 1918.

"DEAR SIR GEORGE: The following points may interest Mr. Balfour:

"1. The Bolsheviks have established a rule of force and oppression unequalled in the history of any autocracy.

"2. Themselves the fiercest upholders of the right of free speech, they have suppressed, since coming into power, every newspaper which does not approve their policy. In this respect the Socialist press has suffered most of all. Even the papers of the Internationalist Mensheviks like 'Martov' have been suppressed and closed down, and the unfortunate editors thrown into prison or forced to flee for their lives.

"3. The right of holding public meetings has been abolished. The vote has been taken away from everyone except the workmen in the factories and the poorer servants, and even amongst the workmen those who dare to vote against the Bolsheviks are marked down by the Bolshevik secret police as counterrevolutionaries, and are fortunate if their worst fate is to be thrown into prison, of which in Russia today it may truly be said, 'many go in but few come out.'

"4. The worst crimes of the Bolsheviks have been against their Socialist opponents. Of the countless executions which the Bolsheviks have carried out a large percentage has fallen on the heads of Socialists who had waged a lifelong struggle against the old regime, but who are now denounced as counterrevolutionaries merely because they disapprove of the manner in which the Bolsheviks have discredited socialism.

"5. The Bolsheviks have abolished even the most primitive forms of justice. Thousands of men and women have been shot without even the mockery of a trial, and thousands more are left to rot in the prisons under conditions to find a parallel to which one must turn to the darkest annals of Indian or Chinese history.

"6. The Bolsheviks have restored the barbarous methods of torture. The examination of prisoners frequently takes place with a revolver at the unfortunate prisoner's head.

"7. The Bolsheviks have established the odious practice of taking hostages. Still worse, they have struck at their political opponents through their women folk. When recently a long list of hostages was published in Petrograd, the Bolsheviks seized the wives of those men whom they could not find and threw them into prison until their husbands should give themselves up.

"8. The Bolsheviks who destroyed the Russian Army, and who have always been the avowed opponents of militarism, have forcibly mobilized officers who do not share their political views, but whose technical knowledge is indispensable, and by the threat of immediate execution have forced them to fight against their fellow countrymen in a civil war of unparalleled horror.

"9. The avowed ambition of Lenin is to create civil warfare throughout Europe. Every speech of Lenin's is a denunciation of constitutional methods, and a glorification of the doctrine of physical force. With that object in view he is destroying systematically both by executions and by deliberate starvation every form of opposition to bolshevism. This system of "terror" is aimed chiefly at the Liberals and non-Bolshevik Socialists, whom Lenin regards as his most dangerous opponents.

"10. In order to maintain their popularity with the workingmen and with their hired mercenaries, the Bolsheviks are paying their supporters enormous wages by means of an unchecked paper issue, until today money in Russia has naturally lost all value. Even according to their own figures the Bolsheviks' expenditure exceeds the revenue by thousands of millions of rubles per annum.

"These are facts for which the Bolsheviks may seek to find an excuse, but which they cannot deny.

"Yours sincerely,

"R. H. B. LOCKHART.

"Report by Mr. H———, Vladimir, October 14, 1918

"Recent Legislation

"All lands, buildings, machinery, etc., were now nationalized, without any compensation being paid to the former owners. The result has been utter deadlock; all private

enterprise being killed. * * * All private trading is being taken over by the Government and the stocks are being confiscated. * * *.

"The system of education has been entirely altered. All religious instruction has been abolished, and in its place a form of state socialistic instruction substituted. The peasantry now refuse to send their children to the state schools and they remain without education. Clothing, such as winter overcoats, belonging to private people are being confiscated for the benefit of the Red Army. No man is supposed to possess more than one suit of clothes, two changes of linen, or two pairs of boots; anything above this is requisitioned for so-called State purposes. All furniture is nationalized.

"Report by Mr. G. ————, who left Petrograd in November, 1918

"The foreign press has, as I understand, published some details about the September massacres in Petrograd, when more than 1,000 men were shot in Kronstadt and at the Peter-Paul Fortress indiscriminately, without any trial, not even the pretense of a court-martial; shot, or drowned, as was the case with Father Ornatsky, the well-known priest of the Kazan Cathedral in Petrograd, who was drowned with his 2 young sons, who were officers, along with many others. Whereas the shooting in big towns has during the last months decreased owing to Lenin's personal dislike of Red terrorism, it is continuing in the provinces, where priests, landowners, physicians, rich merchants, lawyers, are indiscriminately shot in cold blood, without any trial and without any reason besides a general pretext of being counterrevolutionists. Arrests and domestic searches are going on as before. There are some thousands of men and women starving in the prisons of Petrograd—professors of universities, eminent lawyers, priests, generals, officers, ladies of society, bankers, etc. There are towns and districts where all the priests who have to wear their hair long in accordance with religious custom now have been forced to have it cut short. In other towns churches have been desecrated and bishops arrested or shot.

"Report by Colonel Kimens, Acting British Vice Consul at Petrograd, dated November 12, 1918

"The state of affairs in Russia is becoming daily more critical, and the reign of terror is assuming proportions which seem quite impossible, and are incompatible with all ideas of humanity and civilization. Government, properly speaking, has ceased to exist in Russia, and the only work done by the Soviet authorities is inciting of class hatred, requisitioning and confiscation of property, and destruction of absolutely everything, and world propaganda of Bolshevism. All freedom of word and action has been suppressed; the country is being ruled by an autocracy which is infinitely worse than that of the old regime; justice does not exist, and every act on the part of persons not belonging to the "proletariat" is interpreted as counterrevolutionary and punished by imprisonment, and in many cases execution, without giving the unfortunate victim a chance of defending himself in a tribunal, as sentences are passed without trial.

"The whole legislation of the country is done by decrees, which are published by the central Soviet authorities at Moscow and the northern commune at Petrograd, and are supposed to be enforced everywhere, but in reality this remains only on paper and the local authorities obey only such orders from which they can derive a personal profit, and ignore all others. The chaos has gone so far that the central authorities are no longer obeyed, and as a result of it every province has become a state in a state. Anarchy is rampant everywhere, villages rise against villages, peasants against peasants, and the country is entering upon an era of open interior warfare, so that if this state of things is allowed to continue only the fittest will survive.

"The prima facie reason of this state of affairs is the expropriation of landed property, and the subsequent abolition of all other property. This is the root of the whole evil which has brought Russia to the present condition.

"The first step taken in this direction was the expropriation of landed property belonging to the peasants, followed by the nationalization of town property and houses. In December 1917, the banks were seized, and soon afterwards began the nationalization of works and factories. Now all furniture is being confiscated, and people are allowed to have only a small quantity of clothes. The nationalization of trade which has now been decreed will be the final death-blow to life and Russia's productive power will come to an end.

"Mr. Alston to Mr. Balfour.—(Received January 4.)

"(Telegraphic)

"VLADIVOSTOCK,
January 2, 1919.

"With the exception of the Bolsheviks, the whole population is terrorized almost to a point of physical paralysis and imbecility. Slender supplies of even the simplest food are only to be had when the watch of the Bolshevik guard weakens, and three-quarters of the people are slowly starving to death.

"General Poole to War Office—(received January 12)

"(Telegraphic)

JANUARY 11, 1919.

"There is evidence to show that commissariats of free love have been established in several towns, and respectable women flogged for refusing to yield. Decree for nationalization of women has been put into force, and several experiments made to nationalize children.

"Mr. Alston to Mr. Balfour—(received January 15)

("Telegraphic)

"VLADIVOSTOCK,
"January 14, 1919.

"I have received following from consul at Ekaterinburg, dated the 13th January:

"'The number of innocent civilians brutally murdered in Ural towns run into hundreds. Officers taken prisoners by Bolsheviks here had their shoulder straps nailed into their shoulders, girls have been raped, some of the civilians have been found with their eyes pierced out, others without noses, whilst 25 priests were shot at Perm, Bishop Andronick having been buried alive there.

"'I have been promised the total number of killed and other details, when available.'

"Mr. Alston to Earl Curzon—(Received January 25)

"(Telegraphic)

"VLADIVOSTOCK,
"January 23, 1919.

"The Bolsheviks can no longer be described as a political party holding extreme communistic view. They form relatively small privileged class which is able to terrorize the rest of the population because it has a monopoly both of arms and of food supplies.

"Lord Kilmarnock to Earl Curzon—(Received February 11)

"Atrocities Perpetrated by the Bolsheviks in Estonia

"How the victims were executed by the Bolsheviks is described by one of these unfortunates, Proprietor A. Munstrum, who managed to save himself by a miracle: 'On the afternoon of the 11th January, 56 of us were led to the place of execution, where the grave was already made. Half of us, including six women, were placed at the edge of the grave. The women were to be killed first, as their cries were so heart-rendering the murderers could not listen to them any longer. One woman tried to escape but did not get far. They fired a volley, and she sank to the ground wounded. Then the Bolsheviks dragged her by the feet into the grave. Five of the murderers sprang after her, shot at her, and stamped on her body with their feet till she was silent. Then a further volley was fired at the other victims. In the same way they were thrown into the graves and done to death with butt ends and bayonets. After which the murderers once more stamped on the bodies.'

"Bolshevik plans for world revolution

"Bolshevism in Russia offers to our civilization no less a menace than did Prussianism, and until it is as ruthlessly destroyed we may expect trouble, strikes, revolutions everywhere. * * * For Bolshevik propaganda unlimited funds are available. No other country can give their secret service such a free hand, and the result is that their agents are to be found where least expected."

I am quite convinced that anyone, upon reading these quotations, will accept the version that what took place in November 1917, when the Russian people were brutally tortured and murdered, was not a revolution by the people, but a suppression of all but Communists, about 5 percent of the population, many of whom were imported. It is impossible for any reasonable person to conceive how citizens of any country, seeking to establish a democracy, could impose upon other harmless citizens such cruelty and tortures as were perpetrated by the Communists upon the people of Russia. It has been referred to frequently as the cruelties equal or exceeding those under the despotism of the historical "Asiatic Princes."

Communists did not begin acts of cruelty in 1917, for looking back over the pages of history we find that three times within 100 years communism reared its hydra head in the stricken city of Paris when it was torn by the desperation of its suffering peoples; three times in a century, in one country alone, Communist leaders stood ready to inflict their doctrines at a time when human resistance was at a low ebb, susceptible to the luring lies of those ready for the long and patiently awaited opportunity. Each time repeated efforts were made to destroy government and supplant the leadership of the people with their own through ruthless murders without trial, and above all to eliminate religion and put atheism in the place of Christianity. In November of 1793, midst the horrors of the great revolution of that period, atheism reigned supreme; the National Convention abolished the Sabbath and the leaders of the Paris Commune declared that they intended to dethrone the King of Heaven as well as the monarchs of the earth. Finally, November 10, 1793, the leaders of the Paris Commune—Herbert Chaumette, Nomore, and the Prussian anarchist, Clootz, prevailed upon the National Convention to decree the abolition of the Christian religion in France.

Again in 1848 there was a revival of the Paris Commune with its same doctrines, and in the revolution of 1871, when all France was suffering from a devastating war, the Commune came into being with atheism to the forefront, and human carnage so horrible that words fail to describe it.

When this insurrection began in May 1848, it was only a prelude to the great Communist rebellion of June. Fearing another demonstration of an extensive scale, the government made the necessary preparations to meet it. Finding the burdens imposed upon the national treasury too heavy to be borne, the government in June, resolved upon the discharge of the immense army of workmen, more than 1,000 in number, uselessly employed in Paris at the public expense. This alarmed the workmen, who immediately organized for another desperate struggle, for the purpose of bringing about the realiza-

tion in practice of the theory of communism and socialism—a community of goods and manners.

Once more and with greater horror, if such can be conceived in the imagination of humans, communism took its toll, when after the communal elections in Paris on the 26th of March 1871, which resulted in an overwhelming majority for the revolutionists, the Commune was organized, having its first sitting on the 29th of March. A reign of terror was now inaugurated in Paris and the outrages of 1793 were repeated. The cry of the Socialists and Red Republicans was: "Death to the priests." "Death to the rich." "Death to the property owners."

Aristocrats and wealthy persons were in constant danger of being dragged to the guillotine, and more than 100,000 of the more respectable Parisians fled in consternation from the city. Priests were arrested and thrown into prison, churches were sacked and religious service was suspended, journals, which supported the Versailles government were oppressed, and several journalists were sentenced to death. The insurgents boldly avowed their determination to march to their side and disperse the National Assembly, overthrow the Thiers government, and establish the universal republic.

The Paris Commune finally grew desperate and the most shameful outrates and revolutionary excesses were perpetuated. Additional numbers of priests and nuns were thrown into prison, and at length a demand was made on the church for 1 million francs, the insurgents threatening to kill the Archbishop of Paris if the sum was not paid. The archbishop suffered later, with others of the church, the most shameful treatment from a band of infruiated Reds.

Persons of prominence in both social and official circles have openly advocated the introduction of Communist doctrines, limitations of constitutional rights, control by centralized authority, economic planning for the entire United States, breaking down of State lines, and the establishment of a strong Federal police force, in other words a Red army, to enforce the orders of autocratic bureau chiefs seeking to regulate the activities of every individual, the use of his property, the hours of his work, and in fact, every activity of his daily life. Public expressions of others, either directly or by analysis and comparison with the principles of communism, show only too clearly a desire to substitute Russian Communist institutions for those existing under our Constitution; and that being so, where can the line of demarcation be drawn?

Lenin, during this preliminary period, despite the ill-considered liberality of the United States, expressed himself freely, one statement being, "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction" (Reader's Digest, December 1949).

Not too long after that, among other courses which were devised by the Communists, was long-planned social upheaval in the United States by creating bitterness between the white and Negro citizens here, and with this in view, discussions were held at meetings of the comintern which was the highest, and controlling body in Communist Russia, with a view to sending to the United States representatives of the Communist regime to develop their plan. I can offer no better illustration of this than by quoting verbatim from the official translation of the minutes of a meeting of the Russian Comintern in 1928, which illustrates clearly what I have said.

Comrade Jones, Communist member from the United States of America, where he had been engaged in activities directed by the Communist Party in Russia, spoke at the meeting following the opening speech by Bukharin before the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in the hall of the Trade Union House, Moscow, July 17, 1928. He said, among other things:

"Comrades, the draft theses on the colonial question are by far the most thorough theses in point of detail that we have had up to now on this question. * * * We organized here at the Congress a small subcommittee of the Anglo-American secretariat which dealt with the Negro question in America. This commission has done a considerable amount of work, which, of course, is by no means complete, but the first steps were made for a real investigation of this question.

* * * * *

"We have to adopt a program that will take care of their immediate needs; of course, keeping in mind the necessity for organizing the revolution. * * * It is not so much the question of a new program but of carrying out the program that was adopted by the fourth and fifth congresses on this question. Up to now nothing has been done. The central slogan around which we can rally the Negro masses is the slogan of social equality. And the reason why we have not organized the Negroes in America and why we have such a small number of Negroes in our party is because we have not fought consistently for this principle."

It can, therefore, be readily seen that, as early as the fourth and fifth congresses of the Communist International preceding the one from which the above quotation is taken, plans were in formation for organizing the Negroes in America to demand equality, not only legally but also socially, holding out to them the possibility of establishing a Soviet republic for Negroes in America.

Immediately after Russia had been taken over by Lenin and his followers beginning on the 17th of November 1917, it was recognized by Lenin that one of the first and foremost objectives to be included in the Communist program of world control was the eventual subjugation of the United States of America and to that end he left nothing undone. It is not necessary to dwell upon developments toward consummation of the ultimate objectives of subjugation of the United States, except to say that it became one of the outstanding objectives of Soviet Russia. Recognizing that success of this plan could not be allowed to rest upon the pursuit of one course of action, Soviet Russia selected the agitation of the Negro in the United States, holding out the promise of not only legal but social equality and, to the more ambitious, the possibility of an independent Negro republic south of the Mason and Dixon line. A corollary objective by Soviet Russia, bankruptcy of the United States through instigating higher wages, to increase the cost of production particularly relating to national defense, and other phases of industry.

A third objective, which has to a large degree been successfully pursued, involved stimulating political liberals to make such demands of government as would create havoc—politically, financially, and socially.

I think it important to illustrate clearly that this effort by Russian Communists, planned soon after the takeover by the Communists of Russia itself, has to do with whatever they would conceive of to create disturbances in the United States with a view to weakening its world position to be continued through the years.

A subcommittee of the House of Representatives had been created in 1939 by the House of Representatives, entitled "Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 76th Congress, 1st Session, Acting Under House Resolution 130, Directing the Committee on Appropriations of the House To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Works Progress Administration as a Basis for Legislation." I had been placed in charge of the conduct of such investigations in the State and city of New York. There had been created by the Works Progress Administration a project designated by the title "Project No. 1," separate and apart from the Administration having to do with construction of roads, streets, public schools, and the like, and in this "Project No. 1" were five divisions, one of which was known as the Writers Project, supposedly for writers who were unable to obtain employment. I found in that project a Negro by the name of "Charles White" from whom I obtained an interesting story. I first had him sign a detailed affidavit, and later, acting in accordance with the directions of the committee, I took him to Washington where he testified before the subcommittee.

Charles White, who evidenced integrity and intelligence, testified to the fact that he had been sent to Russia in 1930 with 99 persons, of whom about 30 were Negroes, he being one, remaining in Russia about 18 months during which time they were taught sharpshooting, handling, and manipulation of rapid-fire machineguns, how to construct the various barricades in street fighting, defending public squares, taking public buildings, and how to destroy the tank (military tank), horseback riding, and secret coding. Upon being asked what purpose was to be served by all this so far as the Communist Party was concerned, he said:

"The program of the Communist Party for the Negroes was to be self-determination in the black belt. Generally speaking, that means the Cotton Belt, where most of the Negro slaves lived when they were brought to the States and where they are concentrated heavily."

I found that without question there had been constant and determined infiltration by the Communists into the Works Progress Administration.

It can, therefore, be readily seen that Russia at that time was continuing the plan originated by the Russian Comintern not many years after taking control of Russia in 1917, as definitely illustrated by the meeting of the Comintern in 1928 as herein previously shown.

It has been very clearly shown that Russia developed extensive plans early in the 1920's to create social chaos in the United States by causing conflict between the races, and that during the succeeding years these plans have been diligently pursued from every angle. It is inconsequential whether agitation originated by Russia has since been continued along the same lines by that country or through others in this country who found such destructive policies applicable to their own plans. Such continued similar agitation has been created by NAACP, Freedom Riders, and now the Congress of Racial Equality, stimulated into action and being by the revolutionary decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Brown et al* v. *Board of Education of Topeka et al.*, and decisions in related cases. Regardless of whether it is continued by Russia or by others who have adopted the same pattern, it cannot be denied that there is a continuation of the effort to keep up a constant agitation as typified by the situation now existing particularly in the South. Has any effort ever been made to find out from what source the manifestly large sums of money are coming to support the agitation originated by Russia?

After reviewing carefully all that has been said, is it possible that anyone becoming acquainted with the history of communism, extending back over 150 years, manifesting at all times the same tenets, concepts, and intention, can be successfully dealt with in the manner which has been the practice for so many years? Can anyone doubt that continued delays in nuclear discussions looking toward the elimination of the danger of mass human destruction has not been deliberate necromancing on the part of Russia? Nikita Khrushchev recently bragged of the present possession by Communist Russia of a nuclear bomb exceeding by far any of that nature which has heretofore existed. This, no doubt, has been accomplished during those years in which this country abstained

from nuclear tests, badly needed for advancement of this science on our part and yet no one seems to have realized that it could have been deliberately done by Communist Russia to gain sufficient time to develop through underground testing such a bomb as the Communists now claim to have.

Is it not about time for this country to realize that during the last decade there have been events indicating an unfortunate departure from this country's previous history because never before the armistice in Korea and now the unfortunate Cuban episode, has this country failed to vanquish or dictate all the terms of surrender or armistice in any war, a lamentable departure for as MacArthur has said, "There is no substitute for victory." It is to be hoped that this has no historical significance so far as the United States is concerned, but it should be remembered that there is a similarity between those two instances and a certain event in Roman history when for the first time in its history, Theodosius I, Emperor of Rome from 379 to 395 A.D., because of decadence, particularly in military preparedness, found it necessary to make concessions to the barbarians when they attacked the Roman Empire. It was the first time that Rome failed to dictate all the terms of an armistice or surrender and that occurred less than a century before the fall of the Roman Empire; and today the tempo is faster.

Is it not pertinent to ask if De Tocqueville's observations having relation to the lessons to be learned from the past are not applicable when he said: "The art of administration may be ranked as a science and no science can be improved if the discoveries and observations of successive generations are not connected together."

A cause for a certain degree of sadness presents itself upon recalling the attitude of the United States in past instances of its patience being tried. It emphasizes only too strongly departure from our traditional characteristic attitude toward the offenders of our national dignity and adherence to the warning, "Don't tread on me" which appeared on the first flag of the American Revolution, raised on Paul Jones' ship, the *Alfred*, in 1776. Is this becoming extinct?

Communist regimes have been finding fruitful and increasing readiness on our part toward the payment of ransom in one form or another, a far cry from instances found in history:

In 1797 to demands that United States pay bribes of $240,000 to French officials, Charles C. Pinckney, the U.S. Minister to Paris, proclaimed: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." Final U.S. reply was an undeclared naval war on France that continued for 2 years, led to cooperation without tribute.

In 1904 a naturalized U.S. citizen of Greek origin, Ion Perdicaris, was seized in Morocco by a chieftain named Raisuli. President Theodore Roosevelt, told ransom was demanded, sent the fleet to the area and ordered this message sent to Tangiers: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." Perdicaris was freed.

In 1949 Robert A. Vogeler, U.S. businessman, was jailed in Communist Hungary and charged with espionage. He was freed a year and a half later, after the United States agreed to hand over Hungarian assets seized in West Germany, as part of the ransom.

In 1951 Soviet fighter planes forced down four U.S. airmen over Hungary. The Americans were released after six weeks—but only after the United States paid ransom of $123,605, a Communist pricetag of $30,901.25 on each American head.

Recent record is filled with other examples of how Communists use prisoners for bargaining purposes—in Soviet Russia, Communist Czechoslovakia, Red China.

I can see no reason why citizens of this country should be kept ignorant of the historical facts relating to communism. On the contrary, they should be informed in order that they may realize what the result would be if we were not able to successfully defend ourselves in case of attack. They are entitled to know this * * * particularly all that is contained in the documents to which reference has been made herein, and, as herein previously indicated. These should definitely include documents referred to herein, titles of which, for the sake of clarity, are:

1. "Memorandum on Certain Aspects of the Bolshevist Movement in Russia," "Character of Bolshevist Rule," "Economic Results of Bolshevist Control," "Bolshevist Program of World Revolution," from Robert Lansing, Secretary of State, to Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, dated October 27, 1919.

2. "Memorandum on the Bolshevist or Communist Party in Russia and its Relations to the Third Communist International and to the Russia Soviets," transmitted by D. C. Poole, Chief, Division of Russian Affairs, State Department, Washington, D.C., in a memorandum dated March 20, 1920, for the Under Secretary of State.

3. A collection of reports on Bolshevism in Russia presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty April 1919.

I am confident that if everyone who enjoys the attributes of American citizenship was informed of those facts which the pages of this article reveal, directly or by reference, relating to communism, they would respond to every request of them physically and financially, at once. They are definitely entitled to this and further delay could only endanger the safety of the United States and its citizens beyond the iota of a doubt.

Leadership: The Source of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 2, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Transmitter magazine, November-December 1963 issue, carries a public affairs section which features an article titled "Leadership: The Source of Progress," written by Leonard E. Read.

Mr. Read is organizer and president of the Foundation for Economic Education and formerly served as executive vice president of the National Industrial Conference Board. His thoughts on how to evaluate leadership is particularly timely as we approach a presidential election year.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD the text of this article:

LEADERSHIP: THE SOURCE OF PROGRESS

(Since 1964 is a Presidential election year, now is a good time for all thoughtful citizens to consider the kind of leadership they want for our counrty. The following thoughts are excerpted from an article by Leonard E. Read, president of the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc.)

A Judas goat, one trained to lead innocent sheep to slaughter, is a leader of sorts. But, obviously, this is not the kind of leadership which serves as the source of progress: the goat is no more conscious of betrayal than are the sheep of their fate. This is simply a case of the blind leading the blind, the leader having no role other than that of being followed.

Similar behavior among men is not difficult to observe: our history books are filled with accounts of leaders, so called, who have been in the vanguard of movements ending not only in economic disaster but often in slaughter. These leaders have been distinguished more by their lack of understanding than by any conscious malevolence. They knew not where they were going; they found themselves out front only because millions of people, suffering from prevailing fallacies and emotional enthusiasms, saw in the leader an energetic personfication of their own illusions. Enormous energy and personality quirks—and little else—have marked these leaders. The sad part is that we need not turn to history for examples; we are now experiencing a rash of these leadership situations, not only abroad, but at home as well.

All aspects of life are in flux; nothing stays put. There is progress in some sectors, accompanied by regress in others. For instance, there is economic progress, only to be followed by a decline of material well-being And there is moral, social, political, scientific, technological, intellectual, as well as spiritual progress—and regress. And most everyone prefers progress.

Attaching such value as we do to progress requires, also, that we give a prime value to leadership, for it is an observed fact that progress is a phenomenon flowing from leadership. Thus, when leadership is not understood or when it is sought where it does not exist, progress is not only in jeopardy, it becomes impossible, for it has lost touch with its source. It is important, therefore, that we try to discover for ourselves what true leadership really is.

Let us not confine our reflections to those in the vanguard of destructive movements. That would be to miss the point of this analysis. For example, those of us who believe in liberty will, unless we are extremely careful, think of Federic Bastiat (1801–50) as a leader. But that excellent spokesman for liberty would have been the first to reject any such accolade. He denied the leader-in-person notion when explaining to some of his supporters why he sometimes voted in the French National Assembly with the Socialists and Communists: "* * * one must base his vote on for what instead of with whom." Here we find a cue as to the meaning of true leadership. First, however, a few thoughts on the dangers of thinking of any person as a leader.

When we think of a person—Bastiat, or anyone else, for that matter—as a leader, two kinds of disaster are likely to follow. The first is more than likely; it is certain: We who commit this error in our thinking resolve ourselves into blind followers; we limit what we perceive to nothing more than the personality traits of an individual. Whatever he does is right for no more reason than that it is he who does it.

The second distaster, if it happens, is an outgrowth of the first: Any individual widely hailed as "our leader" is in grave danger of actually believing what he hears; he may conclude that multiple errors add up to truth—that he is, in fact, a leader. Acceptance of this distorted view of self dangerously weakens one's resistence to the messiah complex.

The messiah complex is a common failing, readily detected: those who suffer this psychosis think of themselves as the fountainhead of truth; they see nothing in the cosmos above their own finite minds and, thus, quite naturally, become intellectual and/or political authoritarians: "Believe precisely as I do, or act as I command, lest

you stand condemned in my eyes." They will forsake their role as students or workers in the vineyard, and will pontificate, as oracles, on any subject; indeed, they may even aspire to usurp the role of God. Thus, disaster comes to both the followed and the followers: "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."

Dean Inge once observed, "Nothing fails like success." Why is the good Dean's observation so often confirmed? Success is heady stuff; few can experience it and remain sober. When a student of liberty, for instance, gets ahead of others in his own little orbit, he has a measure of success. But let the others embrace him as their leader (a common failing) and let him, as a consequence of this unwarranted flattery, look upon them as his disciples (an infatuating weakness), and his initial "success" must turn to failure. The studying, which accounted for his success, is at an end. As the saying goes, "He's a big shot."

To bring this analysis into sharper focus, contemplate two relatively intelligent individuals exchanging ideas in a two-way inquiry of serious import. While both leadership and followership would then be in evidence, we could not accurately ascribe the attraction and response to either one of the individuals themselves, but to some object beyond both individuals, which one understands better than the other. The leadership and followership we observe in this situation has only an ideational explanation: one of the persons embodies an idea, an insight, a perception, a new spark of consciousness which he shares; the other, who perceives the point, remarks, in effect, "I follow you." This means that he, also, perceives the idea. Leadership, in this significant sense, is enlightenment, not the making of carbon copies. Nietzsche once observed that it is no credit to a teacher if a student resembles him overly much.

Followership, on the other hand, means to partake of the enlightenment. "To improve oneself," wrote Ortega y Gasset, "one must first admire perfection in others." If it is ideational perfection that is admired in another, then it is ideational perfection of self, not imitation, that one will strive for.

Individuals, when discoursing in a spirit of inquiry, will experience light and interchanges of light—that is, the teacher and student positions will alternate, each feeding on the other, the baton of leadership passing back and forth. It is worthy of note that writing, reading, and printing have done away with many of the limitations once imposed on this process by time and space; we find ourselves elightened by ideas recorded in the distant past.

Refer again to Frederic Bastiat. We of recent generations have not had him as a personal acquaintance; thus, the leadership we are prone to ascribe to his person is patently false. The for what—the work—of this French philosopher and stateman constitutes the solid leadership we follow. His writings are clear expositions of ideas he perceived or consciousness he attained or principles he deduced; they are the fruits of his studies, gleanings from his devoted and intensive search for truth. His awareness that leadership is an ideational phenomenon rather than a personality trait caused him to conclude, "one must base his vote on for what instead of with whom."

When Abraham Lincoln in his Peoria speech said, "Stand with anybody that stands right. * * * Part with him when he goes wrong," he was advocating a disregard of who the person was and a skeptical look at what the person stood for. In short, when looking for leadership, look right through the individual in order to see the nature and quality of the idea or principle he espouses; look through the person, be he labeled friend or foe, Republican or Democrat, clergyman or layman, the great, the near-great, or the commoner. If what is found be adjudged valid and also helpful and enlightening—that is, above or beyond one's own lights—then there is leadership, the only kind that generates progress.

To test yourself for qualities of this "thought leadership," stand before a mirror. Then switch of the lights, or close your eyes, or imagine that your visible image completely disappears—that nothing remains but your invisible essence, your consciousness or range of perception, your thoughts and ideas. This is all the genuine leadership you possess; and the amount of it is to be measured by the extent to which others, looking through you, find enlightment in your ideas.

Searching for and finding leadership as it shows forth in others is nearly as difficult as developing it in self. For no one can comprehend a superior consciousness except as his own consciousness, in some measure, approximates the higher one. Thus, the search for leadership demands a continuing growth in healthy skepticism, discrimination, awareness, wisdom. That the search becomes more difficult as one advances is conceded, the difficulty accounting for much of the misconstruction put on leadership; discrimination in ideas is denied to those who find the required labor and self-discipline too difficult. Yet, sensing the need to follow something—all of us are followers in most respects—many people turn to "leaders"; they follow reputations of fallible men—ready-made and shallow answers to this native necessity—and thus, never discover the kind of leadership on which all progress, all human emergence, is founded.

Where there is no leadership—that is, good ideas being sought, grasped, explained, understood—there is no economic freedom, no liberty. Thus, we need to know what true leadership is, lest we be misled in our quest. Such truths as are perceived, not the persons advancing them, constitute the sole source of progress; only these truths qualify for that type of leadership worth developing or following.

The Late President, John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I know I cannot add anything of significance to the very eloquent and moving words which have already come from the saddened hearts of so many Members of this House over the untimely, the unnecessary, the tragic and shocking death of our late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

However, I would betray every impulse of my nature if I did not express my own deep sorrow and pay my poor flower of tribute to the many bouquets of friendship and affection which have been offered here in his memory.

Like many others, I was honored with the privilege of seeing and being with him on a number of occasions both public and private. He was always gay and cheerful. As someone has already said, "you could see a laugh coming in his eyes before you could hear it from his lips." He was always hungry for information and one of the best listeners I have ever known. In fact, he was a questioner. He posed the questions and complimented you by listening to your answers. The fact that he was so well informed can probably be attributed to his inquiring nature.

The world is a poorer place with the passing of this gallant leader, whose true greatness will never fully be known. We are saddened all the more because our beloved President has been taken from us at a time when his star was strongly in the ascendancy and his efforts for world peace and a better society were only beginning to bear fruit. Even so, his contributions are impressive and John F. Kennedy is destined to become a legend in our time.

In so many ways, the President was a study in contrasts. He was a humble man and a person of aristocratic bearing. He was a very warm human being and yet reserved. He was gentle and he was forceful. He was practical and he was indealistic. And he expressed himself with both eloquence and simplicity.

All of us were touched in one way or another by the courage and the example of this young President, who was wise beyond his years. Those of us who had the privilege of meeting with him occasionally will remember him as a soft-spoken man of great charm and good humor who would rather hear an opponent's views than criticize his thinking. One could and did differ with President Kennedy, but one could not do so without appreciating his openminded receptiveness to differing points of view which characterizes the scholar.

John F. Kennedy, the President, had political opponents, but I cannot believe that John F. Kennedy, the man, had any enemies. Even the man who assassinated him must have had a twisted, distorted, and confused mind. He was mentally and spiritually sick. Those who fought the President and his programs in the political arena would, I believe, be the first to acknowledge his sense of fairplay and his dedication to the democratic ideals and institutions of the country he loved so well. More than any of us realize, during the days and months and years that lie ahead, all of us will miss John F. Kennedy more and more.

The dignity and courage of our late President are traits shared equally by his noble, gallant, and beautiful widow. Mrs. Kennedy's inspiring example during these trying days will remain in our memories forever. May she find some solace in the knowledge that each of us shares her bereavement and joins in her prayers.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my second rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from May 1 to June 12, 1963:

Roll call No.	Date	H.R. No.	R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	Brief description
35	May 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (37 Members absent).
36	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Mills, Democrat, of Arkansas (49 Members absent).
37	May 6		do				Quorum call by Mr. Rogers, Democrat, of Colorado (133 Members absent).
38	do	40	Yea	274	30	129	Final passage of assistance to States re agricultural experiment stations.
39	May 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (54 Members absent).
*40	do	245	Nay	384	2	47	Final passage of measure purported to limit travel expenses for congressional staff members and Members of Congress.
41	May 8	5517	do	207	190	36	Motion to recommit a Senate-House conference report on supplemental appropriations.
42	May 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (46 Members absent).
*43	do	960	Nay	340	40	54	Final passage of measure denying employees right of appeal or hearing in the event that the Secretary of Defense made a ruling that they were a security risk (1 Member voted "present".)
44	May 13	4274	Yea	278	53	102	Final passage of measure authorizing supervised corporal punishment in Washington, D.C., school districts.
45	May 14	5517	do	241	130	62	Final passage of conference report recommitted by rollcall 41.
*46	do	5517	do	168	207	58	House-Senate conference report re Philippine war damage claims, to amend.
47	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bass, Democrat, of Tennessee (62 Members absent).
48	do	340	Not voting	153	217	64	Final passage of measure to send representatives to International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva (R.B.C. in committee hearing with Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; had I been present I would have voted "aye") (1 Member voted present). (See also vote No. 58.)
49	May 15		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma (43 Members absent) (R.B.C. in committee meeting with Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs).
50	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (38 Members absent).
*51	do	6009	Nay	195	222	15	Motion to recommit increase in national debt ceiling (1 Member voted present).
*52	do	6009	Yea	213	204	17	Final passage of national debt ceiling bill.
53	May 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Johansen, Republican, of Michigan (83 Members absent).
54	May 23	6060	Yea	362	9	64	Automatic rollcall on question of whether to debate the equal pay for equal work bill.
55	May 28		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (134 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference with officials of United Aircraft Corp.).
56	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Harris, Democrat, of Arkansas (154 Members absent).
57	May 29		do				Quorum call by Mrs. St. George, Republican, of New York (94 Members absent).
58	do	368	Yea	277	52	104	Appointment by Speaker of 2 Members to attend International Labor Conference, Geneva. (See vote No. 48 above.)
*59	do	5497	Nay	158	174	100	Bill to extend Public Law 78 (bracero program) for 2 years (1 Member voted present).
60	June 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (45 Members absent).
*61	do	3496	Nay	227	174	31	Motion to amend Reorganization Act of 1949 to prohibit Executive creation of any new executive department.
*62-65	do		Present				Quorum calls by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (average of 96 Members absent per call) to block discussion of civil rights under a special order.
*66	do		Nay	53	277	103	Motion to adjourn by Mr. Roosevelt, Democrat, of California.
*67-69	do		Present				Quorum calls by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (139 Members absent).
70	June 5		do				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (51 Members absent).
71	June 6		do				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (64 Members absent).
72	do	6754	Yea	288	79	65	Final passage of Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.
73	June 11		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Baldwin, Republican, of California (62 Members absent) (R.B.C. in conference with Mr. James P. Grant, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asian Affairs).
74	do	6868	Yea	271	122	39	Legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal 1964.
75	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bromwell, Republican, of Iowa (82 Members absent).
76	June 12		do				Quorum call by Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota (28 Members absent).
77	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (64 Members absent) (R.B.C. at Far East and Pacific Subcommittee for testimony of Mr. John Everton, U.S. Ambassador to Burma).
78	June 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kilburn, Republican, of New York (48 Members absent).

* Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 40

House Joint Resolution 245 purportedly limits travel expenses abroad for Congressmen and congressional staff members to a per diem allowance and transportation costs. In my judgment, adverse publicity early in the session on the junketing practices of certain Members stampeded Congress into adopting House Joint Resolution 245. At present there are adequate rules of the Congress, which, if rigidly enforced, would protect the public from any would-be malefactors. House Joint Resolution 245 is not foolproof. Its provisions can be circumvented just as existing rules can be thwarted. I considered my vote against the resolution to be a small exercise of protest in contrast to a large exercise of pacification. I also consider the proposal to be discriminatory, in that Congressmen on official business overseas will not be reimbursed for such necessary expenses as phone calls, cables, interpreters, et cetera. Executives in the private sector are reimbursed for all necessary expenses relative to their work, and I see no reason why Members of Congress should not be accorded the same consideration. It is significant that the House failed to include travel within the United States in the proposal. If the resolution is indeed aimed at accomplishing great reforms, I would think its applicability should not be limited to travel abroad.

ROLLCALL NO. 43

Sections 302(a) and 302(b) of this bill provide for a full field examination before a new employee of the National Security Agency is cleared, and establishes a board of appraisal to review each case. I, of course, subscribe to these provisions. Section 303, however, vests the Secretary of Defense with the summary and unreviewable power to discharge as a security risk any employee of the NSA. No hearing whatever is to be granted to the employee. No matter how many years he may have been employed, he is not entitled to know what the charges are against him, nor who made them. It was because of this section that I opposed the bill. It not only exposes individuals to possible injustice, it exposes the agency itself to a risk that it will lose valuable personnel because some slanderer subjects them to suspicion. Hearings and appeal procedures are an asset, not a liability, because they strengthen morale and diminish the chances of mistaken identity, prejudice, and other errors of judgment. They grow out of a long Anglo-American experience in the administration of justice—out of a knowledge that confrontation and cross-examination are invaluable tools for the discovery of truth.

ROLLCALL NO. 46

At issue on this vote was whether the United States should pay $73 million in war damage claims directly to the Philippine Government, or disburse this sum—through the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—to the individual damage claimants. The amendment which I supported called for the latter method, with the stipulation that claim-

ants certify they would not pay fees to former Philippine War Damage Commission personnel. This would preclude payments to lobbyists who, while members of the War Damage Commission, had also been on the payroll of various corporations entitled to reimbursement under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. The purpose of the act was to provide public rehabilitation of the Philippine economy through payments to individuals and private corporations and organizations. The act explicitly stated that "Compensation shall be payable only to qualified persons." Members who voted against the amendment on this rollcall advocated payment of claims to the Philippine Government and not to the qualified persons as cited in the 1946 law. In my judgment it was not proper to bring a third party—the Philippine Government—into negotiations between the United States and private parties with financial claims against our Government. The United States has no guarantee that the Philippine Government will pay the $73 million to qualified persons under the 1946 act. I found no justification to circumvent existing law once the loophole allowing payment of fees to lobbyists had been closed.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 51 AND 52

It is interesting to note that on final passage of the national debt ceiling bill, only one Republican (former Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN) voted for the increase. The GOP undoubtedly analyzed the bill in political terms—a means of financially crippling the Kennedy administration—rather than in terms of national welfare. H.R. 6009 increases the temporary national debt limit by $2 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963, and by an additional $2 billion during the first 2 months of fiscal 1964. The bill was passed after the House rejected (rollcall 51) a GOP motion to recommit the measure to Ways and Means with instructions to amend it to continue the temporary $305 billion debt ceiling. In rebutting arguments that increasing the debt ceiling was a signal for greater spending, I pointed out that Congressional restraint in passing new programs is the only effective way to control Government spending since the ceiling is a measure of what the Government must borrow to pay for the programs that Congress authorizes. Various emergency actions which the Treasury might take in managing the debt if the ceiling were not raised included: drawing down Treasury cash balances and endangering current policies that limit the flow of dollars abroad; halting the sale of savings bonds; disposing of Federal properties such as mortgages and stockpiled metals on a crash basis which would limit credit for home buyers and hurt the mining industry; and slowing down existing defense and space commitments. Apparently the GOP felt these consequences to be in the national interest. I did not. During debate a conservative southern Democrat told Republicans that:

> The greatest disservice that any of us who claim to be conservatives can do is, under the guise of conservatism, follow policies which are not sound or give the public an erroneous impression of the Nation's fiscal position.

It is also important to recall that during the Eisenhower years the debt ceiling was raised periodically and substantially with the strong support of Republicans and Democrats. As one Member pointed out to the GOP:

> I hope my Republican colleagues will reread their old speeches and again reach their conclusion of yesteryear, because—
>
> "Nor all their piety nor wit
> Can cancel half a line
> Nor all their tears
> Wash out a word of it."

ROLLCALL NO. 59

This year the administration proposed a 1-year extension of the bracero program plus an amendment designed to strengthen the protection for domestic farm labor. The House Agriculture Committee, however, reported a 2-year extension without the amendment sought by the Department of Labor. Contrary to popular misconceptions about the bracero program, it is not administered without cost to American taxpayers. In fiscal 1963 an estimated $1.4 million in Labor Department funds was spent to insure that American farmers complied with wage and other regulations applicable to braceros. Farmers, however, are not required to offer American workers equivalent workmen's compensation or occupational insurance coverage, housing or transportation expenses. In 1962 there were 226,948 braceros imported to the United States for farm jobs, this in the face of about 5.5 million Americans in the ranks of the unemployed. The record indicates that the bracero program depressed the wages and working conditions of American migrant farm laborers, who had no systematic program of recruitment and work contracts to assist them in competing with bracero labor, and who were not offered the same fringe benefits as Mexican laborers. With the termination of Public Law 78 I believe that a similar recruitment programs should be provided for domestic migrant laborers. I am also confident that with abolishment of the Bracero program an adequate supply of American workers can be found to do stoop labor if offered decent wages and working conditions.

ROLLCALL NO. 61

H.R. 3496, a bill to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 with an amendment prohibiting the President from recommending establishment of any new executive department, was passed by a conservative coalition. On this rollcall 158 Republicans joined with 65 southern Democrats to give President Kennedy what, in effect, was an undeserved rebuke. Only three Republicans voted against the measure. The act grants authority to the President to transmit to the Congress for its approval or its disapproval reorganization plans in the executive branch. It was under this authority that President Eisenhower recommended a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President's recommendations are sent to the House Committee on Government Operations. Extensive hearings are held on the proposal. If any Member of Congress files a resolution of disapproval of the plan, and the resolution is approved by the Congress, the President's plan to reorganize is dead. This is standard legislative procedure: the Executive proposes and the Congress disposes—it either accepts or rejects. With the amendment embodied in H.R. 3496 Congress withdrew the power of the President to propose. Those who voted for the amended bill voted to turn the clock back, not just back of Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt, but back of President Hoover, who first suggested the legislation. It is interesting to note that in 1953, when a bill to renew the authority of President Eisenhower to initiate reorganization plans (including the authority to set up new departments) came before the House, it was passed by a vote of 389 to 5. Democrats supported the proposal 184 to 2. Republicans were for it 205 to 3. Democrats gave a Republican President similar support in 1955, 1957, and 1959. In 1963, with a Democrat in the White House, Democrats asked Republicans to give a Democratic President the same powers and responsibilities—no more, but no less—that Democrats gave to a Republican President. It is unfortunate that when the vote was taken the GOP had its eye only on partisan politics and the 1964 campaign, not on efficiency and economy in Government.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 62–69

Under House rules it is impossible to conduct a filibuster of the Senate variety. However, repeated quorum calls can be used to stall speeches on controversial issues when they are being discussed under a special order. It is this tactic which southerners may use to temporarily block northern discussion of civil rights. After regular business had been transacted on June 4, Representative LINDSAY, of New York took the floor to discuss the civil rights crisis under a special order. The southern bloc, led by Representative WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, walked off the floor, leaving Mr. LINDSAY without a quorum. Mr. WILLIAMS then made the point of order that a quorum was not present and asked for a rollcall. Mr. LINDSAY was precluded from speaking while this procedure was in progress, about one-half hour. As you will remember from our discussion on rollcall No. 1, it takes about 40 minutes to complete a quorum call. When a quorum had assembled, Mr. WILLIAMS again walked out, and with him went the number of southern Members necessary to make up the quorum. Then Mr. WILLIAMS came back, noticed the absence of a quorum and again the process was repeated several times. I remained on the floor until late in the evening, giving Mr. LINDSAY, a Republican, my support. At one point, a motion was made to adjourn, a move which, if successful, would have given token victory to the southern coalition. I voted against adjournment on the principle that all Members, regardless of party or philosophy, have a right to present their views in the Congress. I was gratified when southerners finally gave up their obstructionist fight and permitted Mr. LINDSAY to proceed with his speech on civil rights.

Nuclear Ship "President Kennedy": Symbol of America of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, some 3 weeks ago an outstanding, dedicated, and I must say, much too modest Member of this House of Representatives, presented an important address before the annual meeting of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in New York on November 15, 1963.

At that time our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, HERBERT C. BONNER, delivered a message that should be read and taken to heart by all Americans. As he gave a balanced and reasonable analysis of our present depressed maritime situation, he called for constructive action and reappraisal by all concerned.

Even as he was critical of the lagging pace of our liner replacement program, the lack of constructive developments in tramp and domestic shipping, our nuclear ship project and our treatment of superliner legislation, he was calling for more appreciation of our needs and the actions to satisfy them.

I applaud and heartily endorse his criticism and his call for action. The surest way for us to become second-rate in this world is to continue to allow our decline at sea.

HERB BONNER has fought the odds of ignorance over the years of his chairmanship of an important, but little appreciated, committee since January of 1955. Indeed, his influence has been applied in all the years since he became a member of the committee upon his arrival in Congress in 1940. He knows whereof he speaks.

I have had the honor of serving on the Merchant Marine Committee with its distinguished chairman. I have also served on the Armed Services Committee. From those vantage points one learns the essentiality of national seapower—the vital importance of strength at sea in all its aspects. Military, commercial, and scientific—these are fields in which we must be able to stand on our own without dependence upon others. Supremacy at sea is as important as supremacy in space.

So I earnestly commend to this House a careful reading of his thoughtful remarks on the state of our merchant marine today, his criticism, and his suggestions for future, but careful action.

In his well-reasoned speech to the distinguished group of maritime technicians, he expressed his belief that there is a continuing need for large passenger ships under the American flag. He called for review of our need for ships that will express the American ideal around the world—ships that would serve the practical purposes of being available for use if we should ever again have need for dependable, massive military support to follow initial airlift to any of the trouble spots of the future—ships capable of efficiently maintaining the flow of fighting men to the beachheads in a continuous pipeline of strength.

I agree.

And I want to take this opportunity to urge that the superliner legislation that passed the Congress so overwhelmingly in the previous administration be reveiwed, and reenacted if necessary, to provide for a few outstanding passenger vessels under the American flag for operation in those ocean services where there is a great and growing demand for sea travel.

In the vanguard of such a program, I urge the immediate study of the design of a ship which would know no peer for the foreseeable future, powered by nuclear energy, economically feasible for regular service in the transpacific and capable of round-the-world operation.

I would name this ship Nuclear Ship *President Kennedy*.

I can think of no more fitting tribute to the man who has left us with such tragic suddenness, who, despite his youthful years, has been called the First Citizen of the World.

Congressman BONNER's careful analysis of where we stand, why, and where we should go to strengthen our seaborne posture follows:

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, DEMOCRAT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING OF SOCIETY OF NAVAL ARCHITECTS AND MARINE ENGINEERS AT WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1963

Admiral James, members of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am highly honored to be your guest speaker here tonight at the high point of the 71st annual meeting of this outstanding society, composed of the leading representatives of all the segments which, in combination, create the hard core of total American seapower. I am tremendously impressed by the attendance, knowing that here on the speaker's stand and in the audience are so many of the great names and personalities in our American shipping, shipbuilding, ship repair, and ship equipment industries, the U.S. Navy, and the other Government agencies concerned with our seaborne posture.

Those among you who are professional naval architects and marine engineers comprise the elite group who have the know-how to point the way to technical progress in our seagoing enterprises and to translate into workable terms sound concepts of those less skilled in the finer aspects of your art.

Back in the early spring, when your president, Admiral James, extended to me his flattering invitation to be your speaker tonight, I felt I had plenty of time to bone up on some of the details of your specialty so that I could talk to you with the fullest sense of confidence. However, as this date approached and I received a copy of your program listing the 11 technical papers presented during this session, my earlier self-assurance was shattered. I have to confess that I can't even say some of the words you use—much less understand their meaning.

So, it is with a considerabl sense of humility that I appear here tonight to discuss a few of the very many problems that beset us in our exploitation of the world's oceans for our security and economy.

In any discussion of American seapower it is essential to outline briefly where we stand at the present before we attempt to chart a course for the future. We know that our well-established goals are to have an American merchant marine adequate to meet the requirements of national security and the economic welfare of the United States. But where are we in relation to those goals—what obstacles stand in the way of their achievement?

I will not go into much detail, because I am sure most of you are familiar with the figures that show we are far short of having the merchant marine required by our national maritime policy.

Yes, there is a merchant ship replacement program underway, producing slightly over a dozen new cargo ships per year. These new ships are larger and faster than the prewar and war-built ships they replace. But, there are only about 300 of them in prospect under present planning. Since the long-delayed replacement program was initiated in 1958, only 76 vessels have been delivered and entered into service. Present plans call for completing replacement of the subsidized fleet no sooner than 1975. There are no known plans for enlarging the fleets of the present subsidized operators.

There are no plans for replacement of most of the 680 obsolescent, aging American-flag ships owned by the unsubsidized operators.

In January 1954, the active U.S. seagoing merchant fleet consisted of 1,249 ships. As of January 1, 1963, this number was 985 ships—a drop of 264, or at the rate of 24 ships per year. Of the dry cargo ships still active, 90 percent are over 15 years of age.

Note—in connection with these depressing figures—that the U.S.-flag participation in our foreign commerce as recently as 1961 has been as low as 8.8 percent. Today, I believe it hovers around 10 percent.

While our merchant fleet has been rapidly diminishing, our foreign commerce has been rapidly increasing—from 143 million tons in 1950 to about 308 million tons currently. Reliable estimates indicate that continued steady increase in our waterborne foreign commerce will reach 370 million tons or more by 1970. Obviously, we are falling increasingly behind in our merchant shipping position.

While we are deteriorating, most of our free world foreign competitors are carrying their own commerce at percentage rates ranging from 38 percent in Sweden; 41 percent in West Germany; 50 percent in Japan; and 53 percent in the United Kingdom. Relative weakness in relation to our foreign competitors will inevitably leave us at their mercy in world trading.

When the amazing buildup of merchant shipping in the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc is taken into account, our position becomes even more alarming.

As I have indicated, the downward trend in the American merchant marine has been going on for a number of years. It has been clear over these years that the rising costs of Government aid to maintain our merchant fleet on a parity with those of competing foreign-flag fleets have played a material part in the reluctance of both the executive branch and the Congress to broaden in numbers and categories those eligible to receive assistance. In fact, seeking means to minimize assistance to those already receiving it, the Government has urged, and is using, such devices as restraints on the number of subsidized voyages; increasing the statutory life of vessels from 20 to 25 years; holding to a minimum budget requests for the numbers of new ships to be constructed for the replacement program each year; and failure to request authorized appropriations, as in the case of the superliners.

Thus, while our national policy and our clear national interest calls for many more—and more modern—vessels than we have in our oceangoing merchant marine, fiscal restraints—rather than national need—dictate the size, scope, and pace of our program.

Considering the outstanding contractual obligations between the Government and the existing subsidized operators, it can readily be seen that under current fiscal policies there is not much leeway for expansion of the fleet. There is no balanced or concerted national program with regard to tramps, ore carriers, or tankers. They must scramble for what they can get in the way of Government-sponsored cargoes under the Cargo Preference Act—or military cargoes. Present administrative policies force all oversea tanker and ore-carrying vessels to foreign flags.

It seems that this scramble for participation in the limited available forms of Government support is also a major contributing factor in the frequently fierce interunion rivalries which create so much of the instability in our merchant shipping.

And the efforts of the seagoing unions to maintain their memberships through various devices exacted at the bargaining table have contributed to excessive wages and overtime and excessive manning.

These elements have been apparent for a number of years.

In 1955 and 1956, my committee inquired extensively into labor-management problems. Hopefully, we thought that the thorough airing of the problems before a sympathetic and friendly forum would lead to voluntary settlement of differences in line with our concepts of free collective bargaining, and would make more restrictive action, such as legislation, unnecessary.

Unfortunately and regretfully, our hopes were not realized. Five of the eight times in which the injunctive procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act have been invoked have occurred since that review of maritime labor-management problems.

The severe seamen's strikes in 1961 and 1962 and the long, hardheaded, and fruitless longshore strike of December and January, 1962–63, seemed to emphasize the need for again reviewing maritime labor-management relations. Clearly, something needed to be done which would—after complete breakdown of collective bargaining processes—nevertheless protect the third party interests—the public interest—to prevent deep damage to the health, safety, and welfare of this country, engaged as it is in a world where national survival is at stake. Public tolerance—or was it apathy?—resulted in the recent temporary defeat of our very moderate legislation on the piously spoken grounds that it would destroy free collective bargaining and strike at the very roots of the American system. "Leave it up to us," said the opponents to the bill, "and we will not only work out our problems but the public interest will gain thereby."

While all of this was going on we were being confronted with the unbelievable nonsense which has tied up our proud symbol of peacetime uses of the atom, the nuclear ship *Savannah*; the fantastic dispute which arose over the SS *Maximus*; and the utterly outrageous tragi-comedy which has retired the SS *America* from service for many months, if not forever.

I am not here to assess particular blame for these tissue-destroying illnesses. The well known and oft repeated facts and figures should be evidence enough that we have not found the answers.

Former Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Fred Korth, summed up the situation well in a recent article saying:

"In perspective, our merchant marine has not been reduced to its present state due to labor-management difficulties, improper legislation, or unsound shipping practices. These are merely symptoms of the real problem, which is a lack of understanding as to why we need a strong, healthy shipping industry and, therefore no public resolve to do something about it."

This public resolve must be stimulated without further delay if we are to avoid what Admiral Mahan called "the rude awakening of those who have abandoned their share of the common birthright of all people—the sea."

Subsidy alone is no longer—if it ever was—the only answer to maintaining and developing a competitive merchant marine.

We have long since passed the point where we can refuse to reduce costs through mechanization on the grounds that it will mean loss of jobs. On the contrary, the rapidly increasing use of mechanization, or so-called automation, by our competitors—the foreign merchant fleets of Japan, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain and other nations—make it essential that we, too, follow that course as rapidly as possible.

The high level of our economy and our way of life has grown from the untrammeled freedom to invent and employ labor-saving and cost-saving devices and systems. To carry forward with the concept of parity—so inherent in our system of Government aid to shipping—we, too, must automate simply to hold our own.

Up until now, shipping management for the most part has been timid or complacent in regard to crossing the frontiers of automation. Labor has been apprehensive or even belligerent. But the lines are drawn. As one outstanding shipping man said not too long ago, "We must automate or stagnate." This is the very minimum. The alternative could, and possibly would, be instantaneous block obsolescence not too far in the future.

Happily, changes in these attitudes are occurring. Management and labor on the Pacific coast have recognized the problem in the longshore industry and reached agreement which seems to be going well. Today's technology can readily provide the means to bring about major economies in ship design, construction, and operation. Steps are being made in this direction, and a few—though yet a very few—American shipping lines are incorporating mechanized systems in groups of ships presently under contract or obligation. Maritime labor has also recognized that the road to our maritime development, as well as survival, depends upon our taking advantage of the economies of mechanization.

Here, I must comment upon another phase of the American maritime industry where much must be done.

In World War II, with an effort costing more than $12 billion, our shipyards turned out over 5,000 merchant-type ships in a period of 4 years. This entailed the construction of entirely new shipyards. Workers had to be trained, many of whom had never seen a ship, let alone had any experience in their construction. This was possible not only through three-shift, round-the-clock operation, but through the development and employment of new techniques.

By the end of the war, with an oversupply of ships and shipbuilding facilities, our existing yards began to become obsolete. At the same time, the other maritime nations of the world—to a considerable extent with our help—borrowed and adopted the fruits of our wartime experience and improved upon them to the point where the United States is now grievously behind.

We have the highest costs in the world. We pay the highest wages. We have a proliferation of shipyard trades. We take longer from keel laying to launching than several of the other major shipbuilding nations. Of all the leading shipbuilding nations of the world, our productivity is the lowest. This is not simply due to labor rates, for Sweden, whose wages are the highest in the world next to the United States, also has the highest productivity.

As a shipbuilding nation we now rank 9th.

Here I am not trying to say that anyone should expect the American worker to receive less than his brothers in other American industries, nor that our shipbuilding industry should voluntarily make the investments required to increase productivity and lower costs—without ships to build. I do say, however, that there is much to be done in this area which can and must be done in the interest of our national safety. We cannot afford to be behind the rest of the world in shipbuilding. A school child can recognize that we will not have the lead time we enjoyed at the outset of World War II. Our shipbuilding effort was our salvation in that war, and it might well be again. Therefore, as an instrument of national policy, our private shipbuilding industry deserves and needs national support.

I have deplored conditions and attitudes in shipping and shipbuilding and labor. Now I want to deplore attitudes existing in the Government itself.

Since the end of World War II, highly authoritative lipservice has been given by the several administrations to the need for an adequate, modern American merchant marine. Press releases and speeches from chief executives on down to much lesser officials have put together the right words to cheer the hearts and minds of those who appreciate the meaning of seapower. Expensive studies have shown the deficiencies in our maritime posture and made recommendations of various sorts for their correction. But, when it has come to implementing the fine words, significant results have not been forthcoming.

I have already mentioned some of the devices used to slow down our maritime program.

Now listen to this: In a recent opinion rendered in connection with the case of a new applicant for operation in our foreign trade, the majority opinion of the maritime agency pointed to strong foreign-flag competition as a reason for denying operating rights. I found this somewhat shocking, since the very purpose of the 1936 act is to meet foreign-flag competition.

More recently, a high level government-named group, appointed to study our maritime resources for security and trade, seriously made the suggestion that "in view of the world surpluses in shipping capacity, the search for additional practical possibilities for reliance on foreign-flag tonnage should be continued." This I also found shocking. Let's carry the idea a step further and place our reliance upon foreign-flag navies.

These views expressed by responsible sources high in the councils of the Government remind me of a story:

This is the story of a Navy ship which was designed as a commerce raider during the Civil War. She was carefully designed to prey effectively on British commerce if Britain should have joined the Confederacy. Her name was the *Wamponoag* (Wam-pon-o-og).

As a commerce raider, her chief requirements were light armament and extreme speed.

Upon completion, the shipping world was astounded when this new ship averaged 17 knots for 38 hours in a North Atlantic storm during her trial run in February 1868. This was a notable event, since the *City of Paris* held the blue ribbon at the time for crossing the Atlantic at maximum speed of 14 knots:

The Navy, in the early years of the transition from sail to steam, found itself in a predicament. How could this radical innovation of a ship be integrated into the established, traditional program?

The account goes on to say that a board of admirals was convened to serve as a panel to decide what should be done about the *Wamponoag*.

First, the experts agreed two blades of the four-bladed propeller should be removed. Thus, the ship would perform better under sail because of reduction of drag, with the remaining two blades hiding vertically behind the stern post.

It was further agreed that four stacks on such a ship made her a disgraceful-looking craft. So the experts decided to remove two of them. The remaining two, of course, would be telescoped so the ship would look better when it was rigged, and under sail. Of course, removing two of the stacks also made it necessary for them to take out half the boilers.

Then, this distinguished panel decided that it was of utmost importance that they be able to step a proper mainmast. However, a mainmast could not be stepped without the removal of the reduction gears. It was decided that this move should be made.

And, of course, by the time the experts had surveyed their own handiwork, they arrived at a decision that really the best thing to do to solve their problem would be to scrap the ship.

That was the end of the *Wamponoag*.

In reporting its findings, the board observed that the experience "nevertheless may serve as a source from which important lessons may be drawn, and among them it impresses the expediency of consulting, instead of ignoring, experienced and intelligent naval minds."

It was 20 years later, I understand, before the U.S. Navy again had a 17-knot ship.

I think this story points a moral.

To improve the performance and competitiveness of our merchant fleet and its usefulness as a naval auxiliary under emergency conditions, full application must be made of all new technologies. This was the motivation behind the legislation authorizing the construction of the nuclear ship, *Savannah*, which was first introduced in the Congress more than 8 years ago. No one expected the *Savannah* to be economically competitive. She represented that essential first step in the application of nuclear power to a surface vessel for peaceful purposes. She has had her problems—sometimes technical—more recently in the nontechnical area. If the *Savannah* had not been built we would probably not be much further ahead in our knowledge of the potentialities of nuclear ship propulsion than we were 8 years ago.

Whenever the subject of nuclear propulsion for merchant ships is raised, detractors still bring forth the argument that it is not economical; that it is too complex; that its safety has not been fully demonstrated, etc. What this really means is that it is new and will force a change in established concepts.

The *Savannah* has now been constructed and has provided sufficient operational experience to demonstrate that she is extremely safe, and that the propulsion of a merchant ship by means of nuclear power is practical. She has provided a testing ground for social problems which will have to be solved as we apply the new technologies to the merhcant marine of the future. She has been a ground breaker in obtaining acceptance in the very important area of port entry approvals here and abroad. I would not be so bold as to attempt to detail the various advantages offered by nuclear surface ship propulsion. They are many, as you know.

When considering the use of changed concepts in merchant shipping the key question always boils down to one of economics, so the question here is: "Can nuclear systems be used profitably?"

A new technology may offer unique advantages which, if properly used, could eventually lead to the replacement of a more or less conventional technology. On the other hand, the new technology cannot be forced into the straitjacket of the conventional, nor must it be rejected because it does not provide obvious advantages when used in accordance with conventional ground rules. Our *Wampanoag* story is a perfect illustration of what can happen with such a negative approach.

It is necessary to utilize the advantages offered by a new technology, first in those specific areas where maximum advantage can be taken, and then, as it enters useful operation, to improve it and its utilization until it becomes competitive in an ever-increasing area. In other words, use it where it makes the most sense.

According to what I hear from leading naval architects, high ranking Navy officers with intense and concentrated experience in nuclear propulsion for naval vessels, both submarine and surface, and from outstanding industry sources, we are now on the threshold of a breakthrough in nuclear ship applications which, if made now and used where they make the most sense, will produce economically justifiable reuslts.

On the strength of these authorities I take this occasion to urge that this country move forward to its next application of nuclear propulsion to a peaceful surface ship—an application whose success will be as assured as anything can be.

Some 6 years ago I introduced legislation to authorize the construction of an outstanding nuclear powered icebreaker for operation by the U.S. Coast Guard, capable of carrying out multiple missions in the Arctic and Antarctic regions—both areas in which we have great stake. I felt that taking all factors into account the construction of such a vessel made sense and was economically justifiable, even at that time. The legislation passed both Houses overwhelmingly, but was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Our need for new icebreakers increases daily as our interests in the polar regions expands. This need is more than ever a national need, above and beyond the traditional roles and missions of the Coast Guard in the field of icebreaking. Criticism undoubtedly will still be heard concerning the cost of new icebreakers with nuclear propulsion. But I believe the truly wasteful and extravagant course would be to proceed with the construction of conventional ships which will be obsolete by the time the first one is completed several years from now. The long range course, the economical course lies in boldly taking advantage of the most advanced technological concepts presently available so we will have an outstanding ship which may well remain modern over much if not all, of its useful life.

Nuclear power in an outstanding icebreaker, highly mechanized, would pay immediate returns on the investment, plus providing a testing ground of incalculable value for surface shipping of the future.

Again, to advance a proposal which I unsuccessfully espoused before, I want to now seriously urge consideration of the building of another and outstanding superliner passenger ship embodying the latest concepts of nuclear power, large passenger and troop capacity, high speed and extensive mechanization.

I do not believe that large passenger ships have become obsolete, but rather that we are in a transition period marking an increasing demand for surface ocean travel. Rising income levels and the increasing lengths of vacations, both here and abroad, are indicators in this direction.

I do not believe that surface transportation for emergency troop lift has become obsolete. Despite the great utility and advantages and the increasing capacity of airlift, I do not believe it is safe or sound for us to be unable to balance our troop transport capability with a few ships designed with troop lift in mind. Obviously this can be done most economically through the construction of vessels which will be gainfully employed during peacetime periods. Here, again, the construction of such an outstanding ship will not only serve maximum purposes as an element of the peacetime American merchant marine, available for effective use in time of war, and, incidentally contributing to the relief of our balance-of-payments problem, but it will serve as a practical laboratory for the continued advancement of our maritime technology.

I know that research and development programs are being undertaken by the Maritime Administration. I believe they are good programs, conducted with dedication. But it does little good to engage in research and development without application of the concepts being studied. Moreover, unless we follow through to employ on a broad scale the advanced concepts which are developed, we will be hastening the digging of our own grave as our competitors learn of and adopt the advances we conceive.

I conclude with these wise words of Sir Walter Raleigh:

"Whoever commands the sea, commands the trade; whoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself."

Eulogy for John Fitzgerald Kennedy by Rabbi Samuel D. Soskin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following beautiful eulogy delivered at the memorial service held on Monday, November 25, 1963, at Temple Beth Emeth of Flatbush, a congregation of which I have been a proud member since 1931. Rabbi Samuel D. Soskin, our spiritual leader, delivered this moving evocation of the spirit of John F. Kennedy.

The eulogy follows:

EULOGY FOR JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, DELIVERED BY RABBI SAMUEL D. SOSKIN, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE ON MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963, AT TEMPLE BETH EMETH OF FLATBUSH, BROOKLYN

"Out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh." * * * We are met in God's sanctuary to weep for a family which endures the cruel fellowship of sorrow and to mourn with all humanity the loss of one whose death diminishes all of us.

For John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the voice and conscience of a land which has stood as God's stake in human history. In this land millions of peoples have found something so unique, so magnificent that no words can adequately describe it. Perhaps it can best be named the flame of brotherhood in which men are given the right to speak freely and to worship in freedom. It is something Americans give to each other, in order that each may have it for himself.

That flame burned in the soul of our martyred President as he fought against those who would darken the bright landscape of our country with the wicked shadows of bigotry and intolerance. How much we owe to him who was the Ish Tam, the man whole in his integrity whose love for Nation was the reflection of our own love.

Though my soul is grieved, I think back on that event in Washington when the leaders of our Reform Jewish movement presented a Torah to our beloved President. Even now I am held captive to that moment when the descendant of Irish immigrants who had come to America to find freedom, took into his keeping the symbol of that tradition which echoed on Sinai's heights proclaiming that all men must be given freedom because all are God's children.

Surely we Jews should be the first to recognize that John Fitzgerald Kennedy lived by the ideals encased in that Torah and we can honor him only by seeking to match his consecration. It can be done if we are ready to labor and to sacrifice for the enrichment of the lives of fellow men. There are the hungry and the naked and the rejected of the world. They must be fed and clothed and redeemed. There are slums to be erased and bigotries to be wiped away. For what does it avail if men pray to God and do not deeds of justice?

John Fitzgerald Kennedy cherished a vision of a peaceful and righteous world. Within his soul he carried the gold of God which alone can forge the gates of the kingdom of heaven. The bullet which shattered his body could not destroy that vision. We, who are an ancient people and who have held that same vision, know that the coming of the kingdom may be far off. But, it is for us, despite the peril and our almost unbearable grief, to labor for that kingdom.

May the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, servant and leader of his people, friend of all mankind, quicken us for the task, that future generations may say of us as we say of him: "Zecher Tzadik Livrocho," may his memory be for an everlasting blessing.

Amen.

John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that the constituencies of all of my colleagues deeply felt the loss of the President, his tragic death had a tremendous personal impact in my district, for—as I have noted—he was a part of it.

With this in mind, I think it would be most appropriate to include in the RECORD a sampling of the many editorials and articles which appeared in the newspapers throughout southeastern Massachusetts and Cape Cod.

The first is from the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, and was published on November 23, the day after the fatal shooting:

JOHN F. KENNEDY

The American people are in shocked disbelief that President Kennedy is dead. He was the symbol of America's vitality, a man who drove himself day and night to lead the free world through some of its most trying hours.

That was wiped out in a terror-filled moment in Dallas. A sniper's bullet proved once more that the President of the United States is not invincible even though he is the repository of more power than any other person in the world.

The assassin, somehow, thought his miniscule of discontent was greater than the hopes and aspirations of millions of Americans who praised, admired, worked for and, yes, loved the President.

Tragedy had dogged Mr. Kennedy much of his life. An elder brother, Joe, was killed over France while on a special air mission during World War II. A sister, Kathleen, died in an airplane crash. It was only 3 months ago that the President's own son died, shortly after birth.

As a Harvard student, Mr. Kennedy injured his back playing football. He was badly wounded by enemy action in the South Pacific in 1943, for which he was awarded the Purple Heart. While on a Pacific island he contracted malaria, from which he suffered periodic attacks for several years.

None of these deterred John F. Kennedy.

He wrote "Profiles in Courage" in longhand in a hospital bed while recuperating from a spinal operation. His wartime injury did not prevent him from campaigning for a House seat and was not going to diminish his contributions as a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts. Nor did a painful back discourage him from maintaining a rigorous schedule in the 1960 presidential campaign.

While in Canada, Mr. Kennedy injured his back once more. His pace never slackened. He was a living "profile in courage."

At this moment, Mr. Kennedy's widow and family are in their loneliest hours. Messages of condolence, letters of sympathy from round the world, and the tears of those close to the late President cannot fill the void in their lives.

Massachusetts mourns its brave native son. The Nation joins in the mourning for John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Next, Mr. Speaker, a particularly well-written tribute from the Wareham Courier of Wareham, Mass.:

HIS LEGACY IS GREATNESS

Never before has one human being been mourned by so many throughout the world.

Never has there been such a spontaneous and universal expression of genuine grief. It became increasingly obvious that the assassin's bullet unleashed an emotional floodgate, the likes of which had never been known on this earth. It also became evident that John Fitzgerald Kennedy had achieved a stature, in a lifetime shorter than most, unparalleled in history.

Even those who, prior to the deed which plunged the world into darkness temporarily, were at the opposite political pole, or who would have denied a personal liking, suddenly discovered they harbored a steadily growing, sincere affection for this young man who wore the cloak of maximum responsibility and world leadership so gracefully. They, too, fought to hold back tears of sorrow.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy epitomized the American dream—that the Presidency is within the reach of anyone, regardless of race, creed, or color.

This young man, who was overtaken by destiny too soon, grasped the reins of Government of the greatest country in the world at a time when the greatest threat to survival faced that country. He held with a firm hand, and kept us on the road, avoiding the abyss of annihilation which faced us at every turn.

For his Americanism, for his leadership, for his timeless example of what a God-fearing man should be, we offer the words spoken regularly at the end of each of his press conferences, and which we now utter with a much deeper meaning, "Thank you, Mr. President."

For its special Thanksgiving edition, the Old Colony Memorial of Plymouth, Mass., noted that while life goes on "remorselessly," and that a tragedy of timeless implications had befallen the Nation, we owe a debt of gratitude to this country's founders for a Constitution that insured the continuity of Government:

THANKSGIVING DAY, 1963

The murder of the President and all its attendant circumstances have added up to the most harrowing public event that most of us shall ever know.

This was a tragedy of antique power, with timeless implications. Who now can doubt the workings of Providence?

Life goes on remorselessly. The darkest pall must disperse, the sun shine again. Yet Thanksgiving, 1963, cannot be like most, coming so closely as it does on the heels of this dreadful happening.

A great leap into the dark has been taken. Gone is a brave and clear-minded man, who strove with all his might to help and keep us. The bitterness of his taking lingers in the mouth and will not wash away.

Therefore, this year we must look outside our own circle for other things besides family togetherness, abundance of food, and traditional comforts to be thankful for.

Our gratitude must go to the Founding Fathers who, with great foresight, in making the Constitution insured the continuity of our Government, and with it our national life. The banner fell. But swiftly it was raised again.

We have cause for thanks, too, in the fact that our new President is a man of great experience, strong and wise enough to take over the great burdens of Chief Magistrate.

Then there is one more, final reason for thanksgiving. This is the certain knowledge, demonstrated on massive scale, that in crisis the people of America feel and react as one, and so doing draw the whole world in their train.

During the first hours after the President's death a great emptiness came on the land. But soon into the air stole intimations of a slow, sad music, the music of the people, murmuring as one. And presently the mighty and the weak, the few and the many, closed ranks, like the closing of a giant fist.

With this, quite spontaneously, affirmed by the very heart and instinct of all Americans, the President's death became felt as a kind of sacrifice, and the legacy of his hopes took on an even greater urgency than when he had lived.

For reasons inscrutable John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been reduced to dust and a cruel blow visited upon his beloved wife and children, his family and all who loved or liked him. Yet this same blow shocked all Americans into a unique awareness of their nationhood, warned them in terrible depth of responsibilities too often neglected.

This last circumstance has nothing, of course, to do with gratitude. Rather it calls, on this 1963 Thanksgiving Day, for meditation on the final meaning of this life, and a tally not of benefits, but of things worth living—and dying—for.

The famed Vineyard Gazette on Martha's Vineyard hailed the late President for his candor and for representing, as he did, "the utter routing of bigotry."

A MEMORIAL IN THE HEARTS OF MEN

He will be forever young. His youth will live in the pages of history, and this is not a small or unimportant thing. Amid frustration and erosion of the spirit, gravity and crisis, the abundance of John Fitzgerald Kennedy's fresh spirit and optimism will supply the strength of his unforgettable example.

All else aside, he represented too the utter routing of bigotry. In candor of language and behavior, in the context of his personal and official life, it was inconceivable that he would abate in the least from his own faith, or that he would seek to impose it upon others. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews were free to support his policies, and they did; they were as free to oppose his policies, and they did.

The best memorial that can be erected to him is a larger sense of humanity in the hearts of men and women. The things that bind together are more important than the things that rend apart. What diminishes humanity for one, diminishes it for all.

The lesson has been taught for some 2,000 years, but it has not yet been completely learned. May not this tragedy, the dimensions of which are so hard to conceive, bring home again and in the new light

of our times, the force of the spirit and ethic which alone can justify and fulfill our common heritage.

The base newspaper at Otis Air Force Base, where *Air Force 1* made many landings, carried the following tribute from the wing commander, Col. Rudolph B. Walters:

It is difficult during this time of national sorrow to find words capable of expressing the depth of the grief felt by all persons at Otis AFB.

Each person here felt particularly close to President Kennedy, partially due, perhaps, to his frequent visits here. This tragedy has struck us a deep personal blow.

As for myself, I feel that—in addition to losing my Commander in Chief—I have lost a personal beloved friend.

Col. RUDOLPH B. WALTERS.

My predecessor in Congress, former Congressman Donald W. Nicholson, now in retirement at his home in Wareham, Mass., served in the House with the late President and counted him a personal friend. The Wareham Courier printed the following tribute from Congressman Nicholson:

It was with overwhelming shock and sadness that I heard of the untimely death of President Kennedy. I considered him a personal friend and I used to call him "Johnny." Besides his outstanding ability as a legislator for he was very much a friend and thoughtful to all, as everyone can testify.

Speaking for an area of Cape Cod that John Kennedy knew well, the Provincetown Adovate and New Beacon of Provincetown expressed the shock and remorse felt throughout the land:

[From the New Beacon, Nov. 27, 1963]

HAIL AND FAREWELL

Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country.—John F. Kennedy

"He did a great job as President." These were the words of Town Manager Walter E. Lawrence as he reflected upon the sudden and tragic death last Friday of President John F. Kennedy. "His loss is a tragedy for the country and the world," Mr. Lawrence continued. "He was a good, clean, honest, intelligent, young man, whose conduct of affairs met with the approval of his countrymen. Again, his death was indeed a tragic loss."

We echo these words. That such a man, who, in the prime of his life was leading his country ever forward, meeting the problems of the century, both foreign and domestic squarely, and solving them, had evoked nothing but praise from his fellow countrymen of both high and low station.

The late President was a friend of the people. He liked to shake their hand. When there was a problem he told them about it straight from the shoulder, and just what he intended to do about it. He was idolized and mobbed by the younger citizens wherever he went.

Also, the diplomats of the world came to know him as a tactful and resolute negotiator, who wouldn't back down, and always stood up for what he thought was right.

His life as a family man, a loved and loving father to his two children is well known. Much time was spent with Caroline and John, Jr., as much as the affairs of state would allow. Their loss is indeed great.

But to Mrs. Kennedy, the solid Jacqueline, who stayed with her husband from the time of the fatal shot, until the final taps at Arlington National Cemetery, go our heartfelt sympathies. This strong wife was forced to control her feelings and emotions, so that her husband's funeral would be a period of national solemnity, rather than hysteria. To this end she was admirable.

The cape, the State, the country, and the world has lost one of its most dynamic citizens of the 20th century. To him indeed should go the Nobel Peace Prize. As we go forward into the sixties and seventies, let us walk upon that road which he set out to travel, that road that may be paved with ruts and curves, but at its end we will find his goal, and surely our goal—peace and freedom for the whole world. This is his legacy to us. Let us use it well.

[From the Provincetown Advocate, Nov. 28, 1963]

CAPE END STUNNED BY TRAGIC EVENTS—SCHOOLS, BUSINESSES IN MOURNING

Even now Provincetown is quiet, drained of emotion, and still unbelieving.

The news of the assassination of President Kennedy on Friday afternoon came over television and radio minutes after it happened in Dallas, Tex., and it came to an incredulous cape end town far out in a November Atlantic.

First to feel the onslaught of the ghastly tragedy was the town telephone switchboard. Chief Operator Frances Raymond said that suddenly every line flared red, and she had to call for additional help until the force was doubled and every board position filled.

Gradually the streets of the town emptied, and cape enders sat at their radios and TV sets getting more news as soon as it was broadcast. There they stayed for most of the weekend through the tragic drama unfolding in Dallas and Washington.

As soon as reason began to return, many Provincetown people turned to their churches with questioning hearts, and they began to plan for their own mourning. Some places closed immediately and remained so through Monday, though most of the shops and offices closed for the day of the funeral. All schools, too, closed on Monday.

In all churches there were memorial services. At the Universalist Church here in Provincetown in place of the scheduled Thanksgiving message the service was devoted to John F. Kennedy as it was at the Truro Congregational Church. The Church of St. Mary of the Harbor held a memorial service Friday night and a requiem communion service on Monday noon. The Provincetown Methodist Church held a memorial service on Monday during the time of the services in Washington.

Over in Wellfleet the Methodist Church was opened on Friday night for prayers, and on Monday held a communion and prayer service at 3 p.m. The Christian Union Church in North Truro held a memorial service at 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

At the church of St. Peter the Apostle in Provincetown on Sundary night there were evening devotions and recitation of the rosary offered for President Kennedy and a requiem funeral high mass was held Monday night. In Wellfleet there was a funeral mass on Monday night at Our Lady of Lourdes Church and in Truro at the Sacred Heart Church, and at the Church of Our Lady of Perpetual Help in North Truro there were funeral masses at 8 a.m. on Monday morning. The First Church of Christ Scientist held memorial services at Orleans on Monday afternoon.

Two other fine Cape Cod newspapers published editorials that should be included in this small collection. The first, from the Cape Codder, published at Orleans, comments on the violence of the act, and the cruel irony that a man who stood for tolerance and good will was struck down by a moment of hate:

WHAT OF HATE, FRIENDS, WHAT OF HATE?

Why is the sense of loss so great? Why does it curl the heart with a pain that will not be quenched? We think it must be because the loss is, one and at the same time, personal and for the world of man. We grieve for our finite selves and for the infinite world. This is almost unbearable grief because we measure the loss not for ourselves alone but for man everywhere. Something in all mankind was killed by that hateful lead pellet and we all know it.

As and if we know this, there lies the hope. Perhaps—just perhaps—the incredible futility and waste of this mad act may serve to bring home the good this man worked for, a good whose essential was the eradication of violence among men and the hate that spawns violence. His death out of hate and through violence may demonstrate as nothing else could the necessity of bringing about the aims he stood for.

Let there be no mistake about this fact: The hate that killed him is the responsibility of all of us. It will not be fobbed off on the head of the madman who pulled the trigger. It is the same hate and violence that denies the brotherhood of man, that would pit brother against brother in bloodlust rather than tolerate the negotiation of honest differences of opinion between rational men. It is the mark of Cain that we all bear.

What he stood for was a great tolerance, a sense of feeling that encompassed the plight of our Negro citizens in their eminently just search for equality as well as the desperate struggle of all men for peace that would spare nuclear destruction. The great irony is that because of these things he was the object of hate when to all men of good will—and they are multitudinous, in the North and in the South, in the East and in the West—he should have been universally loved.

Now, in death, he is loved. Is it too late?
Hear the tolling bells?
Hear the muffled drums?
They toll, they beat for all of us.

The Dennis-Yarmouth Register made noteworthy comments on the late President's youth and the inspiration his youthful service has been to the young people of the country:

FIRE FROM A DARK FRIDAY

By the time this is printed, volumes will have been written and spoken about the events of the past week. The Nation, under the practiced hand of President Johnson, will have ceased its trembling. The people, having purged their guilt through the mechanisms of mourning, will be composed.

In all probability there is nothing left to be said that could add to the eulogies or to the marvelous articulateness of President Kennedy himself, as passages of his speeches are played back over the radio and television and in our minds.

Nevertheless, one thought arises insistently from the fact of our President's youth. His death would have been more bearable if it had not been for that.

For we are left forever to speculate what might have been, what contribution might have come from a President of the United States, only just come to the peak of extraordinary personal ability.

This thought of youth colors another fact. The excitement aroused by this unusual President infected most deeply young people, people who will increase in places of power and influence for decades to come. His death, still so preposterous, must sooner or later come into perspective. It is the young people who must draw from it a meaning.

It was this generation which could light a fire, he said. The rifle shot extinguished one blazing figure. But could we hope it also kindled the fire of which John F. Kennedy spoke, kindled it among those best able to make it bright? Isn't that the only possible meaning?

As the Nation rearranges itself without President Kennedy, to face a world suddenly drab and tense, we should be looking beyond the shame and degradation of last week. We should look for the flame, and this time unfailingly nourish it.

The Nantucket Inquirer and Mirror tells of the impact of the President's death on that island, where he was considered a neighbor. The newspaper has characterized John Kennedy's greatness as resting in large part upon "his stature as a political idealist whose aspirations were the goals that the community at large wants ultimately to attain. The quarrels he had with his political adversaries usually concerned the timing and mechanical methods proposed to accomplish his ultimate objectives and not the ends themselves." I think all of us can agree with that statement:

THE KENNEDY TRAGEDY

Severe shock and profound grief struck the Nation on Friday, following the assassination of President Kennedy. Good citizens here and everywhere extend deep and affectionate sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy and her children, to the President's parents, to his grandmother, and to his brothers and sisters.

The shooting of the President was the first of two acts of violence last week that contorted the posture of the United States as the world's outstanding society successfully based upon the rule of law. In the first one, a shot from the assassin's rifle overthrew the administration. In the second, the President's alleged assassin was himself summarily executed by one who chose to arrogate to himself the functions of the judicial process.

Had President Kennedy put less faith in the American people, it seems likely that the tragedy of his death would have been avoided. But he was apparently misled by the warmth of his Texas reception and he neglected to take advantage of measures and equipment available for his personal protection. In an unfortunate, though understandable, effort to return the friendship and good will being expressed by the people of Texas, he seems to have cast caution aside and his assassin took advantage of the opportunity thus offered.

In the light of what has happened, there should be imposed upon our Presidents a firm duty and obligation to observe security regulations prescribed for their protection by the officers placed in charge of their personal safety.

The violent, extra-legal execution of President Kennedy's alleged assassin could easily have been prevented if the local police had used ordinary care. There can be no excuse for moving the accused only at a time calculated to satisfy and accommodate representatives of the press, radio, and television. There was no reason for making a public spectacle of the accused by dragging him through a corridor filled with a milling throng of excited people.

The halls could and should have been cleared because the accused was entitled to protection. On the record he deserved no sympathy, but the State of Texas and the city and county of Dallas had a duty and an obligation to see that he was treated in accordance with the law.

The impact of President Kennedy's death has been very great here on Nantucket as it has been throughout the Commonwealth, the Nation, and the world. He was a distinguished neighbor who brought fame and prominence to the Nantucket Sound area. But more importantly, he was an admirable and attractive man because he was young, poised, cultured, handsome, articulate, magnetic, and dynamic. Possessed of all these qualities, he was a statesman who appealed to many world leaders as the one among them who might best be able to guide the world to peaceful solutions of its problems.

In his time, President Kennedy was certainly a great man, but his administration was a short one and much of his program remained unfinished when he died. Whether he has attained historical greatness only time will tell.

President Kennedy's present greatness rests in large part upon his stature as a political idealist whose aspirations were the goals that the community at large wants ultimately to attain. The quarrels he had with his political adversaries usually concerned the timing and the mechanical methods proposed to accomplish his ultimate objectives and not the ends themselves.

The simplicity of the short ceremony in and by which the administration passed to the hands of President Johnson was impressive. But much more so were the solemnity and ceremonial majesty of the return of President Kennedy's body to Washington and to the White House, its removal to the Capitol and its lying in state there in the great rotunda, the filing past by a vast throng of loving, reverent citizens to pay their humble respects, the funeral services and finally the burial itself, each of these episodes was planned and executed with dignity, discrimination and grace and together they satisfied the people of the United States that their late President was being accorded the reverence and respect that they knew the man and office ought to have.

Throughout her tragic ordeal Mrs. Kennedy maintained magnificent composure. A most attractive young woman of unusual beauty and dignity, she, with her charming children, Caroline and John, Jr., commanded tremendous admiration and sympathy from everyone.

The personal courage she so naturally and unwittingly displayed was at least equal in excellence and quality to the political courage extolled so ably in her husband's fine work "Profiles in Courage," so has amply earned the love and affection of the American people.

As its tribute to the late President, the Barnstable Patriot, which is published in Hyannis, printed a poem by Albert Epstein:

RIGHT MAKES MIGHT

(By Albert Epstein)

(Reprinted from the February 8 issue of the Barnstable Patriot as a tribute to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy).

I did not know where fate had cast me;
A Voice called, a Voice—There was nobody—
"Lincoln, enshrined in his memorial,
Will comfort and sustain you;"
I journeyed to his shrine.
Lincoln looked down upon me,
His eyes—the mystery of compassion,
His sad face brightened, illuminated by his gentle smile;
Serene, weighing carefully each word,
Kindness, wisdom, and understanding, faith,
Glorified his thoughts;
"Fear not.
Tyrants cannot destroy us,
Our Constitution or our Bill of Rights,
Degrade free men,
Transform them into slaves;
Our sacred boys have not died in vain.
With abiding faith in our heritage,
With humble pride in our achievements,
With eternal vigilance,
With the guidance of Almighty God,
Freedom, the Dignity of Man, will be preserved.
Convey your message to our countrymen,
Reveal it to the world,
For all men cherish Freedom.
Fear not—
Evil shall not emerge triumphant,
God wills the Brotherhood of Man."

Representative of the reaction in the South Shore area of my district, I wish to include in these proceedings a poem from the South Shore Mirror and an editorial from the Hull-Nantasket Times, as well as excerpts from a column, "How It Looks From Here," written by John Bond, editor of the Rockland Standard:

[From the Hull-Nantasket Times, Nov. 28, 1963]

WHAT WE CAN DO

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country, and, people of the world, ask not what can America do for us, but what can we do for all mankind."

The above inspired words, of course, are from the inaugural address of our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

And after the shocking tragedy and almost unbelievable events of black Friday, November 22, in which the young Chief Executive was cut down in the vicious and cowardly act of a fanatical psychopath, shock waves of horror spread throughout the world, and millions who loved honor, deceny, and John F. Kennedy bowed their heads in grief and murmured prayers in their native tongues.

"What can we do, what can we do," echoed from memory of the President's inaugural words and blended in cadence with the measured tread of the marine guards removing the President's body from the plane to the ambulance, pathetically followed by his bereaved widow, and again in the beat of the military drums as the cortege proceded to the Capitol from the White House on Sunday, and to the last resting place for national heroes, the Arlington National Cemetery on Monday.

As President Kennedy's body was lowered into his grave, amidst worldwide sorrow, the answer to what we can do again came from his gallant soul and high spirit as left in his words from the inauguration: "In your hands, my fellow citizens, rather than mine will remain the future success or failure of our final course," and also from his speech prepared for delivery, but never delivered on Black Friday at Dallas:

"We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask therefore, that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of 'Peace on Earth, Good Will Toward Men.' That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For, as written long ago: 'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.'"

Hatred, bigotry, racial and ethnic prejudice and warped personal rancor, greed, and spite must be made the objective of permanent correction, and its poisonous effect eliminated from all relations between men and nations.

Furthermore, experts in the fields of science, phychiatry, religion, and social welfare must merge their forces more effectively and constantly in a determined drive to reduce and eventually remove completely the basic causes which have given rise to the increasing wave of irresponsibility, immorality, and the wave of crime and violence which have erupted throughout our land.

Then truly we shall be keeping faith with the basic principles upon which our Nation was founded, and upholding the request of our martyred President by not only asking, but proving, what we can do for all mankind.

[From the South Shore Mirror, Nov. 28, 1963]

THANKSGIVING

Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for broadminded courage.
For believing that Baptists would vote for Catholics,

For upholding constitutional religious freedom,
For friendships with Billy Graham and Cardinal Cushing,
Thank you for broadminded courage.
Thank you Mr. President.
Thank you for physical courage.
For PT 109 determination,
For motorcades and quiet demonstration,
For braving chance assassination,
Thank you for physical courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for civil rights courage.
For sacrificing votes for rights of others,
For sharing a most certain Evers bullet,
For losing political life before the physical,
Thank you for civil rights courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for peace-minded courage.
For calm determination banning Cuban missiles,
For clean test ban air, the gift of treaty,
And "fear-not" drive to try negotiation,
Thank you for peace-minded courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you for New Frontier courage.
For dollar concern to win foreign aid for others,
For Peace Corps youth now spread the world around,
For being a Berliner, a UN'er, a frontiersman,
Thank you for New Frontier courage.
Thank you, Mr. President.

—REV. CHARLES W. LUDEKING,
Baptist Church.

NORTH SCITUATE, MASS.

[From the Rockland Standard, Nov. 28, 1963]

HOW IT LOOKS FROM HERE

Whatever you were doing between 1:30 and 2 o'clock on the afternoon of November 22, 1963, you will remember it the rest of your life. You will remember it because it was about midway of those hours that you heard the awful news that President John F. Kennedy had been shot in Dallas, Tex.

For me November 22 started like any other Friday afternoon. Shortly before 1:30 I got into my car at Scituate Harbor to drive to Marshfield for the weekly meeting of the board of selectmen at 2 p.m. As usual the car radio was on and Bruce Bradley had just commented that Saturday would mark the 60th anniversary of Enrico Caruso's debut at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City. With his usual whimsey Bruce took note of the occasion by playing a swinging number that could have been "Jumpin' at the Woodside."

Before the tune was over there was a break for a news bulletin. A tense voice announced that UPI in Dallas had flashed: "President Kennedy has been shot by a sniper—possibly fatally." A few fragmentary details followed. Then a CBS network alert confirmed what seemed too terrible to be true. The President had, indeed, been struck down by an assassin's bullet. How seriously he was hurt was not at once apparent. The grave voices of the reporters in Dallas were ominous.

Mr. Bond then described in detail the reaction he met from various townspeople—a shocked disbelief—and concluded on this fine note of tribute:

I realized as I talked to people, all of them sober faced and sad, that this young man whose loss had stunned the world, was more than a political leader of the highest magnitude. Despite deep and bitter differences that whirled about him in his office as President and leader of the free world, he had in less than 3 years at the vortex of world events won the respect and affection of many of those who politically disagreed with him. He was indeed a good man.

A few sentences from the Brockton Enterprise characterize very well the sense of personal pride that those of us from Massachusetts felt in the achievements of a beloved native son:

President Kennedy was from our State and whether or not you differed from him politically, there was that feeling of pride that a man from Massachusetts was in the White House. The President had visited Brockton before attaining the Presidency and many in our city were privileged to regard him as a friend. While campaigning for his seat in the Senate, President Kennedy made it a point to bring out that former Mayor Charles M. Hickey was a second cousin.

Men, women and citizens of all walks of life have had something to say about President Kennedy's death. We can add nothing to their eloquence. Sympathy for the Kennedy family transcends politics, transcends everything. This is a dark hour. Our hearts are heavy.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts are indeed heavy. I know that there are perhaps hundred of other articles and editorials that could be properly made a part of this RECORD. I have not attempted to pick out the best, by any means, but only a few articles that I felt would be representative of the reaction in an area that was well known to the late President—an area that was proud he considered it his home and made it the site of the vacation White House on many occasions.

Volumes have been written about this sad event and the loss to the Nation. Yet, all of us recognize that at such times words are inadequate substitutes for the deep feelings we have experienced.

Perhaps the best tribute we can pay the late President would be to, each of us, join with the Hyannis Board of Selectmen in the resolution they have offered:

We hereby highly resolve that John F. Kennedy shall not have died in vain; that each one of us, under God, shall do everything possible to eliminate any ideas of hatred, intolerance, or revenge in our hearts to the end that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States, indeed the whole world, has passed, in recent days, through a long, dark, and dismal corridor. Having emerged once again into the light, we are left still in our grief and surrounded by the shrouds of mourning, grim reminder of the tragedy that haunts us—with the heritage of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

As we might expect, this is no ordinary heritage of material value, for this was no ordinary man. The heritage of John F. Kennedy is a challenge to all Americans, to men everywhere, to continue, even though he no longer leads us, the efforts to attain the goals he had set not only for himself, but for every citizen of the United States.

Few men in history are touched with greatness which, we all know, to be a combination of many talents of wisdom and courage, and of knowledge, of purpose and dedication, and of understanding and compassion. All these and more our late President possessed in abundance.

Perhaps history shall remember him best for having sought, above all else, the betterment of mankind. In perilous times and possessing power over the most awesome weapons ever created, he sought peace for the world.

In a land of plenty, he sought an equal share of our goods for all men—to aid the aged, to care for the ill, to educate the illerate, to assist the underprivileged, to guarantee the constitutional rights of every citizen.

He promised to get America moving again. Maybe we just seemed to have stopped but many people here and abroad thought we did. Both friend and foe wondered whether our forward motion had ceased. Many questioned the future of our Nation and the system which made it great. They wondered whether the great changes taking place throughout the world foredoomed a free, competitive society. They wondered whether communism was not truly the wave of the future. They wondered if we were not too well off to protect ourselves, to liberal to fight, too tired to care. They pondered and then equated the Rise and Fall of Rome with the history of the United States. They felt that America would lose its freedom by default.

The inauguration of John F. Kennedy as President changed all this. Not only was America moving, but the spirit or our motion thrust ahead. We had a new President, a new leader who instilled vitality, confidence and faith in our Nation and our system. He demonstrated with great clarity that the United States of America as a Nation was still in its early ascendency.

He looked upon communism, not as an ogre too fearsome to behold but as something that contained within itself the seeds of its own destruction and that what was needed most was time and patience and strength. For he believed that the answer to communism rested not with the Communists but within ourselves provided we had faith in ourselves.

John F. Kennedy's time ran out all too soon, but the legacy he left America was faith, confidence, and a renewed belief in ourselves. The legacy he left the world was a future for freedom.

The Riderless Horse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, many eloquent words have

been expressed concerning various facets of the tragedy which faced our Nation last month.

One of my constituents has forwarded to me a copy of a poem which appeared in the Alameda, Calif., newspaper, the Times-Star.

This beautiful poem was written by Mr. Everett Johannes, of Alameda, and was inspired by the picture of the riderless horse following the caisson bearing the casket of our late President.

I am pleased to share this beautiful poem with my colleagues:

THE RIDERLESS HORSE

Young he was—my rider;
A symbol of the land.
But he was slain—my rider.
I cannot feel his hand.

Brave he was—my rider.
He struggled for his men.
But he is dead—my rider.
He cannot fight again.

A fire burns at his temple,
A flag's at half its height,
A widow grieves in silence,
Her veil is like the night.

We mourn your spur—my rider.
We mourn your forceful hand.
The roses bloom, my rider,
Like grief upon the land.

—EVERETT JOHANNES.

Racial Justice Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the following sermon was delivered on November 3, 1963, by Rev. Armin J. Maronn, pastor of the Zion United Church of Christ, Millstadt, Ill., to his parishioners. I believe Reverend Maronn's sermon placing the responsibility for "Racial Justice Now" on each and every American is worthy of thoughtful consideration by us all:

RACIAL JUSTICE NOW

(By Rev. Armin J. Maronn, pastor)

When I was ordained, on June 23, 1940, I was asked this question, "Do you promise to exercise your ministry with diligence and with due regard for the laws and ordinances of the church?" I answered, "I do so promise, with the help of God."

Therefore, today, in all seriousness I present this mesage in behalf of "Racial Justice Now," as a mandate of the United Church of Christ, and of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. To do otherwise would for me (and I do not speak for any other minister or person) be craven cowardice.

I

To say this does not mean that I accept the mandate or the statement of "Racial Justice Now" blindly, nor should you. I do not, and I cannot ask you to do that. I do have some personal reservations; and I am quite sure that I understand and interpret parts of it in ways differently from others. However, to have some doubts, to raise some questions, does not mean, therefore, that we are to do nothing, and to go on about our task of living as human beings, as Christians, if you please, as if the problems held up to scrutiny did not exist. On the contrary, having now been made acutely aware of the racial crisis in our time, with its injustices (on both sides), with its extremes (on both sides), with its pain and anguish and turmoil for all concerned—we ought to be grateful for the fact that at long last the Christian Church has laid squarely before its members—before you and me, who call ourselves Christians, and profess Christ as Lord—we ought to be grateful that the gospel of reconciliation, of love, of sharing one another's burdens, of justice for Christ's sake, of forgiveness and of repentance is alive and at work in our society like leaven, it is permeating every nook and cranny of our society.

II

How misguided some of our people are, who think that only the United Church of Christ is calling its people to open their eyes to see what is going on around them, to remove the blinds on our eyes, like years ago horses used to wear blinders that would allow them only to see forward to avoid sudden movement or light on the side that would frighten them. With our binds on, we see only our present prestige, prosperity and privilege which we enjoy, and deliberately and wilfully hide from our sight all else. For to see is to know, and to know calls for action, and action will disturb our pleasant little world of our own, so snug and smug.

Not our denomination alone, but others have taken steps similar to our own: Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopals, Disciples, Evangelical and United Brethren, Missouri Lutheran, American Lutheran, to say nothing of our Roman Catholic and Jewish brethren. Nuns, priests, Jewish rabbis, and Protestant clergy have all been involved in study, in protest, and sometimes together shared the hospitality of our American jails.

This must be said, and it is being said, not to leave the impression that it is popular (it isn't), nor that all of the members of these churches either blindly agree or disagree (they don't) with their spiritual leaders, with their synods or their conventions. But it is being said to remind you that the crusade for racial justice now is alive and vibrant in the churches and synagogues that truly care; and that no minister, or priest, or rabbi, or your own pastor is a voice crying alone in the wilderness, nor is he out of tune with the cry for redress of men's grievances. This cry belongs in the church: loud, long and clear. It is what people are concerned about.

III

Nor has the church looked down upon civil disobendience for righteousness sake. What American is there who does not know the significance of the Boston Tea Party—there were men of the cloth in that band of civil disobedients. The Abolition movement began in the churches of the North, to eradicate slavery, and made of the Civil War something more than just a preservation of the Union—incidents of civil disobedience propelled it into a war to free the slaves. American missionaries in India supported Ghandi in his nonviolent civil disobedience movement against the forces of British imperialism. And more, but these are outstanding. It is the solemn duty of the church to be involved, active in every campaign, where the dignity and freedom of humanity are up for fulfillment. And it is just as unrealistic to suppose that one can stop the flow of history to its destiny by doing nothing, by saying, "If people would just be quiet about it, everything would be all right" (as one of our members said), as it is to think that it can be stopped with violent opposition. If the church has been honest and consistent in preaching the gospel of the worth of man as a child of God, it should not be surprised when its hearers, taking it seriously, ask for its reality.

IV

The call is for justice. For justice; and let us not make civil peace or law and order the equivalent of justice. I am a man of peace—I am for law and order, but I am for justice more. There are many times when, for the sake of achieveing the best human approximation of divine justice, that man can secure, he has to upset the applecart of custom, of accepted and customary ways of doing things. Yet justice is a hard taskmaster. Justice demands, as we labor for its reality, to know what we are talking about. It means that we must be informed of our facts, and not act simply on the basis of our prejudices. It means that we have to break out of the shell of our little, compact, narrow communities and become citizens of the world. It means we have to learn the language and the meaning of words that are thrown about us. Every word has two (or more) meanings: that what the dictionary says it means (which is what responsible men mean it to say when they use it), and the meaning in the mind of man when he speaks it, uses it. In our speech, our words must mean what they say or we are not communicating with one another.

For example: In the "Call to Justice Now" which went into your homes this past week, there was the statement that the Negro should be supported "in his struggle to gain acceptance as a person of worth, who may marry whomever he loves and whoever loves him." This is something far different than the highly emotional response than the person who said, "Now they want to force us to sleep with them." Just a plain use of language, and of our heads, knows these two are not the same, and that the one is not being said here. And at another time, the statement said, "we must become radically committed to the struggle of our fellow men to get the best job for which he is qualified." This does not mean that our Negro citizens are demanding top jobs, for which they are untrained, but it does mean that we will support them in the struggle to have the opportunity to prepare in order to become qualified.

It means to get out of the cocoon of our own sheltered reading, when we read only what we want to read, or hear only what we want to hear, to lock the lid on our personal Pandora's box—instead of getting to know the whole story, the truth. And it also means that we should tell it fully and fairly.

V

Because the Negro group in America is the largest minority group, approximately 10 percent of our population, and also because of all that lays in the past of our injustices toward them, there are some who assume that "Racial Justice Now" is concerned only with the Negro's plea for justice. Not so. Also involved are the American Indians (and many a time the church has been the Indian's only friend), the Oriental, the Puerto Rican, the Mexican. Each in his own way has felt discrimination and oppression in this land of the free, politically, and a land we often call Christian religiously. Whenever people speak of white race or of racial purity, I think with horror of a certain paperhanger of Austria who threw the world into its darkest hour with a hate gospel of Nordic supremacy. I think also how only 20 years ago we spoke of the dirty Japs, and in our ignorance lumped Chinese and Koreans with them—and now we have several peacefully living in our own town. During World War I, Germans in Europe were the terrible Huns, and we Americans were the frightful Yanks to them, and in America people in this very town were the despised krauts and forbidden to speak German. Racial justice is for all people.

VI

Finally, despite all that is said previously, our concern for justice is a religious, a

spiritual concern. In a much overworked, but still the most pertinent passage in the Bible, we are told that "God has made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell together." We are one blood, scientifically—this is an attested fact. Color is carried by genes, which determine pigmentation; blood has nothing to do with it. If you were dying, and received plasma from a Negro, your children would not be "darkies."

But much more important is the fact that all men are saved by the one blood of Jesus Christ. We have one Saviour, one Lord, and in Him all men are brothers. This may be very hard to accept, for some. As the musical comedy said so tragically, we have been "carefully taught to hate." To accept that we are "Brothers in Christ" is the biggest hurdle to overcome, and the chief victory.

It is like a man who has a heart attack. The man who does have a bad heart, but knows it not, goes on abusing his body with all sorts of activity, and keels over dead. But the man who knows he has a bad heart, learns to live with it. In a disciplined regimen he comes to appreciate his family far more than ever. Simple pleasures the whole family, of all ages and sexes can now enjoy together makes life for all more meaningful. People with bad hearts, who know it, live longer and more peaceably than others.

So it is with the acceptance that our Negroes are here to stay, and are simply demanding what our Nation in principle holds out to all, for its founding days. Nothing more than any other can expect, nor any less. Can we accept it? If we can, America stands on the brink of an age of growth, peace, and harmony that will be reflected in every facet of her life. We have absolutely no idea what contributions men of all races can make to American history. And what is more, men and women, who call themselves Christians, belong to our churches, worship in their temples, synagogues, chapels will find themselves rid of the cancer of hate that eats at their very vitals.

Like Amos of old, who cried out "Let justice roll down like mighty waters," so I, in the same spirit of the prophets of old, prophets of our one, mighty, Holy God, cry out, "Let justice roll—let 'er roll."

Clean Air Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Clean Air Act conference report, because this is a very important field in which Federal legislation is necessary.

One of the leading weekly newspapers in my district, the Northeast Times, on October 17, 1963, published the following editorial on air pollution:

Despite the splendors of our space age, automobiles, industries, and suburbia's fireplaces continue to pollute our air. It is a constantly increasing price for progress.

The city of Philadelphia recognized this problem years ago and tooks steps to lessen the danger of a polluted atmosphere by eliminating or minimizing major causes.

Philadelphia's progress in this health problem has earned the city recognition from both private and Federal agencies.

One of the city's projects as a leader in research and control of air pollution is its annual sponsorship of Cleaner Air Week, October 20–26. The purpose is to focus public attention on the problem and encourage individual participation in air control projects.

You can contribute to a cleaner air by installing a blowby device on your car. It will reduce your car's contribution to air pollution by about 25 percent. This inexpensive device will return partially burned exhaust gases to the engine for further consumption. It will also reduce maintenance costs.

You can help also by checking your automobile for smoke emissions. A smokey exhaust costs you money because it indicates a waste of gasoline. If your car smokes, see that the engine is properly tuned.

It'll mean financial savings, as well as better health for you, your family, and your neighbors.

Our morning newspaper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, recently published the following editorial in support of legislation to protect the public health:

The air pollution control board's report showing that air pollution in Philadelphia at times exceeds "levels that are regarded as tolerable, even in Los Angeles," should receive wide circulation among all responsible citizens who live or work in the city.

It is highly important to the future of the city and all those who breathe Philadelphia air that it be kept clean enough for good health. That is not now the case, in spite of much talk and good resolutions.

Part of the trouble is that the air pollution control board has one of the lowest budgets in the country and doesn't have the means to do anything much to curb the peril. Another has been the tendency for some officials to overrate the progress that has been made in cleaning up the city's air.

We have had campaigns, it is true, to warn motorists against trailing exhaust fumes through traffic. But the smoky automobiles, buses, and trucks are with us in just as large numbers as ever. Studies have been made to lay the groundwork for a weather monitoring system for alerting industry to avoid smoke-causing operations during periods when adverse weather conditions tend to hold gases and fumes in a pocket over the city. But foggy, windless days are still marked by belching smokestacks and obvious disregard of the smog hazard.

Dr. Julian Sterling, vice chairman of the Air Pollution-Cancer Citizens Committee, blames air pollution from motor exhaust and other sources for deaths from lung cancer, suffocation, bronchitis, and heart failure. There's no doubt it is a serious contributing cause.

The city should be much more concerned about making its air cleaner through better controls and enforcement.

I have introduced an air pollution control proposal (H.R. 8859) and believe the conference report before the House today is very much in the public interest.

Moratorium on Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently carried an editorial on the moratorium that has been called on political speeches. The Times points out the appropriateness of this moratorium, but also expresses the view that orderly and partisan discussion of the issues should not be ruled out. I believe this position is well taken.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD this editorial, which appeared in the November 27, 1963, issue of the Los Angeles Times:

WISE MORATORIUM ON POLITICS

Our governmental processes are undergoing enough strain during this transition period from the Kennedy to the Johnson administrations without the additional burden of political rancor or heckling.

And that's why there is obvious merit in the proposal by a number of Republican leaders for a moratorium on political speeches until the first of next year.

Certainly, President Johnson has every right to expect a little surcease during the next few weeks while he adjusts to his new responsibilities. Fortunately for all of us, he has had the benefit of Capitol Hill experience and of understudy status at the White House. Thus, we can expect the transition period to be relatively free of confusion.

By the same token, there's no reason to expect—or demand—that the pressing foreign and domestic issues of our immediate time go unchallenged and undebated. Congress has many bills awaiting action and certainly the reasoned and reasonable consideration of them must involve full-fledged debate.

But not partisan, personal attacks on President Johnson. That's what the Republican leadership had in mind in proposing the moratorium.

As Senator BARRY GOLDWATER said: "It would not be fair to any new President to have the opposing party heckle him while he is getting organized in his new job."

Strictly from the GOP viewpoint, there's another practical reason for a moratorium. Republicans need time to reassess their political position and to take a new reading on Mr. Johnson, the man. They also need time to let the shock of President Kennedy's assassination wear off.

A self-imposed ban on political speeches sounds like a good idea. Let's just hope that the definition of "political speeches" doesn't rule out orderly and partisan discussion of the issues.

The Mayoress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a profile of a warm, vibrant, delightful personality, Carmen Pertierra, who is vice president of the Riverside Democrats and the Democratic State committeewoman for the seventh assembly district in Manhattan. Oliver Pilat, the author of this "closeup," tells of the great contribution which Mrs. Pertierra is making to the Hispanic community of New York. The article follows:

[From the New York Post, Dec. 6, 1963]

THE MAYORESS

(By Oliver Pilat)

For most Puerto Ricans, "the mayoress" is Dona Felisa Rincon de Gautier, of San Juan.

There is another "mayoress": Carmen Pertierra, new secretary to the Manhattan Borough president.

They call Mrs. Pertierra the mayoress of district 7 because her Spanish-speaking area, between 100th and 110th Streets just west of Central Park, is in the 7th assembly district, which is serviced by her Riverside Democratic Club.

The secretary to the borough president is no typist or stenographer but a $7,500-a-year staff member with special responsibilities—in this case, handling Hispanic problems.

Mrs. Pertierra's appointment caused a political upheaval. It was reportedly the chief reason why County Leader Costikyan threatened for a while to resign.

The previous secretary to the borough president had come from Angelo Simonetti's oldline club in the 13th assembly district. Costikyan had recommended another oldliner as successor.

Borough President Dudley, however, picked Mrs. Pertierra after she was recommended (over Costikyan's head) by Franz Leichter, seventh assembly district reform district leader.

The furor died down when Dudley explained that he had become friendly with Mrs. Pertierra in politics and from her work on a local planning board, that he considered her the best qualified person to do an important and specialized job. Mayor Wagner let it be known that he was enthusiastic about Mrs. Pertierra.

Even so, one newspaper suggested that she must have had secret support from the Liberal Party, since she had been active in local 23 of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, which carries great weight among the liberals.

She did not bother to deny this. "They think I have two parties back of me," she explains with a mischievous laugh. "That's good. Why tell them different?"

Ben Davidson, executive director of the Liberal Party, however, does not relish confusion of this kind. "We knew nothing about the matter," he says, flatly, "until we read about it in the newspapers."

Mrs. Pertierra is a middle-aged, attractive woman with enormous vitality and good nature.

When she reached New York as an immigrant from Cuba in 1943, she joined Local 1 of the Pocketbook Workers. In 1945, she took a job in a nonunion skirt shop. Two weeks later, "because they not pay me for July 4," she explains, "I call a strike."

She secured ILGWU support for the 7-week strike. Did she win? "When ILG lost a strike?" she demands in the staccato rather than broken English that gives drama and humor to her talk. "They never lost."

In Havana, she had been trained as a dressmaker and designer. At the suggestion of Shelley Appleton, local 23 manager—"a wonderful man"—she took courses at the Rand School and elsewhere to equip her for service on various union committees.

Joining the Riverside Club in 1960, she put her union lessons into practice. To the growing Spanish-speaking community in the seventh assembly district, her message was direct and simple: "In cases related to civil rights or any other matter, do not fight alone, just get in touch with me at my home or the club. We will fight together."

Gradually Carmen—as everybody called her—became a power in the Hispanic community, a vice president of the Riverside Club, an early supporter of Mayor Wagner in the 1961 primary, a delegate to the 1962 Syracuse convention, a Democratic State committeewoman.

What of her personal life? She was born Carmen-Ponce in Cienfuegos, Cuba, a city often called the Pearl of the South. In 1948, she married Ruben Pertierra, an employee of the Western Electric Co. who had emigrated from Cienfuegos before her. Their mothers were friends. They now live at 3 West 102d Street. They have no children, but they have raised five nephews.

"All on my side," says Mrs. Pertierra, cheerily. "Ruben is very nice." Half seriously, she adds: "He is proud of me, he does not like people pushed around because of language." Very seriously, she concludes that her husband has helped her to overcome obstacles "as high as Sierra Maestra."

There Is No There There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part 2 of Wolf Von Eckhardt's excellent series on urban renewal and the city which is appearing in the New Republic. This article, entitled "There Is No There There," concerns architecture in the American city. It appeared in the September 21, 1963, issue of the magazine:

THERE IS NO THERE THERE—URBAN RENEWAL AND THE CITY—PART 2

(By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

Whatever sort of age this is—atomic, space, packaging or of unreason—it is also the age of the office. There are now more white collar than industrial workers. Their places of work are the predominant expression of our architecture, just as Greek temples, Roman arenas, medieval cathedrals and Renaissance palaces were the architectural expressions of their respective ages.

In the old hierarchy of buildings the church would rise above the civic building and the civic building would be more imposing than the residence. Now the office towers dwarf all else in the city and what fountains, statuary or other art we allow ourselves in public are lavished on them. Office buildings alone give our cities their focal point and image. And since they are largely alike, our cities are largely alike.

From the distance, these blasphemous, domineering structures converge into a collective beauty of a kind Athens or Chartres never knew. Sonnets have been written about the skyline of Manhattan and, driving along the expressway on a clear day, even distant Kansas City deserves one.

But the beauty is only from afar. As we enter the city we find that the skyscrapers are unimaginatively planted on our pedantic gridiron street pattern. From the resulting canyons we cannot grasp their scale.

They are, however, as distinctly American as the skyline they form. Skyscrapers are William Le Baron Jenny's innovation, first seen in the Home Insurance Building, Chicago, A.D. 1885. Rather than letting his walls carry the load of the floors and roof, Jenny let a steel frame do the job. The walls became mere curtains to keep out the weather. His steel cage could rise just about as high as Elisha G. Otis' invention the elevator, would take you.

American steel cage and curtain wall construction have made an impact on world architecture as decisive as classic columns and pediments, Gothic arches and buttresses and Renaissance facades. In the hands of a few masters, leading among them Mies van de Rohe, the construction technique has produced some great architecture. But it is an egotistic architecture that gets along only with its own kind. It doesn't blend, it arrogantly disdains all building before it. The modern structures that are sprinkled between old ones in our messy cities therefore further disrupt all visual harmony and order. The sharp variations in height and worst of all the untidy parking lots between buildings emphasize the confusion. Only where it is massed in pleasant groups and takes up a block or two in splendid isolation, as in Rockefeller Center, for instance, has modern architecture made an aesthetic contribution to the city, to urban design.

To make matters worse, curtain wall architecture, as Mies van de Rohe and a few others have perfected it, is easy to imitate and to jazz up. In their effort to overcome the predominance of the office in our cities, the architectural hacks recklessly stuff anything that comes their way into the same old steel cages—stores, churches, museums, schools, libraries. The gaudy, colored enamel or stone-veneer curtains just wrap up the tedium. Nor do fancy, grilly, and lacy wrapping help very often. Gaudiness en masse only emphasizes monotony. Los Angeles probably has the most brightly gift-wrapped buildings of them all. Looking down Wilshire Boulevard is like being trapped with a very noisy jukebox. It's a continuous stream of rock-'n'-roll.

A year or two ago, it looked for a moment as though there was salvation in reinforced concrete, which can be sculptured and molded into just about any form. Great feats of engineering and marvelously expressive architecture, like Eero Saarinen's Dulles Airport in Washington, have been accomplished in this medium. The idea was that the flat-chested curtain wall structures would form the calm backdrop to our urban life and that a few sculptural concrete buildings would signify the exceptional importance and spiritual value of their purpose. A leading advocate of this idea is Paul Rudolph, dean of architecture at Yale. No sooner had he uttered it, than he proceeded to build his masterpiece in sinuous, rich and vigorous architectural sculpture—a building that overwhelms its neighbors, including a rather charming, pseudocolonial church across the street. Yet it is nothing but a parking garage located in downtown New Haven. It is also, I fear, a squelcher of the "noble foreground" architecture notion. As long as even the best of our architects refuse to submit to humbleness and discipline, as long as they continue to strive mainly for originality and attention, our cities will remain a visual din, dulling the senses of their captive audience as does the constant drone of piped music in waiting rooms. No one listens. There is no pause, no rhythm, no drama. As Gertrude Stein has put it about one of our cities, "There is no there there."

Rockefeller Center, however, was the beginning of a more hopeful urban design. Begun in 1931 by John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to concentrate the creeping uptown movement of business, it now numbers 16 buildings of varying size but harmonious appearance. The depression crushed the ambition to make it more than a business center by including an opera house and music audtorium along with Radio City Music Hall. But despite the depression, Rockefeller Center was relatively generous with expensive land and thereby the first contribution skyscraper architecture has made to the cityscape on the ground. It yielded as beautifully designated space, gaily alive with fountains and cascades, well-tended flower beds, seats and a sunken plaza which serves as an open-air restaurant in summer and an ice skating rink in winter. And by barring vehicles, this mall and plaza became the first pedestrian oasis in the city.

THE PLAN FOR FORT WORTH

Such truly urban centers, oasis for people who walk, stroll and loiter in the shadows of carefully grouped skyscrapers, are urban renewal's most substantial and welcome contribution to the city. They require, of course, large tracts of downtown land, usually par-

celled up by hundreds of different owners, which can be assembled for one cohesive purpose only with the help of a Rockefeller or the Federal Treasury. This explains why it took almost 3 decades for the Rockefeller Center idea to be emulated.

But aside from finances, no one really quite caught on to the Rockefeller Center idea, especially its relief from automobile traffic, until Dutch planners, during the Nazi occupation, incorporated it in their plans for rebuilding Rotterdam, which the Luftwaffe had destroyed. Whether this is what influenced him or not, the American architect, Victor Gruen, extended the idea of pedestrian malls and plazas in his proposal for downtown Fort Worth, Tex. Gruen's plan, published in 1956, called for encircling the Fort Worth business district with automobile approaches which would walk into the inner city or use slow-moving electric vehicles. Goods and services, including taxis and buses, were to circulate at basement level through tunnels. There were to be a few new cultural and civic buildings, but most of the old buildings were to be left standing. Their streets were to be enhanced with benches, greenery and kiosks and given over to the enjoyment of people. The plan would help business for, as Gruen has said, not even a Cadillac has ever bought a single piece of merchandise.

The Fort Worth plan was not carried out, mainly because the local parking lot operators, a powerful enemy of pedestrians in any city, opposed it violently. But it is, as someone observed, the only unborn baby who had hundreds of grandchildren.

Denver's Mile High Center is among the earliest ones. Philadelphia's Penn Center is almost completed. Baltimore's Charles Center has a new building by Mies van der Rohe but is largely still a very promising hole in the ground. But the most exciting and pleasing, perhaps, is Hartford's Constitution Plaza.

Five years ago Constitution Plaza was a predominantly Italian slum area called Front Market. Now it is a platform island for pedestrians, spanning three city blocks on which eight buildings, of various sizes and design, cluster in an irregular arrangement. Beneath the platform are parking garages for 1,800 cars. The two largest buildings, designed by Kahn & Jacobs and Emery Roth, respectively, and each about 20 stories high, are neat and straight-forward examples of the mid-century curtain wall office building. The low, but prominently located Broadcast House is typical of the current effort to sweeten the severity of this style to the point where it is saccharine. The hotel, designed by Curtis and Davis, represents the best and most restrained of our more sculptural reinforced concrete architecture. And the most dominant structure, the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance building, is an unusually successful architectural stunt. It was designed by Harrison and Abramovitz (the architects who also built New York's new Philharmonic Hall among many other distinguished buildings). Resting on stilts, which could be a little higher, the 10-story Phoenix is a sharply pointed, narrow ellipse in plan, which, in elevation, has a taut skin of dark glass. In all its utter simplicity, it looks somewhat like the huge hull of a mysterious, ephemeral, crystal ship and you look and blink, and look again to believe it.

Charles DuBose, the coordinating architect for the Hartford project, has managed to combine these divergent architectural elements into a wonderfully lively and expressive arrangement. And the design of the spacious plaza which flows between and around the buildings, bridges the streets, which are rich with forests of potted trees and other greenery, a fountain, a clock tower, a variety of different pavements and ever-changing vistas, is a sheer delight. It is the work of Sasaki, Walker & Associates, America's leading landscape architects.

A sad fault of Constitution Plaza is that its victory over the automobile is only limited. It might easily be mirrored in the Connecticut River, a stone's throw to the south. Instead, it is enmeshed in the web of elevated expressways which totally cut it and the rest of the city off from the waterfront. You have to look at the map to discover that Hartford even has a river.

Constitution Plaza is, nevertheless, so thoroughly lovely that even as construction work was still going on, I found strollers and admirers climbing all over it. But there was an exceptionally beautiful summer day and I wonder how bustling, attractive and truly urban the plaza will be at night. Philadelphia's Penn Center I found populated during the day only with very purposeful people who rushed to their desks or the subway. At night it was empty. The crowd was all ambling up and down the movie awnings of adjoining Market Street. Girls laughed at the puppies playing in a pet shop window, young men avidly studied the unclad ladies on the magazine covers and the movie posters on display, and people milled around the bars and penny arcades. Market Street is a bit on the seamy side. But there are things and people to see and anything might happen. There is not much to see in the windows of the swanky and aseptic airline or stockbrokers' offices of the Penn Center buildings.

Once Penn Center's open air restaurants and ice skating rink are in operation the place may have more life. But its aseptic, stuffy quality is shared by all the rest of our new urban centers. Open spaces and plazas are not enough. New York's famous Lever House, for instance, has a lovely court, open to the street. But it is deserted. It leads from nowhere to nowhere, with nothing but some shrubs in-between. And even the most elegantly respectable areas of the city need a touch of the seamy as the human body needs germs. Rockefeller Center could overcome the haughtiness of its airlines and expensive restaurant because there is not only Fifth but also Sixth Avenue, and because New York is New York. Rotterdam's cheerful Lijnbaan solved the problem by including nearly a hundred small shops of all kinds and a touch of amusement park attractions. Colorful parrots, perched on their rods, chatter as you stroll along, and there are inexpensive restaurants and kiosks for food and news.

But the main reason for Lijnbaan's bustling urbanity, and that of all the new parts of Rotterdam for that matter, is that apartment buildings are interspersed with high-rise office buildings. People not only shop and work, but also live there. The downtown center is within walking distance of the entire family and gathers into it all the various people who used to gather around the medieval cathedrals and Renaissance palaces—the lawyers and doctors and dentists and all the rest of the good citizens that make a city stable and respectable.

In America, the offices and commercial enterprises have tended to push apartment buildings out of the downtown area, claiming it almost entirely for themselves. The recent transformation of New York's Park Avenue from a posh residential boulevard to a canyon of corporation palaces was typical. This trend is now being reversed. Several of the most significant urban renewal projects in the country bring apartments and townhouses again into close proximity of the office, though rarely as happily blended in with them as in Rotterdam. Washington's new southwest residential area, for instance, will have office buildings in its midst. And—an almost revolutionary departure from American living habits—these office buildings will also contain stores and even apartments to give the area life at all hours.

A CITY OF TASTE

The bold $85 million Golden Gateway project on the tip of downtown San Francisco, on the north side of Market Street, also puts apartments, offices, and commercial uses together. Here the old produce market had to give way, but San Francisco's energetic redevelopment agency helped to provide a new one at a location which will benefit both the merchants and the city.

At the time of my visit, earlier this summer, I saw only the construction fence, around the huge excavation that will be the Golden Gateway, and a quaint old arch, which is the only thing left on its site. Both are symbolic of the exceptional spirit in which San Francisco approaches its renewal.

It is a spirit more sophisticated than the words "civic pride" would denote and as worldly as it is touchingly parochial. Good architecture and good food really matter in San Francisco. It is, I believe, the only city in the United States which has rejected further expressways in favor of public transportation. It is also the only city in open, angry rebellion against all-digit telephone dialing.

The construction fence at the Golden Gateway, instead of being made of the old doors from demolished buildings, was designed and decorated with care and considerable originality. It provided not only peepholes but shelter for sidewalk superintendents. The archway, left over from the now demolished Colombo Market, will be retained as a whimsical memento of the past. It is surely no great architectural relic, but after some study, was found to be the only worthy one. Along with it, some cobblestones salvaged from the torn up streets, and old cast iron columns from the market will also be used in the new development.

To judge from the models, the Golden Gateway will live up to the tradition of excellence in bay area architecture which, in turn, is highly conscious of the fabulous beauty of its natural setting. Between the towers, slabs and townhouses, there will be lavishly landscaped elevated walkways and plazas. On the street level, below, are arcaded shops and parking. The renewal agency's report gives as much space to the project's artistic embellishments—an international competition for the main sculpture was won by the Parisian Francois Stahy—than to the usual budget figures. This, too, could only happen in San Francisco.

There is no uniform procedure by which urban renewal agencies sell the land they have acquired and cleared to private developers with the assurance that their plans and purposes are met. The city fathers inevitably insist that the land be sold to the highest bidder. The renewers, on the other hand, want to be sure of good architects and good design for the new buildings. In the Nation's Capital, surprisingly, the renewers won out, though Congress intermittenly scowls at them for it. They fixed the price for their redevelopment land on the basis of appraisals and then invited the builders to compete solely on the merits of the designs their architects prepared for them. A panel of architects assisted the authorities with the judgement. Other cities negotiate with developers. Still others, like St. Louis, sell their land to the highest bidder, regardless of design. San Francisco ventured a combination of both methods and got into quite a flurry. The design its very distinguished architectural jury favored was, of course, not that of the highest bidder. In the end, changes and compromises were worked out with entirely plausible results. Downtown land in San Francisco is so highly desirable for real estate enterpeneurs that they will go to considerable lengths and even very best architects, to get it.

THERE'S A LOT OF ROMANCE IN URBAN RENEWAL

St. Louis, however, is one of the cities which has had some difficulty disposing of the land it acquired by eminent domain. Its city fathers, furthermore, wanted to keep renewal a local deal and rejected the Zecken-

dorfs and other bigtime out-of-towners. Their suspicion is understandable. Since John Jacob Astor made his fortunes on the pastures of Manhattan, our giant real estate speculators have not always been overly concerned with the public interest. But, regardless of how much money William Zeckendorf and the handful of other big developers of our time make or lose, there is no question that the bigger the builder, the more competent and more tasteful the building. Good planning, good architecture, and good art have become a matter of prestige with the big boys who build the downtown centers and the large luxury apartment developments. They have become the maecenas of our cities.

"There's a lot of romance in urban renewal," an enterprising young developer told me. "There's no killing in it, just a nice, fair profit at little risk. It takes some expenditures to get your fishing license, such as a good architectural design that will dazzle the renewal authorities. But the way the Government has set up the financing terms, no one has ever foreclosed."

The local authorities and developers who endeavor to renew St. Louis haven't foreclosed either. But in Mill Creek Valley, which, years after its hundred slum blocks were cleared, is still largely a desert, they have succeeded in putting up a disorganized array of buildings of unsurpassable mediocrity. Lately James Scheuer, with his talented architect, Chloethie Woodard Smith, has come to the rescue of St. Louis on one residential project. But a unique planning opportunity was sadly muffed. Mill Creek is at the end of what should be the great, lively axis leading to Eero Saarinen's splendid arch, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, as the Champs-Élysées leads to the Arc de Triomphe. But the people of St. Louis chose otherwise. The grandeur of the arch will expire in a whimper of confusion. "There is no there there" at all.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Clean Air Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, air pollution is a development of our modern civilization. Fumes from motor vehicles are a large part of the problem. Due to the splendid efforts of the auto manufacturers, a solution or partial solution has been developed.

Today in Los Angeles plans are being perfected to equip every motor vehicle in our city and county of nearly 6 million people with a control device of some sort. The fact that there is a control device—that the problem has been analyzed and a preventative in part developed is due to the cooperation of the motor vehicle manufacturers.

But there are new dangers as the numbers of automobiles increase. And I am advised that the production of motor cars now exceeds the growth of population. There are more cars being produced in this country than there are births every day. If my information is correct, there will be produced for the 1963 model year approximately 7,343,000 cars. And there will be, for the same time, approximately 4,167,000 human births.

Today I want to point out to the best of my ability the very real danger to the lives of millions of people living in our metropolitan areas. That problem is still air pollution, in spite of all that has been done. It is insidious and invisible. It deals death and disease to our people. It destroys vegetation. It interferes seriously with our economic life. Its prevention or abatement is tremendously expensive. It can be combated only through Government control, since smog or smaze knows no political boundaries.

It has seriously interfered with the growth of our metropolitan areas and I have heard that some industrial plants, namely the alfalfa compacting plants are spreading smog over the prairies of Nebraska.

Long plumes of smoke from industrial installations, the oil refineries, the steel mills, industrial plants of all kinds, power stations, and others attracted attention to what later became known as stationary offenders. These were offenders that were stationary because of their nature. Gasoline fumes, generated when gasoline tanks were filled at filling stations, came under public survey and a citywide campaign to keep oil and gasoline fumes out of the air was launched. Fumes from the open ladles in steel mills and brass foundries were brought under control.

Real hysteria developed in 1952 when a mystery fog in London killed 4,000 people. The steady progress report of the legislative committee was of little help in the face of tragedies like this. One reason for my great concern with this problem at this time is the very real possibility that a repetition of the London tragedy or the Donora, Pa., tragedy, or the tragedy in Belgium may occur some day soon in this country because of the failure of our National Government to give proper impetus to research and appropriate coordination and dissemination of the scientific knowledge already gained of this great evil.

Crop damage from the polluted air became evident in the lush gardens and fields of Los Angeles County in 1950. The first damage was found on a deposit on the leaves of certain garden plants, another source of damage was pollutants such as sulfur dioxide which caused vegetation to wither and die; and a third source was a dehydration of vegetation from within caused by unknown gas respired by the leaves. As a result of these discoveries the APCD entered into a research contract with our old friends at the California Institute of Technology. In this same year, Dr. McCabe, who had returned to the Department of the Interior, set up a U.S. Technical Conference on Smog which was to have far-reaching effects.

In September 1953, County Counsel Kennedy issued an opinion that the California State law on air pollution was flexible enough to forbid the burning of rubbish if it was found by the APCD that such burning caused discomfort or property damage to a substantial number of inhabitants and that the prohibition would reduce the amount of air pollution.

The full importance of the opinion was not realized until 4 years later when on October 1, 1957, some 1,500,000 domestic incinerators were banned from further use.

In some instances equipment installations to eliminate pollutants cost as much as $1 million for an installation. It should be stated here that while industry as a whole was reluctant to accept the permit system of control, when it was demonstrated that enforcement was to be fair but strict, that industrial leaders throughout the area gave their utmost cooperation. The enforcement task would have been impossible without this cooperation.

When it is remembered that nearly 30 percent of the entire population of this Nation live in cities of more than 50,000 population and that there are 323 cities in this Nation in that class, the problem can be seen in true perspective as of national importance and responsibility.

Great strides have been made in research in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the Federal part of the program is not what it should be in light of the scope of the problem. It should be remembered that the city and county of Los Angeles alone has spent more than $34 million on this problem. It should be remembered that this much more has been spent by private industry to meet the rigid requirements of the control district.

With these figures in mind, the need for new energy at the Federal level, and for coordination and cooperation between Federal, State, and community government is brought into proper focus.

Under these circumstances a brief look at the 11-year history of the air pollution program in the Los Angeles area is in order. Since I lived with this problem, first in the State assembly and later in the City Council of Los Angeles, I think its recital here important.

Although some 60 persons died in the Meuse Valley in Belgium in 1930 as victims of a mysterious "fog," polluted air did not become a real problem until about 1940. At that time, the city of Los Angeles began a study of the problem and immediately ran into the fact that smog knew no political boundaries and that city control or attempts at city control were futile.

The problem was passed over to the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County in 1942 and 3 years later after considerable study, the first countywide ordinance was passed in 1945.

A Citizens Committee of Smog Control was formed of public-spirited citizens and this committee immediately recognized that the problem was bigger than countrywide. They sponsored and secured passage of assembly bill No. 1 through the California Legislature in 1947, and under its terms the first air pollution control district was established in Los Angeles County. A comprehensive study program was launched in cooperation with the California Institute of Technology. We were fortunate to have a number of internationally known experts in the field of air pollution in our area. One who has done a great deal at all levels of control was Dr. A. G. Haagen-Smith. Another man who made a great contribution in the field about this time was Dr. Louis McCabe of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior. He became the first Los Angeles director in 1947.

It has been estimated that great quantities of pollutants, 1,000 tons a day, were caused by the 2 million motor vehicles in Los Angeles County, but there was no device available on the market which could control or eliminate the pollutants caused by gasoline combustion. In fact, there was no general agreement as to what type of control should be developed and while there were many "cure-alls," none had been proved to be com-

pletely effective. The opinion of the county counsel pointed up this need for a device and stated that control of motor vehicles could be exercised only when "such a device is perfected, shown to be effective, available on the market, and the requirement of its use is found to be reasonable." Industrial location is greatly influenced by air pollution. Air pollution today is the bogey man of city planners and legislators at all political levels.

New interest was generated in the problem when 20 people died and some estimated 6,000 become ill as the result of a deadly "fog" in Donora, Pa. Medical science is beginning to discover new dangers from the invisible enemy. Respiratory diseases are definitely affected by smog. How much, authorities are reluctant to state at this time.

While 49 States are still without comprehensive smog or air pollution laws, while our problem in Los Angeles is partly solved—we have come as far as we can at this time. We cannot wait for the rest of the Nation to catch up—we cannot wait—we must continue our fight with renewed vigor—to slow up now will be to betray those people who helped us so valiantly in the early fight.

Let Us Continue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1963

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mrs. Thalia S. Woods, which appeared in the Rockport Democrat, Rockport, Ind.:

LET US CONTINUE

(By Thalia S. Woods)

Certainly we, the people, should not sit back and wonder how the new President will lead our Nation. Rather this is a time for every citizen to give active support to our national program. The President will do his part. He is an able leader who will translate intelligence and understanding into sound achievement. He has asked for God's help, the help of Congress, and our help. Let us give it by sending a word of encouragement or constructive suggestions to our Congressmen and Senators who are genuinely responsive to the will of the people.

We can have confidence in President Johnson. He is a man of fine judgment as was demonstrated over and over again in his leadership of the Senate. He is a man with vision, among the first of our leaders to grasp the significance of space exploration—and to do something about it. He has an iron will, we are told, tempered with consideration and fairness. He will negotiate if it is good governmental business to do so, but will never surrender principle nor compromise commitments. He is a practical man, well acquainted with the problems of men in every walk of life and in every part of the United States; and he has worked to gain a similar understanding of peoples in other countries. He is a good man whose goodness is deeply rooted in religious faith. He is a man of action: quietly, sanely, soberly, speedily, and surely he will keep our Nation on the move.

President Johnson's course has already been charted—for him to follow or change as he meets the unknown; and he will receive that special help which comes when a great and beloved leader has joined "the choir invisible of those immortal dead who live again in minds made better by their presence."

Only Screwballs Blame All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1963

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days when our minds are still so much concerned with the assassination of the late President Kennedy and the possible motivations for that tragic act, I thought the following column from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel was of interest:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

What goes on in the minds of those persons, who, because a mad gunman killed our late President, now attempt as the Wall Street Journal recently said, to assassinate the character of the entire American people? Why are they intent upon presenting to the world a picture of this country as a seething cauldron of hate, when actually it is far from such? Why is it that a minority of haters cry out that there must be no more hate, why is it that a minority of bigots, racial, religious, and political, cry out for an end to bigotry? It is not only irony, but a malicious, dangerous type of irony, promoting the very things it claims to be opposing.

It is assumed, but probably never will be satisfactorily proved, that Lee Oswald killed the late President Kennedy. It has been proved that Lee Oswald was a Marxist, a Communist, and an extreme leftwinger. But no person in his right mind would hold all of the left wing, even the extremist left wing, guilty of one man's mad act. Yet extreme liberals in this country waxed hysterical in the first few moments after Kennedy's tragic death, laying the blame on the anti-Communist right wing. When the facts came out that Oswald was not a rightwinger, but a leftwinger, their frustration prompted even greater hysteria.

WE'RE NOT PERFECT

The United States is no perfect society. It is not a realization of any "City of God." It is made up of the sick, the well, the young, the old, the sane, the insane, the haters, the nonhaters, the bigots, the nonbigots, but there are infinitely more well persons than sick persons, more young persons than old persons, more sane persons than insane persons, more nonhaters than haters, more charitable persons than bigots, more kind people than unkind people.

Along the line of march in Dallas that led to the spot where President Kennedy was murdered, thousands of Americans stood in line to greet him warmly, among them certainly many persons who did not vote for him and who would not vote for him if he ran again. They felt warmly toward the person, but not all of them accepted his politics for their own anymore than they accepted his religion for their own. We don't hate a man in this country because we don't accept his politics for our own, anymore than we hate a man because we don't accept his religion for our own.

ONLY SCREWBALLS BLAME ALL

There are what the vernacular describes as screwballs in any sizable assembly of the garden variety of human beings. There was a screwball among the thousands who welcomed Kennedy to Dallas. That screwball killed him. Only a person or like screwball tendencies would place the blame for one madman's acts upon all of Dallas, all of Texas, or all of the United States. It isn't true, but instead false, and falsity always does damage.

Who's trying to promote in this country the idea that everyone is at everyone else's throat when that isn't true? What's behind all this stimulated excitability and emotionalism? Who benefits most from the success of any attempts to push the national panic button? I wish I knew the answers. Certainly there are bad forces at work in this country. One of those forces is the one that Lee Oswald, the presumed assassin, gave his loyalty to, but even that force can't be charged on the evidence to date with anything resembling collective guilt.

This is a very sturdy country that we have, even in moments of grief as those of recent days. It isn't going to be derailed by those who, professing to be against hate, promote it, and professing antibigotry, act like bigots. It isn't going to be derailed, but the derailment should not even be attempted.

Memorial to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the name and memory of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt will live in the minds and hearts of people everywhere because of her devotion to humanitarian causes and her tireless efforts to help the oppressed, the needy, and the underprivileged.

She has been properly called the first lady of the world. She has made her mark in history as one of the world's greatest women.

A deserving tribute was paid to Mrs. Roosevelt recently by the AFL-CIO with the announcement that a campaign has been launched by the labor organization to raise funds for the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation as a fitting tribute to this remarkable, courageous and dedicated woman.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the AFL-CIO News:

MEMORIAL TO A GRACIOUS LADY: WE REMEMBER MRS. ROOSEVELT BECAUSE SHE WAS ONE OF US

Throughout the crowded years of her lifetime, Eleanor Roosevelt was the tireless champion of working men and women, of the poor and underprivileged, of the common man the world over.

Wherever there were people in need—in sweatshop or slum, in settlement house or refugee camp—there you could find Eleanor Roosevelt.

Wherever there were battles to be fought—for minimum wage or social security, on behalf of sharecroppers or migratory workers,

against the unspeakable evils of discrimination, segregation or child labor, for the union shop or against spurious right-to-work laws—there you could find Eleanor Roosevelt.

And because misery and oppression are global, Eleanor Roosevelt's work was global, too. She was an ardent advocate of the ideals of the United Nations, the architect of its human rights program.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council said of her: "* * * she regarded every cry of human distress as a personal summons."

Eleanor Roosevelt shared the dreams and hopes of those of us in organized labor. In the tumultuous thirties while her husband was leading America out of the depths of the great depression she was ranging herself on our side, fighting for our right to organize, standing shoulder to shoulder with the rest of us in labor's ranks.

But more than that: She was one of us—for a quarter century a dues-paying member of one of the AFL-CIO unions.

She called the labor movement "my movement," and in address to the AFL-CIO's 1961 convention spoke warmly of our efforts "to keep alive the ideals * * * of really helping people to better conditions, to a better way of life."

"A gracious and compassionate lady," AFL-CIO President George Meany called her, one who "instinctively understood the problems and aspirations of workers."

Eleanor Roosevelt labored hard and unselfishly in the humanitarian field and her deeds are our legacy. Death has stilled her voice, but we can still hear the echo of her words: "* * * there is so much to do, so many engrossing challenges, so many heartbreaking and pressing needs * * *."

To meet these needs in her memory, we in organized labor have joined our hearts and hands with those of her other friends to establish the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

Initiated by President Kennedy, chaired by Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, chartered by act of Congress, this educational and charitable organization will carry on the work to which Eleanor Roosevelt devoted her life.

In recognition of the vital link between labor and Eleanor Roosevelt, President Kennedy has appointed a number of the AFL-CIO's most prominent leaders to serve on the Foundation's board of trustees, to further its program devoted to human rights, underprivileged children, cancer research, international good will and peace.

The trade union movement is enriched by its bittersweet ballads, songs that capture the essence of labor's struggles over the years, songs that speak eloquently of labor's dreams and hopes and lofty ideals.

Soaring above the rest are these hauntingly beautiful words:

"If we could consider each other
A neighbor, a friend and a brother,
It could be a wonderful, wonderful world,
It could be a wonderful world."

This is labor's way. And it was Eleanor Roosevelt's way, too. So we have a dual responsibility—to ourselves and to her memory—to work toward the goals of a world of peace, freedom, social justice and human brotherhood.

The labor movement has established the AFL-CIO Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Fund and the executive council has urged each of us to contribute 1 hour's pay or $1 to this fund.

It is so little to ask, this one-time gift. It will mean so much—an assurance to the poor, the homeless, the downtrodden, the people who work for a living all over the world that the candle which Eleanor Roosevelt lighted will always burn brightly, a beacon of hope in a dark world.

Tribute to the Late Senator Robert S. Kerr by Oklahoma State Corporation Commissioner Wilburn Cartwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following tribute paid to the late U.S. Senator Robert S. Kerr by one of the three corporation commissioners for the State of Oklahoma, and my longstanding friend, the Honorable Wilburn Cartwright:

Bob was my friend for over 50 years. I met him in 1911 at school in Ada and at the First Baptist Church there. I was president of my Sunday school class. Bob was 16 and the general secretary of the church.

TO BE GOVERNOR

I was batching in the basement of the administration building—the one and only college building in Ada at that time. Lois, Bob's older sister, invited me to the Kerr home several times. I became very well acquainted with the entire Kerr family. I appreciated very much getting a free meal occasionally and one that I wouldn't have to prepare for myself. Mrs. Kerr was very kind and treated me as a member of the family. I remember one day at the dinner table Bob was seated across the table from me. Mrs. Kerr placed her hands on Bob's shoulders and said "this boy is going to be Governor of Oklahoma someday." It was a rather casual remark but I soon found that Bob took it seriously.

A CERTIFICATE TO TEACH

I had received a third-grade teacher's certificate in 1910, then in 1911 I received a second-grade teacher's certificate and had just finished my second school north of Tupelo at a place called Eubanks. Bob had now received a certificate to teach school. He couldn't have been over 17 at that time. I noticed he was rather inquisitive about my teaching experience. Then he wanted to know if I was going to stay at Eubanks. I told him no, that I had been offered an increase in salary of $10 a month at Lone Star south of Clarita. Then Bob wanted to know if I could help him get the Eubanks School. I told him I would be delighted and that I would recommend him personally to the three members of the school board—Sinclair, Mote, and Bullard.

GOT A SCHOOL

On the following weekend I saw the members of the school board and told them how well equipped Bob Kerr was and what a good teacher he would make. They said "have him come down and we will look him over." I also saw Mr. T. L. Broderick, of Tupelo, a relative of Bob's. It was arranged that Bob would go to Tupelo and in company with T. L. Broderick go out and see the school board. Bob was young, straight, tall and a glib talker. He looked much older than he was. So Bob came back to Ada highly elated that he had the promise of his first school. The board members afterward thanked me and said that he measured up to the qualifications, capabilities and possibilities of a good country teacher.

WANTED TO GET RICH

In the summer of 1914 I was nominated for the legislature in Coal County. Bob was very much interested. He told me he wanted to get into politics. He said he had been studying history, government and oratory and he gave me a copy of William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech. I memorized it and have kept that copy to this day. We continued to see each other daily in summer school at Ada. He told me he was going to get in politics too, sometime, but first he wanted to get rich.

KERR-M'GEE INDUSTRIES

In the fall of 1915 Bob Kerr, Virgil Riddle and Wilburn Cartwright enrolled together at Oklahoma University. Bob was restless, didn't make a fraternity, which disappointed him, and after the first year he quit. As far as I know he never went to school any more. He studied law in Judge McKee's office in Ada, was admitted to the bar and had some cases but he also got in the grocery business. Finally his grocery store burned down and he decided to invest the insurance money in the oil business. By this time his baby sister, Mildred, had married a man by the name of Anderson, and Anderson had gotten in on the early Oklahoma City oilfield. Bob bought an interest with Anderson. But Anderson wasn't very ambitious in the oil business so Bob bought him out. This paid off well. Bob had a knack for making money. What he didn't know about the oil business he thought he could find out through some qualified partner. He goes to Phillips Petroleum Co. and picks Dean McGee. With Bob's general knowledge and ability and Mr. McGee's specific knowledge and education they struck it off extra well together, hence the big Kerr-McGee Oil Industries.

ELECTED GOVERNOR

I was elected to Congress in 1926. Bob was now very rich. He got in politics as Democratic national committeeman and made Red Phillips Governor of Oklahoma, but their friendship didn't last very long. To my knowledge Red was hard to get along with. I inserted a Bob Kerr speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and, at Bob's request, sent out 700,000 copies. This didn't help my friendship any with Red Phillips, but 4 years later (1940) Bob was elected Governor of Oklahoma. I got defeated for Congress in 1942. Bob offered me a position in his administration but World War II was starting and I went to the Army and was gone 3 years. I came back disabled and out of a job in 1945. Bob again offered to help me but I ran for and was elected secretary of state and he donated to my campaign.

ELECTED U.S. SENATOR

Later Bob was elected U.S. Senator. Again he talked to me about securing a position in Washington but instead I stayed on as Secretary of State and then was elected State auditor. By this time Congressman Mike Monroney and Senator LaFollette had gotten through a bill providing for congressional retirement. But the law was not retroactive so it didn't apply to me unless I was reelected to Congress or took a position at the U.S. Capitol for at least a year. Bob told me that any time I wanted to qualify for congressional retirement he would see that I got a position at the Capitol. I told him how I appreciated it and that was exactly what I wanted to do, but that I had a few more things to do politically before taking a job in Washington and retirement.

PLEASANT DREAMS

I can truthfully say that Bob never forgot a friend and he lived according to the ad-

monition of William Cullen Bryant when he said:

"So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

State's Demos Eager To Back New Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the November 27, 1963, issue of the Sacramento Union:

STATE'S DEMOS EAGER TO BACK NEW CHIEF

(By Bert Clinkston)

The full spectrum of California Democrats appeared Tuesday eager to line up politically behind President Lyndon B. Johnson.

"We're optimistic about how he'll perform in the White House," said President Tom Carvey of the liberal 70,000-member California Democratic Council.

"The one break the American people got out of the tragic loss of President Kennedy is the tremendous man who stepped into the Presidency," said Senate President Pro Tempore Hugh M. Burns.

FAVORABLE VIEW

Burns, backer of Johnson for President at the 1960 convention—when Kennedy captured the nomination with ease—could still be expected to look with favor on the new President.

The top party leadership sent a telegram to the new President pledging "unreserved support to your awesome task of guiding our bereaved Nation and the world in the struggle for peace and democracy."

SIGNERS OF MESSAGE

The telegram was signed by State Chairman Eugene L. Wyman, of Los Angeles, Northern California Chairman Roger Kent, of Kentfield, and the two members of the national committee from California, Mrs. Elizabeth R. Gatov, of Kentfield, and Attorney General Stanley Mosk, of Los Angeles.

Carvey's statements were expectedly strong, in the opinion of many Democrats.

"I have already sent a telegram to President Johnson, expressing my full confidence in him and assuring him of our support," said Carvey. "There will be other things as the time goes on that will demonstrate our continuing support."

HERE IN AUGUST

It was Johnson, as Vice President, who stepped to the rostrum in the assembly chamber here last August and delivered a rousing speech for Democratic unity.

Carvey's volunteer CDC and party regulars, including Assembly Speaker Jesse M. Unruh, had been warring for months.

There has been some apprehension among California Democrats as to the degree of enthusiasm the new President could expect from party liberals.

Johnson, considered conservative by many, played the leading part just 2 weeks ago in a civil rights meeting for President Kennedy at Los Angeles.

He has received endorsements as President from Roy Wilkins, head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and from George Meany, head of the AFL–CIO. As a Senator from Texas, Johnson voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, an unpopular law with labor.

KENNEDY PROGRAM

Carvey said he believes Johnson now will push Kennedy's civil rights program through Congress "as a living memorial to President Kennedy. I have absolutely no doubt that President Johnson will carry it out."

"Mr. Johnson has shown that he's a very able political leader," said Carvey. "We haven't always agreed in the past, but the important thing now is to get on with the job.

"I think President Johnson is extremely well prepared to do the job and deserves the support of every one of us. I don't think there's any question that the President has the unified support of Democrats."

Burns said he had no doubts about California Democrats forming a solid front for President Johnson as things were shaping up before a Dallas assassin snuffed out Kennedy's life last Friday.

"We'll have the same kind of support for Lyndon Johnson," said Burns, whose own brand of conservatism drew an invitation from a group of Fresno liberals for Burns to join the Republican Party.

He also added his support to the possibility of Governor Brown becoming vice presidential candidate on the ticket with Johnson next year.

Brown has been mentioned for this by several sources since Johnson ascended to the Presidency. Ironically, Brown had to declare his disinterest in the office when it was suggested he would replace Johnson as second man on the ticket when Kennedy was living.

GOP SUPPORT

Republican Don Mulford, of Oakland, GOP caucus chairman in the assembly, Tuesday appealed to fellow Republicans to abandon partisanship for the rest of the year.

"I would hope that during this period Republicans in California will find ways and means to reduce the hatred and violent objections that appear to have emerged in our political thinking," he said.

"The American tradition respects the dignity of man and reflects the conduct of our affairs with respect to the other person's position."

Communism in World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point on Long Island is one of the five service academies to which all of the Members of Congress have the privilege of appointing young men of high caliber so that through intensive study and training, they may be well prepared to serve their country in peace or in war. I feel especially close to the Merchant Marine Academy because it is located only a few miles from my home and I have had numerous opportunities to visit its fine campus and to become acquainted with the officers and teachers who are molding the lives of the future captains of our merchant ships, the future heads of our great maritime companies, and the future seafarers on the lanes of peaceful commerce throughout the world.

Recently, I learned with particular pride that the Merchant Marine Academy, intent upon broadening the cultural horizons of its cadets, has instituted a series of six special events at which distinguished lecturers, musicians, and artists will appear. It is noteworthy that the first speaker selected by the Academy was the former Prime Minister of Hungary, Ferenc Nagy, now living in exile in the United States. Mr. Nagy spoke on the very pertinent topic: "Communism in World Trade."

I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues several paragraphs from Mr. Nagy's address which may serve to remind us all that the captive nations are still captive and that the heavy tread of communism is still felt daily in the life of every citizen.

COMMUNISM IN WORLD TRADE

(Excerpts from an address by Ferenc Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary, delivered at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, Long Island, Wednesday, Nov. 20, 1963.)

Economic policies of the democratic world serve the welfare and enrichment of society. Governments and parliaments alike try to support and protect the economy in both foreign and domestic policies. On the other hand, in the Communist world, politics come first. The economic activities of the various countries are formulated according to the requirements of politics. The economic well-being of the people plays a minor role in the life of the Communist nations, being subordinated to their political, imperialistic, ambitions.

In a free country, where politics support the economy and where the economy is not used to serve political interests, it would be unimaginable to demoralize agriculture for political reasons as it is done in the Communist countries. The catastrophic results of collectivization are apparent in the fact that those countries which formerly exported their agricultural surpluses, cannot at the present time produce enough for their own population and must purchase the necessary food abroad either for gold or other foreign currency. In spite of this, they (the Communists) do not want to give up the idea of collectivization or to make the peasants independent, which would increase the output from agriculture.

As long as forced industrialization and the even more ruthless collectivization serves to support the general policies of the Communist countries, communism would like to strengthen foreign policy by trade relations with foreign countries. We know this to be a fact, not only because of present trade activities, but because the Communists themselves affirm this.

First of all we must examine the relations of the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union in Comecon, the Common Market of the Communist countries. This Council for Mutual Economic Aid, which is known as Comecon, does not serve the integration of economic aims which would mean equal profits for the Soviet Union and the satellite countries of Eastern Europe. This serves primarily the dominating economic role of the Soviet Union of these

countries. The Soviet Union makes proposals at the Comecon meetings under the pretext of a better division of their roles in Communist industry which deeply injure the interest of the Eastern European countries, increasing their dependency upon the Soviet Union. For example, it would be in the best interests of Hungary to expand its light and precision industries for which she needs workers and labor more than raw materials. Hungary does not have sufficient iron ore or hard coal supplies to work at heavy industry. Therefore it is necessary to import not only raw materials but part of the necessary fuel as well. Of course, this would have to be imported first of all from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union does not take into consideration such viewpoints or the best interests of Hungary and is trying to divert the economic life of Hungary into exactly the opposite direction.

Through another Comecon decision, Hungary was forced to give up the manufacture of the 3-ton earthmoving vehicles and to hand this over to Czechoslovakia. Hereafter, Hungary can manufacture only the heavier 5-ton vehicles. Everyone regards this as a step taken by the Soviet Union to win the support of the Czechoslovak Mr. Novotny in the Soviet's dispute with the Chinese. At the same time the Soviet Union forced Hungary to enlarge and widen her shipbuilding industry. This is most typical of Moscow's determination to keep Eastern European countries in a state of economic dependency on the Soviet Union. The fact is that shipbuilding is highly steel-intensive and Hungary happens to lack steel. By giving this sector an increased importance, the Soviet Union as Hungary's chief supplier of steel, will be better placed to exercise economic pressure.

Naturally Soviet pressure is not confined to Hungary alone, but is exerted upon all the other Eastern European countries, too. The policies of the Soviet Union today in connection with the countries of Eastern Europe are to counteract, with increasing economic pressures, the gradual political liberalization of these countries.

The Soviet Union has set a double standard in her foreign trade policies. While the Soviet Union carries on her trade activities with the free Western countries on the basis of mutual agreements and on the basis of world market prices, the Soviet Union exploits the Eastern European countries through trade connections. This happens through the sale of raw materials or half-completed products exported by the Soviet Union abroad, at a lower rate for the free Western countries than to the East European satellites. At the same time, a higher price is paid for products imported from Western countries than that paid for products of the Eastern European countries.

We have no available data on the latest industrial developments or production of the Communist states. We only know that the latest 5-year plans could not be fulfilled either in the Soviet Union or other countries of Eastern Europe which are under the Communist leadership. It is evident, however, that the individual farming, as opposed to collectivized agriculture, is far superior. This also holds true for industry. In other words, under a free and democratic system, countries now under Communist rule would increase significantly both their agricultural and industrial output.

As a democratic and progressive person, I would never propose that the free world subordinate its economic life to political considerations as it is done in the Communist countries. However, I would consider it entirely proper if the free and democratic countries would use their economic superiority to achieve political concessions from the Communist countries. The food purchases of the Communist countries are not confined to this year only.

The Communist world will be forced, for many years to come, to purchase food from the free countries. I am confident that there will be means and opportunities presented to take advantage of the Communist economic situation without conjuring up provocations or the danger of war. We should, therefore, strive to insure for the peoples now subjugated by communism, more freedom, more human dignity, and more hope for the future.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my third rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from June 12 through August 12, 1963:

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R. B. C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
*79	June 12	4996	Yea	204	209	18	On passage of area redevelopment bill (1 Member answered present).
80	June 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Byrnes, Republican ,of Wisconsin (59 Members absent).
81	do	6755	Yea	283	91	58	1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rates.
82	June 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (58 Members absent).
83	do	7063	Yea	301	93	39	Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce.
84	June 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, of Iowa (50 Members absent).
85	do	247	Yea	263	126	42	Suspending equal-time requirements for 1964 presidential campaign.
86	June 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cohelan, Democrat, of California (98 Members absent).
*87	do	6177	Yea	99	237	98	District of Columbia appropriations; a motion to recommit.
88	June 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ford, Republican, of Michigan (47 Members absent).
89	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (58 Members absent).
90	June 26		do				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (38 Members absent).
91	do	7179	Yea	410	1	22	Department of Defense appropriation bill.
92	July 9		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (46 Members absent). (R. B. C. in conference re highway and flood control projects affecting the 25th Congressional District.)
93	do	3179	Yea	314	82	37	A bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals be entitled to retirement privileges equal to judges of U.S. courts of appeals.
94	July 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (67 Members absent).
*95	do	4897	Not voting	40	338	53	Motion to recommit bill to extend geographic jurisdictional reach of wartime sedition statute (2 Members answered present). (R. B. C. in conference with Mr. Robert Rope, city manager, City of Industry.)
96	July 17	5297	Nay	144	245	44	Motion to recommit conference report on Department of Interior appropriations.
97	do	5297	Yea	331	50	52	On passage of conference report for Department of Interior appropriations.
98	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio (52 Members absent). (R. B. C. at committee reception for President of the Afghan National Assembly.)
99	July 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois (83 Members absent).
100	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri (83 Members absent).
*101	do	5171	Yea	96	258	79	Motion to recommit bill giving GSA control of Federal data processing equipment.
*102	July 24	6518	do	272	102	58	A bill to improve air pollution control programs.
103	July 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (55 Members present).
104	do	4683	Nay	29	343	60	Motion to recommit bill to promote orderly transfer of administrations.
105	July 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Patman, Democrat, of Texas (47 Members absent).
106	do	3872	Yea	379	11	41	To return to conference a bill to extend life of Export-Import Bank.
107	July 31		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (37 Members absent.)
108	do	453	Yea	234	166	32	Resolution to consider conference report re Philippine war damage claims.
109	Aug. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (45 Members absent).
110	do	467	Yea	387	1	44	Resolution to consider NASA appropriations.
111	do	7500	do	334	57	41	Appropriating $5,200,000,000 for NASA.
112	Aug. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (88 Members absent).
113	do	S. 1652	Yea	293	33	106	Extending National Cultural Center Act for 3 years.
114	Aug. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (41 Members absent).
115	do	4955	Nay	181	217	34	Motion to recommit Vocational Education Act (1 Member voted present).
116	do	4955	Yea	377	21	35	On passage of Vocational Education Act.
117	Aug. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (53 Members absent).
118	do	477	Yea	303	72	59	Resolution to consider debt ceiling.
119	Aug. 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Alger, Republican, of Texas (46 Members absent).
120	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida (58 Members absent). (R.B.C. in committee for testimony of Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.)
121	do	7824	Nay	164	229	41	Motion to recommit, with instructions to reduce debt ceiling.
122	do	7824	Yea	221	175	38	To extend present $309,000,000,000 temporary debt ceiling.
123	Aug. 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Diggs, Democrat, of Michigan (115 Members absent).
*124	do	7525	Yea	114	222	97	Motion to recommit District of Columbia criminal procedure bill.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 79

The bill increasing appropriations for area redevelopment was defeated in the House but received subsequent Senate approval. The measure will probably be scheduled for further House action and will receive analysis in a future rollcall.

ROLLCALL NO. 87

This bill, as passed to the Senate, authorizes increasing the Federal subvention to the District of Columbia from $32 to $45 million for fiscal 1964. I supported a motion, which was defeated, to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to raise the authorization to $53 million. The motion was predicated on the fact that if the Federal Government were a taxpayer in the District of Columbia, as is private industry, the property that it owns in the District would pay a property tax bill of $53 million this year. Nearly every parent in the 25th District who has children in the public schools now fills out a form indicating whether he works for the Federal Government or for an industry that contracts primarily with the Federal Government. This is because Congress has decided, through the Federal impacted school program, that if it is responsible for creating an additional load on the local property taxpayer for the support of education, because of children whose parents work for tax-exempt facilities, it should pay its pro rata share of the increased cost in education. I believe that this approach is sound and should be followed in the District of Columbia.

During debate there was virtually no disagreement on the fact that the Capital is in dire financial trouble resulting from soaring costs of District government and prolonged neglect of the District's needs in the areas of education, police and fire protection, recreation, prevention of crime and juvenile delinquency, and so forth. The conditions of school facilities are a particular disgrace. Not only do those who live and work in Washington recognize this fact but in recent months four national magazines have concluded that the Nation's Capital is a national shame primarily because the Congress has failed to provide adequate funds to do a decent job of governing. In my judgment, failure to support the financial formula was a failure by Congress to meet its responsibilities as the world's largest school board, city council, board of supervisors, and State legislature, all rolled into one.

ROLLCALL NO. 95

Although I am recorded as "not voting" on the Justice Department's proposal to extend geographic application of the so-called Wartime Sedition Act, had I been present I would have supported the motion to recommit. If enacted into law, this bill will permit prosecution of Americans abroad for making false statements with intent to interfere with the operations or success of military or naval forces of the United States, or to obstruct the recruiting or enlistment of these forces. Since violation of the act is punishable by 20 years in prison, it is conceivable that many of the most vociferous critics of any administration could be put behind bars, because the law implies that a false statement is any statement which runs counter to information presented by the Government. If rigidly interpreted and enforced, citizens who objected to President Eisenhower's use of Federal troops in Arkansas, or President Kennedy's similar action in Mississippi, could be jailed. Congressman JAMES UTT, Republican, of California, might face imprisonment for alleging that Senator GOLDWATER has information suppressed by the Pentagon showing Russia has a 2-to-1 superiority over the United States in nuclear weaponry.

GOLDWATER says:

I never in my life said anything like that.

Robert Welch, Gus Hall, and others who hold extremist philosophies which I deplore, might, under the Sedition Act, very well be jailed for many of their allegations. While I reject the ideology of extremists of both right and left, I believe it is imperative that we defend their right to hold these views and their right to speak their minds. Sedition does not involve action. It means only speech. The Sedition Act, in my judgment, is in direct conflict with the first amendment:

Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech.

Under the Sedition Act, a dictatorial administration could violate this freedom with impunity.

ROLLCALL NO. 101

I voted to recommit H.R. 5171 because I strongly objected to the perfunctory way it had been handled by the Government Operations Subcommittee. Only 1 day's hearings were held during which two witnesses testified—the Comptroller General and the Administrator of the General Services Administration. The latter, it is important to note, has a vested interest in passage of the bill because his agency would become the sole purchaser and operator of all data processing equipment used by Federal departments and agencies. Under this setup, the potential bureaucratic power of GSA would be tremendous. I was distressed to learn that the subcommittee had failed to call as witnesses—either for or against the bill—administrators of agencies which would be directly affected by its enactment, agencies such as the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Internal Revenue Service, Bureau of the Budget, and so forth. The subcommittee also did not see fit to hear the testimony of representatives of private industry who are the chief users and suppliers of data processing equipment. In light of these proceedings, I could not in good conscience vote for the measure, regardless of the economy merits which its sponsors purported it to have.

ROLLCALL NO. 102

Residents of the 25th District should be particularly pleased with House passage of the Clean Air Act for it is a long-range, well-conceived plan which can do much to help combat smog. I have long been an active proponent of anti-smog legislation, and while a member of the California Legislature authored a bill creating the Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board. Under the provisions of H.R. 6518, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to establish a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control, and to help set up State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies through Federal grants. The bill is not an encroachment upon States rights for it says in hard language that State and local governments have primary responsibility for smog prevention and control. Here are some of the bill's provisions: First, directs HEW to encourage air pollution control programs between all levels of government; second, permits two or more States to enter into compacts for air pollution control; third, directs HEW to make studies of specific smog problems when requested by a local agency or when the Secretary determines that the problem has an interstate effect; fourth, authorizes HEW to research, collect, and distribute information on smog, and to establish training projects and research fellowships for the study of air pollution.

ROLLCALL NO. 124

House passage of the omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia is the best argument I know of for giving Washington citizens home rule. This hastily-drawn proposal, in my opinion, strikes at the very roots of many constitutional guarantees rather than at the alleged crime "epidemic" it purportedly aims to curb. The measure was opposed by the District Commissioners, the Department of Justice, and the District Bar Association. Its most ardent supporter was the Chief of Police. Police chiefs are not generally known as authorities on jurisprudence, and the District Chief is no exception.

Under H.R. 7525, for example, unlike the law of any jurisdiction that I know of in the United States, the police could pick up a person suspected of having committed a crime—or a person suspected of being a witness to a crime—and hold him incommunicado until they are through with interrogation. Such detainment without benefit of counsel clearly violates constitutional safeguards. This provision in the bill also denies to the "detainee" the right to secure his liberty by seeking bail or posting collateral, the right to habeas corpus, and the right not to be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

It is apparent that proponents of such rough-shod legislation were stamped by widespread publicity that Washington is the Nation's leading crime city. This allegation has been refuted by a recent FBI report which ranks the District seventh in crime for all major U.S. cities. The bill's proponents, out of myopia rather than intent, have in effect sacrificed due process of law on the altar of crime control. They have aimed their attack at crime control without giving any consideration to crime prevention. There is no attempt to seek better schools, better housing, better living and working conditions, and better human relations. On the contrary, a realistic attempt to cope with these problems was rejected on rollcall No. 87 when the

House failed to provide fair and adequate appropriations for governing the District. Crime prevention is a very complex and expensive process, involving many disciplines and programs. In my judgment, we cannot escape expense and effort in this area by passing a bill which makes a mockery of American justice and jurisprudence.

CORRECTION

Rollcall No. 20 in my first congressional report is mistakenly listed as consideration of H.R. 5517, final passage of appropriations for the accelerated public works program. This rollcall correctly dealt with H.R. 5389, a measure authorizing a change from silver to gold backing of $1 and $2 bills. The proposal, which I opposed, passed 251 to 122. There were 60 Members not voting. In my judgment, the conversion from silver to gold backing for some $2 billion would further dilute our dwindling gold reserves, and further injure our balance-of-payments situation. Defeat of the bill would also have been an economy move in that it costs the Government 3 cents a year to keep a gold-backed dollar bill in circulation, as opposed to no cost when the dollar is backed by silver. With repeal of silver-backing, the Government puts itself in the surplus silver business to the tune of $2 billion, and goes into competition with silver mines for the industrial and jewelry silver markets.

John F. Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, John Fitzgerald Kennedy has joined the ranks of those patriots whose lives have been spent that others might live to enjoy the fruits of their battles. It is a most tragic and unfortunate fact that death is often the sacrifice of those who would promote a better life. All Americans must admire and respect him for his untiring energy, great ability and sincere devotion to what he believed to be his patriotic duty. He unselfishly dedicated himself to public service.

While he served as Chief Executive of our Nation he manifested strong convictions and sincere leadership, not only for America but the entire free world. His assassination is one of the greatest tragedies of this century. Both friend and foe were stunned with the unbelievable announcement that our President had been shot. Grief, sorrow, and sympathy immediately descended upon the civilized world.

We will long remember President Kennedy's contagious smile, sparkling humor, bright eyes, spontaneous gestures and aggressive leadership. This intellectually powerful young man showed tremendous courage both in war and in peace. His action in the face of the enemy on the field of battle stamped him as a wartime hero. But I am convinced that his highest ambition was to go down in history as the President who did most to bring lasting peace to all mankind.

Conserving the Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the September 28, 1963, edition of the New Republic. This is the third part of Wolf Von Eckardt's series on "Urban Renewal and the City" and discusses what the renewal function should be in preserving those buildings and areas in our cities which add to their charm and esthetic value.

The article follows:

CONSERVING THE OLD—URBAN RENEWAL AND THE CITY—PART III

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

Federal assistance for conservation (which means preserving and sprucing up a neighborhood) and rehabilitation (which also includes selective weeding out of hopeless buildings and replacing them with new ones or small parks) has been available since the Housing Act of 1954. Our cities, in which three-quarters or more of our population live, have been slow in taking advantage of it, though now at last there are approximately 300 urban renewal projects involving rehabilitation across the country. Though urban renewal funds cannot restore buildings, they have been used to enhance them. A notable example is the old customs house in Monterey, Calif., a beautiful remnant of the Spanish past, which has been returned to the enjoyment of pedestrians.

The cosmopolitan elite of Washington, D.C., was probably the first to discover that obsolete city houses and streets could be more lovable than new ones. The spontaneous and private rehabilitation of Georgetown, begun at the end of World War II, seemed at first little more than fashionable snobbery. Yes, it may well mark the beginning of a more sophisticated urban culture in America. Historic Georgetown's rebirth, with its charm and amenities, has deeply influenced the city planners. It has helped make preservation of historic and architecturally worthy old buildings a little more popular.

There remain, of course, far too many historic cities and city districts, architecturally as worthy, or more so, than Georgetown, whose bosses fail to see that preserving esthetic values also has enormous potentials for taxable values. Alexandria, Va., or Annapolis, Md., for instance, patriotically preserve a few buildings wherein some dead hero may have slept. But they destroy irreplaceable old buildings, vistas and waterfronts which give repose to the living.

Sophisticated, historic Philadelphia, however, has most intelligently employed the tools of urban renewal to redeem a century of vandalism and vandalistic neglect. Independence Hall is being enhanced with a splendor it has never known by a grand, tree-shaded mall. It is an inspired work of urban design which will attain its full glory when urban renewal has replaced the dingy surrounding structure with carefully designed corporation palaces.

Several blocks east of Independence Hall is now a unique historical park. Recently, worthless and dilapidated buildings were weeded out between a dozen or so now restored historic buildings. These stand, a bit lonely and a little like rare snails preserved in alcohol, on a well-groomed green swath. The Park Service might put some dignified refreshment kiosks and some benches there to animate the visitors and the area.

South of Independence National Park and east of a wonderful small park called Washington Square, urban renewal's first, most carefully planned and most noteworthy residential rehabilitation project is rising. A careful blending of restored old and frankly modern townhouses with a sprinkling of luxury apartment towers, Society Hill, as the area is called, promises to be worthy of William Penn's dream of a "green country town." Greenways, winding through the entire area, will give it cohesion and will make it possible—I believe for the first time in modern America—to really experience the drama of a townscape in the only way one can really experience it—on foot. As elsewhere there is, of course, the inevitable, elevated automobile expressway wedged between people and their river to disrupt the experience. But here, at least, underpasses will lead to a waterfront park and marina.

The new Society Hill townhouses on Dock Street, designed by I. M. Pei for Alcoa and Zeckendorf, struck me as more exciting on the renderings and models than in their now nearly completed reality. They still harmonize well, the mid-20th-century skyscraper apartments to one side and the 19th-century houses to the other, which is quite a feat. But they are painfully monolithic. Despite the dainty iron fence, or perhaps because of it, the unrelieved, block-long row of dark brick reminded me of a French caserne.

The first completed highrise apartment in the area, a lush affair called Hopkinson House, in contrast, seems a bit too nouveau riche for the refinement the area obviously hopes to attain. Architects Stonorov and Haws endowed it with many handsome architectural details, but somehow there are too many of them.

Many prospective buyers, I was told, inspect Society Hill townhouses and apartments and then settle on one of the dilapidated old 19th-century houses which are sold on condition that they be restored within 2 years. Renovation may, in the end, turn out to be more expensive than a new home in the area. But those who can afford it also find it more gracious and spacious. This tends to justify the faith of Philadelphia's planners and renewers who made restoration of the salvageable buildings on Society Hill their foremost objective. And it tends to refute the lack of faith of the investors who were fearful of the venture.

But the economic success of rehabilitating areas where houses then sell for between $30,000 and $100,000, obviously does not persuade mortgage bankers that rehabilitation of low-income neighborhoods will pay.

TENEMENTS ARE GOOD BUSINESS

Here is the test not of our cultural values but of our social conscience. The trouble has been all along the banks refuse loans for repairs and improvements on buildings which are in parts of the city that seem to them deteriorated or deteriorating. Their secret maps charting their estimates of the ebb and flow of real estate values are far more decisive for the destiny of our cities than the published ones of the planners. And the Federal Housing Administration, which insures their loans, also supports their views.

Rehabilitation, even for the moderate income market, is seldom profitable. Philadelphia, for instance, wants to rehabilitate

a row of 80 very attractive but rundown houses it bought up on Eighth Street as part of the East Poplar renewal project. The land is inexpensive and so are the vacated houses. But Arthur Binns, an experienced builder, found that he would not recover his alteration expenses for the rents he could command in this area. "Who'll pay $100 for an apartment if he can buy a house for $12,000?" he asks. The trouble is the high labor cost for remodeling which demands special fitting and handwork. Sixty percent of the cost of a new house goes into materials and 30 percent for labor. On a remodeling job the reverse is true. Binns threw in his trowel on that one, and, as of a few weeks ago, the empty houses were just standing there.

Slums, on the other hand, are a very profitable business. "Assume you've 12 tenants," the Wall Street Journal recently quoted a perfectly respectable banker, "and each pays $80 a month for a single room. That's $960 a month. Now assume you rehabilitate into one duplex apartment at $350 a month and two smaller apartments at $125 each. That gives you a total of $600 a month. The effect is that the owner is getting less in rental for a substantial alteration deal."

The only weapon against this kind of economic logic is city building code enforcements. It is not a very accurate weapon. Building code enforcement, after a century of neglect, is a tragic instance of too little and too late. The fine for a violation—a broken sewer pipe, say, or a rotten staircase—is far less expensive than the repair. There is a good deal more rent to be squeezed out of the unrepaired building before the courts and the building inspectors get around to it again. When they do, there is only another inexpensive fee. In the end, the building is condemned. The slumlord then merrily evicts the tenants, boards up the place, and waits until redevelopment comes along and pays him his investment in the house and the violation penalties twice or three times over.

Vigorous code enforcement thus, ironically, often aggravates the slums and the plight of its people. In Philadelphia the building inspectors are really busy now. As a result evictions abound. In a particularly grim Negro slum not far from City Hall, called Hawthorne Village, Mrs. Alice Lipscomb, a resident who has earned citywide recognition for her angelic, voluntary community work, showed me identical letters to about 100 different people. They were typed on the stationery of J. Gross & Bros., and all dated May 31, 1963, a few days before my visit. The one I copied read:

"DEAR MR. DUCKET: As we are the new agent of the property you now occupy we hereby give you notice to vacate the property. No more rent will be accepted.

Since this property is in nonconformity with the housing authorities, of Philadelphia, it is necessary that you vacate this property immediately.

"Very truly yours,

"JAY M. GROSS."

William Ducket, I was told, is 72 years old and single. The day he received this letter his light and water were turned off. Neither he nor any of the other recipients of the letter are eligible for urban renewal relocation assistance. Nor can they hope to find room in public housing, at least not for some time. Somehow they all found shelter, of course, somewhere in the spreading slum, awaiting the next eviction. The boarded up houses, meanwhile, can be counted on to serve as hazardous playgrounds for children and abodes for drunks, derelicts and, as Mrs. Lipscomb so delicately put it, "girls who entertain company."

No FHA or Veteran's Administration loans, let alone private repair loans will ever be seen in Hawthorne Village. Nor can the government simply move in directly and undertake deslumming itself, building by building. Short of tearing the whole place down, the only hope of obtaining financing for such low-income areas is urban renewal's tedious rehabilitation process.

This means the local renewal agency must, first of all, make a detailed study of the neighborhood, its physical conditions, its facilities and the nature and mood of its inhabitants to diagnose properly the chances of its recuperation. It furthermore means that the agency must persuade all the residents and building owners to go along. For the owners themselves must fix up their properties. They must have the faith that everyone else's effort and the city's plans for new schools, playgrounds, community centers, improved and planted streets, off-street parking and whatever, justify their sacrifice, which is often considerable. Resident owners usually respond well once the neighborhood gets into the spirit. Absentee owners are often difficult. The renewers speak softly at first, but they carry the big stick of eminent domain. If an owner refuses to bring his building up to standard, the renewers can acquire it and sell it to someone who will.

But even with their most comprehensive improvement plans, such as Ed Logue's for Washington Park in Boston, the Government urban renewal people had a hard time with the Government mortgage people. FHA has tended to apply suburban middle-class standards to such things as heating, hot water, lot coverage, lighting, ventilation and privacy. Housing Administrator Weaver and Renewal Commissioner Slayton finally managed this June to persuade FHA to take it a little easy with poor people who own old houses.

THE HARLEM PARK PROJECT

"Financing and bricks and mortar are not the toughest problem, though," Edward Ewing, community organization director for the Baltimore renewal agency told me. "The trick is winning and involving the people in a rehabilitation area. Where do you start?"

Ewing talked about Harlem Park, a 30-block area of row houses with several churches and two small parks in the northwest section of Baltimore where 15,000 Negroes live, some of them quite poor. The area's rehabilitation was first planned in 1955. A project office in the area was opened, which anyone can visit at any time for advice and help. It is staffed with a sizable platoon of social workers, planners, construction and remodeling experts, financing people especially trained by FHA to prepare loan applications, and relocation workers. The platoon scouted for the local leadership, which is often a chancy business, since some leaders are suddenly without followers when it comes to people's homes and lifetime investments. Here as elsewhere the renewers had to organize the community. They did so by setting up block committees from which in time, a neighborhood council emerged. Ewing also worked with the ministers, and the Grocers and Meat Dealers Union which has many members in Harlem Park.

In meeting after meeting fears were allayed and plans hammered out. Group discussions were followed up with thousands of personal calls. The damnedest problems came up. There were three elderly people who didn't want or need extra electrical outlets which would ruin the nice walpaper. (The rehabilitators got an FHA requirement waived.) A young couple would not risk the money for new window frames until the renewers talked to parents. (The renewers made several trips to the other end of town to persuade the parents.) The problems were myriad, what with relocation and loan requirements and a number of tough hardship cases. The job is only half complete. But the new Harlem Park, on which the rehabilitators and rehabilitated eventually agreed, is emerging.

The crowded and dilapidated old stables and servant quarters in the center of the blocks have been removed. The people in them have been relocated. The new open spaces in the courts are being turned into parks and playgrounds which the residents promise to maintain. Nine hundred new trees have been planted. Everybody was told, both in meetings and by leaflet, to help the trees to grow and to pull up the weeds at the base. When they arrived the small children all painted trees in school and learned about them. A new elementary and a new high school will open this fall and also serve as a community center. The principal, Mrs. Mary Brooks, lives in the area and was appointed to the new school over a year ago to help plan its program with the community. All but a few houses are spic and span and up to standard. A few people can't afford the renovation. Ewing believes his agency has now found some complex legal way to buy the houses, fix them up and then give their present occupants life tenancy.

Harlem Park is no Society Hill, esthetically speaking. The school, unfortunately, is one of architecture's many missed opportunities. A little pagoda in one of the new court parks is just plain silly. "But that is just what the people in the block insisted on. They are very happy with it," explained James Gilliam, the project manager, who showed me around. A woman who had come to greet Gilliam and who overheard our conversation, broke into a gale of laughter. It infected the kids of the block broom-squad who were sweeping their playground. They flocked around to join in our hilarity.

Kansas Law Review Notes Schwengel on Professional Staffs of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from "The Editors' Notes" in the October 1963, issue of the University of Kansas Law Review, in which a letter from our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] about the "Professional Staffs of Congress" is liberally quoted.

THE EDITORS' NOTES

We received a letter over the summer from the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, U.S. Representative from the First District in Iowa, taking issue with Professor Kofmehl's book, "Professional Staffs of Congress" and its treatment by our reviewer, Prof. James E. Titus (see Titus, "Book Review," 11 Kan. L. Rev. 417 (1963)). Representative SCHWENGEL states that "to imply as Professor Kofmehl does, that congressional staffs can be nonpartisan, simply ignores political reality. * * * Upon examination * * * Mr. Kofmehl's assumption breaks down. In the House of Representatives * * * many highly partisan committees may be identified." Representative SCHWENGEL contends that minority staffing is not a partisan issue. To deal with the problem, the House Republican Conference Committee on Increased Minority Staffing and the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on Increased Minority Staffing have been formed by various Republicans in the House and Senate. Representative SCHWENGEL concludes: "It is strange that Democrats,

who claim to speak for all the minorities, neglect so sadly the cause of the minority in the Congress." If any of our readers are interested in the full text of Congressman SCHWENGEL's letter, we will furnish a copy on request. Address requests to the Review and please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Tribute to Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in these remarks and as permitted by unanimous consent of the House, I include a beautiful poem which is a tribute to the widow of our late great President written by Rev. Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S.Sp., chaplain—Lieutenant Colonel—Army of the United States, retired, who is a Roman Catholic chaplain at Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington:

TRIBUTE TO JACQUELINE BOUVIER KENNEDY

(By Eugene L. A. Fisher, C.S.Sp., chaplain (lieutenant colonel), Army of the United States, retired)

With saddened hearts stunned millions watched,
Our champion laid to rest.
He was the fourth one to be notched
On gun beneath Fate's vest.

From Dallas to Bethesda drop
Throughout the day and night
Two lonely figures sadly stop
Their travel with felled knight.

Then on to the grand great White House
With flag-draped coffin sped.
It seemed to house a living spouse
Not hero who was dead.

The caisson bore the last remains,
Rotunda on the Hill,
Where thousands sighed with heartfelt pains
And some were numbed and ill.

Beneath the Capitol's huge Dome
Those lonely figures knelt.
One kissed our hero's final home
Wherein her spirit dwelt.

The mother with her children stood,
Her heart pierced through and mute.
No one had better understood
A little boy's salute.

Then off to Arlington graveyard
The funeral cortege led
Where to the green gray sloping sward
Our drooping spirits fled.

Throughout it all, heart wretched with grief,
A black veiled widowed guide,
Majestic, queenly, with the Chief,
Serenely dignified.

Like classic statute of great fame,
The calm Madonna, tried
In crucible of moulten flame,
Has passed her test with pride.

She merited to light the flame.
It glows eternally
To mark the courage and due fame
Of heroes of the Free.

The pomp of military skilled,
A maiden by grief torn,
The strains of martial music stilled
A heroine is born.

Special Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of December 11, 1963, special report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN COTTON INDUSTRY

Revitalizing the American cotton industry was the subject for debate in the House last week as H.R. 6196, the cotton bill passed 216 to 182. There is little hope this bill will accomplish its stated purpose. It does not solve the basic problem which has caused cotton's problem, as it has created problems for every other agricultural commodity, Government interference, subsidies and control.

As a representative of Dallas, a major cotton center, I recognize the problems besetting the industry and am concerned about them. My interest in the current cotton legislation was not confined to debate on the floor. I worked closely with Republican members on the House Agriculture Committee all during hearings on the bill in an effort to get a measure that would move in the direction of getting cotton back on its feet. These facts were clear from careful study of the problem:

1. Cotton's current problem has been aggravated rather than solved by Government action in the past.

2. H.R. 6196 will only compound the problem further.

3. More equitable legislation would have required the Secretary of Agriculture to use the statutory authority he now possesses under the 1958 amendments to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and the Agricultural Act of 1949 to eliminate the present inequitable two-price cotton system while at the same time increasing the acreage of cottongrowers in order to maintain their income.

4. Taxpayer costs under the cotton program continue to be heavy. Estimates by the Department of Agriculture indicate they will be $612 million in the 1962–63 marketing year and $550.8 million in the 1963–64 marketing year under current legislation.

Some idea of the cost to the American people is contained in a resolution adopted by the executive council of the Textile Workers Union of America, January 22, 1963:

"The American people are paying three tax penalties for the outmoded cotton price-support program. First, they have to foot the bill in taxes for the Federal payments to cotton farmers in support of the inflated price of cotton. Second, they are taxed to provide subsidies amounting to $200 million a year to exporters of cotton produces. Finally, they have to pay at least $600 million a year more in prices for domestically produced cotton products than would be necessary in the absence of high support prices.

H.R. 6196 now proposes a triple subsidy program for cotton—one for producers, another for exporters, and finally the one proposed in this bill for the mills. Total annual cost of H.R. 6196 will be at least $772.4 million or an additional $221.6 million over the present expenditure.

THE WAY OUT

Cotton farmers, like wheat farmers, want less, not more, Government control of the cotton industry. The solution to the dilemma facing cotton will not be an easy one.

We must recognize from the start:

1. It is virtually impossible to meet the conflicting demands of all segments of the cotton industry.

2. Meet fiscal responsibility to all taxpayers.

3. Recognize the continued inroads of synthetic fibers.

4. The effect of foreign competition.

5. The loss of jobs in the textile industry.

6. The promotion of efficient production areas and techniques, while at the same time preserving the status quo for inefficient producers and areas.

7. Federal programs distort, then destroy private market forces of price, demand, supply, and sound profitable enterprise.

Therefore, a better solution to the cotton problem is contained in these recommendations:

1. The Secretary of Agriculture be required by law to follow the mandate and the authority which he has failed to use under the present law.

2. The present acts be amended to effect an orderly transition over a period of years toward lower price supports for cotton which would allow increased markets and the reestablishment of a one-price cotton system.

Businessmen who ask for an additional subsidy as a mean of eliminating subsidies are kidding themselves. Failure to properly solve cotton's problem will mean suicide fo the industry. It is imperative that we stop patching up, by piecemeal legislation, a discredited and unworkable farm policy which has aggravated America's farm problem for more than 30 years.

There is only one real solution to cotton's problem as well as the entire farm problem. We've got to get the Government out of the farm business and allow our free farmers to operate in a free market. It was under such a system we built the greatest agricultural plant in the history of mankind. The failure of Government-controlled agriculture is clear ly shown in the inability of any Communist country to produce enough food and fiber for its people. Only free farmers can meet America's needs. Until we have the courage to face the basic problem of getting the Federal Government out of the farm business we are continuing the threat and increasing the problems of cotton and every other farm commodity.

The cotton lobby was most effective. The bill passed by 216 to 182. I voted against refusing to help cotton industry commit suicide.

Farewell to John F. Shelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed an honor and privilege to have served in this body for the past 15 years with the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN F. SHELLEY.

My fellow freshman in the 81st Congress, JOHN SHELLEY rapidly grew in stature as a wise and able legislator. He leaves behind him significant achievements in many areas, particulary in labor-management relations and equality of employment opportunity.

JOHN SHELLEY will long be remembered too for his unfailing courtesy, his happy, engaging personality and his generous spirit. He is a living refutation of that cynical adage that "Nice guys do not win."

Our loss is San Francisco's gain, for there can be no doubt that he will serve that city as mayor with the same ability and high sense of responsibility that he has shown during his years in Congress.

Our best wishes go with you, Mayor JOHN SHELLEY, as you take up your new duties in the "Golden Gate City."

John Fitzgerald Kennedy: Mankind's Man—A Eulogy

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the horror of the incredible tragedy which recently enveloped the Nation—and the world—still hangs over our head as an inenarrable pall. The senseless assassination of our beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy ended the career of a young, vigorous American in the prime of his life. The youngest man ever to be elected President of the United States, he had dedicated his life to serving his fellow beings unswervingly, unselfishly, unstintingly, with the highest code of morals and ethics as his guide.

As President, he reiterated again and again to the heads of other nations and to the peoples of the world the sincerity of our country in its desire to be their friend, to help them in their troubles, and to give them the assurance of assistance in friendship, whenever they felt the need.

From the days of his wartime service as a young naval officer on a PT boat, he had offered his complete time, service, and devotion to his country and his fellow men. He added in large measure to the dream of mankind—the attainment of the brotherhood of men in a world of peace.

He was mankind's man, a champion of the poor and lowly and of the rich and exalted, and though he walked with kings he never lost the common touch.

John F. Kennedy was the finest product of American democracy. He was a President in the truest of American traditions. Possessed of great intelligence and rare courage, he gave eloquent voice and meaningful action to the conscience of America and to the dream of mankind. His deeds and spoken words will forever serve as an inspiration to men of good will everywhere in striving to reach greater heights.

To honor his memory let us heed his many words of wisdom, among them these:

> With a good conscience our only reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with millions of my fellow Americans and countless millions of people throughout the world in paying final loving tribute to the memory of our martyred 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is still almost impossible to believe that John Kennedy, that young dynamic, vibrant, and courageously statesmanlike champion of peace, is no longer with us—but has fallen before the merciless bullet of an assassin—now, to rest forever among the country's greatest heroes in the hallowed ground of Arlington National Cemetery.

The stirring words he spoke, the high causes he represented, and the bold actions he took during the short years he was permitted to spend among us, will live on to renew our own faith, and the faith of future generations of Americans, that the democratic heritage we treasure can be as meaningful and effective in the space age as it was in the early years of the Republic.

President Kennedy himself had said it:

> The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And John Kennedy spoke to all men in tragically prophetic words when he expressed the secret of America's great past, as well as the key to its bright future:

> We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival, and the success of liberty.

Now John Kennedy, himself, has paid that ultimate price, he has sacrificed his life to assure the survival of the ideals of freedom and liberty that give meaning to America.

On November 22, he passed the torch on to us, the living, to continue the struggle in which he gave the last full measure of his devotion.

We remember the words of his magnificent inaugural address when he said:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

In future years, President Kennedy will be remembered for the vitality and brilliant promise he brought to the task of governing a democracy.

He will be remembered for the great search for peace he carried on in an age and in a world threatened with nuclear destruction.

Who can forget his words to the Congress in reporting on negotiations that ultimately led to the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty?

> A journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step. My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

In international affairs, John Kennedy represented a force for reason, for strength, and for compassion. He sought to make the world safe for diversity, in a world that put a premium on conformity.

He will be remembered for new and imaginative efforts to achieve the goals of peace and prosperity around the globe. The Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and the food for peace program, all bear the mark of his untiring work.

Domestically, President Kennedy visualized his Nation as a young country trying to realize its full potential and secure for all its citizens the blessings of the great promise of America.

With a tremendous drive and determination he promoted the cause of equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans. He strove to revitalize our national economic growth rate to provide the training and the jobs necessary for full employment in an age of rapid technological change and onrushing automation.

He greatly expanded our military capability while launching the country into the space age with characteristic vigor and with a characteristic goal of world leadership.

Realizing that the ultimate success of the American democratic experiment depended on the quality of its citizens, President Kennedy advocated major new programs designed to assure that American education from the first grades on through advanced graduate work would be second to none.

And he and his lovely wife Jacqueline have served as a constant encouragement to the arts as an essential civilizing influence in our national life.

Just a few months ago he expressed what was his own democratic philosophy of the arts:

> Art establishes the basic human truths which must serve as the touchstones of our judgment. The artist becomes the last champion of the individual mind and sensibility against an intrusive society and an officious state. I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. If art is to nourish the roots of our culture, society must set the artist free to follow his vision wherever it takes him.

I do not believe I have heard more fitting or more deeply moving tributes to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy than those delivered in the rotunda of the Capitol on Sunday, November 24, 1963. For that reason I would like to recall these eloquent statements at this time:

BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

> There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.
>
> There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves, that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred prejudice, and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God we will.

BY CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN

There are few events in our national life that unite Americans and so touch the heart of all of us as the passing of a President of the United States.

There is nothing that adds shock to our sadness as the assassination of our leader, chosen as he is to embody the ideals of our people, the faith we have in our institutions, and our belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Such misfortunes have befallen the Nation on other occasions, but never more shocking, than 2 days ago.

We are saddened; we are stunned; we are perplexed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a great and good President, the friend of all men of good will, a believer in the dignity and equality of all human beings, a fighter for justice, an apostle of peace, has been snatched from our midst by the bullet of an assassin.

What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.

What a price we pay for this fanaticism.

It has been said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn. But surely we can learn if we have the will to do so. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from this tragic event.

If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?

Our Nation is bereaved. The whole world is poorer because of his loss. But we can all be better Americans because John Fitzgerald Kennedy has passed our way, because he has been our chosen leader at a time in history when his character, his vision, and his quiet courage have enabled him to chart for us a safe course through the shoals of treacherous seas that encompass the world.

And now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, may he rest in peace.

BY SPEAKER MCCORMACK

As we gather here today bowed in grief, the heartfelt sympathy of Members of the Congress and of our people are extended to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and to Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and their loved ones. Their deep grief is also self-shared by countless millions of persons throughout the world, considered a personal tragedy, as if one had lost a loved member of his own immediate family.

Any citizen of our beloved country who looks back over its history cannot fail to see that we have been blessed with God's favor beyond most other peoples. At each great crisis in our history we have found a leader able to grasp the helm of state and guide the country through the troubles which beset it. In our earliest days, when our strength and wealth were so limited and our problems so great, Washington and Jefferson appeared to lead our people. Two generations later, when our country was torn in two by a fratricidal war, Abraham Lincoln appeared from the mass of the people as a leader able to reunite the Nation.

In more recent times, in the critical days of the depression and the great war forced upon us by Fascist aggression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, later Harry S. Truman appeared on the scene to reorganize the country and lead its revived citizens to victory. Finally, only recently, when the cold war was building up the supreme crisis of a threatened nuclear war capable of destroying everything—and everybody—that our predecessors had so carefully built, and which a liberty-loving world wanted, once again a strong and courageous man appeared ready to lead us.

No country need despair so long as God, in His infinite goodness, continues to provide the Nation with leaders able to guide it through the successive crises which seem to be the inevitable fate of any great nation.

Surely no country ever faced more gigantic problems than ours in the last few years, and surely no country could have obtained a more able leader in a time of such crisis. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed all the qualities of greatness. He had deep faith, complete confidence, human sympathy, and broad vision which recognized the true values of freedom, equality, and the brotherhood which have always been the marks of the American political dreams.

He had the bravery and a sense of personal duty which made him willing to face up to the great task of being President in these trying times. He had the warmth and the sense of humanity which made the burden of the task bearable for himself and for his associates, and which made all kinds of diverse peoples and races eager to be associated with him in his task. He had the tenacity and determination to carry each stage of his great work through to its successful conclusion.

Now that our great leader has been taken from us in a cruel death, we are bound to feel shattered and helpless in the face of our loss. This is but natural, but as the first bitter pangs of our incredulous grief begins to pass we must thank God that we were privileged, however briefly, to have had this great man for our President. For he has now taken his place among the great figures of world history.

While this is an occasion of deep sorrow it should be also one of dedication. We must have the determination to unite and carry on the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy for a strengthened America and a future world of peace.

One of President Kennedy's favorite passages from Scripture was quoted at his funeral service:

There is an appointed time for everything, and a time for every affair under the heavens; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to uproot the plant; a time to kill and a time to heal; a time to tear down and a time to build.

The greatest memorial which we can create for President Kennedy is to see that this is a time to heal—and a time to build.

President Kennedy's eloquent inaugural address of January 20, 1961, will always remind me of the true greatness of this courageous American.

These words will be etched in the proud annals of our history as a beacon light to which we can return in times of trial and difficulty for light and direction:

We observe today not a victory of party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears perscribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revoluntionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay in price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free

society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To the world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed. But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens (and) let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

In this spirit, therefore, let us face the future with confidence, and resolve with President Lyndon Johnson that "John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain."

Lehman's Record for Public Service Unrivaled

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying public tribute to the memory of the late Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, whose death December 5 has saddened the Nation.

Senator Lehman was a kindhearted and modest man who never retreated on basic principles in his devotion to progressive and humanitarian causes. He was one of the great champions of the New Deal and a close associate of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Without question he was one of the most popular and beloved men who ever represented his State in public office. I join with my colleagues in Congress in expressing my deepest sympathy to his widow and other members of his family.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include excerpts of an article which appeared recently in the Washington Post:

LEHMAN'S RECORD FOR PUBLIC SERVICE UNRIVALED

NEW YORK, December 5.—Herbert Lehman, 85, who died here today, was the only man in the past century to hold all the highest elective posts in New York State.

Few can match the Lehman record for public service—4 years as Lieutenant Governor, 10 years as Governor, 7 years as U.S. Senator, and the first Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

He came from a background of great wealth, but Mr. Lehman was one of the great liberal voices of the Democratic Party for a generation.

In the State he carried on the social reform programs of former Govs. Alfred E. Smith and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the Senate in Washington he was a strong advocate of international cooperation with friendly countries and was one of the early opponents of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin.

It was not until 1928, when he was 50 years old—a time when many begin to think about eventual retirement—that Mr. Lehman gave up a $2-million-a-year investment banking career to seek public office.

He was elected to two 2-year terms as Lieutenant Governor under Mr. Roosevelt. In 1932, when Mr. Roosevelt was elected President, Mr. Lehman won the first of four consecutive gubernatorial elections. (The Governor's term was extended to 4 years with his last election in 1938.)

He lost only one election. That was in 1946 when he ran for the Senate and was defeated by Irving M. Ives, a Republican. But in 1949 he won a special election to the Senate and the next year was reelected to a full 6-year term. He did not seek reelection in 1956.

Although he lacked the flamboyance of an Al Smith or Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Lehman was an impressive votegetter in his own right. He defeated such persons as Robert Moses (for Governor in 1934), Thomas E. Dewey (for Governor in 1938), and John Foster Dulles (for the Senate in 1949).

Mr. Lehman was born in a brownstone house on East 62d Street on March 28, 1878. His father, Mayer, a German immigrant, was a founder of the Cotton Exchange and of Lehman Bros., investment banking firm.

The youngest of eight children, Mr. Lehman attended Dr. Sach's Collegiate Institute and Williams College and joined J. Spencer Turner Co., a textile firm. He became vice president and treasurer in 1906 and 2 years later he joined Lehman Bros. as a full partner.

In World War I, Mr. Lehman was first a civilian aid to Mr. Roosevelt, who was then an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In August 1917, although he was several years over the age for military service, he entered the Army as a captain assigned to the General Staff. He became a colonel, assigned to supplying oversea troops. After the armistice he served as assistant to the Secretary of War, supervising the return of supplies, and received the Distinguished Service Medal.

A man always interested in the community around him, Mr. Lehman was caught by the humanitarian approach to government displayed by the then Governor Smith. In 1924, at Governor Smith's request, he successfully mediated a threatened garment strike.

In 1926, he managed Mr. Smith's gubernatorial campaign and 2 years later became finance director of the Democratic National Committee and worked for Mr. Smith's presidential campaign.

It was Al Smith who conjured up the team of Roosevelt and Lehman to help carry New York State in the 1928 election.

Mr. Roosevelt's health and his national activities caused frequent absences from Albany and Mr. Lehman found himself Acting Governor on the average of 3 months a year. Mr. Roosevelt referred to Mr. Lehman as "my good right arm."

Although presidential maneuverings caused estrangement of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Smith, both united to force Mr. Lehman's

gubernatorial nomination in 1932 over the opposition of Tammany Hall.

Mr. Lehman occupied the Albany executive mansion during most of the troublesome depression years. As Governor, he inherited a $114 million deficit from Mr. Roosevelt. When he left office 10 years later, he reported a $54 million surplus in the State accounts.

With Mr. Roosevelt in Washington and Mr. Lehman in Albany, the State administration became known as "the Little New Deal."

Mr. Lehman promoted municipal powerplants and armed the public service commission with greater rate-cutting powers. Cities were permitted municipal housing authorities—the pioneer for public housing. The State made housing loans. Unemployment insurance was introduced. Self-liquidating public works were advanced. Workmen's compensation was broadened.

In November 1942, President Roosevelt named Mr. Lehman director of a new office of foreign relief and rehabilitation set up in the State Department to aid war victims in liberated areas. On December 2, when his Albany term had less than a month to run, Governor Lehman resigned.

In 1949 the Democrats again nominated Mr. Lehman for the Senate to fill the term of the late Robert F. Wagner. This time he won, defeating Mr. Dulles. He was elected to a full 6-year term the next year over Joe R. Hanley.

Mr. Lehman, at age 78, declined to seek reelection when his Senate term expired in 1956.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Hate Campaigns Disable Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a very forthright and thoughful editorial discussing the climate of hate, fear, and distress fomented by extremist groups which in large part made possible the recent and tragic assassination of President Kennedy.

This statement appears as an editorial in the Prairie Farmer, a very well-known periodical distributed in rural areas and published in Chicago since 1841. Its editor, Mr. Paul C. Johnson, points out the disabling effects on democracy of extremist campaigns of hate and fear. I commend Mr. Johnson for his courage in expressing a view which is unpopular in some quarters and Mr. George R. Cook, president of the Prairie Farmer, for his public spirit in publishing this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Prairie Farmer of December 7, 1963, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HATRED IS A DREADFUL THING

(By Paul C. Johnson)

The tragic death of our President at the hands of an assassin has seared our minds with realization of the destructiveness of hate when, like a deadly ray, it focuses on a point. The whole world has been shaken. Had it not been for the reasonableness of civilized people, the consequences might have been dreadful indeed.

It seems to me there has been an increase in hatemongering of late. The readers of this column are probably as quiet and sensible as any group you will find in the world. Yet the letters of hate arrive more or less regularly. Not many, but too many. They contain tirades against something. They are stuffed with badly printed hate literature from some organization or another fighting some kind of a devil. Sometimes the tirade is directed against me, but more often the writer is seeking my support. In effect, he is taking me aside to whisper in my ear warnings of some plot for the destruction of our Nation, of diabolical people who cannot be trusted.

Fear and distrust are the substance of these warnings. They strike out at things that are easy to hate. Anticommunism is now the umbrella most often used to cover expressions of racism, religious bigotry, class hatred, isolationism, or any doctrine of distrust that needs a handle. The result is that the real struggle against communism is being hampered by confusion, and by the use of communism's own weapons: fear and distrust.

When these expressions of hate reach you, either by letter, by word of mouth, or by dark innuendo, step on them, or at least turn your back. Say to your informer, or at least to yourself:

Look, I can't afford to hate anybody. Because hate destroys me. It destroys my Christian principles and stifles my effectiveness as a citizen. It is dangerous. Who knows when it will trigger some unhappy and unstable mind into transforming the hate into an assassin's bullet?

I have responsibilities as a citizen. I can speak up openly when I do not like the way things are going. I can vote. I can openly organize my fellowmen for or against a cause that affects the welfare of my country. I can take a stand. I can be impatient of error. I can be indignant of wrongdoing. But I cannot resort to hate. I have no right to use the weapons of fear and distrust. I have no right to take advantage of ignorance, nor to encourage the destructive uses of prejudice.

One of the clearest instructions in the Scriptures is that we shall love our enemy. That does not mean we have to agree with him or go his way. It does put on us the necessity of honest and open opposition, tempered by understanding and love.

One of the cornerstones of the democratic system is confidence that if given enough honest information the people of the country will come up with reasonably good solutions to the problems that beset the Nation. Even if our own wishes are crossed, or our own judgment is outraged, we abide by the decision of the majority until there is another legal and open opportunity to change the course. We have no right to sulk, or foment hatred, or resort to underground means of tearing down the structures of government which we may oppose in principle.

Dallas: No Mean City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, has made one of the most eloquent testimonies in behalf of a great city I have had the opportunity to see. Like Dr. Harris, I too have felt the warmth and vitality of Dallas on many occasions, and I, too, have come to love its zestful and vibrant spirit, its generous and open-hearted citizenry.

Dallas is one of the finest cities in the United States. The warped mind of an assassin does no discredit to it any more than other murderers can reflect upon any city which happens to be selected by a sick mind to snuff out a human life.

Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's Washington Star, Dr. Harris wrote a column entitled "No Mean City" wherein he helps set the record straight regarding Dallas. I insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NO MEAN CITY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Almost 2,000 years ago there lived and wrought a man whom the centuries have called St. Paul. His name is cut deeply on the record of the ages. In defending himself from certain unfair charges he declared, "I am from Tarsus, Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city." In this dread day that proud assertion might well be on the lips of those whose home city has had turned upon it the searchlight of the world's critical scrutiny, since on that black Friday, November 22, triumph suddenly turned to tragedy, as the President's life was snuffed out. That fair city is Dallas, Tex. Since the dastardly act which set the world aghast it has been the target of vituperation and blame.

There are those, examples of the hate they verbally deplore, who assume that this expanding metropolis, so typically American, will be forevermore a byword and a hissing. Such conclusions are, of course, not warranted by any thinking person. In the face of the fateful happenings, mourned nowhere with more poignancy than in that city, its citizens with heads high have reason enough to stand with Paul of Tarsus and say with him, when the case for Dallas is called, "We are citizens of no mean city."

Let it be remembered that what happened there could happen in any city in America. In spite of all precautions there are no exceptions. The marvelous Secret Service would readily agree to that. Surely in America the exhortations coming from the high and the low against bigotry, hatred, and violence desperately need to be preached. But the horrible deed of the alleged dastardly assassin is the wrong text for these sermons. There is no evidence that he was the product of any present agitation gripping the political life of America. This sinister person was so un-American that to make him the symbol of all that is wrong in America is to blunt the preachments which need to be made. To suggest that all Americans, in a sort of mass guilt-complex, belong in the dock which awaited him is to arraign those who refuse to be stigmatized by what one Senator called "wrongly placed recriminations." And, another Senator, agreeing, commented, "It is an injustice to teeming thousands of hospitable, cheering crowds in Dallas to charge them with murderous guilt. What happened was not America's fault. Only the sober realization of that can make our mourning meaningful and not tortured with a guilt that is undeserved."

What happened in Dallas was not the result of any aspect of the moral malignancy from which America, in her grasping materialism, is suffering. Much—very much—could be said about that. What happened grew out of the twisted mind of one deluded young man. There will never be a Utopia where dangerous, warped individuals, antisocial, will not be at large ready to wrap their venom in a bullet. It may be from a window in Dallas, from a reception line in Buffalo, in a theater or a railroad station in Washington, or in like attempts in Chicago or Florida. But assassinations or foiled attempts do not damn the cities involved. In spite of sharp divisions in the minds of people as to any administration's policies—

and that is the precious prerogative of U.S. citizens—Dallas had gone all out to put differences aside and to give the President an enthusiastic welcome. The wounded Governor of Texas bears witness that Mr. Kennedy's last words expressed his gratitude and delight at the warmth of the reception the city was according him—"magnificent" was the word between the President and the Governor.

And then the unbelievable happened and the death weapon was held by one who had but recently come to the city.

And what about the real Dallas? I know it well. To me it is not a city of spites but of spires. It has been my high privilege to join the outstanding church and civic leaders there on various occasions. The religious life of the city is an inspiration to those who have felt its uplift in the dedication of its laymen and the potency of its prophetic pulpits. Nowhere in America have I experienced evidences of benevolence and care more closely binding all segments of a city's life. United Givers crusades there have the fervor of oldtime revival meetings. In hospital projects, Catholics and Protestants work together in beautiful fraternity.

Dallas is rightly proud of this great metropolis rising majestically on the plain, of her boulevards and parks, her office buildings and hotels, her cultural institutions, her newspapers, her palatial banks and world famous stores. But most of all she glories in her churches, great and small, and she has some of the largest in the land; and, of her schools and colleges including a famed theological seminary training prophets for the years that beckon.

One of the prized photographs in my pictured autobiography is that of a young lad, dressed as Uncle Sam, presenting to me a certificate as an honorary citizen of Dallas. Gazing at that certificate, even while writing this, I say with Paul, "I am a citizen of no mean city."

Record of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, with the passing of Enos S. Stockbridge, I have lost a close personal friend and Maryland has lost one of its valued citizens. I think it is fitting that persons such as Enos Stockbridge, who have earned the gratitude and respect of all members of their communities be given the recognition they so fully deserve.

On Tuesday, December 10, the Baltimore Sun eulogized Mr. Stockbridge in an editorial entitled "Record of Service." In order that all Marylanders may know of the accomplishments of this fine man who has departed us, I ask unanimous consent that the Baltimore Sun editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD OF SERVICE

Enos S. Stockbridge was a lawyer by profession. In private practice he was successful; he was a leading member of the bar. For years he was also, in a very real sense, a public official without portfolio, concerned with the general welfare of the city and the State. In 1944–45 Mr. Stockbridge was chairman of the Charter Revision Commission, whose work materially strengthened the municipal government structure. And it brought about the first successful assault in many years on inequitable representation in a legislative body in Maryland—the big third and fifth councilmanic districts were given increased representation in the city council. In 1951–53 Mr. Stockbridge was first a member and then chairman of the Commission on Administrative Organization of the State. That group's work, among other things, brought basic improvement in the State's budget processes. In 1957–60 he was chairman of the Maryland Self-Survey Commission, whose recommendations led to further improvements and refinements in State government. In such jobs Mr. Stockbridge, in his precise, quiet and friendly way, made a substantial contribution to the welfare of Baltimore and Maryland—and usually without pay. We were fortunate to have had him among us.

The 1963 Achievement Awards to 870 Outstanding Students of English

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a copy of a letter received from Mr. James R. Squire, executive secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill., announcing the selection of 870 outstanding students of English throughout the Nation as winners of the 1963 Achievement Awards for excellence in writing performance and literary awareness. The letter is as follows:

NOVEMBER 27, 1963.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE 88TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES: In the enclosed brochure you will find the names of 870 of the Nation's outstanding students in English who have been cited for excellence in writing performance and literary awareness by the National Council of Teachers of English. The winners and runners-up from your State are listed therein.

These young people were chosen from approximately 6,800 students who were nominated by their schools for the 1963 Achievement Awards competition. Their entries were carefully judged by teams of prominent high school and college teachers across the Nation. We are confident that these finalists, who are recommended by the NCTE for college scholarships in 1964, represent the most able students of English in our Nation today. We also highly commend the respective English departments of these students for contributing to their achievements by providing a superior quality of instruction.

Today statesmen are calling for excellence of performance in all activities crucial to our effectiveness and creativity as a society. We, therefore, present these young people to you in response to this expressed need.

We trust that, should the opportunity present itself, you will assist these young people to develop their talents for the benefit of their country by congratulating them and recommending them to schools and scholarship donors.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. SQUIRE,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, one of the objectives of the NCTE Achievement Awards is the identification of highly qualified students to colleges and universities where they may apply for admission, as well as to scholarship donors. The NCTE is a nonprofit organization without funds to support college scholarships, but those students who receive the recognition of the distinguished chairmen and judges, representing the 50 States, who selected the award winners, do find their prospects of receiving a scholarship greatly enhanced.

It is gratifying indeed in this age when great emphasis is given to other areas of academic activity that the NCTE has balanced the scales of intellectual achievement by recognizing outstanding young students of English. There is great value to the Nation in preserving and developing a high degree of competence in the English language, our most important heritage from our mother country. I commend the National Council of Teachers of English upon the establishment of its achievement awards and urge that it continue its efforts to stimulate interest and achievement among students of English throughout the United States.

On my own behalf, and on behalf of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, I extend congratulations to the award winners from our State. I was particularly gratified by the selection of Joe Ben Champion, a student at Ardmore Senior High School in my district, as one of the finalists. I know that Joe Ben and all the students in Oklahoma and throughout the Nation who have won this distinguished award under highly competitive circumstances, have worked hard and have persevered in the cultivation of their talents and the acquisition of knowledge in their field of study.

I extend to all the winners, both finalists and runners-up, my congratulations and good wishes.

The Death of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I was moved by an item that appeared in the November 29, 1963, edition of the Mandan, N. Dak., Pioneer. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S DEATH DEEPLY FELT BY SCHOOLCHILDREN

How did the death of the President affect the children of the country? Ask their teachers. They know. They observed the youngsters reactions, for it happened during schooltime.

Children are too young to understand much about political philosophies but this they knew and expressed in their simple ways. That their President worked hard for peace. That their President tried hard to help the Negroes. That hate makes men do terrible things.

One little boy, an 8 year old in Miss Martha Huber's third-grade room at Mandan's Roosevelt School, expressed his feelings in a poem which he wrote and then shyly showed to his teacher saying: "It isn't very good but would you read it?"

It was good—for an 8 year old. And it spoke eloquently of the feelings of all children. Here it is:

"A GREAT MAN—JOHN F. KENNEDY

"On a good, good day,
Something happened in a
strange, strange way.
It happened in a car,
From a window not far.
And when it happened,
It made us get saddened.
He was good and great
But was killed by hate."

The poem was written by Mark Seerup, son of Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Seerup, 1009 Northwest Second Street.

Pennsylvania Starts Selling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, among the many favorable editorial comments in Pennsylvania newspapers on the objectives of Governor Scranton's "Committee of 100,000" for economic growth was an editorial in the October 16, 1963, issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin titled "Pennsylvania Starts Selling." As the editorial points out—

Though it would be a mistake to oversell the State and to paint a rosy picture of Pennsylvania's economy, there does seem to be a basis for the Governor's theme that the worst is over and that the outlook is for continued improvement.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the said editorial, which is as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA STARTS SELLING

Governor Scranton on Monday night kicked off the selling phase of the campaign to promote Pennsylvania as a good place in which to locate and expand industry, live, work and visit. He spoke at a dinner in New York City under the sponsorship of his Committee of 100,000 Pennsylvanians for Economic Growth.

Though it would be a mistake at this point to oversell the State and to paint a rosy picture of Pennsylvania's economy, there does seem to be a basis for the Governor's theme that the worst is over and that the outlook is for continued improvement.

Unemployment, at 6.5 percent for August, is still too high, but considerably better than last January's 9.4 percent.

Labor relations are far from perfect, but the trend is toward increasing stability.

The Governor's program to encourage industry-oriented research and to step up industrial development assistance is off the ground.

Business' share of the total tax burden has been reduced over the past decade and has been stabilized at a reasonable 23 percent. The Governor was right not to take credit for this latter development. The Democratic administrations and legislatures deserve as much credit for it as Republicans, and perhaps more.

There was also validity to the Governor's claim that business gets its tax moneys' worth in Pennsylvania, in contrast to States where the business taxload may be less visible but where government services to business are also less visible.

Factors encouraging to economic growth in Pennsylvania are the beliefs that there will be continued dynamism in the efforts to make Pennsylvania attractive to industry and that there will be continued stability in the relationships between government and industry.

This dynamism and stability, of course, the Governor cannot guarantee, but he can make a strong case for them, mainly because more and more Pennsylvanians are coming to understand how essential they to the State's well-being.

Tribute to Hazel Brannan Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, courage and integrity are often born of adversity. It is not unusual to hear of these attributes receiving deserved recognition on the national scene during times of great crisis, but are apt to be overlooked if they flower in small towns and communities in America. This is particularly true in the case of Hazel Brannan Smith, who is editor and publisher of the Durant News and the Lexington Advertiser in Holmes County, Miss., a county with a population of only 27,096.

Mrs. Smith has been recognized by the National Editorial Association, which presented her with its Herrick Award "for editorial writing, embracing the highest type of American principles and ideals"; by the Fund for the Republic, which honored her with a dinner in 1957; by the Mississippi Press Association which, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution commending her at its 1957 convention, and by the Matrix Table of Theta Sigma Phi, national women's journalism honorary, in 1958.

Deep within the segregation stronghold of Mississippi, Mrs. Smith has been a spokesman for freedom, justice, and peaceful settlement of political disagreements. In her column, "Through Hazel Eyes," Mrs. Smith writes:

Suppression of news and trying to control what newspapers print never works. No newspaper worth a cent would let anyone tell it what to print—and those who toady to their advertisers to such an extent that they have lost their souls will one day lose their advertisers too—for after awhile they won't have any readers. The public is entitled to read the news and judge issues for itself on the basis of truthful, honest reporting.

But the "reward" for this journalistic courage has been a loss of advertising and other forms of economic retaliation, according to Mrs. Smith. Although advertising revenues have declined, circulation has expanded, as more people learn of her courageous stand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the following articles:

First. The editorial for which Mrs. Smith received an award.

Second. Portion of an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat about Mrs. Smith.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBATTLED MISSISSSIPPI EDITOR

(By Sue Ann Wood)

"It is not moral or just that any man should live in fear, or be compelled to sleep with a loaded gun by his bedside."

Those words open an editorial by Mrs. Hazel Brannon Smith in the Lexington, Miss., Advertiser, that won the Golden Quill Editorial Award at the International Conference of Weekly Newspaper Editors at Pere Marquette State Park near Grafton, Ill., Thursday night.

They are brave words to print in Lexington, Miss., where Mrs. Smith has been subjected to a 9-year hate and fear campaign for just such courageous editorial statements.

During an interview at the St. Louis Press Club, Mrs. Smith voiced some of her calm convictions that have roused the fury of the White Citizens' Councils of Mississippi.

Speaking in the soft drawl of her native Alabama, the attractive editor commented wryly that things are "anything but settled" in Mississippi these days.

She was in Jackson, Miss., during the recent riots there, and in fact, owns a suburban weekly newspaper in that city, as well as two in Lexington. Unlike most newspapers in the Deep South, hers have been "printing what has been happening" in these tense days of racial crisis.

"The principle I adhere to," she said, "is freedom of the press to print what's going on—to tell the people what's happening in their State—and to stand for equal justice under the law."

HATE CAMPAIGN

For believing and practicing this principle, Hazel Brannon Smith has been the subject of an intense campaign of intimidation, economic boycott and outright threat by the racist White Citizens' Councils.

She has opposed the councils since their formation 9 years ago in Holmes County, where Lexington is located, and the councils have done their best to drive her out of the newspaper business.

The councils, in Mrs. Smith's succinct definition, are "undemocratic, un-American, and contrary to every principle of democracy and freedom."

"They want freedom—their style," she said grimly. "They're in the same category as the Nazis were in Germany and the Kremlin is today. They use all the Nazi techniques—guilt by association, the rule that you're either for us or against us. You either go along with everything they do or you're against them. And if you're for them, you must support everything they do to support white supremacy."

The councils represent a small but potent segment of the Holmes County population, as their campaign against Mrs. Smith has shown.

STILL IN BUSINESS

"We're fortunate that we're still in business after a pressure campaign that's 9 years old," the embattled editor said. "The fact that we are still in business indicates that the great majority of people, in my area of Mississippi at least, are soberminded, sane people."

One of the councils' weapons has been "an economic boycott since 1956," she said. First,

they applied pressure to get her husband, Walter Dyer Smith, fired as administrator of the community hospital, despite a unanimous resolution by the medical staff asking that he be retained. Her husband has since joined her in running the newspapers.

She pointed out that the councils' then "went to work on our advertisers and the people who give us job printing." Advertisers and subscribers were warned to drop Mrs. Smith's papers or face economic reprisals.

"We have very little advertising now, but we've kept going in spite of it," Mrs. Smith said. "Some people have canceled subscriptions, but our gain in circulation has been more than the number who canceled."

Four and a half years ago the councils established a competing newspaper, the Holmes County Herald, in an attempt to put Mrs. Smith out of business, but it is "operating at a loss," she said.

ARREST OF BOMBING VICTIM IS GRAVE DISSERVICE

It is not moral or just that any man should live in fear, or be compelled to sleep with a loaded gun by his bedside.

Holmes County Deputy Sheriff Andrew P. Smith's action in arresting a 58-year-old Negro farmer, Hartman Turnbow, for fire bombing his own home, has come as a numbing shock to the people of Holmes County.

It is a grave disservice to our county and all our people in these days of increasing racial tension and strife.

White and Negro citizens of Holmes County alike simply could not believe that something like this could happen in our country that a man and his wife and 16-year-old daughter could be routed from sleep in the small hours of the morning and be forced to flee their home literally in terror, only to be shot at by intruders outside—then to have the head of the family jailed the same day for doing the dastardly deed by an officer sworn to uphold the law and protect all citizens.

The only evidence presented against the aged Negro man at the preliminary hearing was testimony given by Deputy Smith and that was only an account of the bombing and shooting incident, as reported by Turnbow, to him. Mr. Smith added his own opinions and suppositions, as did County Attorney Pat M. Barrett, who prosecuted the case. As a result the man was bound over under $500 bond for action by the Holmes County grand jury in October.

Mr. Barrett, who said he was "not a demolition expert" nevertheless told the court that "it just couldn't have happened. There is no way on God's earth for that situation over there to have happened like he said it happened."

Four other Negroes, who had been arrested the same day in connection with the same case, were released for lack of evidence. Not one shred of evidence was presented against them. But they had been held in jail 5 days and 5 nights.

This kind of conduct on the part of our highest elected peace officer has done serious injury to relations between the races in Holmes County—where we must be able to live in peace and harmony, or not live at all.

It is distressing that no statement has come from Mr. Smith saying that he is continuing his investigation. Perhaps he is. We hope so.

But irreparable damage has been done, and let no one doubt it.

We have always taken pride in being able to manage our affairs ourselves. When we become derelict in our duty and do not faithfully execute our obligations, we may rest assured it will be done for us.

FBI agents and U.S. Justice officials have already made an exhaustive investigation of this bombing and shooting incident.

A suit has already been filed against Deputy Smith, Mr. Barrett, and the District Attorney, stating these Negroes were arrested on false and baseless charges, which were in effect an effort to coerce and intimidate Negro citizens of Holmes County and get them to cease voter registration activity.

The Federal suits asks for a permanent injunction to prohibit these officers from interfering with voter registration activities, including the prosecution of the charges now filed against Turnbow, who attempted to register to vote here April 9, and Robert Moses, director of SNCC, a voter registration project.

This kind of situation would never have come about in Holmes County if we had honestly discharged our duties and obligations as citizens in the past; if we had demanded that all citizens be accorded equal treatment and protection under the law. This we have not done.

But if we think the present situation is serious, as indeed it is, we should take a long, hard look at the future.

It can, and probably will, get infinitely worse—unless we have the necessary character and guts to do something about it—and change the things that need to be changed.

Fallacies of Deficit Financing Theory Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one reason for the thorough and deliberate consideration being given by the Congress to the tax bill is the deep concern and divided opinion felt throughout the Nation over the issue of deficit financing. Those who support the tax bill accompanied by increased Federal spending generally propound four major arguments in support of deficit financing. In an article in the December 5 Wall Street Journal, Dr. Harley L. Lutz, professor emeritus of public finance at Princeton University, examines each of these arguments and exposes their fallacies. Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Lutz's article in the RECORD:

PLANNED DEFICITS: THEY CAN ONLY CREATE AN ILLUSION OF PROSPERITY

(By Harley L. Lutz)

The long delay in acting on the 1963 tax bill, first in the House and later in the Senate, is to be explained in part by the competition of other projects and policies for congressional attention, but even more importantly by the division of sentiment and conviction over the issue of deficit financing.

From 1931 through 1963, excluding war years, there were deficits in 20 years and surpluses in 6 years. It would seem that this lopsided record should have produced results that would be conclusive, one way or the other. Yet the debate continues. There is a substantial, and apparently a growing, opposition to the policy of planned deficits. Meanwhile, the proponents of such a policy hammer away at four major arguments in its support:

Deficits are needed to generate prosperity.

Deficits are needed to end unemployment.

We cannot have tax reduction without a deficit.

Deficits are not inflationary while large unemployment and unused plant capacity exist.

These contentions will be considered in turn.

DEFICITS AND PROSPERITY

The doctrine of prosperity through spending is part of a theory of fiscal policy known as compensatory or cyclical budget balance. This theory prescribes, first, budget deficits during the cyclical downswing; second, surplus revenues in the upswing to retire the recession-incurred debt; and third, budget balance over the economic cycle. Thus there would be no permanent debt increase from one cycle to the next. The shift from deficit to surplus is assumed to occur more or less automatically as business conditions change from recession to recovery.

The theory looks good on paper and its reliance on automatic stabilizers gives an illusion of scientific completeness. The practical defect is that the time never comes when the recovery movement reaches the point at which deficit spending automatically stops and the accumulation of surplus revenue automatically begins.

Spending programs introduced as a recession curative are continued into the recovery period. There is more political advantage in additional spending than in governmental self-denial to retire debt. When signs of another recession appear, or are deemed about to appear, it is argued that more spending is needed once again to avert a decline.

In the old days prosperity was a familiar and generally well understood condition. The statisticians have introduced a new terminology and new concepts to describe and measure this condition. Prosperity is now called "economic growth," and this growth is measured in terms of the gross national product. Economic growth means an increase of gross national product, that is, an increased volume of production. As related to deficit financing the critical issue is how to achieve the optimum increase of gross national product. Is this to be done by lavish deficit spending or by increased capital formation through saving and investment?

The answer seems obvious because of the logical sequence of production and consumption, and the dependence of production on capital. No matter how much money people have to spend, there can be no buying unless goods—and services—are available.

In a free enterprise society producers test consumer demand by offering a range of goods. Millions are spent every year to develop new varieties and qualities of goods and promote their market acceptance. Producers do not always wait for demand to become manifest before investing to create new products.

A major problem for producers is to keep abreast, or even ahead, of the changes in consumer preference. The greatest profit will go to those who are most adept in perceiving these preference changes and who are quickest to discard unprofitable items while riding the tide of growing demand. But the goods must be available in order for consumer choice to be exercised. Production must precede consumption and capital investment must precede production.

Deficit financing is not needed, either to increase production or to increase income for spending. The employment provided as capital is increased will yield additional income for consumption and investment.

DEFICITS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The causes of unemployment and the actions best suited to remedy it are complicated matters which cannot be dealt with here except as is indicated later. The primary line of inquiry is the effectiveness of deficit spending as a solution.

The blanket approach of the spending theorists is that unemployment is caused by insufficient demand. The Council of Eco-

nomic Advisers has endorsed this explanation, which is accepted also, by some other economists. From this premise the conclusion is advanced that creation of more spending power by deficit financing will increase aggregate demand and automatically put the unemployed to work to supply the increased demand. Therefore, it would be argued, limitation of Government spending by preventing deficits would prevent the unemployed from getting jobs.

However, if the unemployment problem really were one of overproduction and insufficient demand, the imbalance would not be corrected by putting the unemployed to work, for they would add to the excess supply of goods to offset the contribution of their wages to aggregate demand. One solution would bet to pay them much for producing little, or even to pay them for producing nothing at all.

When we look at the unemployment problem from the standpoint of the employer, we see that since he is in business to earn profit he cannot afford to pay a wage in excess of the value of the worker's product. In a free labor market wages would tend to adjust to labor productivity and more would find jobs. But we do not have a free labor market. Rather, it is full of rigidities.

As the hourly minimum wage rose from $1.15 to $1.25 after Labor Day 1963, it was inevitable that this would involve wage adjustments up the line, with some price increases. To a considerable extent, potential workers are priced out of the market by the Federal minimum wage at the bottom and by Government-supported union policies relating to compulsory membership, industrywide bargaining, and wage scales at the top.

Deficit spending on a large scale could lead to a sufficient further depreciation of the currency to offset the barriers mentioned above, provided they were not raised. For example, a person might not be employable at $1.25 an hour in terms of a 50-cent dollar, but he might be in terms of a 25-cent dollar.

DEFICITS AND TAX REDUCTIONS

There can be no disagreement with the case for genuine tax rate reduction. The excessive, intentionally punitive tax rate structure that has been in effect since World War II has been a tremendous barrier to the capital formation on which a high rate of economic growth depends. It has always been accepted that the initial effect of tax rate reduction would be a drop in revenue, thus causing a deficit unless spending were correspondingly reduced.

It has also been agreed that even if spending were not reduced, but frozen at the then existing level, the higher rates of growth generated by the tax cut would shortly increase revenues, at the lower rates, sufficiently to close the deficit gap and eventually to produce a revenue surplus. The impact of a properly phased-out tax cut on the budget would be both moderate and temporary.

This outcome, however, would not satisfy the proponents of prosperity through spending. They argue that since tax reduction, as such, merely changes the proportionate distribution of income as between the people and the Government—the people spending more and the Government less—aggregate demands would be the same as before. Hence, if, by their hypothesis, total demand is insufficient to reduce unemployment and excess plant capacity, there would be no change in this situation by tax reduction. Deficits would still be necessary to bolster sagging demand.

It has been shown above that Government spending will not eliminate the barriers to employment that other government policies have created. There is no way to get rid of the wage rigidities created by the Government and the unions except by legislative action aimed directly at these restrictions on a free labor market. Neither tax reduction nor deficit spending will do it.

The argument that tax reduction, of itself, is ineffective because it merely changes the proportion of total income spent by the people and the Government, respectively, ignores the significance of leaving with individuals and businesses more of their own income. Every dollar of income after tax enables persons to spend more, but it also adds to the incentive to work, to save and invest, to produce more. If we consider the problem of greater economic growth from the standpoint of the conditions essential to additional capital formation through investment, we can see that the case for sound tax rate reduction does not rest on a mechanistic interpretation of fiscal processes but on the energizing effect of letting people keep and use, as they like, more of the income gained by their toil or thrift.

UNUSED RESOURCES AND INFLATION

A persuasive argument for deficit spending is that it is not inflationary while there are unused human and material resources; that is, unemployed and excess plant capacity.

This is the kind of reasoning that can be demonstrated by mathematical formulas and statistical models. Results so obtained are not necessarily corroborated by actual experience. The record shows that over the past 8 or 9 years a slow but steady inflation has been in progress.

For example, in current prices gross national product for 1962 was $553 billion. Measured in 1954 prices it would have been $471.5 billion. The difference—$81.5 billion or about 17 percent—represents price increases rather than more output. During this period unemployment, as a percentage of the labor force, ranged from 5.5 percent to 6.8 percent in the years 1958 through 1962, and even in the years 1955–57. It was above 4 percent. No data are available to indicate excess plant capacity in this period but, as ordinarily defined, there was some excess.

To conclude: The arguments advanced to support deliberately planned deficits in order to bolster the economy or to solve economic problems are without sound foundation. Granted that circumstances may, on occasion, compel spending in excess of revenues, the imbalance should be as brief and moderate as possible. It should not be intentionally prolonged or enlarged as a stimulative substitute for the dynamic drive that is inherent in an unfettered free enterprise system.

The private economy is the only source of strength for the Nation and the only visible means of support for the people and the Government. The principal effect of an ever-expanding Federal budget is to promote Government growth at the expense of economic growth; and the principal effect of a prolonged series of deficits to support such a budget policy is to impair the value of the currency and create an illusion of prosperity by measuring our gains not in real output, but in a larger number of cheaper dollars.

The Higher Education Facilities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased with the action of the Senate on Tuesday, December 10, in adopting the conference report on H.R. 6143, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. I had been happy earlier to lend my support to the bill when it passed the House. I am also pleased that overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle led to the tremendous margin—better than 2 to 1—by which the measure cleared the House. The action of the Senate now clears the way for early action by the President.

The need for additional college academic facilities was recognized and stressed as far back as 1959. At that time it was recommended that a $2 billion program be inaugurated, extending over a period of 5 years, to keep college academic facilities in pace with the rapidly expanding college population.

There can be no mistaking the fact that the rapid growth in the Nation's college-age population has made necessary an expansion of college classroom facilities. This can be shown by the fact that, in the fall of 1962, the total college enrollment in the United States was 4,174,936. It is estimated that, in 1965, that enrollment will increase to 5,220,000—and that in 1970 it will have further increased to 6,959,000.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6143 provides for Federal assistance where that help is most urgently needed. Title I authorizes a 5-year program of matching grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning for the construction of academic facilities and authorizes appropriations of $230 million annually for fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966—after which the Congress would review the program before authorizing appropriations for the final two years of the program.

At least 22 percent of a State's allotment for any year is reserved for construction of academic facilities for junior colleges and technical institutes. Junior colleges have absorbed much of the increase in college enrollments in recent years, and may be expected to continue to do so. It was pointed out during the hearings on this bill that expansion of these 2-year institutions would place reach of thousands of our young people. Also, the shortage of technicians has often forced graduate engineers to do semi-professional work, resulting in inefficient use of professional manpower. The reservation of funds for technical institutions would lead to the training of additional numbers of technicians, releasing the engineers for their more highly skilled work.

Title II authorizes a 5-year program of matching constructions grants for establishment or improvement of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. In order to meet the Nation's needs in the fields of engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences, it will require double the number of masters' and doctors' degrees awarded annually in these fields by 1970. This need will be met through H.R. 6143 in expanded and improved centers of graduate work all over the country—and will lead to decentralization of these centers.

As matters stand now, 75 percent of all doctoral degrees are granted by a small number of universities concentrated in 12 States. The bill, which authorizes appropriation of $25 million for fiscal year 1964 and $60 million each for fiscal years 1965 and 1966, again provides for congressional review of the

program before appropriations are authorized for the last 2 years.

Patterned after the loan provisions of the college housing program, title III authorizes loans to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to higher education building agencies, for the construction of classrooms, laboratories and libraries. Authorized annually for the first 3 years is $120 million, after which the program would again be subject to congressional review before appropriations for the final 2 years would be authorized. The college housing program has been a tremendous success since its inception in 1950. Some 900 colleges and universities, accounting for approximately 85 percent of all enrollments in schools of higher education, have participated in the program. H.R. 6143 will enable these colleges and universities to apply the same methods toward the construction of facilities to teach the students housed under the college housing law.

The general provisions under title IV provide safeguards for the expenditure of Federal funds, specifically prohibiting expenditures for other than the purposes stated in the first three titles of the bill and also insuring that there will be no duplication of programs.

A particularly good feature of H.R. 6143 is that the smaller colleges will be given equal consideration on their projects—and will be helped in direct ratio to our great universities. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in my memory that the smaller colleges and the large universities—the private institutions and the publicly supported institutions—have united in their support for a bill designed to aid higher education.

Mr. Speaker, the need for H.R. 6143 has been repeatedly demonstrated over the years. I am sure, in view of the statement of Tuesday of this week by President Johnson praising the Senate for its action, that he will sign the measure promptly—thus extending to our colleges and universities the aid they have needed so urgently for so long.

J.F.K. in Mold of Classic Tragic Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. H. Gardner, of the Baltimore Sun, has written a column in which he likens our late President, John Kennedy, to the great tragic heroes of literature. His parallel is striking and moving.

I submit this column, which appeared in the Baltimore Sunday Sun on December 1, 1963, for the RECORD.

J.F.K. IN MOLD OF CLASSIC TRAGIC HERO

(By R. H. Gardner)

Apart from all its other consequences, the assassination of President Kennedy is significant for the light it sheds on the old question of whether or not tragedy, in the classical sense, can occur within the framework of the modern world.

Opinion has generally favored the negative side of this argument because of changes, since the time of Shakespeare, in both the form of governments and attitudes concerning the nature of man.

The tragic poets, you will recall, chose kings as their heroes on the theory that a monarch's actions, affecting thousands of people, assume greater importance than those of an average man. His death has greater impact on the universe.

By spreading the king's absolute authority among a number of institutions, democracy shifted the emphasis from the leader to the system. This and the growing belief that, instead of exercising free will, man was a slave to social and psychological conditioning, undermined, on the one hand, the individual's value to the social order and, on the other, the responsibility he formerly felt for his own actions.

Thus the reason why we have no modern tragedies is that playwrights have been unable to conceive of a contemporary figure strong and noble enough to qualify as a tragic hero. In my opinion, the late President has furnished them with an example.

Surely no king in history had the power to affect the lives of more people; yet it was not the power he wielded that made men all over the world, most of whom had never met him, cry in the streets when they heard of the assassination; nor was it this power that made his death a tragedy.

The distinguished scholar, A. C. Bradley, has defined the substance of tragedy—in the Shakespearean sense, at least—as the waste of the good. The death of a "bad" President—and we've had a few—would not, it seems, constitute tragedy. But what is meant by "good"? An examination of the masterpieces of the past indicates that the term implies something more than possession of the Christian virtues.

QUALITIES OF HERO

What do the majority of tragic heroes have in common? The answer is they display a superiority deriving not so much from their positions as kings, generals and demigods as from their qualities as human beings. They have, that is to say, a superabundance of talent, the courage to put it to bold use and the willingness to shoulder responsibility for such actions even when they prove to be disastrous.

In each of these areas, President Kennedy excelled. His keen intelligence, orderly mind, philosophic outlook, historical perspective, self-confidence and high moral purpose constituted a talent for government unparalleled in our time. His confrontation with Russia over the Cuban missiles demonstrated, as no other decision could, his courage; and his statement, following the Bay of Pigs disaster, illustrated a willingness to accept responsibility even when others were at fault.

I do not mean that these were Mr. Kennedy's only attributes, no more than I mean that the above-mentioned events were his only accomplishments; but they adequately illustrate his qualifications as a tragic hero. His death, therefore, represents not only the waste of good, but in view of the pitifully small pool of first-rate talent upon which humanity depends for survival, the wanton destruction of the precious, the liquidation of man at the level of the sublime.

SENSE OF INEVITABLE

Nor is this all. The President's life and death seem to embody that peculiar sense of the inevitable the Greeks called fate.

It is unlikely the American people will ever learn the whole story of Mr. Kennedy's assassination. After almost 100 years, we still don't know the details of Lincoln's. But legend will doubtless attribute it to Lee Harvey Oswald, and it is with this legend that we must deal now.

In the Gospels, Jesus is quoted as saying that it might have been better had Judas never been born; and one might argue that from the standpoint of classical tragedy, Lee Harvey Oswald was born only so that he could commit the monstrous deed the Dallas police attribute to him.

Though, on the face of it, he and the President had nothing in common, they were inextricably linked by a bond of antithesis: Kennedy represented everything that Oswald wasn't.

Reading his story, one perceives the pathetic sordidness of Oswald's life—his childhood concern because he could not add to the income of his widowed mother, his occupancy of an apartment with her above a New Orleans pool hall, his resentment of a society that seemingly had no place for a person such as he, his conversion to Marxism, his decision (born out of desperation) to join the marines, his failure to make a name for himself in this substitute for a normal education.

Yet he learned one thing: How to put a rifle to his shoulder, squint through the sights and shoot.

COULDN'T WIN

Oswald's determination not to be just another failure was manifested in his decision to go to Russia. But even there he was just another man. So he returned—to misery. His wife was not accepted by her new countrymen and, as one who had defected to communism, he was fired from one job after another. He was defeated at every turn.

Apart from his position as the head of a state Oswald considered immoral, President Kennedy must have struck him as an intolerable symbol of a man who had everything—money, family, position, social prestige, intelligence, wit, personal attraction, a lovely wife, beautiful children.

And all Oswald had was an ability to snipe.

Thus the President's tragic flaw—if indeed it can be called that—was his consummate perfection. In a world filled, if not yet dominated, by violence and hatred, he was too good to endure.

And so he fell. And so the reverberations—shaking this mechanized, atom-haunted universe like nothing since the murder of Agamemnon.

The Pennsylvania State University Places Its Resources Behind the Campaign To Expand Research and Development Industry in the Keystone State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, recently there was organized in Pennsylvania the Commonwealth Industrial Research Corporation, a Commonwealth-university agency designed to attract new research and development industry and to stimulate the growth of existing industry.

Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of the Pennsylvania State University, is president of Commonwealth Industrial Re-

search Corporation whose directors include three State and three university officials and three directors selected from the public at large.

Mr. Robert G. Snider is the executive director of Commonwealth Industrial Research Corporation, and with a background as a specialist in research administration he is now prepared to work with State and Federal agencies, local industrial development groups, chambers of commerce, and industrial concerns seeking to increase the amount of technologically oriented industry in Pennsylvania.

The following policy statement has been issued concerning university-industrial relations:

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY RELATIONS

The Pennsylvania State University is an active participant in many phases of commerce, of industry, of institutions of health, the arts—of every aspect of our National, State, and local development. To further implement this relationship with commerce and industry, and to facilitate the Commonwealth's economic development through fuller utilization of the university's strengths in science, engineering, technology, social science, and business, the following relationship and procedures have been developed. These are in addition to the traditional practice of making research results readily available.

The Pennsylvania State University will—

1. Encourage its staff to act as consultants, recognizing the desirability of making this service available particularly to Pennsylvania industry. The university will facilitate this activity under conditions consistent with the responsibilities of the faculty to the university.

2. Encourage the fullest utilization of the specialized skills and abilities of scientists, engineers, and social scientists employed by nearby industry to enhance course offerings of the university in rapidly advancing fields. Such sharing of rare talents will be beneficial to the participants and to the community.

3. Offer the facilities of the university in the recruiting of part-time technical and semiprofessional employees from qualified, advanced students for appropriate work in science-oriented industry. Conversely, to the fullest extent possible, the facilities of this university will be made available on a credit or noncredit basis to qualified part-time and advanced students engaged in study related to work in a technologically oriented industry or in private research laboratories.

4. Encourage industry within or outside Pennsylvania to sponsor research using the special facilities of the Pennsylvania State University. Alternatively, when joint use of facilities, techniques, equipment or personnel by the university and industry would further research, such cooperative endeavor is endorsed, provided that appropriate mechanisms can be arranged.

5. Offer, as need appears, special and advanced courses, symposia, and colloquia, with or without academic credit, to meet the various needs of technologically oriented industry, and private laboratories, and of university scholars, particularly in rapidly advancing or changing fields. Such offerings could be made on or off the campus, daytime or evening, using the best qualified instructors and leaders from the university faculty or from industry, or both.

6. Provide access to special equipment for technologically oriented industry and to research and testing laboratories, when such facilities are not otherwise readily available from commercial sources, in the same manner as computer and reactor facilities are now offered.

7. Make possible full utilization of library facilities and collections of the university for the use of technologically oriented industry of the community. Encourage the mutual exchange of technical literature between industry and the university.

8. Facilitate the development of other close and mutually rewarding relationships between the university, technologically oriented industry and private research laboratories consonant with their respective responsibilities and objectives.

Through openminded and wholehearted cooperation of faculty, industry, the university administration and the Commonwealth Industrial Research Corporation (CIRC) these policies can be implemented effectively. The Commonwealth Industrial Research Corporation, a newly formed nonprofit corporation with three members of the Governor's cabinet, three public members, and three Pennsylvania State University trustees as directors, can serve as a focal point in many of these university-industry relations.

Arrangements made under the policies outlined above must not interfere with the primary objectives of the university—the education of students, the training of scholars, and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

A National Business Magazine, Forbes, Pays a Deserved Tribute to Our Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest tributes I have seen paid to our late President appeared under the byline of Malcolm S. Forbes, publisher and editor in chief of Forbes magazine, in the issue of December 1, 1963. His words also express strong confidence in President Johnson and in the future of the United States. I wish to commend the article to our colleagues. Entitled "A Firm Experienced Hand," the article by Mr. Forbes is as follows:

Three and a half years ago I worked hard for the election of Richard Nixon to the Presidency, and as a delegate to the GOP Convention happily voted for his nomination. During the Democratic Convention I rooted for Lyndon B. Johnson in the conviction expressed often to friends that, "If a Democrat should win, he'd be the best one." Kennedy? Too young, too inexperienced. Attractive, eager, but not mature enough.

At lunch with two friends 48 hours before President Kennedy's death, we discussed at length how glad we were that he was President; that in foreign affairs, American objectives, hopes, and ideals had been made clear and had been kept clear; that the President had displayed firmness without resorting to shallow and explosive brinksmanship. We commented on how no Republican President probably would have dared to ask for the tax reduction so necessary to our maximum economic expansion.

We rounded out the conversation by concluding that Kennedy would undoubtedly be reelected and that by the end of his second term he would be considered as one of the handful of great Presidents.

In 36 months there are few specific legislative milestones on which historians can peg an evaluation of President Kennedy's administration but his greatness as a man is firmly established. With wit and wisdom and calmness he met world crises, and continually concerned himself with measures that would benefit the human lot. The TV program, "Conversation With the President," showed his conception of the job and his remarkable grasp of the problems of our time.

On these pages Forbes in past months has on several occasions supported his actions and proposals.

The man is now beyond support, but some of the measures and the need of them remain.

What now? What about Lyndon Johnson?

I can recollect no unelected—and few elected Presidents who have come into office with better preparation for the job. In the three most immediate problems facing the country President Johnson had unusual responsibilities under John Kennedy.

He was knee deep in defense problems, particularly in matters of space.

In the field of civil rights he headed the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

In connection with foreign relations he has in recent months acquired firsthand familiarity with most of our allies and friends abroad.

Before this exposure to national responsibility on the executive level he, in title and in fact, led the legislative branch as majority leader of the Senate. Virtually every important legislative measure during President Eisenhower's last 6 years achieved passage primarily because of Johnson's help. His support of foreign aid and trade, of NATO and the U.N., social security and expanded civil rights is a matter of record, both in words and deeds.

In one very significant area Johnson's skill exceeds that of the late President—how to get things through Congress.

President Johnson displays one attitude strikingly similar to President Eisenhower's: an almost fervent belief in the free enterprise system. Anybody tempted to sell securities because of uncertainty about the new administration should listen to a replay of the Texas TV station's interview with the President and Mrs. Johnson at the LBJ Ranch, recorded a few weeks ago. No Republican, no conservative, no business leader, no Vermont Yankee ever gave greater or more continuous expression of conviction about free enterprise and the "American way" of economic life than the new President of the United States.

In our profound misfortune we are fortunate that the new hand at the helm is an experienced, firm one. President Johnson knows unusually well the process of governing and the problems facing the Government. He knows unusually well men in Government and particularly the men now in his Government.

In despairing over the still unbelievable deed of assassination, we certainly need not despair over our country's present leadership and future prospects.

A Tribute to the Spirit and Memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, as the tributes to John F. Kennedy con-

tinue to pour across my desk, it is apparent that his memory, above all else, is associated with the fight against the forces of hatred and bigotry. Over and over again runs the theme of bitter sorrow combined with newly formed or renewed determination to join that battle he so gallantly led. The tribute sent me on behalf of 250 members of the Oregon chapter of the National Association of Claimants' Counsel of America eloquently summarizes the substance of hundreds of grieving messages. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SPIRIT AND MEMORY OF JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The assassination of John F. Kennedy on Friday, November 22, stunned and shocked men of good will everywhere. The memory of his brutal, high-noon, murder while riding in a motorcade on the streets of Dallas, Tex., will remain with each of us until the end of our days. We will long remember where we were and what we were doing when we learned of the shooting.

The initial impact of the news was often disbelief that such a thing could come to pass. As disbelief was dispelled by stark reality—then a hope and a prayer that the wounds were not serious or fatal—a hope that soon was ended by the announcement that "The President Is Dead."

John F. Kennedy—the 35th President of the United States—the youngest man ever elected to that high office—the leader of all our people—a man young in vitality, wit, charm, and zest—a man devoted to freedom and to the dignity of all men everywhere of every race, color, or creed—was dead. The litany of what he stood for and fought for could go on. But it would be a litany for the dead as John F. Kennedy had just been spun off from the midst of the living by two blasts from a rifle. A rifle that had been shot from the six-story ambush of a city warehouse on a sunny November day in Dallas, Tex.

The forces of evil (whatever they might later prove to be) had triumphed over the forces of good.

The pallor of profound grief spread over the world to the very edges of Red China. Yet, within 48 hours, this profound grief was to be shattered by the bizarre and by the ugly as the alleged assassin was himself gunned down and murdered in the basement of the Dallas city jail. And all within sight of millions of TV watchers as they sat in their living rooms on that Sunday morning. Violence and hatred on top of violence and hatred.

A little more than a week ago, John F. Kennedy was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery. You and I have now had time to recollect on that awesome and awful long weekend in November. You and I, as lawyers and citizens, have seen not only brutal murders, but we have witnessed the hateful shattering of two great principles—the integrity of the Presidency of the United States and the integriy of due process of law. These two institutions—orderly democratic government and due process of law—are the foundations of our noble profession.

We, of all men, should be in the forefront to protect and promote these fundamentals of the good life. This we can do as lawyers and as men of good will. It is not a program for the other fellow. It is a program for you and for me. That is for whom this bell tolls. It is a personal dedication. A dedication that we will not remain silent or inactive when we hear words or see deeds or acts of hatred and bigotry. Let us resolve that the dignity of man is not only an ideal. It is our way of life.

In the year 1963, the flowers of evil have bloomed. They have bloomed for the ambushed Medgar Evers in Mississippi. They have bloomed for the four little bombed Sunday School children in Birmingham. They have bloomed for those generous and noble law school students who, last summer, were harassed in the South while trying to gain the Negroes' constitutional rights to vote. And now les fleurs de mal have bloomed for John F. Kennedy.

In the year 1964, may the flowers of evil wither on the vine.

To John Fitzgerald Kennedy, let us reverently say: Requiescat in pace.

To ourselves, let us resolutely say: May we not rest in peace until we have fulfilled our resolution to run the good race against hatred, prejudice, and bigotry in all their evil forms and shapes.

JIM KENNEDY,
President, Oregon Chapter of NACCA.

Resolution Commending the House Upon Its Passage of Legislation Providing for Further Development of a Nationwide Fallout Shelter System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors during its conference held in San Francisco, Calif., on November 20, 1963, which commends the House upon the passage of H.R. 8200 providing for further development of a nationwide fallout shelter system. The resolution also compliments the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. EDWARD HÉBERT, chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Armed Services, and the members of the subcommittee for their able and efficient conduct of the hearings on this bill.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTORS

Whereas the great majority of defense officials and authorities, including the civil defense directors of the several States, territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia, deem a nationwide system of fallout shelters an essential element in any truly effective program for national security;

Whereas the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States has, in its wisdom, seen fit to approve legislation providing for further development of a nationwide fallout shelter system, namely, H.R. 8200, approved September 17, 1963; and

Whereas approval of the aforementioned legislation is deemed to reflect, in large measure, essential information and data developed in the course of exhaustive hearings held by Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Armed Services during May, June, and July of 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors, in conference formally convened at San Francisco, Calif., this 20th day of November, 1963, commend the House of Representatives for its action in the approval of H.R. 8200; be it further

Resolved, That the association compliment the members of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Armed Services for their skilled and impartial conduct of the hearings on H.R. 8200, including particularly the chairman of the said subcommittee, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, who tirelessly presided over the prolonged sessions with the utmost wisdom and patience; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, both for distribution to all Members and with a request to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Attest:

GEORGE R. RODERICKS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Gen. George H. Brett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 11th District of Florida were saddened to learn of the passing of one of the Nation's distinguished military leaders. Lt. Gen. George Howard Brett, one of the valiant men of the U.S. Air Force during World War II, died at Orlando, Fla. His record of service to our Nation is an inspiration for our citizens, both military and civilian.

I feel it fitting and proper that his record should become part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and submit for inclusion this dispatch from the Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 3, 1963]

GENERAL BRETT, FOUGHT TWO WARS

Lt. Gen. George H. Brett, 77, former Deputy Commander of the Allied Forces in the Southwest Pacific, died yesterday at Orlando Air Force Base Hospital in Orlando, Fla.

General Brett, whose 35 years of service earned him decorations from 17 foreign countries and the United States, was based in Australia during World War II. He and his aerial flagship, affectionately named *Alexander the Swoose*, became a symbol of the Allied effort in the Southwest Pacific.

Alexander, a Boeing bomber that flew from Brisbane, Australia, to San Francisco in record time in 1942, averaged 150 hours flying time a month, mostly in combat zones, and the general was always aboard.

Born in Cleveland, General Brett was graduated from Virginia Military Institute in 1909 and was commissioned a 2d lieutenant in the Philippine Scouts in 1910. A year later, he transferred to the Army Cavalry and saw action in the Philippine campaign in 1911–12 and the Mexican Border campaign of 1912–13.

QUALIFIES AS FLIER

In September of 1916, General Brett qualified as a military aviator and during World War I served with the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps in France.

Between the wars, General Brett was promoted from major to brigadier general as a wing commander in the Air Corps. He served in Texas, Washington, California, and Kansas, until 1935, when he was ordered to Washington as a student in the Army War College.

In 1940, after tours of duty in the Panama Canal Zone and at various Army posts in the United States, General Brett was named Chief of the Air Corps.

During the first years of World War II, General Brett held numerous posts, including deputy commander of the United Command of the Southwest Pacific area, Chief of American forces in Australia, and Chief of the Allied Air Forces operating in the Southwest Pacific.

CARIBBEAN COMMANDER

From 1942 until his retirement in 1945, he commanded the Caribbean Defense Command and the Panama Department. Rated as a command pilot and technical observer, the general held honorary commissions from five Central and South American countries.

His many awards included the Distinguished Service Medal with an oak leaf cluster, the Silver Star Medal, and the Distinguished Flying Cross. Among his foreign decorations were the Order of Orange-Nassau of the Netherlands and Knight Commander, Order of the Bath of Great Britain.

He is survived by his wife, Mary, of the home in Orlando; a son, Lt. Col. Devol Brett, USAF, of Langley AFB, Va., two daughters, Dora Brett Schriever, wife of Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command at Andrews Air Force Base, and Lucille Freshman, of Washington.

Memorial Issue for President Kennedy Will Be in Tradition With Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has directed the Post Office Department to plan an appropriate postage stamp in memory of our late beloved President. I have also sponsored legislation providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of President John F. Kennedy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by Jim Schrader which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on December 2, 1963:

ABOUT STAMPS: MEMORIAL ISSUE FOR PRESIDENT KENNEDY WILL BE IN TRADITION BEGUN WITH LINCOLN

(By Jim Schrader)

Commemorative: More about the proposed U.S. postage stamp honoring the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy:

It is an American tradition, dating back to Lincoln, to issue a memorial stamp when a Chief Executive dies in office. The time lag, in the past, between the death of a President and issuance of his memorial stamp has varied greatly.

For F.D.R.: The Post Office Department's Information Service recalls that four memorial stamps were issued for Franklin D. Roosevelt, the first of which came out at Hyde Park, July 26, 1945. This was more than 3 months after Roosevelt's death on April 12.

It took less than a month, however, to issue the Harding memorial stamp. But this haste had a telling effect. Harding died August 2, 1923. A stamp was issued September 1. Philatelists and even the Post Office Department regarded the results as unsatisfactory.

In working to get the stamp on the market as rapidly as possible, engravers adapted the vignette, numerals, and lettering of the existing 2-cent ordinary stamp of 1923. A portrait of Mr. Harding was added.

Long wait: The Lincoln memorial stamp was issued June 17, 1866, more than a year after the President's death on April 14, 1865. James E. Garfield died in office September 19, 1881. A Garfield stamp was sold for the first time on February 22, 1890.

There was a long wait between the time President William McKinley died of wounds inflicted by an assassin September 14, 1901, at the Pan American Exposition here in Buffalo. The McKinley stamp did not come out until 1904. Upon their deaths, all Presidents have been honored on postage stamps.

In memory: Plewacki Post Stamp Society of the Adam Plewacki Post 799, American Legion, will have as its theme "in memory of President Kennedy." "Alpex-799," American Legion Philatelic Exhibition, will be held on March 20, 21, 22, 1964. March 22, Palm Sunday, will be exactly 4 months since President John F. Kennedy was assassinated.

The largest stamp and coin exhibition in western New York will be held at the post auditorium at 385 Paderewski Drive.

An official cachet commemorating President Kennedy will be sponsored for the general public. Dr. Matt A. Gajewski, president of P.P.S.S., announced that plans are being made to devote a special section entirely to material of President Kennedy. Complete plans will be announced at a future date.

Bible Reading in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, in this day and time of year, we should meditate and think of the many worthwhile things we have done this year and also what might have been done that we believe should not have been done. We should ask ourselves what can we do to rectify this? My sole purpose, Mr. Speaker, in asking for this time is that every day we now are hearing about schools being ordered to stop their Bible reading.

Mr. Speaker I would like to read into the RECORD a letter written to the U.S. Supreme Court from the Reverend Robert A. Henning, Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

The letter follows:

BEAVER FALLS, PA.,
December 2, 1963.

U.S. SUPREME COURT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEMBERS: It seems appropriate to write to you during the time of year when we are thanking God for his care of the past year during this Thanksgiving season.

It seems even more appropriate to write in view of the recent tragedy in our Nation in the assassination of President Kennedy.

It has seemed to me rather interesting that that a Nation, where prayer and Bible reading has been declared unconstitutional in our public schools, should be driven to its knees when such a tragedy should happen in our Nation. In the memorial service held in our church last Monday morning, I could not help questioning whether or not this might be an act of God to drive our Nation to giving Him his rightful place in our land.

I realize that there are legal complications in such issues as were brought before you but it seems that your decision showed a tragic adherence to the letter of the law rather than to the spirit of the laws as they were made. Added to this, there seems to be a prohibition to the majority of the people of our land in order to protect the minority groups whose rights have been provided for before in most cases in the public schools.

As a minister, I often hear the question brought up, "What about the rights of the majority? When are they going to be protected?" With recent reports that 60 percent or more of the people of our land are professed Christians, this seems to be a real question as it stands before us.

It seems a real tragedy to me that we can force our young people in our schools to study communism but we cannot permit them to meditate upon the word of God or pray. The word of God continues to tell us that "The fear of the Lord is beginning of wisdom." We are worried about the scientific development of our youth but what about the spiritual development?

Is it too much to ask, "Do not the majority of the people of our land have the same privileges of the minorities?" Sirs, I believe that no nation can long stand that does not honor God. My prayer is that the Lord will convict your hearts to a realization of the need of Christ not only in our own lives but in our Nation as well.

I am sorry that this letter is so long and I hope that all are able to read it and think about it although I realize that you receive many letters each day.

In Christ's service,

REV. ROBERT A. HENNING,
Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

Independence of Kenya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 1963, the final transfer of power will take place between Britain and the Kenyan Government, making Kenya an independent nation. We wish to take this great occasion to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the Prime Minister, Jomo Kenyatta, and the people of Kenya on their approaching independence, and express to them all good wishes for a peaceful and progressive future as an independent-nation state.

Kenya's future indeed looks promising. This prosperous country on the east coast of Africa, roughly equivalent in size to the combined area of our States of Colorado and New Mexico, includes some of the best agricultural land in Africa. Kenya is a land of contrasts. The north and northeastern part of the country is arid—almost desertland—but the south contains the fertile well-watered highlands which produce the coffee, tea, sisal, and livestock that are the basis of the Kenyan economy. Agricultural production accounts for more than 80 percent, by value, of all exports.

Kenya is a multiracial society par excellence. Included in Kenya's population of about 6,500,000 people are approximately 6,215,000 Africans; 175,000 Indians, Pakistani, and Goans; 65,000 Europeans; 40,000 Arabs; and 5,000 others. Although a majority of the Africans still practice subsistence agriculture on small farms, under the impetus of government efforts to intensify

African agriculture, African farmers have begun to make a substantial contribution to the production of cash crops, which were formerly produced almost entirely by Europeans. The Asian population is engaged chiefly in marketing, distribution, and transport. In recent years industrial activity has been increasing fairly rapidly; over 2,400 new public and private companies were registered between 1952 and 1962, among them subsidiaries of several large British firms.

Thus, Kenya is reaching the threshold of independence with a more diversified and complex economy than many of its African sister countries. It is not a single-crop economy; an important measure of agricultural diversification has already been achieved. Industrialization has already begun, and recent assurances by Kenyan leaders that an independent Kenya Government will not nationalize industries should encourage further private foreign investment. The marketing, distributing, and transportation industries are thriving concerns.

The inheritance of this progressive economy is a mixed blessing, however, for it is based on a multiracial society in which tensions can easily be aroused if a balance is not struck. The memory of Mau Mau is not yet dead, but the election manifesto of Prime Minister Kenyatta's party, the Kenya African National Union—KANU—should assuage the apprehension of any who fear that a repetition of Mau Mau might accompany independence. The manifesto stated:

The KANU government will welcome those non-Africans who choose to join with us in the noble task of building a Kenya nation. Their training, skills, and knowledge will be of the greatest value to us. We are confident that those who show confidence in us will appreciate the need to pass on to the nation what they can teach the people. They will be fully accepted by us, not only through legal forms, but in our hearts.

We too are confident that the new government and the people of Kenya will achieve lasting harmony in the task of successfully building a progressive and united nation.

Chou Says Sino-Soviet Ties Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to insert into the RECORD an article which I believe has an important bearing on the course of our foreign policy. It answers the questions of many Americans. It also poses important questions about the conduct of some of our policies regarding the international Communist conspiracy.

The article, written by Adam Kellett-Long and David Chipp, reveals that Chou En-lai, Premier of Red China, does not regard the ideological split of Red China with the U.S.S.R. as extending into outright hostility. He points out that it is an internal battle between various aspects of communism. He warns that attempts to deal with Red China and Russia separately in the field of coercion or force "will certainly be disappointed."

He reiterates the idea that an attack on one Socialist country is an attack on all. Khrushchev has made the same statement.

I am hopeful that my colleagues will read this article carefully. It quotes a direct interview with Chou En-lai, and should cast serious doubt on those who say that we can split Peiping and Moscow by giving concessions to either.

Text of the article is as follows:

CHOU SAYS SINO-SOVIET TIES FIRM

(By Adam Kellett-Long and David Chipp)

PEIPING.—Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, said here those who thought they might use differences between the Chinese and Soviet Communist Parties to deal with China and the Soviet Union separately would certainly be disappointed.

The Premier was speaking in answer to questions put in the course of an interview he gave to Gerald Long, general manager of Reuters.

Asked whether differences between the Chinese Communist Party and the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party were likely to have an effect on state relationships between the two countries, he replied, "We don't see it that way.

"Of course, there are serious disputes of principle between our two parties, and on some questions the Soviet side has carried these disagreements over into state relations.

"Contacts between the two states and the two parties will continue as before. I see no reason for thinking that our two states should be severed from one another.

"The Soviet leaders themselves say this is a matter within the Socialist community of nations.

"Some people may have thoughts of using Sino-Soviet differences to deal with China and the Soviet Union separately. Those with such ideas will certainly be disappointed.

"On the contrary, if any act of aggression occurs against any Socialist country this would be an act of aggression against the whole Socialist camp. It would be impossible not to give support. If a country refused to give support, it would not be a Socialist country."

Chou was asked whether the withdrawal of Soviet aid in 1960 had added to China's difficulties in recent years. He said the withdrawal had, of course, had its effects.

The Premier was asked about Chinese statements on incidents on the Chinese-Soviet boarder, including a reference to Soviet coercion of tens of thousands of Chinese citizens into going to the Soviet Union.

He replied: "These incidents occurred in 1962. The situation has recently become better."

Chou was asked what he thought about voices which had been heard in the United States in favor of revising American policy toward China.

He said there were people even within the United States ruling group who thought there should be some changes.

Chou said: "They may talk about making some changes in United States policy toward China, but so long as they don't change their basic policy it would be difficult to bring China and the United States closer together. The policy is one of aggression and war threats against China."

Chou said that, "regardless of what sect or group it may be, we don't see that any of them have any idea of changing the policy of spliting Taiwan from China and therefore we don't see any change in this basic policy."

The Premier said he thought the United States would probably once again manipulate the majority in the United Nations to maintain the Chiang Kai-shek delegate as representative of China.

Chou also said:

"We are very confident that the Sino-Indian border dispute will be solved. There is no reason whatsoever why it should not. The current Indian attitude proceeds from the fact that they need to carry out the cold war, and this meets the need of the United States."

Answering a question about relations with India, the Premier reiterated his willingness to go to New Delhi for talks with the Indian Prime Minister.

He said the Sino-Indian border situation was now relaxed due to a series of measures taken by China.

He said some foreign friends were worried that the conflict might start again, "But our stand is definite. We will never start any conflict." So long as India does not start any new provocations, the situation will continue to be relaxed.

The Premier was asked about the development of China's foreign trade and whether trade with such countries as Japan, Britain and France would increase.

He replied: "We are willing to have contacts with all countries that are friendly to us. That, of course, includes trade and economic contacts.

"We are willing to develop all trade which is based on equality and mutual benefit.

"On this principle our trade with Japan and Western Europe is developing of course not very rapidly, but so long as both sides have a common desire for mutual benefit there are broad vistas," although we must rely mainly on our own efforts, it is impossible not to have contacts with other countries and no country can completely isolate itself.

"The Chinese internal market is developing day by day and demands will become greater and greater and there will always be things which have to be obtained through mutual exchange.

"No doubt there will be possibilities for the development of trade with those countries which wish it. Such relations are developing with Japan and France and Britain, too," Chou said.

The Challenge of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, we have also just concluded the observance of a national day. Pursuant thereto, I have read with much interest the copy of a speech given by Dr. Conrad W. Raker, a leading member of the clergy in Allentown, Pa. This message was a thoughtful recognition of the things which we need do to understand better our heritage of free enterprise and the wise leadership of this country in its founding days, as well as certain contemporary matters. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include this very well thought out statement, which is as follows:

THANKSGIVING

By decree of President Johnson, out of respect for our departed President, the flag will fly at half staff for 30 days of mourning.

Yet, as all of us know from personal family loss, life goes on—one picks up the daily chores almost with a sense of relief at something familiar to do. Numbly at first we return to our tasks. Working and keeping busy is still the best therapy.

And so a stricken Nation, thanks to the built-in reflexes of the human spirit, continues on.

Today I would like to talk to you concerning things close to my heart. My religious beliefs you know, but this is something of my philosophical and political economic credo.

From tragedy and mourning we pass perhaps too abruptly to Thanksgiving.

All reflective men can name and list countless personal reasons for gratitude. Each of us here could compile lists without half trying. We could enumerate health, friends, wealth, loved ones, position and many others.

Today, I would like to dwell on a few very important general reasons for gratitude. These are not personal, but apply equally to us all.

1. I am thankful for the miracle of life itself. The earth takes a year to revolve around the sun. Some of us will be on it for 50, 70, or 100 trips. Yet science tells us each has been on this earth from the very beginning.

The carbon atoms in our body were here from the foundation of the world. The atoms themselves have not changed—just joined with other atoms. But for each of us God took these inert chemicals, breathed the breath of life into them and created us. He gave us a soul. Many people question the Bible because there are a few miracles in it. Look about you. There are miracles everywhere. Is the simplest wayside flower any less miraculous than the distant galaxies of stars revolving in eternal orbit? You and I ourselves are miracles.

Simple chemical elements we are, of the earth earthy, yet we have been touched with divine fire. We can see beauty. Perceive ideas, reason, touch, smell, love, be dedicated to a cause.

In the vast infinitude of space we, perhaps, alone are conscious beings—we can see, feel, study, examine the world about us, understand. We can admire the majesty of the mountains, listen to the song of a bird, enjoy the smile of a friend, thrill to the touch of a hand. We alone in all creation are able to think God's thoughts after him.

Behold, we are but a little lower than the Angels.

And all the gifts God gives with this miracle of life, one of the greatest is the ability to perceive beauty. Beauty in its many forms—line, form, color, sound.

The Germans have a brass quartet used for religious purposes called a Posaunenchor, similar to the trombone choir the Moravians use at their Easter Sunrise Service.

Years ago I remember reading that Albert Schweitzer, the famous man of letters who had spent over 30 years as a physician in Africa, said that the first time he heard one of these groups play, the beauty of the harmony brought tears to his eyes. When I read this my reaction was that he is more sensitive than I, that I am made of a coarser clay.

Yet, several years ago I was in the city of Bielefeld, Germany, staying for a few days at an institution. I'd been on the go from early morning until about 6 p.m. When I got back to my room, darkness had already fallen; in the dark I threw myself on the bed to rest a few moments. Just at the moment before sleep came, over the quiet evening air I heard a Posaunenchor on the hill outside play in four-part harmony some of the old beautiful advent hymns of the church.

Without my being immediately aware of it, tears came to my eyes. Naturally, I thought of Dr. Schweitzer. But God has touched our clay with divinity and part of the miracle life is the ability to perceive beauty. We are but a little lower than the angels. I'm grateful for this miracle of life.

2. I'm thankful, too, for the national heritage that is ours. We, in the United States of America, have inherited a fabulous legacy. The Founding Fathers who formed our Constitution were among the wisest of all men in history. In America we stand on the shoulders of giants; Jefferson, Washington, Madison, Monroe, Franklin, and the two Adams. They had the rare combination of knowledge, imagination, and the practical sense of getting things done.

They developed a remarkably flexible system of government which is good for generation after generation.

Too long we have condemned politicians. We should praise them, our Founding Fathers were practical politicians. They were idealists and political philosophers, but also shrewd political organizers. It was their down-to-earth political thought that developed our present two-party system.

Our American heritage of democracy and representative government shines as a beacon in a world with large patches of totalitarian darkness. We are free because we inhereted freedom. In a world where there is more slavery than freedom, for God's sake, let's be thankful for our freedom and preserve it.

3. I'm thankful, also, for the American way of life and by this I mean the free enterprise system. Why hedge around the word—I'm grateful for the capitalistic system. Just look at the record. It's built the best way of life for mankind the world has ever known. Why should we act as though it's a dirty word? Let's use the word capitalism with some respect—not apologetically.

In the United States the average personal income for each man, woman, and child—not family income—personal income is $2,360. This must seem unbelievable, this must seem like heaven itself to the rest of the world for over 50 percent of the world's population earns less than $80 per year.

Some years ago when the Communists were trying to overrun Greece, we admitted a boy to the Good Shepherd Home from that war-torn land. He had lost both hands in a grenade explosion. He has since been rehabilitated and has been graduated from Muhlenberg College and is now working toward his master's degree at Lehigh. But the point I want to make is that when this 12-year-old boy arrived, 3 days before I could enroll him in the public school, I drove him around with me. Once he looked up at me and wide eyed with wonder said, "In America everybody is rich." We are all wealthy and our wealth is greater than money alone.

This permeates all facets of our lives.

Here is another illustration from the magazine Trustee of our American way of life. It was entitled "Soviet Health Officials Tour American Hospitals."

"Two automobiles traveled along the dirt road under the hot east Texas sun and came to a stop beside a cottonfield where two farmers were working.

Out of one of the cars stepped David Hitt, assistant administrator of Baylor University Medical Center of Dallas. He crawled over a barbed wire fence and approached the farmers.

"You're going to think I'm crazy," said Mr. Hitt, but I've got two carloads of Russians who want to meet you."

Sitting in two air-conditioned limousines were six prominent Soviet health authorities who for nearly 3 weeks had toured hospitals and medical facilities throughout the United States.

One of the farmers, James Marriott, consented to answer some questions by the Soviet visitors.

"How close is the nearest hospital?" asked Aleksei G. Safonov, M.D., Administrator of the Soviet Ministry of Health and leader of the delegation.

"Six miles," replied the farmer. "What would you do in case of an emergency?" Dr. Safonov inquired.

He said he would jump in his car and drive to the hospital, a 15-minute ride.

"Do you have a doctor?" the Soviet official continued.

The farmer said he did. His doctor lived 4 miles away—10 minutes by car.

"What if your doctor is busy with another emergency when you need him?" Dr. Safonov asked.

Mr. Marriott smiled and said, "I'd call another. We've got two more in the area."

A member of the Soviet delegation then asked the farmer how he paid for hospitalization. The young man answered simply "with insurance."

When the delegation first arrived in the United States, they gave many of their hosts the impression their purpose in visiting the United States was to confirm a conviction that medical care here is inadequate and inferior to that of the Soviet Union. At first, they believed a wide gulf existed between hospital care for the rich and poor in the United States. They were to become surprised, as the tour proceeded, to find the extent to which medical insurance is subscribed to by the American people, and were astounded by the free medical care given to the needy.

I can attest to the efficiency of American medicine for the indigent. When somebody from the Good Shepherd Home goes to the hospital they get free medical care which is just as good as anyone in the city.

Grateful as I am for so many things, there are some things that should give us pause.

At one point in the Old Testament history, Elijah looked out upon the horizon and saw a little cloud no bigger than a man's hand. This cloud later covered the sky and became a powerful storm.

There are such omens in our society today and it behooves us to correct them.

The first fallacious idea is—

1. The world owes everybody a living. This is a lot of nonsense. The world doesn't owe us—we owe the world. This is the cry of the lazy—the indifferent—the spineless. We should meet the needs of those who suffer and know want, but this is far removed from the debilitating and erroneous philosophy that the world owes every man a living. The world doesn't owe everyone a living. Every man owes his own day and age the best that is in him.

2. The second small cloud in the sky that could assume ominous proportions is an equally fallacious phrase. Let's have production for use, not for profit. Of course, production is for use, but the implication here is that there is something evil about profit. The profit motive is the most maligned human impulse of our age. It is the profit motive that has produced the greatest material blessing for the largest number of people in all history.

Profits are essential. If the State ever takes over the means of production God help us. In poor China the simple peasants on their little parcels of land individually raised almost as much as the giant communes. But still they don't see—their blind adherence to the old and wornout Marxist dogma is causing them needless hunger and suffering.

Let's not be swayed by stupid, archaic, old-fashioned Communist reasoning, with profits we insure the best possible production.

3. Another shibboleth of the left winger is I'm for human rights as opposed to property rights. A brief glance around the world shows all too clearly that where there are no private property rights there are also no human rights. When a man can in safety own his own vine and fig tree human rights will flourish. Property rights and human rights are inseparable. You can't have one without the other.

Only the weak, the lazy, the ineffectual, and the whiny are consumed by envy for the man who is a success. The great mass of citizens are striving by hard work to get themselves and their children a better position in life, and so it should be.

"We must unhesitantly oppose the use of socialistic and communistic methods in solving the problems of our free enterprise democracy. Our problems are problems of human nature rather than of economics and sociology. The man who has two cars is not preventing another from having one. The man who earns $50,000 a year is not robbing him who receives $400 a month."

The other night on television there was an interview taken several weeks ago with the then Vice President Lyndon Johnson. It did my heart good to hear him. He said he had just returned from a rather lengthy tour to many parts of the world.

He deplored the use of the phrase, ugly Americans, he said really we are the beloved Americans. He was cheered wildly—affection was shown in spite of little incidents, thousands acclaimed him.

This reminds me of an experience I had in Vienna in 1955. You remember that was the time President Eisenhower had been felled by a heart attack? We were invited out to a New Year's Eve party. Many funny and foolish toasts were made, but at one point I rose and said I wanted to propose a toast. By my demeanor they knew I was serious. All stood wondering what my toast would be. I raised my glass and said, "To Dwight David Eisenhower, President of the United States of America." The toast was drunk in complete silence. The little apartment had the atmosphere one associates with moments of religious intensity. I'll never forget the moment. Believe me, in Vienna they loved President Eisenhower and they love America—of that I am absolutely certain. This feeling is far more widespread than we are led to believe.

We have something the rest of the world respects, loves, and wants. Let's stand as men—do our duty as we see it and forget the taunts of jealous men behind the Iron Curtain and above all be thankful: thankful for life itself, thankful for our American heritage, thankful for the free enterprise system.

Thanksgiving Day, 1963, take a good long look at the world about you and in the quiet of your own heart, get down on your knees and thank God you are an American.

The Quiet Year of F. Edward Hébert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of us realize what a hard worker is our colleague from Louisiana, the Honorable EDDIE HÉBERT. During his many years in the Congress he has distinguished himself for many reasons, and for many activities. Perhaps his most outstanding characteristic is that he always does his homework, and so he approaches his legislative chores as a well-informed legislator, with an open mind for any new facts which may be developed.

All of us recall with real admiration Mr. HÉBERT's accomplishments as chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on the Armed Services.

In truth, I think we can all agree that he is one of the hardest working and most gifted Members of the Congress. Therefore, it was with keen interest that I read an article the other day about "EDDIE HÉBERT's Quiet Year." The gist of the piece was that after serving on the investigating subcommittee, EDDIE HÉBERT had moved to the committee on the Reserves in the conviction that it was a soft assignment, and that it would afford him the year or term of rest which he so richly deserves. As former chairman of this subcommittee I could have told him better, but he did not ask me.

Now I read with interest what his experience revealed. I wish that every Member of this body could spend a year or so working with the Reserves. It would be most revealing to you all. As a substitute, for the privilege therefore I invite all of you to read this article, written by John J. Ford, and published in the December issue of the Officer, monthly magazine of the Reserve Officers Association.

THE QUIET YEARS OF F. EDWARD HÉBERT

(By John J. Ford)

When Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, the shrinking violet of New Orleans, gave up the chairmanship of the House Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee last January, he told friends privately that this was going to be his quiet year. In 10 years as the flamboyant, driving chairman of the unit, HÉBERT had earned a national reputation as the House's best investigator, a man who would slay the dragon of waste and inefficiency anytime he could only get his white charger through the front door of the Pentagon. But when Uncle CARL VINSON kicked him upstairs to the chairmanship of a legislative subcommittee —the subcommittee that handles chiefly Reserve legislation—HÉBERT confided he expected things to be a bit more restful.

Some rest. With Congress completing its first full year session in many moons, HÉBERT is one of the few chairmen whose subcommittee has been operative right up to the finish and the group's work is reflected in bills making sweeping changes in the Reserves. Reserve obligation has been equalized for the young men of the country, the procurement of officers, Regular and Reserve, has been overhauled, and the Reserve forces will get new duties and responsibilities as a result of legislation passed by HÉBERT's subcommittee.

In the spring HÉBERT's group held hearings and approved H.R. 6996, which has since become Public Law 110, a measure designed to equalize the obligation to their country of men enlisting in the Reserve. It did away with the 8-year obligation for young men entering the 6-month active duty program in the future and set a standard obligation of 6 years.

Men who spend a short period on active duty are to spend more of their total obligation in the Ready Reserve. For example, a man who goes on active duty for 6 months must spend the remaining 5½ years in a Ready Reserve unit. A draftee who spends 2 years on active duty will then spend only 2 years in a Ready Reserve status and can spend the last 2 years of his obligation in the Standby Reserve.

The measure also revised the 6-month training program to allow active duty time ranging from 4 to 18 months for enlisted reservists. The purpose behind the longer active duty periods was to provide enough training to qualify men in military specialties needed by organized Reserve units. If it can supply these units with "hard" skills men it can cut down the need in future mobilizations for recalling men who previously served long periods of active duty. This section grew out of HÉBERT's earlier investigation of the Reserve callup during the Berlin crisis, which had aired criticism on the recall of fillers.

HÉBERT's subcommittee next approved a long-sought bill to bring the Military and Air Force Academies up to strength with the Naval Academy. HÉBERT, a loyal member of the club, revised the bill to be sure the additional cadets come via congressional appointments and to increase the percentage of congressional appointments at the Naval Academy.

The bill was amended on the floor of the House to require 5 years of active duty for all academies graduates. As the session entered its 11th month, the Senate had not taken action on the bill.

The measure contains a little bonus, unheralded and almost unnoticed, for Reservists who have had 8 or more years of active duty eligible for Presidential appointments. In the past these have been limited to the sons of Regulars.

A MAJOR ROTC REVISION

As November turned the leaves to rust and gold and some Members of Congress to a kind of green at the thought that they might never go home again, HÉBERT's subcommittee was putting the finishing touches on the most important overhaul of the ROTC laws in 47 years. As HÉBERT envisioned the bill it would provide for basically a 4-year ROTC with a modified Holloway (Navy) type program available to all services. Scholarships would be available for 4-year students and retainer pay would be increased from $27 to $50 a month for all advanced ROTC students, scholarship and nonscholarship students alike. The measure would permit the 2-year ROTC program, so earnestly pushed by the Defense Department, to allow transfer and junior college students to take part in ROTC but 2-year students would have to take an intensive summer training course in their junior year to make up for the normal basic course they missed.

The measure also continues the junior (high school) ROTC, requires a 4-year active duty tour for scholarship graduates, requires dropouts to serve on active duty after leaving college and—in a new approach—allows retired officers to be used as ROTC instructors.

The Hébert group is taking steps to try to upgrade the quality of military science courses and the subcommittee is making clear that the ROTC has a responsibility to provide trained citizen reservists as well as active duty officers.

In addition to these bills, HÉBERT's restful subcommittee conducted marathon civil defense hearings that brought some of the best minds in the country into a kind of debate on the morality and the feasibility of a national fallout shelter program. HÉBERT might as well have been in a fallout shelter himself for all the attention his hearings got the Nation's press but his hopeful report may eventually lead to a new awareness of civil defense realities. The bill provides for shelters at all Federal installations and authorizes aid to States for shelters in public buildings. The measure spotlights a new role for the Reserve forces—backing up civil authority in case of emergency. In its report the subcommittee quoted this statement from Army Chief of Staff Gen. Earle G. Wheeler: "We consider all Reserve component units available for civil defense missions * * *." The CD bill has passed the House, awaits Senate action.

HÉBERT is the author of another House-passed bill that he probably hopes no one

will benefit from: H.R. 2989, which extends Missing Persons Act coverage to persons in cold war situations who are "detained in foreign countries" against their will.

JOINT CHIEFS BILL APPROVED

HÉBERT's subcommittee has passed yet another important bill, which won't win the chairman a gold baton from McNamara's band: a measure to provide 4-year terms for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Former Chiefs from each service testified in favor of the bill, Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric testified against it. ROA strongly supported it.

HÉBERT's subcommittee has approved a bill to allow aliens admitted for permanent residence to enlist in Reserve components and he has introduced a bill to grant $100 a year incentive bonuses to Reserve enlisted men, an ROA-inspired measure that may get action next year.

HÉBERT, while his subcommittee was not involved directly, also took part in full committee decisions on extension of the draft laws, the military pay raise and the authorization of military weapons procurement and military construction for both the active duty and Reserve forces.

Mr. HÉBERT, it can be assumed, is not looking forward to another quiet year.

Twentieth Anniversary of International House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was just over 22 years ago that our country entered the bloodiest war in the history of mankind. As my colleagues in the House and Senate know, this terrible war marked the beginning of the end for isolationism in America; that is, the isolationism as it was known in the two decades and more after World War I. In the 1920's we returned to what was mistakenly called normalcy, only to be devastated in the 1930's by the great depression. In the first decade, we were concerned with satisfying our pleasures; in the second, with easing our pain. Then came the cold, sobering effects of 1939; World War II had begun. With the clandestine attack on Pearl Harbor 2 years later, the United States was in that war.

We Americans always have loved peace; in the midst of every war, the leaders of our country and all our people have dreamed, have worked, have planned for the day when the guns are again silent. In the midst of World War II, 20 years ago this month, I had the great privilege to join with 13 other business and civic leaders in my city of New Orleans in establishing an organization designed to foster peace and good will among all men, and to flourish in peacetime, and not in war.

The real driving force behind the founding of International House was the late Rudolf S. Hecht, then chairman of the board of the Mississippi Shipping Co. Early in 1943 I had the honor of working closely with Mr. Hecht to prepare a brochure that projected the idea of establishing this unique organization, the first of its kind in the United States, or anywhere in the world for that matter. We traveled to Washington several times to consult with Secretary of State Cordell Hull and his aids about this organization to promote international trade. Despite the press of his heavy wartime duties, Mr. Hull was most helpful, and was enthusiastic about the idea.

My wife, Lindy, really broke the logjam on finishing the brochure in time to launch our initial drive for support and funds for establishing International House. And it was Lindy who provided this great institution with its motto, "Dedicated to world peace, trade, and understanding," which is inscribed in large letters on the outside wall of International House's building on Gravier Street in New Orleans.

Some two dozen other cities in our country have followed the successful pattern of New Orleans' International House, and organized similar institutions themselves.

It was December 28, 1943, when the articles of incorporation for International House were signed in New Orleans, and a unique and farsighted plan for peacetime was born. The establishment of this progressive organization was a big factor in assuring there would be no return to "isolationism" in my part of the country. Its purpose was, and is, to develop and promote trade and commerce between the people of the whole Mississippi Valley and those of the nations of the world, particularly the countries in our own hemisphere. In the two decades since its founding, International House has served as the great catalyst for the benefit of the port of New Orleans, and business and industry throughout the Mississippi Valley. Its success has been phenomenal, and this success has been showered on all who have worked through International House.

Trade has always been the very life's blood of New Orleans, since its founding in 1718. The old saying that "the proof is in the pudding" was never more true when applied to International House's greatest contribution to my city—its efforts to provide the tremendous increase in the past two decades in the volume of imports and exports handled by the port of New Orleans. In 1962, according to the U.S. Corps of Engineers, a total of 71,570,000 tons of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce passed through the port. In 1962 the dollar value of the foreign cargo alone was $1,667 million. Furthermore, since World War II, New Orleans reestablished itself as America's No. 1 grain port; last year, the port handled 189,049,000 bushels. All of these factor add up to explain why New Orleans is today, and has continued to be, in most postwar years the Nation's No. 2 port next to New York City. And the fine work of the officers and staff of International House has helped the port of New Orleans to enjoy this great development and prosperity.

I had the honor and privilege to be the first executive secretary of International House. In November 1943 the completed plans for establishing this now world-famous organization were announced, and the next month, its articles of incorporation were signed. The 13 distinguished citizens of New Orleans who joined in forming International House were: William G. Zetzmann, who served as its first president; Wilmer Hayward; George H. Terriberry; Leonard K. Nicholson; E. O. Jewell; Charles Denechaud, Sr.; Salvador D'Antoni; A. B. Paterson; George E. Schneider; Eddie F. Lebreton; Theodore Brent; W. P. Flower, and Solon B. Turman. Unfortunately for my community, most of these men have gone to their reward, but their good works live after them and are a daily reminder of their vision and their dedication. Those of us founders who live on are devoted to their memory and their sacrifice, and we are proud to salute them on this memorable anniversary. The founders who are continuing today to serve International House and the city of New Orleans are Mr. Solon B. Turman, chairman of the board of Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; Mr. E. O. Jewell; Mr. Eddie F. Lebreton; Mr. George E. Schneider, president, New Orleans Traffic Transportation Bureau; and myself.

International House first opened the doors of its present home on Gravier Street in June 1945, and today this splendid organization has almost 2,500 members from New Orleans, the Mississippi Valley, and around the world. In its membership, International House boasts the leading business, civic, and professional leaders of many communities, who represent all forms of transportation and every kind of business and industry engaged in trade and commerce.

International House is a nonprofit organization supported by its 2,500 members, and is a fine example of the fruits of energetic and imaginative men working together under our free enterprise system. It is literally an "international clubhouse" which, you might say, sells nothing itself. That is, it sells no physical products. But it does sell, or promote, friendship and good will, trade and commerce, throughout the world.

What was it that prompted this group of leaders in New Orleans to envision such an organization and work toward its establishment during World War II? The most immediate reason was their determination to maintain New Orleans as the Nation's second port in the postwar era. The fact is that during the war our port was enjoying a great boom, as were so many other ports in America. Our businesses and industries, especially those geared to the war effort, also were thriving. In 1943 the port of New Orleans handled a total of $657 million in combined imports and exports. What would happen to this boom when the war ended? How could we maintain New Orleans position in trade and commerce in the competitive postwar years?

By the establishment of an organization like International House.

Through the spring and summer of 1943 our idea for an international clubhouse to foster trade and commerce between the Mississippi Valley and the nations of the world advanced toward reality. By the time the articles of in-

corporation were signed in December, a total of more than $500,000 had been raised to help establish International House. This institution has made New Orleans, more than it ever was before, a truly international, cosmopolitan city. Our port has continued to reign as America's second port. Scores of businesses and industries in Louisiana and other States drained by the waters of the Mississippi and its tributaries have realized the benefits of the constructive work of International House. All of this has been done through the basic concept, in the words of Paul Fabry, the managing director of International House, that "friends always do business easier than strangers, and strangers can, and do, become friends through understanding and trade."

The men who have served as president of International House since early 1944 comprise a "Who's Who" of the business, civic, and professional leaders of New Orleans. The first president of International House was, most fittingly, one of the founders—the late William G. Zetzmann, president of Zetz 7-Up Bottling Co., who served from early 1944 to June 1947.

In chronological order, the other presidents were: A. E. Hegewisch, president of the Hegewisch Corp., who served from June 1947 to June 1949; Lloyd J. Cobb, New Orleans attorney, June 1949 to May 1951; Robert E. Elliott, now senior vice president of the National American Bank, May 1951 to July 1953; C. C. (Bud) Walther, president of Walther Bros. Co., July 1953 to December 1954; Richard G. Jones, executive vice president and general manager of the Jackson Brewing Co., December 1954 to December 1956; Joseph M. Rault, New Orleans attorney, 1957; Richard W. Freeman, president, Louisiana Coca-Cola Bottling Co., 1958; George S. Dinwiddie, chairman of the board, New Orleans Public Service Inc., 1959; Capt. Neville Levy, president of Equitable Equipment Co., 1960; Maurice F. Barr, vice president, Gulf Paramount Theatres, Inc., 1961; Dr. Alton Ochsner, internationally famous surgeon and president of the Alton Ochsner Medical Foundation, 1962.

The president this year has been Lawrence A. Molony, a prominent New Orleans attorney. He is to be succeeded in 1964 by Henry Zac Carter, president of the Avondale Shipyards near New Orleans.

By their service in leading International House to ever greater success, these leaders have given the New Orleans area more than they can ever be repaid in dollars and cents.

In naming the presidents of International House, I cannot forget to pay tribute to the full-time managing directors who have served International House so well through the years. Mr. Stanton Robbins was the first managing director of the organization in 1945 and 1946. Then for 15 years, Charles Nutter, a noted reporter for the Associated Press for many, many years, served at the helm and was instrumental in building International House into the great organization it is today.

In the period 1946–61, Charlie Nutter made a magnificent contribution to the development and growth of International House and to the achievement of its goals not only in our community but also in other communities in the Mississippi Valley. Late in 1961 Charlie Nutter left International House, and today he publishes and directs the operations of several weekly newspapers in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

Early in 1962 Paul Fabry assumed the directorship of International House, and he is carrying on in the same fine manner as did Charlie Nutter.

A list of the many projects International House has executed successfully is innumerable, but I would like to cite the most prominent ones over the past 20 years.

Some of the leading projects of International House are:

First. The annual trade and cultural missions of International House members to nations all over the world.

Second. The annual Pan-American press seminars which bring together leading editors of America with those of all media in Latin America. This year the second such seminar brought to New Orleans 40 participants from 17 countries.

Third. Scholarships to deserving Latin American students for attendance at American colleges and universities: these are provided through the Cordell Hull Foundation.

Fourth. Two-way tourist promotion between New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley, and the nations of Latin America particularly, although travel to and from Europe and Asia also is promoted. International House members often guide VIP's through New Orleans and the Deep South.

Fifth. Special programs for foreign students who are attending universities in Louisiana and Mississippi.

Sixth. Periodic publications and directories to complement the cultural and trade works of the various Government departments and agencies.

Seventh. Special exhibits for foreign artists in this country and exhibits of our art abroad.

Eighth. Various educational television programs.

Probably the most publicized and most successful work that International House does to promote trade and commerce through New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley is through its many trade and cultural missions to countries over the globe. Thus far, International House has sponsored 47 of these missions. Their purpose is to spread the name of New Orleans and its port, to cite the advantages of engaging in trade and commerce through the port and with the businesses and industries of my city and in the Mississippi Valley. Most of these missions have been to the nations of Central and South America, but there have been several to Western Europe, and one to the Soviet Union and the bloc countries and one to the Far East.

Among the mission trips this year, a very fruitful one was the jointly sponsored trip to the five countries of Central America and Panama. The medical school of Louisiana State University joined with International House in sponsoring a 13-day tour of Central America. The result was the establishment of another IH project to provide free medicines and drugs to charitable, nonprofit medical groups operating in the poverty stricken areas of Central America. The LSU Medical School is cooperating in this humanitarian project, and the major pharmaceutical companies are donating the drugs and medicines.

And this summer, 31 civic, business and professional leaders from the New Orleans area participated in the organization's 47th mission, which took them to three Common Market countries and to member nations of the rival free trade asociation. In these countries of free Europe, the IH members met with representatives of the chambers of commerce, the various port authorities, export and other trade associations, and the officials of different cities and towns.

In the coming year, International House is planning five trade and cultural missions: a tour of Central America by Louisiana lawyers to meet attorneys in those countries; a tour of South America to foster further cultural exchange and trade relations between the New Orleans area and Colombia, Ecuador, Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Venezuela; an around-the-world trip in 25 days to further the goals of IH throughout the globe; a mission to the Mediterranean area to expand cultural exchanges and promote business through New Orleans from rapidly developing countries in the Near East, and a small mission to several islands in the Caribbean to explore new opportunities for promoting trade and commerce.

Furthermore, a recent trip this year to San Salvador by IH's director of its international relations department resulted in a decision by the tourism ministers of five Central American nations to establish in America a joint tourist promotion department in 1964. The tourism ministers had invited the IH official to meet with them for their own discussions on forming a regional tourist promotion department; the outgrowth was the ministers' pledge to establish in our country a joint tourist department in addition to their own regional one in Central America.

One of the finest humanitarian projects which International House has engaged in all its years was the formation, with the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce, of an East Pakistan relief committee to raise money and clothing for the distressed people of that country who were victims of a severe cyclone. The committee sent $15,000 worth of clothing and other goods, plus a check of $7,000 to aid the citizens of East Pakistan.

A very worthy and continuing program sponsored by International House is the foreign language instruction it provides at very low cost to New Orleans citizens.

International House offers regular courses in Spanish, French, English, German, and also this year added two classes in Italian. More than 200 students have consistently attended these classes in recent years.

One of the splendid services which International House provides to American businessmen and those of other

nations is through its Thomas F. Cunningham Reference Library. This specialized library on world trade matters was established with the founding of International House, and today its multilingual staff members answers questions of all kinds from all over the world. In effect, the Thomas F. Cunningham Library serves as an international information service on world trade and enjoys a worldwide reputation. Its shelves now hold more than 11,000 volumes; they include trade directories from all over the world; reference books from many, many nations; statistical sources such as publications from the United Nations, reports of central banks of various countries, the publications of foreign governments, particularly from Latin America, and others. The library's periodical files date back 20 years, and tdoay it subscribes to or receives some 450 current periodicals from all parts of the globe. Some of its old periodicals cannot be found in any other library in the New Orleans area, and thus the IH library is a well spring not only for the businessman, but also for the student and the scholar.

The cornerstone of the daily operations of International House is its world trade development department, whose principal job is to bring buyers and sellers together from the four corners of the earth. Over the years the world trade department has established over 350,000 contacts between U.S. businessmen and those of many other countries. The department has comprehensive records of these contacts in its files, and also has extensive files on trade information by country and by commodity. A twice-monthly bulletin relating new opportunities in importing and exporting all kinds of products is published by the department. The work of the world trade department is enhanced through its close contact with American and foreign chambers of commerce, U.S. Government Foreign Service posts, foreign government representatives living in the United States and trade promotional organizations around the world. The department also studies the results of other American city missions to foreign countries for the purpose of trade, travel, and cultural promotion, and participates in many annual international trade conferences.

This year the world trade department published the third edition of International House's "Directory of Importers in the Midcontinent Area of the United States." This directory is of great use to foreign trade commissions; U.S. commercial offices here and abroad; transportation lines and many other groups engaging in foreign trade.

Another vital department of IH is the international relations department, which serves as guide and host to both government officials and private citizens from around the world when they visit New Orleans. This department also directs International House's student exchange program, through which hundreds of students have received scholarships and other forms of financial assistance. International House administers the Cordell Hull Foundation, which is a nonprofit corporation to aid needy and worthy students from Central and South America to obtain a college education in America through special loans. The foreign language program is operated by the international relations department, as is the planning for the various trade and cultural missions taken by IH members each year.

The publicity department of International House, in addition to originating articles and information relating to international affairs, trade, shipping, and the advantages of the port of New Orleans, also publishes Noticias, a weekly Spanish newsletter for Latin American newspapers, and Trade Winds, IH's official log.

International House also has a monthly half-hour television show entitled "VIP" which is telecast over WYES-TV, the educational TV station in New Orleans. IH has helped to make several documentary movies on the Alliance for Progress program too.

With the great emphasis now placed on the vital Alliance for Progress program, which was initiated and pushed by the late President John Kennedy, it is most fitting that International House celebrate its 20th anniversary by hearing from the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Moscoso is to be the principal speaker at the anniversary celebration in New Orleans December 12, and I know he will give a most interesting and important address on his program and its progress. We have seen some positive results from this great program, but we all know that we are late in Latin America, and that the road of obstacles there will be long and difficult. Our country must contend with the unceasing efforts of Communist agents, from Castro's Cuba and elsewhere, to overthrow existing governments. The problems in Latin America are still very acute and are a long way from being solved, and the Alliance for Progress has been launched by our country to give the less fortunate citizens of our hemisphere an opportunity to better their standard of living and to enjoy the fruits of a democratic system of government.

For so many reasons, the success of the Alliance for Progress is vital to the future growth and development of my city of New Orleans, its port, its businesses and industries, and to the whole economy of the Mississippi Valley. As I have pointed out, International House has been a great catalyst in this growth, and the future of IH is intertwined with that of New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley.

On this 20th anniversary of the founding of International House, in which I am proud to have played a small part, I am pleased to salute the new officers of IH and its dedicated staff members, and to congratulate them and wish for them and for International House 20 times 20 more years of increasing success and prosperity.

Economic Outlook for 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following address by James W. Knowles, executive director of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, before the Washington Trade Association Executives, December 11, 1963, in which Mr. Knowles, one of the Nation's leading economists, surveys the economic outlook for 1964, with and without the tax cut now before Congress:

ONLY TOMORROW

For economic advisers, there is only tomorrow. Yesterday already has been buried in history while today we act out the play of life by a script written in yesterday's decisions. Necessarily, therefore, those who, like myself, advise policymakers on economic issues are, by the nature of our job, forced to turn away from the past or the present and constantly face the future.

We can only advise how the decisions that are made now, in combination with past decisions, may influence the future. It is therefore not mere curiosity or an ambition to perform the supernatural that influences economists to try to read beforehand what history will only record after the fact—it is indeed sheer necessity.

It is fortunate, indeed, that for the immediate future we can, to some degree, actually read the future for, in part, it is already written. Many things have been foreclosed by decisions long since made. For example, the budget, with which the President is now struggling, is not one whose total he can fix at will, for his predecessors and the Congress over many years—at least two decades, in fact—have been making decisions that limit present freedom of budget decision. World War II decisions now dictate at least some minimum total for interest on the national debt, veterans benefits, etc.

What we do, therefore, as we attempt to look ahead in economic affairs is to discern ways in which these past and current decisions have limited the range of possibilities for the future.

As one who has at one time taught, I cannot resist the temptation to follow an old format and tell you my conclusions now before I explain to you how I got them. I expect that 1964 will be, in economic terms, a better year than 1963, barring such unpredictable events—at least unpredictable to the economist—as wars or other major catastrophies. I feel safe in making this prediction both because of the many decisions that have already been made and also for a rather simple matter of gambling odds. As a statistician, I am aware of the fact that in the United States the optimist is more apt to be right in such predictions than the pessimist. History shows that the economy rises in more years than it stands still or falls. Therefore, if you want a good batting average as a forecaster, it is wise to be careful about pessimistic predictions.

To understand the likely outlook for 1964, it is necessary to see where we are as we approach the end of 1963 and how we got here. We have been in a rather expansionary year—almost all of the usual measures of economic activity have been showing improvement. Gross national product—the dollar value of

the Nation's output for goods and services—has risen about 6 percent or $30 billion over a year ago; disposable personal income is up 4½ percent; consumer spending is up by $18 billion or 4½ percent; employment has risen 1½ percent or about 1 million jobs. One of the few measures to really stand still this year has been the rate of unemployment which has remained consistently at 5½ percent or more as it has for 6 years. And on this number hangs a tale, so to speak, for it is an indication of something basic that has been happening to the economy. As a nation, we have for some 6 years been experiencing a somewhat moderate rate of expansion in demand—but a persistent one—marked by a very substantial wiping out of cyclical fluctuations. The so-called automatic economic stabilizers, about which economists are wont to speak, have become so powerful that they have indeed produced a remarkably stable upward trend, i.e., a modest rate of growth, but at a high and persistent level of unemployment for labor and capital. The stabilizers have tended to dampen down expansion as well as prevent contractions. It is around this that the great economic debates of recent years have revolved.

I, for one, see no reason why this condition would not continue if action is not taken to alter the way in which these stabilizers operate. The basic way now proposed is in the tax bill at present before the Senate Finance Committee. Ignoring for a moment what effect this bill will have and what its prospects for passage are, we can safely assume that in the absence of action we will experience more of the slow upward drift of the economy, with persistent high unemployment, which may even begin to rise again. This would mean that 1964, in the absence of action, would be marked by rising consumer spending, a modest rise in investment, a further rise in government expenditures—Federal, State, and local, combined—a significant excess of exports over imports, rising employment, and high or rising unemployment. This might mean a gross national product, in total, of something of the size of $20 to $25 billion above the current year, or an increase from $584 billion, roughly, to perhaps something betkeen $605 and $610 billion for the year 1964.

Consideration of the tax bill changes the possible economic outlook significantly. If now the tax bill were defeated we would have to consider the possibility that disappointment effects might have a short run adverse effect on the economy, creating perhaps a modest recession which otherwise might not have occurred. This would be due to the fact that a new uncertainty would be introduced into the situation so far as the businessmen and consumers are concerned. On the other hand, if, sometime early in 1964, a new tax law is passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President, then events could be significantly different. For, in effect, this decision will present a new set of opportunities and new economic forces which have been absent in recent years. This cannot help but have its impact on the decisions of consumers, of business, and of State and local governments—in fact, even on the economic decisions of many in foreign countries.

I have no crystal ball by which to discover what the conclusions of the Senate Finance Committee, the conferees, and the President, will be, but in view of the public commitments that have been made, and because of historical precedence, anyone making plans for 1964 would be wise to take into consideration the great probability, if not near certainty, that some kind of tax legislation will be passed, which will reduce the tax burden on the economy and make some reforms in the tax structure.

The tax bill now under consideration will reduce taxes by roughly $11 billion in two stages—roughly two-thirds effective in calendar 1964, and the other one-third on January 1, 1965, with some continuing effects over subsequent years because of changes in the corporate tax law. Of this total, roughly $9 billion represents reductions in the tax liabilities of individuals, and $2 billon represents the reduction of tax liabilities for corporations.

Now, before I go on I want to warn that this is a very simplified view of the tax measure. Congress doesn't actually legislate a change of so many billions of dollars in taxes; rather it changes either tax rates or the tax base—that is, the definition of taxable income. For this reason, although the bill is called an $11 billion tax measure, if incomes expand as we might reasonably expect, the effect will be a much larger reduction in the theoretical tax liabilities of individuals and corporations than is now estimated since the changed rates and definitions of income will be applied to a new and larger income total than was used in 1963 in estimating the effects of the bill. Roughly, the bill amounts to reduction in revenue by the equivalent of almost 2 percent of the gross national product, so that at early 1963 levels of output and incomes the bill amounts to $11 billion, and by next year it will amount to 2 percent of something over $600 billion, or perhaps $12 billion, or more. In a word, this is a reasonably powerful two-stage booster being applied to the economy.

On the expenditure side of the budget, the trend for several years has been toward a slowdown in the rate of expansion of Government expenditures. On a national income basis rather than the usual administrative budget basis, the total Federal expenditures expanded almost 10 percent between the fourth quarter of 1960 and the fourth quarter of 1961. In the following four quarters to the end of 1962, expansion was only about 7 percent. Over the past four quarters, expansion has been about 4 percent, and I would expect that this rate would be down to perhaps 2½ or 3 percent at the most, because of built-in increases, over the next four quarters. The rate will be progressively declining. In dollar magnitudes, this will probably mean that between now and the end of calendar 1964 the increase in Federal Government expenditures will be only perhaps $2 to $3 billion, most of which would be in response to past commitments, including higher pay for the military and the like.

In addition to this increase in the Federal budget, there would tend to be an increase in State and local spending about in line with increases in revenues, or around $3 to $4 billion per year. Thus, the total of Federal, State, and local government expenditures over the next 12 months seems likely to rise between a minimum of $5 billion and a maximum of $7 billion, with most of the increase at the State and local level.

As far as consumers are concerned, it seems likely that the dominant influence is likely to be the rise in consumer incomes after taxes. In the last year this has brought about a rise in consumer spending of about $18 billion or 4½ percent. For the coming year, this would seem to be a minimum increase and we will have to add to that the influence of the tax bill. This would add not less than $5 to $6 billion. In addition, if the tax bill does what most economists think it will do—stimulate demand, output, and employment—then incomes should rise more rapidly and this will add still further stimulus to consumer spending.

In the business sector, inventory accumulation is likely to follow the pattern of expanding business activity. This year the accumulation has been equivalent to about $4 billion per year, and in 1964 it should be somewhat higher with a substantially higher rate of accumulation toward the end of the year. Residential construction seems likely to show about the same level as in recent quarters as demands rising from expanding incomes and population will be somewhat offset by the rising costs of funds as the residential market has to compete with the rapidly rising demands of business for investment funds.

Recent surveys of business plans for new capital expenditures next year show relatively modest increases—perhaps a billion dollars or so a quarter at most—which would mean a year-to-year increase of between 5 and 8 percent. But these surveys reveal what is the case before the tax bill is law and before business is sure what the tax bill will do to stimulate demand. I would suspect that as soon as the outcome is certain and demand begins to accelerate, new orders for capital equipment and new contracts for industrial and commercial structures will rise sharply, followed later in the year by a rise in actual expenditures for plant and equipment put in place. You may well be aware it takes usually about 6 months for these effects to work themselves out reasonably fully.

The potential here is so large I hesitate to suggest numbers. In the past when capital expenditures have started to expand rapidly, the rates of increase have been on the order of magnitude of from 15 to 30 percent per year. This would suggest, therefore, that toward the end of next year, with the election out of the way, plant and equipment expenditures are likely to be running perhaps as much as one-fourth or one-fifth higher than in the current quarter.

We are left with one area—that of foreign trade. This year exports are exceeding imports by about $4 billion. A rapid expansion in 1964, under the stimulus of a tax bill, would tend to stimulate a rise in imports, particularly of raw and semi-finished commodities, which business needs to support rising levels of production here in this country. Rising demands in foreign countries should expand our exports but it seems altogether likely that the expansion will be moving more rapidly here at home than abroad. It would not, therefore, be unexpected if we find some slight shading or appreciable shrinking of net exports in 1964, until the expansion of dollar revenues by foreigners from our increased imports have their somewhat belated effects in rising foreign purchases of American products. Before leaving this sector, however, I might point out that one of the impacts of expanding demand here will be to raise prospects of profits and hence to encourage capital to remain in the United States. This has been one of the largest single drains on the balance of payments. Therefore, while the balance of payments might get a little worse in coming months as the economy expands rapidly, it will fairly soon begin to improve as the influence of rising activity on capital markets is felt. This may well help to make a substantial contribution toward strengthening the dollar, already the strongest currency in the world.

If we sum up these prospects, we find that whereas without a tax cut total national output, at current prices, might average between $605 and $610 billion for the year 1964, or reach an annual rate of about $620 to $625 billion by the fourth quarter, under the impact of the tax bill the annual rate for the fourth quarter of next year could easily rise to between $635 and $640 billion. Certainly this is not at all an extravagant expansion. In the past, such rapid expansions have progressed at a rate of between 8 and 12 percent per year, which one the current level of GNP would be between $45 and $60 billion, an amount greater than this forecast implies. For the year as a whole, this would

mean averaging much closer to $620 billion or more, rather than $610 billion or less.

I am sure many will ask what effects the more rapid expansion that a tax cut may generate would have on the persistent high unemployment of the last 6 years. Several factors influence the result. First, the labor force at the present tends to increase at between 1 million and 1½ million persons per year because of the growth in the population of those of working age. In a year of rapid expansion, such as we could have next year with a tax cut, expanding employment opportunities usually tend to draw into the labor force a larger proportion of the people of working age.

Furthermore, it is well known to the experts that output per man-hour—one measure of productivity—tends to rise more rapidly when output is rising rapidly than when output rises slowly. Thus a rapid expansion of output next year would create a tendency for output per man-hour to rise more rapidly than usual.

A third factor is the substantial number of people, at the present time over 2 million, who are on part-time work schedules because they cannot find full-time work.

These three factors mean that output could expand rapidly for a while without lowering unemployment substantially. Of course, this could not go on indefinitely, so that sometime next year substantial inroads will begin to be made on unemployment.

I am sure, also, that many will be interested in the possible impact of the tax reduction and the subsequent economic expansion on the Federal budget. I wish there were some simple way of putting in technically correct terms precisely what will happen. Unfortunately there is no such procedure. The administrative budget is created for control purposes, control of the budget by the Congress and by administrative officers. It is not an economic budget such as would be necessary for present purposes. We can, however, say some useful things that will give you an impression of what the outlook is likely to be.

In the first place, it is clear that tax liabilities of individuals and businesses will be reduced by around $7 billion per year or a little more beginning early in calendar 1964, and again by about $4 billion per year beginning January 1965.

Second, it is clear that expenditures, in spite of the best efforts at economy by the administration and the Congress, are likely to be somewhat higher than this year because of the impact of built-in increases in the budget.

It has been officially estimated that for the current fiscal year the administrative budget will show about a $9 billion deficit, with expenditures a little under $98 billion and receipts close to $89 billion. With the tax cut and some modest increases in expenditures, one might at first conclude that the deficit for fiscal 1965 would substantially exceed the $9 billion estimated for fiscal year 1964. This, however, is not the case. In a period of rapid economic expansion starting from a point of substantial unemployment, the Federal Government realizes an increase in revenue equivalent to over one-third of the increase in the gross national output. The rise in output from something under $600 billion in the current quarter to between $635 and $640 billion by the end of next calendar year would increase tax liabilities, at annual rates, of individuals and corporations to the Federal Government by between $10 and $15 billion, or more than the total tax cut. There would be a further substantial gain in the ensuing 12-month period if the expansion continued.

Hence, the pledge to hold down the deficit is not a hopeless one to keep. It is, of course, difficult to estimate precisely when increased liabilities would be paid and turn up in Federal receipts. But it is clear that, from an economic standpoint, the deficit in the Federal budget would be short lived and would disappear very rapidly on a liability basis. Collections can lag behind liabilities for a while but we must expect sometime in the next fiscal year to see the budget approach a balance or a surplus on a liability basis. It would not be surprising if it were so on a cash basis. This is admittedly an optimistic view of the outcome but I repeat that the optimists have been more often right than the pessimists. In this case they are highly likely to be right about the direction of budget changes.

I have stated in other years my conviction that the best way to reduce the Federal budget deficit is to reduce the tendency of the Federal, State, and local tax structures to put a brake on the rate of private economic activity. I am as convinced now as I have been in the past that there should be no lack of opportunity for business, labor, and agriculture if public and private policies are framed to take advantage of the opportunities that lie ahead and to remove the impediments to their exploitation in desirable ways.

We must not assume, however, that once the hurdle of enacting tax legislation in the next few months has been surmounted, the Congress, the President, and the country as a whole can sit back free of economic problems for a long time. I recall that the need to consider tax reduction in the early 1960's was foreseen by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee as early as 1954. There will be many problems facing us—adjusting to technological change, the problems arising from urbanization of our country, the problems due to lack of training, skill, and mobility of labor, and the tax problem will be back with us in two forms. A growing population requires more of the services traditionally performed in this country by State and local governments and in years ahead problems of financing these expenditures may indeed become a real economic issue. Furthermore, in a growing economy like ours, the Federal Government's tax receipts tend to rise more rapidly than the value of total national output. This is due to something you are all aware of—that you pay a higher marginal rate of tax on an increase in your income than the average rate on your total income. Thus as incomes grow, the ratio of taxes to incomes grows unless occasionally a tax reduction bill is put through, as in 1954, or in the bill now before the Congress. I, therefore, would not be at all surprised if after a few years the same tax debate arises all over again—what to do about Federal taxes: Should they be reduced?

Extremism in Our Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Howard White, the very able editor of the Burlington, N.C., Daily Times-News:

EXTREMISM IN OUR LAND

Extremism.

It's a word that has come more into prominence since early Friday afternoon when President John F. Kennedy was struck down by an assassin's bullet and died an hour later.

The period has caused deep concern primarily upon the death of the President, but it also has cast a fear within other public officials, from the national to the local levels, who must make decisions and take positions on matters of debate and which carry emotions that can stir the fullest of reactions.

Extremism never has been without its threat to the individual and his cause, but it can rise and fall in its levels of danger and concern as issues, personalities and events vary in prominence.

Most people don't permit themselves to become so involved that they accept a cause and champion it to any end, regardless of who is affected, hurt, or cut down in the path.

But the extremist element of the Nation has been given much opportunity to increase in its intensity in recent years.

Primary, of course, is the civil rights issue where we have found violence, hatred, and disregard for rights both on the part of Negro and whites. There are those who view their side as the only side, and this brings resentment. There also are those who cannot tolerate any side other than their own, and this leads to extremism.

There is the Cuban issue, which has prompted its share of division. This cannot be more convincing than the arrest in Dallas of a pro-Castro leader as the "prime suspect" in the President's slaying.

There are those who have objected to the American stand on communism. They disregarded laws established by this country which limited visits to Cuba. They didn't like the American law, so they took it upon themselves to break it.

It is remembered that Puerto Ricans were involved in extremist behavior a few years ago as they began shooting in the House of Representatives. President Truman, at Blair House, also was involved in an assassination plot that was foiled, as was President Roosevelt before him.

Regardless of how we feel about the issues before us, this is a time for all Americans to enter into some deep and basic thought. We must have our leaders, and decisions and positions must be made and taken. Those in office cannot always be shielded physically from the public. Yet the President's assassination shows the danger to which leaders subject themselves when they seek and accept public responsibility.

Extremism—both in thought and action—might be our worst enemy today. It is within our own country, felt by our own people, and so often is exhibited as heroic expression.

To conquer this enemy might be the saving stroke of the Nation itself. It rests with every individual who is a part of this Nation and who must share, in his or her own actions, a concern in that which lead to the pulling of the triggers and the tragedy of the deaths in Dallas.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my fourth rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from August 13 through October 21, 1963.

Roll-call No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
125	Aug. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (37 Members absent).
*126	do	6143	Yea	287	113	32	On passage of higher education aid bill (1 Member answered present).
127	Aug. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin (35 Members absent).
128	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Utt, Republican, of California (47 Members absent).
129	Aug. 21		do				Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (32 Members absent).
130	Aug. 22		do				Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican, of Indiana (36 Members absent).
131	Aug. 23		do				Quorum call by Mr. O'Brien, Democrat, of New York (26 Members absent).
*132	do	7885	Nay	222	188	23	Foreign assistance authorization bill, motion to recommit for cuts.
*133	do	7885	Yea	224	186	23	On passage of foreign assistance authorization bill (1 Member answered present).
134	Aug. 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Michel, Republican, of Illinois (50 Members absent).
135	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, of California (54 Members absent).
136	Aug. 28		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (34 Members absent; R.B.C. at civil rights march with congressional delegation).
137	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Snyder, Republican, of Kentucky (93 Members absent; R.B.C. at civil rights march with congressional delegation).
138	do	7500	Nay	176	200	57	To recommit conference report on NASA appropriations authorization bill.
139	do	7500	Yea	249	125	60	On passage of NASA conference report.
140	Sept. 10		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, of Wisconsin (90 Members absent; R.B.C. at National Conference of Business Committee for Tax Reduction).
141	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (116 Members absent; R.B.C. at tax conference).
142	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (90 Members absent).
143	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Thomson, Republican, of Wisconsin (90 Members absent; R.B.C. in office working on backlog accumulated during Labor Day recess).
144	do	S. 1576	Yea	335	18	80	An aid program to help combat mental illness and retardation.
145	Sept. 11		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (98 Members absent).
146	do	504	Yea	336	0	97	Creation of a select House committee to examine scope and effectiveness of federally sponsored research programs.
147	Sept. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bell, Republican, of California (89 Members absent).
148	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri (92 Members absent).
149	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois (85 Members absent; R.B.C. in conference re his bill on U.S. World Film Festival).
150	Sept. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington (47 Members absent).
151	do	527	Yea	320	66	46	To permit consideration of the tax reduction bill.
152	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (49 Members absent).
153	Sept. 25		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, of Wisconsin (25 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to personal matters).
154	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Derounian, Republican, of New York (29 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to personal matters).
155	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio (19 Members absent).
*156	do	8363	Nay	199	226	7	Motion to recommit tax reduction bill.
*157	do	8363	Yea	271	155	6	On passage of tax reduction bill.
158	Sept. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (102 Members absent).
159	Oct. 1		do				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (99 Members absent).
160	do	5555	Not voting	333	5	94	On passage of conference report on military pay bill (R.B.C. receiving innoculations for trip to South Vietnam at time of vote. Would have voted yea).
161	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi (115 Members absent).
162	do	539	Yea	314	12	106	To permit consideration of H.R. 7044, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.
163–175	Oct. 2–Oct. 21		Absent–do				R.B.C. on factfinding mission to southeast Asia with subcommittee of House Foreign Affairs Committee. During this period there were 6 quorum calls and 7 rollcalls, all on measures of negligible controversy.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 126

The 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act was the third aid-to-education bill passed by the House this year, ample evidence of broad congressional consensus on the need for Federal help in most sections of the Nation. Passage of these bills also punctures the political myth that Republicans oppose Federal aid because it means Federal "control." H.R. 6143 stipulates that no Federal department, agency, or employee is permitted to exercise direction, supervision or control over personnel, curriculum, instructions or administration of any educational institution under the act.

The bill, a "bricks and mortar" measure, authorizes a 3-year, $1.2 billion program of grants and loans to public and private nonprofit colleges and universities to help build classrooms, libraries and laboratories. To be eligible for aid, an institution must show that new construction is urgently needed to meet enrollment demands, that construction will be done as economically as possible, and that Federal funds will be limited to one-third of development costs. Matching grants will be made to the States for expanding undergraduate facilities, with at least 22 percent of the funds reserved for junior colleges and technical institutes. Provisions are also made to assist graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 132 AND 133

In the aftermath of the House vote on the foreign aid authorization bill, Congress—and the Nation at large—is scanning the political horizon to see if this ill-advised action indicates more than a temporary breakdown of bipartisan foreign policy. The conservative Los Angeles Times showed its concern in an editorial stating that the Kennedy administration is "understandably nettled" by the House's indiscriminate butchering of the bill—slashing the authorization to $3.5 billion, more than $1 billion under the President's initial request, and $600 million below the Foreign Affairs Committee recommendation. Noting actions which the President has taken to improve our foreign assistance program, the Times deplored the House's "meat-ax cut," and called on Congress to "go along" with the President's "rockbottom" figure of $4 billion.

Gen. Lucius Clay, Republican Chairman of a Committee charged with studying and recommending improvements in our assistance program, has frequently warned that excessive cutbacks in foreign aid could seriously jeopardize U.S. security. "Immediate forced reductions could require rapid deterioration in military forces," said General Clay, "with consequent political disturbances in several of the countries now receiving military aid from the United States. In point of fact, we might well reduce the resources of our own defense budget rather than to discontinue or too sharply reduce the support which makes possible the contribution of the foreign military forces to the security of the free world."

With foreign aid placed in its proper role as an important arm of free world security, the House action on August 23—a day that has come to be known as "Black Friday"—deserves careful examination. The Republican motion to recommit the bill for a cut from $4.1 billion to $3.5 billion was unusual in the history of foreign aid fights. Recommittal motions have seldom been made on foreign aid authorization bills, and they have never involved instructions to cut funds. In fact, the House has rarely made cuts in the foreign aid authorization bill reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I sit.

It is particularly disturbing that the GOP assault on foreign aid was aimed at the Alliance for Progress and the military assistance program. Republican strategy did not permit Members to vote on the Alliance as a separate measure. The $150 million slash in Alliance funds was lumped into the overall cut. This prompted one Arizona Congressman—who believes in cutting with a knife instead of an ax—to declare in a floor speech: "I had no opportunity to support a reduction in foreign aid and also

cast a separate vote concerning the Alliance for Progress. Had I been able to do so, I would have opposed the Alliance for Progress authorization cut. This program is built on a concept of self-help. It is through this means that we will best be able to fight communism in the Western Hemisphere. It is, in my opinion, a way of building the citadel of democracy within the members of the Organization of American States. It is the one avenue to stop Fidel Castro's regime and communism in our part of the world." This view is shared by many Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats—who warn that to cripple our efforts now, when the program is beginning to show results, is not in our best interests.

The $225 million cut in military assistance funds will prevent the carrying out of military plans laid out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to aid U.S. allies. To be sure, the cost of freedom is not cheap—but there are intelligent ways to maximize the benefits of our dollars in the fight against communism. Military assistance to our allies is one of them. It helps keep the Communist bloc encircled by 2.5 million fighting men in such nations as South Vietnam, Korea, Turkey, and Pakistan. It costs 10 times as much to keep a U.S. soldier overseas—not to mention the potential loss of American lives—as it does to keep his allied counterpart in the field with adequate equipment. In my judgment, and in the judgment of our Nation's top military and civilian advisors, the military assistance program helps provide the United States and the free world with maximum strength at the lowest possible cost to American taxpayers.

I do not believe that we need sacrifice security for economy. I believe that with sound policy decisions and efficient administrative procedures, this Nation can have both security and economy. And because our country needs both, I am not prepared to use either as stakes in a political crap game which, according to present indicators, may float its way right up to the 1964 elections. My attitude is apparently not shared by the Republican leadership in the House. Despite telephone appeals by former President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, Christian Herter, Minority Leader Halleck would not call off his partisan attack. The total of 156 GOP members that he whipped into line was believed to exceed the number of Republicans who actually felt strongly for deep cuts in foreign aid. It is against this background that I stand with President Kennedy in calling the action of the House GOP leadership "shortsighted, irresponsible, and dangerously partisan."

ROLLCALL NOS. 156 AND 157

President Kennedy's $11.1 billion tax reduction bill passed the House after a Republican attempt to recommit the measure was defeated. Only one GOP Member voted against recommittal, while 173 voted for. On final passage, 48 Republicans joined 223 Democrats in securing the largest tax cut in the Nation's history. The GOP drive to tie the tax cut to reduced Government spending fell short when Southern Democrats, who have a reputation for being fiscal conservatives, rejected the artificial GOP thesis that by putting a Presidential ceiling on spending the United States would earn a tax reduction. Democrats properly pointed out that Congress is basically responsible for reducing expenditures because it is the branch of government that appropriates the money—the legislative branch spends only what it wants to spend, not what the executive branch asks it to spend. If the GOP motion had passed, I doubt whether any Republicans would have voted next year to cut spending in their congressional districts. The move was obviously Republican strategy to go on record for economy while not having to vote for elimination of pet projects. As one Florida conservative pointed out, the GOP limited-spending proposal was "only an image, and when you reach for the substance, it simply is not there." The wisdom of this observation was reflected by the majority of citizens in the 25th District who wrote urging that I support the President's tax cut proposal.

Enthusiasm for the bill was high not only among individual voters, but among the Nation's business community as well. The 2,400 members of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, for example, advocated a tax cut and reduced Government spending but, displaying sound knowledge of the traditional roles of the executive and legislative branches, did not endorse making cuts and spending dependent on each other. Members of the committee include Henry Ford III, chairman of the Ford Motor Co.; Roger Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp.; Frederick Kappel, chairman of American Telephone & Telegraph; and David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce said the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee "deserves the support of every businessman when it reaches the House floor." Subsequent GOP action punctured another political myth: "Republicans are 100 percent pro-business, while Democrats are anti."

The aim of the program is to create jobs by lifting the repressive weight of tax rates imposed in wartime, when the demand for consumer goods must necessarily be restrained. Today, however, our economy needs to grow more rapidly and produce employment opportunities. H.R. 8363 is designed to stimulate demand and incentives to invest, to narrow the gap that now exists between what we produce and what we could produce, and to help reach full employment. Simply put, it gives consumers more money to spend. And because they have more to spend, they demand more goods and services. As consumer demand increases, business hires more workers to produce more good and unemployment decreases. As the unemployed return to the status of income-earners, they now have money to spend, the demand for goods is further increased, more workers are hired, unemployment is again cut, and so forth.

Under the bill, virtually every American taxpayer—whether high or low income, single or married—will pay less in taxes if and when the proposal is passed by the Senate and put into effect. The largest share of the individual tax cut will go to those with incomes of $10,000 and less—the people who need it most, who account for nearly 85 percent of all taxable returns, and who are most likely to put a large part of their tax savings into the spending stream.

On the average, families with incomes of $3,000 and less will have their taxes cut by nearly 40 percent. Those with incomes in the $3,000 to $5,000 range will get cuts of more than 26 percent. Families with incomes in the $5,000 to $10,000 range will get tax reductions averaging about 20 percent. Those with incomes of more than $10,000 will have their taxes cut by about 15 percent.

Faith in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that construction has begun on a new hardboard plant for the Coastal Timber, Land & Pulp Corp., at Blountstown, Fla. This dynamic new industry is going to mean a new era of progress for this section of Florida. I was sincerely sorry that I could not personally attend groundbreaking ceremonies for this fine new plant, as congressional duties required me to be in Washington that day.

However, I would like to include herewith the remarks of Mr. Harold W. Williams, Deputy Area Redevelopment Administrator, as he spoke at these groundbreaking ceremonies on December 5, 1963.

The remarks follow:

FAITH IN THE FUTURE

(By Harold W. Williams)

It is a pleasure for me to be here as a representative of the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson to bring you the good wishes of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and the Area Redevelopment Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., on this important occasion. All of us in the Department of Commerce and in the Area Redevelopment Administration share with you your pride and pleasure in the prospect of the new multimillion-dollar hardboard plant to be erected on this site, thereby creating new jobs and new economic opportunities for the people of this area.

As we celebrate this groundbreaking, it is important for all of us to keep in mind what it represents:

First of all, it is an act of faith. This project would never have been possible were it not for the faith which you in the Blountstown area and surrounding counties have in yourselves, in your area, in your State, and in your country. You believe that the future holds great things in prospect for this area, and we believe that you are right.

Your faith in this project and in yourselves is matched by the faith that we in the Federal Government have in you and in your area. We think that this is a good project,

that this area is a good area, and that you are a good people worth investing in.

I would hope that you young people in the audience would keep your faith in this area, too. I hope that you will not lightly think of leaving the area, but that you will finish your high school education, and, if at all possible, go on to a college education. Then come back and contribute your faith, your skills, and your devotion to your home area.

We, on our part, working with your parents, will do our best to show our faith by helping to make this the kind of a place which will be attractive to you, and which will provide you with adequate economic opportunities.

A second point which we should all keep in mind is that what we are talking about today is a program which is conservative, in the finest sense, because we are conserving, we are making the fullest use of resources which would otherwise go to waste.

This particular project really represents what the whole area redevelopment program is all about. This hardboard plant is based upon conserving and putting to use an economic resource which has hitherto been going to waste. The raw material which will go into the product of this plant consists of cull logs, swamp hardwoods, scrub oak. Would you not agree with me that it is conservative to turn this waste material into an economic asset?

But this is not the only kind of waste we can see in this area. What about the waste of human resources? What about the skills and talents of the people of this area which are going unused for lack of economic opportunity? Is it not an act of conservatism to stop the waste of human talent, as well?

In a very real sense, there are "cull humans," people who have been cast aside into the economic swamps, "scrub workers," looked upon as weeds for whom there is no economic use. This is what area redevelopment is all about. This is the purpose of the area redevelopment program—to conserve human resources by providing jobs and opportunities for human talents which would otherwise go to waste.

We in the Area Redevelopment Administration are doing this in county after county throughout the country, and this is why we think that this program merits the support of every true conservative in the country.

But we do not do this alone. There is a third important point which must be kept in mind about area redevelopment. It is a partnership program, a program of cooperation and working together among many different segments of our society and among many different levels of our economy. See how this project involves a series of partnerships.

There is first of all a partnership among counties. This is not just a Calhoun County project, but it involved the cooperation and support of people in Liberty County, Jackson County, and Washington County.

Moreover, it is important to keep in mind that this project will benefit not only the Blountstown area, but also all these other counties, and it will be of great benefit to Tallahassee, too. As the trading and wholesale center of this part of Florida, the merchants and businessmen of Tallahassee will certainly gain a great deal not only from the realization of this project, but also from the revitalization of the economy of this area. I know and you know that as the people of this area earn more money they will spend more in Tallahassee, and I am sure that there are many people there who support you in your efforts.

But this is more than a partnership of counties. It is also a partnership of private enterprise and public enterprise. This project was initiated and started by private enterprise, by local citizens seeking to make an honest profit by legitimate enterprise. It is being brought to completion only by help from the Federal Government which is investing more than $2 million in it, and from private enterprise such as the Allis-Chalmers Co., which I understand is investing $1 million. This is a private and public partnership.

There is a partnership at various levels of our economy. First, you have the local development corporation and the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce under the really effective leadership of Mr. M. Brooks Hays and Mr. Fletcher Smith. They provide an essential spark of leadership and accomplishment without which this project could never have been brought to this point. Next, there is the Florida State Development Commission under the excellent leadership of Wendall Jarrard and contributing the indispensable services of Tuure A. Pasto to help put the project in shape. And finally there is the Federal Government. The Area Redevelopment Administration was able to provide the essential financing which was otherwise not available. This represents the kind of working together which makes me proud of our country, of our democracy, and of the small part we in the Area Redevelopment Administration are playing in helping to keep it strong and great.

There is another level of partnership which we must always remember. In the Federal Government, there is the executive branch and there is the legislative branch, and this program could not have come into being without support from the Congress, which passed the Area Redevelopment Act and which appropriated the funds to carry on its work. Nor can this great program continue to help other parts of the country and this area to move on with this important work unless it also continues to get the support of the Congress.

This, then, is what this ceremony is about today. It is an act of faith, faith in the future of this beautiful land and faith in the ability of the good people of this land to make an effective economic contribution to our society and to receive commensurate repayment. It is a tribute to our conservatism, to our decision to conserve and not to waste valuable human and natural resources. And is a demonstration of cooperation and partnerships, partnerships between counties in this area, between the public and private sectors of our society, partnerships of local, State, and Federal bodies, and between the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government.

This is how you can explain what the Federal area redevelopment program is all about to people who ask you about it. Keep in mind that it is an act of faith, a tribute to conservatism, and a demonstration of partnerships.

The area redevelopment program is based upon the private, free enterprise, profitmaking system. It is designed to create jobs by helping and encouraging businessmen to make a legitimate profit. That is how this project started. Some businessmen saw an opportunity to make an honest profit, but they couldn't realize that opportunity without some help. That help was not available, except from the Federal area redevelopment program. Without that help the opportunity would be lost. Tell me, what is wrong with building a program on support for the profitmaking, free enterprise system?

Moreover, the program is based upon local initiative. Nothing happens unless it happens here in the local areas first. We didn't come down here from Washington and force this fine project on you. We didn't come here begging you to accept the Federal money. You took the initiative. You demonstrated that you wanted it. You showed by your own ability to raise locally the magnificent sum of $180,000 that you were behind this project. That shows real local initiative. This is the kind of spirit that made this country grow. The area redevelopment program released that spirit and nourished that initiative. Tell me, what is wrong with building, strengthening, and nourishing local initiative throughout the country?

Keep in mind, too, that no money has been given away in this project. Not a penny of it is a gift. Every cent of Federal money is in a secured loan, repayable with interest. Moreover, this Federal investment will come back to the U.S. Treasury many times over, not only in the repayment of the loan, but also in increased tax collections on the profits of those who own this business and on the wages of those who will work here. Can anyone truly object to repayable Federal investments in projects which will bring back good dividends to the Federal Treasury?

All these facts are reasons why I am proud to be here, proud to be a representative of area redevelopment, proud to have a part in this great program. I am for the area redevelopment program not only because I happen to be employed by the Area Redevelopment Administration, but because I have faith in America, faith in you, faith in this country. I am for the program because I want to conserve human and natural resources and not waste our heritage. I am for the program because I believe in partnership and cooperation as the way to build this country, and I am for the country because I believe in the private, free enterprise profitmaking system, in strengthening local initiative, and in the soundness of public investments which will bring back dividends to the Treasury.

I know that many of you share this belief with me. I am confident that this will be a successful project, and that it will be the forerunner of many more successful projects. This is the beginning. This area is on the road to recovery. This area has a great future. You can build it. And we in the Area Redevelopment Administration will look forward with eagerness to working with you in that great effort. It is an honor to be here today and I wish you all the best of success and accomplishments.

President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to read the eulogy by ex-Gov. David L. Lawrence delivered at the Allegheny County Bar Association memorial services in honor of President John F. Kennedy. If words could only fill the void—and, of course, they cannot—these remarks would certainly be adequate. The wisdom which Governor Lawrence imparts is one gained from long experience and close friendship with many Presidents. He rightly observes that all the renaming of streets, airports, and schools will not absolve us from working for the kind of America that John F. Kennedy worked for, fought for, died for. This is our legacy, this is our duty.

I commend the Governor's remarks for the perusal of my colleagues:

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(Remarks of former Gov. David L. Lawrence)

Words still seem weak and weightless as a means of expressing the heavy burdens of

loss and sadness—and, yes, of shame—which bear down upon us all.

Death, itself, we have been forced to expect.

But none of us could foresee it touching the man whose youth and enthusiasm, and hard courage had symbolized the world's new generation and humanity's brightening hopes.

Yet touch it did, and take it did, and the taking choked mankind's conscience and darkened the human spirit.

And only when it struck—brutally, maliciously, hatefully—did we realize the dimensions of the depth of our love for this man and the height of the hopes he inspired in us.

And only after the terrible deed was done did many recognize the lethal quality of poisonous hate which has infested so much of America's bloodstream and infected its mind and heart and spirit.

That hate has been cruelly apparent for some time and no one tried harder or more forcefully or more diligently to quiet its torment and to exercise its source.

A week before his visit to Texas, the President was in Florida, in his continuous effort to spur this Nation to the greatness he saw for it. And there he borrowed upon a dialog between Scrooge and Marley in Dicken's "A Christmas Carol" with this assessment of human responsibility:

"Mankind is our business," he said, "and if we work in harmony, if we understand the problems of each other and the responsibility that each of us bears, then surely the business of mankind will prosper, and your children and mine will move ahead in a secure world in which there is opportunity for all."

He had devoted all of the brilliance of his impressive intellect to the service of mankind. The sharp, crisp Presidental phrases caused a nation's ideals to soar, while the generosity of his compassion caused many of us to search our inward thoughts and summon up our strength and our devotion to commitments of service.

Yet, as the scriptures tell us, "he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes" (I John ii:115).

And the valiant persuasion of brilliance and compassion, the clarity of reason and comprehension could not light up that darkness. The tragic irony is that the leader who appealed for reason, who called up the Nation's compassion, who devoted his intellect and his warmth to the highest ideals of national and human purpose—the tragedy struck at this man of peace and reason, of honor and strong courage.

That it occurred is our mantle of shame.

And that shame will weigh upon us long after the shock of tragedy passes.

It is a shame which comes, as Dean Moor said list Monday, from the knowledge that "this crime is possible in a world loaded with greed, hatred, and bigotry in religion, politics, race, and creed. In that atmosphere," Dean Moor reminded the conscience of us all, "anything that is vicious and reprehensible can and will happen until we have a change of heart."

Now that John Kennedy is gone, there are proposed memorials of every kind and nature—bridges and city squares, sports stadia and cultural centers, schools and hospitals. Each is appropriate.

But the only fitting memorial to his memory, to his life, and his work, will be the future course of this Nation, in removing hate and evil from our hearts and our lives, in achieving that secure world and the equality of opportunity he strived for, in restoring respect and human dignity as a way of life, and building a nation of high conscience and determined conviction—better, wiser, more united, more reasonable and more reasoned.

In short, the only fitting memorial to John F. Kennedy is the kind of America he worked for, fought for, died for.

He laid down the challenge in his inaugural in words that will ring in history and echo in every ear.

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

His answer has been indelibly inscribed for the ages.

Now, we must respond and by that response will future generations measure us and judge us.

Indeed, by that response will we measure and judge ourselves.

May God give us the wisdom, the courage, and the determination to see to it that the darkness is lifted, and the Nation's soul is cleansed, through the good deeds that are now ours to do.

Dead End Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in Argentina and Brazil have indicated the tragic failure of the Alliance for Progress. Now the complications in Bolivia further dramatize the point.

The Chicago Tribune of yesterday, December 11, discusses the situation and concludes with a most practical suggestion. I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

DEAD END DIPLOMACY

It looks as if the costly and unrealistic Alliance for Progress is leading us up another dead-end street, this time in Bolivia. Communist-led tin miners there have seized four Americans, all of them employed by the U.S. Government.

Anti-American actions are common in Bolivia, but the circumstances of this one are particularly ironic. An Alliance team consisting of a foreign aid representative, a Peace Corps volunteer, and two men from the U.S. Information Agency, showed up in the mountain mining town of Catavi with a check for $15,000 for the construction of a school for miners' children.

The miners evidently accepted the check and listened to the accompanying commercial, which no doubt mentioned the great achievements to be expected under the Alliance for Progress. The Americans were then informed that they would be staying on in Catavi, however unwillingly, as hostages for two labor leaders who had been arrested by the Bolivian Government.

Bolivia will be remembered as the country which was hailed in Washington, barely 6 weeks ago, as an outstanding example of the success of the Alliance for Progress. It is a country to which we have given about $250 million since President Paz Estenssoro seized power in 1952 in a revolution which had the backing of the Communists.

Yet conditions in Bolivia have gone from bad to worse since then. The Vice President under Paz is Juan Lechin, the Communist leader of the mine unions. The Communist program of mine nationalization which Paz was quick to carry out has left the mines a cesspool of waste and inefficiency under the operation of the government, which has acted chiefly as agent for the Communist unions. The disruption of tin production has wrecked the economy of the country and inflation has made its money almost worthless.

There is no ready solution to the mess in which we now find ourselves as a result of trying to maintain a government which, in turn, must rely on the Communists for its existence and can therefore never carry out its periodic promises of cooperation with the United States.

If President Paz should ask us for military help to put down the miners' riots, and if we should oblige, it might very well result in the murder of the American prisoners.

It is a little late to suggest the futility of trying to buy the friendship of illiterate Indians who are lead by acknowledged agents of Fidel Castro, or to point out that by forcing the nationalization of the mines, the Communists created the chaotic conditions which they now exploit for their own advantage, or to remind President Paz that anybody who commits himself to the Communists may as well give up his independence.

But it isn't too late to stop throwing good money after bad and to recognize Bolivia as an example of futility—rather than success—in our dealings with Latin America.

Report of Peace Corps Volunteer on President Kennedy's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article from the Paterson Evening News of December 6, 1963, was sent to me by my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Gordon Canfield.

It well describes the reaction of Peace Corps volunteers in Peru, as well as of the Peruvian people at the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy.

Mary Ellen Patterson, who is referred to in the article, is presently with the Peace Corps in Peru. She is the daughter of Mrs. Dorothy Patterson, who was formerly an aid to Congressman Gordon Canfield on Capitol Hill. Idealistic and deeply patriotic Peace Corps volunteers such as Mary Ellen Patterson make those of us who supported the Peace Corps most grateful.

The article follows:

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER REPORTS PERUVIAN SHOCK AT KENNEDY'S DEATH

Weeping Peace Corps volunteers in Latin America were comforted by men and women in the villages they serve when word of President Kennedy's assassination reached their lonely outposts.

One such volunteer, Mary Ellen Patterson of 181 East 33d Street, in a letter home has told of the dark day and the spirit of kindness with which their Latin American friends reached out to them in their sorrow.

Miss Patterson lives in Urubamba, (Quechua translation is Valley of Snakes) a tiny community 2 hours by jeep along a windy, steep-cliffed road in the Department of Cuzco, Peru.

She wrote: "The news hit hard here in South America. We did not find out until

5:30 p.m. and at first we thought the man was joking. Then another and another told us. Still unbelieving we went to the Normal School to see if Annie Achetelli, another PCV (Peace Corps volunteer) had heard anything. Upon arrival we found everyone huddled around a shortwave radio. We knew then it was no joke.

"SHED TEARS

"We joined Annie and the Peruvians, mourning with and for us. The school flag was lowered to half mast. We stayed and listened to the Voice of America and everything we could find. Our Peruvian friends were wonderful. They brought dinner to us and almost all were in tears.

"We were to have dinner that night with two PCV's in Yucan, and we started off very late. While we were walking, a truck stopped and asked if we wanted a lift to Urubamba. We told the driver we were going to Yucan and he said 'no importa,' turned his truck around and took us right to the door. If only all the world could always perform as our Peruvian friends did that day what a wonderful place it could be.

"My Peace Corps home for 2 years, Cuzco, was the capital of the Inca Empire, embracing in its most flourishing days territory which today constitutes all of Peru and the major part of Bolivia, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Colombia. It was in other words, the Rome of South America.

"Peace Corps volunteers cannot speak for such a large area nor do we consider ourselves experts in foreign aid, but as one lives in the hearts, homes, and towns of the recipients one gathers bits of knowledge.

"LIKE FREE AID

"The people without question like the free food for peace and the tractors. They like the new roads and the free schools built for their children. But Indians sometimes look at us with disdain and question, 'Why do you send your soldiers here to train our soldiers in the art of killing campesinos?' (Campesinos in general are Indians.)

"Yes, they like our profusion when it is in their favor.

"Today, many are worried it will stop.

"What isn't free means work, or do without.

"Some are grateful to the United States. Others are not. These see through the eyes of envy and not of friendship.

"Kennedy's death has brought fears and questions to many.

" 'When will you be called back?'

" 'Nixon will take over.'

" 'Your Government, it will collapse?'

" 'I cried all night. Your President, the good man is dead. The Communists did it. They will start a war.'

"These are some of the comments we hear.

"SOFT AMERICANS

"A young, gay-hearted teacher had this to say, 'You Americans are so forgiving that if there should be a war between you and Khrushchev and his side lost, you would be the first to send emergency relief to help put them back on their feet to start them all over again. Soft Americans.'

"One poltroon who would not come face to face with us shouted from a barroom door, 'Viva Fidel.' Our immediate reaction was to turn around and reciprocate. Instead we walked on in silence past the familiar adobe houses and the hungry little faces until we reached our own.'

"As we sat on the front step in the hot sun, the day's conversations welded into a picture.

"PERUVIANS MOURN

"The normal school insisted we have a quiet dinner with them. They gave us a shortwave radio for as long as we wanted it. All schools canceled classes Saturday, and Monday was declared a day of national mourning. By Tuesday, 'Carretas,' a Peruvian magazine, had a front cover tribute to Kennedy with a picture on the inside of his son, saluting as his father's casket went by.

"Many of our friends sent letters of sympathy. Some tried to write in English, like this very sincere man, a principal and teacher in one of our mountain schools. He sent this note:

" 'I express my profound sorrow for the assassination of Mr. Kennedy. He was a good man and friend of the Peru and all America.' Henry Aguirre Pacheco, teacher of School Maras.

"This is one example of how many Peruvians felt the day of November 22, 1963.

"We are sad. I believe it has affected us more here because everyone comes to pay their respects. The hotel gave us a mourning dinner and another today. People are crying. Most everyone is worried. Most believe the end of the world is near."

For Continued Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a hero of World War II who gave his eyes in the service of our country. He used this means to make his wishes known "to those who have the most important duty of helping to guide our country through its legislature."

I submit his remarks for your consideration.

As you know, I am blind. However, you perhaps do not know that I lost my sight at Iowa Jima during World War II; and I therefore feel that I have invested a most valuable part of my life in my country, and that I must make my wishes known to those who have the most important duty of helping to guide our country through its legislature.

I was among the many on duty in the Pacific who felt that our service was made worthwhile by the expression of the Atlantic Charter of the freedoms that would result to the world because of our taking active part in the war.

I am also among the many who have watched with dismay the freedoms of the Atlantic Charter being lost or diminished, not only in other parts of the world, but to a large extent even here in our own country.

The decade and a half, between 1945 and 1960 seemed to me to be a time of complete disillusionment. As I watched the prestige of the United States fall to its lowest level in history, while at the same time, the United Nations proved itself to be inadequate to meet fully crisis after crisis, I often wondered where the return was on my investment.

Then, in 1960, President Kennedy went into office, and during the last few years I was gratified to see real leadership emerge. At last the United States assumed a firm stand in international politics, and even took the offensive in needed areas such as southeast Asia. Despite the setback of Cuba, a situation inherited by President Kennedy, the United States stopped the Communist world cold by abandoning the philosophy of containment and defense.

For the first time in almost 100 years, we had leadership that showed no fear of tackling intolerance, both religious and racial, in our own country. We had an administration that was not afraid to order both labor and management to conform to a policy that was for the interest of the public at large instead of either business or labor. We not only had an administration that realized that automation was the answer to greater production needed by this Nation to keep our strong position in the world; but, also an administration that by tax legislation, attempted to encourage expansion of industry leading to an even greater increase in production and to the furnishing of more jobs to those replaced by machines. In short, for the first time in a decade and a half we had determined leadership instead of defensive retreat and even more retreat.

I know that you have supported the policies of the Kennedy administration; and while I have no reason to believe that President Johnson will not also continue the trend set by the previous administration, let me strongly urge you, as my Representative, to continue and even strengthen your stand in support of the policies of President Kennedy.

With this letter I send my kindest personal regards; but let me conclude by again urging you to take a strong aggressive stand behind those policies put into effect by President Kennedy. As Chief Justice Warren said, "The world has been made a better place because President Kennedy lived in it." Therefore, I pray that we as a nation will not slip back into another period of apathy like that from which we have just emerged; and it is up to you and your fellow Members of our National Legislature to see to it that we do not do so.

Sincerely,

MONROE L. FOX,
Attorney at Law.

CHAMA, N. MEX.

Trade With Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on foreign aid has authorized the President to continue the most-favored-nation status to Yugoslavia. This was urged by Ambassador Kennan and many others who were apprehensive about the effect of withdrawal of the most-favored-nation status from Yugoslavia. Their wisdom is supported by a recent letter received in our office from Mr. and Mrs. Louis Cole, of Minneapolis, who recently traveled to Yugoslavia. Their letter expresses the conclusion that to change in any way our trade or aid relations with Yugoslavia would be a serious mistake. The letter follows:

My husband and I have recently returned from Yugoslavia. While there, we found the people warm, amiable, and anxious for the friendship of Americans on an individual as well as a national basis. They seemed ambitious, industrious, and most grateful for the aid given them by our country. It is our feeling that to interrupt the flow of this aid, or to change in any way the things we are doing for the Yugoslavs in trade or aid would be a serious mistake.

We were told by many of the people that they greatly admired President Kennedy and wanted to emulate the freedom in the United States. Contrariwise they disliked Khrushchev and the government in Russia. We

would hope Congress will do all it can do to implement this feeling of friendship of the Yugoslavs toward us, so that we can keep this Nation of freedom-loving peoples among those who are our best allies and supporters.

Letter From a Principal to His Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD a letter written to the entire student body of Mainland Junior High School of Daytona Beach, Fla., by my friend John F. May, the principal.

Mr. May periodically communicates with the students with such letters. His latest letter went to the students on Monday, November 25, and I commend it to the Congress as a well-written and thoughtful commentary:

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

DEAR STUDENTS OF MAINLAND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: I am writing this letter to each of you, hoping that you will read it and keep it for many years to always remind you of what a privilege it is to be an American and the responsibilities that go with it.

You have lived the past 3 days in what will probably go down in history as the most disgraceful days of our great country.

We were thinking toward Thursday and another Thanksgiving Day, which started in 1621 by the Pilgrim Gov. William Bradford, when news came that our President had been shot. This should cause us to be ever more thankful that we live in a nation where great men give their lives for their country.

I would like to point out to you that since our first President, George Washington, was elected on April 30, 1789, we have had four of our Presidents assassinated, and all four of the assassins had many things in common. Most of all they carried hate and bigotry in their hearts.

The first President assassinated was Abraham Lincoln by John Wilkes Booth in Washington, D.C. John Wilkes Booth shot and killed President Lincoln because of his stand against the South during the Civil War.

The second President assassinated was James Abram Garfield by Charles Julius Giuteau in Washington, D.C., by a disappointed officeseeker who had wanted to be appointed U.S. Consul to Paris.

The third President assassinated was William McKinley in Buffalo, N.Y., by Leon Czolgosz, a factory worker who was an anarchist. An anarchist is a person who wants to overthrow an established government and live without laws.

The fourth and last President assassinated was John Fitzgerald Kennedy in Dallas, Tex. The alleged assassin was Lee Harvey Oswald, a professed Communist who also held a grudge against our form of government and had been given an undesirable discharge from the Marine Corps.

In a study of all four assassins we find that there was hate and bigotry in their lives and they had a resentment toward our democratic form of government.

John Wilkes Booth resented President Lincoln because he tried to preserve the Union and had to take a stand against the South. He was an actor in bad health and without a regular job. This hate for the President and our Government led him to murder.

Charles Julius Guiteau shot President Garfield because he did not get the position he wanted so his hate drove him to commit murder.

Leon Czolgosz shot President McKinley because he did not respect our form of Government and by shooting our President he felt he could overcome much of the hate in his heart.

Through Lee Oswald I hope you students will learn a lesson that will remain with you throughout life. The teachers and I are continuously trying to get you to be better citizens and to prepare yourself for life. Lee Oswald is an example of a student that had a distaste for school. He quit school at an early age and then blamed our country for his not being able to make a living. He, himself, was not accepted in our society because he would not let people help him.

We try so hard to teach you to be good students, to accept your neighbors, to live with each other and to accept your position in life. There is too much hate in our everyday life where there should be more love for our fellow man.

I hope and pray that each of you will not let President Kennedy's life be lost in vain. I sincerely believe that had Lee Oswald had the proper training in school and church that we would not be grieving the loss of our President.

Always remember the words of President John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address when he said, "Don't ask what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country."

A fellow American,

JOHN T. MAY.

Address of Hon. Leonard Farbstein of New York, at Luncheon Meeting of American Israel Public Affairs Committee December 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include at this point an address made by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, at a luncheon meeting of the American Israel Public Affairs Committe, on December 9.

I wholeheartedly agree with Congressman FARBSTEIN's amendment which provides that no assistance shall be provided under the foreign aid bill, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against our own country or any country which receives U.S. aid.

I commend his remarks to the Members of this body:

I ask you to utter a silent prayer for our departed President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy; for in his passing we lost a good friend, and Israel lost a good friend.

Israel lost a good friend because John Kennedy was the first President of the United States to sell Israel important arms, necessary for her survival. Whenever requests were made of the previous administration for the right to purchase arms from this Government, Israel was generally informed that inasmuch as France was her traditional supplier, we did not think it wise to do so. Whether or not this was the only reason, I leave to your determination. I do not think so. This drastic change was made in the face of what must have been the displeasure and mortification of Israel's enemies.

At the direction of President Kennedy, Hawk missiles were sold to Israel, for defensive purposes. These defensive weapons are the latest word in destroying invading Arab aircraft. Let me say that Israel has been seeking defensive weapons—she seeks solely to protect her borders and people.

Shortly before his death, I wrote to the State Department complaining of the presence of Nazi scientists in Egypt, hired by Nasser for the purpose of building missiles, submarines, and other weapons of terribly destructive power. I requested that we make representations to the German Government to recall its scientists, and to the United Arab Republic to desist from spending its needed moneys for these devilish purposes. I received a reply from that office, signed by the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, advising that the State Department could not interfere in the internal affairs of another country; and that if the German scientists were withdrawn or removed, Russian scientists would take their place. I thereupon wrote directly to the President of my dismay, to which I received a reply by letter from the White House; and 3 days later, the late President publicly announced at a press conference in Washington, "We support the security of both Israel and her neighbors." "We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East and we also seek to limit the spread of communism in the Near East which would, of course, destroy the independence of the people."

So you can understand what I mean when I say we lost a good friend, and Israel lost a good friend, when John Fitzgerald Kennedy passed from the scene. While defending the interests of this country, he did not hesitate to break precedent in the cause of righteousness, of decency, and of fairness.

Now it can be truthfully said that "God reigns and the Government at Washington goes on." And we are the living and must take up the cudgels in behalf of right, decency, and fair treatment for the survivors of the concentration camps and the oppressed of our people who seek a haven of refuge in Israel. And if this haven of refuge is not to be destroyed, and a holocaust is not again to be visited upon our people in Israel, those of us who are able must exert every effort in their behalf. We, who have the good fortune to live in the greatest, most powerful Nation on earth, dare not spare ourselves if Israel is to survive.

I greet all of you who have labored together in the cause of Jewish survival. We must not forget that for centuries, our people have been driven across the face of the earth and, paraphrasing what the late Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver said, some of them are still in its torture chambers in certain areas of the world.

With a new President, Lyndon Baines Johnson, what does the future hold for Israel?

Will the policies of the State Department, insofar as they apply to the Near East, remain the same? Will they change—and if they do, in what respect?

What is our policy in the Near East? I believe our policy in the Near East is based upon keeping peace in the area, keeping the Soviets out, and upon protecting our national interests in the area—which, in this instance, I believe, means oil reserves. These considerations, despite the morals and emotions, the rights and wrongs, in my opinion, will guide our Government in its policy in the Near East.

And the question arises, What will be the effect of my amendment to the foreign aid bill? The amendment says that no assistance shall be provided, under the foreign

aid bill, to any country, which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against the United States or any country receiving assistance until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. In other words, no aid is to be given in the event of war or preparation for war against Yemen, Israel, or any other country to which we are giving assistance. Time alone will tell if this amendment will be given force, and to what degree.

The question really is: Can our foreign policy, as I have stated it, be sustained with my amendment in the law? Can the guidelines of our foreign policy that I spoke of previously, be adhered to if my amendment is faithfully observed? Let's analyze it and see.

There is no doubt that Nasser is presently in violation of that law in more than one instance. First, his troops are in Yemen, where he is obviously committing aggression; and his airplanes have bombed Saudi Arabia, in whose security we have a vital interest. His soldiers have appeared in Algeria in the dispute between Morocco and Algeria.

These are matters of record insofar as aggression in concerned.

It is also a matter of record that he has hired Nazi scientists to build submarines, missiles, etc., and has publicly declared that he intends to drive Israel into the sea. This is also a matter of public record.

If my amendment is to be enforced, in keeping with the intent of Congress, aid should immediately be cut off from Nasser.

That is clear from the legislative history—from the debate in both Houses of the Congress. So the people of the United States, as represented by the Congress, have spoken.

Will this happen? Will the administration feel that it is advisable, in keeping with our present foreign policy, to follow the letter of this amendment and risk the results that might flow therefrom?

Frankly, I doubt it; though I will urge this course. You must remember that there must first be a finding by the President. The President must determine that the nation receiving our aid is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts. That, he may hesitate to do. And frankly, I do not think that we should be surprised, if he does not readily make that finding. Cutting off all aid to Egypt would create political as well as economic instability among most of the countries of the Near East, which I expect, the administration fears.

Although I do not believe the administration will abide by the letter of my amendment; nevertheless, I do not believe that the voice of the Congress, as reflected by the amendment, will be disregarded. I do not think that the State Department which, if it dared, would like to do nothing, can afford to ignore the voice of the Congress, which holds the purse strings.

Some have argued, that the amendment makes it very difficult for the President. But I would like to suggest that this amendment could strengthen the hand of the Executive and the State Department in their dealings not only with Nasser but with all the other countries, not alone in the Near East but throughout the world—at least those who are the beneficiaries of our aid.

Because of my amendment, and judging by the comments which have appeared in the Egyptian press, there is no doubt that Nasser is aware of it—the Egyptian dictator must now be somewhat chastened, since he now can be effectively challenged insofar as his policy toward Israel is concerned.

I maintain that my amendment will put a weapon in the hands of this Government for I firmly believe that Egypt cannot afford to do without our aid, for we feed practically half of her people by the sale of foodstuffs for her local currency, which incidentally is of no use to us. And as a result of the receipt of these grains from us, Nasser is enabled to sell his cotton to the Soviet Union in exchange for implements of war.

Nasser, in my opinion, will prove amenable to persuasion. He must. He has no choice. He cannot expect that his people will be fed by the Russians. They haven't enough food for themselves in the first place, and are considerably extended in the area already.

This amendment provides the persuader, if this administration desire to use it; and I can see no reason why it should not be used. It can be used to good advantage to cut down Nasser's ability to engage in adventures away from home to the detriment not alone of Israel, but to all the countries of the Near East who, at one time or another, were subjected to his machinations.

We understand the President's dislike to loss of "executive flexibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs." Nevertheless, Congress appropriates the money and is responsible to the people. It does have some authority to direct how this money should be spent. No one questions that the conduct of foreign policy is the prerogative of the executive; yet the Congress cannot be considered impotent. It is a partner in every aspect of our complex international relations.

We must also face the fact, and I do not think that I am telling you anything new when I say, that there are some in our State Department who believe that Nasser represents the wave of the future, and these individuals seek so to direct our foreign policy. Beginning with the American Ambassador to Egypt who was the former President of the American University in Cairo and wrote the introduction to Nasser's book on revolution, up through the various echelons in the State Department; we must wrestle with the problem of policy directed by individuals so mentally oriented.

Nasser, of course, encourages this.

In connection with our policy of keeping the Soviets out, as I have mentioned earlier, we give aid to Nasser in order to offset the massive aid given him by the Soviet Union. And so you must understand the resistance on the part of those in the State Department, and perhaps others, to the discontinuance of aid.

Now whether or not my amendment is endorsed tomorrow, or next week, or next month, I would like to stress the significance of that amendment from the standpoint of Israel's security and survival.

My colleagues and I in the House did not support this amendment merely because we wanted to save a few million dollars in foreign aid. Indeed, most of the people who supported it were people who believe in foreign aid. We sponsored this amendment because we want the Department of State to understand that the people of our country do not understand a policy which fails to distinguish between the aggressor and the victim. Most Congressmen feel very strongly on this point.

Most of us are old enough to remember Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous Chicago speech in 1937 when he called for quarantining the aggressor. Many of us believe that if the civilized community had quarantined the aggressor at that time we might have averted war.

What we are now saying to the administration, firmly and emphatically, is that we do not want our country to be neutral where there is the threat of another war. We want the influence of our country to be exerted as vigorously as possible on the side of peace. That is what the amendment means. And when you look at the vote in Congress, it is very gratifying to see that it was unanimous in the House. And in the Senate, where there was a debate, 82 Senators of the 100 Members of the Senate are recorded as being in favor.

Thus we have served notice that what we want is to be certain that our Government stands firmly in opposition to renewed war and in support of Israel's security.

My amendment serves notice, not only on the Department of State, but on Egypt and every other Arab country that threatens Israel, that the American people are deeply and vitally concerned about the peace of the Near East.

We are the voice of American opinion. That is why I am glad to be here today talking to this audience. I know from the years I have spent in Washington of the work you have done to alert the American people, to alert Congress to sound the alarm, and to summon our own Government to a recognition of the danger and its responsibility to avert another tragedy in the Near East.

Our work did not end when Congress voted my amendment. Our work goes on. We must make certain that this amendment is implemented. We must call for a reconsideration of policies which do not serve the peace. We want to insure that all of the resources of our country, diplomatic, as well as military, are mobilized in the service of an Arab-Israel peace.

This then, I feel, is the picture which presently confronts this administration. And what can we expect from the new President and his administration? Here, perforce, we must be guided by the past.

In 1957, when President Eisenhower threatened Israel with punitive sanctions unless she withdrew from the Sinai Peninsula, Mr. Johnson was then the majority leader of the U.S. Senate. He told President Eisenhower that the Senate would not approve economic sanctions against Israel. He called for a just peace and deplored the attempted coercion of Israel.

As a Senator, President Johnson fought to obtain for Israel a fair share of economic aid, noting that Israel was forced to divert its own resources for defensive arms against the Russian arms that were flowing into Egypt.

He also strongly supported the Douglas-Keating amendment to the foreign aid bill directed against the Arab blockade; which amendment, incidentally, was introduced by me and was passed in the House. This amendment called for "freedom of the seas."

When Senator FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, sought to limit this amendment, Senator Johnson took the unusual and courageous step of leading this fight against one of his committee chairmen. As majority leader, he would normally have supported the committee chairman, but because he believed in the principle of "freedom of the seas," he moved to table the Fulbright motion and was successful by a 45-to-39 vote.

I am confident that President Johnson will, at the very least, continue the basic policies of the Kennedy administration. Better than that, I firmly believe that aid to Nasser will be cut down, gradually, and substantially, if he disregards the mandate of Congress and continues his troublemaking.

As for myself, I assure you that I shall continue to do all that a representative of the people can do to make certain that the voice of the Congress of the United States is not lost to would-be aggressors.

Happy To Be Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, too often native-born U.S. citi-

zens do not stop to think about the blessings of their birth in a free land. We sometimes look to a newly naturalized citizen for inspiration and a moment of thanksgiving.

In a letter to the editor of the Palm Beach Post on December 7, 1963, two new citizens set forth in very simple and direct terms what this means to them, and what it means to all of us. I ask that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD:

HAPPY TO BE CITIZENS

EDITOR: Some days ago we got American citizenship, after a touching ceremony of pledging allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

We want to thank Mrs. Elizabeth H. Schafer of the Naturalization Service and Judge R. O. Morrow of the circuit court for the beautiful ceremony; as well as to express our appreciation for the very hearty speeches of Mr. Doyle Rogers, Mr. Robert Foster, and Mr. Horner C. Fisher.

We do thank our dear colleagues and friends for the congratulations and a warm welcome by admitting us to their great family. We feel happy and proud to become citizens of this God-blessed country. We lost our native homeland many years ago, when it was killed and robbed by the same force, which wants, now, to destroy this, our new one. Since then, we were homeless and stateless, and we always dreamed of living in this free and beautiful country.

We pity those millions of unfortunates who have to stay for good in the dark waters of despair and will never reach this God-blessed sunny harbor; the harbor, which is named the United States of America.

WLADIMIR and LUBA IWANOV.

LAKE WORTH.

Runaway Film Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am vitally concerned in the telling blows that have been struck at the motion picture industry in recent years through the phenomena that has commonly come to be known as runaway film production, a term I am sure all of my colleagues are thoroughly acquainted with. I have just received a most illuminating letter from Mr. A. T. Dennison, who is in the business representative for the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada. At this time I would like to have the contents of this communication entered in the RECORD.

In perusing the factual information contained herein I am sure that each and every American citizen can understand what a telling blow the so-called runaway film production is having on a big segment of the American economy. It is because of these devastating blows economically, culturally, and spiritually to an industry that has done so much in the past to show the rest of the world what a privilege it is to live in our free democratic society, that I ask each of my colleagues to give careful consideration to the legislation that has been introduced to curtail runaway film production.

The letter I received from Mr. Dennison is as follows:

Hon. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURKHALTER: As of 1946, the motion picture industry was the second largest industry in California. From 1946 to the present, its position has continually decreased, due to runaway film production. If this tendency continues, there is a strong possibility that California could lose the motion picture industry.

Can California afford to lose this major industry? Congressman KING recently stated that over a billion dollars has been diverted abroad for foreign film production over the last 10 years. The impact of this loss of revenue not only affects State and Federal revenues, but also many allied industries and the labor force they employ. Runaway film production has seriously curtailed the purchasing power of those concerned. The production of motion pitcures requires many manufactured goods and services. (Steel, oil, lumber, textiles, chemicals, shipping, etc.) The lack of this purchasing power ($1 billion) has resulted in increased unemployment and has increased the burden of the taxpayer.

The group most seriously affected by runaway films is the technical craftsmen of the motion picture industry. Unemployment within the craft unions has increased to as high as 50 percent of the motion picture labor force as compared with the National unemployment average of 5 percent. Accordingly, many thousands of jobs have been eliminated from the motion picture's and allied industry's taxpayers and have been given to foreign workers. Of the foreign unions involved, many are Communist controlled or Communist influenced; i.e., Italy—CGIL—the Communist Trade Union Federation of Italy.

The tax structure of the United States further encourages the practice of filming pictures abroad. Under our present law, there are many advantages to both corporations and individuals to invest abroad.

Corporations operating overseas and reinvesting abroad have their taxes deferred, since the earnings are not taxable until returned to the United States. Individuals also enjoy exemptions from taxes and many expenses not deductible in the United States are allowed abroad.

More important is the fact that every foreign country who has the facilities to engage in motion picture production offer the following inducements to producers to film abroad: large subsidies, various tax concessions and cheap labor. In Great Britain, the Government's subsidy known as the Eady Pool, offers to U.S. producers who qualify a subsidy of approximately 30 to 40 percent of the United Kingdom's box office receipts from the film. In Italy, there is a subsidy of about 16 percent of the gross of the film in Italy over a 5-year period before taxes, if the film is produced in Italy, has an Italian version and the majority of the personnel are Italian. The countries of France, Spain, Mexico, and many others also have similar subsidies available to U.S. producers, and they all protect their investment in motion pictures tariff and quota restrictions.

There now exists the problem of films being produced in Communist controlled countries. U.S. films are now being made in the satellite countries of Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. The inducements offered to runaway film producers are free use of studio facilities (sound stages, sets, etc.), free labor technicians, etc. Yugoslavia has been the recipient of American foreign aid amounting to more than a billion dollars. At the same time, Yugoslavia is reported to be offering up to 90 percent financing to American producers to make pictures in that country. In return for these favors, American producers must relinquish to the Communist State story approval, whereby anything anti-communistic may be delted and anything pro-communistic may be inserted. I will include a list of a few pictures produced in Iron Curtain countries.

The motion picture medium is acknowledged as an important disseminator of ideas, and has tremendous impact as a propaganda technique. Joseph Stalin once stated, "The cinema is the greatest means of mass agitation. The task is to take it into our hands. If I could control the medium of the American motion picture, I would need nothing else in order to convert the entire world to communism." From the above, can we not be sure that films produced in Communist controlled or Communist influenced countries seriously impair the security of the United States?

The American Legion recognized this danger, and resolved in September 1963 at Miami, Fla., that a congressional investigation of Communist infiltration and subversion within the motion picture industry should be held.

Currently, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is looking into various phases of Communist activities, and he has requested the committee to authorize Federal funds to carry out an investigation of the infiltration of communism into the motion picture industry, both here and abroad.

At present there are a number of bills awaiting congressional committee approval; one of the most important if Congressman KING's labeling bill, H.R. 7670, and Congressman EVERETT G. BURKHALTER's companion bill, H.R. 7672, which would require motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof to be labeled as to their country or origin. This bill is currently on the agenda of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, whose chairman is OREN HARRIS.

In order to continue our fight to preserve the American motion picture industry, and to preserve California's economy, we are in desperate need of help.

Anything you and your colleagues can do will be sincerely appreciated. I hope we can rely upon your support.

Very truly yours,

A. T. DENNISON,
Business Representative,
IATSE, Local 728.

PICTURES PRODUCED IN YUGOSLAVIA AND IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

"The Achilles Affair," Universal (Rel); stars Dirke Bogarde and Stuart Whitman; Yugoslavia.

"Bridge on the Drina," Garrick Films (U.S. company); Yugoslavia.

"The Cavern," Martin Melcher; stars Brain Aherne and John Saxon; Yugoslavia.

"Dog Eat Dog," Michael Arthur Productions; stars Cameron Mitchell and Jayne Mansfield; Yugoslavia.

"The Dubious Patriots," United Artists; Mickey Rooney; Yugoslavia.

"Journey to a Far Meridian," Lester Cowan (Production); may star Gregory Peck; Yugoslavia.

"King of the Gypsies," Joe Pasternak (Production); stars Tony Curtis, Simone Signoret, and Yvette Mimieux; Budapest, Hungary.

"Lancelot and Guinevere," Universal (Rel); stars Cornel Wilde and Jean Wallace; Yugoslavia.

"Long Ships," Columbia; stars Sydney Poitier and Richard Widmark; Yugoslavia.

"Millie Goes to Budapest" (Cinerama); Grunwald (Production); stars Buddy Hac-

kett; 90 percent Polish, and 10 percent English.

"My Name is Ivan," Mosfilm; Poland.

"The Visit," 20th Century-Fox; stars Ingrid Bergman and Anthony Quinn; Yugoslavia.

CARTOONS

"Astro-Mutts," ABC Films; Zagreb (Yugoslavia) Animation Studios.

"Hound for Hire," Zagreb (Yugoslavia) Animation Studios.

"Happy Lion," Rembrandt Films for M.G.M.; Prague, Czechoslovakia (state-owned studios).

"Frowning Prince," Rembrandt Films for M.G.M.; Prague, Czechoslovakia (state-owned studios).

"Popeye," Rembrandt Films for M.G.M.; Prague, Czechoslovakia (state-owned studios).

"Tom and Jerry," Rembrandt Films for M.G.M.; Prague, Czechoslovakia (state-owned studios).

President Lyndon B. Johnson's First Message to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with my remarks the following article written by my friend, Mr. Walter Zachariasiewicz, with reference to the message of President Lyndon B. Johnson to the joint session of Congress on November 27, 1963:

As Lyndon B. Johnson, for the first time as President of the United States, stood before both Houses of Congress, his audience was in fact the whole Nation and mankind. He stood as a President confident of the tasks ahead of him. The American people and the peoples of the world derived from his first address a new sense of confidence and a feeling of needed reassurance that there would be continuity of the high purpose of our national and international policies. His message impressively restated the American dream and American idealism. Those worried about the impact of change, found in his speech an accurate interpretation and redefinition of the basic principles, ideas, and desires of the American people. This was an inspiring message of courage and renewed hope. It contained elements of humane emotion so natural for a nation in deep mourning.

The speed with which our new President stepped immediately onto the world stage as leader of the West with a firm grasp of issues confronting the world today was truly remarkable. It is a blessing that in these trying moments when the whole Nation is still under the impact of the Dallas tragedy the new captain at our Nation's helm is a man who is the best prepared for the Presidency that this country has had in a generation.

Lyndon B. Johnson has served for the last 32 years in Washington. As Senate majority leader he was the author of his own unsurpassed record. He sat with the late President on every single important decision and so was in a position to share Kennedy's vision of America's future. His close relationship with the late President amounted to a real partnership on all the more important policies and was deepened by the affection that he had for John Kennedy.

There wasn't one unmeaningful word in his historic message to the Nation. Every phrase had deep significance. He spoke with the dignity of the highest office and at the same time with a sincerity that came from the heart and with the simplicity of one who, like John Fitzgerald Kennedy, belongs to, and speaks for all his people.

Appealing to the best in America, he urged us to substitute hate with genuine brotherhood and ignorance with deep understanding. He told us that what will hold the country together is not bigotry or narrow nationalism, but true love of freedom and humanity.

In his moving Thanksgiving address to the Nation, President Johnson amplified this when he said: "For God made all of us and not just some of us in his image."

The President's message was preceded by numerous meetings with Governors, leaders of Congress, labor and civil rights chieftains, all of whom the President asked for good will and advice.

Before the last election many people were reserved about, or even resisted him because they viewed his political philosophy from the narrow viewpoint of his Texas background. His last 3 years have convinced these people that he was criticized unjustly and his most recent address proved once again that the new President deeply believes in the true values of a liberal and progressive America.

Continuation of the "fight against poverty and misery, ignorance and disease in other lands and in our own" and the assurance that his administration will serve all Americans, not one sector or group, demonstrated the new President's mature statesmanship.

There was warmth and a deep sense of humility in his voice when he began his message with these words: "All I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today." Later he stated that an assassin's bullet thrust upon him "the awesome burden of the Presidency," adding that he could not bear the burden alone, that he needs the help of Congress and of all Americans. Or when he told the Governors: "Circumstances over which I had no control brought me into this position that I occupy tonight."

There was America's pride and firmness and there was dramatic force in the President's voice when he spoke about West Berlin and South Vietnam and about our honorable commitments to our friends and allies. The new President is, as his predecessor was, committed to continuous attempts by a strong West to seek through negotiations with the East "to lower world tensions without lowering our guard."

Most encouraging was the new President's first official expression on our strength—it inspired confidence in his administration at the very start. The President said emphatically: "We have shown that we can also be a formidable foe to those who reject the path of peace and who seek to impose upon us or our allies the yoke of tyranny."

The forcefulness of the President's words is matched with his own courage. It was only natural for him to say almost casually to his secret service aids who tried to prevail upon him that he should rather ride than walk to the cathedral to attend the solemn requiem for the late President: "I'd rather give my life than be afraid to give it."

The President's unshaken belief in the right of every man and every nation to enjoy the full freedom was stressed again in his Thanksgiving address to the Nation when he pledged to work unceasingly for a "new day when justice is more universal, when freedom is more strong in every home in the whole world."

In his first historic address to the Nation, Lyndon B. Johnson has shown himself as a man of decision. Although his own style and personal touch are visible, the message, nevertheless, echoed the legacy and spirit of the late John F. Kennedy. "Let us begin," Kennedy said in his inaugural address. "Let us continue," Johnson stated last Wednesday.

"His message," as Mayor Robert F. Wagner said, "is the program not of a party but of the entire American people." It appeals to our sense of mission. It demands deeds instead of words. It commands us to search ourselves. United behind our new President, we should heed his appeal and take upon ourselves the unfinished tasks and move America forward.

Milwaukee County Labor Council Urges Union Members To Plan Constructive Use of Leisure Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include a speech by Harold C. Schrubbe, director of community services activities of the Milwaukee County Labor Council, on November 30, 1963, during a council-sponsored conference of Milwaukee union members on the constructive use of leisure time; and the report of a workshop meeting, moderated by Mike Shokatz, chairman of the community services committee of Local No. 1173, USA, and recorded by Mary Shokatz, a member of the Milwaukee County Labor Council Community Services Committee:

THE CHALLENGE OF LEISURE TIME

(By Harold C. Schrubbe)

It is obvious that in our lifetime we will see shorter workdays and shorter workweeks. There are many theories about the number of hours that man will work to produce what is needed to keep humans alive, healthy, and happy and, too, produce an economic system without poverty. It may seem ironic to discuss leisure time at a time when the labor movement is showing grave concern about unemployment created by automation.

Automation will revolutionize our society and bring new problems but we believe that America is clever enough and farsighted enough to provide for full employment. We have the tools, the know-how, but seem to lack the faith and imagination.

A shorter workweek, of course, means that American workers; and, in fact, all American citizens will have more free time or leisure time, call it what you may. I presume that many of you in this audience can see no problem with the use of your free time. Some of you, too, think that you could use more free time to do some of the things that you never find time to do. But think for a moment about the future, with more leisure hours than working hours; or you might talk to some people, that are unemployed or retired, ask them what they do in their free hours. Unless a situation creates frustration, anxiety, or boredom, there seems to be no problem.

Assembly line or pushbutton work in modern times is no great joy in itself; there is no diversity; there is no craftmanship; there is no opportunity for achievement. There is no chance for excellence; there is only the timeclock everyday and a paycheck every week.

There is no cultural, educational, psychological, or physiological satisfaction on the modern assembly line, pushbutton job. In other words, workers today are faced with dull jobs which are routine and provide no challenge. There was a time, however, when a man fulfilled himself in the job he did. There are many men who still derive a sense of fulfillment from their occupations. But

job alone no longer means what it once did. Man no longer creates with his skill and hands, a pair of gloves, or a table or an intricate part for a machine; he as become the human cog in the whirling boredom and frustration create waste of human energies and potential. Can we then find in the use of free time, off the job, some self-satisfying and growth-producing substitute for this boredom of the assembly line and pushbutton work. Well, that is what we are here for—the AFL-CIO believes, not only, in full employment but also, in the full life. How do we define, then the "full life." I suppose it could mean satisfaction with job, economic status, home family, social intercourse, and a host of other personal values. Certainly, satisfaction is one of the ingredients. But, let me suggest, the "full life" as we refer to it has greater dimension. Yes—it develops deep down inside of us and gives purpose, beauty, and dignity to our being.

In other words, what I am saying is, that it is not enough to care about material things alone, or, it is not enough to exercise only our muscles. Life is not complete without the stimulation of mental and intellectual potential.

I am convinced that a society or civilization concerned only with increased income and greater security does not enrich our culture, unless material advancement is combined sensibly with the arts, eduction, recreation and community service that society can and will end in decadence.

It is said that many of our ideas about leisure come from the Greeks. Aristotle in his "Politica" said, we work in order to have leisure. The Greek word for leisure meant "school"—the Greek concept was that leisure was freedom to learn; to enjoy sports and to cultivate the arts. This concept of leisure, as the noblest end of man, may come to modern man as a result of technological development—as a natural evolution of man. At one time leisure was considered only for the rich but this is not true today.

Because we are a work-oriented society, there has been and will continue to be, great debate about shortening the work week and planning for the constructive use of leisure time but we, in the labor movement, insist on widening human horizons to give meaning to existence. There are those, of course, who have no faith in the future of America, or for that matter, in themselves—they sow the seeds of skepticism—they cannot break with traditional custom—yes, they are the "old fogies," that stand in the way of change—unfortunately, their way of thinking is prevalent in all facets of our community life.

But, be that as it may—change will come—one can feel a new and exciting period to come with freedom for creative use of free time to develop man's individual self. Man is a thinking being and grows wise through knowledge. This knowledge applied will give him greater control over his own future which will enrich human cultures.

Mass man will undoubtedly be the greatest benefactor of this new, fresh, and young life, which will provide strong stimulus for development of the undiscovered self and permit one to walk with the healing beauties of nature. There's certainly nothing wrong or perverted if one can be calmed or joyful at the sight of a sunset or a flower. Should not a worker, too, be impressed or inspired by looking at a Picasso, or a Rembrandt painting? Cannot a worker's ears enjoy a symphony or invoke emotion by listening to an opera? Cannot a worker feel and wish for community betterment?

Other speakers will elaborate on some of these matters but let me, for a moment or two, develop the last question—community service. It seems to me that man's commitment is to his community and fellow man, and that this commitment can nourish his mental and emotional needs and strengthen his life and the life of the community.

Let me suggest that many of the problems in our communities, and for that matter, in the world, need understanding and involvement of all of us. Some areas of concern needing our attention are:

More care and programs for the young and old who need our help so badly.

How about political action and political freedom to build democratic principles?

Then, active participation and support in the civil rights movement—what better use of free time to assure democracy?

We need too, help in fund raising if private agencies are to carry on programs to meet needs coupled with active participation, as volunteers, on agency boards and committees and yes, participation in union affairs, too. Our unions can be made stronger and more effective if more members participate in its meetings and programs.

Why not give attention to neighborhood improvement and reap many benefits and satisfactions?

There is a crying need for citizens participation in legislative matters, to let legislators know how citizens feel about proposed legislation which will strengthen democracy.

These are only a few suggestions for good use of free time and can provide personal fulfillment. Here, then, is a challenge to our institutions, both public and private to help us make the most of our leisure time in community service. This will mean a radical departure from present practices which exclude many segments of the community from active participation. It will mean that agencies and our cultural institutions, too, had better take a long and positive look at the new source of volunteer raw material. For the lifeblood of our community agencies and activities depend more and more on the volunteer. A great change is taking place in the culture of American communities and it seems to me that it is bigotry and arrogance to insist that the best must belong to the few and those few being those with high status and money in our communities.

Leo Perlis, in the national conference, discussing the same subject that we are today, suggested the formation in every community of a united arts fund. I would suggest that we have too many funds, already, and that those cultural institutions and our united fund here in Milwaukee and other areas, begin thinking and planning now to include the cultural activities in their fundraising effort, for the purpose of financing professional theater, ballet, concerts, and art exhibits at prices within the reach of all the citizens of our community for if we agree and if we believe sincerely that man needs cultural stimulation and needs to grow to keep healthy, happy, and productive, then too, we must begin to think now of his needs for the future.

I believe that every human being can have dignity and a meaningful life even in the midst of the maddening machines. My friends, the challenge is yours.

RECORDER'S REPORT ON WORKSHOP DISCUSSION

It was unanimously agreed that the problem of leisure time was the concern of the labor movement, that there is a need now and there will be a greater need in preparing our people for constructive and fruitful uses of their leisure time.

The workshop made a number of suggestions as to how labor might express their concerns, these suggestions included: education of union members in the constructive use of free time, programs for retirees, articles to be carried in various labor publications, preretirement programs, and greater cooperation with other community groups.

The question, "Can an overemphasis on play lead to a public neglect of the arts and civic responsibilities?" Led to a stimulating discussion by the group. It was generally agreed that it very easily could. There was some feeling expressed that workers' free time was his own, to pursue as he saw fit, but at the same time, the group indicated that there had to be some direction from the leadership of the labor movement. It was suggested that unions survey their members to determine what they want and need in the way of free time programs. It was also suggested that union halls be made available for leisure time programs. Suggested too, was the possibility of negotiating into our labor agreements, a 2-hour period, where labor and management could offer an educational program on the arts and skills.

Comment was also made that "who wants all this art and culture now, I am already set in my ways."

There were wide variations in categorizing "play" and "leisure time" under free time.

It was agreed that recreation, community service, and personal development were constructive uses of free time. The following examples were given under their respective headings:

Recreation: golf, fishing, swimming, hunting, baseball, handball, bowling, camping, hiking, horseshoes, boating, hobbies, movies, square dancing, card playing, knitting, sewing, yogi, and skating.

Community service: serving on agency boards, labor unions, United Fund drives, Red Cross, PTA, church, veteran and ethnic groups, political parties, and community volunteer work.

Personal development: participate in adult educational courses, personal reading, observation, and reflection, participation in church activities, attend forums and lectures, exposure to arts, music, and literature, great books discussion groups, labor union activities.

On the question "What can the union and the community do to encourage leisure time activities?" it was agreed that labor has a responsibility to its members and the community. The following suggestions were made as labor's responsibility:

1. Unions make their halls available for free time projects.
2. Unions should expose members to the finer arts and culture.
3. Organize auxiliaries to help.
4. Offer the younger generation scholarships.
5. Set up senior citizens projects.
6. Set up preretirement training programs.
7. Establish labor-management committees.
8. Exert pressure on school boards and other governmental groups.

Listed as community responsibilities were:

1. Creation of an art council.
2. Have mobile units, similar to the bookmobile, provide arts, music, and drama directly to the door of the shops.
3. Educate governmental agencies and units to the wants and needs of people which are generally unmet now.
4. Better community planning.
5. Active labor participation in all community affairs.

It was agreed, that in order to be effective, there has to be a real and sincere coordination of all union activities through the central labor body and its community services committee.

A parting question was raised by the moderator. "What is your opinion of the time all of you spent in today's institute, in the light of what you have heard, learned, and discussed throughout the day? Was it recreation? Was it community service? Was it personal development?" The answer was practically unanimous, it was personal development.

Does this indicate we have accomplished our goal and maybe made a slight inroad to awakening our people to the fact that free time, leisure time or whatever you wish to call it—is labor concern?

Reflections on the Assassination of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, the American people continue to make sad reflections on the tragic assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In recognition of these reflections I submit to the RECORD two appropriate articles, one a statement by State Senator Bill Boardman, of Calais, Maine, and another a front-page extract from the November 28 issue of the Penobscot Times:

PRESIDENT OF ALL THE PEOPLE—A NATION VOICES ITS SORROW, AND ITS HOPE

Several days have passed, and now it must be accepted that it was not a hideous dream: John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the brilliant and vigorous young President of the United States is dead.

People of this area, despite the evidence of news bulletins and television pictures, could not believe it: they could not believe that anyone could be capable of such a crime against the country, and they could not believe that the country was so suddenly bereft of its vital and buoyant young leader. People, it seemed, felt an almost fierce possessiveness toward this President, regardless of their political views.

The recent visit of President Kennedy to the University of Maine—which gave thousands of residents of this area their first and only opportunity to see a President in person—made it more difficult to accept the fact of his loss. People here, whether they saw him in person or on television, felt, after his visit, that he was uniquely our President. They had seen him break into a grin at the wit of University President Lloyd Elliott; they knew that he had actually tried, as a new alumnus, to sing the Stein Song; and many had seen him play his characteristic trick of darting suddenly from his planned route to shake hands with people in the crowd. It made people feel warm toward him that he had so apparently enjoyed himself on his visit to Maine. The President of the United States was no longer an awesome figure in the distant city of Washington, D.C.

The reasons for the great fondness of the people for President Kennedy were as varied as the many facets of his complex personality: from his calm, poised intelligence, to his enthusiasm for touch football; his ready handshakes for people lining a fence, to his vision of world peace; his steady but unobtrusive devotion to his religious faith, to his pride in his family. His youth made him singularly appealing: he was kin to all the young, and older people could take a fond, parental pride in him, even though they might shake their heads disapprovingly at times.

Whatever the reasons, John Fitzgerald Kennedy had, by some magic of personality, become uniquely the President of all the people, in the 2 years and 10 months of his leadership. It is for historians to attempt to explain how he accomplished this. The present can only mourn its great loss.

The words have all been said, by statesmen and politicians, by reporters and broadcasters, by people in all walks of life.

Everyone said the right words, to describe the shock and the horror and the sorrow of the events in Dallas, Tex.

They were said in Old Town and in Lincoln, in Washington and Los Angeles, in Boston and Tampa.

They were the words of a people who were stunned and disbelieving, who were unanimously outraged and sick at heart over the bullet in Dallas that took the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

They were the words of a people who suddenly felt that part of them, too, had died in Dallas on that fateful Friday afternoon. For John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a part of these people, as they were a part of him, because he was the Nation's chosen leader and every American felt that the tremendous burdens he carried were their burdens.

The words and the tears were those of people who had lost a relative or someone who was close to them, and in a sense this was true.

There were words that expressed the revulsion for a terrible deed that ripped the glitter from the vaunted civilization of which Americans proudly boast, and exposed the intolerance and hatred which too many of us have been willing to ignore.

There were the words of a minister who asked if this terrible event were not to be expected by a people who could ignore the callous bombing that wiped out the lives of children in Alabama.

There were the words, too, of millions of people who joined a stricken widow and her two young children in mourning for the death of a husband and father. They mourned, too, for a brave policeman's widow and children in Dallas, and they suffered with the black image which tarnished the Nation when "eye for an eye" revenge killed the man who had fired the assassin's bullet.

They were the words of strangeness and uneasiness, words of an entire people who were joined in the common bondage of sadness and sorrow.

But eventually, they were the words of hope and confidence in the future.

They were the words of a people drawn together by this tragic event, of a people who gained solidarity and strength in their common sorrow.

They were the words of Americans who believe in their country, who know that one chosen from among us has always met the test of the problems ahead.

They were the words of a people who know that the country goes on and the Government goes on.

They were the words of a people who recognized their good fortune in having Lyndon Johnson to succeed John Kennedy—a great great man to succeed a great man in a great Nation.

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY: "* * *; ASK RATHER WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY"

President John F. Kennedy at the age of 46 was in the prime of life, from the standpoint of youthful vitality, and in respect to the high office which he held. Our late President had the unique capacity to draw upon the talent of our country, and at the same time was able to project his image as the President of the United States in a manner which demanded respect. The personality of John F. Kennedy was such that he could draw people to him with remarkable ease. From the day he was sworn in as the 35th President of our great country he was beset by matters of extreme and grave importance to the welfare of our country—these have been trying times for our youthful President, and indeed trying times for the free world under his leadership as President of the United States. One by one the matters affecting our freedom, liberty, and civil rights had come to the front for consideration. Each of the matters came forth as an incident which quickly spread to the knowledge of the people of the world—our integration problems, the Cuban situation which included the effort on the part of the Soviet Union to test our country to the maximum, and the many other incidents some of which may be known only to top officials of our country.

There are many things in this world which we mortals cannot seem to understand; things from the distant past and from the near present. The events of the past weekend, one of the blackest in my lifetime, are difficult to comprehend or fully realize. In a world which has become more civilized day by day how can it be that the President of the United States—a man respected by his own people, and by people throughout the world—has been cut down in one of our own cities at the hands of a brutal assassin?

As in any free country where expression of opinion is protected and freedom of action is a birthright the only safeguard is law and justice—the law as declared by society for the conduct of society, and the courts of our great land which are dedicated to the carrying out of the law of our land—to afford equal justice to all under the law.

When the people of any free nation, separate or in groups, disregard the law and the course of justice they are in deep trouble, as is their nation. The incidents of violence which have marked our past few years in complete, or sometimes partial disregard of the law, including the integration incidents, and the tragic death of our President, have stirred our Nation.

What course this new awareness will take I cannot say for sure, but I certainly hope it will start action in a proper direction. This is indeed a time to reexamine our own attitude and appreciation for the freedom which we are guaranteed under our law, and the protections we are given under the law.

Why at the prime of his career and his life was our President taken from us under such tragic circumstances? Could it be that the Divine Power, which has the ability to give life and to take it away, has been given no alternative but to indicate to us, in this tragic way, the grave error in the course we are following as individuals and from which we must change. To take from us a man who was exerting so great an effort toward peace, justice and equality, in a position where such action could do so much good, in the Divine Plan must have been of strong purpose to call for such action. The tragic passing of our President—occasioned by the anger or wrath of his attacker—by one of the most wicked acts that a mortal being is capable of, namely murder (the taking of the life of another), was in direct and complete disregard of the law of our society and the higher law of Almighty God. Taking the law of God and man into one's own hands, for the presumed purpose of administering justice, is contrary to any sense of justice ——; this sets up the assassin as the sole judge with no rules to follow except his own warped sense of value.

In the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy perhaps we will be able to see the course which has unfolded before us and what should be done to strengthen our sense of values and responsibility to others through the law of society and proper administration of justice. The whole episode of the past week has left me stunned, as it undoubtedly has many citizens of our country and the world; what the meaning of it all is in terms of history, and the will of Almighty God. I am not positive but I hope that as time unfolds we may be given insight into the whole picture of last weekend which claimed the life of our President, a police officer in pursuit of his suspected assassin, and finally the assassination of the man who was the prime suspect in the murder of our President. Violence has spread its full wings and struck with talons sharp, quick and deadly.

In the words of our late President, John F. Kennedy, "ask not what your country can do for you; ask rather what you can do for your country." These words are destined

to go down in history—President John F. Kennedy gave the supreme sacrifice on November 22, 1963; he gave his life in the service of his country. May God grant that he has not died in vain, and may his soul rest in eternal peace.

Respectfully,

Senator BILL BOARDMAN.

CALAIS, MAINE.

The Communist Party Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in 1961 Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee asked FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for an analysis of the Communist Party line for use by the committee. Mr. Hoover pointer out at that time:

Because communism thrives on turmoil, the party is continuously attempting to exploit all grievances—real or imagined—for its own tactical purposes.

He concluded his summary with the following warning:

Unfortunately, there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid. These individuals concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political, and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting. These persons would do well to recall a recent lesson from history. Both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them.

On December 4, 1963, Mr. Hoover delivered an outstanding address entitled "Faith in Freedom." Again he sounded the warning. Again we listened. But will we respond? Mr. Hoover reminds us:

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts of selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

We will succeed.

Mr. Hoover has said.

Communism cannot be defeated by hysteria and name calling, but it can be defeated by education and living proof that our way of life is best.

Because of Mr. Hoover's long association with the fight against communism and his high personal dedication to the American way of life, his remarks are always well received. This is particularly so today as the Nation reflects on the atmosphere which existed in this country prior to the tragic events of November 22. Editorial comment has been noted here in Washington and elsewhere. The call for sanity has been widespread and has recognized the legitimate and healthy function of political debate, support and opposition. But the stress, rightly, has been placed on the rule of reason lest we destroy that which we seek to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that two representative editorials on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Pompano Beach (Fla.) Sun-Sentinel, Dec. 6, 1963]

DIVIDE CLASSES

"The cause of communism is well served by the hatemongers, the lunatic fringe, and other rebels who preach a doctrine of malice and intolerance toward their fellow man," J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, maintains.

And that includes the extremes of the left and the right.

The strategy of divide and conquer is an old one. Over the years it has been used to divide the nobility from the peasants, the rich from the poor, the learned from the ignorant, and set other classes against each other.

The root of the strategy is to generate hate of one group against another.

The strategy was never too successful in America. Feelings of labor against capital warmed but never flared. Religious divisions seldom generated fierce emotions. And so it has been with most issues—except one, slavery-racial relations. It caused a civil war, accounted for tensions for over 100 years and underlies the major problems of today.

Unless we resolve these differences, they can serve the purposes of communism and bring our Nation to its knees.

HARVEY A. CALL.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Dec. 7, 1963]

TENDING THE TREE OF LIBERTY

The uses of liberty are never easy to determine and maintain, even in a nation with a long history of freedom. The United States has had freedom for 187 years and its people are still arguing—often bitterly—about how it can best be enjoyed and preserved.

The political divisions represented by conservatism and liberalism reflect this continuing controversy. Basically, this spread of view is not only inevitable but healthy. Arguing about what freedom is helps to bolster it, to keep it vibrant.

The strains upon liberty are greater today than when this country gained its independence. Then the adversary was a distant government in England which, though moving steadily toward a constitutional democracy at home, was cracking down on colonial America with autocratic power.

Today the old notions of uncomplicated freedom struggle against heavy counterweights. At first government reached out to regulate against flagrant abuses of liberty. In the great depression, it reached out to assist the destitute, the aged, the unemployed, the handicapped. World War II, the Korean war, and the cold war brought a massive enlargement of the Government's role in American life, with defense and related activities holding sway over a greatly expanded Federal budget and biting deep into the economic and political structure.

Nearly all these enlargements have occurred in a brief 30 years, less than a sixth of the country's history as a free land. Small wonder, then, that millions of Americans shape a mood of protest against the steady encroachments. With the Nation growing ever more populous and its problems mounting, the prospect clearly is for more of the same.

No American genuinely wedded to liberty can wish to yield an inch of it casually. Conservatism which acts as a brake and corrective against any cavalier abandonment of freedom serves all free men well. Conservatism moves toward unreality only when, at its fringes, it calls for such sharp reversals as would leave great problems not only unsolved but largely untouched. Liberalism is similarly unreal when it calls for an end—by the day after tomorrow—of the struggles against poverty and for peace. Congress cannot appropriate enough money to bring on the millennium.

Our incredibly difficult task, now and for perhaps decades to come, is to find the sane, plausible course that will hold the great substance of our liberties while giving us some solid hope of effective assault upon our baffling array of problems.

Human Rights Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 10, we celebrated the 15th anniversary of the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and on Sunday, December 15, Americans will observe the 172d anniversary of the Bill of Rights. By Presidential proclamation, the week December 10–17 is known as Human Rights Week. To Americans everywhere, this should be a time for review and reflection. Now, more than ever, we must ask ourselves what we as individuals have done to secure the goal of human rights for all.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes as fundamental that individuals have rights both as members of national states and as members of a developing world society. People thus have rights precisely because they are people, not because they happen to be Americans, Russians, or any other nationality.

The United Nations undertook in the Charter to promote human rights and freedoms. It is the task of the Universal Declaration to define these fundamental rights. The declaration is therefore both a moral and an educational force, expressing a "common standard of achievement" for all peoples. This it has admirably done in the course of the declaration's 30 articles devoted to 2 broad categories: First, personal, civil, and political rights, and second, economic, social, and cultural rights. The articles draw heavily upon the experience of democratic nations, and our own Bill of Rights finds many parallels in the declaration.

The United Nations has set itself a threefold task: the declaration, a convention giving binding legal status to the declaration, and implementing machinery to enforce the observance of the articles. All three instruments will comprise the International Bill of Human Rights.

The second and third stages have been combined in two treaties known as "Covenants on Human Rights." These documents have been in the drafting process since 1947. In 1954, the Human Rights Commission completed its draft version of the covenants, and since 1955 a General Assembly committee has been dis-

cussing their provisions. The standing committee of the Assembly concerned with the human rights bill has completed hearings on both the preambles and the substantive articles falling under the two covenants on civil and political rights and on social and cultural rights. This year, the committee has begun discussion on the aricles of implementation.

There will probably be another 5 years work involved before the covenants can be approved by the Assembly. It is a difficult process to reconcile and codify principles of human rights as they are applied in 111 independent states. Furthermore, the large number of new states admitted to the United Nations over the past few years means that many states now engaged in formulating the covenants had no part in drafting the original declaration. Thus, they might well be perplexed by the covenant's format and less than enthused about the overall objective. Nevertheless, real progress in this difficult area is being made, and soon the declaration may have legal effect in addition to being a moral and educational force.

As we commemorate Human Rights Week we should be aware of the dynamic spread throughout the world of the concepts embodied in our Bill of Rights. The development of an "International Bill of Human Rights" reveals the lasting legacy America can bequeath to the world. But when our own guaranteed freedoms are withheld from some, when men and women are denied the opportunity to fully exercise the rights and privileges of citizenship, and when we lack universal respect for human rights, then our legacy on behalf of an international bill of rights is incomplete and even suspect.

The rule of law must guarantee human rights for all the world's citizens. Law must be used here in the United States to guarantee the declared rights of our own citizens. Law must also ban the denial of equal opportunity to any American. Today we bear witness to the struggle for full enjoyment of the fundamental freedoms now withheld from some of our citizens. These goals must be fulfilled; during this Human Rights Week they should be ever in the forefront of our thoughts.

A great man has died—his life ended before he could witness the realization of these rights which he sought and advocated for all. We can now build a living monument to our departed President. Let us resolve to enact an International Bill of Rights for the peoples of the world and an American Bill of Civil Rights for the peoples of our country.

The Monroe Doctrine Continues To Be Effective Force in Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bronis S. Kaslas, associate professor of international law at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., has written a series of articles on the Monroe Doctrine which has appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News. Today, I would like to submit for the RECORD the final installment in the 4-part series in which Dr. Kaslas has made a significant historic contribution. This installment was published in the December 6, 1963, edition of the aforementioned newspaper.

The article follows:

THE MONROE DOCTRINE CONTINUES TO BE EFFECTIVE FORCE IN HEMISPHERE—PART 4

Another very important fact should not be overlooked. When South American countries became independent, many of them were very backward culturally, economically and politically. Most were not ready for self-government. Both foreign relations and internal affairs were often conducted on a plane of cruel violence.

In many cases, therefore, the United States had to supply a minimum of order and government. Thus, the Monroe Doctrine became a substitute for colonialism, and American intervention was the price the Latin American countries paid for the privilege of being independent and preserving their national freedom.

Between 1933 and 1941, U.S. official policy underwent a considerable change. With the growth of inter-American solidarity, the South American republics were called on for a more important role in the application of the Monroe Doctrine, and the United States undertook some new obligations, for the sake of the doctrine, toward its neighbors.

On December 24, 1938, the Eighth International Conference of American States unanimously approved a "Declaration of the Principles of the Solidarity of America, and the Declaration of Lima."

These declarations reaffirmed the principles of continental defense and noninterference in the internal and external affairs of other states agreed to at conferences of Montevideo in 1935 and Buenos Aires in 1936. It not only upheld "continental solidarity" and the ideals "upon which this solidarity is based," but pledged also reciprocal measures for hemispheric security.

COMMON EFFORT

Inasmuch as these declarations manifest unanimity of opinion by the American republics with respect to the necessity for common efforts in opposing what the United States hitherto asserted the right to achieve alone in pursuance of the Monroe Doctrine, the declarations did not supersede the Monroe Doctrine, but merely expanded the number of its guarantors.

It should be observed that this expansion of the Monroe Doctrine by no means intimates that there rests upon the United States legal obligation to abstain from measures under the Monroe Doctrine in the event a concerted common action of all American states cannot be agreed upon.

A really institutionalized Pan-American community of states was achieved by three famous inter-American acts: the act of Chapultepec of 1945, the Rio act of 1947, and the Bogotá Charter of 1948. The inter-American Conference of Bogotá in 1948 provided institutionalized collaboration through the establishment of an Organization of American States as an instrument to implement the principles of inter-American relationship.

Through all these measures, inter-American solidarity made great strides forward. These instruments all reveal the existence of a certain inter-American legal entity possessing the right to defend the Americas against devious expansionist schemes of certain European or Asiatic powers.

By acquiescing in these arrangements, the United States appeared to agree that the burden which it had long undertaken to bear alone under the Monroe Doctrine was, under certain circumstances, to be shared by her Latin American sisters.

LAW RECOGNIZES DOCTRINE

Apart, however, from the commitments specified in the conventions, the United States did not undertake to bind itself to any obligations to explain or justify its exclusive actions or rights under the Monroe Doctrine.

The place of the Monroe Doctrine in international law depends upon the effect of it upon the conduct of non-American states. The effect expected in this case is compliance with the provisions of the Monroe Doctrine. The test of the soundness of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine depends upon the support for it to be found in the law of nations.

U.S. Governments have never admitted that any restrictions, imposed by the Monroe Doctrine, are at variance with any requirements of international law. No international lawyer can prove that prevention of non-American efforts to destroy the independence of Latin American republics and effective maintenance of peace in the Western Hemisphere are contrary to international law.

The principle of self-defense has always been invoked as justification whenever a question of application of the Monroe Doctrine arose, and this principle of self-defense has always been recognized by international law as a legitimate means of self-protection.

It could, of course, be argued that the threat to the United States must be proved in each particular case. The response to such argument has been that the provisions of the Monroe Doctrine against non-American penetration of the Western Hemisphere are of themselves the safeguard which must be sustained. Yielding to a transfer of territory or the installation of a hostile aggressive European system of government would always weaken the value of that safeguard.

UNSOLICITED PROTECTION

Some Latin Americans, especially Castro, have tried to criticize the United States for the unsolicited protection under the Monroe Doctrine. They also resented the restrictions upon their right of voluntary transfer of territory or base to a non-American power. This attitude fails, however, properly to understand and interpret U.S. interference.

The Monroe Doctrine is not directed against American states as such, but against non-American powers seeking territories or military outposts in the Americas and creating a danger of using them against the United States, as well as against the entire hemisphere.

Thus, the objection against the United States for attempting to interfere with the independence of Latin American countries is only a theoretical one, missing the basic point that, on the contrary, the purpose of the Monroe Doctrine is to safeguard the independence of South America, even from those who might be willing to give it away to a foreign power.

In considering the basis for America upholding the Monroe Doctrine, the most significant factor is that this policy has been very successful. The refusal of non-American states to challenge by force the stand of the United States has been very impressive.

The recent removal of Russian missile bases in Cuba is the best example of this. On the basis of the past record, we may affirm that no power in the world today is in a position to contend that the Monroe Doctrine is contrary to international law and does not exist.

The importance of the Monroe Doctrine is also derived from the continuous and deliberate approval of it by all the Presidents of the United States, by all administrations and by the American people. The last seal to the Monroe Doctrine was affixed by President Johnson when he declared that "We shall not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil."

France's Tribute to the Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FRANCE'S TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT KENNEDY—GENERAL DE GAULLE'S STATEMENT—OFFICIAL MESSAGES—GENERAL DE GAULLE ATTENDS THE FUNERAL—FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

General de Gaulle's statement on the death of President Kennedy:

"President Kennedy died like a soldier, under fire, in the line of duty and in the service of his country.

"In the name of the French people, ever the friend of the American people, I salute his great example and his great memory."

OFFICIAL MESSAGES

Message to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy from General and Madam de Gaulle:

"The great sorrow that has just befallen you distresses my wife and myself to the bottom of our hearts. Rest assured that we are with you in our thoughts and in our prayers. President Kennedy shall never be forgotten."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from General de Gaulle, President of the Republic:

"The death of President Kennedy is a source of deep sorrow to the French people, who held in the highest esteem this great head of state, illustrious servant of freedom and of the destiny of mankind.

"In the face of a misfortune which so profoundly affects your country and which concerns all the peoples of the world, and at a time when fate bestows upon you the highest responsibilities, rest assured, Mr. President, of the more than ever loyal and confident friendship of France for the United States of America."

Message to President Lyndon Johnson from M. Georges Pompidou, Premier:

"Deeply moved by the tragic loss experienced by the United States on the death of President Kennedy, whose courage and great gifts as a statesman were admired by all, the French people wish to convey to you the grief felt by all my fellow countrymen.

"Rest assured that at a time when under such cruel circumstances you take up your high office, my colleagues of the French Government and myself join with you in a feeling of most grieving and most loyal friendship."

Message to Secretary of State Dean Rusk from M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs:

"Profoundly shocked by the news of the act which has just cost the life of the President of the United States, may I assure you that I deeply share in your mourning and in that of the Government and the American people. Mindful of the welcome that President Kennedy extended to me only a few weeks ago, I can appreciate the extent of your sorrow.

"All my countrymen join with me and share in the feelings of friendship toward your country which have existed for two centuries."

Message to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara from M. Pierre Messmer, Minister of the Armed Forces:

"Upon hearing of the tragic death of President Kennedy, I ask you to accept the condolences of the French Armed Forces and also my own personal, sincerest, and grieving condolences."

Message to Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Gen. Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces:

"May I express to you, and request that you convey this message to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the shock and the indignation of the French Armed Forces on hearing the news of the outrage against President Kennedy.

"May I also express to you my deepest personal sorrow at the death of the President of the United States who welcomed me such a short time ago with so much friendliness and warmth."

Statement by M. Roger Seydoux, permanent representatives of France to the United Nations. Before a plenary session of the United Nations General Assembly, held on November 27, 1963, to pay homage to the memory of the late President Kennedy, M. Roger Seydoux, permanent representative of France to the United Nations, made the following statement:

"All my compatriots, for whom the visit in Paris of Mr. and Mrs. John Kennedy remains a bright memory, turn toward the people of the United States, our everlasting friend. We wish them to know that their trial is our trial, their sadness our sadness, their mourning our mourning. Ours also is, despite the heavy loss they must bear, their steadfast faith in the future as is steadfast our confidence in their great destiny."

Statement by the French Premier, M. Georges Pompidou. The following statement by the French Premier was broadcast over French television and transmitted to the United States by satellite via the Pleumeur-Bodou relay station:

"The stupefaction engendered by a despicable assassination, the indignation at seeing President Kennedy struck down by the side of his young wife in the fulfillment of his duties as a humane and liberal head of state, is accompanied by a great sadness also felt in our hearts: sadness because, once again, blind violence has triumphed; sadness because a great and friendly people is plunged into mourning; sadness because the free world has lost one of its surest guides.

"In these tragic hours, all France is at the side of the United States in anger, in grief, and, despite everything, in confidence also for the future."

Statement by French Foreign Minister, M. Maurice Couve de Murville. M. Couve de Murville made the following statement over the three major American television networks. It was transmitted by the communications satellite relay:

"It was with the most grievous impression of shock that we all, in Paris and in France, heard the appalling news of President Kennedy's cold-blooded murder. Many elements combined in our thoughts: the terribly premature disapearance of a statesman of the first magnitude, the death of a man who was the incarnation of youth and vitality, the awful tragedy that hit a glamorous and loveable family, he general feeling of a blow inflicted to a great country for which France has, from the beginning, felt the closest friendship, further reinforced by comradeship in three wars.

"For me, who had the privilege of long talks with President Kennedy, the memory will not pass of his friendliness, his eagerness, his wisdom, and his courage.

"Believe me when I say that we, the French people, today all grieve and pray together with the American people."

Statement broadcast over American television by Mr. Hervé Alphand, French Ambassador to the United States:

"The tragic death of President Kennedy has deeply moved the French people, forever the friend of the American people. Your sorrow is our sorrow and this sorrow we share with Mrs. Kennedy and her family, tonight we pray with them.

"The President had always displayed toward my country a great fondness, particularly on the occasion of his visit to Paris in 1961.

"For me it was also a personal friend who always showed me a profound affection and understanding.

"As General de Gaulle said today, he died as a soldier. We shall never forget his example or his memory, the memory of a great man."

GENERAL DE GAULLE ATTENDS PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FUNERAL

The Presidency of the Republic issued a communique on November 23 announcing that General de Gaulle, President of the Republic, would attend the funeral of President Kennedy. He would be accompanied by M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs; General Charles Ailleret, Chief of Staff of the French Armed Forces; and M. Etienne Burin des Roziers, General Secretary of the Presidency of the Republic.

FRENCH PUBLIC OPINION

France mourns President Kennedy

On the personal orders of General de Gaulle, all flags on public buildings were flown at half staff from 9 a.m., on November 23.

In paying this respect to the memory of President Kennedy, General de Gaulle departed from French tradition, which requires flags to be flown at half staff only during the funeral of a head of state of an allied or friendly power.

On November 23, the Paris Municipal Council sent a telegram to Mrs. Kennedy in which it told her that the city of Paris was in mourning. In addition, a member of the council proposed that the name of John F. Kennedy, defender of the fundamental freedoms of man and who fell for these freedoms, be given to a street in Paris. The council unanimously adopted this proposal on November 28.

In addition to messages of condolence addressed by official French circles to Mr. Charles Bohlen, many people from all walks of life, veterans associations, French-American associations and others sent messages of sympathy to the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

Among many expressions of sympathy, mention should be made of a group of between 2,000 and 3,000 students of all nationalities who went to sign the register of condolence in the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

A service in the memory of President Kennedy was held on November 25 in the cathedral of Notre-Dame de Paris. It was attended by the U.S. Ambassador and Mrs. Bohlen and by Madam Charles de Gaulle. M. Georges Pompidou, French Premier, the president of the senate and Madame Gaston Monnerville, members of the Government and members of the diplomatic corps in the French capital were also present in the great cathedral which was unable to hold the crowds of Parisians who wished to attend the service and who overflowed into the square in front of the cathedral, where members of the Garde Républicaine, swords unsheathed, formed an honor guard.

The French press

The entire French press without exception reflected the feeling of affliction among the French people at the death of President Kennedy. Raymond Aron in Le Figaro of November 23 wrote: "The assassination of J. F. Kennedy affects all mankind * * *. He wanted to be one of those statesmen whom history remembers because they accomplish their task * * *. He will leave a memory which will not be unworthy of the grandeur which he dreamed of achieving."

In an editorial of November 23, Combat wrote: "The crime committed yesterday is the worst one can imagine, since the man it struck down was a symbol in the eyes of hundreds of millions of our contemporaries."

Also on November 23, France-Soir wrote: "Like lightning, anguish and grief have hit the world. The hearts of men and women sank at the same moment, in every country and on all continents. * * * All peoples weep, also, and above all, for this man who, in the words of Pope Paul VI, 'defended the liberty of peoples and the peace of the world.' "

La Nation of November 25 published the following editorial comments: "He was one of the great men of this world. * * * A man with a personal fortune for whom it was possible therefore to have narrow views, and yet he was more aware than millions of others of man's fate, a man, above all, who had the courage to direct his actions in tune with his heart."

Paul Bastid, in l'Aurore of November 25, wrote: "There was in the personality of John Fitzgerald Kennedy a kind of lucid fire in the service of liberty and peace which commanded admiration and sympathy. He devoted himself entirely, with the energy of his temperament and of his age, to causes that are dear to us."

Le Monde, in an editorial in its November 26 issue, said: "He leaves an inspiration, a style, a line from which America will not easily stray." In the same issue, the French poet and Nobel prize winner Saint John Perse, wrote: "Kennedy * * * was an athlete running in a race against fate. He fought fairly and squarely always, and his encounter with death came with his face uncovered."

The next day Le Monde published an editorial containing the following comment: "The gesture by the President of the Republic who, right at the outset, decided to be present at the funeral of a man whom many considered his rival, has come opportunely to show that, in difficult times, he intends to behave as a loyal friend of the United States. He had already proved this during the Cuban crisis."

Eulogy pronounced by M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly

At the opening of the November 26 sitting, in the presence of Mr. Charles Bohlen, U.S. Ambassador to France, M. Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the French National Assembly, pronounced the following eulogy of the late President Kennedy:

"John F. Kennedy was not only the world's most powerful head of state. He was also an exceptional man.

"The murder of this hero, who fell in the flower of his youth, who knew what power and glory was, this murder in which the fate of the ancients finds expression, has already taken on an historic amplitude, and its echo will never die away. No, we shall not forget John F. Kennedy.

"Yesterday, in Washington, France expressed her grief through the presence of the most famous of her citizens, he who, without a doubt, already belongs to history and continues to forge the future.

"Today, the National Assembly shares as one in the mourning of the United States and of its Congress. It participates with emotion in the sorrow of the Kennedy family. Deeply shocked, it pays its respects before the anguish of this charming, worthy, and courageous young woman who brought a little of the gentleness of France into the harsh existence of America's first citizen.

"Tomorrow it will be up to each and every one to pursue his task in defending and expounding the great principles shared by our two countries, principles in whose respect President Kennedy lived and also died."

M. Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, associated the Government with the words of the National Assembly:

"The homage paid by the National Assembly marks the share taken by the French people in the mourning of the American people and shows the esteem and affection for the President who died in the line of duty."

More than 400 deputies stood and observed 1 minute's silence. Meetings were suspended for 1 hour as a sign of mourning.

In Memoriam, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, 1917–63

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with millions of my fellow Americans and countless millions of people through the world in paying final loving tribute to the memory of our martyred 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is still almost impossible to believe that John Kennedy, that young dynamic, vibrant, and courageously statesmanlike chapion of peace, is no longer with us—but has fallen before the merciless bullet of an assassin—now, to rest forever among the country's greatest heroes in the hallowed ground of Arlington National Cemetery.

He was the living, surging, moving, thinking, doing embodiment of democracy.

With his compassion, his courage and his creative genius were blended a warm and good humor—a sparkling wit, a love for his fellow human beings.

The stirring words he spoke, the high causes he represented, and the bold actions he took during the short years he was permitted to spend among us, will live on to renew our own faith, and the faith of future generations of Americans, that the democratic heritage we treasure can be as meaningful and effective in the space age as it was in the early years of the Republic.

President Kennedy himself had said it:

> The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And John Kennedy spoke to all men in tragically prophetic words when he expressed the secret of America's great past, as well as the key to its bright future:

> We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival, and the success of liberty.

Now John Kennedy, himself, has paid that ultimate price, he has sacrified his life to assure the survival of the ideals of freedom and liberty that give meaning to America.

On November 22, he passed the torch on to us, the living, to continue the struggle in which he gave the last full measure of his devotion.

And then we remember the words of his magnificent inaugural address:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course.

VITALITY AND PROMISE

In future years, President Kennedy will be remembered for the vitality and brilliant promise he brought to the task of governing a democracy.

He will be remembered for the great search for peace he carried on in an age and in a world threatened with nuclear destruction.

Who can forget his words to the Congress in reporting on negotiations that ultimately led to the signing of the historic nuclear test ban treaty?

> A journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step. My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, step back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

REASON, STRENGTH, AND COMPASSION

In international affairs, John Kennedy represented a force for reason, for strength, and for compassion. He sought to make the world safe for diversity, in a world that put a premium on conformity.

He will be remembered for new and imaginative efforts to achieve the goals of peace and prosperity around the globe. The Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and the food for peace program, all bear the mark of his untiring work.

A YOUNG COUNTRY

Domestically, President Kennedy visualized his Nation as a young country striving to realize its full potential and secure for all its citizens the blessings of the great promise of America.

With a tremendous drive and determination he promoted the cause of equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color or national origins.

He moved on many fronts to stimulate our lagging national economic growth rate to provide the training and the jobs necessary for full employment in an age of rapid technological change.

PERSONAL COMMITMENT

His program exemplified his deep personal commitment to free all Americans from poverty, from ignorance, from slums, from financial disaster in their older years, from the terror of mental illness and the gray confinement of retardation, from humilitating discrimination, from the chaotic backwash of automation.

While greatly expanding our military defense capability, he launched the country into the space age with characteristic vigor and with a characteristic goal of world leadership.

EDUCATION: THE KEY

Realizing that the ultimate success of the American democratic experiment depended on the quality of its citizens, President Kennedy advocated major new programs designed to assure that American education from the first grades on through advanced graduate work would be second to none.

A DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY OF ART

And he and his lovely wife Jacqueline have served as a constant encouragement to the arts as an essential civilizing influence in our national life.

Just a few months ago he expressed what was his own democratic philosophy of the arts:

Art establishes the basic human truths which must serve as the touchstones of our judgment. The artist becomes the last champion of the individual mind and sensibility against an intrusive society and an officious state. I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. If art is to nourish the roots of our culture, society must set the artist free to follow his vision wherever it takes him.

THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA

I do not believe I have heard more fitting nor more deeply moving tributes to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy than those delivered in the rotunda of the Capitol on Sunday, November 24, 1963.

Let us, therefore, recall those eloquent statements at this time:

SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, MAJORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE—"SHE TOOK A RING FROM HER FINGER"

There was a sound of laughter; in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a wit in a man neither young nor old, but a wit full of an old man's wisdom and of a child's wisdom, and then, in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a man marked with the scars of his love of country, a body active with the surge of a life far, far from spent and, in a moment, it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a father with a little boy, a little girl and a joy of each in the other. In a moment it was no more, and so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands.

There was a husband who asked much and gave much, and out of the giving and the asking wove with a woman what could not be broken in life, and in a moment it was no more. And so she took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands, and kissed him and closed the lid of a coffin.

A piece of each of us died at that moment. Yet, in death he gave of himself to us. He gave us of a good heart from which the laughter came. He gave us of a profound wit, from which a great leadership emerged. He gave us of a kindness and a strength fused into a human courage to seek peace without fear.

He gave us of his love that we, too, in turn, might give. He gave that we might give of ourselves. that we might give to one another until there would be no room, no room at all, for the bigotry, the hatred prejudice, and the arrogance which converged in that moment of horror to strike him down.

In leaving us—these gifts, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States, leaves with us. Will we take them, Mr. President? Will we have, now, the sense and the responsibility and the courage to take them?

I pray to God that we shall and under God we will.

CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN—"THE WORLD IS POORER"

There are few events in our national life that unite Americans and so touch the heart of all of us as the passing of a President of the United States.

There is nothing that adds shock to our sadness as the assassination of our leader, chosen as he is to embody the ideals of our people, the faith we have in our institutions, and our belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Such misfortunes have befallen the Nation on other occasions, but never more shockingly than 2 days ago.

We are saddened; we are stunned; we are perplexed.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a great and good President, the friend of all men of good will, a believer in the dignity and equality of all human beings, a fighter for justice, an apostle of peace, has been snatched from our midst by the bullet of an assassin.

What moved some misguided wretch to do this horrible deed may never be known to us, but we do know that such acts are commonly stimulated by forces of hatred and malevolence, such as today are eating their way into the bloodstream of American life.

What a price we pay for this fanaticism.

It has been said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn. But surely we can learn if we have the will to do so. Surely there is a lesson to be learned from this tragic event.

If we really love this country, if we truly love justice and mercy, if we fervently want to make this Nation better for those who are to follow us, we can at least abjure the hatred that consumes people, the false accusations that divide us, and the bitterness that begets violence.

Is it too much to hope that the martyrdom of our beloved President might even soften the hearts of those who would themselves recoil from assassination, but who do not shrink from spreading the venom which kindles thoughts of it in others?

Our Nation is bereaved. The whole world is poorer because of his loss. But we can all be better Americans because John Fitzgerald Kennedy has passed our way, because he has been our chosen leader at a time in history when his character, his vision, and his quiet courage have enabled him to chart for us a safe course through the shoals of treacherous seas that encompass the world.

And now that he is relieved of the almost superhuman burdens we imposed on him, may he rest in peace.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE—"FAITH, BRAVERY, HUMANITY"

As we gather here today bowed in grief, the heartfelt sympathy of Members of the Congress and of our people are extended to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy and to Ambassador and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy and their loved ones. Their deep grief is also self-shared by countless millions of persons throughout the world, considered a personal tragedy, as if one had lost a loved member of his own immediate family.

Any citizen of our beloved country who looks back over its history cannot fail to see that we have been blessed with God's favor beyond most other peoples. At each great crisis in our history we have found a leader able to grasp the helm of state and guide the country through the troubles which beset it. In our earliest days, when our strength and wealth were so limited and our problems so great, Washington and Jefferson appeared to lead our people. Two generations later, when our country was torn in two by a fratricidal war, Abraham Lincoln appeared from the mass of the people as a leader able to reunite the Nation.

In more recent times, in the critical days of the depression and the Great War forced upon us by Fascist aggression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, later Harry S. Truman appeared on the scene to reorganize the country and lead its revived citizens to victory. Finally, only recently, when the cold war was building up the supreme crisis of a threatened nuclear war capable of destroying everything—and everybody—that our predecessors had so carefully built, and which a liberty-loving world wanted, once again a strong and courageous man appeared ready to lead us.

No country need despair so long as God, in His infinite goodness, continues to provide the Nation with leaders able to guide it through the successive crises which seem to be the inevitable fate of any great nation.

Surely no country ever faced more gigantic problems than ours in the last few years, and surely no country could have obtained a more able leader in a time of such crisis. President John Fitzgerald Kennedy possessed all the qualities of greatness. He had deep faith, complete confidence, human sympathy, and broad vision which recognized the true values of freedom, equality, and the brotherhood which have always been the marks of the American political dreams.

He had the bravery and a sense of personal duty which made him willing to face up to the great task of being President in these trying times. He had the warmth and the sense of humanity which made the burden of the task bearable for himself and for his associates, and which made all kinds of diverse peoples and races eager to be associated with him in his task. He had the tenacity and determination to carry each stage of his great work through to its successful conclusion.

Now that our great leader has been taken from us in a cruel death, we are bound to feel shattered and helpless in the face of our loss. This is but natural, but as the first bitter pangs of our incredulous grief begins to pass we must thank God that we were privileged, however briefly, to have had this great man for our President. For he has now taken his place among the great figures of world history.

While this is an occasion of deep sorrow it should be also one of dedication. We must have the determination to unite and carry on the spirit of John Fitzgerald Kennedy for a strengthened America and a future world of peace.

A TIME TO BUILD

During the funeral service for John Kennedy, Bishop Philip Hannan quoted one of the President's favorite passages from scripture:

There is an appointed time for everything, and a time for every affair under the heavens; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to uproot the plant; a time to kill and a time to heal; a time to tear down and a time to build.

The greatest memorial which we can create for President Kennedy is to see that this is a time to heal—and a time to build.

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS: A BEACON LIGHT

President Kennedy's inspiring and eloquent inaugural address, delivered from the east front of the Capitol to an anxiously awaiting world on that cold but clear January day of 1961, will always remind me of the true greatness of this courageous American statesman.

His words will be etched forever in the proud annals of our country's history, so that in times of trial and difficulty we may return to them again for strength and light and direction:

We observe today not a victory of party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change. For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three-quarters ago.

The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.

We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay in price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

This much we pledge—and more.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

To those new states whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom—and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new Alliance for Progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

To the world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed. But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course—both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens (and) let the oppressed go free."

And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

MEDAL OF FREEDOM

The new President, Lyndon Johnson, expressed America's deep respect for the memory of our departed leader when he announced the award to John Kennedy of the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

In making his announcement, President Johnson said:

Each of us will know that we are the lesser for his death, but each is somehow larger because he lived. As a simple gesture, but one which I know he would not have counted small, it is my privilege at this moment to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to John Fitzgerald Kennedy on behalf of the great Republic for which he lived and died.

President Kennedy's citation reads as follows:

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, soldier, scholar, statesman, defender of freedom, pioneer for peace, author of hope—combining courage with reason, and combating hate with compassion, he led the land he loved toward new frontiers of opportunity for all men and peace for all time. Beloved in life of selfless service, mourned by all in a death of senseless crime, tife energy, faith, and devotion which he brought to his extraordinarily successful though tragically brief endeavors will hereafter "light our country and all who serve it"—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

A SPIRIT OF CONFIDENCE

As he did not shrink from his responsibilities, but welcomed them, so he would not have us shrink from carrying on his work beyond this hour of national tragedy.

In this spirit, therefore, let us face the future with confidence, and, with President Lyndon Johnson, resolve that John Fitzgerald Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain.

President Lyndon Johnson: God Blessed United States With Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a worthy and appropriate tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

This was presented in the Anderson, S.C., Independent, on Wednesday, November 27, 1963, under the direction of former U.S. Senator Wilton H. Hall, of Anderson. I think it expresses our complete feeling of confidence in this great American leader.

The article is as follows:

PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON: GOD BLESSED UNITED STATES WITH LEADERSHIP

On the morning of May 18, 1961, the Independent published an editorial headed "Lyndon John: We Are Fortunate To Have Him as Our Vice President." We concluded with this statement:

"If providence should strike down President Kennedy, he would be our next head of state. We should thank our stars that we have such an astute, patriotic, aggressive, determined man as Lyndon Johnson in the position of undoubted power and prestige he holds today."

Prophetic? Not necessarily so. Reassuring when such a man was only a heartbeat from the Presidency? Certainly.

Men of good will throughout the world pray today for him as he assumes the almost superhuman task as President of the United States.

One of the most important and consoling of facts is that the late President John F. Kennedy—perhaps with prophetic vision of his own—took Lyndon Johnson fully into his confidence on all major issues and dangers confronting this Nation.

Thus President Johnson assumes the office with full knowledge of these issues and dangers, and with the stated determination to carry on unbroken the aims and the hopes of John F. Kennedy.

These aims and hopes are carefully mapped plans for a better nation, a more peaceful world, and determination that the United States of America shall continue to exercise the world leadership it holds.

Background of the two men was drastically different. The one, President Kennedy, was born into a world of luxury. The new President began his career in Texas as a boy shining shoes.

Yet because this is America, because both believed in the American dream, because both were endowed with intellectual and dynamic strength, they became at the same time the only U.S. leaders elected by the vote of the whole Nation.

Some months ago in an interview Lyndon Johnson, speaking as Vice President, had this to say:

"President Kennedy and members of his staff and his Cabinet have given me every opportunity to be aware of all the important decisions that have been made and to participate in them and to make any recommendations I care to make.

"And I have been a party to those decisions—some important ones—the deliberations in connection with the invasion of Cuba and again last October when we had the missile crisis in Cuba.

"We had some 35 National Security Council meetings, meetings of the Executive Council of the Security Committee, of which I was a member. And I participated in all but one of those meetings.

"My recommendations were asked and received, considered. And in both instances, I was a party to both decisions. Although I want to make it abundantly clear that the responsibility is with the President and the President made the decision and accepted responsibility for it."

That crisis and its problems were but one of the many when Lyndon Johnson sat by President Kennedy's side and was consulted and fully informed.

Such procedure was a far cry from the time when the Vice-Presidency was looked upon as a dead end road where his only duties were to preside over the Senate. Americans may thank Almighty God for the wisdom and foresight of the late President Kennedy in taking his Vice President into full confidence.

Thousands of Anderson area residents recall Lyndon Johnson, campaigning here for the Democratic ticket in 1960. He spoke at the Anderson Fairgrounds and we said that those who heard him "will never forget the man and his message." (Anderson County and the Third Congressional District went overwhelmingly for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket.)

We described him as "an intellectual man, a natural leader, a man well schooled in practical politics and in statesmanship. He has a down-to-earth touch, and yet he moves among the mightiest with complete ease and assurance. What is more, they listen to him and believe him."

Even then we saw him as a "world leader who is more and more capturing the attention and respect of all nations" which he has proven time and again since.

What is the philosophy of President Johnson? Here it is in his own words:

"I believe every American has something to say and, under our system, a right to an audience.

"I believe there is always a national answer to every national problem. Believing this, I do not think there are necessarily two sides to every question. However, sometimes * * * often there is a right side and a wrong side.

"I believe achievement of the full potential of our natural resources, physical and human, is the highest purpose of governmental policies next to the protection of those rights we hold inalienable.

"I believe waste in the continuing enemy of our civilization. I believe that the prevention of waste * * * waste of resources, of human lives and opportunity * * * is the most dynamic of the responsibilities of our Government."

Yet, as the Independent commented more than 2 years ago, "he is not an ivory tower philosopher, an idle dreamer, a visionary without the power and energy to turn dreams into reality."

A measure of the new President, heartening to the Nation in estimating his stature, is to be found in the first simple statement he made upon taking the oath of office:

"I will do my best. That is all I can do. I ask for your help, and God's."

The Nation knows that with President Johnson doing his best there is nothing to fear, that the country will go forward, and the world leadership will remain firmly in the grasp of the United States of America.

As the new President assumes his burdens, we extend to him the heartfelt and prayerful hope that a Nation united by tragedy and realization of his problems will uphold his arms and give him new strength in the crucial months and years ahead. (The Harris nationwide poll will disclose tomorrow that 70 percent of the people of the United States feel that Lyndon Johnson will make an excellent President.)

The Independent is confident the new President will have the full support of the people of South Carolina.

There Is a Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville, Ind., News:

THERE IS A PRECEDENT

There's one thing of which we have a superabundance these days, and that is news. All the media are leaded with reports and opinions, some ominous, covering almost every conceivable aspect of human affairs the world around.

In this welter of news, matters of great long-range importance are apt to be tempararily submerged. That has been the case of late with one of our major domestic problems—what course agricultural policy and legislation should take.

This is a complex matter and it would be foolish to oversimplify it. But, as a matter of principle, it's pretty safe to say one of two things will ultimately happen. More controls will be exerted over agriculture, as part of the price of extremely costly Government supports and subsidies. The voters and taxpayers will demand that, if they are forced to dig and dig into their pocketbooks to support a major segment of farming.

Or, on a reasonable, step-by-step basis there will be a return to a free and independent agriculture which stands on it own feet. Many an authority—including a number of leading farm spokesmen—are convinced that this is the only sound course. And it is certainly not without precedent.

The best example of free agricultural activity is livestock. Its production is part of a huge and essential industry which performs with efficiency in providing the whole population with the kind of meat we want. The producers have a day in, day out cash market. There have been good times and bad—but, in the long haul, producers have done well. And they have done it while maintaining their freedom and power of decision.

This a precedent worth thinking about.

The Assassination of President Kennedy: A Eulogy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, among the eulogies for our late President John F. Kennedy, one of the most objective was given by Bob Sherman, news editor of radio station WMNI in Columbus, Ohio, on November 23, 1963.

The eulogy follows:

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY: A EULOGY

Good evening, this is Bob Serman, WMNI news "Current Events and Comments." Tonight, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, 1917–63, in memoriam.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressed the Congress of the United States on December 8, 1941, he assessed the events of the day before as ones which would cause December 7 to live in infamy.

I can think of no more adequate language to denote the day before this Saturday, November 22, 1963.

I am still in a state of stunned amazement, the people I see around me now, as I am certain the people around you, reflect the same ashen somberness which has suddenly cast a pall over the faces of all Americans and our friends around the world.

At 1:30 in the afternoon, on a sun-bathed, crowd-lined street in Dallas, Tex., a portion of the world's light went out; John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead. The heinous crime which took the life of America's 35th President is an event which no Americans, save a fringe of lunatics and insane fanatics, can either justify or find satisfying.

I am profoundly sorry. I speak for all of the people associated with WMNI in extending our heartfelt condolences to the family of the President at this time of grievous personal loss.

I first met John Kennedy, the handsome junior Senator from Massachusetts, in Boston, at a reception for news reporters in 1957. A handshake, an almost automatic, yet deeply warm smile, this was my first observation, and a final impression. I saw him again in a television studio in Parkersburg, W. Va., in 1960. For 2 weeks, a bevy of reporters and I followed this amazing, hard-working strenuous man over the mountain State, traveling in a very old bus, over equally archaic and never-comfortable roads. Being one of the junior members of a large reportorial crew of men like Edward P. Morgan of A.B.C., W. H. Lawrence of the New York Times, and Clark Mollenoff of the Des Moines Register, it did not frequently fail

my fortune to ask a question. But when I did acquire the hard-campaigning candidate's attention, he was always fair to me as if I represented the big networks, not just a smalltown radio-TV news department.

Even if he is not in Washington, regularly covering the White House beat, I think a reporter somehow feels closer to the public officials, particularly the President. I think he feels closer than the average private citizen. Can you imagine how many times, I, for instance, have said "President Kennedy" in the last 3 years? I can't estimate the number. I do know that it has been sufficient to create an almost pavlovian habit that will be arduous to alter.

A vicious sniper's bullet yesterday in Dallas created the necessity to break that habit.

As I mentioned, I believe reporters, because of the nature of their tasks, or perhaps due to the requirements of their profession, feel a closer affinity toward a President than the ordinary citizen. For this reason, and principally because it has been our custom, and I am speaking of the journalists of America, as a body, this evening, I would like to present, if I may humbly solicit your indulgence, this reporter's analysis of the past, tragic, grief-filled hours.

John Kennedy's political program was controversial. I am afraid that to some unsophisticated ears that analysis might seem almost unkind now in lieu of his untimely death. However, I don't think so. It is unfortunate that the word "controversial" has become something to be feared in America. John Kennedy took a stand, he promoted and advanced a political creed and philosophy. This is honorable, judging not the feasibility or the advisability of his political principles or his economic policy. Americans must respect him for—indeed—it requires courage to be controversial.

John Kennedy's contribution to mankind may not and probably will not be his legislature program, his "Peace Corps," his appointees or even his books and essays, but in my opinion, the three short years he was at the center of the world stage, he made his finest donation to humanity, by standing resolutely for his ideals, and firmly by his principles. He was a man of action, and therefore, he generated a reaction. I know he caused people to think. He caused the American political pulse to quicken a bit or so and pumped fresh blood into the mainstream of honest American political liberalism. As a result, John Kennedy helped to create a new conservative political force. His contribution is this: he made people choose up sides. He, because of his stand, caused others to take a stand. The immortal Dante wrote centuries ago, "the hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a time of moral crisis, refuse to take a stand." John Kennedy was not one who failed to meet the basic quality of that kind of statesmanship.

To debate here the individual assets and liabilities of John Kennedy's program, would be a premature act on the part of this commentator. However, to assume that with his death too succumbed the head for future argumentative deliberation over his programing would also be equally fallacious and wholly improper.

Omar Khyham penned the words, "and the moving finger writes and having writ moves on," and so it does. The clock of history continuing to advance. Not one second which has slipped by can be reattained, not even that split second during which the fatal shot was fired into the brain of the late President can be brought back from the clutches of immortality. To hope, as I heard a Detroit priest express it, last night, "that from this personal tragedy, we might construct some good."

What beneficences can result from the death of a man, I cannot say, but, his survivors can hope, and well they should do so.

I hope Americans will not choose to feel disgraced by this event, collectively, or even individually, society is not responsible for this crime. While it is true that a climate of political disagreement exists in America, it is intemperate to regard the actions of one man, a killer, as indicative of the moral character of either the genuine left or the sincere right on the national political spectrum. When society hangs its head in shame and offers a hasty self-indictment because of a single maniac's dastardly deed, that society is only pitying itself. America has no cause for shame. If we hang our heads, it should be for the purposes of prayer in behalf of John Kennedy's soul.

Perhaps the single thing that will be wrought from the tragedy is understanding of our real cause. The preservation of liberty at home and expansion of freedom to the oppressed millions abroad. Also, the vital need to better know our enemy. Let the American people take honor to themselves for the fact that only in this Nation could so horrible an event as the killing of the chief of state occur without subsequent chaos and complete confusion in the normal processes of democratic institutions. This is not to say that the President's death is not cause for concern and remorse, but it is to reassert that the American system can survive such a serious wound and continue to function.

Realizing and knowing now that the assassin represents a philosophy so alien to our way of life that we are repulsed by its prospects * * * perhaps this brazen and brutal killing will cause our people to open their eyes and their minds to the type of degenerate filth that causes the Marxist tributaries to pollute the rivers of freedom, decency and dignity. Today, we are saddened, but aroused people; if history follows its heretofore inevitable course, then tomorrow the majority of our people, I am sorry to report, will return their dank stations of apathy and the dark cellars of complacency.

The evidence which points accusingly at the agent to be a devotee of an alien conspiracy demonstrates again that the Marxist movement has not yet appeased its insatiable apetite for human blood. This, the American people must not forget. Let us, however, hope that this event, as unnecessary and despicable as it was, can cause a new union for the promotion of what our forefathers called the commond good, a refurbished offensive against the dangers of apathy.

John Kennedy said, "We cannot solve all of our problems today, but let us begin." We might well launch the crusade by making a more strenuous effort to open, to expand the channels of meaningful communications between divergent political factions. We might hoe out the weeds which Aristotle described as "despair and irresolution," and instead, replant the seeds of cooperation in the interest of heaping a bountiful harvest of honest disagreement, but, within an atmosphere condusive to victory over the enemy. That enemy, whose deranged devotee has slain our President, either by design or by coincidence, is totalitarianism. An Asian Monarch once assembled his wisest advisers to uncover the simple, irrefutable truth. After much study, they presented the Monarch with a stone tablet upon which were inscribed these words: "And this too shall pass away."

This is true of individuals, it is now accurate of John F. Kennedy, it will, one day, be true of you and me. It need not, however, be true of freedom.

The task is clear, the objective is elusive, the road is long and hard, but, without putting aside differing ideas of how to achieve our goal, but, through wider respect for each other and deeper dedication to our goal, "let us begin."

Our task is to roll back the tide of tyranny, our objective is to shore up the bulwarks of freedom, and to choose prudently our path on the pitfall-pocked road of experience. The President's death must not give rise to an intemperate demand for altercation of our Constitutional Republic, but, it should serve warning for all to see that the fanatical Marxist movement will resort to murder in the streets in an effort to establish their will by attempting to demoralize our American character. Our righteous indignation is warranted at this tragic time, yet it must not drain dry the cup of understanding.

At the same time, it is also fitting and proper to recall that the challenge issued on January 20, 1961, now contains additional poignancy and new pertinence, "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." This clarion call for citizenship, issued by a now deceased statesman, nearly 3 years ago, can be, should be our guide lines for future national endeavors. I join all Americans in praying for the fulfillment of this dream, and begging God's guidance so that we might start, "let us begin."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

John Kennedy—A Hero to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past several weeks I have received many letters from the young people of my State expressing their own distress at the tragic death of our late President.

To these young people, as to their parents, John Kennedy stood for a future of peace, of service, of commitment to ideals. To these young people, he stood for what was best and fine and decent in our political life. His death moved them deeply and it is important to acknowledge their efforts to express their grief.

The high school paper in Albert Lea, Minn., dedicated an entire issue to the late President. It showed great maturity and understanding on the part of the students.

Mr. President, as recognition to all the young Americans who mourn President Kennedy, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Joan Graham of Albert Lea be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRONY SHOULD SOBER CITIZENS

(By Joan Graham)

The body of a great man lay in state in a giant rotunda in Washington, D.C., and a quarter of a million people waited outside in the cold for a chance to file past his coffin.

The body of another man lay in a Fort Worth funeral home, but nobody came—not even his immediate family.

A funeral was held in St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C. It was attended by hundreds of dignitaries from all parts of the world, and carried on coast-to-coast television. Millions mourned.

That same afternoon another funeral took place somewhere in Texas. Another man was buried, but there were no dignitaries. There were no mourners.

A little girl knelt with her mother and kissed the coffin of her daddy. A little boy saluted it.

Two other children, undoubtedly unaware of the fact that their father was dead, paid no such respects. Nobody paid respects.

The man to whom the homage was paid loved and was loved by all. People of all races and walks of life were saddened by his tragic death because they felt that they had lost a leader who had discarded personal prejudices and respected them because they were human beings like himself. He represented love and all that is good and just—and the people wept.

The other man—the one in Texas—was loved by no one. He represented hate, prejudice, arrogance, violence, disrespect, and all that is evil.

What a dignified and wonderful world it would be if everyone would adopt the standard which they so admired in John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and denounce those which they despised in his assassin.

A Sane Approach to Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the operations of the United Steelworkers of America are familiar and well known to me for many years since steel is one of the leading industries in the area I represent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which reflects the attitude of Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the Steelworkers, on the growing problem of automation. The editorial, which appeared in the Washington World on December 16, 1963, follows:

A SANE APPROACH TAKEN TO AUTOMATION

"To the everlasting credit of our great steel industry * * * it recognized the need for a better way to settle our problems."

Coming as they did from a union leader, these were strange words. They were uttered by David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America at the 68th Congress of American Industry, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers.

There was a time, back in the violent days of the sit-down strikes when the coal workers were organizing automobile factories and steel mills, that men such as McDonald hardly would have been welcome in a business parlor.

McDonald, in a speech to the industry conclave, said that automation is an established fact in American industry and should not be opposed by labor organizations.

His reasoning was that "the adversaries we are facing in the cold war are automating and we must stay far ahead." With automation, McDonald stressed, must be provided "opportunities for gainful and useful employment for our work force."

It was after that he hailed the industry in which his union men toil.

McDonald normally does not say too many nice things about business. He comes from the brawling, lusty unionism of days now past. His mentor was John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers.

Lewis as a young man was so tough he felled a mine mule with his fist. Witness, too, the depression times of the thirties when Lewis not only turned grandiloquent phrases but used every weapon at hand, including the sitdowns, to form the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

For all his truculence, Lewis never opposed mechanization of the coal mines; rather he welcomed it to lighten the burden of his men. Instead of fighting machines, Lewis pushed efforts to find other uses for coal.

Making Lewis' job seemingly insurmountable was not mechanization of the mines but the fact that other products (oil, for one) appropriated coal's markets.

Some of Lewis' philosophy certainly was absorbed by McDonald when he served as one of Lewis' most trusted lieutenants in the coal workers' union.

In the present age, McDonald is confronted with modern mechanization called automation. The steel industry has joined McDonald's big union in formation of a human relations committee.

Both the unionists and industry men can do much to offset the impact of automation by considering the human relations involved. Automation must be harnessed to obtain full employment for all men who are able and willing to work.

Here, the old law of supply and demand could be brought into focus. Automation by producing more per man could produce demand for greater supplies of necessities and luxuries. Demands for greater supplies could lead to more jobs, even with automation.

McDonald is indeed wise in facing up to the problem. The steel industry, as McDonald himself pointed out, stands ready to cooperate.

Overdoing "Mercy" in Justice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., dated December 11, 1963, contains an excellent editorial based on some recent comments by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover. The editorial is entitled "Overdoing 'Mercy' in Justice?" I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERDOING "MERCY" IN JUSTICE?

It goes without saying that in the American system of criminal jurisprudence the principle of tempering "justice with mercy" is fundamental.

It is part of the Christian credo of the majority of the Nation's population, of the Judeo-Christian ethic, and the ancient common law which undergirds our system of justice.

Like most Americans, we firmly believe that the accused should be given the benefit of every doubt in the weighing of the evidence and in the interpretation of the law as it applies to his case. He should be given every opportunity to appeal the verdict if there is reason to believe it is incorrect or too harsh.

We are in favor of probationary sentences, especially for youthful first offenders, and of parole for those who have demonstrated during confinement that they have repented

of their sins against God and society and are ready to make a new start.

In some instances, we are in favor of higher court decisions which grant to convicted persons a new trial on purely technical grounds, even though it often is fruitless or inadvisable to try the accused again.

We are among those who have grave doubts about the propriety or the deterrent effect of the death penalty in many crimes where it is now permitted by law and we are sympathetic with those who would like to see it outlawed entirely.

However, we have some rather strong reservations about all of these things, including the advisability of doing away with the death penalty entirely—unless and until provisions are made for keeping hopeless murderers and rapists confined for life, with no chance of a parole or pardon.

And we question the too liberal use of probation and parole unless and until prisons and probation supervisory staffs have the psychological and psychiatric assistance necessary to make sure a proper job of rehabilitation has been done.

Many of these feelings were expressed by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI in a recent speech. The address, entitled "Faith in Freedom," is all the more significant because it was delivered on an occasion when the veteran law enforcement officer was honored by the Brotherhood of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in the National Capital.

Mr. Hoover said in part:

"Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity and fair play. * * * Law and order are bulwarks on which successful government must stand. Without law and order society will destroy itself.

"Fantasy and weakness have too often prevailed in the administration of justice where strength and realism are essential needs.

"There are some misguided social workers and judges who have perverted the meaning of mercy. When so-called mercy aids society's enemies, it is no longer mercy. It is sheer stupidity, if not worse. Justice is needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets—and our families—will continue to be endangered.

"Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

"Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: 'At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny.'

"Judge Learned Hand said: 'Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archiac formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime.'

"Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: 'Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true.'

"Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us 'keep the balance true.'

"Wherever politics and opportunism remain primary consideration in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

"The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the 'rock from which we were hewn.'

"Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

"Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding and faith in God."

Mr. Hoover, who belongs to a generation older than ours has lived to see the perversion of justice by legal technicalities and the outright encouragement of disrespect for law and order, especially as established by State and local laws, in the name of universal brotherhood and equality.

That, along with his other words which we publish at intervals on the general subject, we of the present generation must keep in mind as we work to maintain peace and good order in an increasingly complex society.

Case for a Mock Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished Member from Iowa, FRED SCHWENGEL, recently addressed members of the student body of Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio.

He presented a sound political argument to the student body, and under unanimous consent I include his speech as a portion of my remarks in the Appendix:

CASE FOR A MOCK REPUBLICAN CONVENTION

Greetings from Iowa's First District and from Iowa; from the Congress and especially from the Republicans in the Congress.

A special greeting to you from your Representative in Congress, FRANCES P. BOLTON. Let me add this reminder in regard to her service as your Representative. She is recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike as one of the outstanding Representatives in the Congress. She is an incisive and diligent worker on the Foreign Affairs Committee where she is both practical and human in her approach to the problems there. She, as most of you know, has a great interest in the educational institutions in America and students in particular. She told me she was very happy to know about this indication of your interest in politics at this very crucial and important time in our history.

It is good to be with students again; with people who want to learn about the affairs of state while they are preparing themselves for some technical and special service in this great and free economy we call the American system. As students in a school like this you are interested in and are taught the facts. Then, working from and using sound principles and rules and formulas, you apply your talents to build for the future.

Coming into this kind of atmosphere, it occurred to me that I should present this question—Should Case Institute of Technology hold a mock Republican convention? to one of the miraculous computing machines of today which all of you know about.

I fed these facts into the machine. For the Democrats I included the tax bill and budget deficits, the politics of civil rights, nepotism, the ineptness of our foreign policy—the Cuban fiasco, the Berlin wall, Latin American problems, Vietnam, and the fact that less than 5 percent of the President's recommendations have been acted on by an overwhelming Democrat Congress.

Then I fed the Republican facts into the machine such as their fight against inflation in order to stabilize the dollar, the continued efforts for a realistic and adequate farm program, their consistent fight for a strong civil rights law, the battle for a commonsense foreign policy and the Republican attempt to implement the entire Republican platform adopted in Chicago.

Then I put into the machine the fact that enrollment in this institute is all men with the exception of 10 or 12 coeds.

Then I pressed the button and breathlessly I waited for the answer. The answer was: "If you hold a Republican mock convention one of the candidates could be Jayne Mansfield."

When I pressed for an explanation I got this answer: "She has a better profile."

Now, let me commend you for your interest in politics. We need more young people who have a vital interest in the welfare of this country; people who are well prepared to carry this interest throughout their lifetime. A good place to start is Case Institute of Technology. Political parties are the heart of government in America. They provide the parts that make up the mechanism of government. The more people we can get actively interested in government and politics the more certain we can be that we will have good government.

My confidence in young people has been increased and strengthened through experience I have had in my office as host to 90 college students from Iowa who have been guests of Mrs. Schwengel and me in our home for a week (two at a time) and who spend the day in my office and learning about Congress in action through appointments we set up and meetings and sessions they attend.

In addition, each year I appoint a team of college students as research assistants from the University of Iowa.

Also, each year, I take a graduate student, selected by the political science department at the University of Iowa, to work in my office as legislative assistant and to serve as a liaison to my research team.

These have been enriching experiences for me and, I believe, rewarding experiences for them. I have been thrilled, in my association and work with them, to note their marvelous response to the problems that are presented to them. From them I have received many exciting ideas, among them the Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education. This is a program to allow every student in America who has a desire to gain a college education to do so through the private economy of America.

Now, to emphasize the reasons why you should hold a Republican mock convention. I would like to present two sets of reasons: candidates and issues. Unbiased examination of the facts can result in no other answer but a resounding decision in favor of a Republican mock convention.

Compared to the clearly evident prospects of an exciting Republican convention, the Democrat convention would be a dull, drab affair. There is no contest in the opposition party. The man in the White House controls his party's machinery and there will be little meaningful discussion of platform, issues, and candidates. Unless, of course, they try to run Bobby for Vice President. There will be no opportunity for grassroots ideas; everything will be well planned and, undoubtedly, skillfully executed. Yes, the Democrat convention would be a show, one of the dullest, most uninspiring and uninteresting shows of

the century. It will be even longer and, yes, even more boring than "Cleopatra."

On the other hand, the Republicans can look forward to a spirited race for the presidential nomination. A number of well-qualified candidates have appeared on the horizon. There is no sure bet. There are at least six, perhaps seven, candidates who could conceivably become our nominee. There very well could be a dark horse candidate and you in Ohio are aware of the possibilities of Rhodes to a better profile.

Let me say that all of the Republican candidates have a better profile and would have the capacity and courage to act constructively. It seems that during this administration the craze has been touch football but this is indicative of the character of this administration; they have touched everything but tackled nothing.

Here, you as college students will have a chance to make a meaningful contribution to national politics. Here you will be called upon to make an important and far-reaching decision.

In a Republican convention there would be an opportunity for ideas and brainchilds to come forth from the grassroots.

In 1960 the Republicans formulated one of the best campaign platforms ever written by a national nominating convention. This platform was the result of a study by competent leaders from every facet of our economy which ended in the publication "Decisions for a Better America." This was used as the basis for the platform.

These are the type of decisions that you will have the opportunity to ponder on, build on and extend if you had a Republican convention. You, then, would have the opportunity to make decisions for a better America. An opportunity which will not present itself in a Democrat convention that will provide little opportunity to work its will because their platform has already been written during the last 4 years. And, even with its shortcomings there will be little chance to improve it.

The primary issues which you will be able to discuss at a Republican mock convention, without restrictions or commitments to an administration program are:

Fiscal policy: Here you would have a chance to formulate a policy that would assure a sound dollar, curb and prevent inflation, one that would call for a balanced budget and not a planned deficit.

Civil rights: We Republicans are the party of Lincoln—the first and greatest Republican President. It was Lincoln who said during the Civil War:

"We should adopt some program by which the two races could live themselves out of their old relationships with each other and both come out better prepared for the new." This program has not been completed to date. In 1957 and 1960, under President Eisenhower, the Republicans passed the first civil rights legislation since reconstruction. Now, after almost 3 years of Kennedy rule, with many promises and commitments, we still have no new civil rights legislation.

You, in a Republican mock convention can help to formulate the program initiated by Lincoln. Here we are dealing with a moral question; one that is a problem throughout our country and one to which we must find a solution.

Foreign policy: What we need most of all is a clear, concise, well-defined foreign policy to go with our foreign aid programs. We Republicans have an excellent record in foreign aid. But help is needed and you can assist in providing it, to formulate a foreign policy that would reflect our heritage of freedom and would be conducive to its spread.

Aid to higher education: We need a new outlook on aid to higher education. There is no long-range solution among the administration's proposals. I have a plan, as I mentioned earlier, that provides a new approach that could lend to the solution of this problem, free of church and state difficulties and free of the always present fear of Federal control.

Farm problem: Last but certainly not least, I, coming from a farm State, can see firsthand the failure of this administration to formulate an effective farm program. Here again a new approach is needed. New solutions must be sought. You, through a Republican mock convention, can help us in finding the answers to these questions—you can play an important part.

All in all, a Republican mock convention would provide you with more excitement, it would provide more intellectual stimulation, it would provide for more creative work on your part and would enhance, to a greater extent, your understanding of a national nominating convention.

In light of what I have said, I have no doubts but that you will choose to hold a Republican mock convention, and at its conclusion you will decide to actively support whatever candidate is nominated at the national convention and work to help the Republican Party in this election and in all elections to come.

Portrait of a Great President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of the young people who have written to me of their feelings on the death of the President have enclosed poems which they have composed. One of the young teenagers who has sent a poem is Linda Jean Miller, a student at Northeast Junior High School in Minneapolis.

Mr. President, as another indication of the impact of the President's death on our young people, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Miller's poem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

PORTRAIT OF A GREAT PRESIDENT

The world now mourns a precious man,
Who under his world freedom plan
Brought greater union to us all,
That peace on Earth might be our call.

A man of love and faith was he,
Who led, that man might peaceful be.
His courage and his wisdom great
Saved every land from tragic fate.

Tasks of challenge he did take,
For this a greater world would make.
His smile, his face, his friendly wave
Man ne'er forgets. His life he gave.

His voice, his words, his love of life,
Rang out in speech through lasting strife.
"Ask not what your country can do for you,
But what, for your country, you can do."

Let shine the flame of freedom's light,
That all the lands may shine as bright.
E'en though in silence he does lie,
He in our hearts shall never die.

His strength had come from Heav'n above,
With gifts of power, peace, and love.
His great ideals are set for all,
That a world of liberty may never fall.

He was humble, which made him truly great,
He was kind, which changed most people's hate.
He loved mankind, and they in return
Loved him, who let peace's light yet burn.

For no man did as much he,
To make our world more great and free.
A dedicated man of priceless worth,
Our President Kennedy has left this earth.

—LINDA JEAN MILLER.

Crises Have Tested and Redeemed the Greatness of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, crises have tested and redeemed the greatness of America. I think that the tragic events of the past few weeks have again demonstrated our ability to meet a great crisis as a united people.

Among the television stations of my district there was a united effort to help keep the people of the area fully informed on every development during the crisis, and to preserve calm and a sense of order.

I should like to insert into the RECORD a television editorial which shows the determination we have not to be swayed from our great purposes and ideals, our decision to go forward:

CRISES HAVE TESTED AND REDEEMED THE GREATNESS OF AMERICA

The lives of us all will never quite be the same again. We have been touched by the sweeping events of history, and only time will give us the perspective to judge them properly. The American people have never before been so personally involved in a national crisis. For 4 days we have been witnesses to an unbelievable chain of events, beginning with the cruel death of our President and ending with the world's tribute to his memory. No eloquence can fully describe our grief; certainly, no words can capture the elusive spirit of hope that we all have for our future as a people. Channel 12 has done its very best to keep you close to the events that have so greatly affected our lives.

The American people—of diverse faiths and races, of differing regions and opinions—have traditionally come together as one people to face with courage the tragedies and triumphs of national life. That unity is all the more needed now. We have a new leader who has humbly asked for our help. There is no doubt that he deserves our faith and support in the trying times he faces.

We, as a people, must now recapture the tempo of life which has made us a great nation. We must deserve the faith President Kennedy expressed in us; we must live up to the promise President Johnson has asked of us.

Quoting Abraham Lincoln, "It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us."

New Hampshire's Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the chairman of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, N.H., is Dr. J. Duane Squires, whose keen awareness of history provides an excellent vantage point from which to view the problems and pressures confronting our modern democracy. His stress upon the history of education, constitutional guarantees of freedom, and strength of character reflects concerns which are very much alive in New Hampshire in the present day. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "New Hampshire's Heritage," from the October 1963 issue of the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S HERITAGE

(By J. Duane Squires)

New Hampshire's heritage from the War for Independence is threefold. The great struggle of 1775–83 left, first of all, a lasting impress on the structure and organization of our State government. In the second place, it provided a many faceted range of cultural and social factors in our present life. And, in the last place, it gave us a legacy of great personalities with whom we of this generation should be more familiar. We may consider each of these aspects in a little detail.

In the structure and organization of our State government we start with the constitution of New Hampshire. It is the second oldest such document among the 50 States. It dates from the year 1784 and is second in origin only to the fundamental law of Massachusetts. The New Hampshire constitution, patterned largely after that of the Bay State, has a bill of rights with 38 articles, covering the entire range of human liberty as the Founding Fathers understood that term. The length of the document is about the same as that of the Constitution of the United States, and more than three-fourths of it has gone unchanged since 1784.

Perhaps the most striking provision of the New Hampshire constitution is article 9 of section II, in which the House of Representatives of the State Legislature is discussed. This article, as amended in 1942, assures the Granite State of a house of not fewer than 375 members or more than 400. The number of people entitled to representation is changed after each Federal census, and since 1960 is 822. Basically, and this goes back directly to the years between 1775 and 1783, the unit of representation in the New Hampshire house is the local town. Promises were then made—and they have been largely kept—that, whenever possible, each town could be represented in the State Legislature. It has given us the third largest parliamentary body in the English-speaking world.

Another inheritance from the War for Independence in New Hampshire is the State seal. Adopted in 1784, the design features the U.S.S. *Raleigh*, launched at the Portsmouth Navy Yard on May 21, 1776. The *Raleigh* was one of the first ships built for the infant U.S. Navy. Similar in importance is the State motto of New Hampshire, "Live Free or Die." These famous words were penned by Gen. John Stark, the most noted of New Hampshire's officers under General Washington.

LIVE FREE OR DIE

Settled in 1623 under the authority of an English land grant, New Hampshire was the first of the States to declare her independence, in January 1776, 6 months earlier than the Federal Declaration of Independence, and the first to adopt her own constitution. She was the ninth and deciding State to accept the Federal Constitution, binding the original 13 States together as a republic.

The removal of the powder and guns from Fort William and Mary at New Castle by a small band of patriots in 1774 has been called the first aggressive act of the Revolution. New Hampshire troops played a leading part in the fighting at Bunker Hill. The victory of New Hampshire's Revolutionary War hero, Gen. John Stark, at the Battle of Bennington was of great historic import.

New Hampshire's motto, "Live Free or Die," from a message that Stark sent to be read at an anniversary of that battle, expresses the continuing spirit that has fostered economic, social, and educational progress through the years.

Turning now to the legacy of cultural and social factors which have descended to us from the period of the War for Independence, we note, first, the impress of place names on our map. Three of New Hampshire's 10 counties are named for persons prominent in the Revolutionary years: Belknap, Carroll, and Sullivan. Belknap was a distinguished minister-chaplain in the Continental Army; Carroll was a Marylander who signed the Declaration of Independence and outlived all his colleagues in that immortal action; Sullivan was an outstanding New Hampshire general. Among the towns with Revolutionary names we note Bartlett, Freedom, Hancock, Jefferson, Langdon, Lee, Madison, Mount Vernon, Stark, Thornton, Weare and Washington. Incidentally the last-named is the first community in our Nation to bear that appellation.

Another important facet of the war years was the growing freedom it gave to our people in the choice of a religious denomination. In 1775 there were churches in the State only of the Congregational, Presbyterian, Baptist, Quaker, and Episcopal persuasions. By 1783 these had been widened to include the Free Will Baptists, the Universalists, the Methodists, and, a bit later, the Shakers. Thus religious freedom, as we know it today, began during the Revolution.

Still another facet was a new and greater interest in education. "Knowledge and learning," says article 83 of the constitution of 1784, "are essential to the preservation of a free government." So we are not surprised to see that the Phillips Exeter Academy, one of the oldest such institutions in the Nation, was founded in 1778 and given State incorporation in 1781. Seven more such schools began in the next decade alone. It is worthy of note—and this attests to the importance of the alliance with France—that the one modern language taught by all these early schools was French. And so, often, it remains to this day.

Out of the strong emotions of the struggle for independence came a rising desire for mercy and justice in ordinary law. You know that in old England in 1775 there were 200 crimes legally punishable by death. Even in New Hampshire when the war began, there were 11 offenses so punishable. But by the constitution of 1784 this formidable list was reduced to eight, and the number has been declining ever since that time.

Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, the War for Independence gave New Hampshire folk of this generation an inheritance of notable personalities by which our modern lives might well be brightened.

In the true pattern of the real Nathan Hale, the real Patrick Henry, and the real Paul Revere, New Hampshire produced such military men as Gen. John Stark and Gen. John Sullivan; such signers of the Declaration of Inpedendence as Dr. Josiah Bartlett, Dr. Matthew Thornton, and William Whipple; such great public officials as John Langdon and Meshech Weare; and such religious leaders as Jeremy Belknap and Benjamin Randall.

It would be well if we and our youth today would make such men our exemplars. They gave us undying instances of character, integrity, decency, and honor, from which ideals the Nation can never safely retreat.

President Kennedy, in addressing the 1963 National Congress of the DAR, said:

"In a world which contines to face unprecedented difficulties, the values of the American Revolution are an incalculable asset to our country."

Truthful and good words. And in a recent article Adm. Hyman Rickover remarked:

There is nothing wrong with America that Americans can not set right.

This is the essence of our heritage from the War for Independence.

Coast Guard Cites Hazards in Operation of Diesel Towing Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1963, when I introduced H.R. 9130, a bill to require the inspection by the Coast Guard of diesel-powered towing vessels, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A7091 a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending passage of the legislation. The bill itself was drafted by the Coast Guard, based on recommendations originally made by me in a bill I introduced in the previous Congress.

The Coast Guard had asked that no action be taken by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on my original bill—H.R. 9700 in the 87th Congress and H.R. 942 in the 88th Congress—until the Coast Guard could make its own study of the need for legislation and draft the kind of legislation it thought should be enacted. So that is the background of H.R. 9130.

MASTERS, MATES, AND PILOTS UNION SUPPORTS NEW BILL

Mr. Speaker, I have just seen an article which appeared in the November issue, the Master Mate and Pilot, the publication of the International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, AFL–CIO, reporting that the union, which has been leading the fight for a long time for effective safety standards on towing vessels, has endorsed the new bill. I am including that article as part of my remarks, as follows:

[From the Master Mate and Pilot, November 1963]

MASTERS, MATES, AND PILOTS SUPPORTS REPRESENTATIVE SULLIVAN'S LATEST TOWBOAT INSPECTION BILL

WASHINGTON.—A new attempt to require the inspection of towboats is being made by Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, in a bill introduced Novem-

ber 14 and referred to the House Merchant Marine Committee. House bill 9130 has been endorsed by Masters, Mates & Pilots.

The measure would cover all vessels "engaged or intended to engage in the service of towing, which are above 15 gross tons or 26 feet or over in length," and would include "all towing vessels regardless of manner of propulsion and whether documented or not."

H.R. 9130 would authorize the Coast Guard to promulgate regulations respecting the design, construction, alteration or repair of towboats, and also the manning and duties of the licensed officers and crewmembers.

Broadly similar to Representative SULLIVAN's past attempts to seek legislation for a safer towboat industry, the latest bill "was an outgrowth of a long series of exchanges of correspondence" between both members of St. Louis local 28 and Masters, Mates & Pilots' legislative committee, she noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. H.R. 9700 in the 87th Congress and H.R. 942 in the 88th Congress—identical bills requiring the inspection and certification of towboats—were previous legislative attempts.

Following the introduction of these resolutions, the Coast Guard requested an opportunity to complete its own investigation of the need for this legislation before further action was taken.

The Congresswoman said that the Coast Guard study "revealed in general that operation of diesel-powered towing vessels involves as great a hazard as operation of those propelled by steam and should therefore be subject to similar Coast Guard safety standards."

Mrs. SULLIVAN cited the fact that "while the number of towing vessels has increased 20 percent in the past 10 years, the number of casualties has increased by 120 percent to an average of 559 casualties per year." The Coast Guard has found that "a large percentage of these casualties occurred on uninspected towing vessels."

In endorsing Representative SULLIVAN's H.R. 9130. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon observed that this large percentage of casualties "could be avoided or minimized if well qualified personnel were aboard."

The Coast Guard found that in 1962 that of 5,100 vessels documented for towing services only 103 were inspected and certified by the Coast Guard, the remainder not subject to inspection under existing law. The 530 towboats involved in reportable serious casualties in 1962 represented an average of 1 out of every 10 towing vessels in service, Secretary Dillon said.

H.R. 9130 would become effective not later than January 1, 1965, if approved by both Houses and signed by the President.

Mrs. SULLIVAN represents the Third District of Missouri.

Assassination of the Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, many excellent articles were written following the assassination of our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Robert M. Schrag, assistant editor of the Mennonite Weekly Review, wrote a splendid article entitled "A Moment in History" which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MOMENT IN HISTORY

The doleful drums rolled on Pennsylvania Avenue. Where a President had ridden in triumph, a military caisson bore him slowly along in death. John F. Kennedy was gone, and a world mourned.

The awesome drama was played from beginning to end on one long November week end. On Friday noon the President was in Dallas, vibrantly alive. A few hours later he was back in Washington, dead. Time, space and history itself were foreshortened in a technological age.

"A bad man shot my daddy," said John F. Kennedy, Jr., 3 years old the day of his fathers' funeral. "His world was strangely different, in little ways a child notices but does not understand," wrote the UPI. General MacArthur summed up everyone's personal sorrow: "When he died something died within me."

America's self-confidence was shaken. In a country of law and reason and light, the dark and brutal spirit of the jungle possessed the heart of an assassin with a mail-order rifle. A nation accustomed to smugly lecture its Latin neighbors about their violent politics drew itself up short for a searching look at its own soul. What were we coming to? The deep melancholia of an entire people called forth Shakespeare's lines:

"For God's sake, let us sit upon the ground,
And tell sad stories of the death of kings."

John Kennedy was not a king, but no Caesar ever had more power to decide the fate of nations—the might of the nuclear thunderbolt. During his brief 3 years in office, the force of the atom had once again been contained, however precariously, and the world was grateful. His successful efforts for a nuclear test ban treaty raised the hopes of fearful humanity.

The U.S. Chief Executive was more than a national symbol, for he identified himself with the larger cause of mankind. "I am a Berliner," he declared last June to the throngs in beleaguered West Berlin. A marked contrast to the aged leaders of Europe, the young President and First Lady inspired the world with a spirit of youthful optimism.

Among the ironies of this moment in history was the obvious parallel to President Lincoln, assassinated on Good Friday, 1865, after preserving the Union in the Civil War. Though separated by a century of change, Lincoln and Kennedy faced many of the same basic domestic problems, Kennedy, a strong civil rights advocate, was martyred in the centennial year of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. The London Times described the late President as one "who felt that he was challenged to carry forward the implications of Lincoln's work and who in this last year, has been seen wrestling with the critical issues of race and national unity."

With the numbing shock came also a sense of national rededication to making real the ideals of American civilization, and of Christianity itself. John Kennedy's goal of national brotherhood—transcending even racial barriers—was elusive during his lifetime. Now, at his death, it seemed strangely closer to realization.

In the three grief-filled days from her husband's death to his burial, Jacqueline Kennedy was a model of courage. The darkly veiled young widow bravely led a unique gathering of the world's dignitaries from the White House to St. Matthew's Cathedral for the funeral. Following the requiem mass, quotations were read from the Kennedy inaugural address ("Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country") and from Ecclesiastes ("A time to be born and a time to die.")

It was the making of a legend. The statue of the Great Emancipator looked down upon the somber yet majestic funeral procession as it wound past the Lincoln Memorial toward a hero's grave across the Potomac. And the drums rolled.

The Takoma Park Sister City Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the age of mass communications and jet travel has made every man and woman in the world a neighbor of Takoma Park, Md. We cannot live next door to neighbors without sharing in their experiences. Since it is unwise to live next to people we do not understand or know, the people-to-people program inaugurated by President Dwight Eisenhower and continued by President John Kennedy has answered a very real need. Commending the program, President Kennedy stated:

I know that all Americans are united in their support of the objectives of the people-to-people program. I am certain that the people-to-people program has inaugurated a new chapter in American history.

Through this program, hundreds of thousands have received their first true impressions of the United States and its peoples. Communications of every kind have been exchanged. Personal visits also have been exchanged and the lives of all participants have been drawn closer and enriched.

Young people of many nations, including Takoma Park, now have an entirely different concept of the democratic processes of our Government. They also know more fully the value and importance of the preservation of this form of government, regardless of their land of birth.

Such an exchange among the potential leaders of tomorrow can mean only progress for our Nation and the world. It has truly been said, "No man is an island." We cannot live to ourselves and ignore our neighbors in this age of technological advance and exploding populations. We must learn to live with our fellowmen from all nations or perish.

The people-to-people program meets this need for an avenue of communication and understanding between peoples. Millions are benefited by the program now, and many millions more will receive benefits in the days ahead.

For this reason, I take great pride in announcing that the city of Takoma Park is the sixth city in Maryland to embark on a sister city affiliation.

Following is a record of their achievements to date. I maintain that this report marks another milestone on the road to understanding with our brothers

to the south in the Americas. The text of the report follows:

SISTER CITY AFFILIATION INITIATED BY TAKOMA PARK CITIZENS

Citizens of Takoma Park have named a permanent 30-man citizens' committee and have formed an affiliation as a sister city with Jequie, Bahia, Brazil. Formal organization took place in Takoma Park October 10, 1963. However, many citizens of the park had been working for more than 3 years that something tangible could be done to link the two cities. They decided that a student exchange would be one sure way to begin sister city activity.

In January of this year the Honorable Antonio Lomanto, Jr., mayor of Jequie, met with George M. Miller, the mayor of Takoma Park, and officially exchanged town affiliation charters uniting the two communities. The exchange concluded 3 years of negotiations between Takoma Park and Jequie.

Now, an exchange student has been named by the Brazilian city and she will arrive in the United States in January of 1964. The student, Miss Arly Souza Britto, is niece of the Honorable Antonio Lomanto, who is now Governor of the Province of Bahia, Brazil. Present plans call for her staying with Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Coffman, public relations director of Takoma Park.

Primary in the thinking of Takoma Park citizens is a desire to help present a true picture of Americans to the Brazilian populace. To develop grassroots communications and a full exchange of ideas with citizens of Jequie, residents of Takoma Park named E. W. Tarr, chairman; W. H. McClenon, first vice chairman; Leslie Pitton, second vice chairman; Mrs. Esther D. Geib, secretary; and Mrs. Rhoda Ross, associate secretary, as an executive committee for the project.

Subcommittee chairmen were also named to complete the organization of a program promoting active communications with Jequie, Brazil. Named to the subcommittee posts were: Robert Chasm, community relations; John A. Postle, "ham" radio; H. Eugene Walker, education; Mrs. Ruth B. Pratt, fine arts; Mrs. Rita Robinson, library; Mrs. Fred Grabe, publicity; Mrs. Barbara Thorn, student exchange; Mr. Herbert Smith, technical; Mrs. Hilda Rocco, translation; and W. H. McClenon, organization.

Jequie, Brazil, has a population of 51,000 and is county seat of Bahia. It is located about 120 miles southwest of Salvador, the capital of Bahia Province. Takoma Park's population numbers a little more than 17,000.

The entire project has been undertaken to help implement the people-to-people program inaugurated by President Eisenhower. It is believed that the success of the program has been greatly enhanced by all activities being carried on by active participation of civic, fraternal, religious, and commercial groups. This grassroots level approach has helped many peoples of countries all around the world understand a different side of America.

Although the people-to-people program has always had the blessing of the U.S. State Department, it has always been directed and developed under private, grassroots leadership. City, State, and Federal officials have continually participated in formal meetings and functions of the program, but the direction and the actual implementing of the people-to-people program and sister city projects has always been the work of dedicated citizens in an unofficial capacity.

The next few months will not only mark the arrival of Miss Britto, the Brazilian exchange student, but will also witness the sending of a Takoma Park youth to Brazil for a second phase of the sister city project.

Continuing with the program of good will and personal understanding initiated last January, the newly appointed committee paid an unofficial visit to the Brazilian Embassy on Tuesday, November 19. Through this visit friendly contacts were made with embassy members and additional channels of communication were set up between the Takoma Park committee and the citizens of sister city, Jequie, Brazil.

Responding to this visit, Jorge de Carvalho e Silva, Minister, Chargé Affaires of the Brazilian Embassy, issued the following statement:

"The people-to-people program has been leaning to the Brazilian-American relations a contribution that is as relevant as it is timely. Therefore, it was with satisfaction that the Embassy received the visit of Mayor George Miller, of Takoma Park, Md., with a group of members of the sister city affiliation program.

"I accompany with great interest their contribution toward our joint endeavor in promoting a better understanding between the peoples of two nations that are traditionally friends."

Other projects being fostered by the Takoma Park Sister City Committee are:

1. Constant contact is maintained with Jequie by an organized group of "ham" radio operators.

2. A photo album and scrapbook prepared by Takoma Park Junior High School students has been given to the city of Jequie.

3. Classes in the Portuguese languare are being arranged through the Brazilian Embassy.

The sister city program gives new emphasis to the pioneer spirit of individual action. This spirit moved the founders of our Nation and this spirit will continue to keep our Nation growing, strong and free.

Our Stake in the Arctic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the December 2, 1963, issue of the American Security Council Washington Report presents an eloquent and interesting discussion of a strategic area of the Western Hemisphere which is largely overlooked and little understood by too many. This report entitled "Our Stake in the Arctic" was written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, the associate editor of the News & Courier in Charleston, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have this report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OUR STAKE IN THE ARCTIC

WASHINGTON, *December 2, 1963.*

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Harrigan is associate editor of the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, a member of the ASC's strategy staff, and a major contributor to military journals in the United States, France, Australia, and Japan.)

The danger to the Nation along its southern strategic frontier—from the Soviet Union's outpost in Cuba to the troubled regions of northern Brazil—is perfectly well understood by the American public. But both the danger and the opportunity along the northern strategic frontiers—the Arctic—is comprehended hardly at all.

Yet the United States is an Arctic power as much as it is an Atlantic nation or a land with a strategic involvement in the Pacific. The American Union, through the State of Alaska, is partly above the Arctic Circle. From the defense standpoint, our most important warning system—the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System (BMEWS) is at Thule, Greenland, and watches for missile attack from across the Pole. Since the nuclear submarine *Nautilus* made the first undersea Arctic cruise in the summer of 1957, American sea power has aimed at an increasingly greater role in the Arctic Ocean.

Despite the rising tempo of U.S. defense activity in the Arctic, the American people do not fully grasp our national orientation toward the northern regions. Ever since the days of early settlement, the focus of American attention has been on the Atlantic. Beginning with the rise of Japanese sea power at the end of the 19th century, the Pacific dimension of our strategic vision came into being. To the south, the threat has been clear since the time of President Monroe. But the north has been a frozen land—a barrier that no enemy could cross.

It is necessary that the American people reorient themselves to the Arctic, for the ice is no longer a barrier. Establishment of an under-ice city at Thule, complete with nuclear power station, makes clear that the Arctic climate will be conquered in the years ahead. Moreover, under-ice operation in the Arctic Ocean means that vast oceanic region, bounded by the Soviet Union on one side and the free world nations on the other, will be open to submerged navigation in peace and war.

Americans need to look down at the Arctic from above, so to speak, instead of looking east and west. It is useful to think of the Arctic Ocean almost as one thinks of the Indian Ocean—an ocean that is almost landlocked. If one takes this view, he quickly grasps the principal geographical elements and their strategic significance. The chief geographical feature of the Arctic Ocean is Greenland, which we see as North America's great offshore island—a land with as much strategic significance for North America as Great Britain has for the European Continent. The Greenland and the Norwegian Sea together form the single wide passage from the Arctic Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean. Control of these seas is as important as, for example, the control of the ocean areas between Dakar, Africa, and the coast of South America.

On the other side of the pole, the Bering Strait has the same significance for the Soviet Union that the Suez Canal had for the British Empire. Soviet undersea craft could not move from European Russia to the Far East unless they had clear access through the strait separating Siberia and Alaska.

The Queen Elizabeth Islands of northern Canada, which lie between Greenland and the Beaufort Sea north of Alaska, can be compared with the multitude of strategic islands in the South China Sea and the Indonesian Archipelago.

The only reason that the peoples of the world have not visualized these lands and seas in strategic terms is because the ice kept out shipping. But that day is at an end. The Soviets are keenly aware of the dawn of a new era in the history of the Arctic world, and the United States cannot afford to lag in understanding.

First of all, what is the Arctic? Where are the boundaries? The Arctic Circle provides a poor definition. A far more useful boundary for the purpose of strategic considerations can be fixed at the 60th parallel. Thus the area within this segment includes almost all of Alaska, northern Canada, Greenland, Iceland, northern Norway and Sweden, Finland and the great landmass of Siberia and the Soviet far north.

The Soviet Government has been pushing hard to populate the Arctic and sub-Arctic regions. Today, an estimated 6 million Russians live north of the 60th parallel. Archangel, with a population of 300,000, is the largest city in the northern regions of the globe. The entire State of Alaska has a population of only 226,167 (1960 census).

Decades ago, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, writing in "The Northern Course of Empire," predicted that the center of civilization would shift to the north. Certainly, the population pressures of the 20th and 21st centuries, combined with nuclear power for light and heat, will result in a movement of peoples into these regions.

Development of the Arctic world is inevitable because of the tremendous economic potential of the area. The best fishing grounds in the world are located along the edge of the Arctic. Coal deposits exist around the rim of the Arctic Ocean. The subarctic areas of Canada are rich in radioactive minerals such as uranium and thorium and in iron, nickel, lead, and in petroleum and natural gas as well. Much of the iron used in American steel mills comes from a mine in Labrador. Gold, copper, and tin are produced in the Soviet far north. In addition, great waterways of the Soviet Union, the Yenisei, Lena and Ob Rivers, are arctic and subarctic rivers. They form important commercial avenues to northern Asia. And the sea route across the top of Russia is of increasing importance to that country. It is the Soviet Union's enormous interest in the northern route through the ice that dictated that the U.S.S.R.'s initial nuclear-powered vessel should be the atomic icebreaker *Lenin*, which is nearly twice the size of the largest American icebreaker, the *Glacier*.

The Soviets have been studying the Arctic since the early 1930's. In 1937, the first Soviet scientists set up stations on drifting ice floes. The 1960's find Soviet meteorological stations all along the Arctic coast and among the islands of the east Siberian Sea.

For the time being, however, the United States has gained an advantage in the Arctic as a result of its pioneering in underice navigation. The eight announced U.S. nuclear submarine cruises into the Arctic have produced observations which are of immense importance to our defense. We have learned of passages through the ice, but we also must learn that the Arctic Ocean has a strategic importance second to none. Economically, of course, the region contains great riches. The Queen Elizabeth Islands, for instance, are rich in minerals. When engineering methods are perfected and transportation becomes commercially feasible, commerce will flourish in the Arctic. Initially, the United States will need more and bigger icebreakers, including nuclear-powered craft that can operate for long periods at a time.

The key instrument in the domination of the Arctic is, however, the submarine. It is secure from surface and aerial attack in this wilderness of ice. The only weapon it has to fear is another submarine.

The Soviets are no less aware of this than the U.S. Navy. The logical operating area for Soviet missile-firing submarines will be in the Arctic. Moreover, it is to be expected that they will attempt to take up patrols in Hudson Bay, the vast watery area that provides a water entry into the heart of North America. It is with this potential danger in mind that the Canadian Government recently ordered work to begin on an underwater surveillance system in the area where submarines would enter Hudson Bay. This marine surveillance system in the years to come will be as important as the distant early warning system of radar stations that guarded North America against aerial attack.

In addition, the United States and Canada cannot neglect training of troops for arctic operations. If the Soviets were to seize one or more islands in the Arctic, as they have infiltrated Cuba, it would be necessary to drive them out. The Canadians and their Commonwealth allies, the British, have been mindful of this need and have begun training of parasnowmen. Earlier this year, Canadian and British parachutists practiced the arts of arctic warfare, digging snow holes and trenches, building huts with snow blocks, and mastering the tactics involved in moving across snow into attack.

A strategy of victory requires that the United States press its advantage at all points along its strategic frontiers. In the far north we face the Soviet Union directly. We also face a rising challenge from Soviet seapower, which can be expected to seek domination of the Arctic Ocean. American supremacy must not only be on, under and above the seas but beneath the ice as well.

ANTHONY HARRIGAN,
Guest Editor.

National Commander of the American Legion, Daniel F. Foley, Strikes Back at Antiveteran Article in the Saturday Evening Post, of November 30, by President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Edwin P. Neilan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the national public relations division of the American Legion:

American Legion National Commander Daniel F. Foley today termed an article, appearing in the November 30 issue of the Saturday Evening Post and authored by the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a "blatant and outrageous" attack on veterans and veterans' organizations and a "shocking and unwarranted" indictment of the Congress and of the Veterans' Administration. "This will do nothing to improve the public image of either the Post or the chamber of commerce," Commander Foley stated. The leader of the world's largest veterans' organization said the American people have a right to expect of the Nation's major magazines fair and responsible reporting. "This article," he declared, "is a gross contribution to confusion. It is loaded with inaccuracies and inconsistencies."

The article, entitled "Let's Say No To The Veterans," contends that veterans are the worst offenders among groups receiving from the Congress what its author calls handouts and Federal giveaways. It refers to the veterans' benefits program as a scandal and implies that any veterans' legislation passed by Congress is loosely written. "Congressmen," says the article, "are demonstrably unable to resist" the lobbyists.

To thwart pressure groups, the chamber's president recommends abolishment of the House Veterans' Committee. "If we were to pursue this kind of logic," Commander Foley noted, "one also would have to recommend the abolishment of the constitutionally guaranteed right of petition, and perhaps the American system of representative government. We doubt if the leading spokesman for the business lobby would seriously propose that the Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress be dissolved."

The chamber's president also charges the Veterans' Administration with loose administration of veterans' legislation and with inefficient management of its hospitals. He would discontinue the VA hospital system and he questions the agency's justification for remaining in control of other benefit programs.

The American Legion took particular exception to the Post article's claim that the VA routinely permits veterans to perjure themselves so as to secure free medical care. The Legion's leader stated that "this reckless accusation establishes wtihout doubt the chamber president's complete ignorance of the extreme lengths to which the VA goes to insure that its hospital beds will be used only by those having entitlement on the basis of either service-connection or need." The commander said repeated surveys have demonstrated that abuse of the veterans' hospital treatment privilege is negligible. The findings, he pointed out, consistently have shown that "less than one-half of 1 percent of the cases might be subject to question," and he emphasized that this record is remarkably low in comparison with other public programs of like nature. The Legion spokesman added that his organization has given the VA every cooperation in continuing efforts to eliminate abuse of the non-service-connected medical program.

The Post article, in the Legion's opinion, adds up to an unfair—and unsubstantiated—condemnation of all veterans' programs, even though its writer gives lipservice to the "sensible principle that benefits should be paid only for service-connected disabilities, for unemployability and for need." Commander Foley observed that the Legion has consistently supported this principle and, in fact, participated in establishing it as part of today's law. The chamber's president, however, selected out for particular abuse a general pension bill that is backed by an organization representing less than 10 percent of those in veterans' organizations, but he neglected to make clear the pension policy of the American Legion.

The Legion commander said "anyone even casually acquainted with our organization's longstanding position knows that we stand for a showing of need in non-service-connected benefit programs. The American Legion is," continued Mr. Foley, "the foremost spokesman among veterans' groups for retention of a reasonable test of need in the veterans' disability and death pension programs. Within the framework of existing law, we seek moderate liberalizations in keeping with rising living costs, and such other modifications as will serve to perpetuate the dignified and gracious manner in which the Nation traditionally has cared for its war veterans and their survivors."

The Wabasha, Minn., lawyer identified four major fallacies in the Post article which he said served to discredit any claim its author might make to expertise in the field of veterans' affairs. These, together with the Legion's comment, are:

1. The Post article asks, "If low-income veterans of World War I should be helped, why shouldn't low-income, elderly nonveterans?" The Washington office of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is well staffed with experts in all forms of Government programs. It is inconceivable that its president would be unaware of the public assistance program under which well over two million older citizens, regardless of veteran status, receive a monthly payment consisting largely of Federal funds. The amount paid in such cases is, on the average, approximately the same as the average pension paid by the VA to a war veteran.

2. The Post article says "* * * 85 percent of the VA patients have nonservice disabilities." The quoted figure must have been grabbed out of the air for it bears no ascertainable relationship to official Government

statistics. It is possible, of course, that all VA patients have some non-service-connected disability. The fact is, however, that somewhat over 40 percent of all veterans occupying a VA hospital bed have service-connected disabilities of a compensable degree. Of the remaining non-service-connected group, over 57 percent are under treatment for chronic, long-term disabilities such as tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric conditions. These patients would be a charge on the public whether in a VA or a non-VA hospital.

3. The Post article claims "there are generally more empty beds than patients in VA hospitals, if only because most of the patients are ambulatory." The reference to "ambulatory" patients renders this statement senseless. Under this definition, all beds in any hospital would be "empty" on any given day that all of its patients could stand up and walk. The fact is the VA's record on utilization of beds is much better than non-VA hospitals. The bed occupancy rate for VA hospitals is 90 percent, compared to 75 percent for non-Federal hospitals.

4. The Post article states, "Our veteran population is aging, but not decreasing." This would be a good trick, if possible. The fact is the Nation's war veteran population has been on the decline since March 1958.

The chamber's president, a Delaware banker, favors dismemberment of the VA and letting the general social security system provide for the needs of veterans. Commander Foley called attention to the fact that the writer of the Post article failed to provide the details as to how this would be accomplished. "Furthermore," said the Legion head, "the business-lobby's representative did not tell us how much money, if any, would be saved. The needy—veteran or not—are cared for in our society for the most part through public programs. It is fundamental to the Legion's philosophy, however, that war veterans in need are a Federal responsibility and the VA is the agency for discharging that responsibility; and our philosophy in this regard is founded on the Nation's historic policy of providing special benefits for its war veterans and their survivors."

Representing the 2,600,000 veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean war who are members of the American Legion, Commander Foley said, "Thousands of Legionnaires also are members of some local chamber of commerce. They will have more than a passing interest in their national president's views as expressed in the Post article. We have found over the years that whenever a local installation of a Federal agency is threatened with transfer, dissolution, or curtailment, the local chamber of commerce takes an active part in efforts to retain the status quo. Legion posts and chamber units often have joined forces to justify continued full operation of a given VA medical facility."

Commander Foley stated in conclusion that the Post article presents nothing new. "It's the same old charges from the same old source. No amount of fallacious reasoning will dissuade the American public from its policy of caring for the Nation's war veterans and their survivors through special programs designed to provide for their just and reasonable needs. Neither will groundless attacks against the VA's fine record; nor will such a base purpose be served by impugning the integrity and judgment of Congressmen.

"As national commander, I pledge to all needy war veterans, and to the widows and orphans of those who served, that the American Legion will continue its efforts in their behalf, that the VA's hospital system shall be maintained intact; and that we will fight with our full strength and resources any and all attempts to dismember the VA or otherwise weaken its ability to carry out its important mission.

"We make no apology for our position on veterans' benefits, just as we need not apologize for the American Legion's great and continuing programs of community service; its child welfare work; its sponsorship of youth projects emphasizing American ideals of fair play, tolerance, civic responsibility, and constitutional government; its unselfish service to veterans and their dependents; its support for a national defense establishment second to none; its insistence upon the maintenance of American principles of justice, freedom, and democracy."

Finally, said Commander Foley, "In view of the attitude expressed by the writer of the Post article, perhaps it is also his view that veterans' groups, including the American Legion, should cease their keen interest and participation in countless community projects and endeavors all across America—many of which would not be realized without the support of such patriotic organizations."

More Active Role for Vice President Shows Policy Set by Ike Was Wise One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, none of us can comprehend the powers of the Presidency, nor fully appreciate the influence that office exerts on the world and, indeed, the course of history.

Because we cannot fully understand all these things, we cannot understand the size of the vacuum created by the sudden and tragic death of President Kennedy. A power vacuum must be filled somehow, and filled very quickly. This country was and is fortunate that Lyndon B. Johnson was there to fill the place left by our late President.

We are fortunate that Vice President Johnson played an active and important role in the high councils of the Kennedy administration, and we are fortunate that Lyndon Johnson knew and understood his role.

None of us wanted it this way, and none of us expected that events would turn as they have. But the fact is that President Kennedy is dead, and that President Johnson has succeeded him. I say that it is fortunate for us, and even fortunate for the world, that a man as capable as President Johnson was there to fill the void. The San Antonio Express recently wrote an editorial in this vein, and I include it in the RECORD:

MORE ACTIVE ROLE FOR VICE PRESIDENT SHOWS POLICY SET BY IKE WAS WISE ONE

A single major decision in the political life of John F. Kennedy towers today in lasting tribute to the late President's determination that the Nation is to survive and prosper.

After he had gained the Democratic nomination in 1960, Mr. Kennedy rose above the personal animosity of his loyal followers and selected Lyndon B. Johnson as his running mate. Mr. Johnson was not the favorite choice of the Kennedy supporters, but Mr. Kennedy took him, anyway, as the best man to fill the ticket.

Wisdom of the decision looms as a master stroke in the aftermath of the Kennedy assassination. As the machinery of Federal Government once more begins to generate its awesome power, Mr. Johnson is the man at the throttle.

There is strong possibility the myriad complexities of international and domestic issues confronting the newly elevated Chief Executive would baffle a less experienced helmsman. Instead, continuity of Government under experienced direction is assured.

Need for a fully capable No. 2 man has been apparent in all the national administrations since World War II, when the responsibility for nuclear decisions affecting all mankind was born.

In inheriting the Presidency from the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman came to the high office only lightly equipped for his role in history, but through sheer grit and determination he rose to the challenge of leadership in a crisis.

Dwight D. Eisenhower saw the administrative problem in its proper light and made a working Vice President of Richard Nixon, and for a time it appeared that Mr. Nixon would be called on to take charge when the President was stricken.

Mr. Kennedy maintained the executive policy of keeping an able successor on hand, even though there was little likelihood that the youngest man to become President would die in office.

But when fate intervened, the fast-moving, slow-talking former Senate majority leader was ready, just as he was ready to take the lesser role of Vice President in 1960.

Three years ago, the Kennedy-Johnson ticket looked to be an expedient political arrangement. When disaster struck, the 1960 selection proved to be that of a statesman.

Interpretation of Principles of the Monroe Doctrine To Guard Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bronis S. Kaslas, associate professor of international law at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., has written a series of articles on the Monroe Doctrine which has appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News. Today, I would like to submit for the RECORD the third installment in the four-part series in which Dr. Kaslas has made a significant historic contribution. This installment appeared in the Wednesday, December 4, 1963, edition of the aforementioned newspaper.

The article follows:

INTERPRETATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE TO GUARD HEMISPHERE—PART 4

The principle of noncolonization was construed with the view to checking the advance of Russian colonialism on the northwest coast of America. It was also based on the assumption that the independent Nations of North and South America possess sovereignty over the entire area of the two American continents. This meant that there remained no more territorial areas available for colonization by European powers, and that

the exclusive American sovereignty in this hemisphere must be respected.

The principle of nonintervention was directed against possible attempts by European powers to reestablish autocratic governments in Latin America. European intervention encroaching upon the political independence of American States was, and still is today regarded by the Monroe Doctrine as dangerous to the United States.

CANADA INCLUDED

By virtue of the Monroe Doctrine, the United States appears to assert the right to oppose territorial acquisition of any non-American power in this hemisphere by any process, in any manner. Thus, no distinction has been made between voluntary transfer of American territory by an existing American State and forcible encroachment upon it. Canadian territory is, no doubt, included within this claim under the Monroe Doctrine and was so acknowledged, on August 18, 1938, by a special declaration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The basis of the United States claim against voluntary transfer of any territory within the Western Hemisphere by an American State to a non-American power would be that the defense of the Western Hemisphere, and particularly the safety and the security of the United States, would be rendered difficult and endangered by the transfer of any American territory to a non-American power. In 1912, the Senate of the United States adopted a special resolution to this effect. By its comprehensive terms, this resolution was directed against any foreign government, any government "not American" and enunciated clearly the principle of self-defense. Objections to territorial acquisitions in any form and by any process, by non-American states rests upon the grounds that such acquisitions threaten the safety of the United States and the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

CONTRACTUAL DELINQUENCIES

Under international law, the United States could not assert the right to protect the Latin American Republics against non-American states attempting to resort to forcible action on account of international contractual delinquencies, when the measures taken did not involve occupation of American territory or interference with political independence. Occupation and control of the custom houses of certain insolvent Latin American states has been at times the sole and only means of satisfying contractual delinquencies.

President Theodore Roosevelt, believing that interference with such legitimate claims of non-American states would place them in a remediless condition, proposed in 1905 as an alternative that the United States itself collect the claims of European states as well as its own and thus keep European states out of the Western Hemisphere and forestall foreign occupation of any American territory.

This alternative became known as "Roosevelt's corollary" and the plan proved to be of practical value by preserving both the inviolability of the Monroe Doctrine and the legitimate claims by European powers.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

In the domain of self-defense, a country is usually reluctant to yield, to any foreign state, the right to determine under what circumstances certain measures must be taken to assure its safety and defense. Accordingly, the United States generally avoided collective action with European nations in Western Hemisphere affairs and was for a long time even reluctant to enter into mutual defense agreements with other American states. The reasons for this attitude were explained by Secretary of State Charles Hughes in 1923:

"As the policy embodied in the Monroe Doctrine is distinctively the policy of the United States, the Government of the United States reserves to itself its definition, interpretation, and application."

President Wilson also observed:

"The Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed by the United States on her own authority. It always has been maintained upon her own responsibility."

Or as Elihu Root has said:

"Since the Monroe Doctrine is a declaration based upon the Nation's right of self-protection, it cannot be transmuted into a joint or common declaration by American states or any number of them."

In accordance with this policy, the United States has always emphasized its unwillingness to accept an obligation which would permit any international body to judge its conduct under the Monroe Doctrine. Thus article 21 of the Pact of the League of Nations declared that nothing therein should "be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as * * * the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

During the first period following enunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, the United States practiced unilateral intervention in many forms, in order to carry out its principles. Among the tactics used were nonrecognition, economic pressure, diplomatic mediation, diplomatic intervention, dollar diplomacy, arms embargo, naval blockade, temporary landing of an army, or occupation over extended periods of time. The most difficult problem for supporters of the Monroe Doctrine is justification for U.S. intervention, for certainly, not all actions may be equally justified. There are a few cases where it is hard to see why U.S. forces intervened. Yet, most of interventions were clearly justified on the the grounds of common decency and humanitarian ideals. American political and military assistance made it possible for many Latin American States to maintain their independence without the drain of heavy military budgets. If the United States had not intervened in Latin America, other powers would have, and the result would have been that this hemisphere would have become an area of rivalries between European powers and undoubtedly even Asiatic powers. Under the umbrella of the Monroe Doctrine, the Americas have remained through the 19th and 20th centuries a zone of relative peace, almost enjoying a Pax Americana.

UNITED STATES IN DAYS OF PRESIDENT JAMES MONROE

When James Monroe, fifth President of the United States and promulgator of the Monroe Doctrine, was in office, the United States had a population of 11,300,000, approximately that of Pennsylvania today.

During his administration (1817 to 1825) five States joined the Union: Mississippi, 1817; Illinois, 1818; Alabama, 1819; Maine, 1820; Missouri, 1821. Arkansas became a Territory in 1819. Florida, which was purchased from Spain in 1819, became a Territory in 1822.

Other milestones of his administration included the establishment of the first public school at Boston in 1821 and the crossing of the Atlantic by the first steamship, the *Savannah*, from Savannah, Ga., to Liverpool, England, in 1819.

The American Legion of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the dynamic and forceful national commander of the American Legion, Daniel F. Foley, delivered a speech to the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, on November 9, 1963, which I commend to my colleagues. In his role as national commander of an organization composed of several million former servicemen, Commander Foley has focused attention on those American men and women who are guarding our freedom throughout the world.

One of the great contributions of the American Legion has been its constant and vigilant interest in the preparedness of the U.S. Armed Forces. Commander Foley has correctly pointed out that, in addition to military strength, we must make use of our moral and spiritual resources and be proud of our Constitution and our country.

The American Legion has a program of Americanism which operates through four great youth programs: American Legion baseball, Boys' State and Nation, the National High School Oratorical Contest, and Boy Scout sponsorship. I commend the American Legion for its work with the youth of America and for its selection of Daniel F. Foley as its national commander.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION OF TODAY—TO DISCHARGE THE DUTIES OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Daniel F. Foley, national commander, the American Legion, delivered before the department of District of Columbia, Nov. 9, 1963)

My friends, it always is a distinct pleasure for the national commander of the American Legion to meet with Legionnaires of the District of Columbia and their distinguished guests here in the Nation's Capital, and I look upon this as a particularly pleasant assignment on the eve of Veterans Day 1963.

The American Legion, as always, is delighted to participate in any program anywhere in this land where tribute is paid to America's defenders. While your official observance will take place here on Monday, November 11, this is a matter of little import—for in the hearts and minds of American Legionnaires, every day is Veterans Day.

We meet here with full recognition of the momentous hours of history which our lifetimes encompass. We meet with knowledge of the threat to freedom which exists in the world today. We meet with a calm determination that this monstrous threat shall not prevail—now or ultimately—and that our heroic dead shall not have died in vain.

Our President, in a recent address before the University of Maine, also indicated that our Government is not being lulled into complacency by the existing apparent conciliatory attitude of the Soviet Union. Speaking of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, to which the Legion gave conditional approval, and of the proposed wheat sale, which we opposed, Mr. Kennedy said: "No one of these small advances, nor all of them taken together, can be interpreted as meaning that the Soviets are abandoning their basic aims and ambitions."

While I quote somewhat out of context from his total discourse, the President also said: "Therefore, while maintaining our readiness for war, let us exhaust every avenue for peace. Let us always make clear our willingness to talk, if talk will help, and our readiness to fight, if fight we must." These statements, I believe, to be fairly well in accord with current American Legion thinking on some of our major problems.

We of the American Legion take this solemn occasion to reminisce for a moment on the great sacrifices that have been re-

quired of America's sons and daughters to bring this great Nation of ours into being, and to maintain America to this day—in strength—as a shining symbol of freedom in a darkened world.

It is, indeed, a day upon which we honor the heroes of all our Nation's wars, both the living and the dead. We revive in ourselves and, we trust, in our fellow citizens the knowledge that without the patriotism, the love of country, the unflinching readiness and ability of America's citizen-soldiers to rise to her defense in time of crisis—the America we know and love would long since have passed into the limbo of lost nations whose people were either unable or unwilling to defend themselves and the principles for which they stood.

The principles for which this Nation stands are in dire peril today for the threat to the freedom of mankind has never been greater than that posed by the international Communist conspiracy. The principles of justice and democracy and the God-given rights of the individual—all of which we cherish so dearly—have no place in a Communist-controlled society, and Mr. Khrushchev has assured us that one day we will live under communism.

I say to you my friends that this will not happen as long as we have an American citizenry that is responsive to the admonitions of the American Legion—and I pledge to you that as long as this American Legion of ours exists we will not permit our fellow man to forget the qualities that were required to make this Nation great and to keep her great. We will, to the end of our days, strive to give the ultimate in service to our God and our country, and, in so doing we will endeavor to temper our recommendations with an understanding and recognition of the problems peculiar to the times in which we live.

There are times for treading lightly, there are times for dealing with a heavy hand, but there is no time when we can afford to gamble with the security of this Nation or to jeopardize the future for ourselves or for our children.

We recognize full well that we cannot live in the past, but we know that we can use the experiences of the past to build for today and for tomorrow.

The American Legion has built its record of defending the rights and integrity not only of America's veterans, but of those men and women who currently wear the uniform of their country, and who stand guard on the frontiers of freedom throughout the world.

While the full significance of recent events in South Vietnam have not yet been made clear to the world, let us hope that the change will be for the better and that the new government will press forward with a firm determination for a quick and decisive victory in the war against the Vietcong.

At this very moment there is no place on earth where American fighting men stand in more grave personal danger than in the rotting jungles of South Vietnam. Here Americans are risking, and giving, their lives to help the Government of South Vietnam stem the tide of communism and to repel the Communist Vietcong which threatens to take over all of Vietnam and conceivably all of southeast Asia. They are defenders of freedom.

Although the guns fell silent nearly a decade ago in Korea, young Americans still stand guard over the no-man's land at the 38th parallel which divides free South Korea from Communist North Korea. They watch over an uneasy truce that could be broken by a Communist whim. Their lot is not an easy one, and while they serve where they do they are deprived of the comforts of home and the company of loved ones. They are defenders of freedom.

The U.S. Navy and Marine forces that man our naval station at Guantanamo Bay—and the ships and planes that patrol the Caribbean Sea frontier—sit on a veritable powder keg that could erupt at any moment. The American Legion believes, and we are confident that the vast majority of American people agree with us, that the early return of freedom to Cuba is vital to the defense and security of the Western Hemisphere. Our troops maintaining the vigil in this troubled area go about their daily tasks like men—knowing they are vulnerable—but confident in the knowledge that they can give an excellent account of themselves, one of which their country would be proud, should an attack ever come. They are defenders of freedom.

In West Berlin, American forces and their Western Allies maintain a constant vigil at that monstrous wall which separates the free world from the world of the Communist. There on the doorstep of the Iron Curtain, these men know they are automatically front line troops should an attack ever come. Recently renewed Communist efforts to interfere with traffic on the autobahn leading to Berlin and renewed American resistance to such interference points up once more that our rights of access to Berlin are nonnegotiable. It also provides new evidence that our troops are ready to defend that right of access. They are defenders of freedom.

Those who man the planes of the Strategic Air Command scanning the skies in a constant alert, and those who man the vessels of the U.S. Navy sweeping the seven seas, are defenders of freedom just as surely as are those of us who were privileged to wear the uniform of our country in time of actual warfare.

No Veterans' Day observance, in these trying times, would be complete without due recognition of today's defenders of freedom, and we of the American Legion take this opportunity to salute our sons who walk in our footsteps, and to offer prayers to God that the path they travel shall never lead them to the destiny that was ours—the horror of a shooting war.

Today's citizen-soldier, my friends, is no different from the citizen-soldier who forged the freedom of this Nation at Bunker Hill, at Yorktown, and at Valley Forge. He is no different from the citizen-soldier who preserved that freedom at Chateau-Thierry, the Marne, and Belleau Wood and again at Anzio, Normandy Beach, Guadalcanal, and Iwo Jima, and yet again at Pork Chop Ridge, the Punch Bowl, and the banks of the Yalu River.

He deserves your respect and mine and that of every citizen of every free nation where he lays his life on the line that the freedom of that nation may endure.

We of the American Legion believe the best insurance we can provide to these fine young men and women, and to the generations who will follow them, is to build the military forces of this Nation so strong that no potential foe would dare to attack.

But the building of military might alone is not sufficient to sustain a nation in freedom. While strength is an essential element of security, it must, to be effective, be coupled with a great resurgence of the moral and spiritual resources which helped to make this Nation great, and without which we cannot hope to survive—much less survive in freedom.

The first four words of the preamble of the Constitution of the American Legion are: "For God and country," and to the Legionnaire these are not just idle words.

Through the religious emphasis program of the American Legion chaplaincy, formerly our "Back to God" program, and recently changed to "Service to God and Country," the Legion seeks to rekindle an awareness of the moral and spiritual aspects of everyday life. We encourage church attendance regularly by every individual, at the church or synagogue of his choice, and on every occasion where the opportunity presents itself, we reaffirm our belief in the existence of a Supreme Being and our dependence upon Him.

For our country we seek great strength for we feel it is a necessity in these perilous times. We believe we can best serve our God by serving our fellow man, and this we seek to do through our great programs of Americanism, child welfare and rehabilitation.

While each of these programs, in its own way, provides a service to mankind, I would dwell briefly on our Americanism projects as being most pertinent to this occasion as an example of how we seek to serve both God and country by serving others.

Through four great youth programs, American Legion Baseball, Boys State and Nation, National High School Oratorical Contest, and Boy Scout sponsorship, more than three-quarters of a million young people come in contact with Legion-sponsored youth activities every year. Through these we seek to build sound minds in strong bodies, and through this type of service to our young people, we seek to glorify our God and to strengthen our Nation's mental, moral, spiritual and physical capacities.

We believe it to be the responsibility not just of the American Legionnaire, but of every American who would honor his Nation's past, to be an active participant in affairs of the present.

Every man who would enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship, must discharge the accompanying duties and responsibilities of citizenship. We can pay no finer tribute to those who have gone before than by taking up where they left off and dealing realistically and responsibly with the problems of our day as they did with the problems of their times.

Only by passing on to our children, untarnished, this great and free America that was endowed to us, can we say that we have discharged our responsibility to our country and to those who fought and died to make that country what it is.

Dr. Bradford's Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly privileged to request that I may be permitted by unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very moving poem by Charles H. Bradford, M.D., of Boston, concerning our beloved late lamented President John F. Kennedy. The poem is entitled "Farewell."

Dr. Bradford is an outstanding doctor and one of the greatest medical and humane leaders in the country.

Of a famous Massachusetts family, tracing back to the first Governor of our Commonwealth, he is of the Harvard College class of 1926, a great football player and hammer thrower, member of Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude graduate, also equally distinguished in the Harvard Medical School.

He is now a very famous orthopedic doctor in Boston. He is a twin brother of Mr. Edward Bradford, another fine Harvard athlete in football and track, and the brother of the Honorable Robert Bradford, the very able, distinguished former Governor of Massachusetts.

All the Bradford boys have had great collegiate and service records in time of war. Dr. Bradford was a paramedic and made many parachute jumps behind the enemy lines during World War II.

His father, Dr. Edward Bradford, founded an institution which has done immeasurable good for crippled children, the renowned Massachusetts Hospital School for Crippled Children at Canton, Mass., where the famed Mr. N. V. Swede Nelson has been trustee for the past 22 years.

Dr. Bradford has given most unselfishly the best part of his life to the care and treatment of handicapped children and other afflicted people.

He was a close friend of my late, much-admired friend and great football player-coach, Mr. Charles F. Crowley, of Harvard, Notre Dame, and Columbia.

To my mind, Dr. Bradford is one of the greatest Americans of our time, and it is with genuine feelings of pride, as well as deep appreciation, that I insert his beautiful, touching poem on President Kennedy in the RECORD.

FAREWELL

So bid him now farewell, but not goodbye;
The purposes he built must never die.
Great men, great hearts, great thoughts continue on
Long after we who thrilled to them are gone.
Into our heritage, he now has passed,
Joining the men whose work will always last.

—C. H. BRADFORD, M.D.

BOSTON.

Analysis of Accelerated Public Works Proves It Unsound Program and New $900 Million Authorization Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an unusually factual and objective analysis of the accelerated public works program as prepared by Mr. Gordon L. Calvert, municipal director and assistant general counsel for the Investment Bankers Association of America.

Because our Public Works Committee voted out, 16 to 15, the APW bill of 1963, H.R. 7351, calling for $900 million new authorization despite the substantial opposition to it and despite its sorry record under the present $900 million authorization I believe that this analysis will be most helpful to the Members who are interested in this program.

Mr. Calvert's testimony before our committee is contained hereafter:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS BY THE INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, OCTOBER 17, 1963—RE H.R. 7351 TO INCREASE BY $900 MILLION THE AUTHORIZATION UNDER THE PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

The Public Works Acceleration Act (approved September 1962) authorized the appropriation of $900 million to be allocated by the President to initiate and accelerate in eligible areas (a) Federal public works projects which have been authorized by Congress and (b) public works projects of State and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under other provisions of law. The primary purpose of the act was to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and to help communities to become more conducive to industrial development and better places in which to live and work. Grants under the act for local public works projects of States and local governments are generally limited to 50 percent of the cost of the project (or in some cases up to 75 percent of the cost of the project).

H.R. 7351 and several similar bills before the committee would amend the act to increase by $900 million (to an aggregate of $1.8 billion) the funds authorized for appropriation under the act. We believe for reasons summarized below that additional funds should not be authorized under the act.

(1) THE PROPOSED TAX REDUCTION TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY IS ACCOMPANIED BY A PLEDGE AGAINST FEDERAL SPENDING TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY

President Kennedy has put top priority on the tax reduction bill as the best method to stimulate the economy. When the tax reduction bill recently was before the Rules Committee, the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee emphasized that the country can't adopt both tax reduction and increased Federal spending to stimulate the economy, and he issued a personal statement that if Congress cuts taxes there would be no justification to increase Federal spending solely to stimulate the economy. It was reported that President Kennedy stated that he subscribed to that conclusion.

We concur strongly in these views expressed by President Kennedy and Representative Mills. When a representative of our association testified before this committee on March 30, 1962, opposing adoption of the Public Works Acceleration Act, he recommended that the most effective stimulus in a recession would be a reduction in Federal personal income taxes.

If income taxes are to be reduced to stimulate private spending and the economy generally, it would be wholly inconsistent at the same time to authorize a large Federal spending program to stimulate the economy through expenditures for public works, particularly when there is already a high level of construction of public works by State and local governments and when numerous programs of Federal financial assistance for such projects are already authorized.

(2) STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES ARE FINANCING NEW PUBLIC FACILITIES AT RECORD LEVELS

The sale of new issues of State and municipal bonds to finance construction of local public facilities set new records in both of the last 2 years, aggregating over $8.3 billion in 1961 and over $85 billion in 1962. Sales of such bonds during the first 9 months of 1963 aggregated over $7.6 billion, about 12.7 percent above the volume for the coresponding period in 1962. If sales of new issues continue at this rate for the last quarter of this year, the total for 1963 will set a new record exceeding $9 billion. The proceeds of these bonds have been used to finance the construction of schools, colleges, roads, bridges, water and sewer facilities, recreational facilities, ports, airports, flood control projects and other public facilities.

In many cases the local government which received a Federal grant under the Public Works Acceleration Act would have financed the total cost of the project without any Federal assistance. A high level of construction of public facilities by local governments will be financed without the proposed assistance under the act.

(3) EXISTING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS PROVIDE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO ACCELERATE CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAMS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Billions of dollars are already authorized for direct expenditure by the Federal Government on public works and military construction. Additional billions of dollars of Federal financial assistance to State and local governments are presently authorized under Federal programs which can be used to accelerate capital expenditures by States and municipalities. Some of the major present Federal grant programs (which include varying requirements for matching funds by the State or local government) are the following:

(a) Urban renewal capital grants of about $1.74 billion are authorized to help defray the net costs of projects. (The Housing Amendment of 1961 authorized $2 billion in addition to $2 billion previously authorized and the President's budget estimated that about $250 million would be used in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.)

(b) The Federal Highway Act of 1956 as amended by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961 authorizes Federal grants of 90 percent for the Interstate System and Federal grants of 50 percent for the ABC system (primary, secondary, and urban highway systems). On June 30, 1963, there was a total of over $3.1 billion of funds authorized for prior years not yet obligated and an additional $3.55 billion was authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

(c) The Water Pollution Control Act authorizes Federal grants of $100 million in the fiscal year 1964.

(d) The Federal Airport Act authorizes Federal grants of $75 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

(e) The Hospital Survey and Construction Act authorizes $150 million for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals during the current fiscal year. The Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act authorizes during the current fiscal year $20 million of grants for construction of public and other nonprofit diagnostic treatment centers; $20 million for construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals for the chronically ill; $10 million for the construction of public and other nonprofit rehabilitation facilities; and $20 million for the construction of public and other nonprofit nursing homes.

(f) The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 (approved September 1963) authorizes over a period of 3 fiscal years an aggregate of $105 million for grants for construction of teaching facilities for the training of physicians, nurses, and professional public health personnel; $35 million for grants for the construction of teaching facilities for the training of dentists; and $35 million for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of physicians, dentists, nurses, or professional public health personnel.

Thus, in only these programs the Federal Government already has authorization for the fiscal year 1963 alone to make grants aggregating over $8 billion for assistance to States, local governments, educational, hospital and medical institutions for public facilities.

Existing Federal loan programs to assist local governments or educational institutions include the following:

(a) The community facilities loan program, as amended by the Housing Act of 1961, authorizes an aggregate of $650 million of low interest rate Federal loans to municipalities for community facilities. Total net commitments under this program as of December 31, 1962, were slightly less than $200 million, so there is probably at least $400 million uncommitted under this program.

(b) The college housing loan program, as amended by the Housing Act of 1961, authorizes low interest rate Federal loans to colleges for dormitories and certain related facilities. An aggregate of $2.275 billion in loans was authorized under this program to June 30, 1963, and an additional $300 million is authorized during the current fiscal year and a further $300 million in the following fiscal year.

(c) The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act authorizes low interest rate Federal loans by the Farmers Home Administration to municipalities, including water conservation, irrigation, drainage and flood prevention or control districts, to finance water supply reservoirs, flood control dams and reservoirs, irrigation lands and rural water supply and distribution systems. The maximum permissible is $5 million for any one project.

(d) The Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 authorizes the Farmers Home Administration to make or insure loans to municipalities, including irrigation, drainage, and water supply districts for soil or water conservation projects.

Furthermore, there are four other major Federal financial assistance programs which have passed at least one House pending in Congress:

(a) The proposed Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 (S. 1576) is presently before a conference committee. As passed by the Senate it would authorize an aggregate of over $370 million in Federal grants over the next several years for construction of research centers, facilities for the mentally retarded, and community mental health centers. As passed by the House it would authorize an aggregate of $185 million of grants for these purposes.

(b) Amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act passed by the Senate would increase by $450 million the Federal loans and grants authorized under that act. The bill reported in the House would increase the authorized funds for ARA by over $355 million.

(c) The proposed Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 passed by the House (H.R. 6143) would authorize an aggregate of $230 million in grants over 3 years for college undergraduate academic facilities and an aggregate of $145 million in Federal grants over 3 years for such facilities.

(d) The proposed Urban Mass Transit Act passed by the Senate (S. 6) would authorize (a) an aggregate of $375 million in Federal grants over the next 3 fiscal years for urban mass transit facilities and equipment and (b) Federal guarantee of an aggregate of $375 million of transit revenue bonds. A bill reported in the House (H.R. 3881) would authorize $500 million in Federal grants over the next 3 fiscal years to assist States and local public bodies in financing facilities and equipment for urban mass transit.

The existing authorizations for Federal grants and loans provide adequate funds for the Federal Government to accelerate capital outlays by States, municipalities, and educational institutions at any time that such action is deemed necessary and desirable. Accordingly, it would be highly unnecessary and undesirable to authorize an additional $900 million of Federal funds under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

(4) FUNDS UNDER THE ACT HAVE BEEN USED FOR NONESSENTIAL PURPOSES AT THE EXPENSE OF THE TAXPAYERS

The Public Works Acceleration Act provides that funds shall be available only for projects "which will meet an essential public need."

A brief review of projects which have been approved for funds under the act during the past 3 months discloses swimming pools, recreation center buildings, vacation cabins, a park shelter house, remodeling of a field house, parking facilities, libraries, civic centers, and air conditioning of office buildings. We doubt that taxpayers throughout the United States want to, or should pay for such facilities in other areas. This creates a highly undesirable situation in government where the funds received by the Federal Government from all taxpayers are used to provide special facilities for those who have been fortunate or persuasive enough to obtain a grant from the Federal Government to construct such facilities.

Finally, we would like to emphasize a fact, which should be apparent, that a long list of applicants for a Federal grant under the program does not demonstrate a need. Obviously, when free prizes are given out by the Federal Government at the expense of taxpayers, one can expect a long list of willing recipients.

CONCLUSIONS

For the following reasons, discussed above, we strongly believe that the appropriation of additional funds under the Public Works Acceleration Act should not be authorized:

(1) The proposed tax reduction to stimulate the economy is accompanied by a pledge against Federal spending to stimulate the economy.

(2) States and municipalities are financing new public facilities at record levels.

(3) Existing Federal financial assistance programs provide billions of dollars to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and local governments.

(4) Funds under the act have been used for nonessential purposes at the expense of the taxpayers.

Ira Corbin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the real sources of strengths of every American community is its financial institutions. So much of the life of the community is determined by the strength of its banks and the wisdom of its bankers.

The town of Sandborn, Ind., recently lost one of its finest citizens, Mr. Ira Corbin, who had devoted his entire life to the banking business. He had many other civic interests, and his death is a great loss to the community and county.

Here follows an editorial in tribute to him in the Vincennes Sun Commercial of December 6, 1963:

IRA CORBIN

Knox County Republicanism loses one of its stalwart voices for conservative and economical government in the passing of banker Ira Corbin of Sandborn.

The son of a country banker, Mr. Corbin carried out the traditions of his father. He spent his entire life in Sandborn, but his influence was countywide.

For years he served on the tax adjustment board, always giving wise and practical counsel.

He had a deep interest in Hillcrest Hospital, serving on its board of managers as vice president.

He saw vast changes in the fields of economics and banking, a sturdy rock of the old school.

He will be missed.

Professional Responsibility and the Workload of the Federal District Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was particularly interested in an address on "Professional Responsibility and the Workload of the Federal District Courts," given by David C. Acheson, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, before the student body of the Georgetown Law School.

Mr. Acheson's address impressed me as an excellent analysis of the importance of professional maturity and the responsibilities facing those entering the legal profession. His remarks with respect to the workload of the courts and his suggestion as to easing the burden have proven to be controversial. They are, nonetheless, interesting and provocative, both to those who agree and those who do not.

I believe my colleagues in the Congress would be interested in reading this text and under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

(By David C. Acheson)

It has often struck me as a reproach to the profession of the law—a discipline of analysis—that it should produce so few analytical thinkers. By "analytical thinkers" I do not mean philosophers, but simply people trained to the habit of analysis, distrustful of the herd instinct and the face-value judgment. This independent and analytical habit appears to be a delicate plant at best, and, unhappily, some of the ways of adult life seem to wither this same bloom that legal education is meant to nourish. The process by which this takes place was described last June by a graduating law student of a school which I shall not identify, out of considerations of delicacy. A few selected lines from his address will make his train of thought clear to you:

"Those of you receiving degrees today have been exposed to a specialized form of educational experience here at [law school]. You have been asked not to accept things at face value but to examine a hypothesis from every side and every angle. All subjects have been treated as open issues and dealt with as

though they were unsettled and uncertain. You have been stimulated to reexamine your beliefs and attitudes, even your dogmas.

"A free society has anticipated your situation. There are weekly news magazines which provide news and opinions on all the subjects which they think are important for you to know about. Time permitting, this may be supplemented with local newspapers and both local and network radio or television. All are highly qualified at keeping you selectively informed and focusing controversy on those issues on which we are all agreed. You can thus be alert to the issues without being disturbed by them. * * *

"The hope for those of you who have been deeply influenced by the [law school] approach to life lies in moving on to the four corners of this land where you will be surrounded by good people who will help you get things back into perspective. Though many of you will shortly liberate yourselves from the action-inhibiting patterns of thought I have been discussing, I remain very concerned about those others, that minority, who always find it so difficult to adjust gracefully. Perhaps my few words today may awaken them to their condition before it is too late.

These words were said in humor, but not in jest. Such an ascendancy of community attitudes over the discipline of education—so sharply defined by the graduation orator—is not limited to the political views of lawyers, but extends rather broadly to their professional orientation as well. Perhaps the reason for this is that so many of the professional concerns of lawyers touch upon public affairs, and hence upon areas where community attitudes are crystallized—not to say rigid. Take my own field, the administration of justice. A professional concern such as the use, and proper limits, of interrogation of defendants is one on which a great many nonlawyer citizens have a view, or at least an attitude. Lawyers' views often appear to be influenced as much by those attitudes as by a professional, careful analysis of the matter. One need only attend a lawyers' meeting on this subject to hear stump speeches which are faithful reflections of lay attitudes, straight from the golf course or the cocktail party—talk about "poor defendants" and "poor victims," talk about the sacred constitutional rights of defendants (constitutional is the standard adjective that goes with rights) and talk about the invasion of constitutional rights of law-abiding members of society. It is striking and a little discouraging how seldom, even among lawyers, one hears an analysis of the precise evil to be guarded against and how best to fashion a specific remedy that will be effective, but carry a minimum of side effects. When a legal issue becomes a public debate, a sort of Gresham's law takes over both lawyers and laymen, and the lowest level of debate becomes the norm. In the same way, hysterical criticism by lawyers of the Supreme Court tends to be concentrated on issues before that Court on which the lay citizenry has strong feelings, and thus political and legal controversies coalesce.

At other times it has been thought that lawyers were inherently unoriginal and conservative, rather than taking these qualities from the attitudes of the surrounding community. Such a view was expressed by De Tocqueville, writing, it should be said, in the early 1830's, when the lay community strongly reflected the progressive optimism and drive of the frontier. He observed:

"As the lawyers form the only enlightened class whom the people do not mistrust, they are naturally called upon to occupy most of the public stations. They fill the legislative assemblies and are at the head of the administration; they consequently exercise a powerful influence upon the formation of the law and upon its execution. The lawyers are obliged, however, to yield to the current of public opinion, which is too strong for them to resist; but it is easy to find indications of what they would do if they were free to act. The Americans, who have made so many innovations in their political laws, have introduced very sparing alterations in their civil laws, and that with great difficulty, although many of these laws are repugnant to their social condition. The reason for this is that in matters of civil law the majority are obliged to defer to the authority of the legal profession, and the American lawyers are disinclined to innovate when they are left to their own choice."

To De Tocqueville's perceptions about civil laws one would add, by way of updating, that lawyers have been similarly reluctant to make significant alterations in the administration of criminal justice. To be sure, there are now afoot some proposals and incipient developments in that field which are constructive and even daring. One may cite the very thoughtful and influential report of the Attorney General's Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Criminal Justice, released earlier this year, and the resultant program of the District of Columbia Judicial Conference Committee on Bail. Under this program a foundation grant has been obtained for the purpose of employing a staff to conduct a controlled experiment, on a case-by-case basis, in releasing defendants on their own recognizance, when bail would mean economic hardship or incarceration. But by and large the perception that lawyers have of the problems besetting their institutions are strongly influenced by lay attitudes, professional habit, and traditional vocabulary.

A moment ago I said that lay attitudes and values affect the professional orientation of lawyers. By this I mean that the training of young lawyers appears to be heavily stamped with emphasis upon technical expertness for immediate financial reward, at the expense of the early development of professional responsibility. The emphasis is upon acquiring salable skills and selling them in the dearest market possible. The responsibility of this profession—indeed, the meaning of a profession as a body of educated persons who have a collective function in society—is widely felt to be the concern only of the senior and successful lawyer who has arrived and can afford the luxury of obligations.

If this were so, the law would be a sucker's game, indeed. There are more salable products; the living is notoriously precarious and the work hard. Surely the law is more than just another business, and more than the petty, narrow discipline of Browning's grammarian, who believed:

"The law man seeks a little thing to do,
Sees it and does it:
This high man, with a great thing to pursue,
Dies ere he knows it.
That low man goes on adding one to one,
His hundred's soon hit:
This high man, aiming at a million,
Misses an unit."

The meaning of a profession—a trained group performing a collective function in society—is one that would never have been obscure to Alexander Hamilton. He would have seen that function as creating, operating, and maintaining the system of legal rights and duties which make up liberty and order. From basic constitutional principles to the most petty private litigation, the lawyer who serves this system occupies a public role. It is important that he understand this role early in his training, and that he see the connection between his daily preoccupation and the labor of statecraft. It is no accident that our country was largely founded, and has so often been led, by lawyers. One accepts it as a known fact. But one should know why.

A major characteristic of the law is this identity of the mundane and the essence of civilization. Today I want to discuss one illustrative aspect of that characteristic. This illustration deals with a major institution of our profession, the Federal district courts. Particularly I will discuss the congestion of cases in the district courts, its consequences, the factors that are involved in a solution, and the relation of this problem to you.

Court congestion is sometimes used as an emotive word to connote criticism of a court or the court system. I use it to describe a fact of life, a condition in which disposition of cases is long delayed, or in which the intake exceeds the outflow so that the pending caseload is on the rise. In some of the larger districts the civil caseload falls into both categories—that is, there is a long wait for trial and disposition and the backlog is currently mounting from year to year. With criminal cases the delays to trial are not unreasonable, but there has been a marked increase in the backlog between the last two fiscal years.

In civil cases the pending case figure in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia decreased 0.9 percent from July 1, 1962 to July 1, 1963. In the southern district of New York the figure decreased 11 percent over the same period; in northern Illinois 2.7 percent; in southern California 2.2 percent. But these slight gains do not tell the whole story. In those same districts the long intervals from joinder of issue to trial reflect the impacted character of the traffic moving through the courts. The median interval in the District of Columbia is 21 months; in the southern district of New York 34 months; eastern New York 28 months; eastern Pennsylvania 37 months; eastern Louisiana 24 months; northern Ohio 16 months; northern Illinois 15 months; northern California 17 months; southern California 11 months.

In criminal cases the median age figure shows, of course, a far more current status. That figure, as of June 30, for the District of Columbia was 3 months; southern New York 12 months; southern California 3 months; and northern Illinois 3 months. Of all criminal cases terminated during fiscal 1963, the median interval between indictment and disposition was, for the District of Columbia, 3.6 months; southern New York 2.7 months; southern California 1.4 months; and northern Illinois 3.3 months. Between indictment and jury trial the median periods were 4.6 months for the District of Columbia; and 7.3 for New York southern; 3.3 for southern California; and 7.3 for northern Illinois. This is not a bad showing. Among other things, these figures suggest that much of the recent excitement in the press over the criminal backlog in the District of Columbia may have been exaggerated and that our court performs creditably in the face of the same forces that produce congestion in the dockets elsewhere. But by another measure the outlook is less bright for the currency of the criminal docket. In the District of Columbia the criminal backlog increased 19.7 percent from July 1, 1962 to July 1, 1963, and 7.7 percent fewer cases were terminated than were commenced. In southern New York the backlog increased 4.1 percent and terminations were 4.2 percent fewer than new cases. In northern Illinois the backlog increased 13.6 percent and terminations were 5.1 percent fewer than new cases. In southern California the backlog increased 32.4 percent and terminations were 6.9 percent fewer than new cases. These figures show the tide moving the wrong way and the impacted state of the calendar becoming more acute.

Though there is a certain statistical parallel in the situation of the larger districts' calendars, it would be a mistake to assume that the same causes are at work. There is

no uniform increase in the volume of incoming criminal cases. In the last fiscal year the intake increased in California southern by 44 percent, in Illinois northern by 30 percent, and in the District of Columbia by 8 percent, but decreased in the southern district of New York by 15 percent.

No generalization would be valid for each of those districts, but I believe that I can safely particularize for the District of Columbia. Here there was no increase in the civil backlog during the past fiscal year, but the criminal backlog increased by nearly 20 percent. One would look, therefore, for causes peculiar to the criminal calendar. In my judgment these causes are:

1. The greater complexity and length of criminal trials;

2. The very high proportion of criminal cases in this district that are disposed of by trial; and

3. The insufficiency of available trial time of district judges.

The last decade has been marked by a growing complexity, and hence length, of criminal trials. The average case used to take a little over a day to try. In fiscal 1963 the average was 2.5 days; in the past 2 months of October and November 79 criminal trials were held, taking 219 trail-judge days, or 2.8 days per case, on the average. A more exacting review of the record on appeal has led to a more painstaking recordmaking process at trial. Bench conferences and hearings out of the presence of the jury are increasingly frequent and necessary. A more elaborate motions practice (particularly motions to suppress evidence), and a more intricate insanity defense are additional reasons for the greater length of trials over the last decade. These factors maintain great pressure on district judges, and exact from them all of the courtroom time on criminal trials that they are able to give.

To compound the problem in our district, an unusually high proportion of our criminal cases reach a jury trial. Twenty-eight percent of criminal cases terminated in the past fiscal year in our district were tried. By contrast, in the southern district of New York trials were only 16 percent of total terminations of criminal cases; in California southern trials were only 7 percent; in Texas southern and western trials were 6 percent and 3.7 percent, respectively. Of the districts with a high volume of criminal cases, only Illinois northern is comparable to our own in the very high percentage of cases that are disposed of by trial. This is the hard way of disposition. Wherever trials are high in relation to pleas there is likely to be, indeed there almost must be, congestion in the docket. Moreover, wherever this condition exists, it is certain that the backlog cannot be reduced without some significant increase in the trial time that the judges spend in court.

The consequences of congestion in the criminal docket are not limited to unfavorable statistics. There are much more serious effects which jeopardize effective justice and public support for the court system. Witnesses are compelled to return to court numerous times before a case reaches trial, at inconvenience and monetary cost to their employment and earnings. Counsel must repeatedly answer changing trial dates, with an attendant waste of time and injury to their other work. The resentments engendered by these conditions, on the part of the general public and the bar, damage the esteem in which the courts are held by the community they serve.

I want to emphasize, however, that congestion in the criminal calendar does not necessarily connote any reproach to a court that suffers from it. Congestion is a disease—it is simply the result of an excess of intake over dispositions, and that does not mean that the disposition machinery is faulty or inefficient, or that we must allocate moral blame. It only means that the situation must be corrected and the necessary balance restored.

How does one go about correcting a backlog of criminal cases? Various solutions have been suggested, but not all of them are feasible, wise, or effective.

It is sometimes urged that indictments are too high and the prosecutor is criticized for prosecuting felony cases which the district court may think are more properly prosecuted as misdemeanors in another court. Of course, it is true that the U.S. attorney could to some extent control the volume of indictments by presenting fewer or more numerous cases to the grand jury. But let no one underestimate the independence of grand juries. They want to make their own judgments on possible felony cases and they would deeply resent any attempt by the prosecutor to divert the flow of cases from them or to impose his own wishes on the jurors. Moreover, no prosecutor, given the conditions existing in this and other major districts, could conscientiously throttle back the flow of possible felonies to the grand jury, just for the sake of achieving a sort of paper balance of indictments and dispositions. He would not be justified in doing this, even if he had the power to control grand juries, which he most assuredly does not have. Such a course would demoralize law enforcement, deny to the public the protection it deserves, and would lead rapidly to the commission of a far larger number of offenses.

Mathematically, it might appear possible to reduce trials and increase guilty pleas by making a generous allowance for a plea at the time of sentencing, and the contrary for a litigated conviction. But even a superficial scrutiny of such a proposal makes it clear that both in justice and efficiency there are very serious limitations. The main elements of sentencing ought to be the circumstances of the crime and the factors personal to the defendant which bear on his responsiveness to rehabilitation and treatment of one or another sort. To override these factors with a general deterrent aganist litigation would frustrate the purpose of the sentencing process. In addition, it would hardly be conscionable for a court to penalize a defendant's insistence on his constitutional right to jury trial. And finally, it is clear from figures publicly released by the Bureau of Prisons that sentences in our district are, on the average, substantially more severe than the average of sentences in other districts and in the State courts, in every category of crime but one. Added severity is not our most urgent need.

In principle, if one cannot stay abreast of one's work, one should work harder, and no one disputes that this applies to courts, as to everyone else. The suggestion has been made that district judges should work harder and take shorter vacations. As a practical matter, however, there are limits to the capacity of a court greatly to increase the time its judges spend at trial. One limitation is the health of the court. Illness cannot be turned on and off, and if two or three judges should have long absences from illness, the result can be devastating. As an illustration, take our own District of Columbia Federal court. Last fiscal year three or four serious and lengthy illneses substantially reduced the available court time of the district judges on the criminal calendar. Criminal trials, as a consequence, fell off 20 percent from the previous fiscal year. This produced a record backlog at the end of the last fiscal year of about 300 cases, an increase of more than one-third over the previous year, according to our own statistics. During the summer, inevitably, this figure grew to a high of approximately 400 cases by October 1. Of course, not nearly this number of cases are triable and the figure must not be viewed as the trial backlog. Energetic measures have been initiated by the judges since then to reduce the pending criminal cases. In the past two months alone, the pending case figure has been reduced by 75 cases. This gain has been achieved by keeping a steady assignment of six or seven judges on the criminal calendar. In October and November 79 completed trials were held and 219 judge-days spent at criminal trial, compared with 160 trial days in the same two months of 1962. By the end of the year it is hoped that pending criminal cases wil be reduced to the July 1 figure and further reduced by perhaps 150 to 170 cases in the first 6 months of 1964. But to do this will require an average of six judges on the criminal calendar until July 1.

These strenuous measures deserve the respect and cooperation of the bar, and shed great credit upon the judges of our district court. The limitations, however, are built in and serious. As I have said, a crash program is very vulnerable to a few weeks' illness of two or three judges. And even without illness, the gains in the currency of the criminal docket will be achieved at some considerable cost to the currency of the civil calendar, which, as we saw earlier, barely held its own in the past fiscal year. And, as I pointed out earlier, a similar problem of allocating judges' time between a criminal docket that is out of balance and a civil docket that is relatively stable but impacted, exists in the other major districts of the judicial system. What can be done?

In certain circumstances that are probably not rare, it ought to be readily possible to achieve a de facto enlargement of a court that is under pressure from the heavy calendar. This could be accomplished under title 28 United States Code, section 371(b) and section 294(b), governing transfers of judges to senior status. Subsection 371(b) provides:

"Section 371. Resignation or retirement for age:

* * * * *

"(b) Any justice or judge of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior may retain his office but retire from regular active service after attaining the age of 70 years and after serving at least 10 years continuously or otherwise, or after attaining the age of 65 years and after serving at least 15 years continuously or otherwise. He shall, during the remainder of his lifetime, continue to receive the salary of the office. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a successor to a justice or judge who retires."

Subsection 294(b) provides:

"(b) Any judge of the United States who has retired from regular active service under section 371(b) or 372(a) of this title shall be known and designated as a senior judge and may continue to perform such judicial duties as he is willing and able to undertake, when designated and assigned as provided in subsections (c) and (b)."

Subsection 294(c) provides, in pertinent part:

"(c) Any retired circuit or district judge may be designated and assigned by the chief judge or judicial council of his circuit to perform such judicial duties within the circuit as he is willing and able to undertake."

The scheme of these provisions is plain. By retiring under section 371(b) a district judge goes on the senior list and may be mobilized by assignment as fully as he could be prior to retirement. Willingness and ability are conditions, but they are no more serious limitations than with a judge on active status. With the cooperation of the judges, the statute really permits the enlargement and continued activity of an overworked district court. The necessary circumstances, of course, would be a press of business that could keep an expanded court busy, and one or more judges that have the necessary seniority. In those circum-

stances, eligible judges could go on senior status without a material diminution of work, and by such changes of status would open up new places on the court which would be filled by new appointments.

Obviously, such a solution to a crowded docket could not be proposed as a general one throughout the country. It requires the cooperation of individual judges, in itself a bar to sweeping application. Some districts that are not current in their work may not have judges who are eligible for senior status. Other districts that have eligible judges are current in their work. But where eligibility and backlog coincide, it would appear to me to be to everyone's advantage to make the maximum use of the so-called "retirement" provision of the Judicial Code.

The suggestion would have interesting consequences, by way of example, in the District of Columbia. If four of our fourteen active district judges should elect change of status under section 371(b), and if four new judges were appointed to their places on the active list, there would be a total of 20 sitting judges, including two retired judges now sitting. (This is precisely the number of courtrooms in the U.S. Courthouse.) If one of the added four were assigned to motions, one to civil, and two to criminal, that would make eight judges on the criminal calendar, instead of the present complement of six. What would be the effect on the trial backlog of criminal cases?

With trial held on four days of the week for 42 weeks, and the average judge absent, ill, or in recess for a total of 10 weeks, there are 168 trial days per year per judge on the criminal trial calendar. Eight judges would total 1,344 trial days. How many trials is this? At 2.8 days per trial, 1,344 trial days would allow 480 trials. This would be half again as many trials as were held in fiscal 1963. This trial capacity would be enough to take care of current business and wipe out the backlog in two years, and perhaps still allow for a moderate expansion of the volume of new indictments, a development which has been visible in the last few months. In addition, it would probably enable the court to make significant inroads in the civil calendar, which would earn the warm thanks of the practicing bar. The program on both sides of the docket would give the court a unique position among the large district benches of the country, and reflect the highest possible credit on the court, particularly upon the senior judges whose cooperation alone would make the program possible. I am sure that there are other districts where additional judges could be utilized in the same way, to a greater or lesser degree than here.

It is unfortunate that the word "retirement" has such a strong connotation of inactivity. It may be that this image has caused judges to resist taking on the label of retirement. If so, it has done mischief by impeding the enlargement of overworked courts. Add to this the fact that district judges are notably individualistic in their values, they function individually, their standards and habits of work are traditionally individual and highly personal. Their approach to judicial office is one of individual fulfillment. It is understandable, therefore, that many judges shrink from the step of retirement. Perhaps some of them around the country feel that their only assurance of continued and rewarding judicial work is to remain on the active list.

But the course of action that I suggest here has no resemblance to the popular notion of retirement. On the contrary, the proposal is that senior district judges continue to work, and that they work alongside of more numerous colleagues. Obviously, the workload of an enlarged court that is based upon 60 or 70 criminal trials per year per judge would be no haven of inactivity for a senior judge. Rather, he would retain a full calendar assignment, and there would be no question as to his usefulness and his full participation in the work of the court. He would share with a larger court a caseload that several large courts cannot at present absorb. The work would be brought current, and the public business would substantially benefit.

Moreover, it is not the legal status of a judge which assures his continued fulfillment, but his willingness to work and the presence of work to be done. If there is both work and the will to work, as in the District of Columbia, no change of status will make the slightest difference in the continued judicial career and fulfillment of a judge. If there is neither work nor the will, continuation of active status cannot guarantee fulfillment.

You will ask what all this means to law students and why I trouble you with mere problems of administration that are not answerable in the traditional vocabulary of the intellect. You may say that your business, as Justice Holmes put it, is "to gain the secret isolated joy of the thinker, who knows that, a hundred years after he is dead and forgotten, men who never heard of him will be moving to the measure of his thought."

You are indeed trained to be thinkers, but the profession into which you move in the mid-20th century will not permit you a "secret isolated joy." The lawyer of the present works in a world of complex institutions, and in a network of his rights and duties vis-a-vis these institutions. Chief among these institutions are the Federal courts. You as lawyers will have to understand how the great forces of the day affect the courts as, indeed, they affect every other aspect of national life. The increase and growing concentration of our population; the pressure upon education facilities and job opportunities; the increase in crime; the competitive demands of our society upon relatively fixed resources—these are matters that you cannot leave to economists and dismiss as alien to your own profession. These forces will affect the size and caliber of your profession, the incidence of crime, the workload of the courts, the resources available to the courts, the performance and caliber of judges, and consequently your own practice.

A lawyer's duty to society is no longer served merely by professional probity and by taking an occasional criminal case. He must know what goes on in the legal institutions of society—courts, legal aid societies, legislatures, professional groups. He must know their problems, their economics, their politics. He must concern himself with their successful functioning, their administration, their financing, and their reform. By his admission to the bar he does not merely get a license to sell legal services. Rather, he gets a professional citizenship and he must understand his professional community. To that extent, at the very least, he must develop sophistication and become a capable man of affairs. He cannot defer to some supposed expert, shrugging his shoulders at the growing complexity and specialization of the law. There is no expert in liberty and order.

I have, therefore, talked to you today about court workload and congestion in order, not only to inform you, but to make a point. That point is that it is part of your essential professional maturity to become familiar with the problems of our legal institutions. It is part of a sense of responsibility. It is a substantial part of the difference between a legal apprentice and a member of a profession.

In describing the failure of Athens and its symptoms, Edith Hamilton traced the signs of a dying sense of citizenship, notable of which was the then novel proposal that Athenians should be paid for public services. She wrote:

"The whole process was clear to Plato. Athens had reached the point of rejecting independence and the freedom she now wanted was freedom from responsibility. There could be only one result. 'The excess of liberty in states or individuals,' he said, 'seems to pass into excess of slavery.' If men insisted on being free from the burden of a life that was self-dependent and also responsible for the common good, they would cease to be free at all. Responsiblity was the price every man must pay for freedom. It was to be had on no other terms."

Eulogy by Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein to Memory of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the sermon of Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein at K.A.M. Temple in Chicago on November 25, 1963. It is worthy of a permanent place in the literature of this tragic period when in the presence of a shock and a grief that reached into all nations the whole world seemed on the eve of recapturing its soul. Rabbi Weinstein's eulogy follows:

It is with a heavy heart I speak to you today. Our President has been taken from us—not by the gentle angel who comes to give us peace after the storms and strifes of life's weary years, not by the one who spares us the decay of age and the bemeaning of time—but by the violent one, the mad, distemperate one, the ignorant one of aggressive brawn and little brain—the satanic deputy of all that is raw and primitive in this land of ours—ignorant, violent and primitive, yet armed with telescopic sight, and able to kill from afar, send the arrow by night and speed the pestilence by day. Unhappy land, unhappy time—that preserves the jungle heart and the troglodytic mind and arms them with the shining armor and the long thrust of science.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is cut down in the midst of life. Where was the like of him—Adonis with the mind of Nestor? A golden-haired youth who could have dallied in all the opulent pastures of great wealth and lived as riotously and elegantly as the Medicis—he gave himself rather to the service of our Republic. As a soldier, as Congressman, Senator, President, he revealed a remarkable insight into the political and economic order of our society. He knew the structure of power. He knew intimately the ways in which men are guided and goaded to action. He knew the play and counterplay of forces and the mysterious wheels within wheels which make up the chain of effective command. He was a political marvel who could learn and retain an infinite number of facts about an incredible number of subjects and could sift them and concentrate them upon the problems at hand. One day when the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity was meeting at the White House, I was privileged to watch him as he walked from one meeting to another—some six in all—the Business Ethics Advisory

Committee, the Labor and Management Conference, a joint committee on the new trade bill, a Committee on the Alliance for Progress, the White House Conference on the Aged—and relate himself to the complicated agenda of each group, make excellent suggestions on the work reported and present sound advice on the next steps for each committee. I was given to understand that this 3-hour stint was only a fraction of his working day and that before he would get to bed that night, there were several functions of state, several meetings with congressional leaders on thorny matters and a vast heap of legislative and State Department memos to read, amend and sign.

HIS HEART WAS NEVER ABSENT

But while his mind worked with incredible logic and remarkable speed, and his body sustained an energy expenditure that would have honored a platoon, his heart was never absent. He was one of the most contained men emotionally I have ever known. This was not because there was any lack of feeling. It was because he had suffused his heart into his mind. He could afford no wasteful drain of sentiment. He was completely bent on finding the necessary means to implement his vision of the good society. He would be the first to admit that he was no self-abnegating saint—that he relished ego satisfaction with the best of us; but he would likewise maintain, and rightly, that he had over the long and disciplined years sublimated that ego into community and that what remained of self-interest was enlightened and socialized.

He had style. There was grace in him and an instinct for the right measure for every purpose. His wit was dry, perceptive, often sharp but seldom cutting. He played politics as the young David played his harp—with artistry—so that the wiliest of old wolves and foxes of the Senate knew that his charm was never a substitute for strength, but merely the sense of ease with which he used his power. Together with Mrs. Kennedy he had made the White House a palace of grace and beauty. He removed the last remnants of the coonskin, the spittoon and the antimacassar and made it reflect, as it should, the ripe artistic heritage of our Nation.

I will never forget the visit Mrs. Weinstein and I made on the occasion of the centenary of the proclamation which ended slavery and saw these two beautiful people gracefully representing the youth, the vitality and the power of this Nation in this home which they had made beautiful and intimate without making it parochial.

BRIGHT BROTHER—FATHER TO OUR YOUTH

It is not an accident that so many young people have come to the synagogue to mourn our President. He was their assurance that youth was not allergic to maturity, that one did not have to spend all one's youth in apprenticeship, that one did not have to be dour and solemn to be profound. He was the great arbiter between the generations. He was David hitting bull's-eye the Philistine Goliaths of our time with the smooth round pebbles of his incisive logic. He made political battle as exciting as a gridiron contest, and the war for social security as dramatic as Gettysburg. Through the Peace Corps he developed a most effective moral equivalent for war. The youth of the Nation have lost a father who was also a brother.

It is still not possible to accept the fact that this handsome puissant statesman in whom the forces of nature had opulently conspired to channel incredible riches of strength and wisdom is no more, that the striking profile of courage which lifted our hearts on that bitter January day in 1961 and, bare-headed, cast its golden light was the target for an assassin's bullet. It seemed as he responded to the high challenge of the hour in his crisp New England speech, that he was aligned with the enduring forces of earth and that the bright armor of his genius would turn any adversary's noisome threat.

STAIN OF VIOLENCE IN OUR NATIONAL LIFE

This is not the time to consider the wild barbaric forces still loose in our land, the immaturity of the mass mind and the malevolent forces that play upon it—but we shall have to soon—or the gangsters, the atavistic radicals of right and left, the childish irritation with the inevitable disciplines of a highly interlaced social fabric such as ours will destroy us. There are altogether too many respectable people whose sins of omission and commission help to trigger the gunman's hand and supply the heady stimulation for the dynamiter's throw. We stand idly by the blood of our brother—not only when he is slain but when we encourage under specious slogans the lawless and anarchic and callous forces in our society.

You have seen the cartoon by Bill Mauldin—Abe Lincoln clutching his head in woebegone despair, as he contemplates this new martyrdom. What an ominous red thread of violence connects these century-separated assassinations! The lynch rope, the auto-da-fé faggots, the sniper's bullet—these are the blots on the bright face of the American dream. They are the present-day survivals of our jungle frontier in our land and in our hearts.

Happily we can point to the remarkable discipline of the Negro in the mass demonstrations of the past several years as evidence that even the most wronged and deprived people need not meet violence with violence, that there are great reservoirs of common decency and of Judeo-Christian reverence for life in the hearts of our people. Strange is it not that the most deprived and despoiled of our land can respond with non-violent dignity while those who are asked to share only a little of their wealth and power maul our dignitaries and cry for Judge Lynch? We must mobilize that decency to shrink the area in which the primitives can operate. Let the blood of two Emancipation Presidents be the seed of a new Nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and are entitled to their full heritage under God.

Someone has said that men are things that think a little but chiefly forget. One hundred years ago the rabbi of this congregation, the beloved Liebman Adler, the father of the more famous Dankmar Adler of the Adler-Sullivan team, said in his eulogy of Lincoln:

"The more and more thoroughly we reminisce about Lincoln, the more do we love him and the more do we find his murder aimless and the greater do we see the loss to his own family and the Nation."

What might this dark brooding man with the infinite weariness of the burden of man's inhumanity to man say to this golden-headed colleague who now belongs with him to the ages?

But this is the hour for mourning and for prayer in our heart that God will grant comfort to the sorrowing family—to the wife, to the children, to the parents—too intimate already with grief and to the brothers and sisters who constitute a Maccabean tribe and who in their various ways provided brilliant models of social consciousness and social service at their best.

We must take courage too, for ours is a nation too strong and resilient to be weakened by the loss of even its finest leader. It is the saving grace of a democratic check and balance system such as ours that a temporary blow to one of its powers only shifts the burden to the others until equilibrium is restored. And we have in our new President a man of great sagacity, one knowledgeable in all the varied manners and mysteries of politics and administration and one who faithfully subscribes to the national goals of our late President.

It remains only for us to do the unfinished work—to bind and heal the wounds of our Nation, to bring the Negro and all minorities into the family estate as full brothers in fact, to make the machine in its automated dimensions our servant and not our master, to give effective education and training to all our young and finally, to keep open the channels of communication that we might achieve a just peace in the framework of a world government of the United Nations.

If we would transmute the pain of this hour into the substance of good, then must we here highly resolve that we shall achieve in our land an equality of opportunity and a general security without impounding the liberties of the people, without penalizing differences with death, without reducing the infinite variety of the human condition to the manageable categories of totalitarian necessity. This was the overreaching goal of John Kennedy's massive and brilliant thrust. Our achievement of that goal will be his most adequate and fitting memorial.

I hear an ancient voice speaking from the Book of Books—it comes from one intimate with grief and acquainted with sorrow. He spoke to a nation whose cup of woe had filled to overflowing.

Comfort ye, comfort ye my people—For ye have paid double for all your sins * * *
Bring now good tidings to the humble
And bind up the broken hearted
And proclaim liberty to the captives
And the opening of the eyes to them that are bound.
Proclaim the year of the Lord's good pleasure
Comfort all that mourn * * *
All that mourn in Zion * * *
Give them a garland for ashes
The oil of joy for mourning
The mantle of praise for the spirit of heaviness.

Sixty To Be Honored at Academy Interview Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Saturday noon, January 11, 1964, 60 outstanding young men of the 20th Congressional District, Illinois, will be honored at a luncheon at Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.

They are the candidates for appointment to the military academies, class to begin in June 1964. Qualifying for final consideration by passing civil service examinations, each will receive recognition at the luncheon, which is part of a day-long program of interview and evaluation. During the morning, each will be interviewed by a civilian board. Members of the boards were selected because of their deep interest in the military affairs of our country.

Serving on the interview boards will be: Gene Terry, Quincy; Ralph Knotts, Pittsfield; Donald W. Marshall, Macomb; Philip L. Robinson, Springfield;

Lee Ensel, Springfield; Frank Strieby, Quincy; Carl T. Meyer, Jr., Springfield; Harper C. Allen, Springfield; Ray Samples, Jacksonville; Jack Huff, Quincy; Richard Crook, Springfield; E. C. Bone, Jacksonville; J. E. Fetter, Quincy; Russell D. Shambrook.

From the young men now entering the military academies must come tomorrow's military leadership for the United States. Therefore, I am most anxious to select the best available talent. I appreciate the fine cooperation of the members of the interview boards in making possible this mode of selection.

Here are the candidates:

Charles E. Adkins, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick H. Adkins.

William Robert Kastien, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert D. Kastien.

John S. Lowe, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Siebert Lowe.

John B. MacWherter, Jr., Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John B. MacWherter.

John William Mavis, Rochester, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Alvin M. Mavis.

Anthony Pianezza, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Pino Pianezza.

David J. Sweet, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Sweet.

Thomas Stewart Church, Rochester, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Alexander S. Church.

Lawson Eugene Barclay, Macomb, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Wilson Barclay.

David B. Owen, Bushnell, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank M. Owen.

John Neale Watson, Macomb, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John D. Watson.

Rollie Platt, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Platt.

Larry York, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. York.

John Leonard Komnick, Athens, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Ben J. Komnick.

Ted Olson, Jacksonville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin G. Olson.

Robert DeForrest Burley, Jr., Beardstown, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. Burley.

Barry Davis English, Jerseyville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. William W. English.

Michael Eugene McFain, son of Major and Mrs. Robert E. McFain.

Larry Vail Agans, Rushville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Lora V. Agans.

Darrell Dean Althide, Basco, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Orville F. LaBonte.

Howard R. Arnett, Carlinville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Russell T. Arnett.

Douglas Earl Asby, Gillespie, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Leland E. Ashby.

Roger Damon Cox, Plainville, Ill., son of Colonel and Mrs. Omer L. Cox.

Jack F. Curry, Mendon, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene M. Curry.

Tim Doolin, Ashland, Ill.

James Timothy Farrell, Pittsfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Farrell.

James David Ivers, Eldred, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James Ivers.

Roger Lee Keithley, Blandinsville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Gilbert L. Keithley.

John Martin Silvester, Staunton, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Alex Silvester.

Richard Manard, Baylis, Ill.

Gary D. Schwartz, Quincy, Ill.

Douglas Lee Butler, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Butler.

William J. Daughton, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Daughton.

Thomas Michael Feger, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold H. Feger.

John William Gilman, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. Paul Barber.

John Lapicola, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Lapicola.

Jay Samuel Griswold III, Camp Point, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Jay S. Griswold.

Steve Gustison, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert W. Gustison.

Alfred E. Hempen, Hamilton, Ill., son of Mrs. Margaret Hempen.

Thomas G. Holford, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. John M. Holford.

Forrest Dean Krell, Williamsville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Krell.

Robert Lewis Hormell, Jerseyville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack L. Hormell.

James Lee Narup, Golden Eagle, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Everett C. Narup.

Eugene Randall Olson, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Weslie W. Olson.

Robert P. Randolph, Macomb, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Anthony W. Randolph.

James Merritt Shank, Clayton, Ill., son of Mrs. and Mrs. Herbert M. Shank.

Daniel J. Schoenekase, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl H. Schoenekase.

Carl Damrau, Jacksonville, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Adolph G. Damrau.

Joseph Lawrence Barbush, Benld, Ill., son of Mrs. Eileen Barbush.

Paul R. Bonansinga, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph R. Bonansinga.

Thomas Lloyd Dukett, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd J. Dukett.

Corley Lee Keran, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Keran.

George Robert Laswell, Springfield, Ill., son of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Harry T. Laswell.

Robert S. Micheletti, Springfield, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Americo Micheletti.

Fred Edmun Smith, Bushnell, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred K. Smith.

Jeffrey D. Kinnan, Rochester, Ill., son of Maj. and Mrs. Floyd H. Kinnan.

Willie Cox, Alexander, Ill.

John Keith Feikert, Carthage, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Dale W. Feikert.

James Herbert Hoener, Quincy, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Herbert H. Hoener.

Craig S. Cherry, Girard, Ill., son of Mr. and Mrs. Bob S. Cherry.

The Ship of State Sails On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a moving poem by Mr. W. C. Rion of Goodlettsville, Tenn., entitled "The Ship of State Sails On":

THE SHIP OF STATE SAILS ON

They knew, who planned our Ship of State,
Who saw Her strong and proud and great,
She must withstand Time's lasting tests—
Strong, to the urge of helm and sail;
Proud, to defy the storm and gale;
Great, to surmount the towering crests.

Came first the vision, and the plans,
Next, choice of skillful artisans
To make of parts the perfect whole.
Then, graceful, down Her ways She fled;
Her bow-wave o'er the oceans sped;
Proclaimed to all Her destined role.

Designed for Peace, yet geared for War;
To neither seek aggression, nor
Give way to threats from any source.
For such a ship, for such a test,
The Nation's fittest, finest, best
Were called to keep Her true to course.

Her Captains, Mates, Her able men,
Oft gained the praise of tongue and pen,
And only bigots came to mock.
Not always sailed a sea serene—
She found Herself at times between
Charybdis' whirl and Scylla's rock.

And not alone met foreign foes—
She felt the painful, nagging throes
Of fearful stresses from within.
Oh, good to fight in Freedom's name!
Oh, good, the quest for honored fame!
Oh, shame to face a people's sin!

She lately sailed a charted sea,
Thought safe from lurking enemy,
Her bridge, a brave, skilled Captain trod;
Then came the shots that rocked the world,
His high held flag forever furled,
Why his—known only to his God.

He died—an Abel to hate's Cain—
We trust, sans knowledge and sans pain;
So young, so brave, so loved, so right!
We shared the gloom, we wept our tears,
But found a solace for our fears—
The dawn must always follow night.

Thank God for tried and trusted Mate,
On whom no time nor tide can wait
To mount the bridge, and take the conn.
He ended brief confusion's reign,
And Freedom's Hope still rides the main—
The Ship of State sails on and on.

—W. C. RION.

Place the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on the Subversive List

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 11, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the recent and horrible assassination of President Kennedy has put the spotlight, quickly dimmed, on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee of which the President's assassin was a member. The existence of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is no news to many of us who have been trying desperately to alert the American people to Castro's network in the United States.

The committee, a pro-Castro, Communist-front group, is closely tied to Castro's growing network in Latin America

as well as in this country. Another Castroite group that attempted to halt the election in Venezuela, and which continues to raise havoc in that country as well as far too many other Latin American nations, was doing and continues to do the bidding of Fidel Castro.

Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between the various Castroite groups in Latin America and the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in this country. Their goals are the same, their leaders are Castro and Khrushchev, their methods are violence and bloodshed. Their relationships are interlocked.

And yet, despite the fact that President Kennedy's assassin was an individual who was proven to be a member of this Communist-front organization which, according to Castro himself has its membership files in Havana, the organization in this country is allowed to thrive and to continue to turn out literature designed to fertilize the minds of men like Lee Oswald.

The abundance of publicity and propaganda protective of the leftwing has provided a convenient shield behind which this abominable organization has hidden. You can be assured, however, that their activities have not ceased and that they are continuing to recruit individuals and are continuing to turn out the real hate literature in our society.

An example is found in the literature of V. T. Lee, a national director of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee who, in a Castro-supporting scandal sheet he printed in Tampa (Fla.) when he headed the Tampa chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, accused President Kennedy and Senator Eastland of "withholding diapers from Cuban babies." In this issue, the Senator is labeled a "hatchetman" and a "loudmouth," and reference is likewise made to those "jackasses in Washington."

I say it's time we woke up to the fact, too long overlooked, that groups and organizations that advocate bullets rather than ballots and who urge the replacement of our form of government with atheistic communism deserve to be treated like the common enemy of our freedoms that they are and to be dealt with accordingly.

How long can we countenance this cancer in our system? How long will it take to get action against this group of American-hating U.S. citizens who are, in effect, acting as foreign agents?

For many months I have been calling for placing the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on the Attorney General's subversive list. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 15, 1962. For too long this request has been ignored. The failure to place this organization on the Attorney General's subversive list becomes increasingly baffling when one reviews the anual FBI report for fiscal year, 1961, which states in part:

FBI investigations also have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee.

I shall continue to request that this organization be placed on the subversive list and request it now.

Until we take affirmative action against these pro-Castro organizations, the cancer of communism will grow until it infects our entire system.

Protector of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Bureau of Customs is planning to celebrate 175 years of unbroken service to the American people during its anniversary year in 1964. Because of its unique place in American history, and the great variety of the tasks assigned to the Customs by Congress it would seem fitting to make part of the record a well-documented article which appeared in the October 1963 issue of the Electrical Workers' Journal entitled "Protector of the People" in which the work of Customs is described:

PROTECTOR OF THE PEOPLE—BUREAU OF CUSTOMS TO CELEBRATE 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Every year brings an increasing number of tourists to our shores and an increasing number of American tourists returning from abroad. Every one of these persons comes into contact with the Bureau of Customs—many for the first time. Although its introduction to them may be a new experience to the majority of the public, the Bureau of Customs, U.S. Department of the Treasury, is no newcomer on the American scene, for, on August 1, 1964, the Bureau will celebrate its 175th anniversary. Indeed, it outdates by a month the Treasury Department of which it is a part.

Even before completing its work on electing our Nation's first President, the First Continental Congress had been making plans for our first tax. So, it is not surprising that three of the first five measures adopted by that Congress were on customs matters. The second statute of the First Continental Congress, "An act for laying a duty on goods, wares and merchandises imported into the United States," was approved on July 4, 1789, and was signed by George Washington. Duties were to be collected "from and after the first day of August next ensuing." Newspapers referred to this first tariff act as the "second Declaration of Independence."

The third statute laid duties on the tonnage of ships and vessels. The fifth law, "An act to regulate the collection of the duties imposed by law on the tonnage of ships or vessels and on goods, wares and merchandises imported into the United States," was approved on July 31, 1789. The next day, the Customs Service was in operation.

FIRST SHIP TO PASS CUSTOMS

The first vessel to come under this act arrived at the port of New York from Leghorn, Italy, on August 5, 1789. The brigantine *Persis*, James Weeks, master, had a miscellaneous cargo consigned to one Willian Seton who paid $774.71 in duties. The collector of the New York port was John Lamb, a hero at the capture of Fort Ticonderoga.

The act of July 31, 1789, specified that the customs collector was to board vessels and authorized him to obtain or hire boats or cutters for his use. In August of the following year, Congress appropriated $10,000 for the construction of 10 cutters—the beginning of the Revenue Cutter Service which is now the U.S. Coast Guard.

Until 1913, when Congress passed the income tax law, customs revenues provided the majority of our Nation's receipts. Two million of the total $2½ million collected in 1789 were from customs duties. Today, customs revenues swell our coffers by $1¾ billion, but this amount is only a small percentage of our total revenue.

FAMOUS COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Throughout its history, the Bureau of Customs has employed men famous in American history and literature, including President Chester A. Arthur.

Historian George Bancroft was a collector of the port of Boston. He appointed Nathaniel Hawthorne as measurer in the Boston customhouse at an annual salary of $1,500. Four years later, Hawthorne was appointed surveyor of customs. It is said that, while sitting in the customhouse, Hawthorne found old records that inspired him to write his famous novel, "The Scarlet Letter."

Herman Melville, author of "Moby Dick" and many other famous works, was an inspector in the New York customhouse for 20 years. His salary of $4 a day was later reduced to $3.60 a day.

The famous poet, Edward Arlington Robinson, worked as a special agent at the port of New York and received $4 a day.

Another employee at the customhouse in New York was Matthew A. Hensen, who accompanied Adm. Robert E. Peary to the North Pole. This same customhouse has records of manifests and entries for merchandise imported and duties paid by President George Washington. Various ports have records of negotiations by Thomas Jefferson and other famous American personalities.

MAIN FUNCTIONS OF BUREAU

The main functions of the Bureau of Customs are the assessment and collection of customs, the prevention of fraud on customs revenue and the prevention of smuggling. The purposes of customs duties are twofold: the raising of revenue and the protection of American industries, thereby safeguarding our economy. Thus, we meet Customs in one phase of its role as protector of the people. It also protects the health of our citizens and animal life by cooperating with the Department of Agriculture in preventing the entry of diseased animals and plants, impure seed and destructive insects. We will note other aspects of the Bureau's role as protector as we learn of its various services.

The Bureau of Customs employs 8,811 men and women, only 282 of whom work in the District of Columbia office. Other Customs employes perform their duties at international airports, seaports and border and interior ports. The majority of them are located in customhouses and appraiser's stores. Appraisers examine, appraise, and classify imports. Special agents are also employed in the States and in foreign countries in investigative and enforcement capacities. Men in the investigative field work out of uniform in civil and criminal cases. Enforcement officers usually wear uniforms and perform police duties, primarily in combating smuggling.

A customhouse is a building where goods may be entered or delivered, customs collected and paid, and vessels entered and cleared. It is the principal office at the American ports of entry located in the 47 customs districts of the United States and its territories. Each customhouse is under the

supervision of a collector of customs, who is appointed by the President and approved by the Senate. The Bureau of Customs is headed by the Commissioner of Customs, who is appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The incumbent Commissioner is Philip Nichols, Jr.

CUSTOMS IS BIG OPERATION

Customs activity is on the increase yearly, as man steps up the pace of his activities in this modern world. Figures for the fiscal year 1962 show that customs officers processed 93,057 ship landings from foreign countries; 172,185 international airplane arrivals; a grand total of 43,178,129 vehicular and train crossings at land borders. The number of individuals who passed through Customs amounted to 157,701,981.

All ships, airplanes, vehicles and individuals arriving in this country from a foreign land must report to United States Customs. All imported goods, whether they are duty-exempted or not and regardless of value, must be processed by customs officers. Customs also controls all export shipments with the exception of mail shipments which are the responsibility of the Post Office Department, although customs inspectors periodically examine internationally-bound mail to detect and to prevent violations of export control regulations by mailers.

Customs inspectors spot-check goods to be exported in order to verify that the merchandise is as documented. Inspectors make these examinations on the basis of destination, exporter, consignee, type of commodity or shipments that are likely to involve violations. When goods being or about to be illegally exported are discovered, they are seized by customs officers. During fiscal 1962, 284 seizures of exports (merchandise valued at $912,468.01) were made. Of course, special attention is given to shipments to Soviet bloc countries. Altogether, Customs made 6,855 seizures of illegal exports and imports at a total value of $13,213,716 in fiscal 1962.

Bureau officials are also entrusted with controlling the import of patented and trademarked articles; barring lottery tickets, obscene articles and publications; screening Communist propaganda; enforcing Foreign Assets Control regulations; preventing the illegal import and export of gold; registering and documenting vessels and cooperating with the Coast Guard to insure that safety requirements are met before vessels are cleared and to account for crew members on U.S. vessels returning from oversea trips.

Every person entering or reentering the country must make an oral declaration (still in the experimental stage, as explained later) or must fill out a customs form known as a "baggage declaration" on which he must list all merchandise acquired outside the United States and the amount paid. He presents the declaration with his luggage for examination by a customs inspector. If the amount of purchases does not exceed the exemption allowance and there are no prohibited goods, the merchandise is passed free of duty. Duties will be collected on items in excess of the allowance. The exemption for returning residents is $100 on articles for personal or household use—not to include more than 1 gallon of alcoholic beverages and more than 100 cigars.

INSPECTORS ARE WELL TRAINED

The inspetcor in the blue uniform is well trained for his work, is able to appraise merchandise, affix a value based on current foreign market price lists and apply the correct import duty. He cannot, as is commonly believed, spot a smuggler just by appearance, although he may develop a sixth sense which arouses his suspicions. Then, he must follow through on his suspicions and make a thorough search of the suspect and his baggage—even employing the use of the inspectoscope, a high-powered X-ray device that reveals the contents of all packages, wrapped or unwrapped.

Inspectors' suspicions have paid off many times. Take, for example, the case of the man and his wife who were returning from Mexico with their 3-month old infant. The inspector's intuition led to a thorough search which revealed 10 cartouches of marihuana—in the baby's diaper. The father was held in default of $10,000 bail.

Recently, a plainclothes port investigator at Idlewild (New York International Airport), with no advance information and just acting on a hunch, halted a suspicious-looking man, took him away and searched him. The evidence—five kilos of cocaine concealed on the man's person. Incidentally, some of the biggest cases in the history of the Customs Service have been seizures at Idlewild.

The majority of returning Americans are honest travelers who pay their customs duties as good citizens and who do not attempt to smuggle goods. However, as in many other fields, it's that small percentage of travelers who create the headaches, heartaches, and hard work. Many officials have given their lives in the line of duty, and many enforcement officers have had to kill smugglers in gun battles.

In addition to items that may not be brought into the country, there is a list, drawn up by Congress, of 20,000 items or classes of items that may not be imported without payment of duty. It is believed that, at one time or another, someone has tried to smuggle into the country most of the items on this list. Smugglers are liable to fine and Federal imprisonment.

SMUGGLERS' FAVORITES

The three items that are most often smuggled into the country today are diamonds, heroin (the least bulky and most valuable form of narcotics), and watch movements. Watch and diamond smugglers export black-market gold to pay for their illegal imports. Watch movements, since they are so small, can be carried on the person by the hundreds or hidden behind false panels in vehicles by the thousands.

An international, nonprofit, black-market institution will insure smugglers' diamonds at a premium that varies from 3½ to 7 percent, but narcotics smugglers cannot insure their consignments. It is becoming more difficult and dangerous to smuggle narcotics, as three travelers from Mexico learned—the hard way. The inspector checking their car detected a familiar odor. His sense of smell proved keen, as he traced the odor to the car panels and discovered 11 pounds of marihuana compressed into five bricks.

ALTER TECHNIQUES

Smugglers often change their techniques and the articles they are smuggling in order to elude customs officials. They also make use of messengers, so that they themselves cannot be caught.

Diplomats, since they enjoy immunity from duties and from baggage inspection, sometimes create problems. Also, some countries issue diplomatic passports to persons who do not have diplomatic immunity.

It would be nice if everyone entering the country cooperated with customs officials as one gentleman from Canada did. When the routine examination of his car revealed a dozen oranges, the traveler was told that Department of Agriculture regulations forbid the importation of oranges and that the fruit would either have to be destroyed or returned to Canada. After a moment's thought, the gentleman began peeling the oranges. He sat in his car until he had eaten all 12; then, permission granted, he proceeded on his trip to the United States.

Perhaps you, like many vacation-minded Americans, are planning a trip that will take you out of the country and would appreciate a few tips to travelers. First of all, remember that it is too late to learn about customs regulations on your homeward-bound trip. The Bureau prints helpful pamphlets, available free of charge at any customhouse or from the Bureau of Customs, Washington, D.C. These include: "Customs Hints for Returning Residents of the United States," "How To Ship United States Tourists' Purchases," "Customs Pointers," "Registration of Foreign-Made Articles," "Why Open Every Bag" and "Customs Hints for Nonresidents of the United States."

There are exceptions and certain time limits to the duty-free exemptions so that each traveled should make it his business to find out all the regulations. Pick up or write for the above-listed pamphlets; if in doubt, ask questions of your nearest customs officials. In foreign countries, customs representatives are attached to embassies or consulates.

Be on the lookout for restricted items when shopping abroad. Goods bearing certain trademarks may not be imported.

If you are planning to take a foreign-made article now in your possession with you on your trip, register it at your nearest customs collector's office before you leave. Unless you have proof of where and when you acquired the article, you might have to pay duty on it when you are reentering the country.

List everything you acquired in a foreign country on your declaration. This must include all gifts and items you are bringing home at the request of others and all purchases followed by mail. Clothes purchased and worn during your trip, new cameras or other articles that have been put to use are still subject to duty on your return.

Save your receipts for all purchases and assign the true price to every article listed on your declaration. If you can't support your declarations with dependable proof, the customs officer may appraise the items, using his up-to-date price lists from foreign markets. Above all, don't accept false invoices. Some merchants supply phony sales slips to try to help tourists. Some salesclerks make out false sales slips and then notify customs officials; informers receive 25 percent (up to $50,000) of the sales price of goods.

BE PREPARED

Last, but not least, be prepared for customs officials on your return—it will be easier for them and easier for you. If you have kept a running account of your purchases, you will have no trouble completing your declaration correctly and in a minimum of time. Assemble all receipts and, if possible, pack your oversea purchases in a single bag or all together in one section of your suitcase where they are easily obtainable for examination.

What is Customs doing to make life easier for the traveler? One project already underway is the improving of the physical conditions of passenger areas at piers and airports. Going through Customs is ever so much more pleasant now that these areas have been cleaned, freshly painted, and made to look more cheerful. Lighting systems have been improved. Tables have been provided, so that tourists no longer have to stoop over and open their luggage on the floor.

Another innovation is the preclearance system now in effect in Toronto, Ottawa, Bermuda, and Nassau, whereby customs inspectors examine and clear tourists' baggage on the spot, so that, when they arrive in the United States, the tourists simply step off the plane and continue on their personal business.

Customs, as mentioned briefly, is also experimenting with oral, instead of written, declarations at Bermuda, Nassau, Miami, Honolulu, and New York's Idlewild Airport, where the system has proved extremely suc-

cessful. On an oral declaration, the tourist simply tells the customs official about those purchases which exceed his duty-free $100 exemption. The oral declaration undoubtedly will be put on a nationwide basis in the near future.

In recent years, commercial imports (from which the largest percentage of customs revenue is raised) have arrived as containerized shipments in huge metal vans that are lifted out of ships, lowered onto truck chassis, and delivered unopened to consignees. It is then, when the consignees open up their merchandise, that customs inspectors examine the shipment—saving a lot of time for all concerned.

CUSTOMS ACADEMY

The Bureau of Customs had high hopes for congressional approval of funds in the appropriations for fiscal 1963 to inaugurate two new services, but Congress killed both proposals. Funds were sought to establish a customs academy on Long Island that would provide customs agents with formal training in language skills and in dealing with the public. Congress was also asked for money to hire nine interpreter-hostesses. These girls, qualified to speak foreign languages, would be schooled in tact and would appear as smartly uniformed hostesses to welcome foreign visitors and homecoming Americans and to assist those travelers who cannot speak English, handicapped persons, women with children and the elderly through customs procedures. Perhaps, sometime in the not too distant future, funds will be allocated for these and other services by the Bureau of Customs on behalf of the ever-increasing number of visitors to our shores.

One Member of Congress, Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, has introduced a bill, which has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, "To provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the customs service and of customs employees killed in enforcing the customs laws." We think Representative ROONEY'S tribute to the Bureau of Customs especially deserving: "The United States has not been extravagant in the use of commemorative stamps as a means of recognition of service to our people, perhaps rightfully. However, it seems to me that our customs service, which has been doing a magnificent job in administering and enforcing our complex tariff laws, combating smuggling, assisting many other U.S. agencies in enforcing their laws and performing countless other important duties, deserves the recognition of a commemorative postage stamp to honor its surpassing performance."

To the Bureau of Customs and its employees throughout the world, we say, "Thanks, for a job well done and best wishes on your 175th anniversary."

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my fifth rollcall report to constituents, covering the period from October 22 through December 4, 1963:

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			RBC	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
177	Oct. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (75 Members absent).
178	do	8821	Not voting	350	1	81	To facilitate restoration to Treasury of funds made available to States for unemployment compenstion and social security (RBC on radio program re South Vietnam mission).
179	Oct. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, California (69 Members absent).
180	do	5945	Yea	320	44	69	To establish procedure for prompt settlement of Puerto Rico's political status.
181	Oct. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican, Iowa (152 Members absent).
182	Oct. 28		do				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, Ohio (138 Members absent).
183	do	782	Yea	279	11	42	Making continuing appropriations for fiscal 1964 for certain governmental departments and agencies.
184	do	314	do	119	164	149	Granting authority for 7 members of Education and Labor Committee to visit 7 European cities for purposes of scientific investigation.
185	Oct. 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, Florida (68 Members absent).
186	Oct. 30		do				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (69 Members absent).
187	Oct. 31		do				Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, California (66 Members absent).
188	do	6500	Yea	356	1	76	On passage of conference report for 1964 military construction authorization.
189	do	8195	Not voting	173	158	96	One-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program (6 Members answered present; R.B.C. enroute to California for community workshop program El Monte—would have voted "nay". See rollcall No. 59).
190	Nov. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, Iowa (95 Members absent).
191	do	6143	Yea	258	92	83	On passage of conference report on higher education aid bill. (See rollcall No. 126).
192	do	8920	do	258	98	77	To revise District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.
193	Nov. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Van Pelt, Republican, Wisconsin (76 Members absent).
194	do	564	Not voting	212	149	72	Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 8969. (R.B.C. in office with Pastor Owen Geer of East Whittier Methodist Church; paired "for").
195	do	8969	Nay	172	197	62	Setting temporary debt ceiling limit at $315,000,000,000 for remainder of fiscal 1964—motion to recommit. (2 Members answered "present"; see rollcall No. 52).
196	do	8969	Yea	187	179	64	On passage of debt ceiling limit (2 Members answered "present").
197	Nov. 13		Absent				During this period R.B.C. was in California conducting a series of Federal-community workshop programs. He also spent 1 day in Connecticut for a speech. There were 6 quorum calls and 4 rollcalls, all on measures of negligible controversy.
206	Nov. 19	?					
207	Nov. 19	9140	Yea	358	77	48	Public works appropriations bill.
208	Nov. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, Ohio (56 Members absent).
*209	do	S. 777	Yea	252	133	47	To amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.
210	Dec. 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Cohelan, Democrat, California (109 Members absent).
*211	do	9124	Nay	176	154	104	To revise college and school ROTC programs.
212	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, California (105 Members absent).
213	do	10	Yea	301	18	115	To give the Nation's young people greater opportunity to work in Washington during summer months.
214	Dec. 3		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, Illinois (64 Members absent; R.B.C. at State Department).
215	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gubser, Republican, California (71 Members absent).
216	do		do				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, Illinois (91 Members absent).
217	Dec. 4		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hoeven, Republican, Iowa (33 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to office matters).
218	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Beermann, Republican, Nebraska (41 Members absent).
*219	do	6196	Yea	179	224	29	Motion to recommit Cooley cotton bill, a multimillion dollar subsidy measure (2 Members answered "present").
*220	do	6196	Nay	216	182	29	On passage of Cooley cotton bill (7 Members answered "present").

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALL NO. 209

Mr. Speaker, the main issue on this rollcall was whether the House would accept the $20 million authorization figure set by the Senate for operating the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1964 and 1965, or go along with the $30 million figure recommended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In evaluating the merits of this legislation, it is important to note that the ACDA has been the target of various extremist groups throughout the Nation. Through distortions, half-truths and innuendos many Americans have been led to believe that the ACDA is engaged in a direct conspiracy with Moscow to weaken the security of the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. ACDA cannot, nor can the President, obligate our Nation to reduce its armed forces or disarm without congressional consent. This safeguard is explicitly provided in section 33 of the ACDA Act—Public Law 87-297.

The ACDA's chief function is as a support resource for U.S. officials in their conduct of arms control and disarmament negotiations. ACDA, for example, was useful in helping bring to successful conclusion negotiations for a "hot line" between Moscow and Washington, and the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I participated in extensive hearings on the authorization bill and as a result I am firmly convinced, as was a majority of the committee, that ACDA's request for an increased budget was justified. As was pointed out during floor debate, ACDA was instrumental in developing a verification system—through extensive and expensive research—which permits the United States to monitor Soviet adherence to the test ban treaty. In my opinion, we must continue to base our support of the treaty on scientific information provided by effective technical devices. We cannot leave it to the belief that we can trust the Communists.

There can be no question that ACDA strengthens U.S. security, in addition to promoting the cause of peace. Yet during its first 2 years the Agency operated on a $20 million budget, less than the cost of two B-52 bombers. As one Congressman asked, "Can we appropriate $50 billion for the armaments of war, and find $30 million too much to pay for an instrument of peace?" It was unfortunate, in my judgment, that during floor procedure the requested increase was cut from the bill. I voted, nevertheless, to accept the $20 million authorization figure—the best that could be obtained during this session of Congress.

ROLLCALL NO. 211

My main objection to H.R. 9124 was that it came to the floor under suspension of the rules, a parliamentary procedure which automatically prevents a measure from being amended in any manner whatsoever. Suspension of the rules is normally applied to noncontroversial legislation, bills of limited import upon which the Congress, although informally, is known to be in substantial agreement.

Yet the measure to revise college and high school ROTC programs was brought before the House and described by its floor manager as "perhaps one of the most important, if not the most important piece of legislation that this body has been called on to pass judgment upon." It seemed incredible to me that after this assertion he would bring the bill up under a rules suspension. If the measure was indeed of such great consequence, it certainly should have been open to amendment during the debate on its merits and demerits.

In his recent message to a joint session of Congress, President Johnson emphasized the importance of getting value earned for each dollar our Government invests. Without an opportunity to amend proposed legislation, the chances of getting maximum value are greatly diminished, and there were several areas in H.R. 9124 which were open to serious question as far as spending and subsequent rewards were concerned.

The bill calls for the high school ROTC program, which is a good one as presently carried out in some 250 schools across the land, to be expanded to cover 2,000 high schools. This represents a cost increase of from $5 million annually to $25 million—a hike of 500 percent. And this for a program for which the Secretary of Defense has said there is no military need. The committee report on the bill also indicated that it was opposed by other top civilians at the Pentagon.

In addition, the measure provides that the Holloway plan, presently used by only the Navy, be extended to cover other military branches. This plan permits graduates of civilian colleges, whose 4-year tuition has been paid by the Government, to become regularly commissioned officers for at least 4 years of obligatory service. There is no question that the plan has some merit. But it also has drawbacks. At present, only 62 percent of Holloway plan graduates stay in the Navy beyond the minimum number of years required, and only 38 percent remain for a prolonged period as career officers. These figures compare to an 80-percent retention rate for graduates of the Naval Academy. In effect, the Holloway plan gives a $1 return for every $3 invested. It is for this reason that I question the economic wisdom of shifting the Holloway plan to areas where our officer recruitment needs are being met by OCS programs and others.

If nothing else, the bill should have been amended to require that obligatory service under the Holloway plan be increased from 4 to 5 years, as was done for graduates of our military academies under legislation passed by the House earlier this year. Under suspension of the rules, such an amendment was not possible. It is for these reasons that I voted against the bill.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 219 AND 220

The Cooley cotton bill, in my judgment, is about the poorest piece of legislation passed during this session of Congress. It was also the most lobbied bill of the year. Bombardment supporting the measure came from many quarters, including heavy salvos from the House's biggest guns. All this for a bill which, in effect, is nothing more than a multimillion-dollar subsidy for the cotton textile industry.

A vote for the Colley cotton bill was certainly not a vote for economy. It proposes a triple subsidy for cotton: One for producers, one for exporters, and now one for the mills. It is estimated that the proposal will cost the American people more than $635 million—over and above the present cotton program—during a 3-year period. Such a measure is certainly not in keeping with President Johnson's recent call for increased thrift and frugality in government.

The bill provides that the country's 34 leading textile mills, which already dominate 70 percent of the industry, will get about $350 million of the subsidy. Burlington Mills, the largest firm, will reap some $28 million. This handout represents about 80 percent of the firm's operating income in 1951. Statistics show that another will get a subsidy representing a 370-percent increase in its income. Other income hikes via the subsidy route hit 270, 200, 185 percent, and so on.

Provisions of the Cooley bill were carried to such outrageous extremes that it was fought by both the Farmers Union and the Farm Bureau, probably the first legislative alliance in the history of these two opposing groups.

If signed into law, this bill will permit domestic mills to buy American cotton at the same subsidized low price as foreign competitors. Since 1956 foreign buyers have been able to purchase U.S. cotton at world price levels. Recently these have been about 24 cents a pound, or roughly 8½ cents below the supported domestic price. The argument used by the textile mills is that foreign competition is driving them out of business. This is absurd since only 8 percent of the textiles in the United States are imported and 92 percent are domestic.

The competition which concerns cotton textile mills does not come from abroad. It comes from America's own synthetic textile mills. And even this domestic competition is not as extreme as the cotton mills would have consumers believe. From 1947 to 1961, although employment in the textile industry dropped 25 percent, actual fiber production fell only 2 percent. The unemployment drop is chiefly attributable not to foreign competition, but to automation, technical improvements and the widespread use of synthetic materials.

If the Cooley cotton bill becomes law, we will have opened a Pandora's box of subsidies. All industries which are having difficulty keeping up with technological and economic change will begin arriving at the public trough for a handout. And American consumers and taxpayers will pay the feed bill. This is not my idea of sound economics, and I will continue, regardless of pressures, to cast my vote against this type of legislation.

Community Service Society of New York Supports Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Community Service Society of New York is the largest voluntary and nonsectarian family service agency in New York and, I believe, in the country. It is also the oldest, having 115 years of service behind it.

This organization which is run and directed by a devoted group of citizens in New York has done as much for the health, education, and welfare for the people of New York as any government or non-government organization that one can point to. On its staff it has a group of experts on the subject of social welfare. It raises a very substantial sum of money every year, and it spends it well.

Recently the Committee on Public Affairs of the Community Service Society adopted a series of resolutions on the subject of civil rights legislation. The society is in support of such legislation. On its statement of principles which I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress is a statement based on 115 years of experience in the greatest city in the world. With the

permission of the Speaker and the Members I should like to insert, at this point in the RECORD, the statement just issued by the Community Service Society on this subject:

IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

The Committee on Public Affairs of the Community Service Society of New York, the largest voluntary and nonsectarian family service agency in the State of New York, with 115 years of service to individuals, families, and community, and research into social welfare problems believes that there is an urgent need for Federal civil rights legislation. It believes that such legislation should conform substantially to the following principles:

1. The right of all citizens to vote in all elections should not be denied because of race, color, religion or national origin and such right should be enforceable by the Federal Government;

2. The right of all citizens, without regard to race, color, religion or national origin, to full and equal access to places of public accommodation should be guaranteed, and such right should be enforceable by the Federal Government;

3. The right of all citizens, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, to full and equal access to publicly owned or operated facilities should be guaranteed, and such right should be enforcible by the Federal Government.

4. Any discrimination or segregation on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance should be banned, and such ban should be enforcible by the Federal Government.

5. Any discrimination or segregation on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin by any employer, employment agency, or labor union against any employment applicant, employee, union member, or potential union member should be banned, and such ban should be enforcible by the Federal Government.

6. The Attorney General of the United States should have the power to initiate or intervene in suits alleging the deprivation of rights secured by the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States or any law enacted thereunder, and the power to intervene in any suit alleging the deprivation of any other rights secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

7. The Commission on Civil Rights should be made a permanent agency, and either it or some other Federal agency should be empowered to conciliate disputes involving discriminatory practicts based on race, color, religion or national origin.

The committee believes that any such enactment would be consonant with our Nation's fundamental law and our native sense of fairness, decency, and justice.

Accordingly, the committee on public affairs supports in principle H.R. 7152 as revised by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee, and will consider other legislative proposals in the light of the principles enumerated above.

The long experience of the society confirms that all too often those deprived of fair opportunity suffer a defeated spirit, surrender ambition, concede poverty and abandon trust in justice. These are the consequences of discrimination against whole groups of people, the degradation of segregation. That so many have risen above such condition is wholly to their credit; that so much should be asked of them is grossly unfair to their merit.

We witness tragic human losses each day because of such conditions. We face them in our organization's services devoted to strengthening individual lives and family ties, in our special experimental enterprises to find new ways to restore persons and families to soundness, in our work to revitalize grey and deteriorated areas of the city, in our constant alertness to circumstances affecting the well-being of our people.

In full appreciation of this broad experience in human affairs, and in the interest of substantial justice and equal opportunity for all our people, the committee on public affairs sets forth this position statement on civil rights.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy—In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the shot heard round the world in 1963 carried sorrow to every corner of the earth. To those Americans in foreign lands November 22 brought to their lives a special agony. Far from home and friends, standing on alien ground, it must indeed have seemed for a moment as though they, too, had been dealt a fatal blow. But then the ragged edges of grief were made endurable by the spontaneous, embracing, warm and healing sympathy of newly found friends. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memorial tribute of one such American to his late President, John F. Kennedy. It was presented at a Thanksgiving Day service in Indonesia by Monroe Sweetland, of Portland, Oreg., now professor at the Universitas Padjadjaran.

The memorial tribute follows:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—IN MEMORIAM

Among the favorite quotations of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, are the lines from his New England friend Robert Frost.

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep.
But I have promises to keep—
And miles to go before I sleep."

In his few crowded years our late President keenly relished life itself and lived it fully—the woods of life were, for him, "lovely, dark, and deep." How resolutely he fulfilled his promise. He went many, many miles indeed before the end—and now he sleeps.

There is no need to dwell today on the utter tragedy, the circumstance of his death, nor even the poignancy of this heartbreaking event. Every person feels these facts acutely as a wounded nation, and the whole world pours out its emotion in sympathy to the shattered family—to Mrs. Kennedy and the children, to his father and mother, his grandmother, his brothers and sisters.

We Americans react alike on few occasions, but this is one of those few. Emotions of shock, grief, humiliation, disbelief, anger, outrage, and helplessness are comingled in all of us. Differences of party and principle are merged. We react as Americans—but we in Bandung react as a very special group of Americans in a foreign land, doubly sensitive to the implications of this week, terrible for our Nation and, for its relationships with other peoples.

There is one acknowledgement to be made this day—on this Thanksgiving Day—which I know is in the hearts of all Americans here. This is to voice our deep gratitude to the people of Indonesia for the outpouring of regret and sympathy given to each of us. To an amazing extent the warmth and vitality of the Kennedy personality had radiated deep into the ranks of the people around us. We Americans can never forget the visits to our homes which began as the tragic word from Texas was broadcast, the throng which overflowed the memorial Mass, and even the passers-by on the street or on the campus who grasped our hand to say a few words of respect and regret. These are a measure of American prestige and influence, to be sure, but even more, they measure the extent to which John F. Kennedy was able to project his sincerity, warmth, and genuine interest in people. Seldom has the leader of a nation had this special endowment in so generous a portion. In a few short years the image of leadership of the free world has been given warmth and character, symbolized by this young man in a world where every other major state is led by men a generation his senior.

The warmhearted genius of this great American was not a mere happy accident. Born into a family of wealth and position, he might have chosen a life of affluent indolence. But some inner purpose motivated him from early years toward public life and service. He studied at Harvard and at London School of Economics. He learned much of statecraft from his father's years as U.S. Ambassador at the Court of St. James's. He learned of practical politics from his mother's remarkable family, observing what was good and what was to be avoided in State and local government in turbulent Boston.

He won a seat in Congress as a very young man, proceeding to the U.S. Senate where he quickly became one of its most effective Members. In 1956 he very nearly won the Democratic nomination for Vice President, and in 1960 he won each of the seven hard-fought primary elections which he entered. This led to his nomination, and in November 1960, he broke traditions all along the line to win election as our 35th President.

As President of the most powerful Nation on our earth and the acknowledged leader of the free world it would be easy of the people of the free world to regard him as an institution. But somehow he was able to come through in the public mind as a man—a man capable of love, mistakes, humor, pain, anger, joy, and sorrow. He had known, in common with many of his generation the world around, the horror, degredation, and futility and personal agony of war. His own heroism, his demonstrated physical and moral courage, were fused in the terrors of battle and death.

In his adult years John F. Kennedy had the security and happiness of marriage to a truly exceptional woman. Together they knew the joys and sorrows of parenthood. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy has given a new dimension to the role of First Lady. Her beauty, her youth, her grace, talent, and culture add brilliant lustre to the legend of the White House family at home and abroad. For John F. Kennedy, the man, those who knew him personally will be forever thankful that his years were shared in love and companionship with this woman. Her courage and dignity today would be a source of great pride to her husband. Indeed, an epilog to John F. Kennedy's best-selling book "Profiles of Courage," in which he reviewed the lives of brave American men, might well be inscribed now to his magnificent young widow.

Only history will be our judge, as John F. Kennedy said on January 20, 1961, as he took his oath of office. But already it is apparent that in less than 3 years the leadership of this young man has indeed established new frontiers—has lifted up the horizons of his own people and of all men,

everywhere. Two profound achievements have already been established in history as the torch is passed to his trusted successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson:

First, the trend toward mutual atomic annihilation has been halted by a treaty between the two powers possessing massive atomic capacity.

Second, the full strength and moral leadership of the Presidency has been thrown into the ending of legalized segregation and discrimination under the flag of freedom. Racialism has been the most insulting and offensive defect in our national image, the most vulnerable weakness in our leadership of freemen. In Indonesia and among the large majority of mankind the suspicion of racial arrogance attached to us Americans as to our European cousins, with echoes from the oppressive days of colonialism and imperialism sounding down the years. Now an American President has renewed the appeal of American democracy at home and leadership abroad as he has thrown the moral strength of his leadership into the balance on behalf of freedom. On this basic point I will read you the concluding lines of his stirring and practical message to Congress on June 19, outlining his civil rights proposals:

"I ask every Member of Congress to set aside sectional and political ties, and to look at this issue from the viewpoint of the Nation. I ask you to look into your hearts—not in search of charity, for the Negro neither wants nor needs condescension—but for the one plain, proud, and priceless quality that unites us all as Americans: a sense of justice. In this year of the Emancipation centennial, justice requires us to insure the blessings of liberty to all Americans and their posterity, not merely for reasons of economic efficiency, world diplomacy and domestic tranquillity, but, above all, because it is right."

As Americans on this Thanksgiving Day we may be thankful, too, for many other legacies from the brief years of our young President. Already written into the patriotic adages of America was his ringing challenge in the inaugural address: "Ask not what can your country do for you, but what can you do for your country." And out of that concept came the American Peace Corps with a capability for good which has even now only begun to be developed.

On the occasion, only 3 weeks ago, of the 1963 award by the Protestant Council to President Kennedy as having made the year's most profound contribution to the family of man, the President discussed our obligations as Americans around the world. Every single one of us Americans in Indonesia and in southeast Asia is involved in the implications of his address on that occasion. In conclusion I will excerpt some of the stirring words from that address, in the President's own effective and personal style, for their pertinence to our work here, and the future of our Nation in the world.

"The family of man is not limited to a single race or religion, neither can it be limited to a single city or country. The family of man is more than 3 billion strong. It lives in more than 100 nations. Most of its members are not white. Most of them are not Christian. Most of them know nothing about free enterprise or due process or the Australian ballot. If we are to promote the family of man, let us examine the magnitude of our task." (He then reviewed the major factors of the task as he sees them.)

Then he concludes:

"Some say they are tiring of this task, are tired of world problems, are tired of hearing that those who receive our aid disagree with our diplomacy. But what kind of a spirit is that? Are we tired of living in a free world? Do we expect to make it over in our own image? Are we going to quit now because there are problems not yet solved?

"Surely the Americans of the 1960's can do half as well as the Americans of the 1950's. Surely we are not going to throw away our hopes and means for peaceful progress in an outburst of petty irritation and frustration.

"My fellow Americans: Let us be guided by our interests, not our indignation. Let us heed the words of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians: 'Let us not be weary in well-doing', he wrote, 'for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.' Let the word go forth—to all who are concerned about the future of the human family—that we will not be weary in well-doing and we will faint not; and we shall, in due season, reap a harvest of peace and security for all members of the family of man."

We Americans indeed live a good life, perhaps the freest and healthiest and best on the globe. For this, on our Thanksgiving Day, we are grateful. But we are thankful, too, that men like John Fitzgerald Kennedy can rise up amongst us, help us to be true to the best in our rich traditions.

Surrounded by the good life, we Americans find the woods around us, in the words of Robert Frost, "are lovely, dark, and deep." But as a nation and a people we, too, "have promises to keep—and miles to go before we sleep."

Florida's Panhandle Shedding Old Doldrums for New Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in having inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Joe Crankshaw on "Florida's Panhandle Shedding Old Doldrums for New Progress," which appeared in the December 5, 1963, issue of the Florida Times-Union. I had the privilege of speaking on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of the Territorial Convention which drew up the constitution of the State of Florida, which was observed in Port St. Joe on Saturday, December 7. I am proud of the progress which is being made in this section of my district and throughout the panhandle of Florida, which I have the honor and privilege of representing in the Congress.

The article follows:

FLORIDA'S PANHANDLE SHEDDING OLD DOLDRUMS FOR NEW PROGRESS

(By Joe Crankshaw)

The celebrations in Port St. Joe next Saturday will commemorate the 125th anniversary of the territorial convention which drew up the constitution of the State of Florida near that city.

The convention met on Monday, December 3, 1838, and proceeded to hammer out the first of five State constitutions. It was not until January 11, 1839, that the 56 delegates present cast 67 affirmative (12 of the ballots were by proxy) votes and one negative vote for the document.

On March 3, 1845, the St. Joseph Constitution became the law of the State when Florida was admitted to the Union as the 27th State.

Visitors to Port St. Joe next Saturday will see just one of the many communities which have begun to flourish on Florida's panhandle gulf coast.

St. Joseph, located on St. Joseph's Bay about 40 miles southeast of Panama City was not always a thriving community, but it displayed a progressive spirit when it was first founded by a group of independent citizens, who didn't like their prospects in Apalachicola, which was then the only town in the area.

Apalachicola was an important seaport in those days and it drew trade from as far away as Columbus, Ga. St. Joseph residents wanted to secure some of the trade and, 2 years before the constitutional convention, established a steam railroad, which, some authorities say, was the second such line in the Nation. The first railroad had been formed some years earlier in the Carolinas.

Despite the progress, the fame of the convention site and the railroad, it just wasn't in the cards for St. Joseph to survive. Battered by storms and swept by disease, it soon became only a name on the map.

Today, things are different in Port St. Joe, just as they are all along the panhandle's great gulf coast. Things are so good in fact that an Alabama legislator has revived a long forgotten plan to annex Florida's 10 counties into Alabama.

Next Saturday's visitor will find in Port St. Joe a neat modern city boasting a museum dedicated to the convention, a display of the first Baldwin steam locomotive in Florida and a thriving industry based on the Florida woodlands.

In Panama City, west of Port St. Joe, the tourist will find a vacation and defense town which is proving extremely popular with residents of southwest Georgia and southeastern Alabama. Soldiers from as far away as Fort Benning, Ga., may be found on its beaches almost any warm weekend.

Farther west on U.S. 98, the motorists will find a drive of almost unparalleled beauty as he rides beside bright, white beaches washed by the blue waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

For the visitor with lots of time northwest Florida has plenty to see. There is Pensacola, famed as the site of the Naval Aviation Training Center; Eglin Air Force Base, site of Strategic Air Command testing and experimental activities and the all-weather hangar; miles and miles of tung nut ranches which extend to the horizon over the rolling hills; Florida Caverns at Marianna and the Dr. John Gorrie Memorial at Apalachicola.

In the space of 20 years or so, Florida's panhandle has nearly doubled in population, investment by private enterprise and the Government for capital improvements has shot up into the billions of dollars, all of which promises a rich future for a section of the State, which many Floridians still erroneously consider totally backward.

Just as the city of Port St. Joe is today beginning to realize the vision many men had over 125 years ago, and just as Florida has outstripped all the dreams of its creators, so will northwestern Florida eventually justify the dreams of its representatives at the territorial convention so long ago.

Same Freeman Solution: More Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the scandal involving the operations of one Anthony De Angelis, of the Bronx, is mounting. Total losses to those who dealt with him or his firms are estimated at more than $100 million, a goodly part

of this sum resulting from warehouse receipts for oil which cannot be found.

In addition, several brokerage firms were caught in a squeeze when it developed that the De Angelis firm, Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp., of Bayonne, N.J., could not meet margin calls for futures in vegetable oil which it had been buying. This hit the brokerage firms very hard. One apparently is bankrupt as a result of the credit extended the De Angelis company. The New York Stock Exchange plans to put up $12 million to help one of the concerns involved. A third firm has been suspended from trading.

Undoubtedly there will be investigations as time goes on which will reveal more about De Angelis and his methods. I am concerned about the individuals and firms which may lose heavily in this mess. I am also concerned about another development growing out of the De Angelis crash. There are authentic reports that, as a result of futures trading by the Bronx manipulator and his firms, the Department of Agriculture plans to ask for more control over the commodity exchanges.

The decision apparently has been taken even before the Congress knows anything about this affair beyond what is read in the newspapers. The reports make me very uneasy. My uneasiness grows out of the attitude taken in the past by the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman. Mr. Freeman has his own pet remedy for agriculture's ailments. That remedy is more Government control.

It will be remembered that when Mr. Freeman, former Governor of Minnesota, took office in 1961 he proposed legislation which would have made him a vertiable farm czar. The Congress, after the Department decided what it wanted to do, would have had veto power and nothing else. As Mr. Freeman envisioned it, the House and Senate's function was to rubber stamp his ideas.

As might have been expected, Mr. Freeman's request was rejected. Nothing daunted, he came forward with new proposals for mandatory power. To date, every proposal he has made for farm legislation calls for greater authority for himself and the Department's bureaucrats. Only last spring a wheat measure, which contained mandatory features, was rejected by the growers themselves in a nationwide referendum.

Offhand, I would have thought that Mr. Freeman and his followers would get tired of asking for more power over farmers and institutions which serve the farmers. Not so. Immediately we are told—via the newspapers—after the De Angelis scandal broke, that the Commodity Exchange Authority of the Department had to stand helplessly by while De Angelis and firms tried to corner the vegetable oil futures market. Obviously, this is Department propaganda, and now we hear that Mr. Freeman has decided he needs more authority over futures trading and is going to ask for it.

I want to know a lot more about events before I subscribe to the Secretary's view that the way to prevent other De Angelis situations is to give him more power.

Mr. De Angelis, if reports are true, was one of the really big oil operators under Public Law 480, which authorizes export sales of domestic agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. In actuality, most of these sales are heavily subsidized, since the foreign currencies are piled up abroad and rarely return to this country as dollars. Mr. De Angelis apparently had been in trouble before with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the SEC, and the Department of Agriculture itself. He operated largely, it is said, as a subcontractor in recent years, and consequently did not do business directly with the Department. Yet it seems common knowledge that he sold oil abroad at fantastically cheap prices, prices which apparently figured in his downfall. It would seem that the Department would have bestirred itself and would have looked into the reasons for his strange operations. Surely this kind of trading in Government-subsidized transactions required close scrutiny. These sales abroad did not involve the commodity exchanges, or, if so, in a minor way. With all its vast authority, it seems that the Department could have done something to prevent the chaos which we have now. If anybody at the Department made any moves to head off the De Angelis crash, I have not heard about it.

There is a paragraph in the Wall Street Journal of December 9, 1963, which interests me very much:

> Months ago, Wall Street Journal commodity reporters, puzzled by the record increase in the number of vegetable oil futures contracts outstanding, questioned CEA officials. They were told: "Nothing seems to be wrong. We have a man on the trading floor most of the time, as a regular procedure. But no special investigation is underway."

This would seem to indicate that the CEA was not overly concerned. Is it possible that this regulatory agency, which has a history of asking for additional authority, simply stood quietly by, figuring that De Angelis and his operations might be the road to the legislation they have wanted for years?

Another factor gives me pause. Mr. Freeman and his Department have displayed a propensity to blame private business when something goes wrong. This propensity was evidenced in the course of the Billie Sol Estes scandal. This Texas manipulator got credit from an eastern chemical firm and also made heavy purchases of fertilizer. The chemical firm held liens on some Estes grain warehouses as security for the money it had lent. The Department, quite sanctimoniously, in the spring of 1962 announced it was moving the grain out of the elevators in order not to rescue Billie Sol from his "current financial difficulty." The Department knew that its blow really hit this private company. In the congressional inquiries which followed, some Democrats attempted to put the blame for Billie Sol Estes on "eastern city slickers," the business firm. Officials of the firm were given a thorough going over, and it seemed plain that the Department wanted the firm to take the rap. Now Billie Sol has sunk back into obscurity. It generally is recognized, I think, that this chemical firm was blameless in the Billie Sol Estes affair, while there is grave question in my mind as to whether the Department was in the clear.

As I have indicated, the proposal to give the Department additional authority over the commodity exchanges is not new. It has been put forward several times in the past, the excuse being given that speculation was causing high prices, or low prices, whichever fitted the situation at the time.

Insofar as I can find out, no farmer has lost anything in the De Angelis scandal. Farm prices did drop after reports of the Government's intention to ask for more authority over exchange trading. The markets apparently feel that the result of additional power over the exchanges will be bearish where prices are concerned.

One other factor in this whole picture amazes me. Our cattlemen are in real trouble. Imports are rising. Prices are low and promise to go lower. It is ironic then, that the Department is excited over trading on the commodity exchanges, yet seemingly indifferent to the plight of the cattlemen. The latter are being told, in effect, that nothing can be done about a situation which is costing them millions of dollars each day.

The Department says that cattlemen have refused, in the past, to submit to a control program and that, therefore, they are out of luck. Is a control program the price of help for the cattle producers? Is this the penalty which must be paid? Let me emphasize that Mr. Freeman's answer to every problem is control. I am of the opinion that there are ways to help the cattlemen without putting them in a Government straitjacket. I have an idea that many of them would feel better if the Department evidenced as much concern over these losses as it is evidencing in losses from the manipulation of Anthony De Angelis.

Mr. Speaker, I propose therefore, to take a long and objective look at any request from the Department of Agriculture which asks for more authority over any segment of agriculture, or industry.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Appendix

Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 14, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the following may be of interest to Members from rural areas:

STATEMENT BY HONORABLE ROBERT DOLE, OF KANSAS, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, DECEMBER 10, 1963 (RECOMMENDATION TO REVISE U.S. BEEF IMPORT POLICY)

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing here today on behalf of the livestock industry generally, and specifically on behalf of the thousands of Kansas farmers who have a valid "beef" concerning our present beef import policy.

Just last week our Government raised tariffs on imports of brandy, trucks and certain starch items; for example, brandy valued at more than $9 a gallon in containers of not more than 1 gallon, were raised from $1.25 a gallon to $5. The tariff on trucks valued at $1,000 or more was raised from 8½ percent to 25 percent, and I might point out that more trucks are used by farmers than any other group I know of. This action is to be commended and mentioned primarily to point up the unfavorable situation the cattle producer is faced with.

During 1963 particularly, the the American cattle industry has suffered drastically because of reduced prices, particularly involving cattle in feedlots of the Farm Belt. To a large extent depressed livestock markets are a result of rising foreign imports of live cattle and finished beef products. Farmers, livestock organizations, members of the business community, and Members of Congress representing areas of the Nation where livestock is a major source of income, are increasingly alarmed over this situation, which is steadily worsening.

Kansas ranks fourth in the Nation in cattle population, with more than 5 million head of cattle as of January 1, 1963. Farmers in my district, as in other areas, have gone into the livestock business as a necessary means of bolstering shrinking incomes from the production of wheat and feed grains. Western Kansas, particularly, is not suited to a wide diversity in production of crops, and much of it is often referred to as a one-crop area due to a lack of rainfall and a limited growing season. Forage crops can be successfully raised, hence many farmers have been feeding from 30 to 40 head, to as many as 300 to 400 head, of cattle.

Today in America there are nearly 4 million farms, and 2.5 million of them have livestock. Over 1 billion acres of land are involved in pasture, either permanent or temporary. The growing cattle industry has made a substantial contribution toward holding down the surpluses in feed grains, as millions of bushels are consumed on farms where grown.

The seriousness of depressed cattle prices on the farm economy, and in fact the economy generally, can be immediately seen when the loss per head is estimated to be as high as $30.

Cattle prices have continued to drop steadily for a year now. Choice cattle that were commanding a price of $30 per hundred a year ago brought $22 during the current month of December. These declines in fat cattle prices have been reflected also in the prices of feeders which have dropped from $3 to $4 per hundredweight over the same time. In the December 7 issue of the Drovers Telegram it was stated: "Local price of $21.20 past week is lowest since May 1957, and $4.54 below the 1963 high. Slumping fat cattle markets the past week dropped the average price on slaughter steers at Kansas City to the lowest level in more than 6 years. Losses of $1 or more suffered in the local trade the past 5 days tumbled the average price on beef steers to $21.20 a hundred pounds, lowest weekly figure here since May of 1957. The price compared with $22.01 last week and $26.98 the corresponding week in 1962."

Some officials in the Department of Agriculture have attributed reduced prices primarily to heavy marketing, but we cannot disregard unprecedented beef imports the last 3 years have been a major factor. In 1961 imports totaled nearly 1.3 billion pounds, in 1962 nearly 1.5 billion pounds, and it is estimated they will reach almost 2 billion pounds in 1963. Today nearly 11 percent of the beef consumed in the United States is imported from Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and other countries.

On November 18, 1963, I introduced H.R. 9145 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit imposition of increased duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported in excess of realistic and reasonable annual quotas. In recent years duties on beef have been reduced about 50 percent, and prompt steps must be taken to avoid chaotic conditions in a vital industry. As stated by A. G. Pickett, secretary, Kansas Livestock Commission, in a letter to the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations:

"In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries have not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as using other import controls.

"The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the U.S. cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage. Producers in this country feel that our tariffs and trade policies are permitting this country to become a dumping ground for world supplies of meat, and particularly beef."

USDA officials now recognize imports are having an adverse effect on cattle prices, though they seek to minimize the situation by stating the numbers of live cattle coming into the country are not significant, but admit most 1963 imports have been in the form of frozen and canned beef, in fact, 81 percent was boneless frozen beef, and 14 percent canned beef. It is difficult for farmers, or anyone else, to understand how imported live cattle compete with our cattle producers, but that the finished meat products do not. It has also been suggested by USDA officials that cows imported and used for beef used in hamburger and hot dogs do not significantly affect domestic prices.

The livestock industry is known throughout the history of our country for its independent spirit. Cattlemen pride themselves on being rugged individualists and fear Government programs which could ultimately encompass them, and because of this spirit they have remained free from governmental control or direction.

Now that cattlemen ask their Government to protect their industry against unwarranted imports of beef, some are saying the industry is asking for a subsidy, a form of price support, or even an indirect Government payment. This attitude begs the question and is an insult to the integrity of this great industry.

Tariffs are as old as our country and have played a major role in our industrial development. Tariffs are, in many cases, a necessary facet of our way of life and our economy would suffer without them. Is it unAmerican to protect this American industry rather than use it as a pawn in foreign policy decisions?

Something must be done immediately to avert disaster to thousands of our farmers. The urgency cannot be overemphasized, and I respectfully request prompt action to raise tariffs to the level necessary to protect a great American industry. The Kansas Livestock Association very properly suggests: "a system of quotas be established based on average imports over a long period of time. This system of quotas should be accompanied by substantial increases in our import duties. We feel it is only fair to the livestock industry that our import duties at least equal those of our competitive importing nations. This plan would give importing countries access to our markets on a competitive basis."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Military Construction, Department of Defense, 1964

SPEECH

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to revise and extend my remarks on the military construction appropriation conference report, I insert in the RECORD a tabulation showing the comparison between the amount agreed to in the conference report and the budget estimates as well as the actions of the House and the Senate. This table was inadventently omitted from the RECORD of December 13 in the remarks of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Title	Budget estimate, 1964	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with—		
					Budget	House	Senate
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Military construction, Army	$249,500,000	$200,293,000	$207,070,000	$200,646,000	−$48,854,000	+$353,000	−$6,424,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000			
Military construction, Army National Guard	3,500,000	3,500,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	+2,200,000	+2,200,000	
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY							
Military construction, Navy	269,900,000	194,000,000	202,223,000	198,853,000	−71,047,000	+4,853,000	−3,370,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE							
Military construction, Air Force	628,200,000	451,000,000	487,090,000	468,275,000	−159,925,000	+17,275,000	−18,815,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Military construction, Air Guard	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000			
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE							
Military construction, Defense agencies	29,900,000	24,000,000	27,000,000	24,000,000	−5,900,000		−3,000,000
Loran stations, Department of Defense	20,500,000	14,500,000	20,500,000	20,500,000		+6,000,000	
Total, military construction	1,232,000,000	917,793,000	980,083,000	948,474,000	−283,526,000	+30,681,000	−31,609,000

APPROPRIATION FOR FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE, 1964

Family housing, Army:							
Construction	$57,400,000	$41,364,000	$34,681,000	$34,681,000	−$22,719,000	−$6,683,000	
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	188,290,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	183,396,000	−4,894,000		
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:							
Construction	94,700,000	80,036,000	68,248,000	68,248,000	−26,452,000	−11,788,000	
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	95,981,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	93,944,000	−2,037,000		
Family housing, Air Force:							
Construction	97,850,000	50,321,000	61,027,000	61,027,000	−36,823,000	+10,706,000	
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	197,583,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	193,514,000	−4,069,000		
Family housing, Defense agencies:							
Construction	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000			
Operation, maintenance, and debt payments	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000			
Total, family housing	734,400,000	645,171,000	637,406,000	637,406,000	−96,994,000	−7,765,000	
Total	1,966,400,000	1,562,964,000	1,617,489,000	1,585,880,000	−380,520,000	+22,916,000	−31,609,000

Reassurance From Uncle Bob

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic assassination of President Kennedy, our office has received mail from those who are our younger constituents, all of which has displayed the great admiration for our late President together with expressions of sincere grief and some concern about the transition to President Johnson.

I am sure other Members must have received mail of a comparable nature from their districts. However, this past week it was my privilege to have knowledge of not only one such letter from a college student but also the content of the reply forwarded back in answer by one of the older generation.

My congressional district is just about evenly divided in population between a suburban area and seven other counties whose main source of support is from the soil. One of the leading organizations interested in sound American agriculture is the National Limestone Institute. It is headed by Robert M. Koch as president. Many Congressmen that represent rural America know of Mr. Koch's long time efforts in the interest of a good agricultural conservation program. Bob Koch is well known to Members of both branches of Congress. Like our office, other Members have constituents that belong to the Limestone Institute and are equally interested in what may be the farm program under the new administration. Along with thoughts on this subject, Mr. Koch covers in his letter to his niece the eminent qualifications of our new President to propel our Nation forward to higher goals and objectives through his demonstrated capacity to understand, and then lead.

The two letters, one from a young lady named Helen who is in college and the reply from her uncle Bob provided the reassurance that each Member of this House can forward to their young constituents who may write inquiringly about the transition to the administration of President Johnson. The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

DEAR UNCLE BOB: I know you must be shocked at President Kennedy's assassination as all of us at school were. Here at the university, so many of us who had never seen him wept as we learned of his death.

Many of my friends are somewhat skeptical about Johnson's becoming President. We wonder if he'll "change horses in the middle of the stream," so to speak, in an attempt to push his policies and views, and if he'll be a strong President. We hope that if Johnson is given the opportunity as President, he might be as strong as he once was in the Senate.

Since you are closely associated with people in Washington, you would know more about the new President than any of us. What is your honest opinion of Johnson?

To all of us Kennedy was such an American image of leadership, intelligence, and courage. It seems so unjustifiable, it seems so fruitless to strive in college and in life to get to the top, for when one gets there, a single maniac's decision can ruin everything.

This image has been destroyed and we need to build up faith in a new President. If you have time, could you write, Uncle Bob, and tell us about Johnson so that we can start to gain that faith?

Wish Aunt Helen, Bobby, and Marilyn, and yourself a happy Thanksgiving.

Your niece,

HELEN.

NOVEMBER 29, 1963.

DEAR HELEN: I was not at all surprised to receive your letter of November 23 as I have had a great many quite similar reactions from all parts of the country, as well as some right here in Washington, to the tragic events which began so swiftly at noon on the 22d of November.

As you know, I had an opportunity to become acquainted with President Kennedy and his staff during the last campaign. This personal contact led me to believe that most Americans didn't fully appreciate what an unusual man John Kennedy was and how fortunate we in the United States were in having him as our President. What has happened since November 22 has shown that happily I was wrong. Certainly no man in our history has received such acclaim as he has. Recognizing that like all human beings he had frailties, they now seem so insignificant compared to his proven virtues. His supremely developed intellect, his consummate understanding of our Nation's needs, not in a few instances but in the total area of a governed peoples life, and his great ability to articulate his beliefs set him quickly apart as those of us who were privileged to discuss issues with him saw almost instantly and as everyone of us could recognize in his many TV appearances.

If this had not been so, we would not have had the throngs lining the streets in Washington—second to none this country has ever seen. Nor would the almost unbelievable

crowds have lined up to walk silently past his closed bier all through the night with thousands locked out because of the necessity of proceeding with the state funeral. Nor would there be the almost endless procession by his grave at Arlington Cemetery.

And so you and your college classmates are not alone in feeling this deep-seated, almost unknown, grief. Nor are you alone in raising the questions you have. I have been called on many times since that Friday afternoon when he was so abruptly taken from the helm of our Nation by a great many who wondered what our future course might be.

As you say, some of us are privileged to work rather close to our Nation's leaders and so we do have the advantage over others who don't get to see these individuals until the hot glare of National publicity hits them. To answer you directly, at first I would like to say it is my personal belief that the country is extremely fortunate in having the man who is the best trained of anyone at anytime to step into the Presidency.

By an unusual set of circumstances, we have a man who was a strong contender—in fact No. 2—for his party's nomination for the Presidency. At that point in life he had demonstrated to many of us on the Washington scene that his many years in the House and Senate, capped by the most outstanding record in the Senate as majority leader since the beginning of our country, clearly entitled him to consideration for the highest office in the land.

As you may know, the then Senator Kennedy was severely criticized in many circles when he selected Lyndon Johnson as Vice President. There is no question but that this had a political flavor but anyone who uses this to sell President Johnson short is not fully apprized concerning his background, his performance in the Congress and, more important, his performance since he has been Vice President.

The late President Kennedy did much to train President Johnson as heir-apparent. Vice President Johnson not only attended all Cabinet meetings but he was informed and consulted on all national and international problems. Furthermore, he was sent overseas—not to get him out of the country, as some detractors have claimed, but as the personal emissary of the President.

While President Johnson doesn't have the youthful appearance nor the young family which is so appealing to the younger generation, he does have a thorough understanding of their point of view. Many forget he was one of the original New Dealers and played a leading part in broadening the service of the Government to all the people. Many seem to forget that he has been in the forefront of civil rights activity. As majority leader in the Senate he secured the first civil rights bill in many years. As Chairman of President Kennedys' Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, he has implemented President Kennedy's goals in this critical area.

I could go in more detail proving the same basic concept. It is my hope that, if you and your friends heard his outstanding speech to the Congress last Wednesday, you no longer have such concern as you wrote me about.

Personally, I believe that Lyndon Johnson because of his beliefs, because of his tremendous understanding of the operation of our Government, because of his personal relationship with all the congressional leaders and because he is a pragmatist practicing the art of the possible will become one of this Nation's great Presidents.

While he may not entirely lose his southern drawl, I can assure you he is no more of a sectional man than was President Kennedy. Nor is he just national minded. Most heads of foreign governments are very much impressed with him after they get to know him. Naturally he is not as yet as well known as President Kennedy. President Kennedy's funeral helped a lot by bringing so many here—and many are returning and other coming during the next few months.

So while there is a break, and while no two men operate exactly the same, I am confident President Johnson will so conduct himself and the affairs of the Nation that, while you will greatly miss President Kennedy, you will greatly admire President Johnson as a highly intelligent, liberal President who will command the respect of not only the people of the United States but of the world.

Sincerely,

Uncle Bob.

Herbert Lehman: Statesman and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of one of America's most remarkable elder statesmen, Herbert H. Lehman, has thrust an additional sadness upon a people still mourning the loss of their President. I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep personal grief over his passing and to pay tribute to a beloved national and international servant.

It is difficult for me to realize that Mr. Lehman is no longer with us. Aside from being a personal friend during my adult life, he had been a dynamic and respected political figure since my boyhood in New York State. His indomitable ability and courage had permeated New York politics for more than a third of a century.

Of the great names in American politics that New York has produced, Herbert Lehman stands alone as the only man in the last 100 years to occupy all of her highest elective posts. He was elected to serve her twice as Lieutenant Governor, four times as Governor, and for two terms in the U.S. Senate. His abundant energies and social consciousness benefited not only his State and Nation, but all mankind as well.

On the day of his death he was preparing to leave for the White House to receive the Presidential Medal of Freedom, our Nation's highest peacetime award for a civilian. It is no wonder that the people of the world, and the people of my State specially, feel a kind of empty sadness—as if an old and dear friend is gone.

He was a courageous and practical idealist, a reformer, a philanthropist, a religious leader, a financier and, above all, a humanitarian. He will be remembered among the best Governors ever to serve New York. He was able to reorganize State finances and change an inherited $100 million deficit into a surplus of more than $75 million. He urged programs for public development of natural resources, to improve the prisons, to expand the mental hospitals, to develop welfare and housing programs, and improve the administration of relief.

He was an extremely capable administrator, but he was more. He said:

> Before I went to Albany my life was pretty well divided between business and welfare work. Business was business, and it was only in my welfare work that I allowed my heart and sympathy to play a part. I had not been there long before I discovered that in public work it was impossible to draw a line between business and welfare. I don't believe that I have encountered a question of policy in all my public life which did not cover the economic as well as the humanitarin field.

In his unceasing efforts to promote human welfare, he set before us an inspiring example of how we may hope to forward the international community and world peace.

At the outbreak of World War I, he became associated with the Joint Distribution Committee and directed the collection and disbursement of $75 million for the relief of Jewish war sufferers in Europe and Palestine. Later he became a civilian assistant to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Navy. After the war he was appointed a special assistant to Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War. In 1919, he received the Distinguished Service Medal for his competence and devotion.

At the outbreak of World War II, he resigned his office of Governor at President Roosevelt's request to become head of the newly created Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations. In November 1943, plans for joint United Nations relief activity, which Lehman had begun to formulate, were implemented as 40 countries formed the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Lehman was chosen as Director-General. In 1942, he had said:

> There will be those who will raise objections to our spending money for the people of other lands. They are the ones who say that what happens in other parts of the world is not our concern. But surely this war has proved that we cannot live within our own little shell. We must feed and clothe and find shelter for the millions whose lives have been disrupted by the war. Then we must do what we can to help these people to become once more independent.

He showed this same kind of courage throughout his political career. During the McCarthy hysteria, he joined with Senator Ralph E. Flanders in an effort to strip Senator McCarthy of his committee chairmanships. And on the eve of a crucial senatorial contest, he voted against a crude piece of anti-Communist legislation. It was political dynamite. At the time, he stated:

> I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression some of them hold. My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult.

In the twilight of his life it was this same kind of spirit that made him join with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt to push for governmental reform in his beloved State.

Herbert Lehman spent a lifetime attempting to do what he could to help and benefit other people. He lent an image and a stature to public office that, unfortunately, is too often lacking.

I was 15 when I first met Mr. Lehman. He was then a 50-year-old man with half a century of experience and tremendous personal and financial success behind him. That was 1928, the year he began his political career as Lieutenant Governor under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Youth is impressionable—and in Herbert Lehman we found an officeholder to look up to with admiration and respect. This respect was not dimmed by adulthood.

At the age of 26, I was privileged to be elected to the State senate in Albany. There, my respect for Governor Lehman increased and our acquaintance became a close friendship.

Despite our difference in political party, our goals were similar; and we sought to achieve these to the best of our abilities and respective political parties. We shared a bipartisan belief in the goals of peace, justice, freedom, and the dignity of the individual. Our political affiliation over the years was based on the mutual desire to enact programs that would benefit all the people of New York. I am extremely proud of the fountain pens and certificates adorning the walls of my office that Governor Lehman used to affix his signature to many bills which I had sponsored.

Our personal affiliation was based on respect for the opinions of each other and on the interests we held in common.

The last time I talked with Mr. Lehman and his very lovely and gracious wife, Edith, an exceptionally talented woman in her own right, was last May during a 2-day speaking engagement I had in California. I visited him at the Desert Hospital in Palm Springs. Despite a broken hip and obvious pain, he was alert and cheerful. At 85, he still had the spirit of a young man .

Herbert Lehman served his State and Nation long and well, but he also served mankind. He was the kind of world citizen so desperately needed on a globe beset by misery, misunderstanding, and strife. He was a religious man and he believed that we are our brother's keeper.

The world will miss Herbert Lehman—and we hope for more men like him.

Suggestion for Commemorative Stamp Showing John F. Kennedy, Jr., Saluting His Father's Casket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the great outpouring of ideas from the American public to memoralize our beloved late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is familiar to all of us.

However, an idea originated by one of my constituents, Jack Brandwein, of Sacramento, Calif., seems to me to be worthy of most careful consideration. Mr. Brandwein's suggestion is for a commemorative postage stamp showing young John F. Kennedy, Jr., courageously saluting his father's flag-draped casket. Mr. Brandwein has been circulating petitions all over the country and it is my understanding more than 14,000 signatures have been obtained to this date.

Following is an article from the Sacramento Union which indicates the nationwide attention given to this suggestion by the United Press International:

SACRAMENTO.—The gallantry of John F. Kennedy, Jr., saluting his father's casket, should be reproduced on a postage stamp, the Sacramento Union said today.

In an editorial written for publication on Thanksgiving Day, the newspaper said such a stamp would serve "as a lasting tribute to the courage of all the Kennedys, father and son alike, and Jacqueline, too."

"It will remind us again and again of the rededication to preservation of our Nation's ideals which each of us resolved in silent pledge as we sorrowed for our martyred President," the Union said.

Jack Brandwein, a local furniture store owner and an originator of the idea, said 1,000 petitions, with room for a total of 15,000 signatures, have been printed urging the Postmaster General to issue the stamp.

Truman Urges Plain Talking on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when former President Harry S. Truman decides that "the time has come for plain speaking" on any issue, the results are always interesting and provocative, and usually full of wisdom, too. No one in the United States can speak with more authority on the subject of civil rights, since the civil rights movement in this country had such great impetus under his administration, forming the base on which President Kennedy later built a solid program of action and of legislative recommendations.

In view of the tremendous interest in the civil rights legislation pending before Congress, and in the various parliamentary approaches this week to the problem of having the bill brought before the House for consideration and passage, I was particularly interested in former President Truman's article Sunday in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which begins:

I think the time has come for some plain speaking on the problem of civil rights.

As a Missourian, Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud of our "Man From Independence" who served with such courage and effectiveness as President of the United States. His article in Sunday's Post-Dispatch reflects not only his long experience with the greatest domestic issue facing the United States right now, but also the straightforward way he has approached that issue, first as President and now as one of our great national sources of wise political guidance.

The article referred to follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 8, 1963]

TRUMAN URGES PLAIN TALKING ON CIVIL RIGHTS: SAYS MANY HAVE CONFUSED IDEAS ON ISSUES INVOLVED

(By Harry S. Truman)

INDEPENDENCE, Mo., December 8.—I think the time has come for some plain speaking on the problem of civil rights.

Words have a way of losing their fundamental meaning through overuse. For instance, the words "freedom," "democracy," and "security" lose the strength of meaning with repetition.

And so we find that when people speak of civil rights they seem to be saying it in a rather casual way.

One gets that sort of feeling when listening to some of these heated discussions on civil rights—that too many of the people don't quite mean what they say, or don't quite know what they mean. They have carried, from their early school years, an acceptance that civil rights is a basic right of all the people.

They regard civil rights, which is another word for human rights, as something that they are, of course, for and that every decent person must be for—and there can be no question about their position on it.

SEPARATION OF ATTITUDES

Unfortunately this ready acceptance all too often blows sky high, when some of these same people become involved in a civil rights matter in a personal way. At such a time they come face to face with the problem of what amounts to a separation of attitudes.

On the one side is the right of privacy and all the many privileges that go with it, such as the choice of company, choice of club, choice of friends and whatever social categories with which one elects to associate.

But on the other side is the attitude they are obligated to practice outside their homes and clubs. Here their freedom is subject to the other people's rights and public policy. Here rights to free action must be accommodated to the rights and freedoms of others—and anyone who would refuse to go along with that commitment is going against the current of American present-day thought and action.

Again, our rights of privacy and the privileges of free social choices we may enjoy in our homes are inviolate—and there we can do and say as we please.

But when we are out in public and deal in such areas as public transportation, public parks, public schools, hospitals, housing and such, our rights are limited to where they do not infringe on the rights of others, regardless of the color of their skin or what neighborhoods they come from.

In the eyes of the law and under our system there are no levels or degrees of privilege. The protection of the dignity and freedom of one man is as sacred as that of the next man. If we are to enjoy all the benefits of equality, there can be no special publicly privileged class, or any discriminations.

There are those among us who are still afflicted with the prejudices and primitive hostilities of a bygone age which transcend their other good intentions and good qualities.

For example, whom one eats with, or where, is a personal choice. Whom one invites to his home or private club, that is a social matter and it is of no concern to the community. But when it comes to public places and facilities involving the health, education, and economic opportunities of all the people, that's something else again.

There is no room here for prejudice, bigotry, or special pleading, and no unfair discrimination, personal likes or local hostilities should bar any citizen, and that

means every citizen regardless, from obtaining an education, seeking any job he is capable of holding, and being entitled to a decent place in which to live and to bring up his family.

RIGHT AND WRONG

In considering the broad question of civil rights, some of us tend to confuse our likes and dislikes with what is right and wrong—and, as a matter of fact in our public behavior toward our fellow citizens, as well as to mankind everywhere, it is necessary to understand and practice to do what is right and not what we happen to like or not to like.

Too often the things we either like or dislike, turn out to be wrong. So, what we must understand is that we are dealing with the differences of right and wrong, and what amounts to the difference between fair treatment or mistreatment of our fellow man.

As James M. Barrie expressed it: "The secret of happiness is not doing what one likes, but in liking what one has to do."

From the early beginnings of our history we, as a Nation, have been dedicated to the belief that all men are created equal and that differences of race, color, religion, or national origin should not be cause to deny anyone equality of treatment and equality of opportunity. This Nation has been, from its very beginning, a haven for the oppressed of other lands—and surely we cannot tolerate oppression in our own land.

STABLE SOCIETY

We have managed to produce a highly successful and stable society under our system of government in preserving a free and open society. To help maintain that way of life we need to balance our personal liberties with group authority.

For practical purposes we operate generally under a majority rule procedure. But we learn from history that majority rule if unrestrained could lead to tyranny and oppression. The Founding Fathers understood this very well.

They made sure this would not happen when they provided for the protection of the dignity and liberty of the individual by attaching a Bill of Rights to the Constitution. This made it a matter of the basic organic law of this Nation that all would enjoy freedom of worship, freedom of peaceful assembly, and equal participation in the choice of government on all levels.

SELFISHNESS A FACTOR

The question naturally arises as to why we are continuing to experience resistance from some quarters in putting into full working practice these rights which we have been dutybound to do for over 100 years.

Perhaps one of the answers is that under our thin coat of "company manners" we are preoccupied with selfishness. In other words, we are still living by a double standard.

There are, in every community, the social snobs, the economically overprivileged, the self-serving political bigots to whom human rights are revolutionary subversive words. These are people with special problems—and we understand them—for they regard themselves above the crowd.

But I find it difficult to understand some of those able and intelligent men who speak for those Southern States in a manner truly representative of those States—and surely not of these times.

If their hard, unyielding position on the civil rights bill is the customary delaying action and yet another contest to defer the inevitable, I think these men are badly mistaken, and are hurting the Nation where it is most damaging.

I would hope that they would choose instead to cooperate with the inevitable, and hasten the day when, as a united nation, we can pursue many other urgent tasks which need to be dealt with for the security of the Nation.

We have had all the sectionalism and needless local rivalries we can stand. We have enormous tasks ahead of us to meet threats from without, without having to weaken our position by senseless divisions among ourselves.

HELP FOR RED POWERS

We are flanked by two gigantic powers, one on each side of us: Communist Russia and Red China. They are driven by a fanatical zeal to impose their archaic system on the rest of the world. They are determined to destroy us. If we fail to resolve the issues of civil rights between States and the Federal Government, we shall surely be extending the new tyrannies a helping hand.

It is over 16 years since I proposed to deal with the problem of civil rights during my Presidency. At the time I directed the military to abolish segregation and proposed to the Congress to enact a civil rights program.

We have been trying to advance that cause step by step, but it has been painfully slow. I hope that we can now proceed to put into effect the comprehensive program now before the Congress—so that we can get on with the many other urgent tasks before us.

We have had too much talk—it is time for action.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Tribute to the Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newsletter written by my wife, Mrs. John Sherman Cooper, on the late President John F. Kennedy, which was published in many Kentucky newspapers.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM MRS. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

NOVEMBER 25, 1963.

I have just come from the President's funeral. The house seems very still after the cathedral crowded with the mighty of the nations, followed by the long, slow procession past the Lincoln Memorial over the bridge to Arlington Cemetery. The afternoon was so bright and fair that the thousands of baskets of flowers, which had been sent regardless of the family's wishes, belied the autumn leaves and gave the impression of springtime. John and I mourned not only for our President but also for our friend. He was your friend too. Because it is so easy to forget, I am going to mention some of the things he did for Kentucky.

On January 21, 1961, Senator COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, said on the Senate floor:

"I am glad that President Kennedy in his first Executive order acted to improve the amounts, variety, and nutritional quality of food distributed to needy families. For 3 years, I have urged this action by the Department of Agriculture. * * * I think it humane and appropriate that the first act of the new President was to help the neediest people of the Nation."

Also, in the beginning of 1961 he requested TVA to locate a steam plant in Knox and Bell Counties, on the Cumberland River, to stimulate the economy of southeastern Kentucky. TVA, however, had made a prior decision to locate the plant in Tennessee, but the President wanted it for Kentucky. This year, after the floods in eastern Kentucky, John and I went to visit the disaster area. After having see the terrible devastation, John went to the President, who, at his request, gave increases in funds for flood protection for eastern Kentucky. As you know, one of President Kennedy's last official acts was on November 13, when he said:

"I have today met with Gov. Bert Combs, of Kentucky, and members of the Kentucky congressional delegation to discuss a crash program designed to bring special attention to the especially hard-hit area of eastern Kentucky—the most severely distressed area in the Nation."

There have been many times in the last 3 years that I have asked the President or Mrs. Kennedy to give our State special consideration. I am sure that the thousands who heard the Lexington Youth Symphony or saw the Berea dancers perform on the White House lawn will never forget the honor it gave our State—an honor which every other State in the Union is trying to attain and which was made possible because I asked Mrs. Kennedy to bring it to her husband's attention. It would be impossible to mention the endless special White House tours and other marks of friendship and consideration. In fact, I have never had "No" for an answer in courtesies for Kentuckians. Although we belong to different political parties, John Kennedy was not partisan in friendship. Even when he came to Kentucky during a recent senatorial campaign he had good things to say about my husband, both at the airport and at the dinner in Louisville, which is most unusual in the heat of a campaign. I wish all of you had known him. This poem by Molly Kazan was printed in the New York Herald Tribune, gives you another glimpse of him.

"I think that what he gave us most was pride.
It felt good to have a President like that:
Bright, brave and funny and good looking.
I saw him once drive down East Seventy-second Street
In an open car, in the autumn sun
(As he drove yesterday in Dallas).
His thatch of brown hair looked as though it had grown extra thick
The way our wood animals in Connecticut
Grow extra fur for winter.
And he looked as though it was fun to be alive,
To be a politician,
To be President,
To be a Kennedy,
To be a man.
He revived our pride,
It felt good to have a President
Who read his mail,
Who read the papers,
Who read books and played touch football.
It was a pleasure and a cause for pride
To watch him take the quizzing of the press
With cameras grinding—
To take it in his stride,
With zest.
We were privileged to see him on the worst day (till yesterday),
The Bay of Pigs day,
And we marveled at his coolth and style
And were amazed at an air (that plainly was habitual) of modesty
And even diffidence.
It felt good to have a President
Who said, It was my fault.
And went on from there.
What was spoken
Was spoken well.
What was unspoken
Needed to be unspoken.
It was none of our business if his back hurt.
He revived our pride.
He gave grist to our pride.
He was respectful of intellect;
He was respectful of excellence;
He was respectful of accomplishment and skill;
He was respectful of the clear and subtle use of our language.
And all these things he cultivated in himself.
He was respectful of our heritage.
He is now part of it."

Castro: A Tyrant to All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent analysis of the Cuban situation by Santiago Reachi of the Copley News Service:

The countries that compose the continent of America may have differences of tradition, language, habits, customs and other practices, but we are, basically, agreed as to the form of government.

Not a country in this continent would tolerate any form of political exercise that does not incorporate freedom as its basic philosophy, no matter what the shortcomings may be.

Even the Cubans, with all the undeserved misfortunes they have experienced, love freedom and liberty.

Cuba, today, is the inexcusable victim of high treason, in its ugliest form, and tortuous manipulations. Cuba was subdued by surprise and by the use of malicious cunning, crime, lies, chicanery and robbery. Certain elements of bad luck (let us call it that) militated in favor of the bearded tyrant. It is, nevertheless, inconceivable that an unscrupulous adventurer with a handful of subverters should have reached the heights they have, right under our noses, and we passed the opportunity to get rid of them without needless bloodshed and sacrifices.

The Cubans—and much of the world—welcomed Fidel Castro as a heroic insurgent. He promised elections and a renovation of past objectionable political practices. He promised to do away with dictatorships. He offered anything that suited the palate of the populace at the moment to gain his objective. Cubans accepted him gleefully at his word. Once Castro consolidated his seat of power, he proved to be an apocalyptical beast.

Cubans—as all Latin Americans—love freedom. There can be no greater proof of this than the wholesale emigration of Cuba's most valuable citizens. To this day, the sad and frustrating attempts to flee Castro's island by men and women and children boarding suicidal boats and floats offer the most convincing proof of their love for freedom.

A large number of these people never get to their destination. Cubans will fight for their liberty, cost what it may, and for as long as is necessary. Unfortunately, they have been subjected to so many inconsistencies that by this time they do not know whether we are their friends or their enemies.

Peace as such is not a virtue that will ever be practiced by subverting hordes. Peace must be consolidated first, with those components of the world with whom we are ideologically identified and linked. It seems like we should start this activity in our own continent of America. We should present a solid, inflexible front, then continue with

countries in other continents. With those countries that may not feel disposed to enter into a pact of peace, we shall employ persuasion, convincing arguments and manifest conviction. At the farthest end, if there be no other alternative, the use of force becomes imperative.

Signs of weakness where there is strength is a poor policy in the presence of a sanguinary tyrant. Weakness on the part of the strong demoralizes the forces of freedom. It also brings loss of faith and, when faith is lost, chaos sets in faster. Redemption becomes more difficult. Firmness for freedom is an irreplaceable need.

Every time the free world loses a country or its people to the common tyrant, the problem of regaining them becomes a more hazardous operation, and needlessly so. This conquest of indefensive nations by the hordes of communism has to stop. Our duty is to help effectively. Is it possible that we have forgotten what are the tools that the Communist uses? He is a difficult element to deal with. You have to treat from a firm position of strength.

Eulogy for President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, 24 days have now passed since the death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Both the House and the Senate have devoted a day to eulogies for our fallen leader. Thousands and thousands of words have poured forth from citizens and dignitaries at home and abroad in praise and condolence.

My attention has recently been called to a eulogy delivered by the Very Reverend William-M.J. Driscoll, S.J., president and rector of Georgetown Preparatory School on the occasion of the school's Requiem Mass, Monday, November 25, 1963. This brief tribute has impressed me as among the most distinguished I have read. It is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(Delivered by Very Rev. William-M.J. Driscoll, S.J.)

"Now the trumpet summons us again * * * not to bear arms, but to bear the burden of a long struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation—a struggle against the common enemies of man: Tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself * * *—asking His [God's] blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Thus John Fitzgerald Kennedy sounded the trumpet call as free world leader against these common enemies when he became the 35th President of these United States on January 20, 1961, and he added: "Can we forge against these enemies of man, tyranny, poverty, disease, and war, can we forge a grand and global alliance, north and south, east and west, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?"

A young, dynamic leader of men—extremely intelligent, competent, hard working; eloquent, courageous, temperate; witty, yet serene; with a balanced sense of history which indicated that he knew he both controlled events and also was controlled by them; devoted to the place and use of reason and its power in sifting the destiny of nations and of men; humane, kind, charitable, understanding; a respecter of all persons and their inalienable, God-given human rights; a great lover of human life, of human freedom, of human unity, of human betterment, of international and domestic peace, and most assuredly, a great lover of God.

Not to merely pledge good words, but to do good deeds; not to rest safely neutral, but to oppose any foe for the survival of liberty; not to belabor what divided, but to explore what united; not to ignore the heavy burdens of the poor, the starving, the miserable, the suppressed—either at home or abroad, but to "undo these heavy burdens, and let the oppressed go free"; not to create a new world power, but a new world of law, "where the strong are just, and the weak secure, and the peace preserved"; and to do all of these things for one reason only: because it was right. And why was it right? Because it was God's work; for, as he said so well "here on earth God's work must truly be our own." These were the principles and purposes of our great leader.

The world has always needed big men, men big enough to lead the rest, to inspire the rest of us to follow them into reflected greatness. Without such giants, we are truly "sheep without a shepherd"; our end is chaos and calamity; our path remains unlighted by the stars. But with such leaders, we are lifted up, we find direction, inspiration; we are blasted off the launching pad and propelled almost past the moon; our heartbeat quickened and our realization charged, we almost come to know by convinced personal experience in our contact with our leader that "God created us men just a little less than the angels; and crowned us with honor and glory." And we are inspired then to work to bring about a new creation in ourselves and in the world, helping to prepare for the coming of the world's Lord at time's end. For our vision is from convinced leaders who surpass themselves in performing and inspiring in us petty men noble deeds for our fellow men.

A truly great, active, zealous leader who strives to make his vision of a better world come true, lives in the grateful hearts and in the continued striving of his people and of the world for the ages. When such a leader is taken away, we all feel poor, deprived, less than before; for we have lost something of ourselves.

We have personally, each one of us, lost his greatness, reflected in us. When such a leader dies, we are diminished; but when he is swept away by such a tragedy as we have experienced, as unspeakable as it is incomprehensible, we are crushed; we are lost; we, too, almost die.

Some men are so captivated with God's gift of life to them, that diamond sparkle of immortality, and are so saturated with its purposefulness and how they can best use it for good, that they exert all of their human powers, responding completely to every moment, as though they disdained to make a response which was less complete, less worthy of this divine gift. Such a man we have known; he has been our leader. What an accusation he is, vibrant with the joy of life, uncompromising in his purposefulness, to us who live halfheartedly. Be our mediocrity in the development of our minds and talents in the pursuit of new knowledge as students, or in hesitation in following to the hilt what we come to know is our true vocation in life, or in the determined growth in our Christ-like appreciation and sacrifices of our fellow men, their needs and their rights and their woes, his life of purpose and complete response accuses us personally. "You have not joined this historic alliance," he says to each of us.

Our leader whom we have lost was one of highest and most completely dedicated purpose; he was such a leader because of such high purposes: "Here on earth God's work must truly be our own." Although John Kennedy walked like a prince, talked like a scholar, and was born seemingly destined to be President * * * if this had not been God's plan for him in life, he would have been a leader anywhere because he was a completely dedicated and purposeful man: "Here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

And so he challenges us, his people, to take up the same purpose and complete dedication, to live in the height of our powers. "Will you join in that historic effort?" When he passes from us, that is loss indeed. If we have really heard him and caught his message, our purposeful and dedicated lives will be his abiding monument.

Grateful indeed are we to God who sends us betimes men both wise and good, such as our President, to lead us. Yet—they all pass. The life they briefly possess disappears from our ways, and they are seen no more. And then we come to know that truly only life remains, the life of One who exulted to walk our soddy earth and enlighten all men with His touch and word. His was the life whose vital spark was and is so contagious that we can, even as President Kennedy, still be quickened by its current. Though we lose men of greatness and their inspiring lives, One remains who is Life Itself. "I am the Life." And He also is our Leader: "I am the Way." And He came to lead us to the fullness of life, that "more fruitful life for all mankind": "I came that all men may have life and have it more abundantly."

The death of a great leader is a clarion call to Christian men everywhere who wish to give themselves for a great cause. To rise to such heroic tasks tomorrow, each one of us must respond today in the school that makes leaders, that ultimately made Mr. Kennedy, the school of Christ the Leader, where our President caught, and where we can catch a vision that will make us surpass ourselves.

Surpass ourselves * * * surpass ourselves! Listen: can you not hear an echo, muted by soft falling inaugural snow which now seems to cover yesterday almost like a shroud: "Now the trumpet summons us again. So let us begin anew. It may not be finished in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin. Can we forge against these enemies of men, tyranny, poverty, disease, and war, can we forge a grand and global alliance that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort, knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Listen! Listen! For there is another echo. From another, an earlier inaugural address delivered 2,000 years ago in the sunny spring on distant Palestine's rolling hills. The words are faint, but they are clear. Listen to what they say in answer:

"Blessed are the poor in spirit; blessed are those who mourn; blessed are the patient; blessed are those who hunger and thirst for holiness; blessed are the merciful; blessed are the peacemakers; blessed are those who suffer persecution in the name of right; the kingdom of heaven is theirs.

"Blessed are you, John Kennedy, when men revile you, and persecute you; be glad and lighthearted, for a rich reward awaits you in heaven."

North American Serbian Church Ends Communist Tie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have directed the attention of the Members to the increase in religious persecution in the Soviet Union and Poland.

Of special interest to us should be the attempts of the Tito government to infiltrate the Serbian Orthodox Church in North America by appointing bishops approved by Communist authorities.

The article which I insert into the RECORD at this point is a brief report on the struggle of Serbs in the United States and Canada to maintain their religious and political independence from the activities of Tito's agents. The article entitled "North American Serbian Church Ends Communist Tie" appeared in the December 5 edition of the Macedonian Tribune:

NORTH AMERICAN SERBIAN CHURCH ENDS COMMUNIST TIE

In a previous article we had reported about the court trial held in Waukegan, Ill., to resolve the quarrel between the Serbian Bishop Dionisij, head of the Serbian Orthodox Church in North America, and the three "bishops" recently appointed by the Serbian Holy Synod of Belgrade.

At this trial, of course, the court rejected the allegations of the three Belgrade ecclesiastical emissaries. The trumped-up charges brought in court against Bishop Dionisij had also failed.

A news dispatch by the Associated Press of November 15 states that the Serbian Orthodox Church of the United States and Canada broke away from what it termed "the Communist-controlled mother church in Yugoslavia."

A resolution unanimously adopted by 177 delegates to a 2-day national assembly in St. Sava Monastery near Libertyville, Ill., declared the church's independence from the Holy Synod of Belgrade.

The resolution said the declaration of freedom applied to about 70 churches in the United States and Canada, 15 in Australia, 4 in Free Europe and 1 in South Africa. Bishop Dionisij, who has served some 23 years as spiritual head of the North American Serbian diocese, will remain as head of the new church.

By this action the American citizens from Serbian extraction have thwarted the efforts of the Belgrade regime. Belgrade's effort to subordinate the Serbian Orthodox Church in America to the Belgrade Holy Synod, which is controlled by Tito's Communist Party, has obviously failed, as it should have failed. Why is the Serbian Communist regime so concerned about the religious life of the Serbians living in America and Canada?

Almost 19 years since the Communist rule was established in Yugoslavia not a cent has been appropriated by the Belgrade regime for building or even repairing the existing churches in the country. The Communist regimes are, of course, irreligious; church services are officially boycotted; the people who wish to attend church services are either intimidated or even terrorized. Hundreds of church buildings in Yugoslavia are either abandoned or converted, especially in Macedonia, into museums or amusement halls. Why is it then that the Belgrade Communist regime is so interested in the religious life of American citizens? Why does it spend money to build churches in America and Canada?

Obviously this is a new Communist strategy which aims the spreading of discord among the immigrants living in the United States and Canada; it also aims to disrupt their church life, and wherever possible through the church to spread Communist propaganda in America.

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church in America finds itself in a similar predicament. Bulgarian ecclesiastical emissaries visited America. The Communist-controlled Bulgarian Holy Synod has appointed a bishop to "administer" the Bulgarian American diocese. Will the Sofia and Belgrade church emissaries succeed in their conspiracy?

We shall answer "No."

Depressing Effect of Beef Imports on Livestock Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for some time now, I have been concerned over the mounting beef imports into the United States, a situation which is having a depressing impact on livestock prices. I last called attention to this on the floor of the Senate, on November 19, and I have been doing so all year long.

Last Thursday, December 12, it was my pleasure to appear before the U.S. Tariff Commission in support of action in this area. At that time, I strongly recommended against any lowering of the already-low import duties on dressed beef and veal unless a percentage limitation is imposed.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement, along with one supporting table, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JACK MILLER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Senator MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you, today.

My State of Iowa, as you no doubt realize, ranks first in the number of cattle marketed for slaughter and first in hog production. Most of the feed grains we produce is consumed within our State for these purposes, and feeder cattles are shipped into Iowa from the ranch country of not only Nebraska, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, but from as far away as Texas and Mississippi. The viability of our economy is directly affected by the strength of the livestock market; and it is evident that when the market is strong there is a directly favorable impact on the ranching operations of the States from which feeder livestock are shipped into Iowa, and when the market is weak, there is a reverse impact.

Slaughter livestock prices during 1963 have been disastrous, and I regret to say that there does not appear to be much prospect for any improvement in the near future if conditions continue as they are. The Department of Agriculture on November 18 released a report which forecasts that net farm income will decline by nearly $400 million in 1963, and by another $600 million next year—a total reduction over the 2-year period of nearly $1 billion. There is some reason to believe that the decline will be worse than estimated.

For the first 2 months of this year, the USDA estimates receipts at nearly $160 million below the comparable period of a year ago.

There are many livestock marketing experts who believe that the unrestricted beef and veal importation policy under which we are now operating is having a serious impact on cattle prices throughout the United States—between 25 and 30 cents per 100 pounds on the price of marketed choice steers and about 50 cents per pound on the price of marketed utility cows, for example. Some spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture have theorized that most of the imported beef and veal is of cheaper quality types not under price pressure here, and that such imports do not make a noticeable impact on our domestic prices of better quality products. These spokesmen have overlooked the fact that if the lower quality products are not available, people will buy better quality products which our own farmers produce. They also overlook such findings as the one compiled by the Research Division of USDA in its November issue of the "Livestock and Meat Situation"—an outlook for 1964—indicating that when imports equal about 10 percent of total domestic beef production, it would cause on the average a drop of about 1 percent in the price of choice steers and nearly 3 percent in the price of utility cows. Since 1960, when imports equaled about 5 percent of domestic production, beef and veal imports have increased to the point where last year they amounted to nearly 10 percent and for the first 8 months of this year, they averaged 11 percent. In August, they amounted to 12.3 percent.

According to official USDA estimates, then, livestock producers would otherwise have received an additional 47 cents per 100 pounds in the price of utility cows in 1961 and 1962, or an additional $6.6 million income for each of these years, and as much if not more for 1963. In this grade of beef alone, the loss of income will amount to some $20 million as a result of imports.

In the choice steer category, in 1961 the reduction as a result of the level of imports would have amounted to approximately 27 cents per 100 pounds; and in 1962, nearly 30 cents. This means that in 1961, the out-of-pocket loss to livestock producers amounted to $28 million, in 1962 to $31.4 million, and in 1963 at least $32 million—with a 3-year total of some $91.5 million.

In these two grades of beef alone, then, our cattle feeders have seen their receipts decline by $111.5 million over a 3-year period.

Here is a rundown on the receipt losses incurred in shipping to various markets on the one grade of Choice steer alone: Chicago: 1961, $2.8 million; 1962, $2.7 million; Omaha: 1961, $1.4 million; 1962, $1.4 million; Sioux City: 1961, $1.2 million; 1962, $1.3 million; St. Louis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $208,000; South St. Joseph: 1961, $485,000; 1962, $547,000; Kansas City: 1961, $349,000; 1962, $312,000; Denver: 1961, $377,000; 1962, $289,000; Indianapolis: 1961, $190,000; 1962, $188,000; South St. Paul: 1962, $364,000; Sioux Falls: 1961, $235,000; 1962, $253,000.

Receipts from marketing of livestock and livestock products during the first 9 months of 1963 are reported down $50 million from the comparable period of 1962, even though the volume increased—according to page 6 of the Farm Income Situation for November publication to which I have previously referred; but this appears to be an error

since on page 10 a comparison of receipts for the period January through September for 1962 and 1963 reveals a difference of $99 million, not $50 million. Additionally during October, receipts estimated at $2 billion were down 3 percent.

Meanwhile, livestock production expenses zoomed from $2.5 billion recorded in 1960 to more than $3 billion in 1962, with every indication borne out by official reports, that they will be even higher this year. The parity ratio—the relation between the prices farmers received to the prices farmers paid for goods and services—stood at 77 in October, compared to 81 in December of 1960, and compared further to 100, which the farm sector should have if it is to share fairly with other segments of our economy in the national net income.

I have a table from the 1964 Outlook issue of the Livestock and Meat Situation of November, which I ask to have placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Specified costs and net returns in 6 selected Corn Belt cattle feeding programs, 1961–62 and 1962–63 [1]

Feeding program	1961–62				1962–63			
	Price per 100 pounds			Net return per head [2]	Price per 100 pounds			Net return per head [2]
	Paid for feeder	Received for fed cattle	Margin		Paid for feeder	Received for fed cattle	Margin	
CALVES								
Heifer calves, short fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September-October. Sold as Choice, June-July	$25.01	$25.21	+$0.20	$29.88	$26.20	$23.40	−$2.80	$7.14
Steer calves, long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September-November. Sold as Choice, August-October	27.86	29.18	+1.32	64.87	30.49	24.24	−6.25	1.46
YEARLINGS								
Medium yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Medium, September-October. Sold as Good-Standard, January-February	21.14	24.35	+3.21	18.34	21.89	24.33	+2.44	12.11
Good yearling steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September-November. Sold as April-June	23.79	26.24	+2.45	28.08	25.74	23.02	−2.72	−20.12
Yearling steers long fed: Bought as Good and Choice, September-November. Sold as Prime, July-September	24.68	30.14	+5.46	72.41	26.99	25.02	−1.97	−4.74
HEAVY STEERS								
Heavy steers, short fed: Bought as Good, September-November. Sold as Choice and Prime, March-May	22.44	28.23	+5.80	54.19	24.62	23.91	−.71	−17.14

[1] Feeding programs designed to be fairly representative of average feeding programs in the Corn Belt. Feeders are purchased in Kansas City and sold at Chicago.

[2] Net return over cost of corn, hay, protein supplement, pasture, transportation and marketing expenses. Does not include labor, overhead, cost of other feeds and death loss, or credit for manure and for hogs following feeders.

This table shows the net return per head on heifer calves dropping from $29.88 in 1961–62 to $7.14 in 1962–63; the net return on steer calves dropping from $64.87 to $1.46; the net return on good yearling steers dropping from $28.08 to a loss of $20.12; and the net return on heavy steers dropping from $54.19 to a loss of $17.14. These are conditions which require action—not just an expression of concern.

Few of us will deny that world trade is imperative to improvements in world economy. And it would be contrary to long-established policy to totally exclude certain imports as a means of resolving an economic problem in any one segment of our domestic economy. But it is economically untenable and suicidal to completely ignore the graduel strangulation of an industry through depressed prices induced to a significant degree by a policy of unrestricted imports—increasing faster than the rate of our own consumption.

I do not advocate elimination of beef and veal imports. Nor do I necessarily advocate a limitation on the basis of pounds—say the volume which existed in 1960. Rather, I have been advocating a limitation on the basis of percentage of our domestic production, to the amount which existed in 1960 which was 5 percent.

Because our increasing population demands increased domestic production, the volume or pounds of imports could be expected to rise while the percentage limitation remained constant. This would be fair to those countries which have been exporting beef and veal to us, because as our consumption expands, their volume would expand with it. It would be fair to our own domestic producers, because as our consumption expands, their volume would expand with it rather than being curtailed, as it now is, by an ever-increasing percentage from imports.

In any event, I strongly recommend against any lowering of the already low import duties on dressed beef and veal unless a percentage limitation such as I have referred to is imposed.

I recognize that there are limitations within which the Tariff Commission can act in response to the problem I have outlined, but I have set forth these views to assist the Commission in arriving at a fair and informed judgment on actions relating to this subject within the scope of its authority and the limited purpose of this hearing. Thank you.

Chairman DORFMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Prayers for Elite and Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read a fine letter to the editor in the Columbus Citizen-Journal this morning and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body. It certainly hits the nail on the head:

PRAYER FOR ELITE AND DEAD

After the President's assassination it seemed strange how the "liberal" and left-wing news commentators started speaking in reverent tones about prayer. Some of these men were the same who praised the Warren Court decision forbidding Bible reading and prayer in the public schools.

We keep wondering why they suddenly decided to let God out of the corner closet, since it isn't good for schoolkids to read God's word or to speak to Him.

We keep thinking of this passage of scripture, spoken by the Son of God:

"Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites. For ye shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in" (Matthew 23: 13).

Maybe these men think that prayer is OK for the elite and the dead—just bad for schoolkids. We just keep wondering.

Mrs. O. S. HALL.

The Quiet Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the December 6 issue of the Montana Kaimin, student daily at Montana State University, Missoula, carries a review of Secretary Udall's "The Quiet Crisis," written by Rolf Olson, a graduate assistant at the university's school of journalism.

He concludes his review with these words:

Deeply religious in tone with each chapter captioned by some excerpt of an American author, "The Quiet Crisis" is beautifully illustrated. It's a text for Montanans, a memorium to the late President, a chapter in national policy, a title page for better world relations, and a word for those who care about the future.

Mr. President, this is a perceptive review of an excellent book, and I ask unanimous consent to have the review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION NEED SEEN AS QUIET CRISIS

(By Rolf Olson)

The same fateful week that President Kennedy was assassinated a book, "The Quiet Crisis," was published with the introduction written by him.

Such personal endorsement might have been interpreted as a political maneuver 2 weeks ago. It was not that. Rather, by the wording of the late President, it becomes obvious and significant that the leadership

of the New Frontier was and is recognizing problems inherited from the old frontier—problems yet to be solved.

The author, Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, reviews with philosophic understanding and scientific backing the historic conquest of the American continent. The unanswered, impending crisis: What is to become of the land?

The late President phrased it: " * * * the race between education and erosion, between wisdom and waste, has not run its course."

Udall creates a vivid understanding from the beginning. The early inhabitants, the Indians, knew nothing of land ownership as we know it, he wrote, and they reasoned that it was freely given as the air, the water, the forests, the wildlife that roamed.

The shameful end of the Indian right by economic means—ushered in a shameful century of relentless waste for immediate profits.

While damaging, the times were not all bad to be sure, as they gave birth to a frontier spirit and growth to a nation. While the forty-niners raced to Sutter's Mill, the Mormons were digging irrigation canals in the Utah desert and planting orchards. At the same time men like George Perkins Marsh were planting the seed in the old frontier mind that American resources are not self-renewing and inexhaustible. The result in the face of near destruction of the land, especially during the dust bowl years of this century, was a temporary realization of the long-term importance of conservation.

It was this seed of wisdom that the late President hoped to nourish anew. "The crisis may be quiet," he wrote, "but it is urgent. We must do in our own day what Theodore Roosevelt did 60 years ago and Franklin Roosevelt 30 years ago: We must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problem of the new age."

Why imperious? Water pollution—neglected with many other conservation problems since 1939 because of hot and cold wars—has doubled while the need for fresh water spirals. The Government, Udall writes, is presently faced with the need of building 10,000 treatment plants at a cost of $6 billion.

City subdividers eager for the fast buck are destroying stream valleys and open spaces with ill-conceived paving projects. The author notes in his chapter, "Conservation and the Future," one well liked by Kennedy, the lack of land allowance for wildlife in the past 20 years, resulting in waterfowl reduction. Infringement of industry, agriculture, and urbanization not only threatens the open spaces in innumerable ways, but is adding some 5 million battered cars to junkyards within the populated areas every year.

This irreverent attitude, as Secretary Udall puts it, this want of vision lies at the base of the emerging crisis.

Clairvoyant and straightforward, the author's writing has the warmth of a campfire and the fragrance of pine needles about it.

Deeply religious in tone with each chapter captioned by some excerpt of an American author, "The Quiet Crisis" is beautifully illustrated. It's a text for Montanans, a memorium to the late President, a chapter in national policy, a title page for better world relations, and a word for those who care about the future.

Published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., of New York, it costs $5.

Suffrage in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take the liberty of including an article written by Art Buchwald, which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

It is entitled "Suffrage in Washington," and with tongue in cheek points up how ridiculous the situation is in Washington, D.C.—the Nation's Capital—where citizens of this country are not allowed to vote or to have any voice whatsoever in the administration of their local city affairs.

It is most difficult to believe that such a situation can exist in this democratic country of ours. To deprive any citizen of his right to exercise his franchise is, under such circumstances and in my opinion, unconstitutional.

If this is an example of democracy in action, then it is high time for an "agonizing reappraisal."

Legislation has been introduced, which I have cosponsored, which would extend to the residents of the District of Columbia the privilege of voting in their own local elections and thus actively participate in their own local government, and I urge my colleagues to consider such legislation promptly and favorably so that Washingtonians will no longer be treated as "stepchildren."

The article follows:

SUFFRAGE IN WASHINGTON

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—As many people are probably aware, anyone who lives in Washington, D.C., has never been allowed to vote in any election. But in 1964, for the first time in history, the citizens of the District of Columbia will be allowed to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

There has been some confusion about this sudden suffrage and many people are ringing doorbells in the District, trying to educate other people on what to do. We volunteered to do some doorbell ringing ourself, and we were surprised at some of the reactions when we tried to tell the people about their voting rights.

We came to a house in Cleveland Park and a man answered the door. "Sir, I'd like to inform you about your right to vote in 1964."

"I'm sorry, we don't want any," he said.

"I'm not selling anything," we said before he could slam the door. "I thought you would like to know about your voting rights."

"What's a voting right?"

"It means you can vote for the candidate of your choice."

"I never heard of that, and I've been living in the District 40 years."

"That's just it. You couldn't vote before, but now Congress has made it possible."

"That's fine," he said. "How much is it going to cost me?"

"Nothing," we said. "It's your constitutional right."

"Let me ask you something. If I have a right to vote, can I have a say in what goes on in the schools of the District?"

"Of course not," we said. "That right is reserved for Congress."

"Can I have a say on how they spend my taxes?"

"That's a stupid question," we said angrily. "The House District Committee decides that."

"Will I be able to voice an opinion on the Police Department and the Fire Department and the Sanitation Department?"

"You're being very difficult, sir. All we're letting you vote for is the President of the United States."

"Can I say whether I want a subway system or a highway system or a bus system?"

"You cannot, and you know it. Congress dictates what you can do. After all, they know the problems of Washington better than anyone who lives here all year round."

"Can I elect someone to represent me on housing problems and welfare projects?"

"No, you can't," we said. "Where do you think you're living? You're lucky Congress will let you vote for the President. They didn't have to, you know."

"Can I vote for a better sewage system or a library system or a cultural center?" he demanded.

"No, no, no," we shouted. "How greedy can you get? We let you vote for one office and all of a sudden you want to act like an American citizen. It's time you understood that Congress is in charge of this city, and you couldn't be in better hands."

"Suppose I don't like the way the Congressmen are running this town?" he said.

"You have nothing to say about it. Only the people who elected the Congressmen and Senators have anything to say about them."

"But those voters don't care about what is happening to us in Washintgon," he cried.

"We can't let you vote for everybody. Isn't the President enough?"

"I guess so," he said. "Though frankly, I'd rather vote for a city councilman instead."

Revenue Bill of 1963 (H.R. 8363)—Resolution of the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce, Frankfort, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce, Frankfort, Ky., expressing its policy generally toward tax reduction, and also referring to specific provisions in the tax bill now before the Senate Finance Committee.

I referred the communication to the Senate Finance Committee, which I am sure will give consideration to the recommendations of the resolution. It is helpful to the Congress to have the views of such a group of younger citizens and businessmen.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVENUE BILL OF 1963 (H.R. 8363)—RESOLUTION OF THE FRANKFORT JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, FRANKFORT, KY.

Whereas the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce is ever mindful of Federal legislative enactment which affects the economic and social lives of the people of this great Nation; and

Whereas there is currently pending in the Congress of the United States H.R. 8363 proposing the reduction and reform of income taxes; and

Whereas the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce believes it is the desire of the citizens of the United States to have fair and equal application of our tax laws; and

Whereas the trend in government is toward automation, the use of identifying taxpayers by number rather than by name, and the elimination of personal contact in our self-assessing tax system; and

Whereas the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce believes it is the sacred duty of the Congress of the United States and the Internal Revenue Service to give special consideration to the individnual taxpayer as to possible increase in cost and/or efforts to comply with such laws and regulations where such increases in cost and/or efforts outweigh the benefits to the Government; and

Whereas the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce has reviewed and studied in detail the provisions of the revenue bill of 1963 (H.R. 8363), now before the Congress of the United States, with the above stated objectives in mind: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Frankfort Junior Chamber of Commerce on this third day of October 1963 has adopted the following positions and recommendations with regard to this proposed legislation:

Tax cuts: We endorse the proposed size of the tax cut ($11 billion) but we are firmly opposed to the policy of deficit spending on the part of the Federal Government and recommend strong measures to curtail and control what appears to be an accepted fiscal policy.

Individual tax rate cuts: We approve of the rate cuts in the top and bottom brackets but, in our opinion, the middle income brackets should receive a greater than proportionate cut since they are the ones most affected by reform proposals.

Corporation tax rate cuts: We endorse the proposed cut in corporate tax rates.

Capital gains: We would not separate capital gains into classes as proposed. We believe all capital assets should be treated alike as to holding period, tax rate, etc. We favor reduction in rates on long-term gains to 21 percent and increasing holding period to 2 years.

Capital losses: We believe that capital losses should be allowed to be carried forward indefinitely (until exhausted) as proposed.

Dividends received credit and exclusion: We would repeal the 4 percent dividends received credit but would increase exclusion beyond that which is proposed. Suggested exclusion: $300 ($600 for a married couple if each has dividend income of $300).

Investment tax credit: We support the proposal to no longer reduce depreciable basis by the amount of the credit. We believe it will be an aid to business. It will also nullify the mandatory provision of the credit, since under present law, depreciable basis is reduced by the amount of the credit, whether it is claimed or not.

Group term life insurance: We endorse the provision to tax employees for premiums paid by employer on insurance in excess of $30,000. However, we would suggest relieving the employer of the additional bookkeeping required in reporting such taxable income on W-2 forms.

Reimbursed medical expenses: We believe the the proposed change is reasonable, but will be difficult to administer.

Sick pay exclusion: We are firmly opposed to any changes in present sick pay exclusion provisions. We believe the proposed changes would largely defeat the purpose for which this law was originally enacted.

Standard deduction: We support the proposed changes in the standard deduction.

Itemized deductions: We are opposed to limiting deduction for taxes. We believe all taxes which are presently deductible should remain deductible.

Casualty loss deduction: We are opposed to a limitation on deduction for casualty losses. We believe casualty losses should remain fully deductible.

Income averaging: We endorse the proposal to allow actors, authors, farmers, and others with fluctuating incomes to average them over a 5-year period. We believe this has been much needed and will prove helpful for those involved.

Stock options: We endorse the proposed changes in stock option provisions with one exception—the holding period should be changed to 2 years instead of 3, as proposed. This would be consistent with recommended change in holding period for long-term capital gains.

Recapture of depreciation on real estate: We support the proposed change since it will bring all depreciable assets under a uniform law.

Sale of personal residence by person over 65: We are opposed to this provision since it would further complicate and add to the number of laws for which there is little need.

Charitable contributions: We endorse the proposed changes with regard to charitable contributions.

Loans to carry insurance: We are opposed to denying deduction for interest on a debt to buy or carry life insurance. We believe all interest should remain deductible. Also, the proposed change would be difficult to administer.

Moving expenses: We believe proposed changes will further complicate the present law with regard to moving expenses. In our opinion, both old and new employees should have to include as income any reimbursements which are in excess of moving expenses. At the same time, both old and new employees should be allowed to deduct job-connected moving expenses which are not reimbursed.

Medical expense deductions: We endorse the proposal to remove the 1 percent floor on deduction for medicine and drug costs for taxpayers over 65, or for dependent parents over 65.

Child care expenses: We support the proposed increase in deduction up to $900, for child care expenses. We believe this is a reasonable and desirable change.

Consolidated returns—repeal of 2 percent tax: We endorse the proposal to repeal the present 2 percent additional tax charged for filing a consolidated return.

Corporate current taxpayments: We support the proposal to put corporate estimated taxpayments on a current basis, over a period of 7 years.

Bigotry in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress an editorial which appeared in today's Chicago Sun-Times, on the Soviet Union's national policy of anti-Semitism. Such intolerance is deplored by all men who believe in freedom and justice; and, as the editorial points out, this basic difference between our country and the Soviet Union must be kept in mind.

The editorial follows:

BIGOTRY IN RUSSIA

A report on the state of anti-Semitism in Russia, given to the World Jewish Congress in New York, listed five ways in which discrimination against Jews is shown.

For example, all Jews, even those no longer active in the religion, are designated as "Jew" on their identity cards. This is remindful of practices in Germany that persisted even after World War II; police noted on their records the fact of Jewish birth and some newspapers used the word "Jew" in identification of such persons in the news just as some American newspapers identify race even if it is not pertinent to an understanding of the news story.

In this country, however, as well as in Germany, organized resistance to racial and religious prejudice may be exerted. In both countries, such groups as the National Conference of Christians and Jews have been influential in stopping practices that perpetuate intolerance, such as race and religious labeling.

The Government-imposed restrictions on Jews practicing their religion is one more reminder that in a state opposed to all religion, bigotry is a national policy. In America's relationship with Russia, this fundamental difference between the United States and the Soviet Union must never be forgotten.

We've Lost a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hazard Herald, Hazard, Ky., of Thursday, December 12, 1963, entitled "We've Lost a Friend."

WE'VE LOST A FRIEND

(By Larry Caudill)

Whenever the scroll of human history is unrolled, it will reveal John Fitzgerald Kennedy in the forerank of history's greatest men.

This was evidenced only in small measure in the tribute paid the assassinated President by his people and the world.

The world mourned, but it scarcely knew the full stature of Kennedy.

The breadth of John Kennedy's knowledge and intelligence was amazing. He could speak with knowledgeable authority on almost any subject a common, average man could name.

He was such a gracious, tolerant, common man at first acquaintance that the average man's reaction might be "he's just another ordinary fellow." But within minutes the range of John Kennedy's intelligence and reactions would inspire amazed admiration.

In the winter of 1958–59 the "patriotarch," Joseph P. Kennedy, was in residence at his mansion at Palm Beach, Fla. Most of the time one or more of the Kennedy children was visiting the elder Kennedys.

Jack Kennedy was a Senator and came to Palm Beach during the Christmas holiday recess of Congress.

The civic and social organizations eagerly sought the younger Kennedys at their regular meetings. On this visit Senator Jack Kennedy was invited to the Everglades Club, a select social and civic group which numbers among its members not only plain millionaires but the supermillionaires like Joe Kennedy, whose financial valuation was something like $300 million.

Joe prevailed upon son Jack to speak to the Everglades Club. His speech in general was a report on the work of Congress.

The Palm Beach Post-Times city editor wanted a general interview with Senator Kennedy. The reporter found him relaxed on the lawn of the walled estate on Ocean Boulevard, near a small swimming pool. He had spent the morning on a cabin cruiser trolling for sailfish which were running along the Atlantic Ocean south toward Fort Lauderdale.

Fishing was quite a lengthy topic of conversation because we both were devoted fishermen. He noted that the current run of sails was on the small side, 3 or 4 feet long, whereas the more desirable 6- and 7-footers were scarce. His boat had caught and released unharmed about seven sailfish. It was apparent that Jack Kennedy was an expert fisherman, with a light trout rod in the mountain stream or a long outrigger trolling pole.

Now, a reporter with a willing and intelligent interviewee can ask a million questions with as many topics. Jack Kennedy fielded them all with quick, accurate information.

He was informed on space exploration: He expected that it would be feasible to send a man to the moon within 5 to 10 years. Now we are on the verge of it.

At the Everglades Club the night before, automation in American industry and its effect on employment of the individual worker.

Since he knew the reporter was from eastern Kentucky, Kennedy cited the automation in the coal industry. He said it was more advanced than the country realized.

In the Everglades Club audience, he recalled, mere tycoons of the coal industry where they had been employing 10 men, within 5 to 10 years they would be employing 2 men. The other eight men, replaced by machines, would be jobless.

He sought to impress upon the industrialists that it would be primarily their responsibility to look ahead to that situation and make provision for the 8 out of 10 "automated men."

So it has worked out, not only in the coal industry. Lack of job opportunity is a national problem in all American industry.

Senator Kennedy knew then the peculiar problems of eastern Kentucky and elsewhere in Appalachia from automation and undereducation to overpopulation and economic stagnation.

Eastern Kentucky's people lost a great good friend when President Kennedy died in Dallas.

Recently the Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., task force presented to President Kennedy its preliminary report of the first survey of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The very next day Kennedy called in appropriate officials from every department of Government concerned. He instructed them to put in motion immediately a program for the help of eastern Kentucky, and at the same time to speed up the long-range program for all of Appalachia.

That's how great and how good and how humble was President John F. Kennedy.

What destiny would have dealt him in the future if he had lived can be only speculation. But it could not have been but grand.

His physical presence was long enough to leave his massive imprint on the Nation and the world.

His handsome, wise, gracious shadow will remain to bless us through future history.

Impact of Foreign Beef Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the following is my statement before the U.S. Tariff Commission, December 16, 1963, which may be of interest to my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, DECEMBER 16, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues from the Congress who have testified before this Commission on behalf of the livestock industry of America in urging swift and fair action on the serious problem of foreign livestock imports and particularly beef imports.

The Commission is aware, I am sure, that in 1962, $20 out of every $100 in sales of agricultural products was derived from cattle and calves. Therefore, any impact on the price structure of the cattle market makes itself felt throughout this Nation's whole agricultural economy.

Imports of foreign beef have been increasing steadily and show no signs of declining. In 1962 red meat imports increased 39 percent over 1961, and the importation of live cattle increased 15 percent. The picture in 1963 is much the same. While I do not put the entire blame for the sharp drop in the market on the foreign imports, it does appear obvious that these imports must shoulder a large part of the responsibility for the decline in prices on the American market.

I represent seven counties in west central Illinois. Almost the entire economy of my district is orientated to agricultural production and farm implement manufacturing. The cattle raising and cattle feeding industry is strong in all seven of the counties but especially so in two of them, where conservatively 50 percent of their economy is derived from the beef industry.

When the price of prime beef drops from $30 per hundredweight to $22 per hundredweight in the period of a few months, which it did this year, it means something to the people in these areas. I know because I was an active farmer and cattle producer at one time.

The point is that something has to be done to rectify this problem. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 5870), as have many other Members of Congress who are vitally concerned with the present inequities imposed on the American livestock producer by foreign imports. My bill proposes a system of quotas to be established based on average imports over a 5-year period. Most of the other bills introduced use this same basic approach with minor variations.

I have repeatedly contacted Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of the Ways and Means Committee in an effort to get a hearing on my bill and likewise have contacted Mr. Christian Herter, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, in an effort to solicit his support for the American livestock producer.

To date I have been thwarted in my efforts to right this wrong, but it appears the public is becoming better informed on this problem and I am hopeful some constructive action will be forthcoming in the very near future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Who May Speak for the South?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call my colleagues' attention to excerpts taken from a speech by the Honorable LeRoy Collins. As a southerner by birth myself, I am proud that Mr. Collins has had the courage to speak out for what I believe is the real South, but not the one we usually visualize. Well may others heed his advice, and not only in the region mentioned, but everywhere in this great land of ours.

The excerpts follow:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1963]

WHO MAY SPEAK FOR THE SOUTH?

(By LeRoy Collins)

(NOTE.—These excerpts are taken from a December 3 speech before the Greater Columbia Chamber of Commerce in Columbia, S.C., by Mr. Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters and former Governor of Florida.)

I do not believe anyone is more genuinely proud of his southern birth and "raising" than I am. I love this land. But some thoughts have been brooding in my mind lately, especially in the few mad days since the murder of our young President, and I think South Carolina and Columbia are good places for me to talk these out.

Not all of you will agree with what I have to say. This does not trouble me, and it should not trouble you.

Most of us, when we talk about the South, find the easy things to say. We like to recall the handicaps our region has suffered in the exploitation of its natural resources; the impoverishment, which followed the Civil War, and the later unjust and repressive efforts made to thwart our growth and development. Then we like to speak of the happier days of our recent dynamic economic growth and prosperity—of the "new South," a land of vast new opportunities. And these things are all true. We can prove them by the bank deposits, by the new factories, by the lines on the charts, by the clothes we see children wear to school.

But let us think together this evening about things more personal than material progress.

I do not like it when people speak of southerners as if they are not human parts of the United States. But the prime reason they do this is that for too long we have permitted the South's own worst enemies to speak for it.

We have allowed the extremists to speak for the South—the very ones against whom we in the South have had to struggle in our towns and in our State capitals for much of the progress we have made. They have done it in speeches on the floor of Congress which have sounded like anti-American diatribes from some hostile foreign country.

They have done it in the national press and on the national radio and television to such an extent that citizens outside the South would be entitled to wonder if they might not need visas to pass through our region.

And all the while, too many of the rest of us have remained cravenly silent or lamely defensive while Dixie battle cries have been employed to incite sick souls to violence—egged on by the rabble-rousers' call to "stand up and fight." It is little wonder that other Americans fail to regard us on occasions as

being in the mainstream of American life and citizenship.

And I ask you tonight, how long are the majority of southerners going to allow themselves to be caricatured before the Nation by these claghorns? How many Sunday school children have to be dynamited to death? How many Negro leaders have to be shot in the back? How many Governors have to be shot in the chest? How many Presidents have to be assassinated?

All those evil happenings have been the products of environments where hatred has been preached and lawlessness extolled—environments which you and I know are foreign to the South for which we care deeply and are repugnant to most southerners. Violence and disorder will occur anywhere, regardless of the issue, when reason and discussion are allowed to give way to hate and acrimony.

It is time the decent people in the South, with all their might and strength, told the bloody-shirt-wavers to climb down off the buckboards of bigotry. It is time we started speaking and acting together more like loyal Americans and self-respecting southerners.

You here in South Carolina have shown in many ways that you understand—that you are moving forward. The cities of Oxford, Birmingham, Little Rock, New Orleans, Dallas—and Philadelphia and Chicago, for that matter—are not to be found in the State of South Carolina. And that fact, as all of you well know, is no accident of geography.

It is because the leadership of this community and this State reached a rational decision that South Carolina was not going to allow bigotry and lawlessness to pervade your society and pollute your bloodstream * * * You have demonstrated to the rest of the Nation, which includes the rest of the South, and to yourselves, that a Deep South community does not have to throw itself into a funeral pyre of hate.

Driver Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to draw the attention of my colleagues to the efforts of General Motors Corp. in support of driver education:

General Motors automobile dealers loaned 5,089 new cars to high schools throughout the United States for use in driver education courses during the school year ending August 31, John F. Gordon, president of General Motors, reported today.

During the 12-month period approximately 400,000 young men and women received driving instructions in automobiles provided by General Motors dealers, a compilation of national statistics disclosed. The dealer allowance program, whereby participating dealers are paid a special allowance for each vehicle loaned to high schools, has been in effect for 8 years, during which time more than 2,700,000 students have gained automobile driving knowledge.

"This tangible support of high school driver education by thousands of dealers is impressive evidence of their public-spirited interest in highway safety," Mr. Gordon declared.

"We are pleased to cosponsor this training car loan program with our dealers by sharing the substantial cost they incur. We are convinced that the proper instruction of young people in sound driving skills and attitudes is one of the most productive of all traffic safety measures."

During the year, General Motors paid more than one and a quarter million dollars to Chevrolet, Pontiac, Oldsmobile, and Buick dealers under the cosponsoring plan for dealers participating in the driver training program. Since the inception of the program in 1955, General Motor has paid dealers a total of $5,777,687 as it share of the program.

In addition to the training car loan program, General Motors offers driver training aids to high schools by making a variety of films, booklets, and other driver training aids available to student groups. General Motors also publishes a bimonthly magazine, American Youth, which features good driving articles. The magazine is sent free to teenagers acquiring their first automobile driver's license.

Resolution Adopted by the City Council of Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD two resolutions recently approved by the City Council of Baltimore. The resolution honoring President Kennedy was read and adopted on November 26, 1963.

The second resolution deals with the health care for the elderly proposal that was strongly supported by our late President. It is my hope that the Congress will heed the advice of the Baltimore City Council and enact this necessary program.

The resolutions follow:

BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 245

(Introduced by the President and Messrs. Bonnett, Duffy, Staszak, Panuska, Prucha, Ward, Arthur, Curran, Gallagher, Pica, Dixon, Parks, Soypher, Caplan, Edelman, Rubenstein, Schaefer, Hines, Leone, and Myers, November 26, 1963; (read and adopted).

City council resolution expressing deepest sympathies over the passing of John F. Kennedy:

"John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, has lost his life in the service of his country.

"Millions upon untold millions of people in the United States and in the farthest regions of the earth mourn his passing. The City Council of Baltimore, voicing the heartfelt sentiments of all of our people, expresses the deep and poignant feelings of this community over a terrible and vicious deed of assassination.

"John Kennedy was a great and a good man. Young, vital, compassionate, and able, he was a leader of men and of nations. He left his imprint upon his generation and upon the world. The City Council of Baltimore records its profound sorrow at his passing.

"In the spirit of the late President, who contributed so much to the vitality of the American Republic and who would have been the first to urge that this Nation move forward despite its grief, we express also our fervent and sincere good wishes to the new President, Lyndon B. Johnson: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore,* That the deep sorrow of every resident of Baltimore City be expressed over the untimely and shocking death of John F. Kennedy; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the sincere good wishes of this community be sent to his successor under trying circumstances, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the council be instructed to send copies of this resolution to Mrs. Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That when this body adjourns today on November 26, 1963, it do so in honor and respect for the memory of John F. Kennedy, and in dedication to the spirit of tenacity with which this country moves forward in a time of adversity."

BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 242

(Introduced by Messrs. President, Bonnett, Duffy, Panuska, Prucha, Ward, Arthur, Curran, Gallagher, Pica, Parks, Soypher, Edelman, Rubenstein, Schaefer, Hines, Leone, and Myers, November 18, 1963, referred to the committee on health.)

City council resolution endorsing the President's plan to provide medical care for the aged within the framework of the social security system:

"Americans aged 65 or over number more than 16 million people today. They go to the hospital more often and they stay there longer than the younger people. At the time in their lives when their annual income has been considerably reduced, we find that their medical bill is twice that of persons under 65 years of age.

"When an aged person goes to the hospital, he is likely to stay longer than a younger person because he is more likely to have serious and long-lasting disease. People over 65 are in hospitals, on the average, over 2½ times as much as young people. The average cost per day in 1946 was $9.39; in 1950, the cost rose to $15.26; in 1955, the cost of hospital care per day was $23.12; and in 1960, the average hospital costs were $32.28 a day.

"This age group is generally destitute and is not possessed with sufficient funds with which to pay for needed medical care. A prolonged illness in this group places an undue hardship on their younger relatives who often go broke paying the necessary medical bills. Many of this group are at the present time a burden on our welfare department. It should not be necessary for these people to be compelled to accept charity in their old age because of illness which will inevitably overtake the greater part of this group.

"President Kennedy's plan for the use of the social security approach to insure against the costs of hospital care for older people is the best plan possible.

"Provisions for health insurance benefits for the aged are a necessary part of income protection in retirement. Without such benefits the social security program cannot adequately provide basic security for the aged. For most older people old-age, survivors, and disability insurance cash benefits are barely large enough to keep them housed, and fed, and half of the beneficiaries do not have any significant additional regular income. The benefits are not large enough to meet the costs of expensive illnesses or to pay large health insurance premiums during retirement. The only way to remove the threat to the financial independence of older people posed by the high cost of illness is through providing the aged with basic health

insurance protection in addition to their monthly cash benefits. And this can be assured only through the social insurance methods.

"President Kennedy's plan would cover hospital costs over $10 a day for up to 3 months; nursing home costs for 6 additional months; and hospital clinic service amounting to more than $20: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore*, That this body endorses the President's plan to provide medical care for the aged within the framework of the social security system; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the council be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Joseph L. Mathias, Sr., Friend of the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a copy of an editorial from the Carroll County Times memorializing Mayor Joseph L. Mathias, Sr., of Westminster, Md.

Joseph L. Mathias was mayor of Westminster for 11 terms. During that time he created an enviable reputation in his own area for expanding municipal services to meet the expanding needs of his city, with a minimum increase in tax burden, and, in some instances, a decrease in the tax burden.

I am proud to insert this tribute to Mayor Joseph L. Mathias in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His record of consistent and efficient public service deserves nationwide recognition:

JOSEPH L. MATHIAS, SR., FRIEND OF THE TAXPAYERS

Mayor Joseph L. Mathias has gone on to a well-deserved richer life.

All citizens of Carroll County—but mostly the taxpayers of Westminster—will miss this great man of courage, sincerity, and determination.

The good mayor was fearless, daring, and courageous. He had a certain air of authority about him that people admired. That certain something entranced the voters for 11 terms in which he won election to the highest office the city of Westminster has to offer.

In the face of criticism, he held his ground and always did what he thought his constituents wanted him to do. Mayor Mathias believed in personal diplomacy and used it to good advantage.

For example, when the junior chamber of commerce, human relations committee, and the Westminster Area Chamber of Commerce took the mayor to task on a number of occasions for not appointing a civil rights commission, the mayor took the criticism in stride and did nothing.

Mayor Mathias knew his people and knew what his people wanted. When the time was ripe, he quietly—without fanfare and publicity—had the majority of the eating establishments in the city integrated.

In a day when Government believes in deficit spending it was good to see a mayor who believed in sound fiscal policy. He believed in thrift and frugality and did not believe in "squandering the taxpayers' money." He called his economy "good housekeeping," and added:

"We don't spend more than is absolutely necessary to maintain our services at the highest possible level. There is no gimmick or trick to it—it's just sound business practice. What works for us in private business also works in government."

When Mayor Mathias assumed the chief executive's office in city hall he was burdened with a tax rate of $1.10 a hundred. By strong economy practices, he was able to cut the tax rate from period to period until he was able to bring it down to the present rate of 59 cents, one of the lowest, if not the lowest tax rate in the Nation.

Mayor Mathias' economic practices in government were responsible for Westminster to become debt free for the past 8 years.

Monuments to Mayor Mathias' memory include the installation of a sanitary sewerage system, a 7-acre playground, municipal buildings were developed and completed, and three offstreet, free, parking lots were constructed—one with flowers and shrubbery.

One of the late mayor's uncompleted programs is the doubling of the capacity of the sewage treatment plant from 750,000 gallons to 1,500,000 gallons.

In 1900, young Mathias left Union Mills and went to Hanover, Pa., as an apprentice in the monument business. After 6 years, at the age of 22, he moved to Westminster with his wife, the former Minnie S. Kale.

Shortly afterward he founded the Joseph L. Mathias Monument Co., which he headed until his death last week. After his sons were born he renamed the company Joseph L. Mathias & Sons with offices in Westminster, Hanover, and Baltimore.

His wife preceded him in death by 7 years. At the time of her passing they had been married happily for 51 years.

As president of the Westminster Trust Co. since 1943, and a member of its board of directors for 42 years, Mayor Mathias had been instrumental in the bank's development since its reorganization in 1933. It is ironic that he was not able to live to see the great expansion his bank is currently undergoing.

Mayor Mathias was active in community and religious affairs and was affiliated with many business and social organizations.

Our sympathies and condolences go to his three sons, his sister and grandchildren.

The people of Westminster will miss Joseph L. Mathias—friend of the taxpayer.

From a Manmade Famine in Ukraine to a Cold War Famine in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present negotiations to sell wheat at subsidized prices for liberal credit terms to the Soviet Union, we ought to pause to consider the history of previous agricultural policies of the Communits. I direct the special attention of the House to the main excerpts from an address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Captive Nations Week Committee, prepared for delivery on November 24, 1963, at the Ukrainian Center, Los Angeles, Calif.; as follows:

FROM A MANMADE FAMINE IN UKRAINE TO A COLD WAR FAMINE IN UNITED STATES

(Main excerpts from address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, 30th anniversary of famine in Ukraine, Ukrainian Center, Los Angeles, Calif., November 24, 1963)

It is no play to say that a book could be written with the title "From a Manmade Famine in Ukraine to a Cold War Famine in the United States: 1933–63." Its chapter on Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, the conquest of non-Russian nations, and all the phases of the cold war would show how these two phenomena are interrelated.

In every respect this meeting is not only a solemn reminder of the ravages of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism but also a mass protest against the cold war folly of our planned wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

Many of our scholars still are behind in their understanding of the tragic Russian-made famine in Ukraine 30 years ago. The basic explanation is not economic but political. Five to fifteen million Ukrainians were not subjected to starvation and death simply because of a collectivization program and so-called dekulakization but primarily because of Moscow's attempt to crush the firm nationalism of the Ukrainian peasantry. Moscow's campaign was multipurposed; and Kossior, Stalin's henchman then, publicly admitted that "Ukrainian nationalism is our greatest danger."

What miserable irony we find in these 30 years. In 1933 the upstart, Nikita Khrushchev, spent some time in visits to Kiev to check on Moscow's brutal confiscation of grains in Ukraine that produced the manmade famine; in 1963 the "Hangman of Ukraine" is being fed by us to wage a more successful cold war against us.

This 30th anniversary of the Russian-made famine in Ukraine highlights one essential point—that our leaders are repeating the mistakes of history. In 1933 our leaders disbelieved the tragic truth about millions of Ukrainians starving to death as Stalin confiscated grains to purchase machinery in the West. In their blind disbelief they did nothing to curb this genocidal crime. In fact, they honored the Russian genocidists by conferring diplomatic recognition.

Today, ironically, in 1963, we are witnessing the spectacle of swiftbuck deals in wheat to bolster our cold war enemy. All the economic arguments that have been advanced to justify the deals are just specious rationalizations for an action which is both politically foolhardy and morally debased. The summit of naivete was reached when Secretary Freeman said recently that "to have sought political concessions from Khrushchev would have been a deterrent toward the strengthening and the improving of relationships that were believed to be desirable."

Such foolhardy thinking is strikingly reminiscent of 1933. Once again in our present march toward a moral and psychopolitical disarmament in this country, we have scotched a magnificient opportunity to abet our own national interest, advance the interests of all the captive nations, and make some solid contributions to world freedom. The plain fact is that no country, except the United States, has the wheat reserves to meet the enemy's total requirements.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee took the right position on this wheat issue. We urged the President to offer our wheat for freedom, not for sale. Our Government had an excellent opportunity to display politico-moral leadership in the world by issuing a food-for-freedom declaration. Instead, our position has been degraded by this swap of wheat for gold.

This wheat deal is just another example of the disaster-breeding tendency in this country toward psychopolitical disarmament, brought about in no small measure by skillful Russian diplomacy and propaganda. We have been so brainwashed and tranquilized by Russian maneuvers since 1957 that many are even unaware of the disintegration taking place in our cold war posture. The cycle of 1933 is being repeated in 1963.

How far this self-defeating tendency of accommodation, illusory confidence-building, the support of totalitarism Red regimes, and how Russian-induced coexistence will go will depend on us and millions of Americans who at least profit from the lessons of history. Not only do we protest the wheat deal, we also at this meeting vow that we shall strenuously oppose any unconditional nonaggression pact with the world's outstanding aggressor. This is next in the cards of our psychopolitical disarmament cycle.

More, we must intensify our efforts for the creation of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations, a congressional inquiry into United States-U.S.S.R. relations, a Freedom Commission and Academy, and a winning cold war strategy.

The Grief of Maria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a column entitled "The Grief of Maria" from the Buenos Aires Herald, an English language newspaper of Buenos Aires, Argentina, has been sent to me by the Honorable George O. Huey, our American consul in that city. In the words of Mr. Huey, the article demonstrates that "perhaps we have not been as unsuccessful as it sometimes seems in reaching the minds and hearts of the little people whose responses are seldom recorded." The reams of copy which poured from the typewriters of many eminent journalists recorded every conceivable reaction, both their own and that of persons of varying degrees of distinction, but mostly of those highly articulate. Maria was scarcely literate, but through the plainness of her language shone the greatest sentiment and most sincere tribute which could be paid to our deceased President, and that transcending the boundaries of country, culture, and station.

The article is as follows:

THE GRIEF OF MARIA

On the day of President Kennedy's funeral Maria Baez went out and spent the last 280 pesos in her purse on flowers.

These she arranged on the dresser of her tiny room before a photograph of the dead President cut from a magazine.

"I cannot think what else I can do, señora," she said. "He was such a good man."

Thus Maria Baez, 42-year-old cook in service, paid her rich tribute to a man familiar to her only in photographs.

The middle-aged husband and wife who employ Maria told me that on the day that President Kennedy died she appeared tearfully in the sitting room doorway and said: "Madame, sir: I would like to express to you my deepest condolences over the death of your President Kennedy. I have just heard the terrible news from the porter."

Grief was written on her face; sorrow had bowed her head.

Her employers were touched by the obvious depths of feeling over a tragedy so remote from her own narrow world.

The señor was moved to rise from his chair and take the woman's hand. "Your sentiments are those of kindness, Maria," he said softly. "But you know, President Kennedy was not our President. We are not Americans."

"I know, señor," said Maria, "but is this not a tragedy for all the English-speaking people? I have seen you, sir, made silent by grief. For you it is also a sad personal moment."

Thus expressed herself a woman to whom the world has not shown much kindness since, at the age of 9, it sent her out to earn a living.

Maria Baez cannot read nor write. What she knows of the world is gleaned from her small bedside radio and the pictorial press, and the conversation of the tradesmen and servants who people her small world.

Maria knows nothing of politics or of the intricate affairs of men. She knows only that there are evil men and good ones—and that the man they called President Kennedy was a good one.

Yet Maria also prayed for the man who struck the President down. She prayed with the words of one without religious instruction or congregational ties. Her prayers were of those whose faith is inborn and not directed.

Her employers marvel that a woman who has known so much of what is known as cruel in this world exudes no ill and only good. Her thoughts are for others. She weeps for them though she knows that none will weep for her.

And so Maria Baez mourned for a man, who was a son and a father, a great man whose greatness she did not understand; but a man who in his greatness was a good man.

So Maria, who has never seen the mountains or the sea, shed her tears for that good man beyond the mountains and the sea.

Hon. George A. Dondero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American, an able and fearless legislator, and a good friend celebrates his 80th birthday today.

He is the Honorable George A. Dondero, a Member of the House of Representatives for 24 years, former chairman of the House Committee on Public Works.

I had the honor of succeeding Mr. Dondero after he voluntarily retired from the House in January 1957. He was, and is still, of great help to me, and I still count on his wisdom and his sage advice.

A great many of my colleagues here today count George Dondero as a good friend who fought relentlessly for what he believed.

It is no accident that one of the great channels on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Wiley-Dondero Ship Channel, was named in his honor. Because Mr. Dondero often has been called "Mr. Seaway" for his persistent and victorious effort to win approval for the St. Lawrence Seaway, making our Great Lakes America's Seventh Sea.

Those of us in Oakland County, Mich., remember him for other things as well. He was village clerk of Royal Oak in 1905–06; then township treasurer, village assessor, and village attorney. He was assistant prosecuting attorney for Oakland County and was elected as the first mayor of the newly incorporated city of Royal Oak in 1921.

He was a member of the board of education in Royal Oak for 18 years.

Today, that sleepy little town which George Dondero helped to form and which he led so ably in its beginning years has grown into a dynamic, thriving metropolis in the heart of an area which has experienced rapid, almost explosive, growth.

I have lived in Royal Oak all my life, and I want to take this moment to congratulate this man, George Dondero, who has done so much for his community, his State, and his Nation.

In many ways, George Dondero is Royal Oak. He has many of the qualities of the tree from which the city took its name. He has shown the same strength, the same ability to weather the storms of life, the same strong heart and flawless character which has made this tree a symbol of integrity and principle.

Happily, like the oak, George Dondero does not seem to be troubled by the years. He is still as vital, as interested, yes, as enthused with life as ever and we count it a happy experience when he is able to visit us here in Washington.

On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I want to wish George Dondero a happy 80th birthday, and let us hope we will see more of him here in Washington in the months and years to come.

No Law Can Force a Man To Have a Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial broadcast over radio station WABC in New York on December 3 and 4, 1963. This is a rational statement in answer to those who become irrational without having ascertained the facts. All of the Members of this body will surely subscribe to it.

The editorial follows:

WABC RADIO EDITORIAL 12

(By Walter A. Schwartz, vice president and general manager of WABC)

Can a law force a man to have a conscience? With senators and assemblymen charged with conflicts of interest and unethical junkets the New York State Legislature has asked for a public scrubbing by a

citizens' committee. They want a group of private citizens to tighten the code of ethics for public officials.

WABC thinks this self-conscious maneuver is a pretty good indication of how sadly confused our public officials are about what is ethical. We don't think this State needs more laws to make politicians ethical, no quick legislation will make a public official a better man.

WABC thinks there is only one rule of conscience for a public official—the public good. We think most men in public office work honestly for what they believe is the public interest. Under a tighter code, an honest man would no longer be free to let his own conscience tell him how to do the best job for you. But the not-so-honest man in politics, with no conscience of his own, would know exactly what he must hide to avoid trouble.

We think there should be codes of legislative behavior, but we don't think they should be so binding that they give good men just another reason for avoiding public office. We'd like to see more public officials make their own announcmeents about anything they do that might be misunderstood. If a senator thinks a trip is in the public interest, he should tell the world he's going to take it. If a man's conscience is clean, there's no reason for a secrecy that can only make him seem corrupt.

WABC does not think a citizens' committee or anyone else can legislate a conscience. There is no public conscience, and no law will ever give a man a personal conscience.

The National Christmas Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Francis X. Welch which I know will be of great interest to all of us. The editorial which appeared in the December 19, 1963, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, is as follows:

LOOKING FORWARD TO CHRISTMAS—1963

On the cover of this issue is a reproduction of the 1961 national Christmas tree which was placed as usual on the ellipse just back of the White House. By the time this issue is distributed, the tree for this year will be standing and illuminated. You may already have read elsewhere about the heroic size and other details of this 71-foot Norway spruce—how it was shipped and how it is decorated with so many thousand lights and intricate ornaments.

Back of these bare statistical facts, however, is an interesting human story. The custom really started in 1924 when President Calvin Coolidge walked to the south lawn of the White House to light up a tree from his native State of Vermont. The custom continued during the Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman administrations. With the Eisenhower administration in 1954, the program was expanded to a Pageant of Peace and moved to the ellipse.

The national Christmas tree belongs to all the people because it will be lit up, as is the custom, by the President of the United States from the White House. This year there was something extra special, an unexpected incentive in this labor of love. This year, of course, there will be a new hand on the switch button. But the thought behind the effort of everyone participating was that they were doing something which might bring some joy and hope to a small family that recently suffered a great loss.

For all those concerned knew that we now have a new queen in this country of ours. Not a queen by formal coronation or proclamation, but by acclamation—by universal recognition of valor, loyalty, and wisdom far beyond her years. And we may hope that when this beautiful queen looks out from the great White House she once called home, and where she spent so many more joyous holidays, this brilliant Yule tree on the monument park will win a smile from her lips. We may hope that she will find some comfort in her little ones clapping hands in glee at the sight of the thousands of gay lights and gaudy baubles in the age-old manner of children the world over.

We may be certain that time's green cushion will softly grow and spread, easing the impact of a reality too harsh to recall. We may surely hope that there will be for her, as for all of us, merrier Christmases and happier New Years ahead. As the Irish composer Michael Balfe put it so poignantly, "For memory is the only friend that grief can call its own."

Christmas in Bethlehem, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Postmaster General, Hon. John A. Gronouski, to recognize Bethlehem, Conn., as the Nation's Christmas Village, next year, in the issuance of the 1964 Christmas stamp. Specifically, I have suggested to the Postmaster General that the theme of the 1964 Christmas stamp be a typical New England winter scene and that it be offered for first-day sale in Bethlehem, Conn.

For the last quarter of a century tiny Bethlehem, in Connecticut's picturesque and historic Litchfield County, has been a center of activity in the mailing of Christmas cards and Postmaster Earl H. Johnson has given unstintingly of his time and efforts to many thousands of the residents of many States who have added an extra touch to their Christmas mailings by having them postmarked at Bethlehem.

I have been assured by the Post Office Department that my recommendation for 1964 will be given proper consideration. With permission to extend my remarks, I include here an editorial, "National Recognition for Bethlehem," which appeared in the Waterbury American of November 19, 1963, and a feature story, "Christmas Comes to Bethlehem" which appeared in the December 1963 issue of Connecticut Life magazine:

[From the Waterbury-American, Nov. 19, 1963]

NATIONAL RECOGNITION FOR BETHLEHEM

Our favorite Congressman from the 5th District of the State of Connecticut, U.S. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, has put in a bid with the Post Office Department to put our neighboring town of Bethlehem, Conn., on the national map next year.

Representative MONAGAN has suggested to Postmaster General John A. Gronouski, Jr., that next year—1964—Bethlehem ought to be recognized as the Nation's "Christmas Village" in the issuance of the 1964 Christmas stamp.

The town of Santa Claus, Ind., was so recognized this year, when the 1963 Christmas stamp was issued for first-day sale. It depicts the Peace Pageant Christmas tree with the White House in the background.

The gentleman from the 5th District suggests that next year's stamp should feature an authentic New England scene, and that it should be made available for first day sale at the Bethlehem post office.

We like the idea.

Bethlehem, Conn., has been for many years the scene of heavy mailings of Christmas cards bearing the Bethlehem postmark. The practice has become virtually a tradition in this part of the country for countless thousands who like their yuletide greetings to carry special significance.

We would like to add our voice to that of Representative MONAGAN in seeking this honor and recognition for beautiful Bethlehem, deep in the heart of the Litchfield foothills. We hope others will join in the chorus. It's not any too soon.

[From Connecticut Life, December 1963]

CHRISTMAS COMES TO BETHLEHEM

Nestled in the cradling hills of Litchfield County where a manger can be concealed as easily as a herd of cattle, is Bethlehem which for 11 months out of the year looks like the heart and soul of rural Connecticut.

Clustered around the triangular green are the white frame buildings that house the town hall, the library, and a general store. There are two churches at the triangle's apex, facing each other across lightly-traveled route 132. Four old homes are grouped at the bottom corners of the triangle. In the center of the green there is a flagpole, a small marker which recalls the Bethlehem men who served in the Civil War and World War I and a bronze plaque lying flat upon the grass that honors those who fought in World War II.

The town's 1,600 people farm, dairy, go to work in Waterbury 10 miles away over a spur of hills to the east, raise families or go to school.

It is a quiet town, and like a dozen others in Connecticut, one where the churchly men who were the early settlers turned to their cherished family Bibles to find a name back in 1739.

As December 1963 began the associations of the old name were never stronger. By the time most people started coming to grips with Christmas shopping, card lists, and the yearly visit to a department store Santa, Bethlehem people were already prepared for the season.

The town's semi-official status as Connecticut's Christmas town calls for a toast to Earl S. Johnson, postmaster for the past 30 years. Nearly a quarter century ago he got the idea that now takes the town's name into the far corners of the round earth.

Speaking through the stamp window grill in Bethlehem's 2-year-old post office (it used to overflow the side room at the Johnson Bros. General Store), Johnson recalled "I thought it'd be nice if I had a special stamp to put on my own Christmas cards."

He had a rubber stamp made up—a simple outline of a Christmas tree with a brief message "Greetings from Bethlehem, Connecticut's Christmas Town" written inside.

"It seemed to grow from that," Johnson thought. "People who got cards with a Bethlehem message on them drove up the

next year with their own cards." Every year more people have come. Last year in the few short weeks between the first of December and Christmas, more than 200,000 cards were brought to Bethlehem, rubber stamped with a special Christmas message, canceled and mailed off.

Johnson pays for the rubber stamps out of his own pocket. His small post office bulges with five extra workers at Christmas time.

"The Post Office rules just get forgotten those weeks," Johnson admitted. "Sometimes we're open up to 11 at night, as late as there's someone here with Christmas cards to mail."

Some year soon, Johnson hopes, the Post Office Department will give one of its special Christmas postal stamps a first-day sale in Bethlehem.[1]

"It'd be nice for us, because I've been suggesting these postage stamps for years. But I suppose there'd have to be a few speeches."

This Christmas Johnson will have about 70,000 copies of the Christmas postal stamp and about 100 of his rubber stamps in 10 different designs available for the Christmas card senders who will come to Bethlehem.

One of the designs they might use is the work of Miss Lauren Ford who lives in a rambling barn and blacksmith shop a few miles up the road from the new post office. In her studio there she designs Christmas cards and in a little room off the sheep barn she prints as many as 10,000 cards a year.

Her designs are inspired by the farm life around the town where she has lived for the past quarter century. In one of her favorites the shepherds and wise men are coming to witness the Nativity in the setting of her own home.

Lauren Ford's preparations for Christmas take up most of the available space in "The Sheepfold," as she calls her home. Correspondence, bookkeeping and other tasks are tended to in the dining room; reams of paper and boxes of printed cards are stored in the loft overhead.

A long corridor running off the living room—itself hung with paintings and drawings that have found their way onto Christmas cards—is one workshop with the plates for some 50 card designs labeled neatly and stacked in one corner. A larger room opening off this has more work space competing, however, with a washing machine and dryer. Miss Ford works, surrounded by cages of canaries, easels, paints, books, statues, and drawings in a room off this.

About the only room on this level of the barn-house built into the side of a hill that is not part of the Christmas card operation is the small narrow chapel. Here six rush-covered chairs face a small wooden altar on which stand a gilded Italian baroque reliquary and candlesticks.

That Lauren Ford is a leading designer of Christmas cards has nothing to do with Bethlehem—she made her first Nativity etching years ago in New York—but in the setting and spirit of the Litchfield County town it has become an enjoyed life work.

A few years ago a representative of one of the largest greeting card firms drove to Bethlehem, stayed for lunch and dinner and offered to take over her entire line of cards. She turned him down flatly.

"They would have ended up telling me what to do and not to do. Besides, they would have printed all the cards and that would have broken up our little business which we think is fun."

As Christmas gets closer the press off the sheepfold is running late into the night, tended by Miss Ford and neighbor Bryan Kielty who also herds her Cheviot sheep. In the work rooms above the barn Kielty's wife, Miss Ford's adopted daughter, her long-time artist friend Frances Delahanty who lives at "The Sheepfold" and a crew of friends and neighbors mount cards and package them for mailing.

When Lauren Ford is not working on Christmas cards or clucking conversationally at the sheep she is apt to be a hundred yards or so up the road at the Benedictine monastery of Regina Laudis where a primitive silence and calm peace leave a lasting impression on visitors at Christmas time.

There is a creche at Regina Laudis whose life-sized figures, the work of the nuns and Miss Ford, bring the primitive simplicity of the Nativity into focus for a 20th century Christmas. The Virgin is dressed in a brightly printed peasant skirt with a woolen shawl around her head. Joseph wears dungarees and a red and black checked woodsman's shirt under a homespun hooded cape. The Christ child is covered in his crib by a bright patchwork quilt.

The heavy angular faces and figures were constructed out of plaster and gauze by the Benedictine nuns. Lauren Ford added the clothing from her family's closets and painted the faces.

To the superior of Regina Laudis, Reverend Mother Benedict Duss, the roll of the monastery is to preserve and convey the same primitive simplicity captured in the creche.

The nuns of Regina Laudis are under a rule of enclosure and normally do not leave the monastery and the gardens behind its fence of red-painted planks. Like the 40 nuns she rules, Mother Benedict talks to visitors through a double wooden grill.

Neither the grill nor the rule of enclosure, she felt, prevented Regina Laudis from fulfilling its role.

"The early settlers here and all across America lived simple lives that were very quiet and very primitive. Even though their way of life changed as the world grew up around them what they learned and experienced as settlers was important and should not become lost," she said quietly.

Regina Laudis does little to advertise its presence in Bethlehem. The nuns make liturgically inspired Christmas ornaments of wood and glass in their workshops and sell them in a small building next to the monastery along with herbs, honey, jellies, and other products of their gardens. And although they welcome visitors, both men and women, for an hour, a day, or as long as they care to stay, there is no formal activity designed to lure people to the monastery.

"We are just here," Mother Benedict said gently, "and people come to know we are here." Gesturing toward the nearest of the farmhouses that break the woodlands along the country road outside the monastery, she smiled and added "Of course it is very difficult for someone to be near a monastery and hear the bell for chapel and not become aware of the strange life inside.

"If something in their lives leads them to seek something in ours, we are here. Many are drawn here at Christmas."

As Christmas approachs closer lights and wreaths and creches will make their appearance throughout the little town.

People with stacks of cards will crowd Earl Johnson's rural post office, Lauren Ford's sheepfold printing press will run far into the night, and the nuns of Regina Laudis will rise before dawn to chant matins in their chapel.

There is a quiet quickening in the air and a tingle of excitement as Bethlehem prepares to celebrate the 1,963d Christmas.

[1] Post Office Department has assured Fifth District Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN that they will strongly consider his suggestion that the 1964 Christmas postage stamp get its first-day sale in Bethlehem, Conn. The State town will have to fight off the claims of Bethlehems in Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania as well as places like Santa Claus, Ind., where the 1963 stamp had its first-day sale.

Representative Talcott Praised for Letter to Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the daily diet of the Washington Post on the reading menu of most Members of this body, it is easy to get a jaundiced view of the state of affairs of the Nation and world. The Post has had a field day attacking conservatives and Americans of the political right for some time. Now this paper seems intent on eradicating hate from the American scene notwithstanding it is one of the prime apostles of "hate your neighbor" in this country today.

Some Herblock cartoons are venomous and among the most vicious attacks on political conservatives which can be found anywhere. They cannot be dismissed as mere satire. Human Events recently recalled three of the worst of the hate-Nixon and hate-Goldwater cartoons which, after being published, were reprinted untold millions of times by the Democratic National Committee and the AFL–CIO.

In word pictures, the three cartoons were as follows:

First. Nixon, looking like a plug-ugly, crawls out of a sewer, drenched with slime.

Second. Goldwater, towering over a starving mother with three small children, leers: "If you had any initiative, you'd go out and inherit a department store."

Third. Goldwater, obviously a monster, snarling at two helpless little illegitimate children: "I don't want my tax money spent upon your kind."

The AFL–CIO, along with the Washington Post is currently taking bows as a merchant of love and kindness and is fighting hate in this great Nation. In truth, the leaders of this organization have been at the forefront of those preaching hate of conservatives and those who do not agree with their big spending, big government blueprint for socialism. Trade union papers and periodicals daily extol the virtues of the Socialists and the left while excoriating conservatives. I am convinced that the rank and file of labor does not go along with their leaders in this effort.

A good example is this excerpt from the Allied Industrial Worker on January 1962, which is further indication of the Herblock tie. The Washington Post carries a vicious anti-Goldwater cartoon by Herblock and it is promptly reprinted in the Allied Industrial Worker, as well as other AFL–CIO and leftwing organs. As a comment on the cartoon reprint, in their column entitled "Washington Letter," this union paper asserted:

Herblock's latest peeve is Senator BARRY GOLDWATER who is currently straddling the fence between the John Birch Society and the rightwing of the Republican Party, if that's possible. Goldwater is not as bright as Taft, not as crude as McCarthy, and not

as oily as Dirksen. Nobody has punctured his inconsistencies better than Herblock who savagely takes off on the dapper man with horned rim glasses in a manner which is most upsetting to people accustomed to the social graces. Since Herblock couldn't care less about cocktail parties—he lets fly with cartoons which have shown up GOLDWATER for what he is—a sanctimonious mossback who, if he had his way, would hurl this country into utter social chaos, deprive orphans of their milk, and cast the helpless into the street.

Think of that, Mr. Speaker. Not only is this a blatant lie; it is calculated to engender more than mere opposition to or political dislike and scorn of the junior Senator from Arizona. I charge that it is an example of leftwing extremism calculated to forment hate—nothing but cold and calculated hate of this distinguished American.

It is with great interest, Mr. Speaker, that I read in today's issue of the Washington Post a letter to the editor from our colleague, Representative BURT L. TALCOTT of the 12th District of California. I commend it to the reading of everyone because it strikes a very responsive chord on the "do as I say, not as I do" approach of this local newspaper which has a strange but easily understood double standard:

MORATORIUM ON HATE

Your editorial of December 6 calling Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, a "tyrant" seemed mean, hypocritical, and hateful.

I am sure that you do not presume that your paper can hate, or has a license to peddle hate, when it suits your purpose—but that every other person who disagrees or disapproves is a hatemonger or bigot. But you called a man a tyrant with sanctimonious abandon. Is not calling a man a tyrant as hateful as calling him a Communist? Which caller, really, is more bigoted or hateful?

If we are to invoke a moratorium on hate, should not it apply to everyone? Is not a person who piously decries "hatemongering" by others, but mongers hate himself, even more despicable because of the inconsistent hypocrisy?

Should not the editorial page of a newspaper be in the vanguard of those who eschew hate—even including the cartoonists and columnists it employs? Should not newspapers, as well as ministers and politicians, practice what they preach?

Does not one who has a typewriter and a paper have a higher obligation for truth, honesty, and consistency than one who screams from a mob on the street?

BURT T. TALCOTT,
U.S. Representative, 12th District of California.
WASHINGTON.

Moratorium on Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 16, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from our good colleague, BURT L. TALCOTT from the 12th District of California, is timely and intelligent. Certainly it is entertaining to see a newspaper that spews hate in articles and cartoons take on a better than thou attitude when anyone dares to disagree with them. Once again: What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

MORATORIUM ON HATE

Your editorial of December 6 calling Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, a "tyrant" seemed mean, hypocritical and hateful.

I am sure that you do not presume that your paper can hate, or has a license to peddle hate, when it suits your purpose—but that every other person who disagrees or disapproves is a hatemonger or bigot. But you called a man a tyrant with sanctimonious abandon. Is not calling a man a tyrant as hateful as calling him a Communist? Which caller, really, is more bigoted or hateful?

If we are to invoke a moratorium on hate, should not it apply to everyone? Is not a person who piously decries "hatemongering" by others, but mongers hate himself, even more despicable because of the inconsistent hyprocrisy?

Should not the editorial page of a newspaper be in the vanguard of those who eschew hate—even including the cartoonists and columnists it employs? Should not newspapers, as well as ministers and politicians, practice what they preach?

Does not one who has a typewriter and a paper have a higher obligation for truth, honesty, and consistency than one who screams from a mob on the street?

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U.S. Representative, 12th District of California.
WASHINGTON.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of December 14, 1963:

DECEMBER 14, 1963.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND POLITICS

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The contest in the House this week may make some wonder just who is for civil rights legislation. The question was on the civil rights bill. Since the death of President Kennedy proponents of the legislation have made every attempt to get approval through emotional appeal, demanding the measure be passed as a memorial to the late President. Regardless of whether or not one supports the measure, it must be decided on its merits after reasonable and proper debate, and not on any other basis. Over the years, it has been suggested the civil rights issue was mainly political and has been an instrument through which some have been able to gain the votes of Negroes as long as the issue was kept alive. How political the issue may be can be seen in this week's developments.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee brought out a discharge petition with the claim this was the only way to get around the Rules Committee, which programs legislation, and bring the civil rights bill to the floor for debate.

As a matter of fact, this is not the case. The civil rights bill could have been brought to the floor at any time during the past 10½ months on any Wednesday. Every Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday in the House of Representatives. This means that any chairman of any committee may bring up a bill which has been reported out of his committee and is in the Rules Committee. The majority on the Judiciary Committee and the leadership of the House never tried to use Calendar Wednesday. This week, after the Judiciary Committee finally reported out a bill, the discharge petition was introduced only a few days after the bill went out to the Rules Committee before it would even be possible to schedule hearings.

Here are some interesting facts brought out in debate:

1. In the 1960 campaign the Democratic candidates promised that the first order of business would be a civil rights bill. The administration took office January 20, 1961, but it was not until June 1, 1963, after nationwide demonstrations, the killing of a number of people, and the bombings in Birmingham that the Judiciary Committee considered any civil rights legislation.

2. On January 9, 1963, the first day of this session of Congress, a number of civil rights bills were introduced. No bill was reported out of committee until October 29 and the report was not made until November 20.

3. The chairman of the Rules Committee announced that the bill would be reported under regular procedures early in January, the earliest any action could be taken. In spite of this the discharge petition was introduced and nationwide pressure was put on every Member of the House to sign it.

4. The House leadership attempted, as usual, to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, but this was objected to by Congressman CURTIS of Missouri who pointed out that Calendar Wednesday was a perfectly proper way to bypass the Rules Committee and bring the civil rights issue to the floor immediately.

5. On Wednesday, on an almost straight party-line vote (216 to 166) the leadership adjourned the House to prevent the bill from coming up.

What conclusion can be reached from this chronology? Doesn't it almost make you believe that some of the loudest proponents of the civil rights bill are not so anxious to have it passed as they are to keep it as a political issue?

POLITICAL MORATORIUM?

The possible political motivation behind this week's drive was highlighted by Congressman FRANK BECKER, of New York, speaking directly to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, "We are supposed to have a period of 30 days of mourning for our late President, John F. Kennedy. I wanted to respect that request that was made that we set aside politics during that period of 30 days of mourning. Nobody wanted to respect it more than I. But I have found out in my experience that when the Democrats ask for a moratorium on politics it is only to gag the Republicans, but not themselves. This, to me, is political demagoguery at its lowest level, to introduce a discharge petition within 1 week after a bill goes to the Committee on Rules."

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The House backed down in four important areas in adopting the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill (195 to 164):

1. The authorization is some $121 million higher than the House approved.

2. We accepted favored-nation treatment for Communist-dominated countries including Poland and Yugoslavia.

3. We accepted a weakening of the House position on the 2-percent interest rate on loans.

4. The provision to prohibit aiding Cuba through the United Nations was knocked out. A slap at big Federal spending was contained in the overwhelming defeat of a proposal to spend $400 million for a subway system in the District of Columbia (278 to 76).

However, we approved the conference report on the Clean Air Act which calls for spending $95 million in Federal funds over the next 3 years to accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. This, like water pollution control, should not be the responsibility of the Federal Government, but can be handled better and cheaper by State and local communities.

The large area of Federal aid to education is still being debated, but this week two additional side-door approaches were approved. The House approved amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 which would increase the cost and maintain sole Federal contributions for another year. On one hand we are spending money to urge young people to stay in school and this legislation extends to them an engraved invitation to drop out of school and to receive Federal payments of $20 a week for up to 70 weeks for so doing. The conference report to expand the scope of the Federal education program was approved.

While President Johnson is calling for economy his congressional leaders are demanding heavier Federal spending in every bill they are pushing toward enactment. You cannot expand and add new Federal programs and cut the budget at the same time.

BRUCE ALGER,
Member of Congress.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution of the City Council of the City of Compton, Calif., a portion of which is in my congressional district, in support of the civil rights bill now pending before us.

RESOLUTION 8751—A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COMPTON, CALIF., EXPRESSING ITS CONCERN AND URGENTLY RECOMMENDING THE PASSAGE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL NOW IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the ideals of American freedom and justice, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, have not been enjoyed by all Americans; and

Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States a proposal for legislation to implement, in part, the ideals of American freedom and justice: Now, therefore

The City Council of the City of Compton does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. That this city council go on record in support of the civil rights bill now pending in this session of Congress.

SEC. 2. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all appropriate departments, committees, and persons in Washington, D.C.

Adopted this 3d day of December 1963.

CHESTER R. CRAIN,
Mayor of the City of Compton.

Beauty and the Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Wolf Von Eckardt, part 4 of his series in the New Republic on "Urban Renewal and the City." This part appeared in the October 5, 1963, edition of the New Republic as follows:

URBAN RENEWAL AND THE CITY: BEAUTY AND THE PLANNERS

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

(Fourth in a series of six articles)

In the 5 years from 1585 to 1590 Pope Sixtus V undertook the renewal of Rome. It was congested and unsanitary and he wanted the Eternal City to be a work of art for the greater glory of God and the enjoyment of man. Brunelleschi had just discovered the science of perspective, and Sixtus, enchanted, cut great vistas through the slums, so you could see the old landmarks. He got the leading artists of his time to frame the vistas with fine buildings and opened them up occasionally into great piazzas to give them inspiring settings. And he rhythmically dotted his avenues with fountains and obelisks to add interest and perspective, so that the idea of progressing along the avenues would not seem tedious.

Two hundred and eighty-five years later Baron Haussmann made the Paris we know, building not only grand boulevards and plazas, but also the greatest modern sewer system in the world. In our time Chandigarh in India, which Le Corbusier planned, or Brasilia in Brazil, which was planned by Lucio Costa and whose monumental buildings were designed by Oscar Niemeyer, are built in this tradition of city planning as an art and not just as social and traffic engineering.

Half a century before Haussmann, Maj. Pierre L'Enfant planned Washington, D.C., beautifully and efficiently in this tradition. Americans are proud of it. They don't seem to worry when that plan is desecrated with superhighways and heedless architecture. That's progress. And progress, everyone agrees, must be reconciled with every conceivable poltical and economic interest. But rarely with beauty.

"Surely the only sound foundation for a civilization is a sound state of mind," E. M. Forster has written. "Architects, contractors, international commissioners, marketing boards, broadcasting corporations will never, by themselves, build a new world. They must be inspired by the proper spirit in the people for whom they are working. For instance, we shall never have a beautiful new London until people refuse to live in ugly houses. At present, they don't mind; they demand comfort, but are indifferent to civic beauty; indeed they have no taste. I live myself in a hideous block of flats, but I can't say it worries me, and until we are worried, all schemes for reconstructing London beautifully must automatically fail."

The efforts to reconstruct Rotterdam or Hannover and to renew large parts of Rome and Paris and São Paulo beautifully have not failed. In Washington, St. Louis, Chicago, and elsewhere in the United States they have. This is not because the Dutch, Germans, Italians, French, or Brazilians have better taste. It is because they care about their cities. We still fundamentally distrust our cities, much as Jefferson did. This distrust has driven all Americans who could afford it out of the evil city into the suburbs which have largely spoiled the virtue of the country, despite the carefully manicured lawns and expensive shrubs.

Practically every city in the country now has a city planning department. It tells the sanitation department where the sewers should go as the city grows. It also tells the real estate board where the big deals are, which is mainly determined by how closely people will live together in the various parts of the city. It puts down on a chart what happened 10 years ago and what happens today. Then it draws a line between the two points and projects it to the next 10 years. This is called city planning. City planning also watches what thousands of individuals and their firms and organizations do, and tries to understand this by statistical analysis, probability mathematics, and conversions into averages. This is projected into guesses about the natural, "organic" growth of the city.

The result is a zoning map which has lots of colors. The zoning board implements the zoning map—but not very often. The map has no votes and doesn't pressure anyone. The planning department also worries about traffic. It figures out which street should be noisy with trucks because lots of people live on it and which should be quiet, because only a few people live on it. Then the highway department comes along and builds its highways where it damn well pleases, because there is lots of pressure for highways. Finally, the planning department rearranges its projected sewers and population densities. This is called coordination.

Sometimes the highway department doesn't make up its mind where the highway should go. This frustrates the planning department and makes some people very angry because they don't know whether they'll have to get out of the way or not. This is called poor coordination; it depresses real estate values and slows progress.

The planning department also (sometimes) has ideas for a new park or for keeping the buildings low where high buildings would spoil a view. This called upsetting the applecart. "Applecart" is a folksy name for what sociologists call the power structure. The "applecart" is pushed by the mayor, the city council, or both, who employ the planning department staff. What upsets their cart, of course, is not the park or the low buildings, but the protests. People always protest that parks are only for loafers and that low buildings don't make as much money as tall ones.

A BALANCED DISPERSAL OF UGLINESS

Sometimes a city needs a new public housing project or a new concert hall. That is called a planning problem. When a planning problem occurs the city planning department calls in a planning consultant from out of town. The consultant doesn't know the city or where the project or concert hall would look pretty or where it would be convenient for the people who will use it. But he makes a survey and a big study, which tells all about tax revenues and real estate values and the attitudes of people who don't want a project or concert hall to get into their accustomed ways. Then it recommends the least offensive site. The concert hall is put into a park because it doesn't earn any revenues and the value of the park no longer matters, anyhow. The project is put into the Negro district because Negroes have the best attitude.

The sites are then put on the map and the map is made into a model. The project and the concert hall are put into the model in the form of white boxes, which everybody admires. Then an architect is called in, shown the white boxes and told to make a housing project or a concert hall out of them. It must be so high and so wide and

so deep. The architect has been trained to create architecture. But now he has kids who want to eat. So he designs a big white box just so high and so wide and so deep. If he tries to use beautiful stone on the box or put a mosaic on it, maybe, there's a scandal. No one wants frills for the taxpayers' money.

If a newspaper, as happens rarely, criticizes not the expense but the unsightliness of the ill-proportioned and barren box, the chief city planner writes a letter to the editor. The one Robert B. Jones wrote to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch not long ago reads in part: "The stature of a community's image must be based upon a program of action commensurate with a balanced dispersal of available resources," which is, I suppose, as good a reason as any for the balanced dispersal of ugliness.

Practically every city also has an urban renewal department of some kind. (Atlanta has two.) Some of these departments or authorities are joined with the city housing department or authorities as a hangover from the days when urban renewal was to provide housing. The up-to-date ones are all by themselves. None is ever joined with the city planning department because then either or both might do some city planning which would upset the applecart. The urban renewal department and the city planning department don't talk to each other. They coordinate. This means that they look at each other's maps and models and smile. Then they go back to their respective jobs and coordinate some more.

Two years ago the renewers back in Washington, where you don't see the applecart so much, decided that urban renewal should follow some sensible plan. The cities, they thought, shouldn't go on using money and energy just fixing the stairway when the kitchen was perhaps in much worse shape and repairing either would do no good so long as the roof keep leaking. Since the cities, despite their city planning departments and colored maps, didn't have such a plan, the national renewers promised the local renewers Federal money—two-thirds of the expense—if they'd only prepare one. At latest count, one out of three large cities and one out of five cities over 100,000 population had accepted the bait.

The plans these cities are now making, at a collective cost of about $12 million of Federal expense, are called community renewal programs. The CRP's are scientific. They don't stop with the stairwell the mayor wanted fixed; they take a look at what thousands of individual people and firms and organizations do, and try to understand it by statistical analysis, probability mathematics and conversions into averages. This is projected into guesses about not only the growth but—and here's the new twist—also the probable rate of deterioration of the city and the cost to fix it up.

In 45 percent of the cities which bought the idea, CRP's are prepared by the city planning agencies, in 38 percent by the renewal agencies and in the remaining 17 percent by a combined arrangement of both. As a result, planning agencies and renewal agencies now sometimes do talk to each other since this is the only way they can fight in a civilized manner.

CRP is not a master plan or overall design for the city. To create one, as Boston's renewer, Ed Logue, has said, would be trying to play God. This seems more fitting for Sixtus V or Baron Haussmann than for those who must labor for a community's image with a program of action commensurate * * * etc. Planning such a program of action makes CRP tremendously complex because nobody knows—or at least no two people agree—what the city is after. Looking at the stairwell and the kitchen, and even at the roof, still doesn't tell us what the remodeled house should look like or how it should work.

So CRP, in the end, is really a priority fix-up schedule for needed repairs. It will also tell us that if we tear down a 117-housing unit, 117 families will be out in the cold unless we build 117 new ones. But it tells us nothing about how these new units are to be built. That is called implementation and not a proper planning function. Implementation is up to Sixtus V—or whoever pushes the applecart.

There are exceptions to all this, but not many. The most notable is Philadelphia. There were and are hassles there, but it is just about the only city in the United States which had a master plan and a visual concept of what it wanted to do, at least in the inner city, and then it launched urban renewal to do it. Its chief city planner, Edmund Bacon, looked at the city and the rivers—and what William Penn had in mind when he sketched his vision in 1682. Then Bacon looked at the fine, historic old buildings that needed space around them to be enjoyed, and at the deteriorated old buildings that were very much in the way. The worst of these was the Broad Street Station of the Pennsylvania Railroad, the smut-grimed "Chinese Wall," which divided and blighted downtown. Next Bacon decided where the logical center of the city was, how the various parts and arteries of the city should function and relate to each other and where there would be a fine view of a landmark so you would know where you are in the city.

With the help of his chief designer, Wilhelm von Moltke, and a very sympathetic planning commission, he sketched all this. Next Bacon called in the city's leading architects and they worked on the two-dimensional plan and worked it up into a three-dimensional visual, so you could see how all this would shape up and how it would work. In the end, the concept was built into an enormous model. It was put on public display and much photographed for the newspapers and television. All the civic organizations and the schoolchildren were invited to see it. Everyone got an idea of what all the digging and building would add up to and where all the buildings were to go and why. Public pressure, for a change, worked for the plan.

When urban renewal came, mayor (now Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, who had called in Bacon and prompted all this, and his successor, Mayor Richard Dilworth, set up a capital budget for what the whole thing would cost. Dilworth appointed the most energetic man he could find to ride herd on the effort and back Bacon's concept. His name is William Rafsky. Now Mayor James H. J. Tate has succeeded Dilworth, the political reform drive has diminished, and Rafsky is out. But the master plan is still rolling on by its own momentum, as you can see from the top of city hall. Below emerges an orderly and lovable city.

Washington, D.C., like a very small but growing number of other cities, also has such a detailed, three-dimensional master plan for a limited downtown area. What makes Washington exceptional is that its planning commission staff has developed a broad sketch plan of how the rapidly expanding metropolitan area should grow in the next 50 years. Most cities have just sprawled aimlessly, like Los Angeles, in a huge, congested web of gaudy strip developments which gradually fill in. There is no center and no point of identity where you would say: "Here I am in the heart of the city." There is no concentration where a man can work with the convenience of having the offices of his competitors, suppliers and customers around, buy a necktie, get a flower for his lapel on a nice day, drop in at an art gallery, see a movie, call on his dentist or stockbroker, bump into someone he hasn't seen for a while and buy him a drink—all within walking distance.

Washington's "Year 2000" plan calls for such concentration. It would have the city's residential areas grow along radiating arteries that from above would make it look like a star. Between these extensions would be tongues of open country and parks, reaching close to the metropolitan center. This would give everyone in the city easy and immediate access to fresh air, greenery and recreation. It's a beautiful plan and the President of the United States has endorsed it. But he also endorses sticking the proposed cultural center in an inaccessible park by the Potomac. And he won't permit the planning commission to say that this is nonsense, though most of its members think it is.

Mayor Richard Daley in Chicago has, no doubt, never given much thought to what the proposed 23,000-seat bandshell would do to Grant Park. With its necessary parking it would destroy a good portion of the park and at the same time deprive his inner city of that vital concentration and of another magnet which would attract further improvements and amenities. Likewise, Mayor Raymond D. Tucker in St. Louis is just as proud of his proposed new downtown stadium as he is of Eero Saarinen's magnificent Jefferson Expansion Memorial, soaring stainless steel arch, now being built on the shores of the Mississippi River. This arch, of course, needs an equally magnificent setting. There will be a stretch of downtown mall leading to it. But that will be lined with parking garages the stadium demands.

THE CITY VERSUS AUTOMOBILE TRAFFIC

Such misconceptions, however, are trifling compared to the damage inner city highways, freeways, expressways, loops and their ramps and clover leaves do. At stake here is not whether sentimental antiautomobile intellectuals or fanatical highway engineers will win a silly battle. At stake is the question whether we adjust the city to automobile traffic and thereby ruin the city, or whether we adjust automobile traffic to the city and thereby save the city.

Here, too, the planners in city hall, as well as in their schools and their study centers, are overwhelmingly more concerned about the apple cart than the future of the city. They equate urban transportation with urban highways. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 encourages them to do so. Paragraph 134, entitled "Transportation Planning in Certain Urban Areas" starts out to say that it is in the national interest "to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems" and goes on to say only that "long-range highway plans" are to be formulated.

Most planners also still see in their mind's eye the vision Le Corbusier drew up for his "Ville Radieuse" in the 1920's. It was a city "designed for speed," wherein imposing superhighways and sidelanes are flanked by rhythmically spaced skyscraper slabs on stilts. They rationalize that after all, the automobile has freed people from the tyranny of their location, giving them unprecedented freedom to move about, live, work, and amuse themselves where they please.

But most planners will not see that while you can build a radiant city on the highlands of Brasilia with dubious results, you cannot impose it on Washington or New Haven or Boston or San Francisco and have anything left that's worth speeding around in. Few planners will acknowledge the blight that network of 26 railroad lines, built half a century ago, has brought upon large parts of Chicago. Though it tried hard, Chicago has not yet managed to undo either the tracks or the blight. Who knows what mode of transportation we will use half a century hence? But we can be fairly sure that the downtown expressways, like the railroad tracks, will survive all the apologies of their builders.

The notion that rapid transit is unwanted and obsolete, that it is everyone's inalienable

right to rush through the inner city at 60 miles per hour, undoes all urban renewal efforts. The tyranny of these notions not only consumes an ever-increasing share of our gross national product but takes taxable land away from the city—and depresses adjacent property values to boot. At a time of severe shortage in low-income housing, it tears down more low-income housing than the Nation can build. And the additional cars and parking space drive out of the city more people and business than urban renewal can ever hope to attract.

San Francisco, cut off from much of its waterfront by the hideous elevated Embarcadero Freeway, has rebelled. Its citizens have voted the first new rapid transit system to be installed in this country in 50 years. Atlanta is studying public transit. In Washington the study is complete and a bitter battle with the powerful highway lobby is locked.

But elsewhere the expressways go merrily on, slashing through the city and girdling it tighter than the medieval city walls ever did. And those had more gates than the loops have overpasses and tunnels. The city planners, meanwhile, collect all the data they can find about the decline of mass transport systems built in their grandfather's day to bolster their automobile-dominated plans. In Pittsburgh such data, along with all the other study material, statistics, averages, equations and probabilities, are now fed into a new computer planning machine. It's a breakthrough in the ancient art of city planning that poor Sixtus never dreamed of.

And a Little Child Shall Lead Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the following provocative letter was sent to the editor of the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News. While the last paragraph is not completely factual, it should be required reading for each member of the Supreme Court and Congress.

Do you have an answer to the teacher who addressed the editor?

The letter follows:

AND WHAT ABOUT PRAYER?

EDITOR: As our Nation shares this period of mourning for our beloved President, I personally carry an additional burden.

As you read this humble writing, forget that I am a Protestant, that I am a Republican, just remember that I am a schoolteacher carrying each child's problems on my shoulders.

When the tragic news of the target of the maniac's bullets reached the juvenile ears of my fourth graders, the classroom took on an "air of death."

How do you answer a child when he says, "Let's pray?"

The President of our Nation lay near death, but legally we were denied the right to pray for his well-being. True, the life of the President had expired by this time, but the fact remains we were denied the right to unite in prayer.

Somehow I pulled my thoughts together and lowly said, "Let us 'lower' our heads and 'speak' silently a few kind thoughts about our President who needs our strength."

My mind will always carry the picture painted in my classroom that day. Thirty-four students, with moistened eyes, fearful of the future, asking to unite in prayer.

I would like to ask our many legislators, who caused prayer to be eliminated in our public schools, one question: "What would you have done?"

The American People Were Not the Assassin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, wisely places an intelligent perspective on the question of blame for the late President Kennedy's assassination. It was written by Walter Ridder and appeared recently in various of the Ridder newspapers.

The article follows:

GUILT RESTS ON LONE ASSASSIN, NOT ON AMERICA

(By Walter T. Ridder)

WASHINGTON.—Good for the Republicans. They got off a statement here the other day which has been needed badly in recent days. What they did in effect was to deplore efforts to make everybody guilty or feel guilty about the assassination of President Kennedy.

I've listened for some days now to the bleatings of those who point a finger at me and declare with portentious solemnity that I was 1,500 miles from the scene of the shooting, the fact that never once did I think of killing the President, and the fact that I am on the whole a mild-mannered gentleman with no conspicuous homicidal tendencies counts for not a whit among those who wish to wallow in the mire of self-accusation.

Now, if they feel themselves guilty, that's their business and they obviously have a much better judgment as to their parts in the affair than do I. What I am tired of hearing however is that because I happen to live on this planet that I must therefore stand accused of some complicity in the tragic affair.

Frankly, I don't feel I had anything to do with it and I am not about to don the sackcloth and ashes for my asserted guilt and shame. I may have a sense of shame that the President of the United States cannot ride safely through American streets, but there have been other moments too when I felt shameful as a member of the human race. As Mark Twain once said: "The human being is the only animal that can blush—or needs to."

All Americans do not, as has been so often and so lugubriously intoned since the said event, share in the guilt. As far as has been yet discovered, the guilt appears to rest upon one unbalanced man with whom neither I nor the overwhelming majority of the American people had or desired contact. However, much as some may wish to implicate us in the crazy action of one nut, I reject the responsibility and the guilt.

The curious part about those who are screaming loudest that all of us must share part of the blame is that by and large they are the very same people who littered the air with wild cries of opposition to what they described as "guilt by association." This was generally regarded as something bad and at all costs to be avoided, yet now suddenly through the remotest kind of guilt by association I am told that a part of me stood behind the gun in that warehouse window.

Sorry, boys, I won't play. I subscribe 100 percent to that part of the Republicans statement which said: "There is guilt. But it is not American guilt. It is the guilt of the murderer." Amen.

Opportunity at the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the captive nations of Eastern Europe are the "Achilles' heel" of communism. We should recognize this and dramatize the colonial policy of the Soviet Union.

The Washington Evening Star of yesterday, December 12, carried an article by David Lawrence on this timely subject, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

OPPORTUNITY AT THE UNITED NATIONS—TALK TUESDAY BY JOHNSON VIEWED AS CHANCE TO RAISE ITS MORAL TONE

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson has a significant opportunity to raise the moral tone of the United Nations when he addresses it next Tuesday in New York. For the U.N. has deteriorated into a political machine largely directed by Moscow with the aid of the so-called Afro-Asian bloc.

Instead of functioning as an organization dedicated to the political independence and self-determination of member states, the U.N. now actually passes resoblutions interfering with the internal affairs of certain non-Communist countries, but refuses to apply equal treatment to governments which keep their peoples enslaved as the right of self-determination is denied them.

The latest example of the political chicanery practiced by the U.N. came at a time when the peoples of the free world were absorbed in studying the news of a change in the Presidency of the United States and the after effects. It perhaps is not yet realized that the U.N. Security Council unanimously passed a few days ago a resolution calling on its members to impose an embargo on the Republic of South Africa just because that country's racial policies are considered improper. Implicit in the resolution are threats of even stronger action if South Africa fails to conform its internal policies to the U.N.'s demand.

The U.N. Charter permits resolutions to embargo arms shipments when there is a threat to international peace, but it can hardly be persuasively contended that the internal districting of Negroes and whites in separate residential areas—objectionable as it may be to many people—is by any stretch of the imagination or by any rule of international law a threat to world peace.

The role which the United States took in this strange episode—including a vote for the resolution—is defended here in the State Department as one of desirable expediency. It is conceded that the U.N. is acting in a one-sided manner, but the point is made that the United States did succeed in its effort to keep the arms-embargo resolution voluntary rather than mandatory and did succeed in preventing an oil embargo from being imposed, also.

A rule of expediency is characteristic of political behavior, though it is often un-

moral. The United States in the past has proclaimed some basic principles in giving its support to the Charter of the United Nations. But, unfortunately, principles now have been swept aside, and the faction in the U.N. which has gained by such tactics is the one that is closest to Moscow. Indeed, the whole plan for imposing an arms embargo was undoubtedly engineered by the Kremlin as a means of lining up allies for the Soviet Union among the African nations. If the U.N. is to be operated, however, on the basis of what will please the maximum number of governments, irrespective of their fidelity to principle or their concern for international law, then the value of the Organization itself in future years will steadily diminish.

The whole question is today being treated superficially in America. Many thoughtful people, for instance, have suggested that the time may have to come to consider American withdrawal from the U.N., only to be assailed as not interested in world peace. The argument is advanced that the U.N. is really a useful force for international peace and only incidentally a political tool of the Kremlin.

The U.N. record in dealing with internal questions, however, is neither consistent nor courageous. When India deliberately took over the Portuguese territory of Goa, the United Nations failed to protect Goa, though the United States denounced the takeover. Nor did the U.N. insist on sending its investigating committee into Hungary to get the facts about the Soviet military invasion of that country and the imposition of measures that suppressed the free government in Budapest.

In brief, the U.N. has been of no help in curbing Soviet colonialism, and it has acquiesced in the continued domination by the Moscow government over the captive peoples of East Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia.

Certainly the "apartheid" which the Soviet Government has established by its rule over peoples of many nationalities and races is far more a threat to international peace than the separation of millions of uncivilized tribesmen in one South African country from residence in areas where white men and women and their children happen to live.

The U.N. today, unfortunately, doesn't seem to be concerned with the sovereign rights of nations, as its charter requires. Apparently the U.N. political code means catering to the new African governments, whose naive and inexperienced leaders may some day find the U.N. intervening in their own affairs, too, just as happened in the Congo. Perhaps at that time American taxpayers will not be willing to pick up the tab for the expenses incurred in trying to maintain order as they did for the U.N. military operations in the Congo, to which the Soviet Union hasn't contributed a single ruble.

American Tass No. 2?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 22 of this year I made reference to a move by the Department of Agriculture to set up its own communications system for marketing news. Now another situation has come to my attention which indicates that the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Agriculture may be moving in a direction which represents another step in the movement of the Government into the communications field.

I include a letter which I received from the United States Independent Telephone Association at this point in my remarks, together with a resolution which was adopted by the association's board of directors on November 2 of this year:

UNITED STATES INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1963.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: Permit me to send you herewith a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of directors of our association relating to attempts being made by the Bureau of Reclamation to own and operate a communications system over a multi-state area.

The United States has the most advanced communications system to be found anywhere. It has more telephones than all the rest of the world combined. This accomplishment has been due to the constructive initiative of telephone common carriers under private enterprise. These carriers have the technical know-how and competence to provide communications services of the most efficient character at just and reasonable rates established or approved by public regulatory commissions. This is true whether services are desired by a governmental agency or a private citizen.

To our managing body it appears incongrous and paradoxical indeed that in a nation which has produced communication satellites in the sky, an agency of Government such as the Bureau of Reclamation should undertake to own and operate its own system when advanced facilities and services can be provided by the most competent communications entities in the world which stand ready to do the job.

Your serious consideration of the resolution will be greatly appreciated by this association. Ours is the national organization comprised of the 2,800 independent telephone companies of the country which provide service to 10,600 cities and towns throughout the United States including Hawaii and Alaska.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. BUTLER,
Director, Government Relations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION

Whereas various departments of the Federal Government continue to encroach upon the functions and the assigned mission of private enterprise; and

Whereas Government ownership and operation of equipment and facilities in many lines of endeavor have long been the subject of consideration and review by the executive and legislative branches of the Government, culminating in the adoption of an executive directive promulgated and published by the Bureau of the Budget in 1959 and identified as Bulletin 60-2; and

Whereas the telephone industry has not been successful in its efforts to have the Bureau of Reclamation obtain its communication services from common carrier sources rather than by Government-owned and operated telephone systems; and

Whereas it appears that the Commissioner of Reclamation has adopted a position that the Bureau of the Budget directives, such as Bulletin 60-2, are subject to administrative policy interpretations; and

Whereas a search of the Bureau of Reclamation project enabling legislation and subsequent appropriations reveals no specific authorization by Congress for the separate purchase and ownership of communication facilities, and such ownership and operation of these facilities are not an integral part of the Bureau's primary mission; and

Whereas the telephone industry has taken the position that the Bureau of Reclamation's communication service requirements can be provided through common carrier sources on a less costly basis than would be true if the Bureau owns and operates its own system, provided that fair and reasonable cost comparisons are used in the evaluation of the respective methods of obtaining the needed service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Independent Telephone Association hereby condemns and opposes the incursions of Government agencies—including but not limited to the Bureau of Reclamation—into the field of Government competition with privately owned telephone companies by using completely unrealistic cost factors; and be it further

Resolved, That all members of this association stand ready to meet the communication service requirements of the Bureau of Reclamation or any other governmental agency on such a sound and economic basis that the purchase of communication services from common carrier companies will clearly be favorable as compared to the realistic cost of Government-owned, operated and maintained communication systems, and that all members of this association oppose such Government competition in the telephone industry at every opportunity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Comptroller General, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the Governor of each State.

More About Subways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, those interested in acquainting themselves with facts relative to a subway system in the District of Columbia should look outside of the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency. That report would not disclose any of the facts which caused Mr. Owen Fitzgerald to write the following in his column, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of December 6, 1963:

ARMED GUARDS URGED ON NIGHT SUBWAY CARS

Two Brooklyn Democratic legislators popped a bill into the Albany hopper which calls for the assignment of armed guards on all subway and elevated trains in the city at night.

State Senator William Rosenblatt and Assemblyman Lawrence P. Murphy, cosponsors of the measure, admitting they were reacting to the Sunday evening's television drama which epicted the underground terror.

The lawmakers also cited the recent slaying of a Brooklyn detective by a teenage pack on an IRT subway train at the Nostrand-Flatbush Avenues terminal and the youthful band which robbed a carload of subway riders at gunpoint earlier this year.

Their proposal would amend the Rapid Transit law to require the Transit Authority

to provide uniformed guards or its own policemen aboard every train between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. on weekdays and 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

The legislators who represent the Canarsie-Brownsville areas expect to get the support of all New York City lawmakers of both parties and, perhaps, the backing of the Transport Workers Union and the TA police to bring about passage of the bill at the approaching session of the legislature.

Neither Rosenblatt and Murphy nor a spokesman for the Transit Authority had any estimate of what the proposal would cost in added subway police manpower. The TA now has 972 of its own policemen. A conservative guess would be that the extra guards would cost millions of dollars.

The agency report also ignores the facts outlined in the following article written by Edward J. Silberfarb which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of December 15, 1963.

SIXTEEN DAYS TO GO IN TRANSIT CLIFF-HANGER

(By Edward J. Silberfarb)

There are only 16 bargaining days left, but the fun has hardly begun.

The transit authority and the Transport Workers Union are no closer to settling their chief difference—a question of more pay for fewer hours—than they were last July when Michael J. Quill first revealed his union's demands.

Tomorrow, both sides meet with Mayor Wagner's transit labor board—David Cole, George W. Taylor, and Theodore W. Kheel. The mediators were impaneled to help avert the 11th-hour crisis that has been as common to the transit labor scenario as the cliff-hanging scene in a Saturday matinee serial.

The three-man team managed 2 years ago to coax an agreement out of the union and the transit authority 4 days before the New Year strike deadline, only to find the Fifth Avenue Coach Lines too short of funds to follow the pattern. And so the private company was struck, but the subways and city-owned buses kept rolling.

This year, with the city having seized the Fifth Avenue Coach properties, the TA settlement will cover all bus lines in the city (and subways, of course), except for four small private bus companies in Queens and one in Manhattan.

Actually, the biennial cliff-hanger climax that seems to outrage the public is not unique to transit labor negotiations. It's common to collective bargaining in every industry, and for good tactical reasons.

When contract talks begin, union demands are traditionally at dizzy heights while management offers are nonexistent. Compromise is inevitable.

But if the union chief yields too early, he will not be able to sell the agreement to his members. "We could have held out for more," they'll say.

If management yields too early, the stockholders, or in this case, the public, will say, "You could have held out for less." With a last-minute settlement, both leaders can shrug and say the inevitable was upon them.

This is not to say the transit negotiators have been idle. Subcommittees have been hard at work trying to hammer out agreement on the dozens of demands and counter-demands in the area of work rules and working conditions. Various TA superintendents, like Christopher Marschhauser, head of employee services, and union officials like Daniel Gilmartin, president of Local 100, and Ellis Van Riper, secretary-treasurer, have been grappling with these issues.

The union has submitted a total of 57 demands and the TA has countered with 27 economy measures.

And at the summit, Mr. Quill, TWU international president, and the three TA members, Chairman Joseph E. O'Grady, Daniel T. Scannell, and John J. Gilhooley, have been going through the motions of meeting and reporting "no progress."

But these are preliminaries, of course. The main event is yet to come. That's when Mr. Quill and his traditional opponent, Mr. O'Grady, come to grips over the cost of a wage-and-hour package.

The union now says it wants a 15-percent pay increase and a 4-day, 32-hour workweek. The authority has put no money on the table, and says the shorter week is out of the question.

Cost of the union demands has been put at $165 million by the union and as high as $500 million by the authority.

The price tag of the settlement 2 years ago was $36 million. A package in that price range can be expected again this year, though it could run higher if Mr. Quill remains adamant on some sort of workweek reduction. Many observers think he will.

Whatever the contract, the transit authority won't have enough to pay for it. Unless help comes from somewhere, the fare will rise. Controller Abraham D. Beame has called for a grant of some $13.2 million in State aid—the sum the city and the State give commuter railroads in tax foregiveness.

Mayor Wagner's message last week to Governor Rockefeller on the city's fiscal needs made no mention of transit. The reason is simple. Such a plea would affect the negotiations. Mr. Quill is always alert to the prospect of fresh money.

Nevertheless, Mr. Beame said he will push the matter, if not now, when the legislature convenes next month. By then, presumably, a labor contract will have been signed.

There are other possibilities.

Under current law, the transit authority must pay operating expenses out of revenue, while the city pays capital costs. The city might push for a change in the law to allow a subsidy of operating expenses, or for a law to increase the authority's borrowing power. The TA by special legislation last year was allowed to issue $90 million in revenue bonds to buy new subway cars.

Whatever the outcome, one thing seems sure. The last week of December will be a turbulent one.

Mr. Quill will huff and puff. The 28,000 TA employees he represents will shout, "No contract, no work." And the transit authority will scatter some crumbs before pulling its final offering out of the feedbag.

A strike that could paralyze the city's mass transportation system seems remote, but with transit funds as scarce as they are this year, even that could happen.

From a Glass House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the disturbing performance of our State Department becomes more visible to the naked eye as we note recent complications that are developing not only in Latin America and Africa but also among our Asia allies. This morning's Chicago Tribune has a fair and serious analysis of this disturbing chain of events, which I insert into the RECORD at this point.

FROM A GLASS HOUSE

Inasmuch as the United States has repeatedly played host to top Soviet officials, from Nikita Khrushchev on down, not to mention second-stringers such as Yugoslavia's Tito, it is hard to understand the State Department's indignation at Pakistan for inviting Chinese Communist leaders to pay a friendly visit.

Such a visit would be unfortunate, according to the Department, because Pakistan is "a country allied with us against Communist aggressive claims."

We don't love the men from Peiping any more than the State Department does. But in spite of their pugnacious disposition, they have very litle to shake at us but their pigtails. It will be years before they can pose much of a military and economic threat to us. It doesn't make sense to warn our friends away from one set of international thugs while we entertain other Communists who already possess a sizable nuclear arsenal, who are actively trying to "bury" us economically, and who, despite soothing talk of coexistence have neither renounced the basic Marxian goal of world domination nor done anything to stop their puppet, Castro, from trying to export chaos and revolution to the rest of Latin America.

As for our alliance with Pakistan, the Pakistanis have already accused us of disregarding it. They, too, thought we were allies, they say; they even gave a horse to Mrs. Kennedy as a token of friendship. In return, they charge, we have showered economic and now military aid on their own enemy, Prime Minister Nehru of India, who rarely spoke well of the West until he found his country invaded by Red China.

Pakistan's reaction—a border treaty with Red China, airline concessions, and now a social invitation—is no more sensible than other aspects of this picture. But who is the State Department to throw stones?

Your Money's Worth—Answer to Automation Seen in Adult Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on December 12, 1963, by that well-known and very able columnist, Sylvia Porter, may be of interest to Members of Congress—particularly since the House Membership toiled until fairly late the previous night to consider the conference report on H.R. 8720, the bill amending the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—ANSWER TO AUTOMATION SEEN IN ADULT EDUCATION

(By Sylvia Porter)

"Picture the event in 1994: The doorbell rings. No—the electronic impulse arbitron in the leisure room vibrates and flashes on the all-purpose screen the bulky image of the third-degree robot officer. Third-degree robotoffs call in person for two kinds of violators only: Scofflaws who hang their hovercraft too close to TV aerials (difficult to avoid because they are invisible); or for those who, ignoring the hourly subliminal warnings, have not pressed their TV school buttons for 3 days running.

"Secunda, gum-chewing 12-year-old daughter of the house, goes to the door to argue. 'And I've done all my homework for the next year, too.'

"Metallically but clearly, the truant officer (for it is none other than he) says, 'but I am here for your mother.'"

With this imaginative introduction, Milton R. Stern, an assistant dean at New York University, submits his solution to the growing problem of leisure time in the United States—cradle-to-grave classes.

As certain as automation, says he, is adult education for everybody and he even suggests seriously that cradle-to-grave classes "may soon become compulsory."

EXPLOSIVE PROBLEM

That automation is creating an explosive problem of nonwork in this country is undeniable. The U.S. Government estimates rising output per man-hour, due to automation, is now eliminating a minimum of 200,000 factory jobs a year.

A leading manufacturer of automation equipment, John L. Snyder, Jr., of United States Industries, Inc., says flatly this is "a gross underestimate of the real situation." My Snyder declares automation is eliminating 2 million jobs a year not only through direct displacement of workers but also through the "silent firings" of workers who would have been employed had their jobs not been wiped out.

This, of course, is the great force behind the accelerated drive for a shorter workweek. Union leaders openly admit they are fighting for shorter hours than their members really want.

This is the key reason for the development of the extended vacation, dramatized by the 13-week sabbatical recently initiated in the steel and can industries and certain to spread in coming years.

This has always been the factor behind featherbedding which is work in name only.

At the same time, as reported yesterday, nonwork population is up to 7.3 million, triple the total in 1949, and this group receives $100 billion a year, or one-fifth of our entire personal income.

CURSE OF MILLIONS

In the past, only the wealthy have had the burden of too much leisure and too few interests to enjoy the leisure. Now it's becoming the curse of millions who have been accustomed to filling most of their days with time-consuming tasks and who are utterly unprepared for nonwork.

Since extended leisure time is inevitable, what's the answer? It's not more golf, more gardening, more fishing, bowling or TV watching. These pleasures can become tortures if there is little else.

The answer is a step-up in education of the American adult, as well as the young, to prepare all of us to reach a higher plateau of literacy in every sphere—economic, political, social, cultural.

The stage already is being set for this. Closed-circuit TV in the classroom suggests what is to come. The voluntary return to classes of adults across the Nation to learn new aptitudes and hobbies indicates how far we have moved from the popular image of night school. The campaigns launched by farsighted union, business and community leaders to spur adult education during vacation and off hours telegraph what is on the way.

The dimensions of our future adult education cannot be guessed, but this is sure: We are a remarkably ignorant people and we have a long, long way to go before we can claim otherwise.

One reason Mr. Stern's seemingly eccentric prophecy impresses me is that subconsciouly I came to do it for myself long ago. Whenever I've been asked what I'll do when I get off this rat race of a daily column, my immediate answer has been:

"I'm going back to school to learn and to teach." I've already arrived where Mr. Stern says our country is heading.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

President Kennedy: A Good Boy Scout and a Man of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, never could it be more truly said than of our late President: He has captured the imagination of our youth. And so it is as testimonials of love, of reverence and respect for John Fitzgerald Kennedy pour into our office from our younger generation.

Two of these testimonials in particular I would like to insert in the RECORD, as they represent some of the finest sentiments from youth ever expressed.

The first inclusion comprises the opening remarks of a Boy Scout troop, which identifies itself with the late President, as he himself was a Boy Scout once. These remarks were followed by 1 minute of silence at an opening ceremony of a meeting of Cub Pack 43, sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Hoboken, N.J.

The second inclusion is a poem written by a West New York, N.J., eighth-grader, Frank Leanzer.

John F. Kennedy was the first Boy Scout ever to become President of the United States of America. Like you, John F. Kennedy was a boy, loved fun, games, and activity. Like you, he raised his hand in the Scout oath and law, not so important that he became President of our Nation, as that, when he became a man he never stopped living by that code. Each point of the law was exemplified in his life, each phrase of the oath he followed in his daily life, he was an example to each of us, not so important what we become, but how we live whatever we become, tomorrow and next day and next week, and beyond. May each of us live the oath and law as to fulfill and bring to the world that for which President Kennedy gave his life, ours is the responsibility to build on the heritage which is ours.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Frank Leanza)

That October we were on the brink,
Would the Ship of Liberty sink?

In Cuba were the missiles and IL-38's,
In the hands of J.F.K. lay our fates.

Like a block of granite he stood his ground,
Then Russian ships turned 'round.

There followed a relieving sigh,
For the moment danger had passed by.

He risked his popularity,
So in the South all could be free.

In Birmingham and in Albany,
He did his best so all would be free.

He said: "All equal, all the same,"
The segregationists he put to shame.

James Meredith was a boy who wanted an education,
Getting it was filled with many a trial and tribulation.

So on the campus of Ole Miss a battle was fought,
For in America, liberty is always sought.

Now he is dead,
So let it be said:

He was great, he was grand,
He was the best in the land.

His spirit and ideals shall live on and be infinite,
He asked not what he could do for his country,
He did it.

Dr. Ben Hilbun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, death recently removed from life's active stream, a lifelong associate classmate and friend of mine, Dr. Ben Hilbun, president emeritus of Mississippi State University.

Dr. Hilbun was a man who possessed all the finer patriotic sentiments. He was a man who devoted his life to public service. He literally devoted all of his adult life—with the exception of 2 years immediately following his graduation—to Mississippi State University, where he rose to the presidency of the institution and served as such for many years.

I know that his heart did beat with the interest of serving humanity.

Two editorials, paying tribute to Dr. Hilbun, and reflecting the sentiment of the people of Mississippi and surrounding area, are attached. One entitled "A Gentleman and Educator," is from the Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss., December 14, 1963, and the other, entitled "Dr. Ben Hilbun," is from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., December 15, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that they both be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Dec. 14, 1963]

A GENTLEMAN AND EDUCATOR

Mississippi has lost a fine gentleman and a beloved champion of progressive education in the sudden death of Ben F. Hilbun, president emeritus of Mississippi State University.

The unexpected passing has left a great gap in the ranks of farsighted educators who meant so much to this State's institutions of higher learning.

He was a most eloquent yet modest leader in his field and had served on the State research commission since 1960, plying his way along a long road of experience and hard work.

Dr. Hilbun was known for his tolerance and patient understanding and devoted his life to humble kindness to his fellow man, unchanged by personal successes.

He truly devoted a lifetime of unbroken service to others, possessing the admiration and respect of high State leaders in every field of life.

His unswerving ideals in the field of education conformed with the thinking of the Founding Fathers and ideals and principles that have made this country the great, knowledgeable nation it stands for today.

Many of his activities included service as commander of the American Legion, master of his Masonic lodge, president of his Rotary Club, president of the Southern Association of College Publicity Directors and president of the Mississippi Registrars Association.

He found time from his varied duties to write many articles for magazines and newspapers and shared in securing for Mississippi many projects of worth, including the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Tatum Salt Dome project.

Dr. Hilbun came from Cracker's Neck as a barefoot boy, having farmed his early years in the family's cornpatch to improve his annual corn crop through use of the best and biggest ears or seed.

Not many years later, Dr. Hilbun was one of eight people in the United States to receive an Alumni Achievement Award from the National 4-H Club.

He was no less devoted to his church, serving many times from the pulpit and as a Sunday school teacher.

Mr. Ben, as he was known by many Mississippi students, will long occupy a warm place in Mississippi's memory.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Dec. 15, 1963]

DR. BEN HILBUN

In the death of Dr. Benjamin Franklin Hilbun, Mississippi in particular and the mid-South in general have lost a citizen of sterling worth. While he was interested, active, and useful in a wide variety of undertakings, his primary and compelling concern was Mississippi State University. He was president emeritus when he died and had served the institution in various capacities with fidelity and ability before he became its head.

Dr. Hilbun's distinguished career was an outstanding example of what a man may do when ability and enthusiasm are coupled with strong determination. He worked unceasingly for the causes that attracted his loyalty. His tenacity enabled him to establish a record of long continuity in accomplishment. Dr. Hilbun's talents included writing of excellent clarity and for many years he was a valued correspondent of the Commercial Appeal. He left a monument of solid achievement.

The Aid Slash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of December 16, 1963:

THE AID SLASH

Despite the official and editorial hand wringing that greeted it, there is only one sense in which the House Appropriations Committee's foreign aid slash seems likely to do violence to the national interest. If this additional cut of $800 million forces us to renege on commitments we have given and on which others have relied, then it must be said to have gone too far. Funds for international organizations and development loans indeed appear, as President Johnson suggests, to have been effectively pledged. A decision to withhold them, therefore, involves a question of honor.

What we have undertaken, we must fulfill. We should not, as a nation, back out of our deals, even though those deals were subject from the beginning to the vagaries of continuing congressional approval.

With this qualification, however, it is hard to agonize over what has happened to foreign aid.

It is, of course, very easy, and handy, for the spenders to blame everything on Representative PASSMAN. But the plain fact is that this action faithfully reflects the national mood. Americans everywhere are weary of an exercise in international philanthropy which they instinctively feel does not meet the needs of the day.

It is easy, too, to argue that we are setting a bad example to other nations which ought to be helping us with the foreign aid burden. But the fact is that we are the only people in the world showing any real interest in the idea of buying progress for others. Do our European allies hold back out of simple miserliness? Or is that, in their sophistication, they know what the American taxpayer senses in his frustration—that the present foreign aid effort is not attuned to present reality?

We are not talking here about military assistance; that is another matter. The issue is economic assistance. This sort of aid, to put it plainly if unattractively, is based on the idea that their need for development—for catching quickly up to the 20th century—will force the emerging countries into some form of totalitarianism, probably communism, unless we help. The hope is that if we underwrite their key programs with dollars, we can help lure these people into our way of life.

We have found, however, that our way of life simply cannot be secured by this sort of operation. This should come as no surprise. It is, of course, a recognized principle of the psychology of individuals that the act of accepting financial help virtually compels the recipient to assert his independence by rejecting the donor's influence. Why should we expect it to be any different among nations? We end up being told that we cannot put normal pressure in our own interest on a country we have helped, because if we do it will be thought we are trying to take advantage of our good deed. Our aid becomes a stick with which we ourselves are beaten.

In the aftermath of World War II, the massive American effort to get Europe back on its economic feet made sense—even though a reborn Europe now may reject us. It made sense because it worked. Europe is now strong and free, and this is what we wanted.

The later extension of this aid effort to other areas and different types of problems offered many theoretical attractions. But it has not worked. It is not contributing measurably to anyone's strength and freedom.

The intricate process of disengaging ourselves from the foreign aid program is bound to continue.

Flaxseed and Farm Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from South Dakota, the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, one of the most knowledgeable men in agriculture in Congress, gave an address in Fargo, N. Dak., last November 15. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent commentary, before the Flax Institute of the United States be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAXSEED AND FARM POLICIES

(Address by the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senator from South Dakota)

It is indeed a pleasure to attend your 33d Annual Flax Institute. It is always good to be in the Dakotas at this time of the year—right after a bountiful harvest.

It is gratifying to see farmers, government, and industry meet together to encourage better agronomic practices and production of flaxseed—a crop which in my opinion offers promise of an expanding market for our farmers.

I am especially gratified to have this opportunity to speak to you because I have been told that while industry and government would be well represented, this audience would be mostly farmers who produce flaxseed. It is obvious that the welfare of this great industry is dependent upon adequate domestic farm production and availability of flaxseed. We need proper government legislation and policies to assure this adequate production and availability.

Since statistics and technical subjects are covered in other presentations, my comments today are addressed primarily to the general items of legislation and policy. My comments are based both upon experience as a legislator and as Food for Peace Director.

First, however, I would like in a truly bipartisan manner to second some remarks made by my senior colleague, Senator MUNDT, at another Flax Institute held here in Fargo a few years back. We invite you to meet in South Dakota. We hope our flaxseed production will expand and that you will see fit to meet in one of our fine cities. You will be welcome, I assure you.

Now on a more partisan basis—you all must be well aware that our present administration has twice increased the price support for flaxseed. Among other reasons this was done to encourage and insofar as possible assure production adequate to meet domestic needs for linseed oil and for linseed meal.

These increased support prices were recommended by the Flax Institute in resolutions adopted in 1959. Those of you who produce flaxseed should know that flaxseed processors also recommended the increases made so far. In fact the processors recommended a higher support price for the 1961 crop than the price finally announced by USDA.

I can tell you, too, that the higher price support and other actions to assure adequate supplies of flaxseed and products have had full congressional support from both parties.

Coupled with higher supports, the present administration in the Department of Agriculture revised its flaxseed policy to hold any stocks acquired under the loan program until it is evident that production from the new crop is adequate. This is a continuing policy and has been so confirmed to users of linseed oil. These steps have been effective—flaxseed production has been adequate and the long downward trend in linseed oil consumption has now been arrested. In fact it has turned up and we confidently expect the increase to continue.

While farm program policy to assure linseed oil consumers of a continuing domestic supply has been an important factor, other things have contributed to this desirable development. Research programs by Government and industry have developed some new uses for linseed oil. These research programs are expected to develop other new uses. Two major items so far are the use of linseed oil to protect concrete from winter damage and water-thinned linseed oil house paints.

Flaxseed processors, through the National Flaxseed Processors Association, have spent many thousands of dollars promoting the use of linseed antispalling compound for concrete protection. The association has a large-scale national advertising campaign underway to begin next spring to promote the use of linseed oil house paint.

As you know, such promotion efforts benefit both processors and farmers. It is good to note that research and promotion not only continue, but are expanding. The flaxseed industry is to be complimented on fighting back with hope against the synthetic nonfarm products which have taken over so much of the linseed oil market since World War II. Producers might well consider contributing to the research and promotional programs which obviously benefit both farmers and industry.

In assuring supplies of flaxseed by holding inventories until the new crop is available, CCC has this year come in for some criticism for selling its stock for export while the new crop is being marketed. To those offering such criticism I would suggest only that they note that world market prices have been below the domestic price and that they carefully weigh the alternatives. If CCC sells flax ahead of the new crop, the market impact is about the same and if a shortage results it may seriously jeopardize the continued expansion of this farm market. Shortages in the past are the reason consumers sought for and found nonfarm substitutes for linseed oil. If CCC waits until after harvest and marketing is completed, the additional storage charges add to the cost of our farm programs. There are disadvantages either way.

To CCC I would suggest exploring whether a substantial portion of any flaxseed acquisitions can be marketed through some arrangement which would permit processors to export the surplus in the form of oil around the year. This would make more needed linseed meal available to our farmer feeders here in the Northwest and use normal trade channels.

Now for some general comments on the farm situation.

In thinking about our modern miracle called agriculture, I believe it essential to point out that all Americans—all the world—should extend more recognition to the contributions of U.S. agriculture. Our outstanding farm production record is a reflection of

agriculture's continuance as a dominant force in or economic development. In the past 10 years the average annual increase in output per man-hour on farms was three times the rate of increase in nonfarm activities. One American farmer now produces enough food for 27 people, whereas only 20 years ago he produced only enough for 11.

This productivity has meant much to the economy of the United States. The American consumer has been provided with more and better food at lower cost than others have ever enjoyed. It has given us an opportunity to export tremendous quantities of food and fiber both for dollars and under the food-for-peace program.

At the same time production has been increasing, employment in the agricultural labor force has declined rather sharply, and this has meant that sufficient workers to account for one-fourth of the growth in civilian nonagricultural employment have been released farmworkers. Not only did farm output increase by one-third in the 1947–61 period, but meat, animal and other livestock products went up by about the same amount. There has been a dramatic increase in the per capita consumption of meat of about 17 percent, or 30 pounds. Meanwhile, per capita production and consumption of frozen fruits and vegetables have multiplied by three during the last 15 years.

In the midst of this tremendous improvement in the quantity and quality of U.S. food consumption, we have been witness to a sharp increase in export of food and fiber.

While diets were being upgraded, expenditures for food and fiber have dropped from 27 percent of consumers' disposable income in 1947 to only 19 percent in 1963. This percentage is the lowest on record and the lowest in the world relative to the earnings of consumers. Thus, we must agree that by any standards, the American farmer has done his job well, not only for the American economy, but also for the entire world.

I think that we do not take the time often enough to count the blessings which have accrued to this Nation from the outstanding production record of the best farmers in the world—the 8 percent of our population who make this abundance possible.

During the period when I was fortunate enough to serve as the Director of Food for Peace, I was most impressed by the single basic fact that it was our farmers' productive ability that made the entire U.S. foreign assistance effort possible in the food field. Let me cite a few basic facts to convey to you the magnitude of the work which made possible the food-for-peace program.

Witness the following:

1. In the 9 years that the food-for-peace program has been in existence, we have been able to ship overseas a grand total of almost $13 billion worth of food. During that same period dollar sales amounted to $26 billion.

2. Our food donations are providing supplemental feeding for 100 million undernourished people. Three-fourths of all the commodities are now programed for children through organized school lunch efforts, through other nutritional feeding, and through family feeding plans in which the parents may participate by exchanging work for food.

3. One of the food-for-peace programs which has given me the greatest pleasure has been the fact that school lunch programs have now been extended to 40 million children in 91 countries. This program is growing every day. This food-for-peace school lunch in many areas of the world is the only square meal that the child gets all day. It may amaze you to know that many children have been encouraged to go to school just to get that one meal. Educators in the affected areas have told me that the learning capacity of many, many children has been increased tremendously.

4. We initiated a program under which we used food for wages. We used the food to pay for the building of roads and schools, the establishment of irrigation systems, the construction of homes and public buildings, and the settlement of new areas. Here we have a program under which the workers get fod that is needed to feed their families at the same time that they work to better their communities.

5. American foods are being used to provide a stabilizing catalyst in many new emerging nations which are attempting to grow within a democratic format. Food prevents riots and violent revolution.

6. As economic conditions permit, food-for-peace nations graduate to dollar markets. Witness Japan which has become the largest single purchaser of American farm products, and which not many years ago was a beneficiary of the food-for-peace program. Spain has become a $70 million a year cash market for U.S. farm products. Market development funds generated under Public Law 480 were used to build this demand.

I believe that fundamentally when the history of the 20th century is written that the development and the expansion of the food-for-peace program will be looked upon as one of the most constructive steps ever undertaken by any nation. At the same time we must recognize that in the absence of our farmers' abundant productivity this could not have been possible.

Wheat has played the largest commodity role in the food-for-peace program. I think it is especially dramatic that since July 1, 1954, exports under Public Law 480 have been made amounting to almost 3 billion bushels of wheat. This represents 63 percent of our total wheat exports during this period. It would be well to stop for a moment and think about the internal explosion which would have occurred in U.S. agriculture if these markets had not been made available. Certainly, we must all agree with President Kennedy when in addressing the 1963 World Food Congress he stated, "We are grateful for the opportunity our agricultural abundance offers us to share our food resources."

Recently, the President announced what I consider a wise decision—the agreement to sell wheat and flour and other commodities to the Soviet Union. While this decision was bound to stir some controversy, I am sure that it was right.

We had a situation under which every other exporting nation was selling wheat to the Soviets. We had a situation under which several friendly Western European nations were importing wheat from us and selling flour to the Soviets. We had a situation where the Russians were willing to buy the wheat and flour at world prices for gold or dollars. We had a situation where we were already selling them small amounts of food at world prices. We had a situation—and still have it—where we were paying 26 cents per bushel per annum in storage, handling, and interest charges to store the surplus. We had a situation where such increased demand generated by the Russian purchase would add hundreds of millions of dollars to the plus side of our balance of payments. We had a situation under which we could take advantage of an opportunity to improve farm prices and income. We had a situation under which we could show the Russian people the miracle of U.S. agriculture, and use it as a force for peace. We had a situation in which we had a moral obligation to feed those in need. We had a situation in which we could advance the cause of peace by sharing our abundance of a noncritical commodity.

There is an argument presented, and it is made conscientiously, that we are subsidizing the Soviets because they can buy at the world price. Those of us who understand farm programs realize quickly that the subsidy is to the U.S. farmer, not the exporter (as a national magazine incorrectly stated recently) nor the importing nation. Such subsidized sales are made to other nations every working day.

The Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc nations may be buyers of grain and other commodities in the future. Their agriculture has not achieved anything approaching the efficiency of ours. In good years, they have barely enough. In bad years, they will need to import, probably for a number of years.

As you know, farmers voted in May in a wheat referendum affecting the 1964 crop. Although the Dakotas voted favorably by almost 2 to 1, the wheat certificate program failed to carry. In July, I introduced a voluntary wheat certificate plan for 1964.

Fundamentally, I feel that our wheat growers deserve better of the Congress than inaction. I think that farmers really did not vote to have no program at all, but for a different program.

From my mail and other indicators, I believe farmers support the voluntary certificate plan. I also find support for permitting use of diverted acres for the production of flaxseed and other needed oilseeds. Payments would be reduced on such authorized usage with savings to the U.S. Treasury. I prefer a constructive use of the land. To the extent that diverted acres can be used for needed flaxseed or other oil crops, or as pasture, without creating surplus, or lower price problems, I think it should be allowed.

I am not wed to a certificate program. I will support a better program if one is offered. But I am sure farmers want—and Congress should enact—a constructive wheat program before the price of wheat is allowed to drop from a level based on its food value to a level based on its value as feed .

Even though wheat exports this year will set a new record, the U.S. stocks will remain large. And, our surplus productive capacity is even larger.

Flaxseed offers an opportunity to utilize some of this surplus productive capacity for a crop which has an expanding market for domestic use. Surplus flax, as history demonstrates, can be moved into export channels with nominal losses, if any. I want to assure you all that I shall do everything within my power to see that future legislation and policies encourage domestic production of flaxseed and utilization of linseed oil and meal to meet these expanding requirements.

Atomic Power and Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to those of us who have closely followed the development of civilian atomic power, the events and progress of the past several years are a great source of satisfaction. We are enthusiastic over the important strides that have been made in bringing a third great source of energy to the American people.

The experience we have gained over the past decade in the design, construction, and operation of civilian nuclear powerplants is invaluable. This has been a 10-year period of proud achievement for the national atomic energy program.

There are, however, proponents of non-nuclear energy sources who, perhaps because of its accomplishments, are at-

tacking this country's civilian atomic power program. They cite public safety and unfair subsidy as the key issues.

I wish to commend Dr. Chauncey Starr, president of Atomics International Division, North American Aviation, for a fine address on civilian atomic power made on November 20 before the winter meeting of the American Nuclear Society in New York City. I would like to include in the RECORD the following portions of Dr. Starr's address:

ATOMIC POWER AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Address by Dr. Chauncey Starr)

The first charter of the atomic energy industry, the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, had as a principal objective the improvement of the public welfare. All subsequent modifications of the act have reiterated this goal and have emphasized public health and safety. Because of the awesome nature of the birth of atomic energy, everyone associated with the application of this new technology for peaceful purposes has been acutely aware of this.

Atomic scientists and engineers, in spite of our critics, are members of the community of man, and have a personal as well as professional concern with the public interest. For two decades we have had detailed technical consideration of these problems, much professional debate, followed by positive action and the establishment by the Government of extremely rigorous criteria of nuclear safety.

The users of atomic powerplants, our electric utilities, have of course the most to gain by attention to the public interest. First and foremost, the public is the customer for electric power. Secondly, the requirement that the utilities provide maximum service to their customers certainly includes consideration of the effect of their operations on public health. And finally, the utilities have every motivation, economic and otherwise, to render the best service consistent with public health and safety.

The technological approach taken by the atomic power industry has been the most cautious in engineering history. It has been heretofore customary, in other new technologies, to proceed with application first, safety being secondary, and then to await an empirical balance between safety constraints and social value. I need only call your attention to the history of the automobile, air transport, and of most recent public concern, the use of insecticides. The novel approach of the atomic industry in attempting to establish public safety prior to the construction and operation of atomic powerplants is a direct consequence of the fact that we have placed the public interest as our principal objective, rather than the immediate economic gain of a few. We have assumed as an industry that long term economic gains would follow demonstrated social value.

Why then do we find ourselves presently in the arena of public debate and the target of attack on a subject which is technically sophisticated? There are several reasons. The great international controversy on the testing of atomic weapons and their consequent fallout, and the exaggerations of the scare literature associated with this isuse, have created a large body of "nuclear hypochondriacs." In addition, the vacillation of self-nominated science-statesmen in their mixing of fact, value judgments, and policy has created a public "crisis of confidence" in the reliability of technical experts generally. The result has been a disquieting undercurrent of fear, an irrational anxiety, on the part of an inadequately informed public.

The very success of the atomic industry in developing nuclear reactors has been a further cause for public debate on this issue. The utilities, by displaying active interest in atomic power, have aroused the concern of a fearful segment of the public already sensitized to the proliferation of atomic devices in any form. Mr. David Lilienthal, as a most prestigious representatives of this uninformed but sincere group, has forcibly stated this concern.

Most surprising to me is the violent participation in this attack on the part of the National Coal Association, in what must be a futile attempt to halt the growth of atomic power. All energy studies have shown that the advent of atomic power can make only a partial encroachment into the growing demand for fossil fuel for many decades to come. It would appear that the immediate problem of the shrinking market for coal arises from competition with oil and gas, rather than atomic power. If I may presume to advise the coal industry, in the words of Aesop, "beware lest you lose the substance by grasping at the shadow."

By employing the irresponsible techniques of the fear merchants to use public apprehensions to further their own parochial interests, the coal industry has impugned the good judgment of their very best customers, the utility industry, and the largest user of coal-produced electricity, the Atomic Energy Commission. It has also chosen to overlook the problems of public health and safety which they themselves have created. * * *

In his recent spate of writings, Lilienthal has made many charges and criticisms covering the whole domain of public policy in atomic energy. In these wide ranging comments, he has raised two worthy points of significance to the public interest. I will confine my remarks to these.

The public issue can be summarized in one question: if atomic power is only "just as good," then "why take a chance?" Lilienthal's answer to this question has been "let us not take a chance." Although he has readily admitted to his lack of technical knowledge and, according to his own statement, has not kept abreast of developments since leaving the Commission, nevertheless the fact that he was the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1946 to 1950 lends public prestige to his position. It must of course be remembered that during his tenure atomic power for peaceful purposes was hardly more than a paper program. Therefore, Lilienthal's answer cannot be considered as based upon a competent analysis of the present condition.

First, let us examine the statement "just as good." I do not believe that with this audience I need dwell on the virtues of developing low cost electric power. Every sociological study has shown the strong correlation between standard of living and availability of low cost electrical energy. Our utilities have, therefore, been dedicated to providing an abundance of electric power at minimum cost. They are also most competent to judge the economics of competitive sources of power. In their pursuit of these objectives, they have now decided that there are specific areas of the country and specific conditions which can best be met by the construction of atomic powerplants. Such a conclusion can be reached only because atomic power is better than fossil fuel power in these areas.

Further, many of us in the atomic power industry who have observed the trend of past technical developments and who have knowledge of present research programs know that the rate of cost reduction in atomic power generation will continue for some time. Thus, in those areas of the country where fossil fuel costs are high, atomic power will gradually play a bigger role, not because it is "just as good" but because it is "better than."

With the utility market substantiating the position that atomic powerplants are not only just as good in many areas now, but also will be better than fossil fuel plants in the future, we are still left with the question, "Why take a chance?" This, I believe, is the most significant question to the general public.

In order to discuss this subject in any rational way, it is necessary that we establish a measure of the danger to public health from atomic powerplants. Although I recognize the difficulties in developing a rational approach to public safety in any area, whether it be cigarette smoking, the use of insecticides, or driving, I believe it essential that we in the atomic power industry make an attempt to establish some comparative basis for a public evaluation of the risks which are created by alternative power sources.

The traditional professional approach of the atomic industry in studying the safety of nuclear reactors has been to accept a recognized maximum permissible radiation dose for public exposure. The designer is satisfied if his analysis indicates that under hypothetical, adverse, conditions the public exposure would not exceed this dosage.

I believe that this traditional design approach of our industry is not adequate for the public. It implies a personal value judgment by the industry as to what level of risk the public should take—a judgment which the industry does not have the authority to make. In addition, I further believe that the question as generally asked by the layman, "Why take a chance?" can have only one acceptable answer—namely, that the alternative means of providing electric power, other than atomic power, may involve equal or greater hazard to the public.

If we cannot establish that atomic power is as safe or safer than alternative sources of meeting electric power needs, then we cannot expect public acceptance of this new energy source.

It therefore becomes of paramount importance that we examine the effect on the public health of the alternative of using fossil fuel for the generation of electric power. In attempting this analysis, the hazard to employees of the industry should be considered separately because they voluntarily accept risks as part of their day's work, unlike the population at large. It is worthy of note that the records of the National Safety Council show the coal mining industry to have the highest rate of disabling injuries per man-hour of any industry in the United States. In contrast, the atomic power industry is one of the safest in the country.

Confining our attention, however, to the public health aspect of the population at large, we are faced with the difficult task of evaluating the hazard from the discharge of the noxious byproducts resulting from the burning of fossil fuel, such as sulfur dioxide, nitric oxide, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, particulate matter, etc.

In order to convince the public that atomic powerplants are safe, we have made much of the fact that routine exposure of the public to radiation from a nuclear plant is very much less than the exposure from natural background. For example, here in New York City the annual whole body radiation which the individual receives from all unavoidable natural radioactivity is several hundred times greater than the exposure which would result from his living adjacent to a nuclear power station. Another way of illustrating this point is that the total exposure of a lifetime spent next to a nuclear plant would statistically result in a reduction of longevity of a fraction of a day, the same effect as smoking one or two packages of cigarettes in a lifetime. We have emphasized the point that an atomic powerplant is a "clean air" plant.

Today we have accumulated about 1,500 reactor years of experience. In addition, we have had specific core meltdowns of reactor fuel elements. In none of these events has more than 5 percent of the fission products

been released from the fuel elements, and only a fraction of this leaked into the buildings. Further, our actual experience in handling the release of radioactivity into reactor buildings has given us a much greater confidence in the adequacy of containment. I believe that the estimates of the experts today on the probability of the release to the public of significant radioactivity from a U.S. atomic powerplant would certainly be at the very low probability end of the judgments made in 1957; i.e., one in a billion reactor operating years.

The issue has been raised publicly as to why if the atomic power industry is so confident of the safety of nuclear plants there was and continues to be a desire for Government indemnity against public liability as provided by the Price-Anderson Act. The answer to this question is a simple one to the insurance experts but perhaps a subtle one to the layman. First, I believe anyone can comprehend that a private corporation, because of its limited assets, needs to protect itself against any single calamity which might wipe out those assets. The fact that such a calamity might have an extremely small possibility of occurring does not preclude the desirability for protection. For this reason, both the electric utilities and their suppliers have sought insurance protection in the nuclear area. Recognizing early the necessity for such coverage, private insurance companies were faced with a dilemma; namely, that while they felt it was their responsibility to provide such coverage as a normal practice, they did not have the usual statistical basis for determining the appropriate cost and limit of insurance coverage.

As I have indicated earlier in this talk, the traditional approach to public health in a new industry is the early establishment of a balance between actual experience and social acceptability. The insurance industry normally utilizes a process of actuarial determination of statistical performance to determine its economic approach to insurance coverage. In any field where the actuarial data does not exist, the normal functioning of private insurance companies becomes financially hazardous. Under such circumstances, when the furthering of a national interest would be inhibited by the absence of insurance coverage, the Government has traditionally stepped in to provide such coverage.

In this regard, the fossil fuel industry has had an advantage because the relationship between the air pollutants which fossil fuels produce and public health has not been as openly discussed as the hazards of radioactivity, nor are the sources of air pollution as easily traced. However, the cause and effect relationships between public health and radioactivity are no more certain than those of air pollution.

Great issue has been made of the hazards of handling and disposing of radioactive byproducts from atomic power operation. I believe that there is no one in the industry who doesn't realize the necessity for careful monitoring, handling, and disposition of these materials. However, our complete confidence in being able to handle these materials apparently has created an incorrect public impression of industry indifference.

The whole debate has been highly illogical. For example, there is enough insecticide produced to kill the population of the world many times over. However, there appears to be so little concern about this matter, that our children can walk into any market and purchase enough insecticide to kill themselves and their families. Our chemical industry produces sufficient poisonous materials to destroy our whole population. And yet, insecticides and poisons rank low as a cause of death.

We have obviously accepted the fact that in responsible hands these lethal substances can be controlled so as to perform their useful functions without endangering the population. In view of the highly alert and extremely cautious approach which the whole nuclear industry has applied to the handling of radioactivity, and in view of the very close Federal and State surveillance in this area, the public hazard from the handling of radioactive materials is very much less than from the other toxic substances to which we are likely to be exposed.

In summary, then, I believe there is a sound basis for the position that atomic power is now "just as good" as fossil fuel power and is certain to be "better than." Indeed, if one were to include the costs of property damage attributable to air pollution from fossil fuel plants, the cost of atomic power, which already includes safety and waste disposal costs, would now be "better than."

While it is also true that fossil fuel plants could be made as safe as the atomic powerplants by the inclusion of additional scrubbing and absorbing devices for the removal of pollutants, it has been estimated that the cost of equipment for such a task might run between $50 to $200 per kilowatt, certainly sufficient to make the fossil fuel plant compare unfavorably with atomic power.

Relative to the question of "why take a chance," this quick look at the continual public hazard of the conventional fossil fuel plant compared with only a remote potential hazard of an atomic plant, certainly demonstrates to me that the atomic powerplant is very much safer and much more desirable. Now that the development of atomic power provides an alternative method for the generation of electricity, the public interest would best be served if the utilities maintain the freedom to select atomic power for their systems where appropriate.

Thus, on every count, including both cost and safety, I believe that the public welfare is best served by the continued development and construction of atomic powerplants.

Racial Discrimination in Public Accommodations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, John McClaughry, a very able young man, has written an article concerning my bill which would prohibit racial discrimination in public accommodations.

The article which appeared in the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle on Friday, October 4, brings to focus the human aspects of this civil rights question as distinguished from the commercial aspects.

I think all Senators will find the article both interesting and informative, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROUTY HAS NEW ANGLE ON DISCRIMINATION

Ever since the Kennedy administration submitted its civil rights bill on June 20, legal experts in and out of Congress have waged a fierce debate over the constitutional foundations for the proposed title II. This is the section that would prohibit racial discrimination in public accommodations, such as restaurants and hotels.

One group of lawyers, which includes the President, the Attorney General, and most northern Democrats in Congress, has argued for basing title II on the congressional power to regulate interstate commerce. They claim that discrimination in public accommodations creates a burden on interstate commerce that Congress has the right and the power to remove.

The other group, composed largely of Republicans, opposes use of the commerce clause in this way on the dual grounds that it is amoral, if not immoral, because it treats human beings as just so much merchandise, and that the continual enlargement of the commerce power for purposes more and more removed from the real intent of the framers can only, in the long run, destroy our Federal form of government.

This second group would base the public accommodations section on the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. While this approach is preferable morally, and less of a threat to the structure of a federal system, it poses difficult legal problems. In an 1883 decision the Supreme Court ruled on a law similar to the proposed title II, that the equal protection clause applied only to action by States, not by private individuals.

Finding a solution to this legal problem has not been easy. One obvious way out would be to pass a public accommodations law and ask the Supreme Court to overrule its 1883 decision when a suitable case came before it. Other ways involve new interpretations of such phrases as "sanctioned by the State," "done under State authority," and "State action." Even 14th amendment advocates are not fully convinced of the workability of these approaches.

PROUTY'S ARGUMENT

Now comes Vermont's Republican Senator, WINSTON PROUTY, a member of the Senate Commerce Committee which has held exhaustive hearings on the proposed title II. Senator PROUTY, ably assisted by his top aid, Tom Hayes, has developed a different constitutional argument for a public accommodations law.

Senator PROUTY's argument, in a nutshell, is this. There is an ancient right to travel, recognized in Anglo-Saxon common law for centuries. That right has come to include the right to travelers' accommodations without discrimination because of race, color, creed, or national origin. Congress has the responsibility for giving this unwritten law a statutory basis, thus affording legal protection for its exercise.

When Congress approved the 13th amendment, which abolished slavery, it actually intended the removal forever of all badges of slavery and servitude. Legislative debates of that day, including those attendant on the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1886, make this abundantly clear. If Congress had merely wanted to end involuntary servitude, it would not have needed to add the second clause of the 13th amendment, which grants Congress the power to enforce the abolition of slavery by appropriate legislation.

Furthermore, it is agreed that there are privileges of national citizenship distinct from those of State citizenship. This was decided in the Slaughterhouse cases of 1873. The first sentence of the 14th amendment declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." The fifth section of the same amendment gives Congress the power to enforce the provisions of the amendment by appropriate legislation. Congress, then, can declare what is meant by national citizenship and can pass legislation to protect it. Freedom from racial discrimination in public accommodations should be thus protected.

Senator PROUTY's case is thoughtful and intriguing. It avoids the pitfalls of the commerce clause and the equal protection clause approaches. It affirms an ancient right, it calls for a reinterpretation of the intent of the 13th amendment, and it sets forth a new constitutional doctrine—Congress can declare certain rights incident to national citizenship and can protect those rights by appropriate legislation. The 13th amendment argument asks the Supreme Court to overrule the decision in the Civil Rights Case of 1883. The 14th amendment argument suggests a new foundation for civil rights legislation and asks the Supreme Court to distinguish it from a similar foundation rejected, 5 to 4, in an 1873 decision.

OBJECTIONS

There are, of course, legal objections to the Prouty thesis, just as there have been to all public accommodations bills based on the 13th and 14th amendments. But there are even graver political objections to the administration's commerce clause plan.

At present, the Senate Commerce Committee intends to report a title II bill close to the original Kennedy proposal. The bill will be founded on the commerce clause, with some lipservice to the 14th amendment.

Senator PROUTY will offer his bill as a substitute measure in committee. Since the committee is under Democratic control, it can hardly be expected to dump the Democratic Attorney General's constitutional thesis and substitute one advanced by a Republican Senator.

But many liberal Democratic Senators are being stung by Republican taunts, typified by one observer's charge that "the Democrats' bill sees three kinds of interstate commerce—goods, services, and Negroes." Thus Senator PROUTY's version might even attract a few Democratic votes.

If the Prouty version is not at least added to the Democratic bill in committee, the Senator hopes to offer it on the Senate floor, either as a substitute or as a supplement. The Senate would do well to accept it in place of the dangerous commerce clause version.

But even as a supplement, the Prouty language will be an important addition to the basis for a much-needed law, a law which effectively invokes the might and majesty of the Constitution in behalf of the right of all American travelers to fair and equal treatment.

JOHN MCCLAUGHRY.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 31, 1963, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, upon which I have the honor to serve, formally approved H.R. 8986, an omnibus pay raise proposal to include Federal, postal, executive, and judiciary personnel as well as Members of Congress. The measure, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON, was approved by a majority vote following 3 long months of extensive hearings on every phase of this significant issue.

Witnesses from Federal agencies including the Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, Post Office Department and others, together with representatives of most employee organizations and various other witnesses representing public and private organizations submitted testimony on the salary bills that were under consideration at that time.

During committee deliberations on October 31, 1963, I introduced an amendment to the Morrison bill, H.R. 8986, to carry out the provisions of related legislation that had been proposed through H.R. 4800, also by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman MORRISON, H.R. 5119 by the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JOSEPH KARTH, and H.R. 8205 that I had introduced earlier.

The purpose of these bills cited above was to provide restoration of the anniversary dates for related pay increases that had been established for postal employees under prior legislation. There was no intent to grant unearned salary increments to personnel involved nor was there any design to legislate unreasonable emoluments to any segment of the postal family. Rather it was my intent, as shared by those of my colleagues that had introduced comparable legislation, to provide full and justified credit for time that had actually been served, work that had been performed, by postal personnel under the previous postal field service salary act embodied in Public Law 68.

Since adoption of my amendment by the House committee, several efforts have been made by various individuals and groups to completely misrepresent the nature and purpose of this legislation. In one instance, a spokesman for the Post Office Department stated that it would require a staggering outlay of funds to evaluate the amount that would be due each employee eligible for such benefit. Recently, the Washington Daily News has come forward in an article by one of its columnists to the effect that the proposal constitutes a huge salary windfall to some personnel while denying such consideration to others. This latest comment also includes what I consider to be a highly erroneous price tag on the amendment amounting to more than $48 million.

In my opinion those postal employees who actually performed service under Public Law 68 in such a way as to earn advanced salary levels should receive full credit for such service. I contend that the cost would be far, far below the $48 million indirectly attributed to this proposal by the Department. Furthermore, I know that the amount of time and effort required to properly recognize these deserving employees would be negligible. In addition all employees would not gain such credits at the same time thereby enabling the Department to amortize the cost over a period of 1 to 6 years.

To illustrate the discrepancy that has now developed, through the Post Office Department's implementation of the last pay bill, Public Law 87-793, I am presenting the following explanation to clarify the inequities described hereinabove.

In the Postal Pay Reform Act of 1962, we established 20 salary levels to cover all variety of positions. The first 6 levels contained 12 steps to cover years of service and the higher levels were assigned a correspondingly lesser number of steps since they are figured at higher rates to compensate for supervisorial and administrative duties.

In the implementation of the act, a cutoff date of October 13, 1962, was established that deprived many postal workers of full and proper credits for their prior service. For example, employees in the first four levels, who had not progressed beyond step 5, were able to retain their anniversary dates for step increases. In many instances such employees received an additional step increase within weeks or months after the act of 1962 was approved. On the other hand, employees in the first four levels in step 6 or above, and employees who had already earned longevity step increases under the former law, Public Law 68, did not retain their anniversary dates and were compelled to start new periods toward their next step increases.

The following specific examples will clarify the detrimental effects on some employees with many years of service:

1. A level 4 employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1956, was placed in step 8 on October 13, 1962, at an annual wage of $5,685. An employee in the same level who entered the postal service 2 weeks later on October 15, 1956, was placed in step 7 and received an annual wage of $5,525. The latter employee will be required to serve 3 years in step 7 before going to step 8, thus earning $160 per annum less than the first employee. For the next five step increases over a period of 15 years the employee who entered the service 2 weeks later will be out-of-pocket at least $2,400.

2. An employee who entered the postal service October 1, 1950, was placed in step 9 at $5,845 per annum. An employee who entered October 15, 1950, 2 weeks later, was placed in step 8 at $5,685.

3. An employee who entered the postal service October 1, 1945, was placed in step 10 at $6,005 per annum. An employee who entered 2 weeks later on October 15, 1945, was placed in step 9 at $5,845 per annum, the identical salary of the employee who entered almost 5 years later on October 1, 1950.

4. An employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1938, was placed on step 11 at a salary of $6,165 per annum. An employee who entered 2 weeks later on October 15, 1938, was placed in step 10 at a salary of $6,005 per annum, the identical salary of an employee who entered the service 7 years later.

In conclusion, I respectfully submit that hard-working and conscientious postal personnel are entitled to justice and equality, particularly in those instances where salary credits and pay boosts have been enacted into law and offered as payment for work performed. I request the retention of my amendment and its approval with the balance of the committee's recommendation contained in H.R. 8986.

Aid to Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Dr. Albert Norman is one of the few writers today who do their homework.

When he discusses an important issue, he goes after all the facts and does not rely on opinion unsupported by personal research.

Recently Dr. Norman discussed the question of aid to higher education. Since this is a matter of great concern to the Congress at this time, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVER'S VIEW: AIKEN, PROUTY ON EDUCATION

(Dr. Albert Norman)

Public Federal aid to education has been a major social problem since the end of World War II. The so-called GI bill of rights, which aided the war veterans to get a college or technical education, has highlighted the significant role of the Federal Government in promoting the general welfare of the country through education. Although emphasis was on the erstwhile soldier lucky enough to come back alive, steps were taken in Congress to try to raise the general educational level of the country through financial support of primary and secondary school education.

Among the first to take up the problem was Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN. In 1945, he was a cosponsor with Senator George M. Mead, of New York, of a bill, S. 77, to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in financing primary and secondary schools so as to remove substandard educational conditions and eradicate illiteracy. Although this bill was never adopted by the Congress, it was nevertheless referred to by one writer in a recent book (R. F. Drinan, "Religion, the Courts and Public Policy") as one containing "an unprecedented provision for equal rights and privileges" for the schools. This, despite the long history of Federal aid to education dating back to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 and the Morrill Act of 1861, not to mention President Washington's proposal to Congress in 1790 for aid to higher education.

The Mead-Aiken bill, as it was called, was notable for the absence of any discriminatory provision between public and nonpublic and secular and nonsecular primary and secondary schools as well as for its explicit reservation to the States of control over the content and manner of education. I think, if I have not drawn the wrong deduction, that Senator AIKEN and his colleague meant that citizens and residents within the territory of the United States cannot be excluded because of their religious faith or school preference from receiving the benefit of public welfare legislation.

Two years later, in July 1947 to be exact, Senator AIKEN, for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported bill S. 472, which the late Senator Robert Taft had introduced, the chief purpose of which was identical with that of the Mead-Aiken bill. Although it was approved by the Senate, the bill died in committee of the House. Still concentrating on Federal aid to primary and secondary schools, Senator AIKEN had the same language concerning State control embodied in section 5 of bill S. 723 which Senator SHERMAN COOPER had introduced for himself, Senator AIKEN, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, and five other Senators in 1961. The bill went no further, however, than the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 2, p. 1468). From my own personal point of view this was not as good a bill as the Mead-Aiken and Taft bills. It eliminated from Federal aid the nonpublic school, leaving the impression that none but publicly owned institutions contribute to the general welfare and the individual.

In the matter of Federal aid to higher education since the war, a bill passed the Senate as well as the House in 1962, but the conferees were unable to agree on the disagreeing points. But the effort was resumed this year, and in August the House passed its comprehensive aid bill, H.R. 6143, and sent it to the Senate, where it was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on October 9. It provides for Federal financial aid to colleges and universities, junior, or community colleges, technical institutions, and graduate schools and centers, both public and nonpublic, without regard to religious association, but excluding from its benefits divinity schools and departments which train for the ministry. It provides for Federal nonintervention in the educational policies of the educational institutions receiving this assistance. Except for the fact that H.R. 6143 is a higher education bill, the fundamental philosophy is that of the 1945 and 1947 bills.

So far, so good. The Senate committee report amended the bill in some very important particulars, however. It was made less liberal. And at this point Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY assumed leadership in a movement to restore the original language of the House bill. He fought consistently for the broad base of the House bill on fundamental principle on educational policy. What the Senate committee did was to eliminate the 2-year colleges from the benefits of the bill's grants and loans as well as the liberal arts colleges. It also eliminated the graduate school provision, though it did retain the nondiscriminatory principle in the matter of public and nonpublic and secular and nonsecular colleges and universities. It provided for aid to science and engineering colleges only.

Debate on this version of the bill began in the Senate on October 11 and lasted until the 21st, when a vote was taken. On the first of these two dates, Senator PROUTY sent to the desk an amendment to restore the original House bill. Other amendments were offered. Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, moved to eliminate from the bill the nonsecular colleges, because aid to them, he argued, is in violation of the religious subclause of the first amendment to the Constitution, though others argued that that was discriminatory to the 14th amendment's equal protection of the laws clause, the general welfare clause, and Senator PROUTY himself invoked the ninth amendment which provides that "the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." These, one must assume, are the common law rights in equity of equality of opportunity.

Senator ERVIN's amendment was defeated by a vote of 55–26, Senator PROUTY voting against it, and Senator AIKEN, who was "necessarily absent," to use the official parliamentary language, had it recorded that if present he would have voted "nay." The Democratic Party leaders (MANSFIELD, MORSE, HUMPHREY, KENNEDY) and Republican liberals like CASE and CLARK also voted against the discriminatory amendment (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, p. 18522.) Senator PROUTY's own amendment, however, fared no better, though it had much stronger support than Senator ERVIN's. It was rejected by a vote of 49–33, 18 Senators not voting. Again, Senator AIKEN went on record that if he had been present he would have voted in favor of his junior colleague's amendment. The American Council on Education, principal spokesman for the country's higher educational institution, had passed a resolution in favor of the Prouty amendment.

Before the bill, as reported by committee, came to a vote, Senator ERVIN introduced a substitute religious amendment for his defeated amendment providing that before making a grant or loan, the administrator of the act publish in the Federal Register that he proposes to make such a grant or loan, and that any taxpayer may bring a civil action alleging that the proposed grant or loan is unconstitutional in terms of the first and fifth amendments "or any other provision of the Constitution." This amendment was adopted, both Senator AIKEN and PROUTY opposing it. They were obviously opposed to any limitation on education of a discriminatory nature.

The committee version of the bill, including the Ervin amendment, was put to a vote on the 21st of October and was adopted by a vote of 60 to 21. Senator AIKEN as well as Senator PROUTY voted for it as the best bill that could be got in the Senate. Interestingly enough, both Senators ERVIN and COOPER, whose "religious" amendment was made a part of the bill, voted against the bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pp. 18896–97). Senator PROUTY, as a leading participant in the bill's progress through the Senate and as a member of its Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, was appointed one of nine Senate conferees to meet the conferees of the House to try to resolve their differences. And this is where the matter now rests.

Undoubtedly, important principles are involved here. Some Senators have shown an exceptional consistency in adhering to the principle that neither race nor religion in a bar to a person's free choice of a school and that a blanket prohibition of aid to nonpublic schools on grounds of religious association is inconsistent with the general welfare. It is well worth remembering that nondiscrimination is not a secular legal principle so much as the Christian principle of the equality of all men before God which has become embedded in the so-called secular or positive law. It is strange indeed that the secularists should think they have discovered or, better still, invented, equality, justice, and freedom of thought and opportunity. This concept of the equality of man, especially of poor men, does not begin with our contemporary first Adamses.

From the more practical point of view, the original House bill, which Senator PROUTY tried to restore in the Senate, had advantages in terms of the country's general welfare which greatly outweigh the disadvantages of a presumed conflict with the first subclause of the religious-freedom clause of the first amendment. It brings into play the judicial rule of the "preferred rights."

The American Way Shines Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding tribute to dedicated free citizens of America is presented in the following editorial from the Irving News, Irving, Tex. I include it for the review and reflection of my colleagues:

IN TIME OF GRIEF AND STRESS, AMERICAN WAY SHINES THROUGH

The act which took the life of President John F. Kennedy was an act entirely foreign to the American way of life and mode of government. The same can be said for the fatal shooting of his accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald.

In spite of all else, the American way is found shining in several facets of this monstrous series of events.

The American way was seen in the friendly and excited faces of the jampacked crowds which lined the streets of Dallas, anxious to greet and welcome a President whose views were not always shared by the Dallas majority.

The American way was seen in the heroic manner in which three great American women—Mrs. Kennedy, Mrs. John Connally, and Mrs. J. D. Tippit—bore up under the strain of having their husbands ripped by hate-dipped bullets.

The American way was seen in the saddened but steady manner in which our Government's heaviest burden was shifted from the shoulders of dynamic John F. Kennedy to the shoulders of a seasoned Texan, Lyndon B. Johnson.

The American way could be seen in the American flag clutched by the late President's little son as he departed from viewing a flag-draped bier which he did not really comprehend.

The American way could be seen in the solid unanimity of support pledged for the new President by leading members of both parties in Congress. They knew they would continue to differ on many matters, but they knew that America and the long-range security of the American people would continue to be the common objective of the Government, regardless of party affiliations.

The tears of the New Frontier friends and foes, alike, as the last rites of our late President were conducted, reminded us once more—and never quite so forcefully—that America is a nation with a heart.

The whole Nation—and not merely Dallas—is humiliated by what happened in Dallas on Friday, November 22, 1963. But the finger that pulled the trigger was motivated by a hate and an ideology which is utterly foreign to Texas and all the rest of our Nation.

A Relaxation of Residual Oil Imports?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a most interesting editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald of December 11.

Titled, "New Oil Arbiter for New England," the editorial asks a question which I have been trying to answer since coming in Congress. It is this—Does New England have a chance to be heard? The question related to the fantastic efforts of the coal lobby to prevent a relaxation of residual oil imports into the United States. Under a new directive from President Johnson, it now appears that the Interior Department has no grounds for continuing quotas on residual oil imports.

Let us hope that the Interior Department will arrive at the conclusions which are quite specific; namely, the imports are of little importance to the coal industry and that a lifting of these imports would be of great value to New England:

NEW OIL ARBITER FOR NEW ENGLAND

A well-heeled coal lobby has, since March 10, 1959, deprived New England and the rest of the east coast of free access to a valuable competitive fuel—imported residual (heavy) oil. The quota restriction imposed under Executive decree raises the cost of this cheap fuel, plays havoc with its distribution and while hurting us does little or no good to the depressed soft coal industry. The effect of residual oil imports on the domestic oil industry is negligible—residual is a rapidly declining product in this country.

For years the voice of the coal lobby has been more effective than the voice of New England.

But there is a new arbiter now in this controversy. President Johnson has placed full authority over all national oil policies with the Interior Department. "Final responsibility rests with me and my Department," says Secretary Udall. (The President's divestiture of this authority is an act of high moral sensibility.)

What might be Mr. Udall's feelings in respect to residual imports?

When the Office of Emergency Planning investigated the effect of residual oil imports on national security, it solicited opinions from various departments. The Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the General Services Administration opposed the import restrictions. The Interior Department was simply asked to report on the effect on the domestic oil industry of decontrolling residual.

This Department said that, over the long term, decontrol would provide higher return to the oil industry.

Now since the stated objective of the whole oil import program is to "preserve a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry" (no mention of coal), the Interior Department, now in final command, has no grounds for continuing the quotas on residual oil imports.

Undoubtedly the well-heeled coal lobby, which misses no tricks, will go to work on the Interior Department. But it has no factual standing whatever. The decisive statistics show that residual oil imports are of minimal importance to the coal industry.

Has New England a new chance to be heard now?

Maybe Blame God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks our Nation has been subjected to a campaign by self-righteous individuals in this country, seeking to establish reasons for the late President Kennedy's tragic death.

An editorial from the Ellsworth Messenger, Ellsworth, Kans., aptly brings into focus what appears to be the obvious aim of those engaged in trying to lay the blame for this incident.

The editorial follows:

MAYBE BLAME GOD

The people who are lamenting the loudest, "What is wrong with our society that a President is shot," then giving their own tailored-to-purpose answers, are beginning to sound like a group of ghouls. And leading the macabre chorus is that grand master of calumny, Drew Pearson.

Fortunately, contrary to their purpose, this ghoulash serving is providing the real answer to the question raised by their intellectual contortionings.

What's wrong is that we have developed a pack of tragically misguided, intellectual egoists who use any and every pretext and incident to destroy faith in constitutional government, individual freedom—and hasten the advent of statism. Even unto the assassination of a President.

Truth to tell, it isn't the least unusual that our society spawns a number of psychopathic killers every generation. The fact that our lunatics have directed their lunacy at random and least often at top leadership actually is the unusual note in the analysis. Human nature is given an open-end construction, as it were, and cannot be crash-molded into Golden Rule conformity, as our liberal brethren suggest, even by the state all powerful.

On the contrary, the Pearson pack's big push to federalize morality as shortcut to utopia will only bring us to totalitarianism wherein our psychopaths can worm their way into great power and rule with bloody glee, as happened with Hitler, with Stalin, and all the others back through the tortured pages of history.

If we must place blame for the shooting, other than on the communist killer and associates, if any, then, instead of silly talk about blaming Texas, or society, or the radical right-left, Pearson-and-pack might more directly accuse God for not making mankind a race of angels in the first place.

Actually the blame pointers are trying to shame us into serfdom, which is something new in revolutionary tactics. If there is something wrong with society as they keep insisting, it is due to a contagion which is being spread deliberately, a contagion which produces a softening of the mind, the moral fabric and the willfulness of the citizenry. Drew Pearson is one of the Typhoid Marys who spread the evil virus. The daily press, the syndicated press service, radio, television, the pulpit, our colleges, all of these have a high quota of carriers likewise.

The carriers can most easily be recognized at this time by their way of branding anyone and everyone as "hate mongers" who, in the past 30 years, have either championed constitutional government or dared to oppose openly any of the flood of socialistic programs.

Have you opposed socialized medicine, public power extension, social security, the graduated income tax, the bill to license and restrict sale of firearms—you are a hate monger, so say the contagion crew.

* * * * *

The atmosphere in America would freshen immeasurably if the Pearson pack would leave off hurling clods from the Kennedy grave and move out of the cemetery. It is outrageous that any American's ammunition for ideological warfare should be molded out of national tragedy.

The heat of hatred would cool immeasurably, also, if this same gang would stop shouting "hate monger" at every American who dares to wave the flag, say a prayer in public, or stand for liberty's way of trust in constitutional law and distrust of centralized power in government.

Remarks of the President of the United States Upon the Signing of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the

remarks of the President of the United States on December 16, 1963, at the time of the signing of the Higher Education Facilities Act. The President pointed out the paramount importance of this far-reaching measure and gave due recognition to the great work which our colleagues who managed this bill put into it. The President's statement follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING H.R. 6143, THE HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963, IN THE CABINET ROOM

I am proud and happy to approve at this time the Morse-Green bill, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and to especially compliment Chairman POWELL. Congresswoman GREEN, and their colleagues in the House, Senator MORSE and his colleagues in the Senate, and everyone else who worked so hard for the passage of this very important legislation.

A great former President of the Republic of my State said "The educated man is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free men recognize and the only ruler that freemen desire." So this new law is the most significant education bill passed by the Congress in the history of the Republic. In fact, this session of the Congress will go down in history as the education Congress of 1963, and every person here this morning who has been invited to come to the White House at the request of the President can be very proud, and their children can be very proud, of the part they played in the enactment of this legislation.

Working together, the Congress and the executive branch have made possible the enactment of a series of legislative landmarks in the field of education. Under these various measures:

1. We will help to provide college classrooms for several hundred thousand more students who will nearly double college enrollment in this decade.

2. We will help to build 25 to 30 new public community colleges every year.

3. We will help to construct the technical institutes that are needed to close the gap in this crucial area of trained manpower.

4. We will help to build graduate schools and facilities in at least 10 to 20 major academic centers.

5. We will help to improve the quality of library facilities in our own universities and colleges.

6. We will increase the number of medical school graduates and we will relieve the growing shortages of physicians and dentists and other needed professional health personnel.

7. We will enable some 70,000 to 90,000 additional students to attend college each year under an expanded loan program.

8. We will modernize and expand our Federal-State programs for vocational education in order to train for the changing world of work the 8 out of 10 young people who will never obtain a college education.

9. We will reduce the shortage of qualified personnel for the training and teaching of mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

10. We will expand our manpower development and training program to meet the growing problem of untrained, unemployed school dropouts.

11. We will expand programs for teaching science and mathematics and foreign languages, while extending the other valuable provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

12. We will continue the program of Federal financial assistance for the construction and the maintenance and the operation of schools that are crowded by the presence of children of Federal personnel.

13. And finally, we will, under legislation to be passed shortly, provide public libraries for the residents of cities and counties all over this great country who now have only antiquated library facilities and some have no libraries at all.

This legislation is dramatic, and it is concrete evidence of a renewed and continuing national commitment to education as the key to our Nation's social and technological and economic and moral progress. It will help meet the demands of our economy for more skilled personnel; it will enable many more of our young people to cope with the explosion of new knowledge and to contribute effectively in a world of intellectual, political, and economic complexity.

But these new measures will still not do the whole job of extending educational opportunities to all who want and can benefit by them, nor in meeting our growing national needs. I, therefore, strongly urge the Congress to take early, positive action on the unfinished portion of the National Education Improvement Act, particularly those programs which will assist elementary and secondary schools. In addition, I urge prompt action on proposed programs for combating adult illiteracy, for expanding adult education, for improving the quality of education at all levels.

President Kennedy fought hard for this legislation. No topic was closer to his heart. No bill was the object of more of his attention. Both his life and his death showed the importance and the value of sound education. The enactment of this measure is not only a monument to him, it is a monument to every person who participated in passing it, and most of you are in this room today.

It clearly signals this Nation's determination to give all of our youth the education they deserve, and as long as we have a Government, that Government is going to take its stand to battle the ancient enemies of mankind, illiteracy, and poverty, and disease, and in that battle, each of you are soldiers who wear the badge of honor.

The 100th Anniversary of the Rhode Island Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of great pride for me to be present on September 23, 1963, when the citizens of Rhode Island paid tribute to Rhode Island Hospital for a hundred years of outstanding service, a century during which it cared for nearly 700,000 bed patients and treated over 5 million other patients through its clinics and ambulatory services.

In the characteristic fashion of this forward-looking institution, the theme of its convocation was modest on the point of past performance, but swelled with the counterpoint of tomorrow's medical care and how it can best be provided today.

At the conclusion of the centennial celebration, plans for a capital expansion fundraising drive were announced. Mr. Louis C. Gerry, president of the hospital, said that "the first major building project in Rhode Island Hospital's program for its second century of service" would be a new structure "to house principally ambulatory services to meet the needs of the sick and injured not requiring bed care."

The principal speaker of the evening was Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, widely known as historian, author, and educator. For more than 25 years Dr. Keeney has been part of New England's intellectual life. After taking his A.M. in 1937 and his Ph. D. in 1939 at Harvard, he was a tutor and instructor in history there until World War II. He served with distinction during the war as an officer with the 35th Infantry Division—1942 to 1945—his decorations including the Purple Heart. Joining Brown University as assistant professor of history in 1946, he rose through the professorial ranks and has been university president since 1955.

Dr. Keeney devoted much of his talk to some of the problems raised by the increasing momentum of scientific progress and its effect on medical education. Outlining various ways in which educators attempt to apply the new scientific knowledge, he pointed out that Brown's newly inaugurated 6-year medical education program provides an intensive, coherent development in the basic science on which medicine is based, by combining the conventional college years with the preclinical and clinical portions of medical school.

While this system will add to the number of people who can apply the new medical science, its primary aim is to provide a hard core of physicians equipped to discover new knowledge, or apply knowledge discovered by others, or both.

The problems involved here are so urgent—and Dr. Keeney's remarks so cogent—that I included his address at the Rhode Island Hospital's convocation, September 23, 1963, in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it may be available to all Members of the House:

RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL CONVOCATION

Centennial anniversaries are likely to be retrospective and to contain a great deal of nonsense and pageantry. Whether the anniversary is the hundredth or the four hundredth, men are likely to grow beards and both men and women are apt to wear dusty costumes of a supposedly appropriate period retrieved from the lofts of defunct theatrical warehouses. Together, they attempt to act out the events of the past to the edification and boredom of all those present.

I am pleased that the theme of this convocation and this celebration is directed, not to the events of the last hundred years, but to medical care in tomorrow's world—which is, of course, already today's world. In a moment I shall apply myself to that question.

First, however, I would like briefly to go back 100 years and ask what this community might have been like before the Rhode Island Hospital was founded. When one was ill, he went to Boston if he could afford it or to New York if he was very wealthy, but most people could only suffer in their homes with whatever care the inadequately equipped physicians of the day could give them, and either live or die.

Disease spread rapidly, particularly in the slums which were even more prevalent then than they are today. With the development of the Rhode Island Hospital and the other general and special hospitals of our community this situation has greatly changed and one can secure adequate treatment for most diseases within the community.

If we did not have the Rhode Island and our other fine hospitals, we can be sure

today that our lives would be materially worse and that our population would be considerably smaller.

We tend to take the hospital and those who have operated it for granted and to assume that, since it is here now, it has always been here. But we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the men and women who have been responsible for the very great advances of the hospital since the end of the Second World War. I refer particularly to Louis Gerry, Dr. Marshall Fulton, Dr. Murray Beardsley, Oliver Pratt, Miss Mildred Schwier, Dr. Eva Nellie Blanche Hughes, Miss Medany, and to the many other devoted men and women who have worked with them.

I have spoken of the old guard, for the most part; it would be quite as appropriate to speak of those who have taken their places as chiefs of staff and to speak of the many able people who are much younger. All these have shown devotion, skill, good sense, and great humanity. We are the richer for them.

The program today dealt with some aspects of the forward edge of medical science. Some of the developments in new medical science have not yet had their full impact, either on medical education or on medical practice. We have a great backlog of knowledge of human biology, chemistry, physics, and psychology—and of the fields that lie between—which is not yet fully used in diagnosis and treatment and which may provide the answers to many of our contemporary problems.

We have, on the other hand, a wide spectrum of areas where we know almost enough really to deal with the most serious problems. But between these and behind them, there are areas where we know almost nothing. In almost no area have we succeeded yet in using all that is known.

These medical advances have had great effects upon society, and will have greater ones. Infant mortality has been enormously reduced and expectation of life greatly increased. In some countries of the world the consequent increase in population presents a serious problem. In our country overpopulation does not yet tax our means of sustenance, but the increase is nevertheless a serious problem in that it multiplies the difficulty of opening full and useful lives to all our population of all ages.

Worse, it has augmented the number of those who must live marginal lives or less because they are physically, mentally, or emotionally incomplete. The problem of custodial care in our society is already serious; it will become more serious as we learn to save still more lives, but before we learn how to rebuild minds and bodies so that their possessors can fully use them.

It is not probable that we shall, but we may learn to interfere with abnormal development before it is final.

Another facet of the new science lies in efforts to determine the effect of an individual's biology on his social environment, and of his social environment on his biological destiny. Here, of course, medicine becomes sociology, and involves the whole lives of whole groups of people.

Another result is that the mystery of medicine has decreased in the mind both of the scientist and of the practitioner, but particularly in the mind of the population who are treated with alarming frequency to irresponsible journalistic discussions of medical advance which has not yet occurred but which is described as if it has. As the mystery decreases, the expectation of the individual increases; when he finds that there is no miracle cure, he is apt to lower his opinion of his physician, for he has read in his favorite magazine that there is such a cure.

There are many other changes with which you are all familiar and which we should all contemplate. The problem underlying all these is, of course, the difficulty of translating biology into medicine. Biologists know many things, and will learn more, that could have a dramatic, even drastic effect on medical practice and, more speedily, on medical research. The application of new science in medicine can best occur in the university and the research and teaching hospital. That is why it is so important to Rhode Island that Brown is developing a program of medical education, and that the hospitals are developing and intensifying their programs of research and teaching, and that we are doing so together. How to do so quickly is the problem. In education, it takes a generation for new knowledge to move from the research paper into the textbook. How long does it take for biological research to move from the laboratory into medical practice?

The new medical science has not yet had its full effect on education.

We still have the traditional pattern of a haphazard, almost miscellaneous premedical preparation in college, followed by 2 years of preclinical work that is repetitious for the well-prepared student and may even seem irrelevant for the student who has his eyes only on clinical medicine.

Then we have 2 years of clinical medicine, followed by an inordinately long period of internships, residencies, and research positions, often with a Ph. D. thrown in, which means that the doctor may not be ready to practice until his midthirties.

There are current educational efforts to apply the new knowledge in three principal ways: first, by combining the last 2 years of college with the first 2 years of medical school, and thereby shortening the period of preparation; second, by early low-level specialization intended to prepare for team practice; and, third by intensifying and actually lengthening the preparation through an articulation of the 4 years of college with the preclinical and clinical portions of medical school.

Each of these plans or proposals has advantages and disadvantages. The first two may make recruitment for the medical profession easier, but they will not bring into medicine the best people who are now attracted by science itself. Certainly these two plans will produce more physicians faster, and we need more physicians.

But, on the other hand, they will not greatly increase the use of new knowledge in the practice of medicine, until the application of such knowledge to medicine has been established by others. These two plans may be a trap for the person who changes his mind. If a young man or woman has decided early in his youth that he wishes to prepare himself for low-level specialization and team practice and if he subsequently decides that he wishes to become a medical scientist, he will end up by losing rather than gaining time.

The third proposal provides an intensive, coherent development in basic science on which medicine is applied. It would provide a core of physicians equipped to discover new knowledge or apply knowledge that others have discovered, or both. There are dangers to be overcome. It is commonly supposed that such a program will result in a lack of humane studies.

The truth is that, if the curriculum is properly constructed and the program in the humanities well planned, students in this sort of program can have a better and deeper penetration in the humanities than others. Moreover, if these students are educated in the humane environment of the university, they may well acquire more humanity from conversation and association than from formal study through the curriculum. The second danger is that of losing doctors to science. This is a very real danger. Time alone will tell what the result will be. It should, however, be possible to relate the student to medicine through carefully developed seminars, discussions, experience, and increasing attention to and education in the application of basic science to diagnosis and treatment.

This third program, of course, is the one that we are now establishing at Brown. Our society has two great medical needs. One is for more and better people to apply the new medical science and the other for more and better people to discover the basic knowledge and find ways of applying it. Our program will help a little in the first, but it is directed primarily toward the second need for medical scientists, teachers, and clinicians who will use the research that they themselves have conducted and known. I would point out that two of the four speakers today received their educations on the Continent of Europe. We had a great windfall of such people just before and just after the Second World War, not only in medicine, but in all the sciences and humane studies. The windfall is over; now we must produce our own.

What does all this mean to the Rhode Island Hospital? Very simply that further developments of medical practice depend upon the application of the new science to medical diagnosis and care. Such application can be made only by those who are well educated in basic science and active in clinical research. It cannot be well done by one hospital and one university separately and independently, but only together. It cannot be done by one research scientist and one clinician separately, but only together. Very few individuals can do both. This work can be done only in universities and hospitals where there is an active and developing program of research and study.

Since the Second World War, Rhode Island Hospital has moved rapidly in becoming a hospital that effectively supports extensive programs in research and teaching. Most of us go to the hospital when we are ill are appreciative of the care that we receive. Few of us are aware to what extent investigation and study have brought that care to its present fortunate level.

Finally, these things mean, not only to Rhode Island Hospital, but to all of us, that the new science will either improve society or merely prolong the lives of its members. Which outcome occurs depends upon the conscience, knowledge, understanding, and support of the community in which the hospital, the universities, the colleges, the schools, and the churches are active participants. Whatever these institutional leaders do, the full development of the conscience of the community and its expression in deeds depends upon the general beliefs, the conscience, and the acts of all its members.

BARNABY C. KEENEY.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1963.

Spending Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville News.

SPENDING YOUR MONEY

Charges of waste in the Navy Purchasing Office, leveled this week in the U.S. House of Representatives by Hoosier Congressman EARL WILSON, of Bedford, are enough to raise the hackles on any self-respecting, taxpaying citizen.

In fact, the insane spending as charged by Representative WILSON in just one Government office—if it does, as charged by some others, permeate the entire Defense Establishment—enough to warrant real fear for the future of the Government.

"The Navy Purchasing Officer in Washington, D.C.," Representative WILSON said in a speech before his House colleagues, "is guilty in one of the most flagrant examples of overstocking and waste that I have seen in my 22 years in Congress."

Representative WILSON said a study he recently completed with the aid of Navy employees, shows that the Navy Purchasing Office had up to a 10-year supply of some office items on the shelves. Much of it had to be thrown away, he said, but some was salvaged and some was sent back to the dealer involved.

Implicated in the speech made on the floor of the House was the NPO services branch head, who, he said, in the past has done practically all of the purchasing of office equipment and supplies there. WILSON told House Members of the way this person "bought supplies from a man who has served as a representative of several office supply firms and now owns his own company."

WILSON said evidence has been supplied him by NPO employees "that shows a shocking disregard for the taxpayers' welfare" on the part of NPO purchasing officials. He said NPO employees came to him after hearing in the Navy of his campaign against waste in military purchasing.

"NPO can and has bought electric stapling machines from the Federal supply schedule for $22 to $24. It said it needed only 4 of these machines, bought 24 of them, and had 15 more sitting unused in a stockroom. But it bought them from a retail jobber (a friend of the NPO service branch head), and paid $44.75 each—almost double what it should have paid," WILSON said.

This same person, WILSON charged, "also bought four new copying machines for $895 each before they were on the market. She ordered $1,400 worth of paper and extras and was ready to throw an existing overstock of copying paper for machines on hand down the drain until an alert and conscientious NPO employee stopped the deal. The same employee, with help from other NPO workers, discovered many other items in extreme overstock. All materials were to be used by NPO's approximate 100 employees, and office supplies are customarily ordered to cover only a 3-month period."

WILSON said he was shocked to learn of the oversupply of a great many items, such as 3,000 staple removers, 5,000 boxes (500,000 sheets) of carbon paper, a $5,000 overstock of Verifax and Thermofax copying paper, 3,888 ballpoint pens, 4,668 ballpoint pen refills, 2,710 boxes of paper clips, 395 stamp pads, 2,358 rolls of scotchtape, 540 rolls of pressure-sensitive tape, 246 dozen (2,952) erasers, 91 pencil sharpeners, etc.

The list goes on and on. As Representative WILSON pointed out, "this is just a random sample. There was much more. I have already turned over my complete file on the matter to the General Accounting Office for its investigation and report.

"This is proof," he added, "of the inefficiency, the mismanagement, and the slipshod attitude that is rampant in our Defense Department, and especially in the Navy, today. This is why defense costs more each year and why the workingman's paycheck is nicked a little more each week. * * * The time has come for Congress to act to exercise strong new controls over the way in which the military spends the money we appropriate for defense."

As we have stated many times before, the vast majority of people employed in government at any level are honest, devoted, and hard-working. If this were not true, even in the example cited by Representative WILSON, the uncovering of waste would not be possible. But it has become all too apparent that there are a considerable number whose personal greed transcends all, and that their presence is costly almost beyond belief.

Representative WILSON has been fighting against waste of tax dollars, as have a number of other Members of Congress, for a long time. We hope this good fight bears an increasing amount of the needed fruit of commonsense in the spending of our tax dollars.

End the Bitterness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the conversation recently, I include the following editorial and column from the El Paso Times, El Paso, Tex., for review of those interested.

END THE BITTERNESS

Since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the entire American Nation has been plunged into a period of deep mourning.

That is correct and proper. A President of the United States, a man in the prime of his life, a Chief Executive with a program he wanted to put over, the father of two children, had his life snuffed out by an assassin's bullet.

Sad to say, some elements in our country have been trying to fasten the blame for that assassination on those who disagreed with the policies of the late President Kennedy.

An effort has been made to cause those opponents of the Kennedy policies to have a feeling of guilt.

That is an unfair approach to the subject.

Republicans in Congress have spoken out sharply against such tactics. It was about time.

There is a great deal of difference between sincere mourning and a feeling of guilt.

There are many patriotic, sincere Americans who simply did not, and do not, agree with some of the Kennedy policies. Those people had nothing to do with his assassination.

If the authorities are correct, the assassin was a Marxist, a self-styled Communist. Undoubtedly he had a quirk in his brain. But he had absolutely nothing in common with the conservative element in the United States. The conservatives are diametrically opposed to communism and everything it espouses.

Let's put an end to the bitter and unfair criticism. Every American in his right mind deeply grieves over the death of President Kennedy and resents his assassination.

The late President Kennedy has a place of honor in our history, to which he is entitled. His family has the sympathy and best wishes of all the American people.

Now, let's try to go ahead and support our Government to the best of our ability. We can differ with the policies of the administration and still be good Americans. Never forget that.

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

The Very Reverend Oscar L. Huber, C.M., of Dallas, who administered the sacraments of penance and extreme unction followed by the apostolic blessing to the assassinated President John F. Kennedy, has written an extremely interesting article which appeared in the December 6 issue of the Southwest Catholic Register.

I read that article with particular attention. The heading says: "Dallas Priest Relives * * * President's Final Hour—Father Huber Points to Outburst of Love in City Where J.F.K. Died."

GOES TO HOSPITAL

In his article Father Huber tells of seeing the procession of cars carrying President Kennedy and other dignitaries in Dallas. Then of hearing news of the assassination. He went to the hospital where he administered the final rites to the dying President.

Father Huber's article closes with this:

"I believe that in every place of worship in Dallas, Catholic, Protestant, and synagogue, services, attended by unprecedented crowds, were held for the President on the National Day of Mourning. To me this was a marvelous expression of love, devotion, and deep-seated respect for the President of the United States. The fantastic interest of the people shown by the meticulous preparations made for the visit of the President, merits for them a lasting place in the hall of loyalty. A striking demonstration of sorrow can be seen by the great number of wreaths that decorate the spot where the President was assassinated.

"The people of Dallas, along with the whole world, deeply mourn the loss of our President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. May God grant him eternal rest. Likewise, may God lead the new President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, safely along the arduous paths that lie ahead of him."

To which I would like to add a solemn "Amen."

NOTHING BUT GOOD

Father Huber, a man of God, had nothing but good to say about the people of Dallas. I wish others would follow his example.

After all, it was a Marxist, a self-styled Communist, who is said to have assassinated President Kennedy.

Polish-American Tribute to Our Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the Central of Polish Organizations of Passaic, N.J., last Sunday held a stirring and impressive memorial program for our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

At the end of the services, the chairman read to the assemblage the following letter to Mrs. John F. Kennedy which well sums up the feelings of all good Americans.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1963.

Mrs. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KENNEDY: The Central of Polish Organizations of Passaic, N.J., in the name of the Americans of Polish descent of Passaic and Bergen Counties, have held a memorial service for the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy at the Polish Peoples Home in Passaic, N.J., on December 15, 1963.

The tragic occurrence in Dallas has deprived the Nation of a true champion of

democracy. The members of this organization have especially felt the sorrow of the passing of the late President since they feel they have lost one of their true friends of freedom and one of their mainstays and champions of freedom of oppressed peoples throughout the world.

The whole community of Polish-American descent, together with the societies which form this organization, wish to extend to you and your family their sincere sympathy in your hour of sorrow.

Respectfully yours,

MARIA BELESKI,
Secretary.
JOHN GRYWALKSKI,
President.
BRUNO SKRZYNSKI,
Chairman, Memorial Service.

I Am Not Guilty, by Leo J. Paulin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I offered the motion to recommit the foreign aid appropriation bill for 1964 with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment to prohibit the using of the funds of the American taxpayers to provide credit to Communist countries for purchase of any product by such Communist countries. The House supported my motion by a very large margin of 218 yeas against 169 nays.

Since President Kennedy's tragic death, the liberal left has attempted to develop an atmosphere of "sentiment" for legislative and national action as a tribute to the late President. Leo J. Paulin, the editor of a relatively new local Montgomery County, Md., newspaper, the Maryland Monitor, has placed this matter in the proper perspective in his editorial of December 12, 1963, when he said:

National policies and programs are either right or wrong and the fact that the late President Kennedy has been taken from us under tragic circumstances should in no way influence a legislator's reasoning.

And then noted that—

Prior to the President's death, the Senate was disposed to insist upon negotiating the wheat deal with Russia on a cash basis. After all, it was reasoned, Russia paid Canada "cash on the barrel head" for wheat. Following the President's death, Senate Leader MANSFIELD read a letter from the late President urging that the Senate approve the extension of credit to Russia. Under the illusion that acceding to this "last wish" was paying a tribute to the great young President, the Senate reversed its previous position on the wheat deal.

And then concluded that—

If the wheat deal was right or wrong before the President's death, it must remain right or wrong after his death. The same reasoning should apply to all other national policies.

The entire editorial, "I Am Not Guilty," follows:

I AM NOT GUILTY

(By Leo J. Paulin)

Almost daily since the assassination of President Kennedy, men in high places from many rostrums have sought to read into the reprehensible act a motivation of national hate which they imply should now give way to a national complex of guilt.

To read the solemn declarations from those of Chief Justice Warren down to a neighborhood soapbox politico you almost have the impression that the American public is now a snarling fiery-eyed hater with man against man and wholly without compassion.

It has now been almost conclusively established that the assassination of the late President was the work of a Marxist and was in no way related to racial tensions or opposition to administration policies at any level.

I refuse to accept guilt for President Kennedy's death nor should anyone else, no matter what his political persuasion, feel guilty. None of us are any more guilty of this act than we are guilty of the 5,000 murders committed throughout the land annually. Man has murdered since the day Cain killed his brother Abel.

Wars, murders, the taking of life will probably continue far into the distant future, or until that day, if it ever comes, when homo sapiens is completely self-disciplined, or until the day when he has the courage to subscribe wholly to the Ten Commandments.

The uneasy charges that as a Nation we are guilty of the late President's assassination stem from those who think in liberal political terms with the resultant inference that the opposition is the sower of the seeds of hate.

Without explaining how, these spokesmen for the national conscience infer that the "loyal opposition" should now, like the Arabs, "fold their tents and silently steal away."

Politically, this Nation has been more evenly divided since 1960 than probably at any time in history. For this reason the late President Kennedy met with a great deal of opposition to his programs.

This should not have been unexpected. The Democrats won the 1960 election with a minority of all the votes cast. It must be concluded therefore that the majority of the people was, and continues to be, opposed to many of the Administration's measures.

This opposition is reflected in the lack of a responsive Congress to the desires of the executive branch.

Congress, more sensitive to the grassroots than it is to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, finds it is pressured on both sides and the greatest of these, as it has always been since the first Congress, is the pressure of the "votes back home."

National policies and programs are either right or wrong and the fact that the late President Kennedy has been taken from us under tragic circumstances should in no way influence a legislator's reasoning.

Prior to the President's death, the Senate was disposed to insist upon negotiating the wheat deal with Russia on a cash basis. After all, it was reasoned, Russia paid Canada "cash on the barrelhead" for wheat. Following the President's death, Senate Leader MANSFIELD read a letter from the late President urging that the Senate approve the extension of credit to Russia. Under the illusion that acceding to this "last wish" was paying a tribute to the great young President, the Senate reversed is previous position on the wheat deal.

"If the wheat deal was right or wrong before the President's death, it must remain right or wrong after his death. The same reasoning should apply to all other national policies."

If those in the legislative councils who believed before the President's assassination that a cut in taxes was not practical without a cut in expenditures, then the President's death should in no way change their beliefs. Legislation should not be enacted on sentiment.

Republicans have been no less grieved over the great loss to our country than have the Democrats.

The Nation has every sympathy for Lyndon B. Johnson and the great burden he assumes in holding high the torch of Government. But to suggest the President is infallible because of the arduous task before him is to render a disservice to the democratic processes of this Nation.

Hodgdon Game Management Area Should Be Named for Lieutenant Manuel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that a new game management area has been located at Hodgdon, Maine, this operating under the supervision of the Maine Fish and Game Department.

I also want to say that very appropriately it has been recommended that this area be named the Gordon Manuel Game Management Area, in honor of Lt. Gordon Manuel, a citizen of Hodgdon, Maine, who served with eminent distinction in the military service of his country.

Lt. Gordon Manuel died when he was but 35 years of age, having been taken from our midst by wounds he received in military action during World War II. The Houlton Pioneer Times issue of November 14, 1963, presents a vivid account of Lieutenant Manuel's deeds of heroism and service experiences, with writer Larry Reece using this account as a testimonial for the naming of the game management area.

Because this newspaper article makes some remarkable recordings of heroism on the part of a remarkable Maine citizen, I submit it to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleague:

HODGDON GAME MANAGEMENT AREA SHOULD BE NAMED FOR LIEUTENANT MANUEL

(By Larry Reece)

It isn't often that a sportswriter gets a chance to suggest a name for a game management area, but that's exactly what I'm doing this week in the Pioneer Times.

The new game management area is located in Hodgdon and was completed last month under the supervision of the Maine Fish and Game Department. The name that we have selected is Lt. Gordon Manuel, who was born and raised within 2 miles of the new management area, having lived as a youngster on the horseback road in Hodgdon.

Lieutenant Manuel died at the age of 35 in Guilford as a result of wounds received while in the service of his country during Warld War II. Lieutenant Manuel, who died in 1952, was buried in Arlington National Cemetery. He was survived by his wife Mary,

a son Gordon, Jr., now 17 years old, a sister Evelyn of Washington, D.C., and brothers, George of Kittery and Glenn of Littleton.

When you ask why does his name come up as the most likely one for the new game management area, we would like to have you read the following story of this brave young man from Hodgdon.

HODGDON HIGH GRAD

Lieutenant Manuel was graduated from Hodgdon High School. Shortly after his schooling he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps and earned his way as one of the top bombardier squadron leaders in the war. Then he was only a top rated sergeant, who had been known for his high hip boots which the rest of the crew would call Manuels' duck-hunting boots from Maine. This outstanding bombardier soon earned the respect of his crew and many others, and before long was the squadron's leader.

He arrived in Pearl Harbor 3 days after the Japs had attacked. Lieutenant Manuel was soon to embark on his historic adventure which later would mean his death.

It all started on night, as the story goes, in the copyright book written by the novelist, Quentin Reynolds. He tells of Lieutenant Manuel's 9 months on an island with 70,000 Japs in the book entitled, "70,000 to One."

Lieutenant Manuel, who entered the service in 1939, certainly never forgot those 9 months on that island as we will tell you in the next few lines, but first let us tell you that this young officer while in the service received 13 medals which included 3 distinguished flying crosses, 3 silver stars, 2 distinguished medals, 2 purple hearts, and 3 Presidential citations.

BESTSELLER

The story, which was one of Quentin Reynolds' bestsellers, tells of the hectic 9 months spent by this officer from Hodgdon and reads like this:

It was the 61st air mission for the Hodgdon bombardier, who was the squadron leader of that attack of B-17's that night back in May 1943. His group was planning an attack on Raboul, one of the Japanese held islands in the Pacific Ocean. All at once his plane was hit by one of the so-called night fighters used by the Japs and the plane was rapidly going up in flames. Manuel started to leave the plane, but he had been hit severely by hundreds of small pieces of shrapnel from the B-17. Slowly he managed to pull himself out of the flaming plane, in which most of the crew had been killed, and he parachuted to the ocean waters below. This started his true to life experience which you are about to read.

The water on that fearful night back in May 1943 was cold and uninviting for this bombardier, who now realized that he had received a broken leg in the plane as well, and was bleeding quite badly from his wounds. He quickly took pieces of his clothing and tied them around his legs to stop the bleeding and then after a brief rest started to swim for the nearest strip of land.

JAPS WERE PATROLLING

He realized that he had to get out of the water before dawn and now it was shortly after 2 a.m. The Japs would be patrolling the area that morning and probably would be looking for survivors. Manuel knew only too well what the Japs did to their American prisoners. So bravely he strugled to get to shore, which was a distance of 5 miles and it took Manuel 7 hours to reach this destination.

"After 7 hours in the ocean he felt solid ground under him again but he didn't know that there were 70,000 Japs on that island. He never realized that for the next 9 months he would be hunted down like an animal and would be barely existing on snakes, snails, and bitter tasting plants, always fearful of unfriendly natives who would have slaughtered his head for a cheap pack of cigarettes, that the Japs would have given in return. There were 70,000 ruthless hunters and he was their prize game."

Lieutenant Manuel's story is a true one and not one of make believe. He lived every minute, hour and day of that 9 months in fear, back on that island in 1943. When Lieutenant Manuel, then a sergeant, first settled down on this lonely looking island, he didn't have any idea what island it was. After his return to the United States, he thought it was a place called the Matala Plantation, and this proved to be correct.

BUILT HUT

Upon getting onto solid ground again, he started to make himself a hut, or lean-to as they are sometimes called. He used leaves, sticks, pieces of brush that were available and soon erected a cleverly hidden home, close by the ocean waters. With this type of a home he knew he would be hard to find. From his many hunting experiences in the woods of Maine and around his home town of Hodgdon, he had learned from the different animals how they would hide themselves from hunters.

Night after night he would crawl down to the edge of the ocean waters and soak his legs with the salt water. This nightly practice was later attributed to the saving of his life, as all the poison was kept out by the salt water.

Days, nights, and weeks went past and after crawling and using sticks to walk with for the first 2 months, he was able to travel on his own power, but as yet was not too well. He had lived on snakes, snails, and some of the island's bitter tasting plants during this period of time. Other food was available such as coconuts, but he was unable to climb trees to get them.

Manuel's first contact was with a small group of the island's natives who had located his home. There they stood, facing him with their knives in hand. All Manuel could say was "Me friend, me friend." They came closer and finally contact had been made with these natives and he was on his way to their village.

JAPS ARE TOLD

Once there he was told that the chief of the tribe had sent word to the Japs that there was an American prisoner on the island and that they had him in their village. Manuel quickly hurried out of the hut which had held only him as its special guest and soon he was down the road and away from any trouble, for a little while at least.

Experiences were happening so fast for young Manuel, who at the time of this ordeal was only a man of 26, that he could hardly find time to sleep in peace. In the next few weeks he made friends with some more natives who had drifted into this area by chance. These friendly natives lived about 2 miles down on the lower end of the island. They proved their friendship to this American bombardier, supplying him with coconuts and other food items which he hadn't been able to get. This greatly helped to bring back some of his strength.

At one time during his 9 months on the island he singlehandedly wiped out an entire Jap patrol of 17 men. He also had to kill several other Japs in order to maintain his own life.

There was still no sign of any help for Manuel in getting off the island. Night after night he would watch the sky and see his fellow bombardiers going over on their different missions. But he didn't dare to fire a shot or build a fire as this would attract attention and the Japs would know where to look.

ANOTHER AMERICAN

One day one of his loyal native friends cme running to him all excited. He told Manuel that there was another white man on the island and thought he was American. Manuel wasted no time in getting to the area where the natives had seen this newcomer. Sure enough he was an American. Manuel was overjoyed to find someone that he could talk to. This had been his sixth month on the island, but now there were lot of questions he wanted to ask. The first question he asked the newcomer was "Who won the world series?" He replied the Yanks. Manuel said, "That's good, they are my favorite team."

Manuel, who had now been figured dead by the War Department was more hopeful then ever of getting off the island. Soon American planes would come looking for survivors of the recent crash, the one his new American friend had been in recently.

The natives held the key to their escape from the island as Manuel was later informed that they knew of a place where help could be given in the attempt to escape. The natives had investigated and found a way to relay a message to one of the American ports. This was done with the help of some missionaries and an Australian. Within the week he had the good news that he was going home, as contact had been made with a U.S. submarine to pick up the Americans. The unforgettable night was in January of 1944. What seemed like a nightmare and was just that, was finally over for Manuel who was back on American soil again.

One of the hardest things Manuel later stated that he had to do was to say goodby to that handful of friendly natives who had kept him alive on that island for 9 months.

Manuel, the son of Herbert and Ida Taylor Manuel (the Taylors were one of the first families to settle in the town of Hodgdon) claimed many times after this hectic 9 months that if it hadn't been for his experiences in the woods of Maine and especially around his home in Hodgdon he couldn't have survived the ordeal.

Manuel had been a guide and ardent outdoorsman while he was a resident of Hodgdon. Before his death in 1952 he came back to Hodgdon and hunted one fall with his brother Glenn, of Littleton.

The name of Lt. Gordon Manuel is one of the most colorful in the field of heroism in World War II. He won the respect of the world for his courageous experiences while in the service of his country and certainly must also deserve the respect of his native State and his hometown for his deeds. That's why the name of Lt. Gordon Manuel should be given to the new game management area in Hodgdon, the place where this outstanding hero grew up and played as a youngster.

Clapp Book: "The Congressman"

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not on the floor a few days ago when my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] spoke on the new book by Charles L. Clapp, entitled "The Congressman: His Work As He Sees It."

I just want to add these words of congratulations to the author, Mr. Clapp, who is now a valued assistant to the distinguished senior Senator from my State, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Many books have been written about Congress by men who never served in Congress, and who never worked on Capi-

tol Hill. Many of these books have been interesting, and some have been of real value. But this is the first book I have seen that reports completely and accurately what Congressmen themselves feel about their work.

All of us can learn something from the research that Mr. Ciapp has done in preparing this book, and from the opinions and suggestions expressed by the fine Congressmen who cooperated with him in this project.

The citizens of our country need to know more about how Congress works. This book can tell them. I hope that it will be widely read and appreciated.

Kennedy Called Civil Rights Martyr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KENNEDY CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS MARTYR

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy died a martyr's death. He died because he dared to advocate civil rights for Negroes. He dared to play the good Samaritan to the man farthest down.

It may be said, in truth, he died for the Negro race. He was crucified on a cross of race prejudice. Because he advocated civil rights for Negroes, those of race prejudice hated him with a violent and vicious hatred. Had he possessed the heart of a Faubus or a Barnett or a Wallace, he would be living today.

The foul and dastardly deed that Oswald the assassin did in Dallas was but a link in the cruel chain of circumstances that race prejudice is forging about the South and Nation. The rifle that snuffed out the life of our great President and the dynamite that slew four little Negro girls in Birmingham that fateful Sunday morning, are parts of the same pattern of violence and hatred that is gripping the South. Both of these tragic events were spawned in a climate and atmosphere of a race prejudice that is not only condoned but religiously cultivated even in the hearts of children.

When Oswald the assassin with felonious intent laid low our great President and one of the noblest spirits of history, he was operating in a climate of hatred and violence that race prejudice had prepared before him. The way had been prepared by the massive resisters, and the would-be interpositionists, and the "neverists" and the racists and the white supremacists overt and covert, and the anti-Kennedy press that heckled and hissed and hounded the man unmercifully and unceasingly unto the day of his tragic death.

It is therefore no wonder that Kennedy was slain in the South that hated him with such violent and vicious hatred, the South where race prejudice is threatening to take over the driver's seat, the South where extremists have locked the jaws of good men with fear.

The writer was born in the South and has lived and served in the South, not out of necessity but out of preference, through many years. He will sooner or later sleep beneath its soil. So he cannot resist the urge to lift once more, a voice of warning and protest when he sees race prejudice by its works and ways destroying his beloved Southland, and with it our great Nation.

GORDON B. HANCOCK.

RICHMOND.

Eulogy to President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have this eulogy delivered by Maj. Gen. Teddy H. Sanford, commander at Fort Chaffee, Ark., in the district which I am honored to represent, at the memorial services held at Fort Chaffee on Monday, November 25, 1963, for our late President, John F. Kennedy. I insert this splendid eulogy in the RECORD:

GENERAL'S EULOGY

We the military of Fort Chaffee are gathered here this afternoon, with our friends and neighbors of this community, in the presence of God, to pay our last respects to our late Commander in Chief.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is dead, cut down by an assassin's bullet—an act that has outraged decent men everywhere.

Mr. Kennedy brought to the head of our Government all the essential attributes of a great leader.

He was first of all a man of deep religious faith.

He brought to the White House not only the physical courage he had proven in combat, but also a great moral courage, so essential in the man who must make decisions.

Although he himself was born with wealth and high position, he brought with him a real concern for the average man, and the underprivileged everywhere.

He had an intimate knowledge of the world and its great problems.

He was a man of wisdom and peace and as our new President has said of him "he molded and moved the power of our Nation in the service of a world of growing liberty and order."

He did not shrink from his responsibilities but welcomed them.

He also brought with him a sense of humor, so essential to one shouldered with great responsibility.

His inaugural address was one of the greatest lines from it have been quoted over and over again and they will be quoted for decades to come. Like the one in which he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

He upheld the faith of our fathers, which is freedom of all men. He broadened the frontier of that faith, and backed it with energy and courage.

Mr. Kennedy said in his inaugural address, "The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

History will be much kinder to Mr. Kennedy than we have been.

He shall live in song and story as long as man remains free.

We pray that God shall continue to shed His grace on this Nation as He has so generously in the past.

With God's help we shall pick ourselves up from this great national tragedy and shame, and move forward to new heights, and as Mr. Kennedy said "light the world."

We of the military have not only lost our Commander in Chief, we have, also, lost a great champion. He not only understood military power as an instrument in world politics, he also understood the men and women of the services who constitute that power. He supported their aspiration for a more equal sharing of the privileges of citizenship in this great Nation.

Now that he has been relieved of command and of the great burdens placed upon him, not only by this Nation, but by the whole free world, may he rest in peace.

For his widow and children, his mother and father, and all his loved ones, we pray that God in His mysterious way will bring peace to their broken hearts.

Negro Leader Hits Lack of Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in the general darkness which surrounds the so-called civil rights issue, there comes occasionally a ray of light shed by an intelligence peculiarly competent to know this problem and understand all that is involved.

The Shreveport Journal of December 7 carried a press report of a statement by S. B. Fuller, one of the Nation's leading businessmen, which should be read and pondered by all those who believe that the solution to all the ills of the Negro race is the passage of the patently unconstitutional civil rights bill.

As a man who knows his people, this Chicago businessman, with deadly accuracy, has struck the nail squarely on the head and has driven the proverbial point home, that the Negro has no one but himself to blame for his lack of initiative, courage, wisdom, concentration, and reason.

Far better than my saying it, let this article speak for itself:

NEGRO LEADER HITS LACK OF INITIATIVE

NEW YORK.—Negroes, because of their own "lack of initiative, courage, integrity, loyalty and wisdom," have only themselves to blame for not moving forward, a Negro businessman said Friday night.

S. B. Fuller, one of the Nation's leading Negro businessmen, spoke during a panel discussion before the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) 68th annual congress of American industry. He was the first Negro ever to address the NAM.

Fuller said the Negro has failed to understand that man "must move forward, or the eternal march of progress will force him backward."

He said the Negro mistakenly "believes that the lack of civil rights legislation and the lack of integration have kept him back."

"Unfortunately, the Negro believes that there is a racial barrier in America which keeps him from succeeding, but yet if he would learn to use the laws of observation, concentration, memory, reason, and action, he would discover that there is a world of opportunity right in his own community," Fuller said.

Fuller is president of the Fuller Products Co. of Chicago.

Should Writers Write to Congressmen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am submitting for the RECORD a thoughtful article by Irwin Karp which appeared in the November issue of the Dramatists Bulletin. I think all of us in Congress will appreciate this effort to explain to the public some of the "do's" and "don'ts" of writing effective letters to Members of Congress:

SHOULD WRITERS WRITE TO CONGRESSMEN?

(By Irwin Karp)

Stanley Green's article on the pending jukebox bill (October, Dramatists Bulletin) concludes with the suggestion that guild members "write to their Congressmen expressing their support" for the bill. Considering that his letter on this bill, or on any pending copyright or tax legislation that affects writers, will be one of the thousands of pieces of mail that a Congressman or Senator receives each week, it is natural for an author to wonder whether writing can help, or is simply a futile gesture.

Obviously, much depends on whether his letter is merely another piece of paper in an organized campaign to support or oppose a particular measure, by a show of numerical strength; or, whether it really discusses an issue, reflects the writer's own viewpoint, and is aimed at enlightenment and persuasion.

On some major issues, a flood of mail may influence a bill's fate. For example, the Treasury's proposal to withhold income tax on interest and dividends was opposed by a well organized letterwriting campaign, which probably contributed to its defeat.

In many instances, however, pressure campaigns are self-defeating—and they should be. Certainly, the fate of legislation to reform the Copyright Act, or to give fairer tax treatment to authors and other creative persons, should depend on something more substantial and logical than than counting pieces of mail, pro and con.

In any event, letters from authors can serve a more useful purpose than as mere ballots in a pressure campaign. The tax and copyright problems of writers, dramatists and composers are not among the burning issues that engage the attention of most Congressmen. While members of the committees responsible for legislation in these areas do become acquainted with these problems, and the author's viewpoint, most Representatives and Senators do not. Proposed legislation affecting writers tend to become lost in the mass of other matters they have to consider. One means of directing a Congressman's attention to bills that affect the literary profession and persuading him of the merits of the author's position, is personal correspondence from individual writers.

Do such letters reach Congressmen? And do they have an effect? In a Harper's article (June 1961), Ellen Davis points out that while the great mass of a Senator's mail is handled by his staff and does not reach his desk, he does see and personally reply to, letters from the "unusually thoughtful or articulate constitutent." Of course, if the constituent is not only articulate but also well known, so much better the chance that his letter will be read by the Senator, and not processed by the staff for a form reply.

Miss Davis quotes former Representative James Quigley of Pennsylvania, "By all means, write your Congressman if you have something to tell him. Letters that have something to say and say it well are always welcome." That the Congressman's statement is not just a bromide, is borne out by the experience of authors who have written on legislation affecting the literary profession and the creative arts. They have found that Representatives and Senators do read their letters and are interested in these issues; and that they will give serious consideration to the author's viewpoint. However, these letters were thoughtfully developed expositions of that viewpoint, and not merely perfunctory statements of support for a particular bill—and this, more often than not, marks the difference between a letter that is futile, and one that may actually help.

The U.S. Dollar Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Matt S. Szymczak before the 55th annual meeting of the District of Columbia Savings & Loan League on May 31 at Hot Springs, Va.

Mr. Szymczak, a former member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, is particularly well qualified to speak on economic matters.

Governor Szymczak's remarks follow:

THE U.S. DOLLAR TODAY

(By Matt S. Szymczak, member of the faculty, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., before the 55th annual meeting of the District of Columbia Savings & Loan League, May 31, 1963)

Our economy seems to have a way all its own. In spite of the many varying forecasts as to where it's going, it just keeps going along—not high, not low—but just going along. It is my opinion that a modified tax cut is inevitable—sometime about September or October. And that is bound to stimulate economic growth.

Monetary policy will take all this into account and will proceed accordingly taking into account the money and credit needs of our economy—a high-level stable economy—without inflation, and at the same time, our deficit in our balance of payments. At a time when the economy rises further and the demand for credit increases, interest rates will rise in accordance with the principle of free markets—supply and demand.

Since the late fifties, but especially since 1960, there had been increasing anxiety about the U.S. dollar and, given the dollar's preeminent international role, about the entire world financial system: concern over balance-of-payments deficits, agitated discussion of the gold outflow and the rise of U.S. short-term indebtedness, and at times frenzied gold speculation. Indeed there were moments when serious men could be pardoned for suggesting that America was faced with a clear and present danger of international insolvency. But such talk or at least talk in quite such anguished tones now has largely disappeared. Is it simply that we have learned to live with this constant danger, as we have learned to live with the terrible risks of the cold war between nuclear superpowers? Or has the danger really receded; either because the underlying financial situation has improved, or because our monetary authorities, in cooperation with European governments and central banks, have succeeded in dismantling offensive weapons—in defusing the explosives which might have set off an international financial catastrophe? Nobody, of course, suggests that our financial problem is solved; but hardly anybody today fears imminent financial disaster. Does that mean that our dollar is sounder—and safer—today than it was 1 year, 2 years, 3 years ago?

The sound dollar is not a very clear concept. As a staple of political and editorial oratory, it is a little like mother love: something everybody is for—except, of course, one's wicked opponents. But to define it is a lot harder. No doubt before April 1933 a sound dollar meant a dollar freely redeemable in gold at the fixed parity. Indeed, some may still nostalgically equate real soundness with free coinage and free convertibility into gold. Yet when we speak today, 30 years after the collapse of the international gold standard, of the soundness of a currency—any currency—clearly we must have something else in mind. What is that something—what does a "sound dollar" mean in the context of the world economy of 1963?

I submit that there are two meanings—related to one another, but not at all the same thing. In the context of the domestic economy, "soundness" must surely refer to acceptability and relative stability of purchasing power. In the international context, a "sound dollar" means a dollar whose exchange rate is maintained without resort to exchange control or general import quotas.

Before offering some remarks on the international soundness—or otherwise—of the dollar, I should like to say a few words about a sound domestic dollar. If we agree on a fairly stable purchasing power as the proper criterion of a sound domestic currency, we have reason to be well satisfied with the performance of the dollar in the recent past; measured by the cost-of-living index, the value of the dollar has declined only very little since 1959; measured by the commodity price index, not at all. That in itself, however, does not guarantee plain sailing in the future. Threats to continuing stability or near-stability may arise from three causes: excessive total expenditures, excessive liquidity, and rising costs.

Excessive total expenditures—total demand from consumers, businesses, and Government in excess of what can be produced with available resources—does not appear to be a danger in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, the problem at the moment is just the reverse—total demand for goods and services falls short, by roughly $40 billion annually, of what the economy could produce. This, as you know, is the administration's argument behind the tax cut proposals now before Congress: that by being provided with $10 billion more in disposable income, the public will be induced to spend more on consumption, thus stimulating increased economic activity and utilizing hitherto idle resources. As long as such increased consumer demand—including secondary effects—can be met from existing (but currently unused) resources, no stepped-up price inflation, and therefore no threat to the soundness of the dollar, need be feared.

But there is one proviso: by cutting taxes, the Federal Government will incur a larger deficit. That deficit can be financed by borrowing either from the banks or from the public, i.e., either by new credit creation or by tapping the public's savings. If the first route is chosen, greater liquidity of the public at large will be the result. That in itself need not threaten price inflation, for the public's spending is primarily determined by the level of income, not by whether more or less of its assets are held in liquid form.

Nonetheless, a great increase in liquidity means a lot of financial tinder lying around—tinder that could feed the flames of inflation if a new boom developed and got out of hand. It is clearly for this reason that Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve has pointed out that any increase in the Government's deficit resulting from the proposed tax cut should be financed out of savings, not through the creation of new credit.

I mentioned a third threat to the future stability of the dollar: rising costs. On this subject, little can be added at this late hour to what most of us have been saying for many years: that all of us have a responsibility—a grave responsibility—to exercise restraint in wage demands and in setting prices. Our national record has been much better over the last 4 or 5 years than in the immediate postwar era, but even now unrestrained demands on the part of a few could still rock the boat. We must never forget that we are all in this together.

Let me now turn to the posture we present to the outside world: How sound is the dollar internationally?

Soundness of the dollar as an international currency rests on its free convertibility into other currencies; and, since other currencies are defined in terms of dollars of a given gold content, ultimately on fee convertibility into gold at the request of foreign central banks.

Of course, what here complicates our position, as well as that of the United Kingdom, is the fact that dollars and sterling are widely used as international reserve currencies. Thus, while other countries currencies are fairly safe as long as their national accounts (both current and capital) are balanced, or at least any imbalance is amply covered by foreign exchange reserves, the United States and the United Kingdom have an additional worry, a worry common to all bankers; namely, that their short-term liabilities exceed their ultimate liquid reserves, in this instance gold. But whereas commercial bankers have long been accustomed to reserve ratios of 8 or 10 or, at most, 22 percent, the drop of our national gold reserve to less than 100 percent of foreign short-term liabilities has given rise to a bad case of jitters. To be sure, sterling, the other international reserve currency, has long carried on with gold and foreign exchange reserves oscillating around $3 billion, against foreign sterling balances of around $10 billion—no more than a 30 percent reserve ratio. But we in this country had had 20 years to become accustomed to gold reserves of $20 billion or more, against foreign dollar balances of less than that; so that the new situation, in which we have gold reserves amounting to no more than about $16 billion against foreign short-term liabilities of $20 billion ($25 billion if liabilities to international agencies are included) forced a considerable degree of rethinking and made not only us but international bankers as well rather nervous.

What all this amounts to is that international soundness of the dollar rests on its international confidence. To revert once more to an earlier analogy: other countries, like ordinary citizens, are financially sound as long as their income (plus accumulated savings) matches their outgo; the United States and Great Britain however, like all bankers, must concern themselves not only with their solvency but also with their liquidity; a loss of confidence would destroy their credit and cause a run on the bank.

And that brings us to the crucial point: what does international confidence in the dollar rest on, and how well is it likely to be maintained in the foreseeable future?

Clearly we are concerned here with a psychological phenomenon that is subject to many irrational pulls; but equally clearly it must somehow be linked, although perhaps only after a timelag, with an underlying concrete fact: the international solvency of the American economy. What initially caused nervousness, a few years back, was the sudden realization that the United States, in its capacity as international banker, no longer was holding 100 percent reserves; but what really gave substance to those sudden fears was the fact that for several years the United States had been running annual balance-of-payments deficits of nearly $4 billion; unless foreign countries were willing to add indefinitely to their holdings of dollars—an unlikely assumption—or else, unless the trend was reversed, it would be only a matter of time before American gold reserves were depleted; the more so as about $11½ billion were frozen as domestic gold backing by the Federal Reserve for its currency and deposits, and only the remainder constituted free international reserves.

It was at that time that first priority was given to the task of correcting the imbalance in our international accounts. I need do no more here than briefly enumerate some of the actions taken: reducing our defense expenditures abroad; reducing the value of goods which returning tourists may bring in duty free; purchasing of defense equipment by our allies in the United States; tying a far larger percentage of foreign aid to dollar purchases in the United States; attempts to encourage exports and American travel by foreigners; keeping short-term interest rates high in order to discourage the outflow of short-term capital; negotiations for the early repayment of foreign loans; offers to convert dollar balances into medium-term Treasury securities denominated in foreign currencies; and, last but not least, efforts to hold down prices and keep exports internationally competitive, partly by exhortation and partly by fiscal inducements to modernize. And, of course, by other measures that indicate a serious determination to attain equilibrium in our international payments. A constant search for new and additional ways to do that is evident to all.

The saving grace was that we did not have to resort to a crash program of desperate emergency measures. We do, after all, still have gold reserves of about $16 billion, which can gain us valuable time while carefully prepared longer term measures take effect. And there is evidence that our policies have begun to show results; after years of hovering around $4 billion, our balance-of-payments deficit declined to less than $2.4 billion in 1961 and to $2.2 billion in 1962. It now appears that we were too optimistic when we expected a balance in our international accounts by the end of this year. More likely we will have another deficit this year, perhaps in the neighborhood of $2 billion, and I would caution that even occasional hints that, with luck, we may break even by 1964 should not be taken too literally. A further gradual reduction may be the best we can achieve. Slow progress it is, perhaps, but progress nonetheless. But can we be even sure of that much—a gradual narrowing of our payments gap, and eventual balance sometime in the sixties?

I believe we can. Consider first the trade balance. A recent article in the "Survey of Current Business," based on statistical analysis of recent trends, argues that our exports to other industrialized countries have been rising in direct relation to those countries' economic growth. And even though the rate of that growth has recently slowed down somewhat, we may reasonably expect the growth of those countries—Western Europe and Japan—to continue, albeit at a somewhat less hectic pace. Moreover, while our export prices have remained practically unchanged since 1959, those of Western Europe and Japan have recently been rising. This rise can be expected to continue if you take into account the rapid increase in labor costs in those countries, especially in France and Western Germany. Such a shift in the cost and price relationship will, I venture to say, after a lag bring a considerable shift in the flow of international trade—wholly in our favor. One factor, it must be admitted, may partly offset such an improvement; if the European Economic Community turns inward and surrounds itself with a high tariff wall, our exports may be deprived of some of the markets where they would otherwise enjoy a price advantage. Difficulties with our farm exports, and in general the recent attitude of President de Gaulle's government must indeed give rise to considerable apprehension on that score. But we should not despair too quickly. After all, the Common Market includes five other countries as well as France, and in my opinion, General de Gaulle is not as inward-looking as reported, and Germany is known to be strongly opposed to any inward-looking, protectionist little-Europe policy and in favor of freer trade and economic and political cooperation with the United States and Great Britain. Thus, while it is risky to base economic predictions on political guesses, the long-run political odds are certainly not nearly as unfavorable as they may look at the moment.

But that is not all. Any references to American investment abroad may discourage the outflow of U.S. long-term capital, in fact, there already have been indications of a gradual slackening in this flow; and this trend may accelerate. This, added to the recent reduction in the outflow of short-term capital, will bring further relief to our balance of payments. Nor does it seem likely that foreign aid payments will rise further; if anything, congressional sentiment after the publication of the Clay report points to a further cut. Put all these things together—a probable rise in exports, only partly offset by higher imports if our domestic economy improves further; a probable reduction in the net outflow of long-term capital; and a return flow of earnings on American investments abroad, a leveling off or even reduction in foreign aid—and you see good reasons for expecting a slow but continuing improvement in our basic balance.

Will all this be enough to restore and maintain international confidence and insure that there will not be a run on the dollar? We cannot be absolutely sure; even the soundest banker can never guarantee that some unforeseen event—a default somewhere else, an unsubstantiated rumor—may not lead to a mass panic among his depositors and close his bank. And while domestically, after long and painful experience, we have devised strong safeguards in the form of the Federal Reserve, the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, we have only one equivalent to that in the international field, the International Monetary Fund; and the International Monetary Fund, though it has large resources, cannot create new international credit, and is therefore limited in its role as international lender of last resort. True, as indicated by Per Jacobssen, its Director, the other day, its powers and operations have been greatly expanded.

But when this has been said, there are nevertheless grounds for being optimistic about the future and for asserting that the international financial situation is vastly more stabilized than a couple of years ago. A straw in the wind came in January: after the breakdown of the Brussels talks between Great Britain and the Common Market, there developed a flurry of speculation against sterling. Yet this attack on sterling was brought under complete control within a day (as was also a more recent one in March), in stark contrast to the upheaval which the run on sterling caused 2 years ago—when Britain had to raise the bank rate to 7 percent, ask for a huge loan from the International Monetary Fund, and take drastic action domestically. If the United Kingdom, with much less reserves than the United States and with an economic future that has suddenly become quite uncertain, can ward off an attack on sterling so quickly and suc-

cessfully, there seems even less danger that a successful attack could be mounted against the dollar.

Why should the United States and the United Kingdom, these two international bankers, suddenly find themselves in a so much stronger position? I believe there are several factors which explain this new stability. For one thing, international financial cooperation has been greatly strengthened over the past 2 years. The central banks of the most important countries have agreed to make credit available to one another when any country's currency is under attack. They also have pooled resources and coordinated their policies to counter gold speculation on the London gold market. Finally, the U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have been operating in the foreign exchange markets so that for instance any sudden flight from dollars into some other currency could promptly be countered by official U.S. sales of that currency in the foreign exchange market, before such a movement has a chance to develop into a panic.

But still, this constitutes only a technical defense against sudden speculative moves; it could not stave off forever any long-term flight from the dollar or the pound sterling. The second line of defense consists of something much more solid than more technical devices: the fact that basically the international economic position of both Britain and the United States is now basically much stronger than a few years ago. Britain has a slight surplus in her balance of payments, and the United States has a surplus on current account, and a deficit on capital account that seems at least under control—a deficit moreover, which if the worst came to the worst could be eliminated by stopping or reducing further foreign aid, military expenditures abroad, and foreign investments. To stop any or all of those capital outflows would be politically and otherwise highly undesirable; but the world knows that the United States could in the last resort do that rather than become internationally insolvent, and this knowledge deters any really determined speculation against the dollar. No realistic person can ever overlook that, on its trading account alone, the United States more than pays its way internationally, and therefore ultimately remains master of its destiny.

There is one final circumstance which, indirectly, has strengthened the position of the dollar and the pound sterling: the alternatives to holding on to the two key currencies look so much less inviting now than they did a short while ago. When those two currencies were under attack in 1960 and 1961, respectively, short term capital moved either into gold or into the currencies of Switzerland, the Netherlands, West Germany, France, and Italy. Today only the Italian lira looks reasonably attractive. Gold speculation has lost most of its glitter since the President clearly reaffirmed that the dollar would not be devalued, and since the world's important central banks made it clear that they would use their combined resources to defeat any speculation in the London gold market. Switzerland has recently been suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, making the Swiss franc look less attractive than before. The French have recently been plagued by a deficit in their balance of trade; and though their invisible exports still more than compensate for that, the French are clearly worried that their rapidly rising costs and prices may lead to a further deterioration. As for Germany and the Netherlands, both have found that the recent appreciation of their currencies has made exporting much more difficult for them than they had expected. In fact Germany, the big surplus country of not so long ago, is now in a position very similar to that of the United States in the late fifties: a shrinking surplus in its balance of trade has more and more difficulty paying for the deficit on capital account. Germany's imports have for several years now been rising faster than its exports, and the continuing rapid increase in German wage costs and prices threatens to wipe out the export surplus altogether. In brief, while in the late fifties and early sixties our gold and dollar outflow led to a corresponding increase in the gold and dollar reserves of several European countries (and Japan), today only France still continues to accumulate further reserves; and as I mentioned before, the French themselves already anticipate a turn of the tide—President de Gaulle's attempts to hold down miners' wages, and the resulting large-scale strikes in France, are a clear indication of how desperately worried the French are about the competitiveness of their exports and thus the future of the franc.

To restate this final factor in the newly changed international situation: not only is there much less reason for international speculative funds to flee from the dollar and the pound sterling—even if they wanted to, they have no place to go; the alternatives look no more attractive, perhaps even less so. And, of course, all this is no more than a reflection of the underlying reality: the basic economic imbalance between the strength and competitiveness of the United States and Great Britain on one hand, and Western Europe and Japan on the other, has largely disappeared. There is no reason to withdraw funds from your bank if it is as safe as any other place.

Economic prediction is proverbially risky. Any number of things may happen overnight to make us all look like fools. But if prediction is modestly regarded as no more than an honest attempt to appraise all the factors that impinge on our economy today, and those that look like impinging on it in the near future, then the prospects are moderately comforting. At least so they look to me. If stimulation of our domestic economy is carried far enough to create new investment opportunities at home, so that more of our capital will stay home, but not beyond the point where it would set up new inflationary pressures; if we as a nation continue to pursue prudent policies and to exercise self-restraint with regard to prices and wages, then there are solid grounds for expecting not only economic progress but also a sound dollar, both domestically and internationally. We are by no means out of the woods yet. But I believe we are on the right track and, God willing, we can and will lick the problem.

Inflationary increases in our export prices, of course, would hurt our surplus in exports and thus increase our deficit, but I am optimistic that this will not be allowed to happen here. I hope I am right.

As this is being written, I am mindful of the fact that France has increased its accumulation of reserves and that Germany appears to be moving in the direction of a surplus position in its international payments. Nonetheless, taking a longer period of time into view, I am on the whole optimistic as to the future of our balance-of-payments position.

Plan for Training and Job Placement of Unemployed for Jobs Now Available, Including Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following manuscript by Edwin G. Jenkins:

PLAN FOR TRAINING AND JOB PLACEMENT OF UNEMPLOYED FOR JOBS NOW AVAILABLE, INCLUDING AUTOMATION

(By Edwin G. Jenkins)

OUTLINE

1. Utilizing knowledge gained through years of experience by tradesmen in their respective fields as well as information received through studies of professional experts.

2. A look at America's present program for training unemployed and other technicians needed today and tomorrow.

3. Presenting a practical training program that will benefit all Americans now.

4. A large number of unemployed, unskilled Americans can be trained and employed in good jobs in 12 to 18 months.

5. Supplying adequate labor for unionized operations as well as open shop operations, giving all Americans the freedom of choice of employment.

6. Keeping the American labor force training up to and in constant step with progress made by our scientists and others in the field of automation.

7. Manufacturers and suppliers willing to aid in keeping machinery and equipment of workshops up to their latest developments.

8. The best medicine for the handicapped, school dropouts, and juvenile delinquents is training and good job employment.

AN APPEAL BY A LAYMAN

To each Federal, State, and city official, and each U.S. citizen who is sincerely interested in doing whatever possible to aid all members of our great Nation in securing and keeping jobs of their choosing, irrespective of their origin, race, political or religious convictions.

This layman was born in Birmingham, Ala. on December 4, 1910, and it would seem he was born a few years prior to his time as several things he has envisioned, developed, and presented have been accepted by the American public several years after his inception.

After graduation from State Agricultural and Mechanical School, Normal, Ala., in 1926, he attended Mergenthaler Linotype School in Chicago and returned to Birmingham as the first Negro linotype machinist in the area.

In 1939 he founded the first successful Negro pictorial magazine—"Newspic." The magazine was the only magazine used as a morale builder for Negro servicemen in the U.S. installations, as well as abroad. This magazine was the first Negro magazine to carry regularly four-color process national advertisements. It was founded 3 years before the advent of Negro Digest, Ebony, and other Johnson publications, which have been very successful.

In 1944 he opened the first bowling lanes for Negroes in the South. They were in the basement of the Masonic Temple, Fourth Avenue and 17th Street, Birmingham, Ala.

In 1949 he wrote the curriculum and founded the first complete private printing trade school in the United States. The school was named Manhattan School of Printing, and was located at 333 Sixth Avenue, New York City. He was forced out by his financial partner in a few months without any compensation—only a portion of his back salary as an instructor was received.

In 1950 he acquired the ownership of the oldest Linotype school in America known as Empire Linotype School, immediately developing it into a complete printing school and adding the first complete maintenance course for the Linotype and Intertype machines to be taught in a private trade school. This was done as the need for machinists of these machines was increasing, and the manufacturers of these machines were discontinuing their schools which had been in operation for years.

Next, in 1954, he developed, wrote the course, and instituted the first complete photo offset course to be offered in a private trade school in the United States.

In March of 1958 this layman spent several weeks establishing the International Assistance Foundation, in an attempt to present to the American people a realistic international technical aid program for the, then, new emerging African nations. His plan was to acquaint the people of these countries with the American way of life, thus winning their friendship before they were free. Several others in this country recommended to our Government and other officials that we should train the leaders of these countries in contrast to his suggestion. So, no help was given to the International Assistance Foundation. However, something like $500,000 was given to bring to these shores supposed-to-be leaders of these new emerging countries. To the knowledge of most of us in America, this program was not successful. The program which was attempted by the International Assistance Foundation was, in part, presented under our present Peace Corps program which came into existence a few years after he had presented the International Assistance Foundation plan.

We, as American citizens, have reached another milestone in our history, and the program and techniques employed in apprenticeship training over the last 100 years has not been modified to meet today's demands.

When this layman sees our President in a sincere effort to aid our country in the big job of training and securing jobs for the unskilled and unemployed, which is still growing each day, he feels that it is his duty to present whatever plan he feels will aid in this program.

He noticed in the newspaper reports that President Johnson had asked men like Whitney Young, Jr., Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Farnum to suggest a plan that will aid him in working out the solution to this problem. In each instance they have said that the solution is in the acceptance of all members of America with equal rights in the American apprenticeship program in all trades. He is sure that this was suggested because they feel that through the apprenticeship program we have the answer.

However, this layman is certain that these conclusions were reached based on studies made by experts in different fields who had spent most of their lives either in training in academic institutions, or in research of the printed material available on the subject at hand. He doubts sincerely that laymen such as himself who have spent, as in his case, 38 years in the printing field and have mastered the trade, have been asked their opinions as to what could be done to alleviate this problem.

Years ago Booker Washington started out at Tuskegee Institute and the plan extended to other vocational schools throughout the South that for minority groups to gain their rightful position in the country, they had to master a trade. This layman thinks that most of the minority group members who are today enjoying good positions in trades throughout the country are those who were trained in these schools. These schools a few years ago decided that to train their students to become first class citizens they would have to drop the trades and vocational training programs and emulate other institutions by becoming schools of liberal arts and higher education. Now that they have succeeded in a number of instances, to open doors and employers are ready to receive qualified craftsmen in a number of vocational shop positions, these institutions do not have personnel to offer. Certainly, to remedy this situation, permission to get more minority groups into apprenticeship programs today is not the answer.

The plan which this layman shall attempt to present in the next paragraphs will be centered around the experience and knowledge gained in the printing field. However, through several months' investigating and checking, he has found that, with minor changes, this program is applicable to most trades which we have in the United States today, needing large numbers of persons trained in new fields because of automation.

The time of 5 or 6 years is the usual time required for one to complete apprenticeship programs which leaves the journeyman, once he has completed same, to be in a position not much better than the one he was in when he started the apprenticeship program as manufacturers are developing new and more modern equipment to do the same job in less time each year. So, we need a program that will keep the workers of America trained and in step with the scientists and other persons employed in developing more and more modern equipment.

In most cases, the time of the apprenticeship programs today should be reduced to around 12 or 18 months—not 5 or 6 years—and the way it can be done is very simple.

We have in New York State several qualified private trade schools that are capable of training persons for different skills in 5 or 6 months of concentrated training. The big problem which has come up in most cases has been placement, as industry is not willing to hire these persons who have been trained until they have had some commercial experience.

The next step would be to establish nonprofit workshops in every industry where it is found feasible, so that, with an additional 5 or 6 months on-the-job training with journeyman supervision, the industries would be able to receive from these workshops qualified labor as they would need it. This labor would not only be trained in the most modern techniques of the trade they had selected and which had been standardized throughout the entire 50 States, but they would have been exposed to the latest machines developed for automation as these machines would have been made available by the manufacturers for each of the shops requesting same, as they would be run nonprofit. The manufacturers could loan, give or bequest these machines to the workshop, thus exposing the trainees to the latest America had to offer.

I am sure you realize that industry under normal conditions cannot purchase the latest automated machinery as fast as it is developed. First, because of the large cost. Second, it would be unwise for them to purchase this machinery without adequate labor to man it.

When this layman was in Washington recently, an official asked him what the unions would think of this program. He did not answer him at the time, but since arriving in New York he has given it some thought. This layman doesn't think that we should be concerned with what the unions think of any such program, but we should be concerned with what all the citizens of America would think of the program. The unions represent less than one-half of the constituents of the country. He feels that the open shops in all fields are just as important as the union membership. If we are to be a strong America, the question should be: What does the American public think of the program? What's good for America is good for the unions.

The unions really should be our best supporters for the plan, as, again referring to this layman's experience in the printing field, about eight years ago, after he established the first photo offset printing course, a number of small printing plants, which formerly had done letter press printing, changed over to photo offset printing. These owners were not in a position to hire a photographer, a stripper, a platemaker and a pressman. So, we developed a combination course for a photographer, stripper, platemaker, and pressman. This made it possible for the average small printer to hire one combination man and one pressman. The plant owner would find the jobs and manage the plant. After a few months of this operation, he would usually increase his employees by adding one photographer, one stripper, one platemaker, etc.

When this plant reached 10 or 12 persons or more, it was usually approached by the union, or someone in the shop approached the union, and the plant was organized. In the last 9 or 10 years this layman thinks he can point to more than 100 plants in this area that have been established along these lines, and are now unionized. Most of the members are graduates of our school and not any of them have taken more than 18 to 24 months to secure their union card. So, he feels the union should be our greatest supporter as we are their main source of expansion.

Under the Manpower Training Act this layman understands that New York State alone received a little more than $42 million. This was several months ago. It is understood that only a very few dollars have been spent and they have been spent through efforts trying to expand public school systems.

He has been informed, and since large numbers of his students come from the local New York school of printing, that, although some public schools have very good equipment, they lack good teaching personnel. When he investigated this area he found that, in the main, those who instruct or teach in city vocational schools are those who have not been successful in obtaining union memberships. For that reason, they have taken positions as instructors. If these persons are not capable of obtaining union membership, how can they direct the training of personnel needed for today's automation program?

We cannot understand why a large number of qualified private trade schools in New York State are not being utilized when these private trade schools have to pay taxes, thus help replace the U.S. dollar, spent each year, and the efforts are being concentrated on the public schools which, of course, are nonprofit, and, thus, tax exempt. It does not seem that our resources are being perpetuated in this fashion.

This layman also understands that the little effort that has been made so far toward the Manpower Training Act in New York State includes some phase of training at city schools for offset pressmen, but as a prerequisite the applicant must have spent 2 to 3 years as a journeyman in the field before he is eligible for training. I am sure you can see how this precludes minority group persons who never worked in the printing trade at all.

This layman wishes to point out that this is not a program for just minority groups, but for all Americans, in that he has found through the 13 years that he has directed Empire School of Printing that the high competitive situation in America today makes it a must that all employers hire those who are best qualified to produce their products regardless of their race, origin, political, or religious convictions.

So, he would request that when you consider plans that are going to be presented by a number of experts as you would normally do at this time, you consider the recommendations of a layman which were gained through years of experience, before making your decision.

This layman is Edwin G. Jenkins, director, Empire School of Printing, Inc., 222 Park Avenue South, New York City.

APPENDAGE

If these workshops are established in every trade feasible, the amount of actual commercial work done by them will be less than one-half of 1 percent of the commercial

work done in the respective trades. This certainly would not be an encroachment of nonprofit workshops in the field of commercial work.

Several thousand words have been written covering the development made by IBM, RCA, National Cash Register, Burroughs, etc., in their efforts to develop machines to increase the amount of corrected punched tape to be used in typesetting. However, I have yet to read one word by any firm or person tending to train the manpower necessary to keep the typecasting machine running, as they have changed their gears to get more slugs per minute out of one machine, and of course, will need more maintenance attention.

In New York City alone there are 5,000 or 6,000 linotype operators, but today's requirements for automation require 2,000 to 3,000 linotype and intertype machinists and yet the only complete maintenance course available for the requirement of automation in this area is offered by Empire School of Printing. However, nothing has been done by New York State to utilize this training through the Manpower Training Act, when immediate jobs and union cards are available to all trainees who master this maintenance training.

In Recognition of Miss Debbie Reynolds and Her Work With Emotionally Disturbed Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, since its founding in 1955, the Thalians, an organization for emotionally disturbed children, has had as its most ardent supporter, film star Miss Debbie Reynolds, a valued constituent of mine. Miss Reynolds has been instrumental in raising funds for the organization, which is a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation chartered by the State of California.

In the beginning, its fundraising efforts benefited the Reiss-Davis Guidance Child Clinic in West Los Angeles. As the group became larger and its income increased, Miss Reynolds spearheaded the group's dream by organizing a clinic of its own. This clinic was dedicated in 1959 on the grounds of the Mount Sinai Hospital and is called the Thalians Clinic for Children. At the present moment the clinic is operating at peak level, with more than 125 children under regular observation.

In 1961, when the Cedars of Lebanon and Mount Sinai Hospitals merged, the combined organization began to raise funds for a $50 million medical center for Los Angeles. As part of the center's building fund, the Thalians pledged themselves to raise $1 million to construct and maintain a Thalians building to contain an expanded clinic for children. Miss Reynolds, again, is the vital force behind this drive.

Miss Debbie Reynolds, film star and mother, with so many other pressing duties, should most certainly be applauded for her invaluable service to this group.

Buweps Mission Told by its Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Rear Adm. K. S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons, writing in the December issue of Navy magazine, tells the vital story of this Bureau's mission in protecting the United States as follows:

KEEPING THE FLEET ARMED AND READY IN THE MISSILE AGE

(By Rear Adm. K. S. Materson, U.S. Navy, Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons)

With a background of international tension and unrest, seapower can never be static. A U.S. Navy of about the present size, expressed in terms of packaged weapon systems; i.e., ships, aircraft, and their armament, is needed to reinforce our national determination to resist aggression and to safeguard American interests, as well as the interests of our friends and allies.

It was the high state of instant combat readiness of the Navy, and that in all our Armed Forces, which gave President Kennedy a free hand in taking his firm position in the Cuban crisis. The existence and capability of the fighting forces enabled him to select the time, the place, and the method of coping with aggression. Faced with a most rigorous challenge, naval forces met that challenge successfully, and proved conclusively that a mobile, flexible fleet still is, and will continue to be, an effective instrument in national policy. The ability of the several services to effect superb liaison—between ships and both land-based and carrier-based planes—was well demonstrated and efficiently executed.

OUR OBJECT: TO KEEP PEACE

But we cannot stand still and let scientific progress overtake us. Our responsibilities as a member of the Nation's defense team are many. We must look sharply to the Navy of the future, forever keeping pace with the technological revolution. Only thus can the Bureau of Naval Weapons provide the Fleet with the weapons necessary to give the ability to apply force with discernment, precision and in appropriate degree if and when needed. These newer weapon systems that result from our development effort, with their longer ranges, higher speeds, greater power and shorter reaction time, continue to be much more expensive than their predecessors. Today's and tomorrow's models must have the capability of matching the demonstrated high-performance weapons of any potential enemy. In addition, they must be devised in the fastest and most economical way.

More defense for fewer dollars is being achieved by interservice use of each individual service's research and development program, and today many of the Buweps developed items are doing double duty. They are being put into the arsenals of the Marine Corps, the Army, the Air Force and friendly foreign nations, and vice versa.

Today the U.S. Navy's firepower includes much new and revolutionary equipment. A prime example is the nuclear submarine with its Polaris missiles, a powerful deterrent to a nuclear war, and one of the key weapons in the arsenal of the free world. Among weapons that provide the fleet with the ability to fight and win wars of limited objectives are the surface-to-air Tartar, Talos and Terrier missiles and the antisubmarine rocket Asroc, the drone helpicopter (Dash) armed with advanced torpedoes, the deadly air-to-air Sidewinders and Sparrow III's, the lethal air-to-surface Bullpup, the new free-fall bombs, and the high-performance Hipeg machinegun which fires stockpiled ammunition at a fantastic rate.

IMPORTANCE OF R. & D.

Looking to the future, Buweps programs include Subroc, an antisubmarine rocket with built-in guidance; Typhon, an integrated surface-to-air weapon system; and Phoenix, Shrike and Condor aircraft missiles, all typical of Navy's continued research for progress and improvement.

It should not appear, however, that the Buweps research and development program is totally oriented to aircraft and armament as end products only. It sponsors and conducts a broad program of research and exploratory development, both basic and applied, in all areas of technology that are important to the Navy's mission. Much of this is carried out with reference to Navy weapon systems in order to increase our base of knowledge as well as to advance our technological capabilities. It is from the results of this research and exploratory development that the Navy draws new techniques and new concepts for future weapon systems.

Also the Navy, as a participant in the national space effort, is involved or interested in many undertakings in space technology. Such Navy developments as radar, telemetering gear, full-pressure suits and solid rocket propellants have a profound influence on almost all U.S. space projects. Because of the Navy's pioneering in the field of nuclear propulsion, the application of knowledge gained thus far is invaluable in the national search for means to implement nuclear power as a space propellant system.

While the Navy's present posture is outstanding, our goal will remain a modern Navy that is formidable, versatile and flexible in its undertaking of a wide range of commitments around the world, while at the same time maintaining its readiness for action of any type, or scale, at any time.

Magazine Salutes Congressman Lindsay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], is the subject of a magazine article in the December issue of New York/USA. This is a bimonthly journal of debate, investigation, and fact directed to the State of New York and its officials. Its editor and publisher, James H. Heineman, personally authored this biographical sketch of the gentleman.

From my first congressional association with JOHN LINDSAY, I have respected immensely his distinction and dedication. He is an effective national legislator who well serves his constituents needs and interests.

This article is not the first time the gentleman's obvious abilities have been noted in such public form. Further, we all recognize his performance and poten-

tial will bring him to other worthy tributes in the days ahead. Still, the special character of New York/USA and its circulation among the 10,000 elected and appointive government officials in the top echelons of each branch in every section of New York's municipal, county, and State governments makes this article deserving of special attention.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the selection of JOHN LINDSAY for this notice offers positive proof that his is among the brighest stars in the political firmament.

The article follows:

PROFILE: JOHN VLIET LINDSAY

(By James H. Heineman, editor and publisher)

"The step that the Federal Government should take at this time in promoting the development of the fine arts in the United States is to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Both the previous and the present administrations have called for the creation of such a council, but the measure has been consistently stymied in the House where it has failed to clear the Committee on Rules."

The speaker was the Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY, Representative from the 17th Congressional District of the State of New York, as he reintroduced a bill to promote the growth and development of the fine arts in America.

Republican LINDSAY has been referred to by Show magazine as "the theater's foremost champion in Congress," and a man who has "introduced a number of House bills designed to alleviate some of the pressures on American show business." He is one of the few legislators in the country who recognize that, underneath the so-called cultural explosion of the past decade, with mounting public interest in live theater, with mushrooming art classes and with a 100-percent increase in the demand for books of all kinds, there lies a serious national economic and artistic ill health.

"Little or nothing is heard in Washington about the actions only lawmakers can take," said Mr. LINDSAY recently. "The dramatic arts have no spokesmen there. They have no lobbies. Most Congressmen have never heard from their constituents on legislation affecting the arts."

SPOKESMAN FOR THE ARTS

Fortunately, the statement about no spokesmen is not quite right. We do have Mr. LINDSAY. Last April, he delineated four major proposals for restoring the cultural health of the United States, which in capsule form are:

1. The creation of executive offices at all levels of Government whose purpose it would be to give recognition and status to the arts, and to coordinate community interest and resources in matters of private participation.

2. The establishment of the aforementioned Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, "to exert a unifying force upon the currently confused and chaotic Federal dealings with the arts," and to overcome the obvious lack of direction, muddled duplication and "bureaucratic stodginess" which until now have characterized the governmental approach (or lack of it) to matters creative.

3. The provision for realistic tax relief, both to overcome such deterrents to participation as the 10-percent admissions tax to cultural events and to provide relief for writers, artists, musicians and others whose income fluctuates from month to month and year to year.

4. The development of a plan that would enable cultural institutions to receive Federal financial support, but without governmental intervention or censorship.

Mr. LINDSAY, in speaking up for the arts, cited a number of current and historic examples of measures that have been beneficial. New York State, for example, under Governor Rockefeller, has provided a pattern that might farsightedly be followed by the Government, as well as by other States, in establishing the New York State Council on the Arts. In January 1790, George Washington declared "there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature." John Quincy Adams, in his first message to Congress, recommended the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences and literature. In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as part of a plan for the development of the District of Columbia; and there have been other advances in various departments of the Government which could well be coordinated by an advisory council.

Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY'S efforts and accomplishments, however, have by no means been confined to the arts. He has been a persistent, prolific and productive champion of many meaningful causes, surprisingly so in view of his rather recent arrival on the congressional scene.

VOTE GETTER

It was not until 1958, after serving as Executive Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States and practicing law in New York City, that Mr. LINDSAY entered the Republican primary for Congress. He won by a 3-to-1 margin and later defeated his Democratic opponent by 7,800 votes. In 1960, he erased all doubts about his personal political strength, winning by a margin of 27,000 votes in a district that President Kennedy carried. Then, in 1962, he was elected by more than 53,000 votes, to lead the entire Republican ticket and inspire the remark that "JOHN LINDSAY'S margin of victory was the most impressive election victory ever recorded by a Republican in the city of New York."

The Congressman is a member of the House Judiciary Committee and three of its subcommittees: on revision of laws, trademarks, patents and copyrights; on State taxation on interstate commerce; and on submerged lands. Equally important, however, has been his consistent fight for better education, better health, better housing and the other causes with which he is deeply concerned. He is not a man to retreat from a fight. As he said in mid-September, "My own committee, Judiciary, is presently writing a civil rights bill which will be controversial. * * * a Senate filibuster is expected. Most important will be legislation designed to open up the labor market to all citizens—the removal of racial barriers to jobs. Of next importance is the right of access to public accommodations. * * *

His civil rights bill was described by the New York Times as "the best civil rights bill of 1963."

Among the bills which he has drafted and sponsored, and which have been enacted into law have been an amendment to the title I housing bill; an amendment to the foreign aid bill to strengthen language abilities of oversea personnel (to correct one of the most sophomoric of all American international weaknesses); an amendment to press the State Department to put the United Nations on a self-financing basis; and the Lindsay conflict-of-interest bill, to determine standards of conduct for Government employees at all levels.

More than half a dozen of Mr. LINDSAY'S bills are now under active congressional consideration, including one for hospitalization and home care for senior citizens, another for low-interest construction loans, and one for a President's Advisory Council on Education. He has also sponsored a bill for tax relief to the handicapped, against Government withholding of taxes on interest and dividends, and against the imposition of crippling taxes on U.S. enterprises abroad.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS SPECIALIST

Congressman LINDSAY has been active in international, as well as domestic affairs. In 1961, the House selected him to be one of the nine Congressmen to serve as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, which was held in Paris. A year later, he was reappointed as a delegate, on the basis of his outstanding record. This confidence was also reflected by the delegates of 15 nations who elected him as executive secretary of the Political Committee of the Conference. Recently, he voted against the $585 million cut below the $4 billion figure recommended by a bipartisan majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the foreign aid bill. As he explained it, "The Foreign Affairs Committee had reported a reasonable bill, calling for a reduced and more selective expenditure." This committee had also adopted the Lindsay amendment, which would require administrators of the program to canvass the availability of private, nongovernmental investment in specific projects before making loans from the Development Loan Fund.

"Gradually the aid program must be narrowed down," says Mr. LINDSAY, "and ultimately phased into the private sector. Military support should be withdrawn from governments which are themselves aggressors beyond their borders or tyrants within."

He has taken a deliberate stand on the issue of the test ban treaty, to prohibit nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, or in territorial high seas. "I am satisfied that the treaty is an important step forward," he remarked recently, "that it could lead to diplomatic advances in other areas, that it does not endanger the vital interests of the United States, and that it should receive unconditional Senate consent."

The Congressman is in a unique position to coordinate his talents and interests in the furtherance of both domestic and international measures. The 17th Congressional District, in the heart of midtown Manhattan, includes the United Nations, four major universities, the theater district, the business and garment districts, and a number of diverse residential areas, from the plush apartments of Park Avenue to the Bohemian flats of Greenwich Village.

He has been active in area redevelopment, which he refers to as "probably the worst administered program in Washington." He cites how the Government has, at prodigious expense, "succeeded in assisting the transfer of unemployment from one area to another, doing little * * * to alleviate hard-core unemployment caused by automation."

As one of the most flagrant examples, he points out how the House, last June, rejected an additional, and highly unnecessary, authorization of $355.5 million for the program. Although Mr. LINDSAY and 208 other Congressmen voted against the measure, the Senate passed the bill and the administration will again attempt to put it through the House. "I will again vote against it," states Mr. LINDSAY emphatically, "Unimaginative, expensive pork-barrel legislation is not the answer to the unemployment problems of this decade."

SOUND EDUCATION NEEDED

Congressman LINDSAY is equally strong—but on the other side of the fence—in his pronouncements on education. "Poor education," he says, "is at the root of most social problems. It starts with primary education and, as usual, this area remains untouched by Congress." He recently voted in favor of a 5-year, $1.2 billion program of grants and loans for construction or improvement of public and private college facilities. He also voted for a 4-year bill to provide up to $350

million in matching grants to the States for vocational educational programs, which he refers to as "a sound attack upon the problems of automation."

With considerable foresight, the St. Louis Post Dispatch had this to say shortly after the Congressman arrived on the Washington scene: "This is the first time that the country as a whole has heard [LINDSAY'S] name * * * this country will hear more from him again."

In 1960, he was selected by 50 of the leading correspondents and columnists in Washington as "the outstanding freshman Congressman in his party."

That this acclaim has been deserved is evident by his record of accomplishment during the past 5 years. To put it in the words of the New York Herald Tribune, "JOHN LINDSAY, reliable and dedicated, is the sort of public servant Democrats and independents can vote for with the clear conscience of those who every so often cross party lines when they see an unusual opportunity to contribute to enlightened government.

JOHN VLIET LINDSAY is closing the gap to the top.

Black Neck in the White Noose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New Republic on October 19, 1963. This article, "Black Neck in the White Noose," is part V of a six-article series on "Urban Renewal and the City," by Wolf Von Eckardt.

The problem of relocation would be vastly simplified within the urban renewal program if we dealt with those being relocated as people instead of as Negroes and whites. Von Eckardt says that we are trying to solve housing of the poor with "inadequate public funds, inadequate compassion, and inadequate intelligence." When will we begin to change these negatives to positives?

The article follows:

URBAN RENEWAL AND THE CITY, V—BLACK NECK IN THE WHITE NOOSE

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

(This is the fifth of six articles on urban renewal; the last of the series will deal with possible ways to improve urban renewal programs. During the 3 months he was preparing these reports Wolf Von Eckardt visited Boston, Providence, New Haven, Hartford, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.)

Fifteen years ago, the Supreme Court declared racial housing discrimination unconstitutional. A year later urban renewal legislation gave government the power and means to replace slums with new housing and to move large numbers of people around. Fourteen years later, there are only a handful of racially integrated new neighborhoods, although a good many old integrated neighborhoods have been bulldozed. There is, if anything, more rigid housing segregation today in our cities than there was a decade ago.

Before urban renewal was launched, even Atlanta had a few blocks where whites and Negroes lived peacefully together; Federal urban renewal money has helped weed out the Negro alley dwellings amidst the white homes. Elsewhere, too, of all the blighted areas in the city, those that had long been racially mixed or were in a state of racial transition, have been among urban renewal's first targets. The noble purpose of clearing the slums merged with the furtive determination of the majority to stem the black tide. The evicted Negroes were relocated back into the ghettos surrounded by the white city. "They want to keep the black neck in the white noose," one Negro said.

The NAACP and other Negro organizations initially welcomed urban renewal. Now they are increasingly disappointed and bitter: 72 percent of the people relocated by Government action are nonwhite and the great majority of these are Negroes. Very few of these Negro "relocatees" return to the renewed areas. In the first place, almost half of the cleared land is given over to the automobile—highways and parking lots. Secondly, a good portion of the remaining land is used for offices, shopping, civic and cultural centers as well as a sprinkling of schools, playgrounds, and parks.

The remainder—perhaps a quarter, at most, of the land where slum houses once stood—is used for new housing, and this remnant does little to rehouse the evicted Negroes. These urban renewal apartments and townhouses provide far fewer housing units than they supplant. There are fewer people per room and fewer rooms per acre, for the acres are generously endowed with landscaping. And the rents or purchase prices are almost inevitably in the luxury class.

A few of these new projects, such as Lake Meadows and Prairie Shores in Chicago or the Southwest in Washington, D.C., are integrated. This is a hopeful beginning, at least for middle-class Negroes. But the vast majority of displaced poor Negroes are worse off after urban renewal than they were before. James Baldwin's charge that urban renewal means Negro removal is largely justified.

A relatively small number of relocated Negroes find accommodations in new public (and a very few private) low-rent housing projects. With shocking consistency, however, these projects have been placed in the all-Negro districts of our cities where they remain entirely segregated, even in communities where the theory is that they be accessible to all. Overtly or covertly, race is the predominant issue of urban renewal and urban life. Racial design dictates just about all city planning. No auditorium, no downtown apartment house, rarely a supermarket is built in any American city today whose site was not determined by where Negroes live and where they are likely to move.

Much studied and cited Chicago is an example. The pattern of increasing rather than decreasing residential segregation there has been examined by Karl E. Taeuber of the University of Chicago. Taeuber has devised a convenient index. His theoretical zero point is a normal mixture of the races in each city block in proportion to the Negro and white population of the city. He values a totally segregated block at 100. His finding is that in 10 urban renewal years, segregation in Chicago increased from 92.1 percent in 1950 to 92.6 percent in 1960. A small change, perhaps, but not one to sustain Negro enthusiasm for urban renewal, particularly in view of the fact that of 280,000 new houses built in Chicago suburbs in the same period, less than one-half of 1 percent are occupied by Negroes.

Chicago's low-income families received from the city's Housing Authority 31,000 units. Overwhelmingly, they were built in Chicago's Negro wards. A solid row, some 3½ miles long, of these monuments to segregation is located between 22d and 55th Streets along the expressway, a favorite site for public housing in all our cities. All of them are 16-story high-rise slabs, pushing their inhabitants not only back into the ghetto but also into the sky.

I stopped recently at one of these slabs, the Robert R. Taylor Homes. It is the largest public-housing development in the Nation and a grim institution rising on an expanse of very reluctantly growing grass, which like the project's children on their playgrounds and the open galleries on each floor, is fenced in for its safety. Twenty-eight thousand people moved into its gray and red brick walls in December 1962, to prove that a quarter of a century after public housing became a national program, the Nation still had not learned from its earliest disastrous follies. The cubic-foot-per-person ratio is decent, the mortar is safe, the plumbing is sanitary. But cubic foot, mortar, and plumbing are not built with pride but with distrust—which is all the building reaps from its tenants. There is nothing left for anyone's spirit.

The charming Public Housing Commissioner in Washington, D.C., Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, and the architects she endeavors to recruit, know all this. But when Robert Taylor Homes was designed, her messages, directives, and guidelines had obviously not yet reached Chicago. From the articulate and sober words of this project's dedicated assistant manager, Robert H. Murphy, I heard the same dreary tale that I heard and read about our earliest efforts to house the poor with inadequate public funds, inadequate compassion, and inadequate intelligence: There are rapes of young and molestations of old people in the elevators. The dreary stairwells serve as convenient abodes for all kinds of mischief, of which obscene graffiti are the least serious. Elevators and stairwells alike serve as toilets for small children, who have none on the playgrounds and don't always make it up to the 16th floor. Stolen lightbulbs in the public areas must be replaced two or three times a week.

Murphy, a young Negro social worker, also told me of management's valiant battles against these reactions to a prisonlike, architectural environment. The mothers, whose families average six members, help guard the elevators. The unemployed fathers help patrol the grounds. But they can't guarantee where their children go and what they do. There are a few "community centers" stuck away in vacant apartments. But like the imprisoned playgrounds, they don't offer much inspiration to growing youngsters who can't cross the expressway and rarely cross the industrial strip which encloses their confines on the other side. At night the Police Department obligingly furnishes canine patrols.

Chicago's renewers point to Lake Meadows, Prairie Shores, and the new Carl Sandburg Village, downtown, as evidence that the boundaries of Chicago's black belt have, indeed, begun to crack a little. Perhaps. Still, December 1962 is pretty late in the day to build a Robert Taylor project.

We should not be surprised that the recent NAACP convention booed Mayor Daley. The mayor of Chicago surely believes in civil rights, but he also represents a society which since Jefferson's time has held only disdain for the city and its teeming proletariat. Realtors did not invent the idea that the only good neighborhood to live in is a totally homogeneous neighborhood. We all share in this belief. It upholds our property values, which are, after all, what the banks, Federal mortgage guarantees, and urban renewal all feel compelled to uphold.

Those of us who travel to Europe, marvel at the charm and liveliness of Parisian and Roman streets which have avoided homogeneity. No blockbuster could make his

fortune on them, for no one on these streets is horrified at living next door to poor people or above a grocery. Baron Haussmann, Louis Napoleon's prefect of Paris, was hardly a liberal. But the houses along his boulevards have small stores on the first floor, luxury apartments on the second and third, and dwellings for the poor on the top floor.

WHAT YOU TAKE FOR GRANTED USUALLY HAPPENS

The citizens of Chicago Hyde Park-Kenwood, on the other hand, are predominantly of liberal persuasion. Their famous urban renewal efforts, aided by the University of Chicago and the Federal program, have made a significant crack in their city's racial housing barrier. Their effort began early in the 1950's when more and more poor Negroes began moving into the area. Many white residents fled in panic, because they took it for granted, as did those who stayed, that this influx would result in overtaxing municipal services and in dirty streets. What you take for granted usually happens. Which is not to say that these citizens should not have renewed their pleasant habitat which had emerged on the site of the Chicago Exposition of 1893. But it does raise the question why so few of our citizens and bankers, who rightly fear for their investment, do not simply ask for more garbage trucks and street cleaners. And more police, which is the guts of the issue. It is surely less taxing than urban renewal.

Having set out on urban renewal, the people of Hyde Park-Kenwood determined to make theirs not only a stable community but also a racially integrated one. In this they succeeded, but, in the end, only as their planning settled on two objectives:

The first was that Negroes in the area were to be of the same socioeconomic level as the whites. "Economic homogeneity will take precedence over racial integration," say Peter H. Rossi and Robert A. Dentler in their study of the event. Hyde Park successfully resisted the 200-unit public-housing project the city proposed.

The Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference's second planning objective was a fixed balance between the races. "This was a line of reasoning that could not be stated too openly for fear of misinterpretation of motives. * * * Upper and middle class Negroes, however, who had settled into some of the larger and expensive apartments and homes in Kenwood and Northwest Hyde Park, and who were fearful of finding themselves once again the 'ghetto,' did approve of the stabilization goal," say Rossi and Dentler. Comedian Mike Nichols quipped: "This is Hyde Park, white and blacks shoulder to shoulder against the lower classes." High rents and careful screening achieve socioeconomic homogeneity. Quiet, skilled salesmanship maintains the quota. For thousands of Negro-poor evicted, a few hundred Negroes with status and money return.

"AN ANXIOUS, OFTEN EMBARRASSING EXPERIENCE"

Philadelphia's Eastwick, which will eventually be a huge new community, is one of the first large-scale attempts to integrate the moderately affluent. Somewhat homely on the outside, but most attractive within, the houses, at $14,000 to $14,500 for three and four bedrooms are a wonderful buy. Yet, these houses sell very slowly. There could be many reasons. The project is close to a sometimes smelly oil refinery. The first model houses were unenticingly located along a highway and the first actual units were built in a muddy open field far from the existing school and shopping. Yet the announced integration policy is surely also to blame, particularly since most real estate salesmen just don't know how to cope tactfully with a prospective purchaser's anxieties. At first, Eastwick's salesmen were going to put all Negro comers in one block. These salesmen were fired, and new men were trained by a realtor more experienced in maintaining a racial balance without offending either white or Negro prospects. The new men learned how to assure whites that Negroes will be well mannered and well scattered and how to ask Negroes to wait for their house until sufficient numbers of whites have bought so the Negroes can be dispersed among them. It's an anxious and often embarrassing experience for all concerned, including the salesman who works on commission. It may become easier as President Kennedy's order of November 20, 1962, banning discrimination in federally assisted housing, begins to take effect. But banning discrimination does not achieve integration.

Nor does it seem prudent or fair to leave this vital matter entirely to the skill and tact of real estate salesmen and rental agents who make their living not by integrating but by selling housing. This, however, is exactly what we do if we continue to pussyfoot about a clear and acceptable racial balance. We pussyfoot about a quota, it seems, because Negro sensitivity still demands it. I was unexpectedly enlightened on this in San Francisco, thanks to the spontaneous kindness of Dr. C. Josef Wellington.

Dr. Wellington, a gynecologist, is chairman of the housing committee of the San Francisco NAACP. Between delivering babies, he prepared himself for his additional task by attending two evening courses in city planning. I had called him to inquire about his group's feelings about San Francisco's renewal effort. His response was to ask me to come along to an informal committee meeting.

That evening I found myself among a small group of people as earnest, forthright, and fair-minded as I'd ever want to meet. That evening, too, after years of demolition and relocation, some 300 new homes for people with moderate income were at last in sight. The project is built by the International Union of Longshoremen with a Federal urban renewal subsidy for the cleared land. It is one of the pioneers of a new provision in the 1961 amendment to the Housing Act, section 221(d), which permits the sale of land below the market price to nonprofit organizations in exchange for moderate rentals.

The question which dominated nearly the entire discussion was how to integrate this project successfully. "We don't want this to be another ghetto for colored people," said Mrs. Joye Goodwin, an attractive housewife. "But with Negroes all over town crying for a decent place to live, that's surely what we'll get, if all they keep saying to us is open occupancy." That occupancy would be open to all, regardless of race, was, indeed, all Julia Smith, did and could say. She is the relocation director for the San Francisco Renewal Agency, who was invited to defend the Government's record.

"Damit," said San Francisco's NAACP leader, the wiry pharmacologist, Thomas N. Burbridge, stating what Negroes now say all across the country: "Sure, until now we wanted them to forget color. Now we want them to remember color." But he didn't say how, as the discussion whirled round and round into the night, color was to be remembered or in what proportions. The word "quota" was never uttered, though quota was the only answer within grasp.

What this group felt was what Edwin C. Berry of Chicago's Urban League had earlier told the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights: "I think any quota is odious, and I don't know how you maintain a quota * * * because as soon as you have filled a quota, then you become discriminatory." All Julia Smith could say on behalf of the collective wisdom of the U.S. Government and all others concerned, was: "We'll just have to trust the good will of the project's management." That was the last thing the group was prepared to do.

The arguments against a quota system are valid and compelling. But so is the fact that Negro demand for low-cost housing is far greater than white demand. If there is no other means to achieve integration than temporary manipulation, and none has been advanced, the authorities should acknowledge this and not toss the hot potato to developers and realtors.

That same day in San Francisco, the Negro vice chairman of the housing commission, Salomon E. Johnson, demanded that the all-Chinese public housing project Ping Yuen be broken up and its tenants integrated. The Chinese and the community applauded when Commissioner T. Kong Lee angrily replied: "You'll have to carry us out." The very thought seems ridiculous. No one really, including probably Johnson, would venture that Chinese civil rights are at stake. Even in California a Chinese now has the chance to live just about where he wants. His freedom of choice established, he prefers to live with his own people, much to his own cultural gain and the delight of tourists.

Once their freedom of choice is established fact, many Negroes will also prefer to live together. But first we must prove that for the American Negro, too, the American melting pot will work. But as Berry has said, "You can't get melted if you don't get into the pot."

Atlanta's Urban League's Robert Thompson suggests that the pot be rapidly enlarged, that we overbuild low-income housing until the builders are begging for tenants. It seems an unlikely alternative to overcoming the semantics of active, determined integration. Consider that in all these prosperous years the Federal Housing Administration has served fewer than half of 1 percent of the people in this country with an income below $5,000 a year.

Most of these people are colored and are restive. As the Negro magazine Ebony has ominously asserted: "This population is strategically placed to cause social chaos. Negroes, for the most parrt, inhabit the inner cores of America's largest cities. And they hold the key to the future of the American city—and the future of American democracy."

Some of It Was Wild, but Foods A'plenty Sustained Our Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take very great pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article penned by Miss Dena Snodgrass, research analyst for the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, and which appeared in the December 8 issue of the Florida Times-Union.

The article follows:

SOME OF IT WAS WILD, BUT FOODS A'PLENTY SUSTAINED OUR PIONEERS

(By Dena Snodgrass, Jacksonville Historical Society)

The pioneer settlers who moved into Florida after it became a U.S. territory in 1819, had much for which to be thankful as Christmas approached.

True, adjustment to a new and near-virgin land meant a life of frontier hardships but nature offered encouragement in her bounty of plentiful and good foods.

First among meats was venison (deer), then turkey. Even today more wild tur-

keys are found in Florida than in any other State. There was a quantity of small game too: quail, duck, dove, gopher (land turtle), rabbit and squirrel and fish and soft shell turtle. The o'possum, raccoon and tortoise were known familiarly as possum, coon and cooter. Even the alligator was eaten, for delicious steaks were cut from its tail.

Wild honey was the pioneer's first sweetening and bay leaves, then as now, were used for seasoning.

Blackberries, huckleberries, strawberries, elderberries, mayhaws, the yellow berry of the saw palmetto, persimmons and grapes were among the wild delicacies which helped the pioneer woman fill her shelves with jams and jellies and often wines.

And hickory nuts, chinquapins and pecans, all native, added to her larder.

In the spring, the shoots of the young polkberry, which resemble asparagus, were gathered and cooked as a vegetable. (There was once talk of growing this plant commercially but it could not compete with real asparagus.) The bright pink polkberries on the mature plant, which still grows as a weed in Florida, are poisonous but were used as a dye for clothing, pretty but quickly fading.

Pepper grass, a tasty little weed (and a pest in today's flower beds) was cooked with greens or in soups or used to season pot liquor. It has a refreshing mustard flavor.

Wild pumpkins were enjoyed baked or boiled.

Swamp cabbage, which has a crunchy chestnut taste, was eaten raw or boiled. This is the bud of the cabbage palmetto. The tree dies after the bud is cut. Known also as the sabal palm, it is now the Florida State tree and protected by law. A few years ago swamp cabbage was on the menu of the swank Stork Club in New York, not by that lowly name but as "Florida Salad." It is available at gourmet counters in some stores, labeled "Hearts of Palm," a canned import.

In central and southern Florida the settlers learned from the Indians how to make a white flour from the roots of the native coontie plant or Florida arrowroot.

It was called conti hatcka by the Seminole, meaning white bread-plant.

This plant resembles a thick-leaved fern and is a popular ornamental in Jacksonville parks and gardens.

Most of the first American settlers of Florida were small farmers with 50 to 100 acres of land and a few cattle and hogs which foraged for themselves.

Their first homes were log shelters or one-room cabins.

The cooking was done outside until a larger home could be built with an inside fireplace.

But the immediate clearing of land and the planting of food crops had priority over a larger and more comfortable house. Corn and sweet potatoes were the two basic foods, essential to every farm. As seasons passed, the farmer added beans, turnips, onions and often such fruits as figs and peaches.

"Water mills" for grinding corn sprang up soon all over north Florida.

The dammed water of a stream or pond furnished the power which turned the great creaking water wheels of these mills, grinding the corn into grits and meal between large stones.

It is claimed that the slow motion of the water mill, in contrast to more modern methods of grinding, made a tastier meal.

Even today the discriminating housewife prefers waterground meal.

And these grist mills, as they were also called, were important in another way. They served as meeting places and furnished a welcomed break in the isolation of life on the frontier.

There the men and boys swapped yarns, news of crops and of politics and had shooting and wrestling matches as each gladly waited for his corn to be ground.

Sometimes the women and little children accompanied the men for a picnic and fish fry.

Hog-killing time in the fall was another occasion for pioneer families to get together in a spirit of mutual helpfulness.

Probably the most festive occasion combining necessary food preparation with fun, was the cane grinding and sugar boiling when syrup and sugar were made.

Although the work of tending the juicing, watching the boiling syrup and stoking the fire had to go on continuously, the whole process was so slow that it afforded ample time to be sociable.

The foods of the small pioneer farmer in Florida were virtually limited to those that he had time and strength to grow, plus those provided by nature for the asking.

It was good fare, though at times lacking variety.

He and his family were much better off and healthier than their counterparts in the State's half-dozen towns during the 1820s and he would not have dreamed of exchanging places with them.

CANE SKIMMINGS GAVE FOLKS A REAL "KICK"

The grinding of sugarcane and the boiling of the cane juice to make sirup and sugar were important activities on hundreds of farms in early Florida. The cane stalks were fed by hand between two moving rollers. These rollers were attached to a gear and it, in turn, to a long pole of the end of which was harnessed a mule. The mule walked in a wide circle round and round the mill, thereby turning the rollers which squeezed the juice from the cane.

The juice was caught in a bucket, strained through a cloth and poured into a large basinlike iron kettle. The kettle was set in a brick framework under which a hot fire was kept steadily burning. A shed roof protected the kettle from the rain. An attendant carefully watched the boiling juice. As it began to thicken, he used a long-handled ladle to skim off small bubbles of sediment which rose to the surface as the juice boiled. A clear sirup was the reward of good skimming. Often the skimmings were set aside and allowed to ferment, making a potent beverage known as "buck."

Considerable skill was needed to judge the exact time the sirup had cooked long enough and was ready to cool. If sugar was to be made, it was cooked much longer, just to the point when crystals began to form. A coarse brown sugar was made in these open-kettle mills.

The old-fashioned cane grinding and sirup boiling was a gay and festive affair. Neighbors gathered to help with the work, to visit and to drink the fresh cane juice. It was an exciting treat for the children to sample the sugaring edge of the boiling sirup by dipping into it with a small stick of cane peel, making a sort of hot lollipop.

Sirup is still made in a similar fashion in Duval County but most of today's mills are fully mechanized, and probably a lot less fun.

Patriotism and Human Relations in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my belief that we need to have more patriotism taught in our public schools—patriotism in a good, wholesome fashion, and not through mere empty formalism. Thus, it was with real gratification that I read of the excellent address made by Dr. Neal V. Musmanno, the competent deputy State superintendent of public instruction of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on that very subject, at a meeting of the Pennsylvania State Committee on Human Relations in Harrisburg, Pa., on Monday, December 9, 1963.

Dr. Neal Musmanno and his family have been my longtime friends through the years, and their many successes have been a real tribute to western Pennsylvania. Dr. Musmanno taught in the elementary schools, junior and senior high schools of Stowe Township, Pa., which is in my congressional district. He was an associate professor of education at the University of Pittsburgh and Westminister College, besides being a school administrator for 10 years. His career as an educator covers close to 30 years. He is chairman of the State committee on human relations in education. A teacher's guide produced by that committee won the Freedom's Foundation George Washington Honor Medal National Award this year for "promoting the American way of life." In July 1961, he won the National Freedom Jubilee Education Award for his work in intergroup education and human relations.

It is with real pleasure that I offer Dr. Neal V. Musmanno's fine address on "Patriotism and Human Relations in the Schools" to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

This meeting of the State committee on human relations is called for the purpose of emphasizing the growing need for assisting teachers and school administrators of this Commonwealth to teach the children in our schools those attitudes, understandings and skills which will aid them in the best possible manner to meet our greatest challenge—human relations. We must consider more intensive projects to implement our human relations guide, with specific attention to training workshops and seminars and symposiums for schoolteachers and school officials in our State.

The horrible catastrophe, the assassination of our President, that struck our Nation just 17 days ago challenges each of us as never before to do more and increasingly more to approach the fulfillment and eventual guarantee of man's humanity to man—of universal brotherhood in a free world. Our greatest challenge comes indeed from the final words of President Kennedy's undelivered Dallas speech:

"We in this country, in this generation are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of peace on earth, goodwill toward men. That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: 'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain'."

I shall always remember nor will my family ever forget our visit to the Nation's Capitol during these unendurably sad days of mourning.

Conversation was scarce and brief and quiet in Washington, D.C., that Sunday af-

ternoon and night November 24, as my wife and the three youngest of our seven children and I moved slowly along in a sorrowful procession with 200,000 or more other bereaved Americans toward the majestic Capitol rotunda to walk by the flag-draped casket, to pay final respects to our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

The crushing question of why, why, why, hammers heavy blows on our hearts and minds. WHY? Why did such an awful thing happen in America?

Is it possible that an American would do this? It is possible that a product of our schools could commit so monstrous a crime? And while none of us would want unreasonably to question the education of our youth or adults with respect to right and wrong, still we regret the fact that our educational programs are weak in their emphasis of attitudes and behavior toward the practice of friendly, unprejudiced, democratic relationships with all human beings—with every other person.

We know that no child is born prejudiced. We know that no person is born to hate. Yet prejudice and hatred do prevail and their terrible tolls blacken the pages of history. Man is born for cooperation, not for conflict. This is the lesson of the ages. This is the Golden Rule. This is what Jesus of Nazareth died on the cross to achieve some 2,000 years ago.

No child hates instinctively. It must be taught to hate. That thought was summed up ironically in the James Michener's famed "South Pacific" Rodgers and Hammerstein tune: "You've got to be taught to be afraid of people whose skin is a different shade—you's got to be taught from year to year—with lessons drummed into your little ear—you've got to be carefully taught."

What goes into the heart is just as important as what goes into the mind.

The vital necessity for human relations education is highly dramatized by recent events which drive home in bold relief that prejudice and hatred is as serious a problem with our youth as with our adults. In some of the worst demonstrations we have suffered in our country, we cannot help but note the extent to which you were directly and predominantly involved in these disturbances across the Nation.

The staggering lesson to be learned is the distressing need to teach all Americans, both youth and adults, that democracy and freedom mean that rights and responsibilities are inseparable. And it is not a matter of everyone doing or saying anything he wants in utter disregard for the rights of others in a free society.

Every privilege of freedom carries a heavy responsibility for each of us. Until this basic truth is taught to all age groups in a way to have it become functional in the behavior of all Americans, it will be learned the bitter, scalding, hellish way through hatred-induced terror.

Our schools must direct full attention to the emphasis of human relations to be included in all courses of study including all extra or cocurricular activities. As our State superintendent, Dr. Boehm, has said, "The schools of Pennsylvania must be committed to the elimination of prejudice. We cannot afford the insidious effect of prejudice in our society." The curriculum of our schools must be altered to give the pupils the broader understanding they need to live together and in harmony in today's world. Human understanding and human relations must be a part of the study of every subject, it must be part of the fiber of every teacher.

Effective human relations education demands an active commitment to an understanding and to an appreciation of all peoples and of each and every person as a human being by all teachers, school administrators, parents and all citizens of every community.

Education must be specifically retooled to include the general and specific techniques and learning activities of intergroup education and human relations in order to immunize our children against prejudice and hatred.

Furthermore, emphasis must be placed on the family as basic to our society, and the importance of wholesome and devoted family life should be affirmed constantly in the minds of all our children—of all people.

No teacher, no school person would want to create overdeveloped mental giants who at the same time are underdeveloped human beings. It is to insure the development of every child to his maximum human as well as intellectual potential that intergroup and human relations education is dedicated.

In addition, professors in our colleges as well as teachers in our elementary and secondary schools carry the full obligation of devoting attention to human relations and keeping bright the flame of patriotism and devotion to country in the hearts of the youth in their charge. All our young people should be inspired anew and continually with a real sense of the meaning of history. They should be instilled with a reverence for our country's flag and a love for our country's great men and women living and dead, regardless of party, geography, race, religion, nationality, socioeconomic status, etc. Textbook publishers should be certain the content of their books satisfy this need. All our teachers should devote a much-needed emphasis to holding high the ideals of our country's patriots and illustrious citizens and public officials. Children should be taught to look for the golden rainbow over their heads rather than for the clay at their feet.

Cynicism as well as prejudice must be wiped out of any expression in our classrooms or public forums. Now, we don't mean to indicate that a person should not be anlaytical in his thinking and in his expressions. But it is the manner in which he expresses himself and the attitude he has toward significant events and people. Children must be filled with the fervent desire for intelligent patriotism, based upon respect for an understanding of human dignity and dedication.

We are not thinking here of "superpatriots" or "sunshine patriots,"—those who misuse the ideal concept of patriotism—we are thinking of those honest-to-goodness old-fashioned patriots who love and have abiding faith in our country all the time. In other words a real patriot is a good American citizen at all times—one who "asks not what his country can do for him, but what he does and can do for his country."

Every American citizen must assume the obligation of teaching the children as well as embracing himself the highest ideals of patriotism and our country's rich legacy.

Occurring just 3 days after the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, the shocking and terrible death of our President should cause all of us to rededicate ourselves to this "Nation, under God" and to take "increased devotion to the cause for which he gave his last full measure of devotion."

Then, we shall be practicing and teaching in pure form a satisfying human relationship and personal, devoted attachment to our country and to each and all of its people.

And more important than any eulogy of words we may express, will be the eulogy of action to our lost leader, as we courageously meet and carry out the challenge set forth in the final words of President Kennedy's inaugural address: "Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty * * *. With good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Senator George C. Moffett Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of Texas' outstanding citizens has been recently honored by the Progressive Farmer magazine. In its January 1964 issue the magazine names Senator George C. "Cotton" Moffett the "Man of the Year in Texas Agriculture."

Senator Moffett, who has served in the Texas Legislature since 1931, and in his present capacity as senator since 1939, has rightly won acclaim as "dean of the legislature."

It has been my pleasure to work with Senator Moffett on agricultural matters affecting Texas since I came to the Congress. He has shown a dedication to the Texas farmer that is unequaled. He possesses a broad knowledge of all farm problems, and a keen insight into the needs and desires of the farmer.

I feel this honor is most appropriate. I urge my colleagues to note this tribute to Senator Moffett by the Progressive Farmer magazine.

SENATOR GEORGE C. MOFFETT MAN OF THE YEAR IN TEXAS AGRICULTURE

If you visit State Senator George C. Moffett's office—hard by the entrance of the senate chamber in the capitol of Texas—chances are you'll come away with two things: (1) You'll get an interested and fair hearing; and (2) you'll get a cotton product of some kind.

These two items characterize the unique career of a Chillicothe, Tex., farmer who has "done something" about serving his State. Widely acknowledged as "dean of the legislature," Senator Moffett has served longer in the Texas Legislature than any other man in Texas history.

Senator Moffett was first elected as a member of the house of representatives in 1931. After seasoning through house service, he was elected as State Senator in 1939 and has served continuously ever since.

And most importantly, Senator Moffett has been an active farmer all his life. In the Directory of the Ex-Students of Texas A&M, Senator Moffett lists himself simply as "farmer."

One fellow senator remarked of Senator Moffett: "I wish his name started with A. That way he would be high on the rollcall for voting and I could just hear how he voted and know how to vote on agricultural matters."

However, many people have gotten their "comeuppance" from Senator Moffett when they tried to trespass on his interest and fondness for agriculture. If their proposal does not meet Senator Moffett's standards of "accuring to the good of the whole citizenry of Texas," the proposition—even if agricultural—gets little help.

Senator Moffett is widely known as "Cotton George" because of his lifelong interest in cotton.

He recalls vividly that his first service in the house of representatives was at a special session in 1931. "Cotton was selling at around 5 or 6 cents a pound. Gov. Ross Starling called a special session specifically to consider legislation to prohibit planting any cotton in 1932.

"However, it was my belief than—and still is—that the only sound, long-range solution to the cotton surplus is effective re-

search," Moffett says. Moffett, as a representative, introduced a bill to expand cotton use research in 1931. However, it took him 10 years to pass his bill. In 1941, the Cotton Research Committee of Texas became a reality.

Many of the sound advances in cotton grading and fiber use have sprung from the committee's work and have meant millions upon millions to Texans as well as cotton farmers everywhere.

Truly, Senator George C. Moffett has rendered outstanding useful services to his state and especially to its rural citizenry.

Thus he joins a list of 28 distinguished Texans who have been named "men of the year" by the Progressive Farmer during the last 22 years.

The Subway Situation in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which was broadcast over radio station WINS in New York on December 3, 1963.

We will find no reference to such matters by those who want a publicly owned subway system in the District of Columbia:

SUBWAY SITUATION SEEKS LASTING SOLUTION

MARK OLDS (WINS general manager). Six million subway riders got an advance tip on the question of increased subway fares last Sunday when City Mediator Theodore Kheel, who is working to get the Transit Authority and the Transit Workers Union to agree on a new contract, told the WINS news conference:

Mr. KHEEL. The question there is whether or not the 15-cent fare should be subsidized in order to be maintained at the 15-cent level. I favor subsidizing the fare to keep it at the 15-cent level.

Mr. OLDS. And this fits in snugly with the plans of Transit Union Chief Mike Quill, who boldly stated on an earlier WINS news conference:

Mr. QUILL. I have always maintained that the riding public shouldn't have to pay anything. I think the subway fare should be free.

Mr. OLDS. Sounds wonderful—but what does it mean? Whether the subway fare remains 15 cents or is raised, you and I, the straphangers, will continue to pay the tab. When we subsidize the Transit Authority, we take funds intended for some other service or agency such as education, housing, health, and spend them on our subway system.

If you've ever wondered whether there is an end in sight perhaps Quill answered this whn he told the WINS news conference:

Mr. QUILL. Necessary or unnecessary we're going to press our demands. We come like the snow—every winter.

Mr. OLDS. Too much public business is conducted in the fashion of giving an automatic response to an automatic demand.

And while we're talking about demands—who's making demands on behalf of the people who ride the subways? What's being done to end the violence, to clean the filth and trash from cars and platforms * * * to provide faster service on weekends and holidays?

The first of the year will come and go * * * and with it Mike Quill and this year's crop of ultimatums. But the problems of our subways will plague us until the city moves to create and enforce a long-range plan for solving all our transit problems, those of the rider as well as the worker.

Hate Mail From UAW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I pointed out some of the inconsistencies in the era of love and understanding which groups of the American political left are purporting to encourage. The AFL-CIO again proves the point in the Washington Report of December 16, 1963, which is distributed by Mr. Reuther's UAW. It is typical of the innuendo type of smear and character assassination which is so deftly practiced by this particular union. Again, I reiterate that these tactics are the hallmark of the leadership and not the rank and file. Anyone who has ever listened to Guy Nunn's "Eye Opener" or "Shift Break" knows the type of prejudice and hate which this particular union promotes.

The following article appears in the Washington Report under the byline "Friday PM Wrapup." I recommend it to the reading of the Members of this body so that they may truly judge the extent to which the UAW is really combating hate in the country. Are they combating it or promoting it?

FRIDAY PM WRAPUP

The numbness and shock still lingers in Washington, indeed throughout the land. Gone is the deft phrase, the uproarious witticisms which rocked his press conferences, and the cultural flair at every White House gathering. Many liberals felt J.F.K. was too wordy, too free with long messages to Congress. Now the Sorenson-Kennedy masterpieces should be put into book form and put in the hip pocket of every labor skate in America. These Kennedy speeches and messages are the marching orders for all who dream and work for a better tomorrow.

Vulgar sight: Congressmen who feverishly knocked the late President, offering empty eulogies. One of best from Republican side came from Vermont's WINSTON PROUTY, short and guaranteed to wet the eyes. Senator LONG, of Missouri, notes Kennedy's compassion for Federal prisoners, many paroled because of Presidential intervention above and beyond any other Chief Executives. Senator DIRKSEN recounts a White House chat after he agreed to support test ban treaty. GOLDWATER belabors rightwing theme there's no hate around, but GOP's HUGH SCOTT lowers boom on haters. Looking down from gallery in House of Representatives you see feeble old men with enormous power to keep the country on dead center. They shuffle along, deaf to the pleas of the hungry and jobless, cold to the anguish of persecuted minorities—they return year after year like part of the woodwork, but an active, sensitive man in the White House is murdered.

It's been a bad year for the good guys: Pope John, Estes Kefauver, John F. Kennedy, Hugh Gaitskill, and Herbert Lehman. And last year it was Mrs. Roosevelt's turn to go. The economy worshippers are screaming at defense cuts ordered by President Johnson. Senator MCGOVERN's commission on economic conversion sorely needed to aid transition to peacetime production. Senate foolishly votes spare $7.5 million to Disarmament Agency (HUMPHREY tried for $30 million in 2 years), straps U.S. negotiators as Geneva arms control talks resume January 21. Weirdo on the right: "most poor people in America today are poor because they want to be" (National Review, December 17, 1963). Many are poor because they are honest, others because heartless junior executive types flocking to Young Americans for Freedom think freedom is license to trample over anybody in the way. Recalls famed Herblock cartoon telling poor mother and moppet to "go out and inherit a department store." Louisiana's ill-tempered, GOP-leaning OTTO PASSMAN leads gutting of foreign aid program, killing off U.S. jobs and desecrating memory of late President Kennedy.

Eternal Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which appeared in the New York Times. The letter, written by Jay Newman, a second year law student, is a sensitive and eloquent analysis of the reactions of youth to the death of the late President Kennedy.

The letter follows:

KENNEDY LEGACY TO YOUTH—STUDENT SAYS PRESIDENT RENEWED THEIR PRIDE IN AMERICA

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The death of the young President who inspired and encouraged youth was a deep shock and will have a profound influence upon the students of America, who identified with him as he identified with them.

The high school and college generation had not experienced—as a group—tragedy, anguish, and frustration on a national scale. Pearl Harbor, the death of President Roosevelt are vaguely remembered; take their place as history, not of personalization. The late President united this youth for the first time into one being—a being guided and directed by his heart and mind.

For the first time the youth had a leader, for the first time they have seen their leader die. This will profoundly affect this generation. From it will arise a greater maturity and understanding of the amorphous concept called life. This generation never experienced defeat, injustice on such a grand scale. With the rise of J.F.K., the vigor, vitality, and creativity of American youth was centered around national goals and aspirations as never before. All too soon it is over.

At first it will appear as if the torch were wrested from their hands and given to another generation; but eventually this attitude will be replaced by a greater depth in youth due to the tremendous impact the late President instilled into this Nation: The renewed sense of pride in their country—the individual personalization with the highest office in the land—giving instead of taking—new dimensions to the word "flexibility" and making human dignity a reality. It will be realized that all this has not ended because of his death, but has just begun. Our leader is dead, but his leadership is within America, never to die.

This then is the legacy John Fitzgerald Kennedy has bequeathed to us, the students of America.

JAY NEWMAN,
Georgetown Law Center.

WASHINGTON, *December 7, 1963.*

Automation and Idleness Are Twins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tax exemption for political spending under the guise of business advertising is very costly to American taxpayers.

The average citizen must pay in various ways to subsidize this kind of propaganda aimed against his welfare.

I include herewith, Mr. Speaker, an editorial on this question from the Reading, Pa., New Era:

AUTOMATION, IDLENESS ARE TWINS

This is the tale of two industries.

One industry is U.S. Industries, and its president, John Snyder, is telling the whole country that automation is wiping out 40,000 jobs a week—not a month, but a week. Snyder ought to know. His firm makes automated machinery.

The second industry is Warner & Swasey, an antilabor firm that condemns Government spending yet profits handsomely from the very same Government contracts which a demand for the tools and machinery Warner & Swasey manufacturers.

Warner & Swasey, instead of conceding the problem posed for unemployed workers by automation, spends thousands of tax deductible dollars for full page advertising in national magazines to ask questions like this: "If automation puts people out of work why are more and more people employed."

Obviously, you are supposed to conclude from this question and the advertisement's text that automation isn't really working a hardship and that there's really nothing to get excited about.

But, we'd like to rephrase the question. Why doesn't Warner & Swasey ask: "If automation is supposed to create jobs for people, why are more and more people unemployed?"

The fact is that automation is destroying more jobs than it creates in relation to a growing population with the result that productivity per man-hour is rising—thus requiring fewer employees to turn out a constant amount of goods. This is why unemployment in November increased 500,000 to a rate of 5.9 percent. Nearly 4 million people were idle.

Warner & Swasey likes automation because automation means machines, and that's what Warner & Swasey sells. In short, Warner & Swasey makes its profits by displacing human beings with machines in industry.

What disturbs us is that the 4 million unemployed do not have a collective voice with which to tell their story to the Nation. They cannot place an ad in U.S. News & World Report magazine because they have no money and nothing from which to tax-deduct the cost of the ad.

Warner & Swasey not only can sow its propaganda through such costly national publications but can even force the rest of the Nation's taxpayers to foot the bill for the expensive ads. This is done by charging the cost of these ads off as a business expense. Every dollar thus deducted does not reach Uncle Sam—with the consequence that wage earners are forced to make up the difference by helping pay the carrying charges on a higher national debt.

This sounds very complicated but when you strip away the words it means that you are helping to pay for Warner & Swasey's ad clobbering you.

Long ago organized labor quit fighting machines. But we haven't given up fighting unemployment. And until someone—and the Federal Government seems like the only force large enough—reconciles automation and growing idleness among American workers, the battle will continue.

Polish National Alliance and Its President Karol Rozmarek Pay a Final Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish National Alliance and Polish American Congress, through its president, Mr. Karol Rozmarek, joined the entire Nation and the world in paying tribute to our late President John F. Kennedy. Mr. Rozmarek stated that "to Americans of Polish origin President Kennedy will always remain on lofty heights of reverence."

I believe it is well known to all Members of Congress what a tremendously high respect Americans of Polish descent had for President Kennedy, because of his deep understanding of the impressive contribution which these people have made to the growth of America. I should like, at this point, to include Mr. Rozmarek's entire statement in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

An immense tragedy has struck our Nation and millions of Americans weep in sorrow and anger. In sorrow, for we have lost an enlightened leader, the youngest and most forward looking among the world's statesmen, in this era of the cold war and exploding international crises, which at the same time, is an era of terrifying nuclear weapons, and an era of human destiny involved in the discovery and exploration of the vastness of outer space.

A LEADER

Americans weep in sorrow because we have lost a leader, who would rather bring forth in international affairs a lighted torch of understanding, compassion, and patience.

And Americans weep in anger realizing that the young and purposeful life of our great President has been cut down by an assassin's bullet. A coward hidden in a warehouse, fired the shot which killed our President, plunged us into this mourning and reverberated shockwave.

A STATESMAN

I would like to quote the American Journalist, Max Freeman who writes today of our late President Kennedy: "He was growing all the time in a tradition of spacious statesmanship, and excellence would have been his companion had more time been granted to him * * * and now he will be remembered as the man who broke the furrows and walked always to the far horizons."

To Americans of Polish origin the memory of the late President Kennedy will always remain on lofty heights of reverence. He was our true and tried friend. He understood our ancestry and the cultural, religious, and traditional values that link us with the land of our forefathers.

SYMPATHY FOR POLAND

To Poland and her people, the most ravaged and heroic in World War II, he has shown deep understanding and sympathy, eloquently expressed in his remarkable book "The Strategy of Peace," and in his Senate speeches and his several Presidential addresses.

His name will be hallowed forever in our memory. We express our deepest sorrow to Mrs. Kennedy and her children.

NEW CHIEF

Our ship of state has a new captain at the helm—in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson, until last Friday, the Vice President of the United States. Like his predecessor, President Johnson has proven great qualities of leadership, first in the Senate of the United States and later in the greatly expanded office of the Vice President of the United States.

May God grant him strength and guidance in this most responsible and most powerful office in the free world, in these momentous times.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish National Alliance and Polish American Congress.

The Challenge in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress must be saved from the complete collapse toward which it appears to be heading, and I am pleased to note the appointment of Mr. Thomas C. Mann, former Ambassador to Mexico as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

This appointment has received prompt and proper acceptance, and I am pleased to place into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in today's Chicago Sun-Times on the subject:

THE CHALLENGE IN LATIN AMERICA

President Johnson's appointment of the Ambassador to Mexico, Thomas C. Mann, to his old post of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs is a sound move. Mann was successful in that position under President Eisenhower. He has been a successful and respected Ambassador to Mexico. He is an able and a tough man. His stand against communism and Castroism has been evident and on the record for years.

In asking Mann to take on the difficult job, President Johnson emphasized that he wants the Alliance for Progress to work as it was originally conceived. The Alliance has not worked to date. It has been hampered by shortsighted policies and it has not lived up to the expectations voiced for it at its birth.

Latin American critics of the Alliance for Progress have accused it of being a weak organization too closely tied to Washington policies. The criticism has been well

founded and documented. There are other areas of criticism equally well founded: On this page on March 3 we noted that the Alliance would not work unless private enterprise from both Latin America and the United States stepped into the breach with large investments.

In a letter to Mann, President Johnson has underlined this latter point. He advised Mann to work closely with the private organizations now active in Latin America, the unions, the religious and charitable organizations, and "the private business sector, which can make the significant contribution envisaged in the Punta del Este Charter."

Latin America is the most critical area in the world today for the United States. The recognition last week of the new Governments of the Dominican Republic and Honduras, the appointment of a strong and able man to oversee Latin American policy, the desire to make the Alliance work as it was envisioned is evidence that President Johnson has recognized this and is meeting the challenge with courage and force.

A Final Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, many of my distinguished colleagues have during the last several weeks eulogized our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this time I take pride in bringing to the attention of my colleagues an editorial entitled "A Final Tribute" written by Mr. Andrew A. Minahan, editor of the Merrimack Valley Advertiser, Tewksbury, Mass.

Mr. Minahan, a distinguished newspaperman in Massachusetts, reflects upon the events of the tragic weekend of November 22, 1963, in a sympathetic tribute to our late President.

His article, which appeared in the December 5 edition of the Advertiser, follows:

A FINAL TRIBUTE

(By Andrew A. Minahan)

Over a week of national solemnity and contrite sorrow by a stunned Nation has passed since the shocking assassination of our late bereaved and martyred President, John F. Kennedy. Millions in the Nation had throughout the world witnessed on television and were deeply moved by the Christian fortitude, the indomitable spartan courage, the enduring and magnificent bearing of the President's beautiful young widow, Jacqueline, during the trying days and nights she had to inwardly suffer every second she was observed on television. Her stamina, her mien, were never equalled or excelled by any celebrity in the public eye.

Her display of unquestioned love and devotion to her husband, to the kissing of his casket; the scene of Caroline wiping the tears from her eyes after the services at the cathedral; the military salute of 3-year-old son to the casket as it was being carried out by the bearers a last salute to his beloved Dad were heart rendering memories that will live long in the minds of those who witnessed these dramatic events.

The public will miss the image the late President created on his television appearances, especially his news conferences at the White House—a man with a vibrant, sparkling personality. * * * with a distinctive appealing voice * * * somewhat musical at times, a voice that many TV comedians tried to mock * * * that effused an understanding, sympathetic heart * * * a voice when tuned to a pitch in great heights of oratory in times of crises * * * captivated the Nation more than any other President with the exception of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was idolized by the vast score of newspapermen who were assigned to Washington, even many who did not agree with his political philosophies. His ever infectious, gracious smile; his keen intellectuality that members of the press say was never equalled in their memory; his quick perception that could quickly analyze tricky, confusing, embarassing questions by some critical members of the Fourth Estate which usually brought forth a humourous evasive answer in reply, were among incomparable, unequalled features of his press relations that delighted the members of the newspaper fraternity.

The members of the press place President John F. Kennedy on the highest pedestal as the most considerate, the smartest, and the most beloved man with whom they had ever had relations in Washington.

Having personally known this great man, and members of his family, having the honor and privilege of being part of his campaign press committee in 1960; having been offered a position in his administration in Washington after his election, I, too with the other newspapermen who knew, idolized, and respected him, join with them in unison when they pray:

"Requiescat in pace" "May he rest in peace."

Masterful Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, unqualified praise is due the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its speedy solution of the Frank Sinatra, Jr., kidnaping case and its apprehension of the kidnapers.

This is merely one more example—among many—of the service of this agency, under the leadership of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, to the security of our citizens and the Nation.

I include an editorial which appeared in the December 15 Washington Sunday Star:

"MASTERFUL OPERATION"

These words, voiced in thanks by Frank Sinatra, pretty well sum up the latest performance of the FBI. It was a case right out of crime fiction—the hoodlums charged with the kidnaping are behind bars; the handsome son of the famous film star is safely at home, and the bulk of the huge ransom bundle has been recovered—all in less than a week. The fictional analogy is strengthened by the conduct of Los Angeles police, who, in the best detective-story tradition, were complaining right up to the dramatic climax that the FBI procedures were making things "too easy for the kidnapers."

With that said, the Los Angeles officials can be left to their own embarrassment. For the rest of us there can only be a mental note of appreciation, not only for this case, but also for the amazing record rolled up by the FBI—675 kidnapings solved out of 678 reported abductions for ransom—since 1932.

Conclusion: Any hoodlum who even considers entering the kidnaping business in the face of such odds ought to have his head examined.

A Letter on the Death of President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter sent to June F. Marsh, Pasadena, by Dr. Norman C. Cooper of Seal Beach, Calif.

With the permission of Dr. Cooper copies of the letter were reproduced.

I feel sure that the sentiments expressed in the letter are shared by millions of our fellow citizens. Because it is a beautiful and deserving tribute to our late beloved President, I ask that it be included with my remarks:

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.,
November 25, 1963.

MY DEAR JUNE: I had your special delivery letter of Friday. I was glad to receive the letter expressing your feeling. I had thought of you and Alta both in the last 3 days and of the many conversations we have had about Senator and President and now former President Kennedy, and how often we had expressed how very much he had meant to each of us personally. I, too, was shocked and stunned by his needless and unexpected death. I presume that I had thought too much of him. When he went, something of me went with him. He was perfection to me and was all that I looked for in a human being.

I was numb all Friday afternoon and could only moan—Why did it have to happen. I couldn't cry or weep yet I felt like it. Saturday I was more relaxed and I could cry. I have never felt so badly about anyone or anything before.

He was young, strong and healthy, intelligent, handsome, well educated, an eloquent speaker, had high ideals, altruism, and a sense of oughtness that was uncanny. He had an electrifying personality, a warmth of friendship, a glow and zest for life, a radiant and endearing smile, and was filled with charm, wit, and humor. He was a family man with a lovely, charming wife and two lovely children whom he adored and in turn by whom he was adored. He was a deeply religious man with the roots of his belief and faith penetrating all the ideals of history and one who applied his religion to everyday living. He was leader leading all leaders. He, of course, was so far ahead of his contemporaries that few understood him or what he said or what he meant, as simple and straightforward as his words were.

I never thought of President Kennedy as a President or a political figure. I thought of him as a man walking among people trying to get them to do the right thing, a person who was looking after me and my rights and the other man's rights whether he be black or white, Catholic or Protestant, Jew or gentile, privileged or of low birth. I saw him as looking out for the teenage dropouts from school and for the aged in a medical program. I saw him lift the Negro to the status of a human being and give the underprivileged child a fair chance for his place in the sun.

I identified with him. In so doing I had comfort, and solace, and strength. I walked

more proudly because he lived. I held my head higher because America produced him, because he was ours, because he belonged to me. I owned him. He was mine. He no longer belonged to Rose Kennedy or the Ambassador as a son—he belonged to me as much as he belonged to them. He belonged to all of us. Even the peoples of foreign countries never thought of him as an American—they thought of him as their own. He didn't belong to the Catholic Church—he belonged to every church. The Protestant Church would no more allow him to be buried without their services than would the Catholic Church.

The world, society, humanity and people will never be the same to me now. The pace of humanity in its progress from the caves will be slowed, culture will lapse, and civilization will walk towards its goal with a faltering tread. This was the greatest man since Christ. He was a Moses, a Socrates, a Savonarola, a Lincoln, all in one. The world gets a chance to have a man like this so seldom that it forgets from one man to the next how to treat him, how to accept him, how to use him, how to work with him. I was privileged to know him, to live in his age, and to see his worth. My own personal loss can never be compensated for.

A valiant hero is now a martyr. A profile in courage now lies slain by an assassin's bullet. My heart is heavy, my hopes dimmed, my sorrow great.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN C. COOPER.

The Crisis That Never Happened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following excerpt from the remarks of Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, before a panel discussion on the U.S. balance of payments under the auspices of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce held in New York City on December 9, 1963:

In this connection, I'd like to digress just a moment to say a word about the most recent demonstration of the effectiveness of these credit facilities and the speed with which they can be mobilized. I refer, of course, to the tragic events of Friday afternoon, November 22, when the world was rocked by the news of the incredible shooting of President Kennedy. The shock waves of the first report from Dallas had immediate repercussions in both the securities and the exchange markets, and in the case of the latter, there was a clear risk that panic selling of dollars might suddenly develop. To forestall any such reaction, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, acting on behalf of the Federal Reserve System, immediately moved into the market with sizable offerings of five major foreign currencies. The ability of the system to react so quickly and so decisively in exerting this stabilizing influence on the stunned exchange markets depended mainly on the existence of a tried and tested network of reciprocal credit arrangements with the major foreign central banks of the world. The market knew that our offers to sell foreign exchange were backed under these so-called swap facilities by resources—available at a moment's notice—amounting to nearly $2 billion, in addition to whatever balances of foreign currencies we had on hand. Needless to say, we were very quickly in contact with our colleagues in Canada and in Europe—even though it was past the closing hour in European markets—to work out a coordinated approach for official intervention in the major exchange markets during succeeding days. In the event, the markets' awareness of the vast resources available to the authorities here and abroad, and the knowledge of their ability and determination to use these resources in a concerted and effective fashion, made sizable intervention unnecessary.

The ability of the authorities to deal successfully with situations—in this case the most sudden and unforeseeable situation imaginable—that in the past might well have led to exchange market crises demonstrates, it seems to me, the role that mutual credit facilities have played and can continue to play in providing international liquidity in a meaningful sense.

Just one final word about the dollar and its role in the world. The dollar's position as the leading reserve currency, as one of the major instruments for the conduct of international trade and investment, and as the official yardstick for all other currencies in the International Monetary Fund, did not result from any deliberate or official campaign to urge other countries to give it such recognition. These developments resulted from such basic facts as the enormous economic strength of the United States, virtually complete freedom for foreigners and Americans to use dollars for any purpose they liked, and our readiness at all times to convert officially held foreign dollars into gold at a fixed price of $35 per ounce. If foreign countries continue to hold dollars as a major part of their reserves, as I believe they will, it will not be because of any effort on our part to persuade them that this would be a nice thing to do, nor will it be because of any technical innovations related to the manner of holding reserves. The reason will remain what it is now, a basic belief in the strength of the U.S. economy and in the existence of the will on the part of the American authorities and the American public to maintain unquestioned the dollar's integrity. For my part, I am confident that we shall continue to merit this belief.

The Honorable Adrian Bonnelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the December 12, 1963, issue of Il Popolo Italiano carries a picture of a distinguished Philadelphian—the Honorable Adrian Bonnelly, president judge of the county court of Philadelphia. The occasion is the silver anniversary of Judge Bonnelly on the bench.

Accompanying the picture is an article in tribute to Judge Bonnelly, which, under leave to extend my remarks, I include below:

BONNELLY MARKS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

It was 25 years ago that the former Gov. George H. Earle announced the elevation of a new member to the judiciary. The new member was Adrian Bonnelly, a lawyer well known for his work in immigration and one who had held many important Federal and State positions.

The years which followed his appointment to the bench were marked by the humanitarian efforts of a great man. Judge Bonnelly has always been eager and willing to help anyone in all walks of life.

The judge is known internationally for his outstanding work as a jurist and his silver anniversary on the bench is a milestone in a career which has been indeed illustrious.

Consumer Economics and the "Credit Addict"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the majority leader today that the House next week will consider H.R. 8459, dealing with Federal credit unions, recalls to my mind that at the time President Kennedy was assassinated, I had just returned to my home in St. Louis and had turned on the radio after having met that morning with the Missouri Credit Union League, and had given the keynote address at the league's 35th annual meeting.

The subject of my talk was "Credit Unions and Consumer Economics." In the course of the talk I briefly discussed H.R. 8459 and other legislation affecting credit unions, but primarily the talk dealt with the problems involving the uses and abuses of consumer credit.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest being shown by consumer groups and organizations of lending institutions in the plans of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency for inquiring into consumer credit matters, and in view of the scheduled consideration in the House next week of H.R. 8459, I am submitting herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my keynote talk before the Missouri Credit Union League on November 22, as follows:

CREDIT UNIONS AND CONSUMER ECONOMICS

(Address by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, at 35th annual meeting of Missouri Credit Union League, 9 a.m., Friday, November 22, 1963, at Chase-Park Plaza Hotel, St. Louis)

It is always a great pleasure for me to meet with the men and women responsible for the success of our credit unions, and it is a particular pleasure for me to be invited to serve as keynote speaker at the 35th annual meeting of the Missouri Credit Union League. I don't think we have to take any time complimenting each other back and forth, because you all know of my strong interest in this movement. And since others on your program are going to discuss pending credit union legislation, I see no point in being repetitious and going into that matter in any great detail, either. Of course you know that you can count on my support in the Committee on Banking and Currency for any reasonable legislative proposals to make credit unions more effective and more successful in meeting the needs of their members, but on the whole I think the credit union program now has to look inward as

much as to legislation for its future development.

The credit union movement has been growing to such an extent that there is always the danger that you may outgrow your most important virtue and advantage, and that is the personal knowledge which the officers of the individual credit union have of the character and reliability and integrity of the individual member who is often a borrower. This personal aspect must be retained.

SUPPORT IN CONGRESS FOR H.R. 8459

Of course, the larger you become the more problems you encounter in finding useful and profitable places for your surplus funds. I think there will be a great deal of support in the Congress for proposals to make it more practical for the credit unions to help finance home improvement loans and to invest in various types of instrumentalities of the Federal Government, as proposed in H.R. 8459. There is broad sympathy in Congress for your goals. Most of the Members of Congress think highly of credit unions, because they have had some firsthand knowledge of the credit unions movement; and if they didn't have this information before coming to Congress, then your very effective national organization has certainly managed to lobby them with great skill on the good points about credit unions.

Furthermore, there is a congressional employees' Federal credit union in the basement of the building in which my office is located—and so many congressional staff employees belong to it, and use it, that the Members themselves wouldn't dare to be disinterested in the legislative problems of credit unions.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN PRAISES CREDIT UNION MOVEMENT

A month or so ago—on October 17—when the President signed H.R. 4842 allowing the Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their operations—not a revolutionary bill at all but useful in relieving you of some of the rigidity in the redtape in connection with annual meetings and the appointment of a manager—the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas, recalled on the House floor his sponsorship in the House 29 years earlier of the Federal Credit Union Act, at a time when he was not yet even a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. And he called attention to the fact that credit unions, Federal and State, now have a combined membership of nearly 14 million persons and assets of more than $7 billion. And we all applaud your growth. But as Mr. PATMAN declared, the most important single aspect is the common bond which binds together those who belong to the same credit union. This concept dare not be lost in expansion. Perhaps in some instances where growth is proceeding at a rate which threatens the unity of the membership and the close identification of members with each other, you may have to adopt the principle of a subcommittee structure so that responsibility is more widely shared.

For when you come right down to it, the credit union is the last of the friend-to-friend lending institutions, other than in the field of mortgage credit—and in that area, the savings and loans are now being automated and electronic computerized to such an extent that once the mortgage is arranged, you can carry on all transactions by mail and never see the inside of the institution for years on end. Don't let that ever happen to your credit unions.

NEED TO EDUCATE CONSUMERS ABOUT CREDIT

Now let us turn to the subject your president asked me to discuss: credit unions and consumer economics. Of course, everything you do in your credit unions is directly related to consumer economics—encouraging saving and providing temporary financial help at reasonable interest rates. I cannot think of a better group to talk to on the general subject of consumer issues and consumer problems, because credit unions are already far ahead of most other financial institutions in orienting their philosophy toward the consumer.

I would like to see you do much, much more educational and promotional work in this field, not because you are not already doing an excellent job in consumer relations and consumer education but because there is so much more which has to be done and which is not being done, and which you can do well.

As a nation, we have gone in so heavily for "buy now pay later" that the volume of outstanding consumer credit has more than doubled in the last 9 years; from $32 billion in 1954 to $66 billion today. This doesn't include mortgage debt, which runs to another $176,200 million.

The $66 billion includes only consumer credit other than mortgages; that is, automobiles, other consumer goods, charge accounts, personal loans, and so on. And about 78 or 79 percent of the $66 billion in outstanding consumer debt is represented by installment debt alone. The total of installment debt comes to more than $51½ billion, and automobile paper is less than half of this total; it is about 42 percent of the total of outstanding installment debt.

INSTALLMENT DEBT EQUALS ALL CORPORATE PROFITS

I think we can only begin to appreciate the magnitude of the $51½ billion in outstanding installment debt for consumer goods and consumer wants, things we have bought and are using or have used, but which we must continue to pay for into the future, when we realize that this figure of $51½ billion is almost exactly equal to the rate of total annual profits, before taxes, of all of the corporations in the United States.

Just imagine what would happen to those corporate profits, by the way, if we suddenly had no more installment credit. It would be unthinkable. Factories everywhere would close. Our whole economy is geared to the concept of enjoying now the things we want to buy or use, regardless of whether we can scrape together enough money to pay the whole amount.

If we were to try to go back to the period in our history when people bought only what they could pay for in cash, we would really be in a sad economic state. Generations of consumers have grown up in this country who have learned the magic secret of how not to do without the things they want but can't afford to pay for on the spot.

AMORTIZED MORTGAGES AND INSTALLMENT BUYING

Years ago, about the only thing a family could readily buy without paying cash was a home. In the deal for a home, they usually paid only the interest on the mortgage and had so little equity in the home that they lost it with the first cold breeze of recession—recessions were called panics in those days—when the market value of the home dropped below the face value of the mortgage, and the family was not able to scrape up the thousands of dollars necessary to reduce the mortgage to the home's lower actual value. This was before FHA, and before we had that emergency program in the first years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal to save people's homes—the Home Owners Loan Corporation.

FHA brought secure and practical home ownership within the reach of the majority of American families, who began to pay off their homes in the same manner in which they had previously paid rent. And this is how millions also pay off their cars and their furniture and clothing and refrigerators and other goods contributing to an improved quality of living.

A young couple getting married today sees very little reason to start out with few possessions, as their parents probably did, and certainly they see no economic necessity for doing so. They want to start out at about the same level of living as they enjoyed in their parents' home, and credit is easy enough for most young couples to enable them to have a nicely furnished home or apartment, a late model car, television, lots of travel, good clothing, and all of the things which make for the good life and which their parents or grandparents may have achieved only after 20 or 25 years of hard work and sacrifice—if they ever did achieve them. But, oh, those monthly payments. And, oh, the havoc of any temporary unemployment.

"SAVE NOW—BUY LATER"

The credit unions do a very good job of stressing installment buying in reverse—that is, urging members, though month-by-month savings to accumulate in advance the money necessary to buy the things one wants. Of course, in today's economic fashions, it's a losing battle, but nevertheless, every little bit of education in this direction helps. So keep it up. I am amazed at how many people will do this very thing of advanced financing through Christmas or vacation saving accounts on which they receive no interest at all. I'd like to suggest a kind of promotional campaign in which you stress to your members not only how much less an item will cost if paid for in cash saved up in advance, but also how much less than that it will cost if the money is saved through an interest-bearing savings account, such as in a credit union. Reducing it to such terms, perhaps we can swell the ranks of the save-now-to-buy-later consumer contingent.

We are all price conscious. But, as Senator DOUGLAS's hearings on the truth-in-lending bill have brought out, most Americans have no idea in the world what credit actually costs them, let alone how much the interest rate is. If they knew these things, undoubtedly more people would try to pay in full for the things they buy.

INQUIRY INTO NEED FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION

My Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs has before it now about nine bills which are companion measures to the Douglas bill in the Senate—including the bill which I introduced and which would be the vehicle for hearings when we finally reach that stage. There is widespread interest in the subcommittee, on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic alike, in the subject of consumer credit and in the possible need for corrective Federal legislation in a field which often resembles an impenetrable jungle of confusing information.

Senator DOUGLAS, who was a professor of economics before he was a public official, is one of the most knowledgeable persons in the United States on the intricacies of credit and of the technical aspects of interest determinations, and he has made this legislation one of his major crusades in the Congress. To say his bill is controversial is to engage in massive understatement. Many of those who bitterly oppose the bill claim it is unworkable because of its requirements for stating in each instance not only the cost of financing but also the true annual rate of interest on any loan or credit transaction, with monetary damages in case of glaring error. However, many of the opponents say they are quite willing to provide the borrower with the actual dollar-and-cents cost of financing or of interest, claiming that this is what people are most interested in anyway rather than in the interest rate calculations themselves.

CONSUMERS UNAWARE OF INTEREST RATES

My own feeling, as expressed in that famous advertising slogan some years ago, is that "it's more fun to know"—to have all of

the facts on costs and interest rates. I think most people would be grateful for the full facts about any credit transaction in which they were involved. On the other hand, I recognize the technical difficulties—as well as the very formidable political ones—in placing the true interest rate disclosure requirements into effect through national legislation. Undoubtedly, the prevailing true rates of interest would sound excessive—unconscionable—to most consumers now unwittingly paying 18 to 24 percent or more in true annual interest, when they think they are actually paying a rate somewhere in the neighborhood of 6 percent which they regard as the fair rate.

Your national organization, CUNA, has been doing a tremendous educational job on this issue, and has provided a good deal of the technical information being used by proponents of effective Federal legislation. And I applaud you for this work, for we are all benefiting from the facts which have been brought out and developed in connection with truth in lending.

We have never had legislation on the subject of credit regulation or credit disclosure in the House or in the House Banking Committee since the World War II period when regulation W was in effect, and again when it was proposed during the Korean war. Regulation W, as you may recall, was a Federal Reserve Board requirement that purchasers must pay at least one-third down on any installment contract, and must pay off the balance in a limited period—usually 18 months. This was undertaken during the war as a brake on inflation—as a means of preventing people from using credit too freely in competing for scarce consumer goods very much in demand.

EXCESSIVE USE OF CREDIT UNSTABILIZING

Excessive use of credit has been recognized for years under Federal law as an unstabilizing factor. In 1934, the idea of controlling margin was written into the Securities Exchange Act to prevent excessive and unstabilizing speculation in the stock market with borrowed money. This authority is used constantly by the Federal Reserve Board to raise or lower minimum margins according to the fever temperature of the stock market. Right now, the minimum margin is 70 percent.

In the investigation my subcommittee has been conducting into the surge in sugar prices this year, we discovered that futures speculation on borrowed money—on no more than 10 percent margin, and often as little as 2½ percent—contributed materially to the price spiral last spring which has cost us, as consumers, hundreds of millions of dollars. An unnecessary or artificial increase of as little as 1 cent a pound in the price of raw sugar comes out to $200 million a year. At one brief point this year the price was 6½ cents above normal. As a result of our inquiry, and the questions we have raised, the Department of Agriculture has now, for the first time, suggested not only regulation of sugar futures speculative trading, but of margins as well.

So the unrestrained use of credit, in any area of major economic activity, is definitely a matter of national concern, both to the consumer and to the economy as a whole. It is certainly important to you.

USES AND ABUSES OF CREDIT

Our plan in the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee is to dig into the various types of consumer credit for a better understanding of how credit is used effectively and how it is used destructively—into the uses and abuses of an economic device which can either bring great economic benefits for the country as a whole or great personal hardship for individual families, depending upon how it is used.

As part of our research work preliminary to hearings, we have been making a particular study of the rising tide of personal bankruptcies—nonbusiness bankruptcies—involving individuals not in business or in the professions. About 90 percent of all bankruptcies across the Nation fit into this category, and many, if not most, of them involve people who just couldn't resist buying thinks they couldn't afford.

THE BANKRUPTCY TRAIL

It is a tragedy written out over and over again in dreary legalisms in the Federal courts—symbolized by the two uneven lists on the bankruptcy petition—one being the short list of assets, the other the long list of liabilities. It is a sad thing indeed to see a wage earner's wordly possessions reduced into terms of 10 shirts worth 50 cents each; a child's coat, $2; dinette set, $10; sewing machine, $22.50 and so on. And on the other side of the petition—or on the next page—are item after item of installment debts, personal loan balances, hospital bills, utility bills, rent bills, and all sorts of unpaid obligations ranging through necessities up through expensive luxuries, including large amounts still due on repossessed cars or other installment purchases.

And often—I am sorry to say—the names of credit unions show up in the listings of unsecured creditors of people going into bankruptcy. One fairly large credit union reported to me that it has lost $18,000 or more in unsecured loans to borrowers who went bankrupt. I have come across cases of borrowers owing as much as $900 to their credit unions, meanwhile also owing everybody else in town—and also owing lots of merchants or loan companies in other towns as well. Amazingly enough, the bankrupts often have a history of relatively low earnings but relatively extravagant wants and desires they were able to indulge for quite a while before the house of credit cards collapsed.

DISCOURAGING FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

So it comes back to the question of how well do you actually know your borrowers—how well do you know their characters? When fellow members of a credit union are willing to cosign a friend's note, the supposition is that they are convinced the man is a good risk. They should be sure. When you are working together in the same plant or shop or office, the chances are you get a pretty good opportunity to size up the other fellow in terms of his ability to manage on a salary not too much different from yours. Most of us can spot the chiseler in the gang, the fellow who lives over his means and, in addition, is probably gambling on every lottery or horserace or athletic event he can. A credit union cannot be victimized if the members, as well as the officers, refuse to be just plain softies for bad risks.

Let's face it: the fellow who has run up debts all over town is never a good credit union risk unless, and I stress this, unless the credit union works with him to get him out of debt. Just to hand over a wad of money to such a fellow so that he can pay off his other debts is not the answer. If he has been irresponsible enough to live far above his means, and to try to balance one creditor off against another—constantly borrowing from Peter to pay Paul—you've got a problem on your hands if you lend him money, for he may not proceed to use the money as you had expected.

Under Missouri law, the credit adjusters have now been put out of business, but a good credit union can nevertheless often perform many of the same functions—the worthwhile functions of credit adjusting—if you can arrange for a credit addict to get out from under, perhaps getting the borrower and his employer to agree jointly to have the loan repaid by payroll deductions.

TEMPTING THE CREDIT ADDICT

The credit addict would never reach his sorry state of constant shifting of debts and piling of debts one on top of the other if there were not so many merchants and lending institutions willing to tempt him and play along with him, contributing to his addiction, in the knowledge that a garnishment or a suit in a magistrate's court will get the money back plus a usurious interest rate besides.

As long as the garnishment law makes it comparatively certain for a creditor to get his money back eventually, the abuses of too easy credit are going to continue. What I have suggested is a sort of friendly or voluntary garnishment arrangement to help a credit addict back to economic health.

But of course there are the career deadbeats who feel they have it made—and who have, in effect, made a shambles of consumer credit.

These are the people who buy and buy in one town and then go bye-bye to the next, and their number is large enough, I am sorry to say, to cost us all money—in higher prices we must pay for the things we buy. Credit losses from deadbeats are not large enough to discourage the stores from granting credit, but the losses must be made up somewhere, and you and I are the ones who have to help to make them up.

THE SELECTIVE FINANCIAL AUTOBIOGRAPHY

A career deadbeat very often has a talent for writing a remarkably selective autobiography when he applies for credit, and he also has great skill in keeping a limited number of credit accounts in good standing somewhere. When he applies for credit, on anything from a record player to a late model Cadillac convertible, he can give several credit references which will usually stand up on a cursory inquiry. He may owe every other major store in town, but have a single good account he can cite to the credit office in opening a new account somewhere else. He can obtain the late-model car he wants to buy by citing a paid-up account for a beat-up old-model car he bought elsewhere sometime earlier, while neglecting to mention the ugly repossessions which dot his automobile credit history like junk heaps in an automobile graveyard. The used car dealer is not too concerned for he has so many financing companies competing for his paper that he can dispose of it very frequently on a no-recourse basis, and often without any discount at all, because the financing terms on the good risks are high enough to cover the losses on the deadbeats.

I have discussed with many officials in the credit business the ease with which the career deadbeat seems able to operate and the answer usually is that the credit bureaus could do a better job if all of the firms and organizations which come to them for information were equally interested in giving information to the credit bureaus.

OPPORTUNITIES TO VICTIMIZE PURCHASERS

Certainly, I don't have the answers for all of the ills which plague the economy as a result of such widespread abuse of credit opportunities, but obviously this is a matter which concerns us all as consumers. On the one hand, we don't want to see overly trusting consumers victimized by excessive charges and hidden fees which often turn routine-seeming credit transactions into nightmares, even causing the loss of their homes through fraudulent second mortgages; on the other hand, we do not want to be charged, as a cost of the merchandise we buy, a higher price than the seller would otherwise have to charge if his credit losses were not so high.

Whether or not we can close all of the loopholes in Federal, State and local legislation—and the chances are that new credit abuses will always spring up as we outlaw old ones—the fact is that education in the economics of credit, and in the intelligent use of credit, is the only way to enable the average consumer to cope with almost any credit situation—or at least know what he's in for.

One of the most effective agencies for doing a good job in credit use education, as I said, is the credit union. Of course, the best place of all is the home—but how can parents teach what they themselves have not learned? Teach the parents.

CUTTING THE TRANQUILIZER INTAKE

I guess I'm old-fashioned at heart. We had so little money in my parents' home—with nine children in the family—we had to approach every purchase, no matter how necessary, with a great weighing of all of the pros and cons. I'm glad that today most families do not have to scrimp and go without, but—looking at it another way—when we were able to save a little money ahead in order to buy something we really wanted, the experience of making the purchase, and the joy in its use, were thrills beyond description. When a luxury comes easy, it can't begin to carry the same joy with it.

And there was a lot to be said—a whole lot to be said—for not having the parents lie awake night after night wondering how they were going to be able to meet the monthly installments on a house full of luxuries they really couldn't afford to buy. When my parents worried at night, it was over the rent—and all those shoes.

Of course we are not going back to the old-fashioned ways; there is not a chance. But proper use, rather than abuse, of the opportunities to buy on credit would go a long way, I am sure, toward cutting down the sleeping pill and tranquilizer intake in many an American family where to use cigarette slogan sentence structure, the living is deceptively easy because the credit terms are.

Austrian Foreign Minister Kreisky Describes America's Image in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most discerning appraisals of the United States was given by the Austrian Foreign Minister, Dr. Bruno Kreisky, in his speech of October 2, 1963, before the chamber of commerce at Kansas City, Mo. In his remarks, Dr. Kreisky described with acuteness and understanding America's role in postwar Europe and its changed position as a result of military developments and Europe's economic rebirth.

Dr. Kreisky was introduced by former President Harry S. Truman. His remarks follow:

THE NEW IMAGE OF AMERICA IN EUROPE

In a recent address General de Gaulle spoke of the "double hegemony" of the United States and the Soviet Union. He was quoted as having said: "If two privileged states are always to have a monopoly of power that would be turning the world over to a double hegemony, and a country like ours cannot accept that."

Reading these quotations out of context one might come to the conclusion that Europe has to defend herself against two dangers: First, against the expansion of communism by the Soviet Union; and secondly, against a kind of neocolonialism by the United States of America.

I am convinced that General de Gaulle did not mean it that way and I shall now try to offset this—in my opinion completely misleading—impression with what I believe to be the true situation in present-day Europe.

What I have to say to you today is taken from a book of mine that will appear in Europe within the next few days. I mention this because I want to impress upon you the fact that in presenting my views, I am not making concessions simply to please an American audience. Of course, you will not expect me to be friendly toward the United States; but neither shall I be simply friendly and uncritical. * * *

In 1945, Europe was more devastated by war than it had been in 1918; millions of human beings—whole generations—had been destroyed; Europe's cities lay in ruins; the last economic reserves had been exhausted; currencies tottered on the brink of inflation. Then the U.S. Foreign Secretary, George C. Marshall, delivered his historic speech at Harvard University on June 3, 1947, in which he stated:

"It is already evident that, before the U.S. Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the European world on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this Government. * * * The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all European nations."

An so the dollar came back to Europe, but this time in a different way: No political conditions were attached to the U.S. offer of assistance. The United States lent, and to a certain extent donated, $12 billion to Europe. Thus, and only thus, was it possible in a short time not only to restore the prewar level of production of the European industrial countries but also to achieve a prosperity unprecedented in Europe's economic history. This assistance gave the democratic countries of Europe the strength to advance toward posperity while depriving communism of the economic conditions required for it to spread. Admittedly, Communist Parties in Italy and France are still very powerful today, but this is attributable to political and psychological factors and not to the impoverishment.

The Marshall plan was a bold enterprise of economic assistance, and more, it was a gesture of international solidarity between the people of the United States and the European nations. And, over and above that, it was part of a brilliant political idea to save democracy in Europe.

American foreign policy has been a target of criticism ever since President Wilson delivered his message to Congress on January 8, 1918, on the war objectives of the United States—the so-called "14 points" * * *

In the present context it would be irrelevant to analyse the development of U.S. foreign policy since the end of the First World War. I will restrict myself to a few remarks concerning Roosevelt's foreign policy, because it is criticized as having been "credulous and naive" and responsible for rendering eastern and central Europe to Bolshevism. It is occasionally asserted that Roosevelt allowed the Russians to penetrate into central Europe toward Berlin and Vienna. The fact that the decision of his General Staff was the determining factor in the President's attitude is taken into account by only a small minority of critics. * * *

What carried more weight with Roosevelt, however, was the fact that an offensive from the Balkans against the German armies and the establishment of a second front in Europe—long before Stalingrad—would without the slightest doubt have cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of British and United States soldiers. * * * But only a Balkan offensive would have made it possible to penetrate, simultaneously with Soviet troops, into central Europe. In this connection, it is extremely doubtful Stalin would have agreed to such an offensive; and the danger might have been conjured up of a separate Hitler-Stalin peace. Since neither the United States nor the British Government was ready or able, at such an early stage, to establish a second front, eastern and central Europe was totally occupied by the Soviet troops after the defeat of the German armies at Stalingrad.

The advance of the Soviet troops to Berlin and Vienna and the conquest of eastern and southeastern Europe cost the lives of millions of Russian soldiers. Neither Roosevelt nor Churchill could ask their democratic countries to pay a similar price. And so Europe was divided. One thing is certain: at the outbreak of the Second World War, Russia's borders were 600 to 700 kilometers distant from Vienna and Berlin. Hitler and Goebbels, with their anti-Communist campaign are primarily responsible for bringing the Soviet soldiers into the middle of Europe. Hitler is to blame for the fact that in the spring of 1945 they paraded on the Ringstrasse in Vienna and the Kurfuerstendamm in Berlin.

In July 1947, an article entitled "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," signed by Mr. X, appeared in the U.S. magazine Foreign Affairs. It was the first authentic presentation of the policy of containment and was written by George F. Kennan, then head of the State Department's Planning Commission. This policy of erecting bulwarks against Soviet expansion was the most constructive contribution made by the United States to the maintenance of world peace.

In the cold war, the Western World has scored six decisive points:

1. The end of the civil war in Greece, and the Soviet hope of securing a bastion stretching far into the Mediterranean through the transformation of Greece into a people's democracy, was shattered. Today Greece is closely linked in a military alliance with the West. This was the first reverse suffered by Stalinist postwar policy.

2. The Berlin blockade resulted in the most successful improvisation in military history, an air bridge operated by British and United States Air Forces. The final lifting of the blockade was a triumph for the combination of bold military planning and the political determination of leading democratic statesmen. It was Reuter, then mayor of Berlin, and Willy Brandt, of the German Socialist Party, which was then in power in Berlin, who told the Allies that, if they could manage to supply the city, the people of Berlin would hold out.

3. The Marshall plan was carried out, despite the efforts of the Communist International to prevent it. Communist stevedores in Leghorn and Marseilles unloaded the Marshall aid ships just as Soviet occupation troops in Austria ate bread that was baked from flour provided under the Marshall plan.

4. The peace treaty with Japan, which was concluded in spite of the Soviet Union's abstention, made Japan an ally of the United States and of the Western World.

5. The formation of NATO was an answer to the fall of democracy in Czechoslovakia.

6. The United Nations action in Korea showed that the West, particularly the United States, is able and ready to make a military appearance even in the remotest theaters of the cold war.

All these world conflicts arose during the Stalin era. Since Khrushchev came to power, two quite obvious attempts were made to return to the methods of peaceful negotiation: the signing of the State Treaty with Austria

in 1955 and the recent partial nuclear test ban treaty. The policy of containment has borne fruit. In spite of the polarization processes in international politics, not one square yard of any democratic country in Europe has been lost since this policy was embarked upon.

On the other hand, on October 4, 1957, the United States suffered a psychological setback in the course of the cold war when the Soviet Union succeeded in launching into space the first earth satellite sputnik. The shock which this produced in the Western world was all the greater since at that time the West tended to underestimate the technological capability of the Soviet Union so far as military development was concerned.

U.S. foreign policy had now to take into account the fact that, as a result of Soviet superiority in intercontinental ballistic missiles, the strategic position of the United States had changed. When NATO was established the determining factor was that, even combining their total potential, western and southeastern Europe was unable to defend itself with its own resources and was in urgent need of the alliance with the United States which was not directly threatened at the time. Today the American continent is no longer beyond the range of a direct threat from Soviet attack. In December 1957 the Washington Post stated that, in the event of a worldwide conflict, the first blows would presumably be directed against the United States. The NATO bases for medium-range missiles today serve the purpose not only of protecting the Western European countries of the Atlantic Alliance but also of directly protecting the United States. Thus the European allies of the United States constitute a valuable and necessary supplement to the U.S. potential.

Hence there are two circumstances which have led to a change in the relationship between Europe and the United States: the special strategic importance which Europe has today for the United States and Europe's remarkable economic development.

Whereas in 1948 the U.S. accounted for 53.4 percent of the industrial output of the Western countries and Western Europe for only 30.4 percent, in 1962, following a tremendous growth in overall production, the difference between the United States and Europe fell from 23 to 8.3 percent.

McGeorge Bundy from the White House recently spoke in clear and unequivocal terms of the fundamental change which has taken place in the relationship between Europe and the United States. He recalls that the United States export surplus vis-a-vis Europe has, in recent years, amounted to approximately $5 billion per annum. This surplus has not only financed employment in the United States, but also has an influence on the U.S. world position. In practice it makes it possible also to carry out the comprehensive assistance program and security measures. Later on Bundy states that, from the long-range point of view, it is not an advantage for the United States to be the only real world power in the non-Communist part of the world. Even though the voices of France, Great Britain and Italy—and increasingly also of Germany—are heard in the community of powers—none of them is by itself a power comparable to the United States. U.S. policy therefore supported European unity which has slowly been taking place since 1947. It would be in the interest of the United States for Europe to become a real world power.

U.S. foreign policy is at present concentrating on a new concept, without abandoning the policy of containment. I wonder whether the policy of containment and of strategic and military equilibrium does not generally constitute one of the fundamental premises of coexistence. At the moment it seems to be essential for a U.S. foreign policy to determine whether there are possibilities of achieving a détente whether in the major and decisive areas of friction in the world, solutions can be found in the sense of at least a temporary calm.

This can come about only by establishing contact between the two superpowers, and the attitude that the mere holding of talks is a concession to the Soviet Union must therefore be avoided. Only by direct talks with the Soviet Union is it possible to form any clear ideas about its intentions—and even then there is still a large field for analyses and speculation. Lack of communication between the great powers involves dangerous and unforeseeable risks. Therefore an earnest endeavor must be made to ascertain how far the Soviets are prepared genuinely to achieve real solutions. In view of the deep mistrust which prevails between the powers, presumably they will have to be satisfied, during the first phase, at best with a few test cases. Only after these have shown themselves to be successful can further and more substantial opportunities arise.

So how does the new U.S. policy appear to the European observer? The President and his administration are trying to find new approaches without discarding old and tested methods. Cooperation with Europe is therefore being intensified; and here it cannot be denied that there is still misunderstanding on both sides. On July 4, 1962, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, President Kennedy spoke of the "concrete Atlantic partnership with Europe." He advocated a "Declaration of Interdependence" between the United States and Europe which was to be striven for in the same spirit as the great Declaration of Independence of 1776.

But great questions are still pending: Will it be possible to develop a lasting policy of cooperation with the Latin American States? The Alliance for Progress based on President Kennedy's initiative, is a hopeful beginning. It has decided on an impressive program, but the difficulties are far from being overcome merely with the formulation of the program. Will it be possible to concord the recalcitrant forces of the Western Alliance? Will the present crisis in nuclear cooperation with the most important U.S. allies be overcome? Will fruitful cooperation be achieved between the United States and the great trading systems of Europe—the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association? Can a basis of mutual trust be created with Asia and Africa? In the United Nations with its 112 members, will the United States be able to play a leading role, in the moral sense, in dealing with recurrent problems as they arise? Governor Stevenson has accomplished much in the last few years.

The great illusion of eternal prosperity which culminated at the end of the twenties and which, in the thirties, led to a rude awakening, gave a dynamic impetus to the U.S. economy and gave this country a leading position in modern politcial economy * * *.

In recent years American economics and policy has been facing one problem, deriving exclusively from foreign policy: The problem of the U.S. trade balance, which the British Chancellor of the Exchequer once referred to as the "balance of generosity." This problem may seem all the stranger to some because in the postwar era the dollar rapidly became the world's currency.

The U.S. balance-of-payments difficulties are of a political nature exclusively and have nothing, or scarcely anything, to do with any inadequacy of the American economy. America has provided $125 billion to the world, which, among other things, has led to the closing of the so-called dollar gap, from which Europe suffered for so long. The extent to which things have changed in the last 10 years is apparent from the development of foreign exchange reserves in the central banks of America and Europe:

Gold and foreign exchange holdings amounted to $16.2 billion in the United States and to $17 billion in the countries of the European Economic Community. In 1962 alone these reserves climbed, in the EEC countries, by $600 million and fell by $900 million in the United States. In these circumstances it is obvious that the United States is becoming increasingly less willing on the long run; to quote from the Economist, "to carry the largest share of everyone's burden."

I would like to make here a few remarks concerning the cultural relationship between the United States and Europe. In Europe there still remains a considerable degree of complacency, which is occasionally expressed by the fact that people on the continent talk about the so-called European world culture. They mean, in fact, that the cradle of modern world culture stood in Europe and claim from this a certain superiority. Whenever I can, I try to say in reply to those who proclaim European cultural superiority—they actually recognize the economic and military superiority of the United States—that Europe's cultural development, especially during the past decades, received considerable impetus from America.

American universities, colleges, and other institutions have provided many European scientists, scholars, doctors, and artists, who were forced to leave their native lands, with chairs and facilities for continuing their scientific work—with a lack of prejudice and with an openmindedness which are characteristic of academic life in the United States. The history of our world knows of no comparable expulsion of intellectuals as took place in Europe at the end of the thirties. The whole hostility to the intellect of the Nazi dictatorship manifested itself in this expulsion, and the European thinkers and poets who were spared did not have the strength or the courage to rise up in the name of Western culture. Twentieth century Europe has failed to live up to this act of cultural militancy, while America opened its doors to those who were expelled. This alone is a great deed which will one day be worthily inscribed in the annals of history.

To some of you, part of what I was saying may appear too friendly. I therefore want to reiterate what I mentioned before; namely, that a presentation like the one I am giving here can necessarily be but highly subjective. I could very well imagine that there are people who would, in the framework of such a presentation, attach priority to other questions. I don't want to attempt to give an outline of how such a speech could be set up, but I feel on the other hand obliged to stress one particular aspect: All openminded people in Europe follow with the utmost attention your efforts to find a solution to the racial problem. I know, that in this context nobody has the right to throw stones at others since in Europe, too, many unfortunate happenings were a consequence of prejudice. Whatever may happen, America is at present the object of worldwide attention. This is because you took over the leading role in the free world 40 years ago. It is unthinkable that a country as big as the United States and with such tremendous economic and moral resources would be free to decide if it wants to play this role or not. Some may consider this development as an act of providence and others as a result of more rational reasons. However, America is today—in spite of other opinions voiced in one or the other European country—for us in Europe the power which carries the greatest political and moral responsibility for the destiny of the world and no policy can reverse this process. History itself has already decided.

And this is a good thing. I will readily admit that there are many amongst you who think that the burden is very big and the responsibility almost too heavy. But all of this will become easier in the foreseeable time through genuine partnership between

democratic Europe and the United States.

For the first time in 40 years Europe has become so strong economically as well as politically that genuine partnership has really become possible.

A Sermon on the Death of President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent sermon on the death of President Kennedy by the Rev. Donald J. Maccallum, pastor of the People's Congregational Church, Dover, Del., has evoked wide interest.

Former Senator J. Allen Frear of Delaware called me and spoke of his interest in this sermon.

I am including this sermon at this point in my remarks:

A SERMON ON THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

(Delivered in People's Congregational Church, Dover, Del., by Rev. Donald J. Maccallum, November 24, 1963)

When bitter and senseless tragedy stuns not only a nation but the whole world, when a person whose life and office symbolize the finest in our national character and the highest aspirations of our people is cut down by the hand of a demented assassin, when the reward of conscientious public service and courageous devotion to duty is a bullet in the head, it is time for a people to think, it is time for a people to listen.

We are here to listen to what God might speak to us through this calamitous experience, and we are here to think deeply, honestly, and penitently about the society which must ever bear on its conscience the guilt of its own affliction.

In some other places in the world, the violent death of a chief magistrate would not occasion the alarm or the grief, the astonishment or the sorrow, the abhorrence or the sympathy that have accompanied the murder of the President.

For in some less favored lands, assassination is an expected instrument of political power. But not in the United States. We have protected ourselves from political violence by a common loyalty to peaceable constitutional procedures.

It is not yet possible to know what wildly twisted motive triggered the fatal shot. That it was an act of mental madness is self-evident. But the acts of a demented mind can be the execution of a fearful logic unswerved by civilized traditions or humane instincts. Behind violence is a stimulus to destroy what threatens self-will and personal desire.

And the question which the American people must ask themselves today is whether the social passions of these recent years have provided a climate stimulating to such abhorrent depravity as the murder of our Chief of State.

Whether the President was made a martyr to the principles of domestic justice and tranquillity or whether his death is another sacrifice on the altar of peaceful world relations which he protected with deliberate courage just a year ago, or whether he was the victim of some unsuspected personal vengeance, this fact remains:

We have breathed the foul fumes of a new and dangerous climate in our country in recent months and years. We have departed from our tradition of resolving momentous social issues by rational and peaceable constitutional procedures. We have tolerated shootings, bombings, murders, and mobbings as instruments of political decision. We have incited to riot in place of reason. We have substituted violence for vision. And even in those communities which have not been riven by hateful passions, we have been fed a steady stream of social poison by venomous purveyors of malice and hate.

This is not the kind of society for which our fathers labored. This is not the kind of society for which sons and brothers and husbands have fought as citizen soldiers and laid down their very lives. This is not the kind of society which has inspired other nations to seek for themselves the blessings of liberty and justice and peace. This is not the kind of society to which we have ourselves aspired. This is not the kind of society which reflects the true national character of our people. This is not the kind of society which our President symbolized. This is the kind of society which has a lunatic capacity to destroy our finest national qualities, to crush our noblest aspirations, and to return us to the dark reign of primitive passions, unbridled impulses, and social terror.

The assassination of the President hovers today over this whole Nation as an urgent question mark demanding instant answer: Is this the kind of society we want? Do we want a society in which political victories can be gained by personal violence? Do we want a society in which demented passions can direct our destiny? Do we want a society in which conscientious contributions to the public good endanger even life itself? Do we want a society stripped of those humane and civilized values which men have struggled long and painfully and with great sacrifice to achieve and to protect?

Yes, we have created a new and fearful climate in America—a climate which, if it did not direct the assassin's bullet on Friday, still stimulates the kind of depravity, the kind of insanity, the kind of violence, the kind of inhumanity, the kind of unbridled self-will, the kind of social irresponsibility, the kind of moral blindness so lamentably exalted in Dallas.

Is this what we want? Is this what we believe in? Is this the direction we shall pursue until our luster as a free and just and responsible people is tarnished dull? This is the time for sober self-examination, for probing appraisal of the flaws in our national character and certainly a time for penitence.

These days of universal sorrow should also be days when a new resoluteness of spirit stiffens the American character. The words of our first martyred President ring with renewed urgency across a century of time:

"It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that Government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

However, history shall judge the brief administration of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, those of us who lived under his leadership will testify to its resolute purpose in those days of frightening nuclear crisis and to its resolute firmness in days of domestic discord. Whatever political evaluations the future may make, this President will stand with the Great Emancipator as a purposeful leader who, in the lonely hours of critical decision, chose "firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

You may remember that after that address that asked of the American people a willingness to sacrifice, some cynically inquired, "What sacrifice?" Today we know what sacrifice.

There is only one sacrifice that any man is asked to make for the principles and purposes in which he believes—the sacrifice of his life. Some honored few give up their lives in the course of public duty and perhaps in the stillness of death far more than the vigor of life, they inspire in us, the living, a new spirit of dedication to "the unfinished work which they * * * so nobly advanced."

Life is sacrificed, life is made a holy offering, in some cases by giving it up, in others by living it out in devotion to the highest good we know, the finest purposes we perceive.

"Ask not what your country can do for you," he said. "Ask what you can do for your country." And when we ask, the answer comes: you can consecrate your life by the high resolution that these dead shall not have died in vain; you can dedicate your life "to the unfinished work which they * * * advanced"; you can sacrifice your life by engulfing self-will and self-interest in a consuming passion for liberty and justice for all.

These days of lamentation are also a time for renewed confidence in our Nation and in its destiny. "What are we coming to?" many a person asked when they heard of the sniper's fatal shot. "What are we coming to?" It is understandable that we should ask in the moment of shock. But when composure is regained such despair should vanish.

There is cause, indeed, for grief and sorrow and penitence that such a crime should happen. But there is no cause for despair. For "we know that in everything God works for good with those who love him."

Our Government is not so weak, our Nation is not so fragile, our people are not so resourceless, that we cannot endure, painfully it may be, this bitter assault on our principles, this awful personal tragedy.

The helm of Government has passed into skilled and experienced and devoted hands and the ship of state sails on. The seas may be rough and the winds may be fierce but the vessel is sturdy and the course is clear.

To a mourning people, tempted to despair, these words from an earlier time seem to speak the confident assurance we need:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

"Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!"

—H. W. LONGFELLOW.

PASTORAL PRAYER

Eternal God, our Father, we bring unto Thee the solemn prayer of a sorrowing people.

Forgive us our sins, pardon our iniquities, comfort our afflictions, and renew in us a right spirit that while we mourn, we may not murmer and while we grieve we may not despair.

We give Thee thanks that Thou dost raise up leaders of the people, that Thou dost endow men with noble faculties of mind and spirit devoted to the public good.

Especially in these mournful days we thank Thee for the President now dead in whom we symbolized the hopes and aspirations of our people. For his fathful public service, his integrity of character, his strength of purpose and his breadth of vision, we offer to Thee the gratitude of a grieving nation.

Comfort those who intimately mourn his loss and strengthen those who must pursue the path he laid but did not tread.

Inspire by Thy spirit the President of the United States that he may bear the burdens of his heavy task and guide this people toward their long-sought destiny of liberty with justice, prosperity with peace.

And breathe upon a stricken land the consolation and the comfort which Thou alone canst give.

Save us from corroding bitterness and deliver us from formless fears that we may emerge from tragedy with deeper unity, profounder sympathies, and stronger devotion to this land we love.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Ukrainian-Americans Commemorate Artificial Famine Victims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on November 24, the Omaha branch of the Ukrainian-American Association observed the 30th anniversary of the Moscow-directed artificial famine which claimed millions of lives in the Ukraine.

This was a solemn, commemorative service which took on a new and added significance, coming as it did just 2 days after the violent and brutal act which claimed the life of President Kennedy.

The term "genocide," Mr. President, is at best only dimly understood by the overwhelming majority of Americans, but it is all too well understood by the families and descendants of those who were its victims in the thirties.

Just as it is well to recall the dedication and devotion of our late President, so we should remember the sacrifice of the enslaved peoples of Europe, in order that we may better chart our course in today's world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Omaha branch of the Ukrainian-American Association which has been sent to me by President D. Witjtyk and Secretary W. Stolarskyj.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC., ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF A HEINOUS CRIME PERPETRATED BY COMMUNIST MOSCOW IN UKRAINE

The Communist empire of Moscow and its dictators came into being, grew, spread, gained power, existed and exists now by terror, genocide, and injustice, violating God's commandments and trampling the rights of man, enslaving, subjugating and destroying entire nations.

Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev—these are different names, but the same rule applies. Different persons, but the same methods of merciless dictatorship; an uninterrupted chain of crimes against mankind, based on relentless physical terror and mass murder.

To list some of the events which brought these men to power and by which they are remembered:

The massacre of innocent people in the capitol of Ukraine and surrounding towns in the spring of 1918—Lenin.

The murder of the populous of Budapest and of other Hungarian towns in the fall of 1956—Khrushchev.

Mass deportation and murder of Ukrainian people in the thirties—Stalin.

Mass deportation of Ukrainian youth from their homeland to the deserts of Kazahstan now—Khrushchev. A chain with innumerable links.

Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev are merely stages of Communist Moscow imperialism and their efforts in ever more perfect methods of aggression toward subjugation of the entire world.

Ukraine was the first nation to experience Communist aggression in its most deadly form. It paid for this experience with millions of lives and its nationally independent existence.

This gathering today is dedicated primarily to the memory of one of the most horrible manifestations of Moscow's aggression. Thirty years ago Communist Moscow in its role as occupant of Ukraine, committed a crime unprecedented in the history of mankind. It organized and fostered an artificial famine on the Ukrainian territories, and thereby destroying more than 6 million Ukrainian people. Today we observe the 30th anniversary of this tragedy. We honor the memory of the dead and call attention of the world to this dreadful crime perpetrated by Communist Moscow, at a moment when contemporary Moscow became a constantly growing menace to the free world and this great country of ours.

We declare that—

Whereas Moscow's aggression began 45 years ago when it first attacked the then free and independent Republic of Ukraine; and

Whereas the Ukrainian people, by rendering stanch resistance, kept Moscow from subjugating the countries of Europe still feeble after the war, thus enabling them to live in freedom for many more years; and

Whereas Communist Moscow paralyzed the resistance of the Ukrainian population by means of terror and destruction and, in order to subdue the freedom-loving people, in 1932 and 1933 staged a man-made famine that exterminated more than six million Ukrainians; and

Whereas Communist Moscow perpetrated genocide in Ukraine and for this crime should be condemned by the free world; and

Whereas one of the accomplices in this crime and organizer of other criminal activities committed in Ukraine, is the present dictator and responsible leader of the Communist Moscow empire; and

Whereas Communist Moscow, and especially its present dictators, used similar though less extensive methods of genocide after having occupied the territories of other nations; and

Whereas Communist Moscow's aggressive aspirations have become an evergrowing menace to all nations of the free world, and also to the freedom-loving and independent people in this great country of liberty; and

Whereas the Ukrainian people who still struggle for freedom from captivity and for their own, independent state, should be rendered support and assistance by the free world:

Now, therefore, we Americans of Ukrainian descent, at this gathering in Omaha, Nebr., in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the famine in Ukraine—

1. Denounce before the free world and history this horrible crime, perpetrated by Communist Moscow in Ukrainian territory, in consequence of which more than six million Ukrainians starved to death.

2. Pay our tribute to the memory of their sufferings, and join the Ukrainian people in mourning the victims of the famine.

3. Call on the nations of the free world, above all the people of our great country to condemn this crime perpetrated by Communist Moscow in Ukraine, and to do everything in their power to prevent Moscow from committing like crimes on their territories.

4. Request the Government of our country and all governments in the free world to direct their representatives at the United Nations to take action pertaining to the placement of the crime of genocide, committed by Communist Moscow in Ukraine in 1932 and 1933, on the Agenda for discussion and the adoption of appropriate resolutions.

5. Call on all countries in the free world to sign the Convention on Genocide.

NOVEMBER 24, 1963.

Will of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Monroe Morning World of December 15, 1963:

WILL OF CONGRESS

Some idea of the importance of President Johnson's statement, soon after taking office, that "I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch" is found in attacks that have been and are being made on that branch of Government which has the constituted authority to enact our laws.

One Member of the Senate, who has been attempting to reform Congress in order to make it accede to his views, gave this assessment of legislative bodies: "I have no hesitation in stating my deep conviction that the legislatures of America, local, State and National, are presently the greatest menace to the successful operation of the democratic process."

Our immediate reaction to this statement is that the Senator has no right to be a member of a legislative body if he believes it to be a menace to "the successful operation of the democratic process" and that the Senator does not mean the "democratic process," but means socialism, bureaucracy, or dictatorship—that is, rule by a few or one and not by the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government. If he condemns the legislative branch for using its own judgment, instead of following the dictates of the heads of the executive branch, he would as readily condemn the judicial branch if it did not also follow those edicts. Under the present setup, with a so-called liberal or leftist majority in the Supreme Court, the Court has followed the desires of the executive branch, thus virtually leaving Congress as the only defense between the people and a socialist state, or a bureaucracy, or a dictatorship.

Johnson's statement concerning his respect for Congress was:

"As one who has long served in both Houses of Congress, I firmly believe in the independence and the integrity of the legislative branch. And I promise that I shall always respect this. It is deep in the marrow of my bones."

Harsh attacks have been leveled at Congress by liberals and leftist because Congress has not acted to approve some proposals that would centralize power in Washington, increase the national debt, violate the Constitution, and transgress the rights of individuals to control their private property.

The statement made by the Senator mentioned above shows contempt not only for Congress, in order to make it accede to his views, but for State and local governments and the democratic process itself. It indicates an interest in a more totalitarian form of government than was set up under our constitution.

The Founding Fathers, in establishing our Republic, determined that, in addition to preserving order and providing for the common defense, that one of the principal purposes of this new Government, as set forth in the Constitution, should be "to secure the blessings of liberty."

Thus, they set up three separate branches of government at the national level with a unique system of checks and balances. They divided powers between government at the National and State levels, specifically enumerating all powers which the States agreed to delegate to the National Government, reserving all other powers "to the States or to the people."

Nationally, Congress was designated as the branch of government charged with the responsibility of making the laws. The executive branch was charged with executing the laws and the judiciary with administering justice between litigants in according with the law.

To keep Congress close to the people, provision was made that Members of the House must be elected every 2 years. As a check on House response to the popular will of the moment, Senators were given 6-year terms.

Thus, Congress was intended to set the basic policy for governing this country, in accordance with its charter of powers and responsibilities as set out in article 2 of the Constitution. Congress may enact or refuse to enact any part of the legislative program of the administration. Refusal to adopt some proposals may constitute a far greater service to the people than accepting them, particularly at a time when thousands of proposals are offered and the Nation is going deeper and deeper into debt.

Concluding that Congress is a failure because it refuses to approve civil rights legislation, a tax cut without corresponding reductions in spending and other unwise programs is a biased judgment and one that should and must be rejected by the people of this country.

It Rained in Washington Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there have been countless numbers of words written about the assassination of President Kennedy. We all, I think, felt upon the President's death a sense of great personal loss and grief and attempted to express it in our own way. One of the most poignant messages which has come to my attention was written by Mr. Harold C. Miller, who many of the Members of Congress will remember as the long-time administrative assistant to our late colleague, Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia.

Harold Miller, a veteran himself of the war in the Pacific, as was President Kennedy, attempted to set forth his feelings in a statement written on the day following the assassination. His statement was printed in the Washington papers, but in order that the message it expresses may receive wider distribution, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT RAINED IN WASHINGTON TODAY

(By Harold C. Miller)

It always seems to rain after a terrible tragedy. It comes not with fury, but steadily, softly it tries to wash away the horror the mind cannot fully comprehend.

The blood streaked veteran of every battle knows it well. The weeping widow, once so vivacious, stands with blood streaked clothing.

Why? Why? Why?

The cry goes out through the land. The horror of it is so great the mind is stunned. There is no comprehension, no understanding of the terrible carnage.

It has happened. It is over. The steady fall of raindrops tries to wash away a memory too horrible to relate. It is over. Pay heed to your folly. This is the message of a gentle God trying to soothe his troubled children.

Life must go on.

Each citizen must try to find his own soul in this carnage.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has died in the quest for human dignity and peace. This man has given the full measure of his life. Can we, the living, say the same?

The rain falls steadily.

November 23, 1963.

Jobless Pay—Dying of Anemia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Window:

JOBLESS PAY—DYING OF ANEMIA

At a time of critically high unemployment in a period of relative prosperity, one would think that our unemployment compensation system would be kept current to meet these problems:

1. To provide adequate resources to the jobless.

2. To insure that the program works as an economic stabilizer fighting off threatening recessions or depressions.

All evidence points to the fact that in too many States the unemployment compensation plan is being starved for lack of funds to the point that it is not fulfilling its proper role on either count.

This was spelled out recently by Raymond Munts, assistant director of the AFL-CIO Department of Social Security, before the 56th annual conference of the National Tax Association in Milwaukee.

He made a strong plea for a more realistic financing structure of unemployment compensation but also presented an alarming picture of the program as it operates in most States today.

Munts pointed out that "tax contributions have been consistently lower than required to maintain reserves since World War II." For example, the high in reserves was reached in 1945 at 10.37 percent of payrolls. In 1962 it dropped to the lowest level of 2.95 percent. Reserves in 1963 are expected to be even lower.

At the present time, Munts declared, "some 23 States have reserves at less than one and one-half times payments in a recent high cost year. Seven States have reserves insufficient to pay 12 months benefits under recession conditions."

Asks Munts: "Now that we are at the end of the road, can we continue to have tax contributions at only a fraction of the earlier level?"

One way in which the States have tried to adjust to smaller incomes is to cut down on the benefits to the unemployed. This is seen in the following table:

Maximum weekly benefits as percentage of average weekly wages	Number of States	
	1939	1963
Over 70 percent	16	0
60 to 69 percent	16	1
50 to 59 percent	17	11
40 to 49 percent	2	25
Under 40 percent	0	14

The 1963 figures are after the State legislative actions this year. It is true that in some instances there have been longer duration of benefits but, as Munts observes, "this does not offset the loss in weekly benefit amounts."

We have fallen to the point in the jobless pay program, the AFL-CIO official declares, where "3 out of 10 unemployed are outside the law's protection; 2 out of 10 have been denied benefits because of arbitrary eligibility or qualifying requirement and because their benefits have been cut off before they can find a job.

"The increasingly long periods of unemployment due to general economic conditions and technological change cause from 25,000 to 40,000 workers to use up the last of their benefits every week, depending on where we are in the business cycle."

This has done violence to unemployment insurance as a built-in stabilizer in our economy. For every $5 that workers lose through unemployment they are now compensated for only $1.

"In 1962 alone," Munts says, "workers lost over $17 billion in wages through unemployment and received compensation for $3.3 billion. This is not a very good record for what Arthur Burns, President Eisenhower's economic adviser, called 'our first line of defense against depression.'"

According to Munts, one of the basic problems is the fact that each industry is seeking ways to cut down its own tax rate. Stable employers, such as banks, utilities, insurance companies, etc., want to stress experience ratings while manufacturing and other industries with higher turnover want to cut down the base rate. They all seek to cut.

The unionist is not concerned with the "power play between employers"—but he is concerned that the jobless program "is dying of anemia." He pleads for a system of "functional financing." It has these technical but highly important characteristics:

1. Calculate tax rates so they would produce a yield equal to the benefit cost plus or minus an amount that would adjust the

fund up or down toward the midpoint in the reserve operating range.

2. Reserve levels should be based on percentage of payrolls and not on the first $3,000, as most States do.

3. Adjustment of the tax base year by year to keep up with the cyclical movement toward higher wages.

4. A terminal point on the amount of duration of benefits for which the State is responsible. Massive unemployment due to automation, technological change or other factors, would move responsibility into the Federal area.

These four points are extremely simplified but they seem to point the way toward putting unemployment compensation back on the solid base its pioneers envisioned.

The jobless of the country—and the Nation, itself—have too much at stake not to consider these carefully outlined proposals.

Accelerated Public Works in San Diego, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Special Subcommittee on Accelerated Public Works, of which I am chairman, on December 10, 11, 12, and 13, held hearings on S. 1856, introduced by Senator McNamara, and S. 1121, introduced by Senator Gruening, to increase the authorizations for accelerated public works. On that occasion statements were presented before the members of the subcommittee by or on behalf of State, county, and civic officials from all parts of our great Nation. These statements stressed the major contributions made by the accelerated public works program to the economic well-being and community development of their particular regions and communities, and the imperative need for continuation of APW.

In this connection, a letter has just been received, addressed to Senator Pat McNamara, chairman of the Committee on Public Works, which so clearly and effectively projects the vital impact and continuing benefit of accelerated public works in San Diego, Calif., the Nation's 18th largest city, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 12, 1963.

Hon. Pat McNamara,
Chairman, Senate Public Works Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McNamara: San Diego, the Nation's 18th largest city, has for some time been troubled by continued and persistent unemployment, particularly in the construction labor classifications, the unskilled, and the "line workers." Through the effort of your committee and the Congress, and through consistent self-help projects of our own, some progress has been made in solving this problem. However, any present relaxation of corrective measures will not only prolong extent unemployment, but perhaps negate all previous work.

One of the successful attacks on basic unemployment in the San Diego area has been through the accelerated public works program. Although the city, itself, has as of now received no funds from this source, other local agencies have had some $8 to $9 million in projects approved, thus materially increasing employment in the most critical categories. At the present moment, we have filed accelerated public works applications covering some 35 essential projects at a gross cost of just under $10 million. If approved by the Federal Government, and if Federal funds are made available to match local funds, these projects will provide over 2,000 man-months of employment—largely in the most critical classifications.

The city of San Diego is concurrently carrying out its own efforts to eliminate unemployment. We are in full construction on a $21.5 million community concourse, providing several hundred jobs in construction and material supply. We have just completed a $50 million metropolitan sewer system which provided a large number of construction jobs. We are projecting a capital improvements program for the current fiscal year which will include $17 million in essential work projects, and we will continue every possible effort locally to solve the problem.

But a total attack on unemployment, particularly in the construction trades, can be made jointly by the city of San Diego and the Congress through the extension of the Accelerated Public Works Act and the appropriation of the needed additional funds. Congressional action now will enable us to build now essential sewers, roads, fire stations, community centers, and other basic facilities. Congressional action now will help eliminate unemployment.

The favorable action of your committee is respectfully requested.

Very truly yours,

Frank Curran.

The Democrats' Free Trade Policies Have Finally Brought the Income of a Great Segment of Our Farmers to a Point of No Return

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, our constant tariff reductions on meats, especially on beef, have finally driven the price of cattle down to the lowest level during the past 6 years to a point of no return.

While we adhere strictly to our reciprocal trade treaties with all nations, we permit many nations to place strict embargoes against our exports to them, without placing like limits on their destructive imports to us, not only on meat imports but also on hundreds of other commodities; which have driven many American industries to the wall and is now doing the same thing to our meat-producing farmers.

To ad insult to injury, as far back as 1951 Mike DiSalle, President Truman's dictator of price controls, arbitrarily rolled back the price of cattle 10 percent, and from that day to this Midwest farm income has been on the toboggan. Look at the records.

Republican members of the House Agriculture Committee, headed by Congressman Charles Hoeven, of Iowa, have introduced bills to raise tariffs on meat imports, and to limit such imports, but such bills have never seen the light of day out of committee by the refusal of the Democrat-controlled House Agriculture Committee to report such bills to the floor of the House for a vote.

The last of such bills was introduced on November 18 last, by Congressman Robert Dole, of Kansas, a member of the House Agriculture Committee, who on December 14 made a lengthy statement to the House of Representatives in which he explained the problem of our beef producers. In his statement Mr. Dole did, however, point out that the administration does protect certain of our industries. He said that just last week our Government raised the tariff on brandy from $1.25 to $5 per gallon. I am sure that will be great news to our cattlemen.

Now, in the hope that President Johnson, whose home is in the great cattle-producing State of Texas, and himself a cattleman, will help see to it that our U.S. meat producers interests are protected, we sent him the following letter on December 14 last past:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: We, the undersigned, strongly urge you to chart an immediate program to alleviate the desperate situation now faced by American livestock producers as a result of (1) rapidly increasing imports from foreign sources, particularly of beef, veal, lamb and lamb products; (2) failure of the United States to change to an ad valorem basis; and (3) the fact that the United States is among the most liberal in the world in its agricultural import policies. The United States and Canada are the only two major countries which provide no nontariff protection for domestic producers of livestock.

To stress the importance and the urgency of taking prompt, corrective action, we need only point out to you, Mr. President, that almost one-third of all cash receipts from farming come from the sale of meat animals. Naturally, when you consider that the price of beef dropped from $30 per hundredweight to $22 per hundredweight in the period of a few months, it is evident that the problem of the domestic livestock producer has approached serious proportions, particularly in view of the fact that 1962 red meat imports increased 39 percent over 1961.

The 1964 Outlook Issue, Demand and Price Situation, published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on November 18, 1963, stated as follows: "Red meat consumption will reach 170 pounds per person in 1963, 6 pounds more than in 1962. U.S. base consumption this year will set a record high of about 95 pounds per person, up from 89 pounds per person last year." It seems completely incongruous that this strengthened demand for meat products is being accomplished in the face of the decline of the American livestock industry. We think that when you stop to consider that more than 1 pound out of 10 pounds of meat going on American tables today is being produced abroad, that the rea-

son for the depressed condition of the livestock industry is clear.

Fresh beef imports increased from 414 million pounds in 1960 to 863 million pounds in 1962. Livestock cattle imports increased from 645,000 head in 1960 to 1,230,000 head in 1962.

Mr. President, we feel that when these facts are associated with the fact that Choice fed cattle are bringing approximately 25 percent less than they did a year ago in the livestock markets of the Middle West, that there is a clear connection.

We would be most happy for an opportunity to sit down with you and present still further facts and figures to completely document the case which we seek to make for immediate executive action. We do not seek to halt all livestock imports, but we do feel that it is imperative that quotas on either a voluntary or involuntary basis be established at once until conditions in the industry can be stabilized and the present ruinous trend of downward prices can be halted. We, of the Congress, then pledge ourselves to work for those legislative solutions that properly lie within the domain of this branch of Government.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN B. ANDERSON, Illinois; BOB DOLE, Kansas; WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Wyoming; WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana; H. R. GROSS, Iowa; AUGUST JOHANSEN, Michigan; ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY, Illinois; CARLETON J. KING, New York; VERNON W. THOMSON, Wisconsin; DAVE MARTIN, Nebraska; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; GARNER E. SHRIVER, Kansas; JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona; MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota; RALPH F. BEERMANN, Nebraska; DURWARD G. HALL, Missouri; E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota; CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, Maine; JOHN W. KYL, Iowa; E. ROSS ADAIR, Indiana; CHARLES T. MOSHER, Ohio; FRANK T. BOW, Ohio; DON L. SHORT, North Dakota; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; DONALD G. BROTZMAN, Colorado.

Shipbuilding Achievements of Avondale Shipyards, Inc., New Orleans, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the October 12, 1963, issue of Business Week magazine, describing the shipbuilding achievements of Avondale Shipyards, Inc., of New Orleans.

The article details how, in an industry currently beset with problems of lack of work and reduction of profits, this New Orleans shipyard, headed by Henry Zac Carter, is performing at full capacity and is making record earnings, thus contributing greatly to an improving economic climate in the city of New Orleans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL SPEED AHEAD IN THE DOLDRUMS—IN AN INDUSTRY BECALMED BY LACK OF WORK AND THE NEAR DISAPPEARANCE OF PROFITS, A NEW ORLEANS SHIPYARD IS GOING FULL BLAST, AND MAKING RECORD EARNINGS

"Ive got a theory," says Henry Zac Carter, president of Avondale Shipyards, Inc., of New Orleans, "that if you break a big job into enough pieces, it becomes a small job."

Carter, unlike most shipyard presidents in 1963, is in a position to know something about big jobs. His company is cruising strongly against an industry work tide almost too troublesome to talk about. Avondale's expected revenues of $70 million in 1963 rank eighth among U.S. private shipyards. Its 8-percent profit rate doubles the industry norm. And these profits come on a disproportionate share of industry volume—Avondale's $155-million backlog includes half the subsidized cargo ships to be built in the United States during 1963–64.

UNORTHODOX METHODS

To be sure, a casual visitor to the Avondale yards would see some odd sights. Sections of ships lie around on dry land and, for the most part, upside down. Side-launching is the rule, not the exception.

But there's nothing particularly new to shipbuilding in any of these methods. What is surprising is that, considering the state of the U.S. maritime industry in general, Avondale is having no trouble holding its own.

Carter is the first to admit that "Our industry is in the doldrums—there are too many yards for not enough work. One Russian contract to Japan was larger than all U.S. shipbuilding last year."

MULTIPLE PROBLEMS

A discouraging complex of interrelated problems is besetting U.S. shipbuilders and shipowners alike. The U.S. share of world freight—both in tonnage and in dollars—is declining each year as foreign-flag ships and U.S. ships under foreign registry increase their take.

On top of this, foreign yards with lower wage scales continue to drain off U.S. contracts. Many major yards in the United States today are all but empty of work. And profits, in what business there is, have been driven almost out of sight by competition and price cutting.

True, the U.S. Maritime Administration, under a program begun in 1957, is subsidizing the replacement of 300 obsolete ships owned by 15 lines. Subsidies represent the cost differential between a U.S. yard and a representative yard overseas, and the maximum subsidy today is 55 percent. But, says Donald M. Alexander, U.S. Maritime Administrator, "the cost breach is widening, and the only change in this, if any, is going to come through improvements in design and automation."

WINNING PARLEY

For fiscal 1964, the program will cover just 17 ships, and there are perhaps a dozen shipyards capable of building them. But Avondale has half the current subsidized cargo vessel construction in its hands, will probably get more in the next few months, and is doing a wide variety of other work. Furthermore, it's doing all these jobs profitably.

The company manages this with a combination of geographical and weather advantages, strict budgeting control, diversified facilities—and a sometimes uncanny skill in winning bids.

It's in this last skill—successful bidding—that Carter's work as general auditor of construction for the Maritime Administration during World War II, and as controller of Avondale before he became general manager, then president, shows up most clearly.

When Avondale in August was declared apparent low bidder on four more ships for Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. (it is already building eight), its winning bid of $10.3 million per ship beat the runner-up by just $160,000—and there was only a $260,000 spread in the three top bids. To win, Avondale had to know not only what previous ships of the same class had cost, and what its own costs would be, but it also had to know how much of a profit margin it could safely tacked on.

WATCHING COMPETITION

All this means keeping an eye on the competition. Reports of the Maritime Administration and the Shipbuilding Council of America reveal much about the state of other yards. Suppliers can tell you who is paying how much for what. Then there's the industry grapevine—gossip at trade association meetings and cocktail parties. "Never forget what somebody tells you," says Carter. "Sometimes these boys are talking when they should be listening."

He cites a contract for three of the five ships Avondale is building for Gulf & South American Steamship Co. When bids were invited, Avondale already had on hand jigs and tooling from having built similar ships—this was one advantage. It knew that two of its competitors, the Shipbuilding Division of Bethlehem Steel Co. and Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., had recently been bidding profits of 9.2 and 9.3 percent.

"So we could have bid 9.1 percent," says Carter. "But then we heard that another yard was coming in to bid, one that we didn't know as much about. To be safe, we bid 8.6 percent, they bid 8.7 percent—and we took it."

MAKE IT IN THE YARD

Avondale uses its own data processing equipment extensively, and is also looking at PERT (performance evaluation review technique) methods of work scheduling. But Carter believes "it all comes down to production efficiency, getting more per given hour of work. You've got to make a little at the conference table, and a little on the budgeting—but you have to make most of it in the yard."

Avondale concentrates on two areas—production technology and use of labor. On the latter, its 4,000 employees are nonunion, and the company pays from 23 cents to 31 cents an hour above other marine labor rates for the area to keep them that way. Furthermore, a 5-day workweek is almost unheard of at Avondale—its average workweek runs to 47½ hours, and it will work a 7-day week, if necessary. Because of this, it never has been penalized for a late delivery.

Of course gulf coast shipyards enjoy lower labor and overhead costs than east and west coast yards, and the Maritime Administration reports that almost 30 percent of U.S. merchant ships now are built there, compared to 6 percent 10 years ago. Again, weather and geography play a big part in cost calculations—gulf yards can count on better working weather the year round than east coast or Great Lakes yards. And Avondale is close to the port of New Orleans—which gives it easy access to shipowners, barge lines, offshore oil operators, and repair work for all of these.

DIVERSIFICATION

Avondale has diversified its production facilities so it can save on subcontracting costs and supplier margins by building more of a ship itself. Besides its 25-year-old main yard, the company has three newer operations scattered around New Orleans:

Its Harvey Repaid Yard, acquired in 1947 and located near the center of the port complex, can help on conversion jobs and superstructure work of oil rigs too massive to duck under Mississippi bridges if they are completed upriver. Harvey also pioneered Avondale's stainless-steel controllable-pitch propeller systems.

The Service Foundry Division, a downtown facility bought in 1951, fabricates boilers for Avondale from specialized parts bought outside. It acts as an in-house subcontractor on other companies' patented hatch covers and masts, saving freight costs. And the division reuses all the scrap from other Avondale facilities, and in its spare time, turns out castings from Avondale as well as for other gulf coast yards such as Ingalls.

The Avoncraft Division, at the main yard, was formed 10 years ago as a porcelain-on-

metal specialist. It holds a third of the service station market, and is promoting other architectural applications. Avoncraft's sales are 35 percent outside the company—and it enables Avondale to justify a big sheetmetal shop that can do its ship furniture and ductwork at 60-percent saving in costs.

MORE VARIETY

Diversification of facilities also helps a shipyard to take on a wider variety of work. Concentration on one customer has its problems—unless, like General Dynamics Electric Boat Division, you are riding a winning horse such as the Navy's nuclear submarine program.

Avondale will build anything that will float, and a few things that aren't meant to. Besides the 17 cargo ships under contract now, the company is building 4 destroyer escorts, is looking for more Navy work to balance the cargo ships; it tries to keep a third of its volume in each. Avondale also has gone into naval electronics, with a floating detection system contract.

For the other third of its volume, Avondale looks mainly to inland waterway transportation, the petrochemical pressure vessel market, and the offshore oil industry. It does not shun small craft contracts such as barges and dredges. "We haven't forgotten the small stuff that got us into business, and also, there's more profit in its," says Carter.

MORE MARKETS

The Gulf of Mexico, where oil companies spent $446 million for offshore leases in 1962 (Business Week, Mar. 24, 1962, p. 30) and will spend three times as much to develop them, has brought Avondale some of its most spectacular—if not most profitable—contracts. In the past year, it has sent to sea a $6.2 million submersible platform for Kerr-McGee Oil Industries and a $5 million floating platform for Ocean Drilling & Exploration Co. Now, it is near another offshore equipment job.

Right now, Carter is watching a new market that recently has come to town—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's vast Michoud operations plant, which will build stages and do assembly work for two generations of Saturn boosters. Avondale has built some boiler plant components for Michoud, and is now looking at the space hardware itself.

"We'll go to work for them tomorrow, if we can find something they want that we can do," says Carter.

Newton, Mass., Memorial Sermon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes to our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy, have appeared in the press of our Nation and have been heard from the pulpits of our churches. One of the most moving delivered in my district has been called to my attention by Alderman-elect Edward C. Uehlein of Newton and was written by the Reverend William Foley, rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd of the Waban section of Newton, Mass.

The sermon exhorts the American people, in memory of the late President, to rise to our highest ideals. I ask that the final portion of this inspiring address be printed in the RECORD:

The final veil of the Israelites was the veil of complacency. After Moses destroyed the calf, the people grew penitent. And God made a covenant with Moses and the people that He would be their God and they His people. The people rejoiced greatly. But, as the days became months and the months years, prophets rose up amongst the people because the law that Moses had given them had remained graven on stone and never entered their hearts. They had become a complacent people of outward observance, instead of inward truth, of law without love, of tight lips and loose morals, a people that knew all the words of God but never let them enter their lives.

We too have tended to become a complacent people. We have grown sleek and fat, happy in our material splendor and complacent about our spiritual nature. This is the kind of decay that has preceded the fall of the greatest civilizations known to man. They didn't have to be bombed out of existence, they just got so rotten that they fell of their own weight.

When the people of a nation are no longer roused by the revelations of a Valachi, the appalling rate of promiscuity, the suppression of minority groups, when people no longer speak out and take action against the decay of spiritual values, then they are dead already, and the righteous God shall bury them—perhaps even using a Russia, or a Red China, as His instrument. For the righteous God shall make no complacent compromise with evil.

If our 46-year-old President is not to have died in vain, we must rouse ourselves and turn our blinded eyes to the One who can heal us, who can life us up and take the veil from our eyes so we can see again. His name is Jesus Christ. He has been taking the veils from people's eyes for centuries, showing them the fresh vision of a new and greater life. For in him all veils have been removed, and we can see God face to face—if only we are dissatisfied enough with the veils of a narrow life to come to Him and believe.

Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by Lewis L. Strauss before the Committee on Finance on December 9, 1963, on tax legislation now being considered by the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is an honor to be invited to testify before this distinguished committee while you are occupied with legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code by the reduction of individual and corporate income taxes. (Most Americans feel expert on that sensitive subject—and I am no exception.)

During the past 50 years, I have been engaged in industry, in banking, and more recently in military and civilian public service. In the first two capacities, I was privileged to be a substantial taxpayer. In public service, on the other hand, I had the responsibility for spending many of the billions of tax dollars collected from you and me and the general public. In consequence, I have a somewhat unusual, though not unique, view of the Federal economy. These experiences have resulted in some conclusions which I will try to lay before you very briefly.

Your study, of course, is not limited to consideration of tax brackets. Your decisions about taxation will affect our international credit, our balance of payments, the future purchasing power of the dollar, the level of employment of our people, and many other aspects of our economic life. It is certainly one of the most important and sensitive issues confronting the Congress and, for that reason, I believe the American people are happy that you have approached your decision unhurriedly. A hasty and perhaps wrong conclusion will not be easily undone, nor its undoing even attempted before much harm will have resulted.

Taxes are a necessary evil and properly subject to constructive criticism when they are too high—when the schedules which produce them become too complicated—and when they are inequitable. All these conditions presently prevail, and tax reform is as urgently needed as tax reduction. The crazy-quilt pattern of taxation which grew up when taxes were low probably hinders our economic growth as much as any other single thing.

Though comprehensive tax reform is not attempted in the measure now before you, the best time to achieve procedural tax reform would be when lowering taxes. There has been no time so favorable in the 50-year history of the Federal income tax. It might well be that tax reform would contribute a more lasting stimulus to economic health than a tax cut, if only for the reason that tax reform itself would be likely to be more enduring.

For the present, one assumes that tax reform is excluded from your consideration, beyond the minor changes which H.R. 8363 comprises.

Happily, we have moved away from the era when income taxes were to be used to effect a redistribution of wealth and have returned to the principle that they are primarily the instrument for raising the revenues which defray the cost of government—but currently a new theory has been added—that taxes may be managed, together with deficit financing, to promote economic expansion. This is presently no more than a theory—totally without proof—but there are those who believe in it as revealed truth.

Many who have counseled our Government in the past did not so believe. You will remember the advice of our first President: "As a very important source of strength and security cherish public credit * * * avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exercise in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned."

These principles were still viable 160 years later when a respected witness of recent times before your committee, Mr. Bernard Baruch, testified as follows: "In the face of a tremendous national debt and expenditures, it is folly to talk about tax reductions. I am dubious about the purchasing power a tax cut will generate. The value of any conjectured purchasing power is outweighed, by the jeopardy in which a tax cut will place all the programs supported by taxes."

To reduce taxes before our expenditures and debt are manageable, Mr. Baruch held to be "uneconomic and immoral." I can say to you that his views have not changed.

For some years, and in fields other than economics, we have sailed out of hearing of the voices of experience. We are now in-

structed that it is normal to expect Federal expenditures to grow by from $4 to $5 billions annually, that the budget need not be brought into annual balance but only over some indeterminate cycle of years (which incidentally would make the preparation of an annual budget a futile and meaningless enterprise), and that it is not logical to equate the standards of individual solvency and credit with those two words applied to a government.

The case for tax reduction is a strong one. As you know better than I, in spite of the fact that we are at peace, the general level of personal income taxes is but little lower than in World War II, and the upper brackets are confiscatory. Corporate taxes are actually higher than in 1945. When to this is added the rise in State and local taxation for a total take of above 34.1 percent of the dollar value of the gross national product (in 1962), it is surprising that a blunting of economic initiative has not been more noticeable. Clearly, something must be done about taxes but I respectfully submit that a tax cut alone is hazardous. It should not be the only action taken.

The bill before you is estimated to reduce the tax collected by the Government by from $10 to $11 billion. The budget is not yet public (and perhaps is not even firm as yet), but it is reported in the press that the eventual total under consideration will exceed the current budget by $3 or $4 billion. This year's budget of $98.8 billion was $6.3 billion above last year's, and the average annual increase since 1957 has been over $4 billion. We are told by some economists that there is no need to feel concerned about it because the dollar value of the gross national produce will rise at an annual rate of 6 percent. But there is a soft guess while expenditures are hard facts. If the expenditures and the GNP are projected into the future on these two assumptions, it would still be 1972 before the budget was balanced. Meanwhile the public debt would have gone through the ceiling by $75 billion. And if the GNP grows less rapidly than 6 percent per annum, we will be under water indeed.

The obvious course is to couple tax reduction with expense reduction, for we are no longer dealing with a temporary deficit. The consequences of accepting continuing deficits as a policy are the dangers of uncontrollable inflation and dollar devaluation. Both disasters are presently represented as remote, but they can come up like thunder. It would deny all precedent if a continuing growth in the Federal debt failed to expose our currency to very terrible risks—and by necessitating the imposition of Federal controls, it could totally transform our free economic system.

But Federal expenditures can be brought under control. Beyond the fixed costs of Government, such as interest on the public debt, maintenance and pay of the defense establishment, et cetera, et cetera, we are engaged in enterprises now costing billions and involving the commitment of many billions more which it would be gratifying to continue if we were comfortably solvent but whose discontinuance will not weaken our security. I favor generous outlays for scientific research and development, but many outstanding scientists like Dr. Vannevar Bush and Dr. Philip Abelson have questioned the wisdom of the huge amounts committed now and for the years ahead in the race to be first on the moon. The size of that project alone makes it a notable drain not only on our revenues but on other areas of science, and a number of scientists are critical of it for that reason.

The executive departments have proposed a number of new projects for the next fiscal year. They aggregate $3 billion, and over the next 5 years $17 billion. Many of them are very small as Government projects go, and for that reason it may have seemed churlish to the committees which reported them, to deny a few million here and there when we were appropriating billions. But the small ones add up. Whatever the justification for their individual worthiness, it would be proper, I think, to weigh them in their cumulative effect on the deficit.

The most appealing argument for increased spending, plus a tax cut, is that it will cure unemployment. This takes the form that a large-scale expansion—a boom—will be generated and that everyone will thus find work. If this were only true. The theory assumes that the unemployed will be hired as a result of the increased aggregate demand. But unemployment today is unlike the unemployment in the 1930's. Today a large fraction of the unemployed are concentrated regionally, in areas depressed by specific weakness in demand for the regional product, or by man-replacing devices, as for instance, in the coal fields. Another large proportion are unskilled workers, or teenagers looking for their first jobs, or married women in search of part-time work.

The attempted solution to these kinds of unemployment by increasing the aggregate demand is a nonselective approach to a problem that is essentially selective. President Kennedy at a press conference on October 11 recognized that fact when he said, "We could have a great boom and still have the kind of unemployment they describe."

The kind of unemployment we have will need to be solved by making job applicants employable. This requires imaginative programs for training, retraining, and placement. There are some categories of jobs (see the daily help-wanted columns) which find no takers as well as jobs unfilled for want of skilled people. We are likewise confronted by the curious situation that in the manufacturing industry, for example, 7.4 percent of the man-hours last year were overtime hours and paid for at premium rates. The manufacturing industry could have put all its workers on regular hours and absorbed all its unemployed. Manufacturers are cost conscious and do not pay time rates without reason. The reason is the shortage of skilled workers. An expanded economy will not crack that nut, and manufacturers, by and large, apparently find that some of their workers are worth paying overtime above the established wage, while other workers looking for jobs are not even worth the established wage.

The causes of high unemployment are complex—witness the great difference between the unemployment rate of heads of families (about 2.6 percent) and classifications including persons with no one else to support (5.2 to 11 percent) or between white and nonwhite. I certainly have not studied this enough to explain it or to be dogmatic about the cure for it, but it is hard to see how increasing the gross national product and risking our credit will be the panacea for unemployment.

There is said to be substantially full employment in Germany. We sent some experts there after World War II who advised a new government to expand public spending and ignore deficits. The conservative Germans politely overlooked this advice, adopted a conservative budget policy, and have enjoyed a sustained and spectacular economic growth ever since. Compare this example with some of our Latin American friends. If deficit financing really promoted healthy economic growth and full employment, no country would have any problems at all. But those who have tried it have sacrificed their credit, their currencies, and in some cases their political stability.

May I summarize. There is in my view no question of the need to reduce taxes, to institute simplification of the tax structure and to remove the inequalities presently favoring some taxpayers over others. To cut taxes, however, without at the same time taking positive action to restrain expenditure may briefly stimulate economic growth at the price of inevitable inflation. The threat of inflation is well understood by the American people. They have seen their dollars, represented by their savings and insurance, lose half their value between the mid-1930's and the mid-1950's.

We are properly fearful of inflation, and we will applaud steps taken by the Congress to do more than simply to urge Government to bring expenditure and revenue into balance. Nor need this be at the expense of our defense and security. In the past 10 years while our population has increased by 19 percent, our non-war-connected expenditures have swollen by 245 percent.

In closing, may I leave with you a thought expressed by a great American whose name has long been associated with thrift. Benjamin Franklin said this:

"The taxes are indeed heavy and if those laid on us by the Government were the only ones we had to pay, we might more easily discharge them; but we have many others and more grievous to some of us. We are taxed twice as much by idleness, three times as much by pride, and four times as much by folly." That is the end of the quotation. Now for "idleness," read "featherbedding"—for "pride," read "spending billions for prestige"—for "folly," read "dissipating our substance in futile attempts to buy the good will of despots."

The Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, of the many tributes which have been paid to our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, I think the sermon delivered by Dr. Wallace E. Fisher, senior pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity, Lancaster, Pa., is one of the most outstanding and expressive which I have had the privilege to read. I would like, therefore, to share this sermon with my colleagues, and Dr. Fisher's remarks follow herewith:

JOHN F. KENNEDY, 1917–63

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, projected an image of the splendid American. It is fitting and proper in this Christian service that we take cognizance of his person and his leadership.

In a society of fragmented persons, the fullness of President Kennedy's person was striking: intellectual curiosity, moral sensitivity, social consciousness, political sagacity. Unlike many activist leaders, Mr. Kennedy was an intellectual; indeed, on occasion he could be philosophical like Jefferson and Lincoln and Wilson before him. But in an age when some intellectuals are content to toy with ideas, to fondle them as ends in themselves, John Kennedy was remarkably decisive; he coveted results. Rarely precipitous, often cautious, he cleanly made significant decisions. This rare combination of intellectualism and activism—a vigorous commitment to the "strenuous life"—was reminiscent of another dynamic leader, Theodore Roosevelt.

Deep, quiet emotion gave added dimension to his thoughts, public addresses, deeds. Unostentatiously he worshiped the Christian God, honoring Christ's church as a vehicle of God's grace. Few Presidents have been

as disciplined in corporate worship as Mr. Kennedy. Further, this emotionally healthy man was devoted to his wife and children. He enjoyed to the hilt and accepted responsibly his parental relationships with Caroline and John. His generous, delightful, public recognition of his accomplished wife was positively refreshing. Not least among the Kennedy contributions was the image of an exciting marriage, responsible parenthood, and stable family life. The Kennedys were indeed America's First Family. May the Holy Spirit support and sustain that grief-stricken home, cruelly broken by an assassin's bullet.

Now, an observation on Mr. Kennedy's leadership. No one, of course, can appraise it fairly at this juncture. His administration, launched on an evenly divided vote of the electorate and less than 3 years old in the moment of his tragic death, had only begun to reveal its structure. A later generation of historians will evaluate that structure. But one suspects that the style of his administration will affect future administrations, and the evidences of his personal leadership are plainly discernible.

When the Bay of Pigs enterprise turned into a debacle, President Kennedy accepted full responsibility. That is leadership. As Birmingham seethed and exploded regularly, as the Old South threatened political anarchy, as the Washington freedom march took shape, President Kennedy called for the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in American history. He did so in the full knowledge that this would disrupt his party in the South and offend the complacent and bigoted in every corner of America. That is leadership. On the international front, he resisted the hot-heads and ignored the political illusionists. He examined the Cuban situation methodically, spoke cautiously for weeks, studied the frightening alternatives, and then knowledgeably took the first bold step toward possible nuclear war if Soviet Russia continued to use Cuba as a missile base. That daring, realistic confrontation showed a quality of leadership reminiscent of Mr. Lincoln's costly decision to preserve the Union by force. Honest men differ with John Kennedy's decisions; some charge him with moments of indecision. But no responsible person will deny that Mr. Kennedy was a leader. The 35th President of the United States has won a firm place in that select band which historians call strong Presidents. May his successor be equally strong.

We remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy gladly and gratefully as one who exercised responsibly the leadership inherent in the Presidential office, and exercising that leadership, paid with his life. We remember gratefully his gracious wife who enriched the Presidential office in a score of ways, but never so significantly as in the hour of her husband's tragic death. We remember prayerfully Caroline and John, Junior, whose enthusiastic escapades pointed to a happy family in the White House. We remember gratefully Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy who reared their children to avoid casual living and to serve their country in war and peace. Finally, we remember the late President's Roman Catholic Church which taught him the ways of God, sustained him during hard days, and now offers the comfort of the resurrection Christ to his bereaved family.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy—complex person, devoted husband, exuberant father, dedicated citizen, bold leader—projected an image of the splendid American. May the impact of his person inspire America's youthful and adult citizenry to project that image, too. Forgetting, therefore, the things which ought to be forgotten (for the political arena is a bruising place) and remembering the many things that ought to be remembered ("ask not what your Nation can do for you; ask what you can do for your Nation"), let us campaign actively for human rights and freedom and honorable coexistence. These were his aims; they cost him his life. They should cost us something.

But this tragic event—the assassination of a president in a civilized, free society—calls serious citizens not only to remember their fallen leader but to face up to inescapable historical realities.

First, this Nation has forgotten in its sudden affluence and growing cynicism that the Office of the President of the United States has built-in risks for any incumbent. Four Presidents have been assassinated; three have died in office. One President's wife, Rachel Jackson, died, exhausted by the viciousness of the election campaign. Every incumbent has been harassed, vilified, hindered, hurt. The hour should be at hand when our citizenry view their presidential candidates and elected executives more maturely—giving them sympathtic respect, assessing their awesome responsibilities, cooperating intelligently and generously, and learning to pray daily for them. Critical judgments must be made; free society cannot long exist without them. But such judgments must be made responsibly, respectfully, fairly, honestly, openly.

Second, no responsible American will view the tragic events at Dallas simply as bizarre happenings. Ignorance, prejudice, envy, and willful self-interest have fanned too many fires of hatred in too many places to let Americans rest complacently. These widespread emotional fires not only produce multiple character assassinations by innuendo and slander; they also incite fanatics and warped minds to infamous deeds: a wall of shame in Berlin, an alien society in Cuba, a murdered negro leader and the broken bodies of little children in a bombed church in Birmingham, the assassination of an American President on the open streets of an American city, the senseless killing of a Dallas policeman, the vengeful murder of the assassin. Guilt is corporate. Soul-searching and repentance and mended ways must become our national mood. Lee Oswald's death will not assuage Jacqueline Kennedy's grief nor restore the father of Caroline and John, Jr. But the Kennedy family will find meaning and purpose in the President's death if this Nation rises with new resolve to work creatively for human rights and freedom and honorable coexistence. And that national mood originates and emanates from the complex of American communities like Lancaster or it does not emerge at all. Mr. Lincoln speaks to us, a generation mired in arrogance, pride, prejudice, affluence, multiple fears, and ad-interim ethics: "With malice toward none, with charity toward all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us bind up this Nation's wounds."

Finally, this tragic event reminds Christians that while some human beings can and do emerge as decisive leaders only Christ has the power to save; that human leaders pass away and only God remains as the ground of all existence; that justice and brotherhood are illusions outside God's Kingdom. If, therefore, our citizenry chooses this sad, bleak moment to repent of those things which they have done and ought not to have done, and to repent of those things left undone which ought to have been done; and if our citizenry looks more eagerly to God in the conviction that apart from Him they build to no avail, then Mr. Kennedy who lived creatively shall not have died in vain.

Now we, in the company of our fellow Christians in St. Matthew's Catholic Church in Washington, commit John Fitzgerald Kennedy to Almighty God from whose creative hand he came, and to Christ whose resurrection is every man's best and only hope, and to the Holy Ghost who calls and fashions responsive persons for eternal life with Him who made and redeemed them. Amen.

Editorial in the New York Times Praises Higher Education Act—Points Out a Remaining Area of Need in Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an editorial appearing Tuesday, December 17, 1963, gave an accurate assessment of the value of the recently enacted higher education bill. As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Education, it has been my privilege to participate in the framing of this significant legislation, and to be present on last Monday when President Johnson signed the bill into law.

The Times said in part:

The new law, which provides grants and loans for the construction of academic buildings, belongs—as President Johnson stressed—in the category of historic legislation. It acknowledges that, with the current higher education enrollment of 4.2 million students and the anticipated increase to 7 million by 1970, the funds needed for physical expansion simply would not be found without Federal aid. The alternative might have been reduction of the percentage of young people who could be admitted to college—an unthinkable move, in terms both of popular demand and of national need.

And, the editorial commented on the fact that attention must now turn to another area of educational capability—the public schools:

Having provided much-needed support for higher education, Congress must now turn to the even more basic issue of strengthening the foundation that must support the roof. This foundation is, of course, provided by the public schools.

Mr. President, I concur with the editors of the New York Times that truly meaningful legislation has this week been written into the statute books of our land—the Higher Education Act and the Vocational Education Act. Likewise, I share their view that much remains to be done to raise educational standards and opportunities for all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "The New Education Bill" in the Tuesday, December 17, 1963, issue of the New York Times be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW EDUCATION BILL

With the signing into law of the $1.2 billion college aid bill the President and Congress have moved the Federal Government's participation in education into a new phase.

The new law, which provides grants and loans for the construction of academic buildings, belongs—as President Johnson stressed—in the category of historic legislation. It acknowledges that, with the current higher education enrollment of 4.2 million students and the anticipated increase to 7

million by 1970, the funds needed for physical expansion simply would not be found without Federal aid. The alternative might have been reduction of the percentage of young people who could be admitted to college—an unthinkable move, in terms both of popular demand and of national need.

The new legislation provides special funds for the development of 2-year or community colleges—the institutions which must increasingly act both as a feeder into 4-year colleges and as a protective buffer to prevent mass-enrollments from depressing the quality of the college and university system. These institutions will have to furnish much of the highly skilled manpower without which the cutting edge of university-educated talent will be severely dulled.

Unfortunately, the great advance represented by the college-aid bill has not been achieved without a further blurring of the lines of separation between church and State. The pragmatic compromise that took final form in the bill evolved from the almost insoluble admixtures, of various degrees of church-relatedness in different colleges. What matters now is that the compromise be regarded as an unfortunate, if perhaps necessary, step under the special circumstances of America's peculiar higher education system—and not as a foot in the door.

Having provided much-needed support for higher education, Congress must now turn to the even more basic issue of strengthening the foundation that must support the roof. This foundation is, of course, provided by the public schools; and there ought to be no question whatsoever that such aid must go to the public schools only, reaffirming the clear separations of church and State in elementary education.

The Honorable Carlton R. Sickles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read in the Sunday, December 8 edition of the Washington Post a story by John Maffre about our colleague, CARLTON R. SICKLES, Congressman at Large from Maryland. Mr. Maffre is to be commended for his insightful approach to the problems of a freshman Congressman, who has the additional burdens and responsibilities of being at large. If there is any Member who can carry this double honor with the ease of a veteran, it is CARLTON SICKLES. With all of his problems of representing the whole State, he manages to give us and the Nation the benefit of his first-rate mind, his boundless energy, and his enduring concern for what is right.

The House of Representatives is indeed fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in numbering amongst its Members our good friend and colleague, CARLTON R. SICKLES.

The story follows:

IF I LIVE AND BREATHE: IT MUST BE POLITICS

(By John Maffre)

The 42-year-old Congressman at Large from Maryland is on Capitol Hill for the same reason that Ado Annie in "Oklahoma" is usually on someone's lap.

"I'm in politics because I can't say 'No,'" he admits.

Besides, Representative CARLTON R. SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland, would look abysmally foolish if he told anyone that he was trying to master that little word. Like Annie, SICKLES wouldn't know what else to do when a voter starts talking "purty."

Those are his instincts. He shares them with 534 other tenants of offices on the Hill, and with the countless other hopefuls who would like to break their leases.

For this he pays a price in time, money, privacy, and an outraged digestive system that would stun people who think politics is a bed of roses.

SICKLES belongs to that club of limited membership, the 22 Congressmen elected at large in their native States. He must roam the political sea endlessly like the Ancient Mariner, yearning for a district boundary.

Thus, in Maryland he must be knowledgeable—or seem knowledgeable—about the plight of a sawmill operator in western Garrett County and an Eastern Shore oysterman.

And he must walk the tightrope over the districts of his seven fellow Maryland Representatives, five of them also Democrats.

The Nation's Capital is at his doorstep, so he is expected to be available 7 days a week at everything from a bar mitzvah to a rally at Baltimore's Emerson Hotel. This he tries to do on a travel allowance that is mildly hilarious.

His $22,500 yearly salary melts like spring snow in the heat of political requirements. And though he manages to keep at least a watching brief on a legal practice and a membership in a business administration group, he believes his financial position would be better if he were not in Congress.

"This wasn't a surprise to me, of course," SICKLES said the other morning in his office in the Longworth House Office Building.

"I knew before I came here that it wasn't an all-expense-paid trip. So do most other Congressmen, especially those who have had experience in State legislatures the way I did in Annapolis."

He has said before that he would vote for a salary increase if such a bill reached the House floor, but he didn't regard this as a matter of prime importance.

Is the load too heavy on Members of Congress? SICKLES—like many another freshman legislator—doesn't give a "yes" or "no" answer.

"I'm not complaining. You just have to be available to people. You're their only link with the Federal structure.

"It's true that I have a staff of 10 people, 2 of them running a Baltimore office. But I can't lean on them for everything. No Congressman worth his salt would do that."

It takes longer to get the hang of things on Capitol Hill compared with the State House in Annapolis. There he was one of 123 members in the house of delegates, and now he is one of 435 Congressmen. "It's tougher to get known, and it takes longer to establish that rapport with the others. It's funny to remember that there I had a staff of one, a secretary."

He estimates that he spends about 85 percent of his time on nonlegislative matters, or on what the Hill calls constituent service." This means receiving a stream of visitors, lunching with them, interceding for them with Government agencies, replying to a young girl's letter about sex education in schools—the list is endless.

One girl on his staff spends at least half her time keeping posted on the patronage needs involving postmasterships or mail carrier openings in Maryland.

"Maybe some of the appointments make people unhappy," he admitted with a rueful grin. "You can't please everybody. And this keeps up contacts with leaders all over the State, because you talk to a lot of people."

As a freshman, his chances of getting some resounding legislation passed bearing his signature are thin. Much thinner, in fact, than at Annapolis, where he acquired a name of something of a maverick by sponsoring measures that other delegates wouldn't touch with a 10-foot pole.

What bothers him today is the drumfire of criticism about the laggard pace of Congress in tackling the administration's program. He concedes room for this criticism, but feels that Congress "is in a twilight zone in which people are getting used to the idea that it is a year-round operation."

He has no illusions about his personal struggle that lies just a year ahead.

At this point it would seem that he might run again as Congressman at Large; he has created a generally favorable impression and has developed a lot of statewide contacts.

He may try for the Senate seat now held by Republican J. GLENN BEALL. But the lists are getting crowded for that race, even if the names are being placed in nomination mainly by newspaper reporters.

He knows that the 1964 campaign will cost far more than the previous one, and he is not wealthy.

The prominence he has achieved since 1962 makes him a bigger target to aim at. His voting record as a straight Kennedy man doesn't impress the large conservative segment of Maryland Democrats.

He has been dubbed the darling of the suburbs because of his engaging, independent-minded, low-key manner on the coffeeklatch circuit, but his efforts to be his own man don't always endear him to political managers who are generally upset by anything unorthodox.

However, it can only be assumed that freshman SICKLES isn't going to call it quits after one term, even if he demurs that he isn't saying what his plans are. He doesn't have to.

New York's Master Builder—Robert Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Moses at 75," published in the New York Times of December 18, 1963, being a highly deserved happy birthday tribute to one of New York's and the Nation's first citizens.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MOSES AT 75

He has been one of the great doers of our time. First of all "a park man," he showed such genius for getting things done that he was called, by first one Governor or mayor and then another, to an ever-enlarging field of action in the public interest: hydroelectric powerplants, tunnels, bridges, public buildings, parkways, and finally the uphill battle to a new World's Fair.

A reformer who despised reformers, a planner who scorned planners, a critic who devoured critics, he has managed at one time or another to alienate his best friends—temporarily—and generate in his best enemies a grudging admiration for great jobs well done. He is a man who, even when well-wished on the day he becomes age 75, is like as not to find some fault with the well-wishers.

But, gladly ignoring this perennial hazard, we do wish him well and extend our warmest congratulations on his birthday, with hopes

that he will have many more. We shall not see the like of Robert Moses again, as a public servant, as a builder, as a man. Age has not mellowed him. Moses is a man you have to take as he is; and the city, the State, and the country are the better for having taken him as he is.

How My Organization Promotes Good Community Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech by Don Shaw, a Choctaw County, Okla., 4-H member from my district, who won first place in the State Farmers Union speech contest at Oklahoma City and a trip to Washington, D.C., and the New York World's Fair. "How My Organization Promotes Good Community Living" speaks for the high ideals of the 4-H Clubs and typifies the democratic standards and public service concepts which it instills in its members. "The world goes forward on the feet of its youth," Don told his audience. I heartily concur in this thought and feel further that the world is in good hands in the keeping of such gifted and thoughtful young people as Don Shaw. I commend him, the 4-H Clubs, the Farmer's Union, and all who had a part in this splendid expression of good citizenship.

The speech is as follows:

HOW MY ORGANIZATION PROMOTES GOOD COMMUNITY LIVING

(By Don Shaw, Choctaw County, Okla., 4-H Club member)

We, the American people, have assumed the role of leadership in world affairs. We have not done this as a matter of choice, but rather, this role has been forced upon us by the nations of the world. With this role of leadership have come the problems and difficulties unknown to the history of this country.

In this space age, we recognize that our statesmen are doing their duties—and doing their utmost as leaders of this country. We, as 4-H members, Future Farmers, Farmers Union members, men and women, need to consider the role and the obligations which we must fulfill in order to do our duty as citizens and promote good community living.

As we recognize this fact in this space age—and attempt to overcome these difficulties—it is our duty as 4-H Club members to encourage others to educate, teach and train, that each of us may meet these problems and difficulties, with the courage and determination that has made our country great.

"Ask not what your country can do for you—but what you can do for your country," was spoken by our great President, John F. Kennedy. This is parallel to the motto that each of us as 4-H Club members subscribes "To make the best better." Our successful Peace Corps is based on an objective very similar to the slogan of our 4-H Clubs—"Learn by doing."

What is the American way of life? Some say right to vote, others right to worship as we wish—maybe the right to work, is expressed by others—but all agree that freedom embraces all of it. Freedom is everyone's business. Maybe you have heard some say "I would rather be Red than dead." Can we be complacent? Is your freedom worth preserving?

Democracy is a way of life based on citizenship. It is faith in oneself, and in one's fellow human beings. Citizenship has further been defined as the ability to live as a wholesome and respected member of one's community. Farmers Union locals and countywide organizations join in "Sharing responsibilities for community improvement"—which is 1 of the 10 guideposts 4-H leaders use to assist 4-H members in analyzing their situation, needs and interests.

The Farmers Union as most of you know is a co-op organization, nonprofit and through their many services and activities assist in developing good citizens—which in turn promotes good community living.

The world goes forward on the feet of its youth. The 4-H Club is a part of the great land-grant system of education setup 100 years ago. It strives to train these feet, through citizenship, so they will go down the road to assume leadership and learn by doing, to develop closer family relations and better community living.

The home, school, 4-H Club, Farmers Union all work together to teach citizenship. This training will carry over to our community and later life. Pride in our homes, schools, Farmers Union, 4-H Clubs—all help to contribute to good citizenship. We are a part of our surroundings and everyone has an influence on citizenship of those in community.

In our world today of space travel, we quite often hear "I don't have time." Time—that is needed to improve our community. We may need to evaluate and put first things first. We must find time for community development, if we are to have the kind of a world community we want. A world of peace. A world where our children of every generation do not march off to war.

The 4-H Clubs of Choctaw County are very grateful to the Farmers Union for four county signs which state "Choctaw County 4-H welcomes you," courtesy of the local Farmers Union. The Choctaw County Farmers Union also sponsors our 4-H Club model club program. The model club program has been very successful in promoting good community living. The clubs are scored in five monthly meetings. Points are also received for participation in the share-the-fun rally and dress revue. The Farmers Union also sponsors many other youth activities in my county.

We are proud to have as one of your State directors, Mr. Clifford Hamby, a former 4-H Club member who is interested in us and other youth organizations. With this encouragement—leadership training, citizenship training—in 4-H Club work, we join the Farmers Union in promoting good community living.

Foreign Policy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the whole U.S. foreign policy with respect to Latin America is undergoing a complete and thorough reevaluation in the State Department at the direction of President Johnson. I feel confident that out of this period of review and reappraisal will emerge a hard-hitting and dynamic approach to the battle eradicating the Communist menace from all of the Americas.

In this connection, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two articles by Hal Hendrix of the Scripps-Howard papers, one of the most experienced and wisest of observers and reporters of the Latin American scene. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 17, 1963]

OBSERVERS EXPECT MANY CONSTRUCTIVE CHANGES—LBJ TO PRESS NEW CUBA POLICY

(By Hal Hendrix)

MIAMI, December 17.—The full-scale reevaluation of U.S. policy toward Communist Cuba, called for by President Johnson less than 3 weeks after he took office, will be completed within 2 weeks.

The high priority and quick deadline indicates President Johnson's deep concern over the effectiveness of U.S. measures during the last year to eliminate the Castro-Communist menace.

Although Mr. Johnson sat in on most high-level discussions of the Cuban problem during the Kennedy administration, it is known he feels a penetrating new look at the issue is urgent.

CHANGES

Observers in Washington believes some constructive changes should emerge from the review. They note Mr. Johnson's close relationship with many Congressmen of both parties makes him fully aware of dissatisfaction on Capitol Hill and in the voting precincts with various facets of existing policies.

The State Department's presentation of an updated or new position paper is expected to be delayed only briefly, if at all, by the shift in command in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs last weekend—the President's selection of Ambassador Thomas A. Mann to replace Edwin M. Martin as Assistant Secretary of State.

Basically, the Cuba policy inherited by Mr. Johnson calls for political and economic isolation and preventing Cuba's export of revolution and subversion to other countries of Latin America. It has not proved successful.

REBELLION

The blueprint was supposed to nourish a climate inside Cuba which could encourage an internal rebellion and eventually overthrow the Castro regime.

Actually, the Castro regime, although beset by economic chaos, still is solidly entrenched.

Ironically, damage wrought by last fall's hurricane Flora and the Castro regime's own bungling mismanagement have done more to undermine the Communist-controlled dictatorship than U.S. isolation-style policies.

Five Latin American nations—Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay—still have diplomatic relations with Cuba. There is no indication any of these countries plans to change its posture.

Of this group, Mexico is the key nation. It still affords Cuba an outlet for economic, political, and subversive activity throughout Latin America. It still provides an air link with Havana. It still attempts to stall effective anti-Castro actions in the Organization of American States.

President Johnson has invited Mexican President Adolfo Lopez Mateos to visit him next month. It is assumed Cuba will be discussed, but the visit invitation is not predicated on this topic.

LIMITED SUCCESS

In the area of economic isolation there has been only limited success. Soviet bloc and free world shipping continues to keep Cuban ports busy. About 90 ships a month still are calling at Castro's docks.

Although Cuba's trade with Latin America is down to a trickle, its commercial activity with the Soviet bloc and some Western allies continues. The Soviets show no signs of reducing economic assistance.

When President Johnson gets a look at the State Department's presentation, his alternative could boil down to these:

Continue the current policy.

Recognize it is not possible in the immediate future to get rid of the Castro-Communist regime and map a strengthening of the rest of the hemisphere to resist Havana-directed subversion.

Allow a stepup in anti-Castro activity and increase pressures on Cuba, including such measures as a more effective maritime embargo, sealing off Mexican and Canadian loopholes, lessen restraints on exile "action" groups, which wish to stage raids on Cuba from outside the United States, insure the feasibility of guerrilla warfare inside Cuba, and employ a naval blockade on a bilateral or multilateral basis to halt export of subversive weapons through the Caribbean.

Take unilateral action or press for collective military action against Cuba.

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 16, 1963]

MANN IS AN OLD PRO ON HEMISPHERE PROBLEMS—UNITED STATES WILL RELY ON EXPERIENCE, NOT THEORY

(By Hal Hendrix)

MIAMI, December 16.—President Johnson's selection of Ambassador Thomas C. Mann, a seasoned career diplomat, to direct the Nation's Latin American policies marks a decision to rely on experience rather than theory in handling hemispheric affairs.

Mr. Mann, named Saturday as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, has had more than 20 years' experience with Latin American problems in various State Department jobs.

He returns to a post he held for a few months in 1960–61 before becoming Ambassador to Mexico.

Mr. Johnson last night announced he was giving Mr. Mann complete authority over all U.S. economic, social, and cultural programs in Latin America.

Associates say Mr. Mann would not have accepted the post under any other conditions.

Mr. Mann's appointment, however, is not viewed as a slap at his predecessor, Edwin M. Martin.

Rather, the shift is looked upon as part of a series of broad changes Mr. Johnson has planned in hemispheric affairs.

It is reported Mr. Martin will be assigned a major ambassadorship in Latin America.

He might be named to the post Mr. Mann is leaving in Mexico although there also is speculation Mr. Martin may replace Ambassador Robert McClintock in Argentina or Ambassador Lincoln Gordon in Brazil.

Meanwhile, the United States is expected soon to "normalize" its Alliance for Progress assistance to the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

Diplomatic relations with both countries were restored Saturday.

Economic and military assistance to both countries was suspended in September after their elected governments had been overthrown.

Mr. Mann is expected to recommend naming a new Ambassador to the Dominican Republic to replace John Bertlow Martin, who is not regarded well in Santo Domingo because of alleged efforts to block U.S. recognition of the civilian triumvirate ruling the country.

Reportedly under consideration for the job are John Crimmons, now coordinator of Cuban affairs in the State Department, and Henry Dearborn, counselor of the U.S. Embassy in Bogotá, Colombia.

LAWYER

Mr. Mann, a 51-year-old lawyer, stands taller in realistic intelligence and experience in inter-American affairs than any of the Kennedy administration's New Frontier "experts" who helped shape Latin policies outside the State Department during the past 3 years.

It is no secret Mr. Mann took a dim view of some of them.

A native of Laredo, Tex., Mr. Mann speaks fluent Spanish.

He is highly regarded by Latin American diplomats and government officials. He is what the Latins call "simpatico."

Setting the Record Straight in Danville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on September 4, the senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, asked for and obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with his remarks on civil rights and the so-called march for freedom in Washington, two newspaper articles printed in the Washington Post, one on August 31 by Sue Cronk, and referring to Joyce Barrett, a 24-year-old graduate of Temple University in Philadelphia, who related her experience in Albany, Ga., and another on September 4 also by Sue Cronk and referring to Mrs. Jacob I. (Anne) Karro—wife of a Labor Department lawyer—who was one of the chief "trouble makers" in Danville, Va., according to the city manager, Mr. T. Edward Temple.

Anne Karro drove to Danville, Va., on July 18, according to her story, and later gave an account of her visit to Danville, during which time she was arrested and placed in the Danville jail.

Without intending in any way to reflect upon the senior Senator from Illinois, I might add that I have read many newspaper articles about the racial situation in Chicago for a number of years. According to these reports, nothing has as yet happened in Virginia which would in any way be comparable to the strife existing there.

It is not my desire to enter into another prolonged debate about a subject little understood by the South's frequent critics, but I do believe the people of Danville, it's officials and its medical profession have a right to be heard in the same forum where there was exhibited an utter disregard for veracity.

The charges made against the people and the officials of Danville by this Mrs. Karro, as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 4, are both false and scurrilous, and deserve to be condemned by honest people. The citizens of Danville are rightfully incensed.

Under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert certain articles, I include an article from the Danville Bee, the daily newspaper, and an exchange of correspondence from Dr. Baxter H. Byerly, an eminent ophthalmoligist and secretary-treasurer of the Danville-Pittsylvania Academy of Medicine, Dr. F. C. Hayes, health director of the city of Danville, and Drs. John H. Arnett and Gerald Grope of Philadelphia, Pa., who addressed similar communications to all of the members of the medical profession of their city. The newspaper articles and the correspondence are as follows:

WHITE DEMONSTRATOR'S STORY STIRS FRIENDS BUT OFFICIAL RECORDS DO NOT BEAR IT OUT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A 53-year-old white woman from Bethesda, Md., who joined five local Negroes in a picketing incident here on Saturday, July 20, is thought to be responsible for today's visit to Danville Negroes by a group of whites from suburban Washington.)

She is Mrs. Jacob I. Karro, who was featured in a story in the Washington Post on Wednesday of this week. The column-long story, with a two-column picture of the Bannockburn housewife, was written by Sue Cronk and carries a five-column headline: "Her Danville Deeds Weren't Lost in Shuffle."

The article has been distributed among local ministers and others. Officials involved in the incident and resulting accusations were enraged.

The Bee today carries the complete text of the Post's story, together with local comments and replies inserted in parentheses. It follows:

"When 80 Negroes from Danville, Va., came to Washington to march for jobs and freedom last week, they were welcomed warmly in a white Bethesda neighborhood.

"Residents of the Bannockburn area took the Negroes swimming in their community pool. They cooked suppers for them, put them up in their homes last Tuesday night and packed box lunches for them to take to the march on Wednesday.

"The community's friendly gesture was sparked by a 53-year-old housewife who spent 11 days in a Danville jail cell this summer because, 'just because I'm white, I don't feel I can stand aside and watch the burden of the civil rights problem being carried only by the colored people.'"

(Clerk of Corporation Court T. F. Tucker: "She would not have had to spend 1 minute in jail had she chosen to post bond. I processed her myself at 1:28 p.m., before she went to jail, and she was notified of her rights at the time.")

"Mrs. Jacob I. Karro, wife of a Labor Department lawyer and mother of three, drove to Danville July 18 'after seeing a television show on the police brutality there. I wanted to see what it was all about.'

(Police Chief E. G. McCain: "While we do not know the television program referred to by Mrs. Karro, it could well be the one on the CBS network on June 15 which may yet be the basis for action by the city against the network. It could have been one of many others, likewise falacious."

"On the morning of July 20 she joined a Negro man, woman, and three teenagers in walking back and forth at the corner of Union and Main Streets. The Negroes carried placards asking for better jobs. She carried one saying, 'No more segregation.'

"Five to seven minutes after their demonstration began, all were arrested.

"Anne Karro was booked on six charges. The chief one was violating Danville's corporation court injunction against participating in demonstration. The others ranged from contributing to the delinquency of the three minors with whom she had walked,

to walking 6 instead of 10 paces behind the person in front of her."

(Chief McCain: "The injunction does not ban demonstrations but does spell out those acts not permitted by demonstrators. As for 10 paces, the ordinance specifies a minimum distance of 10 feet—not paces.)

"Bond was set at $2,000. 'It made me feel very dangerous,' Mrs. Karro said."

(Tucker: "Her bond in this court automatically was $2,000 since she is a nonresident of Virginia. Incidentally, it subsequently was reduced to $500.)

"Here is her account of her imprisonment:

"When she was being booked, the arresting officer told Mrs. Karro—a blue-eyed blonde Englishwoman—that he couldn't decide whether to list her as white or Negro."

(Officer T. G. Faulkner: "The truth of the matter is she refused to state her race. She also refused to give such routine information as date and place of birth, height, weight, marriage status and occupation. She gave some information and then started repeating she wouldn't say anything else until she saw her lawyer, Mr. Holt.)

"She was placed in a cell in the white section of the city jail with women arrested on traffic, drunkenness, fraud, and assault charges.

"Her 6 foot 2 inches by 7 foot 8 inch cell contained the only toilet facilities—an open commode and a sink with cold water—for all the white women prisoners. Lack of room made it necessary for her and her cellmates to climb up on their bunks when the other prisoners used the toilet."

(Walter Riddle, assistant city sergeant: "That she had to climb into her bunk for others to use the commode is absurd. Hers was an isolation cell brought into use because of the overflow. Two persons stay in the cell and at times a third was placed there until assigned elsewhere. It has double-decker bunks and a fountain-type drinking facility. Every cell except the one for mental cases has the same toilet facilities. I never saw a cell with a private bathroom.)

"She had to wait 8 hours to get a mattress for her bunk and 6 days to get a drinking mug."

(Riddle: "Mattresses are not placed on bunks until prisoners are assigned. She had hers by bedtime that evening. I don't know anything about the drinking mug—she had the fountain.")

"Meals consisted of grits with eggs or bacon for breakfast, two starchy vegetables and sometimes white sow belly for dinner, and a fried cold cut sandwich for supper. The women had to scrape and wash the male prisoners' dishes before they themselves were allowed to eat."

(Riddle: "We're proud of the meals we serve and the menu is open for inspection. Maybe she never heard of using fatback meat to season vegetables. The women prisoners eat after the men and then wash the dishes—it's standard procedure.")

"As she was denied reading or writing materials and exercise periods, she spent the rest of the day 'just lying on my back. I counted 198 rivets in the ceiling of my cell.'

(Riddle: "This is completely false. Mrs. Karro spent most of her time reading. We do not supply them with sex and crime magazines. Their attorneys brought reams of books and magazines. She was granted writing materials on Wednesday. We furnish it—including postage. She was free to take exercises if she wanted to.")

"Mrs. Karro could hear young Negro girls who had been arrested for demonstrating "crying and screaming for their mothers when they were abused through painful pelvic examinations."

(Dr. F. C. Hayes, medical director: "In the 15 months I have been here, there has been nothing such as she intimates. It could not have happened because only one 49-year-old woman was given such an examination during the period Mrs. Karro was in jail."

(Hayes: "The chronic disease clinic was begun in the jail years ago and is held each Thursday morning. If anyone does not wish to participate in the examination, she is excused and returned to her cell. No clinic in the country provides more privacy.")

(Dr. J. D. Gorman: "On the Thursday in question, six females were brought in for examination, only one of whom was under 25 years of age. One 48-year-old woman was examined when Mrs. Karro inquired if she had to take the examination. When she was told it was not mandatory, she and the remainder declined to take it.")

(Mrs. Sallie Allen, public health nurse: "There has been no crying or screaming at these clinics.")

(W. S. Swafford, clinical disease investigator: "This clinic has proven most effective in controlling venereal disease. We are concerned only with the mental, physical, and social well-being of every person within our purview—their race, religion, and country origin is no concern or ours.")

"Mrs. Karro's husband, who learned from a wire service reporter of her imprisonment, was allowed to see her for 20 minutes when he drove to Danville July 21 and hired a Danville lawyer.

(Riddle: "Prisoners are permitted a 30-minute visiting period each week. I don't know how long Mr. Karro chose to stay.")

"Mrs. Karro thus far has been found guilty of two of the six charges against her, has been fined a total of $30 and had $400 added to her bond. Appeals are pending. She still faces trial on the remaining charges.

"Free on bail, she 'sort of slunk back home.' I felt I'd been lost in the shuffle, that I didn't make any difference in the Danville situation, that there was still no way of reaching anybody.

" 'But I was so wrong. My whole neighborhood was on fire. Many neighbors said they were apologetic and ashamed that they'd felt too chicken to do something similar. I realized that what moved me was not peculiar to me but felt deeply by many people.'

"So Mrs. Karro and some of her neighbors, the majority of whom, she said, 'wouldn't object to colored families moving here,' opened their homes and hearts to the Danville marchers.

"The same Bannockburn group was instrumental in obtaining the desegregation of Glen Echo amusement park.

"Mrs. Karro has been 'very much disturbed for a long time on the question of civil rights.'

" 'I can't understand why more people who feel as I do aren't standing up to be counted,' she said. 'After all, it's as much a white problem as a colored problem. In fact, it's an American citizenship problem.' "

DANVILLE-PITTSYLVANA ACADEMY OF MEDICINE,
Danville, Va., December 9, 1963.

DEAR DRS. ARNETT AND GROFE: The Danville-Pittsylvania Academy of Medicine has received your letter and we were only too glad to answer this letter from private individuals who are primarily interested in upholding the ethical standards of medicine.

A thorough investigation of the allegations referred to in your letter has been carried out by a committee of the Danville-Pittsylvania Academy of Medicine. We believe it best to begin this discussion with routine health department procedures which have been carried out at our jail for years, and in which our academy wholeheartedly concurs because it has been a very fruitful source of case findings for venereal disease and other public health hazards. Each week a team consisting of a qualified physician, a graduate public health nurse, a chronic disease investigator, and a clerk, visit the jail. All new female inmates are then brought out of their cells by the matron. With their permission, they are then registered, blood samples are drawn and individually and voluntarily they are taken into private rooms attended only by the physician and a graduate nurse. Here, the Pap smear and a smear of the urethra and cervix for GC is then taken. No bimanual examination is performed at any time. Male inmates are completely separated from the females at all times and no lay people are in attendance during any part of the physical examination.

On the Thursday in question, July 11, 1963, one 48-year-old colored female was examined on the routine visit to the jail. This examination consisted of drawing the blood sample for serology, a voluntary pelvic examination at which time a urethral and cervical smear for GC was taken, and a Papanicolaou smear was taken. The bimanual examination, which is not routine, was not done on this occasion. At that time, Mrs. Karro asked if she had to take the examination, and she and four others were told by the physician that they would not be examined if they objected. We were at a complete loss to explain, on the basis of any medical procedures, the cries of anguish and fear from the young teen-age girls which Mrs. Karro referred to in her testimony.

It is regrettable that basic disease preventing examinations that have been the routine of our health department for years should be interpreted by an outsider as being used to humiliate or intimidate the individual. It appears that Mrs. Karro was the victim of her own imagination and did not bother to learn the truth.

We wholeheartedly extend to you a cordial invitation to visit our city, our health department, and our jail.

Sincerely,

BAXTER H. BYERLY, M.D.,
Secretary and Treasurer.

NOVEMBER 27, 1963.

Dr. JOHN H. ARNETT,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR DR. ARNETT: A copy of yours and Dr. Grofe's letter was received at this office November 26, 1963.

First, I should like to tell you that no one has a greater respect for the medical profession than I. I must also remind you that as a physician specializing in public health, I will pursue casefinding for venereal disease and cancer control wherever I am most likely to find them. The jail population of the country has been repeatedly shown to include great numbers in both of these categories.

All of Mrs. Karro's accusations were rebutted in the September 7, 1963, issue of the Danville, Va., Bee. I was never informed whether or not this article was picked up by the wire services for transmission across the country. From rereading the article by Sue Cronk, and your letter, as well as the issue of the Bee mentioned above, it seems that Mrs. Karro's imagination was working, as well as her looseness with the truth, as evidenced by her omission of very vital parts of the story. The only clinic that was held during her 11 days in jail was attended by my assistant, a chronic disease investigator, a Public Health nurse (who happened to be a Negro), and a young female clerk. No jailer is ever in attendance, only a matron, and I have never heard her use foul language. There was no young married colored woman involved, but there was a 49-year old colored woman who was examined that day. The others, including Mrs. Karro, when gently spoken to as you mentioned in your letter, preferred not to be examined and were returned to their cell block.

As I stated earlier, these clinics are casefinding clinics and the protection of fellow prisoners is incidental. Those matters are the province of the regular jail physician.

We feel that the high incidence of cervical cancer in promiscuous women makes this very worthwhile. We found two cases in the past year.

So far as Mrs. Karro's drinking cup is concerned, she was assigned to a cell with a fountain type drinking facility and therefore had no need for a drinking cup. There was never a "common drinking cup" involved. After she was assigned to another cell without a fountain, a cup was provided.

I extend to you and Dr. Grofe a cordial invitation to visit the city of Danville and the Danville Health Department.

Sincerely,

F. C. HAYS, M.D.,
Director.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
November 23, 1963.

DEAR DR. FERGUSON: We have been greatly disturbed by reading reports of vaginal examinations practiced upon female prisoners in the Danville jail. If these reports are true, examinations would appear to have been practiced for punitive purposes under the guise of "preventive medicine", and would, therefore, be a matter of concern to all of us who practice the healing art, and especially to you a physican of Danville and a citizen of the State of Virginia.

In order to judge more intelligently the accuracy of the reports by Sue Cronk, which appeared in the Washington Post of August 31 and September 4, which were quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Septmber 4 (see enclosure), we determined to see for ourselves how dependable a person Mrs. Karro might be, and arranged for an interview at her home at Bethesda, Md. She impressed us as being an intelligent, educated and truthful individual with a good memory. We were somewhat relieved, therefore, to learn that she could not personally verify the account of "young negro girls, who had been arrested for demonstrating, crying and screaming for their mothers, when they were abused through painful pelvic examinations." These facts were related to Mr. Karro by a fellow prisoner, and we hope, as fervently as you, that they may not be true. In other respects, however, the articles were apparently accurate.

A definitely ameliorating circumstance which does not appear in the articles was the fact that when a request for a pelvic examination was made to Mrs. Karro it was prefaced with the words "we would like to make a pelvic examination if you have no objection," and was not insisted upon when she did object. However, she relates that a young married colored woman remonstrated to the jailer in her hearing that she had recently had an examination by her own physician, who would furnish the findings if desired, to which the jailer had replied "Your doctor? He doesn't mean a damn thing here. You get on over there and wait."

It seems to us that while there may be valid reasons for subjecting certain types of prisoners to a pelvic examination, these reasons hardly apply here. For example, if the vaginal examinations were done for the protection of fellow prisoners, why was it so difficult for Mrs. Karro to obtain an individual drinking cup? Many diseases, including syphilis, are known to be transmitted via the common drinking cup. Moreover, if these physical examinations were not part of a program of physical indignities and intimidations, why were they limited to a blood test and a vaginal examination?

We realize that here in Philadelphia there have also been instances of sadism, masquerading as "The Law." We write this letter as two concerned physicians; we do not represent anyone but ourselves. We do not know who countenanced these unethical practices at the Danville jail, and, therefore, we are addressing this letter to all Danville physicians listed in the AMA directory, confident that if the physicians of Danville realize what is going on, steps will be taken to remedy the situation.

Fraternally yours,

JOHN H. ARNETT, M.D.
JERROLD GROFE, M.D.

Trends in Public Land Dedications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the 54th Western Forestry Conference held at the Jack Tar Hotel in San Francisco, Calif., Mr. Paul N. Carlin, assistant director for Federal ownership problems for the National Association of Counties, presented a paper on December 12, 1963, discussing "Trends in Public Land Dedications."

Mr. Carlin's presentation traces some of the significant public land statutes and indicates first how the executive branch extended its power to set aside public lands for limited use and then shows how Congress has sought to fulfill its responsibilities by recouping a part of that authority. Finally, the paper describes the increased recognition of the need for multiple-use development of the public lands and concludes that additional congressional direction is required to provide policy guidelines for agencies responsible for the administration of our public lands.

Under leave previously granted I include Mr. Carlin's comments with my remarks and commend it for reading by all Members as further explanation for the need to enact H.R. 8070, a bill for the purpose of establishing a public land law review commission, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to this body on December 7, 1963.

TRENDS IN PUBLIC LAND DEDICATIONS

(By Paul N. Carlin, Assistant Director for Federal Ownership Problems, National Association of Counties, Washington, D.C., delivered at the 54th Western Forestry Conference, Western Forestry and Conservation Association, Jack Tar Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., Thursday Afternoon, December 12, 1963)

President Schofield, Chairman Connaughton, Forest Counsel Glascock, distinguished guests, and members of the conference:

During the early decades of the 19th century, some American leaders viewed the West as an obscure desert wasteland. This attitude was reflected in the eloquence of Daniel Webster when he asked the U.S. Senate:

"What do we want with this vast, worthless area, this region of savages and wild beasts, of shifting sands and whirlpools of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs?

"To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those great mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow?"

It was as if in response to these rhetorical questions that plain, ordinary people began their march toward our western horizons.

This powerful, surging westward movement was to finally push our Nation's boundaries first to the north to encompass the State of Alaska and then southward until it came to rest in 1959 at 18°15′ north longitude in Ka Lae, Hawaii.

The public spotlight which held the public lands transfixed on the center stage for nearly a century has often been referred to as the "lure of the West."

For countless immigrants and families, the answer was simpler. For them, the availability of these lands meant homes, farms, towns, businesses of their own, and individual freedom.

The most outstanding tribute to our early public land policies was the opportunity for all citizens to obtain a clear title to their lands, without feudal encumbrances.

This was the great catlyst which encouraged the rapid settlement of "this vast, worthless area" which consisted of "shifting sands and whirlpools of dust."

This fundamental decision, now accepted as an inherent right, provided the opportunity of economic freedom for all citizens. It was accomplished through the transfer of more than 1 billion acres of land from public to private ownership.

A significant factor in this disposal process has been the establishment of a system of withdrawals and reservations.

By definition, a "withdrawal"' or "dedication" is an action which restricts the disposition of public lands. Generally, the retention of these lands in Federal ownership is insured by dedicating them to a specific public purpose. A "reservation" is a permanent withdrawal.

Conversely, a "revocation" is an action which cancels a withdrawal.

Probably the first withdrawals occurred in New England during our colonial period. Representatives of the King would cruise the forests and mark, with the broad arrow of the King's estate, those trees which were suitable for use as ships' masts. Such trees could not legally be cut by the colonists, but were reserved as the exclusive property of the King.

The ordinance of May 20, 1785, established the basic rectangular public land survey system, as compared to the system of metes and bounds. It also marked the beginning of the general reservation of certain public lands by providing that 1 square mile (sec. 16) of every township was to be reserved for the maintenance of the public schools.

The first large-sacle public land reservation was made on March 1, 1872, when the Congress set aside Yellowstone National Park. This designation placed these 2.2 million acres, and the national parks which were subsequently established, in a permanent status of public ownership.

In 1891, the withdrawal and reservation concept was further expanded with the establishment of the present national forest system.

General statutory authority to temporarily withdraw lands from disposition under the public land laws was conferred upon the President under the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847; 43 U.S.C. 141).

This Presidential authority was further enhanced 5 years later when the Supreme Court ruled in the *Midwest* case (236 U.S. 459) that the President had an implied power to withdraw public lands for a Federal use or purpose. This Presidential authority has been delegated to the Secretary of the Interior.

Thus Congress gradually established a national policy of reserving certain Federal lands for public purposes. Subsequent laws have reserved additional lands not only for their scenic and primeval values, but also for minerals, powersites, reclamation, and wildlife protection.

With a bold signature on June 28, 1934, President Franklin D. Roosevelt ended more than a half century of indecision on the proper disposition of the public grazing lands in the West when he signed the Taylor Grazing Act.

This action was followed on November 26, 1934, by Executive Order No. 6910, which

temporarily withdrew from further entry the remaining vacant, unreserved, and unappropriated lands of the public domain.

Though these lands remain open to the staking of mining claims and for public fishing, hunting, camping, and other outdoor recreational pursuits, their further disposition is contingent upon a classification by the Secretary of the Interior that the lands "are more valuable or suitable for the production of agricultural products * * * or more valuable and suitable for any other use than (grazing) * * *"

Until recently, military agencies were able to withdraw, reserve, or restrict lands for their use simply by filling out the proper form and then applying to the Department of the Interior for as many acres as they specified were absolutely necessary for their operations.

The result was a spectacular increase in the Federal lands controlled by military agencies. From approximately 3 million acres in 1937 their control expanded to 32.6 million acres on June 30, 1961, an increase of 1,087 percent. During the 1961 fiscal year alone, the military's Federal landholdings were increased by an additional 3 million acres.

As a direct result of the strong protests which were made against this rapidly emerging pattern of military ownership, Public Law 85-337 was passed on February 28, 1958.

This significant new law provides that military withdrawals of over 5,000 acres must be approved by a specific act of Congress. It also provided that all hunting and fishing on these withdrawn lands shall be in accord with the State laws where the land is located.

Thus, seven decades into the 20th century, we find that we have grown from an agricultural nation of 3.9 million people during our first census in 1790 to over 190 million persons who reside today in a complex urban-suburban-industrialized society.

We find that 48 percent of the total land acreage of the 11 Western States is still owned by the Federal Government. This percentage of Federal ownership fluctuates among these States from a high of 86.2 percent in Nevada to 29.4 percent in the State of Washington. Alaska is excluded from this consideration because of the uniqueness of their public lands problems.

We also find that most of the 4,099 public land laws were enacted to meet the dynamics of expansion, at a time when agricultural development was considered the highest use.

By way of comparison, a 1961 review by the Bureau of Land Management revealed that substantially less than 1 million acres of the 350 million acres of public domain lands in the 11 Western States had even a slight potential for agricultural development.

The most dramatic impact of an urbanized society has been upon our way of life and its emphasis upon comfort. Professor Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society," vividly depicts a modern family's outing through its memorable description of:

"The family which takes its * * * air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour and passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts for wires that should long since have been put underground. They pass on into a countryside that has been rendered largely invisible by commercial art * * * they picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals. Just before dozing off on an air mattress, beneath a nylon tent, amid the stench of decaying refuse, they may reflect vaguely on the curious unevenness of their blessings * * *."

A "curious unevenness of their blessings * * *" is also an apt description of our federally owned lands.

The public lands embrace most of the West's natural resource potential, are governed by obsolete and badly fragmented land laws, and are subject to contradictory standards which never squarely face the fundamental question as to whether these lands are to be managed for disposition or retention. Nonetheless, several clear-cut trends in public land dedications appear to be emerging.

FIRST. ADDITIONAL CONTROL BY CONGRESS OVER WITHDRAWALS

Federal administrators use withdrawals to stabilize the land tenure pattern and as a "tool" to serve the broadest needs of the public, when conflicting interests arise concerning the use of federally owned lands and its resources. During the decade of the 1950's their revocations were nearly equal in acreage to the withdrawals.

Substantial acreage of federally owned lands are involved in the withdrawal procedures. During the 22-year period from June 6, 1938, to the end of 1960 there were a total of 248 withdrawals, covering 131 million (130,995,628) acres. Each of these 248 withdrawals exceeded 5,000 acres. Though the number of withdrawals was evenly divided between defense and nondefense purposes, the total acreage for nondefense purposes was almost four times as large as the number of acres which had been withdrawn for defense purposes.

In addition, on December 1, 1960, there were 78 applications that exceeded 5,000 acres each, covering a total of 13 million (13,243,004) acres, which were pending in the Bureau of Land Management for nondefense withdrawals. These pending applications included 1 million (1,122,313) acres in California.

For a long time the withdrawal concept has had bitter enemies and in many places it is a popular public issue.

The net result has been a genuine concern in many areas about the withdrawal process.

This concern has been evident in the changing attitude of Congress. Back in 1915, in the Midwest case, the Supreme Court took judicial notice of the fact that the President had been making withdrawals for so long a time, and with the full knowledge of Congress, that this authority had matured into an "implied" right to make withdrawals.

From this previous attitude of congressional disinterest, the past decade has brought several important developments which indicate the extent of this congressional concern.

Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution imposes on Congress the responsibility of all Government property. Pursuant to this responsibility, the Congress passed the 1958 requirement (P.L. 85-337) that military withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres must be reviewed and approvel by a specific act of Congress.

During the past 6 years the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs extended this concept by reviewing all nondefense withdrawals which exceeded 5,000 acres, under a procedure known as "legislative oversight."

The substitute version of last year's wilderness bill (H.R. 776) was reported out of the House Subcommittee on Public Lands with a special section which would require an act of Congress for any future withdrawals of the public lands or national forest lands that involved more than 5,000 acres. This withdrawal provision is again pending before the Congress.

Withdrawals are also in the center of the important controversy between the Congress and the President regarding the degree of public land responsibility to be exercised by the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

These examples are indicative of the deep concern which has been expressed by the Congress. There are further indications that an attempt will be made to establish uniform withdrawal procedures which would be followed by all agencies and departments of the Government.

SECOND. AN INCREASED EMPHASIS ON CURRENT MULTIPLE USES

Several acts of Congress in recent years have expressly recognized the value of the multiple use principle for federally owned lands.

They include: An amendment to the Recreation Act of 1926 (Public Law 83-387); a permit to allow mining and mineral leasing on the same public land tracts (Public Law 83-585); authorization for public agencies to obtain special use permits (Public Law 83-771); an amendment to the Desert Land Entry Act of 1877 (Public Law 84-76); the multiple Surface Use Act which pertains to mining land surfaces (Public Law 84-167); authorization for mineral and resource development on power land withdrawals (Public Law 84-357); and the multiple-use bill for national forest lands (Public Law 86-517).

Recent innovations of the executive branch also endorse the multiple use concept. They have proposed the establishment of national seashores, wild rivers, and national recreation areas in an attempt to develop recreational areas which will encourage the maximum utilization of these areas by compatible uses.

It also appears clear that the people of the United States do not want their public domain to be the private realm of the grazer, the logger, the miner, the oil and gas producer, the hunter, the recreationist, nor of any other single user group. They also seem to be endorsing a balanced program of economic development and public use.

There are caution lights which cannot be overlooked in any consideration of the multiple use concept.

Despite a widespread endorsement of the multiple use concept, the Secretary of the Interior still has no express authority to follow a multiple use principle in the management of the public lands, even though the Multiple Use Act for the national forests was passed by the 86th Congress.

In November 1962, the American Forest Products Industries had a nationwide public opinion survey taken by the Opinion Research Corp. During the process of interviewing average citizens in all parts of the United States, they asked the following question:

"Have you ever heard the term 'multiple use' used in connection with forest lands?"

Eighty-two percent of those who were interviewed said no. Of the remaining 18 percent, only one-fourth of them could mention 3 or more uses, such as wood, water, recreation, wildlife, grazing.

Apparently all of us have failed in our public education program.

The toughest problem confronting the public land administrators will involve the conflicts between competing uses for space which is located near urban centers of population.

If an effective job is to be done, adequate guidelines must be established to prevent the administrator from overstepping his authority and at the same time being clear enough to encourage him to make and carry out those decisions which are necessary for proper multiple use management.

THIRD. NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTION

The fine silken thread which is found carefully woven throughout all aspects of the

public domain is the need for a national public lands policy.

This need is particularly acute for the landlocked communities which must look to federally owned or controlled lands as their only means of expansion.

The surrounding San Francisco metropolitan complex provides an illustration of the rapid growth which is anticipated in many parts of the West. For every San Francisco resident today, there will be four within 60 years. Marin County, which is located north of the Golden Gate Bridge will increase its population 5 times, Sonoma and Solano Counties will each increase eightfold, and Napa County will become 10 times larger.

By 1980, two-thirds of our Nation's population will be urban residents. During the interim, every single day will see California convert another 375 acres of land for their urban growth demands.

The safety valve for the future development of the West will be the public lands. It is essential that a national policy be developed now, before it is too late, which will provide broad statutory guidelines to encourage the maximum utilization and to govern the disposition of this valuable resource.

What happens if this is not done? We need only look to the twisting, tortuous path of the wilderness bill for an example.

Since Congress failed to enact general policies to govern the use of the public lands, a vacuum was created into which the Federal land administrators had to move in order to manage their areas in an efficient manner.

Therefore the executive branch has gradually developed, on its own, the rules as to which areas should be preserved as wilderness, which areas should be open for disposal, and which areas should be retained for recreational use.

We have also learned through experience that withdrawals, even temporary dedications, become almost impossible to revoke when they have been made in support of a program that has wide public acceptance.

The decisions regarding the wilderness areas have already been made. The remaining differences will eventually be resolved on the anvil of compromise.

On the other hand, the intensive pressures on the public lands are only now beginning to be felt. The Bureau of Land Management is already being strongly urged to withdraw some of their areas for preservation and to establish recreation development facilities on other units of the public domain.

If specific policy guidelines are not provided to the Bureau of Land Management, then we will have only ourselves to blame if the final result is another unnecessary battlefield such as the one on which the wilderness bill fights were fought.

The proposed Public Land Law Review Commission bill (H.R. 8070) was reported out of committee last Saturday, December 7. It would provide the framework wherein these policy guidelines can be developed. In addition, it would modernize the voluminous, complex, disjoined, and badly out-dated body of public land laws.

For the public land States and counties, this comprehensive review of the public land laws and policies can develop into one of Congress' finest and far-reaching achievements.

James Russell Lowell may have been thinking of a similar type of a commission when he wrote:

"New times demand new measures and new men;
The world advances, and in time outgrows
The laws that in our father's day were best;
And doubtless, after us, some purer scheme
Will be shaped out by wiser men than we."

Thank you.

Memorial to Howard Boozer Payne, Elberton, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, when friends and good men pass on, it is fitting to recognize their worth. Too frequently we do not let the deeds of such good men properly live after them. Lawyers especially who make their mark in service to their community and who have lived exemplary lives are not praised. We hear more of those few of this profession who bring down criticism rather than elicit praise. Therefore, I am constrained to call the attention of this body to the excerpt from the proceedings of the Superior Court of the Northern Judicial Circuit of Georgia when Howard Boozer Payne at Elberton, Ga., was eulogized because he was a good friend, an excellent lawyer and a Christian gentleman:

MEMORIAL SERVICE OF HOWARD BOOZER PAYNE

Judge Carey Skelton, superior court, northern circuit of Georgia:

"Our first order of business this morning is a memorial service for our late and departed lawyer and friend, the Honorable Howard B. Payne. At this time, I recognize the president of the Northern Circuit Bar Association, Mr. Clete D. Johnson, our circuit solicitor general."

Clete D. Johnson:

"Thank you judge, members of the family of the late Howard Boozer Payne, and ladies and gentlemen. We are starting the court with a memorial service in Mr. Payne's memory. I have appointed a committee to prepare a resolution fitting for this occasion. This committee is composed of Mr. Clarence McLanahan as chairman, Mr. Bob Heard, and Mr. Billy Williford. Now, at this time, I want to call on Mr. Lanahan to present the resolution."

Clarence McLanahan:

"Your Honor please, members of the family of the late Col. Howard B. Payne, and friends and ladies and gentlemen. It gives me great pleasure and an honor to present a memorial to our late friend and fellow lawyer of Elberton."

MEMORIAL TO HOWARD BOOZER PAYNE

Howard Boozer Payne was born in Hogansville, Troup County, Ga., on the 6th day of February 1895, the son of Howard Allen and Sarah Tompkins (Boozer) Payne. He attended the public schools in Hogansville, graduating from high school there in 1911. He continued his education at Emory at Oxford and then at the University of Georgia.

Colonel Payne opened his law office in Elbertson in 1911 and for 51 years continued in his profession. An able man, he was recognized as one of the leading attorneys in northeast Georgia. As a trial lawyer, he was considered one of the best in Georgia and numbered among his clients were some of the State's largest corporations. He served as solicitor of the city court of Elberton for a period of 21 years, also as county attorney, 1920–21.

Upon the entry of our country into World War I, Colonel Payne enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as captain of Company H, 61st Infantry, Fifth Division, for over a year on the battlefields of France. He received citations for gallantry in the San Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne operations. Although he was above age for active duty in World War II, he served for 5 years with the antiaircraft artillery in California. A distinguished veteran of both wars, he retired from the U.S. Army in 1945 with rank of lieutenant colonel.

Colonel Payne married Miss Thelma Wright of Elberton on April 16, 1919, and by the love and loyalty she has been a constant source of inspiration to her husband. There are two children, Howard Boozer Payne, Jr., now of Atlanta, Ga., and Mrs. Ralph E. Cousins, Jr., Barberton, Ohio.

Colonel Payne was a member of the First Presbyterian Church, where he faithfully served for many years as the teacher of the men's Bible class, as a deacon for 6 years, and as a ruling elder for 34 years.

He was tireless in his efforts to promote the welfare and progress of his community. He served as a member of the board of education in 1925–27 and was active in the Rotary Club, serving as its president in 1927–28. Colonel Payne was an organizer and first commander of post No. 14 of the American Legion at Elberton and again served as its commander in 1930. For 2 years he was State chairman of Americanism of the Georgia department of the Legion.

For many years he was a member of the Elberton, Northern Circuit, Georgia, and American Bar Associations. He served as president of the Elberton and Northern Circuit Bar Associations, and for many years was on the board of governors of the Georgia Bar Association. As a lawyer, he was painstaking in the preparation of his briefs and opinions, and brilliant in the presentation of his cases. He was able, learned, self-possessed, courageous, and invincible. Colonel Payne's successes before the bar were extraordinary. He very seldom lost a case that ought to have been won. He convinced the courts by the force of his clear, unanswerable logic in applying the law, and he swayed juries by his eloquence and manner in discussing the facts of the case.

In the practice of law he strictly conformed to to its canons of ethics and was noted for his courteous and gentlemanly demeanor in the trial of his cases. He was a valuable member of the bar, respected by judges, lawyers, and laymen for his ability, his honesty and his integrity. His career was a credit to our bar and to the community which gave him its respect.

Those who personally knew Colonel Payne will always remember him as a man of noble character, possessing those qualities which term a man as great among men. He was a Christian gentleman, a skilled lawyer, a dedicated public servant, a distinguished soldier, a loyal friend, and a devoted husband and father. Howard Boozer Payne, departing this life July 28, 1962, left to his relatives and to his friends a rich heritage.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

Whereas the Memorial Committee having presented the enclosed memorial to Colonel Howard Boozer Payne: Be it hereby

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the minutes of the Superior Court of Elbert County and a copy be sent to the members of his family, the Northern Circuit Bar Association, the Elberton Bar Association, and the Georgia Bar Journal.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE,
ROBERT M. HEARD,
CLARENCE R. MCLANAHAN,
JOHN W. WILLIFORD.

Clete D. Johnson:

"Thank you, Mr. McLanahan. We have with us this morning several members of the northern circuit bar who are going to second this resolution."

The following bar members made appropriate comments which were made a part of

the minutes of the court: Marshall Allison, Judge Hamilton McWhorter, Judge Robert M. Heard, J. T. Sisk, John W. Williford, the late Colonel Z. B. Rogers, E. Freeman Leverett, William F. Grant, Woodrow W. Lavender, Andrew Hill, and Carey Carter, Jr. Concluding the ceremony were the remarks of the presiding judge, Carey Skelton, that "Boozer was a man who was sympathetic, kind, unselfish, and always helping someone and he was always just and kind, even to his foes, I don't mean his personal foes, but to his foes in the practice of law, and his life was beautiful to behold. He never mentioned his deeds in a conversation or ever claimed credit for his many achievements. The passing of Boozer Payne removed from the Georgia Bar Association one of its most distinguished members and advocates, and he will be greatly missed in the councils of his profession."

American-Built Racing Automobiles Could and Should Lead the World—Only One U.S. Manufacturer Realizes This Fact of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the past year automobile racing has made a strong bid to become America's leading spectator sport. Reported attendance at various competitive events has grown about 20 percent during each of the last 3 years and this year could reach an estimated 50 million.

Historically, the many improvements in automobiles resulting from racing are well known. The rearview mirror, low-pressure tires and four-wheel brakes—to name but a few examples—were first developed and tested to meet the demands of racing.

Today, although cars are much more sophisticated and the methods of testing cars are highly scientific, manufacturers still learn a great deal of benefit to the car-buying public from competitive events that they can learn in no other way. That is because the stresses placed on a car by a driver competing in a race cannot be duplicated on any test track.

One leading manufacturer, for example, has torn down from competitive vehicles more than 100 engines, 50 transmissions, and 40 rear axles during the past year. As a result of careful study and followup work, this company has incorporated into its products a number of changes which provide the general public with cars of greater durability and safety.

Engines are more reliable and better able to withstand the strain of continuous freeway driving. Transmissions are more durable and able to withstand the abuse of unskillful shifting. Rear axles are prepared to absorb the sudden shock caused by a foot slipping off of the clutch, or the added strain of hauling a trailer.

With increased durability and reliability in these new cars has come improved performance.

I mentioned that racing may become America's No. 1 spectator sport. I would like to tell you what this has meant to one locality in my home State of South Carolina.

Darlington, a community of 6,000 persons, is located in the rural north-central part of South Carolina.

Darlington is steeped in the ways and customs of the old South. Its principal crops are tobacco, cotton, and sweet potatoes. Until the Darlington Raceway was built, its industry consisted of a 100-year-old cotton mill and a small Dixie cup assembly plant.

Construction of Darlington Raceway was financed with $50,000 supplied by manufacturers and suppliers who received common stock in lieu of cash repayments.

The raceway opened on Labor Day, 1950, with a 500-mile stock car automobile race.

The American Automobile Association, then the ruling body of auto racing, refused to sanction the event on grounds the race would be a farce. The AAA contended no American-manufactured stock automobile could run 500 miles at full speed.

Today no one can correctly tell how many people attended that first race. Thousands jammed the infield.

For tax purposes, the management and tax officers agreed that between 25,000 and 26,000 had paid to see the race.

In 1955, the first 50,000 attendance was registered.

Double-deck boxes and a deluxe paddock stand now have increased seating to almost 40,000, exclusive of infield capacity.

The gross income reported for 1963 was $592,766.08. State and Federal admission taxes totaled $92,604.57. Still to be paid are corporation, income, county, and State taxes, comprising an estimated 52 percent of total income. Today, Darlington Raceway is the largest single-day taxpayer in South Carolina.

The impact of Darlington Raceway on the economy of the State of South Carolina is illustrated by the fact that banks in a three-county area around Darlington reported a $2,500,000 advance over normal deposits 30 days after a Southern 500. Studies indicate that the money was spent for many things other than the race. It went for food, lodging, parking, fuel, and souvenirs. Further, most of the money literally was spent three and four times before it got to the bank.

As an example of how auto racing helps the little man, one farmer near Darlington parks 4,000 cars each race. His wife and sons do the parking and they charge $1.50 per car. This brings them $6,000—more than they ever earned in a full year on the same land raising cotton.

The Darlington Raceway more than once has bolstered the economy of the community in time of crisis. For instance, in 1958 the local cotton mill—which employed most of Darlington's working citizens—closed its doors. Darlington was declared a Federal disaster area, but the soup lines never materialized. Fresh money from the Southern 500 saved the town until new industry could be secured.

Said the vice president of the Darlington County Bank:

Thank God for the Southern 500.

To woo new industry, Darlington officials invited executives of the Pyramid Electric Co. to a Southern 500; the company decided to locate in Darlington because "we're interested in an area that shows so much community spirit and cooperation." Pyramid bought the old cotton plant, remodeled it and today employs more people than ever worked at the old mill.

Dixie Cup, too, enlarged its Darlington facilities and 2 years ago established a permanent Dixie Cup trophy for the Southern 500 winner.

Nearly every one in both Darlington and nearby Florence, S.C., has a part in Southern 500 proceedings. The track itself employs upwards of 600 persons for 1 day to 1 week. Wages range from $1.50 to $3 an hour.

The permanent raceway work force includes a general manager, an assistant general manager, two executive secretaries, two male clerks, a publicist, a grounds superintendent and a labor crew of six. Eleven directors also are on salary and each heads a department.

The impact of the Southern 500 on the people of Darlington has been equally spectacular.

Schools and churches found that they could raise funds for their projects by making and selling box lunches and operating open-air cafeterias. Surrounding towns also felt the bonanza, with race-time housing in demand for a hundred miles in every direction. One seaside resort—Myrtle Beach some 75 miles away—once closed its season on Labor Day but now remains open to a sellout crowd of racing fans.

The establishment of a youth activity fund by the Darlington Police Department did much to win support of those people who did not share in the excitement and profit of the racing program.

The youth activity fund was established by the police department in an attempt to curb juvenile delinquency in Darlington County. The Raceway underwrote the activity by establishing the first Miss Southern 500 beauty pageant on Saturday prior to the Monday Southern 500. All pageant proceeds go to the youth fund. The pageant, now 11 years old, has drawn 20,000 spectators plus stars of stage and screen. A Lake Darpo (Darlington police department) project has been established complete with buildings, fishing, swimming, boating, hiking, camping and other facilities for underprivileged children. The Youth Activity Fund also has provided school buses, equipment for athletes and schoolboy patrols, and an annual trip for school patrol boys to such places of interest as Washington, D.C., Cape Kennedy, Daytona Beach and Silver Springs. Recently the chief juvenile officer of the

South Carolina State Police, asked to speak in Darlington, replied:

Why? You don't need me. Darlington County has the lowest rate of juvenile delinquency in the State.

Another highly worthwhile development is "Southern Festival Week," which starts on Wednesday—the first day of time trials for the Southern 500—and continues until the morning of the race.

Originated in 1953, the Southern Festival includes parties, costume balls, and a gigantic parade in downtown Darlington on Saturday morning. The parade is one of the most unusual in the world; in addition to the usual clowns and bands, it features floats depicting such local activities as an actual tobacco auction.

Managed by the junior chamber of commerce and underwritten by the city council, the race-weekend program provides a bonanza for Darlington merchants and entertainment for entire families. Many out-of-State families now plan their vacations around the Southern Festival. For the men there are the racing and time trials; for the women, parties and the pageant; for the children, primarily the parade. State police estimate that 125,000 persons take part in the week-long activity—not counting the race.

Darlington Raceway and the Southern 500 also serve the interests of highway safety in many ways. The asphalt surface of the race course is used for surface experiments, and a spring-type steel guard railing pioneered at Darlington and proved in 14 years of racing, today is used on highways throughout the country.

Speaking of highways, I read with great interest the article, "The Case for Fast Drivers," appearing in the September issue of Harper's magazine. The article said:

Over 85 percent of all U.S. traffic accidents are caused by factors other than high speed. More than half of the fatal auto accidents in the United States happen at speeds below 40 miles per hour. If no one in the country drove over 50 miles per hour last year, 60 percent of all fatalities would still have occurred.

The greater a car's horsepower, the less likely it is to become involved in an accident. Statistics prove that there is a direct relationship at every level between higher horsepower and fewer accidents.

Seat belts, harnesses, safety door latches and reinforced hubs, plus an indoctrination test for new drivers, have helped produce a record of safety at Darlington that has brought praise from the State highway police. Since the start of the Southern 500, competitive drivers have registered 307,396 miles of high-speed racing with a single fatality and but one accident in which a driver was hurt seriously enough to stay overnight in a hospital. Few highways can boast as good a record.

Since Darlington opened in 1950, new and larger auto raceways have been developed elsewhere in the South, including Daytona Beach, Charlotte, and Atlanta. Darlington's management, welcoming these additions on the theory that each new speedway would create new fans, set up a program of aid and assistance.

In summary, I repeat that well-run competitive performance events not only provide an effective means of developing better, safer, and more durable cars, but help strengthen the economy, morale and social structure of the communities and areas they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I get very tired of seeing some well-known foreign made automobiles in many of the world's well-known races more in ahead of American entries because of an alleged agreement among the Big Three manufacturers of this country not to give official blessing to racing car construction.

Our manufacturers have the greatest know-how, ample financing and every reason to develop the best racer on earth. It is not sinful for the fastest automobile in the world to bear the label "Made in the United States of America."

Mr. Speaker, I enclose an article from Harper's magazine on September 1963, entitled, "The Case for Fast Drivers," by Robert L. Schwartz:

THE CASE FOR FAST DRIVERS

(By Robert L. Schwartz)

(Robert L. Schwartz has written for most major American magazines. As an entrepreneur he built and operated the Japanese-designed Motel on the Mountain at Suffern, N.Y.; as a motorist, he has a license free of speeding arrests)

Contrary to common belief, they are not the worst menace on the road * * * low speed limits don't really reduce accidents * * * and safe-driving campaigns may actually make our highways more dangerous.

More than a clutch of my fellow Americans seem seized with the notion that we live at the mercy of maniacal speed demons who are making death traps of our highway system.

The myth about the "dangerous high-speed driver" is almost a perfect example of a mass search for a scapegoat: there must be someone at fault in the complicated, depressing highway-accident situation—sure enough it's the high-speed driver. A substantial sets of facts supports the myth. The facts, all completely wrong, usually go like this: (1) Auto deaths are increasing at a tremendous rate; (2) the resulting highway carnage is practically a national disgrace; (3) the chief cause is high-speed driving; (4) the horsepower race—the reckless insistence of automobile manufacturers on building cars with more and more powerful engines—is a major supporting cause; (5) a hard core of fast drivers is particularly dangerous; (6) constant safety campaigns to increase public awareness of danger are important; (7) the real solution, however, is lower speed limits.

These truths are all false. The actual facts are these.

Auto deaths are not increasing. In absolute terms, the annual death toll has not only risen but fallen several times during the past three decades. Its highs were 39,969 in 1941 and 40,900 in 1962; its low, 23,823 in 1943. And in relative terms, the toll has decreased markedly. Although more Americans drive more every year, the rate of deaths per mile driven has been cut by better than two-thirds over the past 30 years—from a high of 16.7 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles in 1934 to a current 5.3 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles. Traffic deaths once accounted for 3 percent of all U.S. fatalities; they are now less than 2 percent.

The annual death toll from highway accidents in the United States is lower than the death toll from pneumonia. This is not carnage.

Over 85 percent of all U.S. traffic accidents are caused by factors others than high speed. More than half of the fatal auto accidents in the United States happen at speeds below 40 miles per hour. If no one in the country drove over 50 miles per hour last year, 60 percent of all fatalities would still have occurred.

The greater a car's horsepower, the less likely it is to become involved in an accident. Statistics prove that there is a direct relationship at every level between higher horsepower and fewer accidents.

There are practically no high-speed drivers as a constant group; a man's own driving speeds vary more from hour to hour or from day to day than they do from those of other motorists. A man killed at 40 miles per hour today on a rural highway was going 65 miles per hour yesterday—and he was safer then by 300 percent.

Safety campaigns are more than a bore. They're a menace. By scaring the timid and by emotionalizing danger, they only add another disturbing ingredient to the highway problem.

Finally, and perhaps most surprising, there is evidence that lowering speed limits tends to induce accidents, while raising the limits prevents them.

These disclosures make a mockery of most of the Nation's speed laws, speed limits, and speed enforcement, under which some 3 million Americans were arrested for speeding last year. Local traffic cops, safety officials, and police-court judges may, indeed, be causing more automobile fatalities than they prevent.

Most of this information comes from a survey submitted to Congress in February 1959 by the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce. Called "The Federal Role in Highway Safety," it reports on a massive study of rural driving authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956—the same law that provided for the huge Interstate Highway System now under construction. The survey, the most comprehensive of its kind ever made, covered 600 miles of highway in 11 States and included roadside interviews with no fewer than 290,000 drivers. It amassed statistics on 3.7 billion miles of travel and on accidents involving 10,000 vehicles. It took 3 years to complete, and when it was finished there was so much data that conclusions had to be obtained by feeding the figures into a high-speed computer.

Its findings have subsequently been supported by independent studies conducted by several States—a few of which have quietly changed their speed laws as a result.[1] Nevertheless the report has been widely overlooked by traffic officials and entirely ignored by the public at large, possibly because the most dramatic conclusions were buried deep in an otherwise unremarkable Government pamphlet.

Statistically the study is beyond reproach. Indeed, it is the only study to have measured the percentages of motorists traveling at different speeds, so that it is possible to reach conclusions like this one: A motorist driving at 65 miles per hour on a main rural highway will go almost three times as far before a fatality (22 million miles) as a man going 35 miles per hour (8 million miles). In other words, more people aren't killed at 35 miles per hour because more are driving at 35 miles per hour; more are killed because

[1] Among the more enlightened traffic experts and highway officials who have urged changes as a result of the study, often after confirming State studies of their own: Wilbur S. Smith, Connecticut; J. Edward Johnston, Utah; J. C. Womack, California; J. E. P. Darrell, Minnesota; Martin E. Bruening, Wisconsin; J. P. Mills, Jr., Virginia; Burton W. Marsh, AAA; John E. Baerwald, University of Illinois; Harold L. Michael, Purdue.

35 is a less safe speed on a main rural highway than 65, mile by mile.

The logic to this seeming paradox is simple: a sustained high-speed traffic flow is far safer than a shifting current of fast- and slow-moving vehicles. It is best to set and maintain a speed limit which acknowledges the desire of most motorists to get where they're going within an increasingly shorter time.

LET FAST DRIVERS RULE

What would happen if the speed limits on all U.S. main rural highways were lowered to 40 m.p.h.? By hypothetically projecting the available data, we come up with a national death toll from auto accidents of 90,000—well over double the present figure. Grim support for such an estimate comes from the Pennsylvania Turnpike statistics: when a 1942 Presidential directive reduced turnpike speeds from 70 to 35, in order to save wartime gas and tires, the turnpike death toll shot up to its highest accident and fatality level—before or since.

Raising rural speed limits to 70, on the other hand, would probably cut the national death toll by as much as 5,000. In the New York City area today, the high-speed Garden State Parkway (60 m.p.h., casually enforced) has less than half as many fatalities, mile for mile, as the less crowded, nearby Palisades Interstate Parkway (45 m.p.h., rigidly enforced).

Tickets, under our present system, usually go to the safest drivers. As State surveys have repeatedly shown, the fast drivers are the ones who tend to go at safe speeds, regardless of the rules. Sensibly, many States have taken this lesson to heart and begun to let the drivers themselves determine speed limits. Assuming that, though most motorists ignore unreasonable curbs, they still have a strong, sane interest in their own survival, officials of these States set the maximum speed being used by 85 percent of motorists as the limit. Most drivers respond to such adult treatment by slightly lowering their previous speed.

Where Illinois officials did a statewide test of this theory in 45 low-speed-limit areas, the obedience rate rose by 119 percent, the average speed declined from 42.6 to 42.4 m.p.h., and accidents declined 36 percent from 62 a year to 40.

Results in Utah were much the same. On a two-lane highway west of Salt Lake City, the 85 percentile figure indicated a proper limit of 60, not the posted 40, which was being ignored by 95 percent of motorists. Despite a huge public outcry because school buses were loaded in one section of the area and because the accident rate was already high, the authorities pressed ahead. What happened? Though speed limits had been raised 20 m.p.h., the average speed through the area was reduced, legal limits were observed by 95 percent of motorists instead of 5 percent, and accidents declined in 1 year from 10 to 3 on this highway.

Similarly, when the Nebraska Highway Department raised the speed limits on Highway U.S. 30 as it went through 28 Nebraska villages and towns, the accident rate fell 34 percent.

In Oregon and in Virginia, merely the observance of speed limits was tested. The finding: in every one of nearly 1,000 cases where speed limits were raised, traffic speeds declined.

These findings fly in the face of all previous logic about speed, speed limits, and accidents. Perhaps it will pay to look at the earlier logic in action. Which brings us to Safe Driving Day. This long-planned, widely heralded effort occurred on December 1, 1955. Sponsored by a Presidential committee with over 200 cooperating national organizations, it was the Nation's most massive attempt at an emotional approach to traffic safety. Unfortunately, the death toll climbed 10 percent on Safe Driving Day. Since a prior dry run also increased the traffic toll, and the final performance confirmed it, the plan has been abandoned.

Another emotional effort for safety was a 1960 1-hour CBS television documentary called "The Great Holiday Massacre," narrated by Edward R. Murrow. Though thoughtfully done, the show featured screaming sirens, injured children, sheet-covered victims, and other emotion-loaded scenes. A subsequent audience poll by the National Safety Council found that the number of people who felt personally invoved in the auto-accident probem had declined by 50 percent; most viewers could not personally identify with the gore, and instead transferred their feelings of involvement to certain bad drivers featured on the show.

Emotional approaches to traffic safety, accompanied by our fixation with speed, have done still more serious damage by drying up any interest, and any funds, for a truly scientific study of auto accidents. As a result, practically nothing is known about them. Postaccident investigation is almost nonexistent. The police do little more than see that victims are sent to morgue or hospital and wreckage is cleared from the highway. Detailed mechanical, engineering, medical, and phychological studies are not attempted. The simplest report for a policeman to make is "Driving too fast," and, being human, he usually makes it.

In court, most motorists charged with speeding are understandably readier to plead guilty and leave than to plead not guilty and extend the proceedings. Thus the traffic court doesn't act as a corrective or a teaching influence either. What it does do is bring in money. Since contemporary folklore regards the arrest of speeders as almost noble, and since it is clearly profitable, there is a subtle pressure to keep low speed limits for their income potential—which is enormous. In 1951, for example, 47,000 summonses issued to speeders on the New York City parkway system brought in almost half a million dollars in fines.

IS LIFE WORTH $5?

The saddest and heaviest loss caused by the traffic myths is in research. Quite possibly, more money has been spent on scientific study of any one major air crash than has been spent on the serious study of all of several million typical auto accidents. An average of $100,000 per victim goes into air crash research. An average of less than $5 per victim goes for auto fatalities. The difference in quality of the research is even greater than the difference in dollars.

Private and Government studies continually lead to changes in airline procedures, techniques, and equipment (the Boeing 707 and the Douglas DC-8 have each had over 250 design modifications for increased safety—and more will come). But a typical auto safety effort usually leads absolutely nowhere. In 1960, for instance, the coveted Alfred P. Sloan Radio and TV Award for distinguished public service in highway safety was given to radio station WCCC in Hartford, Conn. What did the station do? It gave schoolteachers 3,000 apples, each with a cellophane wrapper plugging safety—and also plugging radio station WCCC.

The incredible truth of the matter is that there is not one single study of the causes of the typical automobile accident, despite the millions of dollars spent for promoting highway safety. (Useful work done at Cornell, Minnesota, and the University of California, Los Angeles, is excluded since it deals with impact, seat belts, and other factors affecting survival after an accident. It does not attempt to study the cause of the accident. Hardly anybody does.)

The only serious study worthy of respect is one now underway at the Harvard Medical School, under a grant from the U.S. Public Health Service, and this study, as massive, complex, and thoughtful as it is, deals only with a fraction of highway accidents: those which are fatal. One of the earliest things learned by the Harvard group was that the fatal accident is a wholly different breed of animal from the nonfatal accident. Thus the typical or nonfatal accident is still unstudied and uncharted.

Researchers at Harvard investigate fatal auto accidents in the same painstaking detail as is used after air crashes. A team of scientists from many fields pores over the accident site, examining and recording everything. A mechanical and engineering group studies the wrecked cars, the highway, the collision course. An automotive engineer looks for possible auto malfunctioning prior to the crash. Another group of scientists studies the victims involved. This group includes a pathologist, chemist, technician, sociologist, internist, psychiatrist, ophthalmologist, optometrist, statistician, clergyman, and attorney. They examine survivors, witnesses, and others knowing the past history of the principals in the accident. In most cases, they do an autopsy on dead drivers to study (a) possible death or physical impairment prior to accident, (b) influence of alcohol, medication, or drugs, if any, and (c) actual cause of death.

Granted funds to study accidents in depth over a 5-year period, the group has examined over 200 fatal accidents so far. No overall results are yet available, but the fractional returns are interesting and enlightening.

DEADLY SIMPLE SLIPUPS

Among the first things that become clear about fatal accidents was that generally accepted "causes" won't stand up. For instance, the three most widely believed accident causes are speed, traffic violations, and lack of courtesy. These turned out to be without significance.

What does produce accidents? The answer is very simple—and very complex. Fatal accidents are caused by small things, simple, everyday human or mechanical or highway failures. But they always team up. A list of the causes of any hundred fatal accidents would run over 200 items.

Let us take one of the fatal accidents studied by the Harvard group. On the police records, the cause was "speeding," and there was a belief that intoxicants were a factor. The case was thus ended for police purposes.

There were actually four causes of the fatalities. Here, with names and locale changed, is what happened:

At 2 p.m. of a clear October afternoon, Miss Jane Smith and Miss Mabel Jones were returning to Boston from a trip to Gloucester. As they came over the crest of a hill on Route 128, they were in the left (high-speed) lane but were actually within the speed limit (50 m.p.h.). At this moment (cause No. 1) the right front tire of Miss Smith's car lost all its air. This was not a blowout; this was a maintenance failure. Some weeks earlier, Miss Smith's practically new tubeless tire had been cut by a rock and had gone slowly flat. The gas station man fixed it by pouring some rubber-like glop over the inside of the scar. But the cut sawed back and forth on itself, and finally sawed through the repair compound. (The tire should have been thrown away. Did Miss Smith insist on repair instead of replacement? Did the garageman recommend repair as adequate? Or did he tell her he'd replace her tire when he'd only fixed it? No one knows.)

At this point, Miss Smith was not in real trouble. At her speed and with the low density of traffic around her, she should have had no difficulty taking her car slowly off the road and gently braking to a stop. But Miss Smith (cause No. 2) had inadequate driving skills for this situation. She promptly turned a minor problem into a major crisis. She vigorously grabbed the

wheel to straighten the wobbly course of her car, and she slammed on the brakes. A straight-line panic stop with a flat tire is virtually impossible. Miss Smith's car swerved way to the right and went up on the wide, grassy berm alongside the road. Happy day. Miss Smith was now safely out of traffic, pointed in the right direction, and had one-half mile of grass paralleling the road in which to roll gently to a stop with moderate periodic braking. But Miss Smith didn't know about stopping gently with a blowout. She kept her brakes on hard. And now she was on grass. Her car swung back left and headed across her side of the highway toward the dividing grassy mall in the center.

At this point, no one still need have died. But cause No. 3 was looming ahead. The mall was too narrow and had no guardrail to separate opposing traffic. If (cause No. 3) inadequate highway environment had not been a factor, Miss Smith might have bounced along a retaining barrier and come to a noisy, fender-bending halt, hurt but still alive. (Divider barriers on roads with center malls drastically reduce fatalities by preventing head-on collisions.)

But by now, (1) bad maintenance (2) inadequate driving skills, and (3) inadequate highway environment had already gone a long way toward causing a fatal accident. At this point, one and possibly two persons were apparently doomed to death, but cause No. 4 was still to take an additional life.

Miss Smith went across the mall and into the path of a car being driven by David Brown, returning from the beach with his family of four. Brown was in the fast lane and was going approximately 50 m.p.h. Miss Smith, her speed now down to, say, 40, smashed at an angle right into the middle of the front bumper of Brown's car.

A head-on collision is always serious because of the combined speeds of the two cars, in this case, approximately 90 m.p.h. What happened was predictable—though little understood and quite startling. Both cars hit each other four times. In an action much like the bouncing ping-g-g-g when a hammer strikes an anvil, the two cars impacted again and again and again, with such force that one bolt of the Smith car made four distinct, close-together dents in the bumper of the other car. (Passengers are also subject to this injury-producing series of impacts.) In the instant that this was happening, the rears of both cars rose high in the air. An impacting car, whether it hits a tree, a wall, or another car, always goes down in the front and way up in the rear. This action flipped Miss Smith and Miss Jones right through the windshield of their car and sent Miss Jones completely over the Browns' car and into the windshield of a third car, trailing behind Brown. This windshield did not break, but splintered, and the driver, braking hard but without success, smashed under the raised rear end of the Browns' car, still off the ground from impact. So quickly did all this occur that Miss Jones was dead against the windshield of the third car before Brown's car had even settled to the ground.

When the noise and dust had settled, Miss Smith and Miss Jones were dead, Brown, the driver of the second car, was mortally injured (he would die 29 days later while apparently recovering), and all six other passengers were injured.

One safety device almost saved Brown; another saved the driver of the third car. Brown would have died instantly but for the deep-dish steering wheel (a product of Cornell research) which cushioned his impact against the steering column. The driver of the third car would have been killed by the arrival of Miss Jones through his windshield if it had not been safety glass of high-strength modern construction. As it was, no one—neither police nor survivors—would believe that Miss Jones had actually hit that windshield until the Harvard researchers showed lab tests proving the hair on it was hers. The police also (a) would not believe Miss Smith wasn't speeding, (b) would not accept the wobbly brake marks as indicating she had had a flat tire prior to impact, (c) were indifferent to the cut-and-repaired tire as additional evidence, and (d) preferred to ignore an autopsy report showing no alcohol in Miss Smith's blood. Instead, they accepted the "direct evidence" of their observation that Miss Smith was found with beer cans all around her. No one was interested in the Harvard lab report showing that Miss Smith's body finally came to rest among some half-rusted beer cans that had been on the mall for at least 1 month.

Miss Jones and Mr. Brown would be alive today if there had not been (cause No. 4) lack of restraining devices. If all persons involved had been wearing seat belts, two of three deaths would have been prevented and more than half the injuries. This confirmed a typical Harvard finding: the group has never investigated a multiple-death accident without finding that at least half the deaths could have been prevented with seat belts. Yet only a small minority of Americans wear them.

KEEP IT MOVING

Thus, like most of the accidents studied at Harvard, this one had not one cause, but many. None of them was high speed. It rarely is—and Americans are going to have to dismiss the comfortable, but inadequate, myth that speeders and reckless madmen are the principal cause of accidents.

Indeed, the high-speed myth, though still given credence by local police and magistrates (for whom it is a significant source of power and income) is given little importance by sophisticated thinkers about the problem.

Listen to Howard Pyle, president, National Safety Council: "Speed by itself decidedly has been overemphasized as a major cause of traffic deaths."

And to Russell E. Singer, executive vice president of the AAA: "Purely routine speed-checking is futile and wasteful of enforcement officers' time. It clogs the courts on matters that have a minimum relation to real traffic safety."

And to J. E. Johnston, traffic safety engineer (addressing the Institute of Traffic Engineers): "Publicity * * * for the past 30 years has all been aimed at speed as being the major cause of accidents, when nothing could be further from the truth."

Or to John D. Williams, head of the mathematics division of the Rand Corp. (the Air Force "think factory" where both civilian and military problems are pondered by civilian eggheads): "The physical and social structure of the country would be almost frozen in its present attitude were we to freeze the speed of the automobile. Speed is one of the really crucial factors in our society. I cannot help but believe that we would manage better if we were conscious of the need for more speed, rather than believing the exact contrary. Our laws tend to be aimed at the limitation of speed rather than at the promotion of traffic flow. If one recognizes that the central problem is to promote the smooth and rapid flow of lots of traffic, one is likely to devise measures that will in fact operate in this direction—and it will probably have reasonable safety.

"The motto of everyone concerned with traffic should be 'Keep It Moving.' The odds are that no matter what one does to that end, something good will come of it. The odds are that whatever one does that is contrary to the motto will have a detrimental effect."

America produces jet aircraft, space missiles, and over 60 percent of the world's automobiles. It is about time we produced—dispassionately and scientifically—some useful information about vehicular traffic accidents. Outmoded myths about speed can lead us nowhere.

Hammond, Ind., Schools Feature Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Carl Davidson, editor of the Hammond, Ind., Times, reveals the facts wherein our modern history textbook writers are lax in omitting the real foundation of the patriotic spirit which made America great:

MODERNISTS FORGET PATRICK HENRY—PATRIOTISM REMEMBERED IN HAMMOND TEXTBOOKS

President Ernest L. Wilkinson of Brigham Young University disclosed in an address a while back that some of the most cherished and patriotism-building incidents in American history are omitted in modern history textbooks written for our schools.

Here are examples:

1. A month before the fateful conflict at Lexington and Concord in 1775, Patrick Henry, the great Virginia patriot and orator, delivered a historic address which has come ringing down through the generations. It ended with these words:

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Patrick Henry's words might be as applicable in our peril today as they were in colonial times. Yet, his statement appears in only 3 of 45 modern textbooks, according to a survey quoted by President Wilkinson.

The survey showed that the Patrick Henry statement appeared in 12 of 14 school textbooks in the period prior to 1920. Why has it been ignored by so many modern text writers?

2. One of the most touching and patriotism-promoting stories in all history is that of Nathan Hale, a schoolteacher who answered George Washington's call for volunteers to go behind British lines on a spying mission. Caught and convicted by the enemy, he bravely faced his execution with these imperishable words: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

Nathan Hale's utterance appeared in 11 of the pre-1920 texts but in only one of the modern books surveyed. Why deprive our children of such a precious gem of American history?

3. John Paul Jones figured in the fiercest naval battle of the war for independence. Although his ship was battered and bloody after an all-day battle, Jones refused to surrender. His answer to British demands to quit was: "I have not yet begun to fight." He and his compatriots went on to victory.

John Paul Jones' statement appeared in nine of the old history books and in none of the new ones surveyed. Why delete such an epic of courage and patriotism?

We checked on the American history textbook being used in the Hammond public schools for classes in the 8th grade, and found that all three incidents—Patrick Henry's speech, Nathan Hale's statement, and John Paul Jones' refusal to surrender—were included, along with the full text of their historic remarks.

We hope that other texts used in other school corporations and districts of the Calumet region also carry them, because such incidents are the heart, soul and spirit of American history and the development of our democracy.

President Kennedy's assassination seems to have touched off a general upsurge in patriotism across the Nation.

This is heartwarming because people have a way of drifting into complacency, patriotically speaking. The complacency of recent years has ranged all the way from simple indifference to vicious, outspoken contempt.

It is time for Americans to unite in a powerful and well-organized campaign to boost patriotism—to recapture the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; to increase appreciation for the freedom which we have; and to honor our Founding Fathers for their decency of purpose, their vision, their courage, and their sacrifices in laying the cornerstone for the democracy we enjoy today.

We need to carry this program to the youth of the Nation and a good starting place is in the schools—by seeing that the textbooks carry the message of patriotism, that all of our teachers are loyal Americans, and that every opportunity be used to instill in the children a deep and abiding love of country.

It would be a worthwhile project for the educators themselves, through their associations and backed by the PTA's, to carry forth a campaign to see that America's story is told to the children with due honor and patriotism, in our history books. Texts which omit outstanding gems of history such as those mentioned above should not be given preference.

A move in this direction is important. If history textbook writers continue to omit these patriotism-promoting incidents they will soon be lost to the young people—and ultimately forever.

Communist Expansion Since 1917

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress has assisted me in preparing a chart showing Communist expansion since 1917 in various countries of the world. The chart is concise and sets forth some startling figures which I believe will be of interest and value to all of my colleagues. I earnestly urge that everyone take just a few minutes to review the following information.

The chart follows:

Communist expansion since 1917

Date [1]	Country	At time of communization [2]		Mid-1963 [4]		Area in square miles (1963) [6]
		Population [3]	Percent of world total [4]	Population	Percent of world total	
Nov. 7, 1917	U.S.S.R.	[7] 182,182,000	10.1	224,700,000	7.1	8,603,000
Nov. 26, 1924	Mongolia	647,000	.03	1,000,000	.03	614,000
Aug. 3, 1940	Lithuania	[8] 2,879,000	.12	(9)	(9)	(9)
Aug. 5, 1940	Latvia	[10] 1,950,000	.10	(9)	(9)	(9)
Aug. 6, 1940	Estonia	[11] 1,126,000	.05	(9)	(9)	(9)
Nov. 29, 1945	Yugoslavia	15,600,000	.64	19,000,000	.60	99,000
Jan. 10, 1946	Albania	1,125,000	.04	1,800,000	.06	11,000
Sept. 15, 1946	Bulgaria	6,993,000	.30	8,100,000	.25	43,000
Dec. 30, 1947	Rumania	16,530,000	.70	18,900,000	.60	92,000
June 9, 1948	Czechoslovakia	12,339,000	.50	14,000,000	.44	49,000
Sept. 12, 1948	Korea (Democratic People's Republic).	9,291,000	.37	8,900,000	.30	48,000
Aug. 20, 1949	Hungary	9,247,000	.36	10,100,000	.31	36,000
Sept. 21, 1949	China (People's Republic)	463,493,000	18.47	730,800,000	23.00	3,897,000
Oct. 7, 1949	Germany (Democratic Republic)	17,688,000	.70	17,200,000	.54	42,000
Apr. 19, 1950	Poland	24,977,000	1.00	30,800,000	1.00	120,000
Dec. 29, 1954	Vietnam (Democratic Republic)	16,632,000	.60	17,000,000	.53	63,000
Dec. 2, 1961	Cuba	6,933,000	.22	7,200,000	.23	44,000
Total				1,109,500,000	34.99	[12] 13,761,000

[1] Date given is that on which the country declared itself a People's Republic, was incorporated into the U.S.S.R. (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) or, as in the case of Cuba, when Castro announced he would lead Cuba "to a people's democracy." East Germany excludes Berlin in all columns.

[2] Because it is extremely difficult to obtain reliable demographic data for the years prior to 1955, most of the population statistics has been synthesized from the following sources: "Statesman's Yearbook," 1917, 1940, 1941; "U.N. Demographic Yearbook," 1955, 7th issue, table 3, pp. 117-127; "U.N. Demographic Yearbook," 1962, 14th issue, "World Summary," p. 124.

[3] In most cases the population given is quite close to the date of communization. In certain cases, however, the data available was several years distant from the date of communization.

[4] The availability of world total population upon which the percentages must be based is even more difficult to obtain The following world figures taken from U.N. sources were used: 1920, 1,811,000,000; 1930, 2,015,000,000; 1940, 2,249,000,000; 1945, 2,423,000,000; 1950, 2,509,000,000; 1955, 2,750,000,000; 1960, 3,008,000,000; 1961, 3,069,000,000.

[5] "World Population, 1963," Population Bulletin, vol. XIX, No. 6, October 1963. (Percentage for 1963 based on world total of 3,180,000,000 persons.)

[6] Total world area, excluding Antarctica: 52,409,000 square miles. Communist nations constitute 26.25 percent of this figure.

[7] 1915.

[8] 1939.

[9] Presently included in all U.S.S.R. statistics.

[10] 1935.

[11] 1934.

[12] 26.25 percent.

Power, Money—and Now Publicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that a degree of calmness is returning to the national scene, we can more objectively reappraise the tragic events of November 22. I feel a quite and proper reanalysis of the entire chain of events, including the fantastic glare of TV, radio and press coverage of details is in order.

An article by Columnist Eric Sevareid which was carried in yesterday's Washington Evening Star is a practical contribution to reevaluating national publicity patterns, and I insert the article into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members.

POWER, MONEY—AND NOW PUBLICITY—THIRD MAJOR CORRUPTING FORCE BLAMED FOR CALLOUSNESS LEADING TO OSWALD DEATH

It was hatred concentrated to the point of paranoia that killed President Kennedy. About such a state of mind very little can be done; individuals like Oswald will always be with us. But it was sheer disrespect for the legal rights and processes which make civilized life possible that killed the President's killer, and about this condition much can be done.

The events in Dallas revealed in a blinding flash the degree of venom that has been poisoning the American society. They also revealed for all to comprehend the alarming degree of carelessness and callousness with which police, prosecutors and all the information media have for a long time and in many cities handled everything that is implied in that precious phrase "due process of law."

It is hard to disagree with the Civil Liberties Union, which asserts that Oswald could never have received a fair trial. He was convicted by the police and thereupon and therefore by the news media, neither of whom have any business convicting or acquitting anyone. It is hard to disagree with those who oppose turning the Ruby trial into a public spectacle even though his guilt will be admitted at the outset.

For a long time now, in this age of publicity, we have been debasing the very things by which we must live. We have debased the word "fame" by substituting "celebrity." We have elevated the athlete over the scholar, the police and prosecutor over the judge, the public arena over the courtroom. Justice by publicity is not justice. We have reached the point where most of the ablest lawyers in the country refuse to take criminal cases for fear of taint by publicity, as we were once in the condition where most of the best lawyers were afraid to take loyalty cases. The late Senator McCarthy did not invent guilt by accusation, we were getting there on our own, but he helped condition this society to the strange and frightening process.

What the Dallas police did in the case of Oswald any number of other police in other cities have done in the cases of hundreds of other suspects. Even the FBI which, by the uncanny inversions of publicity has become more sacrosanct than our Highest Court, has

declared men guilty before any trial was held. It has been common practice for police at all levels to announce confessions which ought not be revealed outside a courtroom.

What ought to be our most august lawmaking body, the U.S. Senate, has felt unembarrassedly free to provide a national platform so that the cheapest of cheap crooks could broadcast accusations against men not yet tried and found guilty. The news media have simply gone along in most cases. Indeed, we have endured the spectacle of microphones and cameras thrust as a suspect freshly caught and handcuffed with the demanding question, "Why did you do it?"

A certain number of lunatics at large is something any society has to endure. But a spreading disrespect for the legal procedures without which the substance of law and therefore of order cannot be protected is not endurable and need not continue. This wretched condition is not a helpless matter of human nature. It is a matter of offices, organizations and formal codes of conduct. The organizations of policemen, prosecutors, lawyers, and journalists have their own codes, written or understood. They have only to live by them.

Since Biblical times and before, wise men have seen and acknowledged that power and money are corrupters. The 20th century has added a third factor to the list—publicity.

It's Time for a Sensible Gun Registration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many bills have been introduced to tighten up the existing Federal Firearms Act in an effort to help prevent weapons of the type described in the following editorial from getting into the hands of minors, mental incompetents, and criminals. After what happened in Dallas—where we were shown the results of a weapon in the hands of a deranged individual—one should not wonder that many are trying to change the law, but only why it has not been done before this.

The following statement of editorial opinion was broadcast over radio station WINS in New York on December 5, 1963:

LISTENERS URGED TO HELP RESTRICT RIFLES AND SHOTGUNS

(By Mark Olds, WINS general manager)

A 26-year-old Queens career girl is shot to death at her dressing table * * * the murder weapon * * * a .22 caliber rifle * * *. In the Bronx, a 19-year-old robbery suspect is slain in a dimly lit hallway * * * the weapon a .22 caliber rifle * * * and while playing soldier, a 13-year-old Brooklyn girl is accidentally shot to death by her sister * * * the toy a shotgun.

These incidents spell out the facts. There are too many rifles and shotguns in this city. Today, anyone with $20 can purchase a shotgun or rifle. He can store it at home, or carry it through the city streets with no fear of arrest because it's perfectly legal.

WINS calls upon the city and State to enact laws restricting the sale of shotguns and rifles. Many will vehemently oppose this. To them it is a violation of the constitutional right to bear arms. We maintain that in today's society restricting the sale of weapons is in the public interest.

If you believe this, write to: "Guns"—WINS, New York 23, N.Y.

Stand with WINS in moving to rid the city of the fear, shootings and slayings, which to a large part, may be attributed to the unrestricted sale of rifles and shotguns. If you agree, write to: "Guns"—WINS, New York 23, N.Y.

Murder Begets Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Mr. J. James Moore, president of Ears, Inc., an editorial service organization located in Pittsburgh, a copy of an editorial they issued on December 4.

I believe that Mr. Moore, who is no relation to the William L. Moore referred to in the editorial, has expressed, in a forthright manner, the great need for some soul searching in America.

This murder was a headline story—back in April—but in reality the general public considered this another incident and dismissed it from their minds. The murder of our President, however, shook complacent Americans out of their lethargy and many are now becoming aware—for the first time—of the vicious undercurrent of hate and destruction which has been gnawing at the principles of our Nation for an undetermined length of time.

This is indeed a cruel way to be awakened to the prevailing attitude of the day, but, let us hope it is not too late to correct and mend our ways. The life of a young and inspiring President is a costly price for a nation to pay for its indolence and failure to recognize the many inadequacies in actual practice in our land.

I am sure many of my colleagues will appreciate this expression of indignation by Mr. Moore, and, Mr. Speaker, I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MURDER BEGETS MURDER

How many of you remember William L. Moore? Does mention of his name bring back any sad recollections? It should!

William L. Moore was a Baltimore mailman. He was found dead on the shoulder of U.S. 11, some 60 miles northeast of Birmingham, Ala., last April 23. He was shot in the head and the neck—just like President Kennedy was in Dallas.

Moore's body was found on the roadside, tangled in the crude sandwich-board sign he wore on his projected hike from Chattanooga, Tenn., to Jackson, Miss.

You could assume that Moore would be greeted with some scorn, perhaps jeers and maybe even a barrage of stones as he trudged through Alabama on his one-man crusade against segregation. A man wearing a sign advocating equal rights for all isn't likely to be welcome in Alabama.

But who would think that an unknown man like Moore would be murdered? Who would think that the President of the United States would be murdered?

President Kennedy at the time termed Moore's killing "outrageous." The Governor of Alabama, George C. Wallace, a stanch segregationist, called it a foul deed and a "dastardly act." He even had a reward posted for the arrest of the killer.

We know the reason for Moore's killing. But why was President Kennedy assassinated? Was there any similarity between these two crimes?

Moore was killed because he carried a sign on his back, a sign that read "Equal Rights for All." It was a cold, calculated murder done in the dark of the night with two rifle bullets as Moore walked down a highway in the United States of America—a civilized country.

Moore was born in Tennessee and spent his boyhood in Mississippi. He was a southerner and he knew the South. He was a brilliant man and a tortured man who cried out against man's inhumanity to man with a sign on his back. President Kennedy did the same thing in his speeches.

At the time of Moore's death newspapers, radio and TV stations across the Nation cried out with these words: "The blame for Moore's death is shared by all who have condoned violence as the answer to progress and who create the atmosphere of brutality."

Do those words sound familiar? Do they have more meaning since the brutal death of President Kennedy? We certainly hope so.

Specially written for you.

A WORD FOR DALLAS

Dallas, so we are told, is concerned for its image as a result of the horrifying events which occurred there. Civic leaders of the Texas city have held meetings on the problem and a publicity campaign is reportedly shaping up to make the Nation think well of Dallas.

We don't feel such a campaign is necessary. Nobody can blame Dallas for men like Lee Harvey Oswald, or, for that matter, Jack Ruby. Police vigilance, in the killing of Oswald, was lax, but how lax? One stupid policeman at the garage door leading into the city jail may have been responsible. Certainly, the people in Dallas cannot be blamed for what either Oswald or Ruby did.

All this shame on Dallas talk is baloney. Dallas is no different than Birmingham, Chicago, New York City, Detroit, Hollywood, Miami, Boston, and other cities. Nuts, killers, rapists, and arsonists live in all those cities and frequently do grave harm to harmless citizens. But no shame properly attaches to the cities on that account.

It is no disgrace to Dallas that President Kennedy happened to be murdered there by a Communist whose spiritual home is Havana, Cuba.

The ghastly events were not symptoms of something peculiarly amiss in Dallas. They were symptoms of something amiss in these United States. This is a violent country. What we need are more police and tougher judges. Let's not make Dallas our scapegoat.

Specially written for you.

OUR GALLANT LADY

Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy is no longer the First Lady of the United States but she certainly remains so in the hearts of her fellow Americans.

Although others have criticized her while she was living in the White House, we made it a strict policy never to say anything critical about her. If fact, we have always delighted in saying nice things, lauding and praising Mrs. Kennedy. She is undoubtedly the most outstanding First Lady in our country's history.

We plan to continue the same editorial policy with Mrs. Ladybird Johnson. She is not a public official. She is the wife of the President. If we can't say good things about her—then we will remain silent.

Specially written for you.

Vietnam Coup Has Its Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a report by Marguerite Higgins entitled, "Vietnam Coup Has Its Price," needs to be read and reread by the largest number of people possible. It is to show the "wrong" to those who condemned the good Premier of Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, that I place this article in the RECORD. Ngo Dinh Diem's murder was a catastrophe not only for the people of Vietnam, but also for the people of the Orient and the entire free world.

Marguerite Higgins needs no acclaim as a first-rate news reporter. She is well known for reporting the truth and the facts. Her article follows:

VIETNAM COUP HAS ITS PRICE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

SAIGON.—President Johnson has inherited Vietnam's problems at a time when the situation is likely to get worse, in terms of battles and terroristic attacks, before it gets better.

There already has been a setback in the war against the Communist Vietcong since the coup d'etat occurred November 1. But this was predictable.

Those Americans who felt that the coup d'etat was in the interests of the United States were fully warned that a price would have to be paid for getting rid of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother, adviser, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

For example, it is impossible to replace nearly 40 province chiefs who are the backbone of the war effort without creating uncertainty and a hiatus in authority that amounts to an invitation to the Communists to increase their pressure.

MORE TERRORISM

The price paid for the coup d'etat included a sharp rise in terroristic bombing attacks in Saigon. President Diem's police and special forces may have been guilty of brutality, but they did manage to reduce terrorism inside Saigon to almost nothing.

In the crucial and rich Mekong River Delta area, there have also been important losses of real estate. On a visit to the 21st Division area near Mytho in August of this year, I was able to drive in a single unarmed jeep through a large strategic hamlet complex of which Maj. Olen O'Connor, the sector adviser, was very proud. The area had been virtually immune to Vietcong harassment for the entire year.

But in revisiting the area this month, Major O'Connor said the entire hamlet had been completely infiltrated by the Vietcong in operations begun November 3, 2 days after the coup d'etat.

GAINS TEMPORARY

These gains, hopefully, are temporary and will be reversed when the new military junta has a chance to put its mind back on the war.

Despite the sadness of any setback, the stepped-up tempo of the Viet Cong could be of use if it dispelled the myth that dancing in the streets of Saigon and the popularity of the military junta would work some magic on the war. This is misleading nonsense.

If popularity or democracy really were "the best weapon against communism," Czechoslovakia's Jan Masaryk would not be dead today and Czechoslovakia would not be Communist. Czechoslovakia's democratic ways could not save it from the Communist coup d'etat of 1948.

In talking of popularity in Vietnam, the question must be asked, "Popularity with whom?"

CRITICAL INTELLECTUALS

The military junta's popularity is with the citified, educated students, particularly those of Saigon and Hue. But these intellectuals form a small percent of the population in the city which in turn represents less than 10 percent of Vietnam's largely peasant population of 14 million.

Further, the intellectuals of Vietnam always have been undisciplined, driven by factionalism and jealousies and convinced that constant criticism is a mark of intelligence.

In six different trips to Vietnam, this reporter has found students and intellectuals markedly uninterested in fighting or winning the war against the Communist Vietcong—if it means a contribution from them.

Now, many students are hailing the death of Mr. Diem, in contrast to peasants who take a wait-and-see attitude. And none of the students showed any change in their aversion to help the war effort.

COURTS DANGER

In its earnest efforts to be liberal and please the Americans with its democratic image, the military junta has begun to court the same danger of mobocracy that brought on a crisis in such Asian countries as Korea.

Just last week in Hue, 10,000 students demonstrated to demand the firing of teachers who had failed to denounce Mr. Diem vigorously enough to suit them. There have been similar demonstrations in Saigon and the Provinces.

This Asian version of on to the guillotine has been encouraged by the excesses of the Saigon press.

Even the most anti-Diem Vietnamese of them all, the Buddhist leader, Thich Tri Quang, a militant onetime member of the Communist Viet Minh liberation movement, complained about the Saigon press over an interview which quoted him, but which he said he had never given.

The targets of some of the Saigon press smear campaigns include Gen. Paul Harkins, head of the American military mission.

The Saigon press, even at one point, set up a cry for the blood of President Diem's 94-year-old mother.

HANDICAPS GENERALS

Under pressure of this extremism, the military junta has arrested many persons without confronting them with any legal charges and merely on the suspicion of having been "excessively loyal."

These pressures from the mob, and the Vietnam press, are clearly handicapping the generals from getting their minds off the political aftermath of the coup and back on to the war.

Said a British official currently in Vietnam, who was instrumental in winning the anti-Communist guerrilla war in Malaya.

"A certain degree of authoritarianism is necessary to win this type of war. When I see what license and scurrility result from the so-called new freedoms here, I think people—and the press—of Vietnam need discipline for more than the people of Malaya."

The Eternal Flame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a resident of Minnesota's Second Congressional District, Mrs. Dana Anderson, was so moved by the events following the assassination of our late President Kennedy that she composed an excellent poem entitled "The Eternal Flame."

I insert Mrs. Anderson's poem, written using her pen name Elsa Romberg, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

THE ETERNAL FLAME

Think ye now that my light is out
That assassin hands have dealt a blow?
Think ye that all my lips have formed
Now lie with me in earth below?

Ideals that have their life from God
Die not at all when flesh is spent;
Philosophy the Bible gives
Lives on and to the world is lent.

See now the flame marking my grave,
Its voice is louder far than speech
For from its leaping tongues are heard
The ideals all the world would reach.

"Ask not," it says, "what should be done
For self or nations o'er the sea
But together ask how to attain
The best today—the best to be!"

My light burns on; my flame unspent
Leaps higher to declare my way!
Take from its energy some strength!
My light burns on for you today!

Manpower Development and Training Act (H.R. 8720)

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to reassure the Members of this body that the observations of Mr. O'HARA regarding the intent of the program are correct. We recognized from the beginning that existing public and private training efforts should be maintained. In fact, special attention is given to this principle in the act.

Therefore, Mr. O'HARA is correct when he states there are some situations such as the apparel and garment industries where it would not be appropriate to use the manpower development program. In these instances it has been traditional for the employer to provide training on the job and prejob training has never been a precondition of employment. Moreover firms in these industries are highly mobile and compete vigorously with one another in a nationwide market. Training assistance to new firms, for example, in such an industry can have the effect of disrupting competitive relationships and end by forcing other firms to seek similar assistance. If assistance is not extended then unemployment may be created in one area offsetting employment being created elsewhere. And if training assistance is extended then the result can only be a shift in the training function from the industry to the Government. Certainly we want to avoid these possi-

bilities since either would be contrary to the purposes of the act. This is an important matter and I am delighted that Mr. O'HARA has brought this to our attention. I think he should be complimented for the admirable clarification he has provided.

New Towns in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Wolf Von Eckardt, part VI of his series on "Urban Renewal and the City." This part appeared in the October 26, 1963, edition of the New Republic and recommends the new towns plan developed in the early part of this century by Ebenezer Howard. The new towns idea is something which the Congress should take into serious consideration when urban renewal legislation comes before it.

The article follows:

URBAN RENEWAL AND THE CITY, VI—NEW TOWNS IN AMERICA

(By Wolf von Eckardt)

(This is the last of six articles on urban renewal. During the 3 months he was preparing these reports, Wolf von Eckardt visited Boston, Providence, New Haven, Hartford, New York, Philadelphia, Balitmore, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.)

The vivacious Lady Jackson, better known as Barbara Ward, stepped briskly into the center of the ancient theater. In the flickering light of torches held by young Greek peasants, she proclaimed that the failure of our time "to adapt human settlements to dynamic change may soon outstrip even disease and starvation as the gravest risk, short of war, facing the human species."

Then, out of the dark, they stepped forward one by one, 33 "citizens of a worldwide city," distinguished intellectual leaders from a dozen nations. Among them were Charles Abrams, Edmund Bacon, Leonard Duhl, Margaret Mead, and Buckminster Fuller from the United States, S. Giedion (Switzerland), Eiichi Isomura (Japan), W. Ostrowski (Poland) and Sir Watson-Watt (Great Britain). Each spoke a few words in his own language and then signed the solemn Declaration of Delos. It was the culmination of a 4-day floating symposium, cruising the Greek islands this summer. Courtesy, Constantinos Doxiadis who thus added dramatics to his "ekistics."

Doxiadis is the fabulous Greek city planner who operates around the globe, building and rebuilding cities from Louisville, Ky., to Peshawar, Pakistan. "Ekistics" is a word he invented based on the same Greek root as "economics" and "ecology." It denotes just exactly the "new discipline of human settlements" the sages of Delos called for. It would combine the research and labors of sociologists, economists, meteorologists and a host of others with that of the planners and architects. The gist of the Delos Declaration is that "the torrential expansion" of the modern city is too serious a matter to be left to city planners alone.

This is true, of course, but not enough. We need, as Walter Gropius has said, search more than research. There is, furthermore, no dearth of constructive concepts which, in this country at least, could use some dramatic torchlight ceremonies to expose them to public discussion and action—government action. For only government is powerful enough to avert "the gravest risk short of war" and safeguard the welfare of the 7 out of 10 Americans who now live in urban areas.

The much-heralded White House Conference, scheduled for this November, was supposed to do just that. But somewhere between the Housing Agency and the White House it vanished without a trace. It is sad and symptomatic of the New Frustration on the New Frontier that our urban philosophers must cruise to Greek islands to discuss the city, while at home, what with civil rights unrest, growing opposition to urban renewal and other headaches, a national conference seems at the moment too hot to handle.

The most promising not-so-new urban concept that should urgently be molded into a workable government program is what the British call New Towns. The British now have 15 and other countries, notably Canada, are building them, too. New Towns, alias Garden Cities, are comprehensively planned, self-sufficient new communities which offer their residents employment as well as pleasant dormitories in which to raise children.

The idea originated at the turn of the century with the enventive English Court Stenographer Ebenezer Howard. To arrest further crowding of the London slums, he proposed Garden Cities around London's periphery, each surrounded by a green belt which would provide both food and recreational space. But the gardens and the open space were not his only, nor even his central idea. His central idea was the Greek one that any organism or organization has a natural limit. Bees do not build megalopolitan hives. When their hive population reaches 80,000 at most, they breed a new queen and the old one starts a new colony on a site her scouts have found for her. This notion is as valid for people as for bees. Howard's Garden City, with 32,000 people of different vocations, was to provide a variety of enterprises and a thriving social life.

Howard died in 1928, a knighted and beloved leader of an international movement. But he lived to see his proposal realized at Letchworth, constructed in 1903, and at Welwyn, built in 1920, both close to London.

The gravitational pull of the city prevented Letchworth and Welwyn from attracting all the industry and the amenities they need to become as self-sufficient and lively as their planners have hoped. The English New Towns, too, are said to be a bit dull, lacking specialty shops, theaters, and that sort of thing which, of course, no small town, old or new, can sustain. But then the "slurbs, the sloppy, sleazy, slovenly slipshod semicities," as California housers have called our sprawling suburbs, lack urban amenities, too. And they ruin the countryside to boot.

American urbanists, notably Lewis Mumford, Clarence Stein, Catherine Bauer-Wurster, Henry Churchill, Carl Feiss, and others, have therefore long advocated Garden Cities or New Towns. The first attempt to build them in this country became part of Franklin D. Roosevelt's economic recovery effort. The resulting three towns (Greenbelt, Md., Greendale, Wis., and Greenhills, Ohio) are still shining examples of intelligent planning. The program was abandoned, however, partly because of now resolved constitutional questions, before these towns could attract sufficient employment so people could stay put.

This, too, was the fate of Clarence Stein's beautiful Radburn, N.J., built in 1929, and still a model of the ideal suburban community in the motor age. But there are no industries or offices. Like the Levittowns and other suburban developments that followed, Radburn remained a bedroom community, though with better and more congenial community facilities than most.

In this country, the idea has since remained dormant, in part because the new generation of planners became fascinated with the dynamics of Megalopolis, and partly because the Federal Government turned its attention to the limited solution of urban renewal. The younger planning experts, such as Kevin Lynch at MIT insist that Megalopolis can be made livable and efficient with superhighways and bold regional planning, though there is little to show as yet to justify this faith. The Federal Government is hesitant to go beyond what is still billed as a mere slum clearance program.

Very recently, though, the New Town idea has again intrigued private developers with apparently more investment money at hand than they ever had before. Private attempts to build self-sustaining communities have been launched at Beechtree, near Atlanta, Irvine Ranch in California, Columbine near Denver, and Reston near Washington, D.C. The ultimate test of these efforts, of course, is not their 18-hole golf courses and country club atmosphere. It is whether they will actually attract employers and whether their entrepreneurs are willing and financially able to create balanced communities which include poor people with dark skins.

But we cannot rely on the profit motive alone to promote the general welfare. A still more promising development, therefore, is the recent recommendation of Governor Brown's advisory commission on housing problems urging California to adopt the New Towns idea under State sponsorship. The commission, headed by Edward P. Eichler, one of the Nation's most enlightened and successful builders, drew heavily on the advice and experience of such housers as Catherine Bauer-Wurster and Charles Abrams. It considers it a manifest need and mandatory that the State be empowered to acquire land and make it available at low interest for properly planned urban and suburban development. It cites that Alberta, Canada, under its New Town Act of 1956, can declare any area of the Province a New Town and set up a corporation to plan and finance it. After providing the necessary improvements, the land is sold to private industrial, residential and commercial developers who are given Government loans. After development, the town becomes a municipality. Six Alberta New Towns are now underway.

Long before F.D.R.'s Greenbelt Towns, George Washington set the first precedent for governmental land acquisition when he bought the swamps on which Jefferson and L'Enfant planned the National Capital. Its proposal, the Eichler report points out, should not be associated with governmental utopias but rest, rather, "on the realistic need for assembling fragmented land and providing well-placed schools, streets, and utilities in advance of homebuilding rather than after the fact." As Charles Abrams said, "The developers will go where the Government puts the sewers."

Though the American New Towns would never be ideal cities, simply because our fickle ideas change before utopias get built, they could be proper and livable cities rather than slurbs. That means they would have enough land for schools and roads, shops, and homesites, and all the things necessary for proper functioning. Most of all, they would reserve land for growth and green space for recreation, an objective the Federal Government now tries to achieve with disappointing success by contributing 20 percent of the purchase cost of open space cost, with an extra 10 percent bonus if the space is part of a master plan. New Town residents could

reach their places of work without the bother and fatigue of long commuting, which would give them more time for their families and the much touted virtues of our newly won leisure.

"I LIVE THERE ALREADY"

New Towns, with places of work, education, shopping, and human contact right where people live, would also considerably ease traffic, much as afforestation, erosion control, and gully plugging controls river floods. As a Boston lady once put it, "I don't need to travel because I live there already."

But most importantly, perhaps, the New Towns could provide sensible and attractive low-cost housing and open the Negro ghetto. Despite some good will and Federal incentives, downtown land is simply too expensive to provide a decent living environment for large families with small means. On virgin land, acquired by the Government, it should be far easier to build low houses with gardens for poor and lower-middle income people rather than the high-rise human filing cabinets we are giving them now. It should, furthermore, be possible to evolve a system of Government-insured mortgaging that will give the poor the same opportunity for home ownership that those served by FHA now enjoy. This would go far toward eliminating vandalism and other problems public-housing projects are plagued with. People take greater pride in homes they own themselves. Once the plans are made, development of Government-owned land could proceed slowly as needs arise and employment becomes available. There need be no pressure for hasty land disposition as there is in urban renewal and no costly land speculation.

As Abrams and others have argued, the price of such orderly development is merely a slight adjustment in conventional thinking. We have accepted the fact that municipalities, States, and the Federal Government buy urban land and sell it at discount to private developers. Now we must merely adjust to applying the same principle to open land. Why should slum clearance be OK and slum prevention be taboo? Why should we allow the Government in urban renewal but not in urban creation? The only alternative to ugly cities are planned cities. The only alternative to slurbs is a planned countryside which assures all Americans the freedom of choice to live where and as they wish. Now, housing projects and highways continue to mushroom without plan and at exorbitant cost in money, efficiency and beauty. Gas stations and supermarkets continue to blight the habitat wherever their proprietors see fit. Schools are becoming increasingly expensive and hard to get to. And open country for fresh air, watershed management, wildlife, and recreation continues to dwindle.

THE FUTURE FOR NEW TOWNS

For the renewal of the central city, new towns could go far to remove two great handicaps: Traffic congestion and the near impossible task of providing inexpensive housing for those who keep coming into the city and those displaced by slum clearance. If the poor can be happily housed in the new towns and only then, can we with good conscience concentrate our urban renewal efforts on decongesting and revitalizing the inner city, on making it an attractive bustling and stimulating concentration of metropolitan functions. This includes the concentration of offices and fine places of commerce and culture as well as of apartments and townhouses for those who serve and patronize them. These people also happen to be the ones who pay higher taxes. Such urban renewal, uninhibited by the pressure to meet low-cost housing needs, can then also concentrate on an intensive effort to rehabilitate and conserve the aging structures of the middle city. We simply can no longer afford to let our old buildings deteriorate if we hope to house our exploding population.

In short, a new town program must supplement, not replace, the present urban renewal program. That program, despite flaws and hardships, should not be hampered by congressional restrictions. On the contrary, our urban renewal efforts need encouragement to press for more comprehensive and intelligent city planning, for a greater emphasis on good design and for a reform of outdated zoning and building codes. These things cannot be federally legislated. They require greater urban sophistication on the local scene. Cities must reform a real estate tax system which now rewards the slum lords and speculators. And cities must bear down on the real estate profession if it doesn't find ways of cleaning its own house.

So far new towns have been officially recommended only to the State of California. But the Federal Government, too, is beginning to think about them. Urban Renewal Administrator William L. Slayton has assigned a special assistant, Tracy B. Augur, to study the matter.

There are not only legal advantages of inducing the States to assume a greater responsibility for regional planning, the lack of which accounts largely for the mess we are in. No one, to date, has come up with effective means to assure the full and continued cooperation of America's more than 16,000 jealous local authorities on such simple matters as sewers, waterpipes, traffic and smog control, building regulations, and other essentials of a livable environment. Only one sprawling U.S. megalopolis, Dade County, Fla., has metropolitan government and that functions only when its 27 jurisdictions agree on what constitutes a common metropolitan interest, which is rarely. Special authorities for intermunicipal and interstate problems, such as ports, are being tried. But these work only if they can levy their own taxes which then tend to drain revenues needed more urgently for other purposes. There are, therefore, some people who feel that, perhaps, the States ought to be given a try. On interstate problems it might be more fruitful to let one Governor talk to another than to leave matters at the mercy of subordinate bureaucrats on varying levels. What's more, Governors might like the idea of a new town named after them.

Most of our States, to be sure, are still dominated by the rural mind. But as Housing Administrator Weaver has said earlier this month, the United States "is an urban country, and it will have to behave like an urban country." One doesn't have to travel to Delos to see that the torrential expansion and deterioration of our cities entails grave risks.

"Lyndon Johnson: Anxiety Allayed"—An Editorial in Christianity and Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an extremely thoughtful comment on our new President by the distinguished theologian, John C. Bennett, of the Union Theological Seminary.

This editorial, entitled "Lyndon Johnson: Anxiety Allayed," appeared in the December 23, 1963, issue of the journal, Christianity and Crisis.

The editorial follows:

LYNDON JOHNSON: ANXIETY ALLAYED

The first response to the death of President Kennedy was a combination of grief and anxiety about the future of our country and the world. The memorial sermon of Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, which we publish in this issue, expresses these feelings and puts them into a religious context with fine insight as they were felt by many people in Europe.

So long as John Kennedy was at the controls, there was confidence that American power would be used with wisdom and restraint. However, there had been so many widely publicized expressions of public opinion in this country that obviously lacked these qualities that, with Mr. Kennedy gone, fear arose that these wilder counsels might prevail in a crisis.

What knowledge many of us had of Lyndon Johnson was superficial and limited by stereotypes of southerners, Texans, and conservatives. Today, while the grief remains both as a feeling of personal loss and as a sense of what might have been if John Kennedy had had more time to develop and to act as President, the anxiety can be allayed. We can now say to our friends abroad that the new President will continue Mr. Kennedy's policies, that he too will be restrained and that the shock of the assassination has itself discredited the kind of extremism that has been a main source of apprehension.

The new President, as everyone says, will have his own style. He is a very much a man of action rather than of ideas. President Kennedy had a depth of understanding that may not be found in the White House for a long time. But President Johnson has purposes that are very similar to those of his predecessor.

Mr. Johnson's first addres to Congress committed him to the Kennedy program with remarkable forthrightness. He brings his own great gifts as a legislative leader, and it is not unlikely that he may be more successful in driving this reluctant Congress to enact his proposals into legislation than Mr. Kennedy. Because of our peculiar form of legislative stalement and inertia, it takes a long time to put our best ideas into practice, and there is no more effective man in the Nation than Mr. Johnson for the daily legislative struggle.

It is not only Lyndon Johnson's recent words that are reassuring. Many who have watched him closely since he became Vice President believe that he has burned his bridges as a southerner so far as civil rights are concerned. The fact that immediately after he became President he telephoned the leaders of the major Negro organizations was itself significant. He did the same with the most progressive labor leaders.

It took courage for a President from Texas to appoint Chief Justice Warren as chairman of the panel to investigate the events in Dallas. In doing this he ranged himself beside the Chief Justice, who is both one of the most controversial and one of the most beneficent figures in the United States. Mr. Johnson did not have to go out of his way to express his own personal satisfaction in giving the Fermi Prize to Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. This was another sign of his willingness to risk controversy.

The cynics may say that Mr. Johnson knows that he can win only if he gets strong liberal support in the North and that he is now playing for that. But this is not the whole story, and insofar as it is true we can recognize that men grow as a result of the roles in which history casts them. It should also be remembered that Johnson is really no newcomer as a "liberal," for he was one of the earliest congressional supporters of Franklin Roosevelt. He can be

criticized for being more liberal in Washington than in Texas politics and for some of his past associations, but the very nature of politics makes most politicians vulnerable to this kind of criticism.

The most important things to be said about the new President are calculated to remove the worst anxieties for the future that were the first effects of the death of John Kennedy. Mr. Johnson has had less relations to foreign affairs than to the management of Congress. But everything that he has said as well as everything that he has done since he became President indicates that he takes a discriminating view of the Communist nations, that he believes in negotiation, that he has no illusions about the meaning of nuclear war. He has nothing in common with those who see only two alternatives in the cold war: all-out victory or defeat.

J.C.B.

Guns Are a Rarity Today in England—and So Is Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chicago Sunday Tribune carried an excellent article describing the laws which regulate weapons in England. I believe this is a most timely article, particularly since Congress is now discussing the entire question of barring arms in our own country. The article follows:

GUNS ARE A RARITY TODAY IN ENGLAND—AND SO IS MURDER—CITE TIGHT LAWS: COPS LIMITED TO BILLIES

LONDON, November 30.—There are probably fewer than 10 persons walking about London today with guns.

The 90,000 British police don't carry guns and don't want to. They rely on short wooden clubs tucked inside the coat. To carry guns, they say, would encourage criminals to do so also. Several years can pass without a gunfight anywhere in the land.

A detective detailed to hunt down a known gunman will be issued, temporarily, with a gun and a few bullets. On turning back the gun to the police station, he must account for each missing bullet.

MONEY GUARDS UNARMED

Private guards employed by armored car money delivery services are not allowed to carry guns.

The only bodyguards normally armed are the 40 or so members of the special branch who take turns protecting members of the royal family and the Prime Minister. Normally one guard is considered sufficient per person although when the queen's husband, Prince Philip, went to Washington for the funeral of the assassinated President Kennedy, his bodyguard was doubled to two. Prime Minister Sir Alec Douglas-Home, however, made do with just one.

Few criminals carry guns. Of all criminals arrested in England and Wales over the last 3 years—about 400,000—only 159 were carrying guns. Last year only 73 robbery victims reported seeing a gun.

STIFF PENALTIES PROVIDED

To carry a gun opens a criminal to heavy punishment. Just having a gun can bring 3 months in jail and a $140 fine. A burglar or holdup man with a gun or even an imitation gun can go to jail for 14 years. A murderer who uses a gun can be hanged while stranglers or knifers face life in prison at worst.

Ordinary citizens can buy a rifle or pistol of any kind only after getting a certificate from the local police chief. Such certificates are tightly limited. Self-defense is rarely accepted as a reason. A London publisher who said he had a gun to guard against burglars was fined $45 and told by the judge: "Defend yourself with your fists."

The pistol or rifle certificate is good for only 3 years.

Generally, police chiefs issue the certificates only to farmers who need a rifle or pistol to clear their fields of pests, to acknowledged hunters, or to members of the 4,500 shooting clubs. In all of these cases, the kind of gun or pistol is precisely specified in the certificate. The rifle or pistol must be normally kept at a specified place and the ammunition accounted for. The weapon can be carried only between specified places, such as home and sporting club or hunting area. It must not be otherwise carried in a car.

Arms dealers are tightly controlled. They must keep exact inventories and report to police the sale of any gun. Police regularly check dealers' stocks.

RESTRICTED BY AGE

No person under 14 is allowed to buy or have a gun of any kind. At 14, a boy may have an airgun but must not take it away from his home. Anyone over 17 may buy over the counter a smooth-bore shotgun firing small pellets capable of killing birds or rodents. Boys between 15 and 17 may carry a shotgun if accompanied by a person over 21.

All persons buying airguns or shotguns must buy an annual license from the post office for $1.40. The post office has about 400,000 licenses outstanding.

London gunsmiths say their sales are confined almost entirely to shotguns. There was a limited demand some years ago for sporting rifles for use in Africa but such sales are now mainly abroad. Pistol sales are rare. One large gunsmith made its last pistol in 1880.

SHOOTING KEPT DOWN

Britons, amazed at the lax control over guns in the United States, claim tight limitations in Britain keep down shootings. From March of 1957 through December of 1960, only 44 persons were shot dead in England and Wales.

The general lack of guns, by eliminating an easy way to kill in passion, may contribute strongly to the low murder rate here. Last year only 173 persons were murdered in all of Britain. The United States, with three and a half times the population and few restrictions on guns, has about 9,000 murders annually.

Albert Schneider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to pay tribute to one among us who has been giving loyal service to the House for almost as long as I have been on this earth.

I am speaking of Mr. Albert Schneider who began faithfully recording the debate and discussion in the House and in committee 40 years ago today.

Mr. Schneider originally started working in the House of Representatives on a committee assignment after he won a contest conducted by then Speaker Gillett for the position.

He worked as a committee reporter for 30 years before becoming an Official Reporter of House Debates 10 years ago, and he is a former world champion shorthand writer.

I am sure my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Schneider and in thanking him for his able assistance. Let us hope he will be with us for many more years.

Memorial Address by Rabbi Moses Lehrman for Late President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memorial address for the late President John F. Kennedy delivered by Rabbi Moses Lehrman at Congregation B'Nai Moshe November 25.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS FOR THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, DELIVERED BY RABBI MOSES LEHRMAN, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1963, AT A SPECIAL MEMORIAL SERVICE AT CONGREGATION B'NAI MOSHE, OAK PARK, MICH.

We have had an extended Yom Kippur and Tisha B'av combined during the last 3 days. Three days of bewildering shock and stunning meaningless confusion held us in its grip. Perhaps history in the future will manage to extract some reasonable meaning out of this catastrophe—a meaning crystallized in our collective resolves to cast aside all pettiness, selfishness, and vanities, and work as one to bring our world nearer, nearer, however slow, to the doorsteps of the fulfillment of a vision nurtured by our martyred President—the freedom and security of man.

In the meantime the smog of horror still chokes our hearts and stifles our thoughts. The words of David in his eulogy for the slain King Saul and Jonathan rise out of the pages of the Bible, reverberate across the centuries and ring in our ears "How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle," and David continues his lament for his beloved friend Jonathan "I am grief stricken over you, my brother, you have been very dear to me." These moving and sorrowful words might as well be on our lips today.

I know that I am reflecting the crushing experience of all our people in America as well as those beyond our shores who struggle for the dignity of man, as I, feebly, attempt to portray my own bewilderment. When the final news of the death of our President reached my ears, I screamed out—"It can't be true. Unbelievable. Unbelievable." Upon the realization that it was no nightmare, but stark reality, I broke down and sobbed hysterically. When I recovered somewhat, I stood in the family room, staring helplessly into a vast emptiness. "Why" I asked myself, "do I feel so totally crushed? Is it because we have lost our head of state in so tragic a fashion?" That is so, indeed. That is sad enough—the interruption of the career of a man who stood at the helm of our Government during the most critical days of a free world. But there is a great deal more than that. I was proud to be identi-

fied with a way of life which John F. Kennedy so thoroughly and magnificently represented. I was proud each time he appeared before the world on the screen. The miracle of TV made him a frequent visitor in our home. Here was the President in our very living room, so close to us, not a distant symbol locked up in an ivory tower, but a glowing personality, a cheerful countenance, cultured, witty, dynamic, speaking to us and with us. He had grown on us. We grew accustomed to his face, his smile, his sincerity, and idealism. He had become so much a part of our household.

His keen intellect was an inspiration and a stimulation to me. As he spoke to us, I would see before me more than a statesman, a political head of state. I visualized him as a great poet, a gifted linguist, a master of composition, capable of expressing profound thoughts in most eloquent style. At times, I imagined him as a philospher who so ably captured the very secrets of the art of deep living and presented it so vividly and so simply.

I pictured him, at other times, as a religious teacher whose identity with our sacred literature was so marked in his appeals for rededication to the cause of man's highest aspirations. Isaiah and Hosea and Micah found lodging in the depth of his soul and in the breadth of his vision. With Isaiah he looked for the day when the sword will be turned into a pruning hook and man will not learn the art of war anymore. With Micah he translated the goals of man's striving on earth into doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God.

Thus I sensed a kinship with John F. Kennedy which becomes more real in a commonness of ideals and values than in a mere biological relationship. I considered him one of us striving for the fulfillment of the same goals, dreaming the same dreams of peace and brotherhood and working toward their attainment.

I saw in him the warm being whose acclaim did not go to his head. We all recall the intimate scenes describing his visit to distant relatives in a small town in Ireland. We watched him participate in a humble family reunion, cutting the cake and handing out slices to the humbler members of his family. He was not ashamed of his poor relatives, going out of his way to bring prestige to distant cousins at the hands of the most important man of our day. How happy he must have made his less glamorous relatives feel. What greatness. Indeed, with the prophet he taught the world a lesson in "walking humbly with God."

Several weeks ago, I had received an invitation to a dinner in New York, sponsored by friends of the Weizman Institute at which President Kennedy was to be the guest of honor. In his impossible schedule of activities he had found time even for the Weizman Institute of Israel. Thus, my kinship for the late John F. Kennedy, and thus I underwent the crushing experience at his tragic and untimely passing. Already historians are anticipating the place that John F. Kennedy will hold in the history books of the future. The rare combination of the courage of a Lincoln, the intellectual drive of a Wilson and the statesmanship of an F.D.R. guarantee his place among the immortals of all times. The late President will, for generations to come, maintain a place of honor reserved for brilliant and prophetic leadership in the annals of history.

What prompted John F. Kennedy to leave a life of comfort and security to take up the perilous road of leadership? It is always a source of stimulation to ponder upon the qualities of greatness and to behold the motivations which lead a man to give of himself unto a cause. Above everything else, there is an inner voice which summons the man to rise to the hour of destiny and to follow the call wherever it may take him. He must keep faith with himself and his God at whatever the cost may be to his personal comfort.

The voice is heard "Set my people free" and it grips him and masters him and never leaves him until his mission is done. That is the basic feature of great leadership. He cannot rid himself of that compulsion. He is captive in the hands of God. Such was the call that came to John F. Kennedy. He obeyed the voice and chose the perilous course. There was no alternative for him. He was aware of the responsibilities and uncertainties which lurked on all fronts and in his own words "I do not shrink from this responsibility. I welcome it." The security, the peace and future of his country was at stake.

It was not an extemporaneous impulse that hurled him into the thick of battle. It was a commitment begun in the earliest days of his life. All of us recall his self sacrificial heroism as an officer in the Navy on the PT boat which he commanded and which was blown up in battle. His life then hung in the balance as he feverishly labored to save his crew. This heroism on a global scale was manifest in him a year ago in October. Who can forget his courage as he faced the Nation with the gravest decision made in the history of all mankind—a decision to preserve the dignity of America and at the same time to risk atomic warfare. Who of us did not tremble with the President as he solemnly said "I am not unmindful of the risks involved." Think of the gruesome days which followed—the terrifying possibility of global war and its aftermath. This responsibility John F. Kennedy bore with the courage, and glory of a David, a Lincoln and a Roosevelt.

It was not given to him to complete his mission, but the success of his enlightened and heroic thrusts into a no man's land of apathy toward the emancipation of man is historically assured. His name will live forever in the annals of man's highest levels of attainment. It is up to us to make this attainment more real.

When President Kennedy's coffin was taken from the White House yesterday, the announcer very movingly said "President Kennedy has left the White House for the last time." These words pierced me to the very core as it did every American who listened—"for the last time." Yet something was left unsaid—"His spirit has not left it." It will hover over the White House, the Capitol, Washington, Detroit and the whole free world.

It has also been said that a piece within each of us died with the President. Permit me to add to this truth. A portion of John Fitzgerald Kennedy remains within each of us. Let us never forget that. Let us never forget that.

Fur Center Synagogue Memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Fur Center Synagogue, the spiritual pivot of more than 10,000 persons comprising the industry's population, preponderantly of Jewish faith, has expressed the poignant sorrow of its congregants, trustees, the industry at large, in the following memoriam. This memoriam appeared in Fur Age Weekly, following memorial services at Fur Center Synagogue in New York, which were marked by an overflowing attendance:

IN MEMORIAM: JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

A part of the heart of every person in the Nation, and of many in enlightened areas of the world, has been interred with the mortal but heavenly blessed remains of our late President.

Prematurely and savagely plucked from our midst; ruthlessly deterred in his world-enriching mission in life; leaving his loved ones crushed by sorrow universally shared; the rich heritage he left behind is gradually discernible through the Nation's tear-glistening eyes.

Although our late lamented President has been taken to the bosom of his Maker, our hearts brighten with high hopes and renewed faith in his ideals.

The seeds of racial tolerance, global friendship in the cause of freedom in all lands, sown by him in the fertile soil of brotherly love, should by our tender and dutiful nurturing yield a bountiful harvest of world peace and new dimensions to human dignity.

This much we owe to our departed leader, a great man and renowned statesman; above all a good man, indeed a good man.

The trustees, officers and congregants of Fur Center Synagogue, unanimously resolve to perpetuate the memory of our Nation's late President by erecting in the new synagogue building, a suitable plaque, and other form of memorial, as a symbol for posterity, that his memory is enshrined in Fur Center Synagogue, as it is in the hearts of all men of dedicated purpose—Jew and non-Jew alike. November 22, 1963.

Alex A. Bernstein, Chairman, Building Committee; Nathan Farber, Chairman, Fund Raising Committee; Albert J. Feldman, Cochairman, Fund Raising Committee; Harry Metzger, President; Charles Baum, Executive Vice President; Murray Greenberg, Secretary; Rabbi Samuel Blech; Abe Fried, Treasurer; Herman Gitters, Vice President.

ITT and Union Find Jobs for Exiled Cuban Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in bringing to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. in cooperation with the Federation of Telephone Workers of Cuba-in-Exile in providing gainful employment to Cuban exiles. It is known that 664 former Cuban employees of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. are in exile—524 are in the United States. Out of 433 approved applications from former Cuban employees, 232 or 53 percent are now employed and the efforts are continuing.

This is a most commendable accomplishment and is certainly indicative of the excellent company-employee relationship which exists at ITT. I take this opportunity to extend to ITT and the Federation the thanks of the U.S. Government and Dade County, Fla., for their valuable, humanitarian assistance.

ITT AND UNION FIND JOBS FOR EXILED CUBAN WORKERS

NEW YORK.—International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. said today that 232 former

Cuban employees in exile now work within the ITT system or for other companies.

This is the result of a 3-year cooperative effort by the company's management, and the Federation of Telephone Workers of Cuba in Exile, headquartered in Miami, Fla., to find jobs for exiled employees of ITT's Cuban subsidiaries, taken over by the Castro revolutionists in August 1960.

Commenting on the reemployment program, Corbin A. McNeill, ITT vice president and system-wide director of employee relations, said its success is "an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when management and labor work hand-in-hand for their mutual benefit."

Vicente Rubiera Fieto, secretary general of the federation, said:

"The traditional good relationship that we had with the management in Cuba has now, in exile, given us the opportunity to see personal concern on the part of ITT officials, who represent the corporation in endeavoring to assist the telephone workers in various States of the Union who are unemployed and suffer the needs and hardships of exile."

Working with the federation, ITT has received to date a total of 433 approved applications from former Cuban employees in exile. Of this total, 232, or 53 percent, are now employed. Of these, 128 have been placed with ITT system companies in New York, Panama, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and 104 have employment outside the ITT system.

The remaining 201 ex-employees listed as still available, Mr. McNeill pointed out, demonstrate the inherent difficulties posed by this kind of reemployment program.

"We will go right on with our efforts to find placements for these people," he said, "but there are real problems involved. Most of the individuals in this remaining group have little or no knowledge of English, and many have reached the age at which retraining, or learning English, would be difficult. Others are prevented from resettling away from the Miami area because they are responsible for elderly or sick parents or relatives who cannot be exposed to a cold climate."

Information obtained from the Federation of Telephone Workers and other sources indicates that more than 1,300 former ITT employees have left the service of the Cuban subsidiaries since the Castro takeover; more than 1,000 by resignation or outright departure and the remainder by dismissal or imprisonment, including one by execution.

Of these, 664 are known to be in exile—524 in the United States, 131 in Puerto Rico, and 9 in other countries.

As to present arrivals of ex-employees in the United States, the reports indicate they have slowed down due to lack of transportation facilities and difficulties in obtaining permits to leave Cuba. At the end of June 1963 11 arrived in Florida on the return voyage of the last ship delivering ransom goods to Cuba.

The Food Industry and the Food Stamp Plan—An Effective Approach in Combating Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective ways in which we can intensify the battle against poverty in the United States is to assure every American, regardless of income, of a well-rounded and nutritious diet. Without any doubt in the world, we have the food resources to accomplish this. Under the food stamp plan, we also have the necessary machinery—the political instrument—for accomplishing such a purpose. But the food stamp plan is in operation only in a comparatively few areas of the country—in 40 counties and in the cities of St. Louis, Detroit, and Pittsburgh. Many more areas of the country, including all of the major cities not now included, would enthusiastically participate, I am sure, if the funds were available and their expenditure authorized by law so that the food stamp plan could be extended on a nationwide basis.

But to accomplish this will require the passage of legislation. The administration's food stamp bill, H.R. 8107, which I was permitted to introduce for the administration, has been pending for many weeks in the House Committee on Agriculture after having been approved by a subcommittee. I know the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture strongly supports the food stamp idea—he proved that on many occasions over the years in supporting my efforts to have the original proposal I made in 1954 enacted into law in 1959. That law has expired. A new law is needed if the limited pilot plans now financed under section 32 funds are to be extended nationally and be financed by direct appropriations.

FOOD INDUSTRY NOT GENERALLY AWARE OF PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, one of the major reasons for the slow progress on the bill this year is that the food industry has failed to evidence as much interest in this plan as it undoubtedly would if more elements of the food industry, and of the general public, were aware of the workings of the program as now operating.

Several months ago, on October 13, I discussed the food stamp plan at the convention of the Missouri Retail Grocers Association in St. Louis. Since then I have been told that this speech presents the kind of explanation of the program and of the philosophy of the food stamp plan that warrants making it more generally available through the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am, therefore, submitting it for that purpose, as follows:

STATUS OF THE FOOD STAMP PLAN

(Speech by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, at 64th Annual Convention, Missouri Retail Grocers Association, Statler-Hilton Hotel, St. Louis, October 13, 1963)

One of the most moving phrases ever spoken in the Halls of the Congress of the United States was included in a memorable farewell speech a dozen or so years ago by General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur. I am sure you all remember it, for it is now part of the folklore of familiar quotations. Taken from an old barracks ballad, the General's reminder, in closing his military career, was that old soldiers never die, they just fade away.

In politics, it is different. Old issues neither die nor fade away. They constantly recur. They live on, and periodically flare up into immediate importance all over again. I won't try to make you a list of such issues—it would be endless. But your invitation to speak to you today on the subject of the food stamp plan took me back nearly 10 years—for it is almost that long since I introduced my bill to establish a nationwide food stamp plan, and the issue, I might add, is more alive today than it was then when I first raised it in the House of Representatives.

The difference is that now we have food stamp plans in operation in numerous areas of the country, including St. Louis, and—instead of being the visionary dream of some impractical theorist—these plans work and they work well.

HAVE PILOT PLANS JUSTIFIED EXPECTATIONS?

No longer do we debate—as I had to do over and over and over again through a series of congressional hearings and House debates—whether the idea of a food stamp plan is workable and sound, and whether it is preferable to the direct method of food handouts of surplus commodities to the needy.

The question we debate now is whether the pilot plans in operation have been sufficiently successful to justify adopting the same methods on a nationwide basis. This debate has not ended. It is still going on in the Congress. One of the reasons I was so anxious to accept your invitation to talk today on this issue is that you who represent the grocery industry in Missouri can help materially in the resolution of that national debate if you are convinced the food stamp idea is workable and desirable and should be placed in operation in all of the stores in Missouri which might wish to participate in it.

We have the plan in operation in St. Louis only because the city administration, and the food industry here in St. Louis, joined enthusiastically with me in solving a hundred or more problems of redtape and administrative headaches in what was then a relatively untried field. We felt the potential of this plan was great enough to warrant the work which went into solving the problems. And now, I believe, everyone in St. Louis who has any part in the operation of the plan, or who participates in it, recognizes the value of the results.

WORKING OUT ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

But it was not easy and effortless activity in getting the plan started, and in working out the administrative complexities and inflexibilities. At my end of the telephone in Washington, I was in constant touch with the city and State welfare people here, and with the mayor and the alderman and others vitally interested in making the plan work; and, also, I was a nuisance—I am happy to say—to the officials in the Department of Agriculture in pushing and persuading and forcing administrative changes to make the plan operate effectively and intelligently.

Now, I think the time has come to let other communities—in Missouri and elsewhere—share in what is fundamentally a very sound approach to the improvement of the diets of America's lowest income families. Do we have the food in sufficient abundance to assure every worthy American family at least a minimum-standard American diet? There is no question about it.

Our abundance of food, and our ability to produce more and more food far above our own requirements, constitute one of the most glaring differences between our system of enterprise and the Communists' approach. There are, of course, many, many other differences between freedom and totalitarianism, and the abundance of food is by no means the most important difference. There have been occasions in our history when freedom was not necessarily always accompanied by abundance of food and good eating. Most of us, I believe, would take in our belts drastically if freedom required it. It just so happens that our problems today—agriculturally—are just the opposite: that is, what to do with all of the food and how to

utilize it intelligently so it does not rot and spoil.

NOT UTOPIA ON A HANDOUT CARD

All the more reason, therefore, why it is un-American—and I use that term advisedly—for us not to make sure every American family has the opportunity for a good, nutritious, American diet. And the food stamp plan provides us the means and the method to achieve that goal.

As I told the House Committee on Agriculture on June 10 during hearings on my nationwide food stamp bill—which is the Kennedy administration measure, I might add—an administration bill which I was given the opportunity to sponsor because of my long association with this issue, even though I am not on the committee which handles the legislation—but, as I told the committee during the hearings:

"The food is here; all of us prefer to see it eaten rather than stored or powdered or dehydrated or destroyed. The food stamp plan is a workable, effective method of getting good food and needy Americans together at the dinner table, where the rest of us can be found every day of the year."

I also pointed out in my testimony that this plan is by no means "Utopia on a handout card." And I explained why.

PURPOSE IS BETTER UTILIZATION OF FOOD ABUNDANCE

For one thing, every family which can meet the rather stringent income ceilings related to family size and composition, must purchase its food stamps out of the money it would normally be expected to spend on food. This came as something of a shock to many families previously receiving free surplus food each month. They had looked upon the food stamp plan as a possible avenue for increasing their net spendable income on things other than food. But it has not worked out that way, and it has not been intended to work out that way.

The idea—and the only legal basis for a food stamp plan under existing law—is to increase the consumption of food grown on American farms. We have been spending billions of dollars over the years encouraging food output, and other billions in storing the abundance, or in subsidizing its sale or donation overseas. The food stamp plan is the only really workable and successful approach we have developed for enabling more Americans to buy increased quantities of this food. And the studies already made in the short 2 years since the first timid pilot plans were instituted show that the food stamp plan has indeed resulted in higher consumption of meat, milk, dairy products, fresh vegetables, fruit and other nutritious basic food items the very poor had not previously been able to consume.

FRESH FOODS IN PREFERENCE TO POWDERED

Why powder the surplus eggs if we can get more families to eat fresh eggs purchased in the corner grocery? Why powder surplus milk if we can get more families to drink more fresh milk? Why buy up cattle and convert them into canned meat and gravy for the free distribution program if we can enable more families to go into the meat market and buy red meats right out of the refrigerated cases?

Probably the most surprising statements in favor of a food stamp plan of aiding the needy in preference to the older method of distribution of storable surplus commodities each month from central depots came from a former high official of the Department of Agriculture under the Eisenhower administration. When I saw this material printed in a conservative publication, I was, frankly, flabbergasted. For the very man who made the report which gave the food stamp plan the edge—and a decided edge—over the distribution of commodities directly—had been one of the bitterest foes of my food stamp bill during the Eisenhower years. His name is Don Paarlberg, now a professor of agricultural economics at Purdue University, but previously an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture under Ezra Taft Benson.

Let me say that Professor Paarlberg thinks very few Americans go hungry because they are impoverished. Perhaps you in the food business, seeing what your low-income customers buy and live on, might have a different idea about that. But the former Agriculture Department official—who opposed the food stamp idea vigorously when he was in the Department—nevertheless now concedes that in operation, it has shown many, many advantages over the direct distribution method he used to defend so strenuously against my attacks.

GREAT INCREASE IN FOOD BUDGETS OF NEEDY

For these are some of the things which have happened under the food stamp plan:

First, instead of seeing their poorer customers going to a firehouse or an armory or a schoolhouse or some other distribution point to obtain large quantities of flour and dried milk and powdered eggs and cornmeal and so on, the food merchant in the food stamp areas now sees these customers back in his store buying good, appetizing, fresh and frozen and processed foods—just like everyone else.

Second, the low-income families participating in the food stamp plan, while having no more disposable income to spend on other things, have a great income increase when it comes to food purchases. They can now afford a good, well-rounded diet. Their children are introduced to the delicious foods all of the rest of us have taken for granted for years—orange juice, canned soups and frozen vegetables and fresh produce and good red meat and tasty baked goods and delicious poultry and all of the other wonderful domestically produced items you sell.

Third, the food stamp program enlists the State and local authorities in a direct manner and gives them many responsibilities for certification of eligibles. This is no longer done on a hit-and-miss basis, as was often the case in the direct distribution program where no one seemed to care too much how much chiseling went on—after all, it was just surplus stuff the Government couldn't get rid of any other way except shipping it overseas to give away there. But now the local authorities and the State welfare people must investigate and certify—and take responsibility for eligibility.

REGULAR CHANNELS OF TRADE

Fourth, the regular channels of trade are used all of the way through—from manufacturer to wholesaler to retailer.

Fifth, the costs of the program are clearly identifiable. Under the direct distribution program, the actual cost of the free food items is hard to determine, the storage and distribution costs are cloudy because they are divided among various jurisdictions and authorities, and the value of the time devoted by public officials at the various levels to the distribution functions can never be really accounted for. Under the food stamp plan, there are costs—there are expenses. But they are visible and ascertainable, and pretty exact. And the interesting thing about the costs is that even taking into consideration the subsidies involved—the difference between the amount each family spends in purchasing the food stamps and the cash value in terms of the food which can be purchased with those same stamps—the cost to the Federal Government would be about the same under a nationwide food stamp plan as they are now for the direct distribution program.

That is because the storage and packaging and shipping and warehousing and refrigerating and other costs which are necessary under the direct distribution plan would be eliminated under the food stamp plan. A customer coming into your store and buying a pound of butter out of your refrigerated case, and paying for it with a food stamp coupon, is paying for all of the costs of distribution with that coupon. But when a free pound of butter is handed out at a food distribution center, has the Government not had to shoulder similar distribution costs? Of course it has. And these would be saved. Together—adding together the present costs of direct distribution of surplus foods—they come to an amount equivalent to the subsidies involved in a food stamp program.

MORE PUBLIC CONCERN REQUIRED

So what is holding up the adoption of the food stamp plan on a national basis? The answer is that you are—you and others in the food business around the country who have not yet made your voices heard in the Congress on this issue; and your customers, who have not yet learned of the advantages to the needy and to the public of the food stamp plan over the direct distribution system; your Congressmen, and Congressmen from other States, who have not seen enough evidence of interest back home in this issue; and public officials at every level, who have failed to call for action in Congress.

The Secretary of Agriculture is solidly behind this plan. So is the President. So is the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. Hearings have been held on my bill and a subcommittee has recommended some technical changes which I was willing to accept, and which the administration accepted. I look for action in this session—if there is more interest on the part of grocers, wholesalers, manufacturers, and others in the food business, and more interest on the part of public officials at every level, and more awareness on the part of the general public and of the press to the importance of this idea in building better diets and having better nourished Americans in a nation overwhelmed in food abundance.

Unfortunately, I do not at the present moment see any substantial Republican support in the House Agriculture Committee for the plan. They talk about making it a joint Federal-State plan with the States shouldering half of the cost of the food stamp subsidies. If that were to be written into the bill, the program would be killed. There is no doubt about it.

PRIMARILY AN AGRICULTURAL STIMULATION PROGRAM

Missouri, for instance, is not going to appropriate the money to pay half of the cost of the present subsidy in the food stamp plan in St. Louis. It took a lot of doing even to get the State to shoulder some of the costs of certifying the eligibles under the regular welfare machinery. If the State were going to spend more money for its welfare clients, it would probably prefer to increase the monthly checks—and that, of course, is a necessity in any event. The State of Missouri is worried about the adequacy of many welfare costs—medical, rent, clothing, and so on—not just the food costs of its welfare recipients. Every State faces this problem.

The Federal program, however, is not primarily a welfare program—it is a food purchase stimulation program. It is an Agricultural stimulation program, now being paid for out of customs receipts earmarked for the farmers' benefit. One-third of all import duties, by law, are earmarked for surplus food removal purposes or other programs to help stimulate the consumption of agricultural products. It is this source of funds which has financed the food stamp pilot projects.

ATTEMPTS TO SCUTTLE PROGRAM

Under my bill, we would also add direct Federal appropriations to make the plan nationwide. But it would still be a farm-help program primarily. Unless and until we ever increase welfare payments to a level which

would enable the recipients to afford all of the elements of a decent minimum standard of living, including a good diet, there is no other way to assure adequate quantities of good food for the lowest income families in our midst.

If a proposal comes under the heading of aiding the farmer, however, it is amazing how much help we can get for the undernourished. And that is the basis on which this program now operates. It may not be the most idealistic basis on which to approach it—but it works. And that, in itself, is important in a democracy.

So my advice to the grocers of Missouri—those of you from outside St. Louis who also want to enjoy the advantages of participating in this program and who want your low-income customers also to participate—is to get after your own Congressmen and impress upon them the values and virtues of this proposal. Get the grocery industry nationally more directly involved. Get the food manufacturers and processors into it—some have already shown an interest.

And, by all means, don't let the idea be scuttled by impractical amendments and conditions imposed by those who are fundamentally opposed to the whole idea, and who always have been opposed. I am not being partisan when I say that I never got a single Republican vote out of the House Agriculture Committee on my food stamp idea—not once in 10 years. Therefore, I do not intend to go along with crippling amendments intended to appease the enemies of the legislation. On a rollcall vote in the House, I know we can win. The problem is to get the bill out of committee without killing its effectiveness, and I think we can do that, too, if the food industry will join in the fight, and fight intelligently.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT IN AREAS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

This is not a partisan issue, but some partisans have made, or tried to make, partisan advantage out of it. In an instance I am sure you all heard about, a Member of Congress attacked the pilot plans because all of them, at first, went into areas represented by Democratic Members of Congress. But after his anguished cries of the partisanship he claimed was present in the establishment of the pilot programs, implying that Democrats were alone enjoying the benefits of this wonderful program, he didn't lift a finger to try to get it for his own district, or to help get through legislation which—like my bill—would extend it to all districts.

On the other hand, one of the strongest supporters I have had in the Congress for my bill is a Republican Congressman from Pennsylvania who now has a pilot food stamp plan operating in his district. I helped him get it. I supported his efforts. Why? Because, the first time I ever succeeded in having the idea voted on in the House—and it was a bitter battle—he was the only member of the minority party to stand up and support me. Since then, many other Republican Congressman have helped—but none on the Agriculture Committee.

So it is not partisanship—it is primarily a reflection of the kind of district a Member represents. Those Members with a high percentage of unemployment in their districts, and with substantial numbers of people on welfare or receiving surplus food, know what the food stamp can mean in terms of a better diet and a better life for their people, and a better break for the neighborhood grocer, too, I might add.

ST. LOUIS PLAN A SOURCE OF PRIDE

My parting plea, therefore, is: Make sure your Representative in the Congress knows of your interest in this plan. You carry weight with him, for you are a local businessman and what you think about proposals in the Congress bearing on your business are important to your Congressman.

The food stamp plan, as I said, is not utopia on a handout card. It is stringently administered, and if you get it installed in your area, many of your eligible families may not want to participate, at least not at first. That would indicate either that they don't need the help, or that they don't want it; or, and this is more likely, that the administrative red tape is strangling their interest. That happened at first in St. Louis, but we pretty well corrected it. The requirements were overly rigid; they were initially drafted in Washington and Chicago, not St. Louis.

But if a program is valid, and needed, and wanted—the bugs can be worked out. And what has resulted in St. Louis is a source of pride to all connected with it. It certainly is a source of pride to me.

Research on Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development recently filed a report setting forth some of the basic issues relating to Government and science, and listing some questions that deserve attention.

There has been a great deal of public and scientific interest in this report. Universities and scientific centers throughout the country have asked for copies and it has stimulated some serious and concerned discussion, as we had hoped it would.

The use of science by this Nation in developing its future course must be wise and effective. Over the past decade, our Federal authorities have made more and more use of broad research to examine possible courses of action and provide guidelines for decisions. Congress has authorized a great many programs which would encourage just such research.

This is what has prompted occasional soul searching here about the proper way to control and define the uses of such research. We are not alone. All modern Nations have recognized the importance of scientific research to future growth, as well as to the power structure in world affairs.

The importance of considering national policy for science, and promoting greater understanding of the benefits and risks of research, has been widely discussed in the press as well as in Congress. Legislative study has been encouraged. More and more voices are being heard, contributing to this discussion. We welcome it, and I should like to commend to the Members an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News which helps to put this debate in perspective:

RESEARCH ON RESEARCH

While determined to slow down the skyrocketing costs of Federal support for every sort of research program, Congress has recognized the need for a better understanding of just where present research policies are heading. This is all to the good.

The deepening sense of congressional frustration at the runaway size and complexity of federally sponsored research projects is well illustrated in the thoughtful report issued this week by the House Science and Astronautics Subcommittee.

The spending rate for all research and development programs has been rising so rapidly (doubling every 4 or 5 years) that the subcommittee wonders whether Congress is equipped to give "effective direction" in setting priorities and appropriating wisely in the field of science.

It isn't just the amount of total research spending ($15 billion this year) that has soured the romance between Congress and science. The lawmakers are dismayed to find that the "galloping technical revolution is threatening to outrun the number of talented people necessary to nourish it."

They are troubled by conflicting counsel from the scientific community, a "pork barrel" proclivity in the dispensing of funds, the proliferation of a science bureaucracy in some 40 Federal agencies sponsoring research work, and by geographical imbalances in the distribution of grants to industries and universities.

President Eisenhower gave the same warning while he was in office.

It is a different sort of imbalance, however, that alarms respected members of the science community. Dr. Carl P. Haskins, president of the Carnegie Institution, warns that our national tendency to equate success in research with "sheer magnitude of effort" (as in the space lunar expedition) can penalize less glamorous endeavors and do incalculable damage to our "whole pattern of scientific scholarship."

The comprehensive review of the technological scene to be undertaken now by the Science Subcommittee and by a separate nine-member panel organized last summer signals the end of an era in which Congress was willing to sign almost any kind of a blank check for "research."

And the most encouraging sign in all this is the recognition that Congress, having fragmented its jurisdictions among dozens of committees dispensing research money, must educate itself with much more assurance if it is to exercise wise judgment in channeling limited resources in brainpower and money for desirable national goals.

Speech Delivered by President C. Easton Rothwell at Mills College Ceremonies Attending the Death of President John F. Kennedy, Friday, November 22, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, during this period of mourning for the late and beloved President Kennedy, many fine essays and poems have been written lauding the greatness of this man who gave so much on behalf of his country.

In addition to the written words, many beautiful ceremonies and speeches were delivered as eulogies to John F. Kennedy. Among these profound speeches was one delivered by President C. Easton Rothwell of Mills College in Oakland.

I am very pleased to be able to insert his address delivered at special memorial

ceremonies held at Mills College on the night of the terrible tragedy:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY PRESIDENT C. EASTON ROTHWELL AT MILLS COLLEGE CEREMONIES ATTENDING THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

The death of the President has stunned us all. We share in disbelief the realization that his life has been taken for reasons that cannot be anything but trivial by comparison with our well-being as a people or the destiny of the world of which we are so much a part.

This is a moment for grief—the grief we share with the President's family, grief in our loss of a courageous and intelligent first citizen. Whatever our political convictions, we, as Americans, recognize the deep tragedy of a leader struck down in pursuit of his convictions, convictions broadly shared by the people he represented, convictions within which there was no place for the hatred and violence that took his life.

We know that in this Nation ideas are fought upon the battleground of discourse. Issues are won and lost by the peaceful, if turbulent, exchange of debate, by the quiet privacy of the ballot box. They are never settled by a gun fired clandestinely at a man who bears upon his shoulders the most grievous responsibilities of our Government.

Let us be thankful that we live in a nation which can, in the midst of its shock and grief, proceed in orderly fashion to elevate its Vice President to the Presidency. With heavy hearts but with confidence we can say, "The President is dead. Long live the President."

Of course, we shall carry forward. Life must be lived. The Government must govern. The democratic way in its deepest and most sombar sense must prevail. We on this campus, like our fellows across the Nation, shall pause to pay our tribute, and then return to our work. How better can we expiate our shock? How better can we live out our finest traditions; how better express the spirit of a man who expected so much of us?

Our Nation will recover. In this profound test of our spiritual resources we shall respond with an inner knowledge that we can meet whatever the future may bring.

This is a moment for sadness. It is a moment for reflection upon the great waste of all young men who are taken too early in the service of their country, the more so when they are taken by violence. It is a moment for prayer. But it is also a moment for rededication to a people and a nation and a government that can move forward calmly in the midst of tragedy to express without interruption the common will.

Statement of Mayor James H. J. Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, December 12, 1963, the distinguished mayor of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, testified before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works in support of the extension of the accelerated public works program. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include below his excellent statement before the committee:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR JAMES H. J. TATE, MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. Chairman and committee members, I am honored to appear before you today for the purpose of urging an extension of the accelerated public works program. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the hearings of the House Public Works Committee on this subject, but I did submit a written statement setting forth our experience with the program in Philadelphia during the past year and our conclusions as to the benefits to be anticipated by extension of the program. Today, I would like to reiterate that statement and to make the benefits of our experience available to you so that you may see how the program operates in actual practice at the local level—the working level. We, in Philadelphia, have been among the most virgorous supporters of the program since its inception, and now its great value, practicality, and effectiveness have been proven by actual experience. I urge, therefore, your approval of extension of the program, being convinced that it is a good program and an impressive example of the effectiveness of Federal-local cooperation with the assistance of our competitive private enterprise system.

Certainly, any local governmental jurisdiction would prefer to be self-sufficient if at all possible. There are many reasons, however, why this often cannot be done. One of the most important is the fact that unemployment is a national problem that transcends city, county, or State boundaries.

The increase or decrease in job opportunities within a city or labor-market area are tremendously influenced by national policies which affect the overall economic growth rate of the country, as well as by major regional shifts in location of employment-generating industries resulting from changes in resource utilization, technology, labor supply and costs, and changes in transportation costs.

At the local level we are also hampered by the fact that local revenue resources are subordinate to those of the Federal and State Governments, and must depend largely upon the already heavily burdened real estate tax to finance rapidly growing governmental programs.

Twenty percent of our Nation's population lives in poverty, and these same unfortunates are attracted to the urban centers of our large metropolitan areas in search of employment or cheaper living costs. Thus central cities, like Philadelphia, have undue financial burdens stemming from a national problem and what is certainly a national responsibility.

The accelerated public works program is a practical and effective means of attacking unemployment, and at the same time relieving other critical municipal problems more quickly. I am sorry to say that critics of Federal programs which aid local governments frequently overlook these facts of life which exist at the municipal level.

The trend of unemployment in Philadelphia has been a matter of great concern for a long time. At the end of July, 80,000 persons in our work force, or 9 percent, were unemployed. The problems caused by this condition are not getting better, despite heroic efforts to stimulate programs for increasing jobs locally. The APW program offers one means of attacking this problem by helping us to help ourselves.

At this point, I must take vigorous exception to statements made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in testimony before the House Public Works Committee to the effect that Philadelphia decided not to increase its own spending because of the availability of Federal grants. This is not only completely untrue, but it reflects the archaic thinking of the present leaders in this organization who still live in the past while the rest of the world marches on. Even our own Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia acknowledges that the APW program is a constructive effort, and has disavowed the position of the so-called leadership of the U.S. chamber.

The fact of the matter is that the APW grants have enabled us to start programs now—when they are vitally needed—instead of having to wait until some time in the future. Concurrently, we have carried forward as rapidly as possible on all of the projects in our capital program, and have increased our planned expenditures by amounts which are several times larger than the total of approved APW grants.

The clearest and most direct benefit of the accelerated public works program has been in the actual on-site labor generated by each APW grant—labor which, in turn, means thousands of additional jobs supported by actual payroll expenditures of some $15 million a year. To the workers directly involved, this is income they would not have received were it not for this vitally needed program.

In addition to the direct benefit of added on-site labor, construction of public works facilities set off a chain reaction, benefiting labor and business throughout the entire economy. For example, with one of our APW projects having a cost breakdown of 60 percent for labor and 40 percent for materials, local workers were immediately benefited by the 60 percent. But, in addition, production, distribution, and transportation of the materials required labor which, if the same proportion existed, amounted to an additional 24 percent of the project cost. In turn, production of raw materials required labor which, on the same basis, would have amounted to 9.6 percent of the project cost. Thus, in the final analysis, all but a very small portion of the project funds may be assumed to have benefited productive labor.

Along with this, of course, were the additional profits inuring to the contractors, suppliers, and producers involved in the productive process. Incidentally, the reasonableness of these profits was insured by the fact that all of the construction contracts were awarded after formal competitive bidding and careful inspection of all work during construction by both city and Federal inspectors.

In this connection, I have been authorized to place on record the unqualified support of both the Contractors Association of Eastern Pennsylvania, representing management, and the Building and Construction Trades Council of Philadelphia and Vicinity, representing labor, who join with the city of Philadelphia in urging an extension of the accelerated public works program. To both groups, APW has been a material help in sustaining a high level of construction activity.

The fact that we have been enabled to have this activity now, instead of later, has helped substantially in making our urban renewal and redevelopment programs even more effective in stemming the onslaught of urban blight.

The acceleration of certain projects also provides very substantial benefits in the form of maintenance and repair savings. For example, many of our sewers are very old and had been neglected for many years. We are now overcoming the effects of this long neglect and, through reconstruction under the APW program, many of the sewers will be virtually cost free for many years to come.

That APW grants are sound investments is evidenced by the final results. To the extent to which we have put to productive use the idle capacity of our labor, management and equipment, we have acquired needed physical facilities that we would not otherwise have.

The benefits to the individual workers are clearly visible in payroll records showing take-home pay for productive effort. Equally as visible is the concrete and steel and other components of the completed physical facilities. These results are all tangible and

real accomplishments of productive effort for essential purposes. They are not ethereal, as the benefits of subsidies or payments for reducing production, nor are they the unneeded products of made-work. To the contrary, they serve essential public needs.

In summary, I sincerely believe our Philadelphia experience clearly shows that the accelerated public works program will enable communities throughout the Nation to complete now more of the basic public facilities which contribute to their economics and cultural growth as well as to the public health and welfare of their citizens. The APW program has been a significant factor in expediting this work.

Local communities and Federal agencies are now tooled up to better utilize this program in achieving its essential objective, and I believe it can be even more effective in the future than it has been until now. It is for this reason that I strongly urge the Congress to take favorable action on legislation extending this valuable accelerated public works program for 1 year.

Thank you.

Federal-State Antitrust Jurisdictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the following is an excellent article which appeared in the New York Law Forum issue of March 1963, written by my good and distinguished friend, Attorney George C. Mantzoros, of New York. George Mantzoros has had an unusually distinguished career in the practice of law and at present is assistant attorney general in the southern district of the State of New York in charge of the antimonopolies bureau. He was assistant district attorney for the southern district of New York from 1954 to 1957. Mr. Mantzoros is qualified to practice as a member of the bar of two major industrial States, New York and Pennsylvania.

As this is a thoughtful and comprehensive discussion of Federal and State jurisdiction which is of great importance to the business community as well as labor-management groups, I am including this good article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call these basic issues to the attention of the American people, the legal profession, and to the business management groups. We should know these basic tenets and rules of our U.S. free enterprise system.

The article follows:

FEDERAL-STATE ANTITRUST JURISDICTION

GEORGE C. MANTZOROS [1]

I. INTRODUCTION

Federal antitrust jurisdiction under the commerce power extends to intrastate commerce including local restraints of great importance having interstate effects.[2] Examination and analysis of comparative Federal and State antitrust jurisdiction explodes, with surprising force, the myth that the States are excluded from antitrust jurisdiction.[3] The Commerce Clause does not constitute a contraction of State jurisdiction in its traditional and historic sphere of responsibility.[4] A jurisdictional overlap, therefore, exists.

The Attorney General's National Committee in 1955 advocated a balanced program to extend the antitrust laws to all markets, national and local.[5] State antitrust capability plus the renaissance of the States' conventional responsibility in promoting and fostering the concept of competition as the rule of trade, presages fulfillment of a national goal.[6] Legislative activity includes newly enacted antitrust statutes by Hawaii [7] and Washington;[8] and the reactivation [9] and modernization of existing statutes in other States. Progress is noted toward a uniform State antitrust statutes.

State investigations and prosecutions have multiplied. California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Texas and Wisconsin pursued a positive enforcement program.[10] Numerous treble damage actions instituted by States are pending in the Federal courts. Private antitrust actions are evident.

Jurisdictions in the antitrust field, which is the power to adjudicate, must be ascertained from analysis of its two essential elements: legislative authority [11] and the manner of service of process.[12]

II. STATE ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

Regulation of monopolies and restraints of trade within the ambit of the States is exercised under the police power.[13] Legislation declaratory of and in implementation of the common law, antedates the Sherman Act.[14] Generally, State antitrust legislation has been declared constitutional.[15]

The concept of a competitive economy is deeply rooted in the States, and is vividly illustrated by declarations embodied in their constitutions condemning monopolies, as: "contrary to the genius of a free government"; [16] odious, contrary to the genius of free government and the principles of commerce"; [17] "inimical to the public welfare"; [18] and, "against policy." [19]

Federal supremacy of law under article VI, section 2, of the Constitution and the 10th amendments' reservation of State powers is the subject of continuous debate. State jurisdiction in antitrust is not immune from the seemingly eternal debate of Federal-State relations. A series of decisions adopt the position that State antitrust legislation is not preempted by the Sherman Act,[20] Federal Trade Commission Act,[21] Federal maritime and admiralty jurisdiction,[22] and Federal legislation governing copyrights,[23] banks,[24] and fisheries cooperative associations.[25]

Proponents of Federal supremacy presume that the commerce clause gives the Federal Government primary and exclusive jurisdiction.[26] This argument is usually a reecho of U.S. Supreme Court declarations that Congress intended "to go to the utmost extent of its constitutional power in restraining trust and monopoly agreements" [27] by employing "all the power [Congress] possessed." [28] Precedents addressed to measuring Federal antitrust jurisdiction under the commerce clause, however, are actually out of context and do not serve to prove shrinkage of State jurisdiction.

This presumption of preemption by coincidence of mere coverage has been emphatically disavowed by the Supreme Court in *California* v. *Zook* [29] and *DeVeau* v. *Braisted*.[30] Significantly, the Court in *Puerto Rico* v. *The Shell Co. (P.R. Limited)*, upheld the constitutionality of that Commonwealth's antitrust statute, modelled on the Sherman Act, against a challenge based on this presumption. The Court said that the enactment of this statute was an exercise of legislative power "nearly as extensive as those exercised by any State legislature" and "a rightful subject of legislation." [31]

The thread of paramount national interest in unhampered interstate commerce, uniformly regulated, is interwoven in recent preemption decisions. The principle is established "that the exercise by the State of its police power, which would be valid if not superseded by Federal action, is superseded only where the repugnance or conflict is so 'direct and positive' that the two acts cannot 'be reconciled or consistently stand together.'" [32]

State antitrust legislation neither purports to regulate nor imposes a burden which adversely affects interstate commerce. On the contrary, such legislation is uniquely harmonious with the national economic policy,[33] relieving and loosening interstate commerce from monopolistic constrictors. This view is supported by New York judicial policy which accords "great weight" [34] to Federal decisions. The United States Supreme Court decision in *Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky* v. *Tennessee* [35] is most significant on the subject of State antitrust jurisdiction. A foreign corporation had entered into an arrangement to induce merchants to revoke a competitor's orders for oil. Tennessee alleged that the purpose and effect of the arrangement was to lessen competition and thereby raise oil prices within the State. The corporation, which had been shipping the oil into Tennessee from Pennsylvania, claimed that the State antitrust action was an unconstitutional regulation of interstate commerce. Mr. Justice Holmes, speaking for a unanimous court, held:

"It does not regulate the business at all. It is not even directed against interference with that business specifically, but against acts of a certain kind that the State disapproves in whatever connection. The mere fact that it may happen to remove an interference with commerce among the States as well with the rest does not invalidate it."

Congress in 1890 made no attempt to invade the legislative authority of the several States.[36] The existence of a basis for Federal jurisdiction, therefore, does not preclude State court power to render judgment. The decision in *Leader Theatre Corp.* v. *Randforce*,[37] a private action, supports this view. The New York court held that the "exhibition and display of * * * motion pictures is of substantial local significance regardless of the interstate commerce activities involved in making films available for such exhibition and display."

The Standard Oil and Leader Theater cases, therefore, conclusively confirm a State court's power to adjudicate when the jurisdictional requirements over the person and subject matter, the monopolistic practice or act, are present, notwithstanding its reference to interstate commerce. Fundamentally, as a matter of substantive law, antitrust is a proper subject of legislation without cause for conflict in Federal-State enforcement.

III. STATE ANTITRUST JUDICIAL POWER

The States' crusade against the Trusts in the 1880's, occurred during the reign of the rule of *Pennoyer* v. *Neff*,[38] which confined the State's reach of process to its boundaries. Thus, as illustrated in *People* v. *North River Sugar Refining Co.*,[39] New York's action was limited to one of several members of the Sugar Trust.[40]

Congress in 1890 was concerned with the reach of antitrust powers to all markets. The Sherman Act, akin to other legislation,[41] was enacted to supplement State antitrust enforcement. Senator John Sherman emphasized the need for Federal legislation with its "single object" to "supplement the enforcement of the established rules of common law and statute law by the courts of the several States," and to "arm the Federal courts within the limits of their constitutional power that they may cooperate with the State courts." [42]

The recent shift to new-fashioned bounds of due process in *International Shoe Co.* v. *Washington* [43] and *McGee* v. *International Life Insurance Co.*,[44] breathes new life into

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

State antitrust capability in the exercise of judicial power. State legislatures, alert to these changes, have begun to "occupy the new enclave."[45] Washington's assertion of jurisdiction in antitrust actions to nonresidents, "engaged in conduct in violation of this law which has had an impact on this State,"[46] is one of profound significance. The decision in *Matter of La Belle Creole International, S.A.* v. *Attorney General*,[47] holding that a foreign corporation is not immune from the Attorney General's investigatory powers, represents an equally important development.

Congress in 1890, as evidenced in the House Report,[48] expressly contemplating a Federal-State partnership in antitrust responsibility, said:

"It follows, therefore, that the legislative authority of Congress and that of the several States must be exerted to secure the suppression of restraints upon trade and monopolies. Whatever legislation Congress may enact on this subject, within the limits of its authority, will prove of little value unless the States shall supplement it by such auxiliary and proper legislation as may be within their legislative authority."

Concurrent jurisdiction has been judicially affirmed. The Federal Government's action in *United States* v. *E. C. Knight*,[49] was successive and complementary to State actions against the Sugar Trust. The State of Ohio, in *State ex rel. Hogan, Attorney General* v. *The Hocking Valley Ry. Co.*,[50] was held entitled to have a dissolution ordered by a Federal Court made permanent as to intrastate commerce and to supervise the railroad's future conduct. Two Wisconsin decisions held that Federal Trade Commission enforcement did not preclude State action.[51] A Texas appellate court, in 1962, refused to abandon its jurisdiction of a State civil antitrust action because of a successive Federal criminal indictment.[52]

To inject interstate versus intrastate commerce as a formula to Federal-State relations in antitrust enforcement, presumes a definitive division of authority and leads to and constitutes the principal cause of multiple actions. But, the transformation of the national economy has obscured geographical boundaries[53] so that f rmer simple distinctions are no longer available.

A Massachusetts court wisely cautioned against abandonment of jurisdiction over antitrust, a subject historically within the State's competence, "lest it discover later that it has retracted where the Federal Government will not advance and has therefore been derelict in its duty."[54]

Anticipating challenges to jurisdiction and in the exercise of caution, State antitrust attorneys sometimes unduly restrict in the pleadings, antitrust jurisdiction to intrastate commerce requiring Federal supplementary action.[55] Moreover, resistance to the policy of the Attorney General of the United States to include in consent decrees an admission of liability for recovery of damages incurred by States and their political subdivisions, for example, promotes duplication of effort by the States and multiplicity of enforcement actions.[56] Frequently, the existence and the exact nature of the monopolistic practice in State procurement is not known or discernible from the pleadings or the judgment in the Federal action.

True, contemporaneous or successive Federal and State prosecutions do not violate the 5th or 14th amendments.[57] Fears and apprehensions of a race to the courthouse door,[58] are fanciful. Recognition of the States' capability to eliminate restraints from interstate commerce within the exercise of their judicial power insures against the possibility of any practice of multiple action brinkmanship. A comprehensive Federal-State antitrust enforcement policy with adequate liaison and coordination, can provide a policy for concurrent enforcement wherever necessary, to reach all markets and conserve Federal and State resources.

IV. CONCLUSION

It is not too early to forecast that the States are destined to play an increasingly active role in the field of antitrust administration and enforcement. In New York alone, not to mention other States, significant strides have been made since the New York Legislature, acting on the report rendered in 1957 by the New York State Bar Association's Special Committee on the New York Antitrust Laws, amended the Donnelly Act to make clear that it relates to all subjects of commerce, embracing the same economic activities as the Sherman Act.[59] There has been a steady increase in the activity of the New York Attorney General's Anti-Monopolies Bureau, giving some substance, at least, to the adage that history repeats itself. Prior to the Sherman Act of 1890, antitrust enforcement was the exclusive concern of the several States; thereafter, Federal antitrust activity tended to obscure the States' historic role. Now the States are returning to the scene, albeit in a somewhat revised role: rather than any clear cleavage along jurisdictional lines, the tendency of State and Federal antitrust authorities to supplement and complement each other's operations is already apparent, presaging the development of a unified and effective enforcement policy throughout the Nation.

---

[1] Assistant attorney general, State of New York, in charge of antimonopolies bureau (1962); assistant U.S. attorney (S.D.N.Y. 1954–7). Member of the bars of New York and Pennsylvania.

[2] *United States* v. *Employing Plasterers Association of Chicago*, 347 U.S. 186, 189 (1954). See, e.g., *United States* v. *Women's Sportswear Manufacturers Association*, 336 U.S. 460, 464. Attorney General's National Committee on Antitrust, Report (1955) 64.

[3] Annotated 24 A.L.R. 787 (1921).

[4] *Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky* v. *Tennessee*, 217 U.S. 413 (1910).

[5] Attorney General's National Committee on Antitrust, Report (1955), 349.

[6] Toy, State Trustbusters, Wall Street Journal, Aug. 11, 1960, p. 1.

[7] Hawaii Laws of 1961, Act 190 (CCH Trade Reg. Rep. par. 21, 401.02).

[8] Washington Laws of 1961, ch. 216, sec. 16; (CCH Trade Reg. Rep. par. 35, 203.16).

[9] Colo. Rev. Stat., 1953, ch. 55, art. 4, secs. 55–4–1–55–4–9 (Supp. 1957).

[10] B.N.A. Antitrust & Trade Reg. Rep. (1962–63) Nos. 78, 83; National Association of Attorneys General, Antitrust Committee Rep. (1962).

[11] *Nierbo Co.* v. *Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp., Ltd.*, 308 U.S. 165, 167 (1939) (jurisdiction over the subject matter).

[12] *Pennoyer* v. *Neff*, 95 U.S. 714, 724 (1877) (in personam or in rem) 21 C.J.S. [Courts] 43; Ehrenzweig, "Conflict of Laws" (1959) 75–77.

[13] *Smiley* v. *Kansas*, 196 U.S. 447 (1905).

[14] *Northern Securities Co.* v. *United States*, 193 U.S. 197, 338 (1904). Thorelli, "The Federal Antitrust Policy" (1954); Wilson, "State Antitrust Laws," 47 A.B.A. J. 160 (1961).

[15] *International Harvester Co.* v. *Missouri*, 234 U.S. 199 (1914); *German Alliance Insurance Co.* v. *Hale*, 219 U.S. 307 (1911); *Waters-Pierce Oil Co.* v. *Texas*, 212 U.S. 86 (1909); *Central Lumber Co.* v. *South Dakota*, 226 U.S. 157 (1912); *National Cotton Oil Co.*, v. *Texas*, 197 U.S. 115 (1905); *Smiley* v. *Kansas*, supra note 14.

[16] Texas constitution, art. 1, sec. 26. See also, North Carolina constitution, art. 1, sec. 31; Tennessee constitution, art. 1, sec. 22; Wyoming constitution, art. 1, sec. 30.

[17] Maryland constitution Declaration of Rights, art. 41. See also Oklahoma constitution, art. 2, sec. 32; Texas constitution, art. 1, sec. 26.

[18] Mississippi constitution, art. 7, sec. 198; Virginia constitution, art. 12, sec. 165.

[19] North Dakota constitution, art. 7, sec. 146; Utah constitution, art. 12, sec. 20.

[20] *Standard Oil Company of Kentucky* v. *Tennessee*, 217 U.S. 413 (1910); *Leader Theatre Corp.* v. *Randforce Amusement Corp.*, 186 Misc. 280, 58 N.Y.S. 2d 304, aff'd, 273 App. Div. 844, 76 N.Y.S. 2d 846 (1st Dep't 1948); *Speegle* v. *Board of Fire Underwriters*, 29 Cal. 2d 34, 51, 172 P. 2d 867, 877 (1946); *Texas* v. *Southeast Texas Chapter of National Electrical Contractor's Association* (Tex. Civ. App. 1962) 358 S.W. 2d 711 (1962), cert. denied, — U.S.—(1963).

[21] *Wisconsin* v. *Texaco, Inc.*, 14 Wis. 2d 625, 111 N.W. 2d 918 (1961); *Wisconsin* v. *Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation*, 9 Wis. 2d 290, 101 N.W. 2d 133 (1960).

[22] *Commonwealth* v. *McHugh*, 326 Mass. 249, 93 N.E. 2d 751 (1950).

[23] *Watson, Attorney General* v. *Buck*, 313 U.S. 387, 404 (1941); *Straus* v. *American Publisher's Ass'n*, 231 U.S. 222 (1913).

[24] *Peoples Savings Bank* v. *Stoddard*, 359 Mich. 297, 102 N.W. 2d 777 (1960).

[25] *Commonwealth* v. *McHugh*, supra, note 25.

[26] E.g., *Rothbaum* v. *R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.*, supra note 22, 280 App. Div. at p. 535. See, *Charleston & W. Car R. Co.* v. *Varnville Furn. Co.*, 237 U.S. 597, 604 (1915).

[27] *United States* v. *South Eastern Underwriters Association*, 322 U.S. 533, 538 (1944).

[28] *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader*, 310 U.S. 467, 495 (1940).

[29] 336 U.S. 725 (1949).

[30] 5 N.Y. 2d 236, aff'd, 363 U.S. 144, 152 (1960).

[31] 302 U.S. 253, 260, 261 (1937).

[32] *Kelly* v. *Washington*, 302 U.S. 1, 10 (1937). *Kesler* v. *Utah Department of Public Safety*, 369 U.S. 153 (1962); *Huron Portland Cement Co.* v. *Detroit*, 362 U.S. 440 (1960); *DeVeau* v. *Braisted*, 5 N.Y. 2d 236 (1959), aff'd, 363 U.S. 144, 152 (1960); *People* v. *Broady*, 6 A.D. 2d 674 (1st Dep't 1958), aff'd 5 N.Y. 2d 500, cert. denied, 361 U.S. 8 (1959); *Matter of Thatcher* v. *United Construction Workers*, 10 N.Y. 2d 439 (1962); *Texas* v. *Southeast Texas Chapter of National Electrical Contractor's Association*, supra note 23, at p. 714.

[33] *Northern Pacific R. Co.* v. *United States*, 356 U.S. 1, 4 (1958). *People* v. *Fisher*, 14 Wend. 9, 19 (N.Y. 1835). See also, *United States Telephone Co.* v. *Central Union Telephone Co.*, 202 Fed. 66, 70 (6th Cir. 1913).

[34] *Manhattan Storage & Warehouse Co.* v. *Movers & Warehouse Association of Greater New York, Inc.*, 22 App. Div. 332, 335, 28 N.Y.S. 2d 594, 597 (1st Dep't 1941) (Botein, J.).

[35] 217 U.S. 413, 422 (1910).

[36] H.R. 1707, 51st Cong., 1st sess. (1890).

[37] Supra note 23.

[38] 95 U.S. 714 (1877).

[39] 121 N.Y. 582, 24 N.E. 834 (1890).

[40] Thorelli, the Federal Antitrust Policy (1954) 80; 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 51st Cong., 1st sess. (1890), 2459 (Senator Sherman).

[41] *Roth* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 493–494 (1957).

[42] 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 51st Cong., 1st sess. (1890), 2457.

[43] 326 U.S. 310 (1945).

[44] 355 U.S. 220 (1957).

[45] *Bomze* v. *Nardis Sportswear, Inc.*, 165 F. 2d 33, 36 (2d Cir. 1948).

[46] Washington Laws of 1961, ch. 216, sec. 16.

[47] 10 N.Y. 2d 192 (1961).

[48] H.R. 1707, 51st Cong., 1st sess. (1890).

[49] 156 U.S. 1 (1894).

[50] 8 Ohio App. 450, 457–8 (1917).

[51] *Wisconsin* v. *Texaco, Inc.*; *Wisconsin* v. *Allied Chemical & Dye Corporation*, supra note 24.

[52] *Texas* v. *Southeast Texas Chapter of National Electrical Contractor's Association*, supra note 23, 358 S.W.2d at p. 714.

[53] *McGee* v. *International Life Insurance Co.*, supra note 48, at 222–3.

[54] *Commonwealth* v. *McHugh*, supra note 25, 93 N.E., 2d at 762.

[55] See, *Walters-Pierce Oil Co.* v. *Texas*, 212 U.S. 86, 99–100 (1909). Interstate commerce is a necessary element to a cause of action under the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. section 1), but, commerce-interstate, intrastate or local—is not a jurisdictional prerequisite to State antitrust jurisdiction over restraint of trade or monopoly. State jurisdiction is based upon the commission of an act in connection with a restraint of trade or a monopoly, e.g., Donnelly Antitrust Act (N.Y. Gen. Bus. L. sec. 342): "The Attorney General may bring an action * * * to restrain and prevent the doing in this State of any act herein declared to be illegal, or any act, in toward or making or consummation of any contract, agreement, arrangement or combination herein prohibited, wherever the same have been made" (emphasis added.).

[56] National Association of Attorneys General, Antitrust Rep. (1962) 4, 7.

[57] *Abbate* v. *United States*, 359 U.S. 187 (1959); *Bartkus* v. *Illinois*, 359 U.S. 121 (1959); *United States* v. *Lanza*, 260 U.S. 377 (1922).

[58] Dillon, Criticism of Multiple Litigation in Identical Bidding and Merger Cases, 39 Texas L. Rev. 782 (1961).

[59] L. 1957, ch. 893.

The Kennedy Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since the untimely death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, literally hundreds of proposals have been offered on ways in which to memorialize him.

On November 30, 1963, Diario Las Americas—the Americas Daily published an editorial entitled "The Kennedy Plan." Since its inception, the policy of this outstanding newspaper has been constantly embodied in the following mottos: "For a better understanding between the Americas" and "for liberty, culture, and hemispheric solidarity." It serves 21 capital cities of the Western Hemisphere—from Washington to Buenos Aires.

The Kennedy plan, as proposed by Diario Las Americas, would be a continuing, living memorial to its founder:

For gratitude, for respect, and for justice, the name Kennedy should be said when speaking of the Alliance for Progress.

The editorial follows:

THE KENNEDY PLAN

To make promises and not keep them for irresponsibility is easy though immoral. Unfortunately, many are the politicians who, at election time, offer much and do very little or almost nothing of it.

When John F. Kennedy was a candidate to the Presidency of the United States of America, he offered to give the cause of inter-Americanism his best efforts. And when by the will of the majority of his nation he reached the White House in Washington, President Kennedy made good his word. In March 1961, not yet 2 months after assuming the chief office of state, John F. Kennedy, in a memorable occasion, called together the diplomatic representatives from Latin America to announce to them the transcendental project he had termed as the Alliance for Progress, in which he offered the assistance of the United States of America, in a huge scale, for the realization of a vast plan of inter-American cooperation, tending to yield substantial improvements in the living standards of the peoples who, together with those of the United States, through their respective States, make up the inter-American system.

On March 13, 1961, thus, the machinery of the Alliance for Progress was set in motion, in what was the first pronouncement on foreign policy by President Kennedy. The young and winning statesman was commencing to make a reality of his promises of help to the sister nations of Latin America. And in the course of his tenure, to the very moment when a Communist assissin cut short his valuable and renowned existence, President Kennedy showed always his unbreakable determination to carry the Alliance for Progress to the highest tops of victory. For that reason, the plan of the Alliance for Progress deserves to bear the name of its illustrious and enlightened architect. The plan of the Alliance for Progress should be called the Kennedy plan, in homage to the egregious memory of he, who with actions more than with words, gave proof to Latin America of his noble spirit of political, economic, and social solidarity. These three elements are contained in that historic speech delivered at the White House, when President Kennedy announced his formidable plan.

For gratitude, for respect and for justice, the name Kennedy should be said when speaking of the Alliance for Progress. That is, that his name identify what his intelligence, his innermost self and his will conceived, dreamed of and started to shape into reality.

Appropriate Increases in Salaries for Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of the Board of Governors of the State of California formally expressing favor for providing certain increases in the salaries of all Federal judges:

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA,
December 13, 1963.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Post Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: Please be advised that the board of governors of the State bar of California, upon consideration of recent congressional proposals providing for certain increases in the salaries of all Federal judges has expressed itself formally as being in favor of an appropriate increase in such salaries.

Your favorable consideration of an increase in the salaries of Federal judges is respectfully urged by the board of governors.

Very truly yours,

JACK A. HAYES,
Secretary.

Frayed-Collar Friendship—Kennedy Warmth Outstanding Memory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 6, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a splendid article written by Mr. Tom Fox of the Clarion Herald in New Orleans. It gives further insight into the warm and friendly nature of our late great President. The article follows in full.

FRAYED-COLLAR FRIENDSHIP—KENNEDY WARMTH OUTSTANDING MEMORY

(By Tom FOX)

Because great men are always judged on a yardstick of great deeds, America and the free world will remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy for the big things he accomplished in life.

Yet I will remember the slain 35th President of the United States not for his varied achievements but for a little incident that took place 3 years ago.

As news of his assassination spread across the world that black Friday in November, my thoughts raced back to Evansville, Ind., where, on a rainy October afternoon, I spent an hour with Kennedy. He was Senator Kennedy then and he was campaigning for the White House.

I was a sportswriter and fun and games were my beat.

Vice President Richard Nixon had come to town and my editor barked out an assignment: "Go out and talk to Nixon about sports."

Nixon was a sports buff. He forgot about the big issues for a few minutes and talked about Ted Williams and Stan Musial and Sammy Baugh. It was a good interview, easy and relaxed. My editor was impressed.

Five days later Jack Kennedy came campaigning in Evansville.

"We've got to give the Democrats equal space," the editor said. "See if Kennedy likes sports, too."

It was not an easy assignment.

"That [sports] is not the contest this year," Kennedy said. He told me the voters should hear his views on foreign policy, the Cuban situation, unemployment, civil rights.

"Why sports?" he wanted to know.

I asked Kennedy if he could beat Ike playing golf. He seemed irked by the question.

"That's not the contest this year," he said and turned to field a question from a battery of political reporters. I was a one-man sports minority. I needed a fresh approach.

I stood back and sized up the handsome young Senator. He was wearing a brown herringbone tweed suit, a white oxford cloth shirt with blue stripes, and a blue knit tie. I looked at the shirt a second time. I had discovered a weak spot in the Kennedy armor.

The collar was badly frayed at the neckline. Jack Kennedy, seeking the highest office in the free world, was campaigning in a shirt with a frayed collar.

I edged closer to Kennedy.

"If you'll give me your collar size and sleeve length I'll buy you a new shirt," I said.

Kennedy seemed puzzled at my offer.

"Why," he asked, wrinkling his forehead, "would I be in need of a new shirt?"

"Because," I said, whispering into his ear, "the one you have on is badly frayed at the collar."

He drew back. He felt the neckline. He felt it again.

"Do I have that one on?" he asked. I nodded.

He tried to push the frayed edge inside the neckline. I told him my offer still stood. "Oh, no, no," he said, "I have other shirts on the plane."

Kennedy turned to the other reporters, but he took a double take and smiled at me. "Thanks, anyway," he said. The infectious Kennedy grin, the billboard smile that was to win the love and admiration of millions of men of good will the world over, got bigger and bigger. Jack Kennedy was laughing heartily, laughing at himself.

"You're very observant," he said. "Tell your editor I said you should be covering politics."

Perhaps the incongruity of the frayed collar struck Jack Kennedy's Irish sense of humor, for thereafter he talked on endlessly about sports.

He was explaining how his wife, Jacqueline, broke an ankle in a game of touch football at Hyannisport * * * and then a minister began the invocation to open the Evansville political rally on the courthouse square.

"Just a moment," Kennedy said, bringing a finger to his lips and bowing his head in meditation.

When the prayer was over, Kennedy continued the story. "Jackie," he said, smiling, "I just got racked."

The last time I saw Jack Kennedy alive he was in the private compartment of his plane, taking off the shirt with the frayed collar. He seemed tired and drawn.

"The competition in athletics is very similar to the competition in politics," he said as I was leaving. "But you pay more in politics—physically."

People will remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy for many things. The sports buff will tell you he made touch football as popular as Coca-Cola. Wall Street may recall the gusto with which he backed down the steel interests. Diplomats will remember his courage in forcing Red missiles out of Cuba. History, perhaps, will acknowledge him as another Lincoln, a young Roosevelt, a latter day Jefferson. His church will regard him as a noble son.

But I will always remember John Fitzgerald Kennedy on that rainy October afternoon he came to Indiana campaigning for the Presidency in a frayed shirt collar.

In the wake of his tragic death, it's the only memory of the man that I can recall and somehow manage to smile.

Some More About Subways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, advocates of public operation of transit facilities somehow never learn about—certainly they never report about—the facts that are revealed by the following item, written by Joel Seldin in the New York Herald Tribune of December 17, 1963.

New Yorkers read them and weep. Washingtonians should read them and rejoice that they have not yet been so burdened.

If subways are to be public services, free of cost or most of it, to the riders, let us face up to it frankly. Let us say so—and then proceed to build and operate them out of the tax revenues. Do not kid the public, as they are doing in my home city.

I am not convinced that this is the only way to run a railroad.

The article follows:

TRANSIT AUTHORITY TOTES UP QUILL'S PRICE, $238,573,000

(By Joel Seldin)

The full cost of all union demands for subway and bus workers in the transit authority would be $238,573,000 a year, the authority said yesterday.

The 4-day, 32-hour week asked by the Transport Workers Union, if granted with no other increases, would cost $64 million a year, the transit authority disclosed. If it were based on the increased wages and other conditions demanded by the union, the shorter workweek would cost $73,684,000 a year, the transit authority said.

The estimates were revealed after a meeting of the TWU and the transit authority with Mayor Wagner's transit labor board. David L. Cole, the board chairman, said there had been no progress in negotiations in the last month because the union is insisting that the 32-hour issue be resolved before it will discuss anything else.

The authority, which says its 15-cent fare is already imperiled by a deficit, has refused to grant the shorter workweek. TWU President Michael J. Quill insists the TWU members will strike at 5 a.m. January 1 if they do not have a new contract at that time.

SECOND ROADBLOCK

A second roadblock, Mr. Cole reported, is the TWU's insistence that an agreement be reached at the same time for the transit authority and the Manhattan and Bronx Surface Transit Operating Authority, which operates two private buslines the city took over last year.

MABSTOA has 7,000 employees, all members of the TWU. The transit authority employs 28,500 members of TWU, and 1,700 members of the Amalgamated Motor Coach Employees.

Mr. Cole said his board will meet at 4 p.m. today with Mr. Wagner to report on the status of the talks. He said he will also ask the mayor to decide whether he wants the board to concern itself with the MABSTOA employees, who were not city workers when the board was set up.

In addition to Mr. Cole, the board includes George W. Taylor and Theodore W. Kheel. All three are veteran arbitrators and mediators. If the parties cannot agree, the board is empowered to recommend a settlement, which is not binding on either side.

After announcing the bargaining impasse, Mr. Cole displayed a thick book of cost estimates that had been submitted by the transit authority, and said the board was about to study them. Asked to reveal some key costs, he hesitated then put the question to Joseph E. O'Grady, transit authority chairman.

NO COMMENT BY QUILL

Mr. O'Grady had no objection and the figures were released, with a warning from Mr. Cole that they were transit authority figures and not endorsed by the board. Mr. Quill, who had once estimated the total cost of the union's package demand at $165 million, had no comment.

The authority's estimate was that the total package would more than double the present pay of transit workers. On top of the present wage-scale range of from $2.34 to $3 an hour, it would provide an increase of $3.22 an hour.

The 4-day week at present wage rates, the authority said, would be the equivalent of an 86.84-cent-an-hour pay boost. If computed on the basis of the union's additional demands, the shorter hours would be equal to 99.57 cents an hour. The present transit authority work week is 40 hours.

In 1961, the union and the transit authority settled for a package officially described as worth $36 million a year, but since reestimated at about $30 million. The funds came from reserves.

This year, the authority has said it will have a net deficit of $4 million, even if it has no increased labor costs. It is required by a State law to raise the fare if its operating expenses exceed its revenues. It has guaranteed the present 15-cent fare only until January 1.

A POLITICAL ISSUE

The city's transit fare has for many years been a political issue between the city and State administrations. It is complicated this year by the declared aspiration of Governor Rockefeller and the possible hopes of Mayor Wagner in the coming national elections.

It is still uncertain whether the city would need the permission of the State to provide a subsidy for a contract settlement in order to preserve the 15-cent fare.

Mr. Quill has proposed that the fare be eliminated entirely by dividing the cost of city transit among the Port of New York Authority, the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, and real estate taxes.

Rededication to the Program of Our Late President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, among the many tributes and memorials to our late President, John F. Kennedy, the following meditation by Pastor Alton Motter of Minneapolis deserves to be read and remembered by all Americans. Pastor Motter has recently been chosen as the new executive secretary of the Minnesota Council of Churches. His intense commitment to the welfare of man is reflected in his searching question, "Have we the will, the sufficient sense of responsible citizenship to take up where he left off?" I especially commend this message to my colleagues and hope our actions will indicate we have responded affirmatively:

A CHALLENGE TO THE SOUL OF AMERICA

The President is dead. How that news has tested the faith and courage of every American in these days. As we gathered in our sanctuary to find strength and comfort, every word of song and scripture spoke to our souls in an extraordinary way, making the reality of Christ and of faith stand out bold and fresh.

(In the special service of commemoration and dedication held on America's National Day of Mourning on Monday, an overflow congregation heard a memorable meditation delivered by Pastor Alton Motter.)

There is a time in the life of a nation when the grief which encompasses it is too great to be expressed in words. We are in the midst of such a time now.

Most of us believed that the assassination of a President belonged to the struggling stages of our past, that it was something for history books—Lincoln in 1865, Garfield in 1881, McKinley in 1901. But 3 days ago it happened, and, within minutes, the young and vital life of President John F. Kennedy came to an end.

But in a very real sense, the assassin's bullet killed not only our President; it killed

a part of each of us. It was an attack, as was the murder of the murderer since then, upon our democratic procedures, upon our respect and reverence for human life, upon our hopes and dreams.

As we think of the awfulness of the deed which caused his death, we can think only of the words of our Lord from the cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." For it seems clear that only a warped life could commit such a crime; that only a hate-filled personality could bring such sadness to a nation and to the world. What a price to pay * * * for the poison of hatred.

There is, in this great national tragedy, deep and challenging implications for all Americans, but especially for all Christians in America. For it is the Christian's business to overcome hatred, to conquer fear, to provide the inner disciplines which can bring the kind of social and spiritual security which makes murder unnecessary. My friends, how our world cries out for the qualities of Christian love—the kind of compassionate love which can bring justice and freedom and peace to every person, to every race and to every nation of the earth.

This day, then, should be not only a day of mourning for the untimely death of our departed President—for his widow and his children, for his family and his colleagues—this it should be and is. But it must be more: It must be also a day of rededication to the quality of love revealed in Jesus Christ, our Lord, and the ways that love can survive and conquer the evils of our time. "America, America. God mend thine every flaw, Confirm thy soul in self-control, Thy liberty in law."

President Kennedy worked faithfully and diligently to remedy some of the evils of our time: to bring equality of opportunity to all races; to reconcile the differences between nations; to bring hope to the economically dispossessed; and to encourage man's search and struggle for the more abundant life. Have we the will, the sufficient sense of responsible citizenship to take up where he left off? To support such efforts of our new President as he makes his way into the future?

This, then, is truly the hour to recall the words of our martyred President: "Ask not what America can do for you; ask, rather, what you can do for America."

Musicianship on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, for all the differences we Members of Congress have with one another, Christmas reminds us that we can work in harmony and "make beautiful music together."

This idea is reinforced by an article entitled "Toots, Tones, and Taxes," which appeared in the November 1963, issue of Musical Merchandise Review. Researched and written by Larston D. Farrar of Washington, the article dwells on the musical training and abilities of Members of Congress.

The conclusion is that if we in Congress ever decided to get up our own band or orchestra, we might be competition for the National Symphony—or at least Lawrence Welk.

Since many of the Members who replied to the questionnaire used to gather material for the article expressed an interest in knowing the results, I am including "Toots, Tones, and Taxes," and commend the attention of my music loving colleagues to it:

TOOTS, TONES, AND TAXES

(By Larston D. Farrar)

If the sounds from Washington, D.C.'s Capitol Hill sometimes seem disharmonious, let it be know that it is not because the ladies and gentlemen who comprise our Nation's governing body are tone deaf. On the contrary, close to 50 percent of our Senators and Representatives have had training in musical instruments.

This fact came to light in a survey conducted by MMR's Washington editorial office. The survey was made to learn more about the musical habits of perhaps the most influential group of people in the world * * * men and women who set trends, propagate culture and vote on such matters as the excise tax on musical instruments and quality stabilization.

Comments about their musical training, offered by many of the legislators interviewed, are particularly interesting and pertinent, not only because of their source but because they spotlight some of the problems that currently face our industry.

A recently completed survey of the 535 Members of Congress, conducted exclusively by the Washington office of Musical Merchandise Review, indicates that approximately one-half of all U.S. Representatives and Senators have taken musical training of some kind, for periods ranging from a few weeks to many years.

The survey also shows that possibly one-half of those who have taken musical training studied the piano, with the others having been trained in the violin or various band instruments.

The musically eye-opening survey is startling in many respects, since it is generally believed in the music industry that, in general, only one-tenth of all high school students are exposed to musical training in one or more instruments for varying lengths of time. This means that the Congressional music ear is at least five times more keenly attuned to rhythm than that of the average high school graduate. It can also be taken to mean that a person who studies music has a greater chance of winning high political office than one who exhibits no interest at all in such training.

Of the 535 legislators polled by MMR, 159—or more than one-third—replied in writing to the question of whether or not the Representative or Senator ever had studied "the piano, organ, violin or other musical instrument."

Of the Representatives replying—132 in all—some 64 stated that they had studied music, while 68 replied that they had not.

Of the 27 Senators replying, 14 replied that they had studied the piano, organ or other musical instrument, while 13 stated that they had not.

Projecting the figures to the 376 Senators and Representatives who did not reply—for lack of time, illness, lack of interest, or whatever—it is safe to surmise that approximately one-half of all the elected legislators on Capitol Hill today have studied the piano, organ, or a string or band instrument.

The projection can be made with some certainty because the replies came from Senators and Representatives from all areas of the Nation, from both political parties (in ratio to the size of the delegations) and included a truly representative sampling of the legislative body, in the view of statisticians.

The size of the response indicates an unusual interest in music among the legislators, in the view of those who polled Congress, by such methods on other issues. A hundred and fifty-nine replies—by mail—from a group of men as busy and engrossed as our national legislators is an extremely good sampling and shows much greater than usual interest in the subject.

In fact, many of the legislators voluntarily noted in their replies that they would personally be quite interested in learning the results of the study.

Almost all of the letters from those who showed any interest at all were couched in light, friendly and even humorous terms.

"As a boy, I went through the experience common to many youngsters—at least, in my generation," Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah, responded.

"I took piano lessons for a number of years. But my teacher, my parents and I all agreed that this was not my field. I quit long before I ever approached any degree of proficiency."

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, replied succinctly:

"I have studied the piano, the clarinet and played a mandolin."

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, replied: "I have studied the piano and the organ, but cannot claim proficiency in either."

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, confessed that he studied the saxophone, beginning at the age of 9, for 2 years.

Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, had quite an experience, musically, when he was a youngster.

"Like most high school youngsters, I played in our band. My instrument was the sousaphone. This was, however, a minor part of my musical career and a comparatively happy musical experience.

"I regret to say that I was a victim of what might almost be called a 'musical racket,' as a result of which I became thoroughly soured on the whole art and turned away from it completely. I am sure this is my loss, but it was a searing experience.

"I studied piano for 11 years, from the time I was 5 until I was 16. My parents were 'sold' by a Chicago music school on the idea of making me a concert pianist and I was forced to practice long hours every day on scales and finger exercises, and on building up a repertoire of about 100 pieces a year, all aimed at recital performances and contests. Never was there any idea that music could be fun or worthwhile in itself. I am still bitter about the whole wretched time.

"I hope such ideas have passed into the limbo they deserve, and that young people are now allowed to find a little pleasure in the noble art of music."

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, had an entirely different experience in his musical training.

"I studied piano and was rather proficient during my very early teens, especially in the rendition of hymns," he relates. "As I grew older, I wanted to be on the athletic fields and so I can report I literally ran away from the keyboard, lost my touch and can now only pound out a few bars of rather routine music.

"I love sentimental songs and I recall as a member of the glee club in my college days (1920–24) I had a special solo number, 'Moonlight and Roses,' which I 'vocaled' out with gusto. Seriously, though, I do find certain types of music very restful, conducive to contentment and spiritually wholesome."

Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, says: "As a youngster, I studied piano for a limited time. I am sure that it gave me an appreciation of music and musicians that might otherwise never have been nurtured."

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, replied:

"The only instrument I have ever studied is the violin and the only tune I remember learning was 'Where the River Shannon

Flows.' My particular musical enjoyment lies in listening to piano recordings on a hi-fi."

Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, also a member of the "yes" group responding to the query, declared:

"As a boy, I took piano lessons for a little while, but I found fishing and baseball more delightful and did not persist in this venture.

"At one time, in the Army, I bought myself a violin and took a few lessons, but my military duties interfered with that and that venture also came to an abortive end. For some years I sang in a church choir. That is about all I know about music."

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, noted that "I studied the piano years ago, but was forced to give it up, as I began working to attend New York University Law School, and there simply was not time for everything."

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, has a familiar story to relate about his musical training.

"My father, always anxious to give me as well rounded an education as possible, insisted that I take piano and violin lessons," he recounted. "I regret to say that this effort was completely wasted."

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, wrote:

"My experience with the piano was limited to five lessons, but I did somewhat better with the clarinet and played in high school and college in both the band and orchestra. My musical ability has pretty much declined and disappeared since college."

Senator PETER H. DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado, asserted: "As a young man, I took 3 years of piano lessons. Unfortunitely, the teacher and I agreed that the ambition was there, but not the aptitude. Since my wife and children play—both the piano and the guitar—we have music in the house fairly constantly."

The responses from Representatives who admitted they did study music varied as much as those from Senators.

"For a brief period during my youth, I studied the clarinet," Representative BASIL L. WHITENER, Democrat, of North Carolina, reported, "But I do not consider myself as having qualified as a musician."

Representative VERNON W. THOMSON, Republican, of Wisconsin, declared that he played the cornet while in high school and, in fact, played in the State Championship High School Band of Richland, Wis.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, has a different story to tell:

"I studied trumpet and French horn briefly as a youngster. Out of respect to the memory of the composers, I abandoned my attempts to play and have been an avid listener ever since."

Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin, is proud of his musical background. He related it as follows.

"My musical education began at 10 years when I began piano lessons with a private teacher in my home city of Milwaukee. Showing some aptitude for the instrument, I continued my studies at the Wisconsin Conservatory of Music.

"In 1932, upon graduation from high school, I became the organist and choir director at St. Mary Magdalene Roman Catholic Church and it was the earnings from this job which provided the money for my college education at Marquette University. My organ studies were taken at the music department at Alverno College.

"I left the part-time job at St. Mary Magdalene's in September 1939 for a full-time position as organist and choir director at St. Vincent de Paul Church. That position was held until 1948, when I entered the Congress of the United States. While working as a church organist I also was senator in the Wisconsin State Legislature from 1942 to 1948.

"As an organist, I gave a number of sacred and liturgical music concerts and participated in two operettas produced by the parish. Since becoming a Congressman, I have, from time to time, returned to St. Vincent de Paul's—principally at Christmas and Easter—to play the organ. My wife also plays the organ."

Representative ROBERT T. SECREST, Democrat, of Ohio, pointed out that, as a youngster he studied the piano for about 2 years.

"I might make the observation," he said drily, "That if I campaigned for Congress with the same measure of diligence with which I practiced my piano lessons, there would have been no opportunity for you to address an inquiry to me."

Representative FRANK C. OSMERS, Republican, of New Jersey, has an unusual yen, according to his reply:

"From the age of 11 to 16 I studied the violin and was a member of the Dumont, N.J., high school orchestra for 2 years. I regret to say that I didn't continue with music after high school.

"My 16-year-old daughter is highly competent on the piano and one of these days I expect to get a violin and try it again."

Representative CHARLES LONGSTREET WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, reported that "While a grammar school student, I studied the clarinet for about a year with notable lack of success. I enjoy music and have some small facility for simple instruments."

Representative CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, of California, had something of a disappointing experience:

"My distinguished career in the music field consisted of a few months of lessons on the saxophone," he reported. "This was about 45 years ago. The teacher, my parents, and the pupil soon gave me up as a hopeless case."

Representative ELIZABETH KEE, Democrat, of West Virginia, who succeeded her husband in Congress upon his death many years ago, is noted in her State for her musical abilities.

"I studied both piano and voice for several years," she pointed out. "I formerly sang in a church choir and for some time had a radio program—a trio of piano, violin, and voice, at which time I was the soloist. For the past several years I have been too busy as a Member of Congress to pursue my study of music, much to my regret."

Representative OTIS G. PIKE, Democrat, of New York, is an accomplished pianist.

"The first real job I ever had was playing piano in a dance band," he relates. "I still play for my own amusement—drums, as well as piano. My wife plays the piano, my three children play the piano, another child plays the flute and another the trombone."

"I am sorry to say that I have never 'studied' any musical instrument," Representative LIONEL VAN DEERLIN stated, in ironical vein, "although my mother paid for piano lessons."

Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan, has a good story to tell about her musical training. She studied the piano during her childhood years and says "It was one of the worst mistakes my parents ever made, although I managed to keep it quiet."

At any rate, here is the story:

"Eighteen years after we were married my husband and I attended a party in a home where the host recently had installed a piano. He had taken a few lessons. On the piano was one of the old yellow songbooks, "100 Best Songs." I asked the host to move over and I played one of the songs.

"My husband stood in open mouthed amazement. When I had finished, he said, to the stupefaction of the guests: 'My God, I didn't know you played the piano.'

"It has been a standing joke among our friends ever since."

Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, Republican, of California, relates his musical experience as follows:

"Took a few violin and piano lessons in early years—a good parental idea to give some balance to my more natural athletic interests. After attempting to participate in school orchestras, my orchestra leader persuaded me not to impose my musical 'talents' on others. I have not done so since. Our Nation and world could benefit from more good music."

Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Democrat, of Missouri, had much the same experience.

"As a youth, I studied the trumpet and played in a boys' band," he related. ' "I was not good and finally was assigned the task of carrying the colors.

"Incidentally, this was the largest boys' band in the world in Springfield, Mo., under the direction of H. Ritchie Robberson. It interested me in Scouting at the age of 10 and I have continuous membership since that date in the Boy Scouts of America.

"At the present time, I limited myself to a conch shell, on E-flat cavalry bugle, and occasionally a 'sweet potato whistle.' "

Representative TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat, of Massachusetts, noted that he "studied piano—reluctantly—from 10 to 13 years of age. I can't play anything but the scales at present."

Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York, points out his varied experience with musical training:

"During my college days I played the clarinet and saxophone, participating in amateur jazz combos as well as in the Cornell marching band. My musical interest dates from high school when I also played in both the marching band and orchestra.

"At the present time, I play but rarely—occasionally at the home of a friend we play a few Dixieland records on the hi-fi, and toot along in cacophonic bliss."

Representative CHARLES H. WILSON, Republican, of California, had similar success. He relates:

"I cannot claim to be a musician of note. However, I did study and play the trumpet while in high school. Also, while in the military service I was able to blow the bugle on some occasions.

"I regret that I have not had much opportunity to engage in musical activities in past years, but I am still interested in the music field."

Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, Republican, of New York, also has had some interesting musical training and experiences.

"As a boy, I played the slide trombone in the orchestra of my high school at Attica, N.Y., and in the Attica Town Band, and later as a student at Chamberlain Military Institute. During the World War I was a member of the 74th Infantry Band of the New York State National Guard and of the 155th Pioneer Infantry Band in the AEF.

"After returning from service in France, I traded my trombone for an E-flat alto saxophone and studied and played that instrument for a number of years. In recent years, I have not been able to devote my time to these musical instruments, however."

Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, has an interesting story to tell of his musical career:

"I have always been musical from my early days, and took a few piano lessons from a relative and learned something of reading music and pianoforte technique.

"Being deeply interested, as well as being a real music lover, I continued playing the piano on my own and can play almost anything I hear by ear and do a fairly good job. I have a very extensive repertoire, so to speak, of songs that I play, which includes classical as well as popular music.

"For the most part, I keep in touch with modern, popular music, although I must be frank and state that there are not many good songs these days as formerly and that is quite a problem for those of us who love popular music.

"When I was at college, I composed songs for college musicals and during my life have followed popular music very closely and still continue to do so and have many friends among composers and musical people. I am a regular vistor to the famous Boston Pops, and like to attend piano recitals, concerts, musical comedies and other performances where music is played and sung."

Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., Republican, of Ohio, in a wry humor, told of his musical career:

"I studied piano briefly in my youth, but quickly gave it up for football practice. I didnt' turn out to be much good at football, either."

Judging by all the replies, it is legitimate to assume that if Congressmen ever decided to get up their own band, and if they could determine to work together (regardless of party or economic and political differences over legislation), Capitol Hill could have one of the most accomplished bands or orchestras, in the United States.

However, it doesn't appear likely—in view of all the other activities in which Congressmen must take part—that such a band, or orchestra, ever will come about.

After 19 Years—His Message Still Endures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, more than 20 years ago, on Armistice Day, November 11, 1942, a column by Malcolm Bingay, editorial director of the Detroit Free Press, was published. On Veterans' Day in 1961, the Miami Herald republished Mr. Bingay's column and said—

Armistice Day has given way to Veterans' Day and Mr. Bingay died in 1953. But his sentiments on that day 19 years ago are as alive today as the spirit of a free America.

Mr. Speaker, a more appropriate time to present these thoughts on being an American could not be found. Our beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy has been taken from us by an assassin's bullet and the reins of the Government have been taken in hand by our new President, the most able and capable Lyndon Baines Johnson.

With the approaching holiday season and a new year ahead of us, I believe this should be a time for all Americans to take pause to count their blessings and join with me in rededicating ourselves to be better citizens and Americans. In the words of President Johnson—

Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to all my fellow Americans, let us continue.

AFTER 19 YEARS—HIS MESSAGE STILL ENDURES

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

I'm Joe Smith, American.

I think my mother and father were the finest old couple I have ever known.

I loved my brothers and sisters more than anything else on earth.

The companionships of my boyhood are among my tenderest memories.

I prefer my wife to all other women and am not interested in any other.

The deepest joy I have ever known was watching the opening of the eyes of my children.

I recapture that old ecstasy when I dance my grandchildren on my knee.

I would rather be in my own home than in any other place on earth.

I would rather work in my own little garden than to see all the floral grandeurs of all the botanical gardens of the world. Because as each of my flowers blossom I know it is mine because it came into being through my effort.

I think my own neighborhood is the best neighborhood there is in my city.

I mind my own business and never tell anybody how to run theirs. But in all the cooperative efforts necessary for a good neighborhood, tending toward better living, better understanding and the city's welfare in general, I play my part.

I would not belong to a neighborhood association which tried to tell other people how to run theirs.

I think my club is the best there is because it is my club. I know them all intimately and personally. I like them and most of them like me. They are my friends.

I think my church is the best there is because I was born in it. My mother and my father explained to me that I would always have to prove it to be the best by not hating any other or in any way attempting to interfere with their ways of worship, but to help them in every way possible as long as I had taken care of my own first.

I think my own hometown is the best city on earth. I think so because it has been my home all my life. I know every nook and cranny of it—all hallowed with memories and yet pulsating with life.

I know that there are other towns just as good for others because I have traveled over the earth and have seem them. I might even admit that in certain things there are some other towns that excel mine. But this is my hometown.

I think my State is the most beautiful because it is my State. I am soil of its soil. My forebearers rest in its ground. I know its streams and its lakes, its hills and its valleys. My heart swells with pride as I see the glory of it.

This does not mean I do not like all the others States; because, when you put them all together, they make up my own United States.

I have traveled over it from the Pacific to the Atlantic, from the Canadian border to the Rio Grande. I have rubbed elbows with the people and have found, underneath, that they are all alike because they were born and bred under the same set of principles and ideals which God granted me the vision to understand as an American.

That is why I think my country is the cleanest and finest and most generous Nation on earth, because it reflects the collective soul of the American people.

We sprang from all the races of the earth, therefore we have no quarrel with any other people.

I'm willing that we should help them in every way that we can—as we have since we began as a nation.

But, as it is my family, my neighborhood, my church, my club, my city, my State so I want my country to remain our country.

I'm not ashamed of being an individual, nor of being able to stand on my own feet. I'm proud of it.

Though I have no voice I would rather be able to hum the first verse of "The Star Spangled Banner" (which is all I can remember) than to be able to sing the "Internationale" on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera.

You see, I'm just plain Joe Smith, American.

I do not know enough to solve all the problems of the universe in one lecture at a ladies' study club.

I realize I have some problems of my own I cannot solve. So has my family, my neighborhood, my city, my State and my country.

I'm for the ideals and principles of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln. They are mine. Those of Marx and Engels and Lenin may be all right. I do not know. Until I do, I am not willing to throw away my birthright to experiment with something else.

I am for my country in a world of law and order, made possible by my country and its generous treatment of all other nations.

Trust Territories Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our own Congressman MICHAEL KIRWAN, dominant, earnest, and practical in his every action, has again shown us why we respect his fine judgment and secure sense of direction. Early in 1961, he visited the trust territories islands, that are managed by the Department of the Interior, under a trustee agreement with the United Nations (formerly administered by the Japanese, since World War I, after the defeat of Germany, who had purchased the scattered islands from Spain).

What he saw there was enough to turn a puritanical heart to stone. Upon his return he went to work, in his own inimitable way, to remedy the sad conditions under which these underprivileged people were living.

Although a study was made by the United Nations, 3 years ago, not one of the other countries of the 14 comprising this group, evinced any interest in joining the United States in its contributory benevolence to solve or alleviate the problems of these 85,000 souls.

At the time of his visit, $3 million was appropriated to meet our obligation. Through argumentative persistence and factual presentation of actual depressive conditions—the Insular Affairs Committee made it possible for the Appropriations Committee to appropriate $6.5 million.

For 10 years the Interior Affairs Committee had asked for this sum. A large portion of this money was spent on the expenses in maintaining and manning headquarters district offices, transportation and communication systems. So that, as those costs rose, the $6.5 million bought fewer services, the population increased from 47,000 to 85,000 since 1947—thus adding more problems.

Thus, the few funds left that were made available were not sufficient to carry out our promises to further their educational, economic, social, and political progress. This seeming neglect of Micronesia and its people, has brought

criticism (deservedly) upon the United States. But, again, the Insular Affairs Committee raised the budget to $15 million for this year and 1964.

A substantial portion of this sum is being expended on educational programs—to build and equip schools—as reflected in the recent letter received by MICHAEL KIRWAN, from his intimate friend, Rev. William J. Walter, S.J.

President Johnson, upon signing the bill, said, that education is the key to all further progress in the political, economic and social fields. American teachers are now being recruited to teach English, which authorities hope will become the common language of all the islanders.

Congressman KIRWAN stated that every dollar is needed, and more, to accelerate all the programs so that these wards of the United States will develop a way of life inimical to the inroads of communistic doctrines—in the near future years he predicts that $30 million will be needed to realize our determination to mold a grateful people into a government stronghold for democracy.

If the people of the territory decide, in the future, by vote, to select the United States as its protectorate instead of becoming nationally independent, the United States will hold a chain of islands of supreme strategic importance to our security and that of the free world.

Thus, a leader of the Congress, traveling to distant lands to study actual conditions and to note the developing results realized through expenditures of moneys for specific purposes, in accordance with the intention of the Congress, made possible a reevaluation of a projected program, and stimulated stronger support to realize our honest aims in benefiting these unfortunates who were witnesses to the murderous assaults of our troops against the enemy, which cost us many American lives.

The question of whether the $15 million is enough and should other programs be accelerated, were questions asked by former President John F. Kennedy and the State Department, which is embarrassed in that it is suspected that the future debates of the United Nations will be critical of the U.S. administration of the islands. President Kennedy appointed a seven-man mission, headed by Anthony M. Solomon, a State Department official, to survey the islands. These findings and recommendations have not yet been made public but it is rumored that the report will recommend the major acceleration of all programs.

In his closing remarks, Congressman KIRWAN true to the simplicity of his deep-felt appreciation for the confidence reposed in him by his colleagues on the committee, in following his advice and the honesty of his representations in this important matter, said, "I am thankful to the members of the Insular Affairs Committee who made it possible for the Appropriations Committee to give the needed money to the trust territories (islands)."

Congressman KIRWAN received this letter—in itself it tells the whole story—Reverend Walter, a man of God, blessed him for his fine work—and we are proud that we know and associate with such a distinguished servant of the Republic:

YAP, CAROLINE ISLANDS,
U.S. TRUST TERRITORY, PACIFIC,
December 11, 1963.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KIRWAN: Early in 1961 you flew to the trust territory and made a brief stop at Ulithi Atoll. Ulithi had been devastated by a typhoon a few months previous to your visit. It was a sad sight. At a meeting of the chiefs you expressed your sympathy and they gave you a few souvenirs as a present. I was at Ulithi at the time but could not get to the island where you landed in time to meet you.

Things are beginning to happen at Ulithi. Last summer the Government delivered the materials for school buildings. There are to be four grade schools and a junior high school. The natives were expected to donate their work and Mr. James Boykin came to supervise it. I helped a little in an unofficial capacity.

The people were so eager to have their junior high school up for September that they worked overtime to do the job quickly. School opened on time with 125 students from Ulithi and the outer islands. Another American arrived to help Mr. Boykin.

Both he and Mrs. Stahl are completely dedicated people. They do not mind the isolation and lack of civilized living. They are enthused with their work and put in many extra hours trying to help the people. At last we have made a beginning in education and the future looks brighter. Eventually we will have an American teacher at each of the grade schools.

The people of Ulithi Atoll have asked me to send you their thanks and I also hereby include mine. They deeply appreciate your visit and the encouraging words you spoke at that time.

May God bless you for helping to bring about a change. For 15 years I had been living in the atolls and for 15 years I had been ashamed of my country. We had the islands in trust and we were not fulfilling the responsiblity we had assumed. I was becoming a bit discouraged with our system of government—it seemed to be a big bureaucracy without a heart. Having met and talked with the present high commission has changed all that. May you be the first to receive the Christ Child's blessing on Christmas Day.

Sincerely yours,
Rev. WILLIAM J. WALTER, S.J.

Robert D. Byrnes of the Hartford Courant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an anniversary which is being marked this year by one of our correspondents in the Press Gallery. It was just 40 years ago this session that Robert D. Byrnes of the Hartford Courant first began covering legislative activities, as a correspondent with the Connecticut General Assembly.

This year, he watched his 10th Washington swearing-in ceremony when the 88th Congress convened in January. He has been here on the Hill since the war years and is widely known and respected for the scrupulous attention he pays to the correctness of his reports on the way Congress works. He is careful in determining just what can be done and in stating his facts accurately.

He attended Trinity College in Hartford and then went into the newspaper field, arriving in political reporting almost immediately. The Connecticut political field was an exciting one then, as it is today, and he knew the important figures on both sides of the fence, although the Courant has always been one of the most prominent Republican papers in the country. Next year the Courant will mark its own 200th anniversary, and is widely known as the oldest newspaper of continuous publication in the United States.

As the principal political representative of this important newspaper, Mr. Byrnes covered the national conventions as well as the State conventions. When he came to Washington, he concentrated on reporting the doings of those who represented Connecticut, and it is his wont to report not only the rollcall votes, but the teller votes as well so far as he can visually be accurate.

When atomic energy first came under congressional surveillance, the chairman of the joint committee was the late Senator Brien McMahon. Mr. Byrnes rolled up his sleeves and went to work studying the mysteries of the atoms, covered virtually all hearings and all unclassified material and soon emerged as one of the most knowledgeable reports in this area. He is familiar to many of the non-Connecticut legislators who have been active in this field and he has helped many colleagues in questions relating to nuclear physics.

An example of the detailed effort which he puts into his work may be found in the article which he wrote for the Courant last Sunday. He was discussing the present effort to discharge the civil rights bill from the custody of the Rules Committee.

All of us know the difficulties and shadings of the problem which lies before us. The real purpose of the discharge petition which has been filed and now has a substantial number of signatures is to remind the Rules Committee, where personal feelings may obscure the need for this legislation, that a great many Members of Congress expect the committee to bring out the bill for action in reasonable time. There is a difference about what constitutes reasonable time, but the message is there, and the means to do it is in hand.

The petition is a sign of that determination. It does not, as yet, have enough signatures to guarantee action, partly because there is an effort to encourage the committee chairman to carry out his responsibilities. But it is not a frivolous function. The bill, contrary to others in which a few have actively been encouraging discharge, has been recommended by the proper legislative committee. Reports are available for

study. The leadership and the administration have urged that it be taken up.

The legislative role in public affairs is one that deserves the kind of reporting it receives from Mr. Byrnes. He is objective and analytical and he basically reports the facts. Mr. Byrnes, through his long years of experience, has compiled a magnificent record and I want to commend him now.

In an earlier piece this year, Mr. Byrnes conveyed some of the feeling he has acquired for the legislatures and the legislators he has seen in his career. I submit this piece, too, to be reprinted here:

NOT EVERYBODY FOOLED BY WAR AGAINST RULES

(By Robert D. Byrnes)

WASHINGTON.—Some of the supporters of Federal civil rights legislation in and out of Congress have been staging another war dance against the House Rules Committee. Presumably this impresses some people, but the number doesn't include many in the Capitol or elsewhere who are familiar with the situation.

The whooping and tomahawk brandishing is because the commitee has not met and reported out a rule providing for consideration by the House of the civil rights bill. "Tyrant" is just one of the terms that has been applied publicly to Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Rules Committee. It has been asserted that the Rules Committee's only function and duty is to get measures that have been cleared by legislative committees, Judiciary in the case of the civil rights bill, to the floor so the House can "work its will" on them. It is also contended the Rules Committee has no right to examine the merits of legislation which it is asked to clear for the House.

SUPPOSED TO BE FIXED

Solutions to these and whatever other problems may have been presented by the Rules Committee were supposed to have been solved 3 years ago when the committee was enlarged to dilute the power of SMITH and the other conservatives. To be sure, the enlargement was a compromise, and didn't go as far as some of the committee critics wanted. In any event, the added members haven't made the committee a sluiceway through which any and all measures would be poured into the House.

This correspondent, perhaps as a minority of one, believes the 435 Members of the House would be able to do a better job as representatives of their constituents if the restrictions imposed on them by the Rules Committee mechanism were removed. That change is not in the offing so the present furor should be viewed against the background that exists, rather than in some other, and perhaps better, setting.

The Rules Committee is regarded as an arm of the majority leadership in the House and it has a two to one majority from the party in control. Historically it appears the Rules Committee was established as a reform against one-man rule of the House by the Speaker. For some years, at least, with the division between liberals and conservatives blurring party lines there have been and are members of the committee whose votes are not available on a plea of party support.

TARGET OF LIBERALS

Judge SMITH, the present chairman, is a conservative, and thus a target for the liberals anyway. There is no question that he has used his power as chairman to delay measures for which he himself would not vote. The spotlight is on SMITH because of the importance of the Rules Committee, but he acts just the same as do other committee chairmen. For instance, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is now a big chief in the push for action on civil rights, sat on the bill to make a needed increase in the number of Federal judges for several years until there came a time when the Democrats could get patronage from the increase. Senator THOMAS J. DODD has as a major complaint against the Senate leadership that it hasn't been able in 3 years to get Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Labor Committee, to hold a hearing on DODD's bill to regulate the sale of certain drugs.

PROVIDES FOR DEBATE

The "rule" that the Rules Committee reports to provide for debate on a bill customarily sets a limit on the time for general debate on the measure, sets the policy for that bill as to what if any amendments will be in order, and sometimes, forecloses any points of order being made. Sometimes the rule will make a specific proposed substitute in order as a proposed amendment to the bill to be debated. The "rule" has to be adopted by a majority vote in the House before it is effective.

It would seem reasonable for the Rules Committee to make inquiry into the merits of the bill and to get some knowledge of how much controversy is involved in order to recommend a time limit on debate. It is through the Rules Committee that the Ways and Means Committee gets so-called gag rules on its bills, barring any amendments being offered from the floor and thereby reducing all Members, except the 25 on the Ways and Means Committee, to an inferior role as legislators. It has been through the Rules Committee also that bills, chiefly appropriation measures, have come before the House under procedure that prevents points of order being made against provisions that could otherwise be stricken under the general rules of the House.

MAJORITY CAN BEAT IT

Any rule for consideration of a bill can be defeated by a majority vote in the House, thereby preventing consideration of the bill, and that has happened. Such rules can also be amended, but by a complicated process that involves voting down the previous question. The cards are stacked against opponents of a rule by the procedure which permits debate of only 1 hour on a rule, and all the time being controlled by a majority party member of the Rules Committee, though he customarily yields half the time to a minority member.

The idea that the function and duty of the Rules Committee is to get measures to the floor is only half of the story. The other half, not mentioned in the civil rights row, is to save House Members from having to go on record on measures that have dubious merit but great emotional support for a short time. There are bills in every session that would be a majority of votes if they came to a rollcall, but on which the margin would be provided by Members who, for one reason or another, find it politics to submerge their doubts and vote aye. If such a bill doesn't get a rule from the Rules Committee, it doesn't come to a vote in the House, and the probability is that it won't be heard of in the next session.

A FUTILE GESTURE

On an issue like civil rights, with so many people ardently for or bitterly opposed, a welter of politics is to be expected. Such is the gesture of the discharge petition which was opened with a great flourish last Monday. The signers, of course, can go home and claim they did their best to get the bill through before Christmas, though it was obvious that wouldn't happen. What these people won't brag about is that civil rights bills were introduced last January, it wasn't until May 8 that hearings were started, and it wasn't until October 29 that the committee voted out a bill by steamroller tactics that prevented detailed discussion of a measure that had been written outside the committee. Then it took a month, until November 29, to get the report written and the bill ready for consideration by the Rules Committee.

If there isn't a civil rights bill in this Congress, the whole record may show the Rules Committee was the least of the roadblocks.

VETERAN WRITER SINGS LEGISLATORS' PRAISES

(By Robert D. Byrnes)

WASHINGTON.—This is the season when the voice of the legislator is heard again in the land, though most of them haven't yet had a chance to say more than, "I do" as they took oaths to uphold the Constitution. The 88th Congress has convened, the general assembly has come into session at Hartford, and in many other States the legislatures have met to struggle with the problems of what is best for the common good.

There might as well be a warning here that for this date the goal of objective exposition and analysis customarily sought in this space have been abandoned.

It was just 40 years ago, when the 1923 session of the Connecticut General Assembly met, that I, a young reporter sure he was very knowledgeable about government as a result of some college courses, began to learn about legislatures and legislators by covering the house and committee hearings.

STARTED IN 1943

For each succeeding regular assembly session through that of 1943, and the infrequent special sessions, I was on hand for the proceedings at the State Capitol. Wednesday I watched Members of Congress sworn in for a 2-year session for the 10th successive time. It now seems easy enough to report objectively who did what and explain the result, but there is always an inner thrill in witnessing one of the great operations of this wonderful representative form of government.

It is trite to say this is a government of laws and not of men, but the laws are made by men and women. The men and women who have been making laws for four decades in the range of my sight and hearing, have been and are, a wonderful group. It is impossible to count now the literally hundreds I have heard and watched, nor the many who for one reason or another have confided problems that revealed a depth of patriotism and high moral courage that never could be spread upon the records in support of their actions. Suffice to say that the voters who elected them had far better representation and devotion than the voters have ever appreciated.

This is not to say that lawmakers, collectively and individually, don't make mistakes. That would be foolish in the face of the number of bills in every session to amend and correct the laws that have been adopted previously.

NOT ALL PARAGONS

Neither would I make any claim that all the legislators I have known or watched were paragons of all civic virtues. There have been some whose reelections are still mysteries to me, even as I find it hard to understand how they ever won in the first place. There have been the selfish ones who steered a course to reap the utmost personal advantage, some of them cynical, at least in private, and others who offered attempted rationalizations that shouldn't have fooled anybody, but probably did. But such people have been few and far between, and far, far outnumbered by those who, profanely or prayerfully, have confessed to lost sleep or emotional stress for trying to a right course, or, more often, the course that was least wrong under the circumstances.

There was a rare and striking spectacle in the Senate Wednesday when Hawaii Senator HIRAM FONG, Republican, of Chinese ancestry, escorted down the aisle to take his oath his newly elected colleague, DANIEL K.

INOUYE, Democrat, of Japanese ancestry, who lost an arm fighting as a U.S. soldier in Italy in World War II. There was the Connecticut small town where, during the depression, it was decided to send to the house in Hartford a man who otherwise would have had to go on relief. Those instances are not necessarily extremes among legislators for there are few people who are elected to legislative bodies who are without some distinction in background or career.

PUBLIC UNAWARE

It is unfortunate, though perhaps inevitable, that the general public can't be aware of the talent working for it within the State and national legislative halls. It is amazing and wonderful, too, that the talents of several hundred men and women of such varied backgrounds and experience can be fused into a common endeavor that results in what is, for the most part, a wise course. Sure there are some popular heroes who can do no wrong in the eyes of their followers, and others who incur the bitter hatred of some groups. There are the hotheads and those who never seem to be ruffled. But for every one who has some conspicuous virtue or fault, there are scores who contribute as much or more and are known only to their colleagues.

Certainly during the past 40 years one never-failing topic connected with legislatures has been the need for reforming them. In the same period, and more or less connected with the call for reforms, has been the growth of the power of the executive branch of the Government, and, recently, of the judiciary of the Federal level, and a loss, or surrender, of power by the legislative branch. It is probably natural for one whose indoctrination in Government started in Connecticut where the executive was constitutionally weak by design to feel that in a representative form of government, the representatives elected directly by the people to make their laws are, and ought to be, the most important branch of government.

It is a personal opinion that the numerically larger legislative branch, is a bicameral system, is far more interesting to watch and to cover though it is of course true that giant personalities are more often available in daily action in the numerically smaller branches. Representative government takes on real meaning when it functions through a large number of representatives who are answerable to many separate constituencies. In theory, parochial interest should deadlock practically everything. In practice a common national or State interest emerges, and it is a never-ending thrill to watch the operation.

If this appears to be a panegyric of legislators, the aim has been reached.

From Roosevelt to Kennedy to Eternity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 29, 1963

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., as secretary of the Chicago chapter of the Industrial Relations Research Association, recently prepared for that organization the article entitled "From Roosevelt to Kennedy to Eternity."

The Industrial Relations Research Association is composed of many well-known men from all parts of Chicago. Lee C. Shaw of Seyfarth, Shaw, Fairweather & Geraldson is the president. The vice president is Dr. Arnold Weber, of the Graduate School of Business of the University of Chicago. Joseph Borus of the U.S. Department of Labor is the treasurer. The executive board is composed of John E. Cullerton, Irwin E. Klass, Philip Lescohier, Sam Mitchell, Miriam Ringo, Victor Reysa, Elizabeth Slotkin, Martin Wagner, and George Yexall.

Because of the great interest in John F. Kennedy, under unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Dr. Reuter's article:

FROM ROOSEVELT TO KENNEDY TO ETERNITY

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who was born May 29, 1917, became a man of the ages on November 22, 1963. It is thus time to view history.

A MOST CRITICAL YEAR

Historians will describe 1963 as a tragic year. Our great Nation has suffered the passing of great statesmen and humanitarians. When Senator Estes Kefauver passed away, the remark was revised and stated: "Estes' trouble was that nobody loved him but the people." With the passing of Senator Herbert H. Lehman, he was described as "a towering figure in the liberal political movement in the United States and a noted philanthropist."

Senator Wayne L. Morse described the sad event on November 22: "For me, the greatest inspiration from the life and death of President John F. Kennedy is to be found in his own deep devotion to the principles and ideals of self-government. The tragedy of his passing does not flow from those principles and ideals, but from our failure to realize and achieve them."

Editor E. S. James of the Baptist Standard of Texas said: "President Kennedy was not a Baptist, but it is safe to say that Southern Baptists have had no better friend in the White House. He defended the principle of religious liberty for which many Baptists forefathers gave their lives * * * We gave it as our opinion last February that he was a man of courage, integrity, and faith in God; and we shall ever remember him as such * * * The deceased President's faith in God is probably best expressed in a Thanksgiving Day proclamation issued by him November 7."

Another said: "A leader has been lost, and the competence of words withers before the searing tragedy of events. Let it be said, simply: There has been a death, a tragic death, in the family of man."

AN OPINION IN 1960

The writer was concerned about events in 1960, and the following statement was issued under the title "An Opinion of One Southern Baptist Deacon Toward Senator Kennedy." This was quoted in all parts of the Nation. A part of the statement is quoted:

"In 1932, Dr. A. B. Newland, a devout Protestant and prohibitionist, told several people at Holden, Mo., that he thought 'Franklin D. Roosevelt was called of God to become President of the United States.' God may be calling U.S. Senator John F. Kennedy this year.

"* * * now Jack Kennedy is the one chance for 1960 for the Democratic Party and the independents of the Nation. The reasons seem evident, but below are several:

"1. He knows what to do. Dr. Carl S. Winters of the North Shore Baptist Church of Chicago recently said: 'It is not what we know but how we use it that counts; it is not what happens but what we do about it; it is not what we doubt but what we believe that is important.' America can sleep at night with Kennedy in the White House.

"2. He has an understanding of foreign affairs. In the last several years foreign affairs has declined in status in America. Henry C. Wolfe recently gave an example: One of the great myths of our time is that which holds modern Russia to be a Marxist Socialist state.' Since the days Senator Kennedy studied in England, he has recognized the importance of foreign affairs.

"3. He is a religious man. Frank McNaughton, in his new book 'Mennen Williams of Michigan,' says: 'Mennen Williams, the dedicated politician of liberal philosophy, could retire at any time. But an inward voice urges him on, regardless of momentary frustrations and defeats * * * If there was to be a halt at any point in an amazing, complex and considerably fantastic career, God's will would call the halt. Mennen Williams would abide His decree.' Senator Kennedy has this religious statesmanship too.

"4. He is a churchman. As an ordained Southern Baptist deacon, which is the highest lay office in my denomination, I support the 'man of the hour' regardless of church consideration, beause he is a Christian and the best candidate. We must vote as Americans.

"5. He is in favor of good public education. Dr. Anand Malik of India recently noted how the present government has neglected public education: 'The recent wave of criticism of the public school system in this country is undermining the efforts of the free people of the world to introduce the concepts of freedom * * * History will never forgive America for losing faith in human values and the democratic way of life.' We need a strong leader, like Kennedy, to inspire leadership here. This can be attained by setting aside 10 percent of each Federal budget for the next 25 years for free public education.

"6. He recognizes self-education. Philip Lovejoy once said: 'A good teacher will be teaching more than she knows through a process of self-education that will keep her learning while she is teaching,' and Kennedy will encourage this leadership.

"7. He believes in a disciplined nation. America needs dedicated leadership in national affairs through disciplined minds and in keeping with democratic principles. Dr. M. Eunice Hilton of the University of Denver relates the principle to children, but it is sound for all. She says: 'If you can get a child to discipline himself in the smaller things and accept his responsibilities, he will come through in the bigger things.' Kennedy has lived a life of self-discipline and can thus lead a nation.

"8. He has a sense of humor. Dr. T. V. Smith of Syracuse University said: 'A sense of humor will keep you free of make-believe burdens,' and Kennedy can do this in the White House.

"In conclusion, I believe U.S. Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, is the only real hope for good government in the White House in 1961 if America is to have the 'golden age' that President Eisenhower dreams of."

A REPLY

On May 10, 1960, Senator Kennedy replied to the writer's opinion and said:

"Just a note to thank you for your expression of support in my candidacy. You may be sure your confidence and support are a source of great encouragement.

"I am grateful for your good wishes and appreciate your taking the time to send them to me."

A CURRENT OPINION

When President Franklin D. Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, I was in Florida, and I recall the great grief I passed through. Later, I wrote in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that it was the "saddest day in American history." I now believe 1963 holds the record, because President Roosevelt had ample years to carry out his wonderful program, but President Kennedy had just

started. Senator MORSE describes it thus: "I believe that like Abraham Lincoln before him, John F. Kennedy would say that it is for the living to be dedicated to the unfinished work which both these men so nobly advanced; and that from their deaths we should take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

A MAN OF THE AGES

The writer heard of the passing of President Kennedy from his room in the Americana Hotel in New York City. While still suffering great shock and sadness, Professor Rolla Franklin Wood, a great historian, was contacted. Mr. Wood replied:

"So thoughtful of you to write to me from New York about the President's death. President Kennedy was one of the two or three greatest minds to be President; Jefferson and Wilson were not far behind.

"The seeds of hate planted by the John Birchers and others of their kind have borne its fruit * * * We can never know the laws that Kennedy might have signed.

"He was the first President to be born in this century. He put the White House in the most inspiring setting that it has ever had. His mind brought in all the learning that man has been able to unravel. He had a faint glimpse of the first Word War, he suffered the ordeal of the second one, and he fought to avoid the darkness of a third.

"Like Jefferson, he was wealthy but was a friend of the poor, the underprivileged, the colored, and all those that see very little purpose in living. He had courage, imagination, vinsion, and the willingness to die that his ideals might be brought nearer to realization * * * Yes, humanity has lost a friend, a leader the like of which is not likely to appear again in 100 years."

Finally, from Roosevelt to Kennedy to eternity, our world goes marching on with new meaning to President Kennedy's words:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation'—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself * * *

"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The eneregy, the fatih, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world * * *

"With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 6?0, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

National Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a communication from Margarette S. Miller, director, National Bellamy Award, with respect to the Bellamy Award presentation at Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn., October 11, 1963. She enclosed the address of a young man from my own State of Maine, Parker J. Beverage, a student at Cony High School, Augusta, Maine.

I ask unanimous consent to include this address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., OCTOBER 11, 1963

(By Parker J. Beverage, Cony High School, Augusta, Maine)

As this is one of the memorable days in the history of Central High School, I have a singular opportunity and honor in taking part in this ceremony and explaining how Cony High School of Augusta, Maine, earned the 19th cherished Bellamy Flag Award in 1960.

There are 4 prime reasons that contributed to Cony's being selected from some 250 high schools throughout the State of Maine.

At least one-quarter of the credit for bringing the Bellamy Award to Cony belongs to our past principal, Horace A. Croxford. A promoter of school pride and spirit, a spur to the lazy, an encourager to the scholarly, Mr. Croxford is a true teacher. He is lively, soft spoken and articulate, fast with a decision or solution to a problem, and above all, steadfast in the building of character and individual responsibility. Cony was indeed fortunate to have Mr. Croxford as its leader for 9 years. Today he is an instructor in education at the University of Maine.

Naturally, Principal Croxford had extensive support from an excellent faculty; another reason why Cony holds the Bellamy Flag for Maine. Of course the teachers turn out students accomplished in a great many fields of endeavor, but we are most proud of our students who, under Mr. Fred Turner, annually bring back State awards and sometimes even National awards in science.

The third and perhaps foremost reason for the success of Cony is the student citizenship. This is really evident in the presentation of our annual school fair, the Chizzle Wizzle, begun in 1891, 1 year before the Pledge of Allegiance was written. This 5-night, money-raising talent show is the product of practically all Cony students. All lend their abilities in planning, ticket selling, acting, dancing, singing, making costumes, and building and painting stage scenery. What fun we have.

Finally, credit goes to Cony alumni whose accomplishments in varied fields display the result of study and toil. Among the many graduates of whom Cony is proud are two Maine Governors, a U.S. Navy admiral and Air Force major general, a Walt Disney artist, an authoress who won the Westminster Press $7,500 Fiction Award, a major league baseball player, a chief justice in the Maine Supreme Court, and several topflight engineers working on the U.S. space program.

Cony is very proud to be a part of the Bellamy heritage and welcomes Central High School into the distinguished Bellamy family of outstanding schools, gathered here under the Stars and Stripes.

Now, may I present to Bryant Millsaps and the students of Central High School our yearbook, the Coniad.

Inspiring Address by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Gardner on Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, December 14, 1963

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for achievement and progress in the field of human rights often seems a slow and frustrating task. Yet, I believe that we are gradually making progress in the field of public awareness and support for basic human rights. On Sunday, December 8, 1963, an extremely important address on this subject was given before the World Jewish Congress at the Stephen Wise House in New York City. The speaker was the Honorable Richard N. Gardner, the able and highly respected Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and his remarks concerning problems and opportunities in the international promotion of human rights were most informative, timely and valuable to everyone interested in this vital subject.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues may have the opportunity to study these remarks, under unanimous consent, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

THE INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS: PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

(By Richard N. Gardner)

This week marks the 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On this occasion it is fitting and proper that we review past efforts to strengthen the observance of human rights around the world and consider how these efforts may be strengthened in the future.

One of the several ways in which the Charter of the United Nations marked an important advance over the League of Nations Covenant was in its emphasis on human rights. The charter makes the promotion of human rights one of the main purposes of the organization. In articles 55 and 56 members assume the responsibility to take action to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

The legitimacy of international concern for human rights everywhere was thereby acknowledged in an international instrument ratified by every important independent country at the time. In securing the adoption of these revolutionary changes the United States played a leading part, and in doing so had the undivided support and encouragement of the nongovernmental organizations represented at San Francisco.

The United States also took the initiative in the formulation and adoption of article 71, under which international nongovernmental organizations subsequently received consultative status, among them this organization, the World Jewish Congress. Cooperation between governments and voluntary bodies is an old American practice, and is perhaps more highly developed in this country than anywhere else. It is one of the distinctive manifestations of our democratic way of life and may fairly be described as an American contribution to the charter.

The nongovernmental organizations made an outstanding contribution at San Francisco, and ever since, as an examination of the record will show, have played an important part in focussing attention on the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The United States has sought consistently, and under the guidance of its own history and traditions, to give form and substance to the promise implicit in the charter. It pressed for the adoption of an International Bill of Rights, the first element of which was to be the universal declaration, the 15th anniversary of which we are now celebrating. The draft of this declaration, which was the basis for the action of the General Assembly in 1948, was prepared and formulated by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights under the chairmanship of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

On this 15th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is appropriate that we rededicate ourselves to this historic effort under the United Nations to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In his address to the General Assembly on September 20, President Kennedy declared: "New efforts are needed if this Assembly's Declaration of Human Rights, now 15 years old, is to have full meaning."

The U.S. Government in the months ahead will continue to take a leading role in the United Nations and elsewhere in the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all men—and to support practical proposals in the pursuit of this objective.

I need hardly emphasize before this audience the importance of continued U.S. leadership in the worldwide promotion of human rights. Since the Declaration of Independence our country has been dedicated to the pursuit of human rights and fundamental freedoms, not just for Americans, but for all men everywhere. Our power in the world derives not just from our position as an arsenal of weapons or as a storehouse of commodities but as a base from which to seek the universal realization of the dignity of man.

The principles and ideals embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are

the same principles and ideals embodied in our Constitution and basic laws. They represent an essential and irreversible element in the policy of our country.

This applies to our policy at home as well as abroad. It is no accident that President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his first address to Congress, put special emphasis on the speedy passage of the civil rights bill.

There are practical and urgent reasons for our concern with the realization of human rights on a worldwide basis. The experience of recent years has demonstrated not only the interdependence of nations in their pursuit of basic values but also the interdependence between human rights and national security.

We have seen how the destruction of freedom at home in totalitarian societies of the right and the left can lead to the destruction of freedom abroad. Conversely, we know that worldwide progress in the vindication of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all will also be progress toward creating a peaceful and stable world order.

During most of the U.N.'s 18 years, the drive for freedom has tended to be defined as the drive for national independence. But we know that history is studded with examples of unholy alliances between nationalism and tyranny.

Now that freedom has been achieved for so many new nations, we are still faced with the previous question: What about freedom for the individual men and women and children, the individual human persons whose dignity and worth we reaffirmed on the opening page of the U.N. Charter?

We all know how far the world is today from a satisfactory answer to this question.

In some nations, fundamental freedoms are denied by governments as a matter of principle—by racial separation, by political oppression, by religious persecution.

In other nations, many freedoms are deliberately postponed, by government action, to concentrate on what are thought to be more urgent items of public business.

In all nations in greater or less degree, freedoms are infringed by lust for unchallenged political power—by the animosities of tribe or class or caste or sect or party—by prejudice and bigotry and other evils which still divide the branches of humanity.

There is no doubt that these matters are of international concern. They can and should be exposed to the awakened and articulate conscience of mankind in the United Nations and other international forums.

I

What specific measures is the United States now prepared to support in the international effort for the promotion of human rights? The answer falls in two main parts:

In the first place, the U.S. Government embarked on a new policy of considering United Nations human rights conventions on their merits.

In July of this year President Kennedy submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification three United Nations conventions dealing with forced labor, practices akin to slavery, and the political rights of women. Each of these deals with an important human right already guaranteed by the Federal Constitution and by existing Federal law. We believe their ratification can play a significant part in cultivating an international environment congenial to American interests.

Beyond pressing for the speedy ratification of these three conventions, we have been actively participating in the consideration of other human rights conventions—including the two human rights covenants. We do not underrate the difficulty and complexity of the problems which must arise when an attempt is made to formulate a single rule of law affecting human rights which can apply to more than 100 nations with varied social and political systems and traditions. But we are resolved to make every contribution we can toward the development of international standards for the protection of human rights which take account of the legal systems and social structures of participating States.

In the second place, apart from the process of drafting conventions, we are considering ways in which the United Nations can deal with human rights questions on a more objective and professional basis.

In the 17 years of its existence the United Nations has developed effective procedures for dealing with two of its principal concerns—the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion of economic development. It has been less successful in developing adequate procedures with respect to its third concern—the promotion of human rights.

At the present time, for example, the United Nations does not provide its members with an up-to-date, comprehensive and professional analysis of the measures taken by member states in fulfillment of their charter obligations to promote human rights for all their citizens. The Human Rights Commission regularly bypasses discussions of current problems in specific countries. In the vacuum thus created the General Assembly is trading to involve itself in politicized and emotional discussions of a few human rights problems without the benefit of a broad and analytical review of the entire subject.

We continue to believe, as President Kennedy told the Assembly, that "new efforts are needed" if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is to have full meaning.

We should consider the role the United Nations might play in defining standards, in clarifying experience, in reviewing government performance against Charter principles, and in exposing to the conscience of the world the denial of those rights which should be the heritage of all human beings.

If this process of international discussion is to bear fruit, however, it must be genuinely devoted to the national pursuit of human rights—not the national pursuit of self-righteousness. In this field we might well benefit from the application of the familiar legal doctrine of "clean hands": those who would call in question the practices of others should at least be making every effort to put their own house in order.

The real test of a nation's commitment to human rights is not what it says for all the world to hear but what it does in practice for all the world to see.

II

This leads me inevitably to some specific comments about the human rights practices of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union in recent years has sought to assert its leadership in human rights issues before the United Nations. There is a certain irony in this effort—an irony of which the United Nations is frequently reminded not only by ourselves but by other members. For the Soviet Union has adopted as government policy a widespread disregard for those fundamental human rights which are embodied in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We cannot and should not forget for an instant the violations of basic political liberties which have affected all religious and national elements of the Soviet population.

In his gathering today, it is fitting to make some reference to the specific disabilities, religious and cultural, of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union. These are a matter of anxious interest not only to other Jewish communities but to all who seek to build a better world on the basis of the principles embodied in the universal declaration:

There has been a marked decline within the last 3 years in the number of synagogues in the Soviet Union. No Jewish schools are allowed to be established. A majority of the students at the one rabbinical seminary permitted to exist in the entire Soviet Union were denied residence permits in 1962 for the city of Moscow on the grounds of a housing shortage.

No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917, nor has even a Russian translation of the Jewish Old Testament been allowed. Six, no more than six, books in the Yiddish language have been published since 1953.

Even the baking of matzos for Passover has been prohibited and the last kosher meat market in Moscow has been closed.

A person of Jewish descent who may have broken completely with his religious tradition must still carry the nationality designation "Jew" in his identity card.

Our disquiet about the situation of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is not the result of any diplomatic conflict or the so-called cold war. We are equally opposed to any kind of discrimination, and have made that repeatedly clear, in any other country, irrespective of its social or political structure. Our disquiet flows from the deep conviction, which is as old as our Declaration of Independence, that human rights are inalienable, and that the business of government is to recognize and protect them.

Let me express the hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will seek to correct a situation in accordance with their own often proclaimed principle of equality for all the peoples and religions under their jurisdiction. Let me add that any amelioration of this situation would itself be a positive contribution to the development of better mutual understanding, which is the indispensable foundation for a common effort to overcome the dangers and difficulties which stand in the way of the fulfillment of mankind's hope for a better world founded on freedom and justice.

Poem Used at Democratic Dinner at Fowler, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at a Democratic dinner held on September 4, in Fowler, Ind., the Reverend Ambrose Ziegler of the Sacred Heart Church in Fowler offered a fitting and moving prayer. The prayer was written as a Christmas prayer by Helen Steiner Rice, editor of the Gibson Card Co., and was altered slightly by Reverend Ziegler for use at the dinner.

Whether this prayer is used at Christmas time or during some other time of the year, its message is still inspiring and worth pausing to hear. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that Senators may have an opportunity to read and consider it.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER USED AT DEMOCRATIC DINNER, FOWLER, IND., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4

(NOTE.—This prayer was written especially for Aladdin and the "Lawrence Welk Show"

by Helen Steiner Rice, editor, Gibson Card Co., Cincinnati, Ohio. The only difference is two words substituted to fit this particular occasion. In the second line, change "solemn" to "Christmas." In the third line from end, change "elections" to Christmas.")

Our Father up in Heaven,
  Hear this solemn prayer.
May the people of all nations
  Be united in Thy care.

For earth's peace and man's salvation,
  Can come only by Thy grace,
And not through bombs and missiles
  And our quest for outer space.

For until all men recognize,
  That "the battle is the Lord's"
And peace on earth cannot be won,
  With strategy and swords.

We will go on vainly fighting,
  As we have in ages past,
And finding only empty victories,
  And a peace that cannot last.

Oh, we've grown so rich and mighty
  And so arrogantly strong
We no longer ask, in humbleness,
  "God, show us where we're wrong."

We come to trust completely
  In the power of man-made things
Unmindful of God's mighty power
  And that He is "King of King's."

We have turned our eyes away from Him
  To go our selfish way
And money, power, and pleasure
  Are the gods we serve today.

And the good, green earth God gave to us
  To peacefully enjoy
Through greed, and fear, and hate
  We are seeking to destroy.

Oh, Father, up in Heaven
  Stir, and wake our sleeping souls.
Renew our faith, and lift us up
  And give us higher goals.

And grant us heavenly guidance,
  As elections come again,
For, more than guided missiles,
  The world needs guided men.

—Rev. Ambrose Ziegler.

Times-Union Lauds Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, because of my continuing and fervent interest in civil defense, any editorial praise bestowed on the unselfish men and women of our Nation who dedicate themselves to providing instant response to calamity—whether natural or caused by enemy action—pleases me immensely.

Just this week, the Times-Union, the Rochester, N.Y., evening newspaper which serves the congressional district I have the honor to represent, published an editorial praising the vital role of civil defense. It is a fitting tribute, and I take pleasure in sharing its content with my colleagues in the House:

Civil Defense Serves in Peacetime, Too

War is not the only disaster that threatens man. Earthquakes, hurricanes, explosions, plane crashes—and the collapse of a reservoir, as in Los Angeles—can also take frightful tolls of life and property.

Such natural disasters can't be handled only by police, hospitals, and other regular rescue organizations. It's a wise community which, like Metropolitan Rochester, has a large and effective civil defense organization able to help minimize tragedy.

A civil defense force has a major responsibility to help prepare a community for the seemingly impossible job of recovering from nuclear attack. But it will find its peacetime disaster work of greater continuing value than plans for fallout shelters.

Other selfless workers, like volunteer firemen and Red Cross aids, are also needed in such emergencies to aid official rescue operations. But the Los Angeles tragedy is the latest reminder that civil defense is the most important and valuable means of extra assistance.

Because You Are Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the youth of our land are the great fountain of our strength—as a nation in the future. The challenges to our young people grow with every passing day as the complexities of the world's developments elaborate themselves. They need encouragement from our generation.

An excellent exhortation to youth, including a quotation from former President Hoover to the 50th anniversary convention of the World Christian Endeavor Union, recently appeared in the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette in the feature "Sermon for Today" by the Reverend John R. Gunn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for printing of this item, "Because You Are Young," in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Because You Are Young

(By Rev. John R. Gunn)

I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong.—I John 2: 14.

I write unto you, young men and young women, because you are young, because of your youthful strength and the possibilities that lie wrapped up in your youth. Because you are young, life is before you, the world is before you, great opportunities are before you; it is for you to determine what you make of life and your opportunities, and what the world of the future is to be.

Because you are young, listen and give heed to the message delivered several years agy by former President Hoover to the World's Christian Endeavor Union at its 15th anniversary session in San Francisco: "I congratulate you on the achievement of a half century of practical idealism. You have before you even higher privileges and opportunities to serve with vigorous courage and idealism of youth in the solution of myriads of problems of the future. Above all, yours is a mission of simplifying of standards of individual conduct which are the makers of national character. A better world is the mission of youth, and it is your mission."

I write unto you, young man, because you are young. Your opportunities are tremendous. So much is transpiring around you. Never was there such an age, to be young in, as this. Never was there an age when the young man had such advantages and such possibilities as he has today. Never has there been such a time when the young man had the privilege of placing his fingermarks upon such mighty history making events as he has in this great day. We are in a transitional period; we are passing through the greatest crisis the world has ever known. Out of this crisis will come either ruin or a new order of civilization. Which shall it be? The answer depends largely on you who are the rising generation.

I appeal to you, young man. The world needs your youth, and all that is wrapped up in your youth. The need is imperative. In its present condition, society cannot spare your youthful strength, your youthful vision, your enthusiasm, your daring.

There is no time to waste. What is done must be done quickly. Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation. Do not throw away your youth. The world, with its fate hanging in the balance, appeals to you. Be alert to all those splendid opportunities possible to you, because you are young.

Remarkable Lady Inspired Speech and Hearing Center at Gallaudet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, many times I am sure we all do not have the opportunity to understand and appreciate fully institutions and influences in our Nation's life which are close around us.

I am pleased to be able to share an article which has been published in the January 1964 issue of Diplomat magazine which outlines the purposeful and courageous life of Mary L. Thornberry for which the Speech and Hearing Center at Gallaudet College is named.

And of particular interest to each of us serving in the Congress, this article was written by our former colleague, Homer Thornberry, and is a profile of his mother:

Tribute to a Remarkable Texan Who Inspired Speech and Hearing Center at Only College for Deaf—Retiring Member of Congress Recalls Mother's Accomplishments Despite Great Handicap

(One of the President's closest friends, Homer Thornberry, who has represented the 10th U.S. Congressional District of Texas (once represented by Lyndon B. Johnson) since 1949, recently was appointed and confirmed Federal judge of the western district of Texas. This is his poignant profile of his mother, an extraordinary woman who was her own miracle worker under the most trying of circumstances and who was an inspiration not only to family and friends but also for the Mary L. Thornberry Speech and Hearing Center at Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world.—Editor.)

(By Homer Thornberry)

When her father frowned at her for reaching across the table to grab some food, she jumped up, ran to fetch the broom, and returned to hit him over the head. With great interest a few days before this episode, she watched her grandmother milk a cow. Then the grandmother tried to teach the child how to milk. When she made a mistake, her grandmother corrected her.

Furious, the child grabbed up the pail of milk and threw it in her grandmother's face.

This was my mother when she was 8 years old. Totally deaf, she had neither heard nor uttered a word since an illness in infancy. Born in a rural section of Texas into a large family who spoiled her, she had grown up almost without restraint or discipline.

It was not until she began to commit the more serious breaches of conduct that her parents would agree something had to be done. A family friend persuaded them to send her to the school for the deaf in Austin.

Having reached the difficult decision to part with this child whom they loved so much, the parents took her on the 200-mile trip by horse and buggy from our home to the State capital.

My mother never forgot that trip. She told me many times of the nights they camped out and of her first sight of the school now known as the Texas School for the Deaf.

Arrangements were made to leave her in the care of her first teacher, Miss Emily Lewis, whose memory is still revered by many deaf persons in Texas. When the hour came for parting, the tearful parents prepared to surrender their daughter to the stranger and to dark hours of homesickness, but to their amazement, when they went to bid the child goodby, she was happily poring over a book with her new teacher, and already learning the alphabet of the sign language. There were no tears in her eyes, only the dawning of new comprehension as she blissfully waved a farewell. Later, there would be times when she would be homesick and long to see her family, but her introduction to sign language was the real beginning of her life.

For all of her 85 years, my mother faced life with great courage and optimism. Apparently, never having heard the word "defeat," she was unwilling to accept it.

After graduation from the Texas School for the Deaf, she married my father, who was a teacher there. He had lost his hearing infancy and, because of his deafness, had not learned to talk—except by sign language. Twelve years after their marriage, I was born, and their joy was unbounded on learning that my hearing and speech were normal.

Because they could not hear me cry in the night, they took turns, each sitting up half the night by my crib in dim lamplight. In time, I learned to talk to them with my hands.

For the first 3 years of my life I did not speak at all; I communicated only by sign language. Then my parents asked a young girl cousin to live with us, so that she could teach me the use of my voice and ears. Kind and understanding neighbors also helped me learn how to speak.

When I started to school, I had some difficulty in learning how to read. One evening as I was studying my reading lesson at home, I ran across the word "town," the pronunciation or meaning of which I did not know. I showed it to my father. I was unable to grasp its meaning by the word he used in sign language. He then drew for me on paper, as best he could, a picture of a town. I still did not grasp the word. It was only the next day at school when one of my classmates pronounced the written word for me that I understood it.

Some problems experienced by deaf parents may be illustrated by three incidents from my childhood. Once when I had been quite ill all day, I finally dropped off to sleep. My parents kept waking me up every few minutes to inquire how I felt. Each time they awakened me I began to cry. Finally, in desperation during the night, they brought our nearest neighbor, Mrs. Simon Gillis, over to ask me why I continued to cry. My answer was, "I'm all right. If they would just leave me alone, I could sleep."

Another time, I climbed up on the buffet in our dining room and could not get down. When my mother missed me, she ran through the house clapping her hands, as was her habit, to call me. Each time she came through the dining room I could see her and I would hold out my arms, crying to her. But I was partially hidden by an open door and she never thought to look for me on the buffet. Frantically she summoned Mrs. Gillis, who promptly located me by my shrieks.

My mother told me of her embarrassment when once we dined with old friends in another city, and I used profane words, unaware of the meanings. The friends understood the problem and explained to my mother. She then made it clear that I was never to use those words again. As a result, as proficient as I became in the sign language, I do not know to this day whether profane or obscene words exist in that language.

From the time I first remember my father, he was in poor health. In 1918 he died of influenza, leaving my mother with an unfinished home, a mortgage and other debts all past due, and the responsibility of rearing and caring for a 9-year-old son.

Many friends, seeing little hope for the two of us, suggested that we move back to my aged grandmother's small farm. But my mother did not for a moment consider doing so. She was determined that we would remain in Austin, where my education could be continued. When the question as to how we would live was raised, she simply said she would succeed my father in teaching and she would rely upon friends to help her obtain the position. Her will and determination outweighed even the obstacle of her lack of a college education, for friends did see that she was placed on the teaching staff of the Texas School for the Deaf, a position she held for 26 years.

Soon after my father died I recall going with her, dressed in black, to the bank to explain that she could not pay a past-due note but would do so as soon as possible. I can still see the look of dismay on her face as I translated that the note was not the only one, that there was another one outstanding as well.

Gradually, over the years, the debts were paid; yet at the beginning of each summer, for a long time, it would be necessary to borrow money from the bank to tide us over for the 3 months' vacation period.

When I was 12, I began to supplement our income by selling newspapers and delivering milk. At 14, I became a page in the Texas Legislature, and with the money thus earned, my mother and I had our 11-year-old home papered and painted for the first time. Meanwhile, my mother had never allowed deafness, the inability to talk, poverty, adversity or temporary setbacks to discourage her. There was never a doubt in her mind that I would obtain a college education.

She was a firm disciplinarian and she did not spare the rod. Furthermore, she was scrupulous regarding my Christian education in the Methodist Church of our neighborhood, and she herself was active in church circles.

An extremely valuable heritage from her was the recognition of the importance of friends. She acquired hundreds during her lifetime—both among the hearing and among the deaf. Over a period of 70 years she knew the clerks in the grocery stores and the saleswomen in local shops, and often she would pause "to chat" with them by means of tablet and pencil.

After I received my bachelor's degree and my law degree from the University of Texas, I was elected, in turn, to the State legislature, the Office of District Attorney, and the City Council of Austin.

When war was declared and I left home for the first time for duty in the Navy, my mother was nearly 70 years old. And yet she was still alert and able to adapt herself to changing circumstances. She had retired from the faculty by this time, but she consented to be a substitute teacher during the war years.

At the close of the war when I brought my bride home to live with us, my mother welcomed her warmly. Our first child, my mother's namesake, was born when my mother was 73 years old. Absolute adoration. A short time thereafter we moved to a new home and sold the only one I had ever known. I could not hold back the tears on moving day, as I left the house that had meant so much to my mother and me. My mother, dry eyed, never glanced backward.

When, after my election to the U.S. House of Representatives, I moved my family to Washington, D.C., my mother with equanimity made her first plane trip to a strange city, far away from her lifelong friends and surroundings. She made new friends, of course, and found former ones associated with Gallaudet College, the only college for the deaf in the world. With interpretation, she also discovered the delights of television, and sightseeing in and around the Nation's Capitol never failed to thrill her. In the meantime, she had three grandchildren to idolize and she joyfully helped to care for them. No sooner would greetings be exchanged with visitors to our house than she would write on her note pad, "What do you think of my three lovely grandchildren?" They in turn were devoted to her and learned at a very early age to communicate with her in the sign language.

My mother was keenly interested in politics—I remember her going to vote the first time women were permitted to do so—and she was an avid supporter of the Democratic Party. Franklin D. Roosevelt she revered, and she admired the courage of Harry S. Truman. She thought Dwight D. Eisenhower had "a good face" and asked me many times how he "could possibly be a Republican."

She loved Speaker (Mr. Sam) Rayburn and Lyndon Johnson. Both knew her well and many times expressed their admiration for her.

As much interest as she took in politics, she never quite became acustomed to the vicissitudes of her son's political career. Now and then, she would spell out on her hands, "I wish Homer would get a good, steady job."

One of the most rewarding events in her life was my appointment by Speaker Rayburn to the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College. During the years I have served, the college has carried on a building expansion program and will soon accommodate three times the number of students, from all parts of the globe, as formerly.

Today there stands on the campus of that great institution the Mary L. Thornberry Speech and Hearing Research Center. As its dedicated and expertly trained personnel seek to find ways to brighten the future for handicapped infants and adults, it serves as a living memorial to my mother.

Throughout her long life, my mother seemed to be indestructible. In the face of every adversity, she looked to the future with strength and resolution. Even with a fractured hip at the age of 84, she held on with a tenacity which was characteristic of her entire life. She lived a year and a half more, but never once did she abandon her courage, her faith in her friends, nor her belief that, if we but do the right, all else in life will turn out satisfactorily.

Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, many tributes have been paid to the late President Kennedy and all of them very fitting and certainly well deserved. To these I would like to add one written by Joseph L. Manning, secretary-manager of the Independent Retail Grocers & Meat Dealers Association of Baltimore, and published in their magazine, the Maryland Grocers' Skirmisher.

HE WAS LIKE DAVID FACING GOLIATH

In a way he was like David and the world of unrest was like Goliath. He had no fears—because he knew his cause was a righteous one. He faced the colossal problems that confronted him unafraid. His weapon of right like David's was small in comparison to a vast world of bitterness, hatred and greed. Yet in the short time allotted him, he set down for all of us a pattern of courage and determination to make this a better world to live in. Long after he is gone we will remember that his martyrdom at the hands of an assassin was a flaming, unforgettable page in history. That this assassin, born of despair, fear and hate was but a symbol of the people who did not understand John F. Kennedy's place in history.

It was obvious from the start that this great man who faced death in combat sensed that he was a man of destiny, and that time was running out. Like Lincoln his path of "glory" was blocked by overwhelming burdens and heartaches, yet he always gave the impression that these obstacles were part of the play and that he as the principal actor must always convey to the audience a feeling that the show would go on to a happy ending. His courage and confidence were tremendous in the things he believed were right. He never flinched in facing the trials and tribulations that were his as President of the United States.

There were problems he could have bypassed had he belonged to the lesser greats in our history, but he faced them all head-on because, he believed that his generation was a generation of destiny and that the task though great was a duty that he was sworn to and would carry out. Your secretary was honored and privileged to be in his company on several occasions when he was the U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, and twice after he became President. On every occasion he displayed a warm and friendly spirit and always seemed interested in the other fellow's problems.

I recall so vividly when, as a member of a reception committee, along with Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, we met the Senator and Mrs. Kennedy at the Friendship Airport and escorted them to the Emerson Hotel where he spoke in behalf of Adlai Stevenson, who was then the Democratic candidate for the Presidency. We drove them to the hotel and it was one of the most pleasant rides I have ever experienced. Both of them acted as if they had known us for years and their manner had all of us at perfect ease.

Another time after he became President, attending the Press Club banquet in Washington, D.C., I had the pleasure of talking to him before the banquet. It was a great thrill that he remembered me and when he asked me about the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Baltimore and whether or not I was still rendering Irish songs I, of course, was very happy and overwhelmed and it was a night I shall long remember and cherish.

No man was ever more human and warm than he. And only God knows why he was taken so suddenly from our midst. While we are all aware that his name and memory will be carved eternally in the pages of history, his wife, Jacqueline's name will also be etched beside his. Her courage under fire when her husband was slain at her side, and her fortitude in the ceremonies that followed profoundly touched the hearts of her countrymen. May her shadow never lessen.

As I watched his casket being lowered into the grave on television, his undying words echoed loud and clear: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." Greater love hath no man than to lay down his life for his people.

Most sincerely,

JOSEPH L. MANNING.

Art Buchwald's Comment on Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have never known of a housewife who could not manage her household better than her landlord. That is why I favor home-rule for the District of Columbia. Sometimes it can be more important to vote for a city councilman than for the President.

Columnist Art Buchwald, in his column of last Sunday, summed it up. If any of my colleagues in the Congress missed it, here it is:

SUFFRAGE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

As many people are probably aware, anyone who lives in Washington, D.C., has not been allowed to vote in any election. But in 1964, for the first time in history, the citizens of the District of Columbia will be allowed to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

There has been some confusion about this sudden suffrage and many people are ringing doorbells in the District trying to educate other people on what to do. We volunteered to do some doorbell ringing ourself and we were surprised at some of the reactions, when we tried to tell the people about their voting rights.

We came to a house in Cleveland Park and a man answered the door. "Sir, I'd like to inform you about your right to vote in 1964."

"I'm sorry, we don't want any," he said.

"I'm not selling anything," we said before he could slam the door. "I thought you would like to know about your voting rights."

"What's a voting right?"

"It means you can vote for the candidate of your choice."

"I never heard of that, and I've been living in the District 40 years."

"That's just it; you couldn't vote before, but now Congress has made it possible."

"That's fine," he said. "How much is it going to cost me?"

"Nothing," we said. "It's your constitutional right."

"Let me ask you something. If I have a right to vote, can I have a say in what goes on in the schools in the District?"

"Of course not," we said. "That right is reserved for Congress."

"Can I have a say on how they spend my taxes?"

"That's a stupid question," we said angrily. "The House District Committee decides that."

"Will I be able to voice an opinion on the Police Department and the Fire Department and the Sanitation Department?"

"You're being very difficult, sir. All we're letting you vote for is the President of the United States."

"Can I say whether I want a subway system or a highway system or a bus system?"

"You cannot, and you know it. Congress dictates what you can do. After all, they know the problems of Washington better than anyone who lives here all year round."

"Can I elect someone to represent me on housing problems and welfare projects?"

"No, you can't," we said. "Where do you think you're living? You're lucky Congress will let you vote for the President. They didn't have to, you know."

"Can I vote for a better sewage system or a library system, or a cultural center?" he demanded.

"No, no, no," we shouted. "How greedy can you get? We let you vote for one office, and all of a sudden you want to act like an American citizen. It's time you understood Congress is in charge of this city, and you couldn't be in better hands."

"Suppose I don't like the way the Congressmen are running this town?" he said.

"You have nothing to say about it. Only the people who elected the Congressmen and Senators have anything to say about them."

"But those voters don't care about what is happening to us in Washington," he cried.

"We can't let you vote for everybody. Isn't the President enough?"

"I guess so," he said, "though frankly I'd rather vote for a city councilman instead."

Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, no individual has fought harder to obtain permanent status for the House Small Business Committee than Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

It is only right that permanent status be granted the committee, as proposed in House Resolution 46, of which I am the author, and other resolutions which are pending before the Rules Committee.

I take this opportunity to salute Mr. Burger for his untiring efforts in behalf of the pending resolutions and in behalf of the small, independent businessman. Also, I desire to include the following letter I received this week from Mr. Burger:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., December 17, 1963.

Re House Resolution 46.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Room 115, Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: To your everlasting credit you have been consistent in the preceding Congress and the present Congress, in a resolution—H. Res. 46, that would provide long overdue standing committee status for the present House Small Business Committee, which has been a special committee of the House since 1941.

Twenty-two years have elapsed and we believe the committee has come of age and should have the same status as any other standing committee in the House.

Be that as it may, you are to be congratulated in your move to protect efficient small business and to give them the same rights and privileges through their committee as any other standing committee.

It is significant to note that through bipartisan action in the House resolutions along the same line have been introduced by Congressmen MOORE, West Virginia; WIDNALL, New Jersey; KYL, Iowa; RIVERS, Alaska, ST. GEORGE, New York; MCDOWELL, Delaware; LANGEN, Minnesota; STAEBLER, Michigan; NELSEN, Minnesota; MCINTRE, Maine; O'KONSKI, Wisconsin; JOHNSON, Wisconsin; CEDERBERG, Michigan; BARRY, New York; CLEVELAND, New Hampshire.

This in itself has been bipartisan action and all of these resolutions are pending with House Rules. So I believe it would be welcome news in the way of a Christmas or New Years present for small business in your State of Iowa to know of your consistency in their behalf.

With very high regards and thanking you for your usual cooperation,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Safe Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the National Independent regarding standards for safe tires. This article indicates the steps contemplated by the auto safety authorities in New York. They have decided to push for action by the State legislature to establish standards for tires.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is absolutely essential to require tire manufacturers to have such standards and I am hopeful that the several States will enact appropriate legislation in this area, for if they do not and the manufacturers do not take it upon themselves to adopt standards, then I believe the Congress should take the steps to insure that tires purchased by individuals are safe.

We are all aware that there are many causes of accidents and many have been attributed to tire failures.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article referred to in the RECORD at this point:

FAIL TO CONVINCE LAWMAKERS THAT ALL TIRES ARE SAFE; DRIVE IS ON FOR STANDARDS

The ruse being used to palm off inspection procedures as "tire standards" has apparently failed in a first-test audition. What appears to be one result of attempts made to confuse the real issues bearing on safe tires—before as well as after the point of sale—is a decision reached in November by auto safety authorities in New York. They have decided to plug for manufacturing standards when the State's legislature convenes next January. If this means binding tiremakers to minimum specifications—the kind they must meet when supplying original equipment tires, for example—the action taken in New York will not have been in vain.

These officials rightly conclude there is more going into the makeup of safe tires than rubber industry spokesmen are willing to admit. And interestingly enough they take this view after making red-carpet visits to Akron tire factories—after listening to the industry's apologists and after a perusal of RMA's booklet on so-called tire safety standards—and finally after probing the pros and cons of the issue in public hearings.

While these authorities have accepted the advice that tires already in use must meet certain operating criteria in on-the-road inspections (an inspection law goes into effect January 1), they evidently don't buy the assertion that "all new tires are safe tires."

According to State Senator Edward Speno, chairman of the joint legislative committee on motor vehicles and traffic safety, "the lifespan built into many tires is too brief for safety," and he concludes, "that the lifespan of a tire may determine the lifespan of the motorist." Many see his statement as a direct rebuff to those who would compromise the real issues involved.

An advisory committee, made up of New York State lawmakers and members of the tire industry, has been formed for the purpose of hammering out meaningful tire standards. The panel has been asked to report in time for action by the 1964 session of the legislature.

The full significance of this turn of events—pointed toward hard and fast performance standards for all tires sold in New York State—should not be lost on NI readers and BTCS supporters, and on all interested tire merchants. More and more officials in the various States—alarmed by the rising toll of automobile accidents—are moving toward a position also being reached at the Federal level (see National Independent, November issue): The need of not only codifying safety requirements which bind the user, but also enacting tire standards which bind the manufacturer as well. If standards aren't arrived at voluntarily, legislators say they will be forced to use legislative means to get the job done.

Dealers who want to help themselves and assist in the campaign to create minimum standards for new tires should contact Mr. Speno at State Office Building, Albany, N.Y.

Remember this: The action you take here could serve as a model for similar action in your State—could spark a breakthrough in a years-long fight to get a practical solution to a knotty problem that's been a real headache to efficient retailers. Be sure to send this magazine a copy of your letter to Mr. Speno; we'll unify and solidify the action you take in our contacts with these State officials.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our late President John F. Kennedy, has left upon this Nation a shock that will prevail for generations to come.

It was particularly felt by our youth of standing age. In their display of love and reverence for our youthful President who represented the ideals they cherished and hope for in mature life. In the shadows of his glowing consideration for our national youth, as indeed for children of other lands, many have become creative in their individual rights, as did Catherine Kennedy Haugh, of Philadelphia, who contributed her beautiful poem, "Even Heaven Cried," to the memory of a noble and dedicated man.

EVEN HEAVEN CRIED

She looked upon a lady
  Standing tall in pride
But standing all alone
  And even Heaven cried.

She looked upon a little girl
  Who had stood at his side
Who'd lost the one to teach her
  And even Heaven cried.

She looked upon a little son
  So proud and starry eyed
Who didn't know how much he'd lost
  And even Heaven cried.

She looked upon a nation
  Whose tears could not be dried
Such waste, such shame, such pain, such grief
  And even Heaven cried.

—CATHERINE KENNEDY HAUGH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 23, 1963.*

Bausch & Lomb Again Extends in Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to report on an outstanding example of what one American industrial concern is doing to emphasize scientific education.

That concern is Bausch & Lomb, Inc., of Rochester, N.Y. Since the home of this firm, a leader in the optical, mechanical, and electronic industry, is located in the portion of Rochester which I have the honor to represent in Congress, its achievements are of special pride to me.

The case for intensified instruction in the physical and natural sciences in our entire educational system deserves our attention. This is an age of science and technology. If we are to assure that the future will be populated by adequate numbers of those who can keep the free world in the scientific lead, there must be proper provision made for their training.

Writing in the fall issue of the Bausch & Lomb publication, Focus, Percilee B. Price, science consultant and assistant director of educational promotion, Grade Teacher magazine; and secretary of the Science Curriculum Committee, Darien (Conn.) Public Schools, states:

Almost imperceptibly, there began in the late forties and early fifties a discontent with the status quo.

Teachers * * * [and] * * * specialists * * * examined the teaching tools—textbooks, laboratory equipment—and found them inadequate and often outmoded.

All of these efforts to improve our science teaching began with American scientists and teachers before Russia's first Sputnik * * * they had already been on the move to upgrade science education * * * What Sput-

nik did do was jar the public out of its complacency. Overnight, science was written in capital letters.

Some of the most publicized projects were at the high school level. But the elementary and junior high teachers were not idle.

If we examine the projects of the past few years and those currently in progress it becomes apparent that the unifying theme is science as inquiry. That spirit of inquiry must be vigorously nourished from the moment the child enters the classroom. * * * It is from his direct experience in early school years that the child forms the concepts that interpret his world to him. That is why it is so important that science be taught in the elementary grades.

Until now there has been a stumbling block. The elementary school student has been a stepchild as far as scientific instruments specifically designed for his use are concerned. Microscopes too complicated for him to operate, too large, too expensive or too delicate for the adjustment of little fingers have gathered dust on the shelves where they were provided. Or, more often, those shelves have been empty because the instruments were priced beyond the range of an elementary science budget * * * Bausch & Lomb scientists have been cognizant of this, and now, in a dramatic breakthrough, have developed five new microscopes to implement the new science for today's classroom study.

Mr. Speaker, Bausch & Lomb introduced these new microscopes on October 21. Designed for elementary and high school students, the new line of low-cost microscopes promise an economical approach to the expansion of school science programs for younger students.

I have noted with considerable interest the fact that every component of the new Bausch & Lomb microscopes has been designed and manufactured in the United States. Many of the design and manufacturing employees are my constituents, and I compliment them for their ingenuity and skills.

For use in the Nation's 106,000 elementary schools, Bausch & Lomb is offering a low-priced microscope available in either 10 or 100 times magnification. It should give millions of youngsters their first real look at the microscopic wonders of plants, insects, and other natural science specimens.

Two other groups of these new microscopes make available three-dimensional or stereomicroscopy and continuously variable infocus magnification features to more advanced students for the first time at a moderate price.

I applaud Bausch & Lomb for this remarkable contribution to the field of science education in our elementary and high schools. It is convincing proof of the ability of an American industry to meet one of the pressing needs confronting educators across the land.

Mr. Speaker, any report on Bausch & Lomb which failed to mention the years of stewardship that firm has enjoyed as a result of the guiding genius of its retiring board chairman, Carl S. Hallauer, would be incomplete.

Many of my colleagues are personally acquainted with Carl. His prominence in public life has brought great distinction to the community of Rochester. Unselfishness in every undertaking—and they are countless—is truly synonymous with this great American.

If I felt that Carl's recent announcement of retirement from Bausch & Lomb were a signal of retirement from his activity in public affairs as well, I would be very unhappy. Yet, I know, as does everyone who has ever been associated with this man, for whom the term "energy" was invented, that he will relentlessly pursue and achieve the goals which mean a better life for the person he loves most, his fellow man.

Mr. Speaker, the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat & Chronicle published an editorial tribute to Carl Hallauer on Thursday, December 12. I take pleasure in sharing its content with my colleagues in the House:

CARL HALLAUER

It is frustrating exercise to try to catalog the achievements and awards that have graced the career of Carl S. Hallauer, who is about to retire as chief executive officer of Bausch & Lomb.

Let us choose two points, which top the catalog in significance in our judgment.

One is that his is a genuine, vintage, Horatio Alger career, of the sort probable only in America * * * which may be a trite way to say it, but how else is it possible to describe a career that took an orphaned street corner newsboy to national esteem and the friendship of Presidents?

The other point is typical of the man, a little tale that leaked out yesterday when his retirement story broke in this newspaper. Friends from all over, knowing of the coming event, have been trying to persuade Hallauer to be the guest at a party to end all parties. To every feeler, he has replied: "I won't * * * and if you go ahead with it, I won't be there."

He made only this exception.

"If you want to move up the annual (B. & L.) Early Settlers banquet to my birthday, I'll be there * * * because they are my people."

Long Beach Bar Association Memorial to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in its December bulletin the Long Beach Bar Association paid its respects to the memory of the late President John F. Kennedy in the following touching words written by Attorney Blaine Nels Simons:

IN MEMORIAM TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Goodbye—
To father, husband, son,
Too soon, too soon your race is run
Time's sands run out, the battle done.
Goodbye—
And in those few and fleeting years
We hope you felt, throughout the din of cheers,
The deep affection proved now by our tears.
Goodbye—
Sleep on in peace beneath Virginia's sod,
And pity us who on life's highway still must trod,
Not knowing, as do you the loving arms of God.
Goodbye.

—B. N. SIMONS.

Water Pollution and Acid Mine Drainage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works recently conducted hearings on a proposal to provide Federal funds for the purpose of sealing off abandoned coal mines, and thereby reducing substantially the acid mine drainage which contributes heavily to the water pollution problem of the Appalachian States. In the course of those hearings a statement was presented by former Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, of West Virginia, who for many years while a Member of this body urged adoption of such legislation.

His testimony before the committee is both cogent and convincing, and in view of the fact that this is a problem which must be dealt with sooner or later if we are to undertake a meaningful antipollution program, I take this means of drawing his statement to your attention and making known my own agreement with his views:

I strongly favor passage of H.R. 6488 to seal off and prevent acid drainage from abandoned coal mines, and S. 649 to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and provide for reserved and greater pollution abatement. I support these bills because they would help prevent and help reduce pollution of our national water supplies.

Adequate supplies of water of acceptable quality are essential to the continued welfare of the Nation, to its agricultural and industrial development, and to national health and security. It is both economically feasible and highly important to mitigate existing pollution in thousands of miles of our watercourses—and to prevent additional pollution in such limited waters as may yet be relatively pure. Clean water is vitally important. Indeed, without adequate supplies of water of sufficient purity, life in its many forms as we know it would perish from the earth.

Pollution of our lakes, streams, and rivers is an adjunct of the industrial age and an increasingly dense population. The main sources of pollution are industrial and municipal wastes and sewage. Such pollution is dangerous to health and life itself. Acid wastes from coal mines and from some other types of mines, are a significant contributory cause of water pollution in many of the streams in some parts of our country. To keep our Nation strong, we will have to eliminate or minimize the causes for water pollution.

Our national population now numbers about 185 million persons, but by 1980 there may be about 260 million, a growth of about 75 million, or an increase of over 40 percent. We now use about 355 billion gallons of water a day. In 1980 the total available water supply may be only about 515 billion gallons a day, but our daily requirements will have climbed to 600 billion gallons, and, by the year 2000 our requirements may be more than 1,000 billion gallons a day. Therefore, it is urgent that we do all we can to minimize the degree of pollution in the water supplies available to us.

In the 87th Congress, I introduced H.R. 5448 which is identical to Congressman

Blatnik's bill, H.R. 6488 of this session, to provide for sealing off of certain abandoned coal mines to prevent the pollution of waterways, and for other purposes. Naturally, I enthusiastically support his bill.

As a result of the bill I introduced in the 87th Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prepared a report entitled "Acid Mine Drainage," published in 1962 by the House Public Works Committee. This report estimated that about 3.5 million tons of mine acids are discharged annually into over 4,000 miles of the larger streams in this country with about 341,000 tons from the anthracite coalfields of Pennsylvania, 263,000 tons from the bituminous coal fields of the Susquehanna River Basin, 2,500,000 tons in the Ohio River Basin, and 125,000 tons in the Potomac River Basin. No estimates are available for the Missouri, Arkansas-White, or Upper Mississippi River Basins. If all streams including tributaries are included, there may be over 10,000 miles of such acid contaminated streams.

Acid mine drainage comes mainly from anthracite and bituminous coal mines, but lead and zinc mines in Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma, and gold and other ore mines in the Black Hills, and barite and manganese ore mines in Arkansas discharge unusually acid waters.

In Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee, the eight States where such drainage is considered critical, there are approximately 20,000 abandoned mine and other drainage openings contributing to pollution of streams. Many of thes abandoned coal mines are located in areas of serious unemployment. The economic and social costs of pollution abatement in such regions are so comparatively high as to discourage adequate local efforts to prevent pollution. In some cases, the increased costs of pollution prevention or abatement may lower the local industry's competitive position, putting it out of business, and depressing the area still further, closing more mines with additional drainage of harmful sulfuric and other acids.

Drainage of mine acids into streams generally changes the chemical quality of the water, destroying its alkalinity, hardening it, and adding objectionable amounts of iron, manganese, aluminum, and sulfates. This makes the streams undesirable for recreational uses such as fishing, water skiing, boating, swimming, camping, or picnicking, alters the biological life therein, kills fish and other creatures, corrodes culverts, bridges, boat hulls, and other materials, decreases property values, discourages new industries, spreads to other areas, including municipal water supplies, and increases costs of water pollution treatment plants which are also corroded by the acids.

In 1933, a regional program of air sealing of abandoned coal mines began, but apparently that program died in 1938. The air sealing where undertaken improved the situation considerably, reducing treated drainage by 70 to 80 percent in 4 to 5 years after sealing. However, since that time many of the original air seals deteriorated, and in a number of cases coal was bootlegged from them while there were coal scarcities during and after World War II. Consequently, much of the original benefits of previous sealings have disappeared, and, as stated, stark, unhealthy acid drainages flow from abandoned mines, particularly in West Virginia with its numerous areas of closed mines and high rates of unemployment.

H.R. 6488 would provide for sealing off of abandoned drift- and shaft-type coal mines in any of the several States, provided permission of the States and the property controllers is granted. For the most part, unemployed persons in the areas familiar with coal mine work would be employed at the regional prevailing rate to do such work. The Federal appropriation of $5 million being asked for this program is less than the estimated cost of 2 years annual damages (over $3 million a year in 1960) to water supplies, structures and navigation equipment in the Ohio River drainage basin above the Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania State lines.

I heartily support, also, Senator MUSKIE'S bill (companion bill to Mr. BLATNIK'S H.R. 3166) S. 649, as amended, cosponsored by 18 other Senators and passed October 16, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 11. This bill would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, make grants for research and development of projects for water pollution abatement, increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, authorize promulgation of water standards, and issuance of regulations helpful in preventing, controlling and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and establish a procedure for cooperation between the Government and the soap industry for developing detergents which will decompose rather than pollute streams and other water supply sources.

Control of water pollution is highly important to the health of our people, the problems are very complex, and accomplishment of these objectives deserves a strong administrative organizational status. Therefore, I favor the establishment of a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is very desirable to increase grants for research for new or improved methods of controlling the discharge into any waters of harmful sewage from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes. Combined storm and sanitary sewers in many municipalities seriously worsen the national pollution problem, because rainfall may cause the harmful materials to bypass the sewage treatment plants and get into waters used for consumption. Separation of the combined storm and sanitary sewers is a rather costly proposition, however, and perhaps alternative measures are possible and sometimes preferable. Research into these problems is necessary.

Larger cities require larger treatment plants. Therefore, an increase is warranted for the maximum individual treatment plant construction grants.

Authority for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to prepare regulations and national standards of water quality is very important for strong reasons. National standards for water quality would put the whole country on an equal basis and make it more difficult for some persons, industries, cities, or regions to influence agencies or legislatures to allow inferior, harmful standards and get away with pollution through pressure, bribery, or to avoid compliance by moving to another State or locality. Standards and legislation now differ considerably in the different States and regions. The legislatures of 36 States have received bills directing or permitting the establishment of stream classifications, and/or, water quality standards. However, only 22 of those 36 States have adopted classifications or standards. Although interstate agencies and informal interstate groups help to promote provisions for water quality classification, the authority to provide national water quality standards in consultation with the States and local authorities is urgently needed.

Synthetic detergents which do not decompose have caused large volumes of foam and pollutants to pile up on some of our streams and in some of our water supplies. It is necessary that we undertake to facilitate research to develop detergents which will not pollute our water.

Both of these bills are designed to reduce degree of pollution of our national water supplies which are so important to us and to future generations. Therefore, I urgently solicit your support of both of these legislative measures.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as national consternation and grief emanating from the sudden and tragic death of the beloved John F. Kennedy subsides into a period of meditation and composure, we review with wonder and amazement the tremendous impact this courageous and dedicated President had on people of all ages and in all walks of life.

It was a dedicated personal feeling, sufficiently close that his departure was akin to the loss of an immediate member of one's own family.

Such expression was deeply and personally felt by all those fortunate enough to be present when a young priest, Father O'Malley, delivered the following eulogy to the late President during a late November retreat at Woodstock College, Md.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

There was a man sent by God, whose name was John. * * * He was not the light, but—in his way—he gave testimony to the light.

Perhaps the spirit of this weekend is captured best by A. E. Housman's poem to an athlete, dying young:

"The time you won your town the race,
We chaired you through the market-place;
Man and boy stood cheering by,
And home we brought you, shoulder-high.

Today, the road all runners come,
Shoulder-high we bring you home,
And set you at your threshold down,
Townsman of a stiller town."

I don't know whether you cried on Friday. I'm not ashamed to say I did. I don't know why. I didn't really want to. I didn't really know him. And yet, somehow, he was mine.

I suppose this possessive feeling is the result of a kind of cruelty of the press, that opens up a prominent man's life and lets us enter, and know him, and love him. It was strange to me—and almost irritating—that when I heard the news I realized that, at the very moment of his death, I had been looking at pictures of the President, beaming at his little boy. And I had thought to myself, "Yes. That's it. That's what a man looks like."

At first, the news had to be untrue. It was like watching a great athlete stop in the middle of a race, and turn and walk away. It was too big to take in, all at once. And I began to realize a little of what Peter must have felt that night in the garden, when he saw the first torches coming through the trees—This isn't happening. There were all those palms and all those voices crying Hosannah. He's too young. He's too good. We love him.

And then, when the news became undeniable, the question became—Why? Why a good God could allow such a monstrous thing to happen.

New President Described by Colorado's Big Ed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Edwin Carl Johnson, former Colorado Governor and U.S. Senator, that was written on the first day following the assassination of President Kennedy and published in the Colorado Democrat. Governor Johnson served in the Senate with the new President and was an active leader in the national campaign in 1960 to nominate him for the Presidency. The article is as follows:

NEW PRESIDENT DESCRIBED BY COLORADO'S BIG ED

(By Edwin Carl Johnson)

Late in the evening of Black Friday, November 22, 1963, Lyndon Baines Johnson, the new President, aged 55, returned to his beloved Washington, and far away from the hideous heart-breaking tragedy of Dallas.

He was still in deep shock though as he groped his way to his appointment.

Just outside the entrance to the oval office of the President of the United States he paused—then briskly and alone stepped across that thorny threshold and into the crushing burden. Meekly he uttered this prayer: "I will do my best. I ask for your help and God's."

The assassin's bullet has robbed us of John F. Kennedy's magnificent services. He is irreplaceable—but governments provide for continuity. Now a new hand is at the throttle. It is well that he is an experienced and capable pilot.

Lyndon Johnson will do all right. He has tremendous executive ability. He gets things done. Loyalty, integrity, courage, and achievement are the basic foundations of his character. Lyndon Johnson will make the people a great President. He has the know-how and the desire. He does not lack resolution.

In the field of politics, the new President is a skilled craftsman and a super strategist. There is not a more able man in the political world than he.

His former colleagues on the Hill know him as a "natural" and as "the Old Pro." He is familiar with every angle of the important art of politics.

He is generous with words of encouragement to his associates and he has a bag full of compliments to fit every Senator's vanity. His staff stands ready to gun down anyone, who so much as hints a word of criticism. That is strange, too, because the President is a severe disciplinarian. He works like a horse himself and he demands effective, efficient services from his official family.

The President's sense of loyalty is so keen, that even if he did not believe in it, which he does, his purpose will be to carry out the policies of the Kennedy administration in every detail and to the fullest extent possible. He will look upon such a course as his sacred duty.

He may adopt an improved technique but his purpose and his policy will not be altered. Conditions and circumstances change and the political approach must adjust to them. However, a safe prediction is, that insofar as purpose and policies are concerned, there will be more of the same.

In Washington where there is much talk and very little listening, the President is the exception to the rule. No one listens more than he, no one analyzes more carefully what he hears. When he is convinced as to what is right he strikes—and he strikes hard.

He knows exactly how to get what he wants from his old colleagues on Capitol Hill. On rare occasions, as a last resort, he will lay his cause on the line and slug it out. He is not a softie.

It is true that President Johnson is naturally intense and fraught with tensions, nervous, impatient, and hot tempered. Most of the time, however, he has these harmful proclivities under complete control. Largely due to them he likes to counsel with calm and serene friends.

Sam Rayburn, for whom he had a deep affection and tremendous admiration, was a great aid and comfort to him. These two men made a strong team. Nevertheless, the President in his own right is long on commonsense and he has an abundance of mighty sound judgment.

President Johnson is a devoted family man. He is very proud of Lady Bird, his vivacious and energetic wife, and his two lovely teenage daughters. Mrs. Johnson is thrifty and a very successful businesswoman. She will lend great strength to her beloved.

Thoughtfully and wisely President Kennedy has made good use of his Vice President's tremendous public relations talents in the field of international relations. In this acutely sensitive and discriminatory service, Lyndon Johnson has obtained the most marvelous results. In such assignments he has proved himself the master.

Lyndon Johnson does not make long-winded speeches. His are brief and to the point. He can say more in one paragraph than many can say in a whole volume. His short speeches are couched with well-chosen words of tremendous import and expression and they are replete with conviction and clarity.

They are typical, too, of this man's direct and concentrated approach to his tasks. But he is not blunt. He is articulate, eloquent, and persuasive.

The new President will prove to be a good man for the West. His goal is to realize the potential in the Nation's human, mineral, and industrial resources through development and use.

He will make a strong, confident, and alert President. He is eminently qualified. He is the answer to our prayers.

Hon. Homer Thornberry

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Judge HOMER THORNBERRY.

We were sworn into Congress on the same day and were assigned to the same committee. At the outset it was obvious that here was one to be an outstanding Member of Congress, and he has certainly lived up to that promise.

We are going to miss his service here very much, but our loss will be the judiciary's gain. I know he will serve with equal distinction as a U.S. district judge.

I join with all of you in wishing him and his wonderful family Godspeed.

The Penalty of Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 26, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of December 18. It is a relief, in this day and age, to read a temperate and thoughtful article giving the Congress side of the foreign aid program.

Not only, to quote the words of the article, is "Congress saying, in no uncertain terms, that it is fed up with all the mismanagement, abuses, and confusion," but the people are saying the same thing in louder and stronger words.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the executive branch to pause and give ear to the clamor of the people and to realize, though it may be a bitter pill to swallow, that spreading our money all over the world is regarded in most countries as one for them and two for us.

THE PENALTY OF INDIFFERENCE

The trouble foreign aid is having in Congress stems at least in part from the long refusal of the officials concerned to accept reasonable criticisms and make constructive changes.

At the outset the program was paraded under somewhat false pretenses. Most Americans realized the need for a Marshall plan to help rebuild Europe, but they were also given to understand that it and the other assistance programs were temporary. The Marshall plan ended; nothing else ended or was even significantly cut back.

In more recent years the official line has been that foreign aid is a vital, integral, and permanent part of foreign policy. No one is supposed to question the amounts or the uses to which an administration wants to put them. When Congress nonetheless does raise questions, the White House customarily reacts with denunciation instead of trying to meet the lawmakers' justified objections.

So it is today. As the foreign aid bill works its way through the congressional machinery, it has been considerably reduced. Now President Johnson says the reductions, if permitted to stand, would put foreign policy in a straitjacket and spell weakness and retreat.

Among other things, the White House statement observes that the proposed lower appropriation for the Alliance for Progress "would mean that the United States would be providing for all of Latin America less than the Soviet Union is putting into Cuba alone."

It's a bit difficult to see the connection. Soviet aid has not exactly transformed Cuba into a showplace. And the vast problems encountered in the Alliance for Progress have little to do with the exact number of dollars allocated to it.

The same assumption—that the value of foreign aid equals the money spent—seems to underlie the whole program. Yet it should be clear that the success of assistance in a given place depends not merely on money but on how sensible are the purposes of the administrators and the economic policies of the particular country.

Thus aid was successful in Europe partly because most of the governments adopted wise economic policies. In contrast, we have poured over $4 billion into India with scant result; an important reason is that Govern-

ment's insistence on socialism and state planning.

Many in Congress plainly believe it is not unreasonable to ask why the United States, of all places, should spend so much money to support socialism abroad. They think that if we are to have a foreign aid program, it should be in support of free institutions and economic growth, since that would seem to be in the American interest.

A further trouble with an adamant official attitude is that it makes the needed corrections that much harder. The administration of foreign aid has gone through innumerable reshufflings in its history, but none of them has got down to the basic question of how to make the assistance an effective instrument of foreign policy.

The accumulation of all these years of apparent indifference is finally bringing the sort of penalty you would expect. Congress is saying, in no uncertain terms, that it is fed up with all the mismanagement, abuses, and confusion of purposes.

Whatever figure the lawmakers settle on, it is too bad they have not enjoyed more cooperation over the years. If they had, the chances are the Government would be running a more workable program at lower cost to the taxpayer.

Bureaucrats Seek Local Air Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the December 12, 1963, edition of the Arcadian, an outstanding Florida weekly newspaper.

The editorial, "Bureaucrats Seek Local Air Control," speaks for itself. As Editor Earl E. Neiberger points out, this is just another attempt by the Federal Government to take over another local function. Local community action has successfully combated air pollution in many areas. Many communities would like to have the privilege of solving their own problems.

The editorial follows:

BUREAUCRATS SEEK LOCAL AIR CONTROL

It is impossible to kill a frog by dropping it into boiling water. It would react so quickly to this harsh treatment that it would jump out before being hurt.

It is possible to do in the frog via the hot water method. Put the frog in a pan of cold water—then warm it up slowly. The frog is not alarmed by the gradual increase of heat and by the time it decides it really must jump it's too late. It is cooked.

Federal bureaucrats have been using this frog-cooking recipe to expand the control of the Central Government over the affairs of local communities for decades. They have succeeded because, like the frog, the gradualism has lulled taxpayers into a false sense of security. When full realization of their sorry plight comes it is usually too late to do anything about it.

It is not too late, however to halt the latest attempt by the Federal Government to take over a fundamentally local function. In this thrust for more power bureaucrats are pushing for legislation that would hand over to the Federal Government the authority to enforce air pollution control in local communities.

And, using the taxpayers' own funds as bait (the cold water technique) the Federal Government is offering to pay two-thirds of the cost of local air pollution control activities.

This grab for power is being made in spite of the indisputable evidence that the most successful way to combat air pollution is through local community action. This has been proved time and time again in localities throughout the Nation which instituted satisfactory control programs without the need of any outside help.

Air pollution cannot be controlled by Washington dictates or ordinances or statutes. It can be achieved by members of communities working together toward a common goal and these cooperative efforts are bringing results since the U.S. Health Service's own statistics show that there has been a steady reduction in air pollution in 213 urban areas.

Let's all hop out of the pot before the water gets too hot.

We Are Always Outtraded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our excessive unemployment, balance of payments, and loss of gold make it urgent that our tariff negotiators stand up for American interests. American businessmen should be consulted and should be permitted to participate in all tariff negotiations.

The following article appeared some time ago in the New York Journal-American, and I commend this article to the attention of every Member of this Congress:

WHY FOREIGNERS GET JUMP ON UNITED STATES ON TARIFFS

The United States has a serious balance-of-payments problem. It is spending and giving away more than it takes in. So, there is a deficit.

Some progress currently is being made to reduce the deficit, but most of the actions are of a temporary nature.

Among these is the proposed tax on American purchases of securities from foreigners and from foreign governments. The threat of such a tax, which will be retroactive if it ever passes, has all but dried up the flow of foreign securities here.

Another stopgap move is the manipulation of the short-term money rates by the Federal Reserve. This is designed to check the outward flow of short-term money, which goes where the interest rates are highest.

Additionally, the Congress in defiance of the administration is trimming the foreign military and economic aid programs. This is all to the good. The same can hardly be said for the equalization tax on foreign securities, nor for the tinkering with money rates.

There is one area where the United States has a favorable balance in its international dealings. This is in its trade, with exports exceeding imports. Without this the United States would be nearly as bad off as some of the underdeveloped nations.

FOREIGNERS CONSULT INDUSTRY

There has been a lot of talk in Washington about expanding exports, the only trouble is that the message hasn't gotten through to a very important part of the administration—the men carrying on the negotiations for reciprocal tariff reductions. Unless they do get the message soon, the United States faces an increase in imports without counterbalancing expansion in trade.

A study by the great DuPont Co. finds that indicated U.S. and foreign tariff reductions will result in increased imports that greatly exceed any increase in U.S. chemical exports. The reason for this, Lammot du Pont Copeland, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., explains:

"In past tariff negotiations, negotiators for foreign governments have worked extremely closely with knowledgeable industry representatives and were able to obtain important trade concessions while ours have not. This type of industry-government cooperation represents a substantial advantage when dealing with thousands of highly technical and obscure materials."

UNITED STATES IGNORES BUSINESSMEN

Then, Mr. Copeland reveals:

"It is a matter of considerable concern that, to date, there has been no appointment of representatives of industry to act as continuing advisers to the special representatives for trade negotiations."

Mr. Copeland is sure competition will increase from European and Japanese industry with their lower cost, modern plants, technical competence, and highly productive, on an output-per-man-hour-basis labor.

In the face of these facts, our Government tariff negotiators must exercise extreme care and the most informed judgments to see that the effects of the (Tariff) Act are not detrimental to large sections of our economy."

This country in addition to the balance-of-payments problem has just as pressing one at home—unemployment. A rise in imports without counterbalancing increases in exports will aggrevate that situation.

At the same time, Mr. Copeland says businessmen will have to be realistic, admitting that "some industries may have to face not just inroads in their product lines, but even attrition from tariff reduction, just as they face attrition from obsolescence and competition in the domestic market."

NO JOB FOR "EGGHEADS"

He adds, "But it is the responsibility of industry to do everything it can to minimize the effects of such action on itself and its people."

This is no job for eggheads, who seem to be calling the shots on tariffs.

Retired U.S. Employees' Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, recognizing the heavy burdens President Johnson now carries, retired Post Office Clerk Frank A. Winslow offered the following resolution at a meeting of chapter No. 21, National Association of Retired Civil Employees:

Regardless of beliefs and regardless of our affiliations, I move this chapter No. 21, National Association of Retired Civil Employees go on record that we offer a silent prayer that whosoever has taken the helm now, in later years, for the future of our country, that it be successfully charted for the everlasting existence of a nation whose only hope and belief is for a world of peace.

The resolution was adopted unanimously and spread upon the record of

that chapter's deliberations. Should anywhere in the world their be doubt of the strength and continuity of the United States of America, actions such as this by its citizens on their own initiatives should dispel it.

In the Middle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous evidences of the shocking and dangerous attitude which the State Department under the present administration has had toward coexistence with the Soviet Union, but the recent pronouncements of Secretary of State Rusk in Paris are especially revealing.

The Chicago Tribune's editorial commentary this morning most dramatically and effectively discusses the latest Rusk contribution to international confusion, and I insert it into the RECORD at this point.

IN THE MIDDLE

Secretary of State Rusk gave some gratuitous counsel to the Ministerial Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Paris that the Western allies should help Russia with its ideological quarrel with Red China. The Soviet Union's policy of peaceful coexistence, he said, was much to be preferred to Red China's belligerent malevolence.

After Rusk unloaded this strange doctrine, his colleagues in teh Department in Washington rushed forward to "clarify" his remarks by saying he hadn't meant what every reporter on the scene heard him say. We accept the original unadulterated version and ask a few questions.

What business is it of ours to get ourselves in the middle in a squabble between two Communist countries? Especially, why should it be the policy of NATO to interfere when NATO was established for no other reason than to counter Soviet imperialism?

In point of relative menace, there is no comparison between a Russia armed with thermonuclear weapons targeted on the United States and the West and a Communist China which has unlimited cannon fodder but represents no greater intercontinental threat than a string of firecrackers. Mr. Rusk should keep his eye on the main point.

We made the enormous error once before of choosing between two equally malignant and implacable specimens of tyranny. That was when Hitler's Germany tangled in 1941 with Stalin's Russia. There was no profit getting embroiled on either side, as the results of the war later demonstrated.

At the time the fact was so apparent that even Harry Truman, then a Senator and later President, was able to glimpse the reality.

"If we see that Germany is winning," he remarked on June 24, 1941, "we ought to help Russia. If Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany. In that way let them kill as many as possible."

The Tribune was no less perspicacious. In an editorial of July 30, 1941, entitled "If Russia Wins," we advanced the prospect of "the victorious Russian army, recrossing the land which the Nazis had taken and coming west with the hammer and sickle, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class war, and the liquidation of the bourgeoisie."

That was what happened, with the aid of the United States, as a product of Franklin Roosevelt's impetuosity, and the Iron Curtain, the Soviet satellites, and the Berlin wall are part of the legacy. It is exactly as this newspaper foretold in the same editorial:

"No one should indulge in any dreamy speculation of the deliverance of Europe under the protection of the great liberal powers if Stalin is the controller of new forces dominating the continent. His perfidies equal Hitler's and his ruthlessness is not less. The Communist recognizes in Great Britain and the United States two enemies, different in type from the Nazi foe, but fully as hostile and less akin to him in thought and purpose than his German neighbor. The present war is one between forces of similar purposes and some common ideas. The next war would be between the bitterest of enemies, and if the Russians were in the ascendancy it would be a war without quarter."

Yet Mr. Roosevelt was not deterred, and now an American Secretary of State professes to see in Stalin's successor, the canary-swallowing Khrushchev, some promise of a mellowing which makes him seem preferable to the Peiping branch of the Communist international conspiracy.

Perhaps it is true that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn from history. At least, our leaders seem to be trying to validate that aphorism.

Jack Davis Offers Fine Abstractions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to draw the attention of my colleagues to a distinguished citizen of Frederick, Md. Mr. Jack Davis is chairman of the art department at Hood College and is recognized as an exceptionally fine abstract painter.

The Washington Post paid tribute to the fine work of this artist in the December 1 edition. Under permission to extend my remarks I include the Post article:

JACK DAVIS OFFERS FINE ABSTRACTIONS

The Adams Morgan Gallery has come up with a really beautiful show of abstract paintings by Jack Davis, chairman of the art department at Hood College. Davis came to this area from California in 1955. He studied in Paris with Fernand Leger and at the University of California, and has exhibited in major European shows.

Davis repudiates the term "abstract expressionist" in the usual sense of the word, because he sees his paintings as distillations of experience, but with imposed control to suit his ends. His is a search for an image—however abstract—which can "contain the multiple levels of meaning and association that form our lives."

In this Davis shares a direction common to certain other painters, such as Clyfford Still or James Brooks, who, while loosely grouped with the abstract expressionist school, still continue to impose conscious control on the final result—eschewing the kind of action painting characteristic, say, of Jackson Pollock. However, it is a mistake, I think, to equate all abstract expressionism with action painting, with its limitations, unless you wish to call painters such as Still, Brooks, and Davis by a more exact term which implies a distillation rather than a spontaneous expression.

In any case, Davis is an exceptionally fine abstract painter, and it is a pleasure to see again the sensual beauty of oil on canvas, which has recently been lost between assemblage and color abstraction of immaculate variety.

Davis' imagery recalls that of Clyfford Still in its fragmentary ragged shapes that move across the canvas. Those of Davis tend to cling to the edge of the canvas—seeming ready to disappear like wisps of vapor. The ground is usually of a single color—gold, red, or blue—against which fragments float. On several canvases thin perpendiculars at each side seem to force the imagery back into space. But it is a space that counts—rich, varied, luminous, tactile.

Address of Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath Before the 47th General Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be a delegate to the 47th general assembly meeting of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Chicago last month. We were privileged to hear another fine address by its president, Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath.

I am pleased to set forth several important excerpts therefrom, which I believe are of general interest to all mankind:

EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF RABBI MAURICE N. EISENDRATH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS, AT CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 16, 1963

Judge Baar, distinguished delegates, honored guests, friends, many blessings have indeed been bestowed on mankind through Israel: the knowledge and worship of the One God; the purity of family life; the unceasing hunger for knowledge, the vision of justice and peace for all; the foundation of the whole of our Western ethos; the constant pursuit of excellence in the individual and society. So has it been in the past. But today in America, within our Reform Jewish ranks, I seriously doubt whether that "excellency of Jacob whom He loved" (Psalms 47: 4) is any longer our paramount standard and guide. That is why it is so incumbent upon us to examine more closely this biennial assembly's timely and relevant theme, "Judaism and the Pursuit of Excellence."

To do so, it is imperative first of all to comprehend what the word "excellence" itself connotes. Despite Robert Frost's warning that "great caution should be exercised in the use of the word 'excellence' that it be not confused with the word 'perfection,'" I find that Mr. Webster does define it as including all of the following virtues: goodness, purity, preeminence—and finally—perfection.

In Hebrew also there are a myriad of words that we translate as "excellent"—a word oftimes applied to God alone as in Isaiah's prophecy (35: 2) "Thou shalt see the excellence of God"; or in the Psalmist's rhap-

sodic dream of the time when "His excellency shall be over all Israel" (Psalms 68: 34). But as God is thus envisaged as the epitome of excellence, so is this blessed state held out as the prime goal of man' and Israel's pursuit: "Deck thyself," we read in Job, "in majesty and excellence" (Job 40: 10); or, again "Let thy excellency amount up to Heaven" (Job 20: 6) for it is, to quote the Psalmist once more, "The excellent in whom is all my delight" (Psalms 16: 3).

TYRANNY OF THE COMMONPLACE

But there can be little divine delight in what the Lords sees before Him today, not alone in society at large but, perhaps for the first time in our long history, in the "tents of Jacob" as well. At the dawn of our history, whereas in Egypt there was Stygian darkness, "light shone in Goshen." It is not quite so today. While it is fortunately not out of our Jewish household that the names of the Profumos and the Christine Keelers, the love lives of the Elizabeth Taylors and the Richard Burtons, the Billy Sol Estes' swindles, the incredible Valachi brigandage and murders, flash incessantly and incandescently in bold type across the headlines of our daily press, yet, following not too far behind are the petty chiselers and cheaters, the expense account extravaganzas, the bed-hopping so-called romances, the spreading delinquency not alone of adolescents but of adults as well, the dope addiction which is spawning like a plague not only among "lesser breeds without the law" but in the lily-white monochrome suburbias as well. While we Jews were once singlarly free of such moral maladies, today we are claiming—almost as evidence of our normalcy—our full quota of mischief and misdemeanor.

Realism would compel us to confess that the Chadorim and Yeshivoth of the past were not filled with angels. Their melamdim had tsoros aplenty. Those teachers had an abundance of trouble with their ofttimes far too obstreperous pupils. But I doubt whether there were many—if any—drug and dope addicts among them. Yet, today, not a few of my rabbinical colleagues whom I have visited in their communities throughout the country have confided that mere children in their religious schools, sons and daughters of their choicest members, have capitulated to the gutter morals of the crowd; have cast aside completely the inhibiting moral mandates of our Hebraic past; have become assimilated—or is "acculturated" the more fashionable word today?—to the worst, rather than the best in American society. There is no doubt that there were divorces in biblical and Talmudic days, otherwise there would not have been detailed legal regulations concerning them. There was without question adultery too, else this offense would not have been one of the few for which the death penalty was invoked. But there was, I am confident, in our Jewish past, no such wholesale husband and wife swapping and promiscuous jumping in and out of one another's beds as has constrained many an anxiety-ridden grandfather to pour out to me his heart's profound dismay, not for his still well-behaved little grandchildren but for his physically grownup, yet ethically and spiritually undeveloped, immature children. In our Hebrew heritage there was no such thing as prohibition against the drinking of liquor except among certain small and insignificant sects. In fact, our most solemn and sacred as well as our most gladsome simchas were ever hallowed by the Kiddush, the blessing over wine which "maketh glad the heart of man." But there was little of drunkenness, nothing resembling the alarming incidence of alcoholism revealed recently in those comprehensive Yale studies, nothing consonant with even some of our own slaphappy biennial conventioneers. Children were pampered in days of yore with apples and honey on festive occasions, but they were not ruined by the ancient equivalents of Cadillac convertibles and the lavish ostentation of the contemporary Bar and Bas Mitzvoth.

"Society is bettered," says Dr. John Gardiner, president of the Carnegie Foundation and author of the definitive volume appropriately entitled, Excellence, "not only by those who achieve excellence, but by those who are trying."

Are we really trying? Do we hold before our children the inherent adventurousness, the native daring, so appealing to youth? What do the children see in the examples set by their elders? Excellence, of course, but in what?—canasta, bridge, golf, riding, tennis. To be a mediocre bridge player, to fail to break 90 on the golf course, is to be either a square or just plain socially unacceptable. But mediocrity in school work, in moral judgments, in serving one's fellow man in a constructive maner—this is to be "one of the crowd."

We are living a lie and giving the lie to our young people. We insist upon excellence in the superficial areas of our lives—we must make huge sums of money at all costs, we must be proficient in one or more games, we must have a bigger house, a bigger plot of land than our neighbors, but with regard to the eternal verities of our faith, we ourselves, the so-called adults and leaders of our society, crawl on all fours, intellectually speaking, in the slush of slothfulness.

And then we wonder why one out of every four marriages ends in divorce, why, as recent reports in the American Jewish Yearbook reveal, there is an escalating increase in intermarriage leading to a loss to our fold of as high as 70 percent of the children of such mixed marriages; why drinking parties and unharnessed orgies occur among the teenage youngsters of "the best people" of our acquaintance. We have taught our children all about their rights: their right to attend a good college, their right, to have a good job at a good salary and drive a good car to a good club. But we have forgotten to add the other part of the story: their obligations.

Judaism and the Jew did not survive because of rights; Judaism and the Jew survived because of obligations—mitzvoth—to study, to worship, to perform good deeds. God did not wrap us in the silk-lined swaddling clothes of pampered infants; He made it crystal clear what He expected of us and then He commanded us to go forth to accomplish the goals He set before us.

It is ironical that we who have been the repeated victims of the tyranny of others through the ages should now, in a free land, where the opportunity to develop the highest form of intelectual and artistic and moral life is unrestricted, have established a self-tyranny of the commonplace which enslaves us. No Pharaoh ever held us in closer bondage; no Roman edict ever was more constraining; indeed, not even the mass abattoirs of Hitler's demoniacal regime constituted a greater threat to our future as a people than the abject serfdom to the cult of mediocrity to which we have voluntarily subjected ourselves. For unless we can rouse ourselves from our moral and mental torpor characterized by the endless round of spiritually meaningless acts performed by day and the automatic drinking-cards-and sleping pill routine by night, we may expire by smothering from self-indulgence.

All of this has led to a lamentable breaking up of the once sacred precincts of the Jewish home, where husband was priest and wife was priestess at the family altar and where respect for parents was not alone expected and exacted, but deserved. Instead, we have the appalling facts of our Jewish mimicry—and conversion—and, as is the case in all conversions, sometimes we indulge in even greater excesses in that which is bringing moral rot and spiritual cancer into our national organism.

Because we Jews, we Reform Jews, perhaps even more than some of our more orthodox brethren yet tied to some of those Mitzvoth—some good, some bad—of the past—are so hopelessly and seemingly helplessly "involved in mankind," involved in this contemporary descent into indecency and immorality—

1. I recommend that UAHC sponsor, together with other denominations if possible, a conference on religion and morality in America in order, hopefully, to regain for religion—Judaism and Christianity—the moral leadership which they once enjoyed and which today, I fear, they have surrendered to the sensation-hunting press, to the blood and thunder violence and venality of too much of television, to the ever more lurid and lascivious movies, and to the jungle law of the survival of the slickest in business and society as we scamper for status and wealth rather than for excellence of moral stature and wisdom.

EXCELLENCE THROUGH LEARNING

But the holding of a mere conference, or even a series of such conferences, while helpful, will not speed us too far in our pursuit of excellence. We must once again steep ourselves in our Torah which literally means far more than mere learning; which connotes, rather, moral instruction. Thus has Torah been one of the threee pillars, together with Avodah (worship), and G'milus Chasodim (good deeds) upon which, according to our rabbis, the entire world rests.

The general neglect of Torah in our time is something new under the Jewish sun and may be one of the most significant factors in the dimming of that once brightly burning light in Israel, while darkness, even deep, dense darkness, abounded elsewhere. Rabbi Solomon Freehof, with his usual felicitous and illuminating homiletical genius, drove home this gaping contrast between a literate, morally as well as intellectually literate, Jewry and those among whom they dwelt when, in an address he delivered before our NFTB, he developed a d'rush, a commentary, on the ordinary English "pub." He drew attention to the old signposts on those inns dating from early stagecoach days: those signs which deplicted "The Lion and the Mouse," "The Blue Boar," "The Flaming Dragon," and so many others. "Why were there invariably these signs rather than the written legend?" Dr. Freehof asks. For the simple reason, he correctly answers his own rhetorical question, that in those earlier days the average Englishman was illiterate and unable to read even those most elementary of words and hence could identify his favorite pub only by the picture hanging outside.

So, likewise, the reason for the magnificent stained glass windows such as I saw once again at Chartres but a few months ago. They portrayed thus vividly and colorfully the tales from the Bible, old and new, because the average person during those ages when these towering cathedrals were reared could not read even the biblical texts. Those radiant, multicolored walls of splendor were the illuminated Bibles of the unlettered and the illierate.

But, Dr. Freehof adds, at that very time every Jew could read. He had to read or otherwise he couldn't pray, because there was a prayer book from which he was commanded each day to send his supplications soaring unto God. In consequence, we do have what he described as "the longest sequence of mass literacy in the history of the world." "And without such learning today," he rightly concludes, in a modern paraphrase of the rabbinic utterance that "an ignorant man cannot be pious; without such education we cannot be Jews."

What a contrasting picture do we present today. Television has replaced Torah as an

instrument of moral learning; barbecues have replaced the Bible as an evening's recreation; socializing in one form or another has displaced study in any form whatsoever. Diversion, not direction, is the order of the day. Thus the family has ceased to be the centripetal force of our own childhood and that of our forebears. We have made the world family a largely technical term; it no longer holds its members together in mutual and sacred comradeship and trust; it has abdicted its age-old responsibility for training the young, preferring to leave this task to the school, to the synagogue where applicable, and to the mores of the mass media. To paraphrase Polly Adler's "A House Is Not a Home," our homes have become mere houses, parking stations through whose revolving doors we and our children constantly go in and out—mostly out. Schools—even the best of them—and synagogues—are no substitutes; they are merely buttresses and extensions of the family pillar. The vision of greatness—if not the example—is sensed first with the milk from the mother, perceived in the image of the father.

It is fashionable today to deplore the conditions of our schools, both public and private. The overcrowding, the poor quality of teaching, the politics. But it is not fashionable to do anything about them. It is not fashionable to counteract some of these negative aspects of formal education by greater, rather than lesser augmentation at home. And few parents who are here tonight could do much to augment their children's defective education even if they would.

A general literacy test that extends beyond the limits of today's best sellers would probably reveal a shameful paucity of knowledge. Were such a test to be administered in the realm of Jewish knowledge, I shudder to think of the results. And yet, this is a convocation of Jews, of that people who could read when the rest of the world could not; of that people known throughout the globe as students and scholars and teachers; of that people who, above all others, has sacrificed and sweated and struggled to pass along the torch of learning to the next generation; of that people which has risked death again and again rather than deny that learning to others through neglect or destruction of Torah.

Certainly it should be an elementary requirement for those men and women who aspire to and presently hold positions of congregational, regional, and national leadership to be priestly in their personal and communal conduct. Certainly it should be a prime requirement for Jewish leadership that such leaders be conversant with the moral mandates of our faith, reasonably well read in its immortal literature, active participants in all of their congregational worship services and not merely on the High Holy Days, and that they conscientiously practice at least the Decalogue of the 613 Commandments. It is a sad commentary on the confusion of our values that the demands we make upon ourselves for religious leadership are far lower than those we make in secular activities. In the world of sports, which we Americans revere, no man is made a coach who is not proficient at the game; in the world of business, none is elevated without prior proof of competence. Why, then, this denigration of qualifications for that moral leadership which ever in the past has been, and must quickly regain, the dominant influence over men if the prayers that we pray—"the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts"—are to be acceptable unto Him whose will we claim to serve?

How, otherwise, can boards of trustees of our temples pass judgment on what is or is not relevant to Judaism, on what is or is not within the competence of this Union to pursue; how can congregations expect to rear children in the religious schools, to have them drink deeply of the well of living waters which is our Judaism, to be guided by its moral maxims, if the example is not set, if not by each and every parent, then at least by those whom we honor and exalt by elevating them to positions of leadership and trust on the local, regional, and national levels?

How vital it is, therefore, that the biennial assembly should rousingly accept and authorize our Union zealously to implement the most encouraging demand for some kind of decent standards for temple leadership which has been welling up from the grassroots of our farflung constituency, and has already been instituted in a number of our member congregations.

2. I therefore recommend the adoption of the resolution on Standards of Leadership already circularized among you; and the resolute determination on the part of each of our congregational leaders to strive to pursue a greater degree of excellence in the calibre—yes, and the character, I must add—of our Reform Jewish leadership.

EXCELLENCE IN WORSHIP

Many early Reformers, in their zealous revolt against orthodoxy, ruthlessly stripped Reform of all its ritual, not merely that which was outmoded and no longer either meaningful or beautiful. For some years I seemingly turned traitor to my own Reform background and loudly and lustily joined those who urged the recapturing—in synagogue and home—of those artistic forms, be they visual or aural—which were still relevant to our time. As a result, we slowly reintroduced into our worship services, both in synagogue and home, some of the lovelier, pertinent, and moving rituals that add to, rather than detract from, the religious flavor of Judaism.

I have also pointed out many times before that these rituals and rites must be constantly reassessed and reexamined in the light of our ever-changing relationship, as a religious group, to the world in which we live. In this attitude lies the difference between Reform and orthodoxy for orthodoxy means, literally, correct opinion: it is dogmatic, unchanging, rigid, inflexible. It was against dogmatism that the early German Reformers rebelled, not against ritual per se. In Reform Judaism there is no room for immutability—except the immutability of the moral mandates of our teachings. But in Reform Judaism there is a great deal of room for the enrichment of all forms, of all prayers, through the greater, more intelligent, more creative and inspired utilization of imagery in poetry, music, and the plastic arts.

Consequently, I once again plead for a more realistic evaluation of our services of worship. When I voiced this appeal at Miami 4 years ago, I caused some consternation among a few of my most beloved and esteemed rabbinic colleagues, who misinterpreted my comments as an unqualified broadside against the Union Prayerbook, to the creation of which they have given the full measure of their erudite scholarship and exalted spirits. I intended no such an unwarranted aspersion. The Union Prayerbook is undoubtedly one of the rarest and richest liturgies in contemporary worship. And yet—most of our temples are empty on the Sabbath. I have a prescription which might win more of my colleagues to this hitherto unheard and unheeded plea. Take your seat Sabbath after Sabbath, and Yom Tov after Yom Tov, as I have done for the past many years, in the pew rather than in the pulpit; join in this spectator rather than participation exercise, and I believe you will speedily seek with me a further enrichment of our ritual and our entire synagogue program through a further enrichment of our services through further revision of the Union Prayerbook; through the embellishment of our worship in song, dance, drama, and art. I seek the involvement of the multitudes of Jews divorced from the synagogue in the process of creative worship, which has too long been unwisely a monopoly of rabbis only.

As many of you know, we recently held a concert at Lincoln Center in New York City, initiated by the ever-creative Rabbi Abraham Klausner of Temple Emanuel in Yonkers, N.Y., which introduced an original work of liturgical music by Dr. Herman Berlinksi. It was a significant contribution to the Jewish arts—"a spiritual mountain peak," my friend Mr. Norman Cousins called it. It was one which I pray we may continue through the establishment of a Commission on Judaism and the Living Arts.

3. I therefore recommend that this assembly establish such a commission—hopefully with the full cooperation and participation of the Central Conference of American Rabbis—to explore the many ways in which Reform Judaism might express itself more beautifully and completely through all art forms and media.

But this caveat I must add: there is a vast difference between treasuring those traditions which arise naturally out of the existential condition of a living people, which are but the external expression of an inner and heartfelt need, and some of our present exaggerated tendencies to shop around for some dramatic or theatrical or sentimental effect calculated to draw large numbers to the synagogue. Instead of treating learning and worship as a living, growing organism, we seem to be satisfied with a bare facade to be dressed up with the addition of what we suppose to be more exciting or enchanting rites. The result is that we achieve not the burgeoning forth of some clear faith and purpose, but a vague though flashy kind of showmanship which frequently disguises, in the folds of traditionalism, the fact that we believe very little, and do not know precisely what we believe or what our purpose is. True, religious symbols and ceremonies have never thus been artifically concocted in committee rooms to serve as survival values for a people that can apparently find no better raison d'etre than to keep alive its folkways which, in turn, are kept alive in order to keep itself alive. We must continue to be on our guard against overdoing the stress on form, on ritual for ritual's sake, as empty gestures devoid of true moral zeal and religious content, perpetuated for the sole purpose of deceiving ourselves into believing that we believe in anything more than form itself.

4. I therefore recommend that a study group be formed which, together, hopefully, with the Central Conference of American Rabbis, will reevaluate our present stance with regard to worship, to ritual and ceremony, and with special relation to that block-busting example of conspicuous consumption clothed in sacral vestments, the Bar Mitzvah, and with a view to revising further our rituals in consonance with the facts of our present-day life and the content of our pursuit of excellence.

This pursuit on the religious school level has not been nearly as desultory as among our adults. But here, too, we are as yet far from deserving the accolade of excellence. During the 90 years of this union's existence, we have indeed pioneered in this realm of learning. We have set standards which have been complimented by the mimicry of others. We have created curriculums; we have published ever more interesting and brilliantly edited and illustrated volumes; we have helped to extend the hours of instruction within our constituent congregations; we have intensified Hebrew instruction and even established pilot Hebrew high schools; we have held teacher training programs and instituted academies of teacher training; we have won numerous awards in our trailblazing production of film strips and records; we have issued a youth magazine, Keeping Posted, which, aside from astronomically rising subscriptions is making an intellectual

and moral impact upon our youngsters which few of us thought possible.

But all of this is not nearly enough. Not only do most of us not pursue excellence for ourselves in Jewish learning—although we are delighted to accept the honors accompanying Jewish leadership—we will not even support it adequately for our children. Contemporary science has placed before us today a vast array of educational tools, and it is lamentable that we should lag so pathetically behind other educational institutions in utilizing them. Public schools in all parts of the country are experimenting with educational television, but we have not even begun to think about or plan for the utilization of such a potentially effective instrument which could bring the teachings of Judaism into every home—even in the most isolated hamlet and village. For years I have pleaded for correspondence courses for the forgotten, forsaken Jews and their Jewishly starved children in more remote and Jewishly parched areas. Now we might reach them in this marvelously intimate manner. But, again, starvation budgetary rationing precludes our stepping out of the Middle Ages, technologically speaking, into our present era of scientific miracles.

YOUTH SERVES MANKIND

Perhaps our richest opportunity to recapture a living faith for our time lies in our program for youth. Here, more than anywhere else, we can take advantage of the experimental mood and test the newer techniques of worship and education. Nothing is really too startling for the young to see and to try. Nothing is too imaginative or daring. Any risk of trial and error can be essayed. Consequently, there are few facets of our union program that afford us the opportunity of awakening Jewish consciousness, intensifying spiritual aspirations and moral sensitivity, as our union camp program.

In little more than a decade we have seen the phenomenal growth from a single campsite at Oconomowoc to six of our own camps, with other regions still justifiably protesting their alleged "stepchild" or "second-class" status because of the denial of such camps to their area. Our camp properites have grown from 14 acres of God's natural wonderment to more than 1,400; from a staff of less than 20 to one of more than 300 trained and dedicated men and women; from serving only 250 youthful members of our movement to more than 6,000 children and adults yearly. Despite this phenomenal advance, the crying need is still not only for more of such regional camps, but especially for one UAHC camp to be devoted wholly to national sessions—board meetings, model youth groups, institutes, Kallahs (study sessions), Hagigahs (art festivals), for experimental projects where both youngsters, and ofttimes their parents, too, are moved for the first time to commune with God and to communicate with, rather than merely talk at, man.

From these "Yeshivoth under the sky" have come more rabbinic students for our seminary than from any other source, recruited from our own reform ranks; more students for our colleges of Jewish studies, more future teachers for our movement. From our camps has come a new Motzi—a fresh, creative, and moving ritual which has sprung from the hearts of our young people—which is becoming the accepted blessing before the meal in an increasing number of congregations and homes; from our camps have come new hymns and a new spirit of ecstasy in God's presence; a new sense of mitzvah, of duty, of obligation, to "love one's neighbor as oneself" and to struggle against crushing poverty, degrading prejudice, against all forms of injustice, and world devasting war and moral apathy. From our camps comes the hope that lies in the future—the bright hope of a true Judaism through fulfillment of Mitzvoth—if we will but dare to put flesh on this vision of greatness both by supplying the necessary funds which this must command, and by giving our youth the supportive moral strength "to pursue justice" and excellence by personal involvement, participation, and the example of their elders.

Through the NFTY Mitzvah program, 10 young men performed hard manual labor in Puerto Rico for 4 weeks this summer past. Their leaders were both graduates of our NFTY program; one was vice president of his temple youth group at South Shore Temple here in Chicago and the other was president of his temple youth group at Temple Israel in Dayton, Ohio. Both were delegates to the National Leadership Institute. In cooperation with the Puerto Rican Government, these young men helped Puerto Rican families, who had been living in shacks in the hills, build new permanent homes. They lived with these families. At night they sang our Jewish folksongs and heard the folk music of Puerto Rico; they taught English to their hosts and received instruction in Spanish in return. The families of these young people—among them the sons of two of our board members, Mr. Nathaniel Hess and Mr. Clarence Kudisch—paid for their own trips and board. They demonstrated that it is not alone in Israel that there are Negevs to settle and emeks to drain. It would be difficult to convey to you the glowing enthusiasm of this earnest and truly dedicated group of ours. It bears out what I said earlier concerning the need youth has for a challenge—a real challenge to their buoyancy of spirit, their strength of muscle, their adaptability, their toughness of mind and body. There is a chain reaction at work for constructive deeds just as there is in destructiveness. To those jaded adolescents who find their outlet only in racing cars and damaging property, each riot begets more of the same. But to the morally oriented youth of our NFTY, the Puerto Rican experience whets their appetite for further service to their fellow men.

This kind of project must be continued and I am hopeful that many of you who so generously contributed to the Rosa B. Eisendrath Memorial Fund will agree with me that it is to a program such as this that she would have desired most to have these funds devoted.

Thus far we have noted that the pursuit of excellence, the seeking after perfection, begins with each of us as an individual. Within the context of this religious convocation we must acknowledge our obligation, first, to ourselves, to the duty each of us has as a child of God to "be holy as God is holy." "If I am not for myself who will be for me?" Who will attain excellence vicariously for me? Second, we must "diligently teach our children" by example; by being learned enough ourselves to do so by precept also. Only with these solid foundations of individual and family responsibility may the third step toward excellence be accomplished—the strengthening of the synagogue, the house of worship and learning.

Historically and uniquely, Judaism has ever been the rich fruitage of the combined efforts of laymen and rabbis, and it is to the latter that we now turn our thoughtful attention.

RABBINIC PLACEMENT PLAN

There has been a restiveness on the part of congregations and rabbis alike with regard to pulpit placement. It is now well over a decade since the administration of the union recommended to the biennial assembly in Cleveland in 1950 a plan for orderly pulpit placement "with teeth in it" which, in our judgment, would by now have established a more acceptable method of selecting a congregation's spiritual leader. Unhappily, that plan was rejected amid much bitterness—bitterness bred out of a false notion of the absolute, unqualified autonomy of congregations. But all unmitigated autonomy, whether of individuals, congregations, or nations, leads to anarchy. A sufficient number of both rabbis and congregations has bypassed our present voluntary procedure so as to bring great unhappiness to a large segment of the rabbinate and dissatisfaction to a growing number of congregations. For the past several years, as Mark Twain's comment on the weather had it, "everybody has talked about it but nobody has done" much to correct those anomalies which prompted an editorial in an Anglo-Jewish publication to sneer: "It has long been no secret that the present system—or lack of system—in which rabbis are placed for the most trifling reasons, ranging from their relationship to some leader of a congregation to the size of their noses, is demoralizing to the rabbinate and the movement as a whole."

The Central Conference of American Rabbis, therefore, merits our commendation for having now taken the initiative in recommending a plan for pulpit placement which should be inviolable. I must pay tribute to our rabbinic colleagues for once again—as was the case with regard to accepting a compulsory draft for the chaplaincy despite our clerical exemption from such coercion—voluntarily subjecting themselves to the discipling of our conference with regard to pulpit placement. Let us not, then, superficially dismiss this plan because its byproduct may affect our congregation's absolute autonomy. Drafting men for the chaplaincy—to which we have lent silent or articulate patriotic assent—likewise deprives our congregations of the autonomous right to lure them from their stint in the chaplaincy in which they are not constrained by military regulation to serve. But shall it be only when the flag is waved that we waive this fictitious concept of unbounded autonomy? It is high time that, when license leads to moral degeneration, when refusal of more binding regulations and restrictions result in acts of Chilul Ha-Shem, congregations should learn that there is no invasion of so-called autonomy when, by general consent, they voluntarily surrender a portion of their corporate prerogatives for the well-being of all, for the raising of the rabbinic-congregational relationship, especially in the precious task of selecting their spiritual leaders.

However, I am constrained to add that the implementation of this otherwise praiseworthy plan must not be by rabbis only, nor even preponderantly by rabbis, not because of alleged incursions on congregational autonomy, but because this is not exclusively a rabbinic function—especially in Reform Judaism. The Reform movement came into being largely through the pioneering labors of laymen, and while I have always struggled against the misleading designation of the union as a lay body, and have insisted that it is a congregational movement, comprised of both laymen and rabbis, I must underscore the fact that laymen do indeed play, and must continue to play, a significant role in all our Reform Jewish activities. And none is more cherished or even more sacred than the selection by a congregation of its spiritual leader.

Nor should we be misled by false analogies to the regulatory codes and practices of other vocations: Physicians, lawyers, and the like. These are based on person-to-person association, and have no counterpart in the corporate concern of a congregation and of our union of congregations in this delicate dual and reciprocal relationship. Therefore we dare not scuttle our responsibility by taking the line of least resistance and leaving it to the rabbis. Our congregations must be more than "minority stockholders" in so prized an enterprise. Laymen and rabbis must continue—as we have under our present system and as we do in virtually all our joint UAHC-CCAR commissions—to labor together as equal and equally respected partners.

Accordingly, the leaders of both the UAHC and the CCAR have held many mutually agreeable and constructive conferences with a view to amending the CCAR's originally proposed plan, to provide equal rights for congregations. I must take this opportunity to express thanks to Mr. Louis Broido, chairman of the committee negotiating for the UAHC, and to Dr. Bernard J. Bamberger, chairman of the committee negotiating for the CCAR, for their able, fair, and dignified handling of these discussions which resulted in complete agreement on those points at issue. The CCAR unanimously adopted at its meeting in June in Philadelphia the amendments recommended by the UAHC committee, and the presentation made by Dr. Bamberger at that time was so eminently just as to deserve the thanks of all of us. These recommendations were also overwhelmingly approved by the UAHC Board of Trustees at its meeting last May.

6. I therefore urge the adoption of the rabbinic placement plan initiated by the CCAR and amended by both the CCAR and the UAHC, which has previously been circularized to all congregations and which, in the studied opinion of the members of the UAHC Board of Trustees and myself, as well as by the unanimous vote of the CCAR, will assure both rabbis and congregations a more dignified, more just, and more felicitous method of mutual selection and association and improve the quality of congregational-rabbinic relations—a sine qua non to the continued strengthening and growth of our movement.

But even with better and higher standards in the realm of education, of youth, of rabbinic-congregational relationships, we have yet other areas to examine before we can truly say that our direction is firmly set toward that excellence which is the mandate of Judaism.

CHURCH AND STATE

This Nation started its pursuit of excellence with as exemplary a charter as any people in history has possessed, based as it is on our own Torah. The keystone of that charter is the constitutional provision for the separation of church and state, echoing our Bible's viewing with alarm the intervention even of the king in man's freedom of conscience. Today, that freedom is being threatened in America and most distressing are some words culled from a letter of warning I recently received from our own Board member, Congressman MULTER, in which he wrote: "An attempt is being made to bring before the Congress an amendment to the Constitution to permit Bible reading and recitation of prayers in the public schools. A discharge petition, which requires the signature of 218 Members to bring the bill before the House for action is now on the clerk's desk. As of today, more than 100 Members have signed the petition, and at least 11 are Representatives of the State of New York. I think that at least some of the signatories might not have signed and might even remove their signatures from the petition if they knew how controversial this was and how much strong support there is in religious circles for the Supreme Court decision which is sought to be overridden by this resolution." Most shocking of all is the deviation of a segment of our Jewish community, principally among the Orthodox, from one of the few convictions long held by all American Jews that the wall of separation between church and state must be in truth an impregnable wall, not a brigeable moat. To shore up the sagging structures of their parochial schools, they scuttle all principle to sup at the public trough of Federal aid to sectarian schools, blind to our bitter historic experience which so tragically teaches that where church—and synagogue—become tools of the state, as in Germany yesterday and, as we shall soon note, in Russia today, all religions sooner or later suffer.

To be meaningful, religion must be taught in its full integrity an not in a watered down insipid version that satisfies all religions and conveys naught. Santayana has said, correctly, that one cannot be religious without being religious in a particular tradition. Religion in general is nothing; it must be rooted in and flavored by a specific background and spiritual heritage. And this can only be done by the church or synagogue—certainly not by an unaffected and uncommitted—or anticommitted—member of a government institution.

By its decisions the Supreme Court has not injured religion; it has challenged churches and synagogues to do their own jobs, to stop passing the buck to the public school and its captive audience. There is no easy way out of our duties except at the risk of making a mockery of our faith to our children by clothing it in the uniform of anonymity, of bloodless prayer, of mandatory affirmations "to whom it may concern."

If the church and the synagogue cannot inspire prayer and commitment in our congregations, if we cannot do this in our homes, then we will deserve to fail. And no amount of pallid religious patina in the public schools will cover up our failure.

If the Court's decision ultimately means that the door has been closed to the increasing demand for tax support for religious institutions, I personally rejoice in it. Professor Edmond Cahn was right when he wrote that "the way to destroy the churches is to give them all they want in the way of tax moneys and public assistance, because this would make governmental control of the schools inevitable." The total resources of our movement should be mobilized to support the Court's unequivocal decision and to defeat any and all attempts from any quarter to reverse that opinion which alone guarantees religious freedom to individuals and faiths.

JEWS IN RUSSIA

Undoubtedly, the most hideous and horrifying example of what can and does occur when the State dominates the church took place in Nazi Germany yesterday, and it is happening again before many "eyes that see not and ears that hear not" in the Soviet Union today.

During these past few years all efforts to inquire into the true nature of the condition of Soviet Jewry and to seek ways to help save what we have come to understand is a Jewishly desperate community have ended in failure. The organized American Jewish community has conducted its program on the basis of quiet diplomacy. For reasons which at the time seemed valid we refrained from raising our voices in loud public lament or righteous protest. That policy is now bankrupt. The moment of quiet diplomacy, sometimes known as the sha sha approach, is past. The American Jewish community can no longer permit itself to be fobbed off by Soviet officialdom and fear of offending.

A resolution of the 46th General Assembly of the UAHC recognized the "avowed intention of Soviet authorities to seal off its Jewish community from any relationship with their coreligionists throughout the world and to liquidate their spiritual and cultural resources." What has transpired since the passage of that statement only confirms its tragically prophetic character. Despite assurances to the contrary, official Soviet policy seems to be directed toward a most definite though highly sophisticated method of genocide. The Jews of Russia are not being cremated; they are being strangled and starved out of every opportunity to survive as Jews. In recent months they have even been shot. Our religious leaders who visit Russia bring back reports of a haunting religious hunger and spiritual suffocation, of a mailed fist concealed in the velvet glove of pretended freedom.

Last year I participated with other leaders of the American Jewish community in welcoming a delegation of Russian clergy headed by Archibishop Nikodim. At that time, I presented to him on behalf of the Synagogue Council of America, a scared Torah which we asked him to deliver to Chief Rabbi Levin of Moscow. Simultaneously, an invitation was extended to Rabbi Levin to visit America and to meet with his spiritual counterparts here. For over 3 months we awaited his response. When finally released by the Russian censors, his reply acknowledged receipt of the Torah, for which he expressed his deepest gratitude, but he declined our invitation, indicating that his health would not permit him to visit the United States at any time in the immediate future.

The impending extermination of Soviet Jewry challenges world Jewry with a ghostlike quality. Too many of us can see in what is now going on in Russia ominous parallels with what happened in Germany in the early 1930's. Then we stood by all too apathetic and helpless, our hands tied by "considered judgment, political difficulties, organizational competition," and other equally irrational rationalizations. We were neutralized by both external forces and internal factions. We dare not let that happen again. The guilt for a dead six million still awakens millions of us in the middle of the night. We cannot permit another three million to be crushingly added to that already astronomical figure for which we bear so heavy a responsibility.

It is today the fundamental moral obligation of every Jew and every Jewish community in the world to voice publicly their concern and to take whatever action is available to ease the plight and lift the morale and give life back to our brothers behind the Iron Curtain.

This action must be a coordinated effort of organizations and groups. In this matter we cannot afford the typical Jewish luxury of organizational competition and interagency strife to destroy the paramount task of Pidyon Shivuim, the "redemption of the captive."

7. I therefore recommend that this biennial go on record urging our Government to do all in its power to bring an improvement in the plight of Russian Jewry. I urge that this assembly affirm the principle, in this area, of coordinated efforts within the Jewish community, with our UAHC actively participating in the development of such public programs as will focus world attention and coalesce world opinion on this ghastly situation.

JUDAISM IN ISRAEL

But how can we stand steadfast for the wall of separation in the United States and plead and press for religious liberty in Russia when we remain tactfully and diplomatically silent before the ruthless, savage power of a politically entrenched orthodoxy in Israel? The usurpation of public authority in Israel by clerical elements is monstrously wrong because it denies the fundamental right of the individual, because it emulates the doctrine of our oppressors, because it compromises Israel's position in the international arena, because it flouts the struggle on behalf of religious tolerance and harmony of Jewish leaders abroad, because it is a source of bitterness and affliction to our people, because it mocks the ideals of the men and women who gave their last ounce of devotion that Israel might rise as a nation of freemen. Accordingly, we should lend all encouragement possible to that as yet small but dedicated band in Israel who are pleading for the enactment of a bill of rights which will insure freedom of conscience and religion and a constitution stipulating the separation of religion and state, recognizing the right of every man to worship God in his own way or not to worship Him as the inviolate conscience dictates.

Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states, "Men and women of full age, without limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry (including priests) and to found a family." The present laws governing personal status in Israel, aided and abetted by the Minister of Religious Affairs, discriminate unjustly against certain segments of our people, Progressive and Conservative Jews and especially the Bene Yisroel who have kept the torch of Torah ablaze in India for 1,000 years. The Naturel Karta stone and injure Jews and Christians indiscriminately, deny fundamental human rights causing innumerable personal tragedies, and perpetrate an injustice upon the whole people of Israel and all Jews everywhere who have ever been the victims of just such religious absolutism.

Instead of joining battle, we have remained smugly content that our own institutions have thus far been unscathed. Thus we hailed, during the spring and summer, the formal dedication of the HUC School of Archeology and Biblical Studies in Jerusalem, and we congratulate once again Dr. Glueck and Mr. Sidney Meyers and all their coworkers upon this achievement. We are cognizant, however, that to build a Progressive Jewish religious movement in the Holy Land is an indispensable need acknowledged by virtually the whole of Israel leadership, including the now retired prime minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion. In a letter dated March 1963 he wrote to Rabbi Kaufman who, more than any single individual, has made possible the sprouting of the first tender shoots of a Progressive Judaism, of a genuinely holy faith, in that far from religiously holy land, "Because the new immigrants from Asia and Africa are traditional (though not necessarily Orthodox) and deeply concerned with the laws of family chastity, we were compelled to legislate laws of marriage and divorce in accord with the Halacha. Unfortunately, the extremists among the rabbinate and politicians exploit these provisions evilly—and on occasion desecrate the name of Israel publicly. An example is their treatment of the Bene Yisroel Jews of India for whom some of these rabbis have refused to perform the marriage ceremony. Similarly, they abuse the Kashrus monopoly which is theirs.

"There is an absolute necessity," and I am still quoting Ben-Gurion, "to expand the Progressive congregation. As they grow, the Government will grant to them rights equal to those accorded the Orthodox congregation.

"The extremists plant a hatred of Judaism in the hearts of our youth and this I deeply regret. I feel strongly that a man may be liberal in his religious orientation, not observing the minutia of the Halacha, and yet revere Jewish tradition." It is certainly clear, then, that to meet the manifest spiritual hunger of Israelis in all walks of life, far greater efforts and funds must be expended by our American movement than the mere dribble of dollars which has thus far made possible only the most fragmentary and fragile beginnings.

To be sure, we are gratified that there are now three rabbinic leaders laboring with our Chugim, or Progressive congregations, in Israel. We hail also the plans to expand the Leo Baeck School in Haifa, the only secondary school in Israel with a liberal orientation, and

8. I recommend that a special committee be appointed to ascertain the role our union might play—possibly in conjunction with a contemplated overall drive in America for Israel's secondary schools—in vouchsafing the future of this potential reservoir of Progressive Judaism in Israel.

But must more must be done. Rabbi Freehof, the president of the World Union for Progressive Judaism, commended to me a congregational adoption or big brother plan whereby, through the regional organization of the union, continuing support of the Progressive congregations in Israel may be assured. As an immediate result of this excellent suggestion, I am happy to announce that, through the leadership of the president and rabbi of Congregation Rodeph Sholom of New York, Mr. Walter W. Weismann and Rabbi Louis I. Newman, the Jerusalem synagogue—Har-El—is being expanded, as it is full to overflowing. Congregation Rodeph Sholom is subsidizing this expansion.

Our congregation in Kfar Shumaryahu, under the leadership of Rabbi Melvin Zager, has formed the first sisterhood in Israel—a golden anniversary present, I presume, to the American NFTS—and has also formed the first Social Action Committee in Israel.

And this year the first three Israeli students at the HUC–JIR will be ordained and will be ready to undertake their assignments in the Holy Land—our first indigenous rabbinical leaders of Progressive Judaism.

All of this is, to be sure, vastly encouraging. But, again, it is merely a beginning. It is more essential than ever before that we give far greater support to these initial essays of Progressive Judaism in order that they not be throttled into an early demise by the heavy odds favoring Orthodoxy. As here in America, so in the land of our ancestors, excellence must be our goal. And excellence is not possible unless and until Progressive Judaism is wholly freed from the iron grasp of an outworn, archaic, and sterile Orthodoxy. To the extent that we press on with funds and encouragement, these little outposts of a budding new faith for the young and the old Israelis will flourish; to the extent that we have the opportunity to demonstrate—as we now have in small measure—the reverberating and unquenchable, the relevant and contemporary message of Progressive Judaism, to that extent will we, as a world Jewry, finally break out of the rusty chains of Orthodoxy.

9. I therefore recommend that this assembly adopt Rabbi Freehof's suggestion, officially, to initiate a big brother plan whereby, through the regional apparatus of the UAHC, affluent congregations may individually or in cooperation with other congregations, undertake to subsidize and augment the financial needs of our insipient Progressive congregations in Israel. And,

10. I therefore recommend that this assembly adopt Rabbi Freehof's suggestion, for Progressive Judaism the advisability of its making a test case in Israel on the right of Progressive rabbis to perform the marriage ceremony in Israel.

JEWISH COMMUNITY—CONFLICT OR COOPERATION

All such lack of decency and discipline, all such anarchy and chaos, derive from our dismal and disgraceful failure to forge that kind of all-inclusive unity which was the pristine purpose of Isaac Wise. We unite in desperation and disperse at leisure and, I must add, that even to achieve this meager ad hoc unity has required months of shameful organizational maneuvering and the unpardonable squandering of the time and talents of many lay and professional leaders. While Russian Jewry burns in the fires and fears of imminent extinction, we continue blithely to fiddle our disparate and disunited and discordant tunes.

Time and time again I have spoken and written in behalf of a continuing, cooperating Jewish community endeavor, encompassing both the secular and religious Jewish groups, to cope with the unrelenting pressures and problems, challenges and opportunities, which confront us all in these days. Time and again my plea has gone unheeded as one or another Jewish agency echoes the shallow shibboleth concerning the alleged danger of a "Jewish enclave," or views with alarm the imaginary dire consequences of Jewry's speaking with one voice and acting with one accord. By now, one would think, this phantasmagoria ought to have been dispelled by the realities of united efforts in virtually every other Jewery save that of the United States.

We have all rejoiced in the forthright efforts of the Catholic Church, beginning with Pope John and continuing with Pope Paul, to advance the ecumenicity of Christendom. What a pity that this noble attempt among hundreds of thousands of diverse churchmen in all countries can be vigorously undertaken, but our own infinitesimal number of Jews cannot, in this country, manage to adhere in a constant cooperative venture where there are no differences of language, nor geographical distinctions of importance, nor conflicting mores.

PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF

But the ecumenical conference is reaching even beyond this worthy objective of greater universality. It is reaching out toward non-Christian groups as well. If once the church considered itself aloof, removed from the world, above the clatter and bustle of marketplace and business council, that age is now thankfully part of ancient history. Obviously, urbi et orbi—the state and the world—the deep concern for the state of the world are very much a part of her old-new world outlook. The church is now committed to this worldly involvement, strikingly reminiscent of Judaism's prophetic call.

While much it not most of what happens under Michelangelo's magnificent dome is related to internal church structure and policy, the work of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, under the direction of the spirited and venerable Augustin Cardinal Bea, remains of particular interest to Jews, Protestants and other non-Catholics. For Protestants, the questions of religious liberty and church legislation on mixed marriages are perhaps of greatest importance. We Jews, on the other hand, find our attention focused on that commission, in the hope that from its work will emanate a long awaited and sorely needed fixing of Catholic and world perspective on the special relationship of the church to Jewry and Judaism.

The mind is staggered and the heart is enkindled simply by the prospect of the possible implications of the Catholic Church's official disassociation from the age-old charge of deicide leveled against the Jewish people. One can—and I indeed do—hope with reasonable expectation that by official church interpretation and instruction, the cutting edge of anti-Semitism, insofar as it is theologically motivated, can be constructively blunted. This entire emphasis, started by the late and beloved Pope John, if completed, could have so enormous an effect on Jewish life here and throughout the world as to lead not only to a repudiation of anti-Semitism but also to a positive Christian thrust against it.

"ARE YE NOT AS THE ETHIOPIANS * * * ?"

As we seek to unite Christian and Jew and to unify our own Jewish ranks, so likewise must we become far more than silent speculators or even counterrevolutionaries in the present revolution to make all America one. Not because of any decree of the Supreme Court, but because of the mandate of our Supreme Being; not because business is forsaking the segregated cities, and boycotts are causing even bigots to compromise for commercial profits; not because of growing Negro power and the lure of Negro votes, but because our faith demands that we remember that we, too, were slaves in Egypt and insists that we do all "have one Father, and one God has created us all."

It is an extraordinary and rather appalling phenomenon of the human mind that there are among us some 110 percent Americans who lose no opportunity to express their pride in the gallantry of our Founding Fathers in defying the powerful king of

Britain for, among other things, levying "taxation without representation," yet these selfsame individuals will blandly aver, with equally fervid patriotic zeal, their right to deny a whole galaxy of human divinely dowered rights to hosts of our fellow Americans, our brother human beings, 2,000 years after the Hebrew prophets, nearly 200 years after the adoption of our American Constitution and Bill of Rights, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation. How dishonest, how self-demeaning, can we be?

We deplore the force of arms when we are the subjects, but we, as whites and Jews, hesitate not to bare bayonets and to unleash police dogs on such violent creatures as tiny Negro children. We, the modern parents of today's permissive psychology, would not think of spanking our own children for malicious mischief of impertinence; yet we hastily reverse our pet theories of child rearing—when it comes to the children of Negroes. On the one hand, we claim that the Negro child is so amoral, so badly in need of acculturation to the high moral level of our white society, that we, on the other hand, call up the National Guard to prevent such exposure to our "superior" culture. I sometimes wonder whether the Negro, in seeking the opportunity to work side by side with us whites, is not making a grave mistake. But I continue to labor with him for that opportunity because I believe that our white jungle jingoism is sorely in need of the Negro's gentling influence.

It is an endless source of wonder and chagrin to me that we Jews, who more than any other people in the world have known the parayzing fear of irrational hatred, who have had to hide ourselves and our children in our native lands in order to try to escape not merely death, but torture, who have been shoved off the sidewalks of our own hometowns by swaggering lunatics, who have been denied the right to education, to jobs at the lowest level, to fraternizing with whom we please—that we, of all peoples, should harbor within our religious ranks—not a Godless society, as we speak of Soviet Russia—but a religious society—any who can possibly justify on any grounds whatsoever, including economic, the use of the very means which ultimately demolished 6 million of our brethren. For it was only the unbridled and unprotested acts of the early Nazis which made possible their later incorporation into government policy. Though some will bristle at that analogy and though, to be sure, there are no gas ovens in which millions are consumed either in Birmingham or New York, yet our Talmud teaches us that "he who destroys a single soul, it is as if he destroyed the whole world." And a Medgar Evers has been killed. Harmless children have been bombed to death within the walls of their once sacrosanct churches. And few of us have done anything tangible about it. Not I, but the National Council of Churches of Christ, in its recent devastating confession of the church's—and, I might add, the synagogue's—dereliction, declared, "The recent stepped-up resistance to integration parallels the situation and conditions which prevailed in Germany when the Nazis took over." The target of the much-discussed German play, "The Deputy," concerning the possible ill effects of which in Catholic-Jewish relationships some of our more queasy Jews are so uneasy—is not just Pope Pius XII, but all of us during the Nazi holocaust who stood on the sidelines in frozen silence. And the target of some future dramatization of the revolution now raging about us will not be a Governor Wallace or a Bull Connor but will be you and I, in the North as well as in the South. Perhaps even more in the North, for here in Chicago, as in New York and Philadelphia and New Jersey where the law and tradition are on our side, most of us stand callously aloof from the struggle or savagely condemn our Union for issuing a call to individual decency and religious commitment; for participating in a march which, for dignity and decorum, has few, if any, counterparts in history; for inviting as a speaker to this biennial one of the greatest moral and spiritual prophets of freedom in our time. By our deeds, not our words, shall we be known. And thus far even our voice has been muffled and our deeds far too feeble. Not too far have we gone but, rather, not far enough. Not too fast is the timetable which, as President Kennedy told some of our religious leaders in Washington, the Negroes are themselves creating, but far too slow has been our pace which has made the Negro's impatience inevitable. I was proud to see the banners of the UAHC and the CCAR in Washington—but I have not been proud of our absence from so many other acts in consonance with the constitutional rights bestowed upon all Americans and incumbent upon all Jews to support.

But, despite my lack of understanding of such ostrich-like behavior, the fact remains that there are such individuals among us. They are those who recoiled, terrified, from any participation of the UAHC in the march on Washington. And I, too, was terrified when I learned of it while I was in Europe. I was terrified that perhaps the Union of American Hebrew Congregations might not participate; that the threats of economic boycott which we have received from some quarters, the admonition not "to stick our necks out," "the fear of fear itself," might stop us. I thank God and the overwhelming majority of you, and the valiant chairman of our board of trustees, that such was not the case.

Indeed, my chagrin stems from our lagging behind in this new struggle for human freedom in a world where so few enjoy it and so many yearn for it. For had not another religious group in America been represented in that great nonviolent petition to redress the wrongs of a century—had no other religious group been present, I say—we Jews should still have been in the vanguard. But, to mollify the fears of the fearful, every major religious group was on hand as, indeed, they should have been. Had we failed to take our historical place as the world's first defenders of the freedom to worship, as the world's first messengers of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, as the interrogated of God's question, "Are ye not as the Ethiopians to Me?" had we failed to fulfill our mission, we might just as well have packed up our silver-cased torahs, closed up the doors of our resplendent synagogues, and declared ourselves out of business as a Jewish people, bankrupt as custodians of our Jewish faith.

Our call to racial justice also brought forth cries of horror from the easily horrified. Although many congregations—some of them below the Mason-Dixon line—have, I am gratified to report, adopted this minimal document which, in a slightly different form, was first introduced by the Baltimore Hebrew Congregation and, more recently, adopted by the historic Washington Hebrew Congregation—there are still many who have not. Yet the National Council of Churches of Christ—hardly a radical organization—has adopted a platform that makes our call to racial justice look like a wistfully pallid statement. The NCC's document not only calls for demonstrations and other forms of public protest in behalf of the Negro's freedom, but it authorizes its special commission on race and religion to take risks in the pursuit of racial peace. For those of our morally timid who are wont, under all other circumstances, to ask "mah yom-ru ha-goyim?" "what do the Gentiles think?" this is their answer. That's what the Gentiles think about the relevance of Christianity to race. The child, I fear, is outstripping the parent.

It is clear from the protests from certain quarters in our reform Jewish ranks that the peaceful revolution of the Negro has now engendered a counterrevolution. A good many Americans still think—even after a hundred years—that "the Negro is going too fast." Thus we witness the sickening capitulation on the part of our administration in Washington to water down its civil rights program in order, once again, in this world of failing moral fortitude, to pander to those who prefer the safety and glory of lipservice to the risks and honor of all-out conviction. Which side are we on? Well, our statements in official resolutions or authorized committees and commissions are on the side of the angels but, alas, too many of us in our actual deeds, are supporting the establishment, the status quo of the well-favored, shrinking and cowering coyly away from conflict with both our individual conscience and the forces of evil around us, still deluded by the oft-proved fallacy that we can remain safe, free, and rich by playing the game of the Devil. Such tactics have never worked, and they will not work now. By our craven silence as much as by outward cooperation with the "let's keep the Negro in his place" humanities of our day, we will force out from leadership the great advocate of peaceful progress, Dr. Martin Luther King, and drive the rank and file of his followers to a desperate blood-shedding orgy. But they will not be stopped, make no mistake, any more than Titus stopped the Jews in Rome, any more than Hitler wiped out European Jewry, any more than the British blocked the formation of the Thirteen Colonies from uniting as a free and independent political entity, any more than the Arabs have quashed the State of Israel.

11. I, therefore, urge upon you the adoption of the resolution previously circularized among you—the personal commitment to human equality—adopted by the joint commission on social action of reform Judaism and the interim advisory resolutions committee—to the end that we may, as Jews and American citizens, be no less forthright in our espousal of the fundamentals of human equality before God than are our Christian brothers.

Once again I plead with you to take our religion in earnest. Sometimes I feel as though I were the president of some business establishment where we must tread lightly and dodge every moral judgment and collective ethical deed, lest our customers be antagonized and our profits reduced. Sometimes I feel I am the president of a society of Philadelphia lawyers, instead of a venerable religious organization. "Where did you get the authority for this—or that" specific act or statement? It is necessary for our overburdened staff and board members to research chapter and verse for what we do. But, ladies and gentlemen, we have but one authority, far older and more demanding, precedent to and above and beyond detailed resolutions; we have but one law to obey if we really want to be and to remain "am segulah," that "chosen people" of the Book. Nothing in that law commands us to shirk our responsibilities to the covenant that Abraham made with God, that dream of Jacob's which required that through us all "the peoples of the world would be blessed." Judaism was the first great hope of mankind. It may well be the last. One God, one human race under God. "I have put before you good and evil; therefore choose good." "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "What does the Lord require of thee? Only to do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with thy God." This is the law; this is Judaism; all the rest is commentary.

Not by resolutions, no, not even ultimately by legislative acts of Congress, but by the pursuit and prayerfully the attainment of moral and spiritual excellence, shall God's will prevail and His kingdom be established on earth. Only as the Lord spoke to Jeremiah, "After those days * * * I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And they shall

teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord; for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them," saith the Lord: "for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

PEACE IN OUR TIME—OR NEVER

As it is imperative for Jews to be thus united, for Jews and Christians likewise to seek common ground despite our admitted diversities, for all America to be one, so must we—perhaps above all things else—seek unity among all mankind. In many state of our Union messages, I have shared with you my haunting fear that unless the suicidal nuclear arms race is quickly arrested, mankind is doomed to be "all cremated equal." Great events have transpired since our last biennial. Last October, in the Cuban crisis, the world moved ominously toward the ultimate confrontation of atomic powers. In the dread anxiety of that moment of truth, men everywhere—on both sides of the Iron Curtain—glimpsed the outlines of the holocaust which clearly lay at the end of the path which both we and our opponents, in a kind of international drag race, have been inexorably pursuing. The alternative was clear; either both sides alter their collision courses or the denouement of civilization was certain. This horrifying fact was terrifyingly driven home to a group of us—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious leaders—when, in seeking Secretary Dean Rusk's opinion on our plan for a Conference on Religion and World Peace, he frankly told us that neither he nor the President knew from one moment to the next whether that "hot" telephone would be used to give the order to blow our world to splinters. I believe that both Khrushchev and we, ourselves, began to appreciate that the world must cease this danse macabre on the razor's edge of disaster and begin the arduous charting of a new path to world peace.

In recent months some light has finally begun to pierce the glowering gloom. A limited nuclear test ban has been adopted. And if ever there was a time when the cynicism of our day concerning the worthlessness of individual effort was refuted; if ever there was an hour when every letter to a Senator, when every testimony before official hearings, when every telegram to the President counted, it was in the achievement of this treaty. I know whereof I speak. Together with a small but influential group headed by Mr. Norman Cousins and the Honorable James Wadsworth, I became aware of the President's genuine yearning for this test ban, of his fear of senatorial rejection and public opposition. I know the step-by-step program in which our social action commission and religious action center and many of you played a significant and indispensable role. As a result, a greater measure of confidence has developed between the Soviet Union and ourselves. This is a promising portent. But it must be followed up with initiative, imagination, and urgency, because the few faltering steps we have taken are not enough, in and of themselves, to enable all the children of God to live out their lives in peace, "with none to make them afraid."

In my last message I urged the forces of religion to assert their moral leadership in the pursuit of peace. As war is too important to leave to generals, so is peace too important to be left to government alone. Too long have religious groups played the ignoble role of invoking God and high-order rationalizations to justify whatever their own nations chose to do. It is nothing less than blasphemy for men of faith to demean themselves into amen-sayers for whatever policy their governments proclaim. Here, too, there has been progress in the past 2 years. The true role of religion was revealed by the late Pope John in his electrifying encyclical, Pacem in Terris, which held aloft a vision of how men can live together, despite their deep differences, as children of one God and upon one small and shrinking planet.

For several years, I have been urging a summit conference of religious leaders of all faiths to seek to apply God's will to the paramount task of our day: assuring the survival in dignity of the family of man. I am pleased to report progress toward such an interreligious approach and increasing support from some of the most distinguished Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders. An interfaith effort along these lines is now being organized under the co-chairmanship of Roman Catholic Bishop John J. Wright, of Pittsburgh, Bishop Wesley Lord, of Washington, and myself. We are now working hard toward the organization of a special conference of religious leadership which, although it will be much smaller and less formal, will seek to mobilize the religious compulsion toward peace in the way that the National Conference on Race and Religion dramatized the moral scandal of racial segregation in this land. I know you will be pleased to know that Pope Paul expressed his encouragement to this effort in a private audience I had with him at the Vatican this past August.

We have stepped up our activity but, here again, the world is moving too speedily, the issues are too urgent, to permit even a shred of self-satisfaction. The ban is encouraging, I repeat, but I have the disquieting sensation that its passage presaged not true willingness to get off the treadmill of a nuclear arms race and a ritualistic cold war. It is as if our military and the Congress were saying, "This we will swallow, but no more." Nothing is really changed; everything depends upon where we go from here.

It is too easy for the United States to go on with its self-righteous assumption that peace depends on what the aggressive imperialists of the east do or do not do. The truth is that most of the peoples of the world regard both the Russians and ourselves with suspicion; two superpowers willing to subordinate the destiny of all other peoples to the acting out of our own deadly and often irrational contest. Peace depends also, in no small measure, upon what we Americans do or do not do.

Do we advance the cause of peace when we reward the anti-Communist sloganeering of dictators and prematurely baptize as apostles of the free world such free-booters as Franco's Spain, Salazar's Portugal, Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa, Nasser's Egypt, Ibn Saud's Saudi Arabia, and the recent warmly received Marshall Tito? Do we advance the cause of peace when we make Germany the pivot of our entire European policy, so that an American President, less than two decades after the passing of Hitler, declares, "I am a Berliner"? Do we advance the cause of peace when, with all our vaunted ingenuity, we cannot figure out how to use our bulging surplus grain to feed a hungry world? Does it advance the cause of peace when we shirk from a wholehearted priority commitment to do something about the population explosion, which already nullifies most of the benefits of foreign aid and technical assistance to other nations? Do we advance the cause of peace when we use our great power to keep the 800 million Chinese out of the United Nations, despite the fact that no significant disarmament arrangement can ever be worked out unless the Communist Chinese are involved, and despite our psychological awareness that keeping a large nation in the international doghouse is much more likely to cultivate those very qualities of sullen defiance that we despise and fear—qualities which might, conceivably, be mitigated somewhat by the sobering influence of world opinion? Does it advance the cause of peace that we devote half our national budget to defense but cannot find justification to authorize a meager $15 million to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the only Agency of the Federal Government which devotes itself to planning a warless world?

MAN TO MOON OR MISSION TO MAN?

I believe that the deepest, most abiding task of religion—and particularly of Judaism—is to keep man human in an age which conspires to deflate the coinage of the individual human personality—an age in which we can casually speak of the probable death of millions of souls by nuclear bomb as though we were speaking of pestilential mosquitoes. America is in the midst of a crisis of values. We see this within our own Union, within our own congregations, within our own families. Fifteen years of living in the shadow of the bomb, 15 years of cold war and impending peril, in which an immense military-industrial establishment is matched only by the magnitude of a secret intelligence operation which often seems to function independently—or should I say autonomously? These things have conditioned us to the kind of world in which we live. We have become inured to the acceptance of horror, of death by starvation and nitrogen burns, of permanent unemployment, as a way of life. Our changing, chameleon, confused values reflect it. What are the things which are most important to us as a nation? We have given top priority to landing a man on the moon in this decade. This miraculous achievement will cost a minimum of $40 million. Atomic scientist, Dr. Leo Szilard, puts our choice bluntly: "This is a moral issue, and we are making the wrong choice. To race the Russians to the moon and let our old people live on almost nothing is immoral. The moon is not science—not bread. It is a circus. The astronauts are the gladiators. It's lunacy, I say." Those words are from a scientist, I repeat, not a rabbi or a minister or a priest. This sum of money not only could take care of our increasing Golden Age citizens, as Dr. Szilard points out; it would wipe out the wretched slums in every American city; it could build public schools and strengthen our educational system, which is one of our produest boasts and most shameful disgraces. Such programs of national rehabilitation could reduce unemployment and revitalize our economy. But because we have a national commitment to get to the moon first—a daredevil feat on a par with those teenagers who find their excitement only in playing chicken—Congress will certainly not authorize funds for many years to provide decent education and housing and medical care to fortify the basic, inviolable dignity of each American citizen for which our Union of States was called into being.

But no, we must go to the moon. Questions are raised as to the costs of such an effort. Questions are now being raised as to the possibility of a joint effort to reach the moon with the Russians, which they have rejected with a statement I wish we had made. Questions are raised as to when we can get to the moon. But practically nobody has asked the $40 million question: why? Dr. Szilard thinks it lunacy. Vice President Johnson says it is not essential to American military security. Would it not make more sense to try to work out an agreement with the Russians to leave the moon alone, at least until we have fulfilled our Judeo-Christian and American mandates to build God's kingdom on earth first? Have we striven all these millennia, we Jews, to creat the kingdom of God on earth, only to abdicate our responsibilities and transfer our failure to other planets?

It will be pointed out that I am no expert on science or technology, and indeed I am not. But as a human being, as a Jew, as a rabbi in Israel, I cry out against the moral

decay, the corruption of values, the allegiance to the standards of a misguided adolescence which are besmirching American life today, belittling the dignity of the individual, adult as well as child, and betraying the greatest gift that Judaism and the Western World have given to mankind, its concept of of the unfettered spirit, the unrestrained soaring of the human mind and the human soul. Until we knock from the pedestal the false gods that now we idolize, and reinstate in their proper place of top priority the values which have fired thirty millennia of Jewish experience, which have enabled our people, alone of all peoples of antiquity, to survive the holocausts of history, we shall sink further into the slime of indifference, of callousness, of conforming to the lowest common denominator and a primitive, dog-eat-dog existence.

Foremost among these false idols is the rampant nationalism which rationalizes both our insane overkill and our extravagant, foolish race to the moon. Was not U Thant echoing the Hebrew prophets' denunciation of this primitive henotheism when recently he admonished all of us with the words: "Another great fact of our time is the myth of the absolute sovereign state. In San Francisco 18 years ago, the assembled statesmen of the world clung to this myth. They still conceived it possible to have a peaceful world consisting of a number of armed sovereign states clinging to their sovereign status without any thought of abandoning an iota of this sovereignty. If the United Nations is to grow into a really effective instrument for maintaining the rule of law, the first step must be the willingness of the member states to give up the concept of the absolute sovereign state in the same manner as we individuals give up our absolute right to do just what we please as an essential condition of living in an organized society. The individual has to submit to the rules laid down by the authorities, and every one of us has to pay this price as a condition of living. While the sovereignty of each of us is limited to what is necessary in the interest of the community, one retains the domestic rights for the purpose of regulating one's home life."

And so was the historian, Arnold Toynbee, putting into modern lingo the ancient language of Israel's moral seers when he chided: "Ye foolish teenage-minded tribes and sects, have ye not yet grasped the truth that ye are but inseparable parts of the human race, that we have to be human beings before we can be either Russians or Americans, capitalists, or Communists? If man commits genocide on mankind, not even a memory will survive of your precious nationalism." Pope John also dared to declare that "the fact that one is a citizen of a particular state does not detract in any way from his membership in the human family as a whole, nor from his citizenship of the world community."

Dare we Jews, who first envisaged this all-inclusive human family, this universal world community, say and seek any less?

I plead with each and all of you here gathered to share with me the dream wherewith I began, the dream of Jacob that through us, his seed, "all the peoples of the earth may be blessed."

Yes, I, too, have a dream. A dream of:

A union that will realize Isaac Wise's original and, in my judgment, far from fantastic aspiration to include the vast majority of American Jews, committed to the adaptation of our ancient heritage to contemporary needs and dedicated to the pouring of the rich old wine of our historic tradition into the new vessels of our amazing scientific age;

These hundreds of thousands, even millions, of adherents become increasingly knowledgeable of their Jewish lineage and aware of the requirements of their hallowed faith;

Our Reform Jewish movement unified;

Not alone a unified American Reform Judaism, but a unified American Jewish community; and, once again, I would like Reform Judaism to take the initiative in this venture;

An America that will truly be the land of the free and the home of the brave—all men free to enjoy the fruitage of this blessed realm;

A world disarmed with no more "ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-housed," where every man may indeed dwell, not like a rat in his fallout, keepout shelter in the Stygian bowels of the earth but " 'neath his own vine and fig tree, there being none to make him afraid."

CONCLUSION

But we must not be content even with such dreams which, our Bible tells us, "old men dream" while "young men see visions." Let us catch the vision of this union, recharged and rechallenged, regenerated and reborn, to hear God's word and to heed His will; to bring to fruition even in our own time His kingdom of righteousness on earth.

Not backward shall we set our gaze, for, as our rabbis warn us, the phrase Va-y'hi Bi-meh—"And it came to pass in those days"—refers only to calamity; while Ve Hoyo—"And it shall be"—alludes to events of joy—not "the former things that are come to pass," but the "new things which are to be." Toward these "new things"—foundations of a new and more just social order arising from the decayed debris of an outmoded and outrageously unjust one; rededication of our hearts and minds to the new meanings of our old, eternal Jewish teachings; new challenges to young men and women to replace the broken playthings of pampered pleasures—toward these "new things" let us set our face. Onward then. Let us sound the silver trumpet of advance, the shofar of a new year, remembering the poet's assurance that:

"Progress is man's distinctive mark alone,
Not God's, and not the beasts'.
God is; they are;
Man partly is and wholly hopes to be."

Fair Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the tragedy which befell our President and our Nation in Dallas, the American people witnessed the spectacle of an accused virtually being tried by television. The behavior of law enforcement authorities in Dallas illustrates the need for an examination of the effects of news media on the right of an accused to a fair trial which presumably is guaranteed under our system of jurisprudence.

Justice Abraham N. Geller of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in a thoughful letter to the New York Times published on December 12, 1963, raises fundamental questions and makes the sound suggestion that the appropriate committees of Congress conduct an inquiry into the extremely delicate matter of accommodation between freedom of the press and the fair administration of criminal justice.

I commend Justice Geller's letter to my colleagues:

PREJUDICING TRIALS—INQUIRY ASKED INTO EFFECT OF NEWS MEDIA ON RIGHTS OF ACCUSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your recent editorials, as well as several letters published by you, have deplored the excessive emphasis on publicity exhibited in the Dallas mishandling of our processes of criminal justice.

No fairminded person can possibly disagree with the conclusion that such abuses, prejudicial to the right of an accused to a fair trial, are repugnant to our system of justice under law. However, I am afraid that such generalized sentiments or suggestions for a self-imposed code will not produce any concrete results.

The English courts have employed the traditional contempt of court device to keep publicity of criminal proceedings within legitimate bounds. In this country the contempt procedure has not been invoked under equivalent circumstances, probably due to the emphasis upon freedom of press guaranteed in our written Federal and State Constitutions. But, despite the Supreme Court's refusal under the existing circumstances to entertain and pass on the question, Mr. Justice Frankfurter pointed out in *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show* (1950) the basic constitutional issues, the nature of the problem of adjustment and the kind of questions that would have to be faced were we called upon to pass on the issues.

COURTS' POWER

It may be that now, viewing the disastrous effect in Dallas of the trend toward live, on-the-spot coverage of criminal investigations, our courts may increasingly exercise their undoubted power to curb excesses which prejudice the trial of an accused. Our courts have in recent decisions granted new trials and change of venue where local press, television, or radio coverage was of such nature as might have prejudiced the trial of the accused man. Relief of this type, attempting after the event to correct deplorable situations in individual instances, is a poor substitute for the comprehensive preventive remedy which this difficult and delicate problem requires.

The problem is one of balancing competing basic rights—freedom of the press and constitutional safeguards guaranteeing an accused a fair trial. Both are indispensible parts of the same Bill of Rights. There can be no question as to the necessity of keeping the public informed of all the news, including what goes on in our courts.

This extremely delicate matter of accommodation as between freedom of the press and the fair administration of criminal justice can most effectively be resolved by an official inquiry into all phases of the subject and the setting forth of legislative standards within the constitutional framework to be followed.

POSSIBLE LEGISLATION

The subject should be reviewed by a congressional committee to determine whether legislation is appropriate. It may, for example, be deemed feasible to provide in the Federal Communications Act standards for television and radio reporting of criminal investigations and trials, while establishing standards applicable generally to Federal criminal proceedings for public statements by Federal law-enforcement officials and newspaper reporting of such proceedings, which may be the impetus for similar action by the States.

In our own State the present commission on revision of the penal law and code of criminal procedure may decide to explore the advisability of recommending legislation to control abuses in publicity concern-

ing criminal matters prejudicial to the rights of an accused.

I do not presume to suggest any specific remedies but merely that the matter should be dealt with affirmatively by constructive measures designed to prevent excesses which do injury to the rights of accused persons and to the law of the land.

ABRAHAM N. GELLER,
Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

NEW YORK, *December 3, 1963.*

Confidence Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been requesting action in setting up a congressional joint watchdog committee over the operations of the CIA I read with great interest the Washington Post editorial for December 16, 1963. Because of the importance of its subject matter, I include it here in the RECORD:

CONFIDENCE GAP

The intelligence activities of the Nation properly are not subject to the public scrutiny which allows citizens to form independent and informed judgments in other fields. Secrecy demands a considerable degree of public faith that all in the intelligence world goes well. Hence the intelligence agencies, to the limited extent that they can make an impress on the public, must think in terms of the public's confidence in them. They cannot share information but they can impart trust. In the case of the new American assessment of the Soviet Army, the requisite trust is not being built.

For years the figure of 175 Soviet divisions was widespread. In the recent words of Secretary of Defense McNamara, it led the West to think of "a Communist Goliath in conventional strength facing a Western David, almost naked of conventional arms but alone possessed of a nuclear sling." But, Mr. McNamara said, this image has outlived its time. Following the earlier and less publicized efforts of some of his deputies, he produced a working figure of less than 80 divisions. Suddenly, it seemed, chiefly by virtue of recent intensive investigation of the size, combat readiness and mobility of the Soviet Army, its menace had been halved.

This is extremely reassuring, even though a citizen may wonder how earlier intelligence estimates could have been, apparently, so wrong. A citizen may wonder, too, why the new estimates are being publicized now. The answer is easy. The United States is trying to encourage laggard members of NATO to fill their troop commitments. Some members, it is said, have held back because they thought the Soviet army too massive to build up to: They preferred to count on a nuclear deterrent. The new lower estimates permit the United States to argue that the Soviet army is within matching range after all, and precisely this argument is being made.

Understandably, those countries whose NATO commitments have been filled accept the new estimates; they include the United States and West Germany. Britain, one of the laggards, holds on to the old 160–175 division estimates. And so it has happened that the strength of the Soviet army has become a source of friction within NATO. The footdraggers are now able to buttress their procrastination on intelligence grounds and, over the weekend, even Mr. Khrushchev got into the act.

Far more serious is the disturbing question of whether the new estimates were developed in order to stiffen the American argument for conventional forces and for a European defense strategy based upon them, or whether a fresh look at the Soviet establishment produced estimates which then were turned to political use. Unfortunately, the prerequisites of secrecy prevent a full and fruitful discussion of this question. The efforts to reduce the division gap may have produced a confidence gap.

God Is Approved if "Incidental"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I well understand the fact that there are legal, technical, and constitutional questions and interpretations involved in the problem of prayer recitation in schools and the problem of separation of church and state. Honest and sincere people are to be found on both sides of the controversies involving these subjects. Nonetheless, I am becoming increasingly disturbed by the trend of thinking in the United States which has been taking place in recent years. So long as I can remember we have considered ours a religious Nation. Our country has been "one Nation, under God" since the days of our Founding Forefathers, in the minds of most of our people. Yet, for a considerable time we seem to have been drifting away from that concept.

A few days ago the headline of an article appearing in a local newspaper caught my attention. It was entitled "Caroling at Assemblies Approved if 'Incidental'." The article itself was reasonably written and I have no comment to make upon it. It was just the headline which disturbed me, and which emphasized the trend I referred to. That trend seems to say "God is approved, if incidental."

I wonder if too many of us are not caught up in that trend, both in our private and public lives. We acknowledge God as our Lord and Master, and as the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. Yet in actual practice we too often relegate Him to an incidental position. We seem to live our lives, make decisions, and follow courses of action, based not so much upon His precepts as upon temporary expediencies and the hope of immediate advantage. How often, or how seldom, do we seek His guidance in the things we do or say? Putting it another way, how often do we ignore Him and do or say the thing which seems to be most advantageous to us at the moment? How often do we relegate Him to an "incidental" position? Far too many times, I am afraid.

It seems to me that we must recheck the course which we as individuals and as a nation are following. God is not "incidental" however hard we strive to make Him so. Whatever we do, He is still the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. Let us not forget that fact for one moment.

The news article is as follows:

CAROLING AT ASSEMBLIES APPROVED IF "INCIDENTAL"

(By Paul A. Schuette)

Washington public school pupils may sing Christmas carols during student assemblies and still be in harmony with the Supreme Court decision on school prayer, Corporation Council Chester H. Gray said yesterday.

That opinion was contained in Gray's response to six questions submitted by the school board in the wake of the High Court ruling last spring.

Gray indicated that the board acted properly in rescinding its rule that classes must be opened with Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer.

But the Supreme Court decision does not forbid some of the other activities which the board thought might be affected, he said.

Christmas carols and Easter hymns can be sung by pupils in assemblies as long as they are "incidental" and not a part of a religious exercise, said Gray.

School officials also may continue to invite clergymen to give invocations and benedictions at commencement exercises, he said, as long as students' attendance at the ceremonies is voluntary.

In response to a question as to whether students may "spontaneously engage in devotional services on their own," Gray said this probably is legal but not very practical.

A student may pray silently, said Gray, but "to say that a student, might, at his own whim and choice of timing, engage in prayer in audible or otherwise disruptive manner" would violate disciplinary rules.

The board also was asked what the practical effect would be if a considerable number of parents asked that students be excused to attend brief religious services outside of school.

Gray said this is a matter to be determined by school officials, but pointed out that the Supreme Court in 1952 upheld the legality of such program in New York public schools.

Grassroots Support for Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the quality stabilization bill I have many times pointed out that this legislation has extensive support at the Nation's grassroots level. This support is not limited to those persons having a direct interest in the well-being of our independent retail economy, but it also includes a large and knowledgeable segment of the consumer public.

The propaganda smokescreen set up by opponents of quality stabilization to obscure the real issues involved in the bill continues unabated. But no amount of propaganda can obscure the harsh economic facts which make passage of this legislation necessary if our free competitive retail system is to survive.

Either the Congress acts to save the Nation's competitive retail system, or that system is doomed to be bled white by unfair and cutthroat competitive practices.

This was the essence of testimony I gave in early October to the Senate Special Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization. At that time I described the quality stabilization bill as a tourniquet to stop the flow of retail lifeblood. This viewpoint, I am gratified to be able to say, has received wide acceptance and support, not only in my home State of Washington, but in all parts of the country.

As a matter of fact, mail response to my position on this vital economic issue during 1963 has reinforced my conviction that quality stabilization is not simply good economics, but good politics as well. The people best informed about the economic facts of life concerning our Nation's retail market are behind quality stabilization. They are supporting this legislation not because it offers a panacea to our retail ills, but because it is the best solution yet evolved to curb the source of these ills.

The Congress will do well to hear the voice of public opinion on this key issue rather than the chant of the high-powered propagandists of its special interest opponents. Toward this end, I believe that a reading of certain excerpts from letters received in my office on quality stabilization can serve a useful purpose.

Let me begin with a letter received from an official of one of the largest and most important retail trade groups in the U.S. shoe industry:

For some time, the independent retailers have been seriously concerned about their future—

Writes Mr. Edward J. MacDonald, executive vice president of the National Shoe Retailers Association.

The lack of capital and the increasing competition of new forms of distribution has been threatening their security.

Mr. MacDonald continues:

The board of directors of the National Shoe Retailers Association, speaking for the entire membership, unanimously approved the provisions of the quality stabilization bill—eliminating bait advertising, unscrupulous price cutting and merchandising practices—as a powerful means to help guarantee the future security of brand name retailers and, therefore, the future security of the national economy.

So writes an executive of a retail commodity trade association. From a different perspective, another executive official, this one the mayor of a Maryland town, writes on behalf of the interests of the small businessmen of his community and State:

The Quality Stabilization Act is essential to help the consumer—

Writes Mayor John H. Burbage, of Berlin, Md.—

He often is a sucker, being baited into a store by unprincipled loss-leader operators who then gouge him on less known products * * *. The quality stabilization bill will help the quality manufacturer build better and better products, not cheaper and cheaper imitations.

Additional support for quality stabilization comes from Mr. W. F. Moore, of the Christian Booksellers Association, Inc., of Chicago, Ill. Mr. Moore writes:

The Christian Booksellers Association is not seeking legislation that will protect the inefficient merchant, but rather we seek legislation that will provide the necessary protection against the encroachment of unfair competition by unscrupulous merchants * * *. It is our considered opinion that the early enactment of the quality stabilization bill is needed.

Especially gratifying has been the mail response to my own recent testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Quality Stabilization.

From a West Virginia automotive supply executive comes a letter graphically telling of a current economic plight of the small independent businessman. Says Mr. Frank G. McKenzie of Bluefield, W. Va.:

I have been the head of a private enterprise business with several outlets in the automotive after-market for parts, supplies, and equipment since 1930, and have served in many capacities in association work * * * and I have never seen such a squeeze coming up in our field, as well as others, as has occurred in the last few years.

A similar warning is spelled out in a letter from Mr. Moe Weiss, executive secretary of Consolidated Brooklyn Retail Pharmacists, Inc., of Brooklyn, N.Y.:

Unless a fair competitive climate is created soon, to protect small and independent retailers, we will see many thousands of failures—

Writes Mr. Weiss, who urges favorable congressional action on quality stabilization legislation.

But the disease which quality stabilization is aimed at curing is national, not regional, in scope. To the voices of Mr. McKenzie of West Virginia and Mr. Weiss of California, add that of Mr. F. A. Palmer, Jr. of Clute, Tex. Only a few short days ago, Mr. Palmer wrote as follows:

DEAR SIR: I just finished reading your remarks of October 7, 1963, on the quality stabilization bill. I wish to congratulate you on your stand and your astute insight into the basic problem of American small business * * *. My wife and I own a small store in Clute, Tex., and we are supporting four families, representing 21 people, out of this small business. If something is not done in the very near future to protect small business, we will be forced to give up. Multiply this by thousands and see what it does to unemployment.

From Mr. Rudolph Schiller, president of W. Schiller & Co., of St. Louis, Mo., comes still more verification of the plight of the small businessman throughout the country:

Here in the small towns of Missouri there are more small merchants going out of business all of the time and one can see more and more for rent signs.

States Mr. Schiller—

For years we have been hearing about the small businessman, but nothing is done about him.

Mr. Schiller's letter continues:

The small businessman does not want a loan. What he wants is to make a fair and legitimate profit out of at least some of the things he sells, and especially those items which are quality products.

Referring specifically to one of the key elements of the quality stabilization bill, Mr. Schiller concludes:

To my mind, a man who makes a quality product and has it trademarked should have protection all the way down to the consumer.

In the Southeast, the retail situation is described, by Mr. K. K. Kennedy, president of the Florida State Retailers Association, as "tragic." Writes Mr. Kennedy:

Your timely and forceful testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee on behalf of the quality stabilization bill, is a true and heartbreaking portrayal of the tragic situation facing the independent retailers of our State.

And from my home State of Washington, here are but a few excerpts from the many letters I received in response to my quality stabilization testimony before the Senate subcommittee:

From Mr. Robert D. Gibb of Associated Stationers, Seattle:

As a former competitor of yours, and knowing you believe in fair competition, I again thank you for your effort toward this bill.

From Mr. John Walters, Walters Prescription Pharmacy, Inc., Seattle:

Your talk before the committe was logical and presented in such an A-B-C manner that it should be obvious to any fairminded Senator or Congressman that such a bill is necessary if the independent merchant is to survive.

From Mr. Clyde F. Allen of Clyde's Pharmacy, Bremerton, Wash.:

Keep up the good work that you are doing to convince all of your colleagues that this is necessary legislation.

And finally, from Mr. F. N. McCowan, executive director of the Washington State Food Dealers Association, Seattle:

It is very gratifying to know of your interest and work for small business and our free competitive enterprise system.

I know that in recent months there have been hundreds of thousands of words written and spoken concerning quality stabilization. But, in my opinion, few tracts or words spoken on the subject speak more eloquently of the need for enactment of this legislation than some of the pertinent excerpts I have just read. These are the expressions of grassroots American businessmen close to the Nation's retail economy.

These men, Mr. Speaker, who depend on the well-being of the retail economy for their livelihoods, cannot permit themselves to be fooled by the distorted slogans and arguments put forth by quality stabilization's opponents. And, considering that the fate of this legislation might mean life or death for America's independent small businessmen, neither can the Congress.

John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 5, 1963

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation, and throughout the world, American citizens are still deeply mourn-

ing the loss of our President, John F. Kennedy. A poet constituent has written to express his feelings; one of his poems, I wish to insert at this point in my remarks:

TO THE MEMORY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

He was guided, by a star unseen,
And reached a height of fame;
And captivated the hearts of the world
That very few attain.

His life was a testimony,
For his love, of his country,
A hero, both in peace and war,
This we all could see.

This was indeed a good man,
Of courage and too of restraint;
He knew not conceit, nor intolerance,
Always giving his energy and strength.

He typified the American mood,
And the spirit of our day;
Guided by the unseen star,
He never knew dismay.

He gave his life for his country,
That a lesson to teach;
That we should go forward.
And a higher goal to reach.

Hate has taken him from us,
But ever let that shining light;
Point to an eternal pathway
That will lead us from the night.

—CHARLIE HESS.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

In Defense of State and Federal Employment Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, the Minneapolis-St. Paul Chambers of Commerce held a daylong meeting for a discussion of the roles and activities of various hiring channels in today's labor market.

Present at the meeting were representatives of private employment agencies, college placement officers, and the public employment service.

The Chicago regional administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security, Mr. Joseph Borus, did a commendable job of explaining the mission of the public employment service, and of refuting many of the charges being made against it by the private employment agencies.

Mr. Borus answered specific charges made at the same meeting in Minneapolis that were inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 20, 1963. To present both sides of this question, I have unanimous consent to place part of Mr. Borus' reply in the RECORD.

EXCERPT FROM SPEECH OF JOSEPH BORUS, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

In the last year, the U.S. Employment Service and the State employment services have been under serious attack—really for the first time in our history. I want to devote the rest of my remarks this morning to this area.

One area I believe we can dispose of quickly. Unquestionably there have been misunderstandings between the college placement council composed of college staff engaged in student counseling and placement and employment service personnel. The college placement council was under the impression that the employment service planned to operate on college campuses over the objections of college authorities. There certainly would be cause for alarm if such was our intent. This is a free country; I cannot envisage a situation where the employment service would want to or would be able to engage in any functioning on the college campus over the objections of the proper authorities. I know of no legal basis which would permit the employment service to operate in this manner, either federally or at any State level.

I am happy to note that through an exchange of leters the employment service and the college placement council have agreed that the employment service function is to supplement the services available through college facilities and, of course, at the request of college authority.

This misunderstanding, while it lasted, created quite a ruckus; college people are articulate, vocal, organized, and unquestionably felt that right was on their side.

There is a significant problem which does exist and which concerns me greatly.

The provision of additional funds by the last two Congresses has led to attacks and criticisms as to the role of the employment service (again I include the individual State employment services in this term) and questions concerning the alleged desire of the employment service to secure a monopoly position in the placement of labor. A leader in these attacks has been a group of private fee-charging employment agencies organized as the National Employment Association. Before I discuss specifics, I want to make our position clear. This controversy is not of our making. We are not interested in putting private employment agencies out of business. We all know that there are private agencies doing a good and necessary job. There are others which do not and based on past experience, most industrial States license and regulate private employment agencies.

One year ago last month a newsletter was circulated to members attending the association national convention. This newsletter advocated an intensive drive to develop massive support for fee-charging agencies and to discredit the public employment offices. Here is a direct quote from that newsletter: "Congressional investigation of public employment agencies is one virtually certain result of a properly conducted campaign of this kind. A major cutback in tax-supported employment operations is a definitely certain result. Far more public support, increased business, and greater prospects for growth will be inevitable side benefits for private agency owners. But only if they get behind it with strength enough to assure success."

Shortly after the convention, the association announced its campaign and hired a Washington lobbyist. A thousand dollar club was established consisting of individual fee-charging agencies which contributed $1,000 or more to the campaign goal.

Following the initiation of this campaign, there have been articles and editorials in national magazines, prominent newspapers, and in speeches. The attacks have had many elements of similarity. The charges are approximately the same, the same phrases appear in a variety of media, and in mnay cases include an erroneous figure concerning the degree of service provided employed workers, a figure which continues to this day to be used even though it has been noted incorrect in a variety of ways including insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a more correct figure.

Let me list some of the statements concerning the Employment Service made by those who are not in agreement with their understanding of its present operations. Because of the limitation of time, I cannot go into any length in my replies but I am very hopeful that there will be time during the course of the day for us to explore some of these points further.

Charge No. 1. The public employment service has "turned its back on unemployed workers" and is concentrating its placement activity on finding new jobs for people already employed. Consistently, the figure appears that 60 percent of the placements made by the public employment offices last year were of people already employed. The correct figure is considerably different. For many years we have estimated that between 85 and 95 percent of placements are of unemployed workers. The estimate is based partially on the fact that all applicants for unemployment insurance benefits must register for work and thus in all States constitute a major percentage of the applications in the files. After hearing the 60 percent figure a few times, a study was conducted the week of May 19, 1963, in local employment offices in 22 States; these States normally make 75 percent of all placements. The survey showed that 97 percent of the placements made that week were of unemployed workers and only 3 percent of persons with jobs. In Minnesota, the St. Paul local office was selected for the survey. It showed that 12 percent of its placements were of individuals who were already employed and that 88 percent were placements of unemployed workers.

I believe I know where the 60-percent figure comes from. A household survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census in 1959 reported that of all new hires in the Nation from all job sources through all hiring channels, three out of every five were of employed workers changing jobs, one was unemployed and one was a new entrant into the labor force. This survey had nothing to do with public employment service placements, last year or any other year.

Charge No. 2: The expanded activity of the public employment service is driving private employment agencies out of business, is strangling private enterprise, and there are plans to take over all placement activity in the country.

The American labor market operates on the basis of complete freedom of choice by both employers and workers. A worker is free to accept any job for which he qualifies and an employer is free to hire any worker he is able to attract. Employers and workers use the assistance of employment agencies—public or private—only on a voluntary basis and when it helps to fulfill their needs. The truth is that the public and private employment agencies account for only about 20 percent of the hires in the national labor market. In other words, there is a large field in which both groups can operate. Eighty percent of new hires are made through the time-tested channels of friends of present employees, families, trade unions, professional societies, gate hires, and college placement offices.

To achieve a monopoly situation from the present situation, I think we would all agree that it would take legislation to permit this, legislation which I doubt could pass through any Congress.

Finally, as to the existence of private agencies, in the last 10 years the number of private agencies reporting under State unemployment insurance laws has increased 170 percent and their staff has increased by 220 percent.

Charge No. 3: Through administrative action, the U.S. Employment Service is exceed-

ing its legal authority by placing employed workers and by placing workers in the professional fields.

I earlier quoted you the language of the Wagner-Peyser Act which even in the heart of the depression specified placement activities for those who are legally qualified to work without other restriction. A limitation on the segments of the labor force handled by the public employment service would mean that an employed worker who wanted to change jobs and desired assistance in finding a new one would have to use a fee-charging agency. He would not have the option which he has at the present time of using either a fee-charging agency or the public employment service.

I believe the interests of the country call for a maximum mobility of labor, which will permit the fullest utilization of an individual's skills and permit as promptly as possible the granting of a desire of qualified individuals to upgrade themselves. Remember that filling a high level job in a particular organization may open up lower level jobs below. The millions of people who are in jobs which they dislike, who would be glad to change for something better suited to abilities and interests; those who have temporarily had to take jobs beneath their skill level; the man who, while still employed, takes time and effort to improve his education and skill through school or part-time training; are those to be deprived of job assistance? We believe these workers have a right to better themselves if they can and that they have the right to use the public employment office if they choose.

I should like to note two legal opinions concerning the question of whether the employment service is exceeding its authority. The general counsel of the National Employment Association stated as his opinion, "Let us not mislead ourselves into thinking that what the USES is doing had no legal basis and that under existing statutes it can be attacked as violating its legitimate authority and mandate. The USES under present statutes is operating within the framework of the law." Similarly, the counsel for the Ohio Private Employment Association stated, "It does seem clear that the operation of such 'free employment offices' is not limited to such functions as may aid in the administration of the Unemployment Compensation Act but is designed as well to promote generally the employment of individuals at their highest skills, whether or not currently employed on another job, or bringing together prospective employers and employees just as private employment agencies commonly do."

Finally, it is to be noted that the criticisms are largely levied against the U.S. Employment Service. Very little is said with respect to the fact that the States do the operating, that each State employment service by law has an advisory council with representatives of management and labor, that employment service staff is exclusively composed of State civil service employees. Here in Minnesota you have an employment service of which to be justly proud. It was established by the legislature on April 19, 1905, long before the Wagner-Peyser Act. The service's record for accomplishment and for caliber of personnel is of the highest rank. Its record for placements is consistently good. To show the degree of cooperation between the Minnesota State Employment Service and Minnesota employers, let me quote just two statistics. Of the 100 largest firms in Minnesota, 54 are located in Minneapolis. Fifty of the 54 use the Minneapolis office of the Minnesota State Employment Service.

In the first 9 months of 1963, 7,124 employers used the Minneapolis and St. Paul local offices. Of these, 1,597 were employers who did not utilize the service in the preceding year, i.e., were "new business" to the local office. A State employment service is in one sense like any other business. A good job brings more business. In some of our other States where performance is not as good as it is in Minnesota, the results are not as good.

The public employment service is just what the name implies, a public agency responsible to the public. As such it is and should be subject to the examination and scrutiny of all citizens. Like any other public agency, it is open to criticism when it does not live up to its responsibilities or fails to conduct itself properly. Such responsibility and such public scrutiny are basic to our principles of democratic government. I suggest that an understanding of the economic problems of this country and the position of the employment services in relation to these problems is fundamental and that the public employment service finds itself in the ironic position of being attacked because it is living up to its responsibilities and doing it reasonably well.

People Who Live in Glass Houses Shouldn't Throw Stones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the December issue of the Torch, the publication of World I veterans, an interesting article was written by the paper's editor, Mr. Leroy P. Chittenden, in answer to the attack on veterans' benefits by Chamber of Commerce President Edwin P. Neilan.

It is a story which I hope all Members of the Congress will read:

PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN GLASS HOUSES SHOULDN'T THROW STONES

(By Leroy P. Chittenden)

In the November 30 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Edwin P. Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, unleashed a vitriolic article entitled "Let's Say No to the Veterans." In the article, the chamber of commerce president states that veteran groups are the worst offenders among those receiving from the Congress what Neilan terms "handouts" and "Federal giveaways." He states unequivocally that the VA Hospital program is mismanaged and that many, many veterans perjure themselves in order to secure hospital care at Government expense. He also proposes to eliminate the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and would eliminate all VA Hospitals and provide hospitalization for only those with service-connected disabilities in private hospitals. He would take the Government out of the insurance business.

The article goes on to say that 85 percent of VA patients are those with nonservice-connected disabilities. This, of course, is utterly fallacious, as statistics show that some 40 percent of all veterans in VA hospitals have service-connected disabilities and of the remainder about 55 percent have long-term disabilities of a chronic nature and must be cared for either by the Federal Government, States or counties and cities.

The author, who states that he served 39 months in World War II in the Navy, takes particular issue with a pension measure sponsored by the veterans of World War I. Neilan repeats the charges that this scandalous bill would cost the taxpayers of the Nation some $20 billion by the year 2000 and the article is filled with inaccuracies.

It is an old adage that people who live in glasshouses shouldn't throw stones. Neilan is the chairman of the board and president of a powerful chain of commercial banks in the State of Delaware. His home is in Wilmington. He served practically all of his 39 months of naval service in World War II in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. We have no quarrel with this kind of service because he was ordered to this type of duty, but it goes without saying that a man located only 30 miles from his home during his period of service has little knowledge of the rigors of war that the men in training camps, on the battlefield, or on the high seas endured as compared with those with the slight inconveniences undergone by service personnel in positions such as Neilan held.

When I read the Neilan article in the Post, it occurred to me that commercial bankers, as a group, received most-favored treatment at the hands of the Government. So I sought an interview with a man who perhaps has more firsthand information on this particular subject than almost anyone in America.

I talked with the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Congressman from Texas, who is presently the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and a recognized and eminent authority on money and finance.

The Texas Congressman has for many years crossed swords with the banking industry, and during my interview, he made the flat statement that commercial banks of this Nation now enjoy an annual subsidy of over $5 billion paid for by the Government of the United States and the taxpayers of the Nation.

PATMAN, appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee 2 years ago, itemized to some extent the vast subsidy payments now going to commercial banks.

He said that the bankers' lobby appeared before Congress in the early 1930's endeavoring to have a law passed that would make it illegal for them to pay any interest on demand deposits. Congress finally passed that law in 1935 and the banks have had demand deposits free of charge since that time.

The bankers' lobby argued that elimination of interest payments was necessary in order to build up a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insurance premium. Congress had passed a law providing for the insuring of bank deposits as the result of the devastating depression in 1931–33, when banks were toppling like tents in a tornado. The purpose of the Insurance Act was to give the public greater confidence in commercial banks and it resulted in depositors placing their funds in such banks when they had the assurance that the Federal Government stood behind them.

However, the commercial banks have never built up an adequate insurance fund, PATMAN said. The total amount of their insurance premiums in 1960 was only $70 million. Let us contrast this for analysis with the amount of money which commercial banks now have on demand deposit. The total is a little over $130 billion dollars. If the bankers were to pay a yearly interest rate of 2.35, they would have paid depositors over $3 billion a year for the use of their money.

PATMAN described in some detail where this demand deposit money comes from. He says that the Federal Government itself maintains an average balance of $4 billion with the commercial banks each day, and if the banks had paid interest at the Treasury billing rate, they would have paid the Federal Government $94 million a year. Savings and Loan Associations and Mutual Sav-

ings banks maintain demand payments with the banks amounting to over $2 billion, and interest on these funds would have provided $46 million a year.

State and local governments have approximately $12 billion on deposit with commercial banks drawing no interest. If the banks were to pay the Treasury rate on this tremendous sum, the total amount of interest would be $278 million a year.

PATMAN goes on to site other advantages to commercial banks. He figures that the value of interest-free use of demand deposits totals over $3 billion. Added altogether, the figure comes to over $5 billion and the Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee says that these statistics have never been successfully refuted by banking interests in any particular.

Not only do bankers enjoy this tremendous subsidy, but they also have established their position so that they have virtually killed off any competition. It should be realized that an individual cannot start a bank in the manner in which he would engage in the filling station business, or such private enterprise as is common to this country. If he wants to start a bank, he must secure the approval of the U.S. Government, and it can be reasonably understood that he will also encounter stubborn oposition from already established banks.

Congressman PATMAN cites these advantages which have accrued to the banking industry in securing special preference for their particular branch of activity. He adds that there are many more loopholes which provide additional tremendous financial favors for the commercial bankers.

In view of all of these charges, which, as PATMAN says, have never been refuted, it comes with ill grace that the President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should be so critical of benefits which have accrued to the defenders of the Nation.

He complains of a pension bill which, to use his figures, will cost $20 billion by the year 2000. Multiply 36 by $5 billion, and the total comes to $180 billion—ouch.

He should remember that it was these men who successfully fought off the ominous threat to the security of this Nation and made possible the preferred status which they now enjoy along with a huge segment of American industry.

John F. Kennedy Amphitheatre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 12, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, all across our Nation and throughout the world, cities, schools, organizations, and individuals are taking steps to honor the memory of our late and beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the newspaper, the Pioneer, published by the students of California State College at Hayward. This editorial depicts some of the grassroots actively taking place to pay tribute to a great man of our times:

JOHN F. KENNEDY AMPHITHEATRE

At the last student council meeting Miss Connie Voss, frosh rep, proposed that the Fine Arts Building Plaza be named in honor of our late President, John F. Kennedy.

We concur with this thought. Although the naming doesn't necessarily have to apply to the plaza we feel that something on this campus should receive his name in memoriam. Perhaps the 12 story theme building might be a good choice, but it isn't scheduled for completion until 1969.

We feel that a logical choice would be to name our amphitheatre the John F. Kennedy Memorial Amphitheatre and set aside some time during the college's dedication week next spring for the amphitheatre's dedication.

Rights Bill Seen Periled by Political Bypassing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond on December 18 wrote a very important column on the subject of civil rights legislation. As the 1963 session of the Congress ends, I think it important that his words be given wide notice. Let us remember that a good civil rights bill would never pass the House in 1964 unless men on both sides of the aisle who believe in the subject and want to see a result pull together and stay together.

RIGHTS BILL SEEN PERILED BY POLITICAL BYPASSING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—I have to report that a strong civil rights bill is suddenly and seriously in peril.

This dismaying fact will come as a surprise to nearly everybody who has not been privy to the behind-the-scenes politicking which has been taking place.

The very substance of the bill is now in jeopardy and it is being put there not by its enemies, but by its friends.

The delicate, crucial, indispensable bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans—without which no enactable bill could have come from the House Judiciary Committee—is being undermined by extreme partisans.

This coalition is being disrupted—and is on the brink of being destroyed—by the intense, let's-get-the-Negro-votes-now tactics of a group of Democratic liberals, headed by Representative RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri, and their powerful allies in the civil rights leadership organizations. They are intent not only upon claiming for the liberal wing of the Democratic Party all the credit for pushing civil rights, but upon discrediting everything the Republicans have done and are doing to guide the bill to enactment.

Here is some of the evidence:

1. Representative BOLLING is chairman of the Democratic Study Group's civil rights task force, whose first aim is supposed to be to cooperate with likeminded Republicans to get a good bill passed, and is simultaneously chairman of a 15-member Democratic committee raising large funds to defeat Republicans in the big cities where Republican civil rights support is greatest.

2. After relying on Republican cooperation and Republican votes to produce a workable bill, liberal Democrats are now spurning the bipartisan coalition as the means of bringing the bill to the floor and getting it passed. The liberal Democrats have taken the position that the discharge petition is the "must" way to do it, knowing full well that most Republicans have always rejected this method. They are spreading the word that any Republican who opposes the discharge petition is automatically an enemy of civil rights.

It is not true. There was no consultation on the discharge petition with the Republicans, who, like Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, believe that the device of "Calendar Wednesday" (which would bypass the Rules Committee) should be tried.

3. The important strategy conferences of the civil rights leadership groups imperatively need the presence of a broad spectrum of Republican civil rights supporters and these Republicans, including Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, are being totally shunted aside as not wanted.

Says Representative LINDSAY: "Where is the good faith? Why is it necessary now to go in separate directions? Many majority Members have been charged in the past with preferring an issue to a bill. They should take care lest they give further credence to the charge."

Says Representative CURTIS, one of the strongest civil rights supporters: "The substance of the bill and its passage are seriously endangered by excessive Democratic partisanship cutting up the Republicans."

I am not arguing that no political dividends are to be earned for passage of the civil rights bill or that there should be no competition between the parties to claim those dividends.

But it is reckless and irresponsible to start playing politics with the civil rights bill before it is passed. Afterward, yes; then let the dividends and the chips fall where they may.

It is still not too late to rescue the bipartisan coalition from the wreckers.

But at this stage only the top leadership of both parties in the House, at the personal initiative of Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, can put the crucially needed coalition back together.

Now that the facts are coming into the open, it would seem to me that President Johnson would want to use his whole influence to put passage of the bill totally ahead of politics. That was President Kennedy's firm purpose.

The World Mourns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, typical of how our friends abroad feel about the tragic death of our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, is the expression contained in the following letter received by my law partner and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Barnett J. Nova, from one of their dear friends, Mrs. Peter Haddon, of London, England:

NOVEMBER 23, 1963.

MY DEAR GRACE AND BARNEY: I felt I had to write and tell you how completely shocked and horrified we are at President Kennedy's death and how deep and profound our sympathy is at this time.

It really doesn't make sense in anyway and must be absolutely tragic for his wife and family.

We in England share this sad loss with Americans because in the short time President Kennedy held office a great warmth of affection grew up here toward him and everyone, without exception, talks of his great loss

not only to America, but England, the world, and peace.

I still find it hard to believe and must hang on to the thought that God moves in strange ways, otherwise I would find it very difficult to go on believing in God because this all seems so very pointless. Perhaps this is one of the supreme sacrifices which will cause all peoples of the world to move toward better undertanding. I sincerely hope so.

Thinking of you.

Love,

ANN.

Fewer Stores To Share the Pie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we see every day new evidence of the dangerous trend toward retail monopoly in this country. We see small merchants being killed off by large so-called discounters, not because they offer the consumer better service or more efficient operations, but because they engage in often deceptive merchandising and advertising tactics aimed at eliminating competition.

The quality stabilization bill, sponsored by a distinguished group of my estimable colleagues in both Houses of Congress, would permit the small retailer to demonstrate anew his vitality and his efficiency. Unless it is passed, his fate is clear: because he will not engage in shabby techniques, such as running entire departments at a loss in order to build traffic, he will become a part of our vanished scene. And we shall have placed the consumer in the hands of a few, a very few, giant merchandisers. We shall have created less competition, not more; have fewer stores, not a healthy variety; we shall have an undue concentration of economic power in the hands of a few.

The evidence is again before us in the form of a survey published in Business Week magazine. Just one item from it is shocking evidence of the curtailment of competition which we have been witnessing: in the past 10 years, the number of radio-TV stores has dropped from 100,000 to 19,000. How has this happened? It is the result of a policy of many predators who run their radio-TV departments at a deliberate loss just to build traffic. What has happened to the brand names which have been cheapened in this manner? Their reputations have been hurt, their markets have been killed. What has happened to the 81,000 independent businessmen and their employees? Their energies have been lost to the community.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this significant article from the November 6 issue of Business Week magazine in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FEWER STORES TO SHARE THE PIE—THEY GET BIGGER BUT DECREASE IN NUMBER AS DISCOUNTERS, CHAINS SQUEEZE "LITTLE GUYS"

The fates and fortunes of the Nation's consumer goods makers rest in the hands of fewer and fewer retailers every year. And the character of those retailers is changing.

According to the 10th National Sample Census of Retail Distribution, conducted by Audits & Surveys Co., there are now 1,857,280 retail establishments of all kinds in the continental United States. This is a gain of less than 1 percent over 1962, despite an estimated 5 percent increase in retail sales and a 4 percent jump in population. There is now only one store for every 102 persons; last year there was one store per 100.

BEHIND THE CHANGE

The reasons for the change:

Stores are still getting bigger, and large chain units are squeezing out smaller independents. The number of food stores, for example, has dropped 0.8 percent, while drugstores increased only 0.2 percent.

The discounters and other mass merchandisers are still hurting certain lines of business. The number of appliance stores fell 3 percent, while radio-TV stores, which numbered 100,000 a decade ago, dropped 3.2 percent from last year to a low of 19,000 establishments.

The mobility conferred on the population by the automobile is changing a lot of things. Furniture stores dropped a sickening 10.8 percent, and the loss is mostly in the smaller cities. Families tend to drive to the nearest big city to get variety—both in price and styling. The same is true of department stores, which lost 2.4 percent. The outlets that really suffered were the small stores in small towns.

Fashions change, and retail distribution changes with them. The number of shoe stores declined 3.5 percent because of the popularity of leisure and sport shoes—loafers and sneakers, for example—that don't have to be fitted. A host of other retail outlets, from variety stores to haberdashers, has moved into this market. Of the total gain of 12,274 establishments of all types, gasoline service stations alone accounted for over 5,000, reflecting the trend away from economy cars toward the bigger, heavier gas eaters.

The lines of retail specialty are blurring. In the lean days of the compact car, gas stations installed tire and battery departments at a fast clip in order to build volume and profits. Today, the tire, battery, and accessory outlets are feeling the competition: Their number declined 2.6 percent this year.

The market is beginning to stay home. Solomon Dutka, president of Audits & Surveys, sees a long-term movement away from store shopping altogether, toward catalog sales, telephone sales, mail order sales, and door-to-door in-home selling.

EXCEPTION

There is one bright note, however, for the small retailer. He seems to have a future in lines where service and expertise is at least as important as the product. The one class of shoe store that is increasing is the pediatric shoe store—where fitting the shoes is all important. By the same token, gourmet groceries are on the rise, and so are camera, jewelry, sporting goods, and hobby stores.

Oh yes, there are more liquor stores, too.

Hon. Homer Thornberry

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, HOMER THORNBERRY leaves this body with the warm friendship of all his colleagues. The qualities of mind and of heart that have established his preeminence in this Chamber, and have instilled among us a respect, admiration, and affection for him in the highest measure, will make a contribution of immeasurable richness to the Federal bench of this Nation.

Do We Hear an Echo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, much as has been said and written about the economy moves being taken by the Defense Department in closing some military posts around the country. Palm Beach County experienced a similar action in 1959, and while hardships did result, they were of short duration. Today the area is stronger than ever before in its history.

The Palm Beach Post commented on this editorially December 14, and because they speak from the same experience, I ask that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD:

DO WE HEAR AN ECHO?

The loud cries emanating from Congressmen and from State and local officials, over the proposed shutdown of military bases, sound a little bit like an echo to people of this and surrounding communities.

We went through the same wringer during the period from 1957, when the Air Force announced it would close down its Military Air Transport Service base here, and 1959, when it actually closed down, and a $20 million payroll left town.

Now the Pentagon says it will deactivate 26 military bases in 14 States during the next year, and studies are underway which probably will result in the elimination of several others. Subsequent trimming of the military budget may even involve some of the big navy yards, such as those at Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

The immediate reaction of the States and localities involved, not unexpectedly, was an appeal to their Congressmen for legislation to reverse or at least slow down the action. Appeals also have been made directly to President Johnson. And no doubt there will be many hardship pleas heard from the communities involved.

They have our sympathy, up to a point. Sudden loss of a military base is or can be a staggering economic blow.

The MATS installation at Palm Beach Air Force Base, for instance, was credited with providing this area with a stable year-round economy. Before it was established here in 1951, the local business index went up and down like a yo-yo with alternate summer and winter seasons.

But while the military payroll eliminated the summer slump, it turned out in the long run to be something less than an unmixed blessing. We came to depend on it as our major industry, oblivious to the fact that it might be withdrawn at any time for good and sufficient reasons of military necessity, Federal economy, or political expediency.

Its eventual departure in 1959 was indeed a blow. But the blow was softened by a developing industrial economy and the realization that local interests must of necessity be

subordinate to military requirements and the national interest.

In the present instance, there is an obvious effort underway to pare military costs by cutting away the deadwood. Among the 6,700 military installations in this country and overseas there must be much of it, and the taxpaying public in general can but applaud this economy move.

President Johnson has given his assurance, although it was hardly necessary, that the Nation's defense posture will not be weakened. Indeed, if our overall economic structure is bolstered, our military position will automatically become stronger.

Fair Play for Cuba Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the seriousness and effectiveness of slanted pro-Communist propaganda was never better illustrated than in the sickness that tainted Lee Oswald's mind. Our people should never forget that Oswald was an admitted Marxist, that by his own statements Das Kapital was his bible, class struggle, atheism, and the fanatical goal of Communist world domination his motivation.

Not enough has been written concerning the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The tentacles of this committee are far reaching. One of my constituents, the distinguished writer and former member of the Communist Party, Herbert Philbrick, of Rye, N.H., has written about these tentacles in an excellent article appearing in the December issue of Dollar Hollar called "The Roots of Tragedy." I commend the reading of this article to all who seek to know and understand the full scope of what is involved in the awful deed of assassination of an American President.

The article follows:

THE ROOTS OF TRAGEDY

(By Herbert A. Philbrick)

The obituary of President John F. Kennedy was written in 1961, by a member of a pro-Castro organization calling itself the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee." It appears in volume No. 6, page 429, of the Senate Judiciary Committee document entitled "Castro's Network in the United States (Fair Play for Cuba Committee)."

It reads as follows: "Fidel has made it. Kennedy has muffed it. If Fidel Castro were to pass out of the picture tomorrow, it would not change this die. It has been cast. Throughout South America people will be building statutes honoring Fidel Castro long after Kennedy has become the brand name for somebody's baked cookies or a new kind of swiss cheese."

Less than 6 months after the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had published its report, Lee Harvey Oswald, his mind and soul contaminated by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee filth, gunned down the President of the United States.

The brutal, senseless slaying of the President will go down in history as an event marked by bitter irony.

How ironic—and yet, how unsurprising—that the very Marxist, materialist, atheist, leftwing forces, the cheerleaders of the recent Supreme Court ruling against school prayer, should have been the very forces which directly instigated the assassination of President Kennedy. All over the Nation, the people were urged to pray; so far as I know, there was no admonition that we pray except and unless you were in a public school.

How ironic that White House officials had ordered the Dallas police, in advance of the President's visit, to set up a sharp watch over all suspected rightwing extremists, failing to realize, as they have consistently refused to recognize, that the greater danger to this Nation is from the extreme left.

WHAT WENT WRONG?

It is too late to correct the disastrous events of November 1963. But it is not too late to determine why the tragedy happened, and to take steps to insure that further acts of violence are not carried out by the Castro supporters in this country.

The nub of the question, of course, lies with the interlocking relationship of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee; the self-avowed Marxist, Lee H. Oswald; and the Communist International.

Of the role played by the Communist conspiracy, there is no question. At its annual national convention held in New York City in December 1959 the CPUSA gave highest priority to a resolution calling for a "Hands Off Cuba" policy. Henceforth the basic Red objective was to do anything and everything to keep the Castro Communist government in power in Cuba.

Immediately thereafter, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee front was established. However, it was not an ordinary front. It was, instead, a coalition group which included not only members of the Communist Party, but also members of the Socialist Workers Party—the Trotskyists—together with the usual assortment of "fellow travelers"; i.e., those who, although not disciplined members of the Soviet apparatus itself, still were in agreement with the Communist policy to keep "hands off Cuba" and to support Castro.

The inclusion of fellow travelers was not unusual; but the coalition between the Communists and the Trotskyists was both astonishing and alarming. For years, the Stalinists and the Trotskyists had been bitter, bloody enemies, leading to the assassination of Leon Trotsky by Soviet agents in 1940.

Members of the Trotsky wing of the Marxist movement consider themselves to be genuine Communists (they prefer the word "Marxist," to distinguish themselves from the "Stalinists") adhere to the principles of Marx, Lenin, and Engels; they agree that the Communist system must be extended over the entire world and that capitalism must be destroyed; but they believe that Stalin was much too soft on capitalism. The Trotskyist teachings, therefore, are much more savage and extreme than "orthodox" communism. However, for years they were considered noisy but harmless, because they did not have the backing of any major foreign power.

However, in 1956 Nikita Khrushchev denounced Stalin's liquidation of the Trotskyists, and instructed the Communists throughout the world to establish united front relationships whenever expedient, regardless of differing views.

Much to my astonishment, as I know it was with most students of the Communist movement, the Socialist Workers Party accepted the offer. What happened is recorded in the Annual Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1961: the committee expressed concern over the "ultra-revolutionary Trotskyists movement's recent growth in power and influence," and stated: "The improved fortunes of the Trotskyist movement in the United States are attributed to the cooperation Trotskyists have received from the U.S. Communist Party * * * collaboration of Trotskyists and Communist Party members was strikingly illustrated in the operations of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee." Inevitably, the teaching of extreme hatred and contempt, characteristic of the "leftwing" Communists, the Socialist Workers Party, became an earmark of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF THE FPCC

The FPCC was launched in early 1960. According to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reports, six men were involved in its founding; Carleton Beals, Waldo Frank, Richard Gibson, Robert Tabor, Alan Sagner, and Charles Santos-Buch. Waldo Frank was designated chairman; Carleton Beals, cochairman. An FPCC pamphlet reproduced in the Senate report lists the National Sponsors as Carleton Beals, W. E. B. DuBois, Waldo Frank, Richard Gibson, Alexander Meiklejohn, C. Wright Mills, Harvey O'Connor, Linus Pauling, Jean Paul Sarte, I. F. Stone, Robert Tabor, and Willard Uphaus (with a footnote reading "list incomplete").

From the very beginning, the FPCC was given financial backing and support by the Castro Communist dictatorship. Dr. Santos-Buch, one of the founders, testified under oath that the group had cooked up a story that if they were ever questioned as to the source of their funds, they were to claim it came from friends. If further questioned, however, they were to plead the first amendment—the guarantee of free speech under the Constitution. Dr. Santos-Buch, however, showing great courage, told the truth when questioned by the Senate committee.

A check for $3,500, he revealed, had been made out by Raulita Roa, a delegate of the Cuban dictatorship to the United Nations, payable to a "Manuel Bisbee," the chief permanent delegate from Castro Cuba to the U.N. Bisbee endorsed the check; Roa then cashed it in the U.N. building, and the money was then deposited in the Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.

That the FPCC flourished is indicated by some of the checks drawn on their bank account:

December 27, 1960—$8,613 (for cash).

December 30, 1960—$19,000 (for cash).

January 17, 1961—$15,580 (payable to Cubana De Aviacion).

January 19, 1961—$440 (to A. Nash).

January 25, 1961—$600 (to Lillian Gruber).

By April 1961, the FPCC was boasting "more than 6,000 members with 27 chapters in the United States and student councils on more than 40 university chapters in the United States and Canada."

The Senate committee also uncovered large deposits to the FPCC account. Introduced into the record by Mr. J. G. Sourwine, Chief Counsel for the Senate Committee, was a list of 55 $100 bills, deposited on April 21, 1961. Mr. Sourwine asked: "Do you have any idea where the money came from?" The witness, Richard Gibson, replied: "It came from contributions." Mr. Sourwine exclaimed, with astonishment; "Contributions—in hundred dollar bills?—55 of them?" Gibson replied, "That is all I know. I don't know where the money came from and I did not ask." Gibson was, at the time, the national executive secretary of FPCC.

Gibson also testified that he did not know that Robert Tabor, a cofounder of FPCC and the first executive secretary of the organization, had a criminal record; that he did not know Tabor had pleaded guilty and served sentences of imprisonment for armed robbery, auto larceny, and kidnaping.

Besides the unusual—and dangerous—coalition between the Communists and the Trotskyists, however, two other circumstances made the picture more ominous.

First, the House and Senate investigating committees found evidence of great influence by members of the FPCC, its supporters and contributors, in the field of communications; radio, television, magazines, newspapers, and book publishers.

Robert Tabor and Richard Gibson were both reporters and newswriters for CBS in New York; Tabor, in fact, had made a num-

ber of trips for CBS into Cuba, where he had conducted highly flattering radio and television interviews with The Beard. Waldo Frank, who admitted under oath that he had been paid $25,000 by the Castro government to write a book about Cuba, has authored some 35 or more books; they have received an enormous amount of praise in the New York Times book reviews. Carleton Beals not only wrote for the extreme left "Nation," but also testified that he wrote a number of articles for the highly respected "Christian Century." Lyle Stuart, one of the first members of the New York chapter of FPCC boasted a publishing business grossing over $1 million a year. A senior editor of Simon and Shuster was advertised in a leftwing publication as the chief speaker at an FPCC meeting. An FPCC rally in Philadelphia advertised Mr. James Higgins, editor of the York (Pa.) Gazette & Daily as the speaker, to be held at the Philadelphia Ethical Society. Kenneth Tynan, a drama critic for the New York magazine and British TV producer, wrote a blistering article for the affluent Harper's magazine, lampooning the Senate investigation of the FPCC, in which he falsified the questions asked by the Senate committee as well as belittling the damaging evidence.

How much influence the many authors, writers, and newscasters affiliated with FPCC in one way or another had in suppressing the truth about Castro's network in the United States will probably never be known; but Senator THOMAS DODD wrote, in his book "Freedom and Foreign Power," that when there are movements like the Fair Play for Cuba Committee waiting to be exposed, "the press lies dormant," and the "reports of the committees are frequently ignored or buried."

FBI WARNINGS IGNORED

Warning after warning was issued concerning the danger, power, and menace of the FPCC. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover said, in the FBI annual report for 1961, that "FBI investigations have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee." Again this year, in the fiscal 1963 report, Mr. Hoover pointed to "the discovery by FBI agents of a large cache of weapons, explosives, and incendiary devices in the hands of a group of pro-Castro Cubans who intended to create panic and destroy industrial sites in and around New York City."

Earlier this year, Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER, from the 12th District of Florida, testified that "it is obvious that additional legislation is needed—particularly in view of the Justice Department's attitude indicating that it is difficult to prosecute these violators under present laws."

THE TEACHINGS OF HATE

But the third—and possibly the most dangerous of all—is the absolutely vicious, vitrolic content of the FPCC propaganda attack against the U.S. Government, laws, and leaders. Picture, if you will, Lee Harvey Oswald, in the confines of his tiny room in Dallas, Tex., feeding his sick soul upon utterances such as these —

"Some Senators sit in Washington, ugly men in an ugly city, measuring out their lives in cracker talk and municipal bonds; measuring their own importance in sensational headlines. Writhing in the excretion of their own words * * * growling questions that are accusations; spewing yellow bubbles of anger. * * * The State Department was still rattling its sabers. The CIA was still financing Batistianos and cutthroats and rapists and killers and thieves."

"Washington is rolling the drums of war."

"The United States continues to bayonet the peace."

"Thrusting U.S. armed and trained terrorists onto Cuban soil to murder men, women, and children, Washington violates every human law."

"The United States is a cruel aggressor, bent on mayhem."

"I heard the Voice of America spewing lies."

"The people were furious (with anti-Communists) and wanted their blood."

FPCC propaganda constantly implies that treason toward the United States is justifiable. Typical FPCC statements:

"We denounce before the world the intervention of our Government in Cuba's domestic affairs. If this be treason, we stand condemned. If our Government's activities are, as we believe, illegal and immoral, then we as a nation stand condemned."

"As for me, I would rather see Cuba Communist than an American colony. If Cuba were invaded, I would aid Cuba. If this be treason, may a Carnegie study make the most of it."

Ideas not dangerous, you say? Perhaps to rational people the hate propaganda from the poison pens of the Castro network in the United States has little effect. But what about the bearded, beatnik followers of the FPCC? What about Lee Harvey Oswald? If they believe the depraved propaganda of the FPCC—and some of them obviously do—they must believe the world was done a favor when one of their members pulled the trigger of a high-powered gun in November 22, 1963.

But all is not evil to the FPCC. Only the United States is evil. A gun in the hands of an American patriot is a horrible machine of imperialism. A gun in the hands of Castro is a thing of beauty, a weapon for liberation. Thus, Robert Tabor, in the extremist publication the Nation, wrote—

"Cynics were soon disappointed. Even before Fidel reached Havana, the noble noises of the Fidelistas were echoed by the crash of revolutionary rifles as the first and worst war criminals, notorious torturers and mass murderers of the Batista regime died before firing squads."

Did not Lee Harvey Oswald, crouched in a dark window of a warehouse in Dallas, see himself holding in his grasp a "revolutionary rifle"? Were not the three, sharp shots which rang out in Dallas on November 22, in the ears of Lee Harvey Oswald, "noble noises of the Fidelistas"? And did not the bullets sped on their way, in the eyes of Lee Harvey Oswald seek out "a cruel aggressor, bent on mayhem"?

The great tragedy of Lee Harvey Oswald, which became in a few split seconds a tragedy for us all, was that he believed the awful words of Robert Tabor, former CBS newsman and later head of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

And the greater, ironic tragedy is that while Lee Harvey Oswald took the words of Tabor seriously, many of the advisers to the President did not.

Why Calm Can Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Omaha World-Herald December 14. I am inserting it in the RECORD as I believe it would be of interest to the Members of Congress.

WHY CALM CAN HELP

Page 1 of several recent editions of the World-Herald was dominated by sobering news stories:

"Governor Morrison said he would press investigation of threats against a Cozad School Board official and her family. She had resigned after an anonymous letter saying 'it's too bad there is not a Lee Oswald in Cozad.' The FBI also is investigating."

"Omaha postal authorities conferred with police about the possibility that an Omaha man whose house contained an arsenal of live bombs and hand grenades may have mailed some disguised as Christmas gifts."

Not all the madness in America is centered in Dallas. There are twisted minds and potential killers in many communities, and terrible events such as those which occurred in Dallas last month seem to cause latent malevolence to ferment.

As we have said in these columns before, we believe the tone and pitch of public controversy have contributed to the irrational atmosphere in which terrible deeds are perpetrated and in which threats of violence are often heard.

This is true of political debate, which too often degenerates into abuse. It is sometimes true of religious controversy, even at a time when responsible men and women pride themselves on the signs that the major religions of the Western World are moving ever closer together. It is not infrequently true of discussions of racial problems.

It can be argued, and many are so arguing, that madmen we have always with us and that the soft voice of reason in examination and debate has no effect upon them and will not deter them from violent acts.

Yet all of us know, as certainly as such things can be known, that calm and rational discussion does not inflame whereas violent talk sometimes breeds violent and irrational deeds.

If every reasonable person keeps his voice down he will be contributing to the restoration of a calm and agreeable climate.

Quality Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and written about quality stabilization that I feel it is time for the retailer—the man on the firing line—to speak out. Then my distinguished colleagues can weigh what they have to say against the testimony of the so-called experts, officials, bureaucrats and others who talk so blatantly about competition in spite of the fact that they have never operated a retail establishment of their own.

Considerable testimony in support of this legislation has been given by individual retailers. Also, it is no mere coincidence that the estimable gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who have sponsored this measure include many who are themselves thoroughly familiar with retail operations and know from personal experience the difficulties of the marketplace.

Quality stabilization, in addition, has the support of many great trade associations representing thousands of retail-

ers. One retail industry—retail jewelry—has made a survey which shows overwhelming support of the quality stabilization bill.

The thousands of small business, like the retail jeweler, which are the lifeblood of our communities, are locally owned and have helped our towns to grow, are inherently efficient establishments, able to complete vigorously, and anxious to do so. They do not ask for legislation which will shelter them from the rigors of competition. They ask for a climate in which true competition will be fostered, in which their creative energies will be unshackled, and in which their inherent efficiency can again be made apparent.

We have come to the retail jeweler for our engagement ring and we have trusted him to give us fair value. We have bought our wedding ring from him. We have bought gifts for our babies and later for our school-age children; we have turned to him for graduation gifts, and for gifts for wives and parents. We have seen him operate effectively. We have seen proof of his efficiency in the way in which his store has prospered, in the way in which his family has flourished as part of community life.

Suddenly, that inherently efficient retailer has been faced with a rapacious foe, raiding the community for quick profits for his out-of-town operation, making no contributions, but merely draining the vital elements out of the town and its people. He has done so by using the lurid come-on by deliberately taking losses in brand-name items so that he could then unload onto the people a host of shoddy, overpriced items, marked up to compensate for the calculated loss he takes on trademarks used to enlarge traffic. Suddenly, that inherently efficient retailer, along with thousands of others, is forced to the wall. This not only is a blow to a once civically active citizen, his family and his employees but, more important, to the hundreds of customers who had come to know and respect him for his honesty, efficiency and service.

The quality stabilization bill would once again give the retailer a chance to compete successfully and to show his efficiency—to restore an active citizen to the community. This clearly is the view of the jeweler himself, as expressed in his trade magazine, the Jewelers' Circular-Keystone of September 1963. Mr. Speaker I have unanimous consent to have excerpts of this survey printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

QUALITY STABILIZATION

(Millions of words have been written and spoken about the proposed law on quality stabilization. Politicians, trade spokesmen and Government agencies all have stated their cases. But what about the retail jeweler? How does he feel? This article gives his point of view and tells why he thinks this bill will help him.)

Someone up there on Capitol Hill likes the jeweler after all. To the delight of many jewelers and the dismay of their cut-price competitors, a House of Representatives committee has recommended passage of a quality stabilization bill.

After detailed public hearings in May and June, the committee recently issued its verdict on the need for legislation. Here, in part, is what it said:

"The reported bill is essential to the survival of hundreds of thousands of small, independent businessmen—the corner druggist, the jeweler, the hardware merchant, the electric appliance dealer, the bookstore dealer, etc.

"These small merchants are being hard pressed by competitors who sell highly advertised nationally branded merchandise at very low prices, often below cost, in order to drive other merchants out of business. * * *"

Briefly, the proposed legislation would allow manufacturers of brandname merchandise to establish retail prices. They would have the right to withhold goods from any retailer who changed these prices, who used the goods in bait advertising or who published misrepresentations about the goods. The bill is hedged with certain qualifications, the most important being that the proposed law would operate only if the manufacturer is selling in a market where competitive goods are freely available to the public.

Clearly, one committee's recommendation doesn't make a law but informed opinion inside and outside Congress seems to be moving closer and closer to the view that a quality stabilization bill will be passed, in spite of some determined haggling in the Senate.

* * * * *

The jewelry industry, through such organizations as Retail Jewelers of America, the National Wholesale Jewelers Association and the Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, is among those on record in support of the bill. To find out how individual jewelers felt about the proposed legislation and how they believed passage of a quality stabilization law would affect their operations, we asked members of JC-K's retail panel for their comments.

Two reactions stood out. First, almost one panelist in three made no comment. Second, of those who did comment, 8 out of 10 support the bill. One in ten said the bill would make little or no difference in his operation and one in ten opposed the bill.

These figures indicate very strong support for the proposed legislation. The clear feeling is that quality stabilization will help the retail jewelry industry. * * *

From Indiana: "It should improve our busines for it will give a stability to prices lacking at the present time. If the law is passed and the right manufacturers elect to operate under the law, we should be able to sell electric shavers and appliances again. The sale of watches, silver, and other discount items also should be much better if the key manufacturers choose to operate under the law." This jeweler is not hopeful about the law's chances of passing. * * *

From New York State: "* * * I would be a good supporter of any manufacturer who would take advantage of quality stabilization and return to the normal channels of trade. We have had to drop many profitable lines because the discount houses have been selling items for less than we can purchase wholesale."

* * * Enforcement of a quality stabilization law worries a number of jewelers. "If they put teeth into the law and the manufacturers enforce it, I think it will bring back confidence in name brand items," declares a New Hampshire retailer. "If price cutting is allowed, the law won't help a bit. I hope that it is truly enforced. It will help the reputable retailer and enable him to handle merchandise profitably. It will stop the use of an item as a loss leader. Everything depends on the proper enforcement."

* * * The scope of the law also raises questions. "Quality stabilization would definitely help our profit picture," notes an Illinois panelist, "provided it is passed as a national law that can be enforced. Loopholes such as States' options, as in the present fair trade laws, would weaken its value to us. We are in a border city in our State with a neighbor, Missouri, which is quite anti-fair trade."

It was this issue of States rights amendments which angered and shocked supporters of an earlier quality stabilization bill. This bill was cleared to the House calendar last year but it arrived so late that it died with the final sessions of the 87th Congress. Furthermore, when it was cleared by the House Commerce Committee, an amendment was tacked on which would have made the bill operable only in those States which adopted special legislation to supplement the Federal law.

In the current bill, the Commerce Committee once again has added a States rights amendment but it carries far less sting for the bill's supporters. It specifies that manufacturers would have the right to act against any retailer not following manufacturers' established retail prices except in those States which passed legislation prohibiting the manufacturer from such action.

The difference in these two amendments is clear. In one case the Federal law would have been operable only following special action by the individual States: in the other case the Federal law would be operable everywhere unless the individual State took special action to set the Federal law aside.

Some of the immediate and tangible benefits jewelers would get from enactment of a quality stabilization law were touched on already: better prices and hence more profit, an improved flow of quality goods, opportunity to handle certain merchandise made unprofitable by discounter competition.* * *

A certain number of jewelers outside Wisconsin also oppose the legislation. The main argument is that the existence of established retail prices offers a direct invitation to discount operations. As an Alabama panelist puts it: "If there is no 'established price,' 'list price,' 'nationally advertised price' or whatever you call it, there is nothing to discount." What these retailers overlook, of course, is that passage of the bill would outlay discounting of manufacturers' retail prices. The implication seems to be that discounters would somehow manage to get around the law.

Panelists supporting quality stabilization see the picture from just the opposite direction: to them passage of the law provides protection from discounters. "This law is beneficial in every way," states an Ohio panelist. "We will not be beaten over the head with cut prices on nationally advertised merchandise. We will once again regain our status as legitimate merchants instead of being showcases for discount operations."

A New York State jeweler adds this comment: "The law should be beneficial by making competitive claims, descriptions, and qualities more truthful. People who are misled by many existing practices would be able to better compare quality, value and service. In these fields our store should stand out."

Other jewelers see the proposed law wiping out the loss leader, a competitive gimmick against which the small store has almost no answer. Still others see the law giving a welcome injection to the economy by stabilizing prices and generally increasing jewelers' business. Notes a California panelist: "Through deceptive price advertising and price cutting of brand name merchandise the consumer and the retailer have lost faith in many manufacturers, resulting in loss of sales which in turn means loss of taxes."

A West Virginia jeweler who likes the bill says: "It means small appliances can be handled profitably, also shavers which almost vanished from jewelry stores. Mainte-

nance of reasonable prices for watches can be enforced more easily."

Underlying many panelists' answers was one major theme: a quality stabilization bill would help jewelers materially in convincing the public that a jewelry store is a quality store. Consider these comments: "Correct appraisal of values eventually will stop the 'I can get it for you wholesale' approach"—Minnesota. "It should help any retailer who emphasizes standards of quality in merchandise"—California. "It will help improve the picture that a jewelry store is the best place for quality."—New York State.

A North Carolina panelist speaks feelingly about the problem. "Much has been said for and against anything that stabilizes prices of highly advertised consumer products," he says. "For our part, quality stabilization would be good as it would help to restore customers confidence in retail pricing and in retailers. We are fast reaching the point where every item in a retail store is looked at, from the point of view of the customers, as overpriced—regardless of the fairness of the pricing."

Time and again retail jewelers have stressed that public confidence is a necessary first step to any sale. They've also stressed that quality merchandise sold at fair prices and backed up with good service offers them the best opportunity to build regular and expanding sales. Most panelists in this survey showed fairly clearly that they believe a quality stabilization law would help them achieve these aims.

Congress Must Redouble Its Efforts To Solve the National Capital's Transportation Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House decisively buried the White House's rapid transit proposal for the District of Columbia. But we could not bury the National Capital's traffic problem, which will get worse before it gets better.

Only yesterday Washington had its first snow of the year. As usual, the result was to disrupt the city. Snow also fell in Chicago yesterday, but Chicago's rapid transit system continued to function; people got to and from work safely and swiftly.

Congress 3 years ago in the National Transportation Act recognized that it was the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that a rapid transit system was constructed here.

Congress needs to redouble its efforts to solve the National Capital's transportation problem. It is not a question of either good highways or a rapid transit system. Both are essential.

A question asked by many Congressmen in the debate on the Washington rapid transit bill last week was: Why vote rapid transit help to the District of Columbia when the nationwide mass transportation bill, which has already passed the Senate, now continues to await action by the House Rules Committee? The question is a good one. The answer is for Congress to get busy and enact transit legislation applicable to the 50 States and to the District of Columbia as well.

Shall Canada Join the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Toronto Globe & Mail published a most significant editorial entitled "Shall Canada Join the United States?" Evidencing a grassroots interest among Canadians in promoting a union with our Nation, it suggests that the initiative should be taken by the Canadian Government seeking union out of strength rather than to drift into such a union—because of division among Canadian nationals—out of weakness. The language of this editorial—as well as the individual views indicated in the writer's interviews with a cross section of Canadians—suggest to me that our Government should also assume a more active role in promoting closer ties, with—perhaps—eventual union of Canada and the United States.

I commend this editorial by Jean Howarth to my colleagues. In addition it deserves the careful and early attention of the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. The manifold benefits which would emanate from such a union are self-evident and it would seem to follow that postponing attention to this step may make it—not less eventual—but more difficult to attain.

The editorial follows:

SHALL CANADA JOIN THE UNITED STATES?

One question the opinion surveys rarely ask Canadians is if they think it would be a sound idea for Canada to join the United States. I believe the surveyors refrain from asking this question because they're afraid the answer would resound back, yes.

Quebec's mutterings about separations have started a lot of Canadians elsewhere wondering about the subject. If Quebec pulled out, would the geographically divided country that remained be capable of survival? Would we be forced to sue for admission to the United States? Would we, in fact, rather like the idea? And if it would appeal in those circumstances, would it perhaps appeal right now?

Having been unable to persuade any surveyors to ask these questions—I tackled two sets of them on the subject and they both curdled with horror—I decided last month to try a limited survey on my own. I was visiting in British Columbia and Alberta and I asked everybody I met for his opinions on the matter—pensioners and a millionaire, lawyers and garage hands, farmers, newspapermen and civil servants—something more than 200 people. Their answers startled me.

Of those more than 200 people every single one said that he though union with the United States was eventually inevitable. Quebec, they felt, might be speeding up the event, but it was going to happen anyway. From this unanimity they broke into several groups: Those who viewed the prospect with reluctance, those who didn't care one way or the other—"what would be the difference?"—and those who could hardly wait to get the process started. The reluctant ones were a small minority, all in the past-60 age group, and mostly of United Empire Loyalist origins.

The reasons of the unreluctant were various: Canada had been an illogical organization from the beginning, life moved north and south, not east, and west; they already had many friends and relatives in the States; separatism [Canadian, not Quebec] was holding down our standard of living; the States decided our policies anyway and we might as well have a voice in shaping them; internationalism was the way of the future, and it was crippling to cling to empty national prides.

One professional woman nutshelled the views of about a third of those who were in favor of starting union talks immediately. "I was born in Canada," she said, "but my mother was born in Iceland and my father in Ireland, and both of those countries, as well as Canada, have represented home in my heart. My sister is married to a Canadian professor at an American university. Their youngest son was born there and is an American. My brother left last month for a job in Los Angeles.

"We Canadians whose parents came from other countries, and there are so many of us, were simply born into the belief that there are many homelands, all loved, and why shouldn't they cut out their silly borders? I would like to enlarge my Canadian home to take in the United States. Then my new little nephew wouldn't be a foreigner."

Since returning from the west I have continued the survey. Of the more than 100 people questioned here, only one has said that union with the United States was not inevitable, and he added. "Perhaps I cannot bear to think it inevitable. I come of UE stock." There has been more reluctance expressed in Ontario, but most have favored union, and among the young there is as much eagerness for it as in the west.

For myself, I believe that if we think union inevitable then we should consciously seek it, out of strength, and not drift into it out of division and weakness. I also find it an attractive proposition. What our two Nations could put together would make a pretty impressive country, in which there would be more room for living and growing and fighting and agreeing than either of us now enjoys. I think the government—and the surveyors—should stop ignoring this big and engrossing question, and determine our views on the subject.

Aviation Week Lauds Congressman Karth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the unsung heroes of the recent successful launching of the Centaur liquid hydrogen booster was my colleague and friend, JOSEPH E. KARTH.

With characteristic persistence and fairness, he delved beneath the technical complexities during hearings in 1962 of his House Space Sciences Subcommittee and found the real problems connected with the Centaur program.

The Centaur is a booster vital to the success of our national space program. Therefore, Congressman KARTH's investigation served the national interest in the broadest sense. His role was hailed by the widely respected Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine in an editorial by Editor Bob Hotz.

Mr. Hotz on December 9 wrote: "It was Representative JOSEPH KARTH, Democrat, of Minnesota, whose investigation into Centaur's troubles shook the program out of its management difficulties and established its priority as a vital step in the lunar landing program. The investigation conducted by Representative KARTH's Subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee is a prime example of how a responsible congressional investigation can contribute constructively to the solution of major national problems."

Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent that the text of that editorial appear at this point in the RECORD:

CENTAUR'S SUCCESS

A significant milestone in the development of space technology was passed on November 27 with the successful orbital flight test of the Centaur liquid hydrogen-powered space vehicle. The significance of the first successful Centaur flight for the future of space exploration lies in two broad areas.

Technology: The second great propulsive step beyond the liquid oxygen and kerosene technology that began the space age depends on the use of liquid hydrogen fuel in the upper stages of space vehicles that can reach the moon and probe the planets. The technical feasibility of using liquid hydrogen as propellant for a space vehicle was amply demonstrated by the perfect performance of Centaur's two RL10A-3 rocket engines through a 380-second burning period. Solutions to the cryogenic problems that once seemed to make liquid hydrogen an impractical fuel have been proved on this Centaur flight. Although there is still much work to be done to achieve the routine reliability for hydrogen-powered vehicles that manned space flight requires in the upper stages of Saturn, it is evident that this fuel is well launched on the road toward technical success.

Management: The Centaur success also taught significant lessons in the management of development programs probing new technical frontiers. Persistence in hewing to goals despite some agonizing fluctuations in management policies and priorities paid off for Centaur and liquid hydrogen technology. Fainter hearts might have canceled the program under this stress. It also demonstrated how proper management and urgent priorities can reduce apparently insurmountable barriers to solvable problems.

CENTAUR'S KEYMEN

It has been a long and rough road from the original upper stage studies by General Dynamics/Astronautics in 1956–57 to the orbiting Centaur of 1963. As in any effort that produces significant technical progress, its success was dependent on the fiber of the men who participated in the program, from the early ideas conceived by Krafft Ehricke to the successful flight last month from Cape Kennedy. At San Diego, it was Grant Hansen, a vice president of General Dynamics/Astronautics, who was given the job of organizing the team that pulled the Centaur vehicle through its toughest development problems. At Palm Beach, it was Bill Gorton, general manager of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft's Florida Division, and his two chief engineering lieutenants, Bruce Torrell and Dick Mullready, who brought the RL10A-3 engine to its current reliability as the pioneer in liquid hydrogen-fueled rockets.

At Cleveland, it was a Lewis Research Center team headed by David S. Gabriel, Centaur project manager, with Edmund Jonash, Cary Nettles and Ronald Rovenger who developed and executed the rigorous ground testing program in the wind tunnels and rigs that paid off so well in the recent flight performance. And on Capitol Hill, it was Representative JOSEPH KARTH, Democrat of Minnesota, whose investigation into Centaur's troubles shook the program out of its management difficulties and established its priority as a vital step in the lunar landing program. The investigation conducted by Representative KARTH's subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee is a prime example of how a responsible congressional investigation can contribute constructively to the solution of major national problems.

Many times during the Centaur's fluctuating career under successive management of Advanced Research Projects Agency, Air Force and two different NASA centers, the technically timid wailed for the abandonment of liquid hydrogen because its problems appeared too difficult to reach the promised goal of a 40-percent increase in propulsive efficiency. Many times the professional economizers moaned that the program should be abandoned because it would prove to be a great waste of the taxpayers' money with no possibility of any technical progress.

NEW ERA DAWNS

Now that Centaur has opened the way to a new era in significantly larger space payloads, the folly of listening to these faint hearts should be readily apparent. Development of the upper stages of Saturn, all fueled with liquid hydrogen, can proceed with more certainty after Centaur's demonstration. The Centaur vehicle itself will play an important role in the pre-Apollo exploration of the moon and planets. It is scheduled to carry a soft-landing instrument package onto the moon's surface next year and, in 1965 and 1966, it is to carry Mariner instrumented payloads for close reconnaissance of Venus and Mars.

Centaur's success with liquid hydrogen also has provided badly needed encouragement to proceed with operational development of other exotic rocket propellants such as fluorine for greatly improved performance from existing military missile systems and space launch vehicles.

Centaur should merit a permanent page in the history of the space age as an excellent example of what can be accomplished when industry and government devote their best talents and unflagging determination to reach for a distant but desirable technical goal. It has taught lessons that must not be forgotten when new barriers loom on the frontiers of technology.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Resolution by Windham County (Conn.) Democratic Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a letter and a resolution adopted by the Windham County (Conn.) Democratic Association on the death of President John F. Kennedy. The resolution by the association, which represents 15 towns in northeastern Connecticut, all of them in my district, proposes that November 22 of each year be observed as President Kennedy Memorial Day. I endorse this proposal.

The letter and resolution of the Windham County Democratic Association read as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM ST. ONGE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Windham County Democratic Association joins the world in mourning the loss of our late President, John F. Kennedy.

To perpetuate his memory, and to show our esteem for Mr. Kennedy, the members of the Windham County Democratic Association offer the enclosed resolution for your consideration.

Yours truly,

INGRID E. LAWS,
Secretary.

Wherefore the 22d day of November will go down in history as the anniversary of the day that the people of the world were thrown into deep sorrow upon hearing of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

It was a day for sadness for all and will linger in the minds of mankind for many years to come.

It would be most fitting for the Congress of the United States to set aside November 22 of each year as a day when the people of our Nation can rededicate themselves to the ideals which were set forth by our 35th President: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Windham County Democratic Association representative of 15 towns in the northeastern Connecticut area, close to the home State of this late and great President, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to declare November 22 as President Kennedy Memorial Day; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House and President pro tempore of the Senate in Washington, D.C., as well as each Member of the Congress from the State of Connecticut.

INGRID E. LAWS,
Secretary.

AFL–CIO Hate Mail Directed at Senator Lausche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions this week I have commented briefly on the current platitudes and noble pronouncements we are hearing about hatemongering in the United States. The political left has shed many crocodile tears over the lack of love and kindness in politics and, strangely, they seem to find that "rightists, radical rightists, self-styled patriots, conservatives, and constitutionalists" are the apostles of discord, distrust, and hate.

As a gesture toward balance, I will briefly outline innuendo and smear which is coming from the political left which

meets the standards they have instituted for criticizing the political right with the charge of hatemongering. I have found that the greatest effort to induce prejudice and hate seems to come from those on the left who wave the flag of decency the highest. The Ohio AFL–CIO puts out a weekly newsletter entitled "News and Views." Their November 15, 1963, edition carries a prominent article with a lead sentence that is contrived to induce hate and contempt for our U.S. Senator from Ohio. It states:

It's no secret that Ohio U.S. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE is against decent wages.

Now this is an absolute lie. I do not know the Senator's thinking on many legislative proposals but I know personally that it is contemptible to say that he "is against decent wages." It may have been accurate to say that he opposed specific legislative enactments regarding wages and so forth because of a variety of reasons ranging from coverage to constitutionality, but it is not accurate or fair to say that he opposed them because he "is against decent wages."

The leadership of the AFL–CIO has its own particular tarbrush tactic. They are "for people" and those who oppose their legislative propositions are "against people." If you have many objections to their minimum wage proposals which are in no way related to whether a person should receive $1.25 or $1.50 per hour, this does not matter—you are against decent wages. If you would happen to oppose Federal aid to education, you are against kids. If you fail to see the advisability of a national socialized health insurance system it must be due to your lack of compassion for the older people. If you are against the so-called "clean air bill," you are for dirty air. Their strange code of ethics makes it impossible for anyone to be honest or humanitarian who opposes them or has legitimate objections to their program.

The AFL–CIO leadership could do far more for the country and the spirit of peace and brotherhood they supposedly are trying to foster if they would concede that there are many areas for honest disagreement rather than fills their pens with invective and hate in their effort to obliterate political opposition.

A Sermon Preached at a Memorial Service for President John F. Kennedy by W. A. Visser 'T Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, at St. Pierre Cathedral in Geneva, Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of a sermon preached by the distinguished religious leader, the Reverend Dr. W. A. Visser 'T Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, at a memorial sermon for President John F. Kennedy at St. Pierre Cathedral in Geneva, Switzerland.

The sermon follows:

"AN IMMENSE COMPLAINT FILLS THE EARTH"—THEIR DEEDS FOLLOW THEM

(By W. A. Visser 'T Hooft)

(W. A. Visser 'T Hooft is general secretary of the World Council of Churches. This sermon was preached at a memorial service for John F. Kennedy at St. Pierre Cathedral in Geneva, Switzerland)

With my voice I make supplication to the Lord. I call out my complaint before Him. I tell my trouble before Him.

—PSALM 142: 1–2.

This is exactly what we have come here for this morning. Since last Friday an immense complaint fills the earth. Have we not all been deeply impressed and moved by the unanimity of that complaint? We have discovered that even in our divided world it is still possible to have the experience of being of one mind, of seeing the Iron Curtain and the gulf between the continents and the tension between the races vanish for a time as we become simply one great human family.

What lies behind that unanimity? Simply that we have lost a man whom we needed so very, very much. Had we not all been grateful that this young President of the United States had had the courage and the imagination not merely to speak of peace but to act in such a way that the international climate began to become less intolerable? Had we not followed with passionate interest his struggle to give to the Negroes of America the human rights they had desired for such a long time?

His disappearance is not only a loss for our American brethren but for us all. The future, already so uncertain, becomes even more threatening when such a man is taken away from us. The world is now even more out of joint than it was already. Everyone feels it—men of all races, nations, and confessions, some by political insight, some merely instinctively. That is why we are in the midst of an experience that is so exceptional—the whole of humanity mourning together.

But that is not all. We are not only weeping about the death of a statesman on whom we counted and from whom we expected so much. Such a complaint could be egoistic, an expression of self-pity.

THE HUMAN DRAMA

We think also and especially of the human drama and all that it means for his family and all those who have loved him. Here was a man who had really succeeded in the truest sense of that word and whose success could only call forth our admiration. For it is a noble ambition to want to bear the greatest and heaviest responsibility that exists in one's own country. He had undertaken his overwhelming tasks with tremendous energy. He hoped to realize great things for his country and for the world. But before he could make his full contribution the thread of his life was cut, and cut in the most irrational manner. His wife, who had also shown remarkable courage, and his young children remain behind.

James Reston has written that America weeps because the very man who had tried to make violence cease became the victim of violence. Had such a man not deserved a better fate? Must history in its worst aspects repeat itself ad infinitum? Must lives such as those of Abraham Lincoln and Mahatma Gandhi and John Kennedy always end in this way? If that is possible, then everything is possible. How can we suppress in our hearts the feelings of revolt that life appears so meaningless, that we can count on nothing, that history seems to be nothing else than a tale told by an idiot.

The men of Holy Scripture know these sentiments. Our psalmist says that his life has become a prison and that there is no longer any refuge. But he does not let himself be enclosed within his distress. He does not merely share it with his fellow men; he pours out his complaint before God and tells Him his trouble.

That is what we must do today. We must have the courage to address our complaint and even our sense of revolt to the only good address. For God knows how to listen. We could even say: "Ecouter est Son metier" (listening is His job). He will not say to us that we have no right to complain. He will let us pour out everything that we have on our hearts.

But then He will give us His answer. That answer will not be an explanation. We will never know why his family, his country and humanity had to lose the man who seemed more indispensable than anyone else. But God will say to us that it is precisely because we live in a world where such things happen that He has sent His Son and that that Son died on a cross. The obscurity is not abolished, but in that obscurity there is a light for those who have eyes to see the light of Christmas that shines in the darkness.

THAT DIVINE ANSWER

If we accept that divine answer, we will no longer have that terrible sentiment of complete solitude before a blind fate. The great secret of the men of the Psalms is that as they tell their trouble to God they discover that God not only listens but identifies himself with men and enters himself into their sufferings, that the infinite compassion of God has found its full expression in the coming of the Son who is willing to suffer and die for us.

Let us therefore not be ashamed to complain, but let us pour out our complaint before God. Then there will come a moment in the conversation when God will ask us a question: I have listened to your complaint, but is there in your heart not also a place for gratitude? Could you not also think of that great thing, the example given by a man who accepts willingly some of the greatest responsibilities a man can carry and who then devotes himself completely to the task of giving peace and justice and freedom a real chance in the world? For such a man can still exert a profound influence after his death. The very depth and unanimity of the world's distress is already a powerful demonstration of that influence.

Let us then promise to make sure that President Kennedy's vision continues to lead us. The shock the world has received must become a salutary shock that leads us to the decision to work more faithfully, more wholeheartedly for the great objectives John Kennedy had made his own. We must do whatever we can to insure that the great word of Scripture may be confirmed:

"And I heard a voice from heaven saying, 'Write this: Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord henceforth.' 'Blessed indeed,' says the Spirit, 'that they may rest from their labors, for their deeds follow them.' "

—Revelation 14: 13.

SBA Public Service Award Given to National Federation of Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the

House the fact that on December 2, 1963, the Small Business Administration presented its Public Service Award for outstanding service to the National Federation of Independent Business in ceremonies at SBA's Washington headquarters.

The national federation, which was organized in 1943 as a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization to protect, promote, and improve the opportunities of independent business, is a rather unique group. It is the largest business organization in the Nation with about 194,000 members in 2,500 chapters throughout the 50 States.

Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley presented the Public Service Award in recognition of National Federation of Independent Business' efforts to promote independent businesses throughout the country, for support of legislation and Government programs beneficial to small firms, and for supporting the Small Business Administration and its programs of assistance.

Many of our colleagues know and respect the federation's vice president for legislative activities, the genial, and knowledgeable George J. Burger. I know that my colleagues on the Small Business Committee join with me in offering congratulations to George and to the federation for the well-deserved tribute on the National Federation of Independent Business' 20th anniversary.

Berks County Historical Society Honors Gen. Carl Spaatz—Honors President John F. Kennedy in Memorial Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening, December 15, the Berks County Historical Society honored Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, who was commander of the U.S. Air Force during World War II.

I had the honor of introducing General Spaatz, who is a native of Boyertown, Pa., in the Sixth District of Pennsylvania, which I represent. A renowned Berks County historian and world traveler, J. Bennett Nolan, presided at this meeting in the society building in Reading. It was attended by many prominent citizens and members of the historical society.

The meeting adopted a resolution in memory of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I include the resolution with my remarks:

RESOLUTION IN MEMORY OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, ADOPTED BY THE BERKS COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, READING, PA., DECEMBER 15, 1963.

Whereas the members of our Historical Society of Berks County in common with the citizenry of this Nation and of all nations have recently suffered an incomparable and most unexpected shock in the insensate and brutal assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, late President of the United States; and

Whereas President Kennedy has a particular hold on the fealty and interest of our society in that he was himself a zealous and learned student of our American history and the author of books and brochures upon historical subjects:

Therefore, we, the members of this society, do hereby attest to a memory which looms across the whole spectrum of American life, economic and social, bequeathing to us a program, a practical dream whose fulfillment will be his lasting memory.

We direct that a minute of this resolution attesting our sense of loss of Mr. Kennedy's death be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States and be made a perpetual minute in the archives of our society.

The society also paid tribute with appropriate resolutions honoring Col. Frederick A. Muhlenberg and General Spaatz. General Spaatz had an illustrious career as one of our country's outstanding war heroes.

Colonel Muhlenberg represented Berks County in the 80th Congress. He is a direct descendant of the first Speaker of the House of Representatives, Frederick A. C. Muhlenberg. He is one of the five direct descendants of the first Speaker to serve in the Congress. Colonel Muhlenberg addressed the meeting citing reminiscences of World War I.

For his distinguished service, General Spaatz has received many citations and awards. He graduated from West Point in 1914.

In 1917 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross as commander of a pursuit squadron. In 1925 he became Chief of the Air Service. He was Chief of the Air Staff in 1941; Chief, Air Force Command, 1942; and adviser to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in north Africa. In January 1944 he led U.S. Air Forces in Europe; and against Japan in July, 1945. In 1946 he was commanding general of the Army Air Forces.

Among his many awards are the D.S.M. with 8 oak leaf clusters; D.S.C. Legion of Merit; D.F.C. Bronze Star, Mexican Service, World Wars I and II; Victory; European-African-Middle East; Asiatic-Pacific campaigns; American Defense and American Campaign Medals; Grand Officer Legion of Honor; Croix de Guerre and others.

As a native of Berks County, he has a Pennsylvania Dutch background. With his wife Ruth he now resides in Chevy Chase, Md.

Miami: Leading Role in Marine Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 27, 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received my copy of the December issue of the Miamian, the official publication of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce.

The Miamian is noted for the fine quality of its articles, but I was especially impressed by one in the December issue entitled "Miami: Leading Role in Marine Science." The subject also happens to be one in which I am particularly interested.

On December 17, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 877 providing for a world conference on oceanography to be convened in the United States in 1965. Miami, with its Institute of Marine Science of the University of Miami, would be the ideal location for such a conference. As the Miamian says:

The University of Miami's Marine Institute is recognized by authorities as the largest scientific institution in the special field of biological oceanography (study of life in the seas) and the second largest marine graduate school in the free world.

I am hopeful that the 88th Congress will act favorably on my resolution during the 2d session.

The article follows:

MIAMI—LEADING ROLE IN MARINE SCIENCE

Addition of the U.S. Government's Tropical Atlantic Research Laboratory to this area's existing world-renowned University of Miami Marine Institute will help make Miami one of the strongest centers for tropical oceanographic fisheries in the world, predicted Department of the Interior official H. E. Crowther to the Miamian.

It may also have the effect of setting up new sea-oriented industries here, for marine scientists are not only interested in the theoretical aspect of the oceans, but the Interior Department's Fish and Wildlife Bureau which is in charge of the Research Laboratory being set up here, is vitally interested in the actual commercial values of its studies.

The Bureau maintains seven marine labs throughout the United States. The one to be constructed here will employ between 75 and 300 persons and cost about $1.5 million. Crowther states that it will also serve as an opportunity for summer employment for students studying marine biology at Florida's colleges and universities.

Land site for the complex was donated by Dade County to the Department of the Interior. Extensive work by the chamber's marine council, through letters and facts presented to the Department of the Interior and our congressional delegation have been recognized as instrumental in locating the Laboratory here.

The Laboratory will be built directly across the Rickenbacker Causeway from the University of Miami Marine Laboratory on Virginia Key, just down the road from the Marine Stadium and the Wometco Seaquarium which will make the Key as marine oriented as any area in the Nation.

The University of Miami Marine Institute is recognized by authorities as the largest scientific institution in the specal field of biological oceanography (study of life in the seas) and the second largest marine graduate school in the free world.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Frank P. Briggs stated that the selection of the Department's laboratory site here followed months of study of all offered areas in various parts of the country and Florida.

"Although there were several other sites in the final considerations, the Miami area was selected as the location best suited to current and future oceanographic needs. The nearness to the Institute of Marine Science at the University of Miami and the unique research facilities at the Miami Seaquarium will give this oceanography fisheries center a strong start toward making a major contribution to the national oceanographic program."

T. J. Costello, advance liaison man for the Department of Interior with PM, concurred: "The advantages of being so close to a pool of the world's most renowned marine scientists cannot be overemphasized.

"When we get our lab set up here, we will be able to get answers and theories worked out with a minimum of travel time. It's conceivable that many a theory will be discussed just shooting the breeze out there on the pier during lunchtime. We once had to travel thousands of miles to be able to converse with such men as Dr. Warren Wisby, Dr. Gunner Thorson or Dr. Cesare Emiliani.

"We can also utilize the University of Miami Marine Library, one of the finest in the world—and have access to the dozens of Ph. D.'s who are on the University of Miami staff or are visting here for special research."

As Acting Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, H. E. Crowther stated to the Miamian: "Most of the Laboratory's major research effort will be concerned with studies of fisheries, marine biology and oceanography of tropical Atlantic waters. These activities are presently being headquartered in Washington, D.C. The Miami location will greatly reduce the necessary 'steaming' time to and from areas of interest, which will extend as far as the western shores of Africa.

"Expansion of the Bureau's scientific investigations into distant oceanic waters is necessary to obtain to information needed by our commercial fisheries if they are to compete for the world's fishery resources. Our concern stems from the fact that the United States which for generations was a leader among fishing nations, has in recent years slipped from second to fifth place in the harvest of the resources of the seas."

For example, a fish and wildlife scientist stated that from his observations, a huge stand of tuna was to be found in a particular area. One fishery went along and financed the expedition. The tuna were found and turned out to be such a major find that tuna became common and the price went down. A similar new industry is conceivable for this area.

Our own marine lab has succeeded in rearing commercial shrimp from egg to maturity, a major breakthrough. It may mark the start of shrimp "farms" to reduce the import of 100 million pounds of shrimp from foreign lands. At present, shrimping is worth $14 million a year to Florida shrimpers; $71 million to the U.S. shrimpers.

At this moment, ships of the University of Miami Marine Institute and some of her scientists are in the South Atlantic probing the depths for sea life, and going deep into the ocean floor for test cores which are expected to fill in the gaps of millions of years of the earth's history—and thus perhaps predicting some of its future.

The research staff of the five branches of the marine institute consist of about 170 scientists and technicians. Its quarters on Virginia Key are in several large, specially constructed buildings, including a marine behavior building nearing completion.

The behavior building will bring normal oceanic conditions, temperature, pressure salinity, into controlled testing areas for intimate study of marine life: their time, why and how of feeding (the thing every sport fisherman would like to know); their reaction to tides, temperatures, moon phases, sound, color, etc.

Result of this type of research may be the long sought-after shark repellent. In the past, the institute has produced such things as a marine antifouling paint and shipworm deterrents, plus facts about marine life which when isolated are not meaningful to the layman, but in total sum has progressed our knowledge to the edge of full usage of the seas' products.

Its staff is world renowned and unique, being the only marine study center in the continental United States which is located in a tropical coral reef area—the keys and the only living coral reef in the Western Hemisphere—the John Pennekamp Coral Reef Park just south of Biscayne Bay.

Many scientists from all over the world study "on the spot" at the lab and some are presently exploring the coral reef and the Keys at night, seeing for the first time nocturnal fish never before seen by man.

And just as marine science has lowered the price of tuna it has lowered the price of chickens. Small, off-breed fish once called "trash" fish, now called industrial fish, are being produced into a high protein chicken-feed, which has reduced the product-cost ratio from 9 to 3½ to 1. Experiments are underway to develop hog feed from fish which in turn would reduce the cost of pork dramatically.

But in addition to finding new uses for fish, there are the conservation angles: Just how many fish are there in the ocean? Can we fish it out?

What causes the "red tide" that kills or drives fish away from traditional feeding grounds? (Red tide is a red plankton poisonous to fish. The keys suffered a huge epidemic several years ago which ruined commercial fishing—and cut back on the tourist fishermen.) The Institute of Marine Science which was established in 1943 now includes four research divisions—physical sciences, biological sciences and the academic department of marine sciences for graduate studies.

Design of South Bend (Ind.) Artist Chosen for 1963 Christmas Seals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I note with particular pleasure that the design chosen for the 1963 Christmas seal is the creation of Mrs. Judith Campbell Puissi, formerly of South Bend, Ind., and now of Florence, Italy. Mrs. Puissi, whom I am pleased to count as a friend of many years, designed the seal for the National Tuberculosis League.

The pride South Bend feels in Mrs. Puissi's success is made even greater by the fact that the seal design represents her impressions of "Christmas in South Bend."

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article from the South Bend Tribune by Roger Birdsell, headlined "South Bend Inspires 1963 Christmas Seal." The article follows:

SOUTH BEND INSPIRES 1963 CHRISTMAS SEAL

(By Roger Birdsell)

The 1963 Christmas seal is Mrs. Judith Campbell Piussi's remembered impression of "Christmas in South Bend."

Mrs. Piussi, now of Florence, Italy, is back in South Bend to visit her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rudolph Campbell, 18301 Douglas Road.

She designed the 1963 seal, and from 3 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m., Tuesday, in South Bend Art Center she will be the guest of the St. Joseph County Tuberculosis League at an autograph tea.

The seal was designed in 1961 while Mrs. Piussi was working in New York as a free lance commercial artist.

"I was thinking of the idea of Christmas in South Bend," she recalled, "with snow all around and little cozy houses with lights inside."

FIRST VISIT SINCE MARRIAGE

This is the artist's first visit to South Bend since her marriage here in 1962 to Pietro Piussi, an assistant professor of forestry at the University of Florence.

The Piussis met in 1957 while she was studying at the Florence Academy of Fine Arts. They renewed their acquaintance later when he was an exchange professor at the University of Syracuse, N.Y.

The current visit is allowing the Campbells to become acquainted with a new granddaughter, Luisa, 4½ months.

Mrs. Piussi is continuing her art career with particular reference to textile design, a field she happened on rather by accident in New York.

"I used the batik technique—painting with wax on silk which is then dyed—for a window decoration commission for Bonwit Teller," she explained. "A textile manufacturer saw it and asked me to produce some designs for him."

The Christmas seal design was done in college. Mrs. Piussi was asked to submit a design in competition with other artists after doing some other commercial art work for the National Tuberculosis League.

It is the first seal in several years not to have children in the design, though Mrs. Piussi believes the snowman in the design was selected because of its appeal to children.

The league selects a design 2 years before it is used to allow time for the necessary printing of about 400 million sheets of the seals. Mrs. Piussi received $500 for her design.

The artist graduated from John Adams High School in 1952 and DePauw University, Greencastle, as an art major, in 1956. She has exhibited her paintings at the art center and the Herron Art Museum in Indianapolis.

Mrs. Piussi said she will sail back home to Italy January 18 after a Christmas in South Bend.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

V. O. Key, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, among the losses to our country and the field of scholarship which we have recently sustained is that of V. O. Key, Jr.

V. O. Key served both political science and government in many ways. His practical temperament and skilled scholarship fitted well the goal to improve American self-government through better understanding of its nature and its needs. Nowhere was this understanding better exemplified than in his work, "Southern Politics," published in 1949, it served as a model for other regional political studies and is still remarkably current in many respects. He carried forward his work on the States by publishing in 1956 "American State Politics," a wonderfully comprehensive treatment of State government and politics.

V. O. Key's virtuosity is shown in other books he wrote. His book, "A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists," published in 1954, serves as a guide to all modern students of politics. His latest book, "Public Opinion and American Democracy," moved ahead the analysis of public opinion in this country. His book, "Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups," is a masterful text now in its fourth edition and widely used in college courses in political science. Truly, each book he wrote is a classic in its field and indicates the range of his interests and the great analytical power he possessed. His articles and shorter pieces are too numerous to mention but are living testimony to the brilliance and incisiveness of his mind.

V. O. Key served American democracy well. He was a staff member of the National Resources Planning Board in 1937–38 and of the Bureau of the Budget from 1942 to 1945. He was a member of President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs, as I was, and I can testify to the many contributions he made to the deliberations of the Commission.

V. O. Key served his profession with great distinction. A mark of the service he gave, and the respect with which he was held, is the honor he received by being named president of the American Political Science Association in 1958. He served on various committees of the Brookings Institution and the Social Science Research Council, and was a trustee of the Citizens' Research Foundation of Princeton, N.J.

In the field of political science, in university life, in government, his fame as a student of American political processes is unequaled.

His colleagues at Harvard have prepared a very moving eulogy which I append:

V. O. Key was one of those rare spirits who combined total commitment to a life of scholarship with an innate warmth and kindliness that won the affection of all who knew him. Despite the handicap of poor health, he worked, with his wife's understanding support, without surcease or interruption, joyously and creatively, leaving behind him a record of professional achievement which commanded worldwide acclaim. An imaginative innovator and impeccable craftsman, he belonged to that small company of scholars about whom it can truly be said that they move forward frontiers of their disciplines. He demanded much of himself, and he gave endlessly to others—to colleagues all over the country, and to his students at Harvard, Hopkins, and Yale.

V. O. Key was a genuinely modest and self-effacing man. He deprecated his own accomplishments and loved nothing more more than to pay tribute to the good work of others. He was free with the encouraging word, but superlatives were not bestowed lightly. When he spoke them, they were meant full measure. The highest honors of his profession came his way, and no one begrudged them. His devotion to his subject was absolute, but he refused to take himself seriously. Whether in conversation or on the printed page, there was always the wry turn of phrase, amusement at the variety of man's folly, and sympathy for the human comedy.

His simplicity, his unpretentiousness, and his easy, natural courtesy made him friends in all circles. From his native west Texas he brought with him an openness to people, an involvement in their joys and tribulations, and a desire to be neighborly and helpful in every way. His great human qualities were never more radiantly displayed than in the last months of his life in the hospital where his thoughts were constantly with others and where staff and fellow patients alike spoke of him with love and even a touch of awe. Stanch and courageous to the end, he accomplished much, but for V. O. Key the work that was important was the work still to be done.

Investigations by National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, during the inquiries of the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee, many companies were sited as having participated in questionable transactions.

Unfortunately, these companies were not given an opportunity to comment on statements included in the proposed report by three members of the subcommittee. I think it is a matter of fairness that companies and individuals named in the report have an opportunity to present their comments.

With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that comments prepared by the Harvey Aluminum Co. be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(NOTE.—Three members of the Stockpiling Subcommittee repeatedly urged the chairman to allow members of the full committee to review the chairman's statement of conclusions line by line against the record of the committee hearings. This he refused to do, even though it was clear to us that the conclusions he stated were not properly supported by the record. As the hearings progressed it became obvious that the chairman had preconceived conclusions, and neither the facts nor the testimony of others could deter him from reaching those conclusions. His first objective was to reflect adversely on the conduct of the stockpiling program by former Government officials. His second, wherever possible, was to infer improper conduct from previous political connections of individuals in private life, however remote those political connections might be. A third objective of the chairman was to infer that large profits inured to private industry from transactions in which the Government received no advantage. If any of these conditions had been established by the record there would have been no difficulty in producing a unanimous subcommittee report. All members of the subcommittee are vitally interested in the maintenance of our national security, and none would countenance improprieties in the administration of the stockpiling program which is an integral element of our national defense. The statement of conclusions by the chairman, and signed by two other members of the subcommittee, is an irresponsible effort to make political hay out of thin air. Their treatment of the Harvey Aluminum contract is a typical instance in point. What I have to say about that contract is documented fully in the hearing record, yet the chairman's statement omits important facts, misstates other facts, and warps the whole record to suit his preconceived notions. The same is true of his treatment of the Hanna contract and the other transactions he discusses in his statement, and I summarize the Harvey transaction merely to illustrate the unfairness and lack of objectivity by the chairman and his staff in the conduct of this so-called investigation. In my judgment the signers of the chairman's statement have engaged in a willful abuse of the congressional process.)

COMMENTS ON CERTAIN ASSERTIONS REGARDING HARVEY CONTRACT IN DRAFT REPORT ON NATIONAL STOCKPILE

1. The draft report asserts as a fact that it was obvious shortly after the signing of the letter-of-intent agreement in May 1953 and throughout 1954 and 1955, that the Harvey expansion "would not be needed" (draft report, fourth to eighth paragraphs).

This asserted fact is stated in the draft report to be the reason for the Govern-

ment's failure to sign a formal expansion contract with Harvey in accordance with the letter-of-intent agreement (draft report, 8th paragraph), and is the basis for the criticism in the draft report of the making of the final contract with Harvey (draft report, 6th, 8th, 14th and 16th paragraphs).

This asserted fact is not proved by the testimony given or exhibits submitted at the subcommittee hearings, and, indeed, the reports of the Joint Committee on Defense Production covering this period, which are perhaps the best evidence of what was happening at that time, clearly demonstrate that this assertion is contrary to fact. In this connection, it should be noted that these reports of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were fully available to the subcommittee.

The only testimony in the subcommittee hearings bearing on the assertion that it was obvious the Harvey expansion would not be needed is testimony of Mr. Stehman of the Office of Emergency Planning and of Dr. Flemming, former head of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

The testimony of Mr. Stehman was sought for the purpose of showing that when the final Harvey contract was signed in September of 1955 the Government had too much aluminum (hearings, p. 3379).

Mr. Stehman attempted to give testimony which would have shown that during the period July 1953–55 the amounts of aluminum held by the Government plus the amounts which might realistically be expected to be shipped to the Government under the expansion contracts (which only guaranteed the purchase of production not used or sold by the contractor) was substantially less than the stockpile objectives (hearings, pp. 3378, 3413–3415).

He was prevented from giving such testimony by the subcommittee and was instead instructed by it to add to the amounts of Government inventory at the relevant dates, the total maximum exposure of the Government if all the aluminum to be produced under the expansion contracts were to be shipped to the Government and none of it sold or used (hearings, pp. 3413–3415).

The resulting figures are completely meaningless. Among other things they tend to prove the absurdity that when the first and second round of expansion contracts were entered into, the Government by merely making such contracts, exceeded the then stockpile objectives (hearings, pp. 3446–3451).

The only other testimony in the hearings bearing on the assertion that it was obvious that the Harvey expansion would not be needed in the period July 1953–55 is the testimony of Dr. Flemming.

Dr. Flemming was asked whether if he had been "free to act in the matter," he would have entered into a new expansion contract at the time when the Government's entry into the final Harvey contract was under consideration. He said he would not have entered into a new expansion contract at that time (hearings, pp. 3740, 3743). He was asked if the Government at that time had "sufficient production facilities to satisfy the material needs" and he said he felt we were in "good shape at that point" (hearings, p. 3743).

This testimony is to be considered in the light of other facts which appear in the fifth annual report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, to which further reference will be made below.

This report shows that a severe supply shortage in 1955 had caused Dr. Flemming to institute a review of the necessity for further expansion, which took place during the months of June through September of that year, and that the decision of Dr. Flemming not to undertake such further expansion at that time, which was announced on September 22, 1955, after the signing of the final Harvey contract, was made after taking into account the Harvey expansion as well as announced expansions of other U.S. companies (fifth annual report, pp. 26–30).

Thus Dr. Flemming's testimony shows only that he did not consider that the situation would have been so urgent in September 1955 without Harvey as to require him to proceed immediately with a new expansion program. It does not show, and it is significant that he was not asked whether, he believed the Harvey expansion would not be needed.

The only exhibits introduced to support the assertion that it was obvious during the period July 1953–55 the Harvey expansion would not be needed are: first, a letter from Dr. Flemming in June 1953 indicating that a review of the incomplete third round of expansion would be made in the light of the facts that two participants had failed to qualify (only Harvey remained in the third round) and an increase in Canadian shipments had been announced (hearings, p. 3451), and second, an internal memorandum of ODM also made in June 1953 which concludes that by reason of the availability of increased Canadian production a sufficient aluminum supply would be available to meet mobilization requirements without completing the third round of expansion except for the Harvey expansion already authorized (hearings, p. 3452–3453). Both of these exhibits show, not that it was obvious the Harvey expansion would not be needed, but rather that the Harvey expansion was then considered part of the expansion base and in consequence a necessary part of the national defense mobilization.

The assertion in the draft report that it was obvious during the period July 1953–55 the Harvey expansion would not be needed is not supported by the reports of the Joint Committee on Defense Production covering this period.

These reports show that the Harvey expansion became a part of the expansion base in 1953 when Harvey became a participant in the third round of expansion (third annual report, pp. 31–33). They also show that the Harvey expansion was considered to be a part of the expansion base when ODM concluded in 1954 that the urgency for further expansion no longer existed in view of changed military estimates and increased Canadian shipments (fourth annual report, pp. 29–31).

They also show that the Harvey expansion was considered a part of the expansion base in 1955; that a severe supply shortage had developed in that year which caused ODM to cancel Government calls of aluminum for the stockpile so as to alleviate industrial shortages (and not as the draft report implies (seventh paragraph) because the Government did not wish any more aluminum); that, as indicated above, the supply shortage caused Dr. Flemming to institute a review of the necessity for further expansion, which took place during the months of June through September 1955; and that, as also indicated above, the decision of Dr. Flemming not to undertake further expansion at that time, which was announced on September 22, 1955, after the signing of the final Harvey contract, was made in ODM after taking into account the Harvey expansion as well as expansions announced by other U.S. companies (fifth annual report, pp. 26–30).

There is nothing in any of these reports which shows that it was obvious the Harvey expansion would not be needed. Indeed, these reports indicate that throughout the period July 1953–55, and particularly in 1955, the Harvey expansion was considered as a necessary part of the national defense mobilization.

2. The draft report also asserts as a fact that the Government officials refused to enter into the formal expansion contract with Harvey because they believed they didn't need the aluminum (draft report, eighth paragraph).

This assertion is completely unfounded because there is no evidence in the record which indicates that Government ever refused to enter into the formal expansion contract. Indeed, it is absolutely clear from the hearings and from the fifth annual report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production that the breach of the Government's contractual arrangement with Harvey was caused solely by the failure of the Government to obtain the funds to construct the power tieline.

The only relevant testimony is briefly summarized.

Mr. Harding of GSA testified that the failure of the Congress in 1953 to appropriate money for the tieline delayed the execution of the final expansion contract (hearings, pp. 3391–3392). The appropriation bill was submitted so late in the session that it was not acted on "pending further study to be accomplished before the next session of Congress" (House Conference Report 947, hearings on 1953 Interior Department appropriations bill).

The reason for the delay is discussed in an internal memorandum of ODM under date of October 28, 1953, which is part of the record (hearings, p. 3393). It was that Harvey could not bind itself to commence construction of the reduction plant until a firm date was fixed for the availability of power from Bonneville.

Mr. Nickerson, Harvey's counsel, testified that the breach of the Government's contractual relations with Harvey occurred by reason of Bonneville not having the funds to go forward with the tieline (hearings, p. 3419). He also testified that no appropriation for the tieline was submitted to the Congress in 1954 even though the President's budget message had said that such a submission would be made (hearings, p. 3419).

Mr. Kendall, counsel for ODM during the period in question, also testified that the breach occurred by reason of Bonneville lacking funds to build the tieline, at the same time rejecting a suggestion of the subcommittee chairman that the Government did not go ahead with the formal Harvey expansion contract because the Government did not need aluminum (hearings, pp. 3434–3435). He also testified that he did not know what caused the breach of the power agreement but thought it could have been caused by administrative foulup (hearings, p. 3436).

Mr. Nickerson and Dr. Flemming each testified that no one in Government had suggested that the Harvey supply contract be canceled and that Harvey be paid its damages (hearings, pp. 3424, 3743).

The summary of the matters leading up to the signing of the final Harvey contract appearing in the Fifth Annual Report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production (pp. 29–30) also refers to the failure to furnish funds for the tieline as causing the breach with Harvey.

The foregoing does not show that Government officials refused to enter into the formal expansion contract with Harvey, either because they believed they didn't need the aluminum or for any other reason. Rather it shows conclusively that the Government was at all times willing to enter into a formal expansion contract with Harvey, and that it was only the failure of Bonneville to obtain funds for the tieline (which appears to have resulted from an "administrative foulup") that caused the breach of the Harvey contractual arrangements with the Government.

3. The draft report asserts that there should have been a termination provision in the letter-of-intent agreement (draft report, last paragraph).

The only testimony in the record bearing on this point is to the effect that as a mat-

ter of policy none of the expansion contracts had termination provisions because the Government had decided that to obtain the needed expansion the Government would have to make firm commitments (hearings, pp. 3437–3438).

The record suggests an interesting fact in this connection, namely, that this policy of firm commitments must have been approved by the subcommittee chairman when he was head of the National Security Resources Board in the early 1950's (hearings, p. 3437).

A Patriotic Salute to Humble Oil & Refining Co. of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, arriving in each congressional office this week was a beautifully prepared 1964 calendar, the gift of the Humble Oil & Refining Co. of Houston, Tex.

We all receive many calendars each year about this time but I desire to commend your especial attention to this inspiring product of Humble's reminder to us of the wisdom of our Founding Fathers, and the enormous human talents that have contributed so much to our present greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I append herewith the letter to me from Carl E. Reistle, Jr., chairman of the Humble board, the quoted excerpts from the 12 calendar pages, and my response to Mr. Reistle.

HUMBLE OIL & REFINING CO.,
Houston, Tex., December 2, 1963.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: As a Member of the House of Representatives, I believe you will be interested in this unusual "Voices of Great Americans" calendar being issued for 1964 by Humble Oil & Refining Co.

This calendar, which carries portraits and profound thoughts of 12 distinguished Americans, was designed for a very special purpose. That purpose is to remind ourselves forcefully of some of those eternal truths on which this country was built and became great. These same truths will provide the strength and wisdom required for this Nation to endure.

It is my hope that during the next 12 months these excerpts from our national heritage will remind us of the vital importance to America's future of such old-fashioned virtues as loyalty, honesty, and courage.

Sincerely yours,

CARL E. REISTLE, Jr.
Chairman of the Board.

EXPRESSIONS OF 12 GREAT AMERICAN PATRIOTS ACCOMPANYING THE WILLIAM A. SMITH PORTRAYALS ON THE HUMBLE CALENDAR FOR 1964

George Washington: "If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work?"

Thomas Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Ralph Waldo Emerson: "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm."

Abraham Lincoln: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present * * * we must think anew and act anew."

Woodrow Wilson: "There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace."

Robert E. Lee: "Abandon all animosities and make your sons Americans."

Theodore Roosevelt: "If we shrink from the hard contests * * * then the bolder and stronger countries will pass us by."

Thomas Edison: "The yearning of man's brain for new knowledge * * * never can be completely met."

Benjamin Franklin: "When truth and error have fair play, the former is always an overmatch for the latter."

Daniel Webster: "On the diffusion of education among the people rest the preservation and perpetuation of our free institutions."

Alexander Graham Bell: "All great inventions * * * are the product of many minds."

Clara Barton: "Your joy will be the joy of those you serve, and minister to; your reward the success you achieve."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1963.

Mr. CARL E. REISTLE, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board,
Humble Oil & Refining Co.,
Houston, Tex.

DEAR MR. REISTLE: Thank you ever so much for the gift of your exciting 1964 calendar, and for your covering letter explaining the commendable motives that inspired it.

This is precisely what I have been advocating as an additional role for some of our giant business corporations; Preach the American free enterprise system, relate our present greatness and eminence to the foresight of our earlier patriots.

It should become fashionable once again to get a thrill out of the "Star-Spangled Banner" and the "Gettysburg Address." If companies like yours can reinculcate in the citizenry the ideals of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin; Webster and Lincoln and the others, then perhaps some of the upcoming history textbooks will emulate you and return to fundamental Americanism, rather than devoting so much space to the heralds of socialism and the new order this country has endured for three decades.

There is an old axiom—never quarrel with success; but a lot of our Central Government leadership has been doing just that for 30 years, and its detrimental effect on our economy is evidenced by our total debt in excess of $300 billion.

Thank you again for the calendar—not just for mine, but because Humble ordered its production at all. Season's greetings.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

The Sam Houston Commemorative Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Wednesday, December 18, issue of the Lexington News Gazette, which paper has been serving Rockbridge County and the town of Lexington for 162 years. This article concerns the issuance of a new commemorative stamp by the Post Office Department and is entitled: "Sam Houston To Be Fifth Local Man Honored on Stamp."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News-Gazette, Lexington, Va., Dec. 18, 1963]

SAM HOUSTON TO BE FIFTH LOCAL MAN HONORED ON STAMP

(NOTE.—In January, Gen. Sam Houston will become the fifth native or resident of Rockbridge to be honored on a U.S. postage stamp. The following feature, telling of other local men who have previously been honored, and outlining the career of the emancipator of Texas, was written by Maurice Fliess. It is reprinted from the Roanoke Times.)

The individual will soon be able to accomplish that which a highly skilled Mexican army of 1,500 failed to do:

Lick Gen. Sam Houston.

A 5-cent stamp commemorating the Rockbridge County native, 100 years after his death, is scheduled to appear in January.

First day covers will be issued in the largest cities of the State he helped found—a city which bears his surname—Houston, Tex.

Originally, the commemorative stamp was to have been released December 14, but a delay at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in Washington has moved the date to "sometime in January," a spokesman for the Post Office Department reported Saturday.

The frontiersman, soldier, and statesman is the fifth Rockbridge County native or resident to be honored by the U.S. Post Office Department.

Preceding the general were:

Gen. Robert E. Lee, southern leader and president of Washington College, now Washington and Lee University from 1865 to 1870.

Gen. Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, teacher of mathematics and science at Virginia Military Institute in Lexington, before he gained fame in the War Between the States.

Cyrus Hall McCormick, the inventor of the reaper, who was born and lived on his father's farm in northern Rockbridge County.

Dr. Ephriam McDowell, county native and resident, who won international acclaim as the "father of abdominal surgery."

Sam Houston lived in Rockbridge County for nearly 14 years, years which his biographers point out were important in the life of the man who was to play a major role in the liberation of Texas.

The fifth of nine children of Samuel and Elizabeth Paxton Houston, Samuel Houston, Jr., was born on March 2, 1793. Precisely 43 years later, Houston remarked in his autobiography, the Texas declaration of independence was signed.

Houston lived at Timber Ridge, 7 miles northeast of Lexington, where his grandfather (the Scotch-Irish Robert Houston) had constructed a two-story home.

During his boyhood, the young Houston frequently swam in Mill Creek and hunted in wooded areas near his home. He also traveled down the Valley Pike, which ran in front of his home, past Lexington to visit relatives at "High Bridge"—an early term for the Natural Bridge of Virginia.

At the Stone Timber Ridge Church built by Sam's great-grandfather, John Houston, Sam Houston worshipped regularly. The church, still in use today, is located 100 yards from the site of Houston's residence.

The general-to-be was educated briefly within a building that had once served as Liberty Hall Academy, a school which moved to the outskirts of Lexington and evolved into Washington and Lee. "I learned to read

and write," Houston mentioned in his memoirs, "and gained some idea of the imperfect ciphering."

But in 1806, a tragic event severed Houston's connections with Rockbridge County and Virginia.

Samuel Houston, Sr., a brigade inspector and major in the Virginia Milita, while en route to inspection duties in Kentucky, died in Alleghany County at what is now Callaghan.

Sam, Junior, now 14, his mother and the other eight children, packed up and headed southwest into Tennessee.

On two occasions there, Sam left contemporary civilization in favor of a life with the Cherokee Indians—first at the age of 15 for a 3-year tenure.

After that episode, Houston returned home and settled down, studying law, and practicing in Lebanon, Tenn. In 1822 he was elected to the House of Representatives, and 5 years later—with the support of Andrew Jackson's potent Democratic organization—Houston was elected Governor of Tennessee.

After 2 years in that office, Houston resigned and rejoined his friends, the Cherokees.

Soon Houston turned his attention away from the Indians and to the settlers in Texas struggling for independence.

While the Alamo massacre was taking place he was named commander of the Army of the Republic of Texas, and the event proved a windfall to Houston.

On April 21, 1836, his army of 900 men while "Remembering the Alamo" routed 1,500 Mexican troops under General Santa Anna, who was taken prisoner the following day. In the historic battle, the general reported 630 Mexicans were killed and another 730 captured; meanwhile, casualties in Houston's army were 9 dead, 34 injured.

Subsequently, Houston was elected president of Texas from 1836 to 1838 and 1841 to 1844. After Texas was admitted as a State of the Union, he served as Senator from 1846–59, and Governor from 1859 to the beginning of the War Between the States in 1861.

Gen. Sam Houston, far from his former Rockbridge County home, died of pneumonia at the age of 70 on July 26, 1863.

Congressman Pike Reports on 1st Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, with the bang of your gavel ending the 1963 session of Congress this week the longest peacetime Congress in the history of our Nation comes to an end, and I would like to take this opportunity to report to my constituents on its accomplishments and its failures.

While the bang of the gavel marks the official end of the session, I believe it is more accurate to say that the 1st session of the 88th Congress ended with something less than a bang. Despite the many long months of the session, Congress goes home with the bulk of its legislative business unfaced and undone. Its detractors, largely of one political party, have called this session of Congress donothing and disgraceful. Its supporters, largely of another political party, have called it respectable, and constructive, and even outstanding. The facts, as usual, lie somewhere in between. No one has called it the greatest Congress in history and no one is going to find it so described here.

As a generalization, it can be said that those who most loudly label it do-nothing most loudly opposed those things it tried to do. Those who call it respectable failed to push it aggressively toward a more respectable record.

Last January, addressing Congress for his state of the Union message, President Kennedy's first and strongest request was for lower taxes. This January President Johnson's message will be the same, for while the House has passed the tax bill, the Senate has not. On the other hand, the Youth Conservation Corps program, No. 2 among President Kennedy's requests of last January, has passed the Senate but not the House.

This was also the fate of such other important legislative proposals as the wilderness bill, mass transit, a National Service Corps, and the proposal to provide defense counsel for indigent criminal defendants in the Federal courts. Every one of these bills has passed one body of Congress but not the other. At the bottom of the pile may be found the medical care proposal and the civil rights bill, Nos. 3 and 4 among President Kennedy's proposals, neither of which has passed either House of Congress.

Next year, I believe a real attempt will be made to complete all of the above legislation. Any bill stays alive for the entire 2 years of a Congress, but if it is not passed during the second year it dies and the entire legislative process must start all over again with the reintroduction of the bill in the next Congress. How successful the attempt will be I do not know, but if I were rash enough to make a prediction it would be that the tax bill will pass, the civil rights bill will pass, the medical care proposal will fail, the wilderness bill will fail, the mass transit bill will pass, the Youth Conservation Corps bill will pass, the National Service Corps bill will fail, and the proposal for defense counsel for indigent defendants will pass. This fearless forecast, in common with a lot made at the beginning of the session just past, could be completely wrong.

One area in which Congress did accomplish a great deal this session was in the field of education. Four major bills were passed in this general category and signed into law by the President. One bill was designed to help provide facilities for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. A second will help construct and improve teaching facilities for doctors and dentists and provide loans for students in these professions. A third major bill provided a 3-year program of grants and loans for construction of colleges and junior colleges and the fourth bill continued the National Defense Education Act, continued aid to school districts adversely affected by large Government installations—(commonly called impacted areas—and expanded vocational education programs.

Legislation of more purely local interest involved the Fire Island National Seashore, erosion control for the entire south shore of Long Island, and the stabilization of the Fire Island Inlet. Of these, by far the most noteworthy and controversial was the proposal to establish a Fire Island National Seashore.

On June 11, 1963, the Department of the Interior recommended a new national seashore proposal, embracing not only the 31 miles of Fire Island in the towns of Babylon, Islip, and Brookhaven, but stretching an additional 21 miles east along the barrier beach, past the Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets and into the village of Southampton. The cries of anguish which were heard when the Interior Department said there was not enough land on Fire Island paled into insignificance compared with the yells of outrage when they tried to get more.

On June 18, 1963, I introduced my own bill for a Fire Island National Seashore. It embraces the area from the Fire Island State Park on the west to the Moriches Inlet County Park on the east, a distance of 27 miles, and includes several islands in the South Bay and Moriches Bay. It eliminates all land east of the Moriches Inlet. The bill is detailed and specific and I was greatly aided in the preparation of these details by such groups as the committee for a Fire Island National Seashore, the League of Women Voters, the Patchogue Chamber of Commerce, many of the garden clubs and conservation organizations on Long Island and a great many interested individuals.

Four other Congressmen have since joined me in this legislation, and at the hearings held by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at Adelphi Suffolk College on September 30, 1963, it attracted fairly general support. On December 11, 1963, the Senate committee started its hearings in Washington and the Interior Department formally withdrew its request for any land in the town of Southampton. The legislation still has a long way to go, and there are many details to be worked out, but in a farsighted move, the board of supervisors acquired the entire easterly end of Fire Island. Regardless of how long the national seashore legislation may take, or even if it should fail, the land is now in public ownership for the benefit of future generations.

The Congress appropriated $2,100,000 for matching funds for an erosion control project between Moriches Inlet and Shinnecock Inlet; $600,000 for navigation and erosion control work on Fire Island Inlet and the beach west of that inlet, and started a study of erosion control problems on the north shore of Long Island.

As always, the problems of fluctuating employment in our defense industries continued to plague Long Island and occupied a great deal of the time of our office. Defense contracting is always a tricky business—when you have them it is great, when you do not have them it is disastrous. While we continue to exert all our efforts to see our district get its far share, we also hope for the day when greater diversification of our industry will put us less at the mercy of such violent swings in employment.

On the personal level, my work on the Armed Services Committee was greatly increased this year by the fact that I was assigned to three separate subcommittees—one having jurisdiction over Reserve affairs and civil defense, one having jurisdiction over military research and development, and one having jurisdiction over all types of special investigations.

My office staff of five full-time secretaries and two part-time representatives has been kept busy answering a flood of mail on legislation and on all types of personal requests.

We have tried to keep the people of our district informed of our activities by Sunday broadcasts over eight radio stations, and by a weekly column mailed to every newspaper printed in the county.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the people of my district and to thank them for the magnificent demonstration of faith in our system of government which they displayed during the turmoil and shock which followed the assassination of President Kennedy. Republicans and Democrats, people from every walk of life, of every religion, and of all colors, joined in a moving expression of our national tragedy, and in declarations of support and confidence in our new President. A great man is dead, another great man is at the helm, and a mighty nation carries on.

My voting record on all major issues follows: There have been 115 rollcall votes and I have been present and voting 113 times. On one of my absences I was confined to the hospital, on the other I just plain goofed. It was a vote on a motion to adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted to adjourn.

Date (1963)	Issue	Vote
Jan. 9	Election of Speaker (McCormack 256, Halleck 175)	McC.
9	Maintain size of Rules Committee (yea 235, nay 196)	Yea.
Feb. 27	Supplemental appropriation for Department of Agriculture (yea 254, nay 154).	Nay.
27	Funds for Committee on Un-American Activities (yea 386, nay 20).	Yea.
Mar. 11	Extend draft law (yea 388, nay 3)	Yea.
12	Honorary citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill (yea 378, nay 21)	Yea.
13	Add $364,000,000 to Defense appropriation for B-70 aircraft (yea 226, nay 179).	Nay.
13	$15,800,000,000 Defense appropriation (yea 374, nay 33)	Yea.
Apr. 4	$6,000,000,000 Treasury, Post Office, and executive appropriation (yea 386, nay 17).	Yea.
10	$450,000,000 accelerated public works program (yea 228, nay 184)	Yea.
24	Program to increase opportunities for training doctors and dentists (yea 288, nay 122)	Yea.
25	Extend feed grain subsidy (yea 208, nay 195)	Nay.
29	Coordinate Federal programs for outdoor recreation (yea 292, nay 50).	Yea.
May 7	Reduce travel allowances (yea 387, nay 2)	Yea.
9	Tighten Internal Security Act (yea 340, nay 40)	Yea.
15	Recommit Temporary Debt Increase Act (yea 195, nay 222)	Yea.
15	Passage of temporary debt increase (yea 213, nay 204)	Yea.
23	Ban discrimination against women in employment (yea 362, nay 9).	Yea.
29	Continue import of Mexican farmworkers (yea 158, nay 174)	Nay.
June 6	$6,000,000,000 Agriculture Department appropriation (yea 288, nay 79).	Nay.
11	$140,000,000 legislative branch appropriation (yea 271, nay 122)	Yea.
12	$455,000,000 Area Redevelopment Agency increase (yea 204, nay 209).	Nay.
13	Extend existing excise and corporate income taxes (yea 283, nay 91).	Yea.
18	$1,800,000,000 State, Justice, and Commerce Department appropriation (yea 301, nay 93).	Yea.
June 26	$47,000,000,000 Defense appropriation (yea 410, nay 1)	Yea.
July 17	$958,000,000 Interior appropriation (yea 332, nay 50)	Yea.
24	Air Pollution Control Act (yea 272, nay 102)	Yea.
Aug. 1	Authorize $5,200,000,000 space program (yea 335, nay 57)	Yea.
6	Matching grant program for vocational education (yea 377, nay 21).	Yea.
14	5-year program for construction facilities for higher education (yea 287, nay 113).	Yea.
23	Cut $585,000,000 for foreign aid (yea 222, nay 188)	Nay.
23	Authorize $3,500,000,000 foreign aid (yea 224, nay 186)	Yea.
Sept. 10	Authorize $283,000,000 mental health program (yea 335, nay 18)	Yea.
24	$11,100,000,000 tax cut and tax reform (yea 271, nay 155)	Yea.
Oct. 1	$1,200,000,000 Armed Forces pay increase authorization (yea 333, nay 5).	Yea.
7	Extend Civil Rights Commission (yea 265, nay 80)	Yea.
10	$13,100,000,000 appropriation for 23 independent agencies and offices (yea 302, nay 32).	Yea.
23	Establish United States-Puerto Rico Commission on Status of Puerto Rico (yea 320, nay 44).	Yea.
31	Extend Mexican farm labor import program 1 year (yea 173, nay 158).	Nay.
Nov. 7	$6,000,000,000 increase in national debt (yea 187, nay 179)	Nay.
18	$1,600,000,000 military construction appropriation (yea 332, nay 5).	Yea.
19	$4,300,000,000 appropriation for public works and Atomic Energy Commission (yea 358, nay 27).	Yea.
20	$20,000,000, 2-year extension of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (yea 252, nay 133).	Yea.
Dec. 9	$400,000,000 subway system for Washington, D.C. (motion to recommit) (yea 278, nay 76).	Yea.
16	$2,800,000,000 foreign aid appropriation (yea 249, nay 135)	Yea.
16	Prohibit guarantee of credit on sales to Communist countries (yea 218, nay 169).	Yea.

Resolution of Condolence by Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, nearly a month has passed since the death of our great President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Both the House and the Senate have devoted a day to eulogies of our fallen leader. Thousands of words have been spoken by citizens, civic groups, and dignitaries at home and abroad, in praise and condolence.

My attention has recently been called to a resolution of condolence passed on December 8, 1963, by the Council of Administration, Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. This resolution has particularly impressed me. It is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas a pall of sorrow has been cast, not only over the United States of America, but over the North American Continent, and throughout the free world, because of the passing of Comrade John Fitzgerald Kennedy, a combat veteran of World War II, a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the 35th President of the United States, and the greatest leader of our time, who met his untimely death on November 22, 1963, at the hand of a cruel and cowardly assassin; and

Whereas his dedication to the cause of peace and the elevation of human dignity will always be remembered by the immortal words and work he left behind, which are not only known to this grieving Nation but to the entire world; and

Whereas President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in all his public utterances, exorted the people of this world to strive for the common good and the best that is in each of us; and

Whereas he was a man whose private and public life was above reproach; who was sincere and equitable, honest and honorable; one to whom artifice and treachery were unknown, who was a stranger to bigotry and prejudice, an adviser of the indigent, and a friend of all, regardless of race, color, creed or nationality; and

Whereas we of the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, having given lodgement in our minds and hearts and souls to its sublime lessons, mourn the passing of this great and noble comrade, one who was fearless in the cause of right and of humanity; one who, to those dwelling in the darkness of tyranny, oppression and fear, had kindled a flame of hope for better things; and

Whereas we dedicate this meeting in memory of our departed Comrade John Fitzgerald Kennedy, whose name is written in imperishable letters of gold upon our grateful and appreciative hearts, and will forever be inscribed on the tablet of immortals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Administration, Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, convened in regular meeting at Westminster, Md., on this 8th day of December 1963, That when we adjourn today, we do so in the name and on behalf of the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with deep and sincere regret and in respect to the memory of Comrade John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the late President of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That when adopted, a copy of this resolution be made a permanent part of the minutes of this meeting; and copies thereof be sent to—

1. Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, the widow of Comrade John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

2. The Honorable DANIEL B. BREWSTER, U.S. Senator of Maryland, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

3. To each post in the Department of Maryland, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

4. The press.

MICHAEL F. BONADIO,
Department Commander.
JAMES H. DARLING,
Department Adjutant.

A Historical View of Personnel and Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by R. Smith Simpson, entitled "A Historical View of Personnel and Diplomacy," which appeared in the Foreign Service Journal of October 1963. Mr. Simpson, who recently retired from the Foreign Service, makes the sound point that the practice of diplomacy has always required individuals with high qualifications and unusually broad interests; in short, that the requirements of the so-called new diplomacy are really not new at all.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN HISTORICAL VIEW OF PERSONNEL AND DIPLOMACY

(NOTE.—R. Smith Simpson, who voluntarily retired from the Foreign Service a year ago, has contributed over the years of his association with the Service, a number of articles to the Journal, including "Are We Getting Our Share of the Best?" in November, on the quality of candidates for the Service.)

(By R. Smith Simpson)

Of the six published analyses of the State Department and the Foreign Service made at governmental request since the last war, that of the Herter Committee represents in many respects the most realistic effort.

One of the healthy contributions the report makes to the discussion of our diplomatic requirements is to define the environment in which diplomacy must be practiced. Not all predecessors of the Herter Committee have taken the trouble to do this, which may account for their recommendations being insufficiently realistic and perceptive of the developing world situation since 1945. Environment obviously determines not only the techniques we must employ in diplomacy but the personal skills we must seek (and nurture) in our diplomats.

The new diplomacy the Committee concluded to have evolved from our present environment it describes in the following terms:

"In pursuit of our international goals, we have developed an arsenal of instruments more varied than ever before. They include: All the tools of traditional diplomacy, international law, intelligence, political action, technical assistance and various types of foreign economic aid, military aid programs, information and psychological programs, monetary policies, trade development programs, educational exchange, cultural programs, and, more recently, measures to counter insurgency movements. Most of these fall outside the older definition of diplomacy, but all of them must be considered actual or potential elements of U.S. programs. Together they constitute what is here called the new diplomacy (p. 4).

Have any of these ever fallen outside of diplomacy? When was political action not a part of diplomacy? Is not political action the centerpiece of diplomacy? Were not all the elements mentioned by the Committee a part of European diplomacy of the 19th and early 20th century? Do not these elements go as far back as recorded history? One can think, for instance, of the technical and military assistance of Theodosius I who, through a combination of military power and diplomacy, overcame the Visigoths and resettled them in certain designated areas of the Roman empire, securing in return their services as soldiers. This example goes back only to the fourth century A.D. but one can without difficulty recall earlier examples, such as those afforded by Philip of Macedonia, of the melding of military elements with the diplomatic, including in the diplomatic such elements or instruments as bribery, subversion, torture, assassination and insurgency.

Let us look at the more recent example of James Bryce, the British Ambassador to this country from 1907 to 1913. Just as his study, "The American Commonwealth," is still a classic, so his ambassadorship to the United States remains a classic, illustrative of how popular and effective a diplomatic representative can be if he is profound enough to know thoroughly his own country, the country to which he is sent, and the world in which they both function. Combining the qualities of scholar, philosopher and practical statesman, Bryce in his diplomacy effected a very skillful amalgam of political action, information and psychological programs, cultural programs, intelligence and international law:

But let us not overlook our own earliest diplomacy. During and after our Revolution, international law, intelligence and political action, not to mention insurgency and economic and military aid, were a integral part of what we were trying to do. The economic and military aid were in reverse—solicited from abroad rather than extended by ourselves—but the elements were there, fortunately for us. Furthermore, our early diplomatic representatives were information and psychological programs as well as cultural programs in themselves, which made them eminently skillful of course. For there never was a period in which it was more necessary that America be understood by Europe—not just by governments but by politicians in and out of the Government, scientists, philosophers, educators. This was accomplished with eminent success by the Jeffersons, the Franklin, the Adamses of the time. Such was the quality of Jefferson, moreover, that when he was serving at Paris as the diplomatic representative of the confederated 13 States, he was consulted by French political leaders on a variety of their domestic political questions.

Since 1900 our Government has made use of private citizens and sometimes public officials outside the diplomatic establishment to engage in programs which we now too easily associate with a new diplomacy. The work of Arthur Powell Davis comes to mind, a civil engineer who for 8 years was chief engineer (1906–14) and 9 years director (1914–23) of our Reclamation Service. His technical assistance to Turkestan and Panama was too real for one to conclude that this type of assistance originated with us quite newly. Grandiose programs along these lines have originated quite recently, of course, but the weapon—if one must speak of diplomacy in cold war terminology—has been in our arsenal for a good many years. The indigenous Indians, indeed, taught it to us, making it a part of their diplomacy in dealing wtih the earliest settlers on this continent.

Few Americans, including those in our diplomatic establishment, seem to be aware of just how broad were the development programs by which we endeavored to discharge our self-assumed responsibilities to underdeveloped areas inherited from our war with Spain. Largely neglected, accordingly, is the experience we gained in political, military, economic, educational, informational, psychological, social, and administrative affairs, from working with the underdeveloped peoples concerned. From 1899 to 1901, the rebellion of Aguinaldo confronted the U.S. Philippine mission with the necessity of adding counterinsurgency programs to the others. Unfortunately, indifference to diplomacy—to offshore responsibilities and experiences—until comparatively recently, as well as our failure to require some familiarity with these responsibilities and experiences of the men and women entering our Foreign Service, has caused these experiences and their lessons to be lost. It means also that too many of us, in trying to define a new diplomacy, are actually in process of discovering an old diplomacy.

I would suggest that what may be new in our present situation and therefore what may be new in the diplomacy we are endeavoring to create to meet this situation are such things as—

1. The range or scope of elements required to be compounded to meet not simply a situation in one or two areas of the world but in a very large number of areas, eventually every continent, and therefore requiring considerable organization and coordination.

2. The range of peoples and cultures involved, requiring a far greater recourse than ever before to the social and behavorial sciences.

3. Today's accelerated speed at which the world, its decisions and events revolve, requiring greater celerity of decision and maneuver, as well as greater profundity lest decisions produce only superficial improvisation from which later retread must be contrived.

4. The extensive participation of people, press, and public opinion in the diplomatic process.

5. The rise of a philosophy, implemented by documents, hostile to Western philosophy, life, and conduct.

6. Nuclear power, with its capacity for widespread annihilation.

We must view even these elements with discriminating, historical knowledge, however. Ancient Athens also faced a hostile philosophy. Ancient Athens also faced subversion. Ancient Athens also faced the problem of the participation of popular assemblies and public opinion in the diplomatic process. Nor is the concept of diplomacy as extending to dealing with peoples (the government-to-people and people-to-people approaches) really novel. In the 1790's a French minister, known as Citizen Genêt, had this same concept. Had he not been so imaginative in developing it he might have lasted longer. Raising troops and contracting for privateers in a neutral country is, after all, stretching the government-to-people conceptualization a little far. Nor should we forget, as far as element (2) is concerned, that the Japanese specialist and "the China hand" were part of our diplomatic effort long ago. The fact that we dropped them and have now begun once again to replace them does not make them new or area specialization new.

In suggesting what may be new elements in our diplomacy since World War II, I mentioned first the considerable organization and coordination required of a current diplomatic establishment. This element has not only been emphasized by, but has been almost an obsession of, recent analyses of the State Department and the Foreign Service. There is a heavy emphasis upon it by the Herter Committee. It seems that this emphasis has been carried so far as to require a diplomatic Copernicus to come along to suggest that the focal point of all this question of personnel for diplomacy is personnel for diplomacy quite as much as organization for diplomacy. A diplomatic establishment and its performance of the art of diplomacy revolve quite as much around the individuals who make it up as around an organizational chart.

At a critical time in the history of Mexico, David Eugene Thompson, of Nebraska, was our representative there. He was described by one who served with him as "a man of powerful personality, of large intelligence and shrewd judgment, and of sharp and forthright tongue * * *. By the lifelong exercise of a naturally strong intellect on a vast number and wide variety of books, he had, for all his lack of formal schooling, made himself into an unusually well-educated man * * *. His great value to his country lay in the fact that he possessed, as probably no other man possessed, the absolute confidence of the aging Mexican dictator, Don Porfirio Diaz * * * and the friendship between them illustrates the great and beneficent power a North American diplomat could, if he were trusted and well liked, exercise unofficially in Spanish American capitals."[1] Now observe what this led to: "Aware of the relationship between the President and the Ambassador, State Governors, generals, police officials, Federal judges, and even judges of the supreme court would drop into the Embassy to consult him about any case that might happen to involve Americans or Americal interests."[2] This influence, this practice of diplomacy, was personal to Thompson. It could not have been produced by any reorganization of the State Department or the diplomatic service. His type and philosophy may not be those we need today in every country, although I suggest there are a few dictators left and we could use some influence with them, whether of the David Eugene Thompson or the Llewellyn Thompson type. The essential questions are: who are these Thompsons, where and how do we find them, and how do we preserve their talents through an extended diplomatic career? What are the conditions of service required for the cultivation and development of their talents?

Another example—one carrying no stigma of dictatorship—is that of Jules Jusserand who was the French Ambassador in Washington for thirteen years, 1902–1915. Note the length of service. But note also the depth of his culture. He had published in 1889 "English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages," six years later a "Literary History of the English People," and in 1898 "Shakespeare in France." If you are inclined to discount these scholarly accomplishments in a diplomat and to question the connection between diplomacy and English wayfaring life in the Middle Ages, you may be missing the whole essence of diplomacy, the new as well as the old. And if you wonder how, today, a diplomatic officer could engage in such pursuits you may be raising the very vital question which commissions and committees inquiring into the deficiencies and failures of American diplomacy are missing.

Along with his considerable scholarly and reflective accomplishments, Jusserand was tactful and shrewd, practical and perceptive. And to what did all this lead? He was a close friend of every American President during his period of service in Washington. When President Theodore Roosevelt had a particularly difficult question to resolve, domestic or international, he sought the advice of Jusserand. At a time when John Hay, then Secretary of State, was ill and Roosevelt wanted advice on an international problem, he turned not to the No. 2 man in the State Department, nor to another Cabinet member, but to this foreign ambassador. Jusserand was one of his confidants and advisers.

Such are the qualities of diplomacy, such are the qualities that solve a government's dilemma of exercising influence without risk or charge of interference. For the influence is personal, arising from the profundity, understanding, experience, and tact of the individual diplomatic representative.

This, I submit, is what we are trying to define as diplomacy, old and new, and the ability to perform it is what we are trying to find, train, nurture and reward by suitable conditions in our diplomatic establishment. In seeking an improvement of our diplomatic performance, then, the basic questions are: what kinds of knowledge, sagacity, perceptiveness, experience and dynamism do we need, how can we attract those people who possess them, how can we test such people more accurately both for admission and promotion purposes, and what are the conditions of service we must provide abroad as well as in Washington to nurture these qualities? To meet this challenge we must first—and accurately—analyze diplomacy, diplomatic processes and the results we want—the Theodosius, Thompson, Bryce, Jusserand results, if you will. We must then establish the criteria fitted to these results and make the criteria so widely known that people can prepare systematically and adequately as candidates. Drag-net publicity campaigns on "the Foreign Service" will not suffice. Next, we must bring to bear on selection and promotion processes the most up-to-date techniques the behavioral sciences can provide. Finally, in the field, as at headquarters, we must create the conditions which will encourage the results we want. Few, I think, would say we are doing these things successfully now. Few would say the Herter Report dealt perceptively with them.

[1] William Franklin Sands, in collaboration with Joseph M. Lalley, "Our Jungle Diplomacy," University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

[2] Ibid., 133–134.

The Importance of R. & D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of December 16, 1963:

THE IMPORTANCE OF R. & D.

One of the most important bits of industrial news to come across our desk in the past few weeks is the announcement by the Walker Manufacturing Co. that it has acquired 200 acres of land 8 miles east of Jackson for a new engineering research center.

You probably read—or should have done so—the details on the front page of the Citizen Patriot Sunday.

The facility to be erected on the site will be devoted to engineering, research, and quality control for the company's line of exhaust control equipment and related automotive products.

In this era of tough competition at home and from manufacturers abroad, plus worry about automation, and so on, the importance of research and development (R. & D. in the common lexicon) often is overlooked.

Competition, as we have said, is rough. In every industrial nation on the face of the earth great emphasis is being placed on developing new products and new methods of turning them out.

Victory in the race for markets goes often to the firm which is able to keep ahead of its competitors in the laboratory. The products and production techniques which were good enough a year or two ago may not be good enough tomorrow.

Expert observers of the American industrial scene often insist that R. & D. is lagging here; that too many good minds are being put to work in such glamorous fields as the space race instead of keeping America ahead in the more commonplace business of building a better mousetrap.

In any event, R. & D. is one of the great jobmaking and prosperity-producing factors in industry.

And it is possible that Michigan, with its great wealth of know-how in actually producing goods for the consumer market, has not kept up in the R. & D. field.

That could be. Of course, it is not wise to downgrade the assembly line. It will be important, come automation or whatever, so long as the customers can raise money for the downpayment and get financing to purchase the gadgets of modern civilization.

But R. & D., in the long run, will make a lot of jobs, both directly and through providing the techniques to produce even more fabulous items.

Thus it is that every research facility located in Michigan—and, most especially in or near Jackson—has to be hailed as a great step forward for the economy of the State.

A Commemorative Stamp in Honor of Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to sponsor the proposal for a commemorative stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko on the 150th anniversary of his birth.

The recent episode produced by several inconsistent and uninformed editorials in a Washington newspaper served as a good occasion to reemphasize the historic meaning of this early freedom fighter for the freedom and independence of all the captive nations. A letter which I received from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is a professor at Georgetown University and also head of both the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the National Captive Nations Committee, and vice president of the Shevchenko Memorial Committee, points out the character of this episode.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include Dr. Dobriansky's letter in the RECORD:

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,
December 19, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DULSKI: Your leadership in stimulating and assembling evidence for the issuance of a Shevchenko commemorative stamp, and the provision for a Shevchenko Freedom Library section in our Library of Congress, has earned the esteem and gratitude of millions of Americans who have not forgotten the captive nations or our moral obligation as freemen to voice unceasingly their aspirations for freedom. You have our profoundest thanks and everlasting appreciation.

As St. Augustine once put it, evil can always be transformed into a greater good. The evil represented by the outrageous editorials in the Washington Post is a negative type of evidence which, however, has been put to good use. It has precipitated widespread interest in the freedom poet, Taras Shevchenko, and has provided a propitious occasion for further constructive and posi-

tive thinking about the man's immortal works and universal significance. Of course, the editorials written by the paper's editor, Mr. Wiggins, had to be differentiated from the articles written by others on the paper's staff. Yet the editorials do constitute a case of journalistic bigotry and intolerance which all Americans should carefully study. Sensing all this, the Washington Star performed a valuable public service by stating its position on the subject.

You and your colleagues know well the perversions committed by the Soviet Russians and their puppets. Their perversion of Shevchenko, whose greatness lies in his poetic teachings of universal freedom, still is little understood by a few in our country. It is hoped that the Shevchenko monument to world freedom will in time enlighten even these few.

With much gratitude and best wishes,

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

A Tribute to Former Congressman Donald W. Nicholson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, colleagues in the Congress will ask me, "How's Nick—my predecessor, the Honorable Donald W. Nicholson—doing?"

I am always pleased to report that he is in good health and continuing to play an active role in the public affairs of his hometown of Wareham, Mass. His service to his Nation and his congressional district are fondly recalled to mind by an editorial from the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of Monday, December 9. Under unanimous consent, I include it here in the RECORD in order that those of us who knew Mr. Nicholson may read and enjoy this tribute:

A NICHOLSON BRIDGE

From this corner, we utter a hearty second to the legislative proposal sponsored by State Representative Edwin H. Morse, Republican, of Wareham, to name Wareham's Narrows Bridge after a well-known fellow townsman.

A few years ago at a deserved testimonial, they said about the man who would be thusly honored, "You've reached the highest position of anyone coming out of our town." And, indeed, that is the record of former Congressman Donald W. "Honest Nick" Nicholson.

From streetcar conductor to the halls of Government in Washington, six times elected. In between a term in the house of representatives in Boston and 21 years as a State senator, many of them as senate president, highly respected. Small in stature, but, as Congressman JOE MARTIN once said, "I think of him as a great oak, or Plymouth Rock itself, his principles are so great and his convictions so strong."

Everybody knew where Nick stood when he went to the people—including "The 100," his name for those in Wareham who supported his opponents. A sturdy solid bridge serving the community he himself served so well and long—the name of Nicholson would become it.

Why Local Government Serves Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from Nation's Business entitled "Why Local Government Serves Best." It is an interview with Gov. John A. Love of Colorado.

There is no need for me, here, to belabor the dangers of centralism, nor the dire dangers that lurk in the weakening of local and State governments.

No Nation is greater than the sum of its parts. Central Government is not great in itself; weaken, through too much Federal wet-nursing, the responsibilities of local people where they live, work and have their being, and you have begun the decay that can tumble the whole structure of our greatness.

The proper functions of State and local governments must not be violated by an overweaning federation.

The article follows:

WHY LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVES BEST

In the United States we have a partnership arrangement between the National Government and the States. The Constitution so prescribed.

But an imbalance of power, with Washington assuming more authority, has split current political thinking on the future role of government at the local level.

One popular cliché is that States are not meeting public needs. Defenders of the advantages of divided government reply that States are meeting public needs with new efficiency and imagination.

Nation's Business interviewed one of the new State Governors who is an articulate spokesman for the viewpoint that the State has an ascending role in our system. He is Gov. John A. Love, of Colorado, who took office in January and cut State income taxes by 15 percent. Governor Love is a lawyer, a decorated former naval flyer and a Republican. He has been a member of several corporate boards.

Governor Love has appointed a special commission which is now surveying the needs and financial problems of local government in his State.

He is not alone in his concern over the future of government on the local level.

In Ohio, for example, Gov. James A. Rhodes has assigned a Little Hoover Commission made up of business executives to examine the whole State government with an eye to organizing functions in the most economical fashion.

Texas Gov. John B. Connally sees States as having the capability in the next decade to meet what he calls the dominant challenge of the space age—excellence in education.

Governor Connally has named a special committee to study education at all levels.

"Because States have had such tremendous experience and because different States have different needs depending on their environment, they are the best level of government to meet this function," he insists.

Georgia's Gov. Carl E. Sanders believes State government will gain in importance.

"In Georgia there are so many levels of local government," he explains, "that it would be impractical for each to deal directly with the Federal Government." But the State government can coordinate and dovetail its functions with its local governments. To meet some of tomorrow's growing problems, for example, Governor Sanders has established a new Department of Youth to deal with juvenile delinquency prevention and rehabilitation. He is setting up new vocational trade schools and providing State grants to local units for urban expenses.

A closer look at what State and local governments can do, and why, is presented in the following interview with Colorado's chief executive:

"Question. Governor, will State government play a declining or ascending role in the future?

"Answer. I think State government should have an increasingly important role. The charge is well founded that, at least over the past two decades, the States have, to a certain extent, failed to live up to their obligations and responsibilities. There has been a trend toward the Central Government taking over. Many things that are happening show a clear and present danger to our Federal form of government.

"I don't think the trend should be allowed to continue. When government becomes removed from the people it becomes subject to the danger of becoming more arbitrary and less responsive.

"In general, local government is the best. Obviously not all problems of government can be handled on a local basis. But certainly the trend toward more and more centralization represents a great danger to the kind of government which we have historically had, and which we will need in the future.

"Of course, one reason why some States have failed to live up to their responsibilities is that preemption of tax sources by the Federal Government leaves less and less money with which the States can meet their obligations.

"Question. Are State officials really any closer to the voters than are the representatives in Washington, what with today's travel and communications?

"Answer. Yes, I think so. It may be in some ways partly psychological. The citizen is far more likely to call on his city councilman, or his school board member, his county commissioner, or his Governor, and make his problems known than he is to attempt to deal with his U.S. Representative or Senators, and certainly more so than with any of the bureaus in Washington which seem far away and not subject to his control.

"Perhaps the Federal program that worked best, when you consider all things, was the draft program. And I think that the reason was the local draft board.

"Of course my view is necessarily conditioned by my experience in Colorado. I know that the volume of mail and telephone calls and requests for appearances is much our congressional delegation's offices.

"I have a program we call our Governor's forum. I travel the State, taking with me selected members of my cabinet, department heads, and conduct 2-day meetings in various parts of the State in which we seek participation and interest through questions, comments, suggestions, from the people in the area.

"Question. Should the States give local governments more power to consolidate, to tax, to incur indebtedness, so they could meet their problems better?

"Answer. There is a great deal of work that needs to be done in this field.

"Practically all States have a system of local government that was organized a great many years ago, and it has been added to and not organized efficiently. Further, in most areas, local government depends on the property tax, which is perhaps an outmoded form of taxation. In any event, it has been used to such an extent that reliable alternatives must be found.

"In our State we have begun a study in depth of the organization of local govern-

ment and its financing. We have a citizens committee of 100 people which includes members of the legislature, and appointees who represent other levels of government and other interests. We contemplate it is going to be at least a 2-year study program.

"We are going to start with the analysis of what services the various local government entities provide; how are they financed; who uses the services. And we hope to modernize our local governmental system, because it must be kept strong and efficient.

"In Colorado, and I am quite sure it is true in most States, we have a continuous proliferation of special purpose districts. We have the counties which were designed in the time when transportation was by horse rather than by modern means. We have whole new cities. We have school districts, of course. We have been successful there in stimulating a voluntary consolidation of school districts, and it seems to me to point the way toward perhaps solutions in other fields, further consolidation and further efficient organization.

"Question. What are the particular efficiencies and benefits of government on the State level as contrasted to Federal?

"Answer. Well, let's start with the functions that the States now are handling without question or quarrel. They handle the local court system. They also run institutions, the rehabilitation of those who are mentally ill or retarded, the penal and correctional institutions. And there's no thought that these functions should be removed, although there have been moves in the mental health field to provide additional Federal money.

"We also, of course, are in the business of education; primary and secondary education, and State-supported education beyond the high school. Again I don't believe there is any thought that these functions would better be served on a Federal level, with the possible exception, again, of those who wish to provide additional money by the Central Government taxing and returning money to the States. It seems to me that these functions are better handled on a State level and will continue to be better handled on a State level.

"Then there are welfare problems. Again the Federal Government has intruded itself into these fields. Now there is the issue of whether a Federal plan should be established for health care for the aged under social security.

"Just on the basis of pure mathematics and efficiency, it does not seem to be sensible that money be obtained by Federal Government taxation, taken to Washington, and then returned to the States. There is a loss involved in the process itself.

"And although the Federal Government does have an interest in the fact that all people, regardless of what State, have proper education, or that misery and suffering be alleviated, it doesn't seem sensible that if one State, through a lack of proper economic basis, or two States, or three States, need help from outside, we should then make the same pattern apply to all of the States in the Nation.

"It is like pulling all the teeth in both jaws in order to be sure to remove the one with a cavity.

"Question. Some people think that Federal grant-in-aid programs present a jungle of political and financial procedures. Do you think that this is so, from your experience in the Governor's office?

"Answer. Yes. We find it in so many areas. The highway program, of course, presents one form of government grant-in-aid and certain regulations; the U.S. Employment Service, unemployment compensation, welfare programs; all provide rather inflexible standards and procedures, none of which is the same. They needlessly complicate government in its present form.

"Question. Should there be a periodic review of the various grant-in-aid programs?

"Answer. Certainly I'd be in favor of that. But I think there should rather be a definite effort to return tax sources to the States along with the responsibilities.

"Inevitably, regardless of how efficient this review might be, or regardless of how efficiently you run governmental programs, if we in the United States continue to expand the area of government into more and more fields, the cost of government will increase.

"And there is a point—and just exactly what the point is I don't know—at which the government becomes so large that we change the basic governmental and sociological concept we have all adhered to.

"Question. What functions that are now part of the grant-in-aid program should be turned back to the States?

"Answer. The welfare field should be a State and local problem. They should let us have the tax sources, the tax revenues. But, although I'm in favor of turning back some functions, I think it's most important that we make our defense and not let this move toward centralization increase.

"The evident desire of the present central government to intrude itself into the field of education, into the field of medical care, is an example of the continuing trend toward centralization and movement to Washington.

"Question. What about the problem of retraining workers, for example? Is this something that can be done better on the State or Federal level?

"Answer. With the funds available, it certainly would be better done on the State level. We are more cognizant of the local needs, the desires. We are, of course, already heavily in education of all kinds, including vocational and retraining education. The States, I am sure, are in a better position to handle retraining than is some bureau far removed from the scene.

"Question. Governor, do you know of any Federal control that has come about as a result of Federal aid programs?

"Answer. The aid to needy and the aid to dependent children programs have provided sets of standards which run contrary to the legitimate desires of the local county officials who are administering the aid. And those who complain are met with the answer that they cannot handle it a different way because of the Federal standards.

I find that, in the outlying parts of the State of Colorado, local citizens or local officials often comment that welfare should be handled to a greater extent on the county level than on the State level. They make the valid point that they are in a better position to judge the possible abuses and the needs.

"Question. Would Federal aid be better administered and more efficient if it were a block grant rather than specific grants for specific purposes?

"Answer. If we were to buy the concept of the money being collected in the States and sent to Washington and then returned, if we have to go that far, then I would prefer to have the money returned to the States without strings attached.

"As a mater of fact there has been a suggestion that the Federal Government return a percentage of the income taxes collected in a State to that State for education purposes. Now this seems to me waste motion if we could divide the tax sources.

"In Colorado, for example, our general fund budget is roughly $135 million on a fiscal year basis. This isn't the entire amount of money we spend because there are many earmarked funds the highway department, the game and fish department, and so on. We spend in total about $350 to $400 million.

"On the other hand, the Federal income tax take out of Colorado last year was some $1.2 billion. Now the comparison there indicates that we would have relatively little difficulty in financing the expansion that we need in our education beyond the high school program as a result of our increased population and the number of young people seeking this kind of education. We would have very little problem financing it if we could have just a portion of these funds left in the State of Colorado.

"Obviously, there are Federal programs which require large sums of money—national defense, and so on; but certainly to increase the amount, or even to continue to take the present amount of money out of the State, and then talk about expanding programs from the Federal level doesn't make me very optimistic about the continuation of the Federal system.

"Question. Total State government spending has increased about fivefold since the war. Do we need a new kind of tax structure?

"Answer. What I think is worth accomplishing is the readjustment of tax sources from the Federal Government to the State, whether you do it by a credit against Federal taxes, whether you do it by rebate, whether you do it by reduction of Federal taxes for a consequent increase of State taxes. If we reduce the Federal tax we must, of course, consequently reduce the area of activity of the Federal Government.

"Question. Do you think State governments can meet metropolitan area problems better in the future?

"Answer. Yes, I do. Let me give you the example of Denver.

"We have a large and growing metropolitan problem in Denver. Denver is not only a city, but it's a county and it's a school district, and a congressional district, too.

"As a consequence, when Denver annexes adjoining territory it takes land away from the adjoining county and from the adjoining school district, and it makes for uncertainty in administrative planning. It has caused all sorts of problems, not the least of which has been a psychological sort of competition. It's a problem that we all realize has to be solved.

"Again, the citizens committee of 100 I spoke of has been working in this area for a great many years, recognizing the problem.

"If this problem is to be solved, and it must be, it will only be solved by the work on the local level which has a reasonable chance of securing the backing of the citizens. If you attempted to have a Washington bureau or board attempt to solve the problem, I think it would prove impossible. I would imagine that in line with their proposed solutions in other fields that Washington would simply come up with the recommendation that more money be added.

"Question. You don't think we need a Department of Urban Affairs, then, in Washington?

"Answer. No, I certainly don't.

"Question. Governor, what will be the impact of the Supreme Court decision allowing people to take reapportionment disputes to the Federal courts? Will States be more responsive to needs?

"Answer. Well, that decision, together with other movements across the Nation, has had its effect already in the stimulation of reapportionment of many State legislatures.

"Again using Colorado as an example, in the last general election there were two amendments to the State constitution proposed in connection with this problem, one of which would have required the reapportionment of the legislature solely on the basis of population, the other a 'Federal plan,' which provided that the lower house be apportioned strictly on the basis of population, and the senate, the upper house, be apportioned partly on population but also giving some recognition to the geography of the State.

"The Federal plan was approved by the people in the last general election. And it has been implemented by our legislature.

"This approach was opposed in the Federal courts, but a three-man bench of Federal judges dismissed the complaint and upheld the Federal plan. Whether this will be appealed to the Supreme Court, I don't know; but there are similar cases pending in the Supreme Court which will decide whether area, tradition, history, geography—factors other than population—properly have a place in the apportionment of legislatures.

"Question. What responsibilities do businessmen have to the State government? Should they become more deeply involved in State politics?

"Answer. As a general rule, they are not involved nearly enough. Perhaps it's part of a larger problem. For a great many years a great many people felt that the participation in politics was somehow immoral and that nice people, proper people, didn't do it; that you turned your back on it. This, of course, is nonsense. There are many movements which recognize that politics is the art of government, and that unless we properly run the type of government we have that we will lose it.

"I think this general attitude has been even worse, perhaps, in regard to State government, State politics. It has been a stepchild even to a greater extent than government at other levels.

"The State government needs, not only from businessmen, but from all citizens, their interest and their participation.

"Question. Would you say that State government can have a rebirth, a new role, it has not had in recent years?

"Answer. Yes, I think it can. It's going to require not only the interest and participation that I speak about on the State level. Certainly each State must put itself in order. But it also is going to take the kind of successful interest and participation which will change the general thinking in the Central, the Federal Government.

"If we can work right in the precinct, the county, and the State, and certainly in the national elections, we can reverse the trend toward centralization, or at least halt it. I am firmly convinced that this is one of the most important things that we can do to protect the kind of society and government in which we have prospered and progressed."

Speech by James B. Utt, Orange County City Hall Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a dedicatory speech which I gave on December 9, 1963, at the new city hall in Orange, Calif.:

SPEECH BY JAMES B. UTT, OF CALIFORNIA, ORANGE CITY HALL DEDICATION, DECEMBER 9, 1963

Chairman Ronald Fairbarn, Mayor Reynolds, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans, it is a privilege and an honor to share and to have a part in this happy occasion It is fitting to pay tribute to those who planned and built this new city hall. We admire the building, its architecture and its arrangement, but few if any of us will take the time to examine the foundation upon which this building rests.

You see a beautiful tree, you admire its symmetry, its foliage and its vivid color, and we seldom stop to consider that this tree is nourished by a system of roots far more intricate and extensive than is the tree itself. We would reject the thought of anyone cutting away its branches or its foliage, or in any way damaging what we see. We should remember, however, that it is just as destructive to tamper with the roots, or fail to nourish and to water the roots, but the tree itself would perish if this were not done.

Every city, every State, every nation, and every civilization rests upon a foundation. We here are enjoying the fruits of those who planted the tree and nourished it and made it to bring forth and bud. I beg your indulgence for a few moments to look backward, not as a sentimental journey, but rather an excursion into the past to examine the roots and the foundation of this city. Let us be mindful of the blood, sweat, tears, and prayers that went into winning the West and acknowledge the great contributions made by thousands who came before us.

I hope you will pardon an occasional personal reference, made only because my father and my grandfather and I were a tiny thread in the historical fabric of this city. We hear names which mean little to the present generation, but they were giants in the history of this county.

To the east we see Mount Pleasants, and to my mind it brings back the story of Joe Pleasants, who, when a infant, crossed the Great Plains and over the great Sierra Nevadas in a covered wagon in 1849, moving thence from the mining claims of northern California and settling at the foot of what is now called Mount Pleasants. The adjacent mountain is called Modjeska Peak, that also is but a name to the present generation, but I remember the great Polish actress Mme. Helena Modjeska, who lived for years in the community where I was born. She also established the Forest of Arden below the peak which now bears her name. There are dozens of other such monuments named after those sturdy pioneers.

The history of this community and of this country and of this State are one and inseparable. The culture, the law, and religion came to California from Spain. These were firmly established here in California when Father Serra built his first mission in 1769 at San Diego. Our culture was far advanced over anything known on the East Coast. When George Washington spent that cold and bitter winter at Valley Forge in 1775, Father Serra had just completed the beautiful mission at San Juan Capistrano. No architecture in America equaled the architecture found in those early missions at San Gabriel and Santa Barbara. The nomenclature of this State is derived from Spain and still remains in the majority. Such euphonious names as La Jolla, San Luis Rey, Santa Margarita, San Gabriel, and Nuestra Senora La Reina de Los Angeles de la Porceuncala, commonly referred to as L.A., and so on up the coast to Santa Maria, San Francisco, and other cities.

Our interest today is in the city of Orange and so we turn to the year 1810 when this was still a part of Mexico and that government granted to Antonia Yorba and Juan Pablo Peralta a large tract of land, including the area where we stand today. The first water was taken from the Santa Ana River in 1825 to irrigate a few hundred acres along the river. This is an important date to remember, because in that year, water from the Santa Ana River was first put to prior beneficial use and played a most important part in the water rights of Orange County in later court cases, which were determined under the civil law of Mexico, adopted by this State.

After the Mexican War, a Federal Land Commission determined the validity of the titles to these Spanish and Mexican grants, and the Yorba-Peralta grant was held to be valid. Between the years of 1810 and 1865, some of the land had descended to heirs, sold and traded and exchanged for debt and finally, in 1865, under a court decree, the land was partitioned and title vested separately in these new owners. Some of it was given to A. B. Chapman for legal fees and a great portion went to Abel Stearns. Chapman and Glassell formed a partnership, subdivided the land and sold much of it off to other investors. They started a ditch from the Santa Ana River to Orange in 1870, which was completed a year later. In 1873, this ditch was sold to the Semitropic Water Co., which extended its lines farther south. At that time, this community was known as Richland and a map of what is now Orange was filed at the then county seat in Los Angeles in 1871 and consisted of 40 acres. The present plaza was reserved for a park at that time. There was already a post office in California called Richland and it became necessary to change the name of this community. At that time there were orchards of oranges, lemons, olives, and almonds and, of course, a great many grape vineyards. It was difficult to settle on a proper and significant name and a poker game was played; the winner of that game was to choose the name. Prophetically, the winner was the man who wanted the name of Orange. This was in 1875.

In 1874, my father passed through here, overshot the community and landed in a mustard patch in Tustin City, which was located between Gospel Swamp and Tomato Springs. At this time the area was covered with sagebrush, wild game, snakes, lizards, and wild horses. It may amaze you to know that in 1 year, 3,000 wild horses were driven from this county to Chicago to haul the horse-drawn streetcars. In 1 year, the Travis and the Parker boys shipped 19,000 quail to the market in San Francisco and Sacramento. There were still a few condors soaring over the Santiago Canyon and there were still a number of grizzly bears. I remember very well when Ed Atkinson and Andrew Joplin trapped the last grizzly bear in Orange County. This ended a rather heathen and brutal form of entertainment, which used to be held at Irvine, between a grizzly bear and a bull and civilization is none the worse off in this demise.

Probably the greatest contribution to the development of the great Southwest was made by the Santa Ana Valley Irrigation Co., which was formed in 1877, after acquiring all of the water rights south and east of the river, with the exception of one holdout. This system extended over 17,000 acres. The company was organized by three men, none of whom was a lawyer nor an engineer and yet it became the model system for practically every irrigation district in the Southwest. They made the water pertinent to the land, so that no one could get more than his equitable share. The river water was divided between the SAVI and the Anaheim Union Water Co., which was on the north and west sides of the river. The Anaheim Union brought suit against the SAVI to acquire an additional amount of water from the river and one of the longest water suits in the State took place. This suit, which gave an equal amount of water to the SAVI, and the Anaheim Union, was based on riparian rights, and as the Yorbas had put water to prior beneficial use in 1825, the SAVI was able to protect these valuable water rights.

The first well in Orange was dug by J. D. Parker in 1876.

I was not born to the affluent life, but rather I enjoyed the pleasures of poverty and worked in the fields for my father for 25 cents a day. My first outside job, when I was 12 years old, was to be employed by V. L. Steward, a civil engineer for the SAVI.

I was to be paid $2 per day. I had arrived. I was rich. Our work was to measure the water of the Santa Ana River at the dividing point between Anaheim and the SAVI, and to see that each received its equal share. We made water measurements further up the river at Prado. Even in those days, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties were encroaching on our water rights as they are today. The fame of the SAVI system spread rapidly, and around the turn of the century, President Theodore Roosevelt asked the Governor of California to send Henri Gardner, who was one of the originators of this system, to attend a reclamation conference, out of which developed the Roosevelt Dam and the great irrigation system for the Salt River Valley around Phoenix, Ariz., which was patterned after the SAVI system.

Of course, Orange had its share of Chinese laundries. It also had its bandits and its horsethieves and the vigilants, who were formed to put an end to this thievery. The culprit generally confessed before the noose was drawn by the vigilantes and then he had a fair trial and was hung.

Dr. Hayward was the first doctor in Orange, and Dr. Medlock, whom many of you remember, came in 1876. Dr. McCoy was the first dentist.

In 1872, the first public building was built in Orange. Fittingly it was a schoolhouse, but had no teacher. Mr. Stephen McPherson was a schoolteacher who lived in Westminster and he rode horseback each day from Westminster to Orange, in order to teach in this first school. In 1873, Orange had its first post office and Dr. George Beach was the first postmaster. Land was selling at $12 an acre, although not many years before, the going price was 12 cents per acre. In 1875, the Plaza Hotel was built and 2 years later Wells Fargo came to town.

There was a group of New Yorkers who came to Orange in 1887 and built the Rochester Hotel, and named the street Palmyra. The Southern Pacific passed through West Orange in 1876, and in 1887 the Santa Fe came through Orange on its way to San Diego. Then followed the land boom as the Santa Fe would bring passengers out from the Midwest for $1 per person. That was when the great Hotel Del Coronado was built and we even had a four-story wooden hotel in Tustin. The land boom broke in 1888 and most everyone went broke with it. In 1874, the Presbyterian Church was founded and also the Methodist Church, and they both met in the schoolhouse. That was before the Supreme Court frowned upon such things. The Methodists built a church and invited the Presbyterians to use it, but the Methodist bishop decided that the Presbyterians might corrupt the Methodists and put an end to this falderal. So, the Presbyterians went back to the schoolhouse. A Santa Ana wind blew the Methodist Church off its foundation, which was probably nothing more than a mud sill, and they had a hard time getting enough money to build a new foundation. There was an atheist in town who was probably more God-fearing than many others and he offered to haul the gravel for free.

When the Presbyterians built a church they didn't have enough money to buy a bell and so this same atheist said, "Hell, I'll buy you a bell," but he didn't have any money. So, on Sunday morning he visited all the poker games in town and took up a collection and bought them a beautiful bell. The Lutheran Church was built in 1882, and Reverend Krogler was its first minister. The first newspaper was founded in 1884 and was called the Orange Tribune. Its publisher was William Ward. The Santa Ana-Orange-Tustin Railroad was built about that time and extended out as far as El Modeno. Of course, it was horse-drawn and I remember when they finally pulled up the tracks in Tustin. The Bank of Orange was founded in 1886 as a State bank and later became a national bank. In 1888, the city of Orange incoporated and held its first council meeting on April 16, 1888. The Trustees were William Blasdale, O. P. Chubb, C. Z. Culver, Henri F. Gardner, P. J. Shaffer. The first ordinance that was passed was known as the Pasadena Ordinance. No liquor. So, that ended the saloons in Orange until after prohibition.

Time does not permit me to give you the names of all of the sturdy pioneers to whom we owe so much. I will borrow the words of Lincoln when he said, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here but it can never forget what they did here." To the memory of those pioneers, their wives, and children, I would like to dedicate this city hall. They had courage, faith, determination, and patience. They had an unfaltering belief in the omnipotence of God and that His Divine Providence would lead them to their destiny. I would like to close with the words of Tennyson, as spoken by King Arthur to the Knights of the Round Table while he was on his deathbed:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfills himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
Comfort thyself: What comfort is in me?
I have lived my life, and that which I have done
May He within himself make pure! but thou,
If thou shouldst never see my face again,
Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

Call to the State's Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the October 5, 1963, issue of the Wilkes-Barre Record reveals the great efforts of all Pennsylvanians under the leadership of Gov. William W. Scranton to return Pennsylvania to its rightful place in the economic sun of the Nation:

CALL TO THE STATE'S COLORS

"Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country." The words are President Kennedy's, but their meaning has been adopted by Governor Scranton who has asked all Pennsylvanians to become unofficial ambassadors of the Commonwealth to help carry Pennsylvania's industrial message across the country.

The occasion was the formal kickoff dinner to recruit 100,000 Pennsylvanians for the promotion of economic growth. Formation of the committee was one of the planks in the Governor's campaign platform.

It shouldn't be difficult to find 100,000 individuals willing to shoulder the task, out of a population of 13 million. In fact, every Pennsylvanian should flock to the State's standard in this cause, for, to paraphase another national figure, "What's good for Pennsylvania is good for Pennsylvanians."

Regrettably, too many of us have a tendency toward self-interest as opposed to the broader interest of the Commonwealth. We gripe about taxation, yet demand more State services. We complain about quality of government, yet refuse to run for office, or even to vote. On the whole, we tend to let George do it, and then are critical when George does a mediocre job.

If Pennsylvania is to hope for a brighter future and a return to its rightful place among the States, which it is justified in anticipating on the basis of population and natural endowments, there must be a reversal of the point of view which downgrades, belittles, and deemphasizes the efforts of our civic and political leaders.

More important, there must be change in attitude on the part of Pennsylvanians—a change toward greater willingness to participate in public affairs and bear a greater share of the responsibility for making Pennsylvania what it has every right and resource to become in terms of industrial leadership and prosperity.

Welcome, the New Carpet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of December 16, 1963:

WELCOME, THE NEW CARPET

Well, thank goodness, we are getting rid of that beat-up old carpet in the front office. The Governor's office we mean.

Ever since the well-known State cash crisis of 1959, the floor covering in the Governor's office has been a barometer of the State's fiscal condition.

G. Mennen Williams, who had a light, clever touch with public relations, put the rug in the limelight during that dreary period when the State was running overdrafts at the bank and hoping that the wolf at the door was not too hungry.

It was the sort of thing that Williams does so well. It reflected his folksy touch that kept him coming back to the statehouse with voter approval, until he had racked up a recordbreaking six times in office.

Now that the State, due to a solid upswing in business and new tax measures passed a year or so ago, is back in the black, someone up there has decided the old, worn rug should be replaced. And why not? After all, the people of the State of Michigan who visit their Governor's office don't expect to be tripping over a carpet with holes in it.

What really is interesting is the reported attitude of the Governor and his staff toward this refurbishing job. Richard Pyle of the Lansing bureau of the Associated Press writes that the Governor's staff has been treating the replacement of the carpet like a military secret.

Someone has been badly advised. The personal touch Soapy brought to the front office seems to be lacking.

We suspect that if G. Mennen Williams still was drawing his paychecks from the State of Michigan, and Paul Weber still was handling his press relations, the installation of the new rug would be heralded by a flare of bugles and a ruffle of drums.

Between them, Paul and Soapy would have made the buying of the new rug a great and significant incident reflecting the economic recovery of the State and the healthy condition of the treasury.

They might even have had a dedication, or a launching, with someone breaking a bottle of milk over the Governor's desk. When it came to getting into the public eye, this fellow Williams was a genius—still is.

We don't mean to be critical of the Governor and his press secretary. If the choice is between flamboyancy and a businesslike attitude in government, we'll take the latter. It's just a commentary on this strange and fabulous business of politics.

Be that as it may, we are very glad to know that the old, worn carpet is being replaced.

It's a symbol. It very well may mean that things really are looking up for Michigan.

Who can knock that?

Water Pollution: A National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which has appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) American. It is more evidence that the national problem of water pollution is receiving attention and concern in all parts of the country. I confirm this newspaper's remarks about the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, and his work toward abatement of pollution of our waterways:

WATER POLLUTION: A NATIONAL PROBLEM

"The water crisis of the country is not the shortage of water, but the shortage of usable, clean water."

The words are those of Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, and they were spoken at a convention of the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators in Chicago the other day.

We think Representative MONAGAN has put his finger on the problem. The incontrovertible fact is that virtually all of this Nation's major lakes, rivers and streams are being increasingly polluted. Largely this is the result of untreated wastes being dumped into rivers and streams in many parts of the country—including oils, garbage, chemicals, acid drainage from mines and many new chemicals, such as synthetic fibers, detergents, pesticides and even radioactive wastes.

Inevitably this sort of thing must jeopardize our water supplies, menace our public health and destroy aquatic life.

Representative MONAGAN is the author of a bill (H.R. 9007) now before the House Public Works Committee. It is a companion measure to a Senate bill introduced by Senator MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, and already passed by the Senate.

We believe this measure deserves public support and prompt congressional action. We in the Naugatuck Valley have good reason to be sensitive about the problem, considering what has happened to our own once-lovely Naugatuck River. Multiply what has happened here many, many times over, and perhaps we can have some understanding of how vast a problem is this matter of water pollution all across the Nation. The Monagan bill should be passed.

Darling Foundation Outlines 18 Months of Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following:

DARLING FOUNDATION OUTLINES 18 MONTHS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

DES MOINES, IOWA.—Since its inception in the spring of 1962 the J. N. "Ding" Darling Foundation has achieved remarkable progress, according to Sherry R. Fisher, chairman of its executive committee.

Five fields of activity were covered in Fisher's report to the foundation's board of trustees—friends and associates of the late cartoonist and conservationist.

Fisher outlined efforts of the foundation as follows:

1. Establishment in November 1962 of the 1,700-acre J. N. "Ding" Darling Wildlife and Waterfowl Sanctuary on Sanibel Island off the west coast of Florida after negotiations with Federal and Florida State officials. It had long been Mr. Darling's desire to preserve this virgin marsh and mangrove area for the future. It is now being operated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. The magnificent dream to memorialize and preserve the historic 2,000-mile route of the famous Lewis and Clark Expedition (1803–06) was conceived by Mr. Darling shortly before his death. Foundation representatives presented the idea to the Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and Members of Congress in the spring of 1962. It has since been endorsed by representatives of the 10-State area traversed by Lewis and Clark. Congress has adopted a concurrent resolution to identify and mark the trail and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is now forming a plan of development.

3. Mr. Darling often decried the fact that few of the Nation's conservationists could effectively explain their programs in nonscientific language to the public. With this in mind, the Darling Foundation has initiated three education grants of $750 each to outstanding undergraduate wildlife management students at Iowa State University at Ames, Iowa. An additional $300 annual scholarship will be awarded in the fall of 1964 to the outstanding freshman enrolling in wildlife management at Iowa State University. These students will incorporate in their curriculum, journalism, speech, and other communication arts.

4. The Darling Foundation is working toward the creation of a central library of research and informational data in the fields of conservation, wildlife management, and recreation. This would provide quick reference for research data to Federal and State conservation agencies, eliminating much repetitions and expensive research. It is important to establish the center as soon as possible to help blueprint the expanding outdoor recreation programs.

5. The foundation has supplied news material, arranged for conservation meetings, supplied speakers, and otherwise advanced the principles of natural resource conservation which Mr. Darling advocated during his lifetime.

Fisher stressed that the foregoing has been achieved with the contributed time and talents of foundation trustees. He said he hoped for an improvement in the foundation's financial resources in order to set up an organization headed by a competent staff to further implement and expand the plans of the Darling Foundation.

TRUSTEES OF THE J. N. "DING" DARLING FOUNDATION, INC., DES MOINES, IOWA

Horace Albright, 427 Landfair Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

David G. Ainsworth, KSRA Radio Station, Salmon, Idaho.

Harold Bixby, Captiva Island, Fla.—"Topside" Bolton Landing, N.Y.

Doug Blankenship, Boulder Park, Tulsa, Okla.

Carl W. Buchheister, 1239 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Milton Caniff, Torridge, 537 South Mountain Road, New City, Rockland County, N.Y.

Arthur H. Carhart, 2591 Eudora Street, Denver, Colo.

Vernon L. Clark, Windover Road, Des Moines, Iowa (president).

Robert Colflesh, 5016 Harwood Drive, Des Moines, Iowa (vice president).

Clarence Cottam, Post Office Box 1396, Sinton, Tex.

John Cowles, 2318 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

Gardner Cowles, Look, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Marshall N. Dana, Portland Public Docks, 3070 NW. Front Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

Charles K. Davis, Winton Park, Fairfield, Conn.

Edward B. Dodd, Lost Forrest, Sandy Springs, Ga.

M. Hartley Dodge, Giralda Farms, Madison, N.J.

Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gettysburg, Pa.

Sherry Fisher, 303 Fleming Building, Des Moines, Iowa (vice president).

Ira N. Gabrielson, Wildlife Management Institute, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.

Robert Goodwin, 415 Foster Drive, Des Moines, Iowa.

Seth Gordon, 1390 Seventh Avenue, Sacramento, Calif.

C. R. Gutermuth, 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

John M. Henry, 3901 SW. 31st Street, Des Moines, Iowa (secretary).

Thomas L. Kimball, National Wildlife Federation, 1412 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Fletcher Knebel, Cowles Publications, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

Richard Koss, 2310 Terrace Road, Des Moines, Iowa (vice president).

Mrs. Herbert Lewis, 657 Fairmount Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

L. B. Maytag, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Max McGraw, 1200 Charles Road, Elgin, Ill.

William O'Brien, W-2462 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

Reno Odlin, Puget Sound National Bank, Tacoma, Wash.

Joe W. Penfold, 322 Bond Building, Washington, D.C.

Maynard Reece, 5315 Robertson Drive, Des Moines, Iowa.

William Riaski, 1326 Waukegon Road, Glenview, Ill.

Noel Robinson, 706 45th Place, Des Moines, Iowa (treasurer).

John E. Rovensky, Claredon Court, Bellevue Avenue, Newport, R.I.

Arthur Sanford, 560 Orpheum Electric Building, Sioux City, Iowa.

Fred Seaton, Tribune Building, Hastings, Nebr.

Carl D. Shoemaker, 501 Henkel Circle, Winter Park, Fla.

Mrs. Albert Spalding, Aston-Magna, Great Barrington, Conn.

M. O. Steen, Game Forestation & Parks Commission, State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebr.

John Storer, 440 Henkel Circle, Winter Park, Fla.

Hon. Harry S. Truman, Independence, Mo.

Ries Tuttle, 1130 19th Street, West Des Moines, Iowa (executive committee).

James W. Wallace, 2817 Southwest 14th Street, Des Moines, Iowa.

Allen Whitfield, 752 52d Street, Des Moines, Iowa (counsel).

A Look Back: President Kennedy and the Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the NPC Record:

A LOOK BACK: PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE PRESS CLUB

(NOTE.—The tragic news from Dallas, November 22, caused particular sorrow at the National Press Club, many of whose members had reported the activities of President John F. Kennedy and some of whom were with the presidential party that fateful day. The following was written by NPC Historian John Cosgrove (Broadcasting Publications) who recalls the club's association with the late President on a happier occasion almost 2 years ago.)

As I walked through the East Room of the White House that Saturday evening to pay my last respects to the assassinated President, thoughts of another memorable Saturday night passed through my mind.

It was the night of January 28, 1961, just 1 week after his spectacular inauguration as the Nation's 35th President, that John F. Kennedy paid personal tribute to the National Press Club. He stopped by to wish me well on my inauguration as the club's 53d president, and to pick up his membership card. Earlier that evening, News Secretary Pierre Salinger brought over the President's $90 check, the initiation fee for a nonactive member.

Mr. Kennedy's surprise visit electrified the East Lounge. We were having dinner when he arrived. It came about like this:

Pierre Salinger told me in response to earlier discussions about 4:30 that afternoon that the President would stop by but to keep the secret to ourselves. I was bursting, but later told my wife, who then understood my long absence from the receiving line while secret service agents, Pierre and I made a hurry-up inspection tour of the club.

We had a prearranged signal—a long ring on the East Lounge phone when the President left the White House. That meant that Pierre and I would have time to leave the East Lounge and arrive at the F Street entrance to greet Mr. Kennedy.

Unfortunately, the Presidential limousine made better time than anticipated, and when we reached the street lobby, the President was there, alone, pacing in front of the elevators. Smilingly, he inquired, "Where have you been?"

Enroute to the East Lounge via the 13th floor corridor, he graciously stopped for a handshake or to exchange pleasantries with well-wishers.

As I presented him with nonactive card No. 2973, the President praised the club for sticking to its principles and rules, for having "the decency to charge me initiation fee and dues." Many other memberships have come his way since the November elections, he noted, often with no mention whatever of any costs.

Mr. Kennedy said that he was happy to become a member, that he had originally started in journalism, but gave it up for politics because he felt accomplishments could be more readily realized in politics. Also, he hoped that in the final analysis that he would have lent some dignity to both professions.

The President's appearance in the East Lounge was brief, but he did manage to greet head table guests which included Speaker Sam Rayburn and Chief Justice Earl Warren. He had to leave before the swearing-in ceremonies, and in departing looked at me directly and said: "I'm sorry that I can't stay longer, be sure to keep your hand on the Bible." There had been considerable discussion as to whether he had his hand on the Bible when the Chief Justice swore him in just 8 days previously.

The event marked the first participation of a U.S. President in a club inaugural, and added another link to the unbroken chain of Presidents who have belonged to the National Press Club. The line extends back through Woodrow Wilson. William Howard Taft became a member after he left the Presidency.

Membership possibilities were originally discussed with Pierre Salinger the day after John F. Kennedy, Jr., was born, and Pierre told me he felt that the President-elect would be happy to be proposed for nonactive membership.

I had the forms prepared, and Mr. Kennedy was proposed by Sol Taishoff, Broadcasting Publications; seconded by Ted Koop, CBS News; sponsored by Bill Lawrence, ABC News, then with the New York Times.

The Board of Governors approved the election on January 23, and the bulletin board informed the membreship with this announcement:

"John F. Kenndy, a former newspaperman, now in politics, approved for nonactive membership."

A few days after the NPC inauguration I received a letter from the President which said in part:

"I was delighted to be able to stop briefly to accept my membership and to see my colleagues of the press under less menacing circumstances than usual. For better or worse we are likely to have a close association for some time to come, and I am most happy to be a member of the Press Club."

The feeling was mutual, Mr. President.

Excessive Imports Threaten Cattle Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to appear before the Trade Information Committee and the U.S. Tariff Commission in behalf of the beef cattle industry of our country, and quite specifically, in behalf of that portion of the industry located in New Mexico.

I believe that because of the seriousness of the situation, much of what I stated in my testimony on those occasions should be repeated and brought to the attention of the Congress.

I recall that over a year ago, in the fall of 1962, I had the opportunity to extend my greetings to the assembled members of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association. At that time, I offered my congratulations to the livestock producers of New Mexico and of the Nation for the outstanding contribution that they were making, not only to total farm productivity, but to the overall productivity of the United States.

At the same time, I offered them well deserved congratulations for their determination and consistent effort to solve their own problems and thereby improve conditions within their own industry. Today, I believe that New Mexico's livestock producers remain every bit as deserving of that praise as they were a year ago. However, we must look to next year.

The beef cattle industry has been and is faced with a critical situation and their problem, in turn, translates into an economic dilemma for the State of New Mexico. All New Mexicans are well aware that the cattle industry is of substantial importance to our State economy. For example, beef cattle sales are responsible for about 50 percent of our total agricultural cash receipts. Those receipts amount to about $114 million per annum. Such receipts account for the fact that agriculture ranks second, in terms of dollar sales, among our basic State industries. First, mineral resources; third, manufacturing.

It is, naturally, of major concern to us when so large a market becomes economically depressed. Obviously, sharp price drops of $3 to $4 per hundredweight—alive—is clear indication that there is something basically amiss. Figured in prices of 1960, when 553,145,000 pounds of cattle alive were marketed in New Mexico, a loss of $4 per hundredweight equals an overall loss to the State of $22,125,800. So, during a price slump, the livestock producer suffers a direct loss, the business community and, indeed, the entire State suffer indirect but quite substantial revenue losses.

It is my carefully considered conclusion, based on the record, that the primary cause for our depressed market is the rise in imports as a percentage of our domestic production of beef, veal, beef cattle, and calves, which in 1962 was 10.6 percent as compared with 3.9 percent in 1957. That is an increase of almost 7 percent in only 5 years. Relating imports to consumption, we find similarly that they currently represent almost 11 percent of our total consumption; this is compared with less than 4 percent in 1960—here an increase in excess of 7 percent in less than 3 years. In 1962 the volume of imported processing beef equaled 40 percent of our domestic production of a similar quality

beef. Inasmuch as 40 percent of the consumable meat of a choice beef may be and often is ground for hamburger, our cattle industry is at a severe disadvantage in competing with the far lower quality imported processing beef. Both of these meats are known as hamburger and consumers in purchasing either make no distinction between the two or retailers do not properly advise them of the various grades of meat.

In other words, many incorrectly assume that one grade of hamburger is as good as another.

Certainly, I do not advocate excluding all beef imports; but I do unequivocally oppose a further dropping of tariff rates or quotas. When imports for the first 8 months of 1963 equal 122 percent of those of the same period of last year, when in 1962 choice slaughter steers at Chicago average $27.67 per hundredweight and fall in May of 1963 to $22.61 and when in November 1962 choice steers at Chicago sell for $30.13 per hundredweight, but by May of 1963 have fallen to $22.61 per hundredweight, there is then no logical reason to further promote foreign imports. Great alarm has set in; rectifying action is long overdue.

The fault for this situation does not rest with the American cattleman, either singularly or collectively; our livestock producers are not inefficient. The fact is that farm income has remained relatively stable since the 1940's, while simultaneously farm production expenses have increased about four times as rapidly as income. Considerably lower production expenses are one reason that Australia, New Zealand, and Argentina are able to export to the United States about 80 percent of the beef which we import annually. Moreover, relative to other Western nations, a far smaller proportion of American agricultural output enjoys the benefits of nontariff import controls. For instance, France accrues benefits of 74 percent; West Germany, 93 percent; Italy, 63 percent; Australia, 41 percent; New Zealand, 100 percent; and the United Kingdom comes closest to our humble level with 37 percent, outdoing us by 11 percent.

So, while our Nation's import and quota controls have been sharply falling, those of other nations have risen or remained stationary. As we speak of becoming more efficient and interdependent under the Trade Expansion Act for world commerce, we swiftly realize that in the area of beef trade the United States is taking all the action and seems to be furthering every other nation's beef stability but our own. In international trade, as it relates to cattle, we owe no further concessions, but rather are justly due preferred treatment to compensate for the extensive losses already incurred at the cattle market.

Our agricultural production has set an example for the world. Each year, this Nation produces a massive farm surplus. Due in great part to our agricultural prowess, we have the highest health and living standard in the world. To endanger our high standards in the name of responsible livestock efficiency is the height of inefficiency. To what efficient revenue producing use could we put all our vacant grazing lands should we henceforth abolish cattle raising; where would we employ all the livestockmen put out of work? Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz said recently that we lost approximately $40 billion in gross national product last year through unemployment. Can we afford more efficiency similar to the loss of $40 billion? Of course, we cannot.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the unfair treatment which cattlemen have been receiving in the area of foreign trade.

Now we have an opportunity to right the wrong. We have an opportunity and an obligation to afford our livestock producers with proper protection from foreign imports and cutrate prices.

I strongly urge that the virtually unlimited importation of beef be halted. It is truly vital that the present tariff and quota rates be raised to afford proper income protection to the world's best cattle producer, the American cattleman.

Thank you.

Central High's Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me this fall to participate in ceremonies paying tribute to the 22d annual winner of the National Bellamy Flag Award, Central High School, in my home town of Chattanooga, Tenn. The purpose of this splendid award, presented yearly to one high school in the country, is to give recognition to the author of the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag, Francis Bellamy, perpetuate his memory, and encourage the teaching of patriotism and good citizenship in the schools of our Nation.

We are proud of Central, a school already distinguished in many fields. We know this new honor is fully justified by the many remarkable accomplishments over a period of years by the students, faculty, and alumni. This tribute also reflects credit on the whole community, for public schools depend upon public support and encouragement.

The chief executive of Tennessee, Gov. Frank Clement, delivered a truly fine address on the occasion of the Bellamy presentation in which he recalled some of the personal hardships our forefathers faced in winning American freedom. It was an inspiration to all, and I include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF GOV. FRANK CLEMENT AT THE 1963 NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD PRESENTATION, CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., OCTOBER 11, 1963

Mr. Millsaps, Miss Miller, Mr. Dyer, students and faculty of Chattanooga Central High School, distinguished guests, I am not going to try to impress anybody this morning with "who I am," but I'm going to try awfully hard in the few short minutes I have to impress you fortunate young Americans with what you are.

I want very badly to make this award you are here to celebrate "come alive" for you.

You know, your generation has the reputation of being pretty slow to get excited.

I've found out that the old "flag waving" and oratory just doesn't work on the boys and girls of today.

Maybe it's television.

Maybe it's that you're just better educated.

But, somehow, your generation has a way of looking right past all the propaganda and the sentimentality—right into the heart of things.

This seems to begin fairly early in life now.

So, without waving any flags, or getting sentimental, I want in just a few minutes to try to make you see this occasion, and the terrible urgency that is behind it, as I see it.

And, maybe the best way to do it is by telling you what it all cost. Back in the beginning, I mean.

You know, some of America's critics abroad, and a few here at home, say that modern-day America is a nation that knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing.

And, unfair as it is, that statement is at least partly true.

If there is a girl in the audience who doesn't know the price of a new pair of "wee-juns" I would be surprised. Or a boy who doesn't know what it costs to buy a hamburger and a coke at the Krystal.

No, we know the cost of nearly everything that comes into our daily lives.

But what I want to ask you this morning is: "Do you know what this flag to which Francis Bellamy wrote this eloquent pledge cost?"

Do you really know, in personal, individual terms, what some people paid less than 200 years ago so that we can stand up here and, without fear of compromise, "Pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States."

No, I'm not going into the wars or the police actions or anything like that. You don't need me to tell you what those silent slabs of stone mean at Chickamauga and Lookout Mountain.

What I'd like to spend jut a moment doing this morning is reviewing an informal history lesson. I just want to pick out one thread from the broad tapestry of this Nation's illustrious history and let you see it.

Let's call it "Fifty-six Brave Men."

There were 56 American colonists meeting in a hall in Philadelphia in the year 1776. Twenty-four of them were lawyers and judges. Eleven were merchants. All the rest were farmers, teachers and preachers.

Even as they filed into the meeting hall that July morning, an anonymous note was found on the speaker's table. It read: "Take care, a plot is framed for your destruction and all of you shall be destroyed."

It meant just exactly what it said. And, when the final vote was taken in Independence Hall a few minutes later, every man who signed the Declaration took his life in his hands.

If Washington's ragged, outnumbered army could not repulse the British, it was a death warrant they signed, for every last one of them would without a moment's hesitation be tried for treason and hanged.

Even if Washington won, it could mean burned homes, lost wives and children, and wrecked lives.

Have you ever wondered what happened to those 56 men whose names we look at so impersonally today in our history books? What happened to the men who signed the Declaration of Independence, pledging their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor that this Nation, under God, would not perish from the earth?

Five of them were captured and tortured to death by the British. Nine fought and

died from wounds and the hardships of war. Twelve had their homes pillaged and burned. Two lost their sons in battle. Another had two sons captured. John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she lay dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His mill and fields were laid to waste, and for more than a year he lived in forests and caves. He returned home to find his wife dead and his children vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and heartbreak.

Norris and Livingstone suffered similar fates.

Carter Braxton, a wealthy Virginia planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the sea by the British navy. He sold his home and property to pay his debts and died destitute.

Vandals and British soldiers looted the properties of Ellery Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., urged General Washington to open fire on his own lovely home, which had been taken over as headquarters by General Cornwallis. The home was destroyed, and Nelson died in abject poverty.

An interesting sidelight is that Washington spent just one night out of the whole 2 years of the war in his beautiful home at Mount Vernon.

Francis Lewis' home was destroyed and his wife jailed. She died a few months later. On and on the list goes.

Here were 56 American men who had soberly, realistically looked at the facts before signing their names to a document that gave us the way of life the whole world envies today. They knew the odds. The dangers. The hardships. They had asked themselves: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

And they had arrived at their own answer. You are being asked the same question today. How will you answer it?

That is what I want you to think as you stand and recite the stirring words Francis Bellamy wrote in 1892:

"I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

I congratulate every student, every staff member, every parent of Chattanooga Central High School on this outstanding achievement, and I hope that having won it will inspire you to even greater devotion to your State and country in the future.

Thank you.

Dr. Clifford Merrill Drury Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clifford Merrill Drury retires this day as Califonia Professor of Church History at San Francisco Theological Seminary, a position which he has held since 1938. It is a great contribution when a man gives this much of his life to the teaching of students, and Dr. Drury has been a man who was loved by his students. However, his work has extended far beyond the classroom.

Clifford Drury was born and raised on a farm in Iowa; from there he took his undergraduate degree at Buena Vista College in Iowa. He first served his country as private, U.S. Army, during World War I. In 1919 he entered San Francisco Theological Seminary, where he was later to teach, as a student. Here he gained his B.D. and S.T.M. degrees. He then traveled to the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, taking his Ph. D. in church history.

He was ordained a minister in the Presbyterian Church in the United States in 1922, and served as the assistant pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, Calif. From 1923 until 1927 he was pastor of the Community Church, Shanghai, China. On his return in 1928 he became the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Moscow, Idaho; moreover, he not only served that city but the students of the nearby University of Idaho, also.

It was at this time he began what was to be one of his greatest contributions—the study of Christianity in western America. It was at this time he began the series of books and articles which he still continues to produce. Dr. Drury was not a man given to historical novels; his works were scholarly efforts which were written only from original sources. Some of his books include: "Marcus Whitman, M.D."; "Pioneer and Martyr"; "Henry Harmon Spalding, Pioneer of Old Oregon"; "Mary and Elkanah Walker, Pioneers Among the Spokanes"; and "First White Women Over the Rockies"; to name a few. Clifford Merrill Drury has the distinction which few men can claim and that is that all of his books become the definitive work on the subject, the references to which the scholar turns. It has been written of him that "he rescued western American church history from oblivion."

His distinctions thus far would make a full lifetime for any man, but there is more. In the mid 1930's he became a chaplain in the Navy Reserve. He was called to active during World War II, and rose rapidly to the rank of captain. He served as the district chaplain of the Potomac River Command. After the war he became the official historian of the U.S. Navy Chaplain Corps. He wrote the first four volumes of that work and outlined the fifth volume; thus making another historical contribution to his country.

Dr. Drury has since retired as a chaplain, but he is recognized by some as "Mr. Chaplain Corps," and often called upon to speak when chaplains gather. He is now retiring as a professor. The country has lost a chaplain, the Church of Jesus Christ, a teacher; but we gained a man who is young in heart and mind, who now has gained the time to devote to research and writing of western American church history.

Showdown on Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post. This paper, as indeed does any newspaper, has a right to its opinion. It is in very poor taste to accuse the House of irresponsibility.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 18, 1963]

SHOWDOWN ON AID

When the U.S. Senate takes up the tattered and beaten thing that is the foreign-aid appropriations bill, it faces a simple choice. It can uphold Representative OTTO PASSMAN by sustaining the most savage cuts ever inflicted on the program. Or it can uphold President Johnson, the good name of the Senate, and the memory of John F. Kennedy.

As it stands, the bill passed by the House does more than rip the vitals from the foreign-aid program. It does precisely what Mr. Khrushchev would wish this country to do—it buries the program. Of the $2.8 billion in new funds approved by the House, $1 billion is reserved for military aid. This leaves $1.8 billion for all the many other purposes of the program, including development loans, the Peace Corps, the Alliance for Progress, and help for United Nations agencies.

One figure provides a measure of the havoc wrought by the House. A total of $600 million is appropriated for development loans. But this would not even enable the United States to honor its commitments and pledges to the three countries of India, Pakistan, and Turkey, which together have been promised $648 million in loan assistance. Total commitments and pledges reach $816 million, meaning that the sum voted by the House would leave the United States no margin whatever in providing new loans adjudged vital to our national interest.

On Tuesday, President Johnson made his first appearance before the United Nations, and called on all member states to attack jointly man's ancient enemies—hunger, disease, and ignorance. The day before, the House made mockery of Mr. Johnson's exhortation by chopping $30 million from the appropriations to the very U.N. agencies that our President asked the rest of the world to support.

Moreover, Mr. Johnson spoke eloquently about the need to end the cold war by reaching new areas of agreement on peaceful cooperation. The House, through an improvised amendment, sought to bind the President's hand by flatly prohibiting Federal guarantees of private credits on any shipments to any Communist countries. On the one hand, Members of Congress indignantly ask the President to exact concessions from the Communist bloc in commercial transactions; on the other, they forbid him the discretionary authority he needs in negotiation.

Will the Senate go along in approving what Mr. Johnson rightly termed "a policy of weakness and retreat"? Or will it honor its own legislative commitment by approving the $3.6 billion already authorized by Congress? The answer may depend on which voice the Senate chooses to hear. This is the edifying voice of OTTO PASSMAN:

"May I note, Mr. Chairman, that we are getting close to the time of the year where we look for Santa Claus; and we are playing Santa Claus this year through foreign aid."

And this is what President Kennedy said in his last news conference:

"I can't imagine anything more dangerous than to end this program * * * I don't understand why we are suddenly so fatigued. I don't regard the struggle as over and I don't think it is probably going to be over in this century.

"I think this is a continuing effort, and it is not a very heavy one. It is a fraction of our budget, a fraction of our gross national product, and the gross national product of the United States has increased $100 billion, will have by the end of this year, in a 3-year period.

"So what we are asking is a billion dollars less than the average program since 1947, the need today is greater, these countries are poorer, there is a good many more of them; and yet we are being denied, the President of the United States is being threatened with denying him a very important weapon in helping him meet his responsibilities."

Let Us Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been the repository of many beautiful eulogies to our beloved late President. I believe that you will agree with me that the RECORD would not be complete without the inclusion of a statement which was printed in the Morgan Hill, Calif., paper, and sent to me by Dr. Alan D. Chappell of Morgan Hill. The following eloquent speech was made by Dr. Howard M. Nicholson to the assembled students of the Live Oak Union High School:

LET US REMEMBER

(Remarks of Dr. Howard M. Nicholson, superintendent of Live Oak High School, preceding a student assembly.)

Although saddened by the events of the past 4 days, I am proud to be an American. Proud to be a citizen of a nation which in time of deep sorrow can almost come to a standstill, yet can and did demonstrate to the world an orderly and predetermined transition of administration. Proud of our national heritage and forefathers who so wisely prepared for the transition of government. Proud of your deportment last Friday.

The esteem which other nations held for a great American, hold for our Nation, and for each of us—for we are a nation of people—swells my heart with pride. I am also sobered with the realization of the responsibility each of us has to the other, to the Nation, and to the world.

Our flag at half-mast at sea, at half-staff on land, or draped in black, has additional meaning for me, and I am sure all of us, today.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who remained at vital posts while the rest of us were watching history unfold.

My thoughts, and I am certain your thoughts, have and continue to go out to the families of the slain. It is still difficult to comprehend this heinous event. Yesterday, on a little boy's birthday, the Nation buried his father. Tomorrow a little girl on her birthday cannot but help wonder at the events which have deprived her of the physical presence of her father. I pray that someone will be able to help her understand. The following day, Thursday, is the date set aside for national thanksgiving.

Thanksgiving. Even in our sorrow we have much for which to be thankful. And I believe that all of us will be compelled this year, more than any previous year, to individually offer thanks. Perhaps, we shall, and I hope we shall, critically examine and alter our course for a more meaningful life individually, nationally, and internationally.

Now would you stand for a moment's silent contemplation and thanksgiving.

Legislative Accomplishments of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, this 1st session of the 88th Congress has undoubtedly been one of the longest in the history of our Nation. By the same token, from the standpoint of the two committees on which it is my privilege to serve, it has been an extremely busy session. As the ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the second ranking Republican on the Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud of the record of accomplishment of both of these committees. It is a record of solid legislative accomplishment in which the Republicans on the committees played a constructive part, and it is a record with which I am proud to be associated. It is a record which offers living testimony to the reasons for my pride. Permit me to share with you the highlights of our progress during 1963.

EDUCATION AND LABOR

There has been a great deal of comment in the press and other news media concerning our committee, but very little of this comment has even mentioned our legislative achievements. If the work of this Congress thus far leaves much to be desired, the fault does not lie with the House Committee on Education and Labor.

This committee operates in several of the most difficult and most controversial fields of national legislation, fields in which the Congress often hesitates to act, and in which any action requires solid bipartisan effort. Yet, in this first session, the Education and Labor Committee has reported 16 bills, 4 of which have already been enacted. These four acts, I would emphasize, are all of major significance in the fields of labor, education, and manpower development.

Before attempting a very brief review of these acts, I wish to underscore a simple truism known to all who serve in the Congress—behind every bill enacted, reported, or even considered, stands days and weeks, often months, of hard work by the Members and staff of the committee. In our case, during 1963, the committee and its 10 subcommittees conducted more than 200 days of public hearings on matters before it. In addition to the hundreds of hours of executive sessions of subcommittees, the full committee held 28 executive sessions devoted to the drafting, consideration, and reporting of legislation.

Sixteen bills have been reported to the House, most with considerable bipartisan support. The subject matter of these bills reads like a digest of national economic and social problems: fair employment practices; manpower retraining; college academic facilities; equal pay for women; prevailing wages for work on Federal projects; migrant labor; modernization of vocational education; youth conservation; racial discrimination in education; mine safety; adult illiteracy; education of handicapped children; and library services. You will note that not one of these is an easy or noncontroversial subject in terms of the proper Federal role in achieving national goals.

The four major bills from our committee which have already been enacted in this session would represent a respectable committee score for an entire Congress.

First. Equal pay for equal work for women, H.R. 6060, Public Law 88-38: This legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of sex and to accord to women equal pay for equal work has been before the Congress for nearly 25 years. Final action on this is a credit to the 88th Congress.

Second. Manpower Development and Training Act amendments, H.R. 8720, awaiting President's signature: This represents a major strengthening of the manpower retraining program with particular emphasis on meeting the problems of unemployed youth and citizens who lack the basic educational skills necessary to profit from job training. It gives hope that we can strike at the hard core of unemployment in this country.

Third. Vocational Education Act of 1963, H.R. 4955, Public Law 88-210: This act, which also extends the federally impacted school aid and the National Defense Education Act, is the most significant legislation in vocational education since the beginning of Federal participation in 1917. It completely transforms and modernizes the National Vocational Education Act, with its heavy emphasis on education for employment in the economy of the sixties. The act provides generous Federal assistance to the States for this purpose.

Fourth. College Academic Facilities Act of 1963, H.R. 4163, Public Law 88-204: President Eisenhower first proposed this aid for college classroom construction, in 1959, to meet needs which were already urgent. The Federal aid made available in this act may come "in the nick of time" to meet a crisis in higher education caused by a phenomenal increase in enrollments—increases which will mount for the rest of this decade. President Johnson described this as the most important educational enactment by the Congress in the history of the Republic. I think this is somewhat exaggerated in view of other historic education acts, such as the Eisenhower-sponsored National Defense Education Act, but this is extremely important and timely legislation.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs had an extremely busy session. As of December 17, 1963, 406 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee. Testimony in hearings conducted in 26 open sessions consists of 1,701 printed pages. There have been 14 executive sessions resulting in the re-

porting of 26 bills. Of this number, 11 have been enacted into law; 11 have passed the House and are pending in Senate committees; 2 passed the House, were amended and passed by the Senate and returned to the House for further consideration; and 2 bills reported by the committee await the action of the House of Representatives. A brief description of veterans' bills that have become public law in this 1st session of the 88th Congress follows:

Public Law 88-3 (H.R. 212): Permits payment of $250 burial allowance in behalf of veterans whose discharges are changed from dishonorable to other than dishonorable after their death. Claim must be filed within 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of enactment, whichever is later. (Approved April 2, 1963.)

Public Law 88-18 (H.R. 4549): Authorizes a very limited exception to the bar against employing retired officers, so as to permit the appointment of such a retired officer, prior to January 1, 1964, to the position of Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. (Approved May 8, 1963.)

Public Law 88-20 (H.R. 199): Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction," to the other types of service-connected disabilities specified in the law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation for which an additional award in the amount of $47 monthly is provided. (Approved May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88-21 (H.R. 211): Increases, generally by 10 percent, the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes. (Approved May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88-22 (H.R. 214): Provides for payment of a statutory award of $47 per month to those veterans who incurred a service-connected loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, resulting in constant inability to communicate by speech. (Approved May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88-40 (H.R. 249): Extends for another 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization and outpatient care for service-connected conditions of Commonwealth Army veterans who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. Permits the furnishing of drugs under certain conditions. (Approved June 13, 1963.)

Public Law 88-126 (S. 330): Provides that after expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program (generally after January 31, 1965), approval of courses under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act shall be by State approving agencies. (Approved September 23, 1963.)

Public Law 88-134 (H.R. 5250): Under the provisions of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Public Law 881, 84th Congress, effective Jan. 1, 1957), dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to widows, children, and parents based on the service-connected deaths of their husbands, fathers, and children, respectively. Specific monthly rates are provided for children and parents. The widow, however, until enactment of this law, was paid at the monthly rate of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic active rate of pay of her deceased husband. This law increases the $112 factor applicable to widows to $120 per month. (Approved October 5, 1963.)

Public Law 88-148 (S. 13): Provides for conveyance of approximately 19 acres of land, which was originally donated to the Veterans' Administration by the city of Fayetteville, Ark., back to that city for use as a park and recreational area. (Approved October 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88-151 (H.R. 242): Provides for waiver of recovery from veterans of indebtedness to the United States resulting from the payment of loan guarantee claims or from default on direct loans, under circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically, provides that where there has been a default and loss of the property the Administrator may waive recovery if he determines "that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran." (Approved October 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88-207 (H.R. 5691): Allows the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director authority to act upon the recommendations of disciplinary boards in cases involving inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of physicians, dentists, and nurses appointed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. (Approved December 17, 1963.)

Of the bills reported by the committee that have passed the House and are now pending in the Senate, one is deserving of special mention. Each Member of the House of Representatives can take pride in the knowledge that in supporting H.R. 8009, he has made a valuable contribution to the veterans' benefit program. This bill, authorizing as it does a comprehensive program of nursing care in Veterans' Administration and State facilities, provides a most worthwhile and needed benefit for the aging World War I veteran. It is my understanding that a committee in the other body currently is holding public hearings on this bill and I am hopeful that it will become law in the immediate future.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented this review of the work of these fine committees to help set the record straight. I am also proud of the very substantial and constructive Republican contributions to shaping this legislation and presenting it to the Congress. Needless to say, the legislative record of the Committee on Education and Labor reflects particular credit upon its chairman, ADAM POWELL, and upon its ranking Republican, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN. A major share of the credit for legislative action in the field of veterans' benefits, of course, goes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, OLIN E. TEAGUE.

Arizona's Water Needs Emphasized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, Arizona is fighting desperately for survival and water is the key to victory. On December 11, Commissioner Floyd Dominy, of the Bureau of Reclamation, delivered an outstanding speech in Tucson, Ariz., concerning that battle.

He spoke of the vital central Arizona project which Congress must authorize if my State is to receive its rightful share of the Colorado River. He discussed the need for unity within Arizona in order to secure passage of the central Arizona project bill. He probed the value of the Pacific Southwest Water Plan. But above all, he recognized Arizona's immediate and critical need for the central Arizona project.

I believe Commissioner Dominy's remarks to be of such excellence and widespread significance that I wholeheartedly commend them to my colleagues.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER FLOYD E. DOMINY, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, TUCSON, ARIZ., DECEMBER 11, 1963

I am glad to come to Tucson for this is a new area of reclamation activity. Tucson has watched reclamation move ahead in other areas of Arizona since the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed 61 years ago. Now, this city stands to become a part of the State's reclamation program by gaining additional municipal and industrial water under the proposed Central Arizona project. Tucson would be on that very important end of the project's 341-mile-long backbone aqueduct. Construction of this desert lifeline is vital to the city's and the State's continued growth.

You Tucson residents have not had the years of experience with reclamation as have your neighbors in the Salt River, Yuma, and Wellton-Mohawk areas of Arizona. But, I am pleased to learn that Tucson, within the past year, has taken positive steps to build a planning organization familiar with the broader concepts of water resource development. I congratulate you and trust that you will make further progress in this direction. I urge the smaller communities of Arizona in similar positions to do likewise—that they lift their sights above local problems and look at the overall picture. They should become intimately acquainted with reclamation laws and procedures and with the real opportunities that are open to them and go forward on a united front.

The Supreme Court's decision last June, giving Arizona the right to 2.8 million acre-feet of the first 7.5 million acre-feet of mainstream Colorado River water available to the Lower Basin, charted Tucson's as well as the rest of the State's reclamation course. Your Senators HAYDEN and GOLDWATER and your Representatives lost no time in introducing bills in the Congress to authorize the Central Arizona project. This action spelled unqualified support from both political parties of a project so necessary to the State's future. Two hearings have been held in the Senate committee and more are scheduled.

Arizona has waited patiently for more than 12 years while its rights to Colorado River water were fought through the Supreme Court. This waiting period has been costly in dollars as well as in loss of benefits from the additional water. Costwise, the project has jumped from about three-quarters of a billion to about $1 billion. This increase would have been greater except for large savings realized from the redesigning of Bridge Canyon Dam.

Requirements for extensions of project facilities to meet increased needs for domestic and industrial water accounted for some of this rise in cost. The major increase, however, is due to a climb of about one-third in the construction cost index during this period.

With the backing of the Supreme Court and plans for an eminently qualified project as a Federal development under reclamation law, Arizona is now ready and rightfully demanding to go ahead.

The central Arizona project is a major proposal in Secretary of the Interior Udall's Pacific Southwest water plan. Consequently, the efforts to obtain Colorado River wa-

ter for Arizona are twofold. You may understandably ask: Why should Arizona proceed in two directions at the same time; why does not Arizona devote all of its energies to one line of attack and thus not divide its efforts? I think you will find answers to these questions by looking at the overall water situation which confronts not only Arizona but the entire Pacific Southwest today.

Arizona Governor Fannin has advised Secretary Udall that he is in basic agreement with the Pacific Southwest water plan because it includes the central Arizona project in its initial phase. The Governor sees the wisdom of the two-pronged approach to authorization of the State project.

Other Governors in the Colorado River Basin have agreed generally with the regional approach to the solution of our water problems rather than for each State to go it alone.

The water situation in Arizona is typical of that throughout the Pacific Southwest—probably worse than in some States. Approximately half of all the water in central Arizona is obtained by overdrafting or mining irreplaceable ground water supplies. This area is not only using practically all of the available natural streamflows and the ground waters that are replaced, but also an equal amount of water that has been stored underground for ages and is not being replaced. Thus, we are spending all of our water income, and in addition, an equal amount from our inherited legacy of ground water. This mining of ground water totals over 2 million acre-feet per year. Water to be imported by the central Arizona project from the Colorado River would only partially offset this overdraft.

Water shortages outside central Arizona are of much lesser magnitude but certainly of equal importance to the other areas. All areas are equally entitled to any additional water from the Colorado River.

The same water problems that exist in Tucson today are found in most of the State's smaller communities. The central Arizona project plan contemplates that Colorado River water would be transported directly to Tucson. This cannot be done economically for smaller cities at higher elevations. But water can be made available to those cities through exchange agreements. Water can be imported to the lower elevations where it can be used directly while water available in the higher elevations, but now appropriated downstream, can be released for use in the upper areas. Cities like Kingman which are closer to the Colorado River than the proposed central Arizona project aqueduct system could obtain water by direct diversion from the river.

We have formulated and have ready for construction a project plan which will provide benefits for every part of Arizona. But there is one major fault in our plan—there just isn't enough water to meet present needs—let alone those of the future. This holds true for all of the Pacific Southwestern States. That is why Secretary Udall has developed a regional plan which crosses State lines and river basin boundaries to present a solution to the Pacific Southwest's water problems. This plan is based largely on the establishment of a lower Colorado River development fund in which the power revenues from all present and proposed hydroplants along the Colorado River would be pooled after payout to provide financial assistance for construction of water facilities.

The recent Supreme Court decision recognizes that the Secretary of the Interior is responsible for apportioning any shortages in the Colorado River supply. The current dry hydrologic cycle has now been extended to the most critical point in the 67 years of record. This water drouth, along with the increasing upper basin development, could eventually make it necessary for the Secretary to apportion among the States a deficient Colorado River water supply. The Pacific Southwest water plan's major objective is to develop additional water primarily through importation, salvage, groundwater recovery, desalinization, and evaporation control and thus save the Secretary from this undesirable and unhappy task.

The Pacific Southwest water plan gives priority to the central Arizona project. It also recognizes that the future needs of southern California must be met since construction of the central Arizona project eventually will require California to reduce its present Colorado River diversions. The plan, therefore, calls for construction of facilities to import additional water from northern California into the southern part of the State.

Southern California looks to the surplus water from the north coast watersheds to sustain its rapid growth. It may be possible to enlarge a portion of the California State water project aqueduct coupled with an eastside canal through the Central Valley if a decision is reached at once. The Pacific Southwest water plan proposes to deliver an additional 1.2 million acre-feet, or 391 billion gallons of water per year to southern California from the northern part of the State.

California and other Coastal States probably will look more and more to the seas for fresh water. A pilot plant at Point Loma near San Diego—turning out a million gallons of desalted water a day for San Diego's municipal system—is an example of what might be done on a greater scale. The Pacific southwest water plan suggests that plants producing 50 times this amount of water could be built along the coast. There is promise that we might eventually desalt large supplies of sea water from the steam produced by mammoth nuclear powerplants along the west coast. Fresh, potable water could thus be a valuable byproduct of these plants.

But for the present, we must by necessity conserve, salvage, and put to maximum use our available water supply. We must first stop the waste water and at the same time seek new sources of supply.

Channelization, eradication of phreatophytes, lining of canals, groundwater recovery, and regulatory control of surplus flows at Imperial Dam through construction of Senator Wash Regulating Reservoir could have an estimated million acre-feet of Coloradio River water a year. This saving—especially in years of water deficiency on the Colorado River—would be highly important to the success of the Pacific Southwest water plan and its projects, particularly the central Arizona.

If the central Arizona project is authorized under the Hayden-Goldwater bill, it would be incorporated as an integral unit of the Pacific Southwest water plan when the plan is authorized. On the other hand, if for some reason the central Arizona project bill is not passed by the Congress, the project could be authorized as part of the Pacific Southwest water plan. We must keep in mind that because the plan benefits five States and over 11 million people, it can be expected to have a much wider appeal in the Congress than the central Arizona project, which benefits largely one State and fewer people.

Arizona without question needs the central Arizona project at the earliest possible date, and it also needs additional water over and above the 1.2 million acre-feet to be made available with the central Arizona project. These ultimate needs can be provided only through the regional concept of the Pacific Southwest water plan. This leaves Arizona with no choice other than that of going forward on these two fronts to solve its water problems.

Now that our course is laid out for us, let us work for our common objective—more water for Arizona as well as for the Pacific Southwest. We cannot succeed if we fight among ourselves. We must have cooperation and unanimity of purpose and action throughout the entire State—and the region. Congressman ASPINALL, of Colorado, Chairman of the all-important House Committee for Interior and Insular Affairs made this point crystal clear in his address before the Arizona State Reclamation Association in Phoenix last September. He reminded Arizona reclamationists that there is strong opposition to our program by economy minded Congressmen. Unless we can go before the Congress with a united front, authorization of the central Arizona project or the Pacific Southwest water plan is virtually hopeless.

There are many evidences of disunity and divergent thinking within Arizona itself regarding the central Arizona project. I urge you to make every effort to bring together the people of this State so that they will present a united effort before the Congress. It is also essential that all of the States in the region cooperate. The Pacific Southwest water plan provides a vehicle by which this heretofore impossible objective can be achieved.

Residents of cities in the higher areas of Arizona are afraid they will be left out if water exchange agreements are not made before the central Arizona project is authorized. Some have demanded that these agreements be spelled out in the project act. This would delay authorization as consummation of these agreements will require time. There would be ample time to negotiate these following authorization of the project independently or as a part of the Pacific Southwest water plan. Our planning indicates that water would not be available to the central part of the State until about 1975. Invesigations of possible exchanges and diversions are going ahead as rapidly as possible and will continue during the construction period.

But, for the present, the clock is ticking away precious minutes and the need for water presses upon the State. Since the Bureau of Reclamation issued its first report on the central Arizona project in 1947, Arizona's population has more than doubled. Over a million people now live in the central part of the State alone. Phoenix and Tucson are no longer just thriving desert communities—they are booming cities with a combined population of over 700,000 residents in the incorporated areas. This growth has been supported by increasing the overdraft or mining of groundwater basins.

Water for the central Arizona project would be taken from the Colorado River at Lake Havasu behind Parker Dam. There, three in-line pumping plants would lift the water nearly 1,000 feet to the backbone aqueduct stretching southeastward to Tucson. This manmade river across the desert would carry up to 1.2 million acre-feet of water each year.

The Tucson portion of the 341-mile backbone aqueduct would be a closed pipe extending from near Picacho Reservoir. This conduit would deliver 100,000 acre-feet of water annually to supplement Tucson's municipal and industrial water supply. The total static lift of the final increment of water reaching Tucson would be over 2,000 feet.

In our 1947 report, we estimated that only 12,000 acre-feet of project water would be needed by Tucson in the foreseeable future and this would have been obtained from local sources. Under the present plan, the 12,000-acre-foot diversion from the San Pedro River to Tucson would not only be retained, but an additional 100,000 acre-feet of water would be added to the main aqueduct system from the Colorado River. Even this 100,000 acre-feet per year of Colorado River

water would not meet Tucson's anticipated future needs.

The central Arizona project, including Bridge Canyon Dam, would require an investment of about $1 billion. The Congress would need to appropriate this sum over a period of about 10 years—an average of about $100 million a year. Federally financed, the project would be self-liquidating in that all reimbursable costs would be repaid within 50 years. Approximately 65 percent of this investment would be returned to the Federal Treasury with interest. The investment in irrigation works—about 30 percent—would be repaid without interest under reclamation law. About 5 percent, allocated to flood control, fish and wildlife, recreation and area redevelopment, would be nonreimbursable.

I am pleased that the State has resolved its question of whether the central Arizona project should be a State or federally financed project. Several of your respected business and political leaders suggested that the State go it alone. During these critical days of seeking Federal authorization, their ill-advised statements were upsetting. Fortunately, this question was resolved when they explained that their suggestions were that the State consider financing the undertaking only if it does not receive congressional authorization. Governor Fannin and your congressional delegation have reaffirmed their support of the project as a reclamation development.

We of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation discussed this matter in great detail with Governor Fannin, your State officials, and your entire congressional delegation. They are of unanimous opinion that the State could not finance projects of such magnitude. They agree that Federal assistance is needed if water is to be delivered in the quantities required at a price the users can afford to pay and in time to prevent economic retrenchment.

Let me make it clear that we do not go about soliciting federally financed developments. Our investigations of the central Arizona project have been made at the specific request of the State and we stand ready to construct the project if the State wishes and the Congress so directs. However, I feel that I must point out to you some of the problems your State would face in financing a billion dollar project.

First, the State would need to obtain the entire $1 billion through bond issues. This money would have to be repaid at whatever rate of interest the State could obtain. Such interest would undoubtedly be higher than the 3-percent rate currently charged on Government reclamation projects. The project would not have the benefit of interest-free money to cover the investment in irrigation facilities which amounts to about 35 percent of the total amount. It would not receive the benefit of nonreimbursable appropriations which would be made for the 5 percent of the total allocated to flood control, fish and wildlife, recreation, and area redevelopment.

Just how much extra money the State would have to pay in additional interest, I am not prepared to say. But, it is certainly true that whatever this cost should amount to, it would have to be borne by the water and power users. This would be particularly important to the irrigation water users, because, even under the Federal plan, the cost of delivering irrigation water to Arizona could well be higher than the repayment capacity of the lands to be irrigated. Under traditional reclamation law, the difference between the farmers' ability to pay and the actual cost of water is borne by power revenues.

Second, and perhaps most important of all, State construction of the central Arizona project would make it much more difficult, if not impossible, for the State to participate in the benefits of the Pacific Southwest water plan, or any other regional plan providing for the cooperation of other States. And, keep in mind that the central Arizona project by itself provides only a partial solution to Arizona's water problems. The quantities of water actually needed in Arizona can be obtained only through a comprehensive regional plan—such as the Pacific Southwest water plan—in which funds are made available from power revenues through a development fund to cover the costs of such programs as water salvage.

Third, the State can build dams on the Colorado River only under license by the Federal Power Commission. And this Commission is not authorized to issue licenses where Federal lands in certain categories are involved. Only the Congress can do this. The 740-foot-high Bridge Canyon Dam as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation would very probably have to be reduced to approximately one-half size. This situation was well documented some time ago in the Arizona Power Authority's application for a license to build Bridge Canyon Dam.

The half-size dam would reduce the power output by about 50 percent and the power revenues by the same amount. We just can't afford to partially utilize this major powersite and deny the central Arizona project the maximum power revenues so sorely needed for payout.

Fourth, timing is of great importance. Authorization of the central Arizona project is being sought by your congressional delegation at the earliest possible date. This authorization, with the backing of all Arizonans, might come soon. How long would it take Arizona to fight its way through all the roadblocks standing in the path of an independent State project, even if it could be adequately financed by the State?

Fifth, under the water exchange concept of the Federal proposals, projects could be constructed throughout the State from time to time. These could be incorporated in the overall plan and receive benefits of the Federal financing and of Federal subsidies for irrigation water. Under State construction it is probable that each of the exchange projects would have to stand on its own feet. They would not have the financial benefits of integration in a larger plan and some would undoubtedly fall by the wayside.

I have brought these matters to your attention merely as food for thought. I urge that you carefully look into all the problems and become acquainted with your reclamation program before allowing disunity and controversy within the State to cloud Arizona's prospects of solving its water problems. I am convinced that Arizona's unity in the one purpose of obtaining additional water will grow stronger. Additional water must come to the State before the faucets in Tucson and other cities dribble dust instead of water—and before more of your State's fertile acres return to the desert. In working toward solutions to your water problems, I pledge the Bureau of Reclamation's wholehearted support.

Statement of Congressman Joe Skubitz Before the U.S. Tariff Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1963, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission and called attention to the disastrous effects that beef imports are having upon the livestock producers in this country. I urged that a system of quotas be established and substantial increase in our importation duties be made effective. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including the statement which I presented before the Commission. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my State of Kansas is one of the leading States in the Nation in the production of cattle. Kansas ranks fourth in cattle population with an inventory of 5,222,000 head on January 1, 1963. Kansas is an agricultural State and livestock production makes up the largest segment of agriculture in Kansas. Cash receipts from livestock and livestock products in 1962 totaled $683,102,000. This equals 53 percent of all cash farm receipts during 1962.

I represent the Fifth Congressional District which includes 18 counties in the southeastern corner of the State. Four of the top cattle producing counties in Kansas are in my district. Five others have a total population of over 50,000 head. My district has a total cattle population of approximately 1 million head with an estimate value of approximately $130 million.

Net farm income in Kansas was down about 14 percent in 1962 when compared with 1961. Lower livestock prices and increased farm production costs were largely responsible for this decrease in net income. The report in the December 6 issue of the Daily Drovers Telegram, an official livestock price reporting publication, shows that the cattle feeding ratio in November 1963 was 20.1. This is the lowest feeding ratio since 1956 and represents a decrease of 27.7 percent. This would indicate approximately 30 percent decrease in the cattle feeder's income. Such a big reduction in producers' income, which covers the entire nation as well as the State of Kansas and my district in Kansas, is nothing short of disastrous.

I would also like to point out here that my district in Kansas suffered one of the most severe droughts this past season that has ever been recorded. Grass and feed crops were short which means increased feed costs, the livestock water situation is critical in many places, which caused forced liquidation of some cattle that would not have sold normally. This means these producers have suffered additional severe financial losses.

Beef imports have increased the last 2 years far beyond anything we have ever seen in the past. The quantity of beef imports have doubled since 1960 and figures indicate that these imports represented 11 percent of the total quantity of beef consumed in the United States during 1962. This rapid rise in imports has continued through 1963. U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that these imports totaled 712.5 million pounds the first 8 months of this year. Indications are that total imports during 1963 will pass the 1½-billion-pound mark. Actually imports of beef and veal during the first 8 months of 1963 were 17 percent above the first 8 months of 1962. The red meat imports for 1962 exceeded imports in 1961 by nearly 39 percent.

When we compare these import figures to domestic production of manufacturing beef, we find that they equal approximately 40 percent of our total consumption. The major concern of beef producers in my State is the fact that we are becoming a dumping ground for world surpluses for meats, particularly beef and veal. Authorities who have studied this situation first hand are confident that the situation will continue to grow worse unless we proceed to do something about it.

The economic well-being of the livestock producer and all agriculture is vital to the entire economy in Kansas. Agriculture is the largest user of steel, fuel oil and other petroleum products. Without the market furnished by agriculture for supplies and services, business in Kansas could not prosper. This all means a profitable livestock industry is essential if Kansas is to prosper.

Thirty years ago, the tariff on beef was 6 cents a pound. In 1947, this import tariff was reduced to 3 cents. The tariff on live cattle and other meat products were also reduced comparably. During this same 30 years, livestock prices and production costs soared to well over double the figures at that time. As a result of this tremendous increase in the price level, present tariffs are not effective and offer little or no protection to the cattle industry from foreign imports. Rather than further reduction in tariffs at this time, we should have substantial increases as well as quotas. We should point out that it would take an increase of several hundred percent applied to the present tariff rates to catch up with the present economic levels and requirements.

In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as using other import controls.

The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the U.S. cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage.

Dr. Willard W. Cochran, one of the chief economic advisers to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, in his book "Farm Prices, Myth and Reality" published in 1958, stated that the demand for food is highly inelastic. Dr. Cochran continues, "A 2 percent increase in the amount of food offered will drive prices down by 25 percent. The farmer is truly at the crack end of the whip."

The increase in per capita consumption of beef and increased population has taken care of the increase in domestic production. If we use Dr. Cochran's formula we can readily see that when the equivalent of 10 to 12 percent of our consumption in foreign beef is dumped on the U.S. market a terrific pressure will be put on cattle prices. Excessive imports during recent months are directly responsible for the severe break in livestock prices and financial losses by producers. Unless this situation is corrected, our entire economy will suffer.

The United States is the best fed country in the world. Its supply of meat and meat animal products is not only nutritious but our healthy supply of livestock means a healthy, nutritious food supply. It is therefore imperative that during future negotiations, our present quarantine measures and other requirements which protect our domestic animals from foreign diseases be rigidly maintained.

In the forthcoming negotiations, it is imperative that rather than removal or reduction of present tariffs, action must be taken which will protect our livestock producers from this recent flood of imports.

I urge that a system of quotas be established based on average imports over a period of years. Quotas should be established and substantial increases in our import duties be made effective as import volumes increase. The livestock industry feels that import duties should be at least equal to those of our competitive importing nations.

Failures of the Soviet Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the December 16, 1963, issue of Barron's Weekly contains an article on the Soviet economy entitled "Better Things for Better Living?"

It presents information and comment on Soviet economic plans, policies, and failures which is an interesting backdrop to the current negotiations relating to Soviet purchases of wheat and other foods and materials from the United States.

I believe it is significant that the article concludes with the following statement:

Premier Khrushchev, as he perennially threatens, someday may succeed in burying the West, either in peaceful competition or otherwise. However, he will do so only if the free world furnishes the shovel and digs its own grave.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

BETTER THINGS FOR BETTER LIVING?

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, where even penny-ante capitalism constitutes a crime against the state, has lately become a powerful speculative force in free world markets. The huge Russian purchase of Canadian wheat last summer triggered a boom in grain futures and ship charter rates. Mounting expectations of a similar deal between the U.S.S.R. and the United States prompted the notorious Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp. to acquire on credit over $100 million worth of cottonseed and soybean oil contracts, a miscalculation the effects of which are rippling far and wide. In Wall Street last week the sulfur shares were given a whirl on the news that the Kremlin had launched a crash program to modernize and expand the lagging production of chemicals. "The Soviet people created a first-rate heavy industry under the leadership of the party," Premier Khrushchev told the central committee. "Now the state is in a position to channel enormous means into the development of chemistry, agriculture, and light industry to produce more food and goods to directly satisfy the requirements of the people."

Only a Communist, who is trained to say unblushingly that black is white and vice versa, could make a confession of failure sound so good. As nearly everyone west of the Iron Curtain by now must realize—and as even the Russians at last have begun to suspect—the Soviet system has failed to produce. Last year, in a drastic shift in the party line, Premier Khrushchev urged his comrades "to learn from the capitalists, to imitate whatever they have that is good and profitable." Thereby, he promised, his countrymen would help speed the coming of the worker's paradise. This year the pressing necessities have taken priority over pie in the sky. To save the population from starving, Moscow has become a massive buyer of wheat. With an anxious eye to the future, it also has announced a new 7-year plan, aimed at the "chemicalization" of Soviet agriculture and industry.

The plan is impressive in design and scale. However, like the huge czarist bell that proved too heavy to lift, and today stands cracked and silent in the Kremlin, it probably won't work. For one thing, in a desperate admission of need, Moscow is seeking to draw upon the industrial and financial resources of the West, which may not be readily forthcoming. What is far more damaging to its hopes, the manufacture of chemicals is a complex process that largely depends for success upon such bourgeois values as experimentation, innovation, and quality control. In turn, the fruitful application of chemical products to agriculture demands the kind of flexibility and initiative that is rarely found on collective farms. Modern chemistry—"better things for better living," as DuPont would say—is uniquely the product of a free society. No matter how massive the effort, it simply will not flourish in less hospitable soil.

What Moscow unveiled last week plainly qualifies as massive. As outlined before a plenary session of the Communist Party's Central Committee (which, in unprecedented fashion, was thrown open to thousands of lower ranking bureaucrats and technicians), the new plan calls for the expenditure of 42 billion rubles on chemical plant and equipment over the next 7 years. Valued at more than $46 billion at official rates of exchange (and somewhat less in real terms), the huge investment is designed to triple Soviet production of chemicals by 1970. The program places special emphasis on fertilizer, output of which is slated to expand by 15 million tons annually, or 75 percent over the next 2 years, and nearly fourfold by the end of the decade.

Even for a highly developed country like the United States, such goals would be hard to achieve. The scheduled expansion of fertilizer capacity, for example, requires huge new sources of power and new mines. Over the years the USSR has enjoyed scant success in this realm. To be sure, this time something new has been added to the formula—the resources of the free world which is supposed to furnish and finance one-third of the investment. However, Moscow may well have overrated both Western willingness and ability to accommodate it. Thus, the $2 billion worth of plant and equipment which it hopes to buy abroad each year through 1970 actually exceeds the estimated capital outlays by the U.S. chemical industry in 1963. Hence even if it offered cash on the barrelhead, Moscow's chances of finding suppliers hardly look bright. Its hopes of buying on time are dimmer. Apart from the political and moral issues involved—which, of course, argue decisively against such a deal—the Soviet Union, in the light of its repudiation of previous obligations and its doubtful capacity to service future debts, can command large-scale long-term credits nowhere.

Materials and money are not the only stumbling block. Unlike electric power or steel, which any backward country can turn out these days, the marvelously complicated chemical processes must flow from a reservoir of broad-gaged scientific achievement. Thus the whole field of petrochemicals, which is still virtually unknown in the Soviet Union, was pioneered a generation ago not by Du Pont or Allied Chemical, but by a corporate offshoot of Shell Oil. Chemistry's flow processes, which have inspired so many other kinds of automation, heavily depend upon precision instruments and rigid quality control, areas where the Russians, by their own admission, are seriously laggard. According to a recent article by Joseph A. Gwyer, Senior Research Specialist of the Library of Congress, "30 percent of all Soviet tractors, up to 60 percent of all automobiles and up to 25 percent of construction machinery is

systematically idle because of the substandard quality of parts and assemblies." In some Soviet plants, the author points out, official inspection of measuring devices and gages in use found more than half to be faulty.

In the application of chemicals to the soil, finally, the producer's know-how must be matched by that of the consumer. While the Soviets manufacture only a fraction of their fertilizer needs, much of what they do make simply goes to waste. Premier Khrushchev himself tells of touring collective farms and seeing piles of the precious stuff lying by the side of the road, yielding nothing but sleigh rides for children in winter. As the Premier angrily remarked, there may be "no special American wisdom" in its use. Unlike his collectivized counterpart, however, the American farmer knows that fertilizer works only when used in harmony with the kind of crops grown, the amount of irrigation available and the nature of the soil. Unlike the Russian peasant, the American has a constant incentive to experiment and learn. Scholars long have suspected that slavery is the least efficient economic system known to man. The incredible failure of Communist agriculture everywhere—in Cuba, China and now in the Soviet heartland—seems to prove the point.

Sooner or later, then, the new 7-year plan will go the way of its ill-fated forebears. Like the Kremlin's other grandiose industrial schemes, "chemicalization" will wind up in history's dustbin. Premier Khrushchev, as he perennially threatens, someday may succeed in burying the West, either "in peaceful competition" or otherwise. However, he will do so only if the free world furnishes the shovel and digs its own grave.

The Changed Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the 17th annual mid-year meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks was held in New York City on December 3 of this year. My father, the Honorable Roger Keith (former chairman of the committee on banks and banking of the Massachusetts State Senate) attended this conference and heard an excellent address by our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. His speech is a thoughtful presentation of the prospects for further growth of mutual savings banks—and their contribution to our Nation's economy—particularly as it concerns the role of mortgage financing in our country's homebuilding efforts. Mr. WIDNALL also comments upon the proposed Federal Charter for Mutual Savings Banks and other matters of importance to Congress. Under unanimous consent, I included this address in the RECORD:

THE CHANGED OUTLOOK

(Address by the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, U.S. Representative from New Jersey)

President Rauch and members of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, I appreciate the opportunity of meeting with you today.

Our Nation has suffered great shock in the assassination of President Kennedy. But one of the great virtues of our democracy is that we never are dependent on any one man no matter how much he may be loved, how able he may be, or how tragic the circumstances under which he is replaced.

The problems of transition to a new Chief Executive which we face at the present time are actually less than those frequently occasioned as a result of our elective system. There is no change in party control, there is continuity in the Cabinet, and our new President has had 3 years and not just 60 days in which to intimately acquaint himself with many responsibilities of the high office he has assumed. The composition of the Congress remains unaltered. And yet we know there will be change. History records, that is the inevitable result of change in Chief Executives of our Nation. Policies, recommendations, and actions will begin to bear the imprint of the new President.

Our new President is a strong and able individual in his own right. As majority leader of the Senate he had a distinguished career and demonstrated a unique capacity for leadership to obtain constructive accomplishments. Although traditionally the Vice President occupies a submerged role, we can be sure that as Vice President he achieved familiarity with and participated in considerations of many of the great problems that had confronted the former Chief Executive of our Nation. We are fortunate we have such a man to assume the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency which fate has forced upon him.

It is early, of course, to attempt to prognosticate legislative and economic impacts of this sudden change in the executive head of our Government. It comes at a time when our economy has experienced a 33-month upswing which already is longer in duration than our average peacetime expansions. It also comes at a time when the broad base of the expansion is impressive. The advance of our gross national product to a record $588.5 billion on a seasonally adjusted annual rate for the third quarter of the year was the best advance of the year and represented a gain of almost $9 billion from the previous quarter. Before the change in our Presidency, official estimates were that GNP would reach an annual rate of $596 billion in the current quarter, $603 billion in the first quarter of next year and $608.5 billion in the second quarter without a tax cut, and $608 billion in the first quarter and $620 billion in the second quarter with the tax cut passed effective as of January 1 next year.

In view of the turn of events it would seem now those estimates are optimistic, but I also believe the prospects for a substantial tax cut effective January 1 have improved. Prospective hesitancy and uncertainty on the economic front almost surely would enlarge and accelerate support for the tax cut as a counteracting and stimulating force for our economy. It is probably a good guess that GNP, primarily under the force of existing momentum, still will cross the $600 billion level early next year. But a new factor of uncertainty has been added which could trip this already old, 33-month upswing in business.

As the incumbent, President Johnson, falls heir to the Democratic Party nomination next year; he also has fallen heir to the Kennedy program. Doubtless, initially, he will retain that program. But he will face reelection in the light of improved prospects for the Republican candidate, whoever he may be. As he pursues reelection in his own right there will surely emerge shifts in policies and objectives reflecting his own strong personality and his own proven abilities. He will surround himself with his own advisors and gradually shifts will occur in some of the key personnel of the executive establishment. His campaign for reelection will be by his own campaign. Change will become a reality and with change comes hesitancy and uncertainty.

I think this new element of uncertainty will temper our economic picture notwithstanding the stimulative effects of the tax cut. Rarely does business assess change at an economic peak; instead, the normal tendency is that it backs away from peaks while the reassessment is being made. I think that could well be the prospect in store for us and it will be reflected by early summer of next year.

Our balance-of-payments problem will continue to be a constraining influence. Fortunately the mercurial swings in our balance-of-payments deficit so far this year were already a matter of record. The first quarter annual rate of $1.7 billion in the deficit ballooned to $5.1 billion in the second quarter and then subsided to $1.5 billion for the third quarter on a seasonally adjusted annual rate. The Department of Commerce credits "smaller capital outflows" as responsible for "a very large part of the improvement in the balance on regular types of transactions." With the uncertainty engendered by a change in Chief Executives I would think that chances have improved for early enactment of the proposed interest-equalization tax, the effect of which would be to increase the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining funds in this country by approximately 1 full percentage point and thus discourage outflow of funds abroad for portfolio investment. It is reassuring to recall the steps which have been taken to guard against speculative raids on international currencies including our dollar. These include the $6-billion increase in special resources of the International Monetary Fund as well as our standby arrangement with the Fund for drawings up to $500 million, our currency swap arrangements with other countries, and the close and understanding working consultations that have been established with foreign central banking authorities.

Our balance-of-payments position will continue to exert upward pressure on interest rates particularly in the short-term sector. However, as I have already indicated, I think moderation of the level of business activity as a result of the new uncertainties will temper upward pressure on long-term interest rates with the result they will remain approximately at current levels in the period ahead. Two weeks ago I would have leaned to the view that interest rates would move upward in 1964.

Now after having gotten myself out on a limb through attempting to prognosticate at a time when it is particularly difficult to do so I would like to offer a few words of comment about your great industry. Your institutions are enjoying another banner year after setting new highs in savings and assets last year. This year your institutions will probably top last year's record $3 billion increase in savings deposits by approximately 10 percent and boost savings totals to almost $45 billion. Your depositors will enjoy the protection of reserves over the $4 billion level. Early next year we may expect to see assets of your industry cross the $50 billion mark. That is a great achievement and I congratulate you for your fine record as specialists in handling the savings of our citizens.

I would expect that mortgage investment, which is your highest yielding investment, would continue next year to dominate your investment activity. I note that your investment in mortgage loans has moved up from 69.5 percent of assets at the close of 1962 to approximately 71.4 percent of assets as of September 30 of this year.

Residential mortgage loan investments comprise approximately 90 percent of your total mortgage loan investments, so you understandably are interested in the outlook for housing. The forward push which housing has given the economy this year has been from a boom in apartments with little change from last year in single-family housing starts. Since apartment construction represents the more volatile segment of the residential construction industry, I would expect it to respond to a more tempered outlook for the economy as a whole. Despite the sharp upturn in housing starts in September and October which will probably carry us close to 1.6 million starts for the year, I doubt that this strength will continue. I would not expect next year's level of housing starts to equal that for this year.

In view of the fact that approximately 22 percent of your mortgage loans are residential multifamily mortgage loans, I would like to call your attention to a relatively new development in this field in our financial picture.

This newcomer to multifamily structure financing is the condominium in which there is private ownership of a dwelling unit in a multifamily structure. FHA section 234 covers such mortgage insurance. A 60-unit project averaging about $18,000 per unit was started in Florida in July 1962 under the regular FHA section 207 multifamily project insurance program with intent to convert to the FHA section 234 condominium program. The project was completed in April of this year. The conversion to the condominium program will take place when 48 of the units are sold to individual owners. As of the present time I understand 22 of the units have been sold. I mention this not because of any immediate impact on the mortgage market. It is new to our country, but anyone who has traveled in the Spanish-speaking countries cannot fail to be most impressed by the very substantial amount of good housing that is financed under the condominium system of financing. FHA insured section 234 mortgages probably are eligible for investment under your existing statutes. I would suggest you acquaint yourselves with this newly emerging type of mortgage financing.

There is discussion these days of quality of credit. Every time I look at a chart of increase in home mortgage debt I am struck by the fact that truly this is a growth industry. Over the past 10 years nonfarm home mortgage debt outstanding has grown at a compound annual rate of 11.2 percent per year. Few of the glamour companies can match that compound rate of growth. However, a direct spoken rock-ribbed conservative might instead describe it as a credit binge. Home mortgage debt, of course, is the principal component of individual and noncorporate debt, all of the segments of which also have been on the increase. Related to disposable personal income there is no question that the income cover of debt is deteriorating. In 1962, individual debt (including noncorporate business and farms) rose by a record $32.2 billion or 10.4 percent, substantially outstripping the $20 billion rise in personal income after taxes of the same group. As a result, the ratio of personal debt to disposable personal income rose to another new high of 88.9 percent in 1962—up from 84.9 percent in 1961 and from approximately 60 percent in 1953. Possibly you will find this reminder of interest in considering your lending policies.

I would expect a housing bill next year although I think I should point out that the big omnibus housing bills have not come in presidential years. The big omnibus housing bills in recent years became the Housing Acts of 1949, of 1954, and of 1961. Not to be overlooked is the fact that neither the FHA nor Fanny Mae can be held as hostages to a housing bill next year. The basic FHA mortgage insurance programs do not expire until October 1965 and Fanny Mae has ample funds for its regular secondary market operations for the foreseeable future.

We can expect a substantial additional request for urban renewal grant authorization. This will be rationalized with the tax cut deficit on the basis that although additional urban renewal grant authorization is needed for project commitment, there is a very considerable lapse of time before the funds are actually disbursed and hence the additional authorization will not aggravate the tax cut deficit. I am aware of your association's support of the urban renewal program. In this connection I would like to mention a suggestion which I think has considerable merit. Urban renewal has moved away from the original concept of slum clearance. More and more it is moving in the direction of downtown rehabilitation. Central city core areas are bulldozed to make way for new multistory commercial structures surrounded by open space. Even the New York Stock Exchange is a candidate for such a project. We are assured and some of the already completed projects have shown that tax yield to the city is increased multifold from the same area. Yet we continue with taxpayer subsidy for such projects—a two-thirds Federal grant of net project costs. In my opinion these central core area projects should be put on a loan rather than a grant basis. When we find individual cities coming in with billion-dollar plans it is obvious to me that we should be thinking in terms of placing some parts at least of urban renewal on a revolving fund basis.

We may or may not see a big push on moderate income housing in a housing bill next year. Moderate income housing is supposed to serve families with incomes ranging between the upper brackets of low income and the lower brackets of middle income. The genesis of such a program exists in the FHA section 221(d)(3) program which was placed in the law in the 1961 Housing Act with a scheduled termination date of July 1, 1965. Only slightly over 10,000 units have come out of the program to date but this is the one to watch. Many of your savers are moderate income people and I dare say many of your home loan borrowers are moderate income people. But you can't compete with 40-year, 3⅜-percent, 3-percent equity loans which are picked up by Fannie Mae special assistance operations. Fannie Mae special assistance operations are financed directly by the Federal treasury, so broadening this program might encounter Budget Bureau difficulties as the budget deficit impact would be immediate. In particular you should concern yourselves with any attempt to broaden the category of eligible borrowers under the program.

Probably, modest additional authorization will be requested for public housing. But since even the advocates of the program are disturbed by the way it operates we may well see moves to introduce innovations, such as for instance, a rent certificate plan which would get away from institutionalizing the recipients of public housing assistance.

A new housing bill doubtless would propose changes in many of the existing programs. I will not attempt to detail them but suggest they receive your careful consideration as they become known.

Recently our committee was afforded an opportunity to become better acquainted with one of the legislative proposals which you support. About a month ago your industry sent to Washington a very able five-man team of experts to present the case of your industry for Federal charter legislation. The occasion was a hearing before the Bank Supervision Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which my good friend and your good friend Congressman MULTER of New York is chairman. Let me assure those of you who were not present at the hearing that the presentation was most interesting and effective. One of the committee members in complimenting your witnesses stated, and I quote, "In the nearly 5 years that I have served on this committee, this statement that you have made is the most scholarly and helpful statement that has ever been made to the committee." You might also be interested in knowing that notwithstanding the fact the subcommittee is a 13-member subcommittee, no less than 21 committee members, or approximately two-thirds of the full committee membership, attended the hearings at which your industry presentation was made. Sharing honors in this fine presentation to the subcommittee were your president, Stewart Rauch; your vice president, Morris Crawford; your executive vice president, Grover Ensley; your director of research, Saul Klaman; and your general counsel, James Riordan.

Your bill providing for Federal charter of mutual savings banks, as is true of many other legislative proposals, must now find its place in the program of the new President. This possibly can mean delay. In the transition period when the economy will be particularly sensitive to change from established patterns, it may well be that executive policy will be to temporarily forego financial changes of any kind. While delay is discouraging, the fact remains that you have taken an important and necessary first step in formally presenting your proposal to the committee.

I look forward to the opportunity of more actively working with the members of your industry and your national association. I count many of your members among my close personal friends. I have long been familar in my home State of New Jersey with the fine work done by my good friend, John Kress, president of the Howard Savings Institution of Newark. His accomplishments reflect credit both on your industry and on his community as well. I have known your association's executive vice president, Grover Ensley, since the days when he served as the very able staff director of that important and highly respected committee of the Congress, then known as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and now known as the Joint Economic Committee. It is generally recognized that much of the credit for the excellent professional stature which that staff has attained belongs to Grover Ensley. You are indeed fortunate in having him as the executive vice president of your national association. Only recently the former general counsel of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Robert Poston, joined your association as director of your Washington office. Bob is well known and well liked on Capitol Hill and I am sure he will make a valuable contribution to the work of your association.

President Rauch and members of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, again I wish to express my pleasure and appreciation of this opportunity of meeting with you today and participating in this 17th annual midyear meeting of your great national association.

Paul Bencoe's Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Bencoe, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., has asked that the House of Representatives

be informed of his petition to the U.S. Government under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America regarding the nationalization of certain properties.

The petition is as follows:

PETITION TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas Czechoslovakia nationalized without compensation properties belonging to citizens of the United States, in 1946; and

Whereas protection and relief thus far provided by the Government of the United States to U.S. citizen-claimants of compensation from Czechoslovakia has been limited to enactment of Public Law 85-604, and completion thereunder of a Czechoslovakian claims program by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, in 1962; and

Whereas upon completion of the said Czechslovakian claims program, in 1962, a majority of said claimants received compensation equal to approximately 6 percent of the losses due to said nationalization, as determined by the said Commission; for example, against an award of more than $75,000 granted to this petitioner by the said Commission, this petitioner actually received compensation amounting to less than $5,000; and

Whereas for the last 17 years the Government of the United States has been engaged in an effort to negotiate full settlement of the validated claims of U.S. citizens with the Government of Czechoslovakia and is still so engaged, as witness a letter dated September 18, 1963, from the Department of State, a copy of which is attached and marked "Exhibit A" and, in all probability, will continue to be so engaged for many more years before accomplishing its aim; and

Whereas it has been the time-honored policy and practice of the Government of the United States to extend generous aid to deserving causes and people to the end of relieving human suffering and distress and, at times, even to the end of facilitating acquisition of benefit and profit;

Whereas a recent case in point is the Government of the United States promoting and facilitating, or proposing to promote and facilitate, the sales of wheat and other commodities to Russia and its satellites, including Czechoslovakia, and thereby enabling U.S. grain brokers, shipping companies and workers to benefit and profit, by authorizing and instructing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee the credit of and payments by Russia and its satellites, including Czechoslovakia, incidental to purchases by those countries of wheat and other commodities in the United States heretofore made or to be made;

Whereas U.S. citizen-claimants of compensation from Czechoslovakia, numbering approximately 2,000, have been waiting for more than 17 years for payment of such compensation;

Whereas waiting for 17 years and continuing to wait for many more years for payment of the compensation due to them has meant and will continue to mean acute distress, need and suffering for many of the claimants, including this petitioner;

Whereas the needs and aspirations of said U.S. citizen-claimants of compensation from Czechoslovakia are equally worthy of consideration by the Government of the United States as the needs and aspirations of U.S. grain brokers, shipping companies and workers intent upon dealing with Russia and its satellites, including Czechoslovakia, and in point of time and length of suffering antedate them by many years;

Whereas this petitioner and the other claimants have a just grievance in this regard; and

Whereas the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America guarantees to U.S. citizens the right to petition their Government for a redress of grievances;

Now, therefore, I, Paul Bencoe, a citizen of the United States, do hereby respectfully petition the Government of the United States for a redress of the just grievances of U.S. citizen-claimants of compensation from Czechoslovakia by authorizing and instructing the Export-Import Bank as follows:

1. To issue guarantees of credit to private banks and other lending institutions or individuals with respect to loans made by such banks or lenders against collateral consisting of awards granted by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States under the Czechoslovakian claims program, pursuant to Public Law 85-604;

2. To charge interest and fees in connection with such guarantees of credit at the same rates as in connection with the guarantees of credit issued or to be issued incidental to the sales of wheat and other grains to Russia and its satellites, including Czechoslovakia.

PAUL BENCOE.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *December 14, 1963.*

Tribute to John Ross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the State of Tennessee—especially the Chattanooga country—is steeped with true adventure of early-day pioneers blazing new trails through the wilderness. We are proud of our heritage which includes a generous span of history ranging from Indian teepees to today's exciting industrial city.

In the mountains of my State, Anglo-Saxon settlers came face to face with Indian tribes. Here, the Old World met the New. From the hardships of those frontier days came stout and hardy peopeople, deriving inspiration from the lofty mountains. We still do.

The rugged self-reliance of the hard-working, church-going, straight-shooting mountaineers is recognized as a basic quality of the people in our end of the earth. This independence has been characterized by our many real statesmen in public life such as Senator Estes Kefauver and Representative Carrol Reece.

Many Members of Congress are aware that the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn hailed from east Tennessee, but how many realize that Andrew Jackson, Cordell Hull, Andrew Johnson, Admiral Farragut, Sam Houston, and Mark Twain has roots in this same picturesque region. Sgt. Alvin York of World War I fame and the late magnificent opera singer Grace Moore are among the many famous citizens born in the shadows of the mountains.

The list goes on and on until the very veracity of the claims to so many truly distinguished individuals might be challenged. But another, every bit as great, may have escaped the textbooks of time. I am referring to John Ross. He was one of the earliest settlers of Chattanooga. His father was Scotch; his mother part Indian. For years what is now Chattanooga, at the bend of the Tennessee River, was known as Ross' Landing, a prominent trading post.

For 40 years John Ross was chief of the Cherokees, and during that period he won the respect of his people and led them well and with honor. He organized a group of Cherokees to fight with Tennessee troops in the Creek campaign of the War of 1812. John Ross held many jobs during his lifetime, one of which was U.S. postmaster. On frequent occasions he traveled to Washington to argue in behalf of the Cherokee Nation.

Recently, John Ross' boyhood home, outside of Chattanooga, Tenn., has been made a shrine under the auspices of the John Ross House Association, to honor both the Cherokees and Chief Ross. Many contributed energy and money to this worthwhile cause; prominent among whom were the Freemasons. Since John Ross was himself a master mason, it is fitting that Judge Luther Smith, sovereign grand commander of the Scottish Rite Freemasons, should take a personal interest in restoring the Cherokee chief's house. Through preserving John Ross' memory, the fundamental principles of America will also be perpetuated.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article "Chief John Ross" from the August 1963 edition of the New Age in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CHIEF JOHN ROSS

(By Luther A. Smith)

Organizations such as the John Ross House Association are performing a useful service to our country, to religion, to education, and to our heritage of freedom by bringing to our attention the life, character, and example of such vigorous pioneers as Chief John Ross of the Cherokee Indians. It was out of their experiences, their work, their habits, their principles, and their ideals that America was built. By remembering them and honoring them we make a contribution to the perpetuation of the civilization they bequeathed to this generation.

While his environment and the circumstances of his early years caused him to cast his lot with the Cherokee Nation who lived in the mountains of north Georgia, Chief John Ross, throughout his active and useful life, exhibited genuine American characteristics. He sought and acquired a good education, was friendly and gentle in his contacts with others. He had a clear-cut and stern sense of right and justice, and on many occasions, he boldly demanded fair treatment for his Cherokee tribesmen. He was honest and sincere—a religious man, and a member of the Methodist Church. He had a nephew, William P. Ross, who was a promising boy, and John Ross at his own expense had the boy educated, graduating him from Princeton University. William proved his worthiness by applying his talents in serving well the Cherokee Nation. He had a bent for literature and became noted for his writings, particularly in editing magazines and other publications for the special benefit of the Indians. Thus the inspiring influence of John Ross was multiplied manifold in the life and works of his distinguished nephew.

John Ross was born October 3, 1790, at Tah-no-hoo-yah, on the Coosa River, Cherokee Nation. His father was a Scotchman and his Cherokee mother was three-quarters white. The Cherokees had been established

in the southern mountains two or three centuries before their contacts with Western civilization during the incursions of Hernando De Soto in 1540 and the traders and missionaries who followed him. They were enterprising and quick to learn. Sequoya, one of their warriors, invented an alphabet which resulted in the spread of knowledge of events. Ross had a keen and intelligent interest in the affairs of the Cherokee Nation, which numbered about 20,000 to 22,000 individuals living in some 50 or 60 villages or towns. He was soon giving them valuable assistance and advice. He was sent on missions to other tribes. He joined in the war against the Creeks and aided Andrew Jackson at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. Chief John Ross was a wise administrator and had considerable ability as a statesman and diplomat, but he was a strong advocate and a hard fighter for the rights of his people. They were constantly under pressure either from Georgia or the United States, and sometimes both, to move to Arkansas and Oklahoma. He resisted all these efforts and found it necessary to travel from place to place to attend council meetings or conferences, to consider treaties, even going to Washington on many occasions, where he argued ably and made appeals to the officials and to the Supreme Court. He was a man of fine appearance and impressive personality. He always gave a good account of himself and was respected and held in high esteem by officials, friends, and opponents. When he became aware of the inevitable defeat of his efforts, he urged his nation to accept their destiny and proudly led about 16,000 Cherokees to Oklahoma. However, he continued to fight for their just rights and a fair settlement of their claims before the authorities in Washington. He died in that city in August 1866. He was given a Masonic funeral and was buried in the Brandywine Cemetery beside his second wife at Wilmington, Del. He had been chief of the Cherokee Nation for about 40 years.

Although it has not been definitely ascertained where and when John Ross was made a Mason, there is no doubt that he belonged to the fraternity. Certain Masonic records in Arkansas clearly indicate that he was a Mason. That he received a Masonic funeral is valid evidence of that fact. It is well known that he and the great Mason, Gen. Albert Pike, were warm friends. His Indian wife, "Quatie," was buried in the cemetery plot of Albert Pike, in Little Rock. Furthermore, when the War Between the States broke out, Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederacy, knowing of Pike's close personal and professional relationship between him and the Indian tribes, gave him the rank of brigadier general in the Confederate Army and assigned him the duty of lining up the Indian Nations and making treaties with them to support the Confederate States. Pike accepted and proceeded at once to carry out his mission. He had no particular difficulty with any of them except the Cherokees. There was a serious division among them about making the alliance, Chief Ross arguing "that it was not their fight," but he could not resist General Pike's appeals, and he finally yielded and cast the Cherokee Nation's lot with the Confederacy.

It is appropriate to note that Chief John's nephew, William, became a Mason in Washington, D.C., on April 25, 1848, when he received the degrees in Federal Lodge No. 1 and also took the Royal Arch Degrees in Washington. Their thinking and ways of life easily identified both of them as good Masons and good men. It is easy to believe that these two Rosses and Albert Pike, all of whom had frequent occasion to be in the Capital, enjoyed fraternal association on many occasions.

The following information concerning the Masonic affiliation of John Ross was furnished me by Mrs. Gertrude McDaris Ruskin after leaving Washington and before I arrived at Rossville. Feeling sure it is correct, I want to include it in my address, which is as follows: It is not known exactly when Ross became a Mason but it is known that he was one of 38 charter members of the Olive Branch Lodge of Jasper, Tenn. His Masonic demit from this Lodge, dated April 11, 1827, stated that Ross, a Master Mason, remained in good standing with the Order of Free and Accepted Masons. This demit is now at the Gilcrease Museum in Tulsa.

Perhaps it is time for me to give some explanation or reasons why I am interested in the restoration and dedication of this ancient structure called the Chief John Ross House. Several years ago, I made a speech to a large audience in Atlanta. Two or three years later, I received a letter from a lady living in Decatur who said she was in the audience and heard that speech and then had some very complimentary remarks to make about it. She quickly left that subject and spoke of what was burdening her heart. She had something to sell, and she knew all the arts of good salesmanship. She went right to the point:

"We want and need your help in rescuing the old boyhood home of Chief John Ross, who led his people as Principal Chief for nearly 40 years," she said, "built the last year George Washington was President (1797), it still stands at Rossville, Ga., almost on the boundary line of Chattanooga, Tenn., and nearly out of Georgia."

I was interested in her story. Then she went on:

"As you are Georgia born, I hope you will use your influence in helping us save the famous Cherokee Indian landmark and make it into a shrine to honor Chief Ross and his people who were so ruthlessly forced to leave this part of the country for a new home in Oklahoma. Even at this late date we can atone for this cruel treatment of the Cherokees by restoring the home of their old Chief, John Ross."

The lady filled three closely typewritten pages with historical facts spiced with lofty statements and warm devotion to what she considered a great cause. Her story convinced me that this project was commanding her attention as well as that of her husband and many other citizens who considered it a matter of great concern. They themselves were doing their best to put it over, but they sorely needed some outside aid and influence. That was what she was asking me for.

That letter was signed "Gertrude Chewani Ruskin." I later learned that she is one thirty-second Cherokee Indian. I replied that I would take the matter under consideration, investigate it, and let her have my decision as soon as possible. It wasn't long before my Ross House mail was very heavy. Notices, pictures, and other items poured in. I learned that Chief Ross was a Mason and had aided General Albert Pike, one of my predecessors in the office of sovereign grand commander of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite of Free-Masonry, Southern Jurisdiction, in obtaining the cooperation of the Indian nations in furthering the military success of the Confederate Army, Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States, having assigned to Pike this responsibility.

I then sought the cooperation of our active member in Georgia, the distinguished Inspector General Tom C. Law, 33d degree. Other prominent Masons became interested and I had an article published in our monthly publication, the New Age, which aroused additional interest. We made a money gift to the cause, but it was the indomitable determination, devotion, and hard work of Mrs. Ruskin and her husband, Sidney Ruskin, 33d degree, that gave the enterprise the mighty push that put it over. A long list of those who served this cause well has been prepared and in due time will be widely distributed. By a splendid united community effort taking in the whole area, the big job has been completed insofar as the building itself is concerned. We of the supreme council, 33d degree, are happy to have had a part in this worthwhile enterprise.

Here stands the ancient boyhood home of Chief John Ross, a hero to his nation, a lover of right and justice, and a benefactor of humanity, as a noble symbol of the past and a memorial to the devotion of this generation to the exalted principles of those who bequeathed to us the blessings of liberty. May it stand forever as a challenge to future generations to emulate their example.

Text of President Johnson's Address to the United Nations Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the great speech of President Johnson to the United Nations General Assembly:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ASSEMBLY

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates to the United Nations, ladies and gentlemen:

We meet in a time of mourning, but in a moment of rededication. My Nation has lost a great leader—this organization has lost a great friend—world peace has lost a great champion.

But John Kennedy was the author of new hope for mankind—hope which was shared by a whole new generation of leaders, in every continent—and we must not let grief turn us away from that hope. He never quarreled with the past—he always looked to the future—and our task now is to work for the kind of future in which he believed.

I have come here today to make it unmistakably clear that the assassin's bullet which took his life did not alter his Nation's purpose.

We are more than ever opposed to doctrines of hate and violence—in our own land and around the world.

We are more than ever committed to the rule of law—in our own land and around the world.

We believe more than ever in the rights of man, all men of every color—in our own land and around the world.

And more than ever we support the United Nations, as the best instrument yet devised to promote the peace of the world and the well-being of mankind.

I can tell you today, as I told you in 1958 when I came as majority leader of the Senate to the first committee of this great tribunal, that the full power and partnership of the United States is committed to our joint effort to eliminate war and the threat of war, aggression and the danger of violence, and to lift from all people everywhere the blight of disease, poverty, and illiteracy.

I

Like all human institutions, the U.N. has not achieved the highest of hopes that some had held at its birth.

Our understanding of how to live with one another is still far behind our knowledge of how to destroy one another.

But as our problems have grown, this organization has grown—in numbers, authority, and prestige—and its member nations have grown with it, in responsibility and in maturity.

We have seen too much success to become obsessed with failure.

The peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations has worked, in the Congo, in the Middle East, and elsewhere.

The great transition from colonial rule to independence has been largely accomplished.

The decade of development has successfully begun.

The world arms race has been slowed.

The struggle for human rights has been gaining new force.

And a start has been made in furthering mankind's common interest in outer space—in scientific exploration, in communications, in weather forecasting, in banning the stationing of nuclear weapons, and in establishing principles of law.

I know that vast problems remain—conflicts between great powers—conflicts between small neighbors—disagreements over disarmament—persistence of ancient wrongs in the area of human rights—residual problems of colonialism—and all the rest.

But men and nations, working apart, created these problems. And men and nations, working together, can solve them.

They can solve them with the help of this organization—when all members make it a workshop for constructive action, not a forum for abuse—when all members seek its help in settling their own disputes as well as the disputes of others—when all members meet their financial obligations to it—and when all members recognize that no nation, no party, and no single system can control the future of men.

II

When I entered the Congress of the United States 27 years ago, it was my privilege to work closely with a great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As a Member of Congress, I worked with him to bring about a profound but peaceful revolution.

That peaceful revolution brought help and hope to the-third of our Nation then "ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished."

We helped our working men and women obtain more jobs and better wages.

We helped our farmers to own and improve their own land, conserve their soil and water, and electrify their farms.

We harnessed the power of great rivers, as in the Tennessee Valley and lower Colorado, encouraged the growth of cooperatives and trade unions, curbed the excesses of private speculation, built homes in place of city slums, and extended the rights and freedoms of all our citizens.

Now, on the world scale, the time has come, as it came to America 30 years ago, for a new era of hope—hope and progress for that one-third of mankind still beset by hunger, poverty, and disease.

In my travels on behalf of President Kennedy, I have seen too much of misery and despair in Africa, in Asia, and in Latin America.

I have seen too often the ravages of hunger, tapeworm and tuberculosis, and the scabs and scars on too many children who have little health and no hope.

I think that you and I and our countries and this organization can, and must, do something about these conditions.

I am not speaking here of a new way of life to be imposed by any single nation.

I am speaking of a higher standard of living—to be inspired by these United Nations.

It will not be achieved through some hopeful resolution in this Assembly, but through peaceful revolution in the world, through a recommitment of all our members, rich and poor, strong and weak, whatever their location or ideology, to the basic principles of human welfare and human dignity.

In this effort, the United States will do its full share. In addition to bilateral aid, we have with great satisfaction assisted in recent years in the emergence and improvement of international development institutions, both within and without this organization.

We favor the steady improvement of collective machinery for helping the less-developed nations build modern societies.

We favor an international aid program that is international in practice as well as purpose. Every nation must do its share. All United Nations members can do better—we can act more often together—we can build a better world.

III

The greatest of human problems—and the greatest of our common tasks—is to keep the peace and save the future.

All that we have built in the wealth of nations, and all that we plan to do toward a better life for all, will be in vain if our feet should slip, our vision falter, and our hopes ended in another worldwide war.

If there is one commitment more than any other that I would leave with you today, it is my unswerving commitment to the keeping and the strengthening of peace.

We know what we want:

The United States wants to see the cold war end, once and for all.

The United States wants to prevent the dissemination of nuclear weapons to nations not now possessing them.

The United States wants to press on with arms control and reduction.

The United States wants to cooperate with all the members of this organization to conquer everywhere the ancient enemies of man—hunger, disease, and ignorance.

The United States wants sanity, security, and peace for all, and above all.

President Kennedy, I am sure, would regard as his best memorial the fact that in his 3 years as President the world became a little safer and the way ahead a little brighter. To the protection and enlargement of this new hope for peace, I pledge my country and its government.

My friends and fellow citizens of the world: Soon you will return to your homelands.

I hope you will take with you my gratitude for your generosity in hearing so late in your session.

I hope you will convey to your countrymen the gratitude of all Americans for the companionship of sorrow which you shared with us in your messages of the last few weeks.

And I hope you will tell them that the United States of America, sobered by tragedy, united in sorrow, renewed in spirit, faces the new year determined that world peace, civil rights, and human welfare become not an illusion but a reality. Man's age-old hope remains our goal—that this world, under God, can be made safe for diversity, free from hostility, and a better place for our children and all children in generations to come.

And therefore any man and any nation that seeks peace—and hates war—and is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and disease and ignorance and misery—will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them every step of the way.

A Tribute to Homer Thornberry

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives does not accord automatic respect to any of its Members. The regard and esteem any Representative receives in this body he must earn through a thousand acts of hard work, a thousand tests of character, and a thousand demonstrations of tact and ability. HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, has survived 15 years of such exacting scrutiny. It is only fitting and proper that on the occasion of his retirement from the House his colleagues should give public testimony to the magnificent record he has compiled here and to the respect they have for him both as a legislator and as a man.

When HOMER THORNBERRY first arrived here in 1949 to represent the former district of President Lyndon Johnson, he had already compiled a solid record of public achievement. He had served in the Texas House of Representatives, as a district attorney, as a member of the Austin City Council, and as a mayor pro tem of Austin. He had also served his country during World War II as an officer in naval intelligence. This service, however, was merely a prelude to the distinguished career he enjoyed in the House of Representatives.

He interested himself in a wide range of legislation during that career. He served for a number of years on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Then, in 1955, he was appointed to the Committee on Rules, a position for which he was particularly well suited and in which he earned great distinction and well deserved praise.

One facet of his activities is little known, and yet it is perhaps the best measure of his humanitarian instincts. HOMER THORNBERRY was a devoted supporter of programs to aid the deaf. He gave a great deal of his time and energy to that cause. In particular, he has served for many years on the board of directors of Gallaudet College, an institution which trains and educates deaf students.

Congress will not soon forget HOMER THORNBERRY. We know he will bring luster to the judiciary. We congratulate him on the success we know he will achieve in his new position.

A tribute to the Congressman by President Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet College, follows:

Gallaudet College pays affectionate tribute to Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY, who has long seen the necessity for extending to all deaf persons the very best education that the Nation is able to provide.

The son of deaf parents, he has an insight into the nature of deafness possessed by few lay persons. Appointed to the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College in March 1949, he brought to the position the talents that have raised him to prominence in the Government of the United States of America.

In appreciation of his dedicated devotion to the cause of the deaf, Gallaudet College bestowed on him an honorary doctor of laws degree at its 90th commencement, June 5, 1954.

In 1959, the college named its new hearing and speech center the Mary L. Thornberry Building in honor of his mother, a noted teacher of the deaf, who died July 10, 1958. President Leonard M. Elstad, of Gallaudet, said that the college, in honoring the memory of this devoted deaf mother and teacher, would also be honoring her illustrious son, "who continuously maintains his interest in the education of the deaf and who is one of

those most responsible" for the expansion and improvement of the college.

Congressman HOMER THORNBERRY is an eminent example of the public man who has devoted his life and talents to his country and to all good works.

Address by Gov. William W. Scranton at Ceremonies Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Soldiers National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa., November 19, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following address by Gov. William W. Scranton at ceremonies commemorating the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Soldiers National Cemetery, Gettysburg, Pa., November 19, 1963:

To this hallowed ground 100 years ago came the 16th President of the United States to voice the solemn hope that this Nation, under God, might have a new birth of freedom.

He stood here humbly in the presence of a ghostly army of Gettysburg dead. Reflections of his heart's agony were etched in the craggy furrows of his countenance as he admonished his countrymen:

"The grave men," he said, "living and dead, who fought here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract."

One hundred years later we stand in the long shadow cast by that gentle man both on this field and on the pages of history. Our purpose is to commemorate his memory—and we are, of course, engaged in a needless task far above our poor power.

His memory to endure has no need of our faint applause.

His life's work—or even the few eloquent words he spoke here—need no commemoration from us to insure their honored place in the annals of mankind.

If we are but one-tenth as humble as he was, we will realize that we are not here for his sake.

Rather, we are come for our own sake, as freemen, to refresh ourselves at this shrine. We are come to find increased devotion for the unfinished cause of human freedom. We are come to take comfort in the victories of the past because we know that for liberty there lie fierce battles in the future.

Long before Abraham Lincoln spoke here, the homeless visionary Thomas Paine had been able to rally an embryo nation to the cause of liberty by writing that the aspirations of a free people were little more than commonsense.

Lincoln rallied what was left of a nation to fight for the cause of union by appealing to that same commonsense.

Abraham Lincoln was of the people not because he was born in a log cabin, or because he split logs, or came from a poor, but honest family, but because he had a superb appreciation of the honest common sense that can come to a public official from the American people, if he will but let it. And to that, Lincoln was willing to contribute his own quite considerable talent for leadership.

In Lincoln, the two great mainstreams of American political philosophy converged, and he drew deeply from both. From the Jeffersonians, Lincoln took an appreciation of the people's ultimate wisdom. From the Hamiltonians, he took a belief in the need for strong leadership.

Thus, Lincoln, though a master politician, did what our American folklore has come to say is impossible to do. He was able to fulfill his own campaign slogans. He was great as a man and as a President because he had faith in the people, listened to them, but yet led them.

This same strong mixture of following and leading is what is needed in America today.

There are those who would say, of course, that there is no valid comparison between the America of today and the America of Abraham Lincoln.

They would say that we have entered the nuclear age and everything has changed.

Everything has not changed.

Grape shot fired at Manassas ripped life from a man just as surely as an atomic bomb dropped at Hiroshima.

What is more, the ultimate way in which man may die does not change the ultimate way in which he must strive to live.

That ultimate striving for us, as a nation, can be nothing less than eternal warfare on the forces of tyranny no matter the garb in which the tyrant comes disguised.

Whether the tyranny is of power or of money, or of unjust privilege; whether it's a tyranny of fear, or of hunger, or of censorship; whether the tyrant wields the dagger of prejudice or of demagoguery; whether he comes openly mounted on a high horse, or more subtly disguised on a soap box; in every case the great unfinished work to which each generation of Americans must be dedicated is to strike down the tyranny and destroy the tyrant.

In the 187 years that have passed since the American colonies declared their independence, we have found no sounder formula for destroying tyranny than that of Abraham Lincoln.

America will survive so long as we have leaders of the people who use as their guidelines the people's commonsense.

While politicians, and even statesmen, for instance, may argue mightily about the relative danger to the Republic from the far right or from the far left, the people in their commonsense reject both.

While politicians and lawyers discuss the legalistic fine points of civil rights legislation, the tyranny of prejudice is doomed because the American people in their deep commonsense realize it is wrong.

While men of great importance carry on erudite debates over the relative merits of total victory versus total coexistence, the American people long ago decided that though we are not a nation of belligerents, we must never abandon the ultimate effort to free captive peoples wherever they are imprisoned in the world.

The wise and gentle Mr. Lincoln would have understood today's American people. Their commonsense would have appealed to him.

"Human nature," Lincoln told an audience shortly before he died, "will not change. In any future great national trial, compared with the men of this, we shall have as weak and as strong, as silly and as wise, as bad and as good."

Today, 100 years after Abraham Lincoln on this field gave the world his few appropriate remarks, let us resolve to keep faith with the memory of the man who had such great faith in us as a nation.

If we but do that, this Nation, under God, will have a new birth of freedom. If we do that, we shall not perish from the earth.

Myer Feldman To Remain With Johnson Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress and millions of citizens concerned about the preservation of peace and justice in the Near East have been reassured and gratified by a development at the White House.

In the transition from the Kennedy administration to the new Johnson administration, President Johnson has asked Mr. Myer Feldman to continue serving as Deputy Special Counsel to the President and personal adviser on Near Eastern issues, just as Mr. Feldman did for our late, martyred President, John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Feldman is a distinguished authority on the matters with which he deals. His continued efforts assure stability in Washington and security abroad in the complex Near Eastern controversies.

Mr. Feldman's acceptance of President Johnson's request for him to remain on the White House staff in the same capacity is a welcome development. I know I speak for very many colleagues in both Houses of the Congress.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD as an authoritative news feature, a report on Mr. Feldman. It was written by Milton Friedman, White House correspondent of the widely respected Jewish Telegraphic Agency, and has been published in many newspapers.

The article follows:

MYER FELDMAN TO REMAIN WITH JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION

(By Milton Friedman)

Pro-Israel elements were reassured to learn that President Lyndon B. Johnson will rely on Myer Feldman, of the White House staff, to advise him on Jewish issues exactly as Mr. Feldman did for President Kennedy.

Biased recommendations of the State Department will now continue to be observed and balanced by Mr. Feldman. There will once more be at the President's elbow an alternative to any one-sided policy papers submitted by the State Department's Near Eastern Division.

An incident in 1962 illustrated State Department-White House relations. The Department then stressed—both publicly and through diplomatic channels to the Arab States—that discussions held in Israel by Mr. Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to the President, did not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Government.

When President Kennedy heard of this, he commented that the Department did not always reflect his own views. President Kennedy was less than pleased by some career diplomats who actually stated that a visit to Israel by one of his top staff members was private, unofficial, and "not as a representative of the U.S. Government." Indeed, Department spokesmen indicated that Mr. Feldman was in Israel merely as a tourist, so unimportant that "we do not know with whom he had appointments."

Such remarks about a senior White House staff member were unprecedented. They

reflected the vexation of career diplomats at Mr. Feldman's powerful White House role in counterbalancing various strategems dangerous to Israel.

The Department made the comments on Mr. Feldman in response to inquiries by Arab ambassadors. Instead of asserting the right of an American President to have a Jewish assistant concerned about Israel's survival, the Department sought to minimize and discredit the Feldman visit to Israel. (The result was only that the State Department discredited itself, in this connection, in the eyes of John F. Kennedy.)

During his visit, Mr. Feldman discussed Israel's development and security needs with the then Premier David Ben-Gurion. Shortly thereafter, the agreement to sell U.S. ground-to-air missiles to Israel was announced. This was quite an achievement for an "unofficial tourist."

Mr. Ben-Gurion later commented that Mr. Feldman was "the kind of man to whom I can talk."

President Johnson and Mr. Feldman have been acquainted since the early 1950's. Mr. Feldman then helped on some work of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. A Senator at that time, Mr. Johnson was chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. Feldman was then executive assistant to the chairman of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and volunteered to assist the subcommittee.

An indication of the new President's nature emerged when he was telephoned by the bereaved widow of former Senator Herbert H. Lehman who for years led Senate fights on behalf of Israel. Mrs. Lehman urged the President not to attend her husband's funeral in New York because of the risk of assassination attempts so soon after Dallas.

President Johnson replied that when he suffered a heart attack in 1955, the first Senator to offer a prayer for his recovery was Lehman. Mr. Johnson was touched by the compassion and sincerity of the New Yorker. It lingered in his memory, almost as if linked with his recuperation. Consequently, he said to Mrs. Lehman, neither he nor Mrs. Johnson would consider avoiding the Lehman funeral.

Those who know the President are convinced that his attitude toward leaders of Jewish faith and Jewish causes is entirely positive. His designation of Mr. Feldman to continue as Deputy Special Counsel and also personal adviser on Jewish matters was reassuring to many Jewish leaders. Mr. Feldman's quick acceptance revealed his faith in President Johnson.

The new President has assumed duties at a juncture which finds several issues simmering: Israel is about to attempt its water diversion project, possibly bringing Arab violence; the Arab refugee situation has been revived at the United Nations; a Presidential decision must be made on implementation of the anti-aggression amendment involving severance of aid to Egypt; the relationship of the United States and Israel remains to be defined, and the Hawk missiles, although contracted, have yet to be delivered.

Other questions awaiting action include the plight of Soviet Jewry, Arab travel restrictions affecting Americans, Arab boycotts and blockades, immigration reforms, ratification of the Genocide Convention, and various other civil rights and human rights matters.

The coming months will tell the story of the Johnson administration. Mr. Feldman's continued presence signifies reassurance to those concerned about the State Department pressures.

There is every likelihood that President Johnson will display the sense of justice he asserted in defense of Israel when he was Senate majority leader.

Mr. Feldman will be there to assist him. Mr. Feldman's function at the White House is different and on a much higher level than the roles played by David K. Niles, who served President Truman, and Maxwell Rabb, who handled Jewish affairs for President Eisenhower. As Deputy Special Counsel, Mr. Feldman is responsible for many vital communications links with Congress and Federal agencies.

Officially redesignated as the White House's "Watchman of Israel," Myer Feldman is aware that "the Watchman of Israel doth not sleep and doth not slumber."

Donald Willis Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, at the Wright Brothers memorial dinner commemorating the 60th anniversary of powered flight held here in Washington at the Sheraton Park Hotel on December 17, 1963, the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy was presented to Mr. Donald Willis Douglas.

Mr. Douglas was chosen for this honor because of his significant public service of enduring value to aviation in the United States. An aeronautical engineer of renown, Mr. Douglas is widely recognized as a man who has used his creative talents to enhance the progress of aviation and the economy of the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address made by Mr. Douglas on accepting the Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy for 1963. It follows:

REMARKS OF DONALD W. DOUGLAS

Thank you very much for this magnificent, historic award. I am most grateful and humbly proud to be the recipient of the Wright Brothers Memeorial Trophy for 1963.

I am keenly aware of the distinction it carries and of the many illustrious figures in aviation who have preceded me in this distinction. The mere repetition of their names, most of them national heroes and old friends, spells out a saga of man's dramatic conquest of the air.

After 50 years of inspiring contact with the men and acomplishments that made this story possible, the cherished recognition afforded me tonight must be accepted only as a joint tribute to a host of dedicated, courageous people whose combined efforts of a half century helped all of us write the aviation and aerospace story of our beloved country. To all of them and to all here tonight, my thanks.

Memories of those exciting, eventful years, the sobering present, and the vistas and promises of the future—all these tend to make this occasion a memorable one for me. These thoughts, with their nostalgic overtones, come tonight, as they must to many millions of other Americans, at a time when our Nation, saddened and aroused, is determined to reasses its yardsticks of moral values and demand individual and national integrity in all we say, plan, and do.

It has been written that men cannot live by bread alone. Principles, inspiration and integrity must ever remain, as indeed they were for the men we honor tonight, an indispensable part of every consideration. In the lives of the Wright brothers these qualities stood out above all.

As I glance ever so briefly backward and forward, I wonder if the clearest visions do not appear to us either when we are quite young or quite old?

I know now, as I contemplate the past and try to peer into the future, that I tried to share, if only in a minute measure, the visions of the Wrights, the Curtisses, the Chanutes and the other great pioneers of the half century thta changed the world. For better or for worse, those changes still are going on.

The visions and inspirations that the Wright brothers left us are the priceless legacy of our times. This, I am certain, has been, is and always will be, the real motivation behind most of the great strides made by mankind in technology, science, philosophy or religion. And they have usually been made by young men after their first overpowering,—possibly God-given urge to create, improve, teach and accomplish fantastic tasks.

As we honor Wilbur and Orville Wright, I would like to share in this rite and leave with you some visions that I now see—now in what I choose to call my later days.

It is my feeling that we as a nation have become more and more prone to give credit for a big job done, whether in science, engineering, business or politics, to one man. Madison Avenue and present-day public relations experts have learned that it is easier to sell the public on the idea that one man should receive all the credit for an important accomplishment. But on sober thought we all know that this has seldom been true. The Wrights knew that while their achievements were fundamental, there were many, many others without whose help they could not have succeeded. Every successful man knows this, but not all admit it to themselves or to their associates.

Now, the point of my present vision—the upgrading of all the toilers who share in the success of any great accomplishment, and the deemphasizing of the great contribution of just one man, or a small group of men. I am certain every endeavor will be more effective, accomplished in less time and with less cost, if all of the real contributors share in the glory and in the gain.

This, I feel, applies to all group efforts, whether they be in government or industry. It applies more today than yesterday, since all present-day problems are so much more complex than formerly. For quick and satisfactory solutions, the efforts of more and better men are needed. To keep our country in the lead in the world of today, we must solve our problems quicker and at less expense than the other nations are able to do.

We have traveled a long, long way since the days of Kitty Hawk. We have piled record upon record, achievement upon achievement, and triumph upon triumph. We have been able to extend our horizons to stellar dimensions never dreamed of by the simple, God-fearing sons of Bishop Wright.

Yes, we have traveled a long way from the sand hills of North Carolina, but in what direction? Where leads our path of progress—our roads of destiny?

This is, indeed, the $64 question, or to be more accurate, the $64 billion question. It could very well be the question of life or total destruction of the only physical world we here on earth pretend to really know.

Unfortunately, it is a question to which all of our fantastic computers and scientific instruments cannot supply a definite answer.

How do you program courage, confidence, faith, inspiration, or integrity of purpose? How do you identify and transmit to the memory drum the perseverance and integrity the Wright brothers left us? How do you define and feed these values into those amazing metallic monsters that have become our tireless servants and our stern, unbending masters in the last two decades?

Today's questions and answers are infinitely more complex and exacting. They

call for universal perimeters. They require new definitions and new terminologies.

But the fundamentals remain.

Today's aerospace industry is keeping pace with progress in all of its gigantic, awesome strides. As one who has watched this progress from its very inception, I firmly believe that we can solve the problems of the present as we did in the past.

True to the heritage left us by the Wright brothers, our generations, the young and the old, are marching forward unafraid.

And I am confident that when the history of our times is written, it will be recorded that we met the challenge head on.

Inspired by our honored predecessors and with the help of countless millions of Americans and people of good will everywhere, we will keep the faith no matter what lies ahead.

What Law, New or Old, Would Have Stopped Tragedy in Dallas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, since the tragic and terrible event of November 22 there has been much talk about legislation to regulate the sale of guns, especially by mail. An editorial appearing in the Bremerton Sun on December 3, 1963, strikes me as being most sensible and realistic. Under unanimous consent I insert it in the RECORD:

WHAT LAW, NEW OR OLD, WOULD HAVE STOPPED TRAGEDY IN DALLAS?

Most of today's editorial page is devoted to a variety of views on the mail order gun business.

It has pertinence now because of the assassination of President Kennedy with a gun bought in this manner.

The controversy seems to center around this premise: Stopping the mail-order gun business (or, at least, making it more regulatory) will largely eliminate the danger of some nut repeating what Lee Oswald did in Dallas. Further, it is suggested that the weapons laws are pretty loose in most States and what we need is a general crackdown on the manner in which guns are sold to almost everybody who has the money to buy one.

We can't believe that stricter licensing laws for gun owners or tighter policing of the mail order gun business will prevent the assassination of heads of state or even reduce the threat.

It's obvious that some people own guns who shouldn't have them. It is also obvious that some people operate small boats who shouldn't be allowed out of their own yards. The Nation's traffic record proves that there are literally thousands of people who own and operate automobiles who should be grounded for life.

All three are deadly weapons under the right (or wrong) circumstances.

The right to operate a vehicle is strictly enforced. Anyone with the money and the inclination can own a boat or a gun. Whether to license or not to license owners of material things doesn't impress us as a determining factor in their deadliness when they are used incorrectly.

We can't imagine that Lee Oswald, once having conceived a plot to kill the President (if that's what he did) would have been at all deterred by redtape of any length in connection with the obtaining of a murder weapon. As easy as it is to get a gun by mail, he went to the trouble to use an assumed name and an obscure address. Wouldn't he have gone to any other lengths (even to stealing a weapon) if the one avenue had been closed to him?

Guns were invented to kill. That is their sole purpose. In the hands of trained sportsmen they become tools for pleasure and recreation and even food supply. Even then, guns sometimes kill what they aren't supposed to, in which case another hunting accident is recorded.

It's quite probable that a more sensible method of selling weapons should be devised. When even small children can clip a coupon and get a deadly rifle by simply sending the money to a mail order house, there is something wrong with the system. Perhaps a thorough review of legal and illegal gun traffic is in order.

Still, the only way to keep guns from killing is to do away with them. This is not going to happen, of course. And no law, no gun license requirement, nor anything else we can think of will prevent what so tragically occurred on Friday, November 22, in Dallas, Tex.

An Appreciation of the Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Written by Rev. David G. Granfield, O.S.B., for the American Ecclesiastical Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most profound appreciations of our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that I have read appears in the December issue of the American Ecclesiastical Review, a monthly magazine for the Roman Catholic clergy, and published here in Washington at the Catholic University of America. The tribute was written by the Reverend David G. Granfield, a member of the Order of Saint Benedict, who lives at St. Anselm's Benedictine Abbey in Washington, and who comes from my home city of Springfield, Mass. Under permission previously granted, I include Father Granfield's tribute to President Kennedy with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY—1917–63

A servant of the people, strong in mind and spirit; a brave and resourceful Navy lieutenant in a fighting war, an heroic Commander in Chief in the cold one; born to riches, educated for success, graceful in speech, pointed in wit, noble in his patriotism, familiar with suffering, yet youthful in his vigor and indefatigable in his work; courage he valued highly, justice he loved deeply; powerful among the mighty, he was humble with the poor; catholic in his talents and in his visions, he was, above all, Catholic in his religion, not confusing what is Caesar's with what is God's; a seasoned judge of good men, a patient but unrelenting opponent of evil ones; a gentleman by breeding, a diplomat by nature, he was a gifted statesman, and finally, by the will of the people of the United States, a beloved President; a golden legend in his lifetime, John Kennedy won the undying love of his fellow citizens by his sacrificial death; leaving behind two young children and a lovely First Lady, he died a martyr to the cause of equality and peace. May his blood heal the wounds of hate and violence that have rent the fabric of the state; last of all, may John Fitzgerald Kennedy who hungered and thirsted after justice now have his fill for all eternity; great peacemaker that he was may he rest in joy and peace among the children of God.

Pay Scales in Oversea Military Schools Should Be Equalized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the December 21, 1963, issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal and Register to the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara wants a $191 million pay raise for the armed services. The article says the effective pay adjustment will be October 1964.

Meanwhile, as far as I know, the Defense Department, which operates the oversea schools for the children of servicemen, has done little or nothing about the salary schedule of teachers in these schools.

Public Law 86–91—1959—provides that oversea teachers' salaries are to be in line with the scale of teachers' salaries here in the United States. According to a study of the National Educational Association, increases in U.S. teachers' salaries since 1960 have averaged 15 percent. Since September 1960, however, the Defense Department has not provided any salary schedule increase for oversea teachers. Yet a review was supposed to be made each year.

I understand that these oversea teachers will get a $100 increase in 1964, but compared to their counterparts in the United States, salaries will still remain far below the level of teachers' pay in comparable areas in this country. For example, an oversea teacher with 2 years' experience and a bachelor's degree receives $560 a year less than his counterparts here. At the next level above that, the difference is $678, while teachers with 6 years of college receive $1,000 a year less.

In the State of Washington, the Washington Educational Association has declared recently that conditions prevailing in schools for dependents of military personnel in foreign countries are inexcusable. There are 300 schools in 26 countries involved and 7,000 teachers for 160,000 children of our military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House Committee on Armed Services will investigate. This subject should be considered just as soon as Congress reconvenes in January. Certainly the pay scale of civilian teachers in our military establishments abroad should be adjusted and treated with the same fairness as the proposed increases in military pay scales. A National Educational Association report says Defense Department budget re-

quests have been insufficient to allow for adequate pay increases and other educational improvements recommended by their recent survey.

Urban Renewal Programs Create Unemployment

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have followed with great interest the work of the gentleman from Texas, JOHN DOWDY, in the investigation of urban renewal in the District of Columbia. In my judgment the job done by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], by his subcommittee, and by the staff with respect to the Columbia Plaza urban renewal project is one of the outstanding pieces of investigation completed during this session.

Recently my attention has been called to certain information gathered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] on the subject of "Unemployment Created by Urban Renewal Programs." This material seems to be of such importance that it should be made widely available. Accordingly I asked, and have received, permission to insert that statement in the RECORD.

In addition, I include the text of a speech by William L. Slayton, Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, in which he stated that:

It has now been 9 years since rehabilitation was made an integral part of urban renewal by the Housing Act of 1954. During a period of explosive growth in the program nationally, about 200 projects have reached the execution stage involving some degree of rehabilitation, and something in excess of 100,000 dwelling units have been scheduled for rehabilitation. But as to accomplishment, only a few thousand have actually been improved.

The result of this relative lack of accomplishment—much of it understandable, to be sure—has been disillusionment and discouragement in many quarters.

The renewal of our Nation's cities, as you so well know, will simply not be achieved without an effective rehabilitation program. Without rehabilitation, the cost in dollars and in human terms—the inevitable personal hardships caused by dislocation—are simply beyond our capacity.

The success or failure of urban renewal, then, can be measured in terms of the success or failure of rehabilitation, as Commissioner Slayton has so ably pointed out.

UNEMPLOYMENT CREATED BY URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

Urban renewal programs all over the United States—while still small compared to what they are going to be—are destroying small businesses and jobs, and contributing to our unemployment problem. It was estimated that by 1960 more than 400 municipalities had over 650 redevelopment projects in various stages of planning and execution. These involved over 100,000 business firms and the jobs of several times that number of persons. Of the total projects reported in the March 1962 Urban Renewal Directory, 445 of the 1,929 projects (about 40 percent) had been approved at the planning stage. Only 11 percent of the urban renewal projects undertaken since passage of the 1949 Housing Act had been completed by the beginning of 1963. In the 1960–70 decade it is expected that the volume of business dislocation from renewal areas will be at least twice the 100,000 already underway.

A central factor in all renewal projects is that while most of the businesses do relocate either in a nearby area or further out, a substantial part of the businesses displaced never relocate at all. They are compelled by the severity of the jolt to discontinue operations and give up as independent businessmen, and this of course also involves such employees as were attached to the business. In various studies which have been made of numerous projects in different cities, it has been found that no less than one out of every four firms in a redevelopment or renewal project area has discontinued operations altogether. In some lines of business the proportion giving up and going on relief or pension reaches one-third of the number of what were going firms, or 40 percent, and even more. In a 500 page still unpublished study made at Brown University under the Small Business Administration management research grant program, the researchers found that 40 percent of the establishments in the urban renewal areas of Providence had to go out of business. With few exceptions, the nonsurvivors experienced a decline in income even though a majority reentered the labor force in some other capacity.

Urban renewal programs have thus created another type of "dropout" that has not been receiving the attention that is being given to the school dropout problem. It has resulted in significant increases in unemployment and reduction of the labor force. As these projects increase and get underway full scale, they will become an even more important factor in the unemployment situation.

Business dislocations to date have been incidental to clearing and redeveloping residential areas. Business displacements will increase sharply as the Housing Act of 1959 comes into full use, since this provides that 20 percent of the Federal renewal grants may be spent in nonresidential areas, regardless of whether new housing is created. Thus, localities are now able to initiate projects in which the relocation load will be almost totally composed of commercial and industrial establishments.

Businesses displaced by urban renewal projects are practically all small business. This is recognized by the Small Business Administration which has financed such studies of the effects of the program as we have. Their latest study—that in Providence, which indicates a situation quite similar to those found in New Haven and other places studied—shows that 18 percent of the displaced businesses were owner operated and had no employees, 31 percent had 1 or 2 employees, another 30 percent reported 3 to 9 workers, and 21 percent had 10 or more workers. Retailing and service establishments employed over 90 percent of the total and less than 10 percent were in all other businesses, including manufacturing.

Most of these people had been in business in the same neighborhood for a long time—about 86 percent over 5 years, and of the total 20 percent between 5 and 10 years, one-third from 10 to 20 years and another one-third over 20 years. About 9 out of 10 said that they would have continued to do business in the same neighborhood indefinitely if they had not been forced out by a redevelopment project. They went out of business because they could not find a suitable location or get license transfer or proper zoning; or it was too costly to start one; or they would lose contact with customers at any new location. Many of these people are still out of work in different areas of the country because they cannot find a site where they could continue to operate their business or obtain a license or meet the costs of setting up anew. Others, many in advanced years, discouraged by the obstacles, simply threw in the sponge.

The relatively high mortality rate of firms within urban renewal areas has resulted in a level of unemployed the magnitude of which can only be surmised from the reports and studies which have been made of these projects. No one has ever made a full accounting of the unemployment created. It could well total up into a significant proportion of the total number unemployed in the Nation and to be an important factor in hard-core unemployment.

It is no consolation to say that many of the firms which fail to relocate and go out of business are marginal firms. They had provided jobs and sustenance for those who had operated them in the old places and for their employees. This is a national loss hardly ever taken into account in the rosy descriptions of urban renewal.

REMARKS BY WILLIAM L. SLAYTON, COMMISSIONER, URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY BEFORE THE URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATION-FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, WORKSHOP ON REHABILITATION, DINKLER-PLAZA HOTEL, ATLANTA, GA., NOVEMBER 14, 1963

You have now just about completed the second day of what could probably be described as a 3-day "cram course" in urban renewal rehabilitation.

I was reading over the agenda for your workshop the other day and I think that what you have heard so far and the topics to be covered during tomorrow can be of tremendous value. I mean this not because there is any such thing as easy rehabilitation, but more importantly, to lay the foundation for working toward a rehabilitation program that offers us our first real chance for success.

However, I did not come here to tell you how wonderfully the rehabilitation program has been doing thus far, even though we have had some successes. And neither am I going to say we now have all the problems mastered, or that the road ahead will be a smooth one.

The tightly packed agenda of this workshop, the weeks of preparation for it, the months spent in hammering out the new minimum property standards, the representation here of so many from local renewal agencies, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Urban Renewal Administration—all of these point up the seriousness of the task in which we are involved. Even more basic, they are an indication of a very important truth about rehabilitation in urban renewal.

That is: rehabilitation in the urban renewal program has not yet achieved its hoped-for success.

It has now been 9 years since rehabilitation was made an integral part of urban renewal by the Housing Act of 1954. During a period of explosive growth in the program nationally, about 200 projects have reached the execution stage involving some degree of rehabilitation, and something in excess of 100,000 dwelling units have been scheduled for rehabilitation. But as to accomplishment, only a few thousand have actually been improved.

The result of this relative lack of accomplishment—much of it understandable, to be sure—has been disillusionment and discouragement in many quarters.

Frankly, the accomplishments, both in this region and nationally, should have been much greater. The rehabilitation program to date has been too time-consuming, too

difficult, and beset with too many uncertainties. And bear this in mind: the program is going to get much bigger. More and more cities are coming in with rehabilitation projects. I doubt that anyone facing a huge increase in the program would deny that a more effective rehabilitation operation is something we cannot merely hope for—we have no choice but to make it so.

These reasons point to one conclusion: the chips are down for rehabilitation. That is why we are meeting here today.

But if I have made rehabilitation sound so difficult, why do we bother with it at all?

One of the answers lies in the $500 billion investment in existing residential properties. This is the largest single component of our national wealth.

And another reason is equally important—the renewal of our Nation's cities, as you so well know, will simply not be achieved without an effective rehabilitation program. Without rehabilitation, the cost in dollars and in human terms—the inevitable personal hardships caused by dislocation—are simply beyond our capacity.

A third reason is that our vast stock of usable housing is our greatest resource of housing for low income and middle income families. New construction alone never has and never will be able to take care of this tremendous need.

Of course, a balanced urban renewal program is easier to prescribe than produce. Working out the rehabilitation phase is certainly the most difficult. If there is anything we have learned during these past few years, it is the real lesson that rehabilitation is plain hard work.

There is no such thing as "instant renewal," and of course rehabilitation is the hardest part of a complex program. If we did not recognize these facts at the outset then this meeting would be an exercise in futility.

However, we now have a new instrument of opportunity and achievement—a document that holds out a practical promise for making our hopes for rehabilitation come true.

In my opinion, the new FHA minimum property standards for rehabilitation in urban renewal areas represent a real breakthrough.

Certainly they don't provide quick, cheap, or easy panaceas for the problems of rehabilitation. The new minimum property standards cannot be accomplished merely with god intentions, noble plans, pep talks, and clean-up paint-up campaigns. But they do represent a serious and hard-headed approach.

The concepts involved in the new Minimum Property Standards were pounded out over months of discussion, trial and error, and what at times seemed like an endless process of reviewing every difficulty in the book.

I want to pay tribute here to the people in URA and FHA who were able to make and take criticisms in the true spirit of cooperation and desire to achieve a common goal—workable rehabilitation.

What we have here for the first time is a series of tools—working tools—which realistically face the hard problems that have so often been overlooked in the past. They lay the groundwork for a new kind of intimacy and problem sharing among local public agencies. The Federal Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration.

As never before the new approach brings into play not only the desires and enthusiasm of the local members of this team, but also the experience and seasoned judgment of the Federal Housing Administration. We want and need to have FHA's talents working with us during project planning as well as execution. The intentions of both FHA and URA on this point are quite clear: by facing the problems and working them out during project planning, we mean to make these projects work—fast and effectively—during project execution.

As you know, we in the Urban Renewal Administration are so convinced of the necessity for close collaboration between FHA, URA, and the city prior to the adoption of the urban renewal plan that we will require agreement among all three parties on the standards for the area before authorizing the contract for loan and grant.

In reaching agreement the participants will find the minimum property standards of tremendous value. The important thing is that they were prepared by FHA in consultation with URA based on actual field experience. Once these standards have been modified to meet local conditions and have been agreed upon by FHA, URA, and the city, the city will be assured of FHA mortgage insurance for residential properties in the renewal area; provided, of course, that the properties are improved to meet the standards and the property owners have the resources to carry the mortgage. This is the FHA guarantee.

Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver said recently, "With these standards we hope we can bring to an end the numerous conflicts that have frustrated and delayed the progress of rehabilitation in urban renewal areas. We hope we will be able to move forward rapidly with a minimum of redtape, with the processing of loans that formerly would have taken weeks and months."

To which I can only respond, "Amen."

These are some of the elements in this "package" that I call a real breakthrough. They involve a level of teamwork between the Federal Housing Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration that is unprecedented—teamwork, I might add, finding its mandate in the commitment of President Kennedy to a broad program of community development.

The joint URA-FHA commitment is one part of the package and the new minimum property standards are another. They bring into focus a new concept of basing decisions on rehabilitation more realistically on what the structures in the area are actually like, rather than comparing them to new residences.

A third part of the package is the assurance that FHA assistance will be available when the urban renewal planning is actually being implemented.

This is the kind of backing and financial assurance that is essential if conservation is to work.

But let's be frank. This is not the entire package.

We in the Federal Government will provide all the assistance we can in leadership, guidance, financing, education, and information. But we do not carry out the program. This is the job of the city—the local renewal agency. And if the rehabilitation program has been beset with difficulties then I think we must all agree that there have been enough problems for all of us to share.

We have taken a good look at the entire program—not just the Federal side—and I think it not unfair to suggest to the localities planning or carrying out these projects that wishful thinking or trying to shift the responsibility to URA or FHA won't get the job done.

Some of the roughtest problems have to be handled locally—or they won't be handled at all. For example, Ed Logue, of Boston, has a saying which is, "In rehabilitation you can't plan for people, you have to plan with people." This has been true for so long that it should not need repeating. We all know that financing has been a basic difficulty in the rehabilitation effort. But just as basic are needs, desires, and abilities of the people in the area. Any local agency that plans a project without a sensitive awareness of these interests is simply not going to succeed. Rehabilitation can be carried out neither by edict or happy generalites.

The need to work with people also points up another problem—adequate staffing. This was discussed with you this morning by Edgar Ewing, of Baltimore, and Miles Knowles, of Cincinnati. But let me say this: Any local renewal agency that intends to carry out a rehabilitation program of any size had better face the need for attracting and training a staff adequate to do the job. Working with property owners is more than filling out a survey form. It involves getting to know them and acquiring the knowledge of what they can do and what they will do. It means communicating. And this means in turn a staff of competency and dedication.

Only with this kind of staff should rehabilitation be undertaken. We in the Urban Renewal Administration intend to look very closely at every local agency's capacity to undertake rehabilitation projects. We will frown on a staff that is inadequate in number and quality as certainly as we will turn thumbs down on a staff that is too large for the job to be done.

This matter of the capacity of a city to undertake renewal activities in general, and rehabilitation in particular, is one on which I cannot lay too much stress. The ability of the Urban Renewal Administration to provide additional Federal assistance is clearly dependent on the capacity and efficiency with which that assistance is used.

URA assistance is available across the board, but your performance is the most important single determining factor in the provision of such aid. President Kennedy and the Congress have made quite clear their determination that urban renewal assistance is to be provided where local performance—or ability and willingness to perform—demonstrates beyond doubt that the assistance is warranted.

So here you have the picture—perhaps too sketchy—of where we stand today in our rehabilitation effort. These are the facts on which I base a great hope for rehabilitation in the months and years to come.

There can be no doubt that if urban renewal is to succeed, rehabilitation must succeed.

Every house rehabilitated today, every effort made to upgrade a neighborhood, will return its investment many times in livability, stability, and financial soundness. We owe it to ourselves, our communities, our children to commit ourselves to a broad-scale program of renewal in which neighborhood conservation and housing rehabilitation play a major role.

North Philadelphia Social Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include below an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia (Pa.) Daily News of December 16, 1963, concerning the program of the new Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement. The council, as stated in the article, seeks to improve social and economic conditions in North Philadelphia, and I am sure that other interested Members will join me in wishing it and its able executive director, Samuel Dash, every success. The editorial follows:

EXECUTION KEY TO SUCCESS OF NORTH PHILADELPHIA SOCIAL PROJECT

The initial phase of the long-awaited pilot program of the Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement, aimed at improving social and economic conditions in North Philadelphia, has at last been outlined.

Financed by a $1.7 million grant from the Ford Foundation and $165,000 in Federal funds, the PCCA has been studying conditions there since last January.

There are five specific recommendations.

A federation of all civic and neighborhood organizations with the aim of restoring civic pride in the area.

A half-way house where delinquent boys released from correctional institutions can be rehabilitated before returning home.

Establishment of youth achievement centers for youngsters of working parents..

A program of special attention for talented children in junior and senior high schools, aimed at leading them into higher educational programs aided by scholarships.

A joint educational program for police and the community to change their attitudes toward each other.

Samuel Dash, executive director of PCCA, says more recommendations will be forthcoming as time goes on.

PCCA's initial proposals are ambitious if not original. Their effectiveness, of course, will depend to a great extent on community acceptance and participation, and even more important, implementation and execution by designated social agencies.

Given a fair trial, along with the anticipated additional proposals, the program could accomplish wonders.

Brith Sholom Resolution on President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1963, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel in Philadelphia Brith Sholom, a Jewish fraternal society, held a conference on peace. I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution concerning the death of President Kennedy which was passed by that conference.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Whereas John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States devoted his life to America and to its people in peace and in war as soldier, legislator, President, statesman, and world leader; and

Whereas the cause of peace and the strengthening of friendship between nations were his most sought after goals; and

Whereas his efforts to strengthen democracy at home and to create the conditions favorable to peace reflected the image of a progressive America concerned about human ideals; and

Whereas his lifetime of achievement and activity on behalf of his Nation made him representative of the best of our Nation; and

Whereas his own unselfish example inspired our Nation to measure up to the noblest goals of man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Conference on America's 1,000-Mile Journey Toward Peace sponsored by Brith Sholom on this 24th day of November 1963, record its profound grief upon the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy, felled by an assassin's bullet in the service of his country, and join with multitudes everywhere who mourn our Nation's irreparable loss; and be it further

Resolved, That we dedicate ourselves with increasing zeal and determination to further the peaceful aims for which our President labored valiantly; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be conveyed to his beloved widow and young family, with our expressions of deepest sympathy for their personal loss which we share with them.

Residual Oil Quotas Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as you know, residual oil quotas impose an unfair burden on New England's economy amounting to approximately $30 million a year. There is increasing indignation concerning this matter which is broadly bipartisan and which is finding support not only on the entire eastern seaboard but throughout the country. Because of mounting interest in this matter, Mr. Speaker, I am calling my colleagues' attention to a letter that I have just sent to Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall:

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Monday, December 9, President Johnson restored to you the responsibilities and role of being the chief agency for petroleum policy matters for the Federal Government. After your talk with the President that date, you stated "we will have a heavier responsibility than in the past on oil matters," referring especially to all import controls." As a Member of Congress who has been fighting aggressively for relief for my State, as well as all of New England, on this subject of restrictions on residual fuel oil imports, I am most happy to see that we now have one central source that we can go to. I commend President Johnson for making this decision since it will eliminate the confusion of the past that resulted in divided authority and responsibility on oil imports between the White House and your Department.

As you are well aware, in view of the statements that you and your senior aides made at the time of the announcement of the Passamaquoddy project, New England power costs are the highest in the Nation. The findings of the Federal Power Commission studies in the past have always confirmed the fact that New England power costs are the highest in the Nation and, further, that the prime factor creating these high power costs was, and is, the high cost of fuel. The restrictions on residual fuel oil imports that have been kept in effect for the past several years, have been a major source that has contributed to the burden that the New England consumer has had to shoulder in the form of high fuel costs which, in turn, have created the highest power costs in the Nation.

In spite of the facts that I and my colleagues from New England have made known to you in the past, that the coal industry's problems are caused by factors other than residual fuel oil competition, these controls have been kept in force for apparent political reasons. I want to stress again the causes of the coal industry's problems—namely, automation, which now requires only 170,000 miners to do the work of 400,000 miners 10 years ago in order to produce the same volume of coal, conversions from coal to diesel fuel oil by the railroads, and by household consumers from coal to No. 2 fuel oil. None of these products has any direct connection with residual fuel oil. Another factor that has contributed to the coal industry's problems is the fact that the coal mine owners have looked to the taxpayer to finance their research and development in both technological as well as marekting research. An example of the latter is the fact that the coal industry last year spent less than $20 million on research and development as against over $400 million by the oil industry.

Please do not misunderstand me, I am not unsympathetic to the problems of coal regions. In fact, I think it is the responsibility of both the coal mine owners as well as the Federal and State Governments to do everything in their combined power to assist in retraining programs, relocation programs, as well as efforts to attract diversified industries into the depressed areas. Another potential outlet for coal, and one virtually untapped because of the failure of the coal mine owners to aggressively develop foreign markets, is the potential for U.S. coal exports. Here again the coal industry had the taxpayer pay approximately $100,000 for a detailed study by Robert Nathan Associates, "The Foreign Market Potential for U.S. Coal."

I endorse this program 100 percent and urge its implementation to the end that U.S. coal, which, because of its automation can compete with any coal produced in the free world, gets its fair share of foreign markets. Because, in this manner, not only will we help the coal regions, but we will make a very considerable contribution to our serious balance-of-payments program.

Speaking for my own State, residual fuel oil imports have placed an undue burden on every resident of the State, as well as on our industrial machine. At the start of the century, New England was the heart of our industrial empire and now it is far down the line, and one of the main causes of this slippage has been the high cost of power and the high cost of fuel. In the case of the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, I am informed by President Schiller that his utility is paying a premium of at least $300,000 per year due to residual import controls. If we had the traditional free enterprise market economy in residual fuel oil in New Hampshire, President Schiller could effect savings to his customers in his residual fuel oil costs that would, on the basis of present price levels, results in a saving of at least $300,000 per annum.

There is no rhyme nor reason for the continuation of the present restrictions on residual fuel oil. They are not helping the coal industry; they are causing the cost of living for the 50 million odd consumers on the east coast to be higher due to increased fuel costs; they are denying the consumer his traditional right of freedom of choice of supplier; they are hurting friends and customers abroad such as Venezuela; they are compromising our position in our trade affairs because we will have to set aside $750 million of import trade when Governor Herter and his trade negotiating team meet in GATT conferences next year; and, finally, these imports are of no impact on our domestic oil industries, as witness the fact that at the annual meeting of the Industrial Petroleum Association of America in Dallas last November, this reputable and responsible organization excluded residual fuel oil imports

from its resolution on the overall subject of oil imports.

Mr. Secretary, the evidence is such that you can by no stretch of the imagination justify the continuation of these import restrictions which are causing such hardship to the consumer in New England. At least, if you will not lift these controls, then reform the governing regulations so that the factor of end-use control is eliminated and freedom of choice of supplier by the consumer is returned to the marketplace.

Although I have stressed my own State of New Hampshire and the New England region in this letter, as you know, this is a matter of direct concern to all eastern seaboard States. I noticed with interest that Senator JAVITS and Senator KEATING have joined in the battle to remove the infamous residual oil quotas, as reported on pages 23819, 23820 and 23821 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 18, 1963.

Yours very truly,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND, M.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am also calling my colleagues' attention to a letter from Mr. John K. Evans, executive director of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., addressed to the Under Secretary of Commerce, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. Mr. Evans' forthright statement should be read carefully as it meets squarely many false arguments which are being improperly advanced as the reasons for maintaining discriminatory residual oil quotas.

INDEPENDENT FUEL OIL MARKETERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D.C. December 6, 1963.

Subject: Appalachian Regional Commission.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.,
Under Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I read with interest the press release dated December 1, 1963, issued by the National Coal Policy Conference regarding their letter to you on the subject. There are several pertinent points and observations I hereby make for your personal information regarding the contents of this press release.

I agree with Mr. Moody that the coal industry "is the only important indigenous industry in most of the Appalachians. The mining and transportation of coal can provide far more jobs than any other industrial activity." I disagree with the balance of his argument.

First he said, "Government-supported imports of residual oil strike at the heart of the coal industry." Imports of this product, which is in short supply in our country, are not Government-supported. He then goes on to call this product "imported waste oil." The oil industry, unlike the coal industry, finances all of its operations such as research and development out of its profits, unlike the coal mine owners who get Uncle Sam to pick up the tab most of the time. The point I make is that the oil industry cannot afford to waste anything. It has no waste product.

Mr. Moody then goes on to solicit the support of the administration of the legislation his group is sponsoring "to limit imports in the area of competition to 50 percent of residual consumption." Just so that you comprehend what Mr. Moody is asking you to endorse—it is nothing less than end use control and the enforcement by Government decree of not only the complete elimination of the traditional right of the consumer to freedom of choice of energy but to compound the felony on the consumer by forcing the majority of the utilities to convert from residual fuel oil to the consumption of coal at sizable capital expense coupled with higher energy costs. Mr. Moody stated that "the electric utility market is coal's growth market." Since when under our free enterprise system has the electric utility market been captive to coal? It seems that what Mr. Moody is suggesting is nothing less than your sponsoring the adoption of a communistic type of market economy and to hell with the interests of 65 million consumers on the east coast.

Let's look at the facts: There are approximately 160,000 coal miners against around 400,000 in the late forties. Why the drop in employment? The miner today produces over 16 tons per day against 6 tons in the forties—right here is your major reason for unemployment; namely, automation. The balance of the story lies in the conversion from coal to diesel by the railroads and from coal to No. 2 fuel oil by the household consumer—neither of which product has any connection with residual fuel oil.

Mr. Moody is asking you to disregard the interests of 65 million consumers of energy on the east coast for the selfish interests of a few coal mine owners who, incidentally, never had it so good profitwise. The issue he makes re "jobs of Appalachian workers" is 100 percent false as I prove by the above statement. By the way he says he speaks for the United Mine Workers of America—I am informed that of all the unions the latter is the only one that has not had any revision of wage scales to adjust for cost of living increases since 1958. I also understand that the United Mine Workers Welfare & Rehabilitation Fund wasted millions of dollars building 10 hospitals in the Appalachian area, 5 of which have already been taken over by the Appalachian regional hospitals and the remaining 5 are due to be released next year because of lack of need. The funds involved in the construction of these hospitals were contributed by the mine owners at the rate of 40 cents per ton, which subsidy was passed along to the long suffering consumer. The UMWRF could better use its funds for more productive efforts on behalf of its members.

The above is not to imply that something should not be done for the Appalachian area. But the answer is in positive rather than negative action. Continuation of the depressed areas program, of which West Virginia has been a leading recipient, is required. Regarding the coal industry, due to the magnificent job that has been done in the automation of mining operations coupled with the fact that the good Lord has blessed our country with the richest and most easily accessible deposits of coal in the world, U.S. coal can compete in any market in the world and that includes the domestic market. Recently the taxpayer paid for a detailed study of "The Foreign Market Potential for U.S. Coal" and the findings and recommendations of this study should be implemented. Granted the latter function, both cost of study and its implementation would have been assumed by the oil industry if oil was involved, but since the coal mine owners can get Uncle Sam to finance their research and development far be it for me to try to change the historical course. The present negative policy created and endorsed by the coal mine owners only raises the cost of living of 65 million east coast residents, penalizes and is gradually eliminating the small businessman, who markets residual fuel oil, by creating a monopoly/cartel in the marketplace by Government decree, compromises our position in the economic arena of the world, and ties the hands of our trade negotiator in the upcoming GATT Conference next year by the fact that we are maintaining a nontariff barrier against the importation of residual fuel oil that is neither justified in the light of national security nor are these imports harmful to our domestic economy as proven in the Office of Emergency Planning report on residual fuel oil imports dated February 13, 1963. On the contrary domestic production of residual fuel oil has dropped each year since the forties (now down to 8 percent of total refinery yield) and imports are needed to supplement domestic supply.

Regarding the above trade point, we are putting a gun in the hands of our free world competitors by reserving from the negotiating conference table 5 percent of our imports (residual fuel oil imports run at $750 million per year) for reasons unjustified under free world trade standards thereby enabling our friends at the conference table to do likewise—except that they have the right to hit us where it will hurt—such as the importation into their respective countries of American automobiles and manufactured goods. The coal mine owners not only want New England to pay higher energy costs but they also want to create a trade situation in the GATT whereby New England exports will be discriminated against. Further in this regard, our tariff income on this import is only 2½ percent, making it an ideal item to trade off in our bargaining program with the other GATT nations. The Western Hemisphere is of primary national security importance and Venezuela, the main source of supply of residual fuel oil, is not only one of our stanchest friends and allies but also one of our best customers. The present program of unjustified and inequitable import restrictions is not only directly harming Venezuela but also is diverting supplies from that country to the Middle East by U.S. Government decree. Already 70,000 barrels a day have been diverted and trade rumor says that more will follow.

In closing, therefore, since it is open season for giving you advice I suggest in view of the facts, not the fiction that you are receiving from other quarters, outlined in this letter that for the benefit of all our people, and especially the 65 million consumers of energy on the east coast and the manufacturers of the goods we sell and export to Venezuela, that controls on the importation of residual fuel oil either be removed or the governing regulations changed so as to return the marketplace to our traditional free enterprise economy by the adoption of a regulatory system whereby the marketer that gets the customer automatically gets the right to import that customer's requirements of this product. For the domestic coal industry I suggest you render every assistance and support to an all-out program to sell our coal in oversea markets, thereby helping both our balance-of-payments position as well as our coal mining States. For the 170,000 miners, benefits should automatically accrue to them from the increased sale of U.S. coal in world markets, particularly if their union exercises sound fiscal and operational policy and looks after the interests of the miners rather than the coal mine owners. Finally, since the coal mine owners do not have the same sense of humane and civic responsibility that the oil industry has when faced with unemployment problems created by automation—the oil industry instead of firing personnel resorts to attrition reduction by a gradual program placing men already on the payroll in job openings created by the normal attrition of retirement, etc. I urge the continuation of all aspects of our depressed area programs, particularly such rehabilitation activities as adult vocational and retraining schools.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. EVANS.

Pauling and Peace: Questions Linger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Columnist William Henry Chamberlin, respected national news analyst, contributed a most timely and interesting article in the December 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal, following the awarding of the Nobel Prize to Dr. Linus Pauling. The commentary by Mr. Chamberlin is calm and analytical, and warrants study, and I insert it into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members.

PAULING AND PEACE: QUESTIONS LINGER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Usually the award of a Nobel Prize, for peace or for literary or scientific achievement, is unanimously hailed by the countrymen of the honored individual. This is not the case with the peace award to Dr. Linus Pauling, distinguished American chemist and political amateur who has passionately opposed nuclear preparedness by this country.

If they give the matter any thought at all, the vast majority of the American people who believe, with Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, that the prerequisite of a tolerable peace is full matching of the Soviet threat, in nuclear as in conventional weapons, will dissent from the reasoning that led to this singular award. Dr. Pauling, whose alarmist estimates of the consequences of radioactive fallout have been vigorously challenged by Dr. Edward Teller and other equally competent scientists, has long conducted a one-man crusade against development of a nuclear arsenal.

Future historians may well regard as President Kennedy's finest hour his courageous decision to blockade Cuba, with a clear intimation that more drastic measures would follow, if necessary, in order to force the withdrawal of the Soviet missiles which had been stealthily introduced into Cuba behind a screen of falsehoods told by the Soviet Ambassador to the United States and the Soviet representative in the United Nations. Pauling's contribution in this time of national crisis was to brand President Kennedy's attitude as "horrifying" and to wire the White House that the President had placed all the American people and many others "in grave danger of death through nuclear war." The idea that the risk of nuclear war had been frivolously undertaken by Soviet Premier Khrushchev never seems to have crossed Dr. Pauling's mind. In this grave hour who served the cause of peace better, the President or the scientist?

A COMPLEX TASK

Historical experience shows that the maintenance of peace with its indispensable accompaniments, honor and justice, is a vastly more complicated and delicate task than Dr. Pauling and the Norwegian parliament's peace prize committee realize.

The elite British students who, in the 1930's voted after a debate in the Oxford Union that they would not fight for King and country, in the event of another war, were not improving the prospect of peace. Quite the contrary. They were confirming the impression of Adolf Hitler, at that time the principal menace to peace, that the British youth had gone soft and decadent and that Britain could be pushed around at will. And this same judgment must apply to a good deal of well-meant advocacy of one-sided disarmament in all the Western nations at this time.

Hitler and his tyranny are now an unpleasant memory. But aggressive communism has stepped into the place of Nazism. Anything calculated to cast doubt on the will of free peoples to defend their freedom by all means, if necessary, is no service to the prospect of peace.

Peace is not something that can be won by a vote, or a manifesto, or a slogan-shouting parade and demonstration in a country where the government has not the slightest impulse to resort to aggressive war. It depends not on the will of free countries which have nothing conceivable to gain from war, but on the cold blooded calculations of dictators like Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, who are under no effective control by the Russian or Chinese "man in the street." Such dictators are only impressed by a clear demonstration of the will and the power to react swiftly and strongly in the event of attack.

A posture of defenseless helplessness in the face of a dynamic predatory power is not a formula for peace, but an invitation to war under less favorable circumstances.

PAULING'S TEST BAN ROLE

The suggestion of a member of the Nobel Prize committee that Dr. Pauling's campaign against nuclear testing helped to bring about the treaty of last summer, renouncing nuclear testing, except in the case of underground tests, which cannot be verified, is not consistent with easily ascertainable facts. The proposal to outlaw surface and space tests, detectable, by instruments, was advanced by the Western powers some time ago and at first rejected by the Soviet Union. So the suggestion that any special efforts of Dr. Pauling were needed to prod an unwilling America into this reciprocal concession is clearly inaccurate.

It is indeed ironical that the Nobel Peace Prize should have been conferred on the basis of a misreading of the real issues of war and peace. The award was a case of shockingly bad judgment, an implied criticism of the defensive military policy of the United States and its NATO allies. It was, therefore, a political award, and a very wrongheaded one in the bargain.

Thanksgiving Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the postscript to the Thanksgiving Proclamation which was issued on the 8th of November by the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of the State of Oregon:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE CAPITOL,
Salem, Oreg., November 26, 1963,

My Thanksgiving Proclamation was issued prior to the death of President Kennedy. May I, therefore, express these thoughts as a postscript to that proclamation:

"May we be thankful for the provisions of our Founding Fathers wherein the reins of government pass from leader to leader in death without revolution or disruption.

"May we be grateful the late President chose well his Vice President and made of him a confidant so that he might assume these duties in tranquil but effective transition."

MARK O. HATFIELD.

New England Agriculture Threatened by Unequal Grain Shipping Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is still vitally important to the well-being and economy of New England and particularly to my State of New Hampshire. For this reason I have written to Mr. C. S. Baxter, chairman, General Freight Traffic Committee-Eastern Railroads, New York, N.Y., demanding that feed grain rates to New England be equalized and competitive with grain rates to other parts of the country—particularly those that are in direct competition with New England and New Hampshire agricultural products. Because of mounting interest and concern in regard to this important problem, I am calling my colleagues' attention to the letter I have just written to Mr. Baxter:

DECEMBER 12, 1963.

Mr. C. S. BAXTER,
Chairman, General Freight Traffic Committee, Eastern Railroads, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BAXTER: There is pending before your committee the matter of reduced freight rates on corn in bulk for New England destinations, and I would very much appreciate receiving a report with respect to the status of same.

In the meantime, there is a new publication for nontransit rates to apply on corn in bulk, in single carloads, from numerous origins in the State of Ohio to Maryland and Virginia published for account of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad pursuant to a notice of independent action issued by that carrier, effective on November 19, 1963.

The Pennsylvania Railroad will, it also is understood, take immediate steps to place in effect a similar basis for rates to apply on carload shipments of corn, from common points in Ohio to blanket the destination territory of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, this representing a defensive measure to meet the competition of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

It is understood that the rates published by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad approximate 60 percent of the present single carload rates on shipments of corn from origins to destinations, representing reductions ranging from 20 to 28 cents per hundredweight of corn.

This will, it is believed, place the New England poultrymen at a disadvantage averaging out to about $5 per ton of corn.

It is well recognized that the direct competition for the products of the New England poultryman in the natural markets for poultry meat and eggs comes from Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia; hence, the New England Millers & Shippers Association filed a protest and petition for suspension with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission's Board of Suspension has, however, concluded not to suspend the published rates.

It is quite apparent that something positive should be done with respect to the New England proposal for reductions in bulk shipments of corn via rail. Unquestionably, New England poultrymen—as well as New England rail carriers—will suffer irreparable damage as a result of the adjusted rail rates on corn to Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, unless immediate action is taken to permit

competitive rates on carload shipments of corn to New England destinations.

You are probably aware that if the railroads do not take steps to provide New Hampshire agriculture with desperately needed relief, we will have to explore alternative possibilities. It is my understanding that this would include legislation to facilitate the movement of grain via the St. Lawrence Seaway. It certainly would include consideration of the fact that railroads care so little for our economy, any request they make for help in other areas must be weighed accordingly.

Your early attention to this matter will be appreciated.

Your very truly,

JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Member of Congress.

Why We Mourn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the most touching memorial tributes which I have seen to our beloved late President, John F. Kennedy, by Rabbi Richard C. Hertz, of Temple Beth El in Detroit on Friday evening, November 29, 1963, entitled "Why We Mourn":

WHY WE MOURN—A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Rabbi Richard C. Hertz)

One week ago we came here dazed and stunned by the tragic news of President Kennedy's assassination. In the few hours that had elapsed since 2 o'clock on that fateful Friday afternoon, we groped for words to express our shock, our horror, our disbelief that such a monstrous, depraved deed could be perpetrated against our President. We turned to God for comfort because there seemed nowhere else to go. Then we turned to television too. And for 3 solid days all America sat glued to the screen, unwilling to leave for fear of missing one detail of the grim, unfolding tragedy. Television made the sorrow a deeply personal experience for all America. By the time Monday night came around, we were emotionally drained. We had so completely identified ourselves with the personal tragedy of John F. Kennedy, with Jacqueline Kennedy, with Caroline and John, with Robert and Edward and the entire Kennedy family, that we felt as if one of our own family had been shot. John F. Kennedy had become a part of us, and something of us was buried Monday in Arlington.

Our Nation has been in mourning all week.

WE MOURN FOR JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

He was so young, so vigorous, so energetic, so witty, so full of high hopes for a better world, so eager to give his country so much of himself.

When he took the oath of office on Inauguration Day, it was as if a young Greek god had snatched up the torch of leadership and Apollo-like, he went forth up Pennsylvania Avenue into a brave new world. His meteoric career inspired youth to public service in the Peace Corps. The young people of America are especially in mourning for one of their own, for he gave them an excitement of expectation.

He was a martyr to the cause of civil rights and human rights. The Negro saw in him a champion of emancipation 100 years after it had been proclaimed. People of all creeds and races rallied to his standard. They eagerly identified with him in the battle for justice and equality on behalf of the underprivileged, the disinherited, and disadvantaged, the oppressed and the exploited.

He brought a sense of history to everything he did. His intellect, his Harvard training, his gift for communicating, marked him a man of his generation, an eloquent spokesman for that strange new world which the Second World War had ushered in. More than any President since Woodrow Wilson, he believed in the power of ideas. His quick intelligence gave him an extraordinary grasp of the vast scope of the presidential office. His deep intellect molded a philosophy of government that rare oratorical powers of eloquence enabled him to articulate with grace and with distinction. He was deeply concerned over the preservation of peace, the necessity for nuclear disarmament, the insistence on peaceful negotiation of differences with allies no less than with adversaries.

He was himself a profile of courage. Whether in overcoming personal and physical pain or in persevering in political life, his singlemindedness of purpose, his sense of personal duty to face high responsibility enabled him to say on that cold January day of his inauguration:

"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.

"My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man." John F. Kennedy wrote his answer with his own blood on the streets of Dallas, Tex.

WE MOURN FOR JACQUELINE KENNEDY

This beautiful, gracious, regal-like woman who brought so much of her own esthetic character into the White House gave a majestic object lesson to all America in courage, self-control and dedication. She too had a sense of history and understood that though other women have lost their husbands in the prime of life, her husband belonged not only to herself but to the people of the world. Her justifiable pride in his achievements and her immeasurable loss were seen in every closeup of her controlled face. She too was a living profile in courage.

WE MOURN FOR LITTLE CAROLINE AND JOHN-JOHN

When Jacqueline Kennedy took Caroline and John, Jr. by the hand and led them up the steps of the Capitol rotunda to pay their last respects to the flag-draped coffin, those children walked right into the hearts of all America. Nothing could surpass the poignancy of little John asking for another small flag for his daddy—or the look of confidence and security Caroline found in the eyes of her mother as she grasped Caroline's hand tightly and looked down at her as if to say, "Watch me and do likewise."

WE MOURN FOR AMERICA'S DISRESPECT OF LAW AND ORDER

The assassination of the President by a sniper from a tall building was horrible enough, but to have the suspect apprehended and then shot down while under police protection, the way other prisoners have been lynched in the South—that was the supreme blot on our country that compounded national tragedy into monstrous outrage.

What a price America must pay for fanaticism and lawlessness. Violence begets violence—and where does it all end?

America prides herself on the democratic concept of "equal justice under law." Even in this case, the world saw unmasked on TV—live—an example of how Western vigilante justice operates. Lee Oswald had not confessed; he had not been brought to trial; he had not been defended; he had not been sentenced. At the very moment that cooler, grief-stricken minds were calling for traditional American protection of our laws with full opportunity for his defense before a properly constituted court, millions saw on TV a monstrous Texas western carried out live on the screen, as Lee Oswald was shot in an outrageous breach of police responsibility—with the crowd outside shouting its murderous approval of this disgusting, appalling killing.

WE MOURN FOR OUR NATION

This dastardly deed was perpetrated in our country, the so called land of freedom and equality before the law.

A horrible scar was inflicted upon our country that made this civilized country look uncivilized. We lost face with ourselves and with our world. We saw an image in the world's mirror and we did not like what we saw. We mourn for our own shame as well as for our sorrow. This happened not in South Vietnam nor in some Latin American cesspool of revolution, but in the proud State of Texas.

We kept asking ourselves: How can this happen in America? What is happening to our country? Where is the respect for law and order? Has hate and prejudice so warped the minds of America that reason is gone, justice is gone, decency is gone, freedom is gone, public safety is gone? Is ours to be an age of fanaticism and bigotry? What kind of sickness of soul has come over America? Where will strife and bitterness lead us? What will unreasoned violence do to the democratic fabric of our life? What will be the new America if lawlessness and racism persist in this country, if unstable and warped minds can take the law into their own bloody hands? Where is the dream of America?

WE MOURN FOR OURSELVES

A part of us went into the grave with John F. Kennedy. We ourselves are guilty of his murder. All of us in America had a part in the slaying of our President. We are guilty by our silence over the forces of primitive hatred that have eaten their way, cancer-like, into the bloodstream of American life. We are guilty by our inaction, by our willingness that heavy burdens be borne by one man alone; by our readiness to allow evil to be called good and good evil; by our continued toleration of ancient injustices. We are guilty because we think we are good people, but good people willing to do nothing to undo evil. Now we have to learn all over again that bystanders are not innocent, for now the consequences have caught up with all of us.

If there is any hope at all, any lesson to be learned from the shock of this tragedy, it is perhaps the realization of how a free and civilized nation must live up to the responsibilities of personal citizenship.

The shock that stunned America may in the long run be the means of awakening people of this country to their full moral responsibilities. The memory of our martyred President will not wither but will grow in meaning and intensity. The assassination

of President Kennedy, like Lincoln's, will not be forgotten. But maybe people will now realize more soberly that hatred spawns bigotry, that freedom will not be denied human beings any longer simply because their skin is black. John F. Kennedy in life may mean even more in death if his martyrdom arouses people to a greater unity, a greater sense of dedication to our public responsibilities as citizens. President Kennedy died for his country. We are asked only to live for our country—to put aside our passions and our prejudices, and recognize the human right of all people, all classes, all religions, and treat our neighbors as Americans all.

When I first heard the grim news of the assassination my mind went back exactly 100 years ago, almost to the day, November 19, 1863, when Abraham Lincoln boarded a special train out of Washington to journey to Gettysburg, there to dedicate a new cemetery where so many fallen heroes of the Blue and the Gray lay recently buried. Edward Everett had been chosen the orator for the day, and for 2 solid hours he held forth in masterful eloquence. Then the President was called on for a few appropriate remarks. Mr. Lincoln rose to his full height, took out of his stovepipe hat a few scraps of paper, and looked out upon the crowd with those sad eyes of tragedy, with words that seem so appropriate at this hour:

"The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here had thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

A few months later, the War Between the States was officially over, but reprisals, hate, and revenge were not quelled. One evening when a weary Mr. Lincoln went out to Ford's Theater for a rare moment of recreation, he was shot by a wild assassin, John Wilkes Booth. All during the night he battled for life; but as morning came he closed his eyes. Mr. Lincoln was dead. Standing over him, to the end, was Secretary Stanton. As Mr. Lincoln breathed his last, Secretary Stanton exclaimed, "Now he belongs to the ages."

This we say of John F. Kennedy: "Now he belongs to the ages."

As our prayers go out to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for wisdom and divine guidance, so we take renewed hope from President Johnson's moving words to the Congress on Wednesday and to the Nation yesterday, Thanksgiving Day. We have a new captain to guide our ship of state—able, dedicated, experienced, decisive in action and humble in his responsibilities.

With Longfellow, we pray:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State,
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee!"

John Fitzgerald Kennedy is gone—but he is not truly gone. His spirit goes marching on in the hearts of a grateful nation,

"The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart—
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget!"

Three for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent editorial from the South Bend Tribune which points to the magnificent record which the 88th Congress has already compiled this year in the fields of education and job training.

I should point out that the South Bend Tribune gave strong support to three of the major measures which have been enacted into law this year, the college aid, vocational education, and manpower retraining bills.

The editorial follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Dec. 18, 1963]

THREE FOR EDUCATION

There'll be no civil rights or tax reduction laws out of Congress this year, but the legislators at least lived up to their responsibilities in the areas of education and job training. In a flurry of pre-Christmas activity late last week, the House and Senate completed work on bills designed to meet three undeniable national needs.

One is a $1.2 billion measure authorizing a 5-year program of Federal grants and loans for construction and improvement of higher educational facilities at both public and private institutions. The bill passed at a moment when the country's colleges and universities have a record number of students behind ivied walls, with a great many more to come.

The college enrollment boom in the next few years will be like nothing the country has ever experienced. Neither private nor State institutions will be able to handle it adequately without assistance. Congress' action will help insure that the country's brainpower pool is kept adequately stocked.

The second measure increases the amount of Federal money to be sent to States for vocational education. Aimed primarily at plugging part of the serious dropout drain that threatens to produce a flood of unemployables, the measure insists that the new money be used for job-oriented training.

At the same time, it ends traditional vocational school emphasis on homemaking and farm skills. It is high time many of the U.S. high schools stop turning out armies of better trained youngsters who go back to the farm and put their education to work increasing the food surplus glut.

The third and perhaps most important measure passed by Congress is an extension of the Federal Manpower Retraining Act. The new measure does three important things. It pushes back the time when States must take over part of the retraining costs; it broadens the program to cover young men and women, who make up a disproportionate share of the unemployed; and it specifically authorizes basic education courses for those who need it to qualify for job training.

The Manpower Retraining Act has been every bit as successful an approach to unemployment as anyone might have wished, as far as it went. With the changes approved by the 88th Congress, it will be able to go a lot further now, striking right to the "hard core" of the country's biggest unsolved economic and social problem.

The Secret Service and the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the tragic assassination of President Kennedy much interest has been expressed as to what are the role and duties of the Secret Service and FBI, respectively, concerning protecting the lives of our Presidents.

The David Lawrence column in the December 19, 1963, issue of the Washington Evening Star contains an interesting and factual discussion with regard to many of the questions that have arisen in this regard.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the column for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Dec. 19, 1963]

THE SECRET SERVICE AND THE FBI: AGENCIES SAID TO WORK WELL TOGETHER, NEITHER WAS AT FAULT IN ASSASSINATION

(By David Lawrence)

Many people are puzzled by the terms "FBI" and "Secret Service," and there is a tendency to assume that both agencies are charged with protecting the life the President and members of his family. Actually, this duty is imposed by law only on the Secret Service, which is a divsion of the Treasury Department. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, a division of the Department of Justice, has no statutory responsibilities relating to the protection of the President.

The Secret Service has only about 400 agents, and they have two primary responsibilities—protection of the President, the Vice President and their families, and the detection of counterfeiting of coins or currency.

Lee Harvey Oswald, who assassinated President Kennedy, never at any time gave the slightest inkling that he intended to commit any act of violence. All through his life he had been considered a taciturn individual and had avoided normal activities with friends. This tendency toward solitude was manifested even when he was in service in the Marine Corps.

Of the many people who have been contacted by newsmen and others interested in learning about Oswald, all the informants agree that he was an odd person and encouraged very few to seek him out. The record shows recommendations for psychiatric treatment when he was as young as 13 years of age. He never, however, earned a reputation as being a vicious person. There was not the slightest evidence in the records of either the Secret Service or the FBI to indicate that Oswald was likely to be engaged in any violence. Certainly no one had ever heard him make any threats against the President.

It has been suggested recently that a person with Oswald's record might have been watched on this occasion, because he had once gone to Russia and renounced his citizenship. It is also a fact, however, that he came back to America and was helped by the U.S. Embassy to make the return trip. There was no evidence that he was a person likely to engage in violence.

There are many Communists or persons of Communist sympathy in the United States who have publicly expressed views similiar to Oswald's. Some have even defected, either

in the Korean war or under other circumstances, but subsequently have returned to their native land. Unless such as individual gives some sign of having become violent, or threatens somebody with violence, there is no inclination to single him out and put him under constant guard.

The FBI has estimated it gets at least 500 letters a week which it puts in the "crackpot" class. Each is read and evaluated, however, and appropriate action taken where it is necessary. No letters implicating Oswald were ever received.

Many statements have been made to the effect that the FBI and the Secret Service have not cooperated with each other and that hard feelings exist between the agencies. This is denounced as false by persons inside both agencies.

Thus, the Chief of the Secret Service, James J. Rowley, is a former special agent of the FBI and a close personal friend of the present Director, J. Edgar Hoover. Mr. Rowley also is a lecturer at the FBI National Academy, which is a training school for local law enforcement officers.

Cooperation between the two agencies is carried on day after day in personal liaison contacts, and the unequivocal statement is made by FBI officials that if, in the course of their investigations, any information which comes within the jurisdiction of the Secret Service is developed, it is immediately transmitted to the appropriate Secret Service office.

During President Kennedy's administration, it was argued by some of the television cameramen that they could not get a good view of the President in a parade if he was too closely surrounded by Secret Service men. In the Dallas motorcade, the Secret Service men were not placed around the President as closely as they have been on other occasions. But there were agents not only in the car with the President and Vice President but in other cars immediately behind each automobile, all watching the crowd carefully for any threatening gesture.

So the all-important problem of how to protect the life of the President of the United States is not going to be solved by blaming either the FBI or the Secret Service or both. Secret Service agents are, after all, obliged to carry out the wishes of the President himself. If he decides to ignore their warnings and ride in an open automobile, or to select a parade route which is against their advice, these facts are never made public, but the result can be tragic.

The main dilemma relates to the policing of the high buildings along streets through which a procession might be passing. If the Secret Service and the FBI were required to post guards in every building, or if they were obliged to investigate the record of every employee on every floor in every building along the parade route, there would not be enough personnel in either the Secret Service or the FBI or the two agencies combined to do the job. Certainly they couldn't act on 4 days' notice.

There does not seem at present any sure way to prevent an attack on the President's life except by insisting that he ride in a bulletproof automobile.

Driver Education in Pittsburgh Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from station KDKA radio and television:

DRIVER EDUCATION IN PITTSBURGH SCHOOLS—TRAFFIC SAFETY

Once again, the call has been made to Pittsburgh to install driver education in public schools. Pittsburgh is the only major city in the Nation without such instruction.

The latest call came from State traffic safety commissioner, Harry Brainerd. Speaking at the mayor's highway safety conference, Commissioner Brainerd pointed to the increasing number of traffic deaths on our highways. He estimated that 50 percent of the very critical problem of young drivers could be eliminated, if driver education is installed in all of our schools.

The grim statistics certainly bear him out. Youngsters who take driver education are involved in only half as many accidents as those who do not. Insurance companies recognize its value by granting a 15-percent discount for driver education.

Now, if it is accepted as an essential education program in other cities, then why not in Pittsburgh? Well, of course, Pittsburgh public schools have some pretty severe financial pains. But so do some other cities, and they have found the money for driver education. It is largely a matter of considering the value of this instruction in its proper importance.

As Commissioner Brainerd points out, which is more important—how to bake a pie or drive a car safely? What good is it to learn woodworking, or even science, if a youngster goes out on the highway without proper driver training, and kills or cripples himself or others?

As we stated in previous editorials, driver education is a must for Pittsburgh. We urge school officials to meet with representatives of government, PTA, civic and safety groups, and develop a plan to install it here. There must be a way.

Driver education not only is a good investment in saving lives, injuries, and the economic loss of traffic accidents, but also in insuring the future of our children.

This (KDKA-TV) (KDKA-Radio) editorial was presented in the public interest. This station welcomes comments on its editorial opinions and recognizes its obligation to present over these facilities the opposing views of responsible spokesmen in order to achieve a balanced presentation on this issue.

On Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Industry," published in the Uniontown Standard, Friday, October 4, 1963.

The editorial follows:

ON INDUSTRY

Gov. William W. Scranton was in Reading, Pa., on Monday evening to speak at the Pennsylvania Kiwanis District Convention.

The dinner meeting was in the gymnasium of Albright College and was attended by at least 1,000 persons. It was a good audience for the Governor since every section of the State was represented.

The Governor used "new industry" as his theme. He told of his 100,000 industrial ambassadors.

The plan is for everyone who knows anyone in industry to talk about bringing new plants to the State, and to expand those that already are here. In addition the Governor said that a Pennsylvania committee is now being formulated which will visit industrial areas all over the world. During the visits the Pennsylvania story will be told with the hope that new industry will locate in the State.

It is an ambitious program. Added to the programs that had already been started in previous administrations such as the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, it creates an atmosphere of "doing" instead of sitting quietly and accepting defeat.

Abolition of Second-Class Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, out of the tragedy of the last weeks, a new determination has been born, to get on with the unfinished business of this country. There is no unfinished business facing us that is more critical to our moral health than the abolition of second-class citizenship based on race or religion. In the city of Fremont in my district, many good citizens are devoting their energies to this problem. I should like permission to insert in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the News Register of Fremont by one of those dedicated citizens, Mr. Floyd R. Erickson of the Fremont Committee on Human Rights.

The letter follows:

EDITOR, SIR: What is there now left to be said or feel that each of us has not heard or felt during the past 2 weeks. Each of us, in his own way, is aware of a great personal loss—a loss magnified by the tragic awareness of the victory of ignorance and hate that brought about the death of this man who gave so freely of himself to promote human decency and who also extended personal efforts toward achieving human rights.

Each of us has identified himself with Mr. Kennedy as a devoted father and husband who enjoyed his family, and also as a man who recently suffered extreme personal tragedy. We are also grateful for and extremely proud of his courageous contribution during World War II.

Mr. Kennedy's efforts have personified the aims we as a group mutually hope to achieve. He is not much more than a generation away from a minority group and only through concerted efforts of many people, overcame this vicious blind prejudice, and finally was enabled to attain the highest office of the land.

During his life he sought equal rights for all people in this country by personal example and proposed civil rights legislation, and abroad, to a degree, by promoting the Peace Corps. Yet his tragic death exposes the appalling society of hate that exists all around us; that should now serve to give added impetus to our efforts to accord equal rights to all by all means at our disposal.

Out of the depths of this recent calamity and the certainty of the vicious rationale that produced it, I am stirred to the realization that the efforts of all who seek hu-

man decency and human rights has only begun.

Three hundred and fifty years ago John Dunne stated, "Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in all mankind." I have never been so sadly aware of this truth as in the past 2 days. As a memorial, let each of us resolutely promote greater dignity in our daily contacts with our fellow man.

FLOYD R. ERICKSON,
Fremont Committee on Human Rights.

Memorial Tribute to Our Late President John F. Kennedy by Rev. Harry H. Kruener, Minister of Plymouth Church of the Pilgrims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO MR. KENNEDY
(Delivered at Borough Hall, Brooklyn, December 6, 1963)

"When a high heart we magnify
And a sure vision celebrate
And worship greatness passing by
Ourselves are great."

These lines were penned by John Drinkwater in tribute to Abraham Lincoln. They are words eminently befitting John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our President, so young, so full of hope, so quickly fallen, now resting among the Nation's heroes in our Nation's nobles field of honor.

John Kennedy had a high heart, he was a fine human being, and for that alone we will surely miss him. What gaiety, what honest love of give-and-take he brought into American politics. Ruling has always been a sober business and it takes a big man to hold power and yet enjoy it. It takes a great-hearted man to be solemn when life and death hang in the balance, to be decisive when destiny knocks, to be clear when the issues are confused, to read much and yet not be bookish, to be an intellectual without losing the common touch, to laugh without being shallow, to enjoy the full life given our generation of Americans and yet never to forget that "from those who have been given much, much will be required" in the long, last judgment of history. We have lost a man with a high heart.

We would be remiss to forget in our praise the high heart of the lady of the White House and her children. Never could we be prouder of our First Family than in the hour of their deepest grief. Other nations have their symbols of royalty, people of majesty, sense of honor, devotion to duty. In a mother and daughter kneeling quietly at a bier, in a tiny son saluting the last mortal remains of his father, we have known that this land, to which the commonest of men have come for shelter and opportunity, can and has produced an aristocracy, a royalty second to none.

The poet speaks of Lincoln's sure vision. We are here today to salute the idealism, the sure vision of our fallen leader. John Kennedy had a vision of a new and greater America and a new and better world for all mankind. He was possessed of a dream that our children would live in a land without racial injustice or second-class citizenship, a dream of freedom, stoutly defended but generously offered to the submerged poor of the earth in every continent, every clime. He took to heart the angels' song of "peace on earth, good will toward men." He made us all feel we were a Nation of forerunners, bound for a finer tomorrow. He followed a star to which he never played false. He knew that without vision the people always perish.

So we have seen greatness passing by, passing all too suddenly from our mortal sight, and having seen such greatness we resolve ourselves to be a bit greater in the days ahead. The business of being free men in a free land is yet unfinished. The high heart that was his must be ours now, driving from our own hearts all rancor, all hatred, all fear of change, all extremism, all selfish gain at the expense of the common good. And the sure vision must be ours, also, for we can all too easily forget the dark lessons of these last 2 weeks and fall back into the old ways of mediocrity and public apathy.

God grant that John F. Kennedy shall not have died in vain, nor lived among us in vain. We are a great people if we have the courage to be great. Ours is the most exciting age in the history of man, and those who stride ahead without fear toward its frontiers, wherever those frontiers may be, are those who will win and claim the splendor and glory of this age.

I know others have spoken of their nation's "finest hour" as being in the black days of war. My fellow citizens, I think two weekends ago was our finest hour, as Americans in this century. We were a humbled people, a shocked people, a united people, a people who turned quietly back to the God our fathers had known. We saw greatness passing by, laid to rest by the muffled drums of time, and we resolved ourselves once more to be great.

HARRY H. KRUENER.

Ohio State University Young Republican Club Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Ohio State University Young Republican Club adopted a very fitting and appropriate memorial statement on the assassination of President Kennedy. In order that others may share it, I am inserting it in full in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF PRESIDENT JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

1. The Young Republican Club of the Ohio State University expresses its profound grief at the dastardly assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

2. The President of the United States is President of all the people, of all parties, and of every persuasion sanctioned by the rule of law. As Chief Magistrate he bears in his person the greatness and purpose of the Republic. The hand raised against him was raised not only against us all, but against that which makes our Union sacred and enduring.

3. The nobility of our form of government is equaled only by its difficulty. The President must at the same time be an effective leader of a party, and one who commands loyalties beyond party. Mr. Kennedy possessed to an extraordinary degree the quality which engendered friendship and respect even in the midst of highly partisan politics. He bore the dignity of his high office with a modesty and grace which reflected the best traditions of his great predecessors. He will long be mourned and long remembered.

Be it resolved that this statement be sent with our deepest sympathy to Mrs. John F. Kennedy.

Be it also resolved that copies of this statement be forwarded to the press.

On behalf of the Ohio State University Young Republican Club.

WILLIAM O. MARTIN,
President.

What Castro Would Do About Racism if He Were President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the days and weeks which followed the tragic assassination of the President of the United States, many speeches, newspaper columns, editorials, and cartoons have appeared in which efforts have been made to place the blame for such a dastardly act on hatred, bigotry, bitterness, and racism on the part of the American people.

Of course, at the very beginning an immediate inference was drawn that the crime was commited by a representative of the so-called rightwing groups within our Nation. Later, however, many well-meaning people did unwittingly attempt to convey a guilt complex upon the American people as a whole. In this hour of national sorrow such a feeling may be natural to expect on the part of a Nation in mourning.

Many leftwing columnists, editorial writers, and cartoonists, however, have deliberately continued their attempt to place the blame on one segment of our population when they themselves are constantly writing and preaching bitterness and hatred in their columns and attacking those with whom they disagree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to put this whole matter into proper perspective. The world now knows that the assassin of our President, Harvey Oswald, was an avowed Marxist, Communist, a leftwing fanatic who renounced the United States. In his room was found a copy of the Militant, the official organ of the Socialist Workers Party. He had been photographed with a copy of this paper in one hand and the murder rifle in the other.

Material appearing in this periodical is very revealing, and since charges of bigotry and hatred were so loosely bantered about, I believe that Members of Congress should have the opportunity to see the type of trash that spawned the hatred that killed John Kennedy. I think they should have the chance to read the views subscribed to by the President's murderer.

I therefore submit for the RECORD an article from the Militant of June 17, 1963, entitled "What Castro Would Do About Racism if He Were President of the United States." I apologize for these words that defile the decency of these Halls, but it is necessary that you know the brand of bigotry that killed John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

The article follows:

WHAT CASTRO WOULD DO ABOUT RACISM IF HE WERE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(NOTE.—The following is a section of a speech delivered at a Harlem civil rights rally June 1 by Newsman William Worthy who faces a jail term for returning from Cuba to his native United States without a passport. The rally was sponsored by the Harlem Anticolonial Committee.)

May I draw a word picture of what we really are talking about when we say: "Decolonize America now." Let us imagine that in November 1960, Fidel Castro, instead of John F. Kennedy, had been elected President of the United States. On the basis of his clear record of eliminating all racial barriers in Cuba and stopping police brutality, about 95 percent of the cops in this country, black and white, North and South, would catch the first planes out, to escape prosecution. Many of them would wind up in South Africa as "refugees." There they would find the political and racial climate wholly compatible and congenial.

If "Bull" Connor were caught and arrested before fleeing, Fidel would not permit anyone to lynch him. He would be given a fair trial. In open court, evidence would be presented of 30 years of his tyranny and terror as Birmingham's police commissioner. Ol' Bull would have full opportunity to testify in his own defense. His attorneys could cross-examine all of the prosecution's witnesses, many of whom would be Negroes. And then, since it is inconceivable that any court could find him innocent, he would be taken out and shot.

Meanwhile, on his first day in office, Fidel would have occupied the entire South with Federal troops. Without bureaucratic delays, the jails would be emptied of all freedom fighters and other victims of the Jim Crow system. Fidel's new Cabinet would decree the immediate desegregration of all public facilities. Henceforth, all persons who continued to discriminate would go to jail or to a humanely operated rehabilitation center in an effort to cure them of their racist insanity. All jobs, all housing, all opportunities would be made available to everyone without discrimination.

Most beautiful of all, Fidel would disband the entire repressive FBI apparatus and would burn all the secret police garbage and intimate gossip that thousands of psychopathic agents have assembled over the years. He would put J. Edgar Hoover in an integrated cell in Atlanta Penitentiary as punishment for four decades of criminal neglect of duty. Hoover has never protected the constitutional rights of Negroes.

Sadly but realistically even a pacifist has to make a prediction that will scare and alarm many persons. The prediction is that it is going to take a drastic, Castro-type revolution before this problem of the races will be resolved. North and South, the twisted white man in the United States has no more intention of giving up his Jim Crow system than do the fanatics in the Union of South Africa.

Five years ago, even three years ago, I wouldn't have dreamed of speaking in these terms. Today, honesty and the facts before my eyes compel me.

The Urban Planning Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in late September the Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton, approved a Federal grant under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954—the urban planning assistance program—for the town of Thetford, Vt. The Wall Street Journal took note of this action in an editorial on November 5 entitled "This Is Urban Renewal?"

I was pleased to see that the Journal today has included in its letters to the editor column a letter from Mrs. Pauline Peters, executive secretary of the Thetford Planning Commission. I think that Mrs. Peters' letter should clarify any misunderstandings that may exist as to the purpose of this grant in particular, and the program of urban planning assistance in general, and the benefits available through it to smaller communities. Under unanimous consent, I include the text of this letter in the RECORD:

THETFORD'S PLANNING PROGRAM

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL: Your editorial entitled "This Is Urban Renewal?" (November 5) has been brought to our attention. As spokesmen for the town of Thetford, Vt., we feel an obligation to submit this reply.

First, the title itself is misleading. The town of Thetford is in no way involved in urban renewal—it is undertaking a comprehensive planning program. To be specific, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, through the Urban Renewal Administration, is responsible for the administration of a variety of programs authorized by the Housing Act of 1954 as amended.

The program in Thetford is a "section 701 planning program" (urban planning assistance), not urban renewal. These are two entirely different programs, administered by different departments with different funds and handled locally by different public gencies. Second, it seems obvious that Thetford, by planning now while it has no big city woes," intends to avoid them in its future growth. It is thus possible that urban renewal, a necessary corrective measure in areas that did not plan their urban growth will probably never be needed in Thetford. If many of our big cities had had the benefit of intelligent planning in their early development, taxpayers in Thetford and hundreds of other small towns around the country would not now be helping to foot the bills for huge renewal projects in New York, Chicago, and Boston.

Finally, this program demonstrates that Thetford not only is concerned about its future, but is actively planning the best way to meet the problems of growth, and is investing nearly $3 per capita of its own funds in the effort. This seems to us to enhance, not detract, from the image of community reliance traditionally associated with the typical Vermont town.

If assistance to smaller communities in the intelligent guiding of municipal growth through planning is not a proper function of government, if the smaller community cannot reasonably expect to receive its proportionate share of tax dollars devoted to this purpose, then indeed we should be concerned about the functions of Federal agencies.

MRS. PAULINE PETERS,
Executive Secretary,
Thetford Planning Commission.

THETFORD, VT.

Independence of Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, Libya will celebrate the 12th anniversary of her independence. We wish to take this occasion to send warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Idris I; and His Excellency, the Libyan Chargé d'affaires ad interim to the United States, Ben Jeleil.

When Libya was first proclaimed independent on Christmas Eve 12 years ago, world opinion held small hope for the rapid development, much less the continued existence, of the state. Having a per capita income estimated at $35, Libya was described as the "poorest nation on earth," "little more than a vast empty tract of the Sahara's rock and sand." Even the illiteracy was above 90 percent, with only 14 Libyan college graduates in the entire country.

By means of generous support from the United Nations, the United States, and Great Britain, the Libyan federation began its tortuous role as an independent state in the world community. The country was comprised of three Federal states, loosely joined under a central government, headed by King Idris I. Moreover, because of intense rivalry between the populous Cyrenaican and Tripolitanian units, separate Federal capitals had to be maintained in Benghazi and Tripoli, creating much duplication, confusion, and expense.

Today, the picture has changed. Almost overnight, remote cases have become boomtowns, "where cars outnumber camels." In the major cities, apartment buildings are mushrooming, with supermarkets and highways servicing the expanding urban population. Furthermore, the per capita income now averages over $100. The reason for this sudden prosperity is the discovery of vast deposits of oil in 1959.

Guided by the experiences of the other oil producing countries of the Middle East, the Libyan Government has established a development council to supervise and coordinate economic development. To this council is allocated 70 percent of all oil revenues, which, by 1965, will total $300 million.

Public utility development projects will comprise 40 percent of the council's funds; agricultural schemes will receive 30 percent; while the remaining 30 percent will be granted for education, health, housing, sanitation, and welfare.

This almost overwhelming prosperity has also created a sense of stability. Recent changes in the Constitution, agreed to by popular consent, transforms the nation from a federation to a unitary state. The province system has been abolished, with the Federal state being broken into districts. A new administrative capital is being constructed at al-Baida to eliminate both rivalry and expense. Confidence in the Government is apparent throughout Libya.

Relations with the United States since independence in 1951 have remained warm and cordial. Since 1954, when Wheelus Air Force Base was established, over 10,000 U.S. servicemen and their dependents have been stationed in Libya. The oil industry has brought several more thousand Americans to Libya, to live and enjoy the friendship of the Libyan people. Then, too, U.S. aid has specifically fostered agricultural and hydrological projects to increase the benefits for the farmers. Working with the knowledge that Libya was once the granary of the Roman Empire, American technicians have resurrected Roman irrigation plans, at times using the original systems laid out 19 centuries ago. Furthermore, model farms have shown the farmer what can be accomplished with little capital.

Work in these fields as well as in education and public health has earned for the United States the amity of a grateful people. Therefore, as the Libyans celebrate their 12th anniversary of independence this December 24, let us, too, salute their achievements and wish them continued success and rapid development as allies of the free world, as participatns in and stanch supporters of the Organization of African Unity, and as friends.

M. Sgt. John D. DePriest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a man named John D. DePriest who lives in Hayward, Calif., who writes to me fairly regularly, and his letters are always a pleasure to read. Although he is severely disabled, he writes mostly of other people who need help. Or he writes with precision and wit of matters which concern all of us. Master Sergeant DePriest, retired from the Air Force, has served his country well, and he continues to serve this country from a wheelchair, with his mind and his pen. Another of his salutary letters appeared in the News Register of Fremont and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to have it included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. John is also a regular reader of the RECORD, and I hope when he reads this he does not write me to complain about wasting the taxpayers' money.

To the EDITOR.

SIR: Born to high station with a silver spoon in his mouth, John F. Kennedy could have spent his life in leisure and security—the Riviera in the winter, Switzerland in the summer. But with his God-given qualities of compassion and justice, wisdom, courage, and decision, he was drawn into the battle for your and my humanity—the ocean of human interest—to be the leader of a great people, and a friend of the peoples of the world.

As John the Baptist, his voice crying in the wilderness, he would cry out for social justice, for equality, for the rights of the individual. And who can say that John the Baptist, like our beloved John F. Kennedy was murdered for speaking the truth—for defending the rights of God and man? "Greater love than this no one has, that one lay down his life for his friends."—JOHN 15: 13.

From the echo of that shot in Dallas 2 weeks ago waves of sorrow and misery have flowed the world.

Our great President Kennedy will accomplish in death what he could not accomplish in life * * * to show that all men are created equal and that social justice must prevail. This will be accomplished. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, has not died in vain. Nineteen hundred years ago our blessed Lord not only expressed this idea, but exemplified in His own life.

JOHN D. DEPRIEST.

HAYWARD, CALIF.

Hope for Needed Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Verne McKinney, editor of the Hillsboro, Oreg., Argus, has written a most timely and excellent editorial on the need for economy in Government spending. I wholeheartedly commend it to my colleagues:

HOPE FOR NEEDED ECONOMY

President Lyndon Johnson is giving every indication that he is interested in economy in Government and seems determined to "get a dollar's value for a dollar spent." We hope that he means it and will get the greatly desired results.

It cannot be achieved, however, with the continual appeal for new programs that mean greater expenditures.

Reportedly, he has called in department heads and asked them to make studies as to where economies and reductions can be made. He has also called 7,500 defense contractors to make a reexamination of costs and a search for economies.

In spite of this searching for economies, however, the report out of Washington is to the effect that the budget for the next fiscal year may go to $103 billion. This would be a record budget for national expenditures in either war or peace.

Surely, with some hardheaded cutting and economies, reductions can be made in Federal expenditures. If it was up to the voters of Oregon, who most convincingly showed how they felt about higher taxes in the October 15 election, we are sure something would be done.

If it has to be, it can be done as State officials and lawmakers found out.

A Memoir of John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in these sad days as we mourn our late President John F. Kennedy, all of us treasure anything that helps to fill out the full portrait of this great leader and warm and vital friend.

Prof. John Lydenberg, of Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., in my district, once taught a section of an English literature course at Harvard College in which President Kennedy was a student. His recollections of that experience, published in the Geneva Times on December 17, will be of interest, I believe, to every Member of this body. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Professor Lydenberg's eloquent memoir and personal tribute:

PROFESSOR LYDENBERG ALSO TAUGHT JOHN KENNEDY

John F. Kennedy had many teachers and two of them happen to be from Geneva. The reminiscences of J.F.K. by Harold Klue who taught Kennedy at the Riverdale Country School appeared in the Times last week.

They brought forth another set of memories by John Lydenberg who taught Kennedy at Harvard.

Professor Lydenberg, recently elected councilman in the first ward, recalls a somewhat more grown-up Kennedy than Mr. Klue.

As a freshman, Kennedy enrolled in Professor Lydenberg's section of an English literature course.

"Yes, I taught him at Harvard," said Mr. Lydenberg yesterday, "but I'm not sure he would have remembered me. He was a good student, full of bounce and curiosity.

"His bounce was physical as well as mental. He and his great friend Glenn Frank, Jr. (I don't suppose anyone now remembers Glenn Frank, Sr., then Governor of Wisconsin and before that president of the University of Wisconsin) used to pound up the shaky stairs in the old frame house in which our section met. And I recall the two of them once valuting together out of a window of Weld Hall to attack me for something as I was innocently loping down the steps of Widener Library.

"There was always that urge for action, with John Kennedy, as well as the mind that eagerly absorbed the information on which action should always be based.

"I bitterly mourn his passing and can only hope that we will be able to find other men with somewhere near his potential for greatness. I dearly hope that perhaps we here, in Geneva, in our homes, in our jobs, and especially in our political activity, can somehow give the Presidents-to-come more help in realizing their potential.

"If we wish to honor John Kennedy's memory, we must not simply mourn, but we must, each and every one of us, follow his lead in searching for knowledge and in finding the courage to act upon that knowledge once we've found it."

Studebaker Strips Our Gears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I find that after all the fuss and fury, reason or alibi in the Studebaker move to Canada, that it all boils down to the one inescapable conclusion: cheaper labor, cheaper government, cheaper production and no tariff barriers.

The cheaper production is not much use without a market. When the competitors in the market are not protected against foreign competition, one of two results obtain: either a corporation dies, its people are unemployed and the domestic economy is hurt, or the corporation—like Studebaker—moves to the cheaper production area to join the foreign competitors so that it can enjoy the fruits of our foolishness.

You will note that in either case the end result is the same: men are layed off and the economy suffers.

Mr. Speaker, there is another culprit in this trade fiasco that not only is not condemned but in fact is honored because of his dereliction in the matter of upholding the U.S. economy.

This third offender against the U.S. workingman, the U.S. Treasury, and the U.S. economy in general is the American producer who invests in production facilities in foreign countries to supply their own foreign markets thereby cutting out exports.

This, too, results in the same effect upon the U.S. economy, loss of jobs, and loss of Treasury income.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, the awful truth must prevail, this Nation or any other nation that attempts to stem the commercial nature of trade by engaging in unsound, uneconomic trade practices, for whatever reason, will soon find itself the beggar nation instead of the giver nation.

We all knew the frantic appeals from our Government officials for many of our debtors to ease up on their demands against us in order to save our dwindling and disappearing gold supply and our dollar from an ignominious exit from the world money mart.

Now we read with interest all the company talk about Studebaker and it can all be summed up in a few lines from the following story in the Financial Post, Toronto, Canada, December 14, 1963.

The whole issue is boldly etched upon the economic slate for all to see in these words from Byers A. Burlingame, president of Studebaker Corp., when he says, "the Canadian company can build more efficiently and more cheaply than Studebaker at South Bend."

There it is plain as day, more efficiently and more cheaply. I can understand the "more cheaply" statement but "more efficiently" takes a little examination.

If the Studebaker people read their own ads they can't believe their highly touted father, son and over on into the third generation of skilled workers has been outclassed by foreign workers.

If their plant in Canada is more efficient and more modern in its techniques, do not forget it was money out of the U.S. parent plant that built the Canadian plant, and if this is the case then how much of the delinquency in efficiency at South Bend be charged to labor, how much to taxes and, most important how much to management.

Surely we cannot stand idly by and watch both our economic muscles in the form of our physical plants being vacated and at the same time destroying the reputation of the displaced workers, so that the workers, the town, and the country itself is classified as insufficient.

This certainly will not help the displaced loyal workers get jobs for Chrysler or any other auto maker.

In fact, the whole mess traces back to our trade policies.

Studebaker and Rambler were going great on their compacts in competition with the imported little cars.

However, when we failed to stem the flood of imports and they reached an alarming portion of our cash market the giants of the industry—General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler—jumped into the compact field.

Yes, they cut down the imports but in the process they struck a fatal blow to Studebaker and didn't help Rambler any.

Rambler had a little more going for it, a longer history in small cars, dealers, service, and reputation in small-car production.

Now that the ill winds of trade have driven Studebaker to the cheaper production area of the lower labor standards we can look for more and more imports of parts and even cars by the other U.S. producers.

Do not be surprised if we find ourselves realizing what George Ball meant when he said "certain U.S. industries are expendable" and will have to go out of business so nations less developed industrially can go into these production industries.

Evidently no one ever thought that Studebaker was indispensable but the record speaks for itself.

Strange, but one of the industries George Ball said was expendable was the textile industry.

Lo, and behold, after allowing much of it to be expended in the interest of free trade, friendly neighbors, and world peace and good will, the Congress passed a bill appropriating millions of dollars to the stockholders of textile mills whether they earned a dividend or not, the Government subsidizes the raw material.

Maybe we ought to look at Canada's coal subsidy program.

Canada pays a subcontractor on coal to railroads of up to about $5 a ton plus a 50-cent-a-ton tariff in order to keep U.S. cheaper produced coal out of the areas far from the coal fields.

It goes further and pays a subsidy of up to 90 cents a ton to the user to make up the difference between the B.t.u. cost of coal versus fuel oil.

What would happen if we paid a subsidy to our coal users to keep Canadian gas out of our Western coal-consuming areas?

Again what would happen if we placed an embargo or an equalizing charge against Studebakers coming in from Canada to protect what is left of our auto industry from their unfair low cost production? It is interesting to note that the Canadians are actually surprised if not shocked at the apparent lack of interest in Washington over the Studebaker move.

One can almost hear the mockery of the words of Marie Antoinette. When told the peasants had no bread, she said:

Let them eat cake.

When I approached certain officials on the plight of the 6,000 displaced workers, many of them no longer young men and women, I was told, "Oh, it will work out all right, we'll retrain them for other jobs and skills; in the meantime we'll move real fast on relief for them." "Go ahead let them eat cake."

An innocent bystander might run into trouble if he asked why South Bend's present unemployed have not been retrained or have not been reemployed.

You will note in reading the following stories out of Canada that Canadians have wiped out the ridiculous 6½-percent tariff by devaluating their dollar.

Is it not a strange group of sophomoric economists who say that a 6½-percent tariff at the manufacturer's cost level is the high and yet in Pennsylvania every car buyer has to pay 5 percent on the retail sales price but no one seems to think this is a trade hindrance or holdback?

I would wish that all Members would read the full story as follows:

NO UPROAR IN WASHINGTON OVER STUDEBAKER'S SWITCH

WASHINGTON.—There is no "anti-Canada" campaign being generated because of Studebaker's decision to move its carmaking operation to Canada.

Instead of shouts of retaliation against Canada, Washington's attitude is one of trying to help the South Bend, Ind., area make up for the loss of the carmaking business.

Indiana Senator VANCE HARTKE told FP there is no thought whatever of retaliation against Canada, because the action was clearly motivated by corporate problems.

Almost on the heels of the disclosure that Studebaker's automobile division was leaving South Bend, conferences were set up in Washington by Senators, Representatives, and officials of the U.S. Commerce Department. Congressmen hoped the Federal Government might be able to give defense orders to industries in the South Bend region to help in creating jobs for the 6,000 workers unemployed by Studebaker's action.

In the last 2 years, Studebaker has received almost $200 million in U.S. Government orders from the Pentagon, the U.S. Post Office, and the General Services Administration. The company's backlog of Government business is estimated to be worth about $90 million.

In a joint statement, the Indiana Congressmen said, "We share a great confidence in the people of the South Bend area. We are determined to work with them to meet this new challenge."

Senator HARTKE said he was "disappointed and concerned" at the Studebaker action. He is worried not only about the effect in the South Bend region, but also in other Indiana communities where plants had served as suppliers to the Sstudebaker automobile division.

Some Canadian officials had been apprehensive that Washington might be inclined to blame the new Canadian auto parts trade policy for the Studebaker move. There is, however, no indication either in Congress or the Commerce Department as yet that this is the case. There is some feeling that the auto parts policy might have been a factor in the move, but only a relatively minor one and one of many.

"This has been brewing for a long time, and there are a vast number of much more important reasons for the move," one U.S. official told FP.

[From the Financial Post, Dec. 14, 1963]

(NOTE.—This team of five Canadians sits this week on the hottest spot in Canadian industry. They asked for, and got, a chance to make cars for the U.S. market. Some say it's a last-gasp gamble, but these men are confident: "We'll pull it off—quickly, we hope.")

(By Carlyle Dunbar)

HAMILTON.—For Christmas 1963, Studebaker, of Canada, Ltd., has been given what it asked for: the challenge of supplying Studebaker cars to the United States and all the world.

Whether this opportunity proves to be golden, or a one-way drive to oblivion for Studebaker Corp's 111-year-old vehicle business, rests now on the ability of five Canadians.

The five men, who are now in the hot blaze of competition as no other Canadian auto executives have ever been:

Gordon Edward Grundy, 51, a chartered accountant, since 1958 president and general manager of Studebaker of Canada, Hamilton, Ontario.

William Alan Moeser, 41, a mechanical engineer, since October 1962 director of manufacturing at Studebaker of Canada.

H. Graeme Allwood, 51, accountant, comptroller since 1962.

Ralph A. Wilson, 39, director of purchasing since 1959.

Robert James Orr, 46, director of marketing since 1961.

Grundy has been put in charge of Studebaker Corp.'s automotive division in the United States.

Within 3 months, motorcars from Studebaker of Canada's 350,000-square-foot one-story factory at Hamilton will start to be shipped to the 1,900 U.S. Studebaker dealers. Price is expected to be little changed—which might mean lower Studebaker prices in Canada.

Car production at Studebaker Corp.'s headquarters, South Bend, Ind., will cease when orders received up to December 16 have been filled. About 6,000 American workers will lose their jobs, a rambling 6-million-square-foot factory will be idle.

Never before has any firm attempted to sell a Canadian-made car in the United States.

It is now the job of Grundy and his small executive staff to show that it can be done, by matching U.S. car prices and slugging it out with the heavyweights in the world's largest car market. They suggested they could compete in the U.S. market, and the parent company started examining the idea "a number of weeks ago." Idea was adopted last weekend.

Studebaker Corp.'s big decision to abandon its money-losing South Bend carmaking operation ($40 million loss since 1959) is accompanied by another big change in strategy.

The plan: To quit the annual model-change rat race, and make the same car year after year. Henry Ford put North America on wheels this way, and Volkswagen has climbed to No. 4 in world car production with the same policy.

In essence, what Studebaker has decided is this: It's better to make a profit producing 30,000 cars a year in Canada than continue losing money producing 60,000 or more cars a year in the United States.

There are many skeptics. "Observers consider the move to Canada a last-ditch gamble to keep Studebaker in the automotive business," the New York Times reported this week.

But listen to Comptroller Allwood, the man who watches Studebaker of Canada's costs: "I don't think it is a gamble at all. If the Canadian company has its overhead costs covered now, I think you can see that additional production volume will not increase these costs anywhere near the same amount."

Studebaker's Canadian rivals aren't commenting officially on the firm's big challenge. But Studebaker officials have been called by executives from other firms with congratulations, wishes of good luck—and a reminder that the reputation of the country's auto industry now rides on their shoulders.

Grundy says: "We have no intention of running off the restyled 1964 models and calling it quits."

Though no model changes are planned for some years, Studebaker already has a completely new car designed for introduction in the future. The firm will drop the Hawk model (first introduced in 1953) and the stylish, fiberglass-body Avanti (which may be revived later).

Grundy's management team says Studebaker of Canada has made a profit in 51 of its 52 years in Canada. Although Studebaker's share of the Canadian car market has fallen from 4 percent in the late 1940's to current 1½ percent, it is profitable.

"If we can make money producing 8,000 cars a year, the profitability of this factory looks pretty good at 30,000 a year," marketing director Orr says.

Byers A. Burlingame, president of Studebaker Corp., says the Canadian company can build cars more efficiently and cheaply than Studebaker can at South Bend.

Since 1950, Studebaker's U.S. sales have fallen from more than 300,000 a year to an expected 1963 total of less than 70,000.

How is the Studebaker of Canada team going to compete in the United States? The project has been sketched out only in broad terms. "We eventually have to prove it in cold, hard figures," Allwood says.

Here are the points the top executives make:

Without any significant changes in the factory, car production can be raised on two shifts to 30,000-plus per year. Additional production equipment can be brought from South Bend if needed. Company will need 425 more men for the second shift. Total employment now: about 700.

The work force is versatile, as Canadian car factory workers have to be. "We have always felt we turned out a better car than the South Bend plant," says Moeser. Studebaker has many long-service men capable of assuming supervisory jobs. Moeser started "rejuvenating" his supervisory team 18 months ago.

Management staff is lean. "We pay our people well, but we don't have too many of them," Allwood says. The staff will remain lean, because elimination of annual model changes will reduce the number of design and research engineers retained from the U.S. operation.

"Grundy's policy is to give each man a job and responsibility, and let him do the job and simply keep Grundy informed of what he has done," say Studebaker men.

Internal reporting and paperwork is at a minimum, says R. H. Westmore, director of management services. Parent company procedures have not been followed.

This is similar to the management philosophy of American Motors (Canada), Ltd., which has quickly built a growing and profitable carmaking operation (FP, Oct. 20, 1962). The policy: you can't run a small company with big-company methods.

Other key management men at Studebaker of Canada are: F. G. Stacey, director of industrial relations; C. A. Beaudoin, treasurer; and Westmore.

Position of director of planning has been vacant for several months—but the retired planning director, C. S. Finkle, spent his last year on the job preparing plans for physical expansion of the Hamilton plant. The plans may be used soon, Grundy indicates.

"We made all our tooling ourselves in Hamilton this year. We had better door fits and part fits than we ever had before—and much better than the rest of the industry," a production man said. "We just felt we could do it, so we went ahead and proved it. The 1964's have gone together better than any car we have ever built."

Wages at Hamilton will average less than at South Bend. Assemblers' wages, which are "close to average" in factories, are $2.40 per hour at Hamilton versus $2.70 in the United States.

Cost of parts and materials will be relatively the same as in the United States, Allwood says. Evidence: more than 30 parts were being made by Canadian parts firms for use in all U.S.-made Studebakers.

U.S.-made parts in Canadian-built cars will reduce the price on which U.S. import duties will be levied, Orr says.

"The 6½ percent U.S. duty on cars is not really much. The difference in exchange between Canadian dollars and U.S. dollars more than offsets it," he says.

Canadian duties on imported parts will be eliminated by increased exports by Studebaker.

But, "We are as sure as hell going to lean toward Canadian suppliers," Orr says.

By continuing to make the 1964 model cars—which were completely redesigned—for several years without change, parts costs should be reduced again.

"When you make 30,000 parts instead of 10,000, you can do it cheaper. When you can make 90,000 over 3 years, you are in the big league for low costs," said an official.

By eliminating a "modest face lift" on the 1965 cars, Studebaker expects to save $4 million in retooling expenses.

Studebaker officials hint they may be able to reduce car prices eventually by purchasing parts in larger quantities, avoiding retooling.

The public will get a better car because quality control won't have to be restarted every year, but the benefits will accumulate year after year, the Studebaker men say.

"Think what the end of the annual model change will mean to the buyer of a 1964 car. His will look the same as a 1965. It will mean less depreciation on his car," they say.

The big unknown factor in the new era at Studebaker is how the American car buyer and dealer will act.

Studebaker's U.S. dealers are reported to be complacent. A program to add some ginger to retail selling in the United States started in July 1962. Despite this, sales of the new 1964 models slumped.

How the U.S. consumer will react to a made-in-Canada car is yet to be learned. But Ontario and Federal trade officials say that practically anything with a made-in-Canada label will sell in the United States.

Moeser says the likelihood that Studebaker dealers will have a shortage of cars to sell will help production scheduling. It could also change attitudes in the U.S. dealer network.

The Studebaker officials say there is no question of the firm's success as a major exporter in the long run. What concerns them is doing it quickly.

"We have some old pros and some young pros, and we have not got any amateurs," Allwood says.

Brooklyn—College Town, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn, the borough of colleges, celebrated American Education Week with a full schedule of activities. I am proud that my district includes many of Brooklyn's institutions of higher education which participated in the week's events.

It is particularly significant that we note the contribution of our colleges at this time when we have passed the most extensive education law on the books to date. The work which our schools have initiated can now be carried on to completion. The goal of educational excellence is not beyond our reach and through the help of positive legislation such as the college aid bill, we will reach this goal.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun on November 11 entitled "College Town, U.S.A." I am confident all Members will enjoy reading about "Dodgertown's" conversion to "Collegetown":

COLLEGE TOWN U.S.A.—OUR 57,700 STUDENTS IN 12 SCHOOLS

(By Cindy Hughes)

Brooklyn, the borough of churches, is also a big college town.

The birthplace of the Dodgers grows more baccalaureates than baseball players, even.

Brooklyn has more college students than any borough in the city, the U.S. Census Bureau has revealed. In fact, it has more than any metropolis in the country, except Chicago and Los Angeles.

Its 12 institutions of higher learning boast a total enrollment of about 57,700, and that not counting some of the smaller religious training organizations, nursing schools, or trade schools.

This is American Education Week, and our town is appropriately in the middle of it with speeches, exhibits, lectures, and forums in many of its colleges.

Most of these activities were encouraged and coordinated by a committee to celebrate "Brooklyn—the Greatest College Talent Town," headed by Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association, and Democratic Congressman HUGH L. CAREY.

EVERYBODY IN

The oldest and smallest, the biggest, and the youngest of Brooklyn's colleges will be taking part in the celebration.

Higher education in Brooklyn goes back 118 years, when the Brooklyn Female Academy was founded in 1845 "to provide for girls the same type of education provided for boys in the best colleges."

After the academy burned down in 1853, Mrs. Harriet Packer donated funds to rebuild at 170 Jeralemon Street, and the school was renamed "Packer Collegiate Institute."

Packer stands at that same address today, the original wing half buried in modern additions. Its tiny enrollment (the junior college has 70 students) provides more listings in "Who's Who of American Women" than any similar institution in the country.

Next on the scene was Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, founded by some of Packer's people in 1854 to give the sons of Brooklyn's socially elite the same excellent education their daughters were getting.

GRADUATED TO COLLEGE

Polytechnic started out as a prep school, but it was doing a brother-and-sister act with Packer by offering college-level courses.

Today Polytechnic covers 1 square block at 333 Jay Street and has 5,700 students. Well known for its aerospace and electrical engineering courses, it has one of the biggest chemistry departments in the world. Three of this year's Nobel Prize winners studied there.

The College of Medicine of the State University's Downstate Medical Center at 450 Clarkson, has 677 M.D. and Ph. D. students. It is the direct descendant of the medical college of Long Island College Hospital, founded in 1860 at 350 Henry Street.

Among its graduates are Dr. John Walsh, obstetrician to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, and Dr. Julius Lempert, famed ear surgeon.

Dr. Walsh also attended St. John's University, Brooklyn's fourth oldest college. It began in 1870 at 75 Lewis Avenue as St. John's College.

HAS 4,198 STUDENTS

Today St. John's has a new campus in Jamaica, and its business administration, nursing, and liberal arts schools at 96 Schermerhorn Street, have 4,198 students. The Most Reverend John J. Boardman, auxiliary bishop of Brooklyn, was a student at St. John's.

St. Francis College, 180 Remson Street, numbers among its alumni Dr. John Flynn, former president of Kings County Medical Society, and City Councilman Thomas Cuite. Present enrollment is 2,082.

The Brooklyn College of Pharmacy was founded in 1886 by the Kings County Pharmaceutical Society. For years it held classes above a drugstore on Myrtle Avenue, attended by drug clerks.

The college is today part of Long Island University, with 521 students at 600 Lafayette Avenue. It established in recent years the country's first graduate program in hospital pharmacy administration.

Pratt Institute is located at its original 1887 location at 215 Ryerson Street. It is famous for its art and industrial design schools, and its engineering and science faculty rates third in the country (MIT is first). Pratt has 5,000 students. Among its alumni are dress designer Norman Norell and Elwood Engel, designer of the Chrysler Imperial.

ALUMNI ARE NOTABLE

Brooklyn Law School, at 375 Pearl Street, claims nearly 60 alumni who are judges of courts of record in the metropolitan area.

Founded in 1901, it now has 1,200 students. Its famed alumni include two presiding justices of the appellate division, Bernard Betein and George J. Beldock; Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy, Fire Commissioner Edward Thompson, Queens District Attorney Frank O'Connor, Richmond District Attorney John M. Braisted, Jr., and Aaron Koota, chief assistant district attorney of Brooklyn.

Cathedral College of the Immaculate Conception, 555 Washington Avenue, was founded in 1914. Five of its graduates have been made bishops, including the Most Reverend Charles Mulrooney and the Most Reverend Joseph Denning, both auxiliary bishops of Brooklyn.

St. Joseph's College for Women, founded in 1916, is noted for its child study department. It has an enrollment of about 600.

SHE'S TELSTAR ENGINEER

Dr. Gertrude Unser, only woman member of the board of education's board of examiners, is a St. Joseph's alumna. So are Patricia Loth, engineer on the Telstar and Nike projects, and Sister Mary Madeline, director of the Angel Guardian Home in Brooklyn.

Long Island University began with rented office space on Court Street in 1926. It now has five campuses: two in Brooklyn, two in Nassau, and one in Suffolk.

Its students at 385 Flatbush Avenue Extension number 5,109.

The biggest and second newest is Brooklyn College, which has 23,500 students in its 33d year.

Under president Harry Gideonse, the college is now planning a long-range expansion program. Dr. Gideonse hopes that the enlargement, together with the proposed Kingsborough Community College, will take care of Brooklyn's booming college population.

Plans include putting up an education, psychology, and mathematics building, an addition to the science building, and an addition to the gymnasium, to be built over the Long Island Railroad tracks passing the 40-acre Bedford Avenue campus.

TO COST $4 MILLION

Acquisition of the air rights and laying of foundations are the goals for this year. Its estimated cost: under $4 million.

Brooklyn College alumni include comedian Sam Levenson, singer Alfred Drake, author Irwin Shaw, housing authority Joseph P. McMurray, and Pulitzer Prize-winning writer Oscar Handlin.

New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences at 300 Pearl Street, founded in 1946, has 8994 students. It also is planning expansion—a new building to cost $14.4 million. It's already the largest community college in the State.

The board of higher education is now looking for a president for Kingsborough Community College, which will welcome about 200 students at the proposed Manhattan Beach site next fall.

All these colleges except Kingsborough are cooperating with the Brooklyn Is a College Town Committee this week. In addition, the nursing schools of Brooklyn Hospital, Brooklyn Jewish Hospital, Kings County Hospital, Long Island College Hospital, Methodist Hospital, St. Catherine's Hospital, and St. Mary's Hospital are participating.

KEPPEL TO SPEAK

At Equitable Savings & Loan, Willoughby and Pearl Streets, there will be 16 display windows prepared by the colleges. They will be dedicated on Tuesday, November 19, at 11:30 a.m., by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Keppel will speak at a luncheon later to a group of community leaders in the Towers Hotel.

"Brooklyn Is a College Town" will be recognized with other events this week.

St. John's University will hold a human rights forum Friday at noon at 96 Schermerhorn Street. St. Joseph's College for Women will hold a weeklong exhibit, "Children's Toy Gallery."

Packer Collegiate is displaying documents and photos from its archives, and Polytechnic will hold afternoon science lectures tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday.

New York Community College will have an exhibit at the hotel show, New York Coliseum. Long Island University will present a debate on the Federal civil rights bill tomorrow night, "morning lecture on the American novel" Thursday, and a panel discussion of "The Problems of Africa" on Friday afternoon.

Pratt Institute will have art exhibits; Brooklyn College is having an art show tomorrow, a reception Wednesday, a lecture on "Graduate Education" Thursday, a play and a concert Friday and the weekend.

Ships That Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter in answer to a letter from Mr. Baldwin of the Lumber Institute.

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

The tone of your letter and the attached agenda plus the NAHB attacks on H.R. 2513 shows pretty much how the so-called export trade increase and dollar balances have deteriorated since a few of us stood up against the misnamed Trade Expansion Act in 1962.

All of the propaganda to the contrary the most telling statistics can be read in the waterline of the outgoing ships from the lumber terminals in Dundock, Baltimore, Md.

While in session I live below Annapolis on the Chesapeake Bay. I see the ships coming into our ports loaded to the waterline, I see them going out floating high, wide, and easy.

When they are low in the water they're on an outward voyage you can bet it's foreign aid, military vehicles or wheat and other Public Law 480 shipments.

What doesn't seem to phase the sophomoric economists, the unwitting victims of the hard sell artists of the international trade profiteers is that when imports squeeze the domestic market it results in depressed prices, lowered profits for expansion and investment, static labor wages and automated unemployment.

We talk about percentages of domestic market when measuring imports with little or no consideration given to the spread of the imports. For instance if the lumber imports are 70 percent of U.S. market and probably a lot more when one checks into all types, forms and prices containing lumber products are counted, it doesn't mean that the loss of business is spread evenly over all U.S. lumber producers. It can't hit one producer harder than another. In fact, it can and has put the regional or marginal producer out of business and bids to put the average producer on the shelf in a few short years.

You ask what I think can be done. It's beyond what I think, it's now a problem of reversing millions of pages of propaganda and endorsement of unsound economic trade policies.

This can only be done if all the industries affected would courageously and unselfishly do what the industrial trade profiteers have done, join together all their efforts and awaken to the fact that one by one they have no power or effect upon Congress or the press, or the people, or the President.

Let's be realistic. No U.S. industry can survive in a free-trade world so long as we have fixed costs of production based upon raw materials, labor, taxes, and services in the United States which are for all practical purposes mandated by Government with local, State and Federal tax agencies, union contracts and protection for unions under our Constitution, antitrust and antiunemployment laws.

No sane person would advocate wiping out the systems of check and balance contained in the above mentioned and other laws of our Nation and yet the very same persons who scream to high heaven if we ever attempted to cut out social security, unemployment compensation, etc., are in the forefront demanding so-called free trade with nations whose basic costs of production are in no more reasonable or measurable terms comparable to ours.

I've been to Europe and Asia, Hong Kong to Japan. I've seen their production facilities, their costs of labor and their government commissions for export products. I've seen the most modern plants in the world being run by 7-, 15-, and 25-cent-an-hour labor.

The problem isn't one of labor alone anymore than it's one for the lumber industry alone.

As you note more than a hundred Members of Congress signed a petition in behalf of the lumber industry. More than 200 signed a petition to help save the shoe industry.

Individuals and regional groups comprising a sizable majority of both Houses of Congress have at one time or another signed petitions or introduced legislation seeking quotas for this or that product or industry. Many others have dropped antidumping bills into the hopper.

It's strange but true, Congress is made up of in the main of protectionists, protectionists for their individual district's products but collectively the Congress is far so-called free trade.

Why is this the case? The answer can be oversimplified by saying that they are looking after their own skins locally and yet nationally they are make-believe statesmen.

This is true, but it isn't the whole reason for the paradoxical position of being for and against a subject matter at one and the same time.

Basically all of us are both protectionists and freetraders. We want protection for what we sell and we want bargains for what we buy. Few of us seem to grasp the full picture. When any one worker is displaced by unsound trade practices and policies, every other worker loses.

When any one industry suffers all others suffer. Only recently have some of the more able newsmen started to cut out the chaff from the wheat and are telling the truth about the import-export trade policies and their effect upon our National economy.

One such newsman, Jack Anderson, writing in the syndicated news column "Washington Merry-Go-Round" slapped the fake figures and false picture painted about the steel industry. You will note that he covers the fact that U.S. oversea investments have created the overexpansion in steel production and we are just starting to see the results of free trade between unlike economics in a given world surplus product.

We've seen this in cotton, wheat, peanuts and other agricultural products. We are entering the final stage of the cotton fiasco when Congress votes on an additional $300 million subsidy for the cotton, this time we pay it to the textile mills.

Shades of free trade seem to be forming a shroud around the U.S. free enterprise system. The formula for cotton, subsidy out of the U.S. treasury for cottongrowers, payments to cotton warehousers, purchases by U.S. Government, resell to foreign textile mills for $42.50 less than domestic mills, floods of cotton textile hit U.S. market, U.S. textile mills lose income, workers lose jobs, Government proposes $42.50 gift (credit on purchases) to U.S. mills to save U.S. industry.

The cost of subsidy on cotton from and to textiles will be greater in dollar value than the entire cotton export dollar collected by U.S. Government.

This then is the order of doing business in any line of U.S. product thrown into the profit-seeking calendar of international trade.

When we finally realize that free trade is only sound in iron competitive items and job protection is as important to a democracy as military defense, we will come up with a formula for world trade that will more closely resemble fair and equitable trade between competing economics.

We should never tariff goods we do not produce whether manufactured, mined or farmed. No other nation should, unless its customs are revenue measures and not protective measures.

Before putting before you exerpts from Jack Anderson's story on steel let me remind you that glass, rubber, cheese, mushrooms, in fact anything from soup to nuts is on the list in the hands of Christian Herter and in the forthcoming Kennedy round of GATT meetings we may set the stage for the embalment of free enterprise, individually owned and operated U.S. industrial complex.

The story on steel follows:

"STEEL AID ABROAD BOOMERANGS

"(By Jack Anderson)

"More details can now be told about the foreign aid fiasco in steel—how American generosity has built up foreign steel industries, putting dozens of our own mills out of production and thousands of workers out of work.

"By unofficial count, 179 foreign steel plants have received American loans or grants since World War II. This aid has enabled them to install machines and adopt techniques more modern than our own.

"Thus the U.S. steel industry through its tax payments not only has helped to finance its foreign competitors but has obligingly provided them with better equipment.

"No wonder the American share of the world's steel output has dropped from 46 percent in 1950 to 25 percent today. U.S. steel products have been pushed out of two-thirds of their former markets, causing a sharp production slump.

"Foreign mills built at American expense are now turning out wire and rod so cheaply, for instance, that imports have captured 30 percent of the U.S. market. Even steelplate, the bread and butter of the industry, is beginning to roll in from abroad.

"STEEL FRANKENSTEIN

"Typical example: With the best of intentions, Uncle Sam helped to rebuild Japan's war-wrecked steel industry until it is now taking customers away from U.S. mills.

"From 1955 until 1960, 10 great Japanese steelworks received foreign aid grants amounting to $155,300,000. Nine more mills were granted Export-Import Bank loans totaling $121,100,000.

"The Yawata Iron & Steel Co. for example, received a $5,300,000 grant in 1955, a $26 million loan in 1957, another $20 million grant in 1959, and still another $26 million loan in 1962. Its blast furnaces are now producing more steel than most American mills.

"Even as French President Charles de Gaulle was tightening the screws on American products, Uncle Sam doled out four separate loans totaling $6,556,000 to France's giant Union Sud du Nord steel works in 1960–61. A smaller $66,000 grant went to Miferma, another French steel company.

"Dictator Franco got $59,513,000 in grants for nine Spanish steel plants, the largest an $18 million grant for the Altos-Hornos Viscaya works in 1961. The Empresa NAC Siderurgica mills received several American grants, the latest a $6,600,000 payment last year.

"In Latin America, Mexico and Argentina received the most U.S. aid. Altogether 22 Mexican steel plants collected $90,780,236 from Uncle Sam, then promptly began shipping steel plate across the border to U.S. customers. Another 22 Argentine plants received $88,580,560 in U.S. handouts.

"STEEL FOR REDS

"The only Communist country whose steel production got a U.S. boost was Yugoslavia.

Uncle Sam granted the Yugoslavs $15 million to purchase a U.S. steel mill in 1961. Earlier, Yugoslavia's Niksic Iron Works was given $5,610,000 in American counterpart funds.

"The largest single grant was arranged in 1959 by Tom Dewey, the two-time GOP presidential candidate, for Turkey's Eregli Steel Mill. Amount, $129,600,000.

"The loan was granted, incidentally, while Vance Brand was the Government's development loan chief. He promptly retired from the loan fund to become a high-paid consultant, and later a director of Koppers, the company that did the engineering on the Turkish steel plant.

"Even our prosperous northern neighbor, Canada, once received a $5,700,000 Export-Import loan to aid her steel industry.

"Around the world, foreign steel mills have been subsidized by the American taxpayers. Unhappily, the American desire to better the world has reached the point that we are in danger of crippling the goose that lays the golden eggs."

I know this is more than you bargained for but I can't let up in what I believe to be the most dangerous situation, economically, th's Nation found itself in our generation.

We cannot blend the exact science of economics, the inexact science of world diplomacy and the will of the wisp of commercial world trade without disaster.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Imported Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mrs. HANSEN. H.R. 2513 as amended by the Senate provides for imported lumber to be marked by country of origin. Thus, under its provisions imported lumber would have to be stamped with the name of the country from which it came.

Certainly consumers in this Nation are entitled to know from what nation they are buying their lumber products. Lumber is not presently marked and it is impossible for a domestic consumer to seek redress from the foreign manufacturer from any deviation from grade. In fact, many times when complaints are made as to grade, domestic agencies are blamed for discrepancies which actually should be blamed on the foreign shipper. This occurs because grade stamps presently being used by foreign lumber producers indicate that the rules under which the foreign lumber is graded were those of domestic grading agencies such as the West Coast Lumbermen's Association or a similar organization. If the consumer is unable to determine by inspecting the lumber from which country it came, he often unfairly blames domestic grading agencies for any imperfections when in fact he should not.

Marking lumber to make it possible for domestic consumers to determine from what country their lumber came would eliminate this confusion and any dissatisfactions with the lumber could be reported to the correct source.

All Americans are aware of the problems facing the domestic lumber industry. Today we find that on an annual basis imports of Canadanian lumber average about 6 billion board feet yearly. This is about 16 percent of our Nation's annual production.

This is a fact which must be faced in many of our Nation's communities in which lumber mills formerly provided thousands of men and women and children their livelihood. Now the mills are closed, men are out of work and a great industry is in trouble.

Most of the present lumber problems in our Nation may be traced to the increasing imports of Canadian lumber. But other countries might easily move into a position that further erodes our domestic lumber industry. For instance the Soviet Union is a major exporter of lumber and now accounts for about 14 percent of the total world's lumber export market. It is not generally known throughout the world but it is a fact that Russia's forest resources are larger than those of any other nation and account for almost 20 percent of the world's total. This is a threat which must not be taken lightly.

H.R. 2513 will make it possible for our Nation's consumers to be fully knowledgeable about the source of the lumber they buy. They will be able thus to buy intelligently and with full knowledge of the type, grade and value of the lumber they buy.

Memorial Services for the Late President, John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, memorial services for the late President, John F. Kennedy, were held at the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, McLean, Va., on November 25, 1963, at 11 a.m. Whether partisan or nonpartisan, sympathetic or blase, we can all benefit from the remarks of Pastor H. Alvin Kuhn as they were delivered at that service. The complete text of his message is printed verbatim:

So many words have been spoken on radio and television and so many written in the newspapers about the tragic events of the past few days and the persons immediately involved in them, that I do not need to add to that number. It is not necessary, nor proper, that a eulogy be read, for our purpose is not to glory in the life of a man, regardless of the office he holds, but to renew our trust and faith in Jesus Christ in whom all men stand revealed as sinners, dependent upon the grace of God, and in whom all men may find hope and comfort in time of sorrow.

As the Christian Church, our primary task is to declare God's saving act in Jesus Christ to the living, that in Him we and they may find the strength and the courage we need in times of personal or national crisis.

The life of John F. Kennedy now belongs to God and to history. His work on earth is done. But his family, his friends, the citizens of the country and world he led, live on. It is to them and to us we proclaim again the victorious words of our Lord, "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believes in Me, though he die, yet shall he live."

It is to them and to us that we repeat the assuring words of the Apostle Paul, "For I am sure that neither death nor life, nor anything else in all creation will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."

The wife and children of John F. Kennedy, the wife and children of Police Officer Tippit, the wife and children of Lee Harvey Oswald, their fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, close friends, and acquaintances—and we, too—have been caught up in a wave of events that could overwhelm any person whose life is not anchored in the life of Him who died and rose again, Jesus Christ, our Lord. It is for them in particular that we pray, even as we pray for ourselves, our new President, and our country.

As the earthly body of one we here honor is placed among the thousands who have given their lives for their country, it is fitting that we pause to show our respect for the man, and the office he held. But the mark of our Christian faith lies not in our losing ourselves in helpless grief, but, rather, in our rededicating ourselves to the tasks God gives us among the living. In life we stand in the midst of death; but our faith is sure, our hope is firm, our will is resolute, for we live and move and have our being in God.

Amen.

Marian Anderson To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Marian Anderson, whom I am proud to number among my constituents, has announced her retirement after a final concert tour next year. It seems hardly possible. It seems only a short time ago that she burst on the American scene, a young new star whose rich and powerful voice thrilled the world of music and won her an everlasting place in the hearts of all Americans.

The Danbury News-Times recently wrote a fine editorial tribute to Miss Anderson, which I am pleased to offer for the RECORD.

MARIAN ANDERSON TO RETIRE

Marian Anderson, the noted contralto, will make her last concert tour in late 1964 and early 1965, with appearances in this country and abroad.

Danbury has counted her as a distinguished resident since 1940. It is only a few weeks ago that she joined others in the community in dedicating the new Huntington Hall of the Danbury Scott-Fanton Museum and Historical Society.

It is fitting that Miss Anderson has decided her final tour will be an international one—to the Far East, Africa, Europe, and North and South America.

It was in 1957 that she toured the Far East for the State Department. Her warmth and her personality in a way did more to achieve goodwill toward America than scores of diplomats and millions of foreign aid dollars.

Miss Anderson has received 24 honorary degrees, many medals and citations, served as a

U.S. delegate to the United Nations in 1958 and most recently received from President Johnson the Medal of Freedom which President Kennedy had awarded her before his death.

Her many activities on the national and world scene have not prevented Miss Anderson from being a good neighbor in her hometown. She has not only participated in many civic and church affairs but has on several occasions made her Joe's Hill home available for benefits sponsored by local groups.

One incident has never been made public before. Mayor J. Thayer Bowman tells the story.

One Thanksgiving weekend he was walking late at night along a deserted Main Street, not far from city hall, when he noticed some activity in a cosmetic store. The proprietor was busy getting Christmas stock and displays ready.

He had three volunteer helpers. They were passing by in a car, saw he was working alone and stopped to lend a hand. Marian Anderson and her husband, Orpheus Fisher, were two of the three volunteers.

Not a major incident; nothing to rate world attention. Yet, it is typical of one whom Danbury has come to know best as a good neighbor.

Miss Anderson deserves the joys of retirement which await her after her final concert tour.

Forces Shaping the College of Arts and Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues would agree with me that the College of Arts and Sciences constitutes the heart of the program of American higher education. Dr. Francis H. Horn, president of the University of Rhode Island, shares this viewpoint, but he believes this college is more "resistant to change than other components of American higher education." While Members of Congress may not accept his views in their entirety, I believe his splendid report at the annual meeting of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in Chicago on November 12, 1963, will stimulate their thinking and produce readiness for change. Dr. Horn is one of the Nation's educational leaders whose remarks are always at or near the growing edge of our culture. For these reasons, therefore, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the RECORD:

FORCES SHAPING THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

(By Francis H. Horn)

The contemporary American university—or multiversity, as Clark Kerr terms the larger modern universities—is an amalgam of the colonial college with its British heritage and of the German university, whose influence was crystallized with the founding of Johns Hopkins in 1876, shaped and modified by the land-grant philosophy of service to society and democratization of educational opportunity. At the heart of this complex institution is the college of arts and sciences, which, despite accretions to its role and purpose by the graduate school with its research interests, remains basically the inheritor of the old collegiate tradition of American higher education. This is a conservative tradition developed over a period of nearly 250 years of holding fast to a curriculum that was already obsolescent when Harvard College was founded in 1636, yet still defended vigorously almost two centuries later by the famous Yale Report of 1828.

The college of arts and sciences today is the spiritual, if not actual academic home of the most conservative faculty members, those who look back nostalgically upon the good old days that never were, who write about our collegiate wastelands, and who would restore the university to the ivory tower and reclaim it from the marketplace. The college of arts and sciences is likely to be, therefore, much more resistant to change than the other components of American higher education.

Nevertheless, major and revolutionary changes are upon us. Al Eurich, in his predictions concerning higher education in the next century, indicates that the significant changes will begin in the midsixties. He foresees the acute enrollment increases of 1964, 1965, 1966, galvanizing the leading colleges and universities into action. The exact nature and extent of the changes cannot be foretold with any certainty, but I am convinced they will be more far reaching than most educational administrators realize today.

This paper will point out some of the forces accelerating change in higher education in general and in the university's college of arts and sciences in particular. It will pose many questions but propose few answers. It sees the university and its central college in the years ahead increasingly caught between a series of competing and often contradictory forces, the specific results of which will inevitably be different for different institutions.

The basic conflict, and it may well turn out to be the most bitter, is that between effecting change and preserving the status quo. This struggle will result chiefly from attempts to adapt higher institutions to the explosion of population, the expansion of knowledge, and the demands on the university for greater public service of all kinds. These forces will affect the organization, the program, the methods, and the objectives of both the university and the college of arts and sciences. They will result in modifications in traditional attitudes, objectives, and achievements of both faculty and students and of their relationships to the university and to each other.

To me it seems fruitless to try to predict the shape of higher education 40 or 50 years hence. It is a sheer impossibility to do so with any assurance. How many of us could have foreseen even 25 years ago the nature of our society today? I would remind you that a scientist as knowledgeable and experienced as Vannevar Bush, who was in charge of the Nation's scientific effort during World War II, in 1945, in testifying before a scientific committee about the possibility of an intercontinental rocket carrying an atomic warhead, said: "Technically, don't think anyone in the world knows how to do such a thing, and I feel confident that it will not be done for a very long period of time."

The fact is, technological change resluting from scientific discovery is so great and so revolutionary that no one can know for sure what impact it will have on mankind, on society, on education even a decade hence. It must be remembered, for example, that 90 percent (I believe the figure is that) of all the scientists the world has ever produced are living today; that they are working with far more sophisticated instruments than scientists have ever enjoyed before; and that our knowledge in most sciences is doubling every 10 years.

I would point out, furthermore, that the most spectacular advances, at least those with perhaps the greatest implications for education, may well be in the life and behavioral sciences rather than in the physical sciences. The current work on the DNA molecule, the attempt to find the blueprint for life, has been called "an enterprise so breathtaking in its dimensions that it dwarfs even the fantastic goal of getting to the moon."

This search is concerned with "unraveling the secrets of the basic chemistry of life and the mechanisms of heredity." Out of such genetic studies may come the awesome power to regulate life—to control and alter the evolution of the human race, to mold human beings to our own specifications.

The psychologists are also exploring areas by which the minds and conduct of men may be controlled. Dr. Carl Rogers, an eminent psychotherapist, has stated that "Among behavioral scientists it seems to be largely taken for granted that the findings of such science will be used for the prediction and control of human behavior." He goes on to say that "few are aware of the breadth, depth, and extent of these advances in psychology and the behavioral sciences. And still fewer seem to be aware of the profound social, political, ethical, and philosophical problems posed by these advances." And one should add, educational problems, especially for our colleges and universities.

As a matter of fact, it is only recently that any real attempt has been made to study the psychology and sociology of our present college students. Far more of our decisions about higher education need to be made in the light of such findings and considerations as are set forth in Nevitt Sanford's volume, "The American College."

For the most part, however, our educational decisions are made off the cuff, on the basis of prior experience, without benefit even of the scientific information that has been available to us for years. Faculty members continue to defend positions concerning the curriculum on much the same basis as did the Yale faculty in 1828. Attempts at reform are still being opposed in terms of the "faculty psychology" concept of mental discipline, which investigations have long since disproved.

Even the appeal to history and precedent is often without foundation in historical fact. The late Whitney Griswold's defense of a liberal education in the face of an alleged growing vocationalism is typical. Lamenting "the decline of the liberal arts as a force in our national educational system," he declared: "These studies are disappearing under a layer of vocational and other substitutes like the landscape in the ice age. Both schools and colleges are denying themselves the benefits of studies which, for 2,000 years, throughout Western civilization, have been esteemed as the key to the good life as well as to all true academic achievement." Any review of higher education will show that there are no such studies. Most of what constitutes a liberal education today was unknown even 300 years ago when Harvard was founded, let alone 2,000 years ago.

The intent of these comments is primarily to insist that in terms of higher education in the future, we can no longer rely on the experience of the past as the major guide to our decisions. In today's truly revolutionary society, in trying to blueprint higher education for tomorrow's world, we must look to the future for our guideposts, taking into account what specific existing scientific knowledge is appropriate. This is difficult, particularly because of the conservative nature of academic men—is it not one of the ironies of our time that professors are regarded as radicals when in fact, when it comes to education iteself, they are the most conservative of men.

Let me emphasize again, that in spite of the fact that I insist we look to the future rather than to the past in appraising the university of the future, I am convinced that our actual predictions concerning its modification can be only short-range ones. Nevertheless, we can see the forces that are already at work shaping the future of the university, and if we are intelligently aware of these, we administrators can, perhaps, help to make it an institution closer to our heart's desire. It is my assignment today to outline these forces, as I see them, particularly as they influence the college of arts and sciences.

It is inevitable that one begin with population growth, and the resulting increases in college enrollment. I would remind you of the danger of predictions on enrollment. It was less than 15 years ago that Seymour Harris, in his "The Market for College Graduates," was warning that the colleges and universities were turning out too many graduates, both bachelors and doctors. In the midfifties, most enrollment predictions saw modest increases based upon normal trend lines. When in 1955 I suggested at a national meeting of admissions officers that college enrollment would exceed 6,500,000 by 1970 and possibly reach 12 million by 1975, there was considerable questioning of the reliability of my crystal ball. With 4½ million students enrolled this fall, the first prediction appears now to be fairly conservative, the second, certainly not unattainable. It is generally acknowledged today that enrollment will at least double in the next decade.

Regardless of the exact figures, the increasing enrollments will create special burdens for the college of arts and sciences. In the first place, students enrolled in this college will increase more proportionately than they will in all undergraduate colleges combined. As the percentage of high school graduates increases, partly because it is the expected thing to do and partly because young people and their parents recognize that a college education is pretty much a necessity in contemporary society, more of these high school graduates will be uncommitted to a vocational choice. Such uncommitted students enroll in the college of arts and sciences.

In the second place, graduate enrollment will increase proportionately more rapidly than undergraduate enrollment. In spite of more graduate work outside the area of the traditional arts and sciences, the major burden of graduate work, especially at the doctorate level, is in these traditional areas. The continuing growth of postdoctoral study is a problem almost exclusively for the college of arts and sciences. It is recognized, of course, that administratively, graduate instruction is handled by the graduate school. But the departmental affiliation of the faculty is in the college, and it has the acute problem of providing faculty time for their graduate responsibilities.

Third, the future will witness a great upsurge of continuing education for adults of a nondegree nature, some of it in traditional credit courses, some in various kinds of noncredit courses. The constant emphasis upon education as a lifelong process, the necessity for which is driven home almost daily in this puzzling and rapidly changing world, will surely result in many millions of adults flocking to our evening colleges and extension divisions. Greater longevity—the normal lifespan will reach a hundred for children already born—and a resulting substantial increase in the period of retirement—for many individuals the years of retirement will exceed the years of active employment—will magnify the problem. In addition, in response to the same pressures for continuing education, increasingly our regular daytime programs will be opened to part-time adult students. Though a good deal of continuing education for adults will be in occupational areas, most of it will be in the traditional arts and sciences.

In addition to the greater burden on the college of arts and sciences resulting from increased enrollments, certain curricular emphases will increase its load. I cite three: First, is the tendency to increase the general education requirements in the professional programs. Pharmacy, for example, has been extended to a 5-year curriculum to provide for more general education, which means more work in arts and sciences.

Second, is the tendency to stress basic foundation courses rather than the more professional courses. In engineering, for example, there is now more emphasis on physics, chemistry, and mathematics, less on the strictly engineering subjects. And third, is the tendency, not yet strong, but, in my opinion, inevitable, to make more and more professional programs graduate programs. In time, I expect to see architecture, business, education, journalism, even engineering, become graduate curriculums, based upon the completion of a liberal arts undergraduate degree.

Part of the effect of these forces on the college of arts and sciences may be offset by the rapid development of public 2-year colleges. The aim in some States is to have such a college within commuting distance of its entire population. California is close to achieving this goal; Florida is moving rapidly toward it. Junior college education may become as universal as high school education is today. Eurich predicts that as a result, the baccalaureate degree will "fall into disuse," junior college graduates move into senior colleges and universities for a 3-year master's degree, and these institutions discontinue their freshman and sophomore years. Hutchins essentially urged such a reorganization of higher education 25 years ago, except that he proposed granting the bachelor's degree to junior college graduates.

The proposal never succeeded even at Chicago and the earlier experiment on this basis at Stockton Junior College and the College of the Pacific was abandoned. The Michigan branch at Dearborn and the new Florida Central University are operating upper divisions only. I doubt, however, that the pattern will become widespread. I don't look for the universities to give up their lower divisions on the main campus. Nevertheless, I do expect that with the growth of community colleges and of 2-year branches of the university at other locations, the work of the freshman and sophomore years will decrease in volume and importance. In any case, the universities must expect to enroll far more transfer students from 2-year colleges than they now do.

Another factor tending to reduce the amount and significance in the university of lower division work is the expansion of college-level courses in the high school and the opening of college courses, especially during the summer, to selected high school students, resulting in many more advanced placements of entering students.

The university, primarily the college of arts and sciences, may gain some relief, moreover, if the year-abroad practice continues to expand. There is growing advocacy for a year in a foreign country or countries for every American as part of his college experience. This is more likely to become routine for students in arts and sciences than for students in the professional colleges. Offsetting this trend may be a comparable movement of 1-year undergraduate foreign students to this country. In any case, the numbers of foreign students will increase more rapidly than the increased enrollment of American students, magnifying the problems associated with serving these students; but it is not likely that students from overseas will ever be more than a small percentage of our total student enrollment.

Inevitably, there will be much more mobility than in the past on the part of college students, as is the case with European university students. American universities will have to provide more flexibility and understanding in dealing with this problem.

In the light of the growing number of students, how can they be taught effectively? Or, indeed, taught at all? The problem of staffing the classrooms is aggravated by the trend toward lower faculty teaching loads. Faculties in universities of only average standing are agitating for teaching loads of 9 hours or less; in the best universities, they have attained them. Even young teachers in the disciplines in shortest supply are demanding and getting loads of 6 hours.

At the same time that most faculty members are teaching, or want to be teaching, fewer hours, there is much wringing of hands over the difficulties of recruiting and retaining adequately prepared college teachers. You are all familiar with Ray Maul's studies, which show that the percentage of new teachers with Ph. D.'s is declining, of those with only a bachelor's degree, increasing. There is considerable fear that the quality of faculties is going down, and this at a time when the universities must accommodate more students and better prepared students. Is this fear justified?

I do not share it. Counteracting this trend is the technological revolution in teaching, still scarcely making its influence felt, but eventually destined to modify drastically current instructional practices. I have never been enthusiastic about teaching by TV on campus (I have always believed in its great potential in adult education) and using the new mechanical gadgets such as teaching machines. Even language laboratories have been oversold. Yet I am convinced that Eurich is correct when he indicates that television will make the standard lecture obsolete, improve the conventional laboratory demonstration, in short, provide us with the technology necessary to build a genuine system of mass education. Television, along with programed learning and independent study, will revolutionize our learning processes and procedures. This mechanization of instruction and the development of greater self-direction for the student's own education will enable universities to get along with fewer teachers for the same size student body. These will be better teachers, on the average, than we now have. Since fewer teachers will be needed, poor, even mediocre, teachers will be vigorously weeded out, and the quality of education improved.

I see an end to the tenure principle, admittedly after a hard battle. The time is coming when a teacher cannot command the salary of a Madison Avenue advertising executive for an academic year, and at the same time be guaranteed the security no one in any other line of work enjoys. The monetary rewards of the professor will be much greater than at present, but the risks will then be real. No longer will a member of the academic profession be assured of a lifetime job—unless he commits a major crime—regardless of the quality of his performance as teacher and researcher. The net result, however, will be better teaching and better learning by the students.

Contributing to better learning will be expanded provision for independent study. There will be more adjustment for individual differences, needs, and objectives. The university must discard the rigid academic lockstep and provide more flexible means of progress toward the degree.

These changes I foresee in teaching methods and academic practices will affect the whole university; the college of arts and sciences will differ little from the other colleges in its response, except that it will take a harder fight—because of the special conservatism of the faculty of arts and sciences to bring about the changes.

The college of arts and sciences will, however, feel more directly another force at work in the university—the split between the "two cultures." This conflict, together with the growth in size of the student load in the college of arts and sciences and general complexity of academic organization, will, I believe, result in administrative changes within the college.

There is a trend, already apparent from changes in such universities as Minnesota, Michigan State, and Utah State, to separate the sciences from the humanities and the social sciences. The trend is bound to accelerate. Even if the college of arts and sciences is not separated into two colleges, some sort of division structure will be developed to handle the administrative problems of such a large segment of the student body and faculty. In one way or another, the unity of the college is likely to be fractured, with resulting modification in the curriculum.

When one turns to forces that affect the content of the curriculum, one is confronted by the impact of the explosion of knowledge. Knowledge is expanding in all existing areas, often rendering present knowledge obsolete, especially in the sciences. New areas of knowledge are being developed, based, of course, on knowledge and concepts in existing areas, as in space science. The problem for the university is primarily one of how to delete the obsolete material from the course content or the curriculum and how to incorporate the new knowledge promptly and effectively. The problem is aggravated because areas of knowledge heretofore neglected—modern literature, the geography and ethnology of tropical Africa, the civilization of the Near East, south, and southeast Asia, the Far East, for example—must now be included in both the undergraduate and graduate curriculums.

As the corpus of knowledge with which the university must concern itself continues to expand, the old question of "What knowledge is of most worth?" forces itself upon us with renewed insistence. The problem is especially acute for the college of arts and sciences; in the professional curriculums, change and expansion occur, but not nearly to the same degree, and the range of choice is narrower. The struggle between traditional disciplines still firmly embedded in the curriculum, foreign languages, for example, and newer disciplines knocking at the door, such as international relations, or older ones expanding greatly and clamoring for more time, such as biology, is especially acrimonious among the arts and sciences. What is best for the students is seldom a major factor in the interdepartmental struggles over status and student time.

What is best for students, it seems to me, is the maximum amount of liberal education—the broader, the better. As knowledge expands, the curriculum becomes more specialized and fragmented. Yet at the undergraduate level, the educational experience should be concerned with generalization and integration. Few university colleges of arts and sciences are deeply concerned with such objectives, and with providing a broad liberal education. Primarily, they have become preparatory schools for graduate work, and are influenced in many ways, both openly and subtly, by the policies, practices, and methods of the graduate school.

Maurice Freedman, a professor of English at New Mexico, in his recent "Chaos in Our Colleges," an excellent book whose title is a misnomer, writes concerning instruction in the freshman English course that "Training of freshmen in footnote citation becomes a substitute for teaching the essence and substance of a subject." Even high schoolteachers of English are guilty of this because "manipulating scholarly apparatus has come to seem the first task of the student of English." Of all the forces currently shaping the college of arts and sciences, the influence of the graduate school is the most pervasive; it may be the most pernicious. Unless present tendencies are reversed, the individual and the Nation will be lost as surely as if someone triggered the nuclear bomb.

I hope you will agree with me that education is the best hope for the salvation, or at least the preservation of mankind and the civilization he has so painstakingly built up over the centuries. Unless we bring more wisdom into the affairs of man and of nations, the holocaust will be upon us, or perhaps worse, a totalitarian form of society evolve, in which the freedoms we have always taken for granted are denied us. Admittedly, we do not know much about the development of wisdom and of wisemen. True wisdom is undoubtedly the achievement of a long lifetime. Yet formal education remains the best avenue to the development and nourishing of wisdom that we know of. The foundation for wisdom, however, will seldom be firmly laid in a narrow and specialized curriculum, or one in which even the nonspecialized subjects are taught almost solely as introductory courses for prospective majors and graduate students.

We must try to reverse the tendency to mold the college of arts and sciences into a lower level copy of the graduate school. We must make the provision of a broad, liberal education the central purpose of the college of arts and sciences (and of the separate liberal arts college as well, where the virus of specialization and professionalization has been equally at work, as McGrath and his colleagues have so cogently pointed out). Concerning the objective of the college of arts and sciences, but definitely not the content of the curriculum, I would urge consideration of the historical tradition. The aim of the oldtime college was to produce educated men, however imperfectly they may have done it.

I am not so naive as to discount the importance of specialized knowledge and professional preparation. The need of society for such talents is greater than ever, but just as significant are the breadth of knowledge, the critical judgment, and the power to reason, that are seldom fully developed in the specialist who lacks a sound foundation in the liberal arts. Without an informed and reasonably intelligent body of citizens, moreover, our free society is threatened. It is the task of the college of arts and sciences to provide the liberal base for such a citizenry, including its highly trained specialists. The training of specialists should be left to postbaccalaureate education, or if the various professional fields as business and engineering do not become graduate curriculums, confined primarily to the colleges which offer such preparation at the undergraduate level.

In this connection I offer a positive suggestion—lengthen the undergraduate curriculum in arts and sciencies to 5 years. I am not optimistic that this will be adopted—the whole tendency of current practice is in the other direction. Students are pressured into accelerating their education, especially their undergraduate education, so that they can get on with the real business of graduate education. But in today's world, most individuals will be men or women long after they are active doctors, lawyers, accountants, or engineers. The business of the college of arts and sciences—I distinguish this from the business of the university—is the making of men and women. And it can no longer be done, even as imperfectly as institutions of higher education can do it at their best, in the traditional 4 years, increasingly being compressed into three.

The undergraduate program should be lengthened to a normal minimum of 5 years. It will need to be flexible, because certain agreed-upon goals must be achieved before the student is certified for his degree. Only the bachelor's degree should be awarded. The inflexible academic lockstep must be broken, as I have already pointed out. Some students may make it in 4 years; others will require 6, depending upon the student's ability and application and the extent and quality of his secondary education.

The undergraduate curriculum in all professional areas as well as in arts and sciences should be lengthened to 5 years. I have suggested that such professional areas should and may hopefully become graduate programs. If education, business, engineering, and the others remain undergraduate programs it is even more important that they be extended to 5 years.

But I am concerned today primarily with the undergraduate program in arts and sciences. And because of the need for a broad liberal education, I would further propose, whenever possible, to eliminate the major. I am not persuaded that an undergraduate student must pursue some field in depth, at least if such depth is at the expense of exposure to and understanding of some of the humanities, including the fine arts, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. If I may again, in spite of my caution not to do so, appeal to tradition; for several centuries, there was nothing in the undergraduate curriculum comparable to our specialized major. Jefferson's plan for the University of Virginia first provided for such specialization. But why should a student preparing for medicine or law have an undergraduate major; or for business or architecture; even for social work or public administration? Admittedly a few, a very few, prescribed courses may be necessary, as in medicine, or desirable, as in social work. But surely not 30 or 40 semester hours in a restricted field. For students preparing for doctoral work in the sciences, more specialization is necessary, but, for example, is 39 hours in physics necessary, the amount specified by the American Physics Society (at the University of Rhode Island, the major requirement is 47 hours in physics courses alone)?

It seems to me that as much specialization as possible should be postponed to the graduate school, although I recognize this calls for a reorganization of graduate education. The student should be introduced to as many areas of the arts and sciences as possible. He shouldn't have to miss either chemistry or Shakespeare, art or anthropology.

The charge of superficiality will of course be raised against the proposal. Pope's aphorism, "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing," will be cited. But Pope was wrong. A little knowledge of Shelley, Moliere, or Tolstoy is better than no knowledge at all, so long as that little is accurate. Similarly, a little understanding of Keynesian economics, existentialism, or Soviet foreign policy is better than none at all, again provided that that little is accurate, and that the student prossesses reasonable intelligence. It is necessary, therefore, to insist upon greater prescription, however the curriculum is approached, whether through standard courses, or interdisciplinary or integrated courses. Greater prescription within the college of arts and sciences is necessary even if the program remains its present length and with its current organization.

A broad liberal program of the arts and sciences is necessary in this complex and rapidly changing world, where individual happiness and responsible citizenship depend increasingly upon education that continues through life. The undergraduate college lays the foundation for lifetime learning; it should develop in the student a permanent interest in matters cultural and intellectual; it should prepare him to find enjoyment in the infinite pleasures of the mind. It is a large order. We are not filling it today.

Some critics feel we are failing miserably. Ping Ferry, the irascible but brilliant vice president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, recently sharply attacked the colleges for their failure, calling them a "resounding flop." The Nation, he charged, is "intellectually underequipped," and only the institutions of higher education can correct the deficiency and save the country from catastrophe.

There is some justification for his charge. If certain forces at work shaping the college of arts and sciences (and again, this applies to the separate liberal arts college) are not redirected, the Nation and the world may well be lost.

There is no time to discuss other forces at work shaping the future of the college of arts and sciences, such as the pressures for public service. Just consider, for example, how we are to meet the ever-increasing demands upon our faculties for service to educational institutions overseas and to Government, both at home and abroad. I do want to comment briefly upon the necessity of restoring some balance between teaching and research. A continuation of the current trend toward what President Kerr calls the "nonteachers"—and he comments that "the higher a man's standing, the less he has to do with students"—can only result in disaster for student and society. In spite of more independent study, and mechanized learning, the teacher cannot be dispensed with, however, much the best teachers may appear on tape or TV.

If no accommodation can be established between teaching and research, it may be necessary within the college of arts and sciences to create a separate faculty for undergraduate teaching—as existed in the early days of Johns Hopkins, which had its collegiate and its university professors—even though these teachers may have to settle for second-class status in the halls of ivy.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that the necessary redirection of the college of arts and sciences and of the forces shaping it, is unlikely to come from the faculty. Faculty conservatism, as I pointed out at the beginning, makes faculties resistant to change. They can now bring about change only through the apparatus of some sort of faculty government, whether consensus within the college faculty or the faculty senate or both. President Kerr questions whether faculty government in universities "can agree on more than preservation of the status quo."

Real educational reform will depend upon the sort of leadership academic administrators—deans and presidents—give to the task.

Let me end on the note with which I began—the rapidity and the extent of the changes in our society which are already, however imperceptibly, moving to modify American higher education and college of arts and sciences in particular. In his "The Two Cultures," C. P. Snow writes: "During all human history until this century, the rate of social change has been very slow. So slow, that it would pass unnoticed in one person's lifetime. That is no longer so. The rate of change has increased so much that our imagination can't keep up with it. There is bound to be more social change, affecting more people in the next decade (he was speaking in 1959) than ever before. There is bound to be more change again, in the 1970's." Sir Charles goes on to plead for Britain and America and the whole West to "look at our education with fresh eyes," because it is only through education that the intelligence necessary to society's survival can be made to prevail in the world. He concludes, as I wish to, on a note of great urgency: "Isn't it time we began?" he cries. "The danger is, we have been brought up to think as though we had all the time in the world. We have very little time—so little that I dare not guess at it."

Snow is speaking to us in particular—to you deans and to us presidents. The burden of bringing about change in our universities and in colleges of arts and sciences rests primarily upon us. We cannot effect significant change without the help of at least some of our faculty. But leadership is ours. In the end, we deans and presidents may well be the most influential of the forces shaping tomorrow's college of arts and sciences.

Changing Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 4, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, now that the new year has about started it is not surprising to see old faces with new looks and old songs with new tunes. I have been preaching and politicking against so-called free but unfair foreign trade so long that I am grateful for any help I can get.

The worm is turning although it is still a long way from total victory but the solid wall of the sophomoric world economists who prevailed upon Congress to pass the trade bill is beginning to show some big cracks.

Some of the cracks are serious. For instance after 5 years of sponsoring a bill to force all importers to mark every item sold in the United States with the country of origin, the Senate passed the bill finally right before recess.

The President answers retaliation against Common Market by upping tariffs to make up for the loss of chicken sales. This would have been a serious foreign relations problem a few years ago, but the old dollar sign still controls trade whether the free trade fakers like it or not.

The House passes a bill giving $270 million to textile mill stockholders because imports have hurt the textile mill profits. This can be the beginning of the end of either our trade policies or our free enterprise systems.

House passes a bill to stop dumping of stainless steel sheets by Japanese under a deliberate abuse of interest in Congress in tariff regulations.

Association of American Railroads passes resolution to support laws limiting imports of residual oil in an attempt to help the railroad and coal industry.

The National Milk Producers Association hits hard at further cuts in tariffs on dairy products; removal of dairy products from the list of commodities being considered for tariff cuts was urged November 25 by the National Milk Producers Federation of the Trade Information Committee, which is holding hearings preparatory to negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, scheduled in Geneva next year.

Lower tariffs and increased imports would put a heavy burden on the U.S. price support program and add to its cost of operation, the federation informed the committee. Imports reduce income to Americans by depriving them of more desirable markets and forcing domestic production into Commodity Credit Corporation.

For example—

It was stated—

imports of frozen cream displace outlets for domestic fresh cream and drive down its price. The displaced fresh cream is made into butter and nonfat dry milk, and sold to CCC for substantially less net return.

The firm policy of Congress—that the foreign trade program should not be permitted to impair the domestic agricultural programs it has enacted—was restated in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—

Emphasized E. M. Norton, federation secretary.

Further reducing tariffs would increase the pressure of the disparity already existing between domestic support prices and the prices of dairy products in world trade.

The cheese industry has just completed hearings before the Tariff Commission begging for relief from imports. They say that more than 50 percent of all U.S. cheese consumption is imported. We don't have to look far to see why we have surplus feed grain and billions of dollars for farm relief.

Pennsylvania mushroom growers claim imports will destroy our domestic mushroom business unless we do something about imports from Formosa and Japan.

Steel mills loss of production because of imports takes 50,000 jobs from steel workers in 1963.

Former Secretary of State Christian Herter announces plans to consider tariff cuts on all U.S. products at Geneva Conference of GATT.

Our glass industries have petitioned the President, the Tariff Commission and Congress not to allow any cuts in glass tariffs.

Lead and zinc, lumber and coal producers still are fighting to save U.S. market from imports.

Elgin Watch Co. slashes 600 worker's jobs and says it is up to the Government to give them defense jobs.

Try and buy U.S. made watches. Even the Russians are getting into the "trade in United States act." They are charged by the watchmakers unions of shipping into Jamaica and then the Jamaicans under preferential trade treatment export to United States by simply putting a strap on the watch and shipping it into the United States in a box made in United States of America.

It would take a full book to cover the trade losses we have sustained, but a recent survey showing our unemployment up to 5.9 percent in November makes a joke out of the promises made to the American people and Congress by both the then Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges that the new trade bill would bring in from 4 to 6 million new American jobs.

As a Congressman, I made a prediction that industry would be hurt, mining would be hurt, and farming would be hurt, and considering our consumption and growth in population our workers would be hurt by any lowering of trade barriers. If you do not believe I was right ask the 6,000 workers at Studebaker, in Indiana.

You will note from the press and I quote:

Studebaker cars will be imported into the United States from Canada to existing dealers, the Studebaker president said.

This means that because of cheaper labor, less taxes for foreign aid and defense, and less costs for regulated utilities, Studebaker hopes to produce cheaper in Canada while still enjoying the relative security and privileges of being an American citizen corporation. Nice if it holds up, but sooner or later the 6,000 laid off employees will not be able to buy Studebakers or any other car, then where does Studebaker move to?

Do not be too hard on Studebaker; our trade acts, our economic aid to competitors plus a policy of urging our corporations to invest overseas are to blame for Studebaker, and hundreds of other American companies that have run away from U.S. responsibilities while still enjoying the lucrative U.S. marketplace without restrictions.

It would be interesting to have a candidate for U.S. Senator or President campaign on a trade platform.

This would be especially interesting if the candidate really believes in free trade but understands our job economy enough to know the difference between free, fair, and fake trade agreements.

For instance we've sold—or have we—$250 million worth of wheat to Russia. It is reported that this makes a 100 percent increase in cash sales of wheat and yet according to the fake trade figures given out by the proponents of free trade we are supposed to be selling $2 billion worth of wheat to foreign countries.

It is not hard to see why our balance of payments is out of whack. We sold $475 million worth of wheat to Brazil. However, we take payment in cruzeiros—Brazillian dollars—under an agreement that gives the United States the use of 10 percent of $47,500,000 if we use it in Brazil, we loan to Brazil 60 percent or $380 million for economic development and give Brazil the last 10 percent or $47.5 million. This means the U.S. taxpayer paid out $47.5 million of wheat, shipped it to Brazil and received not one cent back in the United States.

The balance of payments goes out the window and in the words of the old refrain—that's where our money goes, selling wheat for worthless cruzeiros, that's where our money goes.

The first duty of a government is to its own people just as it is a father's duty to his family.

No American ought to be out of work in his own country if he is expected to live and raise his family in keeping with our traditions and our way of life.

I am now and have always been for the 32-, 35,- 36-hour week but I am realistic enough to know that if we increase costs on our products and lower our tariff on imports we will have a no-hour week.

I believe the two biggest blunders of our times were the passage of the so-called free trade expansion bill followed by giving industry a $3-billion-a-year tax credit to automate so it could meet foreign competition.

In the end, automation must be more harmful than beneficial to the economy since even complete automation will not stop imports because we will not hesitate to help our friends overseas become automated and, secondly, importation plus automation spells job stagnation in all production-line industries, mining, and farming.

The fact that we are preparing to pay subsidies to textile manufacturers to meet the unfair competition from foreign countries is as fantastic a proposal as ever submitted to Congress.

We came within 18 votes of defeating this measure in the House with all the weight of the leaders, both past and present, against us. In a secret ballot this bill would not have received much more than the sponsors support.

There is always a silver lining in every cloud and this bill, if the Senate passes it, may well break the back of the international profiteers or it will give every industry a subsidy to make up differences between foreign and domestic costs of production.

One flaw in the ointment, however, is the problem of getting the money to pay the subsidies.

When the northern Democrats and Republicans joined the cotton-State Democrats and Republicans, it created a new unholy alliance against the little peoples who have to pay the freight.

Unemployment will not be solved by talking or by trading; it can only be cured by hard work and a dose of buy-American when we spend our American-earned dollars.

Every nation must protect itself economically the same as it does militarily.

We have laws against dumping goods by foreign producers and so do other nations. The trouble is, the only way we can sell to other countries is by dumping subsidized products or foreign aid purchases except in machinery and material the other nations do not produce or produce in short supply.

All trade should be free in noncompetitive goods and all jobs both here and in foreign countries should be protected in competition goods.

Our policy is just the opposite. We charge high imports on scotch, diamonds, and other non-U.S.-produced items and let the foreign countries flood our market with fuel oil, glass, steel, cheese, and so forth.

Funny, if it was not so tragic, a nation with unemployment, glassworkers import glass so it can give away wheat. Do not be shocked, in some cases we can be accused of doing worse.

For instance, the freetraders are now building up a case to have open trade with Russia in nonstrategic goods. It has long been the opinion of experts in defense that all things are strategics, from a grain of wheat to the H-bomb.

Remember the story of the king who for want of nail lost a shoe, for want of shoe lost a horse and for want of horse lost a war and his kingdom.

Yes, small wheels make empires move, and when a nation can buy its so-called nonstrategic needs it can devote more time to producing its strategic materials.

The same people have been screaming about our allies trading with Red China and Cuba. Who is going to stop Russia from feeding the Chinese and helping the bearded one in Cuba? Certainly not the wheat traders.

What is even worse than poor people who get the wheat will not be told we sold it on credit and took a loss of 60 cents a bushel on every bushel.

They will not be told because they will be told that the high price of bread is the fault of the American who charged so much for the wheat. You can bet the little people will pay the freight.

Hoffa After Sickles' Scalp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in yesterday's paper that a corrupt labor leader, Jimmy Hoffa, is now so bold as to threaten to put up $100,000 to defeat an outstanding Member of this body.

Representative CARLTON SICKLES of Maryland, the target of Hoffa's threat, has made an outstanding contribution to the Congress. It nauseates me to read where a labor leader who has gained a reputation for selling out the workingman through such things as sweetheart contracts and unwise or fraudulent investment of pension plan funds, is now threatening to finance the defeat of a Member of this Congress who is honestly and conscientiously doing his best to represent the interests of the workingman as well as all the citizens of Maryland and the United States of America.

I feel confident that Congressman CARLTON SICKLES will come through in glorious colors against the opposition of Mr. Hoffa and his like. I only regret that the Teamsters Union is not fortunate enough to have a national leader of the ability, honesty, and unimpeachable character of Representative SICKLES.

In order that my colleagues can share my disgust at Mr. Hoffa's action in threatening Representative SICKLES, I enclose the complete article from the Washington Daily News.

HOFFA AFTER SICKLES' SCALP

(By John Herling)

James R. Hoffa, the Teamsters leader, has threatened Representative CARLTON SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland, with defeat in the next election because Mr. SICKLES helped block Mr. Hoffa's effort to seize control of a national health and welfare organization.

"I'll put up $100,000 to beat SICKLES," Mr. Hoffa angrily announced to an audience of pension fund representatives in a meeting last month at Miami Beach, Fla.

When word of the Hoffa threat reached Mr. SICKLES, he confronted Mr. Hoffa. "Yes," said Mr. Hoffa, "that is right. I said that. Maybe it will take less than $100,000. But I hear there are some Teamsters in Maryland who will vote for you even if I don't like it."

Members of the National Conference of Health, Welfare, and Pension Plans administer funds totaling more than $25 billion.

The organization is primarily a group of administrators and trustees established to discuss technical problems. (Representative SICKLES is one of 15 regional vice presidents.)

Mr. Hoffa made a surprise appearance at the Miami meeting and, with the support of some Teamsters henchmen, in the role of representatives of Teamsters pension funds, began a systematic attempt to break up the conference workshop.

His stated object, according to officers of the national conference, was "to control the prestige and public support of the organization in his campaign to merge all Teamsters funds with his Central States fund, with headquarters in Chicago." Mr. Hoffa also "indicated," they said, that such control would help in his "well publicized ultimate aim of control of major banks and insurance companies in all parts of the United States."

Mr. Hoffa's tactics of rule or ruin became clear when his followers surrounded the conference mikes and barred other delegates from access to them. Credentials of delegates were "stolen," conference officials charged, and the result was a parliamentary shambles.

Representative SICKLES was outstanding in the defense of the conference against the Hoffa onslaught. His leadership aroused Mr. Hoffa to threaten to use $100,000 to defeat Mr. SICKLES.

Undismayed by Mr. Hoffa's financial and political fist, Representative SICKLES and his fellow directors have now voted to dissolve the national conference. This is a frank maneuver to prevent it from becoming a Hoffa instrument over many labor-management trusts not currently affiliated in any way with the Teamsters Union. Of 850 national conference memberships, there was a maximum of 150 Teamsters fund memberships.

Incidentally, Mr. Hoffa's feeling that "some Teamsters in Maryland" will vote for Representative SICKLES "even if I don't like it," seems evident from a quick survey of Maryland political sentiment—in and out of trade unions. Several months ago, a Baltimore Teamsters local had defeated a Hoffa-sponsored business agent. In the last few days, Mr. Hoffa has become painfully aware of a rising tide of discontent with his leadership inside the Teamsters Union where he has long boasted control of the rank and file.

Despite falling off of Hoffa strength, the significance of Mr. Hoffa's threat to Representative SICKLES runs beyond the Maryland borders. It reflects in a harsh light the kind of punitive action Mr. Hoffa reportedly undertakes against anyone who thwarts his will in or out of the Teamsters Union. Reports of such Hoffa threats are frequent, but not usually verified. Through the Teamsters political organization, Mr. Hoffa apparently believes he has a huge campaign chest which he can draw on to smash opponents in public or private life.

Savarese Requested To Resign From Birch Society or Sever Relations With the District of Columbia Republican Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post, December 17, 1963, an item appeared that was rather significant, in my opinion.

According to this article, the chairman of the District of Columbia City Republican Committee, Hon. Carl Shipley and other top Republican leaders in the District, requested a GOP city committeeman, Dr. Melchior F. R. Savarese, to resign from the John Birch Society or sever his relations with the Republican city committee.

I believe Mr. Shipley and the Republican committee should be commended for refusing to allow membership in an extremist organization to weaken and embarrass the Republican Party in the Nation's Capital.

The John Birch Society, like all other such organizations, rightwing or leftwing, has no respect for either political party. The founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch, in his book "The Politician," made this very clear.

Quoting from page 268 of this book, Robert Welch, in his own words, stated:

> The Communists can now use all of the power and prestige of the Presidency of the United States to implement their plans, just as fully and openly as they dare. They have arrived at this point by three stages. In the first stage, Roosevelt thought he was using the Communists to promote his personal ambitions and grandiose schemes. Of course, instead, the Communists were using him, but without his knowledge or understanding of his place in their game. In the second stage, Truman was used by the Communists, with his knowledge and acquiescence, as the price he consciously paid for making him President. In the third stage, in my own opinion, the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency. For this third man, Eisenhower, there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. That word is "treason."

Again quoting another contemptible passage from the same book, Welch stated:

> This door to betrayal is known to be wide open, and nobody—in Congress, in the executive branch, in the Pentagon itself—nobody even dares to try to close it.

These words come from the head of the John Birch Society. It is completely incompatible for anyone involved in the Republican or Democratic Party organizations to work, also, in behalf of any extremist group that heaps scorn and abuse on all who do not adopt their own very narrow vision.

The 1963 Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we will soon move into the second session of the 88th Congress. Much lies before us if we are to keep faith with the American people. I have in mind the civil rights bill, the tax bill, medicare, the National Service Corps, the Youth Employment Act and other legislation advanced to us by the late President Kennedy. President Johnson will soon deliver his state of the Union message. I confidently expect that he will urge action on this unfinished business. My constituents expect enactment of this program and I suspect that millions of others do, too. I herewith place before you the results of 5,500 questionnaires returned to my office in recent weeks. I cite you first the overall percentages and then some actual returns from 4 of the 14 municipalities polled in my district.

1963 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals—

(a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 88 percent; oppose, 9 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

(b) To prevent racial discrimniation in places of public accommodation? Favor, 67 percent; oppose, 27 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 62 percent; oppose, 32 percent, no opinion, 6 percent.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 63 percent; oppose, 29 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 56 percent; oppose, 23 percent; no opinion, 21 percent.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 74 percent; oppose, 18 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 53 percent; oppose, 33 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 72 percent; oppose, 21 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 67 pcerent; oppose, 27 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 62 percent; oppose, 33 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 60 percent; oppose, 32 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 58 percent; oppose, 27 percent; no opinion, 15 percent.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 68 percent; oppose, 18 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 16 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

9. Do you thing our foreign-aid program should be: More, 9 percent; less, 67 percent; the same, 24 percent.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 64 percent; oppose, 26 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 82 percent; oppose, 12 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

12. Do you consider yourself: a Democrat, 35 percent; a Republican, 29 percent; an independent, 36 percent.

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS FROM THE CITY OF BURLINGTON

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals: (a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 440; oppose, 52; no opinion, 18.

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 331; oppose, 145; no opinion, 33.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 310; oppose, 169; no opinion, 38.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 346; oppose, 129; no opinion, 34.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 285; oppose, 120; no opinion, 110.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 351; oppose, 106; no opinion, 51.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 312; oppose, 134; no opinion, 64.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 411; oppose, 61; no opinion, 37.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 394; oppose, 88; no opinion, 27.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 367; oppose, 110; no opinion, 32.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 347; oppose, 124; no opinion, 41.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 357; oppose, 93; no opinion, 58.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 391; oppose, 48; no opinion, 71.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 340; oppose, 79; no opinion, 86.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 38; less, 310; the same, 137.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 357; oppose, 110; no opinion, 42.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 447; oppose, 28; no opinion, 30.

12. Do you consider yourself: a Democrat, 258; a Republican, 107; an Independent, 102.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE BOROUGH OF PRINCETON

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals: (a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 339; oppose, 21; no opinion, 11. (b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 304; oppose, 47; no opinion, 20. (c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 277; oppose, 69; no opinion, 25. (d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 265; oppose, 75; no opinion, 29. (e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 254; oppose, 42; no opinion, 77. (f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 312; oppose, 36; no opinion, 23. (g) To testablish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 228; oppose, 87; no opinion, 56.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 243; oppose, 84; no opinion, 45.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under Social Security? Favor, 244; oppose, 95; no opinion, 32.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 224; oppose, 119; no opinion, 29.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 220; oppose, 110; no opinion, 39.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 207; oppose, 85; no opinion, 79.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 246; oppose, 54; no opinion, 69.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 319; oppose, 26; no opinion, 26.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 60; less, 175; the same, 135.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 243; oppose, 81; no opinion, 46.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 296; oppose, 42; no opinion, 36.

12. Do you consider yourself: A Democrat, 104; a Republican, 115; an independent, 156.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE CITY OF TRENTON

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals: (a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 530; oppose, 65; no opinion, 23

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 380; oppose, 189; no opinion, 50.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 362; oppose, 205; no opinion, 51.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 400; oppose, 160; no opinion, 60.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 338; oppose, 164; no opinion, 115.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 433; oppose, 118; no opinion, 67.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 328; oppose, 192; no opinion, 97.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 466; oppose, 108; no opinion, 43.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 450; oppose, 132; no opinion, 32.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 368; oppose, 190; no opinion, 55.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 372; oppose, 186; no opinion, 62.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 404; oppose, 139; no opinion, 73.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 426; oppose, 110; no opinion, 80.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test ban treaty? Favor, 426; oppose, 103; no opinion, 87.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 61; less, 406; the same, 144.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 406; oppose, 129; no opinion, 81.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 502; oppose, 75; no opinion, 43.

12. Do you consider yourself: A Democrat, 157; a Republican, 110; an Independent, 219.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE TOWNSHIP OF MAPLE SHADE

1. Do you favor or oppose President Kennedy's civil rights proposals:

(a) To enforce the constitutional right to vote for all citizens? Favor, 294; oppose, 52; no opinion, 10.

(b) To prevent racial discrimination in places of public accommodation? Favor, 189; oppose, 142; no opinion, 28.

(c) To permit the Attorney General to institute suits to end school segregation? Favor, 184; oppose, 150; no opinion, 24.

(d) To establish an agency to help communities voluntarily solve racial problems? Favor, 226; oppose, 106; no opinion, 28.

(e) To extend by 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights? Favor, 171; oppose, 105; no opinion, 78.

(f) To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs? Favor, 231; oppose, 89; no opinion, 39.

(g) To establish a permanent Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity? Favor, 167; oppose, 142; no opinion, 46.

2. Do you favor or oppose a reduction in Federal income taxes? Favor, 252; oppose, 83; no opinion, 18.

3. Do you favor or oppose an old-age hospital insurance program under social security? Favor, 270; oppose, 65; no opinion, 21.

4. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for public school education? Favor, 231; oppose, 101; no opinion, 17.

5. Do you favor or oppose Federal aid for construction of college facilities? Favor, 218; oppose, 113; no opinion, 24.

6. Do you favor or oppose a National Service Corps to help the unfortunate? Favor, 226; oppose, 81; no opinion, 50.

7. Do you favor or oppose the Youth Employment Act to establish a Youth Conservation Corps? Favor, 278; oppose, 38; no opinion, 42.

8. Do you approve or disapprove the recently signed nuclear test-ban treaty? Favor, 245; oppose, 58; no opinion, 50.

9. Do you think our foreign aid program should be: More, 20; less, 262; the same, 57.

10. Do you favor or oppose Federal programs to assist States and municipalities for urban renewal, public health, and highway construction? Favor, 223; oppose, 81; no opinion, 35.

11. Do you approve or disapprove continuing our program to aid economically depressed areas in the United States? Favor, 313; oppose, 22; no opinion, 21.

12. Do you consider yourself: A Democrat, 166; a Republican, 44; an independent, 132.

American Legion Distinguished Service Award to Senator Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 12, the American Legion Department of Kentucky at its 45th annual convention, held in Louisville, Ky., presented to our colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] one of its two 1963 distinguished awards.

The plaque presented to Senator COOPER by Commander Harry A. Greene is inscribed with the citation:

Nineteen hundred and sixty-three Kentucky Distinguished Service Award, American Legion, presented to JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, U.S. Senator, in recognition of his untiring efforts rendered in the Senate of the United States in behalf of the veteran, his widow and/or dependents and for his years of dedicated public service.

Given at Lousiville, Ky., this 12th day of July 1963.

Harry A. Greene,
Department Commander.
Ray A. Beyer
Department Adjutant.

The award was the first of its kind made by the American Legion Department of Kentucky. The second award was presented to Mrs. Callas, in honor of her husband Mike Callas, deceased, a former Commander of the Department of Kentucky, and a distinguished Legionnaire.

We are glad that the honor was bestowed on our colleague, Senator COOPER. He enlisted in 1942 in the U.S. Army as a private, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in July 1943, after completing Officers Candidate School at Fort Custer, Mich. He entered France in 1944 with the 3d U.S. Army under Gen. George Patton and served through the campaigns in France, Luxembourg, and Germany, being discharged as a captain in December 1945.

After the close of the war, he was assigned to military government, in Munich, where he served as legal adviser in the 3d Army Zone on the repatriation of displaced persons, and was later placed in charge of the reorganization of the German judicial system in Bavaria. I know that all Senators are pleased with the great honor accorded to our distinguished colleague.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech of Senator COOPER at the convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION DEPARTMENT OF KENTUCKY, AT ITS 45TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, LOUISVILLE, KY., FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1963

I cannot tell you how greatly I appreciate your invitation to speak to the 45th annual convention of the American Legion of Kentucky and to be in the company of my fellow Legionnaires. While I have met with many posts throughout Kentucky, and have attended State conventions, this is the first occasion that I have had to speak at an opening session of this great body of veterans. I thank Commander Greene and all of you for this great honor.

This morning my thoughts go back to the early days of the American Legion. We are familiar with its history—how it was formed in Paris, France, in March 1919, and how it has grown throughout the United States, and indeed all over the world, until today its membership embraces 2,600,000 veterans and 925,000 members of the auxiliary. It is well for our people in Kentucky to remember that the American Legion, Department of Kentucky, is a strong patriotic and civic organization of over 30,000 members, and 6,500 members of the American Legion Auxiliary.

It is natural and proper that the Legion is concerned with its fellow veterans, and particularly the plight of the disabled, and the children and widows of veterans. But its broad interests and objectives are for the Nation—the promotion of patriotism, the combatting of totalitarian ideologies, and the preservation of security and freedom.

These objectives are as valid and important today as they were when the first charter was drawn.

I remember well in the twenties—in the early days of the American Legion—that it fought for the development and maintenance of a strong national defense. It was criticized and characterized as a warmongering organization. But it was right, and if the United States had been prepared as the legion advocated, World War II might have been ended more quickly, and Russia's first penetration into Germany and Eastern Europe prevented. The American Legion was the first to warn this country of the danger of penetration by Soviet espionage. Again, it was characterized as extreme and irrational. But it was right, for the record shows that the Soviet Union has acquired vital defense and security secrets of the United States, and recent news informs us again that it has never ceased its efforts to undermine the security of our Nation. The American Legion was one of the first organizations to inform and warn our people of the gulf between the American system of free government and the Communist system—a gulf which cannot be bridged unless the Communist world rejects the basic tenets of its totalitarian system.

It is difficult to know what one should talk about to an assemblage which possesses such a history. But because I am speaking to the legion which embraces men of experience—who know not only the theory of freedom, but the actuality of preserving freedom—I feel it my duty to discuss briefly and frankly some of the grave issues which face our country and which call for the consideration and action of the Congress.

The overriding issue before the Nation, as it has been since World War II and will be for many years, is the defense of our country, our people, and our free institutions. We are in danger because the Soviet Union and the Communist world maintain as their inexorable objective the communization and domination of the world, and above all of the United States. The Soviet Union's policy of coexistence does not change this objective, because the word "peace" in its lexicon includes the encouragement and support of Communist revolution throughout the world.

There are many points of danger and crisis in our world. Those most apparent are Berlin and Western Europe, and Cuba and Latin America. While these situations are in our thoughts and must guide our action, I want to point out several facts which indicate our strength, and which indicate some weaknesses in the Communist world.

With the exception of its entrance into Cuba, which I will discuss later, I do not consider that the Soviet Union has scored any impressive successes in other parts of the world—in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, and in Africa. Communist China has not been able to produce sufficient food for its people, and food production is a basic test for any country striving to achieve strength and leadership. There are some signs of cracks in the Communist alliance. It seems unlikely that the Soviet Union and Communist China will admit an open break—because this would split the whole thrust of world communism. Yet if reports are true, extreme divisions have been opened in their Communist doctrine—divisions which cannot be healed unless Russia should abandon its policy of coexistence, accept Communist China's doctrine of continuing revolution and ultimate war against the United States and other free countries.

But interesting and hopeful as these developments may be, we cannot rely upon weaknesses in the Communist bloc for our protection. We must maintain such overwhelming military strength that the Soviet Union and Communist China will know that they will be destroyed if they should attack us. I have had the opportunity to see the records of our military strength.

I believe, as do our military leaders, and such valued leaders of our Armed Services Committees in the Congress as Congressman VINSON and MAHON and Senators RUSSELL and SALTONSTALL, that we possess this strength.

I will not burden you with too many statistics, but some figures are important. Our total active duty military strength is 2.7 million men and women; our Reserves are 2.1 million. The Navy has 859 ships in its fleet. The Air Force has 15,500 planes, and the Navy and Marines another 8,800 aircraft.

Turning to our nuclear power, which of course is our chief deterrent, the Strategic Air Command has 650 bombers on a 15-minute alert, chiefly B-52's with approximately 75 B-58's. Nine Polaris subs with 144 missiles each are in operation; 9 more will be operational by mid-1964, with some 20 more in various stages of development. Today the Air Force has 200 intercontinental ballistic misiles in place, and 800 more are scheduled to be in place by mid-1964.

The total defense budget is $53.6 billion. All of us who have been in the service know there is waste in the military, as in other agencies of the Government; and the defense budget will be cut. But the Congress will not impair the military strength of the Nation. For we know, as you do, and as Winston Churchill said years ago, that the safeguard of freedom rests on the strength of the United States.

But strength without information and purpose is not enough. The unfortunate criticism of our military power in 1960—a power which at that time was greater than Soviet strength—created doubt in the minds of our people, our allies, and I am afraid the Soviet Union, that we had the capacity to defend ourselves.

The world must know our strength because power is a harsh reality, and is respected. I have said on the Senate floor several times that the President should on occasion and within the limits of security, spell out to the world our military capacity—and our will to use it if we should be attacked.

Now I would like to speak briefly about two of the most troubling and controversial issues before our country.

The first deals with negotiations with the Soviet Union. Our Government, under Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, has sought since World War II to develop an alternative to the arms race, and the danger of thermonuclear war, by negotiations with the Soviet Union on nuclear testing and disarmament.

At Geneva in 1955, President Eisenhower made an initiative in his open skies inspection proposal—designed to reduce the threat of surprise attack, and to create an atmosphere of confidence in which disarmament proposals could be considered. Speaking in that year, he pledged the United States "to devote its entire heart and mind to find a way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

President Eisenhower established an office in the State Department to study means of negotiations for a nuclear ban and for disarmament. President Kennedy, with the approval of the Congress, has expanded this office into the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I have been informed that the work of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is one way, and perhaps the only way, in which the United States can join together a group of scientists who can continuously detect and evaluate any testing advances made by the Soviet Union. If there were no other purpose, this work of the Agency is necessary to our defense and security.

In a few days the United States will meet again with the Soviet Union to consider a recent proposal of the Soviet Union to ban nuclear testing in the air, water, and outer space—a proposal which had been previously suggested by leaders in the United States. No one can foretell the results of these negotiations, for the proposal is hedged with con-

ditions. We only know there is little in the record of the Soviet Union to indicate that progress can be made.

We live in a world in which two major systems, the United States and Russia, are in confrontation. Both possess nuclear weapons at least a million times more powerful than those which existed at the outset of World War II. Both are engaged in increasing the number, quality, and destructive power of these weapons in an arms race.

There are some in our country who announce that there can never be an effectively verified arms control agreement with the Soviet Union. Others urge the untenable position that an agreement must be obtained at all costs—even at the cost of effective verification—and if an agreement is not possible, they urge the unilateral disarmament of the United States.

The true issue is to determine whether it is possible to work out an effective and secure arms control agreement and nuclear ban which would better serve the interests of our national security than a continuation of the arms race. This issue can only be resolved by the painstaking process of negotiation. Only in this way can it be determined whether the interests of the United States and the U.S.S.R. against total destruction are sufficiently strong to outweigh the interests which divide the two.

The refusal to face the real issue is compounded by the use of slogans which obscure the hard decisions which we must make. Some call any disarmament negotiations a part of a no-win policy; others chant the defeatist and cowardly slogan "better red than dead."

Any treaty concerning nuclear testing or disarmament must be ratified by the Senate. I know no one in the Senate—and I include myself—who would vote for a treaty which would compromise the safety of the United States. And I must say, I do not believe the President would accept or propose a treaty which would endanger the life of our country.

It is generally believed that the Soviet Union would not risk a nuclear war and its own destruction. But as long as our issues with Russia remain unsolved we will have to live as an armed state, and under the threat of war. We have not thought much about managing our own lives, our Government, and our industrial economy during a long period of such danger, for we have never lived at the brink of a thermonuclear war.

All our efforts toward negotiation may prove futile as they have in the past. But our system is distinguished from the Soviet system, for we believe in a moral order. We will maintain our defenses; we will not surrender or risk the security of our country and its freedom. But as a people, I believe it imperative and morally right that we continue our efforts to reach honorable and just agreements with the Soviet Union, including disarmament.

Now I come to the most difficult question of all—Cuba. I know the concern of the people of our country about Cuba. The same concern is felt deeply by all of us in the Congress. Many speeches are made about Cuba, but there are few suggestions as to what ought to be done about it.

While circumstances could require it, I know of no one in the Congress in any position of responsibility or leadership who has advocated an invasion of Cuba. Last fall, when I went to Washington at the time of the Cuban crisis, it was not known what the Soviet reaction would be. There was a solemn concern that war, even a nuclear war, might develop. A situation of danger continues, though not of the same imminence, and I believe that the chief source of danger lies in the continuing presence of Soviet troops. It is the Soviet presence in Cuba which gives authority to Castro, promotes subversion, and incites Communist action in the countries of Latin America.

In a speech in the Senate on February 11, I proposed that the United States should adopt as its policy that we would not accept or tolerate the continuance of a Russian base in Cuba, or anywhere in this hemisphere. It was said by some that if we insisted on the removal of Soviet forces from Cuba the Soviet Union could as reasonably ask for the removal of American troops from Europe and the Pacific. My answer is that our troops, and even Soviet troops, are in Europe because of agreements and events which occurred during and following World War II. But the Soviet Union, by its entrance in Cuba, has extended a new threat into the Western Hemisphere, and beyond the status quo which it insists it has the right to maintain in Germany and Eastern Europe.

It is our understanding that Mr. Khrushchev agreed with President Kennedy that troops as well as missiles would be removed from Cuba—and it was upon this basis that the blockade was lifted. We are informed that the President is seeking to secure the withdrawal of Russian troops from Cuba by diplomatic means. It is my view, as it was in February, that if Mr. Khrushchev does not keep his promise to remove troops, the President should take the same firm measure that he took last fall and impose a blockade.

The imposition of the blockade would bring again the risk of war. But it would not be a confrontation, such as that of last October, which would place the Soviet Union in the position of backing down. The Soviet Union would be called upon to fulfill its promise, and I do not believe that war would result. I hold that it is important that we establish the proposition that we will not accept a Russian base in Cuba, or in the Western Hemisphere.

There are many controversial issues before the Congress and the country—among them fiscal problems, unemployment, education, and civil rights—and they must be met. Every important issue before the Congress is difficult and controversial. They cannot be solved to the entire satisfaction of any group, whether it be the business community, labor, agriculture, veterans organizations, or even the Republican and Democratic Parties. For all have, as is natural, their special positions.

Our system is one of representative government, and it is the obligation of the Congress to make decisions which we believe are in harmony with our constitutional system of government, which will protect and secure our country and lead it forward, and which represent as fully as possible the interests of the country as a whole.

This does not mean that our decisions as a group or as individuals are always right. There are many voices in our country today, and they reflect a tremendous concern and interest in the affairs of government, and in the issue our country faces. There is criticism, and sharp criticism.

The right of criticism cannot be questioned, and should be encouraged, for criticism expresses opinion and can reduce the possibility of future mistakes. But I must say that those who base their criticism on loose charges that those who serve our Government are less patriotic than they, or are engaged in some conspiracy to surrender our country and its freedom, speak untruly and breed hate. They do no service or good to our country.

No one can speak for every Member of the Congress, because all are as human as the people they serve. But I know the overwhelming majority in the Congress are informed, patriotic men whose greatest devotion is to the preservation and strengthening of our country and its freedom. And whatever our disagreements with him on policy or politics, I would not charge the President of the United States with any less patriotism or devotion to our country.

As I speak to this convention, I am conscious that all of us have had experiences in our military service which have drawn us into a deeper appreciation of our country I have had the honor of serving in several capacities in the government—as a local official, a Member of the Senate, delegate in the United Nations in the development of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and as an ambassador. I am glad that following my service during World War II with the 3d Army in Europe, I was able to intervene with General Patton and secure his order preventing the forcible repatriation of Russians who did not want to return to the Soviet Union. I am glad that as a member of the United Nations, I represented the United States when the U.N. for the first time condemned the Soviet Union for its breach of its wartime treaties with Nationalist China. But I value above all the experiences of my life, my service in the Army during World War II because, like you, I knew that we were engaged in a service which was greater than ourselves, and for our country.

I did not serve, like many of you, continually in the front lines. But at times I saw the death of young men—far from their homes, their families, and their country. We can never forget that those who went down in the sea, the air, or who fell in some dark forest, and gave up life, and all their aspirations and dreams, for this country, its future, and its freedom.

As men who have served our country—our flag—in time of peril, who have sacrificed and have seen the sacrifice of others, we have a special responsibility to look at the problems of our country fairly and objectively, to do everything possible to meet them, and to provide leadership wherever we live.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Two Poems by Joseph C. Carson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a resident in my district, Mr. Joseph C. Carson, of Buffalo, N.Y., writes poetry as a hobby. He is also a great humanitarian, and is active in civic and charitable affairs.

Mr. Carson has sent me two of the poems he has composed, one following the inauguration of President Kennedy in 1961, and the other following the tragic assassination of our beloved President, which I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point:

JUST FRIENDLY KIND: AS YOU LEAD THE WAY

Best wishes, Mr. President
As you lead us on our way
And may God's guiding grace be yours
In all you do and say.

May Congress and the Senate
Each lend a helping hand
To make your burdens lighter
In a way you'll understand.

We find at each election
Those that win and lose
The meaning of democracy
Is to have the right to choose.

And what we all should realize
As we play the game
That when the contest's over
We're Americans just the same.

So let us pledge to do our best
And mean it when we say
Hand in hand—throughout the land
We're with you all the way.

May you find the road to the future
Paved with blessings from above
That will guide your way to a brighter day
In this wonderful land we love.

—JOSEPH C. CARSON.

MARCH 1961.

DEDICATED TO OUR LATE PRESIDENT, JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY: HE PASSED OUR WAY

Well done Thy noble servant
Your task on earth is o'er
Though you left us for the great beyond
You will live forever more.

Your words and deeds are a volume
With pages edged with gold
That through the years the world will find
A treasure to behold.

We will miss you gallant leader
More than words can ever say
We are asking God to help us
And lead us on our way.

We are asking God to grant the peace
You strived so hard to gain
And to make it everlasting
So you labored not in vain.

You left us fondest memories
Few others ever will
That will echo through the ages
Although your voice is still.

God called you to that distant shore
Your helping hand is gone
But the guiding light you left the world
Shines on and on and on.

—JOSEPH C. CARSON, 1963.

Resolution on Death of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the mayor and City Council of Vestavia Hills, Ala., has adopted a resolution of condolence on the untimely death of former President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and a resolution commending our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for the courage and understanding with which he has assumed his new duties as President of the United States.

I include the resolutions, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE

Whereas an assassin did take the life of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, on November 22, 1963, at Dallas, Tex.; and

Whereas the citizens of Vestavia Hills, Ala., join with their fellow Americans in mourning the assassination of our President, and deploring the godless philosophy which caused his murder; and

Whereas the citizens of our community desire to express their most sincere condolences, prayers for surcease from sorrow and wishes for the future welfare and happiness of the bereaved widow and children of the President: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That we join in silent prayer to God for our departed President and, that we do, by this resolution, express our personal sorrow and deep sense of loss to the bereaved family of John Fitzgerald Kennedy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the official minutes of the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., and the original be sent to the widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

Unanimously adopted in regular session this 2d day of December 1963.

ROBERT M. GUILLAT, *Mayor.*

Attest:

HENRY G. GALLIMORE,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION

Whereas the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson did enter upon the high office of President of the United States of America under most tragic and trying circumstances, viz, the murder of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy by an assassin; and

Whereas the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, in assuming the duties of the office of President of our beloved Nation, conducted himself at all times with good taste, with Christian consideration of the sensibilities of those bereaved, with courage and understanding of his duties and the needs and requirements of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Vestavia Hills, Ala., in regular session assembled, That we express for ourselves and on behalf of the citizens of our community our grateful appreciation to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson for the tone of his words and decisiveness of his actions during those trying days, and that we pray to Almighty God for divine guidance to our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in the difficult days that lie ahead.

Unanimously adopted this 2d day of December 1963.

ROBERT M. GUILLAT, *Mayor.*

Attest:

HENRY G. GALLIMORE,
City Clerk.

Academic Freedom: The Right To Inquire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, although academic freedom has enjoyed a long and prosperous history in America, it is nevertheless a fragile concept subject to the everblowing winds of intolerance. For this reason alone the vitality and significance of academic freedom must be brought repeatedly to public attention. Our institutions of higher learning have attained great stature throughout the world, but will hurriedly wither with the demise of academic freedom.

Recently, these winds of ill will have been directed against a great academic institution, one with which I am personally familiar and in which I place every confidence, the University of Minnesota. In response to this grave assault upon our traditional academic freedoms, the regents of the University of Minnesota have issued the following statement on academic freedom. It deserves the careful consideration of my colleagues, for today, more than ever, we must draw upon the strong resources of the university "as it seeks to bring the methods of reason to bear upon our problems."

The statement follows:

TEXT OF STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

We, as the board of regents, are responsible to the public for the health and vitality of the university. It is our responsibility to inquire continuously into the conduct of the university to make sure this health and vitality are preserved.

The university community is a city of more than 50,000 persons; they come from every part of the country; of the undergraduates, 94 percent come from somewhere in Minnesota. They represent a cross section of our population, differing from a random cross section only because they are especially selected for intellectual interests and intellectual competence. We assume that almost every type of political conviction is to be found among them, just as in any city of 50,000 adults one would expect to find the complete variety of political, social, economic, and religious beliefs.

The university, the city, and the State do have facilities to insure order in such a community. For varying problems of public safety we have provided for us a university security staff, a city police, and the FBI. We have confidence in the effectiveness of these law enforcement agents, and we cooperate with them. We believe the American community is fundamentally law abiding; that it abhors both resort to violence in the affairs of men and the use of extralegal methods in the examination of alleged violations of law.

Of all crimes or violations, the American philosophy and tradition require that we assume the citizen innocent until proved guilty. We believe it proper that the university leave the law enforcement role in American society to established law enforcement agencies. The university's tasks are learning, research, constructive criticism, and intellectual inquiry. By fulfilling its role, the university makes its contribution to public order by nourishing devotion to the rule of reason in the conduct of human affairs.

FREE UNIVERSITIES

It cannot be too strongly stated that the only atmosphere in which a university can fulfill its assigned role is the atmosphere of freedom. Nor is it surprising that in America, where free discussion is the first principle of our political faith, universities have flourished best, and have at the same time made the most remarkable contribution to the public good. Those universities contributing most have been those which are most free.

From the first days of our independence the giants of American history have revered the principle of free speech; they have had enough faith in our form of government to state affirmatively that if truth and error were allowed to contest in free debate, truth would triumph. They have also recognized that any effort to close by force a free discussion is destructive of the dictator and of those dictated to. The first is poisoned by power; the latter is denied a share in the public dialogue. The man denied participation in free discussion loses, at the very least, his participating right as a citizen, but he may also be robbed of the dignity and self-respect which freedom encourages.

The inherent validity of free competition among ideas is as apparent in the economic community as in the educational community. No one who has observed the development of the American economy can deny the efficiency of freedom. But perhaps an example of the creativity of freedom in the economic marketplace will serve to clarify the importance of freedom to the marketplace of ideas.

As recently as 40 years ago, the typical market was a corner grocery store. Whether found in the country or city it was heated by a pot-bellied stove, its aisles were crowded, its shelves crammed. Its proprietor helped each customer through the wilderness of items one by one. Gradually, in a kind of merchandising conversation, the entire enterprise was changed. One merchant to increase the attraction of his business, widened the aisles; he was answered by a competitor who lowered shelves to put all items within easy reach; he in turn was answered by another who encouraged self-service.

Step by step the modern supermarket was born. But no one firm jumped directly from the narrow, crowded, confused grocery store of 1920 to the specially designed supermarket of today. It required a merchant's conversation in which free men challenged and answered each other in a free and competitive atmosphere.

MARKETPLACE OF IDEAS

The marketplace of ideas is comparable, but even more dependent upon a completely free conversation. The student and the professor must live in an atmosphere where questioning is encouraged; where every alternative can be explored; where their free minds may be allowed to test the validity of each idea, and where they feel free to follow wherever truth may lead. Such a free atmosphere is not merely necessary to university freedom; it is also the way of life which we have a right to associate with America.

To ask that the university be respected in its right to this freedom is not to ask for special privilege, but rather to ask for the opportunity to demonstrate the efficiency of the freedom in which we all believe and for which so many brave Americans have died. The most American activity of them all is to think, to speak, and to inquire freely. The un-American activity is to deny such freedom.

A university must cherish freedom or be untrue to its own nature. Equally it cherishes responsibility, the natural corollary of freedom. In this connection the regents endorse the following statement adopted by the Association of American Universities in 1953 and reprinted in 1962:

"Historically the word university is a guarantee of standards. It implies endorsement not of its members' views but of their capability and integrity. Every scholar has an obligation to maintain this reputation. By ill-advised, though not illegal, public acts of utterances he may do serious harm to his profession, his university, to education, and to the general welfare. He bears a heavy responsibility to weigh the validity of his opinions and the manner in which they are expressed. His effectiveness, both as scholar and teacher, is not reduced but enhanced if he has the humility and the wisdom to recognize the fallibility of his own judgment. He should remember that he is as much a layman as anyone else in all fields except those in which he has special competence. Others, both within and without the university, are as free to criticize his opinions as he is free to express them."

RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS

University teachers, as teachers, are judged for scholarly competence by their peers from the moment they aspire to membership on a faculty. The demands of such judgment are heavy, for the academic profession insists that its members be both skilled and devoted in their search for truth. The profession grants status and tenure to its members in proportion to their publicly demonstrated competence within a given academic discipline. And just as the medical profession must assume responsibility for establishing the standards of competence which admit members to the practice of medicine, so must the academic profession assume responsibility for establishing the standards of competence which qualify its members for the practice of teaching.

Just as the atmosphere of freedom within a university is the best guarantee of productive and responsible instruction, so, also, is it the best guarantee that students will grow toward responsible citizenship. A free society calls for citizens well schooled in the wisdom traditional to that society. It also calls for citizens accustomed to grappling with new ideas, to participating in the give and take of public discussion and to assuming public responsibility for one's own thinking.

Students properly assert their right to learn responsibilities of choice and decision which they must bear as citizens, and the free university properly provides the most appropriate setting for such learning.

We cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of a free university to the development of citizens able to carry responsibility in a free society. The dangers of fanatic, angry, and irrational behavior were brought home to every American with the assassination of President Kennedy.

NATIONAL GOALS

It is time for Americans to draw closer together in dedication to our national goals. These include continued freedom, concern for the rights of others, political and spiritual tolerance, equality of opportunity, equality before the law and protection from the laws delays, and access to the blessings of justice and public order.

These goals will not be won through angry and emotional outbursts which divide our people. They can be won by systematic, rational, and thoughtful analysis of the obstacles to our national purposes. The university is of paramount importance to our Nation as it seeks to bring the methods of reason to bear upon our problems—to find better means to public peace, as well as more effective ways to deter threats of violence which may be directed toward our Nation. To do its rational work wisely, a university by its very nature requires freedom to inquire.

The people of Minnesota have been wise in their support of education. Their agricultural and industrial economy, as well as their public peace and safety, are the better because of this wisdom. The university, operating in an atmosphere of freedom, has made great contributions to the healthy, stable society of which we are all now so proud.

We as regents are satisfied that to a very high degree the faculty of the university, and its administration, understand the mission of the university and are using their freedom responsibly.

We are satisfied that the existing agencies for enforcement of law and the protection of national peace and safety are alert and adequate to their tasks.

We are al[illegible] that the university officials are prepared to, and do, cooperate with them in assuring national safety.

We are impressed by the great responsibilities related to our national safety and prosperity that are continuously entrusted to the university personnel, and we wish to take this opportunity to reaffirm our faith in the university and in the efficiency of freedom.

Happy Birthday, Mr. Speaker

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people I represent here—all the people of Alabama—I extend to you our best wishes on the occasion of your 72d birthday.

Your inherent kindness, your fairness as presiding officer of the U.S. House of Representatives, your great patience, your compassion for the problems and the well-being of all Americans are

greatly admired by every Member of the House.

It is the wish of myself, and I am sure of everyone else here this morning, that you have many happy returns of this day and much happiness in the years ahead.

Happy birthday, Mr. Speaker McCORMACK.

Review of the Book "National Security"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the London Times recently characterized the new book, "National Security, Political, Military, and Economic Strategies in the Decade Ahead," as "an indispensable aid to the student of American strategic thinking." I have found it precisely that. In this Hoover Institution publication the thoughts of 34 of the Nation's best thinkers on matters of security are placed together in comprehensible form by two skilled editors, David M. Abshire and Richard V. Allen, of the Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University.

The volume includes the thoughts of James D. Atkinson, Morris Bornstein, Karl Brandt, Henry W. Briefs, W. Glenn Campbell, Herbert S. Dinerstein, Otto Eckstein, Roger A. Freeman, Gottfried Haberler, Herman Kahn, William R. Kinter, Henry A. Kissinger, Kurt L. London, Edward S. Mason, Albert J. Meyer, Oskar Morgenstern, Gerhart Niemeyer, G. Warren Nutter, Stefan T. Possony, Virgil Salera, Thomas C. Schelling, James R. Schlesinger, Irving H. Siegel, William S. Stokes, Robert Strausz-Hupe, George E. Taylor, Edward Teller, Frank N. Trager, Norman B. Ture, Richard L. Walker, Murray L. Weidenbaum, Karl A. Wittfogel and Arnold Wolfers. Its introduction is by Adm. Arleigh Burke, U.S. Navy, retired.

On December 20 the Washington Post carried an informative review of "National Security" written by Robert A. Kilmarx, himself a noted expert on strategy of the nuclear age. The review follows:

COLD WAR STRATEGY MAP EXAMINED FOR LOOK AHEAD

(Reviewed by Robert A. Kilmarx)

("National Security: Political, Military, and Economic Strategies in the Decade Ahead. Edited by David M. Abshire and Richard V. Allen. Praeger. 1039 pp.)

This outstanding collection of broad analyses of national security problems has been made available to the reading public at a most fortunate time. Concern has been expressed by the administration since the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty that the public might be less inclined to support necessary defense expenditures because of the relatively relaxed state of international tension.

The assassination of President Kennedy may have reinforced this danger, since the forces of intolerance, hatred, and extremism which many people apparently believe contributed to his death may be viewed in part as the product of cold war instability, ideological conflict, and economic frustration.

In assessing the strategic needs of our time, the pitfalls of euphoria about national security policies could be compounded by apathy toward cold war conflict and withdrawal from international burdens.

This is particularly true if the Soviets continue to avoid precipitating major crises over an extended period, while getting used to President Johnson's policies and determination—and improving their economic and technological bases for future military power and political advance.

Need for such a book has long been acute. The library of monographs, studies, reports, and proposals on national strategy is becoming too extensive and specialized to satisfy the needs of a busy citizenry. The national strategy of the United States may be likened to a river which has many tributaries and meandering propensities. Unless its general direction, the sandbars it must pass, and alternate channels into which it may flow, is public knowledge, the democratic process cannot be served.

This book not only maps out much of the present strategic terrain but also provides environmental guides to future policy flow, to challenge the interest and judgment of a thoughtful reader.

Many of its prominent and well-qualified contributors reemphasize the all-important fact that the Communists still present a long-term, persistent threat to our way of life. Neither the Soviet objective of world domination nor the tactics employed have fundamentally changed in spite of the return to peaceful coexistence in foreign policy.

Some of the contributing specialists see hope for the eventual evolution of Soviet policy away from traditional goals of global hegemony; others disagree and conclude that if a successful outcome is to be attained, U.S. containment policy must be supplemented more by a forward strategy that attempts to move the site of the cold war to enemy territory.

In editing this symposium, David Abshire and Richard Allen have done an excellent job organizing a vast amount of material. This permits the reader to become readily acquainted with the principal themes, to refer easily to particular areas of policy interest, to obtain clear synopses of contributed articles and to follow the discussion of controversial viewpoints.

Pupils of Winton School, Hayward, Calif., Honor John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged to visit Winton School, Hayward, Calif. My visit was 2 weeks after the death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and I was touched to observe the beautiful manner in which the pupils at Winton School were sharing in the national mourning and honoring his memory.

Amongst the thoughtful things done by the pupils in memory of President Kennedy was to dedicate to him the entire first page of their fine student newspaper, "Green and White." A most excellent picture of our late President, with the White House in the background, its flag at half-staff, by Student Artist Roy Ostyn was featured, together with a sensitive eulogy.

Mr. Speaker, I am immensely proud of the young people of America, those to whom we will turn to for national and international leadership in the coming decades. My visit to Winton School has refreshed my confidence in the American adults of tomorrow.

The Black Omen for Red Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with the elevation of Ambassador Mann to Under Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs we may see a new tightening of U.S. policy toward Cuba. Congressional disapproval of many of our past actions and inactions are evident everywhere. Opposition to the foreign aid bill in the House has increased in recent years in proportion to the feelings in Congress that all is not well within the State Department in implementing stated U.S. policy. There is reason to hope that Mr. Mann will bring his well-respected talents to bear on the problems facing us all over South and Central America. His past performance and experience indicates that we have reason to expect substantial improvement.

Cuba itself is facing new difficulties, which indicate that the time for us to press our economic blockade is at hand. Castroism is faltering. Now is the time to push for complete isolation.

Editorial comment on the internal condition and external activity of Cuba points up the fact that Castro is in for some difficult days. I include an editorial from the Miami Herald in the RECORD at this point:

THE BLACK OMEN FOR RED CUBA

Omens abound that the focus of Communist infection in the New World—Red Cuba—may soon be excised.

First, there is the forthcoming showdown in the Organization of American States. Venezuela has formally accused Cuba of aggression. Its proof—3 tons of munitions traced from Belgium to Cuba to Venezuela—is being checked by an OAS committee.

The procedure invokes the 1947 Treaty of Rio de Janeiro for sanctioning aggression. A mere majority of the 20 OAS member nations can call a conference of foreign ministers under the treaty. By two-thirds vote, the ministers can order appropriate hemispheric action up to and including the use of armed force.

Second, there is a detailed report to the OAS committee from an organization of Cuban exiles telling how and where Red Cuba has been smuggling "arms, subversive agents, narcotics, and counterfeit money" into neighboring lands.

Third, there are shortages of nearly everything inside Cuba, and frantic squirmings by the Fidel Castro regime.

No longer do volunteers fill the ranks of Castro's armed forces. He has invoked harsh new rules to get the manpower he needs for holding his subjects in line. He also has been shuffling ministerial assignments, thus raising questions about reliability in high places.

Fourth, communism's abject failure in Cuba for 5 long years has opened the eyes of its erstwhile dupes in the Western Hemisphere.

Crushing Castro in 1959 might have made him a martyr to Latin Americans bemused with his phony legend as a modern Robin Hood. The eviction of Castro today would be hailed by everyone but hard-core Communists as good riddance to bad rubbish.

Finally, there is the plight of Castro's puppet masters in the Kremlin, desperate to feed and otherwise mollify their own subjects.

Their announced plan to spend $46 billion on their chemical industry, including fertilizers, means they will be compelled to trim expenses somewhere. Where better than in their newest colony, Red Cuba, a liability which is both costly and undependable?

The Late President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a resolution by the De Kalb County Democratic Executive Committee, expressing its sorrow and loss at the death of our late President. I submit this resolution for insertion in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DE KALB COUNTY DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE IN MEETING HELD DECEMBER 4, 1963

Whereas the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963, has shocked the people of this State and Nation; and

Whereas President Kennedy had become a significant world leader and a capable President of the United States; and

Whereas he was the leader of the Democratic Party; and

Whereas the people of Georgia had given him overwhelming support in his campaign for election as President; and

Whereas his leadership in life has been lost to the people of Georgia, the United States and the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the De Kalb County Democratic Executive Committee, That our profound feeling of sorrow and of sympathy be communicated to his family and furthermore, that our appreciation for the outstanding services of John F. Kennedy, in war and in peace, is hereby expresed by the members of this committee; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this committee and that a copy be transmitted to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

KELSEY HOWINGTON,
Chairman.

Mrs. HARRY B. WILLIAMS, Jr.
Secretary.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

An Address by Dr. Kenneth E. Appel, Professor of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, at the Dedication of the Oaklawn Psychiatric Center, Elkhart, Ind., September 20, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to have been present for the ceremonies marking the dedication of the Oaklawn Psychiatric Center in Elkhart, Ind., on September 20, 1963, and to hear an address by one of the most distinguished figures in the field of mental health in the United States, Dr. Kenneth E. Appel, professor of psychiatry at the School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Dr. Appel's address, "The Community and Psychiatry," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It seems appropriate to draw attention to Dr. Appel's address today in view of the 324 to 4 record vote in the House of Representatives yesterday, December 19, in favor of a bill to make supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation.

The Oaklawn Psychiatric Center is sponsored by the Mennonite Churches of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. The northern Indiana district of the Church of the Brethren and the Elkhart community also share in support of the center.

The address follows:

THE COMMUNITY AND PSYCHIATRY

(By Kenneth E. Appel, M.D., professor of psychiatry, School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania)

The Oaklawn Psychiatric Center is a new bulwark against many of the destructive forces in man and society. It is a happy state of affairs that sickness can be attacked by service, education, and research in a place of such beauty. It is fortunate that there is leadership with such foresight here in the community, the State, the board of directors, the person of your director, and the religious foundation that has been urgently, effectively, and progressively behind this magnificent undertaking. This to me is the blossom, the fruits, the works, of solid religion.

To survive one cannot be content with conditions as they are. One must be curious and explore, explore the resources at hand and develop new resources. This involves science, education, and research, to which this new facility is dedicated—plus the inalienable joining of service in psychiatry.

The joint commission has cut out new paths to further the enrichment of life with health and well-being. It has etched new plans for a multidimensional many-sided attack on mental illness. It has broadened the concept of psychiatry. Psychiatry is no longer just the domain of mental hospitals. It is not just the province of psychiatrists. It is not merely the concept of the mentally ill or the insane. The joint commission has emphasized new understandings of mental and emotional illness—whether through molecular chemistry, psychoanalysis, chemical genetics, or sociological factors. It has moved psychiatry into new areas. It has moved it into the community. It has moved it into the general hospital. It has pointed out the need of the collaborating, helping professions. Psychiatry is not just the function of the psychiatrists, nor even of the general practitioner. It involves many other helping professions and disciplines, including chemistry, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and religion. Treatment and prevention are not just hospital functions. They extend to the community, to the home, to the school, to the factory, to the church.

UNEMPLOYMENT

There are the unemployed. It is an irony that the silent people, the helpless people in our mental hospitals and in our communities need human contacts; and the thousands, yes millions of the unemployed or retired need useful work to do. Yet our human and social engineering, our economic engineering, has not developed ways and means of bringing these two great needs together to supplement each other. These are challenges as you see not just for psychiatrists, but for sociologists, for economists, for government and for religion I should think—for the citizen—for you and me. There is need for the use of nonprofessional personnel—including the clergy. This runs against the tradition of many professional groups, including physicians. But human behavior is not alone a medical problem. It is a problem involving the community and many disciplines.

The problem of personnel is going to become worse in psychiatry. With the 1½-percent increase in the population every year—an increase in the population of the United States—a city, the size of Philadelphia every year—we have not had the social and medical planning to meet this real pressing problem. Someone has written a book on the population squeeze. It has been estimated that, in the Philadelphia area, by 1970 the population will have over a 20-percent increase. There is not the medical personnel, there is not the social work personnel, there is not the psychological personnel, certainly there is not the psychiatric personnel, to take care of the problems involved in such an increase of people living together and rubbing elbows. New ideas need to be developed, new experiments need to be tried. New recruitment. Therefore research is one of the important recommendations of the joint commission. Research in human behavior. Yet few medical schools have departments of human behavior—human engineering and ongoing research in these important fields.

POPULATION SQUEEZE

Ritchie Calder[1] writes of the population squeeze: "Six hundred years is not long in the time scale (of geology and anthropology)—but in that relatively short space of time, if things go on as they are (and, of course, they cannot) there will then be standing room only on the face of this planet—each person would only have one square meter of land to live on."

Calder,[2] as professor of international relations at Edinburgh, continues in his inaugural lecture—"Our relations with other species are a condition of our own survival" (p. 2). (The United States is finding only one-third of the 100 minerals used in American industry at home.) "The advanced countries are becoming richer and more prosperous and the underdeveloped countries are becoming proportionately poorer" (p. 11). [Many] "are sick, hungry, and ignorant, they remain poor and endure squalor and because they live like animals they breed like animals" (p. 12). "Democracy is a word which echoes meaninglessly in empty bellies. What we glibly call communism in those countries is hunger becoming articulate" (p. 13). "The only permanent solution [is] to enable countries and regions to produce their food requirements" (p. 15).

"All the majesty of his mind can be dethroned by his stomach. He can spend 40,000 million pounds a year on the defense of peace and ignore the real content of the peace he is supposed to be defending. He can split the atom and release the power of matter and use this, his greatest discovery, to poison the goodness of the earth and destroy his species. He can outboast the ancients, who in ignorance of their material success, built pyramids as the gravestones of their civilization but modern man can throw his pyramids into space and they may orbit eternally round a planet which died of this neglect. Or he may choose to use his science and his wisdom to cooperate with all his kind in the peaceful enrichment of his earth and of the people who live on it" (p. 19).

VETO EVOLUTION

"For the first time in history man, the earthling, has the power of veto over continuing evolution" (p. 18).

Psychiatry represents a complex interweaving of chemistry, physiology, medicine, psychology, sociology, anthropology, and culture. It requires not only professional personnel, it requires the interest of the community, relatives, of friends, of legislatures, and of volunteers. Psychiatry is thus everybody's business. It is related to the ancient question, Who is my neighbor? The difficulties of people who suffer from mental illness are not peculiar of them. All of us have our ups and downs and worries, our problems and difficulties, our failures and distrusts, pains, our sufferings and frustrations, our disappointments, our successes and achievements. This is life. Some time ago a psychotic patient was helped over 24 hours of distress and antisocial and antagonistic impulses by a phone call from

[1] Calder, R. "After the Seventh Day." Mentor Book, New York, 1961, p. 265.

[2] Calder, R. "Earthlings in the Space Age." University of Edinburgh. Inaugural lecture No. 11, Nov. 2, 1961.

friends to come to tea. She felt welcome, she felt together, she felt belonging, she felt wanted. These were healing forces in a critical condition. These are practical measures that do not require the scientists to implement.

The healing effect of interest. The relief from talking things over. The resources that develop from discussion and searching out possibilities and alternatives in patient, considerate, understanding, human relationships. These are helpfulnesses that come from constructive togetherness. These are situations that we all can try to create in our limited ways. But they help to counteract hunger, fear, greed, domination, exploitation, dependency, ignorance, superstitution, prejudice, cruelty, complacency, deprivation, and rejection, hate, anxiety, loneliness, which are the germs of desolation and destruction, just as fatal as the tubercle bacillus, the low oxygen of the stratosphere, and the bacillus pestis. There is releasing of the cooperative search for new solutions to disruptive, distressing, stressful conditions. This is helping the individual come into his own, whenever his constructive capacities and interests lie. This is helping the individual move into society again, cooperatively and constructively. This is a long way—just the opposite in fact—from authoritative manipulation, decisionmaking, domination, direction, dependency, and brainwashing which is so often misconceived as psychotherapy.

STATEMENT BY THE LATE PRESIDENT

Our President has said, "Unless man can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control—and man, like the minosaur will decline and disappear."[3]

Chaplain Harris of the U.S. Senate writes,[4] "In a nation where more than half of our hospital beds are occupied by persons who experienced mental breakdowns, the psychiatrists seem to be as essential as obstetricians, where successful men have a way of hitting the top of the obituary column about the same time as they hit the top in their profession, it may not be inappropriate to inquire whether some of us may not be too eager * * * just how bright are these men in a hurry who purchase their pedestals (or pursue security) with half-lived, half-enjoyed lives?" These are concerns of all of us. They are causes of fallout, whether in inefficiency, unemployability, psychosomatic illness, emotional or mental disease, or mental retardation. These are not only medical and psychiatric problems, but moral and religious ones.

The report of the Joint Commission is full of challenges. Whitehead says that a nation that cannot break through its traditional ways of thinking and behaving and living is doomed to destruction. C. P. Snow says that the future belongs to those who can employ future directed thinking instead of status or traditional directed thinking. Toynbee indicates those nations have survived or those people have survived who have been able to develop resources to meet new conditions. He has some things very positive to say about religion. Psychiatry and mental health are forward looking. The report of the Joint Commission indicates new solutions for old problems—which we believe are related to the survival not only of ourselves, but of our children and children's children.

PEOPLE FOR PEOPLE

My plea is: People for people. Personnel for sick people. Not people against people—indifferent to people—distant from people—hostile to people—afraid of people. But people for people to counteract the illnesses that break the strongest bonds we know between people.

Words point to things, objects, conditions. Words also catch the spirit of a place and its people. The words that come today, that the Oaklawn Psychiatric Center etches in bold, proud outlines are:

"New horizons, new levels of community life, new levels of mental health, and mental health in action."

It is most fitting and appropriate to mark this occasion. Achievement is accompanied by a feeling of well-being. The overflowing of well-being becomes celebration. Celebration here is not only of an individual, the board of directors, but of the community—and I must emphasize again—a religious community energized by practical devotions and sacriments of service.

This is the kind of community festival which not only calls attention to community accomplishment; it is a sign of community well-being and community strength. Community effort, devotion and action for the community good is here given public witnese and religious sanction and dedication. This is true wealth of a community: leadership of men of vision and wisdom, and participation, involvement and collaboration of people themselves. There is dedication here to new ideals of health and service. This marks, I believe, high achievement of Western culture and civilization.

It is showing mercy.
It is acting justly.
It is walking together.
Going together.
Doing together.
Walking humbly together.

And these are ancient precepts from the Bible which point to personal strength and health, and community, state, and social well-being.

Science advances by degrees. The Joint Commission of Mental Illness and Health, established by the Congress of the United States made a survey of mental health resources and strengths available in the United States today.

PSYCHOTHERAPY

One of the foremost recommendations of high priority is to further and spread the use of the science of personal psychological treatment called psychotherapy, and the use of new drugs that produce and maintain stability. These measures and methods effect restraint of the emotional and impulsive excesses, urgencies and impetuosities, which appear in people under great stress and strain. These stresses and strains may be of a personal, physical, medical, surgical, economic, family, business, social nature, or frustrated ambition or moral disappointment. Overwhelments of feeling and impulse—whether of fear, excitment, discouragement, depression, loneliness, withdrawal, incapacity, or the reflections of these in physical disabilities and pain—the so-called psychosomatic conditions—can often be controlled by drugs used by psychiatrists and general practitioners to restrain and stabilize the impulsive, unreflective, underrational emotional convulsions till under personal guidance rational, selective, organizing, controlling capacities of the individual come to the fore, reassert themselves and often offer new constructive potentialities of achievement for the individual.

The Joint Commission points to new community opportunities by the use not only of the newer drugs and the new psychology and new psychotherapy, as I have indicated, but by new community concepts of mental and emotional illness and new concepts of treatment in the community as represented by this Psychiatric Center. New and broader concepts of religion, I make bold to believe, are not only renewed attacks on mental and emotional and social illness but also represent new strengths and resources in community health and well-being. The enlargement of outpatient treatment into day-care centers, such as this new Oaklawn Center, represents a forward-looking attack on the No. 1 health problem of our Nation, namely emotional and mental illness. This was not formerly possible for the knowledge was not available. Here in this enlightened community the new possibilities are seized upon in the forefront in the battle against the suffering of mental illness and the community weakness of mental illness. Mental illness is not only a responsibility in part of the individual who is ill, but it is often the responsibility of the community environment in its causation. This Psychiatric Center will forge new community well-being and happiness.

RENEWED SOCIAL IDEALS

This is why it is an honor for me to be here today to share in this festival. I rejoice in these achievements, reaffirmations, and rededications to renewed social ideals. These are the evidences of the real strengths, ideals, and well-being of these United States.

May I close by quoting a prayer for the ages from one of the great saints of humanity—whose daily saying, renews our faith, and strength, and implemented, will help lighten the burden of many psychiatric family and social tensions—tensions and disasters such as we are witnessing today, not only in Vietnam but in certain parts of our country:

"Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace.
Where there is hatred, let me bring love;
Where there is wrong, forgiveness;
Where there is discord, harmony;
Where there is error, truth.
Where there is doubt, let me bring faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where there is darkness, Thy light,
Where there is sadness, joy.

"Lord, grant that I may seek rather
To comfort—than to be comforted;
To understand—than to be understood;
To love—than to be loved.

"For, it is by giving that we receive;
It is by self-forgetting that we find;
It is by forgiving that we are forgiven;
It is by dying that we awaken to the eternal life."

—ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

[3] President Kennedy addresses the United Nations General Assembly, Sept. 25, 1961.

[4] The Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 23, 1961.

Christmas Message of Richard Cardinal Cushing of Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston Notes Achievements of Late Beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in his annual Christmas message to his flock in the Roman aCtholic archdiocese of Boston, Richard Cardinal Cushing, a close personal friend of our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, again paid tribute to President Kennedy for his unstinting labors on behalf of "peace on earth." Under unanimous consent, I include Cardinal Cushing's message, taken from the Boston Herald

of December 20, in full in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CARDINAL PRAISES KENNEDY'S NOBILITY

Richard Cardinal Cushing, in his annual Christmas message, entitled "The President of Peace," said last night that "We can begin to see an international orchard of good fruit growing out of the tragic martyrdom of our much loved and sorely missed young President, John F. Kennedy."

TURNED THE HEARTS OF MEN

The cardinal's message:

"'The people that walked in darkness, have seen a great light. To them that dwelt in the region of the shadow of death, light is risen.'

"The test ban treaty, the prevailing price of wheat, a heartening pause in the mad, incessant rush to arm, the talk of butter instead of guns emanating from Moscow, slashed budgets in the Pentagon—all this accumulation of positive thought and action regarding disarmament has surely turned the hearts of men, in this Christmastide, toward genuine sentiments of peace on earth, good will among men.

"Gradually, in our cautious optimism about world peace, we can begin to see an international orchard of good fruit growing out of the tragic martyrdom of our much-loved and sorely missed young President, John F. Kennedy.

"If his administration accomplished nothing else—and certainly there have been many other fine achievements—his legacy to us of a more stable peace alone would enable his memory to be resplendently enshrined in the minds and hearts of all men."

PERSONAL CHARM

"John Kennedy's irresistible personal charm, his penetrating intellect and nerves of steel in varied dialog with Khrushchev and the other key leaders of the world, have yielded worldwide easement where there was paramount tension, universal hope where there was widespread fear.

"'We arm to parley.' J.F.K. used to say, citing the words of Churchill. And parley he did, strong in the strength of America's embattled traditions and vast resources. Yet he always 'parleyed' with greater emphasis on the will to win, not by guns and bombs, but in the arts of peace and the works of peace.

"We can certainly advance the educated guess that so very much of the domestic and moral instability which plagues our families, our religious practice, our school decorum, has been due to the terror and fear implanted in the human spirit by the constant threat of holocaustal atomic war."

WALKING IN DARKNESS

"J.F.K. knew, in the words of Isaiah, that all too many members of the human family walked in darkness and in 'the shadow of death' because of dread of the H-bomb.

"Beset by sore domestic problems though he was: civil rights, the unfinished business of Abraham Lincoln; aid to education in which the common interest alined him against many of his coreligionists; the liberals versus the conservatives, with lifelong friends arrayed on both sides; always, he knew that world peace in a climate of dignity and justice was the mightiest challenge of his high calling.

"National unity in wartime is easy: national unity in time of peace is difficult, yet much more productive of the positive things to which all Americans stand dedicated: a full dinner pot, educational opportunity for all, a big brother generosity to those peoples and nations in need of our overflowing abundance."

AMERICA'S ROLE

"Our late President knew with profound conviction that America could not adequately fulfill its democratic destiny in a climate of war. Peace, peace with justice and dignity, this is and has ever been the prerequisite of America's role in a free and prosperous community of nations.

"The current lessening of world tensions gives the fact of history to J.F.K.'s oratorical pleas to make a beginning, take one step forward, even in the face of 100 years of uncertainty.

"In this happy, annual commemoration of the birthday of the Prince of Peace, let us also commemorate a noble American and constant follower of the Christmas star, under which he, like the shepherds and the wise men, harkened to the message of 'peace on earth to men of good will.'"

Education Congress of 1963 Writes Historic Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, those who are quick to criticize this 1st session of the 88th Congress would do well to read the excellent article which appeared today in the Washington Star.

Miss Susanna McBee has done the Nation an impressive public service by reviewing the truly impressive record the Congress has written in the field of education.

It is truly said the future of our Nation lies in the hands of our youth. I am proud to be a member of the House Education and Labor Committee which wrote the legislation adopted by the Congress.

This impressive record is at once a tribute to all the members of my committee, its chairman, the leadership of this House and to Speaker McCORMACK without whose untiring leadership and cooperation this record could not have been written.

We in the Congress have built a living memorial to President Kennedy in moving the important legislation through Congress. Generations of young Americans will be able to look upon the Members of the 88th Congress for building in America a new frontier in education.

Mr. Speaker, Miss McBee's excellent article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 23, 1963]

EDUCATION CONGRESS OF 1963 OUTDID HISTORICAL LANDMARK

(By Susanna McBee)

President Johnson said the other day this session of Congress will go down as the Education Congress of 1963.

Earlier, he had predicted that Congress was on its way to doing more for education than any Congress since the one that passed the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862.

But after some quick calculations, the administration concluded that Congress this year has done even more for schooling than the 1862 Congress.

That does not mean all educational problems have been solved. A major area of need which Congress has not dealt with, and is not likely to next year, is aid for elementary and secondary schools.

FOUR ACTS PASSED

Still, when the price tags of four 1963 acts are totaled, Government spending will reach more than $3 billion in new aid to education over the next 4 years.

In just a few years, the Government will be spending nearly three times as much on education as it has spent in the last century under the 1862 Morrill Act and the 1958 National Defense Education Act, which among other things provided Federal loans to college students.

Until this year, $334 million has been spent on land grant college teaching programs and $800 million has gone for various NDEA projects.

The 1963 acts are:

A "bricks and mortar" college aid measure authorizing $1,095 million over the next 3 years.

A Vocational Education Act which also extends the National Defense Education Act programs for 1 year and the aid to areas "impacted" with children of Federal employees for 2 years. The cost over the next 4 years would be $1.6 billion. Congress has appropriated funds to continue the "impact" and student loan programs the rest of this fiscal year. The administration is expected to request supplemental appropriations for the new programs early next month.

A $236.4 million aid to medical education program.

A medical retardation facilities act that provides $51.5 million in grants in the next three years for research and training of teachers to instruct handicapped children.

AID TO COLLEGES

The biggest chunk of Federal aid went to colleges. Spokesmen for higher education had been warning that the "war baby boom" is finally hitting the college campuses.

To meet the need, the Nation's 2,100 public and private colleges will have to spend about $2.3 billion a year for physical plant expansion. Now they are spending about $1 billion annually.

If they take advantage of the new construction aid act, their spending could be stepped up the required billion dollars extra a year.

Only a fraction of such construction would be financed by the Federal Government, which will provide $835 million in grants and $360 million in loans over the 3-year period. Universities would have to match most construction grants on the basis of two local dollars for each Federal dollar. The Government will put up 40 percent of the cost of projects at public community colleges and technical institutes.

Another crisis in higher education, which Congress has met this year, was the shortage in Federal loan funds for needy college students. In raising the ceiling on loans from $90 million to $125 million this year and $135 million next year, Congress will be helping 70,000 more students this year and 90,000 more next year.

MEDICAL SCHOOL AID

Another measure, the Medical Education Act, should go far to prevent a shortage of doctors, dentists, and other medical personnel. Because of the new program, the number of students entering medical and dental schools should go from 12,500 to 19,000 a year.

From 7,500 to 9,000 students will be able to get loans up to $8,000 each for a 4-year course under a $1.4 million program approved for the next 3 years. Medical, dental, and other health schools will be eligible for $175 million in construction grants, with the Federal Government paying two-thirds of the cost of new buildings or major expansion projects.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Congress also shifted the emphasis in vocational education from agricultural and home

economics training to jobs offered in a more urban, technical society.

It struck at the school dropout problem by approving a work-study plan for students who want to earn money and attend high school at the same time and a program of five residential job training schools for youths aged 15 to 20.

It boosted Federal aid to vocational education, now about $57 million a year, by another $731 million over the next 4 years.

Most of the 1963 education bills were passed without fanfare. But next year they will become political weapons when Congress defends its record against charges that it has "done nothing."

Late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy Praised for Revival of Conservation Movement by National Wildlife Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, demonstrated during his tenure in office a keen awareness of the necessity to preserve America's natural resources through an enlightened conservation program. I am sure that my colleagues will want to read an article in Conservation News, published December 15, as an educational service of the National Wildlife Federation, and entitled "J.F.K. Will Be Remembered for Revival of Conservation Movement." Under unanimous consent I include this article with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

J.F.K. WILL BE REMEMBERED FOR REVIVAL OF CONSERVATION MOVEMENT

The late President John F. Kennedy, to use a judgment of Franklin D. Roosevelt made by then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the 1963 annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation in Detroit, will perhaps be remembered as favorably and as affectionately because of the revival that he gave to the conservation movement in this country as he will be remembered for any of the other numerous things he did.

The proponent of a "third wave" of conservation in the United States, following that of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy during his tragically foreshortened tenure in the highest office in the land breathed new life into this vital field of endeavor by taking such personal and dramatic steps as:

Sending on March 1, 1962, a bold and farseeing special message to the Congress on conservation—a document termed by Interior Secretary Udall "an unprecedented charter for vigorous action, and a specific program for the future";

Proposing, and addressing on May 25, 1962, a White House Conference on Conservation—the first to be called since Theodore Roosevelt convened Governors of the States in 1908—which brought together some 280 leaders of national conservation policy in public and private life for an exchange of views; and

Emphasizing the need for "new programs of land stewardship" in many of his speeches, especially those made during a September 1963 swing through 10 Western States when he made his call for a "third wave of conservation" and told audiences, "Conservation, in the real analysis, is the job of us all."

The late President indicated his awareness of conservation problems early in his administration. On March 3, 1961, while dedicating the new headquarters building of the National Wildlife Federation in Washington, D.C., he quoted a poem read at his inauguration by the late Robert Frost which began, "The land was ours before we were the land's," interpreting this to mean that "this new land of ours sustained us before we were a nation, and although we are now the land's—a nation of people matched to a continent—we still draw our strength and sustenance * * * from the earth."

"It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down undiminished to those who come after us what was handed down to us by those who went before, the natural wealth and beauty which is ours," the late President said at the NWF building dedication ceremony, noting, "To do this will require constant attention and vigilance, sustained vigor and imagination."

These qualities—especially vigor and imagination—were brought to bear on the Nation's conservation problems by Mr. Kennedy and his able team of hand-picked "New Frontiersmen" including Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. Some of the fruits of the Kennedy administration's labors:

The establishment of three new national seashores—Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Point Reyes in California, and Padre Island in Texas—and several new National Wildlife Refuges;

The creation of a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within the Department of the Interior to act as a needed focal point within the Federal Government for all outdoor recreation activities;

The strengthening of Federal water pollution control programs, especially in the areas of law enforcement and grants for waste treatment plant construction;

The authorization of a $105 million loan for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to initiate a crash program of wetlands acquisition;

The accelerated setting aside of wilderness areas within the national forests despite the failure of Congress to pass the administration-supported wilderness bill;

The adoption of a Department of Commerce regulation requiring coordination with State conservation agencies in the planning of highways built with Federal funds; and

The steps taken within the Federal establishment to lessen the potential threat of chemical pesticides to man and wildlife, through research, law enforcement and education programs.

The Strategy of Deception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a most significant book on Communist worldwide tactics.

This book is entitled "The Strategy of Deception." It is a collection of essays edited by Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, recently published by Farrar, Straus & Co. This remarkable book in 16 short, easy-to-read chapters details the full deception of Communists and their activities throughout the world.

This is an ideal book for layman and expert alike. It discusses how the Communists operate in India, Africa, Spain, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Great Britain, and elsewhere.

Many of the contributors are well-known figures. One—Julian Gorkin—was actually the founder of the Communist movement in Levant, Spain.

"The Strategy of Deception" shows how the Communists continually deviate and zigzag and vary their basic principles and their very ideologies to follow the line put forth by Moscow or now, in many cases, the line put forth by Peiping.

It is interesting to note that there is no worldwide Communist tactical pattern. In each case the Communists merely choose the most expedient path to gain the most credit and recognition possible.

This book amply demonstrates in each of the 16 essays and in the excellent introduction written by Mrs. Kirkpatrick the complete unreliability and irrationality of the Communist movement and the Communist leaders.

This book is recommended to those among us who would like to gain a working knowledge of communism in action.

I hope all my colleagues will find the time to examine "The Strategy of Deception" for I feel there is no one so sophisticated or so knowledgeable who cannot benefit from it.

John Crown's Legacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD today Dr. Howard A. Rusk's column which appeared in the New York Times yesterday, Sunday, December 22, that I feel is most inspiring and merits thoughtful reading. The article follows:

JOHN CROWN'S LEGACY—VETERAN LEAVES EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND A PLEA THAT LOVE SUPPLANT GREED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

(In 1946 a letter was published in this column from a young veteran in Halloran Hospital, a letter created by suffering and bewilderment. In 1950, after 4 years of struggle, the writer, John Crown, died.

(His legacy to the world was an example of courage and a philosophy of life that, in these troubled and uncertain days, plead even more eloquently for the necessity of understanding than the day on which his letter was written.

(In this era of precocious technology, hydrogen bombs, guided missiles and all the additions to the horrors of war that have caused an epidemic of anxiety, tension, and hate throughout the world, this pain-wracked boy's prescription for peace among men merits thoughtful rereading during this period of mouring for our late President.)

My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can now find no peace in the world or in my country.

Having lived so close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles, Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profit, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, Junior wants more spending money. To these, I say, is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for such petty gains?

Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life.

All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold. When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the nation and of the world.

As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will be the world. Until each of us stops "hogging the road" with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in the world. If man wishes peace again, he must return to the great commandment, "Love my neighbor as thyself for the love of God."

It Could Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

IT COULD HAPPEN HERE

'Tis 2 days till Christmas; we're still in the "House."
Not many are stirring, not even my spouse.
Most Members await in the cloakroom with care
In hopes that our Speaker may soon take his chair.

The pressmen were restless and ready for bed
But visions of headlines ran through their head.
The ladies were quiet, but the men could still yap;
So for some it was hard to catch much of a nap.

Then throughout the "Hill" bells rang with a clatter,
And I rushed from my room to help settle the matter.
Away down the tunnel Members rushed with a flash;
They sped up the stairways in a final mad dash.

The galleries were 'most empty when we reached the door,
But this didn't matter to those on the floor.
Then, what to our wondering eyes did appear
But, H. R. GROSS and nine foreign reindeer,
With such a driver, so witty and quick
Most knew in a moment it must be a trick.

More rapid than pages, his chargers they came.
He arose and objected, and called for the names:
"Now CHARLIE, now CARL, LES, and HALE; let's not tarry;
And the same goes for you—PASSMAN and NATCHER, RHODES, FORD and GARY."
To the top of his voice (it filled the big hall)
"Now, let's get this settled, once and for all."

"We've been here a year, through thick and through thin
And this final obstacle gets under my skin."
So up to the mike with a statement he flew
With a full 5 minutes, and an amendment, too.

And then in a twinkling we heard with alarm
A voice that we knew had acquired new charm.
As I lifted my head and was turning around
To the well came the Speaker, without making a sound.
As he walked he was smiling, from his head to his toes;
And his colleagues were hopeful he'd hold down the "noes."

A bundle of papers he took from the stack
And stood ready and waiting to answer back.
His eyes sort of sparked as he looked at H. R.
And his patience would be tried if H. R. went too far.
But to those in their seats, this could be the end;
And back to our districts, our fences to mend.

The finale was set and H. R. was in form.
He fumed and he fussed and kicked up a storm.
H. R. had a knack for this sort of fight
And some say he'd skip Christmas if he thought he was right.

He was ranting and raving (was his usual self)
And not many laughed when he moved to place "aid" on the shelf.
A wink of his eye and a twist of his head
Soon gave many to know this bill could be dead.

He spoke his words, then looked to his right
And saw his friend, JOHN, itching to fight.
And dropping his hands, he paused with a smile
And then strode to his seat near the center aisle.

As the battle raged, we prayed for a "whistle"
But alas, came the words that fell like a missile.
I heard the Speaker, as he pounded the gavel
"We'll adjourn till tomorrow; so don't plan to travel."

If Peace Breaks Out—Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in his column in the New York Herald Tribune for December 21, 1963, Laurence Barrett raises timely and significant questions. The reaction to the proposed closing of certain military installations by the Department of Defense shows how unprepared the Nation is for a reduction is for a reduction in defense spending. It is past time for an overall approach to the problems and potentials of the conversion of our economy. I call my colleagues' attention to Laurence Barrett's thoughtful article, which follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 21, 1963]

IF PEACE BREAKS OUT—DISASTER?

(By Laurence Barrett)

WASHINGTON.—Two ugly questions remain in the wake of the congressional uproar over the Pentagon's plans to cut out some obsolete military installations.

Is the gigantic American Defense Establishment an irreplaceable prop of the American affluent society?

If peace ever breaks out on some distant, happy day, will the fear of economic dislocation become a brake on disarmament?

To hear a few outraged Members of Congress talk, the answer to the first question is a definite yes, and to the second, a strong maybe. To hear lawmakers talk, military spending is just another huge, juicy hunk of meat in the old pork barrel. One New York Representative threatened to turn the Pentagon upside down and inside out before he'd let it touch facilities in his district. Other lawmakers said that closing the bases wouldn't really save money, because the Federal Government would have to provide for those who are injured economically.

These arguments smack of immorality and idiocy. They are immoral because they imply we can be prosperous only by preparing for war. They are idiotic because they state explicitly that we must prepare for war in an inefficient manner.

Yet it is not surprisng that these arguments are made. We have been living in a garrison state with little interruption since 1941. The habit and mood become more difficult to break as time goes on. Further, the ramifications of defense spending grow more diffuse and complex all the time.

Tody the Defense Department pays roughly 10 cents out of every dollar's worth of goods produced and services performed in this country. The Defense Department gives direct employment to about 3.6 million persons and, through procurement of hardware and construction of facilities, pays the salaries of millions more.

Not enough is known about this whole area. Just last month Charles J. Hitch, Defense Department comptroller, told Congress: "We do not actually know the number of persons directly engaged in defense work in the private sector of the economy." This means we haven't the vaguest notion of how many are so engaged indirectly.

Discussing the same problem recently, Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Defense Secretary, said: "If you ask us what will be the effect over the next few years of changes in defense demand for, let us say, molded ceramic items, we cannot give an answer. The Defense Department does not buy molded ceramic parts as such, but rather buys missiles and precision equipment which do use these parts."

Steps are being taken to remedy this ignorance, but it will be some years before the studies are completed by the Institute for Defense Analyses and the Research Analysis Corp., two nonprofit organizations supported by the military. Meanwhile, the Defense Department, through its Office of Economic Adjustment, attempts to help communities that are adversely affected by changes and reductions in defense spending. There are also proposals for a new, high-level agency to deal exclusively with these problems.

This is all to the good, but the question is whether it is good enough. Both the Defense Department and the Government at large could do more.

The Pentagon should break the pork-barrel psychology that it has helped to create. The announcement of big military contracts

should not be given first to Congressmen to announce to the papers back home. This creates the impression that district X got the contract because the Congressman bested competing Congressmen for it. This impression has another side, obviously: If the legislator gets credit for defense business that comes in, he deserves blame for the loss of such business. This is neither accurate nor healthy.

Also, the Pentagon should not invite special pleas from Congressmen on behalf of particual sites for new installations and particular contractors. The Pentagon has quite enough manpower and computers to figure out these matters for itself. In most cases these representations are merely window dressing anyway. But they do propagate the pernicious notion that Senator Foghorn—staunch advocate of economy in government that he is—is sending millions of bucks to the folks back home.

It goes without saying that occasionally legislators do exert such influence, and not only at the Pentagon. It also goes without saying that this is wrong.

Beyond this, the Government has an obligation to reassure the country that its prosperity does not depend on the Defense Establishment. This can be done only through preparation and publication of comprehensive plans for what we would do if the world ever did achieve real peace. This is no easy task. There has been some tentative thinking along these lines, but so far it has been inadequate and little publicized.

It is true that the Government has no obligations to support industry and labor with defense funds. But it is also true that the needs of national security created the present imbalance and a national policy is required to mitigate the effects of present changes and possible future large-scale reductions.

Otherwise, the Congressmen will continue to whine and holler for their pork, scaring the long underwear off the folks back home in the process.

Let Us Reject Aid to Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to stay here through Christmas Day to prevent aid to our enemies. My five children are willing for me to stay here. It would be a very appropriate celebration of the birth of Christ if by staying here we could prevent aid to the anti-Christ force of the world. On the other hand, it would be a blow to American prestige and the Christian world for this Congress to approve officially loans, wheat, grants, or any aid directly or indirectly, to Communist Russia which is that sinister force in the world seeking to destroy everything Christmas represents.

We have been told over and over again that the purpose of foreign aid is to stop communism, which is atheism. It would be utterly inconceivable for this Congress to go home for Christmas having voted for a foreign aid bill to help destroy communism and at the same time vote in the same bill for money to help communism—to feed them and to strengthen them. When we were faced with our enemies this time of the year in 1944 in the Battle of the Bulge, we did not shoot at them on one hand and then with the other feed and strengthen them so that they could continue to fight against us.

Mr. Speaker, a basic principle is involved here today. We are the direct Representatives of the people. They are against communism, overwhelmingly. We cannot hold on to "God and mammon" at the same time. Let us stand up, be counted, and reject this aid to our enemies.

President Johnson's Role in the Defense of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, so that there would be no question as to how President Lyndon B. Johnson stands insofar as his attitude toward Israel is concerned, Mr. Milton Friedman, White House correspondent of the widely respected Jewish Telegraphic Agency and correspondent of the Jewish News has written an article dealing with President Johnson's past activities and statements in connection therewith.

I have the honor to insert this article written for the Jewish News in the RECORD.

The text of the article follows:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ROLE IN THE DEFENSE OF ISRAEL

(By Milton Friedman)

WASHINGTON.—President Lyndon B. Johnson has assumed office with the reputation earned as Senate majority leader and as Vice President for consistent friendship for the state of Israel. Washington observers compared him, in his attitude toward Israel, with former President Harry S. Truman who first granted recognition to the new state in 1948.

Mr. Johnson exerted his power as Senate majority leader on behalf of Israel in a number of critical situations. His most memorable pro-Israel action took place in February 1957 when the Eisenhower administration threatened Israel with punitive sanctions. The White House was then exerting what Senator Johnson considered "one-sided" pressure on Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula.

Mr. Johnson summoned his chauffeur and drove to the White House. A heated session ensued. Mr. Johnson bluntly informed President Eisenhower that the Senate would not approve economic sanctions against Israel.

The outspoken Texan told the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and former United Nations Delegate Henry Cabot Lodge that their threats to impose sanctions on Israel were unwise and unfair. He was against "pressure on one side in a two-sided dispute."

Mr. Johnson called for a just peace, deploring the attempted "coercion" of Israel as a "method of settlement." He told the Eisenhower administration it had lost sight of the basic facts in the Israel-Arab dispute.

Addressing fellow Senators, he said that "contrary to widespread assumptions in the United Nations and in Washington, the issue is not originally the result of Israel's armed invasion of Egypt. The issue was raised by Egypt's long-standing insistence of maintaining a 'state of war' with Israel and implementing it by both guerrilla raids and a double blockade in the Suez Canal and Strait of Tiran. It was this Egyptian maintenance of a state of war and the exercise of belligerent rights * * * that resulted in Israel's military counteraction."

Mr. Johnson made clear his affinity for Israel after his election to the Vice Presidency. In addresses before Jewish audiences and during his visit to the State of Israel, Mr. Johnson left no doubt of the continuity of his sentiments.

As a Senator, Mr. Johnson fought to obtain for Israel a fair share of economic aid programs, noting that Israelis were forced to divert their own resources for defensive arms against the Russian arms flowing into Egypt.

Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on May 2, 1960, introduced an amendment aimed at nullifying the Douglas-Keating "freedom of the seas" amendment. Senator FULBRIGHT sought to shield the Arab blockade and oppose Israel's shipping rights. But Mr. Johnson arose with a motion to table the Fulbright amendment. The motion, coming from the majority leader, was carried by 45 to 39.

Mr. Johnson served as chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. In this capacity he insisted that individuals be afforded an equal chance for employment without regard to their race or religion. His efforts in this connection were cited by Jewish organizations.

Under the leadership of Mr. Johnson, the Senate recognized its responsibilities on civil rights and enacted the first legislation in decades. As a Senator he also actively fought "McCarthyism" and extremism of the right.

During his last year in the Senate, the participation of a few members of the U.S. Armed Forces in George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi Party came to Mr. Johnson's attention. In his capacity as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Committee, he demanded an immediate explanation from the Defense Department. Within days, the Department moved to have the Marine Corps discharge a marine who had joined the Nazi movement.

Mr. Johnson was reportedly vexed last June when Arab diplomats demanded that his wife resign as honorary chairman of an Israel Independence Ball, sponsored by Israel bonds, in Washington.

In a letter replying to the Iraqi Embassy chargé d'affaires, Mrs. Johnson stated that "I have, for whatever small value it may be, tried to be accessible and available to as many as possible, without distinction as to religion, race, or region, and certainly including all states of the Near East." She added that "I shall continue to do so."

The Iraqi diplomat had insisted on Mrs. Johnson's resignation because "the State of Israel is based upon the usurpation of another nation's land by force, displacing 1 million Arabs from their homeland." In her reply, Mrs. Johnson said "the easiest course for the wife of a public official would be, of course, never to lend name, hand, or heart to any endeavor charitable or commemorative."

The Arab diplomats in Washington charged that 13 Arab embassies had invited Mrs. Johnson to their social affairs but she had "not honored one of them" with her presence.

Members of Congress of both parties later asked the State Department to declare offending Arab officials persona non grata, and to expel them from Washington. The State

Department agreed that the Arabs were at fault, but said that drastic action was not in the diplomatic interest of the United States.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL, of Detroit, was among those who strongly protested against the arrogant attitude of the Arabs in their attacks on Mrs. Johnson.

Mr. and Mrs. Johnson are known to have given private support to Israel philanthropic needs. Mr. Johnson, on one occasion, while purchasing a $1,000 Israel Development Bond, told an Israel bond official that he thought highly of the bond undertaking, and had previously purchased a number of bonds.

The True Facts Are Always a Complete Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I long ago learned that a legislator worth his salt must grow a thick skin and learn to take abuse from the ignorant as well as from the malicious. Usually, the best course is to ignore such slanderous tripe. Occasionally, one's self respect demands that we take notice and reply.

Such an item appeared about me, written by one William V. Shannon under the title "District of Columbia Subway" and published in the New York Post of December 12, 1963.

I am happy and most grateful for the fact that our distinguished majority leader, the very able gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, upon learning of this diatribe against me, sent off a letter to the publisher of the paper, which speaks volumes and which is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1963.

Mrs. DOROTHY SCHIFF,
Publisher, New York Post,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MRS. SCHIFF: Permit me to draw your attention to the column of William V. Shannon in your issue of December 12, 1963, headed "District of Columbia Subway."

I believe in every columnist's right to oppose any legislation with which he disagrees even when I disagree with his conclusions. However, I certainly cannot be considered biased against the subway transit system for the District of Columbia as I voted for the bill both on a standing vote and on a rollcall vote as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will indicate. I favor the transit system. Nonetheless, I think it is grossly unfair to state that my colleague Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, who had an opposite view and who was backed overwhelmingly by Members of the House, was not honest in the presentation of his point of view, nor do I think that any of the 278 Members of the House of Representatives who supported him were acting with any ulterior motive.

Frankly, I do not think the article is fair or accurate. For instance the reference to Representative MULTER as red faced and rolypoly. He is neither. If that reference was intended to paint him as dissolute, it was both unfair and untrue. He neither drinks nor smokes. He bears the reputation among his colleagues as being a man of unusual personal morality and integrity.

The item then pictures him as aggressive, self-important, and humorless, causing him to be disliked and opposed by his colleagues because of his mannerisms. This statement also is both unfair and untrue. Mr. MULTER has the utmost respect and admiration from Members on both sides of the aisle, for knowledge, ability, understanding, accuracy, fairness, and kindliness—as well as good humor. His advice and guidance are constantly sought by all who know him. The prestige he enjoys among his colleagues and the members of his own delegation and in the Congress as a whole, is evidenced by the fact that he has served as Democratic whip of the State of New York for many years, in which role I can testify he has performed with outstanding ability and success.

While I was hopeful that the District transit bill would pass, I think it ought to be pointed out that organized labor supported the defeat of the bill if an amendment it favored was not adopted. Mr. MULTER supported the amendment which was rejected by the House and the bill was then recommitted by a vote of 278 to 76. I must emphasize both with respect to this bill and with respect to the bill to revise the ABC Act of the District of Columbia, that regardless of the views of any Member on the merits of either of these bills, no Member questioned the integrity of Mr. MULTER in expressing his point of view in strong language. No one to my knowledge had the slightest idea that he was motivated by any impulse except the public good. I have known Congressman MULTER and worked with him on many pieces of legislation in the years gone by. I am personally convinced that he is one of the most conscientious Members in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MULTER has long been one of those Members who has been in favor of complete autonomy for the District of Columbia. He has repeatedly offered the administration's bill for this purpose. He has remained on the Committee on the District of Columbia even though it has been a burden from which he has long sought to be relieved. He has been requested to stay because of his valuable service. He is a good soldier and has responded accordingly. In his capacity as a member of that committee he has made a record which includes not only his fight for the administration's District home rule but also among others the following important measures: the administration's tax program including increased Federal payments; improvement of educational and hospital facilities; improvement of the operation of the District juvenile court; prohibiting the unlawful practice of law; juvenile delinquency and crime deterrent bills; granting the privilege of confidentiality to clergymen; regulation of pawn shops and personal loan companies to protect those who must resort to them for borrowing; regulation of employment agencies to protect the unemployed from the unscrupulous; improvement of the workmen's compensation laws; improvement of the compulsory automobile insurance laws; urban renewal bills; parking facilities; abolition of capital punishment; municipal art council and children's theater; antisegregation; standard weights and measures; and extension of minimum wage laws.

In conclusion may I only for the sake of emphasis say that in my honest view there is no more honorable, nor more hard working Member of Congress than Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Sincerely,

CARL ALBERT,
Member of Congress, Majority Leader.

Some further facts on the subject matter of Shannon's maliciously slanderous harangue are as follows:

I introduced and caused to be reported to the House from the Banking and Currency Committee the administration's mass transportation bill in the last session. A similar administration bill was reported in this session of this Congress. Both bills include provisions protecting private enterprise and labor. Those provisions, and the entire bill, were supported by labor, management, and Governors and mayors from across the country, regardless of political affiliation. It was these same provisions that I urged be written into the District of Columbia transportation bill. The committee rejected both amendments. The House adopted the private enterprise amendment but rejected the labor amendment. The District bill was overwhelmingly defeated for several reasons, the more important of which are the following:

(1) It called for an expenditure of $400 million in the District of Columbia alone, while the mass transportation bill for the entire country called for $500 million for the entire country including the District of Columbia.

(2) The labor unions, national and local, were united in their efforts to kill the bill if it did not protect labor, both in the construction and operation of the transit facilities.

My view prevailed by a vote of 278 to 76. An analysis shows the following: The District committee reported the bill by a vote of 11 to 4. At least 5 of those 11 voted against the bill on the floor. There are 25 Members on the full committee. Only 10 of them voted against me on the rollcall. There are 33 Members of the Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve. Only eight of them voted against me on the rollcall. There are 13 members on the Small Business Committee on which I serve. None of them voted against me on the rollcall. There are 41 members from New York State, 21 Republicans and 20 Democrats. Only three Republicans and one Democrat voted against me on the rollcall. I think that speaks volumes in answer to Shannon's slander.

A word about the ABC liquor bill: This bill was the first attempt to revise the ABC law of the District of Columbia since 1934. It represented the best thinking of every segment of the industry and of a Special Citizens' Committee appointed by the District Commissioners. It met all of the valid objections of the Attorney General. The language against unfair competition was that suggested by the Attorney General. The opposition to the bill was stirred up by the local newspapers who were afraid they would lose some advertising if the bill as enacted contained a provision against false advertising. Although the bill as reported to the floor did not contain a word concerning price fixing the newspapers labeled the bill as a price-fixing bill which would push the consumers' cost up by $1 a bottle. That statement was either deliberately false or made with an utter disregard for the truth. In order to make assurance doubly sure, however, on the floor of the House (unfortunately with very few Members present) specific language was written into the bill prohibiting anything in the bill being construed so as to permit price fixing.

The article concludes with a snide remark about my having organized a bank on the Island of Nassau. Of course, he doesn't say that the Island of Nassau is in the Bahamas which is British territory subject only to British laws and in no way subject to the laws of the United States or of any State thereof.

There is nothing illegal, improper, wrong, or unethical about any Member of the U.S. Congress acting as a lawyer for or being an officer, director, or stockholder of a financial institution in the United States, and many of our colleagues are lawyers for or officers, director, or stockholders of such institutions. It is certainly more legal, more proper, and

more ethical, for a legislator to engage in such activities on behalf of a financial institution that can be in no way subject to the laws, control, or regulation of our Government.

I have been a Member of this House since 1947. At no time have I done anything to bring discredit or dishonor to this Congress, to our country, or to myself. I intend to continue to so conduct myself, as long as God gives me life.

Memorial Address to John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorial address to our late President by the distinguished mayor of the city of New Haven, the Honorable Richard C. Lee.

This very hall has rung with stirring eulogies to our lamented leader, and I feel that Mayor Lee's is a touching and inspiring as any we have yet heard. From President Kennedy's numerous speeches he has selected a few tremendously pertinent quotations, which suggest to us, as well as quotations can, the essence of the man. I wish to congratulate Mayor Lee on this moving address.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF RICHARD C. LEE, MAYOR, CITY OF NEW HAVEN, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY, WOOLSEY HALL, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1963

We gather this afternoon in one of the most solemn moments of American history, for not only has America lost its President, but the free world has lost a great leader, and we—the people of this Nation—have lost a symbol of all that is decent and warm, courageous and dedicated.

None of us in this hour of world tragedy is equipped with the simple eloquence which can express our pain, our anguish, and our sorrow. We can find comfort only in realizing how much he brought to this Nation, and with what courage and dedication he served the cause of freedom and democracy.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy; J.F.K.; Jack; the President of the United States; politician, humanitarian, soldier, father, husband, stateman; but, as well, an articulate and eloquent champion of the rights of free people everywhere.

His words have ringed the world.

Hear him now—January 20, 1961: "In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility; I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people of any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it, and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."

In 1956, in "Profiles in Courage" "without belittling the courage with which men have died, we should not forget those acts of courage with which men * * * have lived. The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is no less a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequence, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human morality."

And then, again, written as if to offer us now on this day of national tragedy, in this hour of our grief, these words:

"To be courageous * * * requires no exceptional qualifications, no magic formula, no special combination of time, place, and circumstance. It is an opportunity that sooner or later is presented to us all. Politics merely furnishes one arena which imposes special tests of courage. In whatever arena of life one may meet the challenge of courage, whatever may be the sacrifices he faces if he follows his conscience—the loss of his friends, his fortune, his contentment, even the esteem of his fellow men—each man must decide for himself the course he will follow. The stories of past courage can define that ingredient—they can teach, they can offer hope, they can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For this, each man must look into his own soul."

On January 9, 1961, as President-elect of the United States of America, he appeared before the State legislature of his home State of Massachusetts. In discussing the challenge before public servants, he summarized his own credo in these few lines as he approached the office which would lead, ultimately, to his death:

"Courage, judgment, integrity, dedication * * * these are the qualities which, with God's help, this son of Massachusetts hopes will characterize our government's conduct in the 4 stormy years that lie ahead. Humbly I ask His help in this undertaking; but aware that on earth His will is worked by men, I ask for your help and your prayers as I embark on this new and solemn journey."

But perhaps more symbolic even of what he believed, of how he spoke, are these words of January 20, 1961:

"And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

In the words of the Secretary of War in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, "Now he belongs to the ages." And we who remain behind, seeking solace, and comfort, and inspiration, hear, again, what he offered to us just 3 short years ago as advice and counsel:

"In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation,' a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself."

Everyone has his cherished memory of the President. Some of these memories are widely shared with millions of Americans. Others are not so widely known. I give you, from among my memories, one of his favorite bits of history, as he recounted it in one of his early addresses in Connecticut some years ago.

Then a Member of the U.S. Senate, he was talking of public service and dedication, of the necessity for choosing as elected leaders people who would lead, people who believed in the cause of justice and freedom, people indefatigable in their pursuit of that which was right and good and necessary for America. His words were these:

"Long years ago—indeed, in another century—this was stated well by one of the Founding Fathers of the then tiny democratic nation of Colonial States. The century was the 18th; the year was 1780; the time of the day was noon, when, suddenly, over the city of Hartford, Conn.—then a little town—the sky began to blacken, and by 3 in the afternoon, it was as dark as night.

"Many people of devout and passionate religious beliefs thought then that the day of judgment had arrived, and prepared themselves to meet their Maker. On this day, the Connecticut House of Delegates was in session, and some of the more religious of their members thought, in deference to this day of judgment, that the House should adjourn. But the Speaker of the House, Colonel Davenport, rose to his feet, and addressed the members as follows:

" 'Gentlemen, the day of judgment is either here, or it is not. If it is not, there is no cause for alarm. If the day of judgment is here, I prefer to be found at my duty. Mr. Clerk, bring candles and let us proceed.' "

Ladies and gentlemen, on Friday, November 22, the day of judgment arrived for the President of the United States. He was found at his duty. May he rest in peace.

Our Late President—An International Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the end of the 30-day period of national mourning for our late, beloved President. While we in America mourn the loss of a great citizen and leader, the world joins with us in tribute to a man whose stature knew no national bounds, whose concern was always for the dignity of man wherever he may be.

A recent article by H. O. Sonnesyn, editor of the North Minneapolis Post, contains two letters written by Danish and German students expressing their country's grief and shock over the assassination. Both are remarkable letters, revealing the deep friendship these nations felt for President Kennedy. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

PEN PALS SHARE IN SORROW—YOUTHFUL DANE, GERMAN, WRITE OF J.F.K.'S DEATH

Judy Gallagher, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francis Gallagher, 5400 42d Avenue North, Robbinsdale, has two pen pals, one in Germany and the other in Denmark. It was interesting to read the letters written by them to her after the death of the late President John F. Kennedy. The Denmark pen pal wrote his letter on the very same day he heard about the death of the U.S. President.

The Denmark pen pal said:

"I just only will tell you that I have heard about the murder of the President of the United States. I was the first in my family, I think one of the first in Denmark who knew about President Kennedy's death. I was lying ill in bed at this time. I tried to find some music and heard an American sta-

tion. The time was 7:52 p.m. and then the speaker said, 'Here we are with a special news.' Then it comes. 'The President of the United States of America was shot today.' My heart got up in my neck. I jumped quick out of my bed and ran to my mom and pop in the living room and cried that the President was dead. At first they would not believe me, but at 8 o'clock the news from the Danish radio comes and then they must believe me.

"I know that I can say for all the Danish people that we are very, very sorry. It is going to our hearts that a so beautiful, clever and busy man, who has done so much good should be dead right now. Mom was very near to cry, and there was being a remarkable silence in the room. The speaker who said it had trouble to say he was dead. The time is now 9:30 p.m. at the November 22, 1963. I think that all TV stations have broken their programs. We have seen pictures from the murder over the German TV. We are thinking of his wife and his children.

"I think that you and me are feeling the same. We must think a little of what happened."

Her German pen pal wrote the day after the assassination. He started his letter by addressing:

"Family Gallagher:

"It is afternoon stillness in a German province. The second night comes over Europe and the second night over America. It is 17.00 h local time, that is 12.00 h eastern standard time. Three snow-white candles are standing in my room. When it is 19.00 o'clock then I put these in the windows of this room, and I set these on fire.

"On this night at 07.00 I have heard a transmission from my hometown. The spokesman was the mayor, Willy Brandt. He gave orders that all Berliners put at 19.00 burned candles in the windows. And I am also a Berliner.

"With greatest dismay the free world, and especially the Berlin inhabitants, have received the message of the death of the President of the United States of America.

"John Fitzgerald Kennedy. In the Federal Republic and in West Berlin is ordered state mourning. All flags are on half mast.

"A great man went out of our middle. A friend of the German people. A fellow citizen of the Berliner. We can be very proud of him. To 03.00 local time in the morning I hear the informations of the Voice of America and American Forces network Europe.

"John F. Kennedy is dead. But in our hearts he lives on."

The German pen pal also wrote this line in German. We have spelled some of the words in the American way so they would be easier to decipher.

Judy's two pen pals are only 17 years old. We think it was indeed remarkable that youths of this age in foreign lands pay such beautiful tributes to the late President John F. Kennedy. The speed with which they conveyed their regrets after they had heard about the death of our President is also remarkable. We are wondering how many of us would have shown the same spirit these two teenagers did had the tables been reversed. We think it is a rather remarkable display of international friendship.

Tribute to a Great Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I noted with sorrow in the Washington papers recently that Rear Adm. Morton L. Ring—SC, U.S. Navy, retired—had passed away. He leaves behind a great record as public servant of the highest type.

Those of us who had business with the Munitions Board and prior to that the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy remember Mort Ring as a courteous, cooperative, and highly trained and qualified public servant. In testifying before the various committees on complicated subjects, he displayed not only charm but the ability to see the overall picture of national defense and fiscal responsibility, though he wore the uniform of one of the partisan services.

Admiral Ring's contribution to the progress that is now being made in the Defense Department is great, and his passing is a cause for grief to those of us who knew him so intimately.

The 1963 National Bellamy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1963, the Central High School of Chattanooga was presented the 1963 National Bellamy Award. It was the proud honor of Topeka High School in Topeka, Kans., to receive this award in 1961. A representative of Topeka High School, Lawrence Vogel, a senior, attended the presentation in Chattanooga this year and the text of his address follows:

NATIONAL BELLAMY AWARD

(Lawrence Vogel, Topeka High School, Topeka, Kans.)

As a representative of the 1961 Bellamy designee, I have been asked to tell you about Topeka High School. Organized in 1870, it is now in its 94th year. Located in a city of 126,000 people, it has been influential since its beginnings and until 1961 was the only high school in Topeka.

Reference and reading material is available through one of the best equipped and certainly the most beautiful high school library in the entire country. In an authentic English great hall atmosphere, students read and study from 11,000 volumes, including priceless autographed copies.

All Trojans enjoyed a proud day when President Kennedy presented the 1962 National Teacher of the Year Award to our own Mrs. Marjorie French at the White House in Washington. She is an authority on secondary mathematics and is in constant demand at conferences all over the country. Following this excitement came the announcement that Mrs. Dorothy Greer was recognized by the Wall Street Journal as the Journalism Teacher of the Year and was also presented a $1,000 achievement award.

Topeka High School graduates have won literally thousands of scholarships, including 63 merit finalist awards and 7 merit scholars. Topeka High School girls have been among the top 10 in the State in the Betty Crocker "Homemaker of Tomorrow" program since it began, and Jean Eberhart, now leading her class at Stanford, was the national Betty Crocker winner in 1960. In an enviable record our girls have captured three State winners and two runnerup positions as well in that competition.

Among our hundreds of illustrious graduates are the Menninger brothers, Drs. Karl and William, known the world over in psychiatric fields.

We at Topeka High are exceedingly proud of our building whose gothic architecture has made it a symbol of everything "far surpassing the average," and along with the Will Rogers High School of Tulsa, Okla., and the Berkeley High School in California, Topeka High was also listed in the Journal as among the top 25 high schools in the Nation.

Our flagpole is the fore yardarm of the historic SS *Constitution*, *"Old Iron Sides,"* which was brought to Topeka through the efforts of then Vice President of the United States, Charles Curtis, a former Topeka High School student. From it, on special occasions, flies our beautiful Bellamy flag.

Bryant, may I present you with a copy of our yearbook, an example of our fine publications which have won every honor possible on State and national levels, and a framed portrait of our school, whose gothic tower was displayed on the cover of the Southwestern Bell Telephone directory last year.

Statement of H. M. Horner Before Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD testimony of Mr. H. M. Horner, chairman of the United Aircraft Corp., before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower.

Mr. Horner is a distinguished business leader in the defense industry, and I think his endorsement of Senator HART's proposed Commission on the Applicability of New Technology to Community and Manpower Needs makes important reading.

It can easily be seen that United has long been taking significant steps in the direction of adjusting to a peacetime economy. I find these efforts truly commendable in support of national policy, as well as being just plain good business sense. I hope many of our other important defense contractors are following the same path:

STATEMENT OF H. M. HORNER, CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED AIRCRAFT CORP., BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER, SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, CHAIRMAN, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

Senator CLARK, members of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, I am H. M. Horner, chairman of United Aircraft Corp. I welcome this opportunity to appear before you. We at United are extremely interested in the committee's investigations into the proper utilization of defense industry manpower and resources. We are equally concerned with the effect on our communities, manpower and enterprise of the Nation's possible or sudden transition from cold war to peace. As the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has clearly indicated, Connecticut is likely to experience a relatively heavy economic impact from disarmament.

Let me say at the outset that United endorses the bill introduced by Senator HART

to establish a Commission on the Applicability of New Technology to Community and Manpower Needs. Though United Aircraft, like other companies in the defense industry, has fully demonstrated in the past its ability to respond rapidly to the Government's changing requirements, it would be next to impossible over the short term to convert our plants' specialized manufacturing capabilities and labor force skills from defense to wholly commercial and consumer products without severe dislocations. It would necessitate laying off personnel, terminating work with vendors and shutting down facilities to the point where we could support reduced operations on a profitable basis. The situation today is entirely different from that prior to and following World War II. Then, production of commercial products was drastically curtailed and manpower converted on a priority basis to defense production. Pent-up demand for consumer goods following the war permitted the sudden contraction of defense with only temporary dislocations to the economy. Today, there is ample capacity in being and manned for both "swords" and "plowshares." It is essential, therefore, to evaluate fully how our considerable technical skills and specialized capabilities can be channeled profitably into serving new and worthwhile commercial needs. Perhaps a brief review of United's present position and approach to this problem of conversion may be useful to this subcommittee.

As you know, United Aircraft ranks 25th, based on number of employees, of the 500 largest industrial corporations and 39th based on total sales. It is the seventh largest defense contractor in the country accounting for approximately 2.6 percent of the defense procurement business. Including our unconsolidated Canadian subsidiary, we have somewhat over 66,000 employees working in 25 plants, most of which are company-owned. The major portion of its operations are concentrated in Connecticut where our Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, Hamilton Standard, Sikorsky Aircraft, Norden, Corporate Systems Center divisions, CANEL and Research Laboratories are located, accounting for approximately 55,000 employees. In addition, we have a Research and Development Center in Florida and United Technology Center in California which are concerned with advanced liquid and solid rocket propulsion engines for the missile and space markets. United's employment in its Connecticut plants represents approximately 13 percent of Connecticut manufacturing employment. In addition, it is estimated that there are more than 15,000 employees in subcontractors' plants in Connecticut and 60,000 throughout the Nation whose employment is supported by UAC subcontracts. United has consistently maintained a policy of procuring from vendors a significant amount of its product manufacturing in order to benefit from vendors' special skills, to contribute to cost control and to make possible more rapid and orderly expansion in times of emergency. Approximately 80 percent of our business is under contract with the Government principally for the design, development and manufacture of such major aerospace products as gas turbine powerplants, liquid and solid rocket engines, environmental and engine controls, helicopters, electronic devices for navigation, radar and communications. These require the technical skills of close to 7,500 graduate engineers and scientists and more than 19,000 others working in our various research and engineering departments.

In order to reduce our dependence on defense business, United has spent an average of more than $30 million (3.5 percent sales) out of profits each year for the past 5 years for research and development largely aimed at exploiting current products and developing new products for commercial and all indsutrial markets.

United Aircraft has maintained over the years a preeminent position in domestic and foreign commercial aircraft markets which today accounts for approximately 20 percent of our business. It is of interest to note that we have more than doubled the commercial share of our business in the past decade. With greater utilization of air transport, both passenger and freight, we foresee an important increase of better than 40 percent in this business over the next decade. In order to maintain our position in this market we have developed out of profits a new turbofan engine which is being used to power the highly successful Boeing 727 commercial aircraft now going into service and will be used to power the Douglas DC9. We have also developed modifications of our standard line of gas turbine engines for other industrial and marine applications. For example these engines burning natural gas are being used for gas line pumping; equipped with free turbines and generating equipment, they are being used by several utility companies as peaking power units. They are also being tested for several marine applications. We believe that this gas turbine technology originally developed for aircraft purposes has many broad industrial and marine applications, and we are working diligently to exploit this market.

Three of the four domestic commercial helicopter airlines are using Sikorsky equipment, and these newer aircraft are able to operate economically enough to offer a needed transportation convenience to the traveling public. We expect an expanded use of commercial helicopters as transport vehicles and also for other commercial and industrial roles such as servicing offshore oil rigs, as a lifting crane for construction purposes as well as continued use as a rescue vehicle.

Several years ago we started the intensive development of fuel cells, as we feel that this energy conversion device offers great promise for commercial and industrial applications. The fuel cell converts chemical energy directly to electricity without the use of rotating machinery and at a considerably higher efficiency than the more familiar, conventional, energy conversion systems.

Within the past few years we have acquired rights from the Zeiss Co. in Germany, and we have developed and marketed worldwide an electron beam cutting and welding machine which offers manufacturers a new and better solution to many manufacturing problems.

Another extremely important area in our opinion is our development of microminiaturized and molecular circuitry for use in hospitals and health institutes. Utilizing our growing technical skills in the biosciences, we are working with the Nation's hospitals to develop products for the remote, continuous monitoring of various physiological conditions with no wires and little inconvenience to the patient, and to partially automate postoperative wards, outpatient clinics and special medical equipment. Such telemetry devices will be of considerable assistance to the medical practitioner and research scientist.

These are a few examples of the efforts which we have made within the limitations of our financial resources to expand our base into the commercial and industrial markets, so that we will be less dependent upon the defense industry. While we are making progress in this direction, it will take many, many years to supplant with commercial business the plant capacity and employment now utilized by Government business. If we had been allowed to earn a normal profit rate on our military business, we could have progressed further and faster in this endeavor. In this connection, it is significant to note that, although United ranks 39th among the 500 largest companies based on total sales, it holds the position of 380th based on profit as a percent of invested capital and 441st based on profit as a percent of sales.

In conclusion, I would like to say that a thorough study of the application of the new technologies to civil and social problems as proposed by the bill introduced by Senator HART should be helpful in enabling the national economy to adjust itself to disarmament. I believe the Government can initiate certain actions in the near term which can be constructive. For example, I believe the Government could provide more extensive support of basic research, develop expanded programs in the biosciences and those related to the improvement of the civilian economy, investigate new sources of food, and study the further requirements and consequences of automation in business and industry. In the area of aerospace itself, consideration could well be given to the full funding of an accelerated supersonic transport program, the logistic support for a permanent base on the moon, and the requirements for successful outer space exploration. Thank you.

Foreign Securities Tax Called Damaging to American Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a column in the December 16 issue of Newsweek magazine, Henry Hazlitt pinpoints the shortsighted nature of the administration's proposed tax on foreign securities sales in the United States. He points out the bewildering contradictions in continuing to give away massive amounts of foreign aid, insisting that this has little adverse effects on the balance of payments, and at the same time to oppose private investment overseas and to contend that such investment is a threat to our balance of payments.

Hazlitt points out that a large part of our exports are made possible by our private investments and that these are real exports that foreigners pay for. Exports resulting from foreign aid, he says, are sham exports that we pay for. Foreign investment not only promotes development abroad, but by stimulating our exports, it creates jobs for Americans.

Another critical discussion of the administration's foreign security tax proposal appeared in the Wall Street Journal of December 12. Under unanimous consent, I include both the Hazlitt column and the Wall Street Journal editorial in the RECORD:

[From Newsweek, Dec. 16, 1963]

AID—OR INVESTMENT?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Some bewildering contradictions have developed in our foreign economic policy. The Government wishes to continue to give away, for example, some $4 billion a year in taxpayers' money to aid foreign countries. It insists that this aid is having only a negligible adverse effect on our balance of payments. At the same time it is opposed to American

citizens investing their own money at their own risk in foreign countries. It contends that such investments are a serious threat to our balance of payments. So it has proposed an almost prohibitive tax on them.

The Government's theory is fallacious and the facts are against it. In the long run the outflow of American capital to foreign countries is more than balanced by the inflow of income earned by that capital. From 1958 through 1962, income from all private foreign investment amounted to $15.4 billion compared with an aggregate net outflow of new investment of $16.6 billion. In 1962 alone income amounted to $3.8 billion compared with a net outflow of $3.3 billion.

In a message to Congress last summer, President Kennedy called attention to this. "Our payments deficits," he pointed out, "measured in terms of our loss of gold and the increase in our short-term liquid liabilities to foreigners, have consistently been equaled or exceeded by the growth of our long-term high-yielding foreign assets—assets which have been and will continue to be an increasing source of strength to our balance of payments."

SHORTSIGHTED TAX

Isn't it shortsighted, then, to stop the further growth of these assets? Isn't it obvious that, regardless of any immediate result, the proposed tax must adversely affect our balance of payments in the long run?

It is clear from the very nature of the transaction that a large part of our exports are made possible by foreign investment. With the dollars they obtain from American purchasers of their securities, foreigners buy our goods. Our exports must tend to be reduced by the same amount as we reduce our foreign investment.

But though the Government objects to private foreign investment, for fear it will hurt our balance of payments, it insists upon continuing to give away some $4 billion a year in foreign aid. And it argues that this will not substantially hurt our balance of payments. A cut of $1 billion in our total foreign aid program, Government officials maintain, could save only $100 million in our balance of payments, but would cost us $900 million in exports.

It is hard to see just how the Government could go about proving this statistically. But to the extent that it is true, why doesn't the same logic apply to our foreign investments? Why are they a threat to our balance of payments while foreign aid is not? Why wouldn't cutting off $1 billion in foreign investments also cost us $900 million in exports?

LOANS CREATE EXPORTS

The truth is that it would. In the long run, in fact, cutting off $1 billion in foreign investment must cost us, other things remaining unchanged, $1 billion in exports. The real difference is that the exports made possible by foreign investment are real exports. Foreigners pay for them. The exports resulting from foreign aid are sham exports. We pay for them. Sound foreign investments build American economic strength. Foreign giveaway sets back our own capital development and economic growth.

The truth is the exact opposite of what our foreign economic policy assumes. Foreign investment creates exports and so creates jobs for Americans. It creates assets, and in future years must benefit our balance of payments through payments of interest, dividends, and return of capital.

Private foreign investment, also, really develops the countries into which it is put. For them it is wealth-creating and income-creating. It is, in fact, by far the quickest and most efficient means to their economic progress. And if a government, as in Argentina, is shortsighted enough to think it can seize past foreign investments in its country without killing off future investments, or even losing our foreign aid, it ought to be promptly taught the opposite.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 12, 1963]

WHO WILL WEAR THE HAIR SHIRT?

Treasury Under Secretary Roosa was taking sharp issue the other day with critics of the proposed tax on American purchases of new foreign securities. His comments took some curious twists.

None of the critics' questions that the proposal, which Congress is still considering, has contributed to a major improvement in our balance-of-payments situation. Because it threatens penalties on Americans who lend abroad, foreign borrowing in the U.S. market has slowed to a trickle and, for the time being at least, the payments deficit has been reduced. But many critics retain doubts about the means used to attain this desirable end.

For one thing, the critics sympathize with those foreigners who traditionally have looked to the United States as a major source of new capital. Mr. Roosa, speaking at a New York meeting of the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, brushed these worries aside. Too many members of the U.S. financial community, he contended, "wear the hair shirt for those (foreigners) who want to do more than their resources allow."

This, to say the least, is an odd view of international finance. It appears to imply a preference for some sort of international capital isolationism, with each nation forced to rely solely on its own financial markets. It certainly is at odds with the traditional American position of favoring free flow of funds among nations.

Even if one accepts the idea that capital flows now must be curbed, because of our payments difficulties, some critics of the proposed tax argue there are better ways to set up the obstructions. They urge establishment of a Government committee which would screen foreign plans for borrowing in the United States.

This suggestion got short shrift from Mr. Roosa, for a peculiar reason. A capital issues committee, he said, would inflict the "intruding arm of Government into private economic transactions." Yet the proposed tax just as surely controls private transactions, as the near-suspension of foreign borrowing here has proved.

Still another way of slowing down foreign borrowing here would have been to permit U.S. long-term interest rates to rise, thus making such borrowing more expensive.

This wouldn't have worked, however, the Treasury Under Secretary declared; it would have taken too much time. "We needed something decisive. The scale of action necessary could not conceivably have been met by a change in long-term interest rates in time to prevent the situation from taking a tumble." Hence, the proposed investment tax was—and is—an absolute necessity.

How did matters reach this drastic pass? Is the payments deficit some new emergency that had to be met by overnight measures? Hardly. The deficit has persisted through 12 of the past 13 years.

Even now, as administration officials concede, the problem is far from solved, and a full solution calls for more than Government tax gimmicks or other controls. The dangers of this approach were foreseen by Roger Blough, chairman of United States Steel, in remarks at the chamber of commerce gathering.

"Too seldom is any form of control lightened or eliminated," he commented. "The diagnosis is usually that the medicine is all right, you just need more of it." The investment tax "expedient" carries with it the possibility of a "parade of expedients, each one with less justification than the last."

A much better answer would be for the Government to overhaul some of its loose monetary and fiscal policies. A major part of the balance-of-payments deficit is accounted for by foreign aid and military spending abroad. It has become clear to many in Congress, if not the administration, that much of our foreign aid is futile and some of it is just plain foolish. A tighter approach to spending generally, which President Johnson has promised, would show the world that we do, after all, care about the dollar.

If the United States, instead, elects to continue the irresponsible policies of the past we, far more than the Europeans Mr. Roosa discussed, will be trying to do more than our resources allow. And if this leads us over the brink, who will wear the hair shirt for us?

In Memoriam: John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Patrick Joyce is a top newsman whom I have known for 17 years, our friendship dating back to 1946 when he was working on an article for the International News Service on the freight subway system in Chicago's Loop. Mr. Joyce is a resident of the seventh ward which has been my home for more than half a century. Prior to coming to Chicago he lived in Massachusetts and as an active newsman several times interviewed President Kennedy's grandfather, "Honey" Fitzgerald, whom he describes in a letter just received by me as "a grand man in every way."

With this preface, Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a poem by Patrick Joyce that eloquently speaks a sentiment felt by all Americans:

IN MEMORIAM: JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Patrick Joyce)

No man can know the measure of
His nation's loss, the wide world's love.
Are all the yearnings of his years
Lost in the tumult and the tears?
Peace for this earth, and freedom's breath,
Have they, too, died our leader's death?
Or, sharp in sorrow, shall we learn
Goals that he sought, we cannot spurn:
Hope for our youth, aid for the old,
Help for the hungry and the cold?

One nation bound in brotherhood:
This was the cause for which he stood;
A world of freemen reaching far,
To the remotest sun or star;
A world of good, where men could find
God and their destinies entwined.
Now is the time to dry our tears:
He was a man for all the years.
Bear high his banner, heed his call:
Make this his brave memorial.

Leading Economist Discusses the Nature of Our Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview on youth unemployment, Martin R. Gainsbrugh, vice president and chief economist of the National Industrial Conference Board, made a number of important observations on the nature of our current unemployment and what we can do to eliminate it. He points out, for example, that we have a unique phenomenon in our society of jobs that remain unfilled at the same time that we have a consistently high rate of unemployment. For several communities labeled as areas of "chronic unemployment," he points out that a high rate of joblessness is accompanied by large increases in help wanted ads. Mr. Gainsbrugh also points out that we lack and very much need measures of both the totals and types of job vacancies that exist in our economy.

Although he certainly does not minimize the unemployment problem, particularly as it affects youth, he points out that about 1 million of the currently unemployed have been without work for 15 weeks or more. Much of the remaining unemployment, amounting to about 3 million persons, he says, is frictional, a good part of which in his judgment is voluntary.

Finally, he makes the important point that productive employment for our youth could be satisfactorily resolved if principal reliance were again placed upon the profit mechanism as the chief instrument for economic expansion. Jobs have always been created in this country by stimulating more private investment and making it more attractive to employ people.

The interview with Mr. Gainsbrugh appeared in the December 1963 issue of Challenge magazine which is published by the Institute of Economic Affairs of New York University. Under unanimous consent, I include this important interview in the RECORD at this point:

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

(NOTE.—One of the most disturbing problems facing our economy is the high rate of unemployment among youth. It may grow even worse as those born in the postwar population boom enter the labor market at a time when automation is eliminating many jobs traditionally filled by teenagers. Martin R. Gainsbrugh, vice president and chief economist, National Industrial Conference Board, believes the problem "could be satisfactorily resolved if primary reliance were again placed upon the profit mechanism as the chief instrument for economic expansion." A grassroots program surveying current and prospective job openings, coupled with intensive training programs for young jobseekers, is another prerequisite.)

Question. Mr. Gainsbrugh, why is the Nation faced with an acute problem of finding job opportunities for young people at this particular time?

Answer. The heart of the problem is that by 1967 there will be 3.3 million more young people in the labor force than there were in 1962. The rate of growth in these 5 years in the 14- to 21-year-old group in the labor force will be double that of 1957–62. This large bulge in teenage population stems from the baby boom of the early postwar years. Back in 1940 we had about 2.4 million births annually. And as late as 1945 the figure was still 2.7 million. In the next 5 years, from 1945 to 1950, the number of births increased to 3.5 million and continued upward to 4 million or more throughout the fifties. With decreasing infant mortality rates, we were thus adding perhaps as many as a million to 2 million more births to our population curve annually in the first postwar decade than in the previous 10-year period. That baby crop is what is inflating our labor force now.

Question. About what percentage of our young people actually finish high school?

Answer. On the basis of the available statistics for what we call the retention rate, of an average of 1,000 entering grammar school, a little less than two-thirds will complete high school and about one-third of the 1,000 will enter college. This, of course, means that the large increase in the teenage population in turn brings a corresponding increase in those entering the labor force at around age 18, when, for the majority of teenagers, the educational process is completed.

Question. You indicated earlier that there will be 3.3 million new entrants into the labor force in the next 5 years. In view of this, how many new jobs are being created to absorb these people?

Answer. Over the past 10 years, from 1953 to 1963, employment has increased from about 62 million to 69 million. In other words, we created about 7 million new jobs over this decade. The problem of job creation was aggravated by many factors. One in particular is the increasing productivity of agriculture, which makes it possible to increase the output of agricultural products sharply per person employed. Agricultural employment has dropped by nearly 2 million over the past decade. What this implies is that the rise in nonagricultural employment was far more than 7 million. Actually, this Nation succeeded over the past decade in creating about 8.5 million jobs. In fact, comparing the fall of 1963 with the fall of 1962 we find that employment today is at least 1 million greater in nonagricultural industries than it was a year ago. And yet, I hasten to add, unemployment, as best it can be measured, still represents 5.5 percent of our civilian labor force, or in relative terms, unemployment is just as sticky now as it was a year ago, and far stickier than in past recovery periods of the same duration. After 32 months of recovery we have a higher rate of unemployment than in any earlier postwar recovery of like duration.

Question. How many jobs are permanently eliminated each year through the impact of automation?

Answer. Such official studies as have been made of the displacement effects of mechanization, or, to use a word that requires careful treatment, automation, strongly suggest that the displacement effects are too frequently overstated. The emphasis is all too often on the number of people who are thrown out of work without considering the jobs that may arise through the improvement of the product or the lower prices and wider markets that may arise through the economies made possible by increased mechanization. In other words, in considering the impact of mechanization, the economic arithmetic ought to embrace the effects of job creation as well as of job displacement.

Question. Have any studies been made on this question?

Answer. The latest study by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that the employment decline in manufacturing industries, where the effects of automation should be most pronounced, stemmed as much from declining demand for some of the key products in question, such as steel, as it did from the improved technology in its production. On the basis of this study, it would appear that the total employment decline among manufacturing industries during the period 1957–61 amounted to about 331,000 production workers per year. Of this total, 144,000 jobs were lost because of declining demand. Only 187,000, in the Bureau's judgment, could be associated with increasing productivity. It should be noted in this connection that the employment decline here relates only to production workers, and in many instances employment opportunities have expanded for technical and white-collar workers at the same time that the displacement of blue-collar workers has stepped up.

THE SERVICE SECTOR

Question. How fast have job opportunities actually increased in the service sector?

Answer. In the first place, in the manufacturing sector, mechanization as well as a decline in demand undoubtedly led to a decline in employment for all of manufacturing; that is, production and white-collar workers combined. Total manufacturing employment today is a half million lower than it was a decade ago. The growth sector of the economy, in contrast, is not in goods production, but rather in the providing of services to our service-hungry society. Within the entire service sector embracing trade, finance, personal service, and government, the total number of jobs created over the decade reached nearly 8 million—nearly 1 million over the past year alone. What compounds the Nation's unemployment problem is that the skill requirements of the service sector or of the white-collar jobs in the goods sector of our economy are not those possessed by unemployed workers who formerly had jobs in manufacturing or agriculture. So we have the unique phenomenon of jobs that remain unfilled at the same time that we have a consistently high rate of unemployment. It hasn't been determined as yet whether today's unemployment is primarily a phenomenon arising from too few jobs in our society or whether in fact we have a rising number of job opportunities and not enough skilled people to fill them. Our own work at the conference board in connection with the measurement of the volume of help-wanted ads clearly indicates that for several communities labeled as areas of "chronic unemployment, a high rate of joblessness is accompanied by marked increases in help-wanted ads.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Question. What is the precise relationship of a man's education and training to his ability to secure a job?

Answer. The higher the level of education of the individual, the greater should be the degree of ease with which he can find a job. In addition, his rate of compensation upon entering a given occupation and his lifetime earnings vary in proportion to his education. Let's take the high school class of 1961. Of the 916,000 high school graduates of that year who did not enroll in college, 80 percent entered the labor force. In all, some 730,000 high school graduates sought jobs and 600,000 were successful in finding them. True, this was a high rate of unemployment even for the high school graduate—about 18 percent—but note the contrast as compared with the dropouts. There were in that year some 354,000 dropouts—that is, young men and women who failed to complete their high school program. Two-thirds of these entered the labor force or sought employment, but only 175,000 found employment. In other words, almost two-thirds of the high school

graduates found employment in the year in question whereas only half of all the dropouts did.

Question. Was there much of a difference in their pay?

Answer. Those who completed their secondary education had, as expected, greater success in finding jobs and, again, at higher levels of compensation. It may be pertinent, too, to indicate the dollar value of an education over an individual's lifespan, to the extent that such values can be measured. The lifetime income of an individual who has completed just his elementary education may very well approximate $150,000. In contrast, the lifetime income of a high school graduate would come to nearly a quarter of a million dollars. As for the college graduate, his lifetime earnings might very well approach $400,000 or more.

Question. It has been said that our unemployment rate stems from inadequate demand as well as frictional and structural factors. Do you agree?

Answer. Again the terminology used requires careful development. By frictional we mean unemployment arising primarily in our society from the shortrun movement of individuals from one job to another, usually a better job. By structural we often mean unemployment of a longer term period, arising from changing technology or shrinking industrial or consumer demand for a given product. The sustained unemployment in coal mining areas, for example, is structural as distinct from short-term or frictional unemployment. The word structural, however, might also be taken—and occasionally is—to imply basic weaknesses in our economic system, thus suggesting the need for drastic changes in that system, in order to increase the economy's ability to create more jobs. I would depart strongly from any such conclusion. Over the longer run, population in the United States has traditionally been transformed into a productive factor, primarily through the market mechanism and particularly the profit incentive.

Question. How much of current unemployment is frictional and how much is structural?

Answer. Despite my previous emphasis upon sticky unemployment, the official figures indicate that only about a million of those currently unemployed have been without work for 15 weeks or more. This might well be labeled hard-core unemployment, whereas much of the remaining unemployment is frictional, and in my judgment a good part of that is voluntary. In the aggregate, the task of job creation we now face can readily be magnified. In past periods of high-level prosperity we have had as many as 4 percent of our people moving from one job to another, in other words frictionally unemployed, and have accepted that situation as approaching full employment. In the dynamic 1960's, with technological innovation more pronounced than in any previous decade, a 4-percent rate of frictional unemployment might again be viewed as creating no serious social or economic problem. Our primary target, then, is to reduce unemployment by about 1.5 percent of the labor force, or by roughly a million, particularly hard-core unemployment. This, however, is not meant to minimize our unemployment problem. The problem of unemployment among our youth in particular overhangs tomorrow's labor market as well as today's. What we have been experiencing thus far is the first few ripples of the tidal wave that will hit every local labor market in the years immediately ahead.

Question. Why is the unemployment rate among young people entering the labor force approximately twice the national average?

Answer. Again the answer to this question is not simple. What types of jobs do young people normally hold, particularly the dropouts? They have found employment in the past as operatives in factories or as unskilled laborers. This is particularly true of the males. Today a dropout who enters the labor force is confronted with shrinkage in his traditional job opportunities as unskilled jobs become more and more automated. The number of young males employed in agriculture, too, is steadily shrinking. As for females, their primary sources of employment in the past have been office, clerical, or sales work or as domestic workers. Here the current demand has not shrunk and this is reflected in a lower unemployment rate for young women than for young men. I think a related factor may well be the educational training of those who have completed their high school education. Many of the job vacancies exist in part because patterns of education continue along vocational lines which do not sufficiently emphasize the kind of training required in the service sector, particularly of technicians.

RESPONSIBILITY OF BUSINESS

Question. What is the business community's responsibility for alleviating youth unemployment in our basically private enterprise economy?

Answer. Industry is as desirous as any other group in our society of rendering tomorrow's citizen productive. Frankly, unless the youth of today becomes the productively employed citizen of tomorrow, the golden potentials of the 1960's will not be achieved. Much of the expansion in industrial capacity planned for the balance of the 1960's rests upon the assumption that our youth, as it matures, will find productive employment, and as it forms the families of tomorrow, will become the source of demand for new homes, new cars and other goods and services. There is also the prospect that unless employment is generated in the private sector, youth will look increasingly for employment in the public sector, and this could contribute toward further growth of what has been correctly labeled today's "mixed economy." Thus both as trustees working on behalf of their shareholders, and because of their desire to preserve what remains of the voluntary enterprise system, the leaders of industry are rightly concerned about the degree of youth unemployment currently prevailing and in prospect.

Question. What is Government's responsibility?

Answer. This responsibility was clearly defined first in the Employment Act of 1946 and again in the more recent Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Under these statutes the Federal Government assumed responsibility for creating ample job opportunities for all jobseekers. In connection with these statutes, the full use of the Nation's resources is pledged for this purpose, with the proviso, however, that the measures pursued must be consistent with the prevailing free enterprise system.

PROGRESS THUS FAR

Question. What has been done by industry and Government to date to help solve this problem?

Answer. While some progress has been made, I'm hopeful that much more will be done jointly by industry and Government. The figures on unemployment still suggest that progress has been inadequate. My primary suggestion here is that exploration of the problem be intensified at the grassroots level, that the communities themselves proceed to survey the prospective increases in their own labor forces and then determine as best they can what job opportunities for youth will emerge in the years immediately ahead.

Question. Where a gap is found between potential young jobseekers and job availabilities, couldn't crash programs be undertaken to expand local job opportunities?

Answer. A first step toward solution is recognizing that the problem exists. At the State and local level, as at the Federal level, creation of an environment that contributes to more rapid economic growth would be desirable. Where a marked gap exists between the supply of young people entering the labor market and the foreshadowed demand for their services, special steps might be taken to break down skilled job requirements as in World War II, to permit a better mesh with the limited skills of those entering the labor force. The community, too, could well devote intensive efforts to altering its vocational and educational programs, where indicated, so that the high school graduate of the future would bring to his prospective employer skills more in keeping with the job requirements of tomorrow's labor market.

Question. Are any such community programs already in existence?

Answer. Philadelphia has instituted one; Illinois has a governor's committee on unemployment already at work along these lines. I would hope, too, that we as a people would begin to devote more resources and effort to measuring current and prospective labor demand. As I indicated earlier, we lack, and much need, measures of both the total and types of job vacancies which exist. We also need to develop better foreshadowing statistics of prospective labor demand, in much the same way that such statistics have been prepared for capital investment or for consumer purchases. Industry as well as government could begin to give more thought to its future personnel requirements. Training programs could then be better adapted to fill future manpower needs.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

Question. How effective would you say are the efforts undertaken thus far by industry?

Answer. As I indicated earlier, the existing efforts are largely preliminary. Even so, they suggest that intensive efforts in this direction have a good chance of being successful. During a recent visit to Rochester, N.Y., for example, I learned industry there had contributed toward a modest retraining program of the unemployed at the Rochester Institute of Technology. They found investment in training technicians to have a high payoff in terms of the productive employment to which those retrained could be put.

Question. Do you believe that excessive youth unemployment will be largely eliminated or do you see this as a persistent problem for our society?

Answer. President Kennedy's committee to review the adequacy of our employment and unemployment statistics, of which I was a member, concluded that there were no unemployment statistics prior to the 1930's primarily because unemployment earlier had never been long sustained. There have been periods in the past, as in 1921, when there was a bothersome rise in unemployment, but these proved to be of short duration. True, the problem of unemployment was not resolved in the 1930's—we still had nearly 10 million people unemployed at the beginning of World War II—but I regard that and our dismal performance in the 1930's as a direct consequence of the economic imbalances introduced by World War I, aggravated by peculiar economic policies we pursued once depression set in, rather than as a sign of the onset of stagnation in the United States or as an indication of the inability of the free enterprise system to create sufficient employment to match the growth in its labor force. It may be a confession of faith on my part, but I believe that the problem of finding productive employment for our youth could be satisfactorily resolved if primary reliance were again placed upon the profit mechanism as the chief instrument for economic expansion. That is how jobs have always been created in this country, by stimulating more private investment

and making it more attractive to employ people.

Question. Has the administration taken any steps in this direction?

Answer. We have seen how such a limited incentive as the 7-percent investment credit for companies investing in new tools contributed significantly toward the prolongation of the current recovery, as did the recent liberalization of depreciation. The prospect of a reduction in corporate taxes is also making private investment more attractive, and that in turn would contribute toward an expansion in employment. Given a proper fiscal policy, I believe needed progress can and will be made toward creating productive employment for our youth. The individual firm, in turn, can contribute toward such employment by stepping up its rate of inovation and product improvement, as well as its expenditures for research and development, in the months immediately ahead.

Question. Thank you, Mr. Gainsbrugh.

Harry Truman Writes: Limit CIA Role to Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, another significant article by the Honorable Harry S. Truman appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, December 22, 1963. The title of that article was "Limit CIA Role to Intelligence," and as usual, President Truman shared generously his practical experience, as President, in running the Government of the United States and presented some equally practical recommendations. I commend this article to the reading of Members of Congress:

LIMIT CIA ROLE TO INTELLIGENCE

(By Harry S. Truman)

INDEPENDENCE, Mo., December 21.—I think it has become necessary to take another look at the purpose and operations of our Central Intelligence Agency—CIA. At least, I would like to submit here the original reason why I thought it necessary to organize this Agency during my administration, what I expected it to do and how it was to operate as an arm of the President.

I think it is fairly obvious that by and large a President's performance in office is as effective as the information he has and the information he gets. That is to say, that assuming the President himself possesses a knowledge of our history, a sensitive understanding of our institutions, and an insight into the needs and aspirations of the people, he needs to have available to him the most accurate and up-to-the-minute information on what is going on everywhere in the world, and particularly of the trends and developments in all the danger spots in the contest between East and West. This is an immense task and requires a special kind of an intelligence facility.

Of course, every President has available to him all the information gathered by the many intelligence agencies already in existence. The Departments of State, Defense, Commerce, Interior, and others are constantly engaged in extensive information gathering and have done excellent work.

But their collective information reached the President all too frequently in conflicting conclusions. At times, the intelligence reports tended to be slanted to conform to established positions of a given department. This becomes confusing, and, what's worse, such intelligence is of little use to a President in reaching the right decisions.

Therefore, I decided to set up a special organization charged with the collection of all intelligence reports from every available source, and to have those reports reach me as President without departmental "treatment" or interpretations.

I wanted and needed the information in its natural raw state and in as comprehensive a volume as it was practical for me to make full use of it. But the most important thing about this move was to guard against the chance of intelligence being used to influence or to lead the President into unwise decisions, and I thought it was necessary that the President do his own thinking and evaluating.

Since the responsibility for decisionmaking was his—then he had to be sure that no information is kept from him for whatever reason at the discretion of any one department or agency, or that unpleasant facts be kept from him. There are always those who would want to shield a President from bad news or misjudgments to spare him from being upset.

For some time I have been disturbed by the way CIA has been diverted from its original assignment. It has become an operational and at times a policymaking arm of the Government. This has led to trouble and may have compounded our difficulties in several explosive areas.

I never had any thought that when I set up the CIA that it would be injected into peacetime cloak-and-dagger operations. Some of the complications and embarrassment that I think we have experienced are in part attributable to the fact that this quiet intelligence arm of the President has been so removed from its intended role that it is being interpreted as a symbol of sinister and mysterious foreign intrigue—and a subject for cold war enemy propaganda.

With all the nonsense put out by Communist propaganda about "Yankee imperialism," "exploitive capitalism," "warmongering," "monopolists," in their name-calling assault on the West, the last thing we needed was for the CIA to be seized upon as something akin to a subverting influence in the affairs of other people.

I well knew the first temporary Director of the CIA, Admiral Souers, and the later permanent Directors of the CIA, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg and Allen Dulles. These were men of the highest character, patriotism, and integrity, and I assume this is true of all those who continue in charge.

But there are now some searching questions that need to be answered. I, therefore, would like to see the CIA be restored to its original assignment as the intelligence arm of the President, and that whatever else it can properly perform in that special field—and that its operational duties be terminated or properly used elsewhere.

We have grown up as a nation, respected for our free institutions and for our ability to maintain a free and open society. There is something about the way the CIA has been functioning that is casting a shadow over our historic position and I feel that we need to correct it.

In Memoriam: Justice Charles E. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is my sorrowful duty to report this day an irreparable loss to the bar of the State of Connecticut and the Nation. Justice Charles E. Clark of the second circuit court of appeals succeeded in his lifetime in achieving an eminence on the bench, behind the lecturn, and with the pen, sufficient to make him a respected authority in each of these fields; respected to a degree in each that would have satisfied a lesser man in any one. For this reason it is difficult to categorize Judge Clark. When we praise a man we like to refer to that accomplishment which made most famous, but with Judge Clark there are so many achievements to which we can point that we feel inadequate in trying to single out any one.

The newspapers identified Judge Clark in their headlines as the former dean of the Yale Law School, certainly abundant recognition for any man. I prefer to remember him, however, for his scholarly and tireless work in the movement for judicial reform. In Connecticut it is to him to a great degree that we owe our progressive circuit court system, a model system of which our State is justly proud. On the national scale his was the chief influence in the construction of the rules of civil procedure now followed by our Federal courts. That his influence at both State and national levels was so great is mute testimony to his deep understanding of the letter of the law, and his heartfelt concern for its spirit. "Due process" to him called forth visions not of the volumes on his library shelf, but of his fellow men, standing before the bar of justice.

Judge Clark served in his later years as chief justice of the circuit court of appeals, a post which he filled in a manner earning him the boundless respect of his colleagues and the attorneys who pleaded before him, successful and unsuccessful litigants alike. Approaching 70 he voluntarily stepped aside as chief justice to yield his place to a younger man, but he retained his position on the court bench, and maintained always that vigorous activity which characterized his whole life.

It was my privilege to know him personally, a privilege accorded many men because that was the judge's way. Still it was a valuable privilege, because he was the sort of inspiration to his fellow men that was not to be found elsewhere. Like others who knew Judge Clark, I shall miss him. But in his passing Judge Clark left a challenge to those of of us who mourn; a challenge to each to make of himself a bigger man, that together we may fill the tremendous gap in our ranks caused by his untimely loss.

CHARLES EDWARD CLARK, A GREAT LEGAL MIND

Memorial services will be held tomorrow at Yale Battell Chapel for Charles Edward Clark, one of the great legal minds of this generation. In 74 productive years he wrote his own memorial to his chosen law profession and to himself in office, college classroom, and on the bench.

Judge Clark knew his law as did few other men. Without law, fairly administered, there can be no justice. Without justice there can be no equality of man. Judge Clark made lasting contributions to equality for his fellow men.

This equality was assured in his decisions as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. He labored to perpetuate it as a professor and later as dean of the Yale University Law School. He pledged it as a young attorney in private practice. He put his philosophy in printed form so other attorneys could benefit from his knowledge. Books written by Judge Clark are in the libraries of every law school and most law offices.

Judge Clark knew the frailties of man and his tendency to err. He could detect innocent mistakes, quickly segregate them from premeditated and deliberate violations. He was a student of man as well as the law.

Judge Clark's face was normally wrapped in smiles. This smile was never more pronounced than on a sunny June morning last year when Yale honored him with an honorary doctor of laws degree. Also honored that day with an honorary degree was another outstanding American, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Judge Clark was a great jurist because he was a fine human being. This was acknowledged by all who knew him. No more noble tribute can be paid to a man who dedicated his life to justice and decency.

Regulation of Gunsmiths Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a letter to the editor of the Hartford Courant, Hartford, Conn., which appeared in that newspaper's issue of December 20, 1963. The letter is written by Mr. Terrance Hogan, of Waterford, Conn. He suggests that gunsmiths who mount scopes for long-range accuracy should be regulated as a way of curbing future killers. His letter reads as follows:

REGULATE GUNSMITHS DURING THE INTERIM

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

With all due respect to the highly commendable efforts of Senator DODD, it is doubtful that his proposed control of firearms traffic will stop or even discourage potential assassins as would a strict control and licensing of scopes mounted on high-power rifles.

While politics is the art of the possible, perhaps we should first do what we can to curb in a practical way all potential fanatics such as the one who shot our great leader so recently. Oswald's rifle was virtually useless for the job without a scope. It was mounted by a gunsmith many weeks before the shooting. As an ex-marine with plenty of combat experience, I know—just as most sportsmen know—that mounting a scope for long-range accuracy is for the highly skilled expert only. It would be a relatively simple matter to regulate the gunsmiths until the Senator's more ambitious legislation can be enforced.

Law enforcement agencies such as the Secret Service and the FBI should welcome this legislation. It would force future killers to get much closer to their intended victims. This would make surveillance a lot easier. High windows of distant buildings would not be the liability they are today for those responsible for the lives of prominent individuals. If Oswald's scope mounting had been routinely reported, John F. Kennedy would be alive today.

TERRANCE HOGAN.

Urban Renewal: The Failure of Federal Government Officials To Administer the Housing Act Properly Has Led to Rent Strikes in Cleveland and Other Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the rent strike which has been making headlines in the Cleveland, Ohio, papers should be called to the attention of the Members of this body because that rent strike is a direct result of the application of urban renewal laws enacted by the Congress.

The rent strike occurred in what is known as the Hough area in Cleveland. It is the area to which poor people were driven from such urban renewal projects as Garden Valley—a project which, by the way, is in serious financial difficulty.

The poor people in the Hough area are living in quarters below minimum housing code standards and are paying rents which should entitle them to decent, safe, and sanitary housing. They are striking to have their housing brought up to minimum standards before they pay the rent. They have been driven to strike by the failure of the city of Cleveland to enforce the housing code.

I am sure all of you are aware that the Housing Act of 1954 included a requirement that each city had to establish a so-called workable program before it could be eligible for Federal urban renewal assistance. One of the requirements of that workable program from its inception has been enactment and enforcement of an adequate housing code.

Obviously, the city of Cleveland has failed to fulfill the requirements of the workable program. Under the expressed will of Congress it should not be elligible for further Federal urban renewal assistance. But the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency continues to work with Cleveland and to make plans for further urban renewal projects.

To show you the extent of the violation of which Cleveland is guilty I need only to read the following two newspaper stories. The first is an article by Bob Siegel which appeared on June 22, 1957, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. Part of the article reads as follows:

GUION SAYS EXTRA $500,000 CAN HALT SLUMS

(By Bob Siegel)

"Slums can be stopped right now.

"An extra $500,000 a year for housing code enforcement can be the wisest investment in itself this city ever made."

That's what Building Commissioner William T. Guion said.

Guion wants the money to hire an extra 50 to 60 housing inspectors. With them, he promised he'll deliver tough enforcement of the housing and sanitary laws throughout Cleveland.

Guion and Law Director Ralph Locher emerged from a tour of the Hough area this week in full agreement on one thing:

The Hough neighborhood can be kept from becoming a slum.

PRODUCES RESULTS

A battery of building inspectors, thrown into the Hough district late last year and this spring, turned up more than 600 violations.

A full 500 have been corrected—because manpower was available to follow up each complaint.

The extra inspectors came from other deteriorating sections of Cleveland. But they produced results in the Hough area, where the tour revealed new paint jobs, clean yards and brighter homes.

To Locher it proved "where you put the inspectors in force, you get results."

Creation of a new department of housing and development to include building, slum clearance, and air pollution divisions is a good idea, Guion thinks. It could also include the health inspection division, he suggested.

"That way we could all fight slums with a single purpose," Guion said.

One major problem is a shortage of qualified inspectors. "Not enough trained men," Guion said. "I have trouble hiring as many men as I'm authorized to have now."

Guion wants a training school for housing inspectors, similar to the police and fire schools.

The enlarged staff would mean more administrative headaches, but more rigorous supervision of the inspectors, Guion agreed.

"But with enough men and money we can provide the tough inspection that stops creation of new slums," he concluded.

The second story was written by Paul Lilley and published on March 2, 1962, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It reads as follows:

SMALL HOMES IGNORED; BLIGHT CYCLE CONTINUES

(By Paul Lilley)

Millions of dollars have been pumped into some of the city's older residential sections during the past 8 years to save them from rot and decay.

Millions of dollars more were spent to raze hopeless neighborhoods to provide new, modern, safe, and sanitary housing.

All of these urban renewal dollars, city officials admit, have been spent as the direct result of the city's failure to enforce building and housing codes.

Year after year—at every budget hearing—code enforcement officials have asked for enough money to inspect small residential properties, considered the backbone of every neighborhood.

But, year after year, enforcement needs gave way to more popular demands for police, fire, relief, smoke abatement, airports, and recreation.

DECAY STILL GOES ON

Meanwhile, thousands of one- and two-family dwellings were allowed to rot beyond repair because their owners were not required to maintain them properly.

The same rotting and the same decay is going on today because enforcement officials still do not have the necessary funds to inspect them.

When the housing code was passed 3 years ago, 75 inspectors were promised to do a complete job of inspections—including those small properties which had never been checked.

Yesterday's finance committee hearing on the housing budget showed only 40 inspectors. Many of these will be assigned to urban renewal areas.

Charles Sheboy, housing commissioner, said he again would be unable to inspect the smaller homes. The number of inspectors allowed, he said, would only permit the recheck of the city's 20,000 multiple dwellings.

The only check of a single- or two-family house, outside of urban renewal areas, he said, would be made upon specific complaint.

If no complaints—no checks. The cycle continues. The city, by inaction, may help to create the urban renewal areas of the future.

Mr. Speaker, the rent strike in the Hough area is proof positive that Mr. Lilley's prediction has come true. Cleveland has failed to enforce its housing code. Slums have developed. The city has failed to do anything effective about them. The citizens have had to take the law in their own hands.

But where has the Federal Government been during all this time. I do not know what representations the city of Cleveland has made year after year in its applications for recertification of its workable program. But it is abundantly clear that the Federal Government has accepted without question whatever representations the city of Cleveland has seen fit to make. By its failure to insist on the enforcement of codes the Federal Government has made itself a party to the failure of Cleveland. It has violated the law as enacted by this Congress.

Under the Housing Act of 1954, the approval of workable programs was made a nondelegable function of the Administrator of HHFA. That program is administered from his office. The Administrator must accept personal responsibility for this failure and for similar failures which have developed in city after city across the United States.

This is a matter of utmost importance to the millions who live in substandard conditions. They look to Government to help them. They have a right to expect city officials to protect the minimum quality of the accommodations in which they live. They also have the right, under legislation which the Congress has seen fit to pass, to look to the Federal Government for help. When the help is not forthcoming the people lose confidence in the American system.

Time has passed when we can be complacent about these affairs, particularly when the families involved belong to a race already being discriminated against. We must demand that Federal officials take remedial action. Failure to act should be cause for their dismissal.

I include here an article from the Cleveland Press of December 11, 1963:

RENT STRIKERS GAIN IN HOUGH

The city's first rent strike in years apparently resulted in a victory today for six tenants of a four-story apartment house at 8503 Hough Avenue.

Their dictum, "No repairs, no rent," brought action on two fronts:

Plumbing repairs were begun in the 30-suite building, which has only seven tenants, by the Ross Realty Co., rental agents for the owner, Mrs. Lena Gordon, of 14233 Cedar Road, University Heights.

A city inspector was dispatched to the building to check on its condition, and especially to note whether repairs have been made as a result of fire damage in October of 1962.

The apparent victory for the rent strikers presaged additional strikes in the Hough area, but Miss Ruth Turner, executive director of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), said no new demonstrations would be encouraged until the present one is definitely solved.

She indicated a wait-and-see attitude to determine whether Ross Realty is proceeding with repairs in good faith at 8503 Hough.

"We have to operate in good faith," said Melvin Ross, vice president of the rental agency. "We have more at stake than this 1 building; we manage over 500 suites. We have to do what we say we will do."

In any event, the six tenants joining in the rent strike at 8503 Hough indicated through CORE, their representative, that no money would be paid the landlord until the repairs are completed.

Money orders for the rent were placed in escrow in a bank yesterday.

Under a tentative agreement reached late yesterday, this money was to have been paid to Ross Realty today upon start of the agreed-upon repairs. But the tenants changed their minds and decided not to pay until the work is completed.

"The work has to be done, rent or no rent," said B. Ross, president of Ross Realty. "We sent a man out this morning to start plumbing repairs."

Ross and his son reported that other landlords had called them, promising support in a drive to rid landlords of the hazard of renters who stay 1 month or so and then move on.

It is possible, they said, that the landlords will exchange renter lists so that a prospective applicant for an apartment can be scanned for his reliability before he is permitted to move in.

Melvin Ross denied charges by Miss Turner that he had threatened the six rent strikers or had implied that CORE was "conning" them out of their money.

"I threatened no one, said nothing derogatory about CORE in any way when I returned to the apartment house after reaching what I thought was an agreement," Ross declared.

The tentative agreement between CORE and Ross involved four points:

Extermination of rats and roaches.

Replastering to eliminate holes through which water leaks from top to lower suites.

Plumbing repairs to eliminate leaks and put balky toilets back in operation.

Purchase of more garbage cans to complement the one-to-a-tenant supply now on hand.

Houston (Tex.) Chronicle Editorializes Favorably to Foreign Aid and President Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William P. Steven, editor of the Houston Chronicle, which is one of the most highly regarded and widely read newspapers in the State of Texas telegraphed me today the content of that paper's lead editorial for this date strongly supporting President Johnson, as follows:

Congress shouldn't hamstring the President. No one favors selling American wheat to the Communists unless we get something of more than equal value to us for it. One possibility is Communist gold. Another is some concession making world peace more certain.

The responsibility for these negotiations rests with the President. The Constitution makes him responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs. To conduct foreign affairs effectively, he needs all of the tools for bargaining, not just some of the tools.

We have the feeling that the Congress is not acting for the good of the country in attempting to deny President Johnson the use of American wheat as a bargaining device.

If we have confidence in President Johnson as a negotiator (and Congress knows about that ability), and if we have confidence that President Johnson will never make a trade that is injurious to the United States, then the amendment to the foreign aid bill is of no use.

The Texas Democrats who have supported the amendment would do better, in this case, to support President Johnson, the first President from their State.

Christmas Message From the Silvio O. Conte Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to share with my colleagues the message of my December 1963 newsletter, which I plan to circulate in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

The letter includes a Christmas message which calls attention to the great era of communications in our time and contrasts that with the humble and holy message of "Peace on earth, good will toward men" which was delivered by just a few people in the period of the birth of Christ some 1,963 years ago in the hills of Bethlehem.

It also includes material, in case any Members missed the recent rollcall, which indicates that a great deal of work was actually done during this session of Congress. It will remain for the 2d session of the 88th Congress to continue making strides from the groundwork which has already been accomplished.

Let us hope that the new year will find even more and greater successes.

The message follows:

A JOYOUS YULETIDE AND A HAPPY NEW YEAR FROM THE SILVIO O. CONTE FAMILY

DEAR FRIEND: My report will reach you before the new session of the 88th Congress opens in early January. Everybody at our house extends to you our best wishes for a joyous Christmas, with fond hopes that the New Year will bring you an abundance of happiness.

How few mortals were privileged to share the initial joy at the Nativity of the Son of God. The Herald Angels sang their glad tidings to but a handful of poor shepherds in the hills of Bethlehem. The Christmas star guides only three weary travelers to the foot of His manger.

In our day, man's voice reaches out to every corner of the world at the touch of a switch. Manmade starts carry messages across oceans and far into space.

This Christmas may the perennial joy of the spirit of Bethlehem reach into the hearts of all men to form a bond far stronger than we have created with wire or electronic waves.

May the hope of "peace on earth" be made attainable by the acceptance of our present sorrows and labors.

May the promise of "good will to all men" be our goal for now and throughout the coming year.

To the disappointment of many, the 88th Congress has not completed action on two major pieces of legislation—the civil rights bill and the tax bill. However, it has been one of the longest sessions in American history and one of the most productive.

Through November 30, the session enacted 190 new public laws in 164 legislative days for the House and 171 days for the Senate.

For both Houses the production schedule has averaged better than one new public law completed each legislative day.

In addition there are now 11 major enactments in conference; and 13 more are through conference but still awaiting final approval of the conference agreements.

During the same months the session placed on the books a total of 107 private laws, adjusting claims and grievances of citizens.

The Senate, in the same period, approved a total of 66,294 Presidential nominations for civil and military places.

The Senate had 205 calls of yeas and nays, and the House 95. In addition the Senate ordered 54 quorum calls, and the House 114.

A total of 13,717 measures were introduced in both Houses. All have been enacted upon, or now have active status on the committee calendars of the House and Senate.

Only one veto came to Congress during the entire session, and that on a minor private bill which President Kennedy rejected because he feared it might establish a costly and dangerous precedent. (S. 1201.)

During the first 11 months of the session—one of the longest and most difficult in our constitutional history—the proceedings made 21,858 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These pages were divided 13,921 for the Senate and 7,937 for the House.

As the 12th month of the session opened December 2, there were 92 additional measures reported in both Houses awaiting final legislation clearance. Total measures passed through November 30 were: Senate 699; House 812.

As soon as the Congress recesses for the Christmas and New Years holidays, my family and I plan to immediately motor to our home in Pittsfield to spend Christmas with our families. We will all return to Washington on New Years Day.

My wife, Corinne, and the children join me in sending this Christmas letter to you. We are grateful for your kindness to us over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, 1963:

JOHN F. KENNEDY, 1917–63

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here today to pay tribute to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, we pay tribute to a continuing force among us. For the finest thing that we can say about the late President is that, in a very genuine sense, he is with us here today on the floor of the House where his admirable career had its beginning and where he gave his state of the Union addresses.

These addresses, Mr. Speaker, were model surveys of plans, programs, and policies of a vigorous young man who lived actively the life of the mind and one who attempted to fuse the ideal with the real into programs that were part and parcel of the great American tradition. Few people agreed with all of his ideas, but many people were to agree with most of them.

It will be the place of history to record how successful his brief tenure as Chief Executive of our land was and how meaningful many of his programs will become with the passage of time.

We can already say with certainty, for example, that the dream of the Peace Corps has become a reality. We do not know, on the other hand, whether the Alliance for Progress will develop into the kind of a program and demonstrate the great potential that it has. And on and on—these and other judgments will be made by the ultimately objective hand of history.

We can remember him now as one who believed in the career of politics and equated the word "politics" with good government.

This was true of the young John Kennedy at Choate and later at Harvard, and during his graduate work at the London School of Economics. Soon after his commendable career in the U.S. Navy, he was to go into the rough and tumble politics of the Boston area, an area that had been called an advanced school of political science.

The young man obviously was a man of destiny, and his election to this body from the 11th Congressional District in Massachusetts was the beginning of one of the distinguished careers in the history of American public life.

Few of us would have thought that such an amazing career would have been possible, but John Kennedy demonstrated that it was. And we can remember him with a great deal of pride for innumerable things and incidents.

It seems incredible to me that just a short while ago I had a wide-ranging discussion with him during the ground-breaking ceremonies for the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College in Massachusetts. He had come there to pay tribute to the poet whom he loved, and after the ceremony, we talked about legislation and he expressed intimate detail of issues which confronted the Nation, issues which were, in a real sense, his own plans for the extension of American social progress and progress around the world—the free world in which he had become the undisputed leader.

All of us have our own private prayer for the late President and for the surviving members of his family.

As a recent issue of Commonweal magazine so profoundly stated: "The loss of a President is more than the loss of its most important officeholder and the symbol of its law and order, as stunning as that is in itself. It is also the loss of a man—in this case—with a peculiarly apt set of talents and convictions for our time."

The editorial goes on to state, quite basically, that he was a man of our time, who understood the problems of our time. While we may have had different interpretations of how certain policies could have been executed, he stood squarely in line with those whose view of the world was broad, and not narrow.

It was one of peace, and not hate. It was also one of hope, and in summing up, I would like to quote from a statement made by Mark Van Doren, in Cornwall, Conn., just over the borders of the Berkshires where John Kennedy loved to visit.

Mark Van Doren, the distinguished poet and writer said, at the conclusion of his public statement:

"The oneness of the world is what we are now feeling; and fearing, if we doubt that it can soon enough be good, at least within the limits of mankind's capacity.

"But there are fears and fears, noble and ignoble; and the noblest fear is that which each of us can have lest he himself fall short of being as sensible, as reasonable, as steadfast, and as loving as he can. It is not for others to be these things to the limit of possibility. It is for ourselves, each one of us, whoever, whatever, and wherever he may be.

"Goodness," Van Doren said, and we all must agree, "begins at home. If it is not there, it may be nowhere. The clearest sign that it is there, the unmistakable sign, is our fear that we ourselves have not been all that we could be. This is a noble fear, another name for which, when hope and faith come with it, is humility. Hope and faith, and not despair, upon which fear can feed until it fills the world. Hope and faith, the final cure of fear; along with knowledge—all of which we can possess—and charity: the rarest, the most difficult, and still therefore the greatest of these."

My deepest sympathies go out to the wife and family of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Do Not Weaken President Johnson's Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of discussion during the past few days about the amendment to the foreign aid bill which some have described as a license to use American taxpayers' money to "finance the feeding of Communists."

I believe the time has come when we should put this entire debate in its proper perspective. I have the highest regard and respect for the distinguished minority leader who quite properly is fighting for points for his side.

I am sure that leaders of all the other nations in the world find it difficult to understand just what is going on here in the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, I feel equally certain many Americans find it difficult to keep track of what is happening here. But having said all of this, I should like to point out that, complex as our system of legislative government is, the fact remains that it works and in its complexity, it affords the individual American the greatest degree of freedom and human dignity.

While I have the highest respect for those who argue the amendment to limit the President's freedom in dealing in foreign affairs should be adopted because "this is the only way to keep American dollars from feeding the Communists," I submit, Mr. Speaker, advocates of this amendment are wrong. They are going contrary to the American Constitution; they are not serving the best interest of the United States; there is nothing in the bill that would permit us to use taxpayers money to feed the Communists.'

Let me reiterate what I said the other day here on the floor. The compromise language adopted by the conferees would make it crystal clear that we here in Congress are opposed to extending any credit to the Soviet Union for the purchase of our surplus wheat unless the President finds that such a sale would be in the national interest. The compromise provides the President must inform Congress and the American people within 30 days why he thinks such credits should be extended if indeed such credits are extended.

The compromise proposal provides such strong language that I doubt if any credits would ever be extended to the Soviet Union but the important thing to remember is that under the compromise proposal, we here in Congress have an opportunity to express our opposition to any credits to the Soviet Union without tying the President's hands in foreign affairs.

History shows that every time Congress has tried to write foreign policy on the floor of the House or the Senate, our Nation has suffered. World War II could most probably have been avoided if Congress had not written foreign policy on the floor of the Senate in rejecting the League of Nations following World War I. Thousands of American boys most probably could have been spared their lives because World War II could have been avoided had there been some mechanism for collective security such as the League of Nations. But no, those who thought they knew better, decided to write foreign policy on the floor of Congress. We have countless examples of similar experiences which have set this Nation's goals of world peace and freedom back because shortsighted politicians played Russian roulette with America's foreign policy.

There is really only one fundamental issue involved here this afternoon. This issue is whether the President of the United States shall face his Communist adversaries strong with the full support of this Nation's legislative body; namely, the Congress of the United States.

I am unalterably opposed to giving the Soviet Union any credit for the purchase of wheat or anything else from the United States. I happen to believe that the Soviet Union's credit is meaningless. But that does not mean that I have to support amendments which would tie President Johnson's hands in dealing with the Soviets.

I happen to believe as firmly as I believe in my Lord that Lyndon Johnson is a dedicated American whose only goal in life is to see the demise of Communist tyranny and the victory of American freedom and dignity. For anyone to suggest otherwise would be a monstrous assault on the truth. I stand before man and God convinced that Lyndon Johnson will give his life to see American freedom triumph over godless communism. It is a mockery of commonsense to suggest that Congress must place some sort of restrictions on President Lyndon Johnson in his dealings with the Soviets on the sale of wheat. Anyone who has had any dealings with President Johnson knows that Khrushchev has never met his equal; Lyndon Johnson can be depended on not to give the Soviets an inch unless he is convinced it will serve the long-range interest of the United States and the ultimate victory of American democracy over Communist despotism.

What a scandalous demonstration of weakness, Mr. Speaker, it would be for us here in Congress to serve notice on the entire world that we do not trust this new President who has inherited the burdens of the entire free world; that we do not believe he is capable of leading our Nation to the ultimate victory; that we believe here in Congress that only Congress itself can set down the guidelines which Mr. Johnson must follow in his dealings with the Soviets. I cannot think of a single act which we, as Members of Congress, can approve which would prove more devasting to our best interest as a nation and would be of greater comfort to the Communists who are determined to embarrass and destroy President Johnson—or any other American President—be he Democrat or Republican—than to adopt this restriction on the President's freedom to use all of the weapons of democracy at his disposal to bring about the ultimate collapse of international communism.

Mr. Speaker, I say those who urge the adoption of this restrictive amendment just have not read our Constitution.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, have they read the Export-Import Bank Act. This act clearly provides that any credits which the Bank underwrites must be secured by the party benefiting from the transaction.

Let us see for a minute what it is that we are talking about. There have been statements here that this legislation would permit the use of American dollars to subsidize the feeding of Communists. Let us put these statements to a test.

If I understand the act correctly, and I think I do, if an American grain dealer—using private capital—decides to sell American surplus wheat to Russia, he may ask the Export-Import Bank to secure the sale so that if the Soviet Union defaults on its payments, he will still recover his losses. He may also ask the Bank to guarantee or cover the sale, because he has to borrow part of the money to buy the surplus wheat from American farmers or from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The banks lending him money to purchase the wheat to sell to Russia want some sort of backing. This is understandable. So he goes to the Export-Import Bank. He must pay the Bank a premium to get the backing. And this is most important—before the American Export-Import Bank can underwrite this credit, if first will ask the Soviet Government to put up collateral which the American Export-Import Bank can redeem immediately on world markets if for some reason the Soviet Union fails to meet its payments to the American grain dealer who sold the wheat to Russia in the first place. The American Export-Import Bank actually makes a profit on the transaction. If the Soviets fail to meet their payments—and if they did they would ruin their credit on commodity purchases throughout the world—the Export-Import Bank first cashes in the collateral which the Russians have put up before it pays out any losses to the American grain exporter. This clearly indicates that should there be any losses because of the Soviets failure to pay, those losses must be recovered from Soviet collateral and not American taxpayers. To say, then, that American taxpayers are being asked to subsidize sale of wheat to Russia and in this way "feed the Communists" is stretching the truth beyond all scope of reason; it is the most staggering torture of the truth we have seen in this session of Congress.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Soviets have not indicated in any manner that they will ask for credit if they enter into a surplus wheat deal with the United States. The reason for their hesitation is clear. The Soviets would have to pay a 5-percent additional rate on the entire transaction which is the amount that American brokers must charge the Soviets because they must borrow the money from American banks to purchase the wheat in the first instance if any credit is to be extended at a prevailing interest rate of 5 percent.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, those fighting for this restrictive amendment have not been thoroughly frank with the American people. The Soviet Union has been paying cash in gold to the Canadians because the Soviets do not want to or cannot afford the 5-percent carrying charge if they buy on credit. The Soviets have indicated they will pay us in gold also. There is nothing to indicate that our own American grain dealers could sell the surplus wheat to Russia without charging the same additional 5-percent carrying charge. Furthermore, our late President Kennedy clearly stated that any sale of wheat to Russia would have to be on a "cash on the barrelhead and commercial credit basis." Thus the sale would immediately improve our gold supply and our balance-of-payments problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe our Republican friends should acknowledge that the American Export-Import Bank is controlled by the most businesslike group of Republicans you will ever find. The Export-Import Bank has never lost a penny on a transaction it secured since 1934. What makes our colleagues on the other side think the Bank is about to extend the Soviets credit unless the Bank feels absolutely secure it is a sound investment? Since when have the Republican businessmen who run the Export-Import Bank shown any signs of going soft in their international relations? The Export-Import Bank has had a fantastically good record of success and I doubt if it will change now for the Soviet Union or anyone else.

It appears, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this whole debate has turned around a struggle for power; a struggle for control of this Nation's foreign policy. Why do not our colleagues on the other side offer a constitutional amendment to take the responsibility of formulating foreign policy away from the President and vest it in Congress. But they will then also have to take the full responsibility for such a move, and the chaos that would follow.

Appendix

The Christmas Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials on the Christmas season.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN HOC ANNO DOMINI

When Saul of Tarsus set out on his journey to Damascus the whole of the known world lay in bondage. There was one state, and it was Rome. There was one master for it all, and he was Tiberius Caesar.

Everywhere there was civil order, for the arm of the Roman law was long. Everywhere there was stability, in government and in society, for the centurions saw that it was so.

But everywhere there was something else, too. There was oppression—for those who were not the friends of Tiberius Caesar. There was the taxgatherer to take the grain from the fields and the flax from the spindle to feed the legions or to fill the hungry treasury from which divine Caesar gave largess to the people. There was the impressor to find recruits for the circuses. There were executioners to quiet those whom the Emperor proscribed. What was a man for but to serve Caesar?

There was the persecution of men who dared think differently, who heard strange voices or read strange manuscripts. There was enslavement of men whose tribes came not from Rome, disdain for those who did not have the familiar visage. And most of all, there was everywhere a contempt for human life. What, to the strong, was one man more or less in a crowded world?

Then, of a sudden, there was a light in the world, and a man from Galilee saying, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

And the voice from Galilee, which would defy Caesar, offered a new kingdom in which each man could walk upright and bow to none but his God. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." And he sent this gospel of the kingdom of man into the uttermost ends of the earth.

So the light came into the world and the men who lived in darkness were afraid, and they tried to lower a curtain so that man would still believe salvation lay with the leaders.

But it came to pass for a while in divers places that the truth did set man free, although the men of darkness were offended and they tried to put out the light. The voice said, "Haste ye. Walk while you have the light, lest darkness come upon you, for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth."

Along the road to Damascus the light shone brightly. But afterward Paul of Tarsus, too, was sore afraid. He feared that other Caesars, other prophets, might one day persuade men that man was nothing save a servant unto them, that men might yield up their birthright from God for pottage and walk no more in freedom.

Then might it come to pass that darkness would settle again over the lands and there would be a burning of books and men would think only of what they should eat and what they should wear, and would give heed only to new Caesars and to false prophets. Then might it come to pass that men would not look upward to see even a winter's star in the east, and, once more, there would be no light at all in the darkness.

And so Paul, the apostle of the Son of Man, spoke to his brethren, the Galileans, the words he would have us remember afterward in each of the years of the Lord:

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

A TIME FOR MOURNING, A TIME FOR REJOICING

The official mourning now is over, the thoughts of Christmas uppermost. An unsettling, untimely juxtaposition; and yet it is not all that strange that a time of mourning should be so quickly followed by a time of rejoicing.

There is cause for satisfaction in the superb functioning of the institutions of Government in the wake of a crisis that could easily topple other governments. It is not only that there was no hiatus in the Presidency; it is also the way Government officials have pursued their tasks with, if anything, new dedication.

Some of these men, perhaps a good many, may leave Government in the months and years to come, but for the time being they are determined to do their best for the President of the United States. The constitutional concept of the institution of the Presidency, as distinguished from the individual occupying it, could hardly be more plainly vindicated.

Not least, of course, is the man presently occupying it. The whims of politics could have given the Nation one ill equipped for the role, though it hasn't happened often in our history. But whatever disagreements we, ourselves, have or may have with Mr. Johnson, we have no doubt of his abilities, no doubt that here is a president.

And however fragile the peace, it is nonetheless peace, unlike many another Christmas in memory. Indeed, there is a little more hope this time that it may endure a while, because of a variety of political forces in the world having nothing to do with sentimentality. We still live in the shadow of the bomb, but we are learning to live there.

The bountiful land was never more bountiful, though the poor, as it is said, we have always with us. The truth, however, is that the overwhelming majority of Americans are not poor in the sense that all history and most of today's world understands the meaning of poverty. The affluent society, some call it in mockery; we would not care to mock the blessings of well-being.

It is also said that our materialism shows at its worst in the commercialization of Christmas. Perhaps some of the criticism is justified, but it is really rather superficial. Most people know in their hearts, even if they don't say so, that they give gifts because they want to, because their loved ones are just that.

For this Nation is not what some supposedly authoritative voices have been insisting it is this past month, a nation consumed in hatred and rancor and bitterness; that is an unworthy caricature. A tragic event has occurred, but it is no more an index to American psychology than any senseless murder anywhere. If proof were needed, it can be found both in the ordered ways and the outpouring of tears this very month has witnessed.

And that, it seems to us, after a time of sorrow, is no small reason for a joyous Christmas.

Return to India: Ambassador Finds Vast Problems and Bright Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 3, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent article written by our former colleague, the distinguished U.S. Ambassador to India, the Honorable Chester Bowles, entitled, "Return to India: Ambassador Finds Vast Problems and Bright Prospects."

The article, which appeared in the New York Times of November 16, 1963, follows:

RETURN TO INDIA: AMBASSADOR FINDS VAST PROBLEMS AND BRIGHT PROSPECTS—HUGE NATION HAS MADE GREAT PROGRESS, MR. BOWLES SAYS, TERMING U.S. ASSISTANCE IMPORTANT AND APPRECIATED

(By Chester Bowles)

(NOTE.—Chester Bowles was named U.S. Ambassador to India last April, returning to a post he had served in previously, 1951–53. This article was written for the New York Times magazine.)

NEW DELHI.—It is imperative that Americans see the whole of India, with all its complexities, frustrations and promise; that, above all, we understand what its leaders and people are seeking to do and the nature of their successes and failures.

The most casual glance at the map and a cursory understanding of political realities underscore the importance of a viable India—with its population greater than Latin America and Africa combined, a rich and deeply rooted culture, a growing economic potential and a strong democratic commitment.

India's success or failure will have a major impact on tomorrow's world. More specifically, India is the only Asian non-Communist nation, with the single exception of Japan, that can become an effective counterweight to Communist China.

American interpreters of India may be divided into three groups. At one extreme are those who are so intrigued with India's rich past, so moved by the soaring concepts of Gandhi, and so excited by Indian art and culture that they are oblivious to India's poverty and to the serious obstacles to her success.

IN THE MIDDLE

At the other extreme are those grim pessimists who see in India only its squalor, its illiteracy, its apathy and bureaucratic confusion.

Somewhere between the two are those who view India in a more balanced perspective: conscious of India's difficulties, they are also conscious of its progress and strength.

Let us begin by considering India from the gloomy perspective of the pessimist. The first aspect they worry about is India's awesome poverty and rapid population growth.

On one's first walk through the streets of an Indian city the desperate poverty of the majority of the people is manifest. In recent Parliamentary debates, the political opposition maintained that the daily income of the lower half of the Indian population was only 4 cents, while the Government spokesmen stoutly asserted that it was not less than 10 cents.

The agricultural output of currently cultivated lands is among the world's lowest, there is very little more land which can be brought under cultivation and each year there are 9 or 10 million more mouths to feed.

The unemployed and underemployed number in the tens of million. Three-fourths of India's people are illiterate. Health standards are low; life expectancy is only about 40 years in contrast to nearly 70 in the United States and Western Europe.

LANDHOLDERS ARE STRONG

Despite courageous legislation, India is still deeply divided by caste. In what is probably the world's most stratified social system, the "untouchable" and the lower caste person must struggle against almost insuperable odds to achieve a position of dignity and economic security for himself and his family.

In many rural areas the concentration of economic power in the hands of landholders and moneylenders adds to the schisms in Indian society.

In the face of these massive problems much of the economic dialog continues to be focused on theoretical, ideological abstractions; political debates frequently center on such labels as "leftist" and "rightist," applied in ways that seem largely irrelevant to the real issues facing Indian society.

The second area of uncertainty that troubles many observers of the Indian scene is the diffuse and contradictory elements in India's foreign policy. Precisely where is India going? What do her leaders want from the world?

India is in continuing danger of aggression from Communist China, which launched a surprise assault against her in the autumn of 1962 and whose forces continue to maneuver menacingly along the Himalayan frontiers. At the same time, the chronic India-Pakistan dispute precludes a joint defense of the subcontinent.

Additionally, India's relatively indifferent attitude toward Africa and much of the rest of Asia has limited her influence and prestige, even among those who have most to gain from her success.

To compound the confusion, New Delhi's nonalinement policy appears to most American visitors to be based on a double standard which equates the objectives and policies of the United States with those of the U.S.S.R. In this context, it is often alleged that India's spokesmen take for granted America's willingness to defend her and to help, while being uncertain of precisely what the Soviet Union will do, they go out of their way to curry favor with the Soviets.

TWELVE MAJOR LANGUAGES

The third area of uncertainty in India that often attracts the attention of the pessimist is the complexity of Federal-State relations and the multiplicity of Indian languages. There are 12 major languages in India and only half of the population understands the national language—Hindi. The resulting centrifugal tendencies in Indian policies are strong; indeed, some of the pessimists have predicted that sooner or later the Indian Union will come apart at the seams.

Even the most friendly observer who totals up this drab inventory of India's liabilities, without reference to India's successes on the other side of the balance sheet, may emerge as a confirmed pessimist. However, when we turn from the problems yet to be overcome to consider the great distance India has traveled since independence and the massive gains now being made, the scene comes into sharper and vastly more favorable focus.

Let us first consider India's economic gains. In the last decade, India's national income has increased by more than 40 percent and the rate of savings and investment has roughly doubled. Overall industrial production is now twice what it was in 1953, steel output has tripled and electric power output has quadrupled.

In chemicals, machinery, fertilizer, coal, cement and a host of other products, the base has been laid for a modern industrial state; in many key products, large-scale output is already underway.

Anyone who has watched India's bootstrap struggle since independence cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that it is now Indian engineers who design, build, and operate the vast hydroelectric, steam, and even nuclear-power projects, that about 90 percent of the components of Indian-produced trucks are manufactured in India, and that, while India was one of the first nations outside of Britain, the United States and the U.S.S.R. to sign the test ban treaty, Indian scientists are acknowledged to have had the capacity to produce a nuclear explosion well in advance of China if their Government had so decided.

In agriculture, progress has been substantial. Food grain production has increased by about 50 percent. Although there are 70 million more people than 10 years ago the average Indian receives roughly 200 calories more each day.

YIELDS INCREASE

Already the possessors of the largest irrigated areas in the world, the Indians have brought 20 million additional acres under water in the past 10 years. Eighteen million acres more—an area larger than Michigan—are scheduled for irrigation in the current 5-year plan.

In several states, per-acre yields are steadily rising as farmers learn to use chemical fertilizers, better seeds, and improved irrigation techniques.

In addition to agricultural and industrial achievements, India has been making extraordinary gains in the fields of public health and education. For example, malaria cases, which numbered 75 million annually in 1953, have dropped to less than 100,000 under the impact of an extraordinarily well-organized nationwide eradication campaign originally sparked by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Life expectancy has increased from about 27 years to over 40; infant mortality rates have dropped by 50 percent. Four thousand medical doctors are now graduating each year from India's 72 medical schools.

To check the massive increase in population which these life-giving measures are producing, India has embarked upon the world's most ambitious population-control program—a program Indian officials describe as "the very center of planned development."

The number of family planning clinics, which totaled 144, 7 years ago, has increased to 8,504; most of them are in rural areas. By 1966 some 4,000 new clinics will have been added.

Twenty million posters and 60 million pamphlets have been distributed on the subject of family planning. All medical school and nursing school graduates now receive training in the essential techniques.

FORECAST ON POPULATION

Moreover, there is some evidence, admittedly uncertain, that the effort is already showing results. The national birth rate, which averaged 48 per thousand in 1931, has dropped to 40. Moreover, in Bombay, where a vigorous program has been in effect for several years, the rate is down to 28 per thousand. In rural areas, intensive pilot programs have resulted in a decline in birth rates by as much as 30 percent.

Although the skeptics are doubtful, Indian planners and U.S. advisers working through the Ford Foundation feel there is a reasonable chance that India's population may begin to balance out in the 1970's with a birth rate of 25 per thousand and a death rate of 20.

The education of this vast population will, of course, be an essential key to India's development effort. Although the problem is awesomely great, nearly 70 percent of Indian children under 12 are now in school. Since 1953, literacy has been increased from 10 percent to over 25 percent.

In this same period, the number of students in high school and college has doubled; the University of Calcutta alone has an enrollment of 114,000. The increase in the number of graduates from the engineering, medical and other professional schools is particularly impressive.

In regard to the pessimists' second basis for concern, the uncertain course of India's national policies, it is fair to suggest that in today's mixed-up world such uncertainty is not limited to India. In such established societies as France, Russia, the United Kingdom and Brazil, we see a profound national soul searching.

"DREAM WORLD" CRUMBLES

Indeed, in our own United States many frustrated opposition leaders seem to be arguing that the time has come to reverse the policies which have brought the U.S.S.R. to the negotiating table and the world at least one step closer to peace.

On the positive side of the ledger, India a year ago came quickly and sharply out of its "dream world," as Mr. Nehru described it, and responded realistically to the Chinese aggression. Regardless of the popular phraseology, her Government is no longer nonaligned with respect to Red China.

Moreover, India recognizes the importance and vulnerability of southeast Asia; she is beginning to see her stake in helping her neighbors, such as Nepal, stand against aggressive Chinese designs.

Now let us turn to the pessimists' third basis for concern: India's extraordinary complexity and deep-seated regional differences. A comparison between India's accomplishments and Europe's hopes may help to put this particular worry in a more realistic perspective.

India's population is slightly greater than Europe's without Russia. If we should suddenly wake up to read that Europe had acheived unity comparable with that of India, with a single Prime Minister, a single Parliament, a single set of internal laws, with a common market and a common constitution, the event would be hailed as a modern political miracle.

Instead of worrying about the difficulty of Portuguese communicating with Greek or the cultural gap between the Italian and the Irish, or the fact that no one European language could be understood by more than half the people, there would be rejoicing and acclaim for the extraordinary opportunity that this vast merger of diverse nations had opened up for everyone concerned.

Yet when the pessimists consider India they see not the remarkable unity of more

than 450 million people in 15 States under a common government that provides a basis for growing political and economic strength, but the differences which it is assumed will at some point fragment the whole.

Similarly, when these observers see the give-and-take of Indian politics, the deep-rooted differences within the Congress party and the rise of new leaders to challenge the old, they sense not the free-wheeling vigor of a democratic society but the weakness of disunity.

This identity is reflected in the remarks of a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court who once told me that he felt more at home in Indian courts of law than in those of any other country in the world.

On balance, India's record since independence has been extraordinarily impressive and promising. Yet, despite prodigious work and sacrifice by the Indian people, these accomplishments would have been impossible without generous American (and other foreign) help, as most Indians are quick to say.

In the last 10 years, the United States alone has given over $5 billion of economic assistance, half of it in loans and grants and half in "surplus" agricultural products. On the average, one shipload of American farm produce has left U.S. ports for India every day; in total, we have been contributing about 4 percent of India's grain supply.

When the power facilities being constructed in the current 5-year plan are completed, the United States will have contributed about half of India's total electric power capacity. We have provided hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of railroad equipment, heavy machinery, and vital raw materials.

We are training over 3,500 Indians in our country every year and have helped train many times that number through American technical-assistance personnel in India.

In addition, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and other private American institutions have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of equipment and technical guidance.

Wherever you go in India the results of this outpouring of American assistance and skill are evident. Indeed, when the history of these decades is written, I believe it will be said that American economic development policies have been more effective in India than in any other developing country.

In the matter of defense, recent U.S. efforts to assist India have also been substantial.

INDIA APPRECIATES AID

With American and British help, the Indian Air Force is being strengthened.

Although economic aid cannot be expected to win us first prize in a global popularity contest, there is clear evidence that India understands and appreciates the friendship and support the United States has given her.

In recent studies of public attitudes, for example, more than 90 percent of the Indian people expressed the hope and belief that their country would cooperate more closely with the United States. Only 16 percent expressed similar views in regard to the Soviet Union, less than 1 percent in regard to Communist China.

What about the future?

There is no doubt that the people of the United States who have made such sustained efforts since World War II to help create a more stable and peaceful world have an enormous stake in what happens in India. If India succeeds in developing her economy by democratic means and maintaining her political stability under Communist pressure, it will be a vindication of everything America has been trying to do.

And right now, pessimists to the contrary, the outlook is increasingly favorable.

Automation in Industry—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz Sets Forth Facts—The Charleston Gazette Calls for Public Works Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at this Christmas season, and as we approach the new year 1964, it is important that we keep before us the fact that we have problems as well as blessings and reasons to be grateful. We must be determined that we shall not brush aside the conditions of change induced by technological advancements but, rather, that we will be resourceful and aggressive in seeking solutions.

As was stated so ably by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz recently:

The most dangerous myth in immediate times is that machines produce as many jobs for men as they destroy and therefore represents no threat to workers.

I agree with Secretary Wirtz that—

This is a half-truth, and, therefore, a half-lie. The truth is that machines permit the extension of men's work activities. The implied lie is that this will happen automatically or without the exercise of full human responsibility.

In the distinguished Labor Secretary's speech from which I quote—an address prepared for a midyear commencement at the University of Michigan—Mr. Wirtz declared that—

Any philosophy or policy about automation must necessarily start from clear recognition that unrestrained technological advance is not only inexorable, but essential to the maintenance and elevation of the standard of living. Full employment in this country is completely dependent on our being more efficient producers than our competitors in a world where the competition is tougher every day. The alternative to automation would be economic stagnation. * * *

Machines now have, in general, a high school education, in the sense that they can do most jobs that a high school education qualifies people to do. So machines will get the unskilled jobs, because they work for less than living wages. Machines are, in the most real sense, responsible for putting uneducated people out of work.

The answers are not to smash the machines. They are to recognize that the individual versus the machine is as unfair a match today as the individual versus the corporation was in the last century, and the advancing technology requires the exercise of collective—public and private—responsibility for its effects and collective measures to carry out this responsibility.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor has provided us with a cogent statement of why people today are haunted by the "specter of becoming robots," and he is forthright in admonishing us to "recognize that the individual versus the machine is an unfair match."

The human factors behind the problems of advancing technology as expressed especially by progress in automation are part and parcel of the unemployment figures of our Nation. This is brought to our attention forcefully and clearly by an editorial, "Only Crash Programs Can Help Unemployed," in the December 21, 1963, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, in which it points out:

The unemployment figure for November is in, and it is by no means reassuring—almost 6 percent—in round totals 4,292,000 workers or 115,000 more unemployed than in January of this year.

The Gazette editorial asserts further:

The paradox is the unprecedented prosperity for approximately 80 percent of the population, while 20 percent or more than 30 million Americans, according to Federal statisticians, are living in poverty.

I agree with the Gazette that—

The quickest, surest, and admittedly the most expedient way to assist these forgotten and forsaken is to trigger a huge public works program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the thought-provoking editorial to which I have made reference and from which I have quoted briefly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY CRASH PROGRAMS CAN HELP UNEMPLOYED

"The foreign front," writes James Reston in a recent column, "was Kennedy's major problem but the home front is likely to be Johnson's, and the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the 'slum war' is likely to be more urgent with every passing month."

The unemployment figure for November is in, and it is by no means reassuring. Almost 6 percent (5.9 percent to be exact) of the Nation's work force is idle. In round totals the figure is 4,292,000 workers or 115,000 more unemployed than in January of this year.

The paradox is the unprecedented prosperity for approximately 80 percent of the population, while 20 percent or more than 30 million Americans, according to Federal statisticians, are living in poverty.

How to bring this 20 percent into the mainstream of American life, thus guaranteeing to this helpless minority a meaningful stake in the economy, is the dilemma confronting the Johnson administration.

Allocating defense reductions to alleviate their plight—and surely substantial slashes in defense expenditures can be achieved without impairing in the least the national capacity to wage total war—is undoubtedly part of the answer.

But, as Reston notes, simply transferring funds from one account to another isn't the solution it appears to be at first acquaintance. Cutbacks in defense will mean job losses among the employed, and the long-term interest isn't accommodated by elevating unemployed at the expense of those already employed. Therefore, cutbacks must be softened by reconversion efforts.

Conversion of defense projects, however, will take time and the dreadful status of the Nation's neglected calls for immediate action. Their humiliating condition—an awful blotch upon the character of a nation which boasts of its constant concern for all its citizens—will hardly wait for reconversion to have been proved successful, so that the Government can then take up the next priority. Thier needs are now, and they shriek for attention.

Obviously, the quickest, surest, and admittedly the most expedient way to assist

these forgotten and forsaken is to trigger a huge public works program in the Nation's cities, where the greatest needs exist. The United States is no longer an agrarian nation. It is urban, and no city of any size lacks a significant slum area with despairing, ghettoized inhabitants and appalling problems of housing, education, diet, crime, and disease.

Reconversion can assist the employed, but only crash programs and revolutionary measures can help today's unemployed.

Editor Replies to Rightwing Columnist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the hate network that broadcasts thousands of messages by extreme rightwing radicals many syndicate columnists add to the confusion which threatens representative government.

Bob Gerhart, editor of the New Era, an AFL–CIO newspaper published in Reading, Pa., gives a fitting reply to one of these syndicated columnists in her defense of rightwing reaction:

EDITOR REPLIES

Something I wrote immediately after President Kennedy's assassination got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, thanks to Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES. Little did I expect that from that august tome my words would find their way into a nationally syndicated column written by one Edith Kermit Roosevelt and published last Sunday in the Philadelphia Bulletin. Yet, they did, thus providing me with material for this column.

As you can well imagine, a syndicated conservative columnist—even with the name Roosevelt—would hardly select the New Era of Reading, Pa., as a journalistic bosom buddy. Nor have I held my breath over the years in anticipation of gold-leafed awards for extolling the likes of Robert Welch and BARRY GOLDWATER. So I was not chagrined to read that Columnist Roosevelt disapproved of what I wrote.

Here is the paragraph which she picked out of "Closed Shop Talk" as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of the eulogy by Members of the House of Representatives for the late and beloved President John F. Kennedy: "Discussing the issues is no longer the American way. All you do today is call the other guy a crook and then lump everyone on his side together and you have a formula for winning elections. And is it merely a coincidence that this is the method employed by one of our major parties consistently to achieve power and control at local, State, and national levels?"

Miss or Mrs. Roosevelt (she doesn't say which and she apparently is a lackluster unknown in the writing business) then declares that my comments above refer "to the Goldwaters * * *" rather than to those of liberal persuasion in the Congress. She specifically chastises Republican Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, for speaking out against the "unadulterated venom spewed by out and out crackpots for paranois and profit." Miss (or Mrs.) Roosevelt says that I am critical of the Goldwaters but not of the Kuchels.

Now this raises an interesting point. In the first place, the paragraph she picked from my new era column was removed completely from context. My comment about calling "the other guy a crook and then" lumping everyone on his side into a neat package was a specific reference to the Republican tactics in the last municipal and countywide election.

And whether Miss (or Mrs.) Edith Kermit Roosevelt likes it or not, Republicans in Reading and Berks County did use McCarthyite "guilt by association" techniques to win the election.

Implied in her column is the thought that the radical right may assail an individual's character, attack personalities, question motives of elected leaders, and generally excoriate those who believe in humanitarian legislation—without fear of rebuttal from those under attack. Somehow, this is part of a widespread psychology in which certain economic, political and social positions are approved by the opinionmaking community (sometimes known as the establishment) and anyone who challenges them is a rebel, radical or a combination of both.

No matter what this high priced Sunday Bulletin columnist says, there is a wealth of evidence that the hatred and bitterness rampant in high places in recent months and years is not accidental but is the outpouring of a well-financed corps of practitioners with hate in their hearts. They turn out statements, radio broadcasts, brochures, lectures, magazines, and newspaper ads, the very roots of which are nurtured in rightwing manure.

Can anyone deny that probably the best example of what I am saying was the full page advertisement which the American Factfinding Committee ran in the Dallas Morning News the day of President Kennedy's assassination? This was the venomous ad which sought to imply that Kennedy and his policies were communistic in nature. Do you think I'm stretching this? Judge for yourself. Here are some of the questions asked of the President in the ad: Why had Gus Hall, Communist leader, "praised everyone of your policies and announced that the (Communist) Party would endorse and support your reelection in 1964?" and "Why have you scrapped the Monroe Doctrine in favor of the spirit of Moscow?" If these questions aren't deliberately worded to imply Kennedy was soft on communism if not an outright Communist, I'd like someone to explain it otherwise.

Questions in the ad were of the "When did you stop beating your wife?" caliber. They were mealy mouthed, filled with weasel words, and cleverly contrived to create a point of view without flatly stating it. But tragically, they did help create a climate in which a warped mind such as Oswald's could pull the trigger perhaps with a feeling of encouragement and sanction. For the rightwingers now to say that they were fighting people like Oswald is to skirt the fundamental issue entirely. So was Kennedy fighting Communists.

There are those of us who, by reading the history of the great depression of the 1930's, find that economic conditions spawned a domestic breed of commies. With millions unemployed, children starving, mills shut down, stockbrokers diving out of skyscraper windows, and all the rest, the depression turned many destitute people in search of an alternative. Some thought the red philosophy had the answer. Most Americans didn't, thanks to the Roosevelt New Deal with its concern for human needs.

The struggle between rightwingers and liberals in our Nation today reflects the concern of humanitarians for the "depressions" which even today exact a horrible toll in human life and suffering in many areas of the globe—including our own country. What President Kennedy saw, and President Johnson sees, is the need to extend the domestic New Deal to global proportions so that worldwide communism may be defeated on the economic front by free institutions, just as the American variety of communism was virtually wiped out of existence by enlightened, liberal policies of the last 25 years.

Rightwingers who use hate and vituperation to enlist hostility against the United Nations, the Peace Corps, foreign aid, and concern for one's fellow man of all colors, can probably trace their genes to the same kind of people who developed the hate Roosevelt and hate Truman cults of bygone days. Kennedy was a victim of the hate spawners, and I am not being hateful in saying so—Miss (or Mrs.) Edith Kermit Roosevelt to the contrary notwithstanding.

Democracy—Commentary by David Schoenbrun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few days ago the well-known commentator, David Schoenbrun, made an excellent statement which I believe is worthy of the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have his commentary printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID SCHOENBRUN COMMENTARY

In American terms, democracy means, very simply: "I'm just as good as the next fellow." That's true enough. It's also very false indeed, when applied to world affairs, and when applied to government, and when applied very superficially.

Sure, we're just as good as the next fellow. We're just as good as the next fellow in the eyes of the law. But, it's a great distortion of democracy to think that all men are born equal. They're not. Some are tall and some are short. And some are fat and some are thin. And some are bright and some are stupid. There's no such thing as equality among people. There is only, in the terms of Thomas Jefferson, "equality before the law."

Is this important? Does it have any meaning in world affairs? Yes, indeed it does. It has great meaning in the government of our country. It's because we think we're just as good as the next fellow, that every American thinks he's as good as the President of the United States. And an extreme version of this is the fact that there are some men who think they can shoot the President of the United States.

Two years ago I was with Vice President Lyndon Johnson. I was standing right behind him in the streets of Dallas, Tex., as we came out of the hotel, and a man pushed through the crowd and spat full in his face. Is that democracy? Is that being as good as the next fellow? Or is that the sort of thing that leads to the assassination of a President?

This is the kind of distortion that permits the preaching of hate, the kind of distortion that weakens our country. We're not just as good as the next fellow. There's such a thing as a boss in business. There's such a thing as a leader of public life. We owe our leaders a good deal more respect than we pay them. This may be the great lesson of the tragic events of the last 10 days.

It's a lesson that has great meaning in the world.

Respect. We believe in respect in our families. We believe in respect in our jobs—very few people have got the guts to badmouth their boss. But apparently every American thinks he has a God-given right to badmouth his President or the leaders of his Government. There is no such right. It is a license. It is not liberty. The great Justice of the Supreme Court, Oliver Wendell Holmes, once said, "Freedom of speech does not give a man the right to stand up in a crowded theater and shout 'Fire' and cause a riot." Freedom of speech in democracy does not give us the right to vilify our President or our leaders.

We do not owe them automatic obedience. We do owe them the respect of the high office they bear. We cannot expect the peoples of the world to respect our country, if we do not respect the men who lead it.

Civil Rights Tactics in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Ron Rankin of Legislative Research, Inc., entitled "Civil Rights Tactics in Congress." This article appeared in the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register.

CIVIL RIGHTS TACTICS IN CONGRESS

(By Ron Rankin)

Many national leaders, including President Johnson, have asked for support of the omnibus civil rights bill, H.R. 7152.

Questions have been raised by certain members of the House Judiciary Committee who charge that the committee reported out a substitute for H.R. 7152 for a vote by the House of Representatives without the benefit of any consideration, debate, or study of the bill by any subcommittee or committee of the House and without any memer of any committee or subcommittee being granted an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill. They called this legislation "the most radical proposal in the field of civil rigths ever recommended by any committee of the House or Senate. It was drawn in secret meetings held between certain members of the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General and members of his staff and certain select persons, to the exclusion of other committee members."

History of H.R. 7152 shows that a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee had prepared a substitute bill for H.R. 7152. Title 1 of the substitute was read and discussed by the full Judiciary Committee prior to October 22, and at a meeting held on that date a motion, a point of order was made that the House of Representatives was then in session. Several postponements followed.

On October 29, the full committee met at 10:30 a.m. The motion of Congressman ARCH A. MOORE, Republican, of West Virginia, was promptly voted down, after which Chairman CELLER offered a 56-page mimeographed substitute which he described as an amendment and moved that the committee approve the bill. The chairman announced he would recognize a member of the committee to move the previous question and that no amendments could be offered to his proposal; no debate had; and no questions asked or answered.

Five members of the full Judiciary Committee claim the bill was, upon order of the chairman, read hastily by the clerk, without pause or opportunity for amendment, and that several members of the committee repeatedly requested to be permitted to ask questions, have an explanation of the bill, discuss it, consider its provisions, and offer amendments. They further claim that the chair refused to grant such requests or to recognize these members of the committee for any purpose, and that after the reading of the bill in the fashion hereinabove described, Chairman CELLER announced he would allow himself 1 minute to discuss the bill, after which he would recognize for 1 minute the ranking minority member Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio. This did not amount to debate, as debate is generally understood.

Several members of the Judiciary Committee have stated that Chairman CELLER and Representative MCCULLOCH made no effort in the 2 minutes consumed by both together to even so much as explain the provisions of the bill. In short there was no actual debate or even any opportunity to debate, and immediately upon the conclusion of the remarks of Mr. MCCULLOCH, the ranking minority member, the chairman recognized a member of the committee friendly to the chairman's proposal who moved for the previous question. (A parliamentary move used to shut off debate.) The clerk of the committee immediately called the roll upon the motion to approve the bill and before the tally could be completed or the vote announced, it was announced that the House was in session and the committee was recessed. The committee met later in the afternoon, and, the tally of vote upon the motion to approve the bill having been completed and announced at the morning meeting after the House session had commenced, a motion was made and adopted that H.R. 7152 be reported to the House.

TACTICS BY PROPONENTS

Several members claim the full-committee substitute for H.R. 7152 was railroaded through the Committee on the Judiciary without an opportunity by members of that committee to discuss, debate or amend the 56-page mimeographed document. Congressman GEORGE MEADER said he was delivered his copy of this all encompassing bill after 10 p.m. the evening before the vote was taken.

While this document was being forced through the committee wholly without study, it was hailed as "moderate" legislation and as a "compromise" when in truth and in fact it was, in the expressed opinion of some committee members, no less extreme and vicious than the subcommittee proposal, and that in coordination with these statements, the reported bill was denounced, publicly, by civil rights political pressure groups for the apparent purpose of creating the impression the substitute measure was, in fact, a watered down version of the unacceptable subcommittee proposal.

EFFECTS

The Judiciary Committee proponents of this measure have stated, "the bill, as amended, is designed primarily to protect and provide more effective means to enforce the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States." Dissenting members of this committee have reported that "in truth and in fact, the bill, under the cloak of protecting the civil rights of certain minorities, will destroy civil rights of all citizens of the United States who fall within its scope. And that Congress would abnegate its duty to consider and protect all of the Nation's citizens."

If according to some committee members, the proposed legislation is enacted, the President of the United States and his appointees—particularly the Attorney General—would be granted the power to seriously impair the following civil rights of those who fall within the scope of the various titles of this bill:

1. The right of freedom of speech and freedom of the press concerning "discrimination or segregation of any kind * * * at any establishment or place" as delineated in the bill (secs. 202–203).

2. The right of homeowners to rent, lease, or sell their homes as free individuals (secs. 601–602).

3. The right of realtors and developers of residential property to act as free agents (secs. 601–602).

4. The right of banks, savings and loan associations and other financial institutions to make loans and extend credits in accordance with their best judgement (secs. 601–602).

5. The right of employers "to hire or discharge any individual" and to determine "his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment" (title VII).

6. The seniority rights of employees in corporate and other employment (title VII, title VI via sec. 711 (b)).

7. The seniority rights of all persons under the Federal civil service (sec. 711 (a)).

8. The seniority rights of labor union members within their locals and in their apprenticeship program (title VII, title VI via sec. 711 (b)).

9. The right of labor unions to choose their members, to determine the rights accorded to their members, and to determine the relationship of their members to each other (title VII, title VI via sec. 711 (b)).

10. The right of farmers to freely choose their tenants and employes (title VI and title VII).

11. The right of farm organizations to choose their members to determine the rights accorded to their members, and the relationship of their members to each other (title VI and title VII).

12. The right of boards of trustees of public and private schools and colleges to determine the handling of students and teaching staffs (title IV, title VI, title VII).

13. The right of owners of inns, hotels, motels, restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms, soda fountains, motion picture houses, theaters, concert halls, sports arenas, stadiums, and other places of entertainment to freely carry on their businesses in the service of their customers (title II, title VI, and title VII).

14. The right of the States to determine the qualifications of voters in all Federal elections and many State elections (title I).

15. The right of litigants to receive even-handed justice in the Federal courts; this legislation places civil rights (particularly the Attorney General) in a special category with preferences and advantages not afforded parties in any other form of litigation (sec. 101(d) title IX).

In a pamphlet title "Blueprint for Total Federal Regimentation," two past presidents of the American Bar Association, John C. Satterfield and Lloyd Wright stated, "The act clearly violates the Constitution of the United States by extending powers of the Federal Government beyond those permitted under the Constitution. It also destroys rights reserved to the States and to the people by granting to the executive departments powers which were intended under the Constitution to be within the realm of judicial determination and legislative action. Moreover, it destroys the fundamental system of checks and balances set up in the Constitution. If it is enacted, the States will be a little more than local government agencies, existing as appendages of the Central Government and largely subject to its control. This legislation assumes a totally powerful National Government with unending authority to intervene in all private affairs among men, and to control and adjust property relationships in accordance with the

judgment of Government personnel. It is impossible to prevent Federal intervention from becoming an institutionalization of special privilege for political pressure groups. This must lead eventually not to greater human freedom but to an overdiminishing freedom."

Effects of the Proposed Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles written by Eliot Janeway. They deal with the advantages of a tax cut and its possible bearing upon the strength of the dollar and the economic growth of the United States.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Dec. 5, 1963]

TAX CUT MIGHT PEP CONFIDENCE IN DOLLAR

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, December 4.—As President Johnson begins to get the stalled legislative machinery moving again, a tax cut becomes a practical probability for early 1964. The question is ceasing to be whether we are to have a tax cut, and becoming how much of one can we hope for, and how soon we can expect to get it.

This double question about the 1964 tax cut—how much? and how soon?—in turn raises the question of the dollar, its strength and stability. The dollar has been suspect and under strain this past year while the tax cut has lingered in legislative limbo.

A vote of confidence in the dollar—from friends, creditors, allies, and competitors—will be looked for as a necessary accompaniment to a vote for a tax cut.

It need not be too hard to get such a vote. Nor need it take too long. The United States, after all, is the richest country in the world—both as to liquid capital and as to productive capacity. The dollar, whether the dealers in foreign exchange quote it fractionally higher or fractionally lower, is the currency for which foreigners have most use.

DOLLAR IS INTERNATIONAL

As a matter of fact, the strong European currencies command premiums because they are really national media of exchange, not international. The Swedes, the West Germans, the French, the Swiss, and the rest like to hold on to their own currencies, and to use dollars for their international transactions. The dollar is acceptable everywhere.

The only alternative international currency is the British pound. When it is under pressure—and it will be next year, with the British Labor party a favorite to win the election then—the dollar becomes even more acceptable.

Even the Russians, when they made their first approach to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in the wheat negotiations, offered an all-cash deal; and the cash was to be in dollars. When the Russians went along with Washington's counter-request for payment in gold, the bargaining premise was that the dollar is "as good as gold."

MANAGEABLE FIGURE

In terms of arithmetic, our payments gap is qualitatively of the first magnitude—if only because deficits eat away at confidence. But, quantitatively, the sums involved in the U.S. payments deficit are small. This is a $600 billion economy. The outside limit of our payments deficit is a less than 1 percent factor.

The highest guesstimate has been $5 billion a year, and half that is more likely. This is a manageable figure—once it has been demonstrated in the marketplace that the U.S. economy is recovering its ability to meet foreign competition. The test on this front is the cash earning power of U.S. industrial reports. A gain here would quickly reduce the present payments deficit to a level too nominal to be a source of worry and weakness.

How to do it? One way is by adopting the successful European technique of tax credits for export earnings. As the tax cut moves toward the top of the legislative agenda, the question of the export tax credit will follow in its wake.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Dec. 9, 1963]

BULL MARKET WOULD YIELD U.S. A DIVIDEND

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, December 8.—The stock market has been giving President Johnson a resounding vote of confidence. True, allowances must be made for the honeymoon period which generosity allows to any new President. Nevertheless, Wall Street has been as quick and as firm as the obvious spokesmen for the Democratic-liberal alliance to say that Lyndon Baines Johnson has its respect, too.

This is a good beginning. But political honeymoons don't last very long, and neither do honeymoons in the marketplace. The first tests by performance will confront the new administration very quickly.

The stock market is more than an indicator of how we Americans are making out at the pocketbook level. It also measures how well we are doing in the outside world—not just how successfully private business is competing for customers, but how effectively our Government is bargaining with the powers that be abroad.

Financial opinion overseas is more political than it is here at home—partly because businessmen in other countries can always count on their governments to lend them a helping hand in foreign competition. When exports rise, when investment outside their own boundaries is safe and profitable, it is because the governments behind them are managing well, businessmen abroad expect to do well in dollars and cents terms.

APPRAISE IN SIMILAR WAY

Naturally, then, people who control capital abroad tend to assess ups and downs here by the same standards they use in their own countries. When they judge that our Government is managing well in its dealings with them, they have confidence in our markets. Contrariwise, any evidence that they may be pulling out of our markets raises the question whether they are discounting our political influence and operations.

The U.S. balance-of-payments problem, which has lately got so much publicity and provoked so much worry, is the measure of the movement of money in and out of the country. In recent years U.S. industry has been attracted to foreign investment by higher rates of profit and of growth abroad. This is a minus in the U.S. balance of payments, because it drains capital out of our domestic economy.

But an offsetting plus in our payments balance has been supplied by the large-scale movement of liquid funds into the United States. Foreign capital likes the United States for many good reasons—safety; convertibility of the dollar; and, not least, the scale and diversity of investment opportunity here.

PROVIDE PROTECTION

If there's anything that foreigners like better than accumulating U.S. dollars, it's using them to accumulate U.S. stocks. Money prefers anonymity; and broad, public markets—for stocks as well as for certificates of indebtedness—provide sounder protection and earning power for capital than numbered accounts in Swiss banks.

In the recent period of worry about the dollar and pressure on it, there has been a real question whether foreign capital held here in liquid and semiliquid form might get anxious enough to start going home. Any faltering in the stock market, reflecting any weakening of business confidence, threatened to magnify the dollar drain.

But the dollar and the stock market are tied together for better as well as for worse. Any strengthening in the New York stock market can be counted on to bring foreign capital into its favorite investment medium and thus, more than incidentally, to strengthen the dollar. Thus, a new Johnson bull market would yield a political dividend to the harassed U.S. Treasury.

He May Add Kennedy Name to Ticket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the world shuddered last November 22, not only because of the terrible crime which had been committed, but because many people throughout the world thought that the light had gone out of the great Nation to which they turned for leadership.

Our country and the world are privileged to have a man with the high caliber of leadership and statesmanship possessed by President Lyndon B. Johnson to take over the reins of Government. The transition in the Presidency has been the smoothest in our history, clearly demonstrating the dynamism of our democracy and a magnificient tribute to President Johnson.

However, it is no wonder that all parts of the world have an innate curiosity to know as much as possible about the new man to whom free people must now look for their inspiration and guidance. When a noted journalist of the Washington area, Mr. Clayton Willis, was in Kenya to attend the independence celebrations there, he was asked to write an article about President Johnson. I am pleased to submit this article for the RECORD. It appeared in the Daily Nation of Nairobi, Kenya, published December 18, 1963:

HE MAY ADD KENNEDY NAME TO THE TICKET

(By Clayton Willis)

The new President of the United States is by no means a lightweight.

Thrown onto the world stage by tragedy, Lyndon Johnson is a tried political veteran who has courage.

When he was majority leader in the U.S. Senate, Johnson was known as a man who went into conferences with men who strongly disagreed with each other, applied his persuasive powers, and came up with decisive action through compromise.

HAS POWER

In fact, the then Senator Johnson deserved much credit for helping to push through Congress many of Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower's programs. And at a time when the Congress was made up of a Democratic majority.

So, we may look for Johnson to have more effective relationship with Congress than did President Kennedy.

Kennedy, either because of his age or other reasons, did not establish the best relationship. And, as Congress appropriates the money for foreign aid and other American programs, the relationship which a President has with it is a key point.

Whereas President Harry S. Truman was relatively unknown politically when he became President after the death of Roosevelt in 1945, Johnson has considerable political power and is known throughout the United States.

NO CHANGE

While American Vice Presidents had narrow scope of responsibility until the death of Roosevelt, this has changed. President Truman gave his Vice President, Alben W. Barkley, somewhat increased responsibility. But, the big change came with Eisenhower.

The general gave Vice President Richard M. Nixon considerably increased responsibility for the 8 years he was in office and President Kennedy continued this trend. Kennedy sent Johnson abroad frequently as his personal envoy.

Johnson's foreign policy will probably be essentially the same. Radical changes should not be forthcoming because, for one thing, the American political mechanism is a labyrinth and cannot be altered with the snap of the fingers.

As far as the integration issue is concerned, Johnson is generally regarded as a moderate. His attitude, although probably less aggressive than Kennedy's, will be pretty much the same.

President Johnson is less reserved than the late John F. Kennedy. The tall Texan (6 feet, 3 inches in all), is of the "hail fellow well met" school.

Here's an example of the Johnson personality which I observed first hand.

DYNAMISM

Johnson, as did Kennedy, went to Albuquerque, N. Mex., for the Western States Democratic Conference which was held there in February 1960.

Held at a sprawling ranch-style motel in the desert, the conference was a real political melee.

As I was talking to the public relations-conscious Johnson, he spotted a Christian Science Monitor press badge on my coat lapel. "That's a great newspaper," he said. "I read it every day."

We discussed the paper briefly and talked of other subjects. Johnson, a good mixer, greeted others who flocked around him to have a look at the Presidential aspirant.

Suddenly, Johnson spotted a friend across the crowded room. He called out the man's name, and like a shot bounded across the crowded room, thrust out his hand and greeted him. During a 15-minute period, Johnson repeated the performance many times.

Spotting someone he knew across one of the three rooms in which delegates and others were meeting at that stage of the day, he greeted the person enthusiastically, had a few words, then moved on to the next.

It is this dynamism and enthusiasm for which he is noted as a campaigner. Even though he suffered a severe heart attack several years ago, Johnson goes on with his amazing drive.

Johnson, in 1960, did not have the broad, national political organization which Kennedy did. Also, Johnson was from a State regarded as southern by many.

THE NORTH

In 1964 it will be different. With the death of Kennedy, the election might become a wide-open affair. Johnson will have the vast power and prestige of the Presidency behind him. This is a tough thing to beat in American politics.

However, the tag of "southerner" on him will complicate the situation.

It is, of course, too early to tell what will happen at the Democratic Convention next year. But, Johnson may well offer Robert F. Kennedy, the late President's brother and the Attorney General, the Vice-Presidency.

This would add the Kennedy name and influence to the ticket. It would tend to bring along the Kennedy faction of the Democratic Party. And, Kennedy being from the State of Massachusetts, it would add the northern region to the Democratic ticket.

REPUBLICANS

President Kennedy did the thing in reverse. He attempted to get the South and the Johnson wing of the party behind him by putting Johnson on the ticket.

On the other hand, the Republicans have a better chance now. The big problem with the Republican Party is that it is split between several candidates. If the Republican can unite soon behind a strong candidate, they may be able to win back the Presidency.

Only time will tell.

Unemployment Decreases in West Virginia During 1963—State's Economy Is Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article, from the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette of December 23, which indicates progress in West Virginia during the present year. It is notable that we have lessened our unemployment from approximately 12½ to 7½ percent; and that the economy of the State has been strengthened. Gov. W. W. Barron has so reported.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Dec. 23, 1963]

ECONOMY SOARS, BARRON REPORTS

West Virginia's economy soared to a new record this year and the outlook is even brighter for 1964, Governor Barron said Sunday.

Records were established in salaries and wages, retail sales, dollar value of manufactured products and in at least nine other categories for which monthly indexes are kept, he observed.

"These things all add up to real progress," the Governor commented. "We have every reason to look for another record next year. All signs point to continuation of the economic boom we have enjoyed these past 2 years."

Barron predicted West Virginia's economic growth would be even greater next year if Congress approves the proposed reduction in Federal income taxes.

"We had a record business year in 1962, but this year is a great deal better," he continued. "At the same time, we have been able to bring a substantial reduction in unemployment; and the number of jobless in the State now stands at its lowest point in many years."

As a result of the drop in unemployment, employers next month will be restored to a merit rating for unemployment compensation tax purposes, he explained.

That will mean an annual savings of about $12 million for them, he said. The lower tax rate is permitted by law if the unemployment compensation fund reaches $45 million by January 1. It now totals more than $56 million.

Total unemployment dropped 14.3 percent this year, Barron observed. Those without jobs now number about 40,000, with 11,000 of them earning wages by participating in the state work and training program (formerly known as aid to dependent children of the unemployed).

He said there were 105,600 unemployed West Virginians when he became Governor in 1961.

Barron said only 4 of 22 economic indicators failed to record better performances this year than in 1962 (he didn't cite the four).

Five categories didn't set new records, but they did top their 1962 figures, he added.

"West Virginia, as a State, can do whatever we think we can," Barron commented. "We have the ideas, the intellectual capacity and the resources to do it. We have ignited the spirit and determination of our people. We have restored confidence."

He said the economic development activities of his administration are "showing excellent results and will continue to move forward as we expand our programs and institute new ones."

Since he became Governor, 196 new manufacturing plants and expansions of existing ones have been reported, which created 11,724 new jobs, he said.

Barron cited these economic improvements this year as compared to 1962:

Total personal income, up 3.1 percent to $3,316 million; coal production, up 7.2 percent to 127,121,000 tons; average weekly earnings in mining, up 9.3 percent to $129.92; average weekly earnings in manufacturing, up 3.1 percent to $104.45.

Automobile sales, up 14.1 percent to $235.7 million; lumber production, up 18.3 percent to 356,808,000 board feet; sale of ordinary life insurance, up 8.1 percent to $339.3 million; electric power production, up 5.7 percent; gasoline sales, up 5.9 percent to 580.8 million gallons.

Postal receipts, up 18.1 percent to $12,668,000; bank debits, up 5.8 percent to $10,924 million; value of building permits issued, up 3.1 percent to $51,512,000; salaries and wages, up 1.6 percent to $2,180,500,000; consumer tax collections, up 3.1 percent to $44,799,000; business privilege tax collections, up 0.7 percent to $55,745,000.

Value of manufactured products, up 1.8 percent to $2,620 million; retail sales, up 3.4 percent to $1,825 million; carloadings of class I railroads, up 2.4 percent to $2,128,000.

I Refuse To Hand the Communists a Spade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Com-

mittee on whose shoulders rest to a very great degree along with the other 49 members of that committee, the credit of these United States which has been greatly weakened over the past three decades. Now we are being asked in this bill to further weaken our credit by guaranteeing the payment of about half a billion dollars worth of wheat and other commodities, the Communists wish to obtain from us simply on their promise to pay, which is no good. They owe us billions of dollars this minute which they refuse to pay while we are spending $50 billion annually of our taxpayers' dollars mainly to keep the commies from burying us, as Khrushchev promised he will do; and as bread is yet one of the most important military commodities, I will not hand the ungodly Communists a spade with which to bury us.

The Foreign Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the foreign aid bill which appears in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHACKLE ON FOREIGN AID

The sorriest episode in a dismal year on Capitol Hill is the partisan controversy over financing the projected Soviet wheat deal that is holding up adjournment in the House. Even if President Johnson emerges with the permissive power he wants—and should have—for Government underwriting of credit for the so-called private commercial transactions with Communist countries, the squabble is bound to damage international respect for the American decisionmaking process in world affairs.

The House already has contributed substantially to undermining national prestige by its meat-axe treatment of all aspects of foreign aid. But the current excursion into congressional obstructionism has nothing to do with the merits of foreign aid. It represents an effort mainly by the Republicans, under Minority Leader HALLECK's direction, to deny the President the discretion he needs to explore another possible bridge to improved East-West relations. The worst aspect of this assault on Executive flexibility in administering American foreign policy is its focus on what is essentially a side issue. It is ridiculous to paralyze the legislative process over a question that so clearly should be answered in the affirmative: Whether short-term credits should be made available to finance the sale of grain to Russia and other Communist nations when the President finds it in the national interest.

Conferees representing the Senate and House already have undone some of the restrictions the House had sought to impose on the President's freedom to guide U.S. policy on Government loans and other forms of aid to certain countries, including Poland and Yugoslavia. In this period, when both our allies and our adversaries abroad are seeking to evaluate the effects on our foreign policy of the change in White House leadership, putting new curbs on the exercise of Presidential authority could inflict lasting harm to our position in a world of fast-changing power balances.

Redistrict Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 23, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the subject of congressional redistricting is of particular interest to me since Maryland is one of the States with unequitable division of congressional districts and is facing the possibility of electing all eight of its Congressmen at Large in 1964, in the event that the courts strike down the current district lines.

An editorial titled "Redistrict Now," appearing in the Washington Evening Star on December 21 points out that the Maryland Committee for Fair Congressional Redistricting has attacked the constitutionality of the State legislature's past actions on this subject and I was particularly pleased to note that Maryland's Attorney General Thomas B. Finan is supporting this action.

In the belief that the Star's editorial will be of interest to all Members of Congress, I insert here in the Appendix:

REDISTRICT NOW

Governor Tawes has been taking the relaxed position that the citizens of Maryland will have their opportunity in a referendum next November to vote the State's latest congressional redistricting scheme up or down. And that being the case, he says, why bother to drag the legislature back into the controversy at this point?

There is, of course, a very good reason, which is becoming increasingly apparent to nearly everyone but the Governor. For if the legislature does not evolve a more equitable division of congressional districts on its own, it is entirely possible that the courts will upset both the existing system and the inadequate revision which is up for referendum before the coming year runs out. If that should happen, Maryland could find itself electing all eight of its congressmen at large in 1964. In Texas, where the districting system is not vastly worse than Maryland's, a Federal court already has ordered at-large elections. And it is generally expected that Georgia's system, currently under scrutiny by the Supreme Court, also will be overturned.

The Maryland Committee for Fair Congressional Redistricting has been making these points in a series of pleas to Mr. Tawes—first to call a special session of the legislature, and more recently to bring the issue before the legislature at its session in February. All to no avail. Now, however, the Maryland committee has attacked the constitutionality of the legislature's past actions in a legal suit filed yesterday in Baltimore.

At the last reading the Governor was still unmoved. In a statement which was a welcome surprise, however, his old political ally, Maryland Attorney General Thomas B. Finan, has spoken out in terms cautiously supporting the citizens' committee's arguments.

Mr. Finan is not oblivious, of course, to the importance of keeping on the side of the angels in the event he should find himself running for Governor next year. As of today, however, Mr. Finan is the top legal officer of the State. And the weight of his words will make it a good deal more difficult for the legislature to ignore the need to redistrict once again when they gather in Annapolis on February 7.

Germany's Reaction to Kennedy Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 1963, I had the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by a German exchange student relating his impressions after spending a year living with an American family and attending an American high school.

The exchange student, who has returned to his homeland, is Jens Brueckner. While in the United States, he lived with the Herman Haedicke family of Imlay City, Mich. Mr. Brueckner attended Imlay City Community High School.

The Imlay City Times, in its December 13, 1963, issue, printed part of a letter written by Jens Brueckner describing his reaction and that of others in Germany to the tragic death of our late President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe some of my colleagues may find Jens Brueckner's letter interesting and under unanimous consent I wish to place the excerpt from the letter, as it appeared in the Imlay City Times, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GERMANY'S REACTION TO KENNEDY DEATH

Jens Brueckner, German exchange student who spent last year in the Herman Haedicke home, and attended Imlay City Community High School, recently wrote to the Haedicke family, following the assissination of President Kennedy.

Jens' letter follows, in part, telling of his reaction, and that of the German people, to the assassination of the President.

OLDENBURG,
November 30, 1963.

It was a deep shock last Friday when I heard about the assissination of the President. At first I just could not believe it, and when I heard that he was wounded, I surely thought that these wounds would not be mortal. The more I was shocked when the speaker announced after a period of silence, "Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, is dead."

When I heard about the happenings in Dallas, I immediately switched to the AFN, an American station in Germany. They broadcasted all incoming news from Texas, described every detail, and so I got a very clear and accurate picture. All German radio programs were interrupted to present all news about the President.

It was a shock for the entire German people when they heard about the death of the President. You can say that no President was as popular as Kennedy here in Germany. Through his visit to Germany in June he won so many friends, and so many people felt as if a member of their family had died.

Stations did not present anything else but serious and solemn music and news from America. The regular prog am was interrupted until 1 day after the funeral. The funeral itself was broadcast too, and you could even see it on television through Telstar.

The days from Friday to Monday were days of national mourning. There was no sport, no movies, no dances, etc. You really can say that it was a shock for the entire nation, and that the people are really worried what the future will bring.

JENS BRUECKNER.

Show Sukarno the Big Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, complications in foreign affairs continue to mount. Especially troublesome not only to the United States but to other free nations of Asia is the continued saber rattling of pro-Communist President Sukarno, of Indonesia.

The Chicago Sun-Times, in an excellent editorial in this morning's Tuesday, December 24, issue makes a practical suggestion as to how we might serve the cause of world peace by handling the problems caused by Dictator Sukarno. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Members:

SHOW SUKARNO THE BIG STICK

President Sukarno, of Indonesia, has once more threatened that he will crush the fledgling state of Malaysia. This time he is embroidering his war talk with a boast that the presence of the U.S. 7th Fleet, "not even two or three 7th Fleets" would be enough to stop him.

The jingoistic statements of Sukarno point up the assessment of the situation in southeast Asia expressed by the editors of "Jane's Fighting Ships." The experts of that compilation of the naval strength of the world said of southeast Asia, where the naval ships of a score of nations prowl the waters: "A potentially explosive mixture; a small or rising nation could strike the spark."

Sukarno has had flint and steel in hand for months. His fear of the new state of Malaysia, a federation of Malaya, Singapore, and the northern Borneo territories of Sarawak and Sabah, is based in the belief that the federation is a front for continued British rule of the area and a direct threat to his dream of ruling all of Oceania. Sukarno's guerrillas have been active against the new state since it was formed in September and he threatens new moves today when he will issue a new command.

The time has come to be firm with Sukarno. His hysterical advocacy of war against Malaysia, his plans to rule all of southeast Asia are a menace to the peace of that explosive area.

Sukarno has a navy of sorts, largely obtained from Russia. He has renamed the Indian Ocean the "Indonesian Ocean" and has served notice that this is his mare clausum—his sea.

There is talk in Washington of making a peaceful sortie into the Indian Ocean with the 7th Fleet. India, deeply concerned with the potential of Sukarno's ambitions, says it does not object to such a sortie. Let Sukarno compare his naval strength with that of the 7th Fleet.

There is merit in showing, at the right time and in the right place, the true extent of retaliatory power. The time appears to be at hand to confront Sukarno, as Premier Khrushchev was confronted, with the extent of the power he scorns.

Visiting Imprisoned Kinfolk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why the hole that has been placed in the Berlin wall for Christmas cannot become a doorway of peaceful and free relations between the East-West areas of this city.

Unquestionably, there will be advantages to those who govern affairs of Eastern Berlin, for otherwise the situation would never have occurred—many in the world will be impressed by this apparent demonstration of brotherhood on the part of the Communist bloc, and Russia will extract a rich propaganda benefit from it all. Furthermore, those who live under the most austere and severe conditions in Eastern Berlin will be afforded the opportunity of sharing, in gifts received, the fruits of their more fortunate brothers. This should, for the time being, serve to relieve a little of pressures of discontent in the Eastern sector.

As all of this poses as a warm thought during this warm season, there is also a sad note of cruelty to it all, for Christmas is a short-lived thing. And after the season has gone, the snows of Russian discontent will blow to block the hole in the wall again, leaving those on the eastern side of the wall only the luxury of a thought on their brethren in the West.

How truly warm the season would be if somehow by some miracle the non-Christian Communist world proved at least humane enough to recognize that every man—regardless of his creed—is brother to his fellow man.

I insert into the RECORD an appropriate article from the December 19 issue of the Bangor Daily News:

VISITING IMPRISONED KINFOLK

West Germans will be happy over the agreement which permits them to visit relatives in East Germany during the Christmas season. It offers a chance to see loved ones again, if only for a brief time.

But the agreement also underscores a tragic fact—that citizens living behind the Iron Curtain are prisoners of the state. No such accord—reached only after almost 2 weeks of wrangling—would have been necessary if the borders were open to free movement either way by civilians.

Instead, there is the Berlin wall and the miles upon miles of guarded frontier. No East German is allowed to travel to the West, the Communist rulers well knowing that few of them would want to return.

For those behind the Iron Curtain life is much like being in a vast prison camp. The yuletime visits of their free-world kin are little more than sad visits to a prison.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 17, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include my newsletter to my constituents for December 20, 1963:

FOREIGN AID STUDY A TREMENDOUS TASK—(SUPPLEMENT TO FOREIGN AID NEWSLETTER OF AUGUST 24, 1963)

The House this week took its most determined stand to date against big foreign aid spending. In approving the foreign aid appropriation it cut $1,700 million from the original budget request. The appropriation of $2,801,700,000 as finally passed was reduced from the $3,599,050,000 which was authorized just a few days earlier. The slash was due largely to the masterful report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid led by Congressman OTTO PASSMAN, of Louisiana. This study and report is one of the best prepared I have seen in my 9 years in Congress, and represents the finest type of constructive legislative work.

The Foreign Operations Subcommittee in its consideration of this bill conducted more than 800 hours of research and hearings. Testimony by officials of the executive branch and others resulted in over 11,000 pages of transcript. The 4 volumes of printed hearings contain 3,849 pages of testimony and related data and represent a most thorough examination of the budget estimates of the foreign aid program. (These statements give some idea of the effort that goes into committee work, the part of a Congressman's job which demands most of his time and attention. It is testimony to the care and thoroughness which is given to important legislation before it can be presented to the House for action.)

The hearings brought out many little known facts concerning foreign aid. Testimony showed that our aid program is being continued in countries where one of the following illegal action has occurred:

1. A dictator has taken over control of the country.

2. A military junta has overthrown a friendly government.

3. A president or premier has been assassinated.

4. A newly elected president has been prevented from taking office.

5. A monarch has been dispossessed by a rebel force.

6. Twenty-nine aid-recipient countries have experienced an illegal change of government during the period 1948–63.

7. Of these 29, Cuba is the only country which is not now receiving direct U.S. aid, although she does receive assistance from the United Nations.

Of concern to many is the attitude of some officials of our Government on foreign aid. This attitude is exemplified by the statement of William Kling, Special Assistant for Economic Affairs, African Affairs, Department of State: "I do not think that our aid program has to be necessarily directed toward rather unrealistic policies of only helping our friends."

How on earth can Mr. Kling or the State Department justify using the hard-earned money of American taxpayers to help our enemies? Yet, this is exactly what we are doing in too many instances.

1. Of the 112 countries in the world, the administration contemplates granting of assistance during fiscal year 1964 to a minimum of 100 countries, territories, or possessions.

2. The proposed military assistance program alone envisages grant aid to 65 countries and credit assistance to 3 additional countries.

3. Aid is given to countries which first tried Communist-bloc assistance and after becoming disenchanted turn to the United States for help.

4. Aid is given to countries where the attitude of the official and semiofficial press and radio is anti-American.

5. Aid is given to countries indulging in unwise fiscal policies, deficit spending, and lack of self-help.

6. We continue our aid to five countries in Latin America which still maintain trade and diplomatic relations with Cuba.

7. Foreign aid funds in the pipeline (already appropriated and unexpended) amount to $7.6 billion projected into fiscal 1964.

THE ISSUE: AID TO COMMUNISM

The issue which tied up the adjournment of Congress in bitter debate was the House passed amendment (218 to 169) to prohibit the U.S. Government from underwriting credit to Communist countries buying American goods, including the sale of wheat to Soviet Russia. After three attempts and by the Democratic leadership exerting every possible pressure on its members, the House approved the final report by 30 votes (189 to 159). With no regard to the political moratorium the Democratic leadership and the President charged the Republicans with "delaying tactics" and sitdown strikes against the bill." The fact is, the conference report had been voted down twice and many Members had left Washington to be at home with their families on Christmas. In an all-night session Friday, a long Saturday session, and a session on Monday, it was the Democrats who could not muster the votes, most of the Republicans had remained on the job or returned to Washington at the first call.

Now, what was the basis of our opposition to the bill?

1. We do not believe we should be doing business with Russia on any basis. Certainly we should not finance their ability to do business with us.

2. This bill, as all legislation, should have been decided on its merits. It was not, as charged by the majority leader, "a slap at President Johnson" to vote against the bill.

3. The bill makes it possible for the United States to extend credit to Russia with no collateral except the word of the Government of the Soviet Union and it has never honored its word or its agreements.

I could list many other reasons and will have more to say on our dealings with the Communists in the coming year. This will be the last newsletter until Congress reconvenes January 7. To all our friends, "Season's greetings."

OK—But Not Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I feel that Secretary of Defense McNamara deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress in his efforts to produce economies in the Defense budget.

As a Representative from the Chicago area, I especially urge him to reject the protests made by a number of our colleagues from Chicago and Boss Daley of that city.

I am pleased to note and direct the attention of the Members to an excellent editorial in the December 20 edition of the Suburbanite Economist, an outstanding Chicago area publication, which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

OK—BUT NOT US

Most everybody believes taxes of all kinds are too high and that they can be reduced sharply without impairing services and endangering the city, county, State, and Nation.

President Lyndon B. Johnson also thinks so. So he is doing something about it. After consulting with Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, the President ordered 35 military installations closed. The reduction will eliminate 75,000 jobs and save $900 million a year.

When one considers the Armed Forces still have 6,700 sites here and abroad, the closing of 35 is comparatively insignificant.

That is, by comparison.

But as soon as the news was announced, Congressmen and Senators of States which will be affected created a storm of protest. They charged communities near the sites will suffer unemployment and loss of business.

Some of our Congressmen have joined them. They are protesting the moving of the 5th Army Headquarters from the old Chicago Beach Hotel to Fort Sheridan for the same reasons cited by the other objecting Congressmen.

All of which now brings up an important question. How are taxes to be reduced unless payrolls and other expenditures are to be reduced? Or as the old saying has it, "You can't eat your cake and have it, too."

Why Not Save on Aid, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, economy truly is a unique concept today, particularly in a day and age when the expenditure of a billion dollars in Federal funds hardly invites the flutter of an eye lid—and President Johnson repeatedly has paid tribute to this unique and desirable thing called economy.

It seems to me, however, that President Johnson missed an excellent chance to effect economy in Government spending when the foreign aid bill recently was before the Congress. The President could have—by urging reductions in foreign aid expenditures—saved funds which very effectively could either have been put on our soaring national debt or applied as a saving on the budget that the President will be submitting to the Congress for fiscal 1965.

An article appearing on the editorial page of the December 19 issue of the Bangor Daily News appropriately and deliberately deals with this subject, and I insert it into the RECORD for the convenience of my colleagues:

WHY NOT SAVE ON AID, TOO?

President Johnson's declaration early this week that a reduction in foreign aid spending would be dangerous can be taken with several grains of political salt.

He made the remarks after the House voted only $2.8 billion, $1.7 billion less than originally requested by the late President Kennedy. A larger compromise figure will probably be reached with the Senate, but still substantially less than what was sought by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

It seems to us the President is inconsistent in saying foreign aid must not be cut. He has called for cutbacks in defense spending and has urged every department of the Government to trim sails. Why should foreign aid be exempt?

Experience with foreign aid since World War II has shown that billions upon billions have been wasted. Some of the money has gone into boondoggling projects. Much of it has simply served to bolster the political if not the personal fortunes of leaders of aided countries, entrenching ruling classes while giving little if any help to the needy masses.

Money has been used in a futile effort to buy the friendship of neutrals.

And when it comes to worthy foreign assistance, it is time that our now prospering allies bear more of the burden, American taxpayers have shelled out more than $100 billion in foreign aid, almost one-third of the towering national debt, since the war's end. Such a drain should not be allowed to go on and on indefinitely. The Nation has plenty of vast domestic problems for which money is needed.

The House was right. Foreign aid spending should be reduced and the huge bureau of some 60,000 persons handling the program reduced along with it. It has taken on all the appearances of being a bureaucratic racket.

Birthday Greetings to a Beloved Leader

SPEECH

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, December 21, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, if each of us who serve in this House was asked to name the most beloved Member among us, I have no doubts that there would be complete unanimity in naming the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN W. McCORMACK, not because he is the Speaker, but because he is the man that he is.

Here is a wise man, possessed of commonsense in an uncommon abundance; a man of penetrating understanding, with the patience of Job; a kind man, whose mind is devoid of evil thoughts and whose heart reaches out with genuine compassion for his fellow men. This is my estimate of the man who celebrates his 72d birthday today, after having known him for a little less than a year.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the good people of Hawaii, and for myself, I extend to you birthday greetings and congratulations upon your attainment of 72

years of useful living. You have distinguished yourself as a leader of leaders, beloved by all, as perhaps no other man in your present position has ever been. In the many years that you have devoted to public service, you have carved for yourself an indelible niche in the annals of American history; as an effective leader and a statesman. To your statesmanship and espousal of our cause, we citizens of the 50th State owe much for our present privileged status of full, first-class American citizenship.

To you, Mr. Speaker, Hawaii sends its fondest aloha with best wishes that you will continue to serve your State and your Nation for many more years to come. God bless you.

The Case of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly pointed out the diabolical nature of Soviet foreign policy especially as it applies to the oppression of the captive lands behind the Iron Curtain.

The December 16 edition of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin directed special attention to the Hungarian question, and in its commentary very effectively analyzes Soviet Union colonial operations. I insert the editorial into the RECORD at this point:

THE CASE OF HUNGARY

Seven years ago, on December 12, 1956, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution condemning Soviet intervention in Hungary, to crush an anti-Communist revolt. Since that time, neither Moscow nor its puppet, Budapest, has made the slightest effort to mollify world opinion by admitting U.N. observers or pulling out the Soviet troops that installed Premier Janos Kadar.

Meanwhile, the U.N. has recognized its helplessness by dropping the Hungarian question from the General Assembly agenda, in effect abandoning the unhappy country to its fate. Secretary General U Thant made a token visit to Budapest, but there was never any such thing as an on-the-spot investigation, much less action, other than resolutions.

Now come reports from diplomatic circles in Moscow that the Soviet Union will shortly withdraw its armed forces from Hungary. This is interpreted by the hopeful as a further easing of tensions, an expression of Soviet confidence in the stability of the Kadar government, and proof that a general thaw continues.

The circumstances hardly justify optimism of this kind. In 1955, there was supposed to be a big thaw also, but in the fall of 1956, when the Hungarians revolted against foreign domination, an abrupt change brought a quick freeze. On October 30, the Kremlin assured the world and the U.N. that it was withdrawing its troops. Five days later, the Soviet Union, having gained the time it needed, moved seven additional armored divisions against Budapest and ground out the last spark of resistance. It was Mikoyan who managed the affair, and installed Janos Kadar, after doublecrossing the Hungarian rebel leaders.

This is such recent history that it should be borne in mind. Whatever Khrushchev's motives may be in recalling the army of occupation, if he has any such plan, it is not likely that his ultimate objective is a genuine peaceful settlement in Central Europe, as we understand such things. Any threat to the continued stability of his quisling, Janos Kadar, that is, to the continued repression of free Hungarians, will bring the Soviet tanks once more rumbling over the border.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Report on Accomplishments of 1st Session of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice to submit a report to the residents of my district at the end of each session of Congress on the legislative action and my voting record on some of the vital issues. The following is a report of the limited legislative accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

It is apparent to everyone that the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy completely overshadowed all legislative action or administrative programs. So much has already been written and spoken on this regrettable act that I do not feel any useful purpose would be served by writing a further tribute in this report. Along with other Members, I inserted a special memorial tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 5.

It is difficult to point to any significant accomplishment of this Congress or the establishment of any new doctrine or policy by it. Perhaps the most unusual aspect of this Congress would be that it has been the only Congress in peacetime to be in session during a full calendar year. An explanation of this unprecedented session appears to divide along party lines. The majority party indicates that it is a result of unusual developments throughout the year, such as the consideration of the civil rights bill and other unavoidable controversial issues. The Republicans, on the other hand, contend that the mood of the country simply was not responsive to the expensive programs that were insisted upon by the late President Kennedy and now sought by President Johnson. No doubt there is some validity to both points of view, but the 12-month session is now a matter of record without an impressive list of legislative accomplishments.

In retrospect, it appears that a considerable amount of attention of the administration was taken up in the field of foreign affairs, although there were very few new legislative proposals in this area. At the head of the list would undoubtedly be the ratification of the test ban treaty, which has been hailed as a major accomplishment in easing the tensions between East and West. Although this ratification of the treaty was exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Senate, Members of the House had strong feelings about the wisdom of the ratification as it affected the future of our national security. It is not possible to comment at length in this report on that matter, but I would like to observe that I think the importance of the treaty itself has been greatly overestimated. It contains a provision that when one of the signatories breaks the agreement and proceeds with further atmospheric testing, all members are released from their commitment and are free to proceed in a like manner. This is little more than a voluntary suspension agreement that was negotiated under the Eisenhower administration and prevailed from 1958 to 1961.

Another observation I would make on this Congress was the gradual emergence of a more conservative attitude. Spending proposals met with little enthusiasm and this is no doubt responsible in part for the rejection of many parts of the Kennedy legislative program. I think this conclusion is supported further by the considerable amount of press releases made by the new President, Lyndon Johnson, reflecting his determination to reduce Government spending. In my opinion, the new President will have strong congressional support in this regard. I hope this is not a short-term conservative effort on the part of the new President merely to obtain passage of the tax reduction bill.

Some short mention should be made that the principle of Federal aid to colleges, first commenced under the land grant college program 100 years ago, has been broadened to apply to facilities for all colleges and universities across the Nation, both public and parochial. This is probably the most significant policy decision that was established by this Congress. An argument of considerable persuasion for approving this program was the estimate by the Office of Education that the college enrollment in 1970 would be doubled over its present level.

The unprecedented length of this session has made it difficult for Members to attend all committee meetings and conferences throughout the year. In my most responsible position, that as a member of the Rules Committee, my recorded voting percentage is 96 percent. I was highly honored to be selected as one of the five Republicans to serve on this very important committee and have conscientiously attempted to coordinate the interests of the United States, the State of Kansas, my congressional district, and the Republican Party in voting my decisions in that committee.

The function of the congressional office may be of some interest to recipients of this report. From January 1 to December 15, we received 9,826 pieces of first-class mail. During the same period, 14,734 pieces of first-class mail were sent by this office. I subscribe to all the weekly and daily newspapers of the district and make every effort to keep informed of all developments in Kansas. I also receive a substantial number of trade publications which also report matters of interest to the economy in Kansas. We were honored to receive 831 visitors in the office this year, down from the 1,285 last year.

The following is a brief summary of the appropriations for Federal projects and functions of the Second Congressional District: civil works projects—$19,105,000; military construction—$6,100,000; soil conservation and ACP work—approximately $2½ million.

Your Congressman is proud to be one of the original sponsors of a student program we have designated as "A Week in Washington." This is a nonpartisan educational project for college juniors to observe the firsthand operation of the Federal Government. This is the fourth such year for this program, and a total of 30 students have participated. The students spend a week in Washington observing Congress in session, attending committee hearings, visiting by appointment the headquarters of both major party committees as well as the many historical points of interest. Appointments are arranged with Members of the House and Senate of both political parties. The students are selected by the participating schools and, in most instances, are political science majors, although this is not a requirement. I am pleased to report that some of the students participating in this program have later been awarded Rhodes and Fulbright scholarships while others have been awarded Woodrow Wilson fellowships. A considerable number of these students have indicated their desire to continue their education with an objective of entering public service or possibly a teaching career in the future. The participating students this year were Fritz Aldrine, of Topeka, representing Washburn University; Frances Barry, Shawnee Mission, of Mount St. Scholastica College; Patricia Shafer, Wichita, Kansas State University; Charles Marvin, Lawrence, of the University of Kansas; Terry Watson, Osborne, St. Benedict's College; and Joyce Milleret, of Lawrence, representing St. Mary College.

During the past year, over 50 young men have competed for appointment to the service academies. Each was given an equal opportunity. The Academic Board at each Academy will choose the best qualified individual. This impartial process of selection is not used by all Members. The young men presently at the Academies from our district include: West Point, Peter C. Linn, Manhattan; John B. Kozak, Leavenworth; William W. Obley, Junction City; Dennis E. Coats, Topeka. Naval Academy, William T. Benson, Topeka; Elroy A. McAlexander, Mayetta. Air Force, Leroy

W. Stutz, Effingham; David L. Nolting, Nortonville; Edward A. Petersen, Topeka; Lewis T. Moore, Wakarusa; Roger T. Templin, Topeka.

I make every effort to personally read all mail from Kansas and dictate the replies. Most readers of this session know that I write a weekly news report that is sent to all the newspapers of the district as well as the wire services. I am proud to report that in my 9 years of congressional service, this report has gone out each week that Congress was in session as well as at additional times as there was news to report of general interest in northeast Kansas. Also, a weekly report is taped and made available to all radio stations which serve the northeast Kansas area.

It has previously been my practice to make an extensive tour of the entire district between the first and second sessions of each Congress. This has not been possible this year because Congress has remained in session. I have returned to Kansas whenever the legislative program would permit.

I have not introduced many public bills during this session of Congress. One of the important bills is a proposal to amend the Interstate Commerce Act which would insure an adequate supply of railroad boxcars. Although the bill did not pass, it did stimulate some action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission to induce the eastern railroads to return cars to the Middle West.

After the rejection of the Nation's wheat farmers to the bushel management wheat program, I joined 20 other midwestern Congressmen in introducing an amendment to the Feed Grain Act which would authorize a voluntary wheat program as well as an extension of the soil bank program. This bill is still before the House Committee on Agriculture.

The other bills which I introduced were of principal interest to individuals and not general in nature.

The following is a résumé of my voting position on what I consider to be some of the more important issues that have been before the House this session:

Voted against a subsidy to Russia and other Communist countries by way of permitting the Export-Import Bank to guarantee the repayment of loans for sale of U.S. commodities to them.

Voted for assistance for public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate institutions.

Voted against foreign aid.

Voted against a tax reduction for 1964–65 without a limit in Federal spending.

Voted against the expansion of the Area Redevelopment Agency.

Voted against the extension of the public debt limit.

Voted to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational opportunities in the Nation.

Voted to increase the opportunities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel.

Voted to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

Voted against making supplemental appropriations for Philippine war damage claims.

Voted against additional travel privileges for the Committee on Education and Labor.

Voted to limit allowances and necessary transportation costs for travel outside the United States for Members of Congress.

Voted for assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for facilities for the mentally retarded.

Voted and spoke against a bill to pay a subsidy to domestic cotton processors.

I hope you will continue to write me your views on legislation pending before the House or on any other matter relative to the administration of the Federal Government. If you wish any further explanation in regard to the above summary, I will be glad to furnish that to you also.

A Tribute to the Telephone Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this past year, this Congress and its committees have devoted a great deal of attention to the broadcasting industry, its practices, the FCC, the rating services, and allied questions and problems. Our concern has always been whether the broadcasters have acted as they must in the public interest, whether they have operated to the benefit and satisfaction of the public; whether the culture of our Nation has taken a step forward.

A lot has been said about the "wasteland" in television entertainment. In my opinion, there are some outstanding examples of the use of our airwaves as a national asset rather than a debit. One has been brought to my attention through an event which occurs next February and I am taking this opportunity to bring it to the attention of this Congress and to the attention of the appropriate congressional committees. Next February 25, the National Broadcasting Co. will observe a distinguished anniversary, the 1,000th program of the "Bell Telephone Hour."

I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the outstanding record of this remarkable program, "A Tribute to the Telephone Hour" by Robert Cumming in Music Journal, be reprinted in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO THE TELEPHONE HOUR

(By Robert Cumming)

The "Bell Telephone Hour" is a happy marriage of showmanship and musical education. It openly embraces all forms of musical expression with pride, as well as with the commercial idea of pleasing as many as possible, and ends up having shown that all music is integrated. The worlds of the ballet dancer, the singer (concert, opera, folk, jazz, musical comedy or popular), the pianist and the violinist are not as far apart as some snooty musicologists would have us believe.

True musicality knows no discrimination. This magic ingredient of human nature graces both Rodgers and Ravel, the Brothers Four and Mischa Elman, Peggy Lee and Renata Tebaldi, Louis Armstrong and Lupe Serrano. The overall result of presenting a motley combination of "good" talent is, to some, a manifestation of something deeper than "good" entertainment. And the musical public should know more about such a worthwhile program, for the history of this single enterprise is a reflection of nearly a quarter of a century of American musical tastes and talent.

The Telephone Hour is the most long-lived of today's night-time network programs. It has cultivated its own audience with an undeclared music-for-everybody philosophy. Since the program's transition from radio to TV, it has broadened its scope to include jazz, pop, concert, opera, ballet and modern dance. (Actually, the series is now the only regular TV showcase for ballet and modern dance.) It doesn't stint on talent or production and attempts to present everyone to best advantage. In the past three seasons, the series has featured more than 150 top musical personages.

The actual history of the "Bell Telephone Hour" began on September 4, 1941. For 17 years the program was a Monday night feature of network radio. During this time, 931 weekly broadcasts were achieved, presenting 1,093 major offerings. It is noteworthy that, for the first 2 years on radio, the late tenor, James Melton, and soprano Francia White were featured. Since the guest-artist format was introduced, however, the list of "favorites" has been narrowed down to 14 artists, including Jascha Heifetz and Lily Pons, who lead the list with 54 and 51 appearances respectively. The remaining dozen are Ezio Pinza, Marian Anderson, Bidu Sayao, Blanche Thebom, Ferruccio Tagliavini, Nelson Eddy, Robert Casadesus, Eileen Farrell, Helen Traubel, José Iturbi, Zino Francescatti and James Melton.

Arthur Daly was producer-director from April 29, 1940, to November 24, 1941. Wallace Magill served in this capacity from December 1, 1941, to June 30, 1958, when Henry Jaffe Enterprises took over the reigns and still holds them. Floyd Mack was the New York music announcer throughout the program's 18 years on radio. Richard Joy was the Hollywood narrator, and Tom Shirley was the commercial announcer for 15 years. Warner Anderson, now a movie and television star, and Kenneth Banghart, presently a news commentator for NBC, were also commercial announcers for the program; Gayne Whitman served in this regard from Hollywood. The present staff of regulars is headed by Mel Brandt.

In the 18 years on the air, the "Telephone Hour" missed only five weekly broadcasts. There were cancellations in 1943 and 1944 for national defense purposes, and in 1944, 1948, and 1956 for political broadcasts. Out of 931 programs, it would be expected that last-minute emergencies would prevent the appearance of dozens of guest artists, but this happened only 11 times. In all but one instance, the artist was replaced by another "regular" on the program. Lily Pons had to miss four broadcasts but was replaced by Jascha Heifetz, Grace Moore, Gladys Swarthout, and Oscar Levant. Jussi Bjoerling and George London each sang when actually ill. Renata Tebaldi canceled her December 2, 1957, appearance due to the death of her mother on November 31.

A certain number of mishaps could also be expected during 931 broadcasts, but there have only been four worth mentioning. In

one instance, a pianist walked off the stage just as Floyd Mack announced her encore. Quick reinstatement of script and part of the next orchestra number put the show back on time. Heifetz once broke an E string on his violin in the middle of a selection, but he finished the passage on the other three strings and then exchanged fiddles with the concertmaster to complete the work. After one rehearsal, Nelson Eddy broke an offbeat instrument (the jaw bone of an ass) which accompanied him in a folk song; when another was finally secured for the broadcast, Eddy promptly broke that one as well, and the broadcast went on sans jaw. Rumor had it that it was an assiduously premeditated assassination. Kreisler once forgot the melody of one of his own compositions and had to be prompted by Donald Voorhees.

And Donald Voorhees is the veteran supreme, whose record is unequaled in broadcasting. The maestro has been on the Telephone Hour podium literally from the beginning. Orchestral musicians compliment him for his knowledge of each instrument and, though he may have conducted a score many times, he will study it carefully before each rehearsal so that the composer's intention (as well as the circumstances under which it is being performed) are fresh in his mind. No time is wasted. His fan mail is indication of wide audience approval, as was also witnessed firsthand as a result of his most recent article in Music Journal (November-December 1961). He is a frequent guest conductor of symphony orchestras from Boston to Denver and returns to his hometown of Allentown, Pa., to conduct the annual concerts of the symphony orchestra.

Notable broadcasts in retrospect were highlighted by debuts of established and lesser known artists, such as Maggie Teyte, Mildred Miller, Barbara Gibson, Michael Rabin (at 14), Marilyn Dubow (at 13) and Lorin Hollander (at 12). A complete broadcast was devoted to music from Rodgers and Hammerstein's South Pacific, with Ezio Pinza and Mary Martin as guest artists, very shortly after that musical opened on Broadway. Bing Crosby was guest artist on a program devoted to American folk songs. Basil Rathbone and Fred Allen appeared as narrators in performances of Prokofiev's "Peter and the Wolf." Walter Hampden narrated "The Vision of a Man Named Bell" on three occasions.

Two 1-hour broadcasts took place on March 3, 1947 celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Graham Bell. Jascha Heifetz and Helen Traubel were the guest artists; Raymond Massey read a special dramatic piece and A.T. & T. president, Walter S. Gifford, made one of his five appearances on the show. The other broadcast took place in 1955, to mark the beginning of the "Telephone Hour's" 16th year on the air. Lily Pons, José Iturbi, Eileen Farrell, Brian Sullivan and Michael Rabin were the guest artists. The broadcast of February 17, 1947, featuring pianist Artur Rubinstein, was the first to use the microphone pickup designed by Joseph Maxfield (of Bell Telephone Laboratories). The two-piano team of Ethel Bartlett and Rae Robertson played for the July 6, 1952, broadcast when an air-raid drill was held in the middle of the program. The two artists played after the show was over to entertain the studio audience until the "all clear" was sounded.

Although this is the first "token" article on the history of the "Telephone Hour" to appear, it is this magazine's way of calling attention to an outstanding service to music. It is our recognition of a company sharing the same fundamental premise—music for everybody. Special awards have been given to the Bell Telephone Hour" during recent years which are worth special attention: In 1959, 1960, and 1962 the National Association for Better Radio and Television presented an award for "outstanding entertainment program on television." There were three in 1959: the General Federation of Women's Clubs Award for the "outstanding musical series on television," the George Foster Peabody Award for "outstanding television entertainment" and the Look TV Award for "best musical series of the year." In 1961 there was a special award received from the Foreign Press Association.

Indeed, the collective impression of this program over the years has been an overwhelming aid in the advancement of music in America. Today's gigantic television audience is hearing some of the finest artists of our time in a way that is acceptable to them. As far as musical ideals are concerned, granted it is a compromise. But if music is to be nurtured and served to best advantage, it must have the widest audience possible. If live music is to survive in a mechanical age, there must be people in the seats of the concert hall. And these seats should be filled with the "advanced" students of the art, whether practicing musicians or intelligent listeners.

Music is too big to be the exclusive property of a chosen few. Purists have no monopoly on taste and sensitivity, for these qualities are largely learned and relative. There is a great drive in life for mankind to express "something higher" through painting, sculpture, the dance, musical composition, inspired poetry and literature, scientific achievement, philosophy, a simple folk song, a spiritual, a rendition of an art song or concerto. The "Telephone Hour" is a direct line between the muse of music and the musical masses. And it is a fine connection, set up and maintained by an important man who specialized in "communication for everybody"—Alexander Graham Bell.

Report of the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in an era where national and international attention is focused increasingly in attaining—and maintaining—human dignity and individual rights, it is heartening to see that here in Washington great strides are being made in a highly sensitive area—that involving relations between the Metropolitan Police and the Negro community.

The very real progress that is being achieved here is dramatically illustrated in the report of the Commissioners' Council on Human Relations which was issued recently.

The Council's report commends the Metropolitan Police Department for its increasing sensitivity to the problems which have arisen with the recent migration of Negroes into the District. It is all the more encouraging when one recalls that only a few years ago serious charges were leveled against the Metropolitan Police Department for its failure to cope effectively with many of these problems.

This awareness and sensitivity on the part of the police is due in large measure to the continuing efforts of Mrs. Ruth D. Bates, the Council's Director of Research and Education, Paul M. Rilling, its Executive Director, and Police Commissioner Robert V. Murray and members of his Department, to alleviate existing tensions and to create a workable human relations program in this area.

The Council report lists the following indications of progress by the Metropolitan Police Department in recent months:

First. Chief Murray issued a directive that assignments within the Department shall be made without regard to race.

Second. Permanent assignments to squad cars were made on a desegregated basis in 7 of the 14 police precincts.

Third. An increasing number of foot patrol teams were integrated.

Fourth. The Accident Investigation Unit was integrated.

Fifth. Chief Murray appointed a citizens study committee to consider present promotional procedures.

Sixth. Cram courses are being sponsored for all officers preparing for promotional examinations.

Seventh. Seventeen complaints of discriminatory conditions by police officers were successfully resolved, and the Council report stated that "conditions leading to these complaints have been significantly improved."

Eighth. An improved and clear-cut procedure for the processing of complaints of police brutality has been started.

Ninth. Training in human relations is being implemented for all police recruits.

Tenth. Special human relations training for police officers of the rank of sergeant and above will be initiated in the spring of 1964.

Eleventh. The Department is requesting that funds be provided in the 1965 budget for financing of a cadet training program as an aid in recruitment and training.

Twelvth. The Department is considering a precadet program in cooperation with Washington Action for Youth—WAY—Manpower Development Training Act—MDTA—and the District of Columbia Public Schools.

Thirteenth. A study committee has been appointed for the establishment of a unit on police-community relations within the Police Department.

The report points up that difficult problems still exist and makes several recommendations for solving them. However, we can all take pride in the progress that is being made, and I hope that it will serve as a blueprint for other communities throughout the country which are faced with similar problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Council's report will be very informative for every Member of this body and the general public. I therefore include the report in the RECORD at this point:

HUMAN RELATIONS PROGRAM IN THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—A PROGRESS REPORT BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS' COUNCIL ON HUMAN RELATIONS, DECEMBER 12, 1963

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING

November 8, 1963, marked the graduation ceremonies for the second group of Metropolitan Police Department recruits to complete a 13-week (520 hours) training course.

The additional week (or 40 hours) was developed by the training director of the Metropolitan Police Department, in cooperation with the commissioners' council on human relations, to expand the human relations training program.

The program includes lecturers and panel discussants on various human relations topics and represents a balance between police and civilian participants. The first such class began in the spring of 1963 and drew inquiry and praise from many parts of the country. Each class program has shown improvement, reflecting the Department's goal of developing the best program in the Nation.

In addition to the Council on Human Relations and an integrated training division staff, some of the participats in human relations training have included Isadore Seeman of the Health and Welfare Council; Deputy Chief Howard V. Covell; Russell L. Bradley, and Louis Radelet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; Deputy Chief George R. Wallrodt, Capt. James E. Stargel, and Sgt. Thomas R. Estes, all members of the Police Department's Advisory Committee; Dr. John J. O'Connor, director of the human relations workshop at American University; representatives of the press, radio, and television media as panel discussants; also a panel of officers of community organizations including the Commissioners' Crime Council, the federation of civic and citizens associations, respectively, the Washington Urban League, the Washington Business League, the central labor council, and the Citizens Crime Commission of Metropolitan Washington.

Varied methodology included films on human rights, class participation in programs such as the rumor clinic, incident control, a Bogardus social distance test, and other activities. Underscoring the significance of the training have been the forthright statements issued by Commissioner Tobriner before each of the expanded training classes, as well as the graduation ceremonies of the first group receiving this new training.

Deputy Chief George R. Wallrodt's remarks to recruits are in consonance with the Commissioner's. He states:

"In order to function properly and efficiently, we must have the support, respect and confidence of all law-abiding citizens. In order to gain and hold this support, respect, and confidence, we must treat all people in a courteous, fair and impartial and unbiased manner, regardless of nationality, or race, or religion."

The statement made by recent graduate Joseph F. Bell, who was elected by the recruits of classes 170–171 as class speaker, gives some indication of the success of the revitalized training program:

"Those of us who are in the law enforcement profession realize we must thoroughly know and understand all of the laws and regulations which we are required to enforce. However, this is not enough. We must also realize the importance of good police-community relations. We are fully aware and certainly in perfect agreement with those famous words, 'All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' To this end, we dedicate ourselves."

Training for veteran officers

It was the opinion of the Police Department's Advisory Committee—composed of Police Department officials—and council staff, in a November 1962 meeting, that human realtions training should be extended to supervisory officers in order to sensitize them to sociological changes in the community. This we felt most imperative; these officers have a direct influence upon the attitudes of subordinate officers.

Capt. William Couperthwaite, the new Director of the Training Division, announced that human relations training in the amount of 8 hours will be scheduled in the early spring for each officer with the rank of sergeant and above.

DESEGREGATION OF FACILITIES AND UNITS

On July 20, 1963, Police Chief Robert V. Murray clarified his position and issued his order to precinct commanding officers banning discrimination in the assignment to squad cars, police beats, and in other personnel actions. This had the salutary effect of making obsolete one of our findings and recommendations of the July 17 report.

One of the greatest benefits derived through greater efficiency and cooperation of law enforcement officers of both races is a better understanding of the many racial, religious, and ethnic components of their community that they receive as they learn to work more harmoniously with their fellow officers.

Obviously, the issuance of an order is not of itself sufficient. It must be accompanied by education and enlightment. This will be the responsibility of commanding officers to the chief as they seek to implement his order in their respective precincts. There have been no reports of conflict as a result of this changeover.

As of August 30, 1963, 3 of 14 precincts had integrated squad cars; as of December 10, 1963, 7 of 14 precincts had integrated squad cars.[1]

On August 20, Glennard Buchanan became the first Negro driver in the accident investigation unit. This event received the commendation of police officials and the community and press as well. Comments from residents as they see an increasing number of integrated cars should be encouraging to the entire Police Department.

Monthly reports indicate that foot patrol duty and various units of the police department are increasingly becoming integrated.

The Chief and other police officials, with the cooperation of the Commissioners and the council on human relations, during the last several months, have been exerting special efforts to extend equality of opportunity to all areas of the Police Department.

RECRUITING

Cadet training program

The 1965 Metropolitan Police Department fiscal budget includes a request to finance a cadet program for high school graduates of the District of Columbia. Eighteen-year-olds would spend a minimum of 2 years as trainees in various divisions of the police department where, as GS–2 and 3 employees, they would perform a variety of clerical and related functions. Upon satisfactorily completing the required period of training, they would be eligible, at age 21, for recruit training as members of the Police Department.

The program, recommended by Chief Murray as early as 1955, has recently been strongly supported by the Citizens Council and other organizations. The program will serve to (1) motivate high school students of all races to prepare for a career in the Metropolitan Police Department; (2) raise aspirations of youth; (3) encourage cooperation between youth and law enforcement officers; (4) help to decrease the high unemployment rate of youth; (5) increase the recruitment of District of Columbia residents making it easier for the police department to maintain its authorized strength; (6) serve to improve the quality of recruits to the police department and (7) free the busy police officer of many routine details.

The Commissioners are supporting this program. The Council on Human Relations feels it should be implemented in the near future.

[1] Permanent assignments.

Precadet program

Through the cooperation of Washington Action for Youth (WAY), a precadet program has been developed with the Metropolitan Police Department and the District of Columbia public schools. Following approval of all parties concerned, the program will be submitted for financing through the Manpower Development and Training Act.

This program, too, is endorsed by the Commissioners and is strongly supported by the Council.

Racial data regarding recent appointees

From January 1, 1963, to November 30, 1963: 276 white, 78 Negro.

From June 1, 1961, to April 30, 1962: 315 white, 60 Negro.

PROMOTIONS

There is no area of police activities that has been given greater attention by the community than the matter of promotions. It has held the continuous attention of the Commissioners and the Council on Human Relations. The council has witnessed the concern of many organizations, public and private, including the Washington Urban League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Federation of Civic Associations, the Congress of Racial Equality, and members of the police department itself, protesting the absence of Negroes in higher policymaking echelons of the Police Department.

Following is the racial composition of uniformed policemen covering the period July 1, 1962, to June 30, 1963:

Rank	Number of employees	Number of Negroes
Chief	1	0
Deputy chief	11	0
Inspector	14	0
Captain	44	0
Lieutenant	83	3
Motorcycle sergeant	8	0
Detective sergeant	76	7
Sergeant	131	6
Detective	135	24
Motorcycle, private, technician II, and station clerk	221	13
Plainclothesman and technician I	130	21
Private	2,005	395
Total	2,859	469
Last year's total	2,840	434

For the period July 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963, of 135 officers promoted in the police department, 10 were Negroes.

On July 23, 1963, a committee on police matters of the District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce, headed by Mr. W. Burdette Hoc. aday, met with the President of the Board of Commissioners and staff of the Council on Human Relations regarding this matter. On August 22, the Chief of Police scheduled his first of several meetings with this committee. Meanwhile, special efforts have been initiated in the past several months by the Chief of Police toward affirmative action in executing the Commissioners' nondiscrimination order in the Police Department as follows:

Cram courses

To assist police officers to prepare for biennial promotion examinations offered in 1963, the Chief instituted cram courses offered to all candidates on an equal basis. Police captains volunteered their time for instruction. Also volunteering many hours of time was Lt. Tilmon B. O'Bryant, one of three Negro lieutenants who are candidates for the rank of captain.

Biennial examinations

On October 19, 1963, of those reporting to take biennial civil service examinations for promotion, three Negro lieutenants with the highest efficiency ratings possible were in-

cluded. It is generally felt that the inclusion of Negroes in the ranks of captain and above would be tangible evidence of progress toward equality of opportunity in the Police Department.

Study committee on promotions procedures

As a result of a series of recent meetings of community leaders with the Chief of Police, it is apparent that there are both real and imaginary concerns pertaining to the promotional procedures in the Police Department. A previous lack of communication between the Police Department and the public has resulted in a general lack of information regarding this and other areas of the Department. It is felt, too, that no matter how good a program might be, progress demands that it be constantly evaluated in light of a society's changing needs.

To this end, the Chief conferred with Council staff in August, following meetings with the District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce Police Committee. As a result, he appointed an ad hoc biracial committee to study the promotions procedures of the Police Department. The committee is fortunate to have the experience and assistance of Deputy Chief Howard V. Covell, who will serve as consultant. Also serving in a consultative capacity to the committee of private citizens will be Inspector John S. Hughes and Council staff.

LIAISON OFFICER IN HANDLING OF EMPLOYEE COMPLAINTS

District government's liaison program in the handling of complaints regarding discrimination in employment is not quite a year old. However, Deputy Chief Loraine T. Johnson, who was given a rather heavy backlog of complaints when he assumed the duties of liaison officer, handles them with dispatch and sensitivity and personal follow-through. Just to know there is someone in the Department assigned to hear complaints has been a source of reassurance to police officers who are members of minority groups. The cooperation of his office with the Police Chief and with the liaison program headed by Commissioner Duncan is bringing about a gradual but significant improvement in the morale of nonwhite officers who, in the past, have felt excluded from experience and training leading to promotional opportunities.

Nevertheless, problems still remain. It is our hope that the time will soon come when there will be no complaints of discrimination to process.

Between June and November 30, 1963, 19 police employee complaints have been processed by the liaison officer. In 17 of these cases, conditions leading to these complaints have been significantly improved. The remaining two complaints are under investigation.

AUGUST 28 MARCH ON WASHINGTON

Commendations and requests for advice continue to come in to the Metropolitan Police Department, the Council on Human Relations, and the Commissioners regarding the professional behavior of the Metropolitan Police during the march on Washington. This has been followed by commendations for the 36-hour continuous duty during the events following the assassination of our President. Washington can take pride in the courteous and impartial manner in which the Department performed on these two critical occasions.

MEETINGS BETWEEN THE POLICE CHIEF AND COMMUNITY GROUPS

One of the most favorable results for our community of the August 28 march on Washington has been the opportunity it afforded the Chief to meet and work cooperatively with local and national civil rights leaders. Since the march, at his request, the council has assisted him in arranging a series of meetings with small groups of community representatives. The meetings have not been limited to "a chosen few," but have included the grassroots as well as the top officials of public and private organizations. The discussions have been candid and have been a source of a mutual exchange of information and concern between the chief executive officer of the police department and the community. The meetings will continue after Christmas.

COMPLAINTS OF POLICE BRUTALITY

Although police brutality today, as contrasted with 10 years ago, is a rarity in the District of Columbia, the Commissioners and the chief of police are learning to take every precaution to see that this archaic practice is ended. The community is alarmed at any complaint of brutality.

For facilitating the filing of complaints of brutality, the President of the Board of Commissioners and the Chief of Police have agreed on the following procedures: Complaints may be filed (1) with the Chief of Police; (2) with the President of the Board of Commissioners; (3) with the U.S. attorney's office.

The Chief has declared in recent meetings with community leaders that, although a great deal of the time of police officials is consumed in the processing of complaints—many of which have been found to be invalid—each complaint is handled with extreme care and dispatch.

It is recommended, further, that periodic reports be furnished the public regarding the number of complaints filed and the disposition of these cases, since the public is entitled to knowledge of the investigative results as well as the original complaints.

PRECINCT CRIME COUNCILS

Precinct crime councils, growing out of the efforts of the original Commissioners' crime councils, have been established in several of the District's precincts. In communities like the 14th, 9th, 6th, and 2d precincts, the councils are rather active. Programs of crime councils are presently being evaluated by the original organizers.

Studies reveal that precinct or community councils or committees (the names vary but usually have more positive titles than crime councils) can serve a truly worthwhile purpose in (1) helping the individual citizen to understand and appreciate problems of the police; (2) developing better opportunity for police-community relations; (3) helping to educate citizens in maintenance of law and order; (4) sharpening the awareness for the need of public and/or private social agency services in the neighborhood; (5) reporting to the police on areas of tension: schools, labor-management, intergroup, etc., and other trouble-breeding activities; (6) promoting interracial, interfaith, and intergroup cooperation through activities with the police department.

St. Louis has a highly organized program whereby elected representatives from precincts or district councils make up a citywide police-community relations council which, along with the police department, serves as a liaison to the district precinct councils. (This was discussed in depth in our July 17 report.) Each member is given an identification card stating he is a member of the police-community relations committee.

A recent project of the citywide committee was a doorknob checklist brochure on protecting one's home against burglary. Citizens and police worked together to produce this checklist; it was distributed to every home in St. Louis by members of the Boy Scouts.

POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS UNIT

Recognized as one of the best police-community relations programs in the country is the police-community relations division of the St. Louis Police Department. That division serves as liaison to the St. Louis Community Relations Council and works with the total community in the encouragement of harmonious police-community relations.

Chief Murray, who has visited and was impressed with the St. Louis program, is appointing a committee to study this program and those of other cities. The committee will advise the chief concerning the establishment of a police-community relations division within the Metropolitan Police Department. The establishment of such a division would be an important step in effecting more harmonious relations between the police department and the community it serves.

ANNUAL INSTITUTE ON POLICE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Seven persons from Washington, including police and other Government officials attended the annual Police and Community Relations Institute at Michigan State last May. The trip was made possible through a scholarship grant from the National Conference of Christians and Jews and its executive director, Mr. Russell L. Bradley.

It is recommended that community organizations and individuals of the District who are interested in fostering better police-community relations put forth every effort to send representatives to the institute which will be held again next May. The Metropolitan Washington Chief of Police already has been invited to deliver a special address to the institute.

POLICE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Another favorable result of the meetings between Metropolitan Police officials and community representatives is the recognition of the need for stronger contacts between the police and the community. An institute on police and community relations sponsored jointly by Metropolitan Police and citizens of Washington could serve the function of correcting misinformation and providing an exchange of ideas and concerns that would lead to greater cooperation and mutual respect.

Senator Nelson's and Representative Kastenmeier's Great Fight for Midwest Atomic Accelerator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, and Congressman ROBERT KASTENMEIER have devoted tremendous time and ingenuity to the tough task of persuading both the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations to include in the 1965 budget an atomic accelerator that in my judgment would contribute immensely to the Nation's scientific and educational progress.

Senator NELSON together with Congressman ROBERT KASTENMEIER have personally taken charge of the congressional drive to win the crucial inclusion by the executive branch of this project in the upcoming budget.

The Milwaukee Sentinel has written an editorial supporting this project and

summing up the arguments for it with admirable conciseness. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Four Forces" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR FORCES

Is MURA, the Midwestern Universities Research Association's proposed $154,633,000 atomic accelerator project at Stoughton, Wis., to be a victim of President Johnson's budget tightening?

Answering that question is like looking into the heart of an atom to learn the secrets of matter and energy—exceedingly difficult. The physics of the Federal budget are every bit as complicated as the physics of atomic research. In both cases, the whole is made up of many particles, revolving around each other and exerting force and counterforce.

Thus, with the MURA decision, there are many forces at work and, therefore, to be taken into consideration. In making a plea for the MURA project, Senator NELSON, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has described four forces exerting pressure for approval of the project: Scientific, educational, economic, and political.

Scientists support the project, NELSON pointed out. The Ramsey panel of 10 top scientists on the President's Science and Advisory Committee, drafting a balanced program of development in nuclear physics for the next decade and beyond, recommended construction of the MURA machine provided that it did not delay higher energy projects also recommended. MURA plans, the panel says, "are in the most advanced stage of any proposed machine and construction of this accelerator could be started immediately."

From the educational standpoint, the MURA machine is necessary to give midwestern scientists access to a topflight research tool. Midwestern universities produce a third of all our Ph. D. scientists, but an estimated 60 percent leave the region for greener research pastures. Massive Federal grants for research, particularly in California, New York, and Massachusetts, have contributed to most of this migration, NELSON says.

On the economic front, the Midwest has been short changed. Federal investment in the East and West has triggered booms there and a decline in the Midwest. Wisconsin was among the big losers in prime military contracts in the last decade. MURA would help reverse an adverse economic trend, NELSON says, by contributing to the development of science-oriented industries.

Politically, the MURA proposal exerts a strong force. Letters endorsing the MURA request have been signed by 16 Senators and 57 Congressmen from both parties and 9 States. The proposal has broad public support in a region that has 50 million people, more than a fourth of the Nation's population.

This merely sketches the nature of the four main forces which argue for including MURA funds in the budget. President Johnson, who has available all these arguments set forth in their complete detail, has to look at MURA in relation to the whole budget and its several parts. He has also to consider priorities as well as relative values.

On all counts, MURA rates high. For scientific, educational, economic, and political reasons it deserves to be included in the upcoming Federal budget, ahead of other proposed Federal programs that don't begin to match MURA with forces in their favor.

Adoption of Conference Report on H.R. 9499

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, as one of five Members of the House who conferred with the Senate for many hours in search of a compromise on this appropriations bill, I urge the adoption of the conference report as the best agreement possible under the legislative circumstances that exist today. In my judgment your House conferees drove as hard a bargain as could be driven, and I feel our efforts deserve the support of this body.

We conferred over a period of 12 hours last Friday, beginning at 11 a.m. and ending in the vicinity of 11 p.m. At one point we walked out of the conference because of the adamant position of the Senate conferees. Finally, thanks in large part to a giving of ground on the part of the Senate, we were able to reach an agreement that has been a subject of controversy in this House since. As one who helped work out that agreement, I intend to support it.

Let me make myself clear. I have always maintained that any sale of wheat to Communist countries should be a cash-on-the-line transaction. We have a surplus of wheat that is costing us millions of dollars just to handle and we need gold. I therefore have considered a cash deal to be in our best interest.

I question the advisability of extending credit, however, and I voted last week against the guarantee of such credit by the Export-Import Bank when the question was before the House in connection with this bill. And I felt the position of the House in opposing the guarantee of such credit was sound.

It was my responsibility, on the other hand, to represent the House in conference with the Senate, which has voted twice against placing any restrictions whatsoever on the Export-Import Bank in the event that agency is called on to guarantee credit in a transaction with the Soviet Union.

It became the job of the House conferees, therefore, to work out with the Senate conferees an agreement acceptable to both Houses. And I must confess that I do not think the debate we have engaged in since does justice to the job we were able to do in conference under the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The House had approved a $2.8 billion foreign aid appropriation. The Senate increased this to $3.3 billion but we got it back to an even $3 billion in conference—a reduction of $1½ billion in the budget request and $600 million in the amount previously authorized by the Congress.

What is more, we were able to get into the bill a statement of congressional policy on the guarantee of credit in trade with Communist countries where no policy now exists. We were successful in retaining the prohibition against guaranteeing credit with an exception—to satisfy the Senate—where the President certifies to the Congress that the transaction is in the national interest. Such certification by the President to the appropriate committees will give the Congress an opportunity to take action on the question of credit in each instance if it is so inclined.

This was not exactly what I wanted—but what agreement in the Congress satisfies everyone to every degree? It was, I feel, the best agreement the Senate would accept and I do not think the compromise was unreasonable.

We are achieving a $900 million reduction in the foreign aid program and we are getting a prohibition against the guarantee of credit to Communist countries where no prohibition now exists.

I do not believe we will strengthen the House position by refusing to accept the conference report. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

Religious Faith in the American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore, has directed my attention to an article by Adlai E. Stevenson, in which our Ambassador to the United Nations expresses the conviction that religious faith has been the most significant single element in our history and our tradition.

Mayor McKeldin was so impressed with Ambassador Stevenson's article that he took the time to write personally to the Ambassador. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled, "Religion Called U.S. Foundation," from the Baltimore Sun of December 17, together with Mayor McKeldin's letter to Ambassador Stevenson be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELIGION CALLED U.S. FOUNDATION

(NOTE.—In the following article, one of a series adapted from Roland Gammon's "Faith Is a Star," Ambassador Stevenson says religion is at the foundation of American life.)

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., December 17.—I believe the Christian faith has been the most significant single element in our history and our tradition.

From the beginning, it has been the most powerful influence in our national life. It has inspired our highest achievements.

Religious faith remains, in my opinion, our greatest national resource. It animates the great majority of our adult people. It expresses itself in many ways, although there are many who find it difficult to give formal expression to that faith.

HIGH MORAL PURPOSE

Yet it is a very real thing to most of us. We believe that there is a Creator who has given us life and the capacity and obligation to distinguish good from evil, to serve the good and oppose the evil. We feel under a constant obligation to measure up to the highest moral purposes we know, and that in the long run the good will prove to be the wise and practical and the lasting.

We think that, in the tasks of government as in all other aspects of life, it is incumbent upon us not only to serve righteousness—the good, the ideal—but at times to take risks for it.

Gilbert Chesterton once said: "If our statesmen were visionaries, something practical might be done." In our American vocabulary, we are afraid of that word "visionary." But in the sense that Chesterton used it, in the sense of vision to see the wise course and to follow it, we pray that our leaders shall be blessed with it, because we know that "where there is no vision the people perish."

There is one thing of incalculable worth which this religious outlook has given us as a nation. It is our protection against the moral confusion, which is too often the moral nihilism, of this age.

PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

The blight of moral relativism has not fallen destructively upon us. We talk of the difficulties of charting a moral course, we acknowledge that there are all too many who confuse mere legality with morality, but the mass of our people expect of their public servants probity and decisive distinction between right and wrong in the discharge of their public responsibilities.

Here is the ultimate foundation beneath the strength and security of the Republic. Here, not in our wealth, not in our productive ingenuity, not in our arms, but here in the religious convictions of our people is our stability for the present and our confidence for the future.

In my public life I have tried always to follow the rule laid down 2,500 years ago by the Prophet Micah: "To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with my God."

DECEMBER 19, 1963.

Hon. ADLAI STEVENSON,
United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: Please accept my thanks for your confession of religious faith, as it was published in the Baltimore Evening Sun. It will be to thousands of others, as it was to me, an inspiration at the season of the year when our hopes come closest to triumph over our fears.

Reading the article has spurred me to do today what I have had in mind for some time; that is, to write to you a note of appreciation of your fine work at the United Nations. I accept the dictum that partisanship should end at the water's edge and the United Nations, regardless of its geographical location, comes under that rule. But because we differ in our party allegiance, I feel all the more under an obligation to tell you that you have represented the United States in the international forum as every intelligent and patriotic American wishes to have it represented—vigorously and boldly, but always urbanely, always with what Jefferson called "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

I venture to add my warm personal good wishes for a holiday season that may be all that you could wish—and more.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE MCKELDIN, *Mayor.*

Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, does the Congress have authority in the field of foreign relations, and if so, does the exercise of that authority in disagreement with the President weaken the United States and its image around the world?

Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill a subject was discussed which, in my judgment, requires further elaboration. Does congressional disagreement with a Presidential recommendation harm "the image and authority of our new President around the world," or would it "weaken the President's authority in dealing with other nations and in consequence weaken the United States," or would it impair the authority of the President who "is the sole repository of that responsibility in the field of foreign affairs"?

The Speaker of the House of Representatives addressed the House and urged defeat of the motion to recommit the conference report on foreign aid appropriations with instructions to deny credit in Communist wheat transactions and said the following:

Mr. Speaker, I shall make my remarks brief. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] very frankly stated the issue when he said that this question goes right to the point of our foreign policy. Let us pause for a moment and realize the responsibility in the field of foreign policy and where that responsibility mainly lies. Under the Constitution the President of the United States is the sole repository of that responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 21, 1963, p. 24224.)

Similarly, the majority leader, in urging adoption of the rule waiving points of order against the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill, said the following:

The real issue here is the image and authority of our new President around the world. Are we going to give Communist and free nations alike the impression that he does not have, in the performance of his responsibilities as the respository of American foreign policy, the complete confidence of the Congress and the American people? President Johnson succeeded to office by succession after a base assassination, and the question in all nations is, do the American people have a leader? Would the Congress want to convey the impression that we would want to tie the President's hands or to limit his authority when we did not do this to either of his predecessors, President Eisenhower or President Kennedy? Any such action would weaken the Presidents authority in dealing with other nations and in consequence would weaken the United States. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 24, 1963, p. 24322.)

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] disagreed with the proposition that a vote against providing credit for transactions with Communist countries indicated any distrust of the President. He said:

Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] stated, you really are not interested in listening to speeches. But there has been the inference on the floor of this House and in the press that anyone who opposes the administration is showing a distrust of President Johnson. Mr. Speaker, I want this House and I want everyone to know that I will take great issue with anyone who distrusts Lyndon B. Johnson. I would also take great issue with anyone who challenges his ability to fill this high office that he now holds.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have faith in this Congress and in this House, and I take issue with anyone who says that this Congress and this House does not have a right to say something about how our money is going to be spent (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 24, 1963, p. 24322.)

This proposition was likewise challenged by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and myself as appears on page 24327 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 24, 1963:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the majority leader saw fit to try to define the standards under which Lyndon Johnson will be declared to be either a strong President or a weak President. In my opinion, whatever he may be called by history will be decided by what he does, and not by what the House of Representatives does. In my opinion, he has the capacity to be a strong President and he will be a strong President, but he does not get to be a strong President because the legislative body rolls over and plays dead for him. He does not get to be a strong President because the legislative branch votes against its own convictions and refuses to stand up to tell him that in this instance we think he is wrong. This is all that we are trying to do, and so help me if I thought that my vote today would blacken the escutcheon of Lyndon Johnson as a strong President of the United States, then I would not vote the way I am going to vote. I do not believe it—I think he is a much stronger man, perhaps, than those who have set what I think is a false standard for Presidential strength.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I like what the gentleman has just said. It is in line with what the gentleman from Texas said. There are those who seek to make disagreement the equivalent of distrust. If we must agree with everything that the President says or else be disloyal or weaken our country, I think that is a very dangerous doctrine.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to analyze the two propositions advanced by the Speaker and the majority leader. In my opinion, they are grossly erroneous and constitute a dangerous doctrine.

These propositions are:

First. The President is the "sole repository of responsibility in the field of foreign affairs."

Second. Refusal by Congress to grant the President requests for power indicates a lack of "confidence," weakens the President "in dealing with other nations," and damages the "image" of the President and the United States.

The President is the "sole repository of responsibility in the field of foreign affairs."

Nothing in the Constitution provides or even suggests that the President is the "sole repository of responsibility in the field of foreign affairs." The President's constitutional authority in this field, article II, section 2, clause 2, is as follows:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls.

And the provision in article II, section 3, "he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers."

The Congress, on the other hand, is the repository of the great bulk of governmental power in the field of foreign as well as domestic affairs.

Article I, section 1 of the Constitution provides:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Executive authority in the field of foreign affairs is founded on statutes enacted by the Congress. The execution of such congressional policy is possible only through appropriations made by Congress and derived from revenues which only Congress has the power to levy.

Instead of the President being the "sole repository of power," it is more nearly accurate to say that both the President and the Congress have power in the field of foreign affairs but that by far, the greater part of that power is vested in the Congress.

To say otherwise, would be to indicate that instead of a democracy, we are a dictatorship.

To contend that the enactment of legislation in the field of foreign affairs is beyond the scope of congressional authority and constitutes some sort of invasion of the prerogatives of the President, is a dangerous departure from principles of self-government through elected representatives.

It has always been difficult for me to understand how the chief elected officer of the House of Representatives, sometimes referred to as the greatest and most powerful deliberative legislative body in the world, could fail to uphold the power, prerogatives and dignity of the representative body which he heads and, on the contrary, exaggerate the powers of a coordinate branch of the Government in derogation of the powers of the body for which he speaks.

Refusal by Congress to grant the President's requests for power indicates a lack of "confidence," weakens the President "in dealing with other nations," and damages the "image" of the President and the United States.

Coordinate with the first proposition, is the second one; namely, that the conscientious exercise of the powers vested in the Congress according to convictions of individual Congressmen on national policy based on familiarity with the views and wishes of the American people is an affront to a coordinate branch of the Government whose principal duty is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This proposition is unacceptable.

The majority leader is the second highest officer of the House of Representatives and, no less than the Speaker it seems to me, he should be at all times jealous of the prerogatives, and vigorously uphold the power of the body of which he is a principal officer. The majority leader, however, seems to suggest that any time the Congress disagrees with the President, fails to grant a request he makes or in any way expresses its own will if that differs from the recommendations the President may make, it is undermining Presidential authority, creating an unfavorable image of the President and weakening the United States.

What kind of doctrine is this? This philosophy smacks of a totalitarian regime where the elected representatives of the people are rubberstamps. Such a Congress, never daring to disagree with the Executive, would be a sham and a pretense. It would be more honest and fairer to simply abolish a Congress so impotent. Have we gone so far along the road toward totalitarian bureaucracy that the principal leaders of the House of Representatives say in one breath that we have no power in the field of foreign affairs and, in the next breath, that if we use such power as we may have to disagree with the Executive, we are undermining the strength of the United States in dealing with other countries?

TV Wins Friends for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as one who on occasion both criticized and praised the content of television programs in this country, I am delighted to see that recent surveys indicate that American television is winning friends for this country overseas.

Since the surveys were conducted by the U.S. Information Agency headed by Edward R. Murrow, I feel that its findings can be relied upon.

We in this country are inclined to put far too much emphasis on the effect of American political or official controversy on the attitude towards America throughout the world and too little on the less overt but far more widely observed impact of American television abroad. It is good news for America that with this marvelous new instrument of communication, this country is generally winning friends by relying on a television system that is privately owned and operated. By contrast television in most other countries is an arm of the government.

I ask unanimous consent that an article reporting oversea reaction to American television be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV WINS FRIENDS FOR UNITED STATES OVERSEAS, NEW SURVEYS SHOW

Television programs produced in the United States are creating a generally favorable impression of American life in four Western European countries and Japan.

Far from tarnishing the American image abroad, as some critics have suggested the export of television shows, appears to be winning foreign friends for the United States.

The main oversea complaint against American television is not that the medium may be giving an unflattering picture of life in the United States but that its composite version of the national image may be too rosy.

These conclusions emerge from audience research among viewers in Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The research, conducted by independent polling organizations in each of the countries, was sponsored by the U.S. Information Agency, of which Edward R. Murrow is Director.

OPINION REGULARLY SURVEYED

Results of the study were compiled in November 1962, but the information was not declassified until recently. The Information Agency noted that such studies did not constitute any statement of Agency policy but merely reflected continuing samplings of foreign public opinion.

By coincidence, Mr. Murrow was among those who had questioned whether some American TV shows and motion pictures might not encourage a distorted understanding of U.S. values. Newton N. Minow, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, also had expressed similar views.

The Agency noted that the research covered 650 persons in each of the four Western European counties and 972 persons in Japan. The Agency said that the responses probably would not vary more than 5 or 6 percent from the results that would be obtained from a complete census of the population of the countries.

The worldwide growth in television viewing was illustrated in the percentages of those who acknowledged watching TV, either daily or occasionally.

In Japan the addiction to the home screen reached 88 percent, in Britain 86 percent, in Italy 77 percent, in West Germany 61 percent, and in France 53 percent.

As for the reaction to American shows, the studies found that 72 percent of Japanese viewers thought they were either "very enjoyable" or "rather enjoyable."

In Britain the figure was 70 percent, in Italy 67 percent, in West Germany 57 percent, and in France 48 percent.

Only in France did the number of those finding American TV "not so enjoyable" or "not at all enjoyable" exceed those giving an approving word.

Forty-nine percent of the Frenchmen interviewed were in the unenthusiastic category. In West Germany the figure was 40 percent, in Italy 31 percent, in Britain 30 percent, and in Japan 24 percent.

Where the figures do not add up to 100 percent, respondents expressing "no opinion" make up the balance.

QUALITY OF SHOWS PRAISED

Among factors winning foreign endorsement of American television were the favorable portrayal of harmonious family life, freedom of the individual, and a basically optimistic spirit, the high standard of living in the United States and the quality of the shows themselves.

Unfavorable impressions were attributed mainly to excessive crime and violence on the shows but immorality and sexual suggestiveness and superficiality of content were cited as other reasons for negative reactions.

Forty-nine percent of the Britons interviewed said they believed "U.S. life was worse than presented on American TV programs." In Italy that opinion was voiced by 24 percent, in France 22 percent, and in West Germany 18 percent.

In France and Italy some viewers maintained that the United States was not adverse to improving on reality.

Congressman Harding Answers Idaho Power Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the Idaho Power Co. has been conducting an expensive campaign to misinform the people of Idaho about the Bonneville Power Administration.

Idaho Power has spent thousands and thousands of dollars in newspaper advertisements, door-to-door campaigning, and brochures attacking the Bonneville Power Administration. One of their latest little brochures is the following little gem entitled, "Facts You Should Know About the Plan To Bring Bonneville Power to Southern Idaho":

FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE PLAN TO BRING BONNEVILLE POWER TO SOUTHERN IDAHO

1. Bonneville does not serve homes, farms, stores, offices, schools, shops, or most industries.

2. Bonneville delivers electric power below cost to a few preference customers who profit by tax avoidance.

3. Bonneville is subsidized by taxpayers. It pays no taxes. It has operated at a deficit of about $60 million during the past 5 years.

4. Bonneville will have to ask Congress for an expenditure of about $100 million for transmission facilities to deliver power to eastern Idaho.

5. There is a surplus of firm power in southern Idaho. Bonneville cannot justify squandering tax money to build duplicating power facilities.

6. Southern Idaho has a better record of industrial development—lower taxes—and far less unemployment than the Northwest areas which have been served by Bonneville for many years.

7. Bonneville power rates are artificial. They produce deficits in spite of taxpayer subsidy, tax avoidance, and access to the Federal Treasury for capital funds.

8. Bonneville power supplants the facilities of taxpaying companies to the detriment of taxing districts such as schools, cities and counties, State and Federal governments.

9. Bonneville is now taking over reclamation project power, and will sell it below cost to preference customers. This will deprive Idaho reclamation projects of millions in legitimate revenues by subterfuge—the glib assurance that somehow Bonneville will replace these funds from its deficit-ridden operations.

10. There's no magic about Bonneville power. It is an example of the Federal Government in business—replacing taxpaying, investor-owned enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, in order to inform my colleagues and the people of Idaho of the misinformation, innuendoes, and false charges that the Idaho Power Co. is using to propagandize the people of Idaho on this matter, I present the following comments pertaining to each one of their 10 so-called facts:

ANSWER TO FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW

1. Bonneville does not serve homes, farms, stores, offices, schools, shops, or most industries.

The Idaho Power Co. seems to be trying to make the point here that as individual users Idahoans will not receive BPA power directly, and hence will not benefit from lower-cost power. The thing to point out is that BPA does, indirectly, serve homes, farms, stores, offices, schools, shops, and all industries, and that its contracts require that the benefits of its low, uniform rates are passed on to the ultimate consumer.

It also should be noted that any time a widely used resource can be made available to an area at a lower cost, the standard of living in the area rises.

The extension of the marketing area introduces an element of competition in southern Idaho. The private utilities there—out of concern that communities may break away and form their own public utilities in the years ahead—will improve their services and maintain the lowest possible rates. This pattern of improved efficiency is especially evident in Washington State, where competition from public utility districts is a beneficial influence. Hundreds of thousands of homeowners, small business proprietors, and other customers save millions of dollars through lower electric rates, and these dollars find their way into local trade channels through the purchase of capital and consumer goods. (This element of competition is very real. Indeed, one utility has one rate in Washington and another higher rate in Oregon where public utility laws are less favorable.)

"2. Bonneville delivers electric power below cost to a few 'preference customers' who profit by tax avoidance."

Bonneville does not sell power below costs. The Bonneville Project Act requires rates which will cover costs. Nor does BPA sell only to a few "preference customers." Besides the customers in southern Idaho presently served through the Bureau of Reclamation, BPA has 119 customers. They include the largest private and public utilities in the Pacific Northwest. Idaho Power is one of these.

It is true that public utilities do not pay income taxes, but this is because they are nonprofit organizations. Their net is plowed back into system improvements or returned to customers through lower rates. There is no profit to tax. But they do pay other taxes, which vary according to the law of the States.

Thus, although taxes paid by public distributors are lower than those of private utilities on an individual comparative basis, public utilities do pay taxes. And although they are nonprofit utilities their tax contribution, such as in the State of Washington, runs into millions of dollars.

One should remember too, that, strictly speaking, no utility—private, public, or cooperative—pays taxes. Only consumers pay taxes. The utility merely serves as tax collector or pipeline for tax collection. Idaho Power Co. doesn't pay its tax bill. Its customers do.

"3. Bonneville is subsidized by taxpayers. It pays no taxes. It has operated at a deficit of about $60 million during the past 5 years."

BPA, of course, pays its own way, with interest, and repays about 80 percent of the cost of the dams in the U.S. Columbia River power system, including substantial assistance to irrigation. During the past 5 years, BPA has used about $60 million of a $79 million surplus, but is still about $20 million ahead of its repayment schedule. These facts are presented in greater detail in BPA's last annual report. This surplus came about because BPA rates were higher than necessary to cover costs. It can be argued with considerable force that the use of this surplus now is a means of returning the overpayments to BPA customers.

"4. Bonneville will have to ask Congress for an expenditure of about $100 million for transmission facilities to deliver power to eastern Idaho."

The feasibility report estimated the cost of an extra-high voltage transmission line from Lewiston to Soda Springs at (1) $81,170,000 for a direct-current line and (2) $77,880,000 for an alternating-current line. The direct-current line would have a capacity of 940,000 kilowatts and the alternating-current line a capacity of 900,000 kilowatts.

The report also shows that annual revenues would repay the cost of these lines. In addition, the two areas would be able to combine their generating facilities to take advantage of diversity in peak loads and save an investment greater than the cost of the line; Idaho has its peak demands for power in the summer and the rest of the BPA marketing area has its peak in winter. Thus the cost of the line would be deferred twice over, first by annual revenues and secondly by a savings in investment.

"5. There is a surplus of firm power in southern Idaho. Bonneville can not justify squandering tax money to build duplicating power facilities."

The demand for power will exceed the supply in southern Idaho in the next 10 years unless power is imported to the area or steamplants are built. Without a BPA line southern Idaho may expect a seasonal power shortage after 1967 and a year-around shortage after 1972; this statement takes cognizance of all existing and proposed projects of the Federal Government and Idaho Power Co. The needs of 20 electric distributors which now buy power from the Bureau will surpass the available supply from the Bureau in 1964, and it was these customers who first requested Bonneville service to be assured of their future supply. Fourteen of these customers are municipalities or rural electric cooperatives. By 1972 the area's feasible hydroprojects will be built or under construction. In 1972 power from steamplants will be less expensive than power from remaining, less feasible hydrosites, but more expensive than power from existing hydroplants.

In chapter VI under transmission requirements the feasibility report points out that the interchange capacity between southern Idaho and the rest of the Northwest is rather small—250,000 kilowatts. By the summer of 1968, which is the earliest the line could be built, some 400,000 kilowatts of transmission capacity will be needed to coordinate Idaho resources and meet load growth.

"6. Southern Idaho has a better record of industrial development—lower taxes—and far less unemployment than the Northwest areas which have been served by Bonneville for many years."

This bland assertion of industrial growth is false. Tom Roach, president of the Idaho Power Co., in a talk to the Pocatello Chamber of Commerce August 15, 1962, said, "In the 7-year period 1955–61 the new industries locating in southern Idaho and eastern Oregon totaled 116. They furnish employment to approximately 5,500 people."

Roach went on to say that from 1955–61 BPA added three industries and lost one for a net of two. He compared BPA industrial customers, which have electroprocess loads of over 10,000 kilowatts, with the Idaho Power Co.'s industrial customers which except for FMC do not fall in this class. They are mostly small industries. Roach's comparison is not valid, for BPA is primarily a power wholesaler. His statistics, if comparable, should include industrial customers added by distributors in BPA's western area.

The three customers BPA added in this period consumed 3.1 billion kilowatt-hours in 1961. Idaho Power's sales to all of its industrial customers in 1961 totaled 1.3 billion kilowatt-hours.

The industrial growth in Oregon, and especially in Washington, is much greater than that of Idaho Power Co.'s service area. But it is very difficult to make accurate comparisons because of the paucity of figures available. For example, the Washington Department of Commerce and Economic De-

velopment hesitates to publish any figures in this regard because of the unreliability of estimates.

Idaho does not have lower taxes. The only fair way to compare taxes is on the basis of the percentage which each person pays from his income to both State and local coffers. The U.S. Bureau of Census publishes these figures on a per capita per $1,000 of income basis. The latest figures are for 1961 when Idaho was ranked 13th among the States. Washington was 19th, Oregon 23d, and Montana 2d.

No competent comparison with regard to unemployment is possible, for Idaho lacks any industrial centers which can compare with Spokane, Seattle, Portland, or Tacoma. Besides, Idaho has had an outmigration and there are no records to show what percentage of these emigrants left to seek jobs in other States.

"7. Bonneville power rates are artificial. They produce deficits in spite of taxpayer subsidy, tax avoidance, and access to the Federal Treasury for capital funds."

BPA rates, of course, must meet repayment obligations and are reviewed by the Federal Power Commission. This point is nothing more than a play on such words as "artificial," "taxpayer subsidy," "tax avoidance," and "access to the Federal Treasury." It is a glittering generality built on fluff. As stated earlier, BPA is still $20 million ahead of its repayment schedule and further it has proposed a program for remaining fiscally sound. A major part of that program is to market surplus power in California, providing legislation is first passed to protect the region's power supply.

"8. Bonneville power supplants the facilities of taxpaying companies to the detriment of taxing districts such as schools, cities and counties, State, and Federal Governments."

BPA does not supplant the facilities of taxpaying companies. It supplements them by broadening and lowering the cost of a vital resource.

In Oregon and Washington the development of the economy that has come about because of low-cost power from the U.S. Columbia River power system has created taxable wealth many times greater than would have existed without the system. The dams were built by the Federal Government at a time when private capital was unwilling and unable to do the job on the scale necessary to assure such priceless added benefits as irrigation and navigation, which by themselves contributed greatly to the growth of the region. It is fortunate the Government built the dams when it did, for the region's supply of electric power played an important role in creating the industrial might that helped to win World War II.

Idaho Power Co. often repeats that 60 percent of the property taxes which it pays goes for school support. Tax payments to schools by electric utilities are important. However, they are only part of the story. The other part has to do with electric rates charged such tax-supported schools. A dollar saved by a school on its electric bill is as valuable for school support as a dollar paid to such a school by the electric utility which serves it.

Recently a lot of emphasis was placed by private power companies in Washington State on taxes paid for them by school support. To keep the record straight the PUD's made an analysis in which they recomputed their power bills to schools using the rates of neighborhing private power companies. These recomputed bills were then compared to the actual bills which the schools paid. In most cases the schools received greater benefit from the PUD's savings and tax payments than if they had received a property tax from private power and had been charged private power rates. Idaho Power Co. would suffer by such a comparison, for its rates are substantially higher than the rates of private power companies in the State of Washington.

"9. Bonneville is now taking over reclamation project power, and will sell it below cost to preference customers. This will deprive Idaho reclamation projects of millions in legitimate revenues by subterfuge—the glib assurance that somehow Bonneville will replace these funds from its deficit-ridden operations."

The extension of BPA's marketing area to southern Idaho is compatible with the area's irrigation program. It will not affect the water supply for irrigation, nor will it affect the irrigators' present repayment arrangements. The effect, if any, on their pumping power supplies or rates will be favorable. Irrigation will continue to have priority over power production, just as it does at Grand Coulee Dam, another Bureau project for which BPA markets power.

The extension also will enhance the financing of future reclamation projects by making available a much greater revenue base on which to obtain irrigation assistance. Before the order was issued, BPA was obligated to repay $566,033,000 in irrigation assistance. The obligation for this assistance to irrigation in southern Idaho, which BPA will assume, totals $28,802,000. In other words, the assistance which power gives to irrigation in other parts of the Columbia River Basin is 20 times greater than in southern Idaho.

The combined southern Idaho and main U.S. Columbia River power systems would provide a power revenue for irrigation assistance many times larger than is presently available within southern Idaho alone. The main system has a capital investment in Federal generating facilities 70 times that of southern Idaho. Revenues are 30 times as large. Thus the future of new reclamation projects in southern Idaho should be enhanced rather than hindered by the extension of the marketing area to include all of Idaho.

The total investment in the main system to be repaid from BPA revenues now is about $1.6 billion. The repayment obligation which BPA will assume in southern Idaho is less than 1 percent of this total.

"10. There's no magic about Bonneville power. It is an example of the Federal Government in business—replacing taxpaying, investor-owned enterprises."

In other parts of its service area BPA has not replaced the private power companies, but it has made them more profitable and more efficient. Low-cost power from the Federal system has brought private utility rates down. As these rates came down, sales increased—and so did the companies' profits and the values of their stocks. These companies have not suffered one iota in relation to Idaho Power Co. in terms of profits or stock values. It's pretty hard to beat the combination of lower rates for the consumer and more profits for the company and its stockholders. Based on the evidence elsewhere in the Northwest, the only conclusion is that Idaho Power, its stockholders, and its customers will all benefit from bringing BPA power to southern Idaho.

A savings of $2, $3, or $4 a month to the individual residential customer is considerable by itself. But when you consider that private utilities serve 130,000 Idaho homes, the total is tremendous. If private utility customers in Idaho could get their power for the same price as private utility customers in the Bonneville service area, these Idaho customers would save between $3 and $4.5 million a year. In Oregon the two major private utilities today are selling power to homes for much less than in 1938 when BPA power first became available. Idaho Power Co. is not.

Civil Rights Groups Employ New Weapon: Rent Strikes in New York and Cleveland Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the rent strike, according to a front-page story in today's Wall Street Journal "is a new tactic developed by civil rights groups to improve slum areas largely occupied by Negroes."

Three such demonstrations are underway in New York City, including the one in Harlem. Civil rights leaders claim a short strike recently wrung improvements from a Cleveland landlord. And other rent strikes are being considered in such big cities as Los Angeles, New Orleans, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, and Chicago.

I am sure all of the Members of this Congress are aware that the Housing Act of 1954 included a requirement that each city had to establish a so-called workable program before it could be eligible for Federal urban renewal assistance. One of the requirements of that workable program from its inception has been enactment and enforcement of an adequate housing code. Obviously New York City, Cleveland, and other cities now faced with rent strikes, have failed to fulfill the requirements of the workable program. Under the expressed will of Congress cities which have failed to establish workable programs should not be eligible for further Federal urban renewal assistance.

Under the Housing Act of 1954, the approval of workable programs was made a nondelegable function of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That program is administered from his office. The Administrator must accept personal responsibility for the failure of the workable program provisions to achieve the purposes which the Congress had in mind.

This is a matter of utmost importance to the millions who live in substandard houses. They look to government to help them. They have a right to expect city officials to protect the minimum quality of the housing accommodations in which they live. They also have the right, under the Housing Act of 1954, to look to the Federal Government for help and, especially, they have a right to expect the Administrator of HHFA to enforce the nondelegable functions of the workable program with which he is charged.

I do not know what representations New York City and Cleveland have made year after year in their applications for recertification of their workable programs. But it is abundantly clear that the Federal Government has accepted without question whatever representations these cities have seen fit to make. By its failure to insist on the enforcement of codes the Federal Government has made itself a party to the failure of

New York City and Cleveland, and has itself violated the law as enacted by this Congress.

In the District of Columbia, which has received over $100 million in Federal urban renewal funds, the Washington Post reported on August 2, 1963, that owners of 750 defective buildings have enjoyed a holiday from code enforcement. In addition to the 750 defective buildings yet to be acted on, an additional 1,350 potentially dangerous structures "will be inspected and dealt with within the next few months." In the face of such well-known facts, can the District's Commissioners, or the Administrator of HHFA, maintain that the District of Columbia has a workable program? I do not think so.

Obviously, the Housing Act of 1954 was meant to be enforced. It is high time that the Administrator of HHFA took steps to do so. By ignoring the law he has helped to create the conditions which have led to these rent strikes.

I include as part of my remarks the articles from the Wall Street Journal and Newsweek to which I have previously referred:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 30, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS EMPLOY NEW WEAPON: RENT STRIKES IN SLUMS—HARLEM TENANTS DEMAND HEAT, REPAIRS; CORE SAYS TACTIC SCORES VICTORY IN CLEVELAND

(By Russell Watson)

NEW YORK.—Mrs. Molly Cummings hasn't paid the rent on her four-room Harlem apartment here since November 1. Moreover, she doesn't intend to pay it until the landlord repairs the 2-foot-wide hole in the ceiling and turns on the heat.

Mrs. Cummings and about 800 of her neighbors in more than 50 buildings are staging a "rent strike." By not paying rent they hope to prod their landlords, or failing that the city government, into correcting what they regard as substandard living conditions in their tenements. "We say if enough people stop paying rent, something's got to happen," says Jesse Gray, director of the Community Council on Housing, a local group which organized the Harlem strike.

The rent strike is a new tactic developed by civil rights groups to improve slum areas largely occupied by Negroes. Three such demonstrations are underway in New York City, including the one in Harlem. Civil rights leaders claim a short strike recently wrung improvements from a Cleveland landlord. And other rent strikes are being considered in such big cities as Los Angeles, New Orleans, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, and Chicago.

COURT FIGHT

For their part, landlords argue that by withholding rents, tenants make it harder for them to pay for such services as heat and repairs. In New York, some landlords hit by rent strikes have served their tenants with dispossession notices which require tenants to appear in civil court to show cause why they shouldn't be evicted.

Mr. Gray says the strikes will contend in court that their rent doesn't have to be paid because the buildings are unfit for habitation. And even if this defense fails to hold up, he believes that mass evictions of rent strikers are unlikely. "That's an awful lot of people to throw out on the street," he says.

Most landlords and rental agents charge that tenants contribute to the poor living conditions in slum areas. "You can't have a slum landlord without slum tenants," says Samuel A. Hawkins, a managing agent for several Harlem buildings.

But Mr. Gray insists that "any harm done by the tenants is like a drop of water falling on Yankee Stadium. Don't worry, when we get decent housing, we'll learn how to take care of it."

Mrs. Birdie Peterson, one of the tenants participating in the Harlem rent strike, shows a visitor her kitchen sink, filled with brown, greasy water. She says the water began backing up into the sink about 3 months ago but that she has been unable to get the landlord to repair it.

There's a hole in the floor between Mrs. Peterson's kitchen and living room. And the apartment radiators have been cold for weeks, even before the rent strike started, she says.

FEAR OF RATS

"But what really worries me are the rats," she adds rolling up her sleeve to show a bite on her upper arm. "I'm scared for my kids. They have to go to bed at night because they need their rest and it's the only place you can keep warm. But they're afraid to sleep because a rat might get in with them."

Since 1959 Harlem has been designated a "rat-infested area" by New York's Board of Health, which blamed the condition on structural deficiencies, overcrowding and inadequate garbage disposal facilities. It ordered landlords and rental agents to treat their properties with rat poison at least once every 2 months.

Nevertheless, about 700 cases of rat bites are reported in New York each year, "almost all of them in the bad housing and low income areas of the city," according to Jerome Trichter, assistant commissioner of health. And he believes the actual number of cases is far higher.

City officials say that since the rent strike started a number of tenement landlords in Harlem have simply abandoned their buildings. And officials add that they've been having trouble finding them to answer complaints about building violations.

"Normally tenements change hands frequently and often it's hard to figure out who the owner actually is," explains an inspector for the city's Rent and Rehabilitation Administration. "Most of them work through agents, which makes it even harder to find them."

The Rent and Rehabilitation Administration has the authority to slash rents to as little as $1 a month in buildings where it finds persistent violations of the city's building code. In extreme cases it can place buildings into receivership and make repairs, charging the landlord for the work. During the receivership, rents are paid to the city.

Even the threat of such action often produces results, says Hortense W. Gabel, an official of the Rent and Rehabilitation Administration. Of 1,445 buildings referred to the agency for action in the first 8 months of 1963, landlords voluntarily agreed to comply with the building code in 942 cases.

Although she sympathizes with the plight of slum dwellers, Mrs. Gabel, like most city officials, questions the legality of rent strike tactics. "There is a remedy offered by this office," she says, "if only people will be content to work within a legal framework."

But many tenants complain that some city agencies are slow and lax in enforcing the law against landlords. "The pattern seems to be that the violations pile up and nothing is done," says James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). "The rent strike is a last resort, after we've tried negotiating with the landlord and after we've exhausted the administrative remedies."

OTHER STRIKES

CORE has organized rent strikes now going on in Manhattan's lower East Side and in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn. In Cleveland, CORE claims that after it organized a strike in one apartment house the landlord made major repairs and promised additional minor ones. He then received the back rent from six families which had been held in escrow.

This week the Cleveland chapter plans to launch strikes against a 20-family apartment building and against landlords of several one-family houses. The chapter has some 15 "strike teams" organizing tenants of other slum apartments for future strikes.

CORE leaders say that the first rent strikes has already prompted other Cleveland landlords to improve their properties voluntarily. And C. L. Cheboy, Cleveland housing commissioner, reports that the city's inspection of low income housing is "going full blast."

[From Newsweek magazine, Dec. 30, 1963]

NEW YORK: THE RENT STRIKE

The old man bundled in a sweater against the cold in his bleak Harlem apartment crouched down and removed a small, gray strongbox from beneath his rumpled bed. From a bureau, he produced a set of keys. Then, settling in a rickety chair, he placed the box on his lap and opened its twin locks. Inside was $50. "I got my rent money right here," he said. "As soon as that landlord fixes up this place like he's supposed to he can have his rent."

In hundreds of other chilly, ramshackle tenement flats, people gazed at the gaping holes in their walls and ceilings, at the stopped-up sinks and toilets, at the icy radiators, and said the same thing. Suddenly, New York was listening. A rent strike—a new and potent weapon in the northern Negro revolution—had taken hold in Harlem, and was spreading fast.

Cold blasts: Now familiar with sit-ins, school boycotts, and other expressions of Negro discontent, city officials didn't quite know how to cope with the new phenomenon. "It has an explosive quality," warned Rent and Rehabilitation Administrator Hortense Gabel.

So it has. "The concept that the Negro is going to explode in the summer, when it's hot, you know, that's a farce," says rent-strike leader Jesse Gray. "Harlem is about to explode right now—in the cold."

The strike began without fanfare in November in 16 central Harlem buildings, many of them so dilapidated that the city had already ordered the rents cut. By last week, 850 families in 58 tenements had joined the boycott. Hundreds of phone calls were pouring into strike headquarters, and Gray predicted that 500 or more buildings would join the drive after the first of the year. "We have been in touch with Detroit and Chicago," he reported. "We hope the impact of Harlem will spread all over the country."

The doleful conditions that triggered the Harlem rent strike are not new. But the spirit is. Hand-painted banners reading "Freedom Now," and "Jail the Slumlords," decorate Gray's drafty, storefront headquarters on 117th Street just off Fifth Avenue. Stacked against the green walls are cardboard posters, one picturing a landlord facing a judge in court. "I plead guilty to having rats and roaches," says the landlord. "I sentence you," the judge replies, "to 6 weeks in Florida." Both have the faces of rats.

The risk: Desperate as they are, the strikers realize that they are running the risk of court action by withholding rent. "What do I do when the marshal comes with the eviction notice?" asks one worried tenant on 118th Street. Gray has the answer: "We have a basic right to due process. The landlord can claim the rent and we have a basic reason for not paying it. The court will decide who's right."

Several landlords have already gone to court to evict tenants in the struck buildings and the first cases are on the docket for this

week. Other owners appear to be biding their time, hoping the boycott will disintegrate. The city is moving to take over at least 14 of the struck tenements under its receivership program, in some instances at the request of the landlords themselves.

Led by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, a delegation of top Negro political figures gave their stamp of approval to the boycott at a tenants' rally organized by Gray. "The bells toll, the drums roll," exulted POWELL. "Harlem is on the march again."

Mayor rat: Gray a bustling 39-year-old former seaman, tailor, and Negro newspaperman who has been working with Harlem tenants for a decade, reflects the bitterness of the posters when he talks about the strike. "Nothing is being done," he insists. "We might just as well elect a rat mayor."

Actually, New York, under Mayor Robert F. Wagner has made substantial strides in his drive against the slums. In 1950, 16 percent of the city's rented housing units were classified as substandard. A decade later, the figure had been cut to 11 percent, placing the city near the front rank of big urban centers. But because of its sheer size, New York has nearly twice as many substandard apartments as any other American city. And because the great majority of slum tenements are held as speculative investments by absentee landlords, thousands of flats that were substandard 13 years ago are in even more shameful condition today.

Most of the rent strikers' homes fall into this category. "These people have nothing," says Gray, "so they have everything to gain." And the boycott has already produced a few tangible results the strikers can appreciate. "We strike, now my toilet flush," reports Mrs. Nazareth Ricks, who lives with her three children in a four-room, $37.03-a-month flat across the street from Gray's headquarters. Others are still waiting for relief. "That exterminator stuff that they put down for the rats and roaches are doing no good," one woman wrote the city. "The rats are in bed with the baby. The ratholes are big enough for a cat to get through."

Students' Memoriam to Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the student body of Willard Junior High School in Berkeley, Calif., can be proud of the editorial staff of the school newspaper. The editors of Scoop published a memorial edition on Tuesday, November 26, following the memorial holiday weekend. These wonderful youngsters gathered over the weekend and channeled their feelings of distress and sorrow into this special mimeographed edition. I am proud to insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IN MEMORIAM—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

(By Martha Simpson)

John Fitzgerald Kennedy died Friday, November 22, leaving behind him records of great accomplishment during his office as 35th President of the United States. The death of this great President went not unmourned, for he was dear to the heart of not only his family, but to all the people of the United States, which he, prudently and confidently had guided through unending local and national crises since his inauguration on January 20, 1960.

Special announcements being broadcast from Dallas reached Berkeley a little after 11, Friday, the 22d of November. First, word came that the President had been shot, then that these sad tidings meant that the President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was dead.

The reactions of Willard students here were those of anger, shock, and sorrow. Some students left Willard to attend special Mass held in his honor that afternoon. Others remained at Willard that day and tried to participate as usual in classes. The teachers, also feeling tense and grieved, tried to maintain classes. Mr. Shearer sent around bulletins urging the students to continue classes as normally as possible and consoling them in their sorrow.

We, the people of the United States, mourn the death of our late President, but now we must prepare for the future, under the guidance of Lyndon Baines Johnson, former Vice President. Even in our deepest sorrow we must pledge our support to Lyndon Johnson, our new President, and have confidence that he will guide us with prudence through the next difficult years.

(By Sheila Reinke)

On May 29, 1917, John F. Kennedy was born, and on November 22, 1963, he died, a great man and a great leader. He was born in Brookline, Mass., of a wealthy Catholic family.

Kennedy entered politics in 1946 and was elected to the House of Representatives. In 1952, after a long period in the House, he became Senator from Massachusetts.

In 1953 he married Jacqueline Bouvier. They later had two children, Caroline, now 6, and John Fitzgerald who is just 3.

In October 1962, he put up a blockade against Cuba, and stopped all trade of the United States with that country, in order to rid Cuba of Russian missiles. Kennedy got Peace Corps aid for underdeveloped countries, passed a bill for $600 million aid program to Latin America, and created the Alliance for Progress. He later got Russia to sign a limited nuclear test ban treaty.

In the 3 years he was President many great things were done.

A little less than a century ago Abraham Lincoln was shot down. There is a parallel between Lincoln and Kennedy. Both Presidents worked for equal rights for all races, colors, and creeds.

(By Dan Roberts)

At around 12:30 in the afternoon of Sunday, November 23, 1963, a Dallas nightclub owner shot and killed Lee H. Oswald, the alleged assassin of our late President, John F. Kennedy. This happened while the Dallas police were trying to move Oswald from the Dallas city jail to the larger county jail.

This crime shows us that not only are there people who will kill the President of the United States, but that there are certain citizens who do not have enough confidence in the government of their own country to let that government use its legal machinery to convict the President's slayer.

As a lot of our readers know, an interdenominational service was given in the park in front of the Berkeley City Hall on Sunday, November 24. After the service several people were interviewed on their opinions of the murder of Oswald. The general theory was that even though it was fairly definite that he was the assassin of our late President, Oswald should have been able to enjoy the right of every American citizen to be judged by a group of his own equals.

The crime that was carried out in the basement of the Dallas City Hall was almost as terrible as the one that snatched up the young life of the late John F. Kennedy. Killing the leader of this great Nation was a crime almost unparalleled in history. On the other hand, the murder of Lee H. Oswald was tragic in its own special way.

Jack Ruby, the murderer of the alleged assassin, not only took away an American's right to a free trial, but also killed the one possible source of light on the basic motives and organization of the assassination.

America, land of the free, and home of the brave, and a haven of justice, should raise its mighty voice not only in grief over the death of its youngest President, but in anger over the flouting of the laws set up by our forefathers.

(By Matthew Barr)

The President is dead. We have lost one of the foremost leaders the White House has ever held. The assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy has left a wake in the minds and acts of the American people.

Few other Presidents did as much for civil rights as he did. He was one of the Presidents who did not shrink under the great burdens of the Presidency. The test ban treaty, the lessening of the cold war tensions, foreign aid, taxes, all these subjects had been dealt with fairly and justly by Kennedy during the 2 years and 10 months he held office. Everything was going well: the future seemed bright when Kennedy was shot down last Friday.

The irrational violence that we have experienced in the slayings of President Kennedy and Oswald prove this: the whole Nation needs a reeducation. This sounds wholly silly at first, reeducation the Nation of 185 million people—but when you think it over, about the reactions of the people on civil rights, you may think it a good idea to teach people that all human beings are entitled to equal respect.

Sensible people who respect democracy must stand up for our equal rights now, or we may find ourselves washed away in a flood of chaos.

Waste of Tax Dollars in International Financial Dealings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on December 26, 1963, the Carroll County Times, in an editorial entitled "Wrong Way Radar or Taxpayers' Trail of Woe," reports another instance of wasting U.S. tax dollars. As we begin consideration of the foreign aid conference report, which appropriates $3 billion to assist nations throughout the world, I think we should bear in mind some of the errors in administration of our international financial dealings.

Mr. Charles Mooshian, editor of the Carroll County Times, has continually used his paper to advance the interests of good government. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Wrong Way Radar or Taxpayers' Trail of Woe," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRONG-WAY RADAR OR TAXPAYERS' TRAIL OF WOE

Radar is a remarkable scientific device which makes possible the charting of a trou-

ble-free course by spotting potential pitfalls along the route.

It did not work out that way for the Federal Government in a recent financial transaction, however, and as usual, the taxpayer was left high and dry on a reef.

The woeful details were unraveled recently by Congressman RICHARD H. POFF, Representative of Virginia. He reported that the Pentagon purchased 47 radar predictors from a British firm for $2,145,740. Soon afterward they were declared surplus and the seller offered to take them off our hands for all of $114,500—yes, you read it correctly the first time—$114,500.

Almost immediately the British firm sold the same machines to Portugal for $493,500. And where do you think Portugal got the money to pay for them? Right. From the United States, of course.

To recapitulate—Portugal has 47 radar predictors; the British firm is $2,524,740 richer; the United States is $2,524,740 poorer, and we even paid the shipping charges, the amount of which has not been disclosed.

Defenders of the wonder machine's reputation have advanced a perfect alibi for its failure to perform properly, in this instance—they point out that the radar predictors were never out of their cases until they reached Portugal.

Doing Business With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following column by David Lawrence entitled "Doing Business With Khrushchev," to the Members of the House. Mr. Lawrence correctly points out that during the debate on the question of whether or not the U.S. Government should guarantee loans made to finance grain sales to the Soviet Union, the argument was frequently used that to deny the President this power was to deprive him of his inherent constitutional right to conduct the foreign policy of our country. The proponents of this argument completely forgot that under section 8 of article I of the U.S. Constitution, it is the legislative branch that is clearly given the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." It should be obvious to anyone that a regulation concerning the power of an instrumentality of the Government like the Export-Import Bank to extend or guarantee credit in dealings with foreign countries is certainly within the legitimate constitutional prerogatives of the Congress. Indeed, it is not going too far in my opinion to say that any attempt by the Chief Executive to instruct the Eximbank in this regard is an unconstitutional usurpation of legislative authority.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Lawrence also correctly draws a parallel between the attitude of those who thought it was possible to do business with Hitler and the present-day attitude of those who believe that it is possible to do business with Khrushchev. I think it may be possible to do business with Khrushchev but it ought to be business that is conducted on a strictly cash basis, and not be subsidized by the American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning the press reports a statement by Mr. Burton Joseph, one of the private grain traders who has been attempting to negotiate a deal with Soviet Russia to the effect that credit guarantees for the U.S.S.R. is a "phony issue." Mr. Joseph insists that the Soviets have at all times been willing to pay cash, and that they are not interested in a long-term credits guaranteed by the U.S. Government. Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Joseph is correct in his statement it is certainly doubly difficult to understand why President Johnson and the Democratic leadership in Congress raise such a hue and cry over the amendment to the foreign aid appropriation bill which would have made it a matter of policy that such credit guarantees be prohibited in trading with Communist nations. One wonders, indeed, if the real issue involved is not the desire on the part of some to go much farther down the road toward accommodation with the Soviet Union. One wonders if a great deal more than the mere sale of 3 million tons of grain to the U.S.S.R. is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, in earlier remarks, I have expressed the fear that what the Soviet Union was really interested in was not merely American wheat but in establishing an open line of credit with the United States so that it could purchase badly needed chemicals, fertilizer plants, and other strategic and critical items which are in short supply. I would suggest that the Congress be unusually alert in the days and months ahead to see what turn our trade with Soviet Russia and other Communist nations may be taking.

Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

DOING BUSINESS WITH KHRUSHCHEV: U.S. FINANCING OF SOVIET WHEAT DEAL RECALLS DEALS WITH HITLER IN 1930'S

(By David Lawrence)

If America ever tolerates dictatorship as an instrument of government, it could come about only through acceptance of the misguided concepts of expediency so often set forth nowadays by some of the so-called liberal philosophers. For no more flagrant example of distorted constitutionalism could be offered today than the doctrine of those who are charging that any refusal by Congress to supply credit facilities for the sale of wheat to the Soviet Government is an interference with or invasion of the power of the President to conduct foreign policy or is a curb on the exercise of presidential authority.

Yet this is the argument on which was based the administration's drive to coerce a reluctant and unwilling House of Representatives to pass such a measure. It was finally approved by a narrow majority after 10 days of wrangling, three procedural votes, and the engendering of a good deal of hard feeling.

The Constitution gives no power to the President to order funds to be made available to other countries just because he thinks it's good foreign policy. There is no discretion vested in the President of the United States to spend public money unless Congress votes him such discretion.

No President can declare war without a prior resolution by Congress. No President can make a binding treaty without the consent of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. No President can make rules for the "Government and regulation of the land and naval forces" without authority from Congress.

The real issue in the latest controversy between the Executive and Congress developed as a result of the President's proposal to buy good will among foreign nations by giving them grants or loans and specifically permitting the use of the credit of the U.S. Government to finance wheat sales by Americans to the Soviet Union. Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee and a Democratic Party leader, said he has no objection to sale of the wheat but wants to see it financed by "cash on the barrelhead." There are many other Members of Congress who don't want to see any transactions at all with Russia financed by the American Government. They were dragooned by administration pressure into voting for such a measure.

The Constitution gives to Congress the sole power to deal with this whole matter. It says explicitly that "The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations." It doesn't say that the President shall share in such power. Yet the so-called liberals are crying out that the initial behavior of Congress in recent days was an interference with the President's conduct of foreign policy. Some went so far as to imply that some constitutional right is being invaded by Congress when it insists on looking carefully at every proposed use of the American taxpayers' money. Maybe the next step will be to insist some day that Congress turn over the tax receipts in their entirety to the Executive to be spent as he sees fit.

It is strange how often history repeats itself. Back in the early 1930's, the rise of Hitlerism caused widespread dismay. There were proposals in various countries to cut off commercial relations and, specifically, to bar the export of arms to Nazi Germany. But the materialistic instinct prevailed, and many European countries yielded to the temptation and exported all kinds of goods to help Hitler build his military machine. Even some American businessmen and other prominent citizens, returning from visits overseas in those days, declared confidently: "You can do business with Hitler." This fantasy continued until even after World War II broke out in the autumn of 1939.

Today there's a similar cry: "You can do business with Khrushchev." It is being echoed around the United States. What seems incredible is that anybody who has studied the events prior to World War II would seek today to "do business" with a government which has made such a treacherous record as that of the men in the Kremlin in recent years—including the deployment of missiles in Cuba little more than a year ago. Yet many not only advocate expanded trade with the Communist regime—thus indirectly helping Moscow to strengthen its hold on the oppressed and enslaved peoples in Eastern Europe—but actually favor the lending of taxpayers' money to back up sales by private merchants of wheat.

Certainly, this is an issue that the people should decide without dictation from the executive branch of the Government. The executive viewpoint is entitled to consideration when it is expressed as part of a program of proposed foreign-policy objectives. But foreign policy in the last analysis is made, as the Constitution stipulates, by the people's representatives in Congress whenever such policies involve the expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

A Memorial to John Fitzgerald Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 13, 1963, Dr. Harry M. Moffett, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Gastonia, N.C., delivered a memorial to the late President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The occasion on which this address was delivered was the annual dinner of the Gaston County Democratic Party.

The memorial address was so impressive that many of our friends have suggested that it should be made available to the public through the RECORD. I concur in this thought and, therefore, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

A MEMORIAL TO JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

I accepted the invitation to offer this memorial because I have long wanted to express, however clumsily, something of my faith and my conviction about our American democratic process. These opinions and this faith have been a part of my personal philosophy since long before John Fitzgerald Kennedy became a public figure. However, in his experience in the Presidency many of my concerns and convictions about the conflicts, the tensions, the challenges that are America came to light.

Any man who attains the world's highest and most powerful office of leadership, the American Presidency, can only achieve it by passing through the turbulent channel of the American two-party political system. There is no other way to the American Presidency save this one, and it is a demanding and stormy path.

Our constitutional democratic Republic with its rights and privileges—its high possibilities for human achievement—rests upon two equally important and essential but, eternally conflicting, principles of political truth.

One is the right of private ownership of property and the principle of the right to profit from one's labor and the use of one's talent. Without this basic right, and this unassailable principle, the stability, strength, and preservation of this great Nation cannot endure.

Equally essential to our way of life and our national greatness is the second principle which is the right of all citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The principles of equality before the law, and of freedom to enjoy all the privileges and rights of American citizenship that we can earn, whatever one's economic, racial, religious, or social background is inherent in our Constitution, in our national ideals, in our popular assumptions, and through all our history has been constantly pressuring for fuller achievement and development in this land.

In every citizen, in every community, in every county and State, in both political parties, the conflict between the claims of property rights and privileges, as against the extension or protection of personal rights and individual liberties is in constant tension and debate—and this tension, I believe, to be the major source of our strength, our progress, and our liberties.

No man can emerge as President of this country until he has been subjected to all the practical pressures, the sectional schisms, the public partisanship that creates the fierce intraparty strife and political warfare that is inherent in our system.

No man can emerge from this fierce fight without being marked and scarred by the ordeal through which he has passed. Nor can he assume the gigantic responsibilities of high office with the full support and assurance of the Nation behind him. The very toughness of the pragmatic political battle that brought him victory raises question among many Americans as to the readiness of his mind, his spirit, sometimes even his deep commitment to the great ideals and principles that are imbedded in our Nation's strength and unity.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, youngest man to attain this office, first of his religious faith, son of a wealthy and powerful family, reared in privilege, and popularly believed to have been groomed for his achievement by an ambitious father, entered his high office with more than the usual burden of public doubt, fear and hostility bearing down upon him.

Moreover, he took office in a period of awesome, terrifying world crisis and deep domestic discord.

Over a billion people of varying degrees of unreadiness have shaken off serfdom, revolted against poverty and indignity, and are crying for liberty and equality. In this revolutionary age, confronted by a formidable ideology embodied in two fanatically ambitious nations, John Kennedy faced the awesome task of identifying this Nation of overwhelming power and wealth with the hunger and need of a confused world being tempted by false promises of social justice and freedom from Communist powers bent on totalitarian world domination. In an age where he had, at his command, enough destructive power to destroy civilization; in an age in which war is a horror not to be contemplated by rational men; with courage, vision and determination, he set out to strengthen his country's world leadership, to bring hope and help to bewildered humanity, and to confront, control, and conquer the ambitions of the Communist world by working toward some far distant but necessary world order of nations, while at the same time strengthening and expanding our national military might and security.

For his sensitivity to the new demands and terrible challenges of this new nuclear and space age, for conscientious statesmanship and courageous leadership in behalf of our great democracy, I give him honor and respect.

He inherited at home many formidable tasks. The most controversial, the most explosive, the source of the greatest and most dangerous disunity, was the critical struggle over the expansion of civil rights to a historically, discriminated against, racial minority. Held in subtle bondage to poverty, through limited educational and economic opportunity and discriminatory laws, their plight is supported by a vast complex of entrenched fears and privilege, of submerged guilt and open hate; of deep frustrations and accepted prejudices. Here, in this conflict, the fundamental principles of our constitutional democratic government are locked in a deadly struggle in which, not only our national respect for law, order, and justice, but our influence and leadership of the peoples and nations struggling for life and liberty, in our world is in serious jeopardy.

While I do not for one moment ask, or demand your entire approval of his approach to this problem, I am confident you will join me in honoring his courage and his commitment to the basic, but difficult, principles and ideals of our American dedication to liberty and justice for all men everywhere, as he saw them, and for his willingness to risk his political future in a bold confrontation of the problem, for he sought to create through law an area in legal and civil justice by which he hoped, I believe, to establish an atmosphere in which the subtle, more personal and intangible difficulties of racial desegregation could be confronted and adjusted in peace and order.

I would honor the memory of this man because I came to see in him an expression of, what I believe to be, a priceless and essential factor in the maintenance of our liberty and strength. He gave every evidence of being a devout, sincere, adherent of his religious faith who believed himself responsible to God for his conduct and life. He was loyal to his church and to his creed. At the same time, he was equally and fully committed to the vital American principle of religious liberty and the separation of church and state.

I respect him and honor his memory because of the way he conducted himself before the press, the public, and the world at large.

He was acutely aware of the presence around him of hate, vituperation, and vicious fanaticism, and of the ever-lurking possibility of death, yet he always bore himself with courage and courtesy, with consideration and honor. He personified his faith in freedom, his confidence in his countrymen, his openness to the world about him, by the abandon with which he exposed himself, with the minimum protection, to the mercy of people wherever he went. This cost him his life, and it cost his country and the political party represented here their elected leader.

If, however, from the stunning shock of these events, there emerges a fresh awareness of the burdens, responsibilities, and demands of political leadership in our country in this revolutionary new era—

If, among all reasonable citizens of this land, there is awakened a new understanding of the need for honest, forthright, courageous debate on the part of partisans of differing public and private interests but at the same time a condemnation and repudiation of vituperation, of threats, of malicious unsupported attacks on the integrity and loyalty of those we oppose—

If, at last, we awaken to the vital importance of personal and community standards of high moral integrity, of respect for law and the rights of others, of need for protecting and encouraging responsible character and conduct in all our people and in all our affairs—

Then I am confident that not only the memory of this slain President, but all that is honorable, decent, just, and deeply and profoundly American in his faith, his philosophy, and his conduct of his office will live on to strengthen and enrich the dynamic stream of our democracy and the world leadership of this great Nation.

A Polish-American Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert the following tribute from a most vital and respected group in the Eighth District of New Jersey, which I have the honor of representing in this body:

LEAGUE OF POLISH SOCIETIES OF PATERSON, N.J.,

Paterson, N.J., December 5, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES S. JOELSON,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On November 30, 1963, at the executive board meeting of the League of Polish Societies, representing the Polish-American

organizations in the city of Paterson, N.J., a resolution was unanimously adopted expressing the extreme sorrow in the hearts of the Americans of Polish extraction, on the untimely death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

It was further resolved, that this resolution be sent to you so that it could be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a lasting monument of our deep sorrow.

We further hope and pray that God will grant to our new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, the wisdom, strength, and courage to fulfill the destiny of our beloved United States of America, which we all love so dearly.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY R. SIERAKOWSKI,
President of the League of Polish Societies.

Lyndon Baines Johnson Will Be a Great President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include with these remarks a newspaper article published in the Buenos Aires Herald of Thursday, December 12, 1963:

James A. "Big Jim" Farley, 75-year-old American statesman who served five U.S. administrations told businessmen here that American leadership at home and abroad will remain unaffected by President Kennedy's assassination.

"You can be assured that President Johnson will be a truly great President. He knows how to turn to others for assistance and he will be able to get through the House and Senate the legislation which he thinks should be adopted," Farley said.

He added that Johnson is well versed in Government and has a better knowledge of Government than did the late President when he assumed office. Johnson, in Farley's opinion, was the strongest leader the Senate ever had and is indeed a very strong man.

GUEST

Farley was guest speaker yesterday at a luncheon given by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America at the American Club. Emphasizing that Johnson when Vice President had been close to the late President at all times, Farley said the experience obtained at home and abroad had capacitated him to continue Kennedy's policy ideas and whatever he may have had in mind.

Speaking of the assassination of the President, Farley said it is hard to understand why a thing like that could happen. He was of the opinion that President Kennedy would go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents of the United States.

Later in the day Farley told a press conference that he had spoken to President Johnson before starting his tour of Latin America. Johnson had assured him he would continue the policy aiding these countries through financial and other forms of aid.

UNDERSTOOD

This included the Alliance for Progress program. "President Johnson understands the problems afflicting ocuntries in this part of the world and wants to help. He welcomes cooperation from the governments concerned."

Finally Farley said he believed Johnson would receive full party support at the next elections and be elected President for another term irrespective of what candidate the Republicans nominated. He believed he would even carry some States, such as California, which had voted against Kennedy at the last presidential election.

James Farley is visiting Argentina in connection with his office as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. and is regarded as a rare phenomenon of the American scene—a man who has been a success in public office, public life, politics, and business.

Farley was campaign manager for Franklin D. Roosevelt, helped mastermind the President's election, served the Roosevelt administration as Postmaster General for 7 years and is a former Democratic National Committee Chairman.

Diluting the People's Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Diluting the People's Wisdom," which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette of December 21, 1963. I think the editorial contains a message of such import that it should be called to the attention of all Members.

The editorial follows:

DILUTING THE PEOPLE'S WISDOM

It is a wonder the Presidential Commission on Registration and Voting Participation didn't recommend a law making it a criminal offense not to vote in America. Some of the recommendations the Commission did make would be every bit as destructive as forced voting would be of intelligence as an ingredient of elections.

By the law of averages the Commission did come up with some good recommendations in its report to President Johnson. It recommended against poll taxes and in favor of absentee voting and allowing new residents of a State to vote for president if they were qualified to vote in their former places of residence. (Arizona already fulfills all three of these specifications.)

Most objectionable of the recommendations were those urging reduction of the voting age universally to 18 and outlawing of literacy tests. Coupled with the suggestion of a door-to-door canvass to register those who are too lazy to move beyond their front door for the privilege of citizenship, these add up to an effort to cheapen voting and dilute the wisdom the people bring to the process of employing their representatives in government.

If 18 is a better age than 21 for a lower limit on voting, why is not 16 better than 18? Why not 7, when, some psychologists say, the "age of reason" begins in children? Or, if the age limit on voting is to be reduced, how about the age limit on a U.S. Representative (25), a U.S. Senator (30), or the President (35)?

If some degree of literacy is not to be required of voters, why not, as a dissenting commissioner asked, print our ballots in Swahili? It wouldn't make any difference. Or would it?

Voting is a proud privilege; let's keep on treating it like one.

Amendment No. 20—Sale of Wheat to Russia

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the wheat sale amendment is a much misunderstood and highly controversial item which will demand explanation for months to come. It is at this time unpopular with the people and a vote against it would be far the simplest way to meet the issue.

Unfortunately for me the problem cannot be resolved that simply. Many factors are to be weighed. This is foreign policy. Foreign policy is by law the responsibility of the President. Congress can set guidelines but in this first major issue affecting the new administration, Congress could endanger foreign policy by tying the President's hands; by saying we do not trust him.

Few people will realize the real issue before the House is not a prohibition against credit on sales of wheat to Communist nations. The House voted such a prohibition—and my vote was cast for it. However, that amendment was dropped in conference. What is before us now is a restriction on the way credit is used. If the wheat amendment is voted down, the President can, under existing law, extend loans and credit. The amendment before us would require a certification that credit is in the national interest and require that Congress be notified of each transaction. It tightens existing law.

This is only a beginning in the tangled skein of the wheat amendment. We are talking about short-term credit in which the Export-Import Bank would endorse the Russian's promise to pay in gold. Actual terms would be 25 percent cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months. A similar system is followed by other Western nations when sales are made to the Russians.

Significantly we have for years been making loans and grants to Communist nations without the furore which accompanies today's action. Billions have gone—my vote to the contrary—notably to Poland and Yugoslavia. There is no assurance any of it will come back.

By contrast, in the present deal, the United States proposes to cut down on the $8½ billion tied up in agricultural surplus, to cut down on the million-dollar-a-day storage costs, to move more U.S. products onto the world market, to move them at world prices instead of cut rate, and to realize money instead of promises from the transaction. This is not a giveaway.

Other Western Nations trade with the Communists. They are using our money, our methods, even our machinery to get business we admittedly can use. There is nothing in this which smacks of appeasement or soft dealing. It is a business transaction with reasonable safeguards.

We still are committed to the winning of the cold war; to the defeat of communism. We are not financing communism through this transaction. We tried building a wall around the free world but the free world would not be so contained. Now we seek areas where a thaw can be achieved with benefit to us. Turning surplus wheat into gold is to me a transaction more advantageous to the United States than to Russia.

Waiving of Points of Order Against the Conference Report on H.R. 9499

SPEECH

OF

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in listening to debate on the amendment made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] it appears to me that a significant matter should be added to this record. This is testimony of Hon. Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, made before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on February 25, 1963. I call the attention of the House to a record of these hearings on the matter of the Export-Import Bank Act extension.

The testimony is significant to this debate because Mr. Linder cites the fact that three entities in Cuba, after that country was overrun by Castro, have failed to make payment to American exporters. These defaults exceed $36 million and have been guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank.

I call attention of the House to page 14 of the hearings, wherein Mr. Linder states the following:

> In addition to this $3.7 million [in losses] we have loans in default which have not been written off because we are still hopeful of ultimate collection or at least some settlement thereon. These comprise three loans to entities in Cuba aggregating $36.3 million.

I further call attention of the House to page 28 of the hearings, and the following question and answer:

> Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Linder, in the three loans to entities in Cuba aggregating $36.3 million, do you really have some reasonable expectation of salvaging something from those loans?
>
> Mr. LINDER. Well, we have the same reasonable expectation I would think, Mr. MOORHEAD, that the United States in general has of not expecting the Castro regime to last forever. Except in the case of a Communist takeover, successor governments have invariably honored the obligations of their predecessors and to that extent we have some reason to hope. I will leave it to you.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has reported to this House that the intended Russian payment for wheat purchased from this country would be 25 percent in cash, 25 percent in 6 months, 25 percent in 12 months, and 25 percent in 18 months.

If defaults were made in the case of Cuba due to Communist takeover, it seems perfectly clear that in the event we should have an increasingly hostile relation with Russia, the Communists would default as they have done in Cuba, in which case the money of American taxpayers through the Export-Import Bank would be used to guarantee the Russian payment, and we would thus be in the position of paying Russia to use our wheat.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should support this kind of financing. On the basis of the proven record in Cuba alone, I urge that we continue our refusal to concur with Senate amendment No. 20.

Report to the People of the 22d District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 88th Congress has been a long and fruitful one. We can be proud of our accomplishments. I will presently set forth my voting record and comments on the legislation we have acted upon, but first I want to make some remarks concerning the session we have just completed.

Congress has been criticized for the length of the past session, but these critics fail to recognize that the long session was due to the extraordinary number of complex and controversial matters which confronted us. Foremost among these were the civil rights, tax, and education bills. Had we chosen to turn our backs on these problems or been content with only token legislation in these fields, we could have adjourned earlier and given ourselves more time to spend in our districts. But a Congressman does not fulfill his obligation to his constituents or to the Nation by such action. It is the duty of a Congressman to seek genuinely constructive solutions to these and the other pressing problems we face. This cannot be done quickly. It demands time, energy, and thought.

This year our efforts have been crowned with success. During the session, the Members reached general agreement on the need for a broad civil rights bill and on the basic structure of the tax bill and passed three major education bills. This is an excellent record. It shows the vitality of our legislative process. Of course, it is not perfect. Improvements can and should be made, but our achievements demonstrate that our system of representative democracy continues to work well and is the best yet devised by man.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

The long, arduous task of Congress this year was made even more difficult by one of the most brutal, tragic events in our Nation's history—the assassination of President Kennedy. The loss has been a painful one for us all, and the burden of guilt we share because this senseless act was permitted to occur in a law-abiding society is a heavy one. President Kennedy was truly a man of courage and vision, with a deep sense of the past and a deeper commitment to the future. He brought new energy and purpose to our Government, and his death has left a void in American life.

Nevertheless, I am confident that President Johnson will carry on President Kennedy's work and noble dedication to a better America and a better world. President Johnson shares the same ideals and goals to which President Kennedy so eloquently committed his administration, and I am sure there will be no change in President Johnson's legislative program. The succession of Lyndon B. Johnson to the Presidency demonstrates the strength and continuity of our form of government. President Kennedy is gone, but our democratic nation and our debt of gratitude to this great American live on.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the past session, Congress appropriated almost $50 billion for the continuing buildup of our nuclear and conventional armed forces. I supported every request made by Defense Secretary McNamara, including a long-overdue pay increase for military personnel, to assure that our defenses and the morale of our troops will be the strongest in the world.

At present and for the foreseeable future, our military might will be superior to that of any nation. We possess 500 long-range ballistic missiles and have an equal number of intercontinental bombers on the alert at all times. Our Polaris weapons system is "at the ready." Such deterrent power could destroy any aggressor. In 1963, our special forces units in Vietnam showed how well they can carry out conventional and counter-insurgency action. Every American can feel secure in the knowledge that our Armed Forces are prepared to meet any challenge.

Secretary McNamara recently indicated that in view of our great strength the defense budget can be expected to level off and perhaps decline a little in the years ahead. I hope the world situation continues to improve, as it did this year with the signing of the test ban treaty, and meaningful economies can be made in the huge defense budget in the future.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

I am deeply distressed by the drastic cuts made in foreign aid. This program is the cornerstone of our foreign policy in those areas of the world where the outcome of the struggle between freedom and tyranny is still in doubt. In the past, this program has been markedly successful. It is largely responsible for the strong economy and independence of Western Europe, Japan, and the Philippines. The reductions made in 1963 were wholly unjustified and impaired our own security and our position as the leader of the free world.

As a result of the cuts, we cannot make development loans to the new Asian and

African nations. We will also be forced to curtail supporting assistance to Laos, Vietnam, and the Congo. These are crucial times in the history of many such areas. We cannot abandon them and expect them to survive in freedom. We have a vital interest in that survival, for ultimately our own security depends on it.

Most disturbing to me was the reduction in funds for the Alliance for Progress. This action virtually repudiated the pledges of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy to assist the nations of Latin America in a peaceful evolution of modernization. I cannot understand how some Members of Congress can be content to provide less aid for all of Latin America than the Soviet Union gives to Cuba alone. This is no way to fight communism.

I concur in the judgment of every President since World War II that a substantial foreign aid program is essential to our foreign policy. The expenditures for this program constitute only a small fraction of our own budget for defense, and the contribution to the protection of our interests and the interests of freedom around the world far exceeds the cost.

A pleasant contrast to the treatment given foreign aid was approval of a 50-percent increase in the size of the Peace Corps. Wherever the Corps has been invited, it has been a notable success. This program should certainly be expanded to give more Americans an opportunity to serve their country.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The most important legislation affecting the national economy was President's Kennedy's proposal to stimulate economic growth by tax reduction and reform. I will have more to say on this later.

Another important bill will broaden and strengthen the Manpower Development and Training Act. It is the aim of this program to supply the skilled labor increasingly needed by our economy. It is anticipated that by 1965, 400,000 workers will have been retrained under this program and placed in productive employment. The legislation enacted this year will extend the training period for certain classes of workers, establish additional courses of instruction and open up new opportunities to youth.

There is a constant need for a wide variety of public works. If California is to continue to prosper, there must be an adequate and controlled supply of water. This year we passed two bills providing funds for more than 30 projects in California, including $15 million for flood control to protect life and property in Los Angeles County. These projects will help us meet the demands that will be made in the years ahead by California's burgeoning population and expanding industry.

Also essential for economic progress is a first-class highway system. Congress recognizes this and enacted amendments to the Highway Act which will insure that our national road networks will be the best and most modern in the world.

SPACE PROGRAM

During the past few years, we have proudly watched the expansion of our frontiers to outer space. We have seen American initiative and research and development push us into a leading position in space technology. Now that we have moved to the forefront in this field, we cannot abandon the role of leadership but must continue to move forward, pursuing our national interest by exploring the unknown.

In light of the importance of the space program, I feel particularly privileged to represent the State of California and the 22d District, where so much of our Nation's space work is being carried out. For the past 3 fiscal years, California has received nearly half of all the major contracts awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and 6 of the 10 largest NASA contractors are California aerospace firms. On June 30, 1963, the 22d District was the place of performance of $377.5 million worth of research and development contracts—15 percent of the total for the entire State. Firms in the 22d District received more than 25 research and development contracts during the year.

EDUCATION

The 1st session of the 88th Congress can look with pride upon the legislative landmarks it has established in the field of education, passing some of the most significant education measures in our history. Passage of three major phases of the administration's education program led President Johnson to predict that this session will "go down in history as the Education Congress of 1963." This legislation will give us new weapons in our never-ending battle against illiteracy and poverty.

Congress approved a bill to provide teaching facilities and loans to prospective physicians, dentists, and those in related medical professions. This will boost the number of medical school graduates and relieve the growing shortage of health personnel.

The "brick and mortar" bill—the first major new Federal program of assistance to education since 1958—sets up a $1.2 billion plan to help finance the building of classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other academic facilities in colleges and universities across the Nation. This 3-year program will help us accommodate the hundreds of thousands of students who will nearly double college enrollment in this decade and will enable us to offer them the physical facilities necessary for the pursuit of knowledge.

The $1.5 billion vocational education bill expands and modernizes our existing vocational educational training program, designed to develop our most important resource—manpower—by teaching basic skills, curbing school dropouts, and working with illiterate adults. The bill substantially increases the amount of Government loans to college students under the National Defense Education Act. Unfortunately, no improvement was made in the impacted areas aid. Large school districts, such as Los Angeles, are discriminated against, and I will continue my opposition to this program until its deficiencies are corrected.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Congress made significant gains in the area of health and welfare during the first session, approving several bills which will be of direct benefit not only to those afflicted by poverty and disease but to all our citizens.

Congress authorized $50 million for the next 5 years to increase aid to States for maternal and child-health services and for crippled children's programs. Another bill authorizes $238 million during the next 3 years to aid States in providing mental retardation facilities and constructing community health centers. Congress authorized a $50 million increase in the Government program of direct loans to nonprofit corporations and cooperatives for construction of housing for the elderly, as well as allowing the Federal Housing Authority another 2 years in which to insure mortgages for low- and moderate-income groups.

Los Angeles area residents can be encouraged in their long, relentless fight against smog by the passage of the clean air bill. The research and pollution control programs to be jointly undertaken by the local, State, and Federal Governments give promise of eventually eradicating this menace to our health and well-being.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Despite the passage of several agricultural bills this year, we are still faced with the basic problem of excess farm production. The farm bloc in Congress demands reduced spending in other sectors of the economy, but it continues to clamor for higher price supports for its own products while refusing to cut down production and eliminate surplus goods.

For the most part, farm legislation this year solved only a few superficial problems. I reluctantly supported the cotton bill because it will eliminate the two-price system which puts our American mill operators at a competitive disadvantage with foreign manufacturers. I strongly opposed the extension of our Mexican farm labor program because I see no reason for American farmers to continue their exploitation of foreign labor. Furthermore, there is an adequate supply of domestic workers available at reasonable wages. The passage of the feed grain bill did offer an encouraging note in this dreary area, for the bill provides price supports only for producers who make voluntary acreage reductions.

However, farm subsidies continue as the most indefensible of all Federal spending. They deserve the attention of Congress in the next session.

BILLS I HAVE SPONSORED

It was my privilege this year to introduce a companion medicare bill to provide hospitalization insurance to the aged under social security. The heavy costs of hospital and related health care have long posed a grave threat to the security of our senior citizens who have contributed so much to make this Nation

great. Most of these elderly people are unable to qualify for or afford private insurance to adequate protect them against the high cost of hospitalization. Consequently, many of them are forced to seek private or public aid and become public welfare burdens. Hearings on this bill have been completed, and I hope that this measure will become law.

I am pleased to report that work on the Federal building in the Valley Administrative Center in Van Nuys will begin shortly. After many months of effort, my colleague, the gentleman from California, EVERETT BURKHALTER, and I were able to secure the final approval and financing for this much-needed facility.

I have also introduced a bill to allow voting registrars, upon proper application, to dispense with the requirement of a Federal law that they retain ballots for 22 months following an election. The purpose of the present law is to preserve records which would be necessary in a suit to enforce voting rights. Such a suit would never be needed in Los Angeles where our officials are among the best and fairest in the Nation. Enactment of my bill as part of the omnibus civil rights bill will greatly reduce the large storage costs which the county must bear.

While I am concerned with the welfare of this nation as a whole and the welfare of my State and district in particular, I have not ignored the needs of individual constituents. For this reason, where circumstances warranted, I introduced private bills for the relief of deserving individuals.

THE SECOND SESSION—CIVIL RIGHTS

While I am highly pleased with the accomplishments of the first session of Congress, there are several important items which remain to be acted upon during the coming year.

Highest priority must be given to the civil rights bill. The late President Kennedy gave his wholehearted support to this long-needed bill, and President Johnson is strongly urging its early passage. During the past year, civil rights has become the Nation's No. 1 problem. The protests and demonstrations by our Negro citizens have made it unmistakably clear that they will no longer accept second-class citizenship.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I helped draft the civil rights bill which outlaws racial discrimination in voting rights, public accommodations, employment opportunities and federally assisted programs. It also permits the Attorney General of the United States to bring suit to prevent certain violations of the Constitution, particularly in the area of school segregation.

Discrimination and prejudice, whether they be subtle or blatant, are injurious to our national welfare. They contradict principles upon which this Nation was founded and impair our economic, social and cultural life. The sooner we remove this cancer, the sooner all of us will be able to realize our fullest potential as free Americans.

The leadership given the Judiciary Committee by Chairman EMANUEL CELLER and ranking Republican WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, working with the late President, produced an excellent bill, one worthy of support by Republicans and Democrats. This House and this Nation are truly served by these two great Americans. It is hoped that the Rules Committee will realize that it is in the national interest to expedite this bill. It is imperative that Congress act swiftly on this urgent matter, gaining the bipartisan support necessary to secure a strong bill and make the American ideals of liberty and justice for all a reality.

TAX BILL

The second most important issue facing Congress in 1964 is the tax reduction and reform bill now awaiting action by the Senate. Last January, President Kennedy proposed a broad program to reduce Federal income tax for individuals and businesses and to make our tax law more equitable.

Virtually every taxpayer in the country would pay lower taxes under this program, and everyone would benefit from the increased economic activity brought about by the release of tax savings to the private economy. Most of the individual tax reduction savings would be spent and respent, circulating throughout the economy and bringing it new life. This would generate new jobs and greater output, taking up much of the slack in our economy. Together with business tax savings, it would stimulate the kind of investment that results in faster economic growth and full employment and would bring the average American a greater level of prosperity and job security.

Initially, the tax cut would increase our Federal deficit by only a small degree. Our current deficit is the direct result of the inadequate growth of our economy. However, as our economic activity picks up, unhampered by the straitjacket of high taxes, the national deficit will be reduced, making it possible to balance the budget within the next few years. Our economy is fully capable of reducing unemployment to a reasonable level and producing enough tax revenues to meet our essential expenditures.

Regrettably, there seems little possibility that the tax bill will contain the reforms originally expected. Some taxpayers will retain their position of unfair privilege, shifting their responsibilities to others.

OTHER LEGISLATION

The assassination of President Kennedy has focused our attention on the inadequacies of Federal laws governing the sale of firearms. The Constitution guarantees Americans the right to bear arms, but some reasonable regulation over the traffic and shipment of weapons is needed if we are to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals and lunatics.

Several provisions of the National Housing Act, which have made low-cost financing available to so many homeowners, will come up for renewal during the second session of Congress. The FHA and urban redevelopment programs should be continued. I have introduced a bill to amend the act to permit loans for construction of sidewalks, gutters and other public improvements to be insured under that law. These improvements are especially needed in my district, and I am hopeful my amendment will be included in the omnibus bill.

Other matters which should receive favorable consideration include revisions in our immigration laws, legal counsel for indigent defendants in criminal cases in the Federal courts and royalties for composers for the jukebox performance of their work.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists major legislative decisions made in the 1st session of the 88th Congress and my position on each of them:

My vote	Issue	Outcome
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE	
Supported	Extension of the military draft	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $47,200,000,000 for defense [1]	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $1,600,000,000 for military construction projects.	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $5,100,000,000 for NASA research and development.[2]	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $2,300,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission.	Enacted.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Supported	Appropriate $3,000,000,000 for foreign aid	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $7,500,000 for operations of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.	Enacted.
Supported	Extend Export-Import Bank for 5 years and increase its lending authority.	Enacted.
Supported	Increase size of the Peace Corps	Enacted.
Supported	Limited nuclear test ban treaty [3]	Ratified.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Supported	Tax reduction and reform bill	Passed House.
Supported	Extend and strengthen Manpower Development and Training Act.	Enacted.
Supported	Continuation of the Interstate and Defense Highway System.	Enacted.
Supported	Extend corporate and certain excise taxes	Enacted.
Supported	Reduce unemployment compensation tax rate	Enacted.
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION	
Supported	Permanently increase House Rules Committee to 15 members.	Approved.
Supported	Extend Civil Rights Commission	Enacted.
Supported	Provide for orderly transition between election and inauguration of a new President.	In conference.
Supported	Extend President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress.	Passed House.

Footnotes at end of table.

My vote	Issue	Outcome
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION—continued	
Supported	Establish Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.	Enacted.
Supported	Extend period for raising contributions for construction of the National Cultura. Center.	Enacted.
Supported	Suspension of "equal time" rule of FCC for presidential and vice presidential election of 1964.	In conference.
	HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
Supported	Health professions education bill	Enacted.
Supported	Higher education facilities bill	Enacted.
Supported	Vocational education bill	Enacted.
Supported	Establish safety standards for seat belts for autos	Enacted.
Supported	Establish air-pollution-control program	Enacted.
Supported	Increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for research projects to prevent mental retardation.	Enacted.
Supported	Provide for construction of community mental health centers.	Enacted.
Supported	Increase funds for construction of housing for the elderly.	Enacted.
Supported	Extend FHA program for mortgage insurance for low- and moderate-income groups.	Enacted.
Supported	Tax relief for child care expense for deserted wives	Enacted.
Supported	Equal pay for person performing the same work regardless of sex.	Enacted.
	SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS	
Supported	Increase pay and subsistence allowances for military personnel.	Enacted.
Supported	Increase payments to widows, parents, and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities.	Enacted.
	SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS—Continued	
Supported	Permit conversion of exchange of national life insurance policies to new plans.	In conference.
Supported	Permit VA to waive recovery on default on home loans in certain hardship cases.	Enacted.
Supported	Assist States in providing nursing home facilities for veterans.	Passed House.
Supported	Provide educational assistance to children of disabled veterans.	In conference.
Supported	Raise enrollment of Military and Air Force Academies.	Passed House.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Supported	Feed grain bill	Enacted.
Supported	Cotton bill	Passed House.
Opposed	Continue importation of Mexican farmworkers	Enacted.
Supported	Extend exemption of peanuts for boiling from marketing quotas.	Enacted.
Supported	Develop outdoor recreational plans	Enacted.
Supported	Public works bills	In conference.
Supported	Abolish Beach Erosion Control Board; transfer its functions to Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors; establish Coastal Engineering Research Center.	Enacted.
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Supported	Federal contribution to District government	Enacted.
Opposed	Amendments to the Criminal Code	Passed House.
Opposed	Increase number of police dogs	Passed House.
Opposed	Permit teachers to use corporal punishment in public schools.	Passed House.
Supported	Strengthen enforcement procedures against unsafe structures.	Passed House.

Bill No.	Bills I have sponsored	Status
H.R. 5264	To provide hospital and related services under social security to the elderly	Hearings completed.
H.R. 5544	To provide insurance under the National Housing Act for loans made to homeowners for the construction of public improvements.	Pending in committee.
H.R. 8882	Authorize reduction of the period under which certain voting records are required to be retained	Pending in committee.
H.R. 7557	To repeal the "cooly trade" laws	Pending in committee.
H.R. 3596	To strike a medal commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra	Enacted.
H.J. Res. 543	To establish a U.S. World Film Festival Commission	Pending in committee.
H.R. 5289	For the relief of Mrs. Zara Schreiber	Enacted.

[1] I opposed the expenditure of an additional $363,00', 00 for 2 more RS-70 air raft. In so doing I supported the judgment of Secretary of Defense McNamara that the cost and effectiveness of these planes do not justify such large expenditures.

[2] I opposed every effort to reduce the funds for the manned space flight program.

[3] Although treaties are considered only by the Senate, I made my position known to both our California Senators. The, each supported the treaty.

What Is Wrong With the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the John Birch Society is in the midst of an all-out campaign to recruit new converts in Idaho. They are stepping up their public meetings, newspaper advertising, and other efforts to attract Idahoans into the society.

Inasmuch as Idahoans are writing to me inquiring just what is wrong with the John Birch Society since it is supposedly anti-Communist, I include at this point in the RECORD an open letter to me published on November 11 in the Blackfoot News and my answering letter on this subject:

[From the Blackfoot News, Nov. 11, 1963]

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN HARDING

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The press has devoted a lot of energy toward denunciation of the John Birch Society during the past 2 years. So have you and many of your colleagues. There must be a lot of information about the Birchers that the average newspaper reader has not had an opportunity to glean.

My point is this: If the Birch Society is as despicable as the news media would have us believe, we are entitled to know what the aims of the society are. I am assuming that your outspoken criticism of the John Birch Society comes from a precise knowledge of their aims and desires.

Would you please explain the creed of this society so that the "intelligent" people of southern Idaho can become as well informed as yourself and possibly join you in their denunciation.

MAX COVINGTON.

BLACKFOOT, IDAHO.

Mr. MAX COVINGTON,
Blackfoot, Idaho.

DEAR MAX: When I returned from Idaho to Washington after the assassination of President Kennedy, I found your open letter to me published in the Blackfoot News on November 11 on my desk. I have purposely delayed answering until after the official mourning period for our beloved President had expired.

In a speech I delivered in the House of Representatives on September 25, I included a brief of Mr. Welch's book, "The Politician," which had been prepared by an outstanding young Republican attorney who is a member of the same 70's Quorum that I am a member of in the Potomac Stake. I believe that his brief exposes what is wrong with the first of the John Birch standard works, "The Politician." In this book Mr. Welch has made radical accusations. Not only has he accused many loyal Americans of being Communists, but he has also charged that the Congress, the executive branch, and the Pentagon itself are in the control of the Communists.

I quote directly from Welch's book, "The Politician":

"This door to betrayal is known to be wide open; and nobody—in Congress, in the executive branch, in the Pentagon itself—nobody even dared to try to close it. Those who want it kept open are too completely in charge. And this is just one more indication of how powerful the Communist influence has now become in almost all of our Federal agencies" (p. 285).

Even more radically stated, Mr. Welch accused President Roosevelt of being used by the Communists without his knowledge, President Truman of being used by the Communists with his knowledge, and President Eisenhower of being a Communist. Again I quote from "The Politician":

"The Communists can now use all the power and prestige of the Presidency of the United States to implement their plans, just as fully and even openly as they dare. They have arrived at this point by three stages. In the first stage, Roosevelt thought he was using the Communists, to promote his personal ambitions and grandiose schemes. Of course, instead, the Communists were using him; but without his knowledge or understanding of his place in their game. In the second stage, Truman was used by the Communists, with his knowledge and acquiescence, as the price he consciously paid for their making him President. In the third stage, in my own firm opinion, the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency. For this third man, Eisenhower, there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. That word is treason" (p. 268).

Max, I want to point out that even though I feel it necessary to call to the attention of the people in my district these harsh, extreme, un-American statements of Mr. Welch

and the John Birch Society, I feel no hatred in my heart toward them. Rather, the feeling that I have for the leaders of this society is one of pity. I realize that they hate me for I have received many letters telling me so. But I do not hate them; I pity them.

The above two quotations are directly from Mr. Welch's book, "The Politician." This book and "The Blue Book" comprise the primary standard works of the Birch Society.

An outstanding eastern Idaho radio executive has carefully read and reviewed "The Blue Book" for his listeners. Gene Shumate, the owner-manager of station KRXK at Rexburg, Idaho, is a courageous, loyal American. Our political philosophies are often in disagreement, and we have taken turns attacking the views of each other over his radio station, yet I have the highest regard for Mr. Shumate and for the fine service that he is rendering to his listeners. Mr. Shumate is well aware of the fact that an informed people will remain a free people. That is why he attempted to inform his listeners of the contents of the John Birch Society's "The Blue Book."

I would like to refer you to those portions of Mr. Shumate's broadcasts on November 10, and November 17, referring to "The Blue Book."

"KRXK EDITORIAL—NOVEMBER 10, 1963

"Let me tell you something about the John Birch Society. And most of what I tell you will be from 'The Blue Book,' the primer of the society. I secured a copy on loan from the library of the Idaho State University in Pocatello. The copies are hard to come by.

"John Birch, himself, died several years before the founding of the society that carries—as far as I am concerned, 'besmirches'—his name. He was an American, a Baptist missionary, in China, and he was killed by the Chinese Communists. He was a martyr for Christianity.

"A book was written about him by Robert Welch. Welch was an unsuccessful political aspirant in Massachusetts, but a successful businessman.

"On December 9, 1958, he called a meeting of 11 men in Indianapolis. It was at this meeting the John Birch Society was formed. The 11 men are not named in 'The Blue Book.' The books itself is a compilation of lectures he gave during the 2 days with the 11 men.

"In his introductory remarks, he made such statements as, 'To anybody who has watched the way the administration moved heaven and earth to keep McCarthy from getting at the Army Loyalty Board * * * it was clear that treason * * * is widespread and rampant in our high army circles.'

"I am not going to attempt to quote all the statements in their entirety, because they are too long for listening. You could charge me with quoting out of context, but I don't think I am missing the essentials of Welch's remarks.

"His rather lengthy introduction deals with the danger of communism in this country. He says at one place, 'This octopus (meaning communism) is so large that its tentacles now reach into all of the legislative halls, all of the union labor meetings, a majority of the religious gatherings, and most of the schools of the whole world.'

"Welch deals with religion to a great extent and has one entire chapter on his religious philosophy. It is obvious that anyone who is not a Fundamentalist is suspect to him. Also in the introduction, to prove his point about how communism has taken over this country, he said, 'Fully one-third of the services in at least the Protestant churches of America are * * * watering down the faith of our fathers * * * converting Christianity into a so-called social gospel * * * an advocacy of the welfare state by Socialist politicians. Some actually use their pulpits to preach outright communism.'

"I will interrupt here to explain that apparently a Communist is anyone whom Welch calls a Communist.

"I will also interrupt to say that much of what Welch says about communism and about government can be agreed with. It's when he comes to how evils should be coped with that the John Birch Society becomes frightening. As I said last week, 'I am reading the "Blue Book" because 40 years ago I missed "Mein Kampf" and I don't want to make the same mistake again.'

"Section 4 of the 'Blue Book' is entitled, 'So, Let's Act.' In this section he for the first time outlines what the John Birch Society should do. He has 10 points. Again, I will abbreviate in the interest of time.

"Point 1. Establish reading rooms; provide 100 books of anti-Communist nature. He said, 'How many books each of these reading rooms would have, especially which books, and under what arrangements, would of course have to be tightly controlled from headquarters.'

"You will notice throughout the 10 points how 'headquarters' is to make the decisions.

"Point 2. 'We would see that the circulation of the conservative periodicals was expanded as rapidly as it could be done without too much waste.' The periodicals he mentions are: American Opinion, published by Welch, National Review, Dan Smoot Report, and Human Events. The society would see to it that these periodicals are placed in doctors' and dentists' offices, fraternities, and barbershops, but the barbershop proprietors would have to sign a pledge they would display the magazines.

"Point 3. Support, maintain, and increase the number of stations using such radio programs as Fulton Lewis, Clarence Manion, and dozens of more localized broadcasters throughout the country. 'This would take the form of encouraging sponsors by both patronage of their products and letters of approval; of praising stations and networks for carrying such programs; of getting together groups to hear such broadcasts; by helping to raise money when absolutely necessary to keep such programs or present stations and get them on more.'

"Point 4. 'We would institute the organized planning and control to make full and effectively, coordinate use of the powerful letterwriting weapon that lies so ready at hand. The letterwriting of subgroups should not be left to the haphazard or halfhearted following by the members of hopeful pleas or suggestions. It should be definitely planned, directed, and the amount and promptness of participation constantly checked and evaluated by a central headquarters or director.'

"Point 5. 'We should organize fronts—little fronts, big fronts, temporary fronts, permanent fronts, all kinds of fronts.' Welch gives some examples: 'Committee for Withdrawal of Recognition.' 'Committee To Protest the Firing of Medford Evans,' Evans was a professor of Northwestern State College in Louisiana, 'A Petition To Impeach Earl Warren,' 'A Committee To Investigate Communist Influences at Vassar College,' 'Women Against Labor Union Hoodlumism,' 'A Petition to the Airplane Pilots Association To Grow Up,' and 'Please, Mr. President, Don't Go.' The last was in reference to a summit conference.

"Point 6. Start shocking the American people into a realization of what is happening. Welch gave an example of what he would do. He said, 'There is the head of one of the great educational institutions in the East whom at least some of us believe to be a Communist. Even with $100,000 to hire sleuths to keep him and his present contacts under constant surveillance for awhile, and to retrace every detail of his past history, I doubt if we could prove it on him. But, with just $5,000 to pay for careful research, I believe we could get all the material needed for quite a shock. Of course we would have to satisfy ourselves completely as to whether our guess had been correct, from the preliminary research, before going ahead with the project and spending that much money. But if we are right, and with the research job done, we would run in the magazine an article consisting entirely of questions to this man, which would be devastating in their implications. The question technique, when skillfully used in this way, is mean and dirty. But the Communists we are after are meaner and dirtier, and too slippery for you to put your fingers on them in the ordinary way.'

"Even if I agreed with the rightfulness of the other 10 points—and I don't agree with any of them—I would recoil from such a society as could accept point 6. It is the most un-American of them all.

"Point 7. 'Send observers to lectures by those opposing militant anticommunism and have observers confound the speakers.'

"Apparently the same tactic of unanswerable questions would be used here. It should work well in our churches.

"Point 8. 'Organize a lecture bureau made up of prominent people who speak on specific subjects, but which could still carry a strong anti-Communist message. This, like everything else we are talking about, is a matter of planning, supervision, and control.'

"Point 9. Welch was a little vague in this one, I thought, but from what I got out of it the point was to 'extend our body into other countries.'

"Point 10. 'Put our weight into the political scales in this country as fast and as far as we could.'

"Those are the 10 points of action of the John Birch Society. Welch has some ideas on what the ideal government would be. I will get to those next week.

"But let me sign off today with the point again that throughout the 10 steys, the control from headquarters is essential. There must be one guiding genius. Who is this paragon? Welch answered that question to his 11 listeners, too. He said, later in the book, 'Because I know in my own mind, beyond all doubt or question, that without dynamic personal leadership around which the split and frustrated and confused forces on our side can be rallied, rapidly and firmly, we do not have a chance of stopping the Communists before they have taken over our country. It is not that you would choose me, or that I would even choose me, against other possibilities. It is simply that under the pressure of time and the exigencies of our need you have no other choice, and neither do I.'

"That's what he said. That is why I have compared Robert Welch's 'The Blue Book' of the John Birch Society with Adolph Hitler's 'Mein Kampf.'

"KRXK EDITORIAL, NOVEMBER 17, 1963

"Today we continue with the 'Blue Book' of the John Birch Society. Last Sunday I went over the 10 organizational points laid down by Robert Welch in his outline for the 11 men in Indianapolis on December 9, 1958.

"Again, I will devote myself to his book without getting into the strange acts and words of some of his followers; the spitting on Adlai Stevenson, the calling of President Eisenhower and General Marshall Communists, the vitriolic letterwriting to Congressmen and Senators. In 'The Blue Book' Welch does not deal with Eisenhower. He does devote considerable time to the advisability of impeaching Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren. And he does designate himself as the only effective leader of a society that will ultimately rule the country. I will repeat his quote on that subject, 'Because I know in my own mind, beyond all doubt or question, that without dynamic personal leadership around which the split and frustrated and confused forces on our

side can be rallied, rapidly and firmly, we do not have a chance of stopping the Communists before they have taken over our country. It is not that you would choose me, or that I would even choose me, against other possibilities. It is simply that under the pressure of time and the exigencies of our need you have no other choice, and neither do I.'

"Mr. Welch spoke well of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in 1958. First he selected him and then rejected him as the savior of the United States * * * again leaving only himself.

"I am going to quote extensively now. In his chapter on 'Under Positive Leadership' he said, 'BARRY GOLDWATER has political know-how and the painstaking genius to use that know-how with regard to infinite details. He is a superb political organizer, and inspires deep and lasting loyalty. He is absolutely sound in his Americanism, has the political and moral courage to stand by his Americanist principles, and in my opinion can be trusted to stand by them until hell freezes over. I'd love to see him President of the United States, and maybe some day we shall. But does anybody in this room think there is any slightest chance of BARRY GOLDWATER supplying the dynamic overall leadership needed to save this country for anybody to be President of? If so, I think he is still not fully aware of the nature and totality of the forces at work. For GOLDWATER, by the very circumstances of his political success, present prestige, and the expectations of his supporters, will inevitably think and move in terms of political warfare. Even if he personally should reach the point and the understanding of wanting to consider political action as just a part, no matter how important, of much broader overall action, how much chance do you think there is that his friends and supporters would let him step out of the strictly political role in which he has been so successful? How much chance is there that they would let him build and utilize forceful leadership on all of the other fronts where we must fight the Communists? How many of the steps which we discussed yesterday afternoon, and which I am sure must be taken if we are to have any chance at all, do you think you could count on BARRY GOLDWATER's leadership to bring about, no matter how much he was beseeched, and no matter how much he himself came to feel inclined, to do so?'

"Robert Welch in his 'Blue Book' later says, 'As you look more and more carefully into the hopes that have been bred, and the disappointments that have followed, throughout the political performances of these 20 years, you come increasingly to realize the wisdom of the old advice: 'Put not your faith in politicians.' We shall have to use politicians, support politicians, create politicians, and help the best ones we can find to get elected. I am thoroughly convinced, however, that we cannot count on politicians, political leadership, or even political action except as a part of something much deeper and broader, to save us.'

"It seems obvious to me that Robert Welch has no faith in a representative form of government. He has just said as much. But he says more. He says, 'The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. A republican form of government or of organization has many attractions and advantages, under certain favorable conditions. But under less happy circumstances it lends itself too readily to infiltration, distortion, and disruption. And democracy, of course, in government or organization, as the Greeks and Romans both found out, and as I believe every man in this room clearly recognizes—democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud.

" 'For withstanding the stresses and strains of internal differences and external animosities, throughout changing political climates over long periods of time; for the building of morale and loyalty and a feeling of unified purpose and closely knit strength; for effective functioning in periods of crisis and a permanence of high dedication throughout more peaceful decades; for these and many other reasons, the John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels. The fear of tyrannical oppression of individuals, and other arguments against the authoritarian structure in the form of governments, have little bearing on the case of a voluntary association, where the authoritative power can be exercised and enforced only by persuasion. And what little validity they do have is outweighed by the advantages of firm and positive direction of the Society's energies. Especially for the near future, and for the fight against communism which is the first great task of the Society, it is imperative that all the strength we can muster be subject to smoothly functioning direction from the top. As I have said before, no collection of debating societies is ever going to stop Communist conspiracy from taking us over, and I have no intention of adding another frustrated group to their number. We mean business every step of the way.

"A page later, elaborating on this, Welch said, 'Those members who cease to feel the necessary degree of loyalty can either resign or will be put out before they build up any splintering following of their own inside the Society. As I have said, we mean business every step of the way. We can allow for differences of opinion. We shall need and welcome advice. And we expect to use the normal measure of diplomacy always called for in dealing with human beings. But whenever differences of opinion become translated into a lack of loyal support, we shall have short cuts for eliminating both without going through any congress of so-called democratic processes.'

"And with this, I will end the quotations of Robert Welch in 'The Blue Book' of the John Birch Society.

"I wish that this book was in popular distribution. I don't know of many of them available to the public. I borrowed a copy from the Idaho State University Library and must now return it.

"I wish that everyone could and would read it, but I realize that's wishing much too much.

"If I were to review the basic tenets of the John Birch Society, as outlined in 'The Blue Book,' I think I would do it briefly, like this: Communism is evil. A Communist is one whome Robert Welch says is a Communist. The representative form of government is ineffective. Robert Welch is effective. Therefore, Robert Welch should head the Government and the John Birch Society should be the Government. The public is not to be trusted. Therefore, don't trust them. Robert Welch believes in God. And so can you, so long as your God is the same as Robert Welch's.

"So let's all join the storm troopers and live happily ever after."

I recently told a group of high school students to be interested in our government, to investigate the political philosophies of the two parties in order to find which party most nearly matched their own thinking and to become active in it. I counseled them that this was the advice I would give my own son. I would be most proud if, after reading American history and American political thought, he made a decision on his own to be an active worker in the Republican Party. However, naturally I added that I would be even more proud if he decided to become active in the Democratic Party. Both of our two political parties are composed of dedicated Americans working for a better America.

Since the death of our beloved President Kennedy, we have seen the untiy that has existed between leaders and elected officials of both the Democrat and Republican Parties.

However, I counseled these students to avoid extremists. The Communist Party U.S.A., the Socialists, the Fair Play for Cuba organization and other extreme left-wing groups have done nothing to build America. In many instances they make their programs appealing to young people, following the Devil's technique of telling 99 truths to get a person to believe 1 lie. But I know that anyone who becomes affiliated with one of these groups, either through deceit, misinformation, or bitterness, will live to regret it.

The same is true of the extremists on the right. We have seen George Lincoln Rockwell and his American Nazi Party, Elijah Muhammad and the Black Muslims, Robert Welch and his John Birch Society, and other extremists who again will use the vicious technique of telling 99 truths to get a person to believe 1 lie that will ruin his life should he accept it.

We have no need of extremism on either end of the political spectrum. It is for this reason, Max, that I have felt it my duty as an elected Representative to speak out against political extremists. After reading "The Politician" and "The Blue Book" which are the standard works of the John Birch Society, I have made the speeches in opposition to the views of the society.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH HARDING,
Member of Congress.

Federal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article in Mr. Saburo Kido's "Observation" column in the November 19, 1963, edition of the New Japanese American News has just come to my attention.

Mr. Kido has many thoughtful comments and worthwhile ideas regarding the proposed Federal pay raise legislation bill, and I believe we would do well to give them our most careful consideration.

The article follows:

PAY RAISE

(By Saburo Kido)

There is presently pending in Congress a bill to raise the salaries of most of the civilian employees in the Federal service. This includes Members of Congress, Cabinet members, sub-Cabinet officers, members of many Federal regulatory agencies and the Federal judiciary.

During the last years of the Eisenhower administration, a comprehensive study of Federal salaries was undertaken by a committee headed by Clarence Randall, formerly head of Inland Steel. At the request of President Kennedy, this report was updated.

The report recognized the need for attracting and retraining outstanding men and women in the Federal service. The bill now pending before Congress sets the pay scale at substantially less than that recommended by the Randall Committee.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee favored a bill which would in-

crease Cabinet salaries to $35,000 a year and congressional salaries to $32,500. It also would raise the salaries of practically every civilian working for Government from the Vice President on down.

The pay boost for each Member of Congress would be the first since 1955. The $10,000 increase means a percentage increase of 44 percent. During the same period, postal employees and classified civil service workers have received increases totaling 55 percent. Thus, it can be seen that the legislators' salaries have not kept pace with the cost of living.

As far as we are concerned, the Members of Congress should be paid a salary which would make it possible for the recognized leaders in a community to seek office and be assured of compensation somewhat similar to that which they might expect in positions of leadership in their own community.

Until recent years, Congress was in session ordinarily from January through July. The Members had time to attend to their private business affairs or professions to supplement their income.

Originally, the pay was $6 a day, which lasted for almost 30 years. Then for the next 40 years Congress paid itself $8 a day; but still only working days.

In 1856, the Members decided to raise this to $3,000 a year, but with deductions for each day of absence except for illness.

The last pay raise was in 1955 when it boosted its salary from $15,000 to the present $22,500.

The present trend is for Congress to hold longer sessions. The present body will be in session for the whole year. This would mean that unless a person is independently wealthy, many qualified candidates could not afford to serve in Congress.

A true cross section of our community is needed to make democracy work at its best. This means that the compensation of the Congressmen should be adequate so that they will not have to worry about their income even if they are kept in Washington, D.C., all year round.

The same case could be made for the Cabinet officers and the Federal judiciary. The sacrifice in income in many instances has been too great. In Los Angeles alone, there are many local and State officers who are receiving incomes greater than those received by Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and the judiciary.

The Federal Government today is one of the biggest businesses in the world. Billions of dollars are being appropriated and administered for various functions.

Those who have the responsibility of determining the financing of the works of the Federal Government should be paid adequately so that they can give their fullest attention. The only way to attract competent men would be to see to it that they will not have to make too great a sacrifice in rendering public service.

The first Congress set up the following guidelines for salary:

"The compensation should not be set so high that it would attract poor people to seek the salary instead of the office; nor so low that only the rich could afford to serve."

Since the pay scale in every civilian field has been raised, it does not seem to be out of line for Congress to see that the Federal employees receive comparable salaries. This seems to be especially true as far as Congress and the higher echelon of Federal employees are concerned. Congress should not be too squeamish about doing what is fair and right.

Those who believe in good government will recognize the fact that we must have competent and capable men in responsible positions. This means that the pay scale should not be below what is paid in civilian life.

We believe the people will not condemn any raise in salaries. They have witnessed the spiraling of the cost of living. Therefore, they would consider it only proper that the adjustments be made.

The Need for a Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 20, 1963

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that my colleagues in the House have been receiving considerable correspondence on the Civil Rights Act of 1963. My own experience has been that critics of this bill usually fall back upon some form of the argument, "You cannot legislate brotherly love."

The following article, by the Reverend G. F. LeMoine, of Minneapolis, is the best presentation of the necessity for civil rights legislation that I have read. I commend it to my colleagues, for the question "Why law?" is one that will be facing us on the House floor early in the next session:

HE ASKS CIVIL RIGHTS QUESTION, "WHY LAW?"

(By Rev. G. F. LeMoine)

I am often asked the questions, particularly in these days of a push for more adequate civil rights legislation: "Does law, or a law, do any good? Don't people's hearts have to change?"

These are important questions. They involve concepts of the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man. They express concerns which have troubled "religious man" for thousands of years. Obviously, then, the few remarks which I shall make here are not designed to do more than reopen the discussion—once more.

If you and I examine ourselves realistically, after we have become emotional about freedom, we will very likely find that we have not been considering freedom in the general, but rather in the particular—"my" freedom. We will discover, also, that we have been, to a large extent, expressing the idea of arbitrary freedom when dealing with my freedom. The old song "I want what I want when I want it" is clearly a part of our feeling tone. So then, when we pray, we do to some extent say: "Nevertheless, not thy will, but mine be done." We do tend to set up false gods to worship—one of them, ourselves, as the center of the universe.

But, when I have said this, I must hasten to add the other side of the coin. We are at war within ourselves about this matter of freedom. Even though we are tempted by the idea of being absolutely free, we know that there are limitations to our freedom. We yearn to learn the bounds of our freedom so that we may know the ground of our existence. The phrase "whose service is perfect freedom" has very deep spiritual significance here.

This war within ourselves, over the matter of freedom, is reflected in groups whether they be small or large. In the family, in the Nation, and in the world there is the continuing struggle to find a livable (viable) concept of freedom.

At this point, I should like to make a categorical statement. A universe without law does not exist and will not exist. The concept of such a universe only exists so that you and I can make the decision to submit our wills freely to God, the lawgiver. Law is with us in this life and the life to come.

When St. Paul stated that "the law was our schoolteacher to bring us unto Christ" (Galatians 3:24), I do not believe that he was negating the essentiality of law. Rather, I think he was speaking of a progression in his understanding of law—law depersonalized to law personified in the lawgiver, Christ.

Solomon Schechter in his book "Aspects of Rabbinic Theology," also refers to law as a schoolteacher: "The Torah was simply the manifestation of God's will, revealed to us for good—the pedagage, as the rabbis expressed it, who educates God's creatures. The occupation with the Torah was, according to the rabbis, less calculated to produce schoolmen and jurists than saints and devout spirits."

It appears to me that we have, many times, been unfair to both St. Paul's understanding of law and also to a Jew of the school of Hillel (the Judaism extant today is the direct descendant of this school—and Paul studied under Rabbi Gamaliel, the grandson of Hillel). We set up a false dichotomy when there was none for them. There are always degenerated forms about: Family life; business; age interrelationships; the interplay of nations; and, at times and places, the church. God comprehends the perfect forms and concepts, we approximate to the perfect as we recognize the limitations of our freedom and blend and bend it in accordance with His will.

So then to the questions regarding civil rights legislation or any other laws. In an ideal society, even though the fact of a universe of law would still be true, we would certainly not need written laws.

Within a Christian ideal community this would mean simply, that using our Lord's life as the guideline for his own life, and seeing his own life as only having meaning in Christ's life, and realizing that this is also true for others, the Christian would willingly submit himself to the law of love (agape).

But Christians do not have this ideal society. We are in the race, we press on toward our goal, our high calling in Christ Jesus—but, perhaps, only a few saints of the saints of God reach that goal in this life.

Apart from the internal disposition of the heart, do Christians need any external standard by which to judge whether a person is or is not a Christian? Despite divided Christendom, I think we would find that Christians have always set forth a minimum standard of laws for persons to live up to externally if they wanted to bear the name of Christian. This standard varies from era to era, from communion to communion, and from one geographical location to another—but there has been a minimum. People living in community have to establish a minimum standard for those who desire to live in that community.

But what about the state as a separate entity, even though Christians, Jews, atheists, etc., are members of the state? As noted one can conceive that, for internal purposes, an ideal state would not need written law. However, we do not have an ideal state and therefore the state must establish the minimum external standard that can exist if persons within that state are to live in relationship to one another. Depending upon the moral capacities of the persons of the state, the standard will be low or high one.

In civil rights legislation, it seems obvious that for many millions of citizens of the United States, the written minimum standard is too low and must be revised to a higher level. This says nothing about what the

ideal is or should be, but again, and I think obviously, the ideal will always be higher than the minimum standard.

I am contending that written law is necessary for the conduct of society. This is not to suggest, in the slightest, that the written law be frozen, but rather that it must be responsive to the increasing sensitivities of people. Historically, whenever the cry goes out for "freedom in Christ," or something similar, it usually means in practice a wave of antinomianism. A great leader such as St. Paul or Martin Luther will have a valid understanding, but disciples less than a generation removed will turn freedom into license.

Do written laws change hearts? I think they do. For one thing, the process of wrestling with changing cultural concepts, in anticipation of a written law, forces individuals to examine their consciences. For another, once the law is on the books people begin to learn to live with it—we are rather adaptable animals. How many persons who cried never in 1954 at the time of the famous U.S. Supreme Court decision abolishing segregated schools, are at least saying sometime now.

In concluding this article, I should like to share with you Aristotle's four stages in the moral history possible to a man: the first (akolasia, or downright wickedness), in which he neither knows nor desires what is good; the second (akrasia, or incontinence), in which he knows what is right, but fails to do it; the third (enkrateia, continence or self-control), in which he succeeds in doing right by constant effort and struggle; the fourth (sophrosyne, or temperance), in which the personality is so harmonized that the right is done without a struggle.

It appears to me that Aristotle's stages can be helpful in this summing up of the place and importance of laws. To me the thought would be that the guiding principle of law runs through all four stages. If all were as in the fourth, there would be no need for wrtten law. Since the ideal state does not exist, written law is necessary to enable men of different moral attainments to live together in society.

New Year's Dragon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

As we meet today in the closing hours of 1963 the problems of 1964 already crowd in upon us. I have read with concern the appended news article from today's Christian Science Monitor on the shift in world positions with respect to Red China. Since the events reported may be the basis for some difficult questions for the United States in 1964, I am appending the story by Goeffrey Godsell for the information of the Congress.

PEIPING SCORES AFRICAN GAIN

(By Geoffrey Godsell)

The virtual certainty that Tunisia will shortly announce recognition of Communist China might well be the watershed that marks:

The end of Peiping's isolation from the center of the stage of world diplomacy;

The bell for the last lap leading to the Chinese Communists' admission to the United Nations.

To this extent, the announcement that Chinese Premier Chou En-lai has accepted President Bourguiba's invitation to visit Tunis—coupled with the prospect of Tunisia's recognition of the Peiping regime—is the biggest single triumph of the Chinese leader's current African tour.

VOTED FOR ADMISSION

Mr. Chou has already visited the United Arab Republic (Egypt), Algeria, and Morocco. His reception in each was friendly: That was to be expected since each recognizes the Mao Tse-tung regime. But there is no evidence that in any of those three countries he managed to persuade the governments significantly to shift their basic policy further in Peiping's favor.

In fairness to President Bourguiba of Tunisia, it should be said that his invitation to Mr. Chou and his apparent intention to recognize the Chinese mainland government probably does not mean any radical change in the substance of Tunisian foreign policy—which might be described as nonalinement on the side of the West.

ADMISSION FAVORED

During the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, Tunisia voted in effect for—not against—admission of representatives from Peiping as rightful occupants of the Chinese seat.

It was one of five former French territories in Africa to do so. (The others were Algeria, Guinea, Mali, and Morocco.) Twelve former French African territories voted against; and one (Mauritania) abstained.

The vote in the General Assembly was 41 in favor of Communist China's admission, 57 against, 12 abstentions, and 1 absentee. Thus if the other French African territories used Tunisia's recognition of the Communist regime as a cue to shift their votes in the U.N., Peiping might well find a majority voting for it at next year's General Assembly.

INDEPENDENT LINE

Such a shift is all the more likely because of the policy which French President de Gaulle now is pursuing toward the Chinese Communists. He is edging closer to them—largely because of his desire to hew out for France a foreign policy independent of that of the United States—and might well have recognized them, were it not for the diplomatic ties which he still maintains with the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa.

Hitherto, most former French African territories have followed France in its attitude toward the Chinese (and on other questions) without giving much thought to the issue. Now, however, they probably sense that the green light has been given from Paris for a more positive attitude toward the Chinese Communists—and Tunisia is the first to go ahead.

ISOLATION PIERCED

Full details of Mr. Chou's subsequent itinerary in his widesweeping tour of Africa have been withheld. After Tunisia, it is known for certain that he plans to visit Ghana, Guinea, Mali, and Somalia; but the acceptance of invitations to other African countries has not been specifically excluded.

Thus it is possible that a shift in the policy of other former French territories might result in other countries yet being added to his route.

One thing now is clear: Mr. Chou's foray into Africa, planned originally as largely an attempt to wean Africans from any pro-Soviet sympathies, has shattered more than anything else Peiping's isolation from international diplomacy outside the Communist world.

Ironically, African decisions to recognize Peiping will almost certainly be explained as moves to insure that Africans are identified with neither of the Communist giants—an explanation of which the sincerity need not be questioned.

The Wheat Deal: A Hollow Victory for the American Taxpayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have noted a good many newspaper articles speaking of a victory for President Johnson over the inclusion of a credit guarantee for Russian wheat deals in the foreign aid bill, but I have seen little of the defeat suffered by the American taxpayer. One exception to this general press comment was an article in the New York Herald Tribune of Thursday, December 26, 1963, by David Lawrence.

As Mr. Lawrence correctly points out, Congress, by backing down on the credit guarantee prohibition after pressure from the President, abdicated its proper role in deciding how the money being appropriated should be spent. Strangely enough, many of those applauding this Presidential victory at the expense of Congress as an institution, have been among those most critical of Congress as an institution. We are constantly being told by these same people that Congress must revise itself to assume its proper role. Although no one has ever bothered to define in writing what they think that proper role is, it is apparent that part of this role is to be a rubber-stamp for the policies dreamed up by administration officials having no responsibility to the voters.

The administration has chosen, and its majority in Congress has endorsed, a policy of doing business with the Russians at whatever cost to the American taxpayer. The illogic of aiding our enemy to relieve pressures at home so that he can become more belligerent against us is clearly developed by Mr. Lawrence in his article. What is equally illogical is the assumption that Congress was interfering in an area in which it has no interest by attempting to stop credit guarantees.

Congress has already put a ban on direct loans to Communist countries, yet I have heard no one requesting Congress to repeal this ban because it interferes with the Executive. Nor did anyone criticize Congress authorization of credit guarantees to Western countries, on these grounds, either.

Mr. Lawrence's article follows:

WAS WHEAT DEAL VICTORY ABDICATION BY CONGRESS?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—If America ever tolerates dictatorship as an instrument of Government, it could come about only through acceptance of the misguided concepts of expediency so often set forth nowadays by some of the so-called liberal philosophers. For no more flagrant example of distorted constitutionalism could be offered today than the doctrine of those who are charging that any refusal by Congress to supply credit facilities for the sale of wheat to the Soviet Government is an interference with or invasion of the power of the President to conduct foreign policy or is a curb on the exercise of Presidential authority.

Yet this is the argument on which was based the administration's drive to coerce a reluctant and unwilling House of Representatives to pass such a measure. It was finally approved by a narrow majority after 10 days of wrangling, three procedural votes and the engendering of a good deal of hard feeling.

The Constitution gives no power to the President to order funds to be made available to other countries just because he thinks it's good foreign policy. There is no discretion vested in the President of the United States to spend public money unless Congress votes him such discretion.

No President can declare war without a prior resolution by Congress. No President can make a binding treaty without the consent of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. No President can make rules for the "government and regulation of the land and naval forces" without authority from Congress.

The real issue in the latest controversy between the Executive and Congress developed as a result of the President's proposal to buy good will among foreign nations by giving them grants or loans and specifically permitting the use of the credit of the U.S. Government to finance wheat sales by Americans to the Soviet Union. Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee and a Democratic Party leader, said he has no objection to sale of the wheat, but wants to see it financed by "cash on the barrelhead." There are many other Members of Congress who don't want to see any transactions at all with Russia financed by the American Government. They were dragooned by administration pressure into voting for such a measure.

The Constitution gives to Congress the sole power to deal with this whole matter. It says explicitly that "the Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations * * *." It doesn't say that the President shall share in such power. Yet the so-called liberals are crying out that the initial behavior of Congress in recent days was an interference with the President's conduct of foreign policy. Some went so far as to imply that some Constitutional right is being invaded by Congress when it insists on looking carefully at every proposed use of the American taxpayers' money. Maybe the next step will be to insist some day that Congress turn over the tax receipts in their entirety to the Executive to be spent as he sees fit.

It is strange how often history repeats itself. Back in the early 1930's, the rise of Hitlerism caused widespread dismay. There were proposals in various countries to cut off commercial relations and, specifically, to bar the export of arms to Nazi Germany. But the materialistic instinct prevailed, and many European countries yielded to the temptation and exported all kinds of goods to help Hitler build his military machine. Even some American businessmen and other prominent citizens, returning from visits overseas in those days, declared confidently: "You can do business with Hitler." This fantasy continued until even after World War II broke out in the autumn of 1939.

Today, there's a similar cry: "You can do business with Khrushchev." It is being echoed around the United States. What seems incredible is that anybody who has studied the events prior to World War II would seek today to "do business" with a government which has made such a treacherous record as that of the men in the Kremlin in recent years—including the deployment of missiles in Cuba little more than a year ago. Yet many not only advocate expanded trade with the Communist regime—thus indirectly helping Moscow to strengthen its hold on the oppressed and enslaved peoples in Eastern Europe—but actually favor the lending of taxpayers' money to back up sales by private merchants of wheat.

Certainly, this is an issue that the people should decide without dictation from the executive branch of the Government. The executive viewpoint is entitled to consideration when it is expressed as part of a program of proposed foreign-policy objectives. But foreign policy in the last analysis is made, as the Constitution stipulates, by the people's representatives in Congress whenever such policies involve the expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

It may make an interesting issue for the 1964 presidential campaign, especially since the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives has finally gone on record by overwhelming vote as supporting a policy of "doing business with Khrushchev." It thus favors giving him financial credits to save his regime from internal economic troubles and to help him avoid a revolution, thereby building up his position for the armament contests of the future.

A Meditation: On Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of 1963 made the holy season of Christmas a sobering and thoughtful one. One which made all reflect and think, "for whom the bell tolls." Many words and letters have been written as a tribute to the late President Kennedy. The following meditation which I wish to include in the RECORD was written by the Reverend Michael Farina of St. Thomas the Apostle Church, in Washington, D.C. He gave it in place of a sermon on Sunday, November 24:

A MEDITATION: ON DEATH

Birth is an awesome mystery
A wondrous one
When mere man shares in the creative power of God.
Oh, it is a gift of love.
Yet, then does a man challenge why?
Asking, seeking?
When other wombs are barren and other arms unfilled
With such a gift of love
God has given him.
Then, they weep tears of joy.

Death is a terrifying mystery
A frightening one
When mere man must acknowledge the power of the Creator.
Oh, it is a gift of love
Yet, then does a man challenge why?
Asking, seeking?
When hearts, with an unspeakable loneliness, unfilled
With such a gift of love
God has taken from him.
Then they weep tears of sorrow.

God is a mystery
A loving one
Creator knowing, wisdomwise in purpose why and when
The seed quicken, the flower reach beauteous bloom
Time into eternity intrude,
Exchanging love for life and life for love
And this in love.

Civil Rights Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months full page newspaper advertisements entitled "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs," sponsored by an organization which advertises itself as "the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom," have been appearing in the newspapers of Idaho. This advertisement makes many fantastic charges, wild misrepresentations and false insinuations in an attempt to stimulate Idahoans to write their Senators and Congressmen urging them to vote against civil rights legislation.

Fortunately, in the State of Idaho we have a very excellent and workable civil rights bill. If every State had a civil rights bill of the scope and fairness of the Idaho law, there would be no need for Federal legislation. However, I for one, deplore the fact that citizens of the United States who can be drafted into the Army of the United States, who are taxed not only by the Federal Government, but also by their respective State and local governments are denied the right to participate fully in the services furnished by those governments.

Many of us throughout the Nation have been dismayed at unsuccessful attempts of Negro citizens to attend the State universities in their home States which are supported partly with their tax moneys. In the few instances where a Negro has won admission it has almost taken an Army to give him this right of attaining higher education in his home State.

Many of us have also been discouraged to note that an outstanding Negro can come to the North, attend an outstanding university of science or technology, receive a Ph. D. in the scientific work of his choice, but then should he return to a Federal missile or defense installation in the South as part of a scientific team, he is denied the right to stay in the same hotel with other members of his team and is denied the right to eat in the same restaurant with other members of the scientific team simply because of his race.

Many of us further deplore the fact that millions of Americans are being denied their constitutional right to vote in elections in some of our Southern States simply because of their race.

I, for one, intend to vote to eliminate these wrongs. I did not intend to speak out on this subject. I had merely intended to vote my conscience on civil rights. However, when this so-called Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom publishes the following full page ad in an attempt to deceive the people of Idaho, I feel as their elected representative I must attempt to set the record straight:

[From the Eastern Idaho Farmer, Idaho Falls, Idaho, Nov. 21, 1963]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LEGAL WRONGS: CIVIL RIGHTS BILL OF 1963

A package of legislation called "the Civil Rights Act of 1963" now is pending in the U.S. Congress.

The title is a misnomer. This bill is but 10 percent civil rights. The rest—90 percent—is an extension of Federal executive power created at the expense of individuals, States, and municipalities. The bill is, in fact, the blueprint for a controlled system of life; it would establish new principles of law of drastic and far-reaching implications.

Consider the bill's principal provisions:

Under the cloak of civil rights—if this bill becomes law—the Federal Government henceforth will dictate to whom you may sell or rent your home.

If you are the proprietor of an establishment that offers goods and services for use or hire—not just public accommodations (hotels, restaurants, and such) but any kind of business that offers anything to the public—then, under this bill, your business would be subject to Federal control.

In like manner, the bill covers all contractors and subcontractors in every program or activity where direct or indirect financial aid is rendered by the Government. It will apply to you: If you borrow money from or deposit money in a Government-insured bank; if you have an FHA, VA, or Small Business Administration loan; if you are a realtor or developer; if you are a farmer who has financial dealings with the Farm Credit Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the Soil Conservation Service, or if you have Federal crop insurance, or deal with the REA or participate in any agricultural program involving Federal funds.

EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Under this act, all employers who participate in any of these programs can be told by a Federal FEPC whom they shall hire, fire, promote, and demote, and how they shall handle their employees.

Under this act Federal inspectors would be empowered to rule that racial or religious imbalance exists in a business. Thereafter, that business could not employ or promote the people it might prefer but only such racial or religious individuals as the Federal inspector designated. His ruling could require that racial or religious balance be obtained and apply to all job classifications: to common laborers, to skilled laborers, to the secretarial staff, to supervisory employees, and to vice presidents, all alike. A Federal agency would be prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner.

ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement of the Federal inspector's findings would be simple; failure to comply would mean the end of all participation in Federal programs. Your loan could be called; you could be blacklisted for further loans from banks or financial institutions insured by the Government; and you could be prevented from taking part in any activity that had to do with Federal financing. In certain injunctive situations, an employer could be jailed without the protection of a jury trial.

And that is only part of it.

UNIONS

The bill goes on: In giving the Federal Government new control over the hiring, firing, promoting, demoting, and payment of employees, the act also would give Federal commissioners new powers to destroy not only the seniority system of unions, but also an employee's rights within the company for which he works. This is so because the act gives full and unlimited power to Federal inspectors to determine who shall be hired, promoted, demoted, or fired, whenever a charge is made that racial and/or religious imbalance (discrimination) exists.

VOTERS

Nor is that all. The bill boldly seeks for the Justice Department unprecedented powers to gain Federal control of the electoral machinery.

In 1961, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recommended—contrary to express provisions in the Constitution—that the Federal Government impose new control over the qualification and registration of voters. The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would implement these recommendations.

It follows, then, if this act were made law, a politically minded Attorney General could go into an area where the voting might be close and swing the election. See how it would work: The language of the bill allows the Attorney General, at his own discretion, to file a "discrimination" suit and, without proof of his allegations, register tens-of-thousands of voters. The ballots, then, could be cast and counted and the election won, even though the Attorney General's action, later, was determined by the courts to have been invalid.

PROFESSIONAL AND SMALL BUSINESS

The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would also bring under Federal control individuals and businesses never before thought to be constitutionally subject to such regulations. Under the bill's title II, any person who pays a business license to a State or municipality could be included.

Thus, the act brings under Federal supervision almost every profession and every business—lawyers, realtors, small establishment, doctors, restaurants, gasoline stations, theaters, hotels, motels, and lodging houses. The smallest soda fountain would be covered.

EVERYONE

A careful reading of this Civil Rights Act of 1963, we believe, will convince the impartial citizen that the administration is here proposing, under an emotional and racist appeal to civil rights, to destroy age-old liberties of the individual and to cast off constitutional restraints upon Federal power. The bill would intimately and immediately affect every parent of school-age children, every businessman, every professional man, every homeowner, and every wage earner in the United States.

Many of the provisions of the act, in our view, violate the Constitution of the United States. They are also contrary to existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. But no one can foretell what the Supreme Court would hold, if Congress were to make a legislative finding in the areas mentioned; that is, if the Civil Rights Act of 1963 were passed by Congress.

SCHOOLS

The bill goes even further. If this act should become law, between 100 and 200 statutes now in effect would be amended. Everyone who has dealings with Federal educational programs, for instance, would be subject to new requirements. Under the provisions of the act, the U.S. Commissioner of Education could influence the transfer of children from one school to another, back and forth, until racial balance and religious balance existed. (The correction of racial imbalance is of such importance to the sponsors that the phrase appears eight times in a single brief section of the bill.)

Under the authority proposed in connection with Federal financing, school lunch programs, research programs, the building of schools, Hill-Burton hospitals—all such programs and organizations would be subject to new Federal controls.

The so-called "softening amendments" proposed by Attorney General Kennedy do not actually change the effects of the bill.

Write Congress. If you do not want such controls to apply to you, if you do not want your personal liberties snatched from you in the areas covered by the bill, if you want to preserve liberty under the law, then write to your Senators (both of them) and to your Congressman, today. Ask them, earnestly, to vote against this legislation. Tell them the truth, that 90 percent of "the Civil Rights Act of 1963" is not Civil Rights at all, but Federal control. Do this and you will stop this grab for power. Fail to do it, and the legal foundation will be laid for the most revolutionary change in our country's history. You have "civil rights" too. Put them to use in a fight against this bill.

Sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, 301 First Street NE., Washington, D.C.; William Loeb, Manchester, N.H., chairman; and John J. Synon, Richmond, Va., director.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD three outstanding newspaper columns related to this advertisement. On November 4, the New York Times carried the following article written by Ben A. Franklin:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 4, 1963]

MISSISSIPPI FUNDS FIGHT RIGHTS BILL—STATE GIVES $20,000 IN TAX MONEY TO CAPITOL LOBBY

(By Ben A. Franklin)

WASHINGTON, November 3.—Public funds of the State of Mississippi are supporting the most active lobby here against civil rights legislation.

Reports filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives show that $20,000 has been paid by the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, a tax-supported State agency, to the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, Inc.

The committee, which was organized last July to oppose the Administration's civil rights bill "and all similar legislation," recently registered as a lobby.

The committee maintains a suite at the Carroll Arms Hotel, a Capitol Hill landmark that overlooks the two Senate office buildings.

INDUSTRY BACKING SOUGHT

It has tried to enlist the support of other lobbyists here, notably those representing industrial and trade associations and has spent more than $23,000 in 2 months.

Since its creation by the Legislature in 1956, the Mississippi Sovereignty Commission has used public funds extensively to underwrite programs of the Citizens Councils of America, an extreme segregationist organization. Attempts to challenge this use of tax funds have failed in the courts.

The coordinating committee reported the $20,000 contribution in its lobbyist's registration statement. Such statements are required to be filed quarterly. The committee's report covered its operations during the 3 months ending September 30.

The committee said earlier that it would court heavily on contributions from all Southern States that maintain so-called sovereignty commissions. Besides Mississippi, these are Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. The committee had called its program "the greatest unified project ever undertaken in the South."

But many sovereignty commissions were largely paper organizations at the outset and are now dormant, with little financial backing. The committee's report shows that, through September 30, only Mississippi had contributed.

The only other reported contributions have been made by two Virginians—Landon B. Lane of Altavista, vice president of the Lane Co., which manufactures cedar chests, and Bruce Dunstan, a Richmond real estate owner and philanthropist. Each contribution was $1,000.

LOEB IS CHAIRMAN

The committee chairman is William Loeb, the conservative editor and publisher of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader and other newspapers. The vice chairman is James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News Leader. These posts were described as largely honorary.

The secretary-treasurer and most active top officer is John C. Satterfield of Yazoo City, Miss., a close adviser to Gov. Ross R. Barnett.

As president of the American Bar Association in 1961 and 1962, Mr. Satterfield charged that the Supreme Court was eroding State's rights and threatening the country's liberty and security by giving "inordinate weight" to the rights of individuals.

A year ago he served as a special adviser to Governor Barnett during the crisis that followed the admission of James H. Meredith as the University of Mississippi's first Negro student.

The committee's assistant secretary and staff director is John J. Synon, a Richmond public relations man who once served as a special assistant to former Gov. Goodwin J. Knight of California. The committee's lobbying report said Mr. Synon was paid $519.63 a week, plus expenses.

The committee has also hired a Washington lawyer, George Stephen Leonard, at a reported fee of $750 a month.

Its report showed that it had paid $500 to Horace B. Clay, a former legislative assistant to Senator JOHN B. TOWER, Republican, of Texas, for "research on pamphlets."

Senator TOWER's office said Mr. Clay had resigned his job there September 30.

The report also listed a payment of $250 to William Schulz, an assistant to Fulton Lewis Jr., the radio commentator, for "research service for pamphlets." It disclosed a payment of $114.64 for "travel, committee meetings," to Mrs. Ray L. Erb of Washington, former national defense chairman of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Erb is now an employee of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc.

On December 19 Perry Swisher, the publisher and editor of the Intermountain wrote the following article:

[From the Intermountain, Pocatello, Idaho, Dec. 19, 1963]

THE 38TH PRECINCT

(By Perry Swisher)

The people of this region have been invited to believe that the civil rights bill now before Congress is "10 percent civil rights and 90 percent an extension of Federal executive power."

A large paid advertisement appeared recently in dozens of our weeklies, signed by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom and listing a New Hampshire man, William Loeb, as its chairman. The truth is that the Deep South is the heavy investor in this campaign. Its key official is John C. Satterfield, confidant of Mississippi Gov. Ross Barnett and special adviser to Barnett during the race riots at the University of Mississippi over the enrollment of the Negro student James Meredith.

The State of Mississippi contributed $20,000 to the committee, the largest amount reported when the committee filed, as required by lobbying laws, with the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives. The money came from the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission, a State agency supported by State revenues.

I serve on a State advisery commission to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. This is the commission that found at least 100 counties in seven States are still imposing on qualified Negroes voting standards that are not imposed on whites. The coordinating committee says the Attorney General could force the acceptance of ballots even from voters the courts later found to be ineligible. This isn't so. Technically, something like that could have been contrived under one version of the bill, but that version is long gone.

The committee asserts that anyone buying a business license from a State or municipality could be covered by the civil rights bill, and goes on: "Thus, the act brings under Federal supervision almost every profession and every business—lawyers, realtors, small establishments, doctors, restaurants, gasoline stations, theaters, hotels, motels, and lodginghouses. The smallest soda fountain would be covered."

Mississippi's sovereignty commission, if you take the short view, has not wasted its money. I have seen one column that appears in several papers, a couple of editorials and one chamber of commerce resolution based on this misleading scare talk. Yet the bill doesn't prohibit discrimination in barbershops, bowling alleys, beauty shops, or retail stores not serving food, or in small rooming houses, and decidedly it does not make persons or businesses subject to the act by virtue of their State or local licenses.

Again, contrary to the ad and direct-mail literature, the bill does not give the commissioner of education authority to influence the transfer of schoolchildren to prevent "racial imbalance." I don't know, some earlier proposal may have mentioned "racial imbalance" but the civil rights bill before Congress does not, althought the ad declares the phrase appears 8 times "in a single brief section."

Farmers and homeowners are to infer that the bill places them under Federal control. What the bill does is to provide that when Federal money is available to farmers, it is available to Negroes too, not just white farmers, and that when Federal funds or credit are extended for homebuilding, all citizens are eligible to buy such homes.

Contrary to the committee's literature, the bill doesn't empower Federal officials to tell employers "whom they shall hire, fire, promote, and demote" and to force them to keep their crews in racial or religious balance. What the bill does do is to make racial discrimination, as the basis for any of these actions, unlawful. If this is the stickiest aspect of civil rights, it is also the most vital if we want to surmount the human and economic waste of racial bigotry.

The civil rights effort is not "the most revolutionary change in our country's history," as I see it. The revolution was the intrusion of slavery and the South's attempt to deny the Republic, after the birth of a nation dedicated by covenant to equality before the law and, by moral conviction, to equality of opportunity.

To me the revolution is the assault upon the Federal emblem, in behalf of practices that are hostile to the freedoms that a Federal constitution guarantees to all of us. Whatever our own faults may be, we in the North can't progress by honoring the bias that poisoned the South. Nor can the South, granted the depth of its dilemma, resolve it by pretending that assuring justice to the minority is an injustice to the majority who have pledged themselves so often to "one nation, indivisible, under God, with liberty and justice for all."

On December 22, Robert E. Baker, a reporter with the Washington Post, was the author of the following article:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 22, 1963]

AD'S DATA INACCURATE, RIGHTS BODY CHARGES

(By Robert E. Baker)

An advertisement sponsored by the anti-civil-rights lobby is guilty of distortions, the staff of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission has charged in a memorandum.

The advertisement is the work of the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom, a group that, while the civil rights bill in Congress has been on stage, has been operating in the rightwing.

Many newspapers in the North and Midwest have published the advertisement since mid-November.

SOUTHERN LEADERS

The ad is a terrifying picture of the civil rights bill, which is not surprising since two of the artists are among the South's most articulate segregationists.

James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond, Va., News Leader and a space age advocate of 19th century interposition for nullifying Supreme Court decisions.

John C. Satterfield of Yazoo City, Miss., who blasted the Supreme Court as he stepped out of the presidency of the American Bar Association in 1962 and who was an adviser to Gov. Ross R. Barnett who tried interposition in the University of Mississippi desegregation case.

The Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom has been financed principally by the Mississippi State Sovereignty Commission which also employs Satterfield and which has appropriated tax funds to the white citizens councils.

The lobby's advertisement attacks a civil rights bill that in reality has not existed since November 20 when the House Judiciary Committee reported out a compromise bipartisan measure.

This is what stirred pro-civil-rights Congressmen and State advisory committees to ask the U.S. Civil Rights Commission staff to draw up a memorandum on the advertisement.

REBUTTALS OF AD

Here are some of the charges made in the ad and the rebuttals contained in the memorandum:

Ad—the U.S. Attorney General could file suit, register tens of thousands of voters, elect his preferred candidate, even if courts later found his action invalid.

Memo—Compromise bill gives Attorney General no such power.

Ad—Anybody who pays a business license or any business offering goods or services to the public would come under the public accommodations provision.

Memo—Nobody would be subject to the act by virtue of their license. Specifically exempted from the bill are barber shops, beauty parlors, many other service businesses, retail stores, bowling alleys, and other places of recreation unless food is served.

Ad—The U.S. Commissioner of Education "could influence the transfer of children from one school to another—back and forth—until racial balance and religious balance existed."

Memo—The Commissioner would have no such authority.

Ad—"The correction of 'racial imbalance' is of such importance to the sponsors that the phrase appears eight times in a single brief section of the bill."

Memo—The compromise bill makes no mention of racial imbalance.

Ad—Employers could be told "whom they shall hire, fire, promote, and demote, and how they shall handle their employees."

Memo—The bill gives the Federal Government no such power. Employers, labor unions, and employment agencies would be required only to treat people on the basis of merit without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

GUILTY OF DISTORTIONS

The advertisement, concludes the staff of the Civil Rights Commission, is thus guilty of "omissions and distortion," and is not even relevant to the bill now pending in the House of Representatives.

The advertisement does make a one-sentence reference to the amendments adopted by the House Judiciary Committee: "The so-called softening amendments proposed by Attorney General Kennedy do not actually change the effects of the bill."

The Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedom operates from a headquarters in the Carroll Arms Hotel on Capitol Hill.

When lobby headquarters was asked for comment on the memorandum, Director John J. Synon, of Richmond, left word that only Satterfield, the secretary-treasurer, was authorized to handle press inquiries and that Satterfield would be out of town until January 8.

Synon, along with the lobby's Chairman William Loeb, of Manchester, N.H., are the two signers of the advertisement.

LOEB DECLINES COMMENT

Loeb, the sometimes bombastic and always outspoken publisher and editor of the Manchester Union-Leader newspaper, said in answer to an inquiry that he would be unable to give out information on the timing and other details of the advertisement for a few days.

In Richmond, Kilpatrick, who serves both as vice chairman of the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government and vice chairman of the anti-civil-rights lobby here, expressed some surprise that the content of the advertisement had not been changed to conform with amendments.

He said that he, Satterfield, and others had prepared the ad in October.

However, Kilpatrick said the amended bill was "lousy, far worse than the one President Kennedy submitted in June" and that he was in the midst of writing a 5,000-word attack on it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that an informed people and an educated people will remain a free people. I personally appreciate the efforts of Ben A. Franklin, Perry Swisher, and Robert E. Baker in letting the citizens of the United States know there is another side to civil rights.

Upon first encountering this falsely labeled "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs" ad, I asked the Department of Justice, who would be charged with interpreting and enforcing civil rights legislation, to study the charges made in this and give me their analysis of it. In response to my request, I have received the following letter from Burke Marshall, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. I, therefore, am enclosing Mr. Marshall's letter for the benefit of my colleagues and all the people of Idaho:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., December 27, 1963.

Hon. RALPH R. HARDING,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARDING: This is in reply to your request for our comments on a newspaper advertisement sponsored by the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms. The advertisement attacks the civil rights bill now pending in Congress.

The purported analysis of the pending bill, entitled "Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs," reveals a complete lack of understanding of the proposed legislation. The pending civil rights bill seeks simply to protect the right of American citizens to be free from racial and religious discrimination and to guarantee to them the full enjoyment of citizenship. As such, the bill is a constitutionally and morally justified exercise of the obligations and authority of the Federal Government.

The bill does not establish "dictatorial Federal control," as the advertisement claims. If enacted, it would simply help in the realization of the promise of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States that all men are created equal and are entitled to the equal protection of the laws.

The extravagant statements made in the advertisement do not fairly represent either the contents of the bill or its purposes. These extreme statements are hardly calculated to assist in the solution of a problem which is of such immense importance to the United States and to the citizens most directly affected.

The following is an examination of what the various provisions of the bill would do, and also what the bill would not do. The latter is particularly important in view of the innuendoes, distortions, and exaggerations contained in the advertisement.

A. PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT TO VOTE

1. In many localities, local election officials have a habit of turning down Negroes on the ground that they are illiterate (even those who are teachers or college graduates) while at the same time registering white applicants who are unable to read or write.

2. The bill would rectify this situation by requiring that equal standards be used for all applicants. And the bill makes no changes in existing law, under which the courts—not the Justice Department—have the right to register persons who are eligible to vote when those persons have been illegally turned down by local officials.

3. The bill also would prevent long and unnecessary delays in voting suits by requiring that such suits be heard on an expedited basis, with a provision for prompt appeals.

4. The bill does not give the Department of Justice power "to gain Federal control of the electoral machinery." It merely requires fairplay for all eligible voters, regardless of race. That is as it should be.

B. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

1. The bill contains no provisions whatever governing the sale or rental of private homes.

2. The bill does not affect doctors, lawyers, or realtors.

3. The bill does not affect small rooming houses, with no more than five rooms for rent, which are actually used by the proprietor as his residence.

4. The bill does not affect places of business merely because they pay State or local license fees to operate their establishments.

5. The bill would prevent racial discrimination when it is supported by the State. Discrimination of that type has already been declared unconstitutional.

6. The bill would require that certain business establishments, whose operations affect interstate commerce and which hold themselves out as serving the public, provide these services to the public, without distinction as to race. These establishments include hotels and motels furnishing lodging to transients; restaurants and lunchrooms; motion picture houses, theaters; gasoline stations.

7. At least 30 States and many municipalities now have such legislation requiring fair treatment of all races in places of public accommodation. Federal legislation would extend this protection throughout the country. Under article I of the Constitution and under the 14th amendment the Congress has the clear constitutional authority to pass such legislation.

8. Many Southern States have long had laws on the books prohibiting businessmen from serving their customers on a nondiscriminatory basis. There is no record of protests that this constituted an unwarranted governmental interference with business.

C. NONDISCRIMINATION IN PROGRAMS ASSISTED BY FEDERAL FUNDS

1. The bill provides that, where Federal money is used to support any program or activity—money which is paid into the Treasury by Negro and white citizens alike—the program must be used for the benefit of both races, without discrimination. This is basic American justice and fairplay.

2. Sweeping statements in the advertisement intimating that the bill would affect persons who borrow money from or deposit money in a federally insured bank, farmers who have financial dealings with Federal agencies, and the like, are distortions designed to arouse resentment. The bill will not punish innocent beneficiaries of Federal aid for wrongs committed by others. The bill would not affect an individual farmer, for example, who borrows money through a Government agency. It would affect the distributor of those funds if the distributing agency refused to lend to Negroes but did lend to white persons.

3. The bill does not require the calling of any loans or blacklisting of individuals.

4. The bill will permit the appropriate Federal agency to refuse to give further Federal aid to those who are carrying out certain programs or activities with Federal assistance but who deny the benefits of these programs to individuals solely because of their race. Even this cutoff will not be made until all methods of persuasion and voluntary compliance have been completely exhausted.

5. The bill provides that the courts will be the ultimate judges of whether funds may be cut off. Ample opportunity is provided for judicial review of any Federal agency action which cuts off assistance on grounds of racial discrimination.

D. DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. Under the bill, the Federal Government will have no control whatever over hiring and firing of teachers or selection of textbooks.

2. It is not true that the bill would enable the Commissioner of Education to "force the transfer of children from one school to another."

3. The charge that the bill would mean "thought control" of future generations is untrue and absurd.

4. The bill provides for technical assistance and financial grants to schools which are complying with the law of the land by beginning the desegregation of their classes if—and only if—the local authorities request such assistance. Local authorities would remain in complete control of their school systems.

5. It is a startling fact that today, nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court of the United States declared that compulsory segregation in public education violates the Constitution, almost two-thirds of the previously segregated school districts have still not afforded Negro children their constitutional rights. The bill would enable the Federal Government, under certain conditions, to bring suit in court for school desegregation in compliance with the Constitution. Thus, the bill would simply implement the law of the land and hasten the enjoyment by all our citizens of their constitutional rights.

E. FAIR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (EMPLOYERS, EMPLOYEES, AND UNIONS)

1. Nothing in the bill permits any individual to demand employment.

2. The bill contains no provision to require a quota system or racial or religious balance in employment.

3. The bill does not permit the Federal Government to control the internal affairs of employers or unions or to tell them whom to hire or fire.

4. The bill does prohibit racial discrimination by certain employers engaged in interstate commerce, and by labor organizations,

and it continues existing prohibitions against racial discrimination in Federal employment and employment under Government contracts.

5. The statement that "Federal administrative personnel would be prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner" is completely inaccurate. The Commission would seek to obtain voluntary compliance. If unsuccessful, the charges of discrimination would be tried before a Federal court, with full right of appeal.

6. Some 25 States now have laws to prohibit discrimination in employment. Federal law would extend this protection throughout the 50 States.

F. EFFECT ON EVERYONE

The legislation will be unwelcome only to those who wish to treat our Negro citizens as second-class human beings. Negroes serve in our Armed Forces, pay taxes which support our local, State, and Federal governments, and contribute to the economic welfare of the country by buying goods and services. They must no longer be subjected to hardship and humiliation because of their color.

The legislation will be welcome to all of us who believe in the American ideal of equal opportunity for all our citizens and who wish to maintain the respect not only of other nations but—what is most important—of ourselves.

Sincerely,

BURKE MARSHALL,
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to he RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Report of the House Majority Leader on the Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 88th Congress

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and arduous session. The size of the workload has been tremendous and I commend all of the Members of this House for their diligence and dedication. Legislating has never been a simple, orderly task. As the crises of our times accelerate, it becomes even less so. Our reward lies in the knowledge that we have reached many enduring decisions which reflect the desires of the entire Nation. The Congress was intended to be—and is—the vehicle for the expression of the will of the people. It is the forum of all men, those with whom we personally agree and those with whom we do not. Never has so much effort been expended in a search for points of compromise. Perhaps never have we been so aware that we build for the future, not just for today, that, in truth, we shape the future course of the Nation in these troubled times.

The nature of the days in which we live presents us with both an extraordinary challenge and a heavy burden of responsibility. We dare not be frivolous. Mr. Speaker, we have not been frivolous. If, as I believe, the proper criterion for measuring the accomplishments of a Congress is the manner in which it has attempted to resolve the critical issues of the day, this Congress is a historic one. Several crises have burst upon the national scene in the past year. We have met them. A national railroad strike has been averted. A partial nuclear test ban treaty has been ratified. A turning point in civil rights has been reached. In addition, we have concerned ourselves with the "quiet crises"—the nagging problems which beset any great Nation in its relations with the world and with its citizens.

The record of this session—an excellent record by any measure—will stand as a tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts and our Presiding Officer, Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK. We and the entire Nation are indeed fortunate to have the benefit of his outstanding ability, experience, and leadership.

We are also fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with an outstanding political leader and a man of unquestioned decency, courage, and dedication. All too brief was the tenure of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. We who worked closely with him knew him well as a statesman and as a person. We respected him equally in both capacities. We shall miss him equally in both capacities.

On January 20, 1961, President Kennedy told his fellow citizens that the "struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself" would not be finished in the first 100 days, the first 1,000 days, in the life of his administration, "nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet." But, he said, "Let us begin."

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of President Kennedy, we did begin. From January of 1961 to the present, the Congress has been engaged in a full-scale attack on the myriad, baffling problems of the 1960's. This attack did not cease on that tragic day, the 22d of November 1963. On November 28 President Johnson, in his address to a joint session of Congress, said, "Let us continue." This Congress, under the leadership of a Democratic President and controlled by the Democratic Party, intends to do just that.

The proposals put to us by the late President Kennedy are far reaching in import. He was well aware of that fact. In his last news conference, on November 14, he described the civil rights bill and the tax reform measure as "very complicated and important pieces of legislation; in fact, more significant in their own way than legislation that has been sent up there for a decade." Mr. Speaker, quick and simple answers are both unwise and impossible. We have sought the reasonable, not the sensational. I believe we have found, and will continue in the next session to find, enduring solutions.

It might be noted here that not one of the recommendations made to this Congress by President Kennedy has been rejected. Also, only once during this session did he use his veto power—and then on a private bill. Nor has President Johnson used his veto power. The current practice in some quarters of accentuating the negative—concentrating on what Congress has not done—is most misleading.

I am proud of the record of this session. I am proud of the Democratic majority in this House. We have debated, considered, and pondered the critical issues of our day. We are well on our way toward a solution to many of them. That, Mr. Speaker, can truly be called a job well done.

A Gallup poll published on January 8 of this year concluded:

> As the new Congress convenes, the mandate of the people calls for a legislative program dominated by action on domestic matters.

Our record shows that we have met that challenge.

Without doubt the activities carried on by the Federal Government in the areas of health, education, and welfare are vital to the happiness and well-being of the citizens of the United States. It is essential that the Congress of the United States remain alert to new problems in these areas and seek reasonable solutions to them. At the same time, it must constantly reassess the solutions initiated at an earlier time and continue those which are viable, strike out those which have outlived their usefulness, and place new emphasis where it is needed. The first session of the 88th Congress has done just that.

The appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1964 totaled $5,077,114,500. Included in this figure were $432,793,000 for the Office of Education, $40,271,000 for the Food and Drug Administration, $1,608,723,000 for the Public Health Service, $128,415,000 for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, $91,500 for the Social Security Administration, and $2,826,742,000 for the Welfare Administration.

This amount was in addition to the amount appropriated for the Department by Public Law 88–25, the supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1963. The appropriation made there was $214,641,000.

EDUCATION

President Johnson described our accomplishments in the area of education in this manner:

> This Congress is well on its way to doing more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was passed 100 years ago.

I believe that even if we had not passed any other legislation, our record in the single area of education would have made this a historic session. President Johnson expressed the same view. On December 16 he predicted that "this session of the Congress will go down in history as the 'Education Congress of 1963.' "

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

Unquestionably one of the major accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress is the Higher Education Facilities Act. It is the first general college aid program ever enacted and its success after years of bitter controversy is a magnificent triumph for this Democratic-controlled Congress.

As enacted, this measure authorized a 5-year, $1,195 million program of Federal grants and loans as follows:

First, for a 3-year period beginning with the fiscal year 1964, annual appropriations of $230 million for matching grants to the States for the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of

undergraduate academic facilities with 22 percent of the funds—$50,600,000 per year for 3 years—reserved for public junior colleges and public technical institutes.

Second, $25 million in the fiscal year 1964 and $60 million in each of fiscal years 1965 and 1966 for construction grants to graduate schools for cooperative graduate centers, making a 3-year, $145 million program.

Third, $120 million annually for fiscal years 1964 through 1966, or $360 million altogether, for loans to institutions for the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of both undergraduate and graduate academic facilities.

Grants for undergraduate academic facilities and public junior colleges and technical institutes are to be administered by a State agency representing public and private educational institutions and the public. The other funds authorized in the bill are to be allocated directly by the Federal Commissioner of Education to institutions making application. The 22 percent for public junior colleges and public technical institutes is to be allocated to the States on the basis of the number of persons graduating from high school in the most recent school year and the relative per capita income in the respective State. The remaining 78 percent will be allocated according to the following formula: one-half the funds on the basis of the relative college and university enrollments in the States and one-half on the basis of enrollments of students in grades 9 through 12 in all private and public schools in the States. These grants which may be allocated for private as well as public undergraduate facilities, are restricted to the construction of structures designed for the natural or physical sciences, mathematics, modern foreign languages, engineering, or for use as a library. The sums allocated for construction at public junior colleges are not limited to these categories. The Federal Government would pay up to one-third of the construction costs of the former and up to 40 percent of the latter.

This law provides that loans can be made directly to institutions of higher education but limits the amount of loans to any one State to 12.5 percent of the total amount of loans under the program. Excluded from eligibility for both loans and grants are those facilities which are used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, those used primarily for any part of a program of a school or department of divinity, or those intended primarily for events for which admission would be charged to the general public, such as gymnasiums or recreational activities. Facilities used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing or public health are also ineligible. Grants will be recovered if, within 20 years, the applicant or its successor ceases to be a public or nonprofit institution or if the facility ceases to be used for academic purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to enable existing colleges and universities to expand their enrollment and to encourage the establishment of new public colleges. Such expansion is essential. The U.S. Office of Education reported that the Nation's public classroom shortage was 121,200 when the school year started last fall. Without action, that shortage will become critical. College enrollments in 1970 are expected to be double those in 1960. Approximately 7 million students are expected to be in attendance as compared with 3.6 million in 1960. U.S. population aged 18 to 22 was 11,784,000 in July 1960 and is expected to rise to 17,806,000 in 1970. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, have indicated that in order to meet demands of the additional students colleges must spend an average of $2.3 billion annually on their physical plants. Expenditures currently fall short of this by $1 billion.

The majority of the Members of this body agree with the statement made by the late President in his message on education transmitted to the Congress on January 29 of this year:

> Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth, and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The majority also agree with his description of education as "the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." As such, its increased quality and availability are vital.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

The 1946 Vocational Education Act provided matching grants to the States for vocational education programs in the specific areas of agriculture, trades, and industry, home economics, distribution, fisheries, practical nursing, and technical training. Realizing that there have been technological developments since 1946 which have greatly altered vocational education needs, President Kennedy, in 1961, directed an advisory board to examine the program and to make recommendations. That board advised that the program be geared to the training and retraining of people of all ages and races and that it be directed toward training in the skills and techniques which are necessary to meet changing economic needs in the United States. Accordingly, in his January 29 message on education, President Kennedy requested an expansion of the vocational education program.

In his civil rights message of June 19, the late President, in addition to his proposal for a civil rights bill, renewed his requests for a number of other legislative proposals which would improve the lot of the Negro. Among these requests were proposals for an extension of the National Defense Education Act student loan program and of the "impacted areas" program.

On December 18, President Johnson signed a bill including these three programs. In doing so, he declared that it provides the tools for a major attack on one of the biggest obstacles to the Nation's economic growth.

Part A of this bill is the Vocational Education Act of 1963. This calls for a permanent program and authorizes expenditures of $1,031 million on new programs in this area for the first 5 years in addition to the $57 million per year currently spent on vocational education under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden legislation already in existence. The new act authorizes funds of $60 million for this fiscal year, $108,500,000 for the second year, $177,500,000 for the third year, and $225 million for fiscal year 1967 and each year thereafter. These funds will be used for Federal grants to the States to enable them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need these earnings in order to continue their vocational training. This training is to be available to persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed high school or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps.

The sum of $150 million through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, is authorized for residential training schools and work-study program for youths aged 15 to 21.

The technical education program, now in operation under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, was given increased authorizations of $15 million for fiscal year 1965 and $60 million each year thereafter.

This act also provided permanent authorization for the practical nurse training program. For fiscal years 1964 through 1966, $5 million is authorized for each year for this program, making a total of $15 million for practical nurse training under this legislation.

To summarize briefly, for fiscal years 1964 through 1968 this important act provides $806 million for the basic program of vocational education, $150 million for residential schools and work-study programs, $60 million for technical education under the National Defense Education Act, and $15 million for practical nurse training—making a grand total of $1,031 million for these 5 years.

Part B of this same act is the extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. That historic act had initiated a 7-year, $1 billion program of loans and grants to the Nation's students and schools. We have extended that program for an additional year and increased the college loan fund from $90 million to $125 million in the current fiscal year and to $135 million next year. As a result, the amount any one college may borrow is increased from its present ceiling of $250,000 to $800,000.

Part C of this act extends Federal aid to impacted areas for an additional 2 years and authorizes expenditures of $527,600,000 for this program. This is an important program in which the Federal Government pays part of the costs

of constructing and operating schools attended by children whose parents either work or live on Federal property or whose parents are connected with projects which cause a sudden increase in Federal contract activities in the area.

This act is a major addition to the country's vocational education programs. It is a sorely needed attack upon the chronic problems of unemployment, uneducated youth, and the lack of skilled laborers. As such, it is a contribution to the Nation's education, social, and economic health.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

On September 24 President Kennedy signed the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. Similar legislation has been considered by Congress in every year since 1951 but without enactment. This measure, Public Law 88-129, is a significant piece of legislation from which all the people of this country will ultimately benefit.

Studies have shown that the number of trained physicians who become available each year must be increased 50 percent by 1975 if the present ratio of physicians to population—137 physicians for every 100,000 American people—is to be maintained. Similarly, the number of trained dentists who become available each year must be increased by 100 percent in order to maintain the present ratio—56 dentists for every 100,000 Americans. These ratios are generally accepted as a minimum requirement. In order to meet present needs each year more than 1,500 graduates of foreign medical schools are licensed to practice in this country. One-fourth of the interns and residents in our hospitals are foreign medical graduates. To maintain the present ratio of physicians to population will require an increase of 4,000 new students in schools of medicine each year. Existing schools are unable to accommodate that number of students.

But even increased facilities are not enough. Many qualified young people cannot afford the long, expensive training required to become physicians and dentists. More than 40 percent of the medical students now come from the 12 percent of the Nation's families with annual incomes of $10,000 or more. Only 14 percent come from the 50 percent of the Nation's families with annual incomes below $5,000. As a result of the high cost of training, the number of applicants to medical and dental schools has dropped in recent years. For example, the number of medical school applicants dropped from 22,279 in 1950 to 14,397 in 1960.

On February 7, President Kennedy sent to Congress a special message on improving American health. In it he recommended legislation authorizing Federal grants for the construction of teaching facilities and loans for medical students. We have responded to this need. Specifically, Public Law 88-129 authorizes:

First, a 3-year program, beginning in the 1964 fiscal year, of Federal grants for the construction of teaching facilities for the training of medical, dental, and other health personnel. Grants of $175 million were authorized for fiscal 1964-66. They are to be apportioned as follows: $105 million for teaching facilities for the training of physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, or professional public health personnel, $35 million for dental schools, and $35 million for the replacement or rehabilitation of existing medical and dental teaching facilities.

Second, a loan program for students of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy to be initiated in the fiscal year 1964-66 and phased out in the following 3 fiscal years. $30,700,000 was authorized for the first 3 years.

MENTAL HEALTH

The scourge of mental illness and mental retardation is one of our most critical problems. The disastrous effects of these conditions were dramatically described by President Kennedy in his message transmitted to Congress on February 5. Speaking of these health problems, he said:

> They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families of the afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon both the Public Treasury and the personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.

The two major proposals of the President contained in that message have been enacted by this Democratic-controlled Congress.

On October 31, President Kennedy put his signature on Public Law 88-164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This act provided:

First, a $26 million authorization, over 4 years, for grants to public and private nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research on mental retardation.

Second, a $32.5 million authorization over 4 years for grants to be used for the construction of clinical facilities for the treatment of the mentally retarded, the demonstration of techniques for diagnosis, the treatment, training or care of the mentally retarded, and for training physicians or other specialized personnel.

Third, an authorization of $67.5 million, over 4 years, for grants to the States to pay the costs of constructing public and private nonprofit facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, education, training, and care of the mentally retarded.

Fourth, an authorization of $150 million, over 3 years, for grants to the States for constructing community health centers for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation of mentally ill patients in their own communities.

Fifth, an authorization of $45.5 million, over 3 years, to expand two existing programs of grants for the training of teachers of mentally retarded and deaf children. Teachers of visually handicapped, speech impaired, crippled, and emotionally disturbed children were included.

Sixth, an authorization of $6 million, over 3 years, for research and demonstration projects to improve educational opportunities for handicapped children.

Seventh, an authorization of $1.5 million in the fiscal year 1964 for grants to the States for the training of teachers of the deaf.

This is a very necessary program. The population of the United States spends $2 billion annually on mental illness. Half the hospital beds in the country are occupied by mental patients and 1 out of every 10 persons requires psychiatric attention during his lifetime. The number of mentally retarded in this country at the present time is estimated at between 5 and 6 million. Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has rightly stated that—

> The facts regarding mental illness and mental retardation reveal national health problems of tragic proportions compounded by years of neglect.

Present facilities are nowhere near adequate to meet this problem. Large State mental hospitals are primarily institutions for quarantining the mentally ill, not for treating them. In addition, two-thirds of the large public institutions were built before 1900 and are overcrowded and inadequate. New methods of treatment and research on mental retardation and the rehabilitation of the mentally ill are sorely needed. As an editorial in the Washington Post declared:

> It is hard to see any argument against modernizing the Nation's approach to mental affliction. Relief from this scourge and shame is long overdue.

The other half of the program proposed by President Kennedy in his message of February 5 is covered by Public Law 88-156. Recognizing that a major key to the prevention of mental retardation lies in the expansion of preventive medical care for expectant mothers and their infants who, due to low income or other reasons, would not otherwise receive it, this body, in cooperation with the coordinate House, has enacted legislation to amend title V of the Social Security Act. The amendment provides additional Federal assistance to States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through new grant programs and the expansion and improvement of existing maternal and child health and crippled children programs.

This bill increased the $25 million authorized annually for Federal-State matching grants for both maternal and child health services and for crippled children's services to $30 million each for the fiscal year 1964, $35 million each for 1965, $40 million each for 1966 and 1967, $45 million each for 1968 and 1969, and $50 million each for 1970 and subsequent years.

In addition, the bill authorized three new programs: first, a 5-year $110 million program of grants to public health agencies for the prenatal care of low-income expectant mothers who have conditions which could increase hazards to the health of mother and child; second, an $8 million annual program of grants for research relating to maternal, child health, and crippled children's services; and, third, a $2.2 million grant for planning projects to increase public awareness of mental retardation pro-

grams and to initiate local action against retardation.

In December, this House passed a bill appropriating $41,886,000 to finance the first year of these two programs. This was in the form of a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Senate approved this amount for the mental health programs but added an additional $216 million for impacted school areas.

This bill is presently in conference.

This is truly a remarkable accomplishment. The initiation of a broad new program in the area of mental health is highly significant in itself. For the same session of a Congress to appropriate funds for the first year of that program is doubly significant.

CLEAN AIR ACT

The Clean Air Act, passed by this session of Congress, will continue for 3½ years the existing program of research and technical assistance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the research grants to air pollution control agencies. In addition, it strengthens the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and directs him to recommend remedial action. New programs of Federal grants to State, regional, and local air pollution control agencies and new programs of Federal action to abate interstate air pollution are also included. The bill authorizes $5 million for the fiscal year 1964, $25 million for 1965, $30 million for 1966, and $35 million for 1967.

This measure will grant the authority sought by President Kennedy in his message on health transmitted to the Congress on February 7. In that message he noted the overwhelming evidence linking air pollution to the aggravation of heart conditions and to increases in the susceptibility to chronic respiratory diseases. He also pointed out that economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion every year and agricultural losses total $500 million each year. Further industrial growth and the concentration of the population in urban areas would intensify this problem unless appropriate action was taken.

SAFETY: AUTOMOBILE SEAT BELT STANDARDS

This Congress, recognizing that substandard automobile seat belts are a hazard to the safety of the public, has passed a bill requiring that the manufacturers of those belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce meet certain safety requirements. Specifically, the bill directs the Secretary of Commerce, acting on the advice of the Bureau of Standards, to prescribe and publish minimum safety standards for seat belts.

Violations of these standards, if done "knowingly and willfully," are punishable by a fine of up to $1,000, imprisonment for 1 year, or both.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT AMENDMENTS

Last year this Democratic-controlled Congress passed an act which was described by President Kennedy as, "perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1946."

He was referring to the Manpower Development and Training Act. Since September 1962 when that program of vocational and on-the-job training went into operation some 17,700 persons have completed courses. Of that number approximately 70 percent have been placed, almost all of them in training-related jobs. Projects involving 87,000 trainees have been approved and it is estimated that some 400,000 unemployed workers will be trained and placed in productive employment during the 3 years of the program. Training is now being offered in more than 300 different occupations and more than one-half of those in the training program have been drawn from the hard-core, long-term unemployed.

This is indeed a creditable record. The success of this program should be of interest to every citizen of the United States for the time has come when the problem of unemployment is everyone's problem. It is estimated that every person who is unemployed, if he is on relief, costs the taxpayers of the country $1,000 per year. Manpower training, then, is not only a stimulant to the economy and an assist to the unemployed worker but also a sound investment.

This year we have amended the Manpower Development and Training Act in order to make this program even more effective. We have lowered the age of youth eligible for training allowances from 19 to 17. The 17-year-olds now eligible will have to have been out of school for at least 1 year.

The amendment permits up to 25 percent of the persons receiving training allowances to be youths under 22 years of age. The original act limited youth training allowances to 5 percent of the total training allowances.

We have also postponed the requirement, originally due to become effective next July 1, that individual States match Federal funds for manpower training. The amendment requires one-third matching by the States in the fiscal year 1966.

We have also added 20 weeks of basic education in reading and writing to the training allowance period.

In addition, the amendment permits increases in the weekly training allowances to $10 above the State unemployment compensation payment. This provision is designed to motivate unemployed workers to seek training rather than to draw unemployment pay.

Trainees are allowed to work 20 hours a week without any loss in training allowance and they are made eligible for the program with 2 years of prior work experience rather than 3 as required by the basic law.

Finally, we have increased the authorizations for the program. The original act authorized $161 million for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. The amendment authorized $161 million for the fiscal year 1964, $407 million for the fiscal year 1965, and $271 million for the fiscal year 1966.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUNDS

The railroad unemployment insurance system, established in 1936, provides benefits for unemployed railroad employees and maternity benefits for female railroad employees. It is supported by payroll taxes paid by the employers. The railroad retirement system, which provides benefits to retired railroad employees on the basis of both age and disability, is financed by payroll taxes under which employee and employer pay equal amounts. The nature of these programs makes necessary the accumulation of large reserves for future use. However, the reserves in the retirement fund totaled about $4 billion this year and current income to the system had fallen about $77 million a year short of what was needed to pay anticipated future needs. Nor was the unemployment insurance fund in a healthy state. Heavy demands had depleted reserves and required borrowing from the U.S. Treasury and the retirement system.

Public Law 88–133, enacted by this Congress, is intended to restore the finances of the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment systems to a sound condition. Its main provisions provide for an increase in the taxes paid by the employers and employees to support the systems. Other provisions are intended to increase the earnings of the retirement system funds invested in Government securities and to cut the expenses of the insurance system by tightening qualifications for benefits. At the same time, the law provides for gradually raising retirement benefits. Although little increase is expected in the near future, higher benefits are expected eventually to toal about $40 million a year.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The activities of the Department of Labor are essential to the promotion of the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, the improvement of their working conditions, and the advancement of their opportunities for profitable employment. Public Law 88–136 appropriated $350,078,000 for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1964. This was in addition to the $25,250,000 appropriated for that Department in the Supplemental Appropriations Act.

Related agencies whose appropriations were made in Public Law 88–136 were the National Labor Relations Board, $22,460,000; the National Mediation Board, $1,950,000; and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, $5,690,000.

In addition, we have appropriated $200,000 for the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

RAIL LABOR DISPUTE

On August 28 the Congress of the United States, by joint resolution, averted a national railroad strike which would have been disastrous in its effects. In his message on the rail dispute submitted to Congress on July 22, President Kennedy dramatically described the effects of a prolonged rail strike:

> Many industries which rely primarily on rail shipment * * * would be forced to close down almost immediately. There would not be enough refrigerated truck capacity to transport all of the west coast fruit and vegetable crop. A substantial portion of these and other perishable products would rot. Food shortages would begin to appear

in New York City and other major population centers. Mail service would be disrupted. The delay, cost, and confusion resulting from diverting traffic to other carriers would be extremely costly; and considerable rail traffic would be wholly incapable of diversion.

The national defense and security would be seriously harmed. More than 400,000 commuters would be hard hit.

As more and more industries exhausted their stockpiles of materials and components * * * the idling of men and machines would spread like an epidemic * * * The August grain harvest would present a particularly acute problem.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that by the 30th day of a general rail strike, some 6 million nonrailroad workers would have been laid off in addition to the 200,000 members of the striking brotherhoods and 500,000 other railroad employees—that unemployment would reach the 15 percent mark for the first time since 1940—and that the decline in our rate of GNP would be nearly four times as great as the decline which occurred in this Nation's worst postwar recession.

At the same time, shortages, and bottlenecks would increase prices * * * thus impairing our efforts to improve our competitive position in foreign and domestic markets and to safeguard our balance of payments and gold reserves. And even if the strike were ended by private or congressional action on the 30th day, at least another month would be required before the economy would be back on its present expansion track. Indeed, a prolonged strike could well break the back of the present expansion and topple the economy into recession before the tax reductions and other measures now before the Congress for reinforcing the expansion have had a chance to take hold.

Without detailing the history of the dispute which made such a disastrous strike imminent, the main outlines of the problem may be recounted. The work rules dispute between railroad management and the railroad brotherhoods dates back to 1959 but did not reach crisis proportions until early 1963. Four years of negotiation, litigation, and attempts to resolve the basic questions at issue had failed.

The dispute arose when, on November 2, 1959, the railroads served notice of proposed work rules changes to the 5 railroad unions representing some 200,000 operating employees. It was estimated that initially the changes would eliminate 40,000 firemen from diesel and yard crews and would ultimately eliminate a total of 68,000 jobs.

On September 7, 1960, the unions served notice on the carriers of their proposed rule changes. Their recommendations concerned the same issues contained in the carrier proposals as well as changes in wage structure and fringe benefits.

On October 7, 1960, because of the vast gulf between the two sets of proposals, all parties agreed to refer the subject to consideration by a special Presidential study commission. The Commission, composed of five representatives of the carriers, five representatives of the unions, and five members representing the public, was appointed by Executive order on November 1, 1960. Neither side was to be bound by the determinations or recommendations of that Commission.

After 13 months of hearings and deliberations, the Commission issued its report on February 26, 1962. This report recommended specific changes in the current rules together with certain suggested employee protection provisions.

Litigation on the proposed changes culminated in a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States that there was no legal barrier to the initiation of the changes in the work rules with appropriate bargaining and recourse to the Railway Labor Act procedures.

Since the parties were still unable to resolve their disputes, the President, on April 3, 1963, established an emergency board pursuant to section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. This Board was unable to mediate the dispute, but its report of May 13, 1963, did contain valuable recommendations designed to aid the parties in further collective bargaining.

In the meantime, the Secretary of Labor continued attempts to bring about a settlement. On July 10, 1963, at the request of the President, the parties agreed to maintain the status quo until July 29 in order that a special subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy could review the dispute and report thereon. The President also announced that if the parties were unable to reach a settlement by July 29 he would send a special message and proposed legislation to the Congress. On July 22, when there appeared to be little hope for a settlement by July 29, the President did submit his message.

On August 28, just 6 hours before a nationwide strike was scheduled to begin, President Kennedy signed into law a joint resolution adopted almost unanimously in both Houses of the Congress. This act created an ad hoc seven-member arbitration board to resolve the two primary issues: firemen on diesel locomotives and manning of train crews. It provided that an arbitral award would be made within 90 days, would take effect 60 days later, and would be in effect for 2 years unless the parties agreed otherwise. The five secondary issues of the dispute were not put within the purview of the commission but, rather, were subjected to further collective bargaining. A strike over any of those issues was prohibited for 180 days.

On August 16 the carriers and the unions had agreed, through the Secretary of Labor, that the two major issues in dispute should be submitted to arbitration. They were unable to agree on arbitration terms or the secondary issues. However, even even this incomplete agreement allowed the Congress to implement what was actually a private and voluntary decision. This fact was pointed out by the President in his message accompanying the signing of the joint resolution and serves as an answer to those who fear future congressionally imposed arbitration of labor disputes. An editorial in the New York Times lauded the provisions as "the soundest approach now open for protecting the public against the crippling damage of a nationwide rail strike."

MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

In December, the Congress passed a bill extending the Mexican farm labor program for 1 year. Under this program, initiated in 1951, an agreement is reached with the Republic of Mexico establishing procedures for admitting Mexican laborers for temporary employment in the United States. The Department of Labor recruits and places these workers, assists farmers and workers to establish contracts for work, and requires farmers to pay transportation and to provide adequate housing and working conditions. This program has been extended periodically since that time.

The number of Mexican farm laborers entering the country has drastically declined since 1956. In that year 455,197 entered; in 1962 only 194,978 entered. The act has been renewed over the years because there were insufficient U.S. farm laborers available. Farmers who are unable to mechanize or to carry out expensive recruitment of labor would be greatly harmed if the program were suddenly terminated. In particular, the harvesting of next year's perishable crops would be impossible without the aid of the Mexican farm laborers. Termination of the program must be accomplished in such a way as to enable the users of Mexican farm labor to adjust to the end of the program.

EQUAL PAY ACT

Since 1945, many attempts have been made to enact legislation prohibiting discrimination in wages because of sex. Until 1962, no such bill passed either House. In that year equal pay measures passed both Chambers but never reached conference. That legislation would have established a new structure for the administration of the act and different standards of coverage from those existing under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

On June 10, President Kennedy signed into law the Equal Pay Act of 1963. He praised "those Members of Congress who worked so diligently to guide the Equal Pay Act through" and heralded it as "another structure base to democracy."

This act amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to require an employer of persons working in interstate commerce to grant equal pay "for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal effort and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions."

This legislation marks a significant step forward in the drive for full equality of economic opportunity. There are almost 25 million women in the Nation's work force and justice demands that they receive the same compensation as men when they perform the same work. Discriminatory wage rates have an adverse effect upon purchasing power and the general standard of living. Such rates also affect the morale of the female worker and, consequently, her productivity. Nor can the unfair competitive advantage to the discriminating employer be condoned.

This legislation has an advantage over that considered in 1962 in that by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act it simplifies the administration and enforcement of the law. It is preferable to have the law administered by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor rather than to create an additional administering and enforcing structure within the Department.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In 1958 Congress enacted the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act which allowed the States to extend the length of time during which unemployment checks could be paid to jobless workers. To finance these extra benefits, the Congress authorized Federal loans to States which took advantage of the act. These loans were to be repaid before January 1, 1963. If they were not repaid, the Government would levy an additional tax of 0.15 percent of the State's taxable wage base each year until the amount of the loan was repaid. By 1963, only the District of Columbia had repaid its loan. Therefore, the Act required that the employers in 16 States which had received loans pay an extra 0.15 percent tax on 1963 wages, 0.30 percent on 1964 wages, 0.45 percent on 1965 wages, and 0.60 percent on 1966 wages.

On November 7, 1963, the President signed Public Law 88–173, a measure designed to ease these taxes. It does not reduce the ultimate amount of taxes which must be paid by the employers in the States but it does freeze the rates at 0.30 percent for 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 and thus extends the payments over a longer period of time.

Three of the 16 States had also received advances from the Federal unemployment trust fund account under title XII of the Social Security Act. Existing law provided for the repayment of these advances in much the same manner as advances under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act. It set an extra tax on employers of 0.15 percent beginning with wages paid in 1961 and increasing 0.15 percent each year through 1970. Public Law 88–173 froze the tax at 0.15 percent for the years 1963 to 1967. Thereafter the tax will increase by 0.15 percent each year until the advance is repaid.

Existing law allowed the States to make repayments of these advances from their unemployment funds. In this way, they could avoid the extra tax on employers. However, the law did not allow repayments on an installment basis. Public Law 88–173 provided that the extra tax for the repayments under both the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act and title XII of the Social Security Act would not go into effect for any one year if a State, prior to November 1 of that year, paid to the U.S. Treasury a specified installment on the advances. All of the provisions of this law are designed to ease the burden on States which were hard hit in the recession years between 1957 and 1960.

A related matter was covered by Public Law 88–31. In 1961, Congress, spurred on by rising unemployment, enacted the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act, a proposal of the Kennedy administration. This measure authorized Federal financial advances to the States to enable them to pay 13 weeks of additional unemployment insurance benefits to jobless workers who had exhausted their benefits under the State programs. To repay the Federal Treasury for the advances thus authorized, the act raised by four-tenths of 1 percent, for calendar years 1962 and 1963, the existing unemployment insurance payroll tax levied on employers to support regular unemployment insurance programs. This year a tax reduction was recommended because the Department of Labor estimated that the retention of the four-tenths of 1 percent tax would produce an excess of $172 million.

By Public Law 88–31, Congress reduced the extra tax from 0.4 to 0.25 percent. This was expected to save employers about $181 million. It also increased by $7,148,000 the fiscal 1963 authorization for grants to the States for the administration of their unemployment compensation laws and for the operation of employment offices.

HOUSING FACILITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

On February 21 President Kennedy sent to Congress a special message on aiding our senior citizens. In this message he pointed out that it has been estimated that nearly one-half of our aged population live in substandard housing or housing unsuited for their special needs. This is not a problem with which the Congress of the United States is unfamiliar. In 1962 the Democratic-controlled 2d session of the 87th Congress passed the Senior Citizens Housing Act. That act authorized a $200 million expansion of Federal programs for the promotion of better housing for the elderly. This year another Democratic-controlled Congress, on the recommendation of a Democratic President, has further expanded that program.

Public Law 88–158 authorized the appropriation of an additional $50 million for aid to the low-income elderly. The Housing Act of 1959, as amended in 1961 and 1962, authorized the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make direct loans, at interest below the market rate, from a special revolving fund. These loans are made to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies providing low-cost rental housing for the elderly; $225 million had been authorized for this program and of that amount $150 million had been appropriated and committed. The law we have passed this year authorized $50 million to be added to the $75 million authorized but not yet committed.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

On August 19 President Kennedy signed into law a bill which extended for 3 years the termination date for the drive for funds to erect a National Cultural Center. Since the original 5-year fund-raising period was scheduled to expire on September 2, 1963, this noteworthy project would have been canceled if Congress had not acted.

This measure gives the trustees more time to raise, through public subscriptions, the estimated $30 million needed to build the Center in the District of Columbia. It also increased the size of the board of trustees from 15 to 30 members, thus permitting both a broader geographical representation and a broader representation of the arts.

In signing the bill, President Kennedy expressed his appreciation to the Members of the Congress for their continued interest. He pointed out that every major capital in the world has a cultural center which serves as a stage for demonstrating the best of the nations' cultural life. The lack of such a center in the Capital of this Nation is felt both by our own citizens and by foreign visitors. Through it, visitors will come to see the lasting benefits of a free society.

HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS

In October this House passed a bill requested by the National Historical Publications Commission and supported by President Kennedy. This measure authorized Federal aid to public and private nonprofit organizations for the collecting, preserving, compiling, microfilming, and publishing of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States.

Under the present system of private financing of these activities with, it is true, occasional Federal help, much material of historical significance is not available to those who have need of it. This bill constitutes a significant contribution to historical scholarship.

TRIBUTES

On four occasions during this session we have had the honor of manifesting our esteem and admiration to a respected citizen of the United States or of the world.

In December this Congress voted to place the likeness of John F. Kennedy on the 50-cent piece. This bill was proposed by President Johnson as a means of honoring the assassinated President and is a fitting memorial.

In a tribute to one of America's most beloved and admired citizens, we have passed a bill granting a Federal charter to the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. That organization, designed to foster the ideals and activities of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, will have no Federal financial backing. However, the granting of a Federal charter provides, as President Kennedy stated in signing the bill, "a fitting and effective way to carry on the programs to which Mrs. Roosevelt so ably dedicated her life."

The intent of Congress was well expressed by President Kennedy in his remarks at the proclamation ceremonies declaring Sir Winston Churchill a citizen of the United States. That proclamation was made as a result of a bill passed by the Congress of the United States. President Kennedy said:

> We meet to honor a man whose honor requires no meeting—for he is the most honored and honorable man to walk to the stage of human history in the time in which we live. By adding his name to our rolls, we mean to honor him—but his acceptance honors us much more.

The granting of honorary citizenship to a foreign national is unprecedented in our history. By granting it to Sir Winston Churchill, we have recognized one of America's greatest friends and his many contributions to the free world.

This Congress has passed a bill which, I am confident, expresses the wishes of every citizen of the United States. Its purpose is to ease the transition to private life of former First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy. As approved, it will provide

$50,000 for temporary secretarial help and office space for 12 months so that she may reply in an appropriate manner to the thousands of letters and telegrams from people throughout the world expressing their sympathy on the tragic death of her husband. The bill also extended free mailing privileges to her for life and authorized the payment of $15,000 for the late President's funeral and burial expenses.

Because it was the unanimous view of Federal law-enforcement experts that an element of danger to Mrs. Kennedy and to her children exists, the bill also extends Secret Service protection for 2 years.

This bill expresses in only a very small way the inspiration which Mrs. Kennedy's example of dignity, courage, and poise has been to every one of us and to people throughout the country.

ASSASSINATION INVESTIGATION

Public Law 88-202 grants full subpena powers to the special seven-member Commission appointed by President Johnson on November 29 to investigate the assassination of the late President Kennedy and the subsequent violent death of the man charged with the assassination. This Commission is directed to discover all of the facts in the case and to report these facts to the President, to the American people, and to the world.

This legislation, which was requested by the Commission, is necessary in order that the Commission may compel witnesses to testify and to produce evidence.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The only civil rights legislation passed since the Civil War was enacted by the 85th and the 86th Congresses, both Democratic controlled. In addition, as President Kennedy pointed out in his special message on civil rights submitted to the Congress on February 28:

> In the last 2 years, more progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans than in any comparable period in our history. Progress has been made—through Executive action, litigation, persuasion and private initiative—in achieving and protecting equality of opportunity in education, voting, transportation, employment, housing, government, and the enjoyment of public accommodations.

The Congress and the Democratic Party can be justifiably proud of their record.

But pride in our progress has not blinded us to the fact that discrimination continues to exist in this country. As the report of the Civil Rights Commission, submitted to the President on February 12, stated, citizenship is not yet "fully realized for the American Negro." This is a problem which is national in scope, and further steps toward the elimination of the injustices and humiliations of racial discrimination must be taken. To the Congress falls the task of working out a constitutional, reasonable, and desirable means to right this wrong.

Aware of the heavy responsibility we bear and the delicate task we face, this body has devoted much thought and time to the best method of accomplishing the desired ends. On November 20, the Judiciary Committee of this body reported a bill described by the majority of the members of that committee "as a reasonable and responsible bill whose provisions are designed effectively to meet an urgent and most serious national problem." This is no small accomplishment, and it is sincerely hoped and anticipated that the early days of the next session of this Congress will witness the passage of a new Civil Rights Act.

The major provisions of the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee may be described in general terms:

Title I concerns voting rights. It is designed to meet the problem of lengthy and often unwarranted delays in judicial proceedings under the prior Civil Rights Acts and the discriminatory use of literacy tests and other devices by registration officials.

Title II would prohibit discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin in specified places of public accommodation. Included are hotels and motels, theaters and other places of amusement presenting sources of entertainment which move in interstate commerce, and restaurants, lunch counters, and gasoline stations which sell food or goods which move in commerce or serve interstate travelers. Discrimination in such establishments is also outlawed if it is supported by State action.

Title III relates to the desegregation of public facilities. It authorizes the Attorney General, under certain circumstances, to bring suit to desegregate public facilities, other than schools, which are owned or operated by State or local governmental units. It would also authorize the Attorney General to intervene in pending actions in the Federal courts where relief from discriminatory practices by State or local governmental units or officers is sought.

Title IV covers the desegregation of schools. It authorizes the Commissioner of Education to provide, upon application by local authorities, technical assistance and financial aid to assist in dealing with problems incidental to desegregation. It also authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits seeking desegregation of public schools where the student or parents involved are unable to bring suit and where he considers that a suit would materially further the public policy favoring the orderly achievement of desegregation in public education.

Title V effects minor procedural and technical changes in the Civil Rights Commission, makes it a permanent body, and gives it additional authority to serve as a national clearinghouse for information concerning denials of the equal protection of the laws and to investigate allegations as to patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in Federal elections.

Title VI declares it to be the policy of the United States that discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin shall not occur in connection with programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. It also authorizes and directs the appropriate Federal departments and agencies to take action to carry out this policy.

Title VII seeks to eliminate, through the utilization of formal and informal remedial procedures, discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, or national origin. It authorizes the establishment of a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and delegates to it the primary responsibility for preventing and eliminating unlawful employment practices.

Title VIII directs the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a survey to compile registration and voting statistics in those geographic areas recommended by the Civil Rights Commission.

Title IX provides for appeals for higher court review when a Federal court has refused to accept transfer or a civil rights case to it from a State court.

Each of these provisions is designed to meet a form of discrimination presently existing.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

On October 7, the House sent to the President a private bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Mason. To it was appended an amendment extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to September 30, 1964. Admittedly, this was a stopgap measure. The future of that Commission hinges on the omnibus civil rights bill discussed above.

As noted, the civil rights bill reported by the Judiciary Committee of this body would make the Commission a permanent body and give it additional authority. Since action on that bill is not yet complete, the enactment of Public Law 88-152 assumes great importance. For without timely action, the Civil Rights Commission, established in 1957 and extended for 2-year periods in 1959 and 1961, would have expired on September 30 of this year, with 60 days following that date to wind up its affairs.

The 1960 platforms of both major parties promised to create a permanent Civil Rights Commission. That remains the hope of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives. We have insured that the invaluable work of that body will not be interrupted. The experience which it has gained in the 6 years of its existence has enabled it to make a most significant contribution toward the solution of one of the most critical problems of our times. It has investigated deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in housing, employment, education, and the administration of justice. Its reports and recommendations have served as the basis for remedial action by the executive branch and by Congress. In debate on the extension of the Commission, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this body described those reports most eloquently. They are, said Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, "like unto the ringing of a bell to shake the torpor of the American conscience."

In his civil rights message of February 28, President Kennedy enumerated the reasons why it is essential that the Commission be maintained. Despite its remarkable accomplishments, there are other areas of violations of rights which

remain to be investigated. But perhaps of even greater importance is the fact that as more and more communities recognize the discrimination existing within their jurisdiction, they must have some impartial agency to which they can turn for guidance and for information on how similar racial problems have been settled in the past. The Civil Rights Commission is eminently qualified to fulfill this function.

AGRICULTURE

The principles and purposes of the Democratic administration relative to a viable agricultural program were perhaps best summarized by President Kennedy in his farm message to the Congress of the United States on January 31:

> Proper management of our resources of food and fiber is a key factor in the economic future of the Nation. Both fiscal necessity and economic commonsense require us to go beyond the gains we have made in the last 2 years. Our capacity to produce still outruns the growth of both domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. Our abundance must still be harnessed in such a way as to bring supply and demand more nearly into balance. And the benefits of our agricultural progress still need to be translated into improved income to farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, expanded exports, and reduced expenditures for price support programs.

The net farm income in both 1961 and 1962 was raised to its highest peak since 1953. The substantial decrease in Government surpluses has resulted in a real saving to the taxpayers. But, not content with this admirable record, this body, in conjunction with a Democratic President and a Senate controlled by the Democratic Party, has pushed forward in this area during this session of Congress.

The Department of Agriculture, of course, is the agency primarily concerned with this vital aspect of our economy. It is this Department which performs functions relating to research, education, conservation, marketing, regulatory work, agricultural adjustment, surplus disposal, and rural development. We have appropriated $6,224,370,215 for the fiscal year 1964 for that Department.

This was in addition to $32,610,000 appropriated for the Department of Agriculture in the Supplemental Appropriations Act. A further appropriation to the Department in connection with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation is discussed below.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed by law to carry on several important functions. It is the agency established to make loans on and purchase any amounts of commodities offered to it by farmers. It stores surpluses, operates surplus disposals, conduct special feeding, and special export programs, and makes payments under the various cropland retirement programs.

On February 28, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, reported that only $127.6 million of the Commodity Credit Corporation's $14.5 billion authority to borrow from the Treasury and private sources remained. He described this as a "perilously low level."

The Congress acted quickly to insure that the necessary functions performed by the Corporation would not be interrupted. We passed a supplemental appropriation of $508,172,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1963. This was to meet expenses of the Corporation in providing surplus commodities for sale abroad.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Most of the State agricultural experiment stations were established as long as 70 years ago and such facilities are inadequate for utilization research. Such research, the finding of new markets and new uses for agricultural products, is essential to the well-being of the Nation's agricultural program. Accordingly, the Congress, during this session, passed a bill authorizing matching Federal grants to the States to assist in the acquisition, construction, and remodeling of buildings, laboratories, and other capital facilities of the State agricultural experiment stations.

FEED GRAINS

When President Kennedy assumed office, feed grains constituted one of the most crucial agricultural problems. The surplus of over 3 billion bushels of feed grains would have multiplied to nearly 4 billion bushels by the end of the crop year if no steps had been taken. The voluntary feed grains program authorized in 1961 and extended in 1962 marked the begining of the solution to this problem. It was estimated that, because of that program, the surplus would be reduced by 860 million bushels by October of this year. As a result taxpayers would save over $800,000 a day. The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, estimated that by the end of the 1964 marketing year the entire feed grain surplus will have disappeared, leaving only the supply of feed grains needed for national reserves. This is a spectacular accomplishment and is attributable to the feed grains program. Had we not enacted new legislation this year, unlimited production and low prices would have accompanied the end of the existing program. Such disastrous results were prevented by the signing of Public Law 88–26 on May 20 of this year.

Under the feed grains acreage diversion program, the Government offers incentives, such as land diversion payments and higher price supports, to farmers who take feed grain acreage out of production. The theory upon which this is based and which has been borne out in this program is that in the long run it is less of a burden on the taxpayers of this country to make such payments than it is to buy the surpluses and pay storage costs on them over the year. The bill passed this year differed from the 1962 law in that it left details to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Without elaboration, the major provisions of this bill may be summarized as follows:

First, it authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, if he determines that the supply of feed grains would otherwise be excessive, to institute a feed grains acreage diversion program in 1964 and 1965 under which price supports would be paid to farmers who voluntarily take out of production up to 50 percent of the average acreage planted in feed grains in 1959 and 1960.

Second, it authorizes the Secretary to set price supports for corn between 65 and 90 percent of parity.

Third, it authorizes the Secretary to issue payment-in-kind certificates to cooperating farmers. These certificates would be equal to a maximum of 50 percent of the price support rate on the normal production of the retired areas.

Fourth, it requires that the retired areas be put to soil conserving uses but permits certain crops, if unsupported and nonsurplus, to be grown in exchange for a minimum 50-percent cut in the diversion payment.

Fifth, it authorizes the Secretary, as an incentive to cooperation, to offer direct payments-in-kind based on the normal production of the actual planted areas.

Sixth, it directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to issue negotiable payment-in-kind certificates to cover the direct portion of price support and the acreage diversion payments.

Seventh, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase the certificates from farmers and to market an equivalent amount of grain.

Eighth, it sets the value of grain used in payment at not less than the current support price minus the value of the direct payment plus carrying charges and authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to deduct reasonable carrying and storage charges from the value of certificates presented for redemption after 30 days.

Ninth, it permits the Secretary to make up to 50 percent of the payments in advance, to provide bases for a few farmers who did not grow feed grains during the 1959–60 base period, to make adjustments for hardship or emergency situations, under certain conditions to exempt producers of malting barley from acreage cutbacks, and to provide for sharing of payments among several producers on a farm. This program is based upon the principles embodied in the 1961 and 1962 programs but takes advantage of the knowledge and experience gained from the highly successful operation of those programs.

COTTON

In his farm message, transmitted to the Congress on January 31, President Kennedy said:

> A healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation.

He went on to enumerate the problems which confront the cotton industry, problems which, as he pointed out, "it alone cannot resolve."

To protect U.S. growers of cotton and to maintain large export market for our raw cotton, the Government supports domestic raw cotton prices and provides exporters with a subsidy to make the supported cotton competitive in world markets. For a combination of reasons, this program has resulted in a decline in cotton sales, an increase in the stockpiles of cotton, and a decrease in the growers' acreage allotments. The major

reasons for this situation are the rapid growth of imports and the competition from textiles made with artificial fibers.

Domestic cotton prices are being supported at a level of nearly 32½ cents a pound through acreage allotments and the purchases of surplus stocks by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The world market price of cotton is 24 cents a pound. Therefore, U.S. cotton can be sold on foreign markets for considerably less than it can be purchased in the United States. The program has worked perversely in discriminating against American textile manufacturers and in accentuating the surplus problem by encouraging the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton. The Commodity Credit Corporation now has more than 8 million bales of surplus cotton and the cost of controlling cotton production, buying up surpluses, storing them, and subsidizing exports is running at a rate of about $1 billion a year.

In December, this body passed a bill, supported by both President Kennedy and President Johnson, which provides for a Federal subsidy which would reduce the cost of raw cotton for domestic textile manufacturers to a level competitive with the low world market price paid by foreign textile manufacturers. This subsidy would be paid in the form of raw cotton withdrawn from the mounting national stockpile and the amount of the subsidy would be at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The bill also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a special program of research to reduce the cost of cotton production in the United States. An appropriation of $10 million annually was authorized for this purpose.

The other provisions of this bill, too complex to enumerate, revised the cotton acreage control and price support laws.

It is anticipated that when this measure is enacted it will make domestic mills more competitive with foreign mills and cotton more competitive with other fibers. A reduction in cotton surpluses and an attendant decrease in the cost to the American taxpayer will result.

SHIPPING

In 1961, Congress passed the dual rate shipping law, which gave the Maritime Commission greater regulatory powers over dual-rate contracts. Under dual-rate contracts, steamship conferences—voluntary associations of ocean carriers which serve common routes—charge two rates, one for shippers who agree to ship exclusively in conference ships and another higher rate for those who do not sign an exclusive agreement. The law set a deadline of April 3, 1963, for Commission action in approving, disapproving, or modifying dual-rate contracts.

Early in 1963 the Commission notified Congress that an extension of the time limit was necessary. In response, Congress enacted Public Law 88-5 by which the time limit for Commission action was extended for 1 year.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The formulation and administration of programs for the management, conservation, and development of our natural resources is the important task performed by the Department of the Interior.

Public Law 88-79 provided appropriations for that Department—except for its power agencies—for the fiscal year 1964. The total appropriation was $612,061,750. Of that amount $595,301,750 is in definite appropriations. Included in this total are the following amounts:

Bureau of Land Management	$45,212,500
Bureau of Indian Affairs	206,623,550
National Park Service	112,524,500
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	1,900,000
Geological Survey	63,700,000
Bureau of Mines	39,528,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	47,192,400

This is in addition to $33,169,650 appropriated for the Department of the Interior in the supplemental appropriation bill.

OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

The Democratic-controlled 85th Congress authorized the first inventory of outdoor recreation resources in the Nation's history. It directed an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to survey available play areas and to predict needs for the future. Accordingly, a 15-member Commission was formed. The report of that group was transmitted to Congress in 1962. It urged the Federal Government to coordinate Federal, State, local, and private activities in a massive effort to insure adequate recreation facilities. It noted that over 90 percent of the population of the United States participates in some form of outdoor recreation and found a great need for additional outdoor recreation areas and facilities. It urged that the need be met by the coordination of activities at the various levels of government.

In 1962 a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was established in the Department of the Interior. It was charged with the responsibility of formulating a nationwide outdoor recreation plan, of encouraging regional and intergovernmental cooperation, of sponsoring and engaging in research, and of promoting the public use of outdoor recreation facilities.

In May of this year the Congress of the United States enacted legislation giving statutory authority to that Bureau. Public Law 88-29 directed the Secretary of the Interior to prepare an inventory of outdoor recreation needs, to formulate within 5 years a nationwide plan for future recreation development by Federal, State, and local agencies, to sponsor research and educational plans, and to coordinate all Federal activities concerned with outdoor recreation.

On May 28, President Kennedy signed this measure into law. He stated his belief, shared by Members of this body, that "all Americans will ultimately benefit" from this "recognition of the Congress of the vital need to protect and wisely administer this Nation's great heritage of outdoor recreation resources."

GUAM

In November, President Kennedy signed into law two complementary bills concerned with Guam, our westernmost possession in the Pacific. Because this possession has been rightly described as "the showcase of democracy in the Far East," its position in our national interest cannot be overlooked.

The first of the bills, Public Law 88-170, authorizes the payment of $45 million to the Government of Guam to provide for rehabilitation in connection with damage caused by Typhoon Karen in 1962. That storm totally destroyed or extensively damaged approximately 70 percent of the civilian residential housing and 40 percent of the commercial structures on the island. In April of this year a second storm, Typhoon Olive, leveled many of the temporary housing units erected to house the homeless Guamanians. Of course, much of the rehabilitation required is unrelated to the typhoons. No really permanent effort has yet been made to rehabilitate the island from the ravages of World War II.

Of the $45 million authorized by this bill, over $34 million will be in the form of loans and is repayable to the Federal Government over a 30-year period. The remaining $10,700,000 will be in grants.

The second bill, Public Law 88-171, was passed to clarify and make more certain the authority of the territory of Guam to create a public agency empowered to carry out urban renewal and housing activities and to participate in Federal programs of assistance in this area. No additional expenditure of Federal funds is involved in this measure. It merely defines the authority of the Legislature of Guam to undertake this much-needed program. It should insure a positive program of urban zoning and renewal.

The sacrifices and patriotism of the people of Guam are unquestioned. The passage of these bills is in the best interests both of that island and of the United States.

PUERTO RICO COMMISSION

In October, this body passed a bill establishing a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. The Commission was directed to study all factors bearing on the present and future relationship between the United States and that Commonwealth including existing applicable laws, treaties, constitutions, and agreements. The Commission, made up of seven U.S. members and six to be designated at the option of Puerto Rico, is required to report to the legislatures and heads of Government of the United States and Puerto Rico on the opening day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, January 1966.

The purpose of this Commission is to clarify the present relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico and to provide the basis for consideration of our future relationship.

In December the Senate passed this bill with minor amendments. Final action is imminent.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT AMENDMENTS

In 1958 Congress initiated a program of Federal incentives for billboard control by the States. The Highway Act of 1956 had prohibited the construction of service stations and rest stops on all future interstate highways but contained no provision for the control of billboard displays. In 1958 a majority of the

Members of the Congress agreed that such control would be beneficial in preserving the natural beauty of this richly endowed country, in preventing erosion, and in permitting landscaping and reforestation. Therefore, Congress adopted controls but instituted a bonus program rather than direct Federal regulation.

Under that program a State must pass legislation prohibiting billboard advertising, with certain exceptions, within 660 feet of new rights-of-way acquired after July 1, 1956, along the Interstate Highway System. States passing such legislation receive a one-half of 1 percent bonus on the Federal funds apportioned to them for construction. In 1961 these controls were renewed for 2 years and on June 30 of this year they expired.

On October 24 the Federal Aid Highway Amendments Act of 1963 was enacted. This law extended for 2 years the program of Federal incentives for billboard control. Other provisions were designed to improve the planning and administration of the existing interstate highway program and did not involve any new programs or funds.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Law 88–25, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963, included a significant appropriation to finance public works projects under the 1962 Public Works Acceleration Act.

That act had authorized the President to allocate $900 million to initiate or accelerate, in eligible areas, previously authorized Federal public works projects or State or local public works projects for which Federal aid has previously been authorized. In 1962 the Congress appropriated the first $400 million. This supplemental appropriation bill appropriated an additional $450 million for the program.

In addition, the public works appropriation bill passed in December provided for the appropriation of $30 million toward this program which has so successfully stimulated the U.S. economy.

RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

In December we passed a bill authorizing an appropriation of $816,847,000 for flood control and navigation projects in certain river basins. Of this total, $700 million is an added authorization for projects agreed upon earlier and $116,847,000 will be used for additional projects.

Agreement on this bill came after prolonged debate with our coordinate body. Compromise on the provisions became imperative because some projects had run out of funds and others were about to. This is a reasonable agreement. In fact, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] said:

> A great new chapter in water resource development is being written by this program.

FINANCE

The basic purpose of the Department of the Treasury, despite the diversification of its activities throughout the years, remains the same as it was in 1789 when that Department was created. That purpose is the management of the financial affairs of the Nation. The import of this activity is so obvious as to require no elaboration.

Public Law 88–39, signed by President Kennedy on June 13, appropriated $1,103,650,000 for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1964. This is in addition to $8,544,900 included in the supplemental appropriation bill.

TAX REDUCTION AND REFORM

In his state of the Union message, delivered before a joint session of Congress, President Kennedy put forth his proposals for the revision of the income tax structure. There he noted that—

> It is increasingly clear—to those in Government, business, and labor who are responsible for our economy's success—that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. Designed to check inflation in earlier years, it now checks growth instead. It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources. It invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and causes chronic budget deficits.

Thus did he announce the reasons for his tax proposal, reasons to be repeated in his budget message of January 17, his economic report to Congress of January 21, his special message on tax reduction and reform of January 24, and numerous speeches before private groups. On November 15, 1 week before his death, he predicted that if the tax reduction bill was passed promptly—

> We will be sailing by next April on the winds of the longest and strongest peacetime expansion of our Nation's economic history.

Great strides toward economic security were made during that all too brief period when a Democratic-controlled Congress worked with the late President Kennedy. Our national output made a phenomenal rise from $500 to $600 billion. Labor income increased by 16 percent. For the first time in our history 70 million persons were at work in this country. Factory earnings exceeded $100 per week for the first time in history, an average increase of $10 per week in 3 years. The stock market broke all records. This is a record which President Kennedy, the Congress and the Democratic Party were justifiably proud of.

One critical domestic problem which has been attacked but not solved is that of unemployment. If the economy had grown in the past 2½ years at the rate it grew during the previous 2½ years, the unemployment rate today would be up to 8 percent rather than at the present 5½ percent. But even 5½ percent is too high. Some 4 million workers are idle and over 3 times that many experienced some unemployment during this year.

This fact must be considered in relationship to the Nation's unprecedented supply of manpower. The extraordinarily high birth rate in the 1940's and the replacement of men by machines means that we must discover some means of stimulating a demand for manpower equal to the supply. A majority of the Members of this body believe that this stimulation will come from the enactment of a tax reduction and reform program. Accordingly, on September 25, a $11.1 billion tax reduction for individuals and corporations, the largest in the Nation's history, was passed by this House.

As passed, H.R. 8363 would reduce individual tax bills an average of 20 percent over a 2-year period. Some of the reform provisions of the bill would raise taxes, leaving a net average reduction of 18.8 percent. New rates on individual income taxes would range from 14 percent in the lowest bracket to 70 percent in the highest. The present range is 20 to 91 percent. The present 52-percent tax on corporation income would be lowered to 48 percent in 2 years.

In addition to these changes in tax rates, this bill constitutes a broad overhauling of the Federal tax laws. Provisions, much too complex and lengthy to detail here, cover such matters as the rate of payment of corporation taxes, numerous changes in deductions, a drastic revision of the tax rules on capital gains, new limits on immunity, and various other structural changes. These provisions will provide greater equity, a broader tax base, full and efficient flow of capital, the simplification of tax administration and compliance, and the removal of special privileges and hardships.

This measure is a very complex and a very important one. As President Kennedy said in his March 13 speech to the Advertising Council:

> We are talking about, in a sense, something new, and it is appropriate that we talk about it in detail.

This body has talked about it in great detail. The coordinate body is now doing likewise. It is anticipated that final action on this historic bill will be taken early next year.

CORPORATE AND EXCISE TAXES

Many temporary excise taxes were levied during the Korean War. Others have been added since. On June 29 of this year the President signed into public law the 10th annual extension of these taxes.

Extension of these taxes, scheduled to expire on June 30, was expected to result in $2.8 to $2.9 billion for the Federal Treasury during the 1964 fiscal year. It was estimated that expiration of the taxes would cost the Government between $4.1 and $4.2 billion in loss of revenue during a full year of operation.

These extensions were requested by President Kennedy in his budget message, transmitted to Congress on January 17. The majority of the Members approved a flat extension of the rates even though the corporation tax might later be reduced as part of President Kennedy's omnibus tax bill. This bill, therefore, merely prevented a substantial loss of revenue pending consideration of the more inclusive tax bill to be discussed below.

Specifically, Public Law 88–52 extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1964, the existing 52-percent corporation income tax rate and the existing rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and passenger travel by air.

SILVER PURCHASE REPEAL

In his January 21 Economic Report to the Congress, President Kennedy urged "revision in our silver policy to reflect the status of silver as a metal for which there is an expanding industrial demand." The fact which prompted this request is the soaring demand for silver. Thirty years ago over 90 percent of the silver mined throughout the world went for monetary use, for tableware, and for jewelry. At that time less than 10 percent went for commercial uses. Today, long-established commercial uses have enormously increased and many new uses have accompanied the advent of the space age. In the United States alone, industrial consumption increased tenfold in 30 years.

At the time that demand was increasing the supply of silver was decreasing. The production of silver on this side of the Iron Curtain has declined from 254 million ounces for the yearly average for 1925–29 to 199 million ounces in 1962.

The result was that the Treasury Department ran out of nonmonetary silver which it had, for years, been unloading on the market to make up for the gap between production and consumption of silver in the United States and to prevent an increase in the price of the silver. On November 28, 1961, at the direction of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury suspended sales of silver. It became obvious that a revision of our silver policy was needed. The adverse effects of a failure to do so are well chronicled in an article which appeared in the Economist:

> Relief is sorely needed. If the present antiquated laws on silver remain unchanged, within 2 years the Treasury will have run through its own supplies of the metal and, because America produces only one-sixth of its domestic needs, it would be forced to compete with private purchasers on foreign markets. This would not only imply an unwelcome and unnecessary drain on America's balance of international payment; it would also almost certainly mean a rapid rise in the price of silver above the established monetary price of $1.29 an ounce. This, in turn, would tempt citizens to melt down coins and turn in $1 bills for their value in silver as fast as the Treasury produced them, making a complete farce of the Treasury's efforts to provide Americans with an adequate supply of money in small denominations.

In order to prevent this nightmare, the 1st session of the 88th Congress repealed the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and certain provisions of the acts of July 6, 1939, and July 31, 1946, relating to silver purchase. This new measure, Public Law 88–36, marks the end to policies adopted in 1933 when the Federal Government began to subsidize silver miners and represents an urgently needed adjustment to vastly changed circumstances.

This law authorizes the issuance of gold-backed $1 and $2 Federal Reserve notes to replace $1 and $2 silver certificates. Thus the silver reserve fund backing these certificates is released for use in coins. It also repealed the silver purchase acts which required the Treasury to buy newly mined domestic silver offered to it at 90.5 cents per ounce and repealed the 50-percent transfer tax on profits made in silver sales. It is estimated that this law will release sufficient silver to satisfy coinage needs for 15 years.

NEW ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

To further expedite the myriad activities of the Department of the Treasury, this Congress has authorized a fourth Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. That Department had fewer Assistant Secretaries than other departments and a member of the classified civil service was performing the duties and accepting the responsibilities of an Assistant Secretary in overseeing the work of the mint and the Secret Service. This bill raised that position to the level of an Assistant Secretary. No increase in salary or other costs were involved.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

On three occasions during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the national debt limit of the United States has been raised. This was necessary in order to give the Treasury Department the needed flexibility to take advantage of favorable market conditions. In addition, some leeway is needed to handle the immediate and unexpected needs of Government agencies.

In 1962, Congress provided for a temporary fiscal 1963 debt limit of $308 billion from July 1, 1962, through March 31, 1963; $305 billion from April 1 through June 24, 1963; and $300 billion from June 25 through June 30, 1963. On July 1, the debt limit would drop to the legal permanent limit of $285 billion.

In his budget message of January 17, President Kennedy requested prompt extension of the $308 billion limit until June 30. The Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, urged Congress not to force him "to resort to an array of unsound financial procedures."

Responding, Congress in May raised the ceiling from $305 billion to $307 billion until June 30 and to $309 billion for July and August. To prevent the limitation from reverting to its permanent level of $285 billion on September 1, Congress extended the temporary $309 billion debt limit from August 31 until November 30, 1963. In November the limit was again raised. The new ceiling established was $315 billion and is to carry the Treasury through June 29, 1964.

DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE

As part of the administration's program to counter the balance-of-payments deficit, the Congress, in 1961, enacted legislation which reduced from $500 to $100 the total value of articles acquired abroad which might be brought in duty free by a resident returning to the United States. That bill was due to expire on June 30, 1963.

On June 29 the President signed Public Law 88–53. This bill extended the temporary reduction for 2 more years. The Treasury Department reported that the reduction had, in 1962 alone, lowered U.S. expenditures abroad by $123 million. The reduction is obviously a useful means of combating the balance-of-payments deficit.

COMMUNICATIONS: SUSPENSION OF EQUAL TIME REQUIREMENT

In June, this body passed a joint resolution, recommended by President Kennedy, providing for the suspension of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934. Under that section a broadcasting station providing time to a political candidate must offer equal time to all other candidates for the same office. In 1960, the Congress had suspended this requirement to permit the Democratic and Republican presidential and vice presidential candidates to use broadcasting facilities without requiring the broadcaster to provide equal time to minor or splinter-party candidates. This temporary suspension permitted the debates between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon.

This bill is presently in conference with representatives of the Senate and only very minor differences remain to be settled. The main thrust of the measure will be identical with that passed in 1960.

CAMPAIGN COSTS: PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT

In 1961 President Kennedy established the President's Commission on Campaign Costs to recommend improved ways to finance the expenditures required of nominees for the offices of President and Vice President. On April 18, 1962, that Commission issued its report. Among other recommendations, it proposed that the Government pay the expenses incurred in the transition from one administration to another.

The costs of the transition are essential Government expenses which are pertinent to the offices of President and Vice President and should be borne by the Federal Government. To place this burden on the national committee of the political party or on private individuals or groups is unfair. Also, disruptions during this period of the transfer of executive and administrative power cannot be countenanced.

Accordingly, both houses of the Congress, during this session, have passed bills authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide office space, compensation for staff personnel, travel expenses, subsistence allowances, and communications and printing services for the President- and Vice-President-elect. Amendments by the Senate have sent this bill to conference but it is expected that final action will come soon.

VETERANS

The Veterans' Administration was established in 1930 to administer those laws passed by Congress which authorize benefits for former members of the Armed Forces and for the dependents and other beneficiaries of deceased former members of those forces. The supplemental appropriation bill appropriated $46,300,000 to enable the Administration to carry on its valuable work.

The independent offices appropriations bill appropriated $5,384,784,000 for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1964.

In his budget message, transmitted to the Congress on January 17, President Kennedy expressed the theme which has been adopted by the present Democratic-controlled Congress relative to legislation for the welfare of veterans of the Armed Forces. He said:

This country has recognized that the Government's primary obligation for veterans benefits is to those who incurred disabilities in the defense of our Nation and to the dependents of those who died as a result of military service.

With this fact in mind, this Congress has passed several bills of benefit to veterans. Among them are the following:

Public Law 88–22 provides additional compensation for veterans who are suffering from a complete loss of speech as a result of military service.

Public Law 88–20 provides additional compensation for veterans having a service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears.

Public Law 88–21 provides a 10-percent increase in the monthly payments to children and parents of veterans who died from service-connected causes.

Public Law 88–134, which complements the above, increases from $112 to $120 the basic monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans who have died from service-connected causes.

Public Law 88–3 amends section 904, title 38, of the United States Code, so that burial allowances may be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority from dishonorable to other than dishonorable after the death of the veteran.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In his state of the Union message, delivered before a joint session of Congress on January 14, 1963, President Kennedy stated:

This country * * * continues to require the best defense in the world—a defense which is suited to the sixties.

The House of Representatives, in cooperation with its coordinate body, has succeeded in meeting this challenge.

Public Law 88–149 appropriated $47,220,010,000 to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1964. This bill did not include funds for military assistance abroad, military construction, civil defense, Army Engineers flood control work, or the military pay boost. Included in this figure are $12,850,700,000 for military personnel, both active, and reserve, $11,714,033,000 for the operation and maintenance of our forces, $15,706,047,000 for procurement, and $6,949,230,000 for research and development.

The following provisions were also included in this appropriations bill: First, it provides that the Army National Guard be programed to attain a strength of 400,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1964 and that the Army Reserve be programed to attain a strength of 300,000.

Second, it provides funds for 969,900 Reserve personnel on paid drill status by the end of the fiscal year 1964. This included a National Guard force of 384,400 and Army Reserve force of 281,000.

Third, it requires the Department of Defense to report quarterly to the Appropriations Committees any disbursements made under the $15 million contingency fund. This fund was provided for "emergencies and extraordinary expenses" in connection with "confidential military purposes."

Fourth, it authorizes expenditures for military personnel greater than the appropriated amounts if the President determines that increases are necessary.

Fifth, it continues the President's authority to spend any amount required to institute an airborne alert.

Sixth, it provides that at least 35 percent of the funds made available for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels be allocated for work in private shipyards. However, the Secretary of Defense was given authority to have such work done in Navy shipyards if it is consistent with the public interest.

Seventh, it earmarks $125 million of the Air Force research and development funds for a mach 3 manned aircraft program.

Eighth, it authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to $150 million from other funds appropriated for the fiscal year 1964 to the emergency fund, provided that no transfer would exceed 7 percent of the appropriation from which it was taken. He is also authorized to transfer an additional $200 million if he deems it necessary to improve readiness and so notifies the Appropriations Committees.

Ninth, it sets a limit of 20 percent of the direct costs on indirect costs associated with Defense Department research grants.

In addition, the supplementary appropriations bill for 1963 allocated $220,162,000 to the Department of Defense.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

In addition to the general Department of Defense appropriation, the military construction appropriation bill appropriated $1,585,880,000 for the fiscal year 1964 for construction at military bases in the United States and abroad and for the construction and maintenance of military family housing. Of the total, $948,474,000 was for construction. The balance, $637,406,000, was appropriated for the general support of the family housing program.

DRAFT EXTENSION

In his budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, President Kennedy requested a 4-year extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which was due to expire on January 30. Public Law 88–2 is the response of this Congress to that recognized need. In testimony before the Armed Services Committee of this body, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service, said:

The evaluation of the determination of this Nation by our friends, by neutrals, by our possible enemies, and even by ourselves, depends * * * on how well we seem prepared to mobilize our manpower.

Realizing that the maintenance of draft levels commensurate with the requirements of the Nation's national defense requires the continuation of the draft law, we have extended until July 1, 1967, the induction authority provided by the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, the Dependents Assistance Act providing increased quarters allowances for enlistees with dependents, and the law providing special authority to induct medical, dental, veterinary, and allied specialists and to grant special pay to these inductees.

The personnel ceilings established for the Armed Forces after World War II have been suspended since 1950. This law continued that suspension until July 1, 1967.

ARMED SERVICES: UNIFORM RESERVE PROGRAM

During the 87th Congress, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of this body, in studying the efficacy of the Reserve program, found that many of the reservists called up during the Berlin conflict of 1961 were inadequately prepared. As a result, 2- and 3-year active-duty enlistees had to be recalled to duty to make up for the lack of training on the part of the reservists. In an effort to eliminate such deficiencies as well as the confusion among reservists as to the exact nature of their reserve obligation, we have enacted Public Law 88–110.

This law amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act by repealing existing Reserve programs and establishing a uniform permanent Reserve program for eligible individuals between 17 and 26 years of age. The duration of the active duty obligation will be determined by the length of time required for the reservist to qualify for the special skill for which he enlisted. This measure will provide additional flexibility, uniformity, and equity within the reserve programs.

MILITARY PAY RAISE

On October 2, President Kennedy, with a good deal of pleasure, signed into law a measure which originated in this body, a bill authorizing military pay increases of an estimated $1,243,084,000 a year; $1,213 million of that amount was for the military forces of the Defense Department, and the remainder was for the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. A request for a military pay raise was included in the budget message of the President transmitted to the Congress on January 17 of this year. In that message it was noted that the last general military pay raise occurred in 1958. Since that time wage increases in private industry have provided strong inducement for highly trained military personnel to leave the service for higher paying jobs in civilian life.

The majority report of our Armed Services Committee pointed out that military pay has risen only 16.2 percent since 1952 whereas the salaries of professional and technical workers have risen 49 percent in the same period, the salaries of production workers 44.8 percent, and of civil service employees 34.3 percent. The increased combat efficiency resulting from less turnover in the services is essential to our national security. In addition, the high costs of training new personnel will be decreased.

Approximately $1,057,729,000 was authorized for active duty personnel in the Department of Defense; $951,044,000 is for basic pay increases averaging nearly 17 percent in every grade except for personnel with less than 2 years of service. The largest increase was in the basic pay of officers and enlisted men in the middle grades.

There was authorized $42,502,000 for family separation allowances and approximately $77,520,000 a year for terminal leave payments, social security, severance pay, Reserve readjustment pay, death gratuities, and reenlistment bonuses.

Approximately $11,663,000 was authorized for submarine pay, high-pressure chamber duty, double incentive payments for hazardous duty, hostile duty pay, medical and dental incentive pay, and contract surgeon's pay.

This bill also provides an entirely new way of computing retirement pay in the future and thus, as the Washington Post said, "remedied an old injustice." In the future a method based upon increases in the cost of living will be used. This system, currently provided for civil service retirees, provides that whenever the Consumer Price Index rises 3 percent over the preceding year, retirement pay will rise correspondingly.

The provisions for retired personnel in the Department of Defense totaled $82,-372,000. Of this, $40,984,000 is for a flat 5 percent increase for all personnel retired between June 1, 1958, and April 1, 1963. Approximately $27,517,000 is intended to allow persons who retired prior to 1958 to recompute their retirement pay on the basis of the pay rates in effect between 1958 and 1963. Persons in this category can, instead, receive a straight 5 percent cost of living increase; $4,400,-000 is for retirement benefits for personnel retiring between April 1 and October 1—the effective date of the law—and $9,471,000 for personnel retiring during the balance of the fiscal year 1964.

This law also had the effect of increasing the pension paid to widows of military personnel who die either on active duty or of service-connected causes after leaving the service.

Approximately $73,229,000 is authorized for retirement pay for reserve personnel in the Department of Defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The Department of Defense has estimated that between 25 and 65 million lives would be saved by providing reasonable protection against fallout radiation. The majority of the Members of this House have come to believe that civil defense is an integral part of the Nation's military defense. Although nuclear war is unlikely, it is a possibility over the next several decades and its consequences are too grave to be discounted.

Accordingly, in September of this year, we passed a bill authorizing $190.6 million in the fiscal year 1964 to begin new phases of the civil defense program. This bill would authorize $175 million in outright grants for the construction of fallout shelters in public and non-profit institutions. It would also require fallout shelters in all Federal buildings and authorizes $15.6 million for that purpose.

Hearings on this program are underway in the other body.

In addition, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, adopted for fiscal year 1963 in May of this year appropriated $15 million for surveying, stocking, and marking civil defense shelters.

The independent offices appropriations bill, passed in December, also contained appropriations for the civil defense program. It provided $70,319,000 to continue the established civil defense program and $41,250,000 for research, the shelter survey, and the marking of civil defense shelters.

It also made an appropriation of $27,-500,000 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable it to procure additional emergency civil defense hospitals, to maintain the 2,680 hospitals acquired in prior years, and to continue the emergency health training and preparedness activities of the Department.

NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The national stockpile is composed of goods acquired to meet estimated needs in time of war. The Kennedy administration was consistent throughout in demanding that the stockpile not exceed national emergency requirements. The excessive storage of any material is an unnecessary burden on public funds and a possible source of questionable profits to contractors.

In line with this, the 1st session of the 88th Congress has passed two laws designed to hold down the supply of stockpiled materials.

Because the supply of cadmium, a metal used chiefly in electroplating, chemicals, and alloys, is in excess of our national stockpile objectives and because there is a severe scarcity of cadmium on the domestic market, a scarcity adversely affecting industry, we authorized the sale of 2 million pounds of cadmium of domestic interests. This bill waived the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act.

Similarly, Public Law 88-154 authorized the disposal of the surplus waterfowl feathers and down now held in the national stockpile. Again, the normal 6-month waiting period was waived.

ATOMIC ENERGY

On July 22 President Kennedy signed into law (Public Law 88-72) a bill authorizing appropriations of $216,271,000 for Atomic Energy Commission construction projects for the fiscal year 1964. Such appropriations are necessary if the program of the development, use, and control of atomic energy for the maximum contribution to the general welfare and to the common defense and security is to be continued.

Included in the total authorization are $172,562,000 for 46 new projects, $7,500,000 added to a previous appropriation of $15 million for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, $709,000 added to a previous authorization of $3,600,000 for research and development of the last breeder reactor concept, $30 million for the development, design, construction, and operation of a spectral shift nuclear powerplant, and $5,500,000 for a cooperative program with West Germany under which the United States would supply a particle fuel element for testing in Germany.

This law also contains a provision requiring authorization by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of all Atomic Energy Commission appropriations after January 1, 1964. Currently all authorizations except those for construction are made under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. It is intended that this provision will give Congress authority to exercise a greater degree of legislative control over the atomic energy program.

A supplemental Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill was passed in November. This measure authorized an additional $17,945,000 for the construction of 12 additional new facilities for the nuclear weapons development program. These facilities were intended for use in implementing three of the four safeguards which President Kennedy pledged to adopt if the Senate consented to the ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. These four safeguards were the continuation of comprehensive underground nuclear test programs, the maintenance nuclear laboratory facilities to attract and retain scientists, the improvement of detection equipment, and the maintenance of the facilities needed for the rapid resumption of atmospheric testing.

This bill did not include an authorization for the improvement of detection equipment, the third safeguard. This is primarily the responsibility of the Department of Defense. However, the 12 construction projects authorized will implement the other three safeguards.

This bill brought the total authorization for the fiscal year 1964 for new construction projects to $190,507,000.

Appropriations for the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1964 were made in the Public Works Appropriations Act passed in December. That act made appropriations of $2,342,669,000 for operating expenses and $400 million for plant and capital equipment for the Agency.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established in 1961. It is responsible for the conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation, the preparation for and management of U.S. participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field, the dissemination, and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament, and the preparation for, operation of, or direction of U.S. participation in such international control systems as may, under treaty arrangements, become part of U.S. arms control and disarmament activities. Its original appropriation was $10 million.

In November the Congress authorized appropriations of $20 million through the fiscal year 1965 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Such appropriations were recognized as essential to the continued success of that agency. That it has been successful may be attested by two outstanding achievements in the past year—the partial nuclear test ban treaty and the emergency "hot line" link between Washington and Moscow. Long and careful research by the Agency preceded both of these achievements.

In December an appropriation of $7,-500,000 was made for the fiscal year 1964.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

In 1958 Congress established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In carrying out the policy of Congress that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, that agency was empowered to conduct research for the solution of problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere and develop, construct, test, and operate aeronautical and space vehicles for that purpose; to conduct activities that may be required for the exploration of space with manned and unmanned vehicles; to arrange for the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the United States and for cooperation by the United States with other nations in pursuit of peaceful purposes in aeronautical and space activities; and to provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning NASA's activities and the results thereof.

To enable that Agency to carry out the tasks which face it in this area of vast potential for the good of all mankind, Congress this year appropriated $5 billion for the fiscal year 1964. As sent to the President, this bill appropriated funds as follows: $3,926 million for research and development, $680 million for the construction of facilities, and $494 million for administrative operations.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS: THE WORLD BANK

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Finance—the World Bank—came into existence on December 27, 1945, when the Articles of Agreement, formulated at the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods, N.H., were signed in Washington by representatives of 28 governments. There are now 101 members and the organization has successfully carried out its purpose of assisting in the reconstruction and development of its member countries. As of March 31, 1963, it had made 338 loans amounting to the equivalent of $6,758 million to 61 countries and oversea territories.

In November this Congress enacted legislation authorizing the U.S. Governor of that organization to vote for a $1 billion increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock. No U.S. funds were involved; the bill was necessary only because the Articles of Agreement establishing the Bank required congressional approval for any capital stock increase. Approval was given in order to allow for the admission of new members and to permit special increases in the capital subscriptions of existing members. The rapid increase in membership had left only $210 million of the Bank's total $21 billion capital stock authorization available for subscription by members.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The Export-Import Bank of Washington was established in 1934 to aid in the financing and facilitation of exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States or any of its territories or insular possessions and any foreign country or the agencies or nationals thereof. It makes long-term loans to help finance the purchase of U.S. exports and also provides guarantees and insurance for the protection of U.S. exporters against political and credit risks.

In his budget message transmitted to Congress on January 17, President Kennedy rightly referred to the Bank's "significant contribution to the expansion of our foreign trade." Aware of this contribution and responding to the requests of the President, this Congress has, by Public Law 88–101, extended the life of the Bank for 5 years. We have also raised the total amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance that the Bank may have outstanding at any one time by $2 billion and increased by $1 billion the total amount of export credit insurance and guarantees that may be outstanding at one time.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Department of State is the chief adviser to the President in the field of foreign policy and has the primary responsibility for initiating and implementing the foreign policy of the United States. We have appropriated $322,696,000 for that Department for the fiscal year 1964.

This is in addition to the $7,870,300 appropriated in the supplemental appropriation bill.

A properly conceived and administered foreign aid program is of great value to the national interest of the United States. As was pointed out in the report of the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, a 10-member committee appointed by President Kennedy in 1962:

> We live in a world in which poverty, sickness, instability, and turmoil are rife and where a relentless Communist imperialism manipulates this misery to subvert men and nations from freedom's cause. A foreign aid program is one instrument among many which we and other developed countries adequately can afford and vigorously must use in the defense and advancement of free world interests.

To carry out this program, we have appropriated $3,298,705,607 for the fiscal year 1964.

FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDING ACT

Public Law 88–94, signed by President Kennedy on August 12, authorized a 2-year, $50 million appropriation for the Department of State in connection with the operation of its 286 oversea diplomatic posts. The authorization covered appropriations for the acquisition, construction, alteration, and leasing of building overseas. The bill specifies that the financing is to be made from U.S. owned foreign currencies. This is an important provision. If these funds are used rather than making a further demand upon our gold reserves, a favorable effect upon our balance of payments can be anticipated.

This is a good and reasonable housekeeping bill. Like any wise householder, the Government of the United States must provide for the maintenance and upkeep of its facilities.

PHILIPPINE WAR CLAIMS

The Foreign Service Buildings Act contains provisions relevant to Philippine war claims. These provisions, much debated in both Houses of Congress, are the result of a compromise worked out between the two bodies.

The Philippine War Claims Act of 1962, Public Law 87–616, authorized the payment of $73 million to Philippine corporations and citizens as the unpaid balance of World War II damage claims filed under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. The amendment to the 1962 act, adopted this year, is an equitable compromise by which the United States shall fulfill its obligations to the people of the Philippines while placing restrictions on lobby and claim collecting practices.

This amendment provides:

First, that no payment in excess of $25,000 be made to any individual claimant under the act.

Second, that no former Commissioner or employee of the Philippine War Damage Commission or their assigns or associates is eligible to receive remuneration in connection with any claim coming under the act.

Third, that anyone within the jurisdiction of the United States who pays remuneration in violation of the act is subject to a fine of $5,000 and/or imprisonment for 1 year and anyone who receives remuneration is subject to a fine of $5,000 and/or imprisonment for 5 years.

Fourth, that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission recover from anyone receiving remuneration in violation of the act an amount equal to three times the amount received in remuneration.

Fifth, that a claimant's acceptance of a payment will be considered full satisfaction and final settlement of his war damage claims.

Sixth, that a special fund be established in the U.S. Treasury. This fund will consist of the difference between the amount paid in approved claims and the amount that would have been paid if the $25,000 limit had not been placed upon individual claims. This amount—estimated at between $20 and $30 million—will be used for educational exchange programs between the United States and the Philippines.

Seventh, that the difference between the approved claims—paid and placed in the educational fund—and the $73 million appropriated in 1962 will revert to the general fund of the U.S. Treasury.

PEACE CORPS

In my report last year I referred to the Peace Corps as "a new, imaginative, and informal approach to the field of foreign aid to the lesser developed nations." That Corps, established by President Kennedy in 1961, has been an undisputed success.

In 1962 we appropriated $59 million for that agency. This year we have almost doubled its funds by authorizing $102 million for the fiscal year 1964. This will allow it to increase from 6,600 to 11,300 the number of volunteers sent to underdeveloped countries to live and work with the people and to assist them to raise their standard of living. One of the sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CORNELIUS GAL-

LAGHER, described it as "the best investment we have ever made to demonstrate the real spirit of America's desire to help the people of other lands."

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time to present a fairly complete picture of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I have not, of course, discussed all of the measures enacted during this session. But I did wish to document my earlier statement that we have devoted ourselves to the whole spectrum of needs of a diverse country and a diverse people.

There are those who will call this bill important and that bill petty. There are those who scoff at what they call housekeeping bills. There are those who see the extension of an earlier measure as automatically minor and the enactment of a new one as automatically major. All of these are subjective judgments and none of them is entirely true. To a young man in the service the military pay raise is significant. It probably is not to a bachelor in his 68th year. But the extension of the housing for the elderly program is of interest to that gentleman. The appropriation for the operation of diplomatic posts abroad may not seem very dramatic to a housewife but the mental retardation bill will if she has a child so afflicted.

I could go on enumerating examples such as this. I trust I have said enough to make my point: This is a vast country with myriads of problems and the efficient governance of the Nation requires attention to all of them, the large and the small, the dramatic and the tedious, the momentary and the persisting.

A legislative record is made by well ordered, consistent action. This requires time, patience, an open mind, and a willingness to cooperate. The Members of this body have displayed these qualities in high degree. The result is a laudable beginning toward what I truly believe will be a historic Congress.

Address by Dr. Gershon B. Chertoff at Union Junior College, Cranford, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the appeal of the late President John F. Kennedy to reason and learning was a principal theme of a recent address by Dr. Gershon B. Chertoff, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Israel, Elizabeth, N.J. Dr. Chertoff spoke at the Thanksgiving memorial program for students at Union Junior College at Cranford, N.J., on November 27, just 5 days after the tragic assassination in Dallas.

The death of President Kennedy should certainly strengthen our resolve to root out prejudice and unreasoning distrust wherever we find it. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Rabbi Chertoff's moving address, as published in the Cranford Citizen and Chronicle of Thursday, December 5, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. GERSHON CHERTOFF

It goes against the grain to celebrate our country and sing its praises so soon after our martyred President has fallen cold and dead. How shall we offer thanks when on the silent ground lies the silent slain? We weep for the voice of hope that was stilled; we grieve for the promise not completely fulfilled; we mourn for the burgeoning greatness that had not yet reached its climax.

In the President's death there is not only tragedy, but also transfiguration. America was always promises, and continues to be. And now that he belonge to the ages, the President's words, along with those of the two Roosevelts, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Washington, have become testament rather than tool, and are part of the American scriptures that have always inspired America to break a lance with the future and laugh at fears for the morrow.

For us of the academic and scholarly community, there is particular consolation. In his last prepared address for Dallas, which was undelivered but published, the President spoke directly to us. In it he emphasized the indispensable link between leadership and learning.

"Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company," he wrote, "but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendency with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem."

The pursuit of learning and the exercise of reason—these are the tasks of the academic community and are inseparable from the civilized life.

You are being trained in the life of reason, so that you might be civilized. You are being taught to think. Thinking is a sophisticated activity. The authentic thinker recognizes the complexity of problems and does not seek simple (simplistic) answers. He has a feel for subtleties and is willing to live with partial solutions. He respects differences of opinion and has the wit and wisdom to agree to disagree. We never achieve this goal in its entirety, but if we make the attempt, we cannot wholly fail.

The barbarian on the other hand does not even make the attempt. The connoisseurs of violence, from Faubus to Wallace to Barnett, together with their followers and predecessors who created the atmosphere for Oswald's act, are the true primitives. They devaluate everything about life except the instruments for defacing it. They confuse their own rhetoric with reality. They think with their fists and persuade with a gun; they spew words of hate and defy the law, in a vain attempt to force simple and swift solutions where there are none. They are extremists because they cannot live with the frustrations and irritations of continuing problems. Their cult of force, if successful, would bring about the dethronement of reason, the closing off of discussion, the denial of the rights of opposition, and an end to democracy.

The late President Kennedy's appeal to reason and learning, his very martyrdom, call us back to the faith of our Founding Fathers and might very well serve as the text for Thanksgiving. His challenge recalls the "decent respect to the opinions of mankind" that animated the authors of the Declaration of Independence. They rested their case before mankind on a common belief in self-evident truths, in reason, and in the moral ideas of Western civilization shared by educated men everywhere.

It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work to which they were committed and which our martyred President so nobly advanced.

On his last sad journey, from which he did not return, the President stopped at Tampa, Fla., where he addressed the business community. He deplored the attitudes of those businessmen who were interested only in their business and not in the business of Government. To them "the balance sheet and profit rate of their own corporation" were "of more importance than the worldwide balance of power or the nationwide rate of unemployment."

And he quoted to them the passage from Dickens' Christmas Carol in which Ebenezer Scrooge is terrified by the ghost of his former partner, Jacob Marley. And Scrooge, appalled by Marley's story of ceaseless wandering, cries out, "But you were always a good man of business, Jacob." And the ghost of Marley, his legs bound by a chain of ledger books and cash boxes, replies: "Business? Mankind was my business. The common welfare was my business. Charity, mercy, forbearance, and benevolence were all my business. The dealings of my trade were but a drop of water in the comprehensive ocean of my business."

Charity, mercy, forbearance, and benevolence, together with a passion for justice and and an acceptance of the yoke of the law, these are the ingredients out of which democracy is made. They will not be achieved unless we eradicate from our minds and hearts the egoism that restricts our concerns to our own private affairs alone and hardens our hearts to the common weal.

Democracy is a sophisticated doctrine, beyond the reach of the barbarian, the connoisseur of violence. It demands the educated heart as well as the educated mind. It is no wonder that we falter and fail. But if in the words of the Preamble to the Constitution we are to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, then, in the words of President Kennedy, "whether we work in the White House or the statehouse, or in a house of industry or commerce, mankind is our business, and if we work in harmony, if we understand the problems of each other and the responsibilities that each of us bear, then surely the business of mankind will prosper, and your children and mine will move ahead in a secure world, and one in which there is opportunity for them all."

The ancient commentators in their quest for universal meaning in scripture interpreted synonyms which the careless eye sees as nothing but trifling, as being rife with subtleties. In the Bible when a man has passed away, Holy Writ usually describes him as having died. But when King David died he is described as having "slept with his fathers."

The distinction according to the commentators is momentous. The expression of sleeping was used in the case of David because he left a son like himself, who walked in the ways of his father and continued his noble deeds. Therefore, David did not truly die, but lived on in the reflected life of his son. But when a man's ideals and his style of life are not carried on by worthy successors, then he dies with the death of his ideals.

Democracy is forever precarious and unstable, and in no manner does it promise a tame idyll or a static utopia. The violence that destroyed the President and tore the fabric of our society is the price we pay in failure for the vision of the ideal society.

We now know baffement, tragedy, sacrifice, and defeat. But we may well know fulfillment if the President will not have died, but will have slept with his fathers.

Our efforts will consecrate his unhappy end if we dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task begun by our Founding Fathers, that the President set before himself. Let us here firmly resolve that from this honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which he gave the last full measure of devotion. Then he shall not have died in vain, and this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and violence shall be no more.

Navy Yards and Naval Strength Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent authoritative British publication, Jane's Fighting Ships, touching upon comparative naval strength in the world declared that "the United States still has the greatest navy the world has ever seen," but "the Soviet Navy has a new look which must have a profound effect on naval thinking and planning on both sides of the Atlantic."

I think it can be said that this observation by a great naval authority like Jane should be carefully heeded and taken to heart by those in the Congress and administration having to do with the defense of this Nation, particularly our naval strength.

According to Jane's the world has more navies than ever before, 96 in number. While some of these are considered to be no mere infants-in-arms, but quite considerable fleets, notably those of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Indonesia, it seems that we should lose no time in carefully reappraising our own position in terms of naval strength.

It is the opinion of Jane's that the United States, as the senior partner of the victorious Allies, is in danger of becoming topheavy with the weight of its outdated, war-built hulls, although, of course, the United States has built in recent years the biggest and most sophisticated warships in every major category, while the navies of the so-called defeated nations are rising on a pinnacle of new steel, unfettered by the deadwood of a generation gone.

In brief, our Navy, while strong, has more older ships than the newer navies, and this is especially true of the Russian Navy which is being built up at a very rapid rate.

Jane's made reference to the oft-reiterated and reiterated and proven maxim exemplified by Nelson, Churchill, and Mahan: "Who rules the sea rules the world."

While this maxim is now subject to some revision, it is pointed out that if the United States can turn out nuclear-powered submarines at the rate of 10 to 12 per year, so also can the Soviet Union.

It is said that the Soviet naval watchword seems to be intelligence, infiltration, and interception. To these ends, the Soviet Union has built and is building a strong and modern navy second only to that of the United States. It has rapidly built and is increasing alarmingly an enormous merchant fleet while our own American merchant marine has been permitted to fall back in comparative strength with other great powers. The Soviet Union has also accumulated the world's largest, most modern, and unusually versatile fishing fleet of trawlers which, as we know, are being widely used for gathering information, sometimes close to our shores and in this Western Hemisphere.

In addition, it has created a large fleet of survey ships in a massive and worldwide oceanographic research effort, according to such a distinguished authority as Jane's.

The Soviet has made sufficient progress with the building of a new spearhead in the shape of new warships, including guided missile ships and nuclear submarines, that she has been able to discard her long streaming tail of older warships, although this Nation has not had such notable success along these lines.

It is also Jane's informed view that the Soviet Navy has the most powerful submarine fleet the world has ever known. Even excluding training and obsolescent units, there are believed to be over 400 effective submarines, including 25 nuclear powered, and over 40 armed with guided missiles.

According to the commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, submarines constitute the Soviet Union's main striking force at sea and this is something that has been known to our own, as well as other, naval experts in the world.

The information furnished by Jane's, much of which has been and is available to our own experts, and the pertinent observations made as a corolary to this information, should certainly be sobering upon our own thinking and acting in the planning and construction of naval craft for our own Navy and national defense.

Short of cutting down key critical construction of new naval craft in modern categories, this Nation should be now building at a greater rate than it is in these categories to match the Soviet and other navies of the world, so that we will not be left behind as long as it is necessary in this troubled world to provide for our security and that of our associates of the free world.

We can hope and work for peace, to be sure, and we must devote ourselves energetically to that end in the name of humanity, freedom and justice. But we must never negate our naval strength or allow it to fall below that of our competitors in overall naval potential.

Above all, we cannot allow important arms and agencies of that strength, like the Boston Naval Shipyard, and other repair and modernizing installations to deteriorate, run down, to be curtailed or, as some propose, entirely eliminated.

Till the time comes that an effective, permanent, lasting peace is established—let us hope and pray that will be soon—our course is obvious and imperative. It must be to keep our Navy and all other vital defense arms in a state of adequacy, readiness and modernity to meet every test, every challenge.

Instead of laying plans to dismantle the Boston Naval Shipyard and similar installations in the country, it would seem far more appropriate for us, indeed vital and compelling for us, to build up, streamline and modernize these establishments so that they can serve us and our great Navy with more efficiency, skill and readiness to meet every need in a sensible, economical manner.

We must under no circumstances allow our understandable zest and quest for sensible economy to jeopardize our defense forces and leave the Nation more susceptible to military attack.

I think that we must meet those challenges of the Soviet Union and other nations in naval strength and we must do it without further delay or equivocation.

I am forwarding a copy of these remarks to our great President, the distinguished Secretary of Defense, the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I hope that the subject matter will be carefully pondered, examined, appraised, and acted upon before our great American Navy becomes less than the greatest and most effective in the world and unable adequately to perform its proper role in defending the country.

Navy yards, naval strength, and a powerful, balanced striking force are vital to the safety and security of this Nation, and I most respectfully urge upon the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Joint Chiefs their most energetic efforts, not only to hold the line for the Navy, but to build and develop this great defense arm and keep it as the greatest and the best Navy in the world.

Tribute to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the unhappy days after November 22 many fine tributes were paid to President Kennedy. One of the most eloquent I have seen is the moving address which Rabbi Gershon B. Chertoff, of Temple Bnai Israel in Elizabeth, N.J., delivered to the students and faculty of Union Junior College on the day before Thanksgiving.

It was hard for all of us to thing of giving thanks so soon after the tragedy which shattered the Nation. But Rabbi Chertoff's inspiring address has demonstrated that this Thanksgiving was a time to be grateful for the heritage of reason and knowledge which President Kennedy left us, and to which we must now dedi-

cate ourselves. I ask unanimous consent that Rabbi Chertoff's Thanksgiving tribute to our late President be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY RABBI CHERTOFF

It goes against the grain to celebrate our country and sing its praises so soon after our martyred President has fallen cold and dead. How shall we offer thanks when on the silent ground lies the silent slain? We weep for the voice of hope that was stilled, we grieve for the promise not completely fulfilled, we mourn for the burgeoning greatness that had not yet reached its climax.

In the President's death there is not only tragedy, but also transfiguration. America was always promises, and continues to be. And now that he belongs to the ages, the President's words, along with those of the two Roosevelts, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Washington, have become testament rather than tool, and are part of the American scriptures that have always inspired America to break a lance with the future and laugh at fears for the morrow.

For us of the academic and scholarly community there is particular consolation. In his last prepared address for Dallas, which was undelivered but published, the President spoke directly to us. In it he emphasized the indispensable link between leadership and learning.

"Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company," he wrote, "but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem."

The pursuit of learning and the exercise of reason—these are the tasks of the academic community and are inseparable from the civilized life.

You are being trained in the life of reason, so that you might be civilized. You are being taught to think. Thinking is a sophisticated activity. The authentic thinker recognizes the complexity of problems and does not seek simple (simplistic) answers. He has a feel for subtleties and is willing to live with partial solutions. He respects differences of opinion and has the wit and wisdom to agree to disagree. We never achieve this goal in its entirety, but if we make the attempt, we cannot wholly fail.

The barbarian on the other hand does not even make the attempt. The connoisseurs of violence, from Faubus to Wallace to Barnett, together with their followers and predecessors who created the atmosphere for Oswald's act, are the true primitives. They devaluate everything about life except the instruments for defacing it. They confuse their own rhetoric with reality. They think with their fists and persuade with a gun, they spew words of hate and defy the law, in a vain attempt to force simple and swift solutions where there are none. They are extremists because they cannot live with the frustrations and irritations of continuing problems. Their cult of force, if successful, would bring about the dethronement of reason, the closing off of discussion, the denial of the rights of opposition, and an end to democracy.

The late President Kennedy's appeal to reason and learning, his very martyrdom, calls us back to the faith of our Founding Fathers and might very well serve as the text for Thanksgiving. His challenge recalls the "decent respect to the opinions of mankind" that animated the authors of the Declaration of Independence. They rested their case before mankind on a common belief in self-evident truths, in reason, and in the moral ideas of Western civilization shared by educated men everywhere.

It is for us the living to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work to which they were committed and which our martyred President so nobly advanced.

On his last sad journey, from which he did not return, the President stopped at Tampa, Fla., where he addressed the business community. He deplored the attitudes of those businessmen who were interested only in their business and not in the business of government. To them "the balance sheet and profit rate of their own corporations" were "of more importance that the worldwide balance of power or the nationwide rate of unemployment." And he quoted to them the passage from Dickens' Christmas Carol in which Ebenezer Scrooge is terrified by the ghost of his former partner, Jacob Marley. And Scrooge, appalled by Marley's story of ceaseless wandering, cries out, "But you were always a good man of business, Jacob." And the ghost of Marley, his legs bound by a chain of ledger books and cash boxes, replied: "Business? Mankind was my business. The common welfare was my business Charity, mercy, forebearance, and benevolence were my business. The dealings of my trade were but a drop of water in the comprehensive ocean of my business."

Charity, mercy, forebearance and benevolence, together with a passion for justice and an acceptance of the yoke of the law, these are the ingredients out of which democracy is made. They will not be achieved unless we eradicate from our minds and hearts the egoism that restricts our concerns to our own private affairs alone and hardens our hearts to the common weal.

Democracy is a sophisticated doctrine, beyond the reach of the barbarian, the connoisseur of violence. It demands the educated heart as well as the educated mind. It is no wonder that we falter and fail. But if in the words of the Preamble to the Constitution we are to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, then in the words of President Kennedy, "whether we work in the White House or the statehouse, or in a house of industry, or commerce, mankind is our business and if we work in harmony, if we understand the problems of each other and the responsibilities that each of us bears, then surely the business of mankind will prosper, and your children and mine will move ahead in a secure world, and one in which there is opportunity for them all."

The ancient commentators in their quest for universal meaning in Scripture interpreted synonyms which the careless eye sees as nothing but trifling, as being rife with subtleties. In the Bible when a man has passed away, Holy Writ usually describes him as having died. But when King David died he is described as having "slept with his fathers."

The distinction according to the commentators is momentous. The expression of "sleeping" was used in the case of David because he left a son like himself, who walked in the ways of his father and continued his noble deeds. Therefore David did not truly die, but lived on in the reflected life of his son. But when a man's ideals and his style of life are not carried on by worthy successors, then he dies with the death of his ideals.

Democracy is forever precarious and unstable, and in no manner does it promise a tame idyll or a static utopia. The violence that destroyed the President and tore the fabric of our society is the price we pay in failure for the vision of the ideal society. We now know bafflement, tragedy, sacrifice, and defeat. But we may well know fulfillment if the President will not have died, but will have slept with his fathers.

Our efforts will consecrate his unhappy end if we dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task begun by our Founding Fathers, that the Preesident set before himself. Let us here firmly resolve that from this honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which he gave the last full measure of devotion. Then he shall not have died in vain, and this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and violence shall be no more.

Scranton Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. WEAVER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the press has devoted much space to discussion of potential candidates in 1964. The State of Pennsylvania is proud that its favorite son for the Republican nomination is a young, aggressive and intelligent individual who currently serves as Governor of that State—William W. Scranton.

He has many qualifications for the Presidency. He has compiled an enviable record as Governor. Scranton has broad experience in government, not only on the State level, but on the National level. He has made a creditable record while serving with the State Department and as a Member of Congress.

An editorial appearing December 24, 1963, in the Washington Evening Star outlines the outstanding assets of this young leader.

The editorial is as follows:

SCRANTON AGAIN

Back in July, the Star suggested that William W. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania, was the best man the Republicans could put forward as their presidential candidate. Now, as a lot of other people seem to be reaching the same conclusion, we say it again.

Politically, much has changed. President Kennedy's death, which no one could foresee, has materially altered the estimates which, though it may seem a cold and unfeeling thing to say, must still enter into the political calculations. As always, the political men at the conventions will try to nominate a winner.

It would have been very difficult for any Republican—barring some unforeseen national or international turn for the worse—to have beaten John F. Kennedy. Anyone who thinks that Lyndon B. Johnson, given the current signs and portents, will be less than a formidable opponent in November, had better think again. This coming election will be tough for the GOP, and the party will have to come up with its strongest possible candidate.

All of which brings us back to Pennsylvania's Governor Scranton.

In his political career (he is only 46) Governor Scranton has been something of a reluctant dragon. But he has worked hard and with success to alleviate the distress in some of his State's problem areas. He was pushed into running for the House in a strong Democratic district. He won by some 17,000 votes. (John Kennedy carried the district by about 15,000 votes).

The next big test came when Mr. Scranton was urged to run against Richardson Dilworth, Philadelphia's "reform" mayor, for

the governorship. To the surprise of most people, including Mayor Dilworth, Mr. Scranton won by about 500,000 votes.

Now it starts all over again. Governor Scranton is being urged to skip the reluctant-dragon business. General Eisenhower is said to be among those urging him. Republican National Chairman William E. Miller and the New York Herald Tribune have added their encouragement. In any event, if he intends to make his move, which evidently he does, Mr. Scranton must make it soon. The Republican convention is only about 7 months away.

Nationally, the Governor is not well known. He can't hope to sit back and wait for the GOP nomination to come to him on a platter.

Without trying to list all of Mr. Scranton's qualifications, and without contending that he is the only worthy Republican, we would point to the following: He is a man of considerable culture. He has served with credit in the State Department. His service in the House of Representatives also was effective. As Governor of a State with many problems, he has shown an intelligent dedication to serving the needs of the economically distressed, to maintaining a certain fiscal sanity even at the risk of opposition from a certain segment of old-line GOP supporters. With all of this, he has been a stanch supporter of civil rights.

What else? Governor Scranton has a wife who is reported to be a more-than-ordinary asset on the campaign trail. From what we have seen of him, he is a politician endowed with a refreshing and unusual measure of candor. And perhaps most important of all, he looks like a man occupying the strategic middle ground, who could be expected to unite all factions of the GOP. If this proves so, he will win the nomination.

Report of Activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 1st Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on December 19 I presented to the Senate a preliminary report of the activities of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia during the 1st session, 88th Congress. I now desire to supplement that report with a full review in detail of the committee's activities for that period of time.

However, before I do this, may I extend to my colleagues on this committee my appreciation for their helpfulness and assistance in our work. I believe that they are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the people of the entire country for the hours they spend in tending to the business of the Nation's Capital City while carrying on their other major activities incident to their service in the Congress. May I further express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who gave of their time and energy; namely, the very effective and hardworking senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee; the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], whose energies and skills and experience in municipal government have been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; and my warm friend and the capable junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who has carried a major load of the committee's work as chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee, during his first year as a Member of the Senate. To the other committee members, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], whose long service, both in the Senate and the House, made his work most valuable to the committee; the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose past service in the House has been most useful to the committee; and to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], whose experience in the House of Representatives and in the legislature of his home State has done much to assist the committee with its many problems, I wish to express my sincere thanks for the hours they gave to our committee.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the cooperation I received personally as committee chairman from the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and the individual members of his committee. Likewise, I wish to commend the cooperation and assistance that the staff members of the House District Committee have extended to the staff members of my committee during this session of Congress.

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 1st session, 88th Congress, the following:

Senate bills	88
Senate resolutions	1
Senate joint resolutions	3
House bills	34
Nominations	3
Grand total	129

During the session, there were reported to the Senate from the committee 18 Senate bills and 12 House bills.

Of the 34 House bills referred to the Senate, 21 are pending before the committee. Seventeen bills and acts have become public law. Twelve Senate-passed bills are pending before the District of Columbia Committee of the House.

Twenty-nine hearings were held by subcommittees on Senate bills, and 13 hearings were held by subcommittees on House bills.

The full committee held 17 hearings on bills and nominations and 6 joint hearings with the District of Columbia Committee of the House.

The full committee met in executive session on four occasions.

Number of bills, resolutions, acts and nominations referred to committee	129
Number of bills, acts and nominations reported to Senate	33
Number of bills and acts in process (hearings held)	12
Number of bills and acts indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation	10
Number of bills, resolutions and acts awaiting final action	86

The following is a list, by number and title, of all bills and acts passed by the Senate during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number:

S. 485, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended.

S. 489, to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; Public Law 88–85.

S. 490, to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; Public Law 88–89.

S. 628, to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

S. 646, to prohibit the location of chanceries or other business offices of foreign governments in certain residential areas in the District of Columbia.

S. 933, to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act and for other purposes.

S. 994, to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended.

S. 995, to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes.

S. 999, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925.

S. 1024, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes.

S. 1078, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act.

S. 1082, to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 1227, authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts); Public Law 88–19.

S. 1401, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, construct, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility.

S. 1406, to authorize the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes.

S. 1533, to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; Public Law 88–212.

S. 1964, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits.

S. 2054, to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia; Public Law 88–211.

H.R. 1933, to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the

minimum age limitation for registration; Public Law 88-81.

H.R. 1937, to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; Public Law 88-57.

H.R. 2485, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; Public Law 88-137.

H.R. 3190, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will; Public Law 88-192.

H.R. 3191, to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 4, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; Public Law 88-191.

H.R. 3537, to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; Public Law 88-60.

H.R. 4276, to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; Public Law 88-218.

H.R. 4330, to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; Public Law 88-111.

H.R. 5061, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; Private Law 88-67.

H.R. 5338, to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; Public Law 88-243.

H.R. 6177, to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; Public Law 88-104.

H.R. 7497, to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; Public Law 88-193.

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate:

Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1963 (reappointment).

Orman W. Ketcham, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires May 5, 1963.

Edmond T. Daly, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years, vice Randolph C. Richardson, deceased.

More Committee Staff for the Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Iowa City Press Citizen of Friday, December 13, 1963. This is another instance where writers covering the Congress have sensed the need for more minority staff assistance on congressional committees:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM STUDY POSTPONED AGAIN

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—All hope for study of congressional reorganization and reform have been knocked for this session and probably the next after two short, dull rounds of debate.

On successive days, Senators JOE CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, cosponsors with 30 other Senators of a resolution to set up a Joint Committee on Organization of Congress—asked unanimous consent to consider an amendment which would permit six Senators and six Representatives to study the antiquated Senate and House rules.

Two words—"I object"—were enough to kill the unanimous-consent request under existing rule. Sponsors of the reform movement had no stomach for a knockdown drag-out fight which might lead to a filibuster. So they threw in the towel. And modernization of congressional procedures to speed them up is dead.

Many Senators and Representatives are pretty sensitive these days to criticism that this session has been a "do-nothing Congress. Their contention is that long sessions and apathy in Congress are not new. The same criticisms of every Congress have been made for the last 50 or 100 years.

Back any intelligent Member of Congress into a corner for his private opinions, however, and he will deliver a far worse indictment of the present legislative inaction than anything that has been said or written by outside critics.

What it all adds up to is that Congress is not adequately organized to handle its present problems, to say nothing of the increasing workload in the next 25 years.

What's needed is said to be a change in structure of Congress as well as a change in its Members' attitudes.

On the latter, "We don't have time to think out the answers to our problems," says one Member. "We're lucky if we can just identify them. I barely know what's going on."

On the structural reorganization of Congress, 50 percent of the delays are now said to be caused by jurisdictional disputes between committees.

Who is responsible for the foreign trade issue which is becoming increasingly important, for instance? Is it the Foreign Relations or Commerce Committee? Or is it Finance Committee business because tariff rates are involved? Or agriculture, for farm product exports and imports? Or interior, for minerals? How can they all get into the act?

The fact that both Senate and House committees have to hold separate hearings on every issue is another great time consumer. Joint Senate-House subcommittee hearings have been suggested to eliminate this duplication of effort.

It is generally agreed that congressional committees still do not have adequate staffing for policy planning to deal with modern, increasingly complex problems.

One major deficiency cited is on national security issues that involve both international relations and military affairs. Another inadequacy is in the field of international finance.

The majority party which controls all committees is in far better position on staffing than the minority. Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, has headed a House Republican policy subcommittee that has worked diligently on this issue. It has put out a lot of publicity, but it hasn't solved its problem and probably won't till there is general reorganization.

The increasing workload of Congress during the next quarter century is bound to make present organization and procedure seem even more inadequate. Reform has to be effected for the future, it is felt, even if not for the present.

Population growth means a greater concentration of people in cities. Constantly improving farm technology means that more food will be produced by far fewer people. Automation makes achievement of full employment more difficult.

Congress has to gear up to deal with more complex human problems as well as political, economic or international affairs. And it has to gear up to make decisions faster.

Need for Better Planning in Defense Cutbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the recently announced cutback in employment on 33 military installations points up once again how badly we need to develop plans for the conversion of our Defense Establishment to meet changing military and disarmament situations.

One fruitful approach to this whole area is embodied in the proposal by my good friend from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of his bill.

The December 18th issue of the New York Times carried a most interesting and perceptive discussion by James Reston of some of the economic problems we are likely to encounter in the event of cuts or shifts in our military spending.

I would particularly like to draw the Senate's attention to Mr. Reston's comment that, "the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the slum war is likely to be more urgent with every passing month."

I can think of no more cogent argument for quick action in this area and I hope before too much more time has passed we will have taken some concrete steps toward establishing this vitally needed conversion machinery.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's article be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the article follows:

WE KNOW WHAT WE WANT—BUT ARE WE READY?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 17.—President Johnson told the United Nations today that "the United States wants to see the cold war ended, once and for all." But what if it happened, or even began to happen? Would the United States be ready?

There is already trouble ahead for a great many American communities, because the U.S. Government's plans to cut military expenditures are running ahead of the plans to convert to useful civilian occupations.

The recent decision to close some military bases and the ensuing cries of anguish from the communities involved are merely an indication of the problems ahead.

Secretary of Defense McNamara has given a dramatic estimate of the Nation's military superiority over the Communists within the last month. He has said that it should be possible for the United States to maintain this superiority "without overall increases in our defense budget. * * * The defense budget will level off and perhaps decline a little."

THE UNEMPLOYED

Meanwhile, the unemployment figure for November was 4,292,000, or 5.9 percent of the work force—up from 4,177,000 in January of this year—and while 80 percent of the people are enjoying unprecedented prosperity, about 20 percent, or over 30 million, are living on what the Government calls poverty standards.

This confronts President Johnson with two questions: first, whether the coming savings on defense are to be allocated to human needs for jobs, houses, schools and hospitals in the city and country slums; and second, whether the defense cutbacks are to be cushioned by an effective plan of reconversion.

There are small reconversion committees scattered through the various departments and agencies of the Government: in the Department of Defense, the Disarmament Agency, and the Council of Economic Advisers, to mention only three.

Walter Heller, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, talked to President Kennedy last summer about pulling these committees together into a Presidential Conversion Commission, but no decision was taken on this before the assassination.

Meanwhile, Senator MCGOVERN has introduced a bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and Negro leaders have talked to President Johnson about using the defense cutbacks as a means of dealing with the plight of the slums.

The defense cutbacks have started, however, and a look ahead at the production of nuclear weapons indicates just how serious this problem is likely to be as time goes on.

CURRENT SPENDING

At the present time the Government is spending over $1.5 billion a year to mine uranium, convert it into U^{235} and plutonium, and process it into nuclear weapons. President Kennedy announced that we had a nuclear capacity in being to kill over 300 million human beings in a single hour. Secretary McNamara has said that we now have "more than 500 operational long-range ballistic missiles" in addition to the Strategic Air Command, over 500 bombers on quick ground alert, and "in stockpile or planned for stockpile tens of thousands of nuclear explosives for tactical use."

The need for the raw materials and the production of these raw materials into fissionable material for weapons will accordingly decline over the rest of this decade. Already this year savings of tens of millions are planned in the production of fissionable material, though the mining costs and weapons production costs will remain about the same.

Eventually, however, whole towns will be affected. The Hanford, Wash., plant for example, now employs over 6,000 and is the sole economic support of Richland, Wash., a town of over 25,000.

THE APPALACHIAN PROBLEM

Other towns likely to be affected are Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., Portsmouth, Ohio, and Savannah River, Ga., among others. This is not an emergency problem. Nobody here is talking about closing up these plants in the foreseeable future, but conversion takes a long time.

The Atomic Energy Commission is the biggest user of electrical power in the country (6 percent). Its purchase of coal is a major factor in keeping the coal mines going in some of the poorest regions of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, and Illinois, and therefore plans for the future of these already depressed areas are important.

This is the kind of problem that is likely to plague President Johnson. The foreign front was President Kennedy's major problem, but the homefront is likely to be Johnson's, and the need for some effective way to convert from the cold war to the slum war is likely to be more urgent with every passing month.

"Hunger, disease, and ignorance," the President said, were the enemies of the United Nations. But they are also the enemies of one-fifth of the people of the United States.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit my voting record for the 88th Congress, 1st session, as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

VOTING RECORD OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(Citations are to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

JANUARY 9, 1963

Election of Speaker, page 10 (256–175); vote HALLECK.

House Resolution 5. Provides that the rules of the House of Representatives for the 88th Congress shall be the same as those of the 87th Congress with the exception of the Committee on Rules, whose membership shall be increased from 13 to 15 members permanently. On ordering the previous question, page 20 (249–183); vote nay; on agreeing to resolution, page 20 (235–196); vote yea.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963

House Joint Resolution 284. Supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for 1963.

On passage, page 2890 (254–154); vote, general pair.

House Resolution 249. Provides $360,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On agreeing to resolution, page 2916 (386–20); vote yea.

MARCH 11, 1963

H.R. 2438. Extends the induction provision of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. On passage, page 3742 (388–3); vote yea.

MARCH 12, 1963

H.R. 4374. Proclaims Sir Winston Churchill as honorary citizen of the United States of America. On passage, page 3799 (378–21); vote yea.

MARCH 13, 1963

H.R. 2440. Authorizes appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. On committee amendment increasing the funds provided for research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft for the Army by $363,700,000 and earmarking the amount for development of the RS–70 weapons system, page 3876 (226–179); vote yea. On motion to recommit with instructions designed to reduce by 5 percent the procurement funds and by 12½ percent the research and development funds, page 3877 (149–258); vote yea. On passage, page 3878; (374–33); vote yea.

APRIL 4, 1963

H.R. 5366. Treasury-Post Office appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 5474 (386–17); vote yea.

APRIL 10, 1963

H.R. 5517. Supplemental appropriations, 1963. On Boland amendment to restore $450 million for public works acceleration program, page 5806 (228–184); vote yea.

H.R. 5389. Repeals certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver. On passage, page 5824 (252–122); vote yea.

APRIL 24, 1963

H.R. 12. Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, designed to delete the student-loan provisions, page 6533 (171–239); vote nay. On passage, page 6534 (288–122); vote yea.

APRIL 25, 1963

H.R. 4997. Feed Grain Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, page 6750 (196–205); vote yea. On passage, page 6750 (208–195); vote nay.

APRIL 29, 1963

H.R. 1762. Promotes the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation. On Griffin amendment to require the Secretary of the Interior to file annual reports itemizing the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation accepted or used in connection with this program, page 6842 (292–50) vote general pair.

MAY 6, 1963

H.R. 40. To assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 7373 (275–30); vote yea.

MAY 7, 1963

House Joint Resolution 245. Provides that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States. On passage, page 7421 (386–2); vote yea.

MAY 8, 1963

H.R. 5517. Supplemental Appropriations, 1963. On recommitting the conference report with instructions to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 47, providing funds for World Food Congress and a contribution of $65,000 to the International Peace Corps Secretariat, page 757 (207–190); vote yea.

MAY 9, 1963

H.R. 950. Amends the Internal Security Act of 1950, to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency. On passage, page 7680 (340–40); vote present (paired against).

MAY 13, 1963

H.R. 4274. Amends District of Columbia Code to permit principals and teachers in District of Columbia schools to use reasonable force in maintaining order in schools. On passage, page 7681 (278–53); vote general pair.

MAY 14, 1963

H.R. 5517. Supplemental Appropriations, 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 8018 (242–129); vote yea. On ordering the previous question on motion to concur in Senate amendment 76 with an amendment, page 8024 (168–207); vote nay.

House Resolution 340. Authorizes travel outside U.S. continental limits by members of the House Committee on Education and

Labor. On agreeing to resolution, page 8033 (153–217); vote yea.

MAY 15, 1963

H.R. 6009. To provide, for the periods ending June 30, 1963, and August 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit. On motion to recommit, designed to continue temporarily the present $305 billion public debt limit, page 8101 (195–222); vote yea. On passage, page 8102 (213–204); vote nay.

MAY 23, 1963

H.R. 6060. Prohibits discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. On agreeing to House Resolution 362, the rule under which the legislation was considered, page 8682 (362–9); vote yea.

MAY 29, 1963

House Resolution 368. Authorizes the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva. On agreeing to resolution, page 9248 (278–52); vote yea.

H.R. 5497. Amends title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years. On passage, page 9280 (158–174); vote nay.

JUNE 4, 1963

H.R. 3496. Reorganization Act Extension. On Brown (Ohio) amendment to prohibit creating any new executive department, or abolishing or transfering an executive department or all the functions thereof, or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof, page 9511 (226–175); vote yea. On motion to adjourn, page 9590 (53–276); vote nay.

JUNE 6, 1963

H.R. 6754. Agriculture Department and related agencies appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 9837 (288–79); vote yea.

JUNE 11, 1963

H.R. 6868. Legislative appropriations, 1964 On passage, page 10053 (271–122); vote yea.

JUNE 12, 1963

H.R. 4996. Amends certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. On passage, page 10122 (204–209); vote nay.

JUNE 13, 1963

H.R. 6755. Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963. On passage, page 10263 (283–91); vote yea.

JUNE 18, 1963

H.R. 7063. Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 10418 (301–93); vote yea.

JUNE 19, 1963

House Joint Resolution 247. Equal-Time Rule Suspension Act. On passage, page 10572 (263–126); vote yea.

JUNE 24, 1963

H.R. 6177. Relates to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States. On motion to recommit, designed to increase the Federal contribution from $45 million to $53 million, page 10771 (99–237); vote yea.

JUNE 26, 1963

H.R. 7179. Defense Department Appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 11129 (410–1); vote yea.

JULY 9, 1963

H.R. 3179. Provides that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes. On passage, page 11642 (313–83); vote yea.

JULY 16, 1963

H.R. 4897. Repeals subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code, to extend geographical application of laws relating to seditious activities affecting the Armed Forces. On motion to recommit, page 12029 (40–339); vote yea.

JULY 17, 1963

H.R. 5279. Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations, 1964. Conference report—On motion to recommit providing for insistence of House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 52 providing for planning for construction of a National Air Museum, page 12079 (144–245); vote yea. On agreeing to conference report, page 12080 (333–50); vote yea.

JULY 18, 1963

H.R. 5171. Authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal agencies and departments. On motion to recommit, page 12277 (96–258); vote not voting.

JULY 24, 1936

H.R. 6518. To improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. On passage, page 12581 (273–102); vote yea.

JULY 25, 1963

H.R. 4638. Promotes the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. On motion to recommit, designed to eliminate the authorization of appropriations, page 12632 (29–343); vote nay.

JULY 30, 1963

H.R. 3872. Export-Import Bank Act Extension. Conference report—On motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and ask for further conference with Senate, page 12868 (379–11); vote yea.

JULY 31, 1963

H.R. 5207. Amends the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 to authorize additional appropriations (also to pay balance of payment for Philippine war damage). On agreeing to House Resolution 453, the rule waiving points of order against and providing for the consideration of the conference report, page 13050 (234–166); vote yea.

AUGUST 1, 1963

H.R. 7500. Authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On agreeing to House Resolution 467, the open rule providing for consideration of the bill, page 13078 (387–1); vote yea. On passage, page 13128 (335–57); vote yea.

AUGUST 5, 1963

S. 1652. Amends the National Cultural Center Act. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 13290 (293–33); vote yea.

AUGUST 6, 1963

H.R. 4955. Vocational Education Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, designed to insert language requiring all vocational education programs to be conducted on a racially nondiscriminatory basis by July 1, 1965, page 13506 (181–217); vote yea. On passage, page 13507 (378–21); vote yea.

AUGUST 7, 1963

H.R. 7824. Continues for the period ending November 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit. On agreeing to House Resolution 477, the closed rule waiving points of order against and providing for 4 hours of debate on the bill, page 13542 (303–72); vote yea.

AUGUST 8, 1963

H.R. 7824. Public debt limit. On motion to recommit, designed to limit the extension to October 31, and to fix the increase at $307 billion in lieu of $309 billion, page 13817 (164–229); vote yea. On passage, page 13818 (221–175); vote nay.

AUGUST 12, 1963

H.R. 7525. Relates to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit, page 13956 (114–222); vote yea.

AUGUST 14, 1963

H.R. 6143. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. On passage, page 14194 (287–113); vote yea.

AUGUST 23, 1963

H.R. 7885. Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, designed to reduce certain authorizations, page 14831 (222–188); vote nay. On passage, page 14832 (224–186); vote yea.

AUGUST 28, 1963

H.R. 7500. Authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Conference report—on motion to recommit with instructions to limit the aggregate amount of authorizations to $5,203,719,000, page 15302 (176–200); vote general pair. On agreeing to conference report, page 15303 (249–125); vote paired for.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

S. 1576. Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. On passage, page 15830 (335–18); vote general pair.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1963

House Resolution 504. Creates a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. On agreeing to resolution, page 15876 (336–0); vote yea.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963

H.R. 8363. Amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes and to make certain structural changes with respect to income tax. On agreeing to House Resolution 527, the closed rule providing for the consideration of and 8 hours of debate on H.R. 8363, page 1698 (324–65); vote yea.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1963

H.R. 8363. Amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes and to make certain structural changes with respect to income tax. On motion to recommit, designed to limit Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1964 to $97 billion and for fiscal year 1965 to $98 billion, page 17196 (199–226); vote yea. On passage, page 17197 (271–155); vote nay.

OCTOBER 1, 1963

H.R. 5555. Military pay increase. On agreeing to conference report, page 17466 (333–5); vote yea.

H.R. 7044. Authorizes $1.5 million for construction of Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. On agreeing to House Resolution 539, the open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7044, page 17470 (314–12); vote general pair.

OCTOBER 7, 1963

H.R. 3369. For the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason. On suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 541, providing for the House agreement to a Senate amendment, extending for 1 year the life of the Civil Rights Commission, page 17908 (265–80); vote general pair.

OCTOBER 8, 1963

H.R. 7179. Department of Defense appropriations, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 17954 (336–3); vote yea.

OCTOBER 10, 1963

H.R. 8747. Independent offices appropriations, 1964. On motion to recommit, designed to reduce by $200 million the research and development funds for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, page 18308 (145–192); vote yea. On passage, page 18309 (302–32); vote yea.

OCTOBER 14, 1963

H.R. 5871. Amends District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act. On passage, page 18460 (150–89); vote yea.

OCTOBER 15, 1963

H.R. 6237. Amends act to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States. On passage, page 18593 (158–154); vote nay.

OCTOBER 21, 1963

S. 1576. Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 18970 (299–13); vote yea.

OCTOBER 22, 1963

H.R. 8821. Relates to restoration of Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act amounts. On passage, page 18995 (350–1); vote yea.

OCTOBER 23, 1963

H.R. 5945. Relates to political status of Puerto Rico. On passage, page 19126 (320–44); vote yea.

OCTOBER 28, 1963

House Joint Resolution 782. Continuing appropriations through November 30, for fiscal year 1964. On agreeing to resolution, page 19348 (279–11); vote yea.

House Resolution 314. Grants additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor. On agreeing to resolution, page 19351 (119–164); vote yea.

OCTOBER 31, 1963

H.R. 6500. Military construction authorization, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 19644 (356–1); vote yea.

H.R. 8195. Provides a 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program. On passage, page 19685 (173–160); vote nay.

NOVEMBER 6, 1963

H.R. 6143. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 20069 (258–92); vote yea.

H.R. 8920. Revises the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. On motion to recommit, page 20090 (258–98); vote yea.

NOVEMBER 7, 1963

H.R. 8969. To temporarily increase the public debt limit for the balance of fiscal year 1964. On agreeing to House Resolution 564, the closed rule providing for consideration of the bill, page 20306 (212–149); vote yea. On motion to recommit, page 20328 (172–197); vote yea. On passage, page 20329 (187–179); vote nay.

NOVEMBER 14, 1963

H.R. 8864. International Coffee Agreement Act of 1963. On passage, page 20729 (181–145); vote nay.

NOVEMBER 18, 1963

H.R. 2988. Relates to Armed Forces participation in international sports. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 20941 (284–30); vote general pair.

H.R. 8135. Provides for establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 20943 (284–30); vote general pair.

H.R. 9139. Military construction appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 20957 (332–5); vote yea.

NOVEMBER 19, 1963

H.R. 9140. Public works appropriations, 1964. On passage, page 21191 (358–27); vote yea.

NOVEMBER 20, 1963

S. 277. Amends the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On passage, page 21445 (251–133); vote yea.

DECEMBER 2, 1963

H.R. 9124. Amends title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the ROTC programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (failed); page 21885 (176–154); vote nay.

H.R. 10. Extends the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of 1883 to temporary summer employment. On suspending the rules and passing the bill, page 21899 (301–18); vote nay.

DECEMBER 4, 1963

H.R. 6196. Revitalizes the American cotton industry. On motion to recommit, page 22208 (179–224); vote yea. On passage, page 22289 (216–182); vote nay.

DECEMBER 9, 1963

H.R. 7885. Foreign Assistance Act of 1963. On agreeing to conference report, page 22719 (195–164); vote yea.

H.R. 8929. Authorizes the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region. On motion to recommit, page 22741 (278–76); vote nay.

DECEMBER 10, 1963

H.R. 8747. Independent offices appropriations, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 22791 (356–22); vote yea.

Conference report—on preferential motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 92, which provides funds for site and planning expenses involved in construction of a VA hospital at Bay Pines, Fla., page 22794 (170–204); vote yea.

H.R. 6518. Improves, strengthens, and accelerates programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. On agreeing to conference report, page 22811 (273–109); vote yea.

H.R. 7457. Provides legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. On agreeing to House Resolution 579, the rule providing for consideration of the bill, page 22815 (345–12); vote yea.

DECEMBER 11, 1963

On motion to adjourn until December 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon, page 23061 (214–166); vote nay.

DECEMBER 12, 1963

H.R. 9140. Public Works Appropriations, 1964. On agreeing to conference report, page 23078 (329–47); vote yea.

H.R. 4955. Vocation Education Act of 1963. On motion to recommit, page 23120 (180–192), vote nay. On agreeing to conference report, page 23121 (301–65); vote yea.

DECEMBER 13, 1963

H.R. 9139. Appropriations for military construction, Department of Defense. On ordering the previous question, page 23387 (300–4); vote yea.

DECEMBER 16, 1963

H.R. 9499. Foreign aid appropriations and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. On the motion to recommit, page 23578 (218–169); vote nay. On passage, page 23579 (249–135); vote yea.

DECEMBER 17, 1963

H.R. 8667. Authorize additional appropriations in regard to river basins flood control projects. On the preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, page 23642 (329–41); vote yea.

H.R. 9413. The President John F. Kennedy memorial 50-cent piece. On the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, page 236 (352–6); vote yea.

DECEMBER 19, 1963

House Joint Resolution 875. Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for combating mental retardation. On passage, page 24028 (324–4); vote yea.

DECEMBER 23, 1963

House Resolution 600. Privileged resolution from the Rules Committee to consider without any point of order H.R. 9499 (foreign aid appropriations, supra). Question is on the House considering the resolution, page 24290 (202–105); vote yea.

DECEMBER 24, 1963

H.R. 9499. The foreign aid appropriations bill. Question is on waiving the conference report, page 24336 (189–158); vote live pair with Mr. HALEY (Florida). Mr. MATHIAS withdrew yea vote and voted present. Mr. HALEY voted nay.

A Better Briefed Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of December 10, 1963:

A BETTER BRIEFED CONGRESS

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—A problem which seriously confronts Congress—wholly apart from its horse-and-buggy procedures—is, plainly and simply, lack of knowledge. Yes; lack of expert, look-ahead information and ideas on the rapidly developing issues which beset the Nation.

This lack has been underlined by Senators and Representatives and by those who have made studies of the legislative branch. It has been suggested, for instance, that committee staffs in Congress are often inadequate, and particularly that the staffing permitted to the minority membership of some committees (in these days, the Republicans) is notoriously insufficient.

Now comes Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Democratic whip, to suggest a way out of this problem. He suggests the establishment of what might be termed a "Congressional Institute of Fellows"—a permanent institution, functioning something like the policy planning staff of the State Department—to provide plans and background data on every kind of subject with which Congress is wrestling, from trade to taxes and from foreign aid to balance of payments.

Senator HUMPHREY suggests that the "Institute of Fellows" be staffed by experts—scholars, for instance, on temporary leave of absence from their colleges and universities. This would assure a constant freshening of the knowledge available.

As long ago as 1922, Walter Lippmann was observing the difficulty which Members of Congress experienced in keeping on top of the issues confronting them. Since that date, complexities have multiplied and whole new subjects for legislation—space, the cold war, social security, Atlantic partnership, stimuli to the economy, and atomic energy, to name a few—have churned into view.

The White House—the executive branch—has in recent years amassed an array of experts to enrich Presidential thinking. President Kennedy set up dozens of commissions to make studies and report back on basic issues. President Johnson has his own brain trust and calls on competent experts. Congress has occasionally sought expert reports, as in the field of foreign aid, but these efforts have been sporadic. A Senator usually relies on his own overworked staff, on assists from the Library of Congress, on personal research, and on what he gleans from presentations at committee hearings.

But individual Senators and Representatives often confess themselves to be insufficiently informed on national security issues, on monetary policy, or, for instance,

on the rivalry of Federal, State, and local governments for the citizen's tax dollar.

Should Congress take steps to provide a policy-planning staff? Legislators should not be apprehensive that such an institute would become the dictator of policy to Congress. The experts would be on tap, not on top. They would provide background data, and, where requested, formulate alternative programs. The function of probing and making the final decisions would remain, as always, with Congress.

If Congress is to legislate in heads-up fashion in this busy latter half of the 20th century, it should be willing to consider any and all proposals designed to increase its intelligent grasp of today's problems.

Public Works Acceleration—The First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the American Public Works Association Reporter, in November 1963, reprinted a most interesting article by my good friend, Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber, Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, Area Redevelopment Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Because of the very informative and timely nature of Dr. Hoeber's statement, I am sure it will be of interest to the Members, and therefore I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION—THE FIRST YEAR

(By Johannes U. Hoeber, Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, Area Redevelopment Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce)

Almost exactly 1 year ago, on September 14, 1962, President Kennedy signed the Public Works Acceleration Act which had been passed by Congress a few days before. The act was designed to bring the enormous economic potential of public works to bear upon the perplexing problems of those areas of our country which have remained distressed in the midst of a growing and expanding national economy.

The Public Works Acceleration Act is a companion piece to the Area Redevelopment Act which had become law on May 1, 1961. Both acts are aimed at relieving unemployment and stimulating economic growth in those areas of the country which have lagged behind in the Nation's recovery from the recession of 1960–61. The Area Redevelopment Act is designed primarily to create permanent jobs; the Accelerated Public Works Act provides immediately available temporary jobs. Industrial and commercial loans, public facility loans and grants, technical assistance, and retraining of workers displaced by technological changes are the tools of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Acceleration of previously authorized Federal public works projects and grants-in-aid to States and local communities for the initiation or acceleration of public works projects of their own are the tools of the Public Works Acceleration Act. Both statutes aim the rifle at the areas of special economic need, not the shotgun at the total economy. PWA and WPA, the twin pump-primers of the New Deal, were attempting to cope with the nationwide depression of the thirties. In the sixties the targets of ARA and APW are the pockets of economic distress in the midst of the affluent society. To use the terminology of the economist: the public works program of the thirties was aimed primarily at cyclical unemployment; the programs of the sixties are designed to relieve structural and technological unemployment and underemployment.

PROGRAM PURPOSES

Participation in the public works acceleration program is limited, therefore, to the approximately 1,000 areas of substantial and persistent unemployment or low family income designated as "redevelopment areas" by the Secretary of Commerce, and additional approximately 300 labor markets designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial unemployment. In the aggregate, these areas cover about one-third of the country, comprise about one-third of the total population, but contain almost one-half of the total number of unemployed or underemployed persons in the labor force.

The public works acceleration program has two principal purposes:

(1) To provide immediate useful work for the unemployed in the eligible areas;

(2) To help these areas to become more conducive to industrial and commercial development through the improvement of their public facilities.

APW is not a work relief program, but APW projects must contribute substantially to the reduction of local unemployment. APW projects are designed to create jobs for the unemployed, but they must also serve an essential public need. The Public Works Acceleration Act authorized the appropriation of up to $900 million; Congress appropriated the first $400 million on October 24, 1962, and another $450 million on May 17, 1963. By the first week in October the total of $850 million will have been committed to specific projects.

ORGANIZATION AND CRITERIA

The funds are appropriated to the President, to be allocated by him to the Federal agencies responsible:

(a) for the construction of Federal public works projects, referred to as direct Federal projects, and

(b) for programs authorizing Federal financial assistance to State and local public works projects, referred to as grants-in-aid projects.

Immediately following the passage of the legislation, the President, by Executive order, designated the Secretary of Commerce to assist him in the administration of the act. The Secretary of Commerce, in turn, assigned to the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration the responsibility for coordinating the public works acceleration program.

The act imposes certain limitations upon the availability of funds:

(1) Public works projects—both direct Federal and grant-in-aid—must be located in eligible areas.

(2) Direct Federal projects must have been previously authorized by Congress, either by item or by class.

(3) States and local governments must increase their total public works expenditures during the fiscal year in which a project is initiated by at least as much as they are required to contribute to the cost of the project.

(4) No more than 10 percent of the funds may be made available to any one State.

(5) At least one-third of the funds must be allocated to the rural areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act as so-called 5(b) areas.

(6) In keeping with the concept of acceleration, projects are eligible only if they can get underway within no more than 120 days after funds are obligated and can be more than half completed within a year after they are started.

(7) Projects must meet an essential public need and contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment.

(8) They must not be inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the physical and economic development of the area.

(9) In general, Federal agencies, contractors and subcontractors must employ on these projects qualified persons who regularly reside within the eligible area where the project is located.

For grants-in-aid to States and local communities the act provides a sliding scale of Federal contributions geared toward the economic need of the area. The higher the rate and duration of unemployment and the lower the median family income, the higher may be the Federal grant. In most areas the total of Federal contributions may not exceed 50 percent of the total project cost; 64 areas many receive 58 percent, 99 areas 66 percent, and 166 areas 75 percent.

HOW IT WORKS

Applications for grant-in-aid projects are filed with and reviewed by the Federal agencies which administer the program under which the project is authorized like, for example, the Hill-Burton and water pollution control programs of the Public Health Service and the community facilities loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Theirs is the primary responsibility for determining whether the project is technically feasible and legally eligible. This includes the all-important responsibility for reviewing the cost estimates on which the grants are based.

Both the direct Federal projects and the grant-in-aid projects are then submitted to the Area Redevelopment Administration for final clearance and allocation of funds. The act provides that adequate consideration must be given to the relative needs of eligible areas. It is here that ARA has played its greatest role and carried its heaviest responsibility.

It became evident at the very beginning of the program that some kind of guideline would have to be developed to prevent the competely arbitrary distribution of these funds. "First come, first served" was not sufficient by itself as a rule to assure a well-balanced program. By itself, this rule would have given an unfair advantage to the highly organized—mostly larger urban—communities whose budget offices, public works departments, planning commissions, etc., could have prepared and filed their applications long before the technically less well equipped—mostly smaller—communities could have filled out the necessary pieces of paper. The full-time grocer and part-time mayor of the mining village in the hills of Kentucky just cannot compete for speed with the administrative teams of such cities as Philadelphia, Detroit, New Orleans, and San Diego.

ARA developed, therefore, as a guideline for the distribution of the available funds a "fair share formula" which assured, by and large, the allocation of funds in direct proportion to the number of unemployed in the eligible area. For areas smaller than a labor market, as defined by the Labor Department, where current unemployment figures are not available, population was substituted for unemployment. In one State, Pennsylvania, the number of unemployed was so large that the formula had to be reduced to comply with the statutory provision that no State may receive more than 10 percent of all funds.

The formula has not been administered as a rigid-quota system. In many areas just one approvable and desirable project exceeded the fair-share formula by a sizable amount. In others lack of local initiative or lack of local matching funds held the level of participation below what the formula

would have allowed. ARA publishes monthly a directory of all approved projects. This record will show that the relative needs of the eligible areas have been given every possible consideration.

The $850 million appropriated by the Congress in October 1962 and May 1963 have been allocated by the President to 12 participating agencies. In order to get the program underway quickly, approximately 30 percent of the first appropriation of $400 million was allocated for direct Federal projects of such agencies as the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service in the Agriculture Department, the National Park Service, and the Bureaus of Indian Affairs, Reclamation, Land Management, and Sport Fisheries, and Wildlife in the Interior Department, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Public Roads in the Commerce Department. These are the agencies which had hundreds of projects on the shelf ready to go immediately.

When the Congress acted on the second appropriation of $450 million, it limited the direct Federal projects to those dealing with the preservation of forests under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior. Consequently the President allocated only 10 percent of this appropriation to direct Federal projects.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO DATE

The bulk of the funds, almost $700 million or 80 percent of the total, were allocated to the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for grants-in-aid to States and local communities.

Funds have now been committeed to over 6,000 projects in more than 3,000 communities in almost 1,000 of the 1,300 eligible areas. The largest amount, about 27 percent, has been allocated to waste treatment and waste disposal projects; water supplies and other public utilities will receive 16 percent; hospitals and health facilities, 14 percent; street and road improvements, 13 percent; public buildings, 12 percent; conservation measures, 8 percent; recreational facilities, 4 percent. Projects range in size from $2,000 for the improvement of fishing facilities in Clearwater, Minn., to $2.3 million for the Eastern Kentucky Mountain Highway. Costs per man-year vary from $5,000 for the improvement of forest roads to $25,000 for heavy construction. What all the projects have in common is that they could not have been undertaken this year, or next year, or, maybe, not at all without the accelerated public works program.

Now that the first year of public works acceleration is drawing to a close, these are the results achieved so far, the goals which are clearly within reach, and the problems which still remain:

(1) At the end of last month 3,320 different projects had actually been started and 1,195 of them had already been completed.

(2) During the first 10 months of the program—and these include the months when it was just getting underway—an average of more than 17,000 people per month were employed on the sites of these projects, and it may be safely estimated that at least the same number, another 17,000, were employed off-site producing the materials and supplies and providing the services which go into these projects. This adds up to a total average monthly employment for the first 10 months of 34,000 people.

(3) During August, the last month for which figures are available, on-site employment reached over 44,000. Including off-site employment, this adds up to 88,000 jobs during August.

(4) Since many of the projects financed from the first appropriation will still be under construction early next year, when most of the second appropriation projects will get underway, on-site employment may be expected to reach a peak of over 100,000 and on-site and off-site employment combined will reach a peak of over 200,000.

(5) During the 2 to 2½ years it will take to complete all 6,000 projects the program will have generated more than 220,000 man-years of on-site and off-site employment. This is the equivalent of 11 percent of the unemployed in the eligible areas.

(6) Together with local matching funds the program will channel over $1 billion into public improvements in the economically distressed areas of the country. This will make an appreciable dent into the large backlog of urgently needed facilities which has accumulated over the years.

(7) With all of the $850 million appropriated so far committed to specific projects, there will remain on the books of the participating agencies, applications for accelerated public works funds in excess of $800 million. This, despite the fact that most of the Federal agencies submitted for consideration only a fraction of those direct Federal projects which are eligible under the act, and despite the fact that ARA, CFA, and HEW as early as last January, discouraged States and local communities from filing further applications. The true backlog of eligible projects, is, therefore, far in excess of the above-mentioned amount.

Extracts From "Our Heritage"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Americans of Polish descent all over the world are observing the millennium of Christianity in Poland. There is no greater emphasis anywhere than in the western part of Pennsylvania where the second observance was held at Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Hall, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Sunday, October 13. There, those attending emphasized the Polish heritage and its contributions to the American way of democratic living.

Allow me to mention some of those contributions at a time when the Poles are observing the millennium of Christianity in Poland. I do this through extracts from an article entitled "Our Heritage" by Joseph A. Borkowski, a resident of Pittsburgh and president of the Central Council of Polish Organizations:

EXTRACTS FROM "OUR HERITAGE"

WORK PERIOD AND REST

From "Polaniec Manifesto dated May 7, 1794": "That the peasant shall have relief from labor, so that he who has worked 5 or 6 days in a week shall be freed for 2 days in the week; he who worked 3 or 4 days shall be freed for 1 day; he who has worked 2 days, shall be freed for 1 day."

PERTAINING TO NEGROES

Testament 1798, Kosciuszko: "I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property * * * hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades."

THE FIRST STRIKE TO WIN POLITICAL EQUALITY

Jamestown Colony: The first Poles arrived in America on October 1, 1608, on the British ship *Mary and Margaret* under the leadership of Capt. John Smith. During the second administration of Gov. George Yardley the year of 1619, the colonists then numbering about 2,000, the Governor called for the first election of delegates to the first American Legislative Assembly. However the voting was limited to those of English stock. In view of the fact that the Governor was powerless to grant any concessions to the Poles, "a strike was declared which assumed such proportions that it disrupted the normal existence of the Colonies." After the dispute was taken to England, "the Poles were given the full franchise and were made free as any inhabitant."

THE FIRST POLE IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Anthony Sadowski, Indian trader and interpreter employed by Provincial Governor of Pennsylvania, traded in and around Pittsburgh area in the years of 1729. Beautiful bronze marker is on the Fifth Avenue side of Allegheny County Courthouse, commemorating Sadowski's pioneering activities.

THE FIRST POLISH FAMILY IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

Charles Treziyuling came from Poland in 1791 and settled in Phillipsburg Centre County. He was an engineer of ability and one of the first canal commissioners in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. His full name Baron Charles Stegner Trzeziyulny, born 1767 and died 1851. His descendants played a significant part in development of upper northern counties and took active part in the Civil War.

CHRISTIAN FREDERICK POST AND FORT DUQUESNE

When the French took over the present area around the Pittsburgh's Point and erected Fort Duquesne in 1754, they came here to stay much to British dismay, particularly since they suffered a number of defeats. When the French were united and aided by the Indians, they seemed to be unbeatable. Gen. John Forbes given the task to drive the French from the Point area was aware that if the situation is to be resolved it was necessary to alienate the Indians from the French. To accomplish this assignment General Forbes asked Christian Frederick Post to win over the Indians in view of the fact that Post was the only "man of peace" in whom the various Indian tribes had confidence. As a result the Fort Duquesne fortification was destroyed and its defenders left as the French had no choice since the Indian tribes failed to support them.

Christian Frederick Post was born in Chojnice (Conitz) Poland in 1710 and came to early colonial shores as a Moravian missionary. He died in Germantown, Pa., on April 1785 and is buried in the "lower graveyard" cemetery.

THE FIRST POLISH PRIEST IN PITTSBURGH DIOCESE

Rev. Stanislaus Parzyk arrived in Pittsburgh November 20, 1852, and was one of the founders of the Passionist Order in America. He played an important part in aiding and organizing Polish parishes and was the first to say the holy mass to newly arrived immigrants in the basement of St. Michael's Church.

THE FIRST ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH OF POLISH DESCENT

St. Stanislaus Parish, 21st and Smallman Streets, Pittsburgh, Pa., is the mother church of all Polish churches in Pittsburgh Diocese. The St. Stanislaus Kostka Parish had its inception on August 15, 1875. To Rev. Cezary Tomaszewski, C.S. Sp., goes the credit for establishing a weekly newspaper, Wielko-

polanin, in 1899, and initiating the organization of the Holy Family Orphanage. The Sisters of Nazareth arrived to St. Stanislaus Parish in August 1895.

PADEREWSKI'S FIRST CONCERT IN PITTSBURGH

Ignacy Jan Paderewski's first Pittsburgh concert was on April 22, 1893, at the Old City Hall, formerly located in the present Market and Forbes (formerly Diamond) Streets. More than 2,000 Pittsburgh socialites were present at the concert and the critics unanimously agreed that there was "great poet of the pianoforte."

FORMATION OF POLISH ARMY IN PITTSBURGH

On April 3, 1917, a speech by Ignacy J. Paderewski to delegates at the convention of the Polish Falcons at 97 South 18th Street SS., Pittsburgh, Pa., Nest No. 8 Hall, began the movement to recruit a Polish Army in the United States to fight in Europe with Allies for creating an independent Poland. A historical marker at the hall commemorates this historical event.

FORMATION OF CENTRAL COUNCIL OF POLISH ORGANIZATION

The first formal meeting of the Central Council Committee was held on April 3, 1930, at Nest 8, South 18th Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. First officers elected were Dr. Teofil A. Starzynski, president; Rev. John Pudlo, vice president; Alice Bednarko, vice president; Stanislaw Osada, secretary; Rose Zmudzinski, financial secretary.

MILLENIUM OF CHRISTIANITY IN POLAND

More than 18,000 people crowded the Civic Arena on Sunday, November 12, 1961. The celebration was initiated by Central Council of Polish Organizations.

Finnish Government Honors Photographer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently a man who has earned the respect of all the Members of the Senate and who is held in deep affection by all of us was signally honored by a nation that has endured centuries of national tragedies but which has always been a nation of indomitable courage.

His Excellency, R. R. Seppala, Ambassador of Finland, presented the Order of the Lion of Finland, Officer First Class, to Mr. Frank Muto, photographer of the Democratic Party at the Capitol, in a ceremony at the Finnish Embassy.

In appreciation for the humanitarian work done by Mr. Muto during the winter war 1939–40, the Finnish Government expressed its gratitude by presenting him with this decoration. Mr. Muto has old ties with Finland. He first arrived there in 1939 at the time of the winter war and stayed there acting as a war correspondent and photographer. Traveling all over the country, he reported about the war and life in Finland during those crucial times. In his efforts to help the Finnish people, Mr. Muto joined the Hoover Finnish Relief Center and gave a helping hand to refugees and others during his travels in the war zones.

Mr. Muto accompanied the then Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson on their successful visit to Finland last September.

Mr. President, we here in the Capitol see every day evidence of Frank Muto's humanity. We rejoice that the people of Finland have taken this opportunity to pay tribute to him for these same qualities.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this, my 14th annual report to my constituents, is intended to cover some phases of important world and national events which occurred during 1963. It briefly details the passage of our Ship of State through at times calm but, more frequently, rough and turbulent seas of events.

The year 1963 will go down in history, above all, as the year of the great tragedy which befell our Nation. The assassination of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, that monstrous deed, shocked every American. In the lonely reaches of their hearts, in the privacy of their homes, and in public observances held throughout the Nation, the people of the United States mourned the passing of a leader who, in a brief span of less than 3 years, had left his indelible imprint upon the course of our national history.

President Kennedy belonged not only to us and to the present, but to the world and the future as well. In his person, he combined some of the best characteristics of the many nationality strains which comprise our great nations. He was conscious of the spiritual, cultural, economic and political values of countries whose births predate that of the United States. He was even more deeply steeped in that rare blending of different cultural heritages achieved here which we know as the American tradition. In addressing himself to the problems of our day, in shaping the goals and the policies of the Government which he headed, he drew on both. He embraced the highest ideals of the Western, Judeo-Christian civilization. And he was loyal to the institutions and traditions which our unique experiment in human freedom and democracy produced upon the American soil. Thus, while serving his country, he served mankind.

President John F. Kennedy worked for, and died for, the implementation of the principles of human dignity, justice, and freedom. He fought against the denial of basic human rights to people everywhere. His death left on our shoulders the responsibility to continue that task. We must rededicate ourselves to the realization of the promise which is America, so that he will not have died in vain.

At the moment of its great loss, our Nation was fortunate to have a man of the caliber of President Lyndon B. Johnson assume the responsibilities of the Presidency. His many years of public service, his congressional experience, and his dedication to the programs and the high goals of the Kennedy administration, generated public confidence and the belief that he would strive to continue the work begun in 1960. He has, I am sure, the prayers of all thoughtful and fairminded Americans in the discharge of his grave duties.

The year 1963 was a year of turbulent change in many other parts of the world. To the South, continuing economic instability, political disorders, and military coup d'etats in several of our sister republics, hampered the advance of the Alliance for Progress and cast dark shadows on the future of that momentous undertaking. Communist subversion, generated by the Castro regime in Cuba, was not helping the cause of hemispheric security and progress. In Africa, Arab forces clashed in the north, the situation in the Congo remained perilous, and apartheid policy of the Republic of South Africa was giving rise to mounting resentment throughout the continent which threatened to erupt in violence.

In the Middle East, fighting flared in Yemen, and governments fell in Iraq and Syria while the smoldering Arab-Israel conflict continued to resist a peaceful solution. In southeast Asia, the aftermath of the 1962 invasion of India by Red China continued to present problems. Indian-Pakistani relations took a turn for the worse, the infant Federation of Malaysia was, and is now, battered on all sides, and valiant President Diem of South Vietnam, having led his new nation through the years of bitter, bloody struggle against the deeply entrenched Communist guerrillas, was brutally murdered. Many Western news media and governments appeared to nod with approval at the change in the Government of South Vietnam, a change which to date has enhanced the takeover of the Orient by the Communists. And in Western Europe, three of the four major powers required new governments.

Not all of the changes occurring in 1963 were disruptive, of course. There were many hopeful developments. The peaceful, orderly elections leading to the transfer of executive power in Venezuela and Mexico are an instance in point. The restoration of civilian, democratic government in Argentina is another. The encouraging outcome of the United States-Soviet negotiations in the United Nations on outer space and disarmament must also be noted. The complete list of encouraging changes in 1963 would be very long. For this reason, I would like to mention only two more which I have watched with particular interest as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

In Western Europe, there were some signs that President de Gaulle's opposition to Britain's entry into the Common Market, and United States led North Atlantic community defense force, was

possibly softening. In spite of General de Gaulle's speech on New Year's Eve, in which he appeared to reaffirm French opposition to the admission of Great Britain to the Common Market, some observers predicted that before 12 months pass by, there may be a noticeable shift in the French position. And in Eastern Europe, the ferment of change appeared to have some effect on the solid voting pattern of the Communist bloc in the United Nations.

As a member of the U.S. Delegation to the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations this fall, I had a front-row view of these developments. For the first time, conflicts developed in the positions of the Communist and Communist-dominated countries. Yugoslavia was first to create a major breach by making a payment on its arrearages for United Nations peacemaking operations. Rumania and Albania parted from the other Communist countries in voting on a resolution dealing with the denuclearization of Latin America. Several other breaches were noted. What their developments mean, no one can tell precisely at this time. They will bear constant close watching.

I personally believe that this atmosphere of relaxation of the U.S.S.R. is but a pattern of the Soviet Communist "peace" offensive. All must agree that it is in no way substantive. It is my fear that the people of the free world including many Americans and persons within our own Government will succumb to accepting this change as the real thing. This, and the unfortunate "going left" movement in governments around the world must be stopped or there will be more great tragedies in the years ahead. This new atmosphere of the U.S.S.R. was undertaken, in my viewpoint, because the Communists were made to realize by the stand of President Kennedy in Cuba that America would fight to maintain our way of life, even in a nuclear age.

The first session of the 88th Congress is being labeled with many unfavorable terms. This is unfortunate. All, including the news media, should weigh the density of the issues under consideration; the thorough review needed by the committees of Congress before congressional action is taken; the crises of the day; the change of governments; the shattering of traditions. These force Congress to act with patience and care. Congress has made a significant beginning in the consideration of the complexities faced by enacting legislation of benefit to all of us. So, as Al Smith said, "Let us look at the record."

The debt limit was extended to meet the demands of the national budget and the total national debt as of June 30, 1963, was $305.8 billion. Interest on the debt for fiscal year 1963 was $10.1 billion. In the same fiscal year, expenditures totaled $119.1 billion, revenues were $114.0 billion, leaving a deficit of $5.1 billion.

Defense spending continues to be the largest single budgetary item, and $47 billion was appropriated to maintain our military posture. Of this amount, $15.3 billion was for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, and ships; $5.3 billion was for research, development, construction of facilities, and administration of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and $216.2 million was for the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission, including new construction projects.

To insure sufficient manpower to operate our defense systems, it was necessary to extend the draft to July 1, 1967. However, since sufficient unmarried men were available, the drafting of married men was suspended.

Many men with important technical skills were leaving the armed services because of the low pay schedules. In order to restore morale, military pay was increased for the first time since 1958, based on grade and length of service. The raises vary from $12 to $120 per month for enlisted men and from $56 to $95 per month for officers.

A treaty was ratified by the U.S. Senate which bans nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. This treaty was signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This was the first step taken by international agreement which culminated in the signing of a limited nuclear test ban treaty.

After substantial cuts in committee and on the floor, the $3 billion Foreign Assistance Act was approved by Congress. This is another item for national defense. It represents the United States share of our mutual defense with our allies. While I have consistently supported foreign aid, I have long favored a complete review of this program. Some of my amendments to tighten the administration of the program were incorporated in the bill as passed by Congress. Others, such as my amendment which conditions the granting of aid to any country by requiring the recipient to agree to reviews, inspections, and audits by the United States, were deleted by the conference committee. I will continue my efforts to have these incorporated in the foreign aid program.

The completion of a 2-year study on the needs of the Foreign Service buildings culminated in the authorization of nearly $50 million for the purchase, construction, major alteration, long-term leasing, maintenance and repair of buildings overseas required by the Department of State for the next 2 years. After long controversy, the Philippines war claims bill, which terminated World War II obligations to that nation, was enacted.

The year 1963 has been the greatest in the history of our country for legislation in the field of education. Congress enacted the long-awaited Higher Education Facilities Act, a $1.2 billion measure, and the more than $1 billion Vocational Education Act. A 3-year, $238 million program was authorized to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities and construction of community mental health centers. Another program provides $350 million over a 5-year period to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs. This same program provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation. Congress extended and expanded the National Defense Education Act and the federally affected areas education program.

My efforts, along with many of my colleagues, to obtain equal pay for equal work by women culminated in the enactment of an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act covering women. I was at President Kennedy's desk when he signed the bill and was honored when he presented me with one of the pens with which he affixed his signature.

Legislation for the benefit of veterans and their families was enacted. A bill to increase the payments to parents and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities, as well as one to increase payments to widows of veterans whose deaths were due to service-connected disabilities, were passed. Also, the law to provide educational assistance to children of deceased veterans was amended to include children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability. Congress also enacted laws to permit the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on default on home loans in certain hardship cases; to provide additional compensation for service-incurred loss of hearing in both ears; and to increase compensation for veterans suffering complete loss of speech.

In one area the program for housing assistance to the elderly was broadened. While, in another area, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was extended for 2 years. Quick passage of the Peace Corps bill showed the success of this Agency. Funds were increased to $102 million, while the number of volunteers was increased to 11,000.

A new program to reduce air pollution in cities authorized $187 million for Federal grants and confers additional powers on the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct research and cooperate with State officials in solving the problem. The Manpower Training program will relieve the States of matching Federal funds for the fiscal year beginning next July and lowers the age limit for youth training allowance from 19 to 17, to help more young people who are school dropouts.

A $4.4 billion public works bill was passed which provides funds to finance flood control, harbor improvement and reclamation projects. A large amount of the appropriated funds is for the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The threatened railroad strike forced Congress to lay aside other business to enact legislation to prevent a disastrous strike. The law provides for arbitration of the two main disputed issues and collective bargaining on all others. The arbitration award will remain in force for 2 years; thereafter, the parties are free to take such action as they desire.

Tax legislation passed in the 1st session of the 88th Congress continued for 1 year existing excise taxes, as well as the income tax rate of 52 percent on corporate profits. Special tax deductions for child care were granted working mothers, de-

serted by their husbands. The Export-Import Bank, which renders invaluable services to American exporters and which has always operated at a profit, was extended to 1968.

During 1963, the New York City office of the Internal Revenue Service was retained in New York, due to the joint efforts of the New York congressional delegation, which acted to prevent transfer of the office to Boston.

Early in 1964, Congress will take action on three bills of major importance which are our hope and which were the recommendations of the late President Kennedy. These bills—tax revision, civil rights, and medical care for the aged—include some new concepts and social changes which the Kennedy administration attempted to achieve and which President Johnson had pledged to enact. He has marked them urgent.

Tax revision legislation, which would reduce taxes by $11 billion over the next 2 years, has passed the House of Representatives, and is due to be acted upon by the Senate early in January. The bill does not repeal the extra $600 personal exemption for each taxpayer aged 65 or over. It provides a minimum standard deduction of $300 in addition to the $600 exemption provisions.

This provision will be particularly beneficial to many lower income taxpayers. The bill also repeals the existing "floor" on the deductibility of medicine and drugs to persons aged 65 and over or to dependent parents aged 65 or over. The bill doubles the existing $50 dividend exclusion, making $100 per taxpayer. The bill does repeal, in two stages, the 4-percent dividend credit. The effect of the combination of the doubling of the exclusion and the gradual repeal of the credit will be to reduce taxes for 2 million taxpayers who receive dividend income. The bill does not repeal the retirement income credit.

In the field of civil rights, far-reaching legislation was approved by the House Judiciary Committee and is scheduled for action early in January. The civil rights bill, which will restore to all Americans their inherent rights, provides for enforcement of voting rights; injunctions against discrimination in public accommodations; protection of rights to education and extension of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years; establishment of a Community Relations Service and a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity; and nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs.

The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives began public hearings on the subject of medical care for the aged in mid-November. The hearings have been suspended, but will resume sometime in January.

We are a nation which has weathered many crises. Our national security cloaks our rights and provides for freedom and human dignity. These qualities we enjoy because we are strong and unified. I know that all Americans pledge their cooperation to President Johnson in the days ahead. He has earned the confidence of the American people. His leadership among men—as we his former colleagues can so surely attest—will be a source of strength in preserving our way of life.

It has been an honor and privilege to serve the people of Brooklyn. My Washington office is open year round, and letters sent there receive immediate attention. The address is EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress, Washington 25, D.C. When Congress is not in session, I meet with my constituents at the Madison Club, 739 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, on Monday and Thursday evenings after 8 o'clock.

A Political Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Prof. John H. Kessel, a bright and dedicated young man currently working at the Republican National Committee, in a recent news article refuted a widely held political belief—that most college professors are Democrats.

This article appeared in the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of December 8, 1963, and I commend it to the attention of all readers of the RECORD:

SURPRISE—PROFESSORS CAN BE REPUBLICANS, TOO

(By Arthur Edson)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans are happily convinced that a widely held belief—that most college professors are Democrats—is a political myth.

Appropriately, they produced a live, and lively, egghead to make the announcement: John H. Kessel, who got his Ph. D. at Columbia and is now on loan to the Republican National Committee from the University of Washington.

"I don't know why everyone assumes college teachers are Democrats," Kessel said. "We have the names of 13,000 who are Republicans."

SINCE F.D.R.?

Republicans suppose the belief grew out of Franklin D. Roosevelt's well-advertised brain trust. Then came Adlai E. Stevenson, with his literary grace, who was thought to be irresistible to intellectuals.

Throughout this period GOP speakers frequently made fun of the professorial theorist who, in their words, never met a payroll.

Suddenly, belatedly, Republicans discovered that their rivals had a cerebral hammerlock on the theory that the thinking man thinks Democratic.

One example will show how prevalent this belief is:

Clinton Rossiter in his book, "Parties and Politics in America," discusses those who hold high degrees in the sciences, humanities and social studies. And he says confidently:

"Such people, most of whom are professors, are strongly Democratic in political preference."

Passing beyond the college campuses, Rossiter says:

"The anti-Republican urge would be even stronger among painters, poets, dramatists, musicians, entertainers and others engaged in esthetic or intellectual pursuits."

As a celebrated egghead from Cornell, Rossiter concludes:

"The egghead vote in America is not a large one, but for what it is worth it is heavily Democratic."

Republicans concede there is no way to refute this, especially since no one can define an egghead. And despite all the cascading figures, it still is difficult to be precise on how any group votes.

The usual method is to take small samplings and draw large conclusions.

OHIO STUDY

But a unique study has just been completed by Arthur Peterson of Ohio Wesleyan's Arneson Institute of Practical Politics. Registration books were checked name by name to determine the political preferences of the professors in Ohio's 41 major colleges.

The tally: 2,734 voted Republican, 1,691 voted Democratic, 1,956 were independents.

Surprisingly, college teachers turned out to be almost as remiss in their civic duties as some other groups—30 percent didn't vote at all.

Kessel is sufficiently buoyed up by the evidence to risk generalities.

Democrats, he admits, have the professorial edge in social studies. Even in Ohio the Democrats led this department by a 3-to-2 margin. This edge is important for here the books on politics are spawned.

But as one moves on to the natural sciences, so Kessel's theory runs, GOP strength picks up. It's a powerhouse once it gets to law and especially medicine, he feels.

USEFUL

Both parties now bid openly for professorial help, and the serious presidential candidate studies academic prospects like a football coach sizes up tackles.

"Professors can give politicians new ideas," Kessel says. "But they have a hard time talking to each other because they both are experts.

"The politicians are experts only on the here and now. The professor thinks terms of general interest and of the long-range view."

Voting and Attendance Record of Representative Gerald R. Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report is as follows:

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 9	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 9	Election of the Speaker. (McCormack, 256; Halleck, 175.)	Halleck.
3	Jan. 9	H. Res. 5, on a motion calling for a vote on the resolution concerning rules of the House. (Passed 249 to 183.)	No.
4	Jan. 9	H. Res. 5, to adopt for the 88th Cong. the House rules of the 87th Cong. except that membership on Committee on Rules shall be increased permanently from 12 to 15 members. (Passed 235 to 196.)	No.
5	Feb. 27	H.J. Res. 284, to approve a supplemental appropriation of $508,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 254 to 154.)	No.
6	Feb. 27	H. Res. 249, to authorize an amount not to exceed $360,000 for use by the Committee on Un-American Activities in carrying on its work. (Passed 385 to 20.)	Yes.
7	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
8	Mar. 11	H.R. 2438, to extend for 4 years the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (selective service). (Passed 387 to 3.)	Yes.
9	Mar. 12	H.R. 4374, to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. (Passed 377 to 21.)	Yes.
10	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
12	Mar. 13	H.R. 2440, to increase the authorization for military procurement by $363,700,000 to develop the RS-70 weapons system. (Passed 226 to 179.)	Yes.
13	Mar. 13	H.R. 2440, to recommit to committee the bill authorizing appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in order to reduce by 5 percent the procurement funds and by 12½ percent the research and development funds. (Defeated 149 to 258.)	Yes.
14	Mar. 13	H.R.2440, on final passage of the bill to authorize $15,856,391,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 374 to 33.)	No.
15	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
16	Apr. 4	H.R. 5366, to approve the $5,900,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Treasury and Post Office and for the Executive Office. (Passed 385 to 17.)	Yes.
17	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
18	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
19	Apr. 10	H.R. 5517, to add $450,000,000 for the public works acceleration program to the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963. (Passed 228 to 184.)	No.
20	Apr. 10	H.R. 5389, to repeal certain legislation relating to silver including authorization to issue $1 Federal Reserve notes in place of $1 silver certificates. (Passed 251 to 122.)	Yes.
21	Apr. 23	Quorum call	Present.
22	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
23	Apr. 24	H.R. 12, to recommit to committee the Health Professions Education Assistance Act in order to delete the provision for student loans. (Defeated 171 to 239.)	Yes.
24	Apr. 24	H.R. 12 on final passage of the Health Professions Education Assistance Act. (Passed 288 to 122.)	No.
25	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
27	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present.
29	Apr. 26	H.R. 4997, to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture the Feed Grains Act of 1963. (Defeated 196 to 205.)	Yes.
30	Apr. 26	H.R. 4997, on final passage of the Feed Grains Act of 1963. (Passed 208 to 196.)	No.
31	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
32	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 29	H.R. 1762 (S. 20), to amend the bill establishing a bureau in the Department of the Interior to coordinate outdoor recreational programs by requiring it to file annual reports itemizing the source, value, purpose, and use of each donation accepted in connection with this act. (Passed 292 to 50.)	Yes.
34	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
35	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
36	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
37	May 6	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
38	May 6	H.R. 40, to provide Federal matching funds to assist in the construction and remodeling of facilities for research in State agricultural experiment stations. (Passed 274 to 30.)	Absent.[2]
39	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
40	May 7	H.J. Res. 245, to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States. (Passed 384 to 2.)	Yes.
41	May 8	H.R. 5517, to recommit to conference the supplemental appropriations bill, 1963, in order to insist upon the elimination of funds added by the Senate for the World Food Congress and $65,000 to the International Peace Corps Secretariat. (Passed 207 to 190.)	Yes.
42	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 9	H.R. 950, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency. (Passed 340 to 40.)	Yes.
44	May 13	H.R. 4274, to amend the District of Columbia Code to permit principals and teachers in District of Columbia schools to use reasonable force in maintaining order in schools. (Passed 277 to 53.)	Absent.[3]
45	May 14	H.R. 5517, to accept the conference on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963, which includes among others a provision for $450,000,000 for the accelerated public works program. (Passed 241 to 130.)	No.
46	May 14	H.R. 5517, to order the previous question in order to vote on a provision in the bill relative to the Philippine war damage claims payment. (Defeated 168 to 207 with the provision later ordered recommitted to conference for further consideration.)	No.
47	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
48	May 14	H. Res. 340, to authorize travel outside the United States by members of the House Committee on Education and Labor. (Defeated 153 to 217.)	No.
49	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
51	May 15	H.R. 6009, to recommit to committee the bill to increase the national debt limit in order to amend the bill by providing for a continuation of the debt limitation at $305,000,000,000. (Defeated 195 to 222.)	Yes.
52	May 15	H.R. 6009, on final passage of the bill to increase the national debt limit to $309,000,000,000 for July and August 1963. (Passed 213 to 204.)	No.
53	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 23	H. Res. 362, to adopt the resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6060 (S. 1409), the bill relative to equal pay for equal work by women. (Passed 362 to 9.)	Yes.
55	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 29	Quorum call	Present.
58	May 29	H. Res. 368, to authorize the Speaker to appoint official delegates from the House of Representatives to the meeting of the International Labor Organization in Geneva. (Passed 277 to 52.)	Yes.
59	May 29	H.R. 5497, to continue for 2 years the program under Public Law 78 of 1951 by which Mexican nationals are temporarily admitted to the United States as agricultural laborers. (Defeated 158 to 174.)	Yes.
60	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
61	June 4	H.R. 3496, to amend the bill providing for certain exemptions of the Reorganization Act by prohibiting the creation by the President of any new executive departments under the authority of the Reorganization Act. (Passed 227 to 174.)	Yes.
62	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
64	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
65	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
66	June 4	On a motion to adjourn the meeting of the House. (Defeated 53 to 277.)	No.
67	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
69	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
70	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
71	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
72	June 6	H.R. 6754, to approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $5,900,000,000. (Passed 288 to 79.)	No.
73	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
74	June 11	H.R. 6868, to approve the legislative appropriation bill in the amount of $140,000,000. (Passed 271 to 122.)	Yes.
75	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
76	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
77	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
79	June 12	H.R. 4996, to adopt the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963, increasing the authorized funds for the program by $455,500,000. (Defeated 204 to 209.)	No.
80	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
81	June 13	H.R. 6755, to adopt the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963, continuing for 1 year the corporate tax rates and the rates on certain excise taxes scheduled to change or expire on June 30. (Passed 283 to 91.)	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
82	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 18	H.R. 7063, to adopt the 1964 appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce in the amount of $1,800,000,000. (Passed 301 to 93.)	Yes.
84	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
85	June 19	H.J. Res. 247, to suspend the equal time provisions of the Communications Act to enable radio and TV facilities to grant equal time to 1964 presidential and vice presidential candidates for major parties without extending same privilege to minor candidates. (Passed 263 to 126.)	Yes.
86	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 24	H.R. 6177, to recommit to committee the bill relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia in order to increase the contribution from $45,000,000 to $53,000,000. (Defeated 99 to 237.)	No.
88	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
89	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 26	Quroum call	Present.
91	June 26	H.R. 7179, to adopt the 1964 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the amount of $47,000,000,000. (Passed 410 to 1.)	Yes.
92	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
93	July 9	H.R. 3179, to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior. (Passed 314 to 82.)	Yes.
94	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
95	July 16	H.R. 4897, to recommit to committee the bill extending the provisions of the sedition law to include acts of sedition committed against the United States in foreign countries by U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens. (Defeated 40 to 338.)	No.
96	July 17	H.R. 5279, to recommit to the conference committee the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior in order to eliminate $511,000 for initiating plans for a National Air Museum Bldg. (Defeated 144 to 245.)	No.
97	July 17	H.R. 5279, to approve the conference report making appropriations in the amount of $958,456,500 for the Department of the Interior in fiscal 1964. (Passed 331 to 50.)	Yes.
98	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
99	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
100	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
101	July 18	H.R 5171, to recommit to committee the bill authorizing General Services Administration to handle purchase, lease, operation of automatic data processing equipment by Federal agencies and departments. (Defeated 96 to 258.)	No.
102	July 24	H.R. 6518, to adopt the Clear Air Act which authorized $90,000,000 previously for research, investigation, and training in the area of air pollution. (Passed 272 to 102.)	No.
103	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
104	July 25	H.R. 4638, to recommit to committee the Presidential Transition Act in order to eliminate the authorization of appropriations. (Defeated 29 to 343.)	No.
105	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
106	July 30	H.R. 3872, to insist on the House position that the Export-Import Bank should be financed by appropriations rather than through back-door spending. (Passed 379 to 11.)	Yes.
107	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 31	H. Res. 453, to adopt a rule waiving points of order and providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Building Act as amended to pay balance of payment for Philippine war damage. (Passed 234 to 166.)	No.
109	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
110	Aug. 1	H. Res. 467, to adopt a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7500, a bill authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 387 to 1.)	Yes.
111	Aug. 1	H.R. 7500, to approve the bill authorizing $5,200,000,000 in appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 334 to 57.)	Yes.
112	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
113	Aug. 5	S. 1652, to amend the National Cultural Center Act to extend the termination date for fund raising for 3 years and to enlarge the board of trustees. (Passed 293 to 33.)	Yes.
114	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
115	Aug. 6	H.R. 4955, to recommit to committee the Vocational Educational Act of 1963 to amend the act to provide that by July 1, 1965, all vocational educational programs conducted under the act should be on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. (Defeated 181 to 217.)	Yes.
116	Aug. 6	H.R. 4955, to pass the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (Passed 377 to 21.)	Yes.
117	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
118	Aug. 7	H. Res. 477, to adopt the rule permitting consideration of H.R. 7824, the bill to extend the $309,000,000,000 debt limit until Nov. 30. (Passed 303 to 72.)	Yes.
119	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
120	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
121	Aug. 8	H.R. 7824, to recommit to committee the bill on public debt limit to set the temporary limit at $307,000,000,000 until Oct. 31, 1963. (Defeated 164 to 229.)	Yes.
122	Aug. 8	H.R. 7824, to pass the bill extending the $309,000,000,000 public debt limit until Nov. 30, 1963. (Passed 221 to 175.)	No.
123	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
124	Aug. 12	H.R. 7525, to recommit to committee the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 114 to 222.)	Paired against.
125	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 14	H.R. 6143, to pass the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. (Passed 287 to 113.)	Yes.
127	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
128	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
129	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
130	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
131	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
132	Aug. 23	H.R. 7885. to recommit to committee the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 in order to reduce the authorization for foreign aid by $585,000,000. (Passed 222 to 188.)	Yes.
133	Aug. 23	H.R. 7885, on final passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 authorizing $3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964. (Passed 224 to 186)	Yes.
134	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
135	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
136	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
137	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
138	Aug. 28	H.R. 7500, to recommit to conference committee the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in order to reduce the dollar amount to $5,200,000,000 as originally approved by the House. (Defeated 176 to 200.)	Yes.
139	Aug. 28	H.R. 7500, on final passage of the NASA authorization bill for $5,350,000,000. (Passed 249 to 125.)	Yes.
140	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
141	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
142	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
143	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
144	Sept. 10	S. 1576, to approve the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Centers Construction Act of 1963 as amended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. (Passed 335 to 18.)	Absent.[3]
145	Sept. 11	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
146	Sept. 11	H. Res. 504, to establish a select committee of the House to investigate research programs conducted or sponsored by the Federal Government. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
147	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
148	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
149	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
150	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
151	Sept. 24	H. Res. 527, to adopt a closed (gag) rule providing for 8 hours of debate on the Revenue Act of 1963. (Passed 320 to 66.)	No.
152	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
153	Sept. 25	Quorum call	Present.
154	Sept. 25	Quorum call	Present.
155	Sept. 25	Quorum call	Present.
156	Sept. 25	H.R. 8363, to recommit to committee the Revenue Act of 1963 to provide that tax reduction should become effective only if expenditures in fiscal year 1964 are estimated by the President to not exceed $97,000,000,000 and for the year 1965 not to exceed $98,000,000,000. (Defeated 199 to 226.)	Yes.
157	Sept. 25	H.R. 8363, to approve the Revenue Act of 1963 as recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means. (Passed 271 to 155.)	No.
158	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
159	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
160	Oct. 1	H.R. 5555, to adopt the conference report on the military pay raise bill. (Passed 333 to 5.)	Yes.
161	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
162	Oct. 1	H. Res. 539, to adopt an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 7044, a bill to authorize $1,500,000 for construction of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial. (Passed 314 to 12.)	Yes.
163	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
164	Oct. 7	Quorum call	Present.
165	Oct. 7	H.R. 541, to agree to a Senate amendment to H.R. 3369 (a private bill) extending for 1 year the life of the Civil Rights Commission. (Passed 265 to 80.)	Yes.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
166	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
167	Oct. 8	H.R. 7179, to approve the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the amount of $47,200,000,000. (Passed 335 to 3.)	Yes.
168	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
169	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
170	Oct. 10	H.R. 8747, to recommit to committee the independent office appropriation bill in order to reduce by $200,000,000 the research and development funds for NASA. (Defeated 145 to 192.)	Absent.[2]
171	Oct. 11	H.R. 8747, to adopt the independent offices appropriation bill in the amount of $13,000,000,000. (Passed 302 to 32.)	Absent.[2]
172	Oct. 14	H.R. 5871, to modify the retirement benefits of judges of local District of Columbia courts. (Passed 149 to 86.)	Absent.[4]
173	Oct. 15	Quorum call	Present.
174	Oct. 15	H.R. 6237, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material of American history. (Passed 157 to 154.)	No.
175	Oct. 21	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
176	Oct. 21	S. 1576, to adopt the conference report on the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Centers Construction Act of 1963. (Passed 296 to 14.)	Absent.[3]
177	Oct. 22	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
178	Oct. 22	H. R. 8821, to revise the methods for repayment to the Treasury of funds advanced by the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act. (Passed 350 to 1.)	Absent.[3]
179	Oct. 23	Quorum call	Present.
180	Oct. 23	H.R. 5945, to establish a United States-Puerto Rico commission to study relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. (Passed 320 to 44.)	Yes.
181	Oct. 24	Quorum call	Present.
182	Oct. 28	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
183	Oct. 28	H.J. Res 782, to extend the continuing resolution for appropriations for fiscal year 1964 through Nov. 30, 1963. (Passed 279 to 11.)	Absent.[3]
184	Oct. 28	H. Res. 314, to authorize a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor to visit Russia and other European countries for the purpose of inspecting scientific data processing arrangements. (Defeated 119 to 164.)	Absent.[6]
185	Oct. 29	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
186	Oct. 30	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
187	Oct. 31	Quorum call	Present.
188	Oct. 31	H.R. 6500, to adopt the conference report on the military construction authorization bill. (Passed 356 to 1.)	Yes.
189	Oct. 31	H.R. 8195, to approve the bill extending for 1 year (to Dec. 31, 1964) the provisions of Public Law 78 relating to the use of Mexican nationals as agricultural laborers in United States. (Passed 173 to 158.)	Yes.
190	Nov. 6	Quorum call	Present.
191	Nov. 6	H.R. 6143, to adopt the conference report on the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. (Passed 258 to 92.)	Yes.
192	Nov. 6	H.R. 8920, to recommit to the Committee on the District of Columbia a bill to revise the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the District. (Passed 258 to 92.)	Yes.
193	Nov. 7	Quorum call	Present.
194	Nov. 7	H. Res. 564, on the adoption of a closed rule to take up for consideration H.R. 8969, a bill to raise the public debt limit. (Passed 212 to 149.)	No.
195	Nov. 7	H.R. 8969, to recommit to committee the bill to increase the public debt limit from $309,000,000,000 to $315,000,000,000 until June 29, 1964. (Defeated 172 to 197.)	Yes.
196	Nov. 8	H.R. 8969, to approve the bill to increase the public debt ceiling to $315,000,000,000 until June 29, 1964. (Passed 187 to 179.)	No.
197	Nov. 13	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
198	Nov. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
199	Nov. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
200	Nov. 14	H.R. 8864, on final passage of the bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. (Passed 182 to 144.)	Absent.[4]
201	Nov. 18	Quorum call	Present.
202	Nov. 18	H.R. 2988, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities. (Passed 282 to 30.)	Yes.
203	Nov. 18	H.R. 8135, to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area. Canadian River project, Texas. (Passed 283 to 30.)	No.
204	Nov. 18	Quorum call	Present.
205	Nov. 18	H.R. 9139; to approve the military construction appropriation bill for 1964 in the amount of $1.500,000,000. (Passed 332 to 5)	Yes.
206	Nov. 19	Quorum call	Present.
207	Nov. 19	H.R. 9140, to approve the public works appropriation bill for 1964 in the amount of $4,200,000,000. (Passed 358 to 27.)	Yes.
208	Nov. 20	Quorum call	Present.
209	Nov. 20	S. 777, to amend and approve the bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization and modify personnel security procedures for contractor employees. (Passed 252 to 133.)	Yes.
210	Dec. 2	Quorum call	Present.
211	Dec. 2	H.R. 9124, to suspend the rules and pass the bill relative to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps including expansion of junior ROTC and other changes. (Defeated 176 to 154; 2/3 vote required for passage.)	Yes.
212	Dec. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
213	Dec. 2	H.R. 10, to extend the apportionment requirement relative to State residence and open competitive examinations to temporary summer positions with the Federal Government in Washington. (Passed 301 to 18.)	Absent.[2]
214	Dec. 3	Quorum call	Present.
215	Dec. 3	Quorum call	Present.
216	Dec. 3	Quorum call	Present.
217	Dec. 4	Quorum call	Present.
218	Dec. 4	Quorum call	Present.
219	Dec. 4	H.R. 6196, to recommit to committee the bill entitled "A bill to revitalize the American cotton industry." (Defeated 179 to 224.)	Yes.
220	Dec. 4	H.R. 6196, on final passage of cotton bill. (Passed 216 to 182.)	No.
221	Dec. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[6]
222	Dec. 6	Quorum call	Present.
223	Dec. 9	Quorum call	Present.
224	Dec. 9	H.R. 7885, to adopt the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, authorizing $3,600,000,000 for the mutual security program in fiscal 1964. (Passed 195 to 164.)	Yes.
225	Dec. 9	Quorum call	Present.
226	Dec. 9	H.R. 8929, to recommit to committee a bill authorizing construction of a 23-mile rapid transit system including a subway in Washington, D.C. (Passed 278 to 76.)	Yes.
227	Dec. 10	H.R. 8747, to approve the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill of $13,200,000,000. (Passed 356 to 22.)	Absent.[2]
228	Dec. 10	H.R. 8747, to adopt the amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill providing funds for site and planning expenses involved in construction of a VA hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. (Defeated 170 to 204.)	Absent.[2]
229	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
230	Dec. 10	H.R. 6518, to approve the conference report on the Clean Air Act, a bill relative to the prevention and abatement of air pollution. (Passed 273 to 109.)	Absent.[6]
231	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
232	Dec. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
233	Dec. 10	H.R. 7457, to adopt the rule for consideration of the bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. (Passed 345 to 12.)	Absent.[2]
234	Dec. 11	On a motion to adjourn the House of Representatives at about 1 p.m. (Passed 214 to 166.)	No.
235	Dec. 12	H.R. 9140, to adopt the conference report on the public works appropriation bill in the amount of $4,400,000,000. (Passed 328 to 47.)	No.
236	Dec. 12	Quorum call	Present.
237	Dec. 12	H.R. 4955, to recommit to committee the conference report on the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (Defeated 180 to 192.)	Yes.
238	Dec. 12	H.R. 4955, to approve the conference report on the Vocational Education Act of 1963. (Passed 300 to 63.)	No.
239	Dec. 13	Quorum call	Present.
240	Dec. 13	H.R. 9139, to adopt the conference report on the military construction appropriation bill in the amount of $1,500,000,000. (Passed 300 to 4.)	Yes.
241	Dec. 16	Quorum call	Present.
242	Dec. 16	H.R. 9499, to recommit to committee the foreign operations appropriation bill with orders to report forthwith the bill amended to bar use of funds of Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit of Communist governments. (Passed 218 to 169.)	Yes.
243	Dec. 16	H.R. 9499, on final passage of the foreign operations appropriation bill in the amount of $3,100,000,000. (Passed 249 to 133.)	Yes.
244	Dec. 17	Quorum call	Present.
245	Dec. 17	H.R. 8667, to insist on the disagreement of the House with the Senate amendment authorizing $50,000,000 for construction of the Knowles Dam and Reservoir at Flathead, Mont. (Passed 329 to 41.)	Yes.
246	Dec. 17	H.R. 9413, to provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John F. Kennedy. (Passed 352 to 6.)	Yes.
247	Dec. 19	Quorum call	Present.
248	Dec. 19	H.J. Res. 875, to pass a supplemental appropriation bill of $41,800,000 for mental health activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 324 to 4.)	Yes.
249	Dec. 20	Quorum call	Present.
250	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD R. FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
251	Dec. 21	H. Res. 598, to adopt the rule waiving all points of order for consideration by the House of the foreign aid appropriation bill. (Passed 182 to 95.)	Yes.
252	Dec. 21	H.R. 9499, to recommit to the conference committee the foreign aid appropriation bill in order to strengthen the limitation on the Export-Import Bank relative to guarantee of credit to Communist governments. (Passed 141 to 136.)	Yes.
253	Dec. 21	Quorum call	Present.
254	Dec. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
255	Dec. 23	H. Res. 600, to suspend the rules and adopt the rule waiving points of order, etc., on the foreign aid appropriation bill. (Defeated 202 to 105; 2/3 vote required.)	Absent.[5]
256	Dec. 24	H.R. 9499, to adopt an amendment to foreign aid appropriation bill barring use of funds of Export-Import Bank for guaranteeing credit to Communist governments unless President determines that such guarantees are in the national interest and reports each such determination to the House and Senate. (Passed 189 to 158.)	No.

[1] Speaking engagement away from Washington.
[2] If present, would have voted "yes."
[3] In Michigan.
[4] Attending session of Interparliamentary Union as official delegate of the House of Representatives.
[5] If present, would have voted "no."
[6] Attending meeting of Presidential Commission on Assassination of Mr. Kennedy.

Never Shun a Controversy, Let the Chips Fall Where They May, Let's Be Forthright on Federal Spending, Etc.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in these last trying days we have been concerned in this body with one of the more controversial categories of Federal spending—the foreign aid program. In the course of this debate I have received many letters from my constituents asking, not only how I stand on foreign aid, which I support, but how I stand on public spending in general.

Mr. Speaker, this is always an exciting challenge, for like all Members I am anxious to make my views eminently clear on every question that comes up.

Now, in regard to Federal spending, I find in some parts of my State a clear consensus that we should have lower taxes but more defense, fewer Federal aid programs but more Federal money spent in Arizona, less bureaucracy but more jobs for deserving constituents. I am not at all sure that my State is unique in this respect.

In recent days I received a letter from one constituent asking my views on Federal spending, and I drafted a reply. I was about to mail it when I decided to give the matter just a little further thought. However, I put so much work into the letter that I though it might be of some value to those of my colleagues who find themselves similarly hard pressed on the Federal spending issue.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert my unmailed constituent reply at this point in the Appendix:

DEAR FRIEND: You have expressed alarm at the rate of Federal spending, and asked me as your Congressman where I stand. I had not intended to discuss this controversial question at this particular time. However, I want you to know that I do not shun a controversy. On the contrary I will take a stand on any issue at any time no matter how fraught with controversy it may be. Here is exactly how I stand.

If, when you say "Federal spending" you mean the billions of dollars wasted on outmoded naval shipyards and surplus airbases in Georgia, Texas, and New York; if you mean the billions of dollars lavished at Cape Kennedy and Houston on a "moondoggle" our Nation cannot afford; if, sir, you mean the $2 billion wasted each year in wheat and corn price supports which rob midwestern farmers of their freedoms and saddle taxpayers with outrageous costs of storage in already bulging warehouses; if you mean the $4 billion spent every year to operate veterans hospitals in other States in order to provide 20 million able-bodied veterans with care for civilian illness; if you mean such socialistic and pork-barrel projects as urban renewal, public housing, and TVA which cynically seek votes while robbing our taxpayers and weakening the moral fiber of millions of citizens in our Eastern States; if you mean the bloated Federal aid to education schemes calculated to press Federal educational controls down upon every student in this Nation; if you mean the $2 billion misused annually by our Public Health Service and National Institutes of Health on activities designed to prostitute the medical profession and foist socialized medicine on every American; if, sir, you mean all these ill-advised, unnecessary Federal activities which have destroyed States rights, created a vast, ever-growing, empire-building bureaucracy regimenting a once-free people by the illusory bait of cradle-to-grave security, and which indeed have taken us so far down the road to socialism that it may be, even at this hour, too late to retreat—then I am unyielding, bitter, and four square in my opposition, regardless of the personal or political consequences.

But, on the other hand, if when you say "Federal spending" you mean those funds which maintain Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Fort Huachuca, and other Arizona defense installations so vital to our Nation's security, and which every year pour hundreds of millions of dollars into our State's economy; if you mean the Truman-Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson mutual security program which bolsters our allies along the periphery of the Iron Curtain enabling them to resist the diabolical onslaught of a godless communism and maintain their independence; if you mean those funds to send our brave astronauts voyaging, even as Columbus, into the unknown, in order to guarantee that no aggressor will ever threaten these great United States by nuclear blackmail from outer space; if you mean those sound farm programs which insure our hardy Arizona cotton farmers a fair price for their fiber, protect the sanctity of the family farm, insure reasonable prices for consumers, and put to work for all the people of the world the miracle of American agricultural abundance; if you mean those VA programs which pay pensions to our brave soldiers crippled in mortal combat and discharge our debt of honor to their widows and orphans and which provide employment for thousands of Arizonans in our fine VA hospitals in Tucson, Phoenix, and Prescott; if, sir, you refer to such Federal programs as the central Arizona reclamation project which will, while repaying 95 percent of its cost with interest, provide our resourceful people with water to insure the growth and prosperity of our State; if you mean the Federal educational funds which build desperately needed college classrooms and dormitories for our local universities, provide little children in our Arizona schools with hot lunches (often their only decent meal of the day), furnish vocational training for our high school youth, and pay $10 million in impact funds to relieve the hard-pressed Arizona school property taxpayers from the impossible demands created by the presence of large Federal installations; if you mean the Federal medical and health programs which have eradicated the curse of malaria, smallpox, scarlet fever, and polio from our country and which even now enable dedicated teams of scientists to close in mercilessly on man's age-old enemies of cancer, heart disease, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and mental retardation that afflict our little children, senior citizens, and men and women in the prime years of life; if you mean all these Federal activities by which a free people in the spirit of Jefferson, Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, and F.D.R., through a fair and progressive income tax, preserve domestic tranquillity and promote the general welfare while preserving all our cherished freedoms and our self-reliant national character, then I shall support them with all the vigor at my command.

This is my stand and I will not compromise.

Sincerely,

MORRIS K. UDALL,
Member of Congress.

Consumer Credit Is Prosperity's Propellant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one person who thinks that the American consumer will return additional income to the economy from a tax cut is the president of Western Pennsylvania National Bank, M. A. Cancelliere. In a speech delivered recently at the University of Virginia, Mr. Cancelliere, a sound-thinking businessman, emphasized:

> Give the consumer extra income through a tax cut, and he'll spend all the additional disposable income, then dip into savings or borrowing power to spend even more. If he has an old car, he'll buy a new car—
>
> And so on.

What Mr. Cancelliere is trying to point out in the following remarks is very wise,

I think. This is that consumer credit is prosperity's propellant. I might also add that this may be true to the same degree for corporations and for governments. As long as confidence exists, prudent investment by all sectors is the stimulus for our economic growth. The banking field has a responsibility for such growth, and as my friend points out, if a loan officer has no bad loans, then he may not be doing the job correctly. Consumer credit is certainly a powerful fuel that helps make our economy move forward.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission, I include the following speech for the interest of my colleagues:

CONSUMER CREDIT IS PROSPERITY'S PROPELLANT

The future of consumer credit has been viewed with many shades of optimism. Regardless of the degree of optimism with which we view the future of consumer credit, we all can agree that consumer credit is prosperity's propellant. It is the fuel of the American era of abundance. Much the same as rocket fuel, it gets you where you want to go fast (when properly used). But when the fuel is carelessly handled, it will cause damage. You, the men who are distributors of consumer credit, are responsible for a significant part of our economy's purchasing power. We must handle the explosive force of this financial fuel of prosperity with respect.

The power of consumer credit on the economy would have shocked the banker of 50 years ago. The old American goal of "a chicken in every pot" has been transformed into "two cars in every garage" thanks to consumer credit. A recent survey prepared by Dr. George Katona of the University of Michigan points out "We are middle-class society with middle-class comforts. The number of rich has not been increased, but the middle class has grown." This group is the backbone of American consumption. While the average amount of credit has not increased in recent years, the number of persons using credit has. Surveys show that early this year close to one-half of all spending units owed some installment debts.

Most observers agree that both the short- and long-term outlook for consumer credit remains bright, barring, of course, sudden disapperance of confidence that may result from crisis in political or international affairs.

EXTRA TAX CUT

The American consumer enjoys consuming. Give the consumer extra income through a tax cut, and he'll spend all the additional disposable income, then dip into savings or borrowing power to spend even more. If he has an old car, he'll buy a new car. If he has a new car, he'll buy a second car. If he has one television set, he'll buy a second one. If he has two black and white sets, he'll want a color set. And when his house is bulging with the good things of the material world, he'll start thinking about a second house for long weekends with the family. And Mr. and Mrs. Consumer will drive to their second house in their second car, towing a motorboat. The consumer has insatiable demands just as long as he is confident of tomorrow.

But, despite this intense desire to purchase commodities and services, this family is sensitive to quality and service. Sell him an inferior product and he'll remember your brand as the one to avoid. Fail to live up to your promises of financial services, and the consumer not only will ignore you the next time he needs money, but he'll pass the word among his family and friends about his disappointment in your institution.

This is our smart, sophisticated, credit customer. He also has a built-in radar set that tells him when to cut down on his borrowing and when to borrow with a sudden burst of confidence. Many of our consumer credit customers know when to buy and when not to buy far better than most of us realize. And this smart customer of ours is multiplying rapidly.

PROJECTED GROWTH

It has been pointed out that if our population grows from 180 million to the projected 215 million by 1970, and if this growth is accompanied by a gross national product of $800 billion, then you and I can anticipate consumer credit totals will hover close to the $100 billion mark. I wonder what sort of world we will have in 10 years with its $100 billion consumer credit market. It's been suggested that 1973 may reach a level of prosperity enabling every man, woman, and child to purchase considerably more than $2,500 each of goods and services. How differently will this money be spent? Surely it will depend on the changes occurring in the consumer's habits and the products being offered to him. In 1973 Mrs. Consumer will go to the supermarket and pay for her weekly groceries with a credit card * * * issued by a bank, I hope. One quarter of her purchases will be products of a form and content that do not exist today. Mrs. Consumer's children will go to schools that will have nearly as much automated equipment and technical devices as today's research centers. At night Mr. and Mrs. Consumer will view wall-to-wall color television. During the commercials they will go to automatic food dispensers in the kitchen for snacks. Their bathrooms will be factory-delivered units composed of one-piece plastic that includes all fixtures. Radically new heating, air conditioning, visual and audio systems will be as commonplace in the home as today's electric can opener.

Services are expected to expand far beyond what we have today. And paying for these services may be accomplished by consumer credit in the 1970's. Some consumers will rent special vacation vehicles, others will have different autos delivered to their door for different occasions and Mrs. Consumer may drive a completely new type of vehicle for automated grocery shopping. Today's paper plate used on picnics may develop into inexpensive, disposable dishware suitable for use when the boss comes to dinner. Disposable clothing for all members of the family may be accepted as readily as today's paper napkins. Some of these predictions may fail to materialize while others will become classic understatements.

CHANGES THAT WILL OCCUR

The changes that will occur in transportation, manufacturing, medicine, energy fuels, construction, communications, and retailing will alter social, political, and economic attitudes that today are accepted as unchanging. We bankers must recognize these changes and be flexible enough to design and deliver financial services to fulfill the demand. For if we do not react readily to market changes, then someone else will get our customers. So let us take a look at the unfavorable shadows of this bright new world of tomorrow. A looming shadow of doubt is whether our economy can provide jobs for the postwar baby boom as they reach the family formation age during the next several years.

Bankers know that marital trouble among young married people is the reason for many installment loan defaults. There is both opportunity and peril in how we extend credit to marginal cases. Any experienced loan man knows the difference between the good and the poor credit risk. It takes astute bank policy, an ever-alert management, and a highly sophisticated procedure to decide which among the many marginal credit risks are tomorrow's quality customers and those you never want as customers. And remember, 7 years from now you'll be dealing in much larger loan volumes, at a faster pace, and with a higher percentage of marginal cases.

INCREASED COMPETITION

Compounding the pitfalls surrounding your share of the consumer credit market of the 1970's will be increased competition. I don't know of a single bank that is planning to shrink in size. All want to grow. And some of this growth will occur in consumer credit. The only prediction I can make tonight with complete assurance is that competition will increase in the consumer credit field. But there is no certainty that all the increase will be healthy competition. The softening of rates to an unprofitable level is unhealthy. Extending terms to a point where thin equity becomes no equity is unhealthy. These are harmful to the consumer, the merchant, and the lending institution. That triple-headed monster of higher delinquency, repossession, and loss ratios could devour bank profits, undermine the consumer's confidence, and impede the future growth of the banking industry.

Mr. and Mrs. Consumer are able and willing to make their purchases with reasonably standard credit terms. The excessively liberal credit terms lure those buyers who are already on the ragged edge of being overcommitted. Retailers of big ticket items should be made aware that a slower build-up of the consumer's equity actually extends the time of the next purchase.

TRUST IS OUR GREATEST ASSET

The banking industry enjoys great public confidence. This trust is our greatest asset. Shortsighted consumer credit policies that lead to unhealthy competition can do nothing but destroy public trust in us. Yes, there will be more people needing consumer credit. Yes, these people will need autos, washing machines, dryers, television sets, furniture, cribs, playpens, and the other yet-to-be-developed "necessities of modern American life." Let us continue to serve this unprecedented demand for consumer credit with vigorous merchandising * * * not with panic-born softening of rates to unprofitable levels or stretching terms to ludicrous and dangerous periods of time. The buying public deserves quality credit as well as quality products. The race to serve the consumer credit customer will go to the lending institutions that are alert to market changes, cost conscious and anxious to get and hold alert, experienced loan officers. The intensified competitive situation that will continue to grow in direct proportion to the increasing consumer credit market undoubtedly will be accompanied by a profit squeeze that may turn the dream of increased business into a nightmare of reduced earnings for those firms that blithely give away their profit in order to get business.

NO MAGIC FORMULA

There are no magic formulas to enable a bank to profitably increase its consumer credit business in 1973, or in 1963 for that matter. In order for a bank to have a profitable and growing consumer credit department, bank management must give that department maximum support. This means that during periods of tight money, a bank must not reduce the money supply of the consumer credit department. Any bank can lend copious amounts of money when credit is easy. But the bank able to lend funds during tight money periods will be the growth leader of his market area. The smart consumer credit bankers cannot blow hot and cold with customers. If the customer doesn't get money when he needs it, he'll go to your competition. The key to a profitable consumer credit operation is people. A computer cannot call on dealers. Automation has yet to replace an effective collection man. Computers play a significant role in the servicing of loan accounts, but acquisition costs, collection costs, and production costs require quality people.

ONE GOOD OFFICER

One good consumer loan officer is worth his weight in computer tape. And this value can be enhanced by the training you are receiving at this fine school. Giving full support to the consumer credit department must be augmented by a bank's tight control of costs. This involves quality control of loan production, through experienced people, servicing through automation and effective collection, again by well-trained people.

At our own bank, Bill Harrison, the head of our consumer credit department, has a rule: "It takes one person to grant a loan but two people must turn down a loan." Bill's rationale is that before a loan is turned down the first loan officer's judgment must be substantiated by another loan officer. Our bank is the same as your bank, we don't like to turn down loans unless we are certain it is not in the best interest of the bank or the customer. All of us in consumer credit walk the tightrope of profitable service between the desire to have larger volumes and the danger of poor risks.

At our own institution consumer credit has been a propellant of growth. During the past 10 years, Western Pennsylvania National has emphasized the significant role of consumer credit. The reasons are obvious. Western Pennsylvania National is a savings bank and a retail bank. Two-thirds of our deposits consist of time deposits and a large portion of our activities are with small businessmen and average people. Consumer credit is the bread and butter of our type of bank.

THREE CHARACTERISTICS

In addition, our bank has become quite active in the certificate of deposit market during the past year. Add up these three characteristics of our bank and you will understand why we need to employ our funds in loans that have high yield, relative liquidity and flexibility. Consumer credit supplies these three characteristics. Consumer credit not only is a vital part of our loan portfolio, but it has increased in its importance to our bank's profitability as we have continued to grow. Our own bank has enjoyed the experience of seeing additional business result from consumer loans.

In short, while prospects for consumer credit are exceedingly bright, there is a need for a hardnosed and objective approach by banks. The population boom, in itself, does not guarantee prosperity. Our economy must be able to provide jobs to the men and women born in the forties for a prosperous period in the seventies.

Consumer credit now is a built-in part of the American way of life. Careful planning on the part of lending institutions is a necessity in maintaining the public confidence we bankers now enjoy. The key to sound consumer credit, mutually beneficial to both the customer and the bank is people; trained, experienced people such as yourselves, who are guided by sound policies.

TEACH YOU A LESSON

And if this sounds too general, let me be a little more definite: A good consumer loan administrator should not let a bad experience throw him off balance. Let a bad loan teach you a lesson, not freeze your thinking. Naturally it is a traumatic experience to the loan officer when his first dealer goes out of trust. The right approach is to find out where you went wrong and develop a procedure to prevent a recurrence—but don't crawl into a shell and attempt to maintain a 100-percent record. A good loan officer keeps his mental guard up at all times. But if you have no bad loans, then you may not be doing your job correctly. Keep volume up and keep loss averages down to a reasonable figure. I know it's easier said than done, but it is being done by successful loan men every day in hundreds of banks and other lending institutions around the country.

A good consumer loan administrator should be educating himself constantly. He should keep alert to his industry's trends, his competitor's actions, and to the talk on the street. He should read as much about the business as he possibly can. He must have a streak of curiosity, too. He should not accept rumors about dealers or people but attempt to ferret the truth. In medium-sized consumer credit operations, the loan officer must have good credit judgment, be a top salesman and be a firm collector. In the larger operations, he can be any of the three depending upon his aptitude. And of course, in the smaller operations he must be all three.

FULL-TIME JOB

The important point is that regardless of the size of the operation, being a consumer credit officer is a full-time job. The responsibility to the community, the customer and the bank are too great to permit consumer credit to be a part-time job.

We should continually keep in mind: "That consumer credit has vast social, political and economic significance as it helps to lift the standard of living of the many to a level once available only to the privileged few." Consumer credit is a powerful fuel that helps make our economy move forward—let us use this financial fuel wisely.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Summary of Major Legislative Activity, 1st Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 17, 88th Congress, I submit herewith a summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

During the first session, 662 House bills and resolutions and 13 Senate bills and resolutions were referred to the committee. Twenty bills were reported to the House, of which 10 were enacted into public law; 4 were approved by the House but not acted upon in the Senate, and 5 remained on the House Calendar on the adjournment of the first session. One House joint resolution passed the House and was amended in the Senate. The House has yet to concur in the Senate amendments.

The following bills reported from the committee became public law:

H.R. 12, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act—House Report No. 109; Public Law 88–129.

H.R. 6518, to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution—Clean Air Act—House Reports Nos. 508 and 1003; Public Law 88–206.

S. 1576, Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963—House Report Nos. 694 and 862; Public Law 88–164.

House Joint Resolution 665, providing for the settlement of the railroad labor dispute—House Report No. 713; Senate Joint Resolution 102 became Public Law 88–108.

H.R. 8100, a bill designed to restore the railroad retirement system to a satisfactory financial condition—House Report No. 748; Public Law 88–133.

H.R. 2876, repealing the Inland Waterways Corporation Act—House Report No. 347; S. 1031 became Public Law 88–67.

H.R. 134, requiring safety standards for automobile seat belts—House Report No. 378; Public Law 88–201.

House Joint Resolution 220, granting consent for an extension of 4 years of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas—House Report No. 681; Senate Joint Resolution 33 became Public Law 88–115.

H.R. 2906, providing for the emergency transportation of any motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce by towing—House Report No. 483; Public Law 88–208.

H.R. 4646, declaring a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream—House Report No. 482; Public Law 88–88.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE NOW AWAITING SENATE ACTION

H.R. 6199, granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact of agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission. House Report No. 909.

H.R. 8462, authorizing the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes—House Report No. 908.

H.R. 8344, amending the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1—House Report No. 1032.

H.R. 8673, amends the Federal Aviation Act to provide that the validity of an instrument, the recording of which is provided for by such act, shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered—House Report No. 1033.

BILLS REPORTED TO THE HOUSE ON WHICH NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

H.R. 5445, amends the Interstate Commerce Act to permit freight forwarders to acquire other carriers subject to such act—House Report No. 421.

H.R. 1341, requires passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards—House Report No. 491.

H.R. 3669, the Quality Stabilization Act—House Report No. 566.

S. 1153, airport construction—House Report No. 1002.

H.R. 8316, length and frequency of broadcast commercials—House Report No. 1054.

JOINT RESOLUTION WHICH HAS PASSED BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE

House Joint Resolution 247 suspends the equal opportunity requirement of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for the 1964 presidential and vice-presidential campaigns. The joint resolution passed the House and was amended in the Senate. The House has not yet concurred in the Senate amendments; House Report No. 359.

In addition to the bills which the committee reported to the House during the first session of the present Congress, public hearings were held on the National Capital Airports Corporation; use of Dulles and Friendship Airports; development of a commercial supersonic aircraft; Transportation Act of 1963; National Accident Prevention Center; reorganization of Public Health Service; animal drugs; medical care for fishing boat owners; operation of motor vehicles by disabled persons; automobile speedometers; judicial review of biological orders; safety latches on refrigerators; labeling—wood, steel containers, and labels—Securities and Exchange legislation; review of administrative process in regulatory agencies; and broadcast editorializing and broadcast rating services.

A detailed explanation of the reported bills is contained in the committee reports which accompanied them, and in the activity report of the committee for the 1st session of the 88th Congress which will be filed in the House next month.

Poetic Eulogy of President Kennedy by Dr. Charles H. Bradford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a most appealing, inspiring eulogy, in poetic form, of our late, much lamented, dear and great friend, President John F. Kennedy. This very moving poem is entitled "Farewell."

This beautiful, metered eulogy was written by Dr. Charles H. Bradford, one of the greatest surgeons and medical leaders in the Nation, and will have extraordinary appeal to people everywhere who admired and loved our great President.

Dr. Bradford is an outstanding doctor and one of the greatest medical and humane leaders in the country.

Of a famous Massachusetts family, tracing back to the first Governor of our Commonwealth, he is of the Harvard College class of 1926, a great football player and hammer thrower, member of Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude graduate, also equally distinguished in the Harvard Medical School.

He is now a very famous orthopedic doctor in Boston. He is a twin brother of Mr. Edward Bradford, another fine Harvard athlete in football and track, and the brother of the Honorable Robert Bradford, the very able, distinguished former Governor of Massachusetts.

All the Bradford boys have had great collegiate and service records in time of war. Dr. Bradford was a paramedic and made many parachute jumps behind the enemy lines during World War II.

His father, Dr. Edward Bradford, founded an institution which has done immeasurable good for crippled children, the renowned Massachusetts Hospital School for Crippled Children at Canton, Mass., where the famed Mr. N. V. Swede Nelson has been trustee for the past 22 years.

Dr. Bradford has given most unselfishly the best part of his life to the care and treatment of handicapped children and other afflicted people.

He was a close friend of my late, much-admired friend and great football player-coach, Mr. Charles F. Crowley, of Harvard, Notre Dame, and Columbia.

To my mind, Dr. Bradford is one of the greatest Americans of our time, and it is with genuine feelings of pride, as well as deep appreciation, that I insert his beautiful, touching poem on President Kennedy in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

(By Charles H. Bradford, M.D.)

1. SOLEMN MEMORY

Sadly, the Nation's flag, at half mast flies,
Telling of grief, greater than we can say;
For, deep within, a painful sorrow lies,
Too heavy and sincere to pass away.
A strong, wise, friendly, brave, and hopeful man,
Bearing the burdens of the Chief of State,
Has come now to the end of his life's span,
Cut off, in his best years, by tragic fate.
In solemn gratitude, we strive to tell
The thanks that, from our hearts, he has deserved,
Who, leading us through stormy trials, fell
With full devotion to the cause he served.
In years to come, when grief has stood aside,
Our people still, will guard his name with pride.

2. WAR SERVICE

When war first called, he sacrificed at once
His place of rank, and influence, and wealth;
Accepting arduous duty that confronts
More toilsome tasks, straining his strength and health.
His patriotic spirit never sought
A service that from peril might be free;
But in the front line combat zone, he fought,
Meeting the foe in battle, on the sea.
And when, from desp'rate risks, his craft was downed,
He organized the rescue of his crew;
And by indomitable courage, found
Means of escape, to join the fight anew.
In hardship, valor, and true sacrifice,
He paid more than his share of victory's price.

3. STUDIES, THOUGHTS, VISION

His active mind, in scholarship, pursued
The complex lessons history had taught;
And from a wealth of studies, he reviewed
Life's deeper meaning, and more basic thought.
Out of this background, his broad vision grew,
Sensing the principles that guide a state;
And from his own experience, he drew
Ideas that would a New Frontier create.
In a more personal historic mood,
The profiles of his countrymen, he scanned,
Marking the urgent crisis where each stood,
And the firm courage, great events demand.
By such wide knowledge trained, he dared to meet
Tasks where the greatest leaders must compete.

4. WORLD LEADERSHIP

When finally, he reached the topmost place,
Over the ramparts of the world, he watched,
Meeting conflicting powers, face to face.
With calm, bold moves, that every challenge matched.
By his undaunted leadership, he showed
That freedom's cause was resolute and strong,
And that no hostile threat would be allowed
To shake the truths, supporting it so long.
His quiet fortitude has left behind
An aim; a goal, that stands before us still;
By building common sympathies, to find
That the world's peace lies in the world's good will.
Though with still-grieving thoughts, his loss we feel;
Still-waiting time will cherish his ideal.

5. FAREWELL

So bid him now farewell; but not goodbye.
The purposes he built must never die.
Great men, great hearts, great thought continue on
Long after we who thrilled to them are gone.
Into our heritage, he now has passed,
Joining the men whose work will always last.

Everyone, Regardless of Economic Circumstances, or Cultural Interests, Can Enjoy the Free and Simple Magnificence of the Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 24, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep interest in legislation in behalf of the arts, I have studied the various bills relating to the National Cultural Center very closely during the past 6 years. Despite defects in all of these bills, I have voted favorably on all of them because it seemed to me that, with the assurance that further Federal funds would not be invested, the possible gain to the general public outweighed the obvious risks.

However, when the project is changed in a way that calls for an immediate investment of some $35 million in Federal funds and an uncertain financial future, and when all of this is proposed as a memorial to a beloved and mourned American President, then I believe that Members of Congress owe their constituents careful study and analysis of the plan, House Joint Resolution 871, to provide it. For this reason I shall go into this matter at some length at this time in order to bring to your attention a number of questions, some of them alarming, for which Congress must seek satisfactory answers before it can properly pass legislation, such as House Joint Resolution 871, dedicated to a deceased President and calling for an unprecedented large sum of Federal money.

I urge you to prepare yourself for the House consideration of this matter to begin January 7, 1964. Perhaps the presentation I submit at this time will stimulate you to do your own research on this proposal.

Here are some of the troublesome problems that raise inevitable doubts, and demonstrates the need for legislative caution:

First. Is the memorial concept a "face-saver" for an otherwise faltering project?

Second. Why are Federal funds needed now when Congress has been repeatedly told, again as recently as last August 5 that the project could be realized through public contributions?

Third. How can a building designed for a 13-acre tract be fitted into the 9 acres authorized by Congress?

Fourth. How can Congress, in good conscience, authorize a $15.4 million loan on a parking garage to applicants who candidly admit that they do not anticipate enough revenue to pay the annual interest, let alone the operating costs and reduction of principal?

Fifth. Should a Presidential memorial be built with borrowed money—in effect, should it be subject to a first mortgage?

Sixth. Is there a proven need for the project in its present form, aside from the memorial aspects, that justifies such major Federal participation?

Seventh. Should the administration of a Presidential memorial be governed largely outside the control of Congress by a largely self-perpetuating board of lay citizens appointed by the President without review by Congress?

Eighth. What happens to congressional responsibility, the taxpayers of the future, and the memory of President Kennedy, if the Center is a financial failure?

Ninth. Is the site a desirable one for the intended use in spite of severe criticism by leading architects and other qualified experts?

Tenth. Is this "sole" memorial in fact the most suitable one for the mourned President it would commemorate? Should Congress ignore other worthy memorial proposals that have been submitted to it? The Senate-passed companion measure drops the word "sole." Should we insist on its retention.

I do not pretend to have the answers to all of these questions, but I am certain that they should be developed by a suitable commission of Congress. I hope that my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, will join me in this appeal to reason and dignity. Certainly a memorial based on culture, of all memorials, should arise from a thoughtful approach, calling on all the skills of our vast Nation before the position of Congress is irrevocably decided.

Yesterday's plan for a national theater, no matter how attractive, should not be hastily improvised into a monument for the ages. To do so is not worthy of Congress, of the people of the United States nor of President Kennedy.

The National Cultural Center has been before Congress as a legislative matter three times; once in the summer of 1958, when the original bill was passed, again in 1960, when the act was amended in certain technical respects, and again during the summer of 1963, when the act was extended for 3 years due to the failure of the fundraising campaign to make its goal within the 5-year limitation originally set by Congress. Each time that this legislation has been before Congress, it has been brought to the floor with a severe limit on debate. Thus, Congress has never had a chance to consider as thoroughly as it should the defects as well as the virtues of the act and the project.

The act, as well as its first amendment, were passed during the Eisenhower administration with the backing of President Eisenhower. It was made clear to Congress in 1958 and in 1960 that the President favored the project only on the basis that the obligation of the Federal Government was to provide a site of about 9 acres and that all other capital and operating funds would be raised by public subscription. The extension of the act was passed in the Kennedy administration with the backing of the White House, and the same clear representations as to funding through public contributions only were made by the proponents of the extension. The record is crystal clear on this point.

House Joint Resolution 871, which proposes to change the name of the National Cultural Center to the John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts, and to provide up to $15.5 million of Federal funds as capital, and to lend another $15.4 million in Federal funds for construction of a parking garage, and to designate the proposed Center as the sole national memorial to the late President in the National Capital area, evolved from a very simple amendment which was sent to Congress with the recommendation of President Johnson. House Joint Resolution 871, with its concept of borrowing authority and other unique provisions, is substantially different from the amendment first recommended by the White House. It is of some significance that House Joint Resolution 871 was prepared within 24 hours after penetrating questions were asked during committee hearings by Representative CRAMER of Florida and this joint resolution appears to be have been drawn in an attempt to answer most of the questions he raised.

Even so, it appears to be full of defects, and it certainly raises many questions which Congress should face and resolve before taking final action on the present problems. For the first time, there is an opportunity for extended debate which is more important than ever in view of the suddenness and brevity of the recent committee hearings and the fact that the only public witness who appeared during these hearings, the president of the District of Columbia Federation of Musicians, AFL-CIO, expressed grave concern about many aspects of House Joint Resolution 871, and the project as it is currently organized.

In order for Congress to deliberate and legislate intelligently in the public interest, it is necessary to consider the theater and art concepts of this memorial to President Kennedy. These components of the legislation are especially important, because of the fact that the project has been in existence for more than 5 years and therefore the proposed memorial, like a business corporation, becomes subject to the liabilities as well as the assets that have been acquired during its 5-year, nonmemorial, history. Congress must consider a point that has been raised by a number of thoughtful Members, including Senator ELLENDER of Louisiana, Representative BROWN of Ohio, and Representative CRAMER of Florida. This is that the trustees of the National Cultural Center see the conversion of the Center to a memorial as a means of rescuing a project that might not otherwise have succeeded.

FIRST. THE QUESTION OF MAGNITUDE AND NEED

Other than in the matter of acreage, the original legislation set no limit on the nature of the building or buildings to be erected nor their cost. The hearings produced testimony from the American Institute of Architects under which it recognized the national importance of the project and recommended that the design be chosen through a nationwide competition which the institute agreed to administer free of charge as a public service. The trustees never availed themselves of this generous offer, and appointed as sole architect, Edward D. Stone. The first plan he developed called for three theaters and two small auditoriums under one roof with underground parking facilities at an estimated cost of $75 million.

Many proponents of the original legislation were surprised and shocked, since they had believed that the project should be started with a single theater suitable for opera and ballet and, perhaps, symphony concerts. Based on figures from other cities, it was assumed that this could be accomplished for about $10 million. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], one of the authors of the original bill, had this to say as late as 1961:

> When I backed the proposal I had in mind the construction of a comparatively modest multipurpose auditorium here in Washington which could serve as a showplace for the performing arts, related traveling painting and sculpture exhibitions, and so on. The Center, under present plans, is far larger than the population of the metropolitan area of the Nation's Capital can reasonably or realistically be expected to use. The Congress gave the Center a site almost as large as that of the Lincoln Center in New York City on which six major buildings will be located. I do not believe the additional land called for in two bills before the Congress is needed, or that the powers of the Congress should be exerted to obtain it.

During 1962 the project was redesigned, retaining the concept of three theaters under one roof, but eliminating working space which would have made the project a true cultural center equivalent to cultural centers in other big cities in this country and in other nations. The cost of the revised structure was announced as $30 million. It now appears that the trustees also eliminated the parking facilities from their cost estimates. It was not made publicly clear until the present hearings that the parking facilities (to be discussed below) were not included in the $30 million estimate. Indeed, publicity material issued by the trustees states that the parking garage is an integral part of the project and the $30 million cost estimate. The information developed at the hearings,

therefore, came as a surprise to the Congress, the public and, doubtless, to most donors.

There appear to have been no adequate studies that would indicate a need at present or in the immediate future, for the three theaters that are presently proposed. Roger L. Stevens, the chairman of the board of trustees, stated at the recent hearings grave doubts that there is enough audience available at present for the structure that is being planned. He said that it was the hope of himself and his colleagues that the existence of the three new theaters would encourage the growth of audiences.

Washington is already graced by Constitution Hall in which symphony concerts by the resident National Symphony Orchestra and by visiting orchestras from the United States and abroad have flourished for many years. It has been made available by its owners, the Daughters of the American Revolution, at very low rentals so that it appears that there is no urgent need for another symphony hall in Washington. In respect to an opera house, it is widely acknowledged that there is no suitable auditorium in Washington for grand opera, and great ballet groups. It follows, that a genuine need does exist in this field, but there appears to have been no adequate market study as to the number of days in each year that such an opera house would be economically useful. In respect to the proposed theater, judging by the rest of the country, the so-called legitimate theater appears to be diminishing in holding the interest of audiences. The National Theater in downtown Washington is not occupied in each of the 52 weeks of the year and, with rare exceptions, it does not attract audiences to the limit of its seating capacity. Could the National Theater survive as the legitimate business enterprise of its owners if it were faced with the competition of a tax-exempt theater on Federal property? One of the corporations owned in part by Roger L. Stevens is lessee of the National Theater.

Related to the question of need is the attitude of the potentially largest users of a cultural center. The two most active performing arts organizations in Washington, the National Symphony, which has been operating for 32 years, and the Washington Opera Society, which is now in its 7th year, have both been quoted in the press as expressing concern that vigorous fundraising for the National Cultural Center was creating difficulties for them in their own essential fundraising activities. In this connection I call your attention to an article in the Wall Street Journal of September 6, 1963. This same concern has been voiced by the managements of America's major symphony orchestras, who presumably would be the most frequent users of the Center after the Washington organizations. At a conference of the 25 major orchestra managers in San Francisco on June 23, the National Cultural Center was discussed and the consensus was that active fundraising for the Center was in "direct conflict" with the fundraising needs of the orchestras in their own communities. This would indicate that the national efforts to raise contributions would be at least privately resisted, if not publicly opposed, by the very performing arts organizations who the Center's trustees count on to be the core of support for the National Cultural Center. Since these existing cultural organizations are widely scattered among the constituencies of Congress, it follows that Congres should take time to inform itself thoroughly regarding the impact of the proposed legislation on existing cultural activities throughout the United States.

SECOND. THE QUESTION OF SITE

During the hearings leading to the original legislation, the proponents were virtually unanimous in recommending a site on the Mall close to downtown. They lost out to the Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution and the present site along the river was hurriedly designated as a substitute in the closing days of the 85th Congress. Most thoughtful critics continue to be opposed to the present site despite its acknowledged scenic splendor. It has been widely characterized as "an island in the midst of a spaghetti-maze of arterial highways." It was pointed out during the hearings that successful theaters are almost invariably located in downtown areas and that those that have been located off the beaten track are often doomed to be failures. The Washington Auditorium, which is now being demolished, and which was out of the downtown area in its day, was cited as an example. Officials close to President Kennedy who were active on the Planning Commission for Pennsylvania Avenue had recommended to him that the Cultural Center project be broken up into its three components and that these be built one at a time as part of the rehabilitation of Pennsylvania Avenue between the White House and the Capitol.

The Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue was critical of the present plans and site on these grounds: First, the site is so far from the center of the Nation's Capital that it could do little to enrich the city's cultural life; second, the present location is not served by major public transportation facilities; third, housing all performing arts stages in a single building might result in a structure so large as to be out of proportion to the rest of the city.

The New York Times on December 11, 1963, said that the National Cultural Center "seems doomed to be a well-landscaped traffic island in the midst of freeways; culture over a giant car park. Pedestrians will undoubtedly be able to burrow over or under the automotive obstacle race, but this is peculiarly bad planning. As it stands now, the National Cultural Center is a well-intentioned gesture, dubiously sited, promising prettiness but shortchanging the possibility of architectural greatness—a backhanded tribute to culture and Mr. Kennedy."

The most experienced, independent, concert manager in Washington, Patrick Hayes, has been frequently critical of the large size of the Cultural Center project and of the site. After the memorial legislation was introduced, Mr. Hayes in two broadcasts—December 1 and 15, 1963—urged caution and deliberation by Congress and continued to raise serious questions regarding the site.

Congress should certainly have a chance to review the question of site, especially if the Cultural Center is to be a memorial to President Kennedy, since no American would want a Presidential memorial to risk failure as a business enterprise, a risk which now must be considered by the Congress because of the unique nature of this proposal as developed in House Joint Resolution 871.

Another serious question relating to the site is its size. The original act authorized only 9 acres. The plan for the National Cultural Center developed by Edward D. Stone, architect, as well as publicity issued by the trustees of the Center, calls for 13 acres. When this discrepancy was brought up by me on the floor of this House on August 5, 1963, I was assured by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] that no additional land involving Federal funds would be acquired for the National Cultural Center. In spite of these assurances, officials of the National Cultural Center testified at the hearings on this legislation on December 12, 1963, that 4 additional acres would have to be acquired by the Federal Government through the National Capital Planning Commission at a cost of some $3.3 million to be appropriated by Congress. Congress has not authorized this extension of the acreage for the National Cultural Center, nor has it authorized such an appropriation, but it appears that the presently planned building cannot be erected on the present 9 acres according to the trustees of the Center, who say it is the "obligation" of the Federal Government to buy the additional land.

THIRD. THE QUESTION OF PARKING

The business risks of the memorial come into sharp focus in relation to recently uncovered facts about the parking garage which is essential to the operation of the Center. In order to justify the omission of the cost of the parking garage from the publicized cost of the Center, Mr. Stevens, the Center's chairman, testified that he considered parking to be noncultural and therefore that it would be improper to ask for public contributions to pay for the construction of it. Presumably the same standard has not been applied to the funds needed for construction of restaurants, checkrooms, and other noncultural activities within the Center. It was at the time of that testimony on December 12, 1963, that Congress first heard of the proposal to borrow funds to construct the parking garage. It is noteworthy that the originally proposed memorial bill did not include such borrowing authority so that it is certain that Congress would have been faced with this request later on if it had passed the bill as originally proposed.

At the time of his testimony, Center Chairman Roger Stevens stated that construction costs of the garage would be $10,800,000. In House Joint Resolution 871, which emerged a day later, borrowing authority is asked for $15.4 million. Three days later Mr. Stevens testified that the additional $4.2 million

was needed because of architects' fees, engineers' fees, and allowance for increases in construction costs.

This astounding proposal would put a first mortgage on a presidential memorial for the first time in our history. Moreover, according to the testimony of its own proponents, this mortgage is certain to default. The proposed parking garage with spaces for about 1,600 cars is to be built at the unprecedented high cost of $10,000 per parking space. According to the testimony of Mr. Stevens, the best anticipated revenues from the use of this parking will not be enough to pay the annual interest charges, let alone the annual operating costs, and any reduction whatsoever of the principal of the 30-year loan that is sought. It is clear that the end result will not be a loan, but a further $15.4 million contribution from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Stevens testified that it was proposed to operate the parking garage at a dollar a car on an in-and-out basis regardless of time. Because of its isolated position, most tourists would be able to approach the proposed Kennedy memorial conveniently only by private automobile. Those tourists who merely want to view the building—and it is unclear whether they may ever enter free—rather than attend one of the spectacles to be presented there, would thus have to pay $1 for the privilege of parking. The other presidential memorials provide free parking conveniently near and, of course, free admission. Might not this affect the attitude of tourists toward the memory of President Kennedy?

It is also to be questioned whether enough parking and adequate entrance and exit facilities have been planned. The present seating capacities of all of the Center's facilities add up to more than 12,000. For this, 1,600 parking places underground, and no surface parking, are being planned. By comparison, the Federal Government's Carter Barron Amphitheater has a seating capacity of 4,000 and adjacent parking lots for more than 1,100 cars. The Carter Barron Amphitheater is also served by regularly scheduled D.C. Transit routes. Yet, at the times when it plays to large audiences, the Carter Barron parking lots are quickly filled and the parking spills over to adjacent streets for many blocks around. According to the architect, Mr. Stone, there will be only one access road from the surrounding highways to the Cultural Center. This would tend to raise a serious problem, both in entrance and exit, for 1,600 cars at a time when there is intensive activity in the theaters, especially when audiences are leaving at one time.

Here it shall be noted that the parking problem appears to be greatly aggravated by the difficult site that has been chosen. If the Cultural Center project were to be located in downtown Washington, existing and future commercial parking facilities could take care of all of the needs at no expense to the Federal Government.

FOURTH. THE QUESTION OF MATCHING FUNDS

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy both laid great emphasis on the fact that no Federal money would go into the construction of the Center. Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, spoke on this subject just this past December 18, saying:

> President Kennedy was aware that if the Cultural Center could be constructed entirely through private contributions, it would have much more meaning for the people all over the country. * * * President Kennedy realized this, and attached great significance to the raising of private funds. * * * He made it the subject of White House messages.

Chairman Stevens of the Center has himself laid great emphasis on this aspect of the plan for the Center. Writing in the American Music Teacher for September–October 1962, he stated:

> When Congress sets aside a 13-acre tract [sic] on the Potomac for the National Cultural Center it also stipulated—in conformity with the American tradition—that the funds for erecting the Center should be raised by popular subscription. In other words, Congress hoped that the people of our country would indicate their enthusiasm for this program by a kind of referendum, in which their votes would be cast in the form of voluntary contributions, both large and small.

Yet, it is now proposed that a memorial to President Kennedy be erected in a way that is not in conformity with a long-established and successful American tradition. This tradition and precedent have not been violated in the case of the congressionally authorized memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt which is yet to be built and which, when it is built, is to be constructed from funds made available entirely by public subscription.

FIFTH. THE QUESTION OF ADMINISTRATION

All existing Presidential memorials in Washington (including those authorized but not yet constructed) have been developed under the direct control of Congress through congressional commissions. Congress is now being asked to consider a Presidential memorial of unprecedented magnitude and of unprecedented usage and cost with unprecedented haste—and also is being asked to waive the commission approach which has resulted in the great memorials to Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson. Congress is being asked to surrender fiscal control and administrative control to a board dominated by lay citizens appointed by the President without the advice and consent of Congress. It is being asked to do this in the face of a proposal for a Presidential memorial which is simultaneously being presented to Congress as a "business proposition" which is supposed to pay its own way. It would appear that because of the grave risks in the uncharted course set for the proposed project that the thoughtful commission approach is more necessary than ever before.

SIXTH. THE QUESTION OF FINANCIAL RISK

For the first time in our history, Congress is being asked to authorize and pay the major cost of a Presidential memorial which, once it is built, must be maintained as a business. This injects the problem of calculated risk into a memorial monument, something which Congress has never had to deal with before. During various committee hearings, Congress has relied on the testimony of one witness, Mr. Stevens, for assurances, unsupported by figures, that the project would pay for itself once it is built and would not be a future burden to the taxpayers. Although the statements of Mr. Stevens, whose investments are primarily in the theater and in real estate, should be carefully considered, his opinion runs counter to all actual experience in this field. Comparable cultural centers erected, or being erected in other big American cities, have assumed that they would need annual operating funds in addition to those coming from operating revenues. Lincoln Center in New York found that its construction costs just about doubled in the course of construction, and it still has not raised all of the capital that it needs. Lincoln Center has also found that its annual operating costs are greater than those assumed in the planning estimates. In the other nations of the world, opera houses and cultural centers all receive large annual subsidies from their governments. They cannot and do not exist from operating revenues alone.

It thus becomes virtually certain that Congress will have to provide annual operating funds to keep such a gigantic enterprise solvent. Comparison has been made with the National Gallery of Art, which was constructed entirely through private means and given to the Government. Yet, the National Gallery requires and receives from Congress an appropriation of more than $2 million a year which it needs in order to operate. A complex cultural center of the performing arts will undoubtedly require even more in annual subsidies in order to operate.

Congress has been given rosy predictions in regard to other so-called self-liquidating projects, the most recent and notable of which is the District of Columbia Stadium. Congress now knows that even the most careful business predictions by experts cannot be considered negotiable. This is an especial problem for enterprises which depend upon paying audiences in order to remain solvent. For example, far from paying for itself, the District of Columbia Stadium cannot pay the interest on its Government-guaranteed bonds and the Government has had to step in in order to make the interest payments.

It is true that Congress has already authorized the undertaking of such necessary financial risks in connection with the construction of the theaters of the National Cultural Center. However, the circumstances under which Congress approved the plan were much different from those that are now being proposed. The original plan called for a project which, except for the grant of land, would be capitalized and supported entirely through private contributions. The project at that time was not a memorial project and therefore there was no implied obligation to rescue it, if it should fail. Now Congress is confronted with a plan under which a major Federal investment of at least $35 million is to be made immediately. This plan for a presidential memorial can hardly be allowed to fail, once it has

been built, regardless of the future cost to the Federal Treasury.

A presidential memorial that, in the future, found itself in financial trouble would not be a graceful tribute to the man to whom it is dedicated.

Congress is also being asked to pass in House Joint Resolution 871 a measure which would supersede more than 40 conflicting memorial proposals on which hearings have never been held, and whose virtues will never be known if, for the first time in our Nation's history, a presidential memorial is authorized under emergency conditions. Precedent and prudence appear to require the commission approach. Congress, for example, should have a completely detailed fiscal report of the Center's operations to date including a complete listing of all donations made, the names of the donors and the conditions attached to the gifts. Congress should have this information because it is the Congress and, also, because it is being asked to authorize Federal funds that must match, among other items, substantially more than $1 million which have been spent already on purely administrative and promotional activities. The commission approach would also give Congress the needed opportunity to consider, in less chaotic circumstances, whether or not the Cultural Center, attractive as the idea may sound at the moment, is in fact the most suitable memorial to President Kennedy. Representative SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, has appropriately pointed out that although the late President's interest in the performing arts was a matter of record, it was not the dominant interest in his life.

It would be wise to consider whether a Cultural Center memorial is the type of memorial that would appeal to most Americans in connection with their late President. It is apparent that the greatest value of the Cultural Center memorial will be to those who are able to afford the admission prices to the attractions that it will present. It follows that the Center will be of more value to the residents of Washington than to its visitors. Many millions of Americans who visit Washington will be excluded from the fullest enjoyment of a memorial such as House Joint Resolution 871 will provide. Everyone, regardless of economic circumstances or cultural interests, can enjoy the free and simple magnificence of the Lincoln Memorial.

The Invisible Americans: America's Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 30, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a moving article in the Saturday Evening Post, Ben Bagdikian paints a sad and shocking picture of the more than 30 million Americans whose lives have been destroyed by poverty. The article goes beyond the gray and faceless statistics—so many unemployed, so much spent on relief, so much paid out in unemployment compensation—and shows us the tragic human meaning of the word poverty.

The shocking words and photographs of this article have done the country a great service. For the poverty stricken of today have been rightly called the invisible poor. As the author points out, in the midst of the greatest prosperity mankind has ever known "most comfortable Americans have come to believe that the poor do not exist at all." Unfortunately the poor do exist—and barely exist at that. They eke out meager lives in the migrant labor camps, in shabby city slums, and the in the stagnant backwaters of rural poverty. Forgotten or ignored by most Americans, they remain a permanent shame to a country which has made the phrase the "American way of life" a proud boast of its success.

We cannot stand aside with the smug complacency of the prosperous and say that the poor deserve their misery. Most of the poor are trapped by circumstances far beyond their control. In many cases, poverty is an inherited condition, passed from father to son. The poor and uneducated parent rears poor and uneducated children. We are beginning to realize that the elimination of poverty in this country is not a utopian goal but a practical necessity. As Mr. Bagdikian puts in a sharp phrase:

> Poverty is like cancer. Left to itself it will only get worse.

The poor are more than a burden on our conscience, they are a drain on the Nation's pocketbook. They are the outsiders of our economy. Having little they spend less. Living on the margins of our economy, they contribute nothing to it.

Bold and imaginative new programs are needed to eliminate the running sore of poverty from our Nation. A good beginning has been made through such programs as area redevelopment, the Manpower Retraining Act and increased vocational training. Another new and exciting idea which will bring immediate help to this Nation's poor is the National Service Corps. I hope that this dramatic program which will put the idealism of this Nation to practical use will soon be acted on by the House of Representatives. These are practical programs designed to keep people off the relief rolls and to help them to help themselves.

I wholeheartedly support President Johnson's determination to continue an unceasing fight against poverty. We cannot rest until all our citizens are able to take their place as 20th century Americans in a free and prosperous land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "The Invisible Americans," be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE INVISIBLE AMERICANS

(By Ben. H. Bagdikian)

There is a world inside the United States where the American dream is dying. It is a world where, when it rains at night, everyone gets up to move beds away from the leaks. Where there is no electricity—but refrigerators are valued to keep food safe from rats. Where regularly at the end of the month whole families live on things like berries and bread. Where children in winter sleep on floors in burlap bags and their lung X-rays at age 12 look like old men's. Where students drift hungry and apathetic through school and their parents die 10 or 20 or 30 years earlier than their countrymen.

These are the poor. They are not just the psychological cripples. Nor are they located only in small, isolated pockets. They are everywhere in the country. Every city, every region has them. In a few places there is scarcely anyone else.

At least 36 million Americans, 1 in every 5, are poor. They are the men, women, and children who don't come close to living under minimal standards of food, shelter, and medical care. They are not basically different from their fellow Americans. But they have had the bad luck to be born in a poor region, or to be trained for a dying or automating industry. They may have dark skins. They may be sick. They may have lost their jobs after they were 40 years old—too old to find new jobs but not old enough to die. Or like the American Indians and the small farmers, they may merely have been born into an obsolete culture.

The poor in 1963 are largely invisible. They are concealed by modern apparel—all Americans tend to dress casually and, with modern dyes, most old clothes remain unfaded. They are also hidden by the new shape of the metropolis, where the most wretched people are unseen in the central cores of cities while their comfortable compatriots are gone to the suburbs. Finally, the poor are obscured by the national average. Since World War II it has been taken for granted that the United States, with the world's highest standard of living, has eliminated poverty. For 80 percent of the population this is true, and this 80 percent assumes it is the same for all.

The American poor are incomparably luckier than the poor of Asia and Africa and the Middle East, who die by the hundreds on the streets. But poverty is measured according to the standards of a man's own community.

If most of America is well fed, the man who can't find three meals a day for his family is poor. If most of America has modern weatherproof housing, the man whose home is leaky and has no piped water is poor. If most of America has enough medical care to stay alive until age 70, the man who can't afford to live beyond age 55 is poor. Such a man is poor statistically. But he is also poor in a far more damaging way: He is a failure in his neighbor's eye and in his own.

Most of the poor are helpless victims of a social upheaval they could neither foresee nor control. Farms are becoming great mechanized operations, surviving through science, size, and big investment. In the process country people are being squeezed off the land—more than a million a year—and are fleeing to the cities.

The traditional urban foothold for the novice from the country is the unskilled job, and this is being eliminated by automation. Nevertheless, the city has much excitement, some jobs, and a tradition that the starving shall be fed. At this moment, millions of rural Americans are merely waiting for the busfare or the hint of a job, or for the last vestige of family loyalty to die so that they can flee the rural misery

they know for the risk of urban misery unknown.

Willie Johnson is a short, stocky West Virginian. He is 55 years old, which means that society expects at least 7 more years of work from him before he qualifies for a social security pension. Like his father, he went into the coal mines at age 13 and worked steadily. Twelve years ago he was earning more than $100 a week. Today he earns nothing. He will probably never work again.

"If a man looks hard enough," the middle-class belief goes, "he will find some work." This is hard to believe in Logan County. It is one of the 230 counties of southern Appalachia, the beautiful mountain region that runs from West Virginia to northern Alabama, where 7 million Americans are gasping from economic suffocation. In all of Appalachia the three main ways to earn money—farming, lumbering, and mining—need ever fewer men. In Logan County, where mining is the sole source of money, there were 14,000 men in the mines in 1954 when Willie Johnson last held a job. Now there are only 3,500.

With 10,000 families out of work in one small county, the men who get no welfare because they are not crippled or have no dependents live in abandoned shacks or friends' woodsheds, and no one is sure how they stay alive.

Willie Johnson's family is on maximum relief in the county. Each month they get $165. Rent is low, $27 a month (four rooms, leaky roof, no running water). Electricity is $7.50. This leaves $130.50 for everything else.

With eight children at home, it is not an easy choice between shoes, books and food. Books in the public high school cost $28 a year; this can be prohibitive. When he was in the ninth grade, the oldest son, young Willie, dropped out of school so the younger ones could stay in.

"First 2 weeks we have it right smart," Willie Johnson says of their diet. Breakfast is eggs, salt pork and brown gravy. Lunch is a bowl of pinto beans. Supper may be two fryers for 10, potatoes, beans, milk for the children and coffee for the parents.

The last 2 weeks bring a pinch known to millions of the poor: By then, small catastrophes have occurred—a schoolchild's shoes have literally fallen apart and one has to spent $4 for a new pair that will disintegrate in the first rain, or $8 for a pair that will last. The night they had an unexpected visitor the 10 Johnsons were having berries picked from the back hill, mixed with flour. It was on the 25th of the month, with a week more to go before the next welfare check.

For two Christmases there have been no presents in the Johnson household. The children have never seen a movie. An old television set is broken. The last time a doctor was in the house was 1951. Recreation? "I don't know the meaning of it," Willie Johnson said without rancor.

He mostly sits on his sagging porch in a sagging tubed chair, looking at the melancholy hills around him. From his chair he can see, high and shadowy on a distant ridge, a strip mine that produces 40 railroad cars of coal a day. When he was young, it employed 500 men. Today it produces the same amount of coal with 20 men. Young Willie spends a lot of time sitting on the porch too.

Johnson goes to bed at sundown, in one of the four beds in which the 10 members of the family sleep.

"I pray every night. My boy, he wants to be a mechanic. This girl of mine, she's 14, she wants to be a teacher. They talk about this and while they're talking I'm hoping and at night I pray: They've got to get out of here."

The farmer has always been the folk image of the perfect American—hard working, self-reliant, prospering from his own labor, and beholden to no man. Farmers and farmworkers are today among the poorest people in the United States. Forty acres and a mule no longer will support a family. It takes at least 325 acres for an average American standard of living, plus good credit at the bank, and heavy investment in fertilizers, weed killers, and complicated machinery.

The brutal fact is that most farmers are not really needed anymore. Fifty years ago each one grew enough food and fiber for 7 people; today he provides for 24. It is not surprising that in the last 10 years 8 million Americans left their farms for the cities. At this moment there are over 1.5 million young men between 10 and 19 growing up on farms, but in the next 10 years there will be only 150,000 openings for farm operators. Yet most farmers still retain their compulsive desire to make things grow, and their bitter love for the land.

Columbus Cooper is 57 years old. His father owned his own farm and divided the land among his male children. Cooper started clearing his 26 acres when he was 16 years old. He built his present house with his own hands, an unpainted pine clapboard cottage. On a rainy day recently he looked out on his land in Sumter County, S.C., at the sagging tobacco shed, the drizzle glistening on the small tractor and moistening the rust on his 6-year-old car. For him, too the revolution was a perpetual puzzle.

"Things are kind of standing still. That's what's worrying me. I'd like to redeem myself, but the expenses are growing. Things could break bad for me if I can't stop this expense and pay back my indebtedness * * *. Sometimes I can't sleep nights trying to solve my problems."

It is generally agreed that a farmer in the United States, if he wants to live at an ordinary standard of living, needs to gross at least $10,000 a year cash income. Columbus Cooper, with a family of 12, grosses $1,500.

He is no rarity in American farming. There are 350,000 full-time family farms that average $438 a year in sales. Because he is a Negro he is worse off than most. More than 40 percent of all Negroes in rural areas have less than $1,000 a year income. Rural whites are better off, but not much; 50 percent earn less than $3,000; 20 percent, less than $1,000.

Cooper, a thoughtful man who dresses neatly and looks out steadily through shell-rimmed glasses, cannot quote national statistics. But he knows that 4 years ago he had to mortgage the farm for the first time for $2,000 at 7-percent interest. Since then he has reduced it to $1,500, sometimes with bales of cotton. But each year he has less money to start the next crop and has to borrow for seed, fertilizer, and fuel to cure his tobacco.

He grows most of the vegetables they eat—cabbage, collards, turnips, peas, beans—and spends $600 a year for store food: rice, flour and occasionally stew meat. If the cow is milking, the children get milk. In summer he and the boys may catch pike, bream or catfish. In winter and fall they hunt for squirrel, which Mrs. Cooper boils and then fries.

He pays $400 a year on his tractor, $85 for kerosene to cure his tobacco, $200 for fertilizer. Clothes, mostly shoes, cost about $150 a year. All his older children finished 12th grade and the rest plan to; he carries heavy insurance—at $200 a year—to try to guarantee it. But this already is $1,635, and provides nothing on his mortgage or on the $300 he still owes on his car. Nor for medical and dental bills. Or anything else.

Mrs. Cooper is a younger, round-faced serious woman who thinks she works harder than her mother, who worked very hard. "I do a lot of mending and altering hand-me-downs, but you know older girls in school."

Their living room was neat ("the roof leaks in 2 or 3 places but not bad") with clean yellow curtains on the windows, an old but scrubbed linoleum, 2 sofas used for sleeping in summer (there are 7 beds for 12 people), and a piano given them by an aunt in North Carolina.

"Jo Earl, she's 15, takes lessons. They cost 60 cents a week. It's a lot for us, but I think the girls ought to have something like that," Mr. Cooper said.

At Christmas they spend about $2 for each child. "Birthdays there aren't presents, but we do eat something special, like chicken or sweet bread."

A doctor was last in the house 4 years ago. When toothaches are unbearable the children go to a dentist in town at $3 a visit.

When Cooper wishes out loud, he wishes he could pay cash to start each crop instead of going into debt. He wishes he could get a Government loan to clear 20 more acres and thus increase his income.

"But mostly I hope my kids do better than I'm doing. They'll have to achieve something on their own, and they'll have to study for that, learn modern farming, or a trade like brickmasonry. But I hope they won't have to leave home. Oh, I hope they won't. But I want them to do better than I have."

"Those who labor in the earth," wrote Thomas Jefferson, "are the chosen people of God."

But Jefferson didn't know the migrant workers, the 2 or 3 million Americans who work on other people's farms. They move like nomads from farm to farm and from State to State. They live in the worst squalor, the most hopeless family chaos, and the most ignored poverty of the American poor.

Theirs is a strange existence. Their seasonal movements are charted on maps like those of the birds, but more is known about birds than about these human beings. They are almost outside the normal workings of American society—except that their hands pick the Nation's fruit and vegetables.

They are constantly crossing State lines, but are exempt from Federal minimum-wage laws for workers in interstate commerce. They are almost never eligible for welfare, since they do not live long enough in one place. They do not get unemployment compensation when they are out of work, or workmen's compensation when they are injured.

In 1960 the average migrant worker earned $1,016. Where there are families, they all work. It is hard to get anyone to admit there is still any child labor, but in 1959 a special U.S. census showed 457,000 children between the ages of 10 and 15 employed in agriculture.

If you drive north from Miami on Route 441, you will see no sign of migrants unless, somewhere along a 30-mile stretch north of Fort Lauderdale, you turn off onto dirt roads, bump into still smaller roads and run into 1 of the 90 clusters of shacks in the tall grass where 35,000 migrant workers work during the winter. They hope to earn enough money to move north for picking in the summer, and then have enough at season's end to get back south again.

This year desperation ran through the camps. One Thursday it began to rain in flooding sheets, and 2 days later the last of the bean crop was ruined. It was a severe financial loss for the farmers, but it meant starvation for the pickers.

Mildred Mason—not her real name—is 18 years old. She had an illegitimate child when she was 15, but the baby died of dysentery. This is not unusual. She now is legally married, has two healthy children and appears to be in firm control of her life. This is unusual.

She and her husband Joe live in a one-room shack. There are no windows, only hinged boards. Fleas and flies are so thick nobody troubles to brush them off anymore.

The only source of heat and cooking is an open fire outside their doorway. Water comes from a pump that serves 11 other shacks.

Mr. Mason can make $36 or $42 a week, and Mildred makes $20 or $30. But they do not make this very week. In 1959 the average days worked by all migrant workers was 143, and work gets harder to find as automatic machinery learns to plant, weed, and pick. Cotton used to be a 6-dollar-a-day crop 6 months a year. Now it is closer to 60 days. Yet migrants continue to appear, like the Masons coming mostly from sharecropping, where there is now no work whatever.

The Masons see the handwriting on the wall but do not know what to do about it. Last May they left Florida after 6 months work with $25 to show for it. They arrived, 2 days and nights of continuous riding later, in Cedarville, N.J., with $14 left. The strawberry crop in New Jersey was 10 days late, so they—two adults and a child, with one on the way—tried to stretch the $14 until the crop was ready. After a summer of picking—with time off while she was sick—they returned to Florida with $3.

Mildred Mason is slender, solemn, and possessed of an uncommon poise. But now she spoke in a rush: "I don't want my husband picking crops anymore and I don't want my children to. I'm tired of worrying about crops being ready, worrying if it's going to rain, worrying if there'll be a storm. I want food for my kids, a house that doesn't have rats or bugs, that has windows in it, a house where the wind won't come through the wall and the rain won't come in like there was no roof at all. I want my kids to have an education. It's awfully hard to get a job without an education. We're good pickers. But I never in my whole life had more than $40 cash at one time. Right now I don't have a single penny."

Her eyes filled and she looked fierce as her 6-month-old child crawled to her feet and stuck a fist into his mouth.

"I don't have a single penny and no food. But I don't care. I don't want to go up that road anymore."

—

José Chico is a powerful, barrel-shaped American Indian who calculates that he is 61 years old. During the first 30 years of his life he lived pretty much as his forefathers did in the year A.D. 1500. Like others in the Papago tribe in southern Arizona, he dwelt in adobe houses, grazed cattle, coaxed crops out of the grudging soil, hunted deer and rabbit in the mountains. The tribes were ruled by village elders in remote family clusters in what is still some of the most lonely and inaccessible inhabited land in the United States. Their ancestors have been there for about 5,000 years, and, like most of the 500,000 American Indians, his people are repulsed by personal aggressiveness and by failure to work for family and tribe. The mastery of the quiet Indian was his instinct for catching deer, his ingenuity in trapping flashfloods to sustain desert gardens, the incredible sensitivity to the austere land and its life. But now this is all wrong. The lack of personal aggressiveness in a competitive labor market becomes apathy and laziness. The sensitivity to nature becomes quaint confusion in the city. Family and tribe are no help on the paved streets of Phoenix and Chicago. In less than a lifetime, José Chico's world has leaped ahead 500 years.

José Chico, cataracts forming over his eyes, peers over the desert range, at the giant cactus, the golden paloverde trees, the scarlet punctuation of the ocotillo, the purple mystery of mountain and mesa—the visible evidence that the tribe is rich in nature, since they own 4,000 square miles of this land. Yet starvation is endemic among them.

Like his father, he still coaxes a usable garden out of the desert, he still does some herding of cattle for others. In addition, he picks some cotton to make about $500 a year to support his wife and five children. He gets surplus Federal foods. But still there is not enough cash.

Two of his sons attend a mission high school in New Mexico, their tuition and board paid by the church. But he got a letter saying they needed shoes. The $30 he had saved for food for the month of May went by return mail.

José Chico stood by the corner of the well-made adobe house and the neat ocotillo-branch corral he has proudly maintained his whole life. He was somber. What did his children paln to do to make a living after they finished high school in New Mexico?

He stared at the questioner as long as it is courteous for an Indian to look at anyone without speaking. Then he looked back at the shadows stretching out over the desert.

"I don' know," he said, "Come back home with me, I think. Maybe, I hope."

"George, you obscenity-head. You know what today is? You know, you dumb bastard. Today is Sunday, April 14, Easter. And you know what that means? That means a bottla wine is gonna cost you 85 cents."

A half-human sound: "All I got is an obscenity 70 cents."

"Thass what I'm telling' ya, you cheap obscenity. The only way you're gonna get a bottle today is from the bootleggers. There ain't no 50-cent bottles today. There ain't no sales."

The animal sound came plaintively again. "All I got is 70 cents."

"Why, you cheap bastard. You got 5 bucks downstairs advance rent. Got get it, you cheap bastard. You know today's Easter."

From a distant cage a voice groaned.

Nearby someone vomited.

Another voice cried out in sleep.

You walk down both long flights of stairs, past the flophouse sign that reads, "Clean, Quiet, No Drunks." Outside, a man's body was sprawled across the curb, half in and half out of the gutter, an empty wine bottle near his hand.

The Easter sun was just up, pouring yellow, horizontal, and thick down West Madison Street like a searchlight. There was no sound, but moving ghostlike through the blinding light were dozens of men, shuffling, wandering, moving noiselessly in the middle of the street, along the side of buildings, men who walk all night because they have no place to sleep or who have slept in doorways and are in the sun trying to warm muscles gone stiff from sleeping on concrete. A few purposeful men already rifle the trash barrels for the treasured empty bottles, worth half a cent each toward the golden goal of 50 cents, the price of one pint of red fluid marked port, which acts on foodless bodies to produce a strange narcosis through which some men choose to die slowly, all for 50 cents a pint. Except that this was Easter and you would have to spend at least 85.

This was skid row in Chicago, one of the areas in the country's 100 largest cities where men congregate to accompany each other over the edge of civilized life and then over the edge of life itself.

But these wrecks are not typical of the poor. They are only a few hundred thousand of the more than 30 million poor. Actually, they constitute only 60 percent of skid row inhabitants. The rest are aging bachelors, maybe former seamen or truck-drivers, who have come to skid row to live as cheaply as they can or because they prefer its naked drama to life in a respectable middle-class rooming house.

My flophouse room was a steel cage, a windowless hole with ugly mustard-colored corrugated steel walls. It was 8 feet long, too narrow to stretch the arms wide in, and 8 feet high, the top covered with chicken wire. Inside was a locker, a broken wooden stool and a cot with one sheet, one blanket and lice. On the whole floor of the building—where my cage was No. 270—the stench was solid, sticking in the throat for days after, a mixture of urine, vomit, dirty socks, sweaty bodies and smells unidentifiable. It was a place easy to leave for the rough excitement of Saturday night on skid row. For the huge bar—"Full Shot Beer, 25 cents"—where a casual inquiry brought a cold, "You ask too goddam many questions." For the all-night movie: "It's a good joint; they let you sleep but you gotta watch out you don't wake up and maybe your shoes is gone." Or the mission where a lugubrious sermon on Sodom and Gomorrah was preached to 18 soundly sleeping men.

Back in the flophouse the sounds are much like those of men dying. The maids usually find one man dead each morning among the 38 flophouses.

"O Lord," an old man's voice cried out in the night. "O Lord, have mercy on my soul. O Lord, I'm sick. I'm dying. Please, O Lord, have mercy on my soul."

A voice from the next cubicle barked, "Shut up, you bastard."

Other men got the shakes as they lay on their cots, the terrible shivering of a man addicted to wine and now having withdrawal symptoms cured only by a new drink. Only during their fitful sleep do fragments from the past float to the surface of men's minds, like the cry in the night, "Where's my dad? Where's my dad?" and the wild sobbing.

Edmund MacIntosh had been depending on the theory that hard-boiled eggs and opened cans of meat need no refrigeration. And he was sick.

He had also depended on the theory that if you work hard, live frugally and mind your own business you will get by without help. And now he was 74 years old and needed help.

MacIntosh, to use a descriptive but not a real name, depended on hard-boiled eggs because his Los Angeles hotel room has no refrigerator, and he cannot afford to eat out. He is trying to live on his $50-a-month social security check. Room rent is $38.50 a month, which provides a room with clean linen every 2 weeks and clean towels every day. The remainder goes for food and chewing tobacco. Every week friends on the same floor do his shopping for him: 2 dozen eggs, seven small cans of V-8 juice, two cans of meat, a carton of dry cereal and his tobacco. He boils the eggs at once and eats them morning and evening. He stretches a can of meat for 3 days or so. He has just discovered that hard-boiled eggs and canned meat need refrigeration in warm weather.

MacIntosh has a solid, dignified manner, even as he lies on his bed, propped on an elbow, his square-jawed face ashen. He looks vital, but he has dizzy spells, and so fears to walk outside. "I'm afraid I'll fall down, and the cops will think I'm a wino. That happened to a friend of mine, and when I couldn't find $21 bail money for him he got 30 days."

His response to the present problem is one of hurt rather than anger. He was always able to earn money. He finished high school in North Carolina and 2 years in a military institute. He was in the Navy in World War I, married a Georgia girl, had a daughter and after the war bought a newsstand on Times Square in New York and made $2,500 a year. When the depression ended that he worked in a Baltimore hospital, then in the late 1930's got back to newspaper distribution in Washington at $3,000 a year. He joined the Navy the day after Pearl Harbor and was on a troop transport at Midway when he got the letter saying his wife was getting a divorce.

After the war he became a watchman at a California airbase for $38 a week with free room; then a railroad guard at $80 a week, until 1954, when the railroad began laying off men.

Then he came to Los Angeles—"because it's warmer here, and that helps"—and be-

gan doing a variety of odd jobs. He had a regular clientele for lawn cutting until automation reached him in its own way. "People began getting those power mowers. That was the end of me."

He had known he was eligible for social security but let it pile up. When the power mowers took over, he collected an accumulated $1,250 and began his $50 a month. He bought a suit of clothes and prepared for the rest of his days. But it became apparent $50 a month would not care for the rest of his days. He sold his TV set when he was economizing. But this only brought $15.50. He is down to $250 of his nest egg and needs medical care for his stomach, his dizziness, his failing eyesight. And he needs something to help through his loneliness. "I got a letter a year ago. It was from the bank telling me how much I had left."

Edmund MacIntosh is 1 of 8 million Americans who form the aged poor. He lives, or tries to, on $600 a year. There are 1.5 million lone individuals who live on less, tucked away in the cheapest roominghouses. Millions of others live in poverty as couples. These are the lonely old people known mostly to welfare workers, to postmen delivering the social security checks on the first of the month, and to the firemen who carry the elderly outdoors when an alarm flushes them out of the geriatric warrens.

When Edmund MacIntosh was a boy, there were fewer than 4 million Americans over 65. Today there are more than 16 million. In 1920 more than 30 percent of the aged were working, today only 20 percent work. Science is keeping them alive longer but it is taking away their jobs, making them obsolete.

MacIntosh did nothing wrong in planning for his old age, but his plans were not good enough. And now he needs help.

"What I need most is medical attention. I need a suit of clothes. I'd like to go to church. I'd love to go to a picture show. And if I had some good company, I guess that would be pretty good."

Into the cities they pour, refugees from a silent revolution.

We are in the midst of a great upheaval in American life. In the last four decades 27 million people have flocked to Metropolis. It is a greater migration than the one from Europe, which at its height—from 1880 to 1920—brought 21 million newcomers to America's cities.

In Chicago the white folk from the countryside come mostly by Trailways bus, carrying all they own—a suitcase tied with rope, an old trunk, three shopping bags, a folded baby buggy, a bag of grits— and clutching a letter from a relative, who came earlier, with an address and a warning: "Don't take the cabs, they'll cheat you."

If they are colored, they come mostly by that great iron artery in southern Negro life, the Illinois Central Railroad, getting off in awe under the largest building they ever saw, carrying their old suitcases and trunks, cardboard boxes with clothes and pans—and they, too, bring a carefully written address, an address that may no longer exist, because newcomers go to the slums, and massive redevelopment is turning numerous urban slums into vacant lots or luxury apartments.

If they are American Indians, they may come in rickety old cars from the Dakotas and Utah and Arizona, fleeing the hunger of the reservations, making Chicago the fourth-largest concentration of Indians in the United States.

But it is not just Chicago. It is the same in New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, Atlanta, St. Louis—all the great cities. Almost all of the newcomers are poor, and most of them remain poor.

There are enormous differences in each person's response to adversity, and this has led to the assumption by some people that poverty makes one more noble. This was never true for most of the poor, nor is it now. Yet the belief persists that the poor, compared with the affluent, ought to be more honest, more resourceful, more puritanical, more disciplined, more resilient against despair, more emotionally stable and simultaneously more aggressive and more submissive. They are not. Poverty is the pressure of living at the bottom of the social sea, and this pressure finds the weakness in every personality. Poverty is dirty, hungry, cold in winter, broiling in summer, and worst of all it is lonely and self-reproaching.

The modern American immigrant comes at an unhappy time. The unskilled job, foothold for the newcomer, is being replaced by machines. From 1947 to 1961 twice as many new people entered the labor force as there were new jobs to be had. From 1957 to 1962, industrial production went up 20 percent, but there were 1 million fewer factory jobs. The new openings are in white-collar, professional and managerial work, and these are the jobs for which the untrained poor are totally unsuited.

Today's cities are stranger to the American rural poor than were Boston and New York to the European immigrants of the turn of the century. All Americans 2 generations ago were learning to live in the city, and the Europeans often were city folk of long standing. Today's rural migrants come from simple homes and shacks. Back in the small towns whole lifetimes were spent in face-to-face personal relations that stayed stable. But in the city these are replaced by impatient people who talk fast, and demand applications in triplicate. The punctuality and impersonality of city jobs seem depressing.

In school the children of newcomers are, in the fifth grade, two grades below city children of the same age, a reflection of the slower paced education that existed where they came from.

The final irony is that today it costs more to be poor. Children must go to school: thus law as well as custom demands a higher standard of living. And the family without a car is lacking what has become a basic tool of American living: The factories and shopping centers have fled to the suburbs, as have the experienced city dwellers. The poor find it harder to compete for jobs, and they pay more for their food than those with cars. They feel more isolated than ever.

"You mean you want to take a look at a hillbilly?"

Homer Burleigh, 33, out of Anniston, Ala.—hefty, freckle faced and sandy haired—stood in the doorway of his flat, dressed in T-shirt and slacks, immobile with resentment. Like 20,000 other southern whites now living in the 2½ square miles of Chicago's Uptown, he has his troubles, his pride, and an innate suspicion of the city slicker.

But he is too good natured to stay sullen. Inside, four of his five children, ranging from 2 to 7 years old, ran about in underpants. His wife, a wan, tired woman, was pregnant. The 5-year-old chanted at the visitor, "You got on a necktie. You got on a necktie."

Once Homer Burleigh decides he likes you, he is an engaging man. His mother had died when was 3. As he tells it, he had fought with his stepmother, gone with an uncle to Detroit; and, by persistent trial and a winning honesty about his lack of experience but his desire to learn, was soon earning $100 a week. Two years later, with a 1940 Chevrolet and $3,000 in savings he went back to Anniston. "Between me and the car and a few good-looking women, that $3,000 didn't last 10 months."

Like many southern white men, he shifted from the North, when plants shut down or work slackened, to the $40-a-week jobs back home in Alabama. Then he met his wife, a waitress with a child by a previous marriage. They decided to get married and try Chicago. Four days after his arrival he was earning $100 a week on a punch press.

In the next 7 years there were four more children, more rent, more food, more medical bills. They learned to make his pay stretch fairly well until work began to slacken. He couldn't support his family on less than 40 hours' work, so when his plant went on short time he went out and found another job working full time. But this meant he built up no seniority, and when the new plant had to lay off men, he, being the last hired, would be the first fired.

A familiar set of walls moved in on him. Machine-shop work in the city went on shorter time. He had the almost universal desire for a car and the $60 a month on his 1954 Pontiac became harder than ever to squeeze out of his $300 take-home pay. He developed running sores under his arms that interfered with his work. The finance company attached his pay. So Homer Burleigh committed folly. He got a new social security number and drew his pay under another name, to balk the finance company.

A doctor gave him a letter saying he should not work. He applied for welfare aid, which would take about 2 weeks to be processed and during those weeks he kept on working.

When I saw Homer Burleigh, his welfare had been cut off because of fraud. He did not know what would happen about the social security number. He said the finance company had seized the car. Because he was out of work and without welfare aid for a month, he had fallen behind in his rent, and he was going to be evicted in 4 days. Already the furnishings of normal life were beginning to fall away. One room of the flat was bare except for a sewing machine in the middle of the room, one chair and a caged parakeet in the corner. The living room had two pieces of furniture, a sofa, and a TV set.

"If the arm continues this way and if they don't give me assistance," he said gloomily, "I'm going to have to put the kids in a home."

Homer Burleigh is a likable man who reacted foolishly to a crisis. Whether society punishes him is yet to be seen. But there remain his wife, five children and a sixth expected, and whether they head down the road to perpetual dependence upon others will be governed by how farsighted society is in dealing with the poor, the foolish, and the unlucky.

"I'm going to be a lawyer," said Harry, aged 6. "Lawyers make good money. I'm going to keep my money."

"I'm going to be a doctor," said his 7-year-old brother firmly, "and I'm going to take care of my family."

Their 8-year-old sister announced serenely, "I'm going to be a nurse in a big hospital and wear a real uniform and help people."

The sweet optimism of youth could have been heard in millions of American homes, but this home was rather special.

Though it was midafternoon, the tenement was dark. Gray plastic sheeting was tacked to the insides of the windows. Plaster was off part of the ceiling and walls, and strands of hair on laths trembled with the passing wind from outside. Double doors opened onto the kitchen, which was almost invisible. Its windows, too, were sealed with opaque plastic, presumably to preserve heat. But the darkness was thickened by a crisscross of clotheslines that filled the room with hanging rags of clothes. In one corner of the kitchen was a table with three legs and one chair. In another was a stove bearing a pan of cold soapy water with clothes soaking, next to it a pan of cold beans and beside that a crusted frying pan bearing one single short rib congealed with fat. Through one kitchen door was a bathroom with the toilet boarded over; it had frozen

and burst in the winter cold. Through another door was the kids' room, two beds for seven children. Neither bed had a mattress; the children slept on the springs.

"Look at this book I got from school," Harry said. "Want to hear me read?"

Harry read about Dick and Jane and their dog, Spot. Dick and Jane were cleancut, well-dressed Anglo-Saxon children who lived behind a white picket fence in a red-roofed cottage with geraniums in the window. Their mother was a smiling blond with clear, square teeth. Their father wore a snap-brim hat, a conservative suit, and carried a briefcase. And they all lived happily in a schoolbook called "Friends and Neighbors."

Little Harry might as well have been reading science fiction. His own family had never in his memory eaten a meal together—there were not enough chairs, dishes, or forks. The mother's role or the oldest daughter's at mealtime was to watch as each child took a portion of the pot on the stove to make sure no one took more than his share.

But Harry was still eager to please. He had not yet learned that other people expected him to be like Dick and his sister to be like Jane, to have parents like Dick and Jane's, to live in a house like Dick and Jane, and that as a Negro slum kid all of this was as remote to him as the canals of Mars. And unless he were uncommonly lucky, this book and the school would soon seem as remote.

The Martins—a fictitious name—are living off welfare. They came from McCrory, Ark., 6 years before, and Martin got a job at $84 a week in a meatpacking plant. Last year the plant moved away, and the family went on welfare. Last winter a newborn child whose crib was a supermarket basket died of pneumonia. Martin began drinking and has been more or less drunk ever since.

Mrs. Martin looks weary and bewildered, huddling in the perpetual twilight of their tenement, fearful of the outside world. She was hard to picture as a young woman entering a new city with excitement—until I asked when she had last bought a dress. She stared blankly and then for the first time her eyes lost their emptiness and she smiled. Her voice had a kind of life it had not had before, so much so the children stopped talking and listened in amazement.

WHO ARE THE POOR?

Average family income in 1960 was $6,800, certainly not "poor." But "average" is an abstraction. If a man with an income of $200,000 a year lives in a mansion and the only other house on the block belongs to his chauffeur, with $4,000 a year, the average income for that block is $102,000—which tells nothing about either inhabitant. Something like this has happened nationally.

Half of all American families earn less than $5,600. Almost one-third earn less than $4,000; 22 percent earn less than $3,000; 13 percent earn less than $2,000; and 5 percent of our families earn less than $1,000.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics regards $1,500 in cash and benefits—free food and fuel, for example—as necessary for a lone individual to live modestly. And in 1959 the U.S. Department of Labor surveyed 20 American cities to find what is a "modest but adequate" family budget. The average was about $6,000, of which a family of four spent about $4,000 for food, shelter, taxes, medical and working expenses.

If the lowest adequate income for an individual is $500 and that for a family $2,000, there are still 20 million Americans who fail to meet those standards. As the standards rise, so do the totals. If the minimums are raised to $1,000 and $3,000, there are 36 million poor. If to $2,000 and $4,000, there are 54 million.

Assuming that 36 million qualify as poor, one can identify a number of groups composing this total, some of them overlapping. About 8 million live in rural areas, mostly on farms. About 8 million are aged poor. About 7 million fall into that group of obsolescent citizenry, the "unskilled workers"—people who wash dishes, work in hospitals, drift in and out of similar simple labor. About 500,000 are American Indians. A few hundred thousand are derelicts on skid rows. Among these groups are the semipermanently unemployed: Coal miners, steelworkers, meatcutters, autoworkers—families of men who once worked for the most respectable wages in industry but who have now been replaced by machinery.

Most noticeable of the poor is the Negro, once concentrated in the rural South, now two-thirds in the cities. Many went from field to factory during World War II and the Korean war, when labor was in demand; but being the last hired, they were the first fired when automation or recession came. Negroes still average 40 percent less than whites in wages and have double the white unemployment rate. They are 22 percent of the American poor—double their proportion of the population. But, numerically, the great majority of the poor are white.

Poverty is not particular to any region. It is a normal reservoir in all rural areas. It is a migratory stream of desperation headed for the cities. And it is now a festering concentration in every metropolis in the land.

HER LAST GOOD DRESS

"It was 6 years ago. We was making good money at the meat plant and he took me out to a dress shop. When he saw how much I liked that dress, he said 'Honey, you get it.' It cost $30. Oh, that was a dress, I mean it really was a dress. It was pink, and it was cut a lot lower than this one and it had sequins all over, and they shined and shined and the pink was so pretty."

The girl from McCrory, Ark., was for the first time identifiable as a woman with a range of emotions. Then the face began to sag again. She wiped her hands automatically on the sides of her stained dress, and one could see that her slip was held up with pieces of knotted twine.

Outside, Sister Mary William, the young, tall, indomitable Irish nun who strode through Chicago's West Side, looked down the endless line of row houses, at the trash barrels lolling on their sides, the broken glass laid like a glistening carpet as far as the eye could see. It was the sight her own father had looked at when he first visited from St. Louis and asked his daughter in dismay, "What was it you did that was so bad they sent you here?"

She crunched the broken glass under her awkward black shoes and said, "You figure out what's going to happen to Harry Martin when he finds out he's never going to be a lawyer. And his brother's never going to be a doctor. And his sister's never going to be a nurse. The worst most of us have to resign ourselves to is that there's no Santa Claus. Wait until this hits those kids."

Poverty is like cancer. Left to itself, it will generally get worse. There is no simple cure. And elementary humanity requires that the sufferer be cared for.

Welfare payments are inescapable. Families in the city cannot create their own food and shelter without work, and in a rapidly developing industrial country it is inevitable that some men will have their work suddenly withdrawn. If the poverty that follows is not to be multiplied by the deprived children, and if industrial society is to remain civilized, such families cannot be left to starvation and exposure.

Yet simple money payments do not solve the problem. What is needed is intelligent work to help the poor to self-sufficiency. Many need to be taught the subtle skills of city living. The unemployed have to be kept in touch with jobs and new skills, for the poor live in isolation from the world of success.

The best work among the poor is done by those who live among them. The poor are submissive, but they are also suspicious. It is "us" and "them," and the social worker who is one of "them" seldom gets anywhere.

It is impossible to cross the United States in pursuit of poverty without being impressed by its paradox: the continuing vigor of the land and the strong pulse of humanity among its people. And yet poverty continues to be the fate of one American in five. This does not mean that America is callous about its poor. It means that most comfortable Americans have come to believe that the poor do not exist at all.

This belief is dangerous. It is easier than ever to avoid seeing the poor, but it is also more perilous. Each year the poor become more densely packed into the centers of our cities, ever more isolated from the hopes and satisfactions of normal American life. While this is happening, the demands increase for education and skill in order to earn a living. Thus, the poor get packed tighter together while their hope of rising becomes dimmer. There are persistent rumors that Communists are running food and propaganda into the starving populations of Kentucky and West Virginia. It would be ironic if they should undermine a proud people's faith in the future, and in the midst of a country that has a strong tradition for helping the unfortunate.

Time is running out on the fuse of poverty. To look into the faces of the poor in America is heartrending but the situation is not yet hopeless.

There is not yet the frozen, bitter cynicism of the Old World poor. Their children are not yet taught to hate those who have money. Their parents, most of them, still feel a sense of obligation to work for something better. To look on José Chico's face was one of obstinate hope, on Homer Burleigh's of belligerent pride, on Columbus Cooper's of quiet courage. They still expect—without much proof—that it is abnormal for them to be poor. When that expectation goes, this country will have changed.

"Poverty in the midst of plenty," the late President Kennedy said shortly before he was killed, "is a paradox that must not go unchallenged, because there are men, women and children who need intelligent help.

"But comfortable Americans have another reason for challenging poverty, for to turn their backs on those in need would tarnish the noblest element in the American character."

TRANSACTION OF SENATE BUSINESS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 249, the Acting President pro tempore, on December 31, 1963, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 9499) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"THE KENNEDY STAR"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a poem written on the occasion of the death of President Kennedy be printed in the RECORD. It is titled: "The Kennedy Star," and was written by Rex Trowbridge of Sisters, Oreg.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY STAR

There's a new star in heaven tonight,
An orb in outer space—silvery bright:
Symboled for all the world to see,
A martyr's mark, the light of liberty.

There's a new star in heaven tonight,
Triumph of right o'er the devil's might:
The roll of muffled drums, flags unfurled;
"Ring Freedom's Bell!" heartbeat of the world.

Bells for our martyr—ring,
Marking mankind's travail:
"Oh death, where is thy sting?"
God's mercy will prevail.

"Flame of freedom," in heaven tonight,
Beacon of hope, and celestial light:
Let your heart be thrilled anew—
"The Kennedy Star" is shining for you.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. ALEX RADIN TO THE WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSOCIATION OF SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech given on December 12, 1963, to the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association in Seattle, Wash., by Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY ALEX RADIN, GENERAL MANAGER, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING OF WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS' ASSOCIATION, SEATTLE, WASH., DECEMBER 12, 1963

Many things of great importance to your organization and to the Northwest have happened since your last annual meeting. Construction was begun on the Hanford atomic powerplant, and our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, who played such an important part in the authorization of this project, was on hand to make the principal address at the ground-breaking ceremonies. The Bonneville marketing area bill has been approved by both the Senate and the House, with only one major difference—the Westland amendment—separating the conferees and preventing final agreement on the bill. Improvements were made in the Bonneville payout procedure, and the Bonneville marketing area was extended into southern Idaho. Oral argument was held by the Federal Power Commission on the Washington Public Power Supply System's application to build the Nez Perce project, and it is likely that the Commission will issue its decision shortly—perhaps before the end of the year. Great progress was made in securing Federal appropriations for interties between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, tying together three great Federal power systems—those of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Central Valley project in California, and the Colorado River storage project.

But the event of overriding importance for the entire country if not for the world was the tragic assassination of President Kennedy. Thus, many things have changed in Washington just within the period since November 22. President Kennedy is dead. Lyndon Johnson is our new Chief Executive. While major principles undoubtedly will remain the same, it seems inevitable that there will be some changes in policies, practices and personalities in the Federal Government, for no two men could be expected to conduct the office of the Presidency in precisely the same manner.

Despite conjecture about people and programs, there is a strong sense of continuity in the transition of leadership. The distance between Boston and Austin may be great in terms of geography, but not necessarily in terms of philosophy. President Kennedy took pride in the fact that his administration had not permitted "another Hells Canyon blunder." President Johnson actively supported the high Hells Canyon Dam during his tenure in the Senate, and he had an excellent voting record on public power and rural electrification issues during his long service both in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

He cast a number of votes in favor of appropriations for Bonneville transmission lines, including those of a controversial nature. Twice he voted for authorization of a high Hells Canyon Dam as a Federal project. He voted in favor of TVA steamplants and TVA revenue bond legislation, and in opposition to the Dixon-Yates contract. He voted to authorize the Colorado River storage project. He indicated his support for local as well as Federal public power by voting for Senator MAGNUSON's amendment to authorize construction of Priest Rapids Dam by local public agencies, and for development of the Niagara project by the Power Authority of the State of New York. He voted in favor of the Gore-Holifield bill authorizing $400 million and directing AEC to construct full-scale reactors. He has a strong record in support of REA appropriations, and many times has spoken out in favor of the rural electrification program.

Thus, President Johnson has a well-established voting record on issues of concern to this group. It is not 100 percent as we would see it, but it is certainly strongly sympathetic to the programs we have espoused for full development of the Nation's water and power resources.

The unity of purpose which has been exhibited by President Johnson in assuming his high office reemphasizes in clear, compelling fashion a lesson which we in the public power movement have learned on dozens of different battlefields: If we continue to push forward objectives prepared in the past and tested by time, we can ultimately secure the solid support which is essential to success in any endeavor.

Our goal has been, and still is, more power at lower cost for all Americans. This is one reason we support Federal multiple-purpose water projects including hydroelectric features. This is why we advance the idea of common carrier transmission facilities tying together great river basin systems. This is why we fight for the right of citizens' groups to form their own utility and supply themselves with electricity, if they desire to do so.

These programs for which many of you have struggled and won were implemented not simply because they happened to be good politics, but because they were good public policy. Every taxpayer and every ratepayer has a stake in insuring that the power potential of falling water at a damsite is not wasted or given away for exploitation. The 8,600-mile regional grid maintained by the Bonneville Power Administration and the postage stamp rate it permits are benefits to jobholders in every corner of the Northwest. Each homeowner and parent in the State of Washington is aided by the work of your public utility districts and other local public agencies in reducing residential and school rates by action and example.

Because these programs are good public policy, they have won backing from all across the country. The vote of a Congressman from New York City may be essential for the building of a dam on the Columbia River, nearly 3,000 miles from his home, just as TVA was a concept fostered by a Senator from Nebraska. The economic leverage of inexpensive electricity is an idea supported by businessmen and scholars who may never see or hear of Bonneville Dam. Support for the principles of PUD's comes from union members in States throughout the Union.

And because these plans and projects furthered a common cause, representatives of consumer-owned electric systems from Florida to Maine, from Massachusetts to Texas and California, have contributed a portion of their time, effort, and prestige to help insure their implementation. Among the stanchest defenders of the preference clause are men who do not expect to ever buy or sell a kilowatt-hour of Federal power.

One of the major power issues before the current Congress is the proposed interconnection of the Northwest and the Southwest.

All parties to the controversy agree that such a tie is not only technically feasible and desirable, but also that it possesses enormous economic potential. Studies show that extra-high-voltage transmission facilities could pay for themselves in 10 short years. Estimated benefit-cost ratios run as high as 4 to 1. A hydroelectric project which could show this kind of values would be considered a rare find. The lucrative nature of this interconnection is indicated by the fact that no less than seven separate non-Federal proposals have been submitted for construction of all or part of the needed facilities.

All parties interested in the intertie agree that it will be built. Its possibilities for beneficial use are extensive. It would permit sale in California and the Southwest of energy surplus to the needs of the Northwest; last year, Federal dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries spilled water that could have produced $33 million worth of power at standard BPA rates—a sum almost twice the BPA deficit for that year. It would allow sale of the Northwest's excess peaking capacity. It would provide a means of obtaining Southwest off-peak steam to firm up substantial quantities of Northwest secondary power. It would encourage exchanges of power to take advantage of diversity in peak loads between regions.

All parties involved in the intertie proposals agree that the Northwest should be assured protection against the draining of one of the region's richest resources—its hydroelectric potential—developed and undeveloped.

What all parties do not agree upon is who should build these intertie facilities.

Our association has supported Federal construction of this regional connection. No other individual entity or combination can provide the same financial advantages—either to the Federal Government or non-Federal users. Three major Federal power systems—BPA, the Central Valley project in California, and Federal dams in the Colorado River Basin—could be linked for mutual benefit of all affected areas, and the greatest possible return on taxpayer investment in existing projects. Bulk of the exportable surplus power in the Northwest is at Federal dams. Federal facilities would be common carrier, available to all at cost. Prevention of monopoly could be assured.

While I believe that Federal interties offer the greatest advantages to electric consumers and to the national welfare, we are realistic enough to know that there are obstacles yet in the way of securing final approval and appropriations for Federal lines. For this reason I am pleased that consideration is being given by local public agencies and rural electric co-ops to alternative proposals for construction of inter-ties by consumer-owned groups, in the event that we do not achieve complete success for the Federal lines. The study and consideration of these alternatives by consumer-owned utilities

should not, however, diminish in any way our continued support for the Federal lines, which still offer the best alternative.

During the last few weeks there have been encouraging actions in the Congress which have advanced the prospects for efficient, effective, and equitable interconnection. But many obstacles remain. The House of Representatives adopted an amendment to the regional preference bill which requires new authorization for any Federal intertie.

To my knowledge this amendment was not requested by the people of the Northwest, although it was sponsored by Congressman WESTLAND of your State. I have seen no public statement to indicate that either private or public power spokesmen in this region asked for this block to construction of these lines. To my knowledge it was not sought by consumer or producer interests of the area; in fact, I see no way by which this provision would be of benefit to the Northwest. It is apparently an appendage added to a bill upon which you had previously secured agreement throughout the Northwest. The only interests that it serves are those of the private power companies of California. I believe that you should vigorously oppose this amendment.

Why is the amendment objectionable?

This amendment is not germane to S. 1007, which would define the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration and establish ground rules for the transfers of power between the Northwest and other areas.

No hearings were ever held on the amendment so that opponents might have an opportunity to present their side of the case.

The amendment is prejudicial to Federal construction of an intertie but favors non-Federal construction.

It weakens the bargaining position of the Secretary of the Interior in trying to obtain the best possible arrangements for the Federal Government and preference customers.

The amendment constitutes a deauthorization act. It takes away existing authority of the Department of the Interior to build feasible and desirable transmission lines.

It is a block to the most effective marketing of northwest surplus power, and can only delay realization of maximum revenues needed to reduce and eliminate the BPA deficit.

Full congressional review of intertie proposals has been carried out by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. These committees recommended appropriation of $8.5 million to initiate construction, subject to approval of S. 1007. But retention of this amendment will kill Congress beneficial action.

The effect of the amendment is simple to grasp. What would happen if every transmission line proposed by the Bonneville Power Administration were subject to individual legislative review—in addition to passing through the normal appropriations process? What if each transmission proposal had to gain approval by the House and Senate twice? The opportunity for killing off an advantageous program is automatically doubled.

Furthermore, is it not possible that the Westland amendment could be a double-edged sword? If it is logical for Congress to specifically authorize as well as appropriate funds for lines outside of the Bonneville area, could it not be argued later by opponents of your program that Congress also should be required to authorize transmission lines within the Bonneville area? These are the types of issues that arise when this Pandora's box is opened.

There are many outside your region who wish to work with you in creating an intertie which will aid all parties. I do not believe they seek to steal Northwest power; they want to buy your surplus and have agreed to accept the protections which you believe are needed. They look forward to exchanges of power which will be of help to every participant—and this is undoubtedly the long-range future of such a tie.

I urge that you continue to strengthen your contacts with your friends in these other areas and work together for a program which will prove of value to everyone. This is the kind of thing which public power has stood for in the past, and for which your own organization has worked so diligently.

It is a cliche, but worth repeating, even so: In unity there is strength. Unless all can benefit, then everyone may suffer.

Net benefits to the Northwest for this interconnection could run as high as $872 million over the next 50 years. The Southwest could realize net benefits of up to $883 million over the same period.

It is estimated that revenues to Bonneville Power Administration in the first 10 years would average $24.5 million annually. In a region facing the first boost in Federal power rates since 1937, this is a meaningful figure, and represents a goal which I believe is worthy of your wholehearted support.

Reflecting now upon the intertie issue, my thoughts go back to a dramatic talk given by Glenn Lee, publisher of the Tri-City Herald, at a dinner after the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Hanford project. With his typical enthusiasm Glenn painted a vivid word picture of his dreams of a western empire stretching from Alaska to Mexico—a prosperous empire that could be the Ruhr of the West. It seemed to me, as Glenn spoke, that the Pacific Northwest, with its vast hydroelectric resources, its coal deposits and its great potential for atomic power, could be the hub of this western empire. But it could become this hub only if its great power resources are interconnected with those to the north, the east, and the south. Thus, in my opinion, the interties are a key to your area's future development. The kind of dream pictured for you by Glenn Lee has been transformed into reality in the past by the great leaders of your area and of your own organization. I am confident that you will have the insight, the tenacity, and the dedication to the public good that will make this new dream a reality, too.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on December 30, 1963, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 249, 88th Congress, he did on December 31, 1963, sign an enrolled bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on December 31, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9499. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.